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SMALL MOLECULE SYNTHESIS

The synthetic scheme is shown in Supporting Figure S1 and the NMR spectra of new compounds are shown in Supporting Figures S2-S3. In short, rapamycin was acylated with the N-succinimidyld carbonate 1 according to a literature procedure that enables selective modification of the C40 position, yielding the caged rapamycin monomer 2 in 45% yield. This yield is comparable to other reported modifications of rapamycin. The tethered triple bond in 2 was then used in a highly efficient double [3+2] cycloaddition reaction with 1,4-diazidobutane in the presence of CuSO4, sodium ascorbate, and tris[(1-benzyl-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)methyl]amine (TBTA), delivering the rapamycin dimer dRap in 85% yield.

General synthesis methods. Reactions were performed under nitrogen using flame-dried glassware. CH2Cl2 was dried by MB SPS Compact solvent purification system and stored over 4 Å molecular sieve. All other reagents and solvents were used without further purification. Spectra were recorded in CDCl3, and chemical shifts are reported relative to CHCl3 (7.24 ppm for 1H NMR).

1-(5-Methoxy-2-nitro-4-prop-2-nyloxyphenyl) ethanol-caged rapamycin (2). In a flame-dried vial, rapamycin (Rap) (50.0 mg, 0.055 mmol) was dissolved in dry DCM (1.3 ml) under argon. DMAP (13.4 mg, 0.109 mmol) and 1-(5-methoxy-2-nitro-4-prop-2-nyloxyphenyl)ethyl N-succinimidyld carbonate 1 (107.0 mg, 0.273 mmol) were added. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 20 h, the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure, and the product was purified by column chromatography on SiO2 (eluted with DCM/ethyl acetate 10:1, 5:1, 2:1, 1:1), delivering 29.2 mg (45% yield) of 2 as a light yellow solid. 1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.75 (s, br, 1H), 7.07 (d, 1H), 6.36-6.21 (m, 3H), 6.17-6.04 (m, 1H), 5.95-5.84 (m, 1H), 5.54-5.36 (m, 2H), 5.25 (d, J = 5.4 Hz), 5.17-5.07 (m, 2H), 4.79-4.67 (m, 3H), 4.60-4.15 (m, 2H), 3.94 (s, 3H), 3.90-3.51 (m, 3H), 3.47-3.22 (m, 8H), 3.18-3.03 (m, 5H), 2.87-2.50 (m, 3H), 2.38-2.11 (m, 1H), 2.03-1.63 (m, 12H), 1.61-1.32 (m, 12H), 1.24-0.86 (m, 27H); MS calcd for [M + Na]• C64H90N2NaO19 1213.60, found 1213.60.

Light-cleavable rapamycin dimer (dRap). The caged rapamycin 2 (28.1 mg, 0.0235 mmol) and 1,4-diazidobutane (1.0 mg, 0.071 mmol) were dissolved in H2O (0.5 ml), t-BuOH (0.5 ml) and DCM (0.5 ml). CuSO4 • 5 H2O (0.5 mg, 0.002 mmol), tris[(1-benzyl-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)methyl]amine (TBTA, 3.8 mg, 0.007 mmol) and sodium ascorbate (4.3 mg, 0.021 mmol) were added to the solution. The reaction mixture was heated to 40 °C for 24 h. The solvents were concentrated under reduced pressure and the resulting residue was dissolved in small amount of DCM/MeOH and purified by column chromatography on SiO2 (eluted with 33% DCM in EtOAc, then 5% MeOH in EtOAc), delivering 15.3 mg (85% yield) of dRap. 1H NMR (300 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.74 (s, br, 2H), 7.63 (s, br, 2H), 7.06 (d, J = 3.0 Hz, 2H), 6.40-6.37 (m, 6H), 6.35-6.10 (m, 2H), 5.95-5.82 (m, 2H), 5.52 (dd, J = 8.7 Hz and J = 15.3 Hz, 2H), 5.37 (d, J = 9.9 Hz, 2H), 5.29-5.24 (m, 6H), 5.20-5.08 (m, 2H), 4.74 (s,
Different mechanisms may lead to the experimentally observed association of FKBP12 with either its analogs or a second bound FKBP12 protein. An additional mechanism suggests that modification of the rapamycin molecule at position C40 does not affect its ability to bind FKBP12, or form a ternary complex (pRap) with FKBP12 and FRB, which appears to deter further aggregation on that surface. This observation indicates that the FKBP12 molecule can not only bind to a modified rapamycin anchored to the surface, but can inhibit protein-protein interactions, though it remains unclear whether this bound FKBP12 can itself interact with other proteins. Thus, the experimental evidence is mostly consistent with possibility of the binding mode of dRap to FKBP12, but not with FRB, which raises questions about the structure of the dRap-FKBP12 complex and its interaction with FRB.

In order to understand why dRap does not engage in formation of a ternary complex with FKBP12 and FRB, a series of atomistic molecular dynamics simulations were conducted. First, the model setup was benchmarked against known thermodynamics parameters of Rap complexes. Next, using this setup the behavior of dRap-based protein complexes was simulated.

Different mechanisms may lead to the experimentally observed association of dRap with FKBP12 but not FRB. One such mechanism could be steric hindrance of FRB binding caused by either the second Rap structure alone or a second bound FKBP12 protein. Another mechanism suggests that the binding mode of dRap to FKBP12 may be different from that of Rap to FKBP12, thereby preventing formation of an optimal binding interface for FRB molecules. A third mechanism may involve formation of the stable complex of dRap and two FKBP12 molecules, capable of outcompeting the ternary complex containing FRB.
The trivial steric hindrance due to the close proximity of the second Rap natural product appears to be an unlikely scenario. The linker length of dRap is sufficient to permit association of the FRB molecule with the dRap-FKBP12 complex (Figure S5). In principle, a stretched linker conformation may be unfavorable, but a 120 ns long simulation at an elevated temperature of 420 K revealed only a negligibly small (ΔG < 1 kBT = 3.5 kJ/mol) preference for the linker to be in a compact conformation (Figure S8). This difference is much smaller than the free energy of FRB association, ΔG_{FRB} = -74.2 kJ/mol (estimated from a K_D at 300 K), and is insufficient to prevent FRB association.

To elucidate possible differences between the binding modes of dRap and Rap to FKBP12, a series of 10 independent 72 ns docking simulations were performed. These simulations were conducted at an elevated temperature of 420 K to accelerate pose sampling. In each simulation, a single ligand molecule was initially placed at a random site in the simulation box along with a single FKBP12 molecule. The ligand pose was sampled every 0.3 ps and compared to the experimentally determined ligand pose of the FKBP12/Rap complex. Similarity between simulated and experimental binding poses is characterized by the root-mean-square difference (RMSD) between the positions of atoms of the ligand. This difference is determined by first aligning the structure of the simulated FKBP12 to the crystal structure of FKBP12 in complex with Rap, followed by calculating the mean distance between ligand atoms (excluding hydrogen atoms). In the case of dRap, the RMSD was determined between atoms of Rap in the crystal structure and corresponding atoms of the rings in the simulated dRap molecule. RMSD was computed for both rings of dRap and the smallest value was selected to characterize the pose (Figure S6). In the simulations, the binding pose of the Rap molecule is very well recapitulated, while dRap has a different ensemble of binding poses. The difference of binding pose distributions is expected, given the different structure of the ligands. The ensemble of dRap binding poses contains a significant fraction of Rap-like binding poses, which may be sufficient to permit FRB binding. To estimate the effect of binding pose ensemble difference on the binding energy balance, the entire ensemble of dRap poses in the bound state was split into two sub-ensembles, denoted as “FRB-compatible” with an RMSD < 0.15 nm and “FRB-incompatible” with an RMSD > 0.15 nm. In these simulations, the fraction of FRB-compatible poses is P_{comp} = 0.15 ± 0.07 (Figure S6) which corresponds to an energetic barrier of ~6.6 kJ/mol. This energetic cost of placing dRap into the FRB compatible binding pose is much smaller than ΔG_{FRB} = -74.2 kJ/mol. Thus, it is unlikely that binding of dRap to FKBP12 is in an aberrant pose that prevents FRB association with the complex.

Finally, to test if dRap-mediated interaction of two FKBP12 molecules can successfully compete with the notoriously strong binding of FRB to the FKBP12-Rap complex, the free energies of complex formation for both systems were computationally compared. The free energies were calculated using non-equilibrium steered molecular dynamics (SMD) simulations. In these simulations, ligand and substrate are being pulled away from each other using harmonic potentials with moving origins. The free energy of binding can then be estimated from the amount of work required to break the complex apart with the upper limit of free energy given by the Jarzynski equality.

The important parameters of SMD simulations are the harmonic potential force constant and the origin pulling rate. A high pulling rate results in more energy dissipation and overestimated free energy of binding. A large force constant reduces deviations of ligand from the pulling trajectory, but results in larger force fluctuations (Figure S9). In the simulations, an attempt to stay in quasi equilibrium regime was made by choosing a pulling rate such that the average force-driven displacement (0.02 nm/ns, Figure S10) remains small compared to the Brownian motion (diffusion coefficient of dRap D_d = 0.45 ± 0.06 nm^2/ns, and FKBP12 D_d = 0.32 ± 0.04 nm^2/ns).

In the SMD simulations, steering potential was applied along the vector between centers of mass of the ligand and substrate and did not dictate a specific dissociation pathway. At least 10 trajectories were generated with sufficient time to bring interacting molecules at least 1.2 nm apart, which is the cut-off distance for Van der Waals and short-range Coulomb interactions. This distance approximately corresponds to 1.5 r_D (Debye screening length, in 0.14 M NaCl r_D ~ 0.8 nm) and beyond this distance long-range electrostatic interactions in the simulations contribute less than 10% to the total electrostatic energy in the system. The work of dissociation in each trajectory can then be computed by integrating instantaneous force along the ligand path (Figure S7a).
Dissociation work was computed by averaging corresponding Boltzmann weights and their first moments (unweighted, arithmetic average). The unweighted average has resulted in larger estimated work of dissociation (Figure S11). This difference reflects the wide spectrum of ligand dissociation pathways with different work of extraction. The application of the Jarzinski’s work estimator in non-equilibrium simulations is explained in more detail in the literature. The dissociation work obtained by averaging Boltzmann weights is reported in Table S1. As a benchmark of this SMD-based computational approach, its predictions were compared with experimentally measured binding affinities of binary complexes. The experimental energy of binding of Rap to FKBP12 and to the FRB domain in conjunction with FKBP12 can be directly computed from the published dissociation constants. In order to calculate the binding energies of Rap-mediated complexes, the available experimental structures of the ternary complex, FKBP12-Rap-FRB, were used. In the case of the FKBP12-Rap complex, a pulling force was applied to the centers of mass of the FKBP12 and Rap molecules. For the FKBP12-Rap-FRB complex, the pulling force was applied to the centers of mass of the FKBP12 and FRB molecules, while leaving the rapamycin molecule unaffected.

In the case of the FKBP12-dRap complex, the simulations could not be initialized with an experimental structure, as it is unknown. Instead, the model of this complex was constructed from a series of equilibrium simulations at elevated temperature (T = 420 K). Ten trajectories of 120 ns each were generated starting from two FKBP12 molecules and one dRap molecule randomly placed into the simulation cell. System snapshots were collected every 120 ps and grouped into clusters according to the pairwise root-mean-square deviations with a cut-off of RMSD = 0.5 nm. Cluster centroid structures that were obtained were roughly grouped into different categories by the mutual orientation of the FKBP12 molecules: head-to-head, head-to-back and back-to back, Figure S7b. Centroids of the three most populated clusters were used to initialize pulling simulations and to compute binding energies. The first cluster centroid, belonging to the head-to-head group, resulted in the largest absolute binding energy, suggesting that the head-to-head configuration is the most probable structure for the FKBP12-dRap-FKB complex. The calculated binding affinity is consistently overestimated, which is a known artifact of non-equilibrium simulations caused by undersampling of low-dissipation pathways of ligand dissociation. However, the calculated binding affinity correlates well with experimental data and can be used to analyze the behavior of FKBP12 and FRB in the presence of the Rap analogs.

The FKBP12-dRap complex was not driven to complete dissociation as the FRB binding site becomes exposed at an earlier time when dRap is present in an extended conformation. The FKBP12 chains were pulled apart until the protein chains are fully dissociated, but before the dissociation of dRap from FKBP12. While a steady state of full dissociation has not been achieved, the calculated free energy of partial dissociation of the complex is already larger than the energy of full dissociation of the FKBP12-Rap-FRB complex (Figure S12). The difference between the binding free energies of FKBP12-dRap-FKB12 and FKBP12-Rap-FRB exceeds ΔG$dRap > 10$ kJ/mol (Table S1). In other words, formation of FKBP12 homodimers mediated by dRap is more favorable compared to formation to FKBP12-FRB heterodimers. The data cannot rule out the possibility of formation of heterotrimers, heterotetramers, or higher order oligomers. However, since at small concentrations the stability of larger aggregates is reduced compared to the stability of dimers, it appears reasonable to assume that in this system the role of heterotrimers and heterotetramers would be negligibly small. Thus, the inability of dRap to heterodimerize FRB and FKBP12 is likely caused by the dominating engagement of dRap in the formation of FKBP12 homodimers.

Table S1. Binding free energies ΔG₀, computed in simulations and estimated from measured dissociation constants (K₀). Standard error of simulated ΔG₀ was calculated from 10 independent SMD runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simulated / kJ mol⁻¹</th>
<th>Experimental / kJ mol⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FKBP12-Rap</td>
<td>85 ± 4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKBP12-Rap-FRB</td>
<td>94 ± 5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKBP12-dRap-FKB12</td>
<td>&gt;120</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXPERIMENTAL PROTOCOLS**

**Fluorescence Polarization Assay.** FKBP12 (R&D Systems) was stirred with fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) at a 1:5 ratio for 3 hours in carbonate-bicarbonate buffer (pH 9.0). FKBP12-FITC was separated from free FITC by overnight dialysis (MWCO 3,500 Da; Spectrum Laboratories, Inc.) into phosphate buffered saline (PBS; pH 7.4). Protein was recovered and the concentration was determined by measuring absorbance on a NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer using the literature value for the molar extinction coefficient of FITC. FKBP12-FITC was diluted to 2 µM and dRap was dissolved at a 100X the final concentration in PBS. FKBP12-FITC was aliquoted into a 384-well plate and dRap 100X stocks were added resulting in the required final concentrations of 200 nM, 2 µM, or 20 µM. After 20 minutes of incubation at room temperature, fluorescence polarization was measured on a Biotek Synergy 4 microplate reader.

**K-LISA mTOR Activity Assay.** GST-p70S6K (Calbiochem) was incubated in glutathione coated plates for 1 hour. mTOR (Sigma-Aldrich) was mixed with FKBP12 (R&D Systems) and either Rap (100 nM) or dRap (50 nM). Samples were placed in the dark or irradiated with UV light for 3 minutes on a transilluminator (365 nm, 25 W) and then kept on ice for 20 minutes. The samples were added to GST-p70S6K containing wells and incubated at 30 °C for 30 minutes. p70S6K phosphorylation was detected with an α-p70S6K-T389 phosphorylation antibody and Luminata Forte ELISA HRP Substrate (Millipore) on a Biotek Synergy 4 microplate reader.

**TEVp Complementation Assay.** HEK-293T cells were maintained at 37 °C and 5% CO₂ in Dulbecco’s modified Eagle’s medium (Hyclone) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (Hyclone) and 10% streptomycin/penicillin (MP Biomedicals). Cells were passaged into a 96-well plate and when 80-90% confluent, were transfected with pFRB-TEVnt, pFKBP12-TEVct, and pTriExGloSensor (100 ng/each) using Lipofectamine 2000 (0.5 µL) (Invitrogen) according to manufacturer’s protocol. Twenty-four hours after transfection Rap (100 nM) or dRap (50 nM) were added and cells were incubated for 3 hours at 37 °C and 5% CO₂. Luciferase activity was determined using a Bright Glo-Luciferase Reporter Assay kit (Promega) and a Biotek Synergy 4 microplate reader.

**Cre Recombinase Complementation Assay.** HEK-293T cells were passaged into two 4-well chamber slides, and grown to 80% confluency. The cells were then transfected with the Cre Stoplight (600 ng, 1 well per slide), pcDNA-FKBp-Cre59 (60 ng, 1 well per slide) and pcDNA-FRB-Cre60 (60 ng, 1 well per slide) using X-tremeGENE HP DNA transfection reagent (2:1 X-tremeGENE/DNA; Roche Biomedicals) in OptiMEM medium (Invitrogen). The transfection mixture was incubated at 37 °C for 6 hours, followed by the replacement of the OptiMEM transfection medium with DMEM. The cells were then incubated with Rap (10 nM) or dRap (5 nM) at 37 °C and 5% CO₂ overnight, followed by irradiation of selected wells for 5 min on a transilluminator (365 nm, 25 W) and replacement of medium with DMEM grow medium. Thirty-six hours post transfection, the cells were analyzed on a Carl Zeiss LSM 700 laser confocal microscope with a 20X plan-apochromat objective for the expression of GFP (excitation at 488 nm with an argon laser and emission at 493-545 nm) and DsRed (excitation at 561 nm with a solid state laser and emission at 574-659 nm) reporter proteins. Quantification of fluorescence was performed using Zen 2009 imaging software. Three independent integrations were performed.
**Supporting Figures**

**Figure S1:** Synthetic reaction scheme for the light-cleavable rapamycin dimer (dRap).

**Figure S2:** $^1$H NMR spectrum of dRap
**Figure S3:** $^{13}$C NMR spectrum of dRap

**Figure S4:** Fluorescence polarization of FITC labeled FKBP12 in the presence of dRap. Asterisks represent statistically significant differences in fluorescence polarization; P value < 0.05.
Figure S5. A hypothetical structure of the dRap-induced complex of FKBP12 and FRB. One copy of the FRB domain is removed for clarity. The FKBP12-FRB interface structure is based on the experimental structure of the Rap containing ternary complex. Rap is shown in pink and the light-cleavable linker (cyan) is in an extended conformation, displaying a length that is sufficient to avoid steric clashes between the two protein complexes.

Figure S6. Distributions of root-mean-square differences of ligand atom positions between the simulated Rap binding pose and the experimentally observed Rap binding pose in FKBP12. The smaller differences (RMSD < 0.15 nm) correspond to the pose that is compatible with association of the FRB domain. When the difference is large, the ligand pose may prevent interaction with FRB. For dRap, the different area fill colors mark the threshold between FRB-compatible versus FRB-incompatible poses. The estimated probability of dRap to be found in an FRB-compatible pose is $P_{\text{comp}} = 0.15 \pm 0.07$. This is a significant fraction of compatible poses and sufficient to allow heterodimerization with FRB (see discussion in the text for more detail).
**Figure S7.** (a) Pulling force and work as function of pulled distance for the dual FKBP12-dRap complex starting from the head-to-head configuration. Distance is measured between centers of mass of FKBP12 chains. Force and work curves have been averaged over 10 independent simulations. (b) Typical configurations of dimer FKBP12 complexes with dRap (ligand not shown). Three representative structures have been aligned to overlay chain 1 and expose the relative orientation of chain 2. Shaded regions (marked by red color) indicate fragments of chain 2 that are in contact with chain 1. β5/β6 loop (“head”) is shown with a thicker line.

**Figure S8:** End-to-end distance distribution of the linker chain connecting the Rap fragments in the dRap. Inset shows distance fluctuations in the course of simulation. Multiple transitions are observed between compact and extended states.
Figure S9: Steered molecular dynamics simulation of dissociation of Rap-FKBP12 complex performed with different force constant of the pulling potential. Changing the force constant from 960 kJ/mol/nm$^2$ to 9600 kJ/mol/nm$^2$ produces a different dissociation trajectory, but has small effect on the calculated total work of dissociation. A) Average work of dissociation as a function of position $r_a$ of the origin of the pulling potential. B) Average force and distance between ligand and protein centers of mass. The sharp force peak indicates position of the breaking point, and softer pulling potential results in a breaking point occurring at the larger $r_a \sim 0.4$ nm. Shaded area indicates standard error computed over 10 trajectories. For display purposes, data curves were smoothed using running average over 150 ps window.

Figure S10: Steered molecular dynamics simulation of dissociation of Rap-FKBP12 complex performed with different pulling velocities. Changing the velocity from 0.02 nm/ns to 0.05 nm/ns produces a noticeable force spike at the position of the origin of the pulling potential $r_a \sim 0.7$nm. As a result the calculated total work of dissociation has increased. A) Average work of dissociation as a function of position of the origin of the pulling potential. B) Average force and distance between ligand and protein centers of mass. Shaded area indicates standard error computed over 10 trajectories. Data curves were smoothed using running average over 150 ps window.
Figure S11: Unweighted average work (red curve) of dissociation of FKBP/Rap complex compared to exponentially weighted work (blue curve). The difference between weighted and unweighted work estimations at the plateau region is $\sim 16$ kJ/mol. Gray shaded area indicates standard error calculated over 10 trajectories.

Figure S12: Work of dissociation of the Rap and dRap based complexes as a function of the pulled distance. The work of dissociation in the case of dRap complex does not reach plateau since pulled protein molecules are still connected by the stretched ligand and pulling work is being spent on extending the ligand linker fragment. Shaded area indicates standard error computed over 10 trajectories. Data curves were smoothed using running average over 150 ps window.
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