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Computational Methodology

Simulation Details

System Setup:
For the surface-adsorbed systems, each system simulated consisted of a single peptide chain, two single-layer graphene or $h$-BN substrates, ~3200 water molecules and a sufficient number of Cl$^-$ counter-ions to ensure the overall charge neutrality of the system. The overall cell dimensions were ~49×43×80 Å$^3$, and ~50×43×80 Å$^3$ for graphene and $h$-BN respectively. The two 2D sheets were placed ~48 Å apart along the direction perpendicular to the surface plane, and the intervening gap was filled with liquid water. The number of waters was adjusted to ensure the density of water in the centre of this sandwich configuration was equivalent to the density of liquid water at 300 K and 1 atm.

For the peptide “in-solution” simulations (in the absence of the 2D material), the simulation comprised a single peptide chain, ~7000 water molecules and sufficient counter-ions to ensure overall charge neutrality of the cell. The simulation cell had dimensions of approximately 60 × 60 × 60 Å$^3$.

All three peptide chains were modeled in the zwitterionic form, i.e. the N- and C- termini of the peptide were uncharged (i.e. modeled as NH$_3^+$ and COO$^-$, respectively), consistent with the peptides used experimentally.

REST-MD Simulation Details:
All simulations were performed using Gromacs 2018. The GRAPPA force-field and BoNi-CHARMM force-field$^{2,3}$ were used to model the interactions with the graphene and $h$-BN surfaces respectively. The peptides were modeled using the CHARMM22* force-field,$^{4,5}$ and the modified version of TIP3P water$^{6,7}$ was employed. All simulations were performed in the canonical ($NVT$) ensemble, at 300 K with temperature regulated by a Nose-Hoover$^{8,9}$ thermostat. Note that all replicas were run at the same thermal temperature of 300 K. The LJ non-bonded interactions were tapered to zero between 10 and 11 Å, whereas the electrostatic interactions were treated using a particle mesh Ewald (PME)$^{10}$ summation with a real-space cutoff of 11 Å. A time step of 1 fs was used, each system simulated for 20×10$^6$ MD steps and exchanges between adjacent replicas attempted every 1000 steps ($\equiv$ 1 ps). Coordinates were saved every 1000 steps.

The REST approach is a version of Hamiltonian replica exchange molecular dynamics (H_REMD) that provides advanced sampling of the conformational space of a system.$^{11-13}$ For fuller details of the technique, its implementation in GROMACS and investigation of the improvements sampling efficiency, we refer readers to Terakawa et al., Wright et al. and Tang et al.$^{11-13}$

In the present study the ‘effective temperature’ window spanned 300-430 K across sixteen replicas. The $\lambda$ (scaling) values used for the replicas were 0.000, 0.057, 0.114, 0.177, 0.240, 0.310, 0.382, 0.458, 0.528, 0.597, 0.692, 0.750, 0.803, 0.855, 0.930, and 1.000. The initial configuration
of the peptide in each replica differed, covering a range of different secondary structure motifs, 
e.g. α-helix, β-turn, PPII helix and random coil.

**Simulation Analysis:**
The degree of residue-surface contact was determined by calculating the fraction of the total 
REST-MD reference trajectory (i.e. the trajectory that corresponds to the unscaled Hamiltonian, 
λ=0.000) that a reference site on a residue was less than or equal to a cutoff distance of the 2D 
surface. The reference sites and cutoff-distances (for graphene) were the same as those used in 
previous work. For the h-BN interface, we used the same procedure, based on residue-surface 
contact information, as published in earlier studies to establish appropriate cutoffs for all residue 
types present in the three peptides. The resultant distance-based cut-offs were evaluated to be the 
same as those already published for the peptide/graphene interface.

To determine the Boltzmann-weighted ensemble of peptide conformations, the Daura clustering 
algorithm, with a 2 Å cutoff for the atoms in the peptide backbone was employed. The clustering 
analysis was performed over the full 20,000 frames of the reference trajectory. The percentage 
population of each distinct structure was determined from the fraction of the total 20,000 frames 
that were assigned to that distinct structure.

Peptide secondary structure was examined using the STRIDE algorithm. In each case, each 
frame in the relevant 20,000 frame trajectory was analysed, via STRIDE assignment of secondary 
structure motif on a residue-by-residue basis. The total number of instances of each secondary 
structure assignment was counted and the overall percentage fraction of that motif was calculated.

Convergence of the REST-MD simulations can be monitored by different metrics, such as the 
number of peptide backbone clusters as a function of REST-MD simulation steps, and the degree 
of swapping between replicas as a function of REST-MD simulation steps (referred to herein and 
in previous work as replica mobilities). Representative data of each type of analysis are shown in 
Figures S1 and S2, indicating satisfactory performance.

![Figure S1. Number of peptide backbone clusters as a function of REST-MD simulation progress, for adsorption of BP1 and BP7 at the aqueous graphene interface.](image)
Experimental Methodology

Materials:
Sodium dodecyl sulfate was purchased from Sigma and ammonium persulfate was acquired from BDH Chemicals. Thermal release tape was sourced from Semiconductor Equipment Corporation. Single layer graphene and h-BN on copper foil were obtained from Grolltex. All peptides (> 95% purity) were commercially synthesized from Genscript. The Au QCM sensors used were purchased from Biolin Scientific. Milli Q water (18.2 MΩ·cm) was used for all the experiments. All chemicals were used without additional purification.

Methods:
All QCM measurements were conducted using a Q-Sense E4 instrument from Biolin Scientific. Single layer graphene or h-BN grown on a Cu foil were first transferred onto thermal release tape carefully to ensure there were no air bubbles. After an ozone-UV treatment of 5 min, they were etched with (NH₄)₂S₂O₈ (100 mg/mL in Water) for 3 h, followed by rinsing with water and drying with N₂ gas. The graphene or h-BN thermal tape was adhered to the Au QCM sensors at room temperature and released by heating to 125 °C using a hotplate. XPS spectra of the deposited h-BN were collected on an M-Probe Surface Science XPS spectrometer. Spectra were collected using a spot size of 800 mm, 0.01 eV step, and averaged over 50 scans. Prior to each QCM measurement, the sensors were cleaned with a 5 min ozone-UV treatment. This was followed by washing with water for 30 min, 4 wt% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) for 30 min, and water again for 30 min, all at a flow rate of 150 μL/min. Measurements started with a flow of water for 10 min followed by 30 min of the peptide solution at varying concentrations (2.5-20 μg/mL) at 22.5 °C. Using the Sauerbrey equation, the change in frequency is directly related to the mass of peptide adhered to the surface which enables the rate parameters to be determined.

Figure S2. Representative plots of replica mobility (exchange between replicas) for BP1 adsorbed at the aqueous h-BN interface for a) replica 0, and b) replica 15.
Peptide Conformational Analysis: Free in Solution

For each of the sequences, BP1, BP7, and P1, the peptide secondary structure was investigated in the absence of the 2D material surface (i.e. free in solution). Circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy (Figure S3) showed that all three peptides were predominantly random coil in structure. Interestingly, the BP7 and BP1 peptides had a similar spectrum with a signal positioned at ~198 nm, while the P1 peptide displayed a signal that was shifted to ~195 nm.

![CD Spectra](Image)

**Figure S3.** Summary of conformational analyses. Left panel: circular dichroism spectra; middle panel: representative snapshot of the most populated cluster; right panel: population (expressed as a percentage of the total ensemble) of the top-ten most populated clusters, with total number of clusters indicated in the top right corner.

REST-MD simulations of the peptides free in solution were analysed for secondary structure using both clustering analyses (Figure S1) and also the STRIDE algorithm (Table S1). In the clustering analysis the ensemble is classified into groups of similar structures. The outcomes of this analysis provides information in terms of 1) the overall number of similar structures (denoted here as clusters), and 2) their relative population in the ensemble. The most populated clusters for
all peptides in solution are presented in Figure S1, along with the populations of the top-ten most populated clusters. In each case, the population of the most populated cluster is not dominant (i.e. under 50%), and each peptide supports a high number of clusters (254-288). The most populated cluster in each case features secondary structure, with P1 supporting 20% as partially-helical structure, BP7 supporting 23% as a beta hairpin, and BP1 supporting 10% as a distorted helix. However, the most populated cluster structures are not representative of the entire ensemble, given that the remaining clusters (250+ clusters) were chiefly unstructured, corresponding with a random coil assignment. Despite the low population fraction of each such random-coil cluster structure, the sheer number of these overwhelm the contribution of the most populated cluster, thus resulting in an overall random-coil character for each peptide conformational ensemble.

The STRIDE analyses complemented these clustering data, and again indicated that random coil characteristics dominated the conformational ensemble in each case, followed by β-turn contributions (Table S1). Nonetheless, each sequence exhibited small differences in the proportions of the non-random-coil contributions. Specifically, P1 featured the highest fraction of helical content (12%) of the three sequences, whereas BP7 was remarkable for the relatively high content of β-sheet (as opposed to β-turn) motif. This finding is consistent with the reasonably similar appearance of the experimentally-determined CD spectra for each of the three peptides.

Table S1. Percentage contribution of secondary structure motifs determined from STRIDE analyses of the “in-solution” molecular dynamics simulation trajectories. RC corresponds to random coil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>BP1 / %</th>
<th>BP7 / %</th>
<th>P1 / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha helix</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 helix</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta sheet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta turn</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2. Percentage contribution of secondary structure motifs determined from STRIDE analyses of the surface-adsorbed molecular dynamics simulation trajectories on the two substrates, for the three peptides. RC corresponds to random coil.

**Graphene**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>BP1 / %</th>
<th>BP7 / %</th>
<th>P1 / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha helix</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 helix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta sheet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta turn</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**h-BN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>BP1 / %</th>
<th>BP7 / %</th>
<th>P1 / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha helix</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-10 helix</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta sheet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta turn</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S4. Cluster population distributions for the top-ten most populated clusters, in both the surface-adsorbed and un-adsorbed states, as determined from the molecular dynamics simulations. The total number of clusters is indicated in the inset.
Figure S5. Confirmation of \( h \)-BN deposition onto the QCM sensor surface. (left panel) XPS spectra of the \( h \)-BN coated Au QCM sensor. Peaks associated with the Au surface and \( h \)-BN are evident. The presence of carbon likely arises from adsorbed material that is desorbed and removed prior to QCM analysis. (right panel) Raman spectrum collected (using 633 nm excitation) from \( h \)-BN on the Au QCM sensor. The sharp peak at 1370 cm\(^{-1}\) corresponds to the \( E_{2g} \) mode of \( h \)-BN.
Discussion of Possible Origins of Residue Specific Binding on \( h \)-BN vs. Graphene

The physical origins of the indicative residue binding specificity on \( h \)-BN vs. graphene demonstrated by this work are currently not definitively resolved and represents a substantial challenge to resolve in future. The answer to the question, e.g. “why do bulky aliphatics prefer to bind to \( h \)-BN over graphene?”, has not yet been established and requires further, integrated investigation from both experimental and modelling perspectives.

One possible (currently speculative) answer is that given that the anticipated leucine/valine–surface interaction (in the absence of water) can only be driven by van der Waals contributions, which would be similar for both \( h \)-BN and graphene, this points to differences in the interfacial solvent structuring at the graphene vs. \( h \)-BN interfaces, and suggests that entropic contributions due to displacement (and therefore release) of interface-bound waters might give rise to this specificity effect. For example, earlier work\(^{18}\) comparing solvent structuring at graphene and \( h \)-BN interfaces showed an excess of hydrogen-bond acceptors at the \( h \)-BN interface, which is the reverse of what has been observed for the water/graphene interface. Clearly resolution of this interesting question is outside the scope of the current work and will require significant future effort to resolve, but it is a question that could be addressed in future.
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