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## GENERAL METHODS

## NMR

${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded at room temperature on a Bruker AC-200 (200 MHz) instrument using the partially deuterated solvent as the internal reference. Chemical shifts $(\delta)$ are expressed in ppm. The multiplicity of a signal is indicated as: br - broad, $\mathrm{s}-\operatorname{singlet,~} \mathrm{d}$ - doublet, t triplet, m-multiplet, etc.

## Mass Spectrometry

ESI-MS experiments were performed using an ESI-ToF Mariner ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Biospectrometry ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Workstation of Applied Biosystems by flow injection analysis using MeOH as the mobile phase. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained by electrospray ionization on a Perseptive Biosystem Mariner ESI-ToF spectrometer (Foster City, CA). An $1 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{M}$ solution of neurotensin, angiotensin I, and bradykinin in an 1:1 $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ mixture, containing $1 \%$ formic acid, was used for calibration.

## Transmission electron microscopy (TEM)

Samples were analyzed on a Jeol 300PX instrument. Samples were prepared immediately before used. A small drop of solutions was floated on a glow discharged carbon coated grid and excess was removed by \#50 hardened Whatman filter paper. For the samples with negative staining, the grid was then floated on $2 \%$ uranyl acetate solution for 10 seconds, and the excess was removed by \#50 hardened Whatman filter paper.

## Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)

A Carl Zeiss Merlin field emission scanning electron microscope operating at 5 kV accelerating voltage was used. A small drop of the milk-like aqueous suspension was placed on a microscope glass cover slip and allowed to dry overnight.

## FT-IR absorption

FT-IR absorption spectra in KBr discs were recorded with a Perkin-Elmer 1720X spectrophotometer; $v_{\text {max }}$ is given for the main absorption bands.

## SYNTHESES AND CHARACTERIZATIONS

## General

1-hydroxy-7-aza-1,2,3-benzotriazole (HOAt) was purchased from GL Biochem (Shanghai) Ltd. H-$\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OH}, \quad \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Leu}-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}, \quad \mathrm{Boc-Leu}-\mathrm{OH} \quad$ and N -(3-Dimethylaminopropyl)-N'ethylcarbodiimide hydrochloride (EDC•HCl) were obtained from Iris Biotech (Germany). Di-tertbutyl dicarbonate $\left(\mathrm{Boc}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$, thionyl chloride, propargylamine, 1,8-Diazabicyclo[5.4.0]undec-7-ene (DBU), Triethylamine (TEA), $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime}-$ Tetramethylethylenediamine (TMEDA), copper(I) iodide and nickel(II) chloride hydrate were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich.

The deuterated solvent $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ was purchased from Euriso-Top (France).
All other chemicals and solvents were Sigma-Aldrich, Fluka or Acros products and used as provided without further purifications.

## Synthesis of Boc-Cys(Me)-OH

H-Cys(Me)-OH ( $5 \mathrm{~g}, 367 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in 80 mL of solvent mixture of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1: 1$ $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ ) with TEA ( $6 \mathrm{~mL}, 43 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). $\mathrm{Boc}_{2} \mathrm{O}(8.4 \mathrm{~g}, 38.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in 25 mL of $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ and added to solution of amino acid. The mixture was stirred at rt for 18 h . The organic solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the aqueous residue was acidified with HCl 1 M . The precipitate was extracted with $\mathrm{AcOEt}(3 \mathrm{v})$, then the organic phase was washed with water (2v) and brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated to dryness under reduced pressure. The product was recovered as an oil ( $8.2 \mathrm{~g}, 94 \%$ yield $)$.

HRMS (ESI+): $m / z$ calcd. 235.0878, found $236.1029[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.
FT-IR absorption: $\bar{v} 3318,3103,2979,2924,1716,1510,1394,1368,1249,1164,1056 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.60(\mathrm{~s} \mathrm{br}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{COOH}), 5.42(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}$ urethane), $4.54(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\alpha \mathrm{CH}$ ), 2.97 ( $\mathrm{d}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \beta \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 2.14 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, ), $1.44\left(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Boc}\right)$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 175.52,155.70,80.74,53.02,36.46,28.42,16.39$.

## Synthesis of Boc-Cys(Me)-Leu-OMe

Boc- $\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OH}(6.76 \mathrm{~g}, 28.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and activated with HOAt $(3.9 \mathrm{~g}$, $\mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{EDC} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(5.48 \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{mmol})$. Separately $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Leu}-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ with addition of TEA ( $8 \mathrm{~mL}, 57.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and the obtained solution was added to the active ester. TEA (4 $\mathrm{mL}, \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added to the resulting mixture until basic pH . The mixture was stirred at rt for 18 h . The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue dissolved in AcOEt. The organic phase was washed with $5 \% \mathrm{KHSO}_{4(\mathrm{qq)}}(4 \mathrm{v}), 5 \% \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3(\mathrm{qq)}}(3 \mathrm{v})$ and brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved in AcOEt and precipitated by addition of petroleum ether. After filtration and drying, the product was obtained as a white solid ( $8.35 \mathrm{~g}, 84 \%$ yield).

HRMS (ESI + ): $m / z$ calcd. 362.1875 , found $363.1966[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.
FT-IR absorption: $\bar{v} 3342,3281,3085,2973,2920,1756,1682,1656,1557,1522,1315,1274$, $1251,1225,1197,1158,1020 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.84$ (d, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}$ amide), 5.37 (d, 1 H , NH urethane), 4.66-4.55 (m, $1 \mathrm{H}, \alpha \mathrm{CH}$ ), 4.30-4.20 (m, 1H, $\alpha \mathrm{CH}$ ), 3.73 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H},-\mathrm{OMe}$ ), 2.98-2.67 (m, 2H, $\beta \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cys}$ ), 2.17 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$, $-\mathrm{SMe}), 1.68-1.60\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \beta \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right.$ and $\gamma \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Leu}$ ), $1.46\left(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Boc}\right), 0.93\left(\mathrm{~d}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \delta \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Leu}\right)$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 173.08,170.68,155.53,80.65,53.59,52.46,51.09,41.63,36.41$, 28.40, 24.93, 22.92, 22.02, 16.04.

## Synthesis of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$

$\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OH}(5 \mathrm{~g}, 0.037 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was suspended in 120 mL of dry MeOH and cooled in a $\mathrm{MeOH} /$ ice bath. Then $\mathrm{SOCl}_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise to the mixture. After removal of the bath, the mixture was refluxed for 2 days. The residual solid was removed by filtration and the filtered was evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved in the minimal amount of MeOH and precipitated by addition of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The solid recovered after filtration was dried obtaining 4.8 g of product as a solid ( $70 \%$ yield).

HRMS (ESI+): $m / z$ calcd. 149.0510 , found $150.3091[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.
FT-IR absorption: $\bar{v} 3003,2864,2633,2500,1743,1594,1571,1507,1434,1316,1235,1206$, $1064 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (200 MHz, DMSO) $\delta 8.91\left(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}\right), 4.23(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \alpha \mathrm{CH}), 3.74(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H},-\mathrm{OMe}), 3.04$ (d, $2 \mathrm{H}, \beta \mathrm{CH}_{2}$ ), 2.11 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H},-\mathrm{SMe}$ ).
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}$ ) $\delta 168.73,52.82,51.63,33.37,15.38$.

## Synthesis of Boc-Leu-Cys(Me)-OMe

Boc-Leu-OH ( $2 \mathrm{~g}, 8.65 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in 40 mL of $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and activated with HOAt $(1.18 \mathrm{~g}$, $8.67 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{EDC} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}(1.65 \mathrm{~g}, 8.64 \mathrm{mmol})$. Separately H-Cys(Me)-OMe•HCl ( $1.6 \mathrm{~g}, 8.62$ mmol ) was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ with addition of TEA ( $2.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 10.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and the obtained solution was added to the active ester. TEA was added to the resulting mixture until basic pH . The mixture was stirred at rt for 48 h . The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the residue dissolved in AcOEt. The organic phase was washed with $5 \% \mathrm{KHSO}_{4(\mathrm{aq})}(4 \mathrm{v}), 5 \% \mathrm{NaHCO}_{3(\mathrm{aq)}}(3 \mathrm{v})$ and brine. The organic layer was dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, filtered and evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved in AcOEt and precipitated by addition of petroleum ether. After filtration and drying, the product was obtained as a white solid ( $2 \mathrm{~g}, 64 \%$ yield).

HRMS (ESI + ): $m / z$ calcd. 362.1865 , found $363.3309[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.
FT-IR absorption: $\bar{v} 3325,2955,2921,1747,1740,1689,1649,1525,1443,1276,1208,1169 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $200 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 6.88$ (d, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{NH}$ amide), 4.87 (d, 1 H , NH urethane), 4.84-4.66 (m, $1 \mathrm{H}, \alpha \mathrm{CH}$ ), $4.14(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \alpha \mathrm{CH}), 3.76$ (s, $3 \mathrm{H},-\mathrm{OMe}$ ), 2.95 (dd, $2 \mathrm{H}, \beta \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cys}$ ), 2.10 (s, 3H, -SMe), $1.77-1.56\left(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{BCH}_{2}\right.$ and $\gamma \mathrm{CH} \mathrm{Leu}$ ), $1.44\left(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Boc}\right), 0.94$ (dd, $\left.6 \mathrm{H}, \delta \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{Leu}\right)$.
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $50 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 172.60,171.23,155.70,80.33,53.21,52.74,51.78,41.25,36.45$, 28.42, 24.84, 23.05, 22.06, 16.32.


Fig. S1 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of $\operatorname{Boc}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OH}$ in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.
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Fig. S2 ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra of Boc-Cys(Me)-OH in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.


Fig. S3 ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of $\operatorname{Boc}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})$-Leu-OMe in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.


Fig. S4 ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra of Boc-Cys(Me)-Leu-OMe in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.


Fig. S5 $^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra of $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}$ in DMSO- $d_{6}$.
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Fig. S6 \({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\) NMR spectra of \(\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}\) in DMSO- \(d_{6}\).


Fig. \(\mathbf{S 7}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}\) NMR spectra of Boc-Leu-Cys(Me)-OMe in \(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\).


Fig. S8 \({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}\) NMR spectra of Boc-Leu-Cys(Me)-OMe in \(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\).


Fig. S9 FT-IR spectrum of Boc-Cys(Me)-OH in KBr disc.


Fig. S10 FT-IR spectrum of Boc-Cys(Me)-Leu-OMe in KBr disc.


Fig. S11 FT-IR spectrum of \(\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})-\mathrm{OMe} \cdot \mathrm{HCl}\) in KBr disc.
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Fig. S12 FT-IR spectrum of Boc-Leu-Cys(Me)-OMe in KBr disc.

\section*{X-Ray diffraction}

Crystals of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe and Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe were grown by slow evaporation from methanol. X-Ray diffraction data were collected with an Agilent Technologies Gemini E four-circle kappa diffractometer equipped with a 92 mm EOS CCD detector, using graphite monochromated \(\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \alpha\) radiation ( \(\lambda=1.54178 \AA\) ). Data collection and reduction were performed with the CrysAlisPro software (version 1.171.36.28; Agilent Technologies). A semiempirical absorption correction based on the multi-scan technique using spherical harmonics, implemented in the SCALE3 ABSPACK scaling algorithm, was applied.

Both structures were solved by ab initio procedures of the SIR 2002 program, \({ }^{[S 1]}\) and refined by full-matrix least-squares on \(\mathrm{F}^{2}\), using all data, by application of the SHELXL-97 program, \({ }^{[\mathrm{S} 2]}\) with anisotropic displacement parameters for all of the non-H atoms. H-Atoms were calculated at idealized positions and refined using a riding model. Details specific to the individual structures are given below. Relevant crystal data and structure refinement parameters are listed in Tables S 1 and S2. CCDC-1057628 and 1057629 contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre via www.ccdc.cam.ac.uk/data_request/cif.

\section*{Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe (1)}

Data collection was performed up to theta \(=51.25^{\circ}\) as the crystal, owing to its size (smallest dimension 0.01 mm ), did not significantly diffract beyond \(1.0 \AA\) resolution. The choice of the hexagonal space group \(\mathrm{P}_{5}\), rather than its enantiomorph \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\), was based on the known (L) configuration of the Cys and Leu residues used in the synthesis. Restraints were applied to the anisotropic displacement parameters of the methyl carbon atoms of the Boc and OMe protecting groups and the \(\operatorname{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})\) residue, to approach isotropic behavior. Overall, many crystallographic parameters suffer from the far from optimal crystal size and quality. We are confident, however, that the basic conformational features of the molecule and its packing mode, as discussed in this work, are unambiguously established.

\section*{Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe (2)}

The Leu side chain shows positional disorder. It was refined on two sets of positions (atoms C1G, C1D1, C1D2 for the first set, while C1G', C1D3, C1D4 for the second set) with refined population parameters of \(0.658(8)\) and \(0.342(8)\), respectively. Restraints were applied to the bond distances and bond angles involving atoms of the disordered parts, as well to their anisotropic displacement parameters.

\section*{Structure description}

The molecular structure of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe, as determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction analysis, is illustrated in Fig. S14. Backbone and side-chain torsion angles are listed in Table S3, whereas the intermolecular H-bond parameters are reported in Table S4.

The urethane, peptide and ester bonds ( \(\omega\) torsion angles) are found in the usual trans disposition. The conformation adopted by both \(\alpha\)-amino acid residues is semi-extended, with values of \(\phi, \psi\) backbone torsion angles \(-95.2(4)^{\circ},+132.9(3)^{\circ}\) for L-Cys and \(-66.3(4)^{\circ},+158.5(3)^{\circ}\) for L-Leu. Overall, the backbone is bent at the level of the \(\alpha\)-carbon of Cys, and the N-H groups of Cys and Leu point to opposite directions.

In the packing mode, the \(\mathrm{N} 1-\mathrm{H}\) group is intermolecularly H -bonded to the \((y,-x+y, z+1 / 6)\) symmetry equivalent of the (urethane carbonyl) O 0 atom, and the \(\mathrm{N} 2-\mathrm{H}\) group is H -bonded to the ( \(x-y, x, z-1 / 6\) ) symmetry equivalent of the (peptide) O 1 atom (Table S3). As a result, H-bonded molecules wrap around the sixfold screw axis along the \(c\) direction, each molecule being connected to the next by two H-bonds. (Figure S15a). The left-handed, supramolecular sixfold helix thus generated is characterized by a very narrow internal lumen, about \(2.5 \AA\) in diameter (Figure S15b). The \(\operatorname{Cys}(\mathrm{Me})\) and Leu side chains, as well as the N - and C-terminal tert-butyl and methyl ester groups of each molecule are located on the external surface. Each helical row of molecules is surrounded by six counterparts (Figure S16). Lateral stabilization between rows is provided, in addition to van der Waals interactions, by a C-H...O interaction taking place between the (Boc) C02-H02B group and the ( \(x-1, y-1, z\) ) symmetry equivalent of the (methyl ester) OT atom (Table S3).

In the X-ray diffraction structure of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe (Figure S17), the backbone conformation is characterized by sets of \(\phi, \psi\) torsion angles \(-116.68(18)^{\circ},+108.45(17)^{\circ}\) for L-Leu, and \(-159.11(15)^{\circ},-172.42(16)^{\circ}\) for L-Cys. The most striking conformational difference between this peptide and its positional isomer Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe, described above, is found at the level of the C-terminal residue, which adopts an extended conformation in Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)OMe while it is semi-extended in Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe.
The packing mode of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe is characterized by the occurrence of two intermolecular H-bonds, namely between the N1-H group and the \((x+1, y, z)\) translational equivalent of the (urethane carbonyl) O 0 atom, and between the \(\mathrm{N} 2-\mathrm{H}\) group and the \((x-1, y, z)\) translational equivalent of the (peptide) O 1 atom. Although the H -bond donor and acceptor atoms are the same as in the intermolecular H-bonding scheme of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe, the
different symmetry operators involved result in a completely different overall packing arrangement. Indeed, at variance with the helical packing of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe, the packing mode of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe can be described as a highly corrugated arrangement of molecules in the \(b c\) plane, with the intermolecular H -bonds connecting molecules along the \(a\) direction (Figure S18).

\section*{Crystallographic references}
[S1] M.C. Burla, M. Camalli, B. Carrozzini, G.L. Cascarano, C. Giacovazzo, G. Polidori, R. Spagna, J. Appl. Crystallogr. 2003, 36, 1103.
[S2] G.M. Sheldrick, Acta Crystallogr. 2008, A64, 112-122.

Table S1. Crystal data and structure refinement for Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Identification code & mc237f \\
\hline Empirical formula & \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}\) \\
\hline Formula weight & 362.48 \\
\hline Temperature & 293(2) K \\
\hline Wavelength & 1.54178 Å \\
\hline Crystal system & Hexagonal \\
\hline Space group & P 65 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Unit cell dimensions} &  \\
\hline & \(b=11.4458(2) \AA \quad \beta=90^{\circ}\). \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{c}=27.7551(5) \AA \quad \gamma=120^{\circ}\). \\
\hline Volume & 3148.95(10) \(\AA^{3}\) \\
\hline Z & 6 \\
\hline Density (calculated) & \(1.147 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\) \\
\hline Absorption coefficient & \(1.580 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}\) \\
\hline F(000) & 1176 \\
\hline Crystal size & \(0.20 \times 0.05 \times 0.01 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}\) \\
\hline Theta range for data collection & 4.46 to \(51.25^{\circ}\). \\
\hline Index ranges & \(-11 \leq \mathrm{h} \leq 11,-11 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq 11,-27 \leq 1 \leq 27\) \\
\hline Reflections collected & 18290 \\
\hline Independent reflections & \(2281[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0441]\) \\
\hline Completeness to theta \(=51.25^{\circ}\) & 100.0 \% \\
\hline Absorption correction & Semi-empirical from equivalents \\
\hline Max. and min. transmission & 1.00000 and 0.81551 \\
\hline Refinement method & Full-matrix least-squares on \(\mathrm{F}^{2}\) \\
\hline Data / restraints / parameters & 2281/31/217 \\
\hline Goodness-of-fit on \(\mathrm{F}^{2}\) & 1.042 \\
\hline Final R indices [ \(\mathrm{I}>2\) sigma(I)] & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=0.0403, \mathrm{wR}_{2}=0.1040\) \\
\hline R indices (all data) & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=0.0468, \mathrm{wR}_{2}=0.1083\) \\
\hline Absolute structure parameter & -0.01(3) \\
\hline Largest diff. peak and hole & 0.307 and -0.145 e. \(\AA^{-3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table S2. Crystal data and structure refinement for Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Identification code & mc238f \\
\hline Empirical formula & \(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}\) \\
\hline Formula weight & 362.48 \\
\hline Temperature & 293(2) K \\
\hline Wavelength & 1.54178 Å \\
\hline Crystal system & Orthorhombic \\
\hline Space group & \(\mathrm{P} 2{ }_{1} 2_{1} 2_{1}\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Unit cell dimensions} & \(\mathrm{a}=5.08911(7) \AA \quad \alpha=90^{\circ}\). \\
\hline & \(b=12.09583(13) \AA\) ¢ \(\quad \beta=90^{\circ}\). \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{c}=32.4406(4) \AA \quad \gamma=90^{\circ}\). \\
\hline Volume & 1996.95(4) \(\AA^{3}\) \\
\hline Z & 4 \\
\hline Density (calculated) & \(1.206 \mathrm{Mg} / \mathrm{m}^{3}\) \\
\hline Absorption coefficient & \(1.661 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}\) \\
\hline F(000) & 784 \\
\hline Crystal size & \(0.80 \times 0.06 \times 0.02 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}\) \\
\hline Theta range for data collection & 2.72 to \(69.34^{\circ}\). \\
\hline Index ranges & \(-5 \leq \mathrm{h} \leq 4,-14 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq 14,-39 \leq 1 \leq 38\) \\
\hline Reflections collected & 14108 \\
\hline Independent reflections & \(3652[\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{int})=0.0220]\) \\
\hline Completeness to theta \(=69.34^{\circ}\) & 98.1 \% \\
\hline Absorption correction & Semi-empirical from equivalents \\
\hline Max. and min. transmission & 1.00000 and 0.63618 \\
\hline Refinement method & Full-matrix least-squares on \(\mathrm{F}^{2}\) \\
\hline Data / restraints / parameters & 3652 / 50 / 245 \\
\hline Goodness-of-fit on \(\mathrm{F}^{2}\) & 1.035 \\
\hline Final R indices [ \(\mathrm{I}>2 \operatorname{sigma}(\mathrm{I})\) ] & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=0.0391, \mathrm{wR}_{2}=0.1077\) \\
\hline R indices (all data) & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=0.0406, \mathrm{wR}_{2}=0.1091\) \\
\hline Absolute structure parameter & 0.00(2) \\
\hline Largest diff. peak and hole & 0.280 and -0.173 e. \(\AA^{-3}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table S3. Selected backbone and side-chain torsion angles [ \({ }^{\circ}\) ] for Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe and Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe.
\begin{tabular}{llllll}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe } & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe } \\
\hline Torsion angle & & & Torsion angle & & \\
\hline C01-OU-C0-N1 & \(\theta^{1}\) & \(179.0(3)\) & C01-OU-C0-N1 & \(\theta^{1}\) & \(-179.00(18)\) \\
OU-C0-N1-C1A & \(\omega_{0}\) & \(-175.2(3)\) & OU-C0-N1-C1A & \(\omega_{0}\) & \(-179.10(15)\) \\
C0-N1-C1A-C1 & \(\phi_{1}\) & \(-95.2(4)\) & C0-N1-C1A-C1 & \(\phi_{1}\) & \(-116.68(18)\) \\
N1-C1A-C1-N2 & \(\psi_{1}\) & \(132.9(3)\) & N1-C1A-C1-N2 & \(\psi_{1}\) & \(108.45(17)\) \\
C1A-C1-N2-C2A & \(\omega_{1}\) & \(171.1(3)\) & C1A-C1-N2-C2A & \(\omega_{1}\) & \(-173.14(15)\) \\
C1-N2-C2A-C2 & \(\phi_{2}\) & \(-66.3(4)\) & C1-N2-C2A-C2 & \(\phi_{2}\) & \(-159.11(15)\) \\
N2-C2A-C2-OT & \(\psi_{2}\) & \(158.5(3)\) & N2-C2A-C2-OT & \(\psi_{2}\) & \(-172.42(16)\) \\
C2A-C2-OT-CT & \(\omega_{T}\) & \(176.6(5)\) & C2A-C2-OT-CT & \(\omega_{T}\) & \(176.39(19\) \\
N1-C1A-C1B-S1 & \(\chi_{1}{ }^{1}\) & \(-73.8(4)\) & N1-C1A-C1B-C1G & \(\chi_{1}{ }^{1}\) & \(-82.1(3) /-51.0(4)^{\mathrm{a}}\) \\
C1A-C1B-S1-C1D & \(\chi_{1}{ }^{2}\) & \(-74.4(4)\) & C1A-C1B-C1G-C1D1 & \(\chi_{1}{ }^{2,1}\) & \(65.9(5) /-58.7(9)^{\mathrm{b}}\) \\
N2-C2A-C2B-C2G & \(\chi_{2}{ }^{1}\) & \(-72.8(4)\) & C1A-C1B-C1G-C1D2 & \(\chi_{1}{ }^{2,2}\) & \(-171.3(3) / 178.5(6)^{\mathrm{c}}\) \\
C2A-C2B-C2G-C2D1 & \(\chi_{2}{ }^{2,1}\) & \(163.0(3)\) & N2-C2A-C2B-S2 & \(\chi_{2}{ }^{1}\) & \(71.18(19)\) \\
C2A-C2B-C2G-C2D2 & \(\chi_{2}{ }^{2,2}\) & \(-74.7(4)\) & C2A-C2B-S2-C2D & \(\chi_{2}{ }^{2}\) & \(-80.84(18)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\({ }^{\text {a }}\) Minor occupancy conformer N1-C1A-C1B-C1G'.
\({ }^{\mathrm{b}}\) Minor occupancy conformer C1A-C1B-C1G'-C1D3.
\({ }^{\mathrm{c}}\) Minor occupancy conformer C1A-C1B-C1G'-C1D4.

Table S4. Hydrogen bond parameters [ \(\AA\) and \({ }^{\circ}\) ] for Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe.
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline D-H...A & \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{H})\) & \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{H} \ldots \mathrm{A})\) & \(\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{D} \ldots \mathrm{A})\) & \(<\) (DHA) \\
\hline N1-H1...O0\#1 & 0.86 & 2.09 & \(2.929(4)\) & 164 \\
N2-H2...O1\#2 & 0.86 & 2.01 & \(2.868(4)\) & 179 \\
C02-H02B...OT\#3 & 0.96 & 2.54 & \(3.485(5)\) & 168 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Symmetry transformations used to generate equivalent atoms:
\#1: y,-x+y,z+1/6; \#2: x-y,x,z-1/6; \#3: x-1, y-1, z

Table S5. Hydrogen bond parameters [ \(\AA\) and \({ }^{\circ}\) ] for Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe.
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
D-H...A & d(D-H) & d(H...A) & \(d\) (D...A) & \(<\) (DHA) \\
\hline N1-H1...O0\#1 & 0.86 & 2.12 & \(2.965(2)\) & 166.7 \\
N2-H2...O1\#2 & 0.86 & 2.25 & \(3.093(2)\) & 167.1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Symmetry transformations used to generate equivalent atoms:
\#1: x+1,y,z; \#2: x-1,y,z


Fig. S13. X-Ray diffraction structure of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe with atom numbering.


Fig. S14. X-Ray diffraction structure of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe with atom numbering. Anisotropic displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 30\% probability level


Figure S15. Packing mode of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe. A single helical row of molecules is shown as viewed (a) perpendicularly and (b) down the sixfold screw axis. Intermolecular H-bonds are indicated by dashed lines.


Figure S16. Overall packing of Boc-L-Cys(Me)-L-Leu-OMe as viewed nearly down the \(c\) axis.


Figure S17. X-Ray diffraction structure of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe with atom numbering. Only the major occupancy site for the disordered Leu side chain is shown.


Fig. S18. X-Ray diffraction structure of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe with atom numbering. Anisotropic displacement ellipsoids are drawn at the 30\% probability level


Figure S19. Overall packing of Boc-L-Leu-L-Cys(Me)-OMe as viewed nearly down the \(b\) axis. The intermolecular H -bonds are indicated by dashed lines.

\section*{HPLC-Mass Spectrometry}

High-resolution mass spectra were obtained by electrospray ionization on a Perseptive Biosystem Mariner ESI-TOF spectrometer (Foster City, CA). An \(1 \times 10^{-9} \mathrm{M}\) solution of neurotensin, angiotensin I, and bradykinin in an 1:1 \(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) mixture, containing \(1 \%\) formic acid, was used for calibration. The HPLC column used was Agilent Zorbax C18 0.1\%. The mobile phase solvents are composed of A: \(0.1 \%\) formic acid in water and B: \(0.1 \%\) formic acid in acetonitrile. The HPLC measurements were performed using an Agilent 1200 series apparatus (Palo Alto, CA). The Photo Diode array (PDA) was set to monitor UV scan from 200 to 450 nm and the chromagram was recorded at 275 nm . The HPLC-MS analysis of the Azo derivatives was carried out before and after the UV irradiation to investigate the catalytic process of the ternary catalyst. Full scan mass spectra, in both positive and negative ion modes, were acquired over a mass scan range of 100-400 amu.
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\section*{Characterization of the reduced species of Methyl Orange}

The chromatographic separation of Methyl Orange (MO) run at 0,20 and 45 and 60 min after UV irradiation respectively were monitored using full scan MS experiments. Before UV irradiation treatment the MS chromatograms of time 0 min sample showed only one chromatographic peak characterized by a molecular ion at \(m / z 306[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)corresponding to MO. After 20 min of UV irradiation, the chromatographic peak at \(m / z 306\) decreased, and two new additional peaks were detected in the sample with different retention times. In particular one peak reveled a molecular ion at \(m / z 172[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}\)(attributed to a reduced specie of methyl orange with a formula of \(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{NSO}_{3}\) ), while the other peak reveled a a molecular ion at \(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 137[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\) (attributed to the other reduced specie of methyl orange with a formula \(\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) ). After 45 and 60 min of UV irradiation, in both samples, only the two molecular ions at \(m / z 137[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)and \(m / z 172[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}\)were detected. No other degradation products of MO were detected in the samples after UV irradiation.

\section*{Characterization of the reduced species of Methyl Red}

The chromatographic separation of Methyl Red (MR) run at 0,20 and 45 and 60 min after UV irradiation respectively, were monitored using full scan MS experiments. Before UV irradiation treatment the MS chromatograms of time 0 min sample showed only one chromatographic peak characterized by a molecular ion at \(m / z 270[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)corresponding to MR. After 20 min of UV irradiation, the chromatographic peak at \(m / z 270\) decreased, and two new additional peaks were detected in the sample with different retention times. In particular one peak reveled a molecular ion at \(m / z 137[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to a reduced specie of MR with a formula of \(\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) ), while the other peak reveled a a molecular ion at \(m / z 138[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to the other reduced specie of methyl orange with a formula \(\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}\) ). After 45 and 60 min of UV irradiation, in both samples, only the two molecular ions at \(m / z 137[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)and \(m / z 138[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)were detected. No other degradation products of MR were detected in the samples after UV irradiation.

\section*{Characterization of the reduced species of 4-amino-azobenzene}

The chromatographic separation of 4 -amino-azobenzene (AZ) run at 0,20 and 45 and 60 min after UV irradiation respectively, were monitored using full scan MS experiments. Before UV irradiation treatment the MS chromatograms of time 0 min sample showed only one chromatographic peak characterized by a molecular ion at \(m / z 198[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)corresponding to MR. After 20 min of UV irradiation, the chromatographic peak at \(m / z 198\) decreased, and two new additional peaks were detected in the sample with different retention times. In particular one peak reveled a molecular ion at \(m / z 94[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to a reduced specie of MR with a formula of \(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}\) ), while the other peak reveled a a molecular ion at \(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 109[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to the other reduced specie of methyl orange with a formula \(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) ). After 45 and 60 min of UV irradiation, in both samples, only the two molecular ions at \(m / z 94[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)and \(\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 109[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)were detected. No other degradation products of MR were detected in the samples after UV irradiation.

\section*{Characterization of the reduced species of benzoic acid}

The chromatographic separation of benzoic acid run at \(0,1,2,3\) and 4 hours after UV irradiation respectively, were monitored using full scan MS experiments. Before UV irradiation treatment the MS chromatograms of time 0 min sample showed only one chromatographic peak characterized by a molecular ion at \(m / z 123[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)corresponding to benzoic acid. After 1 hour of UV irradiation, the chromatographic peak at \(m / z 123\) decreased, and a new additional peaks were detected in the sample with different retention times. In particular the peak reveled a molecular ion at \(m / z 109[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to a reduced specie of MR with a formula of \(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}\) ), while the other peak reveled a a molecular ion at \(m / z 109[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)(attributed to the other reduced specie of benzoic acid with a formula \(\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{O}\) ). After 4 and hours of UV irradiation, only the two molecular ions at \(m / z 123[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)and \(m / z 109[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}\)were detected. From HPLC the ratio of reduction is \(96 \%\). No other degradation products of benzoic acid were detected in the samples after UV irradiation.~~~

