Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Organic & Biomolecular Chemistry. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2018

**Electronic Supplementary Information** for "Stapling of two PEGylated side chains increases the conformational stability of the WW domain via an entropic effect"

Qiang Xiao, Natalie A. Bécar, Nathaniel P. Brown, Mason S. Smith, Kimberlee L. Stern, Steven R. E. Draper, Katherine P. Thompson, Joshua L. Price

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602, United States

1. Structure of WW variants	1
2. Synthesis of WW variants	2
3. Global Fitting of Variable Temperature CD Data	3
4. ESI-TOF spectra data of WW variants	. 15
5. Analytical HPLC data	. 23
6. Turbidity experiments to assess aggregation kinetics	. 30
8. Synthesis and characterization of PEGylated Asn derivatives	. 31

## 1. Structure of WW variants



Figure S1. Sequence and structures of WW variants

#### 2. Synthesis of WW variants

**Peptide Synthesis:** All WW variants were synthesized as C-terminal acids on Fmoc-Gly-Wang LL resin (EMD Biosciences) by microwave-assisted solid phase peptide synthesis using a standard Fmoc N $\alpha$  protection strategy. as described previously<sup>1</sup>. All Fmoc-protected amino acids were purchased from Advanced Chem Tech, except for the modified non-natural asparagine derivatives with PEG or hydrocarbon chain on the residue, which were synthesized as described in section **8** below. Unstapled WW variants were cleaved from resin and purified by preparative reverse-phase high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) on a C18 column using a linear gradient of water in acetonitrile with 0.1% v/v trifluoroacetic acid. Peptide identity was confirmed by electrospray ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry.

We used an analogous approach to prepare the stapled WW variants, except we reduced the resin loading (i.e. the number of Fmoc-protected amino groups on resin) of the initial 40 µmol of resin by approximately 50% using a 1:1 mixture of Fmoc- and Boc-protected amino acids during the first coupling reaction. Attempts to perform the ring-closing metathesis reaction at higher resin loading were unsuccessful, presumably because of on-resin peptide aggregation. We performed all subsequent coupling and deprotection reactions with the resulting 20 µmol resin; after the final coupling and deprotection cycle, the resin was allowed to swell in dichloromethane for 10 minutes, and then rinsed three times with dichloroethane. A freshly made 0.5 M solution of the first-generation Grubbs ruthenium complex (purchased from Combi-Blocks) in dichloroethane (1.6 mL, 800 µmol; 40 eq. relative to resin) was then added to the resin and stirred for 2 h with bubbling N<sub>2</sub> (to facilitate removal of ethylene as the reaction progressed). Stapling of the Asn-linked olefin-terminated hydrocarbons in WW variants **h16/19-mn** was sufficiently complete at this point, and we proceeded with cleavage, purification, and characterization as described above.

For the less reactive O-allyl terminated Asn-linked PEGs in WW variants 16/19-mn and 16/32-44, additional steps were necessary. The catalyst solution was drained from the resin, which was rinsed three times with dichloroethane. A second aliquot of a freshly made solution of first-generation Grubbs ruthenium complex (1.6 mL, 800 µmol; 40 eq. relative to resin) was then added to the resin and stirred for 2 h at room temperature with bubbling N<sub>2</sub>. Complete stapling of WW variant 16/32-44 required heating of the two metathesis reaction mixture to 60 °C, presumably because of the increased distance in primary sequence between the O-allyl Asn-linked PEGs in 16/32-44 (16 residues apart) relative to 16/19-44 (3 residues apart).

We note that using super-stoichiometric amounts of the first-generation Grubbs ruthenium complex was absolutely essential to generating enough of each stapled WW variant for subsequent purification, characterization, and thermodynamic experiments. Attempts to use catalytic (i.e., sub-stoichiometric) amounts did not result in enough of the desired stapled product, suggesting that the heterogeneous on-resin ring-closing metathesis reaction is much less efficient than the corresponding homogeneous solution-phase reaction.

## 3. Global Fitting of Variable Temperature CD Data

Following purification and characterization (as described above), the conformational stability of stapled and unstapled WW variants was assessed by variable-temperature circular dichroism spectropolarimetry. Data from three replicate variable temperature CD experiments on WW variants 16/19-00, 16/19-11, s16/19-11, 16/19-12, s16/19-22, s16/19-22, s16/19-23, s16/19-23, 16/19-33, s16/19-33, 16/19-34, s16/19-34, s16/19-44, s16/19-22, h16/19-22, h16/19-23, hs16/19-23, 16/32-00, 16/32-44, and s16/32-44 were each fit globally to a model for a two-state thermally induced unfolding transition, as shown in equation S1:

$$[\theta] = [(c_n + d_n \bullet T) + K_f(a_n + b_n \bullet T)]/(1 + K_f),$$
(S1)

where T is temperature in Kelvin,  $c_n$  is the *y*-intercept and  $d_n$  is the slope of the post-transition baseline for replicate *n* ( $c_1$  and  $d_1$  for replicate 1;  $c_2$  and  $d_2$  for replicate 2;  $c_3$  and  $d_3$  for replicate 3);  $a_n$  is the *y*-intercept and  $b_n$  is the slope of the pre-transition baseline for melt *n* ( $a_1$  and  $b_1$  for replicate 1;  $a_2$  and  $b_2$  for replicate 2;  $a_3$  and  $b_3$  for replicate 3); and Kf is the temperature-dependent folding equilibrium constant. Kf is related to the temperature-dependent folding to the following equation:

$$K_{f} = \exp[-\Delta G_{f} / RT], \qquad (S2)$$

where R is the universal gas constant (0.0019872 kcal/mol/K).  $\Delta G_f$  is a function of temperature, as shown in the following equation:

$$\Delta G_{f} = \Delta H_{0} \bullet (T_{m} - T)/T_{m} + \Delta C_{p} \bullet [T - T_{m} - T \bullet \ln(T/T_{m})], \qquad (S3)$$

where  $T_m$  is the midpoint of the unfolding transition and the temperature at which  $\Delta G_f = 0$ ;  $\Delta H_0$  is the change in enthalpy upon folding at  $T = T_m$ ; and  $\Delta C_p$  is the change in heat capacity upon folding. The parameters for equations S1–S3 were used to calculate the values of  $\Delta G_f$  for each WW variant in the main text and in the tables below. CD spectra and variable temperature CD data for each WW variant are shown in Figures S2–S23, along with the fit parameters (± standard error). Standard parameter errors were used to estimate the uncertainty in the thermodynamic values given in the main text by propagation of error.



**Figure S2**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variant **16/19-00** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S3**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-11** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S4**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants s16/19-11 in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta$ Gf,  $\Delta$ Hf, and -T $\Delta$ Sf at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S5.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-12** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S6.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-12** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S7.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-22** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S8.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-22** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S9.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-23** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.



**Figure S10.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-23** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_{f}$ ,  $\Delta H_{f}$ , and  $-T\Delta S_{f}$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_7_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S11**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-33** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S12.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-33** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S13**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-34** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S14.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-34** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_9_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S15**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/19-44** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S16.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/19-44** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_10_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S17**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **h16/19-22** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S18.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants hs16/19-22 in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of 16/19-00), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S19**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **h16/19-23** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of **16/19-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S20.** (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants hs16/19-23 in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 332 K (the melting temperature of 16/19-00), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S21**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/32-00** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 317.5 K (the melting temperature of **16/32-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S22**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **16/32-44** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_{f}$ ,  $\Delta H_{f}$ , and  $-T\Delta S_{f}$  at 317.5 K (the melting temperature of **16/32-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S23**. (A) CD spectra and (B–D) variable temperature CD data (triplicate) for 50  $\mu$ M solutions of WW variants **s16/32-44** in 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7. Fit parameters from equations S1–S3 appear in the table, as do calculated values for  $\Delta G_f$ ,  $\Delta H_f$ , and  $-T\Delta S_f$  at 317.5 K (the melting temperature of **16/32-00**), with the indicated standard errors.

# 4. ESI-TOF spectra data of WW variants

Name	Molecular	Z	Expected	Observed
	Formula		[M+z·H]/z	[M+z·H]/z
16/19-00	C179H270N56O50S	4	1010.009	1010.012
16/19-11	C189H286N56O52S	4	1052.038	1052.034
s16/19-11	C187H282N56O52S	4	1045.030	1045.037
16/19-12	C191H290N56O53S	4	1063.044	1063.044
s16/19-12	$C_{189}H_{286}N_{56}O_{53}S$	4	1056.036	1056.035
16/19-22	C193H294N56O54S	4	1074.051	1074.050
s16/19-22	C191H290N56O54S	4	1067.043	1067.039
16/19-23	$C_{195}H_{298}N_{56}O_{55}S$	4	1085.057	1085.055
s16/19-23	C193H294N56O55S	4	1078.049	1078.046
16/19-33	C197H302N56O56S	4	1096.064	1096.058
s16/19-33	C195H298N56O56S	4	1089.056	1089.049
16/19-34	$C_{199}H_{306}N_{56}O_{57}S$	4	1107.070	1107.072
s16/19-34	C197H302N56O57S	4	1100.062	1100.062
16/19-44	C201H310N56O58S	4	1118.077	1118.070
s16/19-44	C199H306N56O58S	4	1111.069	1111.061
h16/19-22	C197H302N56O50S	4	1072.071	1072.072
hs16/19-22	$C_{195}H_{298}N_{56}O_{50}S$	4	1065.064	1065.056
h16/19-23	$C_{200}H_{308}N_{56}O_{50}S$	4	1082.583	1082.579
hs16/19-23	C198H304N56O50S	4	1075.575	1075.572
16/32-00	$C_{179}H_{270}N_{56}O_{50}S$	4	1010.009	1010.008
16/32-44	C201H310N56O58S	4	1118.077	1118.072
s16/32-44	C199H306N56O58S	4	1111.069	1111.068

Table S1. Summary of the mass spectrum data for the WW variants

ESI-TOF spectra for WW variant 16/19-00, 16/19-11, s16/19-11, 16/19-12, s16/19-12, 16/19-22, s16/19-22, 16/19-23, s16/19-23, s16/19-33, s16/19-34, s16/19-34, s16/19-44, s16/19-44, h16/19-22, hs16/19-22, hs16/19-23, hs16/19-23, 16/32-00, 16/32-44, s16/32-44 are shown in Figures S25–S46.

![](_page_14_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S24. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-00. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1010.009$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1010.012$  Da.

![](_page_15_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S25. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-11. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1052.038$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1052.034$  Da.

![](_page_15_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S26. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-11. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1045.030 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1045.037 \text{ Da.}$ 

![](_page_15_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S27. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-12. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1063.044$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1063.044$  Da.

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S28. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-12. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1056.036 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1056.035 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1056.0$ 

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S29. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-22. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1074.051$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1074.050$  Da.

![](_page_16_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S30. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-22. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1067.043$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1067.039$  Da.

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S31. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-23. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1085.057$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1085.055$  Da.

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S32. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-23. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1078.049 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1078.046 \text{ Da.}$ 

![](_page_17_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S33. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-33. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1096.064$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1096.058$  Da.

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S34. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-33. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1089.056$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1089.049$  Da.

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S35. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/19-34. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1107.070 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1107.072 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1107.07$ 

![](_page_18_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S36. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-34. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1100.062 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1100.0$ 

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S38. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/19-44. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1111.069 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1111.061 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1111.0$ 

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S39. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant h16/19-22. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1072.071$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1072.0718$  Da.

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S40. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant hs16/19-22. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1065.064$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1065.056$  Da.

![](_page_20_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S41. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant h16/19-23. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1082.583$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1082.579$  Da.

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S42. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant hs16/19-23. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1075.575 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1075.572 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1075.$ 

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S43. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/32-00. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1010.009$  Da. Obs'd  $[M+4H]^+/4 = 1010.008$  Da.

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

Figure S44. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant 16/32-44. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1118.077 \text{ Da. Obs'd } [M+4H^+]/4 = 1118.072 \text{ Da.}$ 

![](_page_21_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S45. ESI-TOF spectrum for WW variant s16/32-44. Expected  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1111.069$  Da. Observed  $[M+4H^+]/4 = 1111.068$  Da.

## 5. Analytical HPLC data

Analytical HPLC traces for WW variant 16/19-00, 16/19-11, s16/19-11, 16/19-12, s16/19-12, 16/19-22, s16/19-22, 16/19-23, s16/19-23, s16/19-33, s16/19-34, s16/19-34, s16/19-44, s16/19-44, h16/19-22, hs16/19-22, h16/19-23, hs16/19-23, 16/32-00, 16/32-44, s16/32-44 are shown in Figures S47–S68.

![](_page_22_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S46**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-00**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_22_Figure_4.jpeg)

**Figure S47**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-11**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_22_Figure_6.jpeg)

**Figure S48**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-11**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_23_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S49**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-12**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S50**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-12**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_23_Figure_4.jpeg)

**Figure S51**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-22**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_23_Figure_6.jpeg)

**Figure S52**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-22**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

**Figure S53**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-23**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

**Figure S54**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-23**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_24_Figure_5.jpeg)

**Figure S55**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-33**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_25_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S56**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-33**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S57**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-34**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

**Figure S58**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-34**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_25_Figure_6.jpeg)

**Figure S59**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/19-44**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

**Figure S60**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/19-44**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

**Figure S61**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **h16/19-22**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_26_Figure_5.jpeg)

**Figure S62**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **hs16/19-22**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S63**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **h16/19-23**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S64**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **sh16/19-23**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_27_Figure_4.jpeg)

**Figure S65**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/32-00**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_27_Figure_6.jpeg)

**Figure S66**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **16/32-44**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B ( $A = H_2O$ , 0.1% TFA; B = MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

**Figure S67**. Analytical HPLC Data for **WW** variant **s16/32-44**. Protein solution was injected onto a C18 analytical column and eluted using a linear gradient of 10-60% B (A = H<sub>2</sub>O, 0.1% TFA; B= MeCN, 0.1% TFA) over 50 minutes, followed by a 10-minute rinse (95% B), and a 10-minute column re-equilibration.

### 6. Turbidity experiments to assess aggregation kinetics

Analytical HPLC experiments suggest that hs16/19-23 is substantially more hydrophobic than s16/19-23. We wondered whether PEG-stapled WW variants might be more resistant to aggregation than hydrocarbon-stapled WW variants. To explore this possibility, we monitored the turbidity (absorbance at 405 nm) of 1.5 mg/mL solutions of 16/19-00, of s16/19-23, and of hs16/19-23 in phosphate buffered saline at 50 °C as a function of time. Though hs16/19-23 shows an initially higher level of turbidity than s16/19-23, the solutions are indistinguishable at the end of the experiment, suggesting that PEG stapling and hydrocarbon stapling provide similar protection from aggregation. This result agrees with the similar stability of s16/19-23 and hs16/19-23 (compare  $T_m$  values in main text Table 1).

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Figure S68**. Absorbance at 405 nm of 1.5 mg/mL solutions of **16/19-00** (gray circles), of **s16/19-23** (orange circles), or of **hs16/19-23** (purple circles) in phosphate buffered saline at 50 °C as a function of time. Experiment performed in triplicate, with standard error as shown above.

## 7. Synthesis and characterization of PEGylated Asn derivatives

## 2-(2-(2-azidoethoxy)ethoxy)ethan-1-ol (QX1011)

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

To a solution of NaN<sub>3</sub> (3.85 g, 59.30 mmol) in water (200 mL) was added 2-(2-(2-chloroethoxy)ethoxy)ethan-1-ol (5.00 g, 29.65 mmol) at room temperature. The reaction mixture was then refluxed overnight. The crude mixture was extracted with DCM for 3 times after the reaction was completed. The combined organic phases were washed with saturated brine and dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, evaporated to dryness to obtain QX1011 as colorless oil without further purification. Yield quantitative. MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>13</sub>N<sub>3</sub>O<sub>3</sub>Na<sup>+</sup> 198.08, found 198.08 [M+Na<sup>+</sup>]. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  3.76 – 3.73 (m, 2H), 3.71 – 3.67 (m, 6H), 3.63 – 3.62 (m, 2H), 3.41 (t, *J* = 5.0 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  72.47, 70.66, 70.39, 70.07, 61.77, 50.64.

![](_page_30_Figure_4.jpeg)

Figure S69. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1011.

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

To NaH (60 % in mineral oil, 1.3 g, 32.30 mmol, washed with dry hexane) in THF (50 mL) was added QX1011 (2.83 g, 16.15 mmol) at 0°C under argon. The reaction mixture was stirred at 0°C for 1 hour, allyl bromide (3.9 g, 32.30 mmol) in THF (10 mL) was added slowly at 0°C and stirring was continued for another 2 hours at room temperature. The reaction mixture was poured into cold saturated ammonium chloride solution (40 mL) and extracted with ethyl acetate. The combined organic phases were washed with saturated brine and dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, evaporated to dryness. The products were separated by flash column chromatography to obtain the desired product QX1013 as colorless oil. Yield 67.5%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>17</sub>N<sub>3</sub>O<sub>3</sub>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>223.16, found 233.16 [M+NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  5.86 (ddt, *J* = 16.4, 10.8, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.2 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.0 Hz, 1H), 5.12 (dd, *J* = 10.4, 1.7 Hz, 1H), 3.97 (d, *J* = 5.5 Hz, 2H), 3.63 – 3.61 (m, 8H), 3.56 – 3.54 (m, 2H), 3.33 (t, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  134.72, 116.97, 72.13, 70.64, 69.97, 69.97, 69.36, 50.60.

![](_page_33_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)


Compound QX1013 (2.35g, 10.90 mmol) and PPh<sub>3</sub> (5.73 g, 21.80 mmol) in a mixture of THF (40 mL) and water (1 mL) were stirred at room temperature overnight. 1M HCl (60 mL) was added and extracted 3 times with diethyl ether. The aqueous phase was lyophilized to obtain compound 9 as colorless oil without further purification. Isolated yield 72%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>19</sub>NO<sub>3</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 190.14, found 190.15 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  8.25 (s, 2H), 5.94 (ddt, *J* = 16.4, 11.2, 5.8 Hz, 1H), 5.30 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.2 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, *J* = 10.4 Hz, 1H), 4.07 (d, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 2H), 3.90 – 3.83 (m, 2H), 3.74 – 3.66 (m, 8H), 3.62 (dd, *J* = 5.6, 2.9 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  134.42, 117.92, 109.98, 72.17, 70.22, 70.02, 68.95, 67.58, 66.65.



\_\_\_\_\_

Figure S77. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1015.





Figure S80. HSQC data for compound QX1015.

## *tert*-butyl (S)-16-((((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)amino)-14-oxo-4,7,10-trioxa-13-azaheptadec-1-en-17-oate (QX1017)



To Fmoc-Asp-tBu (1.65 g, 4.0 mmol) dissolved in dry DMF (25 ml) was added HATU (2.5 g, 6.0 mmol), HOBT (920 mg, 6.0 mmol), DIPEA (2 ml, 12.0 mmol). Then the mixture was stirred for 15 minutes at room temperature. Then compound QX1015 (dissolved in 5 ml DMF) was added to the mixture and the system was stirred for another 2 hours at room temperature. Upon completion of the reaction monitored by TLC, 30 ml water was added to the flask and extracted 3 times with ethylacetate. The organic phases were combined, washed with saturated brine and evaporated to dryness. The crude was then applied to flash column chromatography to obtain the product QX1017 as white solid. Yield 78%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{32}H_{42}N_2O_8H^+$  583.30,  $C_{32}H_{42}N_2O_8NH_4^+$  600.33,  $C_{32}H_{42}N_2O_8Na^+$  605.28, found 583.30 [M+H<sup>+</sup>], 600.33 [M+NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>], 605.28 [M+Na<sup>+</sup>]. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.77 (d, *J* = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 7.62 (dd, *J* = 7.6, 3.5 Hz, 2H), 7.40 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.31 (s, 1H), 6.07 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 5.91 (ddt, *J* = 16.5, 11.0, 5.8 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 5.20 (d, *J* = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 4.49 (dt, *J* = 8.9, 4.6 Hz, 1H), j 4.02 (d, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 2H), 3.66 – 3.52 (m, 12H), 2.86 (dd, *J* = 15.5, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 2.69 (dd, *J* = 15.5, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 1.48 (s, 9H).



Figure S81. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1017.



Figure S82. <sup>1</sup>H NMR data for compound QX1017.

# (S)-16-((((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)amino)-14-oxo-4,7,10-trioxa-13-azaheptadec-1-en-17-oic acid (QX1019)



Compound **QX1017** (953 mg, 1.80 mmol) was dissolved in a mixture of TFA (3 ml) and water (150 uL). Then the reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2 hours. After completion of the reaction, TFA and water were removed by rotavapor. Yield quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>28</sub>H<sub>34</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>8</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 527.23, found 527.24 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-d)  $\delta$  10.59 (s, 1H), 7.76 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.60 (d, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 7.40 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.32 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.06 (s, 1H), 6.28 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 5.84 (ddt, *J* = 16.6, 11.0, 5.9 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (d, *J* = 17.2 Hz, 1H), 5.18 (d, *J* = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 4.63 – 4.57 (m, 1H), 4.39 (d, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 4.22 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 3.99 (d, *J* = 5.9 Hz, 2H), 3.62 – 3.50 (m, 12H), 2.92 (dd, *J* = 15.5, 3.9 Hz, 1H), 2.77 (dd, *J* = 15.3, 6.4 Hz, 1H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  173.29, 171.91, 159.97, 159.42, 158.87, 158.33, 156.70, 143.39, 141.27, 133.35, 127.83, 127.15, 125.11, 119.99, 118.66, 116.73, 112.94, 72.23, 70.25, 70.03, 69.76, 69.02, 68.75, 67.82, 46.91, 39.77, 38.94, 37.82.



Figure S83. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1019.







## QX1083

Procedure was performed as described above for compound **QX1011** but using 2-(2-chloroethoxy)ethan-1-ol as starting material. Yield: 44.3% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>9</sub>N<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 132.08, found 132.08 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  3.77 (dd, *J* = 5.3, 3.7 Hz, 2H), 3.74 – 3.69 (m, 2H), 3.63 (dd, *J* = 5.2, 3.7 Hz, 2H), 3.43 (t, *J* = 5.0 Hz, 2H), 2.24 (b.r.s, 1H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  72.44, 70.07, 61.79, 50.74.



Figure S88. <sup>1</sup>H NMR data for compound QX1083.





Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1013 but using QX1083 as starting material. Desired product not visible by mass spectrometry, though detectable by NMR. Yield: 82.7%; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  5.92 (ddt, *J* = 17.3, 10.3, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, *J* = 17.3, 1.7 Hz, 1H), 5.19 (dd, *J* = 10.4, 1.6 Hz, 1H), 4.04 (dt, *J* = 5.7, 1.5 Hz, 2H), 3.72 – 3.64 (m, 4H), 3.65 – 3.59 (m, 2H), 3.40 (t, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  134.66, 117.15, 72.29, 70.73, 70.06, 69.45, 50.68.



Figure S91. <sup>1</sup>H NMR data for compound QX1085.



## 2-(2-(allyloxy)ethoxy)ethan-1-amine (QX1095)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1015 but using QX1085 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>15</sub>NO<sub>2</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 146.12, found 146.12 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  8.14 (b.r.s, 2H), 5.91 (ddt, *J* = 17.3, 10.4, 5.8 Hz, 1H), 5.29 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 5.20 (dd, *J* = 10.3, 1.2 Hz, 2H), 4.04 (d, *J* = 5.8 Hz, 1H), 3.83 (t, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 2H), 3.73 – 3.68 (m, 2H), 3.66 – 3.61 (m, 2H), 3.28 (q, *J* = 5.4 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  134.25, 117.94, 72.13, 70.21, 69.13, 66.69, 39.73.



Figure S94. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1095.









Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1017 but using QX1095 as starting material. Yield: 85.8%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>30</sub>H<sub>38</sub>N2O<sub>7</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 539.28, found 539.28 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.78 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.63 (d, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 7.41 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 2H), 7.33 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.26 (t, *J* = 6.0 Hz, 1H), 6.11 (d, *J* = 8.4 Hz, 1H), 5.92 (ddt, *J* = 16.4, 10.9, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.29 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.7 Hz, 1H), 5.21 (dd, *J* = 10.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.50 (dt, *J* = 8.9, 4.7 Hz, 1H), 4.43 (dd, *J* = 10.3, 7.4 Hz, 1H), 4.33 (t, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 4.25 (dd, *J* = 10.3, 7.1 Hz, 1H), 4.03 (d, *J* = 5.7 Hz, 2H), 3.58 (dt, *J* = 9.4, 3.5 Hz, 6H), 3.47 (q, *J* = 5.3 Hz, 2H), 2.91 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 2.72 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 1.49 (s, 9H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  170.02, 169.83, 162.57, 156.19, 143.96, 141.26, 134.48, 127.67, 127.06, 125.20, 119.93, 117.45, 109.99, 82.22, 72.23, 70.30, 69.68, 69.33, 67.11, 51.43, 47.15, 39.23, 38.62, 37.92, 36.50, 31.45, 27.93.









Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1019 but using QX1099 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{26}H_{30}N_2O_7H^+482.22$ , found 482.23. [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  10.94 (b.r.s, 1H), 7.79 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.61 (dd, J = 12.4, 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.43 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (t, J = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.98 (s, 1H), 6.30 (d, J = 7.5 Hz, 1H), 5.89 (ddt, J = 16.4, 11.7, 6.1 Hz, 1H), 5.39 – 5.16 (m, 2H), 4.74 – 4.33 (m, 2H), 4.24 (q, J = 6.3 Hz, 1H), 4.07 (dd, J = 16.4, 5.9 Hz, 2H), 3.84 – 3.54 (m, 8H), 2.90 (dd, J = 18.3, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 2.77 (dd, J = 18.3, 5.4 Hz, 1H).







Figure S105. HSQC data for compound QX1101.



### QX1107

Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1015 but using 2-azidoethan-1-ol as starting material. Yield: 90.7%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>11</sub>NOH<sup>+</sup> 102.09, found 102.09 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  8.24 (s, 2H), 5.95 (ddt, *J* = 16.4, 10.9, 5.6 Hz, 1H), 5.34 (dd, *J* = 17.3, 1.7 Hz, 1H), 5.23 (d, *J* = 10.4 Hz, 1H), 4.09 (d, *J* = 5.6 Hz, 2H), 3.78 (t, *J* = 5.1 Hz, 2H), 3.28 (q, *J* = 5.4 Hz, 2H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  134.07, 117.93, 72.12, 65.41, 39.68.



Figure S106. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1107.







<u>N<sup>2</sup>-(((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)-N<sup>4</sup>-(2-(allyloxy)ethyl)-L-asparagine (QX1111)</u>



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1019 but using QX1107 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>24</sub>H<sub>26</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>6</sub>H<sup>+</sup>439.19, found 439.18 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  9.38 (s, 1H), 7.79 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.62 (d, *J* = 7.7 Hz, 2H), 7.43 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.88 (s, 1H), 6.38 (d, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 5.88 (ddt, *J* = 16.5, 11.1, 5.8 Hz, 1H), 5.29 (d, *J* = 16.3 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (d, *J* = 9.9 Hz, 1H), 4.69 – 4.60 (m, 1H), 4.42 (qd, *J* = 10.5, 6.8 Hz, 2H), 4.31 – 4.14 (m, 1H), 4.02 (d, *J* = 6.0 Hz, 2H), 3.62 – 3.39 (m, 4H), 3.05 (dd, *J* = 17.9, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 2.90 (dd, *J* = 15.9, 6.6 Hz, 1H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  174.13, 171.82, 159.62, 159.07, 156.79, 143.34, 141.32, 133.32, 127.89, 127.17, 125.08, 120.07, 118.68, 116.54, 112.76, 109.98, 72.11, 67.92, 67.83, 50.62, 46.92, 39.84, 37.63.



320 330 340 350 360 370 380 390 400 410 420 430 440 450 460 470 480 490 500 510 520 530 540 550 560 570 580 590 600 Counts vs. Mass-to-Charge (m/z)

Figure S110. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1111.



Figure S112. <sup>13</sup>C NMR data for compound QX1111.



Figure S113. HSQC data for compound QX1111.



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1013 but using 2,2'-((oxybis(ethane-2,1-diyl))bis(oxy))bis(ethan-1-ol) as starting material. Yield: 33.10% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{11}H_{22}O_5H^+$  235.15, found 235.15 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  5.92 (ddt, *J* = 17.3, 10.3, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (dd, *J* = 17.3, 1.7 Hz, 1H), 5.19 (dd, *J* = 10.4, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 4.03 (dt, *J* = 5.7, 1.4 Hz, 2H), 3.75 – 3.72 (m, 2H), 3.70 – 3.65 (m, 10H), 3.63 – 3.60 (m, 4H).



Figure S114. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1127.







## 3,6,9,12-tetraoxapentadec-14-en-1-amine (QX1139)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1015 but using 1-azido-3,6,9,12-tetraoxapentadec-14-ene as starting material. Yield: quantitative. MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{11}H_{23}NO_4H^+$  234.17, found 234.17 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO-*d*<sub>6</sub>)  $\delta$  8.02 (s, 2H), 5.87 (ddt, *J* = 17.3, 10.6, 5.4 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, *J* = 17.3, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 5.13 (dd, *J* = 10.5, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 3.94 (dt, *J* = 5.4, 1.6 Hz, 2H), 3.60 (t, *J* = 5.3 Hz, 2H), 3.57 – 3.46 (m, 12H), 2.94 (q, *J* = 5.6 Hz, 2H).









#### tert-butyl (S)-19-((((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)amino)-17-oxo-4,7,10,13-tetraoxa-16-aza-icos-1-en-20-oate (QX1141)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1017 but using QX1139 as starting material. Yield: 67.2%; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>34</sub>H<sub>46</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>9</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 627.32, found 627.32 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.75 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.60 (dd, *J* = 7.3, 4.9 Hz, 2H), 7.38 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.30 (t, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 6.48 (t, *J* = 5.5 Hz, 1H), 6.15 (d, *J* = 8.5 Hz, 1H), 5.89 (ddt, *J* = 16.1, 11.2, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.25 (dd, *J* = 17.2, 1.5 Hz, 1H), 5.16 (d, *J* = 10.4 Hz, 1H), 4.48 (dt, *J* = 8.8, 4.6 Hz, 1H), 4.41 (dd, *J* = 10.5, 7.2 Hz, 1H), 4.30 (dd, *J* = 10.6, 7.4 Hz, 1H), 4.22 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 3.99 (d, *J* = 5.7 Hz, 2H), 3.67 – 3.49 (m, 16H), 2.88 (dd, *J* = 15.7, 4.9 Hz, 1H), 2.70 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.4 Hz, 1H), 1.47 (s, 9H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  170.16, 169.93, 156.20, 143.97, 143.83, 141.23, 134.62, 132.08, 132.00, 128.58, 128.49, 127.65, 127.07, 125.25, 125.18, 119.91, 117.20, 82.07, 72.19, 70.53, 70.51, 70.43, 70.23, 69.65, 69.35, 67.02, 51.45, 47.12, 39.32, 38.61, 37.75, 27.92.



Figure S122. ESI-TOF data for compound QX1141.







Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1019 but using QX1141 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>30</sub>H<sub>38</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>9</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 571.26, found 571.26 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.75 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.60 (t, *J* = 8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.38 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.30 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.29 (d, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 1H), 5.87 (ddt, *J* = 16.4, 10.9, 5.7 Hz, 1H), 5.24 (dd, *J* = 17.3, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 5.16 (d, *J* = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 4.58 (s, 1H), 4.38 (dd, *J* = 10.5, 7.3 Hz, 1H), 4.31 (dd, *J* = 10.5, 7.3 Hz, 1H), 4.21 (t, *J* = 7.3 Hz, 1H), 3.99 (d, *J* = 5.7 Hz, 2H), 3.67 – 3.50 (m, 16H), 2.78 (d, *J* = 6.3 Hz, 1H), 2.75 (d, *J* = 6.1 Hz, 1H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  172.63, 171.34, 163.06, 156.04, 143.89, 143.74, 141.23, 138.90, 134.39, 127.69, 127.10, 125.24, 125.18, 119.92, 117.50, 114.31, 72.17, 70.51, 70.39, 70.32, 70.30, 69.97, 69.34, 69.19, 67.20, 47.05, 39.61, 37.83, 36.73.



Figure S126. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX1143.






To a solution of NaN<sub>3</sub> (650 mg, 10 mmol) in DMSO (20 mL) was added 9-Bromo-1-nonene (1 ml, 5 mmol) at room temperature. The reaction mixture was heated up to 100  $^{\circ}$ C for 8 hours. The crude mixture was extracted with ethyl ether for 3 times after the reaction was completed. The combined organic phases were washed with saturated brine and dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate, evaporated to dryness to obtain QX1151 as colorless oil. Desired product not visible by mass spectrometry, though detectable by NMR. Yield quantitative. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  5.83 (ddt, *J* = 16.9, 10.1, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 5.02 (dd, *J* = 17.1, 1.9 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (dd, *J* = 10.2, 2.0 Hz, 1H), 3.28 (t, *J* = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 1.61 (q, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 1.43 – 1.33 (m, 10H).





## QX1153

Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1015 but using QX1151 as starting material. Yield: 54.5% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>19</sub>NH<sup>+</sup> 142.16, found 142.16 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  8.16 (b.r.s, 2H), 5.82 (ddt, *J* = 16.9, 10.2, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 5.02 (dd, *J* = 17.1, 1.9 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (dd, *J* = 10.1, 1.9 Hz, 1H), 3.08 – 2.93 (m, 2H), 2.06 (q, *J* = 6.8 Hz, 2H), 1.48 – 1.29 (m, 10H).









Figure S133. <sup>13</sup>C NMR data for compound QX1153.



tert-butyl N<sup>2</sup>-(((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)-N<sup>4</sup>-(non-8-en-1-yl)-L-asparaginate (QX2001)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1017 but using QX1153 as starting material. Yield: 42.4% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>32</sub>H<sub>42</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 535.31, found 535.31 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.79 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.64 (dd, *J* = 7.5, 2.2 Hz, 2H), 7.43 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.33 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.16 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 5.82 (ddt, *J* = 17.1, 10.3, 6.8 Hz, 1H), 5.78 (s, 1H), 5.01 (d, *J* = 17.8 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (d, *J* = 11.1 Hz, 2H), 4.50 (dt, *J* = 8.7, 4.6 Hz, 1H), 4.43 (dd, *J* = 10.3, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 4.34 (t, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 4.25 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 3.25 (q, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 2.89 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.8 Hz, 1H), 2.73 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 2.04 (q, *J* = 7.1, 6.3 Hz, 2H), 1.51 (s, 9H), 1.41 – 1.25 (m, 10H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  170.08, 169.72, 156.28, 143.92, 143.80, 141.27, 139.06, 127.72, 127.72, 127.11, 127.09, 125.25, 125.21, 119.98, 119.98, 114.27, 82.37, 67.20, 51.49, 47.13, 39.65, 38.07, 33.75, 29.60, 29.13, 29.01, 28.83, 27.95, 27.95, 26.87.









## <u>N<sup>2</sup>-(((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)-N<sup>4</sup>-(non-8-en-1-yl)-L-asparagine (QX2003)</u>



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1019 but using QX2001 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>28</sub>H<sub>34</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>H<sup>+</sup>479.25, found 479.25 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  10.86 (b.r.s, 1H), 7.77 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.59 (dd, *J* = 7.7, 3.5 Hz, 2H), 7.41 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.36 – 7.29 (m, 2H), 6.59 (s, 1H), 6.44 (s, 1H), 5.79 (ddt, *J* = 17.0, 12.3, 6.3 Hz, 1H), 4.99 (d, *J* = 17.3 Hz, 1H), 4.94 (d, *J* = 10.1 Hz, 1H), 4.58 (s, 1H), 4.43 – 4.30 (m, 1H), 4.21 (t, *J* = 7.2 Hz, 2H), 3.27 – 3.20 (m, 2H), 2.98 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.7 Hz, 1H), 2.88 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.7 Hz, 1H), 2.02 (q, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 2H), 1.55 – 1.17 (m, 10H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  173.93, 173.81, 171.67, 159.73, 156.81, 143.40, 143.26, 141.27, 138.99, 127.90, 127.90, 127.16, 125.08, 125.05, 120.07, 120.07, 114.25, 67.97, 46.85, 40.48, 37.60, 35.26, 33.68, 28.97, 28.89, 28.89, 28.75, 26.68.



Figure S139. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX2003.







Yield: 54.4% To a stirred solution of 1,12-dibromododecane (1.64 g, 5 mmol) in 10 mL THF was added dropwise a solution of t-BuOK (561 mg, 5 mmol) in THF (5 mL) at 75 °C over 30 min. The reaction mixture was kept stirring for 30 min at this temperature and then cooled back to room temperature. After standard workup with Et2O, the crude product was purified by flash column chromatography with hexanes as mobile phase to afford the title compound as colorless clear oil (672 mg, 54%). MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{12}H_{23}BrH^+ 247.10$ , found 247.10 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (500 MHz, Chloroform-d)  $\delta$  5.82 (ddt, J = 16.9, 10.1, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 5.00 (dq, J = 17.2, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.94 (ddd, J = 10.2, 2.1, 1.1 Hz, 1H), 3.42 (t, J = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 2.05 (q, J = 6.7 Hz, 2H), 1.86 (dt, J = 14.5, 7.0 Hz, 2H), 1.45 – 1.35 (m, 4H), 1.29 (s, 10H). 13C NMR (126 MHz, Chloroform-d)  $\delta$  139.19, 114.11, 34.02, 33.81, 32.84, 29.48, 29.44, 29.42, 29.12, 28.93, 28.77, 28.18.



Figure S143. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX2009.





dodec-11-en-1-amine (QX2013)



## QX2013

Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1015 but using QX2009 as starting material. Yield: 73.6% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for  $C_{12}H_{25}NH^+$  184.20, found 184.20 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  8.15 (b.r.s, 2H), 5.82 (ddt, J = 16.9, 10.2, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 5.00 (dd, J = 17.4, 1.8 Hz, 1H), 4.94 (d, J = 10.3 Hz, 1H), 3.01 (s, 2H), 2.05 (q, J = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 1.79 (t, J = 7.6 Hz, 2H), 1.47 – 1.18 (m, 14H).



Figure S147. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX2013.







tert-butyl N<sup>2</sup>-(((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)-N<sup>4</sup>-(dodec-11-en-1-yl)-L-asparaginate (QX2015)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1017 but using QX2013 as starting material. Yield: 57.4% MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>35</sub>H<sub>48</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 577.36, found 577.3648 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  7.79 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.64 (dd, *J* = 7.5, 2.2 Hz, 2H), 7.43 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.12 (d, *J* = 8.2 Hz, 1H), 5.84 (ddt, *J* = 16.9, 10.1, 6.7 Hz, 1H), 5.66 (s, 1H), 5.02 (dd, *J* = 17.1, 1.9 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (dd, *J* = 10.4, 2.1 Hz, 1H), 4.50 (dt, *J* = 8.3, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 4.41 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 1H), 4.34 (t, *J* = 8.8 Hz, 1H), 4.25 (t, *J* = 7.1 Hz, 1H), 3.26 (q, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 2.90 (dd, *J* = 15.6, 4.7 Hz, 1H), 2.73 (dd, *J* = 15.7, 4.5 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (q, *J* = 7.9 Hz, 2H), 1.51 (s, 9H), 1.45 - 1.22 (m, 16H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  170.01, 169.67, 156.25, 143.93, 143.79, 141.27, 139.23, 127.70, 127.70, 127.07, 127.07, 125.25, 125.20, 125.18, 119.97, 119.97, 114.13, 82.39, 67.19, 51.46, 47.14, 39.67, 38.10, 33.83, 29.62, 29.54, 29.54, 29.48, 29.29, 29.15, 28.95, 27.94, 27.94, 27.94, 26.92.



Figure S152. <sup>1</sup>H NMR data for compound QX2015.



## N<sup>2</sup>-(((9H-fluoren-9-yl)methoxy)carbonyl)-N<sup>4</sup>-(dodec-11-en-1-yl)-L-asparagine (QX2017)



Procedure was performed as described above for compound QX1019 but using QX2015 as starting material. Yield: quantitative; MS(ESI-TOF) m/z calc. for C<sub>31</sub>H<sub>40</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>H<sup>+</sup> 521.30, found 521.30 [M+H<sup>+</sup>]; <sup>1</sup>H NMR (300 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  10.99 (b.r.s., 1H), 7.80 (d, *J* = 7.5 Hz, 2H), 7.61 (d, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.44 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 7.34 (t, *J* = 7.4 Hz, 2H), 6.46 (s, 1H), 6.39 (d, *J* = 6.5 Hz, 1H), 5.84 (ddt, *J* = 16.9, 10.2, 6.6 Hz, 1H), 5.02 (d, *J* = 17.5 Hz, 1H), 4.96 (d, *J* = 11.0 Hz, 2H), 4.57 (s, 1H), 4.41 (qd, *J* = 10.4, 7.3 Hz, 2H), 4.24 (t, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 1H), 3.29 (q, *J* = 6.9 Hz, 2H), 3.02 (dd, *J* = 15.8, 3.9 Hz, 1H), 2.87 (dd, *J* = 15.9, 7.5 Hz, 1H), 2.06 (q, *J* = 7.0 Hz, 2H), 1.45 – 1.20 (m, 16H). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (75 MHz, Chloroform-*d*)  $\delta$  173.51, 171.76, 156.68, 143.42, 143.26, 141.31, 139.23, 127.92, 127.18, 125.06, 120.10, 114.13, 109.99, 77.46, 67.94, 50.62, 46.89, 40.54, 37.62, 35.38, 33.82, 29.51, 29.46, 29.17, 29.13, 28.93, 26.77, 25.03.



Figure S155. ESI-TOF MS data for compound QX2017.





