Supporting Information

Construction, mechanism and antibacterial resistance insight of the polypeptidebased nanoparticles

Jian-Bin Zhen, Mu-Han Zhao, Ying Ge, Ya Liu, Li-Wei Xu, Cheng Chen, Yong-Kuan Gong and Ke-Wu Yang*

Key Laboratory of Synthetic and Natural Functional Molecule Chemistry of Ministry of Education, Chemical Biology Innovation Laboratory, College of Chemistry and Materials Science, Northwest University, 1 Xuefu Avenue, Xi'an 710127, P. R. China.

Corresponding author: Prof. Ke-Wu Yang

E-mail address: kwyang@nwu.edu.cn.

Characterization

Proton Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (¹H NMR). The NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker AV 400 MHz spectrometer, using tetramethylsilane as an internal standard and DMSO-d₆, CDCl₃, or D_2O as solvent.

DLS Study. Measurement of particle size Distribution Polymer Micellar solution was carried out by dynamic light scattering apparatus (DLS) on a Malvern Zetasizer Nano-ZS at a fixed scattering angle of 90°. The micellar solution was centrifuged for 10 min at 5000 rpm to remove the insoluble particles and measured with polymer concentration of 1mg/mL for sample preparation.

Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM). The morphologies of micelle and bacteria were observed utilizing scanning electronic microscope (SEM). To obtain SEM images of p**2**, a drop of solution was spread on a silicon wafer and dried. For bacterial cells were incubated at 37° C to the mid log growth phase (OD₆₀₀=0.4~0.6), and then treated with p**2** at 2×MIC for 3 h. The treated bacteria was collected, washed with PBS and fixed with 2.5% (v/v) glutaraldehyde for 2-4 h, then washed again with PBS and distilled water, respectively. After dehydrating by 30, 50, 70, 90 and 100% ethanol and then replacing with tertiary butyl alcohol, which was dripped on the silicon wafer and freeze-dried. Samples were treated with gold before observation.

GPC. The molecular weight and polydispersity index of polymers were determined on a Water 1515 gel permeation chromatography (GPC) instrument equipped with two Plgel 5 mm Mixed-D column. THF or DMF was used the eluent with a flow rate of 1 mL/min, and the polystyrene as standard was used for column calibration. The polymers was centrifuged and filtered prior to experiments.

Zeta potential. Zeta potential studies was measured on a Water Nano-ZS 90 Nanosizer (Malvern Instrument) at a fixed scattering angle of 90° at room temperature.



Scheme S1. Synthetic routes of the monomer NCAs.



Scheme S2. Synthetic route of the liner polymers.



Scheme S3. Synthetic route of the pectinate polymers



Figure S1. ¹H NMR spectrum of Phe-NCA in CDCl₃.



Figure S2. ¹H NMR spectrum of Leu-NCA in DMSO-d₆



Figure S3. ¹H NMR spectrum of Z-Lys-NCA in DMSO-d₆.



Determination of the composition of polymer 1:

Table S1	The integrals	of different	characteristic	neaks
Table 21.	The integrals	of unierent	characteristic	peaks

Spectrum	A(m+n)	A(g+h)	Ax
Figure S4	94.78	2	17.43

The integral area of peak was set to be 2 as the internal reference, corresponding to the amount of the alkenyl hydrogen of initiator. The DP of polymer was determined as the following:

$$\mathsf{DP} = \frac{Am + n}{Ag + h} \times \frac{2}{5} = 18.9 \approx 19$$

DP of lysine =
$$\frac{Ax}{Ag + h}$$
 =8.71≈9

DP of phenyalanine = 19-9=10



Figure S5. ¹H NMR spectrum of polymer 2 in D_2O



Figure S6. ¹H NMR spectrum of polymer 3 in DMSO-d₆

Determination of the composition of polymer 3

Table S2. The integrals of different Characteristic peaks

Spectrum	Ai	Al	Ab
Figure S6	18.02	2	49.25

The integral area of peak was set to be 2 as the internal reference, corresponding to the amount of the alkenyl hydrogen of initiator. The DP of polymer was determined as the following:

DP of leucine =
$$\frac{Ai}{Al} \times \frac{2}{2}$$
 =9.01 \approx 9

DP of phenyalanine =
$$\frac{Ab}{AI} \times \frac{2}{6} = 8.2 \approx 8$$



Figure S7. ¹H NMR spectrum of p**4** in D_2O



Figure S8. ¹H NMR spectrum of p**5** in D₂O



Figure S9. The GPC trace of p**2**.



Figure S10. The GPC trace of p4.



Figure S11. The GPC trace of p5.



Figure S12. Determination of the critical micellization concentration of p4



Figure S13. Determination of the critical micellization concentration of $\ensuremath{\mathsf{p5}}$



Figure S14. DLS studies of different copolymers nanoparticles (by intensity).



Figure S15. DLS studies of different copolymers nanoparticles (by intensity) in MH.



Figure S16. SEM images of *P. aeruginosa* (A-C) and MRSA (ATCC43300) (D-F) before and after treatment with assembled p**2**.



Figure S17. Fluorescence micrographs of MRSA (ATCC43300) (A-C) and P. aeruginosa (A-C).



Figure S18. Resistance acquisition of MRSA (ATCC43300) and VRE in the presence of sub-MIC levels of assembled p2.

Table S3. Zeta potentials of three copolymer nanoparticles in aqueous solution at room temperature.

Polymer micelles	p5	p4	p 2
Zeta potential(mV)	+13.5	+21.6	+29.7

Table S4. Numerical $\Delta \mu RIU$ values of p2 with different concentrations on different bacterial cells.

a ci	Δ μRI	U±5
Concentrations	S. aureus (ATCC29213)	E.coli (BL21)
(mg/mL)	p	2
20	3180.52	2183.71
5	1675.37	1595.99
1	927.82	621.32
0.2	463.84	457.98
0.1	286.32	271.60
0.05	219.83	207.14

Company d(0.2 ma/mL)	$\Delta \mu RIU \pm 5$	
Compound(0.2 mg/mL)	S. aureus (ATCC29213)	E. coli (BL21)
p4	320.33	97.83
p 2	463.84	457.98
Imipenem	7.95	4.31

Table S5. Numerical $\Delta \mu RIU$ values of p2, p4 and Imipenem on different bacterial cells