Supplementary information

Biohybrid Photosynthetic Charge Accumulation as Detected by Flavin

Semiquinone Formation in Ferredoxin-NADP⁺ Reductase

Lisa M. Utschig*, Udita Brahmachari, Karen L. Mulfort, Jens Niklas, Oleg G. Poluektov

Chemical Sciences and Engineering Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, IL 60439,

USA

Corresponding author: Dr. Lisa M. Utschig, Chemical Sciences and Engineering Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, IL 60439, USA.

Email: <u>utschig@anl.gov</u>

Tel: +1-630-252-3544



Figure S1: Absorption spectrum of (black) purified FNR, $A_{280}/A_{456} = 54$; and (blue) purified FNR reconstituted with ²H-FMN, $A_{280}/A_{456} = 6.9$.



Figure S2: PSI-driven NADP⁺ Reduction. A. Reaction scheme for the PSI-driven *in vitro* reduction of NADP⁺. B. Time course of NADPH formation as monitored at 340 nm. The reaction conditions were: 20 mM Hepes pH 7.29, 3 mM MgCl₂, 2 mM sodium ascorbate, 0.03% n-dodecyl β -D-maltopyranoside, 10 μ M cytochrome c₆, 0.5 mM NADP⁺, 4 μ M ferredoxin and 60 nM PSI. The reactions were differentiated with 0.5 μ M FNR reconstituted with ²H-FMN (blue circle), and 0.5 μ M FNR reconstituted with FAD (red square). Rates (@ 5 min) 77,000 mol NADPH (mol PSI⁻¹) h⁻¹ for FNR reconstituted with FMN and 100,400 mol NADPH (mol PSI⁻¹) h⁻¹ for FNR reconstituted with FAD.



Figure S3: Time course absorption spectra of RuFld and RuFd driven NADP⁺ reduction. The experimental conditions were: 20 mM Hepes pH 7.97, 100 mM sodium ascorbate, 2 mM NADP⁺, 0.5 μ M FNR and 4.8 μ M (A) RuFld or (B) RuFd. The samples were placed in 2 mM cuvettes and illuminated with 455 nm LED (950 mA). The samples were removed from the light at specified times for UV-Vis spectral measurements. Rates of NADPH formation (@ 20 min): (A) 8500 mol NADPH (mol FNR)⁻¹h⁻¹ (B) 1050 mol NADPH (mol FNR)⁻¹h⁻¹.



Figure S4: Time course absorption spectra of Ru-apoFld NADP⁺ reduction. (A) Full UV-Vis spectrum taken at different times. (B) Plot of NADPH formed over time as determined by absorbance at 340 nm. The experimental conditions were: 20 mM Hepes pH 7.97, 100 mM sodium ascorbate, 2 mM NADP⁺, 0.5 μ M FNR and 4.8 μ M Ru-apoFd. The sample was placed in 2 mM cuvette and illuminated with 455 nm LED (950 mA). The sample was removed from the light at specified times for UV-Vis spectral measurements. Rate of NADPH formation (@ 50 min): 630 mol NADPH (mol FNR)⁻¹ h⁻¹.



Figure S5: The three oxidation states of the flavin adenine dinucleotide (FAD). Figure taken from NIH Public Access.



Figure S6: cw X-band EPR spectra of RuFd + FNR(²H-FMN) in H₂O buffer (black) and in D₂O buffer (cyan) and the respective simulations (red, blue). The sample contained 700 μ M RuFd, 325 μ M FNR(²H-FMN), 400 μ M NADP⁺, 0.1 mM sodium ascorbate, 140 mM NaCl, 20 mM Hepes, pH 7.97 and was exchanged into the D₂O buffer using 3000 MWCO centrifuge device (Amicon Ultra). Simulation parameters are summarized in Table S1. Note, that the spectral region around 338 mT in the D₂O buffer sample (cyan) is somewhat distorted due to the subtraction of the RuFd signal.



Figure S7: PSI-driven NADP⁺ reduction comparing Fd and Fld as the shuttle proteins between PSI and FNR. Time course of NADPH formation as monitored at 340 nm. The reaction conditions were: 20 mM Hepes pH 7.29, 3 mM MgCl₂, 2 mM sodium ascorbate, 0.03% n-dodecyl β -D-maltopyranoside, 10 μ M cytochrome c₆, 0.5 mM NADP⁺, and 60 nM PSI. The reactions were differentiated with 4 μ M Fd (blue circle) or 4 μ M Fld (grey square). Rates (@ 5 min) 92,500 mol NADPH (mol PSI⁻¹) h⁻¹ for assay using Fld and 100,400 mol NADPH (mol PSI⁻¹) h⁻¹ for assay using Fd.

Table S1: Simulation parameters (g-tensor, ¹H and ¹⁴N hyperfine tensors) for the EPR spectra of the flavin radicals in deuterated RuFld biohybrid ²H-Fld in H₂O buffer (black, Figure 8A), and FNR(²H-FMN) in H₂O buffer (black, Figure S6) and in D₂O buffer (cyan, Figure S6). Non-exchangeable protons of the isoalloxazine moiety are not listed.

Neutral Flavin Semiquinone								
	² H-Fld	FNR(² H-FMN) in H ₂ O FNR(² H-FM)						
	(this work)	(this work)	(this work)					
g-tensor	2.0044, 2.0036, 2.0021	2.0044, 2.0036, 2.0021	2.0044, 2.0036, 2.0021					
A(¹⁴ N(5))/MHz ^a	0, 0, 50.5	0, 0, 51	0, 0, 51					
A(¹⁴ N(10))/MHz ^a	0, 0, 25	0, 0, 29	0, 0, 29					
$A(^{1}H(5))/MHz^{a}$	5, 44, 25	3, 31, 23	(3, 31, 23)/6.5 for ² H					

^a The sign of the hyperfine coupling constants cannot be determined from the EPR spectra.

Table S2: Simulation parameters (g-tensor, ¹H and ¹⁴N hyperfine tensors) for the EPR/ENDOR spectra of neutral protein bound flavin radicals and anionic protein bound flavin radicals. Non-exchangeable protons of the isoalloxazine moiety are not listed. All examples are taken from Okafuji et al., *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 112, 3568-3574 (**2008**) and references cited therein (for Table 1).

	Neutral Flavin Semiquinone			Anionic Flavin Semiquinone	
	A. niger	E. coli DNA	Na ⁺ -NQR	A. niger glucose	Na+-NQR
	glucose oxidase	photolyase		oxidase pH 10	
	pH 5				
g-tensor	2.0043, 2.0036,	2.00431,	2.00425,	2.00429, 2.00389,	2.00436, 2.00402,
	2.0021	2.00360, 2.00217	2.00360, 2.00227	2.00216	2.00228
A(¹⁴ N(5))/MHz ^a	0, 0, 53	0, 0, 50.1	0.2, 0.2, 52.2	0, 0, 53	2.3, 2.3, 57.6
A(¹⁴ N(10))/MHz ^a	0, 0, 30	0, 0, 31.7	2.0, 2.0, 28.9	0, 0, 25	1.6, 1.6, 28.9
$A(^{1}H(5))/MHz^{a}$	10, 33.9, 24.1	8.5, 37.0, 24.9	0.2, 38.6, 25.8	-	-

^a The sign of the hyperfine coupling constants cannot be determined from the EPR spectra.