
CHAPTER 5

Implicit Modeling of Membranes

Alan Grossfield

IBM T. J. Watson Research Center, 1101 Kitchawan Road, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA

- I. Introduction
- II. Classes of Models
 - A. Solute-Focused
 - B. Membrane-Focused
- III. Interesting Problems in Implicit Membrane Modeling
 - A. Antimicrobial Peptides
 - B. Protein–Protein Association
- IV. Conclusion
- References

I. INTRODUCTION

Biological lipid membranes are central to many biological processes. They form selectively permeable barriers, allowing cells to control their contents and create concentration gradients. However, in contrast to the totally passive view espoused by standard undergraduate texts, biological membranes also actively modify cell behavior by altering the function of membrane proteins, modulating the stability of protein–protein associations, and altering the binding and distribution of small molecules including salts and osmolytes (Jensen and Mouritsen, 2004; Brown, 1994; White and Wimley, 1999; Epan, 1998, 2003; Mouritsen and Bloom, 1993; Nyholm *et al.*, 2007).

Membrane composition varies significantly in different tissues within a given organism, emphasizing that the distribution of specific lipid species is not a matter of simple abundance. For example, rod outer segment disk membrane, found in the mammalian visual system, contain roughly 50% polyunsaturated ω -3 fatty acids; this is an enormous enrichment considering their natural abundance is more like 5% (Boesze-Battaglia and Albert, 1989; Boesze-Battaglia *et al.*, 1989) Since humans are unable to synthesize ω -3s, this implies the body must be specifically trafficking them to the disk membranes. Polyunsaturated lipids have been shown

1 to significantly enhance the function of rhodopsin (which constitutes more than 1
2 90% of the protein in the disk membranes) (Mitchell *et al.*, 2001; Niu *et al.*, 2001;
3 Grossfield *et al.*, 2006), clearly demonstrating that the cell is manipulating mem- 3
4 brane content in order to optimize function. The story gets even more interesting 4
5 when the concentration of cholesterol, which inhibits rhodopsin function, is con- 5
6 sidered: the concentration is high (25–30 mol%) in immature disks found near the 6
7 bottom of the rod outer segment stack, and is greatly reduced (5 mol%) in mature 7
8 disks (Mitchell *et al.*, 2001; Niu *et al.*, 2001, 2002; Pitman *et al.*, 2005). 8

9 The last 20 years have seen a significant increase in attempts to model mem- 9
10 branes, and in particular to model their interactions with proteins and other 10
11 permeants. Conceptually, the simplest approach is to perform all-atom molec- 11
12 ular dynamics simulations; to our knowledge, the first example of a protein 12
13 modeled in an explicit lipid membrane was gramicidin in a DMPC bilayer, con- 13
14 ducted by Woolf and Roux (1994). Recent improvements in computer speed 14
15 have significantly changed the landscape of this field; where simulations were 15
16 once run for 100s of picoseconds, present technology allows us to run explicit 16
17 membrane systems for hundreds of nanoseconds (Grossfield *et al.*, 2006) or 17
18 even microseconds (Martínez-Mayorga *et al.*, 2006; Grossfield *et al.*, 2007). 18
19 However, in order to reach these timescales, the calculations require extremely 19
20 powerful supercomputers (Allen *et al.*, 2001), and even then, running long 20
21 enough to generate statistical convergence is difficult (Grossfield *et al.*, 2007;
22 Faráldo-Gomez *et al.*, 2004). 22

23 As a result, many interesting calculations can be expected to remain out 23
24 of reach of all-atom molecular dynamics for the foreseeable future. These 24
25 include simulations of membrane protein folding and insertion, dimerization (or 25
26 oligomerization) of integral membrane proteins, and membrane poration by an- 26
27 timicrobial peptides. In each case, the time- and length-scales involved would 27
28 require prohibitively long simulations. In principle, one could trade temporal 28
29 information for improved convergence by using enhanced sampling tools such as 29
30 replica exchange dynamics (Okamoto, 2004). However, while some such calcu- 30
31 lations have been reported for membranes (Nymeyer *et al.*, 2005), this technique 31
32 is difficult to apply to bilayers because of the higher temperatures tend to disrupt 32
33 bilayer structure. 33

34 One approach which has garnered significant interest in recent years is the use 34
35 of coarse-grained molecular models, where the number of atoms per molecular is 35
36 strategically reduced and the interaction potential simplified, dramatically dimin- 36
37 ishing the computational cost of the calculations and concomitantly increasing 37
38 the feasible simulation size and time. However, these methods will be discussed 38
39 extensively elsewhere in this volume, and so we will not explore them here. 39

40 An alternative approach is to combine a continuum representation of the mem- 40
41 brane with a atomic representations of the rest of the system. This scenario allows 41
42 us to focus our computational effort on the portion of we are most interested 42
43 in, for example the membrane protein whose folding we wish to explore. Rep- 43

resenting the membrane implicitly has a number of significant advantages, the most important of which is computational efficiency: as a rule, implicit models are dramatically less expensive per energy evaluation than the equivalent all-atom systems. Moreover, these models generally produce an approximation to the solvation free energy of the system, as opposed to simply the potential energy as computed in an all-atom system. As a result, no additional sampling of environmental degrees of freedom is required for a fixed solute structure. This savings is significant when one considers the nanosecond to microsecond relaxation and reorganization times of explicit lipid membranes. Finally, the absence of explicit “solvent” molecules simplifies conformational searching and enhances the power of sampling techniques like replica exchange.

The primary tradeoff in using implicit membrane models is their presumed lack of high-resolution accuracy; almost by definition, replacing all-atom models with analytic formulas sacrifices a certain level of detail. Thus, the key question becomes: what physical characteristics of the membrane must be reproduced in our membrane models to yield physically correct behavior of membrane permeants? The answer, of course, depends on the details of the system being considered, and the scientific questions asked. A model could simultaneously be well suited for some circumstances and wholly inadequate in others.

II. CLASSES OF MODELS

Lipid membranes self-assemble in an attempt to isolate hydrophobic acyl chains from the surrounding aqueous environment. Under appropriate conditions, this leads to the formation of stable bilayers, with a hydrophobic core, and interfacial region containing a mixture of polar headgroups and water, and the surrounding aqueous medium. Despite this apparent simplicity, biological membranes are capable of remarkable diversity of structure and dynamics. Although many models focus on a single property—the thickness of the hydrophobic core—real membranes have a broad range of physical characteristics which vary with lipid composition. These include structural quantities such as surface area per lipid, chain order, intrinsic curvature, and pressure profile, as well as dynamic properties such as the dielectric profile, diffusion coefficients, and chain and headgroup reorientation relaxation times.

Moreover, these properties are not independent of each other. For example, changing the hydration levels of model membranes modulates the surface area per lipid, and thus the chain order parameters. However, lipid surface area can also be controlled by varying the headgroup type, the length and degree of unsaturation of the chains, and the presence of other membrane permeants, such as cholesterol. The surface area per lipid in turn affects the magnitude of headgroup–headgroup interactions and, particularly in the case of charged headgroups, the distribution

of ions near the membrane surface. All of these properties can in principle affect the binding, conformation, stability, and oligomerization of peptides and proteins.

Thus, one critical question is, which of these membrane properties must be included to generate a successful implicit membrane model? Unfortunately, there is no simple answer to this question, as the answer depends largely on the model's intended use.

For example, if one plans to model a membrane protein using an all-atom representation, then effectively including the electrostatic effects of the membrane is probably paramount. If instead one wishes to use a simpler rigid-cylinder model for an embedded alpha helix then other issues become more important. As a direct result of this diversity, many different approaches to implicit modeling have emerged in the literature. For purposes of discussion, we have divided them into two broad classes: *Solute-focused* and *Membrane structure-focused*. Obviously, these labels represent something of a simplification, but we think this classification is on the whole helpful, in that it provides a context for understanding recent work.

A. Solute-Focused

This section will describe models best characterized as “solute-focused”. By this, we mean models where the solute—typically a protein, peptide, or small molecule—is considered with atomic or near-atomic resolution, and the membrane is largely a backdrop intended to provide an appropriate venue. As a rule, these models neglect details of membrane structure other than the thickness of the hydrophobic low-dielectric core, and contain few provisions to account for the solute's disruption of membrane structure. Instead, these methods tend to focus on the membrane–solute interactions and the ways in which the membrane modifies solute–solute interactions, especially via electrostatics.

Although membrane electrostatics will be discussed in a separate chapter of this book, one cannot adequately introduce this class of implicit membrane models without first reviewing electrostatic and dielectric theory as applied to membranes. Indeed, one of the most pervasive concepts in membrane modeling is the notion of a low dielectric slab embedded between semi-infinite regions of high dielectric. For this reason, we begin by considering the simplest circumstance, a spherical charge in an infinite uniform dielectric. The charging free energy for a charge q in a sphere of radius a embedded in a region of dielectric ϵ can be computed by integrating the electric field over all volume outside the sphere

$$\Delta G = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int \epsilon E^2 dV = \frac{1}{8\pi} \int_a^\infty \epsilon \left(\frac{q}{\epsilon r^2} \right)^2 4\pi r^2 dr = -\frac{q^2}{2\epsilon a} \quad (1)$$

generating the familiar Born equation (Born, 1920). This derivation can be generalized for the case of a permanent (Bell, 1931) or polarizable (Bonner, 1951)

dipole (the so-called Onsager equation), or for an arbitrary charge distribution (Kirkwood, 1939).

However, the situation becomes somewhat more complex when the environment itself becomes heterogeneous, as is the case in a membrane. The electrostatic field due to a point charge approaching the barrier between two semi-infinite dielectric slabs is easily computed using the method of images (Jackson, 1962), and from this one can compute the charging energy. However, this solution contains an unphysical divergence as the charge approaches the dielectric interface due to the point charge approximation. This divergence, which appears repeatedly in the development of membrane models, was resolved by Ulstrup and coworkers by converting the volume integrals into surface integrals and directly accounting for the intersection between the ion surface and dielectric interface (Kharkats and Ulstrup, 1991). The result for an ion a distance $h > a$ from the interface is

$$\Delta G = -\frac{q^2}{8\epsilon_1 a} \left\{ 4 + \left(\frac{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \right) \left(\frac{2}{h/a} \right) + \left(\frac{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \right)^2 \left[\frac{2}{1 - (h/a)^2} + \frac{1}{2h/a} \ln \frac{(2h/a) + 1}{(2h/a) - 1} \right] \right\} \quad (2)$$

while the result for $0 \leq h \leq a$, where the ion overlaps the dielectric interface, is

$$\Delta G = -\frac{q^2}{8\epsilon_1 a} \left\{ \left(2 + \frac{2h}{a} \right) + \left(\frac{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \right) \left(4 - \frac{2h}{a} \right) + \left(\frac{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \right)^2 \left[\frac{(1 + h/a)(1 - h/a)}{1 + 2h/a} + \frac{1}{2h/a} \ln(1 + 2h/a) \right] \right\} + \frac{q^2}{4\epsilon_2 a} \left(\frac{2\epsilon_2}{\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{h}{a} \right). \quad (3)$$

The same authors also derived analytic solutions for the charging free energy for a spherical charge in the presence of a slab of low dielectric surrounded by semi-infinite regions of higher dielectric, albeit without the finite ion size corrections (Iversen *et al.*, 1998). However, this solution involves several infinite sums, and is thus cumbersome to implement computationally, although Flewelling and Hubbell devised an efficient approximate solution (Flewelling and Hubbell, 1986). Krishtalik took this approach one step further, deriving an analytical solution for the case where there are 5 distinct dielectric regions (2 high-dielectric water regions, 2 moderate-dielectric interfacial regions, 1 low dielectric core) (Krishtalik, 1996). Previously, Parsegian published analytic solutions to several simple problems related to ion permeation through membranes (Parsegian, 1969).

Since analytic approaches are only readily applicable to simple geometries such as spheres, numerical methods are necessary in order to treat more biologically-relevant systems. The most obvious approach is to numerically solve the Poisson equation (or, if salt effects are to be included, the Poisson–Boltzmann equation)

(Schnitzer and Lambrakis, 1991; Sharp and Honig, 1990; Murray *et al.*, 1997; Lin *et al.*, 2002)

$$\nabla \cdot \epsilon(\vec{r}) \nabla \Phi(\vec{r}) = -4\pi\rho(\vec{r}), \quad (4)$$

where Φ is the electrostatic potential, $\epsilon(\vec{r})$ is the position-dependent dielectric constant, and ρ is the charge density (typically represented by a finite number of point charges q_i). Once this equation has been solved, the electrostatic free energy can be computed as

$$\Delta G_{\text{elec}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \rho(\vec{r}) \Phi(\vec{r}) dV = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i^{\text{charges}} q_i \Phi_i, \quad (5)$$

where Φ_i is the electrostatic potential at the location of the i th charge. There is an extensive literature on the application of this formalism to biomolecular problems, so instead of reviewing it here we will simply suggest readers consult the recent review by Baker and the references cited there (Baker, 2005).

Several groups have directly applied the Poisson–Boltzmann approach to membrane-protein association thermodynamics. For example, Ben-Tal *et al.* used it to examine the thermodynamics of α -helix insertion, representing the membrane as a simple low dielectric slab (Ben-Tal *et al.*, 1996). Murray and coworkers explicitly included the lipid headgroups in their calculations (Murray *et al.*, 1997); this was particularly important in later work examining the association of basic peptides with anionic lipid bilayers (Murray *et al.*, 1999).

Computing the electrostatic solvation free energy via the Poisson equation has a number of distinct advantages: it is directly seated in electrostatic theory, and within the limits of the dielectric assumption and numerical accuracy it is correct. However, there are a number of drawbacks. Historically, the finite-difference approaches typically used are relatively expensive, and computing forces sufficiently accurate for use in molecular dynamics was difficult. Recently, progress has been made in some of these areas (Lu *et al.*, 2005a, 2005b; Feig *et al.*, 2004), but for many applications rigorous Poisson electrostatics are still prohibitively expensive. Moreover, unless headgroups and some waters are explicitly included, this approach does not reproduce the correct sign of the electrostatic potential at the center of the lipid bilayer, which is thought to be crucial in the thermodynamics of many membrane permeants (Lin *et al.*, 2002).

As a result, significant effort has been invested in developing faster, if more approximate, methods for computing electrostatic energies in dielectric media. Many of the most commonly used methods are variants of the generalized Born approach originally developed by Still and coworkers (Still *et al.*, 1990). Although these developments have been the subject of several recent reviews (Bashford and Case, 2000; Feig *et al.*, 2004), the underlying techniques and assumptions become relevant when the formalism is expanded to cover membranes, so we will discuss it here as well.

Most generalized Born methods are built around the empirical solvation free energy expression suggested by Still *et al.* (Still *et al.*, 1990)

$$\Delta G = -\left(1 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \sum_{i,j}^{N_{\text{atoms}}} \frac{q_i q_j}{\sqrt{r_{ij}^2 + \alpha_i \alpha_j \exp(-r_{ij}^2/4\alpha_i \alpha_j)}}, \quad (6)$$

where q_i is the partial charge on the i th atom, the sum is over all atom pairs (including self-interaction) and α_i is the i th generalized Born radius. The radii are constructed by computing the electrostatic free energy to solvate each charge individually in the protein, and then plugging that free energy into the Born equation (Eq. (1)) to extract an effective radius. The free energy is computed assuming the protein is a region of low dielectric, usually 1, and only the atom under consideration is charged. As a rule, the Coulomb field approximation is invoked to simplify the calculation; that is, the electric field due to the charge is presumed to be undistorted by the surrounding dielectric boundary. The result is volume integral over all space excluding the atom itself. This can be converted to a difference between two volume integrals, one over all space outside the atom, and the other only over the volume outside the atom but inside the protein

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_i} = \frac{1}{R_i} - \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{\text{solute}, r > R_i} \frac{1}{r^4} dV. \quad (7)$$

Although Eq. (6) appears to contain only pairwise interactions, many-body effects are included implicitly via the volume integral in Eq. (7).

The key to the effectiveness of the Generalized Born method is the calculation of the effective Born radii; recent work has shown that if “perfect” radii are used—the electrostatic free energy of each atom is computed numerically using a standard Poisson solver—then Eq. (6) does an excellent job reproducing the molecular solvation energies computed using the Poisson equation (Lee *et al.*, 2002), which in turn does a good job reproducing the electrostatic portion of the solute–solvent interaction from explicit solvent simulations (Wagoner and Baker, 2004). The original Still formulation used a numerical integration over the protein volume, which was expensive and was ill-suited to computing forces suitable for molecular dynamics calculations. Many groups developed better approaches to performing this integral, including pairwise approximations (Bashford and Case, 2000; Feig *et al.*, 2004), various numerical schemes (Srinivasan *et al.*, 1999; Lee *et al.*, 2002, 2003; Grycuk, 2003; Tjong and Zhou, 2007), and a reformulation as a surface integral (Ghosh *et al.*, 1998; Gallicchio *et al.*, 2002). Some groups also added corrections intended to improve on the Coulomb field assumption (Lee *et al.*, 2003; Grycuk, 2003; Tjong and Zhou, 2007)

The situation becomes significantly more complex when one considers a membrane environment, because in that instance energies and forces depend not only

1 on the relative position of the atoms but on their absolute location in the mem- 1
2 brane. To our knowledge, the first membrane model explicitly based on the 2
3 generalized Born formulation was due to Spassov *et al.* (Spassov *et al.*, 2002). 3
4 Their approach, which they call GB/IM, includes the heterogeneous dielectric 4
5 environment by considering the membrane interior to have the same dielectric 5
6 as the protein, with the result that the volume integral over the embedded por- 6
7 tion is replaced by an integral over the whole of the membrane interior, which 7
8 is approximated by an analytic function fit to Poisson–Boltzmann results. The 8
9 remaining protein volume is integrated using the efficient pairwise method of 9
10 Dominy and Brooks (Dominy and Brooks, 1999). They applied their method- 10
11 ology rigid structures of bacteriorhodopsin and rhodopsin, and performed a short 11
12 dynamics simulation of the influenza fusion peptide bound to the membrane. 12

13 *Im et al.* (2003a) took a related approach. They extended previous work from 13
14 the Brooks group (Im *et al.*, 2003b), where numeric behavior of the volume in- 14
15 tegration was improve by use of a smoothing function, and, like Spassov *et al.* 15
16 (2002), considered the membrane to be part of the protein interior. Their ap- 16
17 proach contained analytic corrections to the Coulomb field assumption originally 17
18 designed for soluble proteins. They validated their results by examining the be- 18
19 havior of several membrane-binding peptides, including melittin, M2-TMP, and 19
20 the glycoporphin A dimer, comparing against Poisson–Boltzmann calculations and 20
21 experimental structural information. The same model was later used to explore the 21
22 folding and insertion of several designed helical transmembrane peptides (Im and 22
23 Brooks, 2005). 23

24 Although both of these methods appear to perform well in practice, the assump- 24
25 tion that the membrane and protein have the same dielectric is troubling. Because 25
26 the protein charges are explicitly represented, one would expect the continuum 26
27 dielectric inside the protein to be 1, as done for simulations where both solute and 27
28 solvent are explicitly represented; the force field parameters are chosen with this 28
29 application in mind. By contrast, the membrane interior has a dielectric of 2–4. 29
30

31 Feig and coworkers introduced a formalism to explicitly handle multiple di- 31
32 electric environments (Feig *et al.*, 2004), and later applied it membrane modeling 32
33 (Tanizaki and Feig, 2005, 2006). This model, called the heterogeneous dielec- 33
34 tric generalized Born or HDGB, contains several notable technical advancements. 34
35 First, the membrane representation is improved: the chemical heterogeneity of 35
36 the membrane–water interface (Jacobs and White, 1989) is explicitly included in 36
37 the calculation by modeling the membrane as a series of dielectric slabs, rather than 37
38 just two regions. They computed the free energy profile for a test charge in this 38
39 model using the Poisson–Boltzmann equation and used the results to spline-fit an 39
40 effective dielectric constant profile to be used in the simulations. While the phys- 40
41 ical meaning of a bulk quantity like the dielectric varying smoothly on atomic 41
42 lengthscales is unclear, the result is a formalism which accurately recapitulates a 42
43 more realistic model for membrane electrostatics. Moreover, this method is built 43

1 on top of a rigorous volume integration scheme (Lee *et al.*, 2003), and has been 1
2 very carefully parameterized and characterized. 2

3 However, this careful characterization revealed some unfortunate complications 3
4 when applying this model to larger molecules, such as a bacteriorhodopsin 4
5 monomer or trimer. Tanizaki and Feig found that the results were very sensitive 5
6 to the long range electrostatics cutoff, oscillating over a range of hundreds 6
7 of kcal/mol (Tanizaki and Feig, 2006); this can result in almost comic failures, 7
8 where setting the electrostatic cutoff at a seemingly reasonable 16 Å causes the 8
9 bacteriorhodopsin monomer to be most stable in a horizontal orientation, with the 9
10 helices lying in the plane of the membrane and the loops embedded in the mem- 10
11 brane core. These effects go away with a sufficiently long cutoff, in the range 11
12 of 36–38 Å, but the result is a dramatic increase in the computational cost. Al- 12
13 though this problem has not been reported with the other methods discussed here, 13
14 it seems likely that the underlying mechanisms will be present in all of them. 14

15 To this point, we have focused entirely on the electrostatic components of these 15
16 models. This is of course incomplete; all of these models, whether intended for 16
17 bulk solvent or specific to membrane modeling, contain at least one additional 17
18 term representing non-electrostatic effects. Most follow the traditional approach 18
19 from bulk solvent modeling and assume that these interactions can be related to 19
20 the solvent accessible surface area. This approximation makes intuitive sense, and 20
21 has some theoretical basis in the scaled-particle theory of hard sphere solvation 21
22 (Pierotti, 1976). However, several groups have argued that nonpolar solvation, 22
23 which includes terms from cavitation, hydrophobic effects, and favorable van der 23
24 Waal's interactions, requires a somewhat more subtle treatment (Gallicchio *et al.*, 24
25 2002; Levy *et al.*, 2003). Wagoner and Baker showed that a significant fraction of 25
26 the error in continuum methods, when compared to explicit solvent calculations, 26
27 was due to the treatment of the non-electrostatic components, and that including 27
28 terms to explicitly account for volume effects and attractive solute–solvent inter- 28
29 actions greatly improved the situation (Wagoner and Baker, 2006). 29

30 The situation is—at least in principle—far more complex in the context of 30
31 a lipid bilayer. Lipid acyl chains are far larger than water molecules, and un- 31
32 like bulk solvent, these chains have a net orientation. As a result, cavitation 32
33 effects should arguably have some additional shape and location dependence. 33
34 Furthermore, the largely anhydrous environment means that hydrophobic inter- 34
35 actions should likely be neglected in the membrane core, but other nonpolar 35
36 terms, such as favorable solute–solvent dispersion interactions and solvent en- 36
37 tropy remain. Finally, molecules permeating the lipid bilayer feel a lateral pressure 37
38 profile; this pressure varies significantly not only with location in the mem- 38
39 brane but also with membrane composition (Carrillo-Tripp and Feller, 2005; 39
40 Ollila *et al.*, 2007; Cantor, 1999a), and may have functional implications (Cantor, 40
41 1997a, 1997b, 1999b; Pitman *et al.*, 2005). 41

42 Still, most of the methods discussed above model nonpolar interactions strictly 42
43 on the basis of solvent accessible surface area, usually parameterized to repro- 43

duce partitioning free energies from water to liquid alkane and combined with a position-dependent scaling factor which turns the interactions off in the membrane interior. However, even within this genre, there are some interesting variations. Tanizaki and Feig (2005) attempted to capture position dependent effects by fitting the effective surface tension in the membrane to the potential of mean force of O₂ permeating an explicit lipid bilayer (Marrink and Berendsen, 1996). As a result, this parameterization accounts for variations in cavitation and dispersion with membrane depth.

Ben-Tal *et al.* (1996) took a different approach in their calculations exploring rigid helix insertion into lipid bilayers; while they did use an area term, they also included a term to account for lipid disruption, based on chain statistics calculations from Fattal and Ben-Shaul (1995). However, the inclusion of this term relies on the rigid-body nature of the calculation, since it is derived by treating the helix as a featureless cylinder.

Lazaridis took an entirely different approach in developing his implicit membrane model. IMM1 (Lazaridis, 2003), which is a generalization of the EFF1 solvation model (Lazaridis and Karplus, 1999) to a membrane environment. EFF1 consists of a distance-dependent dielectric combined with a pairwise, distance-dependent solvation term. IMM1 adds an explicit position-dependent atomic potential, parameterized to reproduce liquid-hydrocarbon transfer free energies of model compounds, combined with an enhancement of the electrostatic interactions in the bilayer interior. Although there is little theoretical justification underlying the functional forms of the model, it is easy to compute, and dynamics trajectories on systems such as the glycophorin A dimer, a helix isolated from bacteriorhodopsin, and several membrane-binding peptides all produced qualitatively reasonable results. In a later paper, IMM1 was further generalized to represent the internal water in a simulation of a transmembrane β -barrel protein (Lazaridis, 2002).

Several groups have also developed purely empirical implicit membrane models. For example, IMPALA model of Ducarme *et al.* (1998) applies simple atom-restraints, parameterized to reproduce partitioning experiments, independent of molecular context. This method is essentially free computationally, but has a number of unphysical implications, most notably that atoms of a given type feel exactly the same membrane forces whether on the surface of the molecule or buried in the interior. As a result, such a method is completely incapable of reproducing basic phenomena such as the stabilization of helical structure by the membrane environment. The same complaint can be made about the model from Sanders and Schwonek, although that model succeeds admirably in its stated goal of reproducing binding thermodynamics of small rigid molecules (Sanders and Schwonek, 1993).

Efremov *et al.* (1999a, 1999b) developed a model based entirely on solvent accessible surface area, generalizing the atomic solvation parameters of (Eisenberg and McLachlan, 1986). Initially, their models were parameterized to reproduce

low dielectric bulk solvent like hexane (Efremov *et al.*, 1999a) and octanol (Efremov *et al.*, 1999b), although later studies introduced spatial heterogeneity (Efremov *et al.*, 2002; Vereshaga *et al.*, 2007). These models produce qualitatively correct behavior, for example stabilizing α -helices, but as with the original atomic solvation parameters are not quantitatively accurate.

Of course, conceptually simple models are not to be disdained solely on that account. Rather, the goals and assumptions of the calculation must always be considered. For example, Pappu *et al.* showed they were able to find the correctly packed dimer structure of glycoporphin A by representing the membrane as an infinite dielectric (no electrostatics at all) and a spring to prevent helix flipping (Pappu *et al.*, 1999).

B. Membrane-Focused

In contrast to the methods discussed in Section II.A, the methods presented in this chapter are largely focused on understanding the effects of membrane structure on the behavior of bound molecules. As a rule, the solute representations are not as detailed, but more care is taken to retain information about the membrane. In general, these models are intended in large part to describe the variation of membrane-solute interactions as a function of membrane composition, phenomena that are largely neglected by the models described previously.

The present class of models can be further divided into two subclasses: continuum models and chain models. The former class represents the membrane using some form of continuum mechanics based on some bulk property, *e.g.* hydrophobic thickness, while the latter attempts to build toward macroscopic predictions via a microscopic consideration of chain statistics.

The best known of the continuum models is the “mattress model” of Mouritsen and Bloom (Mouritsen and Bloom, 1984; Jensen and Mouritsen, 2004). In this approach, the lipids (and any additional membrane components, such as transmembrane proteins) are represented primarily as coupled springs with variable hydrophobic thickness. By assigning equilibrium thicknesses to the lipids and protein in specific phases, the elastic energy can be computed as

$$H_{\text{Elastic}}^{\alpha} = n_L^{\alpha} A_L^{\alpha} (d_L^{\alpha} - d_L^{0,\alpha})^2 + n_P^{\alpha} A_P^{\alpha} (d_P^{\alpha} - d_P^{0,\alpha})^2, \quad (8)$$

where n_i^{α} is the number of molecules of i in phase α , A is the effective force constant for thickness deformations, d_i is the hydrophobic thickness of molecules of type i , and $d_i^{0,\alpha}$ is the equilibrium thickness of molecules of type i in phase α . Specific protein–lipid interactions can also be included, such as hydrophobic mismatch

$$H_{\text{hydro}}^{\alpha} = \frac{n_L^{\alpha} n_P^{\alpha}}{n_L^{\alpha} + n_P^{\alpha}} B_{LP}^{\alpha} |d_L^{\alpha} - d_P^{\alpha}| \quad (9)$$

1 and favorable adhesion

$$H_{\text{adhes}}^{\alpha} = \frac{n_L^{\alpha} n_P^{\alpha}}{n_L^{\alpha} + n_P^{\alpha}} C_{LP}^{\alpha} \min(d_L^{\alpha}, d_P^{\alpha}), \quad (10)$$

2
3
4
5 where B and C are the positive and negative interaction coefficients for the re-
6 spective terms. These energy terms constitute the excess enthalpy for the system,
7 which can then be combined with the free energy for an ideal mixture to compute
8 the free energies for different states. Thus, one can use the mattress model ex-
9 amine the effects of membrane permeants on lipid structure (and *vice versa*). For
10 example, the original paper focuses on the effects of different “proteins” on the
11 lipid phase diagram (Mouritsen and Bloom, 1984). In part because of its lack of
12 atomic-level details, this model has been very successful in interpreting and sug-
13 gesting experiments, particularly those involving designed single transmembrane
14 helices such as the WALP and KALP families (Nyholm *et al.*, 2007).

15 However, the mattress model is neither the only nor the first continuum model
16 for lipid–protein interactions. To pick one representative example, we consider
17 the work of Owicki and McConnell, who used Landau–de Gennes theory to con-
18 sider lipid–protein interactions in terms of order parameters related to the lipid
19 gel–liquid phase transition (Owicki *et al.*, 1978; Owicki and McConnell, 1979).
20 Their model describes mechanisms by which different lipid species could alter
21 protein–lipid and even protein–protein interactions. However, the utility of the
22 work is somewhat limited by its mandate that the protein be evenly distributed in
23 the membrane, and by its focus on the notion of an annulus of boundary lipids
24 surrounding the protein.

25 Brown and coworkers have proposed an alternative continuum formulation.
26 Inspired by the unusual lipid composition of retinal rod outer segment disk mem-
27 branes, with high concentrations of non-lamellar-forming lipids, they focused on
28 spontaneous curvature of the membrane rather than simple hydrophobic matching
29 (Gibson and Brown, 1993; Brown, 1994, 1997). When applied to the Meta-
30 I/II equilibrium of photoactivated rhodopsin (Endress *et al.*, 2002), this
31 model suggests that the lipid-composition dependent portion of the free energy
32 change can be written as

$$\Delta G^0 = \kappa [(H_{\text{MII}}^L - H_0^L)^2 - (H_{\text{MI}}^L - H_0^L)^2] + \gamma_{\text{LP}} (A_{\text{MII}}^P - A_{\text{MI}}^P), \quad (11)$$

33
34 where H_i^L is the mean curvature of the membrane with the protein in state i ,
35 γ_{LP} is the lipid–protein surface tension, and A^P is the exposed area of the pro-
36 tein, believed to increase upon formation of Meta-II. More recently, this model
37 was used to argue for the role of spontaneous curvature in modulating rhodopsin
38 aggregation as well as function (Botelho *et al.*, 2006). This work proposes that in-
39 creased protein concentration and decreasing bilayer thickness alter rhodopsin’s
40 properties via the same mechanism, a competition between curvature strain and
41 hydrophobic matching.
42
43

By contrast, another subclass of models focused on the statistical physics of the lipid chains. In fairness, these two subclasses are not as distinct as they appear: chain states are invoked in the derivation and parameterization of the continuum models, and the results derived from the chain models, especially in the mean-field approximation, point back toward quantities used in the continuum methods.

A useful starting place to review chain-based models is the work of Marčelja (1974, 1976). His model considers the membrane as a set hexagonal of lattice sites, each of which contains a single lipid molecule. Each lipid is characterized by a molecular order parameter

$$\eta_j = \left\langle \frac{1}{n} \sum_m \left(\frac{3}{2} \cos^2 v_m - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\rangle_j, \quad (12)$$

where n is the number of carbon segments in the chain v_m is the orientation of the m th segment. Lipid–lipid interaction is represented in the molecular field approximation, summing over nearest neighbors

$$\Phi_i = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j=1}^6 V_0 \phi_j, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\phi_j = \left\langle \frac{n_{\text{tr}}}{n^2} \sum_m \left(\frac{3}{2} \cos^2 v_m - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\rangle_j \quad (14)$$

and n_{tr}/n is the fraction of trans states, V_0 is the coupling constant, and Φ_i describes the strength of the molecular field acting to orient the molecule at site i . If there is a protein molecule at a neighboring site, a term in Eq. (13) is replaced by the lipid–protein interaction V_{lp} (Marčelja, 1976). Thus, the total energy for the i th position in the lattice is

$$E_i(\Phi_i, P) = E_{\text{int}} - \Phi_i (n_{\text{tr}}/n^2) \sum_m \left(\frac{3}{2} \cos^2 v_m - \frac{1}{2} \right) + PA \quad (15)$$

is dependent on the chain's internal energy E_{int} , the cross-sectional area A and lateral pressure P . The partition function for the i th chain is

$$Z_i = \sum_{\text{confs}} \exp[-E_i(\Phi_i, P)/k_B T]. \quad (16)$$

Thus, the average orientations for all chains can be calculated by solving the following set of coupled non-linear differential equations

$$\phi_i = \frac{1}{Z_i} \sum_{\text{confs}} \frac{n_{\text{tr}}}{n} \sum_m \left(\frac{3}{2} \cos^2 v_m - \frac{1}{2} \right) \exp[-E_i(\Phi_i, P)/k_B T]. \quad (17)$$

The total internal energy thus becomes

$$U = \sum_i [E_{\text{int}} - n\Phi_i\phi_i/2] + V_{\text{lp}} \sum_{\text{lp pairs}} n\phi_i/12, \quad (18)$$

where the latter term is necessary to correctly account for protein–lipid interactions in the hexagonal lattice.

Writing the total system partition function as the product of the individual partition function in Eq. (16), and combining with Eq. (18), it is straightforward to write the system’s entropy and Gibbs free energy.

This formalism can be used to investigate the effects of a protein on lipid structure as a function of temperature, protein size, and concentration. Most interestingly, one can compute the effective protein–protein potential of mean force; in this manner, a Marčelja-type model can be used to explore the effects of lipid composition on protein oligomerization and aggregation. Several other groups have explored similar models, differing primarily in the details of lipid chain representation and the manner in which the resulting equations are solved (Meraldi and Schlitter, 1981; Pink and Chapman, 1979).

More recently, Ben-Shaul and coworkers have developed a comprehensive membrane model which explicitly account for chain statistics (Fattal and Ben-Shaul, 1993, 1994, 1995). They begin by expressing the system’s free energy as a sum of three terms

$$F = 2N(f_t + f_s + f_h), \quad (19)$$

where N is the number of lipids per leaflet (the present equation assumes a symmetric planar bilayer), f_t is the free energy per lipid chain, f_s the surface free energy due water–chain interaction, and f_h is the free energy due to headgroup–headgroup and water–headgroup interactions. Describing individual chain conformations using the rotational isomeric approximation combined with an overall tilt vector, the probability distribution P over all conformations α can be constructed, and the chain free energy computed as

$$f_t = \sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha)\epsilon(\alpha) + k_B T \sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha) \ln P(\alpha), \quad (20)$$

where $\epsilon(\alpha)$ is the internal energy of conformation α . $P(\alpha)$ is constrained to obey

$$\sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha) = 1, \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{\alpha} P(\alpha) [\phi(z_i; \alpha) + \phi(-z_i; \alpha)] = a\rho, \quad \text{for all } z_i. \quad (22)$$

The first equation represents a simple normalization of probability. In the latter, $\phi(z_i; \alpha)$ is the atomic number density of conformation α in the membrane slice z_i , a is the area per chain, and ρ is density of the bilayer interior. Equation (22)

explicitly assumes constant density in the hydrophobic interior of a symmetric planar bilayer, but can be easily generalized to account for heterogeneous density drawn from experiment, or to deal with more complex geometries such as curved bilayers or micelles.

Minimizing Eq. (20) with respect to Eqs. (21) and (22) gives

$$P(\alpha) = \frac{\exp[\beta\epsilon(\alpha) - \beta \sum_{z_i} \pi(z_i)\phi(z_i; \alpha)\Delta z]}{\sum_{\alpha} \exp[\beta\epsilon(\alpha) - \beta \sum_{z_i} \pi(z_i)\phi(z_i; \alpha)\Delta z]}, \quad (23)$$

where $\beta \equiv 1/k_B T$, the denominator is the chain partition function Z , and $\pi(z_i)$ are a series of Lagrange multipliers physically corresponding to the lateral pressure profile along the membrane normal. Substituting back into Eq. (20) generates

$$f_t = k_B T \ln Z - a\rho \sum_{z_i} \pi(z_i)\Delta z. \quad (24)$$

Thus, calculating any chain property amounts to computing the appropriate $\pi(z_i)$ values for the system. This model has a number of desirable properties, most notably the direct dependence of the chain thermodynamics on the headgroup type, via the surface area per chain a . This area can in turn be considered as a variable, which is where the latter two terms in Eq. (19) come into play.

In addition to considering alternative membrane geometries, this model can also be generalized to include the effects of other molecules included in the bilayer. Ben-Shaul and coworkers considered simple protein models such as impermeable walls and cylinders (Fattal and Ben-Shaul, 1995), while other groups have used analogous approaches to consider protein-protein interaction (May and Ben-Shaul, 2000; Bohinc *et al.*, 2003). The lateral pressure profile computed in this model can be directly connected to the intrinsic curvature described in the models from Brown and coworkers, in that heterogeneity in the pressure leads directly to a preference for intrinsic curvature. As we will see below, this is a repeating theme in chain-based models of membranes.

Frink and Frischknecht (2005a, 2005b) have used a simple coarse-grained chain representation combined with density functional theory to compute lipid bilayer properties. Although the details of their formulation are too complex to describe here, it is interesting to note that once again the lateral pressure profile plays a central role. They have applied their model to explore the effects of alcohols on lipid structure (Frischknecht and Frink, 2006), and to explore pore-formation due to the binding of rigid helices (Frink and Frischknecht, 2006). By contrast to the models described in Section II.A, their model allowed them to compare different modes of pore-formation.

Over the last 15 years, Cantor has presented a series of papers describing another chain-based model focused on the lateral pressure profile (Cantor, 1993, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 1999a, 1999b, 2002). His approach uses a lattice model to account for chain conformations, with a constant density assumption similar to that of Ben-Shaul. He has used his model to explore the effects of chain length

1 and unsaturation on the equilibrium width, area fluctuations, and lateral pressure 1
 2 profile of planar lipid bilayers (Cantor, 1999a). He has also proposed that lateral 2
 3 pressure is a common mechanism by which bilayer composition can be used to 3
 4 regulate protein function (Cantor, 1999b, 2002). Specifically, if a protein has two 4
 5 states with different shapes in the membrane, then the free energy difference be- 5
 6 tween the two states is 6

$$7 \quad \Delta G_{12} = \Delta G_{12}^0 - \int \pi(z)(A_2(z) - A_1(z)) dz, \quad (25) \quad 8$$

9 where ΔG_{12}^0 is the intrinsic free energy difference between the states, excluding 9
 10 bilayer effects, $A_i(z)$ is the area profile for the protein in state i , and $\pi(z)$ is 10
 11 the lateral pressure profile. The last term in Eq. (25) provides a direct mechanistic 11
 12 coupling between the lateral pressure profile (and thus lipid composition) and the 12
 13 protein's conformation equilibrium even in the total absence of specific lipid- 13
 14 protein interactions. Cantor has also proposed that this model provides a simple 14
 15 framework for understanding the mechanism of most general anesthetics (Cantor, 15
 16 1997b, 2001). 16
 17 18
 19 20
 21 22

23 III. INTERESTING PROBLEMS IN IMPLICIT MEMBRANE MODELING 23

24 There has been a great deal of work to develop models for implicitly model- 24
 25 ing membrane-protein interactions. This work spans a broad range of different 25
 26 approaches, each with different strengths and weaknesses. In particular, the meth- 26
 27 ods described in Section II.A have the advantage of using atomic descriptions 27
 28 of the solute of interest; this means that subtle differences, such as the effects 28
 29 of mutations or chemical modifications, can be directly examined. However, the 29
 30 membrane is usually represented in a very simple manner, and non-electrostatic 30
 31 effects in particular are not included in detail. As a result, these models do not as 31
 32 a rule capture the effects of lipid composition, except crudely via the hydrophobic 32
 33 thickness of the membrane. Moreover, if solute binding is correlated with disrup- 33
 34 tion of membrane structure, these models will not capture it, since these models 34
 35 explicitly assume membrane structure is invariant. By contrast, the models in II.B 35
 36 represent membrane-bound solutes in far less detail, but do far more to include 36
 37 the effects of lipid chain structure. However, they typically lack atomic detail and 37
 38 tend to represent lipid-protein interactions phenomenologically. As a result, they 38
 39 cannot easily be used to resolve questions which depend on the details of solute 39
 40 structure. This means that there are many interesting problems which will require 40
 41 new approaches combining the strengths of the existing solute-centric models 41
 42 with better representations of membrane structure. 42
 43 43

1 A. Antimicrobial Peptides 1

2
3 Antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) are an ancient immune mechanism, ubiquitous 3
4 in multicellular organisms and even found in some bacteria (Zhang *et al.*, 2000; 4
5 Risso, 2000; Zasloff, 2002a, 2002c, 2002b). In humans, they are found mostly on 5
6 exposed organs, such as the eyes, skin, and mouth. Unlike the rest of the immune 6
7 system, these peptides generally act in a non-inflammatory way. This is critical, 7
8 as organs such as the eyes are constantly exposed to pathogens, and permanent 8
9 inflammation would seriously degrade their performance. 9

10 AMPs exhibit a broad diversity of structures, ranging from single helices to β - 10
11 strands to small globules (Zasloff, 2002c). However, the vast majority of them 11
12 share two characteristics: amphipathic structure and positive charge. The former 12
13 quality encourages binding to the membrane–water interface, while the latter 13
14 enhances selectivity toward bacterial membranes, which tend to be enriched in 14
15 anionic lipids compared to the zwitterionic lipids most common in mammalian 15
16 cells. Interestingly, transformed cancer cells also have a higher concentration 16
17 of anionic lipids, and some AMPs have been shown to have antitumor activity 17
18 (Jacob and Zasloff, 1994; Mader and Hoskins, 2006). Lipopeptides have also 18
19 found use in the development of vaccines (BenMohamed *et al.*, 2002). The bio- 19
20 physics of AMPs binding to lipid membranes have been extensively reviewed 20
21 (Epand and Vogel, 1999; Shai, 1999; Huang, 2000, 2006; Doherty *et al.*, 2006; 21
22 Chan *et al.*, 2006). 22

23 Unlike most other classes of drugs, AMPs do not inhibit enzymatic pathways, 23
24 or indeed specifically bind any proteins in their targets. Rather, they operate by 24
25 binding to and disrupting the membrane (Boman *et al.*, 1994). As a direct result, 25
26 pathogens such as bacteria, fungi and viruses are far less likely to evolve immunity 26
27 to them, because doing so would require changing the lipid composition of their 27
28 membranes and likely disrupting many of their own native proteins. 28
29

30 Despite this, AMPs have not for the most part found much use as antibi- 30
31 otic drugs, because they are relatively hard to synthesize and tend to break 31
32 down rapidly in the body. However, in recent years, scientists have borrowed 32
33 from the basic properties of AMPs to design new potential drugs, for exam- 33
34 ple using peptide mimetics (see for example Ref. (Ishitsuka *et al.*, 2006)). Shai 34
35 and coworkers have had remarkable successes by combining two strategies: 35
36 including D-amino acids to foil peptidases (Avrahami and Shai, 2003), and 36
37 conjugating shorter peptides to fatty acids (Avrahami *et al.*, 2001; Avrahami 37
38 and Shai, 2002, 2004; Makovitzki *et al.*, 2006; Makovitzki and Shai, 2005; 38
39 Malina and Shai, 2005). The essential insight into the value of lipidization is that 39
40 hydrophobicity is relatively non-specific. That is, most of the sequence in AMPs 40
41 is devoted to making them hydrophobic enough to bind to membranes, as opposed 41
42 to lysing them after binding. Thus, one can dispense with most of the sequence if 42
43 the peptide is attached to an acyl chain; Shai and coworkers found that sequences 43

1 as short as 4 amino acids had strong antimicrobial activity against fungi and bac- 1
2 teria, without significantly damaging human cells (Makovitzki *et al.*, 2006). 2

3 Unsurprisingly, there has been a great deal of interest in modeling the binding 3
4 of AMPs to model lipid membranes (La Rocca *et al.*, 1999). Indeed, membrane- 4
5 disrupting peptides such as gramicidin, alamethicin, and melittin have become 5
6 standard test cases in the development of implicit membrane models. In fact, much 6
7 of the interest in modeling isolated helices and helical aggregates in membranes 7
8 derives from the classic “barrel-stave” model, where amphipathic helical peptides 8
9 initially bind to the membrane interface, then cooperatively associate and fully 9
10 insert to form pores; this process has been explored via theoretical means (Frink 10
11 and Frischknecht, 2005a; Bohinc *et al.*, 2003) and by explicit molecular dynamics 11
12 simulations (Tieleman *et al.*, 1999b, 1999a). 12

13 However, there is significant evidence that many if not most AMPs do not op- 13
14 erate via the “barrel-stave” mechanism. Rather, the “carpet model” appears more 14
15 prevalent (Chan *et al.*, 2006); in this view, peptides bind interfacially and stabilize 15
16 highly curved lipid structures, leading to the formation of toroidal pores (“worm- 16
17 holes”) and even micellization of the membrane. 17

18 This case is a difficult one to treat computationally. Poration due to lipid 18
19 binding occurs on too long a time scale for all-atom molecular dynamics; the 19
20 calculations which have been done have typically begun by performing a particu- 20
21 lar pore-forming oligomeric structure (Tieleman *et al.*, 1999b; La Rocca *et al.*, 21
22 1999). In principle, solute-focused implicit membrane models can reach the nec- 22
23 essary time- and length-scales for spontaneous oligomerization, and as described 23
24 above have had some successes in describing barrel-stave-type pore formation. 24
25 However, these models cannot represent the kinds of membrane disruption ex- 25
26 pected according to the carpet model, and so cannot be used to elucidate which if 26
27 either model applies to a given solute. The only example we are aware of where an 27
28 implicit membrane model was used to examine the mechanism of poration is the 28
29 work of Frink and Frischknecht, described above (Frink and Frischknecht, 2005a, 29
30 2005b), which applied density functional theory. In this model, however, protein 30
31 helices are represented as impermeable hard cylinders, neglecting other phenom- 31
32 ena such as electrostatics and amphipathicity. As such, these calculations, while 32
33 highly instructive, cannot be used to reveal the binding mode of. for example, a 33
34 particular amino acid sequence. 34

35 An implicit membrane model which could successfully attack this problem 35
36 would most likely need the following properties: 36

- 37 • Atomic- or near-atomic-level solute description. 37
- 38 • Accurate electrostatics, including both dielectric effects and effects due to 38
- 39 headgroup charge and dipoles. 39
- 40 • Membrane which responds to solute structure. 40

41
42 Several models from Section II.A have the first property, and could readily be 42
43 extended to have the second. However, none of the existing models can readily 43

1 meet the third requirement, which should make this an interesting future research
2 problem.

3 4 5 *B. Protein-Protein Association* 6

7 Although biophysical experiments frequently focus on the behavior of iso-
8 lated proteins, biologically many if not most membrane proteins function as
9 part of complexes (Alberts *et al.*, 1994). Of these complexes, homodimers are
10 most easily studied by biophysical techniques, since only a single protein needs
11 to be overexpressed. In particular, there is great interest in the dimerization
12 of G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) (Park *et al.*, 2004), the largest super-
13 family of proteins in the human genome. These proteins are responsible for a
14 broad array of physiological processes involving signaling (Bockaert and Pin,
15 1999), and as a result are commonly targeted in drug development (Ma and
16 Zimmel, 2002). Among GPCRs, only one protein, rhodopsin, has been struc-
17 turally resolved at atomic resolution (Edwards *et al.*, 2004; Li *et al.*, 2004;
18 Okada *et al.*, 2002, 2004; Palczewski *et al.*, 2000; Schertler *et al.*, 1993). In
19 recent years, significant controversy has erupted over the oligomeric state of
20 rhodopsin in its native membrane environment. Several groups have demon-
21 strated that rhodopsin dimerizes in non-native membranes (Kota *et al.*, 2006;
22 Mansoor *et al.*, 2006), and Palczewski and coworkers showed striking im-
23 ages from atomic force microscopy showing ordered rows of rhodopsin dimers
24 (Fotiadis *et al.*, 2003a). However, others have argued that these dimers are arti-
25 facts of sample preparation conditions (Chabre *et al.*, 2003; Fotiadis *et al.*, 2003b),
26 and have argued that the functional form of the protein is most likely monomeric
27 (Chabre and le Maire, 2005).
28

29 In principle, one way to resolve this controversy would be an unambiguous de-
30 termination of the dimeric structure of rhodopsin. However, this seems unlikely,
31 because any crystal structure could be countered by the argument that the dimer
32 was stabilized only by crystal packing. Instead, various groups have attempted to
33 map a generic GPCR dimer interface using mutagenesis studies (Javitch, 2004;
34 Guo *et al.*, 2005; Fanelli and De Benedetti, 2005; Filizola *et al.*, 2002; Filizola
35 and Weinstein, 2005b).
36

37 Ideally, this sort of strategy would be complemented by molecular-level simu-
38 lation, to flesh out the details and validate the interactions. Indeed, there have been
39 several efforts along these lines (see for example references (Filizola *et al.*, 2006;
40 Filizola and Weinstein, 2005a)). However, such efforts are complicated by the
41 very long time scales necessary to sample large-scale rearrangement of protein-
42 protein interfaces; it is to be expected that even a totally incorrect protein-protein
43 docking would be stable on the 10–100 ns timescale readily accessible by all-
atom molecular dynamics. Using existing implicit membrane models is more

1 appealing, since conventional molecular dynamics simulations could be aban- 1
2 doned in favor more efficient searching and sampling techniques. However, the 2
3 best of the existing solute-focused are expensive for larger systems; for exam- 3
4 ple, Feig's work on bacteriorhodopsin trimers showed that the need for very 4
5 long electrostatics cutoffs greatly increased the computational cost (Tanizaki 5
6 and Feig, 2006). Moreover, these models are not capable of capturing the effects 6
7 of specific lipid species. This could be critical to assessing the stability 7
8 of dimers, since we know that rhodopsin is both highly sensitive to and cap- 8
9 able of perturbing its lipid environment (Brown, 1994; Botelho *et al.*, 2006; 9
10 Polozova and Litman, 2000). As such, we once again reach a point where new 10
11 models will be needed in order to resolve the problem. 11
12
13

14 IV. CONCLUSION 14

15
16 Lipid membranes are critically important biologically, both as passive barriers 16
17 and as active participants in membrane protein function. Molecular modeling has 17
18 already made significant contributions to our understanding of their roles, and can 18
19 be expected to be even more valuable as structures of more membrane proteins 19
20 become available. However, for many applications, explicit all-atom calculations 20
21 are prohibitively expensive, and will remain so for the foreseeable future. In this 21
22 context, the development of new models for representing protein–lipid interac- 22
23 tions implicitly becomes extremely important. A great deal of impressive work 23
24 has been done, but still more remains. 24
25

26 References 26

- 27 Alberts, B., Bray, D., Lewis, J., Raff, M., Roberts, K., Watson, J.D. (1994). "Molecular Biology of the 27
28 Cell", 3rd ed. Garland Publishing, Inc., New York. 28
- 29 Allen, F., Almasi, G., Andreoni, W., Beece, D., Berne, B.J., Bright, A., Brunheroto, J., Cascaval, 29
30 C., Castanos, J., Coteus, P., Crumley, P., Curioni, A., Denneau, M., Donath, W., Eleftheriou, M., 30
31 Fitch, B., Fleisher, B., Georgiou, C.J., Germain, R., Giampapa, M., Gresh, D., Gupta, M., Haring, 31
32 R., Ho, H., Hochschild, P., Hummel, S., Jonas, T., Lieber, D., Martyna, G., Maturu, K., Moreira, J., 32
33 News, D., Newton, M., Phillhower, R., Picunko, T., Pitera, J., Pitman, M., Rand, R., Royyuru, A., 33
34 Salapura, V., Sanomiya, A., Shah, R., Sham, Y., Singh, S., Snir, M., Suits, F., Swetz, R., Swope, 34
35 W.C., Vishnumurthy, N., Ward, T.J.C., Warren, H., Zhou, R. (2001). Blue Gene: A vision for 35
36 protein science using a petaflop supercomputer. *IBM Syst. J.* **40**, 310. 36
- 37 Avrahami, D., Shai, Y. (2002). Conjugation of a magainin analogue with lipophilic acids controls 37
38 hydrophobicity, solution assembly, and cell selectivity. *Biochemistry* **41** (7), 2254–2263. 38
- 39 Avrahami, D., Shai, Y. (2003). Bestowing antifungal and antibacterial activities by lipophilic acid 39
40 conjugation to D,L-amino acid-containing antimicrobial peptides: A plausible mode of action. 40
41 *Biochemistry* **42** (50), 14946–14956. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/bi035142v>. 41
- 42 Avrahami, D., Shai, Y. (2004). A new group of antifungal and antibacterial lipopeptides derived from 42
43 non-membrane active peptides conjugated to palmitic acid. *J. Biol. Chem.* **279**, 12277–12285. 43
- 44 Avrahami, D., Oren, Z., Shai, Y. (2001). Effect of multiple aliphatic amino acids substitutions on the 44
45 structure, function, and mode of action of diastereomeric membrane active peptides. *Biochem-*
46 *istry* **40** (42), 12591–12603. 46

- 1 Baker, N.A. (2005). Improving implicit solvent simulations: A Poisson-centric view. *Curr. Opin.* 1
2 *Struct. Biol.* **15**, 137–143. 2
- 3 Bashford, D., Case, D.A. (2000). Generalized Born models of macromolecular solvation effects. *Annu.* 3
4 *Rev. Phys. Chem.* **51**, 129–152. 4
- 5 Bell, R.P. (1931). The electrostatic energy of dipole molecules in different media. *Trans. Faraday* 5
6 *Soc.* **27**, 797–802. 5
- 7 Ben-Tal, N., Ben-Shaul, A., Nicholls, A., Honig, B. (1996). Free energy determinants of α -helix in- 6
8 sersion into lipid bilayers. *Biophys. J.* **70**, 1803–1812. 7
- 9 BenMohamed, L., Wechsler, S.L., Nesburn, A.B. (2002). Lipopeptide vaccines—yesterday, today, and 8
10 tomorrow. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **2**, 425–431. 9
- 11 Bockaert, J., Pin, J.P. (1999). Molecular tinkering of G protein-coupled receptors: An evolutionary 9
12 success. *EMBO J.* **18**, 1723–1729. 10
- 13 Boesze-Battaglia, K., Albert, A.D. (1989). Fatty acid composition of bovine rod outer segment plasma 11
14 membrane. *Exp. Eye Res.* **49** (4), 699–701. 12
- 15 Boesze-Battaglia, K., Hennessey, T., Albert, A.D. (1989). Cholesterol heterogeneity in bovine rod 13
16 outer segment disk membranes. *J. Biol. Chem.* **264** (14), 8151–8155. 14
- 17 Bohinc, K., Kralj-Iglic, V., May, S. (2003). Interaction between two cylindrical inclusions in a sym- 14
18 metric lipid bilayer. *J. Chem. Phys.* **119**, 7435–7444. 15
- 19 Boman, H.G., Marsh, J., Goode, J.A. (Eds.) (1994). Antimicrobial peptides. In “Ciba Foundation 16
20 Symposium”, vol. **186**. Wiley, Chichester, pp. 1–272. 17
- 21 Bonner, W.B. (1951). The electrostatic energy of molecules in solution. *Trans. Faraday Soc.* **47**, 1143– 18
22 1152. 18
- 23 Born, M. (1920). Volumen und hydrationswärme der ionen. *Z. Phys.* **1**, 45. 19
- 24 Botelho, A.V., Huber, T., Sakmar, T.P., Brown, M.F. (2006). Curvature and hydrophobic forces drive 20
25 oligomerization and modulate activity of rhodopsin in membranes. *Biophys. J.* **91**, 4464–4477. 21
- 26 Brown, M.F. (1994). Modulation of rhodopsin function by properties of the membrane bilayer. *Chem.* 22
27 *Phys. Lipids* **73** (1–2), 159–180. 23
- 28 Brown, M.F. (1997). Influence of nonlamellar-forming lipids on rhodopsin. In: Epand, R.M. (Ed.), 24
29 Lipid Polymorphism and Membrane Properties. In: “Current Topics in Membranes”, vol. **44**. Aca- 25
30 demic Press, San Diego, pp. 285–356. 26
- 31 Cantor, R.S. (1993). Statistical thermodynamics of curvature elasticity in surfactant monolayer films: 26
32 A molecular approach. *J. Chem. Phys.* **99**, 7124–9149. 27
- 33 Cantor, R.S. (1996). Theory of lipid monolayers comprised of mixtures of flexible and stiff am- 27
34 phiphiles in athermal solvents: Fluid phase coexistence. *J. Chem. Phys.* **104**, 8082–8095. 28
- 35 Cantor, R.S. (1997a). Lateral pressure in cell membranes: A mechanism for modulation of protein 29
36 function. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **101**, 1724–1725. 30
- 37 Cantor, R.S. (1997b). The lateral pressure profile in membranes: A physical mechanism of general 31
38 anesthesia. *Biochemistry* **36**, 2339–2344. 32
- 39 Cantor, R.S. (1999a). Lipid composition and the lateral pressure profile in bilayers. *Biophys. J.* **76**, 32
40 2625–2639. 33
- 41 Cantor, R.S. (1999b). The influence of membrane lateral pressures on simple geometric models of 34
42 protein conformational equilibria. *Chem. Phys. Lipids* **101**, 45–56. 35
- 43 Cantor, R.S. (2001). Breaking the Meyer–Overton rule: Predicted effects of varying stiffness and 36
44 interfacial activity on the intrinsic potency of anesthetics. *Biophys. J.* **80**, 2284–2297. 37
- 45 Cantor, R.S. (2002). Size distribution of barrel-stave aggregates of membrane peptides: Influence of 37
46 the bilayer lateral pressure profile. *Biophys. J.* **82**, 2520–2525. 38
- 47 Carrillo-Tripp, M., Feller, S.E. (2005). Evidence for a mechanism by which omega-3 polyunsaturated 39
48 lipids may affect membrane protein function. *Biochemistry* **44**, 10164–10169. 40
- 49 Chabre, M., le Maire, M. (2005). Monomeric G-protein-coupled receptor as a functional unit. *Bio-* 40
50 *chemistry* **44** (27), 9395–9403. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/bi050720o>. 41
- 51 Chabre, M., Cone, R., Saibil, H. (2003). Is rhodopsin dimeric in native retinal rods? *Nature* **426**, 42
52 30–31. 43

- 1 Chan, D.I., Prenner, E.J., Vogel, H.J. (2006). Tryptophan- and arginine-rich antimicrobial peptides: 1
2 Structures and mechanisms of action. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1758**, 1184–1202. 2
- 3 Doherty, T., Waring, A., Hong, M. (2006). Peptide–lipid interactions of the beta-hairpin antimicrobial 3
4 peptide tachyplesin and its linear derivatives from solid-state NMR. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1758**, 4
5 1285–1291. 5
- 6 Dominy, B.N., Brooks, C.L. (1999). Development of a generalized born model parameterization for 6
7 proteins and nucleic acids. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **103**, 3765–3773. 6
- 8 Ducarme, P., Rahman, M., Brasseur, R. (1998). IMPALA: A simple restraint field to simulate the 7
9 biological membrane in molecular structure studies. *Proteins: Struct. Funct. Gen.* **30**, 357–371. 8
- 10 Edwards, P.C., Li, J., Burghammer, M., McDowell, J.H., Villa, C., Hargrave, P.A., Schertler, G.F.X. 9
11 (2004). Crystals of native and modified bovine rhodopsins and their heavy atom derivatives. *J. Mol.* 10
12 *Biol.* **343** (5), 1439–1450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2004.08.089>. 10
- 13 Efremov, R.G., Nolde, D.E., Vergoten, G., Arseniev, A.S. (1999a). A solvent model for simulations of 11
14 peptides in bilayers. I. Membrane-promoting alpha-helix formation. *Biophys. J.* **76**, 2448–2459. 12
- 15 Efremov, R.G., Nolde, D.E., Vergoten, G., Arseniev, A.S. (1999b). A solvent model for simulations 13
16 of peptides in bilayers. II. Membrane spanning alpha-helices. *Biophys. J.* **76**, 2460–2471. 13
- 17 Efremov, R.G., Volynsky, P.E., Nolde, D.E., Dubovskii, P.V., Arseniev, A.S. (2002). Interaction of 14
18 cardiotoxins with membranes: A molecular modeling study. *Biophys. J.* **83** (1), 144–153. 14
- 19 Eisenberg, D., McLachlan, A.D. (1986). Solvation energy in protein folding and binding. *Nature* **319**, 15
20 199–203. 15
- 21 Endress, E., Heller, H., Casalta, H., Brown, M.F., Bayerl, T.M. (2002). Anisotropic motion and molec- 17
22 ular dynamics of cholesterol, lanosterol, and ergosterol in lecithin bilayers studied by quasi-elastic 18
23 neutron scattering. *Biochemistry* **41** (43), 13078–13086. 0006-2960 J. Art. 19
- 24 Epand, R. (1998). Lipid polymorphism and protein–lipid interactions. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1376**, 20
25 353–368. 20
- 26 Epand, R.M. (2003). Fusion peptides and the mechanism of viral fusion. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1614**, 21
27 116–121. 21
- 28 Epand, R.M., Vogel, H.J. (1999). Diversity of antimicrobial peptides and their mechanism of action. 22
29 *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1462**, 11–28. 23
- 30 Fanelli, F., De Benedetti, P.G. (2005). Computational modeling approaches to structure-function 24
31 analysis of G protein-coupled receptors. *Chem. Rev.* **105**, 3297–3351. 25
- 32 Faráldo-Gomez, J.D., Forrest, L.R., Baaden, M., Bond, P.J., Domene, C., Patargias, G., Cuthbertson, 26
33 J., Sansom, M.S.P. (2004). Conformational sampling and dynamics of membrane proteins from 27
34 10-nanosecond computer simulations. *Proteins* **57**, 783–791. 28
- 35 Fattal, D.R., Ben-Shaul, A. (1993). A molecular model for lipid–protein interactions in membranes: 29
36 The role of hydrophobic mismatch. *Biophys. J.* **65**, 1795–1809. 29
- 37 Fattal, D.R., Ben-Shaul, A. (1994). Mean-field calculations of chain packing and conformational statis- 30
38 tics in lipid bilayers: Comparison with experiments and molecular dynamics studies. *Biophys.* 31
39 *J.* **67**, 983–995. 32
- 40 Fattal, D.R., Ben-Shaul, A. (1995). Lipid chain packing and lipid–protein interaction in membranes. 33
41 *Physica A* **220**, 192–216. 34
- 42 Feig, M., Im, W., Brooks III, C.L. (2004). Implicit solvation based on generalized Born theory in 35
43 different dielectric environments. *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 903–911. 35
- 44 Feig, M., Onufriev, A., Lee, M.S., Im, W., Case, D.A., Brooks III, C.L. (2004). Poisson methods in 36
45 the calculation of electrostatic solvation free energies for protein structures. *J. Comput. Chem.* **25**, 37
46 265–284. 38
- 47 Filizola, M., Weinstein, H. (2005a). The structure and dynamics of GPCR oligomers: A new focus 39
48 in models of cell-signaling mechanisms and drug design. *Curr. Opin. Drug Discov. Devel.* **8** (5), 40
49 577–584. 41
- 50 Filizola, M., Weinstein, H. (2005b). The study of G-protein coupled receptor oligomerization 42
51 with computational modeling and bioinformatics. *FEBS J.* **272** (12), 2926–2938. [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-4658.2005.04730.x) 42
52 dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-4658.2005.04730.x. 43

- 1 Filizola, M., Olmea, O., Weinstein, H. (2002). Prediction of heterodimerization interfaces of G-protein
2 coupled receptors with a new subtractive correlated mutation method. *Protein Eng.* **15** (11), 881–
3 885.
- 4 Filizola, M., Wang, S.X., Weinstein, H. (2006). Dynamic models of G-protein coupled receptor
5 dimers: Indications of asymmetry in the rhodopsin dimer from molecular dynamics simulations in
6 a popc bilayer. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* **20** (7–8), 405–416. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10822-006-9053-3>.
- 7 Flewelling, R.F., Hubbell, W.L. (1986). The membrane dipole potential in a total membrane potential
8 model. *Biophys. J.* **49**, 541–552.
- 9 Fotiadis, D., Liang, Y., Filipek, S., Saperstein, D.A., Engel, A., Palczewski, K. (2003a). Rhodopsin
10 dimers in native disc membranes. *Nature* **421**, 127–128.
- 11 Fotiadis, D., Liang, Y., Filipek, S., Saperstein, D.A., Engel, A., Palczewski, K. (2003b). Is rhodopsin
12 dimeric in native retinal rods? (reply). *Nature* **426**, 31.
- 13 Frink, L.J.D., Frischknecht, A.L. (2005a). Density functional theory approach for coarse-grained lipid
14 bilayers. *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 041923.
- 15 Frink, L.J.D., Frischknecht, A.L. (2005b). Comparison of density functional theory and simulation of
16 fluid bilayers. *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 041924.
- 17 Frink, L.J.D., Frischknecht, A.L. (2006). Computational investigations of pore forming peptide as-
18 semblies in lipid bilayers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 208701–208704.
- 19 Frischknecht, A.L., Frink, L.J.D. (2006). Alcohols reduce lateral membrane pressures: Predictions
20 from molecular theory. *Biophys. J.* **91**, 4081–4090.
- 21 Gallicchio, E., Zhang, L.Y., Levy, R.M. (2002). The SGB/NP hydration free energy model based
22 on the Surface Generalized Born solvent reaction field and novel nonpolar hydration free energy
23 estimators. *J. Comput. Chem.* **23**, 517–529.
- 24 Ghosh, A., Rapp, C.S., Friesner, R.A. (1998). Generalized Born model based on a surface integral
25 formulation. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **102**, 10983–10990.
- 26 Gibson, N.J., Brown, M.F. (1993). Lipid headgroup and acyl chain composition modulate the MI–MII
27 equilibrium of rhodopsin in recombinant membranes. *Biochemistry* **32**, 2438–2454.
- 28 Grossfield, A., Feller, S.E., Pitman, M.C. (2006). A role for direct interactions in the modulation of
29 rhodopsin by omega-3 polyunsaturated lipids. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 4888–4893.
- 30 Grossfield, A., Feller, S.E., Pitman, M.C. (2007). Convergence of molecular dynamics simulations of
31 membrane proteins. *Proteins: Struct. Funct. Bioinf.* **67**, 31–40.
- 32 Grossfield, A., Pitman, M.C., Feller, S.E., Soubias, O., Gawrisch, K., The role of water in the activation
33 of the G protein-coupled receptor rhodopsin. Science under review.
- 34 Grycuk, T. (2003). Deficiency of the Coulomb-field approximation in the generalized Born model: An
35 improved formula for Born radii evaluation. *J. Chem. Phys.* **119**, 4817–4826.
- 36 Guo, W., Shi, L., Filizola, M., Weinstein, H., Javitch, J.A. (2005). Crosstalk in G protein-coupled
37 receptors: Changes at the transmembrane homodimer interface determine activation. *Proc. Natl.*
38 *Acad. Sci. USA* **102** (48), 17495–17500. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0508950102>.
- 39 Huang, H.W. (2000). Action of antimicrobial peptides: Two-state model. *Biochemistry* **39**, 8347–8352.
- 40 Huang, H.W. (2006). Molecular mechanism of antimicrobial peptides: The origin of cooperativity.
41 *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1758**, 1292–1302.
- 42 Im, W., Brooks III, C.L. (2005). Interfacial folding and membrane insertion of designed peptides
43 studied by molecular dynamics simulations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 6771–6776.
- 44 Im, W., Feig, M., Brooks III, C.L. (2003a). An implicit membrane generalized Born theory for the
45 study of structure, stability, and interactions of membrane proteins. *Biophys. J.* **85**, 2900–2918.
- 46 Im, W., Lee, M.S., Brooks III, C.L. (2003b). Generalized Born model with a simple smoothing func-
47 tion. *J. Comput. Chem.* **24**, 1691–1702.
- 48 Ishitsuka, Y., Arnt, L., Majewski, J., Frey, S., Ratajczek, M., Kjaer, K., Tew, G.N., Lee,
49 K.Y.C. (2006). Amphiphilic poly(phenyleneethynylene)s can mimic antimicrobial peptide mem-
50 brane disordering effect by membrane insertion. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **128** (40), 13123–13129.
51 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/ja061186q>.

- 1 Iversen, G., Kharkats, Y.I., Ulstrup, J. (1998). Simple dielectric image charge models for electrostatic 1
2 interactions in metalloproteins. *Mol. Phys.* **94**, 297–306. 2
- 3 Jackson, J.D. (1962). “Classical Electrodynamics”. Wiley, New York. 3
- 4 Jacob, L., Zasloff, M. (1994). Potential therapeutic applications of magainins and other antimicrobial 4
5 agents of animal origin. *Ciba Found. Symp.* **186**, 197–223. 4
- 6 Jacobs, R.E., White, S.H. (1989). The nature of the hydrophobic binding of small peptides at the 5
7 bilayer interface: Implications for the insertion of transbilayer helices. *Biochemistry* **28**, 3421– 6
7 3437. 7
- 8 Javitch, J.A. (2004). The ants go marching two by two: Oligomeric structure of G-protein coupled 8
9 receptors. *Mol. Pharmacol.* **66**, 1077–1082. 9
- 10 Jensen, M.Ø., Mouritsen, O.G. (2004). Lipids do influence protein function—the hydrophobic match- 10
11 ing hypothesis revisited. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1666**, 205–226. 10
- 12 Kharkats, Y.I., Ulstrup, J. (1991). The electrostatic Gibbs energy of finite-size ions near a planar 11
13 boundary between two dielectric media. *J. Electroanal. Chem.* **308**, 17–26. 12
- 14 Kirkwood, J.G. (1939). The dielectric polarization of polar liquids. *J. Chem. Phys.* **7**, 911–919. 13
- 15 Kota, P., Reeves, P.J., Rajbhandary, U.L., Khorana, H.G. (2006). Opsin is present as dimers in COS1 14
16 cells: Identification of amino acids at the dimeric interface. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103** (9), 15
17 3054–3059. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0510982103>. 15
- 18 Krishtalik, L.I. (1996). Intramembrane electron transfer: Processes in the photosynthetic reaction cen- 16
19 ter. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta Bioenergetics* **1273**, 139–149. 17
- 20 La Rocca, P., Biggin, P.C., Tieleman, D.P., Sansom, M.S. (1999). Simulation studies of the interaction 18
21 of antimicrobial peptides and lipid bilayers. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **15**, 185–200. 18
- 22 Lazaridis, T. (2002). Structural determinants of transmembrane β -barrels. *J. Chem. Theory Com- 19
20 put.* **23**, 1090–1099. 19
- 23 Lazaridis, T. (2003). Effective energy function for proteins in lipid membranes. *Proteins: Struct. 21
22 Funct. Gen.* **52**, 176–192. 22
- 24 Lazaridis, T., Karplus, M. (1999). Effective energy function for proteins in solution. *Proteins: Struct. 23
24 Funct. Gen.* **35**, 133–152. 24
- 25 Lee, M.S., Salsbury, F.R., Brooks III, C.L. (2002). Novel generalized Born methods. *J. Chem. 25
26 Phys.* **116**, 10606–10614. 25
- 27 Lee, M.S., Feig, M., Salsbury Jr., F.R., Brooks III, C.L. (2003). New analytic approximation to the 26
28 standard molecular volume definition and its application to generalized born calculations. *J. Com- 27
28 put. Chem.* **24**, 1348–1356. 28
- 29 Levy, R.M., Zhang, L.Y., Gallicchio, E., Felts, A.K. (2003). On the nonpolar hydration free energy 29
30 of proteins: Surface area and continuum, solvent models for the solute–solvent interaction energy. 30
31 *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **125**, 9523–9530. 31
- 32 Li, J., Edwards, P.C., Burghammer, M., Villa, C., Schertler, G.F.X. (2004). Structure of bovine 32
33 rhodopsin in a trigonal crystal form. *J. Mol. Biol.* **343** (5), 1409–1438. 32
- 34 Lin, J.-H., Baker, N.A., McCammon, J.A. (2002). Bridging implicit and explicit solvent approaches 33
35 for membrane electrostatics. *Biophys. J.* **83**, 1374–1379. 34
- 36 Lu, B., Cheng, X., Hou, T., McCammon, J.A. (2005a). Calculation of the maxwell stress tensor and the 35
37 Poisson–Boltzmann force on a solvated molecular surface using hypersingular boundary integrals. 36
38 *J. Chem. Phys.* **123** (8), 084904. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.2008252>. 36
- 39 Lu, B., Zhang, D., McCammon, J.A. (2005b). Computation of electrostatic forces between solvated 37
40 molecules determined by the Poisson–Boltzmann equation using a boundary element method. 38
41 *J. Chem. Phys.* **122** (21), 214102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1924448>. 39
- 42 Ma, P., Zimmel, R. (2002). Value of novelty? *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **1**, 571–572. 40
- 43 Mader, J.S., Hoskins, D.W. (2006). Cationic antimicrobial peptides as novel therapeutic agents for 41
42 cancer treatment. *Expert. Opin. Investig. Drugs* **15**, 933–946. 41
- 43 Makovitzki, A., Shai, Y. (2005). pH-dependent antifungal lipopeptides and their plausible mode of 42
44 action. *Biochemistry* **44** (28), 9775–9784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/bi0502386>. 43

- 1 Makovitzki, A., Avrahami, D., Shai, Y. (2006). Ultrashort antibacterial and antifungal lipopeptides. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103** (43), 15997–16002. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0606129103>.
- 2 Malina, A., Shai, Y. (2005). Conjugation of fatty acids with different lengths modulates the antibac-
3 terial and antifungal activity of a cationic biologically inactive peptide. *Biochem. J.* **390** (Pt 3),
4 695–702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1042/BJ20050520>.
- 5 Mansoor, S.E., Palczewski, K., Farrens, D.L. (2006). Rhodopsin self-associates in asolectin liposomes.
6 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103** (9), 3060–3065. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0511010103>.
- 7 Marčelja, S. (1974). Chain ordering in liquid crystals. II. Structure of bilayer membranes. *Biochim.*
8 *Biophys. Acta* **367**, 165–176.
- 9 Marčelja, S. (1976). Lipid–mediate protein interactions in membranes. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **455**,
1–7.
- 10 Marrink, S.J., Berendsen, H.J.C. (1996). Permeation process of small molecules across lipid mem-
11 branes studied by molecular dynamics simulations. *J. Phys. Chem.* **100**, 16729–16738.
- 12 Martínez-Mayorga, K., Pitman, M.C., Grossfield, A., Feller, S.E., Brown, M.F. (2006). Retinal coun-
13 terion switch mechanism in vision evaluated by molecular simulation. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **128**,
14 16502–16503.
- 15 May, S., Ben-Shaul, A. (2000). A molecular model for lipid-mediated interaction between proteins
16 and membranes. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2**, 4494–4502.
- 17 Meraldi, J.P., Schlitter, J. (1981). A statistical mechanical treatment of fatty acyl-chain order in phos-
18 pholipid bilayers and correlation with experimental data A: Theory. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **645**,
183–192.
- 19 Mitchell, D.C., Niu, S.-L., Litman, B.J. (2001). Optimization of receptor–G protein coupling by bi-
20 layer lipid composition I. *J. Biol. Chem.* **276** (46), 42801–42806.
- 21 Mouritsen, O.G., Bloom, M. (1984). Mattress model of lipid–protein interactions in membranes. *Bio-*
22 *phys. J.* **46**, 141–153.
- 23 Mouritsen, O.G., Bloom, M. (1993). Models of lipid–protein interactions in membranes. *Ann. Rev.*
24 *Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* **22**, 145–171.
- 25 Murray, D., Ben-Tal, N., Honig, B., McLaughlin, S. (1997). Electrostatic interaction of myristolated
26 proteins with membranes: Simple physics, complicated biology. *Structure* **15**, 985–989.
- 27 Murray, D., Arbusova, A., Hangyás-Mihályné, G., Gambhir, A., Ben-Tal, N., Honig, B., McLaugh-
28 lin, S. (1999). Electrostatic properties of membranes containing acidic lipids and adsorbed basic
29 peptides: Theory and experiment. *Biophys. J.* **77**, 3176–3188.
- 30 Niu, S.-L., Mitchell, D.C., Litman, B.J. (2001). Optimization of receptor–G protein coupling by bi-
31 layer composition II. *J. Biol. Chem.* **276** (46), 42807–42811.
- 32 Niu, S.-L., Mitchell, D.C., Litman, B.J. (2002). Manipulation of cholesterol levels in rod disk mem-
33 branes by methyl– β -cyclodextrin. *J. Biol. Chem.* **277**, 20139–20145.
- 34 Nyholm, T.K.M., Özdirekcan, S., Killian, J.A. (2007). How protein transmembrane segments sense
35 the lipid environment. *Biochemistry* **46**, 1457–1465.
- 36 Nymeyer, H., Woolf, T.B., Garcia, A.E. (2005). Folding is not required for bilayer insertion: Replica
37 exchange simulations of an alpha-helical peptide with an explicit lipid bilayer. *Proteins* **59** (4),
38 783–790.
- 39 Okada, T., Fujiyoshi, Y., Silow, M., Navarro, J., Landau, E.M., Shichida, Y. (2002). Functional role
40 of internal water molecules in rhodopsin revealed by X-ray crystallography. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
41 *USA* **99** (9), 5982–5987.
- 42 Okada, T., Sugihara, M., Bondar, A.N., Elstner, M., Entel, P., Buss, V. (2004). The retinal conform-
43 ation and its environment in rhodopsin in light of a new 2.2 angstrom crystal structure. *J. Mol.*
Biol. **342**, 571–583.
- 44 Okamoto, Y. (2004). Generalize-ensemble algorithms: Enhanced sampling techniques for Monte
45 Carlo and molecular dynamics simulations. *J. Mol. Graphics Modell.* **22**, 425–439.
- 46 Ollila, S., Hyvönen, M.T., Vattulainen, I. (2007). Polyunsaturation in lipid membranes: Dynamic prop-
47 erties and lateral pressure profiles. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **111** (12), 3139–3150.

- 1 Owicki, J.C., McConnell, H.M. (1979). Theory of protein–lipid and protein–protein interactions in 1
2 bilayer membranes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **76** (10), 4750–4754. 2
- 3 Owicki, J.C., Springgate, M.W., McConnell, H.M. (1978). Theoretical study of protein–lipid interactions 3
4 in bilayer membranes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **75** (4), 1616–1619. 4
- 5 Palczewski, K., Kumasaka, T., Hori, T., Behnke, C.A., Motoshima, H., Fox, B.J., Le Trong, I.,
6 Teller, D.C., Okada, T., Stenkamp, R.E., Yamamoto, M., Miyano, M. (2000). Crystal structure
7 of rhodopsin: A G protein-coupled receptor. *Science* **289**, 739–745. 6
- 8 Pappu, R.V., Marshall, G.M., Ponder, J.W. (1999). A potential smoothing algorithm accurately pre-
9 dicts transmembrane helix packing. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* **6**, 50–55. 7
- 10 Park, P.S.-H., Filipek, S., Wells, J.W., Palczewski, K. (2004). Oligomerization of G protein-coupled
11 receptors: Past, present and future. *Biochemistry* **43**, 15643–15656. 8
- 12 Parsegian, A. (1969). Energy of an ion crossing a low dielectric membrane: Solutions to four relevant
13 electrostatic problems. *Nature* **221**, 844–846. 9
- 14 Pierotti, R.A. (1976). A scaled particle theory of aqueous and nonaqueous solutions. *Chem. Rev.* **76**,
15 717–726. 12
- 16 Pink, D., Chapman, D. (1979). Protein–lipid interactions in bilayer membranes: A lattice model. *Proc.*
17 *Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **76**, 1542–1546. 13
- 18 Pitman, M.C., Grossfield, A., Suits, F., Feller, S.E. (2005). Role of cholesterol and polyunsaturated
19 chains in lipid–protein interactions: Molecular dynamics simulations of rhodopsin in a realistic
20 membrane environment. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **127**, 4576–4577. 14
- 21 Polozova, A., Litman, B.J. (2000). Cholesterol dependent recruitment of di22:6-PC by a G protein-
22 coupled receptor into lateral domains. *Biophys. J.* **79**, 2632–2643. 15
- 23 Risso, A. (2000). Leukocyte antimicrobial peptides: Multifunctional effector molecules of innate im-
24 munity. *J. Leukoc. Biol.* **68**, 785–792. 16
- 25 Sanders II, C.R., Schwonek, J.P. (1993). An approximate model and empirical energy function for
26 solute interactions with a water–phosphatidylcholine interface. *Biophys. J.* **65**, 1207–1218. 17
- 27 Schertler, G.F., Villa, C., Henderson, R. (1993). Projection structure of rhodopsin. *Nature* **362**, 770–
28 772. 18
- 29 Schnitzer, J.E., Lambrakis, K.C. (1991). Electrostatic potential and Born energy of charged mole-
30 cules interacting with phospholipid membranes: Calculation via 3-D numerical solution for the
31 full Poisson equation. *J. Theor. Biol.* **152**, 203–222. 19
- 32 Shai, Y. (1999). Mechanism of the binding, insertion and destabilization of phospholipid bilayer mem-
33 branes by alpha-helical antimicrobial and cell non-selective membrane-lytic peptides. *Biochim.*
34 *Biophys. Acta* **1462**, 55–70. 20
- 35 Sharp, K.A., Honig, B. (1990). Electrostatic interactions in macromolecules: Theory and applications.
36 *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biophys. Chem.* **19**, 301–332. 21
- 37 Spassov, V.Z., Yan, L., Szalma, S. (2002). Introducing an implicit membrane in generalized-Born/
38 solvent accessibility continuum solvent models. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **106**, 8726–8738. 22
- 39 Srinivasan, J., Trevathan, M.W., Beroza, P., Case, D.A. (1999). Application of a pairwise generalized
40 Born model to proteins and nucleic acids: Inclusion of salt effects. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **101**, 426–
41 434. 23
- 42 Still, W.C., Tempczyk, A., Hawley, R.C., Hendrickson, T. (1990). Semianalytical treatment of solva-
43 tion for molecular mechanics and dynamics. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **112**, 6127–6129. 24
- 44 Tanizaki, S., Feig, M. (2005). A generalized Born formalism for heterogeneous dielectric environ-
45 ments: Application to the implicit modeling of biological molecules. *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 12706–
46 12713. 25
- 47 Tanizaki, S., Feig, M. (2006). Molecular dynamics simulations of large integral membrane proteins
48 with an implicit membrane model. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **110**, 548–556. 26
- 49 Tieleman, D.P., Sansom, M.S.P., Berendsen, H.J.C. (1999a). Alamethicin helices in a bilayer and in
50 solution: Molecular dynamics simulations. *Biophys. J.* **76**, 40–49. 27
- 51 Tieleman, D.P., Sansom, M.S.P., Berendsen, H.J.C. (1999b). An alamethicin channel in a lipid bilayer:
52 Molecular dynamics simulations. *Biophys. J.* **76**, 1757–1769. 28

- 1 Tjong, H., Zhou, H.-X., GBr⁶: A parameterization-free, accurate, analytical generalized Born method, 1
2 *J. Phys. Chem. B*. 2
- 3 Vereshaga, Y.A., Volynsky, P.E., Nolde, D.E., Arseniev, A.S., Efremov, R.G. (2007). Helix interactions 3
4 in membranes: Lessons from unrestrained Monte Carlo simulations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **1**, 4
5 1252–1264. 5
- 6 Wagoner, J., Baker, N.A. (2004). Solvation forces on biomolecular structures: A comparison of ex- 6
7 plicit solvent and Poisson–Boltzmann models. *J. Comput. Chem.* **25**, 1623–1629. 6
- 7 Wagoner, J.A., Baker, N.A. (2006). Assessing implicit models for nonpolar mean solvation forces: 7
8 The importance of dispersion and volume terms. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 8331–8336. 8
- 9 White, S.H., Wimley, W.C. (1999). Membrane protein folding and stability: Physical principles. *Annu.* 9
10 *Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* **28**, 319–365. 9
- 10 Woolf, T.B., Roux, B. (1994). Molecular dynamics simulation of the gramicidin channel in a phos- 10
11 pholipid bilayer. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **91**, 11631–11635. 11
- 12 Zasloff, M. (2002a). Innate immunity, antimicrobial peptides, and protection of the oral cavity. 12
13 *Lancet* **360**, 1116–1117. 13
- 14 Zasloff, M. (2002b). Antimicrobial peptides in health and disease. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **347**, 1199–1200. 14
- 15 Zasloff, M. (2002c). Antimicrobial peptides of multicellular organisms. *Nature* **415**, 389–395. 15
- 16 Zhang, G., Ross, C.R., Blecha, F. (2000). Porcine antimicrobial peptides: New prospects for ancient 16
17 molecules of host defense. *Vet. Res.* **31**, 277–296. 17
- 18 18
- 19 19
- 20 20
- 21 21
- 22 22
- 23 23
- 24 24
- 25 25
- 26 26
- 27 27
- 28 28
- 29 29
- 30 30
- 31 31
- 32 32
- 33 33
- 34 34
- 35 35
- 36 36
- 37 37
- 38 38
- 39 39
- 40 40
- 41 41
- 42 42
- 43 43