

Comparative Studies for Evaluation of CO₂ Fixation in the Cavity of the Rubisco Enzyme using QM, QM/MM and Linear-Scaling DFT methods

Morad M. El-Hendawy¹, Niall J. English^{1,2}, Damian A. Mooney^{1,2*}*

¹The SFI Strategic Research Cluster in Solar Energy Conversion and ²the Centre for Synthesis and Chemical Biology, School of Chemical and Bioprocess Engineering, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland.

Keywords: Rubisco, Carboxylation step, linear-scaling DFT, QM/MM, PM6

We evaluate the minimum energy configuration (MM) and binding free energy (QM/MM and QM) of CO₂ to Rubisco, of fundamental importance to the carboxylation step of the reaction catalysed by Rubisco. Two structural motifs have been used to achieve this goal, one of which starts from the initial X-ray Protein Data Bank structure of Rubisco's active centre (671 atoms), and the other is a simplified, smaller model (77 atoms) which has been used most successfully, thus far, for study. The small model is subjected to quantum chemical Density functional theory (DFT) studies, both *in vacuo* and using implicit solvation. The effects of the protein environment are also included by means of a hybrid quantum mechanical/molecular mechanical (QM/MM) approach, using PM6/AMBER and B3LYP/AMBER schemes. Finally, linear-scaling DFT methods have also been applied to evaluate energetic features of the large motif, and the result obtained for the binding free energy of the CO₂ underlines the importance of the accurate modelling of the surrounding protein milieu using a full DFT description.

* Corresponding Authors: niall.english@ucd.ie, Tel +353-1-7161646, Fax +353-1-7161177; damian.mooney@ucd.ie, Tel +353-1-7161827, Fax +353-1-7161177

Introduction

Ribulose-1,5 bisphosphate carboxylase oxygenase (RuBisCO, or Rubisco) is an enzyme which catalyses the carboxylation of ribulose 1,5-bisphosphate, RuBP, to yield two molecules of D-3-phosphoglyceric acid (PGA)¹. It remains one of the most important and intriguing enzymes known to Man, representing the key plant enzyme involved in the first (and rate-limiting) step of the fixation of atmospheric CO₂ (Calvin cycle). It is also the world's most abundant enzyme, accounting for up to 30 - 50% of the soluble leaf protein in C₄ and C₃ plants, respectively; suggesting that there is between 5-10 kg of Rubisco for every person on earth² converting on the order of 10¹¹ CO₂ per annum into organic material¹. However, its abundance has been seen as direct result of its perceived inefficiency.^{1,3-5} This inefficiency is marked by two main observations: 1) low catalytic rate of carboxylation per active site (k_{cat}) (between 3-10 s⁻¹) and 2) the competition between the dual functions of the enzyme in catalysing carboxylation (reacting with CO₂) relative to oxygenation (reacting with O₂), i.e. its specificity factor (τ) (ranging from 10 (purple photosynthetic bacteria) to 80 (C3 and C4 plants))⁶, where $\tau = V_{CO_2} K_{O_2} / V_{O_2} K_{CO_2}$ (the V_x corresponds to the maximum reaction velocity and the K_x correspond to the Michaelis constants, where x is either CO₂ or O₂)⁷.

Its unique place in catalysing the conversion of large amounts of inert inorganic carbon, CO₂, into organic carbon has given it even greater significance in recent times; if harnessed appropriately, it provides a tantalising win-win proposition in both supplying a sink for anthropogenic CO₂ and yielding useful, accessible organic material which could not only be used to increase food production but could also supplement the raw materials and fuel supplied by traditional, fossil-based hydrocarbons.^{5,8,9}

Unfortunately, due to the complexity of the enzyme, it is still largely unknown what the rate-limiting step in the process Calvin cycle is; whether it is one of the steps in its actual reaction with RuBP (to yield PGA) or is it the diffusion mechanism of substrate/product through the protein. A significant body of literature has, therefore, built up over the past 10 to 20 years in trying to understand the structure and function of Rubisco with the expressed aim of either applying genetic engineering in improving its efficiency in fixing CO₂ for food, and/or biofuel production^{1,4,6,10-16}, or in seeking inspiration from it in developing synthetic analogues capable of yielding small molecular weight organic feedstock or fuels.

In any event, the study and elucidation of structural features concerning the molecular mechanism of carboxylation in Rubisco remains an important field of research, in view of the goal of achieving a deeper understanding of this process *per se*, but also rooted in the notion that such insights could yield the ultimate goal of synthesising alternative Rubisco-inspired organic and inorganic analogues. To this end, molecular modelling can offer many insights into deepening our understanding of the key interactions, and structural and reactive properties in the Rubisco active site. In particular, Kannappan and Gready¹⁵ have made impressive progress in this field with their seminal work on molecular modelling of various reactive pathways in Rubisco. However, the increase in computer power in the past few decades, and, crucially, algorithmic advances in linear-scaling DFT¹⁷, permits the accurate study of larger system sizes to thousands of atoms^{18,19}, and the modelling of entire proteins^{20,21}. This allows for the inclusion of the protein matrix well beyond the active site, which QM and QM/MM neglect by necessity, due to its computationally prohibitive nature.

The goal of this study is to evaluate the Gibbs free energy of CO₂ fixation in Rubisco, using quantum mechanical (QM), QM/MM and linear-scaling DFT approaches, in order to assess the

importance of inclusion of the surrounding protein milieu for the accurate determination of fixation thermodynamics. We have also conducted MM using different force-field models to calculate, for qualitative purposes, the minimum energy configuration for bound CO₂. To accomplish this, two structural motifs have been used, one of which starts from the initial X-ray Protein Data Bank structure of Rubisco's active centre (with 671 atoms) for MM, QM/MM and linear-scaling DFT, and the other is a simplified smaller model comprising 77 atoms for QM studies. In all cases, continuum solvation and *in vacuo* calculations are carried out to test explicitly solvation effects.

Methodology

The 1.6 Å-resolution X-ray structure of an activated complex of Rubisco from spinach (*i.e.*, *Spinacia oleracea*) was obtained from the Research Collaboratory for Structural Bioinformatics Data Bank (www.pdb.org)²², with PDB entry code 8RUC²³. The active site of the subunit L (residues 113 to 463) was taken from the whole structure, including the coordinated magnesium ion. This was achieved by taking all residues in all chains within a *circa* 24 Å radius of the Mg²⁺ ion – a rather expansive view of the active site. Missing residues were then added using MODELLER 9v8²⁴, while hydrogen and missing atoms were added using the internal coordinates of the AMBER²⁵ topology files, assuming a pH of 7.5 for protonation states, resulting in 5,458 atoms. Continuum solvation model (PCM) was to be used for subsequent estimates of solvation effects upon CO₂ fixation energetics. We used an empirical dielectric constant of 4, as there is consensus in the literature that this value gives a generally good agreement with experimental results and accounts for the average effect of both the protein and buried water molecules.

Molecular mechanics (MM) calculations were carried out in conjunction with the AMBER 99 parameter set²⁶ which includes the much improved potential parameters for Mg^{2+} as proposed by Aqvist²⁷. We have also tested three different potential models for CO_2 including that contained with Amber99, as well as the EPM parameters developed by Harris and Yung²⁸ and the more recent model developed by Velanga *et al.*²⁹ A summary of the corresponding force-field parameters are shown in Table 1. For MM calculations, we performed energy minimization (0 K MM) in the gas phase, using the BORN solvation approximation as well as using explicit (TIP3P) water molecules.³⁰ In the latter case, we solvated the 671 protein fragment in a water-droplet of a diameter ~ 50 Å, such that the peripheral atoms of the protein were at least 6 Å from the edge of the drop. The outermost water molecules were restrained using a weak harmonic potential.

(insert Table 1 about here)

For the active site, in the carbamylated lysine (Lys 201), the parameters developed by Pang were employed³¹. A cut-off distance of 25 Å was applied to non-bonded interactions, to allow for detailed and converged studies of the CO_2 -protein interaction energy as a function of protein milieu: the CO_2 molecule was placed in its binding position in the active site following energy minimisation and the interaction energy was found to converge to within 10% of that for the whole 5,548-atom protein system in a smaller 671-atom protein system by systematic removal of residues in onion-like ‘shells’ further from the CO_2 . This was found to be a suitable system size for subsequent MM, QM/MM and linear-scaling DFT calculations. We employ a 25Å cut-off

for MM calculations as this was sufficient to include the entire 671 atom fragment (representing our model of Rubisco) when calculating the energies of the CO₂ molecule.

Several trials have been carried out to create a simplified fragment model that can realistically represent the active site of Rubisco and produce reliable energetics using QM calculations^{15,32-37}. Kannappan and Gready examined and assessed the validity of all suggested models¹⁵. They concluded that a 77-atom fragment model is sufficiently large as a reasonable representation of the active site, starting from enediolate intermediate, to study the CO₂ and O₂ fixation processes; we employed this fragment (designated FM20 in their paper¹⁵) in this study (cf. Fig. 1), as a representative system for viable QM calculations. It contains four-carbon (4C) for substrate, an –OPO(OH)₂ group attached to C1 (the charge on which has been neutralised via two protons to prevent artificial energetics for the species). Two CH₃COO[−] ions were placed in lieu of ASP203 and GLU204 residues, and CH₃NH₃⁺ ions were used to replace LYS175 and LYS177. One water molecule was added to complete the octahedral motif (cf. Fig. 1). HIS294 and LYS334 were modelled explicitly by an imidazole ring and NH₄⁺ ions, respectively. The small and large systems are depicted in Fig. 2.

(insert Figs. 1 and 2 about here)

QM and QM/MM calculations were performed using density functional theory (DFT) with the B3LYP/6-31+g(p,d) functional^{38,39} as implemented in Gaussian 09 suite⁴⁰, along with further MM calculations on geometry-optimised structures, with CO₂ placed adjacent the Mg ion (cf. Fig. 1). The functionals employed are those most commonly utilised in the techniques employed. Therefore, this work does not represent a systematic overview of these techniques, per se, but rather an attempt to present the typical range to be expected for the different levels of

approximation. Frequency calculations were performed at the same level of optimisation to obtain zero-point energies (ZPE) and to ensure the absence of any negative eigenvalues. The energies so obtained were corrected for zero-point energy at 298 K. QM/MM calculations were carried out using the ONIOM^{41,42} approach on the 671-atom system, with the inner 77 atoms of the QM region serving as the inner layer, treated using PM6⁴³ or B3LYP/6-31G(d,p)^{38,39,44} approach and the outer region using AMBER. As well as performing QM (77-atom system) and MM, QM/MM calculations *in vacuo* (671-atom system), the PCM solvation model⁴⁵ was also used for water, as implemented in Gaussian 09, in geometry optimisation of the QM, MM and QM/MM systems, to allow for the assessment of solvation effects on fixation free energies. Here, electronic embedding scheme has been used which plays the fundamental role in the non-bonded interactions between the QM and MM regions.

Linear-scaling DFT was applied to optimise CO₂ binding to the 671-atoms system in the ONETEP package, which exploits “near-sightedness” of the density matrix¹⁷. The Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) functional⁴⁶ of the generalised gradient approximation (GGA) was used⁴⁷. Non-orthogonal generalised Wannier functions (NGWFs), localised in real space, were used to represent the density matrix, with truncation radii of 4.6 Å. For NGWFs, a 1s configuration was used for H, a 2s2p for C, N and O, and a 3s configuration for Mg. The NGWFs were expanded in a basis of periodic cardinal sine (psinc) functions⁴⁸ with a kinetic energy cut-off of 750 eV. Core electrons were treated using norm-conserving pseudopotentials. Van der Waals interactions were included in the DFT energy by damped London potentials optimised for the PBE functional⁴⁹. For all but MM calculations, the CO₂ binding free energy was evaluated *in vacuo*⁵⁰ on the geometry optimised structure⁵¹, and in continuum solvation water using a Poisson Boltzmann Surface Area (PBSA) approach⁵².

Results and Discussion

The first series of calculations were conducted using MM, as already discussed. The results of these calculations are shown in Table 2. While it not suggested that these results can be compared with those presented in Table 3 (which are for structures in a reacted/bound state), it is certainly useful from a qualitative point of view to compare the results achieved using different models for CO₂, but also the effect of using different solvation models. Care, of course, should also be taken when comparing the results of minimisations which are not definitively global. Despite this, it is clear that the treatment of water has a very significant effect on energies as well as geometry. On the whole it appears to reduce the overall reduce the binding energy as well as stabilize the CO₂ in a more proximate and strained conformation. The force-field of Velanga *et al.* seems to buck the trend regarding the d_{C-Mg} distance observed.

(insert Table 2 about here)

The binding free energies of CO₂ for QM/MM and QM calculations are provided in Table 3 for *in vacuo* and in continuum-solvent water. As one would expect, the inclusion of continuum solvation tends to render the binding free energy more negative. Although not available, one would expect that the results from MM (AMBER) are rather different (lower) to those of QM-type methods, indicating over-binding to some extent. Indeed, Fox *et al* ⁵⁰ have observed that binding energies are often lower (*i.e.*, more negative) for AMBER than the corresponding full-scale DFT results on identical systems. As fixed-charge MM forcefields, such as AMBER, neglect polarisation in their parameterisation, this may serve to rationalise why over-binding is sometimes observed when using MM, with energetic stabilisation over-emphasised. A better

approximation in the classical domain would be to employ an increasingly sophisticated hierarchy of classical approximations including an appropriately adapted shell model and a suitable polarizable force field. QM/MM results are intermediate in binding energies vis-à-vis QM and linear-scaling DFT, at -12.2 to -12.9 kcal/mol; again, the energetic stabilisation afforded by a lack of polarisation may serve to explain this. However, it is likely that the artifact of the QM/MM boundary affects results substantially. More convincing binding energies, especially when compared to metallo-proteins of comparable size⁵⁰ are the results from pure QM and linear-scaling DFT. The QM result of -6.8 to -8.1 kcal/mol appears to be affected to some extent (almost 20%) by solvation, as one would expect from such a necessarily small system of 77 atoms. This size artifact is very problematic, given that the protein environment surrounding the CO₂ would be expected to play a substantial rôle in modulating the energetic and mechanics of interaction with the complex. In this respect, the linear-scaling DFT result of -4.6 to -5.1 kcal/mol is most appealing and convincing, with a solvation correction of approximately 10% vis-à-vis the gas-phase result. A very useful discussion on the influence of solvation on binding energies is provided by Murata et al.⁵³

Also shown in this table is the angle subtended by the O-C-O (-COO⁻) species created by the reaction of CO₂ with the Enediolate form of RuBP, namely 2-carboxy-3-keto-D-arabinitol 1,5-bisphosphate (CKABP). This very simple structural determinant provides some evidence as to the utility of the each of the techniques used in predicting/supporting experimental observables. As can be seen from this Table, LS-DFT replicates experiment remarkably well, yielding a value of 118.8°, while experiment yields a value of 118.2 ± 1.3°.

(insert Table 3 about here)

Conclusions

Preliminary MM energy minimization calculations on CO₂ at the active site of Rubisco reveal both the effect of different CO₂ force-field parameters, as well as the importance of water in stabilizing CO₂ near the active site. It has also been found that linear-scaling DFT leads to important corrections in a more accurate and satisfactory estimate of CO₂ binding free energy to Rubisco, in conjunction with PCM correction, relative to the QM/MM approach and also smaller-scale QM estimates. Given the importance of Rubisco and the ultimate goal of using computational design to lead in the predictive *in silico* design of biomimetic carbon capture materials, the accurate, full-system treatment of evaluation of thermodynamic parameters is vital for assessing potential for CO₂ fixation. This study confirms this. It is also to be expected that linear-scaling DFT will find many other applications in biology, chemistry, chemical physics and materials science.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge useful conversations with Jacek Dziedzic, Chris-Kriton Skylaris, Peter Haynes, Daniel Cole and Nicholas Hine. The research was funded primarily by the Science Foundation Ireland (SFI)-funded Solar Energy Conversion (SEC) research cluster [Grant No. 07/SRC/B1160], with input from SFI Research Frontiers Programme 10/RFP/MTR2868. We thank SFI for the provision of funds for high-performance computing facilities and the Irish Centre for High-End Computing (ICHEC) for computational resources. The authors acknowledge the support of industry partners to the SEC cluster: SolarPrint, Celtic Catalysts, Glantreo, Mainstream Renewable Power, Kingspan and SSE Renewables.

Figure Captions

Fig. 1: Fragment model representing the active centre of Rubisco. The structure corresponds to the coordination sphere of Mg^{2+} centre with enediolate-bound CO_2 . The fragment involves a hydrogen bond network, represented by green lines. The $\text{Mg}\cdots\text{O}$ bonds of the first coordination sphere are displayed in the top left.

Fig. 2: Representation of the Rubisco active site, with (a) 77 atoms (b) 671 atoms, for respective use in QM (case a) and MM, QM/MM and linear-scaling DFT (case b).

Table 1: Lennard-Jones and charge force-field parameters for CO₂ used in this work.

	$\sigma_{C-C}/\text{\AA}$	$\sigma_{O-O}/\text{\AA}$	ϵ_{C-C}/k	ϵ_{O-O}/k	q_C	q_O
AMBER 99 ^{26,27}	3.400	2.960	43.300	105.73	0.974	-0.487
Harris-Yung ²⁸	2.757	3.033	28.129	80.507	0.652	-0.326
VVA ²⁹	3.595	2.975	76.765	56.414	0.652	-0.326

Table 2: Comparison of calculated MM energies (0 K total energy) for different models of CO₂ in the gas phase, BORN-solvation and explicit water descriptions for the system under investigation. In the case of explicit waters, the entire system was solvated into a water droplet where the outer layer of water molecules was constrained using an harmonic potential. In this later case, 1645 water molecules were included. All energies are in kcal/mol. HY refers to minimisations utilizing the Harris-Yung potential²⁸ for CO₂. VVA refers to minimisations utilizing the Velanga et al. potential for CO₂.²⁹ $\angle\text{O-C-O}$ refers to the angle subtended by CO₂. $d_{\text{C-Mg}}$ refers to the separation (in Å) between the carbon atom of CO₂ and the Mg²⁺ ion.

Model	E_{MM}	E_{vdW}	E_{elec}	E_{solv}	$\angle\text{O-C-O}$ °	$d_{\text{C-Mg}}$ [Å]
MM: Amber 99 (Gas Phase)	-14.185	-8.492	-5.693	-	176.8	5.83
MM: Amber 99 (BORN)	-6.573	-6.924	-6.363	6.715	178.0	5.68
MM: Amber 99 (Explicit)	-11.221	-9.666	-1.556	-	175.1	4.77
MM: Amber 99 / HY (Gas Phase)	-8.041	-6.289	-1.752		179.3	4.77
MM: Amber 99 / HY (BORN)	-5.675	-6.130	-2.246	2.702	178.4	6.07
MM: Amber 99 / HY (explicit)	-9.779	-7.233	-2.545	-	177.9	4.69
MM: Amber 99 / VVA (Gas Phase)	-10.734	-8.489	-2.245		178.3	5.03
MM: Amber 99 / VVA (BORN)	-7.776	-7.649	-2.259	2.133	179.6	7.83
MM: Amber 99 / VVA (explicit)	-10.598	-7.885	-2.714	-	176.5	6.97

Table 3: Gibbs free energies of CO₂ fixation using various methods. Also shown is the angle taken by the O=C=O species (within the newly formed –COO⁻ group) created by the reaction between CO₂ with the Enediolate form of RuBP. The average angle for this group from the experimental structure, 8RUC, is 118.2° (± 1.3 °). Finally, the total CPU hours for each calculation is shown (=total time in hours × number of CPUs). All calculations were based on structures with 671 atoms, except full QM which was based on a structure with 77 atoms.

Model (energies in kcal/mol; angles in degrees)	ΔG^{gas}	$\Delta G^{\text{solv.}}$	$\angle \text{O-C-O}$	CPU hrs.
QM/MM: PM6:AMBER	-12.2	-12.9	113.3	~ 36
QM/MM: B3LYP/6-31+g(d,p):AMBER	-8.2	-9.6	125.5	~ 120
QM: B3LYP/6-31+g(d,p)	-6.8	-8.1	127.7	~ 168
L.S.-DFT: PBE/dispersion	- 4.6	-5.1	118.8	~ 240

References

- (1) Portis, A. R.; Parry, M. A. J. *Photosynthesis Res.* 2007, *94*, 121.
- (2) Richt, J. A.; Schonenbrucher, H.; Adhikary, R.; Mukherjee, P.; Casey, T. A.; Rasmussen, M. A.; Maistrovich, F. D.; Hamir, A. N.; Kehrli, M. E.; Petrich, J. W. *J. Agric. Food. Chem.* 2008, *56*, 6220.
- (3) Fujitani, H.; Tanida, Y.; Ito, M.; Jayachandran, G.; Snow, C. D.; Shirts, M. R.; Sorin, E. J.; Pande, V. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* 2005, *123*.
- (4) Snow, C. D.; Sorin, E. J.; Rhee, Y. M.; Pande, V. S. *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct.* 2005, *34*, 43.
- (5) Sorin, E. J.; Rhee, Y. M.; Pande, V. S. *Biophys. J.* 2005, *88*, 2516.
- (6) Taiz, L.; Zeiger, E. *Plant physiology*; 5th ed.; Sinauer Associates: Sunderland, MA, 2010.
- (7) Galmés, J.; Flexas, J.; Keys, A. J.; Cifre, J.; Mitchell, R. A. C.; Madgwick, P. J.; Haslam, R. P.; Medrano, H.; Parry, M. A. J. *Plant, Cell Environ.* 2005, *28*, 571.
- (8) Boesch, C.; Bundi, A.; Oppliger, M.; Wuthrich, K. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1978, *91*, 209.
- (9) Bundi, A.; Andreatta, R.; Rittel, W.; Wuthrich, K. *Experientia* 1976, *32*, 787.
- (10) Ragauskas, A. J.; Williams, C. K.; Davison, B. H.; Britovsek, G.; Cairney, J.; Eckert, C. A.; Frederick, W. J.; Hallett, J. P.; Leak, D. J.; Liotta, C. L.; Mielenz, J. R.; Murphy, R.; Templer, R.; Tschaplinski, T. *Sci* 2006, *311*, 484.
- (11) Griffiths, H. *Nature* 2006, *441*, 940.
- (12) Sage, R. F.; Kubien, D. S. *Plant Cell Environ* 2007, *30*, 1086.
- (13) Evans, J. R.; Kaldenhoff, R.; Genty, B.; Terashima, I. *J. Exp. Bot.* 2009, *60*, 2235.
- (14) Mott, K. A.; Woodrow, I. E. *J. Exp. Bot.* 2000, *51*, 399.
- (15) Kannappan, B.; Gready, J. E. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2008, *130*, 15063.
- (16) King, W. A.; Gready, J. E.; Andrews, T. J. *Biochemistry-Us* 1998, *37*, 15414.
- (17) Grathwohl, C.; Tunkyi, A.; Bundi, A.; Schwyzer, R.; Wuthrich, K. *Helv. Chim. Acta* 1975, *58*, 415.
- (18) Hine, N. D. M.; Haynes, P. D.; Mostofi, A. A.; Skylaris, C. K.; Payne, M. C. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 2009, *180*, 1041.

- (19) Gordon, M. S.; Fedorov, D. G.; Pruitt, S. R.; Slipchenko, L. V. *Chem. Rev.* 2012, *112*, 632.
- (20) Cole, D. J.; Rajendra, E.; Roberts-Thomson, M.; Hardwick, B.; McKenzie, G. J.; Payne, M. C.; Venkitaraman, A. R.; Skylaris, C. K. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* 2011, *7*.
- (21) Lucia, Lo, D.; Jiang, L. X.; Budi, A. *Proc Ieee Int Conf S* 2010.
- (22) Bernstein, F. C.; Koetzle, T. F.; Williams, G. J. B.; Meyer, E. F.; Brice, M. D.; Rodgers, J. R.; Kennard, O.; Shimanouchi, T.; Tasumi, M. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1977, *80*, 319.
- (23) Pottel, R.; Gopel, K. D.; Henze, R.; Kaatz, U.; Uhlendorf, V. *Biophys. Chem.* 1984, *19*, 233.
- (24) Couch, V. A.; Cheng, N.; Nambiar, K.; Fink, W. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2006, *110*, 3410.
- (25) Cornell, W. D.; Cieplak, P.; Bayly, C. I.; Gould, I. R.; Merz, K. M.; Ferguson, D. M.; Spellmeyer, D. C.; Fox, T.; Caldwell, J. W.; Kollman, P. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1995, *117*, 5179.
- (26) Wang, J.; Cieplak, P.; Kollman, P. A. *J. Comput. Chem.* 2000, *21*, 1049.
- (27) Aqvist, J. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1990, *94*, 8021.
- (28) Harris, J. G.; Yung, K. H. *J. Phys. Chem.* 1995, *99*, 12021.
- (29) Velanga, S.; Vedam, V.; Anderson, B. J. In *7th International Conference on Gas Hydrates (ICGH 2011)*; Proceedings: Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom, 2011.
- (30) Jorgensen, W. L.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Madura, J. D.; Impey, R. W.; Klein, M. L. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1983, *79*, 926.
- (31) Ferrara, P.; Apostolakis, J.; Caflisch, A. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2000, *104*, 5000.
- (32) Garcia, A. E.; Sanbonmatsu, K. Y. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 2002, *99*, 2782.
- (33) Oliva, M.; Safont, V. S.; Andres, J.; Tapia, O. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 1999, *103*, 8725.
- (34) Oliva, M.; Safont, V. S.; Andres, J.; Tapia, O. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 1999, *103*, 6009.
- (35) Oliva, M.; Safont, V. S.; Andres, J.; Tapia, O. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 2001, *340*, 391.
- (36) Ghosh, T.; Garde, S.; Garcia, A. E. *Biophys. J.* 2002, *82*, 350a.
- (37) Ferrara, P.; Apostolakis, J.; Caflisch, A. *Proteins* 2000, *39*, 252.
- (38) Lindahl, E.; Hess, B.; van der Spoel, D. *J. Mol. Model.* 2001, *7*, 306.

- (39) Kutzner, C.; Van der Spoel, D.; Fechner, M.; Lindahl, E.; Schmitt, U. W.; De Groot, B. L.; Grubmuller, H. *J. Comput. Chem.* 2007, 28, 2075.
- (40) Tsuru, T.; Morita, T.; Shintani, H.; Yoshioka, T.; Asaeda, M. *J. Membr. Sci.* 2008, 316, 53.
- (41) Dapprich, S.; Komaromi, I.; Byun, K. S.; Morokuma, K.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Mol. Struct.-Theochem* 1999, 461, 1.
- (42) Carmona, N.; Villegas, M. A.; Navarro, J. M. F. *Thin Solid Films* 2004, 458, 121.
- (43) Gu, Y. F.; Hacıalioglu, P.; Oyama, S. T. *J. Membr. Sci.* 2008, 310, 28.
- (44) Figueroa, J. D.; Fout, T.; Plasynski, S.; McIlvried, H.; Srivastava, R. D. *Int. J. Greenh. Gas Con.* 2008, 2, 9.
- (45) Bernardo, P.; Drioli, E.; Golemme, G. *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.* 2009, 48, 4638.
- (46) Campaniello, J.; Engelen, C. W. R.; Haije, W. G.; Pex, P. P. A. C.; Vente, J. F. *Chem. Commun.* 2004, 834.
- (47) Albaugh, J.; O'Sullivan, C.; O'Neill, L. *Surface & Coatings Technology* 2008, 203, 844.
- (48) Petrich, J. W.; Bose, S.; Adhikary, R.; Barnes, C. A.; Fulton, D. B.; Hargrove, M. S.; Song, X. Y. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2011, 115, 3630.
- (49) Kee, T. W.; Adhikary, R.; Carlson, P. J.; Mukherjee, P.; Petrich, J. W. *Aust. J. Chem.* 2011, 64, 23.
- (50) Kee, T. W.; Adhikary, R.; Carlson, P. J.; Petrich, J. W. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2010, 114, 2997.
- (51) Petrich, J. W.; Adhikary, R.; Barnes, C. A. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2009, 113, 11999.
- (52) Kee, T. W.; Adhikary, R.; Mukherjee, P.; Petrich, J. W. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2009, 113, 5255.
- (53) Murata, K.; Fedorov, D. G.; Nakanishi, I.; Kitaura, K. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 2009, 113, 809.