Investigation of finite-pulse radiofrequency-driven recoupling methods for measurement of intercarbonyl distances in polycrystalline and membrane-associated HIV fusion peptide samples
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Two finite-pulse radiofrequency-driven recoupling (RFDR) methods were compared and applied to the measurement of 3–6 Å ¹³CO–¹³CO distances in polycrystalline and membrane-associated HIV fusion peptide (HFP) samples. The RFDR methods were based on π pulses and were relatively straightforward to implement and insensitive to pulse imperfections. The two tested methods were: (i) constant-time double-quantum buildup with finite pulses (fpCTDQBU) for which the pulse sequence maintained a constant transverse relaxation period while allowing a variable period of dipolar dephasing; and (ii) constant-time finite-pulse rf-driven recoupling (fpRFDR-CT) for which the duration of transverse relaxation increased with increasing dephasing period. The fpRFDR-CT method yielded higher signal-to-noise and an accurate determination of a ~5 Å intercarbonyl distance was made in a crystalline peptide which had T₂ ≈ 55 ms. In some contrast, the HFP samples had T₂ ≈ 15 ms and the fpRFDR-CT data were dominated by transverse relaxation. Examination of the fpCTDQBU sequence showed: (i) the most rapid signal buildup was obtained with application of one ¹³C π pulse per rotor period rather than one ¹³C π pulse per multiple rotor periods and (ii) the data were insensitive to ~15 ppm transmitter offset and to ~5° variation of π pulse nutation angle. For HFP samples which were ¹³CO labeled at a single residue, analyses of the fpCTDQBU data were interpreted with a model of mixed parallel and antiparallel β-strand arrangements in the N-terminal region of HFP and loss of parallel β-sheet structure in the C-terminal region of HFP.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past 20 years, solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) has provided structural information about noncrystalline biological solids such as membrane-associated peptides and proteins, and amyloid fibrils and intermediates.¹–³ A significant number of published studies were measurements of ¹³C–¹³C homonuclear dipolar recoupling (δδ) under magic angle spinning (MAS) with which sharp NMR signals could be observed. The relationship between the internuclear distance r and δδ is r = (7740/δδ)¹/³ where r and δδ have Å and Hz units, respectively. A variety of methods have been developed for measurement of these couplings including R₂, RFDR, SEDRA, DRAMA, HORROR, DRAWS, C7, post-C7, CMR7, SC146, R146, and SR26.⁴–¹⁸ This article describes investigation of the radiofrequency-driven recoupling (RFDR) or SEDRA method in which ¹³C transverse magnetization evolves under trains of ¹³C π pulses with one pulse per integral number of rotor periods.¹⁴–¹⁶ The RFDR setup is straightforward and rapid because the ¹³C pulses are π pulses with quadrature phases. Effects of ¹³C transverse relaxation may be reduced in constant-time (CT) versions of RFDR in which there are a constant number of π pulses and a single total duration of ¹³C evolution for all dipolar dephasing times.¹⁷,¹⁸ Use of ¹³C π pulses that are an appreciable fraction of a rotor period is an additional modification and for such finite-pulse RFDR (fpRFDR) sequences, the average Hamiltonian is proportional to the static homonuclear dipolar coupling Hamiltonian.¹⁹ The fpRFDR technique is relatively insensitive to ¹³C chemical shifts and ¹³C chemical shift anisotropies (CSAs) including tensor orientations and is well-suited to distance measurements in carbonyl (¹³CO)-labeled samples that are relatively inexpensive to prepare.¹⁹–²² Although fpRFDR was originally developed with rotors of small diameter and volume for which the MAS frequency was >20 kHz, fpRFDR has also been applied at the ~10 kHz MAS frequencies achievable with larger volume rotors.²² Higher signals may be obtained with these rotors for samples that are limited...
in concentration such as membrane-associated peptides and proteins.

This paper considers two variants of the fpRFDR sequence. For the constant-time double-quantum buildup with finite pulses (fpCTDQBU) method, the $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse train was divided into two parts, the first of which generated either $^{13}$C dipolar evolution or dipolar refocusing, and the second of which generated dipolar refocusing only. The refocusing was achieved with solid echoes and selection of either evolution or refocusing was controlled by the phase of a $^{13}$C $\pi/2$ pulse. The sum of the durations of the first and second periods was always a single $CT$. The second variant, constant-time finite-pulse rf-driven recoupling (fpRFDR-CT), contained WAHUHA periods for dipolar refocusing. Relative to solid echoes, the WAHUHA approach may result in higher signal because of better dipolar refocusing.

This paper provides some comparison between the fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT methods in both polycrystalline model compounds and membrane-associated HIV fusion peptide (HFP) samples. An investigation was made of the necessity for $CT$ in measurement of structurally interesting $r \sim 5$ Å distances with $d \sim 60$ Hz. In addition, comparison was made between a version of fpCTDQBU with one $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse per two rotor periods and a version with one $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse per rotor period. The latter version could generate more rapid dipolar evolution and permitted shorter durations of $CT$ with concomitant reduced transverse relaxation and higher signals. Investigations by experiment and simulation were also made of effects of transmitter offsets ($\Delta$) and pulse nutation angle ($\theta$) errors on fpCTDQBU data and the derived $^{13}$C–$^{13}$C distances.

In addition to the examination of the fpRFDR techniques, this paper also includes application of fpCTDQBU for determination of $\beta$-strand arrangements in membrane-associated HFP samples. The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) is surrounded by a membrane that the virus obtains from an infected cell during viral budding. Infection of a new cell begins with joining or ‘fusion’ of the viral and host cell membranes leading to deposition of the viral nucleocapsid in the host-cell cytoplasm. For HIV, the gp41 integral membrane protein of the virus, the gp41 integral membrane protein of the virus, 20-residue $\beta$-strand arrangement.47 For peptides in amyloid fibrils, strand arrangements have been elucidated using measurements of interpeptide $^{13}$C–$^{13}$C dipolar couplings in samples containing peptides with a single backbone $^{13}$CO label.48 For an in-register parallel strand arrangement, the $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO $r \approx 4.8$ Å with corresponding $d \approx 70$ Hz while an antiparallel arrangement would typically have greater $r$ and much smaller $d$. This approach is the conceptual basis for the investigation of strand arrangements in membrane-associated HFP in this paper.

**EXPERIMENTAL**

**Materials**

Resins and amino acids were purchased from Advanced Chemtech (Louisville, KY, USA), Calbiochem-Novabiochem (La Jolla, CA, USA) and Peptides International (Louisville, KY, USA). Labeled amino acids were purchased from Icon Services (Summit, NJ, USA) and were fluorenlymethoxy-carbonyl (FMOC)-protected using literature methods. The FMOC-1-$^{13}$C glycine was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, MO, USA). The buffer solution used in the study contained 5 mM HEPES (pH 7.0) with 0.01% NaN$_3$. Labeled amino acids were purchased from Icon Services (Summit, NJ, USA) and were fluorenlymethoxy-carbonyl (FMOC)-protected using literature methods. The FMOC-1-$^{13}$C glycine was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, MO, USA). The buffer solution used in the study contained 5 mM HEPES (pH 7.0) with 0.01% NaN$_3$.

N-acetyl-L-leucine (NAL) and glycyl-L-phenylalanyl-L-phenylalanine (GFP)

Unlabeled N-acetyl-L-leucine (NAL) and unlabeled glycyl-L-phenylalanyl-L-phenylalanine (GFP) were purchased from ICN (Aurora, OH, USA) and Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, MO, USA), respectively. Doubly 1-$^{13}$C, N-$^{13}$C labeled NAL during the past five years, there has been progress in synthesis of HFPs that reflect more closely HFP in gp41. In one effort, a longer ‘N70’ peptide was made which contained the first 70 residues of gp41. Relative to the 23-residue HFP, the N70 construct induced vesicle fusion at much lower peptide concentrations. In addition, high-resolution structures of gp41 constructs which lacked the HFP showed trimeric protein and suggested that at least three HFPs interact with the membrane with their C-termini in close proximity. These structures motivated the synthesis of the chemically cross-linked ‘HFPtr’ construct that contained three HFP strands. The significance of trimerization was indicated by a rate of vesicle fusion induced by HFPtr that was as much as 40 times greater than the rate induced by single-strand ‘HIV fusion peptide monomer (HFPMon)’. One structural hypothesis for the increased fusion of N70 and HFPtr is formation of predominant parallel rather than mixed parallel and antiparallel $\beta$-strand arrangements. A parallel arrangement would place the most apolar N-terminal regions of HFP strands close to one another and the resultant large apolar volume would cause greater perturbation of the membrane and more rapid fusion. Analysis of infrared spectra of membrane-associated N70 supported a parallel strand arrangement.

This paper considers two variants of the fpRFDR sequence. For the constant-time double-quantum buildup with finite pulses (fpCTDQBU) method, the $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse train was divided into two parts, the first of which generated either $^{13}$C dipolar evolution or dipolar refocusing, and the second of which generated dipolar refocusing only. The refocusing was achieved with solid echoes and selection of either evolution or refocusing was controlled by the phase of a $^{13}$C $\pi/2$ pulse. The sum of the durations of the first and second periods was always a single $CT$. The second variant, constant-time finite-pulse rf-driven recoupling (fpRFDR-CT), contained WAHUHA periods for dipolar refocusing. Relative to solid echoes, the WAHUHA approach may result in higher signal because of better dipolar refocusing.

This paper provides some comparison between the fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT methods in both polycrystalline model compounds and membrane-associated HIV fusion peptide (HFP) samples. An investigation was made of the necessity for $CT$ in measurement of structurally interesting $r \sim 5$ Å distances with $d \sim 60$ Hz. In addition, comparison was made between a version of fpCTDQBU with one $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse per two rotor periods and a version with one $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse per rotor period. The latter version could generate more rapid dipolar evolution and permitted shorter durations of $CT$ with concomitant reduced transverse relaxation and higher signals. Investigations by experiment and simulation were also made of effects of transmitter offsets ($\Delta$) and pulse nutation angle ($\theta$) errors on fpCTDQBU data and the derived $^{13}$C–$^{13}$C distances.

In addition to the examination of the fpRFDR techniques, this paper also includes application of fpCTDQBU for determination of $\beta$-strand arrangements in membrane-associated HFP samples. The human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) is surrounded by a membrane that the virus obtains from an infected cell during viral budding. Infection of a new cell begins with joining or ‘fusion’ of the viral and host cell membranes leading to deposition of the viral nucleocapsid in the host-cell cytoplasm. For HIV, the gp41 integral membrane protein of the virus, the gp41 protein contains an 20-residue $\beta$-strand arrangement.47 For peptides in amyloid fibrils, strand arrangements have been elucidated using measurements of interpeptide $^{13}$C–$^{13}$C dipolar couplings in samples containing peptides with a single backbone $^{13}$CO label.48 For an in-register parallel strand arrangement, the $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO $r \approx 4.8$ Å with corresponding $d \approx 70$ Hz while an antiparallel arrangement would typically have greater $r$ and much smaller $d$. This approach is the conceptual basis for the investigation of strand arrangements in membrane-associated HFP in this paper.
and GFF with $^{13}$CO labels at Gly-1 and Phe-3 were synthesized as setup compounds. Solution $^1$H and $^{13}$C NMR confirmed the identity, purity and labeling of the compounds. A polycrystalline D-NAL sample was prepared by aqueous dissolution of a 1:9 mixture of doubly labeled : unlabeled material followed by evaporation of the water and crystallization. The polycrystalline mixture of doubly labeled and unlabeled GFF (D-GFF) sample was similarly prepared except that the doubly labeled : unlabeled ratio was 1:49. The intramolecular labeled $^{13}$C--$^{13}$C distances in crystalline D-NAL and in crystalline D-GFF are 3.07 and 5.40 Å, respectively. The purpose of the dilution was to increase the average distance between labeled molecules so that the intermolecular $^{13}$C--$^{13}$C couplings between labeled molecules could be neglected. The dilution in the D-GFF sample was greater than in the D-NAL sample because the intramolecular $^{13}$C--$^{13}$C distance was larger in the D-GFF sample and the experiments, therefore, probed larger intermolecular distances.

**Fusion peptides**

'HFPtr-F8' was synthesized as a C-terminal amide using a Model 431A peptide synthesizer (ABI, Foster City, CA, USA) equipped for FMOC solid-phase chemistry. The amino acid sequence of HFPtrm-F8 was AVGIGALFLGFLGAAGSTMGARSWKKKKKCA, and a fusion peptide with sequence (AVGIGALFLGFLGAAGSTMGARSWKKKKKCA$_2$) where $A_2$ refers to $\beta$-alanine. The sequences in parentheses represented individual peptide strands and there was a chemical bond between the CO of the underlined cysteine and the NH of the side chain of the underlined lysine. The purified yield for this peptide was ~85%.

Syntheses of ‘fusion peptide trimer (HFPtr)-A6’ and ‘HFPtr-A15’ began with chemical synthesis of a HFP with improved aqueous solubility and the nonnative tryptophan residue. 35% of the nonnative residues of the LAV1a strain of the HIV gp41 envelope fusion protein. HFPtr-A15 was dissolved at a concentration of 0.15 mg/mL. Equimolar HFPtr-A15 was added to a solution of HFPm-F8 (200 µM). The mixture was vortexed and kept at room temperature for 4-60 min followed by ultracentrifugation at 35000 rpm for 45-60 min. The pellet formed after ultracentrifugation was transferred to a 4 mm diameter MAS NMR rotor by spatula. Unbound HFPtrs did not pellet under these conditions and there was approximately quantitative incorporation of HFP into the membrane.

**Lipid preparation**

The membranes for the HFP samples were prepared using a ‘PC/PG/CHOL’ mixture that contained DTPC and DTPG lipids and cholesterol in an 8:2.5 mol ratio. PC/PG/CHOL served as a simple model of the membrane composition of host cells of HIV and had phosphatidylcholine as the major lipid headgroup as well as a cholesterol : lipid ratio similar to these membranes. Unlike host cell membranes, PC/PG/CHOL contained ether-linked rather than ester-linked lipids to eliminate natural abundance lipid $^{13}$CO signals that would have complicated the data analysis. Previous experiments have shown that the membrane-associated HFP conformation was not affected by replacement of ester-linked lipids with ether-linked lipids.

Lipid and cholesterol powders were dissolved together in chloroform. The chloroform was removed under a stream of nitrogen followed by overnight vacuum pumping. Lipid dispersions were formed by addition of 5 mM pH 7.0 HEPES buffer followed by homogenization with 10 freeze-thaw cycles. Large unilamellar vesicles (LUVs) were prepared by extrusion through a filter with 100 nm diameter pores.

**Solid-state NMR sample preparation**

Polycrystalline D-NAL (~260 total µmol with ~26 µmol doubly labeled compound) and D-GFF (~140 total µmol with ~2.8 µmol doubly labeled compound) were ground before being packed in 4 mm diameter MAS NMR rotors.

For the membrane-associated HFP samples, 0.1–0.2 µmol HFPtr or 0.6 µmol HFPtrm was dissolved in ~2 ml of 5 mM HEPES buffer and LUVs (~30 µmol total lipid + cholesterol) were prepared in ~2 ml of buffer. The peptide and LUV solutions were mixed and kept at room temperature for 45–60 min followed by ultracentrifugation at 35000 rpm for 5 h at 4 °C. The peptide/lipid pellet formed after ultracentrifugation was transferred to a 4 mm diameter MAS NMR rotor by spatula. Unbound HFPtrs did not pellet under these conditions and there was approximately quantitative incorporation of HFP into the membrane.

**Solid-state NMR spectroscopy**

Experiments were done on a 9.4 T spectrometer (Varian Infinity Plus, Palo Alto, CA, USA) using a MAS probe in double resonance $^{13}$C/$^1$H configuration. The NMR detection channel was tuned to $^{13}$C at 100.8 MHz and the decoupling channel was tuned to $^1$H at 400.8 MHz. $^{13}$C shifts were externally referenced to the methylene resonance of adamantane at 40.5 ppm. Spacers were used to restrict samples to the central 2/3 rotor volume (~40 µl) in which radio frequency (rf) field variation was less than 10%.

Experiments were performed at ~50 °C rather than room temperature in order to achieve more efficient cross-polarization (CP) and greater signal per $^{13}$C nucleus. There were similar $^{13}$C backbone chemical shifts at both low temperature and room temperature, suggesting that cooling the sample does not cause significant peptide structural changes. The $^1$H and $^{13}$C pulse lengths were approximately obtained by direct pulsing adamantane and the CP matching condition was obtained by running ramped CP on D-NAL. Calibration of the $^1$H $\pi/2$, $^{13}$C $\pi/2$, and $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses was done with the CP ‘Z-filter’ sequence ($^{13}$C $\pi$/$^1$H $\pi$/$^1$H $\pi$ $-$ acquisition) run on the D-NAL sample.

For both the fpCPTDQB and fpRFDRC-CT experiments, typical parameters included 12 000 ± 2 Hz MAS frequency, ramped 50–60 kHz $^{13}$C and constant 65 kHz $^1$H fields during the 3 ms CP period, 20.5 kHz $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses, 50 kHz...
13C π/2 pulses, continuous-wave (CW) 1H decoupling of 95 and 60 kHz during the fpRFDR and acquisition periods, respectively, and 1.5 s recycle delay. Decoupling fields greater than 100 kHz led to arcing in the probe. Except when studying effects of transmitter offset, the 13C transmitter was set to 172.4 ppm for D-NAL, 175.5 ppm for D-GFF, 166.2 ppm for membrane-associated HFpnm-F8 and HFPtr-A6, and 158.4 ppm for membrane-associated HFPtr-A15. A larger transmitter offset was used for the HFPtr-A15 sample because of the larger 13CO linewidth in this sample.

**fpCTDQBU spectroscopy**

Figure 1(a) displays the fpCTDQBU sequence that had the form $CP_{\pi/2} - (fpRFDR)_L - \pi/2 - \pi/2 - (fpRFDR)_M - \pi/2 - \pi/2 - (fpRFDR)_N$ - acquisition where $L$, $M$, and $N$ were integers and $(fpRFDR)_L$, $(fpRFDR)_M$, and $(fpRFDR)_N$ had durations $L_{\text{RF}}$, $M_{\text{RF}}$, and $N_{\text{RF}}$ with $\tau_{\text{RF}}$ being the duration of a rotor cycle. Transverse 13C magnetization was generated during the CP period, evolved during the fpRFDR periods, and was detected during the acquisition period. Both $M = L + N$ and $L + M + N$ were held constant for a data set and the latter expression resulted in a CT period of duration $(L + M + N)\tau_{\text{RF}}$ for evolution of the transverse 13C magnetization. The evolution time can be understood as consecutive periods of duration $2L\tau_{\text{RF}}$ and $2N\tau_{\text{RF}}$ with the $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$, pulse pair at the midpoint of the first period and the $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$, pulse pair at the midpoint of the second period. As will be explained below, the $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$,($\zeta = y, y$) and $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$, pulse pairs refocused the 13C evolution due to 13C–13C dipolar coupling during the 2LRF and 2NRF periods, respectively, while the $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$,($\zeta = x, -x$) pulse pair did not refocus 13C dipolar evolution during the 2LRF period. For $\pi/2$, $\pi/2$,($\zeta = x, -x$) pulse pairs, the 2LRF period was therefore the dipolar evolution period and was denoted as $\tau$. The value of $\tau$ was varied by incrementing $L$ and decrementing $N$ by the same number.

For each $R$, free induction decays (FIDs) with $\zeta = x, y, -x, -y$ were recorded. The $S_0$ signal (no 13C–13C dipolar evolution during $\tau$) was formed from addition of the FIDs with $\zeta = y$ and $\zeta = -y$ while the $S_1$ signal (13C–13C dipolar evolution during $\tau$) was formed with addition of the FIDs with $\zeta = x$ and $-x$. The $2N_{\text{RF}}$ period provided an additional constraint of total CT for transverse 13C relaxation that was independent of $R$ for both the $S_0$ and $S_1$ data. Two versions of the fpCTDQBU sequence were tested and were denoted ‘one-$\pi$-per-$\tau$’ and ‘one-$\pi$-per-2$\tau$’ (Fig. 1(b), (c)). These versions differed during the fpRFDR periods in having one 13C $\pi$ pulse per rotor cycle or one 13C $\pi$ pulse per two rotor cycles, respectively. XY-8 phase cycling was used for the 13C $\pi$ pulses and $L$, $M$, and $N$ were integral multiples of 8 or 16 for the one-$\pi$-per-$\tau$ and one-$\pi$-per-2$\tau$ versions, respectively.

The effect of the $\pi/2$ pulse pairs on 13C dipolar evolution can be understood with average Hamiltonian theory. 25,55,56 The fpRFDR periods refocus 13C chemical shift evolution and result in an average dipolar Hamiltonian between two 13C spins that is proportional to the static dipolar Hamiltonian and has spin operator dependence: 19

$$H_{zz} = 3I_1I_2 - I_1I_2$$

(1)

where $I_1$ and $I_2$ are the nuclear spin operators of 13C spins 1 and 2. For $\zeta = -y$, the propagator during the $\tau$ period is represented by:

$$U(\tau) = e^{-i(DL_{\text{RF}})H_{zz} \tau} e^{i(\pi/2\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{yz}} e^{i(\pi/2\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{xy}} e^{i(\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{zz}}$$

(2)

where $D$ is the effective angular dipolar frequency. Equation (2) is evaluated as follows:

$$U(\tau) = e^{i(\pi/2\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{yz}} e^{i(\pi/2\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{xy}} e^{i(\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{zz}}$$

(3)

where $H_{yy} = 3I_1I_2 - I_1I_2$. The second and third terms commute with one another and can be interchanged to yield:

$$U(\tau) = e^{i(\pi/2\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{yz}} e^{i(\delta_{\text{RF}})H_{zz}}$$

(4)

Incorporation of the conditions that $H_{yy}$, $H_{yy}$, and $H_{zz}$...
Finite-pulse RFDR in polycrystalline and membrane peptide samples

Figure 2. (a) The displayed fpRFDR-CT pulse sequence included cross-polarization (CP) from 1H nuclei to 13C nuclei, a constant-time (CT) period, and an acquisition period during which 13C NMR signals were detected. Continuous wave 1H decoupling was applied during the CT and the acquisition periods. The CT period contained K cycles of (2M + 4N)τRF, where K was an integer, M and N were integral multiples of 8, and τRF was the duration of a single rotor period. Each (2M + 4N)τRF cycle contained intervals separated by 13C/2π/2 pulses and panel (b) displays the series of 13C π pulses in each of these intervals. The 13C CP rf phase was y and the phase of each 13C π/2 pulse was noted above the pulse. Each (2M + 4N)τRF cycle could be understood to have a central 6τRF WAHUHA period during which the 13C–13C dipolar evolution was refocused. For M = N, the CT period can be considered as a series of WAHUHA periods and so data were obtained with no dipolar coupling period. For M > N, 13C–13C dipolar evolution was not completely refocused and S1 data were obtained. The total duration of the 13C–13C dipolar recoupling or dephasing period was τ = 2K × (M − N)τRF and data with increasing τ were obtained by incrementing M and decrementing N while keeping (M + 2N) and K constant.

Transverse 13C relaxation (T2) measurements

For the fpRFDR-CT experiment, the 13C magnetization was longitudinal during the period between the first and second π/2 pulses and the period between the third and fourth π/2 pulses. For the dephasing period τ = 3KΔMτRF, the total 13C transverse relaxation period τT = 2K × (M + N)τRF = K × (4MΔ + ΔM)τRF. Quantitative interpretation of the fpRFDR-CT data therefore required consideration of 13C transverse relaxation and 13C T2 times were measured with a Carr–Purcell multiple echo sequence containing CPy − [QτRF − π/2 − 2QτRF − πy − QτRF − detect]P where Q was an even integer, P was an integer, and a data set consisted of echo signals with different values of P. For all samples, the echo intensities E(t) fitted well to a single exponential decay E(t) = E(0) exp(−t/T2) where t = 4PQRF. The uncertainties in the fitted T2 values were <± 8%. Experimental parameters for the Carr–Purcell sequence included 10 kHz MAS frequency, ~65 kHz 13C π pulses, and ~95 kHz 1H CW 1H decoupling.

Experimental data analysis

For each pair of S0 and S1 fpCTDQBU spectra with a particular dephasing time τ, integrated signal intensities in the isotropic carbonyl regions were denoted as S0 and S1, respectively. A single experimental uncertainty σ was calculated as the root-mean-squared deviation of integrated intensities in 24 regions of the S0 and S1 spectra which contained noise rather than signal. The integrated intensities were incorporated into the normalized dephasing parameter:

\[
\frac{(ΔS)}{S_0} = \frac{S_0 - S_1}{S_0} = 1 - \frac{S_1}{S_0}
\]
The $\Delta S^{\exp}$ was the double-quantum filtered signal and the factor $1/S_0^{\exp}$ compensated for $T_2$, for comparison with simulations which did not consider $T_2$ decay. The uncertainty in $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ was calculated as follows:\(^{58}\):

$$\sigma^{\exp} = \frac{\sigma}{S_0} \sqrt{1 + \frac{S_1^2}{S_0^2}} = \frac{\sigma S_1}{S_0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{S_1^2} + \frac{1}{S_0^2}}$$  

(8)

The fpRFDR-CT data were similarly analyzed except that for each value of $\tau$, there was only one spectrum. The $\tau = 0$ spectrum with no dipolar coupling period was denoted as $S_0$ and the other spectra with variable dipolar coupling periods were denoted as $S_1$. In addition, separate $\sigma_{S_0}$ and $\sigma_{S_1}$ were calculated as the root-mean-squared deviations of integrated intensities in 12 regions of the $S_0$ and $S_1$ spectra without signal. The normalized dephasing parameter for the fpRFDR-CT data was $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ and the uncertainty in $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ was calculated:

$$\sigma^{\exp} = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{S_0}^2}{S_0^2} + \frac{\sigma_{S_1}^2}{S_1^2} + \frac{\sigma_{S_2}^2}{S_2^2}} = \frac{\sigma_{S_1}}{S_0} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{S_0}^2}{S_1^2} + \frac{\sigma_{S_2}^2}{S_2^2}}$$  

(9)

For $\tau = 0$, $S_1/S_0 = 1$ and $\sigma^{\exp} = \sqrt{\sigma_{S_0}/S_0}$.

One goal of this study was quantitative comparison of D-NAL and D-GFF simulations done for two or three \(^{13}\)C with different internuclear distances. However, the experimental samples contained natural abundance \(^{13}\)C close to the labeled \(^{13}\)C and the experimental \(^{13}\)C labeling was near natural abundance. Values of $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ and $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ were calculated from $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ and $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ to compensate for these effects and followed the correction methods detailed in previous work.\(^{22}\) As one example, the following approximations were used to calculate $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ for D-GFF.

First, there were approximations relevant to calculation of $S_0^{\exp}$ and $S_1^{\exp}$:

1. \(^{13}\)CO signals from Gly-1, Phe-2, and Phe-3 were completely resolved.

2. There was 99\% labeling of Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO and Phe-3 \(^{13}\)CO.

3. Intermolecular \(^{13}\)C--\(^{13}\)C dipolar coupling was not considered. For Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO, the closest intermolecular carbon nucleus was $> 4$ Å away.

4. $S_1 = S_0$ for a molecule with a labeled Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO and a Phe-3 \(^{13}\)CO.

5. $S_1$ values for a molecule with a labeled Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO and nearby natural abundance \(^{13}\)CO were set with the following criteria: (5a) $S_1 = 0$ when $\tau \leq 32$ ms and the labeled Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO/natural abundance \(^{13}\)CO nuclei were separated by one or two bonds, (5b) $S_1 = 0$ when $\tau > 32$ ms and the labeled Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO/natural abundance \(^{13}\)CO nuclei were separated by one, two, or three bonds. (5c) $S_1$ was not affected by the natural abundance \(^{13}\)C if neither criterion 5a nor 5b was satisfied. The criteria were based on the $\sim 1.5$, $\sim 2.5$ and $\sim 3.8$ Å distances for one-, two- and three-bond \(^{13}\)C--\(^{13}\)C separations, respectively, and the consequent 2200, 500, and 140 Hz dipolar couplings.

6. $S_1 = S_0$ for a natural abundance Gly-1 \(^{13}\)CO in an unlabeled GFF molecule.

The expression of $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ for D-GFF was:

$$(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp} = \frac{1 - U_{C1} + n A_C}{1 - U_{C1} - U_{C2} - m A_C} \left(\Delta S/S_0\right)^{\exp} - \frac{m A_C}{1 - U_{C1} - U_{C2} - m A_C}$$  

(10)

where $U_{C1} = 0.01$ and $U_{C2} = 0.01$ were the fractions of Gly-1 and Phe-3 \(^{13}\)CO sites in D-GFF, respectively; $A_C = 0.011$ was the fractional \(^{13}\)C natural abundance; $n = 49$ was the ratio of unlabeled GFF to D-GFF molecules in the crystal; and $m$ was the number of unlabeled carbon nuclei which satisfy either criterion 5a or 5b. Incorporation of the previously noted parameter values for $\tau \leq 32$ ms and $m = 2$ yielded:

$$(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp} = 1.969 \left(\Delta S/S_0\right)^{\exp} - 0.023$$  

(11)

and for $\tau > 32$ ms and $m = 4$ yielded:

$$(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp} = 1.634 \left(\Delta S/S_0\right)^{\exp} - 0.047$$  

(12)

The expressions for $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ of D-NAL were determined in a manner similar to those of D-GFF.

The $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ of the membrane-associated HFPs were analyzed in the context of two structural populations. For one population with fraction $h$, there was a detectable dipolar coupling ($d$) between the labeled \(^{13}\)COs and for the other population with fraction $1 - h$, $d = 0$. The resulting $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ had a general form:

$$(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp} = \frac{1 - U_{C1} + n A_C}{h(1 - U_{C1} - m A_C)} \left(\Delta S/S_0\right)^{\exp} - \frac{m A_C}{h(1 - U_{C1} - m A_C)}$$  

(13)

The fpRFDR-CT $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ expressions were similarly derived and yielded a general expression for D-GFF and D-NAL:

$$(S_1/S_0)^{\exp} = \frac{1 - U_{C1} + n A_C}{1 - U_{C1} - U_{C2} - m A_C} \left(S_1/S_0\right)^{\exp} - \frac{n A_C + U_{C2}}{1 - U_{C1} - U_{C2} - m A_C}$$  

(14)

The $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ or the $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ expressions had the general form $a \times (\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp} - b$ or $a \times (S_1/S_0)^{\exp} - b$, respectively, where $a$ and $b$ were positive numbers. The $a^{\exp}$ associated with $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ and $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ were therefore $a^{\exp}$. The overall data analysis included the goodness-of-fit metric $\chi^2$ that had $(\sigma^{\exp})^{-2}$ dependence. Although the $h$ in the HFP analysis was a fitting parameter, the HFP $a^{\exp}$ were calculated with $h = 1$ and the variations of $\chi^2$ with $h$ were therefore independent of $a^{\exp}$.

\bf{fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT simulations} $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\exp}$ and $(S_1/S_0)^{\exp}$ were calculated as a function of the labeled \(^{13}\)CO--\(^{13}\)CO dipolar coupling $d$ and dephasing time $\tau$. The D-NAL and D-GFF simulations considered the two \(^{13}\)CO sites in a single molecule while the HFP simulations considered three \(^{13}\)CO sites with each site on a different HFP.
strand. Three HFP strands were used both because there were three strands in HFPtr and because simulations with more than three spins required significantly more computer time. In a previous study, similar 13CO–13CO distances were obtained when fitting HFP experimental data with simulations based on two 13CO spins or three 13CO spins.22 The number of structures considered in the HFP simulations was reduced to a tractable number by choosing an in-register parallel strand geometry with a single variable distance and dipolar coupling d between the 13CO in the central strand and the 13COs in each of the two outside strands. The simulations also incorporated the weak dipolar coupling between the 13COs in the outside strands.

The simulations were done with the simulation program for solid-state NMR spectroscopy (SIMPSON) program and incorporated the 13C part of the fpCTDQBU or the fpRFDR-CT part of the program including the MAS frequency and the 13C rf fields, pulse lengths, timing, and phases but did not incorporate 1H.59 Additional input parameters included the 13CO CSA principal values, the Euler angles that related the CSA principal axis system to a fixed crystal axis system, and the Euler angles that related the 13CO–13CO internuclear vector to the crystal axis system. The fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT simulations were not significantly sensitive to these additional parameters but some effort was still made to choose reasonable parameter values.22

The 13CO CSA principal values of NAL and GFF were determined by fitting experimental centerband and spinning sideband intensities with the Herzfeld–Berger method.60 In ppm units, the (δ11, δ22, δ33) principal values of the carbonyl and carboxyl sites of D-NAL were (246, 201, 85) and (258, 172, 87) ppm. The number of structures considered in the HFP simulations was broader than the other two HFP samples which may be supported by previous torsion angle measurements.35 The peak shift of the HFPtr-A6 spectra was 173.7 with 3 ppm peak width and line shape similar to those of the HFPtr-A15. The 13CO CSA principal axis directions were inputs to calculate the Euler angles for the 13CO principal axis system and the 13CO–13CO internuclear vectors in the crystal frame.

Some SIMPSON simulations were done on a PC with a WINDOWS operating system and a 1.7 GHz processor while other simulations were performed on a LINUX cluster using two 1.8 GHz processors.

As noted earlier in the paper, the fpRFDR-CT dephasing period τ = 3KΔMτφ and the transverse relaxation period ττ = K(4M0 + ΔM)τφ, and the effect of differential transverse relaxation was empirically incorporated into the simulation results with multiplication of (S1/S0)exp by exp(−τ/3T2).

Determination of best-fit internuclear distances

For the fpCTDQBU experiments, comparison was made between (ΔS/ΔS0)exp and (ΔS/ΔS0)sim calculated as a function of d and the best-fit d was determined from χ2 fitting:

\[
\chi^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{(\Delta S/\Delta S_0)_{\text{exp}} - (\Delta S/\Delta S_0)_{\text{sim}}}{(\sigma_{\text{sim}})^2}^2
\]

where the j subscript refers to a particular τ and N was the total number of τ.

RESULTS

fpCTDQBU spectra

Figure 3 displays, for example, 13C fpCTDQBU spectra of different samples. For each panel, peak shifts in ppm and assignments were: a, 180.1, carboxyl and 178.4, amide COs of D-NAL; b, 180.3, Phe-3; c, 176.7, Phe-2; and 170.8, Gly-1 COs of D-GFF; c, 172.6, CO of membrane-associated HFPtrm-F8, and d, 174.9, CO of membrane-associated HFPtr-A15. The 13CO signals of the membrane-HFP samples had ~75 and ~25% respectively contributions from labeled and natural abundance sites. The peak shift of the HFPtrm-F8 spectra agreed better with the database distribution of β-strand 13CO shifts for Phe (174.3 ± 1.6 ppm) than with the distribution of helical shifts (177.1 ± 1.4 ppm).66 A β-strand conformation at this site was also supported by previous torsion angle measurements.35 The peak shift of the HFPtr-A6 spectra was 173.7 with ~3 ppm peak width and line shape similar to those of the HFPtrm-F8 spectra. The HFPtr-A6 shift was also more consistent with the database distribution of β-strand shifts for Ala (176.1 ± 1.5 ppm) than with the distribution of helical shifts (179.4 ± 1.3 ppm).66 The peak shift of the HFPtr-A15 spectra was also consistent with β-strand conformation but the peak was broader than the other two HFP samples which may indicate greater conformational heterogeneity near Ala-15.

In Fig. 3(a), (ΔS/ΔS0)exp > 0.9 for the D-NAL spectra which was a reasonable result because d = 270 Hz and dτ = 3.6. In Fig. 3(b), (ΔS/ΔS0)exp ≈ 0.55 for the D-GFF spectra with d = 49 Hz and dτ = 1.4. The Gly-1 and Phe-3 signals included ~35% contribution from natural abundance.
Comparison between fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT experiments

For the version of the fpCTDQBU method in this study, there was a $S_0$ and a $S_1$ acquisition for each dephasing period $r$. For the fpRFDR-CT method, there was only one $S_0$ acquisition per data set and consequent higher sensitivity because for a fixed total time for data acquisition, more time was available for signal averaging of $S_1$ spectra. On the other hand, data analysis for this version of fpRFDR-CT had greater complexity because the contribution of transverse relaxation was $r$-dependent.

Figure 4 displays an initial comparison of the two experiments using the D-GFF sample for which the labeled $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO distance was comparable to the structurally interesting distances in the HFP samples. The $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ derived from the fpCTDQBU experiment were fitted to $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ calculated as a function of $d$ and Fig. 4(a) displays $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ and best-fit $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ plotted as functions of $r$. The best-fit value of $d$ was $49.4 \pm 1.2$ Hz with corresponding $r = 5.39 \pm 0.05$ Å which agreed with $r = 5.40$ Å in the crystal structure. As displayed in Fig. 4(b), a similar analysis was done for the $(S_1/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ calculated from the fpRFDR-CT data and $(S_1/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ which incorporated the experimentally-derived $T_2 = 54$ ms. The $T_2$ correction had the functional form $\exp(-r/162 \text{ ms})$ and had a minor effect on the data analysis because the decay constant for $(S_1/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ was $\sim 30$ ms. The best-fit $d = 59 \pm 3$ Hz corresponded to $r = 5.07 \pm 0.09$ Å. Comparison of the fpCTDQBU and fpRFDR-CT results for microcrystalline GFF showed that the fpCTDQBU method was more quantitative and the fpRFDR-CT method yielded higher signal-to-noise which agreed with expectations for the two approaches.

Figure 5 displays plots of fpCTDQBU $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ versus $\tau$ and fpRFDR-CT $(S_1/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ versus $\tau$ for the membrane-associated HFP samples. Figure 5(a) shows qualitative differences between the fpCTDQBU data of the three samples with the largest $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ buildup for the HFPmn-F8 sample and $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ $\approx 0$ for the HFPtr-A15 sample when $\tau < 35$ ms. There were much less pronounced differences among the fpRFDR-CT data which might be understood from the measured $T_2 \approx 15$ ms for these samples and the expected $\exp(-r/45 \text{ ms})$ decay that would be $d$-independent. The shorter $T_2$ contrasts with the longer $T_2$ of GFF as well as the $T_2 \approx 50$ ms reported for $^{13}$Cs in fibrillized amyloid fibrils. The Fig. 5 data suggested that $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO distances in the membrane-associated HFP samples would be more straightforwardly derived from the fpCTDQBU experiment and this method was the focus of our subsequent study.

Optimization of fpCTDQBU parameters

It was shown in a previous study that use of longer rather than shorter $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses in the fpCTDQBU experiment resulted in faster buildup of $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{cor}}$ with $r$. Faster buildup allowed use of smaller $CT$ values with the concomitant effect of increasing $S_0$ and $S_1$ signal intensities. However, for the moderate 12 kHz MAS frequency of our experiments, longer $\pi$ pulses also reduced chemical shift refocusing with the effect of decreasing $S_0$ and $S_1$ signal.

Figure 3. $^{13}$C one-$\pi$-per-180 3D-EM spectra of: (a) D-NAL with $\tau = 13.33$ ms (b) D-GFF with $\tau = 28.00$ ms (c) membrane-associated HFPmn-F8 with $\tau = 29.33$ ms and (d) membrane-associated HFPtr-A15 with $\tau = 30.67$ ms. The MAS frequency was 12 000 Hz and (a) $CT = 20.0$ ms (b) $CT = 41.33$ ms or (c, d) $CT = 64.0$ ms. For each lettered pair of spectra, the $S_0$ spectrum is on the left and represented the sum of $\zeta = y$ and $\zeta = -y$ data and the $S_1$ spectrum is on the right and represented the sum of $\zeta = x$ and $\zeta = -x$ data. Dotted lines are drawn at the peak labeled amide carbonyl $S_0$ intensities. Each spectrum in panel (a), (b), (c), or (d) respectively represented the sum of $64, 4000, 10 000, or 10 000$ scans and was respectively processed with 75, 75, 200, or 300 Hz Gaussian line broadening. Processing also included dc offset correction and polynomial baseline correction.
Figure 4. (a) Plot of D-GFF fpCTDQBU ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{corr} (squares) and ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{sim} (crosses) versus dephasing time. Acquisition parameters included one-$\pi$-per-$\tau_D$, MAS frequency = 12 000 Hz, 20.5 kHz $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses, and $CT = 41.33$ ms. Each ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{corr} was calculated from a ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{exp} determined with $S_0$ and $S_1$ spectra that each represented the sum of 4000 scans. The integration regions were 1 ppm and were centered at the Gly-1 13CO peak (170.8 ppm) and the $S_1$ spectra that each represented the sum of 2048 scans. The integration regions were 1 ppm and were centered at 170.8 ppm which was the peak shift of the Gly-1 13CO in the HFPmn-F8, HFPtr-A6 and HFPtr-A15 samples, respectively. The integration regions were 2 ppm and the $\sigma_{corr}$ were $\sim0.05$. The displayed ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{sim} were calculated with the best-fit $d = 49.4 \pm 1.2$ Hz and corresponding $r = 5.39 \pm 0.05$ Å for the Gly-1/Phe–3 13CO labeled pair. The $\chi^2 = 8.4$ for this best-fit value. (b) Plot of D-GFF fpRFDR-CT ($S_1/S_0$)_{corr} (squares) and ($S_1/S_0$)_{exp} (crosses) versus dephasing time. Acquisition parameters included MAS frequency = 10 000 Hz, 15.2 kHz $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses, and $CT = 67.2$ ms. Each ($S_1/S_0$)_{corr} was calculated from a ($S_1/S_0$)_{exp} determined with $S_0$ and $S_1$ spectra that each represented the sum of 2048 scans. The integration regions were 1 ppm and were centered at the Gly-1 13CO peak (170.8 ppm) and the $\sigma_{corr}$ were $\sim0.04$. The displayed ($S_1/S_0$)_{sim} were calculated with the best-fit $d = 59.0 \pm 3.0$ Hz and corresponding $r = 5.07 \pm 0.09$ Å. The $\chi^2 = 4.0$ for this best-fit value.

Figure 5. (a) Plot of fpCTDQBU ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{corr} versus dephasing time for membrane-associated HFPmn-F8 (squares), HFPtr-A6 (crosses) and HFPtr-A15 (triangles). Acquisition parameters included one-$\pi$-per-$\tau_D$, MAS frequency = 12000 Hz, 20.5 kHz $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses, and $CT = 64.00$ ms for HFPmn-F8 and HFPtr-A15 or $CT = 41.33$ ms for HFPtr-A6. Each ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{corr} was calculated from a ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{exp} determined with $S_0$ and $S_1$ spectra that each represented the sum of 10 000, $\sim$40 000, and 10 000 scans for the HFPmn-F8, HFPtr-A6 and HFPtr-A15 samples, respectively. The integration regions were 2 ppm and the $\sigma_{corr}$ were $\sim0.10$, 0.06 and 0.09 for the HFPmn-F8, HFPtr-A6 and HFPtr-A15 samples, respectively. (b) Plot of fpRFDR-CT ($S_1/S_0$)_{corr} versus dephasing time for membrane-associated HFPmn-F8 (squares), HFPtr-A6 (crosses), and HFPtr-A15 (triangles). Acquisition parameters included MAS frequency = 12000 Hz, 20.5 kHz $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulses, and $CT = 64.00$ ms. Each ($S_1/S_0$)_{corr} was calculated from a ($S_1/S_0$)_{exp} with $S_0$ and $S_1$ spectra that each represented the sum of 12 000, 33 000, and 21 000 scans for the HFPmn-F8, HFPtr-A6, and HFPtr-A15 samples, respectively. The integration regions were 2 ppm and the $\sigma_{corr}$ were $\sim0.04$, 0.10, and 0.08 for the HFPmn-F8, HFPtr-A6, and HFPtr-A15 samples, respectively. The ($\Delta S/S_0$)_{corr} or ($S_1/S_0$)_{corr} in each plot were calculated with $h = 1$, i.e. all labeled $^{13}$CO experienced the same homonuclear dipolar coupling.
intensities. For samples with $d \approx 50$ Hz, an examination was made of $(\Delta S/S_0)$ buildup rates, corresponding reasonable $CT$ values, and $S_0$ signal intensities as a function of $\pi$ pulse length and it was found that there was a broad signal-to-noise maximum near 20 kHz $\pi$ pulse field. Much of the optimization was done using SIMPSON simulations and these calculations were experimentally validated by spectra obtained with the D-GFF and D-NAL samples. Most of the subsequent fpCTDQBU experiments were done with 20.5 kHz $\pi$ pulses.

The original implementations of the transverse RFDR or fpRFDR experiments for quantitative $^{13}$C–$^{13}$C distance determination were done with the one-$\pi$-per-2$\tau_R$ version, cf Fig. 1(c). The ratio of (total $\pi$ pulse time)/$\tau$ for the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version was two times larger than for the one-$\pi$-per-2$\tau_R$ version and the one-$\pi$-per-$\tau_R$ version might therefore exhibit a larger finite pulse effect and a more rapid buildup of $(\Delta S/S_0)$. This more rapid buildup was experimentally demonstrated for D-NAL and can be observed by visual comparison of the squares and crosses in Fig. 6(a). Use of shorter 35.0 kHz $\pi$ pulses in the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version decreased the buildup rate, cf up triangles in Fig. 6(a).

Because the ratio of (number of $\pi$ pulses)/$\tau$ was two times larger for the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version than for the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version, the one-$\pi$-per-$\tau_R$ version might exhibit reduced chemical shift refocusing and decreased $S_0$ and $S_1$ signals. This reduction was experimentally demonstrated for $S_0$ signals, cf squares versus crosses in Fig. 6(b). The $S_0$ signal could be partially recovered in the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version by using 35.0 kHz $\pi$ pulses, cf up triangles. A reasonable compromise was 20.5 kHz $\pi$ pulses in the one-$\pi$-per-$2\tau_R$ version with reduced $CT$, cf down triangles in Fig. 6(a), (b). Relative to longer $CT$ data, the $S_0$ intensity was twice as large and a rapid buildup rate was retained for $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$.

These experimental parameters resulted in a duty factor $t_s/\tau_R = 0.3$ and fpRFDR rather than short-pulse RFDR was dominant in the average Hamiltonian. All of the $S_0$ data sets of Fig. 6(b) had inverted parabola shape with a maximum near $\tau/CT = 0.5$ and $\approx 20\%$ reduction in signal for $\tau/CT = 0.1$ or 0.9. The dipolar echo periods during the $S_0$ acquisition had durations $2\tau$ and $CT - 2\tau$ and $S_0 \approx F(2\tau) \times F(CT - 2\tau)$ where $F(t)$ was the dipolar echo amplitude. The variation of $S_0$ with $\tau$ suggested that $F$ may have both exponential and nonexponential decay components.

Figure 7 displays the effect of $^{13}$C transmitter offset on $(\Delta S/S_0)$ of (a) D-NAL and (b) D-GFF. The offset parameter in ppm was defined as $\Delta = \delta_{\text{transmitter}} - \delta_{\text{peak}}$ where $\delta_{\text{peak}}$ was the average shift of the $^{13}$CO labeled sites. For D-NAL in Fig. 7(a), there was little difference between $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ determined with $\Delta = -6.7$ or $-16.7$ ppm and similar invariance to offset was seen for $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$. Invariant $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ and $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ were also observed for $\Delta = 12.7$ ppm (not shown). For the same $\Delta$, there were systematic differences between $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ and $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ at large values of $\tau$ which are not currently understood. The best-fit $d$ from $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ was also $\approx 10\%$ larger than the $d$ calculated from the $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO distance in the crystal structure. For D-GFF in Fig. 7(b), similar $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ were observed for $\Delta = 0$ or $-12.0$ ppm and yielded best-fit $d = 49.4$ or 44.6 Hz, respectively. The $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO distance in the GFF crystal structure corresponded to $d = 49$ Hz.

Figure 8 displays the effect of variation of the $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse nutation angle ($\theta$) on $(\Delta S/S_0)$ of (a) D-NAL and (b) D-GFF. Each plot includes $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{corr}}$ and $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ calculated for $\theta = 180^\circ$ and best-fit $d$. The plots also include $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ calculated with this $d$ value but with different values of $\theta$. For D-NAL, very similar $(\Delta S/S_0)^{\text{sim}}$ were obtained for $\theta = 170^\circ$.
Figure 7. (a) D-NAL and (b) D-GFF plots of fpCTDQBU (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) and (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) versus dephasing time as a function of transmitter offset (\(\Delta\)) calculated relative to the midpoint of the labeled carbonyl and carboxyl shifts. Acquisition parameters included one-\(\pi\)-per-\(\tau_p\), MAS frequency = 12 000, 20.5 kHz \(^{13}\)C \(\pi\) pulses, and (a) \(\tau_p = 20.00\) ms or (b) \(\tau_p = 41.33\) ms. Each (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) was calculated from a (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{pop}}\) determined with \(S_0\) and \(S_1\) spectra that each represented the sum of (a) 32 or (b) 4000 scans. The integration regions were 1 ppm and were centered at (a) 178.3 or (b) 170.8 ppm which were the peak carbonyl shifts. The displayed (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) were calculated with the best-fit (a) \(\tau_p = 296\) Hz or (b) \(\tau_p = 49.4\) or 44.6 Hz for \(\Delta = 0\) or \(-12.0\) ppm, respectively. The symbol legend: green squares, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\), (a) \(\Delta = -6.7\) ppm or (b) \(\Delta = 0\) ppm; black crosses, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\), (a) \(\Delta = -6.7\) ppm or (b) \(\Delta = 0\) ppm; red up triangles; (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\), (a) \(\Delta = -16.7\) ppm or (b) \(\Delta = -12.0\) ppm; blue down triangles, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\), (a) \(\Delta = -16.7\) ppm or (b) \(\Delta = -12.0\) ppm.

Figure 8. (a) D-NAL and (b) D-GFF plots of fpCTDQBU (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) and (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) versus dephasing time for \(^{13}\)C \(\pi\) pulses with different nutation angles. Acquisition parameters included one-\(\pi\)-per-\(\tau_p\), MAS frequency = 12 000, 20.5 kHz \(^{13}\)C \(\pi\) pulses, and (a) \(\Delta = -6.7\) ppm, \(CT = 20.00\) ms or (b) \(\Delta = 0\) ppm, \(CT = 41.33\) ms. The numbers of scans, integration parameters, and calculation of (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) were the same as in Fig. 7. The \(^{13}\)C nutation angle is denoted \(\theta\). The symbol legend: green squares, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\), \(\theta = 180^\circ\); red up triangles; (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\), \(\theta = 180^\circ\); black crosses, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\), (a) \(\theta = 170^\circ\) or (b) \(\theta = 175^\circ\); blue down triangles, (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\), (a) \(\theta = 190^\circ\) or (b) \(\theta = 185^\circ\).

180°, or 190° while for D-GFF, there was some variance of the (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) calculated for \(\theta = 175^\circ, 180^\circ,\) or \(185^\circ\). The D-GFF (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) calculated with \(\theta = 175^\circ\) were subsequently considered as an ‘experimental’ data set and were fitted to (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) calculated with \(\theta = 180^\circ\) and different values of \(\Delta\). The new best-fit \(\Delta\) was \(~10\)% different from the value originally determined using the (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) values. A similar variance was obtained when fitting (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{sim}}\) calculated with \(\theta = 185^\circ\).

Fitting of HFP fpCTDQBU data

For the HFPtr-A15 sample, Fig. 5(a) shows that (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) \(\approx 0\) for \(\tau < 35\) ms and comparison with simulations suggested an upper limit of \(~15\) Hz on \(\Delta\) or a lower limit of \(~8\) Å on \(r\). The HFPmn-F8 and the HFPtr-A6 samples both had fairly rapid buildup of (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) calculated with \(h = 1\), i.e. all labeled \(^{13}\)CO were considered to have the same value of \(d\). However, the (\(\Delta S/S_0\))\(_{\text{cor}}\) at large \(\tau\) were between 0.4 and 0.6 and these values were about half of the expected
amenable to measurements on samples with inexpensive fraction (20 Hz/DC4). Nuclei have similar chemical shifts and chemical shift tennings under MAS. In particular, fpRFDR is applicable to spin systems whose evolution for MAS. 1

Over the past 20 years, there have been significant methodological advances in measurement of 13C–13C dipolar coupling. The horizontal and vertical axes are the measurable dipolar coupling and h parameters, respectively. The shading legend: black, (a) 1.0 < h2 < 1.1 or (b) 6 < h2 < 7; dark gray, (a) 1.1 < h2 < 2.0 or (b) 7 < h2 < 10; gray, (a) 2 < h2 < 5 or (b) 10 < h2 < 20; light gray, (a) 5 < h2 < 10 or (b) 20 < h2 < 50; white, (a) h2 > 10 or (b) h2 > 50.

**DISCUSSION**

Over the past 20 years, there have been significant methodological advances in measurement of 13C–13C dipolar couplings under MAS. This paper includes investigation of two related methods for these measurements which are based on rotor-synchronized finite 13C π pulses, i.e., pulses which are a significant fraction of a rotor period. Strengths of these sequences include the following: (i) nearly all pulses are π pulses with quadrature phases; (ii) the sequences are amenable to measurements on samples with inexpensive 13CO labeling; (iii) the setup is straightforward and rapid; and (iv) the data are relatively insensitive to chemical shifts and CSA including the relative orientations of the dipolar and chemical shift tensors. Use of finite rather than short π pulses in CTDQBU led to more rapid buildup of ΔS/S0. In particular, fpRFDR is applicable to spin systems whose nuclei have similar chemical shifts and chemical shift tensor orientations such as 13CO in β strands. Much slower buildup is observed with short-pulse RFDR in this system.

The CT aspect of fpCTDQBU allowed neglect of transverse relaxation in the data analysis but also led to reduced signal because of transverse relaxation during the long CT period. Versions of fpCTDQBU which incorporate shorter CT should therefore yield higher signal-to-noise data. Previous CTDQBU and fpCTDQBU studies had used the one-π-per-2πr version while in the present study, it was shown that the one-π-per-πr version led to more rapid buildup of ΔS/S0 presumably because there was a larger finite pulse effect. For r ~ 5 Å and d ~ 60 Hz, CT could be reduced by a factor of ~0.6 to ~40 ms, cf. Figs 4(a), 5(a). The sensitivity improvement should be significant for samples such as membrane-associated HFPs which have T2 ~ 15 ms. An additional advantage of the one-π-per-πr version was (ΔS/S0)im of ~0.9 at large dτ as compared to ~0.75 for the one-π-per-2πr version, cf. Fig. 4(a). This study also showed that reasonable transmitter offsets and errors in the 13C π pulse nutation angle reduced best-fit d by ~10% and the corresponding best-fit r by ~3%. This error is small compared to the variation in τ among different HFP structural models and the method should therefore be useful for distinguishing among the models.

This paper also includes some investigation of the related fpRFDR-CT sequence for 13C–13C distance measurement in HFP samples. One advantage of the chosen version of fpRFDR-CT was its use of multiple WAHUHA cycles for refocussing of 13C–13C dipolar coupling rather than the solid echo used in fpCTDQBU. In the context of average Hamiltonian theory, the solid echo only averages dipolar evolution for two spin 1/2 nuclei whereas WAHUHA averages dipolar evolution for multiple spin 1/2 nuclei. Comparison of S0 spectra between the two sequences for GFF indeed showed ~1.5 times higher signal for fpRFDR-CT. For this version of fpRFDR-CT, there was variation of the transverse relaxation period with τ but multiplication of...
(S_i/S_0)^{\text{corr}} by exp(-τ/3T_2) led to accurate determination of d and r in GFF which had T_2 ≈ 55 ms. This simple approach to transverse relaxation correction was more problematic in the HFP samples because T_2 ≈ 15 ms and the decay time constant of (S_i/S_0)^{\text{corr}} with τ was comparable to 3T_2. The shorter 13CO T_2 appeared to be specific to membrane-associated HFP as previous reports of 13CO and 13CH_3 T_2 in amyloid fibrils were ≈ 80 ms. Future studies might consider a different version of fpRFDR-CT which has a fixed transverse relaxation period and which uses a solid echo rather than WAHUHA for 13C–13Cd dipolar refocusing. Another alternative is the recently developed PITHIRDS-CT sequence in which evolution or averaging of 13C–13Cd dipolar coupling is accomplished with different combinations of acquisitions which have different placements of the 13C π pulses within the rotor cycles.

One difference between the versions of fpCTDQB and fpRFDR-CT presented in this paper was the acquisition of an S_0 spectrum for each τ in fpCTDQB and acquisition of a single S_0 spectrum in fpRFDR-CT. This difference resulted in higher sensitivity for fpRFDR-CT. If S_0 were independent of τ for fpCTDQB, data analysis could also be done with a single S_0 spectrum, but Fig. 6(b) showed ~20% variation of S_0 with maximum S_0 for τ ≈ CT/2 and minimum S_0 for τ = 0 and τ ≈ CT. Considering S_0(τ) ≈ F(τ) x F(CT − τ) where F(τ) was the dipolar echo intensity, it appeared that F(τ) had a nonexponential decay component which caused greater signal loss at larger t. The variation of S_0 with τ was also qualitatively observed in simulations and could be reduced by using higher 13C π pulse phase cycles such as XY-16 or XY-32. Another possible solution is multiple short echo periods which would each contain a (π/2)(π/2) pulse pair at the center of each period rather than a single long echo period with a single (π/2)(π/2) pulse pair at the center of the period. The rationale for this approach is that the solid echo works better for smaller values of dipolar coupling times echo period. The PITHIRDS-CT sequence might also be useful because it is based on the relative positions of π pulses in the rotor period rather than on solid echoes.

Although improvements to the finite pulse-based methods should be possible as detailed in the previous paragraphs, the fpCTDQB sequence in the form presented in this paper is already a useful method to investigate membrane-associated HFP strand arrangements. It was encouraging that significant differences were observed between the data of peptides labeled at different 13CO sites. cf Fig. 5(a). An effort was made to understand the structural implications of these data with the caveat that data for peptides with other labeled sites will be needed to develop an unambiguous structural model. Although one sample was made with HFPmn and the other two were made with HFPtr, it was assumed that the variations of (∆S/S_0)^{\text{corr}} among the samples were due to the different 13CO labeled sites rather than the differences in cross-linking.

The interpretation was done in the context of β-sheet HFP models previously developed using solid-state NMR and infrared data. In one model, adjacent HFP strands are parallel to one another and are in-register. Example hydrogen bonds between adjacent strands would be Ala-6 CO–HN Leu-7, Phe-8 CO–HN Leu-9, and Ala-15 CO–HN Gly-16. In this model, the distance between labeled 13COs on adjacent strands is ≈ 4.8 Å for the HFPtr-A6, HFPmn-F8, and HFPtr-A15 samples. In a second model, adjacent HFP strands are antiparallel to one another with strand crossing between Phe-8 and Leu-9. Example hydrogen bonds between adjacent strands are then Ala-6 CO–HN Phe-11, Phe-8 CO–HN Leu-9, and Ala-15 CO–HN Val-2. A key feature of the antiparallel model is the variation among the different samples of the distance between labeled 13COs on adjacent strands, e.g., ≈ 4.8 Å in HFPmn-F8 and >15 Å in HFPtr-A6 and HFPtr-A15.

The clearest data analysis could be done for the HFPmn-F8 sample, cf Fig 9(a), and yielded best-fit d ≈ 80 Hz, r ≈ 4.6 Å, and h ≈ 0.8. The best-fit distance was generally consistent with the predicted distances of either the parallel or the antiparallel model. For the parallel model, the same d ≈ 80 Hz would be preferred for the HFPtr-A6 sample and the good-fit region of the χ^2 plot for this sample included d ≈ 80 Hz with accompanying h ≈ 0.5, cf Fig. 9(b). The antiparallel model predicted r ≈ 15 Å and d ≈ 2 Hz for HFPtr-A6 and was a poor fit to the data. The parallel strand arrangement did not appear to extend to Ala-15 as evidenced by (∆S/S_0)^{\text{corr}} = 0 for τ < 35 ms in the HFPtr-A15 data, cf Fig. 5(a). The upper limit on d for this sample was ≈ 15 Hz.

An overall HFP model consistent with the data in this study was: (i) a mixture of parallel and antiparallel strand arrangements in the region of HFP that included Ala-6 and Phe-8; and (ii) loss of parallel β-sheet structure in the Ala-15 region. Supporting evidence for point (i) included the larger h of the HFPmn-F8 sample relative to the HFPtr-A6 sample. This result correlated with: (i) the large d predicted by both parallel and antiparallel models for HFPmn-F8 and (ii) the large and small ds predicted for HFPtr-A6 by the parallel and antiparallel models, respectively. Previous measurements of interstrand homonuclear and heteronuclear dipolar couplings in HFP samples were also consistent with a mixture of parallel and antiparallel strands.

As noted above, evidence for loss of parallel β-sheet structure near Ala-15 included (∆S/S_0)^{\text{corr}} = 0 for the HFPtr-A15 sample. This C-terminal ‘fraying’ of the parallel β sheet was also consistent with larger Ala-15 13CO linewidths and with previous measurements of interpeptide 13CO–15N dipolar couplings. Previous studies have also shown that the Ala-15 13COs were in close 5–6 Å proximity to the 31P in the lipid headgroups while distances between Ala-6 or Phe-8 13COs and lipid 31Ps were >8 Å. The combination of the different data suggests a general structural model in which: (i) residues in the apolar N-terminal region of HFP are located in the low water content acyl chain region of the membrane and form regular β-sheet structure and (ii) residues in the more polar C-terminal region are located in the lipid headgroup region and have greater structural disorder because of hydrogen bonding with water.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This study demonstrated improved performance of the fpCTDQB sequence using the one-τ-per-τ_x version as well
as the robustness of the sequence to transmitter offsets and errors in the $^{13}$C $\pi$ pulse nutation angle. In addition, significant differences in fpCTDQBU data were observed for membrane-associated HFP labeled at different $^{13}$C sites and were interpreted with a model of mixed parallel and antiparallel $\beta$-strand arrangements in the N-terminal region of HFP and loss of parallel $\beta$-sheet structure in the C-terminal region of HFP. Future comparative $^{13}$CO–$^{13}$CO distance measurements among different HFP constructs should elucidate variations in strand arrangements among the constructs and may be correlated to differences in their observed fusion rates.
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