Carbohydrates

Random-Coil:α-Helix Equilibria as a Reporter for the Lewis^X–Lewis^X Interaction**

Timothy M. Altamore, Christian Fernández-García, Andrew H. Gordon, Tina Hübscher, Netnapa Promsawan, Maxim G. Ryadnov, Andrew J. Doig, Derek N. Woolfson,* and Timothy Gallagher*

Weak multivalent interactions are now recognized as key to many biological processes.^[1] Since the discovery of carbohydrate–carbohydrate interactions (CCIs),^[2] studies of this phenomenon have now linked CCIs (both *cis*- and *trans*-CCIs) to critical biological recognition events, such as cell signaling and adhesion, fertilization, and metastasis.^[3] CCIs are intrinsically weak so their study and quantification at the monovalent level is a significant challenge that represents the focus of this Communication.

Previous work has relied on macroscopic or multivalent systems including synthetic polymers,^[4] micelles and vesicles,^[5] glycosylated nanoparticles,^[6] and Langmuir–Blodgett monolayers.^[7] These studies have generally (though not exclusively) focused on the biologically important Lewis^X– Lewis^X (Le^X–Le^X) interaction.^[4–8] As a result, a number of factors important in CCIs are now apparent, and these include multivalent (Velcro-like) presentation of carbohydrates on a surface; a requirement for polyamphiphilic surfaces associated with the hydraphobic effect;^[9] and, in certain cases, roles for both divalent metal cations (e.g. Ca²⁺) and ionic (charge) effects. While multivalency effectively amplifies CCIs, the complexity of such macroscopic systems makes mapping the individual impact of component carbohydrate (CHO) units and their associated molecular features difficult to define.

To achieve a more detailed picture of CCIs, while recognizing the inherent challenge of studying this phenom-

[*]	Dr. T. M. Altamore, C. Fernández-García, Dr. A. H. Gordon, Dr. T. Hübscher, Dr. N. Promsawan, Prof. Dr. D. N. Woolfson, Prof. Dr. T. Gallagher School of Chemistry, University of Bristol Bristol BS8 1TS (UK) E-mail: t.gallagher@bris.ac.uk
	Prof. Dr. D. N. Woolfson School of Biochemistry, University of Bristol Bristol BS8 1TD (UK) E-mail: d.n.woolfson@bris.ac.uk
	Prof. Dr. A. J. Doig Manchester Interdisciplinary Biocentre Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Manchester Manchester M1 7DN (UK)
	Dr. M. G. Ryadnov National Physical Laboratory, Teddington TW11 0LW (UK)
[**]	EPSRC, the governments of Germany, Thailand, and Mexico (CONACyT), and AstraZeneca are acknowledged for financial support

Supporting Information for this article is available on the WWW under http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201101055.

enon in isolation (i.e. outside of a multivalent environment),^[10] we have evaluated the ability of a conformationally dynamic system to report on a weak, attractive CCI based on $Le^{X}-Le^{X}$. Random-coil: α -helix equilibria displayed by alanine-rich peptides in aqueous solution, where helix content is highly sensitive to small changes in the free energy of helix formation, provide an attractive, effective and potentially versatile vehicle for this purpose (Figure 1a). The requisite



Figure 1. a) Schematic of random-coil: α -helix equilibrium for detection of CCIs. b) Helical wheel diagram showing functionalized *i*, *i*+4, and *i*+5 sites. c) General peptide sequences used in this study.

peptides are readily accessible, and helix content can be measured accurately by circular dichroism (CD) spectroscopy. We posit that with two CHOs ligated at specified positions (Figure 1 b) on the peptide backbone, perturbation of this highly sensitive equilibrium to a more helical state would indicate the presence of an attractive (i.e. stabilizing) CCI, thereby providing a means of studying this phenomenon in comparative isolation, outside of a multivalent environment.

To validate the feasibility of a peptide-based reporter for this purpose, a series of 19-residue host peptides was designed (Figure 1 c). These comprised mainly Ala and Lys residues, incorporating Tyr (as a UV determinant of peptide concen-

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 11167-11171

© 2011 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

Communications

tration) and orthogonally protected Lys units provided the two necessary glycosylation sites. The N- and C-termini were capped with acetyl and amide groups, respectively, to remove charges and stabilize the helix. Peptides were designed to be close to 50% helical in order to be maximally sensitive (given the weak nature of the interaction to side-chain interactions being pursued) involving the CHO guests. Modified Lifson– Roig helix–coil theory^[11] was used to predict α -helix contents for the isolated peptides in aqueous solution, using parameters for interior and N-cap positions of helices.^[12] Given the α helical repeat of 3.6 amino acids per turn (Figure 1b) glycosylation sites were spaced *i*, *i*+4 to locate two CHO moieties close in space, and to maximize the population of (and preference for) the helical component in the presence of a stabilizing CCI.

General controls were provided by *i*, *i*+5 variants since this relationship provides no stabilizing interaction within an α -helix (see Figure 1b); other controls/benchmarks were also employed as discussed below. Specifically, we have used these sequences to probe the Le^X-Le^X interaction, and to validate the applicability and veracity of the coil:helix approach to detecting and studying CCIs. The introduction of a functionalized C₃ linker based on Le^X thioglycoside **1**^[13] was achieved (see Supporting Information), and provided Le^X thiol **2a** and disulfide **2b** (Figure 2); both were used for peptide ligation. The same C₃ linker unit was common to all the CHO-based controls employed in this study.



Figure 2. Le^{X} thioglycoside 1, Le^{X} thiol **2a** and disulfide **2b**.

Solid-phase Fmoc protocols provided a series of underivatized and *N*- ε -acetyl peptides **3a–d** and **4a–c**, respectively. In addition, and using the same C₃ linker, monoLe^X peptide **5a**, guest bisglycopeptides **5b** and **5c** incorporating two Le^X trisaccharide units, and the corresponding monosaccharide (glucose) **6a/b** and disaccharide (lactose) **7a/b** variants were prepared. CD data were obtained as an average of 30 spectra at five different concentrations and were performed in triplicate to determine experimental repeatability. The intensity of the CD signals at 222 nm indicated that all peptides tested had a helical component in the range of 37–54% (Table 1, Figure 3 and Figure 4, and Supporting Information), consistent with the original peptide design.

Participation of higher-order aggregates was excluded as no concentration dependencies were observed within the range 12.5–200 μ M; this is important as peptide aggregation would interfere with the detection of a monovalent, isolated CCI.

The control systems were further calibrated. Peptides carrying free (i.e. positively charged) lysine at i, i+4 and i, i+5

Table 1: Helicities of peptides: controls and glycopeptides variants.

Cont	Control peptides (X =K) % Helicity ^[a]				
3 a	i, i + 4	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	38		
3 b	i, i+5	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	41		
3 c	i, i + 4	Ac-AKAAAAKA E AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	54		
3 d	i, i + 5	Ac-AKAAAAKA E AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	39		
Acety	lated conti	rol peptides (X =KAc)			
4a	-	Ac-AKAAAAKAXAAAKAKAAGY-NH ₂	52		
4 b	i, i + 4	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	52		
4c	i, i + 5	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	51		
Le ^x g	lycopeptid	es (X =KCOCH₂S(CH₂)₃OLe ^x)			
5 a	-	Ac-AKAAAAKAXAAAKAKAKAAGY-NH2	51		
5 b	i, i+4	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	54		
5 c	i, i+5	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	49		
Othe	r controls	(X =KCOCH ₂ S(CH ₂) ₃ O-Glc 6a/b or O-La	c 7 a/b)		
6a	i, i + 4	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	40		
6b	i, i + 5	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	48		
7 a	i, i + 4	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAA X AKAAGY-NH ₂	37		
7 b	i, i + 5	Ac-AKAAAAKA X AAAA X AKAGY-NH ₂	49		



(controls **3a** and **3b**) had similar and relatively low (38% and 41%, respectively) helical contents.^[15] To demonstrate the sensitivity of the peptide reporter to a stabilizing side-chain interaction, we used a known^[16] glutamate-to-lysine interaction: the *i*, *i*+4 peptide **3c** displayed a higher helix content (54%) than the *i*, *i*+5 **3d** (39%), confirming the ability of a stabilizing effect to enhance helix content in the peptide reporter system used here.^[17]

The *N*- ε -Ac-K (mono- and two bisacetylated) variants **4a–c** relate more closely to the Le^x glycopeptides **5a–c** in structural and charge terms and offered an important control set; we suggest that N-capped **4a–c** are more relevant to this study as controls than the free lysine **3a/b** variants. Monoacetylated **4a**, the *i*, *i*+4 and *i*, *i*+5 bisacetylated peptides **4b** and **4c**, respectively, and the monoLe^x glycopeptide **5a** displayed similar levels of helicity (51–52%, Table 1), indicating that these substitutions (both NAc and monoglycosylation) do not affect significantly the coil:helix distribution.

Comparison of the two key bisglycosylated Le^x glycopeptides **5b/c** showed that *i*, *i*+4 **5b** had a higher helical content than *i*, *i*+5 isomer **5c** (54% vs. 49%). Although small, the increase in helicity associated with the *i*, *i*+4 isomer **5b** (5% vs. **5c** compared against 1% for **4b** vs. **4c**), together with the trend associated with two other glycopeptide controls **6a**/ **b** and **7a/b** (see below), indicates the presence of a stabilizing carbohydrate–carbohydrate interaction.

The differences in helical content observed are small, though we suggest significant based on the effect associated with other glycopeptides controls. Both *i*, *i*+4 and *i*, *i*+5 isomers of mono- and disaccharide bisglycopeptides **6***a*/**b** and **7***a*/**b** incorporating glucose (Glc) and lactose (Lac, Gal β 1-4-Glc) moieties, respectively, were synthesized and coil:helix distributions determined. In each case, and in marked contrast to the bisLe^x glycopeptides **5b/c**, the *i*, *i*+4 variants (**6a** and **7a**) displayed a lower helical content than the corresponding *i*, *i*+5 controls (**6b** and **7b**); the *i*, *i*+4 monosaccharide **6a** and disaccharide **7a** controls were 8% and 12% less helical than the *i*, *i*+5 variants **6b** and **7b** respectively (Figure 3).^[18]



Figure 3. CD spectroscopy of glycopeptides **5 b/c**, **6a/b**, and **7a/b** showing error to two standard deviations.

This demonstrates that the introduction of a mono- then disaccharide moiety (i.e. glyco-based controls possessing a steric, and an escalating steric demand, but no associated stabilizing interaction) results in an increasing destabilization of the helical state. Also noteworthy is that the three bisglycosylated *i*, *i*+5 (i.e. non-interacting, Figure 1b) peptides **5c**, **6b** and **7b**, all have closely similar helix contents at approximately 49% suggesting that isolation of the CHO units from each other has been achieved. These data, and in particular the trend, shown schematically in Figure 4, of a decrease in helical content associated with mono- and disaccharide substrates (**6a** and **7a**) compared to the increase observed for the (trisaccharide) $Le^X - Le^X$ glycopeptide **5b** supports the conclusion that this peptide reporter system is



Figure 4. Trends in helical content observed between free lysine **3 a** and *N*-Ac **4 b** controls and mono-, di-, and trisaccharide-based glycopeptides (**6a**, **7 a**, and **5 b**, respectively). Ratios shown are for helical:random coil in each of the relevant i, i+4 substrates.

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 11167-11171

responding to a weakly attractive, stabilizing and single (monovalent) CCI.

Helix contents can be accurately predicted from helix-coil theory, provided that parameters for the residues present are known.^[11b] This has been carried out for the glycopeptides discussed here, to provide the free energies associated with adding carbohydrate units to the helix and the free energies of the side-chain interaction energies.^[19] This indicates the Le^X-Le^X interaction (associated with *i*, *i*+4 **5b**) stabilizes the helix by approximately 0.5 kcal mol⁻¹, compared to the other *i*, *i*+4 bisglycopeptides **6a** and **7a**.

Given the role reported for Ca^{2+} within Le^{X} -based carbohydrate interactions,^[2,3] the effect of Ca^{2+} on the helix preference of **5b** was also examined. Using either a large excess of Ca^{2+} (167 mm with 100 μ m of **5b** in 10 mm MOPS buffer at pH 7.0) or under titration conditions (50 μ m to 10 mm Ca^{2+}), we observed no significant difference in helical content of **5b**.^[20] This lack of a Ca^{2+} effect is interesting but not without precedent^[21] and, as articulated earlier by Penadés et al.,^[8a] draws attention to the limited understanding currently available as to the precise mechanism by which Ca^{2+} mediates CCIs.

While reflecting the inherently weak nature of CCIs, the differences in helical content and trend observed (Table 1 and Figure 4) are consistent with observation of a monovalent and favorable carbohydrate–carbohydrate interaction. This, in turn, supports the ability of a dynamic random-coil: α -helical peptide system to provide a qualitative read-out of CCIs. Given that peptide synthesis and carbohydrate ligation are straightforward, this reporter, validated here with Le^x–Le^x, offers a new means of probing the molecular level details of a weak but fundamentally important biological interaction.

Received: February 11, 2011 Revised: April 19, 2011 Published online: September 9, 2011

Keywords: carbohydrate–carbohydrate interaction · Lewis^X · peptide reporter

- M. Mammen, S. K. Choi, G. M. Whitesides, Angew. Chem. 1998, 110, 2908–2953; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 1998, 37, 2754–2794, and references cited therein.
- [2] For leading references to the discovery of CCIs, see a) S. Hakomori, *Glycoconjugate J.* 2004, 21, 125–137; b) I. Bucior, M. M. Burger, *Glycoconjugate J.* 2004, 21, 111–123. For a review of the biological and functional role of *cis* (intracellular) and *trans* (intercellular) CCIs, see S. Hakomori, *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* 2004, 426, 173–181.
- [3] a) S. Hakomori, Glycoconjugate J. 2000, 17, 143-151; b) J. M. Boggs, W. Gao, Y. Hirahara, J. Neurosci. Res. 2008, 86, 1448-1458; c) S. Yu, N. Kojima, S. Hakomori, S. Kudo, S. Inoue, Y. Inoue, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2002, 99, 2854-2859; d) S. Hakomori, K. Handa, FEBS Lett. 2002, 531, 88-92; e) Y. Song, D. A. Withers, S. Hakomori, J. Biol. Chem. 1998, 273, 2517-2525.
- [4] Q. Chen, Y. Cui, T. L. Zhang, J. Cao, B. H. Han, Biomacromolecules 2010, 11, 13–19.
- [5] a) A. Geyer, C. Gege, R. R. Schmidt, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 1999, 38, 1466–1468; b) P. V. Santacroce, A. Basu, Glycoconjugate J. 2004, 21, 89–95; c) C. Gourier, F. Pincet, E. Perez, Y. M.

Communications

Zhang, J. M. Mallet, P. Sinaÿ, *Glycoconjugate J.* **2004**, *21*, 165–174; d) C. Gourier, F. Pincet, E. Perez, Y. M. Zhang, Z. Zhu, J. M. Mallet, P. Sinaÿ, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2005**, *44*, 1683–1687.

- [6] a) J. M. de La Fuente, A. G. Barrientos, T. C. Rojas, J. Rojo, J. Cañada, A. Fernández, S. Penadés, Angew. Chem. 2001, 113, 2317-2321; Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2001, 40, 2257-2261; b) J. M. de La Fuente, P. Eaton, A. G. Barrientos, M. Menéndez, S. Penadés, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 6192-6197; c) A. J. Reynolds, A. H. Haines, D. A. Russell, Langmuir 2006, 22, 1156-1163; d) M. Fuss, M. Luna, D. Alcántara, J. M. de La Fuente, S. Penadés, F. Briones, Langmuir 2008, 24, 5124-5128; e) Z. C. Deng, S. Q. Li, X. Z. Jiang, R. Narain, Macromolecules 2009, 42, 6393-6405; f) N. Nagahori, M. Abe, S. I. Nishimura, Biochemistry 2009, 48, 583-594; g) A. C. de Souza, D. N. Ganchev, M. M. E. Snel, J. P. J. M. van der Eerden, J. F. G. Vliegenthart, J. P. Kamerling, Glycoconjugate J. 2009, 26, 457-465.
- [7] a) K. Matsuura, H. Kitakouji, N. Sawada, H. Ishida, M. Kiso, K. Kitajima, K. Kobayashi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 7406–7407; b) K. Matsuura, R. Oda, H. Kitakouji, M. Kiso, K. Kitajima, K. Kobayashi, Biomacromolecules 2004, 5, 937–941; c) N. Seah, P. V. Santacroce, A. Basu, Org. Lett. 2009, 11, 559–562.
- [8] For other Le^X-related work, see a) C. Tromas, J. Rojo, J. M. de La Fuente, A. G. Barrientos, R. García, S. Penadés, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2001, 40, 3052–3055; b) J. Rojo, V. Diaz, J. M. de La Fuente, I. Segura, A. G. Barrientos, H. H. Riese, A. Bernade, S. Penadés, *ChemBioChem* 2004, 5, 291–297; c) G. Nodet, L. Poggi, D. Abergel, C. Gourmala, D. X. Dong, Y. M. Zhang, J. M. Mallet, G. Bodenhausen, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 9080–9085.
- [9] R. U. Lemieux, Acc. Chem. Res. 1996, 29, 373-380.
- [10] a) T. Hasegawa, T. Sasaki, *Chem. Commun.* 2003, 978–979; b) T. Hasegawa, M. Numata, M. Asai, M. Takeuchi, S. Shinkai, *Tetrahedron* 2005, *61*, 7783–7788; c) G. L. Simpson, A. H. Gordon, D. M. Lindsay, N. Promsawan, M. P. Crump, K. Mulholland, B. R. Hayter, T. Gallagher, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2006, *128*, 10638–10639; d) A. Otsuka, K. Sakurai, T. Hasegawa, *Chem. Commun.* 2009, 5442–5444.
- [11] a) B. J. Stapley, C. A. Rohl, A. J. Doig, *Protein Sci.* 1995, 4, 2383–2391; b) A. J. Doig, *Biophys. Chem.* 2002, 101–102, 281–293.
- [12] a) C. A. Rohl, A. J. Doig, *Protein Sci.* 1996, 5, 1687–1696;
 b) C. A. Rohl, A. Chakrabartty, R. L. Baldwin, *Protein Sci.* 1996, 5, 2623–2637.
- [13] J. M. de La Fuente, S. Penadés, *Tetrahedron: Asymmetry* 2002, 13, 1879–1888.
- [14] P. Luo, R. L. Baldwin, Biochemistry 1997, 36, 8413-8421.
- [15] Controls 3a/b are included here for completeness but the charge (and derived effects) associated with the free lysine residues at i, i+4 and i, i+5 is not mimicked in the glycopeptide substrates used subsequently.
- [16] J. S. Smith, J. M. Scholtz, Biochemistry 1998, 37, 33-40.
- [17] Thermal denaturation of key peptides (3c/d and 5b/c) was also performed. Analysis was complicated because the random coil:helix equilibrium is not a two-state system, but a dynamic ensemble of many conformations. Apparent T_M values were observed and the differences, though small, were consistent with the equilibrium CD experiments (see Supporting Information).
- [18] We suggest that, given the differences in structure of the sidechain moieties, it is more meaningful to compare helicity values within a series (i.e. i, i+4 vs. i, i+5) rather than rely solely on absolute values between difference controls/glycopeptides.
- [19] In modified Lifson-Roig theory, these parameters are preferences for helix interior (w), N-cap (n), C-cap (c) helix initiation (v) and *i*, *i*+4 side-chain interactions (p).^[11] In the peptides

discussed here, the relevant parameters are w(Ala) = 1.70, w(Lys) = 1.00, w(Gly) = 0.048, w(Tyr) = 0.48, n(acetyl) = 5.9, n-(Ala) = 1.0, n(Lys) = 0.72, n(Gly) = 3.9, c(All) = 1.0 and v =0.048;^[12b] Peptide 4c contains a KAc residue, with unknown helix-coil parameters. We can safely assume that n = 1 for all novel residues, as a helix is highly unlikely to initiate at a substituted position in the middle of the sequence, so uncertainty in this N-cap parameter makes very little difference to the predicted helix contents. This leaves only one unknown in peptide 4c, namely w(KAc). Fitting the experimental helix content of 51% for 4c gives w(KAc) = 0.89 and hence the free energy of transfer of KAc from the unfolded state to a helix interior is $-RT\ln(0.89) = 0.06 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$. The error range in the experimental helix content of 4c is 49% to 53%. Fitting to these values gives a range of 0.83 to 0.95 for w(KAc). Similar analyses gives the following helix interior preferences for the glycosylated side-chains: $w(\text{KCOCH}_2\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_3\text{OLeX}) = 0.83$, range 0.78 to 0.89, $\Delta G = -RT \ln(0.83) = 0.10 \text{ kcal mol}; w(\text{KCOCH}_2\text{S} (CH_2)_3O$ -Glc) = 0.80; range 0.75 to 0.86, $\Delta G = -RT \ln(0.80) =$ $0.12 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$; w(KCOCH₂S(CH₂)₃O-Lac) = 0.83, range 0.78 to 0.89, $\Delta G = -RT \ln(0.83) = 0.10 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$. All of these sidechains are therefore weakly destabilizing to the helix. In peptides with *i*, i+4 side-chain interactions, the only unknown is now the side-chain interaction parameter, p. Fitting the experimental helix content of 52% for peptide 4b, and using w(KAc), gives p(KAc to KAc) = 1.18, range 1.04 to 1.34. The KAc to KAc interaction thus weakly stabilizes the helix by $-RT\ln(1.18) =$ -0.09 kcalmol⁻¹. Similarly, for **5b** $p(\text{KCOCH}_2\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_3\text{OLe}^{\text{X}}$ to $\text{KCOCH}_2S(\text{CH}_2)_3\text{OLe}^X$ = 1.54, range 1.35 to 1.77, ΔG = $-RT\ln(1.54) = -0.23 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$; for **6a** $p(\text{KCOCH}_2\text{S}(\text{CH}_2)_3\text{O})$ Glc to KCOCH₂S(CH₂)₃O-Glc) = 0.69, range 0.61 to 0.78, ΔG = $-RT\ln(0.69) = 0.20 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$; and for **7a** $p(\text{KCOCH}_2\text{S-})$ $(CH_2)_3O-Lac$ to $KCOCH_2S(CH_2)_3O-Lac) = 0.53$, range 0.46 to $0.60, \Delta G = -RT \ln(0.53) = 0.34 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}.$

- [20] Given the sensitivity of the conformational preferences of the peptide backbone to cations, these titration experiments were carried out under conditions of comparable ionic strength. In addition, the effect of Na⁺ on the helix preference of **5b** was examined and no significant difference in helicity was observed between Ca²⁺ (167 mM; I=0.5) and Na⁺ (500 mM; I=0.5). Full details of these titration studies are provided in the Supporting Information.
- [21] The interaction between Le^x moieties with and without Ca²⁺ in a variety of circumstances has been described and those regions of Le^x that interact with a divalent cation have been proposed. Methods used include NMR spectroscopy,^[8c,13,22] MS and computational studies,^[23] and models representing both *trans*-and *cis*-CCIs have been reported.^[24] However, no Le^x-Ca²⁺ interactions have been detected by NMR spectroscopy in pure water, only in aqueous MeOH, MeOH or DMSO or related mixtures. A direct interaction between Le^x units (in the absence of Ca²⁺) has been reported,^[13] but see also Ref. [22d]. Importantly, Penadés et al. identified a Ca²⁺-independent Le^x-Le^x interaction using atomic force microscopy (AFM)^[8a] while observing a Ca²⁺-dependent effect using analogously glycosylated gold nanoparticles (AuNPs).^[6a]
- [22] a) M. R. Wormald, C. J. Edge, R. A. Dwek, Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 1991, 180, 1214-1221; b) B. Henry, H. Desvaux, M. Pristchepa, P. Berthault, Y.-M. Zhang, J.-M. Mallet, J. Esnault, P. Sinaÿ, Carbohydr. Res. 1999, 315, 48-62; c) C. Gege, A. Geyer, R. R. Schmidt, Eur. J. Org. Chem. 2002, 2475-2485; d) A. Wang, J. Hendel, F.-I. Auzanneau, Beilstein J. Org. Chem. 2010, 6, DOI: 10.3762/bjoc.6.17; e) for NMR and molecular dynamics studies of the Ca²⁺ complexes of a related, pyruvated trisaccharide, see J. I. Santos, A. C. de Souza, F. J. Cañada, S. Martín-Santamaría, J. P. Kamerling, J. Jiménez-Barbero, ChemBioChem 2009, 10, 511-519.



- [23] a) G. Siuzdak, Y. Ichikawa, T. J. Caulfield, B. Munoz, C.-H. Wong, K. C. Nicolaou, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 2877-2881;
 b) G. Siuzdak, Z.-L. Zheng, J. Y. Rhamphal, Y. Ichikawa, K. C. Nicolaou, F. C. A. Gaeta, K. S. Chatman, C. H. Wong, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett. 1994, 4, 2863-2866; c) S.-I. Nishimura, N. Nagahori, K. Takyaya, Y. Tachibana, N. Miura, K. Monde, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2005, 44, 571-575.
- [24] Models of *trans*-CCIs can be viewed as those associated with intermolecular interactions, for example, glycosylated vesicles^[5] or AuNPs. a) Models representing a *cis*-CCI based on Le^x have been reported: A. Geyer, C. Gege, R. R. Schmidt, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2000**, *39*, 3246–3249.