Supplementary Data

Sulfonamide-linked Ciprofloxacin, Sulfadiazine and Amantadine Derivatives as a Novel Class of Inhibitors of Jack Bean Urease; Synthesis, Kinetic Mechanism and Molecular Docking

Pervaiz Ali Channar ^a, Aamer Saeed ^{*,a}, Fernando Albericio ^{b,c,d}, Fayaz Ali Larik ^{*,a}, Qamar Abbas ^b, Mubashir Hassan ^b, Hussain Raza ^b and Sung-Yum Seo ^b

- ^a Department of Chemistry, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad 45320, Pakistan.
- ^b Department of Biological Sciences, College of Natural Sciences, Kongju National University, 56 Gongjudehak-Ro, Gongju, Chungnam 314-701, Republic of Korea
- ^c Department of Organic Chemistry, University of Barcelona, 08028-Barcelona, Spain
- ^d CIBER-BBN, Networking Centre on Bioengineering, Biomaterials and Nanomedicine, Barcelona Science Park, University of Barcelona, Barcelona 08028, Spain
- * Email: aamersaeed@yahoo.com, and fayazali@chem.qau.edu.pk Tel +92-51-9064-2128; Fax: +92-51-9064-2241

AutoDock Scoring Function

Combination of knowledge-based and empirical approach:

 $\Delta Gbinding = \Delta Ggauss + \Delta Grepulsion + \Delta Ghbond + \Delta Ghydrophobic + \Delta Gtors$

where $\triangle Ggauss$: Attractive term for dispersion, two Gaussian functions; $\triangle Grepulsion$: Square of the distance if closer than a threshold value; $\triangle Ghbond$: Ramp function - also used for interactions with metal ions; $\triangle Ghydrophobic$: Ramp function; $\triangle G$ tors: Proportional to the number of rotatable bonds



Figure S1. Ramachandran graph of urease



Figure S2. Hydrophobicity graph of urease



Figure S3. Docking complex 3a



Figure S4. Docking complex 3b



Figure S5. Docking complex 3c



Figure S6. Docking complex 3d



Figure S7. Docking complex 3f



Figure S8. Docking complex 6b



Figure S9. Docking complex 6c



Figure S10. Docking complex 6d



Figure S11. Docking complex 6e



Figure S12. Docking complex 6f



Figure S13. Docking complex 9a



Figure S14. Docking complex 9b



Figure S15. Docking complex 9c



Figure S16. Docking complex 9d



Figure S17. Docking complex 9f



Figure S18. Docking complex 12a



Figure S19. Docking complex 12b



Figure S20. Docking complex 12c



Figure S21. Docking complex 12e



Figure S22. Docking complex 12f



Figure S23: Solvent Accessible Surface Area (SASA) graph of **3e**, **6a**, **9e** and **12d** docked complexes from 0-10000ps time scale.



Figure S24. Chi square distribution graph of 3e, 6a, 9e and 12d docked complexes from 0-10000ps time scale.



Figure S25. ¹H NMR spectrum of 9f



Figure S26. ¹³C NMR spectrum of 9f



Figure 27. ¹H NMR spectrum of 6d



Figure S28. ¹³C NMR spectrum of 6d



Figure S29. ¹³C NMR spectrum of **12f**



Figure S30. ¹H NMR spectrum of 12f



Figure S31. ¹H NMR spectrum of 3e



Figure S32. ¹³C NMR spectrum of 3e



Figure S33. ¹³C-NMR spectrum of 12d



Figure S34. ¹H-NMR spectrum of **12d**

3.6 Root mean square deviation and fluctuation (RMSD/RMSF) analysis of targeted protein

Based on docking energy values and in-vitro results, four docked complexes 4e, 6a, 9e and 12d were selected to evaluate the residual flexibility of receptor through MD simulation. The RMSD and RMSF graphs were evaluated to determine the protein structural behavior. The RMSD graph result of all docked complexes (4e, 6a, 9e and 12d) interprets the protein residual deviation and fluctuations in 10 ns simulation time frame. Initially, all four graph lines were displayed an increasing trend from 0-2000 ps. However, the RMSD value range from 0.2-0.4 nm for all four complexes. The 3e and 9e complexes showed higher fluctuations than the **6a** and **12d** at starting simulation time at 0-2000 ps. After that, from 2000-4000 ps all four complexes graph lines remain stable and showed little fluctuations. At that, both 3e and 9e were at a higher level compared to 6a and 12d and depicts little bit higher RMSD value. From 4000 to 6000 all four complexes steadily increased with very little fluctuations. However, a big fluctuation difference was observed in all complexes from 6000 to 8000 ps. The 3e graph line showed decreased fluctuated behavior compared to 9e. However, both complexes were remained close to each other and depicts no big fluctuation difference. While 6a and 12d presented big fluctuation difference at the same time. The 6a showed a less decreasing trend compared to 12d. After that from 8000 to 1000 ps all four complexes remain stable. The 3e and 9e showed more than 0.5 RMSD value while 6a and 12d were within that value. The comparative analysis justified that **6a** complex simulation graph is more stable throughout the simulation time period as compared to other complexes. However, their RMSD values has not too much deviant from each other (Fig. 4). The generated RMSF results of all docked complexes (4e, 6a, 9e and 12d) showed

the N to C terminal lobes fluctuations within target protein throughout the simulation period. Initially, the N-terminus loop regions were showing little fluctuations. However, **9e** loop residues showed higher value. The generated graph showed that C-terminal loop region is much fluctuated compared to N-terminus. Result depicted that higher peaks in RMSF graph showed the loop conformation and its fluctuations in the simulation time (Fig. 5).



Figure 4. RMSD graph of **3e**, **6a**, **9e** and **12d** docked complexes are mentioned in purple, red, green and blue colors, respectively from 0-10000ps time scale.



Figure 5. RMSF graph of **3e**, **6a**, **9e** and **12d** docked complexes are mentioned in purple, red, green and blue colors, respectively from 0-10000ps time scale.