Molecular dynamics simulations in photosynthesis

Nicoletta Liguori1 · Roberta Croce1 · Siewert J. Marrink2 · Sebastian Thallmair2

Received: 11 December 2019 / Accepted: 24 March 2020 / Published online: 15 April 2020
© The Author(s) 2020

Abstract
Photosynthesis is regulated by a dynamic interplay between proteins, enzymes, pigments, lipids, and cofactors that takes place on a large spatio-temporal scale. Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations provide a powerful toolkit to investigate dynamical processes in (bio)molecular ensembles from the (sub)picosecond to the (sub)millisecond regime and from the Å to hundreds of nm length scale. Therefore, MD is well suited to address a variety of questions arising in the field of photosynthesis research. In this review, we provide an introduction to the basic concepts of MD simulations, at atomistic and coarse-grained level of resolution. Furthermore, we discuss applications of MD simulations to model photosynthetic systems of different sizes and complexity and their connection to experimental observables. Finally, we provide a brief glance on which methods provide opportunities to capture phenomena beyond the applicability of classical MD.
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Introduction: towards a dynamic structural view of photosynthesis

The photosynthetic membrane, or thylakoid, is a continuous membrane system consisting of a lipid bilayer composed mainly of galactolipids and phospholipids (Duchêne and Siegenthaler 2000), with embedded protein complexes and cofactors. The thylakoid separates the aqueous phase of the chloroplast into different domains: the inner portion is called the lumen while the outer one is known as the stroma. In this membrane, the initial steps of photosynthesis, collectively known as the light reactions, take place. Via these reactions, electrons are removed from water and transported across the membrane while protons are pumped into the lumen, creating a proton gradient across the membrane. Electrons and the proton gradient are used to provide adenosine triphosphate (ATP) and nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADPH) to the downstream, “dark” reactions of the Calvin–Benson–Bassham cycle, which produce carbohydrates from water and CO2 (Blankenship 2014; Croce et al. 2018).

The light reactions are regulated principally by four different integral membrane multi-protein complexes binding pigments and other cofactors. These complexes can be classified as follows: two photosystems, PSII and PSI which are large pigment-binding protein complexes (>500 kDa (Heinemeyer et al. 2004)) involved in light-harvesting and light-driven electron transfer processes, cytochrome (Cyt) b6f, a > 200 kDa complex also involved in electron transfer (Baniulis et al. 2008), and the ATP-synthase, which is a > 500 kDa enzyme active in proton-driven synthesis processes (Seelert et al. 2003). Additional players involved in regulatory mechanisms are also present in the thylakoid (Rochaix 2014).

In oxygenic photosynthetic organisms, visible and near-infrared sunlight energy is mainly absorbed by chlorophylls (Chls). Chls are tetrapyrroles and can be found in nature with different substitutions on their pyrrole ring. Some of such substitutions significantly tune the absorption spectra of the Chls (Scheer 1991; Kühl et al. 2005; Chen et al. 2010;
Different photosynthetic organisms adopt distinct types of Chls with absorption properties matching the light spectrum available in their natural habitat (Croce and van Amerongen 2014; Stomp et al. 2007). In addition to Chls, photosynthetic organisms use carotenoids (Cars) and phycobilins to increase their absorption cross section in the green region (500–600 nm) (Beale 1993; Frank and Cogdell 1996), which is poorly absorbed by Chls.

Photosynthetic pigments are bound to the proteins that constitute the cores of PSII and PSI and to the outer antennae: the light-harvesting complexes (LHCs) or the phycobilisomes (Croce and van Amerongen 2014). The light-harvesting complexes are functionally connected to the cores of PSII and PSI forming “supercomplexes” (Gao et al. 2018). For a detailed review on the light-harvesting building blocks of photosynthetic organisms we refer the reader to Croce et al. (2018). The role of an antenna is to absorb solar photons and transfer the excitation energy to the cores where charge separation occurs. The pigment-to-protein ratio is generally very high in the antennae: in the case of plants and green algae, for example, ~ 25 kDa of protein can bind ~ 15 kDa of pigments (Nicol and Croce 2018). Such a large pigment/protein ratio results in crowded supercomplexes, e.g., in the example of the largest PSII supercomplex isolated from plants (Caffarri et al. 2009), this packing corresponds to a dimeric core binding 18 LHCs for a total of ~ 314 Chls and ~ 88 Cars and 4 pheophytins plus additional cofactors and lipids (Su et al. 2017).

A simplified scheme of the functional organization of photosynthetic complexes within the thylakoid membrane is shown in Fig. 1. Two modes of electron transfer pathways take place and are defined as linear and cyclic electron flow, which we here briefly introduce one after the other. During linear electron flow, the excitation energy is first transferred from LHCs to the reaction center Chls (P680) situated in the core of PSII, where charge separation occurs. After charge separation, an electron is donated from P680 to a pheophytin and then to a plastoquinone (PQ) molecule bound to the complex in the so-called $Q_A$ site. Electrons removed from water on the luminal side of the membrane are used to reduce P680+. From the $Q_A$ site, the electron is then transferred to a PQ molecule in the $Q_B$ site. At this site, $Q_B^+\text{PQ}$ after a second turnover of reduction accepts two protons from the stroma and detaches from the site in the form of plastoquinol (PQH$_2$). This molecule diffuses through the membrane until it reaches the Cytochrome $b_6f$ complex. Here, the electrons from PQH$_2$ are donated through a cycle of reactions (Q-cycle) to plastocyanin (PC), a luminal redox protein that then diffuses to PSI. During the Q-cycle, protons are also released into the lumen. In PSI, after Chl excitation has been funneled from the peripheral antennae to the reaction center (P700), charge separation produces an electron which is transferred via several cofactors present in PSI to ferredoxin (Fd), a small protein located on the stromal side of the membrane, while PC reduces back P700+. From Fd, electrons are donated to the NADP reductase (FNR) to produce NADPH, thus concluding the linear electron flow. The cyclic electron flow leads to the build-up of a proton gradient across the thylakoid membrane and operates at the level of Cyt $b_6f$ and PSI. The overall proton gradient built by both transport processes finally drives the ATP synthase to produce ATP. For a more exhaustive introduction to linear and cyclic electron flow and, more in general, to the light reactions, we refer the reader to the following reviews and textbooks (Joliot and Joliot 2006; Rochaix 2011; Blankenship 2014; Nawrocki et al. 2019).

In general, the thylakoid is a highly dynamic system in terms of structures, organization, composition, and the cofactors and proteins involved.
functionality: the transport processes involved in the light reactions are only a part of the “dynamic processes” occurring in the thylakoid. Indeed, because everyday sunlight quality or quantity can change suddenly and irregularly, photosynthetic organisms need to respond to these changes via short-term and long-term acclimation strategies. These mechanisms are used to optimize the usage of light and to balance the amount of excitation in the thylakoid to prevent photooxidation. As a consequence, the structure and composition of the photosystems are dynamically regulated in response to changes in light conditions (Allen 1995; Kar-gul and Barber 2008; Chen et al. 2010; Niyogi and Truong 2013). On the one side, changes in the spectral quality of light lead to responses such as migration of LHCs from PSII to PSI or vice versa (so-called state transitions), changes in protein expression, or synthesis of pigments with an absorption cross section matching the available solar spectrum (Melis 1991). On the other side, an increase of irradiance causes activation of reversible photoprotective mechanisms to avoid photooxidation. Structural changes of photosynthetic subunits, specifically of the LHCs, regulate the fastest of such photoprotective responses (Miuller et al. 2001; Ruban et al. 2012). In plants and algae, these conformational changes are caused by the light-dependent acidification of the thylakoid lumen (Li et al. 2009; Tokutsu and Minagawa 2013; Liguori et al. 2013, 2019; Gan et al. 2014; Dinc et al. 2016; Kondo et al. 2017), while in cyanobacteria structural changes in stress-related protein complexes are triggered directly by light (Kirilovsky 2007). The structural changes of pigments and proteins create quenching sites that shorten the excited state lifetime of the LHCs (photoprotective quenching), this way preventing accumulation of dangerous oxidizing species (Ruban et al. 2012).

Overall, this means that the single photosynthetic subunits continuously interchange among different conformations (e.g., via the photoprotective switch (Ruban et al. 2012), see above) and organizations (e.g., via state transitions (Melis 1991), see above). At a smaller scale, also the pigments can functionally change their structure and cofactors can move between different binding sites (e.g., in the case of the diffusion of PQ (Kirchhoff et al. 2000), see above). Thus, photosynthetic complexes and the thylakoid as a whole exist in a variety of states (Valkunas et al. 2012; Johnson and Wentjes 2019). The ensemble of states in which a single photosynthetic subunit or a complex of them can be found translates into the conformational space of the protein. In the specific case of chromophore-binding systems, the conformational landscape correlates not only with the protein energetic landscape but also with the optical properties of the pigment-protein complex. An example is the different conformations of the LHCs which correlate with different spectral properties (Krüger et al. 2011; Valkunas et al. 2012; Liguori et al. 2015). The various states in which photosynthetic systems can be found are separated by energy barriers: the higher the energy barrier, the less likely it is for a protein or a cofactor to change their conformation. In the case of single proteins, an associated conformational landscape with low energy barriers defines them as disordered systems. Via single molecule spectroscopy (SMS) it has been shown that LHCs have an inbuilt ability to switch reversibly between states more and less quenched and, therefore, between a variety of conformations, which has led LHCs to be defined as disordered systems (Krüger et al. 2010, 2011; Valkunas et al. 2012; Tian et al. 2015; Schlau-Cohen et al. 2015; Mascoci et al. 2019). Changes of the physiological conditions (e.g., nutrients, irradiance, spectrum, temperature, etc.) steer the photosynthetic subunits among different states in the landscape, this way controlling their conformation as well as their organization (Ruban et al. 2012; Valkunas et al. 2012).

To understand the molecular mechanisms of the light reactions, it is an invaluable asset to use a tool that can reconstruct the ensemble of possible conformations, reorganizations, interactions, and movements taking place within the thylakoid. In the last years, several high-resolution structures of the main photosynthetic complexes active in the first steps of photosynthesis (LHCs, PSII, and PSI) have been obtained via X-ray crystallography and cryo-electron microscopy (Pan et al. 2011; Umema et al. 2011; Fan et al. 2015; Qin et al. 2015, 2019; Wei et al. 2016; Su et al. 2017, 2019). These structures are in many cases a superposition of multiple conformations of these complexes and, therefore, lack information of the single states of the system. In addition, often, information on the structural response of the complexes to different physiological conditions is missing.

Already since the late 1970s, molecular dynamics (MD) simulations are helping to characterize the dynamics of biological systems in silico with femtosecond and atomistic resolutions (Thiel and Hummer 2013). MD simulations allow sampling the conformational space of large biomolecular systems, providing information about the motion over time of every single atom. Pioneering work in the field of MD applied to photosynthesis was performed by Schulten’s group that, in the last decades, studied several light-harvesting systems with a focus on understanding the role of pigment dynamics and of the environment on tuning the spectral properties of the complexes (Schulten and Tesch 1991; Treutlein et al. 1992; Damjanović et al. 2002; Perilla et al. 2015). Due to limitations in the computational power at the time, only few tenths of ns were generally accessible for such large systems. As it will be shown in this review, recent progress in the development of dedicated force fields (see Sect. 2.1) for photosynthetic systems and the continuously increasing computational power allowed the field of MD applied to photosynthesis to explore in more detail increasingly longer timescales and larger sizes. The large range in spatio-temporal scale that is important for photosynthetic
processes constitutes a major challenge to its computational treatment. Figure 2 shows that the system size ranges from single molecules—e.g., chromophores like Chls—, single proteins, protein supercomplexes, up to large assemblies of protein supercomplexes. With increasing system size, the required simulation time increases which entails a decrease in accuracy. In quantum mechanics (QM) and QM/molecular mechanics (MM) calculations, electronic and nuclear degrees of freedom are considered. As explained below in Sect. 4.2, QM/MM methods have been successfully used in the characterization of energy transfer and early electron transfer processes. This is not feasible for larger systems thus only the nuclear degrees of freedom are taken into account in atomistic MD simulations. For even larger systems, only simulations at the coarse-grained (CG) MD level provide reasonable simulation time. A diverse selection of photosynthetic complexes and processes has been successfully investigated on a wide range of spatio-temporal scales in the recent years by atomistic and CG classical MD, as presented below in Sects. 3.1, 3.2. If large parts of the thylakoids including numerous protein supercomplexes are simulated, supra CG methods are more suitable in which a protein is only represented by a small number of interaction sites. A brief overview of supra CG methods applied to photosynthesis is given below in Sect. 4.1.

This review aims to introduce the reader to the basic principles of MD simulations, their strengths, and limitations as well as their synergetic potential if employed in combination with experimental techniques. It is intended primarily for researchers in the field of photosynthesis who would like to strengthen their knowledge about MD or who are excited about applying MD methods. In particular, we focus on how atomistic and CG MD has been used to model photosynthetic systems of different size and complexity. Moreover, we give an overview of standard and non-standard approaches that have been used by the photosynthetic community so far. Before concluding, we provide a brief view on the techniques beyond atomistic and CG MD depicted in Fig. 2. The review primarily focuses on classical MD studies on oxygenic photosynthetic organisms. Anoxygenic photosynthetic organisms like purple bacteria have been studied in great detail computationally using mostly MD simulations in combination with QM methods. Because this goes beyond the scope of the current review, they are partly referred to in the last section of this review, which includes selected examples of combined QM/MM studies.

**Molecular dynamics principles**

In biophysics, MD simulations are used to model small-scale biological systems (for example protein-membrane systems) as an ensemble of classical particles and to follow their dynamics enclosed in what is called a simulation box. This is...
done by analyzing the trajectory (coordinates and velocities) generated by the motion of each particle in the simulation box starting from a known set of initial positions, e.g., the protein coordinates from a high-resolution crystal structure. In this section, we review the basic concepts behind MD and explain how to set up and run an MD simulation.

**Interactions among atoms: what is a force field**

In MD, each molecule is approximated as a system of classical point particles, or interaction sites. Depending on the chosen resolution, such particles may represent atoms or groups of atoms. The motions of the particles are obtained by solving the classical Newton equations for the system. The forces acting on the particles are computed over time and depend on the particle positions and the total potential energy of the system ($V_{\text{tot}}$). Electrons are treated adiabatically which means that electronic degrees of freedom are not explicitly taken into account. The particles represent the properties of nuclei evolving on a Born–Oppenheimer potential energy surface. This also implies that molecules are studied in their electronic ground state. $V_{\text{tot}}$ of the simulated system contains the bonded and non-bonded potential energies:

$$V_{\text{tot}} = V_{\text{bonded}} + V_{\text{non-bonded}} \quad (1)$$

$V_{\text{bonded}}$ is the sum of the potential energy associated with chemical bonds, bond angles, and torsional angles (dihedrals) between groups of, respectively 2, 3, and 4 particles. The mathematical description of the bonded potentials can be slightly different for the different models which are available, but typically, the bonded potentials are modeled either via harmonic potentials ($V_{\text{bond}}$ and $V_{\text{angle}}$) or via cosine-based functions ($V_{\text{dihedral}}$), as described by the following equations:

$$V_{\text{bonded}} = V_{\text{bond}} + V_{\text{angle}} + V_{\text{dihedral}} + V_{\text{improper dihedral}} \quad (2)$$

where

$$V_{\text{bond}}(d_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2} K_{b}(d_{ij} - d_{b})^2 \quad (3)$$

$$V_{\text{angle}}(\theta_{ijk}) = \frac{1}{2} K_{a} (\cos \theta_{ijk} - \cos \theta_{a})^2 \quad (4)$$

$$V_{\text{dihedral}}(\phi_{ijkl}) = K_{d}(1 + \cos(n\phi_{ijkl} - \phi_{d})) \quad (5)$$

$$V_{\text{improper dihedral}}(\varphi_{ijkl}) = \frac{1}{2} K_{d}(\varphi_{ijkl} - \varphi_{d})^2 \quad (6)$$

A representation of each term and the meaning of each variable are reported in Fig. 3A. The bonded potential $V_{\text{bond}}$ describes the covalent bond stretching between 2 atoms. The angle potential $V_{\text{angle}}$ carries information about the bending of 3 particles and is associated with three covalently bound particles. The dihedral potential $V_{\text{dihedral}}$ describes the angle between the two planes formed by 4 covalently bound particles (Fig. 3A); where n represents the periodicity of the potential. When necessary, the improper dihedral potential ($V_{\text{improper dihedral}}$) can be used to maintain the planarity of the molecule, for example, within rigid planar structures such as tetrapyrroles or along conjugated chains. All force constants ($K_{b}$, $K_{a}$, $K_{d}$, and $K_{ad}$) are chosen to reproduce the expected stiffness of the molecule. Together with the equilibrium constants ($d_{b}$, $\theta_{a}$, $\phi_{d}$, and $\varphi_{d}$), they are established based on ab initio calculations which are often additionally refined to reproduce selected experimental observables (see below the details on how these parameters are derived and validated). $V_{\text{non-bonded}}$ describes the interaction between any pair $i,j$ of particles. It is the sum of van der Waals, often modeled as a Lennard–Jones ($L-J$) potential ($V_{L-J}$), and Coulomb ($V_{\text{coulomb}}$) interactions:

$$V_{\text{non-bonded}}$$

Fig. 3 Bonded potential terms and force field resolutions. A Representation of the principal variables inside the bonded potential terms in the example of a betacarotene molecule: the variables are distance ($d_{ij}$), angle ($\theta_{ijk}$), dihedral angle ($\phi_{ijkl}$), and improper dihedral angle ($\varphi_{ijkl}$), and the different indices $i$, $j$, $k$, $l$ refer to different interaction sites. B A betacarotene molecular structure represented at different levels of resolution: AA (all-atom resolution), UA [united-atom resolution, in particular in the case of GROMOS (de Jong et al. 2015)] and CG [coarse-grained resolution, in particular in the case of Martini (de Jong et al. 2015)]. The arrows indicate how the atoms of a UA-type of structure are grouped (“mapped”) into a CG-one
Atomistic force fields

For small proteins and in general systems of few tens of thousands of atoms, there is the possibility to model them accurately and for long simulated timescales (up to the μs range) using an all-atom force field, that is to say that all the atoms of the system are taken into account as individual particles when solving the equations of motion. However, in the effort to sample as much conformational space as possible and, therefore, to reduce the computational cost related to sampling, it is possible to simplify the system with the so-called united-atom (UA) FFs (Jorgensen et al. 1996; Oostenbrink et al. 2004; Yang et al. 2006). In this approximation, all non-hydrogen atoms are explicitly taken into account but some of the hydrogens of non-polar groups are included implicitly in the particle representing the non-hydrogen atom of the corresponding group (see Fig. 3B). This way, the number of particles is reduced and some of the fastest vibrational motions of the molecule are suppressed, which reduces the computational cost of the simulation.

Currently, several all-atom and UA FFs are available and validated for all amino acids, several lipid classes, and different solvents (Oostenbrink et al. 2004; Zhu et al. 2012; Nerenberg and Head-Gordon 2018). Importantly for the photosynthetic community, nowadays several of these FFs have also been derived and validated for photosynthetic pigments and cofactors: most all-atom FFs (such as CHARMM and Amber) have been validated by comparing simulated properties against ab initio calculations (Damjanović et al. 2002; Ceccarelli et al. 2003; Karki and Roccatano 2011; Cerezo et al. 2013; Guerra et al. 2015; Adam et al. 2018; Kim et al. 2018). In the case of the Amber force field for Cars (Prandi et al. 2016), this set of parameters has been specifically validated to reproduce selected spectral properties. The UA FF available for the pigments, cofactors, and lipids associated to photosystem II (PSII) and the LHCs (López et al. 2013; van Eerden et al. 2015; de Jong et al. 2015; Liguori et al. 2015) have been developed based on the building blocks of GROMOS. Respecting the guiding rules of this FF (Oostenbrink et al. 2004, 2005; Schmid et al. 2011), they have been validated against experimental data.

Coarse-grained force fields

To be able to simulate larger biomolecular ensembles for longer simulation times, the resolution of the molecular representation has to be reduced. Metaphorically speaking, it corresponds to a zooming out of the simulation box containing the biomolecular ensemble. CG FFs are used for this step (Saunders and Voth 2013; Noid 2013; Ingólfsson et al. 2014). They do not describe every atom explicitly but typically group 3–6 non-hydrogen atoms together in one CG interaction site (see Fig. 3B). These are often called CG beads. The resulting lower number of particles in the simulation box reduces the computational cost. A CG bead imitates the average properties of the atoms it represents. There are two major strategies to generate CG FFs called bottom-up and top-down, which tackle the FF parametrization from two opposing sites. While in a bottom-up approach structural properties are the key parametrization targets, in a top-down approach experimental ensemble properties are the major parametrization targets. Often, a combination of both strategies is applied during the parametrization. There exist various CG FFs, e.g., the Martini FF (Marrink et al. 2007; Marrink and Tieleman 2013), the SIRAH (south-American initiative for a rapid and accurate Hamiltonian) FF (Machado et al. 2019), the ELBA (electrostatics-based) FF (Orsi and Essex 2011), and the SPICA FF (DeVane et al. 2009; Seo and Shinoda 2019), which describe water explicitly. Other CG models like e.g., the CgProt FF (Hills et al. 2010), the PLUM FF (Bereau et al. 2014), or the Dry Martini FF (Arnarez et al. 2015), treat the water environment implicitly.

The currently most-widely used CG FF operating at almost atomistic resolution is the Martini FF (Marrink et al. 2007; Marrink and Tieleman 2013). It groups approximately four non-hydrogen atoms in one CG bead based on their physico-chemical characteristics. For example, it treats a functional group like an ester group always as one unit and thus combines it to one bead. The non-bonded interactions of these building blocks are obtained by comparison to experimental partitioning data. The bonded terms are chosen to optimally represent the molecular structure usually obtained from atomistic reference simulations. The selection of the building blocks based on the chemical nature of the grouped atoms allows combining multiple classes of

\[
V_{\text{L-J}}(r) = 4\epsilon_{ij} \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r} \right)^{6} \right]
\]

(7)

\[
V_{\text{coulomb}}(r) = \frac{q_i q_j}{4\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r r}
\]

(8)

where \(\epsilon_{ij}\) is the depth of the potential well of \(V_{\text{L-J}}\), and \(\sigma_{ij}\) is the distance between the pair of particles at which the potential is zero. In \(V_{\text{coulomb}}\), \(q_i\) and \(q_j\) are the charges of two different particles, while \(\varepsilon_0\) and \(\varepsilon_r\) are, respectively, vacuum permittivity and the relative dielectric constants. In both potential terms, \(r\) is the distance between the two particles.

To be able to simulate larger biomolecular ensembles for longer simulation times, the resolution of the molecular representation has to be reduced. Metaphorically speaking, it corresponds to a zooming out of the simulation box containing the biomolecular ensemble. CG FFs are used for this step (Saunders and Voth 2013; Noid 2013; Ingólfsson et al. 2014). They do not describe every atom explicitly but typically group 3–6 non-hydrogen atoms together in one CG interaction site (see Fig. 3B). These are often called CG beads. The resulting lower number of particles in the simulation box reduces the computational cost. A CG bead imitates the average properties of the atoms it represents. There are two major strategies to generate CG FFs called bottom-up and top-down, which tackle the FF parametrization from two opposing sites. While in a bottom-up approach structural properties are the key parametrization targets, in a top-down approach experimental ensemble properties are the major parametrization targets. Often, a combination of both strategies is applied during the parametrization. There exist various CG FFs, e.g., the Martini FF (Marrink et al. 2007; Marrink and Tieleman 2013), the SIRAH (south-American initiative for a rapid and accurate Hamiltonian) FF (Machado et al. 2019), the ELBA (electrostatics-based) FF (Orsi and Essex 2011), and the SPICA FF (DeVane et al. 2009; Seo and Shinoda 2019), which describe water explicitly. Other CG models like e.g., the CgProt FF (Hills et al. 2010), the PLUM FF (Bereau et al. 2014), or the Dry Martini FF (Arnarez et al. 2015), treat the water environment implicitly.

The currently most-widely used CG FF operating at almost atomistic resolution is the Martini FF (Marrink et al. 2007; Marrink and Tieleman 2013). It groups approximately four non-hydrogen atoms in one CG bead based on their physico-chemical characteristics. For example, it treats a functional group like an ester group always as one unit and thus combines it to one bead. The non-bonded interactions of these building blocks are obtained by comparison to experimental partitioning data. The bonded terms are chosen to optimally represent the molecular structure usually obtained from atomistic reference simulations. The selection of the building blocks based on the chemical nature of the grouped atoms allows combining multiple classes of

\[
V_{\text{L-J}}(r) = 4\epsilon_{ij} \left[ \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r} \right)^{12} - \left( \frac{\sigma_{ij}}{r} \right)^{6} \right]
\]

(7)}

\[
V_{\text{coulomb}}(r) = \frac{q_i q_j}{4\pi \varepsilon_0 \varepsilon_r r}
\]

(8)}
Biomolecules like lipids (Wassenaar et al. 2015), proteins (Monticelli et al. 2008; de Jong et al. 2013), sugars (López et al. 2009), DNA (Uusitalo et al. 2015), and RNA (Uusitalo et al. 2017) in one simulation.

Besides the lower number of particles, CG simulations come with another advantage with respect to their computational efficiency: the potential energy landscape is smoothened compared to atomistic FFs which allows the use of a larger time step (see Sect. 2.2). One effect is that the accessible total simulation time increases with respect to a limited computational time. In addition, the smoothened potential energy landscape facilitates the transition between different local minima. However, it entails also limitations: the already-mentioned lower resolution inherently leads to a loss of directed interactions which are mediated by the defined orientation of specific atoms in one CG bead. An important case is represented by hydrogen bonds, which play a key role in stabilizing the secondary and tertiary protein structure. To compensate for their lack in CG models, they are often taken into account by additional bonded interactions in the so-called elastic network (Attilgan et al. 2001; Periole et al. 2009) or Gō-like models (Taketomi et al. 1975; Poma et al. 2017; Thallmair et al. 2019). In addition, the time scale of the simulations does not correspond to real time anymore but is faster by a factor of approximately 3–10 due to the smoothened energy landscape (Marrink et al. 2007).

Another limitation is the introduction of artificial energy barriers upon dimerization of molecules because one CG water bead represents multiple water molecules (Alessandri et al. 2019). Moreover, the bond lengths and the bonded force constants should remain in the range for which the CG FF was parametrized. Too short bond lengths or too weak force constants can artificially increase the non-bonded interactions (Alessandri et al. 2019).

**Time-evolution: integrators**

In order to obtain information about the time evolution of the (bio)molecular system, the numerical integration of the equations of motion is necessary:

\[
v = -\frac{dr}{dt}, \quad a = -\frac{dv}{dt}
\]

(9)

With \(v\) being the velocity, \(r\) the position, \(t\) the time, and \(a\) the acceleration. Both equations can be combined to describe the time evolution by one time step \(\Delta t\) (Frenkel and Smit 2002):

\[
r(t + \Delta t) = r(t) + v(t)\Delta t + 0.5a(t)\Delta t^2
\]

(10)

The calculation of the velocity \(v(t + \Delta t)\) for the next time step requires the acceleration \(a\), which can be obtained from the force \(F\):

\[
a = \frac{F}{m} = -\frac{dV_{tot}}{dr} \frac{1}{m}
\]

(11)

With \(m\) being the mass and \(V_{tot}\) the total interaction potential (Eq. 1). The force is calculated as the negative derivative of the potential energy, which depends on the FF parameters and the actual atomic positions. To perform the numerical integration of the equations of motion, the equations have to be solved using small discretized time steps \(\Delta t\). With the atomic positions at \(t + \Delta t\) at hand, the new forces and new velocities can be calculated which are then used to propagate the system forward in time by \(\Delta t\). In atomistic simulations, where fast motions of atoms such as the hydrogen atoms are taken into account, \(\Delta t\) must be of the order of a few fs, making it computationally unfeasible to obtain long trajectories (>\(\mu s\)). In the case of CG simulations, \(\Delta t\) is typically on the order of a few tens of fs.

There are different integrators available for MD simulations. The simplest one, which is given in Eq. (10), is the Euler integrator (Frenkel and Smit 2002) but it is practically not employed. Commonly used integrators are the leap frog (Verlet 1967), and the velocity Verlet integrator (Swope et al. 1982); the latter is an improved version of the Verlet integrator. They have higher accuracy compared to the Euler integrator. However, their purpose in the MD simulations is the same—they propagate the system in time. For more details, the interested reader is referred to standard MD textbooks (Frenkel and Smit 2002; Berendsen 2007).

**Work flow of an MD simulation**

Here, we summarize the main steps necessary to set up and run an MD simulation. A summary of the workflow is reported in Fig. 4.

**Building the simulation box**

A simulation box must contain only molecules that can be described by FF parameters previously validated and compatible with each other, i.e., for the protein, the pigments and any cofactor, the lipids, the solvent, and the ions.

After obtaining the coordinates of the photosynthetic system of interest (e.g., an LHC), e.g., from a database such as the Protein Data Bank (Bernstein et al. 1977), the system should be (1) checked for missing residues or atoms. In case of gaps in key regions of the structure, these gaps should be filled via sequence homology modeling, e.g., as done for PsbS (Liguori et al. 2019), by using information from other resolved structures of similar proteins, e.g., as done in the case of missing Chls’ phytol tails (Liguori et al. 2015), or by predicting the structure of the missing amino acid sequence, e.g., as done in the case of LHCII (Thallmair et al. 2019); (2) before starting the MD simulations, the photosynthetic
system must be embedded in a meaningful environment, i.e., a lipid bilayer or a detergent micelle in the case of a membrane protein, water in the case of water-soluble proteins, etc. In most cases and in particular if the simulation will be run at an atomistic resolution, the embedding system should have been pre-equilibrated before insertion of the protein complex. The obtained protein-surfactant system (or a water-soluble protein) can then be solvated with water molecules. A different solvent can also be used (if compatible FF parameters are available). Counterions should be added if necessary to neutralize the charge of the system and salt can be added to reproduce physiological conditions. Nowadays, dedicated setup tools like, e.g., the CHARMM-GUI website (Wu et al. 2014; Jo et al. 2017), or the programs moltemplate.sh (www.moltemplate.org), HTMD (Doerr et al. 2017), and insane.py (INSert membANE) (Wassenaar et al. 2015) are available. They enable the user to generate starting conformations for complex biomolecular systems comparably straightforward.

Energy minimization

The preliminary simulation box potentially contains clashes between atoms that must be removed before running the MD
simulation. These clashes are energetically extremely unfavorable because of the steep gradient of the repulsive part of the L–J potential (see Sect. 2.1). Clashes can be removed by running an energy minimization, i.e., an algorithm which, through a series of steps, optimizes the positions of each atom (or CG bead) based on the potential terms associated with the chosen FF. Different minimization methods exist mostly employing a gradient descent optimization algorithm. After the energy of the system has been minimized, MD simulations can be run.

**Choice of the boundary conditions**

To further apply a control on the physiological conditions of the simulation, the MD integrator (Sect. 2.2) must be run with additional tools that restrain the system: indeed, to macroscopically reproduce the target experimental temperature and/or pressure within the simulation, a so-called thermostat and/or a barostat must be applied. Whether one or both of these tools must be applied depends on the experimental conditions that should be modeled and, consequently, on the statistical ensemble that should be simulated. For example, in case of a canonical ensemble (NVT) in which the number of particles in the box (\(N\)), the volume (\(V\)) and the average temperature (\(T\)) are constant, a thermostat must be used. In this case \(V\) and \(N\) are set at the start of the simulation and left unvaried during the trajectory. \(T\) cannot be fixed because it is an average macroscopic property derived from the total kinetic energy of the system and, as such, it should experience fluctuations. Similarly, in the case of an isothermal-isobaric ensemble (NpT), the average pressure (\(p\)) must be constrained and a barostat must be used in combination with a thermostat. Several methods exist for ensuring that \(T\) and/or \(p\) oscillate around the target values (Andersen 1980; Parrinello and Rahman 1981; Nosé and Klein 1983; Berendsen et al. 1984; Hoover 1985; Bussi et al. 2007): in the first case, the thermostat regulates the fluctuations of the velocity distribution and, consequently, the macroscopic average temperature of the box. In the latter case, the barostat regulates the fluctuations in the volume of the simulation box and, consequently, the macroscopic average pressure. Special barostat settings are applied for membrane systems: The semi-isotropic pressure coupling scheme allows to regulate the pressure in the plane of the membrane—typically the \(xy\) plane—individually from the pressure in the aqueous phase which is controlled along the membrane normal—the \(z\) axis (Smith et al. 2019). This ensures a homogeneous pressure within the membrane as well as in the water phase without the need of precisely adjusting the ratio of lipid and water molecules during the setup. Each thermostat and barostat algorithm has its own limits and advantages and the choice of the specific tool to be used must be done thoughtfully (Frenkel and Smit 2002; Hünenberger 2005).

Another boundary condition that must be applied concerns how to treat the edges of the simulation box, which has a finite size. Surface effects can be minimized by replicating the simulated box in all the dimensions, applying the so-called periodic boundary conditions. These replicate boxes are called image cells. Cut-offs in the non-bonded pair potentials must be applied to avoid interactions between a particle in the primary simulation box and the same particle in the image cells. Finally, by applying what is called a minimum image convention, each particle is allowed to interact only with the closest images of all the other particles present in the system.

**Equilibration of the system and production**

The energy minimization produces the set of starting coordinates to be used for the MD simulation. The initial velocities are (generally) randomly extracted from a Maxwell–Boltzmann distribution of velocities associated with the target temperature.

The initial portion of simulated time must be then allocated to the equilibration of the system. Various strategies exist on how to equilibrate a biomolecular ensemble starting from a crystal structure. In most cases, an NpT simulation is suitable to simultaneously relax the system’s temperature and pressure. In more delicate cases, it might be necessary to start the equilibration phase with a brief NVT simulation to first ensure a proper relaxation of the system temperature, followed by an NpT simulation. In any case, both temperature and pressure should be monitored to ensure that the average target values have been reached without further drifts.

Importantly, additional time is required to equilibrate other properties of the system. For example, for MD simulations with lipid membranes, the membrane should reach stable values of e.g., thickness, area per lipid, hydration, etc., that are expected for the chosen lipids. This equilibration usually takes on the order of hundreds of nanoseconds depending on the size of the membrane patch (Marrink et al. 2019). If proteins and cofactors are also present, as in the LHCs, additional care must be taken to ensure that, during the time needed to relax and equilibrate the solvent and the membrane, the initial high-resolution structure is not perturbed. A good practice to avoid this is to apply strong position constraints (on the order of 1000 \(\text{kJ mol}^{-1} \text{nm}^{-2}\)) on the atomic positions of the protein backbone (or \(C_{\alpha}\) carbons) and on the pigments’ and cofactors’ parts whose structure is most critical to the spectral or functional properties of the complex during the first equilibration period (Ogata et al. 2013; Liguori et al. 2015, 2017). After the surrounding
system has reached equilibrium, the constraints on the photosynthetic complex can be removed.

To be noted, an additional period is finally mandatory to equilibrate the whole system. This equilibration can be monitored through different quantities, depending on the type of the analyses that will be run. Typical measures to monitor the equilibration process beyond temperature and pressure are the total, the kinetic, and the potential energy of the system, the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of proteins, the area per lipid or thickness for membranes, and the number of contacts between different lipids types for multicomponent membranes. In general, every analysis run on the whole simulated trajectory shows after which time period the computed quantity has eventually reached a steady-state value. When the key properties of the system have reached a plateau, the system can be considered at equilibrium and all the analyses should be done on the equilibrated part of the trajectory, which is often referred to as the production part of the MD simulation.

**Limited sampling and non-standard MD simulations**

If the MD trajectory is long enough, it is nowadays feasible to reach equilibrium for the simulated system with respect to processes taking place on the low µs time scale. However, in most cases, the system will not be simulated long enough to sample from an equilibrium distribution, meaning that the ergodic principle does not hold, i.e., the ensemble average of a quantity will not be equal to its average over the simulated time. To overcome this lack of sampling, it is essential to run multiple independent replicas of the same simulation. One possible way to obtain independent replicas is to assign different initial random velocities in each replica.

Enhanced sampling techniques provide an alternative way to achieve meaningful sampling of states or processes that take place beyond the common time scale of atomistic or CG MD simulations within a reasonable computing time. Typically, the goal is to sample regions of the potential energy surface that exhibit higher energy and are thus not often visited during a standard MD simulation. However, those regions can be important for biophysical and biochemical processes. One example is the sampling of transition pathways connecting different free energy minima that are separated by a significant barrier.

Enhanced sampling techniques can be divided in (i) techniques that require a predefined reaction coordinate along which the sampling is enhanced, and (ii) techniques that do not require such a reaction coordinate. One example of the first group is umbrella sampling (Torrie and Valleau 1974; Kästner 2011). The approach requires knowledge of the coordinate along which the process of interest happens. An additional biasing potential is applied to drive the system step by step from one state to the other ensuring sufficient sampling along the whole path, as shown in Fig. 5B. Steered MD offers an alternative to guide the system along a reaction coordinate using external forces (Izrailev et al. 1999; Vassiliev et al. 2012). A representation of steered MD is given in Fig. 5A. Despite the irreversibility of the simulations, they provide information about pathways and offer a comparison to atomic force microscopy (AFM) experiments. Another approach to increase the sampling along a reaction coordinate is metadynamics (Laio and Parrinello 2002; Barducci et al. 2011). Here, a history-dependent biasing potential is added along selected reaction coordinates, the so-called collective variables. Thus, the biasing potential is updated during the MD simulation. The goal is to drive the system away from the regions of the potential energy surface that have been already visited during the simulation. A scheme of metadynamics is reported in Fig. 5C.

Accelerated MD belongs to the group of enhanced sampling techniques that do not require a predefined reaction coordinate (Voter 1997; Hamelberg et al. 2004; Miao and McCammon 2016). A time-independent bias potential, which only depends on the potential energy, is added to the latter if it is below a certain threshold value (see Fig. 5D). This facilitates exploring higher energy regions of the potential energy surface above the energy threshold, which are unaltered. Another technique not requiring any predefined reaction coordinate is temperature replica exchange (Sugita and Okamoto 1999; Miao and McCammon 2016). Multiple simulations at different temperatures, so-called replicas, are performed simultaneously and configurations are exchanged between replicas if certain conditions are met. The idea is to facilitate the transition of barriers at higher temperatures and to subsequently cool down the system after the barrier crossing by transferring the configurations to the replica at a lower temperature. A scheme for temperature replica exchange is reported in Fig. 5E. Lots of variations of the replica exchange method exist which are in general termed Hamiltonian replica exchange.

If sufficient sampling is achieved using one of the aforementioned enhanced sampling techniques, free energy differences between the states visited can be computed. Another option to calculate the free energy difference between two states provides thermodynamic integration (Straatsma et al. 1986; Abrams and Bussi 2013). Here, the change in free energy along a non-physical path can be calculated. But because the free energy is a state function, its difference between two states does not depend on the path connecting them. Thus thermodynamic integration allows, e.g., calculating the free energy change caused by single point mutations or by cofactor oxidation. Practical aspects of different free energy methods are summarized in this recent review (Hansen and van Gunsteren 2014).
In this section, we will give an overview of how classical MD simulations have been applied so far in the field of photosynthesis: we will zoom-in by going from the slower dynamics at the large membrane scale to the faster dynamics of single photosynthetic subunits. Concomitantly, we will give an overview of how such computational studies relate to experimental evidence.

Beyond the μs timescale: interplay between pigment-protein complexes and the lipid membrane

Both UA and CG FF parameters for all of the major glycolipids of the thylakoid membrane were released in 2013, with the publication of the Martini and GROMOS force field for glycolipids (López et al. 2013). In 2013, thylakoid lipids with atomistic resolution (General Amber force field, GAFF) were used to model PSII dynamics in a thylakoid membrane (Ogata et al. 2013). An extensive report of the behavior of lipids in the thylakoid membrane was published in 2015 (van Eerden et al. 2015). In this work, lipid membranes consisting of up to 2000 lipids, with simulation boxes as large as $25.5 \times 25.5$ nm in the lateral dimensions, were simulated up to 10 μs per system. Thylakoid membrane patches were modeled with the lipid composition of either plants or cyanobacteria, using compositions determined experimentally (Sakurai et al. 2006). The simulations were run mainly at the CG resolution (Martini FF) because of the slow phenomena under investigation, i.e., lipid mixing and lipid–lipid interactions. It was found that all lipid types distribute homogeneously within the membrane patch, with clusters detectable only at the nanoscale. This finding agrees with the even distribution of glycerolipids observed in thylakoids experimentally (Duchêne and Siegenthaler 2000). All lipid classes also showed to have a rather similar diffusion speed, in the order of $20–30 \, \mu m^2/s$ at room temperature (however, this diffusion speed can be expected to be ~4 times slower in reality due to the faster Martini CG dynamics) (van Eerden et al. 2015). Due to its higher degree of saturation (Sakurai et al. 2006), cyanobacteria membrane resulted to be less fluid and also more ordered and thicker than the plant one.
The simulations also showed that plant thylakoids tend to form an inverted hexagonal phase more likely compared to cyanobacteria. This polymorphism was attributed to the larger fraction of polyunsaturated fatty acids in the plant membrane (van Eerden et al. 2015). An inverted hexagonal phase was indeed observed in plant thylakoid membranes (Krumova et al. 2008), but the role of this phase in photosynthesis is still unclear.

Within the membrane, the dynamics of the photosystems and of the associated lipids and cofactors are also characterized by rather slow motions (μs-to-ms timescale). In 2017, MD simulations up to 100 μs at CG resolution (Martini) were performed both for the PSII dimer and monomer of cyanobacteria in a model thylakoid membrane, for a cumulative simulated time of about 0.5 ms (van Eerden et al. 2017a, b, c). Remarkably, the RMSD of the protein reported by van Eerden et al. does not reach a constant value before the first ~ 20 μs (van Eerden et al. 2017a, b, c). The RMSD of the protein backbone is a suitable probe for the equilibration of a simulated system (see Sect. 2.3) and, in this case, it indicates that a complex as large as PSII takes at least few tenths of μs to reach equilibrium in the membrane. Moreover, in a separate work (Van Eerden et al. 2017a), it is illustrated how even a substantial simulation time of ~ 85 μs is not yet long enough to obtain convergent results on the binding of lipids to the different monomeric subunits of PSII dimer. This strongly suggests that simulations should be run for at least several tenths of μs when investigating photosynthetic complexes of similar size and complexity to obtain statistically meaningful analyses, a timescale accessible to CG methods, but more hardly to atomistic simulations (Fig. 2).

MD can also be used to investigate the dynamics of associated molecules like e.g., cofactors in the complexes and in the membrane. For example, steered-MD simulations were used to compute the energetic cost of water diffusion inside PSII (Vassiliev et al. 2012) at atomistic resolution (Amber (Simmerling et al. 2002)). In this work, it was found that all the water channels inside PSII have an activation energy for water permeation higher than the one in lipid membranes (Hub and De Groot 2008), thus suggesting that in PSII internal water diffusion is regulated, which is beneficial to stabilize the oxygen-evolving cluster during turnover. Atomistic MD simulations combined with in silico mutational analysis were used to characterize the role of specific residues and protonation states in controlling the long-distance hydrogen-bond networks that connect the manganese cluster region to the lumen of the thylakoid (Guerra et al. 2018).

In another work, in agreement with previous isotope labeling experiments (Beisel et al. 2010), CG trajectories of PSII (van Eerden et al. 2017a, b, c) suggested that some β-carotene (BCR) can freely diffuse in and out of PSII. The mobility of BCR in the membrane is as high as the one of lipids (see above), and it was computed to be between ~ 30 and ~ 50 μm²/s, depending both on the atomic force field used (respectively, GROMOS (de Jong et al. 2015) and OPLS (Jemioła-Rzemieńska et al. 2005)) and the lipid types present in the membrane (DPPC (de Jong et al. 2015) vs POPC (Jemioła-Rzemieńska et al. 2005)). As expected, the diffusion rates at CG resolution resulted to be about four times higher than the ones with atomistic force fields (de Jong et al. 2015). To the best of our knowledge, no experimental data are currently available on the diffusion coefficient of BCR in membranes. CG simulations of Chl a and b using specially designed Martini bead types showed a diffusion constant of approximately 0.1 μm²/s in DPPC model membranes, which is 7–8 times higher than in atomistic simulations (Debnath et al. 2015). Compared to DPPC, the observed Chl diffusion is two orders of magnitude lower. In addition, the Chls showed aggregation in the DPPC bilayer in agreement with fluorescence quenching experiments in DPPC micelles.

Another good example is the study of the motions of quinones in and out of the reaction center. The binding affinity of electron carriers to the Q_A site was quantified in a MD work on the bacterial reaction center (Madeo et al. 2011). Via steered MD, the unbinding of quinone and of the reduced anionic semiquinone form was modeled and revealed that the two forms have a similar binding affinity, despite the slower dissociation rate of charged semiquinone (Madeo and Gunner 2005). The stability of quinones at its binding sites was also observed in the case of PQ at a CG resolution (Van Eerden et al. 2017b): PQ occupying the Q_A and Q_B sites from the start of the simulations remained stationary in both sites along the whole trajectories, as expected experimentally (Diner et al. 1988; Aragão et al. 1993; Ermakova-Gerdes and Vermaas 1998). Although no spontaneous binding to the Q_B site was observed, PQ was found to enter spontaneously in Q_C sites. Q_C is an additional PQ site nearby Q_B, which was recently discovered in cyanobacteria and whose role is under debate (Guskov et al. 2009). This rate is much faster than the rate of the redox steps (Kolber and Falkowski 1993; Kern and Renger 2007), ensuring a readily available pool of PQ nearby the Q_B site. Inside the exchange channels, PQ was found to be able to reorient (flip-flop), with a flip-flop time much slower (~ 100 μs) than the one observed in bulk membranes (~ 1 μs) (van Eerden et al. 2015). PQH2 reorientation was not observed in the cavities, suggesting a much slower flip-flop time for this cofactor (> 200 μs) (Van Eerden et al. 2017b). This was attributed to differences in polarity between PQ and PQH2.

The lipid-binding sites of PSII were also analyzed in detail (Van Eerden et al. 2017a). In these simulations, with individual simulation times of more than 85 μs, the
immediate surrounding of PSII was found to be enriched in MGDG and SQDG. This enrichment was attributed to electrostatic interactions, as charged residues are involved in 12 of the 13 identified lipid-binding sites of PSII. Only binding sites for MGDG (nine) and SQDG (four) were found, which showed a large variety of residence times between 100 ns up to 86 µs (limited by the simulation time). Determination of the functional role of the observed lipid-PSII interactions was, however, limited by the absence of atomistic detail and, in this case, the absence of experimental comparison.

A recent coarse-grained study of plant light-harvesting complex II (LHCII) showed an enrichment of MGDG in the annular lipid shell of LHCII trimers (Thallmair et al. 2019) (Fig. 6B), similar to PSII. In contrast to PSII, the negatively charged SQDG was not enriched around the LHCII trimers, which might be due to the total charge of −18 of the antenna protein. The composition of the annular lipid shell of LHCII correlates well with the lipids associated with LHCII trimers purified in mild detergent conditions (Schaller et al. 2010). The cone shape of MGDG, which fits well the hour-glass shape of the LHCII trimer, was identified as the main reason for the MGDG preference (Thallmair et al. 2019).
Conformational changes of single photosynthetic subunits can take place on the nanosecond timescale (Liguori et al. 2015, 2019; Ioannidis et al. 2016; Daskalakis and Papadatos 2017). The protein can alter its conformation by locally changing the secondary structure and/or by the motion of selected domains; the pigments and cofactors bound to the protein can also move within or away from their binding pockets and/or can undergo structural deformations. Small displacements, such as motions of protein side chains or backbone fluctuations, can also occur much faster on the ps timescale (Charlier et al. 2016).

Various MD studies have shown that there is a heterogeneity in flexibility along the structure both at the level of the photosystems and of the single LHcs: as it could be expected, the most flexible domains are the ones more exposed to the membrane/water environment, i.e., external protein subunits in the case of PSII and PSI (Ogata et al. 2013; Harris et al. 2014; van Eerden et al. 2017a, b, c) or exposed protein domains in the case of isolated LHCs (Liguori et al. 2015; Thallmair et al. 2019). The most rigid parts are instead the core protein subunits of the photosystems and the core domains of the LHCs. This heterogeneity in flexibility matches the crystallographic B factors of the structures used for the MD simulations discussed here (Jordan et al. 2001; Liu et al. 2004; Umema et al. 2011) and, also, the heterogeneity measured via NMR (Sunku et al. 2013) and electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy (Dockter et al. 2012).

Importantly, structural flexibility can have a functional role in photosynthesis regulation (Ruban et al. 2012; Liguori et al. 2019) because it correlates with spectroscopic observables in several photosynthetic pigment-binding complexes (Pascal et al. 2005; van Oort et al. 2007; Liguori et al. 2013, 2017; Staleva et al. 2015; Gwizdala et al. 2016; Kondo et al. 2017). As above anticipated, single molecule (Krüger et al. 2011; Valkunas et al. 2012; Schlau-Cohen et al. 2015) and Raman spectroscopy (Pascal et al. 2005; Ruban et al. 2007) have detected conformational changes in the LHCs, but the specific domains involved in the conformational switches remained unidentified for long.

Conformational changes of an LHC were reported via MD simulations for the first time in 2015 (Liguori et al. 2015) via a set of UA simulations (GROMOS FF) on a monomeric LHCCI embedded in a model lipid membrane. This work provided structural insights to a series of previous experimental findings. For example, high disorder was systematically observed via simulations at the N-terminus, in agreement with EPR/ESR results (Dockter et al. 2012; Shabestari et al. 2014). The MD simulations revealed that the motions of the N-terminus correlate with changes in the excitonic interactions of the lowest energy site of the complex, represented by a couple of Chls (Remelli et al. 1999; Novoderezhkin et al. 2005; Müh et al. 2010) (Fig. 6C). The high disorder probed at this Chl site also agrees with several experimental findings (Liu et al. 2004; Standfuss et al. 2005; Müh et al. 2010; Vrandecic et al. 2015). In the same simulations, high disorder at a Car site (neoxanthin) was observed (Liguori et al. 2015), as expected from Raman spectroscopy (Pascal et al. 2005). Finally, a loss of a hydrogen bond at a Chl b pair was observed via MD by equilibrating (and therefore solubilizing) the crystal structure in the membrane (Liguori et al. 2015). This loss matches the H-bond loss measured at a Chl b site upon solubilization of crystalline LHCCI (Pascal et al. 2005). Based on these MD simulations (Liguori et al. 2015), it was then possible to propose which Chl b dimer is involved in the H-bond loss (Pascal et al. 2005).

The MD simulations also provided the possibility to study the effect of the protein environment of LHCCI on the structure of the bound Cars (Liguori et al. 2017). For this work, several independent MD simulations each running for about 1 μs at UA resolution (GROMOS FF) were analyzed. It was found that Cars have a different degree of conformational freedom inside their binding pocket in LHCCI and that the degree of disorder depends on the carotenoid species. This finding confirmed results from ultrafast transient absorption spectroscopy on samples of LHCCI binding astaxanthin: the presence of multiple Car conformations inside LHCCI was indeed detected and it was demonstrated that each Car geometry is associated with a different function in light-harvesting regulation (Liguori et al. 2017).

MD simulations at the CG resolution using the Martini force field revealed that Chls are sensitive to protein–protein interactions between their embedding LHCCI complex and neighboring complexes (Thallmair et al. 2019). Chls in close proximity to protein–protein interfaces in the trimeric complex exhibit less flexibility than Chls located in proximity to the protein–membrane interface. Moreover, the simulations revealed that the average chlorophyll distance in LHCCI monomers is reduced by 0.11 nm if the proteins are assembled in the trimer compared to the monomeric state (Thallmair et al. 2019). This emphasizes the importance of the trimeric state to increase the compactness of the chlorophyll packing to achieve highly efficient energy transfer.

Nowadays, different LHC genes from plants, i.e., LHCCI (Liguori et al. 2015, 2017; Balevičius et al. 2017; Thallmair et al. 2019), CP29 (Ioannidis et al. 2016; Papadatos et al. 2017) and PsbS (Daskalakis and Papadatos 2017; Liguori et al. 2019), have been simulated up to the μs timescale with atomistic resolution. Most of these works have focused in particular on characterizing how the interactions among the Chls and Cars bound to LHCs change depending on the different protein conformations sampled via MD (Liguori et al. 2019).
of studies using MD simulations in combination with QM methods. On the contrary, it was shown that QM protocols have been recently developed to compute Chl-Car couplings along an MD trajectory. Ab initio protocols have been recently developed to compute Chl-Car couplings and also, more specifically, predict the activation protocols of quenching in LHCs (Duffy et al. 2013; Balevičius et al. 2017; Fox et al. 2017; Maity et al. 2019). A brief overview of quenching in LHCs (Duffy et al. 2013; Balevičius et al. 2017; López-Tarifa et al. 2019), it was shown that the ideal point dipole approximation applied on MD trajectories provides a good description of the effects of protein dynamics on Chls–Chls excitonic interactions, without the need of more sophisticated QM methods. On the contrary, it was shown that QM methods are necessary to accurately describe changes in Chl-Car couplings along an MD trajectory. Ab initio protocols have been recently developed to compute Chl-Car couplings and also, more specifically, predict the activation of quenching in LHCs (Duffy et al. 2013; Balevičius et al. 2017; Fox et al. 2017; Maity et al. 2019). A brief overview of studies using MD simulations in combination with QM methods will be given in Sect. 4.2.

Another focus of the most recent MD simulations on LHCs has been to understand the effect of external factors, such as pH or the xanthophyll zeaxanthin, on the conformational dynamics of these proteins. Synthesis of zeaxanthin and acidification of the thylakoid lumen have been proposed to control the activation of photoprotective quenching in the LHCs (Demming et al. 1987; Müller et al. 2001; Li et al. 2009). In two separate MD works, atomistic simulations (OPLS force field) of LHCI (Papadatos et al. 2017) and CP29 (Ioannidis et al. 2016) were run for hundreds of ns in which the luminal glutamic (Glu) and aspartic (Asp) acid residues were assigned a specific protonation state. The protonation pattern was chosen to model either acidic or neutral conditions in the thylakoid lumen and was kept fixed during the whole simulation. As a result of protonation of luminal residues, a conformational change was detected at the level of helix D in both LHCCI and CP29 and such change was found to be able to modify the energetics of a selected Chl dimer (Ioannidis et al. 2016; Papadatos et al. 2017). Because from in vitro as well as in vivo results, no spectral differences are expected to be induced directly by pH in CP29 (Crimi et al. 2001) and LHCCI (Tokutsu and Minagawa 2013; Dinc et al. 2016; Liguori et al. 2016), it could be possible that the actual pKa of CP29 and LHCCI residues is too low to match the protonation pattern assigned in these simulations.

In general, protonating selected residues at the start of an MD simulation and keeping such a protonation pattern fixed throughout the simulation is a reasonable way to test how selected residues, when protonated or deprotonated, influence the dynamics of a protein. However, this choice restricts the MD sampling of the conformational space to the structures associated with that specific protonation pattern. Importantly, setting a fixed protonation pattern does not allow to simulate any specific pH values, which depend on a strict correlation between protonation states and conformations (Nielsen et al. 2011; Gunner and Baker 2016). To obtain information on the whole ensemble of protein conformations (and protonation patterns) associated with a specific pH value, non-standard MD methods need to be used. One of the most popular methods, constant pH molecular dynamics or CpHMD (Baptista and Soares 2001; Baptista et al. 2002; Machuqueiro and Baptista 2006; Oliveira et al. 2016), was applied to the stress-related complex PsbS (Liguori et al. 2019). PsbS is part of the large LHC family (Li et al. 2002a) and is pH-responsive (Li et al. 2002b, 2004), although its detailed mechanism of action is still unknown. The CpHMD work was performed at a UA resolution (GROMOS FF) by running several independent simulations at six different pH values for a total of ~ 5 μs simulated time (Liguori et al. 2019). This work showed that PsbS responds to physiologic pH changes by forming (at low pH) or losing (at high pH) a 3μ helix at the luminal side (helix H3), as reported in Fig. 6D. The pH-sensitive site has been proposed to be key for PsbS to form dimers with other subunits (Fan et al. 2015). Via CpHMD on PsbS (Liguori et al. 2019), it was also shown that the pH sensitivity of PsbS relies on the pKa of its Glu residues exposed to the lumen: in most cases, their pKa is strongly upshifted with respect to the standard value of Glu in water and matches the physiological pH values attained in the thylakoid lumen (Takizawa et al. 2007). Importantly, it was shown that such pKa shifts could not be obtained by continuum electrostatics calculations on the average conformation represented by the crystal structure, but only when taking into account the whole set of conformations equilibrated at each pH value via CpHMD. It is important to mention that the electrostatics of other photosynthetic subunits have been studied in great detail at a static level (without the use of MD simulations), in particular in the case of reaction centers to characterize the titrations and energetics associated to electron transfer processes, e.g., (Beroza et al. 1995; Lancaster et al. 1996; Ishikita and Knapp 2006).

Finally, the effect of pH and zeaxanthin on the dynamics of interactions between different LHC subunits was tested via standard MD. This was done in two separate works at atomistic (OPLS FF) (Daskalakis 2018) and CG (Martini FF) (Daskalakis et al. 2019) level. At atomistic level (Daskalakis 2018), by combining unbiased MD with enhanced sampling (molecular dynamics calculations on the average conformation represented by the crystal structure, but only when taking into account the whole set of conformations equilibrated at each pH value via CpHMD. It is important to mention that the electrostatics of other photosynthetic subunits have been studied in great detail at a static level (without the use of MD simulations), in particular in the case of reaction centers to characterize the titrations and energetics associated to electron transfer processes, e.g., (Beroza et al. 1995; Lancaster et al. 1996; Ishikita and Knapp 2006).
mobility could possibly favor aggregation of LHCII in the thylakoid membrane, one of the mechanisms proposed to regulate activation of photoprotection (Horton et al. 2005; Ruban et al. 2012).

Dynamics beyond the application range of MD

In this section, we discuss examples of studies that are beyond the typical application range of MD simulations (see Fig. 2). In doing so, we would like to give the reader a glimpse on some of the topics and questions which can be addressed using supra CG approaches (Sect. 4.1) and quantum mechanical methods (Sect. 4.2), respectively. In the latter case, we discuss some examples in which MD or QM/MM simulations provided protein-pigment configurations which were then used to investigate the electronic properties of the systems.

Supra coarse-grained approaches

Even coarser representations of (bio)molecules enable the simulation of time and length scales way beyond the order of magnitude that is accessible by atomistic or CG MD simulations (see Fig. 2). This comes at the cost of molecular details and chemical specificity, which have to be sacrificed—at least partially—in the coarser representation.

In a study comparing the diffusion constant of phosphorylated and unphosphorylated LHCII trimers, each protein complex, e.g., the LHCII trimer or the photosystem II, was treated as one CG particle applying a hard-sphere model (Drepper et al. 1993). A Monte–Carlo simulation of a thylakoid membrane patch of several 100 nm was performed to compare the diffusion constant of the two types of LHCII trimers. A similar approach was applied to study the diffusion of plastoquinol in the thylakoid membrane (Tremmel et al. 2003). More sophisticated models have been developed to study the lateral organization of proteins in the thylakoid membrane (Tremmel et al. 2005; Schneider and Geissler 2013; Lee et al. 2015).

Including electronic degrees of freedom using quantum mechanical methods

If the interest of a simulation study is not on the mesoscopic organization of the thylakoid membrane but e.g., rather on photoinduced processes and subsequent electron transfer taking place in the photosynthetic proteins, different theoretical methods are required. In this case, electronic degrees of freedom have to be considered explicitly, and thus, purely atomistic FFs are too coarse for this purpose. A common strategy is to combine a small quantum mechanically described system with a larger system treated with an atomistic FF. This method was pioneered among others by Karplus, Levitt, and Warshel who received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry in 2013 for their developments.

In many cases, atomistic MD simulations are used to sample protein dynamics on the sub-microsecond time scale around the crystal structure. Based on snapshots extracted from these simulations, quantum mechanics/molecular mechanics (QM/MM) calculations are performed to obtain detailed information about the electronic structure of the photosynthetic chromophores. Often semi-empirical QM methods are used due to the system size and the large number of calculations. In an early study, the octameric bacterial light-harvesting II (LH2) complex embedded in a model membrane was equilibrated for 2 ns before using snapshots from a picosecond-long simulation to calculate the absorption spectrum and circular dichroism spectrum of LH2 (Damjanović et al. 2002; Janosi et al. 2006; Kosztin and Schulten 2008). The simulated spectra showed that the broad absorption of the B800 ring is primarily due to fluctuations of the electric field induced by the polar environment.

Recently, a two-dimensional electronic spectrum of LH2 was presented which was modeled purely based on ab initio data (Cupellini et al. 2016; Segatta et al. 2017). The protein environment was taken into account as polarizable environment during the high-level quantum chemical calculations. In doing so it was possible to obtain an accurate description of the Car-Qx spectral region of LH2. The ab initio simulated spectra reinforced the contribution of a dark state of the Cars in this energy range (Segatta et al. 2017). The study highlighted the potential of solely ab initio-based simulation protocols.

In most studies, two-dimensional electronic spectra were calculated by using experimental observables to obtain several modeling parameters as e.g., done for LH2 (van der Vegte et al. 2015) and Fenna–Matthews–Olson (FMO) complex (Olbrich et al. 2011a). Also, the dynamics in the excited states were simulated e.g., for LH2 (van der Vegte et al. 2015), LH3 (Mallus et al. 2018), and the bacterial reaction center (Vassiliev and Bruce 2006; Zhang et al. 2014; Hsieh et al. 2019) based on snapshots extracted from MD simulations. From a theoretical point of view, including the protein environment in calculations of electronic states is challenging. Example studies of its impact on the electronically excited states were performed for the FMO complex (Olbrich et al. 2011b; Vassiliev et al. 2011) and the bacterial reaction center (Narzi et al. 2016, 2017). The impact of nanosecond protein fluctuations on excitation energy transfer and charge separation were evaluated as well for bacterial reaction centers (Vassiliev and Bruce 2006; Zhang et al. 2014; Hsieh et al. 2019; Kulik et al. 2020). MD simulations coupled to quantum chemical calculations permitted also to gain insights in the couplings of selected pairs of
chlorophylls (López-Tarifa et al. 2017) and excitation energy quenching via carotenoids in LHCII (Balevičius et al. 2017; Maity et al. 2019).

Besides the photoexcitation and energy transfer processes, also the different oxidation states of the oxygen-evolving cluster of photosystem II during water splitting in the Kok cycle were studied. Picosecond-long QM/MM dynamics provided new insights in the transition from the S2 to the S3 state (Bovi et al. 2013) and from the S3 to the S4 state (Narzi et al. 2018). The vibrational fingerprint of the oxygen-evolving complex was also studied using QM/MM dynamics simulations (Bovi et al. 2016) as well as the water channels surrounding the oxygen-evolving cluster (Reiss et al. 2019).

The interested reader is referred to the following reviews which provide a more detailed overview of the combination of MD simulations with quantum chemical calculations applied to photosynthetic pigment-protein complexes (Buda 2009; Neugebauer 2009; Segatta et al. 2019; Cupellini et al. 2019). For more general reviews on QM/MM methods, we refer the reader to Wanko et al. (2006) and Senn and Thiel (2009).

Summary and outlook

With this review, we provided a basic introduction to classical atomistic and CG MD as well as an overview of their applications to photosynthetic proteins involved in the first steps of photosynthesis.

We showed that, with classical MD, it is nowadays possible to investigate the dynamics of proteins, lipids, pigments, and cofactors in the thylakoid membrane from the (sub)nanoseconds up to the ~microseconds timescale. In particular, thanks to the development of several FFs at different levels of resolution for lipids and detergent, it is possible to study the behavior of photosynthetic protein complexes in a variety of environments that reproduce experimental conditions. In all these different conditions, we illustrated how classical MD simulations are able to give unprecedented molecular insights on the (sub)nanometer length scale in thylakoids complementing experimental findings. In doing so, MD simulations provide valuable quantitative information for the interpretation of experiments.

Importantly, the power and reliability of MD simulations very critically depend on the proper control of various conditions related to the model as well as to the simulation protocol. These conditions range from the selection of a FF compatible and validated for all components in the simulation box up to the choice of the total simulation time and the number of independent replicas which must be simulated to obtain relevant sampling.

To conclude, it must be emphasized that the large (supra)nanometer scale and (supra)millisecond timescales relevant to complex regulatory mechanisms in the thylakoid membrane represent a limit to the currently available atomistic and CG FFs. Consequently, processes such as the migration of LHCs from one photosystem to another at the base of state transitions (Allen 1995) or the full mechanisms of action of PsbS and zeaxanthin on PSII cannot (or at least have not) yet be determined. However, we can envision that future multiscale modeling, the development of increasingly more accurate CG methods, and the insertion of challenging parameters such as pH in increasingly larger and more complex simulated systems (Perilla et al. 2015; Singharoy et al. 2019) will allow MD simulations to provide structural insight on more and more complex photosynthetic processes in the thylakoid membrane.

Acknowledgements This work is supported by The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO), via a Veni Grant to N.L. and via a TOP Grant to R.C. S.T. thanks the European Commission for financial support via a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Individual Fellowship (MicroMod-PSII, Grant Agreement 748895).

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article’s Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article’s Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

References

Abrams C, Bussi G (2013) Enhanced sampling in molecular dynamics using metadynamics, replica-exchange, and temperature-acceleration. Entropy 16:163–199. https://doi.org/10.3390/e16010163

Adam S, Knapp-Mohammady M, Yi J, Bondar A (2018) Revised CHARMM force field parameters for iron-containing cofactors of photosystem II. J Comput Chem 39:7–20

Alessandri R, Souza PCT, Thallmair S et al (2019) Pitfalls of the Martini model. J Chem Theory Comput 15:5448–5460. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.9b00473

Allen JF (1995) Thylakoid protein phosphorylation, state 1-state 2 transitions, and photosystem stoichiometry adjustment: redox control at multiple levels of gene expression. Physiol Plant 93:196–205. https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1399-3054.1995.930128.x

Andersen HC (1980) Molecular dynamics simulations at constant pressure and/or temperature. J Chem Phys 72:2384–2393

© Springer
Arévalo C, Akabori K, Sasaki J et al (1993) Functional reconstitution of the primary quinone acceptor, QA, in the photosystem II core complexes. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Bioenerg 1142:36–42
Arnarez C, Uusitalo JJ, Masman MF et al (2015) Dry Martini, a coarse-grained force field for lipid membrane simulations with implicit solvent. J Chem Theory Comput 11:260–275. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct500477k
Atilgan AR, Durell SR, Jernigan RL et al (2001) Anisotropy of fluctuation dynamics of proteins with an elastic network model. Biophys J 80:505–515. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3495(01)76033-X
Balevičius V, Fox KF, Bricker WP et al (2017) Fine control of chlorophyll-carotenoid interactions defines the functionality of light-harvesting proteins in plants. Sci Rep 7:13956
Baniulis D, Yamashita E, Zhang H et al (2008) Structure-function of the cytochrome b6f complex. Photochem Photobiol 84:1349–1358
Baptista AM, Soares CM (2001) Some theoretical and computational aspects of the inclusion of proton isomerism in the protonation equilibrium of proteins. J Phys Chem B 105:293–309
Baptista AM, Teixeira VH, Soares CM (2002) Constant-pH molecular dynamics using stochiatic titration. J Chem Phys 117:4184. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1497164
Barducci A, Bonomi M, Parrinello M (2011) Metadynamics. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Mol Sci 1:826–843. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcms.31
Beale SI (1993) Biosynthesis of phycobilins. Chem Rev 93:785–802
Beisel KG, Jahneke S, Hofmann D et al (2010) Continuous turnover of carotenoids and chlorophyll a in mature leaves of Arabidopsis revealed by 14CO2 pulse-chase labeling. Plant Physiol 152:2188–2199
Bereau T, Wang Z-J, Deserno M (2014) More than the sum of its parts: coarse-grained peptide-lipid interactions from a simple cross-parametrization. J Chem Phys 140:115101. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4867465
Berendsen HJC (2007) Simulating the physical world. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
Berendsen HJC, Postma JPM, van Gunsteren WF et al (1984) Molecular dynamics with coupling to an external bath. J Chem Phys 81:3684. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.448118
Bernstein FC, Koetzle TF, Williams GJB et al (1977) The Protein Data Bank: a computer-based archival file for macromolecular structures. J Mol Biol 112:535–542
Bertoa P, Fredkin DR, Okamura MY, Feher G (1995) Electrostatic calculations of amino acid titration and electron transfer, Q-AQB→%3e QAQ-B, in the reaction center. Biophys J 68;2223–2250
Blankenship RE (2014) Molecular mechanisms of photosynthesis. Wiley, Chichester
Bovi D, Narzi D, Guidoni L (2013) The S2 state of the oxygen-evolving complex of photosystem II explored by QM/MM dynamics: spin surfaces and metastable states suggest a reaction path towards the S1 state. Angew Chem Int Ed 52:11744–11749. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201306667
Bovi D, Capone M, Narzi D, Guidoni L (2016) Vibrational fingerprints of the Mn4CaO5 cluster in photosystem II by mixed quantum-classical molecular dynamics. Biochim Biophys Acta-Bioenerg 1857:1669–1677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabi.2016.07.004
Büchel C (2019) Light harvesting complexes in chlorophyll c-containing algae. Biochim Biophys Acta-Bioenerg
Buda F (2009) Introduction to theory/modeling methods in photosynthesis, Photosynth Res 102:437
Bussi G, Donadio D, Parrinello M (2007) Canonical sampling through velocity rescaling. J Chem Phys 126:14101
Caflarri S, Koufïl R, Kereiche S et al (2009) Functional architecture of higher plant photosystem II supercomplexes. EMBO J 28:3052–3063
Ceccarelli M, Procacci P, Marchi M (2003) An ab initio force field for the cofactors of bacterial photosynthesis. J Comput Chem 24:129–142
Cerezo J, Záñiga J, Bastida A et al (2013) Conformational changes of β-carotene and zeaxanthin immersed in a model membrane through atomistic molecular dynamics simulations. Phys Chem Chem Phys 15:6527. https://doi.org/10.1039/c3cp39474X
Charlier C, Cousin SF, Ferrage F (2016) Protein dynamics from nuclear magnetic relaxation. Chem Soc Rev 45:2410–2422
Chen M, Schliep M, Willows RD et al (2010) A red-shifted chlorophyll. Science 329:1318–1319
Crimi M, Dorra D, Bösinger CS et al (2001) Time-resolved fluorescence analysis of the recombinant photosystem II antenna complex CP29. Effects of zeaxanthin, pH and phosphorylation. Eur J Biochem 268:260–267
Croce R, van Amerongen H (2014) Natural strategies for photosynthetic light harvesting. Nat Chem Biol 10:492–501. https://doi.org/10.1038/nchembio.1555
Croce R, van Grondelle R, van Amerongen H, van Stokkum I (2018) Light harvesting in photosynthesis. CRC Press, Boca Raton
Cupellini L, Jurinovich S, Campetella M et al (2016) An Ab Initio description of the excitonic properties of LH2 and their temperature dependence. J Phys Chem B 120:11348–11359. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcb.6b06585
Cupellini L, Bondanza M, Nottoli M, Mennucci B (2019) Successes and challenges in the atomistic modeling of light-harvesting and its photosregulation. Biochim Biophys Acta-Bioenerg. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabio.2019.07.004
Damjanović A, Kosztin I, Kleinekathöfer U, Schulten K (2002) Excitons in a photosynthetic light-harvesting system: a combined molecular dynamics, quantum chemistry, and polaron model study. Phys Rev E 65:31919. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.65.031919
Daskalakis V (2018) Protein–protein interactions within photosystem II under photoprotection: the synergy between CP29 minor antenna, subunit S (PsbS) and zeaxanthin at all-atom resolution. Phys Chem Chem Phys 20:11843–11855
Daskalakis E, Papadatos S (2017) The photosystem II subunit S dynamics under stress. Biophys J 113(1):2364–2372
Daskalakis V, Papadatos S, Kleinekathöfer U (2019) Fine tuning of the photosystem II major antenna mobility within the thylakoid membrane of higher plants. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Biomembr 1861(12):183059
de Jong DH, Singh G, Bennett WFD et al (2013) Improved parameters for the martini coarse-grained protein force field. J Chem Theory Comput 9:687–697. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct300646g
de Jong DH, Liguori N, van den Berg T et al (2015) Atomic and coarse grain topologies for the cofactors associated with the photosystem II core complex. J Phys Chem B 119:7791–7803. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpcb.6b08089
Debnath A, Wiegand S, Paulsen H et al (2015) Derivation of coarse-grained simulation models of chlorophyll molecules in lipid bilayers for applications in light harvesting systems. Phys Chem Chem Phys 17:22054–22063
Demmig B, Winter K, Krüger A, Czygan F-C (1987) Photoinhibition and zeaxanthin formation in intact leaves a possible role of the xanthophyll cycle in the dissipation of excess light energy. Plant Physiol 84:218–224
DeVane R, Shinoda W, Moore PB, Klein ML (2009) Transferable coarse grain nonbonded interaction model for amino acids. J Chem Theory Comput 5:2115–2124. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct800441u
Dinc E, Tian L, Roy LM et al (2016) LHCSR1 induces a fast and reversible pH-dependent fluorescence quenching in LHCII in Chlamydomonas reinhardtii cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 113:7673–7678

Diner BA, de Vitry C, Popot J-L (1988) Quinone exchange in the QA binding site of Photosystem II reaction center core preparations isolated from Chlamydomonas reinhardtii. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Bioenerg 934:47–54

Dockter C, Müller AH, Dietz C et al (2012) Rigid core and flexible terminus: structure of solubilized light-harvesting chlorophyll a/b complex (LHCII) measured by EPR. J Biol Chem 287:2915–2925. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M111.307728

Doerr S, Giorgino T, Martínez-Rosell G et al (2017) High-Throughput automated preparation and simulation of membrane proteins with HTMD. J Chem Theory Comput 13:4003–4011. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.7b00480

Drepper F, Carlborg I, Andersson B, Haehnel W (1993) Lateral diffusion of an integral membrane protein: Monte Carlo analysis of the migration of phosphorylated light-harvesting complex II in the thylakoid membrane. Biochemistry 32:11915–11922. https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00095a022

Duchène S, Siegenthaler P-A (2000) Do glycerolipids display lateral heterogeneity in the thylakoid membrane? Lipids 35:739–744

Duffy CDP, Chmeliov J, Macernis M et al (2013) Modeling of fluorescence quenching by lutein in the plant light-harvesting complex LHCII. J Phys Chem B 117:10974–10986. https://doi.org/10.1021/jp3110997

Ermakova-Gerdes S, Vermaas W (1998) Mobility of the primary electron-accepting plastoquinone QA of photosystem II in a synecochystis sp. PCC 6803 strain carrying mutations in the D2 protein. Biochemistry 37:11569–11578

Fan M, Li M, Liu Z et al (2015) Crystal structures of the PsbS protein essential for photoprotection in plants. Nat Struct Mol Biol 22:729–735

Fox KF, Balevičius V, Chmeliov J et al (2017) The carotenoid pathway: what is important for excitation quenching in plant antenna complexes? Phys Chem Chem Phys 19:22957–22968

Frank HA, Cogdell RJ (1996) Carotenoids in photosynthesis. Photochem Photobiol 63:257–264

Frenkel D, Smit B (2002) Understanding molecular simulation, 2nd edn. Academic Press, San Diego

Gan F, Zhang S, Rockwell NC et al (2014) Extensive remodeling of a cyanobacterial photosynthetic apparatus in far-red light. Science 345:1312–1317

Gao J, Wang H, Yuan Q, Feng Y (2018) Structure and function of the photosystem supercomplexes. Front Plant Sci 9:357

Guerra F, Adam S, Bondar A-N (2015) Revised force-field parameters for chlorophyll-a, pheophytin-a and plastoquinone-9. J Mol Graph Model 58:30–39

Guerra F, Siemers M, Mielack C, Bondar A-N (2018) Dynamics of long-distance hydrogen-bond networks in photosystem II. J Phys Chem B 122:4625–4641

Gunner MR, Baker NA (2016) Continuum electrostatics approaches to calculating pKas and Ems in proteins. In: Methods in enzymology. Elsevier, pp 1–20

Guskov A, Kern J, Gabdulkhakov A et al (2009) Cyanobacterial photosystem II at 2.9-Å resolution and the role of quinones, lipids, channels and chloride. Nat Struct Mol Biol 16:334

Gwizdala M, Berera R, Kirilovsky D et al (2016) Controlling light harvesting with light. J Am Chem Soc 138:11616–11622

Hamelberg D, Mongan J, McConnon JA (2004) Accelerated molecular dynamics: a promising and efficient simulation method for biomolecules. J Chem Phys 120:11919–11929. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1755656

Hansen N, van Gunsteren WF (2014) Practical aspects of free-energy calculations: a review. J Chem Theory Comput 10:2632–2647. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct500161f

Harris BJ, Cheng X, Frymier P (2014) All-atom molecular dynamics simulation of a photosystem i/detector complex. J Phys Chem B 118:11633–11645. https://doi.org/10.1021/jp507157e

Heinemeyer J, Eubel H, Wehmhöner D et al (2004) Proteomic approach to characterize the supramolecular organization of photosystems in higher plants. Phytochemistry 65:1683–1692

Hills RD, Lu L, Voth GA (2010) Multiscale coarse-graining of the protein energy landscape. PLoS Comput Biol 6:e1000827. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000827

Hoover WG (1985) Canonical dynamics: equilibrium phase-space distributions. Phys Rev A 31:1695

Horther P, Wentworth M, Ruban A (2005) Control of the light harvesting function of chloroplast membranes: the LHCII-aggregation model for non-photochemical quenching. FEBS Lett 579:4201–4206. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2005.07.003

Hsieh S-T, Zhang L, Ye D-W et al (2019) A theoretical study on the dynamics of light harvesting in the dimeric photosystem II core complex: regulation and robustness of energy transfer pathways. Faraday Discuss 216:94–115. https://doi.org/10.1039/C8FD00205C

Hub JS, De Groot BL (2008) Mechanism of selectivity in aquaporins and aquaglyceroporins. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 105:1198–1203

Hünenberger PH (2005) Thermostat algorithms for molecular dynamics simulations. Springer, Berlin, pp 105–149

Ingólfsson H, Lopez CA, Uusitalo JJ et al (2014) The power of coarse graining in biomolecular simulations. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Mol Sci 4:225–248. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcms.1169

Ioannidis NE, Papadatos S, Daskalakis V (2016) Energizing the light harvesting antenna: insight from CP29. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Bioenerg 1857:1643–1650

Ishikita H, Knapp E-W (2006) Function of redox-active tyrosine in photosystem II. Biophys J 90:3886–3896

Izrailev S, Stepaniants S, Izsakewitz B et al (1999) Steered molecular dynamics. Springer, Berlin, pp 39–65

Janosi L, Kosztin I, Damjanović A (2006) Theoretical prediction of spectral and optical properties of bacteriochlorophylls in thermally disordered LH2 antenna complexes. J Chem Phys 125:14903. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2210481

Jemiola-Rzemnińska M, Pasenkiewicz-Gierula M, Strzalka K (2005) The behaviour of β-carotene in the phosphatidylcholine bilayer as revealed by a molecular simulation study. Chem Phys Lipids 135:27–37

Jo S, Cheng X, Lee J et al (2017) CHARMGG-GUI 10 years for biomolecular modeling and simulation. J Comput Chem 38:1114–1124. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcc.24660

Johnson MP, Wientjes E (2019) The relevance of dynamic thylakoid organisation to photosynthetic regulation. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Biogenic 1857:1643–1650

Jordan P, Fromme P, Witt HT et al (2001) Three-dimensional structure to photosynthetic organisation. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Biogenic 1520:362–368

Jord˚an P, Fromme P, Witt HT et al (2001) Three-dimensional structure of cyanobacterial photosystem I at 2.5 Å resolution. Nature 411:909–917. https://doi.org/10.1038/35082000

Jørgensen WL, Maxwell DS, Tirado-Rives J (1996) Development of the OPLS all-atom force field on conformational energetics and properties of organic liquids. J Am Chem Soc 118:11225–11236

Kargul J, Barber J (2008) Photosynthetic acclimation: structural reorganisation of an integral membrane protein: Monte Carlo analysis of the migration of phosphorylated light-harvesting complex II in the thylakoid membrane. Biochemistry 32:11915–11922. https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00095a022

Kargul J, Barber J (2008) Photosynthesis Research (2020) 144:273–295

Kargul J, Barber J (2008) Photosynthetic acclimation: structural reorganisation of an integral membrane protein: Monte Carlo analysis of the migration of phosphorylated light-harvesting complex II in the thylakoid membrane. Biochemistry 32:11915–11922. https://doi.org/10.1021/bi00095a022

Kargul J, Barber J (2008) Photosynthesis Research (2020) 144:273–295

Kargul J, Barber J (2008) Photosynthesis Research (2020) 144:273–295
Kärki K, Roccatano D (2011) Molecular dynamics simulation study of chlorophyll a in different organic solvents. J Chem Theory Comput 7:1131–1140

Kästner J (2011) Umbrella sampling. Wiley Interdiscip Rev Comput Mol Sci 1:932–942. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcms.66

Ker R, Greger S (2007) Photosystem II: structure and mechanism of the water: plastoquinone oxidoreductase. Photosynth Res 94:183–202

Kraus CW, Choi B, Rhee YM (2018) Excited state energy fluctuations in the Fenna–Matthews–Olson complex from molecular dynamics simulations with interpolated chromosome potentials. Phys Chem Chem Phys 20:3310–3319

Kirchhoff H, Horstmann S, Weis E (2000) Control of the photosynthetic electron transport by PQ diffusion moduloids in thylakoids of higher plants. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Bioenergetics 1459:148–168

Kirilovsky D (2007) Photoprotection in cyanobacteria: the orange carotenoid protein (OCP)-related non-photochemical-quenching mechanism. Photosynth Res 93:7

Kolber Z, Falkowski PG (1993) Use of active fluorescence to estimate phytoplankton photosynthesis in situ. Limnol Oceanogr 38:1646–1665

Kondo T, Pinnola A, Chen WJ et al (2017) Single-molecule spectroscopy of LHCSR1 protein dynamics identifies two distinct states responsible for multi-timescale photosynthetic photoprotection. Nat Chem 9:772

Kosztin I, Schulten K (2008) Molecular dynamics methods for bioelectronic systems in photosynthesis. Biophysical techniques in photosynthesis. Springer, Dordrecht, pp 445–464

Krüger TPJ, Novoderezhkin VI, Ilioaia C, van Grondelle R (2010) Fluorescence spectral dynamics of single LHClI trimers. Biophys J 98:3093–3101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2010.03.028

Krüger TPJ, Wientjes E, Croce R, van Grondelle R (2011) Conformational switching explains the intrinsic multifunctionality of plant light-harvesting complexes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 108:13516–13521. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1105411108

Krumova SB, Dijkema C, de Waard P et al (2008) Phase behavior of phosphatidylglycerol in spinach thylakoid membranes as revealed by 31P-NMR. Biochim Biophys Acta (BBA)-Biomembr 1778:997–1003

Kühl M, Chen M, Ralph PJ et al (2005) Ecology: a niche for cyanobacterial phytoplankton photosynthesis in situ. Limnol Oceanogr 50:15222–15227

Li X-P, Gilmore AM, Caffarri S et al (2004) Regulation of photosynthetic light harvesting involves intrathylakoid lumen pH sensing by the PsbS protein. J Biol Chem 279:22866–22874. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M402461200

Li Z, Wakao S, Fischer BB, Niyogi KK (2009) Sensing and responding to excess light. Annu Rev Plant Biol 60:239–260. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.arplant.58.032806.103844

Liguori N, Roy LM, Opacic M et al (2013) Regulation of light harvesting in the green alga chlamydomonas reinhardtii: the C-terminus of LHCSR is the knob of a dimmer switch. J Am Chem Soc 135:18339–18342. https://doi.org/10.1021/ja407463

Liguori N, Periolo X, Marrink SJ, Croce R (2015) From light-harvesting to photoprotection: structural basis of the dynamic switch of the major antenna complex of plants (LHClI). Sci Rep 5:15661. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep15661

Liguori N, Natali A, Croce R (2016) Engineering a pH-regulated switch in the major light-harvesting complex of plants (LHClI): proof of principle. J Phys Chem B 120:12531–12535

Liguori N, Xu P, Van Stokkum IJM et al (2017) Different carotenoid conformations have distinct functions in light-harvesting regulation in plants. Nat Commun. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02239-z

Liguori N, Campos SRR, Baptista AM, Croce R (2019) Molecular anatomy of plant photoprotective switches: the sensitivity of PsbS to the environment, residue by residue. J Phys Chem Lett 10:1737–1742. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jpclett.9b00437

Liu Z, Yan H, Wang K et al (2004) Crystal structure of spinach major light-harvesting complex at 2.72 Å resolution. Nature 428:287–292. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02373

López CA, Rzepeia AJ, de Vries AH et al (2009) Martini coarse-grained force field: extension to carbohydrates. J Chem Theory Comput 5:3195–3210. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct900313w

López CA, Sovova Z, van Eerden FJ et al (2013) Martini force field parameters for glycolipids. J Chem Theory Comput 9:1694–1708. https://doi.org/10.1021/ct3009655

López-Tarifa P, Liguori N, van den Heuvel N et al (2017) Coulomb couplings in solubilised light harvesting complex II (LHClI): challenging the ideal dipole approximation from TDDFT calculations. Phys Chem Chem Phys 19:18311–18320

Machado MR, Barrera EE, Klein F et al (2019) The SIRAH 2.0 Force field: altius, fortius, citius. J Chem Theory Comput 15:2719–2733. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.9b00006

Machuqueiro M, Baptista AM (2006) Constant-pH molecular dynamics with ionic strength effects: protonation-conformation coupling in decalysine. J Phys Chem B 110:2927–2933. https://doi.org/10.1021/jp056565q

Madero J, Gunner MR (2005) Modeling binding kinetics at the QA site in bacterial reaction centers. Biochemistry 44:10994–11004

Madero J, Mihajlovic M, Lazaridis T, Gunner MR (2011) Slow dissociation of a charged ligand: analysis of the primary quinone QA site of photosynthetic bacterial reaction centers. J Am Chem Soc 133:17375–17385

Maiti S, Gelessus A, Daskalakis V, Kleinekathöfer U (2019) On a chlorophyll-caroteneinoid coupling in LHClII. Chem Phys 526:110439. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHEMPHYS.2019.110439

Mallus MI, Shaka Y, Prajapati JD, Kleinekathöfer U (2018) Environmental effects on the dynamics in the light-harvesting complexes LH2 and LH3 based on molecular simulations. Chem Phys 515:141–151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemphys.2018.08.013

Malone LA, Qian P, Mayneord GE et al (2019) Cryo-EM structure of the spinach cytochrome b 6 f complex at 3.6 Å resolution. Nature 575(7783):535–539

Marrink SJ, Tieleman DP (2013) Perspective on the Martini model. Chem Rev 112:249–278. https://doi.org/10.1021/cr300094w
thylakoid proteins. Biochim Biophys Acta - Bioenerg 1607:97–109. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabio.2003.09.004

Tremmel IG, Weis E, Farquhar GD (2005) The influence of protein-protein interactions on the organization of proteins within thylakoid membranes. Biophys J 88:2650–2660. https://doi.org/10.1529/BIOPHYJ.104.045666

Treuhtlin H, Schulten K, Brünger AT et al (1992) Chromophore-protein interactions and the function of the photosynthetic reaction center: a molecular dynamics study. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 89:75–79

Umena Y, Kawakami K, Shen J-R, Kamiya N (2011) Crystal structure of oxygen-evolving photosystem II at a resolution of 1.9 A. Nature 473:55–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09913

Uusitalo JJ, Ingólfsson HI, Marrink SJ, Frederix PWJM, van den Berg T, van Eerden FJ et al (2017b) Exchange pathways of plastoquinone and plastoquinol in the photosystem II complex. Nat Commun. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-02514

Vassiliev S, Mahboob A, Bruce D (2011) Calculation of chromophore excited state energy shifts in response to molecular dynamics of pigment–protein complexes. Photosynth Res 110:25–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11120-011-9689-2

Vassiliev S, Zaraiskaya T, Bruce D (2012) Exploring the energetics of water permeation in photosystem II by multiple steered molecular dynamics simulations. Biochim Biophys Acta 1817:1671–1678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbaba.2012.05.016

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.