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## 1 Supplementary Figures



Figure S1. Absorption spectra for pepEDA, pep1osy and pep1jhf at $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ recorded during CD measurements in $10 \% \mathrm{TFE} /$ water (v/v) from 190 to 250 nm at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


Figure S2: Fluorescence polarization assay for determination of the dissociation constant of the FAM-labeled peptides and soluble EGFR. Errors were calculated for three independent replicates using Gaussian error propagation. A) Anisotropy data for pep1jhf and pepEDA show no change in the anisotropy signal. Calculation of the dissociation constant could not be performed. B) For fitting a value of 0.2 anisotropy (added as black squares) was assumed for 1 M EGFR based on previous experiments with proteins and peptides of similar molecular weight and a 0.15 A change in anisotropy. This approximation results in an apparent $K_{d}$ for pep1osy of $70 \mu \mathrm{M}$.


Figure S3. Flow cytometry data analysis of cyclic peptides on A431 (A) and MCF7 (B) cells. Cells were incubated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ peptide for 15 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before measuring fluorescence signal via flow cytometry using a FACScalibur system. Overlay histograms were created using FlowJo.


Figure S4. Flow cytometry analysis of cyclic peptides on A431 cells. (A) Normalized mean fluorescence intensity. (B) Overlay histograms of flow cytometry data. Cells were incubated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ peptide for 15 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before measuring fluorescence signal via flow cytometry using a FACScalibur system.


Figure S5. Live cell imaging of cyclic FAM-labeled peptide variants incubated with A431 and MCF7 cells for 10 min at $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$. Nuclei and lysosomes were counterstained using NucBlue (second row) and Lysotracker DND-99 (third row), respectively. Fluorescence microscopy was performed at $63 \times$ magnification using an inverted laser scanning Zeiss LSM780 microscope. Scale bars are highlighted in red and represent $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$.


Figure S6. Wound healing assay analysis. The gap area over time is analyzed for each sample. Areas were calculated using ImageJ. Linear regressions were calculated to determine to growth rate. Exemplary the data analysis for control (A), hEGF (B), pep1osy (C) and pep1osy hEGF (D) are presented for one replicate.


Figure S7. Transduction experiments. (A) Transduction experiments with an independent rAAV preparation to demonstrate the reproducibility of the experiments. Pep1osy-carrying AAV2 shows significantly enhanced transduction of EGFR-expressing cells in comparison to the rAAV2 $\Delta H S P G$ variant. A431 cells were transduced with mVenus-expressing rAAV peptide variants at a MOI of 50,000. mVenus expression levels of biological duplicates were analyzed 96 hours post transduction by flow cytometry. (B) A431 and MCF7 cells were transduced at an MOI of 50,000 and analyzed for mVenus expression 96 h post transduction. AAV6 and AAV9 vectors with the wild-type capsid are compared to the peptide modified variants. We chose especially AAV6 because it was shown to have a natural tropism towards the EGFR and we thought the incorporation of EGFR-specific peptide might even increase the transduction ability [1]. Plasmids coding for Cap6 and Cap9 proteins were modified to allow for the insertion of peptides in the same position that was previously analyzed for each serotype [2,3].


Figure S8. Identification of the binding interface of pep1jhf and pep1osy. PDB files of the bound peptide to the EGFR are the results of the rational peptide design of pep1jhf (A) and pep1osy (B). Contacts between atom pairs of peptide and receptor were determined using UCSF Chimera. A cut-off of $1.0 \AA$ distance was defined to identify atoms pairs. The binding interface is highlighted in magenta (peptide) and dark blue (EGFR). (C) Alignment of the human EGFR (UniProt P00533) and the chicken EGFR (UniProt A0A1D5NZB4) was generated using Geneious. Regions identified from previous contact determination are highlighted in magenta.

## 2 Analytical Data for Cyclization



Cys-Trp-Ala-Lys-Ser-GIn-Gly-Asn-Lys-Ser-Glu-Tyr-GIn-Cys
Figure S9. Structure and sequence information for pep1jhf in linear (A) and cyclic (B) variant.
$\underline{\text { A linear; }} m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{103} \mathrm{~N}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{2} ;[\mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{H}]^{++}=815.8$; found $=815.8$




Figure S10. TIC spectra of LC-MS analysis of crude linear (A) and cyclic (B) peptide to verify cyclization by disulfide bridge formation.


Figure S11. Structure and sequence information for FAM-labeled pep1osy in linear (A) and cyclic (B) variant.

A linear FAM-labeled; $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{91} \mathrm{H}_{116} \mathrm{~N}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{25} \mathrm{~S}_{2} ;[\mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{H}]^{++}=977.4$; found $=977.4$


B cyclic FAM-labeled; $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{91} \mathrm{H}_{114} \mathrm{~N}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{25} \mathrm{~S}_{2} ;[\mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{H}]^{++}=976.9$; found $=976.9$


Figure S12. TIC spectra of LC-MS analysis of crude linear (A) and cyclic (B) peptide to verify cyclization by disulfie bridge formation.



H-Cys-Tyr-Asn-Pro-Thr-Thr-Tyr-GIn-Met-Cys-NH
Figure S13. Structure and sequence information for FAM-labeled pepEDA in linear (A) and cyclic (B) variant.

A linear FAM-labeled; $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{85} \mathrm{~N}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{3} ;[\mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{H}]^{++}=790.7$; found $=790.7$


B cyclic FAM-labeled; $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{83} \mathrm{~N}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{3} ;[\mathrm{M}+2 \mathrm{H}]^{++}=789.7$; found $=789.7$


Figure S14. TIC spectra of LC-MS analysis of crude linear (A) and cyclic (B) peptide to verify cyclization by disulfie bridge formation.

## 3 Analytical Data of Final Compounds



Figure S15. Structure and sequence information for pepEDA in linear (1), cyclic (2) and 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled cyclic variant.


Figure S16. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of linear (1) pepEDA.


Figure S17. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of cyclic (2) pepEDA.


Figure S18. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled pepEDA (3).




Figure S19. Structure and sequence information for pep1osy in linear (1), cyclic (2) and 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled cyclic variant.




Figure S20. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of linear (1) pep1osy.


Figure S21. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of cyclic (2) pep1osy.




Figure S22. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled pep1osy (3).



Cys-Trp-Ala-Lys-Ser-GIn-Gly-Asn-Lys-Ser-Glu-Tyr-GIn-Cys
Figure S23. Structure and sequence information for pep1jhf in linear (1), cyclic (2) and 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled cyclic variant.


Figure S24. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of linear (1) pep1jhf (3).


Figure S 25. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of cyclic (2) pep1jhf (3).


Figure S26. LC-MS and analytical HPLC data of 5(6)-carboxyfluorescein-labeled pep1jhf (3).

## 4 Western Blot Raw Images



Figure S27. Uncropped, untouched, full original images of the back illuminated blot-membrane image and the bioluminescent western-blot taken with the same camera.

## 5 High Resolution Mass Spectrometry

|  | Formula | $m / z_{\text {calc }}$ | $m / z_{\text {found }}$ | $\Delta$ ppm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pepEDA_1 | $\mathrm{C}_{51} \mathrm{H}_{73} \mathrm{~N}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{16} \mathrm{~S}_{3} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 610.7302 | 610.7320 | 2.83 |
| pepEDA_2 | $\mathrm{C}_{51} \mathrm{H}_{75} \mathrm{~N}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{16} \mathrm{~S}_{3} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 611.7381 | 611.7364 | 2.81 |
| pepEDA_3 | $\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{83} \mathrm{~N}_{13} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{3} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 789.7542 | 789.7510 | 4.01 |
| pep1jhf_1 | $\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{101} \mathrm{~N}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 814.8508 | 814.8536 | 3.39 |
| pep1jhf_2 | $\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{103} \mathrm{~N}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{22} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 815.8587 | 815.8574 | 1.56 |
| pep1jhf_3 | $\mathrm{C}_{89} \mathrm{H}_{111} \mathrm{~N}_{21} \mathrm{O}_{28} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 993.8747 | 993.8734 | 1.33 |
| pep1osy_1 | $\mathrm{C}_{70} \mathrm{H}_{104} \mathrm{~N}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{19} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 797.3687 | 797.3651 | 4.49 |
| pep1osy_2 | $\mathrm{C}_{70} \mathrm{H}_{106} \mathrm{~N}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{19} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 798.3765 | 798.3730 | 4.39 |
| pep1osy_3_Peak1 | $\mathrm{C}_{91} \mathrm{H}_{114} \mathrm{~N}_{20} \mathrm{O}_{25} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{HH}^{2+}$ | 976.3925 | 976.3908 | 1.69 |

1: cyclic; 2: linear, 3: cyclic + carboxyfluorescein;

## 6 General Analytical Methods

## Gradient for preparative RP-HPLC

Flow: $10 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ (Hypersil Gold C 18 column $50 \times 21.2 \mathrm{~mm}, 1.9 \mu \mathrm{M}$ particels) or $4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ (Hypersil Gold $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ column $250 \times 10.0 \mathrm{~mm}, 7 \mu \mathrm{M}$ particels)

Eluent A: water:acetonitrile:TFA, 94.9:5:0.1; Eluent B: acetonitrile:water:TFA, 94.9:5:0.1
Eluent C: water:MeOH:TFA, 94.9:5:0.1; Eluent D: MeOH:water:TFA, 94.9:5:0.1
Method 1 for pep1osy_1, pep1osy_2, pep1jhf_1, pep1jhf_2

| $\mathbf{m i n}$ | Eluent A [\%] | Eluent B [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 5 | 100 | 0 |
| 105 | 0 | 100 |

Method 2 for pepEDA_2

| min | Eluent C [\%] | Eluent D [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 100 | 0 |
| 5 | 100 | 0 |
| 105 | 0 | 100 |

Method 3 for pep1jhf_3, pepEDA_1, pepEDA_3

| $\min$ | Eluent C [\%] | Eluent D [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 80 | 20 |
| 5 | 80 | 20 |
| 85 | 0 | 100 |

Method 4 for pep1osy_3

| $\boldsymbol{m i n}$ | Eluent A [\%] | Eluent B [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 80 | 20 |
| 5 | 80 | 20 |
| 85 | 40 | 60 |

## Standard gradient for analytical RP-HPLC

Flow: $0.7 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; Eluent A: water/TFA, 99.9:0.1; Eluent B: acetonitrile/TFA, 99.9:0.1

| min | Eluent A [\%] | Eluent B [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 95 | 5 |
| 5.5 | 5 | 95 |
| 6.0 | 5 | 95 |
| 6.1 | 95 | 5 |
| 9.0 | 5 | 95 |

## Standard gradient for LC-MS

Flow: $0.3 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}, 40{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Eluent A: water/acetonitrile $/ \mathrm{HCOOH}, ~ 94.9: 5: 0.1$; Eluent B: acetonitrile/water/ $\mathrm{HCOOH}, 94.9: 5: 0.1$

| $\boldsymbol{m i n}$ | Eluent A [\%] | Eluent B [\%] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 98 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | 98 |
| 11 | 2 | 98 |
| 11.5 | 100 | 0 |
| 15 | 100 | 0 |
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