Track structure simulation of low energy electron damage to DNA using Geant4-DNA
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Abstract:
Due to the physical and chemical processes that are involved, interactions of ionizing radiations with cells lead to single- and double-strand breaks (SSB and DSB) and base damage to DNA cells. The damage may kill the cells or may lead to genetic diseases and cancers. Monte Carlo simulations of the DNA damage provides types of the damage and their frequencies. In the present work, in order to derive initial DNA damage, we used the Geant4-DNA code to simulate the physical, physico-chemical and chemical stages of interactions of incident beams of 100 eV– 4.5 keV electrons. By considering the direct damage of electrons and also the indirect radical hydroxyl damage to the DNA, in a simulation, simple and complex damages to SSB and DSB were investigated. Moreover, the yield of damage and the probability of types of DNA damage were evaluated. The results of these calculations were compared with the existing experimental data and other simulations. For electrons with energies less than 500 eV, there were differences between the results and published data, which are basically due to the existing differences in the Geant4-DNA electron cross sections and reaction rates of chemical interactions as compared to the other codes. In this code, the ionization and excitation cross-sections are smaller for low-energy electrons. In the present work, the effect of the threshold energy of the strand breaks was also evaluated.

1. INTRODUCTION

When ionizing radiation interacts with cells, the early and late biological effects are introduced. The initial effects are caused by ionization and excitation interactions, at times less than femtoseconds. Furthermore, the effects of chemical radicals are counted as the initial effects of radiations. The damage to DNA, although not clinically recognizable, may give rise to genetic instability. Eventually, the short-term and also long-term effects of damage cause changes in the cellular structure and lead to cellular obstruction or cancer.1 Understanding the mechanism of radiation damage involves knowledge of the spectrum of molecular damage that instigates initial biological lesions. Due to the differences in primary interactions and track patterns of various ionizing radiations, there are some differences in biological effects induced by such radiations. To infer the basic mechanisms of ionizing radiation interactions with cells, it is essential to determine the relevant physical, chemical, and biological parameters in cells. To study the effect of these parameters, relative data have been generated in structures of biological molecules such as DNA duplex and higher order structures. Especially, due to substantial evidence supporting the biological importance of clustered DNA damage, the DNA molecule is the likely candidate to consider. DNA damage includes single- and double-strand breaks (SSB and DSB) and is classified in the form of simple and complex breaks in cell nucleus. If the damage leads to a mis-repair or unrepair of DNA, especially DSB, this could give rise to the cell death.2–5

Ionizing radiation damage to the DNA have been studied using both theoretical and experimental methods.6,7 A quantitative study of the parameters and effects of radiations has not yet been
experimentally investigated by direct methods.\textsuperscript{8} Therefore, we studied the biophysical interactions by simulating the radiation transport in matter. The most successful track structure Monte Carlo codes for the physical (and chemical) simulations of radiation transport in matter are GEANT4-DNA\textsuperscript{9}, PITS\textsuperscript{10}, MCTS PARTRAC\textsuperscript{11}, and KURBUC\textsuperscript{5} space-time code.

In calculating the damage and type of incident radiation, parameters such as energy, cross sections of interactions, \(E_{\text{th}}\) threshold energy and probability of indirect interactions of chemical radicals with DNA influence the results of SSB and DSB.\textsuperscript{12,13} There have been published results that only considered the direct damage induced by energy deposition in the DNA molecule.\textsuperscript{14-18} Recently, there have been experimental-simulation studies performed with circular plasmid DNA by exploring Auger-electron emitted from radionuclides.\textsuperscript{19} In these studies, however, only direct damage by deposited energy in DNA using MCNP6 has been simulated. Some studies have been performed by Hahn \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{17,18} with experimental-simulation work with electron source and plasmid DNA using Geant4. In these studies, DNA damage was simulated only by direct effect of deposited energy. Pater \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{16} simulated electron beam in water medium using Geant4-DNA; in this work, however, DNA damage was computed only by the direct effect of deposited energy. In the publications that only direct interaction were considered, threshold damage energy was assumed to be lower than the commonly used threshold (appropriate threshold energy by the experimental findings = 17.5 eV). The lower damage threshold compensated the ignored indirect damage. In addition, some previous works simulated DNA damage induced by both physical and chemical interactions.\textsuperscript{11,20,21} Recently, Friedland \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{22} calculated DNA damage with primary light ions using PARTRAC code. Moreover, Meylan \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{23} simulated fibroblast cell nucleus using Geant4-DNA with proton beam and presented a new calculation chain based on the Geant4-DNA code.

In this work, we used the Geant4-DNA (Geant4 version 10.2) code to simulate electrons with energies ranging from 100 eV to 4.5 keV in water and studied DNA damage. The aim was to calculate initial damage exerted on DNA by incident electrons (or other radiations) using the Geant4-DNA code, which simulated both physical and chemical interactions. In addition, the \(Y_{\text{SSB}}\) and \(Y_{\text{DSB}}\), and complexity of the damage are reported. We also studied the effect of the threshold energy in the calculations. Moreover, we compared the \(Y_{\text{SSB}}\) and \(Y_{\text{DSB}}\) (induced by electrons) with the corresponding published simulations and experimental DNA damage yields.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2-1. Monte Carlo Electron Simulation Considering Physical and Chemical Processes

This work was performed using the Geant4-DNA (Geant4 version 10.2) code, which uses Monte Carlo technique for radiation-transport. The code follows the history of electron interactions in water by performing physical and chemical interactions. The Geant4-DNA code simulates physical interactions of primary and secondary electrons in the defined volume, and reports the interaction details such as energy transfer and coordinates of initial and secondary interactions.\textsuperscript{9,24,25} The particles are tracked through the defined geometrical region and if a particle exits from the original mother volume, it is disregarded in the simulation.

The Geant4-DNA code is suitable for simulating the particle transport in water including physical and chemical interactions. In the current work and most other previous similar works, water cross sections were used. The cross sections used for physical interactions are the latest model used in Geant4 (version 10.2) and they have become more precise compared to previous models.\textsuperscript{26} In the recent cross section, all physical interactions such as elastic, ionization, excitation and Auger cascade processes are taken into consideration.\textsuperscript{9,27} The cross sections used in simulations of this work followed the original model of Geant4-DNA with 7.4 eV energy cutoff for electrons (electrons with lower energy than this value deposit all their kinetic energy at this interaction point).
This study consisted of three stages. The first stage was the physical stage in which simulation of physical interactions of primary and secondary particles in water was considered until they reached the energy or geometrical cutoff. The second stage was the chemical stage which included the simulation of physico-chemical and chemical processes up to $10^{-9}$ seconds. The third was the damage formation stage in which a written algorithm determined types of damage in terms of complexity according to definition of damage spectra by Nikjoo et al.\textsuperscript{12} At the end of the physical stage, the coordinates and deposited energy during each step of the ionization and excitation interaction were derived from the code. Furthermore, at the end of the chemical stage, the coordinates of the produced radicals in the environment (water) were determined after $10^{-9}$ seconds. Table 1 displays the radicals and chemical interactions as well as the reaction rates, respectively, according to the Geant4 chemical model and experimental data. All the electron interactions including excitation, ionization, and cascade processes were simulated. The significance of studying chemical radicals and molecules has been proven in previous experimental studies.\textsuperscript{28,29} When the physical stage was terminated, the primary and secondary electrons were thermalized and they entered into the chemical stage ($10^{-15}$-$10^{-9}$ s). In this stage, the chemical radicals and molecules of $H_2O_2, H_2, e_{aq}, OH^-, OH^+$. $H^+$ and $H^+$ were produced in the environment. Then, chemical reactions occurred between molecules and radicals. In Table 1, these reactions are presented as they exist in the Geant4 code. In order to limit the time for this stage, the chemical stage duration was set to $10^{-9}$ seconds.
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Table 1. Chemical interactions and radicals produced in the Geant4\textsuperscript{30} and experimental works (Exp.)\textsuperscript{31}  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Reaction Rate (Geant4) (dm$^3$mol$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Reaction Rate (Exp.) (dm$^3$mol$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_2 + OH^+ \rightarrow H^+ + H_2O$</td>
<td>$4.17 \times 10^7$</td>
<td>$4.5 \times 10^7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH^+ + OH^- \rightarrow H_2O$</td>
<td>$0.44 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$0.6 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$e_{aq} + e_{aq} + 2H_2O \rightarrow 2OH^- + H_2$</td>
<td>$0.50 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^+ + H^+ \rightarrow H_2$</td>
<td>$1.20 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$1.0 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2O_2 + e_{aq} \rightarrow OH^- + OH^+$</td>
<td>$1.41 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$1.3 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^+ + OH^- \rightarrow H_2O$</td>
<td>$1.44 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$2.0 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3O^+ + e_{aq} \rightarrow H^+ + H_2O$</td>
<td>$2.11 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$1.7 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H^+ + e_{aq} + H_2O \rightarrow OH^- + H_2$</td>
<td>$2.65 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$OH^+ + e_{aq}^- \rightarrow OH^-$</td>
<td>$2.95 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3O^+ + OH^- \rightarrow 2H_2O$</td>
<td>$14.3 \times 10^{10}$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-2. Simulation Geometry and Parameters

To simulation were performed in a spherical water media with an isotropic electron source at the center of the sphere. As mentioned, the primary and secondary electrons and chemical radicals were simulated using the Geant4-DNA code. The number of the primary electrons for each simulation was selected to reduce the uncertainty of the simulations below ±5%. For a proper distribution of DNA in the working volume sphere (WVS), and in order to reach a good statistical sampling, we had to sample a large number of DNAs ($2 \times 10^4$-$10^5$). The DNAs were produced through the $\mu$-randomness method.\textsuperscript{32} The sampling accuracy was tested using two criteria.\textsuperscript{33,34} In the first test, the ratio of energy deposition in the original sphere to its volume was compared to the ratio of energy deposition in the DNAs to their volumes. The criteria for a good sampling were the ratios of energy deposition within 5% uncertainty. In the second test, the mean specific energy frequency $\bar{Z}_f$ (Eq. (1) and (2)) of the DNAs with the radius and length of 2.3 nm was calculated and compared to the deposited energies frequency $f$ (>0) (Eq. (3)).\textsuperscript{35,36}
\[
\tilde{z}_f = \frac{\int_0^\infty z f(z)dz}{\int_0^\infty f(z)dz}
\]

(1)

The above equation can be written as follows using the reference.\(^{32}\)

\[
\tilde{z}_f = \frac{\int_0^\infty (1-F(z))dz}{\int_0^\infty f(z)dz}
\]

(2)

where the distribution function, \(F(z)\), is the probability that the specific energy is equal to or less than \(z\) and the probability density, \(f(z)\), is the derivative of \(F(z)\) with respect to \(z\).

\[
f(\geq \varepsilon) = N(1 - \int_0^\varepsilon f(\varepsilon')d\varepsilon')
\]

(3)

where \(N\) is the number of hits per dose unit and \(f(\varepsilon')\) is the energy distribution frequency density for which the energy is smaller or equal to \(\varepsilon'\). For the second test, the following criterion should be established: \(f(\geq \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{\tilde{z}_f}\). If the difference between the above tests was more than 5%, the sampling would be repeated with a larger number of DNAs.\(^3\)

2-3. DNA Model Used in the Simulation

Two types of DNA models have been employed earlier to model the DNA damage. Charlton et al.\(^{37}\) and Nikjoo et al.\(^{12,13,38}\) used the B-DNA model. This model consists of a cylinder divided into sugar-phosphate and base regions without considering the details of atomic structures in oligonucleotides. The sugar-phosphate chains surround the center of a cylinder with a 10 Å-diameter and a 36-degree helical rotation. The DNA molecule diameter is 23 Å. Another common DNA model is Phosphodiesters Groups (PDG) which consists of prisms with circular center bases used in the works of Bernal et al.\(^{39,40}\) Friedland et al.\(^{41,42}\) also used the PDG model and defined the position of phosphor, oxygen, hydrogen and carbon atoms with van der Waals radius. Semenenko and Stewart,\(^{43,44}\) instead of using the DNA model, used the genome distances in the MCDS code.

In this work, the DNA model used was a B-DNA type similar to the model used in Nikjoo et al.\(^{12,13}\) The B-DNA model is one of the most common kinds of double helix DNA types found in cells.\(^{45-47}\) The length of the DNA model in this work was 216 bp and its diameter was 23 Å and consisted of 432 nucleotides. Each nucleotide consisted of a sugar-phosphate backbone and a base group of four species of Adenine, Cytosine, Guanine, and Thymine.

2-4. Direct Interactions and Threshold Energy \(E_{\text{ssb}}\)

DNA damage induced by ionizing radiations is direct or indirect. For a direct damage, a threshold energy (\(E_{\text{th}}\)) is determined. \(E_{\text{th}}\) is the least amount of energy required to cause break in each strand of DNA. The possibility of direct damage might be determined through the comparison of \(E_{\text{th}}\) in a nucleotide with quantities such as the total deposited,\(^{13,48}\) maximum deposited,\(^{49}\) total transferred and maximum transferred energy\(^{39,40}\). In the present work, we studied the total deposited energy (in all events) for examining the possibility of direct damage. For \(E_{\text{th}}\), different values have been chosen in different works. The mostly used threshold energy is 17.5 eV\(^{13,23,37}\) and 10.79 eV\(^{15,16,48}\). For DNA damage simulations that indirect damage by chemical radicals was not considered, the threshold energy was chosen as \(E_{\text{th}} = 10.79\) eV. In this work, given the chemical radicals effects and indirect damage yield, the threshold energy was chosen as 17.5 eV. However, 17.5 eV has been found to be an appropriate threshold energy given by the experimental findings of the spectrometry of Auger electrons\(^{50}\) and I-125 experiments\(^{51,52}\). In the following parts of the article, the damage threshold energy \(E_{\text{th}}\) was considered equal to \(E_{\text{ssb}}\). If the total energy deposition in the nucleotide sugar-phosphate groups
is equal or more than the $E_{\text{ssb}}$, strand break (SB) occurs. In Figure 1, the DNA molecule and SB is shown. When low-energy electrons reach the C-O chain $\pi^*$ orbital of the DNA nucleotide, they can cause SB in DNA. This process has been shown by Barrios et al. through Abinitio electron structure.\textsuperscript{53}

2-5. Indirect Interaction and Hydroxyl Radical Damage

In the chemical stage, chemical radicals and molecules interact according to Table 1 and $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2, \text{H}_2, e_{\text{aq}}, \text{OH}^-, \text{OH}^+, H^+, H^+$ radicals and molecules are produced in the environment. Amongst these types of radicals, hydroxyl radical (OH*) is the most common due to its capability to interact with the DNA molecule.\textsuperscript{54,55} The $e_{\text{aq}}, \text{OH}^+, \text{H}^+$ radicals interact with the DNA sugar and base groups of nucleotides. The likelihood of hydroxyl radical interaction is much more compared to the other two radicals: $e_{\text{aq}}$ and $H^+$.\textsuperscript{56} Thus, the hydroxyl radical share in causing damage in DNA is investigated. Hydroxyl radical interacts with sugar-phosphate groups or nucleobases and produces sugar or base radicals.\textsuperscript{57} The probability of hydroxyl radical interacting with the base and sugar-phosphate is 80% and 20%, respectively. Therefore, the sugar radicals produced due to the interaction of hydroxyl with sugar-phosphate lead to SB with a 65% probability. Consequently, the probability of SB damage (indirect damage) due to the interactions of hydroxyl radical with DNA nucleotides is equal to 13%.\textsuperscript{58} Although the damage probability of hydroxyl radical is between 0.02% to 20%, the common value for the damage probability is $P_{\text{OH}} = 13\%$.\textsuperscript{12,59}

\textbf{Figure 1.} The DNA molecule containing base, sugar, and phosphate chains. In the arrow position, the electron interacts with the C-O chain and produces SB in the DNA molecule.

2-6. Damage Mechanism and its Categorization

We developed a C++ program to sample a large number of B-DNAs in the WVS. We also developed a Python program to compute the damage distances to find the closest nucleotide to the energy deposition points and the coordinates of hydroxyl radicals. Having the $E_{\text{ssb}}$ and $P_{\text{OH}}$, we then specified the types of
the DNA damage. In order to perform the sampling method mentioned in the section 2-2, we chose a large number of DNAs so that for all primary electrons of specific energy, at least $10^4$ DNAs had a minimum of one hit. These samples were distributed randomly in the WVS in different directions. The direct or indirect damage induced to the opposite strands of the DNA within less than 10 bp is considered as DSB. The different types of the DNA damage are divided into two categories of simple and complex. Complex damage includes SSB+, DSB+, and DSB++. Figure 2 shows different types of DNA damage. To categorize damage, various models have been presented by different authors such as Friedland et al., Bernal et al., Nikjoo et al., Charlton et al., and Pater et al. In this work, the damage was categorized using Nikjoo’s definition. In Nikjoo’s definition the damage are named accordingly as DSB++, DSB+, DSB, SSB+, 2SSB, SSB and NB (no break).

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2.** Model of the DNA damage induced by direct energy deposition and reaction of OH radicals. For ease of observation, the DNA is shown as four untwisted linear lines. The solid lines at the top and bottom represent the sugar-phosphate (S-P) backbone; the two dash lines represent the bases. ‘×’ represents an SB in DNA. If two ‘×’s are on opposite strands within 10bp of each other, it will be considered a DSB. If two SSBs are more than 10 bp apart, it is denoted by 2SSB, and if two SSBs are 10 bp apart, but on the same strand of DNA, it is denoted by SSB+. A double strand break accompanied by one (or more) additional single strand break within 10 bp separation is denoted by DSB+. More than one double strand break on the segment within the 10 bp separation is denoted by DSB++. The NB (no break) category refers to a DNA without any SBs.

3- RESULTS

For simulating direct and indirect damage to DNA, we assumed a water sphere. The electron source was located in the center and emitted electrons in random directions. The electron energies for the sources were 100 eV, 300 eV, 500 eV, 1 keV, 1.5 keV, and 4.5 keV. The physical and chemical interactions of the electrons in the water environment were simulated with $10^3 – 10^4$ history. The direct and indirect DNA damage induced by electrons was calculated using an algorithm written in the Python program, given a threshold energy of $E_{\text{ssb}}=17.5$ eV (or 30 eV) and hydroxyl radical interaction probability of $P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13$. The damage was categorized and studied according to Nikjoo’s method presented in Figure 2. In Table 2, the calculated relative yields of different types of strand breaks have been displayed for the threshold energy of $E_{\text{ssb}} = 17.5$ eV and hydroxyl radical interaction probability of $P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13$. When damage occurs on sugar-phosphate, it can lead to simple damage (SSB and DSB)
or complex damage (DSB++, DSB+, SSB+). There are other types of complex damage categorized as SSBc (= SSB* + 2SSB) and DSBc (= DSB* + DSB**),\(^4\) which were calculated in this work and presented in Tables 2 and 4. In Figure 3, the relative damage yields predicted by this work is compared with the results of Nikjoo \textit{et al.}\(^3,\textsuperscript{13}\) with the CPA100, code and also with those of Taleei \textit{et al.}\(^2\textsuperscript{11}\) with the KURBUC\textsubscript{liq} code.

\textbf{Table 2}. Relative yield of the strand breaks classified by damage complexity with \(E_{\text{sub}} = 17.5\) eV and \(P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy eV</th>
<th>No Break %</th>
<th>SSB %</th>
<th>SSB+ %</th>
<th>2SSB %</th>
<th>DSB %</th>
<th>DSB+ %</th>
<th>DSB++ %</th>
<th>SSBc %</th>
<th>DSBc %</th>
<th>(Y_{\text{SSB}}) Gy\textsuperscript{-1}Gbp\textsuperscript{1}</th>
<th>(Y_{\text{DSB}}) Gy\textsuperscript{-1}Gbp\textsuperscript{1}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.72</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>21.98</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>70.88</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>45.41</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>61.77</td>
<td>36.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>38.81</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>38.77</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>35.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>34.01</td>
<td>80.48</td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>42.78</td>
<td>34.03</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>32.07</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>68.01</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>66.35</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>104.01</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 3}. Comparison of the DNA damage spectra predicted by this work (grey), Nikjoo’s (red), and Taleei’s (blue) for 100 eV (a), 300 eV (b), 500 eV (c), 1000 eV (d), 1500 eV (e), and 4500 eV (f) electrons with \(E_{\text{sub}} = 17.5\) eV and \(P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13\)
In Figure 4, the Yield_{SSB} and Yield_{DSB} values of the current work and previous experimental and simulation works are compared. In this figure, the yield values for our simulation DSB damage are compared to Yield_{DSB} in de Lara et al.’s study,7 which was measured with Chinese hamster cells (Figure 4-a). Moreover, our findings are compared to Nikjoo et al.’s simulation with the CPA100 code,4,12,13 Semenenko and Stewart’s simulation with the MCDS code,43,44 Bernal and Liendo’s simulation with the PENELOPE code,39 and Friedland et al.’s simulation with the PARTRAC code41,46 (Figure 4 - b and c). In order to study the effect of the threshold energy of E_{thb}, we calculated the simple and complex SSB and DSB values at threshold energies of 30.0, 21.1, 17.5, 15.0, 12.6 eV, which were the most commonly used threshold energies in previous works. For this purpose, at 300 eV energy, assuming indirect interaction was not present, we calculated the ratio of the total number of DSB to the total SSB (SSB_{total} = SSB + 2 × \{SSB^+ + 2SSB\} + DSB^+ and DSB_{total} = DSB + DSB^+ + 2 × DSB^{++} from ref. 16). This test was performed on 10^4 molecules of DNA in the WVS. The SSB_{total}/DSB_{total} ratio fluctuates from 1.91 to 8.16. Table 3 lists the damage calculation yields at different threshold energies. As seen in Table 3, by increasing the threshold energy E_{thb}, the ratio of SSB_{total}/DSB_{total} increases. It can be seen that the induced DNA damage is strongly dependent on E_{thb}.

**Figure 4.** Comparison of the yield values between the experimental (Exp.) and simulation (Sim.) with current study. (a) comparison of the yield values of this work for the DSB damage with those of the experimental results; (b) and (c) comparison of the yield values of current srufy for the DSB (b) and SSB (c) damage with the simulation results of Nikjoo (CPA100), Semenenko (MCDS), Bernal (PENELOPE) and Friedland (PARTRAC)
Table 3. Threshold energy dependence for direct damage with zero OH radical activation probability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold Energy</th>
<th>SSB</th>
<th>SSB+</th>
<th>2SSB</th>
<th>DSB</th>
<th>DSB+</th>
<th>DSB++</th>
<th>Total SSB/DSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.6 eV</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0 eV</td>
<td>1069</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.5 eV</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.1 eV</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0 eV</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the calculated relative yields of different types of strand breaks, considering $E_{ssb} = 30.0$ eV and $P_{OH} = 0.13$. In addition, Figure 5 presents the relative damage yields predicted by current study for the threshold energies of 30.0 eV and 17.5 eV with an equal indirect damage probability ($P_{OH} = 0.13$). In this figure it is observed that with the increase of $E_{ssb}$, the probability of complex DSB damage decreases. Also, the probability of hits without the NB damage increases. In Figure 6, the yield values for the threshold energies of 30.0 eV and 17.5 eV with equal indirect damage probability ($P_{OH} = 0.13$) are compared. Comparing the results corresponding to threshold energy of 30.0 eV and 17.5 eV, $Y_{SSB}$ and $Y_{DSB}$ decrease. $Y_{DSB}$ for either of the threshold energies decreases as a function of primary electron energy. Moreover, the highest drop rate was observed for 4.5 keV energy and as the energy increased, the relative reduction of the yield also increased.

Table 4. Relative yield of the strand breaks classified by damage complexity with $E_{ssb} = 30.0$ eV and $P_{OH} = 0.13$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy eV</th>
<th>No Break %</th>
<th>SSB %</th>
<th>SSB+ %</th>
<th>2SSB %</th>
<th>DSB %</th>
<th>DSB+ %</th>
<th>DSB++ %</th>
<th>SSBc %</th>
<th>DSBC %</th>
<th>Y_{SSB} Gy^{-1}Gbp^{-1}</th>
<th>Y_{DSB} Gy^{-1}Gbp^{-1}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>59.39</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>44.64</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>38.04</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>68.83</td>
<td>21.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>50.97</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>28.61</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>58.63</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>47.69</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4500</td>
<td>76.03</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>69.36</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4- DISCUSSION

In this work, a large number of electron events were transported from the center of the water sphere. The primary electron interactions were simulated by the Geant4-DNA code. Subsequently, the yield of damage in the DNA samples was calculated, in a process we referred here as damage formation stage.

Figure 5. Comparison of the DNA damage spectra predicted by this work with $E_{\text{ssb}} = 17.5$ eV (grey) and $E_{\text{ssb}} = 30.0$ eV (cyan) with $P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13$ for 100 eV (a), 300 eV (b), 500 eV (c), 1000 eV (d), 1500 eV (e), and 4500 eV (f) electron

Figure 6. Comparison of SSB (a) and DSB (b) yield values for $E_{\text{ssb}} = 17.5$ eV and $E_{\text{ssb}} = 30.0$ eV with $P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13$ for 100 eV to 4.5 keV primary electrons
Table 2 presents the calculated relative yields of different types of strand breaks for primary electrons, assuming \( E_{\text{lab}} = 17.5 \text{ eV} \) and \( P_{\text{OH}} = 0.13 \). The results showed that the probability of SSB, of energies ranging from 100 eV to 1 keV increased and then decreased. Moreover, the probability of DSB, for energies from 300 eV to 4.5 keV decreased. The minimum and maximum \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) occurred at 4.5 keV and 300 eV energies, respectively. Moreover, the least and most \( \text{Yield}_{\text{SSB}} \) was at 300 eV and 4.5 keV energies, respectively. In Figure 3, the relative damage yields predicted by this work, have been compared with those of Nikjoo et al using the CPA100 code and also those of Taleei et al using the KURBUC\textsubscript{liq} code. The probability of simple SSB calculated in this work for energies ranging from 100 eV to 500 eV (Figures 3-a, b, and c) was less than Nikjoo and Taleei’s calculations, and for energies ranging from 1 keV to 4.5 keV (Figures 3-d, e, and f) was more than Nikjoo and Taleei’s results. Moreover, the probability of the DSB damage, especially complex DSB, was more than Nikjoo and Taleei’s studies. However, the trend of the probability of simple and complex damage yields as a function of energy is similar to the Nikjoo and Taleei results. In Figure 4-a, the \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) values were compared with experimental results of de Lara. The relative difference of \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) between our results and de Lara’ results was 4.7\% to 54.1\% at 1 keV and 4.5 keV, respectively. In Figure 4-b, the \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) of previous simulations have been compared with the results in this work. The \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) in this study at 1 keV and higher energies are closer to those of other works. At energies of about 500 eV and 300 eV in Figure 4-b, there were differences between various studies, which is mainly due to the difference in the cross sections, reaction rates. The relative difference of \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) in our simulation with comparison to Nikjoo’s results was between 0.05\% at 100 eV and 62.7\% at 500 eV. Moreover, the relative difference of our results and Semenenko’s was between 24.3\% at 1 keV and 58.1\% at 100 eV. The \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) difference at 1.5 keV was 34.2\% in Benal’s simulation and 14.1\% in Friedland’s simulation. Figure 4-c shows that the trend of changes were similar to Nikjoo’s results. The computed \( \text{Yield}_{\text{SSB}} \) in current study were close to those obtained in the works of Friedland and Bernal.

The differences in the DSB and SSB yield observed in figure 4 is primarily due to differences in Geant4-DNA ionization, excitation cross sections.\(^{62,63}\) For example, there are differences between the excitation cross sections of the CPA100 and Geant4-DNA codes which are shown to be about an order of magnitude different for electron energies higher than 100 eV.\(^{63}\) The cross sections of the CPA100 ionization model are in closer agreement to experimental data as compared to the other models.\(^{64}\) Although for electrons with energies higher than 100 eV, which ionization is known to be the most important process, the ionization cross sections in Geant4-DNA are in a reasonable agreement with the ones in CPA100.\(^{65}\) It is also worth to mention that the maximum of the total excitation cross section in Geant4-DNA is shown to be lower than the one from the PARTRAC code.\(^{65}\)

Moreover, reaction rates listed in Table 1 for the Geant4 chemical model and experimental data, it can be observed that the chemical reaction rates of the hydroxyl radicals with other molecules and radicals (including other OH) are less in Geant4-DNA. Moreover, the production rate values of the hydroxyl radicals are larger in Geant4-DNA as compared to the other experimental values (see the fifth row of Table 1). Therefore, in the Geant4 code, more hydroxyl radicals reacted in the environment and the share of indirect damage was higher. At 500 eV and close to 300 eV energies (Figures 4-a and b), due to the models of electron interactions and chemical reactions in the Geant4-DNA code, the deposited energy of ionization and excitation was closer to the produced hydroxyl radicals after electron full-stop and thus, caused more DSBs, especially complex DSB (Figure 3 and Table 2). This led to an increase in \( \text{Yield}_{\text{DSB}} \) and decrease in \( \text{Yield}_{\text{SSB}} \).

Generally, the differences between the yield values in different codes are due to the difference in the physical and chemical models of Geant4-DNA, the chemical processes considered in the simulations, and DNA geometry. For example, in KURBUC code, the key criteria were threshold energy and accurate chemical interaction probability to determine the yield of SB.\(^{4}\) However, in PARTRAC code, the main criterion was linear acceptation probability (an increasing probability from
zero for a deposited energy less than 5 eV, to 1 when it exceeds 37.5 eV). Moreover, in our simulation, the action of hydroxyl radical interacting with base and base damage was not taken into consideration. The latter effect was also ignored in other published simulations; however, they can affect the SB damage yield. Additionally, the uncertainty of the simulations increase at lower electron energies.

For studying direct effects, the dependence on the threshold energy $E_{\text{th}}$ was investigated (see Table 3). The ratio of $SSB_{\text{total}}/DSB_{\text{total}}$ determines the sensitivity of the energetics of the DNA damage with variation of threshold energy for induction of SSB and DSB. Table 4 presents the results with assuming $E_{\text{th}} = 30.0$ eV. The change in the trend of the probability and the yield of SSB and DSB was similar to that in Table 2 ($E_{\text{th}} = 17.5$ eV). Figure 5 compares relative damage yields predicted by this work for two different $E_{\text{th}}$ (17.5 and 30.0 eV). As the threshold energy increases, due to reduction in multi strand breaks on a DNA, in all figures, the probability of simple and complex DSBs decreases. Moreover, the probability of SSB increases at energies equal to or less than 1 keV (Figures 5-a, b, c, and d). However, with increasing energy (Figures 5-e, and f) due to a reduction in the overall share of SBs through the threshold energy, SSB probability decreases. It is apparent that the results may have been dependent on parameter assumptions in simulation. In Figure 6, which shows the yields comparison at two threshold energies of 17.5 eV and 30.0 eV, it can be observed that Yield$_{SSB}$ and Yield$_{DSB}$ decreases as the threshold energy increases (Figures 6-a, and b). The Yield$_{SSB}$ drop rate was between 2.7% and 33.3% at 100 eV and 4.5 keV energies (Figure 6-a). Moreover, the rate of decrease for Yield$_{DSB}$ changed from 4.58% to 69.04% at 100 eV and 1.5 keV energies (Figure 6-b).

5- CONCLUSION
The main purpose of this work was to simulate the frequency of simple and complex damages in a B-DNA model using the Geant4-DNA code. Using the track structure simulation tools, we were able to simulate energy deposition of the physical processes and chemical reactions of OH radicals in the DNA model. This work was performed by simulating physical and chemical stages using Geant4-DNA and an analysis algorithm using Python program. In this work, we used large number of electron events that were randomly transported from the water sphere center with energies ranging from 100 eV to 4.5 keV. Then, the probability of simple and complex damages as well as that of the Yield$_{SSB}$ and Yield$_{DSB}$ was calculated. Further, the effect of $E_{\text{th}}$ amounts in the calculations was studied. These calculations showed the dependence of the direct DNA damage with the threshold energy. In addition, we compared the results of this work with the corresponding simulations and experimental DNA damage results induced by electrons. There were differences between the results of this work and those of others works, especially at energies below 500 eV. We believe that the reasons for the differences are due to the difference in the physical and chemical models of Geant4-DNA with other codes, the type of chemical processes considered in simulation, DNA geometry, and the selected parameters for damage threshold.
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