

DNA Unzipping as \mathbf{PT} -Symmetry Breaking Transition

Tanmoy Pal,¹ Ranjan Modak,² and Bhabani Prasad Mandal³

¹*Department of Biochemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A8, Canada*

²*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati, Tirupati, India 517619*

³*Department of Physics, Institute of Science, BHU, Varanasi 221005, India*

We show that classical DNA unzipping transition which is equivalently described by quantum mechanical localization-delocalization transition in the ground state of non-Hermitian Hatano-Nelson Hamiltonian is underpinned by generalized parity (\mathbf{P})-time reversal (\mathbf{T}) symmetry breaking transition. We also study the one dimensional discretized version of Hatano-Nelson model in the presence of the single impurity and quasiperiodic potential on a finite-size lattice. Our results show that these models undergo a phase transition from a \mathbf{PT} unbroken phase to a broken phase. Interestingly, the generalized \mathbf{PT} phase transition points also coincide with the localization-delocalization transition for both the models.

INTRODUCTION

Opening up of double stranded DNA (dsDNA), a process known as DNA unzipping, is the first step towards commencement of several life-sustaining physiological processes e.g. DNA-replication, RNA transcription etc. [1, 2]. *In vivo*, DNA unzipping is carried out by a special class enzymes called “helicase” by means of applying mechanical force that is experimentally measured to be ~ 10 -15 pN [3, 4]. In a rather surprising result, DNA unzipping was shown to be a classical equivalent to localization-delocalization transition of the ground state of a quantum particle whose motion is dictated by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian [5, 6] originally introduced by Hatano and Nelson to describe pinning-depinning transition of a flux-line to a linear defect in Type-II superconductors [7, 8]. In further development, an ample amount of numerical and theoretical work reaffirmed that mechanical unzipping of dsDNA is a genuine first order phase transition process in which dsDNA unzips completely when the applied unzipping force exceeds a critical value [9–13]. However, a crucial question still remains unanswered: what is the accompanied symmetry breaking in unzipping transition and what is its quantum picture equivalent?

Success of Hatano-Nelson (HN) Hamiltonian in describing real physical systems has generated much interest in non-Hermitian quantum mechanics. Subsequently, strict self-adjointness requirement of Hamiltonians of usual quantum mechanical formulation has been relaxed to Hamiltonians that remain unchanged under combined effect of discrete \mathbf{P} and \mathbf{T} symmetry [14, 15]. Such non-Hermitian \mathbf{PT} symmetric systems generally exhibit a phase transition (or more specifically a \mathbf{PT} symmetry breaking transition) that separates two regions of a Hermiticity breaking parameter: (i) region of the unbroken \mathbf{PT} symmetry in which the entire spectrum is real and eigenstates of the systems respect \mathbf{PT} symmetry and (ii) a region of the broken \mathbf{PT} symmetry in which the whole spectrum (or a part of it) appears as complex conjugate pairs and the eigenstates of the systems do not respect \mathbf{PT}

symmetry [14–24]. This formulation of complex quantum mechanics created remarkable interest in several fronts of physics including open quantum systems, scattering theory, optics [25–27] etc. Particularly, the theory of non-linear optics where several physical processes are known to follow Schrödinger like equations, provides a fertile ground to verify the implications of such formulations experimentally. \mathbf{PT} symmetric complex potentials are realised through complex refractive index in the optical media and the consequence of \mathbf{PT} phase transition has been experimentally realised in optics [28]. This created an avalanche in the study of non-Hermitian quantum theories [16, 29]. The applicability of this path breaking formulation of complex quantum theories thus relies on the observing \mathbf{PT} phase transition in various physical systems. In this context, it is also important to point out that in quantum mechanics the decomposition of the anti-unitary operator $\mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{UK}$, where \mathbf{U} is an arbitrary unitary operator and \mathbf{K} is the complex conjugation operator, is always possible. Unitarity of \mathbf{P} thus makes \mathbf{PT} anti-unitary. Available freedom in choosing \mathbf{U} allows formulations of system specific anti-unitary \mathbf{PT} operator while still conforming to the general rules of \mathbf{PT} symmetric quantum mechanics. \mathbf{PT} breaking transition in such systems are known as generalized \mathbf{PT} transitions [30].

While equivalence of DNA unzipping transition to localization-delocalization transition of the ground state of Hatano-Nelson model and importance of \mathbf{PT} symmetry in non-Hermitian quantum systems both have long been well recognized, some questions are still unanswered: In particular, does HN Hamiltonian support a \mathbf{PT} transition? And if such a transition exists, how is it related to the DNA unzipping/localization-delocalization transition? In this present work, we attempt to answer those crucial questions. Our main results in this paper are three folds: 1) We show that the ground state of the non-Hermitian Hatano-Nelson system undergoes a generalized \mathbf{PT} transition. The \mathbf{PT} transition point coincides with the DNA unzipping transition which could also be seen as the localization-delocalization transition of the ground state. 2) The discretized version

of the Hatano-Nelson Hamiltonian with a single impurity on a finite lattice also shows a generalized **PT** transition. Unlike the continuum model, here the transition is not restricted to only the ground state. In contrast, all the eigenstates remain eigenfunctions of the generalized **PT** operator in the **PT**-symmetric phase. Remarkably, this generalized **PT** transition also coincides with the localization-delocalization transition. 3) We also study the effect of quasi-periodic potential on a lattice and find that, unlike the single-impurity model, even in the thermodynamic limit this model shows generalized **PT** transition as well as the localization-delocalization transition. Quasiperiodic potentials are a good substitute for a true random disorder [31–34]. While realizing a true disorder is difficult in experiments, the quasiperiodic potentials have been realized in ultra-cold experiments [35]. However, it is important to note that the effect of the quasiperiodic potentials in one-dimensional (1D) Hermitian quantum systems is quite different from the effect of true disorders. While in 1D any tiny amount of true disorder is sufficient to localize all the states (a phenomenon known as Anderson localization), in presence of quasiperiodic potential even in 1D one can observe the localization-delocalization transition [36–38].

MODEL

Continuum Model

Here, we revisit the existing works on HN Hamiltonian in DNA context and simply restate the essential results relevant to our discussion [5–8]. For simplicity, let's model a dsDNA as two Gaussian polymers of contour length N interacting through a short range potential that acts only at the same contour length, thus mimicking native base pairing. Moreover, one end of the dsDNA is anchored at the origin and a time independent constant force \mathbf{g} is applied at the free ends of the two polymers in opposite direction. Up to an additive center of mass term the resulting Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\frac{H}{k_B T} = \int_0^N d\tau \left[\frac{\epsilon}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 + V(\mathbf{r}(\tau)) - \mathbf{g} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}(\tau)}{\partial \tau} \right]. \quad (1)$$

Eq. (1) describes a single polymer of elastic constant ϵ under a force \mathbf{g} in a potential $V(\mathbf{r})$ where τ is the contour length variable and $\mathbf{r}(\tau)$ is the τ dependent segment coordinate. The partition function $Z = \int \mathcal{D}\mathbf{R} \exp(-H/k_B T)$ is obtained by summing over all polymer configurations. Signatures of any phase transition can be obtained from the free energy per unit chain length at the thermodynamic limit which is given by $f = -\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} k_B T N^{-1} \ln Z$. By treating τ as a time-like coordinate, the partition function Z can be interpreted as the transition amplitude of a fictitious quantum

particle through the imaginary time mapping $\tau \rightarrow it$ and $k_B T$ identified as \hbar . The Hamiltonian of the corresponding quantum particle is given by

$$H_q(\mathbf{g}) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} (\mathbf{p} + i\mathbf{g})^2 + V(\mathbf{r}), \quad (2)$$

where ϵ is the mass of the quantum particle and \mathbf{p} is canonical momentum. A special feature of the Hamiltonian $H_q(\mathbf{g})$ is that the unzipping force \mathbf{g} appears in it as an imaginary time vector potential.

Definition of **P** and **T**

Here we define **P** and **T** transformations in the context of dsDNA. **P** transformation could be naturally realized as a reflection on a mirror kept along the contour length dependent center of mass of the two strands such that its net effect is to exchange the position coordinates of the native base pairs. On the other hand, the effect of **T** is to reverse the direction of the applied unzipping force. The effects of **P** and **T** transformations on a partially opened dsDNA is schematically shown in Fig. 1a. With these **P** and **T** definitions, we can readily see from Fig. 1b and 1c that the totally zipped state of dsDNA remains invariant under **PT** but partially or completely unzipped state of dsDNA changes under **PT**.

We now define quantum operators corresponding to **P** and **T** operations. Similar to the classical case, **P** could be defined as $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}$ and \mathbf{g} does not change under **P**. Eventhough $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{g}) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}$, it could be readily observed that $\mathbf{P}H_q(\mathbf{g}) = H_q(-\mathbf{g})$, which is similar to the mirror reflection defined for dsDNA. The realness of $H_q(\mathbf{g})$ then comes to our aid in defining the time-reversal operator $\mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{P}\mathbf{K}$. Thus $\mathbf{PT} \equiv \mathbf{K}$ and $H_q(\mathbf{g})$ is trivially **PT** symmetric. In summary, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{p}) &\rightarrow -\mathbf{p}, \quad \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow -\mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{g}) \rightarrow \mathbf{g}, \quad \text{and,} \\ \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{p}) &\rightarrow -\mathbf{p}, \quad \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{g}) \rightarrow -\mathbf{g}, \quad \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{r}) \rightarrow \mathbf{r}, \quad \mathbf{T}(\mathbf{i}) \rightarrow -\mathbf{i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1. Schematic representation of **PT**-transformation applied to a dsDNA. Two single strands are identified as S1 and S2 and the arrows show the direction of the applied unzipping force of magnitude \mathbf{g} . (a) Partially opened dsDNA under **P** and **T** transformations. (b) Zipped dsDNA state remains invariant under **PT** transformation. (c) Unzipped dsDNA state changes under **PT** transformation.

Exact solution in one dimension

We restrict ourselves in one dimension to further simplify the problem at hand. In one dimension, HN Hamiltonian becomes

$$H = \frac{(p + ig)^2}{2m} + V(x), \quad (4)$$

where $p = (\hbar/i)\partial/\partial x$ momentum operator, and $V(x)$ is arbitrary attractive real potential. For $V(x) = -V_0\delta(x)$ where $V_0 > 0$, this model can be exactly solved [30]. To obtain the energy eigenvalues and eigenstates of H , one needs to calculate the right eigenvectors solving Schrödinger equation i.e. $H\psi^R(x) = \epsilon\psi^R(x)$, where $\psi^R(x)$ is the right- eigenvector. Using periodic boundary condition, $\psi^R(L) = \psi^R(0)$, it has been shown that for $g < g_c = V_0$, the ground state of this model is localized and it has a real eigenvalue $\epsilon_{gs} = -V_0^2/2$ (without loss of generality we set $\hbar = m = 1$). On the other hand the excited states energies are given by, $\epsilon_{ex} = k^2/2 = (k_1^2 - k_2^2)/2 + ik_1k_2$, where k , is a complex number $k = k_1 + ik_2$. For $g < g_c$, k_1 and k_2 are given by [39],

$$k_1 = \frac{(2n-1)\pi}{L} + O(L^{-2}),$$

$$k_2 = g + \frac{1}{L} \ln \frac{g}{g - g_c} + O(L^{-2}),$$

where $n = 1, 2, \dots, L-1$ (where $n = 1$ corresponds to the 1st excited state). Given that n can be as large as $L-1$, even in the thermodynamic limit i.e. $L \rightarrow \infty$, ϵ_{ex} remains complex. Hence, even though for $g < g_c$ the ground state energy is real, there is no true **PT**-symmetric phase (note that to call it a **PT**-symmetric phase, the necessary condition is that all energy eigenvalues need to be real).

For $g > g_c$, k_1 and k_2 are given by,

$$k_1 = \frac{2n\pi}{L} + O(L^{-2}),$$

$$k_2 = g + \frac{1}{L} \ln \frac{g}{g_c - g} + O(L^{-2}),$$

where $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, L-1$ (where $n = 0$ corresponds to the ground state for $g > g_c$). Interestingly, for any finite L , the ground state for $g > g_c$ is always complex. However, in the thermodynamic limit, the imaginary part of energy goes to zero. This is in contrast to the $g < g_c$, where the ground state energy is real even when L is finite.

The ground state for $g < g_c$ reads as,

$$\psi_{gs}^R(x, g < g_c) \propto \exp[-(V_0 - g)x] \quad x > 0$$

$$\propto \exp[(V_0 + g)x] \quad x < 0. \quad (5)$$

On the other hand, the ground state for $g > g_c$ reads as,

$$\psi_{gs}^R(x, g > g_c) \propto e^{ik_1x} \quad x > 0$$

$$\propto e^{ik_1x} + ce^{-ik_1x+2gx} \quad x < 0. \quad (6)$$

It is straightforward to check that under the **PT**-transformation rule (see Eqn. (3)) $\psi_{gs}^R(x, g < g_c)$ remains invariant, while $\psi_{gs}^R(x, g > g_c)$ does not. It is very important to point out that in thermodynamic limit, while the ground state energy remains real for any value of g , only $\psi_{gs}^R(x, g < g_c)$ remains the eigenstate of the **PT** operator, which implies that the ground state of the continuum Hatano-Nelson model goes through a generalized **PT** transition.

Discrete Model

Having shown that the ground state of the 1D Hatano-Nelson model in continuum displays generalized **PT** transition, here we study the discretized version of that model on a finite lattice. While the effective continuum model shows DNA unzipping transitions in the thermodynamic limit, in nature the DNAs are of some finite lengths and hence for the practical purposes, one should also investigate the finite size effect on these transitions. Here, we study the discretized version of the Hatano-Nelson model on a one-dimensional lattice of size L , which is described by the following Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_j (e^g c_j^\dagger c_{j+1} + e^{-g} c_{j+1}^\dagger c_j) - \sum_j V_j n_j, \quad (7)$$

where, c_j^\dagger (c_j) is the fermionic creation (annihilation) operator at site j , $n_j = c_j^\dagger c_j$ is the number operator and V_j is real and positive. The Hamiltonian H is non-Hermitian for $g \neq 0$, but all the elements of the matrix representation of H are completely real. First, we want to demonstrate in a similar spirit to the continuum model, even the discretized model is also **PT** invariant. If one takes 2×2 version of the Hamiltonian Eqn. (7) and chose on-site potential symmetric around the origin i.e. $V_1 = V_2$, the Hamiltonian reads as,

$$H_{2 \times 2}(g) = \begin{bmatrix} V_1 & e^g \\ e^{-g} & V_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The parity operator reads as,

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

It is straight forward to check that $\mathbf{P}^{-1}H(g)\mathbf{P} = H(-g)$. On the other hand, the time reversal operator **T** always can be expressed as $\mathbf{T} \equiv \mathbf{U}\mathbf{K}$, where **U** is a Unitary




FIG. 2. (Left panel) shows the variation of η with g . (Right panel) shows the variation of γ with g for different values of $L = 50, 100, 150$, and for Model A. Inset of right panel shows variation of η for the ground state as a function of g .

operator and \mathbf{K} is a complex-conjugation operator. It has already been argued in the context of the continuum model that under time reversal operation, $g \rightarrow -g$, that implies the appropriate time reversal operator in this context can be thought of $\mathbf{T} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{K}$. Note the \mathbf{P} is also a Unitary operator. Hence, it is easy to check that $(\mathbf{PT})^{-1}H(g)\mathbf{PT} = H(g)$. This argument can be generalized trivially for any finite-dimensional matrix of $L \times L$. In other words, given that the effective \mathbf{PT} operator in this context is simply complex conjugation operator \mathbf{K} , and also all the matrix elements of H are reals, that ensures the invariance of H under the \mathbf{PT} transformation.

We investigate two models, 1) Model A: $V_j = V_0\delta_{j,L/2}$ (discrete version of the single-impurity Hatano-Nelson model), and 2) Model B: $V_j = V_0 \cos(2\pi\beta j + \phi)$, where β is an irrational number. Without loss of any generality, we choose $\beta = \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{2}$, and ϕ is a random number chosen between $[0, 2\pi]$. We do averaging over ϕ to obtain better statistics and for all of our calculations we have used periodic boundary conditions and we have fixed $V_0 = 20$. For $g = 0$, the model B is same as the Aubry-André (AA) Hamiltonian, which supports a delocalization-localization transition as one tunes V_0 . In the thermodynamic limit, $V_0 = 2$ corresponds to the transition point [40] between localized and delocalized phases and for $V_0 < 2$ ($V_0 > 2$), all the eigenstates of this model are delocalized (localized).

RESULTS

PT-transitions

First, we focus on model A. In Fig. 2, we plot the fraction of complex eigenvalues η as a function Hermiticity breaking parameter g . We find that for a fixed L , there is a critical value of g_c , below which all eigenvalues are real. Interestingly, g_c is L dependent. As we increase L , g_c decreases and tends towards zero. However, to check if




FIG. 3. (Left panel) shows the variation of η with g . (Right panel) shows the variation of γ with g for different values of $L = 50, 100, 200$, and for Model B.

the transition is **PT** transition or not, one needs to ensure that eigenstates of the Hamiltonian for $g < g_c$ are also the eigenstates of \mathbf{K} operator. We define a quantity as,

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ \langle \text{Re}[R_n] | \text{Re}[R_n] \rangle > 0}}^L \sqrt{\langle \text{Im}[R_n] | \text{Im}[R_n] \rangle}, \quad (10)$$

where $|R_n\rangle$ s are right-eigenvectors of the Hamiltonian H . Hence, by definition $\gamma = 0$ implies that $|R_n\rangle$ s are completely real (apart from a trivial global complex phase). It also ensures that those $|R_n\rangle$ s are also eigenvectors of K operator. We find that γ is zero for $g < g_c$, and non-zero otherwise (see Fig. 2), indeed the Hamiltonian undergoes a generalized **PT** transition at $g = g_c$. However, g_c is L dependent. As we increases L , g_c decreases and tends towards zero as $L \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, even though there exists a **PT** transition in the finite size systems for model A, in the thermodynamic limit i.e $L \rightarrow \infty$, $g_c \rightarrow 0$, implies no **PT**-transition.

Also, it is important to point out that, even in the thermodynamic limit, the ground state shows a spontaneous **PT**- transition. In the inset of Fig. 2, we have studied whether the ground state energy is complex or real by defining a quantity η_{gs} , which is defined as,

$$\eta_{gs} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{Im}[E_{gs}] \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

We find that there exists a g_{th} (which is $\sim V_0$), above which the ground state energy is complex, and this g_{th} is independent of L . However, the value of the imaginary part of the ground state energy, i.e. $\text{Im}[E_{gs}]$ goes to zero as we approach to $L \rightarrow \infty$ limit. In the continuum model, we have also observed the same, and identified it as a DNA unzipping transition as well as a **PT** transition of the ground state.

Next, we focus on the model B. While model A, is one of the simplistic model of DNA-unzipping transi-




FIG. 4. (Left panel) shows the variation of MPR with g for model A. (Right panel) shows the variation of MPR with g for different values of $L = 50, 100, 150$ for Model B.

tion, which can also be analytically solved in the continuum limit, model B can be relevant when one wants to study the DNA unzipping transition in the presence of disordered medium. One of the most natural choice in this context will be a true random potential, where one chooses V_j s to be completely random numbers. However, given that completely disordered potential is difficult to realize in the ultra-cold atom experiments, here we restrict our self to the quasi-periodic potential, which in the Hermitian limit i.e. $g = 0$, has been realized in the experiments. Once again, in Fig. 3, we show the variation of η with g . We find indeed there exists a g_c , which separates between the **PT**-symmetric and **PT**-broken phase. Unlike the model A, in this case generalized **PT**-transition is stable even in the thermodynamic limit. We find that g_c does not change as we increase the system size L . Also, we have plotted γ as a function of g , have identified that indeed the eigenvectors of the model B for $g < g_c$ are completely real, hence they are also eigenstates of \mathbf{K} .

Localization-delocalization transition

While in the previous section, we have identified that indeed model A and model B both undergo a generalized **PT** transition as one varies the Hermiticity breaking parameter g , now the question arises whether one can associate this transition with the DNA unzipping transition (or localization-delocalization transition) or not. Note that in the continuum, the ground state of the Hatano-Nelson Hamiltonian undergoes a **PT** transition at $g = g_c$, and the DNA unzipping transition (or localization-delocalization transition of the ground state) takes place exactly at the same point.

In order to identify the localization-delocalization transition (DNA unzipping transition), one of the most popular diagnostic tools is the Participation ratio [41–43], which is defined as

$$\text{PR}_k = \frac{\sum_j |\langle L_k^j | R_k^j \rangle|}{\sum_j |\langle L_k^j | R_k^j \rangle|^2}, \quad (12)$$

where $|L_k^j\rangle$ and $|R_k^j\rangle$ are k -th left- and right-eigenvector of the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. We define mean participation ratio (MPR) by averaging over all the eigenstates. In the localized phase $\text{MPR} \sim 0(1)$, on the other hand, in the delocalized phase $\text{MPR} \sim 0(L)$, scales with system size.

Figure. 4 shows the variation of MPR with g for different values of L . We find that indeed for $g < g_c$, MPR remains $O(1)$, on the other hand, for $g > g_c$ it increases with L . For model A. As the generalized **PT** transition point $g_c \rightarrow 0$ in the thermodynamic limit, we also witness the same behavior from MPR results. However, for model B, the localization-delocalized transition persists even in the thermodynamic limit. The localization-delocalization transition point obtained from the MPR results exactly coincides with the generalized **PT** transition point obtained in Fig. 3. This proves indeed in these models both the DNA unzipping transition and generalized **PT** transition occur simultaneously.

CONCLUSIONS

In this work, our main goal is to see whether one can connect the **PT** transition with the DNA unzipping transition. First, we show that the non-Hermitian Hatano-Nelson model that describes DNA unzipping transition is invariant under **PT** transformation. The ground state of this model undergoes a **PT** transition i.e. the ground state remains an eigenstate of the **PT** operator in the zipped phase and it is no more an eigenstate of the **PT** operator in the unzipped phase. Next, we have studied the discretized version of this model in the presence of a single impurity and also in the presence of quasi-periodic potential. Interestingly, we have found that in the case of the single impurity while the finite size system shows a generalized **PT** transition as one tunes the Hermiticity breaking parameter, but in the thermodynamic limit even an infinitesimal amount of Hermiticity breaking term makes the phase **PT**-broken, hence there is no generalized **PT**-transition. However, **PT** transition persists for the ground state. On the other hand, in the presence of the quasi-periodic potential, we find a generalized **PT** transition even in the thermodynamic limit. Remarkably, the generalized **PT** transition point exactly coincides with the localization-delocalization transition point in these models.

DNA is one of the most important molecule in biology. However, the results presented here and results already existing in the literature [44–47] indicate that DNA could be a testing ground of classical analogues of several quantum processes. Further, it will be interesting to investigate the Hatano-Nelson Hamiltonian in the presence of other types of quasiperiodic potentials which supports mobility edges in the Hermitian limit [48–51]. Also what will be the fate of such transitions in higher dimensions

is an open question, and need further investigation.

Acknowledgements: RM acknowledges the DST-Inspire research grant by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, SERB start-up grant (SRG/2021/002152). BPM acknowledges the research grant for faculty under IoE Scheme (Number 6031) of Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.

-
- [1] Richard R. Sinden, Christopher E. Pearson, Vladimir N. Potaman, and David W. Ussey, “Dna: Structure and function,” in *Genes and Genomes*, Advances in Genome Biology, Vol. 5, edited by Ram S. Verma (JAI, 1998) pp. 1–141.
 - [2] James D. Watson, Tania A. Baker, Stephen P. Bell, Alexander Gann, Michael Levine, Richard Losick, and Inglis CSHLP, *Molecular biology of the gene*, 6th ed. (Pearson/Benjamin Cummings; Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, San Francisco; Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y., 2007).
 - [3] U. Bockelmann, B. Essevaz-Roulet, and F. Heslot, “Molecular stick-slip motion revealed by opening dna with piconewton forces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4489–4492 (1997).
 - [4] Pavan Umate, Narendra Tuteja, and Renu Tuteja, “Genome-wide comprehensive analysis of human helicases,” *Communicative & Integrative Biology* **4**, 118–137 (2011), pMID: 21509200, <https://doi.org/10.4161/cib.13844>.
 - [5] Somendra M Bhattacharjee, “Unzipping dnas: towards the first step of replication,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **33**, L423 (2000).
 - [6] David K. Lubensky and David R. Nelson, “Pulling pinned polymers and unzipping dna,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1572–1575 (2000).
 - [7] Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson, “Localization transitions in non-hermitian quantum mechanics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 570–573 (1996).
 - [8] Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson, “Vortex pinning and non-hermitian quantum mechanics,” *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 8651–8673 (1997).
 - [9] Rajeev Kapri, Somendra M. Bhattacharjee, and Flavio Seno, “Complete phase diagram of dna unzipping: Eye, y fork, and triple point,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 248102 (2004).
 - [10] Garima Mishra, Debaprasad Giri, M. S. Li, and Sanjay Kumar, “Role of loop entropy in the force induced melting of dna hairpin,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **135**, 035102 (2011), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3609970>.
 - [11] Sanjay Kumar and Mai Suan Li, “Biomolecules under mechanical force,” *Physics Reports* **486**, 1–74 (2010).
 - [12] Tanmoy Pal and Somendra M. Bhattacharjee, “Rigidity of melting dna,” *Phys. Rev. E* **93**, 052102 (2016).
 - [13] Tanmoy Pal, Keerti Chauhan, and Sanjay Kumar, “Role of hoogsteen interaction in the stability of different phases of triplex dna,” *Phys. Rev. E* **105**, 044407 (2022).
 - [14] Carl M. Bender and Stefan Boettcher, “Real spectra in non-hermitian hamiltonians having pt symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 5243–5246 (1998).
 - [15] Carl M. Bender, Dorje C. Brody, and Hugh F. Jones, “Complex extension of quantum mechanics,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 270401 (2002).
 - [16] Carl M Bender, “Making sense of non-hermitian hamiltonians,” *Reports on Progress in Physics* **70**, 947–1018 (2007).
 - [17] Ali Mostafazadeh, “Time-dependent pseudo-hermitian hamiltonians defining a unitary quantum system and uniqueness of the metric operator,” *Physics Letters B* **650**, 208–212 (2007).
 - [18] Chia-Yi Ju, Adam Miranowicz, Guang-Yin Chen, and Franco Nori, “Non-hermitian hamiltonians and no-go theorems in quantum information,” *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 062118 (2019).
 - [19] Namrata Shukla, Ranjan Modak, and Bhabani Prasad Mandal, “Heisenberg uncertainty relations for non-hermitian systems,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.02844* (2022).
 - [20] Ranjan Modak and Bhabani Prasad Mandal, “Eigenstate entanglement entropy in a \mathcal{PT} -invariant non-hermitian system,” *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 062416 (2021).
 - [21] Bhabani Prasad Mandal, B.K. Mourya, K. Ali, and A. Ghatak, “Pt phase transition in a (2+1)-d relativistic system,” *Annals of Physics* **363**, 185–193 (2015).
 - [22] Avinash Khare and Bhabani Prasad Mandal, “A pt-invariant potential with complex qes eigenvalues,” *Physics Letters A* **272**, 53–56 (2000).
 - [23] Bhabani Prasad Mandal, Brijesh Kumar Mourya, and Rajesh Kumar Yadav, “Pt phase transition in higher-dimensional quantum systems,” *Physics Letters A* **377**, 1043–1046 (2013).
 - [24] Haresh Raval and Bhabani Prasad Mandal, “Deconfinement to confinement as pt phase transition,” *Nuclear Physics B* **946**, 114699 (2019).
 - [25] Z. H. Musslimani, K. G. Makris, R. El-Ganainy, and D. N. Christodoulides, “Optical solitons in pt periodic potentials,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 030402 (2008).
 - [26] A. Guo, G. J. Salamo, D. Duchesne, R. Morandotti, M. Volatier-Ravat, V. Aimez, G. A. Siviloglou, and D. N. Christodoulides, “Observation of pt-symmetry breaking in complex optical potentials,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 093902 (2009).
 - [27] Carl T. West, Tsampikos Kottos, and Tomaz Prosen, “Pt-symmetric wave chaos,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 054102 (2010).
 - [28] S. K. Özdemir, S. Rotter, F. Nori, and L. Yang, “Parity-time symmetry and exceptional points in photonics,” *Nature Materials* **18**, 783–798 (2019).
 - [29] Ali Mostafazadeh, “Pseudo-hermitian representation of quantum mechanics,” *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics* **07**, 1191–1306 (2010).
 - [30] Carl M Bender, MV Berry, and Aikaterini Mandilara, “Generalized pt symmetry and real spectra,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **35**, L467 (2002).
 - [31] Ranjan Modak and Debraj Rakshit, “Many-body dynamical phase transition in a quasiperiodic potential,” *Phys. Rev. B* **103**, 224310 (2021).
 - [32] Archak Purkayastha, Sambuddha Sanyal, Abhishek Dhar, and Manas Kulkarni, “Anomalous transport in the aubry-andré-harper model in isolated and open systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **97**, 174206 (2018).
 - [33] Ravi Kumar and Ranjan Modak, “Geometric quenches in quasisordered lattice systems,” *Phys. Rev. B* **105**,

- 224202 (2022).
- [34] Madhumita Saha, Santanu K. Maiti, and Archak Purkayastha, “Anomalous transport through algebraically localized states in one dimension,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 174201 (2019).
 - [35] Dmitry A. Abanin, Ehud Altman, Immanuel Bloch, and Maksym Serbyn, “Colloquium: Many-body localization, thermalization, and entanglement,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **91**, 021001 (2019).
 - [36] Elihu Abrahams, PW Anderson, DC Licciardello, and TV Ramakrishnan, “Scaling theory of localization: Absence of quantum diffusion in two dimensions,” *Physical Review Letters* **42**, 673–676 (1979).
 - [37] Philip W Anderson, “Absence of diffusion in certain random lattices,” *Physical review* **109**, 1492 (1958).
 - [38] Patrick A Lee and TV Ramakrishnan, “Disordered electronic systems,” *Reviews of Modern Physics* **57**, 287 (1985).
 - [39] Naomichi Hatano and David R. Nelson, “Vortex pinning and non-hermitian quantum mechanics,” *Phys. Rev. B* **56**, 8651–8673 (1997).
 - [40] Serge Aubry and Gilles André, “Analyticity breaking and anderson localization in incommensurate lattices,” *Ann. Israel Phys. Soc* **3**, 18 (1980).
 - [41] Qi-Bo Zeng, Shu Chen, and Rong Lü, “Anderson localization in the non-hermitian aubry-andré-harper model with physical gain and loss,” *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 062118 (2017).
 - [42] Longwen Zhou and Wenqian Han, “Driving-induced multiple \mathcal{PT} -symmetry breaking transitions and reentrant localization transitions in non-hermitian floquet quasicrystals,” *Phys. Rev. B* **106**, 054307 (2022).
 - [43] Hui Jiang, Li-Jun Lang, Chao Yang, Shi-Liang Zhu, and Shu Chen, “Interplay of non-hermitian skin effects and anderson localization in nonreciprocal quasiperiodic lattices,” *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 054301 (2019).
 - [44] Jaya Maji, Somendra M Bhattacharjee, Flavio Seno, and Antonio Trovato, “When a DNA triple helix melts: an analogue of the efimov state,” *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 083057 (2010).
 - [45] Tanmoy Pal, Poulomi Sadhukhan, and Somendra M. Bhattacharjee, “Renormalization group limit cycle for three-stranded dna,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 028105 (2013).
 - [46] Tanmoy Pal, Poulomi Sadhukhan, and Somendra M. Bhattacharjee, “Efimov-like phase of a three-stranded dna and the renormalization-group limit cycle,” *Phys. Rev. E* **91**, 042105 (2015).
 - [47] Somendra M. Bhattacharjee and Damien Paul Foster, “Efimov-dna phase diagram: Three stranded dna on a cubic lattice,” *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **155**, 064903 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0059153>.
 - [48] Ranjan Modak, Soumi Ghosh, and Subroto Mukerjee, “Criterion for the occurrence of many-body localization in the presence of a single-particle mobility edge,” *Physical Review B* **97**, 104204 (2018).
 - [49] Pallabi Chatterjee and Ranjan Modak, “One-dimensional levy quasicrystal,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10772* (2022).
 - [50] Sabyasachi Nag and Arti Garg, “Many-body mobility edges in a one-dimensional system of interacting fermions,” *Phys. Rev. B* **96**, 060203 (2017).
 - [51] J. Biddle and S. Das Sarma, “Predicted mobility edges in one-dimensional incommensurate optical lattices: An exactly solvable model of anderson localization,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 070601 (2010).