Rui Zhang and B. I. Shklovskii

Theoretical Physics Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

(Dated: March 22, 2024)

Abstract

We study a solution of long polyanions (PA) with shorter polycations (PC) and focus on the role of C oulom b interaction. A good example is solutions of D NA and PC which are widely studied for gene therapy. In the solution, each PA attracts m any PCs to form a complex. When the ratio of total charges of PA and PC in the solution, x, equals to 1, complexes are neutral and they condense in a macroscopic drop. When x is far away from 1, complexes are strongly charged. The C oulom b repulsion is large and free complexes are stable. A sx approaches to 1, PC sattached to PA disproportionate them selves in two competing ways. O ne way is inter-complex disproportionation, in which PCs make some complexes neutral and therefore condensed in a macroscopic drop while other complexes become even stronger charged and stay free. The other way is intra-complex disproportionation, in which PCs m ake one end of a complex neutral and condensed in a small droplet while the rest of the complex form s a strongly charged tail. Thus each complex becomes a \tag tad pole". These two ways can also combine together to give even lower free energy. We get a phase diagram of PA-PC solution in a plane of x and inverse screening radius of the monovalent salt, which includes phases or phase coexistence with both kinds of disproportionation.

PACS num bers: 61 25 Hq, 82 35 Rs, 87 14 Gg, 87 15 Nn

I. IN TRODUCTION

Condensation in solution of two oppositely charged polyelectrolytes (PE) is an important phenom enon in biology and chem ical engineering. One of the most interesting applications is DNA condensation by polycations (PC), which is widely used in gene therapy research. A good example is condensation of DNA with poly-lysine [1]. Complexation of DNA with PCs can invert the charge of bare DNA and help DNA to penetrate negatively charged cell membrane. At the same time, adsorbed PC in complexes or their condensate may protect DNA from digestion by enzymes inside the cell [2]. Trem endous amount of experimental works have been done in this area [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7].



FIG. 1: Objects appearing in a solution of PA and PC (left column) and their symbols used in Figs. 2, 4, 9 and 10 (right column). The long polymer is PA and the short polymer is PC. (a) a single PC. (b) negative PA-PCs complex. (c) positive PA-PCs complex. (d) condensate of alm ost neutral complexes. (e) tadpole m ade of one PA-PCs complex. Here only the case of positive tail is shown. The tail can be negative, too.

In this paper, motivated by DNA-PC condensation, we study the equilibrium state of a solution of polyanions (PA) and polycations (PC) in the presence of monovalent salt and

focus on the role of C oulom b interaction. We assume that both PA and PC are so long that at room temperature T their translational entropy can be ignored in comparison with their C oulom b energy. We are particularly interested in the case when PA ism uch longer than PC and m any PC s are needed to neutralize one PA. In Fig. 1 we list objects which can appear in such a solution. Each PA attractsm any PC s to form a PA-PC s complex (Fig. 1b,c). Neutral complexes can further condense in a liquid drop (Fig. 1d). One complex can form a neutral head and a charged tail to become a tadpole (Fig. 1e). And it is possible to have excessive free PC s (Fig. 1a). When and where these objects exist or co-exist with each other depends on two dimensionless parameters: the ratio of total charges of PC and PA in the solution, x, and b=r_s, where b is the size of the monom er and r_s is the D ebye-H uckel screening radius provided by monovalent salt. The main result of this paper is the phase diagram in a plane of x and b=r_s as shown in Fig. 2. We discover a new phase of \tadpoles" originating from the polymer nature of the objects. We also present a rst theory of broadening of the phase of a single drop with decreasing r_s (curves x₄ (r_s) and x₄⁰ (r_s) in Fig. 2).

Up to now, there was no complete theory of phase diagram for such system s. Previously, the complexation of oppositely charged polyelectrolytes was studied in a symmetric system in which the length, concentration and linear charge density of PA and PC are the same [8, 9]. It was shown that even in the absence of monovalent salt, strongly charged PA and PC form a single m acroscopic drop of neutral dense liquid, which separates from water. It corresponds to the phase at x = 1 in our phase diagram (Fig. 2). On the other hand, the phase diagram of a solution of DNA and short polyam ines was studied in Refs. [10, 11, 12] in which translational entropy of polyam ines plays a very in portant role. We postpone discussion of the role of translational entropy till the end of this paper (Sec. VI). In our previous works [13, 14], phase diagram s have been discussed for other system s. In Ref. [13], solution of very long PA with positive spheres was considered. This system is similar to chromatin in the sense that each PA binds many spheres making a long necklace. We also discussed the phase diagram of a system of oppositely charged spheres in strongly asymmetric case when each say negative sphere complexes with many positive ones [14]. Many features of the phase diagram in Fig. 2 are also applicable to these systems and we will return to them in the conclusion.

A recent paper of us studied the exactly same topic [15]. But it missed two phase coexistence regions at $r_s ! 1$ (comparing Fig. 2 of Ref. [15] with Fig. 2 in this paper). The

3



FIG.2: Typical phase diagram of a solution of PA and PC. The horizontal axis x is the ratio of total charges of PC and PA in the solution. The vertical axis $b=r_s$ is the ratio of the length of a m onom er size of the PA m olecule to the D ebye-Huckel screening radius r_s . Sym bols are explained in Fig.1.

m ain purpose of the present paper is to make corrections and to discuss the complete phase diagram we have right now.

It is enough to bok at x < 1 side of F ig. 2 to see the main feature of the phase diagram. It contains three phases: the phase of a single drop for $x > x_4$, the phase of free complexes for $x < x_1$, and the \tadpole" phase for $x_2 < x < x_3$. Between these phases, there are three regions of phase coexistence. This phase diagram is very much similar to the phase diagram of water in temperature and volum e coordinates [16], when r_s =b is considered as temperature and x as volum e. The three phases mentioned above are like gas, solid and liquid respectively. Essentially, this analogy originates from the G ibbs' phase rule [16], which is crucial to determ ine our phase diagram (see Sec. III).

Let us now try to understand the physics of this phase diagram. We start from the horizontal axis ($r_s ! 1$) and rst focus on x < 1 side. In the solution, each PA adsorbs many PCs to form a complex. When x 1, the number of PC is not enough to neutralize

all PAs and each PA-PCs complex is strongly negatively charged (Fig. 1b). The Coulomb repulsion between complexes is huge and all complexes stay free, or in other words, colloidal solution of complexes is stable (see ranges $0 < x < x_1$ in Fig. 2).

When x = 1, each PA-PCs complex is neutral and there is no Coulomb repulsion between them. They all condense to form a macroscopic strong correlated liquid drop (see Fig. 2). Due to the orderly arrangement of positive and negative charges in the drop, a certain amount of short-range correlation energy is gained (Fig. 3). We de ne " < 0 as the energy gain of a neutral complex in the macroscopic drop. Note that monomers on the surface of the drop can not gain as much energy as monomers inside. This de nes the surface energy of the drop which plays an important role in the competition between two kinds of disproportionations (see the next paragraph).



FIG.3: A schem atic illustration of short-range attraction between neutral complexes in a condensed liquid drop using the model of strongly charged PA and PC.A portion of two complexes in the liquid drop is shown. PA and PC charges are shown by black and white dots correspondingly. The dashed lines show two complexes sitting in parallel planes. The complexes attract each other because charges of the same sign are farther away than charges of the opposite sign.

In vicinity of x = 1, the long-range C oulom b repulsion between charged com plexes completes with the short-range attraction due to correlations. As x increases, condensation starts at $x = x_1$. To m inimize the free energy, PCs can be redistributed among complexes so that a portion of complexes are neutral and therefore condensed in a macroscopic drop, while the rest of complexes become stronger charged and stay free. This is called inter-complex disproportionation [2] or partial condensation [13] (see Fig. 4a). It is essentially a coexis-

tence of the two phases: the single drop phase and the free com plexes phase. On the other hand, PCs can also disproportionate them selves within each com plex, which we call intracom plex disproportionation (Fig. 4b). PCs move closer to one end of PA molecule, making one part of a PA molecule neutral and condensed in a droplet, while the other part is even stronger charged and not condensed. Unlike inter-com plex disproportionation, this gives a new \tadpole" phase, as far as L is nite, where L is the length of a free PA-PCs com plex (see Fig. 2). It is possible to com bine the two ways of disproportionation to accom plish even lower free energies (see Fig. 4c,d). As a result, at $r_s ! 1$, we have the sequence of these phases as shown on the horizontal axis of Fig. 2.

W hat happens at x > 1 side is alm ost the same, except that here the number of PC is larger than necessary to neutralize all PAs and each complex is strongly positively charged (charge inverted) (Fig. 1c). Let us brie y rem ind the nontrivial mechanism of charge inversion at x > 1 side [17]. We illustrate it in Fig. 5 for the model of strongly charged exible PA and PC, in which the distance between charges, b, is the same for PA and PC molecules and is of the order of B jerrum length $l_{\rm B} = 7A$ (e²=D $l_{\rm B} = k_{\rm B}T$, D = 80 is the dielectric constant of water). When a new PC molecule arrives at a neutral PA-PCs complex, all PCs in the complex can rearrange them selves so that the charge of this excessive PC is sm eared in the whole complex and the Coulomb self-energy of the PC is e ectively reduced to zero (Fig. 5). This elimination of the Coulom b self-energy is essentially due to correlation of PCs in the complex and can not be described by Poisson-Boltzm ann mean eld approximation. We de ne $_{\rm c}$ < 0 (c stands for \correlation") as the chem ical potential related to the elim ination of the Coulomb self-energy of PC in the complex. Related to the charge of PC, it acts as an external voltage overcharging PA.W ith increasing x, the inverted charge of the complex increases. At certain critical $x = x_m$ (m stands for m axim um charge inversion")(see Fig. 2), the maximum charge inversion is achieved where $_{\rm c}$ is balanced by the C oulom b repulsive energy of the complex to a PC. The topological structure of the phase diagram is alm ost symmetric about x = 1. The only asymmetry appears at $x > x_m$. Here additional PCs are not attracted to maximum charge-inverted PAs and stay free in the solution (see Fig.2).

Now let us discuss screening by a monovalent salt. This screening electively cuts of the range of the Coulomb interaction at the distance r_s . As r_s decreases, inst the long-range Coulomb repulsion is reduced, while the short-range correlation induced attraction is not



FIG. 4: Possible phases and phase coexistence due to disproportionation. Symbols used here are explained in Fig. 1. (a) Coexistence of free com plexes and a single drop (inter-com plex disproportionation): PCs disproportionate them selves among PAs so that a portion of PA-PCs com plexes are neutral and condensed in a macroscopic drop, while the rest of them are stronger charged and free. (b) The tadpole phase (intra-com plex disproportionation): PCs disproportionate them selves within each PA-PCs com plex to form a \tadpole", with a neutral condensed \head" and a charged \tail". (c) Coexistence of tadpoles and free com plexes. (d) Coexistence of tadpoles and a single drop. In these two cases, inter and intra disproportionation are com bined to achieve a lower free energy.

a ected. A coordingly, all the ranges of condensation in the phase diagram become wider (Fig. 2). Eventually, in the limit of very small r_s , the short-range correlational attraction is also screened out and the macroscopic drop completely dissolves (not shown in Fig. 2). In the intermediate range of r_s we are interested in, there are two major elects of screening. First, the tadpole conguration disappears at certain r_s (Fig. 2). Indeed, if we compare intra and inter disproportionation, the form er has a lower C oulom b energy but a higher surface energy. At large r_s , the C oulom b energy is more important and tadpoles are preferred, and vice vera. In the analogy to the phase diagram of water, it is like the solid-vapor phase transition at





FIG. 5: An illustration of charge inversion of a PA molecule by exible PCs when they are both strongly charged. Negative PA charges are shown by black dots. Positive PC charges are shown by white dots. When a new PC molecule is adsorbed to a neutral PA-PCs complex, its charge is fractionalized in mono-charges and its C oulom b self-energy is eliminated by redistribution of all PCs in the complex. In reality, the numbers of charges of PA and PC can be much larger than numbers shown here. Im agine for example that PA and PC have charges 1000e and +100e.

by temperature. Second, the single drop phase occupies a nite range of x around x = 1 at a nite r_s , which grows with $1=r_s^2$ (Fig. 2). Recall that at $r_s ! 1$, the macroscopic drop should be neutral and therefore it exists only at x = 1. If each condensed complex were charged ($x \in 1$), the total charge of the macroscopic drop would be proportional to its volum e and the Coulomb energy per unit volum e would be huge proportional to its surface. On the other hand, at r_s much smaller than the size of the macroscopic drop, the Coulomb energy is not accumulative but additive for each volum e of the size r_s . Therefore the macroscopic drop can tolerate some charge density and the range of the single drop phase in the phase diagram widens.

Currently our theory can be compared with experiments only qualitatively since in many cases it is not clear, whether the equilibrium state of the system is reached in experimental times due to the slow kinetics. Also the interesting tadpole phase could be very hard to realize due to a very large critical r_s above which tadpoles can exist. In solutions of DNA with PC, charge inversion of complexes is observed at x > 1 [1, 2]. The size of condensed

particles reaches maximum close to x = 1 corresponding to the single drop phase in our phase diagram. When $x \in 1$, the size of condensed particles decreases in agreement with our equilibrium phase diagram [1, 2, 3]. In solutions of DNA with basic polypeptides, at x < 1, it is observed that DNA molecules exist simultaneously in two distinct conformations, i.e., elongated conformation and condensed conformation [4]. This corresponds to a phase coexistence of free complexes and a single drop in our phase diagram ($x_1 < x < 1$ in Fig.2). On the other hand, the enhancement of condensation with the help of simple salt is observed in Ref. [1]. Certain tadpole-like phases have also been observed in experiments [1, 5, 6], although we do not think they are equilibrium tadpole phases discussed in this paper.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss all possible phases when $r_s ! 1$. We then consider the role of screening by monovalent salt and get the complete phase diagram in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we discuss x > 1 side more carefully and reveal another possibility for the phase diagram. In Sec.V, we estimate parameters " and $_c$ m icroscopically in the case of strongly charged PA and PC. In Sec.VI, we discuss the role of translational entropy of PC in connection with previous works [13, 14]. We conclude in Sec.VII.

II. PHASES IN THE ABSENCE OF MONOVALENT SALT

In this section we discuss all possible phases in the absence of monovalent salt, i.e., r_s ! 1. A lthough this situation is not realistic, it serves as a start point for more complicated theory at nite r_s (see Sec. III). Here and below, W e focus on the role of the Coulomb interaction and neglect all other interactions such as hydrophobic force. W e focus on x < 1side and postpone the discussion of x > 1 side till Sec. IV.

Let us rst clarify the term inology \phase". By de nition, a phase of a system containing one or several substances is an equilibrium hom ogeneous state [16]. The chem ical potential of each substance in each phase is uniquely de ned and calculated independently. In the present case, we have a system of two substances: PA and PC .Follow ing the de nition, there are three possible phases: the phase of a single drop (F ig. 1d), the phase of free com plexes (F ig. 1b), and the tadpole phase (F ig. 2e). A lthough we cannot proof rigidly that only these three phases can appear in the phase diagram, we have a quite convincing argument. We show in the last subsection of this section that three possible phases or phase coexistence are ruled out by free energy considerations.

9

At x = 1, there is no C oulom b repulsion between complexes, the phase of a single drop is preferred due to the short range correlation energy gain (see Fig. 3). At x = 1, the phase of free complexes is preferred because of strong C oulom b repulsion between complexes. Then it is natural to conclude that the tadpole phase, which is kind of combination of the other two phases, appears in vicinity of x = 1. To testify this idea, we focus on possible phase coexistent regions. For example, the phase of free complexes can coexist with the tadpole phase, and the tadpole phase can coexist with the phase of a single drop. By minim izing the free energies in these two regions respectively, we can not the ranges of x in which one or the other phase is preferred, or the two phases coexist. This leads to the phase diagram at $r_s \, ! \, 1$.

A. The free energies of the three phases

For pedagogical reason, let us start from the free energy of the tree phases. We rst notice that the Coulomb energy of each charged complex can be calculated by considering it as a conductor with certain capacitance. To see this, let us recall that the total chem ical potential of a PC molecule adsorbed in PA is given by

$$= _{c} + q :$$
 (1)

Here the rst term is the correlational chemical potential, and the second term is the electric energy of a PC given by the local electric potential in the complex. Since both and $_{\rm c}$ are the same along the complex, must be the same in the complex. It is in this sense that the PA-PCs complex can be considered as a conductor and the concept of capacitance can be used to calculate its C oulom b energy.

We denote N as the total number of PA molecules in the solution. For the phase of free complexes (see Fig. 1b), we have

$$F = N \frac{(nq \ Q)^2}{2C} + nE(n)$$
 (2)

Here C is the capacitance of a free complex, Q and q are the bare charges of PA and PC, n is the number of PC in each free PA-PCs complex, and E (n) < 0 is the correlation energy of a PC in a complex as a function of n. In this expression, the rst term is the Coulomb self-energy of free complexes. The second term is the negative correlation energy of PCs in free complexes. We emphasize again that we study very long and strongly charged PC and PA such that their translational entropies are negligible. Since all PCs are adsorbed to PAs, the net charge of each free complex, (nq Q), is equal to (x 1)Q. We will show in Sec. V that near the phase coexistence region, jn $n_j n_i$, where $n_i = Q = q$ is the num ber of PC in a neutral complex. Consequently, $_c(n) = Q [nE(n)] = Qn$ is approximately equal to its value $_c$ at $n = n_i$. Furtherm ore, it is convenient to consider the average free energy of each complex, f = F = N, instead of F. Finally, we rewrite the free energy as

$$f = \frac{(x - 1)^2 Q^2}{2C} + \frac{(x - 1)Q}{q} + n_i E (n_i);$$
(3)

where C is given by

$$C = \frac{D L}{2 \ln (L=b)}$$
(4)

as the capacitance of a cylindrical capacitor. Here L is the length of a free PA-PC complex and D = 80 is the dielectric constant of water.

U sing sim ilar notations, for a phase of a single drop (see Fig. 1d), we have

$$f = n_i E(n_i) + ":$$
 (5)

Here remember that each complex in the drop is neutral. The expression includes the negative correlation energy of PCs in neutral complexes, and the negative correlation energy of a neutral complex due to condensation, ".

For a tadpole phase (see Fig. 1e), we denote z as the fraction of the tail part of each com plex. We have

$$f(z) = \frac{(x - 1)^2 Q^2}{2C_t} + (1 - z)'' - 1 - \frac{3b}{R}^2 + \frac{(x - 1)Q}{q} + n_i E(n_i):$$
(6)

This free energy is almost a combination of the last two free energies except two di erences. First, the capacitance of a tadpole is determined by its tail, given by

$$C_{t} = \frac{D zL}{2 \ln (zL=b)} :$$
(7)

Second, the correlation energy due to condensation is gained only in the head" of the tadpole. Therefore there is an additional factor 1 z in the second term. The surface energy of the head is also included in the second term [18]. R is the radius of the head of the tadpole (see Fig. 4b), given by

$$R = \frac{3}{16} (1 z) \hat{B} L^{1=3} :$$
 (8)

B. The phase diagram at r_s ! 1

Now we are ready to discuss the free energy in the phase coexistence regions and get the phase diagram at r_s ! 1 . We rst consider the coexistence of the phase of free complexes and the tadpole phase (see Fig. 4c). We denote y as the fraction of tadpoles in the coexistence. Combining Eqs. (3) and (6), we have

$$f(y;z) = \frac{(x - 1)^2 Q^2}{2 [yC_t + (1 - y)C_i]} + y(1 - z)'' - 1 - \frac{3b^2}{R} + \frac{(x - 1)Q}{q} + n_i E(n_i):$$
(9)

Here the rst term is the Coulomb energy of the system of free complexes and tadpoles with capacitances C and C_t correspondingly. These capacitances are additive because all complexes are in equilibrium with respect of exchange of PC and the electric potential of all complexes is the same (see discussion at the beginning of the subsection IIA).

To M inim ize this free energy with respect of two variables y and z, it is convenient to separate the free energies into two parts

$$f(y;z) = \mathbf{J}'' \mathbf{j} = \frac{(1 \ x)^2 \ln (\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b})}{1 \ y + yz} \qquad y(1 \ z) + \frac{(1 \ x)^2 yz \ln z}{(1 \ y + yz)^2} + \frac{5y(1 \ z)^{2-3}}{(\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{b})^{1-3}}^{\#}; \quad (10)$$

where

$$= \frac{Q^2}{D L \mathbf{j''}}$$
(11)

is in order of 1 for strongly charged PA and PC (see Sec.V), and Eqs. (4), (7) and (8) have been used. In this expression, the last two terms of Eq. (9) have been neglected since they are independent of y; z. The rst square bracket contains the main terms of the C oulom b energy and the correlation energy, in which $\ln zL$ in C_t has been replaced by $\ln L$ and the surface energy has been ignored. The second square bracket contains correction terms in the rst order to make up the two neglects in the main terms. We will see below that the small parameter we used to expand this free energy is $\ln (L=b)=(L=b)^{1-3}$, for L b.

We rst minimize the main terms in Eq. (10) and get

$$y(1 z) = 1 (1 x) \ln (L=b)$$
: (12)

Putting it back to the correction terms in Eq. (10) and taking the m inim um, we get

$$z = 1 \qquad \frac{5 \ln (L=b)}{3 (L=b)^{1=3}}^{\#_{3=4}} :$$
(13)

Combining the above two conditions, we have

$$y = 1$$
 (1 x) $\ln (L=b)$ $\frac{3 (L=b)^{1=3}}{5 \ln (L=b)}$: (14)

Speci cally, considering y = 0 and y = 1, we get the boundaries of the phase coexistent region (see Fig. 2)

$$1 \quad x_{1}(1) = \frac{1}{(1-b)};$$
(15)

$$1 \quad x_{2} (1) = \frac{1}{q - \frac{1}{\ln(L=b)}} \cdot \frac{5 \ln(L=b)}{3 (L=b)^{1-3}} + \frac{9}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}$$

Here and below x(1) means $x(r_s ! 1)$. When x increases from $x_1(1)$ to $x_2(1)$, y increases from 0 to 1 linearly. This is actually the level rule [16] and the sign of a rst order phase transition.

For a very long PA, L b, parameter $\ln (L=b)=(L=b)^{1=3}$ 1. Therefore z is close to 1, the free energy expansion in Eq(10) is self-consistent. Also x_1 (1) is close to 1 and x_2 (1) is close to x_1 (1).

We consider the other phase coexistent region (see Fig. 4d) following the same approach. Combining Eqs. (5) and (6), we have

$$f(y;z) = \frac{(x \ 1)^2 Q^2}{2yC_t} + y(1 \ z)'' \ 1 \ \frac{3b}{R}^! + (1 \ y)'' + \frac{(x \ 1)Q}{q} \ _c + n_i E(n_i):$$
(17)

The free energy sim ilar to Eq. (10) is

$$f(y;z)=j''j= \frac{(1 x)^{2} \ln (L=b)}{yz} + yz \quad 1 + \frac{(1 x)^{2} \ln z}{yz} + \frac{5y(1 z)^{2}}{(L=b)^{1-3}}^{\#} : (18)$$

M in in izing the main terms (in the rst square bracket), we get

$$yz = (1 \ x) \ \ln (L=b)$$
: (19)

Putting it back to the correction terms (in the second square bracket) and taking the minimum, we get

$$z = \frac{5 \ln (L=b)}{(L=b)^{1=3}};$$
 (20)

Combining the two conditions, we have

$$y = \frac{(1 x)^{p} (L=b)^{1=3}}{5 \ln (L=b)};$$
 (21)

Therefore the boundaries of this coexistent region are (see Fig. 2)

1
$$x_{s}(1) = q \frac{1}{\ln(L=b)} \frac{5 \ln(L=b)}{(L=b)^{1-3}};$$
 (22)

$$1 \quad x_4 (1) = 0:$$
 (23)

We see that the same small parameter $\ln (L=b)=(L=b)^{1=3}$ works here. Again, the phase transition from the tadpole phase to the phase of a single drop is in the rst order.

C. W hy not other phases

In this subsection, we argue that several other possible phases or phase coexistence do not appear in the phase diagram at $r_s \mid 1$.

O ne possibility would be that the tadpole phase does not appear at all, but the coexistence of the other two phases shows up in vicinity of x = 1. This is called inter-complex disproportionation (Fig. 4a). We showed in Ref. [15] that this coexistence has a higher free energy than the tadpole phase in some range of x < 1. As far as the tadpole phase exist, it in mediately follows that the only phase coexistent regions can exist are those involving tadpoles (see Fig. 4c,d). And the inter-complex disproportionation region (Fig. 4a) has now here to show up.



FIG.6: C om parison of two-heads and one-head con gurations. (a): a two-head con guration. The diam eter of the smaller head is d. (b): a one-head con guration made from (a) by combining the two heads then releasing tail of length order of d from the head, such that the two con gurations have same capacitance. The C oulom b energy is the same for the two con gurations, but the surface energy is higher in (a).

The second possibility is a phase in which every complex has more than one \head" and therefore forms a necklace structure. Let us argue that the one-head-one-tail tadpole

con quration is the best for intra-com plex disproportionation. To do this, we have to include the capacitances of heads which gives a small correction to Eq. (7). First of all, let us show that for a complex with given charge, one head is better than two heads. Consider an arbitrary two-heads con guration with the diameter of the smaller head d (Fig.6a). We can always construct an one-head con guration from it by combining the two heads then releasing additional tail of the order of d from the head in such a way that the capacitances of the two con gurations are the same (Fig.6b). The total free energy consists of the longrange Coulomb energy and the short-range correlation energy in droplets. For the two con gurations, the Coulomb energies are the same since the capacitances are equal. But the surface energy is higher in the two-heads con guration since the surface is much larger. Thus, for any two-heads con guration, we can always nd a one-head con guration with lower energy. By similar argument, obviously a conguration with many heads along the com plex is even worse. Furtherm ore, the single head always prefers to be at the end of the tail. This can be understood by considering a metallic stick with xed charge on it. The electric eld is larger at the end of the stick than in the middle. Therefore to reduce the Coulomb energy, it is better to put a metallic sphere at the end of the stick to make eld there sm aller.



FIG.7: An illustration of instability of hypotheticm icelle-like droplets in a PA-PC system. Symbols are explained in Fig.1. If tadpoles are not stable, one could think that they merge into micelles. But micelles would immediately break down to reduce Coulomb energy.

The third possibility is a phase in which every few complexes come together to form a micelle-like object (see Fig. 7). However, micelle-like droplets are not stable. For example, suppose several charged PA-PCs tadpoles would gain energy merging into a micelle. Instead of sharing one head by several tails, to reduce the Coulomb energy, it is better to break

the m icelle into one tadpole and several tails. Repeating this process, certainly one ends up with a two phase coexistence (see Fig. 7).

Finally, we want to point out that the necklace phase and the mixelle phase are always worse in free energies than the tadpole phase. This is not only true at $r_s ! 1 . 0$ ne can show that they do not exist in the case of nite r_s too.

III. PHASE DIAGRAM IN A PLANE OF SCREEN ING RADIUS AND CHARGE RATIO

In this section, we consider a more realistic situation of nite r_s and get the complete phase diagram in a plane of $b=r_s$ and x (see Fig. 2). Again we focus on x < 1 side. The r_s range we are interested in is b r_s L. As r_s becomes smaller than L, the long-range C oulomb repulsion is rst reduced while the short-range correlational attraction is not a ected. Eventually, when $r_s < b$, the short-range correlational attraction is also screened out and the macroscopic drop completely dissolves but we do not consider such salt concentrations. In the range of our interest, b r_s L, there are two major implications of screening (see Fig. 2). First, the phase of single drop grow sup. Second, the tadpole phase and related phase coexistent regions are destroyed.

Let us not discuss the general connement to the phase diagram given by the Gibbs' phase rule [16]. Suppose the number of coexistent phases is m. Then for our two substances system, the number of independent equations following the condition of equal chemical potentials is 2 (m 1). The number of unknowns is m + 1. For example, they can be chosen as the charge ratio x in each phase and the common parameter $b=r_s$ shared by all coexistent phases. To have a solution to the equations, we require 2 (m 1) m + 1. This gives m 3. That is to say, the number of coexistent phases cannot be more than 3. It is convenient to de ne a chemical potential

$$_{x} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}; \qquad (24)$$

and consider the phase diagram on a plane of $_x$ and $b=r_s$ (see Fig. 8). When three phases coexist, all variables are completely determined. It corresponds to a point in the phase diagram (the triple point). When two phases coexist, there is one therm odynamic degree of freedom. It corresponds to a line in the phase diagram. If we change variable from $_x$ to its conjugate variable, x, we get our phase diagram (Fig. 2). One can easily show that in this

phase diagram, three phases coexist on a line, and two phases coexist in a region.



FIG.8: Schematic phase diagram on a plane of $_x$ and r_s . Here $_x$ is a chemical potential which is conjugate to x.

The phase diagram s we get is very much similar to the phase diagram of water [16]. Indeed, if we consider $_x$ as pressure, r_s =b as tem perature, and x as volume, then F ig. 8 is like the PT diagram, and F ig. 2 is like the TV diagram of water. Notice that in our system, real tem perature or pressure plays no role. The system is always at room temperature. And the pressure is negligibly small, since in comparison of the C oulomb energy, we have completely ignored the translational entropies of PA and PC, which is related to the volume and the pressure of the system.

Having gured out the topological structure of the phase diagram, let us determ ine all phase boundaries by considering the three two-phase coexistent regions. We start from the coexistence of tadpoles and free com plexes (Fig. 4c). In the presence of m onovalent salt, the free energy is still given by Eq. (9), but the expressions of C and C_t can be di erent. Let us rst assume that $zL < r_s$ L. Then C_t is still given by Eq. (7), while C is now

$$C = \frac{D L}{2 \ln (r_s = b)} :$$
 (25)

Following the same procedure as in subsection IIB, we get

$$z = \frac{r_{s}}{2.7L} \exp \left(\frac{5 \ln (r_{s}=b)}{3 (L=b)^{1=3}} \right)^{\#};$$
(26)

$$y = \frac{1}{1 + z} \frac{(1 + x)^{2} \ln (r_{s} = b)}{1 + z};$$
(27)

At y = 0 and y = 1, we get the boundaries of this coexistent region (see Fig. 2)

1
$$x_{1}(r_{s}) = q \frac{1}{\ln(r_{s}=b)}$$
; (28)

1
$$x_2(r_s) = \frac{r_s}{2.7L \ln (r_s=b)} \exp - \frac{5 \ln (r_s=b)}{3 (L=b)^{1=3}}^{\pi}$$
: (29)

In the limiting case of r_s ! L, these equations go back to Eqs. (15) and (16).

If $r_s = zL$, not only C, but also C_t gets a new expression

$$C_{t} = \frac{D zL}{2 \ln (r_{s}=b)} :$$
(30)

In this case, one can check that the free energy given by Eq. (9) does not have a m inim al extrem um. Indeed, the C oulomb energy of the system becomes so short-ranged that there is almost no di erence to distribute all charges to free complexes or tadpoles. The surface energy of heads dom inates and the coexistence of free complexes and the single drop is preferred (see Fig. 2).

W e now consider the coexistence of tadpoles with the single drop (Fig. 4d). In the case of nite r_s , the free energy given by Eq. (17) should be revised to

$$f(y;z) = \frac{(x - 1)^2 Q^2}{2 [yC_t + (1 - y)C^0]} + y(1 - z)'' - 1 - \frac{3b^2}{R} + \frac{(x - 1)Q}{q} + n_i E(n_i):$$
(31)

Here C⁰ represents the capacitance of a condensed complex in the single drop. A s discussed in Sec. I, when $r_s ! 1$, the macroscopic condensate is almost neutral and the phase of single drop exist only at x = 1. For nite r_s , the macroscopic drop can tolerate certain charge density. Therefore C⁰ appears. In order to calculate C⁰, we assume that the macroscopic drop is uniform ly charged [19]. If the charge density of the macroscopic drop is and the charge of each complex is $b^2L = 4$ [18], the electrical potential of the macroscopic drop is

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{e^{r=r_{s}}}{Dr} 4 r^{2} dr = \frac{4 r_{s}^{2}}{D};$$
(32)

This gives

$$C^{0} = \frac{b^{2}L}{4} = \frac{Db^{2}L}{16r_{s}^{2}}$$
 (33)

W hen $r_s \ ! \ 1$, the capacitance C $^0 \ ! \ 0$ as expected.

In the case of $zL < r_s$ L, C_t is still given by Eq. (7). M in in izing the free energy as in subsection IIB, we get

$$z = \frac{5 \ln (L=b)}{(L=b)^{1=3}} + \frac{\ln^2 (L=b)}{8 (r_s=b)^2} :$$
(34)

And y is still given by Eq. (19). Setting y = 0 and y = 1, the boundaries of the coexistent region are (see Fig. 2)

$$1 \qquad x_{s}(\mathbf{r}_{s}) = \frac{1}{\ln(\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{b})} \frac{5\ln(\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{b})}{(\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{b})^{1=3}} \left[1 + \frac{(\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{b})^{1=3}\ln(\mathbf{L}=\mathbf{b})}{40(\mathbf{r}_{s}=\mathbf{b})^{2}}\right]^{\#};$$
(35)

$$1 \quad x_4 (r_s) = 0$$
: (36)

In the other case of $r_s = zL$, C_t is given by Eq. (30). Again the free energy Eq. (31) has no m inim all extrem um but a maxim all extrem um. And the m inim all free energy is achieved at z = 1. This leads to the coexistence of free complexes and the single drop is preferred (see Fig. 2).

We are now ready to determ ine the position of the line at which three phases coexist in Fig.2 (it is also the upper boundary of the tadpole phase and the two two-phase coexistent regions). The critical r_s , r_c , is determined by the cross point of x_2 (r_s) and x_3 (r_s). In the leading order, we have

$$r_{c}' L^{2=3}b^{1=3} \ln (L=b)$$
: (37)

Unfortunately, r_c is large and not easily realized in experiments. For example, for b = 7A and L = 100b, r_c ' 99b = 693 A. This means that the tadpole phase and all phase coexistence related with it are typically not relevant to experiments. Physically, comparing with intercomplex disproportionation, the tadpole phase (intral-complex disproportionation) is better in the C oulomb energy, and worse in the surface energy. For the C oulomb energy to be more important, r_s has to be large. Therefore the tadpoles must be extinct at small r_s .

Finally we consider the coexistence of free complexes and the single drop (see Fig. 4a) when $r_s < r_c$. Combining Eqs. (3) and (5), we have

$$f(y) = \frac{(x - 1)^2 Q^2}{2 [yC + (1 - y)C^0]} + (1 - y)'' + \frac{(x - 1)Q}{q} + n_i E(n_i);$$
(38)

where C is given by Eq. (25). M inim izing the free energy, we have

$$(x \quad 1)^{2} \frac{1}{\ln(r_{s}=b)} \quad \frac{b^{2}}{8r_{s}^{2}}^{\#} = \frac{D J''J}{Q^{2}} \frac{y}{\ln(r_{s}=b)} + \frac{(1 \quad y)b^{2}}{8r_{s}^{2}}^{\#_{2}} :$$
(39)

And

1
$$x_1 (r_s < r_c) = q \frac{1}{\ln (r_s = b)};$$
 (40)

1
$$x_4 (r_s < r_c) = \frac{b^2}{8r_s^2} \frac{\ln (r_s = b)}{1}$$
 (41)

Here we put $r_s < r_c$ as the argument to remind us that these expressions are meaningful only at $r_s < r_c$. We see that the width of the single drop phase grows proportionally to $1=r_s^2$ with decreasing r_s (see Fig. 2). When $r_s ! r_c$, x_4 (r_s) ! 1 as expected.

IV. POSSIBLE NEW PHASES AT x > 1 SIDE

In this section, we discuss the phase diagram at x > 1 side. At x > 1, the number of PC molecules is more than enough to neutralize all PA molecules. The signs of charges of free complexes or the tails of tadpoles are inverted to positive. In spite of this di erence, all physics we discussed in the last two sections remain valid. Therefore one expects that the topological structure of the phase diagram is symmetric about x = 1. And the boundaries $x_i^0(r_s)$ (see Fig. 2) satisfy

$$x_{i}^{0}$$
 $1 = 1$ x_{i} (42)

where i = 1;2;3;4.

However, a little asymmetry exists since the charge inversion process cannot go forever, but reaches its maximum value at certain critical value of $x, x_m \cdot x_m$ is determined from the balance of the gain in the correlation energy with the overall C oulomb repulsive energy for a PC molecule. For example, for a free complex, we have

$$j_{c}j = \frac{(x_{m} \quad 1)Q q}{C};$$
 (43)

where each free complex carries net charge $(x_m = 1)Q$. In this equation, the left hand side is the magnitude of the gain in correlation energy, and the right hand side is the C oulom b repulsive energy given by the net charge of the complex. At $x > x_m$, extra PC m olecules are not attracted to the complexes, but stay free in solution (see Fig. 2). U sing Eq. (25), we get

$$x_{m} (r_{s}) = 1 + \frac{D L j_{c} j}{2Q q \ln (r_{s}=b)}$$
: (44)

When $r_s ! 1$,

$$x_{m}(r_{s}) = 1 + \frac{D L j_{c} j}{2Q q \ln (L=b)}$$
 (45)

Furthermore, the existence of x_m gives another possibility to the phase diagram. For our purpose, it is enough to consider the simple case where the free complexes and the single drop coexist (see Fig. 4a). One can show that the conclusion is the same for phase coexistence involving tadpoles. Indeed, what we discussed above is self-consistent if $x_1^0 < x_m$. But what if $x_1^0 > x_m$? To answer this question, we rst notice that x_1^0 has another physical meaning. In Eq. (39), for the accuracy we needed, keeping the rst term on each side, we get the net charge of each free complex in the phase coexistent region

$$\frac{(x \quad 1)Q}{Y} = \frac{Q}{\ln (r_s = b)} :$$
(46)

A coording to Eq. (40), this net charge is equal to $(x_1^0 \quad 1)Q$. When $x_1^0 > x_m$, to keep the phase coexistence, each free complex should carry charge $(x_1^0 \quad 1)Q$ while it is only allowed to carry $(x_m \quad 1)Q$ because of the nite correlation chemical potential $_c$. In this situation, x_1^0 because its physical meaning and the charge of each free complex saturates at the maximum value $(x_m \quad 1)Q$. The free energy of Eq. (38) should be revised to

$$f(y) = y \frac{(x_m - 1)^2 Q^2}{2C} + y \frac{(x_m - 1)Q}{q} + (1 - y)'' + n_i E(n_i):$$
(47)

Here for the purpose of discussion, the second order term related to C^{0} has been ignored. W ith help of Eqs. (40) and (43), this free energy can be written as

$$f(y) = y \frac{(x_m - 1)^2 Q^2}{2C} \quad (1 - y) \frac{(x_1^0 - 1)^2 Q^2}{2C} + N n_i E(n_i):$$
(48)

C learly, when $x_1^0 > x_m$, the m inimum of f (y) is reached at y = 0. Therefore at x > 1 side, we arrive at a phase of total condensation in which all complexes are condensed but some PCs are free. This leads to a di erent phase diagram (Fig. 9).

It is convenient to classify all PA-PC systems into two categories. In the rst category, $x_1^0(1) < x_m(1)$, and we have phase diagram Fig. 2. In the second category, $x_1^0(1) > x_m(1)$, and we have phase diagram Fig. 9. Interestingly, both two categories are realistic as we will see in Sec. V. Notice that in the second case, decreasing r_s to a critical value, r_0 , eventually leads to inversion of inequality $x_1^0 > x_m$ (see Fig. 9). We discuss this e ect in detail in the next section after we estimate " and c m icroscopically.

In the case when $x_1^0(1) > x_m(1)$, the phase of single drop expands around x = 1 with growing L=r_s at x > 1 side too (see Fig. 9). We calculate the boundary of this phase with the phase of total condensation at $r_s > r_0$. W hat we need to nd out is just how many excessive PCs the macroscopic drop can tolerate at nite r_s . Applying the condition of maximum charge inversion to a condensed complex, similarly to Eq. (43), we have

$$j_{c}j = \frac{(x_{s}^{0} - 1)Q q}{C^{0}}$$
 (49)



FIG.9: Phase diagram of solution of PA and PC in the case when at $r_s \ ! \ 1$, we form ally have $x_1^0 > x_m$. The meaning of axes and symbols are the same as Fig.2.

T herefore

$$x_1^0 (r_s < r_0) = 1 + \frac{D j_c \dot{p}^2 L}{16Q q r_s^2}$$
 (50)

At $r_s < r_0$, we arrive at inequality $x_1^0 (r_s) < x_m (r_s)$ and Eq. (40) gives the boundary of the phase of single drop (see Fig. 9). We will discuss the transition at $r_s = r_0$ in detail in the next section.

V. PHASE DIAGRAM OF STRONGLY CHARGED POLYELECTROLYTES

In this section, we consider a simple system where linear charge densities of PA's and PC's are equal. Both of them are strongly charged such that every monomer carries a fundamental charge e and e^2 =Db' k_BT (see Fig. 5). We estimate parameters " and _c m icroscopically and choose from the two phase diagrams shown in Figs. 2 and 9.

We rst consider the case of r_s ! 1 . As discussed in Sec. I, $_c$ is equal to the C oulom b self-energy of a PC,

$$_{c} = \frac{qe}{D b} \ln (q=e):$$
 (51)

On the other hand, when neutral PA-PCs complexes condense, they form a strongly correlated liquid. M onom ers of two PEs locally form NaC Hike structure such that the energy in order of \vec{e} =D b permonom er is gained (Fig. 3) [18]. Therefore

"'
$$\frac{Qe}{Db}$$
: (52)

W e see that indeed de ned by Eq. (11) is in order of 1.

Substituting L = Q b = into Eqs. (15) and (45), we have

$$x_1^0(1)$$
 ' $1 + q \frac{1}{\ln(Q=e)}$; (53)

$$x_{m} (1) = 1 + \frac{\ln (q=e)}{2 \ln (Q=e)}$$
: (54)

A coordingly, we get the critical value of q at which $x_1^0 = \ x_m$,

$$q_{\rm c} = \exp 2 \ln (Q = e) \quad : \tag{55}$$

W hen $q > q_b$, or PC is long enough, $x_1^0 < x_m$, we have the phase diagram of reentrant condensation (horizontal axis of Fig. 2). W hen $q < q_b$, or PC is relatively short, $x_1^0 > x_m$, we have the asym m etric phase diagram with total condensation at x > 1 side (horizontal axis of Fig. 9). The possibility of having two di erent phase diagrams for di erent q is related to the interplay of the logarithm s in Eqs. (51) and (54). For xed Q, when q increases, x_m increases but x_1^0 is xed. Therefore we can have either $x_m < x_1^0$ or $x_m > x_1^0$ by changing q. Notice that q_b is exponentially sm aller than Q.

Now let us consider the e ect of screening by monovalent salt. We are interested in the case of r_s by hen the short-range correlation is not a ected yet and " is xed. A coording to Eq. (40),

$$x_1^0(r_s) ' 1 + \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\ln(r_s=b)}}$$
 (56)

In order to discuss x_m (r_s), we consider two dimensional event cases, qb=e r_s Qb=e and r_s qb=e. When qb=e r_s Qb=e, the chemical potential $_c$ is still given by Eq. (51). From Eq. (44),

$$x_{m}(r_{s}) = 1 + \frac{\ln (q=e)}{2 \ln (r_{s}=b)}$$
: (57)

A coordingly, the critical value of q at which x_1^0 (r_s) = x_m (r_s) is

$$q_{\rm c}(\mathbf{r}_{\rm s}) = \exp 2 \ln (\mathbf{r}_{\rm s} = \mathbf{b}) \quad : \tag{58}$$

It decreases with decreasing r_s . Therefore, for a system with $q < q_s(1)$, q can be larger than $q_s(r_s)$ at small r_s . Correspondingly, at x > 1, for small r_s , the phase of total condensation is replaced by the phase coexistence of free com plexes and the single drop. We have a phase diagram shown in Fig. 9. Letting $q = q_s(r_s)$, we get the critical value of r_s at which this phase transition happens

$$r_0 = bexp \quad \frac{\ln^2 (q=e)}{4}$$
: (59)

Notice that r_0 is much larger than qb=e.

In Fig. 9, $x_1^0(r_s) > x_m(r_s)$ at $r_s > r_0$, while $x_1^0(r_s) < x_m(r_s)$ at $r_s < r_0(x_1^0(r_s))$ curve at $r_s > r_0$ is not shown). By de nition of r_0 , the curves $x_1^0(r_s)$ and $x_m(r_s)$ merge at $r_s = r_0$. The curve $x_s^0(r_s)$ is given by Eq. (50) for $r_s > r_0$ and Eq. (40) for $r_s < r_0$. At $r_s = r_0$, these two expressions are equal to each other. At x > 1 side, the solid line at $L=r_s = L=r_0$ corresponds to a rst order phase transition. Notice that r_0 can be either smaller or larger than r_c . Here for simplicity, only the form er case is shown in Fig. 9.

When b r_s $qb=e_r$

$$c = \frac{qe}{Db} \ln (r_s = b); \qquad (60)$$

and x_m (r_s) = 3=2 [17]. In this case, we always have x_1^0 (r_s) < x_m (r_s) as shown in Figs. 2 and 9.

Finally, in all cases discussed above, the value of x_1^0 is close to 1, i.e., jn $n_i j = n_i$ in the condensation regime. Therefore the approximation used in Sec. II that $_c$ is a constant is valid.

VI. THE ROLE OF THE TRANSLATIONAL ENTROPY OF POLYCATIONS

A major approximation in this paper is that the translational entropy of PCs is negligible (we can always ignore PA's translational entropy since it is much longer than PC). In this section, we would like to discuss the validity of this approximation and the role of the translational entropy.

First, let us estim ate when this approximation is valid. Consider PCs with concentration p in the solution. The free energy due to its translational entropy is $k_B T \ln (pv_0)$, where v_0 is the normalizing volume. One the other hand, according to Eq. (51), the Coulomb energy is in the order of qe=D b' qk T=e. They are equal at the critical value, $p = \exp((q=e)=v_0$.

Therefore for a long PC with large q, we can ignore PC's translational entropy even at exponentially smallp.

If PC is very short, its translational entropy should be included. DNA with short polyam ines is a good example of such systems [10, 11, 12]. In this case, the phase diagram gets another dimension, say, the concentration of PC, p. The elect of PC entropy was discussed in detail in Ref. [13, 14] in which the phase diagram is drawn in a plane of two concentrations of oppositely charged colloids at given r_s . Here we discuss the same elect in the language of total charge ratio x used in this paper in the simple case where $x_1^0 > x_m$ and $r_s ! 1$. For simplicity, we neglect the possibility of intra-molecule disproportionation and the tadpole phase.

In this case, the free energy in Eq. (38) gets an additional term due to the translational entropy of PCs [13]

$$f(n;y) = y \frac{(nq \ Q)^{2}}{2C} + nE(n) + (1 \ y) [nE(n_{i}) + "] + \frac{xQ}{q} yn (1 \ y)[nIn \ p \ \frac{ynq}{xQ}p \ \frac{1 \ y}{x}p \ \frac{v_{0}}{e};$$
(61)

where e is the natural exponential. Here the expression in the square bracket before the logarithm represents the number of free PC in the solution, while the expression in the round bracket in the logarithm represents their concentration.

Now n and y are two independent variables. Taking @F = @n = 0 and @F = @y = 0, we get

$$c = \ln p \frac{ynq}{xQ} p \frac{1}{x} \frac{y}{p} v_0 \frac{(nq Q)q}{C}; \qquad (62)$$

$$" = \frac{(nq \ Q)^{2}}{2C} + (n \ n_{1}) \ _{c} \ \ln \ p \ \frac{ynq}{xQ} p \ \frac{1 \ y}{x} p \ v_{0} :$$
(63)

In Eq. (62), eliminating n by Eq. (63), we can calculate the boundaries of the condensation regime by setting y = 0 and y = 1. For y = 0, we get two boundaries of a total condensation phase,

$$p \ 1 \ \frac{1}{x} = p_1;$$
 (64)

$$p \ 1 \ \frac{1}{x} = p_1^0$$
: (65)

For y = 1, we get two boundaries of the free com plexes phase,

$$p \ 1 \ \frac{x_1}{x} = p_1;$$
 (66)



FIG.10: Phase diagram in a plane of PC's concentration p and total charge ratio x ($x_1^0 > x_m$ and $r_s ! 1$). Symbols used are explained in Fig.1. It shows how the phase of total condensation replaces that of partial condensation with decreasing p.

$$p \ 1 \ \frac{x_1^0}{x} = p_1^0$$
: (67)

Here

$$p_{1} = \frac{1}{v_{0}} \exp^{0} c \frac{2J' \dot{p}^{2}}{C}^{A}; \qquad (68)$$

$$p_{1}^{0} = \frac{1}{v_{0}} \exp^{\theta} c_{c} + \frac{2J' \dot{p}^{2}}{C}^{A} :$$
 (69)

A coordingly, as shown in the phase diagram Fig. 10, a regime of total condensation is sandwiched by two regimes of partial condensation, which are further sandwiched by two regimes of free complexes.

In Fig. 10, results of previous sections are recovered in the limit p ! 1. Due to the translational entropy of PC, at nite p all critical x are shifted to higher values. At the same time, a total condensation region acquires a nite width even in the absence of monovalent salt [13]. In the limiting case where x ! 1, the concentration of PA is much smaller than that of PC, and the entropy of PC is xed, which o ers a xed charging voltage to PA.

As a result, all PA-PCs complexes are either totally condensed or totally free. The partial condensation regimed disappears [13].

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we discussed com plexation and condensation of PA with PC in a salty water solution. Using ideas of disproportionation of PCs among com plexes and inside com plexes (inter- and intra-com plex disproportionations) we arrived at the two phase diagrams in a plane of x (ratio of total charges of PC and PA) and $L=r_s$ (ratio of the length of PA, L, and the Debye-Huckel screening radius, r_s) shown in Figs. 2 and 9. In the case of strongly charged PA and PC, we nd that both two phase diagram s are possible depending on the relative length of PC to PA. Fig. 2 corresponds to a more generic case of relatively long PC, while Fig. 9 to the case of relatively short one. Our phase diagram s show how total condensation is replaced by the partial one and then by phases of stable com plexes when x m oves away from x = 1.

We discovered two new features of the phase diagram s. First, at large screening radius they include a new phase of tadpoles and corresponding phase coexistence. Second, we found that the phase of the single drop form ed at x close to 1 widens with decreasing r_s as $1=r_s^2$.

A lthough we talked about strongly charged PA and PC one can also consider phase diagram of weakly charged PA and PC and develop a microscopic theory for it. In both cases, the qualitative picture is the same since our discussion of the phase diagram is rather general and independent of the microscopic mechanism of the short-range attraction.

As mentioned in the introduction, the problem we solved in this paper should be considered as an example of a more general problem of the phase diagram of the solution of two oppositely charged colloids. Another important system of this kind is a long PA with m any strongly charged positive spheres. W hen long double helix DNA plays the role of PA, this system is a model for the natural chromatin. Therefore, we call such system articial chromatin [13]. Our phase diagram swith all new features including tadpoles should be valid for articial chromatin as well.

There is another class of systems where only some of our predictions are applicable. In the Ref. [14] we considered solution of large negative spheres with positive spheres which

27

are smaller in both radius and charge. C on plexation and condensation of such spheres obey the phase diagram s similar to discussed above. For example, screening by monovalent salt again leads to $1=r_s^2$ expansion of the range of the single drop (total condensation) phase. A nother our prediction, the tadpole phase, however, is not applicable to this case, because it is essentially based on the polymer nature of PA.

In a case when the role of PA is played by DNA, one should remember that the double helix DNA is so strongly charged that the elect of the Manning condensation by monovalent counterions must be included [13]. Since DNA complexes with positive macroions (PC, positive spheres or multivalent cations), this Manning condensation can be weaker than free DNA due to counterion releasing. The quantitative description of this elect depends on the geometry of the positive macroions and the microscopic structure of the complex in the system [13]. Generally speaking, this elect leads to the renormalization of the bare charge of PA, Q. In this case, total condensation still happens around x = 1 but renormalized charge enters in calculation of x. This means that if on the other hand x is evaluated using the bare charge of DNA, all phase diagram s are centered around a smaller than 1 value of x.

Our phase diagrams deal with equilibrium states of the system. But not all of them can be achieved in experimental time scale due to slow kinetics. Therefore it is not easy to directly compare our theory to experiments. For instance, a phase of many condensed particles with nite size is often found in experiments which does not appear in our phase diagram [1, 2, 3, 7]. We believe that this phase is not a real equilibrium state, but the state frozen kinetically [20, 21]. Thus, kinetics is extremely important for applications and we plan to address it in the future.

A cknow ledgm ents

The authors are grateful to V.Budker, A.Yu. Grosberg, and M.Rubinstein for useful discussions. This work was supported by NSF No.DMR-9985785 and DM I-0210844.

^[1] V. Budker, V. Trubetskoy, J. A. W ol, Condensation of non-stochiom etric DNA/Polycation complexes by divalent cations.

- [2] A.V.Kabanov and V.A.Kabanov, Bioconjugate Chem. 6 (1995) 7. And references therein.
- [3] E Laiand J.H. van Zanten, Biophys. J. 80 (2001) 864.
- [4] K.M inagawa, Y.M atsuzawa, K.Yoshikawa, M.M atsum oto, M.Doi, FEBS Letts. 295 (1991)
 67.
- [5] D.D.Dunlap, A.Maggi, M.R.Soria, L.Monaco, Nucletc Acids Research 25 (1997) 3095.
- [6] A.A.Zinchenko, V.G. Sergeyev, S.Murata, K.Yoshikawa, J.Am. Chem. Soc. 125 (2003) 4414.
- [7] V.A.Bloom eld, Biopolymers 44, (1997) 269.
- [8] V.Y.Borue and I.Y.Erukhim ovich, Macrom olecules 23 (1990) 3625.
- [9] M. Castelnovo and J.F. Joanny, Eur. Phys. J.E 6 (2001) 377.
- [10] M. Olvera de la Cruz, L. Belloni, M. Delsanti, J. P. Dalbiez, O. Spalla and M. Dri ord, J. Chem. Phys. 103 (1995) 5781.
- [11] E.Raspaud, M.O. Ivera de la Cruz, J.-L.Sikorav, and F.Livolant, Biophys. J. 74 (1998) 381.
- [12] T.T.Nguyen, I.Rouzina, and B.I.Shklovskii, J.Chem. Phys. 112 (2000) 2562.
- [13] T.T.Nguyen and B.I.Shklovskii, J.Chem. Phys. 115 (2001) 7298.
- [14] R. Zhang and B. I. Shklovskii, Phys. Rev. E 69 (2004) 021909.
- [15] R. Zhang and B. I. Shklovskii, Physica A 352 (2005) 216.
- [16] L.D.Landau and E.M.Lifshitz, Statistical Physics, Part 1 3rd ed. (Butterworth-Heinem ann, Oxford, 1980).
- [17] T.T.Nguyen and B.I.Shklovskii, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89 (2002) 018101.
- [18] In this paper, for simplicity, we do not discrim in the between the size of the monom er and the distance between charges in the polymer. This is a resonable approximation for strongly charged polyelectrolytes (b' $l_{\rm B} = 7$ A).
- [19] R.Zhang and B.I.Shklovskii, cond-m at/0310321.
- [20] T.T.Nguyen and B.I.Shklovskii, Phys. Rev. E 65 (2002) 031409.
- [21] B.-Y. Ha, and A. J. Liu, Europhys. Lett. 46 (1999) 624.