Probing the mechanical unzipping of DNA

N.K.Voulgarakis, A.Redondo, A.R.Bishop, and K. . Rasmussen

Theoretical Division and Center for Nonlinear Studies,

Los A lam os National Laboratory, Los A lam os, New Mexico 87545, USA

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

A study of the microm echanical unzipping of DNA in the fram ework of the Peyrard-Bishop-D auxois model is presented. We introduce a Monte C arlo technique that allows accurate determ ination of the dependence of the unzipping forces on unzipping speed and tem perature. Our ndings agree quantitatively with experimental results for hom ogeneous DNA, and for -phage DNA we reproduce the recently obtained experimental force-tem perature phase diagram. Finally, we argue that there may be fundamental di erences between in vivo and in vitro DNA unzipping.

PACS num bers: 87.15 A a, 64.70.-p, 05.90.+m

Separation of double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) into single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) is fundamental to DNA replication and other important intra-cellular processes in living organisms. In equilibrium, DNA will denaturate when the free energy of the separated ssDNA is less than that of the dsDNA.Because of the larger entropy of the

exible single-strand, this can m ost easily be achieved by increasing the tem perature of the sam ple until the DNA m elts, som ew hat above body tem perature. In living organism s, how ever, DNA separation is not only therm ally driven, but also enzym es and other proteins m ay force the two strands apart.

Recent advances in single-molecule force spectroscopy and dynam ical force spectroscopy (DFS) has made possible the system atic investigation of force-induced separation of dsDNA at room temperature where dsDNA is thermally stable in the absence of an applied force [1]. A lthough, these studies have signi cantly enhanced the understanding of the mechanical aspects of DNA replication and transcription in vivo, it is also in perative for further developm ents of technologies, such as polym erase chain reaction and DNA chips, to understand the relation between therm al denaturation and force-induced separation. An initial step in this direction was taken by Danibwicz et al. [2] who published an experimentally determined phase diagram for the denaturation temperature as a function of the applied force. This study showed, as theoretically predicted [3], that the force required to unzip the DNA decreases with increasing tem perature. However the applied theoretical fram ework [2] does not capture all details in the entire temperature range.

The mechanical unzipping of DNA has also been a subject of several theoretical studies, which have offen concentrated on macroscopical aspects by investigating therm odynamic equilibrium conditions [4]. Simulating realistic dynamics is unfeasible since the time scales reachable in molecular dynamics simulations are orders of magnitude smaller than in experiments [5]. In this work we present a simple and e cient numerical Monte Carlo (M C) approach, to describe the unzipping processm acro-

scopically as well as sem im icroscopically. In particular, we provide a theoretical underpinning for the experim ental force-tem perature phase diagram recently published by D anilow icz et al. [2].

For this purpose, we use a simple one-dimensional model of DNA proposed by Peyrard-Bishop-Dauxois (PBD) [6]. This model has been demonstrated [7, 8, 9] to describe the therm ally generated large amplitude local

uctuations quite accurately, an aspect which is generally ignored in the therm odynam icm odels. W e will show that thism odel successfully describes m any of the m icrom echanical unzipping properties of DNA and provides signi cant insights into the physical phenom ena governing unzipping.

In a typical unzipping experiment, one strand of the DNA molecule is tethered, at the term inating base, to a

xed surface while the other strand is connected through a polymeric linker to a force probe, such as a laser trap or an atom ic force m icroscope (AFM) cantilever. For the sake of sim plicity, the force probe is usually treated as a linear spring whose elastic properties can be determ ined through the system calibration. The force required to keep the molecule extended at a given distance is determined by measuring the de ection of the force probe. By pulling the molecule apart at a constant speed, the force-extension curves of the system can be obtained. It should be mentioned, how ever, that the force determ ined by such techniques cannot be consider a characteristic quantity of the DNA, because it strongly depends on the elasticity of the experimental setup, as well as on the pulling speed. How ever, by perform ing the experim ent at a wide range of pulling speeds and tem peratures, useful inform ation regarding the energy landscape of the DNA unzipping process can be accumulated.

Similarly to this typical experimental setup, we use the model schematically represented in Fig. 1. In this model there is only one degree of freedom describing the relative displacement of each base pair (bp) from its equilibrium position. The hydrogen bonds that hold the two strands together are approximated by a Morse potential (dashed lines), while the stacking interaction between successive




FIG.1: A schematic representation of the PBD model in a dynamic force spectroscopy experiment.

base-pairs is described by nonlinear springs (solid black line). The model's rst base to the left is xed, while the complem entary base is attached to a linear spring (force probe) of sti ness k_0 which moves at a constant speed v_0 . The force probed by the spring is therefore given by Hook's law, $V_{pull}^0 = k_0 (y_0 \quad y_1)$, where y_1 and y_0 are the displacements (see Fig. 1) of the rst base-pair and the spring's opposite end point, respectively. Speci cally, the potential energy of the model is :

$$V = {X \ h} {D_{n} (e^{a_{n} y_{n}} \ 1)^{2} + } \\ \frac{k}{2} (1 + e^{b(y_{n} + y_{n-1})}) (y_{n} \ y_{n-1})^{2} + V_{pull}; (1)$$

The PBD model parameters are those determined by C ampa and G iansanti [7]. To compute the force applied during the unzipping process, we performed M onte C arbo simulations: The force probe is moved to the right $(y_0 \mid y_0 + y)$ by the distance y after which N M onte C arbo steps are performed in order to compute the average displacement, hy_1 i of the rst base pair. The force will then be given by $F = k_0 (y_0 - hy_1 i)$. The more M C steps used for sampling, the closer to equilibrium the system is before the next y move occurs. Thus, in this M onte C arbo framework, the pulling speed can be dependent.

ned as $v_0 = y=N$. However, it should be emphasized that no direct comparison to the real time can be made as this depends on the detailed implementation of the M onte Carlo method. Here, the unit of pulling speed is $V = 10^{-4} \text{ A/MC}$ steps.

We rst investigate the initiation of the unzipping process. In Fig. 2 we present the force extension curve of a hom ogeneous 300 bp AT sequence, for di erent values of the sti ness, k_0 , of the force probe. A signi cant force barrier at 2 A extensions is observed for sti force probes. This barrier gradually decreases with decreasing sti ness, and nally vanishes for $k_0 \le 16 \text{ pN}/\text{nm}$ (see inset of Fig. 2). A simple interpretation of this result can be understood by considering the energy landscape of the entire




FIG.2: Force-extension curves of a 300 bp hom ogeneous AT sequence for three di erent values of the probe sti ness k. The inset shows the height of the force barrier, $F_{m \ ax}$, as a function of k_0 . All curves correspond to averaging over 10^3 M onte C arlo simulations at T = 300K and $v_0 = 0.1V$.

system (DNA and force probe) [10]. A ssum ing, for sim – plicity, the unzipping of the rst base pair only, for sm all k_0 , the total energy has two local minim a separated by an activation barrier. The rst minimum corresponds to the bound state of the base pair and the second to the unbound state. As the force probe moves, the energy landscape is increasingly tilted, and eventually the second minimum becomes the global minimum. Beyond this point the unbound state is the energetically most favorable. In the simulation (and also in the experiment) only the transition between the bound and unbound state can be observed. States close to the activation barrier are different to th

cult to probe, since the probability decays exponentially with increasing barrier height. For large k_0 , how ever, the elastic energy of the force sensor becom es dom inant and the total energy has only a single m in im um such that the unzipping process is continuous with no inaccessible regions. In fact, for very sti probes (> 1:6 10⁵ pN /nm) the resulting force accurately represents the derivative of the potential energy with respect to the extension. In the PBD model, the force barrier originates from a combination of the force needed to break the hydrogen bond and the force needed to overcom e the entropic barrier of the stacking interaction [11, 12]. However, it is important to notice that this barrier can be observed only for the unzipping of the rst base pairs. When the rst base pair is unzipped the e ective probe consisting of the actual force probe and the new ly form ed single strand becom es very soft and the observation of the force barrier is no longer possible. An experimental indication of the existence of this force barrier can be found in the work of K rautbauer et al. [13], where signi cant force barriers are observed at the initiation of the unzipping process. However these authors attributed this barrier to interactions with other molecules. The experimental ambiguity of this barrier m ay be attributed to two factors: First, the experim ental apparatus does not have a resolution of 2 A where the barrier exists. Second, the typical total sti ness of

the force probe and the polymeric linkage is very small. The question of whether this force barrier exists when enzymes bind the DNA molecules obviously depends on how still their interaction is. The development of more sophisticated experimental techniques able to accurately probe protein-DNA interaction, will shed light on to what extend the binding process is driven by enzymes or thermal uctuations [8] and supercoiling elects [14]. In what follows, we use $k_0 = 1.6 \text{ pN}/\text{nm}$, corresponding to the value of the force probe still ness between the lower limit of AFM cantilevers and the upper limit of a typical optical tweezer.

One of the most common questions investigated by DFS experiments is the dependence of the unzipping force on pulling speed. In Fig. 3 (a) we present the forceextension curve of a hom ogeneous AT sequence for three di erent values of v_0 , at T = 300K. It is seen that faster pulling leads to higher measured force, in agreem ent with experiments [15]. However, for small v_0 (0.2V) the m easured force remains practically constant during the simulation, indicating that the system is close to equilibrium. This force corresponds to the experimentally observed unzipping force. During the unzipping of long DNA molecules, a slight increase in the slope of the forceextension curve is also observed, corresponding to the elastic energy of the stretched single strand and force probe system [4]. It should also be noted that for even slower pulling speeds the molecule unzipping can take place m ore easily. This occurs because there is su cient time for the system to be stochastically driven over the activation barrier at even low er forces [15].

A coording to our num erical results, presented in Fig. 3(b), the unzipping force of a hom ogeneous AT and GC sequence is 20 and 36 pN, respectively. These values are roughly twice what one would expect from experiments [16, 17]. To understand the source of this di erence one should recall that the PBD model was originally developed in order to study unforced therm al denaturation. In this context, the choice of only one degree of freedom, which describes the relative motion of a base pair, was su cient. However, this picture does not accurately describe the single strand dynam ics in the kind of experin ents we are considering here. During unzipping, two dynam ically uncorrelated single strands form , and so at the macroscopic scale of the experiment there is a small possibility for two long single strands to be completely recombined. In the PBD model, the single strands are alwaysdynam ically correlated. As a result, in our num erical simulations, the single strands lack entropy, resulting in arti cially high unzipping forces. In reality, junzipped base pairs produce two single strands each consisting of j bases. The two single strands should be considered as a series of springs with e ective sti ness k=2j, rather than as in the PBD model where the e ective sti ness is k=j. A simple way of imposing this e ective entropy reduction on the PBD model is to reduce the strength




FIG. 3: Force-extension curves obtained through M onte C arlo simulations for (a) AT sequence at three di erent pulling speeds, (b) AT and GC sequences at $v_0 = 0.2V$ and $v_0 = 0.1V$, respectively. Sub gures (c) and (d) are the same as (a) and (b) but using the improved description of the singe strand stacking interaction (see text for details). In (d) $v_0 = V$ and $v_0 = 0.16V$ for AT and GC sequences, respectively. Each curve is the average over 10^3 independent simulations. In all cases T = 300K, $k_0 = 1.6$ pN /nm and the num ber of unzipped base pairs is 300.

of the stacking interaction, in the single-stranded region, to k=2. This requires the introduction of a displacement threshold y_{th} beyond which this transition takes place. The choice of this threshold does not critically a left the result, since our interest lies in describing the problem at the macroscopic scale of the experiments.

In Fig. 3 (c) and (d) we present the num erical results obtained from this approach. The resulting rate dependence on the calculated force is exactly the same as in Fig. 3(a), but the unzipping force of hom ogeneous AT and GC sequences is 9 pN and 17:5 pN, respectively, values that are in excellent agreem ent with the existing experim ental results [16, 17]. It is in portant to em phasize that in vivo unzipping is expected to require more force than the experim ents indicate [18]. Existence of the force barrier and the fact that the unzipping experiments probe the locally required force through a long and exible single strand linker yields a lower unzipping force. In nature, enzymes apply the force directly to the DNA lacking the exible linker that signi cantly lower them easured force [15]. Indeed, simulations of the unmodi ed PBD model indicate that an enzyme is required to apply a force of at least 20 36 pN to unzip the DNA molecule. It is clear that ourm odel and num erical approach will be able to shed new light on fundam ental processes, such as replication and transcription when applied to interpret single-molecule exprimental data obtain for these process [19, 20].

W ith the M onte C arb technique and the single strand m odi cation to the PBD m odel described earlier, we are now able to determ ine the force required to unzip DNA at a given temperature and compare directly with the experim ental results of D anilow icz et al. [2]. These au-




FIG.4: Force-tem perature phase diagram the -phage DNA. Squares correspond to the experim ental results of R ef. [2]. C incles represents our num enical results for k_0 = 1.6 pN /nm and v_0 = 0.16V. Each point is the m ean value of the force-extension curve obtained by unzipping the $\,$ rst 300 base-pairs of the m olecule for 10^3 di erent simulations.

thors presented the force-tem perature phase diagram of the -phage DNA at a constant force, com pared with the prediction of a simple therm odynam ic model. Figure 4 depicts our results obtained for the unzipping of the st 300 bp of the -DNA. Since the molecule under investigation is not hom ogeneous, the unzipping force at each tem perature corresponds to the mean value of the forceextension curve. As shown, our results are in very good agreem ent in the tem perature range of 20 $\,$ 50 °C . We notice a di erence between our prediction and the experim ental results for T < 20 $^{\circ}$ C. This low temperature behaviorm ay be due to a con gurational change [2], or to tim e scales of experim ental techniques. Our predictions are more consistent with the experim ental results than those of the therm odynam ic model. This improvement ism ost evident at high tem peratures, with the therm odynam ic model yielding signi cantly higher forces. This is mainly attributed to the fact that the spontaneous bubble form ation for T > 40 $^{\circ}$ C [21], is not described by the therm odynam ic model. The bubble form ation, which is predicted by the PBD model [9], leads to a considerable reduction of the m easured force at those higher tem peratures.

In summary we have presented a Monte Carlo approach to mechanical unzipping of DNA, within the framework of the simple PBD model. Our method allow sus to investigate the dependence on unzipping speed and temperature. We demostrated and analyzed the existence of a force barrier at the initiation of forced unzipping which has generally been ignored in experimental setups. Further, we found that the single strand, as it extends between the double stranded molecule and the force probe, causes a decrease in the measured force. We showed that a modi cation of the PBD model is necessary to appropriately account for this e ect and match experimental results. However, we not that the unmodi i ed PBD model reliably captures the local dynamics

involved in the unzipping of DNA.W ith the described m odi cation, we were able to quantitatively reproduce the experimental force-temperature phase diagram recently obtained for -phage DNA.Evidently, the PBD m odel successfully encompass both the traditional therm al separation and the more recently investigated forceinduced DNA unzipping, and therefore o ers signi cant predictive power for in vivo situations as well as emerging technologies.

W e thank D r. Steven K och for inform ative discussions. W ork at Los A lam os is perform ed under the auspices of the US D epartm ent of Energy under contract W -7405-ENG-36.

- [1] R.S.Conroy, C.D an ilow icz, Contem porary Physics 45 (4), 277 (2004).
- [2] C.Danilowicz, Y.Kafri, R.S.Conroy, V.W.Coljee, J. Weeks, M. Prentiss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 078101 (2004).
- [3] D.R.Nelson, Nato Science Series, series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry 160, 65 (2004) (and references therein).
- [4] U.Bockelmann, Ph.Thomen, B.Essevaz-Roulet, V.Viasno, and F.Heslot, Biophys J 82, 1537 (2002).
- [5] M. Peyrard, Europhys. Lett 44 (3), 271 (1998).
- [6] M. Peyrard and A. R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 2755 (1989); T. D auxois, M. Peyrard, A. R. Bishop, Phys. Rev. E 47, R 44 (1993).
- [7] A. Cam pa and A. Giansanti, Phys. Rev. E 58, 3585 (1998).
- [8] C.H.Choi, G.Kaloskas, K. .Rasmussen, M.Hiromura, A.R.Bishop and A.Usheva., Nucleic Acids Res. 32, 1584 (2004).
- [9] S. Ares, N. K. Voulgarakis, K. . Rasmussen and A. R. Bishop, Phys Rev. Lett. 94, 035504 (2005).
- [10] H.Qian, B.E.Shapiro, Proteins 576, 37 (1999).
- [11] S.Cocco, R.M onasson, J.F.M arko, Phys. Rev. E 65, 041907 (2002).
- [12] N. Singh and Y. Singh, Eur. Phys. J. E 17, 7 (2005).
- [13] R.K rautbauer, M. R ief and H.E.G aub, N ano Letters 3 (4), 493 (2003).
- [14] C.J.Benham, Proc.Natl Acad.Sci.U.S.A.90, 2999
 (1993).
- [15] E. Evans and K. Ritchie, Biophys J 76, 2439 (1999).
- [16] B.Essevaz-Roulet, U.Bockelmann, F.Heslot, Proc.Natl. A cad. Sci.USA 11935, 94 (1997).
- [17] M. Rief, H. Clausen-Schaumann, H. E. Gaub, Nature Structural Biology 6, 346 (1999).
- [18] S. J. Koch, A. Shundrovsky, B.C. Jantzen, M. D. Wang, Biophysical Journa 83, 1098 (2002).
- [19] Taekjip Ha, Ivan Rasnik, W eiCheng, Hazen P.Babcock, George H.Gauss, T in othy M.Lohm an and Steven Chu, Nature 419, 638 (2002).
- [20] D avenport, R J; W uite, G JL; Landick, R; Bustam ante, C, Science 287, 2497 (2000).
- [21] Y. Zeng, A. Montrichok and G. Zocchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 148101 (2003).