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#### Abstract

We investigate the statistical mechanics of a torsionally constrained polym er. The polym er is modeled as a uctuating rod with bend sti ness $A k_{B} T$ and tw ist sti ness $C k_{B} T$. In such a model, therm albend uctuations couple geom etrically to an applied torque through the relation $\mathrm{Lk}=\mathrm{Tw}+\mathrm{W} \mathrm{r}$. W e explore this coupling and nd agreem ent betw een the predictions of our m odel and recent experim ental results on single -NA m olecules. This analysis a ords an experim ental determ ination of the $m$ icroscopic tw ist sti ness (averaged over a helix repeat). Q uantitative agreem ent between theory and experim ent is obtained using $C=109 \mathrm{~nm}$ (i.e. tw ist rigidity $C k_{B} T=4: 5 \quad 10{ }^{19}$ ergam ). The theory further predicts a them al reduction of the ective tw ist rigidity induced by bend uctuations. Finally, we nd a sm all re ection ofm olecular chirally in the experm ental data and interpret it in term s of a tw ist-stretch coupling of the D NA duplex.
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## I Introduction

In this paper, we investigate the statisticalm echanics of a polym er chain $w$ ith torsional rigidity. W em odel the polym er as an elastic rod sub ject to therm al uctuations. Each conform ation of the chain is statistically w eighted according to the energy associated w ith bending and tw isting. This is in contrast to conventionalpolym erm odels, which account only for the energy cost of bending the polym er backbone 11 This neglect of torsional energy is often well justi ed, asm any polym ers are free to release tw ist by sw ìveling about the single carbon bonds that constitute their badkbone. Even for polym ers that cannot sw ivel freely, the tw ist usually am ounts to an uncoupled Gaussian degree of freedom that can sim ply be integrated away. The situation is quite di erent, how ever, in the presence of a torsional constraint. In this case, the tw ist is coupled to the conform ation of the backbone and cannot be elim inated so easily. Such a situation can arise when the polym er is ligated into a circle, or when its ends are clam ped and a torque is applied at one end. The concept of a torsional constraint can also be extended to the dynam ics of a polym er in a viscous uid: here viscous dam ping provides the necessary resistance to the stress ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~W}$ hatever the origin of the constraint, it will result in a coupling betw een the tw ist and the bending $m$ odes of the backbone.
$T$ he origin of this coupling lies in $W$ hite's theorem : $\mathrm{Lk}=\mathrm{Tw}+\mathrm{W}$ r4: 国: 目 T his form ula relates a global topological invariant of any pair of closed curves (the Linking num ber, Lk ), to the sum of a local strain eld (the Twist, Tw) and a global con gurational integral (the $W$ rithe, $W$ r). If the linking number is $x e d$, the polym er will be forced to distribute the invariant Lk between the degrees of freedom associated with Tw and W r. From a statisticalm echanics point of view, the set of com plexions available to the system is then restricted. T he elastic energy of each allowed com plexion re ects the sum of a tw isting energy and a bending energy associated w ith the $W$ rithe of the badkbone. O f course we do not need to consider xed linking num ber for torsional rigidity to be im portant: a chem ical potential for Lk in the form of an applied torque also couples the bend uctuations to the tw ist.

Perhaps the most im portant exam ples of tw ist-storing polym ens are biopolym ers, especially DNA. Unlike m any of its hydrocarbon-chain cousins, the monom ers of DNA are joined by multiple covalent bonds; additional speci c pairing interactions between bases prevent slippage betw een the strands. This multiply-bonded structure inhibits the unw inding of the DNA helix to release a torsional stress; instead, there is an elastic energy cost associated w ith the deform ation.

Recently it has becom e possible to perform experim ents on single m olecules ofD NA. In a classic experim ent, Sm th et all anchored one end of a DNA duplex to a solid
substrate while the other end was attached to a m agnetic bead. The conform ations of the polym er could then be probed by considering the end-to-end extension of the chain as a function of the $m$ agnetic force applied to the bead. These experim ents, and others which stretch DNA molecules using electric elds, ${ }^{6}$ hydrodynam ic ow $s, 9$ or optical tweezers 19 were soon analyzed using the \worm-like chain" (W LC) model ${ }^{11}$ W orking w ithin this fram ew ork, B ustam ante, M arko and Siggia11; 12 and Vologodski13 were able to reproduce the experim ental force-extension curves for DNA over a wide range of forces (from $10^{2} \mathrm{pN}$ to 10 pN ) w th just one tting param eter, the DNA bend persistence length.

Since the original D NA stretching experim ents, signi cant im provem ents have been m ade. In particular, a series ofelegant experim ents14: 15; 16 has succeeded in torsionally constraining the DNA using sw ivel-free attachm ents at both ends. A s a result, one can now directly explore the interplay betw een D NA's intemal resistance to tw isting and the conform ations of its backbone.

In this paper, we will explain som e of these new results analytically in term s of a theory of tw ist-storing polym ers. O ur nal form ula, given in (41) below, quantitatively ts the experim ental data of Strick et al 14 and of $A l l e m$ and and C roquette 16 w ith just two im portant $t$ param eters: the bend sti ness A and tw ist sti ness C (a m ore precise statem ent appears below ). O ur analytical approach rests upon linear elasticity and perturbation theory about a straight rod. T hus we do not address the rem arkable structuraltransitions induced in D NA by torsionalstress, 14; 15 norw ill we system atically study the plectonem ic transition or other phenom ena involving self-avoidance. M arko and Siggia have previously studied the ects of them al uctuations on plectonem ic D NA; 17 we have chosen instead to work in a regim e not a icted by this theoreticaldi culty. W e w ill show that our analysis is justi ed in a well-de ned region of param eter space where $m$ any experim ental data points are available (solid symbols in Figure 1), and from the data deduce the fundam ental elastic param eters of D NA.

The $m$ ain points of our results were announced previously 18; 19 Som e of the steps were independently derived by Bouchiat and $M$ ezard 20 in a di erent analysis of the sam e experim ents. The present paper gives som e new analytical results, particularly in section VD, and applies the analysis to som e new experim ental data (see Figure 1).

In addition to these analytical results, Vologodskii and $M$ anko, and Bouchiat and $M$ ezard, have recently perform ed $M$ onte $C$ arlo $\operatorname{sim}$ ulation 2 21: 20 to study the conform ations of DNA under applied tensions and torques appropriate to those in the experim ents studied here. M arko has also studied the related problem of torsional constraints on the overstretching transition 22; 23

A part from quantitatively reproducing the experim ental extension curves with just a few $t$ param eters, our theory also predicts a reduction of the e ective tw ist rigidity of a polym er caused by conform ational uctuations. W e give the form of a new e ective tw ist rigidity $C_{e} k_{B} T$, which is sm aller than the $m$ icroscopic rigidity $C k_{B} T$. This e ect, anticipated som e tim e ago by Shim ada and Y am akaw 24 has a sim ple explanation : part of the exœess Link im posed on a solid rod can be m oved into the bend deform ations of its backbone through the coupling associated w ith the Lk constraint. O ur simple form ula ( (g) below ) m akes this intuition precise for the case of a highly stretched rod.

It $m$ ay at rst seem that all the relevant physics could be found in the classical works of the nineteenth œentury 25 but actually one can see at once that classical beam theory is qualitatively at odds w th the experim ental data of F igure 1: it says that a rod under tension will smply tw ist in response to an applied torque as long as is sm all enough. Only when the torque exceeds a critical value will the rod buckle into a helical con guration, thus shortening the end-to-end extension. Unlike its macroscopic counterpart, how ever, a m icroscopic rod is continuously bu eted by them al uctuations. Because the rod is never straight, its average shape w ill respond as soon as any torsional stress is applied; there is no threshold, as seen in Figure 1. In sections \#1 we will create a simple $m$ athem atical model em bodying this observation and use it to explain the data.

## II Experim ent

The statisticalm echanical problem of a tw ist-storing polym er sub ject to a Lk constraint is realized in the experim ents of Strick et al 14: 15 and $A$ lem and and C roquette 16 In these experim ents, a segm ent of double-stranded - D NA of length $L$ 15:6 m is held at both ends: one end is xed to a glass plate while the other is attached to a m agnetic bead. B oth ends are bound in such a way as to prevent sw iveling of the polym er about the point of attachm ent. By rotating the $m$ agnetic bead in an applied $m$ agnetic eld, the experim enters are then able to adjust the excess linking num ber to any desired, xed value.

W hile the direction of the applied eld xes the linking num ber, a gradient in the sam e eld allow s the D NA m olecules to be put under tension. T he experim ent is therefore able to study the statistical $m$ echanics of the biopolym er in the xed tension $f$ and linking num ber Lk ensem ble. Them easured response is then the end-to-end extension $z(f ; L k)$ of the chain as a function of the applied stress. In contrast, traditional ligation experim ents control only $L$ and $L k$, and $L k=L$ can take on only rather $w$ idely-spaced discrete values.

M oreover, them easured quantity is gelm obility, whose relation to backbone conform ation is not sim ple.

Som e of the experim ental results for forces greater than 0.1 pN are show n in $F$ igure 1 . In the gure, the solid lines are our theoretical $t$ to the solid points. These curves were produced by tting four param eters: the m icroscopic persistence lengths A ; C and tw iststretch coupling D (all averaged over a helical repeat), as well as the arclength of the polym er L. The bend persistence length A has been determ ined in a num ber of earlier experm ents)71: 26: 10 while $L$ can be determ ined from only the data points $w$ ith zero exœess Link. The tted values ofA and L therefore serve $m$ ainly as a check of the theory. In our twe used 69 di erent points, only som e ofw hich are depicted as the solid sym bols in Figure 1. The gure also show s open symbols. These points correspond to ( $f, L k$ ) pairs that lie outside the region where our model, which has no explicit self-avoidance, is valid. Due to this neglect of self-avoidance, our phantom chain model will have a $m$ athem atical pathology associated with con gurations that include self-crossings. To dealw ith these di culties, we w ill sim ply require that the chain be pulled hard enough that such con gurations becom e statistically negligible. A s we will see, \pulling hard enough" corresponds to a restriction on the applied stretching force $f$ and the applied torque (see appendix B).Apart from the restrictions of the phantom chain model, there were also om issions of data points for physical reasons. For exam ple, at large applied tensions and torques, the D NA m olecule undergoes structural transform ations. In section VI, we will discuss our data selection criteria and the tting procedure m ore fully.

## III PhysicalM odel

Throughout m ost of this paperwe willm odelD NA as a uctuating elastic rod ofuniform circular cross-section and xed contour length $L$. This idealization neglects D N A 's helical nature: in particular, the length scale associated w ith the helical pitch of the m olecule ( $2=!0=3: 6 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) does not enter as a param eter. The concept of fractional overtw ist ( $=2 \mathrm{Lk}=\mathrm{L}!\mathrm{o}$ ) is therefore m eaningless. N evertheless, we will retain the traditional notation to provide a connection to the published experim ental data, expressing our results in term s of and noting that and $!_{0}$ enter only in the combination $!_{0}$. In the $m$ ain text we will show that our achiral, isotropic elastic rod model captures the $m$ ain features of $F$ igure 1. At the end of our calculation, in 41), we w ill also allow for intrinsic stretching and a possible asym $m$ etry between positive and negative, a chiral e ect associated w ith the tw ist-stretch coupling of a helical rod.

In appendix A we will introduce helical pitch e ects and show that at modest stretching tension they can be sum $m$ arized in an e ective, \coarse-grained" energy (see 1) below). They also lead to a new phenom enon, chiral entropic elasticity, via the tw ist-bend coupling of DNA 27 This e ect is potentially another source of asym $m$ etry betw een over- and undertw isting, but the available data do not at present give detailed inform ation about the asym $m$ etry, and so we om it this com plication from the $m$ ain text.

A ccordingly we de ne an elastic energy functionalwhich describes the bending and tw isting of an isotropic elastic rod of xed arclength $L 28$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E_{\text {bend }}}{k_{B} T}=\frac{A}{2}^{Z_{L}} \quad(d E=d s)^{2} d s ; \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{E_{\text {tw ist }}}{k_{B} T}=\frac{C}{2}^{Z_{L}} 0_{3}^{2} d s: \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In these form ulas $\hat{\hat{f}}(\mathrm{~s})$ is the tangent to the rod backbone at the point $w$ ith arclength $s$ from the end. W e im agine inscribing perm anently a \m aterial fram e" em bedded in the rod; then 3 is the rate of rotation of this fram e about $\hat{\ell}$ (see [11) below; our notation $m$ ainly follow $s$ that ofM arko and Siggid ${ }^{17}$ ). W e are free to choose a convenient $m$ aterial frame; we choose one which coincides w ith the xed lab frame when the molecule is unstressed. (In keeping $w$ th the rem arks above, there is no reason to choose a $m$ aterial frame initially rotating relative to the lab at !o.) A and C are the bend and tw ist \persistence lengths," which are given by the respective elastic constants divided by $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{T}$. These param eters are understood to be averaged (or \coarse-grained") over the scale of a helical repeat. In appendix A we nd the relation between them and a m ore elaborate elasticity theory incorporating the intrinsic helicity of the D NA duplex.

Equations [1) are $m$ athem atically identical to the kinetic energy of a sym $m$ etric spinning top $w$ ith arclength s playing the role of tim e. H ence there is a direct analogy between the dynam ical equations of $m$ otion for a top and the equations describing the equilibrium for an elastic rod, an observation due to K ircho 29 Them m ain technical point of our analysis is the extension of K ircho 's observation to a mathem atical correspondence between the therm al uctuations of an elastic rod and the quantum m echanics of a spinning top 29; 19; 18

The bend persistence length A which appears in (1) is a well-known param eter that has been $m$ easured in several experim ents. A $m$ ong other things, this param eter is know $n$ to depend on the salt concentration of the surrounding uid 30 W ang et al havem easured $A=47 \mathrm{~nm}$ for DNA in bu er conditions sim ilar to those in the experim ents studied here 10

The value of the tw ist persistence length $C$ has not been determ ined as directly as A. C yclization kinetics studies, 31; 32; 24; 33 topoisom er distribution analyses 34; 35 and uorescence polarization anisotropy (FPA) experim ents $36 ; 37$; 38 have provided
$m$ easurem ents of this param eter, but these determ inations are som ew hat indirect and the results have been di cult to reconcile w th each other. 39 ; 39 In particular, results obtained from straight and circular DNA's using a single technique (FPA) yield di erent values of the tw ist rigidity: C 50 nm for linear DNA's and C 85 nm for circular D NA's ${ }^{36}$ This discrepancy $m$ ay be a consequence of the them alsoftening of the torsional rigidity predicted by our theory (see (G)). The main goal of the present paper is to interpret the single D NA m olecule data in F igure in in term sofa theory we call \torsional directed walks", thereby perm itting a new m easurem ent of $C$. Like the bending rigidity A, C may be expected to depend on the bu er solution; the dependence of $C$ should how ever be $m$ uch weaker than $A$ since tw isting does not $m$ odify the spatial distribution between charges on the backbone to the sam e degree as bending.
$T$ he rod is sub ject to a stretching foroe $f$ and a torsional constraint. It $w$ ill prove sim plest to im pose the torsional constraint through a xed applied torque rather than directly through a xed linking number. Since the $m$ olecules we $w$ ill study are $m$ any tim es longer than A or C, we are in the them odynam ic lim it, and so we expect the two ensembles to give the sam e physical results.
$T$ he two stresses on the polym er require the introduction of two $m$ ore term $s$ in the polym er's energy functional:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E_{\text {tension }}}{k_{B} T}=\tilde{z}=\tilde{f}_{0}^{Z^{L}} \hat{\epsilon} \text { êds; and } \quad \frac{E_{\text {torque }}}{k_{B} T}=2 \sim L k: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $z$ is the end-to-end extension of the polym er. T he tension and torque have been expressed in term s of the therm alenergy:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { f } \quad f=k_{B} T \text {; and } \sim \quad=k_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{~T} \text { : } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In ( $)$ ) and throughout this paper, Lk denotes the excess Link, consistent w ith the rem arks at the beginning of this section; thus $L k=0$ for the unstressed rod. In general, Lk is de ned only for closed loops. If we have an open chain with both ends held at xed orientations, as in the experim ents under study, then we can draw a xed, im aginary retum path com pleting our chain to a closed loop and let Lk denote the Link of this closed loop. Choosing the retum path so that $L k=0$ when the rod is straight and unstressed then gives in general Lk = Tw + W rwhere the term s on the right refer only to the open, physical rod.

Before we include $E_{\text {torque }}$ in our energy functional, the Link m ust be $m$ ore explicitly expressed. To get a useful expression, we rst note that the Twist is de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Tw}=\frac{1}{2}_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}}{ }_{\mathrm{L}}{ }_{3} \mathrm{ds}: \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $W$ rithe involves only the space curve $x(s)$ swept out by the rod's centerline. In general, this number is given by a com plicated, non-local form uld 49: 5 involving a double integral around the closed curve:

H ow ever, a result due to Fuller allows us to rew rite this quantity as a single integral over a local W rithe density. This smpli cation is $m$ ade possible by noting that for sm all variations about som e reference curve $\varkappa_{0}(\mathrm{~s})$, the integrand in 回) becom es a total derivative. Perform ing one of the integrals then yields a single integral over a local quantity ${ }^{6}$ Specializing to the case where the reference curve is just the $\hat{e}_{2}$-axis then gives 41

$$
\begin{equation*}
W r=\frac{1}{2}^{z} \frac{\hat{t} e_{2} \hat{\epsilon}=d s}{1+\hat{t}} d s: \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Fuller's result holds as long as there is a continuous set of non-self-intersecting curves interpolating between the reference curve and the curve in question, such that the denom inator in (G) never vanishes. W e can now com bine the term sto get the fullenergy functional for our m odel of D NA :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E}{k_{B} T}=\frac{E_{\text {bend }}}{k_{B} T}+\frac{E_{t w} \text { ist }}{k_{B} T} \quad \tilde{f} \quad 2 \sim L k: \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Formul (TATE De ne the elastic model we will use through the end of section $V D$. Later, in section $V$ and appendix A we will consider various elaborations of the m odel and determ ine that they are relatively unim portant in capturing the m ain features of the data in $F$ igure 1 .

A s noted in the introduction, we expect that therm al uctuations will have an im portant e ect on the rod's tw ist degree of freedom. A m acroscopic elastic rod under tension will sustain a nite am ount of applied torsional stress w ithout buckling. O nœ a threshold is reached, however, the stress can be partially relaxed by bending the backbone. L inear stability analysis of the energy (7) show s that this threshold is given 25 by $\sim_{\text {crit }}=2$ Af. Unlike its macroscopic countenpant, however, a microscopic rod is sub ject to therm al uctuations. These uctuations prevent the rod from ever being straight; as we show below, even in nitesim al torsional stresses will then a ect the bend uctuations. Even though there is no chiral energy term, individual uctuations will not be inversion sym $m$ etric. An applied torsion will push the uctuations with the corresponding helical sense closer to instability, while suppressing those of the opposite helical sense. The end result w illbe a coupling betw een the applied torsion and the m ean
end-to-end extension of the rod proportionalto ${ }^{2}$ (term $s$ linear in $m$ ust drop out since the $m$ odel does not break inversion sym $m$ etry).

Later we will consider the e ects of m olecular chirality: e.g. in section VI , we w ill include a tw ist-stretch coupling tem $D$ 22, 42, 43. It will tum out that the e ect of this coupling on the experim ent we study is sm all: this is already apparent in $F$ igure 1 w here the data points are nearly sym $m$ etric about $=0 . N$ evertheless, by including the tw iststretch coupling, we w illbe able to determ ine the param eter D roughly.

A nother w ay that chirality enters a physicalm odel ofD NA is through an anisotropic bending term. A ny transverse slige through them olecule is easier to bend in one direction than in another. $M$ icroscopically, this anisotropy has its origin in the shape of the base pair plates that $m$ ake up the rungs on the DNA ladder. Since these plates are longer in one direction than the other, bending about the short axis ( $\backslash$ tilt") is m ore di cult than bending about the long axis ( $\backslash$ roll") 44; 45; 46 In appendix A we consider such an anisotropy, as well as the related tw ist-bend coupling 27 nding that these e ects can be sum $m$ arized to good accuracy in an e ective coarse-grained m odel of the form (1). This conclusion could have been anticipated since the im portant uctuations are on length scales around $2 \mathrm{~A}=\tilde{\mathrm{f}}$, and for the foroes below 8 pN that we consider, this averages over at least several helical repeats. W e conchude that the treatm ent ofD NA as an achiral rod ofelastic m aterial is su cient to understand how its extension changes under applied tension and torque.

At this point it $m$ ay be noted that unstressed natural DNA is not a perfect helix; its axial sym $m$ etry is already broken, even in the absence of therm al uctuations. In particular, it is well known that the unstressed, zero tem perature structure of DNA is sequence dependent 47; 48 The e ect of this quenched disorder has been studied recently by Bensim on, D ohm $i$, and $M$ ezard 49 and by one of us 50 For sim ple m odels of weak disorder, the $m$ ain e ect is sim ply to renorm alize the bend persistence length A. In the present paper, we neglect explicit inclusion of the quenched disorder associated w ith sequence-dependent e ects. T hus our bend rigidity $A$ is the e ective value including disorder.

Even though the bend and tw ist rigidities represent averages over a helix repeat, they are stillm icroscopic param eters and therefore re ect only the short-scale behavior. A s we go to longer length scales, we expect the e ective bend and tw ist rigidities to be m odi ed by the geom etric coupling im plicit in W hite's form ula. In particular, we will nd that the e ective tw ist rigidity is reduced for sm all applied tensions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{e}=C^{@} 1+{\frac{C}{4 A} \overline{\mathrm{Af}}^{\mathrm{A}}}_{1}^{1}: \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The dependence of $C_{e}$ on length scale enters through $f$ : as m entioned above, ${ }^{q} \overline{A=f}$ sets the scale of the $m$ ost im portant uctuations in the problem. At $s m$ all tensions, or equivalently at long length scales, $C$ is e ectively reduced. Equation (8) describes this \softening" of the tw ist rigidity. The reducing factor is explicitly dependent on $k_{B} T$, indicating that this is a them ale ect.

## IV G roup Language

In the next section we will consider the therm odynam ic com plexions available to a torsionally constrained polym er. To prepare for the task, we m ust rst de ne convenient variables for evaluating the energy functionalofthe last section on the group of rotations, SO (3). The bending and tw isting deform ations that appear in 1]) aswellas the Lagrange m ultiplier term s for extension and Link which appear in ( (ᄌ) $) \mathrm{w}$ ill need to be expressed in term s of these variables.

W e will use two reference fram es related by an elem ent of the rotation group. The rst of these fram es is \space- xed"; we will take as its basis the orthonom altriad $f e_{i} g$, $w$ ith $i=x, y$, or $z$. A rotation $g(s)$ relates this fram $e$ to the \body- xed" (or \m aterial") frame $f \hat{E}(s) g$ with $=1 ; 2$, or 3 , where $s$ denotes a point on the rod backbone. As $m$ entioned earlier, we will take $\hat{E_{3}}(s)=\hat{E}(s)$ to be the tangent to the rod's centerline, and the rem aining two vectors to be constant directions when the rod is straight and unstressed. The local orientation of the polym er is then given by the 33 orthogonal $m$ atrix $g_{i}(s)=\hat{E}$ (s) 全Them atrix $g$ contains only three independent entries. W ew ill som etim es nd it convenient to represent it in a nonredundant way using Euler angles:

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(s)=e^{L_{3}(s)} e^{L_{1} \quad(s)} e^{L_{3}(s)}: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus for example $\hat{f}(s) \quad \hat{2}=g_{3 z}(s)=\cos \quad(s)$.
$T$ he generators of in nitesim al rotations are then $m$ atrix operators acting on $g$. $W$ hen these operators act from the left they are called \body- xed rotations"; when they act from the right they are called \space- xed rotations". In either case a convenient basis for the generators is

W e can then describe the rotation of them aterialfram easwewalk along the rod backbone as an in nitesim albody- xed rotation or as a space- xed rotation ${ }^{\wedge}$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
=g g^{1} \text { and }{ }^{\wedge}=g^{1} g: \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ere and elsew here, a dot signi es $d=d s$. W ew illalso w rite the pro jections of the rotation rates onto the generators as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(; L) \quad \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr}[L] \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and sim ilarly for ${ }^{\wedge}{ }_{i}$.
W th these de nitions we can cast the formulas of the previous section into $m$ ore usefiul forms. We rst com pute that $(\mathrm{d} \hat{E}=\mathrm{ds})^{2}=1^{2}+2^{2}$ and substitute into (1) $\cdot \mathrm{Next}$, a sim ple calculation gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{3}=\left(-+\cos \rightarrow \text { and } \hat{z}_{z}=(-+\infty) \rightarrow\right. \text { : } \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ext, note that $\hat{f}=\hat{\mathrm{E}_{3}}=g_{3 i} \hat{e}_{\mathrm{i}}=\sin \left(\sin \hat{\hat{e}_{\mathrm{x}}}+\infty \quad \hat{e}_{\mathrm{y}}\right)+\infty \quad \hat{e}_{2}$. Explicit evaluation of the localW rithe density (6) then gives w ith (4, 13) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Lk}=\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{z}}\left(-+\rightarrow \mathrm{ds}=\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{3^{+\hat{\wedge}^{\mathrm{z}}}}{1+\cos } \mathrm{ds}:\right. \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

$W$ ith this last expression, the energy functional 7) is explicitly given in term s of an elem ent of the rotation group and its derivatives, as expressed by the angular frequencies
$=$ and $z$.
W e close this section with a mathem atical ne point, which will not a ect our calculation. Strictly speaking, our con guration space is only locally the group manifold SO (3). W e will exclude the points $=$ where (14) is singular. M oreover, we need to \unw rap" the rem aining space. The physical origin of this step is sim ply the fact that rotating the rod by 2 does not retum it to an equivalent state, but rather introduces an extra unit ofLink. M athem atically we sim ply rem em ber that $+\quad$ is not to be identi ed m odulo 2 (see (14)), though
is.

## V C alcu lation

## V A The P ath Integral

W ew ish to com pute the average extension hzi and relative excess Link hLki for a tw iststoring polym er sub ject to a given tension and torque. To nd these properties, we $m$ ust rst com pute the partition function. At each point along the arclength of the polym er, the local orientation will be given by som e rotation g . To calculate the weight ofany con guration entering into the partition function, we sim ply apply the appropriate B ollzm ann factor. In the last section we described how the term softhe energy fiunctional
appearing in this factor can be wrilten in term sof rotations. $U$ sing these expressions, it is now possible to w rite dow n a path integral on the group space:

$$
\begin{equation*}
z={ }^{z}[\operatorname{dg}(s)] \exp \frac{1}{k_{B} T}\left(E_{\text {bend }}+E_{t w i s t}\right)+2 \sim \operatorname{Lk}+\tilde{F} \quad z: \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

This partition function gives us the quantities of interest, nam ely the average chain extension hzi and the average excess Link resulting from an applied tension and torque:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{hzi}=\frac{@}{@ \mathrm{f}} \ln \mathrm{Z} ; \quad \mathrm{hLki}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{@}{@ \sim_{f}} \ln Z: \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

A direct evaluation of the partition sum in (15) is di cult; fortunately, such an evaluation proves to be unnecessary. In this paper we instead extend a standard polym er physics trick 1012 It tums out that the partition sum is closely related to the \propagator" for the probability distribution for the polym er's orientation g . W e de ne the unnorm alized propagator by

The probability $P_{s}(g)$ for the polym er to have orientation $g$ at position $s$ is then given
 our perspective, for a long chain $\log \left(g ; L ; g_{i} ; 0\right)$ becom es independent of $g$ and $g_{i}$. In fact the propagator is then just a constant tim es the partition function $Z$. The utility of studying the seem ingly com plicated instead of $Z$ com es from the realization that obeys a simple di erential equation. $W$ e will derive this equation in section $B$. Its solution for large $L$ is dom inated by a single eigenfunction of the di erential operator. A $m$ ed w th this know ledge, we w illcom pute in section V .C quantities such as the average extension hzi and linking num ber hLki by substituting for $Z$ in the them odynam ic relations (16).

## V.B The Schrodinger-Like Equation

The next step, then, is to determ ine the di erential equation obeyed by ( $9 ; \mathrm{s} ; \mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{i}} ; 0$ ) as a function of $s$. To do this 51 consider the evolution over a short backbone segm ent of length :

Here $E\lfloor h(s)]$ is the elastic energy of the short segm ent of rod from $s_{f}$ to $s_{f}+$. We introduced a norm alizing factor $N$ to get a continuum lim it: as long as this factor does
not depend on $f$ or ~ it will not enter the quantities of interest (see (1母)). In this subsection we will com pute the functional integral in 18), retaining term $s$ up to rst order in , and hence com pute $d=\mathrm{ds}_{\mathrm{f}}$.

As ! 0, we will see that only matrices $q$ close to $g_{f}$ produce appreciable contributions to the path integral. It is therefore possible to write $g_{1}$ uniquely in the form $g_{1}=\exp (\mathrm{T} L) g_{f}$. M oreover, over the short segm ent under consideration we $m$ ay take $h(s)$ to interpolate betw een $g_{f}$ and $g_{1}$ in the sim plest way:

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(s)=\exp \frac{s S_{f}}{} \mathrm{~L} \quad g_{f}: \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

The functional integral then reduces to an ordinary integral over $T$ :

W e have suppressed an overall constant, absorbing it into N in 18). The exponential factor on the right side gives the invariant volum e elem ent of group spaca 52 near the point $g_{f}$. In the end, this factor $w$ ill not $m$ odify the di erentialequation that we develop, but it is included here for com pleteness.

The energy functional $E[h(s)]$ can now be evaluated on the arclength slice of length . $W$ ith the usefiulabbreviation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{M}\left(g_{f}\right) \quad\left(g_{f} L_{3} g_{f}{ }^{1} ; L\right)=(\sin \sin ; \sin \cos ; \infty s) ; \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

we get that $=T=$ and ${ }^{\wedge}=M T M$ which are constants (independent ofs) over the short segm ent. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mathrm{E} \text { h( } \mathrm{s})]}{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}}=\frac{\mathrm{A}}{2}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}^{2}+\mathrm{T}_{2}^{2}\right)+\frac{\mathrm{C}}{2} \mathrm{~T}_{3}^{2}+\sim \mathrm{T}_{3}+\frac{\mathrm{T}_{1} \mathrm{M}_{1}+\mathrm{T}_{2} \mathrm{M}_{2}}{1+\mathrm{M}_{3}} \quad \text { fcos }: \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

The factore ${ }^{E=k_{B} T}$ weights each path from $g_{1}=\exp (T I) g_{f}$ to $g_{f}$; as ! 0 it indeed $k i l l s$ all those $g_{1} w h i d h$ wander too far from $g_{f}$, i.e. all deform ations where $T>=\bar{A}$.

W e also need to express $\left(g_{1}\right)$ in term s of T. Here and below we abbreviate $\left(g_{f} ; S_{f} ; g_{i} ; 0\right)$ by $\left(g_{f}\right)$. De ne the left-acting (body-xed) derivatives $J$ via

$$
\begin{equation*}
J \quad(g) \quad \llbracket \quad g]_{i} \frac{@}{@ g_{i}} \text {; } \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

and sim ilarly the right-acting (space- xed) derivatives $\hat{\mathcal{J}_{i}}$. Then $\quad\left(g_{1}\right)=e^{\mathrm{T}} \quad \mathrm{J} \quad\left(g_{f}\right)$ or

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(g_{1}\right)=T J+\frac{1}{2} T T J J+ \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we abbreviated still further by om liting the basepoint $g_{f}$ on the right-hand side.
W e can now combine $18,20,22,24$ ) and perform the $G$ aussian integral $d^{3} T$. F irst complete the square, de ning $\mathrm{T}_{3}=\mathrm{C}=2\left(\mathrm{~T}_{3}+\sim=\mathrm{C}\right)$ and $\mathrm{T}=$ $q \overline{A=2}(T+\sim M=A(1+\cos )), \quad=1 ; 2$. Choose the nom alization $N$ so that the lim 进 ! 0 reproduces. Collecting all order- term $s$ and using $M_{1}{ }^{2}+M_{2}{ }^{2}=\sin ^{2}$ then gives

$$
\begin{align*}
-= & \frac{\sim^{2}}{2} \frac{1}{C}+\frac{1}{A} \frac{1 \cos }{1+\cos }+\underset{\mathrm{COS}}{-}+\frac{\sim}{A(1+\operatorname{COS})}\left(M_{1} J_{1}+M_{2} J_{2}+M_{3} J_{3}+J_{3}\right) \\
& +\sim J_{3} \frac{1}{C} \frac{1}{A}+\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{A}\left(J_{1}^{2}+J_{2}^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{C} J_{3}^{2} \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

Further consolidation then gives $=\left(\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{E}_{0}\right)$, where

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{0} \quad \tilde{f}+\frac{\sim^{2}}{2 C} \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the di erential operator $H$ is de ned by

$$
\begin{align*}
H= & \frac{K}{A} \\
& \frac{1}{2 K} J^{2}+K(1 \quad \cos ) \frac{\sim^{2}}{4 K} \frac{(1 \cos )^{2}}{1+\cos } \frac{1}{2 K} \frac{A}{C} 1 J_{3}^{2}  \tag{27}\\
& \frac{\sim}{K} \frac{A}{C} \frac{1}{2} J_{3}+\frac{1}{2} \hat{J}_{z} \quad \frac{\sim}{4 K} \frac{1}{1+\cos }\left(J_{3}+\hat{J_{z}}\right):
\end{align*}
$$

W e have arranged the term $s$ in (27) to facilitate a system atic expansion in pow ers of ${ }^{1}$, where $K \quad A f \quad \sim^{2}=4$.

An im portant property of $H$ is that it com $m$ utes $w$ ith both the operators $J_{3}$ and $\hat{J_{z}}$. $T$ he physicalm eaning of this property is sim ply that a uniform rotation of the rod about the constant axis $e_{z}$ changes nothing, and (by the rod's isotropy) neither does uniform rotation of the rod about its ow $n$ t-axis.

Thus the unnorm alized propagator obeys a di erential equation which is of Schrodinger type, in im aginary tim e. The derivatives $J$ correspond to $i=h$ tim es the usual angular m om entum operators, and so on. In the next section, we will exploit the quantum mechanical analogy to nd solutions to this equation which will in tum allow us to determ ine the quantities hzi and hLki.

## V .C Solution and R esults

It is now possible to $m$ ake a direct connection betw een the eigenvalue problem associated to 27) and our polym er problem.

In ordinary quantum $m$ echanics, the solution to the Schrodinger equation for a sym $m$ etric top can be w ritten as a superposition of $W$ igner functions 53

$$
\begin{equation*}
(g ; t)={ }_{j m k}^{x} C_{j m k} e^{i \mathbb{E}_{j m k} t} D_{m k}^{j}(g): \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $m$ and $k$ are angular $m$ om enta associated $w$ th the operators $J_{3}$ and $\hat{J_{z}}$, and $\mathrm{E}_{j \mathrm{~m} k}$ is the eigenvalue associated w ith the $W$ igner function $D_{m k}^{j}$. The coe cients $C_{j m k}$ characterize the initial state at $\operatorname{tim} \mathrm{e} t=0$.

It $m$ ay seem di cult to apply (48) to our statistical problem, since in our case $\mathrm{J}_{3}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{J}_{z}}$ are real, antisym $m$ etric operators $w$ th no basis of real eigenvectors. Sim ilarly, and unlike the case of the worm like chain, $H$ has no particular symmetry. A little thought shows, however, that these are surm ountable problem s. Since one end of our rod is clam ped, the initial probability distribution $(g ; 0) \mathrm{m}$ ay be taken to be a deltafunction concentrated on $g=1$, the identity matrix $=+=0$. This is indeed an eigenstate of $J_{3} \quad \hat{J_{z}} w$ th eigenvalue $m \quad n=0$. The other end of the rod $m$ ay also be considered clam ped to $=0$, but since we work in the xed-torque ensemble the overall rotation + is free to take any value. In other words, after evolving $(g ; 0)$ to $(g ; L)=e^{\left(E_{0}+H\right)}(g ; 0)$ we need to project it to the eigenspace with $J_{3}+\hat{J_{z}}=0$. Since as noted earlier $J_{3}$ and $\hat{J_{z}}$ both com $m$ ute $w$ th $H$, we $m$ ay perform the pro jection on ( $g ; 0$ ) instead.

Thus for our problem we should sim plify 27) by setting $J_{3}=0$ and $\hat{J_{z}}=0$, obtaining the di erential equation that appeared in earlier work 20: $19=\left(H+E_{0}\right)$, where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{H}=\frac{\mathrm{K}}{\mathrm{~A}} 4 \frac{\tilde{J}^{2}}{2 \mathrm{~K}}+\mathrm{K} \frac{\sim^{2}}{4 \mathrm{~K}} \frac{1 \cos }{1+\cos } \quad(1 \cos )^{5} ;  \tag{29}\\
\mathrm{K} \overline{\mathrm{Af} \quad \sim^{2}=4} ; \tag{30}
\end{gather*}
$$

and $E_{0}=\quad\left(\tilde{f}^{\sim}+\sim^{2}=2 C\right)$. Them ajordi erence betw een this equation and that obtained for ordinary (non-tw ist storing) polym ers is that the long-w avelength cuto is now controlled by $K$ instead of Af.

The operator in (29) really is sym $m$ etric, and hence $w$ illhave realeigenvectors ( $m$ odulo a subtlety discussed in appendix B). The solutions to our Schrodinger-like equation will then have the form (28) w ith it replaced by arclength s. For a su ciently long chain, the lowest \energy" solution will then dom inate. The therm odynam ic properties of the polym er can then be determ ined by rem em bering that , the unnorm alized propagator, becom es equal to a constant tim es the partition function $Z$, and applying (16).

W e gain further con dence in the above analysis when we note that the term set to zero in (27) include som e which are linear in the applied torque. For reasons outlined in section HI, we do not expect these term $s$ to play a role in the determ ination of the low est energy eigenvalue. T he m odel that we de ned is non-chiral and therefore cannot tell the di erence betw een over- and undertw isting.

W e must now com pute the lowest eigenvalue of the di erential operator in (29). F inding it w ould be a straightforw ard task were it not for the singularity in the potential term when ! . This singularity is associated w ith the backbone tangent $\hat{t}$ looping around to point anti-parallel to the end-to-end displacem ent vector $+\hat{e}_{\mathrm{z}}$. Physically, this situation corresponds to the onset of supercoiling. W hen the applied torque is too high or the tension is too low, the chain willbegin to lop over itself. Since realchains cannot pass through them selves, they begin to form plectonem es. In our phantom chain model, there is no self-avoidance, and so the chains can pass through them selves, shedding a unit of Lk as they do. T he $m$ athem atical pathology associated w ith the ! singularity in 29) is therefore an inevitable consequence of our m odel's neglect of self-avoidance.

The physical breakdown of the phantom chain $m$ odel and the corresponding $m$ athem atical problem of the ! singularity can be avoided by assum ing that the backbone tangent $\hat{E}$ rem ains nearly parallel to the $+\hat{e}_{\mathrm{z}}$-axis. Such a situation is indeed realistic for a chain under su cient tension, or m ore precisely, for a su ciently large K 30). In this regim $e$, we can then perform a perturbative expansion about $=0$. The singularity of (29) does not a ect low orders of perturbation theory. The singularity can still enter nonperturbatively via \tunneling" processes, in which the straight 0 con guration hops over the potential barrier in 29), but these will be exponentially suppressed ifthe barrier is su ciently high, a condition $m$ adem ore precise in appendix B. $T$ he perturbative regim $e$ is experim entally accessible: we will argue that it corresponds to the solid sym bols on $F$ igure 11. O utside this regim $e$, the phantom chain model is physically inappropriate, as explained above, and so a fill nonperturbative solution of our m odelw ould not be m eaningfiul.

W e can sim plify the problem by changing variables from to ${ }^{2} 2(1 \mathrm{cos})$. In term $s$ of the spherical Laplacian $J^{2}=\frac{1}{\sin } \frac{@}{@} \sin \frac{@}{@}$ becom es $\left(1 \quad{ }^{2}=4\right) @{ }^{2}+(1$ $\left.3^{3}=4\right)^{1} @$, so

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=\frac{K}{A} \quad \frac{r^{2}}{2 K}+\frac{K}{2}{ }^{2}+\frac{1}{2 K} \quad \frac{3}{4} \frac{@}{@}+\frac{2}{4} \frac{@^{2}}{@}{\frac{\sim^{2}}{}{ }^{2}}_{164^{2}}^{!\#} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r^{2}={ }^{1} @$ @. W e have not $m$ ade any approxim ation yet.
W e now construct a perturbative solution to the eigenvalue problem de ned by 31). In the quantum m echanical analogy this equation describes a two-dim ensional
anharm onic oscillator, w ith interpreted as a radial coordinate; thus the problem can be solved using the $m$ ethod of raising and low ering operators.

Sw itching to C artesian coordinates, we set

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\frac{s}{K} \times \frac{1}{K} \frac{@}{@ x} ; \quad \text { and } \quad B=\frac{s}{K} \quad y \quad \frac{1}{K} \frac{@}{\varrho} \quad \text { : } \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ow (31) can be rew ritten as $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{0}+\mathrm{H}$, where

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{0} & =\frac{K}{A}\left(N_{a}+N_{b}+1\right) ; \quad \text { and } \\
H & =\frac{K}{A} \quad \frac{1}{8 K} 1 \quad \frac{1}{4}^{n}\left(A_{+}^{2} \quad A^{2}\right)+\left(B_{+}^{2} \quad B^{2}\right)^{O_{2}}+O\left(K^{3}\right): \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

H ere $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{a}} \quad \mathrm{A}+\mathrm{A}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{b}} \quad \mathrm{B}_{+} \mathrm{B}$ correspond to the usualoccupation num ber operators in the quantum $m$ echanical analogy. It is now straightforw ard to calculate the low est energy eigenvalue as an expansion in $K^{1}$ to obtain 19

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{E}_{0}+\frac{\mathrm{K}}{\mathrm{~A}} \quad 1 \quad \frac{1}{4 \mathrm{~K}} \quad \frac{1}{64 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}+\quad: \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Rem arkably, this is exactly the sam e form ula as the one appearing in the worm like chain m odel; the only di erence is that $K$ is now de ned by 30) instead of by A f. The last tw o term s retained will now give anharm onic corrections to the sim ple low est-order calculation announced earlier 18 The ellipsis represents term sofhigher order in $K{ }^{1}$ than the ones kept. W e explore the status of such term s in appendix B. In particular, the last term of (31) has been dropped altogether. Since the expectation value of this term is obviously divergent at $=4$ (i.e. the antipode $\hat{f}=\quad$ ) ), a certain am ount of justi cation w illbe needed for dropping it.

From this eigenvalue, the $m$ ean extension and the average linking number for a given tension and torque can be found using (16), (28), and (34):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{\mathrm{z}}{\mathrm{~L}}=1 \frac{1}{2 \mathrm{~K}} 1+\frac{1}{64 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}+O\left(\mathrm{~K}^{3}\right) ; \quad \text { and }  \tag{35}\\
&{ }^{\mathrm{Lk}}{ }^{+}=\frac{\sim}{2} \frac{1}{\mathrm{C}}+\frac{1}{4 \mathrm{AK}}+O\left(\mathrm{~K}^{3}\right): \tag{36}
\end{align*}
$$

$M$ ore accurate versions of these form ul are given in appendix B. By solving the second of these equations for the torque we obtain the new, e ective tw ist rigidity $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}$ by noting that $\sim\left(\mathbb{f}^{\prime} ; \mathrm{Lk}\right) \quad(2 \mathrm{Lk}=\mathrm{L}) \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}(\mathfrak{f})+O\left(\mathrm{~K}^{3}\right)$, where $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{e}}(\mathfrak{f})$ is given by the form ula (8) . This form ula describes the \therm al softening" of the tw ist rigidity alluded to earlier. Thee ective rigidity $C_{e}(f)$ is reduced from the bare, $m$ icroscopic value by a factorw hich arises from therm al uctuations.

C om bining (35) and (36) together w ith the de nition of $K$ in (30) produces a form ula for the average end-to-end extension for a polym er sub ject to a linking num ber constraint and an applied tension. In section $V I$ we w ill com pare this theoretical prediction to the experim ental results of Strick et al 14 and A lem and and C roquette 16

## V D O nset of $N$ on $-P$ erturbative C orrections

The theory described above is only valid in the regim ewhere the phantom chain $m$ odel is appropriate. In this section, we extend our analysis by estim ating thee ect ofplectonem e form ation close to its onset. As discussed above, our model is unable to include such e ects quantitatively, as it lacks the self-avoidance interaction which stabilizes plectonem es. Instead, in this section we will suppose that the $m$ ain consequence of the singularity is to allow each segm ent of the polym er to be in one of two con gurations. In the rst instance, the polym er uctuates about a nearly straight conform ation and can therefore be described by the theory developed in the preceding sections. In the second instance, the polym er is driven across the \tunneling" barrier into a standard kink conform ation as depicted in Figure $\sqrt{2}$, gaining approxim ately one unit of $W$ rithe. O ur im proved form ul will have no new tting param eters beyond the ones already introduced.

W e are interested only in the initial stages of plectonem eform ation and so it will be su cient to approxim ate each plectonem ic coillby a circle. The energy required to form such a loop is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E}{k_{B} T}=\frac{A}{2} \frac{2 R}{R^{2}}+f 2 R \quad 2 \text { j j } j: \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the rst two term s represent the energy costs associated w ith bending the polym er and contracting against the im posed tension. The last term gives the elastic tw ist energy released as $T$ w ist gives way to $W$ rithe. M axim izing the energy release, we nd the optim al radius of a coiled segm ent to be $R=A=2 \tilde{f}$, so that for $\sim>0$ the presence of a kink lowers the energy of the polym er by $E=k_{B} T=2$ (2A $\tilde{f} \sim$ ).
$W$ e now in agine the polym er to be $m$ ade up of segm ents of length 2 R . Each of these segm ents $m$ ay be in the extended or the plectonem ic kink con guration. A ctually, we will consider tw o possible types of kink: one in which a unit of $T$ w ist is shifted into W rithe, and itsm irror im age which generates a negative $W$ rithe as wellas a counteracting positive Tw ist. The reverse kinks are energetically unfavorable for appreciable applied torque, but we retain them to elim inate any asym $m$ etry in the excess linking num ber.

For the $m$ odest applied torque considered here, it $w$ ill be su cient to treat a dilute gas of positive and negative kinks. Denoting the population of kinks by $n$ and that of
reverse kinks by $n_{+}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \quad i=\frac{L}{2 R} \exp \frac{E}{k_{B} T}: \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $E+=2(2 A f+\sim)$ is the energy of a reverse kink, and is a num erical factor of order unity arising ultim ately from a functional determ inant. Since we do not know how to compute we set it equal to unity.

The e ect of the kink/anti-kink gas is to modify (35) and (36), producing shifts in the average extension and average linking num ber:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{Z}{L}=e^{E=k_{B} T}+e^{E+=k_{B} T}  \tag{39}\\
*^{\mathcal{L}}{ }^{+}=\frac{1}{2} \frac{2 \tilde{f}}{A} e^{E=k_{B} T} e^{E+=k_{B} T}: \tag{40}
\end{gather*}
$$

These expressions are to be added to (35) and (36). The latter expression can then be solved for ~ to get a corrected version of (\$).

The model proposed here for plectoneme form ation is too simpli ed to give quantitative predictions about the non-perturbative regim $e$. H ow ever, the $m$ odel does allow us to predict the onset of these e ects and con $m$ that the data we select are not a ected by plectonem e form ation (see Figure 『).

## V I Fit Strategy and Results

The extension function $h z$ ( $f$;Lk)i derived in the previous sections describes an achiral elastic rod. Before $m$ aking direct com parisons of this form ula to experin ental data, we w illextend them odelsom ew hat. So farwe have neglected structuralchanges in the D NA at a microscopic level. In particular, we have om itted e ects related to the intrinsic stretching along the polym er backbone. Recent experim ents have investigated these e ects 19 ; 54 in particular, $W$ ang et al. found a sm all change in the relative extension of $f=$, where $=1100 \mathrm{pN}$ is the intrinsic stretch m odulus. For m oderate foroes we $m$ ay sim ply add this shiff to the extension form ula found in the previous section 55: 12 For the highest foroes we consider ( $8: 0 \mathrm{pN}$ ), this translates into a relative extension of about $0: 007$, which is hardly notioeable in F igure 1 . N evertheless, we will include this correction as it im proves the quality of our $t$ slightly w ithout introducing a new tting param eter.

In addition, we w ill also consider the possibility of elastic couplings which do not respect the inversion sym $m$ etry of the $m$ odel that we consider. In reality the DNA we
seek to describe is chiral, and so at som e level we expect this fact to show up as an asym $m$ etry betw een overtw isting and undertw isting in $F$ igure 1. O ne way that chirality $m$ ight enter a m odel for DNA is through an intrinsic tw ist-stretch coupling 23; 42, 43 This coupling results in a change in relative extension of $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{TD}!_{0}^{2}=$, where D is the tw ist-stretch coe cient. The near sym $m$ etry in the data of $F$ igure Øindicates that the e ects of such a coupling will be sm all in the region of interest. A though the coe cient D will tum out to be com parable in size to the bending coe cient $A$, the shortening due to bend uctuations dom inates that due to the elastic tw ist-stretch coupling. This disparity arises because bend uctuations are diverging as $\mathrm{K}!0$.

As mentioned in section 凹, an anisotropy between the \tilt" and \roll" elastic constants coupled together with the associated tw ist-bend coupling term might also produce an asym m etry between positive and negative. We investigate this possibility in appendix A and nd that the corresponding chiral entropic elasticity term s are not $m$ easurably di erent from the tw ist-stretch $m$ odel over the range of stretching foroes studied.

Putting the intrinsic corrections associated with and D together with the perturbation theory result of the last section, we obtain a theoretical prediction for the relative extension as a function of applied force and overtw isting. For the purposes of com parison to experim ent, we will now sw itch from the variable Lk to the relative overtw ist which is de ned with respect to the helical pitch of DNA: $=2 \mathrm{Lk}=!{ }_{0} \mathrm{~L}$. Then,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mathrm{z}(\mathrm{f} ;)^{+}}{\mathrm{L}}=1 \mathrm{e}^{0} \frac{\mathrm{~s} \frac{\mathrm{Af}}{\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T}}{\frac{\sim^{2}}{4} \frac{1}{32}^{1}}^{1}+\quad \frac{\mathrm{z}}{\mathrm{~L}}+\frac{\mathrm{f} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{TD}!_{0}^{2}}{\mathrm{~K}^{2} \mathrm{~L}}: ~}{\mathrm{~A}} \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Form ula 41) is our nalresult for the high-force (orm ore precisely, large K ) extension of a tw ist-storing polym er sub ject to a torsional constraint. H ere $\mathrm{hz}=\mathrm{Li}$ is the expression in (39). To com pare our result to the experim ental data, 14 we solved 39), (36), and (40) for $\sim$ in term s off; , then substituted $\sim$ and $K$ into (47).

A part from the intrinsic stretch and tw ist-stretch term s described above, 41) contains tw o additionalsm all re nem ents. O ne of these appears in the last term, where nite-size e ects have been accounted for. This term can be understood by writing the extension as an expansion in term s of the transverse com ponents of the backbone tangent. De ning the complex variable $(s)=\hat{\ell}(s) \quad\left(\hat{l}^{2}+i_{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ and its Fourier com ponents p , we have to low est order

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{z}{L}=1 \frac{1}{2}_{p}^{x} \text { hj } p \text { fi+ }: \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

The leading entropic reduction of hzi in (35) is then easy to evaluate, including nitelength e ects. A s the $m$ ain e ect of an applied torque is tq decrease the e ective force and change the low wavenumber cuto in our theory from Af to $K$, we know how to $m$ odify the usual tangent-tangent correlation function to yield

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{p j} j_{p i} i & =\frac{4 A}{L}_{n=1}^{X^{A}} \frac{1}{A^{2} \frac{2 n}{L}{ }^{2}+K^{2}} \\
& =\frac{1}{K} 1 \frac{2 A}{K L}: \tag{43}
\end{align*}
$$

This expression should be com pared w ith the leading-order correction obtained from the in nite-rod calculation in section $V$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{p} j_{p}{ }^{3} i & \frac{2 A}{Z}_{0}^{2} \frac{1}{(A q)^{2}+K^{2}} d q \\
& \frac{1}{K}: \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

The di erence between the tw o term s is $2 \mathrm{~A}=\mathrm{LK}{ }^{2}$. To obtain the nite length form ula we $m$ ust subtract this di erence from the result obtained in the last section; the resulting correction appears in the last term of (41). N ote that for the restricted values of K that we consider (see below ), this contribution to $z=L$ never exceeds 0.002 for the data set we analyze.

The other re nem ent introduced in (41) is that for convenience we replaced $(1=2 K)\left(1+1=64 K^{2}\right)$ by ( $\left.K^{2} \quad 1=32\right)^{1=2}$. Since we will restrict our $t$ to $K^{2}>3$, the di erence between these expressions is negligible. Finally, in A ppendix B we give even $m$ ore elaborate versions of (36) and (41), in which higher-order term $s$ of perturbation theory have been retained; these corrections are sm allthough not negligible at low forces.

W e have now established an expression for the m ean extension as a function of applied tension and torque. U sing the ENS group's data 14: 16 we this form ula (actually, the $m$ ore accurate one given in appendix B) to determ ine the param eters in our m odel: the $m$ icroscopic bend persistence length $A$, tw ist persistence length $C$, tw ist-stretch coupling D, and polym er arclength L. Of these param eters, only $C$ and $D$ are really unknown; A has already been $m$ easured in other experim ents, and $L$ can be determ ined from the points with $=0$ using the ordinary worm-like chain $m$ odel. The agreem ent betw een our best $t$ value of A and earlier experim ents $19 ;[7 ; 26$ serves as a check on the theory. O ther param eters appearing in 41), nam ely $!_{0}=1: 85 \mathrm{~nm}^{1}$ and $=1100 \mathrm{pN} 10$ are independently known and are not $t$.

The least squares $t$ was perform ed using a gradient descent algorithm 56 in the param eter space de ned by A, C, D, and L. The best twas obtained for A = 49 nm ,
$C=109 \mathrm{~nm}, \mathrm{D}=67 \mathrm{~nm}$, and $\mathrm{L}=15: 6 \mathrm{~m}$. Here L is the length of the construct from A lem and and C roquette's experim ent 110 he corresponding length for the Strick et al. data set 14 was determ ined separately using the $=0$ points from that set and was not $t$. In all, 69 data points from the experim ents of Strick et al 14 and of $A l e m$ and and C roquette ${ }^{16}$ were used in the procedure. The data points were selected based on three criteria. The rst cuts were $m$ ade on physical grounds. It is know $n$ that for high applied forces ( $f>0: 4 \mathrm{pN}$ ) DNA undergoes structuraltransform ation or strand separation when
< 0:01 or > 0:03 (D. Bensim on, private com m unication); here of course we cannot use linear elasticity theory. W e therefore om itted such points from the right side of Figure 1. (No points were om itted from the left side.) To avoid biasing the data, in the $t$ we excluded the symmetric region $j j>0: 01$ from the set of points used w ith $\mathrm{f}>0: 4 \mathrm{pN}$.

The second set of cuts was applied for $m$ athem atical reasons. O ur perturbative expansion is in powers ofK ${ }^{1}$ : we required $K^{2}>3 . W$ e discuss this choige in appendix $B$; for now we note that perturbation theory produces excellent agreem ent $w$ th experim ent for the worm like chain 12 even for $K>1$. Choosing $K^{2}>3$ elim inates all of the $f=0: 1$ and 02 pN data points from our t . To con m that we were being selective enough, we tried other values of the threshold (betw een 2.5 and 4.5). This action did not signi cantly alter our $t$ results: in every case we found $C>100 \mathrm{~nm}$.

F inally, in addition to these two sets of data cuts, we also im posed a \tunneling" criterion described in appendix B : the idea is to ensure that the low est energy eigenvalue of the operator $H_{0}$ in (33) is sm aller than the barrier that restrains the system from falling into the unphysical singularity.

The reasonable agreem ent in $F$ igure 1 betw een our theoretical curves and the data outside the region we $t$ (including the 0:1 and 02 pN curves) indicates that our choige of cuts is a conservative one. A s a further check, the dashed lines in F igure 1 show our tting function w thout the non-perturbative correction described in section VD: we see that these lines do not deviate from the solid lines in the range of data we retained.

## V II D iscussion

The global $t$ shown in Figure in indeed resem bles the experim ental data. T he least squares $t$ determ ined the bending sti ness, the tw ist rigidity and the intrinsic tw iststretch ooe cient ofD NA. A s stated earlier, the $t$ to the bending rigidity produced the know $n$ value and thus serves as a chedk on the theory. The chiral asym m etry is a sm all e ect, and so the available data do not a ord a precise determ ination of the tw ist-stretch
coupling D. Thus our $t$ is $m$ ainly a $m$ easurem ent of $C$.
$T$ he tw ist rigidity obtained by the tting procedure is som ew hat higher than what earlier experim ents have found (see section (II). W e cannot give a quantitative estim ate of our $t$ param eter errors, since some of the data 14 do not have error bars, but we note that forcing $C=85 \mathrm{~nm}$ or less gives a visibly bad t . O ne m ight worry that this discrepancy was due to some sort of failure of perturbation theory, despite our great care on this point. The fact that we keep nding large $C$ as we tighten the data cuts gives us additional con dence on this point. Sim ilarly, our large value is not an artifact of DNA denaturation induced by tension, since that would lead to a spuriously low $t$ value. There rem ains the intriguing possibility that on the contrary, im posed tension suppresses spontaneous local denaturation, increasing the integrity of the DNA duplex (J.M . Schurr, private com m unication); in this case our large C m ore accurately re ects the linear elasticity than the other, lower, values.

The discrepancy with earlier work $m$ ay be $m$ ore apparent than real, how ever: if we do not allow for a tension-dependent them al reduction of the tw ist rigidity as in (G) and instead $t$ the data to a constant tw ist rigidity, then we obtain $C_{e}=82 \mathrm{~nm}$, a value closer to those found in the other experim ents 36 he quality of this $t$, obtained with a tension-independent rigidity, is slightly poorer. In any case, a large value of $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{A}$ is not paradoxical and in particular need not im ply a negative Poisson ratio for our model's rod: random natural bends in DNA reduce the e ective bend sti ness A m easured in stretching experim ents, but not C 50 and so the ratio of $C$ to the true elastic bend sti ness is closer to unity than it appears from our e ective-hom opolym erm odel.

Recently, B ouchiat and $M$ ezard 20 have also determ ined the tw ist rigidity of DNA using the experim ental results of Strick et al 14 They derived form ul equivalent to (35) and (36). Then using an exact ground state solution to a cut-o version of (31), they reproduced the observed extension curve hz ( $f$; ) i in Figure 11a over a wider range than we have show $n$. The result of this calculation is a ratio of $C=A$ of approxim ately 1:7.

W hile both approaches are sim ilar, our perturbative approach prechudes us from analyzing the lowest force curves that Bouchiat and M ezard discussed. As described above, we exchuded these data because we expect physical di culties w ith the phantom chain $m$ odel in this regim e; the sam e di culties, it would seem, apply to the analytical results of B ouchiat and $M$ ezard. In particular, at sm all applied tension, the badkbone's tangent vector $\hat{E} w i l l w$ ander from the $z$-axis. If it $w$ anders too far, the system $w$ illbe able to see through the tunneling barrier to the singularity; or in other w ords, the results will be corrupted by the failure ofFuller's form ula for $W$ r. B ouchiat and $M$ ezard approached this problem by introducing a new interm ediate-length cuto $\mathrm{b}=6 \mathrm{~nm}$ into the problem.

The physicalm eaning of this cuto in term sof the mechanical properties ofDNA is not clear to us. M oreover, taking it to be 2.5 nm or less spoiled the sim ultaneous t at all values of $f$.

In contrast, our perturbative treatm ent avoids the singular-potential problem altogether by restricting to a regime where the phantom chain model is valid. Our $m$ odel has no extra scale corresponding to $b$, and yet ts all xed-force curves in its dom ain, in two di erent experim ents, w ith one value of $C$.

In their paper, B ouchiat and M ezard also gave M onte C arlo results. E arlier work by $M$ arko and Vologodskii has also taken this approach 21 Here it is possible to im plem ent self-avoidance, though knot rejection is still di cult. T he advantage of analytic form ul such as 41) is that they perm it global, system atic least-squares tting of hz (f; )i to the data. M oreover, for practical reasons $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations must again im pose a short-distance cuto of at least several tim es the D NA radius, unlike our analytical approach.

## V III C onclusion

In this paper we have investigated the statistical m echanics of a tw ist-storing polym er. $T$ his type of $m$ olecule di ers from a traditional polym er in being unable to relax out an applied excess Link. W hen such a chain is left unconstrained, the tw ist sim ply decouples from the bend uctuations. T he therm ally accessible conform ations are then identical to those for an ordinary polym er. In the case that such a polym er is sub ject to a torsional constraint, how ever, there willbe a coupling betw een the bend uctuations and the tw ist. It is this coupling that we have investigated. O ne of our goals was to show how singlem olecule stretching experm ents can provide a new window onto the nanom eter-scale $m$ echanical properties of D NA.

D ue to the com plications associated with self-avoidance, we considered only chains held nearly straight by tension, then analyzed the statisticalm echanics of the resulting \torsionaldirected walk". W em apped the polym erpartition function onto the solution of a Schrodinger-type equation for the orientation distribution fiunction. From this solution, we were able to nd the entropic extension and the overtw isting of a polym er sub ject to a tension $f$ and relative Link excess .

The theory we developed quantitatively reproduces the results of superooiled singlem olecule D NA stretching experim ents14: 16 (see Figure 1). The agreem ent was achieved by tting the tw ist persistence length, yielding $C=109 \mathrm{~nm}$. The large tw ist rigidity di erentiates DNA from traditional polym ers and $m$ akes possible the coupling of the
tw ist and bend degrees of freedom that plays a central role in our theory.
A part from reproducing the experim entally observed physics, our formul m ake another prediction: the tw ist rigidity is renorm alized (see (36)). The e ective rigidity $C_{e}(f)$ is a function of the applied tension. A ccording to ( $(\mathbf{G})$, it is hardest to tw ist the polym er when it is pulled straight; this is the bare, $m$ icroscopic sti ness. It is the sam e rigidity that resists tw ist at the shortest length scales, and so enters the energetics of structures such as the nucleosom e. A s the tension is relaxed, therm al uctuations begin to play a role. N ow when a torque is applied, the polym er does not resist as much; the bend uctuations have softened the torsional rigidity by absorbing som e of the im posed excess Link. As discussed above, this phenom enon is purely therm al; no such e ect appears in the linear elasticity of a m acroscopic beam for sm all applied torque.

If one na vely extends this them ale ect to zero tension, one sees that the torsional rigidity vanishes com pletely. Of course, our phantom chain $m$ odel precludes us from considering this case; how ever, other recent work 57 has considered this related problem using an explicit self-avoidance term : indeed the e ects of a torsional rigidity do becom e unim portant to the behavior of tw ist-storing polym ers at zero applied tension or, equivalently, at extrem ely long length scales.

## A ppendix A: C hiral entropic elasticity

In this appendix we introduce an additional elem ent of realism into our m odel, nam ely the intrinsic helicalpitch $2=!_{0}$. ForDNA this pitch corresponds to $!_{0}=1: 85=n m$. The helical structure breaks the inversion sym $m$ etry of the problem by allow ing tw o additional term s in the energy functional 27 In principle these explicitly chiralterm s could introduce an asym $m$ etry betw een overtw ist and undertw ist into our results. W ew ill nd this chiral entropic elasticity and show that it has a di erent dependence on stretching force from the intrinsic tw ist-stretch e ect discussed in section VI. Thus in principle the tw o e ects could be distinguished experim entally.

In this appendix we are interested in chirale ects, $m$ anifested by odd powers of in the extension $z(f$; ), in a m odel of DNA without intrinsic stretching. W $\mathrm{e} w$ ill see that such term $s$ are $s m$ all. Hence we can use a sim pler calculation than the one in the $m$ ain text: we will drop $O\left({ }^{2}\right)$ and higher, and we will use the G aussian (or equipartition) approxim ation to the statistical sum s . Since odd-pow er term $s$ are com pletely absent in the achiralm odelof section $V$ above, we can sim ply add the ones we nd to the results of that $m$ odel to get a leading approxim ation to the full chiral entropic elasticity form ula.

A nother approxim ation we will m ake will be to drop term s suppressed by powers of
$1=!0$ rqince this length scale is $m$ uch shorter than both the persistence lengths and the scale $A=f$ fof im portant uctuations.

As discussed in section W, chirally can enter through the anisotropic bending rigidities associated w th the \roll" and \tilt" axes ofD NA m onom ers. In this appendix we will choose a $m$ aterial fram e di erent from the one in the $m$ ain text: here our frame rotates $w$ ith the intrinsic helical tw ist. This choice is convenient in that the anisotropic elasticity appears constant in this fram e: [1) becom es sim ply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E_{\text {bend }}}{k_{B} T}=\frac{1}{2}_{0}^{Z} \int_{0}^{L} d s A_{1}^{0} 1^{2}+A_{2}^{0} 2^{2} ; \quad \text { and } \quad \frac{E_{\text {tw ist }}}{k_{B} T}=\frac{1}{2}_{L_{L}}^{L_{0}} C^{0} 3^{2} d s: \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here we have introduced two microscopic bending constants, $A_{1}^{0}$ and $A_{2}^{0}$. Now even the unstressed state will be chiral: as the body- xed frame f( $\hat{E}_{1} ; \hat{\mathrm{E}_{2}} ; \hat{\mathrm{E}_{3}}=\hat{\text { E }}$ rotates uniform ly at frequency! o along the polym er, it tums the bend anisotropy w ith it. Since the $\hat{E_{1}}$-axis corresponds to the short axis of a basepair, we expect $A_{1}^{0}>A_{2}^{0}$.

A part from the bending anisotropy, the sym $m$ etries ofD NA adm it an explicitly chiral term associated to a tw ist-bend coupling w ith coe cient G. 27 W th these tw o term s , the $m$ echanicalequilibrium state of the stressed molecule will no longer be given by the uniform ly tw isted con guration. Instead, we $m$ ake an ansatz for a new helical ground state: $g_{0}=\exp \left(L_{1}\right) \exp \left(!s L_{3}\right)$, to be justi ed below. Here ! includes a nite piece associated w th the rotation of the unstressed molecule, so that ! $=!_{0}(1+\quad)$. The sm allangle rem ains to be determ ined by the condition ofm echanicalequilibrium . T he elastic energy functional for the $m$ odel is then given by:

In contrast to the discussion in the $m$ ain text, in this appendix wewillwork in the xedLk ensemble. Thus we do not need any Lagrange multiplier associated with the Link constraint.

It $w$ ill prove convenient to introduce the combinations $A=\left(A_{1}^{0}+A_{2}^{0}\right)=2$ and $\hat{A}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{1}^{0} & A_{2}^{0}\end{array}\right)=2$. We em phasize that $A$ is not necessarily equal to $A$ from the coarsegrained model (1); the exact relationship will em erge in due course below. The chiral term s that couple to the intrinsic helical frequency $!_{0}$ are then proportional to $\hat{A}$ and $G$. N ote that $\hat{A}>0$.

W e can now determ ine the helix angle characterizing the mechanicalequilibrium state. $F$ irst write a sm all uctuation from $g_{0}$ as $g(s)=g(s) g_{0}(s) w$ ith $g_{0}$ as above and $g(s) \quad e^{T(s) L}$. Substituting into (11)12) then yields the $i^{\prime}$ 's. Setting the rst variation of (46) to zero then yields three equations expressing the condition that $g_{0}$ be the stressed
$m$ echanical-equilibrium state. O ne of these selects :

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{G}{A_{2}^{0}+\tilde{f}=!_{0}^{2}} \quad \frac{G}{A_{2}^{0}}: \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

The other two are satis ed trivially, justifying our ansatz for $g_{0}$. In deriving the above relationswe used the fact that we are working in the xed- ensemble. T hus the boundary conditions clam p the rod at both ends, xing $T=0$ there, and so we may discard total derivative term s .

For illustration, and to keep the calculation sim ple, we will now m ake the additional assum ption that the chiralparam eters $\hat{A} ; G$ are both $s m$ aller than $A ; C$, and accordingly w ork to leading nontrivialorder in the form er. W e can then easily diagonalize the part of the energy involving the latter using Fourierm odes. Setting ( $\left.T_{1}(s)+i T_{2}(s)\right) e^{i!s} \quad \mathrm{P} \quad e^{\text {iqs }} \quad q$ and $T_{3}(s) \quad{ }^{P} e^{\text {iqs }} q_{q}$ (note that $q_{q}=q_{q}$ ) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E}{k_{B} T}=\tilde{L}+0+1+2 ; \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0=\frac{L}{2}_{p}{ }^{h} A p^{2} \quad!\left(C^{0}+2 G\right) p+\tilde{E}^{\sim} p^{2} J^{2}+C p^{2} j p \jmath^{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above form ul, ! ! o (1+ ) gives the angular frequency for the stressed $m$ in im alenergy state. The sum sare for $1<p<1$ (the physical short-scale cuto will prove im material). A s m entioned above, we will treat 1;2 as perturbations to 0 •

In the harm onic approxim ation, the $m$ ean extension has the sim $p l e$ form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\mathrm{z}}{\mathrm{~L}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{~L}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}}{\mathrm{df}} \ln Z=1 \frac{1}{2}_{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{X}} \text { hj} \mathrm{p}{ }^{\mathcal{J}} i+ \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e de ne D (p) Lhj pJi and com pute this two-point correlator pertunbatively.
$T$ he unpertunbed $D_{0}(\mathrm{p})$ is obtained via equipartition, or equivalently by perform ing the G aussian (harm onic approxim ation) functionalintegralover $p$ and $p$ in $0, y i e l d i n g$

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{0}(p)=L h j{ }_{p} J^{2} i_{0}=\frac{2}{A\left(p^{2} 2 q_{0} p\right)+f^{\prime}} \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi_{1}=C^{0} \frac{2 G^{2}}{\mathrm{~A}_{2}^{0}} \frac{!}{2 \mathrm{~A}}: \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

The next step in determ ining $D(p)$ is to calculate the rst two corrections, ${ }_{1}(\mathrm{p})$ and 2 (p), induced by 1 and 2 respectively. W e de ne these as low est-order corrections to the fiulltwo-point function: $D(p) \quad D_{0}(p)\left[1+D_{0}(p)(1(p)+\quad 2(p))\right]$. Start by expanding the contribution $e^{2}$ to the Boltzm ann factor. There is no rst order correction, so we go to second order:

$$
\begin{align*}
2(\mathrm{p})= & \mathrm{p}^{2} \frac{\left(\hat{A^{\prime}}(2!\mathrm{p})+\mathrm{G}!\right)^{2}}{\mathrm{~A}\left((2!\mathrm{p})^{2}\right.} 2 \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{p}}(2!\mathrm{p})+\mathrm{f} \\
& \mathrm{p}^{2} \frac{\hat{\mathrm{~A}}^{2}+\hat{A G}}{\mathrm{~A}}: \tag{53}
\end{align*}
$$

The second correction arises from the expansion of the energy in powers of ${ }_{1}$. O nœ again we go to second order:

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{1}(p)=\frac{\left(G^{2} p^{2}+2 G\left(A_{1}^{0} p^{2} \quad C^{0}!p\right)\right)}{2 C^{0}}: \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

A s m entioned above, we have dropped tem s of order ${ }^{2}$ and higher: only odd-power term s will create chiral corrections to the extension curve, and we content ourselves w ith investigating the linear ones only. P utting the results of (54) and (53) together gives the propagator

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(p)=h_{D} D_{0}(p)^{1} \quad 1(p) \quad{ }_{2}(p)^{i^{1}}: \tag{55}
\end{equation*}
$$

To get (55) we summed chains of $G$ aussian graphs, sim ilarly to the random-phase approxim ation in $m$ any-body theory.

The relative extension can now be com puted from 50) :

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{\mathrm{z}}{\mathrm{~L}} & =1 \frac{1}{2 \mathrm{~L}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{D}(\mathrm{p}) \\
& =1 \frac{1}{4}_{1}^{\mathrm{z}_{1}^{\mathrm{p}}} \operatorname{dpD(p)} \\
& \left.=1 \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Aff}^{(1+\mathrm{F}}\right)^{1=2}: \tag{56}
\end{align*}
$$

In this form ula we have identi ed A A $2 \hat{A}^{2}=A \quad G^{2}=C^{0}$ as the e ective bend constant, coarse-grained over a helix tum. (H ad we kepto ( ${ }^{2}$ ) term swe could have m ade a sim ilar identi cation of the coarse-grained tw ist constant $C$ in term $s$ of $A ; \hat{A} ;{ }^{0}$; $G$.) $W$ e also de ned

$$
\begin{equation*}
F \quad \frac{2 G^{2}}{\mathrm{~A}_{2}^{0} \mathrm{~A}} \frac{\hat{A^{\prime}}}{\mathrm{A}}+\frac{\mathrm{A}_{1}^{0}}{\mathrm{C}^{0}} \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
$$

The key observation is now sim ply that F in 57) is positive.
Thus we have found a chiral entropic elasticity e ect: the form ul of the main text for $1 \quad z=L$ get $m$ ultiplied by the asym $m$ etric correction factor ( $\quad \mathrm{F}=2$ ). (T his analysis corrects an erroneous claim that no such factor exists.)
$T$ he dependence of this chiralcontribution to $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{L}$ on the stretching tension is di erent from the intrinsic tw ist-stretch term introduced in the $m$ ain text, equation 41), and so in principle the tw o e ects could be disentangled by tting to data. In practice, how ever, the chirale ect in $F$ igure 1 is too sm all to m ake any de nite statem ent. Instead we tried elim inating the $D$ term in (41) and replacing it by the $F$ term in (56), which yields an equally good $t$ but $w$ ith $F=1: 6$. Since this value is not positive, contrary to the prediction in (57), we conclude that the tw ist-stretch coupling D is needed to explain the asym $m$ etry of the experim entaldata. This conclusion is qualitatively consistent w ith an earlier analysis 42 of the highest-force data; here the chiral entropic e ect is very sm all (se (56)). Encouragingly, the $t$ values of A; C are sim ilar to those quoted in the $m$ ain text | our $m$ easurem ent of $C$ is not sensitive to the precise $m$ echanism of chiral sym $m$ etry breaking.

## A ppendix B : D om ain of validity

In this appendix we endeavor to justify our perturbative approach to torsional directed walks, and in particular establish its dom ain of validity and hence the subset of the experim ental data which falls into that dom ain.

## Tunneling

A swe havem entioned severaltim es, the Schrodinger-type equation de ned by 29) su ers from a singularity at the antipode $=$. Indeed, the operator $H$ has no eigenstates at all. W e have em phasized that this singularity is caused by our unphysical om ission of self-avoidance e ects, but it is stillnecessary to have som e criterion forw hen the details of the nonlocal interaction correcting the problem w ill be unim portant, and som e practical schem e for calculating in this regim e58: 59, 60

The key point to note is that if we let $\quad{ }^{2}=4$ and im agine solving our problem for negative (unphysical) values of $t$, then our problem disappears. A nalytically continuing the ground-state eigenvalue in the com plex t-plane back to positive (physical) tyields a result which is nite but no longer real: for $s m$ all $t$ its im aginary part gives the probabillty of a rare barrier penetration process. The real part is an approxim ate eigenvalue describing the $m$ etastable state and controlling the interm ediate asym ptotics
of : this is the num ber we seek. W hen the im aginary part is $s m a l l$, the realpart can be obtained from the lowest orders of perturbation theory, even though eventually at high orders the series diverges.

W e can estim ate the im aginary part of the eigenvalue by nding the saddle point (or \instanton" or \bounce" or \dom ain wall" solution) of the functional integral giving rise to 29). This is the function (s) satisfying the ordinary di erential equation $A^{2}=d V=d$, where $V() \quad(1 \quad \cos )\left(K^{2} \quad t(1 \quad \cos )=(1+\cos )\right)$. The elastic energy of this con guration is then given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{E}{k_{B} T}=2_{0}^{Z} d s \frac{h_{A}}{2}-2+\frac{1}{A} V()^{i}=2_{0}^{Z} d{ }_{0}^{1} \frac{p}{2 V} \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
$$

where 1 is the \tuming point", where $V\left({ }_{1}\right)=0$. The im aginary part of the analyticallycontinued eigenvalue is then proportional to $e^{E=k_{B} T} . N$ um erical evaluation shows that this factor is $s m$ aller than $0.02 \mathrm{when} t<0: 6(\mathbb{A} \quad 1: 6)$, and we have im posed this as one of the conditions selecting the data points used in F igure 1.

## Perturbation theory

From the previous subsection and the references cited there we know that when the tunneling criterion is satis ed perturbation theory w illbe an asym ptotic expansion, whidh we m ay approxim ate by its rst term s . In this subsection we w ill quote the eigenvalues of (31) obtained using second-order perturbation theory. In the last term we expand
${ }^{4}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & 2\end{array}\right)^{2}$ ) in power series, since each succeeding term is form ally suppressed by a pow er of $K{ }^{1}$; we keep the term $\mathrm{s}^{4}+{ }^{6}=4$. W e again abbreviate $t \quad \sim^{2}=4$.
$U$ sing the operator notation of the $m$ ain text, we nd $H=H_{0}+H$, where $H_{0}$ is the nst line of 33) and

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{H}= & \frac{1}{8 A} \frac{t}{32 K^{3}}\left(A_{+}{ }^{6}+3 A_{+}{ }^{2} B_{+}{ }^{4}+3 A_{+}{ }^{2} B_{+}{ }^{4}+B_{+}{ }^{6}\right) \\
& \left.+\frac{1}{4} 1 \frac{t}{K^{2}} \frac{9 t}{4 K^{3}}\right)\left(A_{+}{ }^{4}+2 A_{+}{ }^{2} B_{+}{ }^{2}+B_{+}{ }^{4}\right. \\
& t \frac{2}{K^{2}}+\frac{9}{4 K^{3}}\left(A_{+}{ }^{2}+B_{+}{ }^{2}\right) \quad 21+\frac{t}{K^{2}}+\frac{3 t}{4 K^{3}} ; \tag{59}
\end{align*}
$$

plus term s annihilating the pertunbative ground state. From this we com pute zeroth through second-order shift:

$$
\begin{aligned}
E & =\tilde{f} \frac{2 t}{C}+\frac{K}{A} W_{1} \frac{t}{4 K^{3}} W_{2} \quad \frac{t}{4 K^{3}}{ }^{2} W_{3} \quad \text { where } \\
W_{1} & =1 \frac{1}{4 K} \frac{1}{64 K^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{W}_{2}=1+\frac{5}{8 \mathrm{~K}} \frac{9}{32 \mathrm{~K}^{2}} \\
& \mathrm{~W}_{3}=\frac{9}{4}\left(1+\frac{5}{2 \mathrm{~K}}+\frac{16}{9 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}\right): \tag{60}
\end{align*}
$$

Taking therm odynam ic derivatives as in the text (see 16)), and recalling $t \quad \sim^{2}=4$, gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& !_{0}=\sim \frac{1}{C}+\frac{1}{4 \mathrm{AK}} 1+\frac{1}{2 \mathrm{~K}}+\frac{21}{64 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}+\frac{\sim^{2}}{16 \mathrm{~K}^{3}}\left(2+\frac{15}{8 \mathrm{~K}}+\frac{9}{8 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}\right)+\mathrm{M} \\
& \mathrm{z}=\mathrm{L}=1 \frac{1}{2 \mathrm{~K}} 1+\frac{1}{64 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}+\frac{\sim^{2}}{16 \mathrm{~K}^{3}}\left(2+\frac{15}{8 \mathrm{~K}} \frac{9}{8 \mathrm{~K}^{2}}\right)+\mathrm{M} \tag{61}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
M=\frac{\sim^{2}}{16 K^{3}}{ }^{2} \frac{9}{4} 5+\frac{15}{K}+\frac{112}{9 K^{2}}: \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

The corrections for kinks, (39) and (49), and the other corrections in (41) m ust be added to the expressions (61). The resulting form ul are the ones actually used in the $t$ show $n$ in F igure 1 .

W e are now in a position to state the conditions for perturbation theory to be useful. O ur expansion is in powers of $K^{1}$ and $\sim^{2}=16 \mathrm{~K}^{3}$, so both of these $m$ ust be $s m$ all. To be $m$ ore precise, we im agine holding the force $f$ xed while varying the torque $\sim$, as in the experim ent. The coe cient of $\sim^{2}$ in $z=L$ then gives the inform ation we need to obtain the $t w$ ist sti ness. Com paring the highest-order term of this coe cient retained above to the leading term, we nd their ratio to be less than $10 \%$ when $K^{2}>3$. This explains another of the cuts $m$ ade on the data in the text. $W$ e should also require that $\sim^{2}=16 \mathrm{~K}{ }^{3}$ be $s m$ all, but this is autom atically satis ed when the other im posed conditions are.
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Figure 1: R elative extension of -NA versus applied force $f$ and overtw ist : a single global $t$ to two experim ents. Fiting our model to the solid points shown correctly predicts $m$ any of the open symbols show $n$, even though they were not used in the $t$. On the left are experim ental data from $A \operatorname{llem}$ and and $C$ roquette 16 from top to bottom, the curves are at xed force $0.388,0.328,0.197$, and 0.116 pN . The error bars re ect the $m$ easurem ent of extension; estim ated errors in the determ ination of the force are not show $n$. On the right are data from Strid et al 14 from top to bottom, the curves are at xed force $8.0,1.3,0.8,0.6,0.3$, and 0.1 pN (error estim ates not available). Points corresponding to $f$; where the DNA is known to denature or undergo structuralchange have been om itted from the right hand graph. Solid symbols are within the range of validity of our model (for exam ple, all solid symbols have $K^{2}>3$, see text); open sym bols were not inchuded in the $t$. A total of 69 experim ental data points were used in the tting procedure. Som e of these points are not show $n$; they had froe not equal to one of the ten values listed above. The solid lines are a single global $t$ to both datasets using the theory developed in the text (see 41)). The dashed (higher) lines are the sam e theoretical curves but w ithout our estim ated non-perturbative contribution (section V D) .


Figure 2: D iagram show ing the idealized circular loop m odel of a plectonem e. The tw isted and slightly w rithed conform ation above is shortened by the coil circum ference as the plectonem e form s .
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