

1 **Instantaneous translocation statuses on the fluctuation of ionic**
2 **current for DNA through graphene nanopore**

3

4 *Wenping Lv, Ren'an Wu**

5

6 CAS Key Lab of Separation Sciences for Analytical Chemistry, National Chromatographic R&A
7 Center, Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), Dalian,
8 116023, China

9

10

11

12

13 **Authors Footnotes:**

14 Ren'an Wu (wurenan@dicp.ac.cn)

15 Prof. Dr. of Chemistry

16 Tel: +86-411-84379828; Fax: +86-411-84379617

17

18 Wenping Lv (wenping@dicp.ac.cn)

19 M.S. of Biophysics

20 Tel: +86-411-84379617 ; Fax: +86-411-84379617

21

1 **Abstract:**

2 Graphene nanopore has the ultra-high DNA sequencing sensitivity for the atomic
3 thickness and excellent electronic properties. Extracting the sequence information of
4 DNA from the blocked ionic current is the crucial step for the ionic current based
5 sequencing technology on nanopores. In this letter, the investigation of the effect of
6 measurement induced noise of ionic current as well as the instantaneous
7 translocation statuses from the fluctuation of ionic current signals for DNA through a
8 graphene nanopore was carried out based on molecular dynamics simulations. We
9 found that the molecular thermal noise of ionic current in a graphene nanopore was
10 related with the time interval of measurement, and the tiny conformational and
11 dynamical variations of DNA could be revealed from the fluctuation of the denoised
12 ionic current through a graphene nanopore. Additionally, the neighborhood effect of
13 ionic current blockage for DNA near a graphene nanopore (within 1.5 nm) was
14 observed. These findings suggest that the ionic current blockages not only
15 dependent on the conformational differences (e.g. folding/unfolding) of DNA, the
16 instantaneous translocation status of DNA could also distinctly be revealed by the
17 fluctuation of ionic current.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Keywords:** graphene, nanopore, molecular dynamics, biosensors, DNA sequencing,
26 **noise of ionic current, translocation statuses of DNA**

27

1 Nanopore sequencing is a new technology promising to directly read out the gene
2 information of DNA at single-molecule level.¹⁻³ The center stage of nanopore
3 sequencing is to distinguish the signals of different kind of bases of DNA through a
4 nanopore.^{1, 4-9} The subnanometer thickness (0.34 nm) of graphene sheet comparable
5 to the spatial interval of DNA nucleotide suggests that the nanopore sequencing at
6 single-base level could be realized utilizing a graphene nanopore.^{4, 10} Based on
7 graphene nanopores created experimentally,¹¹ the translocation of double-stranded
8 DNA through monolayer and/or multilayer graphene nanopores has been recently
9 demonstrated.⁵⁻⁷ In these experiments, the fluctuation of blocked ionic current was
10 observed, explained as the difference induced by folded and unfolded DNA or the
11 unzipping of DNA chain.⁵⁻⁷ Thanks to the atomic level molecular dynamics (MD)
12 simulation technology, the subtle structural features of DNA and the graphene-DNA
13 interactions during translocation could be further revealed. In 2011, Schulten et al.
14 observed the difference of ionic current blockages induced by the folded/unfolded
15 DNA, and suggested the discrimination ability of graphene nanopores to A-T and G-C
16 base pairs (bp).¹² Recently, Aksimentiev et al. reported that the translocation of
17 single DNA strands through graphene nanopores might occur in single nucleotide
18 steps,¹³ similar with the biologic nanopores. Moreover, Aksimentiev et al. found that
19 the ionic current blockages induced by different nucleobases could generally indicate
20 the nucleotide type.¹³ Additionally, the sensitivity of ionic current blockades to the
21 orientations of nucleotides in graphene nanopore has also been observed.^{13, 14}

22 Actually, ionic current blockage based nanopore sensing relies on ions through a
23 nanopore which contribute to both the signal and the noise.¹⁵⁻¹⁹ In particular, the
24 membrane capacitance produces noise fluctuations that increase with the
25 bandwidths of measurement,¹⁸ and the noise of ionic current in membrane-like
26 graphene nanopore¹² was distinctly huger than that in the channel-like synthetic
27 nanopore.²⁰ The time resolutions of nanopore analysis experiments were also limited
28 by this effect.^{1, 2, 5-7} On the other hand, experimental and computational results
29 reveal that the initial conformation induced velocity fluctuations of DNA are also
30 important on timescales corresponding to the translocation of a single Kuhn length.²¹

1 To reduce the electrical noise of graphene nanopore, the stacked graphene-Al₂O₃
2 nanopore was constructed and the temporal resolution of DNA and/or DNA-protein
3 complexes detection was significantly improved recently.²² Based on the differences
4 of ionic current signals, researchers found that the translocation of DNA in
5 nanopores usually accompanied with the conformational adjustment.^{12, 20, 21, 23, 24}
6 The effects of DNA conformations on ionic current blockages were observed by
7 means of MD simulations for traditional solid-state nanopores.¹⁵ Due to the atomic
8 thickness of graphene nanopores, the instantaneous translocation information (such
9 as tiny conformational changes, instantaneous translocation speed etc.) of DNA in
10 graphene nanopores might also be revealed in the ionic current signals potentially.

$$11 \quad I(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N q_i [z_i(t+\Delta t) - z_i(t)]}{\Delta t L z} \quad (1)$$

12 Therefore, an all-atom MD simulation study was presented in this letter, to explore
13 the sensitivity of ionic current to the instantaneous translocation statuses of DNA
14 through graphene nanopore. Before the information extraction from the blocked
15 ionic current, the ionic current measurement itself was firstly assessed by
16 investigating the fluctuation (root-mean-square, RMS) dependencies of ionic current
17 to the measure time interval Δt (Eq. 1)^{15, 20}, simulation temperature and external
18 bias voltage. By monitoring the local conformational variations and local speed of
19 DNA in graphene nanopore, how the conformational and dynamical information of
20 in-pore DNA revealed in the fluctuation of ionic current signal were presented
21 afterwards. Moreover, the impact of DNA base-pairs near to graphene nanopore
22 towards the ionic current blockage was further discussed. We found that the
23 synchronous change of the number of atoms of accumulated DNA in graphene
24 nanopore and ionic current fluctuations were directly presented after the thermal
25 noises of ionic current have been filtered. To the best of our knowledge, it should be
26 the first reported result which could directly confirm the sensitivity of ionic current
27 to the instantaneous translocation statuses of DNA in graphene nanopore.

28 Before exploring the information contained in blocked ionic current, we should to
29 assess the reliability of ionic current measurement itself (open-pore ionic current). It

1 is well known that the electrical conductivity of solution is originated from the
2 directional translocation of charge carriers. For example, the Na^+ and Cl^- ions were
3 played as most of the charge carriers in NaCl solution, because the ionization and/or
4 polarization of water molecules were ignored in the case of low bias voltage.^{1, 25}
5 Essentially, the charge displacement within a time interval Δt of the measured
6 length in the direction of external bias voltage determined the ionic current of
7 solution (Eq. 1). For the non-interaction system, the choice of time interval Δt
8 should not impact the measurement of ionic current. While as shown in Figure 1a,
9 the interactions among ions, water molecules and graphene directly impact the
10 movement of charge carriers in NaCl solution.²⁵ Therefore the impact of
11 measurement frequency (the reciprocal of time interval Δt) to the fluctuation of
12 open-pore ionic current was first investigated with different temperatures (280, 300
13 and 320 K) and bias voltages (0 and 1 V).

14 The obtained average (AVG) and the fluctuation (root-mean-square, RMS) of ionic
15 current were plotted as function of the measurement frequency ($1/\Delta t$) in Figure 1b.
16 It shows that the choice of time interval (Δt) could impact the measurement of both
17 the average ionic current and its fluctuation (RMS). If no external bias voltage was
18 applied (0V, 300K), the average ionic current was maintained in zero because of no
19 directional movement of charge carriers occurred in the simulation system. While the
20 fluctuation (RMS) of ionic current was linearly increased with the rise of the
21 measurement frequency, indicating that the thermal motion (no bias voltage applied)
22 induced noise of ionic current could be modulated by the choice of measurement
23 frequency. When the bias voltage (1V, 300K) was applied, no obvious increase of the
24 fluctuation (RMS) of ionic current was observed in high frequency region (> 200 GHz,
25 Figure 1b). However, when Δt was shorter than 4 ps (250 GHz), the fluctuation
26 (RMS) of the ionic current was even higher than the average ionic current (8 nA).
27 With the increase of Δt the fluctuation of ionic current was also reduced, but it was
28 still greater than the noise of no bias voltage was applied (0V, 300K). It suggests that
29 the application of bias voltage could also induce the increase of the ionic current
30 fluctuation. Comparing the results of different simulation temperatures (280, 300

1 and 320 K), the temperature sensitivity of ionic current fluctuation was distinctly
2 presented (Figure 1b). It accords with the molecular kinetic theory that the degree of
3 molecular thermal motion depended on the system temperature.²⁶ On the other
4 hand, we know that the ions would accumulate on the surface of graphene nanopore
5 under the oppression of applied electric field,^{12, 25} while the flexible graphene
6 nanopore model was employed in above calculations (similar with previous
7 researches^{12, 24}). The shaking of atoms at the pore edge of flexible graphene
8 nanopore might also impact the fluctuation of ionic current. Thus an additional MD
9 simulation with rigid graphene nanopore model was further performed. As shown in
10 Figure 1c, the root-mean-square distances (RMSD) of the flexible graphene
11 nanopores was 0.052 ± 0.007 nm, and it is over 2 times higher than that of the rigid
12 graphene nanopore employed (0.021 ± 0.001 nm). However, comparing with the
13 results of different simulation temperatures (Figure 1b), the differences of both the
14 average and fluctuation of ionic current between rigid and flexible graphene
15 nanopore model were undistinguishable (Figure 1d). These results suggest that the
16 thermal fluctuation and diffusion of the molecules (including the ions-self) in
17 solution disturb the directional migration of ions, and contribute mostly to the noise
18 of ionic current.

19 Although the average currents were also increased with the rise of simulation
20 temperature (Figure 1b), they could maintain steady until the time interval of
21 measurements were shorter than 50 ps (> 20 GHz). A similar result reported showed
22 that the average ionic current could maintain steady when Δt in range of $1 \sim 10$ ps
23 for biologic nanopore (α -Hemolysin).²⁷ While, as the average current was obtained
24 from the statistics of the directional movement of charge carriers in the whole MD
25 trajectory, the choice of Δt should not impact the measurement of average ionic
26 current through nanopores. As shown in Figure 1b, with a wider measurement time
27 interval ($\Delta t > 100$ ps, 10 GHz), the obtained average ionic current was decreased
28 with the increase of Δt . But we also noticed that the beginning points of the
29 decrease of the average ionic current were increased with the increase of simulation
30 temperature. For the decrease of average ionic current was caused by the reduction

1 of the statistics of charge displacement, such a temperature dependence of the
2 decrease of average ionic current suggests that the abnormal decrease of average
3 ionic current might result from the displacements of a part of ions were over the
4 length of simulation box. Because the PBC was used in MD simulation, the motion of
5 ions increased with the increase of system temperature and induced more ions move
6 into the nearby period of simulation box. By using a bigger simulation box (20 nm in
7 z-direction), the abnormal reduce of average ionic current could be effectively
8 alleviated (Figure S2). In most of the present experiments the source cell and drain
9 cell were separate,^{5, 7, 14} thus the statistics of charge displacement should be constant
10 and no reduction of average ionic current could be observed in experiments. These
11 findings indicate that the noise of ionic current could be restrained by decreasing the
12 measurement frequency, analogous to the experimental and theoretical results that
13 the thermal noise of ionic current increases with the bandwidth of a detector.^{16, 18,}
14 ²⁴⁻²⁶

15 Based on above discussions and the measurement frequency dependencies of
16 ionic current (Figure S2), the time interval (Δt) of the blocked ionic current
17 measurements for instantaneous translocation status investigation were chosen as
18 50 ps to ensure that the “signal-to-noise” ratio > 5 (the magnitude of the thermal
19 noise was around 2.5 nA). The microscopic kinetics of a double-strand DNA chain
20 (d-poly(CAGT)₄₈) electrophoretically translocating through a 2.4 nm graphene
21 nanopore were investigated based on 6 sections of MD simulations (index 10-15 in
22 Table S1). As shown in Figure 2a, the thermal fluctuations (red lines) of the original
23 ionic current signals (grey lines) were further denoised with a FFT filter (cutoff
24 frequency is 10GHz) for the removal of thermal noises and to improve the
25 presentation ability of ionic current to the translocation information of DNA in
26 graphene nanopore. We found that the magnitude of ionic current signals in Figure
27 2a were significantly influenced by the applied bias voltages (1V or 2V), similar with
28 previous studies.^{12, 24} Meanwhile, Figure 2 also shows that the profiles of ionic
29 current signals were extremely different in the repeat MD simulations (different
30 initial seeds were used in simulation R1, R2 and R3), suggesting that the translation

1 process of DNA in graphene nanopore might be different in these simulations.
2 Therefore the instantaneous translocation speeds of DNA in graphene nanopore
3 were monitored. As shown in panels of [1V, R1], [1V, R2], [2V, R1] and [2V, R2] in
4 Figure 2b, although the bias voltage used in the calculation was ten times higher than
5 that in experiments,^{2, 5, 6, 12} the translocation speeds of DNA were fluctuated around
6 2 mm/ms (about 5.5 kbp/ms) and around 3 mm/ms (about 8.5 kbp/ms) in most of
7 the translocation time for 1 V and 2 V bias voltages, respectively. The translocation
8 speeds of DNA in these simulations seem to be comparable with that of DNA
9 obtained experimentally by using solid-state nanopores.²⁸⁻³¹ While there also were
10 some unpredictable uprushs of translocation speed (quick translocation events)
11 presented in these results, suggesting that the translocations of DNA in graphene
12 nanopore were not stable. Comparing the repeat simulations (plotted with colors in
13 Figure 2b), we found that the translocation speeds of DNA in the three repeated
14 simulations were also extremely different. Especially, similar with the translocation of
15 single-strand DNA in graphene nanopores,¹³ the unceasing fluctuation of in-pore
16 DNA speed in simulation [1V, R3] and [2V, R3] showed that the translocation of the
17 double-strand DNA could also be stagnated in the graphene nanopore. The
18 corresponding ionic current signals show that the magnitude of the ionic current
19 fluctuation was around 3 nA (1V bias voltage) and 3.5 nA (2V bias voltage) all the
20 time (panels [1V, R3] and [2V, R3] in Figure 2a), suggesting that the stagnated
21 translocation events could be revealed in the ionic current signals. The other four
22 panels in Figure 2a show that the magnitude of ionic current signals were raised to
23 the level of open-pore ionic current after about 12 ns (panel [1V, R1]), 10 ns (panel
24 [1V, R2]), 6 ns (panel [2V, R1]) and 5 ns (panel [2V, R2]), respectively. They also accord
25 with the corresponding termination time of the fluctuations of in-pore DNA speeds
26 (Figure 2b), suggesting that the ionic current fluctuation could reveal the
27 translocation process of DNA in graphene nanopore.

28 After the removal of the thermal noises of ionic current signals by FFT filter, some
29 obvious undulates still presented in the denoised ionic current blockages (Figure 2a).
30 As an example, the undulates of the denoised ionic current were marked as arrows

1 a-g in Figure 3, the enlarged drawing of panel [2V, R1] in Figure 2a. The fluctuations
2 of the blocked ionic current signals imply that there were some more detailed
3 translocation information might be contained in the ionic current. By monitoring the
4 fluctuation of blocked ionic current and the local conformations of DNA in graphene
5 nanopore, we found that the peaks and troughs of blocked ionic current were
6 corresponding to the different local conformations of DNA in graphene nanopore one
7 by one (insets a-e of Figure 3). Meanwhile, the trajectory of MD simulation
8 dynamically shows that the local conformational variations (such as yawing and
9 upright) of in-pore DNA did accompanied with the fluctuations of blocked ionic
10 current (Movie S1), suggesting that the speed fluctuations (see panel [2V,R1] of
11 Figure 2b) of the double-strand DNA in graphene nanopore were different from the
12 stacking interaction induced stepwise translocation of single-strand DNA in graphene
13 nanopore,¹³ more like a local conformation induced translocation jam. These results
14 implied that the instantaneous structural (local conformation) and dynamical
15 (in-pore speed) variations of DNA in graphene nanopore could be revealed in the
16 undulate of blocked ionic current.

17 The appeared yawing and upright local conformations of DNA in graphene
18 nanopore (Figure 3) suggests that the accumulated number of atoms of DNA (violet
19 region of DNA in Figure 4a) in graphene nanopore could be also varied. Because the
20 blockages of ionic current originate from the exclusion effect of the in-pore DNA to
21 ionic translocation, the variation of the number of DNA atoms in graphene nanopore
22 could be the essence of the fluctuations of blocked ionic current. Therefore the
23 comparison between the accumulated number of DNA atoms in graphene nanopore
24 and the ionic current signals was performed (Figure 4b and Figure S3). Results show
25 that the magnitude of blocked ionic current fluctuations were reciprocal to the
26 fluctuations of the number of DNA atoms accumulated in graphene nanopore
27 perfectly for the non-stagnant translocation events. It indicates that the volume of
28 the stopper (in-pore DNA) could be the key factor of the ionic current blockages.
29 These results confirm that the valleys of ionic current signal marked with the arrows
30 in Figure 3 did originate from the pore has been closely occupied by the yawed DNA.

1 The unstable translocation and the variation of the number of atoms of the
2 accumulated DNA in graphene nanopore might induce the fluctuation of the
3 interaction between DNA and graphene. As shown in Figure 4c, the DNA-graphene
4 interaction energy was fluctuated in range of $-25 \sim -150$ kJ/mol in the first 3 ns.
5 Compared with the average interaction energy (-27.08 ± 6.32 kJ/mol) between a
6 short in-pore DNA fragment composed of only two base-pairs (ApT and GpC) and the
7 same graphene nanopore (aperture 2.4 nm, monolayer) in our previous research,²⁴
8 the enhanced DNA-graphene interaction imply that the nucleobases were exposed
9 toward graphene surface (π - π stacking interaction was much greater than edge-edge
10 interaction between nucleobases and graphene)^{32, 33} and/or the nearby DNA
11 contribute to the DNA-graphene interaction also. The dramatically enhanced
12 DNA-graphene interaction after 3 ns (the inset of Figure 3c) and the MD trajectories
13 (Movie S1-S2) show that the exposed nucleobases did adhere on the bottom of
14 graphene nanopore steadily after 3 ns due to the π - π stacking interaction between
15 nucleobases and graphene surface.¹³ Similar with the stagnated translocation events
16 in Figure 2b ([1V, R3] and [2V, R3]), the translocation speed of in-pore DNA was also
17 reduced after 3ns, and the DNA translocation was almost stagnated around the 4 ns
18 (panel [2V, R1] in Figure 2b). During this retarded period of DNA translocation (3~4
19 ns), the fluctuation of blocked ionic current seems also be hold-up in some extent
20 (Figure 3). While, the energy barrier of the bending of graphene-adhered-DNA²⁴
21 could induce the remaining-DNA crosswise lying down and blockaded graphene
22 nanopore closely (insets e-f of Figure 3 and/or Movies S1-S2). Thus the adherence of
23 DNA on graphene could also induce the unexpected fluctuations of ionic current
24 (marked with arrows e and f in Figure 3). After DNA passed through the graphene
25 nanopore (6 ~8 ns), the magnitude of ionic current signal (Figure 3) was increased to
26 the level of open-pore ionic current (> 10 nA). On the other hand, the fluctuation of
27 graphene nanopore itself (Figure 4d) was enhanced due to the DNA-graphene
28 interaction during the translocation, but it reduced to the level of the simulation
29 without DNA (Figure 1c) after DNA passed through graphene nanopore (highlighted
30 with yellow band in Figure 4d). Thus the fluctuations of the blocked ionic current

1 might also be influenced by the structural fluctuations of both DNA and graphene
2 nanopore (the other sensing methods which were more elaborate, such as the
3 transverse current³⁴⁻³⁶ might also be influenced by the translocation jam of DNA in
4 graphene nanopore, because the DNA-graphene interaction has changed.)

5 As above discussion, the existence of DNA nearby graphene nanopore might also
6 disturb the migration of ions through nanopore (Figure 3g). Herein, a set of MD
7 simulations were performed to investigate the neighborhood effect of DNA towards
8 ionic current blockage. Here a DNA fragment composed of only two base-pairs
9 (d-(AG)₂) was employed as a stopper to block the ions through graphene nanopore
10 because it is the smallest unit which contained four kinds of nucleobases. 44 sections
11 of MD simulations each with 4 ns length were performed to get the ionic blockages
12 information of the stopper at different positions. The shift range of the stopper (DNA)
13 to the center of graphene nanopore is -2 nm ~ 2 nm (see insets of Figure 5a). The
14 obtained ionic current blockages which induced by nearby DNA of graphene
15 nanopore with two orientations were shown in Figure 5a. The schematic diagrams of
16 the position and orientation altering of DNA fragment in ionic current calculations
17 were shown as insets of Figure 5b. We found that the blocked ionic current (I) of
18 DNA in graphene nanopore (distance is 0 nm) was only about half of the open pore
19 current (I_o), it accord with the reported results.¹⁴ While, the interesting result is that
20 the nearby DNA of graphene nanopore could also induce the ionic current blockages.
21 For instance, the DNA positioned within 0.4 nm to graphene nanopore in z-direction,
22 the blocked ionic currents were almost equal and lower than half of the open pore
23 current (I_o), suggesting that the blockage effect of in-pore DNA towards ionic current
24 (I/I_o) is similar to that of DNA positioned within or at the entrance of graphene
25 nanopore (Figure 5b). When the DNA fragment positioned within 1.5 nm of graphene
26 nanopore, the ionic current blockages were enhanced with the decrease of the
27 interval between DNA and graphene nanopore (Figure 5a). However, the DNA could
28 not impact the ionic current when the DNA-graphene nanopore separation was
29 wider than 1.5 nm, indicating that the neighborhood effect of DNA towards ionic
30 current blockage appears only when the separation between DNA and graphene

1 nanopore is smaller than 1.5 nm. The neighborhood effect of DNA to ionic current
2 blockage suggests that the conformational variation of nearby DNA of graphene
3 nanopore could also induce the fluctuation of ionic current (Figure 2a).

4 In summary, a series of all-atom MD simulations was carried out to assess the ionic
5 current measurement and extract the instantaneous translocation information of
6 DNA in graphene nanopore from the fluctuations of blocked ionic current. A key
7 result of our study is that the thermal motion induced fluctuation (RMS) of ionic
8 current was related with the time interval of measurement, analogous to the
9 experimental and theoretical results that the thermal noise of ionic current increases
10 with the bandwidth of detection. Another key result is that the fluctuations of
11 blocked ionic current were synchronous with the local conformational variations of
12 in-pore DNA, because the number of DNA atoms accumulated in graphene nanopore
13 was changed. Meanwhile, the local conformational variation of DNA could also
14 induce the translocation jam and speed fluctuations, suggesting that the fluctuation
15 of blocked ionic current could also be induced by the unstable translocation of DNA
16 in graphene nanopore. The third key result is that the DNA fragments in graphene
17 nanopore or at the entrance of graphene nanopore have the similar blockage effect
18 to ionic current, suggesting that not only the DNA inside a graphene nanopore, the
19 DNA base-pairs nearby the entrance of graphene nanopore should also impact the
20 magnitude of the measured ionic current. In short, we found that the ionic current
21 blockages not only dependent on the conformational differences (e.g.
22 folding/unfolding) of DNA, the instantaneous translocation status of DNA could also
23 distinctly be revealed by the fluctuation of ionic current.

24

25

1 **Acknowledgement:**

2 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.
3 21175134), the Knowledge Innovation Program of Dalian Institute of Chemical
4 Physics and the Hundred Talent Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences to Dr. R.
5 Wu.

6

1 **Supporting information Available:**

2 Detailed description of the simulation and analysis methods; plot of the average and
3 fluctuation of the ionic current obtained from the three benchmark MD simulations by
4 using different temperature coupling methods (nose-hoover, berendsen and v-rescale);
5 plot of the average and fluctuation of open-pore ionic current by using the big
6 simulation box (6.3x6.3x20 nm³); plots of the comparing of ionic current and number
7 of DNA atoms in graphene nanopore for the simulation [1V, R1], [1V, R2], [1V, R3],
8 [2V, R2] and [2V, R3]; list of the detail simulation parameters of all the calculations
9 in our work; animations illustrating of the synchronically evolution of the MD
10 trajectory of d-poly(CAGT)₄₈ DNA translocation in graphene nanopore and the
11 fluctuation of blocked ionic current as well as the molecular details of DNA adhering
12 on graphene surface.

13

1 Reference:

- 2 1. M. Wanunu, *Physics of life reviews*, 2012, **9**, 125-158.
- 3 2. B. M. Venkatesan and R. Bashir, *Nat Nanotechnol*, 2011, **6**, 615-624.
- 4 3. H. Kumar, Y. Lansac, M. A. Glaser and P. K. Maiti, *Soft Matter*, 2011, **7**, 5898-5907.
- 5 4. Z. S. Siwy and M. Davenport, *Nat Nanotechnol*, 2010, **5**, 697-698.
- 6 5. G. F. Schneider, S. W. Kowalczyk, V. E. Calado, G. Pandraud, H. W. Zandbergen, L. M. K.
7 Vandersypen and C. Dekker, *Nano Lett*, 2010, **10**, 3163-3167.
- 8 6. C. A. Merchant, K. Healy, M. Wanunu, V. Ray, N. Peterman, J. Bartel, M. D. Fischbein, K. Venta,
9 Z. T. Luo, A. T. C. Johnson and M. Drndic, *Nano Lett*, 2010, **10**, 2915-2921.
- 10 7. S. Garaj, W. Hubbard, A. Reina, J. Kong, D. Branton and J. A. Golovchenko, *Nature*, 2010, **467**,
11 190-193.
- 12 8. D. Branton, D. W. Deamer, A. Marziali, H. Bayley, S. A. Benner, T. Butler, M. Di Ventra, S. Garaj,
13 A. Hibbs, X. H. Huang, S. B. Jovanovich, P. S. Krstic, S. Lindsay, X. S. S. Ling, C. H. Mastrangelo,
14 A. Meller, J. S. Oliver, Y. V. Pershin, J. M. Ramsey, R. Riehn, G. V. Soni, V. Tabard-Cossa, M.
15 Wanunu, M. Wiggin and J. A. Schloss, *Nat Biotechnol*, 2008, **26**, 1146-1153.
- 16 9. C. Dekker, *Nat Nanotechnol*, 2007, **2**, 209-215.
- 17 10. M. S. Xu, D. Fujita and N. Hanagata, *Small*, 2009, **5**, 2638-2649.
- 18 11. M. D. Fischbein and M. Drndic, *Appl Phys Lett*, 2008, **93**, 113107.
- 19 12. C. Sathe, X. Q. Zou, J. P. Leburton and K. Schulten, *Acs Nano*, 2011, **5**, 8842-8851.
- 20 13. D. B. Wells, M. Belkin, J. Comer and A. Aksimentiev, *Nano Lett*, 2012, **12**, 4117-4123.
- 21 14. J. Comer and A. Aksimentiev, *J Phys Chem C*, 2012, **116**, 3376-3393.
- 22 15. A. Aksimentiev, *Nanoscale*, 2010, **2**, 468-483.
- 23 16. R. M. M. Smeets, N. H. Dekker and C. Dekker, *Nanotechnology*, 2009, **20**, 095501.
- 24 17. V. Tabard-Cossa, D. Trivedi, M. Wiggin, N. N. Jetha and A. Marziali, *Nanotechnology*, 2007, **18**,
25 305505.
- 26 18. M. Wanunu, *Phys Life Rev*, 2012, **9**, 125-158.
- 27 19. R. M. M. Smeets, U. F. Keyser, N. H. Dekker and C. Dekker, *P Natl Acad Sci USA*, 2008, **105**,
28 417-421.
- 29 20. A. Aksimentiev, J. B. Heng, G. Timp and K. Schulten, *Biophys J*, 2004, **87**, 2086-2097.
- 30 21. B. Lu, F. Albertorio, D. P. Hoogerheide and J. A. Golovchenko, *Biophys J*, 2011, **101**, 70-79.
- 31 22. B. M. Venkatesan, D. Estrada, S. Banerjee, X. Z. Jin, V. E. Dorgan, M. H. Bae, N. R. Aluru, E. Pop
32 and R. Bashir, *Acs Nano*, 2012, **6**, 441-450.
- 33 23. A. F. Sauer-Budge, J. A. Nyamwanda, D. K. Lubensky and D. Branton, *Phys Rev Lett*, 2003, **90**,
34 238101.
- 35 24. W. Lv, M. Chen and R. a. Wu, *Soft Matter*, 2013, **9**, 960-966.
- 36 25. G. H. Hu, M. Mao and S. Ghosal, *Nanotechnology*, 2012, **23**, 395501.
- 37 26. E. L. Dougherty and H. G. Drickamer, *J Phys Chem-Us*, 1955, **59**, 443-449.
- 38 27. A. Aksimentiev and K. Schulten, *Biophys J*, 2005, **88**, 3745-3761.
- 39 28. A. J. Storm, J. H. Chen, H. W. Zandbergen and C. Dekker, *Phys Rev E*, 2005, **71**, 051903.
- 40 29. B. M. Venkatesan, A. B. Shah, J. M. Zuo and R. Bashir, *Adv Funct Mater*, 2010, **20**, 1266-1275.
- 41 30. B. M. Venkatesan, B. Dorvel, S. Yemenicioglu, N. Watkins, I. Petrov and R. Bashir, *Adv Mater*,
42 2009, **21**, 2771-2776.
- 43 31. A. J. Storm, C. Storm, J. H. Chen, H. Zandbergen, J. F. Joanny and C. Dekker, *Nano Lett*, 2005, **5**,

1 1193-1197.

2 32. R. R. Johnson, A. T. C. Johnson and M. L. Klein, *Small*, 2010, **6**, 31-34.

3 33. W. P. Lv, *Chem Phys Lett*, 2011, **514**, 311-316.

4 34. J. Prasongkit, A. Grigoriev, B. Pathak, R. Ahuja and R. H. Scheicher, *Nano Lett*, 2011, **11**,
5 1941-1945.

6 35. J. Lagerqvist, M. Zwolak and M. Di Ventra, *Nano Lett*, 2006, **6**, 779-782.

7 36. K. K. Saha, M. Drndic and B. K. Nikolic, *Nano Lett*, 2012, **12**, 50-55.

8

9

10

11