

Can one predict DNA Transcription Start Sites by studying bubbles?

Titus S. van Erp^{1,2}, Santiago Cuesta-Lopez^{2,3}, Johannes-Geert Hagmann^{1,2}, and Michel Peyrard²

¹ Centre Européen de Calcul Atomique et Moléculaire (CECAM)

² Laboratoire de Physique, Ecole Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 46 allée d'Italie, 69364 Lyon Cedex 07, France

³ Dept. Condensed Matter Physics and Institut of Biocomputation and Complex Systems. University of Zaragoza, c/ Pedro Cerbuna s/n 50009 Spain

It has been speculated that bubble formation of several base-pairs due to thermal fluctuations is indicative for biological active sites. Recent evidence, based on experiments and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations using the Peyrard-Bishop-Dauxois model, seems to point in this direction. However, sufficiently large bubbles appear only seldom which makes an accurate calculation difficult even for minimal models. In this letter, we introduce a new method that is orders of magnitude faster than MD. Using this method we are able to show that the present evidence is unsubstantiated.

PACS numbers: 87.15.Aa, 87.15.He, 05.10.-a

Double stranded DNA (dsDNA) is not a static entity. In solution, the bonds between bases on opposite strands can break even at room temperature. This can happen for entire regions of the dsDNA chain, which then form bubbles of several base-pairs (bp). These phenomena are important for biological processes such as replication and transcription. The local opening of the DNA double helix at the transcription start site (TSS) is a crucial step for the transcription of the genetic code. This opening is driven by proteins but the intrinsic fluctuations of DNA itself probably play an important role. The statistical and dynamical properties of these denaturation bubbles and their relation to biological functions have therefore been subject of many experimental and theoretical studies. It is known that the denaturation process of finite DNA chains is not simply determined by the fraction of strong (GC) or weak (AT) base-pairs. The sequence specific order is important. Special sequences can have a high opening rate despite a high fraction of GC base pairs [1]. For supercoiled DNA, it has been suggested that these sequences are related to places known to be important for initiating and regulating transcription [2]. For dsDNA, Choi et al found evidence that the formation of bubbles is directly related the transcription sites [3]. In particular, their results indicated that the TSS could be predicted on basis of the formation probabilities for bubbles of ten or more base-pairs in absence of proteins. Hence, the secret of the TSS is not in the protein that reads the code, but really a characteristics of DNA as expressed by the statement: *DNA directs its own transcription* [3]. In that work, S1 nuclease cleavage experiments were compared with molecular dynamics (MD) simulations on the Peyrard-Bishop-Dauxois (PBD) model [4, 5] of DNA. The method used is not without limitations. The S1 nuclease cleavage is related to opening, but many other complicated factors are involved. Moreover, theoretical and computational studies have to rely on simplified models and considerable computational power. As the formation of large bubbles occurs only seldom in a microscopic system, MD or Monte Carlo (MC) methods

suffer from demanding computational efforts to obtain sufficient accuracy. Nevertheless, the probability profile found for bubbles of ten and higher showed a striking correlation with the experimental results yielding pronounced peaks at the TSS [3]. Still, the significant statistical uncertainties make this correlation questionable. To make the assessment absolute, we would either need extensively long simulation runs or a different method that is significantly faster than MD.

In this letter, we introduce such a method for the calculation of bubble statistics for first neighbor interaction models like the PBD. We applied it to the sequences studied in Refs. [3] and, to validate the method and to compare its efficiency, we repeated the MD simulations with 100 times longer runs. The new method shows results consistent with MD but with a lot higher accuracy than these considerably longer simulations. Armed with this novel method, we make a full analysis of preferential opening sites for bubbles of any length. This analysis clearly shows that the previously published evidence is unsubstantiated. We end with a discussion to address the required theoretical and experimental advancements that could address the title's question definitely.

The PBD model reduces the myriad degrees of freedom to an one-dimensional chain of effective atom compounds describing the relative base-pair separations y_i from the ground state positions. The total potential energy for an N base-pair DNA chain is then given by $V_1(y_1) + \sum_{i=2}^N V_i(y_i) + W(y_i, y_{i-1})$ with

$$V_i(y_i) = D_i \left(e^{-a_i y_i} - 1 \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

$$W(y_i, y_{i-1}) = \frac{1}{2} K \left(1 + \rho e^{-\alpha(y_i + y_{i-1})} \right) (y_i - y_{i-1})^2$$

The first term V_i is the on site Morse potential describing the hydrogen bond interaction between bases on opposite strands. D_i and a_i determine the depth and width of the Morse potential and are different for the AT and GC base-pair. The stacking potential W consist of a harmonic and a nonlinear term. The second term was

later introduced [5] and mimics the effect of decreasing overlap between π electrons when one of two neighboring base move out of stack. As a result, the effective coupling constant of the stacking interaction drops from $K' = K(1 + \rho)$ down to $K' = K$. It is due to this term that the observed sharp phase transition in denaturation experiments can be reproduced. All interactions with the solvent and the ions are effectively included in the force-field. The constants $K, \rho, \alpha, D_{AT}, D_{GC}, a_{AT}, a_{GC}$ were parameterized in Ref. [6] and tested on denaturation curves of short heterogeneous DNA segments. These examples show that, despite its simplified character, the model is able to give a quantitative description of DNA. Most importantly, it allows to study the statistical and dynamical behavior of very long heterogeneous DNA sequences, which is impossible for any atomistic model.

Despite these successes, it is important to realize the limitations of the model. The PBD model treats the A and T bases and the G and C bases as identical objects. The stacking interaction is also independent of the nature of the bases. Moreover, the one dimensional character has its limitations. In real denaturation experiments, there exists an equilibrium between complete denaturation and recombination. The latter involves a complicated mechanism where two single stranded chains in solution come together and match their complementary bases. As the PBD model basically represents a single dsDNA in an infinite solution, the probability for the denaturated state tends to unity with increasing time at any temperature. It is, therefore, only in the limit of infinite long chains that denaturation curves can be reproduced without additional assumptions. It is hence convenient to decompose the contributions to an observable into an internal and external part. The first comprises the contributions of the dsDNA. The second includes all the contributions of the complete denaturated molecules. Interestingly, experiments can even measure these contributions separately in some cases [7]. In microscopic terms, a configuration $\{y_i\}$ is called a dsDNA molecule when $y_i < y_0$ for at least one $i \in [1 : N]$ with y_0 the opening threshold definition. Similarly, a configuration is completely denaturated whenever $y_i > y_0$ for all i . The internal part can be calculated within the PBD framework. The external part, if needed, can be approximated using a phenomenological approach [6]. According to one-dimensional random walk theory, the external part vanishes for the infinite chain. Moreover, for sufficiently long chains, it is reasonable to expect that the major experimental contributions at 300 K arise from the internal configurations allowing to focus on the internal part only.

As a first investigation, we performed MD simulations of the short DNA sequences described in [3]. To restrict the ensemble to dsDNA, we added the following bias potential that acts on $y_{\min} = \min\{y_i\}$: $V^{\text{bias}}(y_{\min}) = (y_{\min} - y_0)^\nu$ if $y_{\min} > y_0$ and 0 otherwise. We chose $\nu = 6$ imposing a strong biasing force whenever the dsDNA is at

the point of complete denaturation. The addition of the biasing potential is, in principle, required to have all measured statistical quantities well defined independently to the length of the simulation run. In practice, however, all simulations at 300 K did not show complete denaturation, but for higher temperatures the bias was found to be really mandatory to generate meaningful results. In total 100 simulations of 100 ns were performed using different friction constants γ in the Langevin MD simulations and 10 simulations of 1 μ s using Nosé-Hoover. The results are discussed below together with the results of the new method.

The statistical average $\langle A(y^N) \rangle$ of a certain function A that depends on the relative base-pair positions $y^N \equiv \{y_i\}$ is equivalent to the ratio of two N -dimensional integrals $\langle A \rangle = \int dy^N A(y^N) \varrho(y^N) / \int dy^N \varrho(y^N)$ with $dy^N \equiv dy_N dy_{N-1} \dots dy_1$ and ϱ the probability distribution density. Numerical integration calculates these integrals explicitly, while MD and MC calculates only the ratio. Usually, the dimensionality of the system prohibits direct numerical integration making MD and MC far favorable. However, an increase of the computational efforts by a factor of two reduces the error by only a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ in MD and MC, while the reduction can be quite dramatic in low dimensional systems using numerical integration. In the following, we show how to exploit this by creating an effective reduction of the dimensions yielding an orders of magnitude faster algorithm for the bubble statistics calculation. To explain the algorithm, we need to define a set of functions

$$\theta_i(y_i) = \theta(y_i - y_0), \quad \bar{\theta}_i(y_i) = \theta(y_0 - y_i) \quad (2)$$

where $\theta(\cdot)$ equals the Heaviside step function. θ_i equals 1 if the base-pair is open and is zero otherwise. $\bar{\theta}_i$ is the reverse. These function indicate whether a base-pair is open or closed. Using these, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_i^{[m]} &\equiv \bar{\theta}_{i-\frac{m}{2}} \bar{\theta}_{i+\frac{m}{2}+1} \prod_{j=i-\frac{m}{2}+1}^{i+\frac{m}{2}} \theta_j \text{ for } m \text{ even} \\ &\equiv \bar{\theta}_{i-\frac{m+1}{2}} \bar{\theta}_{i+\frac{m+1}{2}} \prod_{j=i-\frac{m-1}{2}}^{i+\frac{m-1}{2}} \theta_j \text{ for } m \text{ odd} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

which are 1 (0 otherwise) if and only if i is at the center of a bubble that has exactly size m . To shorten the notation we have dropped the y_i dependencies. For even numbers it is a bit arbitrary where to place the center, but we defined it as the base directly to the left of the midpoint of the bubble. In order to have these quantities defined also near the ends of the chain, we use $\bar{\theta}_i = 1$ for $i = 0$ and $i = N + 1$. The properties of interest are the probabilities for bubbles of size m centered at base-pair i provided that

the molecule is in the double stranded configuration.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta_i^{[m]} \rangle_\mu &\equiv \frac{\langle \theta_i^{[m]} \mu \rangle}{\langle \mu \rangle} \quad \text{with} \quad \mu = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^N \theta_i \\ &\equiv \frac{Z_{\theta_i^{[m]}}}{Z - Z_\Pi} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here $\mu = 1$ except when all bases are open; then $\mu = 0$. The partition function integrals are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int dy^N e^{-\beta [V_N(y_N) + W(y_N, y_{N-1}) + \dots + W(y_2, y_1) + V_1(y_1)]} \\ Z_{\theta_i^{[m]}} &= \int dy^N e^{-\beta [V_N(y_N) + W(y_N, y_{N-1}) + \dots + V_1(y_1)]} \theta_i^{[m]} \\ Z_\Pi &= \int dy^N e^{-\beta [V_N(y_N) + W(y_N, y_{N-1}) + \dots + V_1(y_1)]} \times \prod_j \theta_j. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can make use of the fact that all integrals Z_X are of the factorizable form $Z_X = \int dy^N a_X^{(N)}(y_N, y_{N-1}) \dots a_X^{(3)}(y_3, y_2) a_X^{(2)}(y_2, y_1)$ using following iterative scheme

$$\begin{aligned} z_X^{(2)}(y_2) &= \int dy_1 a_X(y_2, y_1) \\ z_X^{(3)}(y_3) &= \int dy_2 a_X(y_3, y_2) z_X^{(2)}(y_2) \\ &\dots \\ z_X^{(N)}(y_N) &= \int dy_{N-1} a_X(y_N, y_{N-1}) z_X^{(N-1)}(y_{N-1}) \\ Z_X &= \int dy_N z_X^{(N)}(y_N). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The calculation of $z_X^{(i)}(y_i)$ for a discrete set of n_{grid} values y_i requires only n_{grid}^2 function evaluations whenever $z_X^{(i-1)}$ is known. Hence, a total of $N \cdot n_{\text{grid}}^2$ function evaluations are required instead of n_{grid}^N which is an enormous improvement. Further increase can be obtained by introducing proper cut-offs for the numerical integration. We use integration boundaries such that for all i : $L < y_i < R$ and $|y_i - y_{i-1}| < d$, which we control by a single input parameter ϵ : $d = \sqrt{\frac{2|\ln \epsilon|}{\beta K}}$, $L = -\frac{1}{a_A T} \ln \left[\sqrt{\frac{|\ln \epsilon|}{\beta D_{AT}}} + 1 \right]$, and $R = y_0 + \sqrt{N}d$. Any configuration outside this range but with at least one base-pair closed will have a probability density smaller than $\epsilon/(Z - Z_\Pi)$. A strong decrease in the parameter ϵ will only marginally increase the integration boundaries. We took $\epsilon = 10^{-40}$ that is much smaller than necessary for our accuracy. After storing the following function values in matrices $M_{ij}^{(AT/GC)} \equiv \exp(-\beta[V_{AT/GC}(L + i\Delta y) + W(L + i\Delta y, L + (i+j)\Delta y)])$ with $0 \leq i \leq \text{INT}[(R - L)/\Delta y]$ and $-\text{INT}[d/\Delta y] \leq j \leq \text{INT}[d/\Delta y]$ we can reduce the integral operations for Eq. (5) (using Simpson's rule) into inexpensive multiplication and addition operations only.




FIG. 1: (color). The probability of bubble opening as function of bubble size and position for the AAVP5 promoter and the mutant sequence at 300 K. The 69 bp sequences start at index -46 and end at +23. The TSS is at +1, the mutation is at (+1, +2) where (A, T) bases are replaced by (G, C). Probabilities in each row are normalized by a different factor $\phi(m) = \text{MAX}[\langle \theta_i^{[m]} \rangle_\mu]$ for $i \in [1, N]$ given in the lower panel.

We used this method on the adeno-associated viral P5 promoter and the mutant from Refs. [3] using $y_0 = 1.5$ as opening threshold which corresponds to 2.1 Å in real units. To make the comparison with MD using periodic boundary conditions (PBC), we replicated the chain at both ends, but only computed the statistics for the middle chain. This approach, is cheaper than true PBC which scales as $N \cdot (n_{\text{grid}})^3$. The full probability matrix $\langle \theta_i^{[m]} \rangle_\mu$ was calculated for the middle sequence upto bubbles of size $m = 50$. A fraction of this matrix is presented in Fig. 1 in a color plot. In agreement with Refs. [3] we find preferential opening probabilities at the TSS site at +1 that vanishes after the mutation. Contrary to their results, we find that the TSS is not at all the most dominant opening site. Stronger opening sensitivity is found at the -30 region. Also, different from the previous established findings, Fig. 1 shows that the mutation effect is very local. In Fig. 2 we make the projection by looking at the probability $P_i \equiv \sum_{m=10}^{N-1} \langle \theta_i^{[m]} \rangle_\mu$ that at site i one can find a bubble of size 10 or larger. We compared different boundary conditions and two values for y_0 . In addition, we added the MD results for $y_0 = 1.5$. Different thermostats such as Nosé-Hoover and Langevin with $\gamma = 10, 5$ and 0.05 ps^{-1} were compared. The curves




FIG. 2: (color). The probabilities for bubbles larger than 10 bp for the AAVP5 promoter and the mutant at 300 K. Both semi-PBC as loose ends are compared and two values for the opening threshold $y_0 = 1.0$ and $y_0 = 1.5$. MD results (black) for $y_0 = 1.5$ with PBC are also given with corresponding error bars. A change of scale in the y axis is applied to include the higher openings at the free boundaries.

match within the statistical errors and agreed with the integration method. We obtained relative errors around 10 % for Nosé-Hoover and Langevin with $\gamma = 10$ and 5 ps^{-1} . The errors of the $\gamma = 0.05 \text{ ps}^{-1}$ used in Ref. [3] were considerable larger due a stronger correlation between successive timesteps. The principal error in the new method is mainly due to the finite integration steps. To estimate the accuracy, we compared $\Delta y = 0.1$ and 0.05 with the almost exact results of $\Delta y = 0.025$. Using the TSS peak of the AAVP5 sequence with free boundaries as reference, we found that the systematic error drops from $\sim 5 \%$ to 0.03% for CPU times of 40 minutes and 3 hours only. For comparison, the last accuracy would take about 200 years with MD on the same machine. The evaluation of larger bubbles becomes increasingly more difficult for MD. Bubbles of size 20 showed statistical errors $> 100 \%$ while these were only slightly increased for the integration method. Finally, we calculated the P_i probabilities

for the adenovirus major late promoter (AdMLP) and a control non promoter sequence (See Fig. 3). Also here, our results violate the TSS conjecture. The TSS shows some opening, but cannot be assigned on basis of bubble profile only. Surprisingly, even the control sequence shows significant opening probabilities.

To conclude, we have shown that MD (or MC) encounters difficulties to give a precise indication of preferential opening sites. In particular, information of large bubbles is not easily accessible using standard methods. The method presented here is orders of magnitude faster than MD without imposing additional approximations. The technique is not limited to the PBD model or to bubble statistics only, but it works whenever the proper factorization (5) can be applied. Using this method, we showed that the TSS is generally not the most dominant opening site for bubble formation. These results contradict foregoing conjectures based on less accurate simulation techniques. However, to address the title's question, definitely, there are still many issues to be solved. The PBD model could and, probably, should be improved to give a correct representation of the subtile sequence specific properties of DNA. Base specific stacking interaction seems to give better agreement with some direct experimental observations [8]. Also, the development of new experimental techniques is highly desirable. Therefore, bubbles in DNA and their biological consequences remain a challenging subject for both theoreticians as experimentalists.

We thank Dimitar Angelov and David Dubbeldam for fruitful discussions. TSvE is supported by a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowships (MEIF-CT-2003-501976) within the 6th European Community Framework Programme. SCL is supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Education (FPU-AP2002-3492), project BFM 2002-00113 DGES and DGA (Spain).




FIG. 3: (color). Same as Fig. 2 for the 86 bp AdMLP and the 63 bp non promoter control sequences.

- [1] U. Dornberger, M. Leijon, and H. Fritzsche, *J. Biol. Chem.* **274**, 6957 (1999).
- [2] C. J. Benham, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **90**, 2999 (1993); C. J. Benham, *J. Mol. Biol.* **255**, 425 (1996).
- [3] C. H. Choi *et al.*, *Nucl. Acid Res.* **32**, 1584 (2004); G. Kalosakas *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **68**, 127 (2004).
- [4] M. Peyrard and A. R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2755 (1989).
- [5] T. Dauxois, M. Peyrard, and A. R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 684 (1993).
- [6] A. Campa and A. Giansanti, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 3585 (1998).
- [7] A. Monrichok, G. Gruner, and G. Zocchi, *Eur. Phys. Lett.* **62**, 452 (2003); Y. Zeng, A. Monrichok, and G. Zocchi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 148101 (2003); Y. Zeng, A. Monrichok, and G. Zocchi, *J. Mol. Biol.* **339**, 67 (2004).
- [8] S. Cuesta-Lopez *et al.*, to be published