Tuning the stability of DNA tetrahedra with base-stacking interactions

Jibin Abraham Punnoose,[1^*] Dadrian Cole,[1,2^] Arun Richard Chandrasekaran,[1,3] and Ken Halvorsen[1*]

[1]The RNA Institute, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY, USA.

[2]Department of Biological Sciences, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY, USA.

[3]Department of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, NY, USA.

^These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: khalvorsen@albany.edu; jabrahampunnoose@albany.edu

Abstract

DNA nanotechnology relies on programmable anchoring of regions of single-stranded DNA through base pair hybridization to create nanoscale objects such as polyhedra, tubes, sheets, and other desired shapes. Recent work from our lab measured energetics of base-stacking interactions and suggested that terminal stacking interactions between two adjacent strands could be an additional design parameter for DNA nanotechnology. Here, we explore that idea by creating DNA tetrahedra held together with sticky ends which contain identical base pairing interactions but different terminal stacking interactions. Testing all 16 possible combinations, we found that the melting temperature of DNA tetrahedra varied by up to 10 °C from altering a single base stack in the design while retaining a common sequence in a 6-nt sticky end. This work clearly shows that stacking design influences DNA tetrahedra stability in a substantial and predictable way. The results likely apply to other types of DNA nanostructures and suggest that terminal stacking interactions play an integral role in formation and stability of DNA nanostructures.

The advent of DNA nanotechnology has brought the opportunity to design and build materials from DNA, with nanoscale precision to build desired shapes with sizes ranging from nanometers to microns.[1–3] The use of DNA and RNA as programmable materials can be attributed to the predictable base-pairing which defines interacting regions, as well as the stark (~50 fold) difference in the stiffness between single and double stranded DNA.[4] This allows a combination of structural rigidity in double stranded regions and tight bends in single-stranded regions. Structures can be formed by folding long single-stranded DNA using short DNA oligos called staples (in DNA origami) or by the self-assembly from smaller motifs through sticky end cohesion (hierarchical assembly). In both cases, hybridization of short DNA segments brings selected regions or other short fragments together in a desired geometry. Over the past three decades, the field has grown considerably, and hundreds of structures of varying complexity and function have been designed for applications including drug delivery, molecular computation, and nano robotics.[5–7]

The core design principles in DNA nanotechnology involve hybridization and routing of various DNA strands between different regions throughout the structure. The contact areas between strands in individual uninterrupted duplex regions are typically short, ranging from a few base pairs to ~24 base pairs depending on design and assembly technique.[8,9] Complex designs including DNA origamis can have several hundreds of such contacts, leaving a similar number of nicks and junctions that can potentially impact the structure and stability of the DNA nanostructures.

In recent work by our lab, we quantified the energetics of individual base-stacking interactions using a high-throughput single molecule technique called the centrifuge force microscope.[10] We found energies of individual stacking interactions ranging from -0.5 to -2.3 kcal/mol, and our results suggested that terminal base-stacking energies are sufficiently large to influence the stability of short sticky ends, including those used in ligation and hierarchical assembly of DNA nanostructures.

Here, we provide a comprehensive examination of the role of base-stacking interactions on the stability of a model DNA nanostructure – the DNA tetrahedron. The DNA tetrahedron is among the most studied nanostructures for applications including drug delivery and sensing.[11] While there are a few different designs,[8,12] we chose the DNA tetrahedron which is hierarchically self-assembled from four identical 3-point-star motifs that connect to each other through pairs of sticky ends (Figure 1). In our previous work, we used a 3-point-star motif with 4 nt sticky ends for proof-of-concept demonstration that terminal base-stacking can impact stability.

To test the stability of DNA tetrahedra with all 16 combinations of terminal base stacking interactions, we first had to design sequences for the tetrahedra that could 1) preserve identical base-pairing interactions in the sticky ends across all variants, and 2) enable robust construction of the DNA tetrahedron for all variants. Our previous proof-of-concept work used a 4-nt sticky end (Figure 1a,b) but we found that 3-point-star motifs failed to assemble into tetrahedra with weaker base-stacks.[10] To address this issue, we needed to strengthen the sticky ends of the 3 point star motifs. We tested 5 and 6-nt sticky-ends for a relative strong and weak base-stack and assessed the formation (Figure S1). From these experiments, we moved forward with a design incorporating 6-nt sticky ends. To individually test each base stack, we omitted one terminal base stack from the design and varied the other base stack by altering the downstream

base outside the sticky end on either the short or medium strands (Figure 1c). This design allows a fair comparison between all base-stacks with unaltered sequence in the base pairing region of the sticky ends for all the 3-point-star motifs. This strategy provides a practical way to isolate the effect of changing an individual stacking interaction with minimal perturbation to the overall design.



Figure 1. ***Self-assembly of 3-point-star motif into a DNA tetrahedron.*** (a)The scheme illustrates the hierarchical self-assembly of the 3-point-star motifs using sticky-end cohesion into a DNA tetrahedron. The typical tetrahedra consists of a pair of 4-nt sticky end on each arm, which when assembled would form four base-pairs and two base-stacks. (b) Formation of tetrahedron with 4-nt sticky ends confirmed using non denaturing PAGE. (c) Detailed design of sample 3-point-star motif used in this study with 6-nt sticky ends and one terminal base stack.

The tetrahedra were assembled by mixing DNA strands L, M, and S (sequences in Table S1) in a 1:5:5 ratio at 30 nM in Tris-Acetic-EDTA-Mg^{2+} (TAE/Mg^{2+}) buffer (40 mM Tris base (pH 8.0), 20 mM acetic acid, 2 mM EDTA, 12.5 mM magnesium acetate). The DNA solution was slowly cooled from 95 °C to room temperature over 48 h in a 2 liter water bath insulated in a Styrofoam box. All tetrahedra used the same L strand, but DNA tetrahedra with different base stacks had varying M and S strands to achieve the different stacking configurations (Figure 2a, Table S2). We validated the formation of each DNA tetrahedron for all base-stack combinations using non-denaturing 4% polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (Figure 2b).

While it can be tempting to draw conclusions based on the assembly of the tetrahedra, the efficiency in making the final product can be influenced by strand stoichiometry, strand purity, mixing precision, and hybridization kinetics. These can be difficult to accurately control or assess for 16 independent mixtures of L, M, and S strands drawn from 33 different oligo pools. We considered that a more reliable metric would be to measure the thermal stability of the tetrahedra that did form, independently normalized for each variation. To assess this thermal

stability, we incubated the formed structures for an hour in a range of temperatures (Figure 3a). Following thermal incubation, the fraction of tetrahedra remaining intact was determined by running the sample on a 4% non-denaturing PAGE (Figure 3b), and quantifying the band intensity at each temperature normalized against the intensity at room temperature. For each tetrahedra, the data followed a sigmoidal curve, with increased thermal dissociation observed at higher temperatures until no tetrahedra remained.



Figure 2. ***Design of strands and validation of DNA tetrahedra assembly.*** (a) Schematics of sticky ends and strand designs for all the 16 tetrahedra with differing terminal stacking interactions. Stacked bases upon assembly are bolded and "•" represents a gap. (b) Formation of all 16 tetrahedra confirmed using non-denaturing PAGE.



Figure 3. Thermal tolerance of DNA tetrahedra. (a) Schematics showing disassembly of DNA tetrahedron at elevated temperatures. (b) Non-denaturing PAGE analysis of intact tetrahedron with a G|G stack when incubated in a range on temperature from 20.2 °C to 44.0 °C for an hour. (c) The melting temperature is obtained by fitting a sigmoidal Boltzmann function to the intact fraction of DNA tetrahedron plotted against the incubation temperature. The fitting line represents the average of the individual fits from triplication measurement (Figure S2-S17) and the T_m is the average T_m obtained from the three individual fits. (d) Bar graph representation of the average melting temperatures and the error bar represents the propagated error from the individual fits.

To compare the stability of the tetrahedra, we determined an apparent melting temperature by fitting each plot of intact fraction vs temperature with a Boltzmann function. Each of the 16 tetrahedra were independently produced and analyzed in experimental triplicates to obtain mean melting temperatures (Figure 3c, Figure S2-S17). These results show a range of melting temperatures spanning ~10 °C, ranging from 45.0 ± 0.8 °C for the A|A stack to 34.8 ± 1.5 °C for the C|T stack. In general, we observed that the most stable tetrahedra were those having a purine - purine stack while the least stable were those having a pyrimidine – pyrimidine stack (Figure 4a, b). These results generally followed similar trends as the energetics we found in our previous work quantifying base stacking energies,[10] but do not match exactly. The differences between the rank order strengths of base-stacking interactions between this study and our previous may arise because of differences between thermal and force induced dissociation, as well as inherent difference in complexity between a nanostructure and a simple duplex.

Our results indicate that in the context of a DNA tetrahedron, changing a single terminal base stacking interaction in a 6 bp sticky end can alter the melting temperature of the structure by as much as 10 °C. This clearly illustrates the importance of base-stacking in DNA nanostructure stability. We expect that the relative contribution of base-stacking interactions will increase as the length of the sticky ends get shorter, and also be more pronounced when both terminal stacking interactions are present in the sticky ends (as opposed to the single interaction tested here). While this study is limited to the DNA tetrahedron, it is possible that base stacking interactions also affect formation and stability of other DNA nanostructures.

Our work suggests that base stacking interactions can be part of the design considerations for some types of DNA nanostructures. DNA origami is likely to be the least affected due to typically larger duplex regions, but hierarchical assembly,[8,13] blunt end assembly,[14,15] DNA bricks,[16] DNA superstructures,[17] and DNA lattices[18] are all likely to be affected by base stacking interactions at interfaces. As we partly demonstrated here for the tetrahedron, it is possible to tune the stability of DNA nanostructures by altering key stacking interactions. This may offer new strategies for strengthening (or weakening) structures, in addition to other current tools including ligation [19] and modified DNAs.[20,21]

Acknowledgements
The authors acknowledge general support from The RNA Institute, and to the University at Albany Summer Research Program (UASRP) for support for D.C. Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) under awards R35GM124720 to K.H and R35GM150672 to A.R.C. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

Author contributions
The project was conceived and planned by J.A.P. and K.H. with assistance from A.R.C. Strands were designed by J.A.P. and A.R.C. Experiments were designed by J.A.P., A.R.C. and K.H. Experiments were performed by D.C. and supervised by J.A.P. Data was analyzed by J.A.P and D.C. The project was supervised by K.H. Figures were made by J.A.P. and A.R.C. The paper was written by J.A.P., A.R.C., and K.H. with general input and editing from all authors.

Competing Interests
None.

References

1. Goodman, R. P. *et al.* Rapid Chiral Assembly of Rigid DNA Building Blocks for Molecular Nanofabrication. *Science* **310**, 1661–1665 (2005).
2. Wintersinger, C. M. *et al.* Multi-micron crisscross structures grown from DNA-origami slats. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **18**, 281–289 (2023).
3. Liu, W., Zhong, H., Wang, R. & Seeman, N. C. Crystalline Two-Dimensional DNA-Origami Arrays. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **50**, 264–267 (2011).
4. Bustamante, C., Bryant, Z. & Smith, S. B. Ten years of tension: single-molecule DNA mechanics. *Nature* **421**, 423 (2003).
5. Li, S. *et al.* A DNA nanorobot functions as a cancer therapeutic in response to a molecular trigger in vivo. *Nature Biotechnology* **36**, 258–264 (2018).
6. Liu, H., Wang, J., Song, S., Fan, C. & Gothelf, K. V. A DNA-based system for selecting and displaying the combined result of two input variables. *Nature Communications* **6**, 10089 (2015).
7. Gerling, T., Wagenbauer, K. F., Neuner, A. M. & Dietz, H. Dynamic DNA devices and assemblies formed by shape-complementary, non–base pairing 3D components. *Science* **347**, 1446–1452 (2015).
8. He, Y. *et al.* Hierarchical self-assembly of DNA into symmetric supramolecular polyhedra. *Nature* **452**, 198–201 (2008).
9. Rothemund, P. W. K. Folding DNA to create nanoscale shapes and patterns. *Nature* **440**, 297–302 (2006).
10. Abraham Punnoose, J. *et al.* High-throughput single-molecule quantification of individual base stacking energies in nucleic acids. *Nat Commun* **14**, 631 (2023).
11. Copp, W., Pontarelli, A. & Wilds, C. J. Recent Advances of DNA Tetrahedra for Therapeutic Delivery and Biosensing. *ChemBioChem* **22**, 2237–2246 (2021).

12. Pei, H. *et al.* A DNA Nanostructure-based Biomolecular Probe Carrier Platform for Electrochemical Biosensing. *Advanced Materials* **22**, 4754–4758 (2010).
13. Bhatia, D. *et al.* Icosahedral DNA Nanocapsules by Modular Assembly. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **48**, 4134–4137 (2009).
14. Avakyan, N., Conway, J. W. & Sleiman, H. F. Long-Range Ordering of Blunt-Ended DNA Tiles on Supported Lipid Bilayers. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **139**, 12027–12034 (2017).
15. Wang, R., Kuzuya, A., Liu, W. & Seeman, N. C. Blunt-ended DNA stacking interactions in a 3-helix motif. *Chem. Commun.* **46**, 4905–4907 (2010).
16. Ke, Y., Ong, L. L., Shih, W. M. & Yin, P. Three-Dimensional Structures Self-Assembled from DNA Bricks. *Science* **338**, 1177–1183 (2012).
17. Li, Y. *et al.* Hierarchical Assembly of Super-DNA Origami Based on a Flexible and Covalent-Bound Branched DNA Structure. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **143**, 19893–19900 (2021).
18. Winfree, E., Liu, F., Wenzler, L. A. & Seeman, N. C. Design and self-assembly of two-dimensional DNA crystals. *Nature* **394**, 539 (1998).
19. Rajendran, A., Krishnamurthy, K., Giridasappa, A., Nakata, E. & Morii, T. Stabilization and structural changes of 2D DNA origami by enzymatic ligation. *Nucleic Acids Research* **49**, 7884–7900 (2021).
20. Conway, J. W., McLaughlin, C. K., Castor, K. J. & Sleiman, H. DNA nanostructure serum stability: greater than the sum of its parts. *Chem. Commun.* **49**, 1172–1174 (2013).
21. Liu, Q. *et al.* Enhanced Stability of DNA Nanostructures by Incorporation of Unnatural Base Pairs. *ChemPhysChem* **18**, 2977–2980 (2017).