Synthetic Aptamer Mechanoreceptors Enable Cell-Specific Force Sensing and Temporal Control via DNA Circuits

Tao Xu[1], Soumya Sethi[1], Christoph Drees[1], and Andreas Walther[1,2]*

Affiliations

[1] Life-Like Materials and Systems, University of Mainz, Duesbergweg 10-14, Mainz 55128, Germany.

[2] Max Planck Institute for Polymer Research, Ackermannweg 10, 55128 Mainz, Germany.

*Corresponding author. Email: andreas.walther@uni-mainz.de

Abstract

Cells interpret mechanical cues from their microenvironment with spatiotemporal precision to guide adaptive behaviors. However, engineering synthetic mechanosensing systems with both cell-specificity and programmability remains challenging, especially when targeting ubiquitous classical mechanoreceptors. Here, we introduce an all-DNA mechanosensing platform based on aptamers that transmit force through noncanonical surface receptors. Aptamer–receptor recognition acts as a molecular gate for force transduction, enabling the design of mechanoprobes with dual selectivity – by force magnitude and cell type. These probes interpret diverse mechanical inputs via distinct mechanisms, including actomyosin-driven contractility relayed through focal adhesions and membrane ruffling during macropinocytosis. By integrating aptamer mechanoprobes with upstream DNA reaction networks, we achieve reversible and temporally programmable mechanoresponses. This modular, all-nucleic-acid system offers a general framework for constructing tunable mechanotransduction circuits. It expands the design space for synthetic mechanobiology and provides new opportunities for autonomous, multi-layered mechanical–biochemical regulation in tissue engineering, morphogenesis, and dynamic cell programming.

Introduction

Mechanical forces are key regulators of cellular behavior, shaping processes from morphogenesis to disease progression by guiding how cells sense, adapt, and respond to their microenvironment.[1–4] These responses are typically mediated by mechanoreceptors, which transduce physical stimuli into biochemical signals controlling cell fate, tissue structure, and homeostasis. Understanding and customizing the mechanotransduction process is pivotal for advancing mechanotargeting-based therapies, tissue engineering, and regenerative medicine.[5,6] However, orchestrating orthogonal cell-specific processes and implementing autonomous control mechanisms during complex morphogenesis is still challenged by the limited specificity, versatility, and dynamic tunability of the current mechanosensing toolbox.[7–9]

Selectivity and differential force sensing at the cellular level are key design principles for engineering synthetic mechanosensing materials. Cells endogenously express a variety of mechanoreceptors including integrins, cadherins, T cell receptors, and Piezo channels to accommodate diverse mechanical demands.[10–13] To engage with those, integrin-targeting mechanoprobes (MPs) have been most widely explored.[14] Pioneering studies have employed DNA-based MPs with Arg-Gly-Asp (RGD) motifs to measure piconewton (pN) forces transmitted through integrins. Depending on the DNA architecture, such probes can provide either irreversible ("historical") readouts via duplex rupture or reversible ("real-time") readouts via hairpin unfolding.[15] Recent innovations have even enabled quantification of single-molecule force loading rates.[16,17] However, the broad and often non-specific expression of integrins across cell types undermines terminal specificity[10,18], limiting their applicability in mixed or heterogeneous cell populations. Greater selectivity can be achieved using protein- or antibody-based ligands conjugated to DNA-MPs, which have proven valuable for interrogating T cell signaling and for constructing mechanosensitive cel-cell junctions.[12,19] In addition to sensing forces, previous DNA MPs have made use of force-induced strand separation to reveal cryptic domains amenable for downstream reactivity, such as in situ dimerization or for ex situ amplification.[20,21] Fully protein-based sensors that mimic Notch signaling offer additional strategies to encode both receptor specificity and force responsiveness, yet these approaches typically require labor-intensive protein engineering, including insertion-site optimization to maintain receptor localization and biological function – thereby limiting accessibility, modularity, and scalability.[22,23]

We hypothesized that aptamers – short single-stranded DNA sequences (ssDNA) selected for high-affinity binding to specific cell surface receptors – could serve as a versatile and new family of synthetic mechanosensors. Unlike classical mechanotransduction targets such as integrins or cadherins, many aptamer-accessible receptors are not canonically associated with force transmission. However, given their roles in signaling, trafficking, and cell migration, and since cells continuously recycle surface proteins for quality control, these receptors may transiently interact with the cytoskeleton or become indirectly coupled to intracellular

force-generating machinery – potentially enabling mechanical engagement through previously unrecognized

mechanisms. Indeed, a recent proof-of-concept using the CI-M6PR aptamer demonstrated that even weak

endocytic forces (~4 pN[24]) can be sensed using a DNA MP.[20] However, that system required soft DNA hairpins

suffering from dynamic breathing behavior, which limits force resolution and complicates integration with DNA

reaction circuits. More generally, the design space for aptamer-based force sensors remains largely unclear –

particularly in terms of cell-type specificity, force thresholding, and mechanistic understanding of how force is

generated at the aptamer-receptor interface. Importantly, because aptamers are nucleic acids, they are

inherently compatible with DNA-based strand displacement reactions and programmable logic circuits.[25–27]

This opens opportunities for dynamic and autonomous regulation of mechanosensing – features that are

difficult to achieve with conventional peptide- or protein-based systems like RGD-integrin probes or SynNotch

receptors.

Here, we present a modular and fully programmable mechanosensing platform built entirely from nucleic acids,

in which DNA aptamers function as synthetic receptor ligands embedded within force-responsive DNA MPs.

This approach combines the receptor specificity of aptamers with the tunable force thresholds of DNA

mechanics, enabling the systematic exploration of non-canonical and previously unrecognized force-

generating surface receptors across diverse cell types. Using this platform, we demonstrate two key modes of

selectivity: cell-type selectivity, dictated by aptamer-receptor binding; and force selectivity, governed by DNA

MP geometry and loading direction. In contrast to conventional integrin-targeting RGD probes, our aptamer

MPs display distinct force transmission behaviors, revealing new mechanistic insights into how specific

receptor contexts modulate mechanical engagement. Going further, leveraging the nucleic acid nature of

aptamers, we integrate these probes with upstream DNA-based reaction networks to achieve temporal gating

and switchable mechanosensitivity. This platform establishes a general framework for constructing adaptive,

programmable mechano-interfaces and expands the synthetic biology toolkit for force-guided cell control.

Results

General concept for aptamer-based mechanosensing platform

Our aptamer-based MPs are composed of three modular elements: a terminal aptamer that selectively binds

a target receptor, a DNA duplex that acts as a tunable force-sensitive element, and a fluorophore–quencher

pair that converts mechanical unfolding into a fluorescence signal (**Fig. 1**). The aptamer functions as a

programmable ligand, enabling receptor-specific engagement and ensuring that only receptor-expressing cells

generate detectable force signals. To demonstrate the versatility of this platform, we employ five distinct and

frequently used aptamers targeting diverse cell-surface receptors across five different cell lines. Moreover, the

nucleic acid-based architecture of the aptamer permits dynamic control of receptor recognition via

complementary blocker strands, which can be regulated through DNA-based reaction networks to achieve

multi-layered regulatory complexity, such as temporally gated mechanosensing. For surface functionalization,
we immobilized biotinylated MPs onto streptavidin-coated glass slides and co-immobilized biotinylated RGD
peptides in a 1:1 ratio to support integrin-mediated cell adhesion independent of the aptamer-receptor
interaction.

Fig. 1 Aptamer-based mechanoprobes (MPs) enable cell-type-specific mechanosensing and programmable control via upstream DNA
reaction networks. The all-nucleic-acid MP consists of a cell-targeting aptamer ligand and a DNA duplex serving as a force sensor. A
fluorophore–quencher pair (Rhodamine Red X and BHQ2) transduces mechanical forces into fluorescence signals upon duplex
dissociation. Specific force transmission is gated by aptamer–receptor recognition, allowing for cell-type-selective responses. Tuning
the geometry of the duplex enables force thresholding to filter defined mechanical inputs. Integration with upstream DNA reaction
networks (DRNs) permits programmable and nonlinear regulation of aptamer accessibility, establishing a versatile framework for
engineered mechanotransduction.

Force transmission of aptamer MP requires specific aptamer-receptor recognition

To investigate the role of aptamer–receptor recognition in mechanosensing, we designed a MP incorporating

the AS1411 aptamer, which binds nucleolin (dissociation constant K_d = 69.1 nM)[28] – a membrane-associated

receptor overexpressed in many cancer cells.[29] We selected nucleolin-rich HeLa cells as the test system and

used an AS1411 MP with a zipper-type duplex designed to rupture under a low force tolerance (T_{tol}) of 12 pN.

Subsequently, we seeded cells onto the MP-functionalized surface and imaged them by total internal reflection

fluorescence (TIRF) microscopy after 4 h incubation at 37 °C in 1 % FBS/DMEM medium. Two controls highlight

the successful specific activation: One control bears a randomized sequence without affinity to nucleolin, and

one lacks any ligand (**Fig. 2**a). As expected, only the AS1411 MP generates significant fluorescence, confirming

that specific aptamer-receptor binding enables force transmission (**Fig. 2**a,b). Neither control produces signal,

confirming the absence of any nonspecific interactions, such as from dye-membrane interactions (**Fig. 2**b).

Interestingly, cell spreading area and cell aspect ratio are similar for the three surfaces (AS1411 MP, random

MP and negative control) within the 4 h observation period, indicating that the AS1411-nucleolin couple

operates independently of RGD-integrin mediated adhesion (**Fig. 2**c, Supplementary Fig. 1).

Next, we validate that the AS1411 MP specifically engages the nucleolin receptor by performing colocalization

and competitive binding assays. To this end, we employed the TB-5 aptamer, which binds to a distinct epitope

on nucleolin compared to AS1411, and co-immobilized TB-5[30] and AS1411 MP on the surface at a 1:1 ratio. The

mechanosignals from both MPs colocalize, confirming that they both engage nucleolin (**Fig. 2**d). To further

confirm specificity, we blocked the AS1411–nucleolin interaction using endostatin, a natural ligand for

nucleolin,[29] which reduces the AS1411-derived mechanosignals by 21.7% (**Fig. 2**e). Flow cytometry

corroborates this finding, showing a 23.2% decrease in AS1411 binding to HeLa cells in the presence of

endostatin (Supplementary Fig. 2). Together, these results demonstrate that force transmission through the

AS1411 MP originates from specific aptamer–receptor recognition.

Fig. 2 Specific aptamer–receptor recognition is required for mechanosensing by aptamer-based MPs. a Schematic and representative
TIRF images of HeLa cells cultured on surfaces functionalized with AS1411 aptamer, a randomized sequence, or no ligand. **b-c**
Quantification of mean fluorescence intensity per cell (**b**) and cell spreading area (**c**) for HeLa cells on each surface. n = 54 cells from 3
replicates. **d** Representative brightfield and fluorescence images (TIRF mode) of HeLa cells cultured on surfaces functionalized with a
1:1 ratio of AS1411 and TB-5 MPs. Line profile shows colocalization of AS1411 and TB-5 mechanosignals. **e** Scheme and quantification
of mean fluorescence intensity per cell of HeLa cells without and with endostatin blocking (25 µg/mL) on AS1411 MP surfaces. n = 45
(control), 54 (blocked) cells from 3 replicates. Statistics (b, c): Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons, (e) Two-tailed,
Mann-Whitney test. Scale bars = 20 µm.

Aptamer MP exhibits enhanced force selectivity

To compare the force sensitivity of AS1411 MPs with commonly used RGD-based MPs,[21] we designed each

with two distinct force geometries. In the unzipping mode, the duplex opens base-by-base, resulting in a low

T_{tol} of 12 pN. In contrast, the shearing mode applies force across multiple base pairs near the duplex termini,

yielding a higher T_{tol} of 54 pN based on sequence design (**Fig. 3**a).[15]

Comparing first both RGD MPs, the RGD-unzipping MP produces markedly stronger fluorescence signals than the RGD-shearing MP, particularly at peripheral focal adhesions (FAs) and at central regions indicative of early-stage adhesion events (**Fig. 3**b). This pattern reflects the lower T_{tol} of the unzipping mode, which enables detection of nascent, low-force adhesion events that fail to activate RGD-shearing MP. Although altering the force geometry modulates the average mechanoresponse pattern per cell (**Fig. 3**c), the overall response based on the integrated intensity remains indistinguishable and independent of the MP geometry (**Fig. 3**d). This apparent convergence arises because RGD-integrin linkages are capable of transmitting single-molecule forces that exceed both T_{tol} values (>54 pN), and in some cases can even rupture the streptavidin-biotin linkage (> 100 pN).[31] However, the generation of such high forces is contingent on adequate mechanical resistance from the substrate – typically requiring 33-44 pN counterforce to sustain cytoskeletal maturation and stable adhesion.[32] As a result, shearing-mode MPs promote cell spreading and increase overall force generation, thereby blurring the difference in integrated mechanoresponse between both geometries (**Fig. 3**e).[19]

In contrast, AS1411 MPs show a pronounced distinction between unzipping and shearing geometry. The unzipping mode consistently produces stronger signals in both mean and integrated intensity (**Fig. 3**b-d). Two factors account for this behavior: First, the AS1411-nucleolin couple transmits substantially lower force than RGD-integrin engagement. Second, unlike integrins, the AS1411-nucleolin pair alone does not promote cell spreading (**Fig. 2**c, and **Fig. 3**e). As a result, AS1411 MPs exhibit enhanced force selectivity, with minimal cross activation between geometries. This property makes the shearing mode particularly well-suited for tandem integration with other DNA nanodevices,[33,34] where mechanical stability is essential to avoid unintended force-induced detachment.

158

Fig. 3 Aptamer MPs enable force selectivity via distinct duplex geometries. a Scheme of the mechanosensing through unzipping and shearing geometries in RGD and AS1411 MPs. **b** Representative brightfield and fluorescence images of HeLa cells cultured on surfaces functionalized with RGD and AS1411 MPs featuring different force geometries. **c-e** Quantification of (**c**) mean fluorescence intensity per cell, (**d**) integrated fluorescence intensity per cell, and (**e**) cell spreading area for HeLa cells on each MP type and geometry. n = 49, 47, 45, 36 (left to right) cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons. Scale bars = 20 µm

Source of forces associated with noncanonical mechanoreceptors

Although nucleolin is a well-established molecular target,[35,36] it has not been previously associated with the exertion of mechanical force on the extracellular environment. Our data reveal distinct differences to integrin-targeting MPs, prompting us to investigate the source of nucleolin-associated forces. To test whether aptamer-receptor internalization contributes to force generation, we treated HeLa cells with pathway-specific inhibitors. Neither chlorpromazine (CPZ, 28 µM), which inhibits clathrin-mediated internalization,[37] nor methyl-β-cyclodextrin (MβCD, 1.9 µM) which inhibits caveolin- and lipid-raft-mediated uptake,[38] alters the mechanosignal intensity (**Fig. 4**a, b). In contrast, treatment with 5-(N-ethyl-N-isopropyl) amiloride (EIPA, 100 µM), an inhibitor of macropinocytosis,[39] reduces mechanosignals by 29.8 % (**Fig. 4**b). This implicates macropinocytosis in the mechanoactivation of the AS1411 MP, consistent with previous findings that cancer cells take up free AS1411 aptamers predominantly via macropinocytosis.[40] Flow cytometry further supports this conclusion, showing a 76.6 % reduction in the uptake of free AS1411 aptamers by HeLa cells in the presence of EIPA (Supplementary Fig. 3). Notably, compared to the free state in solution, the inhibitory effect

of EIPA decreases by 46 % when AS1411 is immobilized as a MP on a surface. These results suggest that while

macropinocytosis contributes to force generation, it may not be the main source of nucleolin-mediated force.

Interestingly, previous studies reported molecular associations between nucleolin and FA proteins such as

talin.[41] To determine whether nucleolin-mediated forces spatially correlate with FA structures, we transfected

HeLa cells with a plasmid for constitutive expression of monomeric enhanced green fluorescent protein

(mEGFP)-paxillin and visualized the actin cytoskeleton with phalloidin staining. Notably, nucleolin-generated

forces are clearly localized at peripheral FA sites marked by paxillin, suggesting a spatial and functional

association between nucleolin and FAs (**Fig. 4**c, d, Supplementary Fig. 4). Based on this, we hypothesized

nucleolin may indirectly couple to the actomyosin cytoskeleton to transmit mechanical force

(**Fig. 4**e). To identify the cytoskeletal components responsible for this transmission, we treated cells with

specific inhibitors after allowing 30 min of initial adhesion.[16,42] Inhibiting actin polymerization with cytochalasin

D (10 µM) moderately reduces mechanosignals by 38.9 % (**Fig. 4**f, Supplementary Fig. 5). In contrast, blocking

myosin II ATPase activity with blebbistatin (25 µM) causes a pronounced 77.5 % decrease. Together, these

results demonstrate that nucleolin-mediated forces primarily depend on myosin-driven contractility, which

may be relayed through FAs before reaching nucleolin.

Considering that we aim to develop receptor-orthogonal aptamer MPs, we further investigated the Sgc8-

aptamer as a potential MP for the protein tyrosine kinase 7 (PTK7), using HepG2 cells that overexpress this

receptor. Similar to the nucloelin system, the Sgc8-unzipping MP with a T_{tol} of 12 pN generates strong

mechanosignals (**Fig. 4**g). However, unlike the FA-like patterns observed for nucleolin, PTK7-activated

mechanosignals display spatially distinct, ring-like force patterns with submicron size (**Fig. 4**g). Those are

consistent with a macropinocytic origin, as clathrin- and caveolin-mediated internalization typically generates

vesicles in the nanometer range.[43] To test this hypothesis, we inhibited macropinocytosis using EIPA (100 µM),

which substantially reduces mechanoactivation by 51.9 %, whereas CPZ (28 µM) and MβCD (1.9 µM) inhibiting

clathrin- and caveolin-mediated endocytosis have no effect (**Fig. 4**g, h, Supplementary Fig. 6). To further

examine the spatial organization of these signals, we stained the plasma membrane and performed TIRF

microscopy. As expected, the ring-like mechanofluorescence predominantly localizes to the peripheries of dark

membrane invaginations, consistent with force generation during membrane ruffling in early-stage

macropinocytosis (**Fig. 4**i, j, Supplementary Fig. 7).[44]

To understand the cytoskeletal origin of this force generation, we next examined the roles of actin

polymerization and myosin action during different macropinocytic phases. Actin polymerization is critical for

driving membrane ruffling and protrusion formation during the early-stage macropinocytosis, whereas

myosins contribute to actin network contraction at the base of ruffles as the membrane closes to form

macropinosomes.[45] Treatment with cytochalasin D (10 µM, actin polymerization inhibitor) and blebbistatin (25

μM, myosin II inhibitor) reduces mechanosignals by 56.1 % and 32.6 %, respectively, suggesting that force

generation is dominated by actin polymerization rather than myosin-driven contraction (**Fig. 4**k,

Supplementary Fig. 8). Phosphoinositide 3-kinase (PI3K) catalyzes membrane sealing by generating PIP_3 at the

ruffle bases, thereby recruiting effectors for actin remodeling and vesicle closure.[46] While PI3K activity is

essential for membrane sealing, it is dispensable for ruffle formation.[47] Consistent with this, inhibition of PI3K

using LY294002 (50 μM) does not affect mechanosignals, further confirming that PTK7-mediated forces

originate primarily from early-stage membrane ruffling during macropinocytosis with minimal contribution

from the sealing phase (**Fig. 4**l,m).

Fig. 4 Aptamer MPs reveal force origins associated with noncanonical mechanoreceptors. a Representative brightfield and
fluorescence images of HeLa cells treated with internalization inhibitors on AS1411 MP surfaces. **b** Quantification of mean fluorescence
intensity per cell for HeLa cells under the indicated conditions. *n* = 70, 70, 54, 54 (left to right) cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: Kruskal-
Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons. **c** Representative images of HeLa cells on AS1411 MP surfaces showing brightfield,
mechanosignal, mEGFP-paxillin, and phalloidin-stained actin. **d** Line profile along the white line in (c) shows intensity profiles of
mechanosignals, mEGFP-paxillin, and actin. **e** Schematic: forces acting on nucleolin arise from myosin-II-driven contractility transmitted
via focal adhesions (FAs). **f** Quantification of mean fluorescence intensity per cell following cytoskeletal inhibitor treatment. *n* = 72 cells
from 3 replicates. Statistics: Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons. **g** Representative brightfield and fluorescent images
of HepG2 cells treated with internalization inhibitors on Sgc8 MP surfaces. **h** Corresponding quantification of mean fluorescence

intensity per cell. *n* = 54 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: One-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post-hoc tests. **i** Representative images
showing plasma membrane staining, mechanosignals and brightfield of HepG2 cells incubated on Sgc8 MP surfaces. **j** Line profile from
(i) reveals spatial colocalization of mechanosignals at the inner edge of membrane invaginations. **k** Schematic: PTK7-mediated forces
originate from membrane ruffling during early-stage macropinocytosis; membrane sealing contributes minimally. **l** Brightfield and
fluorescence images of HepG2 cells treated with PI3K inhibitor LY294002 on Sgc8 MP surfaces. **m** Quantification of mean fluorescence
intensity per cell for HepG2 cells without and with LY294002 treatment on Sgc8 MP surfaces. *n* = 54 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics:
Unpaired, two-tailed student's *t*-test. Scale bar = 20 μm.

Versatility of aptamer MPs to customize cell-type-specific mechanoresponses

The specificity of aptamer-receptor recognition enables the modular customization of MPs for cell-type-specific mechanosensing. We demonstrate this principle using three aptamer MPs – Sgc8, MUC1 S2.2 and SYL3c – which target PTK7 (K_d = 0.85 nM)[48], mucin-1 (K_d = 0.12 nM)[49], and epithelial cell adhesion molecule (EpCAM, K_d = 38 nM)[50], respectively. We tested each MP on both receptor-positive and receptor-negative cell lines, selected based on differential receptor expression profiles confirmed by flow cytometry (Supplementary Fig. 9). PTK7-positive HepG2 cells strongly activate the Sgc8 MP, whereas A549 cells with substantially lower levels of PTK7 show minimal response (**Fig. 5**a,b). Conversely, HepG2 cells fail to activate the MUC1 S2.2 probe due to low mucin-1 receptor levels. This contrasts with mucin-1-positive HeLa cells (**Fig. 5**c,d). Similarly, MDA-MB-231 cells generate stronger activation of the SYL3c probe than HeLa cells, consistent with their higher EpCAM expression (**Fig. 5**e,f). These results collectively demonstrate high differential selectivity of aptamer-receptor MP pairs and highlight the broad adaptability of our platform for sensing mechanoresponses across diverse cell types and receptor classes.

Motivated by the need for selective and precise mechanoresponse in complex multicellular environments, we extend our validation beyond simple single-cell-type systems. To this end, we labeled receptor-positive and receptor-negative cells with CellTrace Deep Red and Violet dyes, respectively, and co-seeded them in wells containing the corresponding aptamer MPs to assess cell-type-specific mechanoresponse (**Fig. 5**g). Indeed, mechanoactivation of the MUC1 S2.2 MP occurs exclusively in the Deep Red-labeled mucin-1-positive HeLa cells, while the Violet-labeled Mucin-1-negative HepG2 cells exhibit much lower signals (**Fig. 5**h,i). Switching to the Sgc8 MP leads to strong mechanosignals in the Deep Red-labeled PTK7-positive HepG2 cells, whereas Violet-labeled PTK7-negative A549 cells show minimal signals (**Fig. 5**j,k). These results underscore the utility of aptamer MPs as customizable mechanical elements for precise, cell-type-specific mechanochemical transduction in heterogeneous cell populations.

Fig. 5 Customized cell-type-specific mechanoactivation enabled by aptamer-receptor recognition. a Representative brightfield and
fluorescence images of HepG2 (PTK7-positive) and A549 (PTK7-negative) cells on Sgc8 MP surfaces. **b** Corresponding quantification of
mean and integrated fluorescence intensity per cell of HepG2 and A549 cells on Sgc8 MP surfaces. *n* = 36, 27 cells from 3 replicates.
Statistics: Two-tailed, Mann-Whitney test. **c** Representative images of HeLa (mucin-1-positive) and HepG2 (mucin-1-negative) cells on
MUC1 S2.2 MP surfaces. **d** Corresponding quantification of mean and integrated fluorescence intensity per cell of HeLa and HepG2
cells on MUC1 S2.2 MP surfaces. *n* = 31, 27 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: Two-tailed, Mann-Whitney test. **e** Representative images
of MDA-MB-231 (EpCAM-positive) and HeLa (EpCAM-negative) cells on SYL3c MP surfaces. **f** Corresponding quantification of mean and
integrated fluorescence intensity per cell of MDA-MB-231 and HeLa cells on SYL3c MP surfaces. *n* = 25, 27 cells from 3 replicates.
Statistics: Two-tailed, Mann-Whitney test. **g** Schematic of co-culture assay design. Receptor-positive and -negative cells were pre-
labeled with CellTrace Deep Red and Violet dyes, respectively, mixed 1:1, and co-seeded onto aptamer MP-functionalized surfaces.
h Representative images of HepG2 (PTK7-positive, Deep Red) and A549 (PTK7-negative, Violet) cells co-cultured on Sgc8 MP surfaces.
i Quantification of mechanosignals in HepG2 vs A549 cells. n = 31 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: Two-tailed, Mann-Whitney test.
j Representative images of co-cultured HeLa (mucin-1-positive, Deep Red) and HepG2 (mucin-1-negative, Violet) cells on MUC1 S2.2
MP surfaces. **k** Corresponding quantification of mechanosignals as mean fluorescence intensity per cell. *n* = 31 cells from 3 replicates.
Statistics: Unpaired, two-tailed student's *t*-test. Scale bars = 20 μm.

Aptamer MPs enable programmable mechanoresponses via integration with DNA-based reaction networks (DRNs)

Natural mechanotransduction involves temporally orchestrated biochemical signals that guide adaptive cellular responses. Aptamers, unlike protein or peptide ligands, offer the unique advantage that their DNA structure can be seamlessly integrated with DRNs to emulate this dynamic regulation. Importantly, aptamers can be manipulated directly at their binding site with DRNs without detaching them from the underlying surface by for instance breaking the force-sensitive duplex, thus ensuring their correct configuration and integrity.

To introduce temporal control over mechanoactivation, we regulate aptamer accessibility using designer blocker and activator strands that can be designed with tunable affinities based on base-pairing principles (**Fig. 6**a). We first use a blocker fully complementary to AS1411 to completely prevent binding to nucleolin. This blocker also contains a 5-nucleotide (nt) toehold, enabling its subsequent removal via a toehold-mediated strand displacement reaction (SDR) triggered by an activator strand. In this design, mechanoactivation becomes conditional on the possibility for aptamer-receptor engagement, which can be dynamically regulated through SDR. Cell-free surface assays confirm robust and reversible aptamer blocking (Supplementary Fig. 10). The blocker quenches >90 % of a fluorescently labeled, surface-tethered AS1411 aptamer within 30 min, indicating effective blocking. Subsequent medium exchange with the equimolar activator restores ~ 50 % of the signal within 30 min, confirming aptamer reactivation (Supplementary Fig. 10). We next validate this mechanism under live-cell conditions. Adding 200 nM blocker 30 min after seeding suppresses AS1411-nucleolin mechanoactivation by 75.1 %. Subsequent medium exchange with 200 nM activator restores 82.5 % of the original signal, consistent with aptamer re-engagement and functional recovery of mechanosensing (**Fig. 6**b,c).

Going a step beyond external switching, we next introduce more advanced enzyme-catalyzed DRNs upstream of mechanoactivation to autonomously program the temporal accessibility of aptamer MPs.[26,27] To this end, we replace the DNA blocker with an RNA analogue. This RNA blocker can be selectively degraded by RNase H only when bonded as RNA-DNA duplex at the MP. This degradation releases the aptamer and restores mechanoactivation within programmable time windows (**Fig. 6**d). In this context, RNase H acts as a biochemical gatekeeper. Additional temporal control can be gained by introducing freely diffusing RNA-DNA duplexes as decoy substrates, which compete with the RNA-blocked MP for RNase H activity.

The kinetics of the timer circuit for MP activation depend on the DRN parameters. First, the RNase H concentration can be used to control the time for mechanoactivation to occur. Low RNase H concentrations (≤1 U/ml) fail to initiate measurable mechanoresponse within 4 h. At 10 U/mL, mechanoactivation is restored to 78.2%, while 100 U/mL yields near-complete recovery, consistent with efficient RNA blocker degradation

(**Fig. 6**e,f). To further tune the system, we then fixed RNase H at 10 U/mL and introduced the RNA-DNA decoy.

These indeed slows down the RNA blocker degradation (**Fig. 6**g). 10 nM of decoy is sufficient to modestly delay

the mechanoresponse, while 100 nM nearly abolishes the response within 4 h, with a significant increase

observed only at 7 h (**Fig. 6**h,i).

Because RNA-RNaseH modules can be extended into more complex signaling DRNs,[25] our aptamer

manipulation strategy opens doors for more complex temporal programs in the future. We note that similar

programmable mechanoactivation could also be achieved using antibody- or nanobody-based probes that

block receptor access via engineered protein blockers and activator with progressively tuned affinities.

However, such protein-based systems would require extensive efforts, including site-directed mutagenesis,

affinity optimization, and computational modeling to fine-tune the underlying protein–protein interactions. In

contrast, aptamer systems offer a far more accessible and modular alternative, leveraging predictable base-

pairing rules to design dynamic, multistage mechanical response circuits in a straightforward manner.

319

Fig. 6 Programmable mechanoactiovation enabled by upstream DRNs. a Schematic of switchable mechanosensing using SDRs. HeLa cells were seeded on surfaces grafted with AS1411 MP for 30 min, followed by addition of 200 nM DNA blocker strands to inhibit aptamer–receptor interaction. After another 30 min, 200 nM DNA activator strands were introduced to displace the blockers via toehold-mediated SDR, restoring mechanosensing. **b** Representative brightfield and fluorescence images of HeLa cells on AS1411 MP surfaces after sequential blocker and activator treatment. **c** Corresponding quantification of mean fluorescence intensity per cell. n = 54 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: One-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post-hoc tests. **d** Schematic of enzyme-catalyzed mechanoactivation. Aptamer MPs are initially blocked by complementary RNA strands. Addition of RNase H at varying concentration (0-500 U/mL) degrades the RNA in the RNA–DNA duplexes, resetting the aptamer configuration and restoring mechanosensing. **e** Representative brightfield and fluorescence images of HeLa cells on RNA-blocked AS1411 MP surfaces following addition of different RNase H concentrations. **f** Corresponding quantification of mean fluorescence intensity per cell. n = 36 cells from 3 replicates. **g** Schematic of delayed mechanoactivation. Aptamer MPs are RNA-blocked and exposed to 10 U/mL RNase H. Increasing concentrations of freely diffusing RNA–DNA decoy duplexes (1–100 nM) compete for RNase H activity, thereby delaying aptamer reactivation. **h** Representative brightfield and fluorescence images of HeLa cells on RNA-blocked AS1411 MP surfaces after adding 10 U/mL RNase H and varying RNA/DNA duplex concentrations. **i** Corresponding quantification of mean fluorescence intensity per cell. Reaction medium: 1 % FBS, 1 % P/S, 100 μg/mL actin protein, DMEM. n = 27 cells from 3 replicates. Statistics: Two-way ANOVA with Geisser-Greenhouse correction followed by Bonferroni post-hoc tests. Scale bars = 20 μm.

Conclusion

We have introduced aptamer-based MPs as a specific, modular, and programmable platform for mechanosensing that enables customizable mechanoresponses with dual selectivity – across both cell type and force threshold. We find that aptamer–receptor recognition is a critical determinant of specific force transmission. Exploiting distinct receptor expression profiles on different cells, it is now possible to engineer cell-type-specific mechanoresponses that filter irrelevant mechanical stimuli and facilitate precise functional specialization. Such capabilities are essential for constructing complex behaviors in multicellular systems.

To contextualize the advantages of aptamer MPs, it is instructive to compare them with conventional ligand–receptor systems commonly used in mechanobiology. Although high-affinity ligands such as cRGDfK can achieve targeted, force-responsive delivery of therapeutic agents (e.g., anticancer drugs or antisense oligonucleotides) across $\alpha_v\beta_3$-positive cells,[34,51] their promiscuity toward various integrin subtypes and the structural similarity among integrins limit specificity.[18] Moreover, RGD-integrin engagement promotes adhesion reinforcement, which blurs discrimination between different force geometries. In contrast, aptamers, as shown for the AS1411–nucleolin interaction, can be functionally decoupled from adhesion processes, rendering the tension tolerance (T_{tol}) a dominant parameter in mechanoactivation. This enables the use of aptamer MPs as force-selective mechanical gates and allows their modular integration with other DNA-based nanodevices.

The excellent selectivity of aptamer MPs underscores their importance to interpret noncanonical mechanoreceptors outside of the classical mechanobiology realm, enabling to decouple mechanoactivation from intrinsic mechanotransduction pathways. On the molecular level, we have elucidated two distinct force transmission behaviors: nucleolin-mediated forces arise from actomyosin contractility and are relayed via focal adhesions, whereas PTK7-mediated forces originate from membrane ruffling during early-stage macropinocytosis. These two cases are not meant to be exhaustive but rather exemplify that noncanonical mechanoreceptors can engage in mechanical signaling via diverse, receptor-specific pathways. By proposing a systematic framework for receptor-specific mechanosensing, we lay the groundwork for future exploration of alternative mechanotransduction pathways. From a biological perspective, our findings raise intriguing questions about the mechanical roles of nucleolin, PTK7, and other noncanonical mechanoreceptors. Whether such receptors indirectly participate in other mechanotransduction pathways or contribute to extracellular matrix remodeling remains to be elucidated. These newly uncovered mechanisms also contrast with aptamer internalization by weak clathrin-based endocytic forces (~4 pN), which are limited to measurements with very weak DNA hairpins.[20] In contrast, our aptamer MPs exert forces >12 pN, allowing for the exposure of cryptic ssDNA domains that can trigger downstream reactions such as transcription, hairpin chain reactions,[21] or rolling circle amplification.[52] This expanded force range substantially broadens the design space for intelligent,

force-responsive material interfaces capable of cellular adaptation.

The all-nucleic-acid nature of aptamer MPs offers unique advantages by enabling seamless integration with
the broader toolbox of DNA nanotechnology. Without detaching MPs (or ligands), we introduced two modes
of precise upstream control over receptor engagement: Reversible switching via SDR and programmable timing
via RNase H–driven DRNs. Unlike protein- or nanobody-based MPs, this programmability requires no protein
engineering, expression, or purification, but only base-pairing logic. This molecular tunability allows
mechanotransduction to transcend simple linear outputs and adopt complex, nonlinear, and time-resolved
behaviors. Such temporal precision is especially vital in biological systems, such as morphogenesis and
embryonic development, where cells interpret mechanical and biochemical signals in tightly orchestrated
spatiotemporal patterns.[7]

Looking to the future, aptamer MPs could be further expanded by incorporating an upstream biochemical
control layer responsive to endogenous signals, ranging from small molecules (e.g., ions, ATP), to proteins
(e.g., cytokines), to even specific cell types.[53] Acting as a molecular bridge, aptamer MPs can transduce force
into the exposure of cryptic ssDNA sites, which in turn can initiate localized signal amplification, recruit
biomolecular effectors, modulate synthetic receptors, and ultimately trigger feedback-regulated mechanical
circuits within or across cells. We envision that such aptamer-based, programmable, and feedback-coupled
mechano-adaptive systems could accelerate the development of cell-autonomous behaviors, guide adaptive
morphogenetic processes, and provide a foundation for future advances in synthetic biology and tissue
engineering.

Methods

Materials

Hydrogen peroxide (35 %), sulfuric acid (95 %), (3-Aminopropyl)triethoxysilane (APTES), phosphate buffered
saline (PBS) and ethanol were purchased from Carl Roth. Biotin-PEG-NHS 5K (HE041023-5K) was purchased
from Biopharma. Cyclo[Arg-Gly-Asp-d-Phe-Lys(PEG-PEG-azide)] (RGD-3759-PI), and Cyclo[Arg-Gly-Asp-D-Phe-
Lys(Biotin)] (cRGD-Biotin, PCI-3895-PI) were purchased from Biosynth. 25 mm x 75 mm glass coverslips (10812),
and sticky slide 8 well (80828) were purchased from ibidi. All oligonucleotides were purchased from Biomers.
5-(N-ethyl-N-isopropyl) amiloride, chlorpromazine hydrochloride, Methyl-β-cyclodextrin, LY 294002,
Cytochalasin D and Blebbistati were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. Streptavidin (434302), Alexa Fluor Plus 405
Phalloidin (A30104), CellTrace violet cell profileration kit (C34571), CellTrace far red cell proliferation kit
(C34564), bovine albumin fraction V (BSA, 7.5% solution), paraformaldehyde solution (4% in PBS),anti-PTK7
monoclonal antibody (MA5-25774), Alexa Fluor 488 anti-CD227 (Mucin-1) monoclonal antibody (53-9893-82),
Alexa Fluor 488 anti-CD326 (EpCAM) monoclonal antibody (53-8326-42), and Alexa Fluor 488 goat anti-mouse

IgG (H+L) cross-adsorbed secondary antibody (A-11001) were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific. RNase

H was purchased from New England Biolabs. Actin protein (>95% pure, rabbit skeletal muscle) was purchased

from Cytoskeleton, Inc. All buffers were prepared with nuclease free water. All chemicals and enzymes were

used as such without any further purification.

DNA Hybridization

DNA concentrations were determined using a DeNovix-S-06873 (DeNovix OS 0.8.1 v4.1.5) spectrophotometer.

DNA oligonucleotides were hybridized at 10 μM in a TE buffer additionally containing 12.5 mM $MgCl_2$ in 200

μL PCR tubes and subsequently diluted to 125 nM. DNA oligonucleotides were heated to 95 °C and then cooled

at a rate of 1.3 °C/min to 25 °C.

Surface preparation

Surface preparation method was modified from previously published protocols.[21] Briefly, glass coverslips (25 x

75 mm) were rinsed with ultrapure water and sequentially sonicated in water and ethanol for 20 min each.

The coverslips were then immersed in freshly prepared piranha solution (3:1 v/v concentrated sulfuric acid

(95 %) to hydrogen peroxide (30 %)) for 1 h. **Caution:** Piranha solution becomes very hot upon mixing, and is

highly oxidizing and may explode upon contact with organic solvents. Then, the coverslips were washed 6 times

with ultrapure water, followed by 4 successive ethanol washes. For amine functionalization, the coverslips were

incubated in 3 % v/v APTES at room temperature for 1 h. The coverslips were then washed 6 times with ethanol,

and baked at 80 °C for 20 min. Slides were then reacted with Biotin-PEG-NHS (1 % w/v) for 1 h in ultrapure

water. Next, the coverslips were washed 3 times with ultrapure water, dried under N_2 gas, and stored at -80°C

until use.

The biotinylated coverslips were adhered to sticky-slide 8-well chambers. Wells were incubated with 50 μg/mL

of streptavidin for 1 h at room temperature, followed by three washes with nuclease-free water. Wells were

then incubated with 200 μL of 250 nM probe solution (125 nM cRGD-biotin and 125 nM DNA probes) for 1 h

at room temperature. After washing with nuclease free water, cell imaging media (1 % FBS, 1 % P/S, DMEM;

see below) was added to the well followed by the addition of cells.

Cell culture and transfection

HeLa (ACC 57) and HepG2 (ACC 180) were purchased from DSMZ. A549 (DSMZ, ACC 107) and MDA-MB-231

(DSMZ, ACC 732) were gifts from Tanja Weil laboratory at Max Planck Institute for Polymer Research. HeLa cells

were cultured in Minimum Essential Medium (MEM) (10 % fetal bovine serum (FBS), 1 % penicillin–

streptomycin (P/S)) at 37 °C with 5 % CO_2. A549 and MDA-MB-231 cells were cultured in Dulbecco's Modified

Eagle Medium (DMEM) (10 % FBS, 1 % P/S) at 37 °C with 5 % CO_2. HepG2 cells were cultured in RPMI 1640

Medium (10 % FBS, 1 % P/S) at 37 °C with 5 % CO_2. mEGFP-paxillin WT plasmid was a gift from Michael Rosen

(Addgene plasmid # 186152).[54] Transfection was carried out using the Lipofectamine 3000 Transfection

Reagent (Invitrogen, L3000015) following the manufacturer's instructions.

Force imaging, image acquisition and analysis

All cells were seeded onto the MP surfaces in cell imaging medium (1% FBS, 1% P/S, DMEM) and incubated at

37 °C with 5 % CO2 for 4 h, except for Figs. 6h-i, where incubation times were 2, 4, and 7 h. TIRF and brightfield

microscopy were performed on a Zeiss Elyra 7 Imaging System equipped with 405 nm, 488 nm, 561 nm, and

642 nm excitation lasers using alpha Plan-Apochromat 63x, N.A. 1.46.oil immersion, TIRF objective, pco.edge

4.2 CLHS water-cooled sCMOS cameras. Live cell imaging was conducted at 37 °C in humidified air with 5 %

CO_2. Microscopy experiments were typically conducted using the following parameters: 405 nm laser: 0.4 %

output (~0.01 mW), 488 nm laser: 0.8 % output (~0.7 mW), 561 nm laser: 0.8 % output (~0.8 mW) and 642 nm

laser: 0.4 % output (~0.4 mW). Beam splitters (primary, secondary): LBF 405/488/561/642, SBS BP 490-560 +

LP 640. Exposure time: 50 ms (except for Fig. 2d, RRX-AS1411 200 ms, Atto488-TB-5 200 ms; Fig. 5h, A549-

Violet 200 ms; Fig. 5j, HeLa-Deep Red 100 ms, HepG2-Violet 200 ms). TIRF angle: 66° (n_{oil}: 1.518). All images

were contrasted equally.

Background subtraction methods were adapted from previously published protocols.[55] Briefly raw images were

exported to FIJI (software) followed by selecting 3 ROIs in the fluorescent channel, next the background

intensity was measured and subtracted from the images.

Inhibition experiments

100 µM 5-(N-ethyl-N-isopropyl) amiloride (EIPA), 1.9 µM Methyl-β-cyclodextrin (MβCD), 28 µM

chlorpromazine hydrochloride (CPZ) were used to inhibit the macropinocytosis, caveolae and clathrin-

mediated internalization, respectively. 50 µM LY 294002 was used to inhibit the PI3K. 10 µM cytochalasin D

and 25 µM Blebbistatin were used to inhibit the actin polymerization and myosin ATPase, respectively.

Immunostaining

Cells were fixed with 4 % (w/v) paraformaldehyde in PBS for 15 min at room temperature and permeabilized

with 0.25 % (v/v) Triton X-100 in PBS for 10 min, followed by washes in PBS twice. Unspecific binding was

blocked using 10 % normal goat serum in PBS for 30 min at room temperature. After removing blocking solution,

cells were incubated with Alexa Fluo Plus 405 Phalloidin (1:200 dilution) in 2.5 % (w/v) BSA/PBS at room

temperature for 1 h. Samples were then washed three times in PBS for 5 min each before microscopic

observations.

Flow cytometry

To assess the competitive binding of endostatin to nucleolin, 5×10^5 cells were incubated with 25 µg/mL

endostatin and 2.5 µM FAM-AS1411 in 3 % (w/v) BSA/PBS at 4 °C for 60 min. Cells were washed and then

resuspended in PBS before running through flow cytometer. To quantify the receptor expression levels, 5×10^5

cells were labelled with fluorescent primary antibodies (Alexa Fluor™ 488-anti-MUC1: 5 µg/mL, Alexa Fluor™

488-anti-EpCAM: 5 µg/mL) in 3 % (w/v) BSA/PBS at 4 °C for 30 min. For labelling PTK7, cells were incubated

with primary antibody anti-PTK7 (2 µg/mL) in 3 % (w/v) BSA/PBS at 4 °C for 30 min. Cells were washed three

times with PBS and then incubated in Alexa Fluor™ 488-secondary antibody (5 µg/mL) in 3 % (w/v) BSA/PBS at

37 °C for 30 min. After labelling, cells were washed and resuspended in PBS. To assess the effect of EIPA on

AS1411 internalization, 2×10^5 cells were seeded in standard cell medium in 12-well plates and incubated

overnight at 37 °C. Cells were then incubated with 100 µM EIPA and 500 nM FAM-AS1411 in 1 % FBS/DMEM

at 37 °C for 4 h. Cells were washed and then resuspended in PBS before running through flow cytometer.

Flow cytometry experiments were performed on a Novocyte Quanteon (Agilent, NovoExpress v.1.6.0) with 4

excitation lasers (violet 405 nm, blue 488 nm, yellow-green 561 nm and red 640 nm) and 16 fluorescence

detectors. A total of 10,000 events were collected per sample. Flow cytometry data was analyzed using

FLOWJO (v10.8.1) software.

Statistical analysis

Each experiment was performed at least three independent times. Statistical results were analyzed using

GraphPad Prism 8.0 and shown as the mean ± s.d. Comparisons between two groups were conducted using

unpaired two-tailed Student's *t*-test (Figs. 4m and 5i), and among three or more groups using one-way ANOVA

with Bonferroni test correction (Figs. 4h and 6c) as indicated. If a data set did not pass the normality tests, the

significances were calculated with Mann-Whitney (Figs. 2e, 5b, 5d, 5f and 5k) for two-group comparisons or

Kruskal-Wallis corrected with Dunn's test (Figs. 2b-c, 3c-e, 4b and 4f) for multiple groups. Comparisons of time

course changes in fluorescence intensity of HeLa cells on RNA-blocked AS1411 MP surfaces after adding 10

U/mL RNase H and varying RNA/DNA duplex concentrations were performed using two-way ANOVA with

Geisser-Greenhouse correction followed by Bonferroni post-hoc tests (Figs. 6h,i). For all analyses, *P < 0.05,

**P < 0.01 and ***P < 0.001, ****P < 0.0001 were considered significant. NS indicates statistical non-

significance with P > 0.05.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. Siyu Song and Dr. Miao Xie for their helpful discussion about cell experiments. We

acknowledge IMB Flow Cytometry Core Facility for the flow cytometry data acquisition. This project has

received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020

research and innovation program (M3ALI:101001638), as well as from the CoM2Life start-up funds of JGU.

T. X. acknowledges support from the Max Planck Graduate Center. A. W. acknowledges funding via a Gutenberg

Research Professorship and a Max Planck Fellowship underpinning his Life-Like Materials Program. The Zeiss

Elyra 7 was funded by the Gutenberg Research College and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG;

497845157). Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Author Contributions

T.X. and A.W. conceived the project. T.X. designed, performed all the experiments, and conducted data analysis.

S.S. helped with the surface preparation and probe immobilization. C.D. helped with TIRF measurement. T.X.,

S.S. C.D. and A.W. discussed the data. T.X. and A.W. wrote the manuscript with input from all authors. A.W.

supervised the project.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data availability

All data are available in the article and its Supplementary Information are available from the corresponding

author upon reasonable request.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary information is available in the online version of the paper.

Reference

1.   Vining, K. H. & Mooney, D. J. Mechanical forces direct stem cell behaviour in development and
regeneration. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **18**, 728–742 (2017).
2.   Iskratsch, T., Wolfenson, H. & Sheetz, M. P. Appreciating force and shape — the rise of
mechanotransduction in cell biology. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **15**, 825–833 (2014).
3.   Van Helvert, S., Storm, C. & Friedl, P. Mechanoreciprocity in cell migration. *Nat. Cell. Biol.* **20**, 8–20 (2018).
4.   Chaudhuri, O., Cooper-White, J., Janmey, P. A., Mooney, D. J. & Shenoy, V. B. Effects of extracellular matrix
viscoelasticity on cellular behaviour. *Nature* **584**, 535–546 (2020).
5.   Huebsch, N. *et al.* Harnessing traction-mediated manipulation of the cell/matrix interface to control stem-
cell fate. *Nat. Mater.* **9**, 518–526 (2010).
6.   Kim, S., Uroz, M., Bays, J. L. & Chen, C. S. Harnessing Mechanobiology for Tissue Engineering. *Dev. Cell* **56**,
180–191 (2021).
7.   Negrete, J. & Oates, A. C. Towards a physical understanding of developmental patterning. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*
22, 518–531 (2021).
8.   Toettcher, J. E., Voigt, C. A., Weiner, O. D. & Lim, W. A. The promise of optogenetics in cell biology:
interrogating molecular circuits in space and time. *Nat. Methods* **8**, 35–38 (2011).
9.   Seo, D. *et al.* A Mechanogenetic Toolkit for Interrogating Cell Signaling in Space and Time. *Cell* **165**, 1507–
1518 (2016).
10.   Kechagia, J. Z., Ivaska, J. & Roca-Cusachs, P. Integrins as biomechanical sensors of the microenvironment.
Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol. **20**, 457–473 (2019).
11.   De Belly, H., Paluch, E. K. & Chalut, K. J. Interplay between mechanics and signalling in regulating cell fate.

Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol. **23**, 465–480 (2022).

12. Hu, Y. *et al.* Quantifying T cell receptor mechanics at membrane junctions using DNA origami tension
sensors. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **19**, 1674–1685 (2024).

13. Xiao, B. Mechanisms of mechanotransduction and physiological roles of PIEZO channels. *Nat. Rev. Mol.*
Cell Biol. **25**, 886–903 (2024).

14. Wang, X. & Ha, T. Defining Single Molecular Forces Required to Activate Integrin and Notch Signaling.
Science **340**, 991–994 (2013).

15. Hu, Y., Duan, Y. & Salaita, K. DNA Nanotechnology for Investigating Mechanical Signaling in the Immune
System. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **62**, e202302967 (2023).

16. Jo, M. H. *et al.* Determination of single-molecule loading rate during mechanotransduction in cell adhesion.
Science **383**, 1374–1379 (2024).

17. Hu, Y. *et al.* DNA-based ForceChrono probes for deciphering single-molecule force dynamics in living cells.
Cell **187**, 3445-3459.e15 (2024).

18. Slack, R. J., Macdonald, S. J. F., Roper, J. A., Jenkins, R. G. & Hatley, R. J. D. Emerging therapeutic
opportunities for integrin inhibitors. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **21**, 60–78 (2022).

19. Pawlak, M. R. *et al.* RAD-TGTs: high-throughput measurement of cellular mechanotype via rupture and
delivery of DNA tension probes. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 2468 (2023).

20. Yang, S. *et al.* DNA-functionalized artificial mechanoreceptor for de novo force-responsive signaling. *Nat.*
Chem. Biol. **20**, 1066–1077 (2024).

21. Duan, Y. *et al.* Mechanically Triggered Hybridization Chain Reaction. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **60**, 19974–
19981 (2021).

22. Morsut, L. *et al.* Engineering Customized Cell Sensing and Response Behaviors Using Synthetic Notch
Receptors. *Cell* **164**, 780–791 (2016).

23. Langridge, P. D. & Struhl, G. Epsin-Dependent Ligand Endocytosis Activates Notch by Force. *Cell* **171**, 1383-
1396.e12 (2017).

24. Stabley, D. R., Jurchenko, C., Marshall, S. S. & Salaita, K. S. Visualizing mechanical tension across membrane
receptors with a fluorescent sensor. *Nat. Methods* **9**, 64–67 (2012).

25. Sun, M., Deng, J. & Walther, A. Communication and Cross-Regulation between Chemically Fueled Sender
and Receiver Reaction Networks. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **62**, e202214499 (2023).

26. Deng, J. & Walther, A. Autonomous DNA nanostructures instructed by hierarchically concatenated
chemical reaction networks. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 5132 (2021).

27. Sharma, C., Samanta, A., Schmidt, R. S. & Walther, A. DNA-Based Signaling Networks for Transient Colloidal
Co-Assemblies. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **145**, 17819–17830 (2023).

28. Ma, Y. *et al.* Advancing targeted combination chemotherapy in triple negative breast cancer: nucleolin
aptamer-mediated controlled drug release. *J. Transl. Med.* **22**, 604 (2024).

29. Choo, P., Liu, T. & Odom, T. W. Nanoparticle Shape Determines Dynamics of Targeting Nanoconstructs on
Cell Membranes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **143**, 4550–4555 (2021).

30. Liu, Y. *et al.* A Non-G-Quadruplex DNA Aptamer Targeting NCL for Diagnosis and Therapy in Bladder Cancer.
Adv. Healthc. Mater. **12**, 2300791 (2023).

31. Jurchenko, C., Chang, Y., Narui, Y., Zhang, Y. & Salaita, K. S. Integrin-Generated Forces Lead to Streptavidin-
Biotin Unbinding in Cellular Adhesions. *Biophys. J.* **106**, 1436–1446 (2014).

32. Jo, M. H. *et al.* Single-molecule characterization of subtype-specific β1 integrin mechanics. *Nat. Commun.*
13, 7471 (2022).

33. Yin, J. *et al.* An intelligent DNA nanodevice for precision thrombolysis. *Nat. Mater.* **23**, 854–862 (2024).

34. Velusamy, A., Sharma, R., Rashid, S. A., Ogasawara, H. & Salaita, K. DNA mechanocapsules for
programmable piconewton responsive drug delivery. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 704 (2024).

35. Li, S. *et al.* A DNA nanorobot functions as a cancer therapeutic in response to a molecular trigger in vivo.
Nat. Biotechnol. **36**, 258–264 (2018).

36. Di, Z. *et al.* An orthogonally regulatable DNA nanodevice for spatiotemporally controlled biorecognition
and tumor treatment. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaba9381 (2020).

37. Tang, H. *et al.* Cholesterol modulates the physiological response to nanoparticles by changing the

composition of protein corona. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **18**, 1067–1077 (2023).

38. Wang, Z. *et al.* Organelle-Specific Triggered Release of Immunostimulatory Oligonucleotides from
Intrinsically Coordinated DNA–Metal–Organic Frameworks with Soluble Exoskeleton. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*
139, 15784–15791 (2017).

39. Commisso, C. *et al.* Macropinocytosis of protein is an amino acid supply route in Ras-transformed cells.
Nature **497**, 633–637 (2013).

40. Kotula, J. W. *et al.* Aptamer-Mediated Delivery of Splice-Switching Oligonucleotides to the Nuclei of Cancer
Cells. *Nucl. Acid Ther.* **22**, 187–195 (2012).

41. Ding, Y. *et al.* Heat Shock Cognate 70 Regulates the Translocation and Angiogenic Function of Nucleolin.
Arterioscler. Thromb. Vasc. Biol. **32**, e126–e134 (2012).

42. Kechagia, Z. *et al.* The laminin–keratin link shields the nucleus from mechanical deformation and signalling.
Nat. Mater. **22**, 1409–1420 (2023).

43. Rennick, J. J., Johnston, A. P. R. & Parton, R. G. Key principles and methods for studying the endocytosis of
biological and nanoparticle therapeutics. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **16**, 266–276 (2021).

44. Schink, K. O. *et al.* The phosphoinositide coincidence detector Phafin2 promotes macropinocytosis by
coordinating actin organisation at forming macropinosomes. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 6577 (2021).

45. Mercer, J. & Helenius, A. Virus entry by macropinocytosis. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **11**, 510–520 (2009).

46. Swanson, J. A. Shaping cups into phagosomes and macropinosomes. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **9**, 639–649
(2008).

47. Quinn, S. E. *et al.* The structural dynamics of macropinosome formation and PI3-kinase-mediated sealing
revealed by lattice light sheet microscopy. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 4838 (2021).

48. Du, Y. *et al.* Ligand Dilution Analysis Facilitates Aptamer Binding Characterization at the Single-Molecule
Level. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **135**, e202215387 (2023).

49. Ferreira, C. S. M., Matthews, C. S. & Missailidis, S. DNA Aptamers That Bind to MUC1 Tumour Marker:
Design and Characterization of MUC1-Binding Single-Stranded DNA Aptamers. *Tumor Biol.* **27**, 289–301
(2006).

50. Song, Y. *et al.* Selection of DNA Aptamers against Epithelial Cell Adhesion Molecule for Cancer Cell Imaging
and Circulating Tumor Cell Capture. *Anal. Chem.* **85**, 4141–4149 (2013).

51. Singuru, M. M. R., Amouzadeh Tabrizi, M., Bhattacharyya, P., Ali, A. A. & You, M. Force-Responsive Delivery
of Anticancer Drugs via a DNA Mechanical Nanovehicle. *Nano Lett.* **25**, 336–342 (2025).

52. Ma, V. P. *et al.* Mechanically Induced Catalytic Amplification Reaction for Readout of Receptor-Mediated
Cellular Forces. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **128**, 5578–5582 (2016).

53. Samanta, A., Baranda Pellejero, L., Masukawa, M. & Walther, A. DNA-empowered synthetic cells as
minimalistic life forms. *Nat. Rev. Chem.* **8**, 454–470 (2024).

54. Case, L. B., De Pasquale, M., Henry, L. & Rosen, M. K. Synergistic phase separation of two pathways
promotes integrin clustering and nascent adhesion formation. *eLife* **11**, e72588 (2022).

55. Sethi, S. *et al.* Nuclease-Resistant L-DNA Tension Probes Enable Long-Term Force Mapping of Single Cells
and Cell Consortia. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **63**, e202413983 (2024).