

Increasing the Speed Limit for Hole Transport in DNA

Arun K. Thazhathveetil, Anton Trifonov, Michael R. Wasielewski,* and Frederick D. Lewis*

Department of Chemistry and Argonne–Northwestern Solar Energy Research (ANSER) Center, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60206-3113, United States

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Transport of positive charge or holes in DNA occurs via a thermally activated multi-step hopping mechanism. The fastest hopping rates reported to date are those for repeating poly(purine) sequences in which hopping occurs via a random walk mechanism with rate constants of $k_{\text{hop}} = 4.3 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for poly(dG) and $1.2 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for poly(dA). We report here the dynamics of charge separation in DNA conjugates possessing repeating 7-deazaadenine (dzA) sequences. These data provide an estimated value of $k_{\text{hop}} = 4.2 \times 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for poly(dZA), an order of magnitude faster than for poly(dG).

 \mathbf{C} ignificant progress toward understanding the mechanism and Odynamics of photoinduced charge transport through DNA has been made during the past decade.¹ It is now generally accepted that transport of positive charge (holes) over multiple base pairs in DNA occurs via a hole hopping process.² Both delocalized³ and localized⁴ hole transport models have been proposed. The hopping process is inherently slow, thus limiting potential applications of duplex DNA as a conducting molecule in molecular-scale devices. We have recently reported the experimental measurements of rate constants for reversible hole hopping in poly(dA) and poly(dG) sequences $(k_{hop} = 1.2 \times 10^9)$ and $4.3 \times 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$, respectively).⁵ Our value of k_{hop} for poly(dG) is consistent with the hole mobility ($\mu = 10^{-4} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ V}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1}$) calculated by Senthilkumar et al.⁶ but is 2 orders of magnitude lower than the value derived by time-resolved microwave conductivity from measurements on a poly(purine)-containing duplex in organic solvents.⁷ To place these values in a broader context, our value of μ is similar to that for poly(*N*-vinylcarbazole)⁸ but much smaller than those for some columnar discotic materials.⁹ Hopping rates for alternating or mixed-base DNA sequences are slower still.^{10–12}

Slow hole hopping rates constitute a major impediment to achieving wire-like behavior (fast rates and high efficiency) in DNA, in effect determining the speed limit for multi-step hole transport in DNA. A promising solution to this problem was recently reported by Kawai et al.,¹³ who observed a significant increase in the apparent hole transport rate between guanines in a GA₅G sequence when the A₅ bridge was modified by replacing some or all of the adenines with 7-deazaadenine (zA, Chart 1a). This change was attributed to the higher HOMO energy level for zA vs A, which provides a better match for the HOMO level of G. Stimulated by this report, we have investigated the effects of zA incorporation on the dynamics and efficiency of charge separation in DNA diblock, triblock, and alternating systems possessing A, G, and zA bases. Our measured value of $k_{hop} = 4.2 \times 10^{10}$ s⁻¹

Chart 1. (a) Structures and Oxidation Potentials for the Purine Bases A, G, and zA (ref 20), (b) Structures of the Stilbenes Sa and Sd, and (c-g) Structures of Capped Hairpins Having the Sequences A_n , A_nG_m , A_nzA_m , $A_nzA_nG_n$, and $A_2(GzA)_n$



for a poly(zA) sequence is an order of magnitude faster than that for G-hopping, resulting in faster and more efficient hole transport in the base sequences containing zA.

We have employed capped hairpins possessing a stilbenedicarboxamide (Sa) capping group and a stilbenediether (Sd) hairpin linker separated by various base-pair domains in our investigations of photoinduced charge separation in DNA (Chart 1b).^{10,11,14,15} Singlet Sa serves as an electron acceptor and Sd serves as a hole trap in these systems. Differences in the transient absorption spectra of ^{1*}Sa, Sa^{-•}, and Sd^{+•} facilitate investigation of the dynamics and efficiency of charge separation by means of optical pump-probe spectroscopy on the femtosecond and nanosecond time scales. When the capped hairpins have a poly(purine) sequence consisting of an A-tract or G-tract (Chart 1c) adjacent to the photoexcited hole injector (e.g., ¹Sa), charge recombination is faster than hole transport over multiple bases, resulting in highly inefficient charge separation.^{10,11,15} However, shorter hole transport times and higher efficiencies can be achieved by the use of A_nG_m diblock purine sequences containing a short A-block (2 or 3 base pairs) followed by a

Received:
 May 25, 2011

 Published:
 July 05, 2011



Figure 1. Mechanism for charge separation in A_nB polypurine systems. B = poly(G), poly(zA), zA_nG_n , or (GzA)_n. See Chart 1c-g for structures.



Figure 2. Transient spectra of $A_2zA_2G_2$. The red trace represents the locally excited singlet state (^{1*}Sa) immediately after photoexcitation, and the black trace represents the transient spectra after 4500 ps. The Sa^{-•} radical anion absorbs primarily at 575 nm and the Sd^{+•} radical cation at 535 nm.

longer G-block (Chart 1d).^{5,11} Once the hole reaches the G-block in these diblock systems, return electron transfer requires thermal repopulation of the A-block, a process which is slower than hole hopping (Figure 1). Our studies have provided rate constants for reversible G-to-G and A-to-A hole hopping, $k_{\text{hop}} = 4.3 \times 10^9$ and 1.2×10^9 s⁻¹, respectively, and activation parameters of $E_{\text{act}} = 2.3$ kcal/mol and $A = 7 \times 10^9$ s⁻¹ for hole transport across a G₁₃-block, consistent with a weakly activated, conformationally gated hole transport process.¹¹

Capped hairpins possessing zA bases in diblock, triblock, and alternating purine sequences (Chart 1e-g) were prepared and characterized by the methods previously described for the A_n and $A_n G_m$ hairpins (see Supporting Information).¹¹ Values of T_m are lower for the $A_n z A_m$ and $A_n z A_n G_n$ systems than for the corresponding A_nG_m systems, in accord with the reported effect of isolated $A \rightarrow zA$ replacement on duplex stability.^{16,17} However, all of the zA-modified hairpins have well-defined melting curves with values of $T_{\rm m}$ > 60 °C. Femtosecond time-resolved transient absorption spectra in aqueous solution were obtained as previously described using 350 nm excitation (which provides selective excitation of Sa) from a Ti-sapphire-based system having a time resolution of ca. 180 fs, a spectral range of 425-800 nm, and a time window of 0-6 ns.¹¹ The transient absorption spectra shown in Figure 2 for A2zA2G2 are typical of our data for zAcontaining systems. Charge separation times (τ_{cs}) are determined from first-order fits to plots of the ratio of the transient absorbance at 525 nm (Sd^{+•} band maximum) and 575 nm (Sa^{-•} band maximum) vs time (Figure 3). This ratio increases from ca. 0.4 for the Sa^{-•}-A₃^{+•}B₂-Sd (B₂ = G₆, zA₆, or zA₃G₃) chargeseparated state formed at short delay times to ca. 1.0 for the



Figure 3. Plot of $\Delta A_{525}/\Delta A_{575}$ vs time for A_3G_6 , $A_3zA_3G_3$, and A_3zA_6 sequences.

Table 1. Quantum Yields for Charge Separation (Φ_{cs}) and Charge Separation Times (τ_{cs}) for Capped Hairpins^{*a*}

sequence	$\Phi_{\rm cs}$	$\tau_{\rm cs}$, ns	sequence	$\Phi_{\rm cs}$	τ_{cs} , ns
A ₄	0.23	1.3	A_9^b	0.05	20
$A_2G_2^{\ c}$	0.38	0.22	$A_3G_6^{c}$	0.27	3.1
A_2zA_2	0.56	0.052	A ₃ zA ₆	0.33	0.72
A ₆	0.09	9.0	$A_3zA_3G_3$	0.34	2.2
$A_2G_4^{\ c}$	0.32	1.0	A ₂ GzA	0.54	0.11
A_2zA_4	0.41	0.15	$A_2(GzA)_2$	0.38	0.33
$A_2zA_2G_2 \\$	0.42	0.42	$A_2(GzA)_3$	0.37	0.93

^{*a*} Structures of capped hairpins are shown in Chart 1. Data shown are the averages of at least two measurements. Errors are ca. 10%. ^{*b*} Values for A₉ are estimated. ^{*c*} Values taken from ref 7.

Sa^{-•}-A₃B₂-Sd^{+•} charge-separated state at longer delay times. The transient spectra do not decay on the time scale of our measurements, indicative of the formation of long-lived charge-separated states. Quantum yields for charge separation (Φ_{cs}) are estimated by comparing the integrated band intensities of the transient absorption spectra at long delay times with those for A₁ ($\Phi_{cs} = 1$).¹⁵

Values of au_{cs} and Φ_{cs} for zA-containing systems are reported in Table 1, along with our published data for selected A_n and A_nG_m diblock conjugates. Estimated values for A9 are obtained by extrapolation of the data for shorter A-tracts. Comparison of the results for the diblock A2zA2, A2zA4, and A3zA6 systems with the corresponding A_nG_m systems shows a pronounced decrease in $au_{
m cs}$ and increase in $\Phi_{
m cs}$ upon replacement of G with zA. Values of τ_{cs} for two triblock systems (A_nzA_nG_n, n = 2 or 3) and three alternating GzA systems $(A_2(GzA)_n, n = 1-3)$ are shorter than those for the A_nG_m systems but longer than those for the A_nzA_m systems having the same total number of base pairs. Values of Φ_{cs} for the triblock and alternating GzA systems are larger than those for A_nG_m but slightly smaller than those for A_nzA_m . Thus, the replacement of A or G with zA in diblock, triblock, and alternating systems results in a decrease in the time required for charge separation and an increase in the charge separation efficiency.

More efficient charge separation in our diblock A_nG_m vs poly(A) systems (Chart 1c,d) was attributed to faster hole hopping in a G_n vs A_n track as well as the lower oxidation potential of G vs A, which effectively prevents charge return from the G-block to the A-block on the nanosecond time scale of our experiments (Figure 1).¹¹ The decrease in τ_{cs} for the A_nzA_m vs A_nG_m diblock systems requires that the rate constant for traversal of a z A_m -block be faster than that for a G_m -block (k_{t2}). Assuming that the time required for traversal of the A-block in the A₃zA₆ system is the same as that for A₃ (0.29 ns),¹⁸ the traversal time for the zA₆-block is 0.43 ns (0.72 – 0.29 ns). This traversal time provides an estimated value of $k_{\rm hop} = 4.2 \times 10^{10} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for an unbiased zA-to-zA random walk in the zA₆-block ($k_{\rm hop} = N^2/2\tau$, where *N* is the number of hops and τ is the traversal time).¹⁹ This hopping rate is an order of magnitude faster than for a G-to-G random walk and 30 times faster than for an A-to-A random walk. Faster hole hopping for zA vs G permits hole transport to compete more effectively with either charge recombination from the zA-block (k_{r2} , Figure 1) or thermal repopulation of the A-block, resulting in an increase in Φ_{cs} is limited by charge recombination within the A-block (k_{r1}) prior to arrival at the zA-block (k_{t1}).

Values of τ_{cs} for two triblock systems $A_n z A_n G_n$ (n = 2 or 3) are longer than those for the corresponding diblock $A_n z A_m$ systems. This is consistent with slower G-to-G vs zA-to-zA hopping. Values of Φ_{cs} for the triblock systems are, however, essentially the same as those for the $A_n z A_m$ diblock systems. This indicates that the efficiency of charge separation is determined largely within the $A_n z A_n$ segment of our triblock systems and that little or no charge recombination occurs once the hole reaches the G-block. The three alternating $A_2(GzA)_n$ systems have values of τ_{cs} slightly longer and values of Φ_{cs} slightly smaller than those for the $A_n z A_m$ diblock systems. Thus, the alternating (GzA) sequences display hole transport behavior more similar to that of poly(zA) than poly(G) sequences.

Kawai et al. reported that replacing the A₅ sequence in GA₅G with zA₅ results in enhancement of the G-to-G transport rate by a factor of $>10^3$!¹³ They attributed this increase to closer spacing of the HOMO energy levels of G and zA vs G and A, which would result in faster hole injection from G into the poly(zA) vs poly(A)bridge. Investigations of purine oxidation potentials by Thorp and co-workers indicated that the oxidation potentials of G and zA are essentially the same (Chart 1a).²⁰ The necessity of thermal detrapping of the hole on G for transport across A₅, but not across zA5, can account in part for the very large rate acceleration observed by Kawai et al.¹³ However, much faster zA-to-zA vs A-to-A hole transport is also important. It is important to note that our experimental design does not involve endergonic hole injection and thus permits direct measurements of poly(G) and poly(zA) charge traversal times, from which hopping rate constants can be obtained for the longer purine blocks.

A plausible explanation for fast zA-tract hole transport is suggested by the higher mobility reported for poly(purines) in organic solvents⁷ and by a recent study of duplexes possessing a 7-deazaguanine (zG) \rightarrow G substitution.¹⁶ A single zG substitution results in increased conformational mobility and decreased major groove hydration, both of which might lower the activation energy for hole migration. These results are consistent with a recent theoretical study which finds that charge transport is coupled to solvent fluctuations.²¹ Experiments designed to further explore the effects of duplex conformational mobility and hydration on hole transport dynamics are in progress.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information. Characterization of conjugates $(m/z \text{ values, UV}, T_M, \text{ and CD})$, transient absorption, and plots showing time-dependent band intensity ratios. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

fdl@northwestern.edu; m-wasielewski@northwestern.edu

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Josh Vura-Weis for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Biosciences Division, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, DOE under grants no. DE-FG02-96ER14604 (F.D.L.) and DE-FG02-99ER14999 (M.R.W.).

REFERENCES

(1) (a) Schuster, G. B., Ed. Long-Range Charge Transfer in DNA, I and II; Springer: Berlin, 2004; Vol. 236, p 237. (b) Wagenknecht, H. A. Charge Transfer in DNA; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, 2005. (c) Genereux, J. C.; Barton, J. K. Chem. Rev. 2010, 110, 1642.

(2) (a) Schuster, G. B. Acc. Chem. Res. 2000, 33, 253. (b) Giese, B. Acc. Chem. Res. 2000, 33, 631.

(3) (a) Barnett, R. N.; Cleveland, C. L.; Joy, A.; Landman, U.; Schuster, G. B. *Science* **2001**, *294*, 567. (b) Basko, D. M.; Conwell, E. M. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **2002**, *88*, 98102.

(4) (a) Voityuk, A. A. J. Phys. Chem. B 2005, 109, 10793. (b) Kravec,
S. M.; Kinz-Thompson, C. D.; Conwell, E. M. J. Phys. Chem. B 2011, 115, 6166. (c) Burin, A. L.; Uskov, D. B. J. Chem. Phys. 2008, 129.

(5) Conron, S. M. M.; Thazhathveetil, A. K.; Wasielewski, M. R.; Burin, A. L.; Lewis, F. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2010**, 132, 14388.

(6) Senthilkumar, K.; Grozema, F. C.; Guerra, C. F.; Bickelhaupt, F. M.; Lewis, F. D.; Berlin, Y. A.; Ratner, M. A.; Siebbeles, L. D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 14894.

(7) Yamagami, R.; Kobayashi, K.; Saeki, A.; Seki, S.; Tagawa, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2006**, 128, 2212.

(8) Miyasaka, H.; Khan, S. R.; Itaya, A. J. Phys. Chem. A 2002, 106, 2192.

(9) (a) van de Craats, A. M.; Warman, J. M. Adv. Mater. 2001,

13, 130. (b) van de Craats, A. M.; Warman, J. M.; de Haas, M. P.; Adam,

D.; Simmerer, J.; Haarer, D.; Schuhmacher, P. Adv. Mater. **1996**, *8*, 823. (10) Lewis, F. D.; Daublain, P.; Cohen, B.; Vura-Weis, J.; Shafirovich,

V.; Wasielewski, M. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 15130.

(11) Vura-Weis, J.; Wasielewski, M. R.; Thazhathveetil, A. K.; Lewis,
 F. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 9722.

(12) Blaustein, G. S.; Lewis, F. D.; Burin, A. L. J. Phys. Chem. B 2010, 114, 6732.

(13) Kawai, K.; Kodera, H.; Osakada, Y.; Majima, T. *Nature Chem.* **2009**, *1*, 156.

(14) Lewis, F. D.; Wu, Y.; Zhang, L.; Zuo, X.; Hayes, R. T.; Wasielewski, M. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 8206.

(15) Lewis, F. D.; Zhu, H.; Daublain, P.; Cohen, B.; Wasielewski, M. R. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. **2006**, 45, 7982.

(16) Ganguly, M.; Wang, F.; Kaushik, M.; Stone, M. P.; Marky, L. A.; Gold, B. Nucleic Acids Res. **2007**, 35, 6181.

(17) Ganguly, M.; Wang, R. W.; Marky, L. A.; Gold, B. J. Phys. Chem. B 2010, 114, 7656.

(18) Lewis, F. D.; Zhu, H.; Daublain, P.; Fiebig, T.; Raytchev, M.; Wang, Q.; Shafirovich, V. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 791.

(19) (a) Bar-Haim, A.; Klafter, J. J. Chem. Phys. 1998, 109, 5187.
(b) Kehr, K. W. Czech. J. Phys. 1998, 48, 449.

- (20) (a) Baik, M. H.; Silverman, J. S.; Yang, I. V.; Ropp, P. A.; Szalai,
- V. A.; Yang, W. T.; Thorp, H. H. J. Phys. Chem. B 2001, 105, 6437.

(b) Tibodeau, J. D.; Thorp, H. H. Inorg. Chem. 2004, 43, 408.

(21) Gutierrez, R.; Caetano, R.; Woiczikowski, P. B.; Kubar, T.; Elstner, M.; Cuniberti, G. New J. Phys. **2010**, 12.