EPFL

USING THE CGDNA+ MODEL TO COMPUTE SEQUENCE-DEPENDENT SHAPES OF DNA MINICIRCLES Marius BEAUD, Assistant: Raushan SINGH, Professor: John H. MADDOCKS



Modelling DNA and DNA minicircles

DNA modeling. Depending on the sequence, the shape of a DNA molecule can be completely straight or, on the opposite, have a strong intrinsic bend. To better understand DNA, it is important to be able to predict the shape and the stiffness of a DNA fragment based on its sequence. Models for DNA can be grouped in two categories: the *atomic level* models and the *coarse-grain* models. We focus on coarse-grain models. They introduce simplifying assumptions to reduce complexity: the *rigid base* or *rigid base pair* assumptions. Each base or base pair is represented by a rigid body to reduce the number of free variables. Due to their higher versatility and lower computational cost, coarse-grain models are often preferred when possible.

DNA minicircles. One experimentally important motif is the formation of DNA closed loops, called DNA *minicircles*. Using an adapted version of a coarse-grain model combined with a discretization of a continuum model, one can predict the shape of a DNA minicircle. For this thesis, the main goal was to adapt the existing algorithm for discrete DNA minicircles to use the latest cgDNA+ coordinates. We tested our implementation with different case studies coming from the experimental literature.

Discrete model: cgDNA [Gonzalez, 2013] [Petkevičiūtė, 2014]

Adaptations of cgDNA)—
			-

Rigid base. Each base is represented by a frame in SE(3), this is a vector in \mathbb{R}^3 and a rotation matrix in SO(3). They represent the absolute position and rotation of the frame.

Gaussian pdf. For a given sequence S and parameter set \mathcal{P} , the model predicts a Gaussian probability density function

$$\rho(w; S, \mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta U(w; S, \mathcal{P})},$$

$$U(w; S, \mathcal{P}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(w - \mu(S, \mathcal{P}) \right)^T K(S, \mathcal{P}) \left(w - \mu(S, \mathcal{P}) \right).$$

U is the molecule energy, K is the stiffness matrix and μ is the ground-state.

cgDNA coordinates.

 $w = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n),$ $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^6$: *intras*, relative displacement between base frames, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^6$: *inters*, relative displacement between base pair frames.







periodic cgDNA [Glowacki, 2016]

For periodicity, one has to add an extra set of inter coordinates and a block to model the interaction between the first and last base pairs. The extra block is split in the four corners of the periodic stiffness matrix. We no longer use different parameter blocks for the ends. **NOTE**: periodicity in cgDNA coordinates implies a helical structure, but **do not** imply periodicity in absolute coordinates.

cgDNA+ [Patelli, 2019]

Add representation of phosphate groups, each one associated to a base. Their coordinates are the relative displacement between the base and the phosphate frames. The new base pair level coordinates becomes:

$\tilde{x}_i = [p_i^+, x_i, p_i^-] \in \mathbb{R}^{18}.$

 p_i^{\pm} are the Watson (+) and Crick (-) phosphate coordinates and x_i is the standard intra. The inter coordinates remain unchanged.



New construction of the stiffness matrix.



cgDNA+ coordinates chain structure.

Continuum model [Grandchamp and Glowacki, 2016]

For the continuum model, we rely on the birod model. It models DNA strands as two interacting continuum rods.



On the left: chain structure of the cgDNA coordinates, in blue: intras, in red: inters coordinates. On the right: construction of the stiffness matrix K from the parameter blocks of \mathcal{P} . End blocks are different to account for the end effects in the model. We use the bBDNA software to obtain equilibrium configurations for the continuum birod model. Such configurations are then discretized and used as initial guesses for the discrete energy minimization. The family of solutions is shown as a bifurcation diagram where crosses represent configurations where the two backbones align to form DNA minicircles.



Example of Bifurcation diagram.





Example of a result of cgDNA+min.

NCC vs PC. Non-continuous closure models the formation of DNA minicircles whereas periodic closure computes the shape of a fully formed minicircle. They are solving distinct problems and are not interchangeable.

Five case studies. We tested our implementation on five sequences, with length ranging from 94 to 339 base pairs, coming from the experimental literature.

Results. We observed that cgDNA+min generally behaves similarly to the original cgDNAmin algorithm. However certain sequences produced very different results between the cgDNA and cgDNA+ cases. We believe this is due to the stability of the discretized continuum equilibrium. Changing the energy may change the solution when starting from an unstable configuration.



Webpage of the thesis.

Further details. The reader is encouraged to read the full thesis for more details on the constructions of cgDNA+min. Along with the paper, we built a webpage containing all our results as well as the MATLAB scripts for the four different models: https://lcvmwww.epfl.ch/research/cgDNA/beaud/index.html.

References. All detailed references for this work can be found in the thesis provided online.

