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ABSTRACT: Understanding the molecular mechanism of polycation induced DNA aggregation and condensation is important for optimal design of gene delivery carriers. In this work, we performed a series of all-atom molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to investigate polyethylenimine (PEI) mediated DNA aggregation. We found that PEIs condense DNA through two mechanisms: polyion bridging and electrostatic screening of the DNA charges. At PEI/DNA charge ratio >1, PEIs can completely neutralize DNAs at a short distance (≈12 Å from the C1′ atoms), and this distance is found to be insensitive to the exact value of the charge ratio. When excess PEIs are added to a formed DNA−PEI aggregate, they are found to bind to the aggregate and increase its cationic charge. The added PEIs can also replace the PEIs previously bound to the aggregate. The excess PEIs, however, do not change the spacing of the DNAs in the aggregates. Our simulation results shed light on the mechanisms of PEI, and more generally polycation, mediated DNA aggregation and condensation.

1. INTRODUCTION

DNA condensation has been studied for many years due to its fundamental biological importance, such as the tight packaging of DNA in the chromatin structure and its regulation. More recently, great interest in nonviral gene delivery for therapeutic purposes has stimulated development of systems that can condense DNA and package it suitable for cellular uptake. It was experimentally found that multivalent ions can induce DNA condensation while monovalent or divalent ions lack this capability. Certain synthetic cationic polymers such as polyethylenimine (PEI) can condense nucleic acids into nanoparticulate aggregates and have been employed as effective gene carriers. The compactness and stability of the formed nanoparticulate aggregates were found to be relevant to the delivery efficacy; more stable polymer formulations were correlated with better uptake into cells and, ultimately, better gene expression. The ratio of polymer (e.g., PEI) to DNA in the aggregate formation is known to be critical for transfection; excess PEI gives the aggregates an overall positive charge for increased interaction with membranes and contributes favorably to cell modifications. Several experimental tools are available for the study of aggregate physical features and overall stability. However, little is known about the structures of DNA/polymer complexes at the atomistic level due to limitations of the experimental tools. The role of polymeric cations in maintaining the aggregates stability as well as molecular kinetics in such aggregates remains to be probed. DNA is a highly charged polyelectrolyte with a charge density of −2e/3.4 Å. Mean-field theory such as Poisson–Boltzmann equation always predicts a repulsive interaction between like-charged polyelectrolytes and thus cannot explain the multivalent ion induced DNA condensation. Coarse grained simulations of polyelectrolytes normally treat several or tens of atoms on the polyelectrolytes as a unit and water as a continuous dielectric medium. This method has been employed in the past decade to study oppositely charged polyelectrolyte interactions and had some success in predicting how chain length, charge density, charge ratio, and ion concentration affect the complexation of polycation and polyanion. However, coarse grained simulations neglect the fine details of the molecules, especially the water structure around the binding sites, and thus are only appropriate for interactions over distances exceeding the atomic scale. In the case of polymer mediated DNA aggregation, the surfaces of the DNA segments can be as close as a few angstroms. In such situations, water molecules play a crucial role in arranging their structure (polarity) to mediate the strong electrostatic interaction and to form hydrogen bonds; thus, an atomistic description is necessary in order to understand polycation induced DNA aggregation. Recent experiments have also demonstrated the crucial role of atomic topologies in strong polyelectrolyte interactions.
interactions. For example, it was found that double-stranded RNA resists condensation by trivalent counterions, which can otherwise condense double-stranded DNA, and divalent counterions can condense triple-stranded DNA but lack the capability to condense double-stranded DNA. These findings further underline the requirement to incorporate an all-atom representation in simulating polycation mediated nucleic acids aggregation and condensation. Atomic simulations have recently been employed to study the complexation of single nucleic acid molecule with polycations, where the structure, dynamics, and energetics of the nucleic acid/polylation complexes were investigated, but studies investigating polycation mediated aggregation of multiple DNAs are yet missing.

In this work, we performed a series of large scale all-atom molecular dynamics (MD) simulations to study the PEI mediated DNA aggregation. Specifically, we studied the mechanism and dynamics of PEI induced DNA aggregation, how close the DNA segments are in the DNA/PEI polyplex, and how the compactness of the DNAs is affected by the DNA/PEI charge ratio. The PEI studied in this work is a 568 Da low molecular weight (LMW) PEI. Such LMW PEsIs provide an optimal system size that can be simulated by all-atom MD and are increasingly employed as gene delivery carriers due to suitable compatibility with cellular systems. To our knowledge, this study is the first atomistic simulations on polycation mediated DNA aggregation involving multiple DNA molecules. The results help to elucidate on the mechanism of PEI mediated DNA aggregation at the atomic resolution and, moreover, to understand DNA aggregation and condensation involving other polycations of similar characteristics.

2. METHODS

The DNA simulated in this work was a Drew–Dickerson dodecamer d(CGCGAATTCGCG)$_2$ composed of 24 nucleotides, which carries a Dickerson dodecamer. The first two systems (Table 1), each containing two DNAs and eight PEsIs. The initial configurations of these two systems were constructed by solvating two identical D-4P complexes in the simulation box, as shown in Figures 2a and 2b, respectively. The axes of the DNAs in the two complexes were aligned to be parallel, and the COM of the two complexes were initially separated by 50 Å in 2D-8P-50 and by 32 Å in 2D-8P. The distinction between these two systems is marked by the “50” in the name of system 2D-8P-50, which refers to the initial separation of 50 Å between the two D-4P complexes. The reason for using two different COM distances was to examine the likelihood of aggregation at these separations.

Another simulation was conducted for a system that consists of two DNAs and two PEsIs, indicated by 2D-2P in Table 1. While the 2D-8P-50 and 2D-8P systems both have a PEI/DNA charge ratio of ~1/1, the 2D-2P system has a PEI/DNA charge ratio that is much smaller than one (~1/4). Hence, simulation on this system allows us to investigate the effect of electrostatic screening by PEI on DNA aggregation. The initial configuration of 2D-2P is based on the configuration of 2D-8P at 100 ns of its simulation. Specifically, as will be discussed later, we found that two out of the eight PEsIs in 2D-8P are bridging the two DNAs at the end of the simulation. We kept these two PEsIs and removed the other six PEsIs. 36 Na$^+$ ions were assigned on the locations of the protonated nitrogens on the removed 6 PEsIs. The initial configuration of the 2D-2P system is illustrated in Figure 2c.

To further study the formation of aggregate in the case of multiple DNA segments, we performed a simulation on a system with 4 DNAs and 16 PEsIs, named 4D-16P in Table 1. In constructing the initial configuration for 4D-16P, we followed a similar procedure to that of 2D-8P. In particular, we adopted four D-4P complexes and arranged them on the four corners of a square, as shown in Figure 2d. The axes of the four DNAs were aligned to be parallel, and the COM of each D-4P complex was separated from the COM of its neighboring complex by 35 Å.

To investigate the effect of excess PEsIs on the DNA aggregation, 12 PEsIs were added to the 4D-16P system at the simulation time of 100 ns, and the new system is referred to as 4D-28P. The added 12 PEsIs surrounded the 4D-16P complex in a circular fashion, with 8 PEsIs located at 42 Å from the COM of 4D-16P and 4 PEsIs located at 50 Å from the COM of 4D-16P. The initial configuration of 4D-28P is shown in Figure 2e.

2.2. Simulation Details. A CHARMM format force field was devised for PEI based on the CHARMM General Force Field, and CHARMm 27 force field was used for all other molecules. The force field parameters for PEI have been carefully validated through ab initio calculations, a study on sensitivity of MD results to torsional parameters, and comparison with previous works. The simulations were performed using MD package NAMD, and TIP3P water model, periodic boundary condition, and full electrostatics with particle-mesh Ewald method were used for all the simulations. A cutoff of 12 Å was used for van der Waals interactions and electrostatics pairwise calculations. All bonds containing hydrogen atoms were constrained using the SHAKE algorithm during all the simulations, and a time step of 2 fs was used.

For each system described in section 2.1, the DNA(s) and PEsIs were solvated into a water box, the size of which was set to be large enough to make sure the DNA(s) and PEsIs are at least 36 Å away from their nearest periodic images in each direction. Ions (numbers summarized in Table 1) were then added to the water box by randomly replacing the same number of water molecules using...
Table 1. Information on the Seven Different Systems Simulated in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>system name</th>
<th>no. of DNA/PEI</th>
<th>charge ratio DNA/PEI</th>
<th>no. of atoms</th>
<th>size of simulation box (Å³)</th>
<th>no. of Na⁺/Cl⁻</th>
<th>simulation time (ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D-4P</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>22/24</td>
<td>43244</td>
<td>74 × 79 × 74</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-8P</td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>22/48</td>
<td>60882</td>
<td>88 × 93 × 73</td>
<td>0/26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-8P-50</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>44/48</td>
<td>77149</td>
<td>122 × 78 × 79</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-8P</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>44/48</td>
<td>65965</td>
<td>105 × 78 × 79</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-2P</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>44/12</td>
<td>64423</td>
<td>104 × 78 × 79</td>
<td>36/4</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D-16P</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>88/96</td>
<td>97007</td>
<td>107 × 112 × 79</td>
<td>0/8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D-28P</td>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>88/168</td>
<td>175910</td>
<td>117 × 122 × 120</td>
<td>0/80</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Acronyms of the DNAs and PEIs in Each System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>system</th>
<th>DNAs</th>
<th>PEIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D-8P</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>A1–A4, B1–B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D-2P</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>A1, B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D-16P</td>
<td>A, B, C, D</td>
<td>A1–A4, B1–B4, C1–C4, D1–D4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To describe the binding state of PEI to DNA, a PEI is said to be “in close contact with the DNA” if it is within 4 Å of any N/O atoms of the DNA. We chose 4 Å because this is the distance within which the PEI amine groups can form direct hydrogen bond with the DNA. A PEI is said to be “bound” to a DNA molecule if it has at least one N/O atom within 4 Å of any N/O atoms of the DNA. The extra 12 PEIs in the 2D-8P system were kept for visualization and trajectories analysis.

VMD. During each simulation, the system was first minimized for 2000 steps with DNA(s)/PEIs fixed, and then 2000 steps with DNA(s)/PEIs non-hydrogen atoms harmonically restrained, followed by 1000 steps of unrestrained minimization. The system was then gradually heated from 0 to 300 K in 20 ps with 10 kcal/mol Å² harmonic restraint on the DNA(s)/PEIs non-hydrogen atoms. The restraint was kept on for another 4 ns at 300 K and 1 bar to relax the ions around the solutes. The restraint was then removed, and NPT ensemble simulation was performed for 100–200 ns (simulation time for each system shown in Table 1). VMD was used for visualization and trajectories analysis.

2.3. Definitions and Acronyms. To facilitate the discussion of the simulation results, we introduced the following definitions and acronyms in analyzing the simulation trajectories.

In systems 2D-8P and 4D-16P, each DNA is labeled with a capital letter (A, B, C, or D), and the four PEIs initially associated with the DNA in a 4D-8P complex (see section 2.1) are labeled with the same capital letter plus a number. For example, "A1, A2, A3, A4" stand for the four PEIs initially associated with DNA molecule A. In system 4D-28P, we keep the same labels for the 16 PEIs from 4D-16P and label the extra 12 PEIs by "E1–E12". The acronyms for the DNAs and PEIs in each system are summarized in Table 1.

To investigate the DNA–DNA spacing in the aggregates, we defined the “shortest distance” and “root-mean-square (rms) distance” between two DNA molecules. We first represent each DNA as a series of points each being the COM of a Watson–Crick DNA base pair (see Figure S2 in Supporting Information). For each dodecamer studied in this work, there are 12 such points, and connecting neighboring points results in 11 segments. For a pair of segments from two different DNAs, we can calculate their shortest distance, and there are 121 such distances \( d_{i} \) between all pairs of segments from the two DNA dodecamers. We defined the minimum of these 121 distances as the “shortest distance” \( d_{	ext{shortest}} \) and the root-mean-square of these 121 distances as the “rms distance” \( d_{\text{rms}} \) for each DNA.

To investigate the DNA–DNA spacing in the aggregates, we defined the “shortest distance” and “root-mean-square (rms) distance” between two DNA molecules. We first represent each DNA as a series of points each being the COM of a Watson–Crick DNA base pair (see Figure S2 in Supporting Information). For each dodecamer studied in this work, there are 12 such points, and connecting neighboring points results in 11 segments. For a pair of segments from two different DNAs, we can calculate their shortest distance, and there are 121 such distances \( d_{i} \) between all pairs of segments from the two DNA dodecamers. We defined the minimum of these 121 distances as the “shortest distance” \( d_{	ext{shortest}} \) and the root-mean-square of these 121 distances as the “rms distance” \( d_{	ext{rms}} \) for each DNA.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For the system 2D-8P-50, the two D-4P complexes stayed separate during the 100 ns simulation. Figure 3a shows the configuration of 2D-8P at the end of the simulation, where the two DNAs are separated at a COM distance of around 42 Å. No PEI molecule simultaneously binds to both DNAs. We attribute the lack of aggregation in this case to the fact that the two D-4P complexes were initially separated by a relatively large distance; namely, each complex is 50 Å from its closest complex and 72 Å from its second closest complex as a periodic image. Because each D-4P complex carries a total charge of +2, an overall repulsive electrostatic interaction between the two complexes is expected. A sufficiently close approach might be necessary to allow the attractive interaction between the positively and negatively charged parts of the complexes to form an aggregate.

Although sufficient diffusion of the macromolecular complexes could accomplish this, the 100 ns simulation time was relatively short, so that the diffusion alone apparently did not bring the two complexes close enough to form an aggregate in the 2D-8P-50 system. To obtain an aggregate within a practical simulation time, we brought the D-4P complexes at shorter separations of 32 Å for the 2D-8P system and 35 Å for the 4D-16P system at the beginning of the simulations. In both cases, aggregation happened shortly after the simulation started, and the complexes were never separated again thereafter (see movies “2D-8P.mpg” and “4D-16P.mpg” in Supporting Information). The overall repulsive electrostatic interaction was therefore not an impediment for aggregate formation. In the following subsections, structural analysis was conducted to examine the mechanism of aggregation and to characterize the formed aggregates.
3.1. Mechanism of Aggregation. Figure 3b shows the conformation of the system 2D-8P at the last stage of the 100 ns simulation. It can be seen that all eight PEIs are attached to the DNAs with significant fraction of each PEI in contact with the DNAs. Two PEIs (indicated by the two black arrows in Figure 3b) bind to the two DNAs concurrently, bridging them so that they are closer to each other compared with the initial configuration. Figure 3e is the snapshot of the 4D-16P system at the end of its simulation. As in the 2D-8P system, all PEIs are attached to the DNAs, and about half of the PEIs participate in bridging the DNA molecules. In particular, one PEI (indicated by the black arrow in Figure 3e) binds to three DNAs simultaneously.

To quantify the ability of PEI to bridge the DNA molecules, we plotted the binding state of individual PEIs to each DNA in terms of the number of Ns from each PEI in close contact with each DNA (see section 2.3 for definition of "close contact"), as shown in Figure 4 for the 2D-8P system and in Figure 5 for the 4D-16P system. In Figure 4, each subfigure corresponds to one of the 8 PEIs in the 2D-8P system and contains two curves, each of which describes the number of Ns of this PEI in close contact with a particular DNA (see section 2.3 for the acronyms of the molecules in each system). Similarly, the 16 subfigures in Figure 5 correspond to the 16 PEIs in the 4D-16P system, and the four curves in each subfigure describe the binding state of a PEI with the four DNAs. In Figure 4, at the beginning of the simulation, PEI A1–A4 and DNA A constitute one D-4P complex, and PEI B1–B4 and DNA B constitute the other D-4P complex. Except for B1 and B2, each PEI has at least brief periods during which it forms a polyion bridge between the two DNAs (see section 2.3 for definition of "polyion bridge"). The bridges are transient; they form and break during the simulations. For example, the bridge formed by PEI A1 breaks for several times at around 25, 40, 70, and 85 ns. Notably, PEIs A1 and B4 contribute to the aggregation of the two DNAs significantly, each having more than 1 Ns in close contact with each DNA for longer than 50% of the entire simulation time. At around 60 ns, PEI A1 has as many as 4 Ns in close contact with each DNA. The same happens to PEI B4 at around 50 ns. Figure 5 demonstrates the polyion bridging in the 4D-16P system. Out of the 16 PEIs, 8 PEIs (A1, A3, B1, B4, C1, C3, C4, and D4) participate in bridging two or three DNAs for longer than 50% of the simulation time. In fact, the fraction of PEIs that contribute to bridging has increased from 25% in 2D-8P to 50% in 4D-16P. DNAs A, B, and C are mutually bridged (A and B bridged by PEIs A3, B4, C3; A and C bridged by PEIs A1, A2, C3, C4; B and C bridged by PEIs B3, C1, C3), while DNA D is only bridged with DNA B by PEIs B1 and D4. Noticeably, PEI C3 is bridging three DNAs (A, B, and C) from ~30 ns until the end of the simulation.

The above results clearly demonstrate the presence of bridging PEIs when a DNA aggregate is formed. The bridging PEIs are not "locked" in bound state (see section 2.3 for definition of "bound") and undergo reversible binding. The polyion bridging...
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extra PEIs to the 4D-16P system at 100 ns and setting this time
to be zero for the 4D-28P simulation. Figure 7 shows the
number of Ns from each PEI in close contact with the DNAs in
the 200 ns simulation. It can be seen that the polyion bridging
between DNAs follows a similar characteristic as in 4D-16P.
Eight out of the 28 PEIs (A1, A3, A4, B1, B4, C1, C3, and D4)
participate in bridging two or three DNAs for longer than 50%
of the simulation time. PEIs A3 and C3 are bridging three
DNAs for most of the simulation time. Five out of the added 12
PEIs (E1, E4, E8, E11, and E12) bind with the DNAs for
significantly long periods; however, they mainly bind with one
DNA with only very short time windows to bridge two DNAs.
For example, PEI E8 is only bound to DNA C over most time
of the simulation while bridging DNAs A and C for several ns at
~170 ns. Noticeably, some of the original 16 PEIs were
“replaced” by the added PEIs in that they unbound from the
DNAs while allowing the newly added PEIs to form the DNA
binding. For example, PEI D3 was replaced during the time
window of 50–180 ns (also, see movie “4D-28P.mpv” in
Supporting Information). Seven of the added PEIs (E2, E3, E5,
E6, E7, E9, and E10) make no or negligible contact with the
aggregate during the simulation. By studying the binding state
of each PEI to each DNA in the 4D-28P system, we found that
~18 PEIs were bound with the DNAs at the late stage of the
simulation (see Figure S1 in Supporting Information). As the
18 PEIs carry a total charge of +108 and the 4 DNAs carry a
total charge of ~88, the formed DNA/PEI aggregate is even
more positively charged than the aggregate obtained in the 4D-
16P system which carries a net charge of +8. This is consistent
with the experimental measurements of the ζ-potential of
DNA/PEI complexes; it is well established that the gradual
addition of PEI molecules results in a progressive increase in
ζ-potential, ultimately reaching >+30 mV in the presence of
excess PEI and indicating cationic nature of the final
aggregates.

3.2. Charge Neutralization. As demonstrated in section
3.1, electrostatic screening plays a crucial role in DNA
aggregation. To investigate how PEIs neutralize the DNA
charges, we plotted the cumulative distributions, with respect to
the DNA C1’ atoms, of protonated PEI Ns, Na’/Cl’ ions, and
the net charge of PEI and ions, averaged over the last 40 ns of
the simulations (Figure 7). The C1’ atoms are on the sugar
rings of the DNAs, located inside the DNA helix at a distance of
~5 Å from the surface of DNA defined by the phosphorus
atoms (see Figure S2 in Supporting Information). In systems D-4P, 2D-8P, and 4D-16P, the DNA/PEI charge ratio is approximately 1/1; in systems D-8P and 4D-28P, the DNA/PEI charge ratio is approximately 1/2; and in system 2D-2P, the DNA/PEI charge ratio is approximately 4/1. In each subfigure of Figure 8, the straight dashed black line indicates the total charge all the DNAs in the system carry, and the blue solid curve is the total charge of PEI and ions within given distance to their nearest DNA C1′ atoms. If the black line and blue curve intersect, the DNA charges are 100% neutralized by the PEI and ions at the distance where they intersect. At larger distances, the PEI and ions charges could exceed the DNA charges, and the DNA would be “overneutralized” at such distances. This is the case for the five systems in Figure 8, except the 2D-2P system. It can be seen, for these five systems, with DNA/PEI charge ratio of 1/1 or 1/2, the curves for the net charge of PEI and ions have a similar characteristic. That is, the DNA(s) are 50% neutralized at a distance of ∼7 Å and 100% neutralized at a distance of ∼12 Å from their C1′ atoms; the DNA(s) are slightly “overneutralized” beyond the distance of ∼12 Å from their C1′ atoms and the “overneutralization” maximize at ∼15 Å. For systems D-4P, 2D-8P, and 4D-16P, all the PEI charges are located within 15 Å from the DNA C1′ atoms, supported by the observation that the cumulative number of PEI N+ is constant beyond 15 Å. For systems D-8P and 4D-28P, more PEI charges still accumulate gradually beyond 15 Å, which however are largely neutralized by Cl−. The scenario for 2D-2P is very different from the other five cases. The DNAs are not fully neutralized even at a distance of 25 Å from their C1′ atoms; all the 12 charges from the two PEIs are within 8 Å from the DNA C1′ atoms, and the DNAs are only about 50% neutralized at a distance of 12 Å from their C1′ atoms. This demonstrates that PEI is much more capable of neutralizing the DNA at a short distance from the DNA surface than monovalent ions. We have also plotted the cumulative net charge of PEI/Na+/Cl− based on three time windows at the late stage of the simulations as an evidence of convergence of the simulation trajectories (see Figure S4 in Supporting Information).

3.3. DNA−DNA Spacing in the Aggregate. The DNA−DNA spacing reflects the compactness of DNA molecules in the aggregate and has been a great interest of experimental studies.1,17,41,42 The DNA−DNA spacing from our MD trajectories was analyzed, and Figures 9−12 show the distance between any two DNA molecules as a function of simulation time for the 2D-8P, 2D-2P, 4D-16P, and 4D-28P systems, respectively (see section 2.3 for the definitions of ‘shortest distance’ and ‘rms distance’).
In Figure 9 for the 2D-8P system, it can be seen the two curves decrease at the beginning of the simulation, indicating the approach of the two DNAs. The curves flatten after 40 ns with the average values of $\sim 23$ Å for the $d_{\text{shortest}}$ and $\sim 28$ Å for the $d_{\text{rms}}$. In Figure 10 for the 2D-2P system, the two curves remain relatively stable without significant fluctuation from 0 to 150 ns when the two DNAs are still bridged by one or two PEIs. At about 150 ns when the polyion bridge breaks, the two curve increase dramatically, indicating the separation of the two DNAs. In Figure 11 for 4D-16P, we observe a similar characteristic as seen in Figure 9 for the pairs of DNAs bridged by PEIs (A−B, A−C, B−C, B−D), while, for the pairs of DNAs not bridged by PEIs (A−D, C−D), the $d_{\text{rms}}$ and $d_{\text{shortest}}$ values are much larger than 23 and 28 Å. In Figure 12 for the 4D-28P system, the curves for the DNA pairs bridged by PEIs (A−B, A−C, B−C, B−D) remain almost constants during the entire 200 ns simulation, with fluctuations at a similar magnitude as their counterparts in the 4D-16P system after 50 ns. The DNA pairs not bridged in the 4D-16P system (A−D, C−D) stayed separate during the simulation of the 4D-28P system. This demonstrates that the added PEIs, although can bind to the DNAs and even replace the previously attached PEIs as shown earlier, do not affect the DNA–DNA spacing in the aggregate.

During the simulations, $d_{\text{shortest}}$ of two DNAs can be less than 20 Å, such as the DNA pair in the 2D-8P system at around 18 ns ($d_{\text{shortest}} \sim 12$ Å) and the DNA pair A-C in the 4D-16P system at around 30 and 120 ns ($d_{\text{shortest}} \sim 15$ Å). This is unexpected as the diameter of a DNA molecule is about 20 Å. By further examining the simulation trajectories, it was revealed that the two DNAs adopted an L or T shape arrangement with

![Figure 9](image1.png)

**Figure 9.** DNA–DNA distance in the 2D-8P system which contains two DNAs: (a) shortest distance; (b) root mean square distance (see texts for definition of these distances).
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**Figure 10.** DNA–DNA distance in the 2D-2P system which contains two DNAs: (a) shortest distance; (b) root mean square distance (see texts for definition of these distances).
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**Figure 11.** DNA–DNA distances in the 4D-16P system which contains four DNAs (A, B, C, and D): (a) shortest distance; (b) root mean square distance (see texts for definition of these distances).
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**Figure 12.** DNA–DNA distances in the 4D-28P system which contains four DNAs (A, B, C, and D): (a) shortest distance; (b) root mean square distance (see texts for definition of these distances).
35 kDa poly(L-arginine) was reported to be our simulations results demonstrate that the DNAs in the bacteriophages is −DNA spacing in plasmid DNA/PEI complex should be (29.0 Å) obtained here. Hence, we believe that the average d
3.4. Implications. On the theoretical front of investigating DNA aggregation, Saveliev and Papoian studied the inter-DNA interaction in NaCl and KCl solution using all-atom MD simulations and generated the repulsive interaction potential profiles of two parallel DNA oligomers. Dai et al. performed a series of all-atom MD simulations to study DNA attraction mediated by multivalent ions including putrescine (2+), spermidine (3+), spermine (4+), and cobalt hexamine (3+), the inter-DNA interaction potential profiles were calculated, and the dynamics of the complexes was investigated. The above two works, however, only studied the inter-DNA interaction mediated by monovalent and multivalent ions. To the best of our knowledge, the work presented here is the first all-atom MD simulation of cationic polymer mediated DNA aggregation involving multiple DNA molecules.

Our simulations revealed dynamics of the PEI mediated DNA aggregation, which is unaccessible through experiments. It is likely that the obtained results will be applicable to other polymeric carriers apart from PEI. During the simulations of DNA-PEI aggregation, bridging PEIs were observed connecting multiple DNA molecules even though they were initially confined to a single DNA molecule. The number and binding strength of such bridging PEIs are likely to dictate the stability of aggregates. The bridging PEIs, however, were found to be highly dynamic and the binding to multiple DNA molecules were reversible. Only a select number of PEIs participated in DNA bridging and some remained exclusively committed to DNA molecules that were originally bound to (within the limitation of simulation times). A critical PEI/DNA ratio was needed for stable aggregation; whereas 4 PEI molecules/DNA (corresponding to mass ratio of 0.31) gave stable complexes, 1 PEI molecule/DNA (corresponding to mass ratio of 0.08) was found insufficient to maintain DNA aggregation. Under experimental conditions, we previously reported a polymer/DNA mass ratios of 0.4 for complete DNA binding irrespective of the molecular weight of PEI. Since almost complete DNA binding by carriers is a prerequisite for DNA aggregation, the simulations results were consistent with the experimentally investigated DNA aggregation. It was worthwhile to note that aggregation successfully occurred even though there was a net positive charge for individual PEI/DNA complexes (each D-4P complex carries a net charge of +2). Local attractive forces have compensated for the overall repulsive force associated with like-charged entities. An overall positive charge is typically observed in PEI/DNA complexes prepared with excess PEI, and in this regard, our simulations concurred with the experimental observations. A significant observation derived from the current studies was the ability of free PEI molecules to replace PEI molecules already bound to DNA molecules in an aggregate. This process will have implications for preparation of DNA complexes to be used for transfection, as well as for dissociation of DNA complexes essential for functional transfection. The fact that excess DNA-binding molecules might displace already bound molecules might be utilized to better engineer DNA complexes prepared by step-by-step addition of transfection complexes, where complexes are prepared by sequential addition of constituent molecules. For example, A−B−C−D complexes were prepared by complexing DNA (A) with polymeric polycations (B), followed by the addition of lipophilic substituents (C) and cell-binding moieties (D). Our results support the experimental observation that such sequential addition of DNA-binding molecules can lead to stable incorporation of individual constituents added at later stages of assembly. Optimizing the complex properties in this approach were mostly experimentally driven, and the current study provide an alternative means to further fine-tune the bound state of the complexes. It might be possible to compare the relative binding affinity of substituents in silico beforehand and determining which molecules might be more stably incorporated into the complexes. The final state of the specific molecules in the complexes might be better understood in this way. For example, MD simulations could be used to determine if cell-binding moieties are embedded in a complex or retained on the surface readily accessible for target binding.

Macromolecular displacement of DNA-binding molecules in aggregates might be especially critical for complex stability. Interaction with naturally occurring macromolecules in the extracellular matrix (e.g., heparan sulfate) has undesirable consequence on transfection,47,48 which leads to inhibition of DNA uptake. MD simulations can help identify DNA carriers resistant to such displacements and enhance the stability of

| Table 3. DNA−DNA Distance Averaged over the Last 40 ns of the Simulations (Å) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| DNA−DNA                        | 2D-8P           | 4D-16P          | 4D-28P          |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|                                 | A−B             | A−B             | A−C             | B−C             | B−D             | B−D             | B−D             | B−D             |
| d_shortest                     | 23.2            | 22.3            | 17.1            | 21.4            | 23.1            | 22.7            | 19.4            | 23.1            |
| d_rms                          | 27.7            | 26.7            | 27.1            | 33.3            | 29.9            | 27.3            | 25.5            | 34.7            |
| av                             | 21.4            | 29.0            | 21.4            | 29.0            | 21.4            | 29.0            | 29.0            | 29.0            |

one end of a DNA nearly perpendicular to the other DNA (see Figure S5 in Supporting Information). In such configurations, d_shortest does not reflect the shortest interduplex distance of DNA segments in compact plasmid DNAs, which is the distance between the axes of two parallel DNA segments. Table 3 summarizes average d_shortest and d_rms during the last 40 ns of the simulations for the bridged DNA pairs in the 2D-8P, 4D-16P and 4D-28P systems. Average d_shortest for the 9 pairs of DNAs is 21.4 Å, and average d_rms is 29.0 Å. Because of the special configurations mentioned above for the short DNAs simulated in this work, the actual average DNA−DNA spacing in plasmid DNA/PEI complex should be larger than the average d_shortest (21.4 Å). As d_rms in our calculations characterizes the average distance between two short DNAs that may not have parallel axes, the average DNA−DNA spacing in plasmid DNA/PEI complex should be smaller than the average d_rms (29.0 Å) obtained here. Hence, we believe that the average DNA−DNA spacing in plasmid DNA/PEI complex should be between 21.4 and 29.0 Å. The DNA interduplex distance in bacteriophages is ~27 Å,41 and that for DNAs wrapped around the histone core of nucleosomes was also found to be ~27 Å.1 Our simulation results demonstrate that the DNAs in the DNA/PEI complex are as compact as those in bacteriophages and nucleosomes. The spacing between DNAs condensed by 35 kDa poly(-arginine) was reported to be ~28 Å in a recent experimental study,7 within the range of spacing obtained from our simulations. We have also plotted the radii of gyration of the DNAs in each aggregates (see Figure S5 in Supporting Information), which generally follow a similar trend as “rms distance” shown in Figures 9−12.
DNA aggregates that is needed for cellular uptake. Displacement with intracellular macromolecules, on the other hand, is essential to release the DNA in free form for efficient transfection. Specific proteins capable of interacting with DNA complexes were identified, whose binding to complexes were shown to facilitate nuclear uptake and ultimately transgene expression. The atomistic MD simulations might shed important insight into this process, providing a better means to predict the complex stability in the presence of these intracellular molecules. Simulating displacement of carrier molecules with known DNA-binding molecules such as histones will reveal information about DNA disassembly inside the cells.

3.5. Limitations and Future Studies. Even though the simulations reported here are the-state-of-the-art in terms of model size and simulation time, the current computational limitations restricted us to focusing on only one species of PEI, where the protonation state, architecture, and molecular weight were fixed. Such factors can potentially affect PEI mediated DNA aggregation and will be part of our future work. We already know that PEIs with lower degree of protonation display lower binding affinity to DNA (i.e., binding is less stable in MD simulations). The linear form of the PEI also behaves in a similar fashion as compared to the branched PEIs simulated here. The level of protonation employed in this study was more realistic of PEI’s state under physiological conditions (i.e., pH between 6 and 7), and branched PEI is more commonly used for DNA delivery. On the basis of our past simulations for 23% protonated PEIs, which mimics PEI’s state at pH 8, several conjectures can be made on DNA aggregation by the less protonated PEIs. First, due to their lower binding affinity to DNA, the aggregates mediated by less protonated PEIs would be less stable and the PEI exchange among the DNA molecules might be more common. Because a considerable fraction of Ns in 23% PEIs contribute to binding with DNA through indirect hydrogen bonding mediated by water molecules, we expect the 23% PEIs to neutralize the DNA at a larger distance from the DNA C1 atoms compared with the 46% PEIs; i.e., the capability of 23% PEIs to neutralize the DNA would be weaker. This might cause the formed aggregate in excess PEIs to be less positively charged. The looser binding of 23% PEI to DNA may also increase the DNA–DNA spacing in the aggregate. These conjectures will be tested via additional simulations.

Another limitation is the size of DNA aggregates studies here, where the largest aggregate was composed of 4 DNA molecules leading to a size of ~10 nm with excess PEIs. The aggregate size formed with the PEI/DNA complexes are larger in reality. For example, ~100 nm aggregates are routinely reported for the 25 kDa branched PEI, and we recently reported aggregates as large as 500–700 nm for the PEIs with MW of 0.6–2.0 kDa. Therefore, a larger numbers of DNA complexes will be needed to realistically simulate DNA aggregation employed for cell transfections. Alternatively, longer chain DNA molecules might be needed to achieve more realistic aggregation. MD simulations can help understand what determines the aggregate size obtained under experimental conditions and, more importantly, what makes the aggregation stop before an exuberant aggregate is formed consuming all of the DNA and PEI molecules. Since size is important in the transfection efficiency of the DNA aggregates, better control of transfection could be achieved as a result of such simulations.

4. CONCLUSIONS

We performed a series of all-atom MD simulations to study PEI mediated DNA aggregation. The results clearly demonstrate that PEIs contribute to DNA aggregation through two mechanisms: (i) forming polycation bridges between DNA segments and (ii) screening the negative DNA charges at a short distance from the surface of DNA molecules. As a consequence of the latter mechanism, the PEI/DNA charge ratio needs to be above certain value in order to maintain a stable aggregation. Compared with monovalent ions, PEIs are shown to be more capable of neutralizing the DNAs at close distance and provide full neutralization at ~12 Å from the DNA C1’ atoms, when the PEI/DNA charge ratio is above 1. The DNA–DNA spacing in the DNA/PEI aggregates were between 21.4 and 29.0 Å. Excess PEIs were capable of binding to the already positively charged aggregate and further increase its charge. They can also replace the PEIs previously bound to the DNAs in the aggregate. The binding of excess PEIs, however, does not change the DNA–DNA spacing.
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