

Distributions of Bubble Lifetimes and Bubble Lengths in DNA

M. Hillebrand,^{1,*} G. Kalosakas,^{2,†} Ch. Skokos,^{1,‡} and A.R. Bishop^{3,§}

¹*Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics,
University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, South Africa*

²*Department of Materials Science, University of Patras, GR-26504 Rio, Greece*

³*Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM, 87545, United States*

(Dated: November 20, 2020)

We investigate the distribution of bubble lifetimes and bubble lengths in DNA at physiological temperature, by performing extensive molecular dynamics simulations with the Peyrard-Bishop-Dauxois (PBD) model, as well as an extended version (ePBD) having a sequence-dependent stacking interaction, emphasizing the effect of the sequences' guanine-cytosine (GC)/adenine-thymine (AT) content on these distributions. For both models we find that base pair-dependent (GC vs AT) thresholds for considering complementary nucleotides to be separated are able to reproduce the observed dependence of the melting temperature on the GC content of the DNA sequence. Using these thresholds for base pair openings, we obtain bubble lifetime distributions for bubbles of lengths up to ten base pairs as the GC content of the sequences is varied, which are accurately fitted with stretched exponential functions. We find that for both models the average bubble lifetime decreases with increasing either the bubble length or the GC content. In addition, the obtained bubble length distributions are also fitted by appropriate stretched exponential functions and our results show that short bubbles have similar likelihoods for any GC content, but longer ones are substantially more likely to occur in AT-rich sequences. We also show that the ePBD model permits more, longer-lived, bubbles than the PBD system.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, the study of thermally induced transient local openings in double stranded DNA (the so-called bubbles) has given valuable insight into the potential effect of DNA dynamics on gene transcriptional activity. The fundamentally dynamic process of transcription, which requires the opening of the DNA helix to allow formation of the corresponding RNA strand and then closing again, has prompted the idea that DNA dynamics may be an intrinsic factor in the very first stages of transcription [1, 2]. Bubble opening profiles of various promoter sequences have been studied extensively, revealing correlations between the transcription start site (TSS) or other transcription factor binding sites and regions of high propensity for bubble formation [2–11], suggesting that large fluctuational openings of double stranded DNA may play some role in the process of transcription. Moreover, investigating the lifetimes of bubbles through Langevin molecular dynamics, it has been found that in several experimentally well-studied promoters, long-lived bubbles tend to form particularly frequently at the TSS [5, 6, 12].

The advent of coarse-grained mesoscale models has been a major factor enabling the study of bubbles in DNA. In particular, the Peyrard-Bishop-Dauxois (PBD) model [13] has proved to be very successful in reproducing various experimental observations. The model has

been developed over time to include a nonlinear coupling to accurately model stacking interactions between the base pairs, resulting in the observed sharp denaturation curve of DNA molecules [14–17]. This nonlinearity has also been shown to be crucial for the formation of bubbles in double stranded DNA [18]. The PBD model has been used extensively to investigate various properties of DNA, from quantifying its chaoticity [19, 20], to studying signatures of localized large thermal openings in the dynamic structure factor [21], examining non-exponential decay of base pair opening fluctuations [22], and more [23–34]. Beyond this, other models have been devised to study different aspects of DNA activity [35–45].

The importance of bubbles extends beyond studying DNA's transcriptional function, as for example the presence of bubbles has been found to impact charge transport in DNA molecules [46–50]. Particularly the propagation of a charge along the double helix interacts with bubble openings [51–53], while mobile discrete breathers [54] have been suggested as playing a role in charge trapping in DNA [55].

In this work, considering the PBD model, as well as an extended version of it (ePBD) which takes into account the particular type of neighboring base pairs in the stacking interaction parameters, we present statistical properties of DNA bubbles, including a detailed numerical study of the distributions of bubble lifetimes and lengths in arbitrary DNA sequences at physiological temperature ($T=310$ K). The paper is organized as follows. In Sect. II we describe the PBD and the ePBD models used in this investigation and calculate the energy-temperature curves of the two systems. In Sect. III we suggest physical thresholds for considering base pairs to be open in the studied models and show that they

*Electronic address: malcolm.hillebrand@gmail.com

†Electronic address: georgek@upatras.gr

‡Electronic address: haris.skokos@uct.ac.za

§Electronic address: arb@lanl.gov

are consistent with conventional melting examinations. Then, using these thresholds, in Sects. IV and V respectively we present the distributions of bubble lifetimes and bubble lengths, and discuss their characteristics. Finally, in Sect. VI we summarize our results and mention some future directions for research.

II. DNA MODELS

In this work we use the PBD model of DNA, as well as its extended version ePBD (see below), to study DNA sequences using microcanonical molecular dynamics. In the PBD framework, the on-site intra-base pair interactions are modeled by a Morse potential V ,

$$V(y_n) = D_n (e^{-a_n y_n} - 1)^2, \quad (1)$$

with y_n being the relative displacement from equilibrium of the bases within the n th base pair of a DNA sequence. The nonlinear stacking interaction is accounted for by an anharmonic coupling W ,

$$W(y_n, y_{n-1}) = \frac{K_{n,n-1}}{2} \left(1 + \rho e^{b(y_n + y_{n-1})} \right) (y_n - y_{n-1})^2. \quad (2)$$

Thus, considering periodic boundary conditions, the resultant Hamiltonian of a DNA sequence having in total N base pairs reads

$$H = \sum_{n=1}^N \left[\frac{p_n^2}{2m} + V(y_n) + W(y_n, y_{n-1}) \right], \quad (3)$$

where p_n are the conjugate momenta to the canonical displacements y_n . The parameter values used here are taken from fittings to melting curves of short oligonucleotides [56], which have been used extensively in previous studies (e.g. [2–5, 20–22, 25–28]). These values are $m = 300$ amu for the base pair reduced mass, $D_{GC} = 0.075$ eV, $a_{GC} = 6.9 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ and $D_{AT} = 0.05$ eV, $a_{AT} = 4.2 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ for guanine-cytosine (GC) and adenine-thymine (AT) base pairs respectively in the Morse potential, and $K_{n,n-1} = k = 0.025 \text{ eV/\AA}^{-2}$, $\rho = 2$, and $b = 0.35 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ for the stacking interaction.

In the extended ePBD model, more sensitive sequence dependence is encoded by varying the coupling constant $K_{n,n-1}$ in Eq. (2) depending on the particular succession of neighboring base pairs [57]. The used, sequence dependent, coupling constants are given in Table I, for each possible configuration of successive base pairs. This extended model has the advantage of more accurately modelling the experimentally observed strong effects on melting temperatures of particular base sequences [57], and it has been used efficiently for *in silico* genetic engineering of gene promoters [6].

Our microcanonical numerical simulations were performed by using symplectic integrators, which are integration techniques designed specifically for the efficient long-time integration of Hamiltonian systems (see

$K_{n,n-1}$	C-3'	G-3'	A-3'	T-3'
5'-C	0.0192	0.028	0.025	0.0229
5'-G	0.0249	0.0192	0.019	0.0226
5'-A	0.0226	0.0229	0.0228	0.023
5'-T	0.019	0.025	0.0193	0.0228

TABLE I: Values of the ePBD stacking constants $K_{n,n-1}$ of Eq. (2), in units of eV/\AA^2 . The rows denote the base at site $n - 1$ and the columns denote the base at site n in the conventional 5'-3' direction. The values have been obtained from Fig. 2 of Ref. [57].

e.g. [58]). In particular, we used the fourth order symplectic Runge-Kutta-Nyström method (SRKNb6) [59], which managed to numerically preserve the constancy of Hamiltonian Eq. (3) (usually referred to as the system's energy) with very good accuracy, as the relative energy error $|H(t) - H(0)|/H(0)$ was always smaller than 10^{-6} . The initial conditions of our simulations were set as follows: For all $n = 1, 2, \dots, N$ the initial base pair stretchings are $y_n = 0$, while p_n are randomly chosen from a normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance. Then, the p_n values were uniformly scaled in order to achieve the required energy H , Eq. (3), or energy density $E_N = H/N$ value. We note that in all simulations we impose periodic boundary conditions, i.e. $y_0 = y_N$, $y_{N+1} = y_1$, $p_0 = p_N$ and $p_{N+1} = p_1$.

As a first step in examining the properties of the PBD and ePBD models, we investigate the relationship between the energy density E_N and the temperature T for the two models. Since simulations for both systems are performed in the microcanonical ensemble at constant energy H , Eq. (3), the effective temperature of the system is estimated using the mean kinetic energy per base pair $\langle K \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n p_n^2 / (2m)$, through the relation $T = 2\langle K \rangle / k_B$, with $k_B = 8.617 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ eV/K}$ being the Boltzmann constant. Computing this effective temperature at different energy densities for the two models yields similar but quantitatively slightly different behaviors.

Figure 1(a) shows the energy-temperature relation for the ePBD model, when DNA sequences with various AT/GC composition (quantified by the percentage of GC base pairs, P_{GC}) are considered. More specifically, results for a homogeneous DNA sequence consisted solely by AT ($P_{GC} = 0\%$, blue circles) or GC ($P_{GC} = 100\%$, purple squares) are presented, along with data for the heterogeneous case with $P_{GC} = 50\%$ (green triangles). Similar data for $P_{GC} = 25\%$ and $P_{GC} = 75\%$ have been also computed (not shown in Fig. 1(a) for clarity). For all these cases, averaging was obtained over 100 different realizations of DNA sequences with $N = 1000$ base pairs each. For the homogeneous cases 100 different initial conditions were created, while in the case of heterogeneous DNA sequences with fixed P_{GC} , 100 different random arrangements of the AT and GC base pairs were considered with random initial conditions. All these cases were integrated for 10 ns to allow the system's thermalization, and




FIG. 1: (a) Relationship between the energy density E_N and the temperature T of the ePBD model, for different percentages P_{GC} of GC base pairs in the DNA sequence (points). The data are fitted quite well with Eq. (4), as shown by the curves in the plot. Results obtained for the PBD model are similar. (b) Variation of the fitting parameter γ in Eq. (4) with the GC percentage P_{GC} of the DNA sequence, showing a linear increase as P_{GC} grows for both the PBD (blue circles) and the ePBD (empty orange squares) models. Lines represent linear fits of the corresponding data, whose equations are also shown in the figure. The values in the parentheses indicate the error of the computed fitting parameters, with for example $4.97(1)$ denoting 4.97 ± 0.01 .

then the temperature was recorded every picosecond for a further nanosecond. Averaging over all these numerical results yields the final data points as those shown in Fig. 1(a), where the computed standard deviations give the presented error-bars. Results for the PBD model are very similar to those shown in Fig. 1(a).

At low temperatures we see in Fig. 1(a) a linear relationship between the energy density E_N and the temperature T of the form $E_N = k_B T$, as expected. As the temperature increases, a nonlinear dependence appears and the addition of a simple cubic term provides a close fit to the data [see curves in Fig. 1(a)]. We used the fitting equation

$$E_N = k_B T + \gamma T^3, \quad (4)$$

with γ being a fitted constant. Applying a least-squares fitting algorithm [60], we find Eq. (4) to approximate very well the numerical data for both models, at all P_{GC}

percentages. The resulted values of the fitting parameter γ are shown in Fig. 1(b). For both systems the obtained values of the coefficient γ are of the order of 10^{-10} eV/K³ and are very well represented by linear functions of the percentage P_{GC} , as shown by the straight lines in Fig. 1(b). The parameter γ of the ePBD model is shifted to higher values than that of the PBD system, indicating that the ePBD energy is slightly above the corresponding PBD energy for larger temperatures. This suggests that the lower average stacking energy of the ePBD model (see figure 2 of Ref. [57]) results in a slightly higher overall energy as compared to the PBD model at the same temperature.

The calculated energy-temperature relations will be used in the following Sections in order to obtain results corresponding to fixed temperatures, through our micro-canonical numerical computations. In particular, to simulate the PBD or ePBD system at a desired temperature, we determine its conserved energy density through the respective $E_N - T$ relation and then follow the numerical integration procedure mentioned above.

III. BUBBLE OPENING THRESHOLDS

In order to effectively investigate statistical properties of bubble openings, we first define a threshold for considering a base pair to be separated. In various studies, the thresholds used for this purpose range from around 0.5 \AA up to 5 \AA or more, depending on the particular application (see e.g. [2–9]). Here we choose a threshold that is able to reproduce the known melting behavior of DNA molecules in the PBD model [28], taking into account that by definition at the melting transition 50% of base pairs are separated. Thus the requirement is for our threshold to mark 50% of base pairs open at the melting temperature, for sequences of varied AT and GC base pair compositions.

Actually the characteristic length of the intra-base pair Morse potential in Eq. (1), $1/a_{GC}$ and $1/a_{AT}$ for GC and AT base pairs respectively, provides a physical choice that turns out to fulfil our requirements on such a threshold. It is important to note here that we are using a different opening threshold for AT and GC base pairs. The use of a common threshold is not so consistent with the requirement of 50% open base pairs at melting. On the other hand, it is reasonable to consider different thresholds for the opening of GC and AT base pairs due to the variation of the parameters describing the corresponding on-site Morse potential.

In Fig. 2, we see for the PBD model the increase in the fraction of open base pairs f_o with temperature T , up to the melting temperature defined by $T_m^{PBD} = 325 + 0.4P_{GC}$ [28], for the proposed thresholds of $y_{GC}^{thr} = 1/a_{GC} = 0.15 \text{ \AA}$ and $y_{AT}^{thr} = 1/a_{AT} = 0.24 \text{ \AA}$ for GC and AT base pairs respectively. Each point is the averaged fraction of open base pairs over 100 different realizations of DNA sequences with $N = 1000$ base pairs, apart




FIG. 2: The fraction f_o of open base pairs as a function of temperature T in the PBD model, for chains of various P_{GC} percentages, stopping at the melting temperature in each case (points). Data are line-connected to guide the eye. The thresholds used here for considering a base pair as open are $y_{GC}^{thr} = 0.15 \text{ \AA}$ and $y_{AT}^{thr} = 0.24 \text{ \AA}$ (see text for details). The horizontal, solid black line indicates the value $f_o = 0.5$, i.e. 50% of base pairs are open.

from the last five points (closest to the melting transition) shown in each case, where 200 runs were used in order to have better statistics in the region of interest. At the melting point (corresponding to the high temperature end of the presented data), almost exactly 50% of the base pairs are open (the value $f_o = 0.5$ is indicated by the horizontal, solid line in Fig. 2). These results indicate that the proposed thresholds can be efficiently used as appropriate measures for considering base pairs to be open. It is worth noting that since in the PBD model a scaling factor of $1/\sqrt{2}$ is applied to the stretchings y_n [3, 14], the actual relative displacements of complementary bases represented by these thresholds are 0.21 \AA and 0.34 \AA for GC and AT base pairs respectively.

Noting that the Morse potential, Eq. (1), governing the intra-base pair interactions remains unchanged in the ePBD model, we can implement the same threshold values as in the PBD system for defining the opening of a base pair in the ePBD case. Then, repeating in Fig. 3 for the ePBD model similar calculations to the ones presented in Fig. 2, we are able to obtain the melting temperatures of the ePBD system as the temperature values at which the fraction of open base pairs is $f_o = 0.5$, without going through the detailed procedure implemented for the PBD model in Ref. [28]. This approach allows us to estimate the melting temperature T_m^{ePBD} of the ePBD model for various P_{GC} levels. The corresponding T_m^{ePBD} values are indicated by the vertical lines in Fig. 3 and they are accurately obtained (in K) by the relation

$$T_m^{ePBD} = 315 + 0.4P_{GC}, \quad (5)$$

which retains the experimentally observed linear rela-




FIG. 3: The fraction f_o of open base pairs at a given temperature T for the ePBD model with various P_{GC} percentages (points), stopping when $f_o = 0.5$ (horizontal solid line) in each case. Data are line-connected to guide the eye. The thresholds for considering a base pair as open are as in Fig. 2. Vertical dotted lines indicate the estimated melting temperatures T_m for each P_{GC} value.

tionship between the melting temperature and the GC percentage, exhibiting a slope in quantitative agreement with the measured value [61].

IV. BUBBLE LIFETIME DISTRIBUTIONS

Based on the base pair opening thresholds determined in Sect. III, we are now investigate in detail the statistical properties of bubbles in DNA at $T = 310 \text{ K}$. By performing constant energy molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, we track the creation and destruction of bubbles, and record their lifetimes. Our microcanonical simulations differ from previous studies of bubble lifetimes using Langevin MD [5, 6, 12]. The microcanonical ensemble probes the inherent characteristic times of the model, in contrast to the Langevin dynamics which introduces artificial time scales through the arbitrary damping coefficient. On the other hand, there are of course benefits to considering the fluctuations provided by the random forces in Langevin dynamics, in order to better mimic a heat bath at finite temperatures and assess *relative* timescales of different fluctuations. However, even in this case it is not known whether the white noise of the stochastic term in Langevin simulations realistically describes the biological environment, or a coloured noise with specific characteristics is more appropriate to describe the interactions of DNA with its surroundings. Therefore we have preferred as a first step to investigate the inherent dynamics of the system using microcanonical simulations, while its temperature is effectively represented through its energy density E_N as it is described in Section II (see Eq. 4). It is not obvious what effect

Langevin dynamics would have on the calculated distributions and how the arbitrary friction constant affects the lifetime distributions. Such an investigation is left for a future work. Obtaining statistically sound bubble lifetime distributions for different bubble lengths is a computationally nontrivial task, due to both the large amounts of data required and the complexity of the problem of identifying and tracking bubbles accurately.

To clarify the method we used to obtain bubble lifetime distributions, the outline of the implemented algorithm for the production of the distributions for an individual realization is as follows:

1. Perform MD simulations to create records of open/closed information for each base pair in the DNA sequence at each time step.
2. At each time step, look along the sequence and record the length of any occurring bubble, attributed at the corresponding starting site.
3. Check each bubble (site and length) against the previous time step.
 - If a bubble occurs somewhere that there was no bubble previously, begin a record of that bubble – a tuple of (length, lifetime).
 - If a bubble survives identically, increment the lifetime of that bubble by one time step.
 - If a bubble changes length, close the record of that bubble, and start a new record at that site with the new length.
 - If no bubble is present somewhere that it was existing a bubble previously, close that record.
4. At the end of the simulation, record the list of (length, lifetime) tuples at each site.

We note that our simple bubble-tracking criteria are fairly strict, in that small fluctuations at the end of a given bubble, due to transient openings or closings of base pairs at its ends, would result in starting new bubbles from the beginning. While this choice provides a straightforward and efficient method of lifetime calculation, other more flexible criteria allowing small fluctuations of bubbles when computing their lifetimes may be relevant too. Further, other algorithms measuring the lifetime of bubbles with size larger than a particular length may also be of interest, in particular for exploring bubble dynamics in biologically functional DNA sequences.

Data from many runs can be combined to create statistically meaningful distributions. In our investigation, for each case studied (different AT/GC content) we have in generally used 1000 different realizations of $N = 100$ base pair long DNA sequences, integrated until 10 ns for thermalization, and then data recorded every 0.01 ps for the next 1 ns. In order to establish the accuracy of the implementation of the used algorithm, in the absence of existing results for bubble lifetimes by microcanonical simulations, tests were performed against artificially




FIG. 4: Bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$ for different GC percentages P_{GC} , in the case of bubble length (a) $l = 1$, (b) $l = 2$, (c) $l = 3$, and (d) $l = 8$ (points). Results are shown for the ePBD model, with similar distributions being obtained for the PBD system. The dashed curves correspond to fits of the data with the stretched exponential function of Eq. (6).

created data sets with known distributions, and the full analysis as outlined above was performed on these data sets. The code exactly reproduced the known distributions, providing an assurance about the reliability of the results presented below.

Based on the data obtained with this approach we first examine the effect of the AT/GC composition of DNA molecules on the bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$, for different bubble lengths l . Representative distributions for several bubble lengths and GC percentages are shown with points in Fig. 4, illustrating an approximately ex-

ponential profile with the exception of single base pair openings for $l = 1$ [Fig. 4(a)]. Data for nine different P_{GC} percentages have been obtained, but for clarity we do not present all of them in Fig. 4. Further, lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$ for bubble lengths $l = 1, 2, \dots, 10$ have been calculated, but the cases $l \geq 4$ are very similar and thus only the $P_{l=8}(t)$ is shown in Fig. 4(d). Only results for the ePBD model are shown in Fig. 4, as on this scale the difference between the PBD and ePBD data is very small.

We see from Fig. 4(a) that in the case of bubbles with $l = 1$ a two-peaked profile is present, with the height of these two peaks depending on the GC content. Apart from the case with $P_{GC} = 0\%$, the two peaks are visible around $t = 0.1$ ps and $t = 0.25$ ps. In the case of homogeneous AT sequences ($P_{GC} = 0\%$) the two peaks are very broad, located around $t = 0.15 - 0.20$ ps for the first one and around $t = 0.4 - 0.5$ ps for the second. The positions of these peaks are not related to the periods of the $q = \pi$ vibrational normal modes of GC or AT base pairs (at around 0.4 ps and 0.8 ps, respectively, which are further increased due to thermal softening at $T = 300$ K [21]). The particular complex structure of these distributions may arise from the interplay of the characteristic times of single base pair bubbles and the transient $l = 1$ base pair openings of either increasing or decreasing in size larger bubbles during their opening and closing respectively. As evidenced in Figs. 4(b) and 4(c) some peaks can be still distinguished in the cases of $l = 2$ and $l = 3$, but they become less prominent as l increases. For longer bubbles a smoothing out of these peaks is observed, as seen for example in Fig. 4(d).

The bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$ can be fitted quite well with a stretched exponential function,

$$P_l(t) = A \exp\left(- (t/\tau)^\beta\right), \quad (6)$$

for all cases apart from $l = 1$, where the stretched exponential parameters β and τ depend on l and P_{GC} . These fits are shown for all cases in Fig. 4 by dashed curves. When the corresponding curve is not visible, it is covered by the overlying data points. From Fig. 4(a) we see that the stretched exponential distribution, Eq. (6) does not capture of course the somewhat complex double-peaked profile for $l = 1$, but still provides a rough approximation of the overall behavior. For $l \geq 2$ however, the stretched exponential of Eq. (6) describes the numerical data much more accurately [see Figs. 4(b)-(d)], and can be used to meaningfully approximate the bubble lifetime distributions.

The values of the numerically obtained fitting parameters τ and β of Eq. (6) are shown in Fig. 5. It is apparent, already by inspection of Fig. 4, and, more precisely, from the behavior of the stretched exponent β in Fig. 5(a) (which practically becomes $\beta = 1$ for larger l values, irrespective of the GC percentage), that the $P_l(t)$ distributions of Eq. (6) become more closely exponential as the bubble length l increases. In fact, because $\beta > 1$




FIG. 5: The fitting parameters of the bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$ of Eq. (6) for different P_{GC} percentages (points shown by different colors): (a) the stretched exponent β and (b) the characteristic time τ , with respect to the bubble length l [in number of base pairs (bp)]. The independencies on l of both of these parameters are fitted with the exponentially decaying functions, Eqs. (7) and (8). In (a) and (b) filled (empty) symbols indicate results for the PBD (ePBD) model and solid (dashed) curves show fits with Eq. (7) and Eq. (8) respectively. The insets in (a) present the dependence of the parameters c_β and λ_β of Eq. (7) on the GC content of the sequence (quantified by the P_{GC} value) for the PBD (blue circles) and the ePBD (empty orange squares) models. Solid and dashed curves represent appropriate fits of the corresponding PBD and ePBD data with quadratic functions. These parameters are almost identical for the two models. The insets in (b) are similar to the ones in (a) but for the c_τ and τ_0 parameters of Eq. (8).

for short bubbles, the corresponding distributions show a compressed exponential behavior meaning that there exist more short-lived bubbles (with lifetimes smaller than τ) and less long-lived bubbles (with lifetimes larger than τ) in these cases as compared to a purely exponential distribution. This leads to average lifetimes which are shorter than the characteristic lifetimes τ , as we will see below (cf. Fig. 7). This functional dependence reflects the extreme rarity of large long-lived bubbles in arbitrary DNA sequences. It is worth noting that as we see from

the data of Fig. 5(a) the values of the β exponent decay exponentially and they are practically the same for the PBD (filled symbols and solid lines) and the ePBD (empty symbols and dashed lines) models, at any GC content.

From the results of Fig. 5(b) we see that the characteristic time τ of Eq. (6) also decreases exponentially with bubble length, up to an asymptotic value dependent on the GC content. The PBD and ePBD models give a little different values for τ , with slightly longer characteristic times observed always in the ePBD model, while the difference is more noticeable as the AT content of the sequence increases. This, taking also into account that the exponent β is practically the same for both models, suggests that the ePBD model exhibits typically longer-lived bubbles than the PBD model.

The variation of both parameters β and τ of Eq. (6) with the bubble length l can be fitted with simple exponentials, of the form

$$\beta = c_\beta \exp(-l/\lambda_\beta) + 1, \quad (7)$$

$$\tau = c_\tau \exp(-l/\lambda_\tau) + \tau_0. \quad (8)$$

As already mentioned, the β values are almost indistinguishable for the PBD and ePBD models. This is also reflected by the fact that the computed c_β and λ_β values of Eq. (7) for various GC contents are practically identical for both DNA models, as shown in the insets of Fig. 5(a). Thus, the dependence of c_β and λ_β on P_{GC} can be very well approximated by the same quadratic functions for the PBD and the ePBD models, and the corresponding fitted equations are $c_\beta = 0.0017(1)(P_{GC})^2 - 0.14(1)P_{GC} + 5.9(2)$ and $\lambda_\beta = -0.00015(2)(P_{GC})^2 + 0.014(2)P_{GC} + 0.93(4)$. Thus, for both DNA models the bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$, Eq. (6), approach simple exponential functions for larger bubble lengths l at the same way, as the exponent β tends towards 1 identically in both cases.

We also find that the values of c_τ and λ_τ in Eq. (8) are similar for the two models. As demonstrated in the upper inset of Fig. 5(b), c_τ varies linearly with the GC percentage, fitted by $c_\tau = 0.66(1) - 0.0026(2)P_{GC}$ for both models, while $\lambda_\tau = 1.9$ bp is constant across all compositions for both PBD and ePBD cases. On the other hand, as we see in the lower inset of Fig. 5(b), the asymptotic value τ_0 in Eq. (8) shows a linear decrease with P_{GC} for both systems, while it is always slightly larger for the ePBD model. In particular, this linear dependence can be fitted by $\tau_0 = 0.19(1) - 0.0006(2)P_{GC}$, for the PBD model and $\tau_0 = 0.20(1) - 0.0007(2)P_{GC}$ for the ePBD model.

These results show that the difference between the two models in random averages is only evident in the linear shift of the asymptotic value τ_0 of τ in Eq. (8), with the shape of the distributions $P_l(t)$, Eq. (6), otherwise being very similar. In our computations the normalization constant A in Eq. (6) was considered as a free fitted parameter. The numerically obtained A values quite accurately reproduce the normalization condition $\int_0^\infty P_l(t)dt = 1$, as




FIG. 6: The difference $P_{CC} - P_{CG}$ in the ePBD model between the bubble lifetime probability distributions for DNA sequences containing only C bases along one strand (and G bases along the complementary one), and sequences of alternating CG bases along each strand. The positive difference at longer lifetimes indicates the tendency of longer-lived bubbles to be formed in the homogeneous sequence as compared to the CG periodic repeats. Each line corresponds to a different bubble length, as shown in the legend.

this property was recovered with an overall discrepancy of around 5%.

The advantage of the ePBD model is that it can accurately predict the thermal openings and denaturation temperatures of homogeneous and periodic DNA sequences exhibiting unusual melting transitions, where the original PBD model makes no distinction [57]. A characteristic example is provided by the homogeneous $(C)_{36}$ and the periodic $(CG)_{18}$ oligonucleotides, where their melting temperatures differ by more than 20 degrees (74 C and 96 C, respectively [57]). The PBD model cannot distinguish these two sequences. On the contrary the ePBD model can successfully describe their different melting behavior through the different stacking constants K_{CC} in the former sequence and K_{CG} , K_{GC} in the latter one. Even though the averaged results on random sequences presented in this work show small quantitative differences between the PBD and ePBD models, when such specific DNA segments are considered then the ePBD model provides more accurate calculations of the bubble distributions. To explicitly demonstrate this, we have calculated the bubble lifetime distributions for the homogeneous $(C)_{36}$ and the periodic $(CG)_{18}$ DNA segments of 36 base pairs using periodic boundary conditions in both cases. For simplicity we refer to these sequences as CC and CG respectively, and the corresponding bubble lifetime distributions are denoted as P_{CC} and P_{CG} . The PBD model obviously gives identical distributions P_{CC} and P_{CG} . These are very similar to the P_{CG} obtained by the ePBD model, due to the almost identical value of K_{GC} with the parameter k of PBD and the rel-




FIG. 7: Mean bubble lifetimes $\langle t \rangle_l$ as a function of bubble length l for (a) the PBD and (b) the ePBD model, for different P_{GC} percentages (points). Solid and dashed curves in, respectively (a) and (b) show fits of the data with Eq. (10).

atively nearby value of K_{CC} (see Section II). However the ePBD model results in systematic differences in the P_{CC} distributions due to the much smaller value of K_{CC} . This is shown in Fig. 6 through the difference $P_{CC} - P_{CG}$, computed using the average over 4000 realisations. A systematic variation can be seen in these distributions for all bubble lengths examined here, as P_{CC} is smaller than P_{CG} for relatively short-lived bubbles (indicating more such bubbles in the CG alternating sequences), while it is the other way around for longer-lived bubbles (revealing more long-lived bubbles in the homogeneous CC segment, having a lower stacking energy). At their largest, these differences are greater than 10% of the distribution values at that point. These results show the effect of the sequence-dependent stacking encoded in the ePBD model on the bubble lifetimes of specific DNA stretches.

We can numerically estimate the mean bubble lifetime $\langle t \rangle_l$ according to

$$\langle t \rangle_l = \sum_{i=1}^M t_i P_l(t_i) \delta t \quad (9)$$

where $P_l(t_i)$ is the numerically estimated probability density of bin i with width δt , and t_i is the time at the middle of that bin. As this sum is finite and based on the fact that $P_l(t)$ practically vanishes for relatively large t , the




FIG. 8: Dependence of (a) the asymptotic value δ , (b) the characteristic length α , and (c) the prefactor B , of the fitting of the $\langle t \rangle_l$ numerical data in Fig. 7 with Eq. (10) on the GC content of the DNA sequence. Blue circles show results for the PBD model and empty orange squares for the ePBD model. Lines show linear fits of the presented data with the equations reported at the corresponding panel.

$\langle t \rangle_l$ value in Eq. (9) is computed by considering $M = 500$ bins of width $\delta t = 0.01$ ps. The obtained results are presented in Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) for the PBD and ePBD model, respectively. We see that the mean bubble lifetime decreases exponentially with bubble length l . A clear monotonic decrease in bubble lifetimes with increasing P_{GC} values is also evident at every bubble length. By comparing Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) we see that the ePBD model exhibits slightly higher average lifetimes, but nevertheless shows the same trend as the PBD model. These longer average lifetimes in the ePBD model are consistent with results found in Ref. [57] showing that in general larger base pair displacements are observed in the ePBD than the PBD model (see figure 4 of that reference), taking also into account that the same opening thresholds are considered here in both cases.

The dependence of the mean bubble lifetime $\langle t \rangle_l$ on the bubble's length l for both PBD and ePBD models is accurately fitted through a simple exponential decay of the form

$$\langle t \rangle_l = B \exp(-l/\alpha) + \delta, \quad (10)$$

as shows the good description of the data points in

Figs. 7(a) and 7(b) by the solid and dashed curves respectively. The P_{GC} dependence of the three free parameters of Eq. (10), namely the asymptotic value δ [see Fig. 8(a)], the characteristic length α [see Fig. 8(b)], and the prefactor B [see Fig. 8(c)] is reasonably approximated by linear fits. These are shown by solid blue and dashed orange straight lines in Figs. 8(a)-(c) along with the corresponding PBD (blue circles) and ePBD (empty orange squares) data.

Closing this section, we note that the characteristic times of the bubble lifetimes calculated here are of the order of $\sim 10^{-1}$ ps. This time scale coincides with the faster relaxation time (between at least two distinct relaxation processes appeared in the range from 10^{-2} up to 3×10^3 ps) observed in the time-dependent autocorrelation functions of base pair fluctuations in the PBD model for homogeneous (purely AT or GC) DNA sequences (see figures 1 and 2 of Ref. [22]). In that work, local fluctuations of base pair openings were considered (corresponding to $l = 1$), while microcanonical MD was also used.

V. BUBBLE LENGTH DISTRIBUTIONS

Let us now discuss the distribution of bubble lengths based on our MD simulations. Investigations of such distributions and their dependence on GC content have already been performed using Monte Carlo simulations, at physiological temperature [27], as well as in the temperature range 270-350 K [28]. A uniform threshold of $y_n = 1.5 \text{ \AA}$ was used for both types of base pairs in those studies. Here we use extensive MD calculations and the base pair specific thresholds defined in Sect. III to examine these distributions, at a fixed temperature of $T = 310$ K. For this purpose we perform simulations for DNA sequences of $N = 1000$ base pairs, considering 8000 different, random realizations. Each case is again integrated for 10 ns to ensure thermalization, and then bubble length data are recorded every 0.1 ns for a further 10 ns. These conditions ensure a quite rich statistics, which is necessary for the accuracy of the tails of the distributions for bubble lengths of the order of tens of base pairs.

Corresponding results are shown in Fig. 9. Distributions of bubble lengths $P_L(l)$ for different GC percentages at $T = 310$ K are presented in Fig. 9(a) for the PBD and in Fig. 9(b) for the ePBD model. Similar data have been obtained for four more P_{GC} cases, in between of those values depicted in Fig. 9, not shown here for clarity. From the profiles of these distributions we see that for short bubble lengths ($l \lesssim 4$) the probabilities are relatively unaffected by the base pair content, as practically the $P_L(l)$ results coincide for all P_{GC} values. However for longer bubbles, the GC content of the DNA sequence plays a significant role on the bubble length probabilities as different $P_L(l)$ values are observed at different P_{GC} levels. In particular, in this case AT-rich strands exhibit noticeably more large bubbles than GC-rich sequences




FIG. 9: The probability $P_L(l)$ for the appearance of bubbles of length l in double stranded DNA at physiological temperature $T = 310$ K, for various P_{GC} percentages, plotted in log-log scale for (a) the PBD model and (b) the ePBD model (points). Solid curves in (a) and dashed curves in (b) depict fits of the data with Eq. (11).

in both models, as expected. While this behavior, at larger bubble lengths, is in accordance to what has been previously observed for the PBD model using uniform thresholds [28], the shorter length insensitivity of the distributions on the base pair content of the sequence shown in Fig. 9 is unique for the base pair specific thresholds considered here.

The ePBD model [Fig. 9(b)] favors the appearance of more bubbles at all lengths and GC contents with respect to the PBD system [Fig. 9(a)], in line with the overall lower melting temperatures exhibited by this model, although for the case of pure GC sequences ($P_{GC} = 100\%$) the two models give quite similar results. The differences between the PBD and the ePBD model become more pronounced as more AT base pairs are added to the sequence, with the pure AT sequences ($P_{GC} = 0\%$) showing a distinctive feature in the tail of the probability distribution for longer bubbles ($l > 30$ bp) in the ePBD case.

The numerically computed distributions of Figs. 9(a) and 9(b) can be suitably fitted with a stretched exponential function,

$$P_L(l) = C \exp\left(- (l/\kappa)^{\beta l}\right), \quad (11)$$




FIG. 10: Dependence on the GC content of the DNA sequence of (a) the stretched exponent β_l , (b) the characteristic length κ and (c) the coefficient C of the fit of the $P_L(l)$ distributions shown in Fig. 9 with Eq. (11), for the PBD (blue circles) and the ePBD (empty orange squares) models. Fits of the presented data with a straight line in (a) and (b) and an exponential function in (c), are shown, and the corresponding fitting equations are reported in each panel.

as can be seen by the solid and dashed curves, respectively. In a previous work it has been found that this functional form provided an accurate fitting of the bubble length distributions of PBD, equally well with a power-law modified exponential [27]. Here, however, the latter function cannot describe satisfactorily the tails of the distribution for the AT-rich ePBD case, in contrast to Eq. (11).

The numerical values of the free parameters of the fitting with Eq. (11), namely the characteristic length κ , the stretched exponent β_l , and the preexponential coefficient C for different P_{GC} levels are respectively shown in Figs. 10(a), 10(b) and 10(c). Both the stretched exponent β_l and the characteristic length κ increase linearly with GC content [Figs. 10(a) and 10(b) respectively], with the PBD values being always larger than the ones seen for the ePBD model. From Fig. 10(c) we see that the coefficient C exhibits for both the PBD (blue circles) and the ePBD (empty orange squares) systems an exponential decrease with the GC content, capturing the overall decrease in the number of observed bubbles as P_{GC} increases (Fig. 9). The particular exponential fits

of the preexponential factor are shown in Fig. 10(c) for the two models (blue solid curve for the PBD and the orange dashed curve for ePBD). The difference between the C values for the two models becomes larger for small P_{GC} percentages, with the ePBD values being always higher, in accordance to the larger $P_L(l)$ values observed for this model in Fig. 9. Since for pure GC sequences ($P_{GC} = 100\%$) both models exhibit similar $P_L(l)$ distributions in Figs. 9(a) and 9(b), the fitting parameters of Eq. (11) converge for $P_{GC} = 100\%$ in Fig. 10, as expected, while they are distinctly different in the other P_{GC} cases.

The average bubble length $\langle l \rangle$ can be computed as the number of base pairs in bubbles divided by the total number of bubbles [27]:

$$\langle l \rangle = \frac{\sum_l l P_L(l)}{\sum_l P_L(l)}. \quad (12)$$

Using the numerical results presented in Figs. 9(a) and 9(b) and Eq. (12) we compute $\langle l \rangle$ for both the PBD and the ePBD models for various P_{GC} percentages. The obtained average bubble lengths are shown in Fig. 11 by blue circles for the PBD model and by empty orange squares for the ePBD system. These results indicate that the ePBD model exhibits generally longer average bubble lengths than the PBD system for any GC percentage, once again in agreement with the findings of Ref. [57] that base pair openings tend to be larger in the ePBD model. The fine sequence dependence of the ePBD model through the stacking energy variation also demonstrates greater sensitivity to the GC content of DNA, as its range of $\langle l \rangle$ values is wider, corresponding to the longer tails seen in the bubble length distributions $P_L(l)$ in Fig. 9(b) for AT-rich sequences. For both models we see an exponential decrease in $\langle l \rangle$ with increasing P_{GC} values, which has been also observed previously for the PBD model at physiological [27] and other temperatures [28]. Comparing our PBD results to the previous findings at the same temperature [27], we see that while the average bubble length $\langle l \rangle$ for homogeneous AT sequences ($P_{GC} = 0\%$) are the same in both investigations, in our study we find longer average bubble lengths for GC-rich sequences. The former observation suggests that the larger threshold used in Ref. [27] does not affect so much the average bubble lengths, but most likely the latter difference is due to the base pair specific thresholds for openings used here as compared to a uniform threshold value.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied in detail the distributions of bubble lifetimes and bubble lengths in the PBD and ePBD models of double stranded DNA, using base pair specific physical thresholds for determining base pairs to be open, based on the consistency of the considered openings with the melting behavior of both systems. In particular, the characteristic length scale of the Morse potential, Eq. (1),




FIG. 11: The average bubble length $\langle l \rangle$ as a function of the GC percentage P_{GC} for the PBD (blue circles) and ePBD (empty orange squares) models. Solid (dashed) curve shows fitting of the data with the exponential function reported in the figure for the PBD (ePBD) model.

for AT and GC base pairs yields an effective threshold, as it is in agreement with the requirement that 50% of the base pairs are open at the melting temperature.

Implementing these thresholds and performing extensive MD simulations we computed the bubble lifetime distributions $P_l(t)$ of DNA molecules for different bubble lengths l , for sequences with a variable GC content (Fig. 4). A two-peaked distribution was found for the case of single-site openings [Fig. 4(a)], while for bubbles of length $l = 2$ base pairs or greater, a stretched exponential, Eq. (6), with exponent $\beta \gtrsim 1$ fits the distribution quite accurately. The ePBD model predicts bubbles to be generally longer-lived than the PBD model.

Bubble length distributions $P_L(l)$ were also produced from our simulations (Fig. 9). We found that these distributions are described by usual stretched exponential functions, Eq. (11), for both models. Our results show

that longer bubbles are more likely to appear in the ePBD model, particularly when the sequences have a larger proportion of AT base pairs. The observation of longer in size and also longer-lived bubbles in the ePBD model is related to the lower average stacking energy and the larger base pair displacements occurring in the ePBD model as compared to the original PBD model.

The distributions of bubble lifetimes $P_l(t)$, Eq. (6), and bubble length $P_L(l)$, Eq. (11), obtained in our work, in combination with the results of Figs. 5 and 10, can be used to estimate the occurrence probability for any bubble of length l and lifetime t in a sequence of specified GC content, i.e. a fixed P_{GC} percentage. Our results indicate that inherent long-lived bubbles with lifetimes of the order of ps are infrequent, at least in the framework of the algorithm considered here where fluctuations of the bubble size denote starting off a new bubble. Larger bubbles exhibit exponentially decaying lifetimes.

Prospective future investigations include detailed studies of bubble lifetime and length distributions at functional sites in DNA promoters, using the thresholds proposed in Sect. III, or investigating the effect of the opening amplitude on bubble lifetimes. Similar investigations can also be carried out using Langevin dynamics, in order to consider the effects of a noisy environment on the obtained distributions, as well as exploring the possibilities for a more flexible bubble-tracking algorithm.

Acknowledgments

M. H. and Ch. S. acknowledge support by the National Research Foundation (NRF) of South Africa. G. K. and Ch. S. were supported by the Erasmus+/International Credit Mobility KA107 program. We thank the High Performance Computing facility of the University of Cape Town and the Center for High Performance Computing of South Africa for providing computational resources for this project.

-
- [1] H.M. Sobell, Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. **82**, 5328 (1985).
 - [2] C.H. Choi, G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, M. Hiromura, A. Bishop, and A. Usheva, Nucleic Acids Res. **32**, 1584 (2004).
 - [3] G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, A.R. Bishop, C.H. Choi, and A. Usheva, Europhys. Lett. **68**, 127 (2004).
 - [4] C.H. Choi, Z. Rapti, V. Gelev, M.R. Hacker, B. Alexandrov, E.J. Park, J.S. Park, N. Horikoshi, A. Smerzi, K.Ø. Rasmussen, A.R. Bishop, and A. Usheva, Biophys. J. **95**, 597 (2008).
 - [5] B.S. Alexandrov, V. Gelev, S.W. Yoo, A.R. Bishop, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A. Usheva, PLoS Comput. Biol. **5**, e1000313 (2009).
 - [6] B.S. Alexandrov, V. Gelev, S.W. Yoo, L.B. Alexandrov, Y. Fukuyo, A.R. Bishop, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A. Usheva, Nucleic Acids Res. **38**, 1790 (2010).
 - [7] A. Apostolaki and G. Kalosakas, Phys. Biol. **8**, 026006 (2011).
 - [8] R. Tapia-Rojo, D. Prada-Gracia, J.J. Mazo, and F. Falo, Phys. Rev. E **86**, 021908 (2012).
 - [9] H.-H. Huang and P. Lindblad, J. Biol. Eng. **7**, 10 (2013).
 - [10] K. Nowak-Lovato, L.B. Alexandrov, A. Banisadr, A.L. Bauer, A.R. Bishop, A. Usheva, F. Mu, E. Hong-Geller, K.Ø. Rasmussen, W.S. Hlavacek, B.S. Alexandrov, PLoS Comput. Biol. **9**, e1002881 (2013).
 - [11] R. Tapia-Rojo, J.J. Mazo, J.A. Hernandez, M.L. Peleato, M.F. Fillat and F. Falo, PLoS Comput. Biol. **10**, e1003835 (2014).
 - [12] B.S. Alexandrov, L.T. Wille, K.Ø. Rasmussen, A.R. Bishop and K.B. Blagoev, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 050901 (2006).

- (2006).
- [13] T. Dauxois, M. Peyrard, and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, R44 (1993).
- [14] M. Peyrard and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2755 (1989).
- [15] T. Dauxois, M. Peyrard, and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. E* **47**, 684 (1993).
- [16] T. Dauxois and M. Peyrard, *Phys. Rev. E* **51**, 4027 (1995).
- [17] D. Cule and T. Hwa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2375 (1997).
- [18] N. Theodorakopoulos, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 031919 (2008).
- [19] J. Barre and T. Dauxois, *Europhys. Lett.* **55**, 164 (2001).
- [20] M. Hillebrand, G. Kalosakas, A. Schwellnus, Ch. Skokos, *Phys. Rev. E* **99**, 022213 (2019).
- [21] N.K. Voulgarakis, G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A.R. Bishop, *Nano Lett.* **4**, 629 (2004).
- [22] G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A.R. Bishop, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **432**, 291 (2006).
- [23] M. Peyrard and J. Farago, *Physica A* **288**, 199 (2000).
- [24] M. Peyrard, *Nonlinearity* **17**, 1 (2004).
- [25] S. Ares, N.K. Voulgarakis, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 035504 (2005).
- [26] N.K. Voulgarakis, A. Redondo, A.R. Bishop, and K. Ø. Rasmussen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 248101 (2006).
- [27] S. Ares and G. Kalosakas, *Nano Lett.* **7**, 307 (2007).
- [28] G. Kalosakas and S. Ares, *J. Chem. Phys.* **130**, 235104 (2009).
- [29] G. Weber, J.W. Essex, and C. Neylon, *Nature Phys.* **5**, 769 (2009).
- [30] R. Tapia-Rojo, J.J. Mazo, and F. Falo, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 031916 (2010).
- [31] P. Maniadis, B.S. Alexandrov, A.R. Bishop, and K.Ø. Rasmussen, *Phys. Rev. E* **83**, 011904 (2011).
- [32] J.J. Traverso, V.S. Manoranjan, A.R. Bishop, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and N.K. Voulgarakis, *Sci.Rep.* **5**, 9037 (2015).
- [33] E.O. Martins, V.B. Barbosa, and G. Weber, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **715** 14 (2019).
- [34] M.I. Muniz, H.H. Lackey, J.M. Heemstra and G. Weber, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **749** 137413 (2020).
- [35] M. Manghi and N. Destainville, *Phys. Rep.* **631**, 1 (2016).
- [36] M. Barbi, S. Cocco, and M. Peyrard, *Phys. Lett. A* **253**, 358 (1999).
- [37] S. Cocco and R. Monasson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **112**, 10017 (2000).
- [38] A. Bakk and R. Metzler, *J. Theor. Biol.* **231**, 525 (2004).
- [39] G. Weber, N. Haslam, N. Whiteford, A. Prugel-Bennett, J.W. Essex, and C. Neylon, *Nature Phys.* **2**, 55 (2006).
- [40] C.W. Hsu, M. Fyta, G. Lakatos, S. Melchionna, and E. Kaxiras, *J. Chem. Phys.* **137**, 105102 (2012).
- [41] M. Zoli, *J. Chem. Phys.* **138**, 205103 (2013).
- [42] G.S. Freeman, D.M. Hinckley, J.P. Lequieu, J.K. Whitmer, and J.J. de Pablo, *J. Chem. Phys.* **141**, 165103 (2014).
- [43] M. Zoli, *Phys. A* **492**, 903 (2018).
- [44] M. Zoli, *J. Chem. Phys.* **148**, 214902 (2018).
- [45] X. Wang and Z. Sun, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **59**, 2980 (2019).
- [46] G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A.R. Bishop, *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 3731 (2003).
- [47] D. Hennig, E.B. Starikov, J.F.R. Archilla, and F. Palmero, *J. Biol. Phys.* **30**, 227 (2004).
- [48] P. Maniadis, G. Kalosakas, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A.R. Bishop, *Phys. Rev. E* **72**, 021912 (2005).
- [49] E. Diaz, R.P.A. Lima, and F. Dominguez-Adame, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 134303 (2008).
- [50] A.P. Chetverikov, W. Ebeling, V.D. Lakhno, A.S. Shigaev, M.G. Velarde, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **89**, 101 (2016).
- [51] G. Kalosakas, K.L. Ngai, and S. Flach, *Phys. Rev. E* **71**, 061901 (2005).
- [52] G. Kalosakas, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 051905 (2011).
- [53] L. Gu and H.-H. Fu, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 053032 (2016).
- [54] D. Chen, S. Aubry, and G.P. Tsironis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4776 (1996).
- [55] A.P. Chetverikov, W. Ebeling, V.D. Lakhno and M.G. Velarde, *Phys. Rev. E* **100**, 052203 (2019).
- [56] A. Campa and A. Giansanti, *Phys. Rev. E* **58**, 3585 (1998).
- [57] B.S. Alexandrov, V. Gelev, Y. Monisova, L.B. Alexandrov, A.R. Bishop, K.Ø. Rasmussen, and A. Usheva, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **37**, 2405 (2009).
- [58] E. Hairer, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner, *Geometric Numerical Integration*, Vol. **31** (Springer, New York) 2002.
- [59] S. Blanes and P. Moan, *Journ. Comp. App. Math.*, **142**, 313 (2002).
- [60] J. J. More, *The Levenberg-Marquardt Algorithm: Implementation and Theory*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **630**, Springer Verlag (1977).
- [61] J. Marmur and P. Doty, *J. Mol. Biol.* **5**, 109 (1962).

