

the systematic bends are nearly exactly out of phase. Recent hydrodynamic results also show that the bending locus is not characterized by increased flexibility¹⁴

Interruptions in the A tract

The importance of a continuous run of A residues for the bending phenomenon was investigated by interrupting the A₅ tract with another nucleotide N (sequence code IAN) at the central base. Figure 3 shows that these single base-pair changes cause the gel mobility to revert nearly to normal, from which we conclude that bending is almost abolished. Hence, a continuous run of A residues is the basis for the bending phenomenon; clearly, the purines A and G are not equivalent in this case.

The base least effective in interrupting the influence of a run of As is T; this observation may be of interest in considering possible DNA structural polymorphism in the TATA box region of promoters. In addition, we found that the sequence (G₅N₅)_n has normal gel-electrophoretic mobility (data not shown),

confirming the special role of A tracts (or T tracts if the complementary strand is examined).

Alterations in length of A tracts

To determine the influence of the length of the A tract, we synthesized the series (A_kN_{10-k})_n in which the sequence phasing is kept constant at 10 bp, while the number of A residues in the continuous block is varied. The results collected in Fig. 3 show that an A tract of length 3 produces only slight electrophoretic anomalies; the effect is substantial with 4 As in a row, and increases to a maximum for a tract of length 6. Apparent bending is lessened but still substantial for (A₈N₂)_n and (A₉N₁)_n. In

Table 1 Sequences examined

Name	Sequence (5' → 3')
A ₅ N ₄	C A A A A A C G G
A ₅ N ₅	G G C A A A A A C G
A ₅ N ₆	G G C C A A A A A C G
A ₅ N ₇	G G C C A A A A A C C G
A ₅ N ₁₀	C C G G C A A A A A C G G G C
IAC	G G C A A C A A C G
IAG	G G C A A G A A C G
IAT	G G C A A T A A C G
FCT	G G C A A A A A T G
FGG	C C G A A A A A G G
A ₃ N ₇	G G C C A A A C C G
A ₄ N ₆	G G C C A A A A C G
A ₆ N ₄	G G C A A A A A A C
A ₈ N ₂	C C A A A A A A A A
A ₉ N ₁	C A A A A A A A A A
G ₅ N ₅	T C G T G G G G G C
A ₅ -8	C C A A A A A C G G G C A A A A A A A A
A ₈ -5	C C A A A A A A A A C G G G C A A A A A
A ₆ -T ₆	A A A A C G G G T T T T T T G G G C A A
A ₂₀	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A

Only one strand of each duplex is shown. All duplexes were constructed with 2-bp protruding 5' ends, except A₅N₄, which had 1-bp protruding 5' ends. Multimers of dA₂₀·dT₂₀ were prepared both by ligation of the duplex and, for sequences 100, 140 and 160 bp long, by ligation of dA₂₀ (or dT₂₀) on poly(dT) (or poly(dA)) followed by gel purification of the selected radiolabelled multimers and hybridization with the complementary strand of equal length. This procedure was followed because we could not be certain of the polarity of ligation of dA₂₀·dT₂₀. A₅N₄, A₅N₅ and FGG were synthesized manually using the phosphotriester method and the remainder of the sequences were produced by automated DNA synthesis using phosphoramidite reagents on an Applied Biosystems instrument. A sequence A₇N₃ was synthesized, but since two multimeric ladders of differing gel mobilities were produced, depending on the conditions of ligation, those results are not reported here. Ligated multimers of A₅N₄ and A₅N₅ were cloned, and their sequence was verified by Maxam-Gilbert sequencing reactions.




Fig. 1 Autoradiogram of the multimer series (A_kN_{10-k})_n ($k=4, 5, 6, 7, 10$) electrophoresed on a non-denaturing 8% polyacrylamide gel. Mobility indicators, interpolated where necessary, are: +, multimers of 80-bp sequence length; *, 150-bp sequence length. Chemically synthesized oligonucleotides (Table 1) were purified on a 20% polyacrylamide gel, followed by high salt elution from a DE-52 ion-exchange column. Purified oligonucleotides were desalted using Sep-Pak C18 cartridges (Waters). 8 µg of each oligomer was 5'-labelled with 10 µCi of [γ -³²P]ATP (5 µCi pmol⁻¹; Amersham) in 10 µl of solution, at 37 °C for 15 min. The reaction solution contained 70 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.6), 10 mM MgCl₂, 5 mM dithiothreitol (DTT) and 6 U polynucleotide kinase (New England Biolabs). After labelling with [γ -³²P]ATP, 50 nmol cold ATP and an additional 4 U of kinase were added, and the reaction volume was doubled to 20 µl. Kinasing with cold ATP was continued in the same buffer and temperature as above, for a period of 1 h. Two kinased oligonucleotides of complementary sequence (except for single-stranded residues at the 5' ends) were mixed, heated to 55 °C and cooled slowly to 0 °C to form hybrids. To 10 µl of the hybridized mixture was added 800 U of T4 DNA ligase (New England Biolabs), and the reaction volume was adjusted to 20 µl; the ligation mixture had the same concentration of Tris-HCl, MgCl₂ and DTT as the kinasing step, plus 2.3 mM cold ATP. The ligation reaction was allowed to proceed on ice overnight, after which it was quenched by addition of EDTA (pH 8.0) to 25 mM final concentration. Ligated products were run on non-denaturing 8% polyacrylamide gels (mono:bis acrylamide ratio = 29:1; 90 mM Tris-borate, 2.5 mM EDTA, pH 8.3) until the bromophenol blue dye had migrated 22 cm. The applied voltage was 7 V cm⁻¹, and electrophoresis was carried out at room temperature. Multimers of the BamHI linker (10 bp, New England Biolabs) were also electrophoresed adjacent to a pBR322-HinII digest (data not shown) to confirm their normal gel mobility.




Fig. 2 The ratio R_L^1 (at room temperature) of apparent multimer size, determined from comparison with the electrophoresis markers, to actual chain length. Increasing R_L^1 indicates an anomalous structure which is interpreted as DNA bending. Strong anomalies are seen only when the sequence phasing of the A₅ tract is 10 (A₅N₅) or 11 (A₅N₆), corresponding to the number of base pairs in one double helical turn of DNA. Phasing of the A tracts at 1.5 helical turns (A₅N₁₀) produces no detectable bending, eliminating flexibility as an explanation for the phenomenon. Gels were run at room temperature.

order to be certain that the anomalous properties of these latter two sequences were not due to their high content of homopolymeric poly(dA)·poly(dT), we also examined the series (A₂₀)_n and found (Fig. 3) that these homopolymeric double helices have slightly increased electrophoretic mobility.

An interesting feature of the results in Fig. 3 is the crossover between the mobility curves for (A₅N₅)_n and (A₈N₂)_n at about 130 bp, with the latter showing greater mobility anomalies for molecules longer than the crossover size. We ascribe this behaviour to the strong influence of exact phasing on mobility anomalies: since (A₈N₂)_n has the higher content of homopolymeric poly(dA)·poly(dT), its helix screw is more closely matched to the 10-bp sequence repeat characteristic of this series of molecules. A similar explanation can be applied to the crossover

observed between the two series of polymeric A₄N₆ and A₉N₁ molecules.

Differential phasing of junctions


The substantial electrophoretic anomaly of (A₉N₁)_n is surprising because the 3' and 5' ends of the A tract are nearly a full helical turn apart; if the junctions produced equivalent bends in opposite directions, as, for example, proposed for the junction of an A-DNA segment with B-DNA¹⁵, one would expect the bends to compensate for each other when placed one helical turn apart. This observation raises the possibility that the bend is concentrated primarily at a single site, for which the only logical choices are the 3' and 5' junctions of the block of As. Therefore, we synthesized the series A₅₋₈ and A₈₋₅, which differ in that the former maintains a uniform 10-bp phasing of the 5' ends of the A tracts, with an alternating 7- and 13-bp separation between the 3' ends, whereas the latter has uniform 10-bp phasing of the 3' ends, with the 5' ends now characterized by the 7- and 13-bp alternating separation. Figure 3 shows that A₈₋₅ is clearly more anomalous, and hence more strongly bent, than A₅₋₈. We conclude that accurate phasing of the 3' ends of the A tracts is a dominant factor in bending; it follows that a substantial portion of the bending is concentrated at the 3' junction. However, the 5' junction must also contribute, as bending is maximized when both 3' and 5' junctions have 10-bp phasing, and are approximately half a helical turn (6 bp) apart, as in (A₆N₄)_n.

We investigated the symmetry properties of the bending locus through synthesis of (A₆-T₆)_n, in which every other CA₆C element is inverted to GT₆G. These molecules, with $R_L^1[140 \text{ bp}] = 2.13$, are nearly as anomalous as (A₆N₄)_n. We conclude that 2-fold rotation of an A₆ bending locus does not substantially alter the direction of bending.

Role of flanking bases

Given the importance of the junctions of the A tracts, it might be expected that the extent of bending would depend on the flanking bases. We found this to be the case, although the effects are not dramatic. Among the limited set of sequences examined, the greatest degree of bending ($R_L^1[150 \text{ bp}] = 2.07$ for sequence FCT; see Table 1) is seen when the 5'-flanking base is C and the 3' base is T, as found at the natural bending locus in *L. tarentolae*. The sequence with a flanking C both 3' and 5' is less bent ($R_L^1[150 \text{ bp}] = 2.00$ for A₅N₅), and the phenomenon is reduced further ($R_L^1[150 \text{ bp}] = 1.80$ for FGG) when G is present at both 3' and 5' ends.

Fig. 3 a, R_L^1 (at room temperature) of multimers containing A tracts of different lengths, with constant sequence phasing. Values for the (A₂₀)_n series were obtained from the products of a ligation reaction carried out on (dA)₂₀·(dT)₂₀ as described in Fig. 1 legend. In addition, the mobilities were checked against (dA)_n·(dT)_n (n = 100, 140, 160) because of uncertainty about the polarity of ligation of (dA)₂₀·(dT)₂₀. We prepared (dA)_n by kinasizing A₂₀, hybridizing with an equal concentration (by absorbance at 260 nm) of poly(dT) (Sigma) as template, and ligating as described for Fig. 1 at 4 °C overnight. Ligated multimers of A₂₀ were separated on an 8% denaturing polyacrylamide gel, and bands corresponding to the desired chain lengths were cut out, electroeluted, phenol-extracted and ethanol-precipitated. The corresponding (dT)_n oligomers were prepared analogously, using poly(dA) as template, and hybridized with the (dA)_n strand of equal length for gel analysis. b, R_L^1 (measured at room temperature) for the sequences A₅₋₈ and A₈₋₅, which differ in phasing of the 5' and 3' junctions. The difference in gel anomalies for the two sequences demonstrates non-equivalence of the 3' and 5' junctions; the greater anomaly in A₈₋₅, in which the 3' junctions are phased at 10-bp intervals, implies greater bending at the 3' than at the 5' junction.






Fig. 4 Effect of lowered temperature on the gel mobility of the series $(A_5N_k)_n$, $n = 4, 5, 6, 7$. R_L^4 values are shown for an 8% polyacrylamide gel, run at 4°C, with voltage gradient 8 V cm⁻¹. The dashed lines show the results for gels run at room temperature (Fig. 2).

Temperature

It has been reported^{4,16} that increased temperature causes the gel mobility of kinetoplast DNA fragments to revert to more normal values, a property we found also to be characteristic of synthetic bending sequences. Figure 4 compares apparent lengths measured from gels run at 4°C and at room temperature for the series A_5N_k . Both of the highly anomalous series of molecules A_5N_5 and A_5N_6 become even more so at lower temperature, from which we conclude that bending is increased at lower temperature. However, the response of molecules longer than 100 bp is dramatically different in the two cases, implying a second effect in addition to an increase in the average bending angle; a possible explanation is the effect of lowered temperature on the DNA helical screw¹⁷, as discussed below.

Figure 5a, b summarizes the influence of lowered temperature on mobility anomalies of the series $(A_7N_{10-j})_n$. The molecules $(A_4N_6)_n$ and $(A_5N_5)_n$ are most strongly affected by lowered

temperature, to the extent that $(A_5N_5)_n$ becomes nearly as anomalous as $(A_6N_4)_n$, and retains greater anomaly than $(A_8N_2)_n$ even for molecules longer than 130 bp. Improved phasing match in $(A_5N_5)_n$ at 4°C doubtless contributes to this trend. The very weak bending observed for $(A_3N_7)_n$ at room temperature increases at 4°C, but remains much below that observed for other members of the series. Only $(A_9N_1)_n$ shows a general decline in the extent of mobility anomaly, for molecules between 60 and 150 bp in length, as temperature is decreased.

Models for DNA bending

We have identified two general classes of models for the origin of sequence-directed DNA bending: (1) models which assume that A tracts retain a normal B-DNA structure, and that bending can be explained in terms of nearest (or sometimes next-nearest) neighbour nucleotide sequences, and (2) models which invoke a longer-range structural polymorphism at the A tract, and which focus on the properties of junctions between it and adjacent B-DNA.

Class 1 includes the original analysis by Trifonov and colleagues^{18,19} of sequence periodicities which were proposed to produce 'curving' of eukaryotic DNA and thus ease its packaging in chromatin. Their approach identified the dinucleotides ApA (and TpT) which are clearly related to the A-tract bending phenomenon. The Dickerson-Calladine²⁰⁻²² analysis of base-pair roll resulting from purine-purine clash also falls into this category, although because of compensating roll at sequences adjacent to a purine-pyrimidine (Pu-Py) dinucleotide, the Dickerson²² parameters do not predict the bending observed in the kinetoplast DNA sequence³. On the other hand, the conformational analysis reported by Zhurkin and colleagues^{23,24} predicts that Pu-Py sequences should favour bending by compressing the minor groove, whereas Py-Pu sequences should bend into the major groove. Clearly, this model would predict systematic bending in the kinetoplast sequence with its 5-6-bp alternation of Pu-Py and Py-Pu nearest neighbours.

Models of class 2 take as their starting point the observation that poly(dA)·poly(dT) has an anomalous structure, as revealed by fibre diffraction²⁵, its 10.1-bp helical screw¹¹⁻¹³, its Raman spectrum^{26,27}, and its inability to be reconstituted into nucleosomes^{28,29}. Hence, it is possible that oligo(dA·dT) tracts in DNA can adopt one or more alternative structures in addition to the normal B configuration. One expects that the tendency to form the alternative structure will increase with the length of the A tract, because short runs of A do not gain enough free energy from the structural switch to compensate for the unfavourable free energy at the junctions with normal DNA. If the base pairs




Fig. 5 Effect of lowered temperature on the mobility of the series $(A_7N_{10-j})_n$ and IAC (see Table 1), showing R_L^4 measured on a gel run at 4°C as in Fig. 4. b, Relative changes in R_L^4 values with temperature, shown as the ratio $R_L^4/R_L^4(°)$.

are tilted in the alternative structure, as proposed from fibre diffraction for the 'heteronomous'²⁵ (H) structure of poly(dA)·poly(dT), then a bend in the helix axis is expected at the junction with B-DNA, as illustrated by models built to represent the junction of A- and B-DNA¹⁵. Note that the two strands in the H-DNA model are not equivalent, so there is no necessity for the 3' and 5' junctions of H-DNA with B-DNA to exhibit the kind of equivalence required for A-B junctions by the 2-fold structural symmetry of A- and B-DNA.

Interpretation of the results

The general requirement, characteristic of all the models, for phasing the A tracts in coherence with the helical repeat is clearly verified by our experiments. When that finding is combined with the lack of bending found for molecules in which the phasing is 1.5 helical turns, we can definitely exclude increased flexibility from the list of possible explanations for the observed electrophoretic anomalies.

Our results clearly favour models of class 2, in which runs of A of sufficient length adopt an alternative helical structure. This readily explains the requirement of at least four successive A residues in order to observe strong bending anomalies. In addition, loss of the bending phenomenon when A₅ is replaced by AAGAA eliminates all models that are based on purine clash or preferential bending at Pu-Py and Py-Pu sequences. In the model which invokes bending at ApA dinucleotides, ApA bends separated by half a helical turn cancel each other. On that basis one would expect that the bending in (A₃N₇)_n or in the IAN set, each of which has two putative ApA bending steps, should nearly equal the bending in (A₆N₁)_n in which all but two of the ApA steps cancel. This prediction is definitely in disagreement with the facts. The essential problem with models of class 1 is that the bending observed in short A tracts is substantially less than expected. (We do not argue that small bends based on nearest-neighbour sequence do not occur, only that they cannot explain the A-tract bending phenomenon.)

The striking temperature dependence of bending is also readily explained in terms of the structural polymorphism model, by postulating that the equilibrium between B and the alternative structural form, provisionally called H, is shifted towards H at low temperature. This shift increases the average A-tract bending angle, and also affects the accuracy of helical phasing of the bending loci. Since junctions and therefore bends are absent when the A tract is in the B-form, higher temperature eliminates bending as the H-form disappears. Lowered temperature is expected to improve the phase match in (A₅N₅)_n and (A₄N₆)_n because conversion to the H-form brings the average helical screw closer to the 10-bp sequence repeat. In the case of (A₅N₆)_n, this factor works in the opposite direction because the helix is already overwound relative to the 11-bp sequence repeat, leaving only a modest increase in observed bending at low temperature, due to the increased average A-tract bending angle.

The unusual temperature dependence observed for A₆N₁ may result from a tendency of the H segment to include the single C residue, thus bridging continuously from one A tract to another. This would result in reduced average bending because H-B junctions would disappear, and would alter the otherwise expected increase of bending on lowering the temperature.

The observed non-equivalence in the importance of the 3' and 5' A-tract junctions for bending implies lack of 2-fold symmetry in the structure of the A tract. This supports the proposal that the structure may resemble H-DNA, whose most unusual feature is a lack of equivalence between the strands. A schematic model is shown in Fig. 6, based on the conformation of the dA strand in the H-form structure²⁵ and on the observation reported by Edmondson and Johnson³⁰ that T has a greater angle relative to the helix axis than does A in poly(dA)·poly(dT). It is a natural consequence of the model shown that bending is greater at the 3' than at the 5' junction of the A tract.




Fig. 6 Proposed model for differential bending at the 3' and 5' junctions. The A-tract helix backbone trajectories and tilt of the A residues are taken from the H-DNA structural model²⁵, and the extra tilt of the T residues is based on the optical experiments of Edmondson and Johnson³⁰. (—), Helix axis of the A-tract segment, assumed to be in the H-form structure; (---), helix axes of the adjacent B-DNA segments. At the 5' junction, the G·C base pair from the top B-DNA segment stacks parallel to the A base, rather than the T base, because of the stronger stacking interactions of A. At the 3' junction, the downward-tilted T residue prevents the G·C pair that begins the lower B-DNA segment from stacking parallel to the A base. As a consequence, the helix axis bending angle θ_2 is greater than the corresponding angle θ_1 . The pseudo-2-fold axis for the CA₆C segment lies in the plane of the paper, and runs through the centre of the A₆ tract; rotation about that axis produces no change in predicted bending, as is nearly true for the sequence A₆·T₆. The model is intended to be schematic; the bending angles θ and the base tilt angles have only qualitative significance.

The model in Fig. 6 also explains the observation that 2-fold rotation of every other CA₆C bending locus has little effect on the extent of bending. The pseudo-dyad axis in the model lies in the plane of the paper, and runs between the third and fourth A in the tract. The total bending in the direction of base-pair tilt at the two junctions as shown is not affected by rotation about the approximate 2-fold axis. However, if bending were in the direction of base-pair roll into the major groove at one junction and into the minor groove at the other (in a direction perpendicular to the paper in the model), 2-fold rotation would invert the direction of bending, and the effects of successive A and T tracts would cancel. Hence, models which rely on base-pair roll at H-B junctions can be eliminated.

Our results lead us to stress the potential general importance of local polymorphism of DNA structure. In the case of A-tract bending, a cooperatively induced, altered helical structure is clearly implied, with special effects at the 3' junction of the A tract with adjacent B-DNA. The recent observation by Reynolds *et al.*³¹ of specific antibiotic-induced cleavage at the 3' end of A tracts supports the view that DNA structure is significantly altered at that site. In addition, their observation that the same

drug cuts in the promoter TATA box suggests that a similar alteration may be possible there. Such structural variations may have wide significance for protein-DNA recognition.

This work was supported by NSF grant DMB-8405494 and by a Project Grant for Parasitology and Tropical Medicine from

the MacArthur Foundation. The DNA synthesizer was purchased with the help of NSF grant PCM 8413761. We thank Sarah Woodson and Aino Ruusala for advice and assistance with oligonucleotide synthesis, and Abraham Brown for discussions and for bringing ref. 31 to our attention.

Received 6 December 1985; accepted 4 March 1986.

1. Englund, P. T., Hajduk, S. L. & Marini, J. C. *A. Rev. Biochem.* **51**, 695-726 (1982).
2. Marini, J. C., Levene, S. D., Crothers, D. M. & Englund, P. T. *Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **79**, 7664-7668 (1982).
3. Levene, S. D. & Crothers, D. M. *J. biomolec. Struct. Dyn.* **1**, 429-435 (1983).
4. Marini, J. C. *et al. J. biol. Chem.* **259**, 8974-8979 (1984).
5. Ntambi, J. M. *et al. Molec. Biochem. Parasit.* **12**, 273-286 (1984).
6. Wu, H. M. & Crothers, D. M. *Nature* **308**, 509-513 (1984).
7. Hagerman, P. J. *Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **81**, 4632-4636 (1984).
8. Zahn, K. & Blattner, F. R. *Nature* **317**, 451-453 (1985).
9. Lerman, L. S. & Frisch, H. L. *Biopolymers* **21**, 995-997 (1982).
10. Lumpkin, O. J. & Zimm, B. H. *Biopolymers* **21**, 2315-2316 (1982).
11. Peck, L. C. & Wang, J. C. *Nature* **292**, 375-378 (1981).
12. Rhodes, D. & Klug, A. *Nature* **292**, 378-380 (1981).
13. Strauss, F., Gaillard, C. & Prunell, A. *Eur. J. Biochem.* **118**, 215-222 (1981).
14. Levene, S. D., Wu, H. M. & Crothers, D. M. *Biochemistry* (in the press).
15. Selsing, E., Wells, R. D., Alden, C. J. & Arnott, S. *J. biol. Chem.* **254**, 5417-5422 (1979).
16. Wu, H. M. thesis, Yale Univ. (1982).
17. Depew, R. E. & Wang, J. C. *Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **72**, 4275-4279 (1975).
18. Trifonov, E. N. & Sussman, J. L. *Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **77**, 3816-3820 (1980).
19. Trifonov, E. N. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **8**, 4041-4053 (1980).
20. Drew, H. R. *et al. Proc. natn. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **78**, 2179-2183 (1981).
21. Calladine, C. R. *J. molec. Biol.* **161**, 343-352 (1982).
22. Dickerson, R. E. *J. molec. Biol.* **166**, 419-441 (1983).
23. Zhurkin, V. B., Lysov, Y. P. & Ivanov, V. I. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **6**, 1081-1096 (1979).
24. Zhurkin, V. B. *J. biomolec. Struct. Dyn.* **2**, 785-804 (1985).
25. Arnott, S., Chandrasekaran, R., Hall, K. H. & Puigjaner, L. C. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **11**, 4141-4155 (1983).
26. Thomas, G. A. & Peticolas, W. L. *J. Am. chem. Soc.* **105**, 993-996 (1983).
27. Jolles, B., Laigle, A., Chinsky, L. & Turpin, P. Y. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **13**, 2075-2085 (1985).
28. Simpson, R. T. & Kunzler, P. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **6**, 1387-1415 (1979).
29. Kunkel, G. R. & Martinson, H. G. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **9**, 6869-6888 (1981).
30. Edmondson, S. P. & Johnson, W. C. Jr *Biopolymers* **24**, 825-841 (1985).
31. Reynolds, V. L., Molineux, I. J., Kaplan, D. J., Swenson, D. H. & Hurley, L. H. *Biochemistry* **24**, 6228-6237 (1985).