

Supporting Information

Revisiting the Hole Size in Double Helical DNA with Localized Orbital Scaling Corrections

Ye Jin,^{†,§} Xuyan Ru,^{†,§} Neil Qiang Su,[†] Yuncai Mei,[†] David N. Beratan,^{*,†,‡,¶}
Peng Zhang,^{*,†} and Weitao Yang^{*,†}

[†]*Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27708, United States*

[‡]*Department of Biochemistry, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27710, United States*

[¶]*Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27705, United States*

[§]*Contributed equally to this work*

E-mail: david.beratan@duke.edu; peng.zhang@duke.edu; weitao.yang@duke.edu

S1. Redox potential change and the charge delocalization

The hole delocalization in poly(G) DNA was examined by Voityuk using the computed charge distribution.¹ In this section, we show that the redox potential change is equivalent to the hole charge distribution. For a complex consisting of n base pairs, the redox potential change is defined as the redox potential energy difference between complexes with n and $n - 1$ base pairs.

We consider a 2-site model consisting of two fragments 1 and 2. In diabatic states φ_1 and φ_2 (assumed to be orthonormalized), the positive charge (hole) is localized on sites 1 and 2, respectively. The state energies ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 correspond to oxidation potentials ($F = 1eV \cdot V^{-1}$) of these sites, and the electronic coupling V measures the electronic interaction between these two states. The adiabatic states ψ_1 and ψ_2 are obtained by diagonalizing the 2-state hamiltonian with associated state energy ε_1 and ε_2 (see S1). The energy of the ground state (ψ_1) represents the oxidation potential of the whole two-site system.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 & V \\ V & \epsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{Diag}} \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{S1})$$

According to Voityuk,¹ the charge delocalization can be characterized by the charge difference $\Delta q = q_2 - q_1$. A charge localization is indicated by $|\Delta q| = 1$, and $\Delta q = 0$ indicates that the charge is uniformly delocalized. The difference of charge is determined by the electronic coupling V and the oxidation potential difference $\Delta\epsilon = \epsilon_2 - \epsilon_1$,

$$\Delta q = \frac{\Delta\epsilon}{\sqrt{\Delta\epsilon^2 + 4V^2}}. \quad (\text{S2})$$

Here the oxidation potential difference includes contributions from the differences in ionization energies, internal reorganization energies and interactions with solvent environments. For simplicity, we rescale ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 to zero and $\Delta\epsilon$ ($\Delta\epsilon \geq 0$). Therefore, the adiabatic state energy ε_1 , also as the oxidation potential of the whole system E_{oxi} , can be written as

$$E_{oxi} = \frac{1}{2}(\Delta\epsilon - \sqrt{\Delta\epsilon^2 + 4V^2}) \quad (\text{S3})$$

It can be shown by mathematical manipulations (Taylor expansion) that, for a given electronic coupling V , both $|\Delta q|$ and E_{oxi} decrease as $\Delta\epsilon$ decreases, indicating that the redox potential change is equivalent to the hole charge distribution. Thus, for a dimer complex, a lower redox potential of the complex corresponds to a more delocalized charge distribution. For n -site systems ($n > 2$), these arguments are valid, albeit there is no simple general mathematical expression (except some special cases).

References

- (1) Voityuk, A. A. Are radical cation states delocalized over GG and GGG hole traps in DNA? *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2005**, *109*, 10793–10796.