

Supporting Information

DNA Nanostructures for Targeted Antimicrobial Delivery

[Ioanna Mela,*](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2914-9971) [Pedro P. Vallejo-Ramirez, S](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7879-6761)tanislaw Makarchuk, [Graham Christie, D](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7177-9646)avid Bailey, Robert M. Henderson, Hiroshi Sugiyama, [Masayuki Endo, and](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0957-3764) [Clemens F. Kaminski*](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5194-0962)

anie_202002740_sm_miscellaneous_information.pdf

Supporting information

Table of contents

Section 1. Synthesis and characterisation of DNA origami nanostructures

Section 2. Imaging of the nanostructures

- **Section 3. Bacterial strains imaging**
- **Section 4. Bacterial growth curves**
- **Section 5. Binding affinity of DNA nanostructures**
- **Section 6. Cell viability assay**

Section 7. Enzyme activity in the context of targeted delivery through DNA nanostructures

Section 1. Synthesis of DNA origami nanostructures

1.1 Synthesis of DNA origami nanostructures

We used M13mp18 single-stranded DNA as scaffold (New England Biolabs) and complementary oligonucleotides (Integrated DNA Technologies) to synthesise DNA origami nanostructures. 159 complementary oligos, as described by Yoshidome *et al*[1] *.* fully occupy the whole length of the scaffold. The sequences of the oligonucleotides are listed in Table S-1, in a 5' to 3' orientation.

| 5wf-142 16N | TGC GAA TAT AGT AAA TGA ATT TTC TCG TCT TT | 32 |
|--------------|--|-----------------|
| 5wf-143 16OP | TGA GGA AGG AAA GAC AGC ATC GGA CAC GCA TAA CCG ATA TTT TAT CAG CTT GCT TTA AAG GAA T | 64 |
| 5wf-144 17AB | ATA TGC GTT CAA CAG TAG GGC TTA AAG TAA TTC TGT CCA GCA GAA CGC GCC TGT TTA TTC CAA G | 64 |
| 5wf-145 17CD | AAC GGG TAC AAG CCG TTT TTA TTT AAG CAA ATC AGA TAT ACG TTT TAG CGA ACC TCA AGA TTA G | 64 |
| 5wf-146 17EF | TTG CTA TTA CCA ACG CTA ACG AGC ATA AAC AGC CAT ATT AGT TTA ACG TCA AAA ATA CAA AGT T | 64 |
| 5wf-147 17GH | ACC AGA AGC CAA AAG AAC TGG CAT GAC ATT CAA CCG ATT GTC ATT AAA GGT GAA TTA GCG CGT T | 64 |
| 5wf-148 17IJ | TTC ATC GGG CCA TCT TTT CAT AAT GCC TTG ATA TTC ACA AAG CGC AGT CTC TGA ATA GTG CCG T | 64 |
| 5wf-149 17KL | CGA GAG GGA CCG TAC TCA GGA GGT AGA ACC GCC ACC CTC ACC CAA TAG GAA CCC ATA ACT ACA A | 64 |
| 5wf-150 17MN | CGC CTG TAA CGA TCT AAA GTT TTG TGT ATG GGA TTT TGC TAT AGA AAG GAA CAA CTC GAG GTG A | 64 |
| 5wf-151 17OP | ATT TCT TAG ACA ACA ACC ATC GCC ACG AGG GTA GCA ACG GCT TTG AGG ACT AAA GAC TTT TTC A | 64 |
| 5wf-152 18A | AAT AAA CAT TTT AGT ATA AAG CCA ACG CTA TAC AAA TTC TTA _{CC} | 44 |
| 5wf-153 18BC | ATC CGG TAT TTT ACT CAT CGA GAA CAA GTT AAA CCA AGT ACC GCT TTT ACA TGT TCA GCT AAT GAC GAC GAC | 72 |
| 5wf-154 18DE | AAT CCA AAT TTT TTT TAT CCT GAA TCT TTT GCA CCC AGC TAC AAT TTT TTC TAA GAA CGC GAG GGA AGG CTT | 72 |
| 5wf-155 18FG | AAG GTA AAT TTT AAT AAT AAC GGA ATA CGA AAC CGA GGA AAC GCT TTT TAA GAA ACG ATT TTT TTT TAT CCC | 72 |
| 5wf-156 18HI | ATC CTC ATT TTT CCC CTT ATT AGC GTT TCA TTT TCG GTC ATA GCT TTT TAT TGA CGG AAA TTA TAG GGA GGG | 72 |
| 5wf-157 18JK | ACC CTC ATT TTT CCG GAA TAG GTG TAT CTT GAT ATA AGT ATA GCT TTT TAA AGC CAG AAT GGA AAC AAA TAA | 72 |
| 5wf-158 18LM | TTC AAC AGT TTT CCT CAT AGT TAG CGT AGC ATT CCA CAG ACA GCT TTT TTT CAG GGA TAG CAA GGA GCC ACC | $\overline{72}$ |
| 5wf-159 18NO | TAG TTG CGC CGA CAA TAA CAG CTT GAT ACC GAT TTT TTT CAG CGG AGT GAG AAA ACA ACT | 60 |

Table S-1. Sequences of the 159 complementary oligos.

The DNA nanostructures were made by mixing together 2 μL M13mp18 DNA (10 nM), 5μL oligonucleotide mix (each oligo 200 nM), 2 μL origami buffer 10x (20 mM MgCl2, 100 mM Tris-HCl, pH=7.6), and 11 μL deionised MilliQ water. EDTA was omitted from the origami buffer for the whole of this study (normally included at 1mM), so as not to interfere with the bacterial populations. The mixture was annealed from 85 to 25 °C at a rate of −1.0 °C/min. After annealing, excess oligonucleotides were removed using a Micro Biospin column (Bio-Rad) packed with Sephacryl S-300 (GE Healthcare).

1.2 Modifications to the 5-well frames

The following oligonucleotides were modified to carry aptamers that can bind *E.coli* and B.subtilis^[2]. The aptamers sequence is CAT ATC CGC GTC GCT GCG CTC AGA CCC ACC ACC ACG CAC C (in red in the table below).

Table S-2. Sequences of the 14 aptamer-modified oligos.

The following oligonucleotides were functionalised with Alexa 647 molecules.

Table S-3. Sequences of the 4 Alexa 647-modified oligos.

The following oligonucleotides were functionalised to carry biotin:

Table S-4. Sequences of the 10 biotin-modified oligos.

Section 2. Imaging of the nanostructures

2.1 Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)

Origami tiles were diluted ten times in origami buffer and 25 µl of the sample were deposited on freshly cleaved mica and incubated at room temperature for 10 minutes. The samples were then washed 5 times with 1 ml of origami buffer. The nanostructures were imaged in origami buffer, using a Dimension FastScan AFM microscope (Bruker). The probes used were FastScan-D probes (Bruker), with a resonant frequency of 90 kHz, a spring constant of 0.21 Nm^{-1} and a nominal tip radius of 8 nm.

DNA origami tiles were incubated with 0.17 μM Streptavidin (Sigma Aldrich) for 5 minutes at room temperature, after which they were filtered using a Millipore filter (Millipore, MA, USA) unit with molecular weight cut-off (MWCO) of 100 KDa to remove free protein. The tiles were then prepared for AFM imaging as described above.

To load the streptavidin functionalised origami tiles with the antimicrobial enzyme, the tiles were incubated with 1mg/ml biotinylated lysozyme (Chicken Lysozyme protein, Egg whites, GeneTex) for 10 minutes at room temperature after which they were filtered and imaged as above.

Figure S.1. Large field of view (2x2 μm) of DNA origami nanostructures.

2.2 AFM data analysis

Images of all datasets were plane-fitted using the speed-optimised plane correction function of the SPIP software (Image Metrology A/S, Hørsholm, Denmark), which fits each line in the horizontal axis to a polynomial equation. SPIP was also used for calculation of the volumes of proteins attached to the DNA origami tiles. The "inspection window" feature of SPIP was used to zoom into individual tiles and then the "circular area of interest" tool was used to allow the software to calculate only the volume of the protein rather than that of the whole tile, according to the following equation:

$$
Z_{\text{net volume}} = Z_{\text{material volume}} - Z_{\text{void volume}}
$$

where Z_{material volume} is the volume of all pixels inside the shape's contour with a Z value greater than zero:

$$
Z_{\text{material volume}} = \sum_{\{Z(x,y) \in \text{shape}|Z \geq 0\}} Z(x,y) dxdy
$$

where dx and dy are the point spacings in the X and Y directions of the image, respectively. Z_{void} volume is the volume of all pixels inside the shape's contour with a Z value lower than or equal to zero:

$$
Z_{\text{void volume}} = \underset{\{Z(x,y) \in \text{shape} \mid Z \leq 0\}}{\sum} Z(x,y) dxdy
$$

where dx and dy are the point spacing in the X and Y directions of the image, respectively.

For cross-sections of sample features, tile dimensions measurements, as well as for the 3D rendering of the images, Nanoscope 1.9 software (Bruker) was used. Volume histograms were drawn with bin widths chosen according to Scott's equation^[3], using GraphPad Prism.

"Theoretical" molecular volumes of proteins based on molecular mass were calculated using the equation by Schneider et al^[4]:

$$
V=(M_0/N_0)(V_1 + dV_2)
$$

where M₀ is the molecular mass, N₀ is Avogadro's number, V₁ and V₂ are the partial specific volumes of protein and water, respectively, and d is the extent of protein hydration. The partial specific volume of a typical protein (V_1) is considered to be 0.74 cm³g⁻¹, and the extent of protein hydration (d) has been estimated to be 0.4 g of water/g of protein. The partial specific volume of water (V_2) is 1 cm³g⁻¹

2.3 direct Stochastic Optical Reconstruction Microscopy (dSTORM) Fluorescence microscopy experiments

The fluorescence microscopy experiments performed on the origami structures were conducted on a custom-built microscope based on an Olympus (Center Valley, PA) IX-73 frame with a 100x 1.49 NA oil objective lens (Olympus UAPON100XOTIRF) and a 647-nm laser (MPB Communications Inc. VFL-P-300-647-OEM1-B1). The samples were imaged in total internal reflection fluorescence (TIRF) mode and *d*STORM images collected on an Andor iXon Ultra 897 camera as described previously^[5].

dSTORM on origami structures

16000 frames were acquired for the *d*STORM reconstructions, each recorded at 20 ms exposure time using an EM gain of 200 over a 256x256 pixel region. The pixel size in the image plane was measured to be 118 nm. The raw single molecule data sets were reconstructed using ThunderSTORM[6], and visualized as averaged shifted histograms with a magnification factor of 10. The peak-to-peak distance between the fluorophores tethered to the origami structures was measured by taking a cross-sectional profile in Fiji/ImageJ^[7] between two bright spots in different regions of interest in the reconstructed image, and using a custom MATLAB (Natick, MA) script to measure the average distance between two peaks. Representative large fields of view can be seen in Figure S.2

Figure S.2. *d*STORM reconstruction of origami structures labelled with AlexaFluor647 molecules attached to four anchor points. (a) Large FOV image of the *d*STORM reconstruction, with insets to highlight regions of interest containing origami structures. (b) shows a sub-panel from the large FOV image in (a) with 6 regions selected arbitrarily to highlight origami structures. (c) Zoomed-in insets of the origami structures highlighted in (b), with two (2), three (1,6), and four (3,4,5) detected fluorophore locations.

Section 3. Imaging of bacterial populations

3.1 Sample preparation for SIM

Each one of the bacterial strains was grown overnight (OD_{600} of \sim 1 in the case of *E. coli* and \sim 0.6 in the case of *B. subtilis*). Prior to SIM imaging the cultures were spun down and washed three times in origami buffer. The bacteria were then resuspended in 100 μl origami buffer. In the case of *B. subtilis*, the bacterial pellet was resuspended in 100 μl origami buffer containing 1 μg/ml Nile red dye (Sigma-Aldrich, 72485) to enable visualisation of the bacteria. This step was not required for *E. coli,* as the BL21(DE3) *E.coli* cells used in this experiment had been transformed with pUC19GFP plasmid, and express GFP, meaning no additional staining is required for this strain.

Subsequently, 10 μl of bacterial suspension were mixed with 10μl of DNA origami (final concentration \sim 10 nM) and incubated with shaking at room temperature for 15 mins. The bacteria were gently centrifuged and resuspended in origami buffer to remove excess or unbound origami tiles. 2μl of the sample were deposited on a glass coverslip and an agarose pad was positioned over the sample to prevent the bacteria from moving during imaging. Another coverslip was positioned on top to minimise drying of the agarose pads.

3.2 Structured Illumination Microscopy (SIM)

Images of the sample were collected using 3-color SIM for optical sectioning^[8]. A \times 60/1.2 NA water immersion lens (UPLSAPO 60XW, Olympus) focused the structured illumination pattern onto the sample, and the same lens was also used to capture the fluorescence emission light before imaging onto an sCMOS camera (C11440, Hamamatsu). The wavelengths used for excitation were 488 nm (iBEAM-SMART-488, Toptica), 561 nm (OBIS 561, Coherent), and 640 nm (MLD 640, Cobolt). Images were acquired using custom SIM software described previously^[9].

An automated analysis routine for processing SIM images was written in MatLab. In order to quantify the overlap of the DNA origami (in magenta) with the bacterium body (in green), the code defines the percentage of the bacterium surface covered by DNA origami as the ratio between the number of overlapping pixels (pixels where both colours have non-zero intensity values) and the number of all pixels corresponding to single bacterium.

SIM imaging experiments were repeated three times, each time five fields of view were analysed to determine the DNA origami coverage of each of the two bacterial strains, with \sim 825 single bacteria for *E. coli* and ~750 single bacteria for *B. subtilis* analysed in total*.*

Representative large fields of view from where statistical analyses were obtained can be seen in Figures S.3 and S.4. The images in Figure 3 of the manuscript are subsets of those.

Figure S.3. Large field of view (42x42 µm) of E. coli (in green) decorated with DNA origami (in magenta). Overlap of the two colours is shown in white.

Figure S.4 Large field of view (42x42 µm) of B. subtilis (in green) decorated with DNA origami (in magenta). Overlap of the two colours is shown in white.

Section 4. Bacterial growth curves

Bacterial cell culture studies were conducted using *E. coli* BL21(DE3), expressing GFP and *B. subtilis* (BS168). All experiments were conducted in LB medium, supplemented with carbenicillin (100 µg/ml) for *E. coli* and chloramphenicol (25 μg/ml) for *B. subtilis*. Bacterial starter cultures were grown overnight, and the bacteria were then diluted 1:100 into 150µl LB, and grown over 16 hours in a shaking plate reader, at 37°C, with measurements taken every 5 minutes, in the following conditions:

Table S-5. Experimental conditions for *E. coli*

Table S-6. Experimental conditions for *B. subtilis*

The OD values at 600nm were collected and used for the creation of growth curves. For each condition, 9 individual growth curves were analysed and averaged. Individual growth curves were fitted in MATLAB using the curve fitting toolbox, to a re-parameterised Gompertz growth model^[10], to extract growth rates.

DNA origami carrying lysozyme were prepared as described in Section 2.1 and added to the samples where appropriate.

The growth rates for *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* grown in the presence of DNA origami without aptamers are presented in Figure S.5:

Figure S.5: Growth rates of *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* in the presence of DNA origami with and without aptamers.

To further assess the bacterial growth beyond the first eight hours, we plotted the OD values for the bacterial cultures between eight and sixteen hours of growth. No changes were observed, apart from the expected population decline due to the depletion of nutrients in the growth medium and the accumulation of toxic metabolic by-products.

Figure S.6: Averaged growth curves for *B. subtilis* (n=9, left) and *E. coli* (n=9, right) show that the growth plateaus after eight hours of culture and no significant changes are observed beyond that point.

Section 5. Binding affinity of DNA nanostructures

We estimated the apparent dissociation constant K_d of the aptamer-functionalised nanostructures, to better understand their affinity for the bacterial targets and the impact of having many of them locally concentrated into a multivalent complex.

The aptamers used have a dissociation constant *K^d* of 27.2 nM for *E.coli* and 9.97 nM for *B.subtilis* according to Song *et al*^[2]. Recently, Csizmar *et al.*^[11] have used multivalent scaffolds to target tumour cells and have proposed the following equation to quantify the effect of the multiple valency, *N*, in a molecular scaffold, on its apparent affinity:

$$
K=\frac{K_{d,1}}{N^2}
$$

where $K_{d,1}$ is the affinity of a single-target ligand, and $K_{d,N}$ is the apparent affinity of the multipletarget ligand.

Our DNA nanostructure carries 14 aptamers; we thus obtain an apparent $K_{d,N}$ for *E. coli* and *B. subtilis* of 141 pM and 50 pM respectively.

Section 6. Cell viability assay

In order to explore the future potential of the DNA origami nanostructures to be used *in vivo* for selective bacterial targeting, we performed a mammalian cell viability assay. We used the CellTiter 96® AQueous One Solution Cell Proliferation Assay (Promega), to assess the effects of the DNA origami on mammalian cells. COS-7 cells were plated in a 96-well plate at concentration of 10,000 cells/well in 100µl of media (DMEM+10%FBS). 20µl of CellTiter 96® AQueous One Solution Reagent were added per well and the cells were incubated at 37°C for 2 hours in a humidified, 5% CO2 atmosphere. After 2 h, the absorbance at 490nm was measured, using a 96-well plate reader. The measurements were performed in triplicates.

Figure S.7: Mammalian COS-7 cells are not affected by DNA origami

Section 7. Enzyme activity in the context of targeted delivery through DNA nanostructures

One question that is of great interest in the context of enzyme delivery through DNA nanostructures is the way in which the enzymatic activity is affected by binding of the enzyme to the DNA scaffold and how the high local enzyme concentrations afforded by the delivery vehicle affect the activity of the enzyme against its target.

In the case of lysozyme, it is possible that the loading of multiple enzymes on the same delivery platform leads to synergistic action that enhances its antimicrobial activity. Previous work has indeed indicated that the targeted delivery of several lysozyme molecules does increase antimicrobial activity locally. For example, it has been reported that all of Dextran-conjugated $lysozyme^[12]$ and chitosan-lysozyme^[13] and selenium-lysozyme^[14] nanoparticles loaded with increasing amounts of lysozyme increase activity of the enzyme. The activity of lysozyme has also been shown to increase through delivery via "Engineered Water Nanostructures"^[15]. So overall there is plausible evidence that multiple loading sites provide cumulative benefits for antimicrobial applications, which will be explored in future work.

It is also possible that charge effects mediated by the DNA origami platform affect enzyme function. Although there is no available literature on lysozyme / DNA origami effects of this nature, an increased enzymatic activity was observed when other enzymes (i.e. not lysozyme) were coupled to DNA origami. For example, T. Morii's group used DNA origami to assemble ribulose biphosphate carboxylase/oxygenase (RuBisCO). They show that the enzymatic activity is retained upon binding and possibly enhanced^[16]. Similarly, Zhao et al. showed that GOx/HRP enzyme pairs exhibit enhanced catalytic activity when bound to DNA nanocages^[17], while Ora et al. report intact

activity of enzymes bound on DNA origami for delivery to mammalian cells^[18]. Potentially these effects are indeed mediated by the charge of the DNA scaffold.

References

- [1] T. Yoshidome, M. Endo, G. Kashiwazaki, K. Hidaka, T. Bando, H. Sugiyama, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 4654–4660.
- [2] M. Y. Song, D. Nguyen, S. W. Hong, B. C. Kim, *Sci. Rep.* **2017**, *7*, 43641.
- [3] D. W. SCOTT, *Biometrika* **1979**, *66*, 605–610.
- [4] S. W. Schneider, J. Lärmer, R. M. Henderson, H. Oberleithner, *Pflugers Arch. Eur. J. Physiol.* **1998**, DOI 10.1007/s004240050524.
- [5] C. J. Rowlands, F. Ströhl, P. P. V. Ramirez, K. M. Scherer, C. F. Kaminski, *Sci. Rep.* **2018**, *8*, DOI 10.1038/s41598-018-24052-4.
- [6] M. Ovesný, P. Křížek, J. Borkovec, Z. Švindrych, G. M. Hagen, *Bioinformatics* **2014**, *30*, 2389–2390.
- [7] C. T. Rueden, J. Schindelin, M. C. Hiner, B. E. DeZonia, A. E. Walter, E. T. Arena, K. W. Eliceiri, *BMC Bioinformatics* **2017**, *18*, 529.
- [8] F. Ströhl, C. F. Kaminski, *Methods Appl. Fluoresc.* **2015**, *3*, DOI 10.1088/2050- 6120/3/1/014002.
- [9] L. J. Young, F. Ströhl, C. F. Kaminski, *J. Vis. Exp.* **2016**, DOI 10.3791/53988.
- [10] Z. M.H., J. I., R. F.M., van 'T R. K., *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **1990**, *56*, 1875–1881.
- [11] C. M. Csizmar, J. R. Petersburg, T. J. Perry, L. Rozumalski, B. J. Hackel, C. R. Wagner, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2019**, *141*, 251–261.
- [12] J. Lee, I. Kim, S. Yeo, D. Kim, M. Kim, *Prev. Nutr. Food Sci.* **2018**, *23*, 60–69.
- [13] C. N. Hernández-Téllez, F. J. Rodríguez-Córdova, E. C. Rosas-Burgos, M. O. Cortez-Rocha, A. Burgos-Hernández, J. Lizardi-Mendoza, W. Torres-Arreola, A. Martínez-Higuera, M. Plascencia-Jatomea, *3 Biotech* **2017**, *7*, 1–13.
- [14] P. A. Tran, T. J. Webster, *Nanotechnology* **2013**, *24*, 155101.
- [15] N. Vaze, G. Pyrgiotakis, L. Mena, R. Baumann, A. Demokritou, M. Ericsson, Y. Zhang, D. Bello, M. Eleftheriadou, P. Demokritou, *Food Control* **2019**, *96*, 365–374.
- [16] H. Dinh, E. Nakata, P. Lin, M. Saimura, H. Ashida, T. Morii, *Bioorganic Med. Chem.* **2019**, *27*, 115120.
- [17] Z. Zhao, J. Fu, S. Dhakal, A. Johnson-Buck, M. Liu, T. Zhang, N. W. Woodbury, Y. Liu, N. G. Walter, H. Yan, *Nat. Commun.* **2016**, *7*, 1–9.
- [18] A. Ora, E. Järvihaavisto, H. Zhang, H. Auvinen, H. A. Santos, M. A. Kostiainen, V. Linko, *Chem. Commun.* **2016**, *52*, 14161–14164.