

Cite this: *Chem. Sci.*, 2022, 13, 10715

All publication charges for this article have been paid for by the Royal Society of Chemistry

## Collective adaptability in a replication network of minimal nucleobase sequences†

Sonia Vela-Gallego,<sup>\*a</sup> Zuly Pardo-Botero,<sup>b</sup> Cristian Moya<sup>a</sup> and Andrés de la Escosura<sup>\*,ac</sup>

A major challenge for understanding the origins of life is to explore how replication networks can engage in an evolutionary process. Herein, we shed light on this problem by implementing a network constituted by two different types of extremely simple biological components: the amino acid cysteine and the canonical nucleobases adenine and thymine, connected through amide bonds to the cysteine amino group and oxidation of its thiol into three possible disulfides. Supramolecular and kinetic analyses revealed that both self- and mutual interactions between such dinucleobase compounds drive their assembly and replication pathways. Those pathways involving sequence complementarity led to enhanced replication rates, suggesting a potential bias for selection. The interplay of synergistic dynamics and competition between replicators was then simulated, under conditions that are not easily accessible with experiments, in an open reactor parametrized and constrained with the unprecedentedly complete experimental kinetic data obtained for our replicative network. Interestingly, the simulations show bistability, as a selective amplification of different species depending on the initial mixture composition. Overall, this network configuration can favor a collective adaptability to changes in the availability of feedstock molecules, with disulfide exchange reactions serving as 'wires' that connect the different individual auto- and cross-catalytic pathways.

Received 29th April 2022  
Accepted 5th August 2022

DOI: 10.1039/d2sc02419e

rsc.li/chemical-science

## Introduction

Research on life's origins constitutes a major multidisciplinary effort to unravel the physicochemical means by which living systems could emerge from non-living matter. Many questions remain open in the field, with implications that are both historical (how and where life originated), synthetic (how life can be synthesized from its basic molecular constituents), and conceptual (what essential features of living organisms allow characterization of their aliveness).<sup>1–5</sup> Systems chemistry is proving to be useful in this respect, as it adopts a holistic view for the study of complex chemical systems, wherein dynamic out-of-equilibrium reaction and self-assembly processes govern the system's emergent behaviors.<sup>6–8</sup> An important line in this area involves the development of chimeric systems that combine the properties of distinct biological building blocks, as

a step towards replication, protometabolic networks and protocellular assemblies.<sup>9–13</sup>

In the endeavour to mimic DNA's capacity for replication or, more generally, the capacity of living cells to self-reproduce, different forms of replication have been developed with both synthetic and biological molecules.<sup>14–18</sup> The literature is rich in processes that display *autocatalysis*, either through the product's catalysis of its own formation,<sup>19</sup> *cyclic autocatalysis*,<sup>20,21</sup> or in oscillatory reactions.<sup>22</sup> Most of these autocatalytic transformations cannot be considered self-replication, since they lack the specificity required for information transfer at the molecular level.<sup>18</sup> In the search for such specificity, *template replication* has been proven with different kinds of biopolymers and oligomers, including DNA,<sup>23,24</sup> RNA,<sup>25,26</sup> and oligopeptides,<sup>27,28</sup> as well as with synthetic molecules not present in extant biology.<sup>29</sup> However, this type of mechanism tends to halt the replication process due to an excessively strong binding (and therefore inhibition) of the template and product molecules, which handicaps efforts to achieve exponential product growth.

*Network autocatalysis* has been proposed as an alternative,<sup>30,31</sup> with both theoretical and experimental models based on lipids,<sup>32,33</sup> peptides,<sup>34,35</sup> nucleic acids,<sup>36</sup> and synthetic molecules.<sup>37</sup> Autocatalysis in these networks is normally associated with self-assembly of the replicating species, most commonly into hybridized strands, fibers, micelles or vesicles, the latter

<sup>a</sup>Department of Organic Chemistry, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Campus de Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain. E-mail: andres.delaescosura@uam.es; sonia.vela@uam.es

<sup>b</sup>IMDEA Nanociencia, C/Faraday 7, 28049 Madrid, Spain

<sup>c</sup>Institute for Advanced Research in Chemistry (IAChem), Cantoblanco, 28049 Madrid, Spain

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available: Procedures for the synthesis and characterization of the network components, additional data, supramolecular studies and in depth discussion of the kinetic model and simulations. See <https://doi.org/10.1039/d2sc02419e>



being relevant to the formation of self-reproducing compartments.<sup>32,38</sup> This type of replication was likely widespread in prebiotic scenarios, but, in order to favour the autonomy, robustness and evolutionary potential of replicator populations, they should have acquired additional capacities.<sup>39</sup> For example, the possibility to perform out of equilibrium<sup>35,40–42</sup> is critical for them to evolve. Acquiring catalytic properties could allow them to establish a supportive metabolism,<sup>43</sup> while compartmentalization would benefit them at the population level, avoiding parasitic reactions and dilution effects.<sup>44</sup> Finally, getting control on variability (through mutations) is a necessary capacity to evolve, with the mutations leading to traits that can be selected

for. This can be achieved, among other possibilities, with nucleobase sequences.<sup>45</sup> In this regard, herein we try to address the questions of how simple can be their constituent monomers, and what is the minimal sequence length that can drive the emergence of replication networks.<sup>23,45,46</sup>

To shed light on those issues, we describe a new family of very simple exponential replicators emerging from monomers that display adenine or thymine (A and T), connected through amide bonds to the amino groups of cysteine (Fig. 1A). The role of the amino acid in these molecules is to link the nucleobases in a sequence, through oxidation of its reactive thiol into dynamic disulfide bonds. Supramolecular studies showed that



**Fig. 1** (A) Set of building blocks and transformations that constitute the reaction network under study. A and T are thiol monomers with a single nucleobase, and therefore lack the potential to self-assemble. Black arrows represent the oxidation of A and T into the disulfide dimers AA, TT and AT, which can occur in a non-catalyzed manner or alternatively *via* auto- and cross-catalysis, provided that they are in sufficient concentration to form 'catalytic' aggregates. Grey arrows represent disulfide exchange reactions. (B) Replication network topology, showing cartoons of all possible auto- and cross-catalytic pathways. The three disulfides can self-aggregate (the aggregates being represented as polymers of the supramolecular dimers), which leads to their autocatalysis, with a higher efficiency for AT due to the presence of complementary nucleobases. AA and TT can also replicate through cross-catalysis based on the complementarity of their nucleobase sequences.



such short nucleobase sequences are still capable of controlling the self-assembly of the three formed species (AA, TT and AT), thus determining their replication efficiency. In-depth kinetic experiments and simulations were used to study how the resulting aggregates affect the irreversible auto- and cross-catalytic oxidation pathways of A and T, and the concomitant reversible disulfide exchange reactions (Fig. 1B). In spite of the low complexity of the studied replicators, both in terms of the monomers structure (much simpler than that of ribonucleotides) and of the sequence length (dimers), complementarity of nucleobases enhances self-assembly and so the replication rate of the corresponding auto- and cross-catalytic pathways (AT and AA/TT, respectively), suggesting an adaptive potential that involves the interplay of different collective and competitive dynamic interactions between them.

## Results and discussion

### Synthesis and self-assembly of the network components

The network building blocks (A and T) and the corresponding disulfide homodimers were synthesized and characterized as described in the (ESI, Scheme S1<sup>†</sup>). <sup>1</sup>H-NMR revealed a slow oxidation into disulfides in DMSO (Fig. S1<sup>†</sup>), halted oxidation in acidic water (Fig. S2, <sup>†</sup> bottom), and fast oxidation in aqueous basic medium (pH 11; see Fig. S2, <sup>†</sup> top). One of the requisites to establish base pairing interactions between adenine and thymine, however, is that they stay non-ionized. In this respect, pH titrations monitored by <sup>1</sup>H-NMR confirmed pK<sub>a</sub> values of

$4.14 \pm 0.02$  for the protonated adenine moiety in AA (Fig. S3A<sup>†</sup>), and of  $9.62 \pm 0.03$  for the dissociation of the thymine imide NH in TT (Fig. S3B<sup>†</sup>). It can be assumed that similar pK<sub>a</sub> values are applicable to AT, which is generated together with the homodimers when the oxidation reaction occurs from a mixture of A and T. On these bases, and considering that a slightly basic pH is optimum for disulfide formation/exchange,<sup>34</sup> all the subsequent self-assembly and replication experiments were run in 50 mM borate buffer at pH 8.2. Under these conditions, atmospheric oxygen is the ultimate oxidant responsible for the transformation of thiol into disulfide derivatives.

The existence of aggregation in such conditions was first demonstrated through diffusion-ordered spectroscopy (DOSY) for samples containing AA, TT or an equimolar mixture of AA/TT at different concentrations (from 0.1 to 4 mM). The diffusion coefficient (*D*) was calculated for all samples, through monitoring of the monoexponential attenuation of NMR signals during a pulsed field gradient experiment, followed by plotting the obtained *D* values *versus* concentration (Fig. 2A–C) to determine the critical aggregation concentration (*cac*). Datasets with two clearly differentiated linear regions were obtained for AA and TT, with the one above the *cac* showing a larger and constant *D* value, indicative of the presence of aggregates. The intersection between the two lines pointed to specific *cac* values of 0.51 and 0.9 mM, respectively. For the AA/TT mixture, a sharp transition between the aggregated and non-aggregated states was obtained. The high values of *D* observed at the low extreme of the concentrations range, in comparison to samples with an



Fig. 2 Supramolecular studies of compounds AA, TT, and an equimolar mixture of AA/TT. (A) Plot of the diffusion coefficient (*D*) obtained by DOSY experiments *versus* the concentration of AA (left), TT (middle) and AA/TT (right). Critical aggregation concentration (*cac*) values were calculated as the intersection of two straight lines in the plots for AA and TT, and through fitting to a Boltzmann-type equation for AA/TT. (B, C) TEM micrographs of AA (left), TT (middle) and AA/TT (right) at two different concentrations: 1 mM (B) and 2 mM (C) in 50 mM borate buffer (pH 8.2).



equivalent concentration of AA or TT, is likely related to the lower absolute concentration of each of the individual components in the mixture (half concentration with respect to the pure samples), which leaves them below their individual cac values. For the mixed assembly, in turn, a cac of 0.47 mM was obtained, by fitting the data with a Boltzmann equation ( $R^2 = 0.9993$ ) to detect the slope changing point (Section 3 in the ESI†). Overall, these supramolecular studies suggest that nucleobase sequence complementarity induces a stronger (as indicated by TEM, see below) and cooperative (as indicated by DOSY) self-assembly.

To assess the morphology of the aggregates, TEM studies were conducted at two different disulfide concentrations: 1 and 2 mM (Fig. 2B and C, respectively). At 1 mM, the low density of objects over the grid indicated minor aggregation of AA and TT, showing spherical assemblies for the former (Fig. 2B left/S5A†), yet they were very exceptional (impossible to be characterized by *dynamic light scattering*, DLS) and may not be representative of the main self-assembly pathway, and isolated fibrils for the latter (Fig. 2B middle/S6A†). Despite their low abundance, the presence of sulfur detected by energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX) confirmed that all mentioned structures were formed by the corresponding disulfide compounds. For the AA/TT mixture, intertwined fiber assemblies were observed over the whole grid (Fig. 2B right/S7A†), in a significantly higher abundance than for AA or TT alone. This points to the importance of complementary nucleobase pairing to induce aggregation in the mixture. At the high concentration, aggregation was much more prominent (Fig. 2C) and resulted in lamellar structures for all cases, probably as a result of the hierarchical assembly of fibers into sheets, which could be enhanced by drying effects during the TEM samples preparation. The distance between adjacent sheets could be clearly determined in areas where the lamellar arrangement was perpendicular with respect to the grid surface, yielding similar values ( $\sim 4$  nm) for AA and TT (Fig. S5B/S6B bottom†). For AA/TT, the stronger aggregation gave rise to thicker stacks of sheets (Fig. 2B right/S7B†) that did not permit estimation of the interlamellar distance. In any case, the formation of different assemblies for the three systems, including fibers and lamellar structures depending on concentration, points to a complex assembly landscape, with contribution from hydrogen bonding interactions, nucleobase  $\pi$ - $\pi$  stacking and hydrophobic effects. The involved self-assembly mechanisms will be examined in-depth in subsequent studies but, since previous work has demonstrated the capacity of fibrillar and sheet assemblies to facilitate replication processes,<sup>34,47</sup> we assume these to be the catalytically active ones also in the present case.

### Replication experiments

The initial replication experiments were performed with only one monomer, either A or T at 4 mM concentration, in a reactor that is open to the air, which allows replenishing oxygen as the oxidant.† The reaction kinetics were monitored through reverse phase high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC, see experimental section and Fig. S8–S11†), coupled to electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (ESI-MS) for identification of

species. For this purpose, aliquots were taken at different reaction times and diluted into 1% aq. TFA, to quench both the thiols oxidation and disulfide exchange processes. Fig. S8/S9† show for instance the gradual decay of monomer and growth of dimer elution peak areas for the non-templated oxidation reactions. Calibration curves were performed for A, T, AA and TT in order to quantify their molar concentrations in each aliquot (Fig. S12–S15†). The kinetic profiles, plotted from the obtained concentrations at different reaction times, showed typical features of autocatalysis for both AA and TT (Fig. 3A and B): an initial slow growth of product (induction period) followed by a phase of faster growth (autocatalysis) until full conversion of monomer into dimer. This effect was not observed in control experiments where the oxidation of non-functionalized cysteine or *N*-acetylcysteine was monitored, for which the consumption of thiol was much slower (only 54% conversion after 500 h), and there was not the exponential acceleration of the reaction characteristic of autocatalysis (Fig. S16†). Importantly, for the nucleobase-containing systems, the change in curve slope was observed at a product concentration that matches its cac value, as determined by DOSY, proving that there is no autocatalysis in the absence of aggregates (*i.e.*, below the cac). To confirm the products' autocatalytic nature, seeded experiments with 30% of AA or TT were conducted, maintaining the total concentration of starting materials in the same range as in the non-templated reactions. In both cases, a shortening of the induction period and an overall decrease in the reaction time was observed (Fig. 3C and D; while Fig. S17A and S17B† shows the direct comparison of seeded and non-seeded experiments), indicating that they actually contribute to increase the reaction rate. This effect was less prominent for TT, probably due to its lower tendency to aggregate (higher cac).


Similar results were obtained when conducting the reactions from a mixture of A and T (2 mM each). Fig. 3E depicts the kinetic profiles obtained from HPLC monitoring over time (Fig. S10†), revealing the characteristic features of replication kinetics for both AA, TT and AT. Experiments seeded with 20% of a previously finished reaction resulted in a shortening of the induction period for the three replicating species (Fig. 3F, S17C and S17D†). However, the scenario becomes significantly more complex when the two nucleobases are present, as disulfide exchange reactions can also occur. To study the role of these exchange processes in the global network kinetics, two different reactions were performed (4 mM T + 2 mM AA and 4 mM A + 2 mM TT) with HPLC monitoring (Fig. S11†). In the obtained kinetic curves, two stages could be distinguished, the first one corresponding to a preminent role of disulfide exchange during the first 7 h of reaction (Fig. 3G and H). After 7 h, the reaction stabilized for a short period and then continued the oxidation of thiol groups into disulfides, until complete consumption of free thiol monomers in the medium.

### Kinetic analyses

The above replication data were used to analyse the contribution of all involved processes in the global network kinetics. Two different reactions were initially considered for the







**Fig. 3** Kinetic profiles corresponding to: (first row) the autocatalytic formation of AA (A), TT (B), and the mixture of possible replicators AA/TT/AT (E); (second row) seeded experiments for the autocatalytic formation of AA (C), TT (D), and AA/TT/AT (F); (third row) disulfide exchange reactions (up to 7 h) between AA and T (G) or TT and A (H). Each panel shows the evolution of all involved species over time through experimental data (square data points) and fit curves (marked as  $[ ]_T$  in the figure legend), while the set of rate equations used for fitting are depicted in Table 1. In the templated reactions (C, D, F), the total concentration of starting materials was maintained in the same range as in the non-templated ones (A, B, E), with minor experimental deviations that are difficult to avoid but are considered in the mathematical analysis. Importantly, the non-seeded experiments were repeated three times, while seeded experiments and disulfide exchange reactions were repeated twice (Fig. S17–S20<sup>†</sup>). The treatment of fitting errors with such repeats is shown in Section 7 of the ESI<sup>†</sup>.

formation of each disulfide homodimer: the non-catalysed (R-A1 and R-T1) and the autocatalytic oxidation (R-A2 and R-T2) of the corresponding monomeric thiol (Table 1, boxes 1 and 2). In the reaction schemes,  $AA_{ag}$  and  $TT_{ag}$  refer to the self-assembled products, which emerge from the aggregation processes R-A3 and R-T3 and are in equilibrium with their constituent disulfide dimers, as it has been revealed by DOSY experiments. For kinetic calculations, hence, the concentration of aggregated replicator is needed at any given time. According to Chen *et al.*,<sup>48</sup> the  $AA_{ag}$  and  $TT_{ag}$  concentrations are given by equation Eq-S1 (Section 6.1 in the ESI<sup>†</sup>), in which the total concentration of aggregating compound ( $C_T$ ) can be expressed as a function of  $C_1$  (the concentration of molecularly dissolved compound),  $\rho$  (a parameter related to the aggregation mechanism) and  $K_{eq}$  (the equilibrium constant of the aggregation process). This equation can become complex to solve, but the problem is approachable considering that when  $C_T$  is below  $1/K_{eq}$ , most molecules are in the monomeric form, whereas molecules aggregate rapidly if  $C_T$  exceeds that value. In Fig. S21,<sup>†</sup> for example, when the analytical solutions of Eq-S1<sup>†</sup> for different values of  $\rho$  are compared to the proposed simplification, the outcome differences are negligible. Consequently, in the kinetic model below, Eq-S1<sup>†</sup> is simplified for all the different aggregation processes assuming that  $1/K_{eq} = cac$  (an assumption that is valid for any possible aggregation

mechanism with  $\rho \leq 1$ , see Fig. S21<sup>†</sup>), the  $cac$  being determined from the point of slope change in the kinetic curves (and compared with that obtained experimentally through DOSY).

Despite calculating the equilibrium constants of the studied dinucleobase compounds, modelling the kinetics of the replication network constituted by AA, TT, AT and their thiol precursors, required addressing the rate equations for all the oxidation and thiol-disulfide exchange processes involved. The mechanistic and kinetic details of thiol oxidations and disulfide exchange are complex, however, as they depend on the employed oxidant, pH, the presence of metallic ion salts, *etc.* While the latter are always first-order on both thiol and disulfide, the former can vary with the conditions and mechanism, usually being first- or even lower-order with respect to the thiol.<sup>49,50</sup> Since the mechanism of auto- and cross-catalysis exerted by the dinucleobase assemblies was not known, equations with different orders with respect to both the monomeric thiols and the disulfide aggregates were initially considered. Although in simpler systems, *i.e.*, with reactions that occur in an isolated parallel fashion, the orders would be determined for each isolated process, the complexity of the network under study does not make plausible to probe the different rate equations individually, not even recommendable for predicting its collective behaviour, as there are at any moment various reactions occurring simultaneously. Instead, there are other



**Table 1** Kinetic analysis of the replication network. Boxes 1 and 2 concern the irreversible reactions (either non-catalyzed or autocatalytic) of oxidation of A and T into AA and TT, respectively, and the equilibrium of aggregation of the latter species, as the resulting aggregates are involved in the autocatalysis. Box 3 includes the four possible disulfide exchange reaction steps. Boxes 4 and 5 refer to the cross-catalysis of AA/TT and the autocatalysis of AT, respectively. In all boxes, the table details each of the involved processes, the equations that govern them and the values of the resulting rate/equilibrium constants. The order of the reactions, with respect to the monomers and the catalytic aggregates, in equations Eq-A2, Eq-T2, Eq-A4, Eq-T4 and Eq-AT2, was determined through fitting of the experimental data into rate equations with different orders (see Tables S1–S3), selecting those that led to the lowest mean absolute percentage errors and  $R^2$  values > 0.99. Dispersion graphs for the different fits (Fig. S22 and S23) helped confirming the selected rate equations

	Reaction		Equation		Constant
Box 1	R-A1	$A + A \rightarrow AA$	Eq-A1	$k_A[A]$	$k_A = 2.22 \times 10^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-A2	$A + A \xrightarrow{AA_{ag}} AA$	Eq-A2	$k_{Ac}[A][AA_{ag}]^2$	$k_{Ac} = 9.68 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mM}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-A3	$AA \rightleftharpoons AA_{ag}$	Eq-A3	$K_{eqAAag} = 1/[AA]_{cac}$	$K_{eqAAag} = 1.9 \text{ mM}^{-1}$
Box 2	R-T1	$T + T \rightarrow TT$	Eq-T1	$k_T[T]$	$k_T = 2.04 \times 10^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-T2	$T + T \xrightarrow{TT_{ag}} TT$	Eq-T2	$k_{Tc}[T][TT_{ag}]^2$	$k_{Tc} = 2.24 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mM}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-T3	$TT \rightleftharpoons TT_{ag}$	Eq-T3	$K_{eqTTag} = 1/[TT]_{cac}$	$K_{eqTTag} = 1.25 \text{ mM}^{-1}$
Box 3	R-E1	$A + TT \rightarrow + AT$	Eq-E1	$k_{e1}[A][TT]$	$k_{e1} = 0.15 \text{ mM}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-E2	$T + AA \rightarrow A + AT$	Eq-E2	$k_{e2}[T][AA]$	$k_{e2} = 0.26 \text{ mM}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-E3	$A + AT \rightarrow T + AA$	Eq-E3	$k_{e3}[A][AT]$	$k_{e3} = 0.13 \text{ mM}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-E4	$T + AT \rightarrow A + TT$	Eq-E4	$k_{e4}[T][AT]$	$k_{e4} = 0.07 \text{ mM}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$
Box 4	R-A4	$A + A \xrightarrow{AATT_{ag}} AA$	Eq-A4	$k_{AATT1}[A][AATT_{ag}]^2$	$k_{AATT1} = 8.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mM}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-2}$
	R-T4	$T + T \xrightarrow{AATT_{ag}} TT$	Eq-T4	$k_{AATT2}[T][AATT_{ag}]^2$	$k_{AATT2} = 8.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ mM}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-2}$
	R-AATT	$AA + TT \rightleftharpoons AATT_{ag}$	Eq-AATT	$K_{eqAATTag} = 1/[AATT]_{cac}$	$K_{eqAATTag} = 2.10 \text{ mM}^{-1}$
Box 5	R-AT1	$A + T \rightarrow AT$	Eq-AT1	$k_{AT}[A]^{0.5}[T]^{0.5}$	$k_{AT} = 1.54 \times 10^{-3} \text{ h}^{-1}$
	R-AT2	$A + T \xrightarrow{AT_{ag}} AT$	Eq-AT2	$k_{ATc}[A]^{0.5}[T]^{0.5}[AT_{ag}]^2$	$k_{ATc} = 0.14 \text{ mM}^{-2} \text{ h}^{-2}$
	R-AT3	$AT \rightleftharpoons AT_{ag}$	Eq-AT3	$K_{eqATag} = 1/[AT]_{cac}$	$K_{eqATag} = 2.07 \text{ mM}^{-1}$

approaches, involving fitting and simulating experimental data globally, which are being applied in systems chemistry for the study of complex autocatalytic networks.<sup>35,37,43,45</sup> In the present case, a method for global kinetic analysis through fitting of the experimental data into different possible rate equations was developed (Sections 6 and 7 in the ESI†). This method is not only based on selecting the lowest mean absolute percentage errors and  $R^2$  values of the corresponding fittings (see Tables S1–S3†), but also on plotting dispersion graphs for the different fits that clearly point to specific rate equations and rule out the others (*i.e.*, panel H in Fig. S22 and S23†). Moreover, it is strongly supported on an experimental basis, having employed data from up to five replication experiments (around 270 data points per dispersion graph) for each of the studied pathways (*i.e.*, the autocatalysis of AA or TT, and the auto- and cross-catalytic amplification of AT and AA/TT, respectively), and enables addressing the complexity of the described replication network and other possible future systems.

That type of analysis was first applied to the case of the single-nucleobase replicators, that is, to the autocatalysis of AA or TT. The different rate equations for non-catalyzed (Eq-A1 and Eq-T1 represent the fittest ones according to the dispersion graphs in Fig. S22 and S23,† respectively) and autocatalytic regimes (Eq-A2 and Eq-T2, selected in the same manner) were defined in a MATLAB program (Table 1, boxes 1 and 2). The equilibrium constants of aggregate formation were considered through equations Eq-A3 and Eq-T3 (see above). The fitting

curves can be seen in Fig. 3A–D (with  $R^2$  above 0.99 in all cases), and correspond to a global order of three for the autocatalytic stage (Eq-A2 and Eq-T2) and two with respect to the aggregated replicator. For a complete statistical treatment of fitting errors, see Section 7 of the ESI.† The fact that the best fittings were obtained for a reaction order of two with respect to the replicating species (therefore higher than one) points to an exponential growth.<sup>34,51</sup> This was confirmed by plotting the reaction rate *versus* the replicator concentration, which shows the characteristic behaviour of exponential replicators (see an example for AA in Fig. S24†), as previously described by von Kiedrowski.<sup>51</sup> The orders obtained in the rate equations Eq-A2 and Eq-T2 actually imply that in the ‘catalytic’ hybrid assemblies of monomeric thiol and disulfide dimer, the required ratio between both for the monomer to get activated towards oxidation is of 1 : 2. Importantly, in this replication model we are assuming that it occurs in a regime where aggregates break due to stirring, like others have shown before,<sup>34,40–42</sup> therefore increasing the number of active sites also in an exponential way. Further studies will be devoted to propose a solid mechanistic scheme of this replication process.

In any case, it is worth mentioning that the kinetic constants for the catalyzed reactions were about one order of magnitude greater than the non-catalyzed ones.‡ The calculated equilibrium constants ( $K_{AAag} = 1.9 \text{ mM}^{-1}$  and  $K_{TTag} = 1.25 \text{ mM}^{-1}$ ), in turn, led to cac values of 0.53 and 0.8 mM, respectively, which



are really close to those obtained from DOSY experiments, confirming the quality of the kinetic fits.

A similar procedure was applied for calculation of disulfide exchange kinetic constants, considering four possible reactions/equations (R-E1 to R-E4/Eq-E1 to Eq-E4 – Table 1, box 3; fitting curves in Fig. 3G and H). Importantly, the observed rates for disulfide exchange are about one order of magnitude slower than expected (they usually take place in the range from seconds to minutes).<sup>49</sup> This fact can be attributed to the effect of aggregation, which reduces the amount of available disulfide for the reaction to take place. The constants resulting upon fitting ( $k_{e1}$ ,  $k_{e2}$ ,  $k_{e3}$ ,  $k_{e4}$ ) are one order of magnitude larger than those for the autocatalytic oxidation of monomeric thiols, which makes their reaction rates comparable.

Concerning the analysis of replication from mixtures of both nucleobase monomers, the landscape of non-covalent assembly pathways is more complex than for single replicators. In addition to the self-assembly of AA and TT, two other aggregate types must be considered, resulting from either the complementary interaction between AA and TT (AATT<sub>ag</sub>) or from self-pairing of AT (*i.e.*, AT<sub>ag</sub>). The different aggregation of AT<sub>ag</sub>, with respect to AA<sub>ag</sub>, TT<sub>g</sub> or AATT<sub>ag</sub>, is supported by previous findings for related nucleopeptide replicators, which show that homodinucleobase motifs behave differently as a minimal unit for recognition and replication, compared to heterodinucleobase ones.<sup>45</sup> Consequently, these aggregates open the possibility to have auto- and cross-catalytic reactions, as AATT<sub>ag</sub> can aid in reactions producing AA and TT (R-A4 and R-T4, respectively – Table 1, box 4), and AT<sub>ag</sub> can assist in its own formation (R-AT2 – Table 1, box 5). For mathematical fitting of these processes (Fig. 3E and F), all constants concerning the non-catalyzed and autocatalytic formation of TT and AA, the disulfide exchange reactions, the aggregation constants of AA and TT and the order of those reactions with respect to aggregates in the autocatalytic regime were fixed as previously calculated. An additional requirement for the fitting was to assume that the two kinetic constants involved in the cross-catalysis of AA and TT ( $K_{AATT1}$  and  $K_{AATT2}$ ) must be identical.

This global analysis of the network kinetics revealed interesting aspects of its behaviour. While the uncatalyzed oxidation reactions have very similar values for the three possible disulfides, the auto- and cross-catalytic reactions were  $\sim 4\text{--}5\times$  faster when there is complementarity between nucleobase sequences (*i.e.* for AT and AA/TT) than when there is not (*i.e.*, for AA or TT). Indeed, according to the calculated  $K_{eq}$  values for the aggregation of both AATT<sub>ag</sub> and AT<sub>ag</sub> ( $\sim 2.1\text{ mM}^{-1}$ ), their  $K_{cat}$  would correspond to 0.47 mM (total concentration of disulfides), in agreement with the DOSY data. These minimal nucleobase sequences therefore seem to enhance their replication through complementary base pairing.

### Interplay between synergistic/self-replication pathways

A complete kinetic assessment like the one presented herein, involving all the processes within a complex replication network with up to 4 different interconnected auto- and cross-catalytic pathways, is unprecedented in systems chemistry, and shall

be crucial to predict the collective behaviour of this type of complex systems.<sup>52</sup> For this purpose, it was decided to run model simulations, parametrized and constrained by the obtained experimental data, allowing to explore biological concepts (*e.g.*, global adaptability, bistability, *etc.*) in conditions that are not easily accessible from an experimental point of view, which will be helpful to design new out-of-equilibrium experiments in future works. According to the above kinetic analysis, the network topology presents two dominant competing pathways: the autocatalytic replication of AT (Fig. 1B, top cycle); and the synergistic assembly of AA/TT, which results in cross-catalysis towards their common formation (Fig. 1B, bottom cycle). In a closed reactor, fast disulfide exchange contributes to balance both pathways, leading to a statistical mixture of the three replicating species (see Fig. 3E and F). In contrast, in an open reactor, the asymmetry between both competing pathways (see Table 1, kinetic constants in boxes 4 and 5), together with their possible interconversion through exchange reactions (Table 1, box 3), may lead to adaptive behaviors.<sup>53</sup> To predict the evolutionary potential of this network topology in open environments, a continuous perfect mixing reactor (Section 6 in the ESI†) was modelled using the previously determined kinetic data. In the studied configuration, the 20 mL reactor could be initially loaded with any possible combination of the three species and continuously fed with monomers A and T (4 mM) through two different input streams of  $1\ \mu\text{L min}^{-1}$ , while maintaining a constant reactor volume through the extraction of an equivalent output current. At these conditions the residence time of the replicating species in the reactor is 170 h, which ensures that a stationary state is reached and that they are not washed away by the continuous flow. Another advantage that this *in silico* reactor offered was the possibility to artificially freeze disulfide exchange reactions by drastically reducing their kinetic constants, allowing to assess the importance of disulfide exchange in the network collective dynamics (see below).

When starting from an empty reactor ( $[\text{replicators}]_0 = 0$ ), the system evolved as expected into a steady state dominated by AT (SS<sub>AT</sub>), where  $[\text{AT}] = 1.61\text{ mM}$  and  $[\text{AA/TT}] = 0.32\text{ mM}$ , the latter meaning total disulfide concentration (Fig. 4A, lightest colour curves). A significant decrease in the time needed to reach SS<sub>AT</sub> was observed when loading the reactor with increasing initial AT concentrations (Fig. 4A). SS<sub>AT</sub> was also obtained when the reactor was filled with AA/TT below a threshold concentration (see below). When  $[\text{AA/TT}]_0$  was above that threshold, however, a new steady state appeared (SS<sub>AA/TT</sub>) where AA/TT were the dominant species ( $[\text{AA/TT}] = 1.63\text{ mM}$ ) and AT decreased in concentration ( $[\text{AT}] = 0.31\text{ mM}$ ) (Fig. 4B and S25†). A range of initial proportions of AA, TT and AT, and of total initial disulfide concentration (from 0 to 4 mM), was then tested to determine which steady state would be reached in each case. The result was a 3D surface (Fig. 4C), built from data points for which the resulting steady state changes, marking the boundary between initial conditions that favour SS<sub>AT</sub> (below the surface) or SS<sub>AA/TT</sub> (above the surface). In the graph, three main regions can be distinguished. First, AT always gets amplified far below a total initial concentration of 1.2 mM, and when the initial AT






Fig. 4 Simulations of the network evolution when fed with two input streams ( $Q_{in} = 1 \mu\text{L min}^{-1}$ ) of A and T, in the presence of replicator AT (0–2 mM) (A) or AA/TT (0–2 mM) (B). (C) 3D surface representing the reached steady state ( $SS_{AT}$  below the surface;  $SS_{AA/TT}$  above) for a range of initial replicator proportions (horizontal axes on the graph) and total replicator concentrations (CT, vertical axis). The surface marks the boundary between initial conditions that favour  $SS_{AT}$  (below the surface) or  $SS_{AA/TT}$  (above). (D, E) Simulations of the network evolution when decreasing the exchange constants by six orders of magnitude, with the same input streams and conditions as in (A) and (B).

proportion is greater than 0.7. The amplification of AA/TT occurs, on the other hand, in points far above the surface, at total concentrations higher than 1.4 mM and initial proportions of AT under 0.6. Finally, in the middle region, close to the surface, small changes in the initial total concentration or in the ratios of the replicating sequences produce jumps from one steady state to another, which suggests a high network adaptability.

The capacity of a dynamic system to reach two different steady states depending on the initial conditions is called bistability, and in the present case it seems to be related to their possible interconversion through disulfide exchange. To test this possibility, the network behaviour was simulated in a hypothetical scenario where the exchange reactions were kinetically frozen, artificially reducing the values of their kinetic constants by six orders of magnitude compared to the experimental data (see Table S4<sup>†</sup>). In that situation, the dominant species in the reached steady state is AA/TT, unless the concentration of AT is initially much higher than that of the other sequences (Fig. 4D and E). In addition, the concentration of the ‘losing’ replicative system drops almost to extinction. The reason for this is that, in the absence of exchange reactions, the

dominant catalytic species gets amplified sufficiently quickly to consume all the substrates fed into the reactor. This simulation thus proves the importance of disulfide exchange as wiring reactions that connect the different auto- and cross-catalytic pathways, endowing the whole replication network with a collectively better adaptive potential, as it can switch from one replicator to the other if the conditions are favourable.

## Conclusions

The results of this work underscore the likelihood of replication networks emerging in conditions and from building blocks with reasonable prebiotic plausibility. The replicating species are built from the amino acid cysteine<sup>¶</sup> and two canonical nucleobases, which have been reported in Miller-type experiments,<sup>54</sup> Strecker-derived chemistry<sup>55</sup> and HCN/cyanoacetylene oligomerization reactions.<sup>56</sup> Although for practical reasons our synthesis of A and T was performed following standard organic synthesis techniques, the chemistry of amide and disulfide bond formation/exchange has been extensively studied in prebiotic contexts.<sup>2</sup> More importantly, the molecular complexity of the replicators AA, TT and AT is significantly less than that of





other different replicator families reported to date, suggesting that the structural requirements for chemical evolution to step into replicating species was probably not so high. The present cysteine-based derivatives do not need an oligopeptide or lipid chain to drive their self-assembly and replication processes. On the other hand, the smallest nucleic acid template replicators previously described required a minimum sequence of 6 nucleotides.<sup>15</sup> Importantly, the self-assembly of AA, TT and AT is likely promoted by a combination of H-bond interactions between nucleobases,  $\pi$ - $\pi$  stacking and hydrophobic effects. Building on such supramolecular capacities, the network described herein presents a collective behaviour that can provide significant adaptability between the individual synergistic and 'selfish' replication pathways, aided by exchange reactions that allow interconversion between the different replicating species.

## Data availability

All data are available in the manuscript and in the ESI.† The raw data directly saved from the instruments and simulations of this study are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request.

## Author contributions

S. V. G. performed the experiments, Z. P. B. contributed to the DOSY analyses, C. M. contributed to the computational kinetic analyses, A. d. I. E. conceived the project, S. V. G. and A. d. I. E. designed and analysed the experiments, and wrote and edited the manuscript.

## Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no competing interests.

## Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the H2020 FET-Open (A. d. I. E. and G. A.; CLASSY project, Grant Agreement No 862081) and the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (A. d. I. E.; MINECO: CTQ-2017-89539-P, PID2020-119306GB-I00 and EUIN2017-87022). We would like to acknowledge Dr Ana Pizarro for her advice in the NMR determination of the nucleobase  $pK_a$  values in compounds AA and TT, and Dr Francisco Tato for initial tests on HPLC separations. The professional editing service NB Revisions was used for technical preparation of the text prior to submission.

## Notes and references

‡ Considering the solubility of oxygen at rt ( $8 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ), a concentration of  $0.25 \text{ mM}$  is assumed. However, the oxidation reaction is slow, and the reactor is open to the air, which allows dissolving more oxygen while the reaction keeps progressing.

§ All the kinetic constants obtained with this model are apparent constants, as they involve the oxygen concentration in solution.

¶ It must be noticed that the prebiotic formation of cysteine probably occurred rather late in chemical evolution.

- 1 L. Cronin and S. I. Walker, *Science*, 2016, **352**, 1174.
- 2 K. Ruiz-Mirazo, C. Briones and A. de la Escosura, *Chem. Rev.*, 2014, **114**, 285.
- 3 J. W. Szostak, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2017, **56**, 11037.
- 4 J. D. Sutherland, *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 2017, **1**, 0012.
- 5 R. Krishnamurthy and N. V. Hud, *Chem. Rev.*, 2020, **120**, 4613.
- 6 G. Ashkenasy, T. M. Hermans, S. Otto and A. F. Taylor, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**, 2543.
- 7 Y. Ura, J. M. Beierle, L. J. Leman, L. E. Orgel and M. R. Ghadiri, *Science*, 2009, **325**, 73.
- 8 D. Carbajo, Y. Pérez, J. Bujons and I. Alfonso, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2020, **59**, 17202.
- 9 S. Mann, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **45**, 2131.
- 10 C. Gibard, S. Bhowmik, M. Karki, E. K. Kim and R. Krishnamurthy, *Nat. Chem.*, 2018, **10**, 212.
- 11 C. Bonfio, E. Godino, M. Corsini, F. Fabrizi de Biani, G. Guella and S. S. Mansy, *Nat. Catal.*, 2018, **1**, 616.
- 12 S. Morales-Reina, C. Giri, M. Leclercq, S. Vela-Gallego, I. de la Torre, J. R. Castón, M. Surin and A. de la Escosura, *Chem.-Eur. J.*, 2020, **26**, 1082.
- 13 M. Frenkel-Pinter, J. W. Haynes, A. M. Mohyeldin, M. C. A. B. Sargon, A. S. Petrov, R. Krishnamurthy, N. V. Hud, L. D. Williams and L. J. Leman, *Nat. Commun.*, 2020, **11**, 3137.
- 14 N. Paul and G. F. Joyce, *Curr. Open Chem. Biol.*, 2004, **8**, 634.
- 15 V. Patzke and G. v. Kiedrowski, *Arkivoc*, 2007, **2007**, 293.
- 16 A. J. Bissette and S. P. Fletcher, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2013, **52**, 12800.
- 17 T. Kosikova and D. Philp, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2017, **46**, 7274.
- 18 P. Adamski, M. Eleveld, A. Sood, Á. Kun, A. Szilágyi, T. Czárán, E. Szathmáry and S. Otto, *Nat. Rev. Chem.*, 2020, **4**, 386.
- 19 K. Soai, T. Shibata, H. Morioka and K. Choji, *Nature*, 1995, **378**, 767.
- 20 R. Breslow, *Tetrahedron Lett.*, 1959, **1**, 22.
- 21 J. E. Hein and D. G. Blackmond, *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 2012, **45**, 2045.
- 22 I. R. Epstein and K. Showalter, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1996, **100**, 13132.
- 23 G. von Kiedrowski, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 1986, **25**, 932.
- 24 M. Kreysing, L. Keil, S. Lanzmich and D. Braun, *Nat. Chem.*, 2015, **7**, 203.
- 25 E. J. Hayden and N. Lehman, *Chem. Biol.*, 2006, **13**, 909.
- 26 T. A. Lincoln and G. F. Joyce, *Science*, 2009, **323**, 1229.
- 27 D. H. Lee, J. R. Granja, J. A. Martinez, K. Severin and M. R. Ghadiri, *Nature*, 1996, **382**, 525.
- 28 R. Mukherjee, R. Cohen-Luria, N. Wagner and G. Ashkenasy, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2015, **54**, 12452.
- 29 T. Tjivikua, P. Ballester and J. Rebek, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1990, **112**, 1249.
- 30 S. A. Kauffman, *J. Theor. Biol.*, 1986, **119**, 1.
- 31 V. Vasas, C. Fernando, M. Santos, S. Kauffman and E. Szathmáry, *Biol. Direct*, 2012, **7**, 1.
- 32 D. Segré, D. Ben-Eli, D. W. Deamer and D. Lancet, *Orig. Life Evol. Biosph.*, 2001, **31**, 119.



- 33 I. Colomer, A. Borissov and S. P. Fletcher, *Nat. Commun.*, 2020, **11**, 176.
- 34 M. Colomb-Delsuc, E. Mattia, J. W. Sadownik and S. Otto, *Nat. Commun.*, 2015, **6**, 7427.
- 35 I. Maity, N. Wagner, R. Mukherjee, D. Dev, E. Peacock-Lopez, R. Cohen-Luria and G. Ashkenasy, *Nat. Commun.*, 2019, **10**, 4636.
- 36 S. Arsène, S. Ameta, N. Lehman, A. D. Griffiths and P. Nghe, *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 2018, **46**, 9660.
- 37 S. N. Semenov, L. J. Kraft, A. Ainla, M. Zhao, M. Baghbanzadeh, V. E. Campbell, K. Kang, J. M. Fox and G. M. Whitesides, *Nature*, 2016, **537**, 656.
- 38 P. Walde, R. Wick, M. Fresta, A. Mangone and P. L. Luisi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 1994, **116**, 11649.
- 39 K. Ruiz-Mirazo, C. Briones and A. de la Escosura, *Open Biol.*, 2017, **7**, 170050.
- 40 B. Liu, J. Wu, M. Geerts, O. Markovitch, C. G. Pappas, K. Liu and S. Otto, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2022, e202117605, early access.
- 41 G. Monreal Santiago, K. Liu, W. R. Browne and S. Otto, *Nat. Chem.*, 2020, **12**, 603.
- 42 S. Yang, G. Schaeffer, E. Mattia, O. Markovitch, K. Liu, A. S. Hussain, J. Ottelé, A. Sood and S. Otto, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2021, **60**, 11344.
- 43 X. Miao, A. Paikar, B. Lerner, Y. Diskin-Posner, G. Shmul and S. N. Semenov, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2021, **60**, 20366.
- 44 S. Matsumura, Á. Kun, M. Ryckelynck, F. Coldren, A. Szilágyi, F. Jossinet, C. Rick, P. Nghe, E. Szathmáry and A. D. Griffiths, *Science*, 2016, **354**, 1293.
- 45 A. K. Bandela, N. Wagner, H. Sadihov, S. Morales-Reina, A. Chotera-Ouda, K. Basu, R. Cohen-Luria, A. de la Escosura and G. Ashkenasy, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2021, **118**, e2015285118.
- 46 B. Liu, C. G. Pappas, J. Ottele, G. Schaeffer, C. Jurissek, P. F. Pieters, M. Altay, N. Maric, M. C. A. Stuart and S. Otto, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2020, **142**, 4184.
- 47 B. Rubinov, N. Wagner, M. Matmor, O. Regev, N. Ashkenasy and G. Ashkenasy, *ACS Nano*, 2012, **6**, 7893.
- 48 Z. Chen, A. Lohr, C. R. Saha-Möller and F. Würthner, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2009, **38**, 564.
- 49 M. Trujillo, B. Alvarez and R. Radi, *Free Radic. Res.*, 2016, **50**, 150.
- 50 P. Nagy, *Antioxid. Redox Signaling*, 2013, **18**, 1623.
- 51 G. von Kiedrowski, in *Minimal Replicator Theory I: Parabolic Versus Exponential Growth*, 1993.
- 52 N. Lauber, C. Flamm and K. Ruiz-Mirazo, *BioEssays*, 2021, **43**, 2100103.
- 53 N. Wagner and G. Ashkenasy, *Nat. Chem.*, 2019, **11**, 681.
- 54 E. T. Parker, H. J. Cleaves, J. P. Dworkin, D. P. Glavin, M. Callahan, A. Aubrey, A. Lazcano and J. L. Bada, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 2011, **108**, 5526.
- 55 C. S. Foden, S. Islam, C. Fernández-García, L. Maugeri, T. D. Sheppard and M. W. Powner, *Science*, 2020, **370**, 865.
- 56 S. Islam and M. W. Powner, *Chem*, 2017, **2**, 470.

