Toxicity analysis of 33′44′5-pentachloro biphenyl through chemical reactivity and selectivity profiles
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Global reactivity profiles like electronegativity, hardness, polarizability, electrophilicity index and local selectivity profiles like condensed Fukui function and regional electrophilic power of 33′44′5-pentachloro biphenyl have been calculated using B3LYP/6-31G* including both Hartree–Fock and density functional theory-based exchange functionals in both gas and solution phases in order to gain insights into the toxic nature of this compound. Both global and local electrophilicity have been found to be adequate in explaining respectively the overall toxicity of the selected system and the most probable sites of toxicity, viz. Cl29, C10 and H14. Planarity and electron affinity are the possible criteria for determining the toxic nature of this biphenyl.

TOXICITY of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) has seen an upsurge of interest in recent years. These compounds exhibit toxicity similar to that of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxin (PCDD). This information on PCB has prompted several investigators to understand the toxic nature of PCBs and their interaction with cellular components. The origin of toxicity of PCDDs has been attributed to the electron accepting nature in charge transfer complex with a receptor in living cells. Hence electron affinity of PCBs is used as an important quantity in understanding their toxic effects. Recently, Arulmozhiraja et al. have made an analysis on structure, potential energy and torsional barrier heights for selected polychlorinated biphenyls. Rotational energy barrier, electron affinity and planarity of various PCBs have been calculated in that study to rationalize the non-toxic nature of ortho-substituted PCBs. Rotational energy barriers of biphenyls (BP) and substituted biphenyls have been calculated using B3LYP/6-311+G* calculations by Grein. There are similar calculations on torsional barrier of BP and PCB using various theoretical calculations ranging from semi-empirical AM1 to conventional Hartree–Fock methods. It is evident from the calculations that the toxicity arises mainly from the electron affinity and inherent nature of the planar geometry of the biphenyls and substituted biphenyls. It is well known in gas phase that BP is twisted (torsional angle between two phenyl rings) with twist angle of about 45°. This twist in BP is usually explained as arising from competition between the repulsion of the ortho hydrogens favouring 90° twists (torsional angle φ) and the electron delocalization effect preferring a coplanar arrangement. In chlorinated BPs, this balance in interactions is still perturbed by the chlorine atoms, which influences the geometrical parameters of BPs, specifically the torsional angle between the phenyl rings. It is evident from the previous theoretical studies that torsional angle is not influenced by the chlorine substituents at the para and meta positions. However, torsional angle between two phenyl rings with ortho substitution is nearly 90°. In real life systems, PCBs are known to interact with the cellular components and hence addition and removal of electron during the formation of the complex are very significant events. The electron acceptance as well as electron removal to PCBs lead to changes in the torsional angle φ of PCBs and hence their geometry.

Popular qualitative chemical concepts like electronegativity and hardness have been widely used in understanding various aspects of chemical reactivity. Rigorous theoretical basis for these concepts has been provided by density functional theory. These reactivity indices are better appreciated in terms of the associated electronic structure principles such as electronegativity equalization principle, hard–soft acid base (HASB) principle, maximum hardness principle (MHP), minimum polarizability principle (MPP), etc. Local reactivity descriptors like density, Fukui function, local softness, etc. have been used successfully in the studies of site selectivity in a molecule. It is reported in the earlier study that the rotational freedom of PCBs allows it to orient with any torsional angle in the protein field and provides the pathway for easy interaction with receptors in living cells and hence their toxicity. In this investigation, an attempt has been made to examine how various chemical reactivity and selectivity indices and their associated electronic structure principles manifest themselves when PCBs rotate in the realistic environment so that a proper descriptor can be selected to define toxicity of various compounds.
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Theoretical background

The chemical hardness (η) has been shown to be a useful global index of reactivity in atoms, molecules and clusters. The theoretical definition of chemical hardness has been provided by the density functional theory as the second derivative of electronic energy with respect to the number of electrons N, for a constant external potential V(r).

\[
\eta = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial N^2} \right)_{V(r)} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial N} \right)_{V(r)}. \tag{1}
\]

The corresponding global softness is expressed as

\[
S = \frac{1}{2\eta} = \left( \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial E^2} \right)_{V(r)} = \left( \frac{\partial N}{\partial \mu} \right)_{V(r)}. \tag{2}
\]

Using the finite difference method and Koopmans’ theorem, working equation for the calculation of chemical hardness has been given by

\[
\eta = \frac{IP - EA}{2}, \tag{3}
\]

where IP and EA are ionization potential and electron affinity of the atom or molecule. If \( \varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}} \) and \( \varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}} \) are the energies of highest occupied and lowest unoccupied molecular orbitals respectively, then the above equation can be rewritten as

\[
\eta = \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{LUMO}} - \varepsilon_{\text{HOMO}}}{2}. \tag{4}
\]

Based on the inverse relationship, a minimum polarizability principle has been proposed as a companion to MHP. The site selectivity of a chemical system cannot, however, be studied using the global descriptors of reactivity. For this, appropriate local descriptors of selectivity need be defined. An appropriate definition of local softness \( s(r) \) is given by

\[
s(r) = \left( \frac{\partial \mu(r)}{\partial \mu} \right)_{V(r)}, \tag{5}
\]

such that

\[
s(r) dr = S. \tag{6}
\]

Combining eqs (5) and (6),

\[
s(r) = \left( \frac{\partial \mu(r)}{\partial N} \right)_{V(r)} \left( \frac{\partial N}{\partial \mu} \right)_{V(r)} = \left( \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \mu} \right)_{V(r)} S = f(r) S, \tag{7}
\]

where \( f(r) \) is termed as the Fukui function (FF). To describe the reactivity of an atom in a molecule, it is necessary to condense the values of \( f(r) \) around each atomic site into a single value \( f_k \) that characterizes the atomic contribution in a molecule. For an atom \( k \) in a molecule, the \( f_k \) values are defined as

\[
f_k^+ = q_k(N+1) - q_k(N) \quad \text{for nucleophilic attack}, \tag{8a}
\]

\[
f_k^- = q_k(N) - q_k(N-1) \quad \text{for electrophilic attack}, \tag{8b}
\]

\[
f_k^o = \left| q_k(N+1) - q_k(N-1) \right|/2 \quad \text{for radical attack}, \tag{8c}
\]

where \( q_k \) is the gross electronic population of atom \( k \) in the molecule. Parr and Yang have proposed that larger FF values indicate more reactivity. Hence greater the value of the condensed FF, more reactive is the particular atomic center in the molecule.

Local softness contains the same information as the Fukui function \( f(r) \) plus additional information about the total molecular softness, which is related to the global reactivity with respect to a reaction partner, as stated in HSAB principle,

\[
s_k = f_k S, \tag{9}
\]

for a nucleophilic attack, and

\[
s_k = f_k S \tag{10}
\]

for an electrophilic attack.

Roy et al. have suggested that relative local electrophilicity \( s_k^o/S_k \) which is the electrophilicity of any site as compared to its own nucleophilicity provides a reliable trend of the reactivity of a particular site. Parr et al. have introduced another global electrophilicity index \( \omega \) defined as

\[
\omega = \frac{\mu^2}{2\eta}. \tag{11}
\]

According to the definition, \( \omega \) measures the ability of a molecular species to soak up electrons and is used in understanding the reactivity of the human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) nucleocapsid protein p7 (NCp7) when reacted with a variety of electrophilic agents. Similar to this global quantity, local (regional) electrophilic power \( \omega^k \) can be defined as

\[
\omega^k = \frac{\mu^2}{2\eta^k}. \tag{12}
\]

The site which has the maximum value of \( \omega^k \) can be considered as the active site for the electrophilic attack and this site also coincides with the softest site (nucleophilic) in a molecule and hence the most reactive.
Computational details

The geometry of $33^{44}5$-pentachloro biphenyl (PCBP) is optimized by using Becke’s three parameter hybrid density functional, B3LYP/6-31G*, which includes both Hartree–Fock exchange and DFT exchange functionals. Above calculations have been carried out using GAUSSIAN 98 package. The optimized geometries are characterized by harmonic vibrational frequencies, which confirmed that the structure of $33^{44}5$-PCBP is a minimum on the potential energy surface. The relative energy of $33^{44}5$-PCBP is calculated as a function of torsional angle (rotation through the bond $C_4-C_7$). Since the dihedral rotation with $30^\circ$ increments is made in the selected PCB along the pseudo $-C2$ axis, we restricted the rotational range between $-30$ and $210^\circ$ to avoid repetition. To calculate the relative energy, the geometry at various $\phi$ values is optimized at B3LYP/6-31G*. The relative energy is computed as $\Delta E(\phi) = [E(\phi) - E(30)]$ using the total energies of respective optimized conformations. To select proper electronic descriptor based on the density functional theory for the toxicity of $33^{44}5$-PCBP, the various reactivity and selectivity descriptors such as chemical hardness, chemical potential, polarizability, electrophilicity index and the condensed electrophilicity have been calculated for all the rotated conformations. The condensed Fukui function is calculated using the natural population analysis (NPA). We have also calculated the amount of charge transfer between $33^{44}5$-PCBP and various bases, viz. adenine (A), guanine (G), thymine (T), cytosine (C), uracil (U) and DNA base pairs GCWC and ATH by applying the formula:

$$\Delta N = \frac{H_b - H_a}{2(\eta_a + \eta_b)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

We have also calculated the electric dipole polarizability, which is a measure of the linear response of the electron density in the presence of infinitesimal electric field $F$ and represents second order variation in energy

$$\alpha_{ab} = -\frac{\partial^2 E}{\partial F_a \partial F_b} a, b = x, y, z.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14a)

The polarizability $\alpha$ is calculated as the mean value as given in the following equation

$$\langle \alpha \rangle = \frac{1}{3}(\alpha_{xx} + \alpha_{yy} + \alpha_{zz}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (14b)

Further since Hirschfeld population scheme (Stockholder Partitioning Scheme) is known to provide non-negative Fukui function (FF) values, it has also been used to calculate FF values as implemented in the DMOL package employing BLYP/DN method.

Results and discussion

The optimized geometry of $33^{44}5$-PCBP is depicted in Figure 1 along with the atom numbering. The optimized geometrical parameters of the $33^{44}5$-PCBP at the B3LYP/6-31G* level of theory are listed (Table 1). The optimized geometry is in close agreement with that of the
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Figure 1. The optimized geometry of $33^{44}5$-pentachloro biphenyl (PCBP) with the atom numbering.

| $\text{R}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_1))$ | 1.515 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_2))$ | 1.403 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_3))$ | 1.403 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_4))$ | 1.391 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_2, \text{H}_a))$ | 1.081 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_6))$ | 1.403 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_2, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 1.747 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_10, \text{C}_11))$ | 1.403 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_10, \text{C}_12))$ | 1.733 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_11, \text{C}_12))$ | 1.391 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_11, \text{C}_{13}))$ | 1.746 |
| $\text{R}((\text{C}_2, \text{H}_{22}))$ | 1.081 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_1, \text{C}_6))$ | 121.7 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_1, \text{C}_7))$ | 121.2 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_2, \text{C}_6))$ | 121.2 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_2, \text{C}_7))$ | 121.5 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_3, \text{C}_4))$ | 117.1 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{H}_{13}))$ | 121.4 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_3, \text{C}_4))$ | 117.0 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_1, \text{C}_{13}))$ | 121.2 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_5, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 118.0 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_10, \text{C}_5, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 120.7 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_10, \text{C}_{10}, \text{C}_{11}))$ | 117.3 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_10, \text{C}_{10}, \text{C}_{12}))$ | 121.3 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_11, \text{C}_{10}, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 121.3 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_11, \text{C}_{11}, \text{C}_{12}))$ | 121.2 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_11, \text{C}_{11}, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 120.6 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_{11}, \text{Cl}_{13}))$ | 118.0 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_2, \text{C}_{12}, \text{C}_{11}))$ | 121.5 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_1, \text{C}_{11}, \text{H}_{22}))$ | 121.3 |
| $\text{A}((\text{C}_{11}, \text{C}_{12}, \text{H}_{22}))$ | 117.1 |

Table 1. Optimized geometrical parameters of $33^{44}5$-PCBP at B3LYP/6-31G* level (bond distance $R$ (Å) and angle $A$ (deg) with atom numbering at planar orientation.
previous theoretical results\textsuperscript{11} and the small discrepancy in the geometrical parameters may be due to the basis set variation. The relative energy, hardness, chemical potential, polarizability, scaled hardness (\textit{TPSC}^{\textit{1/2}}) and electronegativity\textsuperscript{33-51} optimized at B3LYP/6-31G\textit{\textsuperscript{*}} for the different torsional angle values for the 33'44'5-PCBP are calculated. The relative energy variation for 33'44'5-PCBP with the torsional angle lies between 0 and 9.7 kJ/mol (Figure 2\textit{a}). The minimum energy conformation corresponds to \(\phi = 30^\circ\). This small energy variation can be attributed to the flexibility of PCBP. It has been shown that 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) which is very flexible is a highly toxic molecule\textsuperscript{51}. This gives a strong evidence that 33'44'5-PCBP which is a non-ortho

Figure 2. \textit{a}. The variation of relative energy (kJ/mol), chemical hardness (eV) and scaled hardness (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for 33'44'5-PCBP. \textit{b}. The variation of polarizability and relative energy (kJ/mol) with the torsional angle (degrees) for 33'44'5-PCBP. \textit{c}. The variation of relative energy (kJ/mol), electronegativity (eV) and global electrophilicity index (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for 33'44'5-PCBP. \textit{d}. The variation of local electrophilic power (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for C atoms in 33'44'5-PCBP. \textit{e}. The variation of local electrophilic power (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for H atoms in 33'44'5-PCBP. \textit{f}. The variation of local electrophilic power (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for Cl atoms in 33'44'5-PCBP.
Figure 2. g. The variation of relative local electrophilicity (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for C atoms in 33’44’5’-PCBP. h. The variation of relative local electrophilicity (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for H atoms in 33’44’5’-PCBP. i. The variation of relative local electrophilicity (eV) with the torsional angle (degrees) for Cl atoms in 33’44’5’-PCBP.

Table 2. Calculated density functional descriptors for 33’44’5’-PCBP using BLYP/DN method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torsional angle (degrees)</th>
<th>Hardness*</th>
<th>Chemical potential*</th>
<th>Electrophilicity index*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>–30</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>–4.467</td>
<td>5.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>–4.513</td>
<td>6.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.755</td>
<td>–4.467</td>
<td>5.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>–4.397</td>
<td>4.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.103</td>
<td>–4.390</td>
<td>4.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>–4.397</td>
<td>4.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>–4.467</td>
<td>5.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>–4.513</td>
<td>6.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>–4.467</td>
<td>5.682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*in eV.

substituted PCB must be a toxic molecule. Further, the flexibility and hence, the rotational freedom of PCBs gives greater chances for it to orient with any torsional angle in a protein field and provides ways and means for easy interaction with receptor in living cells which ultimately leads to their higher toxicity. Arulmozhira et al. have made a systematic investigation on this topic by computing structure, potential energy surface and rotational barrier. In the present study we have made detailed analysis on the toxicity of the selected PCB by considering all important DFT based reactivity descriptors including local electrophilic power and relative local electrophilicity index to select proper descriptor to develop quantitative structure activity relationship. Calculations have also been carried out in both gas and solvent media for different rotational conformations of the selected PCB. These calculations provide more clear insights into the toxicity and chemical reactivity profiles of PCBP. Results from a BLYP/DN calculation are presented (Table 2), which mimics the trends provided by calculations using B3LYP method (Figure 2a, c).

The changes in the rotational energy barrier and chemical hardness for 33’44’5’-PCBP are depicted in the same figure (Figure 2a). Previous studies have shown that for equi-chemical potential samples, maximum hardness can be related to stability of the system. It is found that the minimum global hardness values coincide with the two local maxima in the energy profile at (φ= 0° and 180°) indicating the MHP since these seem to be two of the most reactive conformations. Scaled hardness also exhibits similar profile (Figure 2a). The plot of rotational energy barrier and polarizability (Figure 2b) reveals that φ= 180° and 0° are the two structures having high polarizability and hence these conformations are highly reactive. So the MPP also supports the decisive role played by the planarity of the PCBs. Both the MHP and MPP
Table 3. Calculated charge transfer between 33′4′4′5′-PCBP and bases/base pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Torsional angle (degrees)</th>
<th>Adenine</th>
<th>Guanine</th>
<th>Thymine</th>
<th>Cytosine</th>
<th>Uracil</th>
<th>GCWC</th>
<th>ATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-30</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Cl<sub>20</sub> centre has got higher local electrophilic power (\( \mathbf{\alpha} \)) values for all conformation compared to other Cl centres showing it as a pronounced toxic site. Reactivity of C<sub>10</sub> and H<sub>14</sub> centres also shows high \( \mathbf{\alpha} \) values compared to other C, H centres for most of the conformations. The relative local electrophilicity (\( \mathbf{\delta}_{L}^T/\mathbf{\delta}_{L}^C \)) were calculated at C, H and Cl atomic sites for various rotational conformations of PCBP (Figure 2 g–i). The relative local electrophilicity profiles of Cl suggest that Cl<sub>19</sub> centre is more toxic than other Cl centres for all conformations except \( \phi_e = 90^\circ \) for which enhanced reactivity of Cl<sub>20</sub> is observed. C<sub>9</sub> and H<sub>18</sub> centres also describes high \( \mathbf{\delta}_{L}^T/\mathbf{\delta}_{L}^C \) values compared to other C, H centres for all conformations except for \( \phi_e = 90^\circ \) and 210°. In general the comparison of the results from the profiles of local electrophilicity power and relative local electrophilicity indices indicate that site corresponding to maximum (minimum) local electrophilicity does not correspond to the site having maximum (minimum) relative local electrophilicity. However the results from relative local electrophilicity do not alter the trends observed from the local electrophilicity profiles. We have also calculated the amount of charge transfer between 33′4′4′5′-PCBP and various bases, viz. A, G, T, C, U and DNA base pairs GCWC, ATH by using equation 13 (Table 3). A qualitative estimation of the charge transfer in the interaction of the selected PCB and the DNA base/base pairs is obtained from the values of \( \Delta N \). It is known that electron flows from the less electronegative system to more electronegative system and our results (Table 3) clearly shows the electron accepting nature of PCB for all the conformations though the amount of transfer varies for different conformations. We find that planar geometry allows maximum electron transfer for all the considered base and base pairs.

The values of the relative energy, hardness, chemical potential, scaled hardness and electronegativity in solvent phase for different torsional angle values are obtained using polarizable continuum model. The variation of rotational energy with the torsional angle (Figure 3) shows that the minimum energy conformation has shifted to \( \phi_e = 60^\circ \) and relative energy variation is between 0 and 8.83 kJ/mol. We see that the presence of implicit solvent
environment around 33°44°5'=PCBP reduces its maximum relative energy values from 9.7 kJ/mol to 8.83 kJ/mol. Hence this molecule has more toxic potential in the solvent environment. The other global and local profiles are similar to those observed for gas phase calculations.

Summary

The chemical reactivity descriptors analysis and the possible toxicity effects on 33°44°5'-PCBP is analysed by optimizing at B3LYP/6-31G* and the solution effects on the system are also reported. Further Hirshfeld population analysis is performed to get non-negative Fukui function values. 33°44°5'-PCBP has a very small rotational energy barrier, is highly flexible so that it changes its conformation while moving in biological system, interacting readily, exhibiting its toxic characteristics. Solvation technique also provide similar information but for the shift in minimum energy conformation. Semilocal (regional) electrophilic power of the individual atom and possible active reactive sites has been reported. The ΔN calculation for determining electron transfer between 33°44°5'-PCBP and bases/selected base pairs has been reported showing clearly the electron accepting nature of PCBP.
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