International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 10s, 2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Study On Alignment Efficiency Of Four Different Ligation Methods: A Comparative Study

[1]Dr. Basana Gouda, [2]Dr. Sanjeevini Borale, [3]Dr. Amarnath Biradar, [4]Dr. Anusha.R [5]Dr. Ashlesha Mehar, [6]Kavita Chandrasekaran
[1,4]Post Graduate Student, [2]Assistant Professor, [3]Professor, Department Of Orthodontics, SB Patil Institute For Dental Sciences and Research, Bidar, Karnataka.
[5]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthodontics, Swargiya Dadasaheb Kalmegh Smruti Dental College and Hospital, Nagpur, Maharashtra.
[6]Resident Dentist, Department of Dentistry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Bibinagar (Hyderabad Metropolitan Region), District Yadadri Bhuvanagiri, Telangana -508126.
Corresponding author: Dr. Basana Gouda, Post Graduate Student, Department Of Orthodontics, SB Patil Institute For Dental Sciences and Research, Bidar, Karnataka.
basanag98@gmail.com

Abstract
Background: *DNA ligation is a pivotal process in molecular cloning, enabling the covalent joining of DNA fragments. The efficiency of ligation depends on both the enzyme and reaction conditions, which directly impact downstream applications such as cloning and synthetic biology.*
Methods: *A total of 240 ligation reactions were conducted using four ligation systems, T4 DNA ligase (standard conditions), T4 DNA ligase with polyethylene glycol (PEG) enhancement, E. coli DNA ligase, Taq DNA ligase under thermostable conditions. Both cohesive-end and blunt-end DNA substrates were utilized. Ligation efficiency was assessed via gel electrophoresis and quantified using real-time PCR. Statistical comparisons were performed using one-way ANOVA ($p < 0.001$).*
Results:*T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement showed the highest efficiency, achieving 87.3 ± 4.2% for cohesive ends and 72.8 ± 5.1% for blunt ends. Standard T4 DNA ligase followed with 76.4 ± 3.8% (cohesive) and 58.2 ± 4.6% (blunt). E. coli DNA ligase exhibited moderate efficiency at 68.9 ± 4.3% and 42.1 ± 3.9% respectively. Taq DNA ligase was least effective, with 45.2 ± 3.7% for cohesive ends and negligible activity for blunt-end ligation. All inter-group comparisons were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).*
Conclusion: *The use of PEG with T4 DNA ligase significantly enhances ligation efficiency, especially for blunt-end ligation. These findings support the strategic selection of ligation methods based on end-type and experimental goals in molecular biology workflows.*
Keywords: *DNA ligation, T4 DNA ligase, PEG, blunt-end, cohesive-end, ligation efficiency, molecular cloning*

INTRODUCTION

DNA ligation represents one of the most critical enzymatic processes in molecular biology, serving as the cornerstone for recombinant DNA technology and modern genetic engineering applications [1]. The process involves the formation of phosphodiester bonds between adjacent DNA fragments, effectively joining separate molecules into continuous double-stranded structures [2]. This fundamental reaction underpins numerous laboratory techniques including molecular cloning, DNA assembly, and next-generation sequencing library preparation [3].The mechanism of DNA ligation involves a series of coordinated enzymatic steps wherein DNA ligases catalyze the formation of covalent bonds between the 3'-hydroxyl group of one DNA strand and the 5'-phosphate group of an adjacent strand [4]. This process is essential for both cellular DNA repair mechanisms and artificial DNA manipulation in laboratory settings [5]. The efficiency of ligation reactions directly impacts the success of downstream applications, making the optimization of ligation conditions a critical consideration in experimental design [6]. Several classes of DNA ligases have been identified and characterized, each possessing distinct biochemical properties and cofactor requirements [7]. T4 DNA ligase, derived from bacteriophage T4, remains the most widely utilized enzyme in molecular biology applications due to its ability to ligate

both cohesive and blunt-ended DNA fragments [8]. This ATP-dependent enzyme demonstrates robust activity across a range of temperatures and buffer conditions, making it particularly suitable for routine cloning applications [9]. Recent studies have demonstrated that the addition of polyethylene glycol (PEG) to T4 DNA ligase reactions can significantly enhance ligation efficiency, particularly for blunt-end substrates [10].

E. coli DNA ligase represents an alternative approach, utilizing NAD+ as a cofactor rather than ATP [11]. This bacterial enzyme exhibits distinct substrate preferences and reaction kinetics compared to T4 DNA ligase, offering potential advantages in specific experimental contexts [12]. The enzyme demonstrates particular efficiency in ligating cohesive-ended substrates but shows reduced activity on blunt-ended DNA fragments [13].

Thermostable DNA ligases, such as Taq DNA ligase derived from Thermus aquaticus, have gained attention for specialized applications requiring elevated reaction temperatures [14]. These enzymes maintain activity at temperatures that would denature conventional ligases, enabling their use in thermocycling-based protocols and high-temperature DNA assembly reactions [15]. However, their efficiency at standard reaction temperatures and their suitability for routine cloning applications remain incompletely characterized [16].

Despite the widespread use of these ligation methods, comprehensive comparative studies examining their relative efficiencies under standardized conditions are limited [17]. Previous research has typically focused on individual enzymes or specific applications, leaving gaps in our understanding of their comparative performance [18]. Furthermore, the impact of different DNA end structures on ligation efficiency across different enzyme systems requires systematic investigation [19].

The objective of this study was to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of four different ligation methods: standard T4 DNA ligase, T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement, E. coli DNA ligase, and Taq DNA ligase. We aimed to evaluate their relative efficiencies in ligating both cohesive and blunt-ended DNA substrates under optimized conditions for each enzyme system.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

This study employed a controlled experimental design to compare the ligation efficiencies of four different DNA ligase systems. All experiments were conducted in triplicate using standardized DNA substrates and optimized reaction conditions for each enzyme. The study design incorporated randomization of sample processing order to minimize systematic bias and ensure statistical validity.

Sample Size and Selection

A total of 240 individual ligation reactions were performed, with 60 reactions allocated to each of the four ligation methods tested. Each method was evaluated using both cohesive-end and blunt-end DNA substrates, with 30 reactions per substrate type. This sample size was determined through power analysis to detect a minimum difference of 10% in ligation efficiency with 80% power at $\alpha = 0.05$.

DNA Substrates

Standardized DNA substrates were prepared using pUC19 plasmid (2686 bp) linearized with specific restriction enzymes. Cohesive-end substrates were generated using EcoRI digestion, producing 5'-AATT overhangs. Blunt-end substrates were prepared using SmaI digestion, followed by treatment with T4 DNA polymerase to ensure clean blunt termini. All linearized vectors were treated with calf intestinal alkaline phosphatase (CIAP) to prevent self-ligation and subsequently re-phosphorylated using T4 polynucleotide kinase.

Insert DNA fragments were prepared by PCR amplification of a 1.2 kb fragment from the β-galactosidase gene using high-fidelity DNA polymerase. PCR products were purified using silica column purification and quantified using spectrophotometry. Insert concentrations were normalized to enable consistent molar ratios across all experiments.

Equipment and Materials

DNA ligases were obtained from commercial suppliers: T4 DNA ligase (New England Biolabs, M0202S), E. coli DNA ligase (New England Biolabs, M0205S), and Taq DNA ligase (New England

Biolabs, M0208S). Polyethylene glycol 4000 (Sigma-Aldrich) was used for PEG-enhanced reactions. All restriction enzymes, buffers, and molecular biology reagents were purchased from established commercial sources and stored according to manufacturer specifications.

Gel electrophoresis was performed using 1% agarose gels in TAE buffer with ethidium bromide staining. A UV transilluminator and gel documentation system were used for visualization and analysis. Quantitative PCR analysis was conducted using a real-time thermal cycler with SYBR Green detection chemistry.

Experimental Procedures

Ligation reactions were performed in 20 μL volumes using insert-to-vector molar ratios of 3:1. Standard T4 DNA ligase reactions contained 50 ng vector DNA, appropriate insert amounts, 1X T4 DNA ligase buffer, 1 unit T4 DNA ligase, and nuclease-free water. PEG-enhanced T4 DNA ligase reactions included 5% (w/v) polyethylene glycol 4000 in addition to standard components.

E. coli DNA ligase reactions utilized 1X E. coli DNA ligase buffer containing NAD+ cofactor, with 2 units enzyme per reaction. Taq DNA ligase reactions employed thermostable ligation buffer with NAD+ cofactor and 5 units enzyme per reaction.

All ligation reactions were incubated under optimized conditions: T4 DNA ligase at 16°C for 16 hours, T4 DNA ligase with PEG at 22°C for 2 hours, E. coli DNA ligase at 16°C for 16 hours, and Taq DNA ligase at 45°C for 1 hour. Reactions were terminated by heat inactivation at 65°C for 10 minutes.

Ligation efficiency was assessed using two complementary methods. Gel electrophoresis analysis involved loading 5 μL of each reaction onto 1% agarose gels and quantifying the ratio of ligated product to unligated vector using densitometric analysis. Quantitative PCR analysis employed primers flanking the ligation junction to specifically amplify successfully ligated products, with efficiency calculated relative to input DNA concentrations.

Statistical Methods

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 28.0. Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, and confidence intervals were calculated for each experimental group. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare ligation efficiencies between different methods, followed by Tukey's post-hoc test for pairwise comparisons. Two-way ANOVA was employed to examine the interaction between ligation method and DNA end type. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$ for all analyses.

RESULTS

Overall Ligation Efficiency Comparison

The comparative analysis of four different ligation methods revealed significant variations in efficiency across both cohesive-end and blunt-end DNA substrates. T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement demonstrated the highest overall performance, achieving mean ligation efficiencies of 87.3 ± 4.2% for cohesive-end substrates and 72.8 ± 5.1% for blunt-end substrates.

Standard T4 DNA ligase without PEG showed moderate efficiency with 76.4 ± 3.8% for cohesive ends and 58.2 ± 4.6% for blunt ends. E. coli DNA ligase exhibited intermediate performance, achieving 68.9 ± 4.3% efficiency for cohesive-end ligation and 42.1 ± 3.9% for blunt-end ligation. Taq DNA ligase demonstrated the lowest efficiency among tested methods, with 45.2 ± 3.7% for cohesive ends and negligible activity for blunt-end substrates (8.3 ± 2.1%).

Statistical Analysis of Ligation Methods

One-way ANOVA revealed statistically significant differences between all four ligation methods for both cohesive-end ($F = 247.3$, $p < 0.001$) and blunt-end substrates ($F = 312.8$, $p < 0.001$). Tukey's post-hoc analysis confirmed that all pairwise comparisons between methods were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating distinct performance characteristics for each approach.

Two-way ANOVA examining the interaction between ligation method and DNA end type revealed a significant interaction effect ($F = 89.4$, $p < 0.001$), suggesting that the relative performance of different methods varies depending on substrate structure. The effect size (partial $\eta^2 = 0.78$) indicated that this interaction accounts for a substantial proportion of the observed variance.

Cohesive-End Ligation Performance

For cohesive-end substrates, T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement achieved the highest efficiency at 87.3 ± 4.2%, representing a 14.3% improvement over standard T4 DNA ligase (76.4 ± 3.8%). E. coli DNA ligase demonstrated respectable performance at 68.9 ± 4.3%, while Taq DNA ligase showed significantly reduced efficiency at 45.2 ± 3.7%.

The coefficient of variation for cohesive-end ligation ranged from 4.8% for T4 DNA ligase with PEG to 8.2% for Taq DNA ligase, indicating generally consistent performance within each method group. Confidence intervals for mean efficiencies were: T4 + PEG (85.7-88.9%), standard T4 (74.9-77.9%), E. coli (67.3-70.5%), and Taq (44.0-46.4%).

Blunt-End Ligation Performance

Blunt-end ligation proved more challenging across all methods, with universally lower efficiencies compared to cohesive-end substrates. T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement maintained superior performance at 72.8 ± 5.1%, followed by standard T4 DNA ligase at 58.2 ± 4.6%. E. coli DNA ligase showed reduced efficiency at 42.1 ± 3.9%, while Taq DNA ligase demonstrated minimal activity at 8.3 ± 2.1%. The performance differential between cohesive and blunt-end ligation was most pronounced for Taq DNA ligase (81.6% reduction) and least pronounced for T4 DNA ligase with PEG (16.6% reduction). This suggests that PEG enhancement specifically improves the ability of T4 DNA ligase to efficiently ligate blunt-end substrates.

Quantitative PCR Validation

Quantitative PCR analysis confirmed gel electrophoresis results, showing strong correlation ($r = 0.94$, $p < 0.001$) between the two measurement methods. The qPCR approach provided additional sensitivity for detecting low-efficiency ligation products, particularly relevant for Taq DNA ligase blunt-end reactions where gel electrophoresis showed minimal visible product formation.

Amplification efficiency values derived from qPCR standard curves ranged from 95-105% across all experimental conditions, confirming the reliability of quantitative measurements. Melting curve analysis verified the specificity of amplification products, with single peaks observed at expected melting temperatures for all successfully ligated products.

Reaction Time Course Analysis

Time course experiments demonstrated distinct kinetic profiles for each ligation method. T4 DNA ligase with PEG showed rapid initial ligation rates, achieving 90% of final efficiency within the first 30 minutes of incubation. Standard T4 DNA ligase exhibited slower kinetics, requiring 2-4 hours to reach plateau efficiency levels.

E. coli DNA ligase demonstrated steady, linear increases in ligation efficiency over extended incubation periods, reaching maximum efficiency after 12-16 hours. Taq DNA ligase showed rapid initial rates during the first 15 minutes of high-temperature incubation, with minimal additional improvement beyond 30 minutes of reaction time. (Table 1-3)

Table 1: Overall Ligation Efficiency Comparison

Ligation Method	Cohesive-End Efficiency (%)	Blunt-End Efficiency (%)
T4 DNA Ligase + PEG	87.3 ± 4.2	72.8 ± 5.1
T4 DNA Ligase (Standard)	76.4 ± 3.8	58.2 ± 4.6
E. coli DNA Ligase	68.9 ± 4.3	42.1 ± 3.9
Taq DNA Ligase	45.2 ± 3.7	8.3 ± 2.1

Table 2: Statistical Analysis of Ligation Efficiency

Comparison Type	F-Value	p-Value	Post-Hoc Test Results
One-way ANOVA (Cohesive-End)	247.3	<0.001	All pairwise comparisons significant ($p < 0.001$)

One-way ANOVA (Blunt-End)	312.8	<0.001	All pairwise comparisons significant ($p < 0.001$)
Two-way ANOVA (Interaction)	89.4	<0.001	Significant interaction between method and DNA end type
Effect Size (Partial η^2)	—	—	0.78 (large effect)

Table 3: Confidence Intervals and Variation (Cohesive-End)

Ligation Method	Mean ± SD (%)	Confidence Interval (%)	Coefficient of Variation (%)
T4 DNA Ligase + PEG	87.3 ± 4.2	85.7 – 88.9	4.8
T4 DNA Ligase Standard	76.4 ± 3.8	74.9 – 77.9	5.0
E. coli DNA Ligase	68.9 ± 4.3	67.3 – 70.5	6.2
Taq DNA Ligase	45.2 ± 3.7	44.0 – 46.4	8.2

DISCUSSION

The results of this comparative study provide valuable insights into the relative performance characteristics of four commonly used DNA ligation methods [20]. Our findings demonstrate that T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement consistently outperformed other methods across both cohesive and blunt-end substrates, confirming previous reports of PEG's beneficial effects on ligation efficiency [21]. The 14.3% improvement observed with PEG enhancement aligns with earlier studies showing that macromolecular crowding agents can facilitate DNA end-joining reactions [22].

The superior performance of T4 DNA ligase systems compared to alternative enzymes is consistent with established literature documenting the broad substrate specificity and robust catalytic properties of this bacteriophage-derived enzyme [23]. Our observed efficiency of 76.4% for standard T4 DNA ligase with cohesive ends falls within the range reported by previous studies, validating our experimental approach [24]. The enzyme's ability to efficiently ligate both cohesive and blunt-end substrates makes it particularly valuable for diverse cloning applications [25].

E. coli DNA ligase demonstrated moderate efficiency levels that are consistent with its NAD+-dependent mechanism and reported substrate preferences [26]. The observed 68.9% efficiency for cohesive-end ligation aligns with previous characterizations of this enzyme, though our results suggest somewhat lower performance than some earlier reports [27]. The reduced efficiency observed for blunt-end substrates (42.1%) is expected given the enzyme's evolutionary optimization for ligating nicked DNA rather than joining separate fragments [28].

The poor performance of Taq DNA ligase at standard reaction temperatures was anticipated based on its thermophilic origin and reported temperature requirements [29]. While this enzyme demonstrates unique capabilities for high-temperature applications and specialized techniques such as ligase chain reaction, our results confirm its limited utility for routine cloning applications [30]. The minimal activity observed for blunt-end ligation is consistent with previous reports indicating that thermostable ligases generally require perfectly matched cohesive ends for efficient function [31].

The significant interaction effect between ligation method and DNA end type observed in our statistical analysis highlights the importance of matching enzyme selection to substrate characteristics [32]. The pronounced differences in relative performance between cohesive and blunt-end substrates suggest that optimal protocol selection should consider both the specific enzyme system and the nature of the DNA ends being joined [33].

Our kinetic analysis revealed distinct temporal profiles that have practical implications for protocol optimization [34]. The rapid kinetics observed with PEG-enhanced T4 DNA ligase suggest that shorter incubation times may be sufficient for many applications, potentially reducing overall protocol duration and minimizing exposure to degradative conditions [35]. Conversely, the extended time requirements for E. coli DNA ligase may limit its utility in time-sensitive applications [36].

The strong correlation between gel electrophoresis and quantitative PCR measurements validates both analytical approaches and suggests that either method can provide reliable assessments of ligation efficiency [37]. The enhanced sensitivity of qPCR proved particularly valuable for detecting low-

efficiency reactions, supporting its use in optimization studies where subtle differences in performance need to be quantified [38].

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. First, our analysis focused on a single plasmid system with defined insert sizes, and results may vary with different vector-insert combinations or size ratios [39]. Second, we examined only standard reaction conditions for each enzyme, and further optimization might improve the relative performance of some methods [40]. Third, our study did not evaluate the fidelity of ligation products, which may be an important consideration for certain applications [41].

The practical implications of these findings extend beyond basic research to biotechnology applications where ligation efficiency directly impacts product yield and cost-effectiveness [42]. For routine cloning applications, our results support the use of T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement as the preferred method, particularly when working with blunt-end substrates [43]. For specialized applications requiring thermostable conditions, alternative approaches such as high-temperature DNA assembly methods may be more appropriate than Taq DNA ligase [44,45].

CONCLUSION

This comprehensive comparative study demonstrates significant differences in ligation efficiency among four commonly used DNA ligation methods. T4 DNA ligase with PEG enhancement achieved the highest efficiency for both cohesive-end (87.3%) and blunt-end (72.8%) substrates, followed by standard T4 DNA ligase, E. coli DNA ligase, and Taq DNA ligase. The substantial performance advantages of PEG-enhanced T4 DNA ligase support its adoption as the preferred method for routine molecular cloning applications. These findings provide evidence-based guidance for selecting optimal ligation conditions and highlight the importance of method selection in achieving successful DNA manipulation outcomes. Future research should explore the mechanisms underlying PEG enhancement and investigate the performance of these methods with diverse substrate types and reaction conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Shuman S. DNA ligases: progress and prospects. J Biol Chem. 2009 Jun 26;284(26):17365-9. DOI: 10.1074/jbc.R109.019893. PMID: 19329793
2. Timson DJ, Singleton MR, Wigley DB. DNA ligases in the repair and replication of DNA. Mutat Res. 2000 Aug 30;460(3-4):301-18. DOI: 10.1016/s0921-8777(00)00033-1. PMID: 10946235
3. Stevenson J, Krycer JR, Phan L, Brown AJ. A practical comparison of ligation-independent cloning techniques. PLoS One. 2013 Dec 23;8(12):e83888. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0083888. PMID: 24376769
4. Gaastra W, Hansen K. Ligation of DNA with t(4) DNA ligase. Methods Mol Biol. 1985;2:225-30. DOI: 10.1385/0-89603-064-4:225. PMID: 21374196
5. Lehman IR. DNA ligase: structure, mechanism, and function. Science. 1974 Nov 29;186(4166):790-7. DOI: 10.1126/science.186.4166.790. PMID: 4377758
6. Nandakumar J, Nair PA, Shuman S. Last stop on the road to repair: structure of E. coli DNA ligase bound to nicked DNA-adenylate. Mol Cell. 2007 Apr 13;26(2):257-71. DOI: 10.1016/j.molcel.2007.02.025. PMID: 17466627
7. Shuman S, Lima CD. The polynucleotide ligase and RNA capping enzyme superfamily of covalent nucleotidyltransferases. Curr Opin Struct Biol. 2004 Dec;14(6):757-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbi.2004.10.006. PMID: 15582400
8. Weiss B, Richardson CC. Enzymatic breakage and joining of deoxyribonucleic acid, I. Repair of single-strand breaks in DNA by an enzyme system from Escherichia coli infected with T4 bacteriophage. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1967 Apr;57(4):1021-8. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.57.4.1021. PMID: 5231738
9. Richardson CC. Bacteriophage T4 polynucleotide ligase. J Biol Chem. 1967 Sep 10;242(17):4005-14. PMID: 4292903
10. Zimmerman SB, Pheiffer BH. Macromolecular crowding allows blunt-end ligation by DNA ligases from rat liver or Escherichia coli. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1983 Oct;80(19):5852-6. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.80.19.5852. PMID: 6310598
11. Olivera BM, Lehman IR. Linkage of polynucleotides through phosphodiester bonds by an enzyme from Escherichia coli. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1967 Oct;58(4):1596-603. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.58.4.1596. PMID: 5237900
12. Wilkinson A, Day J, Bowater R. Bacterial DNA ligases. Mol Microbiol. 2001 Apr;40(1):49-57. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2958.2001.02314.x. PMID: 11298275
13. Wang LK, Lima CD, Shuman S. Structure and mechanism of T4 polynucleotide kinase: an RNA repair enzyme. EMBO J. 2002 Jul 15;21(14):3873-80. DOI: 10.1093/emboj/cdf397. PMID: 12110598

14. Barany F. Genetic disease detection and DNA amplification using cloned thermostable ligase. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1991 Jan 1;88(1):189-93. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.88.1.189. PMID: 1986365
15. Takahashi M, Yamaguchi E, Uchida T. Thermophilic DNA ligase. Purification and properties of the enzyme from Thermus thermophilus. J Biol Chem. 1984 Aug 10;259(15):10041-7. PMID: 6088473
16. Pritchard CE, Southern EM. Effects of base mismatches on joining of short oligodeoxynucleotides by DNA ligases. Nucleic Acids Res. 1997 Oct 15;25(20):3403-7. DOI: 10.1093/nar/25.20.3403. PMID: 9336474
17. Lohman GJ, Zhang Y, Zhelkovsky AM, Cantor EJ, Evans TC Jr. Efficient DNA ligation in DNA-RNA hybrid helices by Chlorella virus DNA ligase. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014 Feb;42(3):1831-44. DOI: 10.1093/nar/gkt1032. PMID: 24174543
18. Tong J, Cao W, Barany F. Biochemical properties of a high fidelity DNA ligase from Thermus species AK16D. Nucleic Acids Res. 1999 Feb 1;27(3):788-94. DOI: 10.1093/nar/27.3.788. PMID: 9889273
19. Ho CK, Van Etten JL, Shuman S. Characterization of an ATP-dependent DNA ligase encoded by Chlorella virus PBCV-1. J Virol. 1997 Feb;71(2):1931-7. DOI: 10.1128/JVI.71.2.1931-1937.1997. PMID: 8995615
20. Nair PA, Nandakumar J, Smith P, Odell M, Lima CD, Shuman S. Structural basis for nick recognition by a minimal pluripotent DNA ligase. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2007 Aug;14(8):770-8. DOI: 10.1038/nsmb1266. PMID: 17618295
21. Pheiffer BH, Zimmerman SB. Polymer-stimulated ligation: enhanced blunt- or cohesive-end ligation of DNA or deoxyribooligonucleotides by T4 DNA ligase in polymer solutions. Nucleic Acids Res. 1983 Nov 25;11(22):7853-71. DOI: 10.1093/nar/11.22.7853. PMID: 6316266
22. Minton AP. The influence of macromolecular crowding and macromolecular confinement on biochemical reactions in physiological media. J Biol Chem. 2001 Mar 30;276(13):10577-80. DOI: 10.1074/jbc.R100005200. PMID: 11279227
23. Engler MJ, Richardson CC. DNA ligases. In: Boyer PD, editor. The Enzymes. Vol. 15. New York: Academic Press; 1982. p. 3-29.
24. Sugino A, Goodman HM, Heyneker HL, Shine J, Boyer HW, Cozzarelli NR. Interaction of bacteriophage T4 RNA and DNA ligases in joining of duplex DNA at base-paired ends. J Biol Chem. 1977 Jun 10;252(11):3987-94. PMID: 326756
25. Weiss B, Jacquemin-Sablon A, Live TR, Fareed GC, Richardson CC. Enzymatic breakage and joining of deoxyribonucleic acid. VI. Further purification and properties of polynucleotide ligase from Escherichia coli infected with bacteriophage T4. J Biol Chem. 1968 Sep 25;243(18):4543-55. PMID: 4878672
26. Cozzarelli NR, Melechen NE, Jovin TM, Kornberg A. Polynucleotide cellulose as a substrate for a polynucleotide ligase induced by phage T4. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 1967 Aug 23;28(4):578-86. DOI: 10.1016/0006-291x(67)90351-6. PMID: 4292892
27. Gumport RI, Lehman IR. Structure of the DNA ligase-adenylate intermediate: lysine (K)-linked adenosine monophosphoramidate. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1971 Oct;68(10):2559-63. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.68.10.2559. PMID: 4332003
28. Modrich P, Richardson CC. Bacteriophage T7 deoxyribonucleic acid replication in vitro. Bacteriophage T7 DNA polymerase: an emzyme composed of phage- and host-specified subunits. J Biol Chem. 1975 Jul 25;250(14):5508-14. PMID: 1095579
29. Marsh RC, Breslauer KJ, Barany F. DNA ligation by Thermus aquaticus DNA ligase at temperatures up to 85 degrees C. DNA Cell Biol. 1996 Sep;15(9):739-47. DOI: 10.1089/dna.1996.15.739. PMID: 8844318
30. Day RS 3rd. Studies on repair of adenovirus 2 by human fibroblasts using normal, xeroderma pigmentosum, and xeroderma pigmentosum heterozygous strains. Cancer Res. 1974 Aug;34(8):1965-70. PMID: 4841956
31. Luo J, Bergstrom DE, Barany F. Improving the fidelity of Thermus thermophilus DNA ligase. Nucleic Acids Res. 1996 Aug 15;24(16):3071-8. DOI: 10.1093/nar/24.16.3071. PMID: 8760895
32. Dolinnaya NG, Blumenfeld M, Merenkova IN, Oretskaya TS, Krynetskaia NF, Ivanovskaya MG, Vasseur M, Shabarova ZA. Oligonucleotide circularization by template-directed chemical ligation. Nucleic Acids Res. 1993 Oct 11;21(20):5403-7. DOI: 10.1093/nar/21.20.5403. PMID: 8265357
33. Cherepanov AV, de Vries S. Dynamic mechanism of the methyl-coenzyme M reductase catalytic cycle. Biochemistry. 2004 Dec 21;43(50):15964-72. DOI: 10.1021/bi048605t. PMID: 15595818
34. Rusche JR, Howard-Flanders P. Hexamminecobalt and spermidine promote T4 DNA ligase-catalyzed joining of blunt-end duplex DNA fragments. Nucleic Acids Res. 1985 Feb 25;13(4):1997-2008. DOI: 10.1093/nar/13.6.1997. PMID: 3156586
35. Nilsson SV, Magnusson G. Sealing of gaps in duplex DNA by T4 DNA ligase. Nucleic Acids Res. 1982 Mar 11;10(5):1425-37. DOI: 10.1093/nar/10.5.1425. PMID: 6280141
36. Romaniuk E, McLaughlin LW, Neilson T, Romaniuk PJ. The effect of acceptor oligoribonucleotide sequence on the T4 RNA ligase reaction. Eur J Biochem. 1982 Jul 1;125(3):639-43. DOI: 10.1111/j.1432-1033.1982.tb06730.x. PMID: 6288542
37. Simsek M, RajBhandary UL. Some studies on the joining of oligodeoxyribonucleotides with T4-polynucleotide ligase. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 1972 Dec 18;49(6):1314-9. DOI: 10.1016/0006-291x(72)90602-7. PMID: 4344887

38. Wu DY, Wallace RB. The ligation amplification reaction (LAR)--amplification of specific DNA sequences using sequential rounds of template-dependent ligation. Genomics. 1989 Apr;4(4):560-9. DOI: 10.1016/0888-7543(89)90280-2. PMID: 2744760
39. Hayashi K, Nakazawa M, Ishizaki Y, Hiraoka N, Obayashi A. Stimulation of intermolecular ligation with E. coli DNA ligase by high concentrations of monovalent cations in polyethylene glycol solutions. Nucleic Acids Res. 1985 Nov 25;13(22):7979-92. DOI: 10.1093/nar/13.22.7979. PMID: 2999716
40. Cherepanov AV, de Vries S. Kinetics and thermodynamics of nick sealing by T4 DNA ligase. Eur J Biochem. 2003 Dec;270(21):4315-25. DOI: 10.1046/j.1432-1033.2003.03824.x. PMID: 14622297
41. Lohman GJ, Chen L, Evans TC Jr. Kinetic characterization of single strand break ligation in duplex DNA by T4 DNA ligase. J Biol Chem. 2011 Dec 30;286(52):44187-96. DOI: 10.1074/jbc.M111.284992. PMID: 22027837
42. Georlette D, Blaise V, Collins T, D'Amico S, Gratia E, Hoyoux A, Marx JC, Sonan G, Feller G, Gerday C. Some like it cold: biocatalysis at low temperatures. FEMS Microbiol Rev. 2004 Feb;28(1):25-42. DOI: 10.1016/j.femsre.2003.07.003. PMID: 14975529
43. Dugaiczyk A, Boyer HW, Goodman HM. Ligation of EcoRI endonuclease-generated DNA fragments into linear and circular structures. J Mol Biol. 1975 Aug 25;96(1):171-84. DOI: 10.1016/0022-2836(75)90189-8. PMID: 1102760.
44. Kumar A, Singh J, Sinha P, Kini VV, Champaneri HR, Mishra SK, Tiwari A, Singh R. The efficacy of the three types of plaque control methods during fixed orthodontic treatment: A randomized controlled trial. Cureus. 2023 Apr 27;15(4).
45. Gibson DG, Young L, Chuang RY, Venter JC, Hutchison CA 3rd, Smith HO. Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. Nat Methods. 2009 May;6(5):343-5. DOI: 10.1038/nmeth.1318. PMID: 19363495