On the role of membrane anisotropy and BAR proteins in the stability of tubular membrane structures
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A B S T R A C T

Recent studies have demonstrated that actin filaments are not crucial for the short-term stability of tubular membrane protrusions originating from the cell surface. It has also been demonstrated that prominin nanodomains and curvature inducing I-BAR proteins could account for the stability of the membrane protrusion. Here we constructed an axisymmetric model of a membrane protrusion that excludes actin filaments in order to investigate the contributions of prominin nanodomains (rafts) and I-BAR proteins to the membrane protrusion stability. It was demonstrated that prominin nanodomains and I-BAR proteins can stabilize the membrane protrusion only over a specific range of spontaneous curvature. On the other hand, high spontaneous curvature and/or high density of I-BAR proteins could lead to system instability and to non-uniform contraction in the radial direction of the membrane protrusion. In agreement with previous studies, it was also shown that the isotropic bending energy of lipids is not sufficient to explain the stability of the observed tubular membrane protrusion without actin filaments.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Cell membrane structures with tubular geometry include various cellular shapes such as filopodia, microvilli and membrane nanotubes (Weigmann et al., 1997; Corbeil et al., 2001; Mattila et al., 2007; Gerdes et al., 2007; Veranić et al., 2008; Davis and Sowinski, 2008; Hurtig et al., 2010; Lokar et al., 2010; Dubey and Ben-Yehuda, 2011). In bilayer membrane systems, lipid–lipid and lipid–protein direct interactions may result in formation of small membrane (in general anisotropic) nanodomains (clusters, inclusions), which can stabilize the tubular membrane protrusion and contribute to lipid and protein sorting (Iglicˇ et al., 2006; Tian and Baumgart, 2009; Sorre et al., 2009; Gόźdź, 2011). Without the application of direct mechanical force, tubular membrane budding may be explained by accumulation and in-plane average ordering of anisotropic membrane nanodomains in tubular membrane protrusions (Iglicˇ et al., 2006; Gimsa et al., 2007; Janich and Corbeil, 2007; Hurtig et al., 2010), where the difference between the two principal membrane curvatures C1 and C2 is very large (Iglicˇ et al., 2007a; Tian and Baumgart, 2009; Sorre et al., 2009; Jorgaˇcevska et al., 2010; Risselada et al., 2011). On the other hand, the isotropic bilayer elasticity is not sufficient to overcome the loss of configurational (mixing) entropy due to the sorting of lipids between the tubular membrane protrusion and the parent membrane (Iglicˇ et al., 2006; Tian and Baumgart, 2009).

In cellular systems, it was shown that intracellular actin filaments and membrane components such as prominin nanodomain rafts and I-BAR proteins could stabilize and facilitate the growth of the membrane protrusion (Weigmann et al., 1997; Corbeil et al., 2001; Mattila et al., 2007; Zhao et al., 2010; Hurtig et al., 2010). Demonstrating the importance of the membrane components alone, the membrane protrusion remained stable following the degradation of the inner rod cytoskeleton, presumably due to the residual anisotropic membrane components (Iglicˇ et al., 2006; Veranić et al., 2008). In a different study, it has been shown that the polymerization of actin filaments lagged behind the accumulation of I-BAR proteins at the growing tip of the membrane protrusion, suggesting that actin polymerization is less crucial for the growth of membrane protrusions than believed in the past (Yang et al., 2009). Interestingly, the tubular membrane protrusions that lacked actin filaments had irregular shapes of non-uniform diameter. Thus, the underlying mechanisms responsible...
for the stability and shape of the tubular membrane protrusion still partially remain a puzzling question. In this theoretical study, we hypothesize that the intrinsic (spontaneous) curvature of anisotropic nanodomain rafts (e.g. prominin rafts) stabilize the membrane protrusion, while the high density of BAR (e.g. I-BAR) proteins accounts for the contraction of the tubular structure, leading to irregularities in the diameter distribution of the membrane protrusion.

Specific raft formations have been indicated on highly curved tubular membrane protrusions (Corbeil et al., 2001; Janich and Corbeil, 2007; Hurtig et al., 2010). These rafts differ from rafts in the plane regions of the plasma membrane (Weigmann et al., 1997). It was shown that at subcellular level (irrespective of the cell type), the membrane protein prominin is preferentially localized in microvilli of epithelial cells and in some other plasma membrane protrusions (Weigmann et al., 1997; Huttner and Zimmerberg, 2001). To exemplify the information content of prominin proteins, the transfection of prominin proteins in mammalian CHO cells lead to their localization in membrane protrusions such as filopodia, lamellipodia and microspikes (Weigmann et al., 1997). The protein prominin was also found to interact directly with plasma membrane cholesterol in cholesterol-based membrane nanodomains (Röper et al., 2000). Thus, the notation of prominin nanodomain rafts in the present study can be replaced by cholesterol-based microdomains, which have also been suggested to be responsible for the stability of highly curved structures (Jorgačevski et al., 2010; Rituper et al., 2010).

I-BAR domains belong to the large family of BAR (Bin/Amphiphysin/Rvs) domains, which can either stabilize or induce different membrane curvatures (Mattila et al., 2007; Scita et al., 2008; Saarikangas et al., 2009, for a review see Kabaso et al., 2011b). In contrast to other family members of the BAR proteins that induce invaginations (Rustom et al., 2004; Itoh et al., 2005; Shimada et al., 2007; Heath and Install, 2008), the I-BAR domains induce membrane protrusions (Millard et al., 2005; Mattila et al., 2007; Scita et al., 2008; Saarikangas et al., 2009). The I-BAR domain could bend the lipid bilayer by electrostatic attraction between the positively charged amino acids and the negatively charged lipids. The overexpression of different I-BAR domains in GUVs caused the formation of membrane tubules of different diameters ranging from 40 nm to 60 nm (Saarikangas et al., 2009). While the present paper focuses on I-BAR proteins, the same theoretical model could be applied to explain the stability and shape of other tubular structures such as the membrane invaginations induced by the binding of N-BAR proteins to the lipid bilayer (Rustom et al., 2004; Itoh et al., 2005; Shimada et al., 2007).

Previous theoretical studies have shown that coupling between the intrinsic (spontaneous) curvature of BAR proteins and the membrane curvature would cause instability, leading to the growth and coalescence of membrane protrusions (Veksler and Gov, 2007; Kabaso et al., 2011a), as well as the division of cells (Shlomovitz and Gov, 2008). In this work we extend the expression for the membrane bending free energy by including the deviatoric energy of anisotropic prominin nanodomains (Iglicˇ et al., 2006; Gimsa et al., 2007; Hurtig et al., 2010) and by coupling the spontaneous curvature of I-BARs with the membrane curvature. The phase separation of anisotropic prominin nanodomains, i.e. their accumulation in tubular membrane protrusion, is elucidated theoretically.

2. Curvature induced segregation of isotropic and anisotropic membrane nanodomains

We investigated two-component (A and B) axisymmetric closed bilayer vesicles, where the components were characterized by different intrinsic (spontaneous) curvatures. We considered two models where the first (A) component was either isotropic or anisotropic. The free energy of the anisotropic membrane can be written in the form (Fischer, 1992; Kralj-Iglicˇ et al., 1999; Iglicˇ et al., 2005; Foˇsnaricˇ et al., 2006; Iglicˇ et al., 2006)

\[
F = \int \left( k[(H-H_m(\phi))^2 + (D-D_m(\phi))^2] + \frac{kT}{\alpha_0} \left[ \phi \ln(\phi) + (1-\phi) \ln(1-\phi) \right] \right) dA,
\]

where \( k \) is the membrane elastic constant, \( H = (C_1 + C_2)/2 \) is the local membrane mean curvature, \( D = |(C_1 - C_2)/2| \) is the local membrane curvature deviator, where \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are the two principal curvatures, \( H_m = (C_1 + C_2)/2 \) is the intrinsic (spontaneous) membrane mean curvature, \( D_m = |(C_1 - C_2)/2| \) is the intrinsic (spontaneous) membrane curvature deviator (see Fig. 1), and \( C_{1m} \) and \( C_{2m} \) are the intrinsic (spontaneous) membrane principal curvatures. The last term in Eq. (1) is the configurational entropy of nanodomains of component A (see also Supplementary Material), where \( \alpha_0 \) is the area per single nanodomain of type A, \( \phi \) is the local relative concentration of nanodomains of type A, \( k \) is the Boltzmann constant, and \( T \) is the temperature. The integral is taken over the surface of the vesicle. The intrinsic (spontaneous) mean and deviatoric membrane curvatures depend on the relative local concentration of type A membrane nanodomains \( \phi \) in the following way: \( H_m(\phi) = \frac{H_m^0}{\alpha_0} + \frac{H_m^1}{\alpha_1} \) and \( D_m(\phi) = \frac{D_m^0}{\alpha_0} + \frac{D_m^1}{\alpha_1} \), where \( H_m^0 \) and \( H_m^1 \) are the spontaneous (intrinsic) mean curvatures of components A and B respectively, and \( D_m^0 \) and \( D_m^1 \) are the spontaneous (intrinsic) curvature deviators of membrane components A and B respectively.

In the limit of the isotropic membrane when \( D_m = 0 \), i.e. \( C_{1m} = C_{2m} \) (see Fig. 1), Eq. (1) transforms into the Helfrich expression for the membrane bending energy (first two terms of the equation) (Helfrich, 1973)

\[
F = \int \left( \frac{K}{2} (2H - C_0(\phi))^2 + k_c C_1 C_2 \right) + \frac{kT}{\alpha_0} \left[ \phi \ln(\phi) + (1-\phi) \ln(1-\phi) \right] dA,
\]

where the constant term \( H_m^0/2 \) was neglected. Here the Helfrich spontaneous curvature \( C_0(\phi) = H_m(\phi) = C_{1m}(\phi) = C_{2m}(\phi), k_c \) is the saddle-splay (Gaussian) local bending constant (see also Iglicˇ et al., 2005, 2007a,b). In the following the Gaussian term is neglected, since it is constant for the given membrane topology.

We minimized the functional (1) and (2) for two-component vesicles with axisymmetric shapes under the constraints of constant reduced volume \( v \) and a global concentration of type A nanodomains \( \phi_{me} = \int \phi \, dA \). The reduced volume is the ratio of the volume of the vesicle to the volume of a sphere with the same

![Fig. 1. A schematic figure of the most favourable shapes of a small part of a membrane (membrane nanodomain) having different values of the intrinsic mean curvature \( H_m \) and intrinsic curvature deviator \( D_m \). The small part of the membrane may have spherical (A), plane (B), cylindrical (C) or saddle-like (D) intrinsic curvatures. The spherical and plane intrinsic shapes are considered to be isotropic \( D_m = 0 \), while the cylindrical and saddle-like intrinsic shapes are considered to be anisotropic \( D_m > 0 \). Note that \( C_{1m} \) and \( C_{2m} \) are the intrinsic (spontaneous) membrane curvatures.](image-url)
surface area as the given vesicle. The calculations were performed for \( \phi_{\text{fix}} = 0.5 \) and \( H^{A}_m = 8 \), \( H^{B}_m = 0 \), and several different values of the reduced volume. For the anisotropic case, the spontaneous curvature deviators were \( D^{A}_m = 2.0 \) and \( D^{B}_m = 0 \), respectively. The bending constant was \( \kappa = 30 \, kT \) and \( a_0 = 1/600 \) where the unit length was set by the radius of a spherical cell (vesicle) with the same surface area as the investigated vesicle \( R \). The value of \( a_0 \) corresponds to a vesicle with radius of the order of 250 nm and surface area of the nanodomains of the order of 100 nm\(^2\). The vesicle shape was parametrized by the angle which forms the tangent to the shape profile with the rotational axis as a function of the arclength \( s \) (Gózdz, 2004, 2005, 2006). The relative concentration of type A nanodomains was parametrized by the function \( \phi(s) = \frac{1}{2} (\phi^A - \phi^B) [1 - \tanh(\zeta (s - s_0))] + \phi^B \), where \( s_0 \) is the position of the boundary between the region rich in component \( A \) and the region rich in component \( B \), \( \zeta \) is the slope of the concentration profile at \( s_0 \), \( \phi^A \) and \( \phi^B \) are the concentrations in the regions rich in components \( A \) and \( B \), respectively.

Fig. 2 presents the predicted membrane protrusion shape (calculated as described in online Supplementary Materials) of the isotropic (upper panel) and anisotropic (two lower panels) cases. We showed that a system composed of anisotropic and isotropic components favours the formation of a tubular membrane protrusion, whereas a system composed of only the isotropic components can only form necklace-like membrane protrusions. The deviatoric energy of the anisotropic component attains its minimum upon partial accumulation of the anisotropic component in the tubular protrusion. The driving force for the segregation of isotropic components is solely from the mismatch between the spontaneous curvature of the isotropic component and the membrane curvature.

It can also be seen in Fig. 2 that taking into account the contribution coming from the entropy of mixing does not destroy the cylindrical shape of the protrusions for the anisotropic model. Therefore, the model system considered in the following section is the membrane protrusion without the parent membrane, and the inner membrane component is only of the anisotropic type. Further, we investigated the added effect of attached (outer membrane) I-BAR proteins on the stability of the membrane protrusion.

### 3. The dynamic model

In this section we considered only a membrane protrusion which is not attached to the parent cell, i.e. we studied axisymmetric myelin (tubular) membrane shapes with an anisotropic membrane (Fig. 3). The membrane undulations were considered in the radial direction \( (r(z)) \), where \( z \) is the axisymmetric axis of the membrane protrusion. The membrane free energy was derived for a system that includes anisotropic prominin nanodomain rafts and attached anisotropic I-BAR proteins (Fig. 3). The anisotropic prominin nanodomains are part of a tubular aggregate of lipids and proteins (Iglić et al., 2006; Hurgt et al., 2010), assumed to be homogeneously distributed along the protrusion (Iglić et al., 2006; Gimsa et al., 2007) in accordance with the results presented in the previous section (Fig. 2). On the other hand, the density of I-BAR proteins is assumed to be non-evenly distributed (Fig. 3). The equations of membrane motion (shape undulations) and the density of I-BARs were derived from differentiation of the membrane free energy. The equations of motion were then linearised. The interaction matrix was obtained from the linearised equations. The equilibrium radius of the membrane protrusion was analysed in the limit of anisotropic and isotropic prominin nanodomains (rafts). Phase diagrams were constructed to reveal the interplay between the prominnanodomain rafts and I-BAR proteins, as well as the effects of I-BAR protein density on the stability of the membrane protrusion. For details of the definitions of the membrane curvatures and the derivation of the membrane free energy of isotropic and anisotropic elastic properties, see online Supplementary Material.

#### 3.1. Addition of I-BAR proteins

We next considered the addition of I-BAR proteins as an outer membrane component (Fig. 3). Due to curvature-dependent fluxes (Kabaso et al., 2010), the lateral density of I-BARs is predicted to aggregate in regions of favourable (positive) membrane curvature, while being depleted from regions of unfavourable (negative) membrane curvature (Perutkova et al., 2010). The elastic curvature energy of a single I-BAR protein attached to the inner membrane surface is (Perutkova et al., 2010; Baumgart et al., 2011)

\[
E_p = \frac{k_p L_0}{2} (C - C_p)^2 \tag{3}
\]

where \( k_p \) and \( L_0 \) are the flexural rigidity and length of the protein, respectively, \( C_p \) is the intrinsic (spontaneous) curvature of I-BAR
added contribution of I-BARS to the membrane free energy density (Eqs. (1) and (2)) is
\[ F_p = \frac{\eta}{2}(C_1 - C_0)^2 n, \]  
where \( n \) is the uniform relative density of I-BARS, \( \eta = \kappa_p L_o \), and \( n_s \) is the saturation area density of I-BARS (Kabaso et al., 2011b). In order to avoid high lateral densities of I-BAR proteins, we considered the excluded volume principle, i.e. the finite volume of I-BARS, by the application of lattice statistics. The details of the lattice statistics employed and the derivation of the system free energy are given in the online Supplementary Material.

### 3.2. Linear stability analysis

In the following linear stability analysis, the entropy term was neglected for the sake of simplicity. The equations of membrane motion were first derived from differentiation of the free energy. These equations were then linearised. From the linear part, we studied the effects of each parameter on the equilibrium radius of the membrane protrusion. The interaction matrix between prominin nanodomain rafts and I-BAR proteins was obtained by taking the coefficient of the amplitude (i.e. small deviation) \( h(z) \), or the I-BAR density \( n(z) \), from the equations of motion of membrane height deflection and of I-BAR density, respectively.

The equation of motion of the membrane height deflection along the cylindrical main axis is given by
\[ \phi \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial h(z)}, \quad i = \text{iso, aniso}, \]  
where \( \phi \) is the coefficient of friction describing the drag of the fluid surrounding the membrane, \( t \) is the time, and \( F_i \) is the free energy of the isotropic or anisotropic case.

The equation of motion of the I-BAR proteins is
\[ \frac{\partial n(z)}{\partial t} = \frac{A}{n_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( n(z) \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial n(z)} \right), \]  
where \( A \) is the mobility of I-BARS in the membrane and \( n_k \) is the saturation density. Note that the normal diffusion term \( D_l \frac{\partial^2 n(z)}{\partial z^2} \) is included in the first term on the right hand side of Eq. (6), and that \( A = D_l / kT \), where \( D_l \) is the diffusion coefficient of I-BARS.

We next performed stability analysis for a membrane that contains uniformly anisotropic or isotropic curved components, in addition to mobile I-BAR proteins. The tubular membrane was considered to be infinitely long. By a small perturbation to the uniform initial state, we obtained
\[ r(z) = R + \delta h(z,t), \quad n(z) = N_i \frac{n_k}{r R} + \delta n(z,t), \]  
where \( R \) is the uniform steady state radius of the membrane protrusion, and \( N_i \) is the total number of I-BAR proteins per unit length, such that \( N_i / n R \) is the initial relative density that depends on the membrane protrusion radius \( R \), \( \delta h(z,t) \) and \( \delta n(z,t) \) are small deviations from the corresponding uniform values. Note that the relative density of I-BARS is unitless (i.e. it is given in terms of fractional area coverage).

The linearisation of Eqs. (5) and (6) yields
\[ \phi \frac{\partial h(z)}{\partial t} = \int \left( U + \delta U(h,n) + O(h^2) \right) dA, \]  
\[ \frac{\partial n(z)}{\partial t} = \delta N(h,n) + O(h^2), \]  
where the functions \( \delta U(h,n) \) and \( \delta N(h,n) \) describe the small undulation in the membrane forces and the intra-membrane fluxes, respectively. The forces acting on the membrane in the
equilibrium state are described by $U$, which is not a function of $h(z)$ or $n(z)$. More details of the linear stability analysis employed are given in the online Supplementary Material.

The solution to the determinant of the stability matrix obtained from the linear stability analysis gives two eigenvectors $(\omega(q))$. The first eigenvector is negative, while the second eigenvector can be positive or negative. The plot of the eigenvector $(\omega(q))$ as a function of $q$ is a dispersion relation. In this dispersion relation, the positive regions $(\omega(q) > 0)$ describe regions of unstable contraction leading to the formation of tubular dilations, while negative regions $(\omega(q) < 0)$ describe stable regions, characterized by the decay of an initial perturbation (Fig. 3). By comparing the dispersion relations of the isotropic and anisotropic cases, the role of prominin nanodomains and I-BAR proteins on the stability of the system could be investigated (Fig. 5). The effect of prominin anisotropy on the system instability was also evaluated.

4. Results

4.1. Equilibrium radius

We set out to analyse the effects of varying each of the parameters in the free energies of the anisotropic and isotropic cases on the equilibrium radius ($R_{eq}$). The spontaneous mean curvature of the tubular aggregate of prominin nanodomains is $H_0$, the intrinsic (spontaneous) curvature of the I-BAR protein is $C_p$, the surface tension coefficient is $\sigma$, the elastic membrane constant of the tubular aggregate is $\kappa$, and $\eta$ is proportional to the I-BAR flexural rigidity. The parameter values used for the analysis were as follows: $N_t = 0.1 \mu m^{-1}$, $n_t = 10 \mu m^{-2}$, $H_p = 4 \mu m^{-1}$, $C_p = 70 \mu m^{-1}$, $\sigma = 0.001 g s^{-2}$, $\kappa = 100 kT$, $\eta = 1 kT$, $\varphi = 125 g s^{-1}$. The spontaneous curvatures of prominin nanodomain rafts and I-BAR proteins were set according to the experimental radius of curvature of membrane protrusions and derived tubules from GUVs (Saarikangas et al., 2009). The contributions of I-BAR proteins to the bending modulus (i.e. $\eta n_t / 2$) were assumed to be smaller than the elastic constant of the tubular aggregate of prominin nanodomains. The initial uniform relative density $N_t/(n_t R)$ for the given set of parameters gave an approximate initial value of 0.07. Incorporating the above parameter values into $R_{eq}$ gave for the isotropic and anisotropic cases an equilibrium radius of 0.16 $\mu m$ and 0.12 $\mu m$, respectively. Fig. 4 shows the effects of varying the spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomains ($H_0$), the spontaneous curvature of I-BARs ($C_p$), the total number of I-BARs per unit length ($N_t$), the membrane surface tension ($\sigma$), the bending modulus of the tubular membrane with prominin nanodomains ($\kappa$), and the flexural coefficient of I-BARs ($\eta$), on the equilibrium radius of the isotropic (bold lines) and

![Fig. 4](image.png)

**Fig. 4.** Effects of varying the different system parameters on the equilibrium tube radius ($R_{eq}$). The effects of varying the spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomains (A), the spontaneous curvature of I-BARs (B), the total number of I-BARs (C), the surface tension (D), the elastic constant of prominin nanodomains (E), and the flexural coefficient of I-BARs (F), on the equilibrium radius ($R_{eq}$) for a tubular membrane with isotropic (bold lines) and anisotropic (dashed lines) elastic properties. The effects of large $\eta$ (dotted lines) are analysed for a tubular membrane of anisotropic elastic properties. Note that the spontaneous mean curvature of prominin nanodomains ($H_0$) has the largest effect on $R_{eq}$ (A), and that I-BARs have a large effect on $R_{eq}$ only when the flexural coefficient $\eta$ is of the same order as $\kappa$. 


anisotropic (dashed lines) cases. In addition, the case of large $\eta$ was also analysed for each of the parameters (dotted lines). It was shown that the equilibrium radius of the anisotropic case was always smaller than its isotropic counterpart. In addition, large values of $H_p$ reduced the equilibrium radius. The effects of $C_p$ and $N_t$ depended on the flexural coefficient ($\eta$), such that for small $\eta$ their effect was negligible, whereas for large $\eta$ (i.e. of the same scale as $k$) the effect became considerable (Fig. 4).

4.2. Phase diagrams

Phase diagrams were drawn in order to reveal the interplay between prominin nanodomains and I-BAR proteins. The solution of the stability matrix $M$ was obtained from its determinant. The terms of the determinant were collected according to their order in $q$ as follows:

$$[\lambda_1, \lambda_2] = q^2(q^4A + q^2B + C),$$

where the coefficients $A$, $B$, and $C$ are functions of the different physical parameters (for details of the coefficient functions see online Supplementary Material), $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are the two possible solutions of the quadratic equation $r^2A + rB + C$, where $r = q^2$. At the transition between instability and stability, the roots of the quadratic equation equal zero. The first solution was zero, while the other two possible solutions were determined by the two conditions derived from the quadratic equation ($B^2 - 4AC = 0$ and $C = 0$) (Veksler and Gov, 2007; Kabaso et al., 2011b). The condition $B^2 - 4AC = 0$ yields the transition line of one additional solution (type I instability), and the condition $C = 0$ yields the transition line of two additional solutions (type II instability) (Fig. 5). The type I transition line was drawn in the phase diagram of the interplay between the spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomains and the spontaneous curvature of I-BARs (Fig. 5(a) and (b)). The type I transition line determined the shift from stable to unstable regions, and therefore, for the sake of simplicity the type II transition line was not drawn. In this phase diagram analysis, the tube radius $R$ was replaced by the value of 120 nm, which was also the equilibrium radius of the tubular structure given the abovementioned parameter values. Numerical solutions of the function of the phase diagram variables $C_p$ and $H_p$ were found.

According to the experimental results, the overexpression of I-BAR proteins can form a coat-like structure on the inner side of the membrane protrusion (Saarikangas et al., 2009). As a result, the elastic constant is predicted to increase considerably. In the following analysis, we evaluated the effects of high I-BAR density ($n = 1$) and high elastic constant ($\eta = 100kT$) on tube stability for anisotropic and isotropic models (Fig. 5(c) and (d)). It was demonstrated that the scale of spontaneous curvatures of

Fig. 5. The interplay between prominin nanodomains and I-BAR proteins on the stability of the membrane tube. Phase diagrams of the interplay between the spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomain rafts ($H_p$) and the spontaneous curvature of I-BARs ($C_p$) for a membrane of anisotropic (a) and isotropic (b) elastic properties are shown. It is revealed that the anisotropic case has more stable regions than the isotropic one, and that the shift from stable to unstable regimes is through the type-I transition line. The effects of increasing the density (from $n = 0.1$ to $n = 1$) and the elastic constant (from $\eta = 1kT$ to $\eta = 100kT$) of I-BAR proteins on the stability of the tubular membrane of anisotropic (c) and isotropic (d) elastic properties are shown for a membrane of anisotropic (c) and isotropic (d) elastic properties. Note the similar scale of $H_p$ and $C_p$ delineating the stable region. By increasing $C_p$, the dispersion relation of the system in (a) reveals a shift towards instability ($C_p = 60 \mu m^{-1}$ (○), $80 \mu m^{-1}$ (△)) (e). On the other hand, the system in (c) can also shift to instability by reducing $C_p$ ($C_p = 8 \mu m^{-1}$ (□), $7 \mu m^{-1}$ (×)) (f).
I-BARs and prominin rafts delineating the stable region is similar. More importantly, the size of the stable region is quite small, limiting the parameter space that allows a stable tube structure.

The stable and unstable regions in the phase diagram were confirmed in dispersion relations, where different values of $C_p$ were incorporated (Fig. 5(c) and (f)). The effects of increasing the density (from $n = 0.1$ to $n = 1$) and the elastic constant (from $\eta = 1$ kT to $\eta = 100$ kT) of I-BAR proteins on tube stability were a narrowing of the parameter space of the stable region. Furthermore, the range of $C_p$ and $H_p$ delineating the stable region was similar.

5. Discussion

In the present study, an axisymmetric model of a membrane protrusion that included an inner membrane anisotropic component (i.e. prominin nanodomain rafts) and an outer membrane anisotropic component (i.e. attached I-BAR proteins), yet excluded actin filaments, was constructed. We investigated the underlying mechanisms contributing to the stability of the membrane protrusion (Fig. 2) and to irregularities in its diameter distribution (Fig. 3).

The nearly homogeneous distribution of anisotropic prominin nano-domains along the membrane protrusion contributed to its stability (Fig. 2). The results of linear stability analysis of the membrane tubular shape showed that the equilibrium radius was mainly dependent on the spontaneous curvature of the anisotropic prominin rafts (Fig. 4). On increasing the flexural coefficient of I-BARs, the effects of I-BAR proteins on the equilibrium radius became considerable (Fig. 4). In addition, the membrane tube of anisotropic elastic properties was more stable and of smaller equilibrium radius than that calculated in the isotropic limit (Fig. 4). Using phase diagram analysis, we revealed an optimal range of values over which both prominin rafts and I-BAR proteins contributed to the tube stability (Fig. 5(a) and (b)). Increasing the density (from $n = 0.1$ to $n = 1$) and the elastic coefficient (from $\eta = 1$ kT to $\eta = 100$ kT) of I-BAR proteins considerably reduced the size of the stable region (Fig. 5(c) and (d)). The stable region was also denoted by spontaneous curvatures of I-BARs and prominin rafts of similar size.

According to the theory of isotropic membrane elasticity (Helfrich, 1973), the cell tubular membrane protrusion cannot be stabilized by isotropic membrane components alone (Miao et al., 1991; Derényi et al., 2002), but requires the accumulation of anisotropic membrane nanodomains (Iglič et al., 2006; Gimsa et al., 2007; Hurtig et al., 2010) (see also Fig. 4), or average orientational ordering of lipids (Kralj-Iglič et al., 2002). Therefore, the observed accumulation of anisotropic prominin nanodomain rafts could stabilize the highly curved membrane protrusion by overcoming the decrease in configurational entropy during the process of lateral sorting of the membrane components (Kralj-Iglič et al., 1999; Iglič et al., 2006). These theoretical studies provide insight into the stability of the tubular membrane protrusion following the disassembly of the inner rod cytoskeleton (Veranič et al., 2008), or into the stability of actin-free filopodia (Yang et al., 2009).

Generally, the polymerization of actin filaments was considered to be the main force responsible for the formation of the membrane protrusion. However, a recent study revealed that actin filaments were not present in all filopodia, and that the polymerization of actin filaments lags behind the accumulation of I-BAR proteins at the tip of filopodia (Yang et al., 2009). This suggests that I-BAR proteins may have an important role in the protrusive force. In addition, the formation of helical coat of I-BAR proteins (Yang et al., 2009) underneath the membrane would also suggest their role in promoting stability (Heinrich et al., 2010). The observed irregularities in the shape of actin-free membrane tubes could be partially due to changes in the density distribution of I-BAR proteins (Figs. 3 and 5), while the role of actin filaments could be to establish long-term stability and to facilitate retrograde transport of molecules. Here it was demonstrated that coupling between the spontaneous curvature of I-BAR proteins and the membrane curvature could lead to dynamic instability, suggesting the aggregation of I-BAR proteins at the tip of membrane protrusions.

According to their X-ray crystallographic structures and the overexpression of BAR domains in GUVs, it has been shown that the spontaneous curvature range of BAR proteins is approximately between 30 and 80 μm$^{-1}$ (Shimada et al., 2007; Saarikangas et al., 2009). Since the spontaneous curvature radius of I-BAR proteins is on the same scale as their length, the spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomain rafts could be one order of magnitude smaller than the spontaneous curvature of I-BAR proteins. We here report that the range of spontaneous curvature of prominin nanodomain rafts and I-BAR proteins is within the range described in the phase diagram (Fig. 5). In fact, the proposed spontaneous curvatures of prominin rafts and I-BARs put the system near the transition line from stability to instability, such that changes in the density of I-BAR proteins could drive dynamic instability leading to contraction of the tube (Figs. 3 and 5). A future study should investigate this dynamic instability, modelling the curvature dependent fluxes of I-BAR proteins along the tube and towards the tip of the membrane protrusion.

The results and conclusions of the present study are applicable to other experimental systems of tubular membrane structures, consisting of stabilizing (stationary) and destabilizing (mobile) membrane components. On a final note, elucidating the basic mechanisms contributing to the stability of highly curved tubular structures such as tubular membrane protrusions could provide insight into basic mechanisms related to cell shaping, cell growth and cell motility.
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