Binding of anisotropic curvature-inducing proteins onto membrane tubes
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Bin/Amphiphysin/Rvs superfamily proteins and other curvature-inducing proteins have anisotropic shapes and anisotropically bend biomembrane. Here, we report how the anisotropic proteins bind the membrane tube and are orientationally ordered using mean-field theory including an orientation-dependent excluded volume. The proteins exhibit a second-order or first-order nematic transition with increasing protein density depending on the radius of the membrane tube. The tube curvatures for the maximum protein binding and orientational order are different and varied by the protein density and rigidity. As the external force along the tube axis increases, a first-order transition from a large tube radius with low protein density to a small radius with high density occurs once, and subsequently, the protein orientation tilts to the tube-axis direction. When an isotropic bending energy is used for the protein with an elliptic shape, the force-dependence curves become symmetric and the first-order transition occurs twice. This theory quantitatively reproduces the results of meshless membrane simulation for short proteins, whereas deviations are seen for long proteins owing to the formation of protein clusters.

I. INTRODUCTION

In living cells, numerous types of proteins work together to regulate biomembrane shapes of cells and organelles1 3. Proteins are also involved in dynamic processes such as endo-/exocytosis, vesicle transport, cell locomotion, and cell division. Clathrin and coat protein complex (COPI and COPII) bend membranes in a laterally isotropic manner and generate spherical buds3 4. On the contrary, Bin/Amphiphysin/Rvs (BAR) superfamily proteins bend the membrane anisotropically and generate cylindrical membrane tubes1 3, 9–16. The BAR domains consist of a banana-shaped dimer and bend the membrane along its axis. Dysfunctions of the BAR proteins are considered to be implicated in neurodegenerative, cardiovascular, and neoplastic diseases. Thus, understanding the mechanism of the curvature generation by these proteins is important.

The curvature-inducing proteins can sense the membrane curvature, i.e., they are concentrated in membranes that have their preferred curvatures. The sensing of curvature-inducing proteins, such as BAR proteins7,8,13,17,18, dynamin19, and G-protein coupled receptors20, has been examined using a tethered vesicle pulled by optical tweezers and a micropipette. They typically bind more onto the membrane tube than the remaining spherical component.

Theoretically, the bending energy of a single-component fluid membrane is well described by the second-order expansion to the curvature (Canham–Helfrich energy)21,22. The binding of proteins with a laterally isotropic spontaneous curvature is considered to locally change the coefficients of the Canham–Helfrich energy (the bending rigidity and spontaneous curvature). Budding23–28 and other shape deformations29,30 induced by protein binding have been well explained by mean-field theories using this bending energy. Moreover, traveling waves of membrane deformation can be reproduced by the coupling with reaction-diffusion of multiple types of proteins31–34. In contrast, the effects of the anisotropic spontaneous curvature of proteins have been much less explored. Instead, the bending energy for isotropic spontaneous curvature has been often used for the analysis of BAR proteins17,18,22. A few approaches have been examined for the anisotropy of the protein binding. The Canham–Helfrich energy was extended for anisotropic spontaneous curvature35,36 and membrane-mediated interactions between non-deformable anisotropic objects have been investigated37,10. For cylindrical membranes, the axis of banana-shaped proteins were assumed aligned in the azimuthal direction to derive a force–extension curve41. However, the entropic interaction of the protein orientation has not been considered in these studies.

Recently, this entropic interaction was taken into account by two of us and co-workers42,43 based on Nascimento’s theory for three-dimensional liquid-crystals44. An isotropic-to-nematic transition was obtained on a fixed membrane shape. In this study, we examine the binding of the anisotropic proteins to a cylindrical membrane tube in detail. The axial force along the membrane tube and equilibrium of protein binding/unbinding are considered. Moreover, we clearly show the difference from the binding of isotropic proteins30. The tube part of a tethered vesicle is well approximated by this tube with no volume constraint, when tube radius is much...
A perpendicular protein pair has a larger excluded area (protein axis. (b) Excluded-volume interactions between proteins. Results in Sec. III B. Finally, a summary and discussion are simulation results are compared with the theoretical reactions of membrane tubes are described in Sec. III. The curvatures. Here, we compare our theoretical results with those of the meshless simulations.

Several types of membrane models have been developed for coarse-grained simulations [45–47]. The protein binding has been investigated using molecular simulations [48–54], dynamically triangulated membrane simulations [55, 56], and meshless membrane simulations [48, 49, 57, 58]. Among them, however, the binding effects on the axial force of a membrane tube have been investigated only by the meshless simulations [48, 49, 57, 58]; a characteristic force dependence on the protein curvature was reported for homogeneous states at low protein curvatures, in addition to the protein assembly accompanied by membrane shape transformation at high protein curvatures. Here, we compare our theoretical results with those of the meshless simulations.

The mean-field theory is described in Sec. II. Simulations of membrane tubes are described in Sec. III. The simulation results are compared with the theoretical results in Sec. III B. Finally, a summary and discussion are presented in Sec. IV.

II. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

A. Theory

Protein binding on a cylindrical membrane tube is considered as depicted in Fig. II(a). The membrane is in a fluid phase and the surface area is fixed. The radius and length of the tube are $R_cy$ and $L_cy$: $A = 2\pi R_cy L_cy$. The tube volume can be freely changed. This corresponds to the tubular region of a tethered vesicle in the limit condition, in which the tube volume is negligibly small ($\pi R_cy^2 L_cy \ll V$, where $V$ is the vesicle volume) [31, 32]. Proteins can align in the membrane surface. To quantify it, the degree of the orientational order is calculated as

\[ S = 2\langle s_p(\theta_{ps}) \rangle, \]

\[ s_p(\theta_{ps}) = \cos^2(\theta_{ps}) - \frac{1}{2}, \]  

where $\cdots$ is the ensemble average, and $\theta_{ps}$ is the angle between the major protein axis and the ordered direction. The angles between the ordered direction and the azimuthal direction of the cylinder and between the major protein axis and azimuthal direction are $\theta_{sc}$ and $\theta_{pc}$, respectively, with $\theta_{ps} = \theta_{pc} + \theta_{sc}$ (see Fig. II(a)). Experimentally, the orientational order $S_2$ along the tube ($z$) axis is more easily measured: for $\theta_{sc} = 0$ and $\pi/2$, $S_2 = -S$ and $S_2 = S$, respectively.

The bound protein is approximated to have laterally an elliptic shape with an aspect ratio of $d_{el} = \ell_1/\ell_2$ and area $a_p = \pi\ell_1\ell_2/4$, where $\ell_1$ and $\ell_2$ are the lengths in the major and minor axes, respectively. An orientation-dependent excluded-volume interaction is considered between proteins. When two proteins are perpendicularly oriented, the excluded area $A_{exc}$ between them is larger than the parallel pairs, as shown in Fig. II(b). This area $A_{exc}$ is expressed as $A_{exc} = B_0 + B_2(\cos^2(\theta_{pp}) - 1/2) + O(\cos^4(\theta_{pp}))$ by a Taylor expansion, where $\theta_{pp}$ is the angle between the major axes of two ellipses. In our previous study [42], the values of $B_0$ and $B_2$ are calculated by a two-parameter fit. In this study, the one-parameter fit of $A_{exc} = |4 - b_{exc}(\cos^2(\theta_{pp}) - 1)/a_p|$ is used, since the minimum value $A_{exc}^{min} = 4a_p$ is obtained at the parallel pairs ($\theta_{pp} = 0$) for any ratio of $d_{el}$: $b_{exc} = 0.840, 1.98, 3.44, \text{and} 7.61$ at $d_{el} = 2, 3, 4, \text{and} 7$, respectively. The effective excluded area is represented by $A_{eff} = \lambda A_{exc}$. The parameter $\lambda$ is a function of the protein density and $\lambda = 1/2$ at a low-density limit [44]. At the close-packed condition, the area fraction $\phi$ of the bound protein has the maximum: $\phi_{max} = a_p/\lambda A_{exc}^{min} = 1/4\lambda = \pi/2\sqrt{3} \approx 0.907$ in two-dimensional space [53]. For simplicity, we use a constant value, $\phi = 1/3$, as in our previous study [42, 43], i.e., $\phi_{max} = 0.75$. In this study, we consider no attractive interactions between the proteins and focus on isotropic and nematic phases, such that smectic and crystal phases are not in the scope.

The bending energy of the bare (unbound) membrane is given by

\[ U_{mb} = \int \frac{\kappa_4}{2}(C_1 + C_2)^2 dA = \frac{\kappa_4 A}{2R_cy^2}, \]  

where $C_1$ and $C_2$ are the principal curvatures ($C_1 = 1/R_cy$ and $C_2 = 0$ for the cylinder). The unbound membrane has a bending rigidity $\kappa_4$ and zero spontaneous curvature. The tubular membrane is connected to a large lipid reservoir, and the area difference elasticity [64, 65] is negligible. The bound protein gives an additional bending energy as $\langle U \rangle = U_{mb} + N_p(U_p)$, where $N_p = \phi A/a_p$ is the number of the bound protein and $U_p$ is the bending energy of one protein. The protein has an anisotropic bending energy:

\[ U_p = \frac{\kappa_p a_p}{2}(C_{f1} - C_p)^2 + \frac{\kappa_{side} a_p}{2}(C_{f2} - C_{side})^2, \]  

\[ C_{f1} = C_1 \cos^2(\theta_{pc}) + C_2 \sin^2(\theta_{pc}), \]  

\[ C_{f2} = C_1 \sin^2(\theta_{pc}) + C_2 \cos^2(\theta_{pc}), \]  

where $\langle \cdots \rangle$ is the ensemble average, and $\theta_{ps}$ is the angle between the major protein axis and the ordered direction.
where $C_{\ell 1}$ and $C_{\ell 2}$ are curvatures along the major and minor axes of the proteins, respectively. $\kappa_p$ and $C_p$ are the bending rigidity and spontaneous curvature along the major protein axis, respectively, and $\kappa_{\text{side}}$ and $C_{\text{side}}$ are those along the minor axis (side direction). Here, $\kappa_{\text{side}} = 0$ is used unless otherwise specified.

The free energy $F_p$ of the bound proteins is expressed as

$$F_p = \int f_p \, dA,$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

$$f_p = \frac{\phi k_B T}{a_p} \left[ \ln(\phi) + \frac{S\Psi}{2} - \ln \left( \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} w(\theta_{ps}) \, d\theta_{ps} \right) \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\Theta(x)$ denotes the unit step function, $k_B T$ is the thermal energy, and $\beta = 1/k_B T$. The factor $g$ expresses the effect of the orientation-dependent excluded volume, where $b_1 = B_0/a_p = (4 + b_{\text{exc}}/2)\lambda$ and $b_2 = -B_2\lambda/a_p = b_{\text{exc}}\lambda$. Unoverlapped states exist at $g > 0$. Since $w(\theta_{ps})$ is the weight of each protein orientation, the ensemble average of a quantity $\chi$ is given by

$$\langle \chi \rangle = \frac{\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} \chi w(\theta_{ps}) \, d\theta_{ps}}{\int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} w(\theta_{ps}) \, d\theta_{ps}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

The quantities $\Psi$ and $\bar{\Psi}$ are the symmetric and asymmetric components of the nematic tensor, respectively, and are determined by Eq. (1) and $\langle \sin(\theta_{ps}) \cos(\theta_{ps}) \rangle = 0$ using Eq. (11). When the nematic order is parallel to one of the directions of the membrane principal curvatures ($\theta_{sc} = 0$ or $\pi/2$), $\Psi = 0$. The free energy minimum is calculated from $\partial F_p / \partial S = \partial f_p / \partial \theta_{ac} = 0$. More detail is described in Ref. 42.

In this study, we examine the axial force $f_{\text{ex}}$ and the equilibrium of the protein binding and unbinding. In experiments, an external force $f_{\text{ex}}$ is imposed by optical tweezers and micropipette in order to extend a membrane tube from a liposome. The free energy is give by $F = F_p + U_{\text{mb}} - f_{\text{ex}}L_{cy}$. This force $f_{\text{ex}}$ is balanced with the membrane axial force and is obtained by $\partial F / \partial L_{cy} = 0$ as

$$f_{\text{ex}} = 2\pi \frac{a_p}{R_{cy}} \frac{\partial f_p}{\partial (1/R_{cy})} + f_{\text{mb}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

The last term $f_{\text{mb}}$ represents the force of the bare membrane tube ($\phi = 0$),

$$f_{\text{mb}} = 2\pi \kappa_d \frac{f_0}{R_{cy} C_p} = \frac{f_0}{R_{cy} C_p},$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $f_0 = 2\pi \kappa_d C_p$ is the force at $R_{cy} C_p = 1$ and is used as the unit hereafter.

The proteins bind and unbind the membrane with the binding chemical potential $\mu$. The equilibrium of the binding and unbinding is obtained by minimizing $F - \mu N_p$. Hence, the equilibrium protein density is calculated from $\mu = a_p \partial f_p / \partial \phi$. Here, the number $N_{lip}$ of the lipids and the area $A$ remain constant, so that the ensemble is changed from the $N_p N_{lip} A T$ ensemble to $\mu N_{lip} A T$ ensemble.

Unless otherwise specified, we use $\ell_1 = 3$ and $a_p C_p^2 = 0.26$, which correspond to the N-BAR domain ($\ell_1 = 15$ nm $\ell_2 = 5$ nm, and $1/C_p = 15$ nm) \cite{43}. Another area ratio $a_p C_p^2 = 0.26$ is used to examine $C_p$ dependence. The detail of the numerical methods is described in Appendix A.
FIG. 3. Effects of (a) the bending rigidity \( \kappa_p \) and (b) elliptic ratio \( d_{el} \) of the proteins on the density \( \phi \) dependence of the orientational degree \( S \) at \( 1/R_{cy} C_p = 1 \). (a) From top to bottom, \( \kappa_p/k_B T = 80, 60, 40, 20, \) and 10 at \( d_{el} = 3 \). (b) From top to bottom, \( d_{el} = 7, 4, 3, \) and 2 at \( \kappa_p/k_B T = 40 \). The metastable states at \( \phi \approx \phi_{lim}(0) \) are not shown.

B. Theoretical results

For flat membranes, the proteins exhibit a first-order transition from a randomly oriented state \( (S = 0) \) to an ordered state \( (S > 0) \) with increasing protein density \( \phi \), as shown in Fig. 2(a). This transition density decreases as the elliptic ratio \( d_{el} \) increases, and the same behavior is obtained for spherical membranes \cite{42}. For cylindrical membranes, the proteins are oriented on average even at \( \phi \to 0 \) (see Figs. 2(b)–(e)). The maximum density \( \phi_{lim}(S) \) is given by

\[
\phi_{lim}(S) = \frac{1}{b_0 - b_2 S/2}.
\]  

(14)

that is independent of the membrane curvature \( (\phi_{max} = \phi_{lim}(1)) \). The straight line \( (S = 0) \) for \( 0 < \phi < \phi_{lim}(0) \) in Fig. 2(a) is divided into two, and the right branch remains even at large tube curvatures, \( 1/R_{cy} \), although it has a high energy with a narrow width of \( \phi \) (see dashed lines at \( \phi \approx 0.6 \) in Figs. 2(b)–(e)). Meanwhile, the left branch connects to the upper branch at \( 1/R_{cy} C_p \gtrsim 0.1 \) (see Fig. 2(b)). Note that it is separated at \( 1/R_{cy} C_p = 0.01 \) (data not shown). At \( 1/R_{cy} C_p \leq 1 \), the proteins prefer to align to the azimuthal direction \( (\theta_{pc} = 0) \), while the thermal fluctuations disturb it. Hence, the proteins are more ordered (higher \( S \)) at higher \( \kappa_p \) (see Fig. 2(a)). At high density \( \phi \) (close to \( \phi_{max} \)), \( S \) is dominantly determined by the orientation-dependent excluded volume and the effects increase with increasing \( d_{el} \) (see Fig. 3).

At \( 1/R_{cy} C_p > 1 \), the protein preferred direction is tilted either to a positive or negative angle of \( \theta_{pc} = \pm \arccos(\sqrt{R_{cy} C_p}) \). At low \( \phi \), the positive and negative angles simultaneously exist, so that the proteins exhibit a symmetric distribution with \( \theta_{sc} = 0 \) (see Fig. 4). In contrast, at high \( \phi \), these two angles cannot coexist at the same time owing to the large excluded-volume interactions between them (see the right distributions in Figs. 4(c) and (d)). The transitions between these two states are the second order and first order for \( 1/R_{cy} C_p \leq 1.3 \) and \( 1/R_{cy} C_p \geq 1.35 \) (see Figs. 4(a) and (b)), respectively. The two states coexist at \( \phi \approx 0.55 \) and \( 1/R_{cy} C_p = 1.5 \) as shown in Fig. 4(d). Correspondingly, the \( S-\phi \) curves exhibit discrete changes of the slope and position (see Figs. 2(d) and (e)), respectively. In the case of the second-order transition, the excluded-volume
interactions push the protein into the azimuthal direction leading to the angular distribution of a single peak near the transition point (see the data at $\phi = 0.6$ in Fig. 4(c)), so that the symmetric peak continuously changes to an asymmetric peak at the transition.

Figure 5 shows the tube curvature $1/R_{cy}$ dependence of the orientational degree $S_z$ along the tube axis, protein free-energy, and axial force $f_{ax}$. The preferred orientation changes from $\theta_{sc} = 0$ to $\pi/2$ at $1/R_{cy}C_p = 2$, so that $S_z$ changes from negative values ($S_z = -S$) to positive values ($S_z = S$). Interestingly, the orientational order ($S = |S_z|$) has a maximum at $1/2 < 1/R_{cy}C_p < 1$, i.e., less than the matching curvature $1/R_{cy}C_p = 1$ (see Figs. 5(a) and 2). Oppositely, the curvature $C_e$ of the free-energy minimum is higher than the matching curvature (see Fig. 5(b)). These are determined by the competition between the orientational entropy and bending energy. The curvature ($C_{order}$) of the maximum order and $C_e$ decrease with increasing $\phi$ and $\kappa_p$ (see Fig. 6): at $\kappa_p \to \infty$, $C_{order} \to 1/2R_{cy}$, in which the strength of the approximately harmonic potential of $U_p$ for $\theta_{sc} \ll 1$ (i.e., $\partial^2 U_p/\partial \theta_{sc}^2|_{\theta_{sc}=0}$) is maximum. The amplitudes of the order and the depth of free-energy minimum increase with increasing $\kappa_p$ (see Figs. 6(a) and (b), respectively). Corresponding to the larger energy change in $f_p$, the axial force $f_{ax}$ deviates more from the value of the bare membrane ($f_{mb}$ given by Eq. (13)) at higher $\kappa_p$ (see Fig. 6(c)). Spontaneously formed membrane tubes require no axial force (i.e., $f_{ax} = 0$). The generation curvature $C_g$ of this spontaneous tube increases with increasing $\kappa_p$ and $\phi$ (see the inset of Fig. 6(c)), i.e., a narrower tube is generated. Note that $C_g$ also depends on the bending rigidity $\kappa_d$ of the bare membrane in contrast to $C_{order}$ and $C_e$.

Next, we examine the effects of the protein bending energy in the side direction (see Fig. 7). At zero side spontaneous curvature ($C_{side} = 0$), the proteins more align in the azimuthal direction with increasing $\kappa_{side}$, since the curvature $C_{\theta 2}$ in the side direction becomes closer to
C_{side}. This effect is pronounced at narrow tubes, whereas it is negligible for 1/R_{cy}C_{p} < 1. For a negative value of C_{side}, C_{order} and C_{e} become close to C_{p}, and the proteins more align in a wider range of 1/R_{cy}. For a positive value of C_{side}, C_{order} and C_{e} become deviated from C_{p}, and the proteins less align. The generation curvature slightly increases with increasing C_{side}: C_{g} = 0.412, 0.421, and 0.448 at C_{side} = −1, 0, and 1, respectively, for the condition used in Fig. 7.

We have fixed the protein curvature C_{p} until here. Figure 8 shows the effects of C_{p} variation with maintaining the other parameters. As C_{p} changes from null to 1/R_{cy}, the nematic orientation changes from the axial direction (θ_{sc} = π/2) to the azimuthal direction (θ_{sc} = 0) (see the left half of Fig. 8(c)). This change becomes steeper at higher κ_{p}. During this change, the axial force f_{ex} is almost constant, although a small peak appears for high κ_{p} and/or high φ (see the left regions of Figs. 8(a) and (b)). This is due to little change in the bending energy, because the proteins can find their preferred curvature by adjusting their orientation. For C_{p} ≥ 1/R_{cy}, f_{ex} almost linearly decreases, and the slope increases with increasing κ_{p} and φ (see the right region of Figs. 8(a) and (b)).

These dependencies qualitatively agree with the results of our previous meshless membrane simulations [41, 57, 59]. A quantitative comparison is described in Sec. III B.

Finally, we examine the equilibrium of the protein binding and unbinding. As the binding chemical potential μ increases, more proteins bind onto the membrane. The protein binding exhibits a first-order transition from a wide tube with low φ to a narrow tube with high φ at small force, f_{ex} < f_{0} (see Fig. 9). This transition agrees with the observation of the coexistence of two tubes with different R_{cy} and φ in the experiments of an I-BAR protein [17]. The force-dependence curves shown in Fig. 9 are asymmetric and exhibit weak dependence at f_{ex} > f_{0}, owing to the adjustment of the protein orientation that reduces a change in the protein bending energy (see Fig. 9(c)). These behaviors are different from the binding of proteins with an isotropic spontaneous curvature [30], where the f_{ex}−1/R_{cy} and f_{ex}−φ curves are point symmetric and reflection symmetric to f_{ex} = f_{0}, respectively.

The protein binding has a maximum in the variation of the tube curvature (compare Figs. 9(a) and (b)). This curvature is called sensing curvature (denoted C_{s}) and can be calculated from ∂φ/∂(1/R_{cy}) = 0. Interestingly, C_{s} is varied by μ and κ_{p} (see Fig. 9). For low φ at low μ, C_{s} approach C_{e}, since the excluded volume gives
To clearly show it, the force-dependence curves for the volume but by the anisotropy of the protein bending energy. It indicates the anisotropic interaction of the BAR proteins [17, 18]. It indicates the anisotropic bending energy $U_{\text{iso}}$ with $\mu/k_B T = -0.5, 0, 2.5, 5$, and 5 at $d_{el} = 3$ and $\kappa_p/k_B T = 60$. The solid lines represent thermal equilibrium states. The dashed lines represent the metastable and free-energy-barrier states. The force is normalized by $f_0 = 2\pi \kappa_d C_p$.

The asymmetry of the force-dependence curves is caused not by the orientation-dependent excluded volume but by the anisotropy of the protein bending energy. To clearly show it, the force-dependence curves for the elliptic proteins with an isotropic spontaneous curvature $C_{\text{iso}}$ are plotted in Fig. 10. The proteins have a bending energy

$$U_{\text{iso}} = \frac{\kappa_{\text{iso}} a_p}{2} (C_1 + C_2 - C_{\text{iso}}^2), \quad (15)$$

instead of $U_p$. Note that the anisotropic bending energy $U_p$ with $\kappa_p = \kappa_{\text{side}}$ and $C_p = C_{\text{side}}$ does not coincide to $U_{\text{iso}}$ except for the case of $\theta_{pc} = 0$ or $\pi/2$. The $f_{ex}/R_{cy}$ and $f_{ex}/\phi$ curves become point symmetric and reflection symmetric to $f_{ex} = f_0$, respectively, and the first-order transitions occur both at small and large forces symmetrically. The transition points are almost constant for a variation in $\mu$. This is due to the excluded-volume dependence on the protein orientation, since the transition points move outwards in the case of orientation-independent excluded volume [30].

### III. SIMULATION

#### A. Simulation model

A fluid membrane is represented by a self-assembled single-layer sheet of $N$ particles. The position and orientational vectors of the $i$-th particle are $\mathbf{r}_i$ and $\mathbf{u}_i$, respectively. The membrane particles interact with each other via a potential $U = U_{\text{rep}} + U_{\text{att}} + U_{\text{bend}} + U_{\text{tilt}}$. The potential $U_{\text{rep}}$ is an excluded volume interaction with diameter $\sigma$ for all pairs of particles. The solvent is implicitly accounted for by an effective attractive potential $U_{\text{att}}$. The details of the meshless membrane model and protein rods are described in Ref. [59] and Refs. [57, 58], respectively. We employ the parameter sets used in Ref. [59].

The bending and tilt potentials are given by $U_{\text{bend}}/k_B T = (k_{\text{bend}}/2) \sum_{i<j} (\mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_j - C_{bd} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ij})^2 w_{cv}(r_{ij})$ and $U_{\text{tilt}}/k_B T = (k_{\text{tilt}}/2) \sum_{i<j} (\hat{\mathbf{u}}_i \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ij})^2 w_{cv}(r_{ij})$, respectively, where $r_{i,j} = r_i - r_j$, $r_{i,j} =$

![FIG. 9. Force $f_{ex}$ dependence of (a) the curvature $1/R_{cy}$ of the cylindrical membrane, (b) protein density $\phi$, and (c) the orientational degree $S_z$ along the tube axis for $\mu/k_B T = -2.5, 0, 2.5, 5$ and 5 at $d_{el} = 3$ and $\kappa_p/k_B T = 60$. The solid lines represent thermal equilibrium states. The dashed lines represent the metastable and free-energy-barrier states. The force is normalized by $f_0 = 2\pi \kappa_d C_p$.](image)

![FIG. 10. Force $f_{ex}$ dependence for the proteins with the isotropic bending energy $U_{\text{iso}}$ with $\mu/k_B T = -4, -2, 0, 2$, and 4 at $d_{el} = 3$ and $\kappa_{\text{iso}}/k_B T = 60$. (a) Curvature $1/R_{cy}$ of the membrane tube. (b) Protein density $\phi$. The solid lines represent thermal equilibrium states. The dashed lines represent the metastable and free-energy-barrier states. The force is normalized by $f_0 = 2\pi \kappa_d C_{\text{iso}}$.](image)
\(|r_{i,j}|, \tilde{r}_{i,j} = r_{i,j}/r_{i,j}, w_{cv}(r_{i,j})|\) is a weight function. The spontaneous curvature \(C_0\) of the membrane is given by \(C_0\) = \(C_{bd}/2\). In this study, \(C_0 = 0\) and \(k_{bend} = k_{th} = 10\) are used except for the membrane particles belonging to the protein rods.

An anisotropic protein and membrane underneath it are together modeled as a rod that is a linear chain of \(N_{sg}\) membrane particles [57]. We use \(N_{sg} = 5\) and 10 with the density \(\phi = N_{sg}N_{rod}/N = 0.167\). The protein rods have spontaneous curvatures \(C_{rod}\) along the rod axis and have no spontaneous (side) curvatures perpendicular to the rod axis. The protein-bound membrane are more rigid than the bare membrane: the values of \(k_{bend}\) and \(k_{th}\) are \(k_r\) times higher than those of the bare membrane.

The membrane has mechanical properties that are typical of lipid membranes: the bare membrane has a bending rigidity \(\kappa/k_B T = 16.1 \pm 0.02\), area of the tensionless membrane per particle \(a_0/\sigma^2 = 1.2778 \pm 0.0002\), area compression modulus \(K_A \sigma^2/k_B T = 83.1 \pm 0.4\), edge line tension \(\Gamma/\sigma k_B T = 5.73 \pm 0.04\) [67], and the Gaussian modulus \(\kappa/\kappa = -0.9 \pm 0.1\) [67]. The bending rigidity is calculated by Eq. [13], which is slightly greater than the value \((15 \pm 1)\) estimated by thermal undulation [66]. The membrane tube with a length of \(L_{cy}\) is connected by the periodic boundary, and the tube volume can be freely varied. Molecular dynamics with a Langevin thermostat is employed [66 68]. The dependence on the rod curvature \(C_{rod}\) was calculated at \(L_{cy} = 48\sigma\) and \(N = 2400\) in Ref. 59 using the replica-exchange method [69 70]. The dependence on the tube radius was calculated at \(k_r = 4\) and \(N = 4800\) in this study.

**B. Comparison of simulation and theoretical results**

Figure 11 and Figs. 12-13 show the simulation and theoretical results for the short and long protein rods \((N_{sg} = 5\) and 10\), respectively. Since the simulated proteins do not have an elliptic shape and are flexible, the protein parameters are adjusted as follows. For the short rods, we used the orientational degree \(S_z\) at \(C_{rod}\sigma = 0.15\) (the second line from the top in Fig. 11(d)) for a fit and obtained \(\kappa_p = 30k_B T\) and \(C_{rod}/C_p = 2\) for \(a_p = N_{sg}a_0\) and \(d_{cl} = 3\). This parameter set reproduces the simulation data of \(S_z\) and \(f_{ex}\) at different values of \(C_{rod}\) very well. Thus, this theory can quantitatively describe the behavior of the short proteins.

However, less agreement is obtained for the long rods of \(N_{sg} = 10\) (see Figs. 12 and 13). It is due to the protein assembly induced by the membrane-mediated attractive interactions between the proteins (see the snapshots in Figs. 12(a)–(c)). At a high rod curvature \((C_{rod}\sigma = 0.25)\), the proteins assemble in the azimuthal direction, and the membrane deforms into an elliptic tube, as shown in Fig. 12(c). For longer (narrower) and shorter (wider) tubes, cylindrical and triangular shapes are formed (see Movie 1 in ESI). Thus, large negative values of \(S_z\) (Fig. 12(c)) and nonmonotonic dependence of \(f_{ex}\) for \(C_{rod}\sigma > 2.5\) \((C_{rod}\sigma > 0.25)\) at \(k_r = 4\) (Fig. 13(a)) are obtained. In the elliptic and triangular membranes, the proteins align in the azimuthal direction, so that their stabilities can be analyzed by assuming a fixed protein orientation as reported in Ref. 11. More detail of this assembly is described in Refs. 41 47 59.

For a lower rod curvature \((C_{rod}\sigma < 0.2)\) of the long rods at \(k_r = 4\), the azimuthal assembly does not occur, but clusters of a few proteins appear as shown in Figs. 12(a) and (b). We fitted the linear-decrease region of the force-dependence curve in Fig. 13(a) at \(C_{rod}\sigma > 1\) and obtained \(\kappa_p/k_B T = 60, 90, 120,\) and 150 with \(C_{rod}/C_p = 2.5, 2.05, 1.7,\) and 1.5 for \(k_r = 2,\)
FIG. 12. Membrane simulations of the long protein rods of \( N_{\text{sg}} = 10 \) at \( k_t = 4 \). (a)–(c) Snapshots for (a),(b) \( C_{\text{rod}}\sigma = 0.1 \) and (c) \( C_{\text{rod}}\sigma = 0.25 \). (a) \( L_{\text{cy}}/\sigma = 160 \) (\( R_{\text{cy}}/\sigma = 6.05 \)). (b),(c) \( L_{\text{cy}}/\sigma = 48 \) (\( R_{\text{cy}}/\sigma = 19.66 \) and 18.37, respectively). The front and side views are displayed in (c). (d),(e) Dependence of (d) the axial force \( f_{\text{ex}} \) and (e) orientational order \( \langle S_z \rangle \) along the membrane tube on the tube radius \( R_{\text{cy}} \) for \( C_{\text{rod}}\sigma = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2, \) and 0.25. The symbols with dashed lines represent the simulation data. The black solid lines represent the theoretical results for \( C_{\text{rod}}\sigma = 0.1, 0.15, \) and 0.2.

4, 8, and 12, respectively, at \( a_p = N_{\text{sg}}a_0 \) and \( d_{\text{el}} = 7 \). The orientational orders \( S_z \) calculated by these parameter sets show quantitative deviation from the simulation data, although they capture qualitative behavior (see Figs. 12(e) and 13(b)). Moreover, the other regions of the force-dependence curves have quantitative differences: the heights of peaks at \( C_{\text{rod}}R_{\text{cy}} < 1 \) in Fig. 13(a) deviate from the simulation values, and the slopes at \( \sigma/R_{\text{cy}} < 0.1 \) in Fig. 12(d) are different. Although the present theory assumes the uniform lateral distribution of the proteins, the protein clusters can bend the membrane more strongly as demonstrated by the formation of the elliptic tube. Therefore, we consider that the clusters effectively work as large or rigid proteins. The greater values of \( \kappa_{\text{p}} \) and \( C_p \) obtained by the fits support this mechanism. Thus, for a quantitative prediction of a long protein (i.e., a large elliptic ratio \( d_{\text{el}} \)), it is significant to include the effects of the protein clusters.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

We have studied the equilibrium states of the anisotropic curvature-inducing proteins theoretically and compared them with the simulation results. The protein is assumed to have an elliptic shape with a bending rigidity and spontaneous curvature mainly along the major axis of the protein. On narrow membrane tubes, the proteins exhibit a first-order nematic transition with increasing protein density as reported in our previous paper [32]. Here, we found that this transition becomes the second order on the tubes with intermediate radii. In our previous study, the proteins on a membrane with a fixed shape have been considered. In this study, we extended the theory to proteins on membrane tubes which radius is not fixed and in the binding/unbinding equilibrium. We found that the protein binding affects the membrane axial force differently for wide and narrow tubes. For wide tubes, the force is reduced by the binding. In contrast, it is only slightly modified for narrow tubes, on which the proteins are tilted from the azimuthal direction. With increasing binding chemical potential, a first-order transition between two tube radii with differ-
ent protein densities occurs only once at the wide tubes, whereas the proteins with an isotropic bending energy exhibit the transition twice. For the short proteins, this theory reproduces the protein orientation and axial force obtained by the meshless simulations very well. In contrast, the long proteins have large membrane-mediated attractive interactions so that resultant protein clusters modify the mean orientation and axial force. However, the theory still holds qualitative dependency.

Moreover, we found that the tube curvatures for the maximum protein binding (sensing) and orientational order are different from the protein spontaneous curvature $C_p$. The sensing curvature is higher than $C_p$ at low protein density and coincides to the curvature of the free energy minimum. This is contrast to isotropic proteins $^{30}$ which sensing curvature is constant. The order curvature is lower than $C_p$ and decreases with increasing protein density and bending rigidity. These dependencies are caused by the variation in the protein orientation. Previously, the proteins are often assumed to orient to the instantaneous curvature along the protein minor axis) modifies protein densities occurs only once at the wide tubes, whereas the proteins with an isotropic bending energy exhibit the transition twice. For the short proteins, this theory reproduces the protein orientation and axial force obtained by the meshless simulations very well. In contrast, the long proteins have large membrane-mediated attractive interactions so that resultant protein clusters modify the mean orientation and axial force. However, the theory still holds qualitative dependency.
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