

Instabilities and waves in thin films of living fluids

Sumithra Sankararaman* and Sriram Ramaswamy†‡
 Centre for Condensed Matter Theory, Department of Physics,
 Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560012, India

We formulate the thin-film hydrodynamics of a suspension of polar self-driven particles and show that it is prone to several instabilities through the interplay of activity, polarity and the existence of a free surface. Our approach extends, to self-propelling systems, the work of Ben Amar and Cummings [Phys Fluids **13** (2001) 1160] on thin-film nematics. Based on our estimates the instabilities should be seen in bacterial suspensions and the lamellipodium, and are potentially relevant to the morphology of biofilms. We suggest several experimental tests of our theory.

The equations of active hydrodynamics [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] describe the collective behaviour of self-driven, orientable particles in a fluid medium, and apply over a wide range of length scales, from fish shoals to bacteria to suspensions of actively contracting filaments in the cytoskeleton. This approach to the mechanics of living matter has been pursued vigorously over the past few years [6]. Bacterial suspensions [7, 8] are a natural arena for testing active hydrodynamics. In this Letter we study the active hydrodynamics of a film of fluid, thin in the z direction and spread on a solid surface in the xy plane which is also the easy plane for the orientational order parameter \mathbf{p} of the *polar* active particles suspended in the fluid. For an active system, this polarity implies a current $v_0 c \mathbf{p}$ with respect to the fluid, where v_0 is a characteristic drift velocity and c the concentration of active particles. While our formulation is general, we study mainly the properties of perturbations about an ordered, uniform reference state $\langle \mathbf{p} \rangle = \hat{\mathbf{x}}$.




FIG. 1: Top view of film with contractile polar filaments (solid arrows) with a preference for pointing downhill. Active stresses cause fluid flow (dashed arrows) towards the open end of a splay perturbation, leading to gradients in the height of the fluid film. Modes propagating forward experience a height gradient that further torques (dash-dotted arrow) the filaments in the direction in which they were already perturbed.

Our main results are as follows: (i) Active, ordered thin films, although dominated by viscosity, not inertia, show a *wavelike* response to external disturbances, as a result of the coupled dynamics of free-surface undula-

tions the active stress field, and the concentration. (ii) In large regimes of parameter space this coupling produces a novel instability whose growth rate, to leading order in small wavevector $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y)$, varies as $k_y k_x^{1/2}$ for $k_x \ll \xi k_y^2$ and as k_y^2 for $k_x \gg \xi k_y^2$. The crossover length $\xi = \Gamma |C \sigma_0| h_0^2 / v_0^2 \mu$ depends on the drift velocity v_0 of the active particles, the mean film thickness h_0 , the viscosity μ , an orientation mobility Γ , the coupling C of particle orientation to free-surface tilt, and the typical active contractile or tensile stress $\sigma_0 \equiv W c_0$. W is the strength of the force-dipole associated with each active particle, and c_0 the mean concentration of active particles. (iii) Low motility, i.e., small v_0 , promotes the instability and high motility suppresses it, a point we will return to at the end of this paper. The instability manifests itself in moving (convective) and static (absolute) form. We also offer a simple physical picture (Fig. 1) of the mechanism underlying this unique instability. (iv) We find two other possible modes of free-surface instability. One arises because oriented *tensile* filaments lower the effective surface tension, the other because flows generated by oriented *contractile* filaments reinforce free-surface tilt. In addition, unstable modes of a type already identified [3] in bulk active systems exist here as well, restricted by finite film thickness.

Before presenting our model in detail, a few words are in order about the systems to which it might apply. Bacterial colonies on a surface frequently take the form of organised, rigid *biofilms* [9]. During formation, a biofilm can be thought of as a thin, ordered, fluid layer of active particles, and hence a test-bed for the ideas presented in this paper. The biofilms of wild-type *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* [10] are normally flat carpets, while those of mutants with decreased motility are have irregular, localized bumps. An understanding of these structures should begin with the thin-film hydrodynamics of active fluids. The lamellipodium of crawling cells is propelled by the ATP-driven force of a continually polymerizing and depolymerizing, contractile actin network just below the cell membrane [11] and is thus a moving, thin, active fluid film.

We therefore consider a fluid film containing active particles with concentration field c , and orientation de-

†also at JNCASR, Bangalore 560 064 India

scribed by a vector field $\mathbf{p} = (\mathbf{p}_\perp, p_z)$. Since we are interested here in perturbations about a macroscopically ordered state, we set $|\mathbf{p}| = 1$. We construct equations of motion for $c(\mathbf{r}_\perp, t)$, $\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r}_\perp, t)$, and the height field $h(\mathbf{r}_\perp, t)$ of the film, as functions of in-plane position \mathbf{r}_\perp and time t . Our treatment generalizes [12] to the case of active systems.

The kinematic boundary condition [13] $\dot{h} = u_z - \mathbf{u}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp h$ connects h to the hydrodynamic velocity field $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}_\perp, u_z)$ evaluated at the free surface. Incompressibility $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$ leads to the simplification

$$\partial_t h + \nabla_\perp \cdot \int_0^h \mathbf{u}_\perp dz = 0. \quad (1)$$

We eliminate \mathbf{u}_\perp in favour of \mathbf{p} , c and h through the Stokes equation in the lubrication approximation [13] $u_z = 0$, $|\nabla_\perp \mathbf{u}| \ll |\partial_z \mathbf{u}|$:

$$\mu \partial_z^2 \mathbf{u}_\perp - \nabla_\perp P - \hat{z} \partial_z P - \nabla \cdot \sigma^a = 0 \quad (2)$$

where μ and P are the viscosity and pressure field of the fluid, and $\sigma^a(\mathbf{r}) = Wc(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{p}(\mathbf{r})$ is the intrinsic stress field [3, 14] of the active particles. We discuss the role of gravity later in the paper. $W < 0$ and $W > 0$ correspond respectively to contractile and tensile activity.

The active-particle current is along \mathbf{p} , and the particles cannot leave the film. Thus $p_z(z=0) = 0$, and $\mathbf{p} \cdot \hat{N} = 0$ at $z = h$, where $\hat{N} = (-\nabla_\perp h, 1)/\sqrt{1 + (\nabla_\perp h)^2}$ is the outward normal to the free surface. So $p_z \simeq \mathbf{p}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp h$ at the free surface, interpolating linearly, through director elasticity [15], to $p_z = 0$ at the substrate, i.e., $p_z = (z/h)\mathbf{p}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp h$. Therefore in a z -averaged description $p_z = (1/2)\partial_x h$ and $\partial_z p_z \simeq h^{-1}\partial_x h$. Consider small deviations [16] about a state aligned along $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$: $\mathbf{p}_\perp = \hat{x} + \theta\hat{y}$, $\theta \ll 1$. From the foregoing discussion, the active force density has components $\nabla_i \sigma_{ix}^a = \sigma_0(\partial_y \theta + \partial_x c/c_0 + h^{-1}\partial_x h)$, $\nabla_i \sigma_{iy}^a = \sigma_0 \partial_x \theta$ and $\nabla_i \sigma_{iz}^a = \sigma_0 \partial_x^2 h/2$ to linear order. We now eliminate the pressure P in favour of h , \mathbf{p} and c , through the z -component of (2) and stress continuity at the free surface $z = h$, leading to $P(x, y, z, t) = P_0 - \gamma \nabla_\perp^2 h + \sigma_0(h-z)\partial_x^2 h/2$, where P_0 is a reference pressure and γ the surface tension of the fluid [13].

Using this in (2) and integrating twice over z with $\partial_z \mathbf{u}_\perp(h) = 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_\perp(0) = 0$ we get

$$\mathbf{u}_\perp(z) = \frac{hz - z^2/2}{\mu} \left(\gamma \nabla_\perp \nabla_\perp^2 h - \frac{1}{2} \sigma_0 h \partial_x^2 \nabla_\perp h - \mathbf{f}_\perp \right), \quad (3)$$

to linear order in perturbations of h , where $\mathbf{f}_\perp = \sigma_0[(\partial_y \theta + \partial_x c/c_0 + h^{-1}\partial_x h)\hat{x} + \partial_x \theta\hat{y}]$. Using (3) in (1), linearizing $h = h_0 + \delta h$, $c = c_0 + \delta c$, the in-plane fourier-components $\delta h_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$, $\delta c_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$, $\theta_{\mathbf{k}}(t)$ obey

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta h_{\mathbf{k}} &= -\frac{\sigma_0 h_0^2}{3\mu} [2h_0 k_x k_y \theta_{\mathbf{k}} + h_0 k_x^2 \frac{\delta c_{\mathbf{k}}}{c_0}] \\ &+ \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} h_0^2 \mathbf{k}^2\right) k_x^2 \delta h_{\mathbf{k}} - \frac{\gamma h_0^3}{3\mu} \mathbf{k}^4 \delta h_{\mathbf{k}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

The four effects of activity on the right-hand side of (4) are, from left to right within the square bracket, (i) curvature-induced flow; (ii) anisotropic osmotic flow; and, in parentheses, (iii) splay-induced flow from tilting the free surface and (iv) an active anisotropic contribution to the effective tension. The final term on the right of (4) is ordinary surface tension. For contractile ($\sigma_0 < 0$) stresses, term (iii) destabilises, and the active tension in (iv) stabilises, the surface; for tensile ($\sigma_0 > 0$) stresses the opposite happens.

The dynamics of the polar orientation field \mathbf{p} differs from that of the conventional nematic director. This is in part due to the spontaneous-splay term [17]

$$H_{sp} \equiv - \int d^3 x \tilde{C} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} \quad (5)$$

in the effective Hamiltonian for \mathbf{p} , where \tilde{C} is a phenomenological parameter which can depend on the local concentration, say $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(c_0) + \tilde{C}'(c_0)\delta c + \dots \equiv C + C'\delta c$. Through the ‘‘equilibrium’’ part of the dynamics of our system, the C' term will contribute $-\Gamma \delta H / \delta \mathbf{p} = -\Gamma C' \nabla \delta c$ to the equation of motion for \mathbf{p} , Γ being a kinetic coefficient. The term in C in (5), although a total divergence, enters the dynamics because the free surface is a movable boundary. For a film unbounded in the xy plane, imposing $p_z \simeq \mathbf{p}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp h$ as argued above and carrying out the integral over z gives

$$- \int d^3 x C \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} \simeq -C \int d^2 x \mathbf{p}_\perp \cdot \nabla_\perp h \quad (6)$$

which couples \mathbf{p}_\perp to tilts of the free surface. For $C > 0$ a tilt of the free surface tries to make \mathbf{p}_\perp point uphill.




FIG. 2: An object with head and tail of sizes ℓ and ℓ' respectively, and length ℓ , produces a spontaneous curvature $1/R \simeq (\ell - \ell')/\ell^2$.

A physical estimate of the numerical value of C can be obtained in the following way. A balance between the Frank elastic energy for splay and the energy for spontaneous splay of the polar particles means that

$$\nabla \cdot p = C/K = 1/R, \quad (7)$$

where K is the splay elastic constant and R the radius of curvature generated in the system due to a splay in the particles. From Fig. 2, R is the particle thickness divided by the fractional length difference between the two edges of the particle.

Combining (5) and (6) with the results of [3], the dynamics of the the angle field θ becomes

$$\partial_t \theta = -a_1 v_0 \partial_x \theta - \zeta \partial_y \delta c + \delta(z) \Gamma C \partial_y h + (\lambda A_{yx} - \Omega_{yx}) + D \nabla^2 \theta. \quad (8)$$

The first term on the right-hand side of (8) is advection of θ with a speed proportional to v_0 [18]. The rest, from left to right, are coupling to concentration gradients, with $\zeta = \Gamma C'$, coupling to the free surface through (6), flow-orientation coupling as in nematics [15], and gradient elasticity of \mathbf{p} . The first three terms are polar, and the first is a consequence of activity. $A_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_i u_j + \nabla_j u_i)$ and $\Omega_{ij} = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla_i u_j - \nabla_j u_i)$. For stable flow-alignment [15] $|\lambda| > 1$.

Eliminating \mathbf{u} in favour of θ and h through (3), and averaging over z , (8) becomes, to leading orders in k and linear order in the fields,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \theta = & + \frac{i\Gamma C}{h_0} k_y \delta h_{\mathbf{k}} - (D_+ k_x^2 + D_- k_y^2 + ia_1 v_0 k_x) \theta \\ & - (i\zeta k_y - \Phi k_x k_y) \delta c, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $D_{\pm} = D - (\lambda \pm 1)h_0^2 \sigma_0 / 4\mu$, and $\Phi = (\lambda - 1)h_0^2 \sigma_0 / 4c_0 \mu$.

The active contribution to particle currents with respect to the fluid is $v_0 c \mathbf{p}$ where v_0 is a drift velocity. Thus in the lab frame of reference the continuity equation for the concentration, apart from diffusion, is simply $\partial_t \delta c = -\nabla \cdot [(\mathbf{u} + v_0 \mathbf{p})c]$. Linearizing around c_0 and using (8) and overall incompressibility,

$$\partial_t \delta c = -ic_0 v_0 k_y \theta - iv_0 k_x \delta c + O(k_x^2 \delta c_{\mathbf{k}}, k_x^2 \delta h_{\mathbf{k}}). \quad (10)$$

The $O(k^2)$ terms in (10) come from including fluctuations in p_x as well by explicitly including diffusion of particles.

The instability we are chiefly concerned with here, arising from the combination of activity and the spontaneous-splay coupling C , is best seen in the extreme case of *immotile but active* polar particles, *i.e.* $v_0 = 0$ but $\sigma_0 \neq 0$. To leading order in k the concentration plays no role, and the dynamics is determined by (4) and (8), yielding an unstable mode in the system which grows at a rate $k_x^{1/2} k_y$. In detail, for time-dependence $\exp(-i\omega t)$, to leading order in k , the mode frequency

$$\omega = \pm \frac{1 + i \operatorname{sgn}(k_x C \sigma_0)}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{\Gamma h_0^2}{3\mu} \right)^{1/2} |C \sigma_0 k_x|^{1/2} |k_y| \quad (11)$$

has a real and an imaginary part; the mode displaying an instability travels in the $+x$ direction ($-x$ direction) if $\sigma_0 C > 0$ ($\sigma_0 C < 0$).

This instability can be understood from a simple physical picture, involving the interplay of active stresses σ_0 and spontaneous splay C . To fix ideas, consider as in Fig. 1 a long-wavelength splay perturbation on a set of *contractile* filaments $\sigma_0 < 0$ aligned with polarisation along $+\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, with a preference for pointing *downhill* ($C < 0$), in an initially flat film. The active stresses then generate a flow in the film that increases the height of the free surface ahead of the outward-splayed filaments, and decreases the height ahead of the inward-splayed filaments. The mode propagating along $+\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ will then cause the filaments to sample a height gradient that tilts the filaments

in the centre of the field further to the right. The same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, goes through for the tensile and/or $C > 0$ cases.

For motile particles, $v_0 \neq 0$, let us for the moment continue to ignore the concentration field. In the limit $\Gamma C / v_0 \gg 1$, (4) and (8) then yield mode frequencies

$$\omega_1 = -i \frac{\Gamma C}{v_0} \frac{2\sigma_0 h_0^2}{3\mu a_1} [k_y^2 + O\left(\frac{v_0}{\Gamma C}\right) k_x^2] \quad (12)$$

$$\omega_2 = a_1 v_0 k_x + i \frac{\Gamma C}{v_0} \frac{2\sigma_0 h_0^2}{3\mu a_1} [k_y^2 - O\left(\frac{v_0}{\Gamma C}\right) D_{\pm} k^2] \quad (13)$$

We now include the concentration via (10), but continue in the simplifying limit $\Gamma C / v_0 \gg 1$. One mode retains the purely relaxational form (12), with coefficient modified at $O(\zeta)$. The propagating mode in (13) becomes a pair with speeds of order $v_0 \pm O(\zeta)$, with relaxation rates $\sim \pm (h_0^2 \sigma_0 C \Gamma / \mu v_0) [1 + O(\zeta)] k^2$. The results from (11) to this point establish the main claims at the start of this paper. In particular, it is readily seen that (12), (13) crossover to (11) for $k_x \ll \xi k_y^2$ with $\xi = \Gamma |C \sigma_0| h_0^2 / v_0^2 \mu$.

Some general features are worth noting: (a) Regardless of the sign of $\sigma_0 C$, there is always an instability; (b) increasing v_0 weakens the instability, presumably because a collection of filaments drifting along x samples alternating height gradients along y whose effect cancels; (c) for $\sigma_0 C > 0$ the instability moves with a speed $\sim v_0 \pm O(\zeta)$, combining the effects of the drift speed v_0 and the ‘‘pressure’’ due to ζ , while for $\sigma_0 C < 0$ there is an instability in mode ω_1 , predominantly the height field h , that grows without travelling, the remnant of the instability discussed for $v_0 = 0$.

For $\Gamma C / v_0 \ll 1$ all instabilities involving the interplay of activity with the spontaneous-splay coupling C disappear. The remaining instabilities involve neither polarity nor a drift velocity. The most interesting of these, mentioned briefly below (4), arises as follows: Consider a flat free surface with *contractile* filaments aligned along $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$, and impose a small tilt $\delta h \propto x$. The filaments at the free surface are then tilted relative to those at the substrate. The resulting splay in the xz plane implies that active stresses will pump fluid towards the open end of this splayed configuration, thus increasing the tilt. In addition, the instabilities of a bulk active ordered suspension as originally discussed in [3, 5] can arise, modified here by confinement to a thin film, and the anisotropic active tension [mentioned after (4)], if large enough, will destabilize *tensile* active films at order k^4 .

We now compare the relaxation rates in (11) with the stabilizing contributions $\rho g h_0^3 k^2 / \mu$ due to gravity, ρ being the mass-density of the film and g the acceleration due to gravity, $\gamma h_0^3 k^4 / \mu$ due to surface tension, and $K k^2 / \mu$ due to orientational relaxation, where K is a Frank constant. On dimensional grounds and from standard liquid-crystal physics [15] we take $\Gamma \approx 1/\mu$, where $\mu \approx 10^{-3}$ Pa s is the viscosity of the medium. With this estimate we find the

instability survives these stabilizing agencies provided $kh_0 < \min[C\sigma_0/\rho^2 g^2 h_0^3, (C\sigma_0 h_0/\gamma^2)^{1/5}, C\sigma_0 h_0^3/K^2]$. For γ and ρ we use values for water. σ_0 should be of order $f a c_0 = \phi f/a^2$ where f is the force exerted by the active particle on the fluid, a the particle size, and we take the particle volume fraction $\phi = c_0 a^3$ of order unity since we want an ordered phase. For a bacterium of size $a \sim$ a few μm moving at several $\mu\text{m/s}$ through water $f \sim 1$ pN. We argued in Eq. (7) and Fig. 2 that $C \sim K/R$ where R is the spontaneous curvature associated with a polar object. For thermal hard-rod systems $K \sim k_B T/\ell$ where ℓ is a rod length. For μm -sized objects this would give $C \sim 10^{-6}$ dyn/cm. For a self-propelled object, it is possibly more reasonable to use the force-dipole strength $W = af$ as the natural energy scale, in which case $K \sim f$. For an object of radius $2 \mu\text{m}$ moving through water at $20 \mu\text{m/s}$ this gives K in the range of a piconewton and thus $C \sim 10^{-4}$ dyn/cm. For film thickness $h_0 \simeq 20 \mu\text{m}$, and $C \sim 10^{-6}$ dyn/cm, the instability should be seen if $kh_0 \lesssim 10^{-3}$. However, this is a pessimistic estimate: First, activity rather than thermal energy is quite likely responsible for C . Secondly, the tension γ for biofilms is that between the film and the ambient aqueous medium and therefore much smaller than the air-water value. We expect therefore that the instability should be seen over a much wider wavenumber range, possibly $kh_0 \lesssim 1$.

The experiment of choice to test our ideas would be to compare the dynamics of two initially flat thin films of uniform concentration, one with highly motile bacteria, the other with a low-motility mutant, under conditions of constant bacterial concentration. The mutant population would correspond to a system with v_0 small, and should show our instabilities. The observations of [10] on *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* are of interest in this regard, but are complicated by the fact that the bacteria are dividing. The relation of the waves seen in studies [8] of *Myxococcus xanthus* to the wavelike modes we predict remains to be explored. It seems highly likely that the instabilities and wavelike modes proposed here will appear in the lamellipodium of crawling cells [11] as well. A complete theoretical treatment must include actin treadmilling, as well as the elasticity and anchoring of the cell membrane. In all these examples, the dynamics of the bulk fluid above the film must also be included.

We thank J. Prost, K. Vijay Kumar and J. Käs for valuable inputs, and CEFIPRA project 3504-2 and the DST Math-Bio Centre grant SR/S4/MS:419/07 for support.

* Electronic address: sumithra@physics.iisc.ernet.in

† Electronic address: sriram@physics.iisc.ernet.in

[1] J. Toner and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 4828 (1998).

[2] J. Toner, Y. Tu and S. Ramaswamy, Ann. Phys. **318**,

170 (2005); F. Jülicher *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **449**, 3 (2007).

[3] R.A. Simha and S. Ramaswamy, Phys. Rev. Lett **89**, 058101 (2002).

[4] T.B. Liverpool and M.C. Marchetti, Europhys. Lett. **69**, 846 (2005); Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 138102 (2003)

[5] K. Kruse *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 078101 (2004).

[6] A. Ahmadi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E **74**, 061913 (2006); L. Giomi *et al.*, arXiv:0805.1680; T. B. Liverpool, M. C. Marchetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 268101 (2006); J.-F. Joanny *et al.*, New J. Phys. **9**, 422 (2007); S. Ramaswamy and M. Rao, New J. Phys. **9**, 423 (2007); R. Voituriez, J-F Joanny and J. Prost, Europhys. Lett. **70**, 404 (2005) D. Saintillan and M. J. Shelley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 178103 (2008); V. Mehandia and P. Nott, J. Fluid Mech. **595**, 239 (2008); T. Ishikawa and T. J. Pedley, J. Fluid Mech. **588**, 399 (2007); M. E. Cates *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 068102; I. Llopis, I. Pagonabarraga, Europhys. Lett., **75**, 999 (2006); S. Ramachandran, P. B. S. Kumar, I. Pagonabarraga, Eur. Phys. J. E **20**, 151 (2006); J.P. Hernandez-Ortiz *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 204501 (2005); P. Underhill *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 248101 (2008); G. Grégoire, H. Chaté, and Y. Tu, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 011902 (2001).

[7] C. Dombrowski *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 098103 (2004); I. Tuval, *et al.*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **102**, 2277 (2005); T. J. Pedley and J. O. Kessler, Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech. **24**, 313 (1992); I. S. Aranson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E **75**, 040901(R)(2007); X.-L. Wu and A. Libchaber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 3017 (2000).

[8] O. Ignoshin, R. Welch, D. Kaiser and G. Oster, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. **101**, 4256 (2004).

[9] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biofilm>

[10] M. Klaussen, A. Aaes-Jorgensen, S. Molin and T. Tolker-Nielsen, Mol. Microbiol. **50**, 61 (2003); M. Klaussen, *et al.*, Mol. Microbiol. **48**, 1511 (2003).

[11] See K. Kruse *et al.*, Phys. Biol. **3** (2006) 130137 for an active-hydrodynamic treatment of the steady state of the lamellipodium.

[12] M. Ben Amar and L.J. Cummings, Phys. Fluids. **13** 1160 (2001)

[13] H.A. Stone, Partial differential equations in thin-film flows in fluid dynamics: Spreading droplets and rivulets, in *Nonlinear PDEs in Condensed Matter and Reactive Flows*, NATO Science Series C: Mathematical and Physical Sciences, 569, H. Berestycki and Y. Pomeau eds., Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, The Netherlands (2002).

[14] Y. Hatwalne, S. Ramaswamy, M. Rao and R.A. Simha, Phys. Rev. Lett **92**, 118101 (2004).

[15] P.-G. de Gennes and J. Prost, *The Physics of Liquid Crystals*, Clarendon, Oxford (1993).

[16] Strictly speaking, even in a linearized description, p_x is not constant but rather is slaved to the concentration and height fields. This can be seen by generalizing the treatment of [1] to include the effects of the free surface. This results in subdominant contributions to the dynamics of the height field (4), and modifies the effective diffusivity in the equation of motion (10) for the concentration. We will therefore ignore these effects here.

[17] W. Kung, M.C. Marchetti, K. Saunders Phys. Rev. E **73** (2006) 031708.

[18] The proportionality constant a_1 is not necessarily unity. Since the velocities are defined with respect to the fluid's frame of reference, shifting all velocities by a constant is not an invariance [1].