

Motility states in bidirectional cargo transport

Sarah Klein,^{1,2} Cécile Appert-Rolland,¹ and Ludger Santen²

¹Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, CNRS (UMR 8627),

University Paris-Sud Bâtiment 210, F-91405 ORSAY Cedex, France

²Fachrichtung Theoretische Physik, Universität des Saarlandes D-66123 Saarbrücken, Germany

(Dated: March 16, 2022)

Intracellular cargos which are transported by molecular motors move stochastically along cytoskeleton filaments. In particular for bidirectionally transported cargos it is an open question whether the characteristics of their motion can result from pure stochastic fluctuations or whether some coordination of the motors is needed. The results of a mean-field model of cargo-motors dynamics, which was proposed by Müller *et al.*[1] suggest the existence of high motility states which would result from a stochastic tug-of-war. Here we analyze a non-mean field extension of their model, that takes explicitly the position of each motor into account. We find that high motility states then disappear. We consider also a mutual motor-motor activation, as an explicit mechanism of motor coordination. We show that the results of the mean-field model are recovered only in case of a strong motor-motor activation in the limit of a high number of motors.

INTRODUCTION

Almost every cellular function is related to transport processes. These are necessary in order to maintain concentration gradients, but also in order to build and adapt cellular structures. Many of these transport issues are carried out by molecular motors, i.e. proteins which perform a directed stochastic motion along the polar filaments of the cytoskeleton.

The cytoskeleton of eukaryotic cells is composed of three different kinds of filaments: actin, intermediate filaments and microtubules. These filaments give a cell its characteristic shape, but also play a key role in intracellular transport. Especially microtubules (MTs), which have well-defined plus- and minus-ends, are responsible to sustain transport from the nucleus to the periphery and *vice versa*.

Two families of proteins called molecular motors walk along the MTs - kinesin and dynein. The main difference between the two is that kinesin walks from the minus-end, which is in general located close to the nucleus, to the plus-end which grows in the vicinity of the cell membrane, while dynein walks in the opposite direction [2]. After this processive motion motors detach stochastically from the filament and diffuse around before attaching again.

Molecular motors are able to transport very different types of cargo, either individually or by teams of molecular motors, which are attached to the same cargo. Transport by teams of molecular motors is particularly relevant for large objects like vesicles or cell organelles [3]. Transporting cargo by many motors in a crowded environment is obviously beneficial since it increases the processivity along the MT dramatically and also enhances the ability of the motor cargo complex to withstand larger friction forces.

For several types of cargo, however, a bidirectional motion along a filament was observed *in vivo* [4] and *in vitro*

[5]. These observations suggest that the cargo is transported both by kinesin and dynein motors which are attached to the cargo at the same time. The trajectories of these cargos consist of sections of persistent motion and sudden returns. One key question is if the observed cargo motion is a result of unknown coordination mechanisms or is driven by fluctuations.

Various theoretical models have been suggested, which aim at describing the origin of the complex dynamics of bidirectionally transported cargo [1, 6]. A mean-field model (MF-model) which describes bidirectional cargo motion [1] driven by two teams of molecular motors, was introduced a few years ago by Müller *et al.*. They assume that two equally strong teams of molecular motors with opposed walking directions are bound to a cargo at the same time. The model focuses on the force balance between the two motor-teams without taking the motor positions explicitly into account. The forces acting on the motors determine their attachment and detachment rates. The cargo's velocity depends on the forces acting on the motors and is uniquely determined for a given number of attached motors of "+"- and "-"-motors. Given the mean-field assumption that forces are equally shared among motors moving in the same direction, the model by Müller *et al.* predicts the existence of high motility states in cargo transport that may originate from a purely stochastic tug of war between oppositely directed motors, rather than being induced by a regulatory mechanism.

In this work we will test this scenario by using a more explicit modeling approach which is inspired by the model recently introduced by Kunwar *et al.* [6]. In contrast to the MF-model we explicitly consider the motor's positions on the filament, and the couplings between motors and cargo which are modeled as linear springs in our model (explicit position-based, EPB-model). As we want here to test the consequences of the tug-of-war mechanism rather than modeling an explicit experimen-

tal setup, we consider that "+"- and "-"-directed motors have the same response to applied forces. Our results show the absence of long-living directed transport states. We further extend the model and introduce a motor-motor activation, which was inspired by experimental observations [7].

MODEL DESCRIPTION

In the EPB-model we assume that two teams of motors are tightly bound to a cargo. Each team consists of N "+"- and "-"-motors, respectively.

To determine the load force applied on the cargo at position $x_C(t)$ at time t we take every single motor position x_i into account. We model the motor linker as a linear spring with spring constant α and unextensioned length L_0 , such that motors experience no force when located at a distance smaller than L_0 from $x_C(t)$. So the force $F_i(x_C(t), \{x_i\})$ on the cargo caused by the i -th motor is given by

$$F_i(x_i - x_C(t)) = \begin{cases} \alpha(x_i - x_C(t) + L_0), & x_i - x_C(t) < -L_0 \\ 0, & |x_i - x_C(t)| < L_0 \\ \alpha(x_i - x_C(t) - L_0), & x_i - x_C(t) > L_0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We assume that no force is exerted if the motor is not attached to the filament. When attached the motors can perform steps along the filament with a rate depending on the force F_i

$$s_+(F_i) = \begin{cases} \frac{v_F}{d}, & F_i < 0 \\ \frac{v_F}{d} \left[1 - \frac{F_i}{F_S} \right], & 0 \leq F_i \leq F_S \\ \frac{v_B}{d}, & F_i > F_S \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

for "+"-motors and symmetrically for "-"-motors. If no force is applied on the motors or if the force is in the direction of its motion the motor moves with its force-free velocity v_F divided by the step length d . "+/-"-motors continue stepping in their preferred direction if the force is smaller/bigger than the stall force (+/-) F_S but the velocity decreases linearly when the force applied to it increases. If the force (in absolute value) exceeds the stall force the motors step backwards with $v_B \ll v_F$.

Please note that we don't consider exclusion of the motors on the filament, since the number of possible binding sites in close proximity of the cargo is huge compared to the number of attached motors.

Next to the stepping rates also the motors' detachment rates $k_d(F_i)$ are force-dependent and explicitly given by

$$k_d(F_i) = k_d^0 \exp\left(\frac{|F_i|}{F_D}\right), \quad (3)$$

v_F	1000 nm/s	F_D	3 pN	α	0.1 pN/nm
v_B	6 nm/s	k_d^0	1 s^{-1}	L_0	110 nm
F_S	6 pN	k_a	5 s^{-1}	d	8 nm

TABLE I. Simulation parameter taken from [1] and [6].

where k_d^0 gives the force-free detachment rate and the detachment force F_D gives the force scale. Once a motor is detached it attaches again with a rate k_a within the tensionfree area $x_C(t) \pm L_0$.

In the MF-model [1] the cargo moves with a constant velocity which is determined only by the number of attached motors of each team between two motor events (at-/detachment). To calculate this unique cargo velocity Müller *et al.* introduce an artificial force which assures a force balance between the two teams of motors with equal sharing of the force within one team. All motors are implicitly assumed to move with the same constant velocity as the cargo.

In contrast, here we take the individual motor steps into account. The force applied on the cargo is determined separately for each motor (Eq. (1)) and is modified when the motor hops. We have thus to define how the cargo reacts on the force changes induced by motor hopping. We move the cargo of mass m with radius R along its equation of motion in a viscous medium with viscosity η [8]

$$m \frac{\partial^2 x_C(t)}{\partial t^2} = -6\pi\eta R \frac{\partial x_C(t)}{\partial t} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_+ + n_-} F_i(x_C(t), \{x_i\}). \quad (4)$$

Here n_+ and n_- describe the "+"- and "-"-motors, respectively, which are attached to the filament, such that $0 \leq n_+ \leq N_+$ and $0 \leq n_- \leq N_-$.

In the second part of this paper, we shall consider a possible synchronization of molecular motors via mutual motor activation in a way we describe later.

RESULTS

In this work we analyze whether a model which takes every single motor position into account produces the same high motility state as it was seen for strong motors in the MF-model [1]. Therefore, we consider the same kind of strong motors, as defined in TABLE I, and we measure the velocity distribution and the probability of a given number of attached motors of each kind $p(n_+, n_-)$.

In the MF-model [1] the cargo velocity is simply a function of attached motors and is thus constant between two attachment/detachment events. In our case the cargo moves according to its equation of motion and, therefore, not with constant speed. This is why we discretize

the trajectory and define $\bar{v}(t) := \frac{x_C(t+\Delta t) - x_C(t)}{\Delta t}$. Here we use $\Delta t = 0.16$ s.

No activation

In this first subsection we consider no mutual motor activation. With the chosen set of parameters given in TABLE I the MF-model produces fast cargo motion with a bimodal velocity distribution around $\pm v_f$, corresponding to a bimodal histogram of attached motors (FIG. 2(a)). For the EPB-model, however, these high motility states are not observed (FIG. 2(b)). This result gives strong evidence that fluctuations of the motor positions play a crucial role in the cargo dynamics, and that the MF assumption of an equal sharing of forces between motors of the same kind qualitatively changes the results.

For the EPB-model, the distribution of bound motors $p(n_+, n_-)$ in FIG. 2(b) has a peaked structure on the diagonal, i.e. most of the time the same number of motors of both teams are bound to the filament. Furthermore, in the frame of the EPB-model, we can ask how many of those bound motors are actually engaged in the tug-of-war, i.e. apply a non-zero force to the cargo. This quantity $\tilde{p}(n_+, n_-)$ shown in FIG. 2(c) demonstrates that not all motors which are bound to the filament exert a force to the cargo, a fact which, again, contradicts the mean-field assumption.

When a motor detaches due to a high load, this results in the MF-model into a new cargo velocity and a sharing of the high load between the remaining motors of the team, which most probably will also detach. In the EPB-model, motors have different positions. As illustrated in FIG. 1, the motor that detaches is most probably the most distant from the cargo, with a reservoir of bound motors of the same team behind. After detachment, the cargo can move backwards, and as a result, first, the load between both teams is slightly relaxed. Second, due to the backward motion of the cargo, some bound motors which were not exerting any force will become involved in the pulling of the cargo and replace the detached motor. This effect makes obvious why we cannot detect the detachment cascades as they are observed within the mean-field description, and why high motility states can be sustained only in the MF-model.

Mutual motor activation

In the previous discussion we pointed out that, in the relevant parameter range, the MF-model can exhibit some high motility states (i.e. bimodal distributions of the velocity) that are not present in the EPB-model[9]. This is because the MF-assumption implicitly introduces some synchronization between the motors. We shall now explicitly model some mutual motor activation in the




FIG. 1. One specific realization of the trajectories of the cargo (blue) and of all "+"- (red) and "-"- (green) motors. The arrows indicate a detachment event and the crosses an attachment of a "+"- (red) or a "-"- (green) motor. The color code gives the ratio $k_d(F_i)/s_{\pm}(F_i)$. The initial state is chosen such that it would correspond to a high motility state in the MF-model, with no "+"-motor attached, and four "-"-motors pulling the cargo. We see here that this state is not stable.




FIG. 2. The probability $p(n_+, n_-)$ of n_+ "+"-motors and n_- "-"-motors bound to the filament (a) in the MF-model and (b) for the EPB-model in the case of no activation. The probability $\tilde{p}(n_+, n_-)$ of "+"-motors and n_- "-"-motors which are actually engaged in the tug-of-war (i.e. which apply a non-zero force on the cargo) in the EPB-model is shown without activation in (c) and with a mutual activation with $a = 5$ and $R_A = 32$ nm in (d).

EPB-model, and explore whether this allows to recover a double-peaked histogram of pulling motors as obtained in the MF-model.

The mutual motor activation is introduced as follows. If the i -th motor of one team makes a step, the stepping rate of the motors of the same team within the interval $[x_i - R_A, x_i + R_A]$ is multiplied by a factor a . Here we have




FIG. 3. The probabilities $\tilde{p}(n_+, n_-)$ (top) and $p(\bar{v})$ (bottom) are shown for $a = 1$, so without activation on the left hand side and for $a = 5$ and $R_A = 32$ nm on the right hand side.

chosen $a = 5$ and $R_A = 32$ nm, i.e. 4 tubulin subunits.

We first analyze the influence of activation for a small number $N = 4$ of motors of both teams. FIG. 2(d) shows that the activation does not change the distribution of attached motors significantly. The probability to have no motor pulling $\tilde{p}(0, 0)$ goes to zero and those for the "two against one"-scenarios $\tilde{p}(2, 1)$ and $\tilde{p}(1, 2)$, respectively, are slightly increased. However, we cannot detect a double-peaked distribution.

Now the motor number is increased from $N = 4$ to $N = 40$ motors per team. In column (A) of FIG. 3 the probability of engaged motors $\tilde{p}(n_+, n_-)$ (top) and the velocity distribution $p(\bar{v})$ (bottom) without activation ($a = 1$) are shown. The velocity distribution is peaked around zero and the maximal probability of engaged motors is still on the diagonal. If we introduce the mutual motor activation we observe the bimodal velocity distribution and probability of engaged motors as shown in column (B) of FIG. 3. Apparently, the mean-field assumption is justified for the case of a high number of motors and if, in addition, a synchronization mechanism between the motors exists.

DISCUSSION

In this work we discuss the modeling of motor-induced bidirectional cargo transport inside cells. Apart from the MF-model of Müller *et al.*[1] we also introduce the EPB-model which considers explicitly the positions of the motors bound to the filament in the spirit of [6]. This allows us to calculate the forces which act on each individual motor explicitly, rather than implicitly via a mean-field assumption as in the MF-model. In contrast to the MF-

model, the EPB-model does not exhibit any high motility state corresponding to a bimodal distribution in velocity and number of attached motors.

This result is rather robust and we checked that it does not depend on the particular realization of the motor-cargo coupling or the details of the motors response to external forces. While high motility states are very stable in the MF-model, a realization with only one team pulling the cargo is only a rather rare event with short lifetime in the EPB-model. In order to illustrate this further we introduced the mutual activation of molecular motors as a possible mechanism for synchronization of the motors' motion. When applied to a large number of motors, this mechanism led indeed to a stabilization of high motility states, comparable to the results of the MF model. Therefore, we have shown that fluctuations of motor positions are relevant for motor-cargo system, and that the mean-field assumption corresponds implicitly to an synchronization of the motors which are attached to the cargo. A spontaneous synchronization only via the tug-of-war between the attached motors can be ruled out.

In view of this result one has to discuss the experimental relevance of high motility states. From our point of view there is no clear evidence that these states have actually been observed experimentally, in spite of the fact that, for example, the bimodal velocity distributions found in [5] have been interpreted as an evidence for high motility states. Indeed, in this work, like in many others, the trajectories of bidirectionally transported cargos are not analyzed directly, but cut into runs and pauses. This decomposition of the trajectories follows different definitions in different experiments. A common problem of this decomposition is that it can induce artifacts in the velocity distribution. For example, applying the criteria by [10] to the trajectories produced by the EPB-model also gives a bimodal velocity distribution (see Supplementary Material) though this is not found if we use the full data set. More generally, it would be helpful if full trajectory data would be systematically provided from experiments.

Still, several characteristics of cargo transport have been found experimentally in *in vivo* experiments [11, 12], including anomalous diffusion (sub- or superdiffusion depending on the observation time scales). We have shown indeed in previous work [13, 14] that, using more biologically relevant motor characteristics in the EPB-model, these sub- or superdiffusive particle motion at short times can be reproduced. Still, *in vivo* experiments are not so simple to interpret. *In vitro* experiments with purified motors would allow to have a better control of the system parameters, and to go even further in the comparison with the models and in the testing of various scenarios.

This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the collaborative research center SFB 1027 and the research training group GRK 1276.

-
- [1] M. J. I. Müller, S. Klumpp, and R. Lipowsky, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **105**, 4609 (2008).
 - [2] B. Alberts, A. Johnson, J. Lewis, M. Raff, K. Roberts, and P. Walter, Molecular biology of the cell, 4th ed. (Garland Science Taylor & Francis Group, 2002).
 - [3] M. Schliwa and G. Woehlke, Nature **422**, 759 (2003).
 - [4] V. Soppina, A. K. Rai, A. J. Ramaiya, P. Barak, and R. Mallik, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **106**, 19381 (2009).
 - [5] A. G. Hendricks, E. Perlson, J. L. Ross, H. W. S. III, M. Tokito, and E. L. Holzbaur, Current Biology **20**, 697 (2010).
 - [6] A. Kunwar, S. K. Tripathy, J. Xu, M. K. Mattson, P. Anand, R. Sigua, M. Vershinin, R. J. McKenney, C. C. Yu, A. Mogilner, and S. P. Gross, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **108**, 18960 (2011).
 - [7] M. A. Welte, S. P. Gross, M. Postner, S. M. Block, and E. F. Wieschaus, Cell **92**, 547 (1998).
 - [8] $\eta = 10$ mPas, $m = 10^{-14}$ kg, $R = 1000$ nm.
 - [9] We exclude the cases where only one motor at a time is pulling, for example in the case of a detachment rate much higher than the attachment rate. In these trivial cases no collective effect occurs anyhow.
 - [10] S. P. Gross, M. A. Welte, S. M. Block, and E. F. Wieschaus, The Journal of cell biology **148**, 945 (2000).
 - [11] A. Caspi, R. Granek, and M. Elbaum, Physical Review E **66**, 011916 (2002).
 - [12] I. Kulić, A. Brown, H. Kim, C. Kural, B. Blehm, P. Selvin, P. Nelson, and V. Gelfand, P.N.A.S. **105**, 10011 (2008).
 - [13] S. Klein, C. Appert-Rolland, and L. Santen, EPL **107**, 18004 (2014).
 - [14] S. Klein, C. Appert-Rolland, and L. Santen, EPJST (accepted) (2014).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

One quantity to characterize intracellular transport is the velocity with which a cargo moves. In experiments it is rather difficult to define this velocity. It depends in particular on the measurement time window, and there is no common procedure to determine it. One popular method is to cut trajectories into runs and pauses. Runs are usually defined by giving thresholds concerning their minimal length, minimal duration and/or minimal velocity [5, 10]. Due to the different ways to measure velocity, it is rather hard to compare data from different teams.

Here we want to motivate to use the full data set to characterize cargo motion. We have shown in the main text that the EPB-model produces a velocity distribution which is peaked around zero if we use the whole trajectory to determine it. If we now use the method of [10] we also see a bimodal velocity distribution (FIG. 4). It is obvious why we find this structure: If we ignore the pauses the probability to find small velocities goes to zero. So by definition the distribution is bimodal.

From our point of view this kind of determination of velocity distributions by only taking parts of the data into account can lead to misleading results.




FIG. 4. Velocity distribution of the EPB-model if we use the method of [10] to determine runs and pauses. Here we took the parameters of TABLE I and $N = 4$.