Endocytic proteins drive vesicle growth via instability in high membrane tension environment

Nikhil Walani, Jennifer Torres, Ashutosh Agrawal*

Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA

*Corresponding author, e-mail: aagrawa4@central.uh.edu

(Dated: December 3, 2024)

Clathrin-mediated endocytosis (CME) is a key pathway for transporting cargo into cells via membrane vesicles. It plays an integral role in nutrient import, signal transduction, neurotransmission and cellular entry of pathogens and drug-carrying nanoparticles. As CME entails substantial local remodeling of the plasma membrane, the presence of membrane tension offers resistance to bending and hence, vesicle formation. Experiments show that in such high tension conditions, actin dynamics is required to carry out CME successfully. In this study, we build upon these pioneering experimental studies to provide fundamental mechanistic insights into the roles of two key endocytic proteins, namely, actin and BAR proteins in driving vesicle formation in high membrane tension environment. Our study reveals a new actin force induced 'snap-through instability' that triggers a rapid shape transition from a shallow invagination to a highly invaginated tubular structure. We show that the association of BAR proteins stabilizes vesicles and induces a milder instability. In addition, we present a new counterintuitive role of BAR depolymerization in regulating the shape evolution of vesicles. We show that the dissociation of BAR proteins, supported by actin-BAR synergy, leads to considerable elongation and squeezing of vesicles. Going beyond the membrane geometry, we put forth a new stress-based perspective for the onset of vesicle scission and predict the shapes and composition of detached vesicles. We present the snap-through transition and the high in-plane stress as possible explanations for the intriguing direct transformation of broad and shallow invaginations into detached vesicles in BAR mutant yeast cells.

Significance Biological cells are engaged in an incessant uptake of macromolecules for nutrition and inter and intra cellular communication. This entails significant local bending of the plasma membrane and formation of cargo-carrying vesicles executed by a designated set of membranedeforming proteins. The energetic cost incurred in forming vesicles is directly related to the stressed state of the membrane, and hence, that of the cell. In this study, we reveal a new protein-induced 'snap-through instability' that offsets tension and drives vesicle growth during clathrin-mediated endocytosis, the main pathway for the transport of macromolecules into cells. Since these proteins (actin and BAR proteins) are involved in other interfacial rearrangements in cells, the predicted instability could be at play in cells at-large.

I. INTRODUCTION

 $\mathbf{2}$

Clathrin-mediated endocytosis (CME) is one of the key metabolic pathways for transporting macromolecules into eukaryotic cells [1–7]. It is characterized by a chain of remodeling events that transforms an almost flat patch of plasma membrane into a cargo-carrying closed vesicle. The journey from a patch to a shallow invagination, then to a mature vesicle, and finally, to a detached vesicle is executed by an elaborate set of proteins that act in a well orchestrated fashion. As this shape evolution entails significant local bending of the membrane, it is highly sensitive to the resting tension in the membrane. A higher tension in a membrane makes a membrane taut, making it harder to bend, thus, increasing the energetic cost required to form new vesicles. As a consequence, in cells experiencing high membrane tension, such as yeast cells and mammalian cells with polarized domains or those subjected to increased tension, actin dynamics has been found to be necessary to provide additional driving force to successfully complete CME [8–14]. Although this fact has been established by seminal experimental studies, how actin forces actually drive vesicle formation and can facilitate vesicle scission are not well understood. In addition, the role of another key membrane remodeling protein- the BAR protein, in overcoming tension has not yet been explored. In this paper, we pursue a detailed theoretical and computational analysis to unravel some new mechanisms by which these key endocytic proteins (actin and BAR proteins) offset membrane tension, drive vesicle growth and assist vesicle scission.

We begin by posing a conundrum. In yeast cells, clathrin, actin and BAR proteins contribute to vesicle formation in different capacities. While the inhibition of actin polymerization completely arrests endocytosis [9, 11, 12, 14], the absence of clathrin and BAR proteins only leads to about 50% and 25% reduction in the internalization events, respectively [14–18]. Although a high scission rate is maintained in BAR mutant cells, there is a fundamental difference between the shape evolution process in these and the wild-type cells. In the wild-type cells, a shallow invagination turns into an elongated vesicle with a constricted neck prior to scission which is successfully imaged in experimental studies (Fig. S11) [14, 18, 19]. In contrast, such an intermediate shape is not observed in BAR mutant cells. After a shallow and broad invagination, experimental images are only able to capture detached vesicles in the cytoplasm (Fig. S11) [18]. This is rather intriguing as the existing model of membrane scission requires lipids to come in close proximity and pass through a hemifission state prior to scission to avoid any leak during the topological transition [20–23]. How then does a shallow invagination directly transform into a detached vesicle? We will show in later sections that this conundrum is at the core of the shape-evolution mechanism in the presence of resting tension in the plasma membrane and is critical for understanding the roles of actin and BAR proteins in CME.

Several theoretical and computational studies have advanced our physical understanding of CME in both mammalian and yeast cells [24–27]. Liu et al. [24] studied vesicle formation and scission in yeast cells under the action of curvature-generating proteins and actin filaments. The study highlighted a critical role of lipid phase boundary-induced line tension in budding and scission. In a follow-up work, temporal and spatial coordination of endocytic proteins was studied in an integrated model to simulate endocytosis in mammalian and yeast cells [25]. The study showed a dynamic two-way coupling between the membrane geometry and the various biochemical reactions. Agrawal and Steigmann [26], employed a unified theory of heterogeneous membrane to show that clathrin coat could drive vesicle formation without assistance from line tension in the absence of a resting plasma membrane tension. Agrawal et al. studied the roles of epsin and clathrin in the nucleation of membrane vesicles [27]. Although these studies have provided fundamental mechanistic insights into CME, the physical underpinnings of the remodeling mechanism in the presence of tension and the specific roles played by key proteins in countering tension remain unaddressed.

In this study, we simulate membrane-protein interactions at the continuum scale to explore the consequences of finite tension. We first model the effect of actin forces in driving the growth of a shallow clathrin-coated vesicle. We find that until a critical force is reached, the vesicle undergoes smooth transition. Once the critical force is crossed, it experiences a snap-through transition that drastically elongates and squeezes the vesicle. This leads to a significant in-plane stress in the tubular region of the vesicle that far exceeds the rupture tension. We then model the effect of BAR proteins. We find that the attachment of BAR proteins also drives vesicle formation by instability but it is much more gentle compared to the actin case. To our surprise, we find that after the instability has occurred, the dissociation of BAR proteins leads to a larger elongation and growth of the vesicle. We predict vesicle shapes at different stages of CME which closely match those observed experimentally in yeast cells. To test the in-plane stress as a criterion for membrane scission, we simulate the geometries of detached vesicles. We find that the vesicles in the actin-driven case (in the absence of BAR proteins) are smaller than the vesicles in the BAR-driven case. In



FIG. 1: The conundrum: In wild type yeast cells, actin and BAR proteins turn a shallow invagination into a mature vesicle with a narrow tubular domain prior to scission (lipid membrane is shown in yellow, clathrin coat in red, actin filaments in blue, and BAR coat in green). In BAR mutant yeast cells, the intermediate vesicle with a constricted neck is not observed. A detached vesicle is directly seen after an initial broad invagination. Since a non-leaky scission requires lipids to come in close proximity and transition through a hemifission state, how broad and shallow invaginations undergo scission remains intriguing. This puzzle is at the core of this study. The figure is not drawn to scale.

the latter case, the BAR proteins end up in the vesicle along with the clathrin coat as observed in [18]. We finally show that the membrane tension is the key parameter that regulates vesicle morphology.

II. THE MODEL

The central feature of our model is that it incorporates protein-induced heterogeneities in the membrane in a seamless manner. As was shown in [26, 28], this generalization has a crucial consequence. It breaks down the well known requirement that the surface tension has to be uniform in the entire membrane, as is the case for a homogenous membrane. This feature is very pertinent as tension and its impact on membrane remodeling are at the center of this study. The fact that non-uniform tension can exist in the plasma membrane of cells is supported by experimental studies. The tension-based variation in the roles of actindynamics on the apical and basolateral surfaces of polarized MDHK cells [13] unambiguously shows that the tensions in the two parts of the same plasma membrane are different. It is, therefore, extremely crucial to capture the local variations in surface tension by allowing for heterogeneities in the membrane in order to model all the nuances of the membrane-protein interactions and their effect on membrane geometry. A brief overview of the key physical concepts that govern membrane-protein energetics is discussed next (details are provided in the Supplementary Information).

i) Lipid Membrane: The lipid bilayer is modeled as a two-dimensional surface embedded in three dimensional space. Since a relative misalignment of the lipids costs energy, a bilayer offers flexural stiffness. For an isotropic fluid bilayer, the areal strain energy density depends on the local mean curvature (H) and the Gaussian curvature (K) of the surface [1, 29–33]. For our model, we employ the well known Helfrich-Canham energy density, $W = k_B H^2 + k_G K$, where k_B and k_G are the bending moduli. The values of these parameters and those discussed later are presented in Table S2 (Supplementary Information). Since a lipid bilayer sustains a very small areal dilation (less than 2-3%) [1, 29, 34], we assume that any arbitrary patch on the bilayer surface maintains its area. This results in a Lagrange multiplier field λ , which is well known as the surface tension in the membrane.

ii) Clathrin coat: Tri-legged proteins, called triskelions, assemble to form a clathrin scaffold that imparts

a spherical geometry to the underlying bilayer (Fig. 2a). The preferred mean curvature of the sphere, called the 'spontaneous curvature', is isotropic in nature. In other words, the curvature induced by clathrin is identical in all the directions in the tangent plane at any point on the coated membrane surface. In addition to curvature generation, clathrin scaffold also stiffens the membrane resulting in an increase in the bending moduli of the coated domain [35]. These effects manifest themselves in the form of a modified strain energy density $W = \hat{k}_B (H - C)^2 + \hat{k}_G K$, where C is the spontaneous curvature and $\{\hat{k}_B, \hat{k}_G\}$ are the modified bending moduli.

iii) Actin forces: Polymerizing actin filaments apply a force \mathbf{f} on membrane invaginations. For a point on the bilayer with a unit surface normal \mathbf{n} , projection of \mathbf{f} yields a normal component $(\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}$ and an in-plane component $\mathbf{f} - (\mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{n})\mathbf{n}$ (red and blue arrows in Fig. 2a). Since the precise architecture of the actin network in the vicinity of the invagination and the resulting forces are not yet well established, we model a few different forcing scenarios shown in Fig. 2b. In the first case, we assume that the actin filaments form a branched network and are connected to a portion of the clathrin coat. Hip1R in mammalan cells and sla2p in yeast cells have been known to establish this clathrin-actin link [36–38]. We assume that the actin filaments apply a vertical distributed load on the invagination. This is inspired from the model proposed by Idrissi and coworkers [19] based on their ultrastructural analysis of endocytic profiles obtained using immunoelectron microscopy [12]. A similar model was found to be the most likely driving mechanism when the initial coat fails to deform the membrane significantly [39]. In the second case, we assume that the actin filaments form bundles that apply vertical forces on an annulus at the interface of the clathrin domain and the uncoated membrane. This model is aligned with the dendritic actin network with collar-like arrangement observed via high resolution platinum replica electron microscopy and electron tomography [40]. This is also in agreement with the parallel bundled network scenario proposed by Drubin and co-workers [14] and used in the computational study by Liu et al. on yeast cells [25]. In the third case, we assume that the actin bundles apply inward acting horizontal forces near the base of the invagination. This loading condition has been discussed by Collins et al. [40] and Kirchhausen and co-workers [13] in the context of mammalian cells. For all the loading conditions, we assume that the downward acting forces are balanced by equal upward acting forces that impose global force equilibrium. This should be true in the real scenario as the actin network or bundle has to take support from some structure to apply forces on to the vesicle. A natural consequence of this condition is that it allows the parent bilayer to maintain planar geometry outside the remodeling domain as observed in experimental images.

iv) BAR coat: BAR dimers are crescent shaped proteins that bend the underlying bilayer by forming a cylindrical scaffold. Unlike the clathrin coat, the BAR coat imposes different preferred curvatures in the longitudinal and the circumferential directions (Fig. 2a). As a consequence, interaction of a bilayer with BAR proteins breaks the isotropy present in a typical bilayer. Such a bilayer possesses local orthotropic symmetry and it's strain energy depends on an additional physical parameter D, referred to as the curvature deviator [41–44]. In addition, similar to the clathrin coat, the BAR coat also stiffens the membrane [45]. To incorporate these effects, we prescribe a more generalized bending energy which has a quadratic dependence on D and a corresponding spontaneous curvature D_0 . The resultant strain energy takes the form: $W = \hat{K}_1(H-C)^2 + \hat{K}_2(D-D_0)^2$, where $\{\hat{K}_1, \hat{K}_2\}$ are the modified bending moduli.

We combine these contributions from the membrane and the endocytic proteins to construct the total free energy of the membrane patch. Minimization of the free energy yields the Euler-Lagrange equations that govern the morphology of the membrane patch. Because of heterogeneity, we obtain two force-balance equations in the tangential and the normal directions. The equation in the normal direction, called the shape equation, drives changes in the curvatures (hence the geometry), whereas the one in the tangential direction drives changes in membrane tension. We solve these governing equations for an axisymmetric geometry in conjunction with a few geometric relations and the appropriate boundary conditions to compute the shape transitions of the vesicle and the internal stresses. Further details of the model and the equations are presented in the Supplementary Information.

III. RESULTS

A. Actin forces drive membrane invagination via instability

We first present the actin-driven growth of a vesicle for loading case I (Fig. 2b) in the absence of BAR proteins. We assume an initial invagination has been created by a clathrin domain of $3200 nm^2$. This

estimate of coat size is based on the study of Kukulski et al. [18] in which clathrin was found to form a hemispherical coat on vesicles with an average size of $6400 nm^2$. We assume that the resting tension in the membrane is 0.5 mN/m. This estimate is computed from the Young-Laplace relation based on an estimated turgor pressure of 1 KPa in yeast cells [46] which have an average cell diameter of one micron [47]. The vesicle shapes are computed in response to an increase in the intensity of the actin forces. Such an increase in the force intensity (force per unit area) is expected to arise from an increasing filament density which is observed experimentally in the vicinity of the vesicle [37]. Similar to Oster and co-workers [25], we neglect the pressure across the membrane as the force intensity due to actin is an order of magnitude higher than the osmotic pressure.

Fig. 3 presents our first key finding. The top row shows the vesicle morphology at three discrete stages of actin loading. As expected, the invagination grows as the actin force intensity is increased. The first shape is the initial invagination driven by the clathrin coat in the absence of actin forces (Fig. 3a). As the actin forces are increased, the invagination grows deeper reaching the geometry shown in Fig. 3b in a continuous manner. However, a further slight increase in the actin force leads to an unexpected shape change characterized by a drastic increase in vesicle length and a concurrent reduction in the tubule width (Fig. 3c). To gain insight into this discontinuous shape transition, we plot the force-deflection response of the vesicle (Fig. 3d). On the y-axis is the net vertical downward force due to actin filaments and on the x-axis is the vertical distance of the tip of the vesicle from the initial flat configuration. The force-deflection curve exhibits a classic *snap-through instability* and comprises of three phases. In the first phase, the invagination grows monotonically as the force intensity is increased. This branch tracks shape evolution from the geometry in Fig. 3a to Fig. 3b. After reaching a peak force of about 190 pN, the system jumps to a point on the third linear branch with a much larger invagination length and positive slope. This represents the discontinuous transition from the shape in Fig. 3b to that in Fig. 3c while the intermediate shapes are skipped during the loading phase. The second branch with a negative slope is unstable and is never realized by the system.

How do the computed geometries compare with the experimentally observed shapes? The simulated shape



FIG. 2: (a) Remodeling mechanisms of the three key endocytic proteins. Left: Clathrin coat imposes spherical geometry on to a bilayer. The induced curvature is isotropic in nature. Middle: Actin filaments apply pulling/pushing forces on to a bilayer. This force gives rise to an in-plane component and a normal component. Right: BAR imposes cylindrical geometry on to a bilayer. In contrast to the clathrin coat, the BAR-coat induces anisotropic curvature. In addition, the two protein coats increase the effective bending stiffness of the underlying bilayer. (b) Forces applied by actin network/bundles. The precise arrangement of the actin filaments at the endocytic site is not yet well established. As a result, the distribution of actin forces on an invagination is also not well understood. We therefore model three different potential loading scenarios, inspired from the existing viewpoints in the literature, to simulate vesicle growth.

just prior to instability is very similar to the shallow 50 nm invaginations observed in BAR (Rvs 161/167) mutant yeast cells by Briggs and co-workers [18]. In addition, the computed and experimentally measured angles between the membranes (defined in Fig. S5) during the shape evolution show a very good agreement (Fig. S6). In contrast, a highly elongated vesicle after the instability predicted by our model has not been experimentally observed in these BAR mutant cells. Instead, as mentioned earlier, the experiments report a detached vesicle directly after a shallow invagination. This leads to a natural question- why is the computed post-instability shape not seen in experiments? To investigate this issue, we compute the surface tension and the tangential stress in the vesicle as it undergoes shape evolution. It should be noted that unlike soap films, the net tangential stress in bilaver comprises of two components- the surface tension and the bending-induced stress. The stresses for the shapes just prior to and after instability are presented in Fig. 4. F_{ν} is the net in-plane stress and λ is the surface tension. The maximum tangential stress in the vesicle just before the snap-through transition reaches a value of 1 mN/m. After the transition, the in-plane stress increases to 17 mN/m. To get a sense of how high this stress is, we compute an average estimate of the lysis tension of a bilayer. Since a typical bilayer can withstand a maximum of about 3% areal strain and has an average stretch modulus of 250 mN/m [1, 34], it can endure a rupture stress of around 7.5 mN/m. The peak stress in the post-instability vesicle far exceeds this critical value and as a result, before the elongated vesicle is realized, the bilayer is likely to undergo rupture. Since the tubular domain is narrow (≈ 5 nm in diameter), the lipids in the inner monolayer are adjacent to each other. This can allow a non-leaky scission to proceed via the hemifission state. Thus, a snap-through instability followed by a high stress-induced scission provides a mechanism by which shallow invaginations can end up directly as detached vesicles, providing a



FIG. 3: Actin-driven vesicle growth exhibits classic snap-through instability. The top row shows the vesicle geometries at different stages. (a) Vesicle shape at vanishing actin force. (b) Vesicle shape just prior to instability. (c) Vesicle shape just after the snap-through instability. (d) Overall force-deflection response. The jump undergone by the vesicle at the critical actin force is highlighted with a red arrow. The intermediate states on the force-deflection curve are not realized. The snap-through transition results in a significant elongation and constriction of the vesicle. The simulations have been performed at a resting tension of $0.5 \, mN/m$.

quantitatively tested answer to the mystery observed in BAR mutant yeast cells.

B. BAR proteins act as facilitators

We now simulate the effect of BAR coat proteins on shape evolution. To this end, we incorporate the effect of BAR proteins starting from an intermediate stage corresponding to a net vertical actin force that is lower than the critical force needed to induce snap-through transition. Here, we present the results for a net actin force of 160 pN (84% of the critical force value). To isolate the effect of BAR scaffold on vesicle growth, we hold the actin force and the clathrin domain fixed during the shape evolution. We follow the BAR dimer assembly trend observed in yeast cells characterized by two main phases- the polymerization phase where dimers self-assemble on actin-driven partial invaginations at a uniform rate, and the depolymerization phase, where they begin to dissociate at a uniform rate [25, 48]. This observed change in BAR concentration could be a consequence of either an increase in the areal density of the dimers, or an increase in the area over which polymerization has occurred, or both. For our simulations, we allow both the areal density and area of BAR-coated domain to increase and decrease simultaneously in the two phases (Fig. 5a). We further assume that the BAR coat-induced curvatures and stiffnesses are linearly proportional to the dimer concentration. This assumption is based on the rationale that an increased proximity between the dimers would lead to a stronger lattice with enhanced remodeling capabilities. Such a behavior has indeed been experimentally observed for amphiphysins that bind onto vesicles at dilute concentrations [49].

Fig. 5 (b through g) shows our second key finding. In the BAR-driven case, the shape transition occurs in a more gradual and controlled fashion, in contrast to the rapid and discontinuous transition in the actin-driven case. This is a consequence of the stabilizing effect of the BAR scaffold as it increases the flexural rigidity of the coated domain, thereby reducing it's compliance to bending. The BAR proteins transform the shallow invagination to a more U-shaped invagination as shown in Fig. 5b. An increase in the BAR density and area, leads to vesicle elongation and a narrowing of the neck domain (Fig. 5c). Once past this point, a decrease in the density and the area of the BAR coat has a counterintuitive impact on the vesicle morphology. Instead of decreasing the invagination, the removal of the BAR coat leads to a further elongation and narrowing of the vesicle (Fig. 5d). This irreversibility suggests that the vesicle again undergoes instability during the shape transition, this time triggered by the BAR scaffold. Thus, for a prescribed concentration (hence spontaneous curvatures and stiffness), and area of BAR proteins, there exist two vesicle geometries corresponding to the two branches (polymerization and depolymerization). The two solution branches meet at a unique set of BAR coat values. For the simulated case, this turning point corresponds to a preferred radius of curvature of 15 nm in the circumferential direction, bending moduli of $200k_BT$, and an area of attachment of 3700 nm^2 . We compare the computed vesicle geometries with those observed by Briggs et al. for wild type yeast cells (Figs. 5e-g). The shapes show a remarkable agreement at three different stages of vesicle formation. In addition, we also see an excellent agreement in the angles between the membranes and the tip radius computed from our simulations and those measured by Briggs et al. [18] (Figs. S7 and S8).

What makes the post-instability geometries in Fig. 5 experimentally tractable for visualization? To explain this, we again compute the stresses in the vesicle as it undergoes BAR-driven invagination. Unlike the highly invaginated vesicle in the actin-case, the in-plane stress for the shapes in Figs. 5b-d are well below the rupture limit making them stable structures that could potentially be imaged in experiments. If we continue to decrease the BAR density and the BAR domain size, we see enhanced elongation and narrowing of the tubule leading to higher internal stresses. Eventually, a shape is obtained for which the in-plane stress reaches the critical rupture stress (Fig. S9). All the intermediate shapes are therefore conducive to imaging and might be the reason for a variation in vesicle shapes observed in wild type yeast cells [18].

C. Detached vesicle shapes support stress-based scission criterion

To further test the role of membrane stresses in CME, we simulate the geometry of detached vesicles for actin-driven and BAR-driven cases. Although scission is an intricate process in itself involving participation of special scission proteins or lipids, like dynamin in mammalian cells or PIP2 in yeast cells, we identify the probable sites for scission based on the in-plane stress profile. We hypothesize that the external work needed from scission proteins/lipids for executing membrane scission would be minimal at these sites. We therefore detach the vesicle at the site of maximum in-plane stress and simulate the geometry of the closed vesicle.



FIG. 4: Stresses within the vesicle just prior ()₁ to and after ()₂ instability. Net in-plane stress (F_{ν}) is shown in blue and the surface tension (λ) in magenta. The net in-plane stress comprises of the surface tension and the bending-induced stress. The peak in-plane stress in the vesicle prior to instability is 1 mN/m while after instability, it increases significantly to 17 mN/m in the narrow tubule region. This far exceeds the rupture stress of 7.5 mN/m that a bilayer can typically sustain. As a consequence, the post-instability shape is not stable and the vesicle would directly undergo scission during the snap-through transition.

In addition, we constrain the area and volume of the detached membrane domain before and after scission. The geometries of the vesicles for the actin-driven and BAR-driven cases are shown in Fig. 6. Both vesicles exhibit a prolate geometry, unlike the nearly spherical vesicles observed in mammalian cells at low resting tension values. The vesicle in the actin-driven case possesses a more tear drop geometry. Interestingly, the vesicles observed by Briggs and co-workers in yeast cells also fall into two categories- tear dropped vesicles and prolate vesicles [18]. Their study also revealed a size variation in the wild type and BAR mutant cells. For the wild type cells, the vesicles had an average surface area of 6400 nm^2 and in the BAR mutant cells, the average size reduced to 5000 nm^2 . These values are in excellent agreement with the computed vesicle sizes of 5500 nm^2 and 6480 nm^2 for the actin and BAR-driven cases, respectively based on the in-plane stress criterion. In addition to this match in overall vesicle geometry, our model makes another prediction that is aligned with an observation made by Kukulski et al. [18]. They found the detached vesicles to be coated with both clathrin and BAR proteins. This finding is different from the general notion that the detached vesicles are coated with just clathrin proteins. Our simulations support the findings of Kukulski et al. [18]. As the peak stress is reached at the interface of the BAR coat and the uncoated membrane tubule, the BAR coated domain, along with the clathrin-coated domain, becomes part of the detached vesicle. This match between the simulations and experimental data further bolsters the peak-stress based criterion for scission.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Actin-BAR synergy imparts robustness to the endocytic machinery

Our study on actin-driven vesicle growth predicts a net vertical force of about 190 pN for inducing instability at a resting tension of 0.5 mN/m (Figs. 3 and 7). In terms of force per actin filament, it amounts to an average force of approximately 2.4 pN which is distributed over an area of $1600 nm^2$ in the clathrin-coated domain. This value is comparable to the compressive load required to buckle actin filaments obtained experimentally by Kovar et al. [50] and Footer et al. [51]. However, if the BAR proteins begin to polymerize before the critical actin force is reached, the instability could be induced sooner. In fact, BAR proteins establish a new transition pathway that connects the equilibrium solutions on the first and the third branches of the actin-driven force-deflection curve (Fig. 7). The BAR association phase (in cyan in Fig. 7) induces the instability and drives the initial membrane invagination. Once the instability has been triggered by the BAR proteins and the BAR proteins begin to dissociate, the vesicle has a natural tendency to go to the equilibrium solution on the third branch of the force-deflection curve corresponding to the initial actin



FIG. 5: BAR-driven shape evolution of a vesicle. (a) Areal density and surface area of the BAR proteins (blue curve). Areal density and surface area increase in the initial polymerization phase and decrease in the depolymerization phase. The spontaneous curvatures and the stiffness of the BAR scaffold have been assumed to be proportional to the areal density. (b)-(c): Vesicle shapes during the polymerization phase (membrane is shown in yellow, clathrin domain in red, actin domain in blue, and BAR domain in green).
(d) Vesicle shape during the depolymerization phase. The presence of BAR scaffold provides structural stability making the actin-driven transition more controlled. Intriguingly, the depolymerization of BAR proteins shows a counterintuitive response. Instead of undoing the expected squeezing effect, BAR removal results in a further elongation and constriction of the vesicle. (e)-(g) Observed vesicle shapes in wild-type veast cells [18]. Figs. (e)-(g) reprinted from Cell, 150, W. Kukulski, M. Schorb, M. Kaksonen, J.A.G.

Briggs, Plasma membrane reshaping during endocytosis is revealed by time-resolved electron tomography, 508-520, Copyright (2012), with permission from Elsevier.

force at which the BAR proteins began to polymerize. Thus, once the BAR polymerization has tipped the system over, BAR disassembly reduces the stabilization effect of the scaffold and the vesicle growth becomes more actin-driven. It is for this reason that the disassembly of BAR proteins leads to larger elongation and tubulation of a vesicle.

The above discussion highlights a remarkable synergy between the actin and BAR proteins in driving vesicle growth. If we look at the above findings from a slightly different perspective, we can link the timing of the BAR activity to the functionality of the BAR proteins. Drubin and co-workers, for example, observed



FIG. 6: Shapes of detached vesicles obtained for the actin-driven (left) and BAR-driven (right) shape evolutions. The scission was assumed to occur at the site where the in-plane stress in the vesicle reaches the rupture stress. Both the vesicles exhibit a non-spherical shape, with the actin-driven vesicle having a more tear-dropped geometry. In addition, the size of the actin-driven vesicle is smaller compared to that of the BAR-driven vesicle. These findings are consistent with the observations of Kukulski et al. in BAR mutant and wild type yeast cells [18].



FIG. 7: Synergistic roles of actin and BAR proteins in executing CME. In the absence of BAR proteins, a tension-dependent critical actin force is needed to induce instability and drive vesicle growth. In the presence of BAR scaffold, a lower actin force suffices. A reduced dependence on actin force is accompanied with a stronger squeezing effect of the BAR scaffold. However, a certain amount of actin force would always be needed to form an initial invagination that would allow polymerization of BAR proteins and enable them to drive invagination. This interplay results in a broad range in which the two proteins can work cooperatively to counter membrane tension and drive invagination. The shaded region shows such a domain which ensures that the final vesicle obtained after complete BAR dissociation experiences close to rupture stress.

short phases of BAR polymerization and depolymerization after an initial phase of actin dynamics. Such a timing of the arrival of BAR proteins and their brief stay can now be seen to be more function-oriented than coincidental. The BAR proteins arrive after the actin forces set the stage and bring the system close to instability. The BAR proteins serve to tip the system over and depart, allowing instability driven transition to proceed. Thus, a short but well timed activity of BAR proteins is enough to drive vesicle growth and facilitate CME.

If we take this argument a step further, we can predict a domain over which actin and BAR proteins can synergistically drive vesicle growth (shaded area in Fig. 7). The upper limit of this domain is defined by the pure actin-driven path. To define a lower limit, we require the vesicle after BAR dissociation to experience rupture stress for successful completion of CME. For this pathway, the green domain represents BAR polymerization-dependent invagination and the cyan domain represents BAR depolymerization-driven invagination. The actin force required for this path is approximately 30% lower than the critical actin-force

needed to induce instability in the absence of BAR proteins (double-sided vertical arrow). For any force above this threshold value and lower than the peak force (shaded region in Fig. 7), actin and BAR can synergistically drive vesicle formation and set the stage for scission. This showcases an inherent robustness of the endocytic machinery where the two proteins can work together to complete CME. If, in addition to in-plane stresses, other scission effects, such as the line tension induced by PIP2, are at play, the actin force requirement would decrease further thereby expanding the domain of actin-BAR cooperativity. However, a certain actin force would always be needed to create an initial invagination on to which BAR dimers can polymerize making actin forces indispensable for CME in tense plasma membranes.

B. Instability and morphological evolution

The snap-through transition in Fig. 3d is primarily driven by the actin forces. Application of actin forces on a planar membrane in the absence of clathrin domain leads to a similar force-deflection curve with a marginal reduction in the critical force (Fig. S10). These curves bear similarity to that computed for a tether pulled out of a vesicle by a point force [52]. As the pulling force is increased, the tether elongates linearly till it reaches a critical point, beyond which it undergoes a first order shape transition and continues to elongate at a constant force. The main difference between the force-deflection curves obtained in this study and the one by Derenyi et al. [52] lies in the third branch. While our curves show positive slope indicating structural stiffening, the one obtained by Derenvi et al. remains horizontal. This difference mainly stems from the fact that we apply counter forces from the actin network on to the planar membrane adjacent to the vesicle site. If we suppress this force in the absence of clathrin domain and apply only pulling forces on the bud of the vesicle, we recover a force-deflection curve with a horizontal third branch (Fig. S11). We would also like to note that the force-deflection curves obtained by us and Derenyi et al. [52] do not exhibit any activation barrier associated with the initiation of the invagination as predicted in the case of a tether pulled out of a spherical vesicle by Smith et al. [53]. A possible reason for this difference could be the initial flat geometry considered by us and Derenyi et al. [52] as opposed to a spherical shape considered by Smith et al. [53]. In addition to membrane tethers, instability-induced morphological changes have also been predicted for closed vesicles. For example, Smith et al. predicted an unbinding pathway via metastable shapes characterized by discontinuous transition for adhered vesicles [54]. Agrawal and Steigmann showed that a closed vesicle with a preferred spontaneous curvature undergoes a snap-through transition when subjected to point loads [55].

C. Tension differentiates CME in yeast and mammalian cells

Although membrane tension has been postulated to be an important factor leading to differences in yeast and mammalian cells, it has not yet been quantitatively examined. Mammalian cells on an average have a lower resting tension in the plasma membrane because of a lower turgor pressure [56]. The tension estimates vary from 0.003 mN/m in chick neurons [57] to 0.02 mN/m in molluscan neurons [58]. For the case of vanishing tension, clathrin-driven vesicle formation has been shown to reproduce the experimental findings [26]. For higher tension (0.5 mN/m), we have shown a good match between the simulations and the shape evolution in yeast cells [14, 18]. We now present the results for an intermediate value of 0.08 mN/m, and compare them with the experimental findings of [13] in mammalian cells subjected to increased tension generated by either osmotic swelling or stretching. In addition to lowering the resting tension value, we increase the clathrin coat size to 20,800 nm^2 , which is in between the value used for yeast cells and that for a closed spherical coat (32000 nm^2 for a spherical vesicle of radius 50 nm) that would ideally form in low tension environment in mammalian cells.

The computed shapes with the above parameters are shown in Fig. 8. The shape in Fig. 8a corresponds to a clathrin-induced invagination in the absence of actin forces. It matches well with the stalled vesicles (Fig. 8b) observed by Boulant et al. [13]. The shape in Fig. 8c is obtained after the occurrence of the snap-through transition which bears resemblance to the mature vesicles observed by Boulant et al. [13] (Fig. 8d). The good agreement between the computed vesicle shapes at different tension values and those observed in yeast and mammalian cells provides quantitative evidence that tension indeed is a key factor that differentiates CME in the two cell types. The vesicle in Fig. 8c has a maximum in-plane stress of 0.46 mN/m, almost an order of magnitude less than the rupture tension, thereby, making it stable. We would like to note that vesicles with elongated tubular domains have also been observed in dynamin-mutant

mammalian cells [59]. Since actin burst in mammalian cells (under low resting tension) occurs just prior to scission, our work suggests that actin forces lead to elongation of the vesicles but are unable to dissociate vesicles from the plasma membrane due to inadequate scission stress.



FIG. 8: Vesicle shapes obtained at lower resting tension and larger clathrin coat domain. (a) Vesicle shape obtained in the absence of actin force. (b) A partially stalled vesicle observed in MDCK cells subjected to increased tension [13]. (c) Vesicle shape with actin force. (d) A mature vesicles observed in MDCK cells with enhanced tension [13]. (a)-(b) and (c)-(d) show close resemblance. Figs. (b) and (d) reprinted by permission from Macmillan Publishers Ltd: [Nat Cell Biol.] [13], copyright (2011).

D. Tension governs vesicle morphology

If we generalize the actin-driven shape evolution studies to a wider range of tension values, we find that the vesicle geometry and the initiation and extent of discontinuous shape transition is a function of the resting tension in the membrane. Fig. 9a shows the critical force needed to induce instability as a function of the resting tension in the planar bilayer. These results have been obtained for a fixed clathrin coat size of $3200 \ nm^2$. The critical force increases monotonically with an increase in the resting tension. This trend is aligned with the recent studies by Basu et al. [60] and Aghamohammadzadeh et al. [56] that found actin requirement to be proportional to the turgor pressure and hence, resting tension, in yeast cells. In addition, we compute the invagination length (Z_1) at the critical point prior to and after transition. An increase in tension reduces the initial invagination depth at which the snap-through transition occurs in a linear fashion (Fig. 9b). In contrast, the jump in the invagination length $(Z_2 - Z_1)$ increases almost linearly as the tension is ramped up. Elongation of vesicles is also accompanied with a narrowing of the width of the tubular domain. Thus, beyond a critical resting tension, invaginated vesicles after instability would experience significant in-plane stresses making them experimentally intractable until stabilized by BAR coat proteins. For a clathrin area of 3200 nm^2 , we predict this critical value to be around 0.2 mN/m. These predictions can be tested in experiments by systematically varying tension in the plasma membrane, either by osmotic swelling or stretching, and imaging the vesicles.



FIG. 9: Effect of resting tension. (a) The critical actin force required to induce instability increases monotonically with the resting tension present in the bilayer. (b) The invagination length prior to instability (Z_1) decreases with the resting tension (blue curve). In contrast, the jump in the invagination length $(Z_2 - Z_1)$ increases with the resting tension (green curve). As a consequence, shallower invaginations will transform into more elongated vesicles at higher resting tension. This in turn would increase the in-plane stress in the post-instability vesicle making it susceptible to rupture.

E. Actin induced in-plane stress should be a key determinant of scission

Our study provides strong evidence that in-plane stress should play an integral role in governing membrane scission. Our explanation of the discontinuous transition observed in BAR mutant yeast cells and the vesicle shapes and sizes generated by our model support this prediction. Although other mechanisms have been implicated in scission, membrane stress could facilitate the topological transition and determine the site for membrane scission. For example, Oster et al. proposed the role of line tension in vesicle formation and scission in yeast cells [24]. The arrival of synaptojanin in the later stages hydrolyzes PIP2 in the clathrin coated domain giving rise to a line tension at the interface of the clathrin and BAR coated domains. However, it is important to note that even in the absence of BAR proteins, scission events occur in around 75-80 % of the endocytic events [18]. This alludes to a role of additional mechanisms in executing scission. We propose actin-induced in-plane stress to be a potential candidate. In wild type mammalian cells, since actin burst occurs in the latter part of endocytosis, actin-induced stress could assist dynamin in scission. In addition, actin-induced in-plane stress in the neck domain could facilitate dynamin polymerization [61]. This idea is supported by the recent work of Campelo et al. [62], which predicts that high stress facilitates insertion of shallow proteins within the bilayer. Thus, in-plane stress could act as a facilitator for dynamin-induced scission.

F. Limitations

The major limitation of our mathematical framework is that it is not equipped to model topological changes and hence, cannot be used to simulate vesicle scission. It is for this reason, the model predicts highly elongated vesicles after snap-through transition that would otherwise undergo scission. The other limitation of our study is that the actin loading scenarios modeled are based on the proposals made in the literature and might not be very accurate. However, the findings made above are true for both the distributed network and bundle type actin loadings (Cases I and II in Fig. 2b). Barring some minor quantitative differences, the overall nature of the force-deflection response of the vesicle remains unchanged for the first two cases (Fig. 10). This suggests that our predictions should hold for a wide variation in the actin loading mechanisms. Only the horizontal loading (Case III in Fig. 2b) requires a much higher actin force (almost twice), induces negative in-plane stress in the tubule region and leads to short spherical vesicles typically not seen in yeast cells (Fig. 10). These major differences indicate that a purely horizontal force driven vesicle formation is not likely to exist in the high tension regime. The shape evolutions for cases II and III are presented in Figs. S12 and S13.



FIG. 10: Force-deflection curves for the different actin loading cases presented in Fig. 2b. All the three cases cases show snap-through transition. Cases I and II show similar response with vesicles undergoing a significant elongation after instability. In contrast, case III predicts much smaller invaginations and requires much larger force to induce instability.

G. Concluding remarks

In this study, we investigated the individual roles of actin forces and BAR scaffold in executing CME in high membrane tension environment. We presented a new snap-through instability driven remodeling mechanism that governs vesicle shape evolution. We showed how actin-BAR synergy imparts robustness to the endocytic machinery. Since actin dynamics plays an integral role in other endocytic pathways such as phagocytosis, macropinocytosis and caveolae-mediated endocytosis, it is probable that such an instability could be at play in these processes. Our study reveals that a presence of membrane tension and actin forces are reasons enough to induce an instability-driven shape transformation. In addition, since other cellular processes such as cellular division and locomotion are associated with large scale remodeling of cellular interfaces, it would not be surprising if protein-induced instabilities, regulated by interface tension, contribute to these processes as well.

- [1] Phillips R, Kondev J, Theriot J, Garcia H (2009). Physical biology of the cell. New York: Garland Science.
- [2] Kirchhausen T (2000). Clathrin. Annual review of biochemistry 69(1), 699-727.
- [3] Conner SD, Schmid SL (2003). Regulated portals of entry into the cell Nature 422 (6927): 37-44.
- [4] Roy CL, Wrana JL (2005). Clathrin-and non-clathrin-mediated endocytic regulation of cell signalling. Nature reviews Molecular cell biology 6(2), 112-126.
- [5] Doherty GJ, McMahon HT (2009). Mechanisms of endocytosis. Annual review of biochemistry 78: 857-902.
- [6] Weinberg J, Drubin DG (2012). Clathrin-mediated endocytosis in budding yeast. Trends in cell biology 22(1), 1-13.
- [7] Boettner DR, Chi RJ, Lemmon SK (2012). Lessons from yeast for clathrin-mediated endocytosis. Nature cell biology 14(1), 2-10.
- [8] Hyman T, Shmuel M, Altschuler Y (2006). Actin is required for endocytosis at the apical surface of Madin-Darby canine kidney cells where ARF6 and clathrin regulate the actin cytoskeleton. *Molecular biology of the cell* 17(1), 427-437.
- [9] Rodal AA et. al (2005). Actin and septin ultrastructures at the budding yeast cell cortex. Molecular biology of the cell 16(1). 372-384.
- [10] Fujimoto LM, Roth R, Heuser JE, Schmid SL (2000). Actin Assembly Plays a Variable, but not Obligatory Role in Receptor Mediated Endocytosis. *Traffic* 1(2), 161-171.
- [11] Mooren OL, Galletta BJ, Cooper JA (2012). Roles for actin assembly in endocytosis. Biochemistry 81(1), 661.
- [12] Girao H, Geli M-I, Idrissi Fatima-Zahra (2008). Actin in the endocytic pathway: from yeast to mammals. FEBS letters 582(14), 2112-2119.
- [13] Boulant S, Kural C, Zeeh JC, Ubelmann F, Kirchhausen T (2011). Actin dynamics counteract membrane tension during clathrin-mediated endocytosis *Nature cell biology* 13(9), 1124-1131.

- [14] Kishimoto T et. al (2011). Determinants of endocytic membrane geometry, stability, and scission. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 108(44), E979-E988.
- [15] Kaksonen M, Toret CP, Drubin DG (2005). A modular design for the clathrin-and actin-mediated endocytosis machinery. Cell 123(2), 305-320.
- [16] Payne GS, Schekman R(1985). A test of clathrin function in protein secretion and cell growth. Science 230(4729), 1009-1014.
- [17] Chu DS, Pishvaee B, Payne GS (1996). The light chain subunit is required for clathrin function in Saccharomyces Cerevisiae J. Biol. Chem 271, 3312333130.
- [18] Kukulski W, Schorb M, Kaksonen M, Briggs JAG (2012). Plasma membrane reshaping during endocytosis is revealed by time-resolved electron tomography. *Cell* 150(3), 508-520.
- [19] Idrissi Fatima-Zahra et. al (2008). Distinct acto/myosin-I structures associate with endocytic profiles at the plasma membrane. The Journal of cell biology 180 (6), 1219-1232.
- [20] Bashkirov PV et. al (2011). Variation of lipid membrane composition caused by strong bending. Biochemistry (Moscow) Supplement Series A: Membrane and Cell Biology 5(2), 205-211.
- [21] Frolov VA, Escalada A, Akimov SA, Shnyrova AV (2014). Geometry of membrane fission. Chemistry and Physics of Lipids.
- [22] Noguchi H (2013). Structure formation in binary mixtures of lipids and detergents: Self-assembly and vesicle division. The Journal of chemical physics 138(2), 024907.
- [23] Kozlovsky Y, Kozlov MM (2003). Membrane fission: model for intermediate structures. Biophysical journal 85(1), 85-96.
- [24] Liu J, Kaksonen M, Drubin DG, Oster G (2006). Endocytic vesicle scission by lipid phase boundary forces. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 103(27), 10277-10282.
- [25] Liu J, Sun Y, Drubin DG, Oster GF (2009). The mechanochemistry of endocytosis. PLoS biology 7(9), e1000204.
- [26] Agrawal A, Steigmann DJ (2009). Modeling protein-mediated morphology in biomembranes. Biomechanics and modeling in mechanobiology 8(5). 371-379.
- [27] Agrawal NJ, Nukpezah J, Radhakrishnan R (2010). Minimal mesoscale model for protein-mediated vesiculation in clathrin-dependent endocytosis *PLoS computational biology* 6(9), e1000926.
- [28] Rangamani P, Mandadapu KK, Oster G(2014). Protein-Induced Membrane Curvature Alters Local Membrane Tension. *Biophysical Journal* 107 (3), 751-762.
- [29] Boal D, Boal DH (2012). Mechanics of the Cell. Cambridge University Press.
- [30] Steigmann DJ (1999). Fluid films with curvature elasticity. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 150, 127-152.
- [31] Jenkins JT (1977). The equations of mechanical equilibrium of a model membrane. SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics 32(4), 755-764.
- [32] Helfrich W (1973). Elastic properties of lipid bilayers: theory and possible experiments. Z. Naturforsch C 28, 693.
- [33] Lipowsky R (1991). The conformation of membranes. Nature 349 (6309), 475-481.
- [34] Rawicz W et. al (2000). Effect of chain length and unsaturation on elasticity of lipid bilayers. Biophysical Journal 79(1), 328-339.
- [35] Jin AJ, Prasad K, Smith PD, Lafer EM, Nossal R (2006). Measuring the elasticity of clathrin-coated vesicles via atomic force microscopy. *Biophysical journal* 90(9), 3333-3344.
- [36] Gourlay CW et. al (2003). An interaction between Sla1p and Sla2p plays a role in regulating actin dynamics and endocytosis in budding yeast. *Journal of cell science* 116(12) 2551-2564.
- [37] Kaksonen M, Sun Y, Drubin DG(2003). A Pathway for Association of Receptors, Adaptors, and Actin during Endocytic Internalization Cell 115(4), 475-487.
- [38] Boettner DR, Friesen H, Andrews B, Lemmon SK (2011). Clathrin light chain directs endocytosis by influencing the binding of the yeast Hip1R homologue, Sla2, to F-actin. *Molecular biology of the cell* 22(19), 3699-3714.
- [39] Kaksonen M, Toret CP, Drubin DG (2006). Harnessing actin dynamics for clathrin-mediated endocytosis. Nature reviews Molecular cell biology 7(6), 404-414.
- [40] Collins A, Warrington A, Taylor KA, Svitkina T (2011). Structural organization of the actin cytoskeleton at sites of clathrin-mediated endocytosis. *Current Biology* 21(14), 1167-1175.
- [41] Iglic VK, Remskar M, Vidmar G, Fosnaric M, Iglic A (2002). Deviatoric elasticity as a possible physical mechanism explaining collapse of inorganic micro and nanotubes. *Physics Letters A* 296, 151-155.
- [42] Iglic VK, Heinrich V, Svetina S, Zeks V (1999). Free energy of closed membrane with anisotropic inclusions. *Eur. Phys. J. B* 10, 5-8.
- [43] Fosnaric M et. al (2005). The influence of anisotropic membrane inclusions on curvature elastic properties of lipid membranes. Chem Inf. Model 45, 1652-1661.
- [44] Walani N, Torres J, Agrawal A (2014). Anisotropic spontaneous curvatures in lipid membranes. Physical Review E 89(6), 062715.
- [45] Ayton GS, Blood PD, Voth GA (2007). Membrane remodeling from N-BAR domain interactions: insights from multi-scale simulation. *Biophys. journal* 92(10), 3595-3602.

- [46] Gustin MC, Zhou XL, Martinac B, Kung C (1988). A Mechanosensitive Ion Channel in the Yeast Plasma Membrane. Science New Series, Vol. 242(4879), 762-765.
- [47] Parker SP (1984). McGraw Hill concise encyclopedia of science and technology.
- [48] Sun Y et. al. (2007). PtdIns (4, 5) P2 turnover is required for multiple stages during clathrin-and actin-dependent endocytic internalization. The Journal of cell biology 177(2), 355-367.
- [49] Sorre B et. al (2012). Nature of curvature coupling of amphiphysin with membranes depends on its bound density. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109(1), 173-178.
- [50] Kovar DR, Pollard TD (2004). Insertional assembly of actin filament barbed ends in association with formins produces piconewton forces. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 101(41), 14725-14730.
- [51] Footer MJ, Kerssemakers JWJ, Theriot JA, Dogterom M (2007). Direct measurement of force generation by actin filament polymerization using an optical trap. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104(7), 2181-2186.
- [52] Derenyi I, Julicher F, Prost J(2002). Formation and interaction of membrane tubes. Physical review letters 88(23), 238101.
- [53] Smith A-S, Sackmann E, Seifert U (2004). Pulling tethers from adhered vesicles. Physical review letters 92(20), 208101.
- [54] Smith A-S, Sackmann E, Seifert U (2003). Effects of a pulling force on the shape of a bound vesicle. *Europhysics Letters*, 64(2), 281-287.
- [55] Agrawal A, Steigmann DJ (2009). Boundary-value problems in the theory of fluid films with curvature elasticity. Continuum Mechanics and Thermodynamics, 21, 57-82.
- [56] Aghamohammadzadeh S, Ayscough KR(2009). Differential requirements for actin during yeast and mammalian endocytosis. *Nature cell biology* 11(8), 1039-1042.
- [57] Hochmuth FM, Shao JY, Dai J, Sheetz MP (1996). Deformation and flow of membrane into tethers extracted from neuronal growth cones. *Biophysical journal* 70(1): 358-369.
- [58] Dai J, Sheetz MP, Wan X, Morris, CE (1998). Membrane tension in swelling and shrinking molluscan neurons. The Journal of neuroscience 18(17), 6681-6692.
- [59] Park RJ et. al (2013). Dynamin triple knockout cells reveal off target effects of commonly used dynamin inhibitors. Journal of cell science 126(22), 5305-5312.
- [60] Basu R, Munteanu, EL, Chang F (2014). Role of turgor pressure in endocytosis in fission yeast. Molecular biology of the cell 25(5), 679-687.
- [61] Ramachandran R, Schmid SL (2008). Real time detection reveals that effectors couple dynamin's GTP dependent conformational changes to the membrane. *The EMBO journal* 27(1), 27-37.
- [62] Campelo F, Kozlov MM (2014). Sensing Membrane Stresses by Protein Insertions. PLoS computational biology 10 (4), e1003556.
- [63] Engqvist-Goldstein AE, Drubin DG (2003). Actin assembly and endocytosis: from yeast to mammals. Annual review of cell and developmental biology 19(1), 287-332.
- [64] Kreyszig E (1959). Differential Geometry University of Toronto Press.
- [65] Steigmann DJ, Baesu E, Rudd RE, Belak J, McElfresh M (2003). On the variational theory of cell-membrane equilibria. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries* 5, 357-366.
- [66] Duwe HP, Kaes J, Sackmann E (1990). Bending elastic moduli of lipid bilayers: modulation by solutes. Journal de Physique 51(10), 945-961.
- [67] Faucon JF et. al (1989). Bending elasticity and thermal fluctuations of lipid membranes. Theoretical and experimental requirements. *Journal de Physique* 50(17), 2389-2414.
- [68] Bonifacino JS, Schwartz JL (2003). Coat proteins: shaping membrane transport. Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology 4 (5), 409-414.
- [69] Finer JT, Simmons RM, Spudich JA (1994). Single myosin molecule mechanics: piconewton forces and nanometre steps. *Nature* 368 (6467), 113-119.
- [70] Gallop JL et. al (2006). Mechanism of endophilin N-BAR domain mediated membrane curvature. The EMBO journal 25(12), 2898-2910.
- [71] Yin Y, Arkhipov A, Schulten K (2009). Simulations of membrane tubulation by lattices of amphiphysin N-BAR domains. *Structure* 17(6), 882-892.

Support Information for "Endocytic proteins drive vesicle growth via instability in high membrane tension environment"

Notation	Significance		
$ heta^{lpha}$	Parameters describing the surface		
$\mathbf{r}(\theta^{lpha})$	Position vector to an arbitrary point on the surface		
\mathbf{a}_{lpha}	Tangent vectors at any arbitrary point on the surface		
$a_{\alpha\beta}$	Components of the metric tensor		
$a^{lphaeta}$	Components of the dual metric tensor		
$e^{lphaeta}$	Components of the permutation tensor		
$\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta}$	Components of the permutation tensor density		
n	Unit normal to the surface at any arbitrary point		
$b_{lphaeta}$	Components of the curvature tensor		
$\widetilde{b}^{lphaeta}$	Contravariant adjugate of $b_{\alpha\beta}$		
Ω	Reference configuration		
ω	Current configuration		
Ω_a	Domain over which actin force is applied in reference configuration		
ω_a	Domain over which actin force is applied in current configuration		
W	Strain Energy density in the current configuration		
р	Transmembrane Pressure		
V	Volume enclosed by the membrane		
Н	Mean Curvature		
K	Gaussian Curvature		
$C(\theta^{\alpha})$	Prescribed Spontaneous curvature field		
D	Deviatoric Curvature		
$D_0(\theta^{\alpha})$	Prescribed deviatoric curvature field		
E_b	Total free energy of the bilayer		
E_f	Work done by actin forces		
J	Determinant of the Jacobian		
$\lambda(\theta^{-})$	Direction of alignment of DAD protein		
~	Direction of alignment of DAR protein Direction perpendicular to λ of PAP in tangent plane		
μ	Currenture along direction λ		
hλ κ	Curvature along direction λ		
$\kappa^{\mu}_{\kappa^{0}}$	Prescribed Spontaneous Curvature along direction λ		
κ^0	Prescribed Spontaneous Curvature along direction <i>u</i>		
$k_{\mathrm{D}}^{n_{\mu}}$	Prescribed Spontaneous Curvature along direction μ Bonding modulus of here lipid bilayor		
k_{α}	Gaussian modulus of bare lipid bilayer		
$\hat{k}_{\rm p}(A^{\alpha})$	Bending modulus in the clathrin coated domain of membrane		
$\hat{h}_{B}(0)$	Caussian modulus in the electric coated domain of membranes		
$\hat{K}_G(0)$	Gaussian modulus in the clathin coated domain of memoranes. $(l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4, l_3, l_4, l_4, l_4, l_4, l_4, l_4, l_4, l_4$		
$\hat{K}_1(\theta^{\alpha})$	Modulus associated with mean curvature. (κ_B in clathrin coated domain and κ_B in bare membrane domain).		
$K_2(\theta^{\alpha})$	Modulus associated with deviatoric curvature. (U in clathrin coated and bare membrane domain).		
$K_3(\theta^{\alpha})$	Modulus with gaussian curvature. (k_G in clathrin coated domain and k_G in bare membrane domain).		
$\lambda^{\alpha}_{\alpha}$	Contravariant components of λ		
μ^{α}	Contravariant components of μ		

TABLE S1: Notations

Notation	Significance	
f	Force per unit area in the current configuration	
$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$	Force per unit mass (assumed constant from reference to current configuration)	
ho	Mass per unit area in the current configuration	
u	Variation given to the position vector	
\mathbf{u}_t	Variation in the tangential direction	
\mathbf{u}_n	Variation in the normal direction	
a	Determinant of the metric tensor in the current configuration	
А	Determinant of the metric tensor in the reference configuration	
au	Unit tangent vector to the boundary of the surface	
ν	Unit normal to the boundary of the surface	
Μ	Bending Moment per unit length	
F_{ν}	In-plane normal force per unit length	
F_{τ}	In-plane shear force per unit length	
F_n	Transverse shear force per unit length	

TABLE S1: Notations (continued)

TABLE S2: Parameters used for simulations

Symbol	Significance	Value	Ref.
k_B	Bending Modulus of the bare lipid bilayer	$20 \ k_B T$	[66, 67]
\hat{k}_B	Bending modulus of the clathrin coated domain	$200 \ k_B T$	[35]
C	Preferred curvature of the clathrin coat	$1/50 \ {\rm nm^{-1}}$	[68]
p	Transmembrane (osmotic) Pressure in Yeast	1000 Pa	[46]
f	Maximum force applied by actin filaments	100 - 200 pN	[50, 51, 69]
f_0	Force intensity applied by actin filaments	$< 2 \mathrm{x} 10^5$ Pa	[50, 51, 69]
H_0	Preferred mean curvature of the BAR coat	$0 - (1/30) \text{ nm}^{-1}$	[70, 71]
D_0	Preferred deviatoric curvature of the BAR coat	$0 - (1/30) \text{ nm}^{-1}$	[70, 71]
\hat{K}_1	Mean curvature bending modulus of the BAR coat	0 - 200 $k_B T$	[45]
\hat{K}_2	Deviatoric curvature modulus of the BAR coat	$0 - 200 \ k_B T$	[45]

I. MODEL DESCRIPTION

We model a bilayer as a two-dimensional surface ω with a non-uniform distribution of crescent or banana shaped BAR proteins. The locus of points on ω is tracked by the position vector $\mathbf{r}(\theta^{\mu})$ where θ^{μ} are the surface coordinates. Here and henceforth, Greek indices range over $\{1, 2\}$ and, if repeated, are summed over that range. The basis vectors on the tangent plane at any point are given by $\mathbf{a}_{\alpha} = \mathbf{r}_{,\alpha}$ where $()_{,\alpha} = \partial()/\partial\theta^{\alpha}$. This yields the metric $a_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{a}_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\beta}$, and the unit surface normal vector $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{a}_2/|\mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{a}_2|$. The local curvature tensor field is given by $\mathbf{b} = b_{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{a}^{\alpha} \otimes \mathbf{a}^{\beta}$ where

$$b_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{,\alpha\beta} = -\mathbf{a}_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta} \tag{S1}$$

are the coefficients of the second fundamental form, $\mathbf{a}^{\alpha} = a^{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{a}_{\beta}$ are the contravariant basis vectors, and $(a^{\alpha\beta}) = (a_{\alpha\beta})^{-1}$ is the dual metric [64]. Symmetry restrictions require the strain energy W for an isotropic fluid membrane [30, 31] to depend only on the mean and the Gaussian curvatures (H,K) where

$$H = \frac{1}{2} a^{\alpha\beta} b_{\alpha\beta} = (\kappa_{\lambda} + \kappa_{\mu})/2,$$

$$K = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{\theta\psi} b_{\alpha\theta} b_{\beta\psi} = \kappa_{\lambda} \kappa_{\mu} - \tau^{2}.$$
(S2)

Here $\{\kappa_{\lambda}, \kappa_{\mu}\}$ are the principal curvatures, τ is the twist, and $\varepsilon^{\alpha\beta} = a^{-\frac{1}{2}}e^{\alpha\beta}$ is the permutation tensor density where $e^{\alpha\beta}$ is the permutation tensor. The total free energy of a bilayer that accounts for the areal and volume constraints is given by

$$E_b = \int_{\omega} (W(H, K; \theta^{\alpha}) + \lambda(\theta^{\alpha})) da - pV(\omega),$$
(S3)

where λ is the surface tension field which is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the local area constraint, p is the transmembrane pressure which is the Lagrange multiplier associated with the volume constraint and V is the enclosed volume.

Clathrin coat: Clathrin coat imparts isotropic spontaneous curvature $C(\theta^{\alpha})$ and enhanced flexural stiffness to a bilayer. This results in a modified strain energy $W = \hat{k}_B(\theta^{\alpha})(H - C(\theta^{\alpha}))^2 + \hat{k}_G(\theta^{\alpha})K$ in the coated domain. In our model, coat-induced properties $(C, \hat{k}_B, \hat{k}_G)$ can spatially vary, and hence depend on surface coordinates. The specific values of the parameters used in this study are presented in Table S2.

BAR coat: BAR dimers form a cylindrical coat in contrast to a spherical coat formed by clathrin proteins. As a consequence they generate anisotropic spontaneous curvatures. This breaks the isotropic symmetry present in the above theory and requires the strain energy to depend on a new invariant

$$D = \frac{1}{2} b_{\alpha\beta} (\lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} - \mu^{\alpha} \mu^{\beta}) = (\kappa_{\lambda} - \kappa_{\mu})/2$$
(S4)

called the curvature deviator [41–44]. Here λ corresponds to the direction of attachment of the BAR dimer and μ is the direction orthogonal to λ in the tangent plane of the surface such that { λ, μ, \mathbf{n} } form a local triad (Fig S1). λ^{α} and μ^{α} represent the contravariant components of λ and μ , respectively (for example, $\lambda^{\alpha} = \lambda \cdot \mathbf{a}^{\alpha}$). { $\kappa_{\lambda}, \kappa_{\mu}$ } represent the curvatures along directions λ and μ respectively. We would like to emphasize that the scalar λ is the surface tension field and the vector λ is the direction of attachment of the BAR proteins.

The energy functional in the BAR coated domain takes the form

$$E_b = \int_{\omega} (W(H, D, K; \theta^{\alpha}) + \lambda(\theta^{\alpha})) da - pV(\omega).$$
(S5)

For our study, we allow the modified strain energy to have a quadratic dependence on H and D, in alignment with the Helfrich energy, and set $W = \hat{K}_1(\theta^{\alpha})(H - C(\theta^{\alpha}))^2 + \hat{K}_2(\theta^{\alpha})(D - D_0(\theta^{\alpha}))^2$. The specific values of these parameters are presented in Table S2.

Force from actin filaments: Let \mathbf{f} be the force per unit area (force intensity) applied by actin filaments on a point on the surface with a position vector \mathbf{r} in the current configuration and \mathbf{r}_0 in the reference configuration. The total work done by the applied force over the subdomain on which actin force acts is given by

$$E_f = \int_{\omega_a} \mathbf{f}(\theta^{\alpha}) \cdot (\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_0) \, da.$$
 (S6)

This results in an augmented free energy

$$E = E_b - E_f. \tag{S7}$$

Seamless heterogeneity: The effective membrane properties under the influence of clathrin and BAR proteins and the forces due to actin filaments are specified via a hyperbolic tangent function (tanh) as shown in Fig. S2. This ensures continuity and differentiability of the strain energy density, W, at the interfaces of the protein coated membrane or the actin forcing domain.

A. Variations

We consider a family of surfaces generated by $\mathbf{r}(\theta^{\alpha}; \epsilon)$. The virtual displacement of the surface is given by $\mathbf{u}(\theta^{\alpha}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \epsilon} \mathbf{r}(\theta^{\alpha}; \epsilon)_{|\epsilon=0} = \dot{\mathbf{r}}$, where the superposed dot refers to the derivative with respect to the parameter ϵ [65]. The variation of the total free energy of the membrane-protein system can be written as

$$\dot{E} = \dot{E}_b - \dot{E}_f \tag{S8}$$

where

$$\dot{E}_b = \int_{\omega} \dot{W} da + \int_{\omega} (W + \lambda) (\dot{J}/J) \, da - p \dot{V}, \tag{S9}$$

$$\dot{E}_f = \int_{\omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u} \, da, \tag{S10}$$

and $J = \sqrt{a/A}$ is the ratio of the material area after and before the deformation. We follow the procedure outlined in [26, 44, 65] to derive the corresponding variational derivatives and the Euler-Lagrange equations. We skip the details and summarize the key intermediate steps and expressions.

Eqs. (S2) and Eq. (S4) yield the variational derivatives of the three invariants

$$2\dot{H} = -b^{\alpha\beta}\dot{a}_{\alpha\beta} + a^{\alpha\beta}\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta},$$

$$2\dot{K} = e^{\alpha\beta}e^{\lambda\mu} \left[\frac{\dot{b}_{\alpha\lambda}b_{\beta\mu}}{a} - \frac{b_{\alpha\lambda}b_{\beta\mu}}{a}\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right],$$
(S11)

and

$$\dot{D} = \frac{1}{2} (\dot{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \dot{\kappa}_{\mu}) = \frac{1}{2} \Big[(\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} \lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} + 2b_{\alpha\beta} \dot{\lambda}^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta}) - (\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} \mu^{\alpha} \mu^{\beta} + 2b_{\alpha\beta} \dot{\mu}^{\alpha} \mu^{\beta}) \Big].$$
(S12)

Using the definitions discussed earlier, we can compute the following variational derivatives of the key geometric quantities

$$\dot{a}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{a}_{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{,\beta} + \mathbf{a}_{\beta} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{,\alpha},\tag{S13}$$

$$\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{u}_{;\alpha\beta},\tag{S14}$$

$$\frac{\dot{a}}{a} = a^{\alpha\beta} \dot{a}_{\alpha\beta},\tag{S15}$$

$$\frac{J}{J} = \frac{1}{2} a^{\alpha\beta} \dot{a}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{S16}$$

$$\dot{\lambda}^{\alpha} = a^{\alpha\gamma} (\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{a}}_{\gamma}) + (\boldsymbol{\lambda} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\gamma}) \dot{a}^{\alpha\gamma}, \qquad (S17)$$

and

$$\dot{\mu}^{\alpha} = a^{\alpha\gamma} (\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{a}}_{\gamma}) + (\boldsymbol{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\gamma}) \dot{a}^{\alpha\gamma}.$$
(S18)

Since variation **u** can be decomposed into a tangential component $\mathbf{u}_t = u^{\eta} \mathbf{a}_{\eta}$, and a normal component $\mathbf{u}_n = u\mathbf{n}$, we derive the equilibrium equations for the two components independently.

1. Tangential Variations

For tangential variations, $\mathbf{u} = u^{\lambda} \mathbf{a}_{\lambda}$, which yields

$$\mathbf{u}_{,\alpha} = u^{\beta}_{;\alpha} \mathbf{a}_{\beta} + (u^{\lambda} b_{\lambda\alpha}) \mathbf{n}$$
(S19)

where (); $_{\alpha}$ signifies the covariant derivative. If we substitute it into Eqs. (S11)-(S18) and carry out simplifications outlined in [26, 44, 65], we obtain

$$\dot{a}_{\alpha\beta} = u_{\alpha;\beta} + u_{\beta;\alpha}.\tag{S20}$$

$$\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} = u^{\lambda}_{;\beta} b_{\lambda\alpha} + u^{\lambda}_{;\alpha} b_{\beta\lambda} + u^{\lambda} b_{\lambda\alpha;\beta}$$
(S21)

$$\frac{\dot{J}}{J} = u^{\alpha}_{;\alpha}.$$
(S22)

$$\dot{\lambda}^{\alpha} = -\lambda^{\psi} u^{\alpha}_{;\psi}, \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\mu}^{\alpha} = -\mu^{\psi} u^{\alpha}_{;\psi}.$$
 (S23)

$$\dot{H} = u^{\alpha} H_{,\alpha} \tag{S24}$$

$$\dot{K} = u^{\alpha} K_{,\alpha} \tag{S25}$$

$$\dot{D} = \frac{1}{2} \dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} (\lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} - \mu^{\alpha} \mu^{\beta}) + b_{\alpha\beta} [a^{\alpha\gamma} \dot{\mathbf{a}}_{\gamma} \cdot (\lambda^{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} - \mu^{\beta} \boldsymbol{\mu}) + \dot{a}^{\alpha\gamma} \mathbf{a}_{\gamma} \cdot (\lambda^{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} - \mu^{\beta} \boldsymbol{\mu})].$$
(S26)

Furthermore,

$$\dot{W} = W_H \dot{H} + W_D \dot{D} + W_K \dot{K}, \text{ and} W_{,\eta} = W_H H_{,\eta} + W_D D_{,\eta} + W_K K_{,\eta} + \partial W / \partial \theta^{\eta}.$$
(S27)

Using the above obtained relations, we deduce the in-plane equilibrium equation (for $\dot{E} = 0$)

$$\lambda_{,\eta} = -\partial W / \partial \theta^{\eta} - W_D(b_{\alpha\beta}(\lambda^{\alpha}\lambda^{\beta})_{;\eta}) - \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\eta}.$$
(S28)

This equation regulates the spatial variation of the surface tension field. It is operative when the membrane has heterogeneous properties and is trivially satisfied for homogeneous membranes. In the clathrin coated and bare lipid membrane domains, dependence of W on D is suppressed.

2. Normal Variations

For normal variations, $\mathbf{u} = u(\theta^{\alpha})\mathbf{n}$. This yields

$$\mathbf{u}_{,\alpha} = u_{,\alpha}\mathbf{n} - ub_{\alpha}^{\beta}\mathbf{a}_{\beta}.\tag{S29}$$

Again, substituting Eq. (S29) into Eqs. (S11)-(S18) and carrying out simplifications outlined in [26, 44, 65] furnish

$$\dot{a}_{\alpha\beta} = -2ub_{\alpha\beta},\tag{S30}$$

$$\dot{b}_{\alpha\beta} = u_{;\alpha\beta} - ub_{\alpha\lambda}b^{\lambda}_{\beta},\tag{S31}$$

$$\dot{J}/J = -2Hu,\tag{S32}$$

$$\dot{\lambda^{\alpha}} = u b^{\gamma}_{\psi} a^{\alpha \psi} \lambda_{\gamma}, \qquad \dot{\mu^{\alpha}} = u b^{\gamma}_{\psi} a^{\alpha \psi} \mu_{\gamma}, \tag{S33}$$

$$2\dot{H} = \Delta u + u(4H^2 - 2K), \tag{S34}$$

$$\dot{K} = 2KHu + \tilde{b}^{\alpha\beta}u_{;\alpha\beta},\tag{S35}$$

$$\dot{D} = (u_{;\alpha\beta} + ub_{\alpha\gamma}b^{\gamma}_{\beta})(\lambda^{\alpha}\lambda^{\beta} - \mu^{\alpha}\mu^{\beta})/2,$$
(S36)

where $\Delta = ()_{;\alpha\beta} a^{\alpha\beta}$ denotes the surface Laplacian.

Also,

$$\dot{V} = \int_{\omega} \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, da = \int_{\omega} u \, da \tag{S37}$$

Using the above obtained variations, we obtain the song Euler-Lagrange question, called the *shape equation* that governs the geometry of the membrane

$$\frac{1}{2}[W_D(\lambda^{\alpha}\lambda^{\beta} - \mu^{\alpha}\mu^{\beta})]_{;\beta\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}W_D(\lambda^{\alpha}\lambda^{\beta} - \mu^{\alpha}\mu^{\beta})b_{\alpha\gamma}b_{\beta}^{\gamma} + \Delta(\frac{1}{2}W_H) + (W_K)_{;\beta\alpha}\tilde{b}^{\beta\alpha} + W_H(2H^2 - K) + 2H(KW_K - W) - 2H\lambda = p + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{n}.$$
(S38)

As for the equilibrium equation in the tangent plane, we suppress the dependence of W on D in the clathrin coated and bare lipid membrane domains.

3. Boundary Forces and Moment

In the presence of boundaries, the tangential and normal variations yield additional terms that define the stresses and moments at the boundary [44, 55]. For any arbitrary boundary $\partial \omega$ on the surface, a unit tangent vector $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ (shown in Fig. S3) can be obtained by taking the derivative of the position vector with respect to the arc length that parameterizes the boundary. Thus,

$$\boldsymbol{\tau} = \frac{d\mathbf{r}(\theta^{\alpha}(s))}{ds} \tag{S39}$$

and the unit normal to the boundary, in the tangent plane of the surface, can then be defined by the vector $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \boldsymbol{\tau} \times \mathbf{n}$.

Following the procedure outlined in [44, 55], we arrive at the following boundary terms

$$\dot{E}_B = \int_{\partial\omega} (F_{\nu}\boldsymbol{\nu} + F_{\tau}\boldsymbol{\tau} + F_n \mathbf{n}) \cdot \mathbf{u} ds - \int_{\partial\omega} M\boldsymbol{\tau} \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega} ds + \sum_i \mathbf{f}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_i$$
(S40)

where

$$M = \frac{1}{2} W_{H} + \kappa_{\tau} W_{K} + W_{D} \lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} \nu_{\beta} \nu_{\alpha} - \frac{1}{2} W_{D},$$

$$F_{\nu} = W + \lambda - \kappa_{\nu} M,$$

$$F_{\tau} = -\tau M,$$

$$F_{n} = (\tau W_{K})' - \frac{1}{2} (W_{H})_{,\nu} - (W_{K})_{,\beta} \tilde{b}^{\alpha\beta} \nu_{\alpha},$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} (W_{D})_{,\nu} - (W_{D} \lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta})_{;\beta} \nu_{\alpha} - (W_{D} \lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} \nu_{\beta} \tau_{\alpha})',$$

$$\mathbf{f}_{i} = (W_{K}[\tau] + W_{D}[\lambda^{\alpha} \lambda^{\beta} \nu_{\beta} \tau_{\alpha}])_{i} \mathbf{n}.$$
(S41)

Square brackets indicate forward jumps in values within the brackets at the corners of a boundary when there is a jump in τ and $()' = \frac{d()}{ds}$. Above, M is the bending moment per unit length, F_{ν} is the in-plane normal force per unit length, F_{τ} is the in-plane shear force per unit length, F_{n} is the transverse shear force per unit length and \mathbf{f}_{i} is the force applied at i th corner of $\partial \omega$.

B. Axisymmetric Deformations

We assume that the membrane invaginations possess axisymmetry. We simplify the equilibrium equations (S28) and (S38) for axisymmetric surfaces parameterized by meridional arc length s and azimuthal angle θ . For such a surface,

$$\mathbf{r}(s,\theta) = r(s)\mathbf{e}_r(\theta) + z(s)\mathbf{k} \tag{S42}$$

where r(s) is the radius from axis of revolution, z(s) is the elevation from a base plane and $(\mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_{\theta}, \mathbf{k})$ form the coordinate basis. Since $(r')^2 + (z')^2 = 1$, we can define an angle ψ such that

$$r'(s) = \cos\psi$$
 and $z'(s) = \sin\psi$. (S43)

As mentioned above, $()' = \partial()/\partial s$. With $\theta^1 = s$ and $\theta^2 = \theta$, we can easily show that

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = r' \mathbf{e}_r + z' \mathbf{k}, \quad \mathbf{a}_2 = r \mathbf{e}_\theta, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{n} = -\sin(\psi) \mathbf{e}_r + \cos(\psi) \mathbf{k}.$$
(S44)

Using Eq. (S44) and its derivatives, we can show that the metric $(a_{\alpha\beta}) = diag(1, r^2)$, the dual metric $(a^{\alpha\beta}) = diag(1, \frac{1}{r^2})$, and the covariant components of the curvature tensor $(b_{\alpha\beta}) = diag(\psi', r \sin \psi)$. Together they furnish the two invariants

$$2H = \frac{\sin\psi}{r} + \psi', \quad \text{and} \quad (S45)$$
$$K = H^2 - (H - (\sin\psi)/r)^2.$$

For BAR coated domain, we consider a continuous distribution of proteins on the surface

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda} = -\mathbf{e}_{\theta}, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu} = \cos\psi \mathbf{e}_r + \sin\psi \mathbf{k}, \tag{S46}$$

and the normal curvatures in the above two directions are $\kappa_{\lambda} = (\sin \psi)/r$ and $\kappa_{\mu} = \psi'$, respectively. The curvature deviator is thus given by $D = [(\sin \psi)/r - \psi']/2$. For this choice of λ and μ , the shape equation (S38) for an axisymmetric geometry reduces to

$$p + \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{n} = \frac{L'}{r} + W_H (2H^2 - K) - 2H(W + \lambda - W_D D) + \frac{((W_D)' \cos \psi)}{r}$$
(S47)

where

$$L/r = \frac{1}{2}[(W_H)' - (W_D)'].$$
 (S48)

The equilibrium equation in the tangent plane (S28) takes the form

$$\lambda' = -W' - \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1. \tag{S49}$$

The above equations remain valid for the uncoated and the clathrin coated membranes by suppressing dependence of strain energy density on the deviatoric curvature D. In order to maintain a control over the domains over which clathrin, actin and BAR proteins interact with the membrane, we transform the independent variable from arclength s to area a with the help of the relation $da/ds = 2\pi r$.

For an axisymmetric case, we can express the strain energy density of the BAR coated domain in terms of curvatures along principal directions $\{\kappa_{\lambda}, \kappa_{\mu}\}$

$$W = \hat{k}_1 (\kappa_\lambda - \kappa_\lambda^0)^2 + \hat{k}_2 (\kappa_\mu - \kappa_\mu^0)^2 + 2\hat{k}_{12} (\kappa_\lambda - \kappa_\lambda^0) (\kappa_\mu - \kappa_\mu^0).$$
(S50)

The bending moduli in the $\{H, D\}$ and the $\{\kappa_{\lambda}, \kappa_{\mu}\}$ framework are related by the following expressions $\hat{k}_1 = \hat{k}_2 = (\hat{K}_1 + \hat{K}_2)$ and $\hat{k}_{12} = (\hat{K}_1 - \hat{K}_2)$.

In addition, we non-dimensionalize the system of equations and define

$$\bar{r} = r/R_0, \ \bar{z} = z/R_0, \ \bar{a} = a/2\pi R_0^2, \ \bar{\kappa}_\lambda = R_0 \kappa_\lambda, \ \bar{W} = W R_0^2/k_0,$$

$$\bar{\kappa}_\mu = R_0 \kappa_\mu, \ \bar{H} = R_0 H, \ \bar{D} = R_0 D, \ \bar{K} = R_0^2 K, \ \bar{\lambda} = \lambda R_0^2/k_0,$$

$$\bar{L} = R_0 L/k_0, \ \bar{k}_1 = \hat{k}_1/k_0, \ \bar{k}_2 = \hat{k}_2/k_0, \ \bar{p} = p R_0^3/k_0, \ \bar{\mathbf{f}} = (R_0^3/k_0) \mathbf{f}.$$
(S51)

where $R_0 = 25 nm$ is the normalizing radius of curvature and $k_0 = 20k_BT$ is the normalizing bending modulus.

In terms of these normalized parameters and the partial derivative with respect to a, $() = \partial()/\partial \bar{a}$, the system of equations can be written as

$$\dot{\bar{r}} = \sin\psi/\bar{r}, \quad \dot{\bar{z}} = \cos\psi/\bar{r},$$
 (S52)

$$\dot{\psi} = \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}/\bar{r},\tag{S53}$$

$$\bar{L}/\bar{r}^2 = \frac{1}{2}(\ddot{\bar{W}}_H - \ddot{\bar{W}}_D),$$
 (S54)

$$\overset{\circ}{L} = \bar{p} + \bar{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \mathbf{n} - \bar{W}_H (2\bar{H}^2 - \bar{K}) + 2\bar{H}(\bar{W} + \bar{\lambda} - \bar{W}_D \bar{D}) - \overset{\circ}{\bar{W}}_D \cos\psi, \quad \text{and} \tag{S55}$$

$$\dot{\bar{\lambda}} = -\ddot{\bar{W}} - \bar{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \mathbf{a}_1. \tag{S56}$$

In terms of the normalized principal curvatures, Eqs. (S54)-(S56) can be expressed as

$$\overset{\circ}{L} = \left(\bar{p} + \bar{\mathbf{f}} \cdot \mathbf{n} + (\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} + \bar{\kappa}_{\mu})(W + \bar{\lambda}) - 2\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{2}[\bar{k}_{1}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0}) + \bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})] - 2\bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{2}[\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0}) + \bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})]\right) - W_{D}^{\circ}\cos\psi,$$
(S57)

$$\mathring{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda} = \frac{(\cos\psi)\bar{\kappa}_{\mu}}{\bar{r}^2} - \frac{(\sin\psi\cos\psi)}{\bar{r}^3},\tag{S58}$$

$$\overset{\circ}{\bar{\lambda}} = -\left(\overset{\circ}{\bar{k}}_{1}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})^{2} - 2\bar{k}_{1}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda}^{0} + \overset{\circ}{\bar{k}}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})^{2} - 2\bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu}^{0} + 2\overset{\circ}{\bar{k}}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) - 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda}^{0} - 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu}^{0}\right). \tag{S59}$$

Above,

$$\hat{W}_{D} = (2\dot{\bar{k}}_{1} - 2\dot{\bar{k}}_{12})(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0}) + (2\bar{k}_{1} - 2\bar{k}_{12})(\dot{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda} - \dot{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda}^{0}) + (2\dot{\bar{k}}_{12} - 2\dot{\bar{k}}_{2})(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) + (2\bar{k}_{12} - 2\bar{k}_{2})(\dot{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu} - \dot{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu}^{0}), \tag{S60}$$

and

$$\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu} = \frac{\bar{L}}{2\bar{k}_{2}\bar{r}^{2}} + \overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\mu}^{0} - \frac{\overset{\circ}{\bar{k}}_{2}}{k_{2}}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) - \frac{\bar{k}_{12}}{k_{2}}(\overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda} - \overset{\circ}{\bar{\kappa}}_{\lambda}^{0}) - \frac{\overset{\circ}{\bar{k}}_{12}}{k_{2}}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0}).$$
(S61)

The expressions for the boundary forces and moments reduce to:

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau} &= -\tau M = 0, \\ \bar{M} &= 2\bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) + 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0}), \\ F_{\nu} &= W + \lambda - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}(2\bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \kappa_{\mu}^{0}) + 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})), \\ \bar{F}_{\nu} &= \bar{k}_{1}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})^{2} + \bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0})^{2} + 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) + \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}(2\bar{k}_{2}(\bar{\kappa}_{\mu} - \bar{\kappa}_{\mu}^{0}) + 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})), \\ &+ 2\bar{k}_{12}(\bar{\kappa}_{\lambda} - \bar{\kappa}_{\lambda}^{0})), \\ \bar{F}_{n} &= -\bar{L}/\bar{r}. \end{aligned}$$
(S62)

Boundary Conditions:

The system of equations to be solved comprises of six simultaneous ODE's (S52), (S53), (S57), (S58), and (S59). We prescribe the following six boundary conditions at the two ends of the simulation domain as shown in Fig. S4.

1) For the near end at
$$a = 0$$

$$\bar{r} = 0$$
, $\psi = 0$ and $L = 0$ (due to reflection symmetry about z axis) (S63)

ii) For the far end at $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_0$

 $\bar{z} = 0, \quad \psi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda}_0 \text{ (prescribed far end tension)}$ (S64)

The ODE's along with the boundary conditions are solved in Matlab using 'bvp4c solver'.



FIG. S1: A BAR protein attached to the surface of a bilayer. λ corresponds to the direction of attachment of the BAR dimer, μ is the direction orthogonal to λ in the tangent plane of the surface and **n** is the surface normal. Figure taken from [44].



FIG. S2: Function used to prescribe curvature and force fields generated by clathrin, actin and BAR proteins. $F(\bar{a}) = \tanh [10(\bar{a} - \bar{a}_1)] - \tanh [10^*(\bar{a} - \bar{a}_2)]$ with $\bar{a}_1 = 2$, $\bar{a}_2 = 5$. Here, $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_1$ to $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_2$ represents the area over which the fields are prescribed.



FIG. S3: The three orthonormal vectors on a smooth boundary $\partial \omega$.



FIG. S4: Simulation domain where the boundary conditions are prescribed at the end points ($\bar{a} = 0$, $\bar{a} = \bar{a}_0$). Here **n** is the vector normal to the surface. Parametrization of the surface is done in terms of area (\bar{a}) rather than arc length to control the area over which clathrin and BAR proteins attach to the membrane and actin filaments apply force on the membrane. The direction of increasing area is represented with a purple arrow while the direction of increasing azimuthal angle (θ) is represented with a green curved arrow.



FIG. S5: Angle between the membranes is the minimum angle (α) between membranes in the tubular domain. For a flat configuration this angle is 180^{0} where as for the neck it is 0. The tip curvature signifies the radius of curvature at the tip of the vesicle in the plane of the paper. These definitions are obtained from [18].



FIG. S6: Variation of angle between the membranes (see Fig. S5) with invagination in the Rvs 167 mutant case. As the vesicle becomes more cylindrical or tubular, the angle between the membranes decreases and eventually, goes to zero. Computed data points in solid blue squares match well with the experimental data in solid black circles. Experimental data is reproduced from Cell, 150, W. Kukulski, M. Schorb, M. Kaksonen, J.A.G. Briggs, Plasma membrane reshaping during endocytosis is revealed by time-resolved electron tomography, 508-520, Copyright (2012), with permission from Elsevier.



FIG. S7: Variation of angle between the membranes (see Fig. S5) with invagination in the wild type case. As the vesicle becomes more cylindrical or tubular, the angle between the membranes decreases and eventually, goes to zero. Computed data points in solid blue squares match well with the experimental data in solid black circles. Experimental data is reproduced from Cell, 150, W. Kukulski, M. Schorb, M. Kaksonen, J.A.G. Briggs, Plasma membrane reshaping during endocytosis is revealed by time-resolved electron tomography, 508-520, Copyright (2012), with permission from Elsevier.



FIG. S8: Variation of radius of curvature at the vesicle tip (see Fig. S5) with invagination. The radius of curvature asymptotically decreases to 10 nm with increasing invagination. Computed data points in solid blue squares match well with the experimental data in black circles. Experimental data is reproduced from

Cell, 150, W. Kukulski, M. Schorb, M. Kaksonen, J.A.G. Briggs, Plasma membrane reshaping during endocytosis is revealed by time-resolved electron tomography, 508-520, Copyright (2012), with permission from Elsevier.



FIG. S9: Scission stage for BAR-driven invagination. (a) Vesicle shape, and (b) Membrane stresses. Total in-plane stress F_{ν} crosses the rupture stress of 7.5 mN/m.



FIG. S10: Actin driven force-deflection response in the absence of clathrin coat. The curve exhibits a snap-through instability as observed in the presence of clathrin. Resting tension in the membrane is 0.5 mN/m.



FIG. S11: Force-deflection response in the absence of clathrin coat and counter forces in the planar membrane adjacent to the vesicle site. Unlike the force-deflection curve in Fig. S10, the curve exhibits a horizontal third branch. Resting tension in the membrane is 0.5 mN/m.



FIG. S12: Actin-driven vesicle growth for actin loading II. (a)-(c) Vesicle shapes at different stages. (d) Stress profile for the shape after snap-through instability shown in (c). The behavior is almost similar to loading I.



FIG. S13: Actin-driven vesicle growth for actin loading III. (a)-(c) Vesicle shapes at different stages. (d) Stress profile for the shape after snap-through instability shown in (c). In contrast to the other two loadings, the peak stress in the tubular domain in (c) reaches only 0.25 mN/m.