

Steady State Cargo Transport Modalities of Molecular Motor Ensembles Emerge from Single Motor Behavior

Shreyas Bhaban, James Melbourne, Saurav Talukdar, and Murti V. Salapaka
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, USA.

Transport of intracellular cargo is often mediated by teams of molecular motors that function in a chaotic environment and varying conditions. We show that the motors have unique steady state behavior which enables transport modalities that are *robust*. Under reduced ATP concentrations, multi-motor configurations are preferred over single motors. Higher load force drives motors to cluster, but very high loads compel them to separate in a manner that promotes immediate cargo movement once the load reduces. These inferences, backed by analytical guarantees, provide unique insights into the coordination strategies adopted by motors.

Introduction: Intracellular cargo such as vesicles, filaments and organelles are transported inside the cell by molecular motors like kinesin, dynein and myosin. The motors convert chemical energy to mechanical energy through ATP hydrolysis [1], while operating individually as well as in homologous or heterologous teams [2, 3]. Numerous experimental studies have analyzed multi-motor ensembles and have demonstrated the benefits of working in teams, such as enhanced run-lengths [4, 5] and robustness in a turbulent environment [6]. On the analytical side, there are multiple studies that investigate cargo transport by two [7, 8] or more than two [6] motors and analyze average velocity, run-length and distributions of bound motors [9] that shed light on team behavior. Several of these studies utilize a probabilistic description of single motor behavior to build models that describe transport of cargo by a team [6, 9–11]. These models coupled by Monte-Carlo (MC) methods offer numerous benefits in terms of simulating behavior of teams of motors that help guide tedious experiments [4]. While Monte-Carlo simulations have proven helpful, they suffer from (i) the inability to detect modalities of transport that are rare, (ii) a lack of deductive capability of understanding a specific mode seen in a realization of the MC simulation easily and (iii) the inability to provide insights into the asymptotic behavior of the team of motors. On the other hand simplified models that encapsulate the dynamics of team of motors provide insights analytically, but these models lie on the other end of the spectrum to MC simulations where a detailed description is not addressed.

In this article we adopt a semi-analytic methodology [12] that, while capturing the detailed description of MC methods, is able to provide conclusions on asymptotic behavior and a deductive capability that is lacking in MC methods. The method utilizes a finite dimensional reduction of a Markov model to enable an *exact* calculation of the probability distribution function of the relative behavior of motors in a team, through a computationally efficient semi-analytic approach. We prove (for a generalized case of a team of finite motors) that the relative configurations of the motors in the team while transporting cargo, have a *unique and non-trivial* steady state distribution. This implies that the system of mul-

iple motors carrying a cargo, is a *highly robust system* where irrespective of the initial orientation, the motors in the team assume a unique steady state distribution. Moreover, the distribution which is dependent on external environmental factors is determinable; thereby providing a means to reach conclusions on how the team of motors overcomes an adverse environment. Here the efficacy of the approach is demonstrated by investigating how teams deal with changing ATP concentrations and external load forces by examining two and three motor ensembles. Key analytical results reported here are that, as ATP concentrations are lowered, teams tend to favour multi-motor configurations over single motor configurations; with the cargo more probable to be carried by more than one motor than only a single motor. The implications are that the average run-length of multi-motor ensembles is increased even though average ensemble velocity decreases as the ATP concentration reduces. It is known that reduced ATP concentration lead to reduced single motor velocity, which is hypothesized as a reason for increased runlengths when cargo is transported by two motors [13]. Such a mechanism also provides a possible regulating mechanism by which transport occurs by an ensemble containing a mixture of different motors [14].

The approach in the article also establishes that when the cargo is subjected to different load forces, motors adopt a form of cooperation by clustering together in order to handle increasing load forces. The propensity to cluster increases with load force. However the trend (of closer clustering to handle higher load forces) does not hold for all loads. Indeed, for very high values of load forces (possible when cargo encounters obstacles along the path of travel), the teams abandon clustering. They instead resort to spreading out in a manner where the entirety of the load falls on as few motors as possible, with the rest of the motors assuming configurations where they are subjected to forces that are near the maximum capacity (or 'stall-force') of a single motor. We hypothesize that if the load force can be shared in a manner that prevents any of the motors from being loaded beyond stall force, clustering is preferred as it aids motion. In the case that the load force is very high where even with equitable load sharing the forces on each motor is beyond its stall force, the motor ensemble abandons clustering and




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of structure of the molecular motor Kinesin-I (b) Representation of an ensemble of three motors carrying a cargo. F_{load} is the load force opposing the cargo. The absolute configuration is $Z = [\dots 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 \dots]$ and relative configuration is $M|||M|||M$, where M denotes motor location on the MT and $|$ denotes the MT locations.

prefers configurations where most of the load is taken by a few motors while other motors are only loaded to be near stall and are primed to take steps on a small reduction of load force. Thus separation of motors at very high loads is preferred in order to enable higher probability of immediate cargo translation in the forward direction, once the high forces (e.g. due to obstacle in path of transport) have passed and the high load phenomenon has subsided.

In this article, we begin with a brief overview of the semi-analytic model and introduce terminology to establish the finite-dimensional model. We then establish the existence and uniqueness of the steady state distribution of various configurations of the motors in a team, by instantiating the model for molecular motors involving stepping, detachment and reattachment probabilities. We then analyze the impact of changing ATP concentrations and load forces on ensembles of multiple Kinesin-I motors by studying their effect on the steady state distribution. We leverage the detailed information provided by the complete knowledge of the distribution of motor configurations to give an explanation for the observed behaviors of motor ensembles.

Semi-analytic Model: A single motor is modeled as a hookean spring when stretched, with a rest length l_0 (nm) and stiffness constant K_e (pN/nm), that offers no resistance when compressed [4] (e.g. see schematic for Kinesin-I motor in Fig. 1(a)). The stalling force, F_S , characterizes the maximum load bearing capacity of the motor. We assume that a team or ensemble has \bar{m} motors attached to the cargo, and the cargo has a constant load force, F_{load} , acting against its motion under fixed ATP concentration. The motors traverse on the microtubule (MT) filament, which is modeled as a sequence of equally spaced dimers $a_q = a_0 + qd_s$, where a_q is the location of q^{th} dimer and d_s is the dimer length. Floating motors attached to the cargo can only reattach to locations on the MT that are within l_0 distance of the cargo. Based on [12], the locations of the motors on the MT are represented by $Z := \{z_q\}$, $q \in I$ where z_q motors

are located on the a_q^{th} location of the MT and I is the set of integers (e.g. see Fig. 1(b)). A motor in the ensemble steps, detaches or reattaches to the MT, changing the configuration from Z to Z' . If the probability rate of transition $\lambda_Z(Z', Z)$ from Z to Z' is known, we can define an infinite dimensional Markov model, similar to [16, 17]. Here, the probability of going from Z to Z' in time Δt is represented by $\lambda_Z(Z', Z)\Delta t$. Thereby, the probability that the configuration is Z' at t given that it was Z at initial time t_0 , is represented by $P_Z(Z, t|Z, t_0)$, and satisfies the probability Master Equation where the rates are given by λ_Z . However, as the typical MT filament is much longer (μm) than the average run-lengths of motors (nm), it effectively makes Z a bi-infinite sequence and the subsequent master equation intractable.

The issue is resolved in [12] by showing that the maximum distance between the forward most (vanguard) and rear most (rearguard) motor is bounded, thus enabling a projection of the infinite dimensional model to a finite dimensional model and preserving the Markov property. Thus, instead of an absolute configuration Z we define a relative configuration σ that captures the locations of the motors in an ensemble relative to the rearguard motor (see Fig. 1(b)). Subsequently, in the finite dimensional model, $\lambda_\sigma(\sigma', \sigma)$ denotes the transition rates between the relative configurations σ and σ' . In a manner similar to the absolute configurations, the probability $P_\sigma(\sigma, t)$ of being σ at time t obeys the Master Equation, $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P_\sigma(\sigma, t) = \sum_{\sigma' \in S} \lambda_\sigma(\sigma, \sigma') P_\sigma(\sigma', t) - P_\sigma(\sigma, t) \sum_{\sigma' \in S} \lambda_\sigma(\sigma', \sigma)$, where $S = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1}, \dots, \sigma_{\bar{n}}\}$ is the set of finite relative configurations. For a finite \bar{m} and F_{load} , the space of relative configurations is finite [12]. Let the probability vector be $P(t) = [P_1(t), \dots, P_{\bar{n}}(t)]$ where each element $P_i(t)$ is the probability of the system being in the i^{th} relative configuration, σ_i , at time t . The probability vector $P(t)$ satisfies the master equation $\frac{d}{dt} P(t) = \bar{\Gamma} P(t)$, where $\bar{\Gamma} \in \mathbf{R}^{\bar{n} \times \bar{n}}$ is defined by the transition rates $\lambda_\sigma(\sigma_j, \sigma_i)$ and is impacted by external conditions such as F_{load} and ATP concentration. Solving for $P(t)$, we get $P(t) = e^{\bar{\Gamma}(t-t_0)} P(t_0) = \bar{\mathbf{J}} P(t_0)$, where $P(t_0)$ is an initial probability vector and $\bar{\mathbf{J}} \in \mathbf{R}^{\bar{n} \times \bar{n}}$.

Unique Steady State Distribution: By propagating the above master equation for known models of molecular motors with stepping, detachment and reattachment probabilities (such as, for example, Kinesin-I), it is seen that the steady state distribution P_{ss} reflects the condition of cargo being permanently disengaged from the MT. Thus, if $\sigma_{n+1} = \phi$ denotes the relative configuration where no motors are attached to the MT which characterizes the state where the cargo is permanently lost then the steady state distribution $P^{(ss)}$ is such that $P_{n+1}^{(ss)} = 1$ and $P_j^{(ss)} = 0$ if $j \neq n+1$ where $P_{n+1}(t) = 1$. This is an intuitive yet a trivial and uninformative result, since loss of cargo is an inevitable eventual outcome of transport of cargo [4]. We consider cargo transport under a

meaningful condition that a fixed number of motors, say $m > 0$, remain attached to the MT. Such a conditioning enables an analysis of the mechanisms employed by the motor teams while the cargo is being attached to the MT. When conditioned on the ensemble having at least m motors attached to the MT, the new state space reduces from \bar{S} to $S = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$, where S contains all the relative configurations with at least m motors attached to the MT. The probability vector $P(t) = [P_1(t), \dots, P_n(t)]$ now satisfies the master equation $\frac{d}{dt}P(t) = \mathbf{\Gamma}P(t)$, where $\mathbf{\Gamma} \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$ is the transition matrix after conditioning on at least m motors attached to the MT and is defined by the transition rates $\lambda_\sigma(\sigma_j, \sigma_i)$. Solving for $P(t)$, we get $P(t) = e^{\mathbf{\Gamma}(t-t_0)}P(t_0) = \mathbf{J}P(t_0)$, where $P(t_0)$ is an initial probability vector and $\mathbf{J} \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$. The distribution $P(t)$ contains information regarding the manner in which multiple motors transport a common cargo. It is not evident a priori what the nature of $P(t)$ would be like; whether it has a unique steady state and what the nature of the steady state is. By using the underlying model for molecular motors [4] and a constant load force on the cargo, we utilized properties of the underlying Markov model to prove the following :

Consider a Markov Model with a state space S , transition matrix \mathbf{J} for an ensemble of \bar{m} motors carrying a common cargo; with at least $m \in [0, \bar{m} - 1]$ motors always remaining attached to the MT and the cargo subjected to constant load force F_L [15]. Then, the associated Markov chain has a unique steady state distribution P_{ss} .

See supplementary material [15] section I for proof. It implies that the ensemble of molecular motors carrying a common cargo is a highly robust system that behaves in a fixed manner after an initial transient period has passed. Furthermore, the steady state distribution P_{ss} is independent of the initial distribution $P(t_0)$ at the time t_0 , indicating that no matter how the motors are oriented prior to the initiation of the cargo transport, they prefer to align themselves according to a fixed distribution that is dependent on external conditions.

The steady state distribution P_{ss} is obtained by solving $P_{ss} = \mathbf{J}P_{ss}$. In [15] section II it is seen that the value of $P(t)$ obtained by propagating $P(t) = \mathbf{J}P(t_0)$ approaches P_{ss} obtained by solving $P_{ss} = \mathbf{J}P_{ss}$. Thus by propagating $P(t) = \mathbf{J}P(t_0)$ we can not only conveniently obtain an estimate for P_{ss} but can also analyze the dynamics of the process of orientation of the motors in the ensemble as time progresses, thus making the long term behavior of the ensemble tractable.

Analysis of Steady State Distributions The steady state distribution P_{ss} can be utilized to compute important biological quantities governing intracellular traffic, such as average cargo velocity, run-length and average number of engaged motors. An instantiation for an ensemble of finite Kinesin-I (two and three-motor) yields quantitative and qualitative properties that are in good agreement with existing studies (see [15] section III, IV for details). The agreement between results obtained using the analytic model and existing literature justifies the

usage of the analytic framework to arrive at conclusions about the steady state dynamics of the ensemble and how it responds to changing external conditions. Subsequently, we utilized the computational model to quantify the effect of external conditions on the behavior of the multiple motors, which we observe is captured by the steady state P_{ss} . In particular, we analyze the effect of varying ATP concentration and load forces on transport of cargo by multi-motor ensembles.

Effect of ATP concentration: Fig. 2(a-d) shows the impact of ATP concentration on two and three motor ensembles. We analyzed the probability of 1 motor being attached to the MT (denoted by p_{1mot}) and the probability of more than 1 motor being attached to the MT (equal to $1 - p_{1mot}$). For both two and three motor ensembles, with reducing ATP concentration, the respective p_{1mot} reduces and $(1 - p_{1mot})$ increases. Changes in load force on the cargo have no impact on these observed trends. A direct impact of this behavior can be observed on the variation of average velocity and run-length of multi-motor ensembles with ATP concentration. It is seen ([15] section IV) that, with reducing ATP concentrations, the average velocity for multi-motor ensembles reduces but the runlength increases. The increase in run-length can be attributed to the fact that, even though the velocity has diminished with reducing ATP concentration, the probability of more than 1 motor remaining attached to the MT increases. Here, the cargo has a higher probability of remaining engaged to the MT. This enables the second motor (and third motor for three motor ensemble) to contribute to the cargo motion, allowing for a higher probability of the cargo being linked to the MT during the course of cargo travel. It enhances the overall distance covered by the multi-motor ensemble and corroborates experimental observations such as [13], while providing an explanation based on steady state probability distributions of the multi-motor ensembles. . The increase in the probability of more than one motor attached to the MT can be attributed to reduction in single motor detachment rates with ATP concentration, based on the single motor detachment model [4] used for the analysis in this article. Our analysis predicts that for multi-motor ensembles, the probability of cargo remaining attached through more than 1 motor increases with reduced ATP concentrations contributing to increased cargo run-length.

Effect of load force: The simulation model is further utilized to analyze the impact of varying load forces on the steady state probabilities of relative configurations of two and three motor ensembles, as shown in Fig. 2. It is seen that at very small values of load forces Fig. 2 (e) and (h), a significant majority of configurations have low probabilities with little variation. No one relative arrangement is particularly favored, with the variation in probabilities being very gradual. This indicates that the motors do not prefer any particular relative configuration at these values of load forces. An intuitive explanation is that at such low loads, since equal or unequal load sharing




FIG. 2. Variation of probability distribution function of two and three motor ensembles with ATP concentration

cause insignificant variations in the load forces balanced by each motor in the ensemble, there is no advantage to adhere to a specific orientation. Thus in these regimes motors tend to spread out more evenly while transporting the common cargo.

However, as the load force is increased, certain configurations become more probable. As is seen in Fig. 2 (f) for two motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 5pN$, the relative configurations MM and $M|M$ are more probable, with a combined 29.9% share of the total probability (as compared to 4.7% if all configurations were equally likely). For a three motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 10pN$ (Fig. 2 (i)), the configurations MMM and $M|MM$ become more probable, with a 8.51% share of the total probability (as compared to 0.405% if all configurations were equally likely). A common attribute connecting these configurations is that these represent arrangements where motors are *clustered* together, with little to no separation between their relative locations on the MT.

Let's define probability of clustered states as the sum of probabilities of the clustered states for the two and three motor ensembles respectively. As is seen in Fig. 2(k), not only is clustering favored at the load forces under consideration, but the probability of clustered states tends to increase with load forces. A possible explanation for the preference to clustering is that, clustered states imply motor extensions of similar magnitudes. Thus in such configurations, the load force is shared more equally than in other configurations where the motors are far apart and not clustered together. As load force F_{load} is increased, if non-clustered states are preferred then it would lead to more unequal load sharing between the motors of the ensemble. In such configurations one or more motors may have to handle a higher percentage of F_{load} , bringing the value closer to or above the stalling force F_s ($6pN$ in this case). For example, for two motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 10pN$, in a non-clustered configuration $M||M$ the rearguard motor takes $2.4pN$ while vanguard balances $7.6pN$ load force. This will place the vanguard motor beyond stall, making it unable to step forward and thus inhibiting the overall cargo propagation. Thus,

with increasing load forces, it is disadvantageous to prefer unequal load sharing i.e. configurations with a higher separation between the motors on the MT. Thereby, it is beneficial to prefer a more equal load sharing i.e. clustering, as F_{load} on the cargo increases, as is evidenced by Fig. 2(f),(i) and (k).

However, the trend of 'more clustering' with 'higher F_{load} ' does not hold for higher magnitudes of load forces. In Fig. 2(g),(j) it is seen that beyond a certain value of load force, there is an abrupt departure from a preference to clustering of motors. In case of two motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 25pN$ (Fig.2(g)), the clustered states of MM and MMM are improbable while $M||||M$ (Fig.2(l)) is the most probable (27% share of total probability). For a three motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 50pN$ (Fig. 2(j)), $MM|||||||M$ (Fig.2(m)) is most probable among the three motor configurations (7.48% share of total probability). An analysis of the load sharing in these configurations reveals non-intuitive insights.

In the two motor case with $F_{load} = 25pN$, the rearguard motor in the most preferred configuration of $M||||M$ handles $6.1pN$ while the vanguard handles the rest $18.9pN$ load force. For three motor ensemble with $F_{load} = 50pN$, the rearguard motors in the most preferred configuration of $MM|||||||M$ each handle $7.3pN$ of the load force while the vanguard handles the rest $35.4pN$ force. A possible advantage of such relative configurations is as follows. Here, stalling force for the motors used is $F_s = 6pN$; when the load on the motor is beyond F_s , the motor is unable to take a forward step. At these high loads, a common property among the most preferred configurations is that there is one vanguard motor while the rest of the motors are all rearguard motors on the same location on the MT. The vanguard and rearguard motors are spread out such that all the rearguard motors are loaded beyond but near stall force F_s and the vanguard motor bears the remaining load, whose value is well beyond the stalling force F_s .

Such a high loading event relates to an infrequent yet a possibly debilitating phenomenon inside the cells, such as an unanticipated obstacle along the cargo travel path or

an encounter with an oppositely directed cargo. Occurrences like these are most likely sudden events that do not lead to a progressive loading of the load force on the cargo, but an unexpected spike. Based on our analysis, the preferred orientation is such that as few motors as possible (i.e. a single vanguard motor) are loaded well beyond stall force. In such an arrangement, once the transient loading event goes away and F_{load} starts to subside, it takes little reduction in F_{load} to reduce the force on each of the rearguard motors, subsequently enabling them to take a step and propel the cargo forward (since force on each motor now falls below F_s). It is in this arrangement that the maximum number of motors can be mobilized by the least reduction in F_{load} , while keeping the load force on the one vanguard motor as low as possible. In contrast, for configurations where the rearguard and vanguard motors are closer (like a clustered configuration preferred for lower F_{load}), the non-vanguard motors would be taking a load higher than F_s and there would be less number of motors loaded *just above* their stall force. Thus a larger reduction of load force would be necessary to enable the same numbers of motors to be able to step forward, as in the previous configuration. Another possible advantage is that, for the same reduction in F_{load} , the preferred orientation enables the maximum number of motors (i.e. all but one vanguard) to be able to walk while maintaining the load force on

the vanguard motor as low as possible. Thus, this orientation ensures that the least amount of reduction in the high load force is needed to enable the resumption of motor motion and forward propagation of cargo towards the destination.

Summary: Using a semi-analytic Markov model to analyze intracellular cargo transport by teams of finite motors, we prove that the motors orient themselves according to *unique steady state distributions* irrespective of the initial orientation. It demonstrates the robustness of the intracellular transport mechanism. Analyzing how the distribution is impacted by external factors reveals interesting coordination mechanisms. For a team of multiple Kinesin-I motors at reduced ATP concentrations, more motors prefer to remain attached to the microtubule. This contributes to enhanced ensemble run-length despite despite reduced velocity. Furthermore, an increase in hindering load force on the cargo is tackled by '*clustering*' together. However, at very high load forces the motors abandon clustering and adopt configurations that prefer anchoring the cargo and immediate cargo translocation once the large loading event has subsided. Our approach provides unique insights into the team behaviors of molecular motors, with the analytical approach suitable to study transport mechanisms adapted by teams of other motors, such as dynein, myosin or even heterologous ensembles.

-
- [1] M. J. Schnitzer and S. M. Block, *Nature* **388**, 386 (1997).
 [2] C. Kural, H. Kim, S. Syed, G. Goshima, V. I. Gelfand, and P. R. Selvin, *Science* **308**, 1469 (2005).
 [3] C. Leduc, F. Ruhnnow, J. Howard, and S. Diez, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **104**, 10847 (2007).
 [4] A. Kunwar, M. Vershinin, J. Xu, and S. P. Gross, *Current biology* **18**, 1173 (2008).
 [5] M. J. Müller, S. Klumpp, and R. Lipowsky, *Biophysical journal* **98**, 2610 (2010).
 [6] A. Kunwar and A. Mogilner, *Physical biology* **7**, 016012 (2010).
 [7] F. Berger, C. Keller, S. Klumpp, and R. Lipowsky, *Physical review letters* **108**, 208101 (2012).
 [8] J. W. Driver, A. R. Rogers, D. K. Jamison, R. K. Das, A. B. Kolomeisky, and M. R. Diehl, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **12**, 10398 (2010).
 [9] S. Klumpp and R. Lipowsky, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**, 17284 (2005).
 [10] S. Klumpp, C. Keller, F. Berger, and R. Lipowsky, in *Multiscale Modeling in Biomechanics and Mechanobiology* (Springer, 2015) pp. 27–61.
 [11] F. Posta, M. R. D'Orsogna, and T. Chou, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* **11**, 4851 (2009).
 [12] D. Materassi, S. Roychowdhury, T. Hays, and M. Salapaka, *BMC biophysics* **6**, 14 (2013).
 [13] J. Xu, Z. Shu, S. J. King, and S. P. Gross, *Traffic* **13**, 1198 (2012).
 [14] X. Pan, G. Ou, G. Civelekoglu-Scholey, O. E. Blacque, N. F. Endres, L. Tao, A. Mogilner, M. R. Leroux, R. D. Vale, and J. M. Scholey, *The Journal of cell biology* **174**, 1035 (2006).
 [15] S. material, (2018).
 [16] J. L. Doob, *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* , 455 (1945).
 [17] D. T. Gillespie, *The journal of physical chemistry* **81**, 2340 (1977).