

Controlling interactions in supported bilayers from weak electrostatic repulsion to high osmotic pressure

Arnaud Hemmerle,^{1,2} Linda Malaquin,^{1,2} Thierry Charitat,^{1,*}
Sigolène Lecuyer,^{1,†} Giovanna Fragneto,³ and Jean Daillant^{2,‡}

¹*UPR 22/CNRS, Institut Charles Sadron, Université de Strasbourg,
23 rue du Loess, BP 84047 67034 Strasbourg Cedex 2, France*

²*CEA, IRAMIS, SIS2M, LIONS, UMR 3299 CEA/CNRS,
CEA-Saclay bât. 125, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France*

³*Institut Laue-Langevin, 6 rue Jules Horowitz, BP 156, 38042 Grenoble Cedex, France*

(Dated: June 15, 2021)

Understanding interactions between membranes requires measurements on well-controlled systems close to natural conditions, in which fluctuations play an important role. We have determined, by grazing incidence X-ray scattering, the interaction potential between two lipid bilayers, one adsorbed on a solid surface and the other floating close by. We find that interactions in this highly hydrated model system are two orders of magnitude softer than in previously reported work on multilayer stacks. This is attributed to the weak electrostatic repulsion due to the small fraction of ionized lipids in supported bilayers with a lower number of defects. Our data are consistent with the Poisson-Boltzmann theory, in the regime where repulsion is dominated by the entropy of counter ions. We also have unique access to very weak entropic repulsion potentials, which allowed us to discriminate between the various models proposed in the literature. We further demonstrate that the interaction potential between supported bilayers can be tuned at will by applying osmotic pressure, providing a way to manipulate these model membranes, thus considerably enlarging the range of biological or physical problems that can be addressed.

Keywords: interbilayer forces; statistical physics; electrostatic interaction

I. INTRODUCTION

Supported lipid bilayers offer a unique configuration whereby a single bilayer, accessible to other molecules such as, for example, proteins, peptides, or DNA, is supported on a solid substrate. Beyond their interest for biosensor technology, the access they give to a flat immobilized membrane makes them highly relevant for fundamental studies in biophysics and membrane biology [1, 2]. In particular, they provide a unique way to finely characterize the interactions between membranes and their environment, which are not only crucial for membrane fusion and trafficking, endocytosis, and exocytosis [3, 4], but also fascinating from the physical point of view.

Membranes indeed exhibit extremely complex interactions with their environment, in which both molecular-scale enthalpic and fluctuation-related entropic contributions are inextricably involved. In particular, the effect of confinement has been now discussed for 40 years without a definitive answer being found. Helfrich first realized that, in addition to the direct electrostatic, van der Waals, and hydration forces [4], the long-range effective steric interaction generated by the thermal fluctuations of confined flexible membranes is an essential contribution to the total free energy of interaction [5]. Pure hard wall interaction (hard confinement) was first considered in [5, 6] but is not a realistic description of real systems, and especially not of living ones. Confinement by a “soft” potential was treated either by using self-consistent methods leading to effective exponentially decaying potentials [7–9], or by estimating average values within a full statistical mechanics approach [10]. Which functional form should be used to describe entropic repulsion in real experimental situations, however, remains an open question.

Although the surface force apparatus can be used to precisely determine the direct part of the potential (hydration and van der Waals contributions) [11], the entropic repulsion can only be studied by using scattering techniques. Combination with osmotic pressure measurements allowed in particular the determination of the compressibility $B = \partial^2 \mathcal{F} / \partial d_w^2$, where \mathcal{F} is the system free energy and d_w the interlayer water thickness [11, 12]. Although some agreement was found with the soft potential of Ref.[9], the experimental decay lengths found in [13] were greater

*Corresponding author: thierry.charitat@ics-cnrs.unistra.fr

†Present address: Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire de Physique, UMR, 140 avenue de la physique, Université Joseph Fourier, and CNRS, 38402 Saint Martin d’Heres, France

‡Present address: Synchrotron SOLEIL, L’Orme des Merisiers, Saint-Aubin, BP 48, F-91192 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France




FIG. S1: Schematic view of the experimental setup for specular and off-specular reflectivity. The grazing and scattered wavevectors (resp. angles of incidence) are \mathbf{k}_{in} and \mathbf{k}_{sc} (resp. θ_{in} and θ_{sc}). \mathbf{q} is the wavevector transfer.

than twice the value predicted by theory, ~ 0.2 nm. Moreover, inconsistencies between the temperature dependence of B and the observation of an unbinding transition pointed to the role of static defects in multilayers, which would dramatically affect bilayer interactions [14]. In the work described here, we determine the interaction potential between supported bilayers. These bilayers can be almost defectless but contain much less material than multilayers and could not be studied using diffuse scattering until recently [15].

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Two kinds of supported bilayers were investigated in this study, both consisting of two bilayers (see Fig. 1). The first type, called “double bilayers” in the following, consists of two bilayers of DSPC, whereas in the other, called “OTS-bilayer”, the first monolayer close to the substrate is replaced by an octadecyl-trichlorosilane grafted layer (see Materials and Methods for details). In both cases, the second bilayer is free to fluctuate in the potential of the first bilayer and of the substrate. A combined fit of specular and off-specular data is performed in order to increase sensitivity, using a model taking into account the static and thermal roughness from both bilayers (see Ref. [16] and Materials and Methods). From the fits presented in Fig. S2, we obtain structural parameters, in particular the bilayer-bilayer distance and the interlayer water thickness, but also the interaction potential second derivative, and the bilayer tensions and bending rigidities (Fig. S3). Electron density profiles for OTS or double bilayers can be found in Ref. [16] (an example is given in Supporting Information).

In all cases, the best fit values for the floating membrane tension is 0.3 ± 0.2 mN/m. The bending rigidity decreases from $(250 \pm 50)k_B T$ in the gel phase ($T = 42.9^\circ\text{C}$) to $(50 \pm 20)k_B T$ in the fluid phase ($T = 52.9^\circ\text{C}$) in agreement with previously reported values [15]. The static, substrate-induced roughness of both membranes is always less than 0.3 nm and remains constant, as well as the thermal roughness $\sigma_{th,1}$ of the first, adsorbed membrane, which is on the order of 0.4 to 0.5 nm (Fig. S4 inset). The thermal roughness $\sigma_{th,2}$ of the second bilayer is larger than that of the first bilayer, justifying the denomination “floating bilayer”, in good agreement with previous experiments [16, 17]. A zoom of the off-specular reflectivity in the region where it is most sensitive to the interaction potential is shown in Fig. S2 for different temperatures. It is important to note here that the second derivative of the interbilayer interaction potential is directly linked to the depth of the minimum in the diffuse scattering curve around $q_z \approx 1.0 - 1.5 \text{ nm}^{-1}$, without much coupling to the other parameters. Similarly, the interlayer water thickness is strongly correlated to the q_z position of that minimum. Hence, it can be seen directly in the inset of Fig. S2 that the interaction potential becomes weaker (the minimum is less pronounced) when the interlayer water thickness increases (left shift of the minimum) at higher temperatures.

The second derivative of the interbilayer potential U''_{12} obtained by fitting the experimental data is represented as a function of the interlayer water thickness d_w in Fig. S3, where our data are compared with values obtained by Petrache et al. for Egg PC multilayers [13]. Remarkably, our samples are more hydrated than multilayers (d_w




FIG. S2: Off-specular reflectivity from silicon substrate (\circ) and an OTS bilayer at $T=42.9^\circ\text{C}$ (\square) as a function of q_x . Continuous lines represent best fits. Top inset: off-specular reflectivity as a function of q_z zoomed in the region where it is most sensitive to the potential at $T=42.9^\circ\text{C}$ (\square), 49.7°C (\blacksquare), 51.5°C (\circ), 52.0°C (\bullet), 52.9°C (\triangle). Note the shift in minimum and decrease in contrast with increasing temperature. Bottom inset: specular reflectivity (continuous line), “true” specular reflectivity (dashed line), and diffuse scattering in the specular direction $q_x = 0$ (dotted line) calculated using the model of Ref. [16] using the fit parameters and experimental resolution.

is 0.1 to 0.5 nm larger) and interact via a softer interaction potential (U''_{12} is smaller). Note that in this analysis, the interaction potential is not only strongly constrained via its second derivative U''_{12} , but also via d_w which fixes the position of its minimum. d_w is in turn reported as a function of the second bilayer thermal roughness $\sigma_{th,2}$ in Fig. S4 which shows a strong correlation between the two parameters, demonstrating that there is a large entropic contribution to the repulsion as expected.

The accuracy of our data, in particular for large separations, allows for a precise assessment of the repulsive part of the potential. In particular, it allows for a test of the different functional forms which have been used in the literature to model the entropic part of the potential. With this aim, we first accurately calculated the attractive part of the potential using the Lifshitz theory [18], carefully modelling the silicon-silicon oxide-water-lipid bilayer-water-lipid bilayer stack (for more details see Supporting Information). For $d_w < 3$ nm, a good approximation to the van der Waals interaction energy is $U_{vdW} = -H/12\pi(d_w + 2d_{\text{head}})^2$, with $H = 5.3 \times 10^{-21}$ J and d_{head} the headgroup layer thickness (0.4 – 0.8 nm) in good agreement with previous work [19, 20].

We further modeled hydration forces using a classical exponential decay, $U_{\text{hyd}} = P_h z_h \exp(-z/z_h)$, with $P_h = 1 - 5 \times 10^7$ Pa the hydration pressure and $z_h = 0.16 - 0.2$ nm the hydration length [13].

The renormalization of the microscopic interaction potential by the thermal fluctuations is a complex problem of modern statistical physics. According to Helfrich [21], the membrane free energy is the sum of the microscopic potential and of the entropy cost of confining the flexible membrane, which results in an effective potential controlling bilayer position. The effective potential, average bilayer position, and fluctuation amplitude are thus coupled quantities which must be self-consistently determined.

As mentioned in the introduction, Podgornik and Parsegian have extended Helfrich’s approach [21] to take into account hydration repulsion and van der Waals attraction in the so-called “soft” potential [9], and the self-consistent approaches of Refs. [10, 22] allow the calculation of average position, rms roughness and mean effective potential curvature. All these theories are based on a quadratic approximation of the interaction potential, either symmetric [21] or not [9, 10, 22]. In any case, a non-symmetric case, like ours, can always be mapped to a symmetric case by identifying the strength of the quadratic potential with the second derivative of the asymmetric potential. As an example, the Helfrich potential has been shown to correctly describe a supported bilayer interacting with a single hard wall in the limit of small fluctuations (see [10] and Supporting Information).




FIG. S3: Interaction potential second derivative U''_{12} as a function of the interlayer water thickness d_w . (\square): data from Petrache et al [13] for Egg PC in fluid phase. All other data from this work using DSPC: fluid phase (\bullet); fluid phase prior to (\blacklozenge) and after (\circ) the addition of salt ($T=58^\circ\text{C}$; $\ell_D = 0.5$ nm and 0.4 nm); gel phase prior to (\blacktriangle) and after (\triangle) the addition of salt ($T=40^\circ\text{C}$; $\ell_D = 0.4$ nm); (\blacklozenge) Gel Phase with applied osmotic pressure ($\Pi = 10 \pm 4$ and 450 ± 250 kPa). Red solid (respectively dashed) lines: soft-confinement potential [9] plus electrostatic contribution in the Ideal Gas limit (IG) for Fluid (respectively Gel) phase. Blue solid (respectively dashed) lines: soft-confinement potential [9] plus electrostatic contribution in the Debye-Hückel limit (DH) ($\ell_D = 0.3$ nm) for Fluid (respectively Gel) phase. Green dashed-dotted line: self-consistent model [10] in fluid phase ($\kappa = 50k_B T$). The ellipses show the region of equilibrium states without applied pressure for Helfrich, hydration and van der Waals forces (grey area); soft-confinement, hydration and van der Waals forces (dashed area); soft-confinement, hydration and van der Waals forces plus electrostatic interaction in the ideal gas limit (empty ellipse). The different ellipses were obtained by varying P_h , z_h , d_{head} and κ within the limits indicated in text. Inset: osmotic pressure Π (interaction potential first derivative U'_{12}) as a function of the interlayer water thickness d_w . (\square): Open symbols, data from Petrache et al [13] for Egg PC (\square), DMPC (\diamond) and DPPC (\triangle) in fluid phase. (\blacklozenge) data from this work using DSPC in gel phase with applied osmotic pressure. Red dashed line: soft-confinement potential [9] with electrostatic contribution in the Ideal Gas limit for the Gel phase. Blue dashed line: soft-confinement potential [9] with electrostatic contribution in the Debye-Hückel limit (DH) ($\ell_D=0.3$ nm) for the Gel phase. Green dashed-dotted line: self-consistent model [10] in gel phase ($\kappa = 250k_B T$). Black dotted line: microscopic potential plus electrostatic contribution without any entropic contribution. The same set of parameters has been used in main figure and in the inset.

We first considered hard wall repulsion, with $U_{\text{Hel}} = c_H/\kappa(k_B T/z)^2$ [21] per unit area and c_H ranging from 0.08 to 0.2 [10, 23]. The corresponding d_w equilibrium values at zero applied pressure are given by the dark grey area on Fig. S3 and show poor agreement with the data. As expected, the hard-wall potential also fails to describe the d_w vs $\sigma_{th,2}$ curves (Fig. S4). Accordingly, the classical ‘‘Helfrich Ansatz’’ $d_w \propto \sigma_{th}$ does not apply (Fig. S4). We also note that simply shifting the zero of the potential to account for softness does not help and that the potential of Ref. [6] taking membrane tension into account cannot be distinguished from the hard-wall potential for realistic tension values. The ‘‘soft’’ potential of Podgornik and Parsegian [9] $U_{\text{soft}} = \pi k_B T/16\sqrt{P_h/\kappa/z_h} \exp(-z/nz_h)$ leads to a slightly better agreement but still predicts U''_{12} values one to two orders of magnitude larger than those observed experimentally (Fig. S3) and also underestimates the values of d_w and $\sigma_{th,2}$ data (Fig. S4). Finally, the self consistent theory of Ref. [10], which in principle allows one to calculate the mean d_w , U'_{12} or $\sigma_{th,2}$ more satisfactorily than effective potential theories, is indeed in good agreement with the d_w vs $\sigma_{th,2}$ data, but it strongly overestimates d_w , σ_{th} and U''_{12} , probably because of a bad sampling of the most confined microstates.

As our bilayers weakly interact with the substrate and can be very close to detachment, which was sometimes

observed for temperatures $\gtrsim 60^\circ\text{C}$, a very small but long-range repulsive contribution to the potential would in fact be enough to shift the equilibrium position to higher d_w and lower U''_{12} . Such electrostatic interactions are investigated in Ref.[24], but always ignored in scattering studies on zwitterionic lipids [13]. Phosphatidylcholines present indeed pKa values of 2.7 and 11 [25] and bear a positive charge density $\sigma \sim 0.001 \text{ e}^-/\text{nm}^2$ at the experimental $pH = 5.5$. This small amount of charges, necessarily present due to the amphoteric character of the phosphatidylcholine group, leads to a weak electrostatic repulsion which was recently shown sufficient to prevent vesicles from adhering [26].




FIG. S4: d_w as a function of $\sigma_{th,2}$. Symbols are the same as for figure S3. Dashed-dotted line (blue online): “Helfrich Ansatz” $d_w^2 = 1/6\sigma_{th,2}^2$. Dotted lines (blue online): Helfrich confinement, with a 0.3 nm shift for the lower curve as explained in text. Dashed line (red online): Soft potential (Ref. [9]) without electrostatic contribution. Solid line (red online): Soft potential (Ref. [9]) with electrostatic contribution. Green dashed-dotted line: self-consistent model [10] with electrostatic contribution. Inset: static roughness $\sigma_{st,i}$ (open symbols) and thermal roughness $\sigma_{th,i}$ (closed symbols) of the first strongly adsorbed bilayer ($i=1$, square, red online) and of the floating bilayer ($i=2$, triangle, blue online).

In our experiments, surface charge densities are small and the mean-field Poisson-Boltzmann (PB) theory is expected to appropriately describe the system. For DSPC supported bilayers in ultra-pure water, the Gouy-Chapman length related to the surface charge density σ is $\ell_G \sim 10^2 - 10^3 \text{ nm}$, the Debye-Hückel length which describes screening is $\ell_D \sim 200 - 500 \text{ nm}$ and $d_w \sim 2 - 3 \text{ nm}$. In this regime, the Ideal Gas (IG) limit of the mean-field Poisson-Boltzmann theory, where the interaction potential reads $U_{el} = 2k_B T \sigma / e \ln(d_w)$, should apply rather than the Debye-Hückel limit (DH) [27]. Adding this contribution to the soft potential of Ref. [9] gives a perfect description of our data for both representations U''_{12} vs d_w (Fig. S3) and d_w vs $\sigma_{th,2}$ (Fig. S4). Adding the electrostatic contribution extends the curves previously obtained to larger $\sigma_{th,2}$ and d_w without significantly modifying their low d_w part. Therefore, it cannot significantly improve the agreement for the other forms of the potential (Fig. S3). Accordingly, the charge density is very robust and does not depend on the other parameters. The validity of the soft effective potential in the presence of electrostatic interactions could nevertheless be questioned as the soft potential was explicitly constructed for hydration and van der Waals forces only. Though the influence of electrostatic interaction on entropically induced repulsive forces has not been investigated in detail, these are very long range compared to van der Waals and hydration interactions, and should be only marginally renormalized. Moreover, it was shown in Ref. [27], that in the absence of van der Waals and hydration forces, the renormalization of electrostatic interactions is negligible in the limit where the in-plane electrostatic correlation length ξ (50-100 nm here) is larger than d_w . In order to further check the effect of electrostatic interactions, NaCl was added to a double bilayer. This is expected to increase screening and is easier to analyse than changing the pH to change the lipids degree of ionization. We

prepared two solutions with $\ell_D = 0.45$ nm and $\ell_D = 0.3$ nm (see Materials and Methods). The results are reported in Fig. S3 and S4. A strong decrease in the interlayer water thickness d_w and in the thermal roughness $\sigma_{th,2}$ is observed, as well as a large increase in the interbilayer potential U''_{12} , in good agreement with the strong screening of the electrostatic potential.

A further proof of the good control we have over the interactions between supported bilayers is provided in the inset of Fig. S3 where the effect of osmotic pressure is shown. Osmotic pressure was applied using PVP (see Materials and Methods for details), and here again, the agreement with the theoretical model and with previous experiments on multilamellar systems is perfect. This is a first demonstration that the interbilayer potential of supported bilayers can be tuned using osmotic pressure, allowing us to extend the measurements towards smaller interlayer water thicknesses and to bridge the gap with multilayer studies.

III. CONCLUSION

In this article, X-ray off-specular scattering measurements of the interaction potential between two bilayers adsorbed on a solid substrate are shown to lead to results presenting unprecedented sensitivity, illustrated by the necessity of taking into account the very weak electrostatic repulsion between almost neutral bilayers and the possibility of discriminating between different entropic and electrostatic potentials. These results show that supported bilayers are significantly more hydrated and therefore exhibit more intrinsic properties than the usually studied multilayers, possibly owing to defects in the latter. This opens up a wide range of possibilities for understanding unbinding or investigating the effect of various biological molecules on interaction and adhesion between membranes.

IV. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The supported bilayers were prepared by depositing two bilayers on ultra-flat silicon substrates (SESO, France), where the first, more strongly adsorbed, bilayer is either a bilayer of $L-\alpha$ 1,2-distearoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DPSC, Avanti Polar Lipids, Lancaster, Alabama) made by a combination of classical Langmuir-Blodgett (LB) and Langmuir-Schaefer (LS) depositions (vertical sample) [28] or a mixed octadecylchlorosilane (OTS) - lipid bilayer (OTS bilayers), where the OTS layer is chemically grafted on the substrate [29]. A second, “floating” bilayer is then prepared by a LB deposition, followed by a LS deposition. The first bilayer serves both as a spacer to reduce the interaction between the floating bilayer and the substrate and keep it free to fluctuate, and to investigate bilayer-bilayer interactions. The sample is then inserted into a PTFE sample cell with 50 μ m thick windows. The sample cell is tightly closed and transferred to an alumina box, thermalized by a water circulation, first at 25°C, then heated by steps, with a feedback on the temperature measured inside the sample cell by a PT100 resistance.

Experiments were performed using ultra pure water (18.2 M Ω .cm), obtained from a Millipore purification system. Dissolution of CO₂ in water leads to Debye-Length values around \sim 200 nm, ten times smaller than the 960 nm expected for such samples [30]. By adding Sodium Chloride $c=0.5$ and 1 M, we obtained solutions with Debye length equal to 0.45 and 0.3 nm respectively. Osmotic pressure was applied using polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) of average molecular weight 40 000 (Sigma Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) mixed with milli-Q water. Solutions of 4 and 30 % of PVP (w/w) were prepared and homogenized with magnetic stirrings overnight. The bulk water was then carefully replaced by the PVP/water solutions with syringes, taking care not to expose the bilayers to air. The values of the osmotic pressures are deduced from the PVP concentrations as calculated by Vink [31] and reported in [32], leading to $\pi= 14\pm 2$ kPa and 450 ± 250 kPa.

Specular and off-specular reflectivities were recorded using the procedure of Ref. [15]. The experiments reported here used a 27 keV x-ray beam (wavelength $\lambda=0.0459$ nm) at the CRG-IF beamline of the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF). The scattering geometry is described in Fig. I. The monochromatic incident beam was first extracted from the polychromatic beam using a two-crystal Si(111) monochromator. Higher harmonics were eliminated using a W coated glass mirror, also used for focusing. In all experiments, the incident beam was 500 μ m \times 18 μ m (H \times V). The reflected intensity was defined using a 20 mm \times 200 μ m (H \times V) slit at 210 mm from the sample and a 20 mm \times 200 μ m (H \times V) slit at 815 mm from the sample and recorded using a NaI(Tl) scintillator. Specular reflectivity was obtained by rocking the sample for each angle of incidence (q_x scans for approximately constant q_z) in order to subtract the background. Off-specular reflectivity was measured at a constant grazing angle of incidence of 0.7 mrad below the critical angle of total external reflection at the Si-water interface (0.83 mrad), leading to variation of both q_x and q_z (see Fig. I).

Optimization of slit widths allowed us to extend the in-plane wavevector transfer range q_{\parallel} by one order of magnitude from $2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^{-1}$ to $2 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^{-1}$ compared to the experiments of Ref. [15]. Our experiment is thus sensitive to the off-specular diffusion by both bilayers and not only the more strongly fluctuating one, allowing for a precise determination of interaction potentials.

The differential scattering cross-section (power scattered per unit solid angle per unit incident flux) can be written [16]:

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \approx r_e^2 |t(\theta_{\text{in}})|^2 |t(\theta_{\text{sc}})|^2 \left\langle \left| \int d\mathbf{r} e^{i\mathbf{q}_{\parallel} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{\parallel}} \left[\frac{\rho_{\text{Si}} - \rho_{\text{w}}}{iq_z} e^{iq_z z_s(\mathbf{r}_{\parallel})} + \delta\tilde{\rho}_1(q_z) e^{iq_z z_1(\mathbf{r}_{\parallel})} + \delta\tilde{\rho}_2(q_z) e^{iq_z z_2(\mathbf{r}_{\parallel})} \right] \right|^2 \right\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $r_e = 2.818 \times 10^{-15} \text{ m}$, $t(\theta_{\text{in}})$ and $t(\theta_{\text{sc}})$ are the Fresnel transmission coefficients between water and silicon, for the grazing angle of incidence θ_{in} and for the scattering angle θ_{sc} . The coefficient $t(\theta_{\text{in}})$ represents a good approximation to the actual field at the interface while $t(\theta_{\text{sc}})$ describes how the scattered field propagates to the detector. Eq. (1) has to be multiplied by the incident flux and (numerically) integrated over the detector solid angle to get the scattered intensity. The three terms in between the square brackets describe the surface roughness and bilayers 1 and 2 static roughness and thermal fluctuations respectively. $\delta\tilde{\rho}_i(q_z)$ ($i=1,2$) is the Fourier transform of the i -th bilayer (located at $z_i(\mathbf{r}_{\parallel})$) electron density profiles (form factors), which are described using the so-called 1G-hybrid model [16, 33]. Expanding the square modulus in Eq. (1), we get self- and cross- height-height correlation functions of the substrate and bilayers, where the cross-correlations are sensitive to the interaction potentials.

We describe the substrate correlation function using a self-affine correlation function [34]. Static and thermal correlation functions used in Eq. (1) are derived in detail in Ref. [16] using the free energy:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_q = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^2 [(\tilde{a}_i(q_{\parallel}) + U''_{12}) |\tilde{z}_i(q_{\parallel})|^2 + U''_{is} \tilde{z}_i(q_{\parallel}) \tilde{z}_s(-q_{\parallel})] - U''_{12} \tilde{z}_1(q_{\parallel}) \tilde{z}_2(-q_{\parallel}), \quad (2)$$

with $\tilde{a}_i(q_{\parallel}) = U''_{is} + \gamma_i q_{\parallel}^2 + \kappa_i q_{\parallel}^4$, where γ_i and κ_i are respectively the tension and the bending modulus of the i -th bilayer. U''_{is} and U''_{12} are second derivatives of the effective interaction potential between the substrate and a bilayer and between bilayers. The linear response theory of Swain and Andelman [35] was extended to double bilayers in order to describe the static coupling of the bilayers to the substrate and the thermal correlation functions were derived by diagonalizing $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_q$, applying the equipartition of energy and Fourier transforming.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank J.-S. Micha for assistance during the experiments at ESRF (BM32), the ILL for support laboratories for sample preparation, P. Kélicheff and C. Marques for stimulating discussions.

-
- [1] Sackmann E (1996) Supported membranes: Scientific and practical applications. *Science* 271:43–48.
 - [2] Castellana ET, Cremer PS (2006) Solid supported lipid bilayers: From biophysical studies to sensor design. *Surface Science Reports* 61:429 – 444.
 - [3] Mouritsen O, Andersen O (1998) *In search of a new biomembrane model*, *Biologiske Skrifter* (The Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, Copenhagen).
 - [4] Lipowsky R (1995) *Handbook of Biological Physics, vol. 1* eds Lipowsky R, Sackmann E (Elsevier).
 - [5] Helfrich W (1973) Elastic properties of lipid bilayers: theory and possible experiments. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* 28:693–703.
 - [6] Seifert U (1995) Self-consistent theory of bound vesicles. *Physical Review Letters* 74:5060–5063.
 - [7] Evans EA, Parsegian VA (1986) Thermal-mechanical fluctuations enhance repulsion between bimolecular layers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 83:7132–7136.
 - [8] Sornette D, Ostrowsky N (1986) Importance of membrane fluidity on bilayer interactions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 84:4062–4067.
 - [9] Podgornik R, Parsegian V (1992) Thermal-mechanical fluctuations of fluid membranes in confined geometries: the case of soft confinement. *Langmuir* 8:557–562.
 - [10] Mecke KR, Charitat T, Graner F (2003) Fluctuating lipid bilayer in an arbitrary potential: Theory and experimental determination of bending rigidity. *Langmuir* 19:2080–2087.
 - [11] Rand RP, Parsegian VA (1989) Hydration forces between phospholipid bilayers. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 988:351–376.

- [12] Nagle J, Tristram-Nagle S (2000) Structure of lipid bilayers. *BBA Biomembranes* 1469:159–195.
- [13] Petrache HI, et al. (1998) Interbilayer interactions from high-resolution x-ray scattering. *Physical Review E* 57:7014–7024.
- [14] Vogel M, Munster C, Fenzl W, Salditt T (2000) Thermal unbinding of highly oriented phospholipid membranes. *Physical Review Letters* 84:390–393.
- [15] Dailliant J, et al. (2005) Structure and fluctuations of a single floating lipid bilayer. *The Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 102:11639–11644.
- [16] Malaquin L, Charitat T, Dailliant J (2010) Supported bilayers: Combined specular and diffuse x-ray scattering. *Eur. Phys. J. E* 31:285–301.
- [17] DeCaro CM, et al. (2011) Substrate suppression of thermal roughness in stacked supported bilayers. *Phys. Rev. E* 84:041914.
- [18] Shubin VE, Kékicheff P (1993) Electrical double layer structure revisited via a surface force apparatus: Mica interfaces in lithium nitrate solutions. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 155:108–123.
- [19] Marra J, Israelachvili J (1985) Direct measurements of forces between phosphatidylcholine and phosphatidylethanolamine bilayers in aqueous electrolyte solutions. *Biochemistry* 24:4608–4618.
- [20] Parsegian V (1993) Reconciliation of van der waals force measurements between phosphatidylcholine bilayers in water and between bilayer-coated mica surfaces. *Langmuir* 9:3625–3628.
- [21] Helfrich W (1978) Steric interaction of fluid membranes in multilayer systems. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* 33:305–315.
- [22] Manghi M, Destainville N (2010) Statistical mechanics and dynamics of two supported stacked lipid bilayers. *Langmuir* 26:4057–4068.
- [23] Gompper G, Kroll DM (1989) Steric interactions in a multimembrane system: a monte-carlo study. *Europhys. Lett.* 9:59.
- [24] Cowley AC, Fuller NL, Rand RP, Parsegian VA (1978) Measurement of repulsive forces between charged phospholipid bilayers. *Biochemistry* 17:3163–3168.
- [25] Sanden T, Salomonsson L, Brzezinski P, Widengren J (2010) Surface-coupled proton exchange of a membrane-bound proton acceptor. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107:4129–4134.
- [26] Pincet F, Cribier S, Perez P (1999) Bilayers of neutral lipids bear a small but significant charge. *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems* 11:127–130.
- [27] Andelman D (1995) *Handbook of biological physics*, ed Sackmann E (Elsevier Science).
- [28] Charitat T, Bellet-Amalric E, Fragneto G, Graner F (1999) Adsorbed and free lipid bilayers at the solid-liquid interface. *European Physical Journal B* 8:583–593.
- [29] Hughes AV, Goldar A, Gestenberg MC, Roser SJ, Bradshaw J (2002) A hybrid sam phospholipid approach to fabricating a free supported lipid bilayer. *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics* 4:2371–2378.
- [30] Haughey D, Earnshaw JC (1998) Studies of colloidal interactions using total internal reflection microscopy. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects* 136:217 – 230.
- [31] H., Vink (1971) Precision measurements of osmotic pressure in concentrated polymer solutions. *European Polymer Journal* 7:1411 – 1419.
- [32] McIntosh TJ, Simon SA (1986) Hydration force and bilayer deformation: a reevaluation. *Biochemistry* 25:4058–4066.
- [33] Wiener M, Suter R, Nagle J (1989) Structure of the fully hydrated gel phase of dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine. *Biophysical Journal* 55:315–25.
- [34] Sinha SK, Sirota EB, Garoff S (1988) X-ray and neutron scattering from rough surfaces. *Physical Review B* 38:2297–2311.
- [35] Swain PS, Andelman D (2001) Supported membranes on chemically structured and rough surfaces. *Physical Review E* 63:51911.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

I. FIT PARAMETERS

As described in the manuscript, we perform combined fits of experimental specular and off-specular data. Best fit main parameters for elastic constants (γ_2 , κ_2), interaction potential second derivative (U''_{M_1, M_2}), static ($\sigma_{st,2}$) and thermic ($\sigma_{th,2}$) roughnesses of the floating bilayer are given in Tables S1 and S2. A typical Electron Density Profile (EDP) for a double supported bilayer is also reported as Fig. S5.

A. Influence of temperature and osmotic pressure

	Influence of temperature					Osmotic pressure	
	42.9°C	49.7°C	51.5°C	52.0°C	52.9°C	PVP 4%	PVP 30%
D_{2,H_2O} [Å]	25.0±0.2	26.5±0.2	26.9±0.2	28.1±0.2	29.7±0.2	18.0 ± 1	14.0 ± 1
κ_2 [$k_B T$]	280±50	300±50	300±50	60±20	50±20	200±50	500±50
γ_2 [mN/m]	0.3±0.2	0.3±0.2	0.4±0.2	0.4±0.2	0.5±0.2	1.11± 0.3	0.3±0.1
$\sigma_{2,st}$ [Å]	2.0±0.5	2.5±0.5	3.5±0.5	3.0±0.5	3.0±0.5	3.5±0.5	2.5±0.5
$\sigma_{2,th}$ [Å]	6.3±0.7	8.6±0.9	10.7±0.8	12.1±2	13.2±3	3.8±1	2.8±1
U''_{M_1, M_2} [10^x J/m ⁴]	12.05±0.3	11.8±0.3	11.6±0.3	11.7±0.3	11.5±0.3	13.85±0.1	14.5±0.1

TABLE S1: Temperature evolution and osmotic pressure effect.

B. Influence of salt (NaCl)

	Fluid phase			Gel phase	
	Before salt	$l_D=0.5$ nm	$l_D=0.4$ nm	Before salt	$l_D=0.4$ nm
D_{2,H_2O} [Å]	28.0 ± 1	24.6 ± 1	20.3 ± 1	24.3 ± 1	22.2 ± 1
κ_2 [$k_B T$]	80 ± 50	473 ± 50	232 ± 50	75 ± 10	175 ± 10
γ_2 [mN/m]	0.80 ± 0.1	0.15±0.1	0.79 ± 0.1	0.69 ± 0.1	0.51±0.1
$\sigma_{2,st}$ [Å]	0.5±0.5	1.0 ± 0.5	2.5 ± 0.5	1.0 ± 0.5	1.0 ± 0.5
$\sigma_{2,th}$ [Å]	7.5 ± 1	4.9 ± 1	4.1 ± 1	8.0 ± 1	5.8 ± 1
U''_{M_1, M_2} [10^x J/m ⁴]	12.1 ± 0.1	12.9 ± 0.1	13.3 ± 0.1	12.2 ± 0.3	13.0 ± 0.1

TABLE S2: Effect of salt screening in fluid and gel phase.

C. Example of Electron Density Profile




FIG. S5: Example of Electron Density Profiles showing the effect of osmotic pressure. The upper curve has been shifted of $0.4 e^-/\text{\AA}^3$ for clarity.

II. INTERACTIONS : LIFSHITZ APPROACH

The Lifshitz theory describes the electromagnetic interactions between two continuous media in term of fluctuations of the electromagnetic field, summing over all frequencies. This approach is more general than the *simple* sum of pairwise interactions between atoms. For a review see [1].

We assume a realistic model of supported double bilayers (see Fig. S6), with two semi-infinite media (water and silicon), two layers representing the two lipid bilayers (thicknesses b_1 and b_2) and two water layers (thicknesses l_1 and l_2). Lipid heads are highly hydrated and can be included in water layer. So in our case $l_2 = d_w + 2d_{head}$ where d_{head} is the lipid head thickness. Using these model, Lifshitz theory leads to [1]:

$$U_{M_1, M_2}(l_2, T) = \frac{k_B T}{8\pi l_2^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{r_n}^{\infty} x \ln \left[(1 - \overline{\Delta}_{Si, w_1}(l_1, b_1) \overline{\Delta}_{w_2, w_\infty}(b_2) e^{-x}) \right. \\ \left. \times (1 - \Delta_{Si, w_1}(l_1, b_1) \Delta_{w_2, w_\infty}(b_2) e^{-x}) \right] dx, \quad (3)$$

where $\overline{\Delta}$ and Δ depend on the different geometric parameters (b_i, l_i) and on dielectric constants ϵ_i of each medium. The full expression can be found in reference [1]. The key point in such a calculation is to accurately describe the dielectric permittivity frequency dependence. Following [2], $\epsilon_i(\omega)$ is given by :

$$\epsilon_i(\omega) = 1 + \sum_r \frac{C_r}{1 + i\omega/\omega_r} + \sum_p \frac{C_p}{1 - \omega^2/\omega_p^2 + i\gamma_p\omega/\omega_p^2} \quad (4)$$

The $\omega_{r,p}$ are the absorption frequencies, $C_{r,p}$ the absorption strength and the $\gamma_{r,p}$ are the damping factors. The first sum corresponds to microwave relaxation and the second one to experimental absorption peaks, usually corresponding to Infrared and Ultraviolet frequencies (see Table S3). As shown by Ninham and Parsegian [3], in biologically relevant cases like lipid-water systems, it is of high importance to use the total dielectric data from component substances




FIG. S6: Schematic representation of a supported double bilayer for the van der Waals potential calculation.

		Microwave		Infrared			Ultraviolet		
	ϵ_r	ω_{MW} [10^{11} rad.s $^{-1}$]	C_{MW}	ω_{IR} [10^{14} rad.s $^{-1}$]	C_{IR}	γ_{IR} [10^{13} rad.s $^{-1}$]	ω_{UV} [10^{16} rad.s $^{-1}$]	C_{UV}	γ_{UV} [10^{15} rad.s $^{-1}$]
Silicon	11.6			0.345	0.043	0	0.503	10.448	0
				0.535	0.050	0			
				0.884	0.059	0			
Water	80.1	1.083	75.3	0.314	1.4635	2.29	1.2593	0.0392	0.774
				1.047	0.7368	5.78	1.5172	0.0570	1.335
				1.396	0.1526	4.22	1.7296	0.0923	2.336
				3.065	0.0136	3.81	1.9724	0.1556	3.110
				6.450	0.0751	8.54	2.2606	0.1522	4.491
				2.8068	0.2711	9.498			
Alkanes	2.014			5.54	0.025	0	1.848	1.026	0

TABLE S3: Values of the constants used for the dielectric response $\epsilon(\omega)$ of Silicon [4], Water [2] and [5].

to analyze the fluctuations. In particular, infrared and microwave frequencies are very important as confirmed convincingly by Surface Force Apparatus experiments [2].

An effective Hamaker “constant” is then defined by $H(l_2, T) = -12\pi l_2^2 U_{M_1, M_2}(l_2, T)$. For interlayer water thicknesses $d_w = l_2 + 2d_{head}$ larger than a nanometer, pairwise summation and Lifshitz theory give different values for the Hamaker constant (see Fig. S7). For our experimental values ($d_w < 3$ nm), the van der Waals interaction given by Lifshitz theory is well described by : $-H(l_2 = 0, T)/12\pi(d_w + 2d_{head})^2$, with $H(l_2 = 0, T) \sim 5.3 \times 10^{-21}$ J.

III. SELF-CONSISTENT THEORY (SC) AND EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL IN ASYMETRICAL POTENTIAL

The renormalization of the microscopic interaction potential by the thermal fluctuations is a complex problem of modern statistical physic. Helfrich first realized that, in addition to the “direct” electrostatic, van der Waals and hydration forces [6], the long-range “effective” steric interaction generated by the thermal fluctuations of confined flexible membranes is an essential contribution to the total free energy of interaction [7]. The effective potential, average bilayer position, and fluctuation amplitude are thus coupled quantities which must be self-consistently determined.




FIG. S7: Effective Hamaker constant vs l_2 for a Si/Water/Bilayer/Water/Bilayer/Water, pairwise summation (black solid line) and expression of the form $-H(l_2 = 0, T)/12\pi l_2^2$ (black dashed line). In inset, zoom on the range of interest for our experiments.

A. Effective potential theory

Effective potential theories consist in adding an entropic (fluctuations) term $U_{\text{fl}}(z)$ to the direct potential $U(z)$. The d_w equilibrium value is thus given by the minimum of $U'_{\text{tot}}(d_w) = (U + U_{\text{fl}})'(z = d_w) = 0$. One can also compute the second derivative of the external potential at the equilibrium position $U''_{\text{tot}}(d_w)$.

- Pure hard wall interaction (hard confinement) was first considered in [7] leading to an entropic contribution :

$$U_{\text{fl}} = U_{\text{Hel}} = c_H/\kappa(k_B T/z)^2, \quad (5)$$

with c_H ranging from 0.08 to 0.2 [8, 9] in symmetrical case.

- Podgornik and Parsegian have extended Helfrich's approach [10] to take into account hydration repulsion and van der Waals attraction in the so-called "soft" potential [11],

$$U_{\text{fl}} = U_{\text{soft}} = \pi k_B T / 16 \sqrt{P_h/\kappa/z_h} \exp(-z/nz_h). \quad (6)$$

B. Self-consistent theory

Self-consistent theory developed by [9] considers the position fluctuations of a membrane close to a substrate in an external potential. It is an alternative approach to compute the average membrane position and its root mean square fluctuation amplitude in the range of moderate fluctuations much below the unbinding transition. For arbitrary potentials, partition function \mathcal{Z} , mean membrane-substrate distance d_w , fluctuation amplitude r.m.s. σ_{th} and mean value of second derivative of the external potential can be expressed as self-consistent equations :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z} &= \int dz \exp \left(-\frac{16\kappa\sigma_{th}^2}{(k_B T)^2} U(z) - \frac{3(z-d_w)^2}{8\sigma_{th}^2} \right), \\ d_w = \langle z \rangle &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int dz z \exp \left(-\frac{16\kappa\sigma_{th}^2}{(k_B T)^2} U(z) - \frac{3(z-d_w)^2}{8\sigma_{th}^2} \right), \\ \sigma_{th}^2 = \langle (z-d_w)^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int dz (z-d_w)^2 \exp \left(-\frac{16\kappa\sigma_{th}^2}{(k_B T)^2} U(z) - \frac{3(z-d_w)^2}{8\sigma_{th}^2} \right), \\ \langle U'' \rangle &= \frac{1}{\mathcal{Z}} \int dz U''(z) \exp \left(-\frac{16\kappa\sigma_{th}^2}{(k_B T)^2} U(z) - \frac{3(z-d_w)^2}{8\sigma_{th}^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

C. Comparison between both approaches

We have solved the self-consistent equations with an asymmetric external potential $U(z)$ composed of hydration pressure term $U_{\text{hyd}}(z) = P_h z_h \exp(-z/z_h)$ and an osmotic pressure $U_{\text{osmo}}(z) = Pz$ (see Fig. S8 inset). By varying P_h and z_h from ($P_h = 0.5 \cdot 10^7$ Pa, $z_h = 0.18$ nm) to ($P_h = 0.5 \cdot 10^9$ Pa, $z_h = 0.005$ nm) we were able to mimic a transition from a soft hydration repulsion to hard wall steric repulsion.




FIG. S8: Mean values of the external potential second derivative calculated using self-consistent approach (points) and using effective potential theory (lines) for soft-repulsion (\square and dashed line ($P_h = 0.5 \cdot 10^7$ Pa, $z_h = 0.18$ nm)) and for hard repulsion (\bullet and solid line ($P_h = 0.5 \cdot 10^9$ Pa, $z_h = 0.005$ nm)). The inset shows the associated external potential.

By comparing the results obtained by the self-consistent and “effective potential” theories (Fig.S8) we observe that :

- In the case of a soft repulsion, self-consistent theory (\square) and effective potential theory (blue solid line) are in good agreement, in particular in the small fluctuation regime, and for various bending modulus ranging from 5 to $200k_B T$ (not shown here). It is impossible to adjust a “hard wall” model, whatever the bending modulus used. However, a perfect fit can be obtained with a “soft potential” $U_{\text{hyd}} + U_{\text{soft}}$, where the only fit parameter is the screening coefficient n in the confinement potential $U_{\text{soft}}(z) \propto \exp(-z/nz_h)$. The value obtained for n is $n = 2.4$, in very good agreement with the literature [12]. Nevertheless, the self-consistent approach is underestimating the mean distance d_w and overestimating $\langle U'' \rangle$.

- In the case of hard wall repulsion (\bullet), it is only possible to fit the results with Helfrich effective potential: $U_{\text{Hel}} = c_H/\kappa(k_B T/z)^2$, with $c_H \sim 0.5$. Whatever the parameters used, a “soft potential” model fails to describe this hard wall system. The value of c_H is twice as large as the values obtained in the symmetrical case.

These results show that self-consistent theory is able to describe the continuous transition from a soft hydration repulsion to an hard steric one.

-
- [1] Mahanty J, Ninham BW (1976) *Dispersion Forces* eds Ottewill R, Rowell R (Academic Press).
- [2] Shubin VE, Kékicheff P (1993) Electrical double layer structure revisited via a surface force apparatus: Mica interfaces in lithium nitrate solutions. *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* 155:108–123.
- [3] Ninham B, Parsegian V (1970) van der waals forces. *Biophysical Journal* 10:646–663.
- [4] Senden TJ, Drummond CJ (1995) Surface chemistry and tip-sample interactions in atomic force microscopy. *Colloids and Surfaces A: Physicochemical and Engineering Aspects* 94:29 – 51.
- [5] Hunter RJ (2001) *Foundations of colloid science / Robert J. Hunter* (Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York :), 2nd ed. edition.
- [6] Lipowsky R (1995) *Handbook of Biological Physics, vol. 1* eds Lipowsky R, Sackmann E (Elsevier).
- [7] Helfrich W (1973) Elastic properties of lipid bilayers: theory and possible experiments. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* 28:693–703.
- [8] Gompper G, Kroll DM (1989) Steric interactions in a multimembrane system: a monte-carlo study. *Europhys. Lett.* 9:59.
- [9] Mecke KR, Charitat T, Graner F (2003) Fluctuating lipid bilayer in an arbitrary potential: Theory and experimental determination of bending rigidity. *Langmuir* 19:2080–2087.
- [10] Helfrich W (1978) Steric interaction of fluid membranes in multilayer systems. *Zeitschrift für Naturforschung* 33:305–315.
- [11] Podgornik R, Parsegian V (1992) Thermal-mechanical fluctuations of fluid membranes in confined geometries: the case of soft confinement. *Langmuir* 8:557–562.
- [12] Petrache HI, et al. (1998) Interbilayer interactions from high-resolution x-ray scattering. *Physical Review E* 57:7014–7024.