



King's Research Portal

DOI: 10.1098/rsfs.2018.0028

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):

Weatherill, E. E., Coker, H. L. E., Cheetham, M. R., & Wallace, M. I. (2018). Urea-mediated anomalous diffusion in supported lipid bilayers. *Interface Focus*, 8(5). https://doi.org/10.1098/rsfs.2018.0028

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

•Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research. •You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain •You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Urea-Mediated Anomalous Diffusion in Supported Lipid Bilayers

E. E. Weatherill¹, H. L. E. Coker^{1,2}, M. R. Cheetham^{1,3}, and M. I. Wallace^{*1}

 ¹Department of Chemistry, Britannia House, King's College London, 7 Trinity Street, London, SE1 1DB, United Kingdom
 ²Chemistry Research Laboratory, Department of Chemistry, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3TA, United Kingdom
 ³Cavendish Laboratory, Department of Physics, NanoPhotonics Centre, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB3 0HE, United Kingdom

May 15, 2018

^{*}Corresponding author: mark.wallace@kcl.ac.uk

Abstract Diffusion in biological membranes is seldom simply Brownian motion; in-2 stead, the rate of diffusion is dependent on the timescale of observation and so is 3 often described as anomalous. In order to help better understand this phenomenon, model systems are needed where the anomalous subdiffusion of the lipid bilayer 5 can be tuned and quantified. We recently demonstrated one such model by controlling the excluded area fraction in supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) through the incorporation of lipids derivatised with polyethylene glycol. Here we extend this work, using urea to induce anomalous subdiffusion in SLBs. By tuning incubation 9 time and urea concentration, we produce DCPC bilayers that exhibit anomalous 10 behaviour on the same scale observed in biological membranes. 11

12 Key Words

13 Anomalous, diffusion, lipid bilayers, membranes, urea.

14 Introduction

Diffusion is a vital process that underpins many cellular functions, including protein 15 organisation [1], signalling [2, 3], and cell survival [4]. In living systems diffusion 16 rarely follows the Brownian motion predicted by a simple random walk model but in-17 stead exhibits 'anomalous' subdiffusion, whereby the rate of diffusion is dependent on 18 the timescale of observation [5]. Anomalous subdiffusion has been observed in 3D in 19 the cytosol [6] and in 2D in plasma membranes [7-9]. The underlying mechanism for 20 anomalous subdiffusion in membranes is thought to involve molecular crowding [10], 21 with contributions from slower-moving obstacles [11, 12], pinning sites, and com-22 partmentalisation [8, 10, 13]; reviewed comprehensively elsewhere [14]. The notion 23 that the cell membrane is a homogenous entity in which lipids and proteins are free 24

- to diffuse unhindered, as per the 'fluid mosaic model' [15], has in recent years been
- re-evaluated to accommodate increased levels of complexity [10].
- 27 Anomalous diffusion can be modelled by a power law:

$$\left\langle \Delta r^2 \right\rangle = 4\Gamma \Delta t^{\alpha},\tag{1}$$

where the conventional diffusion coefficient D is replaced by an anomalous transport coefficient Γ , whose dimensions change for different degrees of anomalous behaviour. The anomalous coefficient α defines whether the diffusion is normal ($\alpha = 1$), sub-diffusive ($\alpha < 1$) or super-diffusive ($\alpha > 1$). The units of Γ vary with the degree of anomalous behaviour, which presents a challenge of interpretation. However, by de-dimensionalising the observation time [5] with a 'jump time' τ ,

$$\left\langle \Delta r^2 \right\rangle = 4D\Delta t \left(\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}\right)^{\alpha - 1},$$
(2)

the length-scale λ associated with the 2D anomalous behaviour can be defined ($\lambda = \sqrt{4D\tau}$).

Artificial bilayers have been critical in furthering our understanding of anomalous 36 diffusion [16-21]. In supported lipid bilayers (SLBs), phase separation [17], protein 37 binding [18], and defect formation [22] have been used to generate anomalous diffu-38 sion. Simulations have also played a vital role[5, 23-30], in particular those linking 39 the role of mobile and immobile obstacles within the bilayer to the phenomenon [11, 40 12]. Simulations have also provided the means to better interpret single particle track-41 ing (SPT) data [31], as well as methods for discriminating between distinct classes of 42 anomalous diffusion [32]. 43

In order to elucidate the specific molecular mechanisms giving rise to anomalous subdiffusion *in vivo*, there is a need for experimental models which are able to exhibit readily tuneable anomalous subdiffusion of a biologically relevant magnitude [14]. Re-

cently we used SPT to sample anomalous behaviour over four orders of magnitude 47 of time by forming SLBs containing varying mole fractions of lipids functionalised 48 with polyethylene glycol (PEG), thereby controlling nanoscale obstacle formation [22]. 49 Here, we make use of urea as a chaotropic agent, with reported ability to alter the phys-50 ical properties of lipid bilayers [33-36]. Urea is present at high concentrations in the 51 tissues of deep-sea elasmobranchs (sharks, skates, rays) [37] and is also part of the 52 Natural Moisturising Factor in skin [38], where it is thought to offer cell membranes 53 protection from osmotic shock due to highly saline or dehydrating conditions by sta-54 bilising the lamellar liquid phase. Here we use single-molecule total internal reflection 55 fluorescence (smTIRF) and perform SPT to evaluate urea as a means to induce anoma-56 lous diffusion in pre-formed SLBs. 57

Materials and Methods

59 Materials

1,2-dicapryl-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DCPC) was purchased from Avanti Polar
 Lipids (Alabaster, AL). Texas Red 1,2-dihexadecanoyl-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine
 triethylammonium salt (TR-DHPE) and 1,2-dipalmitoyl-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine N-[methoxy(polyethylene glycol) - 5000] ammonium salt (PEG(5K)-DPPE) was pur chased from Lipoid (Ludwigshafen, Germany). Unless stated, all other chemicals were
 purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. All aqueous solutions were prepared using doubly
 deionized 18.2 MΩ cm MilliQ water.

67 Supported Lipid Bilayers

⁶⁸ SLBs were prepared on glass coverslips by fusion of small unilamellar vesicles (SUVs)

- [39] made from 1.77 mM DCPC doped with 1.0 mol% PEG(5K)-DPPE and 3×10^{-6}
- ⁷⁰ mol% TR-DHPE. The addition of PEG-functionalised DPPE (below the mol% required

to induce anomalous diffusion [22]) helps improve bilayer fluidity by raising the bilayer, thereby reducing interactions between the lipids in the lower leaflet and underlying glass [40]. Texas Red-labelled DHPE was also included in order to assess the
diffusive properties of the bilayer using smTIRF.

Lipid mixtures were first dried with nitrogen and placed under vacuum overnight. The dried lipids were hydrated with water and vortexed before tip sonication (Vibracell VCX130PB with CV188 tip, Sonics & Materials, Newtown, CA) for 15 minutes at 25% amplitude. The resulting clear vesicle suspension was centrifuged (3 minutes; 14000 $\times g$) before the supernatant was retained and any titanium residue (from the sonicator probe) was discarded. SUV preparations were stored at 4°C for up to 48 hours.

Glass coverslips were rigorously cleaned using stepwise bath sonication with DECON-81 90, MilliQ water, and propan-2-ol for 20 minutes each. Immediately before use, the 82 glass was dried under nitrogen and cleaned with oxygen-plasma treatment for 3 min-83 utes (Diener Electronic, Femto). A well was created on each coverslip using vacuum 84 grease (Dow Corning). The coverslip was heated to 37°C before 50 µL of SUV stock 85 were diluted 1:1 in buffer (250 mM NaCl, 10 mM EDTA, 20 mM Tris pH 7.0) and 86 added to the chamber immediately. DCPC SLBs were produced by fusion of the SUVs 87 onto the glass coverslip. The vesicles were incubated for 30 minutes before the mem-88 branes were washed thoroughly with degassed MilliQ water followed by buffer. 89

⁹⁰ Urea was added (or removed) by buffer exchange via pipetting; all but 50 µL of ⁹¹ fluid above the SLB was replaced with 200 µl of the new buffer (containing 0.2, 0.5, ⁹² or 1M urea), a minimum of 5 times. Bilayers were imaged 15 seconds after buffer ⁹³ exchange.

⁹⁴ Total Internal Reflection Fluorescence Microscopy

⁹⁵ 532 nm continuous-wave laser light was focussed at the back aperture of an objective ⁹⁶ lens ($60 \times$ TIRF oil-immersion NA 1.49, Nikon, \sim 1.4 kW cm⁻²) such that total internal reflection occurred at the coverslip/sample interface. The excited TR-DHPE fluorescence was transmitted through 545 nm dichroic and 550 nm longpass filters before
being imaged with an electron-multiplying CCD camera (Andor iXon). The inverted
microscope objective was heated to maintain 37°C at the sample throughout imaging;
above the transition temperature for this lipid to ensure the bilayer was in the liquid
phase. Bilayers were imaged at an exposure time of 20 ms for 5000 frames.

¹⁰³ Single Particle Tracking

SPT was performed using TrackMate [41], a plugin for ImageJ [42]. The space-time
co-ordinates of the output tracks were used to calculate mean-squared displacements
calculated for different observation times using custom-written procedures in MATLAB (MathWorks) as described previously [22].

108 Results

¹⁰⁹ Diffusion of TR-DHPE in the DCPC SLB was fast (6 μ m² s⁻¹) and normal (α = 1.01 ¹¹⁰ \pm 0.01) in the absence of urea (Fig. 1A&B). In the presence of 1M urea, the diffusion ¹¹¹ became slower and more anomalous over time (Fig. 1C). α decreased roughly linearly ¹¹² to 0.38 and the transport coefficient (Γ) showed an approximately exponential decrease ¹¹³ to 0.02 μ m² s^{- α} (Fig1D) over a 10 minute period. Although Γ values cannot be directly ¹¹⁴ compared (because they depend on α , which is also changing), a linear change in α ¹¹⁵ would be expected to cause an overall exponential change in Γ , as we report.



Figure 1: Time dependence of anomalous behaviour induced by 1 M urea (A) Spot locations of tracked TR-DHPE in the absence of urea (left) and after the addition of 1M urea at four time points. Urea was removed by buffer exchange at 200-300 s. Image size: $3 \times 3 \mu m$ (B) Anomalous sub-diffusion increases over time from 15 seconds (turquoise) to 10 minutes (dark blue). (C) Linear decrease of α over time, at a rate of $9.7 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$. (D) Exponential decrease of Γ over time, $t_{1/2} = 69$ s. Error bars throughout represent standard errors from a minimum of 250 tracks.

Increasing the urea concentration of the buffer surrounding the SLB incrementally 116 from 0 to 1 M, with a fixed short incubation time (15 s), resulted in increasingly slower 117 diffusion (Fig. 2A). The behaviour is largely normal at this short interval, with only a 118 modest decrease of α (to 0.94) at the highest concentration tested (Fig2B). An expo-119 nential decrease in Γ with increasing urea concentration was observed (Fig. 2C). From 120 the linear relationship between $\log_{10}(\Gamma/D)$ and α (Fig. 2D) the characteristic length-121 scale (λ) associated with the system was calculated to be 45.1 nm, with a jump time 122 (τ) of 86.1 µs. 123



Figure 2: Effect of urea concentration on lipid diffusion in an SLB (A) Diffusion of lipids becomes slower as urea concentration of the surrounding buffer is increased from 0 (black) to 1M (red). (B) Decrease of α with increasing urea concentration. (C) Exponential decrease of Γ with increasing urea concentration. (D) Plot of log₁₀ (Γ /D) vs. α with linear fit. Blue: Data from 1M urea timecourse (see Fig. 1); Orange: Data from urea titration (This figure). Error bars represent standard errors.

124 Discussion

We observe that urea causes diffusion in DCPC SLBs to become irreversibly slower 125 and more anomalous in a time and concentration-dependent manner. Given our previ-126 ous experiments reporting defect-mediated anomalous diffusion using PEG-doping of 127 SLBs [22], it is appealing to suggest that a similar mechanism must operate for urea. 128 For this case, urea would associate with the bilayer, where its chaotropic nature would 129 act to induce the removal of bilayer patches from the glass coverslip surface, producing 130 defects visible as excluded areas of the surface corresponding to those observed in Fig 131 1A. However, there is little evidence that urea acts directly to solubilise or otherwise 132

permeabilise lipid bilayers [34], and this hypothesis would rely on urea acting at the
 glass-lipid interface.

An alternative explanation for our results would be the action of urea to alter lipid phase behaviour, inducing phase co-existance phases[33]. Unfortunately, the evidence supports a mode of action whereby urea stabilizes the liquid disordered phase [33, 34], suppressing phase separation, rather than encourage it. In our experiments, we observe a decrease in the area fraction of mobile lipids, which is the opposite trend.

A final hypothesis would be the action of urea not on the bilayer, but on the PEG-DHPE. A chaotropic effect on the PEG might act to increase the area fraction occupied by the PEG, which would then again drive the formation of defects in the membrane [22].

The effect that urea has on diffusion appears not only irreversible, but appears to 144 progress even once urea is removed from the bulk solution. The half-life for this pro-145 cess at 1M urea was short (69 s) and was finished after approximately 500 s. We 146 speculate that either our (1000-fold dilution) washing procedure must be ineffective, or 147 there is a more long-lived, direct, interaction between urea and the bilayer. Given the 148 low partition coefficient for urea in lipid bilayers [43] and the evidence from studies of 149 multilamellar phases that it remains primarily in the aqueous layers between bilayers 150 [34], it is difficult to rationalize this as a possible mechanism. 151

Further work is needed to distinguish between these different possible mechanisms
either by viewing the defects directly (e.g. by atomic force microscopy) or by restoring
the defects by addition of fresh SUVs.

155 Conclusion

We have presented preliminary findings demonstrating a novel approach to controlling anomalous subdiffusion in SLBs on a scale relevant to biological systems [13, 16] by incorporating urea into the aqueous medium surrounding a supported lipid bilayer. Although this work involved the use of DCPC, it would be interesting to extend the method to other, more biologically-relevant lipid compositions. As a complementary method to the inclusion of PEG-lipids, we see potential for this approach for producing a simple membrane model with defined anomaleity,

Authors' Contributions

- EEW performed the experiments, HLEC and MRC performed the analysis, MIW se-
- ¹⁶⁵ cured the funding; all authors wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

166 Competing Interests

¹⁶⁷ The authors declare no competing interests.

168 Funding

- ¹⁶⁹ We thank the European Research Council for providing funding for this work (ERC-
- ¹⁷⁰ 2012-StG-106913, CoSMiC).

References

- (1) E. D. Sheets, G. M. Lee, R. Simson and K. Jacobson, *Biochemistry*, 1997, **36**,
- 173 12449–12458.
- 174 (2) D. Choquet and A. Triller, *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 2003, **4**, 251–265.
- (3) B. N. Kholodenko, *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 2006, 7, 165–176.
- (4) U. Cheema, Z. Rong, O. Kirresh, A. J. MacRobert, P. Vadgama and R. A. Brown,
- Journal of tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, 2011, 4, 524–531.
- (5) M. J. Saxton, *Biophysical Journal*, 1994, **66**, 394–401.

- (6) B. M. Regner, D. Vučinić, C. Domnisoru, T. M. Bartol, M. W. Hetzer, D. M.
- ¹⁸⁰ Tartakovsky and T. J. Sejnowski, *Biophysical Journal*, 2013, **104**, 1652–1660.
- 181 (7) F. Höfling and T. Franosch, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 2013, 76.
- (8) T. Fujiwara, K. Ritchie, H. Murakoshi, K. Jacobson and A. Kusumi, *Journal of Cell Biology*, 2002, **157**, 1071–1081.
- (9) Y. Golan and E. Sherman, *Nature Communications*, 2017, **8**, 1–15.
- A. Kusumi, C. Nakada, K. Ritchie, K. Murase, K. Suzuki, H. Murakoshi, R. S.
 Kasai, J. Kondo and T. Fujiwara, *Annual Review of Biophysics and Biomolecular Structure*, 2005, **34**, 351–378.
- (11) M. J. Saxton, *Biophysical Journal*, 1987, **52**, 989–997.
- (12) H. Berry and H. Chaté, *Physical Review E Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Mat- ter Physics*, 2014, **89**, 1–9.
- (13) K. Murase, T. Fujiwara, Y. Umemura, K. Suzuki, R. Iino, H. Yamashita, M.
 Saito, H. Murakoshi, K. Ritchie and A. Kusumi, *Biophysical Journal*, 2004, 86, 4075–4093.
- ¹⁹⁴ (14) M. J. Saxton, *Biophysical Journal*, 2012, **103**, 2411–2422.
- ¹⁹⁵ (15) S. J. Singer and G. L. Nicholson, *Science*, 1972, **175**, 720–731.
- (16) G. J. Schütz, H. Schindler and T. Schmidt, *Biophysical journal*, 1997, 73, 1073–
 1080.
- ¹⁹⁸ (17) T. V. Ratto and M. L. Longo, *Langmuir*, 2003, **19**, 1788–1793.
- (18) M. R. Horton, F. Höfling, J. O. Rädler and T. Franosch, *Soft Matter*, 2010, 6, 2648.
- (19) K. M. Spillane, J. Ortega-Arroyo, G. De Wit, C. Eggeling, H. Ewers, M. I. Wallace and P. Kukura, *Nano Letters*, 2014, 14, 5390–5397.

- (20) H. M. Wu, Y. H. Lin, T. C. Yen and C. L. Hsieh, *Scientific Reports*, 2016, 6,
 1–10.
- (21) M. Rose, N. Hirmiz, J. M. Moran-Mirabal and C. Fradin, *Membranes*, 2015, 5, 702–721.
- (22) H. L. E. Coker, M. R. Cheetham, D. R. Kattnig, Y. J. Wang, S. Garcia-Manyes
 and M. I. Wallace, *arXiv:1709.04698 [physics.bio-ph]*.
- ²⁰⁹ (23) M. J. Saxton, *Biophysical Journal*, 1989, **56**, 615–622.
- 210 (24) M.J. Saxton, *Biophys.J.*, 2001, **81**, 2226–2240.
- ²¹¹ (25) S. Stachura and G. R. Kneller, *Molecular Simulation*, 2014, **40**, 245–250.
- (26) Y. Mardoukhi, J.-H. Jeon and R. Metzler, *Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics*,
 2015, **17**, 30134–30147.
- (27) H. Koldsø, T. Reddy, P. W. Fowler, A. L. Duncan and M. S. P. Sansom, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2016, **120**, 8873–8881.
- (28) J. H. Jeon, M. Javanainen, H. Martinez-Seara, R. Metzler and I. Vattulainen,
 Physical Review X, 2016, 6, 1–17.
- (29) E. Bakalis, S. Höfinger, A. Venturini and F. Zerbetto, *Journal of Chemical Physics*,
 2015, 142.
- (30) M. Javanainen, H. Hammaren, L. Monticelli, J.-H. Jeon, M. S. Miettinen, H.
 Martinez-Seara, R. Metzler and I. Vattulainen, *Faraday Discuss.*, 2013, 161, 397–417.
- (31) E. Kepten, A. Weron, G. Sikora, K. Burnecki and Y. Garini, *PLoS ONE*, 2015,
 10, 1–10.
- R. Metzler, J.-H. Jeon, A. G. Cherstvy and E. Barkai, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*,
 2014, 16, 24128–24164.
- A. Nowacka, S. Douezan, L. Wadsö, D. Topgaard and E. Sparr, *Soft Matter*, 2012, 8, 1482–1491.

- (34) F. O. Costa-Balogh, H. Wennerström, L. Wadsö and E. Sparr, *Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 2006, **110**, 23845–23852.
- (35) Z. W. Yu, Y. Feng, J. Wang, B. Z. Dong and P. J. Quinn, *High Energy Physics and Nuclear Physics-Chinese Edition*, 2001, 25, 75–80.
- 233 (36) P. L. Yeagle and A. Sen, *Biochemistry*, 1986, 25, 7518–7522.
- 234 (37) H. W. Smith, J. Biol. Chem., 1929, 81, 407–419.
- 235 (38) A. A. Rawlings and C. R. Harding, Dermatologic Therapy, 2004, 17, 43–48.
- (39) A. A. Brian and H. M. McConnell, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 1984, **81**, 6159–63.
- (40) F. Albertorio, A. J. Diaz, T. Yang, V. A. Chapa, S. Kataoka, E. T. Castellana and
 P. S. Cremer, *Langmuir*, 2005, 21, 7476–7482.
- 240 (41) J. Y. Tinevez, N. Perry, J. Schindelin, G. M. Hoopes, G. D. Reynolds, E. La-
- plantine, S. Y. Bednarek, S. L. Shorte and K. W. Eliceiri, *Methods*, 2017, 115, 80–90.
- (42) C. A. Schneider, W. S. Rasband and K. W. Eliceiri, *Nature Methods*, 2012, 9,
 671–675.
- ²⁴⁵ (43) J. Diamond and Y. Katz, *The Journal of Membrane Biology*, 1974, **17**, 121–154.