Modelling HA protein-mediated interaction between an influenza virus and a healthy cell: pre-fusion membrane deformation
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We present a mathematical model for pre-fusion interaction between an influenza virus and a healthy cell. Our model describes the role played by hemagglutinin (HA) protein clusters in bringing the viral membrane into close contact with the host cell membrane as a first step of the fusion process between the two membranes. The viral membrane is modelled as a lipid bilayer with bending rigidity. Using the calculus of variations, we compute the deformation of the viral membrane under the influence of HA protein clusters. Our numerical results support the hypothesis of dimple formation in the fusion site proposed in the literature. The asymmetric nature of the protein molecules due to various reasons such as tilting is the primary cause for the dimple formation. We discuss the effects of spontaneous curvature, the protein cluster radius, fusion-site size and the bending moment exerted by the protein cluster. We also examine the effects of membrane tension and the presence of a host cell on the dimple shape. Our results support previous experimental observations.
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1. Introduction

A crucial step for an influenza virus to invade a healthy cell is the fusion of the membranes (merging of lipid bilayers) mediated by hemagglutinin (HA) protein. Despite variations in location, timing and frequency, two lipid bilayers have to be brought into close contact for fusion to occur (Blumenthal et al., 2003; Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Kuzmin et al., 2001; Tamm et al., 2003b; Zimmerberg et al., 1993). On the other hand, when an influenza virus first attaches to a viral receptor containing sialic acid, the viral and target membranes are separated by 13.5 nm (the height of the viral spike protein) (Wiley & Skehel, 1987; Zimmerberg et al., 1993), which is too far apart for fusion to occur. Therefore, understanding the pre-fusion mechanism, i.e. how HA protein brings two membranes close to each other, is important for various purposes such as disease control and drug design.

In modelling the fusion mechanism, most efforts have been put into the study of an intermediate structure called the fusion stalk (a local lipidic connection between the proximal, i.e. contacting, monolayers of the fusing membranes) (Kozlov & Chernomordik, 2002; Kozlovsky et al., 2002; Kozlovsky &
The main focus is on building models in which the predicted energy in a stalk reaches a physically reasonable level (i.e. the required energy is sufficiently low) while assuming that there exists a source of energy required to form a stalk. In fact, a main source of the energy for stalk formation is the energy accumulated during the pre-fusion process. Therefore, it is important to study the dependence of energy on various parameters such as the bending moments exerted by the protein cluster, protein cluster size and fusion-site size during pre-fusion. This will shed light on the possibility of stalk formation as an intermediate stage of the fusion process and consequently the possibility of a successful fusion event. Study of pre-fusion is also useful for the purpose of drug design as the general idea behind modern antiviral drug design is to identify viral proteins, or parts of proteins, that can be disabled. Despite being an important component of the fusion process, the pre-fusion process has not received much attention until recently (Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Kuzmin et al., 2001).

Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) hypothesized that the activated HA protein can produce viral membrane dimples surrounded by a ring-like cluster of HA. Assuming that the top of the dimple is a segment of a perfect sphere connected to a funnel of catenoid form (an axisymmetric surface with zero mean curvature), the energy in the dimple was estimated and found to be sufficient to cause instability of the lipid bilayers (Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998). Similarly, Kuzmin et al. (2001) assumed a perfect spherical shape for the top of the dimple (nipple in their terminology). The formation of a dimple was also favoured as a mechanism for membranes to make intimate contact which leads to subsequent fusion between membranes (Markosyan et al., 1999).

In this study, we propose a model for pre-fusion membrane deformation in the form of an energy functional. Our model is a generalization of the one given by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), which incorporates the energy contribution due to the bending rigidity of the membrane and the energy due to HA protein. Our main objective is to verify the hypothesis of dimple formation (Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Kuzmin et al., 2001; Markosyan et al., 1999) without assuming a specific shape of the viral membrane. Our numerical results confirm the dimple formation and give a more accurate estimate of the extra energy accumulated inside the dimple area.

Experimental work by Markosyan et al. (1999) has revealed that membrane tension inhibits fusion. This suggests that the tension created in the membrane, which was neglected in previous studies (Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Kuzmin et al., 2001), may play a crucial role in the fusion/pre-fusion process. Therefore, we also examine pre-fusion deformation under tension and our result is consistent with experimental observations (Markosyan et al., 1999). Furthermore, when a dimple forms, the presence of the host cell membrane may have an effect on viral membrane deformation. This is also investigated in this paper along with the effects of spontaneous curvature, the fusion-site radius, the protein cluster radius and the applied bending moments. The effect of the spontaneous curvature predicted by our model is in good agreement with the experimental observations (Markosyan et al., 1999).

2. Model

Even though the influenza viral membrane consists of two types of proteins, HA and neuraminidase, it has been suggested that HA is the one which facilitates the fusion of the lipid bilayers (Stegmann, 1993). Therefore, we consider only HA protein in our model. HA is a glycoprotein which consists of a trimer with an individual monomer having HA1 and HA2 subunits (Blumenthal et al., 2003; Gruenke et al., 2002; Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Li et al., 2005; Markovic et al., 2001; Tamm, 2003; Tamm et al., 2003a,b). It is believed that HA1 is responsible for virus attachment to the cell surface via a sialic acid-binding site and HA2 activates the fusion process. During low-pH activation (e.g. when the
protein is exposed to a pH 5 environment), the hydrophobic fusion peptide, previously hidden within the trimeric stem, is projected towards viral and/or target membranes (Blumenthal et al., 2003; Gaudin et al., 1995; Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Skehel & Wiley, 2000). The subsequent refolding of the protein exerts a force on the fusion peptide inserted into the membrane. A similar process takes place in the target membrane due to a protein force (via inserted fusion peptide), but for simplicity we focus only on the viral membrane in this study.

The precise mechanism of how an HA trimer exerts force on a membrane could be quite complex. Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) proposed that the net effect of these HA trimers can be modelled by a bending moment acting on a saddle-shaped membrane. In this paper, we use a similar but less restrictive model, outlined below.

Following Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), we consider a small section of the viral membrane containing an embedded HA trimer. Figure 1(a) shows a section $WXYZ$ of undeformed (neutral pH) rectangular membrane with sides $YZ = dS_1$, $XY = dS_2$ and area $dA = dS_1 dS_2$. $M$, $N$ and $O$ are positions of three monomers anchored in the membrane, connected to each other forming a triple-stranded, $\alpha$-helical coiled coil. When the pH value is lowered, recruitment of additional residues to the coiled coil takes place (Bullough et al., 1994; Carr & Kim, 1993; Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998). This results in an increase of the coiled-coil rigid rod in some direction, e.g. the direction indicated by the arrow in the middle. The coiled coil exerts forces on the membrane at anchor positions, shown by the arrows originating from $M$, $N$ and $O$. Since a HA trimer can be tilted from the normal direction of the membrane (Bentz, 2000; Tamm, 2003; Tatulian et al., 1995), the forces acting at $M$, $N$ and $O$ are asymmetric. As a result of forces due to coiled coil and HA molecule tilting, the membrane deforms, cf. Fig. 1(b).

Let $c_1$ and $c_2$ be the two principal curvatures of the deformed membrane, cf. Fig. 1(b). We assume that the four sides of the segment $WXYZ$ coincide with the principal directions with lengths $dS_1$ and $dS_2$ along the directions of $c_1$ and $c_2$, respectively. Since our focus in this paper is to analyse the
axisymmetric shape of the membrane, we also assume that the principal directions of the bending moment tensor are same as those of the curvature tensor. Let $f_p^{(1)}$ be the bending moment per unit length exerted by HA protein along the two edges $XY$ and $WZ$. To produce a curvature $c_1$, the work performed by the bending moment per unit length in the $S_2$ direction is $f_p^{(1)}\theta_1/2$, where $\theta_1$ is the angle subtended by the circular curved membrane at the centre of the circle and $R_1$ is the corresponding radius (Gere, 2004; Hibbeler, 2005). Note that $\theta_1 = dS_1 / R_1 = c_1 dS_1$; therefore, the work performed to produce a curvature $c_1$ in the membrane segment is $d\omega_1 = f_p^{(1)} c_1 dS_1 dS_2 / 2 = f_p^{(1)} c_1 dA / 2$. Similarly, if $f_p^{(2)}$ is the bending moment per unit length, exerted by a HA protein along the two edges $WX$ and $YZ$, the work performed to produce a curvature $c_2$ in the membrane segment is $d\omega_2 = f_p^{(2)} c_2 dS_1 dS_2 / 2 = f_p^{(2)} c_2 dA / 2$. Therefore, the total work performed by the protein in bending the membrane element $WXY$ is $d\omega = d\omega_1 + d\omega_2 = (f_p^{(1)} c_1 + f_p^{(2)} c_2)dA / 2$.

Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) assumed that the two principal curvatures are equal in value with opposite signs, i.e. $c_1 = -c_2 = c_p$. The total contribution of a HA trimer to the membrane energy is given by integrating $\tau_p c_p$ over the cluster area, where $\tau_p$ is a bending moment applied by the protein to the unit length of the circumference of the membrane fragment. In this paper, we relaxed the assumption made by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) without imposing $c_1 = -c_2 = c_p$ (a perfect saddle shape) a priori. Instead, we note that force due to refolding takes place in a certain direction depending upon the tilting of HA molecule and tilting has been observed in experiments (Bentz, 2000; Tamm, 2003; Tatulian et al., 1995). As a consequence of this asymmetry of the forces (due to refolding of protein including tilting) acting at anchor positions, the resulting bending moments $f_p^{(1)}$ and $f_p^{(2)}$ in general take different values. For example, they could have the same sign but different magnitudes.

We assume that the viral membrane can resist bending and the shape of the membrane is determined by minimizing a Helfrich-type energy functional in addition to the energy induced by the bending moments. The energy functional takes the form

$$E = \frac{1}{2} k_b \int (c_1 + c_2 - c_0)^2 dA + k_g \int c_1 c_2 dA + \frac{1}{2} \int (f_p^{(1)} c_1 + f_p^{(2)} c_2)dA. \quad (2.1)$$

Here, the first two terms are the Helfrich (1973) energy due to the bending rigidity and the Gaussian bending rigidity of the membrane, respectively. The last term is an energy contribution due to the work done by the HA protein. $k_b$ and $k_g$ are the bending rigidity and the Gaussian bending rigidity, respectively, and $c_0$ denotes the spontaneous curvature, which takes the possible asymmetry of the bilayer into account. When $k_g = 0$, $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = -c_2 = c_p$ and $f_p^{(1)} = -f_p^{(2)} = -\tau_p$, our model reproduces the saddle-shaped membrane fragment proposed by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998).

As shown by experimental observations (Markosyan et al., 1999), tension developed in the membranes inhibits fusion. This suggests that the tension created in the lipid bilayer membrane may have considerable impact on the pre-fusion process. We model the membrane under the tension by adding a term into the model as follows (Boal, 2002):

$$E = \frac{1}{2} k_b \int (c_1 + c_2 - c_0)^2 dA + k_g \int c_1 c_2 dA + \frac{1}{2} \int (f_p^{(1)} c_1 + f_p^{(2)} c_2)dA + \gamma \int dA, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\gamma$ is an in-plane tension (tensile stress) developing in the membrane. In this study, the value of $\gamma$ will be varied to examine the effect of membrane tension.

In the following sections, we discuss how to compute the pre-fusion deformation of the viral membrane based on the energy functional given by (2.1) and (2.2).
3. Shape equations of an axisymmetric viral membrane

For the rest of the paper, we focus exclusively on an axisymmetric membrane. In this section, the axisymmetric shape equations of the membrane related to the energy functionals (2.1) and (2.2) are given, followed by the shape equation for a viral membrane constrained by the presence of a cell membrane.

3.1 Shape equation related to energy functional (2.1)

The equilibrium membrane shape can be obtained by minimizing the energy functional (2.1) directly. In this paper, we use an indirect method by deriving an Euler–Lagrange equation (so-called shape equation in the physics literature). Since our objective is to model and analyse the membrane behaviour during the pre-fusion state without the merging of the viral and the host cell membranes, the viral membrane does not experience a topological change. This allows us to drop the Gaussian curvature term in (2.1). Considering an axisymmetric viral membrane, illustrated in Fig. 2, and using the expression for curvatures

\[ c_1 = \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho}, \quad c_2 = \frac{\sin \psi}{\rho}, \]

the energy functional (2.1) can be written as

\[ E_1 = \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \mathcal{L} \, d\rho, \]  

(3.2a)

FIG. 2. Schematic diagram of the axisymmetric viral membrane with the \( z \)-axis as the axis of symmetry. \( s \) is the arc length, \( \rho \) is the distance to the symmetric axis, \( \psi \) is the angle made by the tangent to the membrane with the plane perpendicular to the axis of symmetry, \( \rho_f \) is the maximum distance of the membrane considered, \( \rho_p \) is average of the internal and external radii of the protein ring and \( r_p \) is half of the width (size) of the protein ring.
where
\[ \mathcal{L} = k_b \rho \cos \psi \left( \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \right)^2 + 2k_b \sin \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{k_b \sin^2 \psi}{\rho \cos \psi} + f_p^{(1)} \rho \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{f_p^{(2)} \sin \psi}{\cos \psi} \]
\[ + \frac{k_b \rho c_0^2}{\cos \psi} - 2c_0 k_b \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - \frac{2k_b c_0 \sin \psi}{\cos \psi} + \eta \left( \frac{\cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi}{\cos \psi} \right) \]
(3.2b)

and \( \rho_f \) is the maximum distance of the membrane considered from the axis of symmetry. Here, we have incorporated the geometric constraint \( \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi d\rho = 0 \) via a Lagrangian multiplier \( \eta \).

Using the calculus of variations, the energy functional (3.2a) provides us with the following Euler–Lagrange equations (see Appendix A):
\[ \mathcal{H} = 0, \quad \text{(3.3a)} \]
\[ \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} = - \sin \psi, \quad \text{(3.3b)} \]
\[ \eta \cos \psi = \eta_0, \quad \text{(3.3c)} \]
where \( \eta_0 \) is an integration constant and
\[ \mathcal{H} = \cos^2 \psi \frac{d^2 \psi}{d\rho^2} - \frac{\sin 2\psi}{4} \left( \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \right)^2 - \frac{\sin 2\psi}{4\rho^2} - \frac{\sin \psi}{2\rho^2 \cos \psi} + \frac{\cos^2 \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho}}{\rho} + \frac{f_p^{(1)} \cos \psi}{2k_b \rho} \]
\[ + \frac{\cos \psi}{2k_b} \frac{d f_p^{(1)}}{d\rho} - \frac{f_p^{(2)}}{2k_b \rho \cos \psi} - \frac{\eta c_0 \sin \psi}{2k_b \rho} + \frac{c_0 \sin^2 \psi}{\rho \cos \psi}. \]

3.2 Shape equations related to energy functional (2.2)
Imposing the axisymmetric condition, the energy functional (2.2) can be rewritten as
\[ E_2 = \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ \mathcal{L} + 2\gamma \rho \sec \psi \right] d\rho, \quad \text{(3.4)} \]
where \( \mathcal{L} \) is given by (3.2b). A similar procedure leads the following Euler–Lagrange equations:
\[ \mathcal{H} = \gamma \sin \psi \frac{\sin \psi}{k_b \cos \psi}, \quad \text{(3.5a)} \]
\[ \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} = - \sin \psi, \quad \text{(3.5b)} \]
\[ \eta \cos \psi = \eta_0. \quad \text{(3.5c)} \]
Here, \( \gamma \) is a prescribed (constant) tension in the membrane.

3.3 Bending moments induced by HA trimers
For fusion to occur during conformational change at low pH values, interaction between adjacent HA trimers with high local density results in multiple trimers assembling around the fusion site
(Markovic et al., 2001). These assembled HA trimers can be assumed to form ring-like clusters surrounding the fusion site (Bentz et al., 1990; Blumenthal et al., 1995; Danieli et al., 1996; Kozlov & Chernomordik, 1998; Zimmerberg et al., 1993), and these proteins perform concerted activation to synchronously release the conformational energy (Markovic et al., 2001). Moreover, fusion peptide interaction among neighbouring HAs has been hypothesized to be responsible for a measurable decrease in the lateral mobility of HA after activation (Gutman et al., 1993; Markovic et al., 2001). Based on these observations, we assume that HA trimers are axisymmetrically distributed on a ring formed about the axis of symmetry of the membrane. As a simple model, we also assume that the bending moments \( f_p^{(1)} \) and \( f_p^{(2)} \) exerted by the protein are given by

\[
f_p^{(i)}(\rho) = F_p^{(i)} H(\rho), \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{3.6a}
\]

where the Heaviside function \( H(\rho) \) is

\[
H(\rho) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } |\rho - \rho_p| \leq r_p, \\
0, & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases} \tag{3.6b}
\]

Here, \( F_p^{(i)}, i = 1, 2, \rho_p \) and \( r_p \) are the magnitude of the bending moments exerted by HA protein, the average of the internal and external radii of the protein ring and half of the width of the protein ring, respectively (see Fig. 2). The derivative of the Heaviside function is a delta function, and the derivative of \( f_p^{(i)}(\rho) \) is given by

\[
\frac{df_p^{(i)}}{d\rho} = \text{sign}(F_p^{(i)}) \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq \rho < \rho_p - r_p, \\
\infty, & \rho = \rho_p - r_p, \\
0, & \rho_p - r_p < \rho < \rho_p + r_p, \\
-\infty, & \rho = \rho_p + r_p, \\
0, & \rho_p + r_p < \rho \leq \rho_f. 
\end{cases} \tag{3.6c}
\]

### 3.4 Boundary conditions

To solve the shape equations, we need to impose proper boundary conditions. Let \( \rho_f \) be the distance from the axis of symmetry where the membrane remains undisturbed, i.e. the membrane remains flat (horizontal). At the axis of symmetry \( \rho = 0 \), we use the symmetry condition \( dz/d\rho = 0 \). In addition, \( dz/d\rho = -\tan \psi \) implies \( \psi = 0 \) at \( \rho = 0 \). Since we assume that the membrane is flat at \( \rho = \rho_f \), we obtain \( \psi(\rho_f) = 0 \). Therefore, to solve the shape equations (3.3a)–(3.3c), we use the following set of boundary conditions:

\[
\rho = 0: \quad \psi = 0, \tag{3.7a}
\]

\[
\rho = \rho_f: \quad \psi = 0, \quad z = z_f, \quad \frac{dz}{d\rho} = 0, \tag{3.7b}
\]

where \( z_f \) is arbitrary. Since we need an extra boundary condition due to presence of the unknown \( \eta_0 \), we have added a no-flux type of boundary condition at \( \rho = \rho_f \), where membrane remains flat.
3.5 Shape equations constrained by the cell membrane

So far we have ignored possible interactions between the viral and the host cell membranes. As the two membranes are brought into close contact, we need to consider the deformation of both membranes and their effect on each other. To simplify the discussion, we assume that the presence of the host membrane imposes a maximum height for the deformed viral membrane. As a result, we have a contact problem, which can be treated under our general framework by imposing an additional constraint. As a simple model, we incorporate the presence of a target membrane as an opposing surface for the viral membrane via an inequality $z \leq z_h$, where $z_h$ is the maximum height allowed when the viral membrane meets the host cell membrane.

Following Sage (1968), we implement the inequality constraint by changing it into an equality constraint as $z_h - z = \xi^2$. Here, $\xi$ represents the square root of the vertical distance between the cell membrane and the viral membrane. We allow $\xi$ to take on only real values so that $z_h - z$ will always be positive and satisfy the required constraint $z \leq z_h$. Again, we apply this equality constraint via a Lagrangian multiplier $\zeta$ so that the energy functional for the constrained membrane takes the form of

$$E_3 = \int_0^{\rho_f} [\pi \mathcal{L} + \zeta(z - z_h + \xi^2)]d\rho,$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is given by (3.2b). The corresponding Euler–Lagrange equations are

$$H = 0,$$

$$\cos \psi \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} = \zeta + \eta \sin \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho},$$

$$\cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} = -\sin \psi,$$

$$z - z_h = -\xi^2,$$

$$\zeta \xi = 0.$$

Algebraic manipulations show that (3.9c) and (3.9d) can be replaced by the following equation:

$$2\xi \cos \psi \frac{d\xi}{d\rho} = \sin \psi.$$

Equations (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.9e) and (3.9f) can be solved using boundary conditions

$$\psi(0) = 0, \quad \psi(\rho_f) = 0, \quad \eta(0) = 0, \quad \zeta(\rho_f) = \sqrt{z_h - z_f}.$$

Note that $\eta \cos \psi$ is no longer a constant in this case.

4. Results and discussion

The numerical results are obtained using the solution methodology summarized in Appendix B. Before presenting the results, we note briefly that the value of $\rho_f$, where the membrane becomes flat, should be sufficiently large. In practice, it depends on the density of the activated HA trimers. As mentioned by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), the contact area of a radius $\sim 25$ nm can have $\sim 10$ dimples if all
the HA molecules in this area are activated. This allows us to estimate the range of $\rho_f$ to be from 8 to 25 nm and in our computations we set $\rho_f = 20$ nm. For all computations, the bending rigidity is given as $k_b = 20kT$ as in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), where $k$ is the Boltzmann constant and $T$ is the temperature.

In the following, we first present numerical results obtained by taking a various combinations of the bending moments $F_p^{(1)}$ and $F_p^{(2)}$ (within an appropriate range). Our results show that membrane deformation is related mainly to the difference between the two applied bending moments, $\Delta F_p = F_p^{(1)} - F_p^{(2)}$. In other words, the deformation of the membrane remains almost the same when $\Delta F_p$ is fixed, regardless of the values and signs of $F_p^{(1)}$ and $F_p^{(2)}$.

Figure 3(a) shows the membrane deformation for two cases, namely, $\Delta F_p = 0$, i.e. $F_p^{(1)} = F_p^{(2)}$, and $\Delta F_p = 4 \times 10^{-11}$ N, with the different magnitudes of $F_p^{(1)}$ and $F_p^{(2)}$ (including both negative, both positive and opposite signs). When $\Delta F_p = 0$, the membrane shape remains planar. For the other case, the difference in deformation is small. Moreover, the effect of $\Delta F_p$ on the membrane equilibrium shape is shown in Fig. 3(b). Nonzero $\Delta F_p$ causes the membrane to deform and the direction depends on the sign of $\Delta F_p$. An increase in the magnitude of $\Delta F_p$ increases the dimple height from the planar state.

Recall that in the case of membrane fusion, Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) assume that the viral membrane deforms into a saddle shape at the protein sites with equal bending moments. Our results show that it is not necessary to make assumptions on the curvature of the deformation and the nature of the bending moments. The most relevant quantity is the difference of the two principal bending moments. Because of the asymmetric nature of the protein force, the difference between the bending moments $\Delta F_p$ is usually nonzero, regardless of their signs. Therefore, our model and results are much more general.

Since $\Delta F_p = F_p^{(1)} - F_p^{(2)}$ is the relevant quantity, instead of the magnitudes of individual $F_p^{(1)}$ and $F_p^{(2)}$, for membrane deformation, we define $F_p^{(1)} - F_p^{(2)} = 2F_p$. We use $F_p$ as the primary variable so that

![Diagram](image-url)
direct comparison can be made with the result in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998). Moreover, a change in the sign of $F_p$ simply changes the direction of the dimple formation. With the assumption that the host cell lies above the viral membrane, the relevant direction for viral membrane deformation is upwards. Therefore, in the rest of the paper, only the results with $F_p \geq 0$ are presented. In addition, we will simply refer to $F_p$ as the bending moments (instead of the difference of the bending moments) from the protein clusters (HA trimers).

4.1 Deformation of tensionless membranes

For comparison purposes, we have carried out simulations using a fixed set of parameter values, which are $F_p = 2.4 \times 10^{-11}$ N, $c_0 = 0$, $\rho_p = 8$ nm and $r_p = 4$ nm, which result in a fusion site with a size of $\rho_p - r_p = 4$ nm as in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998).

Assuming the dimple top is a segment of a sphere with radius 7.0841 nm, it was estimated in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998) that the angle $\psi$ at the edge of the dimple top is approximately 0.6 rad. In Fig. 4(a), we plot this segment (dot-dashed line) along with the dimple top produced by our model. It can be seen that the spherical approximation gives only a qualitatively consistent shape. This can be seen more clearly in Fig. 4(b), where the two principal curvatures are plotted. For a spherical shape, both curvatures are constant and equal. However, the curvatures produced by our (more general) model are not constant. Moreover, the mean curvature, $0.5(c_1 + c_2)$, does not vanish in the protein cluster region, contrary to the catenoid shape in the protein cluster region hypothesized by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998).

The distributions of the energy contribution due to bending rigidity and protein bending moments are plotted in Fig. 4(c). Inside the dimple top, the contribution is mainly due to the bending rigidity while in the protein cluster region, the dominating contribution comes from the bending moments exerted by the protein. In order to facilitate fusion, a significant amount of energy must be available for the monolayers to overcome an energy barrier and merge. From our numerical results, we estimate that the energy stored inside the dimple top is approximately 37.43 kT when the height of the dimple top is 9.8 nm. This energy level is in accordance with the energy barrier of $\approx 37$ kT for the merging of monolayers (Kuzmin et al., 2001; Markin & Albanesi, 2002). Since a sufficient amount of energy can be stored inside the dimple top due to the bending moments exerted by the protein cluster, our results support the mechanism proposed by Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), despite the fact that the dimple shape is far from spherical.
In Fig. 5(a), we plot the membrane shape as the size of the fusion site $\rho_p - r_p$ is varied. We note that near the axis of symmetry, the curvature could change signs for some values of $\rho_p - r_p$. This further suggests that the assumption of a spherical shape for the dimple top is not valid. Our results also suggest that there might exist an optimal value of $\rho_p - r_p$ for the HA molecules to form clusters. This can be illustrated further by examining the energy stored in the membrane. For $F_p = 2 \times 10^{-11}$ N, $c_0 = 0$ and $r_p = 2$ nm, the energy stored inside the dimple top and the total energy in the membrane as a function of $\rho_p - r_p$ are plotted in Figs 6(b) and 7(b), respectively. Here, the total energy in the membrane is computed by integrating the energy on the entire membrane segment (from $\rho = 0$ to $\rho = \rho_p + r_p$) and the energy stored inside the dimple top is obtained by integrating only to the edge of fusion site (from $\rho = 0$ to $\rho = \rho_p - r_p$). It can be seen from Fig. 7(b) that the energy stored inside the dimple top attains a maximum value at a critical value of $\rho_p - r_p = 2.75$ nm, comparable to the value of $r_p$. This result is consistent with the discussion in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998), where they found that the inner radius of the cluster is comparable to the radius of the HA trimer cluster.

Next, we examine the effect of protein cluster size $2r_p$ on membrane deformation. We again set $F_p = 2 \times 10^{-11}$ N, $c_0 = 0$ and $\rho_p - r_p = 4$ nm. As shown in Fig. 5(b), increasing protein cluster size leads to bigger dimple height. Total energy in the membrane (including energy by bending rigidity as well as energy due to bending moments exerted by the protein) increases (in its absolute value) as the protein cluster size increases. Energy inside the dimple top also increases with the protein cluster size. This is shown in Figs 6(c) and 7(c). This result is also consistent with the conclusion in Kozlov & Chernomordik (1998).

In Fig. 5(c), it is shown that dimple height grows when the bending moments exerted by the protein cluster increase. In Figs 6(d) and 7(d), total energy in the membrane and the energy inside the dimple top are plotted as functions of the bending moments exerted by protein for $c_0 = 0$, $r_p = 2$ nm and $\rho_p - r_p = 4$ nm. Again the magnitude of the total energy in the membrane is negative and that inside the dimple top is positive. Absolute values of both energies increase with the bending moments. The results indicate that the membrane responds to the protein bending moments by deforming into a particular shape to avoid excessive energy in the protein cluster region and by storing extra energy inside the dimple top.

The effect of spontaneous curvature $c_0$ (reflecting membrane asymmetry due to composition) on the energy stored in lipid bilayers is of considerable interest and has been a subject of much experimental
Fig. 6. Energy in the entire membrane (from $\rho = 0$ to $\rho = \rho_p + r_p$) affected by (a) spontaneous curvature $c_0$, (b) fusion-site radius, (c) protein cluster size and (d) bending moments exerted by HA protein.

work (Markosyan et al., 1999). In Figs 6(a) and 7(a), total membrane energy and the energy inside the dimple top are plotted for $F_p = 2 \times 10^{-11}$ N, $\rho_p = 6$ nm and $r_p = 2$ nm. Both of these energies are not monotonic functions of $c_0$ and a maximum value of the energy inside the dimple top occurs at a small positive value of $c_0$. Therefore, our results suggest that a small (positive) spontaneous curvature favours fusion, while a large (positive) spontaneous curvature inhibits fusion. This is consistent with the experimental observation in Markosyan et al. (1999), where it was observed that the fusion does not occur in the presence of too many agents with positive spontaneous curvature, such as lysophosphatidylcholine (LPC), but the subsequent removal of LPC leads to fusion.

4.2 Membranes under tension

To examine the effect of membrane tension on deformation, we solve (3.5a)–(3.5c). The results are presented in Fig. 8 based on parameter values $F_p = 2.4 \times 10^{-11}$ N, $\rho_p = 6$ nm, $r_p = 2$ nm and
Fig. 7. Energy inside the dimple top (from $\rho = 0$ to $\rho = \rho_p - r_p$) affected by (a) spontaneous curvature $c_0$, (b) fusion-site radius, (c) protein cluster size and (d) the bending moment exerted by HA protein.

$\gamma = 0, 3, 6, 10 \times 10^{-4}$ N m$^{-1}$. The plot for $\gamma = 0$ N m$^{-1}$ corresponds to the tension-free membrane discussed earlier. The plots clearly show the effect of the tension $\gamma$ on dimple height as well as energy stored inside the dimple top. Increasing membrane tension from 0 to $10 \times 10^{-4}$ N m$^{-1}$ reduces dimple height. The energy stored inside the dimple top also drops from 55.40 to 36.28 kT. Therefore, membrane tension makes it more difficult for the membrane to form a dimple and store energy, thereby inhibiting fusion. Our results strongly support the experimental observation in Markosyan et al. (1999), where it was shown that membrane tension prevents dimple formation and inhibits fusion.

4.3 Presence of the host cell

As discussed earlier, the presence of the host cell imposes a constraint on the height of the viral membrane deformation and we examine this effect in Fig. 9. In Fig. 9(a), the shape of the viral membrane
FIG. 8. Deformation affected by membrane tension: larger tension leads to less deformation.

FIG. 9. (a) Deformation of the viral membrane constrained by different heights under same bending moments. (b) Deformation of the viral membrane under different bending moments exerted by the protein with a fixed maximum height constraint.

is obtained by setting the maximum height at 4, 3, 2 and 1 nm while other conditions are kept the same. It can be seen that due to the height constraint, the dimple top becomes flat. In Fig. 9(b), we vary the bending moments exerted by protein while fixing the maximum height. The viral membrane shape begins to flatten and even form a 'reversed dimple' (with negative curvatures) as the bending moments
due to the protein cluster increase. More detailed understanding of the interaction and coupling between viral and host cell membranes can be gained by extending our model which will be pursued in the future.

5. Conclusion

We have presented a mathematical model for the pre-fusion process of viral infection mediated by HA protein. The deformation of the viral membrane and energy stored in the membrane are computed using the Euler–Lagrange equations based on a Helfrich-type energy functional.

Our results on dimple formation due to the asymmetric nature of protein molecules confirm a hypothesis in the literature that pre-fusion deformation can be mediated by HA protein clusters. The energy stored in the dimple top predicted by our model is at a physically reasonable level to facilitate merging of the contacting bilayers. Our results show that there exists an optimal fusion-site size and spontaneous curvature corresponding to a maximum dimple height and energy stored inside the dimple top. Dimple height and energy stored inside the dimple top are positively correlated with protein cluster size and bending moments (i.e. the moments' difference in two principal directions) exerted by the protein. Furthermore, membrane tension plays a role in the membrane shape as well as energy stored inside the dimple top. Membranes with tension resist bending and therefore reduce the chance for contact and fusion. Spontaneous curvature can either favour or inhibit fusion. The predictions based on our model are consistent with experimental observations in the literature. The shape of the viral membrane constrained by the presence of a cell membrane depends upon the location of the cell membrane as well as the magnitude of the bending moment exerted by the protein.

Finally, we note that for studying dimple formation during the pre-fusion stage, it is sufficient to treat the bilayer as a single membrane without distinguishing the two monolayers. As a consequence of the dimple formation, the viral and host membranes come into close contact which eventually leads to membrane fusion. It is believed that fusion starts with the merge of two contacting monolayers in a step by step fashion. In order to model the fusion process in more detail, we plan to generalize our model by considering individual monolayers instead of bilayers. This can be achieved by generalizing the Helfrich energy functional.
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There are a number of ways to derive the axisymmetric shape equation. Obviously, one can try to derive the general shape equation in 3D by modifying the approach in Ou-Yang & Helfrich (1989) and apply the condition of axisymmetry. A more appealing alternative is to work with the axisymmetric form of the energy functional before applying the calculus of variations. However, there have been some concerns and confusion related to this approach (Blyth & Pozrikidis, 2004; Hu & Ou-Yang, 1993; Naito et al., 1993; Pozrikidis, 2003; Seifert, 1997) and it has been argued in Hu & Ou-Yang (1993) that the variation has to be performed in the normal direction to obtain the correct shape equation. In Julicher & Seifert.
(1994), it was shown that the same equation of axisymmetric vesicles (closed lipid bilayer membranes) can be obtained by both approaches. The main conclusion was that an additional equation needs to be introduced for the Hamiltonian (i.e. constant Hamiltonian) with a proper treatment of the boundary conditions. However, the treatment of boundary conditions is not straightforward for fixed integral limits (constant total arc length) and the validity of the argument was again questioned recently (Blyth & Pozrikidis, 2004; Pozrikidis, 2003). Moreover, most of the derivations used the energy functional with the arc length \( s \) as a primary variable, while in some cases it may be advantageous to use the distance from the axis of symmetry \( \rho \) as a primary variable. As pointed out in Hu & Ou-Yang (1993), derivation of the Euler–Lagrange equation corresponding to the energy functional with \( \rho \) as a primary variable might produce an erroneous equation.

In this appendix, we explicitly state the conditions for obtaining shape equations related to the energy functional (2.1), with \( \rho \) as a primary variable. The derivation related to (2.2) is similar and is omitted. Vaidya et al. (2006) have shown that the variation in the direction perpendicular to the axis of symmetry can also produce the correct shape equation if the induced variation in other variables is obtained by using a proper geometric constraint. Therefore, the variation does not have to be in the normal direction. We further demonstrate that to obtain the correct shape equation of the axisymmetric membrane, we only need to impose an equivalent condition \( \cos \psi d\bar{z} + \sin \psi d\rho = 0 \) while performing the variation. We note that our approach is not restricted to the pre-fusion deformation of a membrane segment and can be applied to vesicle shape as well (Vaidya et al., 2006). Finally, it is worth noting that similar geometric conditions are suggested by Julicher & Seifert (1994) for vesicles. However, these conditions have not been implemented in their later work (Derganc et al., 2003; Julicher & Lipowsky, 1996).

Under axisymmetric conditions, we have \( c_1 = \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \) and \( c_2 = \sin \psi / \rho \). We incorporate the geometric condition \( \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \sin \psi = 0 \) in the energy functional (2.1) via an additional Lagrange multiplier \( \eta \) as follows:

\[
\hat{E}_1 = \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ \frac{k_b \rho}{\cos \psi} \left( \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{\sin \psi}{\rho} - c_0 \right)^2 + \frac{\rho}{\cos \psi} \left( f_p^{(1)} \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + f_p^{(2)} \frac{\sin \psi}{\rho} \right) \right] d\rho + \eta \left( \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi \right) d\rho .
\]  

(A.1)

Taking the first variation and using product rule, we get

\[
\delta \hat{E}_1 = \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ \frac{2k_b \rho}{\cos \psi} \left( \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{\sin \psi}{\rho} - c_0 \right) \left( \cos \psi \delta \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - \sin \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \delta \psi + \frac{\cos \psi}{\rho} \delta \psi \right) \right] d\rho + \frac{k_b \rho \sin \psi}{\cos^2 \psi} \left( \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{\sin \psi}{\rho} - c_0 \right)^2 \delta \psi + f_p^{(1)} \rho \delta \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} + \frac{f_p^{(2)}}{\cos^2 \psi} \delta \psi + \left( \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi \right) \delta \eta + \eta \left( \cos \psi \delta \frac{dz}{d\rho} - \sin \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} \delta \psi + \cos \psi \delta \psi \right) \right] d\rho .
\]  

(A.2)
Performing an integration by parts and simplifying, we obtain

\[
\delta\hat{E}_1 = \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ k_b \rho \sin \psi \left( \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \right)^2 + \frac{k_b \sin \psi}{\rho} + \frac{k_b \sin \psi}{\rho \cos^2 \psi} - 2k_b \cos \psi \frac{d^2\psi}{d\rho^2} - 2k_b \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - f_p^{(1)} - \rho \frac{df_p^{(1)}}{d\rho} + \frac{f_p^{(2)}}{\cos^2 \psi} + \frac{k_b c_0^2 \rho \sin \psi}{\cos^2 \psi} - \frac{2k_b c_0 \sin^2 \psi}{\cos^2 \psi} - \frac{\eta}{\cos \psi} \right] \delta\psi \ d\rho
\]

\[
- \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ \cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi \right] \delta\eta \ d\rho + \pi \int_0^{\rho_f} \left[ \eta \sin \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - \cos \psi \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} \right] \delta \zeta \ d\rho
\]

\[
+ \pi \left( \left( \eta \cos \psi \right) \delta z \right)_{\rho=0}^{\rho_f}.
\]

(A.3)

Using the boundary conditions \( \psi(0) = \psi(\rho_f) = 0 \) (Section 3.4), the second to last term of (A.3) vanishes. Since at the boundary \( \rho = 0 \), the variable \( z \) has to satisfy the condition \( \delta z / d\rho = -\tan \psi = 0 \), we are not allowed an arbitrary variation \( \delta \zeta \) at \( \rho = 0 \). Therefore, using \( \delta z \big|_{\rho=0} = 0 \) and the boundary condition \( z|_{\rho=\rho_f} = z_f \) given in Section 3.4, the last term of (A.3) vanishes. Since the variations \( \delta \psi, \delta \eta \) and \( \delta \zeta \) are arbitrary, we obtain the necessary conditions for a minimum energy by forcing the coefficients of \( \delta \psi, \delta \eta \) and \( \delta \zeta \) to vanish, which leads to the following Euler–Lagrange equations:

\[
k_b \rho \sin \psi \left( \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} \right)^2 + \frac{k_b \sin \psi}{\rho} + \frac{k_b \sin \psi}{\rho \cos^2 \psi} - 2k_b \cos \psi \frac{d^2\psi}{d\rho^2} - 2k_b \cos \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - f_p^{(1)} - \rho \frac{df_p^{(1)}}{d\rho} + \frac{f_p^{(2)}}{\cos^2 \psi} + \frac{k_b c_0^2 \rho \sin \psi}{\cos^2 \psi} - \frac{2k_b c_0 \sin^2 \psi}{\cos^2 \psi} - \frac{\eta}{\cos \psi} = 0, \quad \text{(A.4a)}
\]

\[
\cos \psi \frac{dz}{d\rho} + \sin \psi = 0, \quad \text{(A.4b)}
\]

\[
\eta \sin \psi \frac{d\psi}{d\rho} - \cos \psi \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} = 0. \quad \text{(A.4c)}
\]

After simplification, (A.4a)–(A.4c) become (3.3a)–(3.3c).

**Remark** We note that the equations derived here correspond to the correct shape equations obtained in the literature (Blyth & Pozrikidis, 2004; Hu & Ou-Yang, 1993; Julicher & Seifert, 1994; Naito et al., 1993; Pozrikidis, 2003; Zheng & Liu, 1993), by setting \( f_p^{(1)} = f_p^{(2)} = 0 \). To see this, we rewrite (A.4a) as \( \eta = \eta(\rho, \psi, d\psi/d\rho, d^2\psi/d\rho^2) \), compute \( d\eta/d\rho \) and substitute both into (A.4c). A more direct comparison on vesicle shape equations can be found in Vaidya et al. (2006).

**Appendix B. Solution methodology**

In this section, we briefly explain how to solve the Euler–Lagrange equations derived earlier. We use the system (3.3a)–(3.3c) as an example as the method for the systems (3.5a)–(3.5c) and (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.9e), (3.9f) are similar. To solve the system of ordinary differential equations (3.3a)–(3.3c) with boundary conditions (3.7a) and (3.7b), we use the finite-difference method. At the boundaries in which Neumann’s
boundary conditions are given, we determine numerically the boundary values by using a Taylor expansion with the given boundary conditions. We use the following numerical scheme to solve system (3.3a)–(3.3c).

Let $\Delta \rho = \rho_f / (N + 1)$ be the grid size so that $\rho_i = i \Delta \rho$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, (N + 1)$, forms a partition of $[0, \rho_f]$. We assume that $\psi_i$ and $z_i$ are approximations to $\psi$ and $z$, respectively, at the grid point $\rho_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$. On this uniform grid, we use the following discretization schemes:

\[
\frac{d^2 \psi}{d \rho^2} \bigg|_{\rho_i} = \frac{\psi_{i+1} - 2 \psi_i + \psi_{i-1}}{(\Delta \rho)^2}, \quad (B.1a)
\]
\[
\frac{d \psi}{d \rho} \bigg|_{\rho_i} = \frac{\psi_{i+1} - \psi_{i-1}}{2 \Delta \rho}, \quad (B.1b)
\]
\[
\frac{dz}{d \rho} \bigg|_{\rho_i} = \frac{z_{i+1} - z_i}{\Delta \rho}. \quad (B.1c)
\]

After substituting $\eta$ from (3.3c) in (3.3a), the system (3.3a)–(3.3b) can be discretized as

\[
cos^2 \psi_i \left[ \frac{\psi_{i+1} - 2 \psi_i + \psi_{i-1}}{(\Delta \rho)^2} \right] - \sin 2 \psi_i \left[ \frac{\psi_{i+1} - \psi_{i-1}}{\Delta \rho} \right]^2
\]
\[
- \frac{\sin 2 \psi_i}{4 \rho_i^2} - \frac{\sin \psi_i}{2 \rho_i^2 \cos \psi_i} + \frac{\cos^2 \psi_i}{\rho_i} \left[ \frac{\psi_{i+1} - \psi_{i-1}}{2 \Delta \rho} \right] + \frac{f^{(1)}_p(\rho_i) \cos \psi_i}{2 k_b \rho_i}
\]
\[
+ \frac{\cos \psi_i}{2 k_b} \left. \frac{df^{(1)}_p}{d \rho} \right|_{\rho_i} - \frac{f^{(2)}_p(\rho_i)}{2 k_b \rho_i \cos \psi_i} - \frac{\eta_0}{2 k_b \rho_i \cos \psi_i} - \frac{c_0^2 \sin \psi_i}{2 \cos \psi_i} + \frac{c_0 \sin^2 \psi_i}{\rho_i \cos \psi_i} = 0, \quad (B.2a)
\]
\[
\cos \psi_i \frac{z_{i+1} - z_i}{\Delta \rho} + \sin \psi_i = 0, \quad (B.2b)
\]

$i = 1, 2, \ldots, N$.

Using boundary conditions (3.7a) and (3.7b), this scheme produces a system of $2N - 1$ nonlinear equations with $2N - 1$ unknowns $\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots, \psi_{N-1}, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{N-1}, \eta_0$. Using similar procedures, we obtain $2N - 1$ equations with $2N - 1$ variables by discretizing (3.5a)–(3.5c) and $4N$ equations with $4N$ variables by discretizing (3.9a), (3.9b), (3.9e), (3.9f). The resulting system of nonlinear algebraic equations are solved by using ‘fsolve.m’ in the optimization toolbox of MATLAB, which implements the Gauss–Newton method with line search. The Gauss–Newton method uses a nonlinear least-squares solver which employs a line-search procedure and a quasi-Newton method to solve the equations. On varying $N$ from 500 to 2000, we obtained the same result. Therefore, the results presented here are for $N = 500$. In our simulation, optimization was terminated when the magnitude of search direction is less than $10^{-8}$ and the residual is less than $4.89 \times 10^{-20}$. The run time for each case varies between 5 and 20 min on a Pentium IV Dell laptop.