

## Models, Simulations, and Parameters

The demonstration that a single Lyn molecule can initiate phosphorylation of tyrosines on receptors in an aggregate depends on the comparison of dose-response data with predictions of two competing mathematical models. In model A, phosphorylation of aggregated (dimerized) receptors is initiated when the aggregate contains one Lyn molecule, associated with one of the paired receptors. That single Lyn transphosphorylates the other receptor. In model B, both receptors in a dimer must be associated with Lyn for transphosphorylation to proceed. Here we demonstrate the structure of the models by presenting model A in detail. Model A has 14 possible states for the receptor, illustrated in Fig. 4. Their concentrations, along with the concentrations of free Lyn and free ligand, are determined by three conservation laws and 13 coupled, nonlinear ordinary differential equations, given below. The legend to Fig. 4 defines the notation we use for these concentrations, and for the rate constants that govern transitions among the states. In addition,  $R_T$ ,  $L_T$ , and  $C_T$  denote the total concentrations of receptor (FcεRI), Lyn, and ligand (IgE dimers), respectively.

The conservation equations are

$$\begin{aligned} R_T &= \sum R_{ij} + 2 \sum P_{ijk} \\ L_T &= L + R_{01} + R_{11} + P_{010} + P_{110} + P_{101} \\ &\quad + P_{201} + 2(P_{020} + P_{111} + P_{202}) \\ C_T &= C + R_{10} + R_{11} + \sum P_{ijk}. \end{aligned}$$

The system of coupled ordinary differential equations for concentrations of the distinct receptor complexes is

$$\begin{aligned} dR_{01}/dt &= [k_{+L}LR_{00} - k_{-L}R_{01}] - [2k_{+1}CR_{01} - k_{-1}R_{11}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{10} - k_{-2}P_{010}] - [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{11} \\ &\quad - 2k_{-2}P_{020}] \\ dR_{10}/dt &= [2k_{+1}CR_{00} - k_{-1}R_{10}] - [k_{+L}LR_{10} - k_{-L}R_{11}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+2}R_{00}R_{10} - 2k_{-2}P_{000}] - [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{10} \\ &\quad - k_{-2}P_{010}] \\ dR_{11}/dt &= [2k_{+1}CR_{01} - k_{-1}R_{11}] + [k_{+L}LR_{10} - k_{-L}R_{11}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+2}R_{00}R_{11} - k_{-2}P_{010}] - [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{11} \\ &\quad - 2k_{-2}P_{020}] \\ dP_{000}/dt &= [k_{+2}R_{00}R_{10} - 2k_{-2}P_{000}] - [2k_{+L}LP_{000} \\ &\quad - k_{-L}P_{010}] + p_{-3}P_{100} \\ dP_{010}/dt &= [k_{+2}R_{00}R_{11} - k_{-2}P_{010}] + [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{10} - k_{-2}P_{010}] \\ &\quad + [2k_{+L}LP_{000} - k_{-L}P_{010}] - [k_{+L}LP_{010} \\ &\quad - 2k_{-L}P_{020}] - [p_{+1}P_{010} - p_{-1}P_{110}] \\ dP_{020}/dt &= [k_{+L}LP_{010} - 2k_{-L}P_{020}] + [k_{+2}R_{01}R_{11} \\ &\quad - 2k_{-2}P_{020}] \\ dP_{100}/dt &= p_{-3}[2P_{200} - P_{100}] - [k_{+L}LP_{100} - k_{-L}P_{110}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+L}LP_{100} - k_{-L}P_{101}] \\ dP_{110}/dt &= [p_{+1}P_{010} - p_{-1}P_{110}] + [k_{+L}LP_{100} - k_{-L}P_{110}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+L}P_{110} - k_{-L}P_{101}] - [k_{+L}LP_{110} - k_{-L}P_{111}] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} dP_{101}/dt &= [k_{+L}LP_{100} - k_{-L}P_{101}] + [k_{+L}P_{110} - k_{-L}P_{101}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+L}LP_{101} - k_{-L}P_{111}] - [p_{+2}P_{101} - p_{-2}P_{201}] \\ dP_{111}/dt &= [k_{+L}LP_{110} - k_{-L}P_{111}] + [k_{+L}LP_{101} - k_{-L}P_{111}] \\ dP_{200}/dt &= -2p_{-3}P_{200} - [2k_{+L}LP_{200} - k_{-L}P_{201}] \\ dP_{201}/dt &= [p_{+2}P_{101} - p_{-2}P_{201}] + [2k_{+L}LP_{200} - k_{-L}P_{201}] \\ &\quad - [k_{+L}LP_{201} - 2k_{-L}P_{202}] \\ dP_{202}/dt &= [k_{+L}LP_{201} - 2k_{-L}P_{202}]. \end{aligned}$$

Initially (before ligand is added), all concentrations are 0 except  $R_{00}(0)$  and  $R_{01}(0)$ . These initial values are taken to be the steady-state values when  $C_T = 0$  and are therefore determined by the equations

$$R_T = R_{00}(0) + R_{01}(0)$$

$$L_T = L + R_{01}(0)$$

$$R_{01}(0) = k_{+L}LR_{010}(0)/k_{-L}.$$

To compare the predictions of the model with experiment, we solve the set of ordinary differential equations numerically for all the concentrations and then calculate the fraction of receptors that are phosphorylated,  $F_p$ , as a function of time, where

$$F_p = (P_{100} + P_{110} + P_{101} + P_{111} + 2(P_{200} + P_{201} + P_{202}))/R_T.$$

For the simulations we present in *Results* in the main paper, we used the following parameters, estimated as described in ref. 1 from our own experiments, measurements in the literature, and constraints imposed by detailed balance and other relationships among parameters:  $k_{+1} = 8 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{-1} = k_{-2} = 1 \times 10^{-5} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{+2}R_T = 100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{+L}L_T = k_{+L}^sL_T = 14 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{-L} = 193 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{-L}^s = 1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{+L} = 386 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $k_{-L} = 2 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $p_{+1} = p_{+2} = 50 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ,  $p_{-1} = p_{-2} = p_{-3} = 5 \text{ min}^{-1}$ .

The total concentrations of IgE dimer and FcεRI are those given in *Materials and Methods* in the main paper, converted to nM units.

Model B has two additional parameters, the rates of activation ( $k_{+a}$ ) and inactivation ( $k_{-a}$ ) of dimerized Lyn (Fig. 1B in main paper). When we keep track of the activation state of each Lyn associated with aggregated receptors, there are 25 possible states for receptors. The model consists of 3 conservation equations and 22 coupled ordinary differential equations. For the simulations, we used  $k_{+a} = k_{-a} = 1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ .

Predictions of both models do not depend sensitively on the rate constants governing processes that occur on a faster time scale than that of the ligand binding from solution. In particular, the value we took for the forward rate of receptor crosslinking,  $k_{+2}R_T = 100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , is the calculated diffusion limit, but the predicted levels of phosphorylation are essentially unchanged if the value is up to three orders of magnitude lower. The rates of association and dissociation of Lyn with both the phosphorylated and the nonphosphorylated receptor, rates of phosphorylation and dephosphorylation, and rates of activation and inactivation of Lyn in model B, are also in the category of parameters that can change by at least an order of magnitude without changing quantitative predictions significantly.

1. Wofsy, C., Torigoe, C., Kent, U., Metzger, H. & Goldstein, B. (1997) *J. Immunol.* **94**, 77–80.

