### **Determinants of Maximal Force Transmission in a Motor-Clutch Model of Cell Traction in a Compliant Microenvironment**

Benjamin L. Bangasser, $^\dagger$  Steven S. Rosenfeld, $^\ddagger$  and David J. Odde $^{\dagger *}$ 

<sup>†</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota; and <sup>‡</sup>Brain Tumor and Neuro-Oncology Center, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio

Bangasser et al.

Force Transmission in a Motor-Clutch Model

*Submitted January 10, 2013, and accepted for publication June 18, 2013.* 

\*Correspondence: oddex002@umn.edu

#### **Supplementary Information**

#### *Model Simulation Algorithm*

The model simulation algorithm from Chan and Odde(1) was updated from a fixed time step Monte Carlo simulation to a variable time step Gillespie Stochastic Simulation Algorithm (SSA), also known as a Kinetic Monte Carlo simulation(2). Additionally, the order of events in the simulation was updated to:

- 1. Calculate the off-rate for each engaged clutch based on the clutch deformations
- 2. Determine event times based on clutch on- and off-rates (see **Eq. 2**)
- 3. Advance time by the minimum calculated event time
- 4. Execute the reaction corresponding to the minimum calculated event time (binding or unbinding of the particular clutch)
- 5. Calculate F-actin retrograde flow rate based on the current substrate deformation using as linear force-velocity relationship(1).
- 6. Advance engaged clutch positions by the product of the F-actin retrograde flow rate and time step.
- 7. Calculate substrate position through a force balance on the substrate and clutch springs
- 8. Return to step 1

This ordering ensures elastic equilibrium is achieved at the end of every time step, leading to more accurate calculation of clutch off-rate at the beginning of the next step. As shown in **Figure S1A**, using the SSA algorithm resulted in behavior qualitatively similar to that obtained from our previous fixed time step algorithm. In particular, the biphasic dependence of F-actin retrograde flow rate (and equivalently traction force) remains a central and robust aspect of the model. By modest modification of a subset of model parameters, the SSA algorithm produces simulated model behavior consistent with our previous published data (**Fig. S1B** and **C**).

#### *Analysis of each clutch parameter*

The effect of each clutch parameter on the shape of F-actin retrograde flow rate as a function of substrate stiffness, and the position of the optimum is examined below.

**Clutch on-rate**  $(k_{on})$ : An increase in  $k_{on}$  causes an increase in the average number of clutches bound on any stiffness. This causes the ensemble clutch stiffness (see **Fig. 6A** and **B**) to increase, which results in an increase in the optimum stiffness. A large increase in  $k_{on}$  eventually causes a stalled system because more clutches are bound at any given time, providing too much resistance for the motors to break all of the clutch bonds. A decrease in  $k_{on}$  decreases the ensemble clutch stiffness, which shifts the optimum to lower stiffnesses. A large decrease causes few clutches to be bound at any given time resulting in a free flowing system because the motors quickly break the clutch bonds.

**Clutch bond rupture force**  $(F_b)$ : An increase in  $F_b$  causes an increase in the average number of clutches bound on any stiffness. This causes an increase in the ensemble clutch stiffness, which results in an increase in the optimum stiffness. A large increase in  $F_b$  causes a stalled system because more clutches are bound at any given time, providing too much resistance for the motors to break all of the clutch bonds. A decrease in  $F<sub>b</sub>$ decreases the ensemble clutch stiffness, which shifts the optimum stiffness to lower values. A large decrease causes few clutches to be bound at any given time resulting in a free flowing system because the motors quickly break the clutch bonds.

**Number of clutches**  $(n_c)$ **:** An increase in  $n_c$  causes an increase in the average number of clutches bound on any stiffness. This causes the ensemble clutch stiffness to increase, which increases the optimum stiffness. A large increase in  $n_c$  causes a stalled system because more clutches are bound at any given time, providing too much resistance for the motors to break all of the clutch bonds. A decrease in  $n_c$  decreases the ensemble clutch stiffness, in turn decreasing the optimum stiffness. A large decrease causes few clutches to be bound at any given time resulting in a free flowing system because the motors quickly break the clutch bonds.

**Clutch stiffness**  $(\kappa_c)$ **:** An increase in  $\kappa_c$  means that clutch bonds are stiffer, which, by itself, would tend to increase the ensemble clutch stiffness and shift the optimum to higher substrate stiffness. However, stiffer clutch bonds also tend to load quickly and therefore fail quickly, which decreases the average number of engaged clutches. By itself, the decreased number of engaged clutches would decrease the ensemble clutch stiffness. Combined, these two opposing effects might effectively cancel each other, and in fact this is observed in our simulations. The only obvious effect of increasing clutch stiffness is that the retrograde flow rate on high substrate stiffnesses (i.e. well above the optimum) increases. In this high stiffness frictional slippage regime (see **Fig. 6E**), the decreasing number of engaged clutches as the clutch stiffness increases means that the system is tending toward free flowing (i.e. higher F-actin retrograde flow rate). In the low stiffness frictional slippage regime (i.e. below the optimum, see **Fig. 6E**), the substrate stiffness is softer than the ensemble clutch stiffness, and in this regime clutches tend to fail spontaneously prior to reaching appreciable loads. For this reason, the model behavior in the low substrate stiffness regime is insensitive to the mechanical properties of the clutch itself. This is perhaps one of the most surprising findings of the single parameter changes: the optimum stiffness is insensitive to the clutch stiffness, the only parameter that describes a cellular mechanical property.

**Motor stall force**  $(F_m)$ **:** An increase in  $F_m$  strengthens the motors and decreases the load-and-fail cycle time, which shifts the optimum stiffness to lower values. A large increase in  $F_m$  causes clutch bonds to quickly break and results in a free flowing system. A decrease in  $F_m$  weakens the motors and increases the load-and-fail cycle time, which shifts the optimum stiffness to higher values. A large decrease weakens the motors to the point where they cannot break the clutch bonds and the system stalls.

**Number of motors**  $(n_m)$ **:** An increase in  $n_m$  strengthens the motors and decreases the load-and-fail cycle time, which decreases the optimum stiffness. A large increase in  $n<sub>m</sub>$ causes clutch bonds to quickly break and results in a free flowing system. A decrease in  $n_m$  weakens the motors and increases the load-and-fail cycle time, which increases the optimum stiffness. A large decrease weakens the motors to the point where they cannot break the clutch bonds and the system stalls.

**Clutch unloaded off-rate** ( $k_{off}$ ): An increase in  $k_{off}$  is similar to an increase in  $k_{on}$  in that it causes a decrease in the average number of clutches bound on any stiffness, which results in a decrease in the optimum stiffness. A large increase in  $k_{off}$  causes few clutches to be bound at any given time resulting in a free flowing system because the motors quickly break the clutch bonds. A decrease in  $k_{off}$  increases the ensemble clutch stiffness, in turn increasing the optimum stiffness. A large decrease causes a stalled system because more clutches are bound at any given time, providing too much resistance for the motors to break all of the clutch bonds.

**Motor unloaded velocity**  $(v_u)$ **:** An increase in  $v_u$  strengthens the motors and decreases the load-and-fail cycle time, which shifts the optimum stiffness to lower values. A large increase in  $v<sub>u</sub>$  does not cause a free flowing system, but it does cause F-actin retrograde flow rates above the physiologically relevant limit. A decrease in  $v<sub>u</sub>$  weakens the motors and increases the load-and-fail cycle time, which shifts the optimum stiffness to higher values. A large decrease essentially stalls the system because all retrograde flow is near zero.

#### *Analysis of select dual parameter changes*

Dual parameter changes can shift the optimum stiffness over a wide range of values, as long as the changes compensate for each other by avoiding the transitions to either free flowing or stalled states. Below, two examples are explained in further detail.

**Number of clutches/number of motors**  $(n_c/n_m)$ **:** An increase in  $n_c$  by itself shifts the optimum higher and eventually will stall the system. A compensatory increase in  $n_m$ rescues the stalled system but shifts the optimum to lower stiffnesses. However, the optimum has a higher positive sensitivity to the clutches than it has a negative sensitivity to the motors (see **Fig. 3B**). The result is a shift of the optimum stiffness to higher values, but with a lower sensitivity value (*S*). Although the sensitivity of the optimum to the dual parameter change is less, the range is much larger resulting in a high sensitivityrange (*SR*, see **Fig. 5A-C**).

**Clutch on-rate/Clutch off-rate** ( $k_{on}/k_{off}$ ): An increase in  $k_{on}$  by itself shifts the optimum higher and eventually will stall the system. A compensatory increase in  $k_{off}$  rescues the stalled system but shifts the optimum to the left. However, the optimum has a higher positive sensitivity to the on-rate than it has a negative sensitivity to the unloaded off-rate (see **Fig. 3B**). The result is a shift of the optimum stiffness to higher values, but with a lower sensitivity value (*S*). Although the sensitivity of the optimum to the dual parameter change is less, the range is much larger resulting in a high sensitivity-range (*SR*, see **Fig. 5A-C**).



**Supplementary Table S1:** Model parameters for experimental validation.

#### **Supplementary Legends**

**Supplementary Movie S1:** The movie demonstrates motor-clutch behavior with different numbers of clutches  $(n_c)$ . Myosin motors appear in blue on the left side. The F-actin filament is purple with dots placed on it to visualize F-actin retrograde flow. Clutches are the vertical blue lines, and the red is the substrate. When a clutch binds it will extend from the red substrate to the purple F-actin. In the top case,  $n_c = 6$  and the system is free flowing. The F-actin flows at near its unloaded velocity because the clutches provide little resistance to the motors. For  $n_c$ =50, the system loads and fails. F-actin retrograde flow is fast at the beginning of the cycle and slows toward the end of the cycle. In the bottom case,  $n_c$ =150, and the system stalls. In this case, there are too many clutches for the force of the motors to break all the bonds.

**Supplementary Figure S1: Modified model algorithm.** A) The changes in the model algorithm caused a change in the quantitative shape of the output using the same parameters. B and C) Using the new algorithm the model was fit to the embryonic chick forebrain neuron data from Chan and Odde(1) to obtain a new set of base parameters. The new value of  $\kappa_c$  was assigned based on experimental data for the spring constant of integrins(5)(6). The values of  $n_m$ ,  $n_c$ ,  $k_{on}$ , and  $k_{off}$  were allowed to change subject to the constraint  $n_m=n_c$ . The fitted value of  $k_{off}$  turned out to be the same as the original value, so only  $n_m$ ,  $n_c$ ,  $k_{on}$ , and  $\kappa_c$  were altered in the new parameter set. Clutch parameters are highlighted in gray.

**Supplementary Figure S2: Pairwise parameter limits.** A and B) For the dual parameter sensitivity tests, upper and lower limits were reached before resulting in stalled or free flowing system. The upper and lower limits of the multiplier c are shown. Cases were a physiological limit was imposed are highlighted in orange. These tables use the same above and below the diagonal convention used in **Figure 5**. Clutch parameters are highlighted in gray.

#### **Supplementary References**

- 1. Chan, C.E., and D.J. Odde. 2008. Traction dynamics of filopodia on compliant substrates. Science. 322: 1687–1691.
- 2. Gillespie, D.T. 1977. Exact Stochastic Simulation of Coupled Chemical Reactions. The Journal of Physical Chemistry. 81: 2340–2361.
- 3. Kanchanawong, P., G. Shtengel, A.M. Pasapera, E.B. Ramko, M.W. Davidson, et al. 2010. Nanoscale architecture of integrin-based cell adhesions. Nature. 468: 580–584.
- 4. Pasapera, A.M., I.C. Schneider, E. Rericha, D.D. Schlaepfer, and C.M. Waterman. 2010. Myosin II activity regulates vinculin recruitment to focal adhesions through FAKmediated paxillin phosphorylation. The Journal of Cell Biology. 188: 877–90.
- 5. Kong, F., A.J. García, A.P. Mould, M.J. Humphries, and C. Zhu. 2009. Demonstration of catch bonds between an integrin and its ligand. The Journal of Cell Biology. 185: 1275– 84.
- 6. Chen, W., J. Lou, E.A. Evans, and C. Zhu. 2012. Observing force-regulated conformational changes and ligand dissociation from a single integrin on cells. The Journal of Cell Biology. 199: 497–512.



## **C**



# **S2A B**



