Supplemental Materials

Jason K. Davis Suzanne S. Sindi

## 1 Derivation of ELNPM

## 1.1 Full Model

We examine the full kinetics implied by the rate equations in Section 2.2, where we consider each possible configuration of bound Hsp104 separately. We define  $u_{i(b)}$  to be the density of aggregates of size *i* with Hsp104 configuration *b*, where  $0 \le b < 2^{i-1}$  and *b*'s binary expansion is taken to reflect the states of possible fragmentation sites: a 0 appearing in the location of an unbound site, and a 1 in the location of a bound site. Let  $c_b$  denote the Hamming weight of *b*, or the number of 1's appearing in the binary expansion of *b*. Finally, we assume that fragmentation occurs at a rate proportional to the amount of bound Hsp104 and that the resulting daughters are uniformly distributed amongst the possible configurations. Thus, for  $u_{i(b)}$ , fragmentation occurs with rate  $\gamma c_b$  into daughter aggregates with probability  $1/c_b$ . Finally, let  $b_1 \otimes b_2$  denote the bit-wise and of integers  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  and  $\delta(x) = 1$  if x = 0 and 1 otherwise. Then,

$$\frac{du_{m(b)}}{dt} = -2\beta s(t)u_{m(b)} + \beta s(t) \left[ u_{m-1,(b)}\delta(b \otimes 2^{m-2}) + u_{m-1,(b/2)}\delta(b \otimes 1) \right] - (\gamma c_b + \mu_0)u_{m(b)} 
+ \gamma \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^{2^{i-m-1}-1} \left[ u_{i(b+2^{m-1}+2^mk)} + u_{i(k+2^{i-m-1}+2^{i-m}b)} \right] 
- k_{on}h(t) \left[ (m-1-c_b)u_{m(b)} - \sum_{\substack{b' \text{ s.t.} \\ c_{b'}=c_b-1 \\ b' \otimes b=b'}} u_{m(b')} \right] + k_{off} \left[ \sum_{\substack{b' \text{ s.t.} \\ c_{b'}=c_b+1 \\ b' \otimes b=b}} u_{m(b')} - c_b u_{m(b)} \right]$$
(1)

We now sum over every  $b < 2^{i-1}$  such that  $c_b = j$ , only assuming symmetry in the aggregate configuration densities  $(u_{i(b)} = u_{i(b')})$  where b' is the reversed bitstring of b). We write  $u_{mn} = \sum_{b \text{ s.t. } c_b = n} u_{m(b)}$  and carefully count bitstrings and simplify to obtain

$$\frac{du_{mn}}{dt} = -2\beta s(t) \left[ u_{mn} - u_{m-1,n} \right] - (\gamma n + \mu_0) u_{mn} 
+ 2\gamma \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{j=n+1\\b \le 2^{m-1}\\c_b=n}}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{b \text{ s.t.}\\b \le 2^{m-1}\\c_{b'}=j-n-1}}^{b' \text{ s.t.}} u_{i(b+2^{m-1}+2^mb')} 
- k_{on}h(t) \left[ (m-n-1)u_{mn} - (m-n)u_{m,n-1} \right] + k_{off} \left[ (n+1)u_{m,n+1} - nu_{mn} \right].$$
(2)

We simplify the remaining recovery term with a claim: since conversion effectively biases Hsp104 configurations towards the center of the aggregate, a relatively fast enzyme off-binding will restore the configuration distribution to approximate uniformity. Let us proceed by formally assuming  $u_{i(j)} = u_{i(j')}$  if  $c_j = c_{j'}$ . Then (2) reduces to

$$\frac{du_{mn}}{dt} = -2\beta s(t) \left[ u_{mn} - u_{m-1,n} \right] - (\gamma n + \mu_0) u_{mn} + 2\gamma \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=n+1}^{i-(m-n)} \frac{\binom{m-1}{n} \binom{i-m-1}{j-n-1}}{\binom{i-1}{j}} u_{ij} - k_{\text{on}} h(t) \left[ (m-n-1)u_{mn} - (m-n)u_{m,n-1} \right] + k_{\text{off}} \left[ (n+1)u_{m,n+1} - nu_{mn} \right].$$
(3)

## 1.2 Reduced Equations

Equipped with these assumptions, let us define the moments of our aggregate density:

$$\eta = \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} u_{ij}, \quad z = \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} i u_{ij}, \quad z_b = \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} j u_{ij}.$$
 (4)

Then,

$$\frac{ds}{dt} = \alpha_s - \mu_s s(t) - 2\beta s(t)\eta(t) + \gamma(n_0 - 1)n_0 \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{j}{i-1} u_{ij}(t)$$
(5)

$$\frac{an}{dt} = \alpha_h - \mu_h h(t) - k_{\rm on} h(t) [z(t) - \eta(t) - z_b(t)] + (k_{\rm off} + \gamma) z_b(t) 
+ \gamma(n_0 - 1)(n_0 - 2) \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{j(j-1)}{(i-1)(i-2)} u_{ij}(t)$$
(6)

$$\frac{d\eta}{dt} = -\mu_0 \eta(t) + \gamma z_b(t) - 2\gamma(n_0 - 1) \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{j}{i-1} u_{ij}(t)$$
(7)

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = 2\beta s(t)\eta(t) - \mu_0 z(t) - \gamma(n_0 - 1)n_0 \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} \frac{j}{i-1} u_{ij}(t)$$
(8)

$$\frac{dz_b}{dt} = -(\mu_0 + \gamma + k_{\text{off}})z_b(t) + k_{\text{on}}h(t)[z(t) - \eta(t) - z_b(t)] - \gamma(n_0 - 1)(n_0 - 2)\sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\frac{j(j-1)}{(i-1)(i-2)}u_{ij}(t)$$
(9)

While simplified, we still lack moment-closure. However, we note that the unclosed terms are of a very particular form, motivating a discrete transformation of  $u_{ij}$ . Define

$$v_{mn} = \sum_{j=n}^{m-1} \frac{\binom{j}{n}}{\binom{m-1}{n}} u_{mj}.$$
 (10)

Then,

$$v_{i,0} = \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} u_{ij}, \qquad v_{i,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{j}{i-1} u_{ij}, \qquad v_{i,2} = \sum_{j=2}^{i-1} \frac{j(j-1)}{(i-1)(i-2)} u_{ij}, \quad (11)$$

and more generally,

$$\frac{dv_{mn}}{dt} = -2\beta s(t) \left[ v_{mn}(t) - \left(1 - \frac{n}{m-1}\right) v_{m-1,n} \right] - \mu_0 v_{mn}(t) 
- \gamma(m-n-1) v_{m,n+1}(t) + 2\gamma \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} v_{i,n+1}(t) 
- n \left[ (k_{on}h(t) + k_{off} + \gamma) v_{mn}(t) - k_{on}h(t) v_{m,n-1}(t) \right].$$
(12)

This recurrence is 2nd order in n, so we see that it is ill-posed. We can argue 1 boundary condition without additional assumptions: since  $v_{m,n+1} \leq v_{mn}$  by construction, and prion aggregates biologically must have an upper size limit, we have  $\lim_{n\to\infty} v_{mn} = 0$ . We are now left to find 1 more condition to make the problem well-posed.

## 1.3 Approximation

We perform the same non-dimensionalization as in Equations (16a)-(16e), writing again  $\omega(t) = z(t)/\eta(t) - n_0$  and  $p(t) = z_b(t)/[z(t) - \eta(t)]$ :

$$s' = A_s(1-s) - Bs\eta + (n_0 - 1)n_0 \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,1}$$
(13)

$$h' = A_h(1-h) + r \left[ (\omega + n_0 - 1)(k_{-1}p - k_1h[1-p])\eta + (n_0 - 2)(n_0 - 1)\sum_{\substack{i=n_0\\(14)}}^{\infty} v_{i,2} \right]$$

$$\eta' = (-A_0 + p(\omega + n_0 - 1))\eta - 2(n_0 - 1)\sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,1}$$
(15)

$$\omega' = Bs - p(\omega + 1)\omega + (n_0 - 1)(2\omega + n_0) \left(\frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,1} - p\right)$$
(16)

$$p' = k_1 h(1-p) - k_{-1}p + p^2 - \frac{Bsp}{\omega + n_0 - 1} + \frac{(n_0 - 1)(n_0 - 2)}{p\eta(\omega + n_0 - 1)} \left( p \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,1} - \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,2} \right)$$
(17)

Written in this way, it becomes clear that enforcing  $\sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,n+1} = p \sum_{i=n_0}^{\infty} v_{i,n}$ will yield moment closure. Interpreting  $u_{ij}/\eta$  as a probability mass and (I, J)as a joint random variable modeling aggregate size and bound Hsp104, we write  $p = \mathbb{E}[J]/\mathbb{E}[I-1]$  and ultimately understand the nature of our approximation to be the validity of the approximations

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{J}{I-1}\right] \approx \frac{\mathbb{E}[J]}{\mathbb{E}[I-1]},\tag{18}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{J(J-1)}{(I-1)(I-2)}\right] \approx \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[J]}{\mathbb{E}[I-1]}\right)^2.$$
(19)

Consider the 2nd order Taylor expansion of an arbitrary function f(x, y) about  $(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ :

$$f(x,y) \approx f(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + (x-\bar{x})f_x(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + (y-\bar{y})f_y(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + \frac{1}{2} \left[ (x-\bar{x})^2 f_{xx}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + 2(x-\bar{x})(y-\bar{y})f_{xy}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + (y-\bar{y})^2 f_{yy}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \right]$$
(20)

Treating X and Y as random variables and  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  as their means, then

$$\mathbb{E}[f(X,Y)] \approx f(\bar{x},\bar{y}) + \frac{1}{2} \left( f_{xx}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \operatorname{Var}[X] + 2f_{xy}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \operatorname{Cov}[X,Y] + f_{yy}(\bar{x},\bar{y}) \operatorname{Var}[Y] \right)$$
(21)

In our case X = J,  $\bar{x} = z_b/\eta$ , and Y = I - 1,  $\bar{y} = z/\eta - 1$ . Let  $\bar{u} = z/\eta$ ; for Approximation (18), we have f(x, y) = x/y and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{J}{I-1}\right] = p + \frac{1}{\bar{u}^2} \left(p \operatorname{Var}[I-1] - \operatorname{Cov}[J, I-1]\right) + O(1/\bar{u}^3).$$
(22)

For Approximation (19), we have  $f(x,y) = \frac{x(x-1)}{y(y-1)}$  and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{J(J-1)}{(I-1)(I-2)}\right] = p^2 - \frac{p(1-p)}{\bar{u}} + \frac{\operatorname{Var}[J] - 4p\operatorname{Cov}[J,I-1] + 3p^2\operatorname{Var}[I-1] - 2p(1-p)}{\bar{u}^2} + O(1/\bar{u}^3).$$
(23)

Assuming the variances are dominated by the average aggregate size, we have error terms in the first approximation of  $O(1/\bar{u}^2)$  and  $O(1/\bar{u})$  in the second; when multiplied against the terms' coefficients, we obtain  $O(1/\bar{u}^2)$  in either case.