4 Collective dynamics in model biological membranes measured by neutron spin echo spectroscopy

Thermal fluctuations and mechanical properties in lipid bilayers

Abstract: Cell membranes are extraordinarily heterogeneous environments composed of many thousands of chemically distinct lipids, sterols, and proteins. It is this very complexity and diversity in membrane composition that allows for its many varied and critical biological functions. These membranes are rather thin, only 3 to 5 nm thick, and present both structural and dynamic features on a wide variety of length and timescales. Within the hierarchy of length and timescales, the membrane's mechanical properties control many of the key functions such as bilayer shape transformations, protein binding, budding, and molecular transport which in turn are related to such things as apoptosis, endocytosis, protein signaling, and drug delivery. In this chapter, we will review how the elastic properties of membranes control the membranes' dynamics by presenting experimental results obtained by means of neutron spin echo spectroscopy. Toward the end of the chapter, we will consider another interesting property, membrane viscosity, and discuss some future aspects and challenges.
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4.1 Introduction

The biological functions of lipid membranes require that they be highly dynamic. The hydrophobic tails rapidly flex and kink while the individual lipid molecules rotate, protrude, and diffuse on picosecond to nanosecond timescales [1, 2]. Biomembranes are also strikingly fluid with lipid diffusion coefficients on the order of $10^{-8}$ cm$^2$/s,

Elizabeth G. Kelley, NIST Center for Neutron Research, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, USA
Paul D. Butler, NIST Center for Neutron Research, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, USA; Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, USA; Department of Chemistry, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA
Michihiro Nagao, NIST Center for Neutron Research, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, USA; Center for Exploration of Energy and Matter, Department of Physics, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110544657-004
meaning a lipid molecule can diffuse across a typical cell length in less than 10 s [1, 4]. The fast local dynamics of the molecules allow the cell to easily manipulate the lateral membrane organization necessary for protein–protein interactions and cell signaling [5–7]. At the same time, the membrane must bend, bud, and fuse on much larger length scales as cells take in nutrients, send chemical signals, and even grow and divide [8, 9]. There is a large gap in length scale and timescale between the molecular and macroscopic processes that is bridged by the collective membrane dynamics shown in Figure 4.1. These mesoscale fluctuations involve tens to hundreds of lipids on the length scale of nm to µm and have their own role to play in the membrane’s biological functions.

Stochastic membrane fluctuations, such as collective bending and thickness fluctuations, lead to small local changes in the membrane shape. These fluctuations were first observed in red blood cell plasma membranes as early as 1890 [10], and more than 125 years of research has revealed that the membrane shape changes are the result of both active and equilibrium processes [11]. At high frequencies, the fluctuations are dominated by thermal excitations and are thought to play a role in preventing cell–cell adhesion and facilitate the diffusion of membrane-embedded proteins [12–17]. These same fluctuations affect membrane protein folding, channel formation, and function within the membrane [18–23], and play a significant role in cell adhesion [24–28], facilitating vesicle budding and trafficking [8, 19], and influencing cell spreading and motility [20–24]. Moreover, changes in membrane fluctuations have been directly linked to cell function and disease. Studies of macrophages show that the membranes are softer and have a greater fluctuation amplitude when the cells are activated, which likely aids in phagocytosis as the cells engulf foreign bodies [25, 34]. Changes in the fluctuation spectrum of red blood cell membranes also are seen after malaria and parasite infections [35, 36], as well as in sickle cell diseases [37–39], and studies suggest that cancer cells are softer than nonmalignant cells, which may contribute to the bleeding and migration of cancerous cells [40–42]. As such, measuring and quantifying the membrane fluctuations have important implications for understanding both biomembranes and cell functions.

This chapter focuses on measuring the equilibrium undulations in model lipid membranes, namely the mesoscale collective bending and thickness fluctuations, and how the measurements can be used to quantify the membrane elastic and viscous properties. Both of these dynamic processes are a direct consequence of the membrane being soft. As illustrated in Figure 4.1, the bending fluctuations are undulations normal to the membrane plane at a constant membrane thickness (often referred to as height fluctuations) [12, 43–45], while thickness fluctuations are undulations of the two membrane leaflets in opposite directions (sometimes referred to as peristaltic or breathing modes) [46–50]. The fluctuation length scales are dictated by the membrane elastic properties, or how resistant the membrane is to bending or compressing in solvent [51–53], the same properties that determine the energy required for the large-scale membrane deformations that occur in cell processes with macroscopic membrane remodeling. Meanwhile, the thickness fluctuation timescale will be determined by the membrane compressibility and how long it takes the lipids to flow as the membrane relaxes – or the membrane viscosity [53] – the same viscosity that dictates the timescales of molecular lipid and protein diffusion in the membrane that we talked about at the beginning of this chapter [14–57]. In other words, the collective fluctuations are governed by the same properties that influence the microscopic and macroscopic membrane functions, and measuring these dynamics gives us a way to quantify both the elastic and viscous properties that are essential to biological membrane functions.

While the mesoscale dynamics are an important bridge between the microscopic and macroscopic scales, accessing the length and timescales necessary to study the collective fluctuations can be experimentally challenging. Biological membranes are on the order of 5 nm thick, meaning we need to be able to resolve bending fluctuations on sub-nanometer scales. Similarly, theory and experiment suggest that thickness fluctuation amplitudes are on the order of 20% of the membrane thickness [47, 52,
58, 59) and estimates from the membrane viscosity tell us that these fluctuations should relax on nanosecond timescales [59]. These dynamics are too slow for traditional spectroscopic techniques such as NMR [2, 60–62], Raman [63–65], infrared [64, 66], dielectric [67], and EPR [68–70] that are sensitive to the motions of fatty acyl tails and the individual lipid molecules. On the other hand, the dynamical properties are too small and too fast for most light scattering and microscopy methods that are used to study large-scale dynamics and shape changes [36, 71–76]. As illustrated in Figure 4.1, neutron spectroscopy techniques cover a range of length scales and timescales that are hard to access with other characterization techniques and are therefore uniquely suitable for characterizing the collective membrane fluctuations. This chapter will focus on neutron spin echo (NSE) spectroscopy and how this technique can be used to measure the collective bending and thickness fluctuations to determine the membrane elastic and viscous properties.

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows: Section 4.2 presents the basics of neutron scattering and how NSE works. Section 4.3 covers the theoretical background necessary to correlate membrane dynamics with experimental NSE data. In Section 4.4, example NSE measurements of collective bending and thickness fluctuations are presented. A summary and current and future challenges close out the chapter in Section 4.5.

4.2 The NSE Technique

Neutrons are noncharged particles (neutron mass \(m_n = 1.67 \times 10^{-27}\) kg) [75] that have both particle and wave-like properties. A free neutron has momentum \(\vec{p} = \hbar \hat{q}\), where \(\hat{q}\) is the wavevector of the associated wave function and \(\hbar = h/2\pi\) with \(h\) as Planck’s constant. \(\hat{q}\) describes the propagation direction and speed of the wave with a magnitude \(|\hat{q}| = v = \nu_{\lambda}/\Lambda\), where \(\nu_{\lambda}\) is the velocity of the neutron and \(\Lambda\) is its wavelength. Typical neutron wavelengths range from 0.1 to 2 nm, which allows neutrons to probe structures as small as the lipids of a membrane. Neutron scattering also is an important tool for understanding nanoscale dynamics.

The neutron energy is given by \(E_n = \hbar^2 q^2 / 2m_n\) and is on the order of the thermal energy, \(k_BT \approx 10\) eV (1 MeV = 1.6 \(\times\) 10\(^{-13}\) eV), which is far smaller than typical bond energy, which is on the order of 10 eV [76, 77]. These techniques mostly measure the incoherent or “self” dynamics of the electron

between the relative positions of a given atom at different times – and are very useful for determining the diffusion of hydration water, lipids, and other small molecules embedded in lipid membranes [78–80].

Measuring collective membrane dynamics on the tens or hundreds of nanosecond timescales requires an instrument capable of measuring even smaller changes in neutron energy, also referred to as having a higher energy resolution. Measuring a relaxation time on the order of 100 ns requires resolving a change in neutron energy of \(\approx 10^{-4}\) eV, which is currently only achievable using NSE, the highest energy resolution neutron spectroscopy technique [85]. NSE is capable of measuring these really small energy changes because it operates using fundamentally different principles from other spectrometers as we discuss in more detail in Section 4.2.3. Another important difference is that NSE is most suited to measuring the coherent dynamics – dynamics that originate from correlations between relative positions of different atoms at different times – or the exact collective dynamics we are interested in measuring in lipid membranes.

4.2.1 Basics of neutron scattering

A basic scheme of a scattering experiment is shown in Figure 4.2. Consider a neutron beam characterized by its wavevector \(\vec{q}\). If the initial wave vector \(\vec{q}_i\) interacts with a nucleus and scatters, then the final wave will have a different wavevector \(\vec{q}_f\). Here, we can define the momentum transfer as

\[
\Delta \vec{q} = \vec{q}_f - \vec{q}_i
\]

Figure 4.2: Schematic of the geometry of a scattering experiment. The initial neutron wave is characterized by its wavevector \(\vec{q}_i\) and energy \(E_i\). The initial wave interacts with the object and is scattered into scattering angle \(\theta\). The final neutron is characterized by its wavevector \(\vec{q}_f\) and energy \(E_f\). The scattering vector \(\vec{Q}\) is expressed as \(\vec{Q} = \vec{q}_f - \vec{q}_i\), and the energy exchanged is \(\Delta E = E_f - E_i\).
\[ h \nu = E_1 - E_2 - \frac{h^2}{2m} (\vec{q} - \vec{q}') \]  

Equations (4.1) and (4.2) express the momentum and energy conservation of the scattering process, respectively. Here, we consider the magnitude of \( \vec{Q} \) by defining the angle between \( \vec{q} \) and \( \vec{q}' \) as the scattering angle, \( \theta \), and applying \( q \approx q' \) (\( h \nu \approx 0 \) i.e., small energy transfer) as

\[ |q| = Q = 2q \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) = \frac{\lambda n \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})}{\lambda} \]  

In the case of a perfectly ordered system, Bragg’s law states that constructive interference will occur when \( 2d \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) = n \lambda \), where \( d \) is the spacing between scattering planes and \( n \) is an integer. For such systems, \( Q \) is simply given as \( Q = 2n/d \), demonstrating the inverse relationship between the length along the sample and the \( Q \) at which those length scales significantly impact the scattering. In other words, large length scales are associated with small \( Q \) values and vice versa. The primary aim of neutron scattering is to determine the probability of neutrons being scattered in \( \vec{Q} \) with energy transfer \( \hbar \omega \), known as the dynamic structure factor \( S(\vec{Q}, \omega) \). The Fourier transform of \( S(\vec{Q}, \omega) \) with respect to \( \omega \) is called the intermediate scattering function (ISF), \( I(\vec{q}, t) \), which can be written as

\[ S(\vec{Q}, \omega) = \mathcal{F}^{-1} \{ I(\vec{q}, t) \} \]  

\[ I(\vec{q}, t) = \langle \exp \left[ -i \vec{Q} \cdot (\vec{r}(t) - \vec{r}(0)) \right] \rangle \]  

where \langle \cdot \cdot \cdot \rangle indicates an ensemble average over all pairs of atoms, \( t \) is the time, and \( \vec{r} \) and \( \vec{r}' \) are position vectors for the atoms, respectively.

In a static elastic scattering experiment such as small-angle neutron scattering (SANS), we ignore the energy exchange between the neutrons and our samples and integrate the scattering over all neutron energies,

\[ S(\vec{Q}) = \int S(\vec{Q}, \omega) d\omega \]  

which corresponds to the Fourier transform of the instantaneous spatial atomic correlations in the system, that is, the structure of our sample. For the rest of the chapter, we only consider isotropic scattering cases for simplicity and treat the vector \( \vec{Q} \) as a scalar \( Q \). Measuring the membrane structure requires counting the number of neutrons scattered at angle \( \theta \) or corresponding \( Q \).

### 4.2.2 Inelastic/quasi-elastic scattering techniques

Measuring the dynamic structure factor, \( S(\vec{Q}, \omega) \), requires keeping track of the energy exchanged between the neutrons and the sample (\( \omega \)) as these are scattered at a constant angle \( \theta \). For corresponding \( Q \), this type of measurement is called inelastic or quasi-elastic neutron scattering. Information on the dynamic length scales is given by \( \omega \), and more information on the energy scales is given by \( Q \). Neutron spectrometers determine the energy exchanged by analyzing the initial and final neutron energies. Therefore, in order to achieve higher energy resolution, narrow bandwidth \( \Delta \lambda/\lambda \) or \( \Delta \omega/\omega \) of the initial neutron beam is required. The need for a narrow wavelength distribution is driven by the high energy resolution needed to measure relaxation processes on the order of 100 ns would be impossible because of poor counting statistics. Ferenc Mezei, who invented the NSE principle in 1972 [85], illustrates the severity of this limitation in the first text book on NSE [86]. According to his estimates, achieving an energy resolution of \( 50 \text{ keV} \) on an ideal hypothetical time of flight instrument would not count more than one neutron a day in the detector, which means it would take literally years to get any useful information on the sample dynamics. As explained below, his proposed NSE technique broke through this limitation and significantly improved the energy resolution by eliminating the requirement for a narrow \( \Delta \lambda/\lambda \).

### 4.2.3 Characteristics of the NSE technique

Currently, the best NSE instrument in the world (IN15 in Grenoble, France) has an energy resolution of a few neV (or a few \( \mu \)) while using a wavelength distribution \( \Delta \lambda/\lambda \) in the order of 10% [87], ensuring sufficient neutron flux to perform the scattering experiments. There are a handful of NSE instruments in operation around the world [86–91], with more under construction [96]. There are two spectrometers in North America: the SNS-NSE at Oak Ridge National Laboratory [95] and the NGA-NSE (formerly NGS-NSE) at the National Institute of Standards and Technology [91]. The NGA-NSE is a reactor-based instrument while the SNS-NSE is at a spallation neutron source. The instrument design and operation for reactor versus spallation sources are slightly different due to the differences in the neutron source; however, both instruments operate on the same basic principles outlined below. We note that the quantum mechanical description and details of NSE instrumentation are beyond the scope of this chapter, and we instead refer the interested reader to a textbook on NSE [92] as well as publications on specific spectrometers [97, 98] for more information.

NSE measures dynamics by taking advantage of the fact that neutrons have a spin. Although a neutron has no net charge, it has a spin degree of freedom of \( \frac{1}{2} \), which gives the neutron a magnetic moment. The NSE technique uses polarized neutrons, meaning only one state of the neutron spin is selected from the initial neutron beam.
That polarized beam then passes through a variety of magnetic fields as it traverses the instrument, through the sample and onto the detector. The trick to NSE's high energy resolution is to make use of the Larmor precession of the neutron spin in a magnetic field to provide each neutron with an "internal" clock with which to track any change in neutron velocity (or equivalently energy, $E = mc^2/2$) [85, 86, 92]. When the neutron spin direction is parallel to a magnetic field, the polarization of the spin state is maintained. On the other hand, when the neutron spin is perpendicular to the magnetic field, the spin starts to rotate around the magnetic field (called Larmor precession), shown schematically in Figure 4.3b. The neutron spins will precess with a frequency, $\omega = \gamma B$, which is the Larmor constant for a neutron and $B$ is the average field strength, and the precession angle is proportional to the time the neutron spends in the magnetic field: $\phi = \omega t = \omega t_0/v = \theta$ where $l$ is the length of the field. Larmor precession is the same process that is key to NMR (for nuclear spin of various kinds of nuclei) and EPR (for electron spins) spectroscopic techniques that are also used to measure membrane dynamics [61, 92].

In NSE, information about the initial velocity is encoded within the neutron itself through Larmor precession, and the initial velocity can be compared with the final velocity for the same neutron. Figure 4.3a shows a layout of aNSE instrument. The basic idea is the following: The incident neutron wavelength and wavelength distribution are defined using a neutron velocity selector (NVS). The beam is then polarized by passing the neutrons through a polarizer (P) to select one state of neutron spins. The polarized neutrons are then flipped perpendicular to the magnetic field by a so called $\pi/2$-flipper ($\pi/2$-F). The precession frequency is controlled by a magnetic field within the main precession coil along the flight path from the $\pi/2$-flipper to the sample detector (P-1-PC). The neutrons pass through a second precession field (2-PC). A second $\pi/2$-flipper (2-PC) stops the precession and the beam passes through a spin analyzer (A) and hits the detector (D). The spin analyzer only allows the cosine probability of the neutron spin direction parallel to the magnetic field to pass through to the detector. Figure 4.3c shows the neutron intensity $I_0$ transmitted through the analyzer with the angle between the magnetic field and the neutron spin defined as $\phi$, the net change in precession angle after passing through the two precession fields. In this case, $I_0$ can be written as $I_0 = \langle 1 - \cos \phi \rangle/2$. If the sample scatters elastically, that is, $h\nu = 0$, then there is no net change in neutron spin after passing through both precession fields and the initial polarization is recovered, therefore $\phi = 0$ and $I_0 = I$. (Figure 4.3a). The precession angles in the primary (1-PC) and secondary (2-PC) paths are only different when the symmetry is distorted because of a change in the neutron velocity after interacting with the sample, that is, the neutrons scatter quasi-elastically, and both $\phi = 0$ and $h\nu = 0$. In this case, the final spin polarization is rotated by an angle $\phi$ from the initial polarization leading to a decrease in the measured intensity, $I_0$, at the detector. Using this set-up unique to NSE, it is possible to make extremely accurate measurements of the energy change during the scattering process, and therefore to design a spectrometer with high resolution.

The reason NSE can use a relatively broad wavelength distribution and still provide a high energy resolution is because the energy resolution of the neutrons (determined by the distribution of velocity $v_0$ or wavelength $\lambda$) is decoupled from the resolution of the energy transfer with the sample (determined by measuring the change in each neutron's polarization). This characteristic allows NSE to be the highest energy resolution technique among neutron spectrometers with good counting statistics within a realistic experimental time. Furthermore, the measured neutron intensity can be written as $I = \langle S(Q, \omega) \cos(\omega) \rangle d\omega$ because the spin analyzer only allows the cosine probability of the neutron spin direction (1a) to pass through to the detector. This equation is a cosine Fourier transformation of $S(Q, \omega)$, equivalent to $\langle Q \cdot (\hat{u} \cdot \hat{v}) \rangle$, meaning NSE automatically provides results in the time domain, while all the other neutron spectrometers work in the energy domain (see eqs. (4.4) and (4.5)). Because NSE works in the time domain, it is best suited to measuring relaxation processes (quasi-elastic scattering) rather than excitation processes (inelastic scattering).
scattering). In NSE, we define the Fourier time as \( t = 2\pi n y \) (eq. 1), where \( J \) is the magnetic field \((B)\) integral along the neutron trajectory, \( J = \int B dt \).

Figure 4.4a shows a schematic image of \( I(Q,t) \) measured in a scattering experiment. Figure 4.4a shows the correlation function (scattering intensity \( I(Q,t) \)) with respect to space \((Q)\) and time \((t)\). NSE measures the normalized ISF \( I(Q,t)I(Q,0) \), which is used to describe the Q-dependent time correlation function as shown in Figure 4.4b.

![Figure 4.4a](image)

**Figure 4.4a** A typical example of \( I(Q,t) \) in (a) three-dimensional representation as \( Q \) and \( t \) dependence of \( I(Q,t)I(Q,0) \) in (b) representation of the normalized intermediate scattering function \( I(Q,t)/I(Q,0) \) at \( t = 0 \). The \( I(Q,0) \) corresponds to the Fourier transform of the instantaneous spatial atomic correlations, its, structure, and the time decay \( I(Q,t) \) corresponds to how fast the structural correlation is lost with time at the corresponding length scale \( Q \).

### 4.3 Membrane dynamics theory

Membranes in solutions have very large interfacial area. When 0.01 mol of surfactant are dispersed in a liter of water (corresponding to a mole fraction of 10 mmol/L), the total interfacial area of the self-assembled bilayers is in the order of \( 10^2 \) nm², or roughly the size of a football pitch, in just 11 of water. (A typical head area per molecule is \( \approx 0.7 \) nm² while the bilayer thickness is on the order of nm). Therefore, interfacial energy plays a decisive role in determining the shape of the membranes.

The framework for understanding the curvature elasticity of lipid bilayers was established in a seminal paper by Helfrich in 1973 [12]. Because the bilayer is thin and governed by the interfacial energy, he assumed that the bilayer was infinitely thin and wrote the bending energy as what has become known as the Helfrich Hamiltonian.

\[
F = \frac{dA}{2} \left[ C_1 g + C_2 g^3 + C_5 g s \right] \tag{4.7}
\]

where \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) are the two principal curvatures of a membrane, \( C_5 \) is the spontaneous curvature, \( k \) is the bilayer bending modulus, and \( g \) is the saddle-splay modulus, respectively, and the integration is over the area \( A \). The Gauss–Bonnet theorem can be applied to the second term of eq. (4.7) as \( \iint C_1 C_2 dA = 4\pi \). The saddle-splay modulus \( k \) is sensitive to topological changes of the membrane. However, in NSE experiments, the membrane topology does not change and this term is almost constant. Also, if the lipid membrane is fluid and there are no long-range interactions present, a special surface within the bilayer can be defined such that \( k = 0 \) [34, 45], which further supports that the second term in the Helfrich Hamiltonian can be neglected in certain cases.

The interfacial energy also contains a contribution from the elastic energy required to stretch the membrane (which originate from the membrane tension) and is written as a function of the relative area change \( \delta A/A \). However, an area change requires a large compression energy, particularly for short wavelengths, which implies that the surface tension is zero for free unretarded membranes [44, 99]. Further, in order to assume that the interfacial tension is finite, the area change in the membrane must be compensated for by either adding or removing lipid from the bilayer, meaning where there would need to be a reservoir of lipid molecules [100]. Technically, there is a very low concentration of free lipids present in the solution and the bilayer can exchange lipid molecules with the solvent; however, the timescales for lipid exchange are orders of magnitude slower than the timescales of the membrane fluctuations and the lipid exchange cannot compensate for the area changes due to the membrane bending [12]. Early work by Fascoli et al. included a stretching contribution when analyzing the thermal undulations of giant unilamellar vesicles (GUUV, typical sizes on the order of \( \mu m \)) that were measured using an imaging technique [71]. From their analysis, the estimated surface tension was on the order of \( 10^{-5} \) N/m. However, later work by Yeung and Evans suggested that the dynamics measured by Fascoli et al. could also be explained by taking an internal membrane friction into account [101], which will be explained later in Section 4.3.2.

The description of the membrane interfacial energy according to the Helfrich Hamiltonian is an essential starting point to understanding membrane bending dynamics, but the model neglects any change in membrane thickness or internal membrane structure. As we have learned more about the structure and dynamics of lipid bilayers, the models for the membrane deformation energy have also evolved to take into consideration many other contributions. As suggested above, Yeung and Evans and several others have proposed that lipid membrane undulations are affected by an internal membrane friction – a result of the membrane being composed of two monolayers as will be discussed more in Section 4.3.2 [53, 101–103]. In some membranes, the lipid molecules are also tilted with respect to the membrane normal [104, 105]. This
molecular tilt is neglected in Helfrich's original free energy expression [12], but more recent studies have shown that the membrane internal structure does contribute to the membrane energy through a molecular tilt modulus [106--112].

In the following subsections, we describe the theory for the membrane dynamics, as it applies to NSE measurements. The models for NSE data build in complexity with each subsequent subsection as the theory evolves and more details of the membrane structure are considered.

### 4.3.1 Single membrane fluctuation dynamics and intermediate scattering function

Because this chapter is about studying lipid bilayer dynamics with NSE, we start with a model for the \( I(Q,t) \) (which directly measure with NSE, see Section 4.2.3) based on the Helfrich bending Hamiltonian that was derived by Zilman and Granački [20] [99, 113]. At short time, \( t \), and length, \( L \), scales (\( t \ll 1 \mu s \) and \( L \ll L \) a long length scale cutoff), most membranes can be treated as an assembly of independent and nearly flat membrane sheets. The length scale \( L \) depends on the experimental system studied and is defined as the plakette linear size, which is considered as the pore size in a sponge phase, the Helfrich–Serruys patch size (corresponding to the intermembrane collision length) in a lamellar phase, or the vesicle radius.

#### 4.3.1.1 Single membrane fluctuation dynamics – Zilman and uranak approach

When a nearly flat thin elastic sheet is thermally undulating at a height, \( h(\tau) \), from a mean surface as illustrated in figure 4.5, the Helfrich bending Hamiltonian is proportional to the square of the curvature and takes the following form [99, 113]

\[
F = \frac{k}{2} \sum \left[ \frac{d^2 h(\tau)}{d x^2} \right]^2
\]

(4.8)

Here, \( F \) is a two-dimensional vector \((x, y)\) on the planar surface and \( h(\tau) \) is the local height of the surface (by definition \( h(x, y) = 0 \)). As discussed earlier, the spontaneous curvature of the bilayer is assumed to be zero. The second equality expresses the Hamiltonian in terms of Fourier modes, where \( h = \int d^2 \mathbf{r} h(\mathbf{r}) e^{i \mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} \) is the two-dimensional Fourier transform of \( h \). We note here that different community have different notations. In this chapter, we are using \( \mathbf{q} \) rather than \( \hat{q} \) to denote the Fourier component of the membrane fluctuations and use \( \hat{q} \) and \( \hat{Q} \) to denote the wavevector and the scattering (or momentum transfer) vector, respectively, as defined in the previous section on scattering. \( L \) is the membrane patch size, where we consider the dynamics of a membrane plaquette. The membrane is suspended in aqueous solvent with solvent viscosity, \( \eta \), and performs thermal undulations that are coupled to the hydrodynamic flow of the solvent. Applying the equlibration theorem to eq. (4.6) leads to the following expression for the equilibrium spectrum of undulations [114]

\[
(h(0) = k_B T/\alpha^2)
\]

(4.9)

The time-dependent correlation function of \( h(\tau) \) thus follows an exponential decay from its equilibrium value [114]

\[
(h(\tau)/h(0)) = e^{-\omega_0 \tau}
\]

(4.10)

The relaxation frequency \( \omega(k) \) can be determined from a standard hydrodynamic mode analysis [113–116]

\[
\omega(k) = k_B T/\eta^2
\]

(4.11)

In order to calculate \( I(Q,t) \), it is important to first calculate the two-point correlation function \( \langle (h(\mathbf{r}, t) - h(\mathbf{r}, 0))^2 \rangle \). The two-point correlation function can be determined using either a Langevin equation for the undulating bilayers in viscous solvent [99, 113] or the stochastic field approach [114]. Both approaches give the correlation function as

\[
\langle (h(\mathbf{r}, t) - h(\mathbf{r}, 0))^2 \rangle = k_B T/2n_{\sigma} \sum_{n=0}^{d_0} \frac{d q}{4 \pi (1 - e^{-\omega_0 nx})}
\]

(4.12)

where \( d_0 \) represents the size of a lipid molecule (molecular length). At \( t = n t_{\sigma} \) (very short timescales), the calculation yields the simple diffusion of the monomers.
For \( t > n t^2 / x \) (long times), the integral saturates to a constant and the correlation has decayed. In the intermediate time range \( n t^2 / x < t < n t^2 / \lambda \), the lower and upper limits of the integration are replaced by zero and infinity, and the integration evaluates to [99, 113, 114]

\[
\langle h(t, t) - h(t', 0) \rangle^2 \approx 0.17 \left( \frac{n k_B T}{x} \right)^{1/3} \tag{4.13}
\]

The above equation indicates that the membrane plateau dynamics exhibit an anomalous \( r^3 \) time dependence and that the mean square displacement \( \langle h(t)^2 \rangle \) follows \( e^{-r^2} \).

### 4.3.3.2 Intermediate scattering function

Now that we have a theoretical expression for the equilibrium height fluctuations — or correlations between the membrane heights as a function of time — that we can measure with NSE, we need to incorporate eq. (4.13) into \( I(Q, t) \) to be able to fit experimental data. Considering a system containing a membrane plateau, \( p \), with a bilayer size of \( L = L_x \), the \( I(Q, t) \) of the system is given by [99]

\[
I(Q, t) = \frac{N_p}{V} \sum \phi(\eta_p - \eta(0)) \langle h(\eta_p - \eta(0)) \rangle \tag{4.14}
\]

where \( \eta_p \) is the center of mass position of the plateau \( p \), \( N_p \) is the number of molecules in a single plateau, and \( V \) is the macroscopic system volume. The simple plateau ISF is [99, 113]

\[
I_p(Q, t) = \int \delta(\eta - \eta(0)) \tag{4.15}
\]

where \( \delta \) is the position vector of the \( i \)th lipid molecule in the center of mass coordinate frame and the sum runs over all molecules in a single plateau.

The plateau can also undergo simple diffusion, and in that case, the normalized ISF decays by contributions from both the diffusion and the membrane undulations as [117]

\[
\frac{I(Q, t)}{I(Q, 0)} = e^{-D t} \langle h^{2}(Q, t) \rangle_0 \quad \langle h^{2}(Q, 0) \rangle_0 \tag{4.16}
\]

where \( D \) is the center of mass diffusion constant of the patch, and the bracket indicates the average over all scattering angles (orientational average). For vesicles with \( \approx 50 \) nm radius, the diffusion constant from the Stokes–Einstein equation is on the order of \( 10^{-13} \) m²/s. Therefore, for \( t < n t^2 / \lambda \), translational diffusion has a negligible effect \( e^{-n t^2 / \lambda} \approx 1 \) and \( \langle h(t, t) \rangle \) will be determined solely by individual membrane undulations. For the rest of this section, we will focus our attention on the plateau undulations, neglecting contributions from translational diffusion.

However, it is important to note that this simplification is not always possible. Depending on the vesicle size and concentration in the sample as well as \( \eta \) and the Fourier times accessed in a particular experiment, the translational diffusion contribution to \( I(Q, t) \) may need to be taken into account.

The internal position vector \( \vec{R}(t) \) is now expressed in terms of the longitudinal two-dimensional vector \( \vec{r} \) and the transverse component \( h(\vec{r}, t) \), and therefore, we can rewrite eq. (4.15) using a double integral as follows [99, 113]

\[
I_p(Q, t) = \frac{1}{N_p f(t)} \int d\vec{r} \int d\vec{r} \langle \phi(\eta_p - \eta(0)) \phi(\eta(0) - \eta(0)) \rangle \tag{4.17}
\]

where the scattering vector \( \vec{Q} \) is decomposed into two component vectors: a longitudinal in-plane component, \( \vec{Q} \), and a perpendicular component \( Q_z \). The membrane undulations are implicitly assumed to be small. Since \( h(\vec{r}, t) \) and \( \vec{r} \) are weakly correlated, we assume that their averages can be decoupled. In the present treatment, the white noise appearing in the linear Langevin equation follows Gaussian statistics [99, 111, 114], which supports that we can assume that the statistics of \( h(\vec{r}, t) \) are also Gaussian [118]. This assumption relates the height fluctuations with the two-point correlation function, eq. (4.13), as follows [99, 117]

\[
\langle \phi(\eta(0) - \eta(0)) \rangle_0 = \frac{2}{3} \langle \eta(0) \rangle_0^2 \tag{4.18}
\]

Note this expression is for a defined orientation while most lipid membrane samples are randomly oriented in solution. In order to apply the equation to isotropic structures, such as sponge, nonoriented lamellar, and vesicle structures, one needs to take the orientational average over all values of the angle between \( \vec{Q} \) and the membrane normal, as [117]

\[
I(Q, t) = \frac{I_p(Q, t)}{Q^2} = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \int_0^{\pi} \sin\alpha d\alpha \langle h(\vec{Q}, t) \rangle_0 \tag{4.19}
\]

The angles \( \alpha \) and \( \phi \) are defined in Figure 4.5. This average is assumed to be dominated by the region at \( \phi = 0 \) (Q = 0 and \( Q_z = 0 \)) [113, 117]. At the limit of \( \eta > k_B T \), the solution to the integral is approximated as a pure stretched exponential decay [99, 113, 117, 119]

\[
\frac{I(Q, t)}{I(Q, 0)} = e^{-\eta k_B T} \tag{4.20}
\]

where the decay rate \( \Gamma_{2D} \) is
We now have a series of equations that relates the membrane bending modulus to the collective height fluctuations that are experimentally measured with \( I(Q)/I(Q, Q) \) – meaning we can quantify a membrane elastic property from our NSF measurement. In the original work, eq. (4.22) contained the intrinsic bending modulus, \( \kappa \). Here, we replace \( \kappa \) with \( \kappa_0 \) because, as we will see in Section 4.3.2, eq. (4.22) will only describe the intrinsic bending modulus in certain cases. Nevertheless, eq. (4.22) establishes that the measured decay rate is inversely related to the bending modulus and the expression given the trends that you might intuitively expect – a stiff membrane with a large \( \kappa \) will have a lower decay rate and the measured correlations in \( I(Q, Q) \) will decay slower than a softer membrane with a lower \( \kappa \).

It is noted here that both the transverse and longitudinal contributions to the scattering have been calculated by Zimmam and Gratte [99]. These calculations support that the longitudinal contribution is weak and the above description for only the transverse component is a good approximation for isotropically distributed bilayers as long as \( \kappa > k_BT \). For works that consider the longitudinal, in-plane contribution to the dynamics in aligned lipid bilayers, we refer the reader to works by Rhee et al. and colleagues [81, 100].

4.3.2 Internal membrane dissipation - two coupled monolayers

We just saw how the Helfrich model of the membrane as a thin, structureless sheet can be applied to NSF data analysis. However, we know that the lipid membrane is not structureless, but is in fact composed of two lipid monolayers. If there were no interactions between the monolayers, then they would be free to slide past each other. However, for the bilayer to be stable, the monolayers need to interact with each other through van der Waals interactions between the lipid tails. Yeung and Evans suggest that this interaction could lead to "hidden" degrees of freedom in the bilayer bending dynamics due to an internal viscous contribution [101].

A similar idea was also proposed by Seifert and Langer (SL), where by incorporating the effects of potential density variations in each leaflet due to the bending deformations, they suggested that a viscous mode contributed to the membrane fluctuations [102, 103]. For long wavelengths, as represented schematically in Figure 4.6a, bending fluctuations do not significantly perturb the lipid monolayer densities and the standard hydrodynamic theory holds. On the other hand, short fluctuation wavelengths, as depicted in Figure 4.6b, create defects due to the fact that the molecular redistribution required by the perturbation cannot happen quickly enough. As a result, the short wavelength fluctuations are governed by an effective bending rigidity that is higher than the intrinsic bending modulus that controls the long wavelength fluctuations (i.e., the short wavelength fluctuations require more energy than the long wavelength fluctuations). In order to mathematically express these physical effects, Seifert and Langer included a contribution from density modes in each monolayer to the free energy as [102, 103]

\[
F = \int d\mathbf{x} \left\{ \frac{\kappa}{2} \left( \frac{\partial H}{\partial \mathbf{r}} \right)^2 + \frac{\kappa_0}{2} \left( \rho_{\alpha}^2 + 2d\mathbf{H}^2 + \rho_{\beta}^2 - 2d\mathbf{H}^2 \right) \right\} \tag{4.22}
\]

where the mean curvature \( H \) has the relation \( 2H = C_1 + C_2, \), \( K_0 \) denotes the monolayer area compressibility modulus, \( \rho_{\alpha}^2 \) is the scaled deviation of the projected density from its equilibrium value for a flat membrane, and \( d_\alpha \) is defined as the distance between the mid-plane of the bilayer and the neutral surface of a monolayer. The neutral surface in eq. (4.22) is a special dividing surface where the monolayer neither stretches nor compresses as it is bent [45]. This mathematical definition greatly simplifies the expressions for the bilayer free energy; however, it cannot be measured experimentally making it difficult to assign a numerical value for \( d_\alpha \) as we will revisit later in Section 4.4.

The relaxation frequencies for this free energy model are given as follows [102, 103]

\[
\omega_1(k) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\kappa}{k^2}, & k < k_1 \\
\frac{\kappa_0}{k^2}, & k_1 < k < k_2 \\
\frac{\kappa_0}{k}, & k > k_2
\end{array} \right. \tag{4.23}
\]

\[
\omega_2(k) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\kappa_0}{k^2}, & k < k_1 \\
\frac{\kappa_0}{k}, & k_1 < k < k_2 \\
\frac{\kappa}{k^2}, & k > k_2
\end{array} \right. \tag{4.24}
\]

where \( \kappa = 2d\mathbf{H}^2 \kappa_0 \) is a renormalized bending rigidity including the effect of the elastic stretching and compression, \( d \) denotes a friction coefficient for a phenomenological internal dissipation, and \( \tan \) is the monolayer surface viscosity, \( \kappa_0 \) now
accounts for the extra energy required to bend the membrane at short wavelengths. The crossover wavevectors \( k_B = B_0 \omega_0 / \xi_0 \) and \( k_c = \sqrt{2k_B\omega_0} \) separate the range of the characteristic dynamics into three regimes, shown in the plot of dispersion relations in Figure 4.7.
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Figure 4.7: Comparison of the dispersion relations from the theories explained in this Section 4.3. The result for Helrich is the solution of a standard hydrodynamic mode analysis (eq. (A.13)) shown as \( \omega(k) \), and the modification of Watson and Brown (WB) gives \( \omega(k) \). The theory by Sellitto and Langer (SU) has two eigenvalues, \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) (eqs. (4.23) and (4.24)). The model by Bingham, Snye, and Dimles (BSO) gives three independent eigenvalues, \( \omega_1, \omega_2, \) and \( \omega_3 \) which are expressed in eqs. (4.34) to (4.36). \( \omega(k) \) is not shown at high k values where the Stokes approximation breaks down, \( k > \xi_0 \). The arrows at the bottom of the graph show the relevant length scales for the different theories. The parameters used in the calculation are given in the main text (see Section 6.3.4).

For long wavelength undulations (small \( k \)), \( \omega(k) \) corresponds to the usual hydrodynamically damped bending mode and thus overlaps with \( \omega(k) \) predicted by the Helrich theory. \( \omega(k) \) is the damping rate of the slipping mode (density difference fluctuations between the monolayers that is damped by the inter-monolayer friction). For \( k < k_l \) (short wavelength undulations), \( \omega(k) \) becomes the damping rate of the bending mode which is affected by the density mode because the lipid densities cannot respond quickly enough to changes in the membrane shape. Thus, an effectively larger bending rigidity \( k_l \) dominates the fluctuations. In this regime, the rate \( \omega(k) \) is determined by the slipping mode. At the second crossover \( k_c \), the main dissipative mechanism changes from inter-monolayer friction (\( k < k_c \); slipping) to monolayer surface viscosity (\( k_c < k \); membrane hydrodynamics).

The dynamic undulation correlation function can be expressed as the sum of two decaying components as [101, 121–122]

\[
\langle \eta(t)\eta(0) \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{k_B^2} \left( A_1(k)e^{-\omega_1/k_B} + A_2(k)e^{-\omega_2/k_B} \right)
\]

(4.25)

where \( A_1(k) + A_2(k) = 1 \) and

\[
A_1(k) = \frac{\omega_1(k) - k_B^2/k_B}{\omega_1(k) - \omega_2(k)}
\]

(4.26)

A molecular dynamics simulation of a coarse-grained bilayer model has shown good agreement with this theory [123], and NSE data have provided evidence of the slipping mode in liquid bilayers [126, 128].

The ZG theory covered in Section 6.3.2 [99, 110] does not include these internal dissipation mechanisms, and as suggested earlier, eq. (4.21) will work for measurements of long wavelength fluctuations measured with dynamic light scattering (DLS), at small scattering vector \( Q \) that are not affected by the internal membrane friction [126]. NSE measures the short wavelength fluctuations (large \( Q \)), where theory predicts that the inter-monolayer friction affects the dynamics. Early NSE measurements of lipid membrane bending fluctuations reported a much higher bending modulus than measured with other techniques [127–130]. These works used an effectively larger solvent viscosity (three to four times the actual solvent viscosity) as an additional dissipation mechanism to get \( k_B T \) values that were comparable to other experimental techniques [127–130]; however, from the theories described above, we now know that the additional dissipation mechanism comes not from the solvent, but from the inter-monomer friction within the bilayer itself.

There are two ways to include the contribution from the density mode into NSE data analyses; one proposed by Watson and Brown (WB) [117, 119] and the other by the group of Morcom [126, 128]. We note here that, as alluded to in the previous section, the ZG theory has another limitation in that it does not properly account for the orientational averaging in the case when \( k_B T > 0 \) does not hold. However, this point is beyond the scope of this chapter and we encourage interested readers to refer to [131–134].

In the WB theory, they proposed a modification of the ZG theory to include contributions from the internal membrane friction into the NSE data analysis [117, 119]. Since the NSE timescale is relatively short, the energy dissipation from the surface viscosity is too slow to observe \( \omega_1(k) \) from the 3L theory. Therefore, one can assume that the decay in the NSE time window is solely due to the bending modes and dominated by \( \omega_0 \) [117], and eq. (4.21) becomes

\[
\langle \eta(t)\eta(0) \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{k_B^2} \left( \frac{\omega_1(k)}{k_B^2} (1 - e^{-k_B^2/k_B^2}) \right)
\]

(4.27)

We see that this correlation function is almost the same as the one presented in Section 6.3.2 for the ZG theory (eqs. (4.10) and (4.12)) except that we need to replace \( x \)
with $k$. Therefore, all the derivations described in Section 4.3.1 still hold, and the decay follows the stretched exponential function derived by Zilman and Granek. The only modification is to the expression for the relaxation rate, which now includes the effective bending modulus and becomes

$$\tau_{\text{relax}} = \frac{k_BT}{kT} \frac{k_BT}{\eta} Q^2$$

(4.20)

again with $\kappa = 2 \nu k_BT$ [117, 119]. This modification by Watson and Brown [117, 119], to include the internal membrane friction due to the inter-monomer coupling, thus describes short wavelength membrane dynamics more accurately. This model was first applied to NSE data by Choi and colleagues [135], and gave a realistic number for $\kappa$, which supports the validity of the theory to explain short wavelength bending fluctuations without needing to use an effective solvent viscosity.

On the other hand, Arrigati et al. observed a deviation from the predicted $Q^2$ behavior of the relaxation rates measured by NSE (see e.g., eq. (4.26)). Instead, their data suggested a diffusive type $Q^2$ behavior for palmitoyl-oleoyl-phosphatidylcholine (POPC) large unilamellar vesicles [126]. They ascribed the origin of this deviation to hybrid curvature-compression modes, equivalent to the models of inter-monomer friction discussed in this section. They observed a crossover of $\gamma$ from $Q^2$ at $Q \approx 0.4 \text{ nm}^{-1}$, where at low $Q$ the usual bending type $Q^2$ relation is seen, while at high $Q$ the dynamics scale with $Q^2$. Their observation yielded $\kappa_0 = 80 \text{ mN/m}$, $b = 2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ Pa s/m}$, and $k = 15 k_BT$. Interestingly, the inter-monomer friction constant $b$ increased upon addition of cholesterol [124], Meil and colleagues developed an expression for the ISF that includes the hybrid mode as [125]

$$b_{ISF}(Q, t) = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \nu k_BT Q^2 b}$$

(4.99)

where $R$ is the radius of the vesicles. They showed that both the bending and hybrid modes contribute to the measured NSE data, while theory predicts that the hybrid mode dominates at high $Q$. As $b_{ISF}(Q, t)$ goes as $\exp(-t^2)$, the hybrid mode is a non-decaying contribution seen at longer times. These examples suggest that NSE is sensitive to the internal membrane dynamical contributions and a careful evaluation of the theoretical underpinnings is essential to correctly interpret the data.

### 4.3.3 Dynamics of “thick” membranes

The original theory by Heitrich ignored any energetic contributions from the membrane structure [12]. While Yeung and Evans [101, 136] and Seifert and Langer [102, 103] successfully included inter-monomer coupling as an additional dissipation mechanism in membranes, the models still neglect potential changes in the bilayer thickness, even though thickness fluctuations in lipid bilayers have been theoretically predicted since the 1980s [19, 20, 46-48]. Computer simulations also have captured membrane thickness fluctuations [52, 108, 137-141]. Experimentally, the first direct observation of thickness fluctuations in surfactant membranes was made by Farago and colleagues in a stacked lamellar membrane [142, 143], and later more detailed experiments and analyses were performed by Nagao et al. [144, 145, 146]. Thickness fluctuations in single component lipid bilayers were measured by Woodka and colleagues using NSE [58], and the method was then extended to a homogeneously mixed lipid membranes [59]. The experimental thickness fluctuation observations were also reproduced in recent computer simulations [147, 146]. Despite the growing experimental and computational data on the thickness fluctuations, a theoretical model that explicitly accounts for the dynamic contributions from the membrane thickness in the dispersion relation has only recently been developed by Bingham, Smye and Olmsted (BSO) [53].

The membrane geometry considered in the BSO model is schematically represented in Figure 4.8. The upper (+) and lower (-) monolayer surfaces are described by the height functions $h_+(r)$ and $h_-(r)$ from a planar reference plane (dashed straight line in Figure 4.8) as

$$h_+(r) = d_+ r + s_+(r)$$

(4.30)

$$h_-(r) = d_- r + s_-(r)$$

(4.31)

The membrane thickness $d(r)$ is defined as the distance between the outer surface and the undulating mid-surface, $s(r)$.

$$d(r) = d_+ r + s_+(r) - d_- r - s_-(r)$$

(4.32)

Figure 4.8: The membrane geometry considered in the Bingham, Smye and Olmsted model [53]. The monolayer height $h_+(r)$ is the surface height from the reference surface (shown as a dashed line). The monolayer thickness $d(r)$ is defined as the distance between the outer surface and the undulating mid-surface, $s(r)$.
where $k_{b}$ is the monolayer bending modulus for each leaflet, $\gamma_{s}$ is the surface tension which restricts variations in the monolayer/water interfacial area, and $d_{ms}$ is the unperturbed monolayer thickness, respectively. The total free energy was set as

$$F = F_{v} + F_{s} + F_{g}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.33)$$

where $F_{g} = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \gamma_{s} (l_{1} + h_{2}) \right\}^{2}$ is the contribution from a tension that restricts changes in the total membrane area with the frame tension, $\gamma_{s}$. In this framework, Bingham et al. found three types of relaxation frequencies in a "thick" membrane [58].

The first mode is equivalent to the ripple type dynamic (bending) mode of Brochard and Lebon [116]. This mode appears in the model as a coupled bilayer and internal surface mode. The internal surface undulates in phase with the bilayer surface in order to preserve the thickness of each monolayer, and the relaxation is driven by the membrane bending rigidity and tension and damped to the surrounding viscous medium. The relaxation frequency is written as

$$\omega_{0}(k) = \frac{\gamma_{s} \gamma_{w}^{2} + \gamma_{s} \lambda_{0} k^{2}}{k^{2} \pi^{2} + 2\eta}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.34)$$

When we ignore the contribution from the tension and the correction term of $e^{-ik_{s}}$, $\omega_{0}(k)$ is equivalent to the standard hydrodynamic model of a thin elastic sheet (eq. (4.11)), which is plotted in Figure 4.7.

The second mode is a pure peristaltic dynamic mode describing undulations in the bilayer where the thickness of the monolayers undulates in phase (thickness fluctuations). The relaxation frequency is calculated as

$$\omega_{1}(k) = \frac{k_{ds}}{\eta_{m} + 2\eta} = \frac{k_{ds}}{\eta (k_{0} + \frac{2}{k})}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.35)$$

The thickness fluctuation mode is driven by the area compressibility, $k_{ds}$, and damped by the solvent and membrane monolayer viscosity, $\eta$ and $\eta_{m}$, respectively. The mode is split into two regimes based on the Saffman–Delbrück length $l_{0} = \eta \eta_{m} / k_{ds}$ [55]. The dissipation of the long wavelength modes, $k_{ds}$ $< 1$, is dominated by the solvent viscosity, while the short wavelength modes, $k_{ds} > 1$, dissipate through the membrane viscosity. The relaxation frequency for the short wavelength modes can be written as $\omega_{1}(k) \approx k_{ds} / \eta$. This expression suggests that the peristaltic mode can be seen as a local mode in the short wavelength limit, which is similar to the short wavelength behavior of the slippage mode $\omega_{0}(k)$ in the case where it is damped by the monolayer surface viscosity (see Figure 4.7) [102].

Finally, a dispersion relation for the movement of the internal membrane surface ($\omega(k)$ in Figure 4.8) gives the relaxation frequency

$$\omega(k) = \frac{k_{ds} \kappa^{2} \lambda_{0}^{2} \pi^{2} - 1}{\pi \sqrt{k^{4} + k^{2} \lambda_{0}^{2} + 2 \lambda_{0}^{2} / k^{2}}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.36)$$

The internal surface mode also is driven by the area compressibility; however, it dissipates through the inter-monolayer friction as well as through the solvent and membrane viscosities. The new length scale $l = \sqrt{\gamma_{s}/\gamma_{w}}$ represents the dimension at which the forces from the membrane viscosity and the inter-monolayer friction balance. This length scale was estimated to be $l = 10$ nm [53], which is much shorter than $l_{0}$.

While the dispersion relations developed by Bingham, Snye, and Olmsted have not yet been incorporated into the expressions for $F_{\lambda}$, they nevertheless provide important insights into the dynamics measured with NSE. As we will see in Section 4.4.2, these theories have begun to help link the phenomenologically measured thickness fluctuation timescale back to the inherent membrane elastic and viscous properties.

### 4.3.4 Comparing the dynamics predicted by different membrane models

In the past three subsections, the description of a biomembrane has evolved from a thin, structureless sheet (Section 4.3.1) to two coupled monolayers (Section 4.3.2) to a "thick" membrane that can undergo fluctuations in thickness as well as bending undulations (Section 4.3.3). With each section, both the illustrations and equations to describe the membrane dynamics have become more complicated as more terms are needed to describe the added contributions. To summarize the different theories, we compare the predicted dispersion relations in Figure 4.7. The following parameters were used to calculate the dispersion relations: $\kappa = 8.5 \times 10^{-20}$ m, $\eta = 8.5 \times 10^{-3}$ Pa s, $\eta_{m} = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ Pa s, $b = 1 \times 10^{-2}$ Pa s/m, $K_{s} = 12\sigma_{s} / \gamma_{s}$, and $d_{s} = 2d_{m}$. The hydrodynamic thickness of the bilayer and intermembrane coupling constant, respectively, which will be introduced in Section 4.4.1.

**Single membrane fluctuations:** The solid gray line plots $\omega(k)$ versus the undulation mode wavenumber predicted from the standard hydrodynamic mode analysis based on the Hele-Shaw bending Hamiltonian (eq. (4.11)). This model predicts a single dispersion relation for the movement of the internal membrane surface ($\omega(k)$ in Figure 4.8).

**Two coupled monolayers:** Incorporating the effects of inter-monolayer friction introduces a second dissipation mechanism. The modification of the Zilman and Granek (2002) theory by Watson and Brown (WB) considered the change in the dispersion relation given by eq. (4.31) to incorporate the effects of inter-monolayer friction by replacing $x$ with $k$. The dispersion relation predicted by WB is shown as the green dashed-dotted line marked as $\omega_{mb}(k) = \kappa k^{2} / \eta_{m}$. This expression suggests that the peristaltic mode relaxes faster than $\omega_{0}(k)$ because the membrane is effectively stiffer with $k > \kappa$.

WB applied the model developed by Seifert and Langer (SL) to the short wavelength fluctuations measured by NSE. The SL model gives two eigenvalues for the dynamic modes.
for the dynamic modes of coupled monolayers, which are shown in red-dashed ($\omega_k$) and dashed-solid ($\omega_\alpha$) lines. The main dissipation mechanism changes from $\omega_k$ at long wavelengths ($k < k_L$) to $\omega_\alpha$ at short wavelengths ($k > k_L$). At short wavelengths, $\omega_\alpha(k)$ corresponds to the bending modes that are affected by the inter-monomer friction and the fluctuations are governed by the effective bending modulus $k$ also used by WB, so $\omega_\alpha = \omega_\alpha(k)$. Meanwhile at long wavelengths, $\omega_k(\mathbf{k})$ corresponds to the hydrodynamically damped bending modes also predicted by Helfrich and $\omega_\alpha(k) = \omega_\alpha(\mathbf{k})$ at $k < k_L$.

Between the crossover wavenumbers, $k_L < k < k_H$, $\omega_\alpha(k)$ is determined by the slipping mode and the plateaux at high $\mathbf{k}$, where the mode dissipates through the surface viscosity and is independent of wavenumber. However, for the chosen parameters, $k_L < k < k_H$, range is quite narrow and the slipping mode does not contribute significantly despite its predicted importance by SL. The minor contribution of the slipping mode is due to the choice of $\sigma$, as well as $b$ values used to calculate the dispersion relations in Figure 4.7. The experiments by Arriaga and colleagues found a $b$ value that is much larger than the typical value used here ($b = 10^5$ Pa s/m [126]), suggesting more thorough studies, combining experiment, simulation, and theory, are needed to better understand inter-monomer friction and how it affects the membrane dispersion relations.

**Thick** bilayers: The dispersion relation predicted by the model for “thick” membranes by Bingham, Smye, and Olmsted (BISO) are summarized by the blue-dashed ($\omega_\alpha$ and $\omega_\alpha(k)$) and dash-dotted ($\omega_\alpha(k)$) lines. In the calculation, we neglected the contributions from the membrane tension ($y_1 = y_2 = 0$) and plot only the contribution from the height fluctuation as $\omega_{\alpha_2}(k)$. As such $\omega_{\alpha_2}(k)$ completely overlaps with $\omega(k)$ from the Helfrich description. The thickness fluctuations ($\omega_k(\mathbf{k})$) are the fastest mode at low $\mathbf{k}$, but plateau to an almost constant value above $k_{LS} = 2\pi/\mathbf{l}_{LS}$, the same behavior seen in the slipping mode of the SL model $\omega_\alpha(k)$. The internal surface mode $\omega_{\alpha_2}(k)$ also converges to the $\omega_k(\mathbf{k})$ in the high $\mathbf{k}$ range.

Now that we have covered the theory needed to describe the membrane undulations, we will see in the next section how it is applied to actual NSE data. As discussed in Section 4.2, NSE measures the spatial and time correlation function as $I(q, t)$ on the nanometer and nanosecond scales and is thus uniquely suited to probing the small wavelength dynamics predicted to occur from $0.1 \text{nm}^{-1}$ to $\sim 10 \text{nm}^{-1}$ in $Q$ and from 1 ps to sub $\mu$s in $t$ ($10^3 \text{m}^{-1} < Q < 10^5 \text{m}^{-1}$ and $10^{-12} \text{s} < t < 10^{-6} \text{s}$). As we move into the next section, we remind the reader that NSE measures the scatterer’s $Q$, which corresponds to the scattering vector and not the dynamic mode number which we call $k$ here, though the experimentally measured length scales should be weighted in the corresponding $k$ ranges.
4.4.1 Bending fluctuations

Now that we have an experimental system, we will cover actual NSE data. Figure 4.9 shows a typical \( T(Q,t)/(T,Q,0) \) measured using NSE. The solid lines in Figure 4.9 are fits to a single membrane fluctuation model proposed by Zilman and Granek [eq. (4.30)] [99, 113]. The first application of ZG theory to NSE data appeared in Takeda’s paper in which they studied dipalmitoyl-phosphocholine (DPPC) lipid dispersed in \( \text{D}_2\text{O} \) with CaCl\(_2\) [127]. While this lipid/salt mixture is multilamellar, no strong correlation peak was seen in the NSE data and the relaxation rate followed the \( Q^2 \) scaling predicted by Zilman and Granek [127]. Subsequent NSE studies on the same system were used to probe the bending dynamics in the fluid and gel phases to estimate the steric interactions between the bilayers in the unbound state [156].
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Figure 4.9: Normalized intermediate scattering function \( T(Q,t)/(T,Q,0) \) measured by NSE for protonated DMPC in \( \text{D}_2\text{O} \) at \( T \approx 35^\circ\text{C} \). Inset indicates the \( Q \)-dependence of the relaxation rate \( \Gamma (= Q^2) \). Error bars represent ±1 standard deviation throughout the chapter.

Following the early studies of large unilamellar vesicles by Yi et al. [130], NSE has been used to study a wide range of lipid systems including the effects of fatty acyl tail structure [130, 157, 158], inclusion of small molecules such as cholesterol [159, 160], peptides [135, 161], drugs [83, 162–164], and nanoparticles [165], as well as the internal membrane fluctuations [58, 59, 166, 167]. Recently, NSE has also been used to measure more complex systems such as membrane domains [168] and more biologically relevant systems [169, 170].

The inset in Figure 4.9 shows \( T \) following a \( Q^2 \) dependence as expected from the expression for \( \Gamma_{\text{neutral}} \) given in eq. (4.26) with a slope that is proportional to \( \kappa \). In Section 4.3.2, the effective bending modulus is given by \( \kappa = \kappa + 2d_k K_k \). Again, \( K_k \) is the monolayer area compressibility modulus and can be calculated as \( K_k = 12d_k/d_k^2 \), where \( d_k \) is the monolayer bending modulus and \( d_k \) is the monolayer hydrocarbon thickness [171]. The monolayer bending modulus is half the bilayer bending modulus, \( K_k = \kappa/2 \), which opens the expression for \( \kappa \) in terms of the bilayer properties as \( \kappa = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + 8b/d_k/d_k^2 \right) \). The remaining unknown in the expression for \( \kappa \) is \( d_k/d_k \), the ratio of the neutral surface to the thickness of the hydrocarbon tails in the bilayer. Remember from Section 4.3.2, the neutral surface is defined as the surface at which the monolayer bending and stretching energies are decoupled and cannot be measured experimentally [45]. Generally, \( d_k \) is assumed to lie somewhere between half and the full monolayer thickness with corresponding values of \( d_k/d_k \) ranging from 0.25 to 0.5 [108, 135, 172–175]. The first NSE studies to use the Watson and Brown’s equations to analyze NSE data used a value of \( d_k/d_k \approx 0.6 \); which puts the neutral surface within the headgroup region of the bilayer [58, 59, 135]. \( d_k \) is generally thought to be closer to the interface between the lipid headgroups and tail, with \( d_k/d_k \approx 0.5 \) [176–183]. Putting this value into the expression for \( \kappa \) gives \( \kappa = 13k \), which shows much more energy is required to bend the membrane at the NSE scales.

Having an expression for \( \kappa \) in terms of the intrinsic bending modulus, \( \Gamma_{\text{neutral}} \) in eq. (4.26) can now be rewritten as [184]

\[
\frac{\Gamma_{\text{neutral}}}{Q^2} = 0.0069 \left( \frac{k}{T} \right)^{1/2} \pi^{1/2} \frac{\kappa}{kT},
\]

(4.37)

Therefore, we can determine the bilayer bending modulus \( \kappa \) from a plot of \( \Gamma_{\text{neutral}}/Q^2 \) versus \( Q \) measured in an NSE experiment. Note that changing the value of \( \kappa \) only changes the numerical prefactor in eq. (4.37) and scales the value of \( \kappa \) by a constant.

Table 4.1 compares values of the bending modulus for DMPC bilayers at a temperature of around 30°C measured with different experimental techniques. A similar comparison for POPC bilayers is presented in [73] and several other lipids in [185]. All values are on the order of 10 kT, but can vary significantly depending on the experimental technique. The NSE result is comparable to values determined from fluctuation analysis by Mélaërd et al. [186] and some computer simulations [175, 185], but differs by almost a factor of 3 with results obtained from other methods such as micropipette aspiration. Nagle and coworkers discussed the discrepancy between \( k \) values measured by different techniques in detail in their recent work [187]. One important difference is that the different techniques measure the bending modulus on different length and timescales, so it is possible that there are other contributions.
Table 4.1: Comparison of the bending modulus $\kappa$ of DMPC bilayers at $T = 30^\circ$C for various experimental and simulation techniques in literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>$\kappa$ (mJ/m$^2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutron spin echo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.4 ± 2.0 [184]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluctuation analysis</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.1 ± 1.9 [186]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropipette aspiration</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.4 ± 1.4 [153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse x-ray scattering with tilt</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.6 ± 1.1 [112]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without tilt</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6 ± 0.6 [112]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Simulation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.7 ± 1.2 [185]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the bilayer bends, one leaflet must stretch while the other compresses. This physical relationship is expressed mathematically in a model for thin elastic sheets as $K_{st} = b\kappa/(2d)^2$, in which $K_{st}$ is the bilayer area compressibility modulus [171]. The constant $b$ depends on the degree of coupling between the two leaflets: $b = 12$ when the two monolayers are fully coupled and the bilayer behaves as a single slab, while $b = 64$ when the monolayers are completely uncoupled. Rawicz et al. proposed an intermediate value for lipid bilayers of $b = 24$ based on a polymer brush model [188]. Their model assumes that $K_{st}$ is related to the bilayer surface pressure, $\Pi$, through a constant factor, $K_{st} = 6\Pi$, and that the surface pressure is dominated by the entropic contributions from the hydrocarbon tails which are modeled as idealized freely jointed polymer chains (hence the name polymer-brush model) [188]. Any contributions from interactions between the hydrocarbon tails and/or lipid headgroups are neglected, yet despite its simplicity, this model has been shown to hold true for a number of different lipid systems [195]. Because of its success in describing fluid lipid membranes, the polymer brush model is used regularly to relate a measured $K_{st}$ to $\kappa$ and vice versa.

Combining the $\kappa$ values measured with NSE and $d$, values that are measured with an elastic scattering technique such as SANS, we can now use the polymer brush model to calculate values for $K_{st}$. Figure 4.10 shows the resulting values for three phospholipids with different tail lengths and the same headgroup, dimyristoyl-, dipalmitoyl-, and distearoylphosphocholine (DMPC, DPPC, and DSPC) [186]. The values of $K_{st}$ are independent of the tail length as expected [188] and decrease with increasing temperature.

Here, we should note that the value of $b$ from the polymer brush model may have some connection with the inter-monomer friction constant $b$ that appeared in the SL and BSO models. However, $b$ did not contribute significantly to the bending mode in these theories. Instead, $b$ appeared in the slippage mode (eqs. 421) at small $k$. These small $k$ values are not easy to access using NSE and are likely too fast to observe for DLS. Therefore, it is hard to determine if and how $b$ and $\beta$ are related. But, if we can independently measure $\kappa$ and $K_{st}$, then, we can start to calculate the value of $b$ and improve our understanding of both the dispersion relation and $b$.

4.4.2 Thickness fluctuations.

We saw in the BSO model that, in addition to the bending fluctuations we measured in Section 4.4.1, membranes can also undergo thickness fluctuations. To measure the thickness fluctuations with NSE, we take advantage of a unique feature of neutron scattering: that the scattering power of different isotopes can be vastly different. In particular, by judiciously replacing $H$ with $D$, we can carefully control or even eliminate contrast, a technique known as contrast matching, without significantly modifying the properties of the sample. Thus by exchanging $H$ for $D$ in the lipid tails, the scattering contrast of the tails can be "matched" to the surrounding solvent, making the tails "invisible" to the neutrons and thus highlighting the scattering from the lipid headgroups. With this contrast condition, we now emphasize the dynamics from the headgroups and their relative motions.

Recalling the discussion in the previous section, we note that eqs. (4.21) and (4.26) indicate that the undulation fluctuations of a membrane follow a simple
scaling law. Thus, plotting the natural logarithm of the normalized ISF, \( \ln[\langle I(Q,t)/I(0,0) \rangle] \) against \( Q^2 \), as done in Figure 4.11, should collapse all the data onto a single master curve whose slope is given by \( P = -0.0069 \frac{c^2}{\eta^2} \).

Figure 4.11 shows such a plot of ISF data for deuterated DPPC vesicles in which the hydrocarbon tails are contrast-matched to the D2O solvent [58]. While most of the data do follow the expected scaling, the data at \( Q \approx 1.0 \text{ nm}^{-1} \) do not, suggesting that there is another, faster relaxation process contributing at this \( Q \).

As suggested by eq. (4.37), the enhanced dynamics can also be emphasized by plotting the data as \( \Gamma \langle Q^2 \rangle \) versus \( Q \) which, following the same scaling arguments above for pure unidirectional dynamics, leads to a horizontal line whose intercept is related to the bending modulus. The data for DMPC, DPPC, and DSPC bilayers plotted in this fashion in Figure 4.12 all show a distinct peak [58]. The deviation for all of the bilayers is very localized at \( Q \approx 1.0 \text{ nm}^{-1} \) (length scales of \( \approx 3 \text{ nm} \)) which we assign to the membrane thickness fluctuations. The \( Q \)-value of the peak corresponds to the minimum in the scattered intensity of the membrane form factor measured in SAS, supporting the idea that the excess dynamics are occurring at the length scale of the membrane thickness. The same signature of membrane thickness fluctuations was also seen in NSE data for oil-swollen surfactant bilayers [141, 144, 145, 190]. The peak shift to lower \( Q \) from DMPC to DPPC to DSPC in Figure 4.12 then reflects the increase in bilayer thickness with increasing tail length. Note that these thickness fluctuations are only seen in the fluid phase of the membrane [58]. The peak in the data disappears at low temperatures below \( T_m \) (see Figure 4.12) when the lipids are in the gel phase and the membrane is more rigid and less dynamic.

In order to further characterize the excess dynamics at the membrane thickness scale, we assume that they can be captured by a simple additive term to the bending fluctuation decay rate given by eq. (4.37) and can be expressed by the following equation [144]

\[
\Gamma = \Gamma^2 \frac{1}{Q^2} + \frac{1}{Q^2} + \frac{1}{Q^2} \left( Q^2 + Q^2 \right)
\]

(4.38)

in which the first term describes the underlying bending dynamics, quantified using protiated lipid bilayers, and the second term empirically fits the thickness fluctuation peak. The two important parameters extracted from the Lorentz function are the relaxation time given by the decay constant \( \tau_T = 1/\Gamma_T \) and the fluctuation amplitude \( \Delta = 2dQ_0 \), which is given by the half width at half maximum of the Lorentzian, \( \Gamma^2 = \frac{1}{\tau_T} \).

Earlier in the chapter, we noted that the characteristic length and timescales of the thickness fluctuations were related to the membrane's elastic and viscous properties, suggesting eq. (4.38) can be rewritten in terms of the intrinsic membrane properties.

Statistical mechanics predicts a relationship between the bilayer area compressibility modulus \( K_a \) and the fractional change in area \( \delta A = \Delta A/A \) as [52, 193].
Where $A$ and $A_0$ are the unit area of the membrane and the area per molecule, respectively. Assuming the bilayer volume compressibility is negligible ($V = A d_A$), $\Delta V/V = \Delta A/A + \Delta d_A/d_A \approx 0$, $d_A$ is compensated for by a corresponding change in thickness $d_A = A d_A/A_0$ that is, $\Delta d_A = 0$. Both simulation and experiment suggest that the volume compressibility is at least an order of magnitude smaller than the area compressibility ($52, 193$). Therefore, the relation $\sigma^2 = (d_A^2/Q^2) k_T(K_A A_0)/(4 Q h^2)$ leads to an expression for the peak width in terms of the bilayer compressibility modulus $\xi = K_A A_0/(Q h^2)$. The BSO model covered in Section 4.3.3 [53] developed a dispersion relation for the peristatic mode (thickness fluctuations), $\omega_d(\xi)$ in eq. (4.35). $\omega_d(\xi)$ is related to $K_A$ and damped by the viscosities of the solvent, $\eta$, and membrane, $\eta_m$. When the wavelengths of the mode are smaller than the Saffman–Delbrück length $[53]$, $\omega_d = \eta /\eta_m$, the in-plane monolayer viscosity dominates and the damping is independent of the fluctuation wavelength. In general, this condition is satisfied in pure lipid bilayers as can be seen in Figure 4.7, and we can use the dispersion relation of the BSO model to relate the experimentally measured $\gamma_T$ to the membrane viscosity as [53]

$$\gamma_T \approx \frac{\omega_d}{K_A}$$

These refinements lead to an expression for the Lorentzian based on the bilayer’s elastic and viscous properties as [184]

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{mod}} + \Gamma_{Q} = \frac{K_A k_T A_0}{\eta_m Q^2} + \frac{\omega_d}{h^2} + \frac{K_A A_0}{Q (Q - Q_i)^2}$$

In this equation, $K_A$ is calculated from $\kappa$ determined by NSE experiments with protiated lipid bilayers using the polymer brush model, $K_A = 24 A (d_A/d_0)^2$ and assuming that $K_A$ is the same for protiated and full-deuterated lipids within the experimental uncertainty. The area per lipid is given by $A_0 = V_l / (d_0 + d_h)$, where $V_l$ and $d_h$ represent the lipid volume and the headgroup thickness, respectively. $V_l$ can be determined from density measurement to find the specific molecular volume [194] or calculated from equations for the lipid volume available in literature [195]. The tail thickness can be determined from an elastic small angle scattering experiment (such as SANS or SAXS), and the headgroup thickness, while not yet well defined, is generally assumed to be on the order of $d_h = 1 \text{ nm}$ [196–198]. $\Gamma_i$ can also be determined from a SANS or diffraction measurement. Thus, all the parameters in eq. (4.41) are known except for the membrane viscosity $\eta_m$.

The refined analysis method now defines the peak shape in $\Gamma(Q)$ in terms of the structural and elastic parameters and in the process reduced the number of fit parameters from two ($\gamma_T$ and $\xi^{-1}$ in eq. (4.38)) to one ($\eta_m$, in eq. (4.41)). Based on eqs. (4.40), the peak width is related to $K_A$; however, experimentally the data also contain effects from the instrumental Q resolution. The Q resolution smearing can be taken into account using the expressions developed for SANS instruments [199], and the resolution function can be convoluted with eq. (4.41) to fit the NSE data. The fit result illustrated in Figure 4.13 for the temperature variation of $\Gamma(Q)$ in the fluid phase of the DMPC vesicles in which the instrumental Q resolution was expressed as a Gaussian function with a full width at half maximum of $\approx 13\%$ [184]. Note that the baseline at $Q > Q_i$ does not capture the experimental data, which suggests that additional intramembrane dynamics may be present that are not currently considered.

Reformulating the expression for the bilayer thickness fluctuations in terms of the membrane properties now allows us to determine the membrane viscosity $\eta_m$ from the NSE data. The temperature dependence of $\eta_m$ determined from NSE measurements is shown in Figure 4.14 for DMPC, DPPC, and DSPC [184]. The estimated values of $\eta_m$ are on the order of 10 nPa s m, and increase with increasing tail length and decreasing temperature, which qualitatively matches the trends seen in linear alkanes [200, 201]. Interestingly, the measured $\eta_m$ values for these three lipids are about the same ($\eta_m \approx 100$ nPa s m) at $T = T_n$ and decrease by as much as a factor of 2 with increasing temperature, which suggests a strong coupling between the bilayer phase behavior and the lipid motion.

Reported values for the membrane viscosity in literature vary widely. While some of the discrepancies may be due to differences in studied temperatures, the temperature
4.5 Summary and future perspective

In this chapter, we presented the observation of collective membrane fluctuations with NSE and the theory needed to relate the measured dynamics to the membrane elastic and viscous properties. By measuring the bending and thickness fluctuations on the nanoscale, we can independently determine the bilayer bending modulus, \( K_{\text{bend}} \), and monolayer viscosity, \( \eta_{\text{m}} \). These same properties that govern the equilibrium thermal fluctuations will also influence the membrane's viscoelastic response to nonequilibrium deformations that are an essential part of cell function as they package cargo, shape organelles and respond to external forces that we talked about at the beginning of the chapter [210]. Measuring both the bending and thickness fluctuations with NSE also opens the possibility of determining the inter-monomer coupling constant \( \beta \). While extracting an independent determination of \( K_{\text{m}} \) from the thickness fluctuation measurements is currently limited by the quality of the experimental data, continued improvement in NSE instrumentation and data analysis may make these measurements more robust in the future. Alternatively, \( K_{\text{m}} \) could be determined by combining NSE with another technique to measure \( \alpha \) or \( K_{\text{bend}} \), such as those outlined in other chapters of this book. Gelation [211], degree of saturation of the lipid tail [212], and mixing lipids with cholesterol [189] are all known to modulate inter-monolayer coupling and the NSE measurements described here can be used to not only gain insights into a wide variety of lipid bilayers, but help advance our understanding of the complex dissipation mechanisms in these systems.

The development of theory and experiment go hand-in-hand, and extracting more information from the NSE measurements requires a solid theoretical basis. Currently, for example, the thickness fluctuations are treated as an excess to the bending fluctuations and assumed to be an additive term in the decay constant expression (eq. (4.43)), and the \( I(\Omega, t) \) data are fit using the stretched exponential function of the single membrane fluctuation model. In principle though, these two independent modes should be treated as two individual relaxations in \( I(\Omega, t) \). Just as Mell and colleagues have developed a relaxation function incorporating the hybrid modes (Section 4.3.2) [125], proper data treatment for the thickness fluctuations requires the correct relaxation function for \( I(\Omega, t) \) to understand the relaxation behavior and dispersion relation of this dynamic mode.

Recent theory, simulation and experimental works have also begun to incorporate tilt degrees of freedom, described by a tilt modulus, into the analysis of the nanoscale dynamics. The tilt modulus introduces another parameter, in addition to the bending and thickness fluctuation parameters, and these models now have literally too many parameters (see, e.g., Table II in Ref. [108]) to reliably extract from a single experimental measurement. Quantifying all of the lipid membrane properties will require combining multiple experimental techniques with the appropriate theories. For example, recent development of diffuse X-ray scattering allows one to determine both the bending and tilt moduli [109, 112, 213, 214], which could be combined with NSE measurements. The length and timescales probed by scattering methods in particular are highly complementary to ranges accessible by computer simulation, even for thickness fluctuations [84, 146], and combining simulation and experiment is a powerful opportunity to probe the complexities of membrane dynamics.

The theoretical and experimental framework outlined in this chapter provides a foundation for understanding the elastic and viscous properties of lipid membranes, and we hope the examples provided here inform and inspire ongoing investigations into more complex and biologically relevant systems. All of the example NSE data
shown in the chapter were for simple saturated lipid bilayers, yet a single cell membrane can contain hundreds of chemically distinct lipids. While we know this remarkable complexity is essential to cell function, our understanding of how it fundamentally affects the membrane properties is still developing. For example, decades of research have shown that the effects of cholesterol on the membrane properties are highly dependent on the lipid species and our picture of cholesterol-containing membranes is still evolving. Moreover, cell membranes are not only made of lipids, but can contain upwards of 50% by mass of proteins. Simply altering the thickness of model membranes has been shown to affect the biological activity of several proteins while incorporating lipids into lipid membranes also is known to affect the bilayer structural properties. Clearly, there is a synergy in lipid–protein interactions in determining the membrane properties; however, the nature of these interactions are not well understood. All of these initiatives relate to the synergy among structures, dynamics, and functions of biological membranes, and NSE is providing unique insights into the interdependence of the membrane collective dynamics and the elastic and viscous properties.
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