

Rapid Spontaneous Assembly of Single Component Liposomes

P. Sunthar* and Sopan M. Phapal

Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Bombay (IITB), Powai, Mumbai 400076, India.

We present a mechanism and show two variants of a method where the average diameter of spontaneously (barrier-free) assembled single component unilamellar liposomes is intrinsic, in agreement with Helfrich's theory. It depends only on the temperature and the lipid type, eliminating kinetic effects or external forcing normally observed. This provides the first pure system to study the self-assembly of vesicle forming components, and with a natural length scale it may have an implication for vesicle size selection under pre-biotic conditions.

Current hypotheses for the formation of enclosing membranes of protocells (pre-biotic vesicles), are mainly on possible surfactants, their origins or synthesis routes, autocatalysis, and their chemical evolution [1–4]. While these chemistries are the most crucial elements in solving the puzzle of origin of cellular life, the physics of self-assembly has not seen any significant attention in this context. Helfrich's free energy model [5] provides the simplest description of vesicle self-assembly from solution, which has a natural length scale for its average diameter. We show how this can be achieved through a truly spontaneous process (barrier free, unlike the externally driven systems known thus far) for the simplest bilayer forming system (single component lipid). If having a reproducible diameter is important to protocells, then Helfrich's theory is the simplest physical model that provides one, and the stationary phase interdiffusion (SPI) mechanism proposed here is one way to attain it spontaneously. This is applicable to any vesicle forming system, with suitably chosen solvents.

A suspension of unilamellar vesicles is kinetically trapped in high energy states. The vesicle diameter is usually determined by external parameters from the sample preparation process which leads to one of these energy traps (see Supplementary Material Section A for the thermodynamics of vesicles) [6, 7]. Nevertheless, there is *one* characteristic diameter, for vesicles spontaneously assembled from a solution phase of lipids, obtained from an energy balance on a disc micelle aggregate (bilayer disc membrane) [5, 8–10]. This diameter D is given by

$$D \approx 4 \frac{(2\kappa + \bar{\kappa})}{\gamma} \quad (1)$$

where κ is the elastic bending modulus of the membrane, $\bar{\kappa}$ is its Gaussian curvature modulus [11], and γ is the line (edge) tension of the membrane with the surrounding solvent. This diameter has also been known as the “minimum” diameter, obtainable by intense sonication [5, 12]. However, we choose to call it as an *intrinsic size* of the vesicle, as κ , $\bar{\kappa}$, and γ are thermodynamic parameters of the vesicle forming amphiphile in the surrounding solvent (see Supplementary Material Section E for an elaboration on this point). For phosphatidylcholine lipid vesicles in water this theoretical diameter can be estimated to be 13 nm (see Supplementary Material Section D for the calculation) [13–15]. Despite being a natural length

scale, this diameter has not been observed by a spontaneous process starting from a solution phase of a single component lipid system.

Strong hydrophobic interaction of double tailed surfactants and the high energy state of the intrinsic diameter are the chief reasons behind the difficulty of observing such a spontaneous assembly [6, 16]. The small critical aggregation concentrations of phospholipids (typically less than a nM), does not permit efficient dispersion and mixing of the surfactants. Conventional methods therefore require external energy (such as sonication or extrusion) to be dissipated in the system [12], using multi-component systems (such as catanionic, lecithin+bile, etc.) [17–21], or by inducing a spontaneous curvature through certain molecules [22, 23] (for multi-component systems, spontaneous formation occurs when kinetic effects of other surfactants plays a role in modifying the edge energy [20]).

We conceptualise a mechanism to observe the spontaneous assembly. Consider a uniformly dispersed solution of bilayer forming molecules. If the bulk (good) solvent is suddenly replaced by an aqueous (poor) solvent, the changed conditions favour aggregation of the molecules to form circular discs (bilayer membranes or bicelles). The system then gets trapped in its intrinsic size as the discs grow. Such a situation of “magically” replacing the surroundings can be easily achieved in computer simulations of molecules [11, 24, 25], but the challenge is to realise it in reality.

Instead of a bulk replacement, the solvents can be diffusively replaced across an interface, provided they are miscible. When the interdiffusion coefficient of the solvents is much large compared to that of the amphiphile molecule in the original solvent (lipids lengths are about 10 times the diameter of the water molecules, and have a correspondingly smaller diffusivity), these molecules will be localised in space while the original solvent is replaced by the aqueous solvent by interdiffusion, as illustrated in the schematic shown in Figure 1. This results in a condition analogous to the sudden bulk replacement discussed above, albeit in a nearly two-dimensional region. This region of the solution is essentially subjected to a “quench” from a dilute or “gaseous” phase (of the amphiphiles) to a spinodal region leading to a bulk phase separation to the bilayer phase. The assembly of the free surfactants happens spontaneously without any barrier to form discs. These discs, above the critical diameter given by Equation 1 again transition, without any barriers, to a lower energy state of a vesicle (see Supplementary Material Section A). The size of the vesicle would be intrinsic, but at a value determined by

* P.Sunthar@iitb.ac.in




FIG. 1: Mechanism of spontaneous assembly in a nearly two-dimensional plane Here the elementary bilayer forming compound (lipids for example) is generically represented schematically by a hydrophobic body (green) and two polar ends (purple). There are two solvents that are miscible with each other and the elementary compound is highly soluble in one (top; magenta) and poorly soluble in the other (bottom; cyan). At the interface as the solvents interdiffuse, the environment of the compound is rapidly replaced by the poor solvent which favours self-assembly and formation of closed vesicles. *Note:* The representation of two lipids together as a single unit in the good solvent is only for illustrating a generic principle; in reality the lipid coordinates will be different.

the thermodynamics of the lipid in the mixture of solvents.

To achieve this mode of assembly, three components are essential: bilayer forming amphiphile (lipid or a block copolymer), a good solvent and a poor solvent which are intermiscible. We found a classical system—phosphatidylcholine (PC) lipid, ethanol, and water—well suited to capture the phenomenon described. Here, the lipids dissolved in ethanol is brought into contact with water across a stationary interface.

Owing to the high miscibility of water and ethanol the interfaces need to be brought into contact in a *nearly stationary* manner, taking care to avoid any convective (advective) mixing, that can influence the energetics of self-assembly [26] (see Supplementary Material for a description of the setup and the method). Achieving the stationary contact sets this apart from the broad class of ethanol injection methods using the same components [26–28]. As the interdiffusion proceeds, a turbid front is seen to move upwards, indicating the formation of liposomes (see Supplementary Material for a detailed description and a video).

The liposome suspension obtained shows a monodisperse population with a mean hydrodynamic diameter equal to 530 ± 25 nm for the dimyristoyl phosphatidylcholine (DMPC) lipid as seen in Figure 2(a). High resolution transmission electron microscope (HRTEM) images under negative staining show that the liposomes are unilamellar for various types of lipids used (Figure 2(b-d)). An independent estimate of the intrinsic diameter using Equation 1 can be obtained. In the presence of ethanol we find this to be about 300 nm for the DMPC liposome, which is a reasonable order of magnitude estimate of the experimentally observed hydrodynamic diameter of 530 nm, given the approximate estimates involved (see Supplementary Material Section D for the calculations).

That the diameter is intrinsic is reinforced by two crucial

observations. (i) The concentration of lipids does not have an influence on the diameter of vesicles as seen in Figure 3a. Higher concentration only leads to higher number density of vesicles of the same average size, as evidenced by the same number counts from scattering measurements achieved at a higher dilution and visually by a more turbid suspension (see Supplementary Material Section H for calculations supporting this claim). (ii) the proportion of ethanol and water on either side of the interface does not influence the size so long as the vesicles are formed, as seen in Figure 3b. We infer from this that the lipid assembly happens when the bulk concentration of ethanol in the interfacial region is between 25 and 50% (v/v).

Another important inference from Figure 3 is that in this method, kinetic effects do not seem to play a role in determining the average size of the vesicles. Otherwise the concentration of lipids or the magnitude of the gradient of ethanol across the interface would have altered the size, as may be expected in a detergent depletion method [29].

The intrinsic size is expected to change when the moduli κ , $\bar{\kappa}$ or the edge tension γ is altered. The temperature and lipid chemistry (chain length and unsaturation) are two handles that can readily affect a change in the diameter by this alteration. Liposomes are formed only at temperatures higher than the main transition temperature of the phospholipid ($T_m = 24^\circ\text{C}$ for DMPC), and has a significant effect on the size of liposomes as seen in Figure 4a. In the temperature range studied, the size of the DMPC liposomes shows an increase with temperature. In the temperature range 30–40°C the bending modulus is nearly constant at $\kappa \approx 1.3 \pm 0.1 \times 10^{-19}$ J [30]. However, it is expected that the edge tension decreases due to a known decrease in the interfacial tension as the temperature increases. Lipids of various chain lengths and unsaturation also form mono-disperse, unilamellar vesicles as seen in Figure 4b. We find that lipids with shorter alkyl chain length and those with larger number of unsaturated bonds form larger liposomes, as shown in Figure 4b, in agreement with an expected reduction in the bilayer thickness and hence the edge tension. Accurate measurements of the edge tension values and the bending modulus for different lipids in the presence of ethanol is required to further validate our claim.

A remark about the time of synthesis is now in order. In the cuvette assembly considered here, the vesicle synthesis is completed by about 6 hours (see Supplementary Material). An even faster synthesis time of 15 minutes is achieved in a horizontal contact of stationary phases inside a capillary (see Supplementary Material). However, these are not normalised by the amount of liposomes synthesized. Instead we estimate the time it takes for the formation of a single vesicle to be about $t_{\text{ves}} \sim D^2/4\mathcal{D} \approx 5 \times 10^{-5}$ s, for water to diffusively replace ethanol over the length scale of a vesicle. Here, $D \approx 500$ nm is the diameter of the vesicle, $\mathcal{D} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-9}$ m²/s is the diffusivity of water in ethanol. Estimates of the time it takes by other methods is given in the Supplementary Material Section G. For a method that yields monodisperse vesicles by a spontaneous process, this is possibly the fastest known value, and can therefore be qualified as “rapid”.

We conclude that SPI mechanism does provide a truly spon-




FIG. 2: Liposome characterisation (a) Monodisperse size distribution of DMPC liposomes as intensity of scattered light obtained by dynamic light scattering (DLS), shown in comparison with polystyrene standards of monodisperse population. Here, the average size of liposomes, determined from the intensity distribution, is 530 ± 25 nm. (b-d) Negative staining micrographs from HRTEM showing a large unilamellar liposomes from various lipids.




FIG. 3: Liposome size is intrinsic (a) There is no effect of the lipid (DMPC) concentration initially dissolved in ethanol on the diameter of the liposomes formed. (b) Evidence that shows that concentration of ethanol or its gradients across the interface does not influence the diameter of liposomes. The points on the left (squares in blue) were obtained by the pre-mixing ethanol to the aqueous phase in the cuvette, whereas those on the right (circles in red) were obtained by pre-mixing water in the lipid+ethanol solution in the syringe tube. Except for a small region in ethanol fraction (between 25–50% v/v), where no liposomes are stably formed, the diameter of the liposomes is nearly constant at 510 ± 50 nm.

taneous (barrier-free) assembly of lipids to form vesicles, and the observed diameter of the liposomes is quantitatively explained by Helfrich's model [5]. It is too early to claim that SPI could be a possible mechanism for the formation of vesicles of a uniform size under prebiotic conditions, pending identification of possible surfactants [31], suitable solvents, and conditions favouring a interdiffusive mixing. However, it does provide a direction towards this, grounded in the fact that there is a natural length scale dictated by thermodynamics [5].

Nevertheless, the method itself could have fundamental and applied implications. Due to the stationarity of the SPI method it may now be possible to infer the dynamics of micelle to vesicle transition in a single component system using

time-resolved scattering, which has been studied only for kinetically controlled mixed surfactant systems [29, 32]. The proposed mechanism could be combined with hydrodynamics to understand vesicle size selection in ethanol injection methods [26–28]. Our preliminary investigations also reveal that using the SPI process it is also possible to achieve a high degree of encapsulation (more than 80%) of hydrophilic molecules (or drugs) by dissolving it in the ethanol phase.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The financial support of Department of Science and Technology, Government of India, through a special IRHPA grant,




FIG. 4: Temperature and lipid type influences the diameter (a) Diameter of DMPC liposomes shows an increase with increase in temperature. (b) Liposome size also depends on the lipid type, at 27.5°C. Shown are four lipids with various values of acyl chain length:unsaturation: DMPC—14:0, DPPC—16:0, Soy PC—mixture-16:0 (14.9%), 18:0 (3.7%), 18:1 (11.4%), 18:2 (63%), 18:3 (5.7%) and DOPC—18:1.

is gratefully acknowledged. Facilities in SAIF and CRNTS, IIT Bombay were also used in this work. PS also wishes to thank IRCC for the Seed Grant, DuPont for the Young Professor fellowship that supported a part of this work; colleagues

for helpful comments, and KITPC, Chinese Academy of Sciences for the Membrane Biophysics Meeting that provided an opportunity to discuss this problem at length with the several other participants.

-
- [1] D. Deamer, *Nature* **317**, 792 (1985)
- [2] P. L. Luisi, P. Walde, and T. Oberholzer, *Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci.* **4**, 33 (Feb. 1999)
- [3] J. W. Szostak, D. P. Bartel, and P. L. Luisi, *Nature* **409**, 387 (Jan. 2001)
- [4] *Protocells: Bridging Nonliving and Living Matter*, edited by S. Rasmussen, M. A. Bedau, L. Chen, D. Deamer, D. C. Krakauer, N. H. Packard, and P. F. Stadler (MIT Press, 2009)
- [5] W. Helfrich, *Phys. Lett. A* **50**, 115 (1974)
- [6] D. D. Lasic, R. Joannic, B. C. Keller, P. M. Frederik, and L. Auvray, *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **89-90**, 337 (Jan. 2001)
- [7] A. Grafmüller, J. Shillcock, and R. Lipowsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 218101 (2007)
- [8] P. Fromherz, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **94**, 259 (1983)
- [9] E. Sackmann, in *Structure and Dynamics of Membranes: From Cells to Vesicles*, Handbook of Biological Physics, Vol. 1A, edited by R. Lipowsky and E. Sackmann (Elsevier, 1995) Chap. 5, pp. 213–303
- [10] D. Boal, *Mechanics of the Cell*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 2012)
- [11] M. Hu, J. J. Briguglio, , and M. Deserno, *Biophysical J.* **102**, 1403 (2012)
- [12] G. Maulucci, M. De Spirito, G. Arcovito, F. Boffi, A. C. Castellano, and G. Briganti, *Biophys. J.* **88**, 3545 (May 2005)
- [13] H. V. Ly and M. L. Longo, *Biophys. J.* **87**, 1013 (Aug. 2004)
- [14] G. Sanaïotti, C. A. S. da Silva, A. G. Parreira, M. R. Tótoia, A. J. A. Meirelles, and E. A. C. Batista, *J. Chem. Eng. Data* **55**, 5237 (Nov. 2010)
- [15] E. Karatekin, O. Sandre, and H. Guitouni, *Biophys. J.* **84**, 1734 (Mar. 2003)
- [16] R. Laughlin, *Colloids Surf. A: Physicochem. and Engg. Aspects* **128**, 27 (1997)
- [17] H. Hauser, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **86**, 5351 (Jul. 1989)
- [18] N. E. N. Gabriel and M. F. M. Roberts, *Biochemistry* **23**, 4011 (Aug. 1984)
- [19] E. Kaler, A. Murthy, B. Rodriguez, and J. Zasadzinski, *Science* **245**, 1371 (1989)
- [20] J. Leng, S. Egelhaaf, and M. Cates, *Europhys. Lett.* **59**, 311 (2002)
- [21] S. Segota and D. Tezak, *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* **121**, 51 (Sep. 2006)
- [22] S. Safran, P. Pincus, and D. Andelman, *Science* **248**, 354 (1990)
- [23] D. D. Lasic, *Liposomes: from Physics to Applications* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1993)
- [24] A. J. Markvoort, K. Pieterse, M. N. Steijaert, P. Spijker, and P. A. J. Hilbers, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **109**, 22649 (Dec. 2005)
- [25] H. Noguchi and G. Gompper, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 164908 (Oct. 2006)
- [26] S. M. Phapal and P. Sunthar, *Chem. Phys. Lipids* **172-173**, 20 (2013)
- [27] S. Batzri and E. Korn, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **298**, 1015 (1973)
- [28] A. Jahn, W. Vreeland, M. Gaitan, and L. Locascio, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **126**, 2674 (2004)
- [29] J. Leng, S. U. Egelhaaf, and M. E. Cates, *Biophys. J.* **85**, 1624 (2003)
- [30] P. Méléard, C. Gerbeaud, T. Pott, L. Fernandez-Puente, I. Bivas,

M. D. Mitov, J. Dufourcq, and P. Bothorel, *Biophys. J.* **72**, 2616 (Jun. 1997)

- [31] P.-A. Monnard and D. W. Deamer, *Anat. Rec.* **268**, 196 (Nov. 2002)
- [32] S. U. Egelhaaf and P. Schurtenberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2804 (1999)
- [33] D. Lasic, *Biochemical J.* **256**, 1 (1988)
- [34] N. Kucerka, Y. Liu, N. Chu, H. I. Petrache, S. Tristram-Nagle, and J. F. Nagle, *Biophysical Journal* **88**, 2626 (Apr. 2005)
- [35] J. Brady, *J. Fluid Mech.* **667**, 216 (2011)

Supplementary Material A: Thermodynamics of vesicles

Here, we briefly recall important results in the thermodynamics of vesicle formation [5, 8, 10, 11]. The analysis presented here is restricted to zero-temperature (ignoring entropic effects). Consider a curved patch (in the form of a spherical cap) of bilayer membrane (which is also known as bicelle or a bilayer fragment) of area A . There are two important contributions to its free energy density (per unit area of the patch). First is the elastic bending energy

$$g_{\text{el}} = (2\kappa + \bar{\kappa}) \left(\frac{1}{R} \right)^2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where, κ is the elastic bending modulus (splay), $\bar{\kappa}$ is the Gaussian curvature modulus (saddle-splay) and R is the radius of curvature of the spherical cap. The second contribution is from the edge of the fragment which has hydrophobic groups of the lipid exposed to water; the edge energy per unit area of the patch is

$$g_{\text{ed}} = \frac{L\gamma}{A}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where L is the contour length of the edge, and γ is the line tension. The total free energy can be shown to be a function of the fragment area A and the radius of curvature R [8] as:

$$\begin{aligned} G &= (g_{\text{el}} + g_{\text{ed}})A \\ &= (2\kappa + \bar{\kappa}) \frac{A}{R^2} + 2\pi\gamma \left(\frac{A}{\pi} - \frac{A^2}{4\pi R^2} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

The interpretation of this equation is that for a given area A (and a lipid-solvent system) the total free energy is a function of R . The minimum of this free energy determines the likely shape (in terms of the mean curvature $1/R$) to find the fragment in. While this form of the energy provides precise expressions for the diameter of the spontaneously assembled vesicle, and the free-energy barriers for between the two states of a sphere and a disk, a simpler derivation is also possible.

The total energy of a close sphere (without an open hydrophobic edge) is

$$\bar{G}_{\text{sph}} = 4\pi(2\kappa + \bar{\kappa}). \quad (\text{A4})$$

We note that the free energy of a sphere is not dependent on its diameter; the free-energy density is dependent on the curvature, but this dependence vanishes for the energy itself, when integrated over the spherical surface,

For a flat disk (with a zero curvature) the free energy is

$$G_{\text{disk}} = L\gamma = 2\pi D\gamma. \quad (\text{A5})$$

where D is the radius of the disk of the same surface area πD^2 of a sphere of diameter D . For a vanishingly small surface area (πD^2) the free energy of the disk is lower than that of the sphere, and equals it at

$$D = 2 \frac{(2\kappa + \bar{\kappa})}{\gamma}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

For diameters larger than this, the sphere has a lower free energy; however, there is an energy barrier for the transition from the disk to the sphere, which vanishes at

$$D = 4 \frac{(2\kappa + \bar{\kappa})}{\gamma}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

This diameter is therefore the most likely value for the closed vesicle known as the vesiculation diameter [8], and called in the present work as the intrinsic diameter. Earlier works have neglected the Gaussian curvature modulus [8, 9], but recent coarse grained simulations [11] have shown its importance and a way to obtain it accurately. It was found that $\bar{\kappa}/\kappa = -0.95 \pm 0.1$. Approximating $\bar{\kappa} \approx -\kappa$, we get from Equation A7

$$D \approx 4 \frac{\kappa}{\gamma}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

1. Suspension of vesicles

We now consider the free energy of a suspension of vesicles. From Equation A4, we see that the energy does not depend on the diameter. Consider a suspension of M number of unilamellar vesicles, all at its intrinsic diameter D_0 , given by Equation A8. The total free energy is therefore $M 4\pi\kappa$, substituting the above approximation for $\bar{\kappa}$. Let the overall energy of this suspension be normalised to 1 by this value (see Figure 5). Now consider the same suspension where every two vesicles fuse to form one larger vesicle of diameter $D_1 = \sqrt{2}D_0$ (conserving the surface area). The total number of vesicles would now be $M_1 = M/2$, and the normalised suspension free energy would now be $1/2$, since the energy per vesicle is still the same. This logic can be inductively taken for further fusions to give $D_2 = \sqrt{2}D_1 = 2D_0$ with $M_2 = M_1/2 = M/4$. This is schematically illustrated in Figure 5.

From the above analysis it is clear that the intrinsic size is the highest energy state for vesicles (other higher states for the lipid solution are the discs and free surfactants, as shown in Figure 5). These SUVs (small unilamellar vesicles), over time, will tend towards forming LUVs (large unilamellar vesicles). However, this transition would need to cross a free energy barrier for fusion, of the order of $10 kT$ [7]. Further lowering of free energy is also possible by formation of multilamellar vesicles, which have an attractive interaction between the bilayers [33] (calculations not shown here).




FIG. 5: Schematic representation of the free-energy for a suspension of vesicles. The highest energy state is that of the free surfactants subject to sudden change in the environment that leads to a spontaneous aggregation to form discs. The discs, beyond a critical diameter, spontaneously close up to form vesicles. Vesicles of larger diameter are formed by fusion of smaller vesicles reducing the free energy further. But this process has an energy barrier of the order of $10 kT$.

Therefore, we can conclude that uni-lamellar vesicles are meta-stable structures kinetically trapped in high energy states. The kinetic nature of the vesicular state is unlike other surfactant aggregates such as micelles which are in a dynamic equilibrium with the dilute (solution) phase. The vesicle diameter is usually determined by external parameters from the sample preparation process which leads to one of these energy traps (by dissipating energy into the system) [6]. The analysis shown here is minimalistic in that it does not consider any other shape transformation other than a simple fusion to conserve area, which is expected to be valid only for dilute mono-disperse unilamellar suspensions, in the initial times.

Supplementary Material B: Materials and methods

a. Preparation of phospholipid solution. The phospholipids used to synthesize the liposomes are: 1,2-dimyristoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (14:0-DMPC); 1,2-dipalmitoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (16:0-DPPC); and L- α -phosphatidylcholine (Soy PC, a mixture of various lipids: 18:2, 16:0, 18:1, 18:3, 18:0 phosphatidylcholine), all purchased from Avanti Polar Lipids, was used without further purification. 1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (18:1-DOPC) was purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Ethanol (AR grade) was purchased from Merck and MilliQ water was used for the aqueous medium. All the lipids from Avanti Polar Lipids were in solution form in chloroform (20 mg/ml). An appropriate volume of lipid solution is taken out in a round bottom flask (RBF) and the chloroform is evaporated from the lipid solution using a rotary evaporator. This forms a thin film

on the glass surface of the RBF. The RBF is then kept in a vacuum desiccator overnight to remove all the traces of chloroform. An appropriate volume of ethanol is added to the RBF to make various concentrations of phospholipid in ethanol (5, 10, 20, 40, 80 mg/ml).

b. Device setup The experimental setup is shown in Figure 6. The key components of the device are: a container for aqueous phase (square cuvette 10×40 mm) and organic phase container (cut syringe tube 4.8 mm inner diameter). As shown in the setup, a hole is made in the cuvette cap and the cut tube is inserted through it. The phospholipid solution in ethanol is filled in the tube (held by the vacuum of the syringe piston). The aqueous phase is then gently filled in the cuvette through a syringe needle pierced through the cuvette cap. The two phases—water and ethanol—are held in stable contact. The mixing occurs solely due to molecular diffusion of one phase into the other. Adequate care is taken not to introduce convective mixing in the two phases near the interface during the process.

c. Dynamic light scattering (DLS)/Photon correlation spectroscopy (PCS) The liposomes were characterized by DLS or PCS (Zetasizer nano ZS, Malvern, UK) for size and size distribution (polydispersity), without any further processing, except aqueous dilution, when required, for reliable measurements. The laser used internally is He-Ne laser with 633 nm wavelength and 4 mW power and the scattered light is detected at a single angle of 173° . The size and size distribution was calculated by a software (DTS 6.1, supplied by Malvern). The polydispersity and average diameter were evaluated using mono-modal or cumulant analysis method and the intensity-weighted distribution of diameter was evaluated using multimodal/distribution analysis. Usual care is taken to prevent dust and other contaminants in the system.

d. TEM using Negative staining High resolution transmission electron microscopy (Jeol, JEM-2100F) was used to visualize the liposome lamellarity. Negative staining method was used to observe the liposomes under the HR-TEM. An electron dense material—phosphotungstic acid (PTA) 2%w/v—is used as the negative staining agent. PTA is acidic in nature and needs to be neutralized; the pH is adjusted by a dilute NaOH solution. A drop of liposome solution (10 μ l) is placed carefully on a carbon coated TEM grid with the help of a micropipette and kept for air drying for 10 minutes, which is followed by a placing drop of PTA. The sample was air dried before observing. The operating voltage is kept at 120 kV.

Supplementary Material C: Stages of Liposome formation in SPI

The phospholipid dissolved in ethanol is taken in an inverted tube and is in contact with an aqueous phase (cuvette) as shown in Figure 6. As soon as the interface contact is established, the progress of liposome formation is clearly visible in the form of a turbid front that moves upward through the ethanol section. Time lapse photographs of the visual changes observed are shown in Figure 7.

A copy of the time-lapse video of the formation of liposome




FIG. 6: **Experimental setup** Stationary phase inter-diffusion apparatus comprises two components—a container for aqueous phase (cuvette) and a cut syringe tube containing phospholipid-ethanol phase held by the syringe piston. The needle is used to gently add the aqueous phase to generate a stationary contact with the ethanol phase.




FIG. 7: **Stages of liposome formation** Time-lapse photographs of liposome formation; each photograph is taken in a time interval of 5 hours, showing interdiffusion and turbidity of liposome formation. After the initial contact, a turbid front moves upward in the ethanol medium, indicating liposome formation as water diffuses in. At around 6 hours the entire section of the phase inside the cut-syringe becomes uniformly turbid. After about 15 hours, strings of suspension move downwards, which laterally diffuse to form a uniform suspension by about 36 hours. The time stamp is labelled at the top of each frame in the format DD:MM:HH (denoting day, minute, and hour respectively).

suspension is available from:

<http://goo.gl/KOW3VN>

The video has been made from photographs taken in 10 min time intervals (the timestamp is labelled on the top of the cuvette, in the format DD:HH:MM). Three distinct phenomena are observed—(a) Initially, both the lipid and aqueous phases are clear, and soon after, a turbid layer is observed inside the inverted tube which moves upwards, indicating that liposomes are being formed. This is completed by about 6 hours (b) As the white region moves vertically, some amount of liposome suspension also comes out in the aqueous phase (cuvette) and

goes up towards the water-air interface, due to the lower density of ethanol that is diffusing into the aqueous phase. This is followed by a downward movement of “strings” of suspension towards the bottom of the cuvette (at a steady velocity of about $1 \mu\text{m}$ per sec). (c) Finally the strings diffuse out to form a uniformly turbid milky white suspension.

The time of 6 hours for the first stage roughly agrees with the time scale of diffusion of water through ethanol through a distance of 1 cm, the length of the ethanol section in the cut-syringe (see Section G). In the second stage, we believe, the strings form because of a viscous fingering instability occurring due to a mean motion generated by diffusiophoresis of

the liposomes in a gradient of ethanol. Further experiments and analyses are underway to confirm this claim.

Supplementary Material D: Estimate of the Intrinsic Diameter

The intrinsic diameter of the vesicle is given by Equation A8. In the SPI method, the hydrodynamic diameter of the liposomes was found to be 530 nm for the DMPC lipids. Our claim that this is the intrinsic diameter can be validated by using independent measurements.

The line tension γ can be estimated by a molecular geometry model of the arrangement of lipids along the edge [13]:

$$\gamma = \frac{5\pi}{16} \sigma b_0 \approx \sigma b_0, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where σ is the interfacial tension between the hydrophobic tail and the surrounding solvent, and b_0 is the length of the hydrophobic tail of the lipid. For DMPC lipids the length of the hydrophobic tail $b_0 = 2.54/2 \approx 1.27$ nm [34]. We note that recent measurements of the line tension by observing the dynamics of pore closure [15], find the line tension to be dependent on the manufacturing source (possibly because of small amounts of impurities). In the absence of measurements of γ for our sample, we choose to use the above theoretical estimate consistently for the two cases below.

1. Intrinsic diameter in water

When the surrounding solvent is water, we use an water-oil interfacial tension of $\sigma = 35$ mN/m. This gives the line tension to be $\gamma_w = 44$ pN. For DMPC bilayer in water the bending modulus is $\kappa = 1.5 \pm 0.06 \times 10^{-19}$ J at 27°C [30]. Substituting these estimates we find $D_{\text{water}} = 13$ nm. Experimentally, it is observed that more than two hours of sonication results in a diameter of 17 ± 6 nm [12].

2. Intrinsic diameter in ethanol-water mixture

In the method employed in Section B the self-assembly takes place in the presence of ethanol, and the estimates of the physical properties and hence the diameter will differ. The bending modulus of lipid membranes is reduced in the presence of ethanol by about 30% at 20% v/v of ethanol for SOPC membrane vesicles [13]. This implies for DMPC we can expect $\kappa \approx 1 \times 10^{-19}$ J in the presence of ethanol. More significant is the reduction in the line tension alcohol can induce to an oil water interface. The lowest measured interfacial tension for this system is about $\sigma \approx 1$ mN/m [14]. Therefore the line tension can be estimated from Equation D1 as $\gamma \approx 1.3$ pN. This gives an estimated vesicle diameter of 300 nm, which agrees to within an order of magnitude of the experimentally observed value of 530 nm, and is reasonable given approximate nature of the property estimation we have used. More accurate measurements of the either the interfacial or the edge

tension [15] for various lipids in the presence of ethanol may confirm our hypothesis of the intrinsic size.

Supplementary Material E: “Minimum” vs “Intrinsic” diameter

It has been customary to refer to the diameter given in Equation A8 as the minimum diameter of vesicles, because upon subjecting to external driving (sonication or turbulence) the average diameter of liposomes in an aqueous lipid solution will be given by Equation A8; also see Figure 5. The energy dissipated into the system by external means, which can break larger and multilamellar vesicles, leads to the reassembly by aggregation (of discs and free lipids). The qualifier ‘minimum’ is used because vesicles of a diameter smaller than the diameter given by Equation A8 is highly improbable, owing to the high cost of bending a disc of small diameters.

However, we choose to call it as the ‘intrinsic’ diameter since it is more generic. In the present system the observed diameter of 530 nm is intrinsic for the lipid+ethanol+water system. It is the ‘minimum’ only in the surroundings where it forms (in the presence of a significant concentration of ethanol (25–50%) in water). However, as water completely replaces ethanol, the overall concentration of ethanol in the final surrounding can be very low (less than 1% depending on the total volumes of mixtures taken initially). In such a situation, the minimum diameter obtained by sonication (of aqueous suspension of lipids) would be much smaller, around 20 nm (see Section D). It would thus be misleading to call a 500 nm vesicle to be in its minimum diameter. The nomenclature of ‘intrinsic’ vs ‘minimum’ is only one of semantics. Using ‘intrinsic’ also connotes a physical basis to a spontaneously formed vesicle, whereas ‘minimum’ can also refer to something achieved by external force.

Supplementary Material F: Capillary Setup for Stationary Phase Inter-diffusion

The cuvette and syringe method (Figure 6) takes ~6 hours to form the liposomes (1 cm height and 4.8 mm diameter tube). The formation time is observed to be considerably smaller when capillaries are used. Glass capillaries 10 cm long and 1 mm in inner diameter is used with one end sealed. The procedure in short is—the aqueous phase is filled up to 8 cm with the help of a glass syringe attached to a 12 cm long 30 G SS needle; The phospholipid-ethanol solution is taken in another syringe and filled up to 1.5 cm by keeping a 1/2 cm air gap between the phases. Then the two miscible solutions are brought in contact by sucking out the air bubble through another needle. Care is taken to avoid any convective mixing at the interface otherwise a multi-modal size distribution of liposomes is observed. The total time required to form liposomes is less than an 45 minutes as seen in Figure 8. This can be significantly reduced even less to about 15 minutes by gently tapping the capillary, to release vapour bubbles that occlude the motion of the turbid front. We believe the reason for the faster synthesis in a capillary setup is due to a phoretic

motion of the liposomes driven by a concentration gradient of ethanol in water (diffusiophoresis, [35]) or because of a viscosity gradient, which in turn leads to faster mixing of water in ethanol in the opposite direction, furthering the assembly of liposomes.

Supplementary Material G: Time for vesicle formation

As shown in Section C, the entire process in the cuvette cell configuration takes about 36 hours. However, samples taken as soon as the turbid front reaches the top of the syringe section at about 6 hours, also show the same monodisperse distribution of liposomes, implying the completion of vesicle synthesis.

The time it takes for water to diffusively transport along the length of the section inside the syringe can be estimated to be $t_{\text{water}} \sim L^2/4\mathcal{D} \approx 5$ hrs, where $L = 1$ cm section that initially contains the lipid solution in ethanol, and $\mathcal{D} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-9}$ m²/s is the diffusivity of water in ethanol. This is in near agreement with the above observation on completion of liposome synthesis, and in line with the hypothesis of the diffusive mechanism proposed (main text). Though the 6 hours in the cuvette setup and 15 minutes in the capillary setup (Section F) seems fast for a method that yields monodisperse liposomes in a single step, this needs additional qualification.

We now provide detailed comparison of the time it takes for liposome synthesis in this method with other methods. It will be inappropriate to simply compare the overall time of an experiment, because this also involves the total amount of liposomes formed, which could vary from one method to another, given that there has not been any standardised study. Instead it is plausible to compare the expected time for formation of a single vesicle in each of the methods. Table I lists the order of magnitude time taken in various methods. The estimates have been obtained by using the time spent only in the actual liposome formation step. For the present method, we use the approximate time it takes for water to diffusively replace ethanol over a length scale of a liposome diameter: $t_{\text{SPI}} \sim D^2/4\mathcal{D} \approx 5 \times 10^{-5}$ s, where $D \approx 500$ nm is the liposome diameter, and $\mathcal{D} \approx 1.3 \times 10^{-9}$ m²/s is the diffusivity of water in ethanol. This shows that a liposome is formed in about 50 microseconds.

For methods which use shear forces to drive assembly (or break up liposomes), there are no detailed studies of the time taken; in lieu of which, we have used a typical turbulent (Kolmogorov) time scale $t_{\text{turb}} \sim \text{Re}^{-1/2}d/U \approx 1 \times 10^{-5}$ s for a Reynolds number Re of 10000, generated in a macroscopic length of $d = 1$ mm with a bulk fluid velocity $U \approx 1$ m/s.

It can be concluded from analysing Table I that the time taken for the synthesis of a single vesicle in SPI is among the fastest in comparison with other methods that result in monodisperse distribution by a spontaneous process. Even in comparison with the other externally driven methods the SPI method is comparable in the order of magnitude of the time

taken. We can also infer that since the SPI method is interface driven, a larger interfacial contact will produce a greater yield of liposomes in the same time for a given initial concentration of lipids.

Supplementary Material H: Concentration of Liposome Suspension

As shown in the main communication, in the SPI process the concentration of lipids does not influence the size of liposomes. Increasing the concentration of lipids only results in more number of liposomes formed. We observe a suspension of a very high liposome fraction, as visually seen by a highly turbid mass inside the cut-syringe section. However, we were unable to exactly quantify the concentration; as shown in Figure 7, a part of the liposome suspension comes out of the cut syringe section as the turbid front moves upwards. This makes it difficult to obtain accurate measurements. However, an estimate of the volume fraction of the liposome suspension can be obtained based on the average liposome diameter and the amount of lipids used.

Assuming that all of the lipids dissolved in ethanol form liposomes of the same size, and all of them are contained in the cut-syringe section, we can estimate the volume fraction of the liposome suspension in the cut-syringe section:

$$\phi = \frac{c N_A D a_0}{12M}. \quad (\text{H1})$$

Here, c is the mass concentration of lipids, N_A is the Avogadro number, D is the average diameter of the liposomes, a_0 is the area per head group of lipid, and M is the molecular weight of lipid.

For DMPC lipid, $M = 678$ g/mol, and $a_0 = 0.71$ nm². From the DLS measurements we obtain the diameter of liposomes $D \approx 500$ nm. For a concentration of lipids at $c = 20$ mg/ml, we obtain the volume fraction to be

$$\phi \approx 0.5 \quad (\text{H2})$$

which is close to the maximum volume fraction of $\phi = 0.64$ for random packing of spheres. Higher concentrations lead to even higher volume fractions. For the highest used concentration, $c = 80$ mg/ml, we get $\phi \approx 2$, which is higher than the close packing fraction. In this case, as mentioned above, the liposome suspension no longer remains entirely confined to the cut-syringe section, and the estimate is not a correct reflection of the actual concentration.

A high concentration liposome suspension can be harvested by carefully removing the cut-syringe assembly from the cuvette, as soon as the turbid front reaches the top of the cut-syringe. As indicated in the main communication, the liposome formation is completed by this time (at about six hours) and a mono-disperse distribution is obtained even without waiting for 36 hours for the entire process to complete.




FIG. 8: **Capillary setup of SPI mechanism.** Liposome synthesis in a capillary by the SPI method, shows completion of liposome formation in less than 45 minutes. Here the distance moved by the turbid front is plotted against time. Also shown below are sample images of the vesicle dispersion forming inside the glass capillary at different times.

TABLE I: Estimate of order of magnitude time taken for the formation of a single vesicle in various methods against the size distribution and the driving force for size selection.

Method	Distribution	Driving Force for size selection	Time Taken one liposome (order of magnitude)
Ethanol injection	Polydisperse	Fluid shear	10 microsecond
Reverse phase evaporation	Polydisperse	Fluid shear (mixing upon sonication)	Minute
Detergent depletion (extemporaneous)	Monodisperse	Rate of detergent removal	Minute
Electroformation	Monodisperse	Electric field	Minute
Sonication of aqueous solution of lipids	Monodisperse	Fluid shear	10 microsecond
French press	Monodisperse	Fluid shear	10 microsecond
Thin film hydration	Polydisperse, MLV	Spontaneous (or gentle shear)	Hour
Bilayer hydration	Monodisperse	Spontaneous	Minute
SPI	Monodisperse	Spontaneous	10 microsecond