Cooperatively enhanced reactivity and ‘stabilitaxis’ of dissociating oligomeric proteins
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Many functional units in biology, such as enzymes or molecular motors, are composed of several subunits that can reversibly assemble and disassemble. This includes oligomeric proteins composed of several smaller monomers, as well as protein complexes assembled from a few proteins. By studying the generic spatial transport properties of such proteins, we investigate here whether their ability to reversibly associate and dissociate may confer them a functional advantage with respect to non-dissociating proteins. In uniform environments with position-independent association-dissociation, we find that enhanced diffusion in the monomeric state coupled to reassociation into the functional oligomeric form leads to enhanced reactivity with distant targets. In non-uniform environments with position-dependent association-dissociation, caused e.g. by spatial gradients of an inhibiting chemical, we find that dissociating proteins generically tend to accumulate in regions where they are most stable, a process that we term stabilitaxis.

It has become increasingly clear in recent years that, in order to fully understand intracellular reaction pathways, it is not sufficient to know reaction rates and equilibrium constants: understanding the transport properties of the biomolecules involved is also crucial [1]. For example, it is now known that many enzymes undergo enhanced diffusion as well as chemotaxis in the presence of their chemical substrate [2,3]. In turn, chemotaxis in response to chemicals that are being produced or consumed may lead to spontaneous self-organization of catalytic particles into chemically-active clusters [10,12]. Other works have shown the importance of segregation of different biomolecular components into phase-separated fluid compartments within the cell [13,14], or how differences in diffusion coefficients between membrane-bound and cytosolic molecules are crucial for pattern formation and polarization in cells [15,18].

One particularly ubiquitous feature of functional units in biology, be it proteins, enzymes, or molecular machines, is that they are oligomeric, i.e. complexes composed of several subunits that can reversibly associate and dissociate [19,27]. These proteins are typically fully functional only in their oligomeric state. From an evolutionary perspective, one might thus wonder why it is that oligomers are so prevalent, rather than highly stable proteins and protein complexes with irreversibly bound components. We note that, physically, reversibility implies that the associated binding energies and energy barriers are of the order of the thermal energy $k_BT$. Is there, perhaps, a functional advantage to proteins being able to disassemble and reassemble?

Inspired by this puzzle, we investigate here the transport properties of dissociating proteins (Fig. 1). One important question is how association-dissociation might affect the reactivity of a protein that needs to reach and react with a distant target. Such problems, in which a protein diffuses until it finds a certain target, are typically known as first passage problems, and have been subject of many studies in recent years. The effects of different spatial geometries and heterogeneous media [28,29], anomalous diffusion [33,34], or intermittently switching transport kinetics of the protein [35,36], on first passage times have all been explored to a certain extent. A common feature of all these studies, however, is that they deal with systems of non-interacting particles, in which each particle behaves independently from the others: the first passage time is thus related only to the transport properties of a single particle, and is independent of particle concentrations.

This is not the case for dissociating proteins, see Fig. 1(c). Indeed, whereas dissociation does occur independently for each protein, reassociation requires that two protein subunits find each other, and is thus dependent on the overall protein concentration in the system. The first passage time, therefore, becomes a collective property of the system. In fact, we find that association-dissociation can lead to an enhancement in reactivity with respect to a stable non-dissociating protein, but this occurs cooperatively, only for protein concentrations above a critical value. Enhanced reactivity due to association-dissociation is thus a markedly different phenomenon to that obtained in switching diffusion models [37,38], which represent e.g. a protein undergoing conformational changes.

A second important question with regards to the transport properties of oligomeric proteins is how they respond to heterogeneous environments, see Fig. 1(d). We demonstrate here that dissociating proteins tend to spontaneously accumulate in regions in which they are most stable, via a generic mechanism which we term ‘stabilitaxis’. This behaviour may be exploited in order to trigger non-uniform patterns of protein in response to gra-
FIG. 1. (a) Minimal model of an oligomeric protein. The monomers of a homodimeric protein can associate and dissociate with rates $k_+ \text{ and } k_-$, which may be dependent on environmental conditions (concentration of salt or a chemical inhibitor, pH, illumination...). The protein is functional (in this case able to bind and react with the red ligand) only in its dimer form. (b) A non-dissociating but otherwise identical protein. (c) Faster diffusion of the monomers coupled to reassociation into dimers helps a dissociating protein reach a reactive target in shorter time than its non-dissociating counterpart. (d) In the presence of externally imposed spatial gradients of the dissociation rates, dissociating proteins undergo 'stabilitaxis', i.e. they tend to accumulate in regions where the oligomeric form is most stable.

The paper is organized as follows. In the Results section, we first describe the basic model for a dissociating homodimer protein, and predict enhanced diffusion and stabilitaxis arising from dissociation. We then show how enhanced diffusion coupled to reassociation leads to enhanced reactivity with distant targets through a cooperative mechanism, and demonstrate how stabilitaxis leads to non-uniform steady state patterns of protein in the presence of dissociation gradients. Finally, in the Discussion, we embed our results within the context of biology and materials engineering.

**RESULTS**

**Enhanced diffusion and dissociation-induced drift velocity**

We consider the simplest model for the reversible association and dissociation of two identical monomers to form a homodimeric protein, see Fig. 1(a). The concentrations of monomer and of dimer, respectively $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$, are governed by the coupled time evolution equations

$$
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \rho_1 &= D_1 \nabla^2 \rho_1 - 2k_+ \rho_1^2 + 2k_- \rho_2 \\
\partial_t \rho_2 &= D_2 \nabla^2 \rho_2 + k_+ \rho_1^2 - k_- \rho_2
\end{align*}
$$

where both the association and dissociation rates $k_+$ and $k_-$ can depend arbitrarily on the environmental conditions (e.g. concentration of salt or a chemical inhibitor, pH, illumination, etc.), which in turn may be space-dependent. The monomer diffuses with coefficient $D_1$, and the dimer with coefficient $D_2$. Note that, in general, the bulkier dimer will diffuse more slowly than the monomer, so that $D_2 < D_1$. In fact, we have shown in previous work that, for two subunits that are linked into a dimer, the diffusion coefficient of the dimer goes as $D_2 = D_1/2 - \delta D_{\text{fluc}}$ where $\delta D_{\text{fluc}} > 0$ corresponds to a fluctuation-induced hydrodynamic correction [39–41]. We therefore generically expect the even stronger condition $D_2 < D_1/2$.

Direct analytical solution of the coupled non-linear evolution equations (1) is hard. However, further progress can be achieved if we focus on the total protein concentration $\rho_{\text{tot}} \equiv \rho_1/2 + \rho_2$, defined as the equivalent amount of dimeric protein, where the factor 1/2 reflects the fact that two monomers are needed to generate a dimer. Summing both equations (1), we can write an evolution equation for the total protein concentration
concentrations are related to the local total protein concentration by
\[ \rho_1 \approx \frac{K_d}{4} \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{16 \rho_{tot}}{K_d}} - 1 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2 \approx \frac{\rho_1^2}{K_d} \] (3)

where we have defined the dissociation constant \( K_d = k_- / k_+ \), which carries the environment-dependence (or position-dependence) of the association and dissociation rates.

Inserting the values (3) resulting from the local equilibrium approximation into (2), we finally obtain an explicit evolution equation for the total protein concentration
\[ \partial_t \rho_{tot} = \nabla \cdot (D_{eff} \nabla \rho_{tot} - \rho_{tot} \mathbf{V}_{dis}) \] (4)

with the effective diffusion coefficient
\[ D_{eff} \equiv D_2 + \frac{D_1 - D_2}{\sqrt{1 + 16 \rho_{tot}/K_d}} \] (5)

and the dissociation-induced drift velocity
\[ \mathbf{V}_{dis} \equiv -\frac{D_1 - D_2}{8} \left( \frac{1 + \frac{8 \rho_{tot}}{K_d}}{\sqrt{1 + 16 \rho_{tot}/K_d}} - 1 \right) \frac{\nabla K_d}{\rho_{tot}}. \] (6)

To this end, we have investigated the first passage time of dimers placed at the center of a one-dimensional domain of length \( L \), with absorbing boundary conditions for the dimer \([\rho_2(x = 0) = \rho_2(x = L) = 0] \) and no-flux boundary conditions \([\rho_1(x = 0) = \rho_1(x = L) = 0] \) for the monomer. This represents a system in which a target located at the boundaries reacts instantaneously with dimers (diffusion-limited reaction), but is insensitive to monomers. The results for the dissociating case, obtained from numerical solution of the coupled partial differential equations (1) with position-independent \( k_+ \) and \( k_- \), are compared with those for the diffusion of a non-dissociating protein, governed simply by \( \partial_t \rho_2^\text{nl} = D_2 \nabla^2 \rho_2^\text{nl} \) (see Methods).

Because dimers are absorbed at the boundaries, the total protein number \( N(t) = N_1(t)/2 + N_2(t) \) within the box decreases with time. Here, \( N_1 \) and \( N_2 \) are the monomer and dimer numbers, with \( N_i = \int_0^L \rho_i dx \). We can then define a time-dependent reaction rate as \( R(t) = -\frac{1}{N(t=0)} \frac{dN}{dt} \). The reaction rate defined in this way verifies the normalization condition \( \int_0^\infty R(t) dt = 1 \), and serves as a mean-field generalization of the first passage time probability distribution to a system with many interacting particles, which will coincide with the results of a stochastic approach in the limit of large number of particles.

Indeed, we find that, in a system of associating and dissociating particles, first passage is a collective property of the system (Fig. 2). In particular, the reaction rate curve \( R(t) \) depends on the total initial protein number, as given by the number \( N_2(t=0) \equiv \rho_{2,0} L \) of dimers initially placed at the center of the box. The \( R(t) \) curves for several values of \( \rho_{2,0} \) are shown in Fig. 2(a), and compared with that of a non-dissociating protein (black dotted line). At low concentrations, the dissociating protein is mostly in monomer form, and reacts slower than a non-dissociating protein (red line). At intermediate values of protein concentration, however, a positive interplay between faster diffusion in the monomer state, coupled to frequent enough reassociation into the reactive monomers...
FIG. 2. (a) Reaction rate as a function of time for a dissociating protein at three different concentrations, as well as that of a non-dissociating protein. (b,c) Median first passage time at three different concentrations, as well as the peak reaction rate relative to those of a non-dissociating protein, as a function of protein concentration. The median first passage time obtained from $R(t)$ is a mean-field quantity representing the time after which 50% of the initial proteins have reacted with the target, which, for a many-particle system such as the one under consideration, is a more intuitive measure of reaction speed than the mean first passage time.

Moreover, we find that reactivity is enhanced when the dynamics of association-dissociation is sufficiently fast with respect to the diffusion timescale, see Fig. 2(c). For very slow dynamics, with $k_- L^2/D_1 \ll 1$, the protein does not have time to dissociate before reaching the target, and thus behaves effectively as a non-dissociating protein. At intermediate values, dissociation is counterproductive, as the protein has sufficient time to dissociate before reaching the target, but still takes a long time to reassociate in order to react. Finally, when the dynamics becomes fast enough, dissociation is always favorable as it enhances diffusion (Eq. 5) while reassociation is fast enough to not hinder the reaction.

The combined effect of protein concentration and association-dissociation dynamics on the median first passage time is summarized in Fig. 2(d), for the particular case $D_2 = 0.5 D_1$. Cooperatively enhanced reactivity is found at an intermediate range of protein concentrations and for sufficiently fast association-dissociation dynamics. The optimal value of concentration that minimizes the median first passage time decreases with increasing $k_-$ (yellow line). Within the range of values explored, the median first passage time can be up to 40% smaller for a dissociating protein than for a non-dissociating protein, and will decrease even further for larger values of $k_- L^2/D_1$. Note that our results remain qualitatively similar if a measure of reaction speed other than the median first passage time is used. As an example, we also show the line $t_{99} = t_{99}^{nd}$ (dotted line), representing the values above which the time it takes for 99% of the proteins to react is shorter for a dissociating protein than for a non-dissociating one.

The enhancement in reactivity (reduction in median first passage time) that can be achieved thanks to dissociation increases as the ratio $D_2/D_1$ is decreased; see Fig. S1 for the case $D_2/D_1 = 0.3$. In fact, we expect that the minimal median first passage time that can be achieved is $t_{50} = (D_2/D_1)t_{50}^{nd}$, which will occur in the limit in which the protein concentration is very low.
\( \rho_{2,0} \ll K_d \), so that the protein is mostly in monomer form, but the association-dissociation rate is vary fast \( k_\ast L^2/D_1 \gg 1 \), so that reassociation near the target occurs very rapidly. In fact, the limit \( k_\ast L^2/D_1 \to \infty \) corresponds to the local equilibrium approximation (4). We have solved this equation numerically, for the case \( D_2 = 0.5D_1 \), to obtain the median first passage time as a function of total protein concentration, and indeed we find that the first passage time goes from that expected of a monomer \((t_{50} = 0.5\tau_{50}^{\text{mon}})\) at very low concentration, to that expected of a dimer \((t_{50} = \tau_{50}^{\text{dimer}})\) at very high concentration (Fig. S2).

**Stabilitaxis: accumulation in regions of higher stability**

The existence of the dissociation-induced drift velocity \( \bar{J} \) suggests that, in environments with position-dependent dissociation, dissociating proteins will tend to preferentially accumulate in the regions of higher stability after some time. Indeed, we can verify the existence of such ‘stabilitaxis’ by calculating the steady state concentrations for the monomer, dimer, and total amount of protein in a non-uniform environment. From (2), we see that the total flux of protein is given by \( J = -\nabla (D_1\rho_1/2 + D_2\rho_2) \). Requiring that this flux be equal to zero, \( J = 0 \), we find that in a steady state with no influx or outflux of protein into the system, the combination \( D_1\rho_1/2 + D_2\rho_2 \) must be a position-independent constant. Combining this condition with the results of the local equilibrium approximation (3), we finally find the steady-state profiles

\[
\rho_{1,\infty} \approx \frac{K_d}{4D_1} \left( -1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{C}{K_d}} \right) ,
\]

\[
\rho_{2,\infty} \approx \frac{\rho_{1,\infty}^2}{K_d} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_{\text{tot},\infty} \approx \frac{\rho_{1,\infty}}{2} + \frac{\rho_{1,\infty}^2}{K_d} \tag{7}
\]

where \( C \) is a constant with units of concentration, which is used to satisfy the constraint on the total amount of protein.

To confirm the validity of our steady-state results (7), we have compared them to the long time limit of the numerical solution of the coupled partial differential equations (4), with no-flux boundary conditions \( \rho_1'(x = 0) = \rho_1'(x = L) = 0 \) for all species, for two different examples of position-dependent association and dissociation rates \( k_\ast \) and \( k_\ast' \), and therefore of position-dependent \( K_d = k_\ast/k_\ast' \) (Fig. 3). The steady state profile given by (7) reproduces well the numerical results, although it deviates near the box boundaries, because the no-flux boundary conditions are not appropriately captured by the local equilibrium approximation, and at regions with sharp changes in \( K_d \). These deviations become progressively smaller with increasing \( k_\ast L^2/D_1 \). As predicted, the protein does preferentially accumulate in regions of higher stability (lower \( K_d \)), both when one considers the total protein amount including monomer and dimer forms (black lines), as well as just the dimer form (blue lines). The fact that the steady-state profiles depend on the ratio of diffusion coefficients, see (7), clearly demonstrates that stabilitaxis is a nonequilibrium phenomenon, which must be sustained by externally imposed gradients.

The dependence of stabilitaxis on the ratio of diffusion
coefficients is most evident if we consider the limit of a space containing two connected regions, one with very weak dissociation \( K_d \rightarrow 0 \), for which we expect \( \rho_{\text{tot}} \approx \rho_2 \) and \( \rho_1 \approx 0 \); the other with very strong dissociation \( K_d \rightarrow \infty \), for which we expect \( \rho_{\text{tot}} \approx \rho_1/2 \) and \( \rho_2 \approx 0 \). Taking these limits in (7), and solving for \( C \), we obtain

\[
D_2 \rho_{\text{tot},\infty}(K_d \rightarrow 0) \approx D_1 \rho_{\text{tot},\infty}(K_d \rightarrow \infty)
\]

(8)

between the protein concentrations in both regions. For the case \( D_2 = 0.5D_1 \) we thus expect twice as much protein in the region where it is stable than in the region where it is unstable, a prediction which is confirmed by the numerical result in Fig. 3(b).

**DISCUSSION**

We have predicted here a number of non-trivial features in the diffusion, reactivity, and gradient response of dissociating oligomeric proteins. Some of these features could be seen as conferring a functional advantage to dissociating proteins over non-dissociating ones, which might explain why biological evolution has resulted in many important enzymes and proteins being multimeric.

Firstly, we have shown that it can be advantageous (for a bulky protein, enzyme, or molecular machine) to dissociate into non-functional but smaller subunits that can diffuse faster, and later reassociate to perform their function at a distant location. This can lead to significantly faster reaction rates for dissociating proteins. We have shown that enhanced reactivity arises as a cooperative effect, that minimizes reaction time for an intermediate range of protein concentration. Moreover, as can be seen from Fig. 2, dissociation becomes more and more advantageous with increasing values of the dimensionless quantity \( k_- L^2/D_1 \), which compares the rate of unbinding with the typical timescale of diffusion across the system. Crucially, this quantity goes with the square of the system size, and therefore can vary over many orders of magnitude for different systems. For a moderate choice of value of dissociation rate \( k_- = 1 \text{ s}^{-1} \), and \( D_1 = 10 \text{ \mu m}^2/\text{s} \) for the diffusion coefficient of a protein in the cytoplasm, we find values of \( k_- L^2/D_1 \) ranging from 10\(^{-1} \) for a small cell with \( L = 1 \text{ \mu m} \), to 10\(^3 \) for a large cell with \( L = 100 \text{ \mu m} \), all the way up to 10\(^7 \) for diffusion along a neuronal axon or a microfluidic device with \( L = 1 \text{ cm} \). For any given protein, the advantages due to dissociation will be largest when the target to be reached is distant. The typical reactivity enhancements that can be achieved are of the order of \( D_1/D_2 \), and thus for a dissociating dimer are of the order of 10–50\% (Fig. 2).

Secondly, we have shown that dissociation provides a new mechanism for proteins to sense and respond to their environment, by undergoing stabilitaxis or motion towards regions in which their oligomeric form is most stable. Stabilitaxis represents a new way by which non-uniform patterns in the concentration of a biomolecule can be triggered. For example, polarization in the concentration of a dissociating protein within a cell can be triggered by localized production of a chemical that enhanced or inhibits the association or dissociation of the protein subunits. The precise form of the resulting protein distribution can be predicted from equation (7), but in general the typical difference in protein concentration between the regions of low and high dissociation will be of a factor \( D_1/D_2 \), see equation (8). It remains to be seen whether stabilitaxis is exploited by the cell in the intracellular organization of oligomeric proteins.

We note that, while we have focused here for simplicity on the case of a homodimeric protein, we expect that our general predictions of enhanced reactivity and stabilitaxis will hold equally for more complex cases of hetero-multimeric proteins (i.e. composed of more than two subunits, that may also be different from each other). As an example of a more complex protein, we have considered a homohexamer, composed of six identical subunits, and found qualitatively similar results both for enhanced reactivity and stabilitaxis (Supplementary Information, Figure S3). Interestingly, our numerical results show that the prediction (8) for stabilitaxis still holds, if we replace the dimer diffusion coefficient by the hexamer diffusion coefficient. Because the ratio of monomer and hexamer diffusion coefficients is much larger, of the order of 6, the protein accumulation due to stabilitaxis is enhanced correspondingly. We expect that the maximum achievable enhancement in reactivity (for sufficiently fast association-dissociation rate) will also be larger for a multimeric protein with a big difference in diffusion coefficient between the monomeric and multimeric forms.

Beyond the biological implications, our predictions of enhanced reactivity may be useful in the context of chemical engineering, e.g. in the design of synthetic catalytic microreactors. Moreover, our results may also be tested and applied in purely synthetic systems, e.g. using patchy colloids coated with ligands, that can bind to each other to form colloidal molecules. In the context of engineering of “active” or “responsive” materials, one particularly interesting application would be to use colloids coated with light-induced linkers that bind to each other only when illuminated. Such a material would flow and become denser in illuminated regions on demand.
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METHODS

Numerical solution of evolution equations. The coupled evolution equations (1) are numerically solved using MATLAB’s pdepe solver for systems of parabolic partial differential equations [46]. If the length of the 1-D box is L, we can define the dimensionless time as \( \tau \equiv tD_1/L^2 \), position as \( \tilde{x} \equiv x/L \), and concentrations as \( \tilde{\rho} \equiv (k_+ / k_-) \rho = \rho/K_D \). The system is then governed only by two dimensionless parameters, namely the ratio of association-diffusion timescales \( k_- \equiv k_- L^2/D_1 \), and the ratio of dimer-to-monomer diffusion coefficients \( D_2 = D_2 / D_1 \), as well as our choice of initial conditions. In cases with position-dependent \( k_- \), we use the maximum value \( k_{\text{max}} \) for the non-dimensionalization. For the initial conditions, we use a Gaussian profile located at the center of the box for the concentration of the dimer, with standard deviation \( \sigma = 0.01L \), and normalized so that the total amount of dimer in the box is \( \rho_{2,0} L \); the initial concentration of monomer is set to zero. We use 1000 points in the space discretization. The system is evolved in time until 99% of the protein has been consumed (when calculating the reaction rate), or until a steady state is reached (when exploring stabilitaxis).
Calculations for a dissociating hexamer

We consider a model of a dissociating hexamer, composed of monomers which can disassemble and reassemble into all the intermediate states of dimer, trimer, tetramer, and pentamer. All reactions $[m] + [n] \xrightleftharpoons[k_-]{k_+} [m+n]$ for association of a $m$-mer and a $n$-mer into a $(m+n)$-mer, as well as the corresponding reverse dissociation reactions, are considered as long as $m+n \leq 6$. For simplicity, all reactions are taken to occur with the same association and dissociation rates $k_+$ and $k_-$, which thus gives the same dissociation constant $K_d \equiv k_-/k_+$ for all reactions. The concentration of $m$-mers is denoted as $\rho_m$, and their diffusion coefficient by $D_m$. The system is then described by the six coupled reaction-diffusion equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_t \rho_1 &= D_1 \nabla^2 \rho_1 + k_-(2\rho_2 + \rho_3 + \rho_4 + \rho_5 + \rho_6) - k_+ \rho_1 (2\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_3 + \rho_4 + \rho_5) \\
\partial_t \rho_2 &= D_2 \nabla^2 \rho_2 + k_-(\rho_3 + 2\rho_4 + \rho_5 + \rho_6) + k_+ \rho_1^2 - k_- \rho_2 - k_+ \rho_2 (2\rho_2 + \rho_3 + \rho_4) \\
\partial_t \rho_3 &= D_3 \nabla^2 \rho_3 + k_-(\rho_4 + \rho_5 + 2\rho_6) + k_+ \rho_1 \rho_2 - k_- \rho_3 - k_+ \rho_3 (2\rho_2 + \rho_3 + \rho_4) \\
\partial_t \rho_4 &= D_4 \nabla^2 \rho_4 + k_-(\rho_5 + \rho_6) + k_+ (\rho_1 \rho_3 + \rho_2^2) - 2k_- \rho_4 - k_+ \rho_4 (2\rho_1 + \rho_2) \\
\partial_t \rho_5 &= D_5 \nabla^2 \rho_5 + k_-(\rho_6) + k_+ (\rho_1 \rho_4 + \rho_2 \rho_3) - 2k_- \rho_5 - k_+ \rho_1 \rho_5 \\
\partial_t \rho_6 &= D_6 \nabla^2 \rho_6 + k_+ (\rho_1 \rho_5 + \rho_2 \rho_4 + \rho_3^2) - 3k_- \rho_6
\end{align*}
\]

which satisfy a local conservation law for the total protein concentration (defined as the equivalent hexamer concentration)

\[
\rho_{\text{tot}} \equiv \frac{1}{6}(\rho_1 + 2\rho_2 + 3\rho_3 + 4\rho_4 + 5\rho_5 + 6\rho_6)
\]

For the numerical calculation of the first passage time of the hexamer, we set no-flux boundary conditions for the monomer, dimer, trimer, tetramer, and pentamer, and absorbing boundary conditions for the hexamer. For the numerical calculation demonstrating stabilitaxis, we set no-flux boundary conditions for all species. In all cases, the diffusion coefficients are set as $D_n = D_1/n$, e.g. the hexamer diffuses six times slower than the monomer.
FIG. S1. Cooperatively enhanced reactivity of dissociating dimers with $D_2 = 0.3D_1$. Median first passage time $t_{50}/t_{50}^{nd}$ as a function of both protein concentration and association-dissociation rate. The ‘disadvantage’ region corresponds to $t_{50}/t_{50}^{nd} > 1$; the line labeled $t_{50}^\text{min}$ indicates the concentrations that minimize $t_{50}$ for a given $k_{-}$; the line $t_{99} = t_{99}^{nd}$ denotes the values above which 99% of the protein reacts faster in the dissociating case. Comparing to Fig. 2 in the main text, we see that the advantages due to dissociation are bigger when $D_2$ is decreased.

FIG. S2. Enhanced reactivity as a function of protein concentration in the limit of very fast association-dissociation. Median first passage time as obtained from solution of Eq. 4 in the main text with absorbing boundary conditions $\rho_{tot}(x = 0) = \rho_{tot}(x = L) = 0$, which represents the limit $k_-L^2/D_1 \to \infty$. We have used $D_2 = 0.5D_1$ and no dissociation gradient ($\nabla K_d = 0$). The median first passage time goes from that expected of a monomer ($t_{50} = t_{50}^{nd}/2$) at very low concentration, to that expected of a dimer ($t_{50} = t_{50}^{nd}$) at very high concentration.
FIG. S3. Enhanced reactivity and stabilitaxis for a dissociating hexamer. (a) Median first passage time $t_{50}$ relative to that of a non-dissociating protein $t_{nd}$ as a function of protein concentration, and (b) as a function of $k_-L^2/D_1$. The inset is a zoomed out version of the figure, showing that at slow association-dissociation rates reactivity is strongly slowed down. (c) Stabilitaxis in the presence of a dissociation gradient, as given by a discrete jump in $k_-$ and thus $K_d$. The protein accumulates in the region where the hexamer form is stable, with six times higher concentration than in the high-dissociation region where the monomer form is preferred, as suggested by a generalization of Eq. 8. Parameters used are $D_1 = D_1/n$ in all cases; $k_-L^2/D_1 = 10^4$ in (a); $\rho_{6,0} = 0.4K_d$ in (b); $k_-^{max}L^2/D_1 = 10^5$ and $\rho_{6,0} = 10^{-2}K_d^{max}$ in (c).