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W e study the shape, elasticity and uctuations of the recently predicted" "' and subsequently observed (in num erical sim ulations) ${ }^{\underline{a}}$ tubule phase of anisotropic $m$ embranes, as well as the phase transitions into and out of it. This novel phase lies betw een the previously predicted at and crumpled phases, both in tem perature and in its physical properties: it is crum pled in one direction, and extended in the other. Its shape and elastic properties are characterized by a radius of gyration exponent and an anisotropy exponent $z$. $W$ e derive scaling laws for the radius of gyration $R_{G}\left(L_{?} ; L_{Y}\right)$ (i.e. the average thickness) of the tubule about a spontaneously selected straight ax is and for the tubule undulations $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm}} \mathrm{s}\left(\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{L}_{y}\right)$ transverse to its average extension. W e show that for square $m$ em branes ( $w$ ith intrinsic size $L_{?}=L_{y}=L$ ), $R_{G} / L$, and $h_{r m} / L^{1} \quad{ }^{z=2}$, with a bending rigidity anom alous elasticity exponent related to and z. For phantom (i.e. non-selfavoiding) m em branes, we predict $=1=4, \mathrm{z}=1=2$ and $\quad=0$, exactly, in excellent agreem ent w ith $\operatorname{sim}$ ulations. For $D=2$ din ensionalm em branes em bedded in the space of dim ension $d<11$, selfavoidance greatly sw ells the tubule and suppresses its $w$ ild transverse undu lations, changing its shape exponents , $z$, and . For a $D$-dim ensional $m$ em brane em bedded in $d>d \quad(d \quad(D=2)>7=2)$,
$=0$ and $z=(\mathrm{D} 1+2)=3$, while ford $<\mathrm{d}, \quad>0$ and $\mathrm{z}=(\mathrm{D} \quad 1+2)=(3 \quad) . \backslash \mathrm{F}$ lory" theorf, yields, in the physical case of $D=2$ and $d=3,=3=4$, while the recent 11 expansion result ${ }^{\frac{1}{3}, 1}$ y ields $=0: 52$. The actual value of probably lies closer to the $F$ lory estim ate, betw een these tw o lim its. W e give detailed scaling results for the shape of the tubule of an anbitrary aspect ratio, i.e. for the tubule thickness, its transverse undulations, and a variety of other correlation functions, as well as for the anom alous elasticity of the tubules, in term sof and z. F inally we present a scaling theory for the shape and speci c heat near the continuous transitions into and out of the tubule phase and perform detailed renorm alization group calculations for the crum pled-to-tubule transition for phantom $m$ em branes.
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## I. IN TRODUCTION

Tethered $m$ em brane $\overline{i d}^{14^{1}}$ becam e a sub ject, of great interest when it was theoretically predicted ${ }^{151}$ that, unlike polym ers, which are always orientationally disordered, $m$ em branes can exhibit two distinct phases: crum pled and $a t, w$ ith a \crum pling" transition betw een them. The at phase is particularly novel and intriguing, because it provides an exam ple of a tw o dim ensionalsystem $w$ ith a continuous sym $m$ etry that nonetheless exhibits a long-ranged order (speci cally, long-ranged orientational order in the norm al to the $m$ em brane) in apparent violation of the $H$ ohenberg $-M$ erm in $W$ agner theorem ${ }^{6} 6_{1}$. Finis
 them al uctuations in nitely enhance the bending rigid-止 of the $m$ em brane at long wavelengths, thereby stabilizing the orientational order against these very uctuations. $T$ his is perhaps the $m$ ost dram atic illustration yet found of the phenom enon of \order from disorder".
$R$ ich as these phenom ena are, $m$ ost past theoretical
work ${ }^{\left[i^{1} i^{1}\right.}$ has been restricted to isotropic $m$ em branes. In a recent paper ${ }^{\text {h }}$ w we extended these considerations to intrinsically anisotropic $m$ em branes (e.g., polym erized $m$ em branesw ith in-plane tilt order ${ }^{(1)}$ ) and found, astonishingly, that anisotropy, a seem ingly innocuous generalization, actually leads to a wealth of new phenom ena. M ost dra$m$ atically, we found an entire new phase of $m$ embranes, which we called the \tubule" phase, ubiquitously intervenes betw een the high tem perature crum pled and low tem perature $\backslash$ at" phases. The de ning property of the tubule phase is that it is crum pled in one of the two $m$ embrane directions, but $\backslash$ at" (i.e., extended) in the other. Its average shape is a long, thin cylinder of length $R_{Y}=L_{y} \quad O(1)$ and radius $R_{G}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right) \quad L_{\text {? }}$, where $L_{Y}$ and $L$ ? are the dim ensions the $m$ em brane would have in the extended and crum pled directions respectively, w ere it to be attened out. It should be clari ed here that we use the term \cylinder" extrem ely loosely; as illustrated in $F$ ig ', ', a cross section of the $m$ em brane penpendicular to the tubule axis (y) w ill look as disordered as a exible
polym er. These tubules, occurring as a low tem perature phase of anisotropic polym erized $m$ em branes, have little in com $m$ on (and therefore should not be confused) w ith m icrowibules that are found in liquid phospholipid m em brane ${ }^{10}-$.

Only in, the special case of perfectly isotropic m em branes ${ }^{111}$ is it possible for the $m$ em brane to undergo a direct transition from the at to the crum pled phase. T he theoretically predicted ${ }^{12}$ and recently observed ${ }^{2 / 2}$ phase diagram is show $n$ in $F$ ig ${ }^{\prime \prime 1}$.


FIG . 1. P hase diagram for an isotropic tethered $m$ em branes show ing the new tubule and previously studied at and crum pled phases.

T he direct crum pling transition studied previously occurs in our $m$ ore generic $m$ odel only for that special set of cuts through the phase diagram (like $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ ) that pass through the origin. Generic paths (like $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ ) will experience two phase transitions, crum pled-to-tubule, and tubule-to- at, that are in new, heretofore uninvestigated universality classes.

This prediction was recently dram atically con med in $M$ onte $C$ arlo sim ulations of phantom (i.e., non-selfavoiding) m en branes by Bow ick, Falcioni and Thorleifsson (BFT) ${ }^{2}$. They sim ulated $m$ embranes $w$ ith di erent bare bending $m$ oduli $x$ and $y$ in the orthogonalx and $y$ directions. A s tem perature (or one of the bending rigidities e.g. x) is varied, we predicted our m odel would follow a generic path like $P_{1}$ in $F$ ig '1̈1. And, indeed, these simulations' observed two speci c heat bum ps, corresponding to two distinct continuous transitions crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at _(rounded by
nite $m$ em brane size), just as we predictect ${ }^{2}$. Further$m$ ore, the shape of the $m$ em brane in the phase betw een these tw o transitions w as exactly that of the tubule above (see Figure,'근), and had, w thin num ericalerrors, precisely the scaling properties and exponents that we predicted forphantom tubulestu. H ere w e present our detailed study of these transitions and the tubule phase, in the presence ofboth them al uctuations and self-avoidance.
$T$ here are a num ber of possible experim ental realizations of anisotropic $m$ em branes. O ne is polym erized
$m$ em branes $w$ ith in-plane tilt order ${ }^{\text {n'1 }}$ '. Fluid $m$ em branes
 possible to polym erize these w thout destroying the tilt order. Secondly, $m$ em branes could be fabricated by crosslinking D NA m olecules trapped in a uid membrane ${ }^{212123}$. Perform ing the cross-linking in an applied electric eld would align the DNA and "freeze in" the anisotropy induced by the electric eld, which could then be rem oved.
$T$ he tubule cross-sectionalradius $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}$, (hereafter called the radius of gyration), and its undulations $h_{\text {rm s }}$ transverse to its average axis of orientation, obey the scaling law s:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right) & =\mathrm{L}_{?} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{R}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{Y}}=\mathrm{L}_{?}^{\mathrm{z}}\right) ;  \tag{1.1}\\
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rms}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right) & =\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{Y}}=\mathrm{L}_{?}^{\mathrm{z}}\right) ; \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

where $==z$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{1}{3}(1+2) ; \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have specialized in Equn to $\mathrm{D}=2$ (w ith general expression for a $D$-dim ensional $m$ em brane given in the $m$ ain text), the universal exponents and $z$ are $<1$, is the anom alous elasticity exponent for the tubule bending rigidity (as de ned by If , also see below), and for convenience we chose to $m$ easure the intrinsic lengths $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}$ and $\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}$ in units of the ultraviolet cuto, set approxi$m$ ately by the the $m$ onom er (e.g. phospholipid) size.


FIG.2. Schem atic picture of the tubule phase of an isotropic polym erized $m$ em brane, $w$ ith the de nition of its thickness $R_{G}$ and roughness $h_{r m}$, our predictions for $w$ hich

$T$ he scaling functions $S_{R} ; h(x)$ have the lim iting form $s:$

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{R}(x) / \quad \begin{array}{l}
x \quad{ }^{p}=z ; \\
\text { constant; for } x!
\end{array}  \tag{1.4}\\
& S_{h}(x) / \quad \begin{array}{l}
\text { constant; for } x!0 \\
x^{\frac{3}{2}} ;
\end{array} \quad \text { for } x!1 ; \tag{1.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $p$ is the radius ofgyration exponent of a coiled linear polym er $\quad 3=5$. These scaling functions are universal (i.e., independent of $m$ aterial param eters and tem perature), up to an overall non-univensal $m$ ultiplicative factor, which can, and will, depend on $m$ aterial param eters and tem perature.

The scaling form s, Eq 1 "roughly square" $m$ em brane $\{$ that is, one $w$ th $L$ ? $L_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{L}\{$ in the lim it L ! 1

$$
\begin{array}{cll}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{~L} ? & \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} & \mathrm{~L}) / \mathrm{L} ; \\
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \text { s }}\left(\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}\right. & \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} & \mathrm{~L}) / \mathrm{L}^{1} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{z}=2} ; \tag{1.7}
\end{array}
$$

$w$ here we have used the fact that for $L_{y} \quad L_{\text {? }}$, the argu$m$ ent $x \quad L_{y}=L_{\text {? }}^{z}$ of the scaling functions $S_{R ; h}(x)$ goes to in nity as L! 1 , and used Eqi.1 to sim plify Equ.1.7.

D etailed renom alization group calculations show that
is strictly positive. H ence, $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm}} \mathrm{s} \ll \mathrm{L}$ for a roughly square m em brane as L! 1 . Thus, the end-to-end orientational uctuations $\quad b_{n}=L / L \quad z=2$ ! 0 as L ! 1 for such a roughly square $m$ em brane, proving that tubule order (which requires orientational persistence in the extended direction) is stable against undulations of the tubule em bedded in $d=3$ dim ensions.

On the other hand, in the $\lim$ it $L_{y} \gg L_{\text {? }}$, in which the tubule looks $m$ ore and $m$ ore like a linear polym er (a ribbon of $w$ idth $L$ ? and length $L_{y}$ ), we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{r m ~ s} / \frac{L_{Y}^{3=2}}{\left.L_{?}^{z(3=2}\right)}=\frac{L_{Y}^{3=2}}{L_{?}^{1=2+} \quad z=2} \quad L_{y} \quad \frac{L_{y}}{L_{P}\left(L_{?}\right)}{ }^{1=2} ; \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

acting like a rigid polym er w ith a polym er bending rigidIty

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?}\right) / \mathrm{L}_{?}^{1+z}: \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is well know nil does not have long-ranged orientational order i.e., it has a nite orientational persistence length $L_{p}$. For_length sm aller than $L_{P}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right)$ we recover the well-know $n^{4}-L_{y}^{3=2}$ grow th of transverse uctuations. By equating $h_{r m}$ from Eqin w ith the length $L_{y}$ of the tubule, and de ning (ribion w idth-dependent persistent length) $L_{P}$ ( $L_{\text {? }}$ ) to be the value of $L_{y}$ at which this equality occurs, we obtain an estim ate for the orientational persistence length $L_{P}$ of a long, skinny tubule:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{P}\left(L_{?}\right) / L_{?}^{1+} \quad z: \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e see that only very long, skinny m em branes ( $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \gg$ $L_{\text {? }}$ ) w illbe orientationally disordered; for any $m$ em brane w ith a reasonable aspect ratio (i.e., $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{p}}$ ), $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}$ is $m$ uch less than $L_{p}$ ( $L_{\text {? }}$ ), and the orientational order of the tubule persists throughout it. This proves that the tubule phase is stable in the them odynam ic lim it against therm al uctuations.

Equation in indicates that the ective polym er bend modulus $p\left(L_{\text {? }}\right)$ is \anom alous", by which wem ean the fact that $p$ ( $L_{\text {? }}$ ), grows as a power of $L$ ? greater (by the \anom alous dim ension" $z$ ) than 1 (naively expected based on dim ensional analysis). This together w ith the concom tant anom alous dim ension of the persistent length $L_{P}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right)$, Eqine
known as \anom alous elasticity" uctuating $m$ em branes, they have consequences for poly$m$ ers whose intemal structure is that of a long ribbon of dim ension $L_{\text {? }} \quad L_{y}$, with $L_{y} \gg L_{P}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right) \gg L_{\text {? }}$. Provided that L ? is large enough that the anom alous elasticity can $m$ anifest itself, the radius of gyration $R_{G}^{P}$ of this polym er (which, since $L_{y} \gg L_{P}$, will be coiled) will, in fact, grow $m$ ore rapidly $w$ ith the transverse dim ension L ? of the polym er than the conventional elastic theory would predict. Speci cally, we expect:

$$
\begin{gather*}
R_{G}^{p} \quad L_{p}\left(L_{?}\right) \frac{L_{y}}{L_{P}\left(L_{?}\right)} \\
 \tag{1.11}\\
\quad / L_{y}^{p} L_{?}^{(1)} \quad ; \quad(1+\quad z)
\end{gather*}
$$

while conventional elastic theory would imply $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}^{\mathrm{p}}$ / $L_{\text {? }}^{1}{ }^{p}$.

In addition to this anom alous elasticity in the e ective polym er bend m odulus, the uctuating tubule also displays anom alous elasticity for stretching the tubule. In particular, experim ents that attem pt to $m$ easure the stretching $m$ odulus $g_{y}$ of the tubule (de ned $m$ ore precisely by the renom alized version of E qs.5 5 wavevector q w ill produce results that depend strongly on $q$, even in the $\lim$ it $q!0$. In particular, this $a p-$ parent wavevector-dependent stretching modulus $g_{y}(q)$ vanishes as Mj $\ddagger$ 0, according to the scaling law

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{y}(q)=q_{y}{ }^{u} S_{g}\left(q_{y}=q_{?}^{z}\right) ; \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $u>0$ is another universal exponent, and $S_{g}(x)$ another universal scaling function.

Sim ilarly, the tubule bend m odulus (also de ned more precisely by the renorm alized version ofE qs 5.4 and 5. but it diverges in that lim it:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(q)=q_{y} \quad S \quad\left(q_{y}=q_{?}^{2}\right) ; \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

w th 0 yet another universal exponent, and $S(x)$ yet another universal scaling function.
$T$ he relations E qs! 1112 sum $m$ arize all of the scaling properties in term sof the two universalexponents and z (or equivalently ). C learly, we would like to predict their num erical values. T here are three distinct cases to be considered, as we decrease the em bedding dim ension $d$ in which the $D=2$-dim ensionalm embrane uctuates, as illustrated in $F$ ig ${ }^{2}$ (the generalization to arbitrary $D$ is given in the $m$ ain text).


FIG.3. Tlustration (in $D=2$ ) of the three regim es of em bedding dim ension $d$ w ith qualitatively and quantitatively di erent tubule shape scaling properties. O ur estim ates of d 6:5 place the physicaltubule $(\mathrm{d}=3)$ deep in regim e III; the strict bound $d>7=2$ guarantees this.

## Regim e I:

For a phantom $m$ em brane, or for a $m$ em brane $w$ ith intrinsic dim ension $D=2$ em bedded in a space of dim ension $d \quad d_{c}=11$, self-avoidance e ects can be asym ptotically ignored in the tubule phase, and we predictit

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{1}{4} ;  \tag{1.14}\\
z & =\frac{1}{2} ;  \tag{1.15}\\
& =0 ;  \tag{1.16}\\
u & =1 ; \tag{1.17}
\end{align*}
$$

Regim e II:
For a self-avoiding $m$ em brane $w$ ith $d<d<d_{u c}=11$ ( w ith $\mathrm{d}>7=2$ ), we have shown (as we describe in detail in $\operatorname{Sec}_{\frac{-1}{-}}^{-}$) that the bending elasticity is not anom alous, i.e., $=0$, as guaranteed by an exact \tubulegauge"
 leads to the the exponent relation, $z=(1+2)=3$, which states that for $d>d$ all properties of a self-avoiding tubule can be expressed in term $s$ of a single radius of gyration exponent. In this range $d<d<d_{u c}=11$ ofem bedding dim ensionality, the exponents and $z$ can be com puted in an $=11$ d-expansion. This has been done recently by B ow ick and Guitter ( $B G)^{3^{3}}$ who have veri ed the validity of the $W$ ard identity $z=(1+2)=3$ (for $\mathrm{D}=2$ ) perturbatively, to all orders in . Further$m$ ore, for all embedding dimensions $d>d$, the $a b-$ sence of anom alous bend elasticity (i.e., $=0$ ) renders the self-avoiding interaction ine ective in stabilizing wild transverse tubule undulations and for a square $m$ em branes, Eqs! $\overline{1} \cdot \overline{1}$ and $1 . \overline{10}$ show that the $D=2-$ dim ensional tubule phase is only m arginally stable. For $D=2$, this $d<d<d_{u c}=11$ regim e has:

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{2}{5} & \gg \frac{1}{4} ;  \tag{1.18}\\
z & =\frac{1}{3}(1+2) ;  \tag{1.19}\\
& =0 ;  \tag{120}\\
u & =3 \frac{1}{z} ; \tag{121}
\end{align*}
$$

Regim e III:
F inally, as we describe in Sec ${ }_{\mathbf{N}} \mathbf{-}$, the physics of the physical tubule (i.e., $D=2$-dim ensional tubule em bedded in $d=3$ dim ensions) is $m u c h$ richer than that for the em bedding dim ensions $d>d$, where \tubule-gauge" sym $m$ etry in poses strict nonrenom alization of the tubule bending rigidity . For $d<d$, because of the presence of additional elastic nonlinearities (w hich are irrelevant for $d$ near $d_{u c}=11$, but becom e strongly relevant for
physical dim ensionality $d<d$ ), this expansion about $d=d_{u c}=11$ gives no inform ation about the sim ultaneous role that the self-avoidance and elastic nonlinearity play in the physicaltubule ( $D=2, d=3<d(D=2)$ ), where they are both im portant. $W$ e nd that, as the em bedding dim ension $d$ is low ered below $d<d_{u c}=11$ (d $(\mathrm{D}=2)>7=2$ ), the nonlinear elasticity becom es relevant, destabilizing the xed point studied in Ref.i-3, and leading to the breakdown of the $z=(1+2)=3$ relation (w ith the am ount of breakdown described by a new anom alous elasticity exponent ). Hence physical tubules ( $D=2, d=3$ ) are described by a new infra-red stable xed point, that is non-perturbative in
$=11 \mathrm{~d}$, which inconporates the sim ultaneouse ects of self-avoidance and nonlinear anom alous elasticity. This new xed point characterizes the $d<d$ regime (appropriate to a physicaltubule) w ith shape scaling exponents

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{2}{5} ;  \tag{1.22}\\
& >\frac{1}{d} ;  \tag{123}\\
z & =\frac{1}{3}(1+2) ;  \tag{124}\\
2+u & =3 \frac{1}{z} ;  \tag{1.25}\\
; u & >0 ; \tag{1.26}
\end{align*}
$$

W e cannot calculate exactly the critical em bedding dim ension $d$ (D) that separates regim e II and regim e III, but we can derive a rigorous lower bound on it $d(2)>7=2$. Thus the physical tubule, $D=2, d=3$ falls in regim e III. O ur best estim ate of d (2) is that it lies betw een 5 and 7.

It should be em phasized that all of the exponents are universalin a given em bedding dim ension $d$. Indeed, for $d<d<11$, where all of the exponents are determ ined by the single unknow $n$ exponent, there are two di erent analytical approxim ations to that agree to better than $1 \%$ for $d>8$, and to better than $10 \%$ for $d^{\prime}$ s greater than the likely values of $d$. These analyticalm ethods are: Flory theoryllin which predicts

$$
\begin{equation*}
F=\frac{3}{d+1} \tag{1.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the leading order in $=11$ d expansion of $B$ ow ick and G uitter ${ }^{\beta_{1}}$, which gives,

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{3}{4 \quad c} \quad \frac{1}{2} ; \tag{1.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{equation*}
c=0: 13125 ; \tag{1.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e suspect, based on the experience of com paring poly$m$ er exponents obtained from $F$ lory theory w th those
obtained from the -expansion, that, although BG's results are certainly $m$ ore accurate near $d=11$, when the $B G$ and $F$ lory results start to disagree appreciably (i.e., below $d=7$ ), the $F$ lory result is probably the m ore accurate. N onetheless, the extrem ely close agreem ent betw een these tw o very di erent approaches in these high em bedding dim ensions increases our faith in both of them.

In fact, as we describe in detail in $S e c=1$ dim ensional $m$ em brane, $d$ is determ ined by the condition that (d)! $2=5$ as d! $d^{+}$. U sing the $F$ lory result (Eq'i-27'), thisgives d $=13=2=6: 5$; while using the BG result (Eq12g) gives d = $11 \quad 2=(3 c)=5: 92$.

A ll of the exponents jum $p$ discontinuously (as a finction ofd) at d ; gureíq show s such a plot, schem atically, for (d) and (d).
For a physical tubule, F lory theory, Eq'ī27, im plies

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{F}(\mathbb{D}=2 ; \mathrm{d}=3)=3=4 ; \tag{1.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

in contrast to the BG result Equin, which implies (D) $=2 ; \mathrm{d}=3$ ) $=0: 517$. W hat is the correct value of in $d=3$ ? A s discussed above, our experience w ith polym ers suggests that Flory theory is m ore reliable ${ }^{1}$. than the -expansion when both are pushed well below the upper critical dim ension. O ne $m$ ight be concemed that this ceases to be true for tubules, due to the discontinuous behavior ofallof the exponents at d, butwewill present argum ents later that suggest that this is not the case, and that $F$ lory theory is probably quite accurate in the physical case of d=3.
 that self-avoidance destroys the crum pled phase. W hat is de nitely known is that the crum pled phase has only been seen in simulations of phantom $m$ embranes and in $m$ ore recent sim ulations by $B$ aum gartnet ${ }^{19}$ - of a selfavoiding plaquette m em brane m odel. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether our tubule phase will su er the sam e fate. $W$ e think not, for the follow ing reasons:

1. It is clear that self-avoidance, though a relevant perturbation (in physicalem bedding dim ension $\mathrm{d}<$ $d_{u c}=11$ ) has far less e ect on the tubule than the crum pled phase, since points on the $m$ em brane w idely separated in the $y$-direction neverbum $p$ into each other in the tubule phase, but do in the crum pled phase.
2. The analytic argum ent that self-avoidance destroys the crum pled phase is based on, the G aussian variational (GV) approxim ation ${ }^{21122}$, which predicts that the radius of gyration exponent ${ }_{\mathrm{GV}}^{\text {crum pled }}=$ $4=\mathrm{d}$, which im plies that 1 ford 4 , and hence that the $m$ em brane is extended (i.e. at) for those dim ensions (which, of course, include the physical case of $d=3$ ). We nd that the same Gaussian variational approxim ation leads to the sam e conclusion for the tubule phase. O ur result for $D=2$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underset{G V}{\text { tubule }}=\frac{7}{3 \mathrm{~d} 5} ; \tag{1.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

and implies $\underset{G V}{\text { tubule }} 1$ ford 4 , and hence an instability of the self-avoiding tubule to an extended (i.e. at) $m$ em brane in physical dim ensions.

W e are not, how ever, overly concemed by this result, for a num ber of reasons:
(a) The Gaussian variational approxim ation is known to be far from trustw orthy. For example, it predicts $=2=d$ for linear poly$m$ ers, which not only is less accurate for all d between 1 and 4 than the F lory result
$=3=(d+2)$, but also incorrectly predicts that the lower critical dim ension $d_{l c}$ below which linear polym ens are alw ays extended is $d_{l c}=2$, whereas, in fact, it is know $n$ exactly that $d_{1 c}=1$, a result that is also predicted exactly by the F lory theory. T hus, the G aussian variational approxim ation is very unreliable in predicting the low er criticaldim ension of a crum pled ob ject.
(b) T here is a good reason to believe it is equally unreliable for our problem as well. If we com pare the F lory prediction for_ w ith the -expansion calculation of Ref. asym ptotically exact in d ! 11), in, e.g., $d=8$, we -nd they di er less than $1=3$ of $1 \%$ :
$=0: 332{ }_{\underline{B_{1}}}^{1},{ }_{F}$ lory $=1=3{ }^{n_{1}^{1}}$; while the $G$ aussian variationalresult ${\underset{\mathrm{G}}{\mathrm{V}}}_{\text {tubule }}^{\text {a }}=7=19=0: 3684$ is nearly 40 tim es as far o as the $F$ lory result. This strongly suggests that both F lory theory and the expansion are m ore reliable than the $G$ aussian variational approxim ation, and both of them predict substantially $<1$ in $d=3:{ }_{F}=3=4{ }^{1-1}, \quad=0: 517{ }^{\frac{1_{3}^{3}}{2}}$.
(c) Finally, on m ore general grounds, while the G aussian variationalm ethod can be quite useful, only some of its results can be trusted. C ertainly it is likely that the trends of, e.g., exponents w ith dim ensionality d and D, are captured correctly by this theory. The very existence of the crum pled phase relies on the precise value of (d) (it disappears if the $d<d_{c}$, $w$ th $d_{l c}$ de ned by $\left(d_{c}\right)=1$ ). H owever, as with any approxim ate $m$ ethod, especially w ith uncontrolled approxim ations such as the G aussian m ethod, there is little credibility in the actual values of the exponents. Furtherm ore, the $G$ aussian variationalapproxim ation is very closely related to a large expansion in $1=d$ abbut the em bedding dim ension $d!1$ lim it L23. $^{33}$ It is therefore intrinsically untrustw orthy and ad hoc for sm all values of d at which one is assessing the stability of the tubule (or crum pled) phase, which very delicately and
sensitively depends on the precise value of at $s m$ alld.

In the rem ainder of this paper we present the details of our calculations. In Sec!II we introduce the Landau$G$ inzburg-N ilson free energy for our generalized model of anisotropic polym erized $m$ em branes. In Sec'II we w ill rst solve this m odel in m ean eld theory. From this solution we obtain the phase diagram for anisotropic polym erized $m$ em branes, and identify and characterize the new tubule phase as well as the previously studied crum pled and at phases. In Sec.in we show that the scaling properties of the at and crum pled phases are una ected by the an isotropy. In Secsild and consider the e ects ofboth them al uctuations and selfavoidance on the tubule phase. W e treat this problem using F lory theory, renorm alization group and G aussian variationalm ethods. W e calculate the upper criticalem bedding and intrinsic dim ensions for both e ects, and thereby show that both are relevant for the physical case oftw o-dim ensionalm em branesem bedded in three dim ensions. W ealso show that, although there is no anom alous elasticity for the bend $m$ odulus along the tubule near $d=d_{u c}=11$ (due to aforem entioned \tubule gauge" sym $m$ etry), such anom aly $m$ ust set in for em bedding di$m$ ensions $d<d$, with $d>7=2$. W hen this happens, the xed point (perturbative around $d=11\}^{3}$ which describes a self-avoiding (bend elastically non-anom alous) tubule, becom es unstable, and a new xed point controls the tubule phase. $W$ e derive new exact relations $E$ qs, ${ }^{\prime} 6 . \overline{6} \overline{2}$ and ' $6.6 \overline{3}$ ticity exponent (or $u$, related to it) and are appropriate for a physical (w ith anharm onic elasticity) tubule; described by this new xed point. W e then use the $F$ lory' and extrapolated $=11$ d\{expansiot results for in this relation to determ ine $z$ and all other tubule shape exponents in term s of tw o constants that, unfortunately, we were not able to com pute accurately.

In Section $\bar{N}$ and Eq! 1 tic theory as well.

In Section Nin we use the renorm alization group to analyze the crum pled-to-tubule transition. W e then construct a scaling theory of the crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions, and com pute w ithin F lory theory the critical exponents for these transitions.

In Section IVI we sum $m$ arize, conclude, and $m$ ake som e suggestions for further analytic, num erical, and experim entalwork.

## II. M O D EL

O ur m odel for anisotropic $m$ em branes is a generalization of the isotropic $m$ odel considered in Ref. ${ }_{2}^{24} \underline{1}_{1}^{1}$. As there, we characterize the con guration of the $m$ em brane by giving the position $x(x)$ in the d-dim ensional em bedding space, of the point in the $m$ em brane labeled by a D -
dim ensional intemal co-ordinate $x$. In the physical case, $d=3$ and $D=2$, of course. Throughout the rem ainder of th is paper, we w ill distinguish betw een $D$-dim ensional "intrinsic" vectors and d-dim ensional "extrinsic" vectors by using boldface type for the form er, and vector arrow s over the latter.

W e now construct the Landau-G inzburg-w ilson free energy $F$ for this system, by expanding $F$ to leading order in powers of $x(x)$ and its gradients $w$ ith respect to intemal space $x$, keeping only those term $s$ consistent $w$ ith the sym $m$ etries of the problem. These sym $m$ etries are global translation invariance $x(x)!x(x)+x_{0}$, and global rotational invariance $x(x)!\tilde{M^{2}} x(x)$, where $x$ and $\tilde{M}$ are a constant (i.e. $x$-independent) vector and a constant rotation $m$ atrix, respectively. $G$ lobal translational invariance requires that $F$ be expanded only in powers of gradients $w$ ith respect to $x . W e w i l l$ further$m$ ore take the $m$ embrane to be isotropic in the $D \quad 1$ $m$ em brane directions (hereafter denoted by $x_{\text {? }}$ ) orthogonal to one specialdirection (which we cally). Since the physical case is $D=2$, this specialization is innocuous.

The most general $m$ odel consistent $w$ ith all of these sym $m$ etries, neglecting irrelevant term $s$, is,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F[x(x)]=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{D} x^{1} d y \quad ? @_{?}^{2} x^{2}+y @_{y}^{2} x^{2} \\
& +\quad ? @_{y}^{2} x \quad 20 x+t_{?} \quad @^{?} x^{2}+t_{y}\left(@_{y} x\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\frac{b}{2} d^{D} x \quad d^{D} x^{0} \quad \text { (d) } x(x) \quad x\left(x^{0}\right) \text {; } \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where the 's, t's, u's, v's are elastic constants. The rst three term $s$ in $F$ (the term $s$ ) represent the an isotropic bending energy of the m em brane. T he elastic constants $t_{?}$ and $t_{y}$ are the $m$ ost strongly tem perature dependent param eters in the $m$ odel, changing sign from large, positive values at high tem peratures to negative values at low tem peratures. Their positivity at high tem peratures reects the $m$ em brane's entropic preference for crum pling. To see this, note that this crum pled state is one in which all the particles in the $m$ em brane attem pt to cram them selves into the sam e point $x$; in this state, the gradients w ith respect to the intemal space $@^{?}$ I and $\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} \mp$ seek to m in im ize them selves, which is clearly favorable when $t_{\text {? }}$, $t_{y}>0$. H ow ever, when either of these becom es negative, it becom es favorable for the m embrane to atten (i.e., extend) in the associated direction, as we shall show in a mom ent. The $u$ and $v$ quartic tem $s$ are higher order elastic constants needed to stabilize the $m$ em brane when one or both of the rst order elastic constants t. $t_{y}$ becom e negative. Stability requires that

$$
\begin{align*}
& u_{? ~ ? ~}^{0}>0 \text {; }  \tag{22}\\
& u_{y y}>0 \text {; }  \tag{2.3}\\
& \mathrm{v}_{\text {? } \mathrm{y}}>\quad \mathrm{q} \overline{\mathrm{u}_{\text {? ? }}^{0} \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{yy}}} \text {; } \tag{2.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
u_{? ?}^{0} \quad V_{?}+u_{? ?}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}
(D & 1 \tag{2.5}
\end{array}\right):
$$

The nal, b term in E quepresents the self-avoidance of the $m$ em branes; i.e., its steric or excluded volum e interaction.

Equation 2.11 reduces to the $m$ odel for isotropic $m$ em branes considered in Ref. $24_{1}^{1}$ when $t_{?}=t_{y}$, ? ? $=y$, ? y $=0, u_{y y}=4(\forall+u), u_{? ~ ? ~}=u_{\text {? }}=4 u$, and $\mathrm{V}_{\text {? }} ?=\mathrm{V}_{\text {? }}=4 \mathrm{v}$.

## III. M EAN FIELD THEORY

W e begin our analysis of this $m$ odel by obtaining its $m$ ean eld phase diagram, at rst neglecting the selfavoidance interaction. Later, we will consider both the $e$ ects of uctuations and self-avoidance.

In m ean- eld theory, we seek a con guration $x(x)$ that $m$ inim izes the free energy Eq'2.1 (w ithout the selfavoidance term). The curvature energies ? $@_{?}^{2} x^{2}$ and y $@_{y}^{2} x^{2}$ are clearly $m$ in im ized when $x(x)$ is linear in $x$. W e will therefore seek m inim a of F of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(x)=\left(? x_{?} ; \text { y } y ; 0 ; 0 ;::: ; 0\right): \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

O bviously, uniform rotations $\mathscr{x}(\mathrm{X})$ ! $\tilde{M^{\prime}} \Upsilon(\mathrm{X})$, of any such $m$ inim um, with $\tilde{M}$ a constant rotation $m$ atrix, $w$ ill also be $m$ inim a. A continuous degenerate set ofm inim a is thereby obtained, as usual for a system w ith a broken continuous sym $m$ etry. U niform translations of the entire m em brane are also allow ed, of course.

Inserting Eq 3 self-avoidance term, we obtain the $m$ ean- eld free energy for anisotropic $m$ em branes

$$
\begin{align*}
& F=\frac{1}{2} L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{Y} t_{Y}{ }_{y}^{2}+t_{?}(\mathbb{D} \quad 1){ }_{?}^{2} \tag{32}
\end{align*}
$$

$w h e r e ~ L$ ? and $L_{y}$ are the linear dim ensions of the attened $m$ em brane in the ? and $y$ directions, respectively.

This $m$ ean eld theory is precisely that studied long ago by $F$ isher et all ${ }^{25}$ for a com pletely di erent (magnetic) problem. $M$ inim izing the free energy over ? and y yields tw o possible phase diagram topologies, depending on whether $u_{? ~ ? ~}^{0} u_{y y}>v_{? ~}^{2}$ or $u_{? ~ ? ~}^{0} u_{Y y}<v_{? ~}^{2}$.

For $u_{?}^{0} u_{y y}>v_{?}^{2}$, we obtain the phase diagram in $F$ ig ${ }_{1}^{\prime} 1$. B oth ? and $y$ vanish for $t_{?}, t_{y}>0$. This is the
crum pled phase: the entire $m$ em brane, in $m$ ean- eld theory, collapses into the origin, $\quad={ }_{y}=0$ i.e., $x(x)=0$ for all $x$.

In the regim e betw een the positive $t_{\text {? }}$-axis (i.e., the locus $t_{y}=0$ and $t_{?}>0$ ) and the $t_{y}<0$ part of the $t_{y}=\left(u_{y y}=v_{\text {? }}\right) t_{\text {? }}$ line, lies our new $y$-tubule phase, characterized by $?=0$ and $y_{y}=\frac{\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{y}} \dot{\mathrm{F}} \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{yy}}}{}>0$ : the mem brane is extended in the $y$-direction but crum pled in all D 1 ? -directions.

The ? tubule phase is the analogous phase with the y and ? directions reversed, $\mathrm{y}=0$ and ? $=$
$\overline{\hbar_{?} \ddagger u_{?} ?}>0$ (obviously a sym $m$ etrical reversal for the physical case of $=2$ ), and lies betw een the $t_{\text {? }}<0$ segm ent of the line $t_{y}=\left(v_{? ~} y=u_{?}^{0}\right.$ ? $) t_{\text {? }}$ and the positive $t_{y}$ axis. Finally, the at phase, characterized by both
lies between the $t_{?}<0$ segment of the line $t_{y}=$ $\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{Yy}}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{y}}}\right) \mathrm{t}_{\text {? }}$ and the $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}<0$ segm ent of the line $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}=$ $\left(v_{\text {? }}=u_{?}^{0}\right.$ ? $) t_{\text {? }}$.
For $u_{? ?}^{0} u_{y y}<v_{? y}^{2}$, the at phase disappears, and is replaced by a direct rst-order transition from ? -tubule



F IG.4. Phase diagram for tethered $m$ em branes show ing our new tubule phase, for the range of elastic param eters when the interm ediate at phase disappears. A rst-order phase transition separates y -and ? -tubule phases.

The boundaries between the tubule and the crum pled phases rem ain the positive $t_{y}$ and $t_{\text {? }}$ axes, as for $u_{\text {? ? }}^{0} u_{y y}>v_{\text {? }}^{2}$ case.
$N$ ote that a direct crum pling transition (i.e. a direct transition betw een the crum pled and at phase) is very non-generic in this picture: only experim ental loci that pass from $t_{y}, t_{\text {? }}>0$ through the origin (locus $P_{2}$ in Fig (1] ) can experience such a transition. This transition is, in fact, tetra-critical in this picture.
$T$ his does not, how ever, im ply that direct crum pling transitions are non-generic. $M$ any $m$ em branes will be
perfectly isotropic, by virtue ofbeing form ed under conditions of unbroken rotational sym $m$ etry (e.g., random ly polym erized $m$ em branes). A s discussed earlier, this set of m em branes, which is undoubtedly of nite $m$ easure, necessarily lies on the special isotropic subspace of the fill param eter space of the $m$ odel de ned by Eqt2. $\frac{1}{1}$ specied by to $=t_{y}, \quad ? ?=y, \quad ? y=0, u_{y y}=4(w+u)$, $u_{? ~ ? ~}=u_{? y}=4 u$, and $v_{? ~ ? ~}=v_{? ~}=4 v$. The values of the quartic couplings then satisfy $u_{? ~ ? ~}^{0} u_{y y}>v_{? ~}^{2}$ (for $u, v>0$ ), and hence the topology of the phase diagram is $F$ igure ${ }_{1}^{11}$. T he boundaries of the at phase for those isotropic values of the quartic couplings becom e $t_{y}=t_{?} 1+u=v=\left(\begin{array}{ll}(1) & 1\end{array}\right)$ and $t_{y}=(1+u=v) t_{?}$, respec tively. For u and v both positive (as required by stability), the slopes of these lines are less than and greater than 1 , respectively; the isotropic locus $t_{y}=t_{\text {? }}$ therefore lies between the two (i.e., in the at phase), and hence, that $m$ odel does undergo a direct at to crum pled transition.

Membranes with any intrinsic broken orientational symmetry, (e.g., in-plane tilt orderi, which is quite com $m$ on ${ }^{12}$ ), w ill generically have $t_{y}$ t? . Furtherm ore, they will not generically have both $t_{\text {? }}$ and $t_{y}$ vanish at the sam e tem perature. A generic locus through the phase diagram in $F$ ig '11. w illbe like locus $P_{1}$, and w illnecessarily have one of the tubule phases interven ing betw een the at and crum pled phases. O ur new tubule phase is not only generically possible, but actually unavoidable, in mem branes w ith any type or am ount of intrinsic anisotropy.

## IV.FLUCTUATIONSAND SELF-AVOIDANCE IN THE FLATAND CRUMPLED PHASES

In this section, we show that both the at and the crum pled phases of anisotropic $m$ em branes are identical in their scaling properties, at su ciently long length scales, to the eponym ous phases of isotropic $m$ em branes.

Consider rst the at phase. We can inchude uctuations about the $m$ ean- eld solution by considering sm all deviations from the solution in Eq! 3.11

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Psi(x)=\quad ? x_{?}+u_{?}(x) ; y y+u_{y}(x) ; \check{n}(x) ; \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

 and $t_{y}$ both in the range in which the at phase is stable, we obtain the uniaxial elastic energy of $R$ ef. $2 \underline{26}$. As show $n$ in that reference, uctuation e ects in tum renor$m$ alize the anisotropic elastic energy into the isotropic $m$ em brane elastic energy considered by $R$ efs.
at phase, and at su ciently long scales, the anisotropic m em branes therefore behave exactly like isotropic m em branes. This in particular im plies that the at phase of anisotropic $m$ em branes is stable against them al uctuations. As in isotropic $m e m b r a n e s$, this is due to the fact that these very them al uctuations-drriye the bend m odulus to in nity at long wavelength

Speci cally, becom es wavevector dependent, and (q) diverges like $q$ as $q$ ! 0 . In the at phase the standard Lam e coe cients and 271 are also innitely renorm alized and becom e w avevector dependent, vanishing in the $q$ ! 0 lim it as (q) (q) $q^{\prime}$; the values of and $u$ in the at phase di er from those in the tubule phase, as does their physical intenpretation. The at phase is furtherm ore novel in that, iti is characterized by a universal negative Poisson ration which for $D=2$ is de ned as the long wavelength $\operatorname{lm}$ it $q$ ! 0 of $=(q)=(2 \quad(q)+(q))$. The transverse undulations in the at phase, i.e. the $m$ em brane roughness $h_{\text {rm }}$ scales $w$ ith the intemal size of the mem brane as $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm}} \mathrm{s} \quad \mathrm{L}, \mathrm{w}$ th $=(4 \mathrm{D} \quad)=2$, exactly. Furtherm ore, an underlying rotational invariance im poses an exact $W$ ard identity between and $u$, $u+2=4 \quad D$, leaving only a single nontrivial independent exponent characterizing the properties of the
at phase of even anisotropic $m$ em branes. The best estim ate for in the physical case of a two-dim ensional m embrane $(D=2)$, embedded in a $d=3$-dim ensional space com es from the self-consistent screening approxi$m$ ation (SC SA) of Le D oussal and R adzihovsky ${ }^{281}$, who nd $=4=(1+\overline{15}) \quad 0: 82$. The exponent relations above then predict $u=0: 36$ and $=0: 59$. These exponents, together $w$ ith the negative $P$ oisson ratio,predictions ofLeD oussaland R adzihovsky of $=1=3_{2}^{28}$ have been recently spectacularly veri ed to high precision in very large scale sim ulations (largest to date) by Falcioni, Bow ick, G uitter and Thorleifsson ${ }^{29}$.

The root-m ean-square ( $\mathrm{m} s$ ) them al uctuation
 $\hat{n}(x)$ about its $m$ ean value (here taken to be $\hat{z}$ ) is

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\quad d^{D} q q^{2} h \not ̃(q) \jmath{ }^{2} i ; \\
& / \frac{Z}{(q) q^{2}} / \frac{d^{D} q}{q^{2}} \text {; } \\
& / L^{2}{ }^{\mathrm{D}} \text {; } \tag{42}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have im posed an infra-red cuto $q>L^{1}$, on the integral over w avevectors, $L$ being the sm aller of the intrinsic linear dim ensions $L_{\text {? }}, L_{y}$ of the attened $m$ em brane. These uctuations are nite as L! 1, when $2 \mathrm{D}<0$. In the physicalcase $\mathrm{D}=2$, this condition is always satis ed since $>0$. Thus, $m$ em brane orientational uctuations rem ain bounded, and the at phase is stable against them al uctuations, for the physical case D $=2$. Indeed, the SC SA predicts that they rempain bounded down to the low er critical dim ension $D=\overline{2}$. 28:
$N$ ote that this stability of the at phase depends crucially on the anom alous elasticity, i.e., the divergence of (q) as q! 0. In the absence of this e ect, which would correspond to $=0$, the integral over wavevector in

Eqi4 $4_{2}^{2}$, would diverge logarithm ically for $D=2$, describing divergent orientational uctuations leading to an instability of the at phase at any non-zero tem perature. H ence, the at phase ow es its stability to the anom alous elasticity (i.e., the fact that $>0$ ). In contrast, as we shall show in a moment, the tubule phase is marginally stable against therm al uctuations, even in the absence of anom alous elastic e ects. Such e ects are, nonetheless, actually present for self-avoiding tubules, but they are not essential to the stability of the phase.

B ecause of this persistent long-ranged orientationalorder (i.e., because the $m$ em brane is at), widely intrinsically separated parts of the $m$ em branes (ie., points $x$ and $x^{0}$, w ith $\dot{x} \quad x^{0} j$ large do not bum $p$ into each other (i.e., never have $x(x)=x\left(x^{0}\right)$ ); hence, the self-avoidance interaction in Eq 1
$T$ hat the crum pled phase of anisotropic $m$ em branes is identical to that of isotropic $m$ em branes is even easier to see. W hen both $t_{\text {? }}$ and $t_{y}$ are positive, all of the other local term s in EqR. 11, i.e., the,$u$, and v-term $s$, are irrelevant at long w avelengths (since they all involve $m$ ore derivatives than the t-term s). O nce these irrelevant terms are neglected, a sim ple change of variables $x_{?}=x^{0} \overline{t_{?}=t_{y}} m$ akes the rem aining energy isotropic. Thus, the entire crum pled phase is identicalin its scaling properties to that of isotropic $m$ em branes.

In particular, the $m$ em brane in this phase has a radius of gyration $R_{G}(L)$ which scales $w$ ith $m$ em brane linear dim ension $L$ like $L$, with $=(D+2)=(d+2)$ in $F$ lory theory, and ,very sim ilar values predicted by -expansion techniques ${ }^{3}\{32$.

## V.FLUCTUATIONS IN PHANTOM TUBULES

In this section, we ignore self-avoidance (i.e., treat \phantom " m embranes), and consider the e ects of uctuations on phantom tubules. W e w ill show that these uctuations do not destroy the tubule phase, or change the topology of the phase diagram . T he detailed properties of the tubule phase are, how ever, m odi ed by the uctuations.
Let us consider the $y$-tubule phase (i.e., the tubule phase with the tubule axis along the $y$-axis). To treat uctuations, we perturb around the $m$ ean- eld solution $x_{0}(x)=y y ; 0$ by writing

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(x)=y y+u(x) ; \check{n}(x) ; \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\check{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{x})$ is a d 1-com ponent vector orthogonal to the tubule's axis, which we take to be oriented along the y -axis. The average extension factor y is near but not exactly equalto itsm ean- eld value, because uctuations willchange it. Rather, wewillchoose y so that all linear term $s$ in $\widetilde{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{x})$ and $\mathrm{u}(\mathrm{x})$ in the resultant elastic free energy for these variables are exactly cancelled, in the long wavelength lim it, by their uctuation renorm alizations.
$T$ his criterion guarantees that $\check{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{x})$ and $\mathrm{u}(\mathrm{x})$ represent uctuations around the true ground state of F. Precisely analogous choiges have been used in the study of bulk sm ectic A elasticit $\sum_{T}^{n} 9$, and the at-phase elasticity of isotropic $m$ em branes $51+\frac{1 \pi}{2}, 181$.

Inserting the decom position Eq 9.1 Eq[2.1, neglecting irrelevant term $s$, and, for the $m$ om ent ignoring the self-avoidance interaction, gives, after som e algebra, the elastic free energy $F_{\text {tot }}=F_{m f t}+F_{\text {el }}$, where $F_{m} f t$ is simply the $m$ ean- eld free energy for the tubule phase

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m} f t}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~L}_{?}^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}{\underset{\mathrm{y}}{2}}^{2}+\frac{1}{4} \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{yy}} \stackrel{4}{\mathrm{y}} ; \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{el}}[\mathrm{u}(\mathrm{x}) ; \check{\mathrm{K}}(\mathrm{x})]$ is the uctuating elastic free energy part

$$
\begin{align*}
& F_{e l}=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} \quad d^{D \quad 1} x_{?} d y \quad \varrho_{y} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(\varrho_{y} \check{K}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{y} u\right)^{2} \\
& +\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}}^{2} \check{\mathrm{~K}}\right)^{2}+\mathrm{t}\left(@^{?} \check{\mathrm{~K}}\right)^{2}+\mathrm{g}_{?}\left(@^{?} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2} \\
& +g_{y} @_{y} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{y} \tilde{n}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} u\right)^{2} \quad ; \tag{5.3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\quad y, t \quad t+v_{\text {? }}^{y} \underset{y}{2}, g_{y} \quad u_{y y} \underset{y}{2}=2, g_{\text {? }}$ $t+u_{? y} \underset{y}{2}$, and $=t_{y}+u_{y y}^{2} \underset{y}{2}$ are constant coe cients. $N$ ote rst that the coe cient of the linear term $s$ in $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{el}}$ is also the coe cient of the $\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{2}$ term. This is a consequence of the rotation invariance of the original free energy Eq 2.11, which leads to the existence of the $G$ oldstone $m$ ode $@_{Y} \check{n}$. The combination $E(u ; \check{n})$ $@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \check{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2}$ is the only combination of rst $y$-derivatives of $u$ and $\check{n}$ that is invariant under global rotations of the tubule. It is analogous to the non, linear strain tensor of conventional elasticity theory ${ }^{27 ? .}$ O $n$ these general sym $m$ etry grounds, therefore, the free energy can only depend on $\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}$ and $\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}$ through powers of $E$ ( $u ; \widetilde{n}$ ), and this property $m$ ust be preserved upon renom alization. T his has two im portant consequences: the rst is that, since, as discussed earlier, the coe cient of this linear term $w i l l$ be chosen to vanish upon renom alization via a judicious choioe of the stretching factor ${ }_{y}$, the coe cient of $\left(@_{y} \widetilde{n}\right)^{2} w$ ill likew ise vanish ${ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ $T$ his $m$ eans that the $y$-direction becom es a \soft" direction for uctuations ofగ in the tubule phase. W e can trace this softness back to the spontaneously broken rotational sym $m$ etry of the tubule state. It is precisely analogous to the softness of height uctuations in the
at phase of isotropic $m$ em branes, $m$ anifested by the $a b-$ sence of $\left(@_{\mathrm{K}} \widetilde{\mathrm{H}}\right)^{2},\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \widetilde{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}$ term s in the elastic free energy of the at phase, analogous to E qi. $0)$.

The second im portant consequence is that the ratios of the coe cients of the quadratic $\left(@_{y} u\right)^{2}$ and the anhar$m$ onic $@_{y} u\left(@_{Y} \check{n}\right)^{2}$ and $\left(@_{Y} \check{n}\right)^{4}$ term $s$ in $F_{\text {el }} m$ ust always be exactly $4: 4: 1$, since they $m$ ust appear together as
a result of expanding $\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2}\right)^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~W}$ e w ill show in a few m om ents that, for this specialvalue of these ratios, the long-w avelength anom alous elastic behavior of the \phantom " tubule phase can be calculated exactly.

Recognizing that vanishes after renom alization, we can now calculate the propagators (i.e., the harm onic approxim ation to the Fourier transform ed correlation functions) by setting $=0$ in Eq.5.5. $1 . \mathrm{W}$ e thereby obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{hh}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{j}}(\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{i} & =\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{~T} ?_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{q}) ;  \tag{5.4}\\
\mathrm{hu}(\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{u}(\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{i} & =\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{TG} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{q}) ; \tag{5.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{h}}^{1}(\mathrm{q})=\mathrm{tq}_{?}^{2}+\mathrm{q}_{y}^{4} ;  \tag{5.6}\\
& \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{u}}^{1}(\mathrm{q})=\mathrm{g}_{?} \mathrm{q}_{?}^{2}+\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{q}_{y}^{2} ; \tag{5.7}
\end{align*}
$$

and ${ }_{i j}$ is a K ronecker delta when both indices $i$ and $j$ \& $y$, and is zero if either ior $j=y$.

Inspection of the propagators $G_{h}$ and $G_{u}$ reveals that the $\check{n}$ - uctuations arem uch larger than the u- uctuations for $\dot{\mu}$ ? $j \quad \dot{q}^{2}$, and that it is precisely this regim e of wavevectors that dom inates the uctuations. Thus, in pow er counting to determ ine the relevance or irrelevance of various operators, we m ust count each power of jp? j as two powers of $q_{y}$. It is this power counting that leads to the identi cation of the term s explicitly displayed in Eq 5

Calculating the root-m ean-squared (m s) real space positional uctuations hifin ( $x$ ) fi in the harm onic approxim ation by integrating the propagators over all wavevectors, we nd

$$
\begin{align*}
& / q_{q_{2}>L_{?}}{ }^{1} \frac{d^{D}{ }^{1} q_{?}}{q_{?}^{3=2}} / L_{?}^{5=2 D} \text {; } \tag{5.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have introduced an infra-red cuto jo $j>L_{\text {? }}{ }^{1}$ in the last integral. This expression clearly reveals that for \phantom" tubules, the upper criticaldim ension D uc for this problem, below which transverse positional uctuations diverge is $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{uc}}=5=2$; this in principle (but see discussion of dom inant zero $m$ odes in Sec IBI) allow s a quantitatively trustw orthy $=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{uc}} \quad 2=\overline{1}=2$ expansion for the physicalm em brane ofD $=2$. $T$ his should be contrasted w ith the result $D$ uc $\overline{\overline{1}}, 4$ for the analogous critical dimension in the at phase

The lower critical dimension $D_{\text {lc }}$ below which the tubule is necessarily crum pled in this problem is also low ered by the anisotropy. Considering the uctuations of the $m$ em brane norm als $r \check{n}$ in the harm onic approxim ation, one sees im $m$ ediately that the largest of these is the uctuation in the $y$-direction,


$$
\begin{align*}
& Z^{Z} Z^{\mathrm{q}_{2}>\mathrm{L}_{?}{ }^{1} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{D}{ }^{1} \mathrm{q}_{?} \mathrm{dq}_{y}}}{(2)^{\mathrm{D}}} \frac{\mathrm{q}_{y}^{2}}{\mathrm{tq}_{?}^{2}+\mathrm{q}_{y}^{4}} ;} ; \mathrm{q}_{2}>\mathrm{L}_{?}{ }^{1} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{D}{ }^{1} \mathrm{q}_{?}}}{\mathrm{q}_{?}^{1=2}} / \mathrm{L}_{?}^{3=2 \mathrm{D}} ;
\end{align*}
$$

which clearly only diverges in the infra-red L ? ! 1 lim it for $D \quad D_{l c}=3=2$ (but again see discussion of dom inant zero $m$ odes in Sec IBI).

In the argot of the $m$ em brane eld, the elasticity of phantom tubules is anom alous. In contrast to the at phase, how ever, forphantom tubules, the exponents characterizing the anom alous elasticity can be calculated exactly. To see this, we rst note that the u- uctuations go like $1=q^{2}$ in alldirections and hence are negligible (in the relevant wavevector regin e jं? j $\quad q^{2}$ ) relative to the $\check{1}-$ uctuationsw hich scale like $1=q^{4}$ in this regim e. This justi es neglecting the $\frac{1}{2}\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2}$ piece of the invariant E ( $\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{n}$ ) operator. This also em erges from a full renorm alization group treatm ent ${ }^{33}$, w hich show sthat this term is strongly irrelevant. O nce it is neglected, the elastic free energy is quadratic in $u$, and these phonon $m$ odes can therefore be integrated exactly out of the partition function

$$
Z={ }^{Z} D_{\text {uD Khe }}{ }^{F_{e 1}[u ; \tilde{h}]}:
$$

O nce this is done, the only rem aining anharm onic term in the e ective elastic free energy for $\check{n}$ is, in Fourier space,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.F_{\text {anh }} \llbracket \llbracket\right]=\frac{1}{4}{ }_{k_{1} ; k_{3} ; k_{3}}^{Z} \check{\mathrm{~K}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{1}\right) \check{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{2}\right) \quad \check{\mathrm{K}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{3}\right) \quad \check{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{4}\right) \\
& \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y} 1} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y} 2} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y} 3} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y} 4} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{h}} \text { (q); } \tag{5.11}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{q}=\mathbb{K}_{1}+\widetilde{K}_{2}$ and $\widetilde{K}_{1}+\widetilde{K}_{2}+\widetilde{K}_{3}+\mathbb{K}_{4}=0$. Thee ective vertex $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{q})$ above reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{h}(q)=\frac{g_{y} g_{?} q_{?}^{2}}{g_{y} q_{y}^{2}+g_{?} q_{?}^{2}} ; \tag{5.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is irrelevant near the $G$ aussian $x e d$ point (but see
 counting described above.
$T$ he exact cancelation of the relevant term $s$ in $\left.F_{\text {anh }} \mathbb{K}\right]$ above is a direct consequence of the 4:4:1 ratios of the coe cients of the quadratic $\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2}$ and the anharm onic $\varrho_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{Y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{2}$ and $\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{4}$ term s in $\mathrm{F}_{\text {el }}$ that was discussed earlier. G iven this cancelation, $\left.\mathrm{F}_{\text {anh }} \mathbb{K}\right]$ is now clearly less relevant than the anharm onic vertices $@_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{u}\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \widetilde{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}$ and $\left(\Theta_{Y} \check{\mathrm{I}}\right)^{4}$ in the original free energy (before we integrated out the phonons u). This is because the factor $V_{h}(q) / q_{?}^{2}=\left(g_{y} q_{y}^{2}+g_{?} q_{?}^{2}\right)$ vanishes like $q_{y}^{2}$ in the rele-
 are precisely the Fourier transform of $\left(\left(_{\mathrm{y}} \check{\mathrm{h}}\right)^{4}\right.$, of course). $T$ his low ens the upper critical dim ension for anom alous
elasticity of the $\widetilde{\mathrm{K}}$ eld to $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{uc}}=3=2$. Thus, in the physical case $D=2$, there is no anom alous elasticity in $\tilde{n}$; that is, the elastic constants $t$ and in Eq.5. and non-zero as $q_{y}!0$.

H ow ever, as asserted earlier, the full elasticity Eq ${ }^{5} 5$ before $u$ is integrated out, is anom alous, because $g_{y}$ is driven to zero as $q_{y}!0$. Indeed, a self-consistent oneloop perturbative calculation of $g_{Y_{-}}(q)$, obtained by evaluating the Feynm an graph in $F$ ig 'ri', gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g_{Y}(q)=g_{Y}^{\circ}
\end{aligned}
$$

$w$ here $g_{Y}^{\circ}$ is the \bare" or unrenorm alized value of $g_{Y}$.


FIG.5. Feynm an graph equation for the self-consistent evaluation of $g_{y}(q)$.

O ur earlier argum ent show s that (p) can be replaced by a constant in Eq in 13' asp! 0 , since the $\tilde{n}$ elasticity is not anom alous. The self-consistent equation Eq $\mathrm{T}_{2}^{15}=13$ can be solved by the ansatz,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{Y}(q)=q_{y}{ }^{u} S_{g}\left(q_{y}=q_{q}^{z}\right): \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sim ple pow er counting ${ }^{3}$. then show $s$ that w em ust choose

$$
\begin{align*}
& z=\frac{1}{2} ;  \tag{5.15}\\
& u=5 \quad 2 D: \tag{5.16}
\end{align*}
$$

It is straightforw ard to verify that these results hold to allorders in perturbation theory; that is, at every order, the leading dependence on $q$ of the contribution to $g_{Y}$ scales like $q_{y}{ }^{4} S_{g}\left(q_{y}=q_{?}^{1=2}\right) w$ ith $u=5 \quad$ 2D.

It is straightforw ard to verify to allorders in perturbation theory that there is no such renorm alization of $g$ ? $T$ his is because of the an isotropic scaling $q \quad q^{2}$, which im plies that allvertices proportionalto pow ers of perpendicular gradients of $\mathfrak{h}$, i.e., pow ers ofr ? $\check{n}$ are irrelevant. Since only such vertices can renorm alize g? jr ? uj , there are no relevant renom alization of $g$ ? A s a result, g? re$m$ ains nite and non-zero, or, in a word, non-anom alous, as $\dot{\mu} j!$.

U sing the facts that $g_{y}(q)$ is independent of $q_{\text {? }}$ as $\dot{\text { M}}$ ? $j \quad q!0$ for xed $q$, and, likew ise, to be independent of $\mathrm{q}_{y}$ as $\mathrm{q}_{y}$ ! 0 for xed 9 , we can obtain the lim its of the scaling function $S_{g}(x)$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{x}) / \quad \text { constant; } \mathrm{x}!1  \tag{5.17}\\
& \mathrm{x} \mathrm{u} ; \quad \mathrm{x}!\mathrm{l}
\end{align*}
$$

For phantom $m$ embranes $w$ th $D=2, u=1$ and $z=1=2$, so we nd:

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{y}(\mathrm{q}) / \quad \mathrm{g}_{y} ; \quad \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{F}} \ggg_{\mathrm{p}}^{\mathrm{p}} \overline{\mathrm{q}_{?}} ; \quad \mathrm{q}_{y} \lll \mathrm{q} \frac{\mathrm{q}_{?}}{\mathrm{q}_{?}}: \tag{5.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e will now use this result to com pute the meansquared real space uctuationsh(u (L? ;y) u(0;y) $)^{2}$ $h u^{2} i$ of $u(x)$. These can be obtained via the equipartition theorem and by sum $m$ ing all of the Fourier $m$ odes, yielding:

$$
h u^{2} \sum_{q_{z}>L_{?}{ }^{1} ; q_{y}>L_{y}{ }^{1}} \frac{d q_{?} d q_{y}}{(2)^{2}} \frac{1 e^{j q_{?}} L_{y}}{g_{y}(q) q_{y}^{2}+g_{?} q_{?}^{2}}:
$$

Let us assum e, and verify a posteriori, that the integral in this expression is dom inated by wavevectors $w$ ith


$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.h u^{2} \sum_{q_{?}>L_{?}^{1} ; q_{y}>L_{y}^{1}} \frac{d q_{?} d q_{y}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{1}{C^{p}} \frac{e^{j q_{?}} L_{?}}{q_{?}^{2}} q_{y}^{2}+g_{?} q_{?}^{2}\right] ; \tag{520}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c$ is a constant. Inspection of this integral reveals that it is dom inated by q's forw hich the tw o term $s$ in the denom inator balance; this m eans $q_{y} \quad q^{3=4} \ll P^{W_{F}}$, the last extrem e inequality holding as j j j! 0 . This veri es our earlier a posteriori assum ption that $\mathrm{q}_{y} \ll \mathrm{P} \frac{\mathrm{G}_{\text {}}}{}$ in the dom inant $w$ avevector regim $e$.

N ow, changing variables in the integral $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{z}} \quad \mathrm{Q}_{\text {? }}=\mathrm{L}$ ?, $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{?}^{3=4}$, we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { h } u^{2} i=L_{?}^{1=4} S_{u}\left(L_{y}=L_{?}^{3=4}\right) ; \tag{5.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{u}(x) \quad Q_{?>1 ; Q_{y}>x} \frac{d Q_{?} d Q_{y}}{(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{C} \frac{1}{Q_{?} Q_{Y}^{2}+g_{?} Q_{?}^{2}}: \tag{522}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e note that the scaling form for the $u$ phonon correlations is di erent than that of the height eld $\check{n}$ as sum m arized in e.g. Eqs! 11 and 112 , and discussed in $m$ ore detailbelow.

The lim its of $S_{u}(x)$ scaling function can be obtained just as we did for $S_{g}(x)$; we nd, including $\backslash$ zero $m$ odes" (see below ):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
S_{u}(x) / & \text { constant; } \mathrm{x}!1  \tag{5,23}\\
\mathrm{x}^{1} ; \quad \mathrm{x}! & 0:
\end{array}
$$

For roughly square $m$ em branes, $L_{y} \quad L_{r}=L$, so, as
 the appropriate one. $T$ his gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { h u }{ }^{2} i / L_{?}^{1=4}: \tag{524}
\end{equation*}
$$

The authors of Ref. should scale like $h u^{2} i$ in their sim ulations of a square anisotropic m em brane. They did this via their vividly nam ed \salam i" $m$ ethod: $m$ easuring the $m$ om ent of inertia tensor of a \salam i" slioe, a set of N points that all had the same intemal y coordinate (for a $y$-tubule phase). It is straightforw ard to show that the sm allest eigenvalue of th is tensor should scale like $N \mathrm{hu}(\mathrm{x})^{2} \mathrm{i}$, since, as we shall see in a $m$ om ent, the $m$ ean squared displace$m$ ents in the other directions are $m$ uch bigger than those in the $y$ direction. Therefore, from Eq 5.24 we predict that the $s m$ allest eigenvalue of this salam i slice $m$ om ent of inertia tensor scales like $\mathrm{N}^{1=4}$. BFT actually $t$ this eigenvalue to $\mathrm{N} \log \mathrm{L}$, which $m$ ight appear to disagree w ith our prediction, until one recognizes that for L's.betw een 32 and 100 (where m ost of the data of Ref. taken), $\mathrm{L}^{1=4}=(\mathrm{e}=4) \log \mathrm{L}$ to an accuracy of better than 1\% . Thus, their $t$ is certainly consistent with our predictions. To more strenuously test our full scaling predictions Eq ${ }^{1} 52 \overline{2} 1$ and $152 \overline{2}$, one could sim ulate $m$ em branes $w$ ith aspect ratios quite di erent from 1. In particular, we predict based on Eq'5 21' that increasing $L_{y}$ at xed $L_{\text {? }}$ ? from an initially square con guration would not increase this sm allest eigenvalue; nor would decreasing $L_{Y}$ decrease it, until an aspect ratio $L_{y} \quad L_{?}^{3=4}$ is reached, beyond which this eigenvalue would increase like $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}{ }^{1}$.
$W$ e now tum to the computation, for the phantom tubule, of the tubule radius ofgyration $R_{G}$ and roughness $h_{\text {rm s }}$, de ned by:
$w$ here $L$ ? spans the intrinsic ? space of the $m$ em brane. Because $R_{G}$ is by de nition the root-m ean-square ( m s ) distance betw een two points at the sam ey, it is roughly the radius of a typical cross-section of the tubule perpendicular to the tubule axis. Likew ise, $h_{r m ~ s} m$ easures uctuations betw een points widely separated along the tubule axis; hence, it gives the polym er-like transverse "w andering" of the tubule. See Fig ing for an illustration of $R_{G}$ and $h_{\text {rm s }}$.
$T$ he reason we distinguish betw een these tw o quantities is that they scale in di erent ways w ith the $m$ em brane dim ensions $L_{\text {? }}$ ? and $L_{y}$, in contrast to one's naive expectations. This happens because there are large contributions to both quantities from "zero m odes", by which we $m$ ean Fourier $m$ odes $w$ th either $q_{\text {? }}$ or $q_{y}=0$. Those w th $\mathrm{q}_{\text {? }}=0$ correspond to polym er-like undulations of the entire tubule. Recognizing the existence ofboth types ofm odes, we Fourier decom pose $\check{n}(x)$ as follow s:


$$
\begin{equation*}
+{\frac{1}{L_{?}^{D}}}^{X} \tilde{q}_{?} \tilde{K}_{0 ?}\left(q_{?}\right) e^{i q_{?} x_{?}} \text {; } \tag{527}
\end{equation*}
$$

where B, Oy , and 0 ? denote "bulk m odes" (i.e., m odes $w$ th neither $q_{\text {? }}$ nor $q_{y}=0$ ), and "zero modes" (i.e., $m$ odes $w$ th either $q_{\text {? }}$ or $\left.q_{y}=0\right)$, respectively. N ote that we have chosen di erent nom alizations for the three types ofm odes. For phantom m em branes, we proceed by inserting this Fourier decom position into the harm onic, $\tilde{h}$ dependent piece of the elastic free energy $F_{e l}$ (w hich is justi ed, since, as show $n$ above, the elasticity forñ for a phantom tubule is not anom alous), obtaining:

$$
\begin{align*}
& +\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{q}_{\text {? }} \operatorname{tq}_{\text {? }}^{2} \tilde{n}_{0 ?}\left(\mathrm{q}_{\text {? }}\right) \text { 予); } \tag{5,28}
\end{align*}
$$

$N$ ote the explicit presence of the factors of $L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1}$, and $L_{y}$ for the 0 m odes. A pplying equipartition to EqW 28, we can obtain the $m$ ean squared uctuations of the Fourier m odes:

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \tilde{H}_{0 y}\left(q_{y}\right) \jmath^{2} i=\frac{k_{B} T(d \quad D)}{L_{?}^{D} q_{y}^{1} q_{y}^{A}}  \tag{5.30}\\
& h \tilde{n}_{0} \text { ? }\left(q_{\text {? }}\right) \jmath_{i}=\frac{k_{B} T(d \quad D)}{L_{y} t q_{?}^{2}} \tag{5.31}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing these expressions inside E qsi $\frac{5}{2} \overline{2} \overline{9}$ and $15 \overline{2} \overline{9}$, and being carefiulabout converting sum s on $q$ into integrals, we get

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
R_{G}^{2} & =2\left(\begin{array}{ll}
d & D
\end{array}\right) \frac{k_{B} T}{L_{y}}{ }^{Z} \frac{d^{D}{ }^{1} q_{?}}{(2)^{D} 1} \frac{1}{t_{q}^{2}}\left(1 e^{i q_{?}} L_{?}\right.
\end{array}\right)
$$

where the subscripts $L_{?}{ }^{1}$ and $L_{y}{ }^{1}$ denote infra-red cut-

$W$ e observe here that $R_{G}$ in $E q \underline{1}, 32$ does not reœive any contribution from the $q_{\text {? }}=0$ "zero mode" (i.e., in addition to the bulk m ode, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}$ receives a contribution only from the $\mathrm{g}_{y}=0$ \zero m ode").

Scaling $L$ ? out ofboth integrals for $R_{R_{G}}$ by the change of variables $Q$ ? $\quad L_{\text {? }}$ and $Q_{y} T L_{\text {? }}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{G}^{2}=\frac{C_{1} L_{?}^{3}{ }^{D}}{L_{Y}}+L_{?}^{5=2 D} I_{R}\left(\frac{L_{Y}}{\overline{L_{?}}}\right) ; \tag{5,33}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{1} \quad 2(\mathrm{~d} \quad \mathrm{D}) \mathrm{kT}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{q}_{3}}{(2)^{\mathrm{D}}} \frac{\left(1 \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{d} q_{?} \mathrm{~L}_{?}}\right)}{\operatorname{tq}_{?}^{2}}: \tag{5.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a constant of (1), and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Z}_{1 ; \mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{X}} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{G}_{?} \mathrm{dq}_{y}}{(2)^{\mathrm{D}}} \frac{\left(1 \mathrm{e}^{\left.\mathrm{jq} \mathrm{q}_{2} \hat{\mathrm{~L}}_{?}\right)}\right.}{\mathrm{tq}_{?}^{2}+\mathrm{q}_{y}^{A}}: \tag{5.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\hat{L}_{\text {? }}$ the unit vector along $L_{\text {? }}$. De ning the scaling function

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{R}(x) \quad \sqrt{\frac{C_{1}}{x}+I_{R}(x)} ; \tag{5,36}
\end{equation*}
$$

we see that $R_{G}$ can be rew ritten in the scaling form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right)=\mathrm{L}_{?} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{R}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{z}}\right) \tag{5.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

w th, for phantom m em branes,

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D}}{4} ;  \tag{5,38}\\
z & =\frac{1}{2}: \tag{5.39}
\end{align*}
$$

W e will see later that the scaling form Eq to apply when self-avoidance is included, but w ith different values of and $z$, and a di erent scaling function $S_{R}(x)$. For phantom $m$ embranes, from our explicit expression for the scaling function $S_{R}$, we see that it has the lim iting form s:

$$
S_{R}(x) / \quad \begin{align*}
& 1={ }^{\mathrm{p}} \overline{\mathrm{x}} \quad \text { for } \mathrm{x}!0  \tag{5.40}\\
& \text { constant; for } \mathrm{x}!1
\end{align*}
$$

In particular, the lim iting form as $x$ ! 1 implies that for the physically relevant case of a square $m$ em brane $\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }} \quad \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{L}$ ! 1 , for which $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \gg \mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{z}}$, bulk m odes dom inate, and we obtain,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}} / \mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}: \tag{5.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

The sim ulations of BFT ${ }^{-\bar{n}_{2}^{\prime 1}} m$ easured $R_{G}$ for phantom tubules by calculating the largest $m$ om ent of inertia for for a set ofm em brane points that all had the sam e value of the intrinsic coordinate $y$. W hile we have used here a slightly di erent de nition, Eq 5 this $m$ om ent of inertia should scale like our $R_{G}$. And, indeed, BFT found that it did scale like a pow er ofL, as in Eqt. 5.41 , w ith $=0: 24 \quad 0: 02$ in excellent quantitative agreem ent w ith our predictions of $=1=4, E q_{1}^{\prime} 5 . \overline{3}$ uated in $D=2$. It would be of great interest to test our full anisotropic scaling prediction of Eq $q$, 5 the aspect ratio of the $m$ em brane in such sim ulations. For instance, one could $x L_{\text {? }}$ and increase $L_{y}$; we predict that one should observe no change in $R_{G}$. T he sam e
should hold if one decreased $L_{\text {ip }}$ at xed $L_{?}: R_{G}$ should rem ain unchanged until $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \overline{\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}}$, at which point the tubule should begin to get thinner (i.e. $R_{G}$ should decrease).

E quations ${ }^{\prime} \overline{5} \cdot \bar{a}$ and ${ }^{\prime} \overline{5} . \overline{4} \overline{0}$ also correctly recover the lim it of $L_{y}=$ constant $\ll \overline{L_{?}^{z-1}}$ ! 1 , where the $q_{y}=0$ ไzero m odes" dom inate, the tubule sim ply becom es a phantom, coiled up, D 1 -dim ensional polym eric netw ork of size L ? em bedded in d 1 dim ensions, w ith the radius of $g y-$ ration $\left.R_{G}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right) \quad L_{?}^{(3} \mathrm{D}\right)=2$. In the physical dim ensions ( $D=2$ and $d=3$ ) in particular this gives a coiled up ideal polym er of length $L$ ? w ith $R_{G} \quad L_{\text {? }}^{1=2}$, as expected.

W e now tum our attention to the calculation of the tubule roughness $h_{\text {rm }}$. As wew ill see, here the $q_{\text {? }}=0$ zero m ode w ill play an essential role and w ill dom inate the transverse undulations for \very long" tubules, which (because of anisotropic scaling) in particular includes tubules $m$ ade from square $m$ em branes. U sing the de nition of $h_{\text {rm s }}, E q$, 2 , , we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& h_{r m ~ s}^{2}=2(d \quad D) \frac{k_{B} T}{L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1}} L_{L_{y}}{ }^{1} \frac{d_{q_{y}}}{(2)} \frac{1}{\left(q_{y}\right) q_{y}^{4}}\left(1 \quad e^{\mathrm{dq}_{y} L_{y}}\right) \\
& +k_{B} T_{L_{z}^{1} ; L_{y}}{ }^{1} \frac{d^{D}{ }^{1} q_{?} d q_{-}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{\left(1 e^{j q_{y} L_{y}}\right)}{\operatorname{tq}_{?}^{2}+q_{y}^{A}}: \tag{5.42}
\end{align*}
$$

H ere we observe that $h_{r m}$ in Eq ${ }^{15} . \overline{2}=1$ does not receive any contribution from the $q_{y}=0$ "zero mode" (i.e., in addition to the bulk m ode, $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \text { s }}$ receives a contribution only from the $\mathrm{q}_{\text {? }}=0$ \zero m ode"). T his is to be contrasted $w$ ith the behavior of $R_{G}$ that we noted follow ing Eq 5 properties of $R_{G}$ and $h_{r m}$, notes above.

N ow, for perverse and tw isted reasons of our own, we choose to scale $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}$, rather than L ?, out of the integrals in this expression, via the change of variables $Q_{y} \quad G L_{y} ; Q$ ? $\quad L_{y}^{2}$, which leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\mathrm{rm} \mathrm{~s}}^{2}=\left(\frac{C_{2} L_{y}^{3}}{L_{?}^{D}}+L_{y}^{5}{ }^{2 D} I_{h}\left(\frac{L_{y}}{L_{?}}\right)\right) \tag{5.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
is yet another constant of $O$ (1), and

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{h}(x) \quad 2(d \quad D) k_{x^{2} ; 1}^{Z} \frac{d^{D}{ }^{1} Q_{?} d Q_{y}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{\left(1 e^{d_{y}}\right)}{\mathrm{EQ}_{?}^{2}+Q_{y}^{4}}: \tag{5.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

De ning the scaling function

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{h}(x) \quad q \overline{\left.C_{2} x^{2(D} \quad 1\right)+I_{h}(x)} ; \tag{5.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

we see that $h_{r m}$ s can be rew ritten in the scaling form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \mathrm{~s}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}\right)=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{?}^{\mathrm{z}}\right) \tag{5.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith, for phantom $m$ em branes,

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D}}{2} ;  \tag{5.48}\\
z & =\frac{1}{2}: \tag{5.49}
\end{align*}
$$

A gain, this scaling law Eq'ㄴ. $\overline{4} \overline{7}$, continues to apply when self-avoidance is included, $\bar{b} \bar{u}{ }^{\prime} w$ th di erent values of and $z$.

Equations 15 tubule roughness for arbitrarily large size $L_{\text {? }}$ and $L_{y}$, and arbitrary aspect ratio. For the physically relevant case of a square $m$ embrane $L$ ? $L_{y} \quad L!1$, for which $L_{y} \gg L_{?}^{z}$, we obtain,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \text { s }} / & \left.\frac{\left.\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}^{+(\mathrm{D}} \quad 1\right)=2 \mathrm{z}}{\mathrm{~L}_{?}^{(\mathrm{D}}} 11\right)=2
\end{align*} ; \quad \begin{array}{lll} 
 \tag{5.50}\\
& \left.\mathrm{L}^{+(\mathrm{D}} 1\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & \mathrm{z})=2 \mathrm{z}
\end{array}\right. \tag{5.51}
\end{array}
$$

Equations $1 \overline{5} . \overline{4} \overline{-1}, 15 . \overline{4} \overline{9}$ then give, for a $D=2$ phantom tubule, $=\overline{1}=2, z=\overline{1}=2$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \mathrm{~s}} \frac{\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}^{3=2}}{\mathrm{~L}_{?}^{1=2}} ; \tag{5.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore predicts for a square $m$ em brane

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm} \mathrm{~s}} \quad \mathrm{~L}: \tag{5.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his prediction for square phantom $m$ em branes has also been spectacularly quantitatively con m ed in sim ulations by BFT른. Their ingenious procedure for determ ining $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm}}$ s is rather involved, and the interested reader is referred to their paper for a clear and com plete discussion of it. The bottom line, however, is that they nd $h_{\text {rm s }} \quad L$, (our is in their notation) $w$ ith
$=0: 895$ 0:06, in excellent agreem ent $w$ ith our pre-
 be interesting to test the full scaling law EqN. ulating non-square $m$ em branes, and testing for the independent scaling of $h_{r m} s w i t h L_{y}$ and $L_{\text {? }}$. N ote that,
 diate grow th (reduction) when one increases (decreases) $L_{y}$ at $x e d L_{\text {? }}$.

Because, unlike the at phase, no $\log (\mathrm{L}=a)$ correction arises, the $(D=2)$ phantom tubule is just $m$ arginally stable, but w ith w ild transverse undulations which scale linearly w ith its length. A s we will see in Sec $\ddagger$, these w ild uctuations will be suppressed when the é ects of self-avoidance are included.

The above discussion also reveals that our earlier conclusions about the lower critical dim ension $D_{\text {lc }}$ for the existence of the tubule are strongly dependent on how $L_{\text {? }}$ and $L_{y}$ go to in nity relative to each other; i.e., on the $m$ em brane aspect ratio. T he earlier conclusion that
$D_{\text {lc }}=3=2$ only strictly applies when the bulk modes dom inate the physics, which is the case for a very squat $m$ embrane, $w$ ith $L_{y} \quad L_{?}^{z}$, in which case $L_{y} \ll L_{\text {? }}$. For the physically $m$ ore relevant case of a square phantom m embrane, from the discussion above, we nd that $D_{1 c}=2, w h e r e$ the superscript $m$ eans that there are no logarithm ic corrections atD $=2$ and therefore strictly speaking the $D_{-}=2$ tubule is $m$ arginally stable.
E quations $15.3 \overline{7}$, and ${ }^{15} . \overline{4}-7$, also correctly recover the lim it of $L_{?}^{z}=$ constant $\ll \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}$ ! 1 , where the tubule simply becom es a polym er of thickness $R_{G}\left(L_{\text {? }}\right)$ given in Eq. 25 of length $L_{y}$ em bedded in $d \quad 1$ dim ensions. A s already discussed in the Introduction for a $m$ ore general case of a self-avoiding tubule, these equations then correctly recover this polym er lim it giving

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rms}} \quad \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{P}}\right)^{3=2} \text {; } \tag{5.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

w th L ? -dependent persistent length

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{P}\left(L_{?}\right) / L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1}: \tag{5.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

which agrees w ith EqiA rem em bers that, for the phantom m embranes, $=0$. So, as expected for a phantom tubule, if $L$ ? does not grow fast enough (e.g. rem ains constant), while $L_{y}!1$, the tubule behaves as a linear polym er and crum ples along its axis and the distinction between the crum pled and tubule phases disappears.

To sum marize: the radius of gyration $R_{G}$ and the tubule roughness $h_{\text {rm s }}$ scale di erently $w$ th $m$ em brane size $L$ for a square $m$ em brane because the form er is dom inated by bulk m odes, while the latter is dom inated by $\mathrm{q}_{\text {? }}=0$ ไzero m odes".

## VI.SELF-AVOIDANCE IN THETUBULE PHASE

W e now look at the e ects of self-avoidance on the tubule phase, and begin by calculating the upper critical em bedding dim ension $d_{u c}$ below which the selfavoidance becom es relevant in the tubule phase. A m odel of a selfavoiding $m$ em brane in the the tubule phase is described by a free energy functionalwhich is a com bination of the elastic free energy $F_{\text {el }}$ from Eq 5 interaction $F_{S A}$ from Eq tended in $y$-direction using Eqitin for $x(x)$

$$
\begin{gather*}
F_{S A}=\frac{b^{2}}{2} d y d y^{0} d^{D} x_{?} d^{D} \quad x_{?}^{0} \quad\left(d^{1}\right) \\
y y\left(x_{?} ; y\right)  \tag{6.1}\\
y^{2}\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right) \quad y y^{0} \quad u\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y^{0}\right):
\end{gather*}
$$

If the in-plane uctuations $u$ scale sub-linearly $w$ ith $y$ (which we will self-consistently verify a posteriori that they do), at long length scales one can ignore the phonons inside the self-avoiding interaction above. This can be con m ed m ore form ally by an explicit renorm alization
group analysis ${ }^{-13}$.'. W e then obtain a self-avoiding interaction that is local in $y$, w ith corrections that are irrelevant in the renorm alization group sense and therefore subdom inant at long length scales. T he appropriate free energy that describes a self-avoiding tubule is then given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& F=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{\text {? }} d y \quad @_{Y} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{Y} \check{K}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{Y} u\right)^{2} \\
& +\left(@_{\mathrm{y}}^{2} \widetilde{\mathrm{n}}\right)^{2}+\mathrm{t}\left(@^{?} \mathrm{~K}^{2}\right)^{2}+\mathrm{g}_{\text {? }}\left(@^{?} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2} \\
& +g_{Y} @_{Y} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \check{\mathrm{n}}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\varrho_{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{u}\right)^{2} \\
& +v \quad d y d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?}^{0} \text { (d 1) } \check{n}\left(x_{?} ; y\right) \quad \check{n}\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right) \text {; } \tag{62}
\end{align*}
$$

where $v=b=2_{y}$.
It is im portant for sim ulators to note that, although the self-avoiding interaction ise ectively localin intrinsic coordinate $y$, this does not $m$ ean that the e ects of selfavoidance can be included in sim ulations that have each particle on the $m$ em brane avoid only those labeled by the sam e intrinsic y coordinate. Such a sim ulation, rather, m odels the very di erent (unphysical) self-avoiding interaction

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
F_{S A}^{w r o n g}=v & d y d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d^{D} \quad 1 x_{?}^{0} \quad\left(u\left(x_{?} ; y\right) \quad u\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right)\right. \\
& \text { (d 1) } \check{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\text {? }} ; y\right) \quad \check{\mathrm{h}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{?}^{0} ; y\right) ; \tag{6.3}
\end{array}
$$

which accounts for interaction only of particles that have the same intrinsic coordinate $y$ and the sam e extrinsic coordinate. For large $m$ em branes, this unphysical interaction is $s m$ aller than the true self-avoiding interaction in Eqi6 2 by a factor that scales like the inverse of the m s uctuations of $u: h^{2} i^{1=2}$, as can be seen trivially from the scaling of the fiunction of $u$ in Eq. uctuations of $u$ diverge as $L_{\text {? }}$ ! 1 like $u_{r m s} L_{?}{ }^{u}$, w th $u>0$ (e.g., $u=1=8$, ford 11 and $D=2$ ), the wrong self-avoiding interaction in Eq! 6.31 drastically underestim ates the true self-avoiding interaction by a factor that diverges in the them odynam ic lim it. A lthough it is tem pting to do so in sim ulations, one $m$ ust be careful not to im plem ent the unphysical self-avoiding interaction in Eqi6.3. Since it $m$ ight be di cult to im plem ent the approxim ate (but asym ptotically exact) self-avoiding interaction ofE qi 6 the unapproxim ated interaction in Eqi6.

In the next three subsections we analyze the properties of a self-avoiding tubule described tic free energy, using F lory theory ${ }^{\frac{1}{L}}$, the renorm alization group, and the G aussian variationalm ethodin.

## A.Flory theory

The e ects of self-avoidance in the tubule phase can be estim ated by generalizing standard F lory argum ents
from polym erphysics ${ }^{-14}$, to the extended tubule geom etry. $T$ he total self-avoidance energy scales as

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{S A} / V^{2} ; \tag{6.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
V / R_{G}^{d}{ }^{1} L_{y} \tag{6.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the volum $e$ in the em bedding space occupied by the tubule and $=M=V$ is the em bedding space density of the tubule. U sing the fact that the tubule $m$ ass M scales like $L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{y}$, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{S A} / \frac{\left.L_{Y} L_{?}^{2(D} 1\right)}{R_{G}^{d}} ; \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

U sing the radius of gyration $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}} / \mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}$, and considering, as required by the anisotropic scaling, a $m$ em brane $w$ ith $L_{\text {? }} / L_{y}^{2}$, we nd that $E_{S A} / L_{y}^{s A}$ around the phantom xed point, with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{SA}_{\mathrm{A}}=1+4(\mathrm{D} \quad 1) \quad 2(\mathrm{~d} \quad 1) \quad \text {; } \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Self-avoidance is relevant when $S_{A}>0$, which, from the above equation, happens for $=p_{h}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & 2 \mathrm{D}\end{array}\right)=4$ (as per Eq's.

$$
\begin{equation*}
d<d_{u c}^{S A}=\frac{6 D \quad 1}{5 \quad 2 D}: \tag{6.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $D=2$-dim ensional $m$ em branes, $d_{u c}^{S A}=11$. Thus, self-avoidance is strongly relevant for the tubule phase in $d=3$, in contrast to the at phase.
$W$ e can estim ate the e ect of the self-avoidance interactions on $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}$ ( L ? ) in F lory theory, by balancing the estim ate E q : 6.1 , for the self-avoidance energy w ith a sim ilar estim ate for the elastic energy:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{\text {elastic }}=t{\frac{R_{G}}{L_{?}}}^{2} L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{y}: \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equating $\mathrm{E}_{\text {elastic }}$ w ith $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{SA}}$, we obtain a F lory estim ate for the radius of gyration $R_{G}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?}\right) / \mathrm{L}_{?}^{\mathrm{F}} ;{ }_{\mathrm{F}}=\frac{\mathrm{D}+1}{\mathrm{~d}+1} \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which should be contrasted w the thery estim ate of ${ }_{F}^{C}=(D+2)=(d+2)$ for the crum pled phase. The sim ilarity of the expressions is not surprising, since for the tubule phase the $y$-dim ension decouples in both the intrinsic and the em bedding spaces and is not a ected by the self-avoidance. For the physical case $D=2, d=3$ Eq16.10' gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}} / \mathrm{L}_{?}^{3=4} ; \tag{6.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

a result that is known to be exact for the radius of gyration of a $D=1$-polym er embedded in $d=2-$ dim ensionstis Since the cross-section of the $D=2$ tubule, crudely speaking, traces out a crum pled polym er em bedded in two dim ensions (see $F$ ig (רָ) , it is intriguing to conjecture that $=3=4$ is also the exact result for the scaling of the thickness of the tubule. U nfortunately, we have no strong argum ents supporting this appealing con jecture.

For a squarem em brane, $L_{y} \quad L_{?}$, it is straightforw ard to argue, as we did previously, that the $\mathrm{q}_{y}=0$ zero m odes do not contribute to $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}$, and L ? is the relevant cuto . H ence E $q$, 10 generally, we expect

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right) / \mathrm{L}_{?} \mathrm{~S}_{\mathrm{R}} \frac{\mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{Y}}}{\mathrm{~L}_{?}^{\mathrm{z}}} ; \tag{6.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S_{R}(x)$ is the scaling function given in Equin and $z$ is the anisotropy exponent given in Eq! 1.3 .1 .

## B. R enorm alization group and scaling relations

In this subsection, we present a renorm alization group analysis of the physical self-avoiding $m$ em brane, which will also require a sim ultaneous treatm ent of the nonlinear elasticity that was already present in a phantom $m$ em brane, as discussed in Sec $\bar{N}$ :

The correct model, which inconporates the e ects of both the self-avoiding interaction and the anharm onic elasticity, is de ned by the free energy Eq.6.2.

$$
\begin{align*}
& F=\frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{D} x_{?} d y \quad\left(@_{y}^{2} \widetilde{K}\right)^{2}+t\left(@^{?} \widetilde{h}\right)^{2}+g_{?}\left(@^{?} u\right)^{2} \\
& +g_{y} @_{y} u+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{y} \check{n}\right)^{2} \\
& \text { Z } \\
& +v \quad d y d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?}^{0} \text { (d 1) } \check{n}\left(x_{?} ; y\right) \quad \check{( }\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right) \text {; } \tag{6.13}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have set $=0$ and dropped the subdom inant phonon anharm onicity.

It is convenient for the purposes of this section to choose the units of length such that $t==1$ throughout, and choose the renorm alization group rescalings to keep them $\quad$ xed at 1 even after the diagram $m$ atic corrections are taken into account (i.e., beyond the treelevel). W es follow the standard renom alization group procedure ${ }^{36}$ :
(i) Integrate out uctuations of the Fourierm odes u (q) and $\widetilde{K}(q)$ of the elds $u(x)$ and $\widetilde{h}(x)$ w ith wavevectors in the high wavevector shell $e^{1}<q_{?}<, \quad 1<G<$ 1 , where the ultraviolet cuto is of order an inverse $m$ icroscopic length, and $l$ is a param eter known as the \renorm alization group tim e". This integration can, of
course only be accom plished perturbatively in the nonlinear couplings $v$ and $g_{y}$.
(ii) A nisotropically rescale lengths ( x ? , y ) and elds ( $\check{h}(x)$; $u(x))$, so as to restore the ultraviolet cuto to :

$$
\begin{align*}
x_{?} & =e^{1} x_{?}^{0} ;  \tag{6.14a}\\
y & =e^{z 1} y^{0} ;  \tag{6.14b}\\
\widetilde{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{x}) & =e^{\mathrm{ln}^{0}\left(x^{0}\right) ;}  \tag{6.14c}\\
u(x) & =e^{(2} \quad z^{(2) 1} u^{0}\left(x^{0}\right) ; \tag{6.14d}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have chosen the convenient (but not necessary) rescaling of the phonon eld $u$ so as to preserve the form of the rotation-invariant operator $\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{u}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \widetilde{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}\right)^{2}$.
(iii) De ne the e ective length-scale dependent coupling constants so as to bring the resulting long wavelength $e$ ective free energy into the sam eform asE qi. $\overline{1} \cdot \overline{1} \frac{1}{3}$.

A s discussed above, we w ill choose the arbitrary rescaling exponents and $z$ so as to keep the renorm alized (l) and $t(l)$ equalto one. This choice of and $z$ can be show $n$ by standard renorm alization group argum ents to be the . and $z$ that appear in the scaling function Eqsili. $\frac{1}{1}$ and 112, as we w ill dem onstrate later in this subsection.
T he result of the three steps of the above renom alization group transform ation (i.e., m ode integration, rescaling, and coupling rede nition) can be sum $m$ arized in differential recursion relations for the ow ing coupling constants:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d t}{d l}=[2+z+D \quad 3 \quad f(v)] t ;  \tag{6.15}\\
& \frac{d}{d l}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
2 & 3 z+D & 1+f\left(g_{y} ; g_{?}\right)
\end{array}\right] ;  \tag{6.16}\\
& \frac{d g_{y}}{d l}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
4 & 3 z+D & 1 & { }_{g} f\left(g_{y}\right)
\end{array}\right] g_{y} ;  \tag{6.17}\\
& \frac{d g_{?}}{d l}=\left[\begin{array}{lll}
4 & z+D & 3
\end{array}\right] \text {; }  \tag{6.18}\\
& \frac{d v}{d l}=\left[\begin{array}{llll}
2 D & 2+z & (d \quad 1) \quad v f v
\end{array}\right] v ; \tag{6.19}
\end{align*}
$$

where the various $f$-fiunctions represent the graphical (i.e., perturbative) corrections. Since the self-avoiding interaction only involves $\check{K}$, and the param eters in the n propagator ( $t$ and ) are going to be held xed at 1 , the graphicalcorrections com ing from self-avoiding interaction alone depend only on the strength $v$ of the selfavoiding interaction. Therefore, to all orders in $v$, and leading order in $g_{y}, f_{t}(v)$ and $f_{v}(v)$ are only functions of $v$ and $f\left(g_{Y} ; g_{\text {? }}\right)$ and $f_{g}\left(g_{Y}\right)$ are only functions of $g_{Y}$ and g?

It is im portant to note that $g$ ? su ens no graphical corrections, i.e., E qion is is exact. This is enforced by an exact sym $m$ etry

$$
\begin{equation*}
u\left(x_{?} ; y\right)!u\left(x_{?} ; y\right)+\left(x_{?}\right) ; \tag{620}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ( $x_{\text {? }}$ ) is an anditrary function of $x_{\text {? }}$, under which the nonlinearities in $F$ are invariant.

W e further note that there is an additional tubule \gauge"-like sym $m$ etry for $g_{y}=0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widetilde{\mathrm{n}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{y}\right)!~ \check{\mathrm{~h}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{y}\right)+{ }^{\sim}(\mathrm{y}) \text {; } \tag{621}
\end{equation*}
$$

under which the only rem aining nonlinearity，the self－ avoiding interaction，being local in $y$ ，is invariant． $T$ his \tubule gauge＂sym metry dem ands that $f\left(g_{y}=\right.$ $\left.0 ; g_{\text {？}}\right)=0$ ，which implies that if $g_{Y}=0$ ，there is no divergent renorm alization of ，exactly，i．e．，the self－ avoiding interaction alone cannot renorm alize．This non－renorm alization of by the self－avoiding interac－ tion，in a truncated（unphysical）$m$ em brane $m$ odel with $g_{y}=0$ ，has been recently veri ed to all orders in a per－ turbative renorm alization group calculationn．

To see that the and $z$ obtained as xed point solu－
 as the and $\bar{z}$ de ned in the scaling expressions Eqs． 1 and 12 for the radius of gyration $R_{G}$ and tubule $w$ ig－ glyness $\mathrm{h}_{\mathrm{rm}}$ s， we use the renorm alization group transfor－ $m$ ation to relate these quantities in the unrenorm alized system to those in the renorm alized one． T his gives，for instance，for the radius of gyration

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{G}\left(L_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} ; \mathrm{t}(0) ;(0) ;:::\right)= \\
& =h \tilde{n}(\mathrm{~L} \text { ? ; } \mathrm{y}) \quad \check{\mathrm{n}}(0 \text { ? ; } \mathrm{y}) \text { 予 } \mathrm{i}^{1=2} \\
& L_{y} ; t(0) ;(0) ;::
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& e^{21} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{t}(\mathrm{I}) ;(1) ;:: \\
& =e^{l^{R}}{ }_{G}\left(e^{1} L_{?} ; e^{z l} L_{y} ;\right. \text { (l); (1);:: : ; } \tag{622}
\end{align*}
$$

where $t(1)$ ；（1）；：：：stand for all ow ing coupling con－ stants whose evolution with 1 is determ ined by the recur－ sion relations Eqsi6．15－1．19．Choosing $l=1=\log L$ ？ this becom es：
$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{L}_{\text {？}} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} ; \mathrm{t}_{\boldsymbol{i}} ;:::\right)=\mathrm{L}_{\text {？}} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(1 ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {？}}^{\mathrm{z}} ; \mathrm{t}(\mathrm{l}) ;(\mathrm{l}) ;:::\right):$

This relation holds for any choige of the（after all，arbi－ trary）rescaling exponents and $z$ ．H ow ever，if wem ake the special choioe such that E qs， 6 points（see Eqsi6． to constants，independent of 1 （and hence $L_{\text {？}}$ ），as $L$ ？
and hence $\underline{l}$ ，go to in nity．Thus，in this lim it，we obtain from $E q$ 觡 $\overline{2} \overline{3}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}} ; \mathrm{t}_{\boldsymbol{j}} ;::::\right)=\mathrm{L}_{?} \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(1 ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{z}} ; \mathrm{t} ; \quad ;:::\right) ; \tag{6.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

wheret；；：：：are the xed point values ofcoupling con－ stants．This result clearly agrees $w$ th the scaling form $s$ for $R_{G}, E q$ ill（ w ith analogous derivation for $h_{r m}$ ）if $w e$ de ne $S_{R}(x) \quad R_{G}\left(1 ; x ; t ; \quad ; g_{y} ; \underline{v}\right)$ ．

The recursion relations E qs ${ }^{\prime} 6,15 \cdot \overline{1} \cdot \overline{1} 9$ reproduce all of our phantom $m$ em brane results，as well as the upper criticalem bedding dim ension $d_{4 c}^{S A}$ for selfavoidance pre－ dicted by F lory theory，Eq［6．7，and the upper critical
intrinsic dim ension $D_{u c}=5=2$ for anom alous elasticity for phantom $m$ em branes．To see this，consider rst the phantom $m$ em brane；i．e．，$v=0$ ．In this case，$f_{t}(v)=0$ ， and to keep $t(1)$ xed we see from the recursion relation Eqi． 1

$$
\begin{equation*}
2+z+D \quad 3=0: \tag{6,25}
\end{equation*}
$$

A ssum ing for the $m$ om ent that $f\left(g_{y} ; g_{?}\right)!0$ as $l!1$ ， which，as we shall see in a moment，it does for phan－ tom $m$ embranes for $D>3=2$ ，we see from the recursion relation Equ등 for（1）that we m ust choose

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 \quad 3 z+D \quad 1=0: \tag{626}
\end{equation*}
$$

Solving Eqsi6 $\overline{2} \overline{5}$ and $\overline{6} \overline{2} \overline{6}$ for $z$ and yields the phantom m em brane results $z_{-}=\overline{1}=2, \quad=(5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D})=4$ ，as obtained in Eqs $\sqrt{2}=\overline{8}$ and 15

To extract the upper－critical em bedding dim ension $d_{u c}^{S A}$ for self－avoidance from the renorm alization group recursion relations，we construct from them a ow equa－ tion for a dim ensionless coupling constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
v=v t^{a} \quad \mathrm{~b} ; \tag{627}
\end{equation*}
$$

where a and b w ill be chosen to elim inate the anbitrary rescaling exponents and $z$ from the recursion relation for $v$ ．This requirem ent lead to the choice

$$
\begin{align*}
& a=(3 d \quad 5)=8 ;  \tag{6,28}\\
& b=(d+1)=8 ; \tag{629}
\end{align*}
$$

which im plies：

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{d \psi}{d l}=\quad & {\left[\begin{array}{llll}
6 D & 1 & (5 & 2 D) d
\end{array}\right]=4 \quad{ }_{v} f+\frac{d+1}{8} f } \\
& \frac{3 d \quad 5}{8} f_{t} \quad \forall ; \tag{6,30}
\end{align*}
$$

O fcourse，an identical ow equation is obtained for $\mathrm{v}(\mathrm{l})$ if one instead requires that $t(1)$ and（l）are xed，i．e．， independent of 1, thereby determ ining and $z$ and using them inside Eq 6

It is easy to see that the sign of the term $s$ in the square bracket determ ines the relevance of the self－avoiding in－ teraction，which becom es relevant w hen

$$
\begin{equation*}
6 \mathrm{D} \quad 1 \quad(5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D}) \mathrm{d}>0 \text {; } \tag{6.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

i．e．，for $d<d_{u c}^{S A}=\left(\begin{array}{ll}6 D & 1\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & 2 D_{n}\end{array}\right)$ ，consistent $w$ ith the analysis of the F lory theory，Eq：6．7．

Likew ise，the renorm alization group ow equations contain inform ation about the upper－critical intrinsic di－ m ension for the anom alous elasticity， D uc，below which tubule elasticity becom es anom alous．T his can be seen （analogously to the discussion of the relevance of self－ avoidance coupling v）by using E qs：15：17． the renorm alization group ow equation for the dim en－ sionless coupling constant

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{y}=\frac{g_{y}}{t^{3=4} 5=4} ; \tag{632}
\end{equation*}
$$

chosen such that its ow

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d g_{y}}{d l}=\frac{5}{2} \quad D \quad \frac{f}{f} \quad \frac{5}{4} f+\frac{3}{4} f_{t} \quad g_{y} ; \tag{6.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

is independent of the arbitrary rescaling exponents $z$ and . A gain the sam e recursion relation can be obtained by instead using the values of $z$ and required to keep $t(1)$ and (1) $x e d$ inside the ow equation for $g(1), E q 16.171_{1}$. It is then obvious that anharm onic elasticity becom es relevant for $D<D_{u c}=5=2$, where anom alous elasticity of the tubule is induced. A s we w ill see below, in a phantom tubule or a tubule em bedded in $d>d$, this anom alous elasticity m anifests itself only in phonon (u) uctuations, i.e., softens $q_{z}$, but does not renorm alize the bending rigidity. In physical tubules, how ever, which are self-avoiding and are em bedded in $d=3<d \quad 6: 5$, the elasticity is fully anom alous, both $w$ ith respect to the phonon $u$ uctuations (ie. g. vanishes asq! 0) and the height $斤$ indulations (ie. diverges as q! 0).

To further analyze the renorm alization of in a selfavoiding $m$ em brane, it is convenient to integrate out the phonon eld u aswedid in Sec.id for the phantom tubule, obtaining

$$
\begin{align*}
F & =\frac{1}{2}{ }^{Z} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d y \quad\left(@_{y}^{2} \check{n}\right)^{2}+t\left(@^{?} \check{n}\right)^{2} \\
& \left.+F_{\text {anh }} \llbracket \llbracket\right]+F_{S A}[\check{\nwarrow}] \tag{6.34}
\end{align*}
$$

where, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{anh}}$ is the non-local interaction, Eq'든 $\overline{1}, \mathrm{~m}$ ediated by integrated out phonons, w ith a kemel

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{h}(q)=\frac{g_{y} g_{?} q_{?}^{2}}{g_{y} q_{y}^{2}+g_{?} q_{?}^{2}} ; \tag{6,35}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $F_{S A}$ is the self-avoiding interaction.
The long wavelength properties of the tubule phase w ill very $\mathrm{m} u$ ch depend on the behavior of the denom inator in the kemel $V_{h}$ at long length scales. If $g_{y}(q) q_{y}^{2} \gg$ $g$ ? ( $q$ ) $q_{\text {? }}^{2}$ (as we saw for a phantom tubule) then at long scales $V_{h}(q) \quad G q_{?}^{2}=q_{1}^{2}$, which behaves like $q^{2}$ in the relevant lim it of $q$ ? $q^{2}$. In this case, simple power counting around the Gaussian xed point then shows that this elastic nonlinearity only becom es relevant for $D<D_{u c}=3=2$, i.e. is irrelevant for a physicalD $=2-$ dim ensional tubule, as we argued in Sec Vi.

On the other hand, if the scaling is such that $g$ ? $(q) q_{?}^{2}$ dom inates over $g_{y}(q) q_{y}^{2}$, then $V_{h}(q) \quad q$, i.e. a constant at long length scales. Sim ple pow er-counting then show s that this coupling is relevant for $D<D_{u c}=5=2$ and the bending rigidity m odulus of a $\mathrm{D}=2$-dim ensionaltubule is anom alous in this case.

As we saw in our analysis of a phantom tubule, for which one is perturbing around a Gaussian xed point described by $q_{\text {? }} q^{2} \ll q_{y}$ (in the long wavelength lim it), the anharm onic nonlinearity is irrelevant for D >
$3=2$ and is not anom alous. W e now need to extend this analysis to a physical tubule, i.e., to inchude the e ects of self-avoidance.

The analysis of the behavior of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{q})$ (which deter$m$ ines the relevance of anham onic elasticity) at long scales, around an arbitrary xed point, is more conveniently done using the language of the renom alization group through the recursion relations E qs, $\overline{6} . \overline{15}$ and $\overline{1} \mathbf{1} . \overline{19}$. At the globally stable xed point, in the presence ofboth the nonlinear elasticity and the self-avoiding interaction, we can keep $t=\quad=1$ and $g_{y}$ and $v$ xed at xed point values, by requiring

$$
\begin{align*}
& 2+z+D 3 E(v)=0 \text {; }  \tag{6.36}\\
& 23 z+D \quad 1+f\left(g_{Y} ; g_{?}\right)=0 \text {; }  \tag{6.37}\\
& 4 \quad 3 z+D \quad 1 \quad{ }_{g} f\left(g_{y}\right)=0 \text {; }  \tag{6.38}\\
& 2\left(\begin{array}{lll}
(\mathrm{D} & 1)+z \quad(\mathrm{~d} & 1) \\
\mathrm{v} & \mathrm{f} v
\end{array}\right)=0 \text { : } \tag{6.39}
\end{align*}
$$

In light of the above discussion, the anharm onic vertex for $\widetilde{n}$ in this renorm alization group picture becom es relevant when $g_{\text {? }}(1!1)$ renorm alizes to in nity, while it is irrelevant when $g_{\text {? }}(1!1)$ ow sto zero. Thus, the relevanœ of $V_{h}$ is decided by the sign of the renorm alization group ow eigenvalue of $g$ (1) in Eqi' 1

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{z}=4 \quad z+D \quad 3 ; \tag{6.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is exactly determ ined by the values of and $z$, since $g$ ? su ers no graphical renom alization.

A swe have discussed in previous sections, for a phantom tubule $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & 2 D\end{array}\right)=4$ and $z=1=2$. Ford $<{\underset{q}{c}}_{A}^{A}=$ (6D 1) = (5 2D ) (= 11 forD = 2), these values arem odi ed by the self-avoiding interaction, but only by order
d sis ict i.e.

$$
\begin{align*}
& =(5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D})=4+O() ;  \tag{6.41}\\
\mathrm{z} & =1=2+\mathrm{O}(): \tag{6.42}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence a D = 2-dim ensional tubule, em bedded in d di$m$ ensions close to $d_{u c}^{S A}=11, g_{?}=1=2$ and 9 (1) ow s according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d g_{?}}{\mathrm{dl}}=\left[\frac{1}{2}+O()\right] g ; \tag{6.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e. $g_{\text {? }}$ is irrelevant near $d=11$ (for 1 ), $V_{h}(q)$
$g_{?} q_{?}^{2}=q_{y}^{2} \quad q^{2} O^{(1)}$ is irrelevant for a physical $D=2-$ dim ensional tubule, and, hence, $f$ in Eqi6.16 vanishes as $1!1$. So is unrenorm alized near $d=11$, for $D=2$. $T$ hat is, as we described above, the anharm onic elasticity is irrelevant to the bend elasticity for em bedding dim ensions near $d_{u c}^{S A}$, and in this case the filllm odel of a self-avoiding tubule $w$ ith nonlinear elasticity reduces to the linear elastic truncated $m$ odel introduced by uss recently further analyzed in Ref. $\overline{3} 1$.

In this simpler (but unphysical) case, one is justi ed in ignoring the nonlinear elasticity. O ne is then able to analyze (perturbatively in $=\$_{c}^{\Phi} A \quad d$ ) the e ects of the
self-avoiding interaction alone, by com puting the fungtions $f_{t}(v)$ and $f_{v}(v)$ appearing in Eqs, 6 Since, as we discussed above, the \tubule gauge" sym $m$ etry guarantees that in this case the self-avoiding interaction alone cannot renom alize , $\mathrm{f}=0$. Thus, for d near $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{uc}}^{\mathrm{SA}}$, Eqi6.37, leads to $=0$ and an exact exponent relation (leaving only a single independent tubule shape exponent):

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{1}{3}(2+D \quad 1) ; \tag{6.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is exact for a nite range $d<d<d_{u c}^{S A}$ of embedding dimensions, and for phantom tubules in any embedding dim ension. This result has been independently obtained in Ref.

H ow ever, this simple scenario, and, in particular, the scaling relation $\mathrm{Eq}{ }_{6} 6.4 \mathrm{I}^{\prime}$, is guaranteed to break down asd is reduced. T he reason for this is that, as d decreases, increases, and eventually becom es so large that the eigenvalue $g_{\text {? }}$ of $g$ ? changes sign and becom es positive. A s discussed earlier, once this happens, the nonlinear vertex Equ $\mathrm{V}^{-} \overline{3}$, becom es relevant, and acquires a divergent renom äization, i.e., $f \in 0$, and bend tubule elasticity becom es anom alous. W e will now show that the critical dim ension $d$ below which this happens for $D=2$ is guaranteed to be > 7=2, and hence, obviously, > 3 .
 which is valid for $d \geq d$, inside the expression for the eigenvalue $g_{2}$, Eq, $\overline{6} . \overline{4} \bar{q}$, obtaining

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{?}=\frac{1}{3}(10+2 D \quad 8): \tag{6.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e then take advantage of a rigorous low er bound on

$$
\begin{equation*}
>\frac{\mathrm{D} \quad 1}{\mathrm{~d} \quad 1} ; \tag{6.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

im posed by the condition that the $m$ onom er density
$/ L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1}=R_{G}^{d}{ }^{1} / L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1}$ (d 1) rem ain nite in the therm odynam ic L ? ! 1 lim it. U sing this bound inside E qi. 6.451 w w obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{?} \quad \frac{1}{3} 10 \frac{\mathrm{D}}{\mathrm{~d}} 1 \mathrm{1}+2 \mathrm{D} \quad 8 \text {; } \tag{6.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

from which it follows that $g$ ? $m$ ust becom e positive for $d<d^{\mathrm{lb}}(\mathrm{D}) \mathrm{w}$ th

$$
\begin{align*}
d^{\mathrm{lb}}(D) & =\frac{4 D \quad 1}{4} ;  \tag{6.48}\\
d^{\mathrm{lb}}(2) & =7=2 ; \tag{6.49}
\end{align*}
$$

as asserted above.
In fact, $d$ (2) is probably quite a bit bigger than its 7=2 low erbound, as tw o estim ates of it indicate. If, for exam ple, we take the $F$ lory tubule exponent $=(D+1)=(d+1)$ in Eq

$$
\begin{align*}
d^{F} & =\frac{6 D+1}{4} ;  \tag{6.50}\\
d^{F}(2) & =13=2 ; \tag{6.51}
\end{align*}
$$

while if we use the $=11,{ }_{-1}$ d\{expansion result for of B ow ick and Guitter, $(D=2)^{3_{1}^{1}}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{3}{4+} \quad \frac{1}{2} ; \tag{6.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
=1: 05 \overline{8} \quad ; \tag{6.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
d=5: 92: \tag{6.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

So, based on the above estim ates, we expect that in a $D=2$-dim ensional tubule, em bedded in $d<d \quad 6$, the yed point of the truncated tubule $m$ odel introduced by ust and studied in Ref. ${ }^{3} 1 \mathbf{1}$, is unstable to anharm onic elasticity $\mathrm{F}_{\text {anh }}$. This $m$ eans that diverges at long length scales, and the scaling relation Eq betw een $z$ and breaks dow. Thus, for the physicalem bedding dim ension $d=3$, the tubule bend elasticity is certainly anom alous, in the sense that diverges, and probably quite strongly. W e have sum $m$ arized the above discussion in F ig ! $\bar{G}, \underline{1}$, schem atically illustrating how the renorm alization group ow of $g$, and therefore the anom alous elasticIty, change (at d) as a function ofem bedding dim ension d.


FIG.6. Schem atic ilhustration (specialized to $D=2$ ) of change in relevance of $g$ ? ( 1 ) which occurs at $d$. For em bedding dim ensions below $d$ (which includes the physical case of $d=3), g$ ? (l) becom es relevant, leading to anom alous bending elasticity $w$ ith ( $q$ ) $q_{y}$, which diverges at long length scales. O ther consequences of this qualitative and quantitative change for $d<d$ are discussed in the text.
 ' 6 at the xed point values $g$, and $g_{\text {? }}$.

Using the sort of renorm alization group correlation function $m$ atching calculations described earlier, Eqsi622-624, it is straightforw ard to show that the correlation functions of the tubule, including anom alous elastice ects, are correctly given by the harm onic results, E qsit. 6 and 5.7 , except that the elastic constants $g_{y}$ and m ust be replaced by w avevector dependent quantities that vanish and diverge, respectively as q! 0:

$$
\begin{align*}
g_{y}(q) & =q_{y}{ }^{u} S_{g}\left(q_{y}=q_{?}^{z}\right) ;  \tag{6.55}\\
(q) & =q_{y} \quad S \quad\left(q_{y}=q_{?}^{z}\right) ; \tag{6.56}
\end{align*}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& z=f\left(g_{Y} ; g_{?}\right) ;  \tag{6.57}\\
& z_{u}=f_{g}\left(g_{y}\right): \tag{6.58}
\end{align*}
$$

O ur earlier conclusion that the relevance of $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{h}}$ is determ ined by the sign of $g_{\text {? }}$ (Eq ( 6.40$)^{\prime}$ ) can be reproduced by sim ply noting that $g_{y}(q) q_{y}^{2}$ scales like $q_{y}{ }^{4}{ }^{+2}$, and in the long wavelength lim it is therefore subdom inant to $g_{\text {? }} q_{?}^{2} \quad q_{i}^{2=z}$ when

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{u}>2 \quad 2 z ; \tag{6.59}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, upon using Eqi $f_{g}\left(g_{y}\right)=z$, is identical to the condition that $g_{?}>0$.
$T$ he scaling functions have the asym ptotic form $s$

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{g}(x!0)!x{ }^{u} ;  \tag{6.60}\\
& S(x!0)!x \tag{6.61}
\end{align*}
$$

C om bining the expressions Eqsi-57, and $1-5.5$ and $u$ w ith the RG xed point conditions EqS. 37 and , two exact relations hold betw een four independent expo-
 betw een tw o exponents)

$$
\begin{align*}
& z=\frac{1}{3}(2+D  \tag{6.62}\\
& z=\frac{1}{3+u}(4+D  \tag{6.63}\\
& z):
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ hat is, in contrast to the behavior for $d>d$, for $d<d$ there are two independent exponents characterizing the tubule phase, not one. W e furthem ore note that these exponent relations autom atically contain the rotational sym $m$ etry $W$ ard identity. This can be easily seen by elim inating from Eqsi. $\overline{6} .62$ and ${ }_{1} \overline{6} .6 \overline{3}$, obtaining

$$
\begin{equation*}
2+u=3 \quad(D \quad 1)=z: \tag{6.64}
\end{equation*}
$$

U ltim ately, the origin of this relation is the requirem ent that graphical corrections do not change the form of the rotationally invariant operator $\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{u}+\frac{1}{2}\left(@_{\mathrm{Y}} \widetilde{\mathrm{K}}\right)^{2}\right)$.

Just as the divergence of is controlled by $f\left(g_{Y} ; g_{?}\right)$, the softening of $g_{y}(q) \quad q^{u}$ is determ ined by the $u=$ $z f_{g}\left(g_{y}\right)$. Because $f_{g}(0)=0$, this physical $g_{y}(q)$ rem ains non-zero and nite as q ! 0 , only if the running cou$p l i n g g_{Y}(1)$ in the renorm alization group recursion equation Eq.6.17, does go to zero (because then the graphical piece $f_{g}\left(g_{-}\right)$vanishes). Exam ining the ow equation for $g_{y}(1), E q_{1}, 17$, for $g_{y}(1)$ to vanish, we m ust have

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 \quad 3 z+D \quad 1<0: \tag{6.65}
\end{equation*}
$$

 physical case of $D=2$ and $d=3$, we nd $>1=2$. H ence, as long as $z<1$, the condition Eq, 6 is ed, and therefore $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{f}}(\mathrm{q}!0)!0$, that is, $\mathrm{u}>0$. We sum $m$ arize the above discussion in $F$ ig $\underline{i}_{1} \overline{1} .1$.


FIG.7. Schem atic of the tubule \phase" diagram in the em bedding $d$ vs intrinsic $D$ dim ensions. Self-avoiding interaction becom es relevant for $d<d_{u c}^{S A}(D)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}6 D & 1\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & 2 D\end{array}\right)$, $(=11$, for $D=2$ ). Below the $d$ ( $D$ ) curve (for which the lower bound is $d^{1 b}(D)=(4 D \quad 1)=\left(\begin{array}{ll}4 & D\end{array}\right)$ ) the anharm on ic elasticity becom es relevant, leading to anom alous elasticity w ith a divergent bending rigidity.

W e now show that the above generalanalysis of tubule anom alous elasticity in the presence of self avoidance, obtained using the renorm alization group, can be reproduced via a heuristic, but beautiful physical argu$m$ ent sim ilar to that used by Landau and Lifshitz ${ }^{2}$ ? to derive shell theory. For a tubule of diam eter $R_{G}$, the non-zero shear $g_{y}$ elasticity leads to an e ective $R_{G}-$ dependent bending rigidity modulus which will be $L$ ? and $L_{y}$-dependent if the tubule diam eter depends on $L$ ? and $L_{y}$. This can be seen as follow $s$ (see $F$ ig ${ }_{2}^{\prime \prime}(\underline{q})$ :


FIG.8. Ilhustration of the physicalm echanism for the enhancem ent of the bending rigidity by the shear $g_{y}$ elasticity. To bend a polym erized tubule of thickness $R_{G}$ into an arc of radius $R_{c}$ requires $R_{G}=R_{c}$ fraction of bond stretching and therefore costs elastic shear energy, which when interpreted as bending energy leads to a length-scale dependent renor$m$ alization of the bending rigidity and to the $W$ ard identity Eq $\overline{5}_{6}^{6} . \overline{-6} 1$, as described in $m$ ore detail in the text.

If we bend the tubule $w$ th som e radius of curvature $R_{c} \quad R_{G}$, simple geom etry tells us that this $w$ ill induce a strain " Qu along the tubule axis of order " $\quad R_{G}=R_{c}$, since the outer edge of the tubule $m$ ust be stretched by this factor, and the inner edge com pressed by it, in order to accom plish the required bend. This strain induces an additional elastic energy density (i.e., additional to those com ing from the bare ), nam ely those com ing from the $u$ elastic energy. This goes like $g_{Y}\left(L_{Y} ; L_{?}\right)^{\prime \prime}=g_{Y}\left(L_{Y} ; L_{?}\right)\left(R_{G}\left(L_{Y}\right)=R_{C}\right)^{2}$. Intenpreting this additionalenergy as an e ective bending energy density $y\left(L_{\text {? }} ; L_{y}\right)=R_{c}^{2}$, leads to the e ective bending modulus $y\left(L_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{y}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{?} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}\right) \quad \mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right) \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\mathrm{~L}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right)^{2} \text {; } \tag{6.66}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inserting the scaling form $\mathrm{S} \mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{y}}\left(\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}\right)=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{S}\left(\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\text {? }}^{\mathrm{z}}\right)$, $g_{y}\left(L_{?} ; L_{y}\right)=L_{y}{ }^{u} S_{g}\left(L_{y}=L_{?}^{z}\right)$ and $R_{G}\left(L_{\text {? }} ; L_{Y}\right)=$ $L_{\text {? }} S_{R}\left(L_{y}=L_{?}^{z}\right)$ into above expression, we obtain a relation betw een the scaling exponents

$$
\begin{equation*}
2=z(+u): \tag{6.67}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is exactly the exponent relation one obtains by subtracting $E q, \overline{6} \overline{3} \overline{7}$ from Equ ${ }^{\prime} \overline{3} \overline{3}$, and using the expres-
 obtained using renorm alization group argum ents.

Since the above physical shell argum ent is very general, Eqsi6. 6 , and 16.67 , hold independent of the $m$ echanism that generates anom alous elasticity. For the case of the phantom $m$ em brane (for $D>3=2$ ) Eq 6.60 reveals that is not anom alousbecause the soften ing of the shear $m$ odulus $g_{y}(q)$ by therm al uctuations precisely com pensates the bending rigidity produced by the nite diam eter $R_{G}$ of the tubule. Equation ${ }^{1} \overline{6} . \overline{6} \bar{\prime}$, then correctly predicts
for the phantom tubule that $u=2=z$, which is consistent w ith the phantom tubule results $\mathrm{u}=5 \mathrm{2D}$,
$=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5 & 2 D\end{array}\right)=4$, and $z=1=2$. Furthem ore, because the anharm onic elasticity $V_{h}(q)$ is irrelevant for $d>d$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{u}=2=\mathrm{z} \text {; } \tag{6.68}
\end{equation*}
$$

is valid, even in a self-avoiding tubule em bedded in these high dim ensions.

W e note, nally, that all of the exponents $m$ ust show a jum $p$ discontinuity at $d$, as show $n$ in $F$ ig $\overline{1}$, 9. Therefore, unfortunately, an extrapolation from $=11$ d, expansion in a truncated $m$ odel $w$ ith linear elasticity $y^{31}$ dow $n$ to the physicaldim ension of $d=3$ (w hich is below d) gives little inform ation about the properties of a real tubule.


FIG.9. Schem atic graph of the shape exponent and anom alous bend exponent (for $D=2$ ). N ote the jum p discontinuity as a function ofem bedding dim ension $d$, occurring at $d=d \quad 6$.

The com putations for a physical tubule $m$ ust be perform ed for $d<d$, where both the self-avoidance and the anharm onic nonlinearities are relevant and $m$ ust be handled sim ultaneously. A s we discussed above, for $d<d$, the eigenvalue $g_{?}>0$, leading to the ow of $g$ (1) to in nity, which in tum leads to $V_{h}(q)=g_{y}$. Physically this regim e of $g$ ? ! 1 corresponds to freezing out the phonons $u$, i.e. setting $u=0$ in the free energy $F \mathbb{K} ; u]$ in $E q$ i' $\overline{\mathbf{1}} \overline{3}$. . This is consistent $w$ th our nding that for $d<d$, in the ective free energy $F$ in] (w ith phonons integrated out), Eq' $\cdot \overline{6} \overline{3} \overline{4}$, , the kemel $V_{h}=g_{y}$. The resulting e ective free energy functional for a physicalself-avoiding tubule is

$$
\begin{align*}
& F=\frac{1}{2}{ }_{Z}^{Z} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d y \quad\left(@_{y}^{2} \widetilde{n}\right)^{2}+t\left(@^{?} \widetilde{n}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{4} g_{y}\left(@_{y} \tilde{n}\right)^{4} \\
&+v \text { dy d }{ }^{1} x_{?} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?}^{0}  \tag{6.69}\\
& \text { (d 1) } \widetilde{n}\left(x_{?} ; y\right) \quad \widetilde{n}\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right) ;
\end{align*}
$$

U nfortunately, no controlled perturbative study is possible for $d<d$, since one $m$ ust perturb in $g_{y}$ around a nontrivial, strong coupling xed described by $\mathrm{v}=\mathrm{O}$ (1) and $g_{y}=0$. Furthem ore, as we will show below, at this xed point there is no upper critical dim ension for $g_{y}$, i.e. anharm onic nonlinearities are alw ays relevant for $d=3<d$, for any D. This strongly contrasts $w$ th the Gaussian xed point (describing phantom $m$ embranes) at which the anharm onic nonlinearity is only relevant for D $<\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{uc}}=5=2$.

In what follow s, we w ill illustrate how one m ight attem pt to actually calculate the exponents , z, , and u , for $\mathrm{d}<\mathrm{d}$, and enum erate the ( $m$ any) technicaldi culties that prevent us from doing so, and conclude with a cautionary list of several unsuccessfiul uncontrolled approxim ations that we have tried.

In principle, all we need to do is calculate the $f_{i}$ ( $i=t ; v ; g$; ) functions in the recursion relation Eqsi6. ${ }^{1}$ ' 16.19, w hich represent the perturbative ( $\backslash$ graphical") ${ }^{-1}$ corrections to the associated coupling constants. O nce these f-functions are know $n$ they give 4 equations (Eqsi'6 $\overline{3} \overline{6}-$ ' $1-\overline{6} \overline{3} 9$ ) that uniquely determ ining the 4 unknowns tubule shape exponents, $, \mathrm{z}, \mathrm{v}$, and $\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{y}}$, as well as the the
ow of $g$ ( 1 ), and therefore com pletely characterize the long wavelength properties of self-avoiding anharm onic tubules.

O ur goal then is to calculate $f_{t}(v), f_{v}(v), f\left(g_{y}\right)$, and $f_{g}\left(g_{y}\right)$. The functions $f_{g}\left(g_{y}\right)$ and $f\left(g_{y}\right)$ are determ ined by the diagram $m$ atic corrections to $g_{y}$ and , w ith the corresponding Feynm an diagram s displayed in $F$ ig! 1 d. $T$ he results to leading order in $g_{Y}$, are

$$
\begin{align*}
& f\left(g_{Y}\right)=C \quad g_{Y}^{2} ;  \tag{6.70}\\
& f_{g}\left(g_{Y}\right)=C_{g} g_{Y} ; \tag{6.71}
\end{align*}
$$

where $C$ and $C_{g}$ are $d$ and $D$-dependent constants, whose calculation proves to be the sticking point, as we w ill describe below .

(a)

(b)

FIG.10. Feynm an graphs that renom alize: (a) the anhar$m$ onic elasticity $g_{y}$, and (b) the bending rigidity .

O fcourse, once d is below d, no matter how close it is to $d$, the xed point that controls the elastic properties of the tubule phase is not perturbative in $g_{y}$. That is, we do not expect $g_{y}$ to be O (d d), but, rather, O (1), even for $d \quad d \ll 1$. Furtherm ore, of course, since $d \quad 6$, $d \quad d$ is not sm all in the physical case $d=3$ anyw ay. For both of these reasons, truncating the calculations of $f$ and $f_{g}$ at the leading order in $g_{y}$, as we have done in Eqs ${ }^{\prime} \overline{6} . \overline{7} 0$ and ${ }_{1} \overline{6} . \overline{1} \overline{1}$, , is an uncontrolled, and far from trustworthy approxim ation. H ow ever, we know of no other analytical approach. Furtherm ore, as we shall see, even this uncontrolled analytic approach proves intractable: a reliable calculation of the values of the constants $C$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{g}}$ has eluded us.

To com plete the characterization of the xed point we can proceed in two ways. The most direct way is to sim ply perturbatively evaluate the functions $f_{t}(v), f_{v}(v)$. Luckily (for, us) this has recently been done by B ow ick and Guitteris in a truncated harm onic tubule m odel (previously introduced and studied by usil) near $d=d_{u c}^{\text {SA }}$. A though, for the reasons that we discussed above, these calculations are not rigorously applicable to a physical tubule in $d=3<d$ (where anharm onic elasticity is certainly im portant), for lack ofbeing able to do any better we extrapolate these functions, com puted near $d=11,1,1-1$ dow $n$ to $d=3$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathrm{v})=\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~V} ;  \tag{6.72}\\
& \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{v})=\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{~V} ; \tag{6.73}
\end{align*}
$$

N ow using Eqsi6. $\overline{-10}\{16.7 \overline{3}$ in Eqsi four equations for four unknowns ( $\bar{z}, \quad, g_{y}$, and $v$ ), expressed in term s constants $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{g}}, \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{t}}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{v}}$, (specialized here to $D=2$ ).

$$
\begin{align*}
& 2+z \quad 1 \quad \in \mathrm{~V}=0 ;  \tag{6.74}\\
& 23 z+1+C g_{y}{ }^{2}=0 \text {; }  \tag{6.75}\\
& 43 z+1 \quad G g_{y}=0 \text {; }  \tag{6.76}\\
& 2+z \text { (d 1) © } 0 \text { = : } \tag{6.77}
\end{align*}
$$

where the constants $C_{t}$ and $C_{v}$ (com puted in the truncatpd tubule $m$ odel near $d=d_{u c}^{S A}$ for $D=2$ ) are given by ${ }^{31}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{t}=\frac{1}{8{ }^{2}} ;  \tag{6.78}\\
& C_{v}=\frac{0: 068}{5=2} \tag{6.79}
\end{align*}
$$

These equations can be uniquely solved for $, z, g_{y}$, and v . In term sof C and $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{g}}$, in $\mathrm{D}=2$ and $\mathrm{d}=3$ we obtain for and $z$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{1}{4 \mathrm{C}} ;  \tag{6.80}\\
\mathrm{z} & =\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{6 C}+\frac{\mathrm{C}_{g}}{6 \mathrm{C}} ; \tag{6.81}
\end{align*}
$$

from which and $u$ can also be determ ined using the solution for $g_{y}$ inside E qsi. $\mathbf{1}$.57, and 16.59

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{3 C_{g}}{1+C_{g}+2 C} ;  \tag{6.82}\\
u & =\frac{33 C_{g}}{1+C_{g}+2 C} \tag{6.83}
\end{align*}
$$

A nother approach to estim ating the tubule shape exponents is to rely on the usualaccuracy of the F lory theory (in treating the e ects of self-avoidance), instead of the extrapolation of functions $f_{v}(v)$ and $f_{t}(v)$ dow from
-expansion. A though it is usually not stated this way, in the language of renom alization group, Flory theory am ounts to assum ing that the graphical corrections to $t$ and to $v$ are the sam e, i.e. $f_{v}(v)=f_{t}(v) . U \operatorname{sing}$ this in


$$
\begin{align*}
F & =\frac{D+1}{d+1} ;  \tag{6.84}\\
& =\frac{3}{4} ; \text { for } d=3 ; D=2 \tag{6.85}
\end{align*}
$$

consistent w ith our earlier analysis in subsection $N$ ote that, if $f_{v}(v)=f_{t}(v)$ for all $v$, th is result w ould $\overline{\mathrm{b}}{ }^{\prime}$ exact independent of the jum $p$ in the other exponents $z$,
, and $u$ at $d$. That is, 迆would apply even below $d$, and would not jum p, or be in any way non-analytic, at d.

N ow , of course, we know from the explicit leading order calculation in Ref. H ow ever, we do know from that calculation that they are quite close, at least to leading order, as illustrated by the good agreem ent betw een F lory theory and the extrapolated expansion. If this persists dow $n$ to $d=3$, and to large $v$, and our experience $w$ ith polym ers suggests that it $w$ ill, then $m$ ay be quite accurately predicted by $F$ lory theory, despite the com plications associated with the onset of anom alous bend elasticity at d.
 and ${ }^{\prime} \overline{\bar{\prime}} \overline{\mathrm{T}}-\mathrm{A}$, together w th the diagram m atic corrections to
and $g_{y}$ given in E qs, 6.7 d and 16.71 , w e obtain tw o equations (specialized to $D=2$ )

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
6=(d+1) & 3 z+1+C g_{y}^{2}=0 ; \\
12=(d+1) & 3 z+1 & \operatorname{Cg} g_{y}=0 ; \tag{6.87}
\end{array}
$$

which gives for $d=3$

$$
\begin{equation*}
z=\frac{4}{3}+\frac{C_{g}^{2}}{6 C} \quad \frac{C_{g}\left(C_{g}^{2}+6 C\right)^{1=2}}{6 C} ; \tag{6.88}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, at least in this uncontrolled approxim ation of truncated perturbation theory at one loop order, it seem s that we are left w ith the straightforw ard task of calculating the constants $C$ and $C_{g}$. A las, things are not so sim ple, for reasons that are undoubtedly connected with the fact that $d$ is not perturbatively close to $d_{u c}^{S A}$, which
is the only dimension about whigh one can do a genuinely controlled approxim ation ${ }^{n+3} 13$, and the $m$ uch $m$ ore surprising fact that, even though I $5=2 \quad D$ is only $1=2$ (for $D=2$ ), this $I$-expansion in intrinsic dim ension, as we w ill show, is dem onstrably extrem ely unreliable, giving qualitatively di erent answers, such as a reduction, rather than an increase of due to uctuations.
O ur unsuccessfiul (but heroic) attem pts to calculate $C_{g}$ and C were as follow s:
(I)

Calculate them in an $I \quad 5=2 \quad D$-expansion for a phantom m em brane, then use these sam e constants $\mathrm{C}_{g}$ and $C$ for the real, self-avoiding $m$ em brane. This approach obviously $m$ akes $m$ any errors, since, by the tim e we get down to $d(5=2)$, the correlation functions of the true, self-avoiding $m$ em brane are already quite di erent from those of the phantom m em brane, due to the e ects of self-avoidance. Furtherm ore, these e ects are particularly pronounced for intrinsic dim ensions $D=5=2$, since $d_{\text {uc }}^{\mathrm{SA}}(5=2)=1$, as illustrated in F ig $\mathrm{T}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}$.

N onetheless, since no other analytical calculation is available (and we are persistent young lads), we attem pted this I $5=2$ D-expansion. H ow ever, the results $m$ ade no physical sense: we found a negative, i.e., a downward renom alization of . The detailed calculations are virtually identical to those for the renor$m$ alization of at the tubule-to-crum pled phase transition, which are described in SeciV. $\frac{1}{2}$. W e note here sim ply that the origin of this negative contribution to is a negative region of the real-space correlation function $G\left(x_{?} ; y\right)=C\left(x_{?}=y^{2}\right)^{1=4} Y\left(x_{?}=y^{2}\right)$, as given by EqNi. $T$ he integrand $x^{5=4} Y^{3}(x)$ in the $x$-integral of $q$ in ${ }_{3}$ a negative region which, though narrow, actually overwhelm s the positive contribution to from the much longer, but sm aller, tail, as we have veri ed by direct num erical integration ${ }^{39}$.
$T$ his negative region is purely an artifact of calculating in a fractional intrinsic dim ension $D=5=2$. In $D=2$ for a phantom $m$ em brane, where there is no relevant anom alous elasticity for $\check{\mathrm{h}}$, and hence we can calculate $\check{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{h}^{\mathrm{h}}$ correlation functions exactly, we nd the analog of Eq.7._3 is

$$
\begin{align*}
& G(x ; y)=\frac{Z}{(2)^{2}} \frac{d q_{x} d q_{I}}{e^{i q_{x} x+i q_{y} y} q_{y}^{2}}  \tag{6.89}\\
& q_{x}^{2}+q_{y}^{4} \tag{6.90}
\end{align*} ;
$$

which, unlike the analogous correlation function in $D=$
 contribution to in $D=2 \mathrm{w}$ illalso be positive, as weexpect on physicalgrounds (i.e., the shell theory argum ent sum $m$ arized in Eq( $\overline{6} . \overline{6} \bar{\theta})$, while the $5=2 \quad D$-expansion is qualitatively w rong in predicting a negative renorm alization of . C learly, it cannot be trusted quantitatively either, and is, in fact, totally useless.
(II)

D irect, uncontrolled RG in D = 2. N ow, we at least get qualitatively correct upw ard renom alization of . H ow ever, here we have a di erent problem, that appears in any perturbative calculation aw ay from an upper critical dim ension (and is usually \sw ept under the rug") : even though $D=2$ would not, a priori, appear to be far below $D=5=2$, it is, in the sense that graphs that only diverge logarithm ically in D $=5=2$ diverge extrem ely strongly in $D=2$. In particular, follow ing very closely the $m$ anipulations that lead to Eq ${ }^{1}$ 근, we nd a contribution to of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
=q_{0}^{Z} c_{c_{2} q_{y}^{1}}^{y d y}{ }_{0}^{Z} d x \frac{e^{3=(4 x)}}{x^{3=2}} ; \tag{6.91}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ is a well-determ ined constant that we could calculate, and $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ is an arbitrary constant which depends on precisely how the infrared divergence of the above integralis cuto $w$ ith $q$. Thisarbitrary constant is the problem : if the integralE qi6.911 had diverged logarithm ically, the precise value of the constant $c_{2}$ would be unim portant (it would just lead to a nite additive constant). But, since the integral in Eq'61' diverges so strongly (like $\left(c_{2}=G_{y}\right)^{2}$ ) in $D=2$, it is extrem ely sensitive to the precise value of $c_{2}$, which we have no clue as how to choose. Thus, we have no ability to predict at all by this approach.

This strong divergence indicates that in this sense $D=2$ is quite far from $D=5=2$, and any kind of perturbative approach, even to sim ply calculating one loop constants like $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{g}}$ and C , is doom ed.

## C. G aussian variational theory of self-avoiding tubules

H ere we study the e ects of self-avoidance w ithin the tubule phase using the Gaussian variational method, which was previously applied to the study- of selfavoidance, in crum pled isotropic $m$ em branes $3^{21122}$ and in polym ers ${ }^{3}$ ? . It is im portant to em phasize that both F lory theory and the G aussian variationalm ethod are uncontrolled approxim ations in that there is no way to system atically estim ate and reduce the error.

W ebegin w ith the ective H am iltonian that describes the long wavelength behavior of the tubule for $\mathrm{d}<\mathrm{d}$.

$$
\begin{align*}
H & =\frac{1^{Z}}{Z} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d y \quad\left(@_{y}^{2} \tilde{h}\right)^{2}+t\left(@^{?} \tilde{h}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{4} g_{y}\left(\varrho_{Y} \tilde{h}\right)^{4} \\
& +v d y d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?}^{0} \quad \text { (d 1) } \tilde{h}\left(x_{?} ; y\right) \quad \tilde{h}\left(x_{?}^{0}\right. \text {;y) ; } \tag{6.92}
\end{align*}
$$

where, in contrast to other sections we use the notation $H$ to distinguish long-w avelength e ective Ham iltonian (the free energy functional) from the actual free energy F. C om putation of correlation functions in the presence of the self-avoiding nonlinearity cannot be done exactly.

H ow ever, we can replace the H am iltonian H , Equī- $\overline{\mathrm{Z}}$ by a variational $H$ am iltonian $H_{v}$, quadratic in the elds $\check{n}(x$ ? ; $y$ ), which allow s exact calculations of any correlation function. Follow ing the standard variational procedure, we then pick the \best" form of this variational H am iltonian, where by \best" wem ean that it m inim izes an upper bound on the true free energy $F$ ?

$$
\begin{equation*}
F \quad F^{r} \quad h H \quad H_{v} i_{v}+F_{v}: \tag{6.93}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e take our variation ansatz H am iltonian to be

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{v}}=\frac{1}{2}^{\mathrm{Z}} \frac{\mathrm{dk}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{k}_{?}}{(2)^{\mathrm{D}}} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{?} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y}}\right) \tilde{\mathrm{n}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{?} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y}}\right) \jmath^{\jmath} ; \tag{6.94}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $G_{v}\left(k_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right)$ is the variational kemel to be optim ized over. N ote that because of anisotropy intrinsic to the tubule, $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ is not rotationally invariant as it is for the analogous analysis of the crum pled phase.

W e now com pute the right-hand-side of Eqi.93 and $m$ inim ize it $^{\text {over }} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}\left(\mathrm{k}_{\text {? }} ; \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{Y}}\right)$.
where $A=L_{Y} I_{R}^{D}{ }^{1}$ is the \area" of the $m$ em Rrane and we de ned $x \quad d y d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{\text {? }} d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{\text {? }}^{0}$, and $k$ $\mathrm{dk}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{d}^{\mathrm{D}}{ }^{1} \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{?}}=(2)^{\mathrm{X}}$.
The above averages are easily evaluated $w$ th
 $h\left(d\right.$ 1) $\check{h}\left(x_{\text {? }} ; y\right) \quad \check{n}\left(x_{?}^{0} ; y\right) i_{v}$ given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{Z}{(2)^{d 1}} e^{d^{1}} \mathrm{q}^{2} \mathrm{~K}\left(\mathrm{jx}: \mathrm{x}_{: 0}^{0} j\right) ; \tag{6.96}
\end{align*}
$$

where,

$$
\begin{align*}
& K\left(\dot{x}_{?} \mathcal{j}\right)=\frac{1}{2(\mathrm{~d} 1)^{2}} \mathrm{~h} \tilde{n}\left(\mathrm{x}_{?} ; 0\right) \quad \widetilde{\mathrm{h}}(0 \text { ? } ; 0) \mathrm{f}^{f} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{V}} ; \\
& ={ }_{k} \frac{1 \quad \cos \left(k_{?} \quad \underset{~ x}{l}\right)}{G_{v}(k)} \text {; } \tag{6.97}
\end{align*}
$$

and we have used in Eqion 9 , the Fourier representation of the d 1 -dim ensionaldelta-fiunction.

P utting all th is together we obtain for the right-handside of Eq 6

which when $m$ inim ized with respect to $G_{v}(k)$, $\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{N}}=\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{k})=0$ gives an integralequation

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{v}(\widetilde{K})=k_{y}^{4}+t k_{?}^{2} \quad \frac{2 v}{(4)^{(d ~ 1)=2}} \frac{d^{D}{ }^{1} x_{?}\left(1 \quad \cos \left(k_{?} \quad \underset{x}{ }\right)\right)}{K\left(x_{?}\right)^{(d+1)=2}}: \tag{6.99}
\end{equation*}
$$

The only e ect of the anharm onic elasticity tem $g_{f}$ is to generate an upward renom alization of the e ective tension along the $y$-axis

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{Y}={\frac{g_{Y}(d+1)}{2(d \quad 1)}}_{k}^{Z} \frac{k_{y}^{2}}{G_{v}(k)}: \tag{6.100}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since we m ust choose the renorm alized tension along the extended tubule axis $(y)$ to be exactly zero in order to treat the free tubule, all of the anharm on ic elastic e ects disappear in this $G$ aussian variational approxim ation. That is, to correctly model a tubule w th free boundaries, we should have started w ith an elastic H am ittonian w ith a bare, negative tension piece that exactly cancelled them ally generated positive contribution in E q $1,100_{1}^{\prime}$.

The sim ultaneous integral equations Equ6.97 and
 scales they are solved by $K$ ( $x_{\text {? }}$ ) $x_{?}^{2}$, where from the de nition Equ. ${ }^{\prime} . \overline{9}$, we see that $K\left(x_{0}=L\right.$ ? $)$ is proportional to the square of the radius ofgyration or the tubule thickness that we are after, and hence the that solves these coupled non-linear integral equations will be the $G$ aussian variational prediction for the radius of gyration exponent as well. W e substitute this scaling ansatz into $E q_{i}^{\prime} \overline{6} . \overline{9} 9{ }_{-1}$ for $G_{v}(\widetilde{K})$, and nd that while for $d>G_{c}^{\& A}$ the self-avoidance is irrelevant and $=(5 \quad 2 \mathrm{D})=4$ (as found in Sec ${ }_{1}^{N}{ }^{-} A_{1}^{\prime}$ ), for $d<d_{u c}^{S A}$ these integral equations can only be solved if the $\mathrm{tk}_{\text {? }}^{2}$ term in Eq.6.99 is exactly cancelled by a part com ing from the integral in the last term and the resulting propagator takes the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{k})=\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{y}}^{4}+\mathrm{\forall k} \mathrm{k}_{\text {? }}^{(\mathrm{d}+1)} \mathrm{D}+1 ; \tag{6.101}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ is an e ective self-avoiding interaction param eter. Substituting this form into Eqi. $\overline{6} .97$, for $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{v}}(\mathrm{k})$, and requiring self-consistency $w$ ith our original ansatz $K\left(x_{\text {? }}\right) \quad x_{2}^{2}$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{?}^{2} / \frac{Z}{d^{D}{ }^{1} q_{?}{d q_{y}} 1 \frac{\cos \left(k_{?} \quad \underset{Y}{ }\right)}{k_{y}^{4}+\mathrm{vk}_{?}^{(\mathrm{d}+1)}} \operatorname{D+1}}: \tag{6.102}
\end{equation*}
$$

$M$ aking the change of variables $q$ ?
$q_{\text {? }}=\dot{x}_{\text {? }} j$ and $q_{y} \quad G_{F}=\dot{x}_{\text {? }} j, w$ th $=((d+1) \quad D+1)=4$ reveals
that the right hand side of Eq' $\overline{6}=\overline{10}$ is proportional to $x_{\text {? }}$ w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
& =1 \quad \mathrm{D}+3 ; \\
& \left.=\frac{7(1}{} \mathrm{D}\right)+3(\mathrm{~d}+1)  \tag{6.103}\\
& 4
\end{align*}
$$

To satisfy the selfoconsistent condition Eq 1 m ust be equalto 2 . The resulting sim ple linearequätion for has a solution (for $d<\mathcal{C a c}_{a}^{A A}(D)$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{7 \mathrm{D}}{3 \mathrm{~d}} \quad 7 \text {; } \tag{6.104}
\end{equation*}
$$ which for the physical case of $=2$ gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\frac{7}{3 d} 5 \text { for } d<11 ;  \tag{6.105}\\
& =\frac{1}{4} ; \text { for } d \quad 11 \tag{6.106}
\end{align*}
$$

W e observe that $(\mathrm{d}=4)=1$, and therefore (according to the G aussian variational approxim ation) the tubule is no longer crum pled along the ? -direction. This suggests that the tubule phase is unstable to the at phase in embedding dim ensions d < 4 (which unfortunately includes the physical case of $d=3$ ). H ow ever, as discussed in the Introduction, the $G$ aussian variational $m$ ethod is an uncontrolled approxim ation. It probably does give the correct trends of, e.g., exponents $w$ ith dim ensionality d. H ow ever, the variationalapproach is very close, in spirit and technically, to the large d expansion m ethods, and therefore intrinsically unable to obtain the sm all d dependence correctly. It is therefore di cult to place any faith in the actual values of exponents, particularly when the value of at sm alld actually determ ines whether the tubule phase survives or not.

W e believe that this G aussian variation theory is incorrect in predicting that the tubule phase does not exist in the presence of self-avoidance in $d=3$, and, reiterate our earlier observation that both $F$ lory theory ${ }^{1 / 1}$ and the
$=11$ d-expansioda predict that the tubule phase survives self-avoidance. Since both these latter approaches agree quite closely w ith each other, and since, further$m$ ore, the -expansion is the only controlled approxim ation, we are far m ore inclined to trust them than the uncontrolled G aussian approxim ation, which agrees w ith neither.

The nal determ ination of whether or not the tubule phase survives self-avoidance will, or course, rest upon sim ulations and experim ents, both of which we hope our analytic work stim ulates.

> V II. FLUCTUAT ION EFFECTSAT CRUM PLED-TO-TUBULEAND
> TUBULE-TOFLAT TRANSIT IONS

The transition from the crum pled-to- at phase in isotropicm em branes has been previously studiedit ${ }^{4}$ and is
predicted to be driven rst order by uctuations for em bedding dim ensions $d<d_{c}=219$. A $s$ can be seen from $F$ ig '11' this direct transition is very special for anisotropic m em branes. It is easy to see that any path nely tuned to pass through the tetracritical point will undergo a direct crum pled-to- at transition identical to that of isotropic m em branes, discussed in Ref. 2 24'. $^{\prime \prime}$.

Here we focus on the new transitions crum pled-totubule and tubule-to- at, which are generic for mem branes $w$ ith any am ount of anisotropy. A s we discussed at the end of Sec phase diagram topologies depending on the values ofm icroscopic elastic $m$ oduli of the $m$ em brane. H ow ever, for the crum pled-to-tubule transition there is no di erence. In this section we rst study the crum pled-to-tubule transition for a phantom m em brane using a detailed renormalization group analyses. We then study both the crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transition using scaling theory, incorporating the e ects of both the anharm onic elasticity and self-avoidance. $W$ e postpone the m ore technically challenging renorm alization group analysis of the phantom tubule-to- at transition ${ }^{411}$ and renor$m$ alization group analysis of crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions for self-avoiding $m$ em branes ${ }^{33!}$ for fiuture publications.

## A. Renorm alization group analysis of crum pled-to-tubule transition

W e start out w ith the general free energy de ned in EqL2.1, for now ignoring the self-avoiding interaction. W ithout loss of generality we w ill study the transition from the crum pled to the $y$-tubule phase. A s discussed above, in $m$ ean- eld theory, this transition occurs when $t_{y}$ ! 0 from above, while $t_{\text {? }}$ rem ains nite and positive. H ence, sim ple power-counting on the quadratic part of the free energy leads to anisotropic scaling at the transition $w$ th $q_{5} / q_{y}^{2}$. Therefore, the only relevant term s quadratic in $x$ near the transition are: the bending rigidity along the $y$-direction ( $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{y} \\ & \left.\mathrm{@}_{\mathrm{y}}^{2} \mathrm{x}^{2}\right) \text { ), and the surface }\end{aligned}$ tension term salong the $y$ and ? -directions $t_{y}\left(@_{y} \uparrow\right)^{2}$ and $t$ ? $@^{?} x^{2}$, respectively. The corresponding noninteracting propagator at the transition is

$$
\begin{equation*}
h r_{i}(q) r_{j}(\quad q) i=\frac{i j}{t_{?} q_{?}^{2}+t_{y} q_{y}^{2}+q_{y}^{4}} \quad C(q)_{i j} ; \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ he anisotropic scaling dictated by this noninteracting propagator at the transition ( $t_{y}=0$ ) leads to signi cant sim pli cation of the interaction term in the free energy. K eeping only the dom inant nonlinearity we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
F[x(x)] & =\frac{1}{2} d^{Z} d^{D} x_{?} d y \quad y \quad @_{y}^{2} x^{2}+t_{?} \quad @^{?} x^{2} \\
& +t_{y}\left(@_{\mathrm{y}} x\right)^{2}+\frac{U_{y y}}{2}\left(@_{y^{x}} \quad @_{y}\right)^{2}: \tag{72}
\end{align*}
$$

T he critical properties of the crum pled-to-tubule transition can be obtained by applying scaling theory and the renorm alization group to this free energy exactly as we did earlier in treating uctuations in the tubule phase itself. In this case, \lengths" $m$ eans intrinsic coordinates $x=\left(x_{\text {? }} ; y\right)$, and the $\backslash$ elds" are the extrinsic positions $x(x)$. Because of the strong scaling anisotropy of the quadratic pieces of the free energy, we rescale $x$ ? and $y$ an isotropically:

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{x}_{?} & =\mathrm{x}_{?}^{0} \mathrm{e}^{1} ;  \tag{7.3}\\
\mathrm{y} & =\mathrm{y}^{0} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{zl}} ; \tag{7.4}
\end{align*}
$$

and rescale the $\backslash$ elds" according to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{x}(x)=e^{{ }_{1} x^{0}}\left(x^{0}\right): \tag{7.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

U nder this transform ation

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.y(\mathbb{l})=y_{y} e^{(\mathbb{D}} 13 z+2\right) 1 \tag{7.6}
\end{align*} ;
$$

Requiring that both $y$ and $t_{\text {? }}$ rem ain $x e d$ under this rescaling (zeroth order RG transform ation) xes the \anisotropy" exponent $z$ and the \roughness" exponent
(which is the analog of for the tubule phase):

$$
\begin{align*}
z & =\frac{1}{2} ;  \tag{7.8}\\
& =(5=2 \quad D)=2: \tag{7.9}
\end{align*}
$$

A though this choice keeps the quadratic (in w) part ofF Eq 17$)^{7}-1$ ) unchanged, it does change the quartic piece:

$$
\begin{align*}
u_{Y y}(1) & \left.=u_{Y Y} e^{(D} 113 z+4\right) 1 \tag{7.10}
\end{align*} ;
$$

where in the second equality we have used the results Eqs! 7 and 7.9 for $z$ and.$W$ e see that for $D<5=2$, $u_{y y}$ grow s upon rescaling. P hysically, this $m$ eans that its e ects becom e m ore im portant at longer length scales. At su ciently long length scales, it com pletely invalidates the ham onic elastic theory and the naive perturbation theory in the nonlinearity $u_{y y}$ around it, even for arbitrarily $s m$ all coupling $u_{y y}$. Simple additional anisotropic rescaling of $x_{\text {? }}=x_{?}^{0}$ and $y=y^{0}, w$ th
$=\left(t_{\mathrm{e}}=y_{y}\right)^{1=2} 2$, which rescales $y$ and $t_{\text {? }}$ to 1 , reveals that the e ective coupling constant of the nonlinearity is $\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{yy}}={ }_{\mathrm{y}}$. This, together w ith Eqt.11, predicts that the characteristic length scale $L_{?}^{n l}$ beyond which the dim ensionless coupling constant becom es of order 1 and the harm on ic elastic theory and perturbation theory (around it) break dow $n$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{L}_{?}^{\mathrm{nl}}={\frac{\mathrm{y}}{\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{Yy}}}}^{1=(5=2 \mathrm{D})}: \tag{7.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

To analyze the new behavior that prevails on even longer length scales requires a full-blow $n$ renorm alization group analysis.

Such an analysis ${ }^{-1}{ }^{\prime}$. w ill lead to corrections to the sim ple rescaling of $y, t_{?}$, and $t_{y}$, due to the non-linearities (in this case $u_{Y y}$, as discussed above). T hese corrections can be absorbed into \anom alous" exponents , t, and , de ned by the large renom alization group \tim e" (l! 1 ) lim its of $y_{y}(1), t_{\text {? }}(1)$, and $t_{y}(1)$, respectively:

$$
\begin{align*}
& y(\mathbb{I})={ }_{y} e^{(D 13 z+z+2) 1} ;  \tag{7.13}\\
& t_{?}(\mathbb{1})=t_{?} e^{(\mathbb{D} 3+z+} t^{t+2) 1} ;  \tag{7.14}\\
& \left.t_{y}(\mathcal{l})=t_{y} e^{(\mathbb{D}} 1 \mathrm{z} \quad+2\right) 1 \quad \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{t}} \text {; } \tag{7.15}
\end{align*}
$$

The exponent $t$ de ned above is the therm al eigenvalue of the reduced tem perature (surface tension along $y$-direction) which is an inverse of the correlation length exponent along the ? -direction (see below). Requiring that $y$ and $t$ ? rem ain invariant under the renorm alization group transform ation determ ines the values the anisotropy exponent $z$ and the eld rescaling exponent

$$
\begin{align*}
z & =\frac{2 \mathrm{t}}{4} ;  \tag{7.16}\\
& =\frac{104 \mathrm{D}+(\mathrm{D} \quad 3+\mathrm{t}) 3 \mathrm{t}}{2} ;
\end{align*}
$$

which, as quoted above in Eqsi. $\overline{-1}$ and $\overline{7} \cdot \overline{9}$, reduce to $\mathrm{z}=1=2$ and $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5=2 & \mathrm{D}\end{array}\right)=2$, for $\mathrm{r}^{-1}=\mathrm{t}=0$, as is valid at zero order in perturbation theory in $u_{y y}$.

O nœe the values of $t$, and at the critical point are determ ined, the renorm alization group gives a relation betw een correlation functions at or near criticality ( sm all $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}$ ) and at sm allwavectors (functions that are dif-
cult to com pute, because direct perturbation theory is divergent) to the sam e correlation functions aw ay from criticality and at large w avevectors (functions that can be accurately com puted using perturbation theory). For exam ple the behavior of the correlation lengths near the transition can be deduced in this w ay:

$$
\begin{align*}
& ?\left(t_{y}\right)=e^{1} ?\left(t_{y} e^{t^{1}}\right) ;  \tag{7.17}\\
& y\left(t_{y}\right)=e^{z 1} y\left(t_{y} e^{t l}\right) ; \tag{7.18}
\end{align*}
$$

where in the above we assum ed that a critical xed point exists and all other coupling constants have well-de ned values at the xed point. U sing the above equations for $t_{y} e^{t^{1}}$ 1, we obtain,

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
?\left(t_{y}\right) & a t_{y}{ }^{\prime} ;  \tag{7.19}\\
y\left(t_{y}\right) & a t_{y}^{y} ;
\end{array}
$$

where a
(1) is the $m$ icroscopic cuto and,

$$
\begin{align*}
& ?=\frac{1}{t}=\frac{4}{2(2 \quad t \quad 2 \quad)} ;  \tag{720}\\
& y=z_{?} \quad: \tag{721}
\end{align*}
$$

W e now com pute the anom alous exponents to low est non-zero order in , where $=5=2$ D. As usual in the -expansion, the order at which a given graphical correction enters the perturbation theory is equal to the num ber of loops in the associated Feynm an graph. W e split the eld $x(x)$ into short and long wavevector parts $\mathscr{x}(\mathrm{x})=\mathscr{x}_{<}(\mathrm{x})+\mathscr{P}_{>}(\mathrm{x})$ and integrate over the fast elds $M_{>}(x)$. D iagram $m$ atically this leads to one-loop corrections to $u_{y y}$ and $t_{y}$. There are no corrections to $y$ to
rst order in , i.e., $=O\left({ }^{2}\right)$. Furtherm ore, since the interaction $u_{y y}$ alw ays carries a factor of $q_{y} w$ th every eld $₫$, the $t$ tension rem ains unrenorm alized, and $t=0$ to all orders, implying $z=1=2+O\left({ }^{2}\right)$ and $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}5=2 & \mathrm{D}\end{array}\right)=2+\mathrm{O}\left({ }^{2}\right)$.

(a)

(b)

(c)

FIG.11. Feynm an graphs that renorm alize: (a) the nonlinearity $u_{y y}$, (b) the tension $t_{y}$ and (c) the bending rigidity y.

The rst tw o diagram sin F ig $\mathrm{m}_{4}^{-1} 1$, follow ed by the rescaling introduced above (necessary to restore the original uv cuto ), lead to the one-loop recursion relations for $u=\left(K_{3=2}=\overline{2}\right) u_{Y Y}=\left(\begin{array}{c}5=4 \\ y\end{array} t_{?}^{3=4}\right)$ and $t_{y}$, respectively,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{@ u}{@ 1}=u \quad(d+8) u^{2} ;  \tag{722}\\
& \frac{@ t_{p}}{@ 1}=(1 \quad(d+2) u) t_{y} ; \tag{723}
\end{align*}
$$

where $=5=2 \quad \mathrm{D}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{3}=2$ is the surface of area of a $3=2$-dim ensional sphere divided by $(2)^{3=2}$. As usual, in the above, we also rede ned $\ddagger$ to be the reduced tem perature, $m$ easured from its true value at the transition (which in $m$ ean- eld theory starts out at 0 , but is shifted to a negative value by uctuations). N ote that, in contrast to the fam iliar $=4 \mathrm{D}$-expansion for critical phenom ena, for which $=1$ in the physical case $D=3$, here we have $=1=2$ in the physical case $D=2$. Hence, our one-loop expansion should be quantitatively $m$ ore accurate by a factor of $2=4$, than the $4 \quad D$-expansion at the sam e order. Thus, we expect our one-loop values for ? and $y$ to be accurate to $0: 02$.
 $5=2$, (i.e., for $>0$ ) the G aussian xed point is unstable and the critical properties of the crum pled-to-tubule transition are characterized by a nontrivial xed point $w$ ith a xed point value $u$ of $u$ given by:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=\frac{}{d+8}: \tag{724}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ ote that, in contrast to the treatm ent of crum pled-toat transition in isotropic $m$ em brane $5^{2}-$, where the criticalpoint w as only stable for an unphysically large value of the em bedding dim ension $d>219$, the criticalpoint characterizing the crum pled-to-tubule transition found here is stable for all $d$.

Equation $\overline{12}$ can be easily integrated once the xed point valueu , Eqi] 24, is inserted for $u$; com parison w ith the generalE qutan $_{10}^{10}$ then gives ${ }_{t}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
t=1 \quad \frac{d+2}{d+8} \tag{725}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, upon using Eqsi' $\overline{2} \overline{0}$ and $\overline{1} \overline{2} \overline{1}$, gives for a physical mem brane $\left(\mathrm{D}=2, \mathrm{~d}={ }^{-} \overline{3}\right)^{-}$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
? & 1: 227 ; \\
\text { y } & 0: 614: \tag{727}
\end{array}
$$

The exponent to $O\left({ }^{2}\right)$ is determ ined by the diagram in $F$ ig ${ }_{1}^{\prime 11, c}$. Evaluating this diagram in real space and then Fourier transform ing, we nd that this contributes to the free energy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.F=16 u^{2}(d+2) \quad q_{y}^{2} j(q)\right)^{2} \quad(q) ; \tag{728}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Z} \tag{729}
\end{equation*}
$$

(q) $\quad d^{3=2} x_{\text {? }} d y e^{i q} x G^{3}(x)$;
w ith, in tum,

$$
\begin{equation*}
G\left(x_{?} ; y\right)=\frac{Z}{(2)^{5=2}} \frac{d^{3=2} q_{?} d_{y}}{e^{i q_{?}} x_{?} e^{i q_{y} y} q_{y}^{2}} q_{?}^{2}+q_{y}^{4} \quad ; \tag{7.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have rescaled lengths so that $\mathrm{y}=\mathrm{t}_{\text {? }}=1$.

A frer a contour integral over $q_{7}$, and an angular integral ${ }_{0} d(\sin )^{(D)} e^{\text {iq } x_{2}}$, we obtain,
$G\left(\mathrm{X}_{?} ; \mathrm{Y}\right)=2^{7=4} \quad{ }^{3=4} \mathrm{Y}^{2} \quad \frac{\mathrm{X}_{\text {? }}}{\mathrm{y}^{2}} \quad{ }^{1=4} \mathrm{Y} \quad \frac{\mathrm{X}_{\text {? }}}{\mathrm{y}^{2}} \quad$;
where we have de ned

$$
Z_{1}
$$

$$
Y(x) \quad \int_{0}^{1} d u u^{1=4} J_{1=4}(x u) e^{p} \overline{u=2} \cos (\overline{u=2}+=4):
$$

N ow going back to Eq'i-2 we observe that the $q=0$ piece of (q) contributes to the $\left.q_{i}^{2} j^{(q)}\right)^{f}$ part of $F$, additively renorm alizing $t y$ which corresponds to the usual inconsequential $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}$ (critical tension) shiff. T he order $\mathrm{q}_{y}^{2}$ piece of ( $q$ ) renorm alizes ${ }_{\mathrm{y}} . \mathrm{W}$ e de ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\mathrm{q})=\quad(0) \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{q}_{y}^{2} \mathrm{~B}\left(\mathrm{q}_{y}\right) \text {; } \tag{7.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
Z

$$
\begin{equation*}
B\left(q_{y}\right) \quad{ }_{1<\dot{y} j<q_{y}}^{1} d y d^{3=2} x_{?} y^{2} G^{3}\left(x_{?} ; y\right): \tag{7.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ ote that the infra-red cuto on the integral over $y$ is $\mathrm{q}_{y}{ }^{1}$. This integral diverges logarithm ically as $\mathrm{q}_{y}!0$. W e can identify the coe cient of the logarithm with in the expression $y_{y}\left(q_{y}\right) / q_{y}$.

To extract this logarithm ic divergence, we make a change of variables in the integral $\mathrm{j}_{\text {? }} j x y^{2}$ and nd
$B\left(q_{y}\right) \quad \frac{1}{2^{13=4} \quad 3=2} \quad(3=4) \quad Z_{1}{\frac{q_{y}}{}{ }^{1}}^{\frac{d y}{Z}}{ }_{0}^{Z} d x x^{5=4} Y^{3}(x) ;$
where we have used the fact that the surface area of a $3=2$-dim ensional sphere is $2^{3=2}=(3=4)$, and taken into account the factor of 2 com ing from the fact that the original integral over $y$ extends over both $y>0$ and $y<0$.

Putting all of the above together and evaluating the coe cient of the $\log \left(q_{y}\right)$ at the $x$ point value of $g_{y}$ from Eqti24, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{C(2)(d+2)}{8(d+8)^{2}}{ }^{2} \text {; } \tag{7.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { C (2) } \quad 2^{23=4} \quad(3=4)_{0}^{Z^{1}} d x x^{5=4} Y^{3}(x) \text {; } \tag{7.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

The value of C (2) has been calculated num erically $y^{-1} \mathbf{n}^{-1}$, to be C (2) $\quad 1: 166 \quad 0: 001 . U$ sing this value, $=1=2$, and $d=3$ in $E q$ tind we nd that is very sm all,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(D=2 ; d=3) \quad 0: 0015: \tag{7.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

A s noted earlier in our discussion of the tubule phase itself, we do not trust this negative value of , but, rather, believe it to be an artifact of the peculiar negative regim $e$ that appears in the correlation function $G(x$ ? iy) in $D=5=2$. W e expect to be positive, but still quite sm all, at the phantom tubule-to-crum pled transition.

G iven the sm allness of and , and the vanishing of $t$, the exponents com puted here to rst order in are expected to be very accurate.

## B. Scaling theory of crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions

W e will now inconporate the e ects of self-avoidance on these transitions. W e have not yet done the full renorm alization group analysis of this problem (which m ust include both the elastic and self-avoiding interaction nonlinearities) ${ }^{33}-$, and lim it ourselves here to discussing scaling theory and the F lory approxim ation.

Near the crum pled-to-tubule transition, for square m em branes of intemal size $L$, wem ake the follow ing general scaling ansatz for the extensions $R_{y}$ and $R_{G}$ of the $m$ em brane along and orthogonal to the tubule axis, respectively:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \geqslant \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{Y}}{ }^{\text {G; }}{ }_{\mathrm{G} ; \mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{c}} ; \quad \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}>0 ; \mathrm{L} \gg \mathrm{ct} \tag{7.39}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{j}^{\text {G; }} \mathrm{L}{ }_{\mathrm{t}}{ }^{\text {G; }} ; \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}\langle 0 ; \mathrm{L} \gg \text { ct }
\end{aligned}
$$

where subscripts $t$, $c$ and ct refer to tubule, crum pled and tubule-to-crum pled transition, respectively, and ct $/ \mathrm{t}_{y} \mathrm{j}^{1=}$ is a correlation length for the crum pled-totubule transition, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}=\binom{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{T}_{c t}}=\mathrm{T}_{\text {ct }}, \mathrm{T}_{\text {ct }}$ is the crum pled-to-tubule transition tem perature, and $t_{y}>0$ corresponds to the crum pled phase.
$N$ ote that we have built into the scaling law $s$ the fact that both $R_{y}$ and $R_{G}$ scale like $L{ }^{c}$ in the crum pled phase, w ith $c$ the radius of gyration exponent for the crum pled phase (which, as noted earlier, is the sam e for anisotropic and isotropic $m$ em branes). D ue to the extended nature of the tubule phase, $\underset{t}{y}=1$, of course. $T$ he anisotropy in $m$ anifested in the crum pled phase only through the di erent tem perature dependences of $R_{G}$ and $R_{y}$. The form er of these vanishes as $t_{y}!0^{+}$(since the radius of gyration in the tubule phase is much less than that in the crum pled phase, since $t<c$ ), which im plies ${ }_{+}^{G}>0$, while the latter diverges as $t_{y}!0^{+}$, since the tubule ultim ately extends in that direction, which im plies $\stackrel{y}{+}<0$.
$N$ ote also that our expression Eq ing and, in particular, the fact that $R_{G} \not R_{Y}$ even above the crum pled-to-tubule transition (i.e., in the crum pled phase), im plies a spontaneous breaking of rotational invariance even in the crum pled phase! This seem ingly bizarre (but correct) result is actually not all that unfam iliar: polym ers,
which are alw ays crum pled, nonetheless assum $e$, on average, non-spherical shapes $4^{421}$, as can be seen, for exam ple, by looking at the ratio of the average $m$ axim $u m$ and $m$ inim um eigenvalues of the m om ent of inertia tensor. O ur result Eq in for $t_{y}>0$ is only a little $m$ ore surprising, since it predicts an aspect ratio $R_{Y}=R_{G}$ that actually diverges as $T!T_{c t}^{+}$, and $m$ em brane begins to extend into a tubule con guration.

The exponents $\underset{+=}{\text { Giy }}$ de ned in above equation obey the scaling law s

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{+}^{G ; Y}=\frac{{ }^{C} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{G} ; \mathrm{y} \\
\mathrm{Ct}
\end{array}}{} \text {; }  \tag{7.40}\\
& G ; y=\frac{\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{G} ; \mathrm{Y}} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{G} ; \mathrm{y} \\
\mathrm{Ct}
\end{array}}{}: \tag{7.41}
\end{align*}
$$

A s always, these scaling law s follow from requiring that the generalized scaling form $m$ atches on to know $n$ results in the appropriate $\lim$ its.

From F lory theory, we_can derive the values of the criticalexponents in $E q$ 그응, as we have already derived the exponents $t$ and $c$ characterizing the tubule and crum pled phases, sim ply by being $m$ ore careful about tem perature dependent factors in that derivation. A gain, we start by estim ating the totalselfavoidance energy Eq in the tubule phase (i.e., $t_{y}<0$ ) as $E_{S A} \quad V^{2} . N o w$, how ever, we very carefiully w rite the volum $e V$ in the em bedding space occupied by the tubule as $V \quad R_{G}^{d}{ }^{1} R_{Y}$. W riting

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{y}={ }_{y} L_{y} \text {; } \tag{7.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

as we did earlier in our discussion ofm ean eld theory in the absence ofself-avoidance, and using $=M=V$ for the em bedding space density of the tubule, and again using the fact that the tubule $m$ ass $M \quad L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{y}$, we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{S A} \frac{L_{Y} L_{?}^{2(D)}}{\frac{1)}{y_{Y} R_{G}^{d}}}: \tag{7.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using this estim ate of the self-avoidance energy in Eq 2.21 , and estim ating the other tem $s$ in that expression by scaling, we obtain the full F lory theory for the tubule phase, $w$ ith all tem perature dependente ects taken (adm ittedly crudely) into account:
$E_{F L}=t_{y}^{2}+u_{Y Y}{ }_{y}^{4}+t_{?} \frac{R_{G}}{L_{?}}{ }^{2} L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{Y}+V \frac{L_{Y} L_{?}^{2(D 1)}}{{ }_{Y} R_{G}^{d 1}}:$
$M$ inim izing this over $R_{G}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}} \quad \mathrm{~L}_{?}^{\mathrm{t}}{\frac{\mathrm{v}}{\mathrm{t}_{? \mathrm{y}}}}^{1=(\mathrm{d}+1)} \tag{7.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, as we found earlier, $t=\frac{D+1}{d+1}$, but now we have the singular tem perature dependence of $R_{G}$ near the
crum pled-to-tubule transition explicit through the presence of the ${ }_{y}$ term. Inserting this expression for $R_{G}$ into Eq
$E_{F L}=t_{y}{ }_{y}^{2}+u_{Y Y}{ }_{y}^{4}+t_{?}^{\frac{d 1}{d+1}} \frac{v}{y}{ }^{\frac{2}{d+1}} L_{?}^{\frac{2(d D)}{d+1}} L_{?}^{D}{ }^{1} L_{Y}:$

T he exponents de ned by Eqi.7-39 can now be obtained by $m$ in im izing $E_{F L}$ in $E q$ ind $\overline{1}$ ith respect to $y$, which am ounts to balancing two of the three term $S$ in $E_{F L}$, which tw 0 , depending on whether one is interested in the crum pled phase ( $t_{y}>0$ ), the tubule phase ( $t_{y}<0$ ), or the transition betw een them ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}=0$ ).

In the crum pled phase $t_{y}>0$, as a result, the order param eter y vanishes in the them odynam ic lim it, allow ing us to neglect the quartic ${ }_{y}^{4}$ term relative to the quadratic ${\underset{y}{2}}_{2}$ one. Balancing the rem aining two term $s$

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{y}{ }_{y}^{2} \quad t_{?}^{\frac{d}{d+1}} \frac{V}{y}^{\frac{2}{d+1}} L_{?}^{\frac{2(d D)}{d+1}} ; \tag{7.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{y} \quad{\frac{v^{2} t_{?}^{d} 1}{t_{y}^{d+1}}}^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} \mathrm{L}_{?}^{\frac{d \mathrm{D}}{d+2}} \tag{7.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

$U$ sing this expression for $y$ inside $E q$ ' $\bar{i} . \overline{2} \overline{-1}$ for $R_{y}$ gives, for a square $m$ em brane ( $L_{y}=L_{\text {? }}=L$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{y} \quad v^{2} t_{?}^{d} 1 \frac{1}{2(d+2)} t_{y}{ }^{\frac{d+1}{2(d+2)}} L_{?}^{\frac{D+2}{d+2}} ; \tag{7.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, after com paring $w$ th the general form for $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{y}}$, Eq'킄g, gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& c=\frac{D+2}{d+2} ;  \tag{7.50}\\
& \underset{+}{\mathrm{y}}=\frac{\mathrm{d}+1}{2(\mathrm{~d}+2)} ; \tag{7.51}
\end{align*}
$$

equation $1 \overline{1-50} 0$ being a well-known $F$ lory result for the radius of gyration exponent c for-a $D$ rodim ensionalm anifold, em bedded in d dim ensionst special to anisotropic $m$ em branes. Furtherm ore, insert-


$$
\begin{equation*}
R_{G} \quad V^{\frac{d+3}{(d+2)(d+1)}} t_{?}^{\frac{d+5}{2(d+2)(d+1)}} \quad t_{V}^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} L_{?}^{\frac{D+2}{d+2}} \tag{7.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, not sumprisingly gives the sam e expression for $c$ as in Eq in

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{+}^{G}=\frac{1}{2(d+2)}: \tag{7.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\stackrel{y}{\text { y }}{ }_{+}^{G}$ supports our earlier claim that even the crum pled phase spontaneously breaks rotational invariance in
the embedding space. It does so gently by having the identical grow th (for square $m$ em branes) of $R_{G}$ and $R_{Y}$ w ith $L$, but exhibiting anisotropy via the prefactors, $w$ th the ratio $R_{Y}=R_{G}$ diverging as the crum pled-to-tubule transition is approached.
The tubule phase is characterized by $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}<0$ and a nite order param eter ${ }_{y}>0$. Therefore in this phase, the
 becom es negligible relative to the rst tw o term s when L? ! 1 . Therefore, we can neglect that term for a su ciently large $m$ em brane (i.e., a $m$ em brane larger than the criticalcorrelation length cr). M inim izing the rem aining rst two term $S$ in $E_{F L}$ therefore gives y / P $\overline{j_{y} j}$ (independent of $L$ ? ) as in $m$ ean- eld theory in the absence of self-avoidance. Inserting this inside $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{y}}, \mathrm{Eq} \mathrm{B}_{7} . \overline{4}_{2}$ and com paring $w$ th the general scaling form for $R_{y}$, im plies for a square $m$ em brane

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{y}=1 ;  \tag{7.54}\\
& \mathrm{t}=\frac{1}{2}: \tag{7.55}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing this in the earlier expression EqTīn for $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}$, we


$$
\begin{align*}
{ }_{\mathrm{G}} & =\frac{D+1}{d+1} ;  \tag{7.56}\\
G & =\frac{1}{2(d+1)}: \tag{7.57}
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, right at the crum pled-to-tubule transition, $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}=0$ and we m ust balance the last two term S in $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{FL}}$, Eqi. $\mathbf{I}_{-1}$. M inim izing $E_{\text {FL }}$ over $y$, we nd at the transition

$$
\begin{equation*}
y / L_{?}^{\frac{(d D)}{3+2 d}} \tag{7.59}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, when inserted in Eq42 for $R_{y}$ im plies for $a$ square $m$ em brane that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{Y}} / \mathrm{L}^{\frac{\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{d}+3}{3+2 \mathrm{~d}}} \tag{7.60}
\end{equation*}
$$

right at the transition. This leads to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\underset{c t}{y}=\frac{D+d+3}{2 d+3} \tag{7.61}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a square $m$ em brane. $U$ sing the result $E q$ i. 59


$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}} / \mathrm{L}_{?}{ }^{{ }^{\mathrm{c}}}{ }^{\mathrm{G}} \text {; } \tag{7.62}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith

$$
\begin{align*}
{ }_{c t}^{G} & =t+\frac{1}{d+1} \frac{d \quad D}{3+2 d} ;  \tag{7.63}\\
& =\frac{2 D+3}{2 d+3} \tag{7.64}
\end{align*}
$$

 then give

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\frac{2(\mathrm{~d} \quad \mathrm{D})}{2 \mathrm{~d}+3} \tag{7.65}
\end{equation*}
$$

and are reassuringly consistent $w$ th our independent cal-

 above. For the physical case of a two dim ensionalm em brane em bedded in a three dimensional space, $(\mathbb{D}=$ $2 ; d=3$ )

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{C} & =4=5 ;  \tag{7.66a}\\
\mathrm{G} & =7=9 ;  \tag{7.66b}\\
\mathrm{ct} & =  \tag{7.66c}\\
\mathrm{y} & =8=9 ;  \tag{7.66d}\\
\mathrm{Ct} & =3=4 ;  \tag{7.66e}\\
\mathrm{t} & =1=10 ;  \tag{7.66f}\\
\mathrm{G} & =1  \tag{7.66g}\\
{ }_{\mathrm{Y}} & =2=5 ;  \tag{7.66h}\\
+ & =1=8 ;  \tag{7.66i}\\
\mathrm{G} & =1 \\
\mathrm{y} & =1=2: \\
& =2=9 ;
\end{align*}
$$

$N$ ote that the signs of the $\underset{+=}{G \text { iy }}$ imply that $R_{G}$ shrinks as the crum pled-to-tubule transition is approached from above, and grows as it is approached from below, while $R_{y}$ does the opposite. N ote also that the crum pled-totubule transition is quite rounded by nite size e ects, even for large $m$ em branes, because of the $s m$ all value of the crossover exponent , which leads to a large correlation length ct $\left(t_{y}\right)$. Taking an example of a $L=10 \mathrm{~m}$ m em brane w th lattioe constant $\mathrm{a}=10 \mathrm{~A}$, we nd that the crum pled-to-tubule transition is rounded at a reduced tem perature $t_{y} \quad(\mathrm{~L}=a) \quad 0: 13$, while our hypothetical sim ulation of a $10^{4}$ particle net experiences rounding at ty $0: 36$. Thus, the transition $m$ ay not appear shanp experim entally or in sim ulations, even though it is, in principle, in the them odynam ic lim it.
$T$ he singular parts of other them odynam ic variables obey scaling law sim ilar to that for $R_{G ; y}$, Eqin 39. For exam ple the singularpart of the speci c heat per particle $C_{v}$, i.e., a second derivative of the intensive free energy w th respect to tem perature, is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{v} \frac{1}{L^{D}} \frac{@^{2}}{@ t_{Y}^{2}} \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}} R_{\mathrm{y}}^{2} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{D}} 2 ; \tag{7.67}
\end{equation*}
$$

which, using Eq: ${ }^{\prime}-\overline{3} \overline{9}$ leads to the scaling form for $C_{v}$

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{v}=\frac{L}{8} g\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~L}\right) ; \\
& <\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}{ }^{+} \mathrm{L}+\quad ; \quad \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{y}}>0 ; \mathrm{L} \gg \text { ct } \tag{7.68}
\end{align*}
$$

where,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(x) \frac{d^{2}}{d x^{2}} f_{y}^{2}(x) \quad: \tag{7.69}
\end{equation*}
$$

U sing the exponents characterizing $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{y}}$ derived above, we obtain:

$$
\begin{align*}
& =2 \underset{c t}{\mathrm{y}} \quad 2+\quad \text {; }  \tag{7.70a}\\
& =0 \text {; } \mathrm{F} \text { lory theory }  \tag{7.70b}\\
& +=2 \stackrel{y}{+}+1 \text {; }  \tag{7.71a}\\
& =\frac{2 d+3}{d+2} \text {; F lory theory }  \tag{7.71b}\\
& =\frac{9}{5} ; \mathrm{F} \text { lory theory; } \mathrm{d}=3  \tag{7.71c}\\
& =2^{y}+1 \text {; }  \tag{7.72a}\\
& =0 ; \mathrm{F} \text { lory theory } \tag{7.72b}
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ his leads to the unusual feature that outside the critical regim e (i.e. for $L \gg c t$ ), the singular part of the speci c heat above the crum pled-to-tubule transition vanishes in the them odynam ic lim it like L +
 used the F lory estim ates of the exponents, evaluated in $D=2$ and $d=3$. Only within the critical regim e does the singular part of the speci cheat per particle becom es nonvanishing as L! 1.Sim ilar results were rst found for the direct crum pled-to- at transition by P aczuskiet all ${ }^{24}$.

W e now tum to the tubule-to- at (tf) transition. On both sides of this transition, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{O}$ (1). Therefore only the other two radii of gyration $R_{x}$ and $R_{z}$ exhibit criticalbehavior, w hich can be sum $m$ arized by the scaling law :

$$
\begin{align*}
& \geqslant t_{?}^{\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{x} ; 2}^{+; z}} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{t}} ; \quad \mathrm{t}_{\text {? }}>0 ; \mathrm{L} \gg \mathrm{tf} \tag{7.73}
\end{align*}
$$

where $t_{?}=\left(T \quad T_{t f}\right)=T_{t f}, t_{?}>0$ is assum ed to correspond to the tubule phase, tf $/ \mathrm{t}_{\text {? }} j^{1=}$ tf is the correlation length for this transition, and the exponents obey the scaling relations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \underset{f}{z}=0: 59 \text {; }  \tag{7.74a}\\
& \underset{\mathrm{f}}{\mathrm{x}}=1 \text {; }  \tag{7.74b}\\
& { }_{+}^{x ; z}=\frac{\mathrm{t} \begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{z} \\
\mathrm{tf}
\end{array}}{\mathrm{tf}} \text {; }  \tag{7.74c}\\
& x ; z=\frac{\begin{array}{l}
x ; z \\
f
\end{array} \begin{array}{cc}
x ; z \\
t f
\end{array}}{t}: \tag{7.74d}
\end{align*}
$$

In the above we have taken the $x$-direction to be the new (in addition to $y$ ) extended direction in the at phase
(which is why $\underset{f}{x}=1$ ), and is the roughness exponent $t^{\prime \prime \prime}$ of the at phase (quoted for the physicalcase $D=2$ and $d=3$ ), giving the transverse height uctuations of the d 2 com ponents of the displacem ent penpendicular to the at $m$ embrane.

To calculate these exponents, we can use Flory theory in the tubule phase, and at the transition, while in the at phase, where as discussed above, self-avoidanae is irrelevant, we sim ply m atch onto the scaling theory ${ }^{281}$ of the at phase. D oing so, we nd that Flory theory predicts identical behavior for $R_{x}$ and $R_{z}$ in the tubule phase and at the transition:

$$
\begin{align*}
\underset{\mathrm{tf}}{\mathrm{x}} & =\underset{\mathrm{tf}}{\mathrm{z}}=\frac{\mathrm{D}+3}{\mathrm{~d}+3} ;  \tag{7.75a}\\
& =\frac{5}{6} ; \text { for } \mathrm{D}=2 ; \mathrm{d}=3 ;  \tag{7.75b}\\
\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{\mathrm{x}} & =\underset{+}{\mathrm{z}}=\frac{1}{\mathrm{~d}+1} ;  \tag{7.75c}\\
& =\frac{1}{4} ; \text { for } \mathrm{D}=2 ; \mathrm{d}=3: \tag{7.75d}
\end{align*}
$$

W e believe that the identical tem perature ( $t_{\text {? }}$ ) and scaling (w th $L$ ) behavior of $R_{x}$ and $R_{z}$ as the tubule-to- at transition is approached from the tubule side ( $E$ qs ${ }^{\prime} 7.75{ }^{\prime}$ and ( $7.7 \overline{-1}$ ) is an artifact of $F$ lory theory and that in fact $R_{x} \gg R_{z}$ throughout this region, w ith the ratio $R_{x}=R_{z}$ actually diverging as the transition is approached from above. That is, we expect that in reality $\underset{t f}{x}>\underset{t f}{z}$ and $\stackrel{\mathrm{x}}{+}{ }_{+}^{\mathrm{z}}$.

In addition, F lory theory predicts

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{tf} & =\frac{2(\mathrm{~d} D)}{\mathrm{d}+3} ;  \tag{7.76}\\
& =\frac{1}{3} ; \text { for } \mathrm{D}=2 ; \mathrm{d}=3: \tag{7.77}
\end{align*}
$$

In the at phase, $x$ follow from sim ply $m$ inim izing the $m$ ean eld free energy without self-avoidance (since self-avoidance is irrelevant in the at phase), giving

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=\frac{1}{2} \tag{7.78}
\end{equation*}
$$

while matching $R_{z}=L t_{\text {? }} j^{z}$ onto the critical prediction $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{z}} / \mathrm{L} \mathrm{tf}_{\mathrm{tf}}^{\mathrm{z}}$ at the correlation length $\mathrm{L}=$ $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{j}^{1=}{ }^{\mathrm{tf}}$ gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{z}=\frac{\frac{\mathrm{zf}}{\mathrm{tf}}}{\mathrm{tf}} ; \tag{7.79}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the rst equality is an exact scaling law, while the second, approxim ate one uses $F, l o r y$ theory for tf and ${ }_{\text {tf }}$, and the SCSA calculation ${ }^{81}$. of for the at phase, all evaluated in the physical case $D=2$ and $d=3$.

A s the tubule-to- at transition is approached from below (the at phase side) $R_{x}$ shrinksas $R_{x} \quad f_{0}=2 L$ and
$R_{z}$ increases as $R_{z} \quad j_{0} j^{0: 73} L^{0: 59}$ w ith vanishing f? $j$. A pproaching this transition from above (the tubule phase side) $R_{x}$ and $R_{z}$ both extend as $R_{x ; z} \quad j \not j^{1=4} L^{3=4} w$ ith vanishingt? to the $L^{5=6}$ scaling at the tubule-to- at criticalpoint.

The singular part of the speci $c$ heat again obeys a scaling law:
where, in F lory theory,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\begin{array}{r}
\mathrm{tf} \\
+=\frac{3}{2} ; \\
\mathrm{tf} \\
\mathrm{tf}=2
\end{array}, \\
\mathrm{tf}+\quad \mathrm{tf} \quad 2=0 ;
\end{array}
$$

Thus, again, the singular part of the speci c heat vanishes (now like L ${ }^{1=2}$ ) in the therm odynam ic lim it above (i.e., on the tubule side) of the transition, while it is O (1) and $s m$ ooth as a function oftem perature in both the critical regim e and in the at phase.

## VIII. SUM MARYAND CONCLUSIONS

In sum $m$ ary, we have studied the e ects of intrinsic anisotropy in polym erized $m$ em brane. $W$ e found that this seem ingly innocuous generalization leads to a wealth of new phenom ena, $m$ ost rem arkable of which is that any am ount of anisotropy leads to a new, tubule phase which intervenes between the previously predicted at and crum pled phases in anisotropic $m$ em branes (See Fig in ${ }_{[171}^{171}$ ). W e have presented a detailed theory of the anisotropic m embrane focusing on the new tubule phase. C onsidering them al uctuations in the tubule phase we have shown that the phantom tubule phase exhibits anom alous elasticity, and calculated the elasticity and size exponents exactly, as sum $m$ arized in Eqs'5.19, 1 W e then considered the physically more relevant case of a self-avoiding tubule, nding that self-avoiding interaction is im portant for physical dim ensionalities. E stablishing relations betw een the exponent characterizing the diam eter of the tubule and the exponents describing anom alous elasticity and transverse undulations, we calculated the tubule diam eter, size of the undulations and the anom alouselasticity $w$ thin the $F$ lory and $=d_{c c} d\{$ expansion theories. W e have also studied self-avoidance w ithin a Gaussian variational approxim ation, which unfortunately but, we believe incorrectly predicts that selfavoiding interaction destroys the tubule phase (as it does the crum pled phase) ford < 4. W e studied the crum pled-to-tubule transition in $m$ ean- eld theory and w ith the
$=4 \quad \mathrm{D}$-expansion. F inally we developed a scaling theory of the crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions.

Our exact predictions for the phantom tubules
 in the recent sim ulations by the authors of $R$ ef.

The possibility of the existence of a new tubule phase interm ediate betw een the fully disordered crum pled phase and fully ordered at phase is exciting from both basic physics and potential applications points of view. Recently much attention has focussed on utilizing self-assem bled $m$ icrostructures for encapsulations for various applications, m ost notably controlled and slow drug delivery ${ }^{10}$. The structural stability of polym erized m em branes is superior to their liquid m em brane analogs. $T$ he theoreticaldiscovery of the tubule phase signi cantly expands the num ber of possibilities, and also o ers the potential tunability (by, e.g., adjusting the strength of self-avoidance) of the tubule diam eter and therefore the am ount of encapsulation and rate of delivery.

The realization of the tubule phase in polym erized m em branes carries even m ore signi cance if the claim s that the filly crum pled phase in polym erized $m$ em branes does not exist are in fact correct, since in this case the tubule phase is the only disordered phase of a polym erized $m$ em brane.

W ith the recent focus on self-assem bly, it $m$ ay be possible in the near future to freeze in intrinsic an isotropy by polym erizing tilted phase of liquid $m$ em branes or crosslinking polym ers. Further num erical sim ulations which include self-avoidanceo er another avenue to investigate our predictions. W e hope that our work stim ulates further theory, sim ulations and experim ents in this area.
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