# E lasticity, Shape Fluctuations and Phase Transitions in the New Tubule Phase of A nisotropic Tethered M em branes

Leo Radzihovsky

Department of Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309

John Toner

D epartm ent of P hysics, Institute for T heoretical Science, and M aterial Science Institute, U niversity of O regon, E ugene, O R 97403-1274

(M arch 23, 2024)

W e study the shape, elasticity and uctuations of the recently predicted<sup>1</sup> and subsequently observed (in numerical simulations)<sup>2</sup> tubule phase of anisotropic membranes, as well as the phase transitions into and out of it. This novel phase lies between the previously predicted at and crum pled phases, both in temperature and in its physical properties: it is crumpled 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. We derive scaling laws for the radius of gyration  $R_G$  (L<sub>2</sub>; L<sub>y</sub>) (i.e. the average thickness) of the tubule about a spontaneously selected straight axis and for the tubule undulations  $h_{\text{rm s}}$  (L<sub>2</sub>; L<sub>y</sub>) transverse to its average extension. We show that for square m em branes (with intrinsic size L  $_{2}$  = L  $_{y}$  = L ), R  $_{\text{G}}$  / L , and  $h_{\text{rm s}}$  / L  $^{1}$ <sup>z=2</sup>, with a bending rigidity anom alous elasticity exponent related to and z. For phantom (i.e. non-selfavoiding) mem branes, we predict = 1=4, z = 1=2 and = 0, exactly, in excellent agreem ent with simulations. For  $D = 2 \dim$  ensional membranes embedded in the space of dimension d < 11, selfavoidance greatly swells the tubule and suppresses its wild transverse undulations, changing its shape exponents, z, and . For a D-dimensional membrane embedded in d > d (d (D = 2) > 7=2), = 0 and z = (D + 2)=3, while for d < d, > 0 and z = (D + 2)=(3)). F lory" theory yields, in the physical case of D = 2 and d = 3, = 3=4, while the recent 11 expansion results yields = 0:52. The actual value of probably lies closer to the Flory estimate, between these two lim its. We give detailed scaling results for the shape of the tubule of an arbitrary 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 s of and z.F inally we present a scaling theory for the shape and specic 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 membranes.

64.60Fr,05.40,82.65Dp

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

Tethered membranes<sup>4</sup> became a subject of great interest when it was theoretically predicted<sup>5</sup> that, unlike polymers, which are always orientationally disordered, membranes can exhibit two distinct phases: crum pled at, with a \crum pling" transition between them. and The at phase is particularly novel and intriguing, because it provides an exam ple of a two dim ensional system with a continuous symmetry that nonetheless exhibits a long-ranged order (speci cally, long-ranged orientational order in the norm alto the mem brane) in apparent violation of the Hohenberg-Merm in-Wagner theorem<sup>6</sup>. This ordering is made possible by \anom alous elasticity"5;7;8: thermal uctuations in nitely enhance the bending rigidity of the membrane at long wavelengths, thereby stabilizing the orientational order against these very uctuations. This is perhaps the most dram atic illustration yet found of the phenom enon of \order from disorder".

Rich as these phenomena are, most past theoretical

work<sup>4</sup> has been restricted to isotropic membranes. In a recent paper<sup>1</sup> we extended these considerations to intrinsically an isotropic membranes (e.g., polymerized membranes with in-plane tilt order9) and found, astonishingly, that anisotropy, a seem ingly innocuous generalization, actually leads to a wealth of new phenom ena. M ost dramatically, we found an entire new phase of membranes, which we called the \tubule" phase, ubiquitously intervenes between the high tem perature crum pled and low tem perature \ at" phases. The de ning property of the tubule phase is that it is crumpled in one of the two membrane directions, but \ at" (i.e., extended) in the other. Its average shape is a long, thin cylinder of length  $R_v = L_v$ O (1) and radius  $R_G$  (L<sub>2</sub>)  $L_{2}$ , where  $L_{v}$ and L<sub>2</sub> are the dimensions the membrane would have in the extended and crum pled directions respectively, were it to be attened out. It should be clari ed here that we use the term \cylinder" extrem ely lossely; as illustrated in Fig2, a cross section of the m em brane perpendicular to the tubule axis (y) will look as disordered as a exible

polymer. These tubules, occurring as a low temperature phase of anisotropic polymerized membranes, have little in common (and therefore should not be confused) with micro-tubules that are found in liquid phospholipid membranes<sup>10</sup>.

Only in the special case of perfectly isotropic  $m em branes^{11}$  is it possible for them em brane to undergo a direct transition from the atto the crum pled phase. The theoretically predicted<sup>1</sup> and recently observed<sup>2</sup> phase diagram is shown in Fig.1.



FIG.1. Phase diagram for an isotropic tethered m em branes showing the new tubule and previously studied at and crum pled phases.

The direct crum pling transition studied previously occurs in our more generic model only for that special set of cuts through the phase diagram (like  $P_2$ ) that pass through the origin. Generic paths (like  $P_1$ ) 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 simulations of phantom (i.e., non-selfavoiding) mem branes by B owick, Falcioni and Thorleifsson (BFT)<sup>2</sup>. They simulated mem branes with dierent bare bending moduli  $_x$  and  $_y$  in the orthogonal x and y directions. As tem perature (or one of the bending rigidities e.g.  $_x$ ) is varied, we predicted our model would follow a generic path like P<sub>1</sub> in Fig.1. And, indeed, these simulations<sup>2</sup> 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 predicted. Furtherm ore, the shape of the m em brane in the phase between these two transitions was exactly that of the tubule above (see F igure 2), and had, within num ericalerrors, precisely the scaling properties and exponents that we predicted forphantom tubules<sup>1</sup>. Here we present our detailed study of these transitions and the tubule phase, in the presence of both therm al uctuations and self-avoidance.

There are a number of possible experimental realizations of anisotropic membranes. One is polymerized m em branes with in-plane tilt order<sup>9</sup>. Fluid m em branes with such order have already been found<sup>12;13</sup>; it should be possible to polym erize these without destroying the tilt order. Secondly, m em branes could be fabricated by crosslinking DNA m olecules trapped in a uid m em brane<sup>12;13</sup>. 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.

The tubule cross-sectional radius  $R_{\rm G}$ , (hereafter called the radius of gyration), and its undulations  $h_{\rm rm\ s}$  transverse to its average axis of orientation, obey the scaling law s:

$$R_{G}(L_{?};L_{y}) = L_{?}S_{R}(L_{y}=L_{?}^{z});$$
 (1.1)

$$h_{rm s}(L_{?};L_{y}) = L_{y}S_{h}(L_{y}=L_{?}^{z});$$
 (1.2)

where = =z,

$$z = \frac{1}{3} (1 + 2); \qquad (1.3)$$

we have specialized in Eq1.3 to D = 2 (with general expression for a D-dimensional membrane given in the main text), the universal exponents and z are < 1, is the anom alous elasticity exponent for the tubule bending rigidity (as de ned by  $L_y$ , also see below), and for convenience we chose to measure the intrinsic lengths  $L_y$  and  $L_2$  in units of the ultraviolet cuto, set approximately by the the monom er (e.g. phospholipid) size.



FIG. 2. Schematic picture of the tubule phase of an isotropic polymerized membrane, with the denition of its thickness  $R_{G}$  and roughness  $h_{rm \ s}$ , our predictions for which are given in Eqs.1.1 and 1.2.

The scaling functions  $S_{R,h}$  (x) have the lim iting form s:

$$S_{R}(x) / \begin{array}{c} x & p^{=z}; \text{ for } x ! 0 \\ \text{constant; for } x ! 1 \end{array}$$
 (1.4)

$$S_{h}(x) /$$
 constant; for  $x ! 0$   
 $x^{\frac{3}{2}}$ ; for  $x ! 1$ ; (1.5)

where p is the radius of gyration exponent of a coiled linearpolymer 3=5. These scaling functions are universal (i.e., independent of m aterial parameters and tem perature), up to an overall non-universal multiplicative factor, which can, and will, depend on m aterial parameters and tem perature. The scaling form s, Eq.1.4 and 1.5 in ply that for a "roughly square" membrane { that is, one with  $L_2$   $L_y$  L { in the lim it L ! 1

$$R_{G}(L_{?} L_{y} L) / L;$$
 (1.6)

$$h_{\rm rm \ s}$$
 (L<sub>2</sub> L<sub>y</sub> L) / L<sup>1</sup> z<sup>=2</sup>; (1.7)

where we have used the fact that for  $L_y$   $L_2$ , the argument x  $L_y=L_2^z$  of the scaling functions  $S_{R,h}(x)$  goes to in nity as L ! 1, and used Eq.1.3 to simplify Eq.1.7.

D etailed renorm alization group calculations show that is strictly positive. Hence,  $h_{rm s} << L$  for a roughly square membrane as L ! 1. Thus, the end-to-end orientational uctuations  $h_{m s}=L / L$  z=2 ! 0 as L ! 1 for such a roughly square membrane, proving that tubule order (which requires orientational persistence in the extended direction) is stable against undulations of the tubule embedded in d = 3 dimensions.

On the other hand, in the lim it  $L_y >> L_2$ , in which the tubule looks m ore and m ore like a linear polymer (a ribbon of width  $L_2$  and length  $L_y$ ), we nd

$$h_{\text{rm s}} \ / \ \frac{L_y^{3=2}}{L_2^{z\,(3=2 \ )}} = \ \frac{L_y^{3=2}}{L_2^{1=2+ \ z=2}} \qquad L_y \quad \frac{L_y}{L_p\,(L_2\,)} \ \ \textbf{i}^{1=2} \ \textbf{,}$$

acting like a rigid polym er with a polym er bending rigidity

$$_{p}(L_{?}) / L_{?}^{1+z}$$
 : (1.9)

It is well known<sup>14</sup>, of course, that a linear polymer does not have long-ranged orientational order i.e., it has a nite orientational persistence length  $L_p$ . For length sm aller than  $L_p$  ( $L_p$ ) we recover the well-known<sup>14</sup>  $L_y^{3=2}$  growth of transverse uctuations. By equating  $h_{rm s}$  from Eq.1.8 with the length  $L_y$  of the tubule, and de ning (ribbon width-dependent persistent length)  $L_p$  ( $L_p$ ) to be the value of  $L_y$  at which this equality occurs, we obtain an estimate for the orientational persistence length  $L_p$  of a long, skinny tubule:

$$L_{P}(L_{2}) / L_{2}^{1+z}$$
: (1.10)

W e see that only very long, skinny m em branes ( $L_y >> L_2$ ) will be orientationally disordered; for any m em brane with a reasonable aspect ratio (i.e.,  $L_y = L_2$ ),  $L_y$  is much less than  $L_P$  ( $L_2$ ), 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 them all uctuations.

Equation 1.9 indicates that the e ective polym erbend m odulus  $_{p}$  (L<sub>2</sub>) is \anomalous", by which we mean the fact that  $_{p}$  (L<sub>2</sub>), grows as a power of L<sub>2</sub> greater (by the \anomalous dimension" z) than 1 (naively expected based on dimensional analysis). This together with the concomitant anomalous dimension of the persistent length L<sub>P</sub> (L<sub>2</sub>), Eq.1.10 embodies the phenomenon

known as \anom alous elasticity".<sup>15;5;7;8</sup> In addition to

uctuating m em branes, they have consequences for polym ers whose internal structure is that of a long ribbon of dim ension L<sub>2</sub> L<sub>y</sub>, with L<sub>y</sub> >> L<sub>P</sub> (L<sub>2</sub>) >> L<sub>2</sub>. Provided that L<sub>2</sub> is large enough that the anom alous elasticity can m anifest itself, the radius of gyration R<sup>p</sup><sub>G</sub> of this polym er (which, since L<sub>y</sub> >> L<sub>P</sub>, will be coiled) will, in fact, grow m ore rapidly with the transverse dim ension L<sub>2</sub> of the polym er than the conventional elastic theory would predict. Speci cally, we expect:

$$R_{G}^{p} L_{p}(L_{?}) \frac{L_{y}}{L_{p}(L_{?})}^{p};$$

$$/ L_{y}^{p}L_{?}^{(1-p)(1+-z)}; \qquad (1.11)$$

while conventional elastic theory would imply  $R_{\,G}^{\,p}$  /  $L_{\,2}^{\,1}$   $^{\rm p}$  .

In addition to this anom abus elasticity in the elective polymer bend modulus, the uctuating tubule also displays anom abus elasticity for stretching the tubule. In particular, experiments that attempt to measure the stretching modulus  $g_y$  of the tubule (de ned more precisely by the renormalized version of Eqs.5.5 and 5.7) at wavevector q will produce results that depend strongly on q, even in the limit q ! 0. In particular, this apparent wavevector-dependent stretching modulus  $g_y$  (q) vanishes as  $\frac{1}{2}q$ ; 0, according to the scaling law

$$g_y(q) = q_y S_g(q_y = q_z^Z);$$
 (1.12)

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

Similarly, the tubule bend modulus (also de ned more precisely by the renorm alized version of Eqs.5.4 and 5.6) becomes strongly wavevector dependent as q ! 0, but it diverges in that lim it:

$$(q) = q_{y} \quad S \quad (q_{y} = q_{2}^{z}); \quad (1.13)$$

with 0 yet another universal exponent, and S (x) yet another universal scaling function.

The relations Eqs.1.1-1.2 sum marize all of the scaling properties in terms of the two universal exponents and z (or equivalently ). Clearly, we would like to predict their num erical values. There are three distinct cases to be considered, as we decrease the embedding dimension d in which the D = 2-dimensionalmembrane uctuates, as illustrated in Fig.3 (the generalization to arbitrary D is given in the main text).

regime III regime II regime I  
$$3 d_* \approx 6.5 d_{uc}^{SA} = 11 d$$

#### Regime I:

For a phantom m em brane, or for a m em brane w ith intrinsic dimension D = 2 em bedded in a space of dimension d  $d_{sc} = 11$ , self-avoidance e ects can be asymptotically ignored in the tubule phase, and we predict<sup>1</sup>

$$=\frac{1}{4};$$
 (1.14)

$$z = \frac{1}{2}$$
; (1.15)

$$= 0;$$
 (1.16)

$$u = 1;$$
 (1.17)

Regime II:

For a self-avoiding membrane with  $d < d < d_{uc} = 11$ (with d > 7=2), we have shown (as we describe in detail in Sec.V I) that the bending elasticity is not anom alous, ie., = 0, as guaranteed by an exact \tubule-gauge" sym m etry (see Sec.V IB). This, using Eq.1.3 im m ediately 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 terms of a single radius of gyration exponent  $\ .$  In this range d < d < d\_{uc} = 11 of embedding dimensionality, the exponents and z can be computed in an = 11 d-expansion. This has been done recently by Bowick and Guitter (BG)<sup>3</sup> who have veri ed the validity of the W and identity z = (1 + 2) = 3(for D = 2) perturbatively, to all orders in . Furthermore, for all embedding dimensions d > d, the absence 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 mem branes, Eqs.1.7 and 1.10 show that the D = 2dim ensional tubule phase is only marginally stable. For D = 2, this  $d < d < d_{uc} = 11$  regime has:

$$\frac{2}{5}$$
 >  $>$   $\frac{1}{4}$ ; (1.18)

$$z = \frac{1}{3}(1+2); \qquad (1.19)$$

$$= 0;$$
 (120)

$$u = 3 - \frac{1}{z};$$
 (1.21)

Regime III:

Finally, as we describe in Sec.V I, the physics of the physical tubule (i.e., D = 2-dimensional tubule embedded in d=3 dimensions) is much richer than that for the embedding dimensions d > d, where <code>\tubule-gauge"</code> symmetry imposes strict nonrenormalization of the tubule bending rigidity . For d < d, because of the presence of additional elastic nonlinearities (which are irrelevant for d near  $d_{\rm uc}$  = 11, but become strongly relevant for

physical dimensionality d < d ), this -expansion about d =  $d_{uc}$  = 11 gives no information about the simultaneous role that the self-avoidance and elastic nonlinearity play in the physical tubule (D = 2, d = 3 < d (D = 2)), where they are both in portant. We not that, as the embedding dimension d is lowered below d <  $d_{uc}$  = 11 (d (D = 2) > 7=2), the nonlinear elasticity becomes relevant, destabilizing the xed point studied in Ref. 3, and leading to the breakdown of the z = (1 + 2)=3 relation (with the amount of breakdown described by a new anom abus 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 d, which incorporates the simultaneous e ects of self-avoidance and nonlinear anom alous elasticity. This new xed point characterizes the d < d regime (appropriate to a physical tubule) with shape scaling exponents

$$\frac{2}{5}$$
; (1.22)

$$\frac{1}{1}$$
; (1.23)

$$z = \frac{1}{3} (1+2); \qquad (1.24)$$

$$2 + _{u} = 3 \frac{1}{z};$$
 (1.25)

We cannot calculate exactly the critical embedding dimension d (D) that separates regime II and regime 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 regime III. Our best estimate of d (2) is that it lies between 5 and 7.

It should be emphasized that all of the exponents are universal in a given embedding dimension d. Indeed, for d < d < 11, where all of the exponents are determined by the single unknown exponent, there are two dimensions analytical approximations to that agree to better than 1% for d > 8, and to better than 10% for d's greater than the likely values of d. These analytical methods are: F bry theory<sup>1</sup>, which predicts

$$_{\rm F} = \frac{3}{d+1}$$
; (1.27)

and the leading order in = 11 d expansion of B ow ick and G uitter<sup>3</sup>, which gives,

$$= \frac{3}{4 \text{ c}} + \frac{1}{2};$$
 (1.28)

with

W e suspect, based on the experience of comparing polymer exponents obtained from F lory theory with those obtained from the -expansion, that, although BG's results are certainly m ore accurate near d = 11, when the BG and F bry results start to disagree appreciably (i.e., below d = 7), the F bry result is probably the m ore accurate. N onetheless, the extrem ely close agreem ent betw een these two 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 Sec.V IB, for D = 2dimensional membrane, d is determined by the condition that (d) ! 2=5 as d ! d<sup>†</sup>. Using the F lory result (Eq127), this gives d = 13=2 = 6.5; while using the BG result (Eq128) gives d = 11 = 2=(3c) = 5.92.

All of the exponents jump discontinuously (as a function of d) at d; gure 9 shows such a plot, schem atically, for (d) and (d).

For a physical tubule, F bry theory, Eq.1.27, in plies

$$_{\rm F}$$
 (D = 2;d = 3) = 3=4; (1.30)

in contrast to the BG result Eq.1.28, which implies (D = 2; d = 3) = 0.517. W hat is the correct value of in d = 3? As discussed above, our experience with polym ers suggests that F lory theory is more reliable<sup>16</sup> than the -expansion when both are pushed well below the upper critical dimension. One m ight be concerned that this ceases to be true for tubules, due to the discontinuous behavior of all of the exponents at d , but we will 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.

It is widely<sup>17;18</sup>, though not universally,<sup>19;20</sup> believed 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 membranes and in more recent simulations by Baumgartner<sup>19</sup> of a selfavoiding plaquette membrane model. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether our tubule phase will su er the same fate. We think not, for the following reasons:

- 1. It is clear that self-avoidance, though a relevant perturbation (in physicalem bedding dimension  $d < d_{uc} = 11$ ) has far less e ect on the tubule than the crum pled phase, since points on the mem brane widely separated in the y-direction neverbum p into each other in the tubule phase, but do in the crum pled phase.
- 2. The analytic argument that self-avoidance destroys the crumpled phase is based on the G aussian variational (GV) approximation<sup>21;22</sup>, which predicts that the radius of gyration exponent  $_{GV}^{crum pled} =$ 4=d, which implies that 1 for d 4, and hence that the membrane is extended (i.e. at) for those dimensions (which, of course, include the physical case of d = 3). We nd that the same G aussian variational approximation leads to the same conclusion for the tubule phase. Our result for D = 2 is

$$_{GV}^{\text{tubu le}} = \frac{7}{3d 5}; \quad (1.31)$$

and implies  $\frac{\text{tubule}}{\text{GV}}$  1 for d 4, and hence an instability of the self-avoiding tubule to an extended (i.e. at) membrane in physical dimensions.

W e are not, how ever, overly concerned by this result, for a number of reasons:

- (a) The Gaussian variational approximation is known to be far from trustworthy. For example, it predicts = 2=d for linear polymers, which not only is less accurate for all d between 1 and 4 than the Flory result = 3=(d + 2), but also incorrectly predicts that the lower critical dimension  $d_{lc}$  below which linear polymers are always extended is  $d_{lc} = 2$ , whereas, in fact, it is known exactly that  $d_{lc} = 1$ , a result that is also predicted exactly by the Flory theory. Thus, the Gaussian variational approximation is very unreliable in predicting the lower critical dimension of a crum pled object.
- (b) There is a good reason to believe it is equally unreliable for our problem as well. If we compare the Flory prediction for with the -expansion calculation of Ref. 3 (which is asymptotically exact in d ! 11), in, e.g., d = 8, we nd they di er less than 1=3 of 1% :  $= 0.332^{3}$ ,  $_{Flory} = 1=3^{1}$ ; while the Gaussian variational result  $_{GV}^{tubule} = 7=19 = 0.3684$  is nearly 40 times as far o as the Flory result. This strongly suggests that both Flory theory and the -expansion are more reliable than the Gaussian variational approximation, and both of them predict substantially < 1 in d = 3:  $_{F} = 3=4^{1}$ ,  $= 0.517^{3}$ .
- (c) Finally, on more general grounds, while the Gaussian variationalm ethod can be quite useful, only some of its results can be trusted. Certainly it is likely that the trends of, e.g., exponents with 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  $d < d_{lc}$ , with  $d_{lc}$  de ned by  $(q_c) = 1$ ). However, as with any approximate method, especially with uncontrolled approximations such as the Gaussian method, there is little credibility in the actual values of the exponents. Furtherm ore, the G aussian variational approxim ation is very closely related to a large expansion in 1=d about the embedding dimension d ! 1 lim it.<sup>23</sup> It is therefore intrinsically untrustworthy and ad hoc for sm all values of d at which one is assessing the stability of the tubule (or crumpled) phase, which very delicately and

sensitively depends on the precise value of at sm alld.

In the remainder of this paper we present the details of our calculations. In Sec.II we introduce the Landau-G inzburg-W ilson free energy for our generalized m odel of an isotropic polymerized membranes. In Sec.III we will rst solve this model in mean eld theory. From this solution we obtain the phase diagram for an isotropic polym erized m em branes, and identify and characterize the new tubule phase as well as the previously studied crumpled and at phases. In Sec.IV we show that the scaling properties of the at and crum pled phases are una ected by the anisotropy. In Secs.V and VI we then consider the e ects of both therm al uctuations and selfavoidance on the tubule phase. We treat this problem using F lory theory, renorm alization group and G aussian variationalm ethods. W e calculate the upper critical em bedding and intrinsic dimensions for both e ects, and thereby show that both are relevant for the physical case oftwo-dim ensionalm em branes em bedded in three dim ensions. We also show that, although there is no anom alous elasticity for the bend modulus along the tubule near  $d = d_{uc} = 11$  (due to aforem entioned \tubule gauge" symmetry), such anomaly must set in for embedding dimensions d < d, with d > 7=2. When this happens, the xed point (perturbative around d = 11)<sup>3</sup> 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 Eqs. 6.62 and 6.63 between and z, which involve anom alous elas-(or  $_{\rm u}$  , related to it) and are approticity exponent priate for a physical (with anharm onic elasticity) tubule, described by this new xed point. We then use the F lory and extrapolated =  $11 \quad d\{expansion^3 results for in$ this relation to determ ine z and all other tubule shape exponents in terms of two constants that, unfortunately, we were not able to compute accurately.

In Section V we also derive the scaling results Eq.1.1 and Eq.1.2 for  $R_G$  and  $h_{rm s}$ , and for the anom alous elastic theory as well.

In Section V II we use the renorm alization group to analyze the crum pled-to-tubule transition. We then construct a scaling theory of the crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions, and com pute within F lory theory the critical exponents for these transitions.

In Section V III we sum marize, conclude, and make som e suggestions for further analytic, num erical, and experim entalwork.

#### II.M ODEL

O ur m odel for an isotropic m em branes is a generalization of the isotropic m odel considered in Ref. 24. As there, we characterize the con guration of the m em brane by giving the position r(x) in the d-dimensional em bedding space, of the point in the m em brane labeled by a D - dim ensional internal co-ordinate x. In the physical case, d = 3 and D = 2, of course. Throughout the rem ainder of this paper, we will distinguish between D -dim ensional "intrinsic" vectors and d-dim ensional "extrinsic" vectors by using boldface type for the form er, and vector arrows over the latter.

We now construct the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson free energy F for this system, by expanding F to leading order in powers of r(x) and its gradients with respect to internal space x, keeping only those term s consistent with the symmetries of the problem. These symmetries are global translation invariance  $r(x) ! r(x) + r_0$ , and global rotational invariance  $r(x) ! \tilde{M}$ r(x), where rand  $\widetilde{M}$  are a constant (i.e. x-independent) vector and a constant rotation matrix, respectively. G lobal translational invariance requires that F be expanded only in powers of gradients with respect to x. We will furtherm ore take the membrane to be isotropic in the D m em brane directions (hereafter denoted by  $x_2$ ) orthogonalto one special direction (which we cally). Since the physical case is D = 2, this specialization is innocuous.

The most general model consistent with all of these symmetries, neglecting irrelevant terms, is,

$$F[\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{2} \overset{Z}{d^{D}} \overset{1}{\mathbf{x}}_{?} d\mathbf{y} ? \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{?}^{2} \mathbf{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{y}} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{y}^{2} \mathbf{r}^{2}$$

$$+ \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{?} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{y}^{2} \mathbf{r}^{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{t}}_{?} (\overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{?} \mathbf{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{t}}_{y} (\overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{y} \mathbf{r})^{2}$$

$$+ \frac{\mathbf{u}_{?}?}{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{?}^{2} \mathbf{r}^{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} + \frac{\mathbf{u}_{yy}}{2} (\overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{y} \mathbf{r}^{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{u}}_{?y} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{u}}_{?y} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} + \overset{2}{\mathbf{u}}_{?y} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}_{r}^{2} \overset{2}{\mathbf{e}}$$

where the 's, t's, u's, v's are elastic constants. The rst three terms in F (the terms) represent the anisotropic bending energy of the m em brane. The elastic constants  $t_2$  and  $t_y$  are the most strongly tem perature dependent parameters in the model, changing sign from large, positive values at high tem peratures to negative values at low tem peratures. Their positivity at high tem peratures re-

ects 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 attempt to cram them - selves into the same point r; in this state, the gradients with respect to the internal space  $0^{\circ}r$  and  $0_{y}r$  seek to m inim ize them selves, which is clearly favorable when  $t_{2}$ ,  $t_{y} > 0$ . However, when either of these becomes negative, it becomes favorable for the membrane to atten (i.e., extend) in the associated direction, as we shall show in a moment. The u and v quartic terms are higher order elastic constants needed to stabilize the membrane when one or both of the rst order elastic constants  $t_{2}$ ,  $t_{y}$  become negative. Stability requires that

$$u_{22}^0 > 0;$$
 (2.2)

$$u_{yy} > 0;$$
 (2.3)

$$v_{2y} > \frac{1}{u_{2y}^{0} u_{yy}};$$
 (2.4)

where

$$u_{22}^0$$
,  $v_{22}^2$  +  $u_{22}^2$  = (D 1): (2.5)

The nal, b term in Eq2.1 represents the self-avoidance of the mem branes; i.e., its steric or excluded volume interaction.

E quation 2.1 reduces to the model for isotropic membranes considered in Ref. 24 when  $t_2 = t_y$ , 22 = y, 2y = 0,  $u_{yy} = 4$  (w + u),  $u_{22} = u_{2y} = 4u$ , and  $v_{22} = v_{2y} = 4w$ .

# III.MEAN FIELD THEORY

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

In mean-eld theory, we seek a conguration r(x) that minimizes the free energy Eq2.1 (without the selfavoidance term). The curvature energies  $_{?} \quad @_{?}^{2} r^{2}$  and  $_{y} \quad @_{y}^{2} r^{2}$  are clearly minimized when r(x) is linear in x. We will therefore seek minimized of F of the form

$$\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{r} \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{r}}; \mathbf{y}\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{0}) : \qquad (3.1)$$

O by iously, uniform rotations r(x) !  $\tilde{M}$  r(x), of any such m inimum, with  $\tilde{M}$  a constant rotation m atrix, will also be m inima. A continuous degenerate set of m inim a is thereby obtained, as usual for a system with a broken continuous symmetry. Uniform translations of the entire m em brane are also allowed, of course.

Inserting Eq.3.1 into Eq.2.1, and for now neglecting the self-avoidance term, we obtain the mean-eld free energy for an isotropic mem branes

$$F = \frac{1}{2} L_{?}^{D-1} L_{y} t_{y} \frac{2}{y} + t_{?} (D-1) \frac{2}{?}$$
  
+  $\frac{1}{2} u_{?}^{0} (D-1)^{2} \frac{4}{?} + \frac{1}{2} u_{yy} \frac{4}{y} + v_{?y} (D-1) \frac{2}{?} \frac{2}{y} ; (3.2)$ 

where  $L_{?}$  and  $L_{y}$  are the linear dimensions of the attened membrane in the ? and y directions, respectively.

This mean eld theory is precisely that studied long ago by Fisher et al.<sup>25</sup> for a completely di erent (magnetic) problem . M inimizing the free energy over  $_{?}$  and  $_{y}$  yields two possible phase diagram topologies, depending on whether  $u_{?,?}^{0}u_{yy} > v_{?,y}^{2}$  or  $u_{?,?}^{0}u_{yy} < v_{?,y}^{2}$ .

For  $u_{?,?}^0 u_{yy} > v_{?,y}^2$ , we obtain the phase diagram in Fig.1. Both  $_{?}$  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,  $r_{y} = 0$  i.e., r(x) = 0 for all x.

In the regime between the positive  $t_2$ -axis (i.e., the locus  $t_y = 0$  and  $t_2 > 0$ ) and the  $t_y < 0$  part of the  $t_y = (u_{yy}=v_{2y})t_2$  line, lies our new y-tubule phase, characterized by  $_2 = 0$  and  $_y = \frac{p}{f_y j = u_{yy}} > 0$ : the memory 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, y = 0 and  $reversal = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{$ 

the physical case of D = 2), and lies between the  $t_2 < 0$  segment of the line  $t_y = (v_{2y} = u_{2y}^0) t_2$  and the positive  $t_y$  axis. Finally, the at phase, characterized by both

$$\begin{array}{rcl} & (\mathbf{j}_{2}, \mathbf{j}_{1}\mathbf{y}_{y}, \mathbf{j}_{y}, \mathbf{j}_{y}, \mathbf{j}_{y}) = (\mathbf{u}_{2}^{0}, \mathbf{u}_{yy}, \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}, \mathbf{v}_{y})^{1=2} > 0; \quad (3.3) \\ & \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{j}_{y}, \mathbf{j}_{12}, \mathbf{v}_{2}, \mathbf{j}_{y}, \mathbf{v}_{2}, \mathbf{v}_{2}) = (\mathbf{u}_{2}^{0}, \mathbf{u}_{yy}, \mathbf{v}_{2}^{2}, \mathbf{v}_{2})^{1=2} > 0; \quad (3.4) \end{array}$$

lies between the  $t_2 < 0$  segment of the line  $t_y = (u_{yy}=v_{2y})t_2$  and the  $t_y < 0$  segment of the line  $t_y = (v_{2y}=v_{2y})t_2$ 

 $(v_{? y}=u_{? ?}^{0})t_{?}$ . For  $u_{? ?}^{0}u_{yy} < v_{? y}^{2}$ , the at phase disappears, and is replaced by a direct rst-order transition from ? -tubule to y-tubule along the locus  $t_{y} = (v_{? y}=u_{? ?}^{0})t_{?}$  (see Fig.4)



FIG. 4. Phase diagram for tethered membranes showing our new tubule phase, for the range of elastic parameters when the intermediate at phase disappears. A rst-order phase transition separates y- and ? -tubule phases.

The boundaries between the tubule and the crum – pled phases remain the positive  $t_y$  and  $t_2$  axes, as for  $u_{2,2}^0 u_{yy} > v_{2,y}^2$  case.

Note that a direct crumpling transition (i.e. a direct transition between the crumpled and at phase) is very non-generic in this picture: only experimental loci that pass from  $t_y$ ,  $t_z > 0$  through the origin (locus  $P_2$  in Fig.1) can experience such a transition. This transition is, in fact, tetra-critical in this picture.

This does not, however, in ply that direct crum pling transitions are non-generic. Many membranes will be perfectly isotropic, by virtue of being form ed under conditions of unbroken rotational sym metry (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 full parameter space of the model de ned by Eq21 specied by  $t_{v} = t_{v}$ ,  $2 = u_{v}$ , 2 = 0,  $u_{vv} = 4(v + u)$ ,  $u_{??} = u_{?v} = 4u$ , and  $v_{??} = v_{?v} = 4v$ . The values of the quartic couplings then satisfy  $u_{??}^0$ ,  $u_{yy} > v_{?y}^2$ (for u, v > 0), and hence the topology of the phase diagram is Figure 1. The boundaries of the at phase for those isotropic values of the quartic couplings become  $t_v = t_2 + 1 + u = v = 0$ 1) and  $t_v = (1 + u = v) t_2$ , respectively. 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  $t_v = t_2$  therefore lies between the two (i.e., in the at phase), and hence, that model does undergo a direct at to crum pled transition.

M embranes with any intrinsic broken orientational symmetry (e.g., in-plane tilt order<sup>9</sup>, which is quite common<sup>12</sup>), will generically have  $t_y \in t_2$ . Furthermore, they will not generically have both  $t_2$  and  $t_y$  vanish at the same temperature. A generic bousthrough the phase diagram in Fig.1 will be like bous P<sub>1</sub>, and will necessarily have one of the tubule phases intervening between the at and crum pled phases. Our new tubule phase is not only generically possible, but actually unavoidable, in m embranes with any type or am ount of intrinsic anisotropy.

# IV.FLUCTUATIONSAND SELF-AVOIDANCE IN THE FLAT AND CRUMPLED PHASES

In this section, we show that both the at and the crum pled phases of an isotropic membranes are identical in their scaling properties, at su ciently long length scales, to the eponymous phases of isotropic membranes.

Consider rst the at phase. We can include uctuations about the mean-eld solution by considering sm all deviations from the solution in Eq.3.1

$$\mathfrak{X}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{2} + \mathbf{u}_{2} (\mathbf{x}); \ \mathbf{y}\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{y}} (\mathbf{x}); \tilde{\mathbf{h}} (\mathbf{x}) ; \qquad (4.1)$$

Inserting this into our initial free energy, Eq.2.1, with  $t_2$ and  $t_y$  both in the range in which the at phase is stable, we obtain the uniaxial elastic energy of R ef. 26. As shown in that reference, uctuation e ects in turn renorm alize the anisotropic elastic energy into the isotropic m em brane elastic energy considered by R efs. 5,7,8. In the

at phase, and at su ciently long scales, the anisotropic m em branes therefore behave exactly like isotropic m em - branes. This in particular in plies that the at phase of anisotropic m em branes is stable against therm al uctuations. As in isotropic m em branes, this is due to the fact that these very therm al uctuations drive the bend m odulus to in nity at long wavelength  $5^{7/8}$ .

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 <sup>27</sup> are also innitely renorm alized and becom e wavevector dependent, vanishing in the q! 0 limit as (q) (q) ď ; and  $_{u}$  in the at phase di er from the values of those in the tubule phase, as does their physical interpretation. The at phase is furtherm ore novel in that it is characterized by a universal negative Poisson ratio<sup>7;28</sup> which for D = 2 is de ned as the long wavelength  $\lim_{x \to a} \frac{1}{2} = (q) = (2 + (q))$ . The transverse undulations in the at phase, i.e. the membrane roughness  $h_{rm s}$  scales with the internal size of the membrane as h<sub>rms</sub> L, with = (4 D )=2. exactly. Furtherm ore, an underlying rotational invariance im poses an exact W ard identity between and u,  $_{u} + 2 = 4$  D, leaving only a single nontrivial independent exponent characterizing the properties of the at phase of even an isotropic mem branes. The best esin the physical case of a two-dimensional tim ate for membrane (D = 2), embedded in a d = 3-dimensional space com es from the self-consistent screening approximation (SCSA) of Le Doussal and Radzihovsky<sup>28</sup>, who p= 4 = (1 + 15)0:82. The exponent relations nd above then predict  $_{u} = 0.36$  and = 0.59. These exponents, together with the negative Poisson ratio predictions of LeD oussal and R adzihovsky of  $= 1=3^{28}$  have been recently spectacularly veri ed to high precision in very large scale simulations (largest to date) by Falcioni,

The root-mean-square (rm s) thermal uctuation hjî (x)  $2^{2}$  hj n (x)<sup>2</sup> ji of the local membrane normal n (x) about its mean value (here taken to be 2) is

Bow ick, Guitter and Thorleifsson<sup>29</sup>.

hj n (x)
$$\hat{j}i = hjc$$
 ñ (x) $\hat{j}i;$   

$$= d^{D} q q^{2} h \tilde{j}i (q) \hat{j}i;$$

$$/ \frac{Z}{(q)q^{2}} / \frac{d^{D} q}{q^{2}};$$

$$/ L^{2} D; \qquad (4.2)$$

where we have in posed an infra-red cuto  $q > L^{1}$ , on the integral over w avevectors, L being the sm aller of the intrinsic linear dimensions  $L_{?}$ ,  $L_{y}$  of the attened mem – brane. These uctuations are nite as L ! 1, when 2 D < 0. In the physical case D = 2, this condition is always satis ed since > 0. Thus, mem brane orientational uctuations remain bounded, and the at phase is stable against thermal uctuations, for the physical case D = 2. Indeed, the SC SA predicts that they remain bounded down to the lower critical dimension D =  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Note that this stability of the at phase depends crucially on the anom abus 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 Eq.4.2 would diverge logarithm ically for D = 2, describing divergent orientational uctuations leading to an instability of the at phase at any non-zero temperature. Hence, the at phase owes 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 thermal 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.

Because of this persistent long-ranged orientational order (i.e., because the mem brane is at), widely intrinsically separated parts of the mem branes (i.e., points x and  $x^0$ , with jx  $x^0$  j large) do not bum p into each other (i.e., never have  $r(x) = r(x^0)$ ); hence, the self-avoidance interaction in Eq2.1 is irrelevant in the at phase.

That the crum pled phase of an isotropic m em branes is identical to that of isotropic m em branes is even easier to see. When both t<sub>2</sub> and t<sub>y</sub> are positive, all of the other local terms in Eq2.1, i.e., the , u, and v-terms, are irrelevant at long wavelengths (since they all involve m ore derivatives than the t-terms). Once these irrelevant terms are neglected, a simple change of variables  $x_2 = x^{0^{\circ}} \frac{t_2 = t_y}{t_2 = t_y}$  m akes the remaining energy isotropic. Thus, the entire crum pled phase is identical in 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 with m em brane linear dimension L like L, with = (D + 2)=(d + 2) in F lory theory, and very sim ilar values predicted by -expansion techniques<sup>30 {32</sup>.

# V.FLUCTUATIONS IN PHANTOM TUBULES

In this section, we ignore self-avoidance (i.e., treat \phantom "membranes), and consider the e ects of uctuations on phantom tubules. We will show that these uctuations do not destroy the tubule phase, or change the topology of the phase diagram. The detailed properties of the tubule phase are, how ever, modiled 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 mean- eld solution

 $\mathbf{r}_{o}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{y} \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{0}$  by writing

$$r(x) = yy + u(x); h(x);$$
 (5.1)

where  $\hbar(x)$  is a d 1-component vector orthogonal to the tubule's axis, which we take to be oriented along the y-axis. The average extension factor <sub>y</sub> is near but not exactly equal to its mean-eld value, because uctuations will change it. R ather, we will choose <sub>y</sub> so that all linear terms in  $\hbar(x)$  and u(x) in the resultant elastic free energy for these variables are exactly cancelled, in the long wavelength limit, by their uctuation renorm alizations. This criterion guarantees that  $\tilde{h}\left(x\right)$  and  $u\left(x\right)$  represent

uctuations around the true ground state of F . Precisely analogous choices have been used in the study of bulk smectric A elasticity<sup>15</sup>, and the at-phase elasticity of isotropic mem branes<sup>5;7;8</sup>.

Inserting the decom position Eq.5.1 into the free energy 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  $F_{tot} = F_{m ft} + F_{el}$ , where  $F_{m ft}$  is simply the mean-eld free energy for the tubule phase

$$F_{m ft} = \frac{1}{2}L_{2}^{D-1}L_{y}t_{y}t_{y}^{2} + \frac{1}{4}u_{yy}t_{y}^{4}; \qquad (5.2)$$

and  $F_{e1}[u(x); h(x)]$  is the uctuating elastic free energy part

$$F_{el} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{2} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \qquad (\theta_{y}u + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}h)^{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}u)^{2} + (\theta_{y}^{2}h)^{2} + t(\theta^{?}h)^{2} + g_{?} (\theta^{?}u)^{2} + g_{y} (\theta_{y}u + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}h)^{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}u)^{2}; \qquad (5.3)$$

y,t  $\xi + v_{2y}^{2}, g_{y}$ where  $u_{yy} = \frac{2}{y} = 2, g_{?}$  $t + u_{2y} \frac{2}{y}$ , and  $= t_{y} + u_{yy} \frac{2}{y}$  are constant coe cients. Note is that the coe cient of the linear terms in  $F_{el}$  is also the coe cient of the  $(Q_v \hbar)^2$  term. This is a consequence of the rotation invariance of the original free energy Eq 2.1, which leads to the existence of the Goldstone mode  $Q_y \tilde{h}$ . The combination E (u;  $\tilde{h}$ )  $(\theta_y u + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_y \tilde{n})^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_y u)^2$  is the only combination of rst y-derivatives of u and h that is invariant under global rotations of the tubule. It is analogous to the nonlinear strain tensor of conventional elasticity theory.<sup>27</sup>. On these general symmetry grounds, therefore, the free energy can only depend on Quu and Quh through powers of E (u; h), and this property m ust be preserved upon renorm alization. This has two important consequences: the rst is that, since, as discussed earlier, the coe cient of this linear term will be chosen to vanish upon renormalization via a judicious choice of the stretching factor  $v_{,}$  the coe cient of  $(Q_v h)^2$  will likewise vanish.<sup>33</sup> This means that the y-direction becomes a \soft" direction for uctuations of in the tubule phase. We can trace this softness back to the spontaneously broken rotational symmetry of the tubule state. It is precisely analogous to the softness of height uctuations in the at phase of isotropic m em branes, m an ifested by the absence of  $((0, \hbar)^2)$ ,  $((0, \hbar)^2)$  terms in the elastic free energy of the at phase, analogous to Eq 5.3 (when is tuned to 0).

The second in portant consequence is that the ratios of the coe cients of the quadratic  $(@_yu)^2$  and the anharmonic  $@_yu(@_y\hbar)^2$  and  $(@_y\hbar)^4$  terms in  $F_{el}$  must always be exactly 4:4:1, since they must appear together as

a result of expanding  $(@_yu + \frac{1}{2}(@_y\hbar)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(@_yu)^2)^2$ . We will show in a few moments that, for this special value of these ratios, the long-wavelength anom alous elastic behavior of the \phantom " tubule phase can be calculated exactly.

Recognizing that vanishes after renorm alization, we can now calculate the propagators (i.e., the harm onic approximation to the Fourier transformed correlation functions) by setting = 0 in Eq.5.3. We thereby obtain

$$h_{i}(q)h_{j}(q)i = k_{B}T_{ij}^{2}G_{h}(q);$$
 (5.4)

$$hu(q)u(q)i = k_B TG_u(q);$$
 (5.5)

where

$$G_{h}^{1}(q) = tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4};$$
 (5.6)

$$G_{u}^{1}(q) = g_{?} q_{?}^{2} + g_{y} q_{y}^{2};$$
 (5.7)

and  $\hat{i}_{j}$  is a K ronecker delta when both indices i and j  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  y, and is zero if either i or j = y.

Inspection of the propagators  $G_h$  and  $G_u$  reveals that the  $\hbar$ - uctuations are much larger than the u- uctuations for  $j_{l?}$  j  $q_i^2$ , and that it is precisely this regime of wavevectors that dominates the uctuations. Thus, in power counting to determ ine the relevance or irrelevance of various operators, we must count each power of  $j_{l?}$  j as two powers of  $q_j$ . It is this power counting that leads to the identication of the term s explicitly displayed in Eq.5.3 as the most relevant ones.

Calculating the root-mean-squared (m s) real space positional uctuations http:(x) f i in the harm onic approxim ation by integrating the propagators over all wavevectors, we nd

hfi(x) fi/  

$$Z_{q_{2} > L_{2}^{-1}} \frac{d^{D_{1}} q_{2} dq_{y}}{(2_{1})^{D_{1}}} \frac{1}{tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}};$$

$$Z_{q_{2} > L_{2}^{-1}} \frac{d^{D_{1}} q_{2}}{q_{2}^{3=2}} / L_{2}^{5=2} D; \qquad (5.8)$$

where we have introduced an infra-red cuto  $\frac{1}{32}$  j>  $L_2^{-1}$  in the last integral. This expression clearly reveals that for \phantom " tubules, the upper critical dim ension D<sub>uc</sub> for this problem, below which transverse positional uctuations diverge is D<sub>uc</sub> = 5=2; this in principle (but see discussion of dom inant zero m odes in Sec.V IB) allows a quantitatively trustworthy = D<sub>uc</sub> 2 = 1=2 expansion for the physicalm em brane of D = 2. This should be contrasted with the result D<sub>uc</sub> = 4 for the analogous critical dim ension in the at phase<sup>7,8</sup>

The lower critical dimension  $D_{lc}$  below which the tubule is necessarily crum pled in this problem is also low – ered by the anisotropy. Considering the uctuations of the mem brane norm als r h in the harm onic approxim ation, one sees in mediately that the largest of these is the uctuation in the y-direction,

hj n<sub>y</sub>(x) 
$$\hat{f}i = h \hat{f}_{2} \hat{f}(x) \hat{f}i;$$
  
/  
 $Z^{q_{2} > L_{2}^{-1}} \frac{d^{D_{-1}} q_{2} dq_{y}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{q_{y}^{2}}{tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}};$   
Z  
/  
 $q_{2} > L_{2}^{-1} \frac{d^{D_{-1}} q_{2}}{q_{2}^{1+2}} / L_{2}^{3+2} D;$  (5.9)

which clearly only diverges in the infra-red L<sub>2</sub> ! 1 limit for D  $D_{lc} = 3=2$  (but again see discussion of dom inant zero m odes in Sec.VIB).

In the argot of the mem brane eld, the elasticity of phantom tubules is anom alous. In contrast to the at phase, how ever, for phantom 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 all directions and hence are negligible (in the relevant wavevector regime  $j_{12}$ ,  $j = q^2$ ) relative to the  $\hbar$ -

uctuations which scale like  $1=q^4$  in this regime. This justi es neglecting the  $\frac{1}{2}$   $(\mathfrak{G}_y \mathfrak{u})^2$  piece of the invariant E (u; ħ) operator. This also emerges from a full renormalization group treatment<sup>33</sup>, which show sthat this term is strongly irrelevant. Once it is neglected, the elastic free energy is quadratic in u, and these phonon modes can therefore be integrated exactly out of the partition function

$$Z = DuDhe^{F_{el}[u;h]} :$$
 (5.10)

Once this is done, the only remaining anharm onic term in the e ective elastic free energy for h is, in Fourier space,

$$F_{anh}[\tilde{h}] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{k_1;k_3;k_3} \tilde{h}(k_1) \tilde{h}(k_2) \tilde{h}(k_3) \tilde{h}(k_4) \\ k_{y1}k_{y2}k_{y3}k_{y4}V_h(q);$$
(5.11)

where  $q = \tilde{k}_1 + \tilde{k}_2$  and  $\tilde{k}_1 + \tilde{k}_2 + \tilde{k}_3 + \tilde{k}_4 = 0$ . The e ective vertex  $V_h$  (q) above reduces to

$$V_{h}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{g_{y}g_{2}q_{2}^{2}}{g_{y}q_{y}^{2} + g_{2}q_{2}^{2}}; \qquad (5.12)$$

which is irrelevant near the Gaussian xed point (but see Sec.V IB), as can be seen by the simple an isotropic power counting described above.

The exact cancelation of the relevant terms in  $F_{anh}$  [ħ] above is a direct consequence of the 4 :4 :1 ratios of the coe cients of the quadratic  $(@_y u)^2$  and the anharm onic  $@_y u (@_y \hbar)^2$  and  $(@_y \hbar)^4$  terms in  $F_{e1}$  that was discussed earlier. Given this cancelation,  $F_{anh}$  [ħ] is now clearly less relevant than the anharm onic vertices  $@_y u (@_y \hbar)^2$  and  $(@_y \hbar)^4$  in the original free energy (before we integrated out the phonons u). This is because the factor  $V_h (q) / q_2^2 = (g_y q_y^2 + g_2 q_2^2)$  vanishes like  $q_y^2$  in the relevant lim it  $j_{l_2}$  j  $q_y^2$ ,  $q_y$  ! 0 (the other factors in Eq.5.11 are precisely the Fourier transform of  $(@_y \hbar)^4$ , of course). This low ers the upper critical dimension for anom alous

elasticity of the  $\tilde{h}$  eld to  $D_{uc} = 3=2$ . Thus, in the physical case D = 2, there is no anom alous elasticity in  $\tilde{h}$ ; that is, the elastic constants t and in Eq.5.6 are nite and non-zero as  $q_y \mid 0$ .

However, as asserted earlier, the full elasticity Eq.5.3, before u is integrated out, is anomalous, 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 Fig.5, gives

$$g_{y}(q) = g_{y}^{\circ}$$
(5.13)  

$$Z \frac{k_{B} T g_{y}^{2}(q) p_{y}^{2}(p_{y} - q_{y})^{2} d^{D-1} p_{2} dp_{y} = (2)^{D}}{(p_{2}^{2} + (p))p_{y}^{4} (p_{2}^{2} - q_{2}^{2})^{2} + (p - q_{1}^{2})(p_{2} - q_{2})^{4}};$$

where  $g_v^o$  is the \bare" or unrenorm alized value of  $g_v$ .



FIG.5. Feynman graph equation for the self-consistent evaluation of  $g_{\gamma}\left(q\right)$  .

O ur earlier argum ent shows that (p) can be replaced by a constant in Eq.5.13 as p ! 0, since the n elasticity is not anom alous. The self-consistent equation Eq.5.13 can be solved by the ansatz,

$$g_y(q) = q_y^{u} S_g(q_y = q_2^{z})$$
: (5.14)

Simple power counting<sup>34</sup> then shows that we must choose

$$z = \frac{1}{2}$$
; (5.15)

$$u = 5 \quad 2D :$$
 (5.16)

It is straightforward to verify that these results hold to all orders in perturbation theory; that is, at every order, the leading dependence on q of the contribution to  $g_y$  scales like  $q_y^{u} S_q (q_y = q_y^{1=2})$  with u = 5 - 2D.

It is straightforw and to verify to allorders in perturbation theory that there is no such renorm alization of  $g_2$ . This is because of the anisotropic scaling  $q_2$   $q_2^2$ , which in plies that all vertices proportional to powers of perpendicular gradients of  $\tilde{h}$ , i.e., powers of  $r_2$   $\tilde{h}$  are irrelevant. Since only such vertices can renorm alize  $g_2$   $\dot{f}_2$   $u \hat{f}$ , there are no relevant renorm alization of  $g_2$ . As a result,  $g_2$  remains nite and non-zero, or, in a word, non-anom alous, as  $\dot{f}_2$ !

Using the facts that  $g_y(q)$  is independent of  $q_?$  as  $jq_? j = q + 0$  for xed  $q_*$ , and, likewise, to be independent of  $q_y$  as  $q_y + 0$  for xed  $q_*$ , we can obtain the lim its of the scaling function  $S_g(x)$ :

$$S_{g}(x) /$$
 constant; x ! 1  
x "; x ! 0: (5.17)

For phantom membranes with D = 2, u = 1 and z = 1=2, so we nd:

$$g_{y}(\mathbf{q}) / \begin{array}{c} q_{y}; & q_{y} > p \overline{q_{p}} \\ \overline{q_{p}}; & q_{y} < < p \overline{q_{p}}: \end{array}$$
(5.18)

We will now use this result to compute the meansquared real space uctuations  $h(u(L_2;y) u(0;y))^2 i$ h  $u^2 i$  of u(x). These can be obtained via the equipartition theorem and by sum ming all of the Fourier modes, yielding:

$$\begin{array}{c} & Z \\ h \ u^{2} i \\ & & \\ &$$

Let us assume, and verify a posteriori, that the integral in this expression is dominated by wavevectors with  $q_y < < \frac{p}{q_2}$ . Then, using Eq.5.18, we see that

h u<sup>2</sup>i  

$$q_{2} > L_{2}^{1}; q_{y} > L_{y}^{1} \frac{dq_{2} dq_{y}}{(2)^{p}} \frac{1}{c^{p}} \frac{e^{iq_{2}} L_{2}}{q_{2}^{2}} \frac{1}{q_{2}^{2}} \frac{e^{iq_{2}}}{q_{2}^{2}} \frac{1}{q_{2}^{2}} \frac{e^{iq_{2}}}{q_{2}} \frac{1}{q$$

where c is a constant. Inspection of this integral reveals that it is dom inated by q's for which the two terms in the denom inator balance; this means  $q_y = q_1^{3=4} << \frac{p}{q_2}$ , the last extrem e inequality holding as jrj! = 0. This veries our earlier a posteriori assumption that  $q_y << \frac{p}{q_2}$  in the dom inant wavevector regim e.

Now, changing variables in the integral q<sub>2</sub>  $Q_2 = L_2$ ,  $q_y = Q_y = L_2^{3=4}$ , we nd

h 
$$u^2 i = L_2^{1=4} S_u (L_y = L_2^{3=4})$$
; (5.21)

where

$$S_{u}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{Q_{2} > 1; Q_{y} > \mathbf{x}^{-1}}}^{\mathbb{Z}} \frac{dQ_{2} dQ_{y}}{(2)^{2}} \frac{1}{c^{p} \overline{Q_{2}} Q_{y}^{2} + g_{2} Q_{2}^{2}} :$$
(5.22)

W e note that the scaling form for the u phonon correlations is di erent than that of the height  $eld \tilde{h}$  as sum - marized in e.g. Eqs.1.1 and 1.2, and discussed in more detail below.

The lim its of  $S_u(x)$  scaling function can be obtained just as we did for  $S_g(x)$ ; we nd, including \zero m odes" (see below):

$$S_u(x) / constant; x ! 1 x^1; x ! 0:$$
 (5.23)

For roughly square m em branes,  $L_y = L_2 = L$ , so, as L + 1,  $L_y = L_2^{3=4} + 1$ , and the set limit of Eq.5.23 is the appropriate one. This gives

h 
$$u^2 i / L_2^{1=4}$$
: (5.24)

The authors of Ref. 2 measured a quantity that should scale like h u<sup>2</sup>i in their simulations of a square anisotropic membrane. They did this via their vividly nam ed \salam i" method: measuring the moment of inertia tensor of a \salam i" slice, a set of N points that all had the same internal y coordinate (for a y-tubule phase). It is straightforward to show that the smallest eigenvalue of this tensor should scale like N hu  $(x)^2$  i, since, as we shall see in a moment, the mean squared displacem ents in the other directions are much bigger than those in the y direction. Therefore, from Eq.5.24 we predict that the sm allest eigenvalue of this salam i slice m om ent of inertia tensor scales like N L<sup>1=4</sup>. BFT actually t this eigenvalue to N log L, which m ight appear to disagree with our prediction, until one recognizes that for L's between 32 and 100 (where most of the data of Ref. 2 is taken),  $L^{1=4} = (e=4) \log L$  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.5.21 and 5.23, one could simulate mem branes with aspect ratios quite di erent from 1. In particular, we predict based on Eq.5.21 that increasing  $L_v$  at xed L<sub>2</sub> from an initially square con guration would not increase this sm allest eigenvalue; nor would decreasing  $L_{v}$ decrease it, until an aspect ratio  $L_{\gamma} ~~L_{2}^{3=4}$  is reached, beyond which this eigenvalue would increase like  $L_v^{-1}$ .

We now turn to the computation, for the phantom tubule, of the tubule radius of gyration  $R_G$  and roughness  $h_{rm \ s}$ , de ned by:

$$R_{G}^{2}$$
 h<sub>J</sub> (L<sub>2</sub>;y) h (0<sub>2</sub>;y) f i; (5.25)

$$h_{\rm rm \ s}^2$$
 h  $h_{\rm in}(x_2; L_y)$   $h(x_2; 0)$  ji; (5.26)

where  $L_2$  spans the intrinsic? space of the mem brane. Because  $R_G$  is by de nition the root-mean-square (ms) distance between two points at the same y, it is roughly the radius of a typical cross-section of the tubule perpendicular to the tubule axis. Likewise,  $h_{\rm rm\ s}$  measures

uctuations between points widely separated along the tubule axis; hence, it gives the polymer-like transverse "wandering" of the tubule. See Fig.2 for an illustration of  $R_{\rm G}\,$  and  $h_{\rm rm\,\,s}$ .

The reason we distinguish between these two quantities is that they scale in di erent ways with the membrane dimensions  $L_2$  and  $L_y$ , in contrast to one's naive expectations. This happens because there are large contributions to both quantities from "zero modes", by which we mean Fourier modes with either  $q_2$  or  $q_y = 0$ . Those with  $q_2 = 0$  correspond to polymer-like undulations of the entire tubule. Recognizing the existence of both types of modes, we Fourier decom pose  $\tilde{h}(x)$  as follow s:

$$\hbar(x) = \frac{1}{L_{2}^{D-1}L_{y}}^{X} \quad \hbar_{B}(q)e^{iq x} + \frac{1}{p}\frac{1}{L_{y}}^{X} \quad \hbar_{0y}(q_{y})e^{iq_{y}y}$$

+ 
$$\frac{1}{L_{2}^{D-1}} \prod_{q_{2}}^{X} \tilde{n}_{02} (q_{2}) e^{iq_{2} x_{2}}$$
;  
(5.27)

where B, 0y, and 0? denote "bulk modes" (i.e., modes with neither  $q_2$  nor  $q_y = 0$ ), and "zero modes" (i.e., modes with either  $q_2$  or  $q_y = 0$ ), respectively. Note that we have chosen di erent norm alizations for the three types of modes. For phantom mem branes, we proceed by inserting this Fourier decomposition into the harmonic, h dependent piece of the elastic free energy  $F_{el}$  (which is justimed, since, as shown above, the elasticity for h for a phantom tubule is not anom alous), obtaining:

$$F_{0} = \frac{1}{2} X_{q} (tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}) \tilde{p}_{B} (q) f + \frac{1}{2} L_{2}^{D-1} X_{q_{y}} q_{y}^{4} \tilde{p}_{0y} (q_{y}) f + \frac{1}{2} L_{y}^{D-1} X_{q_{y}} q_{y}^{4} \tilde{p}_{0y} (q_{y}) f + \frac{1}{2} L_{y}^{D-1} X_{q_{y}} tq_{y}^{2} \tilde{p}_{02} (q_{2}) f + \frac{1}{2} L_{y}^{D-1} X_{q_{y}} q_{y}^{4} \tilde{p}_{0y} (q_{y}) f + \frac{1}{2} L_{y}^{D-1} X_{q} q_{y}^{4} \tilde{p}_{0y} (q_{y}) f + \frac{1}{2} L$$

N ote the explicit presence of the factors of  $L_2^{D-1}$  and  $L_y$  for the 0-m odes. Applying equipartition to Eq.5.28, we can obtain the mean squared uctuations of the Fourier m odes:

$$h_{\text{Th}_{B}}^{*}(q)_{\text{T}}^{2}i = \frac{k_{B}T(d D)}{tq_{P}^{2} + q_{Y}^{4}}$$
 (5.29)

$$h_{10y}^{m}(q_{y})_{1}^{2}i = \frac{k_{B}T(d D)}{L_{2}^{D-1}q_{y}^{4}}$$
(5.30)

$$h_{10}^{2}(q_{2})_{11}^{2} = \frac{k_{B} T (d D)}{L_{y} t q_{2}^{2}}$$
 (5.31)

U sing these expressions inside E qs.5.25 and 5.26, and being careful about converting sum s on q into integrals, we get

$$R_{G}^{2} = 2 (d \quad D) \frac{k_{B} T}{L_{y}} \frac{Z}{L_{y^{-1}}} \frac{d^{D-1} q_{2}}{(2)^{D-1}} \frac{1}{tq_{2}^{2}} (1 \quad e^{iq_{2} \quad L_{2}})$$
  
+  $k_{B} T \frac{Z}{L_{y^{-1};L_{y^{-1}}}} \frac{d^{D-1} q_{2} dq_{y}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{(1 \quad e^{iq_{2} \quad L_{2}})}{tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}} ; (5.32)$ 

where the subscripts  $L_2^{1}$  and  $L_y^{1}$  denote infra-red cuto  $s j_2 j > L_2^{1}; q_y > L_v^{1}$ , with  $L_2$   $j_2 j$ .

We observe here that  $R_G$  in Eq.5.32 does not receive any contribution from the  $q_2 = 0$  "zero mode" (i.e., in addition to the bulk mode,  $R_G$  receives a contribution only from the  $q_y = 0$  \zero mode").

Scaling L<sub>?</sub> out of both integrals for  $R_G$  by the change of variables Q<sub>?</sub>  $q_2$  L<sub>?</sub> and Q<sub>y</sub>  $q_1$  L<sub>?</sub>, we obtain

$$R_{G}^{2} = \frac{C_{1}L_{2}^{3D}}{L_{y}} + L_{2}^{5=2D} I_{R} \left(\frac{pL_{y}}{L_{2}}\right) ;$$
 (5.33)

where

$$C_1 = 2 (d = D) k T \frac{Z}{1} \frac{d^{D-1} q_2}{(2)^{D-1}} \frac{(1 e^{iq_2 \hat{L}_2})}{tq_2^2} : (5.34)$$

is a constant of 0 (1), and

$$I_{R}(x) = 2 (d = D) k_{f} T \frac{d^{D-1} q_{2} dq_{y}}{1_{rx}} \frac{d^{D-1} q_{2} dq_{y}}{(2 )^{D}} \frac{(1 = e^{iq_{2} \cdot \hat{L}_{2}})}{tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}};$$
(5.35)

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

$$S_{R}(x) = \frac{C_{1}}{x} + I_{R}(x);$$
 (5.36)

we see that  $R_{\,G}\,$  can be rewritten in the scaling form

$$R_{G} (L_{?}; L_{y}) = L_{?} S_{R} (L_{y} = L_{?}^{z})$$
 (5.37)

with, for phantom mem branes,

$$=\frac{5 \quad 2D}{4}; \tag{5.38}$$

$$z = \frac{1}{2}$$
: (5.39)

W e will see later that the scaling form Eq.5.37 continues to apply when self-avoidance is included, but with different values of and z, and a di erent scaling function  $S_R(x)$ . For phantom membranes, from our explicit expression for the scaling function  $S_R$ , we see that it has the limiting form s:

$$S_{R}(x) / \begin{array}{c} 1 = \frac{p}{x} & \text{for } x \mid 0 \\ \text{constant; for } x \mid 1 \end{array}$$
(5.40)

In particular, the limiting form as x ! 1 implies that for the physically relevant case of a square membrane  $L_2$ ,  $L_y$ , L ! 1, for which  $L_y >> L_2^z$ , bulk modes dominate, and we obtain,

$$R_G / L_2$$
: (5.41)

The simulations of BFT<sup>2</sup> measured  $R_G$  for phantom tubules by calculating the largest moment of inertia for for a set of membrane points that all had the same value of the intrinsic coordinate y. While we have used here a slightly di erent de nition, Eq.5.25, the square root of this moment of inertia should scale like our  $R_G$ . And, indeed, BFT found that it did scale like a power of L, as in Eq.5.41, with = 0.24 0.02 in excellent quantitative agreement with our predictions of = 1=4, Eq.5.38 evaluated in D = 2. It would be of great interest to test our full anisotropic scaling prediction of Eq.5.37 by varying the aspect ratio of the membrane in such simulations. For instance, one could x L<sub>2</sub> and increase  $L_y$ ; we predict that one should observe no change in  $R_G$ . The same should hold if one decreased  $L_{yp} \frac{at}{L_2}$ ,  $xed L_2 : R_G$  should remain unchanged until  $L_y$ ,  $L_2$ , at which point the tubule should begin to get thinner (i.e.  $R_G$  should decrease).

E quations 5.36 and 5.40 also correctly recover the lim it of L<sub>y</sub> = constant << L<sub>2</sub><sup>2</sup> ! 1 , where the q<sub>y</sub> = 0 \zero m odes" dom inate, the tubule sim ply becomes a phantom , coiled up, D 1-dimensional polymeric network of size L<sub>2</sub> embedded in d 1 dimensions, with the radius of gyration R<sub>G</sub> (L<sub>2</sub>)  $L_2^{(3 D)=2}$ . In the physical dimensions (D = 2 and d = 3) in particular this gives a coiled up idealpolymeroflength L<sub>2</sub> with R<sub>G</sub>  $L_2^{(1-2)}$ , as expected.

We now turn our attention to the calculation of the tubule roughness  $h_{\rm rm~s}$ . As we will see, here the  $q_2 = 0$  zero m ode will play an essential role and will 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  $h_{\rm rm~s}$ , Eq 5.26, we have

$$h_{\rm rm \ s}^{2} = 2 (d \quad D) \frac{k_{\rm B} T}{L_{2}^{\rm D-1}} \frac{Z}{L_{y^{-1}}} \frac{dq_{y}}{(2)} \frac{1}{(q_{y})q_{y}^{4}} (1 \quad e^{iq_{y} L_{y}})$$

$$+ k_{\rm B} T \frac{Z}{L_{2}^{-1};L_{y^{-1}}} \frac{d^{\rm D-1} q_{2} dq_{y}}{(2)^{\rm D}} \frac{(1 \quad e^{iq_{y} L_{y}})}{tq_{2}^{2} + q_{y}^{4}} : (5.42)$$

Here we observe that  $h_{\rm rm\ s}$  in Eq.5.42 does not receive any contribution from the  $q_y$  = 0 "zero mode" (i.e., in addition to the bulk mode,  $h_{\rm rm\ s}$  receives a contribution only from the  $q_2$  = 0 \zero mode"). This is to be contrasted with the behavior of  $R_G$  that we noted following Eq.5.32, and is responsible for the di erences in scaling properties of  $R_G$  and  $h_{\rm rm\ s}$ , notes above.

Now, for perverse and twisted reasons of our own, we choose to scale  $L_y$ , rather than  $L_2$ , out of the integrals in this expression, via the change of variables  $Q_y = q_z L_y^2$ ,  $Q_z = q_z L_y^2$ , which leads to

$$h_{\rm rm \ s}^2 = \left( \frac{C_2 L_y^3}{L_2^{\rm D-1}} + L_y^{\rm 5 \ 2D} \ L_{\rm h} \left( \frac{L_y}{L_2} \right) \right)$$
(5.43)

where

C<sub>2</sub> 2 (d D) kg T 
$$\frac{Z}{1} \frac{dQ_y}{2} \frac{(1 e^{jQ_y})}{Q_y^4}$$
: (5.44)

is yet another constant of 0 (1), and

$$I_{h}(\mathbf{x}) = 2 (d = D) \mathbf{k} T \frac{Z}{x^{2}; 1} \frac{d^{D-1} Q_{?} dQ_{y}}{(2)^{D}} \frac{(1 = e^{iQ_{y}})}{tQ_{?}^{2} + Q_{y}^{4}} :$$
(5.45)

De ning the scaling function

$$q = \frac{1}{C_2 x^{2(D-1)} + I_h(x)};$$
 (5.46)

we see that  $h_{\text{rm s}}$  can be rewritten in the scaling form

$$h_{\rm rm \ s} (L_2; L_y) = L_y S_h (L_y = L_2^z)$$
 (5.47)

with, for phantom membranes,

$$=\frac{5 \quad 2D}{2}$$
; (5.48)

$$z = \frac{1}{2}$$
: (5.49)

Again, this scaling law Eq.5.47 continues to apply when self-avoidance is included, but with dimensional values of and z.

Equations 5.37 and 5.47 give information about the tubule roughness for arbitrarily large size  $L_2$  and  $L_y$ , and arbitrary aspect ratio. For the physically relevant case of a square membrane  $L_2$   $L_y$  L ! 1, for which  $L_y >> L_2^2$ , we obtain,

$$h_{rm s} / \frac{L_y^{+(D-1)=2z}}{L_2^{(D-1)=2}};$$
 (5.50)

$$/ L^{+(D 1)(1 z)=2z}$$
; (5.51)

Equations 5.48, 5.49 then give, for a D = 2 phantom tubule, = 1=2, z = 1=2

$$h_{\rm rm \ s} = \frac{L_{\rm Y}^{3=2}}{L_{2}^{1=2}};$$
 (5.52)

and therefore predicts for a square m em brane

This prediction for square phantom membranes has also been spectacularly quantitatively con med in sim ulations by BFT<sup>2</sup>. Their ingenious procedure for determ ining  $h_{rm s}$  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 L, (our nd h<sub>rm s</sub> is in their notation) with = 0:895 0:06, in excellent agreement with our prediction = 1 from Eq.5.53 above. As with  $R_{G}$ , it would be interesting to test the full scaling law Eq 5.47 by sim ulating non-square membranes, and testing for the independent scaling of  $h_{rm s}$  with  $L_v$  and  $L_2$ . Note that, unlike  $R_{G}$ , according to Eq.5.52,  $h_{rm s}$  will show immediate growth (reduction) when one increases (decreases)  $L_v$  at xed  $L_?$ .

Because, unlike the at phase, no  $\log(L=a)$  correction arises, the (D = 2) phantom tubule is just marginally stable, but with wild transverse undulations which scale linearly with its length. As we will see in Sec.V I, these wild uctuations will be suppressed when the elects of self-avoidance are included.

The above discussion also reveals that our earlier conclusions about the lower critical dimension D  $_{\rm lc}$  for the existence of the tubule are strongly dependent on how L<sub>2</sub> and L<sub>y</sub> go to in nity relative to each other; i.e., on the mem brane aspect ratio. The earlier conclusion that

 $D_{\rm lc}=3\!=\!2$  only strictly applies when the bulk modes dom inate the physics, which is the case for a very squat membrane, with  $L_y$   $L_z^z$ , in which case  $L_y << L_2$ . For the physically more relevant case of a square phantom membrane, from the discussion above, we not that  $D_{\rm lc}=2$ , where the superscript means that there are no logarithm ic corrections at D=2 and therefore strictly speaking the D=2 tubule is marginally stable.

Equations 5.37 and 5.47 also correctly recover the lim it of  $L_2^z$  = constant <<  $L_y$ ! 1 , where the tubule sim ply becomes a polymer of thickness  $R_G$  (L  $_2$ ) given in Eq.5.25 of length  $L_y$  embedded in d 1 dimensions. As already discussed in the Introduction for a more general case of a self-avoiding tubule, these equations then correctly recover this polymer lim it giving

$$h_{\rm rm s}$$
  $L_{\rm P} (L_{\rm y}=L_{\rm P})^{3=2}$ ; (5.54)

with L<sub>2</sub> -dependent persistent length

$$L_{P}(L_{2}) / L_{2}^{D-1}$$
: (5.55)

which agrees with Eq.1.10 of Sec.I, for D = 2 when one remembers that, for the phantom membranes, = 0. So, as expected for a phantom tubule, if  $L_2$  does not grow fast enough (e.g. remains constant), while  $L_y$  ! 1, the tubule behaves as a linear polymer and crumples along its axis and the distinction between the crumpled and tubule phases disappears.

To sum marize: the radius of gyration  $R_{\,G}\,$  and the tubule roughness  $h_{rm\,s}\,$  scale di erently with mem brane size L for a square mem brane because the form er is dom – inated by bulk modes, while the latter is dom inated by  $q_{2}\,$  = 0 \zero modes".

### VI.SELF-AVOIDANCE IN THE TUBULE PHASE

We now look at the e ects of self-avoidance on the tubule phase, and begin by calculating the upper critical embedding dimension  $d_{uc}$  below which the self-avoidance becomes relevant in the tubule phase. A model of a self-avoiding membrane in the the tubule phase is described by a free energy functional which is a combination of the elastic free energy  $F_{el}$  from Eq.5.3 and the self-avoiding interaction  $F_{SA}$  from Eq.2.1 specialized to the tubule extended in y-direction using Eq.5.1 for r(x)

$$F_{SA} = \frac{b}{2}^{Z} dy dy^{0} d^{D-1} x_{2} d^{D-1} x_{2}^{0} (d^{-1}) \tilde{h}(x_{2}; y) \tilde{h}(x_{2}^{0}; y)$$

$$yy + u(x_{2}; y) yy^{0} u(x_{2}^{0}; y^{0}) : (6.1)$$

If the in-plane uctuations u scale sub-linearly with 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 med more form ally by an explicit renorm alization group analysis<sup>33</sup>. We then obtain a self-avoiding interaction that is local in y, with corrections that are irrelevant in the renorm alization group sense and therefore subdom inant at long length scales. The appropriate free energy that describes a self-avoiding tubule is then given by

$$F = \frac{1}{2} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \qquad (\theta_{y}u + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}\tilde{n})^{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}u)^{2} + (\theta_{y}^{2}\tilde{n})^{2} + t(\theta^{?}\tilde{n})^{2} + g_{?} (\theta^{?}u)^{2} + g_{y} \theta_{y}u + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}\tilde{n})^{2} + \frac{1}{2} (\theta_{y}u)^{2} + v dy d^{D-1} x_{?} d^{D-1} x_{?}^{0} (d-1) \tilde{n} (x_{?};y) \tilde{n} (x_{?}^{0};y);$$
(6.2)

where  $v = b=2_{v}$ .

It is important for simulators to note that, although the self-avoiding interaction is electively local in intrinsic coordinate y, this does not mean that the elects of selfavoidance can be included in simulations that have each particle on the mem brane avoid only those labeled by the same intrinsic y coordinate. Such a simulation, rather, models the very dilement (unphysical) self-avoiding interaction

$$F_{SA}^{w \text{ rong}} = v \quad dy \, d^{D-1} \, x_{?} \, d^{D-1} \, x_{?}^{0} \quad (u \, (x_{?} \, ; y)) \quad u \, (x_{?}^{0} \, ; y)$$

$$(d \ 1) \quad \tilde{h} \, (x_{?} \, ; y) \quad \tilde{h} \, (x_{?}^{0} \, ; y) \quad ; \qquad (6.3)$$

which accounts for interaction only of particles that have the same intrinsic coordinate y and the same extrinsic coordinate. For large m embranes, this unphysical interaction is sm aller than the true self-avoiding interaction in Eq.6.2 by a factor that scales like the inverse of the rm s

uctuations of u: hf i  $^{122}$ , as can be seen trivially from the scaling of the -function of u in Eq.6.3. Since these uctuations of u diverge as L<sub>?</sub> ! 1 like  $u_{\rm rm\ s}$   $L_2^{\rm u}$ , with  $_{\rm u}>0$  (e.g.,  $_{\rm u}$  = 1=8, for d 11 and D = 2), the wrong self-avoiding interaction in Eq.6.3 drastically underestimates the true self-avoiding interaction by a factor that diverges in the therm odynam ic limit. A lthough it is tempting to do so in simulations, one must be careful not to im plement the unphysical self-avoiding interaction in Eq.6.3. Since it m ight be di cult to im plement the approximate (but asymptotically exact) self-avoiding interaction the unapproximated interaction in Eq.6.1.

In the next three subsections we analyze the properties of a self-avoiding tubule described by this nonlinear elastic free energy, using F lory theory<sup>1</sup>, the renorm alization group, and the G aussian variationalm ethod<sup>1</sup>.

# A.Flory theory

The e ects of self-avoidance in the tubule phase can be estimated by generalizing standard F lory arguments from polymerphysics<sup>14</sup> to the extended tubule geometry. The total self-avoidance energy scales as

$$E_{SA} / V^{2}$$
; (6.4)

where

$$V / R_{G}^{d 1} L_{y}$$
 (6.5)

is the volume in the embedding space occupied by the tubule and = M = V is the embedding space density of the tubule. Using the fact that the tubule mass M scales like  $L_2^{D-1} L_y$ , we see that

$$E_{SA} / \frac{L_{y}L_{?}^{2(D-1)}}{R_{G}^{d-1}};$$
 (6.6)

U sing the radius of gyration  $R_{\rm G}$  /  $L_{\rm 2}$ , and considering, as required by the anisotropic scaling, a membrane with  $L_{\rm 2}$  /  $L_{\rm y}^2$ , we nd that  $E_{\rm SA}$  /  $L_{\rm y}^{\rm SA}$  around the phantom xed point, with

$$_{SA} = 1 + 4 (D \quad 1) \quad 2 (d \quad 1) ; \quad (6.7)$$

Self-avoidance is relevant when  $_{SA} > 0$ , which, from the above equation, happens for  $=_{ph} = (5 \quad 2D)=4$ (as per Eq.5.38) when the embedding dimension

$$d < d_{uc}^{SA} = \frac{6D}{5} \frac{1}{2D}$$
: (6.8)

For D = 2-dimensional membranes,  $d_{uc}^{SA} = 11$ . Thus, self-avoidance is strongly relevant for the tubule phase in d = 3, in contrast to the at phase.

We can estimate the e ect of the self-avoidance interactions on  $R_{\rm G}$  (L  $_2$  ) in F lory theory, by balancing the estimate Eq.6.6 for the self-avoidance energy with a similar estimate for the elastic energy:

$$E_{elastic} = t \frac{R_G}{L_2}^2 L_2^{D-1} L_y$$
: (6.9)

E quating  $E_{\rm elastic}$  with  $E_{\rm SA}$  , we obtain a F lory estimate for the radius of gyration  $R_{\rm G}$  :

$$R_{G}(L_{?}) / L_{?}^{F}; F = \frac{D+1}{d+1};$$
 (6.10)

which should be contrasted with the Flory estimate of  $_{\rm F}^{\rm c} = (D + 2)=(d + 2)$  for the crum pled phase. The sim – ilarity of the expressions is not surprising, since for the tubule phase the y-dimension decouples in both the intrinsic and the embedding spaces and is not a ected by the self-avoidance. For the physical case D = 2, d = 3 Eq.6.10 gives

$$R_{G} / L_{?}^{3=4}$$
; (6.11)

a result that is known to be exact for the radius of gyration of a D = 1-polymer embedded in d = 2dimensions.<sup>35</sup> Since the cross-section of the D = 2tubule, crudely speaking, traces out a crum pled polymer embedded in two dimensions (see Fig 2), it is intriguing to conjecture that = 3=4 is also the exact result for the scaling of the thickness of the tubule. Unfortunately, we have no strong arguments supporting this appealing conjecture.

For a square m m brane,  $L_{\rm y}$   $L_{\rm 2}$ , it is straightforward to argue, as we did previously, that the  $q_{\rm y}$  = 0 zero m odes do not contribute to  $R_{\rm G}$ , and  $L_{\rm 2}$  is the relevant cuto . Hence Eq.6.10 gives the correct radius of gyration. M ore generally, we expect

$$R_{G}(L_{?};L_{y}) / L_{?}S_{R} \frac{L_{y}}{L_{?}^{z}};$$
 (6.12)

where  $S_R(x)$  is the scaling function given in Eq.1.5 and z is the anisotropy exponent given in Eq.1.3.

### B.Renorm alization group and scaling relations

In this subsection, we present a renorm alization group analysis of the physical self-avoiding mem brane, which will also require a simultaneous treatment of the nonlinear elasticity that was already present in a phantom mem brane, as discussed in Sec.V.

The correct model, which incorporates the e ects of both the self-avoiding interaction and the anhamonic elasticity, is dened by the free energy Eq.62.

$$F = \frac{1}{2} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \quad (\ell_{y}^{2} \tilde{n})^{2} + t(\ell^{2} \tilde{n})^{2} + g_{?} (\ell^{2} u)^{2}$$

$$+ g_{y} \ell_{y} u + \frac{1}{2} (\ell_{y} \tilde{n})^{2}$$

$$+ v dy d^{D-1} x_{?} d^{D-1} x_{?}^{0} (d^{-1}) \tilde{n} (x_{?} ; y) \tilde{n} (x_{?}^{0} ; y) ;$$
(6.13)

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 xed at 1 even after the diagram matic corrections are taken into account (i.e., beyond the tree-level). We follow the standard renorm alization group procedure<sup>36</sup>:

(i) Integrate out uctuations of the Fourierm odes u (q) and ñ (q) of the elds u (x) and ñ (x) with wavevectors in the high wavevector shell  $e^1 < q_2 < , 1 < q < 1$ , where the ultraviolet cuto is of order an inverse m icroscopic length, and l is a parameter known as the \renorm alization group time". This integration can, of

course only be accomplished perturbatively in the non-linear couplings v and  $g_v\, \mbox{.}$ 

(ii) A nisotropically rescale lengths  $(x_2, y)$  and elds  $(\tilde{h}(x); u(x))$ , so as to restore the ultraviolet cuto to :

$$x_{?} = e^{1}x_{?}^{0}$$
; (6.14a)

$$y = e^{z^{1}}y^{0}$$
; (6.14b)

$$\tilde{n}(x) = e^{\frac{1}{h}0}(x^{0});$$
 (6.14c)

$$u(x) = e^{(2 - z) l} u^{0}(x^{0});$$
 (6.14d)

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  $(@_v u + \frac{1}{2} (@_v \hbar)^2)^2$ .

(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 same form as Eq.6.13.

A s discussed above, we will choose the arbitrary rescaling exponents and z so as to keep the renorm alized (1) and t(1) equal to one. This choice of and z can be shown by standard renorm alization group arguments to be the

and z that appear in the scaling function Eqs.1.1 and 12, as we will demonstrate later in this subsection.

The result of the three steps of the above renorm alization group transform ation (i.e., mode integration, rescaling, and coupling rede nition) can be sum marized in differential recursion relations for the owing coupling constants:

$$\frac{dt}{dl} = [2 + z + D - 3 + f(v)]t; \qquad (6.15)$$

$$\frac{d}{dl} = [2 \quad 3z + D \quad 1 + f(g_y; g_2)]; \quad (6.16)$$

$$\frac{dg_y}{dl} = [4 \quad 3z + D \quad 1 \quad gf(g_y)]g_y; \quad (6.17)$$

$$\frac{dg_2}{dl} = [4 \quad z + D \quad 3]g;$$
 (6.18)

$$\frac{dv}{dl} = [2D \quad 2 + z \quad (d \quad 1) \quad v fv] v; \quad (6.19)$$

where the various f-functions represent the graphical (i.e., perturbative) corrections. Since the self-avoiding interaction only involves  $\tilde{h}$ , and the parameters in the  $\tilde{h}$  propagator (t and ) are going to be held xed at 1, the graphical corrections coming from self-avoiding interaction alone depend only on the strength v of the self-avoiding 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  $(g_y;g_?)$  and  $f_g(g_y)$  are only functions of  $g_y$  and  $g_?$ .

It is important to note that g? su ers no graphical corrections, i.e., Eq.6.18 is exact. This is enforced by an exact symmetry

$$u(x_{2};y) ! u(x_{2};y) + (x_{2});$$
 (6.20)

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

W e further note that there is an additional tubule quuge"-like symmetry for  $q_v = 0$ 

$$\tilde{h}(x_{2}; y) ! \tilde{h}(x_{2}; y) + ~(y);$$
 (6.21)

under which the only remaining nonlinearity, the selfavoiding interaction, being local in y, is invariant. This \tubule gauge" symmetry demands that f ( $g_y = 0; g_2$ ) = 0, which implies that if  $g_y = 0$ , there is no divergent renormalization of , exactly, i.e., the selfavoiding interaction above cannot renormalize . This non-renormalization of by the self-avoiding interaction, in a truncated (unphysical) membrane model with  $g_y = 0$ , has been recently veri ed to all orders in a perturbative renormalization group calculation<sup>3</sup>.

To see that the and z obtained as xed point solutions of Eqs.6.15-6.19 have the same physical signi cance as the and z de ned in the scaling expressions Eqs.1.1 and 1.2 for the radius of gyration  $R_G$  and tubule wigglyness  $h_{\rm rm~s}$ , we use the renorm alization group transform ation to relate these quantities in the unrenorm alized system to those in the renorm alized one. This gives, for instance, for the radius of gyration

where t(l); (l);::: stand for all owing coupling constants whose evolution with lis determ ined by the recursion relations Eqs.6.15-6.19. Choosing  $l = l = logL_{?}$ this becomes:

$$R_{G} (L_{?}; L_{y}; t; ;:::) = L_{?} R_{G} (1; L_{y} = L_{?}^{z}; t(1); (1); :::):$$
(6.23)

This relation holds for any choice of the (after all, arbitrary) rescaling exponents and z. However, if we make the special choice such that Eqs.6.15-6.19 lead to xed points (see Eqs.6.36-6.39), t(1), (1); ::: in Eq.6.23 go to constants, independent of 1 (and hence  $L_2$ ), as  $L_2$  and hence l, go to in nity. Thus, in this limit, we obtain from Eq.6.23

$$R_{G} (L_{?}; L_{y}; t; ;:::) = L_{?} R_{G} (1; L_{y} = L_{?}^{z}; t; ;:::);$$
(6.24)

where t; ;:::are the xed point values of coupling constants. This result clearly agrees with the scaling form s for R<sub>G</sub>, Eq.1.1 (with analogous derivation for h<sub>rm s</sub>) if we de ne S<sub>R</sub> (x)  $R_{G}$  (1;x;t; ; ;g<sub>v</sub>;v).

The recursion relations Eqs.6.15-6.19 reproduce all of our phantom membrane results, as well as the upper critical embedding dimension  $d_{uc}^{SA}$  for self-avoidance predicted by F lory theory, Eq.6.7, and the upper critical

intrinsic dimension D<sub>uc</sub> = 5=2 for anom alous elasticity for phantom membranes. To see this, consider set the phantom membrane; i.e., v = 0. In this case,  $f_t(v) = 0$ , and to keep t(l) xed we see from the recursion relation Eq.6.15 for t(l) that we must choose

$$2 + z + D$$
  $3 = 0$ : (6.25)

Assuming for the moment that f  $(g_y; g_?)$  ! 0 as l! 1, which, as we shall see in a moment, it does for phantom membranes for D > 3=2, we see from the recursion relation Eq.6.16 for (1) that we must choose

2

$$3z + D$$
  $1 = 0$ : (6.26)

Solving Eqs.6.25 and 6.26 for z and yields the phantom mem brane results z = 1=2, = (5 2D)=4, as obtained in Eqs.5.38 and 5.39.

To extract the upper-critical embedding dimension  $d_{uc}^{S\,A}$  for self-avoidance from the renormalization group recursion relations, we construct from them a ow equation for a dimensionless coupling constant

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{a} \ \mathbf{b}} ; \tag{6.27}$$

where a and b will be chosen to eliminate the arbitrary rescaling exponents and z from the recursion relation for v. This requirement lead to the choice

$$a = (3d \ 5) = 8;$$
 (6.28)

$$b = (d + 1) = 8;$$
 (6.29)

which implies:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{v}}{dl} = [6D \quad 1 \quad (5 \quad 2D)d] = 4 \quad \sqrt{f} + \frac{d+1}{8}f$$

$$\frac{3d \quad 5}{8}f_t \quad \mathbf{v}; \qquad (6.30)$$

O f course, an identical ow equation is obtained for v(l) if one instead requires that t(l) and (l) are xed, i.e., independent of l, thereby determining and z and using them inside Eq.6.19.

It is easy to see that the sign of the term s in the square bracket determ ines the relevance of the self-avoiding interaction, which becomes relevant when

6D 1 (5 2D)
$$d > 0$$
; (6.31)

i.e., for  $d < d_{\rm uc}^{\rm S\,A}$  = (6D 1)=(5 2D), consistent with the analysis of the F lory theory, Eq.6.7.

Likewise, the renormalization group ow equations contain information about the upper-critical intrinsic dimension for the anomalous elasticity,  $D_{uc}$ , below which tubule elasticity becomes anomalous. This can be seen (analogously to the discussion of the relevance of self-avoidance coupling v) by using Eqs.6.15-6.17 to construct the renormalization group ow equation for the dimensionless coupling constant

$$g_y = \frac{g_y}{t^{3-4} 5-4}$$
; (6.32)

chosen such that its ow

$$\frac{dg_{y}}{dl} = \frac{5}{2} \quad D \quad f_{f} \quad \frac{5}{4}f + \frac{3}{4}f_{t} \quad g_{y}; \quad (6.33)$$

is independent of the arbitrary rescaling exponents z and

. Again the same recursion relation can be obtained by instead using the values of z and required to keep t(l) and (l) xed inside the ow equation for g(l), Eq.6.17. It is then obvious that anharm onic elasticity becomes relevant for D < D<sub>uc</sub> = 5=2, where anom alous elasticity of the tubule is induced. A swe will see below, in a phantom tubule or a tubule embedded in d > d , this anom alous elasticity manifests itself only in phonon (u)

uctuations, i.e., softens q, but does not renorm alize the bending rigidity . In physical tubules, however, which are self-avoiding and are embedded in d = 3 < d 6.5, the elasticity is fully anom alous, both with respect to the phonon u uctuations (i.e. q, vanishes as q ! 0) and the height h undulations (i.e. 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 as we did in Sec.V for the phantom tubule, obtaining

$$F = \frac{1}{2}^{Z} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \quad (\theta_{y}^{2} \hbar)^{2} + t (\theta^{?} \hbar)^{2} + F_{anh} [\hbar] + F_{SA} [\hbar]$$
(6.34)

where,  $F_{anh}$  is the non-local interaction, Eq.5.11, m ediated by integrated out phonons, with a kernel

$$V_{h}(q) = \frac{g_{y}g_{?}q_{?}^{2}}{g_{y}q_{y}^{2} + g_{?}q_{?}^{2}}; \qquad (6.35)$$

and  $F_{SA}$  is the self-avoiding interaction.

The long wavelength properties of the tubule phase will very much depend on the behavior of the denom inator in the kernel  $V_h$  at long length scales. If  $g_y(q)q_y^2 >> g_2(q)q_2^2$  (as we saw for a phantom tubule) then at long scales  $V_h(q) = q_q^2 = q_y^2$ , which behaves like  $q_z^2$  in the relevant limit of  $q_2 = q_y^2$ . In this case, simple power counting around the Gaussian xed point then shows that this elastic nonlinearity only becomes relevant for  $D < D_{uc} = 3=2$ , i.e. is irrelevant for a physical D = 2- dimensional tubule, as we argued in Sec.V.

O n the other hand, if the scaling is such that  $g_{r}(q)q_{r}^{2}$  dom inates over  $g_{y}(q)q_{y}^{2}$ , then  $V_{h}(q) = g_{r}$ , i.e. a constant at long length scales. Sim ple power-counting then shows that this coupling is relevant for  $D < D_{uc} = 5=2$  and the bending rigidity m odulus of a D = 2-dimensional tubule 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  $q_2$   $q_2^2 << q_y$  (in the long wavelength lim it), the anham onic nonlinearity is irrelevant for D >

3=2 and is not anom alous. We now need to extend this analysis to a physical tubule, i.e., to include the e ects of self-avoidance.

The analysis of the behavior of  $V_h$  (q) (which determines the relevance of anharmonic elasticity) at long scales, around an arbitrary xed point, is more conveniently done using the language of the renormalization group through the recursion relations Eqs.6.15 and 6.19. At the globally stable xed point, in the presence of both the nonlinear elasticity and the self-avoiding interaction, we can keep t = 1 and  $g_y$  and v xed at xed point values, by requiring

$$2 + z + D$$
  $3 \pm f(v) = 0;$  (6.36)

2 
$$3z + D$$
  $1 + f(g_v; g_2) = 0;$  (6.37)

4 
$$3z + D$$
 1  $gf(g_v) = 0$ ; (6.38)

$$2(D 1) + z$$
 (d 1)  $v_{v}$  for  $v = 0$ : (6.39)

In light of the above discussion, the anharm onic vertex for  $\hbar$  in this renorm alization group picture becomes relevant when  $g_{\rm ?}$  (l! 1) renorm alizes to in nity, while it is irrelevant when  $g_{\rm ?}$  (l! 1) ows to zero. Thus, the relevance of  $V_{\rm h}$  is decided by the sign of the renorm alization group ow eigenvalue of  $g_{\rm }$  (l) in Eq.6.18

$$g_{2} = 4 \qquad z + D \qquad 3; \qquad (6.40)$$

which is exactly determ ined by the values of z, since  $g_2$  su ers no graphical renorm alization.

A swe have discussed in previous sections, for a phantom tubule = (5 2D)=4 and z = 1=2. For  $d < \hat{q}_c^A = (6D \quad 1)=(5 \quad 2D) (= 11 \text{ for } D = 2)$ , these values are modied by the self-avoiding interaction, but only by order  $d \quad \Re^A$ , i.e.

$$= (5 \ 2D) = 4 + O();$$
 (6.41)

$$= 1=2+0():$$
 (6.42)

Hence a D = 2-dimensional tubule, embedded in d dimensions close to  $d_{u\,c}^{S\,A}$  = 11,  $_{g_2}$  = 1=2 and g (1) ow s according to

7.

$$\frac{dg_{?}}{dl} = \left[\frac{1}{2} + 0()\right]g_{r}; \qquad (6.43)$$

i.e.  $g_{1}$  is irrelevant near d = 11 (for 1),  $V_{h}(q)$   $g_{2}q_{2}^{2}=q_{2}^{2}$   $q_{1}^{2}$   $c_{1}^{2}$   $c_{1}^{(0)}$  is irrelevant for a physical D = 2dimensional tubule , and, hence, f in Eq.6.16 vanishes as  $l \mid 1$ . So is unrenormalized near d = 11, for D = 2. That is, as we described above, the anham onic elasticity is irrelevant to the bend elasticity for embedding dimensions near  $d_{uc}^{S,A}$ , and in this case the full model of a self-avoiding tubule with nonlinear elasticity reduces to the linear elastic truncated model introduced by us<sup>1</sup> and recently further analyzed in R ef. 3.

In this simpler (but unphysical) case, one is justified in ignoring the nonlinear elasticity. One is then able to analyze (perturbatively in  $= d_{LC}^{SA}$  d) the elects of the self-avoiding interaction alone, by computing the functions  $f_t(v)$  and  $f_v(v)$  appearing in Eqs.6.15 and 6.19.<sup>3</sup> Since, as we discussed above, the <code>\tubule</code> gauge" sym – metry guarantees that in this case the self-avoiding interaction alone cannot renormalize , f=0. Thus, for d near  $d_{uc}^{S\,A}$ , Eq.6.37, leads to =0 and an exact exponent relation (leaving only a single independent tubule shape exponent):

$$z = \frac{1}{3}(2 + D - 1);$$
 (6.44)

which is exact for a nite range  $d < d < d_{uc}^{SA}$  of embedding dimensions, and for phantom tubules in any embedding dimension. This result has been independently obtained in Ref. 3.

However, this simple scenario, and, in particular, the scaling relation Eq.6.44, is guaranteed to break down as d is reduced. The reason for this is that, as d decreases, increases, and eventually becomes so large that the eigenvalue  $g_{?}$  of  $g_{?}$  changes sign and becomes positive. As discussed earlier, once this happens, the nonlinear vertex Eq.6.35 becomes relevant, and acquires a divergent renormalization, i.e., f  $\notin$  0, and bend tubule elasticity becomes anomalous. We will now show that the critical dimension d below which this happens for D = 2 is guaranteed to be > 7=2, and hence, obviously, > 3.

To show this, we use the exponent relation Eq.6.44, which is valid for d > d, inside the expression for the eigenvalue  $g_2$ , Eq.6.40, obtaining

$$g_2 = \frac{1}{3} (10 + 2D = 8) :$$
 (6.45)

W e then take advantage of a rigorous lower bound on

$$> \frac{D}{d} \frac{1}{1};$$
 (6.46)

in posed by the condition that the monomer density

/  $L_2^{D-1} = R_G^{d-1}$  /  $L_2^{D-1}$  (d-1) remain nite in the thermodynamic  $L_2$  ! 1 limit. Using this bound inside Eq.6.45 we obtain

$$g_{2} = \frac{1}{3} = 10 \frac{D}{d} = \frac{1}{1} + 2D = 8$$
; (6.47)

from which it follows that  $\ _{g_{?}}$  must become positive for  $d \leq \ d^{lb} (D$  ) with

$$d^{1b}(D) = \frac{4D}{4} \frac{1}{D};$$
 (6.48)

$$d^{1b}(2) = 7=2;$$
 (6.49)

as asserted above.

In fact, d (2) is probably quite a bit bigger than its 7=2 low erbound, as two estimates of it indicate. If, for example, we take the F bry tubule exponent = (D + 1)=(d+1) in Eq.6.45, we obtain:

$$d^{\rm F} = \frac{6{\rm D} + 1}{4 ~ {\rm D}}; \qquad (6.50)$$

$$d^{F}(2) = 13=2;$$
 (6.51)

while if we use the = 11 d{expansion result for of Bowick and Guitter,  $(D = 2)^3$ 

$$=\frac{3}{4+}$$
  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; (6.52)

with

$$= 1.05 - ;$$
 (6.53)

we obtain

$$d = 5:92:$$
 (6.54)

So, based on the above estimates, we expect that in a D = 2-dimensional tubule, embedded in d < d 6, the

xed point of the truncated tubule m odel introduced by  $us^1$  and studied in Ref.3, is unstable to anharm onic elasticity  $F_{anh}$ . This means that diverges at long length scales, and the scaling relation Eq.6.44 between z and breaks down. Thus, for the physical embedding dimension d = 3, the tubule bend elasticity is certainly anom alous, in the sense that diverges, and probably quite strongly. We have summarized the above discussion in Fig.6, schematically illustrating how the renormalization group ow of g, and therefore the anomalous elasticity, change (at d) as a function of embedding dimension d.



FIG.6. Schem atic illustration (specialized to D = 2) of change in relevance of  $g_2$  (1) which occurs at d. For embedding dimensions below d (which includes the physical case of d = 3),  $g_2$  (1) becomes relevant, leading to anom abus bending elasticity with (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.

0 noe d < d, the new nontrivial relations Eqs.6.37 and 6.38 hold, with functions f  $(g_y; g_?)$  and  $f_g(g_y)$  evaluated at the xed point values g, and  $g_?$ .

U sing the sort of renormalization group correlation function matching calculations described earlier, Eqs.6.22-6.24, it is straightforward to show that the correlation functions of the tubule, including anomalous elastice ects, are correctly given by the harm onic results, Eqs.5.6 and 5.7, except that the elastic constants  $g_y$  and

must be replaced by wavevector dependent quantities that vanish and diverge, respectively as q ! 0:

$$g_{y}(q) = q_{y}^{u} S_{g}(q_{y}=q_{2}^{z});$$
 (6.55)

$$(q) = q_y \quad S \quad (q_y = q_p^z);$$
 (6.56)

with

$$z = f (g_v; g_?);$$
 (6.57)

$$z_{u} = f_{g}(g_{y})$$
: (6.58)

O ur earlier conclusion that the relevance of  $V_h$  is determ ined by the sign of  $g_2$  (Eq.6.40) can be reproduced by simply noting that  $g_y(q)q_y^2$  scales like  $q_y^{u+2}$ , and in the long wavelength limit is therefore subdom inant to  $g_2 q_2^2 = q_2^{2=z}$  when

$$z_u > 2 2z;$$
 (6.59)

which, upon using Eq.6.38 and the de nition of  $_{u} = f_{q} (g_{v}) = z$ , is identical to the condition that  $_{q_{2}} > 0$ .

The scaling functions have the asymptotic form s

$$S_{g}(x ! 0) ! x ";$$
 (6.60)

C om bining the expressions Eqs.6.57 and 6.58 for and  $_{\rm u}$  with the RG xed point conditions Eqs.6.37 and 6.38 shows that, at this new globally stable xed point, two exact relations hold between four independent exponents z, , , and  $_{\rm u}$  (instead of a single relation Eq.6.44 between two exponents)

$$z = \frac{1}{3}$$
 (2 + D 1); (6.62)

$$z = \frac{1}{3 + u} (4 + D - 1)$$
: (6.63)

T hat is, in contrast to the behavior for d > d, for d < dthere are two independent exponents characterizing the tubule phase, not one. We furtherm ore note that these exponent relations autom atically contain the rotational sym m etry W ard identity. T his can be easily seen by elim – inating from Eqs.6.62 and 6.63, obtaining

$$2 + u = 3$$
 (D 1)=z: (6.64)

U ltim ately, the origin of this relation is the requirement that graphical corrections do not change the form of the rotationally invariant operator  $(@_y u + \frac{1}{2} (@_y \hbar)^2)$ .

Just as the divergence of is controlled by f  $(g_y; g_2)$ , the softening of  $g_y(q)$   $q^u$  is determined by the  $u = zf_g(g_y)$ . Because  $f_g(0) = 0$ , this physical  $g_y(q)$  remains non-zero and nite as q ! 0, only if the running coupling  $g_y(1)$  in the renormalization group recursion equation Eq.6.17 does go to zero (because then the graphical piece  $f_g(g)$  vanishes). Examining the ow equation for  $g_y(1)$ , Eq.6.17, for  $g_y(1)$  to vanish, we must have

4 
$$3z + D$$
  $1 < 0$ : (6.65)

However, using the lower bound on , Eq.6.46 in the physical case of D = 2 and d = 3, we nd > 1=2. Hence, as long as z < 1, the condition Eq.6.65 is not satised, and therefore  $q_{r}(q ! 0) ! 0$ , that is, u > 0. We sum marize the above discussion in Fig.7.



FIG.7. Schem atic of the tubule \phase" diagram in the embedding d vs intrinsic D dimensions. Self-avoiding interaction becomes relevant for  $d < d_{uc}^{SA}(D) = (6D \quad 1)=(5 \quad 2D)$ , (= 11, for D = 2). Below the d (D) curve (for which the lower bound is  $d^{lb}(D) = (4D \quad 1)=(4 \quad D)$ ) the anharm onic elasticity becomes relevant, leading to anom alous elasticity with a divergent bending rigidity.

W e now show that the above general analysis of tubule anom abus elasticity in the presence of self avoidance, obtained using the renormalization group, can be reproduced via a heuristic, but beautiful physical argument sim ilar to that used by Landau and Lifshitz<sup>27</sup> to derive shell theory. For a tubule of diameter R<sub>G</sub>, the non-zero shear g<sub>y</sub> elasticity leads to an elective R<sub>G</sub> dependent bending rigidity modulus which will be L<sub>2</sub> and L<sub>y</sub>-dependent if the tubule diameter depends on L<sub>2</sub> and L<sub>y</sub>. This can be seen as follows (see Fig.8):



FIG.8. Illustration of the physical mechanism for the enhancement of the bending rigidity by the shear  $g_y$  elasticity. To bend a polymerized 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 renormalization of the bending rigidity and to the W ard identity Eq.6.67, as described in more detail in the text.

If we bend the tubule with some radius of curvature  $R_c$   $R_G$ , simple geometry tells us that this will induce a strain "  $G_y$  along the tubule axis of order "  $R_G = R_c$ , since the outer edge of the tubule must be stretched by this factor, and the inner edge compressed by it, in order to accomplish the required bend. This strain induces an additional elastic energy density (i.e., additional to those coming from the bare ), namely those coming from the u elastic energy. This goes like  $g_y (L_y; L_2)^{n^2} = g_y (L_y; L_2) (R_G (L_y) = R_c)^2$ . Interpreting this additional energy as an elastic bending energy density  $y (L_2; L_y) = R_c^2$ , leads to the elastic bending modulus  $y (L_2; L_y)$ ,

$$_{y}$$
 (L<sub>2</sub>; L<sub>y</sub>)  $g_{r}$  (L<sub>2</sub>; L<sub>y</sub>)R<sub>G</sub> (L<sub>2</sub>; L<sub>y</sub>)<sup>2</sup>; (6.66)

Inserting the scaling form s  $_{y}(L_{2};L_{y}) = L_{y} S (L_{y}=L_{2}^{z}),$  $g_{y}(L_{2};L_{y}) = L_{y} \ ^{u}S_{g}(L_{y}=L_{2}^{z})$  and  $R_{G}(L_{2};L_{y}) = L_{2}S_{R} (L_{y}=L_{2}^{z})$  into above expression, we obtain a relation between the scaling exponents

$$2 = z( + u)$$
: (6.67)

which is exactly the exponent relation one obtains by subtracting Eq.6.37 from Eq.6.38, and using the expressions Eq.6.57 and 6.58 for  $and_u$ , all of which were obtained using renorm alization group arguments.

Since the above physical shell argument is very general, Eqs.6.66 and 6.67 hold independent of the mechanism that generates anom abus elasticity. For the case of the phantom membrane (for D > 3=2) Eq.6.66 reveals that is not anom abusbecause the softening of the shear modulus  $g_y(q)$  by thermal uctuations precisely compensates the bending rigidity produced by the nite diameter  $R_G$  of the tubule. Equation 6.67 then correctly predicts

for the phantom tubule that  $_{u} = 2 = z$ , which is consistent with the phantom tubule results  $_{u} = 5 2D$ , = (5 2D)=4, and z = 1=2. Furtherm ore, because the anharm onic elasticity  $V_{h}$  (q) is irrelevant for d > d,

$$u = 2 = z;$$
 (6.68)

is valid, even in a self-avoiding tubule embedded in these high dimensions.

We note, nally, that all of the exponents must show a jump discontinuity at d, as shown in Fig.9. Therefore, unfortunately, an extrapolation from = 11 d{ expansion in a truncated model with linear elasticity<sup>3</sup> down to the physical dimension of d = 3 (which is below d) gives little inform ation about the properties of a real tubule.



FIG.9. Schematic graph of the shape exponent and anom alous bend exponent (for D = 2). Note the jump discontinuity as a function of embedding dimension d, occurring at d = d 6.

The computations for a physical tubule must be performed for d < d, where both the self-avoidance and the anham onic nonlinearities are relevant and must be handled simultaneously. As we discussed above, for d < d, the eigenvalue  $g_2 > 0$ , leading to the ow of  $g_1$  (1) to in nity, which in turn leads to  $V_h(q) = g_y$ . Physically this regime of  $g_2$  ! 1 corresponds to freezing out the phonons u, i.e. setting u = 0 in the free energy F [ħ;u] in Eq.6.13. This is consistent with our noting that for d < d, in the elective free energy F [ħ] (with phonons integrated out), Eq.6.34, the kernel  $V_h = g_y$ . The resulting elective free energy functional for a physical self-avoiding tubule is

$$F = \frac{1}{2} \int_{Z}^{Z} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \quad (@_{y}^{2}\hbar)^{2} + t(@^{?}\hbar)^{2} + \frac{1}{4} g_{y} (@_{y}\hbar)^{4} + v dy d^{D-1} x_{?} d^{D-1} x_{?}^{0-(d-1)} \hbar(x_{?};y) \quad \hbar(x_{?}^{0};y) ;$$
(6.69)

Unfortunately, no controlled perturbative study is possible for d < d, since one must perturb in  $g_y$  around a nontrivial, strong coupling xed described by v = 0 (1) and  $g_y = 0$ . Furtherm ore, as we will show below, at this xed point there is no upper critical dimension for  $g_y$ , i.e. anharm onic nonlinearities are always relevant for d = 3 < d, for any D. This strongly contrasts with the Gaussian xed point (describing phantom membranes) at which the anharm onic nonlinearity is only relevant for  $D < D_{uc} = 5=2$ .

In what follows, we will illustrate how one might attempt to actually calculate the exponents , z, , and  $_u$ , for d < d, and enumerate the (m any) technical di - culties that prevent us from doing so, and conclude with a cautionary list of several unsuccessful uncontrolled approximations 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 Eqs.6.15-6.19, which represent the perturbative (\graphical") corrections to the associated coupling constants. Once these f-functions are known they give 4 equations (Eqs.6.36-6.39) that uniquely determining the 4 unknowns tubule shape exponents, , z, v, and  $g_y$ , as well as the the

ow of g (1), and therefore completely characterize the long wavelength properties of self-avoiding anharm onic tubules.

O ur goal then is to calculate  $f_t\left(v\right), f_v\left(v\right), f\left(g_y\right)$ , and  $f_g\left(g_y\right)$ . The functions  $f_g\left(g_y\right)$  and f $\left(g_y\right)$  are determined by the diagram matic corrections to  $g_y$  and , with the corresponding Feynm an diagram s displayed in Fig.10. The results to leading order in  $g_y$ , are

$$f(g_y) = C g_y^2;$$
 (6.70)

$$f_{g}(g_{y}) = C_{g}g_{y};$$
 (6.71)

where C and  $C_g$  are d and D-dependent constants, whose calculation proves to be the sticking point, as we will describe below .



FIG .10. Feynm an graphs that renorm alize: (a) the anharm 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 gy. That is, we do not expect  $g_v$  to be 0 (d d), but, rather, 0 (1), even for d d << 1. Furtherm ore, of course, since d 6, d d is not small in the physical case d = 3 anyway. For both of these reasons, truncating the calculations of f and  $f_q$  at the leading order in  $g_v$ , as we have done in Eqs.6.70 and 6.71, is an uncontrolled, and far from trustworthy approximation. However, 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 Cq has eluded us.

To complete the characterization of the xed point we can proceed in two ways. The most direct way is to simply perturbatively evaluate the functions  $f_t(v)$ ,  $f_v(v)$ . Luckily (for us) this has recently been done by Bowick and Guitter<sup>3</sup> in a truncated harm onic tubule model (previously introduced and studied by  $us^1$ ) near  $d = d_{uc}^{SA}$ . A lthough, 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 important), for lack of being able to do any better we extrapolate these functions, computed near d = 11,<sup>3</sup> down to d = 3

$$f_t(v) = C_t v;$$
 (6.72)

$$f_v(v) = C_v v;$$
 (6.73)

Now using Eqs.6.70(6.73 in Eqs.6.36(6.39 we obtain four equations for four unknowns (z, ,  $q_y$ , and v ), expressed in term s constants C ,  $C_g$ ,  $C_t$  and  $C_v$ , (specialized here to D = 2).

$$2 + z = 1 \quad \text{Gv} = 0;$$
 (6.74)

2 
$$3z + 1 + C g_v^2 = 0$$
; (6.75)

4 3z + 1  $Gg_y = 0$ ; (6.76)

$$+ z$$
 (d 1)  $\xi v = 0$ : (6.77)

where the constants  $C_{t}$  and  $C_{v}$  (computed in the truncated tubule model near d =  $d_{u\,c}^{S\,A}$  for D = 2) are given by  $^{3}$ 

2

$$C_t = \frac{1}{8^{-2}}$$
; (6.78)

$$C_v = \frac{0.068}{5=2}$$
; (6.79)

These equations can be uniquely solved for  $, z, q_{,}$  and v. In term sofC and C<sub>g</sub>, in D = 2 and d = 3 we obtain for and z

$$=\frac{1}{4C}$$
; (6.80)

$$z = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6C} + \frac{C_g}{6C}; \qquad (6.81)$$

from which and  $_{\rm u}$  can also be determ ined using the solution for  $\rm g_v$  inside Eqs.6.57 and 6.58

$$= \frac{3C_g}{1 + C_g + 2C};$$
(6.82)

$$_{u} = \frac{3 \quad 3C_{g}}{1 + C_{g} + 2C} ; \qquad (6.83)$$

A nother approach to estimating the tubule shape exponents is to rely on the usual accuracy of the F bry theory (in treating the e ects of  $\mathfrak{self}$ -avoidance), instead of the extrapolation of functions  $f_v(v)$  and  $f_t(v)$  down from

-expansion. A lthough it is usually not stated this way, in the language of renorm alization group, F lory theory am ounts to assum ing that the graphical corrections to t and to v are the same, i.e.  $f_v(v) = f_t(v)$ . U sing this in Eqs.6.36 and 6.39, we obtain the F lory result for

$$_{\rm F} = \frac{{\rm D} + 1}{{\rm d} + 1} ; \qquad (6.84)$$

$$=\frac{3}{4}$$
; for d = 3; D = 2; (6.85)

consistent with our earlier analysis in subsection VIA. Note that, if  $f_v(v) = f_t(v)$  for all v, this result would be exact independent of the jump in the other exponents z,

, and  $\ _{\rm u}$  at d . That is, it would apply even below d , and  $\$ would not jump, or be in any way non-analytic, at d .

Now, of course, we know from the explicit leading order calculation in Ref. 3 that  $f_v(v)$  does not =  $f_t(v)$  exactly. However, we do know from that calculation that they are quite close, at least to leading order, as illustrated by the good agreem ent between F lory theory and the extrapolated -expansion. If this persists down to d = 3, and to large v, and our experience with polymers suggests that it will, then may be quite accurately predicted by F lory theory, despite the com plications associated with the onset of anom alous bend elasticity at d.

U sing the F lory value for (Eq.6.84) inside Eqs.6.75 and 6.76, together with the diagram matic corrections to

and  $g_y$  given in Eqs.6.70 and 6.71, we obtain two equations (specialized to D = 2)

$$6=(d+1)$$
  $3z+1+C g_v^2 = 0$ ; (6.86)

$$12=(d+1)$$
  $3z+1$   $C_{r}g_{v}=0$ ; (6.87)

which gives for d = 3

$$z = \frac{4}{3} + \frac{C_g^2}{6C} - \frac{C_g (C_g^2 + 6C)^{1=2}}{6C}; \quad (6.88)$$

Now, at least in this uncontrolled approximation of truncated perturbation theory at one loop order, it seems that we are left with the straightforward task of calculating the constants C and  $C_g$ . A las, things are not so simple, for reasons that are undoubtedly connected with the fact that d is not perturbatively close to  $d_{uc}^{SA}$ , which

is the only dimension about which one can do a genuinely controlled approximation<sup>1;3</sup>, and the much more surprising fact that, even though  $_{\rm I}$  5=2 D is only 1=2 (for D = 2), this  $_{\rm I}$ -expansion in intrinsic dimension, as we will show, is demonstrably extrem ely unreliable, giving qualitatively di erent answers, such as a reduction, rather than an increase of due to uctuations.

O ur unsuccessful (but heroic) attem pts to calculate C  $_{\rm g}$  and C  $\,$  w ere as follow s:

(I)

Calculate them in an  $_{\rm I}$  5=2 D -expansion for a phantom membrane, then use these same constants C $_{\rm g}$  and C for the real, self-avoiding membrane. This approach obviously makes many errors, since, by the time we get down to d (5=2), the correlation functions of the true, self-avoiding membrane are already quite di erent from those of the phantom membrane, due to the e ects of self-avoidance. Furthermore, these e ects are particularly pronounced for intrinsic dimensions D = 5=2, since  $d_{\rm uc}^{\rm SA}$  (5=2) = 1 , as illustrated in Fig.7.

Nonetheless, since no other analytical calculation is available (and we are persistent young lads), we attempted this I5=2 D-expansion. However, the results made no physical sense: we found a negative ie, a downward renorm alization of . The detailed calculations are virtually identical to those for the renormalization of at the tubule-to-crum pled phase transition, which are described in Sec.V II. We note here sim ply that the origin of this negative contribution to is a negative region of the real-space correlation function  $G(x_2; y) = C(x_2 = y^2)^{1=4} Y(x_2 = y^2)$ , as given by Eq.7.31. The integrand  $x^{5=4}Y^{3}(x)$  in the x-integral of Eq.7.37 has a negative region which, though narrow, actually overwhelms the positive contribution to from the much longer, but smaller, tail, as we have veri ed by direct num erical integration<sup>38</sup>.

This negative region is purely an artifact of calculating in a fractional intrinsic dimension D = 5=2. In D = 2 for a phantom membrane, where there is no relevant anom alous elasticity for  $\tilde{h}$ , and hence we can calculate  $\tilde{h}$ - $\tilde{h}$  correlation functions exactly, we nd the analog of Eq.7.31 is

$$G(x;y) = \frac{Z}{(2)^2} \frac{dq_x dq_y}{q_x^2} \frac{e^{iq_x x + iq_y y} q_y^2}{q_x^2 + q_y^4}; \qquad (6.89)$$

$$= \frac{1}{4(jx)^{1-2}} e^{y^{2} = (4jx)}; \qquad (6.90)$$

which, unlike the analogous correlation function in D = 5=2, Eq.7.31, is positive de nite. Thus, the anom abus contribution to in D = 2 will also be positive, as we expect on physical grounds (i.e., the shell theory argument summarized in Eq.6.66), while the 5=2 D -expansion is qualitatively wrong in predicting a negative renormalization of . Clearly, it cannot be trusted quantitatively either, and is, in fact, totally useless.

D irect, uncontrolled RG in D = 2. Now, we at least get qualitatively correct upward renorm alization of . How - ever, here we have a di erent problem, that appears in any perturbative calculation away from an upper critical dimension (and is usually \swept under the nug"): 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 manipulations that lead to Eq.7.35, we nd a contribution to of the form

$$= q \int_{0}^{Z} \int_{0}^{c_2} q_y^{-1} \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{1}{x^{3-2}} dx \frac{e^{3=(4x)}}{x^{3-2}}; \quad (6.91)$$

where  $c_1$  is a well-determ ined constant that we could calculate, and  $c_2$  is an arbitrary constant which depends on precisely how the infrared divergence of the above integral is cuto with q. This arbitrary constant is the problem : if the integral Eq.6.91 had diverged logarithm ically, the precise value of the constant  $c_2$  would be unimportant (it would just lead to a nite additive constant). But, since the integral in Eq.6.91 diverges so strongly (like  $(c_2=q_y)^2$ ) 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 simply calculating one loop constants like  $C_g$  and C, is doom ed.

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

Here we study the e ects of self-avoidance within the tubule phase using the Gaussian variational method, which was previously applied to the study of self-avoidance in crum pled isotropic membranes<sup>21;22</sup> and in polymers<sup>37</sup>. It is important to emphasize that both F lory theory and the Gaussian variational method are uncontrolled approximations in that there is now ay to system – atically estimate and reduce the error.

We begin with the elective H am iltonian that describes the long wavelength behavior of the tubule for d < d.

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \int_{Z}^{Z} d^{D-1} x_{?} dy \quad (@_{y}^{2}\hbar)^{2} + t(@^{?}\hbar)^{2} + \frac{1}{4} g_{y} (@_{y}\hbar)^{4} + v dy d^{D-1} x_{?} d^{D-1} x_{?}^{0-(d-1)} \hbar(x_{?};y) \quad \hbar(x_{?}^{0};y) ;$$
(6.92)

where, in contrast to other sections we use the notation H to distinguish long-wavelength elective H am iltonian (the free energy functional) from the actual free energy F. C omputation of correlation functions in the presence of the self-avoiding nonlinearity cannot be done exactly.

However, we can replace the Ham iltonian H, Eq.6.92 by a variational Ham iltonian H<sub>v</sub>, quadratic in the elds  $\hbar (x_2; y)$ , which allows exact calculations of any correlation function. Following the standard variational procedure, we then pick the \best" form of this variational Ham iltonian, where by \best" we mean that it minim izes an upper bound on the true free energy F :<sup>39</sup>

$$F F h H H_v i_v + F_v$$
: (6.93)

W e take our variation ansatz H am iltonian to be

$$H_{v} = \frac{1}{2}^{Z} \frac{dk_{y}d^{D-1}k_{?}}{(2)^{D}}G_{v}(k_{?};k_{y})\tilde{J}(k_{?};k_{y})\hat{J}; \quad (6.94)$$

where  $G_v(k_?;k_y)$  is the variational kernel to be optim ized over. Note that because of an isotropy intrinsic to the tubule,  $G_v(k_?;k_y)$  is not rotationally invariant as it is for the analogous analysis of the crum pled phase.

We now compute the right-hand-side of Eq.6.93 and minimize it over  $G_v$  (k<sub>2</sub>; k<sub>v</sub>).

$$\begin{array}{cccc} hH & H_{v}i_{v} = \frac{A}{2} & k_{y}^{4} + tk_{?}^{2} & G_{v}(k_{?};k_{y}) & hf(k_{?};k_{y})f_{i_{v}} \\ & Z & Z \\ & + \frac{g_{y}}{8} & h(\theta_{y}h)^{4}i_{v} + v & (d \ 1) & h(k_{?};y) & h(k_{?}^{0};y) & v ; \\ & & & & & & \\ \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (d \ 1) & h(k_{?};y) & h(k_{?}^{0};y) & v ; \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array}$$

where  $A = L_y I_{R_2}^{D^{-1}}$  is the \area" of the membrane and we de ned  $_x$  dy d<sup>D^{-1}</sup> x<sub>2</sub> d<sup>D^{-1}</sup> x<sub>2</sub><sup>0</sup>, and  $_k$ dk<sub>y</sub> d<sup>D^{-1}</sup> k<sub>2</sub> = (2)<sup>D</sup>.

The above averages are easily evaluated with hft  $(k_2; k_y) \stackrel{2}{J} i_v = (d \quad 1)=G_v (k)$  and h i, h  $(d \quad 1) \quad h(x_2; y) \quad h(x_2^0; y) \quad i_v$  given by

$$h i_{r} = \frac{Z}{(2)^{d-1}} \frac{d^{d-1} q}{(2)^{d-1}} e^{iq - h(x_{2}, y) - h(x_{2}^{0}, y)} v;$$

$$= \frac{Z}{(2)^{d-1}} e^{q^{2}K(jx_{2}, x_{2}^{0}, j)};$$

$$= \frac{1}{(2)^{d-1}} \frac{d^{d-1} q}{K(jx_{2}, x_{2}^{0}, j)} ;$$
(6.96)

where,

$$K (\mathbf{j}_{2}, \mathbf{j}) = \frac{1}{2 (d - 1)} h \mathbf{j}_{1} (\mathbf{x}_{2}; \mathbf{0}) \quad \mathbf{h} (\mathbf{0}_{2}; \mathbf{0}) \mathbf{j}_{2}^{2} \mathbf{i}_{v};$$
$$= \frac{1}{k} \frac{1 \cos(k_{2}; \mathbf{x})}{G_{v}(\mathbf{k})}; \quad (6.97)$$

and we have used in Eq.6.96 the Fourier representation of the d  $\,$  1-dim ensional delta-function.

Putting all this together we obtain for the right-hand-side of Eq.6.93

$$\frac{F'}{(d-1)A=2} = \sum_{k}^{Z} \frac{k_{y}^{4} + tk_{?}^{2}}{G_{v}(k)} \frac{1}{1 + \frac{g_{y}(d+1)}{4(d-1)}} \sum_{k}^{Z} \frac{k_{y}^{2}}{G_{v}(k)} + \frac{4v}{\frac{2}{Z} \int_{z}^{d-1} (d-1)} d^{D-1} x_{?} \frac{d^{D-1} x_{?}}{K(x_{?})} + \frac{\log (G_{v}(k))}{k} ; \qquad (6.98)$$

which when minimized with respect to  $G_v(k)$ ,  $F = G_v(k) = 0$  gives an integral equation

$$G_{v}(\tilde{k}) = k_{y}^{4} + tk_{?}^{2} - \frac{2v}{(4)^{(d-1)=2}} \frac{d^{D-1}x_{?}(1 \cos(k_{?} x))}{K(x_{?})^{(d+1)=2}};$$
(6.99)

The only e ect of the anham onic elasticity term g, is to generate an upward renormalization of the e ective tension along the y-axis

$$t_{y} = \frac{g_{y} (d+1)}{2 (d-1)} \sum_{k}^{Z} \frac{k_{y}^{2}}{G_{y} (k)} : \qquad (6.100)$$

Since we must 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 anham onic elastic e ects disappear in this G aussian variational approximation. That is, to correctly model a tubule with free boundaries, we should have started with an elastic H am iltonian with a bare, negative tension piece that exactly cancelled them ally generated positive contribution in Eq.6.100.

The simultaneous integral equations Eq.6.97 and Eq.6.99 determ ine G  $_{\rm v}$  (k) and K (x  $_{\rm 2}$  ). At long length scales they are solved by K  $(x_2)$  $x_{5}^{2}$  , where from the de nition Eq.6.97, we see that K ( $x_2 = L_2$ ) is proportional to the square of the radius of gyration or the tubule thickness that we are after, and hence the that solves these coupled non-linear integral equations will be the Gaussian variational prediction for the radius of gyration exponent as well. We substitute this scaling ansatz into Eq.6.99 for  $G_v(k)$ , and nd that while for  $d > d_{hc}^{A}$ the self-avoidance is irrelevant and  $= (5 \quad 2D)=4$  (as found in Sec.VIA), for  $d < d_{uc}^{SA}$  these integral equations can only be solved if the tk<sup>2</sup> term in Eq.6.99 is exactly cancelled by a part coming from the integral in the last term and the resulting propagator takes the form

$$G_v(k) = k_v^4 + v k_2^{(d+1) D+1}$$
; (6.101)

where v / v is an elective self-avoiding interaction parameter. Substituting this form into Eq.6.97 for  $G_v$  (k), and requiring self-consistency with our original ansatz K (x<sub>2</sub>)  $x_{z}^{2}$  gives

$$\mathbf{x}_{2}^{2} / \frac{d^{D-1} q_{2} dq_{y} 1 \cos(k_{2} x)}{k_{y}^{4} + \mathbf{v} k_{2}^{(d+1) D+1}} : \quad (6.102)$$

Making the change of variables  $q_2$   $q_2 = jx_2 j$  and  $q_y = q_2 = jx_2 j$ , with = ((d + 1)) D + 1 = 4 reveals

that the right hand side of Eq.6.102 is proportional to  $x_{\rm 2}$  with

$$= 1 \quad D + 3 ;$$
  
=  $\frac{7(1 \quad D) + 3 \quad (d + 1)}{4}$ : (6.103)

To satisfy the self-consistent condition Eq.6.102, must be equal to 2 . The resulting simple linear equation for has a solution (for d <  $d_{\rm LC}^{\rm SA}$  (D )):

$$=\frac{7D}{3d}\frac{7}{5}$$
; (6.104)

which for the physical case of D = 2 gives

$$=\frac{7}{3d-5}$$
; for d < 11; (6.105)

$$=\frac{1}{4}$$
; for d 11 (6.106)

We observe that (d = 4) = 1, and therefore (according to the Gaussian variational approximation) the tubule is no longer crum pled along the ? -direction. This suggests that the tubule phase is unstable to the at phase in embedding dimensions d < 4 (which unfortunately includes the physical case of d = 3). However, as discussed in the Introduction, the Gaussian variational method is an uncontrolled approximation. It probably does give the correct trends of, e.g., exponents with dim ensionality d. How ever, the variational approach is very close, in spirit and technically, to the large d expansion m ethods, and therefore intrinsically unable to obtain the smalld dependence correctly. It is therefore di cult to place any faith in the actual values of exponents, particularly when the value of at sm all d actually determ ines whether the tubule phase survives or not.

We believe that this Gaussian 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<sup>1</sup> and the

= 11 d-expansion predict that the tubule phase survives self-avoidance. Since both these latter approaches agree quite closely with each other, and since, furtherm 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 with neither.

The nal determ ination of whether or not the tubule phase survives self-avoidance will, or course, rest upon simulations and experiments, both of which we hope our analytic work stimulates.

> V II.FLUCTUATION EFFECTS AT CRUM PLED -TO -TUBULE AND TUBULE -TO -FLAT TRANSITIONS

The transition from the crumpled-to- at phase in isotropicm embranes has been previously studied<sup>24</sup> and is

predicted to be driven rst order by uctuations for em bedding dimensions  $d < d_c = 219$ . As can be seen from Fig.1 this direct transition is very special for an isotropic 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 R ef. 24.

Here we focus on the new transitions crumpled-totubule and tubule-to- at, which are generic for membranes with any amount of an isotropy. As we discussed at the end of Sec.III, there are two possible mean eld phase diagram topologies depending on the values of microscopic 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 membrane 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. We postpone the m ore technically challenging renorm alization group analysis of the phantom tubule-to- at transition<sup>41</sup> and renormalization group analysis of crumpled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions for self-avoiding m em branes<sup>33</sup> for future publications.

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

W e start out with the general free energy de ned in Eq 2.1, for now ignoring the self-avoiding interaction. W ithout loss of generality we will study the transition from the crum pled to the y-tubule phase. As discussed above, in mean-eld theory, this transition occurs when ty ! O from above, while t? remains nite and positive. Hence, simple power-counting on the quadratic part of the free energy leads to an isotropic scaling at the transition with  $q_2 / q_y^2$ . Therefore, the only relevant term s quadratic in r near the transition are: the bending rigidity along the y-direction (  $_{y}$   $\theta_{y}^{2}r^{2}$ ), and the surface tension terms along the y and ? -directions  $t_v (\theta_v r)^2$  and  $t_2 \quad 0^2 r^2$ , respectively. The corresponding noninteracting propagator at the transition is

$$hr_{i}(q)r_{j}(q)i = \frac{ij}{t_{?}q_{?}^{2} + t_{y}q_{y}^{2} + yq_{y}^{4}} \quad C(q)_{ij}; (7.1)$$

The anisotropic scaling dictated by this noninteracting propagator at the transition  $(t_v = 0)$  leads to signi cant simplication of the interaction term in the free energy. K eeping only the dom inant nonlinearity we obtain

$$F[\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x})] = \frac{1}{2} d^{D-1} \mathbf{x}_{?} d\mathbf{y}_{y} \theta_{y}^{2} \mathbf{r}^{2} + t_{?} \theta^{?} \mathbf{r}^{2} + t_{y} \theta^{?} \mathbf{r}^$$

The 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  $x = (x_2; y)$ , and the  $\setminus$  elds" are the extrinsic positions r(x). Because of the strong scaling anisotropy of the quadratic pieces of the free energy, we rescale  $x_2$  and y an isotropically:

$$x_{?} = x_{?}^{0} e^{1};$$
 (7.3)

$$y = y^0 e^{z^1};$$
 (7.4)

and rescale the \ elds" according to

$$r(x) = e^{-1}r^{0}(x^{0})$$
: (7.5)

Under this transform ation

$$y(1) = ye^{(D \ 1 \ 3z + 2)1}$$
; (7.6)

$$t_{2}$$
 (1) =  $t_{2} e^{(D_{3+z+2})1}$ ; (7.7)

Requiring that both v and t? remain xed 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):

$$z = \frac{1}{2};$$
 (7.8)

$$= (5=2 D)=2:$$
 (7.9)

A lthough this choice keeps the quadratic (in r) part of F Eq.7.2) unchanged, it does change the quartic piece:

$$u_{yy} (1) = u_{yy} e^{(D \ 1 \ 3z + 4 \ )1}$$
; (7.10)

$$= u_{yy} e^{(5=2 D)1}$$
; (7.11)

where in the second equality we have used the results Eqs.7.8 and 7.9 for z and  $\cdot$  W e see that for D < 5=2, u<sub>vv</sub> grow supon rescaling. Physically, this means that its e ects becom e more im portant at longer length scales. At su ciently long length scales, it completely invalidates the harm onic elastic theory and the naive perturbation theory in the nonlinearity  $\boldsymbol{u}_{\boldsymbol{y}\boldsymbol{y}}$  around it, even for arbitrarily small coupling  $u_{yy}$ . Simple additional anisotropic rescaling of  $x_{?} = x_{?}^{0}$  and  $y = y^{0}$ , with =  $(t_2 = v_1)^{1=2}$ , which rescales  $v_1$  and  $t_2$  to 1, reveals that the e ective coupling constant of the nonlinearity is  $u_{yy} = y$ . This, together with Eq.7.11, predicts that the characteristic length scale L<sub>2</sub><sup>n1</sup> beyond which the dim ensionless coupling constant becom es of order 1 and the harm onic elastic theory and perturbation theory (around it) break down is

$$L_{?}^{n1} = \frac{y}{u_{yy}}$$
 : (7.12)

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

Such an analysis<sup>36</sup> will lead to corrections to the simple rescaling of  $_{\rm Y}$ ,  $t_{\rm 2}$ , and  $t_{\rm y}$ , due to the non-linearities (in this case  $u_{\rm YY}$ , as discussed above). These corrections can be absorbed into \anom alous" exponents , t, and

, de ned by the large renorm alization group \time" (1 ! 1 ) lim its of  $_y$  (1), t\_? (1), and t\_y (1), respectively:

$$_{\rm y}$$
 (1) =  $_{\rm y} e^{(D \ 1 \ 3z + z \ + 2)1}$ ; (7.13)

$$t_{2} (1) = t_{2} e^{(D - 3 + z + t^{+2})1}; (7.14)$$

$$t_v (l) = t_v e^{(D \ 1 \ z \ +2)l}$$
  $t_e^{t^l};$  (7.15)

The exponent t de ned above is the thermal eigenvalue of the reduced temperature (surface tension along y-direction) which is an inverse of the correlation length exponent along the ? -direction (see below). Requiring that y and  $t_{?}$  remain invariant under the renormalization group transform ation determ ines the values the anisotropy exponent z and the eld rescaling exponent

$$z = \frac{2}{4} \frac{t}{4};$$
 (7.16)  
=  $\frac{10}{8} \frac{4D}{2} + \frac{(D + T)}{8} \frac{3}{t};$ 

which, as quoted above in Eqs.7.8 and 7.9, reduce to z = 1=2 and = (5=2 D)=2, for = t = 0, as is valid at zero order in perturbation theory in  $u_{yy}$ .

Once the values of t, and at the critical point are determined, the renormalization group gives a relation between correlation functions at or near criticality (small  $t_y$ ) and at small wavectors (functions that are different to the second sec

cult to compute, because direct perturbation theory is divergent) to the same correlation functions away from criticality and at large wavevectors (functions that can be accurately computed using perturbation theory). For example the behavior of the correlation lengths near the transition can be deduced in this way:

$$y(t_y) = e^{z\perp} y(t_y e^{\pm 1});$$
 (7.18)

where in the above we assumed that a critical xed point exists and all other coupling constants have well-de ned values at the xed point. Using the above equations for  $t_v e^{t^2}$  1, we obtain,

(1) is the m icroscopic cuto and,

where a

$$r_{2} = \frac{1}{t} = \frac{4}{2(2 t 2) (2 t)};$$
 (7.20)  
 $r_{y} = z_{2};$  (7.21)

We now compute the anomalous exponents to lowest 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 number of loops in the associated Feynman graph. We split the eld  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x})$  into short and long wavevector parts  $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}_{<}(\mathbf{x}) + \mathbf{r}_{>}(\mathbf{x})$  and integrate over the fast elds  $\mathbf{r}_{>}(\mathbf{x})$ . Diagram matically this leads to one-loop corrections to  $u_{yy}$  and  $t_{y}$ . There are no corrections to y to rst order in , i.e., = O(2). Furthermore, since the interaction  $u_{yy}$  always carries a factor of  $q_{y}$  with every eld  $\mathbf{r}$ , the  $\mathbf{t}$  tension remains unrenormalized, and t = 0 to all orders, in plying z = 1=2 + O(2) and = (5=2 D)=2 + O(2).



FIG.11. Feynm an graphs that renorm alize: (a) the non-linearity  $u_{yy}$ , (b) the tension  $t_y$  and (c) the bending rigidity y.

The rst two diagram s in Fig.11, followed by the rescaling introduced above (necessary to restore the original uv cuto ), lead to the one-loop recursion relations for  $u = (K_{3=2} = \overline{2})u_{yy} = (\frac{5+4}{y}t_2^{3+4})$  and  $t_y$ , respectively,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial 1} = u (d+8)\dot{u};$$
 (7.22)

$$\frac{\theta t_{y}}{\theta 1} = (1 \quad (d+2)u)t_{y}; \qquad (7.23)$$

where = 5=2 D and  $K_{3=2}$  is the surface of area of a 3=2-dimensional sphere divided by  $(2)^{3=2}$ . A susual, in the above, we also rede ned ty to be the reduced tem – perature, measured from its true value at the transition (which in mean-eld theory starts out at 0, but is shifted to a negative value by uctuations). Note that, in contrast to the familiar = 4 D - expansion for critical phenomena, 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 more accurate by a factor of  $^2$  = 4, than the 4 D -expansion at the same order. Thus, we expect our one-loop values for  $_2$  and  $_v$  to be accurate to 0:02.

Examining Eq.7.23, we observe that for  $D < D_{uc} = 5=2$ , (i.e., for > 0) the Gaussian xed point is unstable and the critical properties of the crum pled-to-tubule transition are characterized by a nontrivial xed point with a xed point value u of u given by:

$$u = \frac{1}{d+8}$$
: (7.24)

Note that, in contrast to the treatm ent of crum pled-to-

at transition in isotropic mem branes<sup>24</sup>, where the critical point was only stable for an unphysically large value of the embedding dimension d > 219, the critical point characterizing the crum pled-to-tubule transition found here is stable for all d.

Equation 7.23 can be easily integrated once the xed point value u , Eq.7.24, is inserted for u; com parison with the general Eq.7.16 then gives t:

$$t = 1$$
  $\frac{d+2}{d+8}$  ; (7.25)

which, upon using Eqs.7.20 and 7.21, gives for a physical mem brane (D = 2, d = 3)

The exponent to  $O(^2)$  is determined by the diagram in Fig.11c. Evaluating this diagram in real space and then Fourier transforming, we nd that this contributes to the free energy

$$F = 16\hat{u}(d+2) q_{y}^{2} j_{z}(q) j'(q); \qquad (7.28)$$

where

(q) 
$$d^{3=2}x_2 dy e^{iq x} G^3(x)$$
; (7.29)

with, in turn,

77

$$G(\mathbf{x}_{?};\mathbf{y}) = \frac{Z}{(2)^{5=2}} \frac{d^{3=2}\mathbf{q}_{?} d\mathbf{q}_{y}}{(2)^{5=2}} \frac{e^{i\mathbf{q}_{?}} \mathbf{x}_{?} e^{i\mathbf{q}_{y}} \mathbf{q}_{y}}{\mathbf{q}_{?}^{2} + \mathbf{q}_{y}^{4}}; \quad (7.30)$$

where we have rescaled lengths so that  $y = t_2 = 1$ .

A fter a contour integral over  $q_y$ , and an angular integral  $_{0}^{C}$  d (sin )<sup>D 2)</sup>  $e^{iq_2}$   $x_2$ , we obtain,

G 
$$(x_{?}; y) = 2^{7=4} = 3^{=4} y^{2} = \frac{x_{?}}{y^{2}} = y^{1=4} y = \frac{x_{?}}{y^{2}}$$
; (7.31)

where we have de ned

Y (x) 
$$\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} du \, u^{1=4} J_{1=4}$$
 (xu)  $e^{p - \frac{1}{u=2}} \cos(\frac{p}{u=2} + -4)$ :  
(7.32)

Now going back to Eq.7.28 we observe that the q = 0 piece of (q) contributes to the  $q_{j}^{2}$  jr (q) f part of F, additively renorm alizing  $t_{y}$  which corresponds to the usual inconsequential  $T_{c}$  (critical tension) shift. The order  $q_{y}^{2}$  piece of (q) renorm alizes  $_{y}$ . We de ne

$$(q) = (0) \frac{1}{2} q_y^2 B(q_y);$$
 (7.33)

where

7.

$$B (q_y) \qquad dy d^{3=2} x_2 y^2 G^3 (x_2; y) : (7.34)$$

Note that the infra-red cuto on the integral over y is  $q_y^{1}$ . This integral diverges logarithm ically as  $q_y$ ! 0. We can identify the coe cient of the logarithm with in the expression  $\sqrt{(q_y)} / q_y$ .

To extract this logarithm ic divergence, we make a change of variables in the integral  $j_{x_2}$  j  $x_2^{y}$  and nd

$$B (q_y) = \frac{1}{2^{13=4} 3=2} (3=4)^{Z} \frac{q_y^{-1}}{1} \frac{dy}{y} \frac{Z^{-1}}{0} dx x^{5=4} Y^{3} (x);$$
(7.35)

where we have used the fact that the surface area of a 3=2-dimensional 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  $\log(q_y)$  at the xed point value of  $q_y$  from Eq.7.24, we obtain

$$= \frac{C(2)(d+2)}{8(d+8)^2} {}^2; \qquad (7.36)$$

where

C (2) 
$$2^{23=4}$$
 (3=4) dx x<sup>5=4</sup> Y<sup>3</sup> (x); (7.37)

The value of C (2) has been calculated num erically<sup>40</sup> to be C (2) 1:166 0:001. U sing this value, = 1=2, and d = 3 in Eq.7.36, we not that is very small,

$$(D = 2; d = 3)$$
 0:0015: (7.38)

As 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 regime that appears in the correlation function G (x<sub>2</sub>;y) in D = 5=2. We expect to be positive, but still quite small, at the phantom tubule-to-crum pled transition.

G iven the sm allness of and , and the vanishing of t, the exponents computed 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 incorporate 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)<sup>33</sup>, and lim it ourselves here to discussing scaling theory and the F bry approximation.

Near the crum pled-to-tubule transition, for square m em branes of internal size L, we m ake the following general scaling ansatz for the extensions  $R_y$  and  $R_G$  of the m em brane along and orthogonal to the tubule axis, respectively:

$$R_{G,y} = L_{ct}^{G,y} f_{G,y}(t_{y}L);$$

$$R_{G,y} \neq t_{y}^{+} L^{c}; \quad t_{y} > 0; L >> ct$$

$$M_{Ct}^{G,y}; \quad L << ct$$

$$M_{Ct}^{G,y}; \quad L << ct$$

$$M_{T}^{G,y}; \quad L << ct$$

$$M_{T}^{G,y}; \quad t_{y} < 0; L >> ct$$

$$M_{T}^{G,y}; \quad t_{y} < 0; L >> ct$$

$$M_{T}^{G,y}; \quad t_{y} < 0; L >> ct$$

where subscripts t, c and ct refer to tubule, crum – pled and tubule-to-crum pled transition, respectively, and ct /  $j_{xy} j^{1=}$  is a correlation length for the crum pled-to-tubule transition,  $t_y = (T - T_{ct}) = T_{ct}$ ,  $T_{ct}$  is the crum pled-to-tubule transition tem perature, and  $t_y > 0$  corresponds to the crum pled phase.

Note that we have built into the scaling laws the fact that both  $R_y$  and  $R_g$  scale like L  $^{\circ}$  in the crum pled phase, with  $_c$  the radius of gyration exponent for the crum pled phase (which, as noted earlier, is the same for anisotropic and isotropic membranes). Due to the extended nature of the tubule phase,  $_t^y = 1$ , of course. The anisotropy in manifested in the crum pled phase only through the di erent temperature 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  $_t^G > 0$ , while the latter diverges as  $t_y ! 0^+$ , since the tubule ultimately extends in that direction, which im plies  $_t^y < 0$ .

N ote also that our expression Eq.7.39, and, in particular, the fact that  $R_G \notin R_y$  even above the crum pledto-tubule transition (i.e., in the crum pled phase), in 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: polymers, which are always crum pled, nonetheless assume, on average, non-spherical shapes<sup>42</sup>, as can be seen, for example, by looking at the ratio of the averagem axim um and m inim um eigenvalues of the moment of inertia tensor. Our result Eq.7.39 for  $t_y > 0$  is only a little more supprising, since it predicts an aspect ratio  $R_y=R_G$  that actually diverges as T !  $T_{ct}^+$ , and mem brane begins to extend into a tubule con guration.

The exponents  $G_{+=}^{G_{+}}$  de ned in above equation obey the scaling laws

$$G_{+}^{G_{Y}} = \frac{c_{ct}}{ct} ; \qquad (7.40)$$

$$G_{iY} = \frac{G_{iY}}{t} \frac{G_{iY}}{ct}$$
(7.41)

As always, these scaling laws follow from requiring that the generalized scaling form matches on to known results in the appropriate limits.

From F lory theory, we can derive the values of the critical exponents in Eq.7.39, as we have already derived the exponents t and c characterizing the tubule and crum – pled phases, simply by being more careful about tem – perature dependent factors in that derivation. Again, we start by estimating the total self-avoidance energy Eq.2.1 in the tubule phase (i.e.,  $t_y < 0$ ) as  $E_{SA} = V^{-2}$ . Now, how ever, we very carefully write the volume V in the em – bedding space occupied by the tubule as  $V = R_{G}^{d-1} R_{y}$ . W riting

$$R_{y} = {}_{y}L_{y}$$
; (7.42)

as we did earlier in our discussion of mean eld theory in the absence of self-avoidance, and using = M = V for the embedding space density of the tubule, and again using the fact that the tubule mass  $M = L_2^{D-1} L_y$ , we see that

$$E_{SA} = v \frac{L_y L_2^{2(D-1)}}{v R_G^{d-1}}$$
: (7.43)

U sing this estimate of the self-avoidance energy in Eq2.1, and estimating the other terms in that expression by scaling, we obtain the full F lory theory for the tubule phase, with all temperature dependent e ects taken (admittedly crudely) into account:

$$E_{FL} = t_{y y}^{2} + u_{yy y}^{4} + t_{?} \frac{R_{G}}{L_{?}} L_{?}^{D-1} L_{y} + v \frac{L_{y}L_{?}^{2(D-1)}}{vR_{G}^{d-1}};$$
(7.44)

M in in izing this over  $R_{\,G}$  , we obtain

R

$$_{\rm G} = L_{\rm 2}^{t} \frac{v}{t_{\rm 2}^{t}} \frac{1}{y}^{1=(d+1)};$$
 (7.45)

where, as we found earlier,  $t = \frac{D+1}{d+1}$ , but now we have the singular temperature dependence of  $R_G$  near the

crum pled-to-tubule transition explicit through the presence of the  $_{\rm y}$  term . Inserting this expression for R  $_{\rm G}$  into Eq.7.44, we nd

$$E_{FL} = t_{y \ y}^{2} + u_{yy \ y}^{4} + t_{?}^{\frac{d}{d+1}} \frac{v}{y}^{\frac{2}{d+1}} L_{?}^{\frac{2(d-D)}{d+1}} L_{?}^{D-1} L_{y}$$
(7.46)

The exponents de ned by Eq.7.39 can now be obtained by m inim izing  $E_{\rm F\,L}$  in Eq.7.46 with respect to  $_{\rm y}$ , which amounts to balancing two of the three terms in  $E_{\rm F\,L}$ , which two, depending on whether one is interested in the crum pled phase (t<sub>y</sub> > 0), the tubule phase (t<sub>y</sub> < 0), or the transition between them (t<sub>y</sub> = 0).

In the crum pled phase  $t_y > 0$ , as a result, the order parameter  $_y$  vanishes in the therm odynamic limit, allowing us to neglect the quartic  $_y^4$  term relative to the quadratic  $_v^2$  one. Balancing the remaining two terms

$$t_{y y}^{2} y t_{y}^{\frac{d}{d+1}} \frac{v}{y} L_{2}^{\frac{2(d D)}{d+1}};$$
(7.47)

we obtain

y 
$$\frac{v^2 t_2^{d-1}}{t_y^{d+1}} L_2^{\frac{d-D}{d+2}}$$
; (7.48)

U sing this expression for  $_{\rm Y}$  inside Eq.7.42 for R  $_{\rm Y}$  gives, for a square m em brane (L  $_{\rm V}$  = L  $_2$  = L)

$$R_{y} = v^{2} t_{2}^{d-1} \frac{1}{2(d+2)} t_{y}^{\frac{d+1}{2(d+2)}} L_{2}^{\frac{D+2}{d+2}}; \qquad (7.49)$$

which, after comparing with the general form for  $R_{\rm y}$  , Eq.7.39, gives

$$_{c} = \frac{D+2}{d+2}$$
; (7.50)

$$y_{+}^{y} = \frac{d+1}{2(d+2)};$$
 (7.51)

equation 7.50 being a well-known F bry result for the radius of gyration exponent  $_{\rm c}$  for a D -dim ensionalm anifold, embedded in d dim ensions,<sup>30 {32</sup> and  $_{+}^{\rm y}$  new and special to an isotropic m embranes. Furtherm ore, inserting  $_{\rm y}$ , Eq.7.48 inside Eq.7.45 for R<sub>G</sub>, we obtain

$$R_{G} = v^{\frac{d+3}{(d+2)(d+1)}} t_{?}^{\frac{d+5}{2(d+2)(d+1)}} t_{y}^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} t_{y}^{\frac{1}{2(d+2)}} L_{?}^{\frac{D+2}{d+2}}; (7.52)$$

which, not surprisingly gives the same expression for  $\rm_{c}$  as in Eq.7.50, and predicts

$$_{+}^{G} = \frac{1}{2(d+2)}$$
: (7.53)

 $\stackrel{\text{y}}{_{+}} \notin \stackrel{\text{G}}{_{+}}$  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 growth (for square membranes) of  $R_{\rm G}$  and  $R_{\rm y}$  with L, but exhibiting anisotropy via the prefactors, with the ratio  $R_{\rm y}=\!\!R_{\rm G}$  diverging as the crum pled-to-tubule transition is approached.

The tubule phase is characterized by  $t_y < 0$  and a - nite order parameter  $_y > 0$ . Therefore in this phase, the term proportional to  $t_2^{d\ 1=(d+1)}$  in  $E_{\rm FL}$ , Eq.7.46, clearly becomes negligible relative to the -rst two terms when  $L_2$  ! 1 . Therefore, we can neglect that term for a succently largement brane (i.e., a membrane larger than the critical correlation length  $_{\rm cr}$ ). Minimizing the remaining

rst two terms in  $E_{FL}$  therefore gives  $y / f_y j$  (independent of  $L_2$ ) as in m ean- eld theory in the absence of self-avoidance. Inserting this inside  $R_y$ , Eq.7.42 and comparing with the general scaling form for  $R_y$ , in plies for a square m em brane

$$y_{t} = 1;$$
 (7.54)

$$y = \frac{1}{2}$$
: (7.55)

U sing this in the earlier expression Eq.7.45 for  $R_{\,G}$  , we obtain the last line of Eq.7.39, with

$$_{t}^{G} = \frac{D+1}{d+1};$$
 (7.56)

$$G = \frac{1}{2(d+1)}$$
: (7.57)

(7.58)

Finally, right at the crum pled-to-tubule transition,  $t_y$  = 0 and we must balance the last two terms in  $E_{\rm FL}$ , Eq.7.46. M inimizing  $E_{\rm FL}$  over  $_y,$  we nd at the transition

$$_{\rm y}$$
 / L<sub>2</sub>  $\frac{({\rm d} \ {\rm D} )}{{}^{3+2{\rm d}}}$  (7.59)

which, when inserted in Eq.7.42 for  $R_{\rm y}$  implies for a square membrane that

$$R_y / L^{\frac{D+d+3}{3+2d}}$$
 (7.60)

right at the transition. This leads to

$$_{ct}^{y} = \frac{D + d + 3}{2d + 3}$$
 (7.61)

for a square m em brane. U sing the result Eq.7.59 for  $_{\rm y}$  in Eq.7.45 for R<sub>G</sub> gives, right at the transition,

$$R_{G} / L_{?}^{G}$$
; (7.62)

with

$$G_{tt}^{G} = t + \frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d}{3+2d}$$
; (7.63)

$$= \frac{2D + 3}{2d + 3};$$
(7.64)

The scaling relations Eqs.7.40 and 7.41, quoted above, then give

$$= \frac{2 (d D)}{2d+3};$$
(7.65)

and are reassuringly consistent with our independent calculations of exponents  $^{G}_{+;}{}^{Y}$ , c,  $^{G}_{t}{}^{Y}$ , and  $^{G}_{ct}{}^{Y}$ , given in Eqs.7.51,7.53,7.55,7.57,7.50,7.54,7.56,7.61, and 7.64, above. For the physical case of a two dimensional memory brane embedded in a three dimensional space, (D = 2;d = 3)

$$_{\rm c} = 4=5$$
; (7.66a)

Note that the signs of the  $\frac{G}{+=}^{y}$  in ply 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<sub>v</sub> does the opposite. Note also that the crum pled-totubule transition is quite rounded by nite size e ects, even for large m em branes, because of the sm all value of the crossover exponent , which leads to a large correlation length  $_{ct}(t_v)$ . Taking an example of a L = 10 m membrane with lattice constant a = 10A, we nd that the crum pled-to-tubule transition is rounded at a reduced tem perature t<sub>v</sub> (L=a) 0:13, while our hypothetical simulation of a 104 particle net experiences rounding 0:36. Thus, the transition m ay not appear sharp at t. experimentally or in simulations, even though it is, in principle, in the therm odynam ic lim it.

The singular parts of other them odynam ic variables obey scaling laws sim ilar to that for  $R_{G,y}$ , Eq.7.39. For example the singular part of the speci cheat perparticle  $C_v$ , i.e., a second derivative of the intensive free energy with respect to tem perature, is given by

$$C_v = \frac{1}{L^D} \frac{\theta^2}{\theta t_v^2} = \frac{1}{2} t_y R_y^2 L^{D-2}$$
; (7.67)

which, using Eq.7.39 leads to the scaling form for C  $_{\rm v}$ 

$$C_{v} = \underset{B}{L} g(t_{y}L);$$

$$< t_{y} + L + ; t_{y} > 0;L >> _{ct}$$

$$/ \underset{y}{L}; L < _{ct} (7.68)$$

$$: t_{y} = L ; t_{y} < 0;L >> _{ct}$$

where,

$$g(x) = \frac{d^2}{dx^2} f_y^2(x)$$
 : (7.69)

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

. .

$$= 2 \frac{y}{ct} 2 + ;$$
 (7.70a)

$$= 0$$
; F lory theory (7.70b)

$$_{+} = 2 \frac{y}{+} + 1;$$
 (7.71a)

$$= \frac{2d+3}{d+2}; F \text{ lory theory}$$
(7.71b)

$$=\frac{9}{5}$$
; F bry theory; d = 3 (7.71c)

$$= 2^{y} + 1;$$
 (7.72a)

$$= 0; F lory theory (7.72b)$$

This leads to the unusual feature that outside the critical regime (i.e. for L >>  $_{\rm ct}$ ), the singular part of the speci c heat above the crum pled-to-tubule transition vanishes in the therm odynam ic lim it like L  $^+$ 

L<sup>2(d D)=(d+2)</sup> L<sup>2=5</sup>; in the last expression we have used the F lory estimates of the exponents, evaluated in D = 2 and d = 3. Only within the critical regime does the singular part of the speci cheat per particle becomes nonvanishing as L! 1. Sim ilar results were rst found for the direct crum pled-to- at transition by Paczuski et al.<sup>24</sup>.

We now turn to the tubule-to- at (tf) transition. On both sides of this transition,  $R_y = L_y$  O (1). Therefore only the other two radii of gyration  $R_x$  and  $R_z$  exhibit criticalbehavior, which can be sum marized by the scaling law:

$$R_{x;z} = \prod_{i}^{x;z} f_{x;z} (t_{2} L^{tf});$$

$$R_{x;z} = \prod_{i}^{tf} f_{x;z} (t_{2} L^{tf});$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad t_{2} > 0; L >> t_{f}$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad t_{2} > 0; L >> t_{f}$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad L << t_{f}$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad t_{2} < 0; L >> t_{f}$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad t_{2} < 0; L >> t_{f}$$

$$R_{x;z} \neq t_{2}^{+} L^{t}; \quad t_{2} < 0; L >> t_{f}$$

where  $t_{?} = (T \quad T_{tf})=T_{tf}$ ,  $t_{?} > 0$  is assumed to correspond to the tubule phase,  $t_{f} / t_{?}$  j<sup>1=</sup>  $t_{f}$  is the correlation length for this transition, and the exponents obey the scaling relations

$$r_{\rm f}^{\rm z} = 0.59$$
; (7.74a)  
 $r_{\rm f}^{\rm x} = 1$ : (7.74b)

$$x_{z}^{x} = \frac{f \quad tf}{tf} : \qquad (7.74d)$$

In the above  $w \in have taken the x$ -direction to be the new (in addition to y) extended direction in the  $x \in ha$ 

(which is why  $f_{f}^{x} = 1$ ), and is the roughness exponent<sup>28</sup> of the at phase (quoted for the physical case D = 2 and d = 3), giving the transverse height uctuations of the d 2 components of the displacement perpendicular to the at mem brane.

To calculate these exponents, we can use F bry theory in the tubule phase, and at the transition, while in the at phase, where as discussed above, self-avoidance is irrelevant, we simply m atch onto the scaling theory<sup>28</sup> of the at phase. Doing so, we nd that F bry theory predicts identical behavior for  $R_x$  and  $R_z$  in the tubule phase and at the transition:

$$_{tf}^{x} = _{tf}^{z} = \frac{D+3}{d+3}$$
; (7.75a)

$$=\frac{5}{6}$$
; for D = 2;d=3; (7.75b)

$$x_{+}^{x} = x_{+}^{z} = \frac{1}{d+1}$$
; (7.75c)

$$= \frac{1}{4}$$
; for D = 2;d = 3: (7.75d)

W e believe that the identical tem perature (t<sub>2</sub>) and scaling (with L) behavior of R<sub>x</sub> and R<sub>z</sub> as the tubule-to- at transition is approached from the tubule side (Eqs.7.75a and 7.75c) is an artifact of F lory theory and that in fact R<sub>x</sub> >> R<sub>z</sub> throughout this region, with the ratio R<sub>x</sub>=R<sub>z</sub> actually diverging as the transition is approached from above. That is, we expect that in reality  $\frac{x}{tf} > \frac{z}{tf}$  and  $\frac{x}{tf} < \frac{z}{t}$ .

In addition, F lory theory predicts

$$_{tf} = \frac{2(d D)}{d+3};$$
 (7.76)

$$=\frac{1}{3}$$
; for D = 2;d = 3: (7.77)

In the at phase, <sup>x</sup> follows from simply minimizing the mean eld free energy without self-avoidance (since self-avoidance is irrelevant in the at phase), giving

$$x = \frac{1}{2}$$
; (7.78)

while matching  $R_z = L j_2 j^2$  onto the critical prediction  $R_z / L^{\frac{2}{t_f}}$  at the correlation length  $L = j_2 j^{1=t_f}$  gives

$$z = \frac{z_{\text{tf}}}{z_{\text{tf}}}; \qquad (7.79)$$

where the rst equality is an exact scaling law, while the second, approximate one uses F lory theory for  $_{tf}$  and  $_{tf}^{x}$ , and the SC SA calculation<sup>28</sup> of for the at phase, all evaluated in the physical case D = 2 and d = 3.

A sthe tubule-to- at transition is approached from below (the at phase side)  $R_x$  shrinks as  $R_x$ ,  $t = t^{j=2}L$  and

 $R_z$  increases as  $R_z$   $rac{1}{2}$  j<sup>0:73</sup> L<sup>0:59</sup> with vanishing  $rac{1}{2}$  j. Approaching this transition from above (the tubule phase side)  $R_x$  and  $R_z$  both extend as  $R_{x,z}$   $rac{1}{2}$  j<sup>1=4</sup> L<sup>3=4</sup> with vanishing  $rac{1}{2}$  to the L<sup>5=6</sup> scaling at the tubule-to- at critical point.

The singular part of the speci c heat again obeys a scaling law:

$$C_{v} = L^{tf} g_{tf}(t_{2} L^{tf});$$

$$\stackrel{t}{\approx} t_{2}^{tf} L^{tf} t_{1}^{tf} t_{1}^{tf}; t_{2} > 0; L >> t_{f}$$

$$/ L^{tf}; L < t_{f}; L << t_{f} (7.81)$$

$$\stackrel{t}{\Rightarrow} t_{2} t_{2}^{tf} L^{tf} t_{1}^{tf} t_{1}^{tf}; t_{2} < 0; L >> t_{f}$$

where, in F lory theory,

$$_{+}^{\text{tf}} = \frac{3}{2};$$
 (7.82a)

tf = 0; (7.82b)

$$tf = 2 tf + tf = 2 = 0;$$
 (7.82c)

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 0 (1) and sm ooth as a function of tem perature in both the critical regime and in the at phase.

#### VIII.SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have studied the e ects of intrinsic anisotropy in polymerized membrane. We found that this seem ingly innocuous generalization leads to a wealth of new phenomena, most remarkable of which is that any am ount of an isotropy leads to a new, tubule phase which intervenes between the previously predicted at and crum pled phases in anisotropic membranes (See Fig.1). W e have presented a detailed theory of the anisotropic membrane focusing on the new tubule phase. Considering therm 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.5.15,5.16,5.38,5.48. We then considered the physically more relevant case of a self-avoiding tubule, nding that self-avoiding interaction is important for physical dimensionalities. Establishing relations between 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 alous elasticity within the F lory and  $= d_{ac} d\{$ expansion theories. We have also studied self-avoidance within a Gaussian variational approximation, which unfortunately but, we believe incorrectly predicts that selfavoiding interaction destroys the tubule phase (as it does the crum pled phase) for d < 4. W e studied the crum pledto-tubule transition in mean-eld theory and with the

= 4 D -expansion. Finally we developed a scaling theory of the crum pled-to-tubule and tubule-to- at transitions.

Our exact predictions for the phantom tubules Eqs.5.15,5.16,5.38,5.48 have been quantitatively veried in the recent simulations by the authors of R ef. 2.

The possibility of the existence of a new tubule phase interm ediate between 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.<sup>10</sup> The structural stability of polymerized m em branes is superior to their liquid m em brane analogs. The theoretical discovery of the tubule phase signi cantly expands the number 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 polymerized membranes carries even more signi cance if the claims that the fully crumpled phase in polymerized membranes does not exist are in fact correct, since in this case the tubule phase is the only disordered phase of a polymerized membrane.

W ith the recent focus on self-assem bly, it may be possible in the near future to freeze in intrinsic anisotropy by polym erizing tilted phase of liquid membranes or crosslinking polymers. Further numerical simulations which include self-avoidance o er another avenue to investigate our predictions. We hope that our work stimulates further theory, simulations and experiments in this area.

### ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e both thank The Institute for Theoretical Physics at the UCSB, and the organizers of the B iom embranes W orkshop held there, where this work was initiated, for our good tans, their hospitality and nancial support under NSF G rant No. PHY 94-07194. W e acknow L edge partial support from the Colorado Center for Chaos and C om plexity through the Sum m er 1997 W orkshop on Nucleation and Critical Phenom ena in C om plex N onlinear System s, during which this work was com pleted. Leo R adzihovsky acknow ledges support by the N SF CA -REER aw ard, through G rant D M R {9625111, and partial support by the A P. Sloan Foundation. John Toner acknow ledges nancial support by the N SF through G rants D M R -9625111 and D M R -9634596.

- <sup>1</sup> L.Radzihovsky and J.Toner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 4752 (1995).
- <sup>2</sup> M. Bowick, M. Falcioni, and G. Thorleifsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 885 (1997); cond-m at/9705059.
- <sup>3</sup> M .Bow ick and E .G uitter, Phys.Rev.E 56,1 (1997); condm at/9705045.
- <sup>4</sup> For a review, see the articles in Statistical M echanics of M em branes and Interfaces, edited by D.R.Nelson, T.Pirran, and S.W einberg (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1989).
- <sup>5</sup> D.R.Nelson and L.Peliti, J.Phys. (Paris) 48, 1085 (1987).
- <sup>6</sup> P. Hohenberg, Phys. Rev. 158, 383 (1967); N. D. Merm in and H. Wagner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17, 1133 (1966); S. Coleman, Commun. Math. Phys. 31, 259 (1973);
- <sup>7</sup> J. A. Aronovitz and T. C. Lubensky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2634 (1988); J. A. Aronovitz, L Golubovic, and T.C. Lubensky, J. Phys. (France) 50, 609 (1989).
- <sup>8</sup> E.Guitter, F.D avid, S.Leibler, and L.Peliti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2949 (1988).
- <sup>9</sup> L.Radzihovsky, unpublished.
- <sup>10</sup> A. Rudolph, J. Calvert, P. Schoen, and J. Schnur, \TechnologicalD evelopm ents of Lipid Based Tubule M icrostructures", in B iotechnological Applications of lipid m icrostructures, ed. B. G aber et al. (P lenum, 1988); R. Lipkin, Science, 246, 44 (D ecem ber 1989).
- <sup>11</sup> A ctually, in m ost experim ental realizations, the polym erization is random and leads to an isotropic disordered m em brane, m aking the isotropic case quite general.
- $^{\rm 12}$  E.Sachm ann, private com munication.
- <sup>13</sup> D.Bensim on, private communication.
- <sup>14</sup> M. Doiand S.F. Edwards, The Theory of Polymer Dynamics, Oxford University, New York, 1986; P.G. de Gennes, Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, 1979.
- <sup>15</sup> G.Grinstein and R.Pelcovits, Phys. Rev. Lett. 47, 856 (1981); Phys. Rev. AA 26, 915 (1982).
- <sup>16</sup> In the case of polymers, F lory theory agrees with the exact predictions for the radius of gyration exponent in all dimensions d where such exact predictions exist; in d = 4,d = 2, and d = 1, F lory theory recovers the exact results of = 1=2, = 3=4, and = 1, respectively. And in d = 3 dimensions (where an exact result is not available) it agrees with the -expansion to better than 1%.
- <sup>17</sup> G.Grest, J. Phys. I (France), 1, 1695 (1991).
- <sup>18</sup> M. Plischke and D. Boal, Phys. Rev. A 38, 4943 (1988); F.F.Abraham, W.E.Rudge, and M. Plischke, Phys. Rev. Lett 62, 1757 (1989); J.S.Ho and A.Baum gartner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 1324 (1989); F.F.Abraham and D.R.Nelson, J. Phys. France 51 2653 (1990); Science 249, 393 (1990).
- <sup>19</sup> A. Baum gartner and W. Renz, Europhys. Lett. 17, 381 (1991); A. Baum gartner, J. Phys. I (France) 1, 1549 (1991).
- <sup>20</sup> The failure to nd the crum pled phase in computer simulations for self-avoiding m embranes m ight be because self-avoidance interaction shifts the bare to high values, such that in the alm ost universally employed num erical ball and spring m odels this always put the isotropic m embrane on the at side of the crum pling transition.
- <sup>21</sup> M.Goulian, J.Phys. II (France), 1, 1327 (1991).
- <sup>22</sup> P.LeDoussal, J. Phys. A, 25, L469 (1992).

- <sup>23</sup> This is analogous to the fam iliar 1=n expansion for criticalphenom ena, in which one expands about the num ber of spin components n ! 1 lim it.
- <sup>24</sup> M. Paczuski, M. Kardar and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2638 (1988).
- <sup>25</sup> M.E.Fisher and D.R.Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett., 32, 1350 (1974); D.R.Nelson, J.M.Kosterlitz, and M.E.Fisher, Phys. Rev. Lett., 33, 813 (1974), and Phys. Rev.B13, 412 (1976); A.Aharony, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C.Domb and M.S.Green (A cadem ic, New York, 1976), Vol. 6, and Bull.Am.Phys.Soc. 20, 16 (1975).
- <sup>26</sup> J. Toner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 905 (1988).
- <sup>27</sup> L D . Landau and E M . Lifshitz, Theory of E lasticity, Pergam on Press, (1975).
- <sup>28</sup> P. Le Doussal and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1209 (1992). SC SA is incredibly successful in that for the at phase of polymerized mem branes it predicts exponents that are exact in d! 1, d = D and correct to a leading order in = 4 D, thereby showing agreement with all known exact results.
- <sup>29</sup> M. Falcioni, M. Bowick, E. Guitter, and G. Thorleifsson, Europhys. Lett. 38, 67 (1997).
- <sup>30</sup> M.Kardar and D.R.Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1289 (1987); 58, 2280 (E); Phys. Rev. A 38, 966 (1988).
- <sup>31</sup> Y. Kantor and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58, 1289 (1987); Y. Kantor, M. Kardar, and D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev.A 35, 3056 (1987).
- $^{\rm 32}$  J.A .A ronow itz and T .C .Lubensky, Europhys.Lett. 4, 395

(1987).

- <sup>33</sup> L.Radzihovsky and J.Toner, unpublished.
- $^{34}$  In doing this power counting, one must assume that the q = 0 value of the integral in Eq.5.13 is precisely cancelled by the bare gy. This assumption is the only way to solve Eq.5.13 for D < D  $_{\rm uc}$ .
- <sup>35</sup> B. Nienhuis, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 1062 (1982); B. Duplantier in Fields, Strings and Critical Phenom ena, Les H ouches Lectures, edited by E. Brezin and J. Zinn-Justin (1990).
- $^{\rm 36}$  K.G.W ilson and J.Kogut, Phys.Rep.C, 12, 77 (1977).
- <sup>37</sup> S.F.Edwards, unpublished 1968; J. des C bizeaux, K yoto C onference on Statistical M echanics, J. Phys. Soc. Japan Suppl.26,42 (1969); J.Phys.France 31,715 (1970).J.des C bizeaux and G. Jannink, Polymers in Solution: Their M odelling and Structure (O xford U niversity P ress, O xford, 1989).
- $^{38}$  W e thank Stephanie Palmer who generously donated her time to us (computer illiterates), to numerically evaluate integrals appearing in Eqs.7.32 and 7.37.
- <sup>39</sup> R. P. Feynman, Statistical Mechanics: A Set of Lectures, Addison-Wesley (1972).
- <sup>40</sup> T.A. Tokuyasu and J. Toner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 3721 (1992).
- <sup>41</sup> B. Jacobsen and L. Radzihovsky, work in progress.
- <sup>42</sup> L. Cannon, J. A ronovitz, and P. Goldbart, J. Physique I, 1, 629 (1991); J. A ronovitz and M. Stephens, J. Phys. A 20, 2539 (1987); J. A ronovitz and D. Nelson, J. Physique 47, 1445 (1986).