

A viscous active shell theory of the cell cortex

Hudson Borja da Rocha^a, J  r  my Bleyer^b and Herv   Turlier^{a,*}

^aCenter for Interdisciplinary Research in Biology (CIRB), Coll  ge de France, CNRS, INSERM, Universit   PSL, Paris, France

^bLaboratoire Navier, Ecole des Ponts ParisTech, Universit   Gustave Eiffel, CNRS, 6-8 av Blaise Pascal, Cit   Descartes, 77455 Champs-sur-Marne, FRANCE

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
viscous thin shell
cell cortex
active gels
morphogenesis
finite-element
FEniCS

ABSTRACT

The cell cortex is a thin layer beneath the plasma membrane that gives animal cells mechanical resistance and drives most of their shape changes, from migration, division to multicellular morphogenesis. Constantly stirred by molecular motors and under fast renewal, this material is well described by viscous and contractile active-gel theories. Here, we assume that the cortex is a thin viscous shell with non-negligible curvature and use asymptotic expansions to find the leading-order equations describing its shape dynamics, starting from constitutive equations for an incompressible viscous active gel. Reducing the three-dimensional equations leads to a Koiter-like shell theory, where both resistance to stretching and bending rates are present. Constitutive equations are completed by a kinematical equation describing the evolution of the cortex thickness with turnover. We show that tension and moment resultants depend not only on the shell deformation rate and motor activity but also on the active turnover of the material, which may also exert either contractile or extensile stress. Using the finite-element method, we implement our theory numerically to study two biological examples of drastic cell shape changes: cell division and osmotic shocks. Our work provides a numerical implementation of thin active viscous layers and a generic theoretical framework to develop shell theories for slender active biological structures.

1. Introduction

Biological cells can exhibit myriad of shapes, which are intimately linked to the multiple key functions they perform: division, polarisation, apoptosis (i.e., programmed death), or migration. Dynamic changes in the shape of animal cells, also called *morphogenesis*, is mainly controlled by the cell cortex, a dense meshwork of filaments underlying the plasma membrane, capable of generating internal active tensions and torques [1].

The cell cortex is a thin biological structure of few hundreds of nanometers in thickness that extends over several tens of micrometers, the typical cell size [2]. It is composed of semi-flexible actin polymers, actin-binding proteins, and myosin molecular motors, which are the substrates of various phosphorylation events keeping this material out of equilibrium [3]. By continuously hydrolyzing ATP (adenosine triphosphate) into ADP (adenosine diphosphate) and inorganic phosphate, actomyosin networks have two remarkable properties, which are relatively unusual in classical mechanics. First, they are under permanent renewal, principally through the assembly and disassembly of filaments, which happens within seconds; this fast material turnover releases elastic stresses accumulated in the network, making this material viscous on timescales longer than a few dozens of seconds [4]. Second, they are the subject of internal active loads created by molecular motors, which exert contractile traction forces on neighboring filaments; this creates an active source of stress

*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: hudson.borja-da-rocha@polytechnique.edu (H. Borja da Rocha), jeremy.bleyer@enpc.fr (J. Bleyer), herve.turlier@college-de-france.fr (H. Turlier)

ORCID(s): 0000-0001-9615-2022 (Hudson Borja da Rocha); 0000-0001-8212-9921 (J  r  my Bleyer); 0000-0002-9332-9125 (Herv   Turlier)

that is continuously dissipated and renewed, leading overall to an effective surface tension at the cell level [5, 6, 7, 8]; it can also lead to structural rearrangements of actin filaments within the plane of the cell's surface, which has motivated the recent emergence of active-gel theories [9]. Relying on mass and momentum balance and exploiting the fundamental symmetries of the system, active gel theories extend hydrodynamic theories for nematic or polar liquid crystals [10] to account for the activity of motors and, to a certain extent, for the renewal of the material [11, 9]. They have provided a convenient generic theoretical framework to describe the large-scale mechanical properties of active materials through hydrodynamic variables. The cortex mechanics is consecutively described in general by two sources of stress: active stress, which is controlled spatiotemporally by the cell metabolism and depends on the local filament organization, and passive stress, which results from the viscoelastic deformation of the network in response to external loads or gradients in internal active stress. This approach has proven its ability to capture the essential physics characterizing the morphological changes observed experimentally in single cells [12, 13, 7, 14, 15, 16].

Because of the slender character of the cell cortex (around $0.2 - 2 \mu\text{m}$ in thickness [17, 2] for a typical cell radius of $10 - 100 \mu\text{m}$), it is reasonable to rely on thin shell theories to model its mechanics at the cell level [18, 19]. Shells are considered thin if their thickness is much smaller (typically by a factor of 20 or more) than their other characteristic dimensions. The main goal of thin shell theories is to reduce the three-dimensional equations into a two-dimensional model defined onto the shell's middle surface. Even though at the timescale of interest, the passive response of the cortex is essentially viscous, we expect the models we derive to be closely related to those of elastic plates and shells, which have been extensively studied in solid mechanics. It is due to the Stokes-Rayleigh analogy, which states that the equations of slow viscous flow and linear elasticity in the incompressible limit (Poisson's ratio $1/2$) are interchangeable if velocities replace displacements and strain rates replace strains [20, 21]. For a more detailed introduction on elastic shell theories, we refer to classic textbooks [22, 23, 24, 25]. For viscous materials, however, only a few thin sheet models have been derived. Membrane models (in which bending resistance is neglected) have been developed in arbitrary shapes [26, 27] but models accounting for bending resistance were mostly derived for specific geometries [28, 29, 30], with one exception in general curvilinear coordinates [31]. This last study constitutes the starting point of our active shell theory of cell dynamics.

Most of the recent works on dynamic cell shape changes have considered the cortex as a pure viscous surface, with its mechanics described by tensions only [32, 7, 33, 34]. However, several cortex features justify the need to derive a proper thin viscous shell theory that accounts for both stretching and bending resistances. First, the thickness of the cortex is not constant but varies along the cell's surface, which is in contrast to the classical assumption of constant thickness in thin elastic shell theories [35]. Second, the turnover of cortical material is not homogeneous along the transverse sheet direction: polymerization happens mainly at the lipid bilayer (or plasma membrane) surface and creates an inward flux of actomyosin, while depolymerization acts in bulk, ideally at each filament ends [36], as depicted schematically on Fig. 1. The inward polymerization flux breaks the symmetry of the shell with respect to its mid-surface and can potentially generate tangential viscous flows of the cortex, and therefore additional stress that has been neglected so far. Third, pure membrane models of the cell cortex cannot handle compressive forces, that lead to surface buckling, nor active torque generation. Finally, if active-gel theories provide relevant bulk constitutive equations for cortical material, the mathematical form of equivalent two-dimensional stress and torque resultants after dimensional reduction is hard to guess readily.

This paper proposes, therefore, a general thin active viscous shell theory that aims to predict how the shape of a cell responds to arbitrary loads. The load can be internal, such as gradients of contractility, or external, from the mechanical interaction with its environment. Extending to active-gel materials a previous covariant description of thin viscous shells [31], we present a systematic asymptotic expansion of governing equations in powers of a slenderness parameter $\varepsilon \equiv T_0/L$, where T_0 and L are respectively the characteristic thickness and length scale over which the flows varies across the sheet (for a cell, L is typically its




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the cell cortex, composed of actin filaments and actin-binding proteins, in particular myosin molecular motors. The cortex forms a thin layer of thickness $T \ll R_0$ beneath the plasma membrane, where R_0 is the typical curvature radius of the cell. It is under permanent turnover, with a polymerization flux v_p from the plasma membrane surface and a depolymerization rate k_d in the bulk of the layer. The dimensional reduction into a thin theory consists in finding the two-dimensional approximate in-plane and transverse shear stress $N^{\alpha\beta}$ and Q^α , and torque $M^{\alpha\beta}$ resultants, defined on the middle-surface of the shell.

radius R_0 , see Fig. 1). We start from three-dimensional active-gel constitutive laws and mass conservation equations. The expansion is performed in two limits, stretching and bending-dominated, which are then combined to build an approximate two-dimensional model that is valid for the whole range of intermediate behaviors, following the generic method of matched asymptotic expansion [37]. The two-dimensional model is complemented by a kinematic equation describing the evolution of the thickness. Aiming at facilitating the spread, modification, refinement of our model and to highlight its features, we furthermore devise a numerical scheme to solve the 2-dimensional thin shell equations with the finite-element library FEniCS [38], and we illustrate numerically two drastic dynamic cell shape changes: cell division and osmotic shocks.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we start by introducing our notations and provide a summary of differential geometry and kinematics for surfaces and shells. In section 3, we introduce the general governing equations: the linear momentum balance in three dimensions and resulting generic stress resultants and torque balance on a surface; the three-dimensional constitutive equation of the cell cortex, and the mass balance with turnover. Follows in section 4 the core of the theory, with the dimensional reduction of constitutive equations by asymptotic expansion, which we perform successively in the membrane and inextensional limits, based on preliminary scaling arguments. Then we introduce a variational formulation of our problem in section 5, and we derive the kinematic evolution equation for the thickness in section 6. The numerical scheme employed to solve 2-dimensional thin sheet equations with finite elements is detailed in section 7, and numerical results for cell division and osmotic shocks are presented in section 8. We finally discuss our results and suggest possible perspectives in section 9.

2. Differential geometry and kinematics of surfaces and shells

Throughout the text, we use the Einstein summation convention: when an index variable appears twice in an expression, it implies summation of that variable over all values of the index.¹ Latin indices take the value 1, 2, 3, and are used in variables describing the ambient, three-dimensional, Euclidean space. Greek indices take the value 1, 2, and are used in variables in the embedded, two-dimensional, surface. Therefore, $x_i y^i = x_1 y^1 + x_2 y^2 + x_3 y^3$ and $s_\alpha s^\alpha = s_1 s^1 + s_2 s^2$. Bold symbols represent vectors. For a more complete text about differential geometry of surfaces and tensor calculus, we refer the reader to [39]; and to [40] for a concise introduction to tensor analysis.

¹The index appears only twice, once as a superscript (upper index x^i), and once as subscript (lower index x_i).

2.1. Differential geometry of surfaces




Figure 2: Parametric description of a surface patch: each set of coordinates (ξ_1, ξ_2) in the parametric domain \mathcal{P} is mapped to a unique material point \mathbf{r} on the surface \mathcal{S}

Let \mathcal{S} be a surface embedded in \mathbb{R}^3 (e.g. the middle surface of the shell). We describe surfaces parametrically, that is, we choose a set of coordinate variables (ξ^1, ξ^2) in a parametric domain $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and let each of the ambient coordinates r_1, r_2, r_3 of a material point $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{S}$ depend on ξ^α : $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha)$. This corresponds to a mapping of the point (ξ^1, ξ^2) in the parametric domain \mathcal{P} to a point on the material domain \mathcal{S} , see Fig. 2. This mapping is supposed to be an infinitely differentiable homeomorphism. ξ^α are curvilinear coordinates on the surface \mathcal{S} and are non-orthogonal in general. We must, therefore, distinguish between covariant and contravariant components of tensors. At every point in the surface of the patch, the parametrization ξ^α defines in-plane (covariant) tangent vectors

$$\mathbf{a}_\alpha = \mathbf{r}_{,\alpha} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha)}{\partial \xi^\alpha}, \quad (1)$$

the comma denotes the partial derivative with respect to a variable. For tangential vectors to form a covariant vector basis \mathbf{a}_α , we furthermore suppose them linearly independent at any point of the surface. The contravariant basis vectors \mathbf{a}^α are the reciprocals of the covariant basis, and are defined by the relation $\mathbf{a}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}_\beta = \delta^\alpha_\beta$, where δ^α_β is the Kronecker delta. Covariant and contravariant metric tensors of the surface are defined from basis vectors as $a_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{a}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}_\beta$, and $a^{\alpha\beta} = \mathbf{a}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}^\beta$, respectively. These tensors allow one to generalize the notion of dot product on curved surfaces and may also be employed in lowering and raising index of tensors, for instance, $c^\alpha_\beta = a^{\lambda\alpha} c_{\beta\lambda} = a_{\beta\lambda} c^{\lambda\alpha}$. The determinant of the covariant metric tensor is $a = \det(\mathbf{a}_{\alpha\beta}) = a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21}$. The unit normal of the surface \mathcal{S} at any point \mathbf{r} is defined by

$$\mathbf{n} \equiv \frac{\mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{a}_2}{|\mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{a}_2|}. \quad (2)$$

While the normal is usually a unit vector, the same is not true for the tangent vectors, which generally are neither of unit length nor perpendicular to each other.

The second fundamental form of the surface is called the curvature tensor, defined as $b_{\alpha\beta} \equiv -\mathbf{a}_\alpha \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\beta}$, and is symmetric $b_{\alpha\beta} = b_{\beta\alpha} = -\mathbf{a}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{n}_{,\alpha}$. It quantifies the extent of local curvature of the surface in the embedding three-dimensional space.

In a curved manifold, the coordinate system is position dependent as well as the tensors living on this manifold. The covariant derivative accounts for the position dependence of the coordinate system, and extends the notion of derivatives to curved surfaces, producing tensors out of tensors. The resulting tensor is one covariant order greater than the original tensor. Covariant differentiation works differently for covariant and contravariant components and takes the following form,

$$v^\beta|_\alpha = v^\beta_{,\alpha} + \Gamma^\beta_{\alpha\gamma} v^\gamma, \quad (3a)$$

$$v_\beta|_\alpha = v_{\beta,\alpha} - \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^\gamma v_\gamma. \quad (3b)$$

where we introduced the Christoffel symbols, defined by $\Gamma_{\lambda\mu}^\alpha \equiv \mathbf{a}^\alpha \cdot \mathbf{a}_{\lambda,\mu} = \frac{1}{2}a^{\alpha\delta}(a_{\delta\lambda,\mu} + a_{\delta\mu,\lambda} - a_{\lambda\mu,\delta})$. When acting on invariants², the covariant derivative is equivalent to the usual partial derivative, in particular $\mathbf{v}|_\alpha = \mathbf{v}_{,\alpha}$. Particular covariant derivatives are the ones of the basis vectors, which are known as Gauss and Weingarten's relations, given respectively by $\mathbf{a}_{\alpha|\beta} = b_{\alpha\beta}\mathbf{n}$, and $\mathbf{n}_{,\alpha} = -b_\alpha^\lambda \mathbf{a}_\lambda$.

2.2. Differential geometry of shells




Figure 3: (a) Parametrization of a shell of midsurface S and thickness T . The local basis vectors for arbitrary points in the shell are denoted by \mathbf{g}_i , while the basis vectors on the midsurface are \mathbf{a}_α . The position of a material element in the shell is decomposed as $\mathbf{R}(\xi^\alpha, z) = \mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha) + z\mathbf{n}(\xi^\alpha)$, where $\mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha, t)$ is the transverse projection onto the midsurface and $\mathbf{n}(\xi^\alpha)$ is the local normal to the midsurface. (b) Element of the shell: a patch of area $dS(0)$ at $z = 0$ is multiplied by a factor $h = 1 - 2Hz + Gz^2$ at the transverse coordinate z

Thin shells are usually described by a middle surface (or midsurface) S and a thickness T [23, 22]. The middle surface is the two-dimensional surface that is equidistant, at any of its point, to the upper and lower shell boundaries. The Euclidean space in which the surface is embedded is generally called the *ambient* space. We suppose that the midsurface is everywhere continuous, infinitely differentiable and of arbitrary shape. In this text, we follow closely the notation of [23], to which we refer the reader for a more in-depth discussion.

The midsurface is described by a position vector $\mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha, t)$ relative to an arbitrary origin through generalized coordinates ξ^α . We introduce a third coordinate³, $z \in [-T/2, T/2]$, measured along the unit normal $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{a}_3(\xi^\alpha, t)$, defined at each point of the midsurface so that $z = 0$ is the midsurface, and the thickness $T = T(\xi^\alpha)$ is a general function of ξ^α , see Fig. 3. Then, the position of an arbitrary material point of the shell $\mathbf{R}(\xi^\alpha, z, t)$ is defined by the equation

$$\mathbf{R}(\xi^\alpha, z, t) = \mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha, t) + z\mathbf{n}(\xi^\alpha, t). \quad (4)$$

The covariant basis vectors at an arbitrary point in the shell are defined as

$$\mathbf{g}_\alpha = \mathbf{R}_{,\alpha} = \mathbf{a}_\alpha - zb_\alpha^\lambda \mathbf{a}_\lambda = \mu_\alpha^\lambda \mathbf{a}_\lambda, \text{ and } \mathbf{g}_3 = \mathbf{n} \quad (5)$$

where $\mu_\alpha^\lambda = \delta_\alpha^\lambda - zb_\alpha^\lambda$ is a tensor that projects the ambient basis \mathbf{g}_α onto the midsurface basis \mathbf{a}_α (called *shifter tensor* or *shell shifter*). The determinant of the metric tensor is $g = \det g_{ij}$. The covariant metric

²Objects that can be constructed without reference to any coordinate systems are called *invariants* or *geometric*. Scalar fields and vectors are examples of geometric objects

³Derivatives with respect to the normal coordinate will be denoted as $\partial\phi/\partial z \equiv \phi_{,3}$.

tensor $g_{ij} = \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_j$ follows as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\alpha\beta} &= g_{\beta\alpha} = a_{\lambda\rho} \mu_\alpha^\lambda \mu_\beta^\rho \\ g_{\alpha 3} &= g_{3\alpha} = 0 \\ g_{33} &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The contravariant basis vector at an arbitrary point in the shell is $\mathbf{g}^\alpha = h^{-1}(\mu_\rho^\rho \delta_\lambda^\alpha - \mu_\lambda^\alpha) \mathbf{a}^\lambda$, and $\mathbf{g}^3 = \mathbf{g}_3 = \mathbf{n}$, where

$$h = \sqrt{g/a} = \det(\mu_\alpha^\beta) = 1 - 2Hz + Gz^2 \quad (7)$$

measures the deformation of a patch of area at a distance z from the midsurface because of shell curvature, and where

$$H = \frac{1}{2} b_\alpha^\alpha = \frac{1}{2} (b_1^1 + b_2^2), \quad \text{and} \quad G = \det b_\alpha^\beta = b_1^1 b_2^2 - b_2^1 b_1^2, \quad (8)$$

are the two main invariants of the curvature tensor, called the mean and Gaussian curvature, respectively. Finally, the contravariant metric tensor $g^{ij} = \mathbf{g}^i \mathbf{g}^j$ is such that $g^{ij} g_{jk} = \delta_k^i$.

3. Governing equations

The following development of the governing equations is standard and their derivation may be found in more detail in classical books on elastic shell theory [22, 23]. We adopt mostly the notations employed by [23], to which we refer for more details.

At the scale of cells, the Reynolds number is very small, and we are interested in deformations at low frequencies, such that inertial and convective terms in the Navier-Stokes equation are negligible [41]. Therefore, all equations below will be written neglecting inertia. We assume that the distribution of stress throughout the sheet is characterized by the stress tensor $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, in equilibrium with bulk forces \mathbf{f} , described by the inertialess Cauchy's equation of motion

$$\operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{\tau} + \rho \mathbf{f} = 0. \quad (9)$$

The Voss-Weyl formula [39] expresses the divergence of a contravariant tensor field without a reference to the Christoffel symbols, $T^i|_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} (\sqrt{g} T^i)$, when applied to the inertialess Cauchy's equation of motion it yields

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} (\sqrt{g} \tau^{ij} g_j)_i + \rho f^i g_i = 0, \quad (10)$$

where τ^{ij} is the Cauchy stress tensor and f^j are the contravariant components of volume forces. These stresses must be expressed both per unit area of a single reference surface and relative to base vectors that do not vary across the thickness of the sheet. The natural choice for this purpose is the midsurface and its intrinsic base vectors \mathbf{a}_i . If we use $\mathbf{g}_\alpha = \mu_\lambda^\alpha \mathbf{a}_\lambda$, $\mathbf{g}_3 = \mathbf{n}$, the equilibrium equations can be rewritten in the following form [23]

$$\sigma^{\alpha\beta}|_\alpha - b_\alpha^\beta \sigma^{\alpha 3} + \sigma_{,3}^{3\beta} = -h \rho \mu_\lambda^\beta f^\lambda, \quad \text{in-plane equilibrium} \quad (11a)$$

$$\sigma^{\alpha 3}|_\alpha + b_{\alpha\beta} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} + \sigma_{,3}^{33} = -h \rho f^3, \quad \text{out-of-plane equilibrium} \quad (11b)$$

where

$$\sigma^{i\lambda} = h \mu_\alpha^\lambda \tau^{i\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^{i3} = h \tau^{i3} \quad (12)$$

are tangential and transverse stress tensor components referred to the midsurface. Notice that σ^{ij} is not symmetric. Moreover, because of the symmetry of τ^{ij} , it follows that $\sigma^{3\beta} = \mu_\lambda^\beta \sigma^{\lambda 3}$.

3.1. The cell cortex: bulk equations

3D constitutive relations The cell cortex is often described as an active polymeric gel [42]. Polymer gels are cross-linked networks formed by linear or branched polymers. In the cell cortex, actin polymers are furthermore permanently renewed by polymerization/depolymerization, which releases elastic stresses over timescales of dozens of seconds [36, 4]. The cell cortex is therefore often described as a Maxwell viscoelastic material, responding elastically on short timescales and viscously on longer times, [11]. The cell cortex differs from physical gels in which it is an active material: it is out-of-equilibrium, continuously consuming energy in the form of ATP. Here, we work in the viscous regime of cortical behavior and start from viscous active nematic gel equations [11, 43, 12], which consider the stress to be the sum of a passive viscous term, and an active stress exerted by myosin molecular motors in the network $\tau = \tau_{pas} + \tau_{act}$. The viscous response is modeled as a Newtonian fluid

$$\tau_{pas}^{ij} = -p g^{ij} + 2\mu g^{ik} g^{jl} e_{kl}, \quad (13)$$

where p is the hydrostatic pressure, μ is the shear viscosity of the actomyosin gel, and

$$e_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(g_i \cdot \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi^j} + g_j \cdot \frac{\partial u}{\partial \xi^i} \right) \quad (14)$$

is the three-dimensional strain rate tensor, and $u(\xi^\alpha, z, t)$ is the Lagrangian fluid velocity of the shell.




Figure 4: Cortex as an active gel. The myosin transforms the energy of ATP hydrolysis into mechanical work.

The cell cortex generates internal stress from the action of the motor protein myosin. Myosin motors can walk along actin filaments driven by the hydrolysis of ATP. When assembled into minifilaments and associated with several actin filaments, they induce internal stresses in the actin network (see Fig. 4). While the detailed microscopic processes for the generation and renewal of motor-generated stress are complex [44], they lead most generally to contractile stress in actomyosin networks [45, 42], which is a term akin to negative pressure, that will be controlled spatiotemporally by cells through local phosphorylation of myosin chains via various biochemical pathways, such as the RhoA pathway [46]. As a result of motor activity or viscous flow, actin filaments may also acquire a structural organization within the cortex that is generally described with a polar or nematic order parameter [11]. The nematic theory of active gels⁴ [12] predicts an active stress contribution of the general form

$$\tau_{act}^{ij} = \tilde{\zeta} \Delta\mu g^{ik} g^{jl} Q_{kl}, \quad (15)$$

where $\Delta\mu$ is the gain in chemical free energy for one ATP molecule hydrolysis, $\tilde{\zeta} > 0$ is a measure of the local motor contractile activity [11]. Note that we neglect here the conjugate field, a classical passive term

⁴The nematic phase is described by the breaking of rotational symmetry, but not translational symmetry. In the nematic phase, the molecules are randomly polarized, but their long axes are oriented on the average along a particular direction specified by a unit vector \mathbf{t} called the director, see Fig. 5

in nematic hydrodynamic theories, that reflect the restoring forces deriving from elastic energy penalizing gradients of filament orientations (the Frank-Oseen energy)[10]. The local orientation of actin filaments is measured by a traceless nematic tensor $Q_{ij} = \langle t_i t_j - \frac{1}{3} \delta_{ij} \rangle$ where $\langle \rangle$ represents a local (mesoscopic) average over the orientation of the filaments in a elementary mesoscopic volume [10, 47], and the orientation of each filament being characterized by a unit vector \mathbf{t} , see Fig. 5(b).

The bulk constitutive relation is written in its contravariant form

$$\tau^{ij} = -p g^{ij} + 2\mu g^{ik} g^{jl} e_{kl} + \zeta g^{ik} g^{jl} Q_{kl}, \quad (16)$$

where we introduced, to simplify notations, $\zeta \equiv \tilde{\zeta} \Delta \mu$: the magnitude of the actively generated stress in the cortex, which has to be positive to correspond to contractile stress. Note that we count positively the active stress and consider a positive phenomenological parameter $\tilde{\zeta} \geq 0$, taking a different sign convention than in [11].




Figure 5: (a) Visualization of a cross section of the cortex containing the normal to the midsurface. The actin filaments are mainly organized parallel to the midsurface. The addition of new actin monomers happens at the surface in contact with the plasma membrane, while the depolymerization happens uniformly across the cortex thickness. (b) In the tangent plane, the actin filaments are isotropically oriented. The vector \mathbf{t} represents the average orientation of an actin filament.

Local mass balance The actomyosin cortex is under permanent turnover. The polymerization of new actin monomers happens mostly at the surface in contact with the plasma membrane at $z = T/2$, creating a flux of actin inwards the cell at a velocity $v_p = k_p a$, where k_p is the rate of polymerization and a the typical size of a monomer. The depolymerization of the actin may happen through different mechanisms [36]. Here we suppose that depolymerization is a bulk process that essentially happens at each free filament end, in which actin monomers depolymerize at a rate k_d , see Fig. 5(a). Considering actomyosin density to be uniform across the membrane, bulk mass conservation reads

$$\text{div } \mathbf{u} = -k_d + v_p \delta\left(z - \frac{T}{2}\right), \quad (17)$$

where the delta function constrains polymerization from the upper shell surface boundary $z = T/2$.

3.2. Balance of stress and torque resultants

The fundamental dynamic quantities of interest for a thin shell theory are stress resultants and bending moments, which are integrals of the stress and torque across the sheet. Therefore, we integrate the equations (11) with respect to z through the thickness of the shell and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\alpha\beta}|_\alpha - b_\alpha^\beta q^\alpha + \hat{P}^\beta &= 0, \\ q^\alpha|_\alpha + b_{\alpha\beta} n^{\alpha\beta} + \hat{P}^3 &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where

$$n^{\alpha\beta} \equiv \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} dz, \quad q^\alpha \equiv \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \sigma^{\alpha 3} dz,$$

are the stress resultant tensor and transverse shear stress. $\hat{P}^\beta = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \mu_\lambda^\beta f^\lambda \rho h dz + F_+^\beta + F_-^\beta$, and $\hat{P}^3 = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} f^3 \rho h dz + F_+^3 + F_-^3$, with $F_\pm^j = \Lambda_\pm \sigma_\pm^{ij} n_i^\pm$, are the components of the stress applied in the direction \mathbf{a}_j to the sheet outer surface, measured per unit area of the midsurface, and $\Lambda_\pm = (1 + \frac{1}{4} g_\pm^{\alpha\beta} T_{,\alpha} T_{,\beta})^{1/2}$. The outward unit normal vectors are $\mathbf{n}^\pm = n_i^\pm \mathbf{g}_\pm^i$, with $n_\alpha^\pm = -\Lambda_\pm^{-1} \frac{1}{2} T_{,\alpha}$ and $n_3^\pm = \pm \Lambda_\pm^{-1}$.

To obtain the equation for the torque resultant we multiply (11a) by z , then integrate across the sheet,

$$m^{\alpha\beta}|_\alpha + q^\beta = \mathcal{M}^\beta, \quad (19)$$

where

$$m^{\alpha\beta} \equiv - \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \sigma^{\alpha\beta} z dz$$

is the bending moment tensor, and $\mathcal{M}^\beta = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} \mu_\lambda^\beta f^\lambda \rho h z dz + \frac{T}{2}(F_+^\beta - F_-^\beta)$ is the applied moment vector.

Next, we then introduce the *symmetric* effective membrane stress tensor

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = n^{\alpha\beta} - b_\lambda^\beta m^{\alpha\lambda}, \quad (20)$$

and the *symmetric* effective moment tensor as

$$M^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(m^{\alpha\beta} + m^{\beta\alpha}). \quad (21)$$

Then, we eliminate the shear stress resultant q^α using equation Eq. (19), and substitute (20) and (21) into (18) to finally obtain [22]

$$N^{\alpha\beta}|_\alpha + 2b_\gamma^\beta M^{\alpha\gamma}|_\alpha + M^{\gamma\alpha} b_\gamma^\beta|_\alpha + P^\beta = 0, \quad (22a)$$

$$M^{\alpha\beta}|_{\alpha\beta} - b_{\alpha\gamma} b_\beta^\gamma M^{\gamma\alpha} - b_{\alpha\beta} N^{\alpha\beta} - P^3 = 0, \quad (22b)$$

where $P^\beta = \hat{P}^\beta + b_\alpha^\beta \mathcal{M}^\alpha$, and $P^3 = \hat{P}^3 - \mathcal{M}^\alpha|_\alpha$.

It is worth noting that the balance equations (22) are independent of the constitutive law for the shell: they represent universal force balance equations, valid for any 2-dimensional medium equipped with tension and bending moments, and simply expresses the conservation of momentum. Such decomposition is classical in the theory of elastic shells [48, 22], and was also used to model the dynamics of viscous sheets [31]. Moreover, since inertia has been neglected, time does not explicitly appears in the equilibrium equations or boundary conditions.

4. Thin sheet constitutive equations

Because we are writing the equations of a shell theory based on stress resultants, Eq. (20-21), constitutive equations for the stress resultants have to be formulated. These constitutive relations represent the stress field integrated over the shell thickness. Its formulation is not trivial since one must carefully consider the phenomenological three-dimensional constitutive equations for the visco-active material and the mass conservation, introducing the active turnover effects into the two-dimensional constitutive relations.

We now wish to exploit the slenderness of the cortex to obtain approximated "thin sheet" equations. Such an approach is valid when the slenderness parameter $\varepsilon = T_0/L \ll 1$. Then, we use asymptotic expansion in the small parameter ε and in z to express the effective stress $N^{\alpha\beta}$ and bending moment $M^{\alpha\beta}$ in terms of the midsurface velocity $\mathbf{U} \equiv \mathbf{u}(z=0, t) = U^\alpha \mathbf{a}_\alpha + U^3 \mathbf{n}$, in the local basis $\{\mathbf{a}_\alpha, \mathbf{n}\}$. More specifically, the constitutive equations will depend on the two tensors that describe the rate of deformation of the midsurface: the strain rate tensor⁵

$$\Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(U_{\alpha|\beta} + U_{\beta|\alpha}) - b_{\alpha\beta}U_3, \quad (23)$$

and the rate of change of the curvature tensor⁶

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta} = U_{3,\alpha|\beta} + b_{\beta}^{\lambda}U_{\lambda|\alpha} + b_{\beta|\alpha}^{\lambda}U_{\lambda} + b_{\beta}^{\gamma}U_{\gamma|\alpha} - b_{\alpha\gamma}^{\gamma}U_3. \quad (24)$$

The deformation rate of the middle surface is described completely by the pair of symmetric tensors $\Delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$. It is important to note that the rate of tangential stretching depends not only on the rate of surface strain $(U_{\alpha|\beta} + U_{\beta|\alpha})/2$, but also on surface shape changes in the presence of curvature $-b_{\alpha\beta}U_3$.

4.1. Non-dimensionalization and scaling analysis

The effective shear viscosity μ of the cortex is supposed to be fixed, and P is a characteristic stress. Tangential coordinates scale as $x_\alpha = L\hat{x}_\alpha$, while the normal coordinate is $z = \varepsilon L\hat{z}$. Next, we define the dimensionless curvatures $\hat{b}_{\alpha\beta} = Lb_{\alpha\beta}$, $\hat{H} = LH$, $\hat{G} = L^2G$. Then, introduce the dimensionless volume element $h \equiv \sqrt{g/a} = 1 - 2\hat{H}\hat{z}\varepsilon + \hat{G}\hat{z}^2\varepsilon^2$, the dimensionless shift tensor $\mu_\gamma^\beta = \delta_\gamma^\beta - \varepsilon\hat{z}b_\gamma^\beta$, and we approximate the contravariant metric tensor as, $g^{\alpha\beta} \approx a^{\alpha\beta} + 2\varepsilon\hat{z}b^{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$.

In theories of thin sheets, one often distinguishes between two main deformation modes that are highly dependent on the load applied to the system. In the *membrane* (or stretching-dominated) regime, the system responds mainly through stretching such that bending moments can be neglected. While in the *inextensional* (or bending-dominated) regime, the dissipation issued from bending deformation rates becomes significant. These two regimes are described by different scalings for velocity and stress components [29, 49, 27].

In the membrane limit, the velocities and stresses in a viscous sheet scale as [26]

$$\mathbf{u} \sim \frac{PL}{\mu\varepsilon}, \quad p \sim \frac{P}{\varepsilon}. \quad (25)$$

While in the inextensional (bending) regime, the appropriate scaling is [28, 31]

$$\mathbf{u} \sim \frac{PL}{\mu\varepsilon^3}, \quad p \sim \frac{P}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (26)$$

In order to cover both deformation modes within our thin sheet model, we use the method of matched asymptotic expansions [37], which consists of finding approximate solutions separately in each limiting case, and then combining these approximations, giving an approximate constitutive relation that is valid for the whole range of intermediate behaviors.

4.2. Asymptotic expansion: membrane limit

We expand the variables u_i and p into a double power series in $\varepsilon = T_0/L$, and in the dimensionless normal coordinate $\hat{z} = z/T_0$. The scaling (25) indicate the appropriate expansion in the membrane limit

$$u_i = \frac{PL}{\mu\varepsilon} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \hat{z}^n u_i^{(mn)}, \quad p = \frac{P}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \hat{z}^n p^{(mn)} \quad (27)$$

⁵The time derivative of the metric tensor $\frac{da_{\alpha\beta}}{dt} = 2\Delta_{\alpha\beta}$ defines the symmetric strain rate tensor

⁶The time derivative of the curvature tensor is $\frac{db_{\alpha\beta}}{dt} = \Omega_{\alpha\beta}$, determines the rate of change of the curvature tensor

where $u_i^{(mn)}$ and $p^{(mn)}$ are dimensionless functions of the curvilinear coordinates x_1 and x_2 .

We postulate that the active stress scales as the pressure, and the turnover scales as velocities (modulo a length for the depolymerization rate), which gives the following scalings for active parameters: the active stress $\zeta = \frac{P}{\epsilon} \hat{\zeta}$, the polymerization velocity $v_p = \frac{PL}{\mu\epsilon} \hat{v}_p$, and the depolymerization rate $k_d = \frac{P}{\mu\epsilon} \hat{k}_d$.

In the membrane limit, the bending moment $m^{\alpha\beta} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$, and at lowest order, $N^{\alpha\beta} = n^{\alpha\beta}$.

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon L \int_{-\hat{T}/2}^{\hat{T}/2} (1 - 2\hat{H}\hat{z}\epsilon + \hat{G}\hat{z}^2\epsilon^2)(\delta_\gamma^\beta - \epsilon\hat{z}b_\gamma^\beta)(-pg^{\alpha\gamma} + 2\mu g^{\alpha\lambda}g^{\gamma\delta}e_{\lambda\delta} + \zeta g^{\alpha\lambda}g^{\gamma\delta}Q_{\lambda\delta})d\hat{z}. \quad (28)$$

If the Lagrangian fluid velocity is decomposed in the local basis $\mathbf{u}(\xi^\alpha, z, t) = u^\alpha(\xi^\alpha, z, t)\mathbf{g}_\alpha + u_3(\xi^\alpha, z, t)\mathbf{n}$, it follows that the strain rate tensor can be written as [23, 25]

$$\begin{aligned} 2e_{\alpha\beta} &= \mu_\beta^\lambda(u_{\lambda|\alpha} - b_{\lambda\alpha}u_3) + \mu_\alpha^\lambda(u_{\lambda|\beta} - b_{\lambda\beta}u_3), \\ 2e_{\alpha 3} &= u_{3,\alpha} + u_{\alpha,3} + b_\alpha^\lambda(u_\lambda - zu_{\lambda,3}), \\ e_{33} &= u_{3,3}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

One may remark that, at this point, no assumption was made on the kinematic, and our shell model allows for transverse shear and transverse normal deformations. Now, after applying (27) in Eq. (29), we obtain the strain rate tensor

$$2e_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{P}{\mu\epsilon} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(mn)} + u_{\beta|\alpha}^{(mn)} - 2\hat{b}_{\alpha\beta}u_3^{(mn)} + \epsilon\hat{z}(2\hat{b}_\beta^\lambda\hat{b}_{\lambda\alpha}u_3^{(mn)} - \hat{b}_\alpha^\lambda u_{\lambda|\beta}^{(mn)} - \hat{b}_\beta^\lambda u_{\lambda|\alpha}^{(mn)}) \right]. \quad (30)$$

Next, we substitute the expansion (27) for the pressure, use (30) for the strain rate $e_{\lambda\delta}$, and use the approximation for the contravariant metric tensor $g^{\alpha\beta} \approx a^{\alpha\beta} + 2\epsilon\hat{z}b^{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$. Then the leading term of the stress resultant is

$$\frac{N^{\alpha\beta}}{PL} = \hat{T} \left[2a^{\alpha\mu}a^{\beta\delta}\Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(00)} - a^{\alpha\beta}p^{(00)} \right] + \hat{T}\zeta a^{\alpha\mu}a^{\beta\delta}Q_{\mu\delta}, \quad (31)$$

where we introduced the dimensionless strain rate tensor $\Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(00)} + u_{\beta|\alpha}^{(00)}) - \hat{b}_{\alpha\beta}u_3^{(00)}$, which relates to the dimensional strain rate tensor as $\Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{P}{\epsilon\mu}\Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)}$.

To obtain a close relation in terms of velocities referred to the midsurface $u_i^{(00)}$, we need to find relations for the remaining coefficient $p^{(00)}$. These relations are found using the expansion (27) into the mass balance equation (17), and boundary condition (Eq. (95) in App. C); and then equate to zero the factors in the expansion proportional to the same power in ϵ and \hat{z} until the leading term $u_i^{(00)}$ can be fully identified. This will lead to a set of algebraic equations that can be solved sequentially.

The continuity of normal stress implies, from (95), $\tau_\pm^{33} = P_\pm^3$, see App. C. Then, with the expansions (27),

$$\epsilon^{-1} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m (\pm\hat{T}/2)^n \left[-p^{(mn)} + 2(n+1)u_3^{(m+1,n+1)} \right] + \epsilon^{-1}\hat{\zeta}Q_{33} = P_\pm^3.$$

Considering the lowest order term corresponding to $m=0, n=0$, we have

$$p^{(00)} = 2u_3^{(11)} + \hat{\zeta}Q_{33}. \quad (32)$$

Next, from $\text{div } \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{g}^i \mathbf{u}_{,i}$, we rewrite the mass conservation (17) as

$$(hu_3)_{,3} + [a^{\alpha\beta} + z(b^{\alpha\beta} - 2H a^{\alpha\beta})]u_{\alpha|\beta} = -k_d h + v_p \delta \left(z - \frac{T}{2} \right) h, \quad (33)$$

where h is given by (7). Then, we introduce the expansions (27),

$$\sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[(n+1)u_3^{(m+1,n+1)} + a^{\alpha\beta} u_{\alpha\beta}^{(mn)} - 2\hat{H}u_3^{(mn)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right] = -\hat{k}_d + \hat{v}_p \delta(\hat{z} - \hat{T}/2) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon). \quad (34)$$

Anticipating that we only needed the lowest order terms, the expansion was truncated to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. The zeroth order term, $(\epsilon \hat{z})^0$, is achieved when $m = 0$, and $n = 0$, and gives

$$u_3^{(11)} = -a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} - \hat{k}_d + \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} \quad (35)$$

From (32), we can further obtain

$$p^{(00)} = -2a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} - 2\hat{k}_d + \frac{2\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} + \hat{\zeta} Q_{33}. \quad (36)$$

By substituting Eq. (36) into Eq. (31), and rewriting the terms in its dimensional form we obtain the symmetric stress resultant

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta} + 2\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta, \quad (37)$$

where $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = \frac{1}{4}(a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\alpha\delta} a^{\beta\mu}) + \frac{1}{2}a^{\alpha\beta} a^{\mu\delta}$, $Q^{\alpha\beta} = a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} - a^{\alpha\beta} Q_{33}$.

We find therefore that active tension contributions are generated here not only by contractile motor activity $T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta$, as proposed earlier in axisymmetric geometry [33, 7] or in general three dimensional settings [34], but also through active turnover $2\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} (k_d - v_p/T)$. This new active tension term due to turnover, which was overlooked so far, can lead to either a contractile or extensile stress and constitutes an important theoretical prediction of our manuscript.

4.3. Asymptotic expansion: Inextensional limit

The appropriate scaling for the inextensional regime (26) gives the following expansion

$$u_i = \frac{PL}{\mu\epsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n u_i^{(mn)}, \quad p = \frac{P}{\epsilon^2} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n p^{(mn)}, \quad (38)$$

and as in the membrane regime, we hypothesize that active sources of stress scale similarly to the sheet dynamic variables: $\zeta = \frac{P}{\epsilon^2} \hat{\zeta}$, $v_p = \frac{PL}{\mu\epsilon^3} \hat{v}_p$, and $k_d = \frac{P}{\mu\epsilon^3} \hat{k}_d$. We then use a similar approach to obtain leading-order expressions for the dimensional (symmetric) stress and bending resultants $N^{\alpha\beta}$, $M^{\alpha\beta}$. For the sake of the presentation, we defer detailed calculations to Appendix A.

We find for the tension resultant

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta} + T \zeta a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \frac{T^3}{12} \left[\mu C^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + \mu B^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + \zeta D_s^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} \right], \quad (39)$$

where $C^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = 8H \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} - a^{\alpha\beta} b^{\mu\delta} - 5b^{\alpha\beta} a^{\mu\delta} - \frac{3}{2}(a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} + a^{\alpha\delta} b^{\beta\mu} + a^{\beta\mu} b^{\alpha\delta} + a^{\beta\delta} b^{\alpha\mu})$, $B^{\alpha\beta} = 2(G - H^2) a^{\alpha\beta} + 6H b^{\alpha\beta} + 10b^{\alpha}_{\mu} b^{\beta\mu}$, and $D_s^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = G a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 4H b^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - b^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 3a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\delta\gamma} b^{\beta}_{\gamma}$.

And for the bending moment

$$M^{\alpha\beta} = \mu \frac{T^3}{3} \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + \mu \frac{T^3}{12} (6H a^{\alpha\beta} + 4b^{\alpha\beta}) \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + \frac{T^3}{12} \zeta D_b^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} Q_{\mu\delta}, \quad (40)$$

where $D_b^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = H(a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} a^{\alpha\delta}) + a^{\alpha\beta} \hat{b}^{\mu\delta} - \frac{3}{4}(a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + a^{\alpha\delta} \hat{b}^{\beta\mu} + a^{\beta\mu} \hat{b}^{\alpha\delta} + a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu})$.

Note that in this regime the active turnover stress appear only in the terms proportional to T^3 in the membrane stress, and in the bending moment.

4.4. Composite equations

The composite equations for $N^{\alpha\beta}$ and $M^{\alpha\beta}$ are obtained by gathering together the different terms appearing in the membrane and inextensional limits. The approximate constitutive relation obtained by "matching" the terms is valid for the whole range of intermediate behaviors. The ensuing complete system is then,

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta} + 2\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta + \frac{T^3}{12} \left[\mu C^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + \mu B^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + \zeta D_s^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} \right], \quad (41)$$

and

$$M^{\alpha\beta} = \mu \frac{T^3}{3} \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + \mu \frac{T^3}{12} (6H a^{\alpha\beta} + 4b^{\alpha\beta}) \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + \frac{T^3}{12} \zeta D_b^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} Q_{\mu\delta}, \quad (42)$$

In the absence of active terms, our constitutive relations are identical to the ones obtained in [31] for a viscous sheet without couplings between bending and stretching. Moreover, we note that the absence of transverse shear deformation at the lowest order in the asymptotic expansion induces a Kirchhoff-Love type of deformation⁷. For an initially curved elastic shell, Kirchhoff-Love deformations lead to a theory generally named after Koiter [50]. This can be readily seen since the passive parts of the resultants (64) and (65) are, modulo a time derivative, similar to the incompressible limit of Koiter's constitutive equations for elastic shells [50], as one may expect from the Stokes-Rayleigh analogy⁸.

5. Variational formulation: weak form and Rayleigh potential

The weak form is obtained by multiplying the balance equation (22) by a test function, then integrating over the region in space occupied by the shell,

$$\iint_S \left(N^{\alpha\beta} |_{\alpha} + 2b_{\gamma}^{\beta} M^{\alpha\gamma} |_{\alpha} + M^{\gamma\alpha} b_{\gamma}^{\beta} |_{\alpha} + P^{\beta} \right) \delta U_{\beta} dA = 0, \quad (43a)$$

$$\iint_S \left(M^{\alpha\beta} |_{\alpha\beta} - b_{\alpha\gamma} b_{\beta}^{\gamma} M^{\gamma\alpha} - b_{\alpha\beta} N^{\alpha\beta} - P^3 \right) \delta U_3 dA = 0, \quad (43b)$$

where $\delta U_{\beta}(x^1, x^2)$, and $\delta U_3(x^1, x^2)$ are a set of "virtual velocities" (test functions). Using integration by parts, the divergence theorem for curved surfaces, and neglecting the work terms from the surface edges, the variational (weak) form is written as [22]

$$\iint_S \left(N^{\alpha\beta} \delta \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + M^{\alpha\beta} \delta \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \right) dA = \iint_S (P^{\beta} \delta U_{\beta} + P^3 \delta U_3) dA. \quad (44)$$

where $N^{\alpha\beta}$, and $M^{\alpha\beta}$ are defined in (20), and (21), and where $\delta \Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(\delta U_{\alpha|\beta} + \delta U_{\beta|\alpha}) - b_{\alpha\beta} \delta U_3$, and $\delta \Omega_{\alpha\beta} = \delta U_{3,\alpha|\beta} + b_{\alpha}^{\lambda} |_{\beta} \delta U_{\lambda} + b_{\alpha}^{\lambda} \delta U_{\lambda|\beta} + b_{\beta}^{\lambda} \delta U_{\lambda|\alpha} - b_{\beta}^{\lambda} b_{\alpha\lambda} \delta U_3$.

The left hand side of the weak formulation (44) might be interpreted as internal virtual power, since we identified $\delta \Delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\delta \Omega_{\alpha\beta}$ as measures of strain rate increments. The terms in the right hand side of (44) can be interpreted as the virtual power of external loads.

⁷The Kirchhoff-Love kinematical assumption states that the material line orthogonal to the midsurface in the undeformed configuration remains straight, unstretched, and orthogonal to the midsurface after deformation. In our particular case, the condition that the normal is unstretched is relaxed since we allow the shell to vary its thickness.

⁸The Stokes-Rayleigh analogy addresses the similarities between the formulation of viscous and elastic problems. It states that the equations for slow viscous flow derive from the equations of linear elasticity when velocities replace positions and strain rates replace strains [20, 21].

The Rayleigh potential Starting from the weak form (44), if the set of virtual velocities are chosen to be the real velocities $\delta U_i = U_i$, one can identify the resulting variational function as a Rayleigh potential [51, 52], \mathcal{R} , which is the sum of the (passive) power dissipated by viscous forces \mathcal{D} , and the power input of active terms \mathcal{P} .

In the absence of external forces, the Rayleigh potential is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{x}) &= \iint_S (N^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + M^{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta}) \, dA \\ &= \iint_S \left[4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\gamma\delta} + \mu \frac{T^3}{3} \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\gamma\delta} + \mu \frac{T^3}{12} C^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\gamma\delta} \right] dA \\ &\quad + \iint_S \left[\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + \mu B^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} T \mathcal{Q}^{\alpha\beta} \zeta \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + \zeta \mathcal{Q}_{\mu\delta} (\mathcal{D}_s^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + \mathcal{D}_b^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta}) \right] dA \\ &= \mathcal{D} + \mathcal{P}\end{aligned}\tag{45}$$

The Rayleigh potential plays a similar role for viscous problems as the energy potential in elasticity, and allows to calculate the midsurface velocity \mathbf{U} as its minimizer

$$\mathbf{U} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{U}'} \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}', \mathbf{x})\tag{46}$$

The midsurface geometry may then be deduced from the current velocity as $\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \mathbf{U}$. In a sense, this simple variational form expresses here simply the fact that viscous flows minimize dissipation [41]. A generalization of such approach for dissipative systems, to include other sources of dissipation and forces deriving from a free energy, is often named Onsager variational principle in soft-matter physics [53, 54].

6. Evolution of the sheet thickness

To obtain the equation of evolution for the sheet thickness, one may integrate the equation (33), as performed in [31]. Alternatively, we derive here mass balance directly at the level of the shell. Consider a small volume of the sheet $dV = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} dz h(z) \, dS$, where $h(z) = 1 - 2Hz + Gz^2$, and $dS(t) = \sqrt{a(t)} \, d\xi^1 \, d\xi^2$ is a infinitesimal area of the sheet. For constant density ρ , the conservation of mass can be written as

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int_{-T/2}^{T/2} h(z) \, dS \, dz \right) = \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} v_p \delta \left(z - \frac{T}{2} \right) h(z) \, dS \, dz - k_d \int_{-T/2}^{T/2} h(z) \, dS \, dz.\tag{47}$$

In the left hand side, we use Leibniz's integral rule to bring the derivative inside the integral, and since the integration limits $\pm T/2$ are time-dependent, this will give terms in $\partial T / \partial t$. Then, using the fact that $\frac{d}{dt} a = \frac{d}{dt} (\det a_{\alpha\beta}) = \det a_{\alpha\beta} a^{\alpha\beta} \frac{da_{\alpha\beta}}{dt}$, it follows from (23)

$$\left(1 + \frac{GT^2}{4} \right) \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} \, dS + T \left(1 + \frac{GT^2}{12} \right) a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \, dS = v_p \left(1 - HT + \frac{GT^2}{4} \right) \, dS - k_d T \left(1 + \frac{GT^2}{12} \right) \, dS.\tag{48}$$

Given $GT^2 \sim \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \ll 1$, the equation for the time evolution of the thickness becomes, at first order in ε

$$\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = -T a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} - T k_d + v_p (1 - HT) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).\tag{49}$$

For an incompressible passive fluid, the equivalent equation would be simply $\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} = -T a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}$, which states that rate of change of the thickness is proportional to minus the shell stretching rate $a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}$, as found in [28, 31]

7. Numerical approach

7.1. Preliminaries

We discuss here some aspects regarding the finite-element solution scheme used for the numerical simulations. Note, however, that computational aspects of the viscous thin shell theory are not the primary purpose of the present work, and we will refer to a forthcoming publication for more details on this matter.

For viscous membranes, a few numerical implementations have been recently proposed based either using finite element models [55, 34] or discrete geometric approaches (computer graphics) [56, 57]. Yet, no numerical work has been dedicated to implementing viscous thin shells to our best knowledge. Let us first point out that thin shell theories based on the Kirchhoff-Love kinematics are notoriously difficult to implement due to the system being of fourth-order type, which requires C^1 -continuity of the approximating finite element discretization fields to avoid "kinks," leading to infinite bending energies. Since this cannot be achieved with standard C^0 finite elements, one has to resort to either dedicated finite-elements or complex finite-elements [58, 59, 25], isogeometric analysis approaches [60] or to relax the underlying thin shell hypothesis [61]. It is common practice to treat the surface normals as extra degrees of freedom, an *inextensible director*, which leads to a mixed penalty formulation, see for instance [62]. These inextensible directors are allowed to deviate from the surface normals of the midsurface during the deformation, hence accounting for transversal shearing of the shell across the thickness. The use of such a *shearable* (thick shell) instead of an *unshearable* (thin shell) kinematics must, however, consistently converge to the latter in the thin shell limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Although more simple C^0 elements can be considered in the case of thick shell kinematics, shear locking issues are however prone to arise in the thin shell limit, requiring the use of dedicated numerical techniques to circumvent the locking issue.

As a result, the preliminary simulations were conducted by relaxing the thin shell hypothesis in the numerical implementation by considering a director field \mathbf{d} which, contrary to \mathbf{n} , is not necessarily normal to the shell mid-surface, see Fig. 6. Note, however, that since the shell cortex is, in practice, extremely thin, we did not derive a consistent active thick shell theory. Instead, we just aimed at penalizing the lack of orthogonality between \mathbf{d} and the shell mid-surface and adapting the strain measure expressions with \mathbf{d} instead of \mathbf{n} .

7.2. Discrete shell geometry

The discrete shell reference surface, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0$, is assumed to be made of an assembly of flat triangular elements and $\mathbf{d}_0 = \mathbf{n}_0$ denotes the reference shell director which we assume to initially coincide with the reference shell normal. The reference metric tensor $a_0 = \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^T \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0$, and curvature tensor $b_0 = -\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^T \nabla \mathbf{n}_0 + \nabla \mathbf{n}_0^T \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0)$.

Following [61], we assume the shell director to be unstretchable ($\|\mathbf{d}\| = 1$) so that we parametrize the unit director \mathbf{d} by two angles (β_1, β_2) (see Fig. 6), as

$$\mathbf{d}(\beta_1, \beta_2) = (\cos \beta_1 \sin \beta_2, -\sin \beta_1, \cos \beta_1 \cos \beta_2) \quad (50)$$

and we replace the definition of the strain rate tensor $\Delta_{\alpha\beta}$ and rate of change of curvature tensor $\Omega_{\alpha\beta}$ with their linearized expressions for the rate of deformation [61],

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^T \nabla \mathbf{U} + \nabla \mathbf{U}^T \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0), \quad (51)$$




Figure 6: Kinematic of the *shearable* shell model. Left: generic point in the reference and current configurations. Right: Parametrization of the inextensible director \mathbf{d} in terms of two independent Euler angles (β_1, β_2) .

and

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega} = -\frac{1}{2} (\nabla \mathbf{U}^T \nabla \mathbf{d}_0 + \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^T \nabla \boldsymbol{\omega} + \nabla \mathbf{d}_0^T \nabla \mathbf{U} + \nabla \boldsymbol{\omega}^T \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0) \quad (52)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega} = d\mathbf{d}/dt$ is the rate of change of director. In addition, we must also consider the rate of shear strains,

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}^T \boldsymbol{\omega} + \nabla \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{d}_0 \quad (53)$$

When $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = 0$, we recover that $\nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}^T \mathbf{d} = \nabla \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0^T \mathbf{n}_0 = 0$, hence $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{n}$, that is an unshearable kinematics. As a result, we penalize this term in the Rayleigh potential by adding a novel dissipation contribution

$$\phi(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{d}) = N^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + M^{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta} + k_{s,\text{pen}} \mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \gamma_\alpha \gamma_\beta \quad (54)$$

where $k_{s,\text{pen}}$ is a sufficiently large penalization constant.

7.3. Finite-element discretization

At each time step, we must solve for the shell mid-surface velocity \mathbf{U} and the new director \mathbf{d} . In fact, we consider the rate of change $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of the β -parameters to be the main unknowns from which we also have

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} -\sin \beta_{01} \sin \beta_{02} & \cos \beta_{01} \cos \beta_{02} \\ -\cos \beta_{01} & 0 \\ -\sin \beta_{01} \cos \beta_{02} & -\cos \beta_{01} \sin \beta_{02} \end{bmatrix} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{Q}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \quad (55)$$

As a result, we have a 5-dof system to solve at each time step: three velocity components: $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, U_2, U_3)$ and two angular rates of change: $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\dot{\beta}_1, \dot{\beta}_2)$. In the present work, we do not follow the MITC discretization discussed in [61] to remove shear locking but rather use a much simpler finite-element discretization, namely:

- a quadratic continuous (P^2 -Lagrange) interpolation for the velocity field \mathbf{U}
- a linear interpolation with continuity enforced at the triangle mid-sides (Crouzeix-Raviart element) for the angular rates $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$

Such a discretization choice is extremely simple and seems free of any shear locking effects as shown in [63] for nonlinear shells and [64] in the case of plate and shell limit analysis theory.

7.4. System evolution

When considering the system evolution between time t_n and t_{n+1} , the resulting linear system for the current velocity and rate of change of director field is solved when considering the shell thickness to be fixed to its previous value i.e. $T = T_n$

$$U_{n+1}, \dot{\beta}_{n+1} = \arg \min_{U, \dot{\beta}} \mathcal{R}(U, \dot{\beta}; T_n) \quad (56)$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}(U, \dot{\beta}; T_n) = \int_S \phi(U, \dot{\beta}; T_n) \, dA \quad (57)$$

is the system total Rayleighian, with ϕ given by (54). Here, we assume no external loading of the shell, such that all shell deformations are powered by internally generated active stress. Note that, due to the linear expressions of the strain rates (51), (52), (53) and the quadratic form of the dissipation potential ϕ , the resulting system is in fact linear.

We then update the geometry in an asynchronous and Lagrangian manner, by solving the discretized thickness evolution equation and updating the midsurface position and the director using (50) as follows:

$$\frac{T_{n+1} - T_n}{\Delta t} = -T_{n+1} a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta, n+1} - T_{n+1} k_d + v_p(1 - H_n T_{n+1}) \quad (58a)$$

$$d_{n+1} = d(\beta_n + \Delta t \dot{\beta}_{n+1}) \quad (58b)$$

$$x_{n+1} = x_n + \Delta t U_{n+1} \quad (58c)$$

The full finite-element implementation is done within the FEniCS software package [65, 38] and the meshes are produced with the Gmsh generator [66]. In the geometry updating process, we also regularly call some remeshing procedure using the MMG platform [67]. The Python code used for implementation in FEniCS, as well as the two following numerical illustrations may be found here [68]. Considering the symmetry of the numerical examples presented in Sec. 8, the finite element model of the cell is modelled as one-eighth of a sphere.

7.5. Volume constraint

In some numerical illustrations, such as cell division, Sec. 8.2, we want to ensure that the total volume V of the cell is conserved during the division. To do so, we enforce the following constraint,

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \int_S U \cdot n \, dA = 0. \quad (59)$$

Enforcement of this constraint is achieved through the introduction of a Lagrange-multiplier which can be interpreted as the cell hydrostatic pressure P forming the system Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}(U, \dot{\beta}, P; T_n) = \mathcal{R}(U, \dot{\beta}; T_n) + P \int_S U \cdot n \, dA \quad (60)$$

turning the minimization problem (56) into a saddle-point problem

$$U_{n+1}, \dot{\beta}_{n+1}, P_{n+1} = \arg \max_P \arg \min_{U, \dot{\beta}} \mathcal{L}(U, \dot{\beta}, P; T_n). \quad (61)$$

Note that the previous approach can also be easily extended to the case where the volume change rate is imposed to a given constant \dot{V}_{imp}

$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \int_S \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dA = \dot{V}_{\text{imp}} \quad (62)$$

by considering this new Lagrangian instead:

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{U}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, P; T_n) = \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{U}, \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}; T_n) + P \left(\int_S \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{n} \, dA - \dot{V}_{\text{imp}} \right). \quad (63)$$

8. Numerical illustration: osmotic shocks and cell division

This section presents some biologically relevant model problems illustrating the partitioning of the sheet deformation between stretching and bending dominated modes. In particular, cell division and hypo-osmotic shocks are mainly dominated by tensions, whereas fast hyper-osmotic shocks will be bending-dominated.

Because of the thinness of the cortex layer, the active terms proportional to T^3 shall lead to much smaller contributions than terms proportional to T and will be neglected in the simulations. The only active contributions considered in the next will therefore come solely from the tension. Moreover, to further simplify the approach, we continue with a simpler form of the constitutive relations, in which couplings between stretching and bending deformations are neglected at the cost of introducing errors of the order ε [31]. The simplified 2-dimensional constitutive relations used is then

$$N^{\alpha\beta} = 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta} + 2\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta, \quad (64)$$

and

$$M^{\alpha\beta} = \mu \frac{T^3}{3} \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta}. \quad (65)$$

In the following, for the sake of simplicity we neglect local variations in the filament orientation within the cortex, and suppose that filaments remain parallel to the middle surface and isotropically organized along this surface (see Fig. 5). In this limit, the nematic tensor reads [69, 7, 12]

$$Q_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1/3 \end{pmatrix} \quad (66)$$

To explicitly consider filament reorganization one may also have to write down and expand a dynamic equation for the spatiotemporal evolution of the nematic tensor and its coupling to velocity gradients [70, 12].

8.1. Osmotic shock

Here, we mimic the response of a suspended cell to rapid osmotic shocks. Considering a cell in osmotic equilibrium with an external medium, a sudden change in solute concentration creates an osmotic imbalance that will generate a rapid flux of water across the cell membrane, changing its volume until a novel equilibration of concentrations is reached. If the solute concentration in the medium is *increased*, the cell is subjected to a *hyperosmotic shock*, causing an outward flux of water and cell shrinkage. In contrast, a *decrease* in solute concentration leads to an inward flux in the cell called *hypo-osmotic shock*, leading to its expansion. For the sake of simplicity, we don't intend here to solve for a realistic pump-leak model of cell

volume control, involving electroosmotic effects [71, 72, 73], but we impose instead directly the variation of a target volume $V(t)$ using the constraint (63) (see Figs. 7a and 8).

We first consider an hypo-osmotic shock, where a solution may be calculated analytically. We suppose that the cell's response is mainly in the membrane regime, and that the volume can be externally controlled and is given by $V(t)$. Because the deformation is spherically symmetric, the time evolution for the radius of the expanding cell reduces to $R(t) = \sqrt[3]{\frac{3V(t)}{4\pi}}$. In spherical coordinates, the metric and curvature tensors are $a_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(R^2, R^2 \sin^2 \theta)$, and $b_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(-R, -R \sin^2 \theta)$, respectively. Moreover, since $\Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{da_{\alpha\beta}}{dt}$, we have for isotropic deformations $\Delta_{\alpha\beta} = \text{diag}(R\dot{R}, R\dot{R} \sin^2 \theta)$.

The thickness evolution, Eq. (49), can be readily written as

$$\frac{\dot{T}}{T} + 2\frac{\dot{R}}{R} + \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T}\right) - \frac{v_p}{R} = 0. \quad (67)$$

The first-order differential equation (67), subjected to the initial condition $T(t=0) = T_0$ can be analytically solved for a given $V(t)$, consequently, given $R(t)$. The steady-state thickness at a given cell radius R is given by $T_0 = \frac{Rv_p}{k_d R - v_p}$. It slightly differs from the value v_p/k_d value defined in [7, 12], which is valid only in the limit of flat plate $R \rightarrow \infty$. It is corrected here by a curvature term $-v_p HT$ in the thickness evolution, that comes from the asymmetry of the polymerization and the curved geometry of the sheet.

Such simplified system can be used to validate the FEM approach: we impose a sigmoid volume variation $V(t)$ and compare the analytical solution of (67) for the thickness $T(t)$ with the solution obtained through finite elements under the same set of parameters, see Fig. 7.




Figure 7: Hypoosmotic shock. (a) Imposed volume, inserts represent the cell in scaled size and the colors represent the cell's thickness. (b) The time evolution of the thickness. Numerical values are summarized in table 1.

Young-Laplace equation for thin shells In a spherical symmetric system, assuming that tangential tension gradients and bending moments may be neglected, an analog of the classic Young-Laplace equation can be retrieved for thin shells from the out-of-plane equation (22b),

$$\left(1 + \frac{T}{R}\right) P = \frac{2N}{R} = \frac{2}{R} \left[4\mu T \frac{\dot{R}}{R} + 2\mu T \left(k_d + \frac{v_p}{T}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \zeta T \right], \quad (68)$$

where P is the internal pressure that maintains the cell volume constant (external pressure is supposed zero), and N the tension supposed isotropic and homogeneous along the membrane. It is interesting to note the

geometric correction to Laplace's law in $T/R = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ in front of the pressure, that is usually neglected for very thin shells or membranes.

In the approximation of slow volume change ($\dot{T} = 0, \dot{R} = 0$) the above coupled equations at steady-state reduce to

$$P = \frac{2}{R} T_0^{\text{flat}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \zeta + 4\mu k_d \frac{T_0^{\text{flat}}}{R} \right), \quad (69)$$

where $T_0^{\text{flat}} \equiv \frac{v_p}{k_d}$ is the stationary thickness in the limit of a flat shell $R \rightarrow \infty$ with no flow. One can remark that the typical Laplace's formula used in spherical geometry $P = \frac{2}{R} \frac{T_0^{\text{flat}} \zeta}{2}$ [12, 7] is corrected by a term of order $T/R = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ proportional to the turnover rate k_d .

Hyperosmotic shock To probe our model in situations where bending dissipation may become non-negligible, we study the effects of a rapid hyperosmotic shock on a cell. Here, turnover acts as a stabilizing agent: if the volume variation is slower than the typical turnover timescale, the cell cortex will have the time to rearrange and adapt the cell's shape to its new volume without buckling. We thus apply a sudden drop in volume that we model by a sigmoid function, as illustrated in Fig. 8 and Supplementary Video 1. As the cortex does not have time to depolymerize homogeneously, folding induces spatial variation in the thickness correlated to local variations in curvature.




Figure 8: Shape dynamics timecourse of a cell subjected to a hyperosmotic shock. In the left is the *imposed* volume variation over time. The snapshots correspond to the cell shape at successive times. The color-scheme represents the local thickness of the cell.

To compare the relative contributions to the dissipation rate due to bending and stretching, we define the following non-dimensional parameter

$$\overline{D}_b = \frac{D_b}{D_s + D_b} = \frac{\iint_S \mu \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \frac{1}{3} T^3 \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\gamma\delta} dA}{\iint_S \left[\mu \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} (4T \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\gamma\delta} + \frac{1}{3} T^3 \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\gamma\delta}) \right] dA}, \quad (70)$$

which gives the relative weight of the bending passive dissipation $D_b = \iint_S \mu \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \frac{1}{3} T^3 \Omega_{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\gamma\delta} dA$ with respect to the total passive deformation $D = D_s + D_b$, where $D_s = \iint_S 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\gamma\delta} dA$ is the dissipation due to stretching. The timecourse of the parameter \overline{D}_b is plotted in Fig. 9. Two distinctive peaks indicate a significant contribution of bending to dissipation, which may reach up to 60% of the total. Interestingly, these two peaks, indicated by (I) and (III), do not correspond to the most folded cell shape, which rather lies at the minimum of the curve between these two maxima indicated by (II). This is because, for a thin viscous sheet, dissipation is proportional to the square of the rate of curvature change, but not of the curvature itself, like one may be used to in elasticity. Therefore, maintaining highly curved cell shapes does not cost energy, but dissipation will rather oppose rapid shape changes.




Figure 9: Plot of the relative contribution of the bending dissipation to the total dissipation. The two peaks (I and III) represent the instants in time for which the rate of curvature change is the highest. Even though at intermediary time II the cell shape is overall much more curved, bending dissipation is the lowest.

8.2. Cell division

Cell division encompasses two main processes in biology: mitosis, which corresponds to the even splitting of genetic material between the two future daughter cells, and cytokinesis, whereby the mother cell cytoplasm is physically cleaved in two. In the following, we focus on the cell's shape deformation during cytokinesis. In animal cells, cytokinesis is achieved through the ingression of a circumferential actomyosin furrow located at the equator of the cell, while cortical tension at cell poles is resisting the deformation imposed by increasing cell pressure [74, 7]. Various mechanical models of cell deformation over cytokinesis have been proposed in the last decades, with different assumptions about the mechanical nature of the cortical material: contractile [75], elastic [76], viscous [77] or viscoelastic [78]. Other approaches have considered the lipid bilayer mechanics only and attributed most of the mechanical dissipation to cytoplasmic and surrounding medium fluids [79, 80]. In some of these models, a contractile ring structure of different nature is supposed to provide the constricting force at the cell equator [76, 78], while in others, the furrowing is the natural result of higher but continuous activity in the equatorial region, that may trigger possible structural rearrangements of the continuous cortical surface [75, 77]. In agreement with early hypothesis [81], recent active-gel models of cytokinesis [7], and modern experiments [74, 82], all point towards the continuum character of the cortex, that may flow in a Marangoni-like process toward the equator as a result of contractile gradients and can reorganize structurally along the cell's surface in response to extensile and compressive forces. In fact, the hypothesis of surface tension gradients driving furrowing is ancient and goes back to early observations of dividing marine eggs [83, 84, 85] and to the similarity of their shape to one of the olive-oil droplets in response to surfactants [75]. A gradient of contractility centered at the equator has indeed been measured from the cell poles to the cell equator in the form of a Gaussian-like spatial distribution of active RhoA, a protein upstream of actomyosin contractility [86].

Following [7], we start from a spherical cell of radius R_0 and mimic the RhoA gradient by imposing a Gaussian distribution of active stress along a fixed ambient coordinate direction x_α centered at the equator,

$$\zeta = \zeta_0 + (\delta\zeta - \zeta_0)e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{x_\alpha^2}{w^2}} \quad (71)$$

where ζ_0 is the basal level of stress, that creates an active tension at poles, and $\delta\zeta$ is called equatorial *overactivity*. In the initial state, the cell is a sphere of R_0 and uniform thickness $T = v_p/k_d$, which is subjected to an uniform contractile activity ζ_0 . A typical deformation timescale in this system is the ratio of the viscosity to the contractile stress $t_a \equiv \mu/\zeta$. Following the appearance of a Gaussian over-activity, the equatorial region of the cell becomes more contractile and generates cortical flows toward the equator. This creates a local increase in the thickness, which is counterbalanced by depolymerization, as found in the mass conservation

Eq. (33). Material turnover is indeed the essential factor ensuring the overall stability of the thickness evolution in presence of contractility or thickness gradients. The accumulation of matter in the furrow, here represented by the increase in thickness, increases further the contractile stress around the equator⁹. The resulting *contractile ring* then pinches the cell, leading to its constriction. The time course for such dynamics is shown on Fig. 10 and Supplementary Video 2. The spatial distribution of contractility is assumed here to be time-independent, but it may slightly vary with cell shape changes [86]. The spatiotemporal evolution of the thickness and of the midsurface velocity field are illustrated at corresponding timepoints in Fig. 11 and Supplementary Video 2.




Figure 10: Dynamic shape changes of a cell during cell division (cytokinesis) illustrated by successive timepoints of furrow constriction. The color-scheme refers to the rescaled contractile activity signal ζ (71).




Figure 11: Dynamic evolution of the thickness and velocity field during cell division (cytokinesis) illustrated by successive timepoints of furrow constriction. Arrows represent the direction of the velocity field \mathbf{u} . The color-scheme refers to the cortex thickness.

As for the hypoosmotic shock, bending dissipation remains largely negligible in the timecourse of cell division (not shown), and the cell can reach very large curvatures in final stages of cytokinesis at almost no dissipation. Cytokinesis may therefore be well described by a simple membrane theory, where tension is the dominating phenomena, which justifies *a posteriori* the approach of [7], where an axisymmetric membrane theory was derived to model cytokinesis. As originally predicted in [7], we show that full constriction of the furrow, leading to the completion of the cytokinesis, depends on the level of equatorial over-activity ζ/ζ_0 , presenting a threshold ζ_c , below which the full constriction fails. We plot in Fig. 12b, the bifurcation diagram for physiological values of the parameters. Each point in the figure represents the final radius following the dynamics as shown in Fig. 12a, with variable signal over-activity.

Even though the obtained results in [7] were qualitatively correct, well capturing the shape changes in the case of an axisymmetric division of a suspended cell, the model neglected an essential stress contribution, generated by active material (de)-polymerization. To compare the relative contribution of the turnover to

⁹Simple stability analysis of a flat shell under uniform active stress ζ shows that the thickness is stable if $\zeta \leq 4\mu k_d$. If the additional tension generated by turnover $2Ta^{\alpha\beta}(kd - v_p/T)$ is neglected, the threshold for stability doubles to $\zeta \leq 8\mu k_d$, which shows that the turnover stress has a destabilizing effect.




Figure 12: Furrow constriction dynamics. (a) Time evolution of the furrow radius. (b) Bifurcation diagram representing the final furrow radius as a function of the amplitude of the equatorial overactivity.

the total input power, we define the following dimensionless parameter

$$\bar{\mathcal{P}}_t = \frac{\mathcal{P}_t}{\mathcal{P}_t + \mathcal{P}_c} = \frac{\iint_S \mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \Delta_{\alpha\beta} dA}{\iint_S \left[\mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \Delta_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2} T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta \Delta_{\alpha\beta} \right] dA}, \quad (72)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_t = \iint_S \mu T a^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \Delta_{\alpha\beta} dA$, and $\mathcal{P}_c = \iint_S \frac{1}{2} T Q^{\alpha\beta} \zeta \Delta_{\alpha\beta} dA$ are active power contributions due to turnover and contractility, respectively. The stress generated by the polymerization comes from the local difference in thickness created by the cortical flows. Since the variation in thickness is highly concentrated around the equator of the cell, most of the power input due to the turnover stress will be concentrated in this region. Moreover, the turnover stress accounts to up to 25% of the (integrated) power input, as shown in Fig. 13.




Figure 13: The solid black lines shows the relative contribution of the (integrated) power input polymerization with respect to the total power input due to both polymerization and contractility. The insets show that most of the stress generated by the polymerization is localized at the furrow.

9. Discussion

The lack of generic and flexible theoretical and numerical frameworks to realistically simulate the 3D shape changes of single or multiple interacting cells has been limiting our ability to characterize complex

morphogenetic events, such as asymmetric cell divisions [87, 88, 89, 90, 91] and rapid multicellular reorganizations [92, 93, 94], which are fundamental to early embryogenesis and tissue morphogenesis. To fill this gap, we derived in this paper a viscous active thin shell theory for the cell cortex in general curvilinear coordinates, and we proposed a numerical implementation with the finite-element library FEniCS [65, 38], which we hope will facilitate the spread, reuse, modification, and refinement of our model.

We have used systematic asymptotic expansions to derive leading-order constitutive equations governing the dynamics of the actomyosin cortex. The main geometrical assumption is the slenderness of the cortex, meaning that the characteristic thickness T_0 must be small relative to the characteristic size of the cell L . One main physical assumption is to consider the actomyosin cortex as a continuous medium, relying on hydrodynamics active-gel models derived previously to describe bulk rheology of cell cytoskeleton networks [11, 9]. Here, we chose to model the actomyosin material as a single incompressible fluid phase, with an active source of stress and a possible nematic ordering, following previous approaches [12, 7]. Our thin shell theory accounts for stretching and bending resistance, making it relevant for rapid curvature changes (beyond to the viscoelastic time limit). Although viscous in nature, the Stokes-Rayleigh analogy allows for interpreting our model in terms of the classic theory of elastic shells, and the obtained equations may be classified into a Koiter-like shell model.

In contrast to direct active surface approaches [95], the derivation of a proper thin shell theory for the cortex, relying on a systematic asymptotic reduction of three-dimensional constitutive equations, displays its relevance with two important predictions.

- First, the balance between polymerization and depolymerization is predicted to create contractile or extensile tensions but may also oppose or promote the bending of the layer. This effect depends inherently on the shell character of the cortex and relies primarily on our hypothesis of an incompressible phase. It follows that active cell deformations depend not only on the contractile activity of myosin motors but also on the speed of actin (de)polymerization, which is particularly important to relate cell shape changes to its molecular regulation. Such contribution has been previously neglected in previous theories of active membranes [12, 7, 34]. In cytokinesis, we find that up to 25% of the active power input comes from turnover and largely contributes to the equatorial contractile force dividing the cell.
- Second, a proper thin shell model with bending resistance is necessary to account for rapid changes in cell curvatures, as one may observe in hyperosmotic shocks. Here, the asymptotic approach allowed us to calculate prefactors for active bending terms (42), which would have been otherwise difficult to write down directly.

The asymptotic expansion approach provides a relatively generic and rigorous method to derive thin shell models from active hydrodynamic theories. While, for the sake of simplicity, we did not account explicitly here for the dynamics of the nematic tensor and conjugate field, they may be similarly reduced into effective 2-dimensional equations on the midplane. New finite-element approximations for tensor dynamics on surfaces may however be required from a more numerical perspective [96, 97]. Our theory may also be readily extended to account for transverse gradients in myosin or turnover activity that may generate additional active torques, for variations in actomyosin gel density as a result permeation [98], or for possible two-dimensional chiral effects at the cell level [99, 100].

From a numerical perspective, we provided an easily modifiable Python implementation of the model within the general-purpose finite-element library FEniCS. We proposed a numerical scheme based on a penalization method that circumvents the need for C^1 elements to use more simple C^0 elements. In the cortex, gradients in contractile stress can lead to strong tangential motions, and convergent flows, which create excessive distortions of the computational mesh linked to the material [7] (see Fig. 10). In the present

work, such significant distortions were circumvented through repeated remeshing of the computational mesh and interpolation of the fields. This solution may prove costly for larger meshes, and a more appropriate solution using an Arbitrary Lagrangian-Eulerian (ALE) representation [101] may be used, in which one is free to decouple the movement of the Lagrangian particles from the movement of the mesh. Such an approach has been previously employed for the simulation of fluid membranes [34, 102]. Our description may easily be translated into an ALE formulation, and we will refer to a forthcoming publication focused on numerical aspects of active fluid surfaces. The numerical scheme we presented here is fairly general, and its implementation may be easily adapted to tackle other morphogenetic processes. In particular, one can readily envision the study of the cell division when the cell is confined to a rigid shell, the coupling of cortical mechanics with advection-reaction-diffusion equations of regulating proteins lying at the plasma membrane [103, 104, 105, 106, 33, 19], or the generalization of the model to multicellular aggregates, whose shape is represented by non-manifold triangular meshes [8].

Acknowledgements

This project was realized thanks to generous support from the Bettencourt-Schueller Foundation, from the Labex MemoLife and from the CNRS/Inserm ATIP-Avenir program. We thank N. Ribe, and C. Maurini for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] A. G. Clark, O. Wartlick, G. Salbreux, E. K. Paluch, Stresses at the cell surface during animal cell morphogenesis, *Current Biology* 24 (10) (2014) R484–R494.
- [2] A. G. Clark, K. Dierkes, E. K. Paluch, Monitoring actin cortex thickness in live cells, *Biophysical journal* 105 (3) (2013) 570–580.
- [3] M. Kelkar, P. Bohec, G. Charras, Mechanics of the cellular actin cortex: From signalling to shape change, *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* 66 (2020) 69–78.
- [4] N. Khalilgharibi, J. Fouchard, N. Asadipour, R. Barrientos, M. Duda, A. Bonfanti, A. Yonis, A. Harris, P. Mosaffa, Y. Fujita, A. Kabla, Y. Mao, B. Baum, J. x. J. M. x. oz, M. Miodownik, G. Charras, Stress relaxation in epithelial monolayers is controlled by the actomyosin cortex, *Nature Physics* (2019) 1–14.
- [5] J.-Y. Tinevez, U. Schulze, G. Salbreux, J. Roensch, J.-F. Joanny, E. Paluch, Role of cortical tension in bleb growth, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (44) (2009) 18581–18586.
- [6] M. Mayer, M. Depken, J. S. Bois, F. Jülicher, S. W. Grill, Anisotropies in cortical tension reveal the physical basis of polarizing cortical flows, *Nature* 467 (7315) (2010) 617–621.
- [7] H. Turlier, B. Audoly, J. Prost, J.-F. Joanny, Furrow constriction in animal cell cytokinesis, *Biophysical Journal* 106 (1) (2014) 114 – 123. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2013.11.014>.
- [8] J.-L. Maître, H. Turlier, R. Illukkumbura, B. Eismann, R. Niwayama, F. Nédélec, T. Hiragi, Asymmetric division of contractile domains couples cell positioning and fate specification, *Nature* 536 (7616) (2016) 344–348. doi:[10.1038/nature18958](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18958).
- [9] J. Prost, F. Jülicher, J.-F. Joanny, Active gel physics, *Nature physics* 11 (2) (2015) 111–117.
- [10] P.-G. De Gennes, J. Prost, *The physics of liquid crystals*, Vol. 83, Oxford university press, 1993.
- [11] K. Kruse, J. F. Joanny, F. Jülicher, J. Prost, K. Sekimoto, Generic theory of active polar gels: a paradigm for cytoskeletal dynamics, *The European Physical Journal E* 16 (1) (2005) 5–16. doi:[10.1140/epje/e2005-00002-5](https://doi.org/10.1140/epje/e2005-00002-5).
- [12] G. Salbreux, J. Prost, J. F. Joanny, Hydrodynamics of cellular cortical flows and the formation of contractile rings, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 103 (2009) 058102. doi:[10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.058102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.058102).
- [13] R. J. Hawkins, R. Poincloux, O. Bénichou, M. Piel, P. Chavrier, R. Voituriez, Spontaneous Contractility-Mediated Cortical Flow Generates Cell Migration in Three-Dimensional Environments, *Biophysical Journal* 101 (5) (2011) 1041–1045.
- [14] P. Bun, J. Liu, H. Turlier, Z. Liu, K. Uriot, J.-f. Joanny, M. Coppey-Moisand, Mechanical Checkpoint For Persistent Cell Polarization In Adhesion-Naive Fibroblasts, *Biophysj* 107 (2) (2014) 324–335.
- [15] A. C. Callan-Jones, V. Ruprecht, S. Wieser, Cortical Flow-Driven Shapes of Nonadherent Cells, *Physical Review Letters* 116 (2) (2016) 028102.
- [16] M. Malik-Garbi, N. Ierushalmi, S. Jansen, E. Abu-Shah, B. L. Goode, A. Mogilner, K. Keren, Scaling behaviour in steady-state contracting actomyosin networks, *Nature physics* 15 (5) (2019) 509–516.
- [17] Y. HIRAMOTO, The thickness of the cortex and the refractive index of the protoplasm in sea urchin eggs, *Embryologia* 3 (4) (1957) 361–374.
- [18] H. Berthoumieux, J.-l. Maître, C.-P. Heisenberg, E. K. Paluch, F. Jülicher, G. Salbreux, Active elastic thin shell theory for cellular deformations, *New Journal of Physics* (2014) 1–33.
- [19] S. Yin, B. Li, X.-Q. Feng, Bio-chemo-mechanical theory of active shells, *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids* 152 (Jul. 2021).
- [20] G. G. Stokes, On the theories of the internal friction of fluids in motion, and of the equilibrium and motion of elastic solids, *Transactions of the Cambridge Philosophical Society* 8 (1845).

- [21] J. Rayleigh, The Theory of Sound, no. v. 2 in Dover Books on Physics, Dover Publications, 1945.
- [22] F. Niordson, Shell Theory, ISSN, Elsevier Science, 2012.
- [23] A. Green, W. Zerna, Theoretical Elasticity, Phoenix Edition Series, Dover Publications, 2002.
- [24] M. Bischoff, E. Ramm, J. Irlinger, Models and Finite Elements for Thin-Walled Structures, American Cancer Society, 2017, pp. 1–86. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119176817.ecm2026>.
- [25] D. Chapelle, K.-J. Bathe, The finite element analysis of shells-fundamentals, 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-16408-8.
- [26] B. W. Van De Fliert, P. D. Howell, J. R. Ockenden, Pressure-driven flow of a thin viscous sheet, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 292 (1995) 359–376. doi:10.1017/S002211209500156X.
- [27] P. Howell, Models for thin viscous sheets, European Journal of Applied Mathematics 7 (4) (1996) 321–343.
- [28] J. Buckmaster, A. Nachman, L. Ting, The buckling and stretching of a viscida, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 69 (1) (1975) 1–20.
- [29] N. M. Ribe, Bending and stretching of thin viscous sheets, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 433 (2001) 135–160. doi:10.1017/S0022112000003360.
- [30] C. Perdigou, B. Audoly, The viscous curtain: General formulation and finite-element solution for the stability of flowing viscous sheets, Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids 96 (2016) 291–311.
- [31] N. M. Ribe, A general theory for the dynamics of thin viscous sheets, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 457 (2002) 255–283. doi:10.1017/S0022112001007649.
- [32] A. Yeung, E. Evans, Cortical shell-liquid core model for passive flow of liquid-like spherical cells into micropipets, Biophysical journal 56 (1) (1989) 139–149.
- [33] A. Mietke, F. Jülicher, I. F. Sbalzarini, Self-organized shape dynamics of active surfaces, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 116 (1) (2019) 29–34. doi:10.1073/pnas.1810896115.
- [34] A. Torres-Sánchez, D. Millán, M. Arroyo, Modelling fluid deformable surfaces with an emphasis on biological interfaces, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 872 (2019) 218–271. doi:10.1017/jfm.2019.341.
- [35] M. Bischoff, K.-U. Bletzinger, W. Wall, E. Ramm, Models and finite elements for thin-walled structures, Encyclopedia of computational mechanics (2004).
- [36] M. Fritzschke, A. Lewalle, T. Duke, K. Kruse, G. Charras, Analysis of turnover dynamics of the submembranous actin cortex, Molecular biology of the cell 24 (6) (2013) 757–767.
- [37] L. E. Fraenkel, On the method of matched asymptotic expansions:Part I: A matching principle, Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 65 (1) (1969) 209–231.
- [38] M. Alnæs, J. Blechta, J. Hake, A. Johansson, B. Kehlet, A. Logg, C. Richardson, J. Ring, M. E. Rognes, G. N. Wells, The fenics project version 1.5, Archive of Numerical Software 3 (100) (2015).
- [39] P. Grinfeld, Introduction to tensor analysis and the calculus of moving surfaces, Springer, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-7867-6.
- [40] J. G. Simmonds, A brief on tensor analysis, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [41] J. Happel, H. Brenner, Low Reynolds number hydrodynamics: with special applications to particulate media, Vol. 1, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [42] M. Murrell, P. W. Oakes, M. Lenz, M. L. Gardel, Forcing cells into shape: the mechanics of actomyosin contractility, Nature reviews Molecular cell biology 16 (8) (2015) 486–498.
- [43] J. Joanny, J. Prost, Active gels as a description of the actin-myosin cytoskeleton, HFSP Journal 3 (2) (2009) 94–104, pMID: 19794818. doi:10.2976/1.3054712.
- [44] M. Lenz, T. Thoresen, M. L. Gardel, A. R. Dinner, Contractile units in disordered actomyosin bundles arise from f-actin buckling, Physical review letters 108 (23) (2012) 238107.
- [45] P. M. Bendix, G. H. Koenderink, D. Cuvelier, Z. Dogic, B. N. Koeleman, W. M. Briehar, C. M. Field, L. Mahadevan, D. A. Weitz, A Quantitative Analysis of Contractility in Active Cytoskeletal Protein Networks, Biophysj 94 (8) (2008) 3126–3136.
- [46] P. Agarwal, R. Zaidel-Bar, Principles of actomyosin regulation in vivo, Trends in Cell Biology 29 (2) (2019) 150–163. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2018.09.006>.
- [47] M. Doi, Soft matter physics, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [48] A. E. Green, On the linear theory of thin elastic shells, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences 266 (1325) (1962) 143–160.
- [49] G. Pfingstag, B. Audoly, A. Boudaoud, Linear and nonlinear stability of floating viscous sheets, Journal of fluid mechanics 683 (2011) 112–148.
- [50] W. Koiter, On the mathematical foundation of shell theory, in: Proc. Int. Congr. of Mathematics, Nice, Vol. 3, 1970, pp. 123–130.
- [51] L. R. Strutt, John William, Some general theorems relating to vibrations, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society 1 (1) (1871) 357–368.
- [52] E. Minguzzi, Rayleigh’s dissipation function at work, European Journal of Physics 36 (3) (2015) 035014. doi:10.1088/0143-0807/36/3/035014.
- [53] M. Doi, Onsager’s variational principle in soft matter, Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter 23 (28) (2011) 284118.
- [54] M. Arroyo, N. Walani, A. Torres-Sánchez, D. Kaurin, Onsager’s variational principle in soft matter: introduction and application to the dynamics of adsorption of proteins onto fluid membranes, in: The Role of Mechanics in the Study of Lipid Bilayers, Springer, 2018, pp. 287–332.
- [55] S. Reuther, I. Nitschke, A. Voigt, A numerical approach for fluid deformable surfaces, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 900 (2020).
- [56] E. Grinspun, A. N. Hirani, M. Desbrun, P. Schröder, Discrete shells, in: Proceedings of the 2003 ACM SIGGRAPH/Eurographics symposium on Computer animation, Citeseer, 2003, pp. 62–67.
- [57] C. Batty, A. Uribe, B. Audoly, E. Grinspun, Discrete viscous sheets, ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG) 31 (4) (2012) 1–7.

- [58] F. Cirak, M. Ortiz, P. S. Oder, Subdivision Surfaces: A New Paradigm For Thin-Shell Finite-Element Analysis, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 47 (12) (2000) 2039–2072.
- [59] F. Cirak, M. Ortiz, Fully C1-conforming subdivision elements for finite deformation thin-shell analysis, *International Journal for Numerical Methods in Engineering* 51 (7) (2001) 813–833.
- [60] J. Kiendl, K.-U. Bletzinger, J. Linhard, R. Wüchner, Isogeometric shell analysis with kirchhoff–love elements, *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering* 198 (49–52) (2009) 3902–3914.
- [61] J. S. Hale, M. Brunetti, S. P. Bordas, C. Maurini, Simple and extensible plate and shell finite element models through automatic code generation tools, *Computers & Structures* 209 (2018) 163 – 181. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compstruc.2018.08.001>.
- [62] K.-J. Bathe, A. Iosilevich, D. Chapelle, An evaluation of the mitc shell elements, *Computers & Structures* 75 (1) (2000) 1–30.
- [63] E. Campello, P. Pimenta, P. Wriggers, A triangular finite shell element based on a fully nonlinear shell formulation, *Computational mechanics* 31 (6) (2003) 505–518.
- [64] J. Bleyer, A novel upper bound finite-element for the limit analysis of plates and shells, *European Journal of Mechanics-A/Solids* (2021) 104378.
- [65] A. Logg, K.-A. Mardal, G. Wells, Automated solution of differential equations by the finite element method: The FEniCS book, Vol. 84, Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [66] C. Geuzaine, J.-F. Remacle, Gmsh: A 3-d finite element mesh generator with built-in pre-and post-processing facilities, *International journal for numerical methods in engineering* 79 (11) (2009) 1309–1331.
- [67] C. Dapogny, C. Dobrzynski, P. Frey, Three-dimensional adaptive domain remeshing, implicit domain meshing, and applications to free and moving boundary problems, *Journal of computational physics* 262 (2014) 358–378.
- [68] H. Borja da Rocha, J. Bleyer, H. Turlier, Numerical implementation in python using FEniCS (2021). URL https://github.com/VirtualEmbryo/viscousactive_thinshell
- [69] P. M. Chaikin, T. C. Lubensky, *Principles of Condensed Matter Physics*, Cambridge University Press, 1995. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511813467.
- [70] M. C. Marchetti, J. F. Joanny, S. Ramaswamy, T. B. Liverpool, J. Prost, M. Rao, R. A. Simha, Hydrodynamics of soft active matter, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 85 (2013) 1143–1189. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.85.1143. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.85.1143>
- [71] F. C. Hoppensteadt, C. S. Peskin, *Control of Cell Volume and Electrical Properties of Cell Membranes*, Springer New York, New York, NY, 2002, pp. 109–146. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-21571-6_4.
- [72] Y. Mori, Mathematical properties of pump-leak models of cell volume control and electrolyte balance, *Journal of mathematical biology* 65 (5) (2012) 875–918.
- [73] A. R. Kay, How cells can control their size by pumping ions, *Frontiers in cell and developmental biology* 5 (2017) 41.
- [74] J. Sedzinski, M. Biro, A. Oswald, J.-Y. Tinevez, G. Salbreux, E. Paluch, Polar actomyosin contractility destabilizes the position of the cytokinetic furrow, *Nature* 476 (7361) (2011) 462–466.
- [75] H. Greenspan, On fluid-mechanical simulations of cell division and movement, *Journal of theoretical biology* 70 (1) (1978) 125–134.
- [76] P. Pujara, T. Lardner, A model for cell division, *Journal of biomechanics* 12 (4) (1979) 293–299.
- [77] D. Zinemanas, A. Nir, On the viscous deformation of biological cells under anisotropic surface tension, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 193 (1988) 217–241.
- [78] N. Akkas, On the biomechanics of cytokinesis in animal cells, *Journal of biomechanics* 13 (12) (1980) 977–988.
- [79] X. He, M. Dembo, On the mechanics of the first cleavage division of the sea urchin egg, *Experimental cell research* 233 (2) (1997) 252–273.
- [80] Y. Li, J. Kim, Three-dimensional simulations of the cell growth and cytokinesis using the immersed boundary method, *Mathematical Biosciences* 271 (C) (2016) 118–127.
- [81] J. G. White, G. G. Borisy, On the mechanisms of cytokinesis in animal cells., *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 101 (2) (1983) 289–316.
- [82] F. Spira, S. Cuylen-Haering, S. Mehta, M. Samwer, A. Reversat, A. Verma, R. Oldenbourg, M. Sixt, D. W. Gerlich, Cytokinesis in vertebrate cells initiates by contraction of an equatorial actomyosin network composed of randomly oriented filaments., *eLife* 6 (2017) 983.
- [83] O. Butschli, Studien über die ersten Entwicklungsvorgänge der Eizelle, die Zelltheilung und die Conjugation der Infusorien, Vol. 10, C. Winter, 1876.
- [84] J. F. McClendon, The laws of surface tension and their applicability to living cells and cell division, *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 37 (2) (1913) 233–247.
- [85] J. Spek, Oberflächenspannungsdifferenzen als eine ursache der zellteilung, *Archiv für Entwicklungsmechanik der Organismen* 44 (1) (1918) 5–113.
- [86] W. M. Bement, H. A. Benink, G. Von Dassow, A microtubule-dependent zone of active rhoa during cleavage plane specification, *Journal of Cell Biology* 170 (1) (2005) 91–101.
- [87] J. J. Henry, The role of unequal cleavage and the polar lobe in the segregation of developmental potential during first cleavage in the embryo of *Chaetopterus variopedatus*, *Roux’s archives of developmental biology* 195 (2) (1986) 103–116. doi:10.1007/BF00456106.
- [88] A. S. Maddox, L. Lewellyn, A. Desai, K. Oegema, Anillin and the septins promote asymmetric ingression of the cytokinetic furrow, *Developmental cell* 12 (5) (2007) 827–835.
- [89] G. Ou, N. Sturman, M. D’Ambrosio, R. D. Vale, Polarized Myosin Produces Unequal-Size Daughters During Asymmetric Cell Division, *Science* 330 (6004) (2010) 677 LP – 680. doi:10.1126/science.1196112.
- [90] S. Herszterg, A. Leibfried, F. Bosveld, C. Martin, Y. Bellaiche, Interplay between the dividing cell and its neighbors regulates adherens junction formation during cytokinesis in epithelial tissue, *Developmental cell* 24 (3) (2013) 256–270.
- [91] C. Roubinet, A. Tsankova, T. T. Pham, A. Monnard, E. Caussinus, M. Affolter, C. Cabernard, Spatio-temporally separated cortical flows and spindle geometry establish physical asymmetry in fly neural stem cells, *Nature Communications* (2017) 1–15.
- [92] D. Singh, C. Pohl, Coupling of rotational cortical flow, asymmetric midbody positioning, and spindle rotation mediates dorsoventral axis

- formation in *c. elegans*, *Developmental cell* 28 (3) (2014) 253–267.
- [93] R. Jelier, A. Kruger, J. Swoger, T. Zimmermann, B. Lehner, Compensatory Cell Movements Confer Robustness to Mechanical Deformation during Embryonic Development, *Cell Systems* 3 (2) (2016) 160–171.
- [94] K. Sugioka, B. Bowerman, Combinatorial Contact Cues Specify Cell Division Orientation by Directing Cortical Myosin Flows, *Developmental Cell* 46 (3) (2018) 257–270.e5. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2018.06.020>.
- [95] G. Salbreux, F. Jülicher, Mechanics of active surfaces, *Physical Review E* 96 (3) (2017) 032404.
- [96] M. Nestler, I. Nitschke, A. Voigt, A finite element approach for vector-and tensor-valued surface pdes, *Journal of Computational Physics* 389 (2019) 48–61.
- [97] A. Torres-Sánchez, D. Santos-Oliván, M. Arroyo, Approximation of tensor fields on surfaces of arbitrary topology based on local monge parametrizations, *Journal of Computational Physics* 405 (2020) 109168.
- [98] A. C. Callan-Jones, F. Jülicher, Hydrodynamics of active permeating gels, *New Journal of Physics* 13 (9) (2011) 093027.
- [99] S. Fürthauer, M. Stempel, S. W. Grill, F. Jülicher, Active chiral processes in thin films, *Physical Review Letters* 110 (4) (2013) 048103.
- [100] S. R. a. Naganathan, S. Fürthauer, M. Nishikawa, F. Jülicher, S. W. Grill, Active torque generation by the actomyosin cell cortex drives left-right symmetry breaking, *eLife* 3 (2014) e04165.
- [101] J. Donea, A. Huerta, J.-P. Ponthot, A. Rodríguez-Ferran, Arbitrary lagrangian–eulerian methods, *Encyclopedia of computational mechanics* (2004).
- [102] A. Sahu, Y. A. Omar, R. A. Sauer, K. K. Mandadapu, Arbitrary lagrangian–eulerian finite element method for curved and deforming surfaces: I. general theory and application to fluid interfaces, *Journal of Computational Physics* 407 (2020) 109253. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2020.109253>.
- [103] M. Carroll, M. Levasseur, C. Wood, M. Whitaker, K. T. Jones, A. McDougall, Exploring the mechanism of action of the sperm-triggered calcium-wave pacemaker in ascidian zygotes, *Journal of Cell Science* 116 (24) (2003) 4997–5004.
- [104] W. M. Bement, M. Leda, A. M. Moe, A. M. Kita, M. E. Larson, A. E. Golding, C. Pfeuti, K.-C. Su, A. L. Miller, A. B. Goryachev, et al., Activator–inhibitor coupling between rho signalling and actin assembly makes the cell cortex an excitable medium, *Nature cell biology* 17 (11) (2015) 1471–1483.
- [105] P. Gross, K. V. Kumar, S. W. Grill, How Active Mechanics and Regulatory Biochemistry Combine to Form Patterns in Development, *Annual Review of Biophysics* 46 (1) (2017) 337–356.
- [106] J. Bischof, C. A. Brand, K. Somogyi, I. Májer, S. Thome, M. Mori, U. S. Schwarz, P. Lénárt, A cdk1 gradient guides surface contraction waves in oocytes, *Nature communications* 8 (1) (2017) 1–10.

Appendix

A. Asymptotic expansion: Inextensional limit

The appropriate scaling for the inextensional regime (26) gives the following expansion

$$u_i = \frac{PL}{\mu\epsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n u_i^{(mn)}, \quad p = \frac{P}{\epsilon^2} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n p^{(mn)}. \quad (73)$$

It will be useful to introduce the dimensionless strain rate tensors, and rate of curvature change

$$\Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(m0)} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(m0)} + u_{\beta|\alpha}^{(m0)}) - \hat{b}_{\alpha\beta} u_3^{(m0)},$$

$$\Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(m0)} = u_{3,\alpha|\beta}^{(m0)} + b_{\beta}^{\lambda} u_{\lambda|\alpha}^{(m0)} + b_{\beta|\alpha}^{\lambda} u_{\lambda}^{(m0)} + \hat{b}_{\beta}^{\gamma} u_{\gamma|\alpha}^{(m0)} - \hat{b}_{\beta}^{\gamma} b_{\alpha\gamma} u_3^{(m0)}.$$

The strain rate tensor is obtained similarly by inserting (73) into (29)

$$2e_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{P}{\mu\epsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(mn)} + u_{\beta|\alpha}^{(mn)} - 2\hat{b}_{\alpha\beta} u_3^{(mn)} + \epsilon \hat{z} (2\hat{b}_{\beta}^{\lambda} \hat{b}_{\lambda\alpha} u_3^{(mn)} - \hat{b}_{\alpha}^{\lambda} u_{\lambda|\beta}^{(mn)} - \hat{b}_{\beta}^{\lambda} u_{\lambda|\alpha}^{(mn)}) \right], \quad (74)$$

which we then use to obtain the non-symmetric stress tensor

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sigma^{\alpha\beta}}{P} = & \frac{1}{\epsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[\phi_0^{(mn)} + \epsilon \hat{z} \phi_1^{(mn)} + \epsilon^2 \hat{z}^2 \phi_2^{(mn)} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3) \right] + \\ & \epsilon^{-2} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \\ & \epsilon^{-1} \hat{z} (a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + 2a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \\ & \epsilon^0 \hat{z}^2 (\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 4\hat{H} b^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + b^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 2a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_{\gamma}^{\beta}) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

where

$$\phi_0^{(mn)} = -a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(mn)} \epsilon + 2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \left[\frac{1}{2}(u_{\mu|\delta}^{(mn)} + u_{\delta|\mu}^{(mn)}) - \hat{b}_{\mu\delta} u_3^{(mn)} \right], \quad (76)$$

$$\phi_1^{(mn)} = -(\hat{b}^{\alpha\beta} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\beta}) p^{(mn)} \epsilon + 4(a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - \hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \left[\frac{1}{2}(u_{\mu|\delta}^{(mn)} + u_{\delta|\mu}^{(mn)}) - \hat{b}_{\mu\delta} u_3^{(mn)} \right], \quad (77)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_2^{(mn)} = & (-\hat{G} a^{\alpha\beta} + 2\hat{H} \hat{b}^{\alpha\beta} + 2\hat{b}^{\alpha\gamma} \hat{b}_{\gamma}^{\beta}) p^{(mn)} \epsilon + \\ & (2\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + 4b^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 4H a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 8a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_{\gamma}^{\beta} - 8a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\mu\gamma} \hat{b}_{\gamma}^{\alpha}) \left[\frac{1}{2}(u_{\mu|\delta}^{(mn)} + u_{\delta|\mu}^{(mn)}) - \hat{b}_{\mu\delta} u_3^{(mn)} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Notice the extra ϵ in front of each $p^{(mn)}$ term, which comes from the appropriate scaling for the inextensional limit. The remaining components for the stress tensor are

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^{\alpha 3} = & \frac{P}{\epsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n a^{\alpha\gamma} [u_{\gamma}^{(m+1)n+1} (n+1) + u_{3,\gamma}^{(mn)} + \hat{b}_{\gamma}^{\lambda} u_{\lambda}^{(mn)} \\ & + \epsilon \hat{z} [-(n+1) \hat{b}^{\alpha\gamma} u_{\gamma}^{(m+1)n+1} + 2(\hat{b}^{\alpha\gamma} - \hat{H} a^{\alpha\gamma})(u_{\gamma}^{(m+1)n+1} + u_{3|\gamma}^{(mn)})] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)], \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

and

$$\sigma^{33} = \frac{P}{\varepsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[-p^{(mn)} \varepsilon + 2(n+1)u_3^{(m+1,n+1)} \right] (1 - 2\hat{H}\hat{z}\varepsilon + \hat{G}\hat{z}^2\varepsilon^2) + \varepsilon^{-2}\hat{\zeta}Q_{33}(1 - 2\hat{H}\hat{z}\varepsilon + \hat{G}\hat{z}^2\varepsilon^2) \quad (80)$$

The stress resultant, integrated tension along the thickness is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n^{\alpha\beta}}{PL} = & \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \left[\frac{2}{2n+1} \left(\frac{\hat{T}}{2} \right)^{2n+1} \phi_0^{(m,2n)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{2n+3} \left(\frac{\hat{T}}{2} \right)^{2n+3} \phi_1^{(m,2n+1)} + \frac{2\varepsilon^2}{2n+3} \left(\frac{\hat{T}}{2} \right)^{2n+3} \phi_2^{(m,2n)} \right] \\ & + \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{T} \hat{\zeta} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} (\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 4\hat{H} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 2a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\beta) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} \end{aligned}$$

In the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we only keep the terms corresponding to $m = 2$ and $n = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n^{\alpha\beta}}{PL} = & \hat{T} \phi_0^{(20)} + \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[\phi_0^{(22)} + \phi_1^{(11)} + \phi_2^{(00)} \right] + \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{T} \hat{\zeta} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} D^{\alpha\beta} \\ = & \hat{T} \left[2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(20)} - a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(10)} \right] \\ & + \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[-a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(12)} + 2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(22)} - (\hat{b}^{\alpha\beta} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\beta}) p^{(01)} + 4(a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - \hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(11)} \right. \\ & + (2\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + 4\hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 4\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 8a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\beta - 8a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\mu\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\alpha) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(00)} \left. \right] \\ & + \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{T} \hat{\zeta} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} D^{\alpha\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(mn)} = \frac{1}{2}(u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(mn)} + u_{\beta|\alpha}^{(mn)}) - \hat{b}_{\alpha\beta} u_3^{(mn)}$, and $D^{\alpha\beta} = (\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 4\hat{H} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 2a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\beta) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta}$.

We now turn to the equation for the bending moment,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m^{\alpha\beta}}{PL^2} = & -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \int_{-\hat{T}/2}^{\hat{T}/2} \hat{z}^n \left[\hat{z} \phi_0^{(mn)} + \varepsilon \hat{z}^2 \phi_1^{(mn)} \right] d\hat{z} - \varepsilon^3 \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} (a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + 2a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} \\ = & -\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \left[\frac{2}{2n+3} \left(\frac{\hat{T}}{2} \right)^{2n+3} \phi_0^{(m,2n+1)} + \frac{2\varepsilon}{2n+3} \left(\frac{\hat{T}}{2} \right)^{2n+3} \phi_1^{(m,2n)} \right] \\ & - \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} (a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + 2a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} \end{aligned}$$

Again, keeping only the dominant term

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m^{\alpha\beta}}{PL^2} = & -\frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[\phi_0^{(11)} + \phi_1^{(00)} \right] \\ = & -\frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[-a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(01)} + 2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(11)} + 4(a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - \hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(00)} \right] \\ & - \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} (a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + 2a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - 2\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta}) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} \end{aligned}$$

The symmetric effective stress resultant $N^{\alpha\beta} = n^{\alpha\beta} - b_\lambda^\beta m^{\alpha\lambda}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N^{\alpha\beta}}{PL} = & \hat{T} \left[2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(20)} - a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(10)} \right] \\ & + \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[-a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(12)} + 2a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(22)} - 2(b^{\alpha\beta} - \hat{H} a^{\alpha\beta}) p^{(01)} + (4a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} - 4\hat{H} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + 2a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta}) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(11)} \right. \\ & \left. + (2\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 8a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\beta - 8a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\mu\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\alpha) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(00)} \right] \\ & + \varepsilon^{-1} \hat{T} \hat{\zeta} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} + \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} (\hat{G} a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 4\hat{H} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} - 3a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\delta\gamma} \hat{b}_\gamma^\beta) \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

The symmetric effective bending moment is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M^{\alpha\beta}}{L^2 P} = & -\frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[-a^{\alpha\beta} p^{(01)} + (a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} a^{\alpha\delta}) \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(11)} + 2[a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} + a^{\alpha\delta} \hat{b}^{\beta\mu} - \hat{H}(a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} a^{\alpha\delta})] \Delta_{\mu\delta}^{(00)} \right] \\ & - \varepsilon \frac{\hat{T}^3}{12} \left[\frac{1}{2}(a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} \hat{b}^{\alpha\delta}) + a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu} + a^{\alpha\delta} \hat{b}^{\beta\mu} - \hat{H}(a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} a^{\alpha\delta}) \right] \hat{\zeta} Q_{\mu\delta} \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

As for the membrane case in the main text, to obtain a close relation in terms of velocities referred to the midsurface, we need to find relations for the remaining coefficient. These relations are found using the expansion (73) in the boundary conditions (95), and the governing equations (33), (11), and then equate to zero the factors in the expansion proportional to the same power in ε and \hat{z} .

Boundary condition The continuity of normal stress implies, from (95), $\tau_\pm^{33} = P_\pm^3$. Then, with the expansions (73),

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left[-p^{(mn)} \varepsilon + 2(n+1) u_3^{(m+1n+1)} \right] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \hat{\zeta} Q_{33} = P_\pm^3.$$

Considering the term of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-3})$, $m=0$, $n=0$ we have that

$$2u_3^{(11)} = 0. \quad (83)$$

Next, from the term of order $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ we obtain for $n=1$

$$p^{(01)} = 4u_3^{22}. \quad (84)$$

Finally, the $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ equation gives for $n=0$

$$p^{(10)} = 2u_3^{(31)}, \quad (85)$$

We now turn to the next boundary condition, relating the transverse load $\tau_\pm^{3\alpha} = 2\mu g^{33} g^{\alpha\lambda} e_{3\lambda} = P_\pm^\alpha$:

$$\frac{P}{\varepsilon^3} \sum_{m,n=0} \varepsilon^m \hat{z}^n g_+^{\alpha\lambda} \left[(n+1) u_\lambda^{(m+1n+1)} + u_{3,\lambda}^{(mn)} + \hat{b}_\lambda^\gamma u_\gamma^{(mn)} - \varepsilon \hat{z} \hat{b}_\lambda^\gamma u_\lambda^{(m+1n+1)} (n+1) \right] = P_\pm^\alpha. \quad (86)$$

The zero order term, $m=0$, $n=0$, in this equation gives,

$$u_\lambda^{(11)} = -u_{3,\lambda}^{(00)} - \hat{b}_\lambda^\gamma u_\gamma^{(00)}. \quad (87)$$

Incompressibility: mass conservation

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^{-3} \sum_{m,n=0} \epsilon^m \hat{z}^n \left\{ (n+1)u_3^{(m+1n+1)} + a^{\alpha\beta} u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(mn)} - 2\hat{H}u_3^{(mn)} \right. \\ \left. + \epsilon \hat{z} \left[-2\hat{H}(n+1)u_3^{(m+1n+1)} + 2\hat{G}u_3^{(mn)} + (\hat{b}^{\alpha\beta} - 2\hat{H}a^{\alpha\beta})u_{\alpha|\beta}^{(mn)} \right] + \epsilon^2 \hat{z}^2 \hat{G}[u_3^{(m+1n+1)}] \right\} \\ = \epsilon^{-3} [-\hat{k}_d + \hat{v}_p \delta(\hat{z} - \hat{T}/2) - \epsilon \hat{z} 2\hat{H}[-\hat{k}_d + \hat{v}_p \delta(\hat{z} - \hat{T}/2)] + \epsilon^2 \hat{z}^2 \hat{G}[-\hat{k}_d + \hat{v}_p \delta(\hat{z} - \hat{T}/2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (88)$$

Consider first the case $(m, n) = (0, 0)$, giving $u_3^{(11)} + a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} + \hat{k}_d - \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} = 0$. Since $u_3^{(11)} = 0$ it means that $a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} = \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} - \hat{k}_d$.

Next, consider the pair $(m, n) = (2, 0)$, leading to $u_3^{(31)} = -a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(20)}$. Then, using Eq. (85), we obtain

$$p^{(10)} = -2a^{\alpha\beta} \Delta_{\alpha\beta}^{(20)}. \quad (89)$$

If we consider $m = 1$, and $n = 1$, we can show that $2u_3^{(22)} = a^{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} + 2\hat{H} \left(\hat{k}_d - \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} \right)$. It follows from Eq. (84) that

$$p^{(01)} = 2a^{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} + 4\hat{H} \left(\hat{k}_d - \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} \right). \quad (90)$$

Finally, the relation for $m = 2$, and $n = 2$ leads to $3u_3^{(33)} = (\hat{H}a^{\alpha\beta} + \hat{b}^{\alpha\beta})\Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} + 3(2\hat{H}^2 - \hat{G}) \left(\hat{k}_d - \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} \right)$.

Equilibrium equations The remaining parameter $p^{(12)}$ can be found from the out-of-plane equilibrium equation (11b) when looking at the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-2}, \hat{z})$ term

$$p^{(12)} = \hat{b}^{\alpha\beta} \Omega_{\alpha\beta}^{(00)} + 4(\hat{H}^2 - \hat{G}) \left(\hat{k}_d - \frac{\hat{v}_p}{\hat{T}} \right) \quad (91)$$

We now substitute Eq. (87), (89), (90), (91) into Eq. (81), and (82) to obtain the dimensional (symmetric) effective stress and bending moment

$$\begin{aligned} N^{\alpha\beta} &= 4\mu T \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Delta_{\mu\delta} + T\zeta a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} \\ &+ \mu \frac{T^3}{12} \left[C^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + B^{\alpha\beta} \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) \right] \\ &+ \frac{T^3}{12} (Ga^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - 4Hb^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} - b^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} - 3a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\delta\gamma} b_{\gamma}^{\beta}) \zeta Q_{\mu\delta}, \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where $C^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = 8H\mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} - a^{\alpha\beta} b^{\mu\delta} - 5b^{\alpha\beta} a^{\mu\delta} - \frac{3}{2}(a^{\alpha\mu} b^{\beta\delta} + a^{\alpha\delta} b^{\beta\mu} + a^{\beta\mu} b^{\alpha\delta} + a^{\beta\delta} b^{\alpha\mu})$, and $B^{\alpha\beta} = 2(G - H^2)a^{\alpha\beta} + 6Hb^{\alpha\beta} + 10b_{\mu}^{\alpha} b^{\beta\mu}$.

The effective bending moment,

$$M^{\alpha\beta} = \mu \frac{T^3}{3} \mathcal{A}^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} \Omega_{\mu\delta} + \mu \frac{T^3}{12} (6Ha^{\alpha\beta} + 4b^{\alpha\beta}) \left(k_d - \frac{v_p}{T} \right) + \frac{T^3}{12} D^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} Q_{\mu\delta} \zeta \quad (93)$$

Where $D^{\alpha\beta\mu\delta} = H(a^{\alpha\mu} a^{\beta\delta} + a^{\beta\mu} a^{\alpha\delta}) + a^{\alpha\beta} \hat{b}^{\mu\delta} - \frac{3}{4}(a^{\alpha\mu} \hat{b}^{\beta\delta} + a^{\alpha\delta} \hat{b}^{\beta\mu} + a^{\beta\mu} \hat{b}^{\alpha\delta} + a^{\beta\delta} \hat{b}^{\alpha\mu})$.

B. Numerical values

The physical parameters used in the main text are summarized in table 1.

Notation	Quantity	Experimental Value	Numerical Value
R	Cell radius	10 -100 μm	1
e	Cortex thickness	0.2 - 2 μm	0.02
w	Rho-A-GTP signal width	1 - 10 μm	0.15
ζ	Basal Active stress	10 ³ Pa	1
T_a	Cytokinesis timescale	10 ³ s	10
μ	Actomyosin shear viscosity	10 ⁵ Pa s	1
k_d	Depolymerization	0.04 s ⁻¹	4
v_p	Polymerization	0.008 - 0.08 $\mu\text{m/s}$	0.08

Table 1

Numerical values have been chosen so that $R_0 = 1$ and $T_a = 10$ are the reference length and timescale.

C. Boundary conditions

To apply the boundary conditions we need to define a set of basis vector tangent and normal to the outer surface. The position vector in the outer surfaces is

$$\mathbf{x}^\pm = \mathbf{r}(\xi^\alpha, t) \pm \frac{1}{2}T(\xi^\alpha, t)\mathbf{n}(\xi^\alpha, t).$$

Here we specified that the thickness T is a function of time and varies along the sheet. Moreover, \pm indicates that the variable in question is evaluated at $z = \pm T/2$. Then, the covariant and contravariant tangent vectors to the outer surfaces are

$$\mathbf{c}_\alpha^\pm \equiv \pm \mathbf{x}_{,\alpha}^\pm = \pm \mathbf{g}_\alpha^\pm + \frac{1}{2}T_{,\alpha}\mathbf{g}_3, \quad \mathbf{c}_\pm^\alpha = \pm \mathbf{g}_\pm^\alpha + \frac{g^{\alpha\lambda}T_{,\lambda}}{2\Lambda_\pm^2}(\mathbf{g}^3 \mp \frac{1}{2}T_{,\beta}\mathbf{g}_\pm^\beta), \quad (94)$$

where $\Lambda_\pm = (1 + \frac{1}{4}g_\pm^{\alpha\beta}T_{,\alpha}T_{,\beta})^{1/2}$. The outward unit normal vectors are $\mathbf{c}_3^\pm = \mathbf{c}_\pm^3 \equiv \mathbf{n}^\pm = n_i^\pm \mathbf{g}_\pm^i$, with $n_\alpha^\pm = -\Lambda_\pm^{-1}\frac{1}{2}T_{,\alpha}$ and $n_3^\pm = \pm\Lambda_\pm^{-1}$.

The main driver of cortex deformation is generally the local motor activity, which creates additional internal contractile stress (akin to a negative pressure) in the layer, that cells can control longitudinally. However, external normal forces are also present in the form of hydrostatic pressure stemming from the extracellular or intracellular medium (or cytoplasm). Tangential external loads may also exist at the inner and outer surfaces of the cortex, such as friction forces arising from the interaction with the plasma membrane or viscous resistance from the cytoplasm. Then, let $\mathbf{P}^\pm = P_i^\pm \mathbf{c}_\pm^i = P_\pm^i \mathbf{c}_\pm^i$ represent the stress vector applied to the outer surfaces of the cell, per unit area of those outer surfaces. The vectors \mathbf{c}_\pm^i and \mathbf{c}_\pm^i are the given by (94). The tangential components of the applied stress are P_α^\pm or P_\pm^α , and the the normal components P_3^\pm or P_\pm^3 . Continuity of the stress vector at the outer surfaces require

$$\tau_\pm^{ij} n_i^\pm \mathbf{g}_j^\pm = \mathbf{P}^\pm. \quad (95)$$

Notice, however, that the boundary stresses appear in the balance equations only through terms in $F_\pm^j = \Lambda_\pm \sigma_\pm^{ij} n_i^\pm$. To obtain an expression for F_\pm^j in terms of \mathbf{P}^\pm we project (95) onto the midsurface base vectors,

$$F_\pm^3 = \pm h_\pm P_\pm^3 + \frac{1}{2}T_{,\alpha} P_\pm^\alpha + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2 |\mathbf{P}|) \quad (96a)$$

$$F_\pm^\alpha = \pm h_\pm P_\pm^\alpha - \frac{1}{2}T b_\beta^\alpha P_\pm^\beta - \frac{1}{2}a^{\alpha\beta} T_{,\beta} P_\pm^3 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2 |\mathbf{P}|). \quad (96b)$$