Numerical Method to Compute Hypha Tip Growth for Data Driven Validation
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ABSTRACT Hyphae are fungal filaments that can occur in both pathogenic and symbiotic fungi. Consequently, it is important to understand what drives the growth of hyphae. A single hypha cell grows by localized cell extension at their tips. This type of growth is referred to as tip growth. The interconnection between different biological components driving the tip growth is not fully understood. Consequently, many theoretical models have been formulated. It is important to develop methods, such that these theoretical models can be validated using experimentally obtained data. In this paper, we consider the Ballistic Ageing Thin viscous Sheet (BATS) model by Prokert, Hulshof, and de Jong (2019). The governing equations of the BATS model are given by ordinary differential equations that depend on a function called the viscosity function. We present a numerical method for computing solutions of the governing equations that resemble the tip growth. These solutions can be compared to experimental data to validate the BATS model. Since the authors are unaware of the existence of the required data to validate this model, a variety of theoretical scenarios were considered. Our numerical results suggest that if there exists a solution that corresponds to the tip growth, then there exists a one-parameter family of solutions corresponding to the tip growth.

INDEX TERMS Bifurcation, biomechanics, cells (biology), differential equations, morphogenesis, Newton method, nonlinear equations, numerical analysis, shooting method, tip growth.

I. INTRODUCTION

Filamentous pathogenic fungi commonly occur as respiratory infections in immune-compromised patients [5]. They can also produce a wide variety of beneficial drugs and antibiotics [16]. More recently, studies indicate that filamentous fungi are useful in degrading pharmaceuticals [18]. As more pharmaceuticals enter the ecosystem through livestock rearing this might remedy the negative effects of pharmaceuticals on fauna and human health. In nature filamentous fungi play an important role in decomposing organisms. Fungi convert dead cells into soluble compounds that can be absorbed by plants. Consequently, it is important to understand what drives the growth of fungal filaments [11].

Fungal filaments are called hyphae. Hyphae grow by localized cell extension at their tips. Hence, this growth phenomenon is called tip growth. During tip growth a hypha cell exhibits extreme lengthwise growth while its shape remains qualitatively the same and the tip’s velocity remains approximately constant. Furthermore, in the absence of spatial influences the cell’s shape is almost rotationally symmetric. In Fig. 1 we display an idealized cell wall shape during tip growth at equally spaced time steps $t_j$.

The interconnection between different biological components driving tip growth is not fully understood. Consequently, many theoretical models have been formulated [2]–[4], [7]–[9]. The model of Bartnicki-Garcia and Gierz [2] and Bartnicki-Garcia et al. [3] gives a detailed description of the internal transport of new cell wall building material. The model of Campàs and Mahadevan [4] gives a detailed description of the cell wall evolution. To obtain an improved model the models of Bartnicki-Garcia et al. and Campàs, Mahadevan were combined in [12]. This new model is called the Ballistic Ageing Thin viscous Sheet (BATS) model. The governing equations are given by an ordinary
differential equation which is dependent on an experimentally
determined function called the viscosity function. This model
was not validated using experimental data. Since there exists
a lot of variety between fungal hypha species it is important
to first construct a method which can validate the model
given processed experimental data. In this paper we present
a numerical method which, for suitable viscosity functions,
can compute solutions of the BATS model which resemble
hypha tip growth. Furthermore, we give numerical evidence
that for certain viscosity functions there exist no solutions
that resemble tip growth.

Solutions of the governing ODE which resemble tip growth
cannot be straightforwardly computed using a standard ODE
solver since the majority of solutions of the ODE do not
resemble tip growth. By studying the limiting properties at
the tip and the base of the cell we can restrict to a family of
solutions. The solutions satisfying the limiting properties at
the tip admit a classification which allows us to specify which
solutions do not resemble tip growth. Using a Newton method
we can then connect the remaining solutions to solutions
satisfying the limiting base properties.

Let us give an overview of this paper. In Section II we
revise the BATS model. In Section III we present the numerical
method for computing solutions corresponding to tip
growth. This method relies on computing expansions, defining
a classification of solutions and a shooting method based
on a Newton method. In Section IV we apply the method
to a variety of viscosity functions. The numerical results
suggest that viscosity functions exist which admit solutions
corresponding to hypha tip growth. In addition, the numerical
results suggest that there also exist viscosity functions which
do not admit the existence of solutions corresponding to
hypha tip growth. Finally, in Section V we present conclusions
and topics for future work.

II. BALLISTIC AGEING THIN VISCOUS SHEET MODEL

The BATS model is based on the thin viscous sheet tip
growth model of Campàs and Mahadevan [4] and the ballis-
tic tip growth model of Bartnicki-Garcia and Gierz [2]
and Bartnicki-Garcia et al. [3]. It connects these two models
by introducing a so-called age equation. In this section we
will briefly revise the BATS model and present the govern-
ing equations. The details can be found in [12]. For a short
biomechanical overview of the BATS model we refer to [13].
For more details concerning the biology of hypha growth we
refer to [1], [6], [8], [10], [14], [17], [19].

A. MODELLING TIP GROWTH

We assume that the cell wall shape is axially symmetric.
Thus, at a fixed time we describe the cell shape in cylindrical
variables (z, r, φ). Due to its axial symmetry the cell shape
can be fully described in the (z, r)-plane. We parameterize
the r, z variables by s, the arclength to the tip.

During tip growth the cell grows with constant speed in the
direction normal to the tip. In addition, the hypha cell
preserves its overall shape. Hence, tip growth corresponds to a
travelling wave profile: (z(s)+ct, r(s), φ) with c the travelling
wave velocity. We will take c < 0.

We consider a moving reference frame where the tip of the
cell is fixed at lim_{s→0}(z, r) = (z_0, 0) with z_0 < 0. Note that
this removes the dependency on time. We assume that the
cell wall is a thin viscous sheet. We assume that the sheet is
infinitely long. The base of cell then corresponds to s → ∞.
The sheet is subject to an outward force resulting from the
pressure difference. In the hypha biology this corresponds
to the pressure difference between the turgor and the atmo-
spheric pressure. At s the thickness of the thin viscous sheet is
denoted by h(s) and the tangential velocity is denoted by u(s),
see Fig. 2. The travelling wave velocity can then be retrieved
by computing \( \lim_{s→∞} u(s) \).

Cell wall building material is transported to the cell wall in
straight trajectories from an isotropic point source, called the
ballistic Vesicle Supply Center (VSC), see Fig. 2. We fix the
ballistic VSC at (z, r) = (0, 0). For an alternative model for
cell wall building material transport see [15], [20].

We assume that the cell wall ages. The ageing starts when a
cell wall building particle is absorbed by the cell wall. Hence,
we compute the average age of all cell wall particles at s.
Denote by \( T(\zeta, s) \) the time it takes a particle in the cell wall
to travel from \( \zeta \) to s. Observe that the tangential velocity, u(s),
is parameterized by s. Hence, we have that

\[
T(\zeta, s) = \int_{\zeta}^{s} \frac{1}{u(\sigma)} d\sigma. \tag{1}
\]
In Fig. 3 the components of $T(\zeta, s)$ are displayed. There exist other methods to define the local age of the cell wall, for example see [7].

![Figure 3](image)

**FIGURE 3.** Travel time of particles through the cell wall.

We define the cumulative flux $G(s)$ as the total flux of material over the surface of revolution given by the arc from the tip to $\zeta = s$, see Fig. 4.

![Figure 4](image)

**FIGURE 4.** $G(s)$ is the total flux through the grey cap.

Observe that since no particles exit the cell wall the flux is equal to the inflow of cell wall building particles. At a point with arclength $s$ there is cell wall material which originally entered at $\zeta \in (0, s)$ and has been part of the cell wall for $T(\zeta, s)$. Weighing $T(\zeta, s)$ by the mass which enters the cell wall at the boundary of the disk at $\zeta$ we get $T(\zeta, s)G(\zeta)$. To obtain the average age we integrate $T(\zeta, s)G(\zeta)$ over an arc $(0, s)$ and divide it by the total flux over that arc:

$$\Psi(s) = \frac{\int_0^s T(s)G(s)d\zeta}{G(s)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The integral equation (2) can be reformulated as a differential equation which will be presented in the next section.

We assume that the viscosity depends on age. Hence, the viscosity at $s$ is given by $\mu(\Psi(s))$, where $\mu \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+)$ is the viscosity function. The biology suggests that the cell wall ‘hardens’ with age. In this model ‘hardening’ of the cell wall means that the cell wall’s viscosity increases. Therefore, we require that $\mu$ satisfies:

$$\frac{d\mu}{d\Psi} > 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

From an application perspective $\mu$ needs to be determined experimentally. Hypha cells can have different material properties based the fungal cell species and the physical circumstances of the cell. Hence, we expect that $\mu$ is problem specific. Thus, from a theoretical perspective we want to consider $\mu$ as general as possible.

### B. Governing Equations: Five Dimensional First Order ODE

The modeling assumptions from Section II-A can be expressed as two force balance equations, a mass conservation equation and an age equation. We can eliminate the $u$-variable as is shown in [12]. After non-dimensionalisation the governing equations can be expressed as the following five dimensional first order ODE:

$$\rho' = \frac{3}{2}\frac{(1 - \rho)^2}{r} \left(-1 + \mu(\Psi)\Gamma(r, z)\rho\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}\right),$$

$$r' = \rho,$$

$$h' = \frac{r\gamma(\rho, r, z)}{\Gamma(r, z)} - \frac{\rho - r^2}{2\mu(\Psi)\Gamma(r, z)\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}h,$$

$$\Psi' = \frac{rh}{\Gamma(r, z)} - \frac{r\gamma(\rho, r, z)}{\Gamma(r, z)}\Psi,$$

$$z' = \sqrt{1 - \rho^2},$$

where the prime denotes the $s$-derivative,

$$\gamma(\rho, r, z) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} - \frac{z\rho}{\sqrt{r^2 + z^2}},$$

$$\Gamma(r, z) = 1 + \frac{z}{\sqrt{r^2 + z^2}},$$

and $\mu \in F$ with

$$F := \{\mu \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+): \mu' > 0, \lim_{\Psi \to \infty} \mu(\Psi) = \infty\}. \hspace{1cm} (6)$$

A function $\mu \in F$ is referred to as a viscosity function. We will consider the phase space given by

$$M := \{ (\rho, r, h, \Psi, z) \in (-1, 1) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \}. \hspace{1cm} (7)$$

In [12] it is shown that the governing ODE (4) does not have any biologically realistic solutions if it does not satisfy

$$\lim_{\Psi \to \infty} \mu(\Psi) = \infty.$$ 

For notational convenience we will denote a solution vector of (4) by $x$. Hence, we have that $x = (\rho, r, h, \Psi, z)$. When necessary we will indicate the dependence of $x$ on $\mu$ by writing $x(\cdot; \mu)$.

### C. Steady Tip Growth Solutions

Steady tip growth solutions are solutions of (4) which correspond to fungal tip growth in the phase space. A solution $x := (\rho, r, h, \Psi, z)$ is called a steady tip growth solution if it is a solution of the ODE (4) which satisfies the following four conditions:

**T1 Tip limits:**

$$\begin{align*}
\lim_{s \to 0} \rho(s) &= 1, & \lim_{s \to 0} r(s) &= 0, \\
\lim_{s \to 0} h(s) &= h_0 > 0, & \lim_{s \to 0} \Psi(s) &= h_0 \gamma_0^2, \\
\lim_{s \to 0} z(s) &= z_0 < 0.
\end{align*}$$
Rationale: The limits for $\rho, r, h, z$ follow directly from the cell shape in Fig. 2. Then, after computing leading order asymptotics the limit for $\Psi$ follows. 

T2 Analyticity in $r^2$: There exists $s_1 > 0$ and $G \in C^0((-a, a), \mathbb{R}^3)$ with $a = r(s_1)^2$ such that 

$$\rho, h, \Psi, z(s) = G(r(s)^2) \quad \forall s \in (0, s_1).$$

Rationale: This condition follows from the axial symmetry and the smoothness at the tip.

T3 Global constraints: For all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ the following constraints are satisfied 

$$\rho'(s) < 0, \quad \rho(s) > 0.$$ 

Rationale: If we require that $r$ satisfies $r'(s) > 0$ and $r''(s) < 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ we obtain the characteristic tip growth cell shape displayed in Fig. 2. We expect that the cell’s width converges to a constant. We assume that the cell’s length is infinite and the age are positive for all $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

T4 Base limits: 

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} \rho(s) = 0, \quad \lim_{s \to \infty} r(s) = r_\infty > 0,$$

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} h(s) = h_\infty > 0, \quad \lim_{s \to \infty} \Psi(s) = \infty,$$

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} z(s) = \infty.$$ 

Rationale: We assume that the cell’s length is infinite and that the cell’s width converges to a constant. We expect that the cell wall thickness converges to a positive constant. For a detailed derivation of T1-T4 we refer to [12].

Solutions which are not steady tip growth solutions are not meaningful from a biological perspective.

Remark: 

- In [12] the T4 condition of steady tip growth solutions does not contain $\lim_{s \to \infty} \Psi(s)$. In [12] it is shown that the T4 condition without $\lim_{s \to \infty} \Psi(s)$ implies condition T4. Hence, for convenience it has been absorbed in condition T4.

III. COMPUTING STEADY TIP GROWTH SOLUTIONS

Assume that for some viscosity function $\mu$ the governing ODE (4) has a steady tip growth solution. Our objective is to compute the steady tip growth solutions. Observe that T1, T2 are local conditions for small arclength $s$, T3 is a global condition on arclength $s$ and T4 is a local condition for large arclength $s$. The T1-T4 conditions are displayed in relation to the $r, z$-variables. T1 and T2 are conditions related to the limits given in T1 and T4 give degrees of freedom since $h_0, z_0, r_\infty, h_\infty$ are not specified. Then, to approximate steady tip growth solutions we can numerically connect solutions satisfying T1, T2 to solutions satisfying T4 by varying the parameters given by the limits. We then only consider a connecting solution which satisfies T4 to obtain a steady tip growth solution. By computing expansions we will see that solutions satisfying T1, T2 from a two parameter family of solutions and that solutions satisfying T4 form a three parameter family of solutions. Observe that for a solution satisfying T4 this means that besides $r_\infty, h_\infty$ from T4 there is another parameter. The solutions satisfying T1, T2 can be classified in such a way that we can identify solutions which do not satisfy T3. The remaining solution can then be connected to the solutions satisfying T4 using the corresponding expansion.

Note that to compute expansions for solutions satisfying the limiting conditions we must make minor assumptions on $\mu$. These assumptions will be specified in the following subsections.

A. TIP EXPANSION

Let $x$ be a solution of the governing ODE satisfying T1. Observe that the vector field corresponding to (4) is not defined on $\lim_{s \to 0} x(s)$. Consequently, solutions satisfying T1 cannot be computed using a standard solver. Hence, we compute an expansion for solutions satisfying T1 and T2 which is called the tip expansion.

Let $x(\cdot; \mu) := (\rho, r, h, \Psi, z)(\cdot)$ be a solution of the governing ODE (4) that satisfies T1 and T2. We assume that $\mu$ is analytic. The solution $x(\cdot; \mu)$ satisfies 

$$\lim_{s \to 0} h(s) = h_0 > 0, \quad \lim_{s \to 0} z(s) = z_0 < 0,$$ 

where $(h_0, z_0) \in Y_{\text{tip}}$ with 

$$Y_{\text{tip}} := \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-.$$ 

We assume that $x(s; \mu)$ can be written as a formal expansion in $s$. We denote the $i$-th coefficient of the expansion with an $(i)$ superscript and a tip subscript, e.g., 

$$r_s = r_{\text{tip}}^{(i)} + s r_{\text{tip}}^{(i+1)}.$$ 

The equality $r' = \rho$ in the governing ODE (4) implies that $r_{\text{tip}}^{(i)} = (i+1) r_{\text{tip}}^{(i+1)}$ which together with condition T2 implies that 

$$r_{\text{tip}}^{(2 + i + 1)} + S_{\text{tip}}^{(2 + i + 1)} = z_{\text{tip}}^{(2 + i + 1)} = r_{\text{tip}}^{(2 + i + 1)} = 0.$$ 

Substituting the resulting expansions in the governing ODE (4) and collecting terms of the same order we can compute unique coefficients corresponding to the higher order terms. We refer to these expansions as tip solution expansions. For our numerical work we will use the tip expansion up to 8th order as higher order expansion do not lead to improved results. The coefficients are lengthy. Denote by $Y_{\text{tip}} \subseteq Y_{\text{tip}}$ the maximal domain on which the coefficients of the corresponding expansion are defined. We have that 

$$Y_{\text{tip}} = \left\{ (h_0, z_0) \in Y_{\text{tip}} : \frac{10}{3} \neq \frac{h_0 z_0^2}{\mu (h_0 z_0^2)} \right\}.$$ 

The derivation of (10) and higher order coefficients of the base expansion are presented in Appendix V-A.

The tip expansion gives strong evidence that a family of solutions satisfying T1, T2 can be parameterized by $(h_0, z_0) \in Y_{\text{tip}}$. Consequently, given $\mu$ we denote a solution satisfying T1, T2 with $(h_0, z_0) = \alpha \in Y_{\text{tip}}$ by $x_\alpha(\cdot; \mu)$. 
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B. CLASSIFYING TIP SOLUTIONS

We define tip solutions as solutions \( x_\alpha(\cdot; \mu) = (\rho_\alpha, r_\alpha, h_\alpha, \Psi_\alpha, z_\alpha) \) for which there exists a \( s_1 > 0 \) for which
\[
\rho'_\alpha(s; \mu) < 0, \quad \rho_\alpha(s; \mu) > 0, \quad \forall s \in (0, s_1).
\] (11)

Observe that since steady tip growth solutions satisfy T3 it follows that a steady tip growth solution is also a tip solution.

In terms of the \( \rho \)-variable the numerically computed tip solutions resemble the graph in Fig. 5 or the graph in Fig. 6. Fig. 5 is not a steady tip growth solution since \( \rho \) changes sign. Fig. 6 is not a steady tip growth solution since \( \rho' \) changes sign.

We approximate steady tip growth solutions by connecting the numerically computed tip solutions corresponding to \( X_\mu \) to an expansion of solutions satisfying T4.

C. BASE EXPANSION

If \( x \) is a solution of the governing ODE satisfying T4 then
\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} \| x(s) \| = \infty. \quad \text{Consequently, solutions satisfying T4 cannot be computed using a standard solver. Hence, we compute an expansion for solutions satisfying T4 which is called the base expansion.}
\]

Let \( x(\cdot; \mu) : (\rho, r, h, \Psi, z)(\cdot) \) be a solution of the governing ODE (4) that satisfies condition T4. Then, the solution \( x(\cdot; \mu) \) satisfies
\[
\lim_{s \to \infty} h(s) = h_\infty > 0, \quad \lim_{s \to \infty} r(s) = r_\infty > 0. \quad (14)
\]

We assume that \( x(s; \mu) \) can be written as a formal expansion in \( 1/s \). We denote the \( i \)-th coefficient of the expansion with an \( (i) \) superscript and a base subscript, e.g.,
\[
rs = r_{\text{base}}^{(0)} + s^{-1}r_{\text{base}}^{(1)} + s^{-2}r_{\text{base}}^{(2)} + O(s^{-3}).
\]

We take \( \mu \) such that \( v_\mu \) given by
\[
v_\mu(\psi) := \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \psi = 0, \\
1/\mu(1/\psi) & \text{otherwise,}
\end{cases}
\] (15)
is analytic. If \( v_\mu(\psi) \sim c_1 \psi \) for \( \psi \to 0 \) then the formal expansions do not satisfy T4. The proof is given in Appendix VI.

If \( v_\mu(\psi) = O(\psi^2) \) then from T4 we obtain the following lowest order asymptotics for the converging variables:
\[
r_{\text{base}}^{(0)} = r_\infty, \quad h_{\text{base}}^{(0)} = h_\infty. \quad (16)
\]

Substituting the resulting expansions in the governing ODE (4) we find that the leading order terms of \( \Psi, z \) are of order \( s \). We denote the leading order terms of \( \Psi \) and \( z \) by \( \Psi^{(1)}_{\text{base}} \) and \( z^{(1)}_{\text{base}} \), respectively. We obtain that
\[
\Psi^{(1)}_{\text{base}} = \frac{r_\infty h_\infty}{2}, \quad z^{(1)}_{\text{base}} = 1. \quad (17)
\]

Substituting the resulting expansions in the governing ODE (4) and collecting terms of the same order we can compute coefficients corresponding to the higher order terms. These coefficients are not uniquely determined given \( r_\infty, h_\infty \). More specifically, the zero-th order terms corresponding to the \( \Psi \) and \( z \)-component introduce two additional free parameters:
\[
\Psi^{(0)}_{\text{base}} = \Psi_c, \quad z^{(0)}_{\text{base}} = z_c. \quad (18)
\]
Since \( \Psi^{(1)}_{\text{base}} \) and \( z^{(1)}_{\text{base}} \) are non-zero we can absorb \( \Psi_c \) or \( z_c \) in the independent variable \( s \). We will fix \( z_c = 0 \). Observe that (17) implies that T4 is insufficient to define a unique solution.

Let \( (r_\infty, h_\infty, \Psi_c, z_c) \in Y^{\text{base}} \) with
\[
Y^{\text{base}} := \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}.
\]

We can then compute unique coefficients for the higher order terms. We refer to these expansions as base expansions. For our numerical work we will use a base expansion...
up to 7th order since higher order approximations do not yield improved results. Denote by $Y^\text{base}_\mu \subseteq Y^\text{base}$ the maximal domain for which these base coefficients are defined. We have that

$$Y^\text{base}_\mu = Y^\text{base}. \quad (18)$$

The derivation of $Y^\text{base}_\mu$ and higher order coefficients are presented in Appendix V-B.

The base expansion gives strong evidence that solutions $x_\mu(\cdot; \mu)$ satisfying T4 and

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} \Psi(s; \mu) - \frac{r_\infty h_\infty}{2} s = \Psi_i,$$

$$\lim_{s \to \infty} z(s; \mu) - s = 0,$$

can be parameterized by $(r_\infty, h_\infty, \Psi_i) \in Y^\text{base}_\mu$.

D. CONNECTING TIP SOLUTIONS TO THE BASE EXPANSION

Consider the numerically computed $x_{\alpha_*}(\cdot; \mu)$ with $\alpha_* \in X_\mu$. Let $s_1$ be given by (11). Then, the numerics suggests that we can find a $s_0 < s_1$ such that $\rho(s_0) \ll 1$ and $s_1 - s_0 \ll 1$. At $s = s_0$ we connect the $r, h, \Psi, z$-variables of the tip solution to the corresponding variables of the base expansion using a Newton method. Observe that we have four equations and that the base expansion has four degrees of freedom, three parameters given by $r_\infty, h_\infty, \Psi_i$ and one independent variable given by $s$. Note that the dependent variable $s$ can be used as a degree of freedom in the base expansion since the governing ODE (4) is autonomous. The Newton method requires an initial vector. We have good estimates for $r_\infty, h_\infty$ since generally at $s = s_0$ the tip solution is close to the base. We do not have good estimates for $\Psi_i$ and $s$. Hence, we continuously vary over initial estimates of these parameters until the tip solution smoothly connects to the base expansion.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS: BIFURCATION DIAGRAMS AND STEADY TIP GROWTH SOLUTIONS

We applied the numerical method to

$$\mu_i(\Psi) := 1 + \Psi^i, \quad \hat{\mu}_i(\Psi) := \Psi^i, \quad i = 2, 3, 4, 5. \quad (19)$$

Observe that $\mu_i, \hat{\mu}_i \in F$ where $F$ is given by (6), $\mu_i, \hat{\mu}_i$ is analytic as required by Section III-A and $v_\mu, v_{\hat{\mu}}$, defined in (15), is analytic as required by Section III-C. We computed the tip solutions and classified these tip solution using the set $A_\mu$ and $B_\mu$ from (12). This yields a bifurcation diagram of the tip solutions corresponding to a given $\mu$. For the viscosity function for which steady tip growth solutions exist we used the connection method of Section III-D.

A. VISCOSITY FUNCTIONS ADMITTING STEADY TIP GROWTH SOLUTIONS

The numerics suggests that the viscosity functions $\mu_3, \mu_4, \mu_5$ admit steady tip growth solutions.

1) THE SET $Y^\text{tip}_\mu$

Using (10) we compute $y^\text{tip}_{\mu_3}$, $y^\text{tip}_{\mu_4}$, $y^\text{tip}_{\mu_5}$:

$$y^\text{tip}_{\mu_3} = \{(h_0, z_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_- : k_0^4 z_0^8 \neq 5\},$$

$$y^\text{tip}_{\mu_4} = \{(h_0, z_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_- : k_0^5 z_0^{10} \neq 2\}.$$

2) BIFURCATION DIAGRAMS AND $X_\mu$

In Fig. 7 we show the computed $A_{\mu_3}$ and $B_{\mu_3}$. Fig. 7 suggests that $A_{\mu_3}$ and $B_{\mu_3}$ are connected sets. Then, if $A_{\mu_3}$ and $B_{\mu_3}$ are open then Fig. 7 suggests that $X_{\mu_3} \neq \emptyset$. In Fig. 8 we have computed $X_{\mu_3}$.

In Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 we present the computed $A_{\mu_4}$, $B_{\mu_4}$ and $A_{\mu_5}$, $B_{\mu_5}$, respectively. Fig. 9 and Fig. 10 suggest that $B_{\mu_4}$, $B_{\mu_5}$ are connected sets and that $A_{\mu_4}$, $A_{\mu_5}$ are
FIGURE 10. $A_{\mu_5}$ in blue and $B_{\mu_5}$ in red.

FIGURE 11. $X_{\mu_4}$ in orange and $h_0^4 z_0^8 = 5$ in green.

disconnected sets consisting out of two connected components. If $A_{\mu_4}, B_{\mu_4}$ and $A_{\mu_5}, B_{\mu_5}$ are open the numerics also suggests that $X_{\mu_4} \neq \emptyset$ and $X_{\mu_5} \neq \emptyset$, respectively. In Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 we display by an orange curve the approximation of $X_{\mu_4}$ and $X_{\mu_5}$, respectively. The green curve in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 corresponds to the $(h_0, z_0)$ which are not in $Y_{\mu_4}^{\text{tip}}$ and $Y_{\mu_5}^{\text{tip}}$, respectively. Hence, the green curve corresponds to the limiting values for which tip solutions do not exist.

Fig. 8, 11, 12 suggest that the parameter set corresponding to steady tip growth solutions is one dimensional. This means that almost all perturbations on $X_{\mu_i}$ are in $A_{\mu_i} \cup B_{\mu_i}$ where $i = 3, 4, 5$. Hence, steady tip growth solutions cannot be approximated by continuing tip solutions in forward $s$.

3) STEADY TIP GROWTH SOLUTIONS

In this section we will see that the numerical results suggest that steady tip growth solutions for $\mu_3, \mu_4, \mu_5$ exist and that they correspond to tip solutions with parameters in $X_{\mu_3}, X_{\mu_4}, X_{\mu_5}$, respectively.

The range of steady tip growth solutions corresponding to $\mu_3, \mu_4, \mu_5$ varies greatly. Hence, we scale each steady tip

FIGURE 12. $X_{\mu_5}$ in orange and $h_0^5 z_0^{10} = 2$ in green.

FIGURE 13. Steady tip growth solutions for $\mu_5$. 
growth solution by its tip and base parameters. For visualization purposes we plot graphs for the rescaled variables: \(r/r_\infty, z/r_\infty, h/h_0, \Psi/(h_0 r_\infty), s/r_\infty\).

In Fig. 13, 14, 15 we present the numerical approximations of tip solutions corresponding to parameters in \(\mu_3, \mu_4, \mu_5\), respectively. Fig. 13-15acd suggest that these tip solutions are steady tip growth solutions. Fig. 13-15acd suggest that the graphs of the corresponding scaled variables are ordered. The numerically computed steady tip growth solutions are smooth with the exception of the steady tip growth
solution corresponding to $z_0 = -1.4$ as Fig. 15d shows. This non-smooth point occurs at the arclength $s$ where the approximated tip solutions connects to the base expansion. Hence, denote the arclength at the connection point by $s_{\text{base}}$. This non-smoothness at $s = s_{\text{base}}$ worsens when $z_0$ is further decreased. Hence, we did not approximate steady tip growth solutions for $z_0 < -1.4$. For $z_0 = -1.4$ we observe that $h'(s_{\text{base}})$ is not small, see the dashed line in Fig. 15c. For the base expansion corresponding to $\mu_5$ we have that $|h'(s)| \ll 1$ for $s$ large. Hence, we expect that at $s = s_{\text{base}}$ the computed tip solution is not in the domain where the base expansion gives a good approximation of the steady tip growth solution. From Fig. 10 we observe that $(h_0, z_0) \in X_{\mu_5}$ with $z_0 \leq -1.4$ is close to the curve where the tip asymptotic expansion is not defined, $h_0, z_0^5 = 2$. This might lead to an approximation of $(h_0, z_0) \in X_{\mu_5}$ with insufficient decimal precision which results in the non-smooth connection.

In Fig. 13b-15b we performed a transformation on the $r$-axis and $z$-axis to indicate that the tip shape of the scaled variables becomes more pointed when $z_0$ is increased. All these graphs are ordered.

Fig. 13d-15d suggests that $\Psi' > 0$. Fig. 13d-15d suggests that $h$ can be monotonously increasing, decreasing or have a local minimum.

**B. VISCOSITY FUNCTIONS ADMITTING NO STEADY TIP GROWTH SOLUTIONS**

For the $\mu_2, \hat{\mu}_2, \hat{\mu}_3, \hat{\mu}_4, \hat{\mu}_5$ the tip expansions are defined for all $(h_0, z_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-$.

The numerical work suggests that $\mu_2, \hat{\mu}_2, \hat{\mu}_3, \hat{\mu}_4, \hat{\mu}_5$ admit no steady tip growth solutions. More specifically, it suggests that

$$A_{\mu_2} = A_{\hat{\mu}_2} = A_{\hat{\mu}_4} = A_{\hat{\mu}_5} = B_{\hat{\mu}_3} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_-.$$  

Furthermore, we observe that the computed tip solutions corresponding to $\mu_2, \hat{\mu}_2, \hat{\mu}_4, \hat{\mu}_5$ satisfy $\Psi' < 0$ and that the computed tip solutions corresponding to $\hat{\mu}_3$ satisfy $\Psi' > 0$. These observations are also supported by the sign of the leading order term corresponding to the tip expansion of $\Psi'$.

**V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK**

Fungal filaments occur in pathogenic and symbiotic fungi. Hence, it is relevant to study fungal growth models such as the BATS model. We give an overview of the obtained results and discuss future research directions.

**A. OVERVIEW RESULTS**

Our numerical results suggest that there exist viscosity functions for which steady tip growth solutions exist. Hence, we have evidence which supports the BATS model. Furthermore, there exist viscosity functions for which steady tip growth solutions do not exist. This suggests that the viscosity function is a determining factor for tip growth in the BATS model.

The bifurcation diagrams suggests that if there exists a steady tip growth solution then there also exists a one parameter family of steady tip growth solutions. In relation to the cell shape this parameter influences the pointedness of the cell’s tip. Hence, the BATS model allows for a variety of different cell shapes.

**B. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS**

From a mathematical perspective it would be interesting to rigorously prove the existence of steady tip growth solutions. The numerical work suggests that the set $A_{\mu}, B_{\mu}$ can be helpful in proving the existence of steady tip growth solutions. The governing ODE (4) is a five dimensional first order ODE. Hence, it might be fruitful to create a toy model with solutions corresponding to $A_{\mu}, B_{\mu}$ and then show that these sets can be used to prove the existence of a toy steady tip growth solutions.

The computed bifurcation diagrams suggest that if $x(\cdot; \mu)$ is a steady tip growth solution then $h_0$ or $z_0$ as given by condition T1 defines a unique steady tip growth solution. Hence, to compute the steady tip growth solution we only need to have data on $\mu$ and on either $h_0$ or $z_0$. It is important to observe that the governing ODE (4) is non-dimensionalised. During non-dimensionalisation the cell’s parameters have been absorbed in the viscosity function [12]. These parameters concern the pressure difference between the inside and outside of the cell and the rate of cell-wall building material emitted by the VSC, see Fig. 2. Consequently, experiments need to be performed to obtain these parameters.

The numerical method can be applied to validate the BATS model in an experimental setting. However, a method to process the data is still needed. The data processing method should be able to compute a viscosity function which fits the experimental data. Then, in combination with biological parameters it should be possible to verify the BATS model using the presented numerical method. The authors are unaware if the required biological experiments have been performed. Once this data has been obtained a data processing method can be implemented.

In conclusion, we have formulated a numerical technique such that the BATS model can be validated by a to be developed data driven methodology.

**APPENDIX A EXPANSIONS**

We present coefficients of the variables $r, h, \Psi, z$ for the expansions at the tip and the base. The coefficients corresponding to $\rho$ are not presented since they can be directly obtained using $r' = \rho$ from the governing ODE (4).

The expressions become lengthy for high order coefficients. Hence, we only present low order coefficients. These coefficients were computed symbolically using Mathematica (TM). The script is available on request.

**A. TIP EXPANSION**

Let $x(\cdot; \mu)$ be a tip expansion as defined in Section III-A. The viscosity function $\mu$ is analytic. We denote the $i$-th coefficient of the formal expansion of $\mu$ by an $(i)$ superscript. Recall from Section III-A that $r$ is an odd function. We present the 1st and
3rd order coefficients of $r$:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Psi_{\text{tip}}^{(1)} &= 1, \\
\Psi_{\text{tip}}^{(3)} &= -\frac{2\nu_0^4}{27\mu (h_0 z_0^2)^2}.
\end{align*}
$$

Recall from Section III-A that $h, \Psi, z$ are even functions. We present the 2nd order coefficients for $h, \Psi, z$:

$$
\begin{align*}
\Psi_{\text{tip}}^{(2)} &= \frac{h_0(24\nu_0^3(\mu h_0 z_0^2) + 27\mu (h_0 z_0^2)^2 + 8z_0^6)}{18\mu (h_0 z_0^2)(10\mu (h_0 z_0^2) - 3 h_0 z_0^2\nu_0^\prime (h_0 z_0^2))}, \\
\Psi_{\text{tip}}^{(2)} &= \frac{1}{3\nu_0 (h_0 z_0^2)}.
\end{align*}
$$

The lower order coefficients for $r, h, \Psi, z$ are given in Section III-A. Observe that the denominator in the expression for $h_{\text{tip}}^{(2)}$ and $\Psi_{\text{tip}}^{(2)}$ is zero for

$$
\frac{10}{3} = \frac{h_0 z_0^2 \nu_0^\prime (h_0 z_0^2)}{\mu (h_0 z_0^2)}.
$$

More generally, the tip coefficients are defined if and only if $(h_0, z_0) \in Y_{\mu_{\text{tip}}}$.

**B. BASE EXPANSION**

Let $x(\cdot; \mu)$ be a base expansion as defined in Section III-C. We fix $z_\epsilon = 0$ since we showed in Section III-C that the $z_\epsilon$ parameter can be absorbed in the independent variable $s$. The function $v_\mu$ defined in (16) is assumed to be analytic. We denote the $i$-th coefficient of the formal expansion of $v_\mu$ by an $(i)$ superscript. Since $\mu \in F$ with $F$ given by (6) we have that $v_\mu(0) = 0$. As a result of Appendix VI we assume that $v_\mu'(s) \in O(s^2)$ for $s \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we have that $v_\mu(1) = 0$. The 1st and 2nd order coefficients for $r, h, \Psi$ are given by

For $z$ we have that $\Psi_{\text{base}}^{(1)} = \Psi_{\text{base}}^{(2)} = 0$. The 3rd and 4th order coefficients for $z$ are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\Psi_{\text{base}}^{(3)} &= \frac{2\nu_0^2 r_\infty^2}{3 h_\infty^3}, \\
\Psi_{\text{base}}^{(4)} &= -\frac{\nu_0^2 r_\infty (4\nu_0^2 h_\infty^3 - 2\nu_0^2 h_\infty^3 + 6\nu_0^2 r_\infty^2)}{h_\infty^3}.
\end{align*}
$$

The lower order coefficients of the base expansion are presented in Section III-C. Observe that the base coefficients are defined for all $(h_\infty, h_\infty, \Psi_c) \in Y_{\mu_{\text{base}}}$.

**VI. NECESSARY CONDITION VISCOSITY FUNCTION FOR SOLUTIONS SATISFYING T4**

Recall $v_{\mu}$ defined in (16). We will show that if $v_\mu(\psi) \sim c_1 \psi$ for $\psi \rightarrow 0$ with $c_1 > 0$ then the governing ODE (4) does not have solutions satisfying T4. Observe that by (16) it follows that $v_\mu(\psi) \sim c_1 \psi$ for $\psi \rightarrow 0$ is equivalent to

$$
\mu(\Psi) \sim \frac{1}{c_1 \Psi} \quad \text{for} \quad \Psi \rightarrow \infty.
$$

Assume that $x$ is a solution satisfying T4. Then for $s \rightarrow \infty$ we have that

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{r(s)}{r(\infty)} &= \frac{\nu_{\epsilon}(s)}{\nu_{\epsilon}(\infty)} \sim \frac{c_2}{s^3}, \\
\frac{r(s)^2}{2\nu_{\epsilon}(s)\Gamma(r(s), z(s))} &= \sim \frac{c_3}{s},
\end{align*}
$$

where $c_2, c_3 > 0$. We can re-write the $h$-equation in the ODE (4) as

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{(h\sqrt{r})'}{h\sqrt{r}} &= \frac{r \nu_{\epsilon}(\rho, r, z)}{\Gamma(r, z) - \frac{\rho^2}{2\nu_{\epsilon}(\rho)\Gamma(r, z)\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}}},
\end{align*}
$$

Using (21) in equation (22) we find that there exist $s_1$ and $c_4 > 0$ such that

$$
\frac{(h(s)\sqrt{r(s)})'}{h(s)\sqrt{r(s)}} \leq -\frac{c_4}{s} \quad \text{for all} \quad s > s_1.
$$

Integration yields that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} h(s) = 0$ which is in contradiction with the $h$-limit given in condition T4.
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