


NEWSLETTER  
June 2018

Issue no. 13



Cover Image: Imaging cellular actin (green – phalloidin, magenta – Affimer to actin).

---

**Contents**

3. *The committee*
3. *The Chair's Commentary*
3. *Tom Duke Prize  
announcement*
- 4-11 *The case for biophysics  
super-groups in physics  
departments*

12-13. *Book Review:*

14- 18 *Upcoming Summer  
School and Meetings*

Items for the newsletter should  
be e-mailed to  
[m.peckham@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:m.peckham@leeds.ac.uk)

---

**Editorial**

*In the June edition, we have an interesting commentary on the case for biophysics super-groups, a book review, and a reminder of the upcoming meetings. Enjoy reading, and I hope to see you at one of the upcoming conferences!*

*Professor Michelle Peckham  
Newsletter Editor*

## The Committee

## Chair

Pietro Cicuta

## Honorary Secretary

Susan Cox

## Honorary Treasurer

Tom Waigh

## Members

Marisa Martin-Fernandez (*cross representative with national facilities*)Mark Wallace (*cross representative with BBS*)

Rosalind Allen

Chiu Fan Lee (*responsible for website*)

Ewa Paluch

Michelle Peckham (*responsible for newsletter*)*New members:*

Peter Petrov

Achillefs Kapanidis

Bartek Waclaw

Andela Saric

**The Chair's commentary**

A heavily rejuvenated committee recently held its first meeting since I took the Chair. There was strong enthusiasm from both old and new members around the committee's remit, which is essentially to promote Biological Physics both within physics and across disciplines, to coordinate and share best practice with other UK and international activities, to organise and co-organise meetings. Please do get in touch with the Chair or any of the committee members if you wish to contribute to current activities, and if you have an interest in joining in a more official role in the future. Also, please make colleagues aware of the IoP Biological Physics group. This newsletter brings you an in depth analysis by

Bart Hoogenboom and Mark Leake of the state of biophysics and biological physics within UK physics departments, and a review of Mark's new book on tools and techniques.

**Tom Duke Prize announcement**

It is with great pleasure that the Biological Physics Group announces the selection of Dr Robert Endres (<http://rgendres3.wixsite.com/biologicalphysics>) as the Tom Duke Lecturer for 2018/2019. This biannual prize (and task) is given in memory of Prof. Tom Duke, a pioneer in Biological Physics. Previous recipients are Prof. Martin Howard and Prof. Andrew Turberfield. The ambition behind this award is to select an ambassador capable of representing the importance of physics in addressing biological questions. Typically the Tom Duke lecturers are funded to give four seminars across the UK & Ireland, of which at least two in universities where biological physics is not already well established.

Traditionally one of the seminars has been held at UCL, where Tom Duke last worked. This year the opening lecture of the series will take place during the British Biophysical Society meeting in Southampton, 11-13 July 2018. We wish Rob a successful set of lectures and look forward to his feedback on how our community can continue to grow.

## The case for biophysics super-groups in physics departments

Bart W. Hoogenboom<sup>1,2</sup> and Mark C. Leake<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Biological Physics Research Group, Department of Physics & Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom.

<sup>2</sup> London Centre for Nanotechnology, University College London, 17-19 Gordon Street, London, WC1H 0AH, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup> Biological Physical Sciences Institute (BPSI), Departments of Physics and Biology, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, United Kingdom.

**For correspondence email:** b.hoogenboom@ucl.ac.uk or mark.leake@york.ac.uk

**Cite as:** arXiv:1804.09562

*Increasing numbers of physicists engage in research activities that address biological questions from physics perspectives or strive to develop physics insights from active biological processes. The on-going development and success of such activities morph our ways of thinking about what it is to ‘do biophysics’ and add to our understanding of the physics of life. Many scientists in this research and teaching landscape are homed in physics departments. A challenge for a hosting department is how to group, name and structure such biophysicists to best add value to their emerging research and teaching but also to the portfolio of the whole department. Here we discuss these issues and speculate on strategies.*

### What is bio(logical) physics?

But a few centuries ago, physics and biology were primordial components of a single discipline initially called natural philosophy and later natural science, prior to bifurcating along different intellectual paths. By the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, aspects of physics and biology were reunited, exemplified in D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson’s mechanical description of biological growth and shape<sup>1</sup>. In the 1950s, biophysics research pioneered major developments in physiology and structural biology: exemplified by the Hodgkin-Huxley model that describes the propagation of electrical signals in neurons<sup>2</sup>, and by the discovery of the DNA double helix by Watson, Crick, Franklin, Wilkins and others, based on X-ray diffraction experiments<sup>3-5</sup>.

Since the 1950s, experimental and theoretical techniques from physics rapidly developed to address a range of biological questions across extensive length and time scales: research on populations of organisms in macroscale ecosystems, as well as – at the nanometre length scale – research on individual biomolecules<sup>6</sup>; biophysical phenomena at femtoseconds time scale through to biological processes evolving over many years. Besides new insights into biology, these developments led to new physics not necessarily coupled to questions relevant for living objects, such as a ‘moving version of the Heisenberg model’ in the of context active biological matter (exemplified by analogies between quantum coupling in magnetic materials and the spatial patterns of flocking behaviour of populations of flying birds<sup>7</sup>).

In our view, biological physics – which we denote simply as biophysics – encompasses all these research types, be they inspired or motivated by biological questions, where the physics component can lie in the nature of the (experimental/theoretical/computational) tools that are used and/or in the type of science that is generated.

### Is biophysics physics?

Interestingly, when physical approaches are really successful in biology, they are often absorbed by other disciplines: The above-mentioned Hodgkin-Huxley model and DNA double helix structure, both

strongly grounded in physics, were awarded Nobel Prizes in Physiology or Medicine (1963 and 1962, respectively). More recently, in spite being rooted in physics, developments of super-resolution fluorescence microscopy and cryo-electron microscopy were awarded Nobel Prizes in Chemistry (2014 and 2017). Hence, in response to the common misconception that biophysics is simply 'not physics', one may – hyperbolically – retort that the 'less physics' biophysics appears to become, the more important it is.

That said, it is not difficult to find examples of outstanding biophysics that is firmly and unambiguously categorised as physics. One example is the pioneering work of Pierre Gilles de Gennes, awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1991 for studying order phenomena in simple systems in a way that could be generalized to more complex forms of matter, after extending Sam Edwards's seminal work. He developed new polymer physics theories, which involved reptation and branching, steered in no small part by observations of biological polymers, resulting in invaluable biological insights. There is Steve Chu, Nobel Prize winner in Physics in 1997 for his work on cold-atom trapping, who later applied laser trapping technologies towards understanding biomolecules, resulting in important biological insights into the nature of mechanical relaxation of DNA molecules. And more recently Steve Block has used innovative single-molecule biophysics techniques to map out the free energy landscape for nucleic acids – certain forms of these molecules exhibit a wide range of conformational microstates. This work is a single-molecule experimental application of the Jarzynski equality, one of the most important theories of modern statistical mechanics. The physics involved in all three examples is fundamental, but the results have been enormously influential towards understanding biology.

More playfully, we note that the diffusion equation, an immensely important equation in biophysics, is equivalent to a Schrödinger equation in imaginary time, and there is little doubt that quantum-mechanical research involving the Schrödinger equation is physics. In short, biophysics is an important part of physics, as has been firmly and repeatedly articulated and illustrated in past and present<sup>8-11</sup>.

### **Biophysics in physics departments**

While biophysics research can typically be found across university departments and faculties (e.g., in chemistry, biology, physiology), there are numerous reasons, both scientific and practical, for having a strong biophysics component in a physics department in particular, as outlined below.

Firstly, the modern research landscape is highly interdisciplinary in nature, much of it operating at the interface between the physical and life sciences; and so are the demands of many emerging high-tech industries (*i.e.*, future employers for physics students). Physics departments are now responding to these new demands by incorporating biophysics activities in research and teaching.

Secondly, funding bodies increasingly recognise the need to support biophysics research, often via targeted calls involving joint investment from funding bodies with portfolios in engineering/physical sciences and biological/biomedical sciences: By having depth and breadth of biophysical expertise, physics departments are in a better position to develop competitive proposals.

Thirdly, in the context of teaching physics at university, there are great benefits from being able to pool into biophysics expertise<sup>12</sup>. Undergraduate physics concepts can be vividly illustrated by examples from the life sciences: The overdamped harmonic oscillator model can be applied to muscle contraction or tetanus; the diffraction of waves underpins the limits of spatial resolution with which we can investigate the living cell; knowledge of electrical circuits is needed to understand the propagation of signals along nerve cells; even quantum physics has its uses in biology, e.g., to describe photosynthesis; and one can introduce many concepts of statistical physics with biological applications.

### **Biological physics versus condensed matter physics**

A common route to establishing biophysics in a physics department is to coral biologically relevant activity into a condensed matter physics super-group of some form (we here define a “super-group” as a gathering of different principal investigators and their labs/groups). After all, living matter is a form of condensed matter. This has often been seen as the best fit but can create challenges at several levels in the instance of one or only a few investigators being engaged in biophysics. As biophysics grows, departmental discussions in some cases involve sentiments such as ‘biophysics cannot be a super-group because there are too few faculty members in the department’, ‘we cannot break up the current structure because it will disrupt the recycling of departmental funds to faculty members’, ‘it’s not the right time to change the shape of the department’, or ‘there is not sufficient new physics to justify a biophysics super-group on equal basis as others’. Such a debate is often followed by a compromise in the form of new sub-groupings of biophysics: ‘soft/active matter’, ‘biomaterials’, ‘biological physics/physical biology’, or semantic variants thereof. Alternatively, one may change the name of a condensed matter super-group to suggest a greater complexity.


There is a general risk of pooling various emerging physics disciplines as generic ‘condensed matter physics’ as soon as they involve aspects of matter in a condensed phase. The identity of a large condensed matter physics super-group can become confused, because of difficulties in articulating clear overarching themes that cover, e.g., quantum computing, topological insulators and biophysics. This problem is rather common for – but of course not unique to – modern condensed matter super-groups. In such cases, the ‘condensed matter’ label is simply inadequate to describe the range of intellectual diversity. It may satisfy internal administrative needs but can misrepresent the group to the outside world.

Such a misrepresentation does not support the emerging identity of biophysics in physics departments, and potentially stifles growth. On the other hand, the phrase ‘biophysics’ is loaded with pre-conceptions to its applications in the life sciences, among others by its often being paired up with structural biology. However, it is possible to reclaim the word – or its extended version, ‘biological physics’ – to represent a broad, interdisciplinary community populated by researchers from both physical and life sciences backgrounds but converging on similar scientific aims.

### **Inventory of biophysics (super-)groups in UK physics departments**

Given the various routes to support, channel and represent biophysics, we investigated how collective biophysics activities are organised in UK physics departments. By data-mining of all listed UK physics department websites and by collecting straw-poll responses from senior biophysics researchers hosted by these departments, we have categorised departmental biophysics groupings as follows (Figure 1):

- Super-group: Interdisciplinary physical/life sciences is core to a collection of more than one individual research team; this collection of teams has a recognised autonomy for managing small to medium budgets within the department to the same extent as other recognised major groupings.
- Virtual group: This has the outward appearance of super-group but in reality is managed by one or more other super-groups (often ‘condensed matter physics’ or equivalent) for budgetary/administrative matters.
- No collective grouping: There is no cohesive super-group, because there is only one biophysics team in the department or, if more than one, then these teams do not perceive themselves as a collective structure.
- No biophysics: There is no research team in the department whose research/teaching portfolio comprises at least 50% biophysics.



**Figure 1.** Biophysics groupings in UK university physics departments. (A) Proportion of UK physics departments that either have an autonomous biophysics super-group, virtual group, no collective group, or no biophysics at all (see main text for further description). (B) Histogram showing mean number of principal investigators per biophysics grouping for the three categories of (A) that comprise non-zero biophysics components (error bars refer to standard deviations). Data acquired from accessible websites from 49 listed ‘Physics and Astronomy’ departments in the Complete University Guide 2018<sup>13</sup>, checked against straw-poll responses from 19 senior UK biophysics researchers.

An important result (Fig. 1A) is that over half (27 from 49) of UK physics departments have some biophysics presence, estimated from website data to comprise 800-900 active researchers (PhD students, postdocs/fellows and faculty) at the time of writing. That said, a significant minority of UK physics departments (45%) have no significant biophysics presence. Of the biophysics groupings, the largest category, roughly half of all departments with biophysics presence, is that of a virtual group; 39% of these departments have biophysics super-groups; and 11% of these had no collective grouping. Predictably, there was a trend in the number of principal investigators (PIs) in each category (Fig. 1B), with a mean  $10 \pm 2$  PIs per grouping (standard deviation, number of physics departments  $n = 6$ ) for super-groups,  $5 \pm 3$  ( $n = 10$ ) for virtual groups, and  $1.5 \pm 0.9$  ( $n = 11$ ) where no collective group was present.

These data suggest that more than 60% of biophysics academics in UK physics departments are not currently associated with an autonomous biophysics super-group. Also: (i) in four physics departments there exist two separate virtual groups in the remit of biophysics, and (ii) of the 11 physics departments without collective biophysics groups, three have more than one research team (*i.e.*, there are isolated biophysics teams not structured into a collective group). There are also pockets of biophysicists with a physics background in life sciences departments, in engineering and chemistry departments and in a number of virtual interdisciplinary centres, as well as in interdisciplinary research centres funded by biology and/or biomedicine funding bodies, e.g. Medical Research Council (MRC) funded laboratories themed in molecular/cell biology and general medical sciences at Cambridge, University College London and Imperial College London, the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) funded John Innes Centre, and various Wellcome Trust (WT) funded research centres, not to mention the Francis Crick Institute involving University College London, Imperial College London and King’s College London which is co-funded from the MRC, WT and Cancer Research UK (CRUK). An important role of biophysics super-groups in physics departments is to reach out to these other pockets of biophysics research activity.

Other qualitative responses emerged from the straw-poll, reflecting some uncertainty about 'what biophysics is' at senior management levels of UK physics departments. Two example quotes from senior biophysics researchers are: *'Until recently biological physics was barely recognised at all... fair to say that the department doesn't really know how to handle biological physics'* and *'In a sense we aren't managed at all, just left alone'*.

### **Case studies of biophysics groupings in physics departments**

Two case studies, from the physics departments of the University of York and University College London, illustrate how biophysics is positioned in different ways within different universities.

At the University of York, biophysics activities are gathered in a virtual group. In its Department of Physics, biophysics activities increased significantly in 2013 with the recruitment of a new chair, and subsequent recruitment of a lecturer and several early career staff, with a total number of 10 current independent research fellows and academics whose core activities involve biophysics. Most biophysics is pooled as part of a large condensed matter physics super-group comprising 25 academics. This super-group covers five overlapping themes of nanomaterials, photonics, quantum science, spintronics & magnetism, and biophysics & biomaterials. There are also links to biophysics activities in other departments through a cross-disciplinary network of researchers called the Biological Physical Sciences Institute, funded by Departments of Physics, Biology and Chemistry. An autonomous biophysics seminar series in the Department of Physics has increased in popularity over the past few years, also beyond the condensed matter physics super-group, to capture interest from other existing super-groups.

In the Department of Physics & Astronomy at University College London, biophysics activities were initially (from 2009) gathered in a virtual grouping of faculty from its Atomic, Molecular, Optical and Positron Physics and from its Condensed Matter and Materials Physics super-groups. In 2014, this virtual group was transformed into a super-group in Biological Physics, still smaller than but administratively on par with the other four research super-groups in the department. At present it includes 13 tenured academics. Of these, three are not employed by the department, but affiliated for other reasons. Some members have retained a partial affiliation with another research super-group, though the intention is to gradually phase out such joined affiliations. The Biological Physical super-group has its own budget, which is allocated from the departmental budget based on its total number of full-time academic staff. The Biological Physics group is also a key player in the university's Institute for the Physics of Living Systems, a virtual centre which gathers a large biological physics community across departments and faculties.

### **Arguments for biophysics super-groups**

Provided that the number of staff is sufficient to justify the formation of an administrative entity such as a biophysics super-group, this creates a formal path for input in departmental strategy, to ensure that biophysics activities are properly taken into account and where appropriate strengthened. It also provides a formal framework for mentoring, for mutual support, and for cohort formation of graduate students, with the advantage that this is provided by colleagues/students working in a related research field.

Super-group formation enhances the visibility of the biophysics research activities of a department, for students, for potential (biophysics) recruits, for potential academic and industrial partners, and for funders. Increased visibility is also important because the recognition of biophysics as a field by undergraduates lags behind in the UK compared with other countries such as France and Germany. This representation function can in part be

achieved by virtual groupings, although this is at the risk of dilution in the presence of multiple network structures that can be present at a university.

There are also pragmatic financial reasons to consider models that enable biophysics to grow into research super-groups. Business plans vary across different departments but generally involve recycling of overhead income from external grants back to group leaders, typically small sums of a few £k per year. However, within a biophysics super-group, these funds can be routed into nurturing biophysics activities directly, for example networking, seminar series, funds for project students, and travel to biophysics conferences. Although these are small funds in comparison to external grant income, they can sustain the general biophysics concept inside a physics department. In some cases, overheads recycling extends to higher amounts, and pooling these enables dedicated technical/administrative staff to be hired, with more tangible benefits to sustaining biophysics. Networking funds are particularly essential in interdisciplinary research, as its success strongly depends on encounters between researchers typically based in different departments.

When under the umbrella of a non-biophysics super-group, biophysicists run a risk of losing out in the overheads balancing act. This structure is likely to prove increasingly unpopular as greater investment is made into biophysics research: The *Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC)* describes biophysics as one of its growth areas, and there are new cross-council initiatives that increasingly support biophysics activities, such as the Global Research Fund, Antimicrobial Resistance, Multidisciplinary Project Awards from CRUK, and Technology Touching Life. By its multidisciplinary nature, this income can be tapped from multiple funding bodies: This may prove pragmatic in the event of departmental financial stress tests, a bet-hedging strategy more prudent than putting all of one's eggs into one funding body basket. By taking advantage of more collective outputs, a diverse biophysics super-group may enhance its chances of winning major interdisciplinary grants across a wide range of funding sources compared with less collaborative research consortia.

Recent independent reports highlight the increase of interdisciplinary in the UK. The British Academy appraised the cultural challenges within UK academia<sup>14</sup>; UK research councils were reviewed by Sir Paul Nurse<sup>15</sup>, and the research excellence framework (REF) was discussed by Lord Nicolas Stern<sup>16</sup> as evidence of how interdisciplinary science taps into key remits of several research funding councils exceptionally well, but is hampered by organisational and administrative structures of the councils and academic institutions. At the level of physics departments, biophysics super-groups improve the level of interdisciplinary cohesion: They work towards aligning with the recommendations in these reports for developing structures that are more robust with regards to nurturing interdisciplinarity.

## Conclusion

There are several important reasons for developing strong biophysics in physics departments. However, over half of UK physics departments either still do not have any biophysics activity or have a biophysics presence that is hidden behind historic structures of research and teaching. Based on our analysis of the organisation of biophysics in UK physics departments, we conclude that there is scope for immediate improvement as follows:

- The four physics departments that have more than one virtual biophysics group could benefit from consolidating their biophysics activities into a super-group to improve visibility and cohesion.
- The three physics departments that have several PIs who are not part of a collective group structure might similarly benefit from consolidating into at least a virtual group.

- The intersection between super- and virtual groups in terms of numbers of PIs lies at 7-8 per group. In other words, virtual groups with at least 7 separate research teams might qualify as having 'critical mass' for a super-group, relevant currently to three virtual groups in the UK.
- Taken together, it would be feasible for 12 UK biophysics super-groups to exist given the restructuring suggested above, double the number a present, a far more visible identity and force for change.

In spite of an active research community, the UK does not have the international visibility as a hub for biophysical research it deserves, mostly because of a lack of structure. One way to improve the national visibility of biophysics, in addition to fostering the growth of more biophysics super-groups, is for biophysicists across the biology-physics interface to become more unified. In the UK, this is exemplified by the longevity of regular international meetings and focused workshops such as those organized by the Biological Physics Group (BPG) of the Institute of Physics, including Physics Meets Biology; the Physics of Living Matter Symposium organised by the University of Cambridge and University College London; and several more events organized by the Physics of Life network<sup>17</sup> and the British Biophysical Society (BBS)<sup>18</sup>; and recently (2017) by the success of the Joint 19th International Union of Pure and Applied Biophysics (*IUPAB*) and 11th European Biophysical Societies' Association (EBSA) Congress in Edinburgh. This event drew thousands of the world's best biophysicists to the UK thanks to combined efforts of the BBS and the BPG. The BBS and BPG have traditionally represented the UK biophysical interests from more polar perspectives of biology and physics, respectively. However, this successful convergence in Edinburgh illustrated a unified feature of biophysics, which can equally capture biology and physics. Unity at a level of two national societies may offer a valuable template for physics and biology departments to follow; namely, that a biophysics super-group can, and perhaps should, capture expertise from physics and biology departments, for example through establishing joint academic cross-departmental appointments.

Ultimately, it is in the crowd, with shared identity and purpose, that things can change. A collective moment can result in real change, but it is important that a crowd does not become a mob; it needs structure, and accepted routes of engagement. It is very difficult to change things for the better as a single individual: Departmental super-groups offer a potential way forward to build a strong national biophysics community for the future in the UK.

1. Thompson, D. W. *On growth and form*. (Cambridge University Press, 1945).
2. Hodgkin, A. L. & Huxley, A. F. A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve. *J. Physiol.* **7**, 500–544 (1952).
3. Watson, J. D. & Crick, F. H. C. Molecular Structure of Nucleic Acids: A Structure for Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid. *Nature* **171**, 737–738 (1953).
4. Wilkins, M. H. F., Stokes, A. R. & Wilson, H. R. Molecular structure of deoxypentose nucleic acids. *Nature* **171**, 738–40 (1953).
5. Franklin, R. E. & Gosling, R. G. Molecular configuration in sodium thymonucleate. *Nature* **171**, 740–1 (1953).
6. Leake, M. C. The physics of life: one molecule at a time. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* **368**, 20120248 (2013).
7. Popkin, G. The physics of life. *Nature* **529**, 16–8 (2016).
8. Schrödinger, E. *What is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell*. (1944).
9. Purcell, E. M. Life at Low Reynolds Number. *Am. J. Phys.* **45**, 3–11 (1977).
10. R. Phillips and S.R. Quake. The Biological Frontier of Physics. *Phys. Today* 38–43 (2006).
11. Gunawardena, J. Biology is more theoretical than physics. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **24**, 1827–1829 (2013).
12. Goldstein, R. E., Nelson, P. C. & Powers, T. R. Teaching Biological Physics. *Phys.*

- Today* 46–51 (2005).
13. Physics and Astronomy - Top UK University Subject Tables and Rankings 2018 - Complete University Guide: <https://www.thecompleteuniversityguide.co.uk/league-tables/>.
  14. Soskice, D. *Crossing Paths: Interdisciplinary Institutions , Careers , Education and Applications*. (2016).
  15. Nurse review of research councils: recommendations: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/nurse-review-of-research-councils-recommendations>.
  16. Research Excellence Framework review: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-excellence-framework-review>.
  17. Physics of Life: <http://www.physicsoflife.org.uk/>.
  18. British Biophysical Society: <http://www.britishbiophysics.org.uk/>.

**Acknowledgements**


The authors thank Ewa Paluch (University College London) for providing helpful comments and suggestions.

## Book Review

**Biophysics: Tools and Techniques****Mark C. Leake**

CRC Press, 2016

ISBN: 9781498702430



This book treads a difficult path in this rapidly developing field. It covers a huge swath of techniques from chromatography to super resolution imaging, from calorimetry to molecular dynamic simulations, and the list goes on. It tries to be both comprehensive, while also highlighting developing areas and likely future progress. Additionally, the book tries to cover enough basic biology to allow physical scientists to understand the significance of the technical applications, while also covering enough basic physics for biological scientists to grasp the fundamental technical aspects of the techniques.

With these aims in mind the book starts with short introductory chapter covering a brief history of early biophysics, suggesting that the seminal work by Hodgkin and Huxley on signal conduction in nerves is an early

exemplar of biophysics. The work used a wide range of techniques to solve a challenging biological question. It also involved the collaboration of a biochemist (Hodgkin) and a physiologist (Huxley). Both a range of techniques and a collaboration of different sets of expertise are essential in most modern biophysical studies. The chapter continues, describing how modern biophysicists must use a range of tools to understand the biological systems they study, and explaining the structure of the rest of the book. The next chapter is a very thorough biology introduction for physical scientists.

The book then gets to the heart of the matter with two chapters covering optical imaging and related techniques, one on non-optical imaging and detection, and another on forces. Next come details on useful complementary techniques that would not strictly be classed as biophysical but are useful or essential in applying the biophysical tools previously described. The book continues with a chapter on theoretical biophysics including many computation techniques and finally closes with a chapter on emerging biophysical techniques.

The text is highlighted in sections providing “Key Points” and “Key Biological Applications”, emphasising important ideas and applications. The text also contains a huge number of relevant equations, with many sections having “Worked Case Examples” which lead the reader through the details of applying the relevant ideas and equations with example data. The author’s expertise really shines though in these examples and I suspect a large number of them come from real experiments. I recognise several of the examples as the kind of calculations I have done to demonstrate that a particular approach is likely to work (or not!). The chapters end with “Questions”, which could be an invaluable revision aid, or tutorial questions for students learning Biophysics.

It should be noted that the author, Professor of Biophysics at the University of York, is a prominent advocate of biophysical techniques and has worked at the cutting edge of technique development for many years. He has a good grasp of the techniques he is describing and is able to explain them in clear terms without sacrificing detail, or glossing

over limitations. One major strength of this book is the huge breadth of coverage in techniques and the many examples of complementary techniques increasing the overall power of the biophysics in increasing our understanding of biology.

With such a huge remit and the lofty goal of trying to please everyone by being approachable to both physical and biological scientists, I was worried that this book would either be too lightweight or drag terribly. I was very pleasantly surprised; the book is interesting, informative and useful. My one (very minor) complaint is its size, at roughly A4 sized and almost 400 pages it is definitely a weighty read in the most literal sense!

This is by far the most comprehensive book of biophysical techniques I have ever encountered. It covers a huge range of techniques in detail, giving the theoretical background as well as many practical points on specific techniques. Overall I would highly recommend this book for students studying biophysics, biologists wishing to have a better understanding of the techniques available and their theoretical underpinnings, or physicists wishing to better understand biology and how a range of physical techniques can be applied in biology.

In the introduction the author discusses the difficulties that can arise due to the different world-view of many biological and physical scientists, he wisely states “I will not bore you with the political challenges of the collaborative process between physics and biology...”. Prof Leake tries instead to inform his readers of the huge range of techniques available to them and to inspire a broad collaborative approach to the on-going questions in biology. Let us hope that this book will inform and inspire the next generation of biophysicists to further develop their biophysical techniques and understanding of biology.

**Dr. Ian M. Dobbie**  
University of Oxford

(with thanks to the RMS for allowing us to reprint this review from the September 2017 edition of ‘infocus’)

**Summer School 2018: Current topics in active fluids: theory and experiments  
16-20 July, Imperial College London**

The summer school “Current topics in active fluids: theory and experiments” is the 3rd in a series of annual summer schools on Interscale Interactions in Fluid Mechanics and Beyond, organised by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Fluid Dynamics Across Scales at Imperial College London. This year’s school will focus on current advances in the field of active fluids. The main topics covered are hydrodynamic theory, applications of numerical and computational methods to biological systems such as bacterial swarms and dynamic cell tissues, experimental advances in active colloids and active biological materials.

The five-day summer school will consist of keynote lectures by world-leading experts. These will be complemented by introductory lectures along the same themes by early career academics, and selected oral presentations by the participants.

Postgraduate students, Post Docs and early-career academics are welcome to attend and, if they wish, may also submit a one-page abstract for consideration as an oral presentation.

There is a registration fee of GBP 60.00, which covers daily refreshments and lunch from Monday to Friday. Registration details can be found at <http://www.imperial.ac.uk/fluids-cdt/summer-school-2018/>.

## Upcoming Meetings

### **Stochastic models of evolving populations: from bacteria to cancer**

16-20 July 2018, Edinburgh

<http://www.icms.org.uk/stochasticmodels.php>

**“Single-molecule bacteriology”** Biochemical Society: Harden Conference (and see flyer below) 9-12 Sept 2018, Oxford.

Many UK biophysicists are in the program! Invited speakers include Taekjip Ha (Johns Hopkins), Johan Elf (Uppsala), Nynke Dekker (Delft), Antoine van Oijen (Woolongong), Johan Paulsson (Harvard), Suliana Manley (EPFL), Edward Lemke (EMBL), Julie Biteen (Michigan), Seamus Holden (Newcastle), Ricardo Henriques (UCL), Pietro Cicuta (Cambridge), Marcelo Nollman (Montpellier) and 13 additional UK and international speakers.

For more information, see:

[bit.ly/84Harden](http://bit.ly/84Harden)

Registration and early deadline 9 July 2018

**Physics of Living Matter meeting**, 11-12 September 2018 Marseille

<http://www.plm-symposium.org>



**BIOCHEMICAL  
SOCIETY**


**Harden**  
Conferences

## **84th Harden Conference: Single-molecule bacteriology**

**9–12 September 2018**

**Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, UK**

This interdisciplinary meeting will bring together scientists using cutting-edge single-molecule imaging to study mechanisms inside single cells, physicists and engineers driving rapid progress in methodology, and microbiologists applying advanced imaging to basic questions in bacteriology.



Topics will include:

- structural/mechanistic studies using super-resolution and single-molecule methods
- studies of genetic and membrane processes
- new quantitative *in vivo* techniques
- single-cell studies of biomedical significance

Organisers:

Achilles Kapanidis (Oxford)

Stephan Uphoff (Oxford)

Meriem El Karoui (Edinburgh)

Jie Xiao (Johns Hopkins)


# **Submit your abstract now**

Abstract and Earlybird Deadline

## **9 July 2018**

**BBS Biennial Meeting: Registration Is Open!**

11-13 July 2018, University of Southampton



# British Biophysical Society Biennial Meeting

**11-13 July 2018, University of Southampton, UK**

The 2018 BBS biennial meeting is being held at the University of Southampton, on 11-13th July. The meeting will feature an exciting programme of scientific seminars and poster sessions across a wide range of biophysical areas and techniques: Cell Membranes, Cell interior, The whole cell, Delivery into the Cell and Emerging Imaging Technologies. The meeting is jointly sponsored by the Institute of Physics, biological physics group and will feature lectures from both the BBS and IOP medal winners for this year.

Young researchers are particularly encouraged to submit their abstracts, as approximately 50% of all talks will be selected from the submitted abstracts.

Organiser: Syma Khalid ([S.Khalid@soton.ac.uk](mailto:S.Khalid@soton.ac.uk))

**Plenary speaker:**

Hartmut Michel (MPI, Frankfurt)

**Keynote speakers:**

Mark Sansom, (Oxford)

Martin Howard (John Innes)

Kristin Parent (Michigan)

**Invited speakers:**

David Roper (Warwick)

Sarah Harris (Leeds)

Ivo Tews (Southampton)

Mark Wallace (King's College London)

Tanmay Bharat (Oxford)

Kees Weijer (Dundee)

Sumeet Mahajan (Southampton)

**Early registration deadline: 21 May 2018 Registration deadline: 21**

**June 2018 Abstract submission deadline: 21 May 2018**

Early bird rate: Full price (BBS member): £330, Full price (non-member): £360

Student rate: £250, Day rate (no accommodation included): £100

BBS Bursaries are available to help with travel, accommodation and registration costs for younger BBS members (undergraduate, postgraduate, or first three years postdoc) who are attending meetings associated with biophysics. For more information on bursaries, visit:

<http://britishbiophysics.org.uk/student-bursaries>

**For more information and to register, visit:**

<https://www.iopconferences.org/iop/frontend/reg/thome.csp?pageID=746270&eventID=1231&traceRedir=2>

**IOP** Institute of Physics**Physics of Cells: From Biochemical to Mechanical  
(PhysCell 2018)**

3–7 September 2018, The Majestic Hotel, Harrogate, UK



An interdisciplinary conference on experimental measurements and theoretical modelling to further our understanding of cells, their inner workings and interactions with their surroundings. This conference will bring together the best scientific minds from different backgrounds to exchange ideas and discuss the latest results and future directions. We particularly encourage the emerging generation of bright young scientists to participate.

**Topics:**

- Biochemical and mechanical aspects of cells
- Different length scales – from molecules to tissues, subcellular to multicellular
- Interactions between cells and their environment

**Organising committee:**

Guillaume Charras, University College London  
Rhoda Hawkins, University of Sheffield (Chair)  
Nicolas Olivier, University of Sheffield  
Ewa Paluch, University College London

**Key dates:**

Abstract submission deadline	<b>18 May 2018</b>
Early registration deadline	<b>6 July 2018</b>
Registration deadline	<b>31 August 2018</b>