Using Stochastic Models Single-Cell Data to Reduce Models and Design Experiments

Zachary R Fox Center for Nonlinear Studies & Information Sciences Group Los Alamos National Laboratory



Quantitative studies of meso-scale biological processes. Cell measurements Experiment Design Experiment **Predictions!** N 1110011 01101100 01101111 01110111 0010000 1100100 01101111 01110111 01101110 00101100 01101111 01100100 01101111 01101110 00100111 01110100 0100000 01101000 01110101 01110010 01110010 01111001 00101100 00100000 01110100 01110010 01110101 01110011 01110100 00100000 01110100 01101000 01100101 00100000 01110000 01110010 1101111 01100011 01100101 01110011 0111001 Stochastic model Model calibration Data analysis



Outline

Variability in biochemical reactions







Efficient model identification using error constraints

Designing single-cell experiments with Fisher Information



Single-cell fluctuations are critical to understanding and predicting gene expression.

Neuert Lab, Vanderbilt







Neuert Lab, Vanderbilt

Measured single-cell distributions are informative, reproducible, and non-Gaussian.







Neuert, Munsky et al. Science, 2013. Munsky, Li, **Fox**, Shepherd, Neuert. PNAS, 2018.



The shape of gene expression distributions is important.



Gaussian distributions are completely characterized by their means and variances...



... but more complex distributions require analyses that go beyond the first moments of their distributions.

Stochastic modeling allows us to fit and predict probability distributions of biomolecules.





The Chemical Master Equation (CME) describes the time varying statistics of such processes

 $(u(t), \boldsymbol{\theta})\mathbf{p}$





The finite state projection approach to solving the chemical master equation



FSP System (multiple sinks) $g_1(t)$ $g_2(t)$ ${oldsymbol{\xi}}_2$ $g_3(t)$

> Munsky and Khammash, JCP 2006 Fox, Neuert, Munsky, JCP 2016



The FSP approach enables precise approximation of the CME, its sensitivity, and timing distributions.





Fox, Munsky, PLoS Comp Bio 2019

Visualizing the FSP error



t = 1

11

Summary statistics of distributions are not sufficient to characterize gene expression

Statistic used to fit model



by mode predicted tistics Stat





Munsky, Li, Fox, Shepherd, Neuert. PNAS 2018.

Instead, all fluctuation information measured can be used to accurately identify models.



--Time--

Munsky, Li, Fox, Shepherd, Neuert. PNAS 2018.



Outline

Variability in biochemical reactions

- This variability is paramount to understanding and identifying models of gene expression.
- The FSP allows for computation of full probability distributions.



Efficient model identification using error constraints

ϕ_s	1
$ {\rm Projection}\ {\rm Size}, J $	





How can the known FSP error be used with single-cell data to help constrain models?





Measured Data



 $\sum d_{t,i} \log p_J^{FSP}(\mathbf{x}_i, t | \theta)$

The lower bound on the likelihood follows from the definition of the FSP as a lower bound on the true probabilities.



$$p_{J}(\mathbf{x}, t) \\ p_{J'}(\mathbf{x}, t) \end{bmatrix} \text{ for all } t > 0$$
$$t|\theta) \le \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_D} d_{t,i} \log p(\mathbf{x}_i, t|\theta)$$

Fox, Neuert, Munsky, JCP 2016

An upper bound can be found by solving the following optimization problem:



$$\left. \begin{bmatrix} p_J^{FSP}(\mathbf{x},t) \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \right| = g(t)$$

$$g\left(p_J^{FSP}(\mathbf{x}_j,t|\theta) + \varepsilon_{t,j} \right)$$

$$t_{t,k} = g(t) \text{ and } \varepsilon_{t,k} \ge 0.$$

This is solved using an iterative water-filling algorithm.

Fox, Neuert, Munsky, JCP 2016

The optimal error redistribution adds probability where it will most affect the likelihood function.



Simulated Data

Simulated Data

This bound informs the accuracy required to tell apart two models.





Fox, Neuert, Munsky, JCP 2016

FSP-bounds reduce the error needed for model discrimination for the Hog1-p model.

Likelihood



Projection Size required to accept/reject

Outline

Variability in biochemical reactions

- This variability is \bullet paramount to understanding and identifying models of gene expression.
- The FSP allows for computation of full probability distributions.

Efficient model identification using error constraints

• FSP errors allow us to constrain models of **biochemical reactions** using single-cell data.

 FSP-bounds speed up model identification by using minimal computational effort to compare models.

Designing single-cell experiments with Fisher Information



Different single-cell experiments reveal different amounts of information about model parameters.



(Transcription rate)

Different single-cell experiments reveal different amounts of information about model parameters.

rate) **Translation**





(Transcription rate)

Different single-cell experiments reveal different amounts of information about model parameters.



(Transcription rate)

The Fisher information matrix (FIM) quantifies the expected uncertainty of potential experiments

$$\mathcal{I}(\theta) = \mathbf{E} \Big[\Big(\nabla_{\theta} \log L(\mathbf{D}; \theta) \Big)^T \Big(\nabla_{\theta} \log L(\mathbf{D}; \theta) \Big]$$

Different FIM metrics estimate which experiments are better to answer specific questions.



The FSP-FIM extends FIM analyses beyond the limits of well-known distributions and simple stochastic processes.





The FSP-FIM analyzes information for discrete distributions of any shape:

$$FIM_{i,j} = n \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{1}{p(\mathbf{x}_k; \boldsymbol{\theta})} \mathbf{s}_i^k \mathbf{s}_j^k$$

Fox, Munsky, PLoS Comp Bio 2019



The asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator can be used to confirm the FSP-FIM for non-Gaussian data.



Generate simulated data sets

 $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{dist} \mathcal{N}(0, I(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^{-1})$

Fox, Munsky, PLoS Comp Bio 2019





The FSP-FIM provides a more accurate FIM approximation, even when models are linear and moments are computable.



Fox, Munsky, PLoS Comp Bio 2019



The FSP-FIM analysis identifies more informative experiment designs, which were missed by alternate approaches.





10⁰

 10^{-1}

 10^{1}

Sampling period, Δt (minutes)

Fox, Munsky, PLoS Comp Bio 2019

10²

10³

0.0000



Can we use the FSP-FIM to understand time-varying *controlled* systems?

Deterministic, time-varying input signal affects the stochastic model of mRNA expression.





 $k_{21}(t) = \max[0, \alpha - \beta f(t)]$

The FSP-FIM can be used to design experiments to learn about model parameters.



$$\mathbf{s}_{\theta_k}^i(t) \quad \mathcal{I}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{c}) = \sum_{l=1}^{N_t} c_k \mathbf{F}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, t = t_l)$$

Fox, Neuert, Munsky, Complexity 2020

Fisher information analysis reveals which dynamics are informative.



Fox, Neuert, Munsky, Complexity 2020



Optimal experiment designs are better than random experiment designs.





Fox, Neuert, Munsky, Complexity 2020



The FSP-FIM can also be used to optimize measurements to learn about the environment.



Fox, Neuert, Munsky, Complexity 2020



Using different experiment designs to learn deactivation times.



Experimental verification for biosensor experiments.









This method can also be used to find the degradation rate of mRNA which reduces uncertainty in deactivation time.



degradation rate quantified from experimental data

0⁻³ 10⁻² mRNA degradation rate (molecules⁻¹ s⁻¹)

Fox, Neuert, Munsky, Complexity 2020



What can we learn about model parameters from timing distributions?

Composability is a primary challenge in constructing synthetic biological circuits



Potvin-Trottier et al, 2016

Optogenetics could be used to rapidly prototype circuit designs





A repressilator with light controlled system in the background oscillates regularly



Cutting the circuit can help quantify individual elements





Simple stochastic model of derepression of a promoter.





Different repression thresholds have different statistics.



First-passage times are sensitive to Hill function parameters





Fisher information for first passage time distributions

$$f(t) = -\mathbf{1}^{T} \mathbf{A} \exp(\mathbf{A}t) \mathbf{p}_{0},$$

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathbb{E} \left[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log f(t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log f(t; \boldsymbol{\theta})^{T} \right]$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{i,j} = \int_{T} \frac{1}{f(t; \boldsymbol{\theta})} f_{\theta_{i}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{\theta_{j}}(t; \boldsymbol{\theta}) dt$$

$$f_{\theta_{i}} = -\mathbf{1}^{T} \left[\mathbf{A}_{JJ}^{\theta_{i}} \mathbf{p}(t) + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{s}_{\theta_{i}}(t) \right]$$

For the Markov chain model, the first passage time distribution is a phase-type distribution.

The Fisher information matrix is defined as the expected (w.r.t. **data**) first derivative of the log-likelihood function.

For phase type distributions, the FIM can be found as as an integral over the sensitivities of *f(t)* normalized by their probabilities.

The sensitivities can be found from the sensitivities of the original Markov chain.



Three Fisher informations for three approximations of the likelihood.



$$\mathcal{I}_{i,j} = \int_{T} \frac{1}{f(t;\boldsymbol{\theta})} f_{\theta_i}(t;\boldsymbol{\theta}) f_{\theta_j}(t;\boldsymbol{\theta}) dt$$

$$+ \frac{\left(\langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle \frac{\partial \langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle}{\partial \theta_i} - \frac{\partial \langle t \rangle}{\partial \theta_i} \langle \tilde{t}^3 \rangle\right) \left(\langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle \frac{\partial \langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle}{\partial \theta_j} - \frac{\partial \langle t \rangle}{\partial \theta_j} \langle \tilde{t}^3 \rangle\right)}{\langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle^2 \left(\langle \tilde{t}^4 \rangle - \langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle^2\right) - \langle \tilde{t}^2 \rangle \langle \tilde{t}^3 \rangle^2} + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

$$\frac{1}{\sigma(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2} \left[\frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \mu(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{(\sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^2} \frac{\partial \sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \sigma^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \right) \right]$$



Some Hill function parameters can be learned from single cell data.





However, when all three Hill function parameters are free, they can be difficult to identify.



Is there a better experiment to learn these parameters?

Parameter estimation improves with increased variance in the initial distribution of molecule numbers.



What information about the initial distributions of molecule numbers are contained in the first passage times?

Estimating the mean of the number of initial molecules from first passage time distributions.

FPT's were constructed from 50 simulated data sets of 100 trajectories each.

The maximum likelihood estimate of the mean FPT was found for each data point.

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \xrightarrow{dist} \mathcal{N}(0, I(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*)^{-1})$$

Asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator



Outline

Variability in biochemical reactions

- This variability is paramount to understanding and identifying models of gene expression.
- The FSP allows for computation of full probability distributions.

Efficient model identification using error constraints

• FSP errors allow us to constrain models of **biochemical reactions** using single-cell data.

 FSP-bounds speed up model identification by using minimal computational effort to compare models.

Designing single-cell experiments with Fisher Information

The FSP-based FIM makes no assumptions about the shape of gene expression distributions.

 The FSP-FIM can be used to collect optimallyinformative single-cell data.

Acknowledgements

Munsky and Stasevich groups at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO



Gregor Neuert, Vanderbilt







InBio Team



Contact & Feedback: <u>zachrfox@gmail.com</u> <u>zachfox.github.io</u>