

Stochastic single-gene auto-regulation

Tomás Aquino

*Centro de Física da Matéria Condensada and Departamento de Física,
Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, P-1649-003 Lisboa Codex, Portugal**

Elsa Abranches

*Instituto de Medicina Molecular and Instituto de Histologia e Biologia do Desenvolvimento,
Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Prof. Egas Moniz,
1649-028 Lisboa, Portugal and Champalimaud Neuroscience Programme,
at Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, Rua da Quinta Grande, 6, 2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal*

Ana Nunes

*Centro de Física da Matéria Condensada and Departamento de Física,
Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa, P-1649-003 Lisboa Codex, Portugal†*

A detailed stochastic model of single-gene auto-regulation is established and its solutions are explored when mRNA dynamics is fast compared with protein dynamics and in the opposite regime. The model includes all the sources of randomness that are intrinsic to the auto-regulation process. The timescale separation allows the derivation of analytic expressions for the equilibrium distributions of protein and mRNA. These distributions are shown to be well described in the continuous approximation, which is then used to discuss the qualitative features of the protein equilibrium distributions as a function of the biological parameters in the fast mRNA regime.

PACS numbers: pacs 87.10.Mn, 02.50.Ey, 05.40.Ca

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of stochasticity in cells and microorganisms has been discussed theoretically since the 1970s [1, 2]. Because cellular processes often rely on chemical reactions, and correspondingly on chance encounters between molecules or molecular complexes, stochastic effects due to small numbers are ubiquitous in the cell. In particular, cellular decision processes, which are of paramount importance as they allow cells to react to the internal and external media, are based on gene activation and regulation, often depending on random association and dissociation events. While many works focus on the limits imposed by stochasticity and the evolution of noise-minimization strategies [1, 3–5], there is a growing interest in possible functional roles of noise. Generically, the basic role of randomness in gene expression is to provide a natural means of generating phenotype variability across a population, enhancing its capacity to quickly adapt to fast-changing conditions.

The evolution of experimental molecular biology techniques has made single-cell measurements possible and brought numerous confirmations of the presence of stochastic effects in gene expression [6], prompting a renewed interest in the mechanisms underlying gene expression and regulation in general, and specifically on the sources of randomness affecting them. The fact that genes coding for specific proteins are often present in sin-

gle copies may introduce considerable noise. Furthermore, mRNAs are commonly present in low copy numbers, from a few to a few hundred molecules, and many proteins also exist in low number. Because transcription, translation and degradation events are stochastic, finite size fluctuations in mRNA and protein numbers become important. Stochastic effects may suffice to drive long excursions of a gene's expression to higher or lower values, producing well-defined pulses in single cell protein abundances over time and/or multimodal protein expression distributions in a population. Fluctuations of the biological parameters of the system under consideration are another source of randomness. For example, we characterize an active gene by a constant effective transcription rate, while this rate may depend on the presence of transcription factors whose concentration fluctuations induce fluctuations of the effective rate. Examples of theoretical approaches to these ideas can be found in [7–9].

The recent development of single-molecule techniques led to the experimental identification of another, more specific source of variability in gene expression that accounts for the heavy-tailed distributions often found in measures of population distributions of protein and mRNA abundance: both transcription and translation have been found, in many cases, to occur in time-localized bursts resulting in a geometrically distributed number of molecules, see [10–13].

As experimental evidence of these sources of randomness accumulates [14, 15], the tools of statistical physics are being called upon for the development of a theoretical understanding of the underlying mechanics in noisy gene expression. Several models of the simplest elements of a gene regulatory network have been studied as stochastic

*Electronic address: tomas.c.aquino@gmail.com

†Electronic address: anunes@ptmat.fc.ul.pt

processes that include a representation of some of these sources of randomness [7, 16–19]. As expected, the stationary solutions of these models may differ significantly from what one would obtain by simply adding a noise term to the equations stemming from a deterministic description. Moreover, the analytic solutions that can be obtained under certain assumptions were found to be in agreement with a wide set of experimental data [13].

In this paper, we make use of these tools to study a bottom-up model for single-gene auto-regulation that includes all the sources of randomness that are intrinsic to the auto-regulation process and is applicable in general to any auto-regulated protein species. In particular, the case of Nanog, a protein that controls differentiation decisions in mouse embryonic stem (ES) cells, was studied in detail elsewhere [20]. Analytic solutions of the general model obtained in two complementary approximations for the relative timescales of protein and mRNA dynamics are discussed in terms of the qualitative features of the equilibrium protein distributions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we establish the stochastic model. In the following two sections we present the solutions of the model in the fast mRNA regime (Section III) and in the fast protein regime (Section IV). In Section V we extend the model to auto-regulation that occurs at the level of translation, rather than at the level of transcription as it is commonly considered. Finally, in Section VI, we briefly discuss the behavior of the model versus experimental results for distributions of Nanog protein levels in ES cells and conclude. Five appendices contain technical details which are too cumbersome to include in the main text.

II. MODEL

We study the cell-level dynamics, and corresponding population distributions, of a single protein capable of transcriptional auto-regulation and its mRNA. Protein and mRNA concentrations are controlled by the balance between production and degradation events. In transcriptional regulation, the regulatory feed-back is mediated by protein binding to the promoter region in the DNA to alter the transcription rate of its mRNA, and mRNA is translated into protein independently of protein abundance. For concreteness, in agreement with experimental evidence for Nanog in ES cells [21], we consider regulation to be effected by protein dimers. Other choices, such as monomer binding [16] or a general cooperative binding modeled by a Hill function [7] have been used in the literature. We assume the protein and mRNA populations to be non-interacting except for the fact that proteins dimerize prior to binding to the promoter. The timescale of promoter reactions (\sim seconds) is assumed much shorter than that of the mRNA (\sim minutes to hours) and protein (usually \sim hours), in agreement with data for the typical timescales of these processes, see for example [3, 22].

Since regulation takes place at the DNA level, we need to model processes at three different levels: the promoter's (DNA), the mRNA's, and the protein's.

A. DNA Level

For promoter dynamics, we essentially follow [23], adapted to a fully stochastic description. The promoter site is assumed to bind only one dimer molecule at a time. To avoid unnecessarily heavy notation, in what follows we assume a given value of protein copy number n in the cell; probabilities should accordingly be taken as conditional probabilities given n . Denote by P_f the free promoter state and by P_b the bound state of the promoter and a dimer. For each instant t , let $p(P_f, t)$ be the probability of the promoter being free, and $p(P_b, t)$ the probability of it being bound to a dimer. The evolution of the probability of the bound state is governed by the Master Equation

$$\dot{p}(P_b, t | j) = j k^+ p(P_f, t | j) - k^- p(P_b, t | j), \quad (1)$$

where k^+ and k^- are the promoter site binding and unbinding rates, and j is the number of dimer molecules available for binding to the promoter. Since at all times the promoter is either free or bound to a dimer, we have also $p(P_f, t | j) + p(P_b, t | j) = 1$.

The number of dimers in the cell as a function of protein copy number is given in a rate equation description by (see for instance [24]):

$$n_2(n) = \frac{n}{2} + a^2 - \sqrt{n + a^2}, \quad (2)$$

where a is a dimensionless parameter defined by $a \equiv \sqrt{V/(8k_d)}$, V is the cell's volume and k_d is the ratio of the dimerization and undimerization rates. If there are $n_2(n)$ dimers in the cell, the equilibrium probability distribution p_j for the number j of dimers available through diffusion for binding to a promoter with characteristic volume V_P much smaller than the cell's volume V is given by [24]

$$p_j = \mathcal{P}_j(\lambda n_2(n)), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_j(\theta)$ is the Poisson distribution of mean θ (evaluated at j), and $\lambda \equiv V_P/V \ll 1$. When writing down (3) we have taken into account that for typical values of protein (and protein dimer) diffusion coefficients and dimerization rates, see [3, 25, 26], dimer formation and dissociation within the small volume V_P occurs with negligible probability compared to diffusion into and out of V_P . Note that λ is typically very small, since promoters have linear dimensions in the nanometer range and cells in the micrometer range. As discussed for example in [27], other transport mechanisms more efficient than three dimensional diffusion must be at play that enable the promoter to gauge the actual number of molecules

in the cell. Assuming transport does not distinguish between dimers, and that the number of dimers does not influence the transport of a single dimer (essentially, that dimers are independent regarding transport, as is the case for diffusion), the distribution of dimers in V_P is binomial in general, with an “effective rate of volumes” parameter λ . In the relevant limit $\lambda \ll 1$ we regain (3).

We will now explicitly take into account that the promoter timescale is much shorter than the protein timescale by assuming that the distributions $p(P_f, t)$, $p(P_b, t)$, have time to reach equilibrium for each fixed value of the number of proteins. Using the equilibrium dimer number distribution, we have:

$$p^{eq}(P) = \sum_{j \geq 0} p^{eq}(P | j) \mathcal{P}_j(\lambda n_2(n)), \quad (4)$$

with $P \in \{P_f, P_b\}$. Solving equation (1) in equilibrium ($\dot{p} = 0$) and substituting in (4) leads to

$$p^{eq}(P_f | n) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{1}{1 + kj} \mathcal{P}_j(\lambda n_2(n)), \quad (5a)$$

$$p^{eq}(P_b | n) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{kj}{1 + kj} \mathcal{P}_j(\lambda n_2(n)), \quad (5b)$$


where we have introduced the dimensionless parameter $k \equiv k^+/k^-$ and we now emphasize the dependence on protein copy number n .

B. mRNA and Protein Levels

The production of mRNA and protein molecules in the cell has been found, in many cases, to occur in sharp geometrical bursts [10–13]. Although the concept of bursts and the mechanisms underlying them are still open to discussion, see for example [28, 29], a basic description stems from two simple ideas. First, if transcription/translation events are widely spaced compared to their duration, it is reasonable to speak of burst events. Second, the geometric distribution relates to the number of successive “heads” in the throwing of a (generally biased) coin; thus, if during a burst event there is a fixed probability that *another* molecule will be produced, a geometrically distributed number of molecules results. A major achievement of this burst description is that the resulting predicted form of unregulated protein expression distributions [7, 30] is remarkably simple and fits an impressive number of experimental distributions measured for yeast populations [13]. We adopt here an approach in which bursts are formulated in a stochastic framework both for transcription and translation.

Owing to the timescale separation between promoter and mRNA/protein dynamics, the latter are described in

chemical reaction notation by



Here m is the mRNA and p is the protein, while n stands for protein copy number. f is the regulation function, such that:

$$f(n) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \frac{1 + \rho kj}{1 + kj} \mathcal{P}_j(\lambda n_2(n)). \quad (7)$$

Thus, β_m is the transcription rate when the promoter is free, and $\rho\beta_m$ is the transcription rate when the promoter is bound to a dimer; the protein exhibits negative auto-regulation (auto-inhibition) if $\rho < 1$, and positive auto-regulation (auto-activation) if $\rho > 1$; μ_m is the mean transcriptional burst size. With the burst scenario in mind, the transcription rates above are to be interpreted as the mean rates at which a transcription event takes place; this event is modeled as the instantaneous transcription of a certain number (drawn from a geometric distribution) of mRNA molecules. We assume here that regulation affects only the base transcription rate, and not burst size. Finally, δ_m is the mRNA degradation rate. Similar definitions stand for the protein parameters (with β the translation rate, interpreted as the rate at which a single mRNA molecule initiates an instantaneous translational burst, μ the mean translational burst size, and δ the protein degradation rate).

It is interesting to see that the timescale separation for promoter dynamics allows all details of regulation to be condensed in the regulation function. Different regulatory dynamics affecting only the transcription rate and obeying the same timescale separation may be modeled in this framework simply by considering a different form of $f(n)$. Note also that a useful approximation to the promoter occupation function as defined by (7) exists if $k \ll 1$. If $\lambda n_2(n)$ is small, the low j terms of the sum will dominate; Taylor expansion of the denominator to lowest order in kj (for $kj \ll 1$) and explicit calculation of the sum leads to:

$$f(n) \approx \frac{1 + \rho k \lambda n_2(n)}{1 + k \lambda n_2(n)}. \quad (8)$$

If $\lambda n_2(n)$ is large, the large j terms dominate, and the approximation given by (8) remains valid because $(1 + \rho k \alpha)/(1 + k \alpha) \approx \rho$ for large α . Direct numerical calculation reveals that (8) is a good approximation overall, even for moderate values of $k < 1$, see Figure 1.

Let $E_i(\theta) \equiv \frac{(\theta-1)^{i-1}}{\theta^i}$ be the geometric distribution of mean θ (evaluated at i), conditioned to non-zero values $i \geq 1$ because a burst of zero molecules has no physical meaning [33]. Let also $p_{j,n}(t)$ be the joint probability




FIG. 1: (Color online) Approximation (8) for the regulation function. We fixed $\lambda = 10^{-2}$, $\rho = 10$, $a = 10^2$ for a typical example. **Bottom curves:** $k = 10^{-2}$; **top curves:** $k = 0.5$.

distribution of protein and mRNA copy numbers (evaluated at mRNA copy number j and protein copy number n) at time t . Then the Master Equation for the process (6) reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_{j,n}(t) = & \left[\beta_m f(n) \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) + \delta_m (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j + \right. \\ & \left. + \beta_j \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) + \delta (\mathbb{E} - 1) n \right] p_{j,n}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we have made use of the “step operators” \mathbb{E}_m , \mathbb{E} defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_m^i g_{j,n}(t) &= g_{j+i,n}(t), \\ \mathbb{E}^i g_{j,n}(t) &= g_{j,n+i}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for any function g depending on mRNA copy number j , protein copy number n , and time t .


III. FAST MRNA DYNAMICS

Studying the general system described above calls for direct numerical simulations of the dynamics or numerical integration techniques. However, further timescale separations between mRNA and protein dynamics are common. In this section we study the model proposed above for the case of fast mRNA compared to protein dynamics. We explore both the discrete scenario and a continuous approximation.

A. mRNA and protein dynamics

It is convenient in this case to consider fixed protein copy number n , since fast mRNA dynamics should allow

mRNA copy number to equilibrate for each fixed protein copy number. This means we are considering the reactions



at fixed n . Let $q_{j|n}(t)$ be the distribution of mRNA copy number (evaluated at j) at time t , given n protein molecules in the cell. The Master Equation for this process has the simple form:


$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_{j|n}(t) = & \left[\beta_m f(n) \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) + \right. \\ & \left. + \delta_m (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j \right] q_{j|n}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Let $q_{j|n}^{eq}$ be the equilibrium distribution of mRNA copy number, for each protein copy number n . The mean value of mRNA corresponding to this distribution can be found to be (see Appendix A)

$$\langle id \rangle_{q_{j|n}^{eq}} = \mu_m \gamma_m f(n), \quad (13)$$

where $\gamma_m = \beta_m / \delta_m$, and id is the identity function.

In the protein time scale, we have the reactions:



Let $p_n(t)$ be the distribution of protein copy number (evaluated at n) at time t . Since protein translation has well-defined rates for a certain number of corresponding mRNA molecules, and since we assume the mRNA distribution to quickly reach equilibrium for fixed values of protein, the Master Equation for this process reads

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}_n(t) = & \left[\sum_{j \geq 0, i \geq 1} \beta E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) j q_{j|n}^{eq} + \delta (\mathbb{E} - 1) n \right] p_n(t) \\ = & \left[\gamma \delta \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) f(n) + \delta (\mathbb{E} - 1) n \right] p_n(t), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\gamma \equiv \mu_m \gamma_m \beta / \delta$. We see that, when mRNA is fast, protein dynamics depends at each time only on the average mRNA corresponding to the available protein number n . Specifically, the translation rate becomes proportional to $\langle id \rangle_{q_{j|n}^{eq}}$, which is in turn proportional to $f(n)$. Through this mechanism, promoter-level regulation yields a measure of the number of molecules present in the cell at a certain time that is available at the level of translation. Note also that further details of mRNA dynamics, including burst-like production, are lost at the level of protein.

Let us consider as well a continuous approximation of the dynamics. For this we take $x \equiv \lambda n$ as an ‘‘approximately continuous’’ variable (recall that $\lambda \ll 1$). A continuous Master Equation for the distribution $p(x, t)$ of protein ‘‘concentration’’ x reads (see Appendix B)

$$\dot{p}(x, t) = \gamma \delta \int_0^x f(y) [E(x - y, \tilde{\mu}) - \delta_D(x - y)] p(y, t) dy + \delta \partial_x [xp(x, t)] , \quad (16)$$

where $E(x, \theta) \equiv (1/\theta)e^{-x/\theta}$ is the exponential probability distribution of mean θ evaluated at x and δ_D is the Dirac Delta. For simplicity we have chosen to keep the symbol f , such that $f(x) = f(n)$ for $x = \lambda n$. The exponential distribution term accounts for the contribution to $p(x, t)$ due to bursts leading to concentration x , and the Dirac delta term accounts for bursts away from x ; $\tilde{\mu}$ is the rescaled burst size, $\tilde{\mu} \equiv \lambda \mu$. The last term is due to protein degradation.

B. Protein and mRNA distributions

The equilibrium solution of (16) can be found to be (see Appendix C)

$$p^{eq}(x) = A_c x^{-1} e^{-x/\tilde{\mu}} e^{\gamma \int_c^x du f(u)/u} , \quad (17)$$

where the constant A_c depends on the arbitrary constant c and is determined by normalization. Note that, for each copy number n , $\gamma f(n)$ is the effective rate of translation burst events, due to all mRNA molecules, scaled by the degradation rate of the protein.

If we solve equation (15) directly in the discrete setting (see Appendix D), we find the solution:

$$p_n^{eq} = \frac{\gamma p_0^{eq}}{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\gamma \frac{f(i)}{i} + \frac{\mu - 1}{\mu} \right) , \quad (18)$$

for $n \geq 1$, with p_0^{eq} determined by normalization.

The performance of the continuous approximation within its range of validity is exemplified in Figure 2. Generically, the continuous approximations presented throughout this section are very accurate for burst sizes of order 10 and higher. It should be noted, however, that very sharp peaks (with a width of the order of a single molecule) that arise for zero protein or mRNA in some parameter ranges are not well captured by the continuous approximation.

The role of the biological parameters in the qualitative features of the protein distribution is particularly clear in the continuous setting. To study some of these features, consider the derivative of the probability distribution given by (17); concentrations $x > 0$ where probability peaks correspond to $\partial_x p^{eq}(x) = 0$, leading to

$$\gamma \tilde{\mu} f(x) = x + \tilde{\mu} . \quad (19)$$




FIG. 2: (Color online) Illustration of the performance of the continuous approximation for protein with fast mRNA. Example parameters are $\gamma = 1.5$, $\mu = 2 \cdot 10^3$, $\rho = 10$, $k = 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$, $a = 10^2$, $\lambda = 10^{-2}$.

Let us consider the regulation function as given by the approximation described by (8). In the continuous description we write:

$$f(x) \approx \frac{1 + \rho k x_2(x)}{1 + k x_2(x)} , \quad (20)$$

with:

$$x_2(x) \equiv \lambda n_2(n) = \frac{x}{2} + \tilde{a}^2 - \sqrt{x + \tilde{a}^2} \quad (21)$$

and $\tilde{a} = a/\sqrt{\lambda}$. By noting that equation (19) is equivalent to a quartic equation in $z = \sqrt{x + \tilde{a}^2}$, it is easy to prove that p^{eq} is at most bimodal (see Appendix E).

In the case of negative auto-regulation ($\rho < 1$), p^{eq} is always unimodal because the regulation function is monotonically decreasing. Positive auto-regulation ($\rho > 1$) is necessary for more structured distributions, and bimodal distributions do in fact arise for some parameter sets. It is interesting to note that in the limit of weak dimerization (large \tilde{a}) p^{eq} is always unimodal, while in the limit of strong dimerization (small \tilde{a}) it is unimodal if $\gamma > 1$ and bimodal with a peak at zero if $\gamma < 1$; bimodal distributions that do not peak at zero are present only for intermediate dimerization (see Figure 3). Near parameter regions allowing for bimodality, promoter affinity also strongly affects the shape of p^{eq} , as exemplified in Figure 4. The effect of varying γ and ρ is similar, but has a stronger effect on peak positions. Although the burst size parameter $\tilde{\mu}$ also affects the position and relative size of peaks in p^{eq} , its essential role is to produce the heavy tailed distributions commonly observed experimentally.

It is now easy to obtain the distribution of mRNA expression. For the continuous approximation, taking into




FIG. 3: (Color online) Illustration of the effect of varying the dimerization parameter \tilde{a} when bimodality is possible. For low dimerization (**top**) there is only a low concentration equilibrium, and for high dimerization (**bottom**) there is only a high concentration equilibrium. Bimodality without a peak at zero arises only for intermediate dimerization (**middle**). Example parameters are $\gamma = 1.25$, $\tilde{\mu} = 20$, $\rho = 10$, $k = 10^{-1}$, and: **Top**: $\tilde{a} = 20$; **middle**: $\tilde{a} = 10$; **bottom**: $\tilde{a} = 0$.

account the Master Equation (12), we have as in (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}(z, t | x) &= \delta_m \partial_z [zq(z, t | x)] + \\ &+ \beta_m f(x) \int_0^z [E(z-w, \tilde{\mu}_m) - \delta(z-w)] q(w, t | x) dw. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

This is an evolution equation for the distribution of a “continuous” mRNA concentration variable $z \equiv \lambda j$, given a fixed protein concentration $x = \lambda n$ (with $\tilde{\mu}_m$ again a rescaled burst size). Since f depends on protein but not mRNA concentration, we find for the equilibrium distribution (see Appendix C) a Gamma distribution:

$$q^{eq}(z | x) = G(z, \gamma_m f(x), \tilde{\mu}_m). \quad (23)$$

To find the equilibrium distribution of mRNA, we take the integral over all values of protein concentration, weighted by the respective probabilities given by (17):

$$\begin{aligned} q^{eq}(z) &= \int_0^\infty q^{eq}(z | x) p^{eq}(x) dx \\ &= \langle G(z, \gamma_m f, \tilde{\mu}_m) \rangle_{p^{eq}}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Similarly, the solution for the discrete dynamics, corresponding to equation (12), is given by a Negative Bi-




FIG. 4: (Color online) Illustration of the effect of varying promoter affinity k when bimodality is possible. We fixed $\gamma = 1.5$, $\tilde{\mu} = 20$, $\rho = 10$ and $\tilde{a} = 10$.

nomial distribution (c.f. Appendix D):

$$q_j^{eq} = N \left(j, \frac{\mu_m}{\mu_m - 1} \gamma_m f(n), \frac{1}{\mu_m} \right). \quad (25)$$

The discrete equilibrium distribution for mRNA is found in this case by summing over all protein copy numbers n , weighing with the discrete protein distribution given by (18):

$$\begin{aligned} q_j^{eq} &= \sum_{n \geq 0} q_j^{eq} p_n^{eq} dx \\ &= \left\langle N \left(j, \frac{\mu_m}{\mu_m - 1} \gamma_m f, \frac{1}{\mu_m} \right) \right\rangle_{p^{eq}}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

An illustration of the continuous approximation within its validity range is shown in Figure 5.

IV. FAST PROTEIN DYNAMICS

It is now convenient to consider fixed mRNA copy number j , since in this case protein dynamics is much faster and should equilibrate. Let $p_{n|j}(t)$ be the distribution of protein copy number (evaluated at n) at time t , given j mRNA molecules in the cell. We have again reactions (14), but in this case we write the Master Equation for fixed mRNA copy number j :

$$\dot{p}_{n|j}(t) = \left[\beta j \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) + \delta (\mathbb{E} - 1) n \right] p_{n|j}(t). \quad (27)$$

In the continuous approximation, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{p}(x, t | z) &= \frac{\beta z}{\lambda} \int_0^x [E(x-y, \tilde{\mu}) - \delta_D(x-y)] p(y, t) dy + \\ &+ \delta \partial_x [xp(x, t)]. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$




FIG. 5: (Color online) Illustration of the the performance of the continuous approximation for mRNA with fast mRNA. The example corresponds to the protein distribution from Figure 2, with $\gamma_m = 4$, $\mu_m = 20$.

This equation can be solved for the equilibrium distribution in exactly the same way as equation (22), yielding:

$$p^{eq}(x | z) = G(x, \tilde{\gamma}_2 z, \tilde{\mu}), \quad (29)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_2 \equiv \beta/(\lambda\delta) = \gamma/(\tilde{\mu}_m \gamma_m)$.

Similarly, the discrete solution (equation (27)) is:

$$p_{n|j}^{eq} = N\left(n, \frac{\mu}{\mu-1} \gamma_2 j, \frac{1}{\mu}\right), \quad (30)$$

where $\gamma_2 \equiv \beta/\delta = \gamma/(\mu_m \gamma_m)$ and $N(n, 0, \alpha) \equiv \delta_{n,0}$, with $\delta_{n,0}$ a Kronecker Delta symbol.

Following arguments similar to those leading to equation (15), the Master Equation for mRNA reads in this case:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}_j(t) = & \left[\beta_m \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) \langle f \rangle_{p_{i|j}^{eq}} + \right. \\ & \left. + \delta_m (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j \right] q_j(t), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and the corresponding continuous Master Equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{q}(z, t) = & \delta_m \partial_z [z q(z, t)] + \\ & + \beta_m \int_0^z \langle f \rangle_{p^{eq}(|w)} [E(z-w, \tilde{\mu}_m) - \delta_D(z-w)] q(w, t) dw. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The equilibrium solution of equation (32) can be found through the same method as the one used for equation (16), yielding:

$$q^{eq}(z) = A_c z^{-1} e^{-z/\tilde{\mu}} e^{\gamma_m \int_c^z du \langle f \rangle_{p^{eq}(|u)/u}}, \quad (33)$$

where A_c is again a normalization constant. The discrete solution, for equation (31), is

$$q_j^{eq} = \frac{\gamma_m q_0^{eq}}{j} \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \left(\gamma_m \frac{\langle f \rangle_{p_{i|j}^{eq}}}{i} + \frac{\mu_m - 1}{\mu_m} \right), \quad (34)$$

for $j \geq 1$, with q_0^{eq} determined by normalization (note that $\langle f \rangle_{p_{i|j}^{eq}} = f(0) = 1$).

In the continuous approximation, the distribution of protein concentration follows immediately from the integration of the conditional distribution given by equation (29):

$$\begin{aligned} p^{eq}(x) &= \int_0^\infty p^{eq}(x | z) q^{eq}(z) dz \\ &= \langle G(x, \tilde{\gamma}_2 id, \tilde{\mu}) \rangle_{q^{eq}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The corresponding discrete distribution is:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n^{eq} &= \sum_{j \geq 0} p_{n|j}^{eq} q_j^{eq} \\ &= \left\langle N\left(n, \frac{\mu}{\mu-1} \gamma_2 id, \frac{1}{\mu}\right) \right\rangle_{q^{eq}}. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

As expected, in this timescale regime the role of the regulation function is confined to the level of mRNA. The protein distribution depends only on the mRNA distribution, plus translation rate and protein burst size.

In this regime we also find that the continuous approximation is very accurate in its range of validity provided that the burst sizes are of order 10 or higher.

V. TRANSLATIONAL REGULATION

In the preceding sections we have considered the most commonly studied mechanism of gene regulation, in which proteins bind to the promoter to alter the rate of mRNA production. Other mechanisms have been reported in the recent literature that act post-transcription, at the mRNA rather than at the promoter level [31]. In this translational regulation scenario, the regulator molecule, whose concentration depends on that of the protein itself, interacts with the mRNA to change its rate of protein production. We now show that the class of solutions (17) also describes the protein equilibrium distributions in the case of translational regulation.

Consider that mRNA production proceeds through bursts without protein regulation. Then, the general Master Equation (9) decouples, yielding for the mRNA distribution $q_j(t)$ the Master Equation:

$$\dot{q}_j(t) = \left[\beta_m \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) + \delta_m (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j \right] q_j(t), \quad (37)$$

and mRNA reaches equilibrium independently of protein concentrations. The equilibrium solution for an unregulated process of this type, see Appendix D, is a Negative Binomial:

$$q_j^{eq} = N\left(j, \frac{\mu_m}{\mu_m - 1} \gamma_m, \frac{1}{\mu_m}\right). \quad (38)$$

If we assume that translation is modulated by a regulation function \tilde{f} depending on mRNA and protein copy

numbers and describing an interaction (direct or indirect) of the protein with its mRNA, the equilibrium protein distribution will be a solution to the probability balance equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left[\gamma \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu)(\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) \tilde{f}(j, n) q_j^{eq} + (\mathbb{E} - 1)n \right] p_n^{eq} \\
&= \left[\gamma \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu)(\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) f(n) + (\mathbb{E} - 1)n \right] p_n^{eq},
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where $f(n) \equiv \langle \tilde{f}(\cdot, n) \rangle_{q^{eq}}$. This is the same equation that describes the equilibrium distribution of protein with fast mRNA dynamics (compare to equation (15)) in equilibrium. We thus see that the protein equilibrium distribution is the same that was found for fast mRNA in Subsection III B, with the appropriate interpretation of the new regulation function f . Moreover, this solution now holds irrespective of mRNA stability, which influences this process only through the relaxation time of the system.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have established a detailed stochastic model of single-gene auto-regulation and explored its solutions when mRNA dynamics is fast compared with protein dynamics and in the opposite regime. The timescale separation allows the derivation of analytic closed form expressions for the equilibrium distributions of protein and mRNA. Except for very small number of molecules, these distributions are well described in the continuous approximation, which we discuss in detail. We typically find distributions that differ significantly from gaussian distributions and exhibit heavy tails. This is the effect of an essential ingredient of the model, the transcriptional and translational bursts, which typically have a magnitude comparable to system size. The continuous approximation is well suited to the description of the qualitative features of the protein equilibrium distributions as a function of the biological parameters. In particular, we find that for positive auto-regulation and intermediate values of the dimerization parameter a the protein equilibrium distributions are bimodal with two non-zero peaks in a significant range of the remaining parameters.

Distributions with the same features have been found for the protein Nanog in populations of ES cells [8]. Because ES cells maintained in culture do not communicate with each other, and there is no underlying cell organization, population distributions should be a measure of the equilibrium distributions of the corresponding dynamics in a single cell. In contrast with models that involve the coupling of Nanog dynamics with those of other species [8], the fully stochastic model developed here relies on Nanog auto-regulation alone and generates protein distributions in quantitative agreement with

the observed heterogeneity patterns for a wide range of biologically reasonable parameter choices [20]. In more general terms, our results show that a fully stochastic description of single-gene positive auto-regulation generates structured protein distributions that otherwise can only be explained in the framework of more complex gene regulatory networks.

Evidence of translational regulation reported in the biological literature raises the question of understanding its role in the context of stochastic gene expression. Recent work has shown how different post-transcriptional regulation mechanisms modulate noise in protein distributions [32]. Here we have shown that the equilibrium protein distributions for translational regulation have the same form as those that arise under transcriptional regulation in the case of fast mRNA. This property suggests for translational regulation of proteins whose lifetimes are shorter than their mRNA's an additional biological rationale: it allows these proteins to reach the distributions they would have under the standard regulation mechanism, circumventing mRNA stability. This idea concurs with the analysis of [22] based on experimental data for protein-mRNA lifetime pairs.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to D. Henrique for many helpful discussions of the biological foundations and applications of the model. Financial support from the portuguese funding agency Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) under Contract POCTI/ISFL/2/261 is gratefully acknowledged. TA and EA were also supported by FCT under Grants PTDC-FIS-70973-2006 (TA) and SFRH/BPD/26854/2006 (EA).

Appendix A: Mean mRNA in Equilibrium (Fast mRNA)

Consider the mRNA master equation (12). Multiplying both sides by j and summing over j we find an equation for the mean:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \langle id \rangle_{q|n(t)} &= \left[\beta_m f(n) \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) \sum_{j \geq 0} j (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) + \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \delta_m \sum_{j \geq 0} j (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j \right] q_{j|n}(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

Let us compute (omitting the arguments t, n for sim-

plicity):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \geq 1, j \geq 0} E_i(\mu_m) j (\mathbb{E}_m^{-i} - 1) q_j &= \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu_m) \sum_{j \geq 0} j (q_{j-i} - q_j) \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 1} i E_i(\mu_m) \sum_{j \geq 0} q_j \\ &= \mu_m, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

where we have made use of the fact that $q_j = 0$ whenever copy number j is negative. Now let us look at:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \geq 0} j (\mathbb{E}_m - 1) j q_j &= \sum_{j \geq 0} j(j+1) q_{j+1} - \sum_{j \geq 0} j^2 q_j \\ &= \sum_{j \geq 1} (j-1) j q_j - \sum_{j \geq 0} j^2 q_j \\ &= - \sum_{j \geq 0} j q_j = - \langle id \rangle_{q_n(t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Since we are looking for the equilibrium mean we now set the left-hand side of (A1) to zero, and using results (A2) and (A3) we find the desired result.

Appendix B: Continuous Approximation

Here we study a continuous approximation for equations of the form:

$$\dot{p}_n(t) = \left[\delta \gamma \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) f(n) + \delta (\mathbb{E} - 1) n \right] p_n(t), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where f is some function of (protein or mRNA) copy number n , $\gamma \neq 0$ and $\delta \neq 0$ are constants, and the step operator raises n . For some time t , let copy number n be fixed, and let $x = \lambda n$ be the corresponding concentration. In accordance with the main text, the convention $f(n) = f(x)$ will be used. First, note that a reasonable definition for the continuous distribution obeys:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n(t) &\equiv p(x, t) \lambda [(n+1/2) - (n-1/2)] \\ &\approx \int_{n-1/2}^{n+1/2} p(x, t) dx = \lambda p(x, t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Now consider the conditioned geometric distribution. We have:

$$E_n(\mu) = \frac{(\mu-1)^{(n-1)}}{\mu^n} = \frac{1}{\mu-1} e^{-n \log(1-1/\mu)}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

If we take $\mu \gg 1$ (which is biologically common, especially for proteins, see for example [11, 13]) and expand $\log(1-1/\mu)$ around $1/\mu = 0$ we find to lowest order:

$$E_n(\mu) \approx \frac{1}{\mu} e^{-n/\mu} = \lambda \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}} e^{-x/\tilde{\mu}} = \lambda E(x, \tilde{\mu}), \quad (\text{B4})$$

with $\tilde{\mu} = \lambda \mu$. Now notice that, apart from constant coefficients, the creation term in equation (B1) may be written:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) (\mathbb{E}^{-i} - 1) f(n) p_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{i \geq 1} E_i(\mu) f(n-i) p_{n-i} - f(n) p_n(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n (E_{n-i}(\mu) - \delta_{n,i}) f(i) p_i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

where $\delta_{n,i}$ is a Kronecker Delta symbol. Note that the upper limit of the sum can be extended to infinity by taking $E_j(\mu) = 0$ for $j \leq 0$, and the lower limit can be extended to negative infinity since $p_i = 0$ for $i < 0$.

The Kronecker Delta term reads:

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=0}^n \delta_{n,i} f(i) p_i = f(n) p_n(t) \\ &= \lambda \int_0^x \delta_D(x-y) f(y) p(y, t) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

where δ_D is the Dirac Delta. Notice that, for a meaningful conversion to the continuous case, the lower limit of the integral must be strictly included (in order to encompass the contribution of the Delta function). Thus, the upper and lower limits of the integral may be extended to infinity.

For the conditioned geometric distribution term in (B5) we may write:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^n E_{n-i}(\mu) f(i) p_i &\approx \sum_{i=0}^n \lambda E(\lambda(n-i), \tilde{\mu}) f(i) \lambda p(\lambda i, t) \\ &\approx \lambda \int_0^x E(x-y, \tilde{\mu}) f(y) p(y, t) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B7})$$

where again the upper and lower limits of the integral may be extended to plus and minus infinity by considering, respectively, $E(y, \tilde{\mu}) = 0$ and $p(y, t) = 0$ for negative y . Here, the approximations $\mu \gg 1$ (approximating the conditioned geometric distribution with an exponential distribution) and $\lambda \ll 1$ (approximating the sum with an integral, i.e. considering x continuous) have been explicitly used.

Finally, the degradation term in equation (B1) reads, apart from a factor of δ :

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E} - 1) n p_n(t) &= [(n+1) p_{n+1}(t) - n p_n(t)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda} [(x+\lambda) \lambda p(x+\lambda)(t) - x \lambda p(x, t)] \\ &\approx \lambda \partial_x (x p(x, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

where we again make use of $\lambda \ll 1$ to approximate a finite difference with a derivative. Noting that $\dot{p}_n(t) = \lambda \dot{p}(x, t)$

and collecting terms we find:

$$\dot{p}(x, t) = \gamma \int_0^x f(y) [E(x - y, \tilde{\mu}) - \delta_D(x - y)] p(y, t) dy + \delta \partial_x [xp(x, t)] . \quad (\text{B9})$$

Appendix C: Continuous Equilibrium Distributions

Here we follow [7] to obtain an analytical solution to equation (B9). As discussed in Appendix B, the upper and lower integration limits may be extended to plus and minus infinity, respectively. Thus, defining:

$$w(x, \tilde{\mu}) = E(x, \tilde{\mu}) - \delta_D(x) , \quad (\text{C1})$$

we may write:

$$\dot{p}(x, t) = \delta\gamma(w(\tilde{\mu}) * fp)(x, t) + \delta \partial_x [xp(x, t)] , \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $*$ is a convolution product. In equilibrium we have:

$$- \partial_x [xp^{eq}(x)] = \gamma(w(\tilde{\mu}) * fp^{eq})(x) . \quad (\text{C3})$$

Laplace transformation of this equation leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} s \partial_s \hat{p}(s) &= \gamma \hat{w}(s) \mathcal{L}(fp^{eq})(s) \\ &= \gamma \hat{w}(s) (\hat{f} * \hat{p})(s) \\ &= -\gamma \frac{s}{s + 1/\tilde{\mu}} (\hat{f} * \hat{p})(s) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C4})$$

Here, $\hat{g}(s) = \mathcal{L}(g)(s) = \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-sx} g(x) dx$ (integration limit 0 strictly included) is the Laplace transform of function g (evaluated at s), and $\hat{p} = \mathcal{L}(p^{eq})$. Convolution theorems have been used in the first and second lines, and in the third line the explicit form of $\hat{w}(s)$ was substituted. Rearranging terms we have:

$$(s + 1/\tilde{\mu})\hat{p}(s) = -\gamma(\hat{f} * \hat{p})(s) , \quad (\text{C5})$$

which inverse-transforms to:

$$\partial_x [xp^{eq}(x)] = (\gamma f(x)/x - 1/\tilde{\mu}) xp^{eq}(x) . \quad (\text{C6})$$

This equation can easily be solved, leading to:

$$p^{eq}(x) = A_c x^{-1} e^{-x/\tilde{\mu}} e^{\gamma \int_c^x du f(u)/u} . \quad (\text{C7})$$

The constant A_c is determined by normalization (depending on the arbitrary integration limit c).

Consider now the case $f(x) = 1$, for all x . Solving the integral in (17) and normalizing the probability distribution to integral unity we find:

$$\begin{aligned} p^{eq}(x) &= \frac{x^{\gamma-1} e^{-x/\tilde{\mu}}}{\tilde{\mu}^\gamma \Gamma(\gamma)} \\ &= G(x, \gamma, \tilde{\mu}) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

This is the Gamma distribution of parameters γ and $\tilde{\mu}$ (Γ is the Euler Gamma function). With $\gamma = \mu_m \gamma_m \beta / \delta$ and $\tilde{\mu}$ the mean rescaled protein burst size (with definitions according to the main text), this is the equilibrium solution for unregulated protein dynamics with fast mRNA.

Appendix D: Discrete Equilibrium Distributions

In this Appendix we analyze, directly in the discrete setting, equation (B1). Analogously to the continuous case, the discrete Master Equation may be written:

$$\dot{p}_n(t) = \delta\gamma(w(\mu) * fp)(n) + \delta [(n+1)p_{n+1}(t) - np_n(t)] , \quad (\text{D1})$$

where $*$ is now the discrete convolution product, and $w(n, \mu) = E_n(\mu) - \delta_{n,0}$. We now follow the procedures of Appendix C using the Z transform instead of the Laplace transform, $\hat{g}(s) = \mathcal{Z}(g)(s) = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} s^{-n} g(n)$, $\mathcal{Z}(p^{eq}) = \hat{p}$. The corresponding equation in "momentum space" is:

$$s(s-1)\partial_s \hat{p}(s) + \frac{s}{\mu} \partial_s \hat{p}(s) = -\gamma (\hat{f} * \hat{p})(s) . \quad (\text{D2})$$

Inverse-transforming, we get:

$$(n+1)p_{n+1}^{eq} + (1/\mu - 1)np_n^{eq} = \gamma f(n)p_n^{eq} , \quad (\text{D3})$$

leading to the recurrence relation:

$$\begin{cases} p_1^{eq} = \gamma f(0)p_0^{eq} , \\ (n+1)p_{n+1}^{eq} = \left(\gamma \frac{f(n)}{n} + \frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right) np_n^{eq} , \quad n \geq 1 . \end{cases} \quad (\text{D4})$$

This is easily solved, yielding:

$$p_n^{eq} = \frac{\gamma f(0)p_0^{eq}}{n} \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\gamma \frac{f(i)}{i} + \frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right) , \quad (\text{D5})$$

for all $n \geq 1$, with p_0^{eq} determined by normalization (and the standard convention that the product equals one when the upper limit is smaller than the lower). Note that if f is a regulation function as per the main text we have $f(0) = 1$, since the promoter is necessarily free when no protein is present.

Consider now the case $f(n) = 1$ for all n . Write (D5) as:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n^{eq} &= \frac{\mu}{\mu-1} \frac{\gamma f(0)p_0^{eq}}{n} \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\frac{\mu}{\mu-1} \gamma \frac{f(i)}{i} + 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{\gamma' f(0)p_0^{eq}}{n} \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\gamma' \frac{f(i)}{i} + 1 \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D6})$$

with $\gamma' = \gamma\mu/(\mu-1)$. The product can be solved explicitly in terms of Gamma functions, and normalizing to unit sum we find:

$$\begin{aligned} p_n^{eq} &= \frac{1}{\mu^{\gamma'}} \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^n \frac{\Gamma(n+\gamma')}{\Gamma(\gamma')\Gamma(n+1)} \\ &= N \left(n, \gamma', \frac{1}{\mu} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D7})$$

This is the Negative Binomial distribution of parameters γ' and $1/\mu$. The parameters are defined such that:

$$N(n, k, p) = p^k (1-p)^n \binom{n+k-1}{k-1} . \quad (\text{D8})$$

As in the continuous case (Appendix C), with $\gamma = \mu_m \gamma_m \beta / \delta$ and μ the mean protein burst size (definitions according to the main text), this is the discrete solution for unregulated protein dynamics with fast mRNA (as reported for example in [30]).

Appendix E: Bimodal Equilibrium Protein Distributions

Consider the continuous equilibrium distribution for protein with fast mRNA (17) and its derivative:

$$\partial_x p^{eq}(x) = [\gamma \tilde{\mu} f(x) - (x + \tilde{\mu})] \frac{p^{eq}(x)}{\tilde{\mu} x}. \quad (\text{E1})$$

If p^{eq} peaks at zero (i.e. if $\partial_x p^{eq}(0) < 0$), the term in brackets in equation (E1) must be negative at zero. Because $p^{eq}(x) > 0$ for all $x > 0$, other extrema of p^{eq} must satisfy:

$$\gamma \tilde{\mu} f(x) - (x + \tilde{\mu}) = 0. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Consider $f(x)$ as given by (8). A change of variables to $z = \sqrt{x + \tilde{a}^2}$ in equation (E2) leads to an equivalent quartic equation,

$$P_4(z) = -z^4 + 2\tilde{a}z^3 + \alpha_2 z^2 + \alpha_1 z + \alpha_0 = 0, \quad (\text{E3})$$

where the α_i are real constants determined by the biological parameters. The equation $P_4''(z) = 0$ is quadratic in z and has the two solutions:

$$z = \frac{\tilde{a}}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\tilde{a}}{2}\right)^2 + \frac{\alpha_2}{6}}. \quad (\text{E4})$$

If they are real, one of these solutions necessarily obeys $z < \tilde{a}$. Therefore, $P_4''(z)$ has at most one root in $z > \tilde{a}$. Since zeros of P_4 correspond alternately to maxima and minima of p^{eq} , the presence of more than two maxima requires at least four positive roots of $P_4(z)$ in $z > \tilde{a}$. But then $P_4''(z)$ would have at least two roots in $z > \tilde{a}$.

-
- [1] H. Berg and E. Purcell, *Biophysical Journal* **20**, 193 (1977), ISSN 0006-3495.
- [2] O. Berg, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **71**, 587 (1978).
- [3] W. Bialek and S. Setayeshgar, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**, 10040 (2005).
- [4] W. Bialek and S. Setayeshgar, *Physical Review Letters* **100**, 258101 (2008).
- [5] H. Fraser, A. Hirsh, G. Giaever, J. Kumm, and M. Eisen, *PLoS Biology* **2**, e137 (2004), ISSN 1545-7885.
- [6] M. Elowitz, A. Levine, E. Siggia, and P. Swain, *Science* **297**, 1183 (2002).
- [7] N. Friedman, L. Cai, and X. Xie, *Physical Review Letters* **97**, 168302 (2006), ISSN 1079-7114.
- [8] T. Kalmar, C. Lim, P. Hayward, S. Muñoz-Descalzo, J. Nichols, J. Garcia-Ojalvo, and A. Martinez Arias, *PLoS Biology* **7**, e1000149 (2009), ISSN 1545-7885.
- [9] P. Rué and J. Garcia-Ojalvo, *Mathematical Biosciences* **231**, 90 (2011).
- [10] L. Cai, N. Friedman, and X. Xie, *Nature* **440**, 358 (2006).
- [11] B. Kaufmann and A. van Oudenaarden, *Current Opinion in Genetics & Development* **17**, 107 (2007).
- [12] E. Ozbudak, M. Thattai, I. Kurtser, A. Grossman, and A. van Oudenaarden, *Nature Genetics* **31**, 69 (2002).
- [13] Y. Taniguchi, P. Choi, G. Li, H. Chen, M. Babu, J. Hearn, A. Emili, and X. Xie, *Science* **329**, 533 (2010).
- [14] D. Suter, N. Molina, D. Gatfield, K. Schneider, U. Schibler, and F. Naef, *Science* **322**, 472 (2011).
- [15] D. Larson, D. Zenklusen, B. Wu, J. Chao, and R. Singer, *Science* **322**, 475 (2011).
- [16] J. Hornos, D. Schultz, G. Innocentini, J. Wang, A. Walczak, J. Onuchic, and P. Wolynes, *Physical Review E* **72**, 051907 (2009).
- [17] A. Mugler, A. Walczak, and C. Wiggins, *Physical Review E* **80**, 041921 (2009).
- [18] S. Iyer-Biswas, F. Hayot, and C. Jayaprakash, *Physical Review E* **79**, 031911 (2009).
- [19] M. Assaf, E. Roberts, and Z. Luthey-Schulten, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 248102 (2011).
- [20] E. Abranches, T. Aquino, E. Bekman, H. Maamar, A. Raj, A. Nunes, and D. Henrique, submitted (2011).
- [21] J. Wang, D. Lévassieur, and S. Orkin, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **105**, 6326 (2008).
- [22] B. Schwanhäusser, D. Busse, N. Li, G. Dittmar, J. Schuchhardt, J. Wolf, W. Chen, and M. Selbach, *Nature* **473**, 337 (2011).
- [23] R. Quanten and J. Poyatos, *PLoS Computational Biology* **4**, e1000235 (2008).
- [24] N. van Kampen, *Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry* (North Holland, 1992).
- [25] M. Liu, P. Li, and J. Giddings, *Protein Science: A Publication of the Protein Society* **2**, 1520 (1993).
- [26] D. Xu, C. Tsai, and R. Nussinov, *Protein Science: A Publication of the Protein Society* **7**, 533 (1998).
- [27] O. Bénichou, Y. Kafri, M. Sheinman, and R. Voituriez, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 138102 (2009).
- [28] J. Paulsson, *Physics of Life Reviews* **2**, 157 (2005).
- [29] V. Elgart, T. Jia, A. Fenley, and R. Kulkarni, *Physical Biology* **8**, 046001 (2011).
- [30] V. Shahrezaei and P. Swain, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **105**, 17256 (2008).
- [31] L. Waters and G. Storz, *Cell* **136**, 615 (2009).
- [32] T. Jia and R. Kulkarni, *Physical Review Letters* **105**, 018101 (2010).
- [33] Note that, if $E^0(\theta)$ is the non-conditioned geometrical distribution of mean θ , the relation $E_i(\theta) = \frac{\theta}{\theta-1} E_i^0(\theta-1)$ holds for all $i \geq 1$. Thus, “conditioned bursting” with frequency α and mean θ is equivalent to “non-conditioned bursting” with frequency $\frac{\theta}{\theta-1} \alpha$ and mean $\theta-1$, and the difference becomes relevant only for $\theta \sim 1$.