

Efficient fold-change detection based on protein-protein interactions

W. Buijsman and M. Sheinman

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, VU University,
De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

(Dated: October 26, 2019)

Various biological sensory systems exhibit a response to a relative change of the stimulus, often referred to as fold-change detection. In the last few years fold-change detecting mechanisms, based on transcriptional networks, have been proposed. Here we present fold-change detecting mechanism, based on protein-protein interactions, consisting of two interacting proteins. This mechanism, in contrast to previously proposed mechanisms, does not consume chemical energy and is not subject to transcriptional and translational noise. We show by analytical and numerical calculations, that the mechanism can have a fast, precise and efficient response for parameters that are relevant to eukaryotic cells.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multiple biological sensory systems, such as vision and hearing, can detect relative changes in signals—a phenomenon referred to as fold-change detection (FCD) [1, 2]. Consider time-dependent input $X(t)$, given by

$$X = \begin{cases} X_0 & (t < t_0) \\ \alpha \times X_0 & (t \geq t_0) \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

where X_0 is a constant indicating the initial input signal value, α is its fold-change and t_0 is the time at which the input signal changes. The output of a fold-change detecting mechanism to such an input is independent of X_0 . FCD can be useful in systems with wide relevant range of an input signal and/or multiple inputs [3]. Recent studies find evidences of FCD mechanisms in *E. coli* [4–6] and *Xenopus laevis* embryos [7].

It has been demonstrated that fold-changes theoretically can be detected using transcriptional networks. In particular, the incoherent feedforward loop [8, 9] and the two-state protein [10] can provide FCD in the appropriate parameters regime. In order to function, FCD mechanisms, based on a transcriptional network, require continuous protein production and degradation. As a consequence, this type of mechanisms is subject to transcriptional and translational noise [11], continues consumption of chemical energy and lower limit for the FCD response time. The last can be especially significant in mammalian cells (~ 20 min) [6, 12, 13].

Here we describe a FCD mechanism, based purely on protein-ligand and protein-protein interactions. It does not consume chemical energy and is not subject to intrinsic transcriptional and translational noise, but only to the variation of the total protein numbers. We analyze the importance of the last quantity in Sec. III and show that it is not expected to affect significantly the detection efficiency for eukaryotic cells. Moreover, the characteristic response timescales are set by the rates of protein interactions, which have a much broader range and can be much faster than the transcription and translation rates [14–17]. We conclude that FCD, based on protein-protein interactions, can be more effective than




FIG. 1. A schematic representation of the FCD mechanism, as described in this paper. The cursive k -terms indicate the reaction rates, corresponding to the reaction equations, as shown both horizontally and vertically. The ligand S and protein-ligand synthesis product Y_S serve as the input and output, respectively. For clarity, the two copies of Y are grouped by a box.

the one, based on transitional networks.

This paper contains three sections. Sec. II describes the mechanism and shows formally that the mechanism can provide FCD. In Sec. III, the action of the mechanism is demonstrated by numerical simulation. In this section, it is shown that the mechanism can be precise, robust and efficient for parameters that are relevant for eukaryotic cells. Sec. IV provides a discussion of the results.

II. THE MECHANISM

The FCD mechanism, described in this paper, is constructed out of two proteins (denoted by X and Y) and one ligand (denoted by S). Fig. 1 gives a schematic overview of the reactions and the corresponding reaction rates that are involved. In this Section we, firstly, indicate the parameters requirements for proper FCD. Secondly, it is shown formally that the mechanism can provide FCD. Finally, the response of the mechanism is characterized quantitatively.

A. Mechanism description

First, consider the reaction $S + X \rightleftharpoons X_S$, where S serves as the input signal, and X_S is the complex of S and X . Given the association rate $k_{X_S}^{\text{on}}$ and dissociation rate $k_{X_S}^{\text{off}}$, the mean-field dynamics is described by

$$\dot{[X_S]} = [X][S] k_{X_S}^{\text{on}} - [X_S] k_{X_S}^{\text{off}}. \quad (2)$$

The idea behind the mechanism is to find a parameter regime for which $[S]/[X_S]$ remains invariant under fold-changes in $[S]$. Then, an output signal, with a concentration proportional to $[S]/[X_S]$, is generated, by involving the reactions $S + Y \rightleftharpoons Y_S$ and $X_S + Y \rightleftharpoons X_S Y$. For a negligible small concentration of Y proteins (unbound or bound), the steady-state value of $[S]/[X_S]$ is given by

$$\left. \frac{[S]}{[X_S]} \right|_{t \rightarrow \infty} = \frac{k_{X_S}^{\text{off}} + [S] k_{X_S}^{\text{on}}}{[X]_0 k_{X_S}^{\text{on}}}, \quad (3)$$

where $[X]_0$ is the total concentration of X proteins. One can see that, in equilibrium this ratio is invariant under fold-changes in $[S]$ if $k_{X_S}^{\text{off}} \gg [S] k_{X_S}^{\text{on}}$. For a summary of the FCD conditions, see the end of this Subsection.

The second step is to design a mechanism providing an output proportional to $[S]/[X_S]$. Consider the reactions $S + Y \rightleftharpoons Y_S$ with association rate $k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}}$ and dissociation rate $k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}$, and $X_S + Y \rightleftharpoons X_S Y$, with association rate $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}}$ and dissociation rate $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}$, where the total concentrations of Y protein molecules is given by $[Y]_0$. For the schematics of the reactions involved, see Fig. 1. Furthermore, assume that both reactions equilibrate fast, compared to the reaction $X + S \rightleftharpoons X_S$. In the limit $[Y]_0 \ll [X_S]$, such that the reactions involving Y do not alter the dynamics of Eq. (2), the dynamics of $[Y_S]$ and $[X_S Y]$ is described by

$$\dot{[Y_S]} \approx [S][Y] k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}} - [Y_S] k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\dot{[X_S Y]} \approx [X_S][Y] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} - [X_S Y] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}, \quad (5)$$

where $[X_S]$ satisfies Eq. (2). By substituting $[Y]$ from the steady-state of Eq. (5) in the steady-state of Eq. (4),

one gets

$$\frac{[Y_S]}{[X_S Y]} = \frac{[S] k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}} k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}}{[X_S] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}}. \quad (6)$$

We use $[Y_S]$ as the output of the FCD mechanism. In order to provide FCD, $[Y_S]$ has to be proportional to $[S]/[X_S]$. Under the conditions $[Y] \ll [Y_S] + [X_S Y]$ and $[Y_S] \ll [Y]_0$ (which is equivalent with $[X_S] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} \gg k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}$, $[X_S] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} \gg [S] k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}}$, and $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}} \ll k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}$), Eq. (6) can be approximated by

$$\frac{[Y_S]}{[X_S Y]} \approx \frac{[Y_S]}{[Y]_0}. \quad (7)$$

By substituting Eq. (7) in Eq. (6), it follows that $[Y_S]$ is proportional to $[S]/[X_S]$. Thus, the mechanism provides FCD under the conditions mentioned in this Section.

In short, the presented mechanism provides FCD if

- $k_{X_S}^{\text{off}} \gg [S] k_{X_S}^{\text{on}}$, such that $[S]/[X_S]$ remains invariant under fold-changes in $[S]$;
- $[Y]_0 \ll [X_S]$, such that $X + S \rightleftharpoons X_S$ is unaffected by the reactions involving Y ;
- reactions involving Y equilibrate fast compared to $X + S \rightleftharpoons X_S$, such that the dynamics of the output are determined totally by $S + X \rightleftharpoons X_S$;
- $[X_S] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} \gg k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}$, $[X_S] k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} \gg [S] k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}}$ and $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}} \ll k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}$, such that $[Y_S]/[X_S Y]$ is proportional to $[S]/[X_S]$.

B. Conditions for FCD

In order to show that the mechanism can provide FCD when the conditions (a-d) are satisfied, the mechanism properties are checked against the conditions that are sufficient for FCD [9]. A mechanism, with input u , internal variable x and output y , described by

$$\dot{x} = f(x, y, u), \quad (8)$$

$$\dot{y} = g(x, y, u), \quad (9)$$

provides FCD if

$$f(px, y, pu) = p f(x, y, u), \quad (10)$$

$$g(px, y, pu) = g(x, y, u), \quad (11)$$

for any $p > 0$. The dynamics of the mechanism, as described in this paper, can be described in terms of $[S]$, $[Y_S]$ and $[X_S]$. In the FCD regime $[X]$ is given by $[X]_0 - [X_S]$, by condition (b). By condition (d), $[Y] \ll [Y_S]$, $[X_S Y]$ and hence $[X_S Y] = [Y]_0 - [Y_S]$. Consider the substitutions

$$u \rightarrow [S], \quad (12)$$

$$y \rightarrow [Y_S], \quad (13)$$

$$x \rightarrow [X_S], \quad (14)$$




FIG. 2. Mean-field concentrations for initial conditions $[S] = 10\text{nM}$, $[X]_0 = 1\mu\text{M}$, $[Y]_0 = 10\text{nM}$, $k_{X_S}^{\text{on}} = 10^6\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_{X_S}^{\text{off}} = 1\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}} = 10^{10}\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}} = 100\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} = 10^{10}\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, and $k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}} = 5\text{s}^{-1}$ as a function of time. Concentrations that are not mentioned are zero initially. The system is equilibrated before $t = 0\text{s}$. The input S fold-changes at $t_0 = 5\text{s}$ and $t_0 = 10\text{s}$ by a factor $\alpha = 3$. Note the logarithmic scale in the upper plot.

such that $f \rightarrow \dot{[X_S]}$ and $g \rightarrow \dot{[Y_S]}$. From (2) and condition (a), it follows that, in the FCD limit,

$$\dot{[X_S]} = [S][X]_0 k_{X_S}^{\text{on}} - [X_S]k_{X_S}^{\text{off}}, \quad (15)$$

which satisfies condition (10). By substituting Eq. (7) in Eq. (6) and using that reactions involving Y are in a quasi-equilibrium, it follows that

$$\dot{[Y_S]} \sim \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{[S]}{[X_S]} \right), \quad (16)$$

which satisfies condition (11). Since both conditions (10) and (11) are satisfied in the FCD regime (conditions (a-b)), it follows that the mechanism can provide FCD.

C. Mean-field FCD

What is the response of the mechanism to a fold-change? Let the input concentration $[S]$ be given by

$$[S] = \begin{cases} [S]_0 & (t < t_0), \\ \alpha \times [S]_0 & (t \geq t_0), \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

where $[S]_0$ is the initial concentration, α is the fold-change, and t_0 the time at which the input fold-changes. By substituting Eq. (7) in Eq. (6) and using Eq. (3), one can see that the equilibrium value of $[Y_S]$, denoted by $[\tilde{Y}_S]$, is given by

$$[\tilde{Y}_S] = \frac{[Y]_0 k_{X_S}^{\text{off}} k_{Y_S}^{\text{on}} k_{X_S Y}^{\text{off}}}{[X]_0 k_{X_S}^{\text{on}} k_{X_S Y}^{\text{on}} k_{Y_S}^{\text{off}}}, \quad (18)$$

and that the amplitude of the response, $\max([Y_S] - [\tilde{Y}_S])$, for a fold-change by a factor α is given by $(\alpha - 1) \times [\tilde{Y}_S]$.

The response is characterized by a raising and a decay timescale. By evaluating $\dot{[X_S]}$ at $t = t_0$, one can show that the decay timescale τ_d is given by

$$\tau_d = [(\alpha - 1) k_{X_S}^{\text{off}}]^{-1}, \quad (19)$$

which can take values less than a second for biologically relevant parameters, as discussed in the next Section. The raising timescale is, by condition (c), much smaller than the decay timescale.

Fig. 2 shows an example of mean-field values $[S]$, $[X]$, $[X_S]$, $[Y]$, $[Y_S]$, and $[X_S Y]$ as a function of time for an input given by Eq. (17) with two fold-changes with $\alpha = 3$ at $t_0 = 5\text{s}$ and $t_0 = 10\text{s}$. The mechanism parameters are given in the caption; the system is equilibrated before $t = 0\text{s}$. One can see that the response, $[Y_S]$, does not depend on the absolute value of the input, $[S]$. For this set of parameters, conditions (a-d) are satisfied approximately, and therefore the mechanism provides FCD. Note that the steady-state output concentration is slightly different before and after the fold-changes since condition (b) is satisfied only approximately. The relevance of the parameter values to biological systems and the robustness to noise are discussed in the next Section.

III. EXAMPLES AND BIOLOGICAL RELEVANCE

It is shown above that the FCD mechanism requires scale separation both for protein-protein and protein-ligand association and dissociation rates and protein concentrations. Affinity constants of protein-protein and ligand-receptor interactions span, over six orders of magnitude the range $10^{-12} - 10^{-6}\text{M}$, association and dissociation rates are typically in the $10^3 - 10^{10}\text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ and $10^{-4} - 10^4\text{s}^{-1}$ range, respectively [14–17]. Protein concentrations typically vary in the range $1 - 10^3\text{nM}$, corresponding to $10^3 - 10^6$ proteins for eukaryotes and $1 - 10^3$




FIG. 3. Mean-field solution (blue) and simulation (gray) results of $[Y_S]$ as a function of time for the parameters used in Fig. 2. The simulation results in the upper and lower plot correspond to prokaryotes and eukaryotes, respectively. For prokaryotes, 1nM corresponds to 1 protein per cell. The lower plot shows the same result for eukaryotes, where 1nM corresponds to 10^3 proteins per cell.

proteins for prokaryotes per cell [18]. In Fig. 2 it is shown that such a large range of biochemical parameters enables fulfilment of the FCD conditions, still leaving a lot of freedom. This freedom, in principle, can be used to tune the timescale of the detection response.

In order to demonstrate the relevance of the mechanism to biological systems with a finite numbers of protein molecules, we performed a simulation based on the Gillespie algorithm [19]. Fig. 3 shows the simulation results for the parameters, used in Fig. 2. The results are presented for prokaryotes and eukaryotes. For prokaryotes 1M is roughly equivalent to 10^9 molecules per cell; for eukaryotes 1M is roughly equivalent to 10^{12} molecules per cell. As one can see in Fig. 2(a), for prokaryotic cells

the response is too noisy for effective FCD due to finite number statistics. For eukaryotes, the output signal is nearly unaffected by the noise due to large protein numbers, as demonstrated in Fig. 2(b). In this example, the timescales of the initial response is less than a tenth of a second; the decay timescale is approximately 1s.

IV. DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper we describe a new FCD mechanism, based purely on protein-protein and ligand-protein interactions. The mechanism, in contrast to previously proposed mechanisms [8, 10], does not require continuous transcription, translation and degradation of proteins. The mechanism avoids transcriptional bursts and other noise sources due to small number bottleneck processes [11], and benefits from typically large numbers of proteins in eukaryotic cells.

We find that for eukaryotes, the noise due to finite number statistics does not play a significant role. However, for prokaryotes, the typical protein number is not sufficient for a precise FCD on a single cell level. Previously proposed mechanisms are relatively consuming, since the number of proteins has to be large and their lifetime has to be short in order to reduce detection noise and enable a fast response. From this perspective, the mechanism proposed here is advantageous, since it is acting in detailed balance before and well after the transient detection response [20].

We showed that the mechanism is characterized by a response timescale τ_d given by Eq. (19). The value of τ_d , in principle, is limited only by diffusion of proteins [15]. Thus, as shown in the example, presented in Fig. 3, it can be smaller than a second for a biologically relevant set of parameters.

We expect that the proposed mechanism is only a single example of a large class of biochemical fold-change detectors, based purely on ligand-protein and protein-protein interactions.

-
- [1] J. Ferrell, *Mol. Cell* **36**, 724 (2009).
[2] E. Weber, *E.H. Weber On The Tactile Senses* (Psychology Press, 1996).
[3] Y. Hart, A. Mayo, O. Shoval, and U. Alon, *PLoS ONE* **8**, e57455 (2013).
[4] L. Goentoro and M. Kirschner, *Mol. Cell* **36**, 872 (2009).
[5] M. D. Lazova, T. Ahmed, D. Bellomo, R. Stocker, and T. S. Shimizu, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 13870 (2011).
[6] H. Kimura, K. Sugaya, and P. Cook, *J. Cell Biol.* **159**, 777 (2002).
[7] M. Lazova, T. Ahmed, D. Bellomo, R. Stocker, and T. Shimizu, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **108**, 13870 (2011).
[8] L. Goentoro, O. Shoval, M. Kirschner, and U. Alon, *Mol. Cell* **36**, 894 (2009).
[9] O. Shoval, L. G. Y. Hart, A. Mayo, E. Sontag, and U. Alon, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **107**, 15995 (2010).
[10] T. Marquez-Lago and A. Leier, *BMC Systems Biology* **5**, 22 (2011).
[11] J. Raser and E. O'Shea, *Science* **309**, 2010 (2005).
[12] H. Schröder, U. Friese, M. Bachmann, T. Zaubitzer, and W. Müller, *European journal of biochemistry/FEBS* **181**, 149 (1989).
[13] U. Alon, *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits* (Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2006).
[14] P. Bongrand, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **62**, 921 (1999).
[15] E. Levy and J. Pereira-Leal, *Current Opinion in Structural Biology* **18**, 349 (2008).
[16] R. Alsallaq and H.-X. Zhou, *Proteins: Structure, Func-*

- tion, and Bioinformatics **71**, 320 (2008).
- [17] G. Schreiber, G. Haran, and H. Zhou, ChemInform **40**, (2009).
- [18] R. Milo, P. Jorgensen, U. Moran, G. Weber, and M. Springer, Nucl. Acid. Res. **38**, D750 (2010).
- [19] D. T. Gillespie, The Journal of Physical Chemistry **81**, 2340 (1977).
- [20] G. Lan, P. Sartori, S. Neumann, V. Sourjik, and Y. Tu, Nat Phys **8**, 422 (2012).