

Cell size regulation induces sustained oscillations in the population growth rate

Farshid Jafarpour

*University of Pennsylvania Department of Physics & Astronomy,
209 South 33rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6396*

(Dated: December 12, 2018)

We study the effect of correlations in generation times on the dynamics of population growth of microorganisms. We show that any non-zero correlation that is due to cell-size regulation, no matter how small, induces long-term oscillations in the population growth rate. The population only reaches its steady state when we include the often-neglected variability in the growth rates of individual cells. We discover that the relaxation time scale of the population to its steady state is determined by the distribution of single-cell growth rates and is surprisingly independent of details of the division process such as the noise in the timing of division and the mechanism of cell-size regulation. We validate the predictions of our model using existing experimental data and propose an experimental method to measure single-cell growth variability by observing how long it takes for the population to reach its steady state or balanced growth.

Most of us have first cousins that are more or less our age, but the ages of our more distant cousins are more broadly distributed. The difference arises due to the larger number of generations since our last common ancestor with our more distant cousins. The noise in the generation times adds up over generations, giving rise to wider distributions of ages. The number of generations it takes for the descendants of an individual to sufficiently mix in age to be statistically indistinguishable from the rest of the population is inversely related to the variability in the generation times [1].

Here, we show that this problem is very different in the context of single cellular organisms due to the interaction between cell size and generation time. Many single cellular organisms grow exponentially in size before division [2–9]. If a cell grows for a longer time than expected before it divides, its daughter cells will be larger at birth and have to compensate for their sizes by dividing slightly earlier than expected. Otherwise, the noise in the generation times would accumulate over generations in the size of the cells, leading to extremely large cells [10]. This compensation for the error in the generation times not only suppresses the accumulation of noise in cell sizes, but also prevents the accumulation of noise in the distribution of ages over generations and keeps the division times synchronized (see Fig. 1). Given this observation, it is natural to ask what sets the time scale for a population of microorganisms to desynchronize and reach its steady state.

In this Letter, we study the dynamics of population growth of microorganisms starting from a single cell. We show that the correlations induced by the cell-size control mechanism, no matter how small, significantly delay the relaxation of the population to its steady state. We observe transient oscillations in the growth rate of the number of cells in the population. These oscillations are sustained by the mother-daughter correlations and decay due to the competing effect of small variations in the single cell growth rates. We discover that the sin-

gle cell growth rate distribution completely determines the timescale for the relaxation of the population to its steady state as well as the steady state population growth rate irrespective of the details of cell division process and cell-size control mechanism.

The distribution of single-cell growth rates is a major evolutionary trait contributing to the fitness of an organism [11–13]. It has been recently shown that the steady-state growth rate of a population can be found from the distribution of single-cell growth rates [14, 15]. Since the population growth rate is easier to measure than the single cell growth rate distribution, it would be desirable to go in the reverse direction. We provide a relationship between the decay rate of the oscillations in the growth rate of the population and the distribution of single-cell growth rates. This relationship can be used in combination with steady-state results to estimate the growth rate distribution by observing the growth of a population as it relaxes to its steady state. We validate this prediction using the existing single cells data from the “mother machine” experiment from Ref. [2].




FIG. 1. Lineage tree of populations starting from a single cell. (left) In the absence of cell size control, the division times (circular markers) become less synchronized over time due to the accumulation of noise in their generation times. (right) The division times of cells with cell size control stay synchronized due to correlations in the generation times of mother and daughter cells.

Theoretical Model: We use a model introduced in Ref. [10], where cells grow exponentially in size with growth rate κ . Each cell with birth size v_b attempts to divide after its size reaches a target size $v_d = f(v_b)$. We assume a time additive¹ noise ξ in the division process with zero mean and variance σ_ξ^2 such that the generation time τ is given by

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_d}{v_b} \right) + \xi. \quad (1)$$

The function $f(v_b)$ determines the cell-size control mechanism. In the presence of cell-size control, the sequence of initial sizes, $v_b^{n+1} = f(v_b^n)/2$ has a fixed point Δ , and the distribution of initial cell sizes is sharply peaked around Δ . Therefore, all reasonable functions f that are equivalent to linear order near Δ describe approximately the same dynamics. The one parameter family of functions $f(v_b) = 2\Delta^\alpha v_b^{1-\alpha}$, with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ qualitatively captures the full range of behavior for this model and interpolates² between two extremes [10, 16]. The case $\alpha = 0$, known as the timer model, has no cell size control where cells attempt to divide after a period of time independent of their size. Successive generation times in this case are uncorrelated with variance σ_ξ^2 while the variance of the cell size distribution is known to diverge at long time [10]. The case $\alpha = 1$ is known as the sizer model where cells attempt to divide when they reach the size 2Δ independent of their history [17]. The variance in the generation times in this case is given by $2\sigma_\xi^2$. Experimental data support a value of α closer to $1/2$ for many organisms, where cells attempt to divide when they approximately add a constant size Δ to their original size [3, 6, 9, 10, 18–23]. For $\alpha > 0$, the generation times of mother and daughter cells are correlated with Pearson correlation coefficient $C_{MD} = -\alpha/2$ [14], and variance of the generation time is given by $2\sigma_\xi^2/(2 - \alpha)$.

Transient Oscillations in the Absence of Cell-Size Control: In the absence of cell-size control ($\alpha = 0$), the correlation between the division times of mother and daughter cells is zero and the dynamics of the age distribution (the distribution of time since last division) decouples from the size distribution. This case and its generalization to




FIG. 2. Log-scale plot of the expected value of the rate of change of the number of cells in a population starting with a single cell, calculated analytically (red solid curve) and compared with simulation (blue circles). The rate of change of the number of cells can be written as the sum of the division rates (parabolic dashed lines) of all generations (see Eq. (3)). (Top) In the absence of cell size control, $\alpha = 0$, the distribution of division times of higher generations get wider and start to overlap, damping out the oscillations in the growth rate. (Bottom) In the presence of even a small cell size control, $\alpha = 0.1$, the distribution of successive division times quickly approach a steady state distribution with a finite variance (see Eq. (5)) leading to the persistence of oscillations in the growth of the population. The distribution of timing of the 7th and 18th generations are highlighted in both cases for comparison.

asymmetric division are studied in Ref. [1]. For a population starting from a single cell, the timing of the n th division, t_n , is given by

$$t_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \tau_i = n\bar{\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\tau} = \ln(2)/\kappa$ is the cell-size doubling time. The distribution of t_n has the mean $n\bar{\tau}$ and the variance $n\sigma_\xi^2$. Because the distribution of generation times is often peaked sharply around its mean, the growth in the number of cells happens in bursts of synchronized divisions around the times $\langle t_n \rangle = n\bar{\tau}$, leading to oscillating behavior in the growth rate and the traveling waves in the age-distribution [1]. As the noise in the division process accumulates in successive division events, the division bursts widen and start to overlap, and as a result, the population starts to desynchronize and the age-distribution relaxes to its steady state (see the top panel of Fig. 2).

Sustained Oscillations in the Presence of Cell-Size Control: Now we consider the general case of non-zero α and show that the accumulation of noise is suppressed due to the negative correlation induced by the cell size

¹ Realistically, this noise would be multiplicative. For small noise, the multiplicative factor can be evaluated at the expected value leading to an additive noise. One could argue that it is more natural to use a size-additive noise since cells control the timing of their division based on their size. Simulations results (not shown here) indicate that the dynamics is not affected if we use size-additive noise instead.

² If we linearize f around its fixed point Δ , we obtain $f(v_b) \approx 2\alpha\Delta + 2(1 - \alpha)v_b$ which is a linear interpolation between the timer and the sizer model. This convenient nonlinear form simplifies analytical calculations while leaving the simulation results virtually unchanged. This is due to the narrow distribution of v_b around the fixed point Δ .

control³ leading to the persistence of the oscillations in the growth rate and traveling waves in the age-structure of the population at long time. In this case, the timing of the n th generation division can be written as $t_n = n\bar{\tau} + \delta t_n$ where δt_n s are random variables with probability density $g_n(\delta t)$. We have derived the following recursive relationship for g_n (See the Supplemental Material (SM) [24] for the derivation)

$$g_n(\delta t) = \int g_{n-1}(\delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \alpha\delta t) d\delta\tau, \quad (3)$$

where f_ξ is the probability density function of ξ . Now, the expected value of the rate of change in the total number of cells in the population can be written as a sum over the division rates (number of cells produced in each generation multiplied by the division time distribution) of all the generations

$$\frac{dN}{dt} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^n g_n(t - n\bar{\tau}). \quad (4)$$

The width of the distribution of δt is the key to understanding the sustained oscillations. For $\alpha = 0$, the integral in Eq. (3) becomes a convolution leading to the accumulation of the noise at each generation. For $\alpha = 1$, the distribution of δt is given by f_ξ independent of the generation number n . The cells in this case do not desynchronize at later generations and the change in the population is characterized by periodic bursts of divisions at regular intervals. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, the variance of the division time at the n th generation is found using Eq. (3) to be

$$\text{var}(t_n) = \sigma_\xi^2 \frac{1 - (1-\alpha)^{2n}}{\alpha(2-\alpha)}. \quad (5)$$

For $\alpha > 0$, the successive division time distributions approach a limiting distribution with the finite variance $\sigma_\xi^2/\alpha(2-\alpha)$, leading to periodic bursts of divisions and oscillatory behavior. Here, we have made no assumption about the distribution of the noise ξ in the timing of the division process except that it has a finite variance. For a more concrete example, let us consider a Gaussian form for f_ξ ⁴. In this case, using Eq. (3), we are able to show that the g_n s are also Gaussian distributed with the variance given in Eq. (5). Figure 2 shows the comparison




FIG. 3. Oscillations in the population growth rate decay exponentially due to the stochasticity in growth rates of individual cells. The solid red line is the exponential fit used in Fig. 4, the horizontal dashed red line is the steady-state value of the population growth rate, and vertical dashed lines are the expected values of successive division times where the population growth rate peaks. Simulation parameters: $\alpha = 0.5$, $\sigma_\xi = 0.1$, $\bar{\kappa} = \ln(2)$, and $\sigma_\kappa = 0.07\bar{\kappa}$.

of these analytical results with the numerical simulations for two cases of no cell size control, $\alpha = 0$, and a small cell size control, $\alpha = 0.1$.

As shown in Ref. [1] the synchronized bursts of division and oscillations in the population growth rate are associated with traveling waves in the age distribution. Since sizes of cells grow exponentially with their age, the traveling waves in the age distribution induce similar waves in the size distribution of the population which can be used as an alternative method to detect these oscillations.

Stochastic Growth Rate: In practice, a population of uncoupled cells cannot maintain synchronized division for infinite time and the oscillations in the growth rates have to decay as the population relaxes to its steady-state age distribution. In order to capture this relaxation and estimate its time scale, we need to include multiple sources of noise in our model. There are at least two other sources of stochasticity in the growth and division of cells: (1) small variability in the growth rate of the individual cells from one generation to another and (2) random asymmetry in the division plane of otherwise symmetrically dividing cells. In many symmetrically dividing organisms, the coefficient of variation (CV, the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean) of the single-cell growth rate, κ , is significantly larger than that of the division ratio (DR, the ratio of the size of the daughter cell to that of its mother cell). For example in *E. coli*, the CV of DR is between 0.02 and 0.06 [3, 9, 25] while the CV of single cell growth rate is reported to be between 0.06 and 0.20 depending on the growth condition [14, 26–28]. Here we consider organisms in which the stochasticity in the DR can be neglected. The case with stochastic DR is studied in SM [24]. Since κ has a narrow symmetric distribution around its mean $\bar{\kappa}$ [28], its distribution can be estimated as a Gaussian with some variance σ_κ^2 . Furthermore, unlike the correlation in the generation times, the correlation between the growth rate of mother and daughter cells can be negligible depending on the organ-

³ Negative correlations between the generation times of mother and daughter cells that are not due to cell size control are not sufficient to sustain these oscillations. This can be seen by considering a model in which a negative correlation is artificially imposed on the generation times by setting $\tau_{i+1} = \bar{\tau} - \alpha(\tau_i - \bar{\tau}) + \xi_i$ independent of the size of the cell. In this model, for all values of $\alpha > 0$, the accumulation of the noise is only partially suppressed and the oscillations decay at long time.

⁴ We assume the variance is small enough so that τ does not become negative

ism and the growth condition [2, 29] and are ignored in this model.

Figure 3 shows the population growth rate, $k \equiv d \ln(N)/dt$, in a simulation of the model described above, where now the growth rate of each cell is independently chosen from a Gaussian distribution with the mean $\bar{\kappa} = \ln(2)$ and CV of 0.07 (time is measured in the unit of $\bar{\tau} = \ln(2)/\bar{\kappa}$). We observe that oscillations in the population growth rate decay exponentially at long time until the growth rate approaches a steady state value. This value is given by the unique k satisfying the equation

$$\left\langle \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{k/\kappa} \right\rangle_{\kappa} \equiv \int_0^{\infty} \rho(\kappa) 2^{-k/\kappa} d\kappa = \frac{1}{2} \quad (6)$$

where $\rho(\kappa)$ is the distribution of single-cell growth rates. This relationship is obtained from Powell's relationship for population growth rate in the absence of correlations [30], by replacing the distribution of generation times with the distribution of cell size doubling times. This can be done because the noise in the timing of division does not play a role in the population growth rate in the presence of cell size control [14] (see SM [24] for comparison to simulation). In Eq. (6), ρ is the distribution along a lineage (or equivalently over the entire population tree) which is distinct from the instantaneous population distribution [14, 31, 32]. Since the slow-growing cells have longer generation times, they are overrepresented in the population at any given time, and therefore, the population growth rate is always slightly smaller than $\bar{\kappa}$ ⁵. For a narrow distribution, the population growth rate can be approximated in terms of $\bar{\kappa}$ and σ_{κ} [15]

$$k \approx \bar{\kappa} - \left(1 - \frac{\ln(2)}{2} \right) \frac{\sigma_{\kappa}^2}{\bar{\kappa}}. \quad (7)$$

We have a total of five independent variables in our model: α , σ_{ξ} , σ_{κ} , Δ , and $\bar{\tau} = \ln(2)/\bar{\kappa}$. Time and size can be measured in units of $\bar{\tau}$ and Δ , respectively. Figure 4 shows the dependence of the rate of decay of the oscillations of the population growth rate on all of the remaining model parameters α , σ_{ξ} , and σ_{κ} . Surprisingly, this decay rate is completely independent of the mechanism of cell size control, α (with the exception of the single point $\alpha = 0$), and is also independent of the noise in the timing of the division process, σ_{ξ} . It is proportional to the variance of the single-cell growth rate distribution, σ_{κ}^2 . An experimental measurement of this decay rate in the oscillations of population growth rate




FIG. 4. Simulation results for the decay rate of oscillations in the population growth rate shown as functions of σ_{κ} , σ_{ξ} , and α : (top) decay rate increases linearly with the variance of single-cell growth rate distribution, σ_{κ}^2 (the red solid line is a parabolic fit; inset is the log-log plot with linear fit); (middle) the noise in the division process has no effect on the damping of the oscillations in the population growth rate; (bottom) the mechanism for cell-size control does not affect the decay rate either as long as there is a nonzero cell-size control, $\alpha \neq 0$. Time is measured in units of $\bar{\tau}$. Simulation parameters: (top) $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\sigma_{\xi} = 0.1\bar{\tau}$, (middle) $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\sigma_{\kappa} = 0.07\bar{\kappa}$, and (bottom) $\sigma_{\xi} = 0.1\bar{\tau}$ and $\sigma_{\kappa} = 0.07\bar{\kappa}$.

using cell counting techniques can provide the width of the single-cell growth rate distribution.

Conclusion: For nearly a century, microbiologists have been concerned with the relationship between statistical observables of single cells and the properties of their populations [21, 30, 33–37]. Recent advances in single cell tracking technology have led to a surge of renewed interest in this field [2, 38–43]. On one hand, the details of the mechanism of cell size control that allows populations to maintain a narrow distribution of cell sizes [35, 44–51] has become the topic of an intense debate over the past few years [3, 6, 10, 16, 27, 52–56]. On the other hand, the relationship between the stochasticity in the generation times of microorganisms and the growth of their populations has gained recent attention [1, 28, 31, 32, 57–59]. There are two distinct sources of stochasticity in generation times: the noise in the cellular growth and the noise in the division process. We claim that only the former plays a role in the growth and relaxation rates of the population, while cell size control is precisely the process of canceling out the latter over the course of a few genera-

⁵ This argument fails if the growth rates of mother and daughter cells are highly correlated, in which case the fast-growing cells reproduce faster and can in principle compensate for their underrepresentation in the population depending on the strength of the correlation. See Ref. [15] for a more detailed discussion.

tions. As a result, both the time it takes for a population to reach its steady state and the steady-state population growth rate is only affected by the portion of noise in the generation times that is due to the variability in the single cell growth rates and not the stochasticity in the timing of cell division.

The distribution of single-cell growth rates is a major evolutionary trait contributing to the fitness of an organism. It fully determines the steady state population growth rate irrespective of the details of cell division process including both the noise in the timing of division and the details of cell size control mechanism [14, 15]. Here, we have provided a relationship between the dynamics of population growth rate and the distribution of single-cell growth rates. We have shown that a population starting from a single cell shows sustained oscillations in population growth due to the correlations induced by the cell size control mechanism. The timescale for the decay of these oscillations is only dependent on the single-cell growth rate distribution. As seen in Fig. 3, for a realistic value of single-cell growth rate variability, oscillations can be observed for as long as 40 generations. A test tube culture of *E. coli* starting from a single cell begins to saturate after about 30 generations ($\sim 10^9$ cells/ml) making these oscillations visible at any time during the exponential growth phase⁶. This allows the measurement of both the steady state population growth rate k and the decay rate λ . From Fig. 4, the decay rate λ is approximately given by $\lambda \approx 29 \sigma_{\kappa}^2 / \bar{\kappa}$ which combined with Eq. (7) provides both the mean and the variance of single-cell growth rates, $\bar{\kappa}$ and σ_{κ}^2 . This method for measuring the variability in single-cell growth rates is significantly easier and less biased than the direct single cell measurement. See SM [24] for the validation of this method using the existing single-cell data from the “mother machine” experiment from Ref. [2].

FJ gratefully acknowledges Andrea Liu, Randall Kamien, Nigel Goldenfeld, Hillel Aharoni, Jason Rocks, and Helen Ansell for their comments on the manuscript and Suckjoon Jun and Sattar Taheri-Araghi for generously sharing their data.

[1] Farshid Jafarpour, Charles S Wright, Herman Gudjonson, Jedidiah Riebling, Emma Dawson, Klevin Lo, Aretha Fiebig, Sean Crosson, Aaron R Dinner, and Srividya Iyer-Biswas, “Bridging the timescales of single-cell

and population dynamics,” *Physical Review X* **8**, 021007 (2018).

- [2] Ping Wang, Lydia Robert, James Pelletier, Wei Lien Dang, Francois Taddei, Andrew Wright, and Suckjoon Jun, “Robust growth of *escherichia coli*,” *Current biology* **20**, 1099–1103 (2010).
- [3] Manuel Campos, Ivan V Surovtsev, Setsu Kato, Ahmad Paintdakhi, Bruno Beltran, Sarah E Ebmeier, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner, “A constant size extension drives bacterial cell size homeostasis,” *Cell* **159**, 1433–1446 (2014).
- [4] Srividya Iyer-Biswas, Charles S Wright, Jonathan T Henry, Klevin Lo, Stanislav Burov, Yihan Lin, Gavin E Crooks, Sean Crosson, Aaron R Dinner, and Norbert F Scherer, “Scaling laws governing stochastic growth and division of single bacterial cells,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**, 15912–15917 (2014).
- [5] Srividya Iyer-Biswas, Gavin E Crooks, Norbert F Scherer, and Aaron R Dinner, “Universality in stochastic exponential growth,” *Physical review letters* **113**, 028101 (2014).
- [6] Sattar Taheri-Araghi, Serena Bradde, John T Sauls, Norbert S Hill, Petra Anne Levin, Johan Paulsson, Massimo Vergassola, and Suckjoon Jun, “Cell-size control and homeostasis in bacteria,” *Current Biology* **25**, 385–391 (2015).
- [7] Dan Pirjol, Farshid Jafarpour, and Srividya Iyer-Biswas, “Phenomenology of stochastic exponential growth,” *Physical Review E* **95**, 062406 (2017).
- [8] Stefano Di Talia, Jan M Skotheim, James M Bean, Eric D Siggia, and Frederick R Cross, “The effects of molecular noise and size control on variability in the budding yeast cell cycle,” *Nature* **448**, 947 (2007).
- [9] Ye-Jin Eun, Po-Yi Ho, Minjeong Kim, Salvatore LaRussa, Lydia Robert, Lars D Renner, Amy Schmid, Ethan Garner, and Ariel Amir, “Archaeal cells share common size control with bacteria despite noisier growth and division,” *Nature microbiology* **3**, 148 (2018).
- [10] Ariel Amir, “Cell size regulation in bacteria,” *Physical Review Letters* **112**, 208102 (2014).
- [11] Daniele De Martino, Fabrizio Capuani, and Andrea De Martino, “Growth against entropy in bacterial metabolism: the phenotypic trade-off behind empirical growth rate distributions in *e. coli*,” *Physical biology* **13**, 036005 (2016).
- [12] Takashi Nozoe, Edo Kussell, and Yuichi Wakamoto, “Inferring fitness landscapes and selection on phenotypic states from single-cell genealogical data,” *PLoS genetics* **13**, e1006653 (2017).
- [13] Lydia Robert, Jean Ollion, Jerome Robert, Xiaohu Song, Ivan Matic, and Marina Elez, “Mutation dynamics and fitness effects followed in single cells,” *Science* **359**, 1283–1286 (2018).
- [14] Jie Lin and Ariel Amir, “The effects of stochasticity at the single-cell level and cell size control on the population growth,” *Cell systems* **5**, 358–367 (2017).
- [15] Jie Lin and Ariel Amir, “Population growth with correlated generation times at the single-cell level,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.02818* (2018).
- [16] Po-Yi Ho, Jie Lin, and Ariel Amir, “Modeling cell size regulation: From single-cell-level statistics to molecular mechanisms and population-level effects,” *Annual review of biophysics* **47**, 251–271 (2018).
- [17] Odo Diekmann, HA Lauwerier, T Aldenberg, and JAJ

⁶ These oscillations are hidden to the optical density measurements which provide a proxy for the total mass of the population. Cell counting techniques should be used instead to detect these oscillations.

- Metz, “Growth, fission and the stable size distribution,” *Journal of mathematical biology* **18**, 135–148 (1983).
- [18] Suckjoon Jun and Sattar Taheri-Araghi, “Cell-size maintenance: universal strategy revealed,” *Trends in microbiology* **23**, 4–6 (2015).
- [19] John T Sauls, Dongyang Li, and Suckjoon Jun, “Adder and a coarse-grained approach to cell size homeostasis in bacteria,” *Current opinion in cell biology* **38**, 38–44 (2016).
- [20] Michelle M Logsdon, Po-Yi Ho, Kadamba Pavinasasundaram, Kirill Richardson, Murat Cokol, Christopher M Sasseti, Ariel Amir, and Bree B Aldridge, “A parallel adder coordinates mycobacterial cell-cycle progression and cell-size homeostasis in the context of asymmetric growth and organization,” *Current Biology* **27**, 3367–3374 (2017).
- [21] Suckjoon Jun, Fangwei Si, Rami Pugatch, and Matthew Scott, “Fundamental principles in bacterial physiology-history, recent progress, and the future with focus on cell size control: a review,” *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 056601 (2018).
- [22] Shiladitya Banerjee, Klevin Lo, Matthew K Daddysman, Alan Selewa, Thomas Kuntz, Aaron R Dinner, and Norbert F Scherer, “Biphasic growth dynamics control cell division in *caulobacter crescentus*,” *Nature microbiology* **2**, 17116 (2017).
- [23] Fangwei Si, Guillaume Le Treut, John T Sauls, Stephen Vadia, Petra Anne Levin, and Suckjoon Jun, “Mechanistic origin of cell-size control and homeostasis in bacteria,” *bioRxiv*, 478818 (2018).
- [24] See Supplemental Material for the experimental validation of the model with existing data, the derivation of Eq. (3), analysis of the model with stochastic division ratio, and the analysis of steady state population growth rate.
- [25] Jonathan M Guberman, Allison Fay, Jonathan Dworkin, Ned S Wingreen, and Zemer Gitai, “Psicic: noise and asymmetry in bacterial division revealed by computational image analysis at sub-pixel resolution,” *PLoS computational biology* **4**, e1000233 (2008).
- [26] Nathan Cermak, Selim Olcum, Francisco Feijó Delgado, Steven C Wasserman, Kristofor R Payer, Mark A Murakami, Scott M Knudsen, Robert J Kimmerling, Mark M Stevens, Yuki Kikuchi, *et al.*, “High-throughput measurement of single-cell growth rates using serial microfluidic mass sensor arrays,” *Nature biotechnology* **34**, 1052 (2016).
- [27] Mats Wallden, David Fange, Ebba Gregorsson Lundius, Özden Baltekin, and Johan Elf, “The synchronization of replication and division cycles in individual *e. coli* cells,” *Cell* **166**, 729–739 (2016).
- [28] Andrew S Kennard, Matteo Osella, Avelino Javer, Jacopo Grilli, Philippe Nghe, Sander J Tans, Pietro Cicutta, and Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, “Individuality and universality in the growth-division laws of single *e. coli* cells,” *Physical Review E* **93**, 012408 (2016).
- [29] Jacopo Grilli, Clotilde Cadart, Gabriele Micali, Matteo Osella, and Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, “The empirical fluctuation pattern of *e. coli* division control,” *Frontiers in microbiology* **9** (2018).
- [30] EO Powell, “Growth rate and generation time of bacteria, with special reference to continuous culture,” *Microbiology* **15**, 492–511 (1956).
- [31] Nash D Rochman, Dan M Popescu, and Sean X Sun, “Ergodicity, hidden bias and the growth rate gain,” *Physical biology* **15**, 036006 (2018).
- [32] Lee Susman, Maryam Kohram, Harsh Vashistha, Jeffrey T Nechleba, Hanna Salman, and Naama Brenner, “Individuality and slow dynamics in bacterial growth homeostasis,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201615526 (2018).
- [33] AG M’Kendrick, “Applications of mathematics to medical problems,” *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society* **44**, 98–130 (1925).
- [34] H Von Foerster and F Stohman, “The kinetics of cellular proliferation,” *Grune & Stratton* **3** (1959).
- [35] PR Painter and AG Marr, “Mathematics of microbial populations,” *Annual Reviews in Microbiology* **22**, 519–548 (1968).
- [36] Benoît Perthame, *Transport equations in biology* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2006).
- [37] Andrew Rubin and Galina Riznichenko, *Mathematical biophysics* (Springer, 2016).
- [38] Yuichi Wakamoto, Jeremy Ramsden, and Kenji Yasuda, “Single-cell growth and division dynamics showing epigenetic correlations,” *Analyst* **130**, 311–317 (2005).
- [39] Dan Siegal-Gaskins and Sean Crosson, “Tightly regulated and heritable division control in single bacterial cells,” *Biophysical Journal* **95**, 2063–2072 (2008).
- [40] Oleksii Sliusarenko, Jennifer Heinritz, Thierry Emonet, and Christine Jacobs-Wagner, “High-throughput, sub-pixel precision analysis of bacterial morphogenesis and intracellular spatio-temporal dynamics,” *Molecular microbiology* **80**, 612–627 (2011).
- [41] Jonathan W Young, James CW Locke, Alphan Altinok, Nitzan Rosenfeld, Tigran Bacarian, Peter S Swain, Eric Mjolsness, and Michael B Elowitz, “Measuring single-cell gene expression dynamics in bacteria using fluorescence time-lapse microscopy,” *Nature protocols* **7**, 80 (2012).
- [42] Hanna Salman, Naama Brenner, Chih-kuan Tung, Noa Elyahu, Elad Stolovicki, Lindsay Moore, Albert Libchaber, and Erez Braun, “Universal protein fluctuations in populations of microorganisms,” *Physical review letters* **108**, 238105 (2012).
- [43] Guillaume Lambert and Edo Kussell, “Quantifying selective pressures driving bacterial evolution using lineage analysis,” *Physical review X* **5**, 011016 (2015).
- [44] M Schaechter, Joan P Williamson, JR Hood Jun, and Arthur L Koch, “Growth, cell and nuclear divisions in some bacteria,” *Microbiology* **29**, 421–434 (1962).
- [45] AL Koch and M Schaechter, “A model for statistics of the cell division process,” *Microbiology* **29**, 435–454 (1962).
- [46] EC Anderson, GI Bell, DF Petersen, and RA Tobey, “Cell growth and division: Iv. determination of volume growth rate and division probability,” *Biophysical journal* **9**, 246 (1969).
- [47] Peter A Fantes, WD Grant, RH Pritchard, PE Sudbery, and AE Wheals, “The regulation of cell size and the control of mitosis,” *Journal of theoretical biology* **50**, 213–244 (1975).
- [48] Paul Jorgensen and Mike Tyers, “How cells coordinate growth and division,” *Current Biology* **14**, R1014–R1027 (2004).
- [49] An-Chun Chien, Norbert S Hill, and Petra Anne Levin, “Cell size control in bacteria,” *Current biology* **22**, R340–R349 (2012).
- [50] Jonathan J Turner, Jennifer C Ewald, and Jan M

- Skotheim, “Cell size control in yeast,” *Current biology* **22**, R350–R359 (2012).
- [51] Alison C Lloyd, “The regulation of cell size,” *Cell* **154**, 1194–1205 (2013).
- [52] Matteo Osella, Eileen Nugent, and Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, “Concerted control of escherichia coli cell division,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201313715 (2014).
- [53] Lydia Robert, Marc Hoffmann, Nathalie Krell, Stéphane Aymerich, Jérôme Robert, and Marie Doumic, “Division in escherichia coli is triggered by a size-sensing rather than a timing mechanism,” *BMC biology* **12**, 17 (2014).
- [54] Andrew Marantan and Ariel Amir, “Stochastic modeling of cell growth with symmetric or asymmetric division,” *Physical Review E* **94**, 012405 (2016).
- [55] Jacopo Grilli, Matteo Osella, Andrew S Kennard, and Marco Cosentino Lagomarsino, “Relevant parameters in models of cell division control,” *Physical Review E* **95**, 032411 (2017).
- [56] Clotilde Cadart, Sylvain Monnier, Jacopo Grilli, Pablo J Sáez, Nishit Srivastava, Rafaele Attia, Emmanuel Terriac, Buzz Baum, Marco Cosentino-Lagomarsino, and Matthieu Piel, “Size control in mammalian cells involves modulation of both growth rate and cell cycle duration,” *Nature communications* **9**, 3275 (2018).
- [57] Mikihiro Hashimoto, Takashi Nozoe, Hidenori Nakaoka, Reiko Okura, Sayo Akiyoshi, Kunihiko Kaneko, Edo Kussell, and Yuichi Wakamoto, “Noise-driven growth rate gain in clonal cellular populations,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**, 3251–3256 (2016).
- [58] Bram Cerulus, Aaron M New, Ksenia Pougach, and Kevin J Verstrepen, “Noise and epigenetic inheritance of single-cell division times influence population fitness,” *Current Biology* **26**, 1138–1147 (2016).
- [59] Enrico Gavagnin, Matthew J Ford, Richard L Mort, Tim Rogers, and Christian A Yates, “The invasion speed of cell migration models with realistic cell cycle time distributions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.03140* (2018).

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Division time distribution

Let us start with a new-born cell of size $v_0 = \Delta$ (average sized cell) at time $t = 0$. Our goal is to find the probability density $g_n(v_b, \delta t)$ of an n th generation daughter cell being born with the size $v_n = v_b$ at time $t_n = n\bar{\tau} + \delta t$, where $\bar{\tau} \equiv \ln(2)/\kappa$ is the doubling time. Using $v_n = v_{n-1}e^{\kappa\tau_n}/2$ and $t_n = t_{n-1} + \tau_n$, we can derive a recursive relationship for g . Here τ_n is given by

$$\tau_n = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_d(v_{n-1})}{v_{n-1}} \right) + \xi_n = \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{2\Delta^\alpha}{v_{n-1}^\alpha} \right) + \xi_n \quad (\text{S1})$$

with the probability density

$$f_\tau(\tau|v_b) = f_\xi \left(\tau - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{2\Delta^\alpha}{v_b^\alpha} \right) \right). \quad (\text{S2})$$

For an n th generation cell to be born at time $t_n = n\bar{\tau} + \delta t$ with size $v_n = v_b$ given the n th generation time $\tau_n = \tau$, the $(n-1)$ st generation mother cell must have been born with the size $v_{n-1} = 2v_b e^{-\kappa\tau}$ at time $t_{n-1} = n\bar{\tau} + \delta t - \tau = (n-1)\bar{\tau} + (\delta t + \bar{\tau} - \tau)$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(v_b, \delta t) &= \int \int g_{n-1}(v_{n-1}, \delta t + \bar{\tau} - \tau) f_\tau(\tau|v_{n-1}) \delta(v_b - v_{n-1}e^{\kappa\tau}/2) dv_{n-1} d\tau \\ &= \int 2e^{-\kappa\tau} g_{n-1}(2v_b e^{-\kappa\tau}, \delta t + \bar{\tau} - \tau) f_\xi \left(\underbrace{(1-\alpha)(\tau - \bar{\tau})}_{\delta\tau} + \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_b}{\Delta} \right) \right) d\tau \\ &= \int e^{-\kappa\delta\tau} g_{n-1}(v_b e^{-\kappa\delta\tau}, \delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi \left((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_b}{\Delta} \right) \right) d\delta\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S3})$$

Next, we show that g_n has the form $g_n(v_b, \delta t) = \delta(v_b - v_0 e^{\kappa\delta t}) \tilde{g}_n(\delta t)$. The initial condition $g_0(v_b, \delta t) = \delta(\delta t)\delta(v_b - v_0)$ satisfies this form. By induction, it is enough to show that g_{n-1} satisfying this form implies that g_n also satisfies this form:

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(v_b, \delta t) &= \int e^{-\kappa\delta\tau} g_{n-1}(v_b e^{-\kappa\delta\tau}, \delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi \left((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_b}{\Delta} \right) \right) d\delta\tau \\ &= \int e^{-\kappa\delta\tau} \delta(v_b e^{-\kappa\delta\tau} - v_0 e^{\kappa(\delta t - \delta\tau)}) \tilde{g}_{n-1}(\delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi \left((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{v_b}{\Delta} \right) \right) d\delta\tau \\ &= \delta(v_b - v_0 e^{\kappa\delta t}) \underbrace{\int \tilde{g}_{n-1}(\delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \alpha\delta t) d\delta\tau}_{\tilde{g}_n(\delta t)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S4})$$

Now, we have the recursive relationship (dropping the tildes)

$$g_n(\delta t) = \int g_{n-1}(\delta t - \delta\tau) f_\xi((1-\alpha)\delta\tau + \alpha\delta t) d\delta\tau \quad (\text{S5})$$

for the distributions g_n of the deviation δt from the expected timing of n th division. This relationship is derived starting with a new-born cell of size Δ at time $t = 0$. A cell larger (smaller) than Δ is expected to have an n th division time earlier (later) than $n\bar{\tau}$. Redefining δt such that $t_n = n\bar{\tau} - \alpha \ln(v_0/\Delta)/\kappa + \delta t$ would yield the same recursive relationship for the distribution of δt starting with an arbitrary initial size v_0 .

Effect of noise in the division ratio on the decay rate of the oscillations

Let us define the division ratio r to be the ratio of the size of a daughter cell to that of its mother cell right before division. For a symmetrically dividing organism, it has the average $\bar{r} = 0.5$. The variance σ_r^2 of r is typically much smaller than that of the single-cell growth rate, and therefore, it was neglected in the discussion in the main text. However, this variance could vary for different organisms and different growth conditions. To compute the effect of random variations in the division ratio on the decay rate of the oscillations, we take advantage of the main conclusion of the paper, that is the variables α and σ_ξ do not play a role on the relaxation time of the population. Using these results, we can evaluate the effect of noise in division ratio on the relaxation rate for the simplest case of $\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma_\xi = 0$ and compare the predictions with simulations with realistic values of α and σ_ξ .

For the simple case of $\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma_\xi = 0$, each cell divides precisely when its size reaches the final size of 2Δ . The size of the new born cell is given by $2r\Delta$. If r is different from $\bar{r} = 1/2$ due to noise in division, the new born cell will be slightly different in size compared to the average cell and divide with slightly different generation time τ . However, this has the exact same effect on the desynchronization of the population as if the cell would divide symmetrically but had the same delay in its next generation due to a small noise in its growth rate κ instead. We already know how much noise in κ affects the relaxation rate, so if we compute how much of noise δr in r gives rise to the same amount change $\delta\tau$ that is due to some noise $\delta\kappa$ in κ , then we know how the variability in r affects the relaxation rate λ .

The generation time from Eq. (1) of the main text for this case simplifies to $\tau = -\ln(r)/\kappa$. The relative change in the generation time, $\delta\tau/\bar{\tau}$, due to a small deviation $\delta\kappa$ in κ is given by $\delta\tau/\bar{\tau} = -\delta\kappa/\bar{\kappa}$. Similarly, the relative change in the generation time due to the a small change δr in r is given by $\delta\tau/\bar{\tau} = \delta r/(\bar{r} \ln(\bar{r}))$. In the absence of variability in division ratio, the relaxation time is given by $\lambda/\bar{\kappa} = C (\sigma_\kappa^2/\bar{\kappa}^2)$ (see Fig. 4 of the main text). The above argument suggest that the relaxation time with the stochastic division ratio should be given by

$$\frac{\lambda}{\bar{\kappa}} = C \left(\frac{\sigma_\kappa^2}{\bar{\kappa}^2} + \frac{\sigma_r^2}{(\bar{r} \ln(\bar{r}))^2} \right) = C \left(\frac{\sigma_\kappa^2}{\bar{\kappa}^2} + \frac{4\sigma_r^2}{\ln^2(2)} \right). \quad (\text{S6})$$

The constant C was measured in simulations in the main text and has the value $C \approx 29$. Figure S1 compares this prediction with simulation results with realistic values of α and σ_ξ showing that this relationship indeed holds independent of α and σ_ξ .




FIG. S1. Simulation results (markers) for the effect of variability in the division ratio on the decay rate of the oscillations compared with prediction from Eq. (S6) (no fitting parameter, the value of C is taken from the fit to $\sigma_r = 0$ case from Fig. 4 of the main text). Simulation parameters: $\bar{\tau} = 1$, $\alpha = 0.5$, $\sigma_\xi = 0.1\bar{\tau}$, $\sigma_\kappa \in \{0, 0.07\bar{\kappa}\}$, and $\sigma_r \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04\}$.

Relationship between the steady-state population growth rate and single-cell growth rate distribution

There is a well-known equation by Powell [30] for the relationship between the growth rate of the population and the distribution of the generation times, assuming that the generation times are not correlated. This equations reads:

$$\int_0^{\infty} f_{\tau}(\tau)e^{-k\tau} d\tau = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (\text{S7})$$

where f_{τ} is the probability density function of the generation times τ . Similar to the previous section, we can use the main results of the paper that α and σ_{ξ} do not play a role in the dynamics of the population growth rate to simplify the problem. We can set $\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma_{\xi} = 0$ and find the relationship between the population growth rate and the distribution of single-cell growth rates and confirm with simulations that it indeed holds for other value of α and σ_{ξ} . At this limit, the generation time τ is given by $\ln(2)/\kappa$ and the generation times of mother and daughter cells are uncorrelated, and therefore, Powell's relationship applies. Moreover, we have $f_{\tau}(\tau)d\tau = \rho(\kappa)d\kappa$. Therefore, Powell's relationship simplifies to

$$\int_0^{\infty} \rho(\kappa)e^{-\ln(2)\frac{k}{\kappa}} d\kappa = \int_0^{\infty} \rho(\kappa)2^{-\frac{k}{\kappa}} d\kappa \equiv \left\langle \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{k/\kappa} \right\rangle_{\kappa} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

We test the prediction of this relationship for two classes of growth rate distributions, gamma distribution and inverse gamma distribution. For both of these distribution, it can be shown through a scaling argument of Eq. (S8) that the ratio $k/\bar{\kappa}$ is only a function of $\sigma_{\kappa}/\bar{\kappa}$. Equation (S8) can be numerically solved to find these relationships. Figure S2 compares this functional dependence predicted from Eq. (S8) to its values obtained by simulation. Both parameters α and σ_{ξ} are varied along with σ_{κ} to show that they do not play a role in the value of the population growth rate k .




FIG. S2. Predicted dependence of the population growth rate k on the distribution of single-cell growth rates κ for two classes of distributions, gamma distribution (solid blue line) and inverse gamma distribution (dashed black line) compared with simulation results (markers). The values of σ_{ξ} and α are changed along with σ_{κ} for the gamma and inverse gamma distributions, respectively, to show that they do not affect the of population growth rate.

Experimental verification on single-cell data from the “mother machine” experiment [2]

Although we are not aware of any experimental data directly measuring the dynamics of the growth rate of a population starting from a single cell, we can confirm the predictions of our model on an ensemble of single-cell lineages as are measured in the “mother machine” experiment [2] (data courtesy of Suckjoon Jun’s group). We use the data on the growth and divisions of long lineages of the wild-type strains of *Escherichia coli* MG1655 only keeping track of the cells inheriting the old pole (see Ref. [2] for details). The data set includes 113 cells with at least 36 generations. If we synchronize the first division of each cell and histogram the division events over time, the division times of cells desynchronize after a couple of generations (see the left panel of Fig. S3). This is not surprising; the cells are not descendants of the same cell, and in particular, the first generation cells do not have the same size. However, as discussed in the last paragraph of Section A, if a cell is born with a size v_0 different from the average size Δ , the




FIG. S3. Histogram of the timing of successive divisions for an ensemble of cells. After each division, only the cell inheriting the old pole is kept in the population. (Left) The time for each lineage (first generation cell and all of its progenies) was shifted so that the first division for all the lineages take place at time zero. Different lineages become desynchronized after a few generations due to the difference in initial cell sizes. (Right) The time is shifted for each lineage by $+\alpha \ln(v_0/\Delta)/\kappa$ based on the initial size of the first generation cell v_0 to recover the sustained oscillations analogous to the oscillation in the growth rate of a population starting from a single cell. The data is taken from Ref. [2].

expected value of its division times at long time get shifted by $-\alpha \ln(v_0/\Delta)/\kappa$. To test this prediction, we can shift back the time for each lineage by $+\alpha \ln(v_0/\Delta)/\kappa$ based on the initial size of its first generation and recompute the histograms. As shown in the right panel of Fig. S3, after this shift, the division times of the cells stay synchronized for a long time.

The rate at which the division times of different cells become desynchronized should determine the variance of the single-cell growth rate distribution. We find this rate by fitting an exponentially decaying sine curve to the histogram of the division times at long time as shown in Fig. S4. The measured decay rate was found to be $\lambda \approx (0.22 \pm 0.04) \text{ hour}^{-1}$. The mean of single-cell growth rates was measured to be $\bar{\kappa} = (1.840 \pm 0.001) \text{ hour}^{-1}$. The predicted standard deviation of single-cell growth rates is found to be

$$\sigma_{\kappa, \text{predicted}} = \sqrt{\bar{\kappa} \lambda / C} = (0.12 \pm 0.01) \text{ hour}^{-1}, \quad (\text{S9})$$

which is in an excellent agreement with the direct measurement of sample standard deviation, $\sigma_{\kappa, \text{measured}} = 0.135 \text{ hour}^{-1}$. The value of C in Eq. (S9) is taken from the simulation fit in the main text, $C \approx 29$. The measured and predicted coefficients of variation of single-cell growth rates are $CV_{\text{measured}} = 0.073$ and $CV_{\text{predicted}} = 0.064 \pm 0.006$. Single-cell growth rates are measured by linear fits to the logarithm of cell lengths as functions of time. Fits with R^2 less than 0.98 were excluded.

In the absence of the feedback from cell-size control, the oscillations would decay much more rapidly, and $\sigma_{\kappa, \text{predicted}}$ calculated from the decay rate using Eq. (S9) would be much larger than the sample standard deviation of single-cell growth rates. However, in our case, $\sigma_{\kappa, \text{predicted}}$ is slightly smaller than the direct sample measurement. Note that the sample standard deviation is biased due to measurement error and is always slightly higher than the actual standard deviation (for large samples), and therefore, we believe the value predicted from the decay rate is more accurate than the sample standard deviation.




FIG. S4. Decaying sinusoidal fit to the long-time dynamics of division rates of the ensemble discussed in Fig. S3. The decay rate of these oscillations is measure to be $\lambda \approx (0.22 \pm 0.04) \text{ hour}^{-1}$ which determines the variability in single-cell growth rates of $\sigma_{\kappa} = (0.12 \pm 0.01) \text{ hour}^{-1}$ compared to direct measurement of the sample standard deviation $\sigma_{\kappa} = 0.135 \text{ hour}^{-1}$.