

# Phenotype Selection due to Mutational Robustness

Macoto Kikuchi (菊池誠)\*

*Cybermedia center, Osaka University,  
Toyonaka 560-0043, Japan*

*and*

*Department of Physics, Osaka University,  
Toyonaka 560-0043, Japan*

(Dated: December 12, 2023)

Darwinian evolution gives rise not only to the adaptation to the environment but also to the enhancement of the robustness against mutation. Suppose more than one phenotypes share the same fitness value. We expect that some phenotypes are hardly selected as a consequence of the selection bias for mutational robustness. We investigated this phenotype selection for a model of gene regulatory networks (GRNs). We constructed the randomly generated set of GRNs using the multicanonical Monte Carlo method and compared it to the outcomes of evolutionary simulations. The results suggest that the mutationally least robust phenotype is suppressed in evolution.

Living systems have developed through Darwinian evolution, a process in which a genotype changes so that the phenotype fits the environmental conditions. This process consists of the repetition of a mutation of genotype and a selection of individuals. This mutation-selection mechanism of evolution not only gives rise to the adaptation to the environment; it also causes a selection bias in evolution. One of the best-known such biases is the bias for mutational robustness.[1–3]

Mutational robustness is a characteristic trait of living systems that they do not readily lose their functionality by a genotype mutation. The fact that the existing organisms possess this trait can be confirmed experimentally, in particular for microorganisms, by the comprehensive gene knock-out or rewiring of the gene regulatory networks.[4–7] However, how such robustness has developed through evolution is difficult to investigate by experiments. Thus, theoretical studies or computational experiments provide indispensable information. A theory based on population dynamics has shown that mutational robustness evolves in neutral evolution.[8] Since this selection of mutationally robust genotypes is a selection irrespective of fitness, it is called “second-order”.[2] The second-order selection is considered to enhance the evolvability in the cases of non-neutral evolution because the mutationally robust genotypes have a higher possibility of having offspring with high fitness.

We note here the usage of the word “fitness.” Conventionally, fitness is defined based on the number of offspring, and the effects of all the selection biases are taken into account. In this letter, however, we define fitness by a value calculated from a specific fitness function and consider selection biases separately.

Suppose that more than one phenotypes take similar values of fitness. Their robustness distributions of the corresponding genotypes should be different in general. Thus, we expect that the second-order selection affects

the appearance probabilities of these phenotypes; phenotypes with relatively robust genotypes will be favored in evolution; in contrast, phenotypes with relatively fragile genotypes will be suppressed. We expect this phenotype selection that originates from the difference in mutational robustness of genotypes to occur in general situations in evolution. In this letter, we deal with a model of the gene regulatory networks (GRNs) as an example and investigate the enhancement of mutational robustness in evolution and the phenotype selection induced by the robustness using computational methods.

We usually conduct evolutionary simulations (ES) to investigate Darwinian evolution numerically. However, ES alone is not enough for discussing selection biases in evolution because the outcomes of ESs already involve the effects of the selection biases. For exploring characteristic properties of evolution, we need a reference to compare with ES. In the case of GRNs, an appropriate reference system is a randomly generated set of GRNs. If there is no selection bias, properties of evolutionary obtained GRNs should coincide with that of GRNs picked up from this set having the same fitness. Ciliberti *et al.* conducted a random sampling of GRNs in a different context to investigate the structure of the neutral space.[9, 10] However, simple random sampling does not work for the present purpose because GRNs with high fitness are rare. Thus, we need some rare-event sampling method. We have proposed to use the multicanonical Monte Carlo (McMC) method for this purpose.

McMC has been proposed originally for investigating phase transitions of spin systems.[11, 12] In those cases, McMC enables us to sample energy evenly in its entire range. After that, it has been recognized that McMC can also be used for rare-event sampling of non-physical systems by regarding any quantity as energy.[13] Counting the number of large magic squares is an example.[14] It was used to investigate biological networks by Saito and the author.[15] Nagata and the author applied it to GRNs by regarding fitness as energy.[16] In this case, McMC enables us to sample GRNs evenly in the entire range of fitness. The method of comparing the outcomes

---

\* kikuchi.macoto.cmc@osaka-u.ac.jp

of ES and the reference set obtained by McMC has been proposed by Kaneko and the author.[17]. A comparison of ES and McMC was conducted recently also to discuss the evolution of the genetic code.[18]

In a previous paper, we showed for a model of GRN that the mutational robustness is enhanced by evolution, and the appearance of bistability is delayed.[17] These two phenomena are related to each other; our analysis suggested that the reason for the delay in the appearance of bistability was attributed to the fact that the bistable GRNs were less mutationally robust than the monostable GRNs. In this letter, we further explore this phenomenon of phenotype selection due to mutational robustness in a clearer manner.

Many genes regulate their expressions each other in living cells and form complex networks called gene regulatory networks (GRNs). We employ an abstract connectionist-type model of GRNs, in which we express a GRN by a directed graph, ignoring the details of gene expression.[16, 19–27] The nodes represent genes, and the edges represent the regulatory interactions. Hereafter, we consider one-in-one-out GRNs that have one input gene that accepts the input signal from the outside world and one output gene that expresses the target protein. In the present study, we restrict ourselves to GRNs with the number of nodes  $N = 40$  and the number of edges  $K = 120$ .

For this network model, we assume the following discrete-time dynamics:

$$x_i(t+1) = R \left( I\delta_{i,0} + \sum_j J_{ij}x_j(t) \right), \quad (1)$$

$$R(y) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta(y-\mu)}}, \quad (2)$$

where  $x_i(t)$  represents the expression level of  $i$ -th gene ( $x_i \in [0, 1]$ ) at  $t$ -th time step and  $J_{ij}$  is the matrix element representing the regulation from  $j$ -th gene to  $i$ -th gene. Each element of  $J_{ij}$  can take one of three values, 0 and  $\pm 1$ ;  $J_{ij} = 0$  means there is no regulation, and  $+1$  is activation and  $-1$  is repression. Self-regulations (the diagonal elements of  $J_{ij}$ ) are permitted.  $I$  is the input signal imposed only on the input gene (0-th gene), which is in the range  $[0, 1]$ .  $R(y)$  is a sigmoidal response function including two parameters  $\beta$  and  $\mu$ . Throughout this study, we set the values  $\beta = 2.0$  and  $\mu = 0.424$ , corresponding to the spontaneous expression of each gene being 0.3.

Next, we define the fitness function, which is different from the one used in the previous papers.[16, 17] For a given GRN, we first set  $I = 0$  and set all  $x_i$  at the spontaneous expression level as the initial state. Then, we run the dynamics until the steady state is reached. Let us write the expression level of the output gene at the steady state for input level  $I$  as  $x_{out}(I)$ . Thus, the output of this first steady state is  $x_{out}(0)$ . Note that  $x_{out}(I)$  depends on the initial state. Next, we change the input value to  $I = 1$  without changing the expression

levels. We run the dynamics again until the new steady state is reached. The output then is  $x_{out}(1)$ . We define the fitness function as the difference between these two output values:

$$f = x_{out}(1) - x_{out}(0). \quad (3)$$

Namely, we require that the output level of the steady state for  $I = 0$  is as low as possible and that for  $I = 1$  is as high as possible. Using the steady state of  $I = 0$  as the initial state for  $I = 1$  is important, and the value of  $f$  reflects this history. If  $f$  becomes negative, we regard  $f = 0$ .

By investigating the stability of each GRN using the procedure described below, we found that GRNs with the following three distinct stabilities appear at high fitness:[28] (1) Monostable: When  $I$  is increased quasi-statically from 0 to 1 and then decreased quasi-statically from 1 to 0,  $x_{out}(I)$  follows the same trace in both upward and downward change. (2) Toggle switch: A Hysteresis appears in some range of  $I$  between upward and downward change. (3) One-way switch:  $x_{out}(0)$  does not return to the initial value and keeps a high value after the downward change. In terms of dynamical systems, the change in the input signal induces a transition between two fixed points for the bistability to occur. In the case of the toggle switch, the saddle-node bifurcations take place twice in the range of input. In contrast, the saddle-node bifurcation takes place only once in the allowed range of the input in the case of the one-way switch, and thus the transition between two fixed points is irreversible.

The one-way switches of GRNs realize irreversible changes in the cell states in living cells and are relevant to processes such as cell maturations and cell differentiations; an example is the maturation of *Xenopus* oocytes.[29] Although each fixed point of GRN corresponds to a cell state in living systems, in this letter, we regard these three distinguishable stabilities as three phenotypes for discussing phenotype selection. An important point is that these three phenotypes appear at the same fitness value in some range of fitness.

Details of the McMC method applying to GRNs are described in Ref. [16, 17]. We divided  $f \in [0, 1]$  into 100 bins and determined the corresponding weights by the Wang-Landau method.[30, 31] Precisely speaking, we used the entropic sampling method, which is a variant of McMC.[32] From the statistical physics point of view, we can say that we assume the law of equal probability and construct the microcanonical ensemble for each fitness value. GRNs in each bin are sampled with the same probability by this method. To generate a candidate network for the new state, we employed a single-edge rewiring procedure, that is, a cutting of an existing edge selected randomly followed by an addition of a new edge to a non-connected node pair also selected randomly. With the definition of a Monte Carlo step (MCS) by  $K$  Monte Carlo trials, we conducted 16 independent runs of  $1.25 \times 10^6$  MCS and 32 independent runs of  $2.5 \times 10^6$  MCS resulting in  $10^8$  MCS in total. To re-

duce the correlation between the successive samples, we sampled GRNs at every 20 MCS.

We conducted two types of ES: one was the zero-temperature ES, and another was the finite-temperature stochastic ES. We call them ES0 and EST, respectively. In both methods, the population size was 1000, and the initial population was the randomly-generated set of GRNs. In ES0, 500 GRNs from the highest fitness were preserved at each generation; Then, their copies were produced, and each copy was subjected to a point mutation. We employed the single-edge rewiring procedure described above as the point mutation. Since a long run of this method eventually resulted in extraordinary high fitness, we stopped the simulation at the 150th generation. We picked up the GRN of the highest fitness level at the 150th generation and followed back its ancestors to obtain a single lineage. We conducted 48000 independent runs and obtained 48000 lineages. The GRNs were classified by fitness into 100 bins as in the case of McMC. Even a short simulation of 150 generations achieved very high fitness. This type of simulation provides information on the transient process of evolution.

Since it cannot be distinguished by ES0 whether the selection bias is intrinsic in evolution or is a historical effect of a transient process, it is desirable to study the steady state of evolution. For that purpose, we employed the following simple stochastic method in EST: First, we introduced the “evolutionary temperature”  $\beta$ . At each generation, each GRN was assigned a value  $P = e^{\beta f} \times r$ , where  $r$  is a uniform random number in  $[0, 1]$ . 500 GRNs from the highest value of  $P$  were preserved, and their copies were subjected to the point mutation similarly to ES0. We found that this simulation reached a steady state soon. We conducted five independent runs of  $10^6$  generations and sampled 500 GRNs from the highest fitness at every 100 generations. After checking the fitness distribution of the steady state in preliminary runs, we set  $\beta = 0.4$ . Since only GRNs in a limited range of fitness appeared by EST, we will show only data for bins from  $f \in [0.85, 0.86]$  to  $[0.93, 0.94]$  among 100 bins in the following section.

GRNs obtained by McMC or ES were classified into phenotypes, that is, stabilities, by the following procedures: For a given GRN, we first set all the expression level  $x_i$  as the spontaneous expression level and set  $I = 0$ ; we ran the dynamics until the steady state was reached. Then, keeping the steady state values of  $x_i$ 's, we increased  $I$  by 0.05 and ran the dynamics again until the new steady state was reached. The procedure was repeated up to  $I = 1$ . We recorded the trajectory of  $x_{out}$  in this upward change. Next, using the steady state of  $I = 1$  as the initial state, we repeated the similar procedure inversely from  $I = 1$  to 0 to obtain the trajectory of the downward change. If the differences between two trajectories at all the values of  $I$  were less than  $10^{-6}$ , we regarded the GRN as monostable. If the differences larger than  $10^{-6}$  were observed for some intermediate range, we classified the GRN as the toggle switch. if the

difference in  $x_{out}$  at  $I = 0$  for the start and the end was larger than  $10^{-6}$ , the GRN was classified as the one-way switch. Although this classification scheme is not rigorous, it works practically.

We evaluated the mutational robustness of a given GRN by counting the essential edges. An essential edge is defined as the edge that the fitness drops significantly when cut. The fewer essential edges the GRN has, the more mutationally robust it is. We set the threshold of essentiality as 0.5; that is, when fitness became less than 0.5 by the cut, the edge was regarded as essential. This definition is valid for GRNs with much larger  $f$  than 0.5. We tried all the 120 possible single-edge cuts for a GRN and counted the essential edges.

Figure 1(a)-(c) show the appearance probability of the three phenotypes obtained by the three methods. The sum of the probabilities for the three phenotypes for each bin of fitness is 1 for each simulation method. The results of McMC represent the ratios that the three phenotypes should appear if selection bias is absent. Most GRNs are monostable at low fitness; The toggle switches increase as fitness, and finally, the one-way switches start to appear. The appearance probabilities of the three phenotypes differ significantly for evolution from those for McMC. Since most GRNs in the bin  $f \in [0.99, 1]$  obtained by ES0 exhibit extraordinarily high fitness, we show GRNs only of  $f \in [0.99, 0.991]$ . The appearance probabilities of the monostable GRNs obtained by ES0 are high up to large values of  $f$  compared to McMC; This tendency is more significant for EST. It suggests that the ratio of monostable GRNs increases in evolution until the steady state is reached. The appearance of the toggle switches is delayed in evolution compared to McMC, and this tendency is more significant for EST than for ES0. The case of the one-way switches is impressive. Seeing the result of McMC, the one-way switches dominate at high fitness in the absence of the selection bias. They are suppressed by evolution, as is seen for ES0 and EST. In particular, in the steady state of evolution (EST), the appearance of the one-way switches is strongly suppressed in the observed range. Thus, the one-way switches are not favored in evolution.

To investigate the origin of the above selection bias, we counted the essential edges for obtained GRNs. Figure 2(a) shows the probability distributions  $P(N_e)$  of number of the essential edges  $N_e$  for GRNs obtained by McMC in  $f \in [0.9, 0.91]$ . The distributions are normalized so that the sum for each phenotype is 1. The monostable GRNs have the least essential edges. Then, the toggle switches. The number distribution for the one-way switches exhibits a long tail to the large value of  $N_e$ . The largest number of essential edges for the one-way switches observed in the present result was 110. In other words, the one-way switches include GRNs such that more than 90% of the edges are essential. We plot the same probability distributions obtained by EST in Figure 2(b). The result is significantly different from that of McMC; the distributions are strongly biased to-




FIG. 1. The appearance probabilities  $P$  obtained by three methods for  $f \in [0.9, 0.91]$ : (a) Monostable (b) Toggle switch (c) One-way switch. The circles, the slanted crosses, and the squares indicate McMC, ES0, and EST, respectively.  $P$  for the three stabilities for each bin sum as 1 for each method. The error bars indicate three times the standard error.

ward small values of  $N_e$  for all three phenotypes. In the case of the one-way switches, the largest number of the essential edges observed was 70. Therefore, the evolution favors mutationally robust GRNs.

We compare the essential edge distributions of three phenotypes for McMC, ES0, and EST in Fig.3(a)-(c). The fitness range is again  $f \in [0.9, 0.91]$ . In contrast to Fig 3, they are normalized so that the sum for all three phenotypes is 1. While the ratio of the monostable GRNs increases by evolution, the essential edge distribution does not change significantly compared with McMC. In the case of the toggle switches, the distribution shifts toward small number of essential edges from McMC to ES0 and from ES0 to EST. The one-way switches exhibit a remarkable change; GRNs with many essential edges decrease largely in ES0 compared to McMC. The distribution becomes significantly different for EST, in which only GRNs with small numbers of essential edges remain.




FIG. 2. The probability distributions  $P(N_e)$  of the number of essential edges  $N_e$  for the three phenotypes for  $f \in [0.9, 0.91]$ : (a) McMC (b) EST. The circles, the slanted crosses, and the squares indicate monostable, the toggle switches, and the one-way switches, respectively.  $P(N_e)$  for each phenotype sum as 1. The error bars indicate three times the standard error.

To summarize, the results presented in this letter suggest that the one-way switches are hardly selected in evolution because mutationally robust GRNs are favored. This scenario of the phenotype selection was confirmed by comparing the outcomes of the multicanonical ensemble method and the steady state of stochastic evolutionary simulations because the steady state does not depend on the evolutionary history. We consider this selection mechanism to be widely valid and not restricted to the case studied in this letter. Since this phenotype selection can occur whenever more than one phenotype exists for the same fitness value, we expect this phenomenon to occur in real living systems. We may call it the third-order selection because it is a consequence of the second-order selection.

Since the second-order selection is a weak effect, the above phenotype selection may be a further weak effect. However, as the present results suggest, the phenomenon may become significant if the steady state of evolution is maintained. Such situations can be realized experimentally. For example, it will be possible for the effect to be observed for bacteria under constant stress. It should be noted that what is the matter is not the absolute strength of mutational robustness but its relative strength. Thus, this phenotype selection can occur even between mutationally not-so-robust phenotypes.

Next, let us consider an implication of the evolution of the model dealt with observed in this letter. The result of McMC shows that most GRNs are monostable at




FIG. 3. The number distribution of the essential edges for three phenotypes obtained by McMC, ES0, and EST. (a) monostable (b) the toggle switches (c) the one-way switches. The circles, the slanted crosses, and the squares indicate McMC, ES0, and EST, respectively. In contrast to Fig. 2, the sum of probabilities for all three phenotypes for each method is normalized to 1. Note that the scales of the vertical axis for the three figures are different. The error bars indicate three times the standard error.

low fitness; then as fitness increases the toggle switches dominate, and eventually most GRNs become one-way switches. A one-way switch of GRN realizes an irreversible change in the cell states. We note that irreversibility was not required in the definition of fitness. Thus, the irreversible switches can emerge even without it being required explicitly as fitness. It suggests the possibility that the irreversibility observed for real cells has evolved from the monostable reversible GRNs.

Finally, the present study demonstrated that McMC is an effective method for investigating characteristic properties of evolution. McMC clarifies what kind of phenotypes can exist if the evolution process is not considered. The fact that the outcomes of McMC and evolutionary simulation differ considerably implies a possibility that some phenotypes are not reached by evolution. Considering the experimental situation, such phenotypes may be accessible by direct genome engineering other than evolutionary experiments. We remark that a similar computational method is applicable in analyzing the learning process of neural networks.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thank Koichi Fujimoto, Olivier C. Martin, Katsuyoshi Matsushita and Hajime Yoshino for their fruitful discussions and suggestions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K03261.

- 
- [1] H. Kitano, Biological robustness, *Nat Rev Genet* **5**, 828 (2004).
- [2] A. Wagner, *Robustness and Evolvability in Living Systems* (Princeton Univ Press, 2005).
- [3] J. Masel and M. L. Siegal, Robustness: mechanisms and consequences, *Trends Genet* **25**, 395 (2009).
- [4] G. Giaever *et al.*, Functional profiling of the *saccharomyces cerevisiae* genome, *Nature* **418**, 387 (2002).
- [5] T. Baba, T. Ara, M. Hasegawa, Y. Takai, Y. Okumura, M. Baba, K. A. Datsenko, M. Tomita, B. L. Wanner, and H. Mori, Construction of *escherichia coli* k-12 in-frame, single-gene knockout mutants: the keio collection, *Mol Syst Biol* **2**, 2006.0008 (2006).
- [6] D. U. Kim *et al.*, Analysis of a genome-wide set of gene deletions in the fission yeast *schizosaccharomyces pombe*, *Nat Biotechnol* **28**, 617 (2010).
- [7] M. Isaran, C. Lemerle, K. Michalodimitrakis, C. Horn, P. Beltrao, E. Raineri, M. Garriga-Canut, and L. Serrano, Evolvability and hierarchy in rewired bacterial gene networks, *Nature* **452**, 840 (2008).
- [8] E. van Nimwegen, J. P. Crutchfield, and M. Huynen, Neutral evolution of mutational robustness, *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **17**, 9716 (1999).
- [9] S. Ciliberti, O. C. Martin, and A. Wagner, Robustness can evolve gradually in complex regulatory gene networks with varying topology, *PLoS Comput Biol* **3**, e15 (2007).
- [10] S. Ciliberti, O. C. Martin, and A. Wagner, Innovation and robustness in complex regulatory gene networks,

- Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **104**, 13591 (2007).
- [11] B. A. Berg and T. Neuhaus, Multicanonical algorithms for first order phase transitions, Phys Lett **B267**, 249 (1991).
- [12] B. A. Berg and T. Neuhaus, Multicanonical ensemble: A new approach to simulate first-order phase transitions, Phys Rev Lett **68**, 9 (1992).
- [13] Y. Iba, N. Saito, and A. Kitajima, Multicanonical mcmc for sampling rare events: an illustrative review, Ann Inst Stat Math **66**, 611 (2014).
- [14] A. Kitajima and M. Kikuchi, Numerous but rare: An exploration of magic squares, PLoS ONE **10**, e0125062 (2015).
- [15] N. Saito and M. Kikuchi, Robustness leads close to the edge of chaos in coupled map networks: toward the understanding of biological networks, New J Phys **15**, 053037 (2013).
- [16] S. Nagata and M. Kikuchi, Emergence of cooperative bistability and robustness of gene regulatory networks, PLoS Comput Biol **16**, e1007969 (2020).
- [17] T. Kaneko and M. Kikuchi, Evolution enhances mutational robustness and suppresses the emergence of a new phenotype: A new computational approach for studying evolution, PLoS Comput Biol **18**, e1009796 (2022).
- [18] Y. Omachi, N. Saito, and C. Furusawa, Rare-event sampling analysis uncovers the fitness landscape of the genetic code, PLoS Comput Biol **19**, e1011034 (2023).
- [19] E. Mjolsness, D. H. Sharp, and J. Reinitz, A connectionist model of development, J Theor Biol **152**, 429 (1991).
- [20] A. Wagner, Evolution of gene networks by gene duplications: A mathematical model and its implications on genome organization, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **91**, 4387 (1994).
- [21] A. Wagner, Does evolutionary plasticity evolve, Evolution **50**, 1008 (1996).
- [22] M. L. Siegal and A. Bergman, Waddington's canalization revisited: developmental stability and evolution, Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **99**, 10528 (2002).
- [23] J. Masel, Genetic assimilation can occur in the absence of selection for the assimilating phenotype, suggesting a role for the canalization heuristic, J Evol Biol **17**, 1106 (2004).
- [24] K. Kaneko, Evolution of robustness to noise and mutation in gene expression dynamics, PLoS one **2**, e434 (2007).
- [25] C. Espinosa-Soto, O. C. Martin, and A. Wagner, Phenotypic robustness can increase phenotypic variability after nongenetic perturbations in gene regulatory circuits, J Evol Biol **24**, 1284 (2011).
- [26] M. Inoue and K. Kaneko, Cooperative adaptive responses in gene regulatory networks with many degrees of freedom, PLoS Comput Biol **9**, e1003001 (2013).
- [27] M. Inoue and K. Kaneko, Cooperative reliable response from sloppy gene-expression dynamics, Eutophys Lett **124**, 38002 (2018).
- [28] J. J. Tyson, K. C. Chen, and B. Novak, Sniffers, buzzers, toggles and blinkers: dynamics of regulatory and signaling pathways in the cell, Curr Opin Cell Biol **15**, 221 (2003).
- [29] J. E. Ferrell and E. M. Machleder, The biochemical bases of an all-or-none cell fate switch in *xenopus* oocytes, Science **280**, 895 (1998).
- [30] F. Wang and D. P. Landau, Efficient, multiple-range random walk algorithm to calculate the density of state, Phys Rev Lett **86**, 2050 (2001).
- [31] F. Wang and D. P. Landau, Determining the density of states for classical statistical models: A random walk algorithm to produce a flat histogram, Phys Rev E **64**, 056101 (2001).
- [32] J. Lee, New monte carlo algorithm: Entropic sampling, Phys Rev Lett **71**, 211 (1993).