

# Optimal Path to Epigenetic Switching

David Marin Roma, Ruadhan A. O'Flanagan, Andrei E. Ruckenstein, and Anirvan M. Sengupta  
*Dept. of Physics and Astronomy and BioMaPS Institute, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854*

Ranjan Mukhopadhyay  
*Dept. of Physics, Clark University, Worcester, MA 01610*

We use large deviation methods to calculate rates of noise-induced transitions between states in multistable genetic networks. We analyze a synthetic biochemical circuit, the toggle switch, and compare the results to those obtained from a numerical solution of the master equation.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Ey 05.70.Ln 82.39.-k

Fluctuations in bio-molecular networks have been the subject of much research activity recently [1]. Studies on noise in gene expression [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], in signal transduction [7] and in biochemical oscillators [8, 9, 10] demonstrated that having a small number of molecules affects, sometimes critically, the behavior of cellular circuits. Stochastic aspects of the genetic switch between lytic and lysogenic developmental strategies of lambda phage infection in *E. coli* were also studied in an influential paper [11], Arkin, Ross and McAdams.

Specific biological behaviors (phenotypes) can be represented as stable attractors in deterministic descriptions of the biochemical dynamics. In this paper, we are concerned with the robustness of such attractors against spontaneous fluctuations. Some of the previous work in this area has modeled the effects of fluctuations by adding gaussian-distributed Langevin forces to the deterministic equations [12, 13]. Although this description is appropriate in describing typical fluctuations when the number of molecules is sufficiently large [2, 4, 6, 7] *rare events* involving occasional large departures from average behavior are outside the scope of the Langevin treatment (Gaussian approximation). In this paper we discuss the *Eikonal* solution to the master equation which provides a correct and physically motivated approach to describing fluctuations in bio-molecular networks. The appealing features of this approximation scheme are that (a) it captures the Poisson nature of large deviations [14]; (b) it incorporates Gaussian behavior in the appropriate limit; and (c) it provides a natural way of treating moderately large systems in cases in which first principles calculations are prohibitive. The Eikonal solution determines the optimal path by which a system switches between possible states and allows us to compute quantitatively the contributions of fluctuations around the optimal path to the rate of switching. We stress that rare fluctuations

naturally lead to strong dependences of rates on control parameters, suggesting that rare but large events may be critical to both the robustness and adaptability of some biological networks to changes in the environment.

The general ideas are developed in the context of the simple example of the toggle switch [15]. This artificially realized switch consists of two genes placed in a high copy plasmid in *E. coli* that repress each others' expression: once expressed, each protein can bind particular DNA sites upstream of the gene which codes for the other protein, thereby repressing its transcription. If we denote the *i*-th protein concentration by  $x_i$ , the deterministic system is described by the equations:

$$\dot{x}_1 = \frac{a_1}{1 + (x_2/K_2)^n} - \frac{x_1}{\tau} \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{x}_2 = \frac{a_2}{1 + (x_1/K_1)^m} - \frac{x_2}{\tau} \quad (2)$$

The constants  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  incorporate all aspects of transcription and translation reactions. the Hill exponents,  $m$  and  $n$ , represent the degree of cooperative binding of proteins to DNA, and  $\tau$  is the protein degradation/dilution rate (assumed equal for the two proteins).  $K_1$  is the effective dissociation constant for binding of protein 1 in the promoter of gene 2.  $K_2$  is the corresponding parameter for protein 2. For some regions of parameter space, the system has three stationary points: two stable ones and a saddle point [15].

For the purposes of this discussion we model the stochastic evolution of the protein concentrations in the system by a birth-death process in which protein  $i$  is made in short lived bursts of size  $b_i$  and proteins are diluted or degraded at a rate  $\tau^{-1}$ . A more detailed description involving proteins and RNA will be published elsewhere. It is worth noting that, while both the burst size  $b_i$  and the RNA production rate show up as parameters in the stochastic modeling only their product,  $a_i$ ,

shows up in the effective deterministic equations (1) for the protein levels.

To compute the rate of transition from one fixed point to the other, we must solve the master equation [16], which describes the time evolution of the probability distribution of protein concentrations. The qualitative behavior of the stationary solution for the bistable system in the presence of rare escapes from one fixed point to another can be described in simple intuitive terms: the solution displays two peaks centered around the stable points. If we start with probability one around one of the stable points, rare transitions lead to a long tail which leaks into the domain of attraction of the other stable point very much the same way in which the probability amplitude extends beyond the classically allowed region in quantum mechanical tunneling through a barrier. This analogy motivates the Eikonal approximation to the solution of the master equation [14]. The master equation is given by,

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t} = \Omega \sum_r [W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x} - \hat{e}/\Omega)P(\mathbf{x} - \hat{e}/\Omega, t) - W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})P(\mathbf{x}, t)] \quad (3)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the volume of the system,  $\hat{e}/\Omega = \Delta\vec{x}$  is the concentration change associated with individual reaction events, the rate of which is given by  $\Omega W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})$ . Assuming that the distribution is quasi-stationary in the region of interest, we consider solutions of the WKB form:

$$P(\mathbf{x}, t) = C \exp[-\Omega S(\mathbf{x})], \quad S(\mathbf{x}_o) = 0. \quad (4)$$

$\mathbf{x}_o$  being the initial stable point. Assuming that the scaled transition rates  $W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})$  are smooth functions of  $\mathbf{x}$ , and expanding  $S$  to first order,  $S(\mathbf{x} - \hat{e}/\Omega) = S(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\hat{e}_i}{\Omega} \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} S(\mathbf{x})$ , we can rewrite (3) as:

$$\frac{\partial P(\mathbf{x}, t)}{\partial t} = H P(\mathbf{x}, t) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{\hat{e}} [W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})(e^{\hat{e} \cdot \mathbf{p}}) - 1] = 0 \quad (6)$$

where  $H$  is the Hamiltonian describing the time evolution of the probability distribution, and we have used the definition  $p_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} S(\mathbf{x})$ . In a subsequent publication, we will show that this Hamiltonian can be obtained from a path integral formulation of the stochastic process. If we expand this hamiltonian in  $\mathbf{p}$  and keep terms up to second order in  $\mathbf{p}$  we recover the gaussian approach used in [12, 13].

The main contribution to the transition probability is obtained by evaluating  $P$  along the trajectory that optimizes the action,  $S$ . From the Hamiltonian from Eq.6 we

derive the equations of motion along the optimal path:

$$\dot{x}_i = \frac{\partial H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})}{\partial p_i} = \sum_{\hat{e}} [\hat{e}_i W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x}) e^{\hat{e} \cdot \mathbf{p} a}] \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{p})}{\partial x_i} = -\sum_{\hat{e}} \left[ \frac{\partial W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} (e^{\hat{e} \cdot \mathbf{p} a} - 1) \right] \quad (8)$$

The optimal path for the transition from one stable point to the other starts near one stable point, proceeds to the saddle point and from there it follows the deterministic trajectory to the other stable point. Thus we must first find solutions of Eqs. 7 and 8 which start at (near) the initial stable point and end at the saddle point. At the stable points we have  $p_1 = p_2 = 0$ , because the end points of the path are fixed, and since  $H$  does not depend on time,  $H = 0$  along the optimal path. This also implies that if the system is at the stable point it will remain there; so the optimal path must instead start at a point very close to but not exactly at the fixed point. The initial conditions for the momentum can be obtained by approximating the probability around the stable point by a gaussian distribution  $P = e^{-S_g}$  with  $S_g = \frac{1}{2} A_{ij} \delta x_i \delta x_j$ . Then for  $H = 0$ ,  $p_i = \frac{\partial S_g}{\partial x_i} = A_{ij} \delta x_j$ , and we expand the equation  $H = 0$  around the stable point to find  $A_{ij}$ . We then use a shooting method [17] to obtain the solution of the boundary value problem. Fig.1 shows the optimal path against the flow of the deterministic equations, for the parameters indicated along with the spread of the gaussian approximation to the probability distribution around the stable point.




FIG. 1: Optimal path for the parameters,  $a_1 = 156$ ,  $a_2 = 30$ ,  $n = 3$ ,  $m = 1$ ,  $K_1 = K_2 = 1$ ,  $b_1 = b_2 = 1$  and  $\tau = 1$ . The  $x$  axis is  $x_1$  and the  $y$  axis is  $x_2$ .

The value of  $S_0$  measures the exponential suppression of rare events. Calculation of the pre-exponential fac-

tor is usually rather involved but it is critical for the quantitative comparison of rates. This issue, closely related to the Kramer escape problem (see, e.g., Ref.[18]), is relevant in many areas of statistical mechanics of non-equilibrium systems and has been extensively studied in many contexts: Langer has developed an approach for systems coupled to a thermal bath [19]. General birth and death processes with one species of particle have been treated in [20] and multidimensional non-equilibrium systems with gaussian noise have been analyzed in [21]. Below we extend and generalize the results in the above mentioned references to the problem at hand.

The pre-exponential factor in the rate arises as a correction due to fluctuations around the optimal path. To calculate these contributions we write the probability in the Eikonal form (4) with an expansion in inverse powers of  $\Omega$ .

$$P(\mathbf{x}, t) = \exp(-\Omega S_0(\mathbf{x}) - S_1(\mathbf{x}) + O(\frac{1}{\Omega})) \quad (9)$$

Expanding the master equation to second order terms, and collecting the coefficients of different powers of  $\Omega$  we derive an equation for  $S_1$ :

$$\sum_{\hat{e}} [W_{\hat{e}} \hat{e}_i \frac{\partial S_1}{\partial x_i} - \frac{W_{\hat{e}}}{2} \hat{e}_i \hat{e}_j \partial_i p_j - \hat{e}_i \partial_i W_{\hat{e}}] e^{\hat{e}_a p_a} = 0 \quad (10)$$

In turn, after using the equations of motion to rewrite the first term as derivative along the optimal path  $x_{op}(t')$ , Eq. (10) can be transformed into:

$$\frac{d}{dt'} S_1 = \sum_{\hat{e}} \frac{1}{2} W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x}) \hat{e}_i \hat{e}_j \frac{\partial p_j}{\partial x_i} e^{\hat{e}_i p_i} + \sum_{\hat{e}} \hat{e}_i \frac{\partial W_{\hat{e}}(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} e^{\hat{e}_i p_i} \quad (11)$$

To proceed we need  $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x_i}$  along the path. From Hamilton's equations (7) it follows that  $\delta p(t)_a = M(t)_{ab} \delta x(t)_b$ , and thus we can use the components of the matrix  $M$  in place of the derivative  $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial x_i}$  in (10). Moreover, (7) also implies that:

$$\delta x^a = \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_a \partial x^i} \delta x^i + \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_a \partial p_i} \delta p_i \quad (12)$$

$$\delta \dot{p}_a = -\frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^a \partial x^i} \delta x^i - \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^a \partial p_i} \delta p_i \quad (13)$$

. Combining this together with the time derivative of  $\delta p(t)$ ,

$$\delta \dot{p} = \dot{M} \delta \mathbf{x} + M \delta \dot{\mathbf{x}} \quad (14)$$

leads to the following set of coupled differential equations for  $M$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_{ab} + M_{ac} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^b \partial p_c} + M_{ac} \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial p_c \partial p_d} M_{db} \\ + \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^a \partial p_c} M_{cb} + \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^a \partial x^b} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

with initial conditions:  $M_{ij}(t=0) = A_{ij}$ . Finally, solving these equations together with (7) allows us to integrate equation (11) to obtain  $S_1$ .

Given the above solution for the transition probability,  $P(x_f, x_o)$ , from the starting stable point,  $x_o$ , to the saddle point,  $x_f$ . we can compute the associated transition rate by using the formula (see Ref. [18]):

$$\text{rate} = \frac{\lambda_+}{2\pi} \left[ \frac{\det A_{fp}}{\det A_{sp}} \right]^{1/2} * P(x_f, x_o), \quad (16)$$

where  $\lambda_+$  is the positive eigenvalue of the matrix describing the linearized equations of motion around the saddle point,  $\det A_{fp}$  and  $\det A_{sp}$  are the determinants of the matrices appearing in the gaussian approximation of the probability distribution in the starting stable point and in the saddle point respectively.

Finally we are in position to discuss the toggle switch example. In this case, we have four  $\hat{e}_i$ -s describing jumps to the right, left, up or down, given by  $b_1 \hat{x}_1, -\hat{x}_1, b_2 \hat{x}_2$ , and  $-\hat{x}_2$ , respectively. The relevant Hamiltonian defined on times long compared to the inverse binding/unbinding rates of proteins at the two promoters is given by:

$$H = \frac{a_1/b_1}{(1 + (x_2/K_1)^n)} (e^{b_1 p_1} - 1) + \frac{x_1}{\tau} (e^{-p_1} - 1) + \frac{a_2/b_2}{(1 + (x_1/K_2)^m)} (e^{b_2 p_2} - 1) + \frac{x_2}{\tau} (e^{-p_2} - 1). \quad (17)$$

As already mentioned above,  $K_{1,2}$  are the effective dissociation constants for binding of proteins 1,2 at the pro-

motor of gene 2,1, respectively,  $b_i$  is the burst size of protein  $i$  and the ratio  $a_i/b_i$  is a measure of the RNA

production rate associated with the transcription of the gene  $i$ . The results of these calculations (Eq.9) are shown in Figure 2.

To extract the values of these parameters for the experimental system, the spontaneous transition rate has to be measured experimentally for more than one conditions. Since this has not yet been done, we will compare the results of the Eikonal approximation to the solution obtained by direct diagonalization of the Hamiltonian (17). For simplicity we will set the parameters  $K_i = 1, b_i = 1$ .

From the form of the master equation (3) it follows that the eigenvalues of  $H$  measure the decay rates of non-stationary states corresponding to eigenvectors of  $H$  with nonzero eigenvalues. The equilibrium state is represented by the “zero mode”, i.e., the eigenvector of  $H$  with zero eigenvalue, the existence of which is guaranteed by the transition matrix character of the Hamiltonian and conservation of probability. To compute the eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian, we write the master equation in discrete form, replacing the continuous concentration variables  $(x_1, x_2)$  with a lattice with lattice parameter  $1/\Omega$ . Although the system displays infinitely many states, typically the gap between the real parts of the eigenvalues for first and second excited states is much larger than the absolute value of the real part of the first eigenvalue. Thus an arbitrary probability distribution will rapidly decay into a linear combination of the stationary state and the first excited state. Equivalently, the state could be described as a linear combination of two states, each representing a quasi-stationary distribution around a stable fixed point. From then on, we can project the evolution to this two state system. If we start with probability  $p_o$  of being in the state  $(1, 0)^T$ , then the Master equation gives:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} p_o \\ p_f \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -r_{12} & r_{21} \\ r_{12} & -r_{21} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p_o \\ p_f \end{pmatrix}$$

The two-by-two effective transition matrix has columns which sum to zero ensuring probability conservation. Also, the trace  $0 + \epsilon_1 = r_{12} + r_{21}$ , where  $\epsilon_1$  is the eigenvalue of the first excited state. Therefore the first excited eigenvalue will be the sum of the forward and backward rates. In the case of the asymmetric systems, one rate is usually far greater than the other. Consequently the larger rate among  $r_{12}$  and  $r_{21}$  will be approximately given by  $\epsilon_1$ , which can be computed numerically using the Lanczos algorithm. For a symmetric choice of parameters for the two proteins, each rate is just  $\epsilon_1/2$ .




FIG. 2: Scaling with volume: estimates from direct computation of eigenvalues are  $S_0 = 2.63$ ,  $S_1 + \ln(\text{pref}) = 4.85$  whereas optimal path calculation gives  $S_0 = 2.47$ ,  $S_1 = 3.5$ ,  $\ln(\text{pref}) = 1.5$ . In this example the backward rate is 1000 times smaller than the forward rate, so the lowest nonzero eigenvalue is very close to the rate of switching.

To explicitly extract the  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  contributions to the rate from the Lanczos results we re-scale the volume of the system  $\Omega \rightarrow \nu\Omega$  which, in turn, leads to a re-scaling of rates of individual reaction events as  $f(x) \rightarrow \nu f(x)$ . As a function of volume scale factor,  $\nu$ , the logarithm of the rate has the form:  $\ln(r) = S_0\nu + b$ , where  $b$  includes both  $S_1$  and the logarithm of the pre-factor of  $P(x_f, x_o)$  in Eq.16. The results and comparison with the Eikonal approximation are shown in Fig.2. The dotted line is a fit to the data points obtained from calculation of the eigenvalues, and we see that the slope and intercept computed from equations 16,9 are in good agreement with these values. Note that in this example  $S_1$  and the pre-factor are significant contributions to the transition rate.

We have performed similar calculations for the “standard” model of the lambda switch [13, 22]. Since we calculate the order one pre-factor accurately, something that has not been done before in this context [13, 23], we are able to provide a quantitative measure of the spontaneous lysis rate. This turns out to be three orders of magnitude higher than the observed rate. In retrospect, it is clear that accounting for the stability of the lysogenic state requires a more complex model which should include the effect of DNA looping [24]. Whether the stability is due to suppression of fluctuation or due to disappearance of the lytic “fixed” point [25] remains an open question.

Optimal path methods are routinely used for study-

ing rare events related to failure of communication networks modeled as birth and death processes [26]. Such large deviation methods are likely to be important in the context of robustness and adaptability of biological networks. This paper illustrates the power of an approach to fluctuations based on the Eikonal approximation to solutions of the master equation. The scheme incorporates

large deviations in a natural way and provides a quantitative approach scalable to large networks. We also hope that beyond being an efficient computational tool, this method will provide further insight into the stability of epigenetic states of complex genetic networks.

Acknowledgement: This work was supported in part by an NIH P20 Grant GM64375.

- 
- [1] C.V. Rao, D.M. Wolf, and A.P. Arkin *Nature* **420**, 237 (2002). Erratum in: *Nature* **421**, 190 (2003).
- [2] T.B. Kepler and T.C. Elston, *Biophys. J.* **81**, 3116 (2001).
- [3] M. Thattai M and A. van Oudenaarden, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **98**, 8614 (2001).
- [4] E.M. Ozbudak, M. Thattai, I. Kurtser, A.D. Grossman, and A. van Oudenaarden, *Nat. Genet.* **31**, 69 (2002).
- [5] M.B. Elowitz, A.J. Levine, E.D. Siggia, and P.S. Swain, *Science* **297**, 1183 (2002).
- [6] P.S. Swain, M.B. Elowitz, and E.D. Siggia, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 12795 (2002).
- [7] P.B. Detwiler, S. Ramanathan, A. Sengupta, and B.I. Shraiman, *Biophys. J.* **79**, 2801 (2000).
- [8] N. Barkai and S. Leibler, *Nature* **403**, 267 (2000).
- [9] J.M. Vilar, H.Y. Kueh, N. Barkai and S. Leibler, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 5988 (2002).
- [10] D. Gonze, J. Halloy, and P. Gaspard, *J. Chem. Phys.* **116**, 10997 (2002).
- [11] A. Arkin, J. Ross, and H.H. McAdams, *Genetics* **149**, 1633 (1998).
- [12] W. Bialek. in *Advances in Neural Information Processing 13*, edited by T.K. Leen, T.G. Dietterich, and V. Tresp, (MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001), p. 103.
- [13] E. Aurel and K. Sneppen, *Phys. rev. Lett.* **88**, 048101 (2002).
- [14] M.I. Dykman, E. Mori, J. Ross, and P. M. Hunt, *J. Chem. Phys.* **100**, 5735 (1994).
- [15] T.S. Gardner, C.R. Cantor, and J.J. Collins, *Nature* **403**, 339 (1999).
- [16] N.G. van Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1992) 2nd ed.
- [17] W.H. Press, B.P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky, and W.T. Vetterling, *Numerical Recipes in C: The Art of Scientific Computing*, (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1992) 2nd ed..
- [18] Hännngi, Talkner, Borokovec. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **62**, 250 (1990).
- [19] J.S. Langer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 973 (1968).
- [20] C. Knessl, B.J. Matkowsky, Z. Schuss, M. Mangel, and C. Tier, *Phys. Rev. A* **29**, 3359 (1984).
- [21] R.S. Maier and D. L. Stein, *Phys. Rev. E* **48**, 931 (1993).
- [22] M.A. Shea and G.K. Ackers, *J. Mol Biol.* **18**, 211 (1985).
- [23] X.M.Zhu, L.Yin, L.Hood, and P.Ao, *Funct. Integr. Genomics*, e-publication Feb 5 (2004).
- [24] I.B. Dodd, K.E. Shearwin, A.J. Perkins, T. Burr, A. Hochschild, and J.B. Egan, *Genes. Dev.* **18**, 344 (2004).
- [25] M. Santillan and M,C. Mackey, *Biophys. J.* **86**, 75 (2004).
- [26] A. Shwartz and A. Weiss, *Large Deviations for Performance Analysis QUEUES, Communication, and Computing* Chapman and Hall, London, 1995.