

Individuality in Bacterial Growth Homeostasis



Hanna Salman

Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, School of Arts and Sciences Dept. of Computational and Systems Biology, School of Medicine

Workshop on Operation Research of Biological Systems 2018

An Example of Behavior Individuality: Thermotaxis



What causes this change in the response?





When bacteria are subjected to a temperature gradient betweend 18° Coand 30°C, two distinct responses can be observed: Increase in the number of the *cryophilic* Accurence latting most character the martube of 1) thermophilic receptors Tsr causes a switch in the response of the bacteria to cape from high temperature 2) a fixed temperature gradient. × # of Ts Go towards the cold! × # of Tar

100µm

Tar/Tsr Vs. favored temperature





Size Homeostasis

All living cells have to control their size and prevent divergence.



 $V_d = V_b + \Delta$

The distribution of the points is large! Is it noise? How robust is this mechanism at the single-cell level?

Single-cell Measurements

Micron-size traps continuously fed with nutrients by a flow through perpendicular channels





Dynamics of a single cell



If we assume for now that $f_n = 1/2$, then for any cycle *n* as a function of the initial size x_0 :

The previous description of size is not stable against fluctuations if ϕ_n is random



$$\phi_n = \phi^* - \beta \ln \frac{x_n}{x^*} + \xi_n$$

 $x^* = ?$ is a scaling parameter

 $\phi^* + \xi_n$ is the residual accumulation exponent

$$\phi^* = ?, \langle \xi_n \rangle = 0$$

 $\beta = 0.5$ is the feedback parameter *(the slope of the fit)*

This feedback is sufficient to stabilize the cell size and prevent any divergence For any $0 < \beta < 2$

The proposed feedback encompasses all possible models:

$$x_{n+1} = f_n x_n e^{\phi_n}$$
$$\phi_n = \phi^* - \beta \ln \frac{x_n}{x^*} + \xi_n$$

Assume: $f_n = 1/2$, $e^{\phi^*} = 2$,

And neglect noise, then: $x_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2} x_n e^{\phi^* - \beta \ln \frac{x_n}{x^*}} = \frac{1}{2} [2x_n^{(1-\beta)} x^{*\beta}]$

Which is exactly the form in Amir PRL 2014.

Now expand to first order Around $\bar{x} \implies x_n$.

$$x_{n+1} = \frac{1}{2} \left[2(1-\beta)x_n + 2\beta x^* \right]$$

And the size at division would be:

$$egin{aligned} eta &= 0 & x_{div} = 2x_n & ext{Timer} \ eta &= rac{1}{2} & x_{div} = x_n + x^* & ext{Adder} \ eta &= 1 & x_{div} = 2x^* & ext{Sizer} \end{aligned}$$

Statistical Ensembles



What is the cause of the wide distribution?

Correlation scatter-plots are very noisy

With long enough traces, we can disentangle the single-cell correlations



0.5



Different feedback strength



Different Medium, Same behavior

The same behavior is observed in M9 medium supplemented with Lactose.

The strength of the feedback is variable among cells, yet the attractor of cell size dynamics is the same for all cells.



Different Size due to Slow Dynamics



1.4 f = 1.2 f = 1.2f = Due to the fact that the average of the division ratio changes from cell to cell, we see differences in the cell-size:

$$\overline{\ln x_n} = \ln x^* + \frac{\phi^* + \overline{\ln f_n}}{\beta}$$

This could be due to slow dynamics, which would mean that the division ratio changes slowly and therefore there isn't enough statistics during the lifetime of the cell.



Order Matters



When the order of parameters is shuffled, the cell length can diverge for extended periods of time.

Other Data Exhibit Similar behavior



Wang P, et al. (2010) Robust growth of Escherichia coli. Curr Biol 20(12):1099–103.

Can we extract a mechanism from this Data?



Proteins do not exhibit adder behavior ($\beta \neq 1/2$) even on average. Single-cell trace behavior is similar: variable β , common pivot point.

The multi-dimensional phenotype



Protein expression is strongly correlated to cell-size



Stability of Exponential Growth under the control of another

These traces of three components out of 50 were generated under the assumption that x_1 controls cell division, and that the other components are enslaved to the first, namely, components are assumed to grow with the same exponential rates, up to noise. It is seen that components that do not control cell division are not stable and can either decay to zero, as in the case of x_2 , or diverge, as in the case of x_3 .



3 components measured simultaneously



Lac density

 $\times 10^4$

Cell Length

Correlations are strong along individual cycles

Susman et al, PNAS (2018)

Multi-component phenotype model

This can we explain also the exponential growth of protein?

When we measure any specific cellular variable, such as protein content, we are probing the result of the complex interactions in the cell. When we measure several of them, an effective interaction between them will be observed. This interaction can be viewed as an effective description of their participation in the large dynamical system that is the cell, and which may contain many other hidden variables:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\vec{x}\left(t\right) = K\vec{x}\left(t\right)$$

K is the interactions matrix which we assume to be constant

$$\phi_n^{(i)} = \phi^* - \beta_i \ln \frac{x_n^{(i)}}{x^{*(i)}} + \xi_n$$

The feedback can be on one or more components

The solution within the cell cycle:

$$\vec{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c^{(i)} e^{\lambda_i t} v_i \qquad 0 < t < T_i$$

Where: $c = V^{-1} \vec{x} (0)$

Due to the limited dynamic range, each cell cycle can be fit with a simple function with single effective exponent.



Effect of Limited Dynamics Range

Example of radioactive decay of three elements. A mixture of three elements will produce a Geiger counter signal which theoretically will be $y(A, \gamma, t) = A_1 e^{-\gamma_1 t} + A_2 e^{-\gamma_2 t} + A_3 e^{-\gamma_3 t}$



The feedback is variable and can be induced



And its strength does not reflect the control mechanism



Conclusions:

- Cellular growth dynamics point to a feedback mechanism with a universal attractor to stabilize the growth
- The feedback strength however varies among cells
- This feedback appears in all measured properties of the cell, therefore, it doesn't necessarily point to the control mechanism
- The Data we have so far is not sufficient to reverse engineer the cell division control mechanism

Acknowledgements

Pittsburgh Team:



Maryam Kohram



Harsh Vashistha

Collaborators:

Naama Brenner



Lee Susman



Jeff Nechleba







Technion – Israel Institute of Technology