



Published in final edited form as:

*Proc IEEE Conf Decis Control*. 2018 December ; 2018: 2685–2690. doi:10.1109/CDC.2018.8619546.

## Controlling organism size by regulating constituent cell numbers

Saurabh Modi<sup>1</sup> and Abhyudai Singh<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Delaware, Newark, DE USA 19716.  
saurmodi@udel.edu

<sup>2</sup>Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Biomedical Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology, University of Delaware, Newark, DE USA 19716. absingh@udel.edu

### Abstract

How living cells employ counting mechanisms to regulate their numbers or density is a long-standing problem in developmental biology that ties directly with organism or tissue size. Diverse cells types have been shown to regulate their numbers via secretion of factors in the extracellular space. These factors act as a proxy for the number of cells and function to reduce cellular proliferation rates creating a negative feedback. It is desirable that the production rate of such factors be kept as low as possible to minimize energy costs and detection by predators. Here we formulate a stochastic model of cell proliferation with feedback control via a secreted extracellular factor. Our results show that while low levels of feedback minimizes random fluctuations in cell numbers around a given set point, high levels of feedback amplify Poisson fluctuations in secreted-factor copy numbers. This trade-off results in an optimal feedback strength, and sets a fundamental limit to noise suppression in cell numbers with short-lived factors providing more efficient noise buffering. We further expand the model to consider external disturbances in key physiological parameters, such as, proliferation and factor synthesis rates. Intriguingly, while negative feedback effectively mitigates disturbances in the proliferation rate, it amplifies disturbances in the synthesis rate. In summary, these results provide unique insights into the functioning of feedback-based counting mechanisms, and apply to organisms ranging from unicellular prokaryotes and eukaryotes to human cells.

### I. Introduction

In order to achieve physiological function various animals regulate their morphology [1]. For example, tissue size may be regulated by either controlling the sizes of individual cells, or the number of constituent cells [2]–[6]. How individual cells maintain size homeostasis has been extensively studied across organisms ranging from bacteria, animal and plant cells [7]–[15]. Interestingly, data reveals cell-autonomous control strategies that regulate cellular growth or timing of cell-cycle events to suppress aberrant deviations in cell size around an optimal size specific to that cell type [16]–[19]. In contrast, mechanisms that control cell numbers have been less understood.

One strategy to control cell numbers is for cells to secrete a molecule that accumulates in the extracellular space, and is sensed by other cells in the population [20]–[22]. Binding of this secreted factor to cell surface receptors activates signaling pathway that inhibit cell proliferation, thus creating a negative feedback loop (Fig. 1). Such feedback control via secreted factors has been reported in many organisms including *Myxococcus xanthus* [23], *Vibrio fischeri* [24], *Bacillus subtilis* [25], *Dictyostelium discoideum* [26], [27], multicellular animals [28], [29] and plants [30]. For illustration purposes, we show some published data on *Dictyostelium discoideum* in Fig. 1, where the proliferation rates of *Dictyostelium discoideum* cells decrease monotonically with increasing buildup of the secreted factor.

The feedback strategy illustrated in Fig. 1 creates an interesting tradeoff, where cells incur a cost to produce the factor, and would prefer to keep its synthesis to as low as possible [31], [32]. However, a side effect of low levels is shot noise or Poisson fluctuations in secreted factor copy numbers that are propagated to cell numbers. Here we study this tradeoff through a mathematical model that incorporates three different noise mechanisms: stochastic proliferation of cells; stochastic synthesis of the secreted factor from single cells; and external disturbances in model parameters. Our analysis reveals that depending on the source of noise, negative feedback can either buffer or amplify random fluctuations in cell numbers around a given set point. Moreover, when multiple noise sources are present, then an optimal feedback strength provides the most efficient noise buffering. This optimal feedback sets up a fundamental lower limit for minimizing fluctuations in cell numbers, and we systematically study how this limit scales with different parameters. We start by formally introducing the mathematical model followed by its stochastic analysis.

## II. Stochastic model formulation

Let  $x(t)$  and  $z(t)$  denote the number of cells, and the number of secreted factors at time  $t$ , respectively. Cells are assumed to proliferate exponentially with a rate  $g(z)$ , with  $g$  being a monotonically decreasing function as illustrated in Fig. 1. Moreover, cells are removed (or die) from the population at a rate  $\gamma_x$ . Finally, each cell synthesizes and secretes the factor at a rate  $k_z$ , and these secreted factors decay with a rate  $\gamma_z$ . The stochastic formation of this model is shown in Table 1 and consists of four probabilistic events that increase/decrease the population counts by one. The propensity functions in the last column determine how often the events occur. For example, the propensity function for the cell proliferation event is  $g(z)x$  which implies that the probability this event will occur in the next time interval  $(t, t + dt)$  is  $g(z)xdt$ , and whenever the event occurs the cell count increases by one.

Throughout the paper we denote by  $\langle x(t) \rangle$  as the mean value of the stochastic process  $x(t)$ , and by  $\langle \bar{x} \rangle = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle x(t) \rangle$  its steady-state value. Based on the stochastic model in Table 1, the population averages evolve as

$$\frac{d\langle z \rangle}{dt} = k_z \langle x \rangle - \gamma_z \langle z \rangle \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle}{dt} = \langle \mathbf{x} g(\mathbf{z}) \rangle - \gamma_x \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad (2)$$

[35], [36]. In the deterministic mean-field limit where

$$\langle \mathbf{x} g(\mathbf{z}) \rangle \approx \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) \quad (3)$$

we obtain the following approximated nonlinear system

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}{dt} = k_z \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma_z \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle}{dt} = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) - \gamma_x \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad (5)$$

that has a unique equilibrium defined by the solution to the equations

$$g(\overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}) = \gamma_x, \quad \overline{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} = \frac{\gamma_z \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}}{k_z} \quad (6)$$

as long as  $g(0) > \gamma_x > g(\infty)$ . Having determined the mean equilibrium population counts, we next quantify the negative feedback strength by the dimensionless parameter

$$f := - \frac{\overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} g'(\overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle})}{g(\overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle})} > 0 \quad (7)$$

that is essentially the log sensitivity of  $g$  at  $z = \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}$ . A Hill type equation given by

$$g(\mathbf{z}) = (g(0) - g(\infty)) \frac{K^n}{K^n + \mathbf{z}^n} + g(\infty) \quad (8)$$

captures the functional dependence of the proliferation rate on the secreted factor level adequately. Here  $n$  and  $K$  are the Hill coefficient and the half-saturation constant respectively. Using this assumption, (7) becomes

$$f = \frac{n(\gamma_x - g(\infty))(g(0) - \gamma_x)}{\gamma_x(g(0) - g(\infty))}. \quad (9)$$

Note that while the feedback strength is proportional to the Hill coefficient of the proliferation rate, it also depends on the degradation rate of the secreted factor which is part of the feedback loop. Local stability analysis of the equilibrium point yields the following eigenvalues of the linearized system

$$\frac{-\gamma_z \pm \sqrt{\gamma_z^2 - 4f\gamma_x\gamma_z}}{2} \quad (10)$$

and shows that the equilibrium of the nonlinear system (4)–(5) is stable for  $f > 0$ . Note that sufficiently strong negative feedback ( $f > \gamma_z/4\gamma_x$ ) results in complex eigenvalues with negative real parts, and hence, damped oscillatory dynamics.

### III. Optimal feedback strength for regulating cell numbers

Stochastic simulations of the feedback system reveal an intriguing feature - while low levels of feedback strength attenuate random fluctuations in cell numbers, a strong negative feedback amplifies fluctuations (Fig. 2). We further investigate this effect by developing approximate analytical formulas for the noise in cell numbers, where noise is quantified by the steady-state coefficient of variation of  $\mathbf{x}(t)$ . A well-known problem that often arises when dealing with nonlinear stochastic systems is unclosed moment dynamics - time evolution of lower order moments depends on higher order moments [38], [39]. While a number of closure methods have been developed to tackle this issue [38]–[40], we circumvent this problem by exploiting the Linear Noise Approximation (LNA) [41], [42]. Assuming small fluctuations in  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  and  $z(t)$  around their respective steady-state means, LNA works by linearizing nonlinear propensity functions, as in

$$\mathbf{x}g(z) \approx g(\langle z \rangle) \left( \mathbf{x} - f \frac{\langle z \rangle z - \langle z \rangle^2}{\langle z \rangle} \right), \quad (11)$$

and with this approximation all propensity functions in Table 1 are now linear functions of the state space. Time evolution of statistical moments is obtained using the following result from our prior work [36], [39]: the time derivative of the expected value of an arbitrary function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, z)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle \psi(\mathbf{x}, z) \rangle}{dt} &= \langle k_z \mathbf{x} [\psi(\mathbf{x}, z + 1) - \psi(\mathbf{x}, z)] \rangle + \\ &\left\langle g(\langle z \rangle) \left( \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} - f \frac{z - \langle z \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} \right) [\psi(\mathbf{x} + 1, z) - \psi(\mathbf{x}, z)] \right\rangle + \langle \gamma_x \mathbf{x} [\psi(\mathbf{x} - 1, z) - \psi(\mathbf{x}, z)] \rangle + \\ &\langle \gamma_z z [\psi(\mathbf{x}, z - 1) - \psi(\mathbf{x}, z)] \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

(12)

Substituting appropriate monomials for  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$  above yields the following system of differential equations for all the first and second order moments of  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  and  $\mathbf{z}(t)$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle}{dt} = g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} - f \frac{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle - \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} \right) - \gamma_x \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}{dt} = k_z \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle - \gamma_z \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{xz} \rangle}{dt} = g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle \mathbf{xz} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} - f \frac{\langle \mathbf{z}^2 \rangle - \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} \right) + k_z \langle \mathbf{x}^2 \rangle - (\gamma_x + \gamma_z) \langle \mathbf{xz} \rangle \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle \mathbf{x}^2 \rangle}{dt} = & \gamma_x (\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle - 2\langle \mathbf{x}^2 \rangle) + g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} - f \frac{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle - \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} \right) + 2g(\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle) \\ & \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}^2 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle} - f \frac{\langle \mathbf{xz} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \overline{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}}{\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{d\langle \mathbf{z}^2 \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_z (\langle \mathbf{z} \rangle - 2\langle \mathbf{z}^2 \rangle) + k_z \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle + 2k_z \langle \mathbf{xz} \rangle. \quad (17)$$

Solving the moment equations at steady state we obtain the following noise (coefficient of variation squared) in cell numbers

$$CV_x^2 = \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_x f}{\gamma_z \langle \mathbf{z} \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from secreted factor}} + \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_z + \gamma_x f}{\gamma_z f \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from stochastic proliferation}} \quad (18)$$

which can be decomposed into two terms. The first term represents the noise contribution from Poisson fluctuations in  $\mathbf{z}(t)$  (noise from secreted factor) and the other term is the contribution from stochastic proliferation/death of cells. Note that  $CV_x$  decreases as the secreted factor half-life decreases, which makes intuitive sense as then the regulator tracks the cell numbers more faithfully. Interestingly, the first term is amplified, and second term is attenuated with increasing feedback strength  $f$  (Fig. 2). These opposing effects result in  $CV_x^2$  being minimized at an optimal feedback strength

$$f = \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_z \langle z \rangle}}{\sqrt{\gamma_x \langle x \rangle}}. \quad (19)$$

Replacing (19) in (18) and using (3) yields the fundamental limit of noise suppression in cell numbers as

$$CV_x^2 = \frac{\frac{\gamma_x}{\gamma_z} + \frac{2\sqrt{\gamma_x}}{\sqrt{k_z}}}{\langle x \rangle}. \quad (20)$$

While inverse scaling of  $CV_x^2$  with respect to the mean  $\langle x \rangle$  is reminiscent of Poisson-like fluctuations, the numerator value can be made small by having a short-lived secreted factor (high  $\gamma_z$ ) and a high factor synthesis rate  $k_z$ . It is interesting to point out that the ratio  $N = k_z/\gamma_x$  is the average number of secreted factors made by an individual cell in its lifespan, and the fundamental noise limit scales as  $1/\sqrt{N}$ , but the scaling is  $1/\gamma_z$  with respect to the factor decay rate.

#### IV. Incorporating external disturbances in physiological parameters

Our analysis up till now assume constant model parameters, and we now expand the model to allow for external disturbances that transform parameters into stochastic processes.

##### A. External disturbance in the proliferation rate

Data shows that the cellular growth rate can randomly fluctuate with some memory over many generations [43]–[47], and its not hard to imagine these features carrying over to the cell proliferation rate. Motivated by these findings we assume that the proliferation rate  $g(z, y)$  is affected by an external factor  $y$  whose stochastic dynamics is modeled as an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process

$$dy(t) = \gamma_y(\overline{y} - y(t))dt + \sigma_y dw(t). \quad (21)$$

Here,  $\overline{y}$  is the mean level of external disturbance,  $w(t)$  is the Wiener process,  $\sigma_y$  and  $\gamma_y$  are parameters that represent the strength of noise and the time-scale of fluctuations in  $y$ , respectively. Linearizing the proliferation rate

$$xg(z, y) \approx \overline{x}g(\overline{z}, \overline{y}) \left( \frac{x}{\overline{x}} - f \frac{z - \overline{z}}{\overline{z}} + S_x \frac{y - \overline{y}}{\overline{y}} \right), \quad (22)$$

$$S_x := \frac{\overline{y}}{g(\overline{z}, \overline{y})} \left. \frac{\partial g(\overline{z}, y)}{\partial y} \right|_{y = \overline{y}}$$

where  $S_x$  is the log sensitivity of the proliferation rate to the external disturbance. With this approximations we again repeat the analysis of obtaining moment equations and solving it to get noise in cell numbers. We write the moment dynamics of an arbitrary function  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)$  of the states of the system using the extended generator  $L$  of stochastic hybrid systems [35], [36], [39]

$$\frac{d\langle\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)\rangle}{dt} = \langle(L\psi)(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)\rangle. \quad (23)$$

For the system in consideration, the extended generator is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (L\psi)(x, y, z): &= \frac{\partial\psi(x, y, z)}{\partial y}\gamma_y(\overline{\langle\mathbf{y}\rangle} - y) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial^2\psi(x, y, z)}{\partial y^2}\sigma_y^2\right) \\ &+ k_z x[\psi(x, y, z + 1) - \psi(x, y, z)] \\ &+ g(\overline{\langle z \rangle}, \overline{\langle y \rangle})\overline{\langle x \rangle}\left(\frac{x}{\langle x \rangle} - f\frac{z - \overline{\langle z \rangle}}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x\frac{y - \overline{\langle y \rangle}}{\langle y \rangle}\right) \\ &\times [\psi(x + 1, y, z) - \psi(x, y, z)] + \gamma_x x[\psi(x - 1, y, z) - \psi(x, y, z)] \\ &+ \gamma_z z[\psi(x, y, z - 1) - \psi(x, y, z)]. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Substituting appropriately monomials for  $\psi(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)$  we obtain the following moment dynamics

$$\frac{d\langle x \rangle}{dt} = g(\overline{\langle z \rangle}, \overline{\langle y \rangle})\overline{\langle x \rangle}\left(\frac{\langle x \rangle}{\langle x \rangle} - f\frac{\langle z \rangle - \overline{\langle z \rangle}}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x\frac{\langle y \rangle - \overline{\langle y \rangle}}{\langle y \rangle}\right) - \gamma_x \langle x \rangle \quad (25)$$

$$\frac{d\langle z \rangle}{dt} = k_z \langle x \rangle - \gamma_z \langle z \rangle \quad (26)$$

$$\frac{d\langle y \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_y (\overline{\langle y \rangle} - \langle y \rangle) \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{d\langle xz \rangle}{dt} = g(\langle \bar{z} \rangle, \langle \bar{y} \rangle) \langle \bar{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle xz \rangle}{\langle x \rangle} - f \frac{\langle z^2 \rangle - \langle \bar{z} \rangle \langle z \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x \frac{\langle yz \rangle - \langle \bar{y} \rangle \langle z \rangle}{\langle y \rangle} \right) + k_z \langle x^2 \rangle - (\gamma_x + \gamma_z) \langle xz \rangle \quad (28)$$

$$\frac{d\langle xy \rangle}{dt} = g(\langle \bar{z} \rangle, \langle \bar{y} \rangle) \langle \bar{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle xy \rangle}{\langle x \rangle} - f \frac{\langle yz \rangle - \langle \bar{z} \rangle \langle y \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x \frac{\langle y^2 \rangle - \langle \bar{y} \rangle \langle y \rangle}{\langle y \rangle} \right) + \gamma_y \langle x \rangle \langle \bar{y} \rangle - \langle xy \rangle - \gamma_x \langle xy \rangle \quad (29)$$

$$\frac{d\langle yz \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_y \langle \bar{y} \rangle \langle z \rangle - \langle yz \rangle + k_z \langle xy \rangle - \gamma_z \langle yz \rangle \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{d\langle x^2 \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_x (\langle x \rangle - 2\langle x^2 \rangle) + g(\langle \bar{z} \rangle, \langle \bar{y} \rangle) \langle \bar{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle x \rangle}{\langle x \rangle} - f \frac{\langle z \rangle - \langle \bar{z} \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x \frac{\langle y \rangle - \langle \bar{y} \rangle}{\langle y \rangle} \right) + 2g(\langle \bar{z} \rangle, \langle \bar{y} \rangle) \langle \bar{x} \rangle \left( \frac{\langle x^2 \rangle}{\langle x \rangle} - f \frac{\langle xz \rangle - \langle x \rangle \langle \bar{z} \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} + S_x \frac{\langle xy \rangle - \langle x \rangle \langle \bar{y} \rangle}{\langle y \rangle} \right) \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{d\langle y^2 \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_y (2\langle \bar{y} \rangle \langle y \rangle - 2\langle y^2 \rangle) + \sigma_y^2 \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{d\langle z^2 \rangle}{dt} = \gamma_z (\langle z \rangle - 2\langle z^2 \rangle) + k_z \langle x \rangle + 2k_z \langle xz \rangle. \quad (33)$$



Steady-state analysis of this system of differential equations yields the following noise in cell numbers

$$CV_x^2 = \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_x f}{\gamma_z \langle z \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from secreted factor}} + \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_z + \gamma_x f}{\gamma_z f \langle x \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from stochastic proliferation}} + \underbrace{\frac{CV_y^2 \gamma_x S_x^2 (\gamma_z^2 + \gamma_z \gamma_y + f \gamma_x \gamma_y)}{\gamma_z f (\gamma_x \gamma_z f + \gamma_y (\gamma_z + \gamma_y))}}_{\text{Noise from external disturbance}} \quad (34)$$

Comparing with (18) we see an additional third term that represents the contribution from the external disturbance, and this term monotonically decreases to zero as  $f \rightarrow \infty$  (Fig. 3). Assuming a short-lived secreted factor  $\gamma_z \gg \gamma_x, \gamma_y$ , (34) reduces to

$$CV_x^2 = \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_x f}{\gamma_z \langle z \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from secreted factor}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{f \langle x \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from stochastic proliferation}} + \underbrace{\frac{CV_y^2 \gamma_x S_x^2}{f (\gamma_x f + \gamma_y)}}_{\text{Noise from external disturbance}} \quad (35)$$

While the noise contribution from stochastic proliferation scales as  $f^{-1}$ , depending on the relative values of  $\gamma_x, \gamma_y$  the contribution from external disturbance scales between  $f^{-1}$  and  $f^{-2}$ . This emphasizes a key point that feedback regulation is more efficient in suppressing noise arising from disturbances in proliferation rate as compared to inherent stochasticity from small cell numbers. We next consider external disturbance in the synthesis rate  $k_z$  while reverting the proliferation rate back to being a constant.

### B. External disturbance in the synthesis rate

The activity of the feedback secreted factors is usually mediated by secondary molecules [48]. This introduces a disturbance which is external to the feedback system. To model this feature the external disturbance, which follows the dynamics in (21), affects the synthesis rate of the secreted factor as

$$k_z(y)x = k_z(\langle y \rangle) \langle x \rangle \left( \frac{x}{\langle x \rangle} + S_z \frac{z - \langle z \rangle}{\langle z \rangle} \right), \quad (36)$$

$$S_z := \frac{\langle y \rangle}{k_z(\langle y \rangle)} \left. \frac{\partial k_z(y)}{\partial y} \right|_{y = \langle y \rangle}.$$

Here  $S_z$  is the log sensitivity of the secreted factor synthesis rate to the external disturbance. By performing an analysis similar to the previous section we obtain the following noise in cell numbers

$$CV_x^2 = \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_x f}{\gamma_z \langle z \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from secreted factor}} + \underbrace{\frac{\gamma_z + f\gamma_x}{f\gamma_z \langle x \rangle}}_{\text{Noise from stochastic proliferation}} + \underbrace{\frac{fS_z^2 CV_y^2 \gamma_x (\gamma_z + \gamma_y)}{f\gamma_x \gamma_z + \gamma_z \gamma_y + \gamma_y^2}}_{\text{Noise from external disturbance}}$$

(37)

and now the contribution from external disturbance increases with increasing feedback strength  $f$  (Fig. 3). This is intuitive, as the disturbance acts through the secreted factor, and adding more feedback only functions to propagate this disturbance to affect cell numbers.

## V. Conclusion

Regulation of cell number is critical in the functioning of the systems they constitute. For example in *Myxococcus xanthus* the formation of fruiting bodies only occurs in presence of precise cell densities and starvation. Further in *Dictyostelium*, during starvation, the cells aggregate to form spores in a fruiting body which is supported by a stalk [49]. If number of spores in the fruiting body is too small, it will be too close to the ground and cause inefficient spore dispersal. However, if the number of spores is too large then it falls over, possibly ruining a chance of germination of the spores when nutrients become available. In this paper we study the maintenance of precise cell numbers conferred by negative feedback of secreted factors. We show that for low feedback strength of the secreted factor, the noise in cell numbers will be very high (Fig. 2). This leads to cell groups with high cell numbers, as observed experimentally in *Dictyoselium discoideum* with loss of regulation [34], [48].

Note that in resource deficient environments, producing low levels of secreted factors would be desirable albeit with significant noise in the secreted factor. We show that there exists a trade-off between the increase in noise due to the secreted factor and the reduction in noise due to stochastic proliferation. This leads to an optimal feedback strength given by (19) which minimizes noise in cell number (20). Further external disturbance in proliferation rate increases noise in cell number although it can be buffered by the secreted factor to arbitrarily low levels. Note that with increase in the time-scale of the external disturbance we see that noise in cell number increases. This is due to the increased memory in the external fluctuations and consequently proliferation rate through time.

In conclusion our study uses a simple feedback model to study the regulation of proliferation of cells. The results may guide future experimental studies to design regulatory strategies to minimize cell number variation and consequently tissues/organ size to influence morphology and function of animals. This study can be used in further studies to give an evolutionary rationale to the existence of the negative feedback structure similar to that in gene auto-

regulatory loops [50]–[52]. The study can also be extended to cases where the secreted factor is interlinked between two types of cells in the same environment [53].

## Acknowledgment


We thank Dr. Richard Gomer at the Texas A&M University for his helpful feedback on the manuscript. AS is supported by the National Institute of Health Grant 1R01GM126557–01.

## References

- [1]. Roisin-Bouffay C and Gomer RH, “How to reach the right size?” *Med Sci (Paris)*, vol. 20, pp. 219–224, 2004. [PubMed: 14997443]
- [2]. Neufeld TP, de la Cruz AFA, Johnston LA, and Edgar BA, “Coordination of growth and cell division in the drosophila wing,” *Cell*, vol. 93, pp. 1183–1193, 1998. [PubMed: 9657151]
- [3]. TT S, “The regulation of cell growth and proliferation during organogenesis.” *In Vivo*, vol. 14, pp. 141–148, 2000. [PubMed: 10757071]
- [4]. Roisin-Bouffay C, Jang W, Caprette DR, and Gomer RH, “A precise group size in dictyostelium is generated by a cell-counting factor modulating cell-cell adhesion.” *Molecular Cell*, vol. 6, pp. 953–959, 2000. [PubMed: 11090633]
- [5]. Vargas-Garcia CA, Mohammad S, and Singh A, “Conditions for cell size homeostasis: A stochastic hybrid systems approach,” *IEEE Life Sciences Letters*, vol. 2, pp. 47–50, 2016.
- [6]. Buzi G, Lander AD, and Khammash M, “Cell lineage branching as a strategy for proliferative control,” *BMC Biology*, vol. 13, p. 13, 2015. [PubMed: 25857410]
- [7]. Marshall WF, Young KD, Swaffer M, Wood E, Nurse P, Kimura A, Frankel J, Wallingford J, Walbot V, Qu X, and Roeder AH, “What determines cell size?” *BMC Biology*, vol. 10, p. 101, 2012. [PubMed: 23241366]
- [8]. Lloyd AC, “The Regulation of Cell Size,” *Cell*, vol. 154, pp. 1194–1205, 2013. [PubMed: 24034244]
- [9]. Zaritsky A, “Cell-Shape Homeostasis in *Escherichia coli* Is Driven by Growth, Division, and Nucleoid Complexity,” *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 109, pp. 178–181, 2015. [PubMed: 26200854]
- [10]. Wang P, Robert L, Pelletier J, Dang WL, Taddei F, Wright A, and Jun S, “Robust growth of *escherichia coli*,” *Current biology*, vol. 20, pp. 1099–1103, 2010. [PubMed: 20537537]
- [11]. Chaillot J, Cook MA, Corbeil J, and Sellam A, “Genome-wide screen for haploinsufficient cell size genes in the opportunistic yeast *candida albicans*,” *G3: Genes|Genomes|Genetics*, vol. 7, pp. 355–360, 2017. [PubMed: 28040776]
- [12]. Ghusinga KR, Vargas-Garcia CA, and Singh A, “A mechanistic stochastic framework for regulating bacterial cell division,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 6, p. 30229, 2016. [PubMed: 27456660]
- [13]. Vargas-Garcia CA, Ghusinga KR, and Singh A, “Cell size control and gene expression homeostasis in single-cells,” *Current Opinion in Systems Biology*, vol. 8, pp. 109–116, 2018. [PubMed: 29862376]
- [14]. Singh A, Vargas-Garcia CA, and Bjorklund M, “Joint regulation of growth and division timing drives size homeostasis in proliferating animal cells,” *bioRxiv*: 173070, 2017 [Online]. Available: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2017/08/08/173070>
- [15]. Vargas-Garcia CA, Soltani M, and Singh A, “Stochastic hybrid systems approach to modeling dynamics of cell size,” *IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 5863–5868, 2016.
- [16]. Sauls JT, Li D, and Jun S, “Adder and a coarse-grained approach to cell size homeostasis in bacteria,” *Current Opinion in Cell Biology*, vol. 38, pp. 38–44, 2016. [PubMed: 26901290]
- [17]. Deforet M, van Ditmarsch D, and Xavier JB, “Cell-size homeostasis and the incremental rule in a bacterial pathogen,” *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 109, pp. 521–528, 2015. [PubMed: 26244734]

- [18]. Yu FB, Willis L, Chau RMW, Zambon A, Horowitz M, Bhaya D, Huang KC, and Quake SR, "Long-term microfluidic tracking of coccoid cyanobacterial cells reveals robust control of division timing," *BMC Biology*, vol. 15, p. 11, 2017. [PubMed: 28196492]
- [19]. Modi S, Vargas-Garcia CA, Ghusinga KR, and Singh A, "Analysis of noise mechanisms in cell-size control," *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 112, pp. 2408–2418, 2017. [PubMed: 28591613]
- [20]. Gomer RH, "Cell-density sensing: come on inside and tell us about it." *Current Biology*, vol. 7, pp. R721–2, 1997. [PubMed: 9382793]
- [21]. Gomer RH, "Intercellular signalling. knowing that you're among friends." *Current Biology*, vol. 4, pp. 734–735, 1994. [PubMed: 7953564]
- [22]. Yuen IS and Gomer RH, "Cell density-sensing in dictyostelium by means of the accumulation rate, diffusion coefficient and activity threshold of a protein secreted by starved cells," *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, vol. 167, pp. 273–282, 1994. [PubMed: 8207951]
- [23]. Kim SK and Kaiser D, "C-factor: Cell-cell signaling protein required for fruiting body morphogenesis of *m. xanthus*," *Cell*, vol. 61, pp. 19–26, 1990. [PubMed: 2107980]
- [24]. Eberhard A, "Structural identification of autoinducer of photobacterium *fischeri* luciferase," *Biochemistry*, vol. 20, pp. 2444–2449, 1981. [PubMed: 7236614]
- [25]. Grossman AD and Losick R, "Extracellular control of spore formation in *bacillus subtilis*," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 85, pp. 4369–4373, 1988.
- [26]. Gomer RH, Jang W, and Brazill D, "Cell density sensing and size determination," *Development, Growth and Differentiation*, vol. 53, pp. 482–494, 2011.
- [27]. Brock DA, Hatton RD, Giurgiutiu D-V, Scott B, Jang W, Ammann R, and Gomer RH, "Cf45–1, a secreted protein which participates in dictyostelium group size regulation." *Eukaryotic Cell*, vol. 2, pp. 788–797, 2003. [PubMed: 12912898]
- [28]. Conlon I and Raff M, "Size control in animal development," *Cell*, vol. 96, pp. 235–244, 1999. [PubMed: 9988218]
- [29]. Thomas M, Langley B, Berry C, Sharma M, Kirk S, Bass J, and Kambadur R, "Myostatin, a negative regulator of muscle growth, functions by inhibiting myoblast proliferation," *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, vol. 275, pp. 40 235–40 243, 2000.
- [30]. Cockcroft CE, den Boer BGW, Healy JMS, and Murray JAH, "Cyclin d control of growth rate in plants," *Nature*, vol. 405, pp. 575–579, 2000. [PubMed: 10850717]
- [31]. Thattai M and van Oudenaarden A, "Intrinsic noise in gene regulatory networks," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 98, pp. 8614–8619, 2001.
- [32]. McAdams HH and Arkin AP, "Stochastic mechanisms in gene expression," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 94, pp. 814–819, 1997.
- [33]. Choe JM, Bakthavatsalam D, Phillips JE, and Gomer RH, "Dictyostelium cells bind a secreted autocrine factor that represses cell proliferation." *BMC Biochemistry*, vol. 10, p. 4, 2009. [PubMed: 19187549]
- [34]. Suess PM and Gomer RH, "Extracellular polyphosphate inhibits proliferation in an autocrine negative feedback loop in dictyostelium discoideum," *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, vol. 291, pp. 20 260–20 269, 2016.
- [35]. Hespanha JP and Singh A, "Stochastic models for chemically reacting systems using polynomial stochastic hybrid systems," *International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control*, vol. 15, pp. 669–689, 2005.
- [36]. Singh A and Hespanha JP, "Stochastic hybrid systems for studying biochemical processes," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, vol. 368, pp. 4995–5011, 2010.
- [37]. Gillespie DT, "Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions," *Journal of Physical Chemistry*, vol. 81, pp. 2340–2361, 1977.
- [38]. Soltani M, Vargas C, and Singh A, "Conditional moment closure schemes for studying stochastic dynamics of genetic circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Systems and Circuits*, vol. 9, pp. 518–526, 2015.
- [39]. Singh A and Hespanha JP, "Approximate moment dynamics for chemically reacting systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 56, pp. 414–418, 2011.

- [40]. Ghusinga KR, Vargas-Garcia CA, Lamperski A, and Singh A, "Exact lower and upper bounds on stationary moments in stochastic biochemical systems," *Physical Biology*, vol. 14, p. 04LT01, 2017.
- [41]. Kampen NGV, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry*. Amsterdam: North Holland, 1992.
- [42]. Modi S, Soltani M, and Singh A, "Linear noise approximation for a class of piecewise deterministic markov processes," 2018 Annual American Control Conference (ACC), Milwaukee, WI, pp. 1993–1998, 2018.
- [43]. Taheri-Araghi S, Bradde S, Sauls JT, Hill NS, Levin PA, Paulsson J, Vergassola M, and Jun S, "Cell-size control and homeostasis in bacteria," *Current Biology*, vol. 25, pp. 385–391, 2015. [PubMed: 25544609]
- [44]. Kiviet DJ, Nghe P, Walker N, Boulineau S, Sunderlikova V, and Tans SJ, "Stochasticity of metabolism and growth at the single-cell level," *Nature*, vol. 514, pp. 376–379, 2014. [PubMed: 25186725]
- [45]. Ferrezuelo F, Colomina N, Palmisano A, Gar E, Gallego C, Csiksz-Nagy A, and Aldea M, "The critical size is set at a single-cell level by growth rate to attain homeostasis and adaptation," *Nature Communications*, vol. 3, p. 1012, 2012.
- [46]. Hashimoto M, Nozoe T, Nakaoka H, Okura R, Akiyoshi S, Kaneko K, Kussell E, and Wakamoto Y, "Noise-driven growth rate gain in clonal cellular populations," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 113, pp. 3251–3256, 2016.
- [47]. Lin J and Amir A, "The effects of stochasticity at the single-cell level and cell size control on the population growth," *Cell Systems*, vol. 5, pp. 358–367.e4, 2017. [PubMed: 28988800]
- [48]. Phillips JE and Gomer RH, "The p21-activated kinase (pak) family member pakd is required for chemorepulsion and proliferation inhibition by autocrine signals in dictyostelium discoideum," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 9, p. e96633, 2014. [PubMed: 24797076]
- [49]. Katoh M, Chen G, Roberge E, Shaulsky G, and Kuspa A, "Developmental commitment in dictyostelium discoideum," *Eukaryotic Cell*, vol. 6, pp. 2038–2045, 2007. [PubMed: 17905919]
- [50]. Singh A and Hesperha JP, "Evolution of gene auto-regulation in the presence of noise," *IET Systems Biology*, vol. 3, pp. 368–378, 2009. [PubMed: 21028927]
- [51]. Singh A, "Genetic negative feedback circuits for filtering stochasticity in gene expression" *IEEE transactions on Decision and Control*, Orlando, FL, pp. 4366–4370, 2011.
- [52]. Singh A and Hesperha JP, "Optimal feedback strength for noise suppression in autoregulatory gene networks," *Biophysical Journal*, vol. 96, pp. 4013–4023, 2009. [PubMed: 19450473]
- [53]. Zhou X, Franklin RA, Adler M, Jacox JB, Bailis W, Shyer JA, Flavell RA, Mayo A, Alon U, and Medzhitov R, "Circuit design features of a stable two-cell system," *Cell*, vol. 172, pp. 744–757.e17, 2018. [PubMed: 29398113]




**Fig. 1. Controlling cell numbers by feedback control through secreted extracellular factors.**  
*Left.* Schematic of a cell population, where each cell proliferates and secretes a molecule in the extracellular space. The buildup of secreted factors is sensed by other cells in the population. The factor functions to inhibit cell proliferation creating homeostasis in cell numbers. *Right.* Data showing proliferation rates of *Dictyostelium discoideum* cells with respect to the levels of two different secreted factors (*AprA* and *Polyphosphate*). While the inhibition of proliferation rate by *AprA* is gradual, that by *Polyphosphate* is relatively steep and occurs over a narrower range of factor levels. The error bars are the standard errors corresponding to the raw data, and lines represent Hill equations fitted to the data. We refer the reader to [33], [34] for further biological details and experimental procedures.

Author Manuscript


Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript



**Fig. 2. Noise in cell numbers is minimized at an intermediate level of negative feedback.**  
 A. Stochastic simulation of the model presented in Table 1 using [37] for different feedback strengths ( $f=0.01$  (Low),  $f=0.6$  (Optimal),  $f=10$  (High)). For a given mean number of cells, the spread in cell numbers first reduces, and then increases with increasing feedback strength. B. Plotting the total noise, and the different noise components in (18) as a function of  $f$ . While the noise contribution from stochastic proliferation reduces, the contribution from stochastic secreted-factor synthesis increases creating a U-shape profile of the total noise. Parameters chosen for all the above subfigures were:  $\gamma_z = 3\gamma_x = 3\text{day}^{-1}$ ,  $\langle z \rangle = 100$ ,  $\langle x \rangle = 150$ . The functional form of the proliferation rate obtained by substituting the above parameters in (6), (8), (9) was  $g(z) = 2 \frac{\langle z \rangle^{2f}}{z^{2f} + \langle z \rangle^{2f}} \text{day}^{-1}$ .



**Fig. 3. Depending on the source of noise, random fluctuations in cell numbers can be amplified or buffered with increasing negative feedback strength.**

Plots for the noise components shown in (34) and (37) as a function of  $f$ . While adding feedback buffers noise from stochastic proliferation and disturbances in the proliferation rate, it amplifies any noise associated with the secreted factor. The latter includes shot noise or Poisson fluctuation in secreted factor copy numbers, and external disturbances to the synthesis rate. Parameters chosen were:  $CV_y^2 = 0.05$ ,  $\gamma_z = 5\gamma_x$ ,  $\gamma_y = \gamma_x/5$ ,  $\langle x \rangle = 200$ ,  $\langle z \rangle = 80$ .

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript



**TABLE I**

Stochastic events with their corresponding reset maps and propensity functions.

Event	Reset	Propensity function
Cell proliferation	$x(t) \mapsto x(t) + 1$	$g(z(t))x(t)$
Cell death	$x(t) \mapsto x(t) - 1$	$\gamma_x x(t)$
Secreted factor synthesis	$z(t) \mapsto z(t) + 1$	$k_z x(t)$
Secreted factor degradation	$z(t) \mapsto z(t) - 1$	$\gamma_z z(t)$

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript