# Evolution enhances mutational robustness and suppresses the emergence of a new phenotype – A study on gene regulatory network –

Macoto Kikuchi (collaborator: Tadamune Kaneko)

Cybermedia Center, Osaka University

- 1. Introduction
  - robustness, gene regulatory network
- 2. Model and Methods
  - network model, multicanonical MC, evolutionary simulation
- 3. Results
  - fitness landscape, bistability, mutational robustness
- 4. Discussions

# Introduction

# **Central question**

#### **Mutational Robustness**

- Living systems do not easily lose their viability even when some of the genes are mutated.
- This trait of mutational robustness has been developed through the long history of evolution.
- Mutational robustness can be examined experimentally by several methods such as gene knockout or artificial addition of gene regulation.
  - *e.g.* Isaran *et al.* 2008.
- But the answer to the question, "Does mutational robustness evolves?" remains unclear because experimental investigations are difficult.
  - Thus numerical methods play an indispensable role.

We investegated the evolution of mutational robustness for gene regulatory network (GRN) model.

#### Problem

- Evolutionary simulations only provide evolutionary-path-dependent traits.
- To study the universality and the characteristics of evolution, we need a reference system.
- The reference system that we consider appropriate is a set of randomly sampled GRNs.
- A simple random sampling is useless because highly fit GRNs are rare.

# McMC to study evolution

#### Solution

- Rare event sampling using the multicanonical Monte Carlo (McMC) method
  - Random sampling over wide range of fitness

#### The preceding works applying McMC to GRN

- N. Saito and M. Kikuchi: New J Phys 15 (2013) 053037
- S. Nagata and M. Kikuchi: PLoS Comput Biol 16 (2020) e1007969

#### This talk

• T. Kaneko and M. Kikuchi: arXiv:2012.03030

# Gene Regulatory Network 1





- Information coded in a gene is transcribed to mRNA.
- Ribosome assembles amino acids according to mRNA sequence.
  - Protein is produced.

# Gene Regulatory Network 2



 A category of proteins calls transcription facotr regulate expression of other genes working either as activator or repressor.

# Gene Regulatory Network 3

#### Gene regulatory network



repress

- Genes regulate mutually and form a complex network to controle the cell states.
  - Adaptation to environmental change
  - Maturation. • differentiation

# Model and Methods

# Model 1

#### **Connectionist model**

- We ignore details of gene expression and take into account only regulatory interactions.
  - Node: Gene
  - Edge: Regulation

#### Details

- GRNs are represented by directed random graphs
  - N = 32 nodes, K = 80 edges
- One input gene and one output gene
- All the possible networks are allowed



# Model 2

**Discrete-time dynamics** 

$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{x}_i(t+1) &= R\left(I\delta_{i,0} + \sum_j J_{ij}\mathsf{x}_j(t)
ight)\ R(x) &= rac{1}{1+\mathrm{e}^{-eta(x-\mu)}} \end{aligned}$$

- $x_i$ : Expression of *i*th gene ( [0, 1])
- $J_{ij}$ : Regulation of *i*th gene by *j*th gene(0, ±1)
  - $\bullet \ +1:$  activation, -1: repression
- I : Input from exterior world ([0, 1])
- $\mu = 0$ ,  $\beta = 2$  (Hopfield-Tank)

# Model 3

#### Fitness

- We require that the expression of the output node for *I* = 0 and 1 differ as large as possible.
- Fitness is defined as follows:

$$f = |\bar{x}_{out}(0) - \bar{x}_{out}(1)|$$

- \$\overline{x}\_{out}(I)\$ : the fixed-point value (or the long-time average if no fixed point is reached) of the output node for input *I*.
- $f \in [0,1]$  by definition

#### Two methods

- 1. Random sampling by multicatnonical Monte Carlo method
- 2. Evolutionary simulation

# Method 2

#### Multicanonical Monte Carlo

- Originally developed in statistical physics to sample energies evenly.
  - Berg and Neuhaus 1991,1992
- Later, it was realized that McMC can used also for non-physical systems.
  - Review: Y. Iba, N. Saito, and A. Kitajima: Ann Inst Stat Math 66 (2014) 611.

#### Application to GRN

- It enables us to sample GRNs in wide range of fitness randomly (in principle).
- Fitness are divided into 100 bins.
- The weight for each bin is determined by Wang-Landau method.
- 5M samples

# Method 3

#### Example of McMC



# Method 4

#### **Evolutionary simulation**

- Mutation
  - 1. Delete a randomly selected edge
  - 2. Add a new egde to a randomly selected node pair
- Initial population: 1000 random GRNs.
- 500 are selected at each generation based on fitness.
- The lineage of the highest fitness at 150th generation is sampled.
  - 100,000 independent runs: 100,000 lineages

# Results

## Fitness landscape and evolutionary speed 1



#### Observations

- 1. Most GRNs have low fitness (f < 0.1).
- 2. At intermediate fitness, GRNs become exponentially rare as fitness increases.
- 3. For very high fitness  $(f > f^*)$ , GRNs become faster-than-exponentially rare.
- 4. Evolution slows down substantially at  $f \simeq f^*$ .

#### Genotipic entropy matters

• The evolutionary speed is determined mainly by the number of available GRNs (or genotypic entropy).

## **Emergence of bistability 1**



An example of bistability for f = 0.9 The fraction of the bistable GRNs

#### Universality of evolution

- Bistable GRNs emerge, and their fraction grows as fitness increases. All GRNs become bistable as f → 1.
  - Bistability is a new phenotype. This new phenotype that was not explicitly required by the fitness appears inevitably.

#### Particularity of evolution

• Evolution delays the appearance and growth of the fraction of bistable GRNs

#### Evolution is conservative!

#### **Robustness measure**

- We consider the single-edge deletion as mutation.
- Delete a single edge from GRN and compute fitness f' after the mutation.
- Robustness measure for a given GRN is the average of f' for all the possible single-edge deletion.

$$r\equivrac{1}{K}\sum_i f_i'$$

•  $f'_i$  is f' for GRN that *i*th edge is deleted.

- Since (r) increases with f, it is not suitable to compare the robustness measure of different fitness f.
- We focus on difference in  $\langle r \rangle$  of GRNs having the same f obtained by random sampling and evolution.

#### **Robustness measure**



#### **Two-step evolution**

- 1. Early:  $\langle r \rangle$  coincides with random sampling.
- 2. Later:  $\langle r \rangle$  exceeds random sampling.

#### **Probability distribution of** *r*



f = 0.5 f = 0.8

f = 0.99

Evolution enhances mutational robustness!

#### Lethal edges



- Edges are divided in two classes: neutral and lethal
  - Intermediate edges are scarece.

Distribution of f' for f = 0.99

#### Distribution of lethal edges



- Lethal edges are significantly scarce in evolutionally obtained GRNs.
  - The origin of the difference in the mutational robustness is the difference in the number of lethal edges.

f = 0.99

#### Effective network size



- We counted the number of nodes having at least one path to the output node.
  - The effective network size does not affect the mutational robustness.

f = 0.99

# Network motifs 1

#### **Definition of motifs**

• The connection patterns appear in the given network at frequencies much higher than those found in random networks.

- We counted the following patterns for f = 0.99
  - 1. auto-regulation
  - 2. mutual regulation
  - 3. feedforward loop
  - 4. feedback loop
  - 5. mutual activation/repression plus auto-activation



Auto-activation



Mutual activation



Mutual repressionn



# Network motifs 3







Coherent feed-forward

loop



Positive feedback loop



mutual repression plus auto-activation



- Six patterns may be called as motif (but not so significant)
  - $\bullet \ + \mathsf{FFL}$  is ubiquitous motif in GRNs
  - Other patterns are known as motifs in multistable GRNs.

- Motifs are related to the function but not to the mutational robustness.
  - Global structures are considered to be relevant to the mutational robustness.

# Path distribution 1

# The number of paths connecting the input and output nodes



- *n*<sub>path</sub> are significantly different for a small number of paths
  - $n_{path} = 1$  in particular.

# Path distribution 2

The number of paths vs. the number of lethal edges



- The lethal edges are significantly scarce in evolution, irrespective of the number of paths.
  - The difference n<sub>path</sub> does not fully explain the mechanism for enhancement of the mutational robustness.

# Discussions

# Mechanism for enhancement of mutational robustness

#### Mutation consists of two successive processes:

- 1. Deletion of a randomly selected edge
- 2. Addition of a new edge
- When a lethal edge is deleted in the first process, the fitness of the GRN drops down to almost zero, and the possibility is very low that the fitness recovers by the second process.

#### Second-order selection (Wagner)

• GRNs with many lethal edges are more likely to be eliminated than those with fewer lethal edges in evolution.

# **Evolutionary speed**

#### **Entropy** effect

- Speed of evolution is in large part determined by the number of available GRNs.
  - Effect of genotypic entropy.

## Question

- Sato *et al.*(2003) showed that evolution slowed down as fitness becomes high.
  - Consistent with the entropic effect
- They found that evolution speed is in association with phenotypic divergence.
  - Relationship between the phenotypic divergence and the genotypic entropy?

# Summary

#### New method

• We compared the evolution of GRNs with a randomly sampled set generated by the multicanonical Monte Carlo.

#### Results

- 1. Mutational robustness does evolve.
  - GRNs with fewer lethal edges are selected by evolution.
  - Motifs are not relevant to mutational robustness.
  - The number of paths has some relevance to mutational robustness.
- 2. Evolution delays the emergence of a new phenotype.
  - Evolution is conservative.
- 3. Evolutionary speed is determined mainly by genotypic entropy.