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Abstract
The immune response to a pathogen has two basic features. The first is the expansion of a few pathogen-specific cells to form a population large enough to control the pathogen. The second is the process of differentiation of cells from an initial naive phenotype to an effector phenotype which controls the pathogen, and subsequently to a memory phenotype that is maintained and responsible for long-term protection. The expansion and the differentiation have been considered largely independently. Changes in cell populations are typically described using ecologically based ordinary differential equation models. In contrast, differentiation of single cells is studied within systems biology and is frequently modeled by considering changes in gene and protein expression in individual cells. Recent advances in experimental systems biology make available for the first time data to allow the coupling of population and high dimensional expression data of immune cells during infections. Here we describe and develop population-expression models which integrate these two processes into systems biology on the multicellular level. When translated into mathematical equations, these models result in non-conservative, non-local advection-diffusion equations. We describe situations where the population-expression approach can make correct inference from data while previous modeling approaches based on common simplifying assumptions would fail. We also explore how model reduction techniques can be used to build population-expression models, minimizing the complexity of the model while keeping the essential features of the system. While we consider problems in immunology in this paper, we expect population-expression models to be more broadly applicable.

Online supplementary data available from stacks.iop.org/PhysBio/10/035010/mmedia

1. Introduction
The central feature of the adaptive immune system is the ability to respond to a broad range of pathogens, including emerging threats never before encountered, without mounting responses to the native tissues of the body [1]. This dynamic is explained by the clonal selection theory, which underlies our understanding of immunology. This theory postulates that we begin with a very diverse population of immune cells (lymphocytes), with each lymphocyte having a unique and fixed specificity. Consequently the number of lymphocytes specific for a given pathogen is very small. Following infection these pathogen-specific lymphocytes undergo rapid division (clonal expansion) and differentiation into effector cells, which are able to control the pathogen. Following clearance of the pathogen some of these lymphocytes differentiate into memory cells, which are maintained for extended periods and account for long-term protection. The clonal selection theory describes the generation of the T cell and B cell responses. In figure 1 we show a schematic of clonal selection for a typical CD8 T cell response to a viral infection.

The enormous changes in population sizes suggested that, as in ecology, ordinary differential equation (ODE) models of the populations would prove useful to understanding the
immune response [2–4]. In these models cells are restricted to a few distinct phenotypes with division, death, and transition rates between the phenotypes to describe the dynamics. The models typically ignore how the systems biology on the cellular scale governs the rate laws in the models on the population scale. While such models have proven useful in addressing a number of population level questions, they have their limitations. For the approach to work well, phenotypic states must be well resolved and the transitions between them must be rapid.

Figure 2 presents data capturing the dynamics of T cells obtained via flow cytometry. This figure shows the density of CD8 T cells following a yellow fever vaccination plotted as a function of two surface expressed molecules (CD45RA, a signaling molecule that regulates antigen receptor signaling, and CCR7, a molecule which aids in trafficking of T cells to lymph-nodes) [5]. The population gradually transitions from CD45RA low to high during the contraction and memory phases. This figure illustrates one problem with ODE models of multicellular population dynamics: how does one unambiguously partition data into distinct phenotypes when there is considerable heterogeneity or gradual transitions? This ambiguity gives rise to subjectivity and quantitative disagreement between labs in the analysis of immunological data [6].

The flow of populations as they differentiate (figure 2) is governed largely by the systems biology of the cells [7–9]. (While the term systems biology has been used very broadly, in this paper we adopt the most common usage, referring to models of chemical reaction networks typically within single cells or homogeneous cell cultures [10].) Typical systems biology models consist of ODEs or stochastic differential equations that model reaction rates between chemical species, providing a finer resolution of phenotypic states.

While population models lose accuracy in not considering the chemical scale, systems biology models have contrasting limitations resulting from omission of the population dynamics. Typically, the analysis and parameter estimation of differentiating populations has been performed on time scales where division is negligible [11]. On longer time scales, population dynamics and systems biology are coupled and must be considered together. The expression levels of gene products control cell division and death rates. In their turn, cell division and death rates change the number of cells in various phenotypic states and hence shape the expression profiles of populations. Additionally the process of cell division dilutes expression and can generate spurious correlations between expressed chemicals. Clearly, modeling immune system dynamics requires an integrated approach, combining population dynamics and systems biology.

One way to do this is to conceptualize each flow cytometry data set as samples from a density in a multidimensional cellular configurational space, where each dimension denotes the quantity of a specific chemical. Individual cells would trace out trajectories in this configurational space as they differentiate. Unfortunately in vivo single cell longitudinal data is difficult to obtain, and for dividing cells the term longitudinal is undefined. Thus instead of tracking cells over time, one can focus on tracking populations, or distributions of cells in the configurational space. This can be done using partial differential equations (PDEs) and related mathematical concepts, an approach gaining popularity in theoretical immunology [12–14]. We refer to the dynamics of chemical expression (gene, protein, metabolite, etc) in a dynamic population as the population-expression, and models of the population-expression as population-expression models.
Such population-expression models circumvent our inability to define clear cellular phenotypic states. They remove the inherent subjectivity in phenotype discrimination [6], and they remove the need to incorporate additional phenotypes to better fit models to data. They integrate the within cell stochastic chemical kinetics into models of the population dynamics. Ultimately, they allow analysis of the diversity of protein expression within populations, how it changes with time, and how the diversity is affected by selection.

The main goal of this paper is to introduce such population-expression modeling, explain utility of the approach in the context of toy models, and discuss the methodological developments needed for practical applications of the ideas. To achieve this, we first introduce a formalism for population-expression models using PDEs, and non-local PDEs. Following this we provide a number of examples of population-expression models, illustrating where ecological based ODE models succeed and fail, how cell division dilutes chemical quantities, where single-cell analyses fail to describe the population, and how we can infer from data which chemicals may be drivers in regulatory networks. We end with a critical look at some of the key problems arising when we confront population-expression models with ever increasing dimensionality of experimental datasets.

2. Population-expression approach: PDE formulation

Instead of predefining a limited number of cell phenotypes, our population-expression approach takes the abundance of cells with different chemical states as the dynamical variable. We denote by $\rho(\vec{A},t)$ the density of cells at time $t$, with internal biochemical expressions (internal states) of $\vec{A}$.

To describe how $\rho(\vec{A},t)$ changes with time, we first consider how a single cell moves in the configurational space of $A$ values. Denoting the set of differential equations that describe the changing chemical quantities within a single cell by

$$\frac{d\vec{A}}{dt} = \vec{\gamma}(\vec{A}),$$

the abundance $\rho$ flows according to the vector field denoted by $\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})$. A number of techniques exist to translate from the single cell model to a population model [15]. In the accompanying supplementary materials we provide such contrasted derivations, one more common to the fluid-dynamics community (based on the divergence theorem), and the other more common to statistical physics and systems biology (based on the chemical master equation). These techniques have identical results, generating an advection equation describing how the density changes according to the vector field $\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})$:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\vec{A},t)}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot [\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t)].$$

The quantity in the square brackets denotes the total flux of cells changing in expression level as they move through the configurational space, and $\vec{\nabla}$ defines the divergence operator, a vector of partial derivative operators ($\partial/\partial A_1$, $\partial/\partial A_2$, ...). The formulation is valid for arbitrary dimensionality, and the examples in the following sections use either one or two dimensions for simplicity.

Incorporating population dynamics into these equations can be done with additional terms for cell death and sources of new cells:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\vec{A},t)}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot [\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t)] - \nu(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t) + \Gamma(\vec{A}).$$

Here $\nu(\vec{A})$ denotes a cellular death rate that is a function of the chemical concentration and $\Gamma(\vec{A})$ is an influx of new cells entering the system in a chemical state $\vec{A}$.

Cell division can be included by adding nonlocal terms to equation (3). For example, if in a symmetric cell division, all chemicals in the cell are split equally between the two daughters, we have

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\vec{A},t)}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot [\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t)] - \mu(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t)
+ 2^d \cdot 2\mu(2\vec{A})\rho(2\vec{A},t) - \nu(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t) + \Gamma(\vec{A}).$$

Here $\mu(\vec{A})$ is the division rate, which we assume depends on the cell age and other properties only implicitly through the instantaneous state of the cell, $\vec{A}$. In this equation, cells with chemical quantity $\vec{A}$ are removed from the abundance at $\vec{A}$ as they divide with rate $\mu(\vec{A})$. Separately, each cell dividing at abundance $2\vec{A}$ is adding two cells to the abundance at $\vec{A}$. The factor of $2^d$ arises from a subtlety of the non-local calculus. Division adds to an infinitesimal volume of the space, bounded in each dimension by $(A_i, A_i + \delta A_i)$ where $\delta$ is an infinitesimal quantity. The cells however are coming from a region with boundaries $(2A_i, 2A_i + 2\delta A_i)$, which is twice the width in each of the $d$ dimensions. This equation can also be modified to describe dilution in asymmetric cell division.

It is frequently the case that non-locality gives rise to integro-differential equations. If we incorporated partitioning noise into our equation, it would generate an integral term as new cells would enter the population at $\vec{A}$ from a range of values centered around $2\vec{A}$. When considering systems with small numbers of molecules, this approach is an important extension. With large numbers of molecules, the relative variation is small, and partitioning noise can be neglected.

Finally we can very naturally incorporate the stochastic fluctuations resulting from the chemical dynamics [16, 17]. This is typically done by constructing a chemical master equation, and expanding in small relative fluctuations [18]. An example derivation is provided in the supplementary material, available at stacks.iop.org/PhysBio/10/035010/mmedia. Expanding the chemical master equation to lowest order gives equation (2). The expansion of the chemical master equation to next highest order results in a nonlocal analogue of the Fokker–Planck equation, which spreads the population in the $\vec{A}$ space due to stochasticity of the intrinsic chemical processes:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(\vec{A},t)}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot [\vec{\gamma}(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t)]
- \mu(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t) + 2^d \cdot 2\mu(2\vec{A})\rho(2\vec{A},t)
- \nu(\vec{A})\rho(\vec{A},t) + \Gamma(\vec{A}) + \vec{\nabla} \cdot [D(\vec{A})\vec{\nabla}\rho(\vec{A},t)].$$
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Here $D(\mathbf{A})$ is a diffusion tensor. The advection dynamics becomes advection-diffusion dynamics with the incorporation of within-cell stochasticity. Such approaches to modeling fluctuations in single cells are now commonplace in molecular systems biology [19], and many efficient simulation and analysis algorithms have been developed [20].

As in systems biology, in population-expression models some state variables may remain discrete. For example the state of transcription factor binding may be best described by a binary on/off variable, or compartmental spacial dependence could be incorporated into the model (e.g. lung, spleen, etc.). In these cases we typically describe multiple coupled densities $\rho_i(\mathbf{A}, t)$, with population-expression dynamics, equation (5), for each density and with terms that couple the equations through transitions between the states, such as $\sum_k k_{ij} \rho_j(\mathbf{A}, t)$. Of possibly high relevance to the current work, cross-sectional flow cytometry samples from cellular populations at different time points have been used to infer parameters of chemical reaction rates $\gamma_i$ [11]. The population-expression approach differs from these analyses by incorporating the effects of proliferation, cell death, and dilution by cell division. We show below that these effects can substantially bias the resulting expression profile of a population.

Note that, for much of this paper, we assume that $\rho(\mathbf{A}, t)$ can be measured: that the number of samples is large enough so that inference of $\rho$ is not a hard task. This breaks down if $d = \text{dim} \mathbf{A} \gg 1$. We will discuss this case in section 4. Similarly, we assume that population-expression equations are sufficiently low-dimensional to be numerically solvable. When this is not the case, Monte-Carlo simulations might be needed, and we briefly touch on this topic in the discussion.

3. Population-expression approach: examples

In this section, we use the population-expression approach to model simple processes of relevance to different aspects of immune dynamics. The examples illustrate the inadequacy of single cell systems biology (expression) and ecological based ODE (population) modeling approaches.

3.1. Ecological based ODE model failure: slow expression dynamics

Ecological based ordinary differential equation models of phenotypical population dynamics work well only when phenotypes are sharply defined and transitions between them are rapid. This is not always the case. Consider, for example, a transition between phenotypes that occurs when an internal state has changed, but the observables take time to reach their characteristic values for this new state. For example, a good measure of the phenotypic state of a cell may be the binding of transcription factors (TFs) to DNA, which is possible but not easy to measure [21]. On the other hand, we routinely measure expression levels of protein using flow cytometry. These levels are typically controlled by transcription factor binding, but changes in protein expression lag behind changes in TF binding. Thus the dynamics of switching observed in flow cytometry data may be non-trivial.

Here we model cells having a discrete state denoting transcription factor binding (‘off’ or ‘on’), and a continuous variable $A$ for expression level. Off cells can switch to the on state with the rate $k$, and the dynamics of $A$ is given by $\frac{dA}{dt} = \gamma_{off/on}$, where $\gamma_{off/on}$ depends on the state. Namely, the chemical $A$ has two possible production rates: $\alpha_{on}$, and $\alpha_{off}$. In both states there is the same degradation rate $\beta$. This kinetics may correspond, for example, to the expression and decay of mRNA or protein if mRNA levels equilibrate quickly in comparison to the protein dynamics. We consider the cells in the two states separately: $\rho_{on}(A, t)$ is the density of cells in the on state with expression level $A$, and $\rho_{off}(A, t)$ are the cells in the on state. The population-expression equations are

$$\frac{d\rho_{off}(A, t)}{dt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A}[(\alpha_{off} - \beta A)\rho_{off}(A, t)]$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial A^2}[(\alpha_{off} + \beta A)\rho_{off}(A, t)] - k \rho_{off}(A, t), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{d\rho_{on}(A, t)}{dt} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A}[(\alpha_{on} - \beta A)\rho_{on}(A, t)]$$
$$+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial A^2}[(\alpha_{on} + \beta A)\rho_{on}(A, t)] + k \rho_{off}(A, t). \quad (7)$$

Similar models for single cells in equilibrium [22, 23], and even off-equilibrium for simpler cases [24], have been solved exactly. Here we analyze this system numerically in the non-equilibrium context. We solve these equations with a method of lines integration with a finite differencing approximation for $A$ derivatives, and Matlab ODE45 routine for integrating forward in time.

Figure 3 plots numerical solutions of $\rho(A, t) = \rho_{off}(A, t) + \rho_{on}(A, t)$, defined by equations (6) and (7), for two contrasting pictures of differentiation. The left panels shows infrequent TF switching with rapid protein expression ($k \ll \beta(A)$). In this case the protein concentration in each cell tracks its transcriptional state well, phenotypes are well defined, and an ODE model describing switching between them works well. The right panels in figure 3 represent the case when TF switching is rapid, but change in protein expression is gradual. The initial and final states are identical to the scenario on the left. The gradual protein expression gives a large density of cells with intermediate protein expression on day 15, and no well-resolved phenotypes.

Dashed lines in figure 3 define low and high expressing phenotypes, as is typical in the analysis of flow cytometry data. The number of cells in the low expressing phenotype is much more frequent than the high expressing phenotype. The number of cells in the low expressing phenotype is much more frequent than the high expressing phenotype. The number of cells in the low expressing phenotype is much more frequent than the high expressing phenotype.
The steady state distribution given by equations (6) and (7) has a width, while equation (9) has a steady state where all cells are within the $X_n$ partition. Any overlap between the steady state distribution and the $X_{n-1}$ state will not be resolved by such a model. Additionally, this method introduces spurious phenotypes having little to do with the underlying biology. Alternatively, one could make the transition rate $k$ a function of time $k(t)$. Like the previous case, this technique describes the data, but provides little insight into the biology of the system.

3.2. Failure of single cell systems biology: cell division

The models presented here are constructed based on chemical number rather than concentration. This gives correspondence with fluorescence experiments and enables accurate estimation of stochastic effects. Upon cell division we must divide the contents of a cell in half (assuming symmetric cell division). This gave us the non-local PDE in equation (4). Such nonlocal partial differential equations are uncommon and most computational tools are ill-equipped to deal with them. The use of finite difference, finite element, and spectral methods in solving these types of equations has been studied in a series of papers [26–28]. For large dimensional systems, Monte-Carlo integration can provide a more efficient numerical solution. In these examples we use finite difference methods.

Dilution of a dye. As a simple example of dilution by division, consider a dye such as CFSE or BrdU. These dyes are used to measure cell division rates in vivo and are frequently used in studying the cellular dynamics of immune responses. These dyes are not produced by the cells and are degraded slowly, yielding $\gamma = 0$. This removes the advection term in equation (4) yielding

$$\frac{\partial \rho(A,t)}{\partial t} = -\mu \rho(A,t) + 4\mu \rho(2A,t). \quad (10)$$

For a dye that initially has a narrow Gaussian distribution in cells, we have the output shown in figure 5. This system has been well described using ODE models [29, 30], with a single ODE for the number of cells in each peak. We note that, for brevity, we are using a model with exponentially distributed division times. For rapidly dividing cells, more detailed models of cell cycle provide greater accuracy [30, 13].

Dilution and homeostasis. For a chemical that is produced in the cell, division can bias the population-expression. Figure 6 shows an example of this effect. Here we have simulated two populations of cells, one not-dividing (solid) and one undergoing homeostatic division (cell death and division rates are equal, dashed curve). These curves are stationary distributions generated by the equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(A,t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A} \left[(\alpha - \beta A)\rho(A,t)\right] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial A^2} \left[(\alpha + \beta A)\rho(A,t)\right] - 2\mu \rho(A,t) + 4\mu \rho(2A,t). \quad (11)$$

One would then optimize the parameters $k_i$ to produce the best fit to the data. This approach also has its limitations. The steady state distribution given by equations (6) and (7) has a width, while equation (9) has a steady state where all cells are within the $X_n$ partition. Any overlap between the steady state distribution and the $X_{n-1}$ state will not be resolved by such a model. Additionally, this method introduces spurious phenotypes having little to do with the underlying biology. Alternatively, one could make the transition rate $k$ a function of time $k(t)$. Like the previous case, this technique describes the data, but provides little insight into the biology of the system.

3.2. Failure of single cell systems biology: cell division

The models presented here are constructed based on chemical number rather than concentration. This gives correspondence with fluorescence experiments and enables accurate estimation of stochastic effects. Upon cell division we must divide the contents of a cell in half (assuming symmetric cell division). This gave us the non-local PDE in equation (4). Such nonlocal partial differential equations are uncommon and most computational tools are ill-equipped to deal with them. The use of finite difference, finite element, and spectral methods in solving these types of equations has been studied in a series of papers [26–28]. For large dimensional systems, Monte-Carlo integration can provide a more efficient numerical solution. In these examples we use finite difference methods.

Dilution of a dye. As a simple example of dilution by division, consider a dye such as CFSE or BrdU. These dyes are used to measure cell division rates in vivo and are frequently used in studying the cellular dynamics of immune responses. These dyes are not produced by the cells and are degraded slowly, yielding $\gamma = 0$. This removes the advection term in equation (4) yielding

$$\frac{\partial \rho(A,t)}{\partial t} = -\mu \rho(A,t) + 4\mu \rho(2A,t). \quad (10)$$

For a dye that initially has a narrow Gaussian distribution in cells, we have the output shown in figure 5. This system has been well described using ODE models [29, 30], with a single ODE for the number of cells in each peak. We note that, for brevity, we are using a model with exponentially distributed division times. For rapidly dividing cells, more detailed models of cell cycle provide greater accuracy [30, 13].

Dilution and homeostasis. For a chemical that is produced in the cell, division can bias the population-expression. Figure 6 shows an example of this effect. Here we have simulated two populations of cells, one not-dividing (solid) and one undergoing homeostatic division (cell death and division rates are equal, dashed curve). These curves are stationary distributions generated by the equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho(A,t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A} \left[(\alpha - \beta A)\rho(A,t)\right] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial A^2} \left[(\alpha + \beta A)\rho(A,t)\right] - 2\mu \rho(A,t) + 4\mu \rho(2A,t). \quad (11)$$

One would then optimize the parameters $k_i$ to produce the best fit to the data. This approach also has its limitations. The steady state distribution given by equations (6) and (7) has a width, while equation (9) has a steady state where all cells are within the $X_n$ partition. Any overlap between the steady state distribution and the $X_{n-1}$ state will not be resolved by such a model. Additionally, this method introduces spurious phenotypes having little to do with the underlying biology. Alternatively, one could make the transition rate $k$ a function of time $k(t)$. Like the previous case, this technique describes the data, but provides little insight into the biology of the system.
where we have also included the stochastic effects of the chemical dynamics. To keep the system from growing, we have cell death rate equal to division rate, giving an extra factor of 2 in the second to last term.

Figure 6 shows stable distributions for this system with and without $\mu = 0$. As we can see, cell division biases the distribution, reducing the mean and increasing the width. In general, the more rapid the division, the more exaggerated the effects. If the division rate exceeds the chemical degradation rate $\beta$, the stable distribution is very different from what is seen here, and is centered close to $A = 0$.

Statistical deviations resulting from cell division have been studied in previous work [31–33]. This type of noise is typically considered extrinsic noise [31]. It is also often approximated as a local and continuous process and incorporated into chemical decay terms [34], a modeling choice which omits many of the effects illustrated in this section.

**Dilution and expansion.** Figure 7 shows a simulation of a bivariate process where the vertical axis represents a chemical $A_1$ that is produced by the cell, as in equation (4) (figure 6), and the horizontal axis represents a dye concentration $A_2$, with quantities in half simultaneously. The population-expression dynamics as in equation (10) (figure 5). Here the population is expanding rather than undergoing homeostatic division. The equation describing the dynamics of the system is

\[
\frac{\partial \rho(A_1, A_2, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial A_1}[(\alpha - \beta A_1)\rho(A_1, A_2, t)] + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial A_1^2}[(\alpha + \beta A_1)\rho(A_1, A_2, t)] - \mu \rho(A_1, A_2, t) + 8\mu\rho(A_1, A_2, t),
\]

(12)

The simulation considers a system where cells are initially in an equilibrium distribution for a non-dividing population (solid curve in figure 6 for vertical axis, and day 0 density in figure 5 for horizontal axis). Beginning on day 0 in this simulation, the cells are stimulated to divide. This simulation has correspondence with resting lymphocytes that are dyed and then stimulated by an infection on day 0 resulting in rapid expansion. Thought there is no change in the production rate $\alpha$ dilution gives a reduction in expression. Population-expression models can discriminate between reduction in expression resulting from a change in chemical dynamics and this simple dilution. Here $\mu = 0.09$ day$^{-1}$, $\alpha = 43$ copies/day, $\beta = 0.08$ day$^{-1}$.

**Cell division and spurious correlations.** Another effect of cell division is that two chemical quantities that have independent dynamics can have correlations generated by cell division. Cell division will cut both otherwise independent quantities in half simultaneously. The population-expression
than A (dα when analyzing expression data for correlations to avoid spurious level (bottom). The effects of cell division should be accounted for the same time (cell division) introducing correlations in expression levels that are frequently used to infer the structure of genetic regulatory dynamics (equation is 

\[ Q_u \sim 4 \epsilon \delta \mu \rho(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) \]

having a similar form to equation (12). However, A2 also obeys a simple gene-product rate law, and we include an extra factor of 2 in the second to last term for homeostatic division.

A simulation of the equilibrium distribution of equation (13) is shown in figure 8. This is a two-dimensional extension of figure 6. The non-dividing population corresponding to the solid curve in figure 6 is depicted at top, and the correlated spread resulting from cell division shown at bottom. The asymmetry in the distribution is a result of the A2 dynamics being more rapid than the A1 dynamics (d > d).

We note that correlated fluctuations in expression levels are frequently used to infer the structure of genetic regulatory [35, 36], signaling [37], and metabolic networks [38]. Failing to account for the effects of cell division in such an analysis can lead to the incorrect reconstruction of the genetic network. Spurious correlations between gene-products are strongest for pairs where both have slow degradation rates. Correlations in gene-product expression result very naturally from cell division. These correlations are typically grouped with other forms of extrinsic noise [31]. Population-expression models allow us to resolve the relative magnitude of different noise sources in extrinsic noise, potentially improving genetic regulatory network reconstruction methods.

3.3. Failure of single cell systems biology: selection bias

Consider now a two gene example with influx and selection. Here there is an initial population of cells localized around \( (A_1^0, A_2^0) \). These cells have chemical dynamics such that at t = 0, A1 begins to rapidly decrease and A2 begins to gradually increase. The population dynamics that underlies selection in this system arises from changes in the rate of division and death of cells in a manner dependent on the concentrations of A1 and A2 within the cell. We set the division rate proportional to A1 and the death rate proportional to A2. The system also has a gradual influx of cells \( \Gamma (A_1, A_2) \) entering the system around \( (A_1^0, A_2^0) \). Here we do not consider the effects of dilution with cell division.

The system is described, using the vector notation, by

\[ \gamma_1 = \alpha - \beta A_1, \quad \gamma_2 = \delta - \epsilon A_2, \]

\[ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\vec{\nabla} \cdot [\rho \vec{\nabla} + (D \nabla \rho) + d A_1 \rho - d A_2 \rho + \Gamma(A_1, A_2)], \tag{16} \]

having the similar form to equation (12). However, A2 also obeys a simple gene-product rate law, and we include an extra factor of 2 in the second to last term for homeostatic division.

A simulation of the equilibrium distribution of equation (13) is shown in figure 8. This is a two-dimensional extension of figure 6. The non-dividing population corresponding to the solid curve in figure 6 is depicted at top, and the correlated spread resulting from cell division shown at bottom. The asymmetry in the distribution is a result of the A2 dynamics being more rapid than the A1 dynamics (d > d).

We note that correlated fluctuations in expression levels are frequently used to infer the structure of genetic regulatory...
Any such analysis of a dynamic population must also take selective effects into account [39].

Rather than discuss the dynamics of $A_1$ and $A_2$ separately, we can discuss the differentiation of cells moving along the one-dimensional average path (black curve). To do this, we introduce the variable $a$ where cells enter the system at $a = 0$ and the differentiation pathway takes them toward $a = 1$; though, as seen in figure 9 Day 100, they may never reach $a = 1$. In this reduced model, we also neglect the stochastic effects and the only heterogeneity in the system is due to the influx of new cells.

The one-dimensional description is given by

$$\gamma = \epsilon - \epsilon a,$$

$$A_1(a) = \frac{\alpha}{\beta} - \left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} - A_1^0\right)(1-a)^{\beta/\epsilon},$$

$$A_2(a) = A_2^0(1-a) + \frac{\delta}{\epsilon} a,$$

$$\frac{\partial \rho(a, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\left[(\eta - \eta a)\rho(a, t)\right] + dA_1(a)\rho - dA_2(a)\rho + \Gamma(a = 0).$$

In this one-dimensional model, we still have a distribution of cells since influx of $a = 0$ cells gives diversity to the system. In the absence of this influx, we can describe the population with an ODE model where the population has an internal variable (a zero-dimensional approximation):

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dt} = \epsilon - \epsilon a,$$

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} = dA_1(a)X(t) - dA_2(a)X(t),$$

where $A_1(a)$ and $A_2(a)$ are described by equation (18) and (19). This approach was recently used to describe the exhaustion of CD8 T cells during a chronic infection where the internal variable corresponded to the level of exhaustion in the population and where thymic influx could be neglected [40].

4. Choosing the right variables

Traditional flow cytometry interrogates large numbers of cells. However, the information from a single cell is limited by the spectral overlap of the fluorescent dyes to measuring the concentration of about 15 different molecules. Soon, new techniques such as Cy-TOF [41] (which merges mass-spectrometry with flow cytometry) will allow us to overcome this limitation and obtain simultaneous measurements of the concentration of hundreds of molecules at the single cell level. As the dimensionality increases, the techniques of population-expression modeling become computationally intractable. This necessitates dimensional reduction and identification of ‘key players’ among the measured molecular expressions. At the same time, even as we measure more and more quantities, some of the key players will still be omitted, forcing us to look for such important missing links.

In the simplest case, the expression dynamics for all chemical species in the system would be determined by a few key regulators, $B_n$, i.e. $\frac{dA_i}{dt} = \alpha(B, A_i) - \beta(B, A_i) + \eta$, where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the production/degradation functions, and $\eta$ is the noise term. $B_n$ can be an individual chemical species, or more likely some function of many of the individual expressions. The goal is to find the minimal set $\hat{B}$ from data, or to understand if the data does not provide sufficient information to do so.

There is no single universal approach for dealing with large-dimensional data that would solve both of these problems in the immunological context. In fact the problems are not unique to immunology, or even to biology. Classic dimensionality reduction techniques include principal components analysis (PCA) [42], independent components analysis (ICA) [43], LASSO regression [44], and other approaches that explicitly identify (locally) linear subspaces spanned by data [45–47]. Many of these would be problematic in immunology since they measure importance by explained variance, which changes depending on the measurement units used. For example in PCA, using the measured brightness or its logarithm as the raw data may give very different results. The problem is solved elegantly with information-theoretic approaches, which are manifestly reparameterization invariant [48].
Figure 10. A two dimensional system of coupled stochastic biochemical species, with deterministic dynamics as in equations (23) and (24), with $a_0 = 200$ copies/day, $\alpha_1 = 2000$ copies/day, $\beta = 22$ day$^{-1}$, $K = 30$ copies, $n = 6$. $A_1$ exhibits bistability. Since it controls the expression of $A_2$, the distribution of the latter is also bimodal. Notice the asymmetry of the contour plots of the joint probability distribution. By itself, such asymmetry, as in the central panel, simply signals unequal regulation of the two species. However, time series measurements will notice that the population average of $\frac{dA_1}{dt}$ is correlated with the population average of $A_1$, but not the other way around. Graphically, this corresponds to the population escaping from the low expression steady state along the $A_1$ direction first, with $A_2$ following. This is a signal of the potential causal regulation $A_1 \rightarrow A_2$.

For this and related reasons, some of the most successful dimensionality reduction approaches in quantitative cell biology (and in computational neuroscience) have relied on information-theoretic techniques. For example, finding pairs of genes with high mutual information among their microarray mRNA expression profiles that cannot be explained away by confounding effects of other regulatory interactions uncovers “minimal” transcriptional regulatory networks in cells as complex as human lymphocytes [35]. Higher order information-theoretic analyses [49] further disambiguate scenarios where simple pairwise interactions do not explain the data and more complex regulatory patterns are needed instead, (e.g. two or more factors regulating expression [50]). Similarly, searching for projections of the combinatorially complex stimulus space that preserve the information about the rate of spiking is one of the most powerful methods for finding receptive fields of neurons from electrophysiology data [51]. All of these approaches are special cases of the rate-distortion framework [48], where a ‘small’ description of data is sought that nonetheless preserves the information about the variable of relevance [48, 52]. The balance between the amount of information kept and the model size is controlled by the needs of the modeler and the data availability.

These methods should work for the context of immunology, but some changes are needed. First, typical immunology flow cytometry experiments make it hard to assay many different phenotypic or temporal conditions, as is typically used for information-theoretic analyses [35, 51]. This limits the range of variation of the data and can artificially reduce the values of the measured information quantities. Luckily, as demonstrated in [53], having many (tens of) thousands of single cell measurements allows accurate information estimation in these scenarios. However, it is crucial for the measurements to be of a very high accuracy.

The second distinction of immunological data is that, in the foreseeable future, the number of profiled quantities will be in the hundreds, but not in the thousands, with cell surface molecules being the easiest to profile. This leaves a possibility for missing key regulators in the data sets. As was demonstrated recently [53], information theoretic analysis can detect when such important regulators are missing. This is done by observing that a missing regulator induces complex statistical dependences among all of its targets that cannot be explained by simple pairwise correlations [49]. While identification of such missing regulators in a semi-automated fashion is possible [50], the smaller dimensionality of the immunological data requires resetting the balance between the precision and the recall.

The third, and the most fundamental, distinction of immunological data is their population-expression nature. As illustrated in figure 8, cell division and death introduces spurious statistical relations among the measured expressions. Distinguishing effects of regulation versus population on the interactions among the measured variables should be possible by measuring the statistics of relations among physically non-interacting variables in experimental data and in numerical simulations.

Since development and differentiation of immune cells is fast and can be tracked in flow cytometry experiments on the scale of days, the data offers an ability to establish causality of regulation [54]. This is in contrast to identification of non-causal, symmetric relations among variables in most systems biology or computational neuroscience data analysis approaches. We illustrate this on the example of two coupled biochemical species obeying the deterministic dynamics

\[
\frac{dA_1}{dt} = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_1 A_1^n}{K^n + A_1^n} - \beta A_1, \quad (23)
\]

\[
\frac{dA_2}{dt} = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_1 A_1^n}{K^n + A_1^n} - \beta A_2. \quad (24)
\]

Here $A_1$ is self-regulating and can have two stable expression levels. $A_2$ is regulated by $A_1$ and will also be bimodal, but there is a clear difference between the two variables. Solution of the corresponding Fokker–Planck system is shown in figure 10, illustrating that the dynamics of the transient shapes of the joint probability distribution can signal the causality of regulatory relations.

This could be confirmed experimentally by sorting the cell population at an early time (e.g. day 1) into subpopulations based on expression levels. The contrast between the dynamics of the $A_1$-high, $A_2$-low subpopulation and the $A_1$-low, $A_2$-high subpopulation would reveal which is the driver of the system.
These sorted subpopulations would be placed into animals where they are recognized by unrelated genetic markers (e.g. Thy1.1) and monitored to see which subpopulation reaches $A_{1}$-high, $A_{2}$-high more rapidly.

5. Conclusion

Modeling in systems immunology is still in its infancy. Modeling requires identifying the key players and parameters that describe the behavior of interest. Population-expression models provide a tool for interpreting the changing expression profiles of multi-cellular populations that are differentiating while dividing and undergoing selection. They achieve this by connecting the population scale with intracellular systems biology.

The interpretation of immunological data has typically consisted of enumerating cellular phenotypes and describing how the sizes of these populations change over time. In contrast, the interpretation of data with population expression models focuses on the chemical interaction network common to all these phenotypes, and on the dependence of expression levels on division and death rates. One could instead continue adding additional phenotypic states to more accurately describe the data, but this is reminiscent of the ‘epicycles on epicycles’ used to described the motion of the planets in the Ptolemaic geocentric model of the universe. Looking at the problem differently can yield both simplicity and insight.

A complete view of systems biology would capture population dynamics, within-cell systems biology, and spatial effects. The spatial effects like clustering can occur at different scales. At the within-cell scale for example, clustering of molecules in the cell membrane plays an important role in the detection of antigen (infected cells) by T cells. At the population level, pathogens can be localized to the specific tissues and organs which they infect, while B and T cell responses occur in other sites such as the lymph nodes. Some spatial effects can be easily incorporated into the population-expression framework. The population-expression models are well suited to compartmentalization, where one considers a population-expression equation for different tissues and expression dependent trafficking rates between these compartments. For finer scale spatial effects, the population-expression approach breaks down, as the PDEs assume large numbers of cells in the compartments. In these low density regimes one must instead consider a model which treats cells discretely. In molecular systems biology, master equations and discrete stochastic simulations using Gillespie and related algorithms are very commonly used to describe the discreteness of stochastic changes in the phenotype of individual cells [55] alongside continuous Fokker–Planck and Langevin equation approaches. For methodological purposes, we built the current work around the population-expression analogue of the Fokker–Planck equation. However, it is clearly possible to develop the corresponding master equations and stochastic simulation algorithms, where the number of cells in a certain chemical state would be tracked. Nonlocal transitions due to cell division and related phenomena are not conceptually difficult to implement in such approaches, but the number of types of possible transitions, and hence the time complexity of a simulation, might grow excessively because of the nonlocality. We leave the development of these simulation algorithms for future publications.

Advances in a field often require the integration of theoretical and experimental approaches. In the past the use of cellular dynamics data, such as flow cytometric data, typically allowed us to enumerate large numbers (millions) of cells but restricted us to making a handful of measurements on each cell, limiting the phenotypic resolution. The extension of traditional flow cytometry to Cy-TOF [41] allows the measurement of hundreds of biochemical species simultaneously at the single cell level. This allows, for the first time, tracking cellular systems biology dynamics and the population dynamics simultaneously and with high accuracy. The aim is to understand interactions among internal states of single cells and the composition of cellular populations, and hence the responses of the populations to infections. In this paper, we touched upon key problems that need to be addressed for such analysis: simultaneous representation of molecular system and population dynamics, including proliferation and cell death, and identification of key components of regulatory networks. We outlined a few ways in which these problems can be tackled computationally, by modifying current analysis approaches and by introducing population-expression modeling.
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