Nuclear FRAP Model

Model definition

I propose the following parameterization for the Nuclear FRAP model.

 tPB_i : time of PB i, with $1 \le i \le number$ of FRAPs

 Δt : time between consecutive data points

n[t]: number of nuclear molecules at time t

c[t]: number of cytoplasmic molecules at time t

effVn: nuclear effective volume, that is where the molecules can diffuse.

effVc: cytoplasmic effective volume.

effVfrac = effVc / effVn: cytoplasmic to nuclear effective volume ratio

kI: Import rate (has volume units)

kE: Export rate (has volume units)

PBn: fraction of nuclear fluorescence photobleached in each FRAP

PBc: fraction of cytoplasmic fluorescence photobleached in each FRAP

deltaPBn1: extra PBn of first FRAP as compared to following FRAPs

deltaPBc1: extra PBc of first FRAP as compared to following FRAPs

PBfrac = PBc/PBn: ratio of cytoplasmic to nuclear photobleaching

n0: number of nuclear fluorescent proteins at the start of the experiment

c0: number of cytoplasmic fluorescent proteins at the start of the experiment

tot0 = n0 + c0: total number of fluorescent proteins at the start of the experiment

 n_i : number of nuclear fluorescent molecules just after the PB i

c_i: number of cytoplasmic fluorescent molecules just after the PB i

i: PB index. i=0 if $(t < tPB_1)$, i=1 if $(t \ge tPB_1 \& t < PB_2)$, ...

j: time course index, identifies all data point acquired in the same "movie" or file.

geomVn: nuclear geometric volume, relevant for microscopy

geomVc: cytoplasmic geometric volume, relevant for microscopy

geomVfrac = geomVc / geomVn: cytoplasmic to nuclear geometric volume ratio

y: proportionality constant between molecule concentration in geomV and fluorescence signal, assuming perfect focus.

focusN[t]: function describing the nuclear focus during the experiment

focusC[t]: function describing the cytoplasmic focus during the experiment

auto0n: non photoblechable nuclear autofluorescence amount (in units of fluorescence signal)

auto0c: non photoblechable cytoplasmic autofluorescence amount (in units of fluorescence signal)

auto1n: photoblechable nuclear autofluorescence at the start of the experiment amount (in units of fluorescence signal)

auto1c: photoblechable cytoplasmic autofluorescence at the start of the experiment amount (in units of fluorescence signal)

autoPBn: fraction of nuclear photoblechable autofluorescence photobleached in each FRAP

autoPBc: fraction of cytoplasmic photoblechable autofluorescence photobleached in each FRAP

the "recovery" model after each FRAP is given by the ODEs

$$\begin{split} \left\{ \text{n'[t]} &= -\text{kE} \ \frac{\text{n[t]}}{\text{effVn}} + \text{kI} \ \frac{\text{c[t]}}{\text{effVc}} \,, \\ \text{c'[t]} &= \text{kE} \ \frac{\text{n[t]}}{\text{effVn}} - \text{kI} \ \frac{\text{c[t]}}{\text{effVc}} \,, \, \text{n[tPB_i]} = \text{n_i, c[tPB_i]} = \text{c_i} \right\} \end{split}$$

that have analytic solution

$$n[t] = \frac{(c_i + n_i) \text{ effVn kI} + (n_i \text{ effVc kE} - c_i \text{ effVn kI}) \text{ e}^{\left(-\frac{kE}{\text{effVn}} - \frac{kI}{\text{effVc}}\right)t}}{\text{effVc kE} + \text{effVn kI}}$$

$$c[t] = c_i + n_i - n[t]$$

Assuming that at the start of the experiment the system is in steady state we have

$$n0 = \frac{\text{tot0 effVn kI}}{\text{effVc kE + effVn kI}}$$

$$c0 = \frac{\text{tot0 effVc kE}}{\text{effVc kE + effVn kI}}$$

The initial conditions after each frap are given by

$$\begin{split} n & [\texttt{tPBi}] = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} n & [\texttt{tPBi} - \Delta \texttt{t}] & (1 - \texttt{PBn} - \texttt{deltaPBn1}) & \texttt{i} == 1 \\ n & [\texttt{tPBi} - \Delta \texttt{t}] & (1 - \texttt{PBn}) & \texttt{i} > 1 \end{array} \right. \\ c & [\texttt{tPBi}] = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} c & [\texttt{tPBi} - \Delta \texttt{t}] & (1 - \texttt{PBc} - \texttt{deltaPBc1}) & \texttt{i} == 1 \\ c & [\texttt{tPBi} - \Delta \texttt{t}] & (1 - \texttt{PBc}) & \texttt{i} > 1 \end{array} \right. \end{split}$$

Note that we allow for the first PB to produce a larger drop in fluorescence than the subsequent ones, as this is what we observe experimentally. The model has to be solved in chunks of time. (we could get an analytical expression, but it would be quite messy).

A second part of the model relates to the "microscopy effects". The observed fluorescence is proportional to the concentration of molecules in the "geometrical volume", not the "effective volume". (I'm assuming the fluorescence signal has been corrected for imaging PB). Taking into account the autofluorescence and the focus, the expression for the fluorescence level as a function of n[t] and c[t] is given by

$$Fn[t] = focusN[t] \left(\gamma \frac{n[t]}{geomVn} + autoln (1 - autoPBn)^{i} + auto0n \right)$$

$$Fc[t] = focusC[t] \left(\gamma \frac{c[t]}{geomVc} + autolc (1 - autoPBc)^{i} + auto0c \right)$$

To avoid identifiably issues, I adimensionalized the equations to get rid of some parameters. First I define the adimentional rate parameters by dividing by the cytoplasmic effective volume

$$\kappa I = \frac{kI}{\text{effVc}} \Rightarrow kI = \kappa I \text{ effVc}$$

$$\kappa E = \frac{kE}{\text{effVc}} \Rightarrow kE = \kappa E \text{ effVc}$$

Using this in the equation for n[t]

$$n[t] = \frac{(c_i + n_i) \; \kappa I \; + \; (\; n_i \; \kappa E \; effVfrac \; - c_i \; \kappa I \;) \; e^{(-\; \kappa E \; effVfrac - \; \kappa I) \; t}}{\kappa E \; effVfrac \; + \; \kappa I} \; ;$$

where

$$effVfrac = \frac{effVc}{effVn}$$

for the focus we have that $0 \le \text{focus} N \le 1$ and $0 \le \text{focus} C \le 1$, but because we can't know when we are in perfect focus, I define the relative focus by dividing by the nuclear focus at time zero

$$\begin{split} \phi n[t] &= \frac{\text{focusN[t]}}{\text{focusN[0]}} \\ \phi c[t] &= \frac{\text{focusC[t]}}{\text{focusN[0]}} \\ Fn[t] &= \phi n[t] \text{ focusN[0]} \left(\gamma \frac{n[t]}{\text{geomVn}} + \text{autoln (1-autoPBn)}^{i} + \text{auto0n} \right) \\ Fc[t] &= \phi c[t] \text{ focusN[0]} \left(\gamma \frac{c[t]}{\text{geomVc}} + \text{autolc (1-autoPBc)}^{i} + \text{auto0c} \right) \end{split}$$

Second, I adimentionalize the fluorescence variables and parameters, or really I just express the amounts in terms of nuclear fluorescence in the nuclear focus of time zero.

$$\eta[t] = \gamma \operatorname{focusN}[0] \frac{n[t]}{\operatorname{geomVn}} \Rightarrow n[t] = \eta[t] \frac{\operatorname{geomVn}}{\gamma \operatorname{focusN}[0]}$$

$$\mathcal{E}[t] = \gamma \operatorname{focusN}[0] \frac{c[t]}{\operatorname{geomVn}} \Rightarrow c[t] = \mathcal{E}[t] \frac{\operatorname{geomVn}}{\gamma \operatorname{focusN}[0]}$$

$$T0 = \gamma \operatorname{focusN}[0] \frac{\operatorname{tot0}}{\operatorname{geomVn}}$$

$$\alpha \operatorname{ln} = \operatorname{focusN}[0] \operatorname{autoln}$$

$$\alpha \operatorname{lc} = \operatorname{focusN}[0] \operatorname{autolc}$$

$$\alpha \operatorname{on} = \operatorname{focusN}[0] \operatorname{auto0n}$$

$$\alpha \operatorname{oc} = \operatorname{focusN}[0] \operatorname{auto0c}$$

plugging this into the fluorescence equations we get

$$Fn[t] = \phi n[t] \left(\eta[t] + \alpha ln (1 - autoPBn)^{i} + \alpha 0n \right)$$

$$Fc[t] = \phi c[t] \left(\frac{\zeta[t]}{geomVfrac} + \alpha lc (1 - autoPBc)^{i} + \alpha 0c \right)$$

where

$$geomVfrac = \frac{geomVc}{geomVn}$$

I'll assume that the focus for the nucleus and the cytoplasm is constant during a movie. Otherwise, there are identifiable problems between the focus drift parameters and the kinetic parameters of the model.

$$\phi n[t] = \phi n_j$$

 $\phi c[t] = \phi c_i$

where $t \in \text{movie}_j$. I will use second order polynomials evaluated at the time of the PB to model the fluctuations in the focus. Noting that $\phi_n[0]=1$ we have

$$\phi n_j = 1 + an1 \left(tPB_j - tPB_1 \right) + an2 \left(tPB_j - tPB_1 \right)^2$$

$$\phi c_j = ac0 + ac1 \left(tPB_j - tPB_1 \right) + ac2 \left(tPB_j - tPB_1 \right)^2$$

So in summary, noting that the equations for n and c are linear and therefore don't depend on the units they are expressed in, we have

$$\begin{split} &\text{ift} < \text{tPB}_1 \\ &\eta[\texttt{t}] = \frac{\texttt{T0} \times \texttt{I}}{\texttt{\kappaE} \, \text{effVfrac} + \texttt{\kappaI}} \\ &\mathcal{E}[\texttt{t}] = \frac{\texttt{T0} \, \texttt{\kappaE} \, \text{effVfrac}}{\texttt{\kappaE} \, \text{effVfrac}} \\ &\text{ke effVfrac} + \texttt{kI} \\ &\text{ift} >= \texttt{tPB}_i \, \, \& \, \texttt{t} < \, \texttt{tPB}_{i+1} \, \Big\{ \\ &\eta_i = \Big\{ \begin{matrix} \eta[\texttt{tPB}_i - \Delta \texttt{t}] \, \left(1 - \texttt{PBn} - \texttt{deltaPBn1} \right) \, \, \text{i} \, = 1 \\ \eta[\texttt{tPB}_i - \Delta \texttt{t}] \, \left(1 - \texttt{PBn} \right) \, & \text{i} \, > 1 \end{matrix}, \\ &\mathcal{E}_i = \Big\{ \begin{matrix} \mathcal{E}[\texttt{tPB}_i - \Delta \texttt{t}] \, \left(1 - \texttt{PBc} - \texttt{deltaPBc1} \right) \, \, \text{i} \, = 1 \\ \mathcal{E}[\texttt{tPB}_i - \Delta \texttt{t}] \, \left(1 - \texttt{PBc} - \texttt{deltaPBc1} \right) \, \, \text{i} \, = 1 \end{matrix}, \\ &\eta[\texttt{t}] = \frac{\left(\mathcal{E}_i + \eta_i \right) \, \text{\kappaI} \, + \left(\eta_i \, \text{\kappaE} \, \text{effVfrac} \, - \mathcal{E}_i \, \, \text{\kappaI} \, \right) \, e^{\left(- \times \texttt{E} \, \text{effVfrac} - \kappa I \right) \, \texttt{t}}}{\texttt{\kappaE} \, \text{effVfrac} \, + \, \kappa I} \\ &\mathcal{E}[\texttt{t}] = \mathcal{E}_i + \eta_i - \eta[\texttt{t}] \, ; \Big\} \\ &\text{Fn}[\texttt{t}] = \phi n_j \, \left(\eta[\texttt{t}] + \alpha \ln \, \left(1 - \text{autoPNn} \right)^i + \alpha 0 n \right) \\ &\text{Fc}[\texttt{t}] = \phi c_j \, \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}[\texttt{t}]}{\text{geomVfrac}} + \alpha 1 c \, \left(1 - \text{autoPBc} \right)^i + \alpha 0 c \right) \\ &\phi n_j = 1 + \text{an1} \, \left(\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1 \right) + \text{an2} \, \left(\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1 \right)^2 \\ &\phi c_j = \text{ac0} + \text{ac1} \, \left(\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1 \right) + \text{ac2} \, \left(\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1 \right)^2 \\ \end{aligned}$$

So the free parameters I have to use in the fit are

- 1) κ EeffVfrac = combined kE × effVfrac to avoid identifiable issues
- 2) κI
- 3) T0
- 4) PBn
- 5) PBc (or PBfrac)
- 6) deltaPBn1
- 7) deltaPBc1
- 8) geomVfrac
- 9) α 1n
- 10) autoPBn
- 11) α 0n
- 12) an1
- 13) an2
- 14) α1c
- 15) autoPBc

```
16) \alpha 0c
```

17) ac0

18) ac1

19) ac2

To be compatible with previous notation, I go back to latin letters, BUT KEEPING THE INTERPRETATION OF THE GREEK LETTERS!

```
n = \eta

c = \zeta

tot0 = T0

kI = \kappa I

kE = \kappa E

Vfrac = effVfrac

kEVfrac = \kappa EeffVfrac

autoln = \alphaln

auto0n = \alpha0n

auto1c = \alpha1c

auto0c = \alpha0c
```

so we get the following equations (assuming deltaPBc1 = deltaPBn1 PBfrac)

$$\begin{split} &\text{ift} < \text{tPB}_1 \\ &n[t] = \frac{\text{tot0}\,\text{kI}}{\text{kEVfrac} + \text{kI}} \\ &c[t] = \frac{\text{tot0}\,\text{kEVfrac}}{\text{kEVfrac} + \text{kI}} \\ &c[t] = \frac{\text{tot0}\,\text{kEVfrac}}{\text{kEVfrac} + \text{kI}} \\ &\text{ift} >= \text{tPB}_i \,\,\&\,\text{t} < \text{tPB}_{i+1} \,\Big\{ \\ &n_i = \Big\{ \begin{matrix} n[\text{tPB}_i - \Delta t] \,\, (1 - \text{PBn} - \text{deltaPBn1}) \,\, i == 1 \\ n[\text{tPB}_i - \Delta t] \,\, (1 - \text{PBn} + \text{deltaPBn1}) \,\,\text{PBfrac}) \,\, i == 1 \\ c[\text{tPB}_i - \Delta t] \,\, (1 - \text{PBn} + \text{deltaPBn1}) \,\,\text{PBfrac}) \,\, i == 1 \\ c[\text{tPB}_i - \Delta t] \,\, (1 - \text{PBn} + \text{deltaPBn1}) \,\,\text{PBfrac}) \,\, i == 1 \\ c[\text{tPB}_i - \Delta t] \,\, (1 - \text{PBn} + \text{deltaPBn1}) \,\,\text{PBfrac}) \,\, i >= 1 \\ n[t] = \frac{(c_i + n_i) \,\,\text{kI} + (n_i \,\,\text{kEVfrac} - c_i \,\,\text{kI}\,\,) \,\,\text{e}^{(-\,\text{kEVfrac} - \text{kI}) \,\,\text{t}}}{\text{kEVfrac} + \text{kI}} \\ c[t] = \frac{(c_i + n_i - n[t] \,\,;}{\text{kEVfrac} + \text{kI}} \\ c[t] = \text{focusN}_j \,\, (n[t] + \text{autoln} \,\, (1 - \text{autoPNn})^{\,i} + \text{auto0n}) \\ \text{Fc}[t] = \text{focusC}_j \,\, \left(\frac{c[t]}{\text{geomVfrac}} + \text{autolc} \,\, (1 - \text{autoPBc})^{\,i} + \text{auto0c} \right) \\ \text{focusN}_j = 1 + \text{an1} \,\, (\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1) + \text{an2} \,\, (\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1)^2 \\ \text{focusC}_j = \text{ac0} + \text{ac1} \,\, (\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1) + \text{ac2} \,\, (\text{tPB}_j - \text{tPB}_1)^2 \\ \end{split}$$

With free parameters for the fit

- 1) kEVfrac
- 2) kI
- 3) tot0
- 4) PBn
- 5) PBfrac
- 6) deltaPBn1
- 7) geomVfrac

```
8) auto1n
```

- 9) autoPBn
- 10) auto0n
- 11) an1
- 12) an2
- 13) auto1c
- 14) autoPBc
- 15) auto0c
- 16) ac0
- 17) ac1
- 18) ac2

For example, if we assume

PBfrac = 0, no citoplasmic PB

deltaPBn1 = 0, no extra PB in first FRAP

autoPBn = 1, all photobleachable nuclear autofluorescence PB in first FRAP

auto0n = 0, no non-photobleachable nuclear autofluorescence

auto1c = 0, no photobleachable cytoplasmic autofluorescence

autoPBc = 0, no cytoplasmic PB

ac0 = 1, initial cytoplasmic focus equivalent to initial nuclear focus

ac1 = 0, no cytoplasmic focus drift

ac2 = 0, no cytoplasmic focus drift

resulting in 9 free parameters for the fit

- 1) kEVfrac
- 2) kI
- 3) tot0
- 4) PBn
- 5) geomVfrac
- 6) auto1n
- 7) an1
- 8) an2
- 9) auto0c

Model Fit

The parameters kEVfrac, kI and geomVfrac are scanned in log scale. Therefore I define the parameters

```
log10_kEVfrac = log10 (kEVfrac)
log10_kI = log10 (kI)
log2_geomVfrac = log2 (geomVfrac)
```

which are scanned lineally.

geomVfrac is not well defined by the fluorescence data alone. I has identifiability problems with tot0. Chanching the value of geomVfrac influences the value of kI and kEVfrac, as it changes the nuclear fraction. Therefore, we decided to obtain an independent estimate of geomVfrac, based on the cell's images. This can be done for each cell, or use a distribution for the population. We implemented a "ridge regression", where the cost function penalizes departures from the estimated geomVfrac. To do this, we define two new parameters.

```
log2_geomVfrac_mean = best estimation for log2_geomVfrac log2_geomVfrac_sd = standard deviation for the estimation of log2_geomVfrac
```

Note that the distribution of geomVfrac is assumed to be lognormal. Experimental data supports this assumption. The cost function is defined basically as in Cedersund and Roll 2008

$$V (p) = \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \frac{\left(y_{i} \left[t_{j}\right] - \hat{y}_{i}^{M} \left[t_{j}\right]\right)^{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2} \left[t_{j}\right]} + \sum_{k} \alpha_{k} h_{pen} \left[p_{k} - p_{k}^{g}\right]$$

where
$$h_{pen}[x] = x^2$$
 and $\alpha_k = \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}$

In this case there is only one variable over which to penalize (k=1), namely log2_geomVfrac. So we have

$$p_1^g = log2_geomVfrac_mean$$
 $\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2} = \frac{1}{(log2_geomVfrac_sd)^2}$

the cost function is therefore

$$V (p) = \sum_{i} \sum_{j} \frac{\left(y_{i} \left[t_{j}\right] - \hat{y}_{i}^{M} \left[t_{j}\right]\right)^{2}}{\sigma_{i}^{2} \left[t_{j}\right]} + \frac{\left(log2_geomVfrac - log2_geomVfrac _mean\right)^{2}}{\left(log2_geomVfrac _sd\right)^{2}}$$

this statistic is assumed to follow a chi square distribution.