A Biophysics and Bioengineering Perspective:

What makes breast cancer a hard problem, and where are some keys to its prevention, control, and cure?

John Wikswo Vanderbilt

2010 NSF Advances in Breast Cancer Research Workshop October 26-29, 2010 University of Arkansas

What I won't discuss



- Bioelectricity and biomagnetism in breast cancer
- Microfabricated devices for cancer research
 - Cell motility
 - Adhesion of rolling cells
 - Cell stiffness
 - Cell migration after patterning
 - Cellular haptotaxis on patterned substrates
 - Murine mammary fat pad windows
 - Three dimensional microbioreactors
 - Hollow fiber bioreactors
 - A perfused murine aorta model for angiogenesis
 - A microbioreactor for angiogenesis in the chick alantoic membrane

Thick Tissue Bioreactor:





Lisa McCawley and Dmitry Markov, Vanderbilt

BRE

Planar PCPB (parallel capillary perfused biore actors) E

coating with various cell adhesion receptors and assaying neutrophil interaction.



Lisa McCawley and Dmitry Markov, Vanderbilt



Let's discuss control and the complexity of biology, starting with the end of the talk.

Can we instrument and control cancer?



The future of biology and cancer medicine is distributed hybrid multiscale non-linear stochastic control



De Visser, Cancer Immunol Immunother (2008) 57: 1531-1539

The future of biology and cancer medicine is distributed hybrid multiscale non-linear stochastic control



De Visser, Cancer Immunol Immunother (2008) 57: 1531-1539





OUTPUT SENSORS

- Apoptosis
- Differentiation
- Gene / Protein Expression
- Growth
- Metabolism
- Motility
- Signal Transduction



LeDuc, Messner, Wikswo. How do controls approaches enter into biology. *Submitted*, 2010.





Wikswo et al., IEE Proc Nanobiotechnol. 153: 81-101 (2006)

Machine Learning: A robot that can infer a model of "itself"



Hypothesis: Machine learning and model inference with automated experimentation can be extended from robots to bioreactors

J. Bongard, V. Zykov, and H. Lipson, Resilient Machines Through Continuous Self-Modeling, Science, 314, 1118-1121, 2006





Target model placed in black box with 10% noise

 $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{1}}{dt} = 2.5 - \frac{100 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{1}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{2}}{dt} = \frac{200 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{1}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}} - 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} \mathbf{N}_{2}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{3}}{dt} = 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 6 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{2} - 64 * \mathbf{S}_{3} + 16 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{4}}{dt} = 64 * \mathbf{S}_{3} - 16 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3} - 13 * \mathbf{S}_{4} - 100 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{4} + 13 * \mathbf{S}_{5}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{N}_{2}}{dt} = 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 18 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{2} - 100 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{4}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{A}_{3}}{dt} = -1.28 * A_{3} - \frac{200 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{1}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}} + 128 * \mathbf{S}_{3} + 32 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{5}}{dt} = 1.3 * \mathbf{S}_{4} - 3.1 * \mathbf{S}_{5}$

Model inferred without any a priori information

$$\frac{dS_{i}}{dt} = 2.53 - \frac{98.79 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+12.66 \cdot A_{3}^{4}}$$
Glucose

$$\frac{dS_{2}}{dt} = \frac{200.23 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+13.80 \cdot A_{3}^{4}} - 6.87 \cdot S_{2} - 6.87 \cdot N_{2} + 0.95$$
G3P DP Pool

$$\frac{dS_{3}}{dt} = 6.00 \cdot S_{2} - 6.00 \cdot N_{2}S_{2} - 64.16 \cdot S_{3} + 16.08 \cdot A_{3}S_{3}$$
BPG

$$\frac{dS_{4}}{dt} = 64.04 \cdot S_{3} - 16.03 \cdot A_{3}S_{3} - 13.03 \cdot S_{4} - 100.11 \cdot N_{2}S_{4} + 13.21 \cdot S_{5}$$
Pyr Act Pool

$$\frac{dN_{2}}{dt} = -0.055 + 5.99 \cdot S_{2} - 17.94 \cdot N_{2}S_{2} - 98.82 \cdot N_{2}S_{4}$$
NADH

$$\frac{dA_{3}}{dt} = -1.12 \cdot A_{3} - \frac{192.24 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+12.50 \cdot A_{3}^{4}} + 124.92 \cdot S_{3} + 31.69 \cdot A_{3}S_{3}$$
ATP

$$\frac{dS_{5}}{dt} = 1.23 \cdot S_{4} - 2.91 \cdot S_{5}$$
S12

Microfabricated Multitrap Nanophysimeters (MTNPs) enable dynamic measurements on small populations of cells





Faley,S et al., Lab on a Chip, 8:1700-1712 (2008) & 9(18):2659-2664, 2009.



Our Robot Scientist: VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics





15



The End



How hard a problem is cancer?



Just how hard is a hard problem?

What is your favorite REALLY HARD problem?



- What is the nature of dark energy?
- What is the chemistry of interstellar space?
- What occurred at the origin of life?
- How does the brain work?
- Can we create life *de novo*?
- Can we save the planet from its human infestation?
- ...
- How do describe fully the spatiotemporal multiscale complexity of a biological system?
- ...
- How do you cure breast cancer?
- How do you control breast cancer?
- How do you prevent breast cancer?



If the human brain were so simple that we could understand it, we would be so simple that we couldn't.

Emerson M. Pugh, 1938

A <u>Really Hard</u> Problem



The same observation applies to biology:

Human biology is too complicated for humans to fully comprehend.

John Wikswo



So just how hard are biological problems?



Multiscaling makes biological problems hard

- Spatial extent
 - Number of interfaces
- Temporal extent
- Number of molecular species

Length

- Complexity of interactions
- Emergent behavior

Molecules

Time





Yeast Interactome







Multiscaling makes cancer a very hard problem

Lymphatic metastasis is a major pathway for tumor dissemination



Image taken from: www.nccroncology.ch/scripts/index.aspx?idd=110.

3D microenvironment provides numerous biophysical cues





Image taken from: Griffith L.G. et al., Nature Molecular cell Biology Review, Vol.7 (2006)

Autologous chemotaxis as a mechanism of tumor cell homing to lymphatics



Shields, J.D., et al. Autologous chemotaxis as a mechanism of tumor cell homing to lymphatics via interstitial flow and autocrine CCR7 signaling. Cancer Cell, 2007. **11**(6): p. 526-538

Monocytes into M₁ or M₂ Macrophages





• Favor tumor progression.



When a cell comes to a fork in the road, it takes it.

It is in fact a bit more complicated...*VI*/BRE



Breast Cancer Research Vol 9 No 4 DeNardo and Cousses

Cell differentiation Rolling down the epigenetic landscape



S. Huang and D.E. Ingber / A Non-Genetic Basis for Cancer Progression and Metastasis



Fig. 3. Waddington's epigenetic landscape. Reproduced from C.F. Waddington, 1957 [64]. We postulate here that the metaphoric epigenetic landscape corresponds to the attractor landscape (Fig. 2) that can be reduced to the dynamics of a gene regulatory network.



A Complex problem



- Suppose the disease is an emergent phenomenon...
 - the collective effect of multiple mutations and extensive gene regulatory changes in an ensemble of cells leading to a new dynamic (dis)equilibrium state
 - Type II diabetes
 - Lupus
 - Schizophrenia
 - Most cancers
- And God said
 - Let it be cured by distributed hybrid multiscale non-linear stochastic control

The epigenetic landscape reflects complex and dynamic genetic control



Nonequilibrium thermodynamics allows uphill motions Waddington, 1957
Shift the Epigenetic Landscape to Control Cell Fate

S. Huang and D.E. Ingber / A Non-Genetic Basis for Cancer Progression and Metastasis



Shift the Epigenetic Landscape to Control Cell Fate

S. Huang and D.E. Ingber / A Non-Genetic Basis for Cancer Progression and Metastasis





Can reductionist science solve the problem?



Step 1 in Science: Reductionist Explanations

Thermodynamics	Bulk solids	Anatomy
Statistical mechanics	Devices	Physiology
Molecular/atomic	Continuum models	Organ
dynamics	Mieroponio	Cell
Electrodynamics	models	Protein
Quantum chromodynamics	Atomic physics	Genome



Step 2 in Science: Post-Reductionist Theory

Thermodynamics

Experiments

Statistical mechanics

Experiments

Molecular/atomic dynamics

Experiments Electrodynamics

Experiments

Quantum chromodynamics Bulk solids Experiments Devices

Experiments Continuum models

Experiments

Microscopic models

Experiments Atomic physics

Behavior Experiments Physiology **Experiments** Organ **Experiments** Cell **Experiments** Protein **Experiments** Genome





A <u>Really Hard</u> Problem: Metabolic and Signaling Kinetics in a Multiscale Environment

- Question:
 - How do we describe and interpret biological complexity over multiple spatiotemporal scales?
- The standard solution:
 - -Genomics, proteomics, metabolomics arrays
 - Reductionist analysis of components
 - -Mathematical modeling....

The Models



Molecular Interaction Map: DNA Repair



KW Kohn, "Molecular Interaction Map of the Mammalian Cell Cycle Control and DNA Repair Systems," *Mol. Biol. of the Cell*, <u>10</u>: 2703-2734 (1999)

How Many Bits?



- 1 bit = Boolean Logic
- 2 bits = Bialekan Logic
- ...
- N bits = Bio Logic

How big is N?

'Postgenomic' Integrative/Systems Physiology/Biology

- Suppose you wanted to calculate how the cell responds to a toxin...
- Specify concentrations and
- Rate constants
- Add gene expression,
- Protein^N interactions, and
- Signaling pathways
- Time dependencies
- Include intracellular spatial distributions, diffusion, and transport: ODE → PDE(t)
- ... and then you can calculate how the cell behaves in response to a toxin



The Catch



- Modeling of a <u>single</u> mammalian cell may require >100,000 <u>dynamic</u> variables and equations, maybe > 1,000,000
- Cell-cell interactions are critical to system function
- 10⁹ 10¹¹ interacting cells in some organs
- Cell signaling involves highly DYNAMIC biochemical cascades with positive and negative feedback
- Multiple, overlapping regulatory mechanisms
- Many of the interactions are nonlinear
- Models might have a Leibnitz $(1 L = N_a)$ of PDEs
- The data don't yet exist to drive the models ...



It's the numbers....

Where do we get a mole of numbers?

The Practical Problems



- Our understanding of biological phenomena is <u>often</u> based upon
 - experiments that measure the ensemble averages of populations of $10^6 10^7$ cells, or
 - measurements of a single variable while all other variables are, one hopes, held constant, or
 - recordings of one *rapid* variable on one cell, or
 - averages over minutes to hours, or
 - combinations of some of the above, as with a 10 liter bioreactor that measures 50 variables after a one-week reactor equilibration to steady state.
 - costly measurements of the expression of 12,600 genes (Can you afford to read mRNA every 30 minutes for 7 days from multiple cell cultures?)
- Even though we suffer from an explosion of qualitative genomic expression data, we don't have an adequate quantification of expressed protein concentrations or the underlying biochemical reactions they enable.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA **BIOCATALYSIS / BIODEGRADATION DATABASE**



Dennis Bray understands the problem....



- "The past few decades have seen such an explosion of knowledge about the contents of living cells that we now swim in an ocean of data."
- "How can we come to terms intellectually with such an enormous number of interacting entities?"

D. Bray. Reductionism for biochemists: how to survive the protein jungle. *Trends Biochem.Sci.* 22 (9):325-326, 1997.

A possible failure mode



<u>Ontological failure</u>: The phenomenon you are interested in requires elements or laws outside of the set you have been given.

D. Bray. Reductionism for biochemists: how to survive the protein jungle. *Trends Biochem.Sci.* 22 (9):325-326, 1997.



The solution to ontological failure

Get more data...

The Catch



- Modeling of a <u>single</u> mammalian cell may require >100,000 <u>dynamic</u> variables and equations, maybe > 1,000,000
- Cell-cell interactions are critical to system function
- 10⁹ 10¹¹ interacting cells in some organs
- Cell signaling involves highly *DYNAMIC* biochemical cascades with positive and negative feedback
- Multiple, overlapping regulatory mechanisms
- Many of the interactions are nonlinear
- Models might have a Leibnitz (1 L = N_a) of PDEs
- The data don't yet exist to drive the models
- Hence we need to experiment...

Grand Challenge



- Design and build a hybrid silicon/biological system that proposes and generates models and conducts experiments on itself to identify the underlying equations that govern the biology.
- Extracellular: \$3 4 million and 3 5 years
- Intracellular: \$15 20 million and 5 – 10 years



The Robot Scientist





RD King et al. The Automation of Science. Science **324** (5923):85-89, 2009.



VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics





Cell Culture vs Microfluidics VI





Microfabricated Multitrap Nanophysimeters (MTNPs) enable dynamic measurements on small populations of cells





Faley,S et al., Lab on a Chip, 8:1700-1712 (2008) & 9(18):2659-2664, 2009.

VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics







We need lots and lots and lots of numbers.

HPLC mass spectrometry? An HPLC separation might require an hour!

Ion mobility mass spectrometry!



MALDI/nESI-IM-TOFMS







AFRICAN BIOTECH Growing an industry P23

SCHIZOPHRENIA Drug candidates treat more symptoms P.31



MASS SPECTROMETRY Ion mobility brings new dimension P.11

Slide courtesy of John McLean 765

Real-time 2D identification of biomolecular signatures: Integrated omics for dynamic systems biology



We will be adding GC for GC-IM-MS to improve detection of low mass metabolites

L. S. Fenn and J. A. McLean, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 391, 905-9 (2008).

Slide courtesy of John McLean 766

RE



Real-Time Structural Mass Spectrometry



John A. McLean,¹⁻³ Jeffrey Enders,¹⁻³ Cody Goodwin,¹⁻³ Jody May,¹⁻³ Chrissy Marasco,³⁻⁵ Sevu Sundarapandian,¹⁻³ Hod Lipson,^{3,6} Michael Schmidt,⁶ Kevin Seale,³⁻⁵ and John P. Wikswo^{3-5,7,8}

[1] Department of Chemistry, Vanderbilt University

- [2] Vanderbilt Institute of Chemical Biology
- [3] Vanderbilt Institute of Integrative Biosystems Research and Education
- [4] Searle Systems Biology and Bioengineering Undergraduate Research Experience, Vanderbilt University
- [5] Department of Biomedical Engineering, Vanderbilt University
- [6] Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Cornell University
- [7] Department of Physics and Astronomy, Vanderbilt University
- [8] Department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics, Vanderbilt University



VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics







Time-Lapse Bone Bioreactor Media Analysis **VI**/BRE Nutrient consumption and metabolite production



Samples: Andrea Mastro and Erwin Vogler. Analysis: Jeff Enders and John McLean



OK – you now have enough data.

How do you deal with a Leibnitz of non-sparse PDEs involving 100,000 nonlinear variables?

Carefully, very carefully

A possible failure mode



Ontological failure: The phenomenon you are interested in requires elements or laws outside of the set you have been given.

There is a second possible failure mode

Epistemological failure: You have enough elements and the laws do apply, but you yourself cannot understand the explanation that they provide.

D. Bray. Reductionism for biochemists: how to survive the protein jungle. *Trends Biochem.Sci.* 22 (9):325-326, 1997.

Houston, we have a problem.



- The human brain can process only seven pieces of data at a time.
 - "...the seven-point rating scale, the seven categories for absolute judgment, the seven objects in the span of attention, and the seven digits in the span of immediate memory..."

G.A. Miller, "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two: Some Limits on our Capacity for Processing Information," Psychological Review, 63, 81-97 (1956).


The solution to epistemological failure

Get a smarter, bigger brain...

Machine Learning: A robot that can infer a model of "itself"



Hypothesis: Machine learning and model inference with automated experimentation can be extended from robots to bioreactors

J. Bongard, V. Zykov, and H. Lipson, Resilient Machines Through Continuous Self-Modeling, Science, 314, 1118-1121, 2006 RE

VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics















Automated Probing and Inference of Analytical Models for Metabolic Network Dynamics

Michael Schmidt,¹ Ravishankar Vallabhajosyula,² Jerry Jenkins,^{2,3} Jonathan Hood,² Abhishek Soni,² John Wikswo,⁴ Hod Lipson¹

¹ Cornell University
 ² CFD Research Corporation
 ³ Hudson Alpha Institute
 ⁴ Vanderbilt University

Supported in part by DTRA, NIAID, NIDA, NSF and VIIBRE



Symbolic Regression -- Hod Lipson, Cornell --

- Traditional regression
 - Model known, regress coefficients
 - Linear, nonlinear
- Symbolic regression
 - Model unknown
 - Model building blocks given
 - {+,-,*,/,const,sin,cos,exp,log}

Eureqa: http://ccsl.mae.cornell.edu/eureqa







$f(x) = \mathbf{a}x^2 + \mathbf{b}x + \mathbf{c}$

 $f(x) = ae^{bx} + c$



CFDRC🕸

Estimation-Exploration algorithm designs experiments to select best symbolic model



Estimation / Exploration

Symbolic Regression









Into the Black Box: Yeast Glucose Oscillations



780





Target model placed in black box with 10% noise

 $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{i}}{dt} = 2.5 - \frac{100 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{i}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{2}}{dt} = \frac{200 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{i}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}} - 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} \mathbf{N}_{2}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{3}}{dt} = 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 6 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{2} - 64 * \mathbf{S}_{3} + 16 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{4}}{dt} = 64 * \mathbf{S}_{3} - 16 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3} - 13 * \mathbf{S}_{4} - 100 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{4} + 13 * \mathbf{S}_{5}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{N}_{2}}{dt} = 6 * \mathbf{S}_{2} - 18 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{2} - 100 * \mathbf{N}_{2} \mathbf{S}_{4}$ $\frac{dA_{3}}{dt} = -1.28 * A_{3} - \frac{200 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{1}}{1 + 13.68 * A_{3}^{4}} + 128 * \mathbf{S}_{3} + 32 * A_{3} \mathbf{S}_{3}$ $\frac{d\mathbf{S}_{5}}{dt} = 1.3 * \mathbf{S}_{4} - 3.1 * \mathbf{S}_{5}$

Model inferred without any a priori information

$$\frac{dS_{1}}{dt} = 2.53 - \frac{98.79 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+12.66 \cdot A_{3}^{4}}$$
Glucose

$$\frac{dS_{2}}{dt} = \frac{200.23 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+13.80 \cdot A_{3}^{4}} - 6.87 \cdot S_{2} - 6.87 \cdot N_{2} + 0.95$$
G3P DP Pool

$$\frac{dS_{3}}{dt} = 6.00 \cdot S_{2} - 6.00 \cdot N_{2}S_{2} - 64.16 \cdot S_{3} + 16.08 \cdot A_{3}S_{3}$$
BPG

$$\frac{dS_{4}}{dt} = 64.04 \cdot S_{3} - 16.03 \cdot A_{3}S_{3} - 13.03 \cdot S_{4} - 100.11 \cdot N_{2}S_{4} + 13.21 \cdot S_{5}$$
Pyr Act Pool

$$\frac{dN_{2}}{dt} = -0.055 + 5.99 \cdot S_{2} - 17.94 \cdot N_{2}S_{2} - 98.82 \cdot N_{2}S_{4}$$
NADH

$$\frac{dA_{3}}{dt} = -1.12 \cdot A_{3} - \frac{192.24 \cdot A_{3}S_{1}}{1+12.50 \cdot A_{3}^{4}} + 124.92 \cdot S_{3} + 31.69 \cdot A_{3}S_{3}$$
ATP

$$\frac{dS_{5}}{dt} = 1.23 \cdot S_{4} - 2.91 \cdot S_{5}$$





Will Matloff's MicroFormulator



MicroFabricated Real-Time MicroFormulator



Our Robot Scientist: VIIBRE Automated Omni-Omics





85





LeDuc, Messner, Wikswo. How do controls approaches enter into biology. Submitted, 2010.



BRE

Biophysics/Bioengineering & Cancer?



- The need for more realistic *in vitro* experiments
 - Massively parallel, cellular microenvironments for the study of cell-cell, cellcell-drug, and cell-cell-drug-snp interactions
 - Real-time control of biological systems
- The need to control multiple parameters at the same time and measure multiple dynamic variables
 - Cell-scale sensors and actuators
 - Experiments that involve thousands of parameters
- The need to create complex, nonlinear models
 - Symbolic regression and exploration-estimation algorithms for machine learning in automated microbioreactors
 - Models to enable control of cellular responses and biomolecule production
- The need to raise research funds from more diverse sources
- The inability of the human mind (or at least those of the reviewers) to understand the complexity of what is being proposed and/or discovered

The future of biology and cancer medicine is distributed hybrid multiscale non-linear stochastic control



De Visser, Cancer Immunol Immunother (2008) 57: 1531-1539

Really Hard Problems



However...

We do not have to <u>fully</u> understand a phenomenon to control or eliminate it.

John Wikswo

Can we instrument and control cancer? With work!



Acknowledgements

VIIBRE

Shannon Faley **Chrissy Marasco Dmitry Markov Ron Reiserer** Phil Samson **David Schaffer** Kevin Seale Searle SYBBURE Niki Arinze Stephen Arndt Adit Dhummakupt Katelyn Holub Jake Hughey Fric Kim Ayeeshik Kole Will Matlov **Bao Nyugen** Matt Pfister Joe Scherrer Erik Schneibel Laura Wertz Franz Baudenbacher & Group David Cliffel & Group John Mclean & Group Cody Goodwin Jeff Enders Jody May Sevu Sundarapandian

Biological Sciences Todd Graham Carl Johnson Brian Robertson Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Jamey Young **Emergency Medicine** Patrick Norris Mechanical Engineering Jon Edd Molecular Physiology & Biophysics **Tony Weil** Pathology **Jim Chappell** Jeff Davidson Susan Opalenik **CFDRC** Soni Abhishek Jonathan Hood Jerry Jenkins Ravishankar Vallabhajosyula Cornell Hod Lipson Michael Schmidt Daniel I i Gauge Scientific Dan Morrow

DARPA, NIH/NIAID, DTRA, NIH/NIDA

Click to go past the end

There is yet one more potential problem... VI

- We may not be able to understand what the computer tells us about biology.
- The next challenge is to create computers that can explain their findings to us....

• It might be as hopeless as explaining Shakespeare to a dog.

Hod Lipson, 2009

BRE

Rumsfeld's Analysis of Complex Systems



- Observable?
- Controllable?
- Stabilizable?
- Detectable?

Iraq was neither observable, controllable, stabilizable, or detectable ...



Stengel, Optimal Control and Estimation, Dover, 1994, p.7