— Fourth CSPSAT & ASP Seminar —

Concretizing Process Hitting models into Biological Regulatory Networks with Thomas' formalism using ASP

Maxime FOLSCHETTE<sup>1,2</sup> maxime.folschette@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr http://www.irccyn.ec-nantes.fr/-folschet/

Joint work with: Loïc PAULEVÉ<sup>3</sup>, Katsumi INOUE<sup>2</sup>, Morgan MAGNIN<sup>1</sup>, Olivier ROUX<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MeForBio team / IRCCyN / École Centrale de Nantes (Nantes, France) morgan.magnin@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr olivier.roux@irccyn.ec-nantes.fr

<sup>2</sup> Inoue Laboratory / NII / Sokendai University (Tokyo, Japan) ki@nii.ac.jp

<sup>3</sup> AMIB team / LIX / École Polytechnique (Palaiseau, France) pauleve@lix.polytechnique.fr

AtlanSTIC sojourn financed by NII & Centrale Initiatives

# A multi-team topic

**Inoue Laboratory** (NII, Sokendai): Constraint Programming, Systems Biology MeForBio (IRCCyN, ÉCN): Formal Methods for Bioinformatics AMIB (LIX, Polytechnique): Algorithms and Models for Integrative Biology



Professor & team leader

Associate professor



MeForBio

## Algebraic modeling to study complex dynamical biological systems:



#### Algebraic modeling to study complex dynamical biological systems:



- Historical model: Biological Regulatory Network (René Thomas)
- New developed model: Process Hitting
- $\rightarrow$  Allow efficient translation from Process Hitting to BRN



Sorts: components a, b, z



**Sorts**: components *a*, *b*, *z* **Processes**: local states / levels of expression  $z_0$ ,  $z_1$ ,  $z_2$ 



**Sorts**: components *a*, *b*, *z*  **Processes**: local states / levels of expression  $z_0$ ,  $z_1$ ,  $z_2$ **States**: sets of active processes  $\langle a_0, b_1, z_0 \rangle$ 



**Actions**: dynamics  $b_1 \rightarrow z_0 \stackrel{r}{\vdash} z_1$ ,  $a_0 \rightarrow a_0 \stackrel{r}{\vdash} a_1$ ,  $a_1 \rightarrow z_1 \stackrel{r}{\vdash} z_2$ 

Maxime FOLSCHETTE



Sorts: componentsa, b, zProcesses: local states / levels of expression $z_0, z_1, z_2$ States: sets of active processes $\langle a_0, b_1, z_1 \rangle$ Actions: dynamics $b_1 \rightarrow z_0 \ r \ z_1, \ a_0 \rightarrow a_0 \ r \ a_1, \ a_1 \rightarrow z_1 \ r \ z_2$ 

Maxime FOLSCHETTE



**Actions**: dynamics  $b_1 \rightarrow z_0 \lor z_1, a_0 \rightarrow a_0 \lor a_1, \underline{a_1 \rightarrow z_1} \lor \underline{z_2}$ 

Maxime FOLSCHETTE



**Actions**: dynamics  $b_1 \rightarrow z_0 \lor z_1, a_0 \rightarrow a_0 \lor a_1, a_1 \rightarrow z_1 \lor z_2$ 

Maxime FOLSCHETTE



How to introduce some cooperation between sorts?



How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \upharpoonright z_2$ 



How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \stackrel{?}{\vdash} z_2$ 









The Process Hitting modeling







How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** abConstraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** abConstraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle$ 



The Process Hitting modeling

How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** abConstraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** abConstraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle \Rightarrow ab_{10}$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** ab to express  $a_1 \wedge b_0$ Constraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle \Rightarrow ab_{10}$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** ab to express  $a_1 \wedge b_0$ Constraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle \Rightarrow ab_{10}$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \uparrow^2 z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** ab to express  $a_1 \wedge b_0$ ,  $a_1 \oplus b_1$ Constraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle \Rightarrow ab_{10}$ 





How to introduce some **cooperation** between sorts?  $a_1 \wedge b_0 \rightarrow z_1 \vdash z_2$ Solution: a **cooperative sort** ab to express  $a_1 \wedge b_0$ ,  $a_1 \oplus b_1$ Constraint: each configuration is represented by one process  $\langle a_1, b_0 \rangle \Rightarrow ab_{10}$ Advantage: regular sort; drawbacks: complexity, temporal shift





The Process Hitting framework:

- Dynamic modeling with an atomistic point of view
- Efficient static analysis (fixed points, reachability)
- Possible extensions (stochasticity, priorities)
- Useful for the study of large bioinformatics systems



Historical bio-informatics model for studying genes interactions Widely used and well-adapted to represent dynamic gene systems



#### Interaction Graph: structure of the system (genes & interactions)



Interaction Graph: structure of the system (genes & interactions)

#### Nodes: genes

- $\rightarrow$  Name *a*, *b*, *z*
- $\rightarrow$  Possible values (levels of expression) 0..1, 0..2



Interaction Graph: structure of the system (genes & interactions)

## Nodes: genes

- $\rightarrow$  Name *a*, *b*, *z*
- $\rightarrow$  Possible values (levels of expression) 0..1, 0..2

## Edges: interactions

- ightarrow Type (activation or inhibition) ightarrow + / -
- $\rightarrow$  Threshold 1



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)

Maps of tendencies for each gene

- ightarrow To any set of predecessors  $\omega$
- $\rightarrow$  Corresponds a **parameter**  $k_{x,\omega}$



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)

 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Maps of tendencies for each gene} \\ \rightarrow \mbox{ To any set of predecessors } & \omega \\ \rightarrow \mbox{ Corresponds a parameter } & k_{{\rm x},\omega} \\ \\ & ``k_{{\rm z},\{{\rm a}\}}=2" \mbox{ means: } ``z \mbox{ tends to 2 when } a \geq 1 \mbox{ and } b < 1" \end{array}$ 



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)
Concretizing Process Hitting into BRN - 2012/05/21: Frameworks Definitions



Parametrization: strength of the influences (evolution tendencies)

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{Maps of tendencies for each gene} \\ \rightarrow \text{ To any set of predecessors } \quad \omega \\ \rightarrow \text{ Corresponds a parameter } \quad k_{\mathrm{x},\omega} \\ \\ ``k_{\mathrm{z},\{a\}} = 2'' \quad \text{means:} \quad ``z \text{ tends to } 2 \text{ when } a = 1 \text{ and } b = 0'' \end{array}$ 

Concretizing Process Hitting into BRN - 2012/05/21: Frameworks Definitions



Biological Regulatory Network

- $\rightarrow$  All needed information to run the model or study its dynamics:
  - Build the State Graph
  - Find reachability properties, fixed points, attractors
  - Other properties...
- ightarrow Strengths: well adapted for the study of biological systems
- → **Drawbacks**: inherent complexity; needs the full specification of cooperations

### Inferring a BRN with Thomas' parameters





### Inferring a BRN with Thomas' parameters



### Inferring a BRN with Thomas' parameters





- Inputs: a Process Hitting model
- Output: An interaction graph with all information:
  - $\rightarrow$  edges, signs and thresholds
- Difficulties: Process Hitting is more atomistic than BRNs
- Idea: Exhaustive search in all possible configurations





• For each gene [z]



• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators  $[\{b = 0\}]$



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators  $[\{b = 0\}]$ 
  - For each process of a



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators  $[\{b = 0\}]$ 
  - For each process of a



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators [{*b* = 0}]
  - For each process of *a*, determine the set of **focal processes** of *z*



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 0}]
  - For each process of *a*, determine the set of **focal processes** of *z*



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators [{b = 0}]
  - For each process of *a*, determine the set of **focal processes** of *z*



- For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]
- Consider a **configuration** of all other regulators [{b = 0}]
  - For each process of *a*, determine the set of **focal processes** of *z*



• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 0}]
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - · Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\{b = 0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \& \text{ threshold} = 1$ 



• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 1}]
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - · Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\{b = 0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \& \text{ threshold} = 1$ 





• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators  $[\{b = 1\}]$ 
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\{b=0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \& \text{ threshold} = 1$ 



• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 1}]
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - · Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\{b = 0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \& \text{ threshold} = 1$ 



• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 1}]
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - · Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\begin{array}{l} \{b=0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \text{ & threshold} = 1 \\ \{b=1\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_1\} = \{z_1\} \Rightarrow \text{inconclusive } (\sim) \end{array}$ 





• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators  $[\{b = 1\}]$ 
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\{b=0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \operatorname{activation}(+) \& \operatorname{threshold} = 1$  $\{b=1\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_1\} = \{z_1\} \Rightarrow \operatorname{inconclusive}(\sim)$ 

• If possible, determine the general influence of a on z





• For each gene [z], consider one possible regulator [a]

- Consider a configuration of all other regulators [{b = 1}]
  - For each process of a, determine the set of focal processes of z
  - Comparing the sets of focal processes gives the influence

 $\begin{array}{l} \{b=0\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_0\} \preccurlyeq \{z_2\} \Rightarrow \text{activation } (+) \text{ \& threshold} = 1 \\ \{b=1\} \rightarrow a_0 < a_1 \text{ and } \{z_1\} = \{z_1\} \Rightarrow \text{inconclusive } (\sim) \end{array}$ 

If possible, determine the general influence of a on z

Problematic cases:

 $\left. \begin{array}{l} \rightarrow \mbox{ No focal processes (cycle)} \\ \rightarrow \mbox{ Opposite influences } (+ \& -) \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \mbox{ Unsigned edge}$ 

## Inferring the Interaction Graph

Implementation & Results

#### Programming in ASP:

- Formal mathematical definitions  $\rightarrow$  ASP
- Use of aggregates (enumeration = 1 active process per sort)

# Inferring the Interaction Graph

Implementation & Results

#### Programming in ASP:

- Formal mathematical definitions  $\rightarrow$  ASP
- Use of aggregates (enumeration = 1 active process per sort)

### Calling ASP:

- Pint (existing OCaml library) to read Process Hitting models [http://processhitting.wordpress.com/]
- **OCaml** to translate these models to an ASP description and parse the results
- Clingo to solve the description with the adequate program

# Inferring the Interaction Graph

Implementation & Results

#### Programming in ASP:

- Formal mathematical definitions  $\rightarrow$  ASP
- Use of aggregates (enumeration = 1 active process per sort)

## Calling ASP:

- Pint (existing OCaml library) to read Process Hitting models [http://processhitting.wordpress.com/]
- **OCaml** to translate these models to an ASP description and parse the results
- Clingo to solve the description with the adequate program

Results: Very fast execution (personal laptop, 1.83GHz dual-core)

< 1s for 20 & 40 genes models  $\simeq$  13s for a 94 genes model

 $\simeq$  4min for a 104 genes model





**Inputs:** The Process Hitting model and the related Interaction Graph **Output:** The Parametrization related to the Interaction Graph

• For each gene [z] and each **configuration** of resources  $[\omega = \{a; b\}]$ 



- For each gene [z] and each **configuration** of resources  $[\omega = \{a; b\}]$
- Find the set of focal processes of the gene



- For each gene [z] and each **configuration** of resources  $[\omega = \{a; b\}]$
- Find the set of focal processes of the gene  $[\{z_1\}]$



- For each gene [z] and each **configuration** of resources  $[\omega = \{a; b\}]$
- Find the set of focal processes of the gene [{z<sub>1</sub>}]
- Under some conditions, this set is the parameter:  $k_{z,\{a,b\}} = 1$



**Inputs:** The Process Hitting model and the related Interaction Graph **Output:** The Parametrization related to the Interaction Graph

- For each gene [z] and each **configuration** of resources  $[\omega = \{a; b\}]$
- Find the set of **focal processes** of the gene [{z<sub>1</sub>}]
- Under some <u>conditions</u>, this set is the parameter:  $k_{z,\{a,b\}} = 1$

Problematic cases:

- ightarrow Behavior cannot be represented as a BRN
- ightarrow Lack of cooperation (no focal processes)



Inputs: The Process Hitting, the related Interaction Graph and the partially inferred ParametrizationOutput: All admissible Parametrizations observing the dynamics



Inputs: The Process Hitting, the related Interaction Graph and the partially inferred ParametrizationOutput: All admissible Parametrizations observing the dynamics

• Incomplete cooperations may lead to a partial Parametrization  $[\omega = \{a, b\}]$ 



Inputs: The Process Hitting, the related Interaction Graph and the partially inferred ParametrizationOutput: All admissible Parametrizations observing the dynamics

- Incomplete cooperations may lead to a partial Parametrization  $[\omega = \{a, b\}]$
- Ambiguous cases may represent several dynamics [k<sub>z,{a,b}</sub> = 0? 1? 2?]



Inputs: The Process Hitting, the related Interaction Graph and the partially inferred ParametrizationOutput: All admissible Parametrizations observing the dynamics

- Incomplete cooperations may lead to a partial Parametrization  $[\omega = \{a, b\}]$
- Ambiguous cases may represent several dynamics [k<sub>z,{a,b}</sub> = 0? 1? 2?]
- $\rightarrow$  Enumeration regarding:
  - Biological constraints
  - The dynamics of the Process Hitting
Concretizing Process Hitting into BRN — 2012/05/21: Translating a Process Hitting to a BRN

# Enumerating admissible Parametrizations

Implementation & Results

Same implementation scheme than Interaction Graph inference: OCaml translation (with Pint) to ASP and ASP execution

# Enumerating admissible Parametrizations

Implementation & Results

Same implementation scheme than Interaction Graph inference: OCaml translation (with Pint) to ASP and ASP execution

#### Results:

- Very fast execution for parameters inference
  < 1s for 20 & 40 genes models</li>
- Efficient Parametrizations enumeration

After one cooperation removal:

- $\simeq$  4s to find all 42 Parametrizations (40 genes model)
- $\simeq$  20s to find all 129 Parametrizations (20 genes model)

ASP is convenient to program enumeration (cardinalities) and filter only admissible answers (constraints)

# Summary & Future work

- Inference of the complete Interaction Graph
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find the mutual influences
- Inference of the possibly partial Parametrization
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find the necessary parameters
- Enumerate all full & admissible Parametrizations
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find only relevant answers
- Complexity: linear in the number of genes,

exponential in the number of regulators of one gene

# Summary & Future work

- Inference of the complete Interaction Graph
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find the mutual influences
- Inference of the possibly partial Parametrization
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find the necessary parameters
- Enumerate all full & admissible Parametrizations
  - $\rightarrow$  Exhaustive approach to find only relevant answers
- Complexity: linear in the number of genes, exponential in the number of regulators of one gene
- Concretize into more expressive BRN representations
  - $\rightarrow$  Tackle with **unsigned edges** (problematic cases)
  - $\rightarrow$  Use multiplexes to decrease the size of Parametrizations
- Use projections to remove cooperative sorts
  - $\rightarrow$  Make actions independent
  - $\rightarrow$  Drop inference complexity?

### Conclusion

Existing translation: René Thomas → Process Hitting New translation: Process Hitting → René Thomas

- $\rightarrow$  New formal link between the two models
- $\rightarrow$  More visibility to the Process Hitting

### Conclusion

Existing translation: René Thomas → Process Hitting New translation: Process Hitting → René Thomas

- $\rightarrow$  New formal link between the two models
- $\rightarrow$  More **visibility** to the Process Hitting

Using ASP

- $\rightarrow$  Tackles with complexity/combinatorial explosion
- $\rightarrow$  Allows efficient **exhaustive** search & enumeration

### Conclusion

Existing translation: René Thomas → Process Hitting New translation: Process Hitting → René Thomas

- $\rightarrow$  New formal link between the two models
- $\rightarrow$  More **visibility** to the Process Hitting

Using ASP

- $\rightarrow$  Tackles with complexity/combinatorial explosion
- $\rightarrow$  Allows efficient exhaustive search & enumeration

Thank you

## Bibliography

[Paulevé11] PhD thesis: Modélisation, Simulation et Vérification des Grands Réseaux de Régulation Biologique, October 2011, Nantes, France

- [PRM10-TCSB] Loïc Paulevé, Morgan Magnin, and Olivier Roux. *Refining dynamics of gene regulatory networks in a stochastic π*-calculus framework. In Corrado Priami, Ralph-Johan Back, Ion Petre, and Erik de Vink, editors, Transactions on Computational Systems Biology XIII, volume 6575 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 171-191. Springer Berlin/Heidelberg, 2011.
- [PMR12-MSCS] Loïc Paulevé, Morgan Magnin, and Olivier Roux. *Static analysis of biological regulatory networks dynamics using abstract interpretation*. Mathematical Structures in Computer Science, in press, 2012.
- [RCB08] Adrien Richard, Jean-Paul Comet, and Gilles Bernot. *R. Thomas' logical method*, Apr. 2008. Invited at Tutorials on modelling methods and tools: Modelling a genetic switch and Metabolic Networks, Spring School on Modelling Complex Biological Systems in the Context of Genomics.