Parameter Estimation for Signal Transduction Networks from Experimental Time Series Using Picard Iteration
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Abstract: Biological signal transduction models allow to explain and analyze biological cause-effect relationships and to establish and test new hypotheses about biological pathways. Yet their predictive capability crucially depends on the parameters involved. These parameters are usually determined from experimental data. However, due to the appearing nonlinearities, the resulting inverse problem is often ill-posed and difficult to solve. We outline how parameters can be estimated based on Picard iterations. In case of linear parameter dependence and good measurements of the involved entities, the method allows to retrieve good parameter estimates for medium size problems. The proposed method is applied to an IL-6-dependent Jak-STAT3 signalling pathway model. As shown it is well suited for data generated by life cell imaging where accurate time series are available.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cellular signal transduction pathways are biochemical processes whereby initial biological signals such as receptor stimulation proceed via a cascade of biochemical interactions (between proteins or genes) over time. Eventually they lead to the initiation of a cellular response such as cell growth, differentiation or cell death. Having to integrate several cellular signals, balancing them against the cell viability and being shaped by evolution, these pathways are complex in nature. Furthermore, they contain several regulatory elements such as multiple feedbacks to determine the appropriate cell fate (Milo et al., 2002; López-Caamal et al., 2014). To understand the complexity of such ‘cellular integrated circuits’, mathematical models, often in form of Ordinary Differential Equation (ODE)-based, have been widely used. These models crucially depend upon several parameters describing biochemical properties such as the speed and equilibrium of biochemical reactions. While being of biochemical nature, the exact values of these parameters often cannot be directly measured. Instead, they have to be inferred indirectly by fitting the model output to experimental time series data.

Many approaches for estimating parameters from measurement data exist, see e.g. (Schaber and Klipp, 2011; Chou and Voit, 2009; Moles et al., 2003; Chou and Voit, 2009; Voit, 2013; Schlemann-Bullinger et al., 2016; Rumschinski et al., 2010). Often parameters are fitted by numerical optimisation (such as gradient descent) to minimise the difference between model predictions and experimental training data. However, such approaches can suffer from the presence of local minima that lead to different solutions than the optimal one, resulting in sub-optimal or spurious parametrisations. Furthermore, they do not guarantee that a unique solution, or a valid solution at all, can be identified. Therefore, several approaches have been performed that, besides providing means for rigorous parameter estimation, investigate structural identifiability. The latter term refers to the theoretical property whether or not a model including its parametrisation can be fully regenerated from the model input, the topology of the dynamical system and the experimental data (Chis et al., 2011; Chou and Voit, 2009). These general methods comprise approaches based on Generalized Mass Action, S-system based methods (Savageau, 1969a,b; Torres and Voit, 2002), and such from control theory (Geffen et al., 2008; Farina et al., 2006; Lilacci and Khammash, 2010; Otter, 1986).

Besides these more fundamental approaches, several methods to estimate parameters values from given experimental data have been developed. Some approaches use direct integration of the underlying ODE system (Docherty et al., 2012), similar as in other fields of parameter estimation inverse problem theory (Huber and Leeb, 1998). As such example, incremental identification estimation methods, whereby parameter subsets are optimised sequentially (Bhatt et al., 2012), have been developed such as the integrated flux parameter estimation (IFPE) method (Liu and Gunawan, 2014). Moreover, the application of an iterative Picard formalism has been suggested (Kunze and Vrscay, 1999; Tanner, 1972) to identify parameters for determining enzyme kinetics and estimating parameters in bioprocessing. We provide an elaboration of these Picard iteration-based approaches, and show their first application in a realistic signal transduction context.

The contribution is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the Picard iteration formalism to determine the kinetic parameters. The biological example, an IL-6-dependent Jak-STAT3 signalling pathway is introduced...
in Section 3. The application of the derived approach to
the example is summarized in Section 4 and concluded in
Section 5 with an outlook.

2. PROBLEM SET-UP AND SOLUTION METHOD

2.1 Modeling Biological Systems

Cellular signal transduction is the process, whereby an
initial cellular signal such a receptor stimulus is transferred
by a set of biochemical reaction into a certain cellular
response such as cell growth, differentiation and death. To
analyse these often intricate processes over time, computa-
tional models, based on ODEs are often used. Thereby, the
changes of concentrations of biochemical entities, such as
proteins, nucleic acids, lipids or metabolites are typically
modelled by different state variables (denoted as ‘species’)

\[ x = ([x_1], \ldots, [x_n])^T \in \mathbb{R}^n \]  

comprising the concentration of the n species \([x_i]\) within
the cell and their variation in time. We further assume
concentrations of the model species to be sufficiently large
and the cellular content is well-mixed such that spatial
gradients and stochastic effects can be neglected. The
species are converted by chemical reactions following

\[ \alpha_{i,j} x_1 + \alpha_{2,j} x_2 + \ldots + \alpha_{n,j} x_n \rightarrow \alpha_{j} x_j \]  

\[ \beta_{i,j} x_1 + \beta_{2,j} x_2 + \ldots + \beta_{n,j} x_n \rightarrow \beta_{j} x_j. \]  

Thereby, \(\alpha_{i,j}\) and \(\beta_{i,j}\) for \(i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\) are non-negative
stoichiometric coefficients that describe the amount of
entities \(i\) within a reaction \(j\), \(j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\). Furthermore, \(r^+_j\) denotes the forward and \(r^-_j\) the
backward reaction rate for reaction \(j\). For modelling reaction
dates, the law of mass action, where the reaction rate is assumed
to be proportional to the substrate concentrations, is the
simplest and most widely-used assumption (Savageau,
1969a,b; Torres and Voit, 2002), i.e.

\[ r_j(t) = p^+_j \prod_{i=1}^{n} x^{\alpha_{i,j}}(t) - p^-_j \prod_{i=1}^{n} x^{\beta_{i,j}}(t). \]  

In Eq. (4), \(p^+_j\) and \(p^-_j\) denote the forward and backward
reaction constants, whose determination from the state
variables over time (1) is the subject of this paper.

With this notation, the biochemical reaction network can
be written in a compact form as

\[ \dot{x}(t) = N r(t), \]  

where \(\dot{x}(t)\) denotes the change of concentration with time.
Furthermore, all reaction rates are collected into the vector
\(r(t) = (r_1(t), \ldots, r_n(t))\) and \(N \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}\) denotes the
stoichiometric matrix given by

\[ N_{i,j} = \beta_{i,j} - \alpha_{i,j}, \quad i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, n_r\}. \]  

The overall dynamics for a system without time-variant
input and defining a nonlinear vector function \(f: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\), we have

\[ \dot{x}(t) = N r(t) = f(x(t), p). \]  

In Eq. (7), \(x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n\), and \(p \in \mathbb{R}^m\) denotes the time-
invariant parameter vector collecting all rate constants
\(p^+_j\) and \(p^-_j\). Throughout this work, we assume that \(x(t)\)
belongs to the set \(X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n\), and \(p \in \mathbb{P} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m\).

In general, not all model species can be measured. There-
fore, we distinguish between the model states \(x(t)\) and
model outputs \(y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^q\). For simplification, all outputs
are aggregated into the nonlinear vector function \(g\), i.e.

\[ y(t) = g(x(t), p) \]  

where \(g: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q\).

Summarizing Eq. (7) and Eq. (8), one obtains the system

\[ \begin{cases}
\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t), p) \\
y(t) = g(x(t), p),
\end{cases} \]  

which describes the time behavior of the biochemical
reaction network depending on the parameters \(p\).

2.2 Determining Parameters based on Picard Iterations

We provide a method to obtain the vector of time invariant
parameters \(p\) from the model \(f(x(t), p)\). For simplicity of
presentation, we assume that we know all state values
\(x_k\) at particular time points \(k\), \(k = 1 \ldots x\). Generalizations
are possible, but beyond the scope of this paper.

If \(\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) is a solution of (9) with initial condition
\(\phi(0) = x_0\), then \(\phi\) satisfies

\[ \phi(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(\phi(s), p) \, ds. \]  

The Picard iteration scheme provides a recursive way to
obtain an approximate solution \(\psi\) of \(\phi\) a better,
at least local, approximation. To this end, one computes a
sequence of approximations defined as

\[ \psi_{n+1}(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(\psi_n(s), p) \, ds. \]  

The sequence of approximations converges towards the
solution \(\phi\) on the intervall \([0, T]\). For the technical details,
please refer to (Arnold, 1992), chapter 4.

On the other hand, knowing the solution \(\phi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) with
\(\phi(0) = x_0\) enables us to compute the parameters \(p \in \mathbb{R}^m\)
of the differential equation. To achieve this, we assume
that we have \(k\) precise values of the states \(x_j = \phi(t_j)\)
at times \(t_j\), \(j = 1, \ldots, k\), where \(k\) is defined such that
\(k \leq n \geq m\). According to the integral equation we obtain
\(k \times n\) equations,

\[ x_j = x_0 + \int_{t_j}^{t} f(\phi(s), p) \, ds. \]  

These \(k \times n\) equations allow, the computation of the
unknown parameters \(p \in \mathbb{R}^m\), provided that we have
chosen the measuring points such that the system of
nonlinear equations is solvable for \(p\).

The key idea is now to exploit the method of approxi-
mation for parameter determination. We therefore assume
that we know the complete states \(x_0\) and \(x_j\) at time \(t_j\),
\(j = 1, \ldots, k\). If the time steps \(t_j\) are assumed to be
sufficiently close to each other, it is the reasonable to posit
that an interpolating function, i.e., a function \(\varphi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n\) with

\[ \varphi(t_j) = x_j \]  

for \(j = 0, \ldots, k\) provides an approximation of the solution
\(\phi\). Therefore, \(\varphi\) satisfies

\[ x_j \approx x_0 + \int_{t_j}^{t_j} f(\varphi(s), p) \, ds \]  

for \(j = 0, \ldots, k\).
for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. We then aim to determine parameters $\tilde{p}$ such that (12) becomes an equality. Thus, we obtain

$$\varphi^+(t) = x_0 + \int_0^t f(\varphi(s), \tilde{p}) \, ds$$

(13)

passing at time $t_j$ through the point $x_j$. Here, $\varphi^+$ is an interpolating function, which under proper circumstances is a better approximation to $\varphi$ than the original initial interpolating function $\varphi$. Repeating this procedure now with $\varphi^+$ is expected to render better approximations of $\varphi$ and, eventually, the parameters $p$.

### 2.3 Linear Parameter Dependency

The formalism of the previous section can be simplified if mass-action kinetics is used. Then, the model $\dot{x} = f(x, p)$ depends linearly on the parameters and in this case the equations (12) become linear equations for the unknown parameters $p$.

$$\dot{x} = A(x)p$$

(14)

where $A : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, $x \mapsto A(x)$ is an $n \times m$-matrix and we get the linear equation system,

$$x_1 = x_0 + \int_0^{t_1} A(\varphi(s)) \, ds \, p.$$  

(15)

Since more complex kinetics such as Michaelis-Menten or Hill kinetics are approximations of multi-step mass action reaction kinetics, this assumption does not impede the general applicability of our method to biochemical signal transduction analysis.

### 2.4 Simple Example

This example illustrates the underlying ideas of the recursive parameter determination, using the simplest case of employing linear interpolation between two time points.

We consider the differential equation

$$\dot{x} = px,$$

where $p \in \mathbb{R}$ has to be determined.

Let $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the solution with $\phi(0) = 1$ and $\phi(1) = 2$. Then $\phi(t) = t + 1$ is an approximation of $\phi$ and interpolates $\phi$ at times 0 and 1. Thus, we have the equation

$$2 = 1 + \int_0^1 \tilde{p} \varphi(s) \, ds$$

(16)

yielding $\tilde{p} = 2$. Using this parameter and the above interpolation for $\varphi(t)$ and setting it into equation (16) gives for the next approximation

$$\varphi^+(t) = 1 + \int_0^t \frac{2}{3} (1 + s) \, ds = 1 + \frac{2}{3} t + \frac{1}{3} t^2,$$

with $\varphi^+(0) = 1$ and $\varphi^+(1) = 2$.

In turn, when $\varphi^+$ is substituted by $\varphi$ in Equation (16), we can calculate the next iteration for the parameter $\tilde{p}$. We thereby obtain $\frac{2}{3} = 0.692308$ which is close to the true value $\log(2) = 0.693147$ that is derived from exact solution of above example with the mentioned restrictions for the values at $t = 1$ and 2. Continuing with this iteration scheme leads to a convergent sequence of interpolating functions with limit $\phi(t) = 2^t$ together with a convergent sequence of parameters with limit $\log(2)$.

### 3. BIOLOGICAL EXAMPLE

To illustrate the Picard iteration approach, we consider in the following the activation of the Jak-STAT3 pathway, a major pathway in cellular signalling. We thereby model IL-6-dependent receptor complex assembly and signalling.

#### 3.1 IL-6-dependent Jak-STAT3 Signalling

IL-6 is known as a key regulator of inflammatory processes. Dysregulation of IL-6 function leads to numerous pathologies such as Rheumatoid Arthritis, Crohn’s disease and Multiple Sclerosis (Scheller et al., 2006). Computational analysis of inflammatory signalling has proven to be useful for studying underlying disease mechanisms (Dittrich et al., 2012; Veltman et al., 2017).

The mechanisms by which IL-6 initiates signal transduction are given in Fig. 1 and have been reviewed in (Heinrich et al., 2003). Briefly, IL-6 first forms a complex with the receptor subunit glycoprotein 80 (IL-6R). Two of such complexes dimerise and bind to another two adaptor proteins of type glycoprotein 130 (gp130), resulting in a hexameric receptor complex (R_complex). Next, tyrosine kinases of the Jak protein family, which are constitutively bound to the intracellular domain of gp130, become activated after receptor complex assembly and phosphorylate gp130 ((p)R_complex). Then, Signal Transducer and Activator of Transcription 3 proteins (STAT3) are recruited to the phosphorylated gp130 complex. Thereby, STAT3 proteins are in turn phosphorylated by Jak proteins, leading to the formation of active STAT3 dimers. Phosphorylated STAT3 (pSTAT3) dimers are assumed to translocate into the nucleus and act as transcription factors which induce several target genes. These genes include the negative regulator of the Jak-STAT3 pathway, theSuppressors of Cytokine Signalling 3 (SOCS3) (Endo et al., 1997) (modelled here as mRNAs and proteins), eventually leading to a termination of Jak-STAT3 signalling.

### 3.2 Modeling Assumptions and Equations

The dynamic processes of IL-6-induced Jak-STAT signalling as well as inhibition via SOCS3 can be modelled by the following set of differential equations:

\[\text{Fig. 1. Schematic representation of IL-6-dependent receptor complex assembly, Jak-STAT3 pathway activation and activation of target genes.}\]
\[
\frac{dx_1}{dt} = p_1 x_7(t) u - p_2 x_1(t) - 2p_3 x_2(t)^2 x_1(t)^2 + 2p_4 x_8(t)
\]
\[
\frac{dx_2}{dt} = 2p_4 x_8(t) - 2p_3 x_2(t)^2 x_1(t)^2
\]
\[
\frac{dx_3}{dt} = p_5 x_8(t) + 1 + p_13 x_6(t)
\]
(17)

In (17), \( u \) denotes the input IL-6 which is assumed to be time-invariant, hence considering a constant receptor stimulus. The dynamical variables of the system (17) \( x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t), x_4(t), x_5(t), x_6(t) \) denote IL-6–IL-6R, gp130, (p)R\text{complex}, (p)STAT3, SOCS3 mRNA and SOCS3 protein, respectively. We have further introduced \( x_7(t), x_8(t) \) and \( x_9(t) \) which denote the biochemical entities IL-6R, R\text{complex} and STAT3, respectively. These are dependent variables, which can be obtained from biological conservation laws as follows:

\[
x_2^{\text{total}} = x_2(t) + 2x_3(t) + 2x_8(t) := \alpha
\]
\[
x_3^{\text{total}} = x_1(t) + 2x_3(t) + 7x_7(t) + 2x_8(t) := \beta
\]
\[
x_4^{\text{total}} = x_9(t) + x_4(t) := \gamma,
\]
where we have introduced greek letters for simplifying the further notation. Thereby, \( x_2^{\text{total}} \) is set to 16.8 nM, \( x_3^{\text{total}} \) to 83 nM, and \( x_4^{\text{total}} \) to 2.1 nM according to quantitative biochemistry measurements (F. Schaper, Magdeburg, private communication). The constant IL-6 stimulus \( u \) is assumed to be 0.17 nM, which is a typical concentration for IL-6 stimulation experiments (Dittrich et al., 2012). The initial conditions were set to \( x(0) = (0, 0, 16.8, 0, 0, 0, 0) \), reflecting the fact that, while gp130 is at maximum, all other entities are not available at time point \( t = 0 \) and formed after IL-6 stimulation. Notably, the (nonzero) initial conditions for the dependent variables \( x_7(t) \) (IL-6R), \( x_8(t) \) (R\text{complex}), \( x_9(t) \) (STAT3) can be derived from the conservation laws (18). We finally remark that we have not explicitly modelled Jak kinases as we assumed them to be an integral part of gp130.

\[
\dot{x} = f_c(x, p)
\]
where \( f_c : \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^{13} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6 \) and is defined as

\[
f_c(x, p) = \begin{pmatrix}
p_1 u (-\alpha + \beta - x_1 + x_2) + p_4 (\alpha - x_2 - 2x_3) - p_3 x_1^2 x_2^2 - p_2 x_1,
p_4 (\alpha - x_2 - 2x_3) - p_3 x_1^2 x_2^2,
p_5 (\frac{-x_2 - x_3}{1 + p_{13} x_6}) - p_6 x_3,
\end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
\frac{dx_7}{dt} = x_7(\gamma - x_4) - p_8 x_5,
\frac{dx_8}{dt} = p_9 x_4 - p_{10} x_5,
\frac{dx_9}{dt} = p_{11} x_5 - p_{12} x_6.
\]
(19)

and where we have separated the rows by commata for clarity reasons. As we see, the parameter \( p_{13} \), is included in a rational term denoting the SOCS3 feedback and hence prevents the linear dependency of \( f_c \) on its parameters. For providing a straightforward exemplification of our method, we will therefore first set \( p_{13} = 0 \) and later calculate this parameter by steady state assumptions. With this choice, our model \( x = f(x, p) \) depends linearly on the parameters, and we can hence write

\[
\dot{x} = A(x)p,
\]
where \( A(x) \) is a \( 6 \times 12 \)-matrix with block structure

\[
A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} A_1(x) & 0 \\ 0 & A_2(x) \end{pmatrix},
\]
and with \( A_1(x) \) and \( A_2(x) \) being \( 3 \times 6 \)-matrices given as

\[
A_1(x) = \begin{pmatrix} u(-\alpha + \beta - x_1 + x_2) - x_1 - x_2^2 x_3^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{pmatrix}
\]
\[
\begin{pmatrix} \alpha - x_2 - 2x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha - x_2 - 2x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha - x_2 - 2x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha - x_2 - 2x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha - x_2 - 2x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \end{pmatrix}
\]
(20)
(21)

As a consequence, for the determination of the 12 unknown parameters we need the initial state \( x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^6 \) and two more states \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^6 \) at times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), respectively. Assuming these two states, the Equations (12) become linear equations and read as

\[
x_1 = x_0 + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} A(\varphi(s)) \, ds \, p
\]
\[
x_2 = x_0 + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} A(\varphi(s)) \, ds \, p,
\]
(22)
(23)

where \( \varphi \) is an interpolating function of our state vector \( x \) passing through \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \) at \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), respectively. Note that we have 12 equations and 12 unknown parameters.

4. IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS

To numerically exemplify the method, we first calculated the direct problem (17) giving us the temporal evolvement of the state variables by assuming a set of biologically reasonable parameters as given in Table 2. This is first performed for the case without SOCS3 negative feedback.

3.3 Application of the Picard Iteration

To exemplify our method, we cast our biological model (17) into the compact notation

\[
\dot{x} = f_c(x, p)
\]
where \( f_c : \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^{13} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^6 \) and is defined as
We assume the ODE (20) with linear dependency in the parameters $p$.

We take a set of $k$ experimental points of all $n$ state variables.

We assume a first approximation of the temporal behaviour of the solution by interpolating with a polynomial function of $k^6$ order according the example in subsection 2.4.

We plug the first interpolating function into the Picard integral and integrate the polynomials.

We solve the resulting equation for $k \times n$ equations and $m$ parameters (23).

Finally, we construct the next interpolating function over the $x_j$, $j = 0, \ldots, k$ at time $t_j$ and repeat for the procedure $(p_{13} = 0)$ leading to linear dependency on the parameters. Using the initial condition of $x(0) = (0, 16.8, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ and the input $u$ being fixed to 0.17 nM, we calculated the dynamical behaviour for $x_j(t)$ at a step size of 0.04 min. We then calculated the inverse problem for this situation following the protocol in Table 1. We thereby used the time series values of $x_1$ at $t_1 = 1$ (min) and $x_2$ at $t_2 = 2$ (min) that determines the first interpolating function of the solution $\phi$. We subsequently addressed the problem including the negative feedback, where we recalculated the direct problem with parameters above, yet including now the negative SOCS3 feedback and setting $p_{13} = 0.029$.

Using the newly generated set of state variables at large time points (i.e. at the steady state), we can recover $p_{13}$ using the steady state condition where the temporal changes in the system (17) are set to zero. In particular, the third component of Equation (19) becomes

$$0 = p_5 \left( \frac{x - x_2}{2} - x_3 \right) + p_6 \cdot x_3$$

which yields

$$p_{13} = \left[ p_5 \cdot \left( 0.5 \cdot (x_2^{\text{total}} - x_2(\infty)) - x_3(\infty) \right) \right] \frac{1}{p_6 \cdot x_3(\infty)} - 1,$$

(24)

Thereby, we have used the values for $x_2$, $x_3$, $x_6$ at steady state conditions $x_2(\infty)$, $x_3(\infty)$, $x_6(\infty)$, taken their numerical approximation at late simulation times, $t \approx 90$ min.

Analytical and numerical calculations were performed in Mathematica 11 (Wolfram Research, Champaign, Illinois). Results of numeric calculations are depicted in Table 2. There, recalculated parameters were retrieved with an accuracy of 90% for smaller and 95% for larger parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Assumed</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p_1$</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_2$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_3$</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.5920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_4$</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.0484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_5$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_6$</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.0864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_7$</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_8$</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_9$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{10}$</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{11}$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{12}$</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{13}$</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.028*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Outline: Picard iteration method

(24)

Table 2. Assumed kinetic parameter (17) and those recalculated from the proposed inversion method. The asterisk denotes the calculation via steady state conditions.

For our analysis, we posit that the biological process can be described by a given topology of ODEs, that the entire set of biological intermediaries (such as truncated proteins, multimers, etc.) is detectable and that the initial conditions are given. Indeed, while measuring these biological intermediaries can be cumbersome, it is expected that they will be in future measurable through improvements in protein labelling, immunoprecipitation of multimeric complexes and usage of time-dependent expression techniques (PCR, RNA-Seq).

Several limitations of the methods apply. First, convergence of the Picard iteration requires good initial approximation in the function space. More importantly, our method was sensitive against increase of the time interval of the measurements that were taken into account for generating the Gaussian system. This is especially envisaged to cause issues for stiff systems where certain variables contain less information about temporal changes than others. This drawback may argue for combining our methods with such of experimental design (such as analysing the Fisher Information Matrix) such that the most informative time points for measurements can be taken into account. To this end, we note that our method does not require to use the same time points for all observables. To this end, our numerical experiments allow us to determine the size of the time interval in order to compute the parameters within a certain accuracy, hence providing a hint for the number and distance of measurements in a specific experiment.

Finally, the method requires that all states are detectable. Despite these limitations, however, the method would be suitable for experiments such as single cell fluorescent.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We devised here a method to retrieve ODE model parameters from experimental time series based on Picard iteration. The method was able to recover correct parameters for a medium sized inverse problem, the Jak-STAT3 activation pathway, provided accurate time series of all involved entities and assuming linear dependency of the model parameters. To guarantee linear dependency, we first applied our method to a subproblem where feedback was neglected and then demonstrated how the feedback parameter can be retrieved using steady state conditions. We note that, neglecting this feedback and determining it in a second step requires also to generate experimental data where this feedback is broken. This can be achieved either by chemical inhibitors or by point mutations that block the inhibitor or render it useless through missense mutation. We further note that restriction to linear parameters is a feature of our current implementation solving a Gaussian system rather than a feature of the Picard implementation and expect future implementations to address the issue of non-linearity in an appropriate fashion.
imaging (Connolly et al., 2016) where high frequency time lapse-data are available for a large quantity of observables. We further envisage the method to be extendible to the inclusion of experimental errors and for disentangling time-scales for fastly and slowly changing state variables. An application to non-linear parameters to cover more sophisticated kinetics such as Michaelis-Menten or Hill kinetics is in preparation.
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