



HAL
open science

Mathematical Modeling of Tumor-Tumor Distant Interactions Supports a Systemic Control of Tumor Growth

Sébastien Benzekry

► **To cite this version:**

Sébastien Benzekry. Mathematical Modeling of Tumor-Tumor Distant Interactions Supports a Systemic Control of Tumor Growth. 3rd Mathematical Biology Modeling days of Besançon, Jun 2018, Besançon, France. hal-01969102

HAL Id: hal-01969102

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01969102>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Mathematical Modeling of Tumor-Tumor Distant Interactions Supports a Systemic Control of Tumor Growth

S. Benzekry

Inria team MONC, Bordeaux



3rd Mathematical Biology Modeling days of Besançon

June 22, 2018

Tumor growth


What are **minimal** biological processes able to recover the **kinetics** of (experimental) tumor growth?

Exponential



$$\frac{dV}{dt} = aV$$


Gompertz



$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \alpha e^{-\beta t} V$$

Fits very well
Lacks **physiological** interpretation


Logistic



Competition


$$\frac{dV}{dt} = aV \left(1 - \frac{V}{K}\right)$$

Power law



$$\frac{dV}{dt} = \alpha V^\gamma$$

Fits very well
Has **physiological** interpretation




Population approach and its use for prediction


Nonlinear mixed-effects statistical modeling

$$y_j^i = M(t_j^i, \theta^i) + \varepsilon_j^i, \quad \varepsilon_j^i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_j^i)$$

$$\theta^1, \dots, \theta^N \sim \mathcal{LN}(\theta_{pop}, \theta_{\omega}), \quad \theta_{pop} \in \mathbb{R}^P, \theta_{\omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times P}$$




No a priori



With a priori

$$l(\theta^i) = \sum_{j=1}^{J^i} \frac{(y_j^i - M(t_j^i, \theta^i))^2}{2\sigma^2} + \sum_{p=1}^P \frac{(\theta_p^i - \theta_{pop,p})^2}{\theta_{\omega,p}^2} + C$$



Concomitant tumor resistance

- **Inhibition** of secondary **growth** by a primary mass
- Critical clinical implications in terms of **post-surgery metastatic acceleration**





Figure 2. The Presence of a Primary Tumor Is Associated with an Inhibition of Neovascularization and Growth of Its Metastases

O'Reilly et al. (Folkman), Cell, 1994



Questions and experiment


Questions

- **Quantitatively** distinguish between qualitatively valid **theories** of tumor-tumor interactions
- Establish and validate a **minimal model able to simulate tumor-tumor interactions**

Experiment


- Injection s.c. of **two tumors** of 10^6 LLC cells in C57/BL6 mice
- Two groups
 - Control: only one tumor
 - Group S: **simultaneous** injection of cells in two different sites

A mouse with two tumors




One tumor has normal growth and the other is suppressed

Individual growth kinetics





Small/Large in two-tumor bearing animals VS artificially paired small/large controls



Single-tumor growth models



Exponential V0

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV}{dt} = aV \\ V(t=0) = V_0 \end{cases}$$





Power law

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV}{dt} = aV^\gamma \\ V(t=0) = 1 \text{ mm}^3 = 10^6 \text{ cells} \end{cases}$$



Gompertz

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV}{dt} = aV \ln\left(\frac{K}{V}\right) \\ V(t=0) = 1 \text{ mm}^3 = 10^6 \text{ cells} \end{cases}$$



■ Simultaneous
□ Control

Two-tumors models

- Requirements:
 - **Symmetry**: same parameters for tumor 1 and tumor 2
 - Should resume to **single tumor growth** in the absence of the other tumor
- Main assumption for the difference between the two tumors: difference in **the initial take** ($V_{0,1} = 1, V_{0,2} = 0.75$)
- Difference in the growth kinetics should not result from difference in V_0
- Model selection (rejection) criteria: goodness-of-fit + parameter identifiability

Competition

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV_1}{dt} = aV_1 \ln\left(\frac{K}{V_1 + V_2}\right), & V_1(t=0) = V_{0,1} \\ \frac{dV_2}{dt} = aV_2 \ln\left(\frac{K}{V_1 + V_2}\right), & V_2(t=0) = V_{0,2} \end{cases}$$


Angiogenesis inhibition

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV_1}{dt} = aV_1 \ln\left(\frac{K_1}{V_1}\right), & V_1(t=0) = V_{0,1} \\ \frac{dK_1}{dt} = bV_1 - dV_1^{\frac{2}{3}}K_1 - eV_2 1_{K_1 > K_0}, & K_1(t=0) = K_0 \\ \frac{dV_2}{dt} = aV_2 \ln\left(\frac{K_2}{V_2}\right), & V_2(t=0) = V_{0,2} \\ \frac{dK_2}{dt} = bV_2 - dV_2^{\frac{2}{3}}K_2 - eV_1 1_{K_2 > K_0}, & K_2(t=0) = K_0 \end{cases}$$

Proliferation inhibition





$$\begin{cases} \frac{dP_1}{dt} = \alpha P_1 - (\beta P_1 + \gamma(P_1 + P_2)) 1_{P_1 > 0}, & P_1(t=0) = V_{0,1} \\ \frac{dQ_1}{dt} = \beta P_1 + \gamma(P_1 + P_2), & Q_1(t=0) = 0 \\ \frac{dP_2}{dt} = \alpha P_2 - (\beta P_2 + \gamma(P_1 + P_2)) 1_{P_2 > 0}, & P_2(t=0) = V_{0,2} \\ \frac{dQ_2}{dt} = \beta P_2 + \gamma(P_1 + P_2), & Q_2(t=0) = 0 \end{cases}$$

The competition model did not fit



$$\begin{cases} \frac{dV_1}{dt} = aV_1 \ln\left(\frac{K}{V_1 + V_2}\right), & V_1(t=0) = V_{0,1} \\ \frac{dV_2}{dt} = aV_2 \ln\left(\frac{K}{V_1 + V_2}\right), & V_2(t=0) = V_{0,2} \end{cases}$$

The « inhibition of proliferation » model fitted best



Model	Par.	Unit	Median value (CV)	RSE (%)
Proliferation inhibition	α	day ⁻¹	5.77 (67.4)	17.5
	β	day ⁻¹	5.07 (49.3)	21.2
	γ	-	0.074 (2.69e+03)	2.47

Model	SSE	AIC	RMSE	R2	#
Proliferation inhibition	0.204(0.0319 - 0.461)[1]	-14.2(-54 - -8.28)[1]	0.453(0.182 - 0.688)[1]	0.961(0.902 - 0.987)[1]	3
Angiogenesis inhibition	0.336(0.154 - 0.772)[2]	-5.07(-27.5 - 5.67)[2]	0.588(0.4 - 0.891)[2]	0.957(0.645 - 0.986)[2]	3
Competition	0.666(0.141 - 2.2)[3]	0.71(-33.2 - 13.1)[3]	0.828(0.383 - 1.5)[3]	0.694(-0.0757 - 0.964)[3]	2

Summary

- « Proliferation inhibition » model was able to adequately fit the data and provides with a **simple** (3 parameters), **identifiable, biologically grounded model**.
- « Angiogenesis inhibition » model was **also able** to fit the data, but to a lesser extent.
- « Competition model » was not able to fit the data, thus allowing to **reject this theory/model** as being sufficient to explain the data.
- Our model gives a dynamical valid explanation of the **CR paradox** (= if a tumor is able to inhibit the growth of a distant one, how can it grow at the same time?)

Perspective: integrate this model for tumor-tumor interactions into the **organism-level** for the dynamics of the metastatic population


Conclusion

- A general modeling framework for **modeling metastases**
- Simplified model (growth + dissemination) able to describe available clinically relevant **preclinical data** of dynamics of total metastatic burden
- **Quantitative** exploration of classical theories for metastatic colonization and **tumor-tumor interactions** and st
- A **patient-specific key parameter μ** was critical in the quantification of patient-specific metastatic aggressiveness

Acknowledgements

- Preclinical data of ortho-surgical animal models of metastases

**J. Ebos, M. Mastri, Roswell Park Cancer Institute,
Buffalo, NY, USA**



- One and two-tumors study

**Center of Cancer and Systems Biology, Boston, MA, USA
C. Lamont, P. Hahnfeldt, L. Hlatky**

- Biology of the kidney metastases to the lung

**L. Cooley, W. Souleyreau, A. Bikfalvi
LAMC, Inserm, Bordeaux, FR**

**E. Ribot
RMSB, CNRS**

Thank you for your attention!