Mathematical model for pilocytic astrocytoma growth and progression provides clinical decision support





Thomas Buder

Sino-German Workshop on Multiscale spatial computational systems biology

October 10, 2015

Contents

Pilocytic Astrocytoma: Characteristics & subtypes

Open questions in therapy

Mathematical model & Analytic results

Incorporating epidemiological data

Clinical implications & Discussion



Pilocytic Astrocytoma (PA)



Johns Hopkins, Department of Pathology

Characteristics

- classified as WHO grade I
- epidemiology
 - $\hfill\square$ 75 % occurring in the first two decades of life
 - □ highest age incidence: 5 15 years
- Iocation
 - □ *frequently:* cerebellum (60 %)
 - also: cerebellar hemisphere, optic chiasm, hypothalamus, brainstem, spinal cord

Characteristics

tumors

- □ grow as solid masses
- well-circumscribed tumors
- non-invasive

subtypes

- determined on molecular level
- □ differ in their aggressiveness



Subtypes

PA I

- indolent behavior
- slowly growing
- considered as benign
- genetic level
 - activation of MAPK pathway sufficient
 - □ BRAF, KRAS, NF1
 - single-pathway disease

- MAPK activation
 - initially promotes cell proliferation
 - but also induces senescence by increased activity of TSG (e.g. CDKN2A)
 - oncogene-induced senescence

Subtypes



Narita, M. et al. 2011

PA II

- aggressive behavior
- malignant transformation
- senescence is overcome by additional genetic alterations, e.g. CDKN2A
- enables fast tumor growth

gross total resection

- treatment of choice
- favorable prognosis: 90 % cured without additional therapy
- problem: location determines extent of resection
 - □ cerebellum, superficial cerebrum
 - optic pathway, brain stem tumors



gross total resection

- treatment of choice
- favorable prognosis: 90 % cured without additional therapy
- problem: location determines extent of resection
 - □ cerebellum, superficial cerebrum
 - optic pathway, brain stem tumors
- \Rightarrow Only partial resection possible in many cases

partial resection

- Iower survival rates than patients with total resection
- prognosis is highly unpredictable
 - $\hfill\square$ tumor regrowth
 - tumor growth arrest
 - tumor regression
- controversy about further therapy
 - □ wait and see approach?
 - □ radiation therapy?
 - □ extent of *follow-up observation*?



partial resection

- Iower survival rates than patients with total resection
- prognosis is highly unpredictable
 - $\hfill\square$ tumor regrowth
 - tumor growth arrest
 - tumor regression
- controversy about further therapy
 - wait and see approach?
 - □ radiation therapy?
 - □ extent of *follow-up observation*?

How could clinicians be supported?



Insights into regression chance in dependency of residual tumor size could



Insights into regression chance in dependency of residual tumor size could

justify wait and see approach if there is a high chance for regression



Insights into regression chance in dependency of residual tumor size could

- justify wait and see approach if there is a high chance for regression
- justify side effects of additional therapy, e.g. radiation, if there is a low chance for regression



Insights into regression chance in dependency of residual tumor size could

- justify wait and see approach if there is a high chance for regression
- justify side effects of additional therapy, e.g. radiation, if there is a low chance for regression
- justify extent of resection
 - □ avoid risks if only small effect on regression chance
 - □ justify risks if high effect on regression chance



Insights into regression chance in dependency of residual tumor size could

- justify wait and see approach if there is a high chance for regression
- justify side effects of additional therapy, e.g. radiation, if there is a low chance for regression
- justify extent of resection
 - □ avoid risks if only small effect on regression chance
 - □ justify risks if high effect on regression chance

Mathematical model in order to balance between **risk of operation and side effects of further therapies** and **risk of regrowth or progression**.



Tumor growth and progression model

Parameters

- critical tumor size N
 - no regression possible anymore
- mutation parameters u, v

Dynamics

 cell death, proliferation, mutations

Assumptions

- no spatial aspects
- one type-II cell \equiv diagnosis

Mathematical Model

- TGP process X_t
- state space $S = \{0, 1, 2, ..., N, E\}$
 - \Box 0 \equiv all cells wild-type
 - $\square \ k \equiv k \text{ type-I cells, no type-II cell,} \quad 1 \leqslant k \leqslant N$
 - \Box $E \equiv$ at least one type-II cell
- no modeling beyond critical size N
- two absorbing states N and E representing PA I and PA II

Mathematical Model

- TGP process X_t
- state space *S* = {0, 1, 2, ..., *N*, *E*}
 - \Box 0 \equiv all cells wild-type
 - $\square \ k \equiv k \text{ type-I cells, no type-II cell,} \quad 1 \leqslant k \leqslant N$
 - \Box $E \equiv$ at least one type-II cell
- no modeling beyond critical size N
- two absorbing states N and E representing PA I and PA II



regression function

$$eta_\gamma(arrho):=\mathbb{P}(X_t=0 ext{ for some t}|X_0=Narrho), arrho\in[0,1].$$

Parameter regime

$Nu \ll 1$

- each mutant lineage can be investigated independently
- biological implication: tumor develops from a single mutated cell



Parameter regime

$Nu \ll 1$

- each mutant lineage can be investigated independently
- biological implication: tumor develops from a single mutated cell

risk coefficient $\gamma := (N\sqrt{\nu})^2 > 0$

- positive probability of absorption in both states N and E
- biological implication: PA I and PA II are possible outcomes of the model
- γ determines the *absorption probability* and therefore the fractions of PA I and PA II in the model

Fraction of PA I cases in the model

Derivation sketch

• assume occurrence of single *successful* mutant and set u = 0

1

First Step Analysis

$$\alpha^{N}(i) = \sum_{j \in S} \alpha^{N}(j) p(i, j).$$

Linear system of equations

$$P' \alpha^N = b$$

Cramer's rule

$$\alpha^{N}(1) = \frac{\det P_{1}'}{\det P'} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\nu+1}{1-\nu}\right)}$$

• asymptotic result for $N \to \infty$

$$\alpha(\gamma) := \lim_{N \to \infty} \alpha^N(1) = \frac{1}{I_0(2\sqrt{\gamma})}.$$



Fraction of PA I cases in the model



Tumor regression function



- tumor regression function

$$\beta_{\gamma}(\varrho) = \frac{\sqrt{1-\varrho} h_1\left(2\sqrt{\gamma (1-\varrho)}\right)}{h_1(2\sqrt{\gamma})}$$

- risk parameter γ has crucial impact on regression function
- **Goal:** estimate risk coefficient γ

Estimating the risk coefficient γ



Linear dependency between residual tumor fraction and regression.

PA-regression-function approximately

$$T_1(\varrho) = 0.9817 - \varrho$$

very good approximation

$$|R_1(arrho)|\leqslant rac{\gamma}{8}=0.0185$$

- every resected percentage point contributes equally to regression probability
 - avoid risks by resecting small fractions
 - resections always contribute to the regression probability

Quantitative prediction of the regression probability.

• literature research: critical tumor size N equals 9 cm³

Residual tumor size (cm ³)	Tumor regression probability (in %)
0.1	98.91
0.5	94.06
1	88.16
2	76.50
3	65.03
4	53.75
5	42.64
6	31.71
7	20.47
8	10.39

Non-existence of an extent of resection (EOR) threshold.

- \blacksquare malignant brain tumors: EOR threshold of 78 %
- our results suggest non-existence of such a threshold in PA
- important: TGP model able to reproduce EOR threshold

Non-existence of an extent of resection (EOR) threshold.

- \blacksquare malignant brain tumors: EOR threshold of 78 %
- our results suggest non-existence of such a threshold in PA
- important: TGP model able to reproduce EOR threshold



Discussion

- first theoretical model of PA based on population dynamics of tumor and wild-type cells
 - $\hfill\square$ only one parameter: risk parameter γ
 - $\hfill\square$ results robust to changes of γ
- Iimited long-term follow-up data
 - no clinical studies of influence of residual tumor volume
 - results suggest: residual tumor volume is important prognostic marker
 - lack of data could be reason for different results in clinical studies on additional treatment in PA

for your attention!



References

- Buder, T. et al.: Mathematical model for pilocytic astrocytoma growth and progression provides clinical decision support. submitted
- Lambert et al. (2013): Differential expression and methylation of brain developmental genes defines location-specific subsets of pilocytic astrocytoma. Acta Neuropathol, doi 10.1007/s00401-013-1124-7.
- Jones, D. et al. (2013). Recurrent somatic alterations of FGFR1 and NTRK2 in pilocytic astrocytoma. Nature Genetics 45, 927-932.
- Raabe, E.H; Kah Suan Lim; Kim, J. M. et al. (2011). BRAF Activation Induces Transformation and Then Senescence in Human Neural Stem Cells: A Pilocytic Astrocytoma Model. *Clin Cancer Res 2011;17:3590-3599.*
- Durrett, R; Schmidt, D. and Schweinsberg, J. (2010). A waiting time problem arising from the study of multi-stage carcinogenesis. Journal of Nonlinear Science, vol. 20, no. 2, 2010
- Pfister et al. (2008). BRAF gene duplication constitutes a mechanism of MAPK pathway activation in low-grade astrocytomas. J Clin Invest, 118(5), 1739 - 1749.
- M. A. Nowak. (2006) Evolutionary Dynamics: Exploring the Equations of Life. Harvard University Press, 2006
- Wodarz, D. and Komarova, N. L. (2005). Computational Biology Of Cancer: Lecture Notes And Mathematical Modeling. World Scientific, Singapore.
- Wong et al. (2005). Expression analysis of juvenile pilocytic astrocytomas by oligonucleotide microarray reveals two potential subgroups. Cancer Res. 2005 Jan 1;65(1):76-84.

Decomposition into two sub-processes



Regression in the TGP model



$$P_{1}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (N-1)(1-v) & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -2(N-2) - 2v & (N-2)(1-v) & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & (N-3) & -2(N-3) - 3v & (N-3)(1-v) & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 & \ddots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -(1-v) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & -2 - (N-1)v \end{pmatrix}$$

$$|detP_{1}'| = (1 - v) \begin{vmatrix} (N - 1)(1 - v) & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ -2(N - 2) - 2v & (N - 2)(1 - v) & 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ (N - 3) & 2(N - 3) - 3v & (N - 3)(1 - v) & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 2(1 - v) \end{vmatrix}$$
$$= (1 - v)(N - 1)(1 - v) \begin{vmatrix} (N - 2)(1 - v) & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 \\ 2(N - 3) - 3v & (N - 3)(1 - v) & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & \ddots & \ddots & 2(1 - v) \end{vmatrix}$$
$$= \cdots$$
$$= (1 - v)(N - 1)(1 - v)(N - 2)(1 - v)(N - 3)(1 - v) \dots 2(1 - v)$$
$$= (N - 1)!(1 - v)^{N - 1}.$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(3+v) & 2 & 0\\ 3(1-v) & -(4+2v) & 1\\ 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+3v) \end{vmatrix} = 6(v^3 + 9v^2 + 9v + 1)$$
$$= 3!(v^3 + 3^2v^2 + 3^2v + 1), \text{ for } N = 4 \text{ and}$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(3+v) & 2 & 0\\ 3(1-v) & -(4+2v) & 1\\ 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+3v) \end{vmatrix} = 6(v^3 + 9v^2 + 9v + 1)$$
$$= 3!(v^3 + 3^2v^2 + 3^2v + 1), \text{ for } N = 4 \text{ and}$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(4+\nu) & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 4(1-\nu) & -(6+2\nu) & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 3(1-\nu) & -(4+3\nu) & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 2(1-\nu) & -(2+4\nu) \end{vmatrix} = 24(\nu^4 + 16\nu^3 + 36\nu^2 + 16\nu + 1)$$
$$= 4!(\nu^4 + 4^2\nu^3 + 6^2\nu^2 + 4^2\nu + 1) \text{ for } N = 5.$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(3+v) & 2 & 0\\ 3(1-v) & -(4+2v) & 1\\ 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+3v) \end{vmatrix} = 6(v^3 + 9v^2 + 9v + 1)$$
$$= 3!(v^3 + 3^2v^2 + 3^2v + 1), \text{ for } N = 4 \text{ and}$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(4+v) & 3 & 0 & 0\\ 4(1-v) & -(6+2v) & 2 & 0\\ 0 & 3(1-v) & -(4+3v) & 1\\ 0 & 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+4v) \end{vmatrix} = 24(v^4 + 16v^3 + 36v^2 + 16v + 1)$$
$$= 4!(v^4 + 4^2v^3 + 6^2v^2 + 4^2v + 1) \text{ for } N = 5.$$

$$detP' = 120(v^5 + 25v^4 + 100v^3 + 100v^2 + 25v + 1)$$

= 5!(v^5 + 5^2v^4 + 10^2v^3 + 10^2v^2 + 5^2v + 1) for N = 6

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(3+v) & 2 & 0\\ 3(1-v) & -(4+2v) & 1\\ 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+3v) \end{vmatrix} = 6(v^3 + 9v^2 + 9v + 1)$$
$$= 3!(v^3 + 3^2v^2 + 3^2v + 1), \text{ for } N = 4 \text{ and}$$

$$detP' = \begin{vmatrix} -(4+v) & 3 & 0 & 0\\ 4(1-v) & -(6+2v) & 2 & 0\\ 0 & 3(1-v) & -(4+3v) & 1\\ 0 & 0 & 2(1-v) & -(2+4v) \end{vmatrix} = 24(v^4 + 16v^3 + 36v^2 + 16v + 1)$$
$$= 4!(v^4 + 4^2v^3 + 6^2v^2 + 4^2v + 1) \text{ for } N = 5.$$

$$detP' = 120(v^5 + 25v^4 + 100v^3 + 100v^2 + 25v + 1)$$

= 5!(v^5 + 5^2v^4 + 10^2v^3 + 10^2v^2 + 5^2v + 1) for N = 6

$$detP' = (N-1)! \left(\binom{N-1}{N-1}^2 v^{N-1} + \binom{N-1}{N-2}^2 v^{N-2} + \dots + \binom{N-1}{2}^2 v^2 + \binom{N-1}{1}^2 v^1 + \binom{N-1}{0}^2 v^0 \right)$$
$$= (N-1)! \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \binom{N-1}{i}^2 v^i.$$

$$\alpha^{N}(1,v) = \frac{\det P_{1}'}{\det P'} = \frac{(N-1)!(1-v)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} {\binom{N-1}{i}^{2}v^{i}}} = \frac{(1-v)^{N-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} {\binom{N-1}{i}^{2}v^{i}}} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{v+1}{1-v}\right)},$$

where $P_N(x)$ denotes the Legendre polynomials which are the particular solutions to the Legendre differential equation

$$\left(1-x^2\right)\,f''(x)-2x\,f'(x)+N(N+1)\,f(x)=0,\quad N\in\mathbb{N}_0$$

$$\alpha^{N}(1,v) = \frac{\det P_{1}'}{\det P'} = \frac{(N-1)!(1-v)^{N-1}}{(N-1)!\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} {\binom{N-1}{i}^{2}v^{i}}} = \frac{(1-v)^{N-1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} {\binom{N-1}{i}^{2}v^{i}}} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{v+1}{1-v}\right)},$$

where $P_N(x)$ denotes the Legendre polynomials which are the particular solutions to the Legendre differential equation

$$(1-x^2) f''(x) - 2x f'(x) + N(N+1) f(x) = 0, \quad N \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

N	u	v	$\gamma = (N\sqrt{v})^2$	$\alpha^N(1)$	simulated fraction of fixation
10	10-4	10000^{-1}	0.1 ²	0.99106	0.9913
10	10-4	2500^{-1}	0.2 ²	0.96494	0.96536
100	10 ⁻⁴	10000^{-1}	1	0.44174	0.44162
100	10 ⁻⁴	2500^{-1}	2 ²	0.08999	0.08973

The influence of γ $({\it N}\sqrt{\it v})^2=\gamma,$ hence $\it v=\frac{\gamma}{N^2}$ and therefore

$$\alpha^{N}(1,\gamma) = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\nu+1}{1-\nu}\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\frac{\gamma}{N}+1}{1-\frac{\gamma}{N^{2}}}\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{N^{2}+\gamma}{N^{2}-\gamma}\right)}.$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{The influence of } \gamma \\ (N\sqrt{\nu})^2 = \gamma, \text{ hence } \nu = \frac{\gamma}{N^2} \text{ and therefore} \\ \alpha^N(1,\gamma) = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\nu+1}{1-\nu}\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\gamma}{N^2}+1\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{N^2+\gamma}{N^2-\gamma}\right)}. \end{array}$$

It holds that

$$P_{N}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \left[x + \sqrt{x^{2} - 1} \cos \varphi \right]^{N} \mathrm{d}\varphi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 1\},$$

The influence of γ $(N\sqrt{v})^2 = \gamma$, hence $v = \frac{\gamma}{N^2}$ and therefore $\alpha^N(1,\gamma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-\gamma}}$

$$\alpha^{N}(1,\gamma) = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\nu+1}{1-\nu}\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{\gamma}{N^{2}}+1\right)} = \frac{1}{P_{N-1}\left(\frac{N^{2}+\gamma}{N^{2}}\right)}.$$

It holds that

$$P_{N}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{0}^{\pi} \left[x + \sqrt{x^{2} - 1} \cos \varphi \right]^{N} \mathrm{d}\varphi, \quad x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 1\},$$

hence

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} P_{N-1}\left(\frac{N^2 + \gamma}{N^2 - \gamma}\right) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \left[\frac{N^2 + \gamma + 2N\sqrt{\gamma}\cos\varphi}{N^2 - \gamma}\right]^{N-1} d\varphi$$
$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} \lim_{N \to \infty} \left[\frac{N^2 + \gamma + 2N\sqrt{\gamma}\cos\varphi}{N^2 - \gamma}\right]^{N-1} d\varphi$$
$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi} e^{2\sqrt{\gamma}\cos\varphi} d\varphi = I_0(2\sqrt{\gamma}).$$

Fraction of PA I cases in the model

$$\alpha(\gamma) := \lim_{N \to \infty} \alpha^N(1, \gamma) = \frac{1}{I_0(2\sqrt{\gamma})}.$$



I0 denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind.