

DISTRIBUTE MEASUREMENTS FOR MAXIMAL INFORMATION GAIN

SEVERIN BANG

INSTITUT OF PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG

OCTOBER 11, 2022

PREMISES











Goal: model selection

- Goal: model selection
- Fit full and reduced model to same dataset

- Goal: model selection
- Fit full and reduced model to same dataset
- Is the smaller model sufficient to describe the data?

IDEA

- Goal: model selection
- Fit full and reduced model to same dataset
- Is the smaller model sufficient to describe the data?
- Test on slow and fast dynamic



IDEA

- Goal: model selection
- Fit full and reduced model to same dataset
- Is the smaller model sufficient to describe the data?
- Test on slow and fast dynamic



Additionally: look at different time spans for data acquisition

SLOW DYNAMIC

$$\emptyset \xrightarrow{k_1} \mathbb{B}$$

SLOW DYNAMIC

$\emptyset \xrightarrow{k_1} \mathbb{B}$

■ Generation of *B* with Hill type kinetic, a linear *driver* A and Hill coefficient *n*

$$k_1 = \frac{A^n}{(k_M \cdot (1 + v))^n + A^n}$$



SIMULATION STUDY

- Full model: k_M free; reduced model: k_M fixed
- Null hypothesis:

A reduced model with a fixed k_{M} describes the data.

- Data is generated under increasing violation of null hypothesis
- Gaussian noise is added to the data
- Fit full and reduced model
- Estimate the error via an error model







- Accept or reject reduced model based on *p*-value calculated from log-likelihood ratio between full and reduced model
- Plot the relative rate of rejection, i.e. proportion of realizations with p < 0.05 over violation v</p>
- At v = 0: rejection rate should represent chosen p-value threshold. If not:
 - Less rejected: conservative
 - More rejected: anti-conservative











■ Slow dynamic: only little change up until 60



■ Slow dynamic: only little change up until 60



Acquisition schemes make basically no difference

■ Slow dynamic: only little change up until 60



- Acquisition schemes make basically no difference
- Violation manifests as offset

Slow dynamic: only little change up until 60



- Acquisition schemes make basically no difference
- Violation manifests as offset
- ...so look at the fast dynamic



$$\emptyset \xrightarrow{k_1} \mathbb{B} \xrightarrow{k_2} \emptyset$$

FAST DYNAMIC



Generation of B with Hill type kinetic, a linear driver A and cubic degradation:

$$\mathbf{k}_1 = \frac{A^n}{(\mathbf{k}_{\mathsf{M}} \cdot (1 + v))^n + A^n}, \quad \mathbf{k}_2 = B \cdot \mathbf{k}_3 \cdot A^3$$



EXAMPLE – FAST DYNAMIC

























IN SHORT

Insights:

- No silver bullet
- Replicates make only sense on points of high dynamic
- Most efficient would be: pinpoint dynamic by singlets, additional replicates only on relevant points
- But, that is only one aspect, there are more reasons for replicates (outliers, validation etc.)

Outlook:

- Test on typical dynamics
- Evaluate averages vs. error model
- Investigate alternative possibilities to detect outliers
- ► .

Thank you...

- ...to Jens Timmer & the whole JetiLab
- ...to Marcel Schilling
- …to the bwForCluster Helix
- ...to you!

IF THIS TALK WAS ONE SLIDE...

Take home message:

- Measuring more time points in fewer replicates is in general more informative
- Replicates only useful when at time points of maximum dynamic
- If you want to know more:

