

## REPORT

# A theoretical framework for specificity in cell signaling

Natalia L Komarova<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Xiufen Zou<sup>1,3</sup>, Qing Nie<sup>1</sup> and Lee Bardwell<sup>4,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA, <sup>2</sup> Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA, <sup>3</sup> College of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan, China and <sup>4</sup> Department of Developmental and Cell Biology, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

\* Corresponding authors. NL Komarova, Departments of Mathematics and Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA. Tel.: +1 9498241268; Fax: +1 9498247993; E-mail: komarova@uci.edu or L Bardwell, Department of Developmental and Cell Biology, 5205 McGaugh Hall, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697-2300, USA. Tel.: +1 9498246902; Fax: +1 9498244709; E-mail: bardwell@uci.edu

Received 7.6.05; accepted 23.9.05

**Different cellular signal transduction pathways are often interconnected, so that the potential for undesirable crosstalk between pathways exists. Nevertheless, signaling networks have evolved that maintain specificity from signal to cellular response. Here, we develop a framework for the analysis of networks containing two or more interconnected signaling pathways. We define two properties, *specificity* and *fidelity*, that all pathways in a network must possess in order to avoid paradoxical situations where one pathway activates another pathway's output, or responds to another pathway's input, more than its own. In unembellished networks that share components, it is impossible for all pathways to have both mutual specificity and mutual fidelity. However, inclusion of either of two related insulating mechanisms—compartmentalization or the action of a scaffold protein—allows both properties to be achieved, provided deactivation rates are fast compared to exchange rates.**

*Molecular Systems Biology* 18 October 2005; doi:10.1038/msb4100031

*Subject Categories:* computational methods; signal transduction

*Keywords:* protein kinase; mathematical model; network; scaffold; signal transduction

## Introduction

Cells sense and respond to a wide variety of chemical messages, such as hormones like insulin and adrenalin, which originate from other cells or from the environment. Yet, cells use only a limited number of intracellular signaling proteins to transduce this multitude of signals. For instance, some key intermediate modules, such as the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) cascade, are activated by an astonishingly high percentage of known stimuli (Lewis *et al*, 1998). Hence, different signals are often transmitted by common components, yet elicit distinct (and appropriate) outcomes. An important unsolved problem in cell biology is to understand how specificity from signal to cellular response is maintained between different signal transduction pathways that share similar (or identical) components, particularly when this occurs in the same cell (Schaeffer and Weber, 1999; Tan and Kim, 1999; Pawson, 2004).


## Results and discussion

### Simple signaling networks

Figure 1A shows a schematic of a simple signaling network, composed of two pathways, X and Y. Each pathway in the network has a unique input and a unique output. The input for

pathway X is designated  $x_0$ , and can be taken to represent both the signal itself and its receptor; the input for pathway Y is designated  $y_0$ . We assume that the network is exposed to only one signal at a time. The activated species of the downstream elements of pathway X are designated  $x_1$  and  $x_2$ , those of pathway Y are  $y_1$  and  $y_2$ . When a signal  $x_0$  is present,  $x_0$  'activates' (i.e. causes the production of) component  $x_1$  (which might be a protein kinase or a kinase cascade);  $x_1$  in turn activates  $x_2$  (which might be a terminal kinase or a target transcription factor). Pathway components are also deactivated: proteins that are activated by being phosphorylated by a protein kinase are deactivated when that phosphate group is removed by a protein phosphatase, for instance. Figure 1B shows the typical mound-shaped curve of the time course of activation of a given component in response to a square-pulse input signal. The area under such a curve for the final component of a given pathway can be taken as a measure of that pathway's *total output*. Let us denote the total output of pathway X when the cell is exposed to an input signal  $x_0$  as  $X_{\text{out}}|X_{\text{in}}$  (read as 'X output given X input', or simply 'X given X').

Interconnections between pathways often serve a useful purpose (Schwartz and Baron, 1999), but here we concern ourselves with undesirable crosstalk, or 'leaking'. In the Figure 1 network, pathway Y leaks into pathway X, because kinase  $y_1$  is somewhat lacking in substrate selectivity: in addition to phosphorylating its correct target  $y_2$ , it also



**Figure 1** A simple network with crosstalk. (A) The network consists of two pathways, X and Y, that are interconnected because component  $y_1$  activates target  $x_2$ . (B) Output in response to pulse of signal  $x_0$  (top) or  $y_0$  (bottom). (C) Depiction of the ratios equal to the specificity of pathway Y and the fidelity of pathway X.

phosphorylates the incorrect target  $x_2$ . Hence, when the network is stimulated by signal  $y_0$ , in addition to the authentic output  $Y_{out}|Y_{in}$ , there is some spurious output  $X_{out}|Y_{in}$ .

### Definitions of specificity and fidelity

We define the *specificity* of cascade X as the ratio of its authentic output to its spurious output:

$$S_X = \frac{X_{out}|X_{in}}{Y_{out}|X_{in}} \quad (1)$$

Thus (as in Figure 1), if pathway X is activated by a given signal and this does not affect the output from pathway Y, the specificity of X with respect to Y in response to that signal is infinite, or *complete*.

Similarly, the specificity of cascade Y is of the form


$$S_Y = \frac{Y_{out}|Y_{in}}{X_{out}|Y_{in}} \quad (2)$$

In Figure 1, since the action of signal  $y_0$  will result in some output from X, the specificity of Y with respect to X is finite (see Figure 1C). Indeed, if  $S_Y$  were less than 1, it would mean that the signal for Y was actually promoting the output of pathway X more than its own output.

The *fidelity* of a pathway is its output when given an authentic signal divided by its output in response to a spurious signal (see Figure 1C):

$$F_X = \frac{X_{out}|X_{in}}{X_{out}|Y_{in}}, \quad F_Y = \frac{Y_{out}|Y_{in}}{Y_{out}|X_{in}} \quad (3)$$

Thus, a pathway that exhibits fidelity (i.e.  $F > 1$ ) is activated more by its authentic signal than by others. In contrast, if a pathway has fidelity of less than 1, it is activated more by another pathways' signal than it is by its own. In the Figure 1 network,  $F_Y$  is complete, while  $F_X$  is finite.



**Figure 2** Signaling network with shared components. (A) The 'basic architecture'. Component  $x_1$  is common to pathways X and Y. Although the desired route of signaling is for  $x_0$  to activate  $x_2$  and not  $y_2$ , and  $y_0$  to activate  $y_2$  and not  $x_2$ , this cannot be achieved with specificity and fidelity for this network. (B, C) Numerical simulations of signaling through this network under various sets of parameter values. Values that increase  $S_X$  reciprocally decrease  $S_Y$ , and values that increase  $F_X$  reciprocally decrease  $F_Y$ . Shown are the values of outputs  $x_2$  and  $y_2$  in response to inputs  $x_0$  and  $y_0$ , applied separately as square pulses of magnitude 1 and duration 1. In panel B, both the specificity and fidelity of cascade X are larger than those of cascade Y. Parameter values are  $a_1=2$ ,  $b_1=1$ ,  $a_2=2$ ,  $b_2=1$ ,  $d_1 = d_1^x = d_1^y = 1$ . We have  $S_X=2$ ,  $F_X=2$ ,  $S_Y=0.5$ ,  $F_Y=0.5$ . In panel C, the specificity of cascade X is higher than that of cascade Y whereas the opposite holds for fidelity values:  $F_X < F_Y$ . Parameter values are  $a_1=1$ ,  $b_1=2$ ,  $a_2=2$ ,  $b_2=1$ ,  $d_1 = d_1^x = d_1^y = 1$ . This yields  $S_X=2$ ,  $F_X=0.5$ ,  $S_Y=0.5$ ,  $F_Y=2$ . (D, E) Two insulating mechanisms that can augment specificity: (D) compartmentalization; (E) the action of a scaffold protein.

### Cascades that share components

In many cases, two signaling pathways share one or more common elements (see Figure 2A). One well-known example is in mammalian PC12 cells, where treatment with epidermal growth factor (EGF) causes the cells to proliferate, whereas treatment with nerve growth factor (NGF) causes the cells to differentiate and sprout neurites, yet both growth factors signal through the same MAPK cascade (Marshall, 1995). Another example is in baker's and brewer's yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*), where three distinct signaling pathways (mating, invasive growth and osmotic stress response) share elements of the same MAP kinase cascade (van Drogen and Peter, 2002). Experimental data indicate that pathways can be well insulated from one another despite sharing components: treatment of PC12 cells with EGF does not cause them to sprout neurites, and stimulation of yeast with mating pheromone does not activate the stress response, for example (Schaeffer and Weber, 1999; van Drogen and Peter, 2002; Vaudry et al, 2002).

This class of networks can be represented by the 'basic architecture' shown in Figure 2A. Here, the parameters  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are activation rate constants for pathway X;  $a_2$  is the rate at which kinase  $x_1$  activates (phosphorylates) target  $x_2$ . Similarly,

**Table I** Equations and solutions for the networks analyzed in this paper<sup>a</sup>

	'Basic architecture' network (Figure 2A)	Compartmentalization/scaffolding network (Figure 2D and E)
Equation(s) for $x_1$	$dx_1/dt = a_1x_0(t) + b_1y_0(t) - d_1x_1$	$dx_1^N/dt = a_1x_0(t) - D_x x_1^N + D_y x_1^C - d_1^x x_1^N,$ $dx_1^C/dt = b_1y_0(t) - D_y x_1^C + D_x x_1^N - d_1^y x_1^C$
Equations for $x_2, y_2$	$dx_2/dt = a_2x_1 - d_2^x x_2,$ $dy_2/dt = b_2x_1 - d_2^y y_2$	$dx_2/dt = a_2x_1^N - d_2^x x_2,$ $dy_2/dt = b_2x_1^C - d_2^y y_2$
$\bar{x}_1 X_{in}$	$\frac{\bar{x}_0 a_1}{d_1}$	b
$X_{out} X_{in}$ (= $\bar{x}_2 X_{in}$ )	$\frac{\bar{x}_0 a_1 a_2}{d_1 d_2^x}$	b
$Y_{out} X_{in}$ (= $\bar{y}_2 X_{in}$ )	$\frac{\bar{x}_0 a_1 b_2}{d_1 d_2^y}$	b
$\bar{x}_1 Y_{in}$	$\frac{\bar{y}_0 b_1}{d_1}$	b
$X_{out} Y_{in}$	$\frac{\bar{y}_0 b_1 a_2}{d_1 d_2^x}$	b
$Y_{out} Y_{in}$	$\frac{\bar{y}_0 b_1 b_2}{d_1 d_2^y}$	b
$S_X = \frac{X_{out} X_{in}}{Y_{out} X_{in}}$	$\frac{a_2 d_2^y}{b_2 d_2^x}$	$\frac{a_2 d_2^y}{b_2 d_2^x} \frac{(d_1^y + D_y)}{D_x}$
$S_Y = \frac{Y_{out} Y_{in}}{X_{out} Y_{in}}$	$\frac{b_2 d_2^x}{a_2 d_2^y}$	$\frac{b_2 d_2^x}{a_2 d_2^y} \frac{(d_1^x + D_x)}{D_y}$
$F_X = \frac{X_{out} X_{in}}{X_{out} Y_{in}}$	$\frac{\bar{x}_0 a_1}{\bar{y}_0 b_1}$	$\frac{\bar{x}_0 a_1}{\bar{y}_0 b_1} \frac{(d_1^y + D_y)}{D_y}$
$F_Y = \frac{Y_{out} Y_{in}}{Y_{out} X_{in}}$	$\frac{\bar{y}_0 b_1}{\bar{x}_0 a_1}$	$\frac{\bar{y}_0 b_1}{\bar{x}_0 a_1} \frac{(d_1^x + D_x)}{D_x}$
$S_{network} = S_X S_Y$	1	$\frac{(d_1^y + D_y)(d_1^x + D_x)}{D_y D_x}$

<sup>a</sup> $\bar{x}_0, \bar{y}_0$  = the total amount of signal applied;  $\bar{x}_1|X_{in}$  = the total amount of product  $x_1$  in response to signal  $x_0$ , and so on; other parameters and expressions are defined in text.  
<sup>b</sup>See Supplementary information for full solutions.

$b_1$  and  $b_2$  are activation rate constants for pathway Y. Finally,  $d_1^x, d_2^x$  and  $d_2^y$  are deactivation rate constants, and can be thought of as representing phosphatase activity, for example. Assuming that both pathways in the network are *weakly activated* (Heinrich et al, 2002; Chaves et al, 2004), the network can be modeled by a simple system of three linear ordinary differential equations (ODEs) that can be solved to yield precise analytical expressions for pathway outputs, specificities and fidelities in terms of the network parameters (see Table I; also, see Supplementary information for detailed solutions). It can be seen (see Table I) that the specificities of the pathways are independent of the signal strength, and indeed of all parameters that lie upstream or at the level of the shared component. Pathway fidelities, in contrast, depend strongly upon the relative signal strengths and upon the values of upstream parameters. Hence, the two performance metrics, specificity and fidelity, depend on different characteristics of network design. Indeed, it is easy to choose parameters that provide one pathway with specificity but not fidelity.

We define *network specificity* as the product of the pathway specificities:

$$S_{network} = S_X S_Y = \frac{X_{out}|X_{in}}{Y_{out}|X_{in}} \frac{Y_{out}|Y_{in}}{X_{out}|Y_{in}} \quad (4)$$

(Note that network fidelity, the product of the pathway fidelities, is always exactly equal to network specificity.)  $S_{network}$  provides an indication of the specificity intrinsic in the network architecture. Intuitively, it would seem that the basic architecture does not possess intrinsic specificity. Indeed, it can be seen from Table I that, for the basic architecture,  $S_X$  is the reciprocal of  $S_Y$ , and  $F_X$  is the reciprocal of  $F_Y$ , so that  $S_{network} = F_{network} = 1$ . The specificity of pathway X can be increased by changing the magnitude of certain parameters (increasing  $a_2$  or decreasing  $b_2$ , for example), but in so doing the specificity of Y decreases correspondingly (see Figure 2B and C).

Two other useful network measurements are *mutual specificity* (and *mutual fidelity*), properties that exist if all pathways in the network have specificity (fidelity) greater than 1. The basic architecture never exhibits mutual specificity or mutual fidelity.

### Analysis of insulating mechanisms: compartmentalization

Real cellular signaling networks that share components typically contain one or more insulating mechanisms that

are thought to contribute to specificity and fidelity (Tan and Kim, 1999; Schwartz and Madhani, 2004). In *compartmentalization*, different pathways are localized to different cellular compartments, or to different spatial locations within the cell (Figure 2D) (Smith and Scott, 2002; White and Anderson, 2005). The extent of leaking between the two pathways is determined by the efficiency of compartmentalization. For example, assume that the pathway-specific components of pathway *X* are localized to the nucleus, while those of pathway *Y* are localized to the cytosol. Although the shared kinase,  $x_1$ , is found in both compartments ( $x_1^N$  is the nuclear pool and  $x_1^C$  is the cytosolic pool),  $x_1$  activated by  $x_0$  in the nucleus is likely to encounter target  $x_2$ , which is also in the nucleus; it will only encounter target  $y_2$  if it diffuses into the cytosol before it is deactivated. Thus, crossover between the two pathways happens when kinase  $x_1$  leaks in or out of the nucleus.  $D_x$  is the coefficient for the rate at which  $x_1$  exits the nucleus and enters the cytosol, and  $D_y$  is the rate constant for  $x_1$  leaving the cytosol and entering the nucleus.  $D_x$  and  $D_y$  can be considered as pseudo-diffusion rate constants, or exchange rate constants. The parameters  $d_1^N$  and  $d_1^C$  are the deactivation constants for  $x_1$  in the nucleus and cytosol, respectively.

Again, assuming weak activation, the network can be modeled with linear ODEs and precise solutions for specificity and fidelity obtained (see Table I and Supplementary information). The specificity of this network is

$$S_{\text{network}} = F_{\text{network}} = \frac{(d_1^x + D_x)(d_1^y + D_y)}{D_x D_y} > 1 \quad (5)$$

It can be seen that network specificity is greater than in the basic architecture, and is maximized if the exchange rates  $D_x$  and  $D_y$  are small compared to the deactivation rates  $d_1^x$  and  $d_1^y$ . Compartmentalization can also provide both mutual specificity and mutual fidelity, as long as the exchange rates balance each other (see Table I). The limiting case where  $D_x = D_y = 0$  is equivalent to two noninteracting cascades with complete specificity and fidelity. If the leakage coefficients become very large ( $D_x, D_y \rightarrow \infty$ ), we again have a fully connected system with a shared element, equivalent to the basic architecture, and  $S_{\text{network}} = F_{\text{network}} = 1$ .

### Role of scaffold proteins

Scaffold proteins, defined here as proteins that bind to two or more consecutively acting components in a pathway, have been shown to enhance the efficiency of signaling, and have also been proposed to augment specificity by several mechanisms (Whitmarsh and Davis, 1998; Levchenko *et al*, 2000; Burack *et al*, 2002; Flatauer *et al*, 2005). In particular, by binding to multiple components of a given pathway, scaffolds may create the equivalent of ‘micro-compartments’ (Harris *et al*, 2001). That is, if the reactions between those components can only happen on the scaffold (or are much more efficient on the scaffold), then it is as if these scaffolded reactions occur in their own compartment, sequestered away from reactions occurring off-scaffold. In this way, scaffolds may prevent their bound components that are shared with other pathways from

straying into those pathways, and protect them from intrusions from those pathways.

To model this sequestration mechanism, we use the equations for compartmentalization, with the meaning of some of the terms interpreted differently (see Figure 2E and Table I). First,  $x_1^N$  (a**N**chored  $x_1$ ) is interpreted to represent kinase  $x_1$  bound to the scaffold and  $x_1^C$  (C**Y**tosolic  $x_1$ ) is unbound  $x_1$ , free in solution in the cytosol. The equation for  $dx_1^N/dt$  then indicates that the activation of kinase  $x_1$  by signal  $x_0$  occurs on the scaffold and not in solution, while the equation for  $dx_2/dt$  indicates that the activation of target  $x_2$  by kinase  $x_1$  also occurs only on the scaffold. In contrast, the corresponding reactions for pathway *Y* can occur only in solution and not on the scaffold.  $D_x$  is the rate constant for the dissociation of  $x_1$  from the scaffold, and  $D_y$  is a first-order association constant for the binding of cytosolic  $x_1$  to the scaffolded complex. Leaking between pathways *X* and *Y* can occur if  $x_0$ -activated  $x_1$  dissociates from the scaffold and encounters  $y_2$ , or if  $x_1$  that was activated by  $y_0$  in the cytosol binds to the scaffold (see Figure 2E).

The previous results (see equation (5) and Table I) for specificity and fidelity under compartmentalization also apply to scaffolding:  $S_x$  is promoted by a low rate of dissociation of kinase  $x_1$  from the scaffold and a high rate of rebinding; however, these factors reduce  $S_y$ . Obtaining network specificity again requires that deactivation rates be fast relative to exchange rates, so that, for instance, any  $x_1$  that dissociates from the scaffold will be deactivated before it encounters  $y_2$ . In this model,  $d_1^x$  represents the deactivation of kinase  $x_1$  on the scaffold. Interestingly, one way in which it has been proposed that scaffold proteins might enhance signal transmission is by protecting their bound kinases from the action of phosphatases (Levchenko *et al*, 2000; Heinrich *et al*, 2002), equivalent to lowering  $d_1^x$  to close to or equal to zero. Although this might indeed enhance the speed, duration and amplitude of *X* signaling (Heinrich *et al*, 2002), it would lower both  $S_y, F_y$  and network specificity.

### Conclusion

Here, we presented a framework for the analysis of interconnected biochemical pathways. We defined the *specificity* of a pathway as the ratio of its authentic output to its spurious output, and the *fidelity* of a pathway as its output when given an authentic signal divided by its output in response to a spurious signal. These definitions express commonsense notions that a pathway should stimulate its own output more than another pathway’s output, and respond to its own input more than to another’s. Moreover, they are simple ratios of pathway output, a property that is readily measurable by modeling or experiment. We also defined the informative metric of *network specificity*, the product of pathway specificities or fidelities. We demonstrated the utility of these metrics by calculating them for simple networks that share components, revealing the limited specificity inherent in simple architectures devoid of specificity-promoting enhancements. Finally, we showed how the insulating mechanisms of compartmentalization and scaffolding are related, and how both require slow exchange rates and fast deactivation rates in order to promote high levels of specificity.

## Supplementary information

Supplementary information is available at *Molecular Systems Biology* website ([www.nature.com/msb](http://www.nature.com/msb)).

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a National Institutes of Health/National Science Foundation joint initiative on Mathematical Biology through National Institute of General Medical Sciences grant GM75309 (LB, NK, QN), by NIGMS grant P20-GM66051 (LB, QN), by a grant from the National Academies of Sciences Keck Futures Initiative and by NIGMS research grants GM60366 and GM69013 (LB) and by NIGMS grant GM67247 (QN). XZ is supported by Chinese National Natural Science Foundation grant no. 60573168.

## References

- Burack WR, Cheng AM, Shaw AS (2002) Scaffolds, adaptors and linkers of TCR signaling: theory and practice. *Curr Opin Immunol* **14**: 312–316
- Chaves M, Sontag ED, Dinerstein RJ (2004) Optimal length and signal amplification in weakly activated signal transduction cascades. *J Phys Chem B* **108**: 15311–15320
- Flatauer LJ, Zadeh SF, Bardwell L (2005) Mitogen-activated protein kinases with distinct requirements for Ste5 scaffolding influence signaling specificity in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Mol Cell Biol* **25**: 1793–1803
- Harris K, Lamson RE, Nelson B, Hughes TR, Marton MJ, Roberts CJ, Boone C, Pryciak PM (2001) Role of scaffolds in MAP kinase pathway specificity revealed by custom design of pathway-dedicated signaling proteins. *Curr Biol* **11**: 1815–1824
- Heinrich R, Neel BG, Rapoport TA (2002) Mathematical models of protein kinase signal transduction. *Mol Cell* **9**: 957–970
- Levchenko A, Bruck J, Sternberg P (2000) Scaffold proteins may biphasically affect the levels of mitogen-activated protein kinase signaling and reduce its threshold properties. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **97**: 5818–5823
- Lewis TS, Shapiro PS, Ahn NG (1998) Signal transduction through MAP kinase cascades. *Adv Cancer Res* **74**: 49–139
- Marshall CJ (1995) Specificity of receptor tyrosine kinase signaling: transient versus sustained extracellular signal-regulated kinase activation. *Cell* **80**: 179–185
- Pawson T (2004) Specificity in signal transduction: from phosphotyrosine-SH2 domain interactions to complex cellular systems. *Cell* **116**: 191–203
- Schaeffer HJ, Weber MJ (1999) Mitogen-activated protein kinases: specific messages from ubiquitous messengers. *Mol Cell Biol* **19**: 2435–2444
- Schwartz MA, Baron V (1999) Interactions between mitogenic stimuli, or, a thousand and one connections. *Curr Opin Cell Biol* **11**: 197–202
- Schwartz MA, Madhani HD (2004) Principles of MAP kinase signaling specificity in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Annu Rev Genet* **38**: 725–748
- Smith FD, Scott JD (2002) Signaling complexes: junctions on the intracellular information super highway. *Curr Biol* **12**: R32–R40
- Tan PB, Kim SK (1999) Signaling specificity: the RTK/RAS/MAP kinase pathway in metazoans. *Trends Genet* **15**: 145–149
- van Drogen F, Peter M (2002) MAP kinase cascades: scaffolding signal specificity. *Curr Biol* **12**: R53–R55
- Vaudry D, Stork PJ, Lazarovici P, Eiden LE (2002) Signaling pathways for PC12 cell differentiation: making the right connections. *Science* **296**: 1648–1649
- White MA, Anderson RG (2005) Signaling networks in living cells. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol* **45**: 587–603
- Whitmarsh AJ, Davis RJ (1998) Structural organization of MAP-kinase signaling modules by scaffold proteins in yeast and mammals. *Trends Biochem Sci* **23**: 481–485