

Systematizing Cellular Complexity

A Hilbertian Approach To Biological Problems

Nima Dehghani^{a,b}

^a*McGovern Institute for Brain Research, MIT, 43 Vassar
St, Cambridge, 02139, MA, USA*

^b*Allen Discovery Center, Department of Biology, Tufts, 200 College
Avenue, Medford, 02155, MA, USA*

Abstract

Examining individual components of cellular systems has been successful in uncovering molecular reactions and interactions. However, the challenge lies in integrating these components into a comprehensive system-scale map. This difficulty arises due to factors such as missing links (unknown variables), overlooked nonlinearities in high-dimensional parameter space, downplayed natural noisiness and stochasticity, and a lack of focus on causal influence and temporal dynamics. Composite static and phenomenological descriptions, while appearing complicated, lack the essence of what makes the biological systems truly “complex”. The formalization of system-level problems is therefore essential in constructing a meta-theory of biology. This work examines key problems that cells must solve, serving as a template for such formalization and as a step towards the axiomatization of biological investigations.

Keywords: Theory, Model, Formalism, Phenomenology, Axiomatization

Introduction

The Complexity of Cellular Systems

Scientific journals and textbooks often feature graphical representations of cellular mechanisms, ranging from 3D depictions of subcellular structures to diagrams of signaling pathways. Advances in imaging and high throughput gene expression methods, coupled with a deeper understanding of biochemical pathways, have resulted in an abundance of intricate yet simplified representations of intracellular structures and signaling. However, it's

March 18, 2024

critical to recognize that these images are abstractions, simplifying complex cellular systems. Capturing the complexity of cellular interactions with static descriptions is challenging. Given the high degree of complexity and stochasticity in intracellular events, the ability of cells and simple organisms to achieve reliability and robustness is remarkable. Understanding how cells control their inner dynamics and process environmental information, and how they respond to challenging conditions, may require more than reductionist or ateleological approaches. Referring to Lazebnik’s essay “can a biologist fix a radio” [1], we question whether we can truly understand the inner workings of a cell through conventional methods.

Towards an Axiomatic Approach in Biology

Adopting methods from fields like physics or computer science can be beneficial, but more effective is an axiomatic approach. This involves correctly framing questions and developing new methods to understand “evolved” biological systems. Integrating approaches from dynamical systems theory, computer science, statistical inference, and machine learning can provide a more holistic understanding [2]. Instead of concentrating on isolated issues or being confined by our expertise in certain methods, it is crucial to identify a spectrum of problems that a cell must address. Developing a systematic theoretical approach not only is more productive but also shapes our thinking within a well-defined paradigm. This approach mirrors the influence of Hilbert’s list of unsolved problems in mathematics on the field, guiding our thought process in a similar manner [3]. This paper attempts to formalize key challenges in cellular biology: finding the right control switches, addressing the need for reconfiguration, and managing internal noise. In an attempt to formalize these key problems, we provide an expose of these three fundamental challenging issues that cells face. Previous attempts at axiomatizing biology, such as those by Woodger [4] and Mahner and Bunge’s metaphysically-schemed approach to biology [5], are prime examples of failed attempts due to improper formalization of key problems. To avoid repeating these mistakes, it is important to properly formalize these key issues before attempting to develop an axiomatic approach. By working within an adaptable paradigm and adapting it as we progress (both experimentally and theoretically), we can bridge biological intuition with mathematical development, furthering our understanding of living systems. This approach is essential to avoid the pitfalls of previous attempts and to ensure the successful axiomatization of biology.

Problem 1: Where are the control switches?

Challenges of Environmental Adaptation

Single cell organisms must constantly adapt to changing environments, such as fluctuations in temperature, pH, and the concentration of necessary substrates or harmful chemicals. Multicellular systems have more internal stability due to sophisticated regulatory systems, but their individual cells must also overcome fluctuations in their constrained environments. A key question arises: How do cells, whether unicellular or multicellular, maintain their internal stability amidst these changes? To preserve internal stability, cells must identify and manipulate the relevant control mechanisms — or ‘switches’ — to adapt to environmental changes. Effective regulation in cells involves navigating two critical constraints: firstly, the identification of relevant switches without causing irreversible harm or death to the cell; secondly, the necessity of prompt action due to limited resources and time. Consequently, adaptive cellular regulation represents a time-constrained optimization challenge, centered around the discovery and manipulation of the necessary ‘switches’ for appropriate responses.

The Complexity of Cellular Switches

Identifying the right switch at the right time poses a complex problem due to the vast array of potential ‘switches’ in a cell. A possible approach to this challenge is the concept of trial and error ¹, as posited by Ashby [7, 8]. He illustrated this with a hypothetical scenario in which an individual must find the correct configuration among 1000 switches to illuminate a light. The time required to find the right configuration varies significantly across different approaches. For instance, a thorough sequential search would take an impractical 2^{1000} seconds (assuming 2 seconds for each switch’s on and off positions). In contrast, a serial test with some knowledge of partial correctness might average around 500 seconds, while testing all switches individually but in parallel could take merely 1 second. However, while this concept might be applicable to high-dimensional problems like adaptive cellular regulation, it comes with significant risks: incorrect switch activation, deactivation of essential switches, or time constraints might lead to detrimental outcomes for the cell.

¹Karl Popper highlighted the role of ‘trial and error’ as a fundamental process in knowledge acquisition within evolutionary epistemology [6].

In a population context, one might speculate that some cells could successfully adapt through trial and error. However, the structure and hierarchy of cellular switches are far from random [9, 10]. They exhibit a layered organization, with some operating at lower scales and others providing higher-level modulation. This hierarchical architecture implies a *causal* modulatory tuning of more efficient, evolutionarily refined system for achieving the right configuration, rather than relying on mere chance. The inherent complexity of switch configurations, compounded by the often limited and noisy input information, makes a pure trial and error approach both computationally prohibitive and pragmatically risky [11].

Hierarchical Organization and Causal Inference in Cellular Regulation

To reach a desirable problem-specific non-optimal solution that requires little to no knowledge of the sources of external changes, it is crucial for the cell itself to separate and manage control levels at both macro and micro scales. This implies some form of internal tuning within the cell. Phenomenological models can describe the system at the macro scale, but they do not provide insights into the precise molecular interactions occurring at the micro level. Therefore, to understand how cells find the right switches at the right time, it is necessary for us to conduct simultaneous measurements at both scales. These scales should not be examined separately and then stitched together in a fixed diagram. Instead, overlapping complementary measurements at multiple scales can help construct a map of the causal structure of switches and reveal how the cell exerts internal control. This approach is more effective than creating an ever-growing chart of imaginary blueprints.

The complexity inherent in the multiscale nature of protein and genetic switches presents a formidable challenge in deciphering the causal mechanisms underpinning cellular control systems. In the realm of gene regulatory networks, this challenge is exacerbated by the limitations of current data types necessary for unraveling causal relationships [12]. The ongoing evolution of methodological approaches, particularly in handling sparse and noisy gene expression time-series [13, 14], is crucial. However, the current state of data often leads to the development of methods that are inefficient or unreliable [12]. As richer, higher-quality gene expression data becomes available, it is imperative to focus on developing causal inference methods that are compatible with the complex, multiscale nature of cellular switch networks. For instance, in transcriptional regulatory systems, genes with low demand are predominantly regulated by repressors, whereas genes with high demand

are controlled by activators [15]. This mechanism, aimed at minimizing error loads, might have been an evolutionary driver for the emergence of various regulatory motifs [15, 16]. A methodological approach for uncovering the ‘causal’ structure should consider the search for such motifs. Moreover, the reliance of regulatory information transfer on weak links, as opposed to the dominance of strong links in energy transfer and metabolic pathways, may have played a critical role in the evolution of new activating or inhibiting signals [17]. The topological characteristics of these regulatory modules indicate varying connectivity structures, which are influenced by the degree of exposure to environmental variability and noise. Modules closely tied to environmental fluctuations tend to exhibit lower connectivity to enhance network robustness, whereas modules shielded from external noise sources lack a strong evolutionary impetus for sparse connections [18]. In conclusion, biological systems have evolved to minimize errors and maintain robustness amidst environmental and signaling noise. This evolutionary resilience necessitates methods that can effectively capture causality from a functional hierarchical standpoint. A mere knowledge of connections between components is insufficient; instead, we require a form of causal probing akin to in-circuit testing² that can discern interactions at varying scales. Theories like Pearl’s framework of causal and counterfactual inference based on structural models [19], alongside its recent extensions incorporating information theory [20, 21], provide valuable tools for quantitatively analyzing causal structures. These tools can illuminate macro-scale models of network interactions. However, the inherent time-delays and the complex ordering of processes resulting from genetic switch configurations pose significant challenges in unraveling the causal framework of intracellular switches. Presently, the mixed formalisms of information theory and causal modeling are not fully equipped to manage the daunting complexity of time-delays within extensive networks of genes and proteins. Concepts from concurrency theory, originally developed to address the problem of partially ordered components in distributed systems synchronization [22], offer intriguing possibilities. Some concurrency-related methodologies, such as Π -Calculus and Petri nets, have been adapted to

²This approach is similar to how in-circuit testing for printed circuit boards works, where the testing is not just about understanding the connections, but also about probing the functionality of the individual components and the system as a whole. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the system, whether it’s a circuit board or a biological cell.

model cellular signaling pathways [23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. Integrating these approaches with causal modeling and information theory could provide a more accurate representation of the nature of biological switches and their complex, intertwined multiscale dynamics. The primary focus should not be on what experts in a particular method can contribute to biology, but rather on first comprehensively understanding the biological problem and the cellular/subcellular constraints. Once these constraints are well-understood, we can then proceed to construct relevant and robust methods that are tailored to address these specific challenges. This approach ensures that the methods developed are not only scientifically sound but also practically applicable in the biological context.

Problem 2: How to manage the need to reconfiguration?

Homeostatic response and feedback control

We previously discussed how cells maintain their internal state by managing gene/protein switch configurations. This intricate process becomes even more complex when considering responses to significant changes in the extracellular environment. With minimal changes in the extracellular environment, a homeostatic response can handle internal regulation through a few adjustments. The concept of homeostasis, crucial for understanding this regulatory balance, was initially conceptualized by Claude Bernard and later formally defined by Walter Cannon [28, 29]. It deals with maintaining a steady-state goal as a core mechanism in living systems [30]. This mechanism often relies on negative feedback [31, 30]. The significance of negative feedback in achieving a dynamic equilibrium has been a pivotal aspect of cybernetics, highlighting how living systems autonomously counteract external changes [32]. In fact, cybernetics stretched this notion to define purposive behavior, giving the feedback regulatory mechanism a “*teleologic*” flavor [33].

However, challenges such as lag time in response and dampening oscillatory offshoots prompted the development of other control mechanisms, notably integrative error minimization through negative feedback [34]. Although mathematically elegant, the biological realization of integral feedback control was initially unclear. This gap has been recently addressed with the proposal of a controller topology enabling robust adaptation in noisy intracellular networks [35, 36].

Beyond Homeostasis: Adaptive Reconfiguration in Cells

Homeostatic regulation, whether through negative feedback or antithetic integral feedback control, is key in maintaining internal regulation in response to extracellular changes. However, the need for homeostatic regulation extends beyond handling moderate extracellular changes. In cases of more severe environmental shifts, such as a sudden but long-term change in extracellular Na, cells employ additional regulatory approaches that lead to transient expansion or contraction of the homeostatic response bounds³. These adaptive responses are critical for cells facing acute or sustained environmental stresses, necessitating a reconfiguration of gene and protein pathways. This not only pushes the cell to find the right switch configuration to maintain internal stability, but it also mandates the need for long-term or lasting reconfiguration. This leads us to conceptualize the cell's response as a multidimensional landscape with regulatory stable states representing basins of attraction. Exposure to extreme events can push the cell to search for a new optimum basin in a new functional space with altered regulatory bounds, signifying a fundamental shift in the cell's operational parameters.

Upon reconfiguration, a cell transitions into a new functional space, distinct from its original state. This new space presents the cell with unique and modified regulatory bounds, altering both the response time and nature of the intracellular response. The duration and severity of external changes dictate whether this reconfiguration is short-term or long-term. More complex cells may possess a broader functional repertoire, enabling them to navigate more basins in the functional space. They may also have the capacity to quickly revisit an optimal basin upon re-exposure to a similar extreme event. A key feature of adaptive homeostatic regulation is its predictive nature, which aids in reducing the magnitude of response error and the need for compensation [40]. In combination, homeostasis and adaptive homeostasis (allostasis) shape a functional space where phenotypic stability and plasticity define the dynamics and trajectory of a cell's configuration in response to varying degrees of extracellular changes.

Molecular Mechanics: The Role of Ion Channels in Cellular Adaptation

Ion channels serve as a prime example of the adaptive mechanism in cells. Essential for ion transport across cell membranes, these channels ex-

³May be referred to as *Allostasis* [37], *Heterostasis* [38], or *Adaptive Homeostasis* [39].

hibit both phenotypic stability and plasticity, which are crucial for cellular adaptation. They control the membrane potential and intracellular ion concentration, both of which are dependent on the number and type of ion channels presently expressed in a cell. These channels are ubiquitous across unicellular and multicellular organisms, demonstrating the universal importance of this mechanism.

To elaborate, let us consider the case of *KscA*, a well-known bacterial potassium channel, is a tetramer with four-fold symmetry [41]. It operates as a pH-gated, potassium-specific channel, favoring a closed state at neutral pH. The channel exhibits voltage-gated inactivation, and the energy landscape of gating undergoes a conformational change, reaching its minimum when the channel is closed [42]. When the channel is exposed to an acidic environment, electrostatic changes in the protein’s cytosolic domain cause it to open [43, 44]. The duration of the channel’s inactivity influences its reactivation, thereby modulating its response to pH changes [45].

Intracellular pH, regulated through changes in membrane permeability to ions like K^+ , Na^+ , and H^+ [46], can affect many cellular mechanisms, including cell metabolism, cell growth, Ca^{2+} homeostasis, proliferation, and gene expression [47, 48]. This complex regulation involves intricate patterns of nested and recursive control. Extracellular acidity impacts the cytosolic pH, altering the opening probability and activation of potassium channels such as *KcsA*. This leads to a departure from the energetically favored closed state, placing an energy demand on the cell. The speed at which such a change of functional space occurs is controlled by the duration of prior inactivation.

In parallel to the response of voltage-gated K channels, other K transport systems play a crucial role in regulating the cytosolic pH, and thus its effect on intracellular K concentration. For instance, if a cell has Kdp, a K transport system sensitive to both extracellular K concentration and pH, its growth can be inhibited due to a joint reduction of Kdp activity and repression of Kdp gene expression caused by moderate external K^+ . Additionally, at lower pH, the cell’s capacity to regulate its cytosolic pH through K transport is undermined.

Theories from computer science can aid in modeling and understanding these forms of recursion, while physics can guide us in untangling the dynamics at multiple scales. By adapting and fusing these approaches, we may better understand the need for cellular reconfiguration in response to environmental changes.

Adaptive Plasticity in Complex Cellular Systems

In more complex cells and multicellular organisms, the interplay between phenotypic stability and plasticity is further complicated by additional layers of regulatory control. For instance, the steady-state distribution of ion channels is governed by a correlated homeostatic regulation [49]. Furthermore, the macroscopic electrogenic function can be maintained despite variation in ion channel types [50].

On the other hand, more complicated parameters set the functional landscape. For example, in neurons, there can be differential expression of Na and K channels between soma and dendrites [51]. This suggests that the functional space and its minima are uniquely defined for soma versus dendrites. As a result, the functional space in dendrites or soma could be maintained within a pre-set range while it might be altered for the other parts of the neuron. This differential plasticity allows the neuron, as a unit of computation, to have varying overall function due to a polarized spatial balance between phenotypic stability and plasticity.

Such differential regulation underscores the dynamic nature of cellular responses and the importance of understanding these responses in the context of the entire organism. In addition, the intrinsic membrane excitability can also be altered through a dynamic epigenetic modification of DNA (through methylation) that controls the expression of ion channels and synaptic response [52, 53].

A similar situation is observed in the cardiac tissue where the balance between phenotypic stability and plasticity is controlled by a variety of mechanisms at different levels [54]. For example, repetitive pacing transforms the electrophysiological attributes of cardiomyocytes to a new semi-stable state [52, 53]. This shift in the functional space occurs through a reduction in the mRNA concentration of I_{Na} and I_{Ca} channels, effectively altering their expression in cardiomyocytes [55]. The complex molecular mechanism for electrical remodeling of the cardiac cells creates a major challenge for understanding how fine-tuning ion channel expression controls cardiac excitability [56].

The phenomenon of altering electrophysiological properties in excitable membrane (of neurons or cardiomyocytes) can be studied through mixed models combining recursion and dynamics. These models provide a deeper understanding of the intricate causal chains affecting a cell's functional space post reconfiguration. This approach underscores the need for robust, inter-

disciplinary methods to unravel the complexities of cellular adaptation and reconfiguration in response to environmental changes.

Problem 3: How to harness noise rather than succumb to it?

The Dual Nature of Cellular Noise

Cells face the challenge of noise at almost every scale of operation. Noise exists at the boundary with the external world as well as internally across molecular interactions and physical interfaces. Despite the abundance of noise, cells manage to function, grow and evolve. The viewpoint that noise is pure nuisance has been gradually shifting to an understanding that noise is not necessarily detrimental to biological systems [57].

In this context, we will focus on specific aspects of noise, how cells handle such challenges, and what modeling frameworks can elucidate this complex relationship. Let us first consider the ‘boundary noise’. The cell membrane acts as the boundary between the internal and external worlds of the cell. Through molecular sensing and transport, cells receive information about the external world and harvest necessary chemicals. Ligand-receptors and ion channels are key molecular systems through which a cell communicates and samples the external world. Whether a ligand is a small molecule, an ion, or a protein, the resultant conformational change in the receptor protein initiates the intracellular signaling that follows [58, 59].

Aside from cases where a ligand irreversibly binds to its receptor, the ligand-receptor interaction is inherently stochastic and noisy [60]. This inherent noise, contrary to being a mere byproduct, plays a crucial role in the cell’s information processing capabilities. The irreversible binding may be desirable for drug testing purposes [61], but in principle, is the opposite of what a continuous information acquisition system would need.

Considering the ligand-receptor binding as the means for probing the extracellular space, one can think of the “source (of the chemical), particles, and receptor” as an equivalent of “transmitter, channel, receiver”. An information-theoretic treatment can guide in separating different noise sources in a mixture model of kinetic and stochastic reactions [62]. The traditional approach to modeling these interactions, such as information-theoretic modeling, if not accounting for the subtleties of biological systems, might fail to capture many nuances. For example, the speed of ligand-receptor binding defines the nature of the “noise” from a specific vantage point. Slow binding

and unbinding can cause the response curve to reach a saturation point gradually, making it challenging for the cell to differentiate between high ligand concentrations.

From the perspective of the cell, it is the measurement of high concentrations of the ligand that are noisy. Interestingly, this issue has led to the evolution of cells that shift and expand their input dynamics to downstream events that occur at a faster rate. This mechanism enables the receptor to reach equilibrium binding, thereby bypassing the saturation [63]. Interestingly, when the number of receptors in a cell is low, which introduces a different form of noise, the shift of response tuning to downstream machinery can prevent the amplification of receptor-level noise [63].

Boundary Noise and Cellular Communication

Another special treatment of noise occurs at the boundary, where interference noise due to the presence of structurally-similar non-target molecules adds to the inherent stochasticity of a small number of target molecules. In such situations, ligand-induced stochastic cluster formation of receptors takes place, enhancing the receptor’s sensitivity and specificity [64]. A solution for managing noisy ligand-receptor interactions is to synchronize the excitable receptors during signal transduction [65]. These noise-induced phenomena, whether they result in spatial symmetry breaking or temporal symmetry breaking, might have separate evolutionary roots. However, they hint at a key point: cells are not merely passive receivers faltering in the face of abundant noise at the boundary.

An important lesson is to recognize that the nature of the noise itself can guide us in modeling and understanding it effectively. As Monod elegantly put it, biological systems are shaped by deterministic laws and randomness [66]. However, the way that living systems harness noise, as exemplified above, shows us that a purely reductionist approach to the biophysical characteristics of ligand/receptor/membrane will leave us ill-equipped in understanding how cells manage challenging environments [67].

A deeper understanding of boundary noise and its management is crucial for understanding cellular efficiency in noisy environments. Developments such as patch clamp technology have revealed the conductance fluctuations of individual channels as they oscillate between open and closed states, influenced by thermal noise [68, 69].

The probability of voltage-gated channels opening and closing is dependent on the membrane potential, which in turn affects channel noise. These

fluctuations impact the timing and generation of action potentials, as well as subsequent changes in membrane potential. Channel noise can cause significant variations in spiking propagation [70], and it imposes a lower limit on the miniaturization of cell signaling [71, 72]. This is because the noise generated by ion channels can shift the functional state of the cell, leading to spontaneous action potential generation [73].

Harnessing Noise: Stochastic Resonance in Cellular Function

While some aspects of noise can be limiting or detrimental, noise itself can enhance the detection of weak signals in certain nonlinear systems, such as electronic circuits and biological sensory systems [74]. A phenomenon known as *stochastic resonance* (SR) has emerged as a key player in biological systems dealing with noise. SR, which enables the amplification of weak signals in nonlinear systems, illustrates that noise, when managed appropriately, can enhance cellular functionality ⁴.

SR has been shown to contribute to signal detection in various sensory systems, including acoustic/electric stimulation of human hearing [78], vision [79], and noise-enhanced tactile sensation and balance control [80, 81]. Large nonlinear networks are more sensitive to weak inputs when a fixed level of noise is added. In such cases, irrespective of the nature of the input signal, it can be pushed to cross the threshold [82].

However, SR is not limited to large networks of excitable units. SR has also been observed at the cellular level in crayfish mechanoreceptor cells [83], and in bistable single neuron models that show a correlated switch between states when they are driven by noise in the presence of periodic external modulation [84]. For SR to be effective at this scale, the noise must be optimized and adjusted to the nature of the signal [85].

Stochastic resonance (SR) also plays a significant role in ion channel signal transduction at the subcellular level. This was first demonstrated in a large parallel ensemble of an artificial ion channel, specifically polypeptide alamethicin incorporated into planar lipid bilayers. In this case, the signal

⁴SR was first introduced as an explanation for the observed periodic occurrences of the Earth's ice ages [75]. In SR, adding noise to a nonlinear dynamical system can bring a weak signal above the threshold, enabling the system to detect sub-threshold signals [76, 77]. In this case, the system that is subject to periodic forcing shows a resonance in the spectrum that is absent in the forcing and the perturbation [75].

transduction induced by noise increased over a hundred-fold [86]. Ion channel conformational changes are considered as thermally-activated Poisson events. Ion channels open and close stochastically, and they do not have a built-in “absolute” threshold. However, additive noise linearly changes their activation barriers with applied transmembrane voltage, thereby increasing the instantaneous rate of the thermally activated reaction and exhibiting SR [87]. This phenomenon allows for the detection of small amplitude input signals in thermally driven physico-chemical systems, where reaction rates are controlled by activation barriers. This is applicable in systems such as semiconductor p–n junctions and voltage-dependent ion channels [88].

However, it’s important to note that artificial channels used in these studies are less sensitive to temperature variations than natural channels [89, 90]. The higher temperature sensitivity of natural channels near physiological temperature, and the induced conformational transitions, effectively change the energy landscape and transition rate between closed and open states at the level of single ion channels [90]. As a result, at the scale of a single ion channel, enhanced thermal-noise-induced SR affects the rate of information gain more significantly in biological ion channels than in artificial channels [91, 90].

The periodic, aperiodic, and nonstationary stochastic resonance that occur at physiological temperature allows cells to harness noise to enhance signal transmission and information gain with fewer channels [91, 92]. This strategy is energy-efficient for cells, as increasing the density of ion channels to combat noise is energy-consuming.

The collective property of ion channels and its effect on SR also influences the response to noise. The number of ion channels determines the amplitude of the membrane potential fluctuation [93]. In small clusters of ion channels, SR and threshold-crossing are primarily defined by individual channel kinetics and thermal-noise-induced SR [89].

As the size of the membrane patch increases (for example, in soma vs dendrites) and/or the density of ion channels increases (through modulation of gene expression or their polarization, as in neurons), a system-size resonance occurs [94]. This emergent collective property of globally coupled ion channel assemblies exhibits a resonant-like temporal coherence [89]. This collective property leads to a type of SR that occurs only in large clusters of ion channels, even in the presence of the suboptimal intrinsic noise of single channels [89, 95].

Quantization and Noise Management in Cellular Systems

Unlike engineered systems, where efforts are focused on eliminating noise, cells harness boundary noise at the subcellular scale. SR plays a key role in dealing with boundary noise at both the individual ion channel and collective levels. By examining the challenges that cells must overcome, we can gain a deeper understanding of the computational primitives that operate through cellular biophysical interfaces and biochemical pathways. The stochastic nature of ion channels and the presence of stochastic resonance can guide us to probe information gating through the lens of quantization error.

Ligand receptors and ion channels serve as quantizing sampling devices. Their stochastic kinetics and density define the collective sampling rate. We have discussed how SR can enhance the sensitivity of ion channels to sub-threshold inputs. Equally important, thresholded systems exhibiting SR are unique forms of dithered quantizers [96]. Dithering⁵, a technique commonly used in digital signal processing domains such as audio and picture coding, involves adding random noise (or dither) to data before storage or transmission. This process randomizes the quantization error when a reduction in precision is necessary [98]. This dithering characteristic of SR allows cells to modulate the sampling precision and information transfer of ion channels through a quantization operation. Thresholded dynamical systems, such as ion channels and excitable membranes, can be interpreted as multistable systems. Signal transduction through these channels has a finite range, and the sampling process is discrete and stochastic. This leads to inevitable distortion and loss of signal details, which can manifest as spurious frequencies or amplitude reduction due to time discretization and amplitude quantization.

In systems with a nonlinear input-output relationship, the quantization error needs to be independent of the input signal to minimize distortion [99]. In thresholded nonlinear dynamical systems, like cells with excitable membranes, stochastic resonance (SR) is more akin to a special case of a dithering effect rather than a resonant phenomenon [96, 99].

⁵During World War II, engineers discovered that mechanical computers used for radars and trajectory calculations performed better onboard airplanes than on the ground. They found that vibration-induced noise randomized the quantization error, thereby increasing the accuracy of the calculations performed by these mechanical computers [97]. Since then, it has become standard practice to add a small amount of noise to a signal either before quantization (during analog-to-digital conversion) or when reducing the bit-depth of a digital signal (such as during a 256-bit to a 16-bit image reduction).

Just as image dithering maintains the color-depth gradient during bit reduction (for example, when converting grayscale to black-and-white), SR in multi-thresholded dynamical systems can increase the number of quantization levels [100]. SR affects the responsiveness of individual channels, causing them to open stochastically at different rates. Collectively, these opening dynamics create a multi-threshold system.

Instead of setting a fixed threshold for all channels to switch to the open state, the presence of noise induces concentrated transitions to the open state in clusters of channels. The small intervals created around multiple thresholds, determined by the different sizes of these clusters, increase the number of quantization levels. This increased quantization level allows the cell to transduce microscopic fluctuations in the external environment in a graded, discretized manner.

As a result, by harnessing noise, cells can effectively capture a macroscopic view of their environment at the boundary. We can infer that SR enables cells to be sensitive to microscopic fluctuations while maintaining a macroscopic understanding of their environment.

Modeling and Multi-Level Implications of Cellular Noise

Cells' ability to operate efficiently amidst noisy dynamics underscores the functional role of noise in biological systems [60, 57]. The fact that noise at various levels can exhibit non-rigid functional characteristics is significant. This includes boundary stochastic noise in a single channel, clusters of channels in a membrane patch, collective properties of polarized distribution of channels in a single cell, and networks of cells. This highlights the importance of multi-level modeling.

The multiscale effects of stochastic resonance align well with the concept that there is no privileged level of causality in biological systems [101]. This suggests that all levels of biological organization, from molecular to cellular to systemic, play a crucial role in the overall function and behavior of the system. This perspective encourages a comprehensive approach to studying biological systems, taking into account the interplay between different levels and the role of noise in these interactions.

Conclusion

The Challenge of Biological Modeling

Hilbert’s list of problems was not just a set of unsolved mathematical problems, but also a framework for advancing the discipline. While some of these problems remain unsolved, the concept of a framework has endured. Unlike mathematics, which is grounded in logic and proofs, biology has largely been an ever-expanding collection of detailed findings with limited scope. Efforts at biological modeling and theorizing have frequently struggled to synthesize these findings into unified theories. This raises the question: What is missing in our approach? Is biology fundamentally different from fields like physics? Can biology not be tamed with mathematical models? or is it the case that we yet do not have the appropriate mathematical tools to properly model biological systems?

In a thought-provoking essay [102], the author posits that our models, at least at the molecular scale, are mostly phenomenological and amount to little more than educated guesswork. Gunawardena points out that unlike physics, biological models are not objective. Therefore, our best strategy is to begin with a sound set of assumptions that can guide us in selecting the most suitable model for the problem at hand [102]. The essay paraphrases James Black, a Nobel laureate pharmacologist, reminding us that “our models are accurate descriptions of our pathetic thinking”. This depiction of biological models highlights key issues.

Embracing a Problem-Oriented Approach in Biology

However, a frequently overlooked issue with biological models is that regardless of their quality, the disconnect between the models hinders us from formulating fundamental theories. Consequently, while biological sciences have seen exponential growth in data size, they have made only minimal progress in principles. Ironically, biological textbooks often have words like “fundamentals” or “principles” in their titles, but with each new edition, these textbooks increase in volume without ever delivering on the promise implied by their titles. Our work seeks to address this challenge by proposing a program inspired by Hilbert’s approach. We must recognize that while biological models have their limitations, the real challenge lies in bridging the gap between these models to construct more comprehensive theories through an axiomatic approach.

This work advocates for a shift in focus from methods to problems. By outlining the key problems that biological systems need to solve, we can identify the constraints inherent in these problems. This problem-oriented approach not only keeps us aligned with empirical data but also ensures the development of *falsifiable* models, fostering a cohesive framework for integrating diverse biological models into core principles. Adhering to constraints and details rooted in the physical nature of biological components is crucial. This adherence will give us a chance to formulate models that are true to the underlying biophysics with predictions that can be experimentally falsified [103].

It is essential to avoid getting trapped by isolated reductionist descriptions of biological systems. A computational lens can guide us to focus on systemic functions rather than isolated components. There are convergent themes between biological and computing systems that fall under the lens of “computational thinking”, such as distributed and coordinated processes, robustness to failure/attacks and modularity [104].

Integrating Biophysics, Computational Thinking and Cybernetic Principles

The proposed framework, synergizing computational thinking with biophysical modeling, aims to foster the design of experiments towards uncovering fundamental biological principles. This approach also addresses the limitations of cybernetics by integrating insights on feedback and control within a broader reductionist perspective of molecular biology. While cybernetics correctly recognized the crucial importance of feedback and control in biological systems [32], its overemphasis on teleology [33] juxtaposed it with the explosive success of reductionist molecular biology. What makes biology truly unique is its concern with purpose [105], but perhaps searching for behavioral purposeful descriptions untied from the underlying biophysical processes was a key behind cybernetics’ demise. We can bring back the insightful aspects of cybernetics to the center stage and avoid its pitfalls.

It is crucial to acknowledge that models solely aiming to outperform their competition in data fitting are non-falsifiable [102]. The increasing prevalence of artificial neural networks (ANNs) in biology is noteworthy. While ANNs have shown success in modeling complex communication and control pathways, their success hinges on a high-parameter nonlinear fitting process. This often leads to the replacement of one complex nonlinear system with another, resulting in a black box that remains largely misunderstood.

However, the potential of ANNs can be harnessed more effectively within the framework of mathematical models, where they can serve as nonlinear optimizers. This approach enables the fusion of physical laws with data-driven methods, yielding a more comprehensive description and prediction of system behavior [106, 107]. Importantly, it also ensures the falsifiability of our theories, a cornerstone of scientific modeling.

Advancements in machine learning present opportunities to integrate data-driven methods with physical principles, facilitating the creation of models capable of deciphering complex dynamical systems from noisy and incomplete data [108, 109]. This integrated framework signifies a substantial opportunity for advancement in biology. Given the current technological landscape, encompassing precision devices, high-throughput techniques, and advancements in computing and AI, we are well-positioned for significant progress. Theoretical frameworks for cellular computation and cell-cell communication could lay the groundwork for biology to develop its first principled quantitative theories, mirroring the remarkable achievements of physics in the early 20th century. This prospect could be within our reach. What is required is the application of a systematic Hilbertian approach for the formalization of system-level problems.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to express gratitude to the organizers and attendees of the “*What is biological computation?*” workshop at *Santa Fe Institute*. Some of the ideas presented in this work were inspired by discussions that took place during the workshop.

References

- [1] Y. Lazebnik, Can a biologist fix a radio?—Or, what I learned while studying apoptosis, *Cancer Cell* 2 (3) (2002) 179–182. doi:10.1016/S1535-6108(02)00133-2.
- [2] Open problems in mathematical biology, *Mathematical Biosciences* 354 (2022) 108926. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2022.108926>.
- [3] D. Hilbert, Mathematical problems, *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 8 (10) (1902) 437–479.

- [4] J. H. Woodger, Biology and the Axiomatic Method, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 96 (4) (1962) 1093–1116. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1962.tb54121.x>.
- [5] M. Mahner, M. Bunge, *Foundations of biophilosophy*, 1st Edition, Springer Berlin, 1997. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03368-5>.
- [6] K. Popper, *The logic of scientific discovery*, Routledge, 2005.
- [7] W. R. Ashby, The Physical Origin of Adaptation by Trial and Error, *The Journal of General Psychology* 32 (1) (1945) 13–25. doi:[10.1080/00221309.1945.10544480](https://doi.org/10.1080/00221309.1945.10544480).
- [8] W. Ashby, *Design for a brain: The origin of adaptive behaviour*, Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [9] H. Yu, M. Gerstein, Genomic analysis of the hierarchical structure of regulatory networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103 (40) (2006) 14724–14731. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0508637103](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0508637103).
- [10] P. D. Tonner, A. M. C. Pittman, J. G. Gulli, K. Sharma, A. K. Schmid, A Regulatory Hierarchy Controls the Dynamic Transcriptional Response to Extreme Oxidative Stress in Archaea, *PLOS Genetics* 11 (1) (2015) 1–13. doi:[10.1371/journal.pgen.1004912](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1004912).
- [11] X. Bei, N. Chen, S. Zhang, On the Complexity of Trial and Error, in: *Proceedings of the Forty-Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '13*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2013, p. 31–40. doi:[10.1145/2488608.2488613](https://doi.org/10.1145/2488608.2488613).
- [12] S. S. Ahmed, S. Roy, J. Kalita, Assessing the Effectiveness of Causality Inference Methods for Gene Regulatory Networks, *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 17 (1) (2020) 56–70. doi:[10.1109/TCBB.2018.2853728](https://doi.org/10.1109/TCBB.2018.2853728).
- [13] A. Aalto, L. Viitasaari, P. Ilmonen, L. Mombaerts, J. Gonçalves, Gene regulatory network inference from sparsely sampled noisy data, *Nature Communications* 11 (1) (2020) 3493. doi:[10.1038/s41467-020-17217-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17217-1).

- [14] J. Lu, B. Dumitrascu, I. C. McDowell, B. Jo, A. Barrera, L. K. Hong, S. M. Leichter, T. E. Reddy, B. E. Engelhardt, Causal network inference from gene transcriptional time-series response to glucocorticoids, *PLOS Computational Biology* 17 (1) (2021) 1–29. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1008223.
- [15] G. Shinar, E. Dekel, T. Thust, U. Alon, Rules for biological regulation based on error minimization, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103 (11) (2006) 3999–4004. doi:10.1073/pnas.0506610103.
- [16] U. Alon, Network motifs: theory and experimental approaches, *Nature Reviews Genetics* 8 (6) (2007) 450–461.
- [17] M. Kirschner, J. Gerhart, Evolvability, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 95 (15) (1998) 8420–8427. doi:10.1073/pnas.95.15.8420.
- [18] S. Navlakha, X. He, C. Faloutsos, Z. Bar-Joseph, Topological properties of robust biological and computational networks, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 11 (96) (2014) 20140283. doi:10.1098/rsif.2014.0283.
- [19] J. Pearl, *Causality: models, reasoning, and inference*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, 2000.
- [20] E. P. Hoel, L. Albantakis, G. Tononi, Quantifying causal emergence shows that macro can beat micro, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110 (49) (2013) 19790–19795. doi:10.1073/pnas.1314922110.
- [21] E. Hoel, M. Levin, Emergence of informative higher scales in biological systems: a computational toolkit for optimal prediction and control, *Communicative & Integrative Biology* 13 (1) (2020) 108–118, pMID: 33014263. doi:10.1080/19420889.2020.1802914.
- [22] L. Lamport, Time, Clocks and the Ordering of Events in a Distributed System, *Communications of the ACM* 21 (1978) 558–565.
- [23] A. Regev, W. Silverman, E. Shapiro, Representation and simulation of biochemical processes using the pi-calculus process algebra, *Pac Symp Biocomput* 1 (2001) 459–470.

- [24] C. Priami, A. Regev, E. Shapiro, W. Silverman, Application of a stochastic name-passing calculus to representation and simulation of molecular processes, *Information Processing Letters* 80 (1) (2001) 25–31, process Algebra. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0190\(01\)00214-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0020-0190(01)00214-9).
- [25] J. Pinney, D. Westhead, G. McConkey, Petri Net representations in systems biology, *Biochemical Society Transactions* 31 (6) (2003) 1513–1515. doi:[10.1042/bst0311513](https://doi.org/10.1042/bst0311513).
- [26] A. Phillips, L. Cardelli, Efficient, Correct Simulation of Biological Processes in the Stochastic Pi-calculus, *Computational Methods in Systems Biology* 4695 (2007) 184–199.
- [27] C. Priami, Algorithmic Systems Biology, *Commun. ACM* 52 (5) (2009) 80–88. doi:[10.1145/1506409.1506427](https://doi.org/10.1145/1506409.1506427).
- [28] S. J. Cooper, From Claude Bernard to Walter Cannon. Emergence of the concept of homeostasis, *Appetite* 51 (3) (2008) 419–427. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2008.06.005>.
- [29] W. B. Cannon, Organization for physiological homeostasis, *Physiological Reviews* 9 (3) (1929) 399–431. doi:[10.1152/physrev.1929.9.3.399](https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.1929.9.3.399).
- [30] H. Modell, W. Cliff, J. Michael, J. McFarland, M. P. Wenderoth, A. Wright, A physiologist’s view of homeostasis, *Advances in Physiology Education* 39 (4) (2015) 259–266, pMID: 26628646. doi:[10.1152/advan.00107.2015](https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00107.2015).
- [31] D. Schneck, Feedback control and the concept of homeostasis, *Mathematical Modelling* 9 (12) (1987) 889–900.
- [32] N. Wiener, *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1965.
- [33] A. Rosenblueth, N. Wiener, J. Bigelow, Behavior, purpose and teleology, *Philosophy of science* 10 (1) (1943) 18–24.

- [34] T.-M. Yi, Y. Huang, M. I. Simon, J. Doyle, Robust perfect adaptation in bacterial chemotaxis through integral feedback control, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 97 (9) (2000) 4649–4653. doi:10.1073/pnas.97.9.4649.
- [35] C. Briat, A. Gupta, M. Khammash, Antithetic Integral Feedback Ensures Robust Perfect Adaptation in Noisy Biomolecular Networks, *Cell Systems* 2 (1) (2016) 15–26. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2016.01.004.
- [36] S. K. Aoki, G. Lillacci, A. Gupta, A. Baumschlager, D. Schweingruber, M. Khammash, A universal biomolecular integral feedback controller for robust perfect adaptation, *Nature* 570 (7762) (2019) 533–537. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-1321-1.
- [37] B. S. McEwen, Stress, Adaptation, and Disease: Allostasis and Allostatic Load, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 840 (1) (1998) 33–44. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1998.tb09546.x.
- [38] H. Selye, Homeostasis and Heterostasis, *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine* 16 (3) (1973) 441–445. doi:10.1353/pbm.1973.0056.
- [39] K. J. Davies, Adaptive homeostasis, *Molecular Aspects of Medicine* 49 (2016) 1–7, hormetic and regulatory effects of lipid oxidation products. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mam.2016.04.007.
- [40] P. Sterling, Allostasis: A model of predictive regulation, *Physiology & Behavior* 106 (1) (2012) 5–15, allostasis and Allostatic Load. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.06.004.
- [41] D. A. Doyle, J. M. Cabral, R. A. Pfuetzner, A. Kuo, J. M. Gulbis, S. L. Cohen, B. T. Chait, R. MacKinnon, The Structure of the Potassium Channel: Molecular Basis of K⁺ Conduction and Selectivity, *Science* 280 (5360) (1998) 69–77. doi:10.1126/science.280.5360.69.
- [42] T. Linder, B. L. de Groot, A. Stary-Weinzinger, Probing the Energy Landscape of Activation Gating of the Bacterial Potassium Channel KcsA, *PLOS Computational Biology* 9 (5) (2013) 1–9. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003058.

- [43] M. Hirano, Y. Onishi, T. Yanagida, T. Ide, Role of the KcsA channel cytoplasmic domain in pH-dependent gating, *Biophysical journal* 101 (9) (2011) 2157–2162.
- [44] K. A. Baker, C. Tzitzilonis, W. Kwiatkowski, S. Choe, R. Riek, Conformational dynamics of the KcsA potassium channel governs gating properties, *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology* 14 (11) (2007) 1089–1095. doi:10.1038/nsmb1311.
- [45] L. Gao, X. Mi, V. Paajanen, K. Wang, Z. Fan, Activation-coupled inactivation in the bacterial potassium channel KcsA, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102 (49) (2005) 17630–17635. doi:10.1073/pnas.0505158102.
- [46] I. R. Booth, *The Regulation of Intracellular pH in Bacteria*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, 2007, pp. 19–37. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470515631.ch3.
- [47] R. W. Putnam, Chapter 17 - Intracellular pH Regulation, in: N. Spere-lakis (Ed.), *Cell Physiology Source Book (Fourth Edition)*, fourth edition Edition, Academic Press, San Diego, 2012, pp. 303–321. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387738-3.00017-2.
- [48] R. J. Isfort, D. B. Cody, T. N. Asquith, G. M. Ridder, S. B. Stuard, R. A. Leboeuf, Induction of protein phosphorylation, protein synthesis, immediate-early-gene expression and cellular proliferation by intracellular pH modulation, *European Journal of Biochemistry* 213 (1) (1993) 349–357. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1432-1033.1993.tb17768.x.
- [49] T. O’Leary, A. H. Williams, J. S. Caplan, E. Marder, Correlations in ion channel expression emerge from homeostatic tuning rules, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110 (28) (2013) E2645–E2654. doi:10.1073/pnas.1309966110.
- [50] H. Ori, E. Marder, S. Marom, Cellular function given parametric variation in the Hodgkin and Huxley model of excitability, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115 (35) (2018) E8211–E8218. doi:10.1073/pnas.1808552115.

- [51] M. Duménieu, M. Oulé, M. R. Kreutz, J. Lopez-Rojas, The Segregated Expression of Voltage-Gated Potassium and Sodium Channels in Neuronal Membranes: Functional Implications and Regulatory Mechanisms, *Frontiers in Cellular Neuroscience* 11 (2017) 115. doi:10.3389/fncel.2017.00115.
- [52] J. P. Meadows, M. C. Guzman-Karlsson, S. Phillips, C. Holleman, J. L. Posey, J. J. Day, J. J. Hablitz, J. D. Sweatt, DNA methylation regulates neuronal glutamatergic synaptic scaling, *Science Signaling* 8 (382) (2015) ra61–ra61. doi:10.1126/scisignal.aab0715.
- [53] J. P. Meadows, M. C. Guzman-Karlsson, S. Phillips, J. A. Brown, S. K. Strange, J. D. Sweatt, J. J. Hablitz, Dynamic DNA methylation regulates neuronal intrinsic membrane excitability, *Science Signaling* 9 (442) (2016) ra83–ra83. doi:10.1126/scisignal.aaf5642.
- [54] B. Rosati, D. McKinnon, Regulation of Ion Channel Expression, *Circulation Research* 94 (7) (2004) 874–883. doi:10.1161/01.RES.0000124921.81025.1F.
- [55] L. Yue, P. Melnyk, R. Gaspo, Z. Wang, S. Nattel, Molecular Mechanisms Underlying Ionic Remodeling in a Dog Model of Atrial Fibrillation, *Circulation Research* 84 (7) (1999) 776–784. doi:10.1161/01.RES.84.7.776.
- [56] E. Balse, D. F. Steele, H. Abriel, A. Coulombe, D. Fedida, S. N. Hatem, Dynamic of Ion Channel Expression at the Plasma Membrane of Cardiomyocytes, *Physiological Reviews* 92 (3) (2012) 1317–1358, PMID: 22811429. doi:10.1152/physrev.00041.2011.
- [57] L. S. Tsimring, Noise in biology, *Reports on Progress in Physics* 77 (2) (2014) 026601. doi:10.1088/0034-4885/77/2/026601.
- [58] S. Bhattacharya, S. E. Hall, H. Li, N. Vaidehi, Ligand-Stabilized Conformational States of Human Adrenergic Receptor: Insight into G-Protein-Coupled Receptor Activation, *Biophysical Journal* 94 (6) (2008) 2027–2042. doi:10.1529/biophysj.107.117648.
- [59] S. Mary, M. Damian, M. Louet, N. Floquet, J.-A. Fehrentz, J. Marie, J. Martinez, J.-L. Banères, Ligands and signaling proteins govern the

- conformational landscape explored by a G protein-coupled receptor, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109 (21) (2012) 8304–8309. doi:10.1073/pnas.1119881109.
- [60] E. Azpeitia, E. P. Balanzario, A. Wagner, Signaling pathways have an inherent need for noise to acquire information, *BMC Bioinformatics* 21 (1) (2020) 462. doi:10.1186/s12859-020-03778-x.
 - [61] A. H. Newman, Chapter 29. Irreversible Ligands for Drug Receptor Characterization, in: J. A. Bristol (Ed.), *Annual Reports in Medicinal Chemistry*, Vol. 25, Academic Press, 1990, pp. 271–280. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-7743(08)61605-X.
 - [62] M. Pierobon, I. F. Akyildiz, Noise Analysis in Ligand-Binding Reception for Molecular Communication in Nanonetworks, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* 59 (9) (2011) 4168–4182. doi:10.1109/TSP.2011.2159497.
 - [63] A. C. Ventura, A. Bush, G. Vasen, M. A. Goldín, B. Burkinshaw, N. Bhattacharjee, A. Folch, R. Brent, A. Chernomoretz, A. Colman-Lerner, Utilization of extracellular information before ligand-receptor binding reaches equilibrium expands and shifts the input dynamic range, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (37) (2014) E3860–E3869. doi:10.1073/pnas.1322761111.
 - [64] M. K. Kajita, K. Aihara, T. J. Kobayashi, Reliable target ligand detection by noise-induced receptor cluster formation, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* 30 (1) (2020) 011104. doi:10.1063/1.5140714.
 - [65] S. Nagano, Noise reduction and signal enhancement by receptor synchronization, *Nonlinear Theory and Its Applications*, IEICE 11 (4) (2020) 601–609. doi:10.1587/nolta.11.601.
 - [66] J. Monod, On Chance and Necessity, in: F. J. Ayala, T. Dobzhansky (Eds.), *Studies in the Philosophy of Biology: Reduction and Related Problems*, Macmillan Education UK, London, 1974, pp. 357–375. doi:10.1007/978-1-349-01892-5_20.

- [67] D. Noble, The role of stochasticity in biological communication processes, *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology* 162 (2021) 122–128, on the Physics of Excitable Media. Waves in Soft and Living Matter, their Transmission at the Synapse and their Cooperation in the Brain. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2020.09.008>.
- [68] B. Hille, *Ion channels of excitable membranes*, 3rd Edition, Sinauer, Sunderland, Mass, 2001.
- [69] B. Sakmann, E. Neher, *Single-channel recording*, Springer US, Boston, MA, 1995. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4615-7858-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-7858-1).
- [70] Y. Horikawa, Noise effects on spike propagation in the stochastic Hodgkin-Huxley models, *Biological Cybernetics* 66 (1) (1991) 19–25. doi:[10.1007/BF00196449](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00196449).
- [71] J. A. White, J. T. Rubinstein, A. R. Kay, Channel noise in neurons, *Trends in Neurosciences* 23 (3) (2000) 131–137. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236\(99\)01521-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236(99)01521-0).
- [72] E. Schneidman, B. Freedman, I. Segev, Ion Channel Stochasticity May Be Critical in Determining the Reliability and Precision of Spike Timing, *Neural Computation* 10 (7) (1998) 1679–1703. doi:[10.1162/089976698300017089](https://doi.org/10.1162/089976698300017089).
- [73] A. A. Faisal, J. A. White, S. B. Laughlin, Ion-Channel Noise Places Limits on the Miniaturization of the Brain’s Wiring, *Current Biology* 15 (12) (2005) 1143–1149. doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2005.05.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2005.05.056).
- [74] K. Wiesenfeld, F. Moss, Stochastic resonance and the benefits of noise: from ice ages to crayfish and SQUIDS, *Nature* 373 (6509) (1995) 33–36. doi:[10.1038/373033a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/373033a0).
- [75] R. Benzi, A. Sutera, A. Vulpiani, The mechanism of stochastic resonance, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* 14 (11) (1981) L453–L457. doi:[10.1088/0305-4470/14/11/006](https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/14/11/006).
- [76] C. Rouvas-Nicolis, G. Nicolis, Stochastic resonance, *Scholarpedia* 2 (11) (2007) 1474. doi:[10.4249/scholarpedia.1474](https://doi.org/10.4249/scholarpedia.1474).

- [77] L. Gammaitoni, P. Hänggi, P. Jung, F. Marchesoni, Stochastic resonance, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 70 (1998) 223–287. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.70.223.
- [78] F.-G. Zeng, Q.-J. Fu, R. Morse, Human hearing enhanced by noise, *Brain Research* 869 (1) (2000) 251–255. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-8993\(00\)02475-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0006-8993(00)02475-6).
- [79] E. Simonotto, M. Riani, C. Seife, M. Roberts, J. Twitty, F. Moss, Visual Perception of Stochastic Resonance, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78 (1997) 1186–1189. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.78.1186.
- [80] A. Priplata, J. Niemi, M. Salen, J. Harry, L. A. Lipsitz, J. J. Collins, Noise-Enhanced Human Balance Control, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 (2002) 238101. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.89.238101.
- [81] J. J. Collins, T. T. Imhoff, P. Grigg, Noise-enhanced tactile sensation, *Nature* 383 (6603) (1996) 770–770. doi:10.1038/383770a0.
- [82] J. J. Collins, C. C. Chow, T. T. Imhoff, Stochastic resonance without tuning, *Nature* 376 (6537) (1995) 236–238. doi:10.1038/376236a0.
- [83] J. K. Douglass, L. Wilkens, E. Pantazelou, F. Moss, Noise enhancement of information transfer in crayfish mechanoreceptors by stochastic resonance, *Nature* 365 (6444) (1993) 337–340. doi:10.1038/365337a0.
- [84] A. Bulsara, E. Jacobs, T. Zhou, F. Moss, L. Kiss, Stochastic resonance in a single neuron model: Theory and analog simulation, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 152 (4) (1991) 531–555. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(05\)80396-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(05)80396-0).
- [85] K. Wiesenfeld, D. Pierson, E. Pantazelou, C. Dames, F. Moss, Stochastic resonance on a circle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 72 (1994) 2125–2129. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.72.2125.
- [86] S. M. Bezrukov, I. Vodyanoy, Noise-induced enhancement of signal transduction across voltage-dependent ion channels, *Nature* 378 (6555) (1995) 362–364. doi:10.1038/378362a0.
- [87] S. M. Bezrukov, I. Vodyanoy, Stochastic resonance in thermally activated reactions: Application to biological ion channels, *Chaos: An*

Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 8 (3) (1998) 557–566.
doi:10.1063/1.166337.

- [88] S. M. Bezrukov, I. Vodyanoy, Stochastic resonance in non-dynamical systems without response thresholds, *Nature* 385 (6614) (1997) 319–321. doi:10.1038/385319a0.
- [89] G. Schmid, I. Goychuk, P. Hänggi, Stochastic resonance as a collective property of ion channel assemblies, *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* 56 (1) (2001) 22–28. doi:10.1209/epl/i2001-00482-6.
- [90] Y. W. Parc, D.-S. Koh, W. Sung, Stochastic resonance in an ion channel following the non-Arrhenius gating rate, *The European Physical Journal B* 69 (1) (2009) 127–131. doi:10.1140/epjb/e2009-00116-5.
- [91] I. Goychuk, P. Hänggi, Stochastic resonance in ion channels characterized by information theory, *Phys. Rev. E* 61 (2000) 4272–4280. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.61.4272.
- [92] R. K. Adair, Noise and stochastic resonance in voltage-gated ion channels, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100 (21) (2003) 12099–12104. doi:10.1073/pnas.2034447100.
- [93] R. Toral, C. R. Mirasso, J. D. Gunton, System size coherence resonance in coupled FitzHugh-Nagumo models, *Europhysics Letters (EPL)* 61 (2) (2003) 162–167. doi:10.1209/epl/i2003-00207-5.
- [94] A. Pikovsky, A. Zaikin, M. A. de la Casa, System Size Resonance in Coupled Noisy Systems and in the Ising Model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 (2002) 050601. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.050601.
- [95] G. Schmid, I. Goychuk, P. Hanggi, S. Zeng, P. Jung, Stochastic resonance and optimal clustering for assemblies of ion channels, *Fluctuation and Noise Letters* 04 (01) (2004) L33–L42. doi:10.1142/S0219477504001628.
- [96] R. A. Wannamaker, S. P. Lipshitz, J. Vanderkooy, Stochastic resonance as dithering, *Phys. Rev. E* 61 (2000) 233–236. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.61.233.
- [97] K. C. Pohlmann, *Principles of digital audio*, Sams, 1989.

- [98] L. Roberts, Picture coding using pseudo-random noise, IRE Transactions on Information Theory 8 (2) (1962) 145–154. doi:10.1109/TIT.1962.1057702.
- [99] L. Gammaitoni, Stochastic resonance and the dithering effect in threshold physical systems, Phys. Rev. E 52 (1995) 4691–4698. doi:10.1103/PhysRevE.52.4691.
- [100] L. Gammaitoni, Stochastic resonance in multi-threshold systems, Physics Letters A 208 (4) (1995) 315–322. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/0375-9601(95)00731-6.
- [101] R. Noble, D. Noble, Harnessing stochasticity: How do organisms make choices?, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 28 (10) (2018) 106309. doi:10.1063/1.5039668.
- [102] J. Gunawardena, Models in biology: ‘accurate descriptions of our pathetic thinking’, BMC Biology 12 (1) (2014) 29. doi:10.1186/1741-7007-12-29.
- [103] W. S. Bialek, Biophysics: searching for principles, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
- [104] S. Navlakha, Z. Bar-Joseph, Algorithms in nature: the convergence of systems biology and computational thinking, Molecular Systems Biology 7 (1) (2011) 546. doi:https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2011.78.
- [105] E. Mayr, What makes biology unique?: considerations on the autonomy of a scientific discipline, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2004.
- [106] C. Rackauckas, Y. Ma, J. Martensen, C. Warner, K. Zubov, R. Sipekar, D. Skinner, A. Ramadhan, A. Edelman, Universal Differential Equations for Scientific Machine Learning, arXiv 1 (2020). doi:10.48550/ARXIV.2001.04385.
- [107] G. E. Karniadakis, I. G. Kevrekidis, L. Lu, P. Perdikaris, S. Wang, L. Yang, Physics-informed machine learning, Nature Reviews Physics 3 (6) (2021) 422–440. doi:10.1038/s42254-021-00314-5.
- [108] P. Y. Lu, J. Ariño Bernad, M. Soljačić, Discovering sparse interpretable dynamics from partial observations, Communications Physics 5 (1) (2022) 206. doi:10.1038/s42005-022-00987-z.

- [109] P. A. K. Reinbold, L. M. Kageorge, M. F. Schatz, R. O. Grigoriev, Robust learning from noisy, incomplete, high-dimensional experimental data via physically constrained symbolic regression, *Nature Communications* 12 (1) (2021) 3219. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-23479-0.