Extinction Transition on a Pie

Nadav M . Shnerb

Depatm ent of Physics, Judea and Sam aria College, Ariel, Israel 44837

(April 14, 2024)

Extinction transition of bacteria under forced rotation is analyzed in pie geometry. Under convection, separation of the radial and the azim uthal degrees of freedom is not possible, and the linearized evolution operator is diagonalized num erically. Some characteristics scales are compared with the results of recent experiments, and the \integrable" limit of the theory at narrow growth region is analyzed.

The time evolution of bacterial colonies on a petri-dish has been studied recently both theoretically and experin entally [1{4]. The colony is relatively simple biological system, and its basic component, an individual bacterium, involves only \elementary" biological processes like di usion, food consumption, multiplication, death and perhaps som e interaction like chem otaxis. Studies with some bacteria strains have reported a wide variety of complex pattern form ation, in most cases due to com petition for food resources and chem ical interaction. W ith uniform, not-exhaustible background of nutrients and without the presence of mutations and chem ical signaling, these simple strains are suppose to invade a region of nutrient rich agar in the form of a front propagating with some typical velocity, known as the Fisher front [5{7].

B iological problem sofcolony grow th in inhom ogeneous environm ent and under forced convection has been m odeled recently by N elson and Shnerb [8] and by D ahm en, N elson and Shnerb [9]. These studies have focused on the spectral properties of the linearized evolution operator, which becomes non-Herm itian in the presence of convection [10]. An experiment designed to test these predictions, has been carried out recently by N eicu et al [4].

In the experiment, a colony of Bacillus subtilis bacteria is forced to m igrate in order to \catch up" with a shielded region on the the petri-dish, where all the other parts of the dish are exposed to an ultra violet (UV) light, which (under the experim ental conditions) makes the unshilded bacteria im m otile. It was assumed that the adaptation of the bacterial colony to the moving shielded region has nothing to do with inform ation processing or mutual signaling in the colony, but is attributed solely to the combined e ect of \dumb" di usion of individual bacteria and the larger growth rate under the shelter. Theoretically, it was predicted that the adaptation of the colony to the moving environm ent fails as the drift is faster than the Fisher front velocity, and in this case the colony lags behind the shelter and an extinction transition takes place.

In order to get the essence of the theory, let us consider a one-dimensional example, where bacteria are diffusing on a line param etrized by x, and are subject to some environmental heterogeneity which implies uctuating growth rate. If the bacteria di uses, multiply and are forced to migrate with some convection velocity v, the di erential equation which describes the evolution of the colony is,

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 c}{\partial x^2} + v \frac{\partial c}{\partial x} + a(x)c \quad bc^2:$$
(1)

where a(x) is the local growth rate. When the hostile environment outside the \oasis" causes the immediate death of any bacteria, and inside the oasis there is some positive growth rate,

$$a(x) = \begin{array}{c} a & 0 & x & x_0 \\ 1 & elsewhere: \end{array}$$
(2)

If there is no drift, the linearized version of this problem is equivalent to the (in aginary time) evolution of quantum particle in an in nite potential well, and is determ ined by the eigenvalues of the evolution operator, which gives a colony localized on the oasis if it has some m inim alwidth p(which scales like the width of the F isher $front), <math>x_0 > D = a$. The introduction of a drift term into (1) is compensated by the \gauge" of the evolution (Liouville) operator eigenfunctions

 $n = \sin(n \ x=x_0) ! e^{vx=2D} \sin(n \ x=x_0)$ (3)

together with the eigenvalues \rigid" shift

$$_{n}(v) = _{n}(v = 0) \frac{v^{2}}{4D}$$
: (4)

The theory, thus, predicts an extinction transition as all the eigenvalues of (4) becomes negative, i.e., as $v_c = 2 \text{ aD} 0 (1=x_0)$, which is the Fisher velocity [12]. Right above the extinction transition, only the largest grow th eigenvalue (the \ground state") is positive, hence the nonlinear interaction between eigenmodes [the term bc^2 in (1)] are suppressed at the transition, and the analysis is focused on the ground state of the linearized operator.

In the experim ent [4], part of a petri-dish was shielded from the UV source, and then this shield was given a constant angular velocity with respect to the petri-dish. The corresponding convection velocity v(r) = !r was chosen to interpolate between zero (at the rotation axis) and about $2v_c$ at the edge of the dish. It turns out that the colony indeed fails to keep rotating with the shield at about half the radius. On the other hand, the velocity pro le for the bacterial density c(r; !) does not equilibrate on the time scales of the experiment (3 days). In this paper, I consider the di erences between the one dimensional system (1,2) and the actual experimental setup. In particular, the two-dimensional nature of the experiment and the e ect of radial di usion are considered explicitly.

In order to capture the essential physics using the sim plest geom etry, the same extinction transition is considered on a pie, i.e., a section of the two dimensional disc [See Fig. (1)]. A lthough the shielded region of the experiment [4] was not in that shape, it turns out that even in this simple geometry there is a coupling between the radial and the azim uthal degrees of freedom, and the spectrum becomes \chaotic" when convection takes place. The results for this case are, accordingly, relevant also to the more com plicated geometry of the experiment.

The basic equation for the bacterial growth problem on a non-uniform substrate, in the absence of mutation and chem ical interactions, is [8]:

$$\frac{\partial c(\mathbf{x};t)}{\partial t} = Dr^{2}c(\mathbf{x};t) + a(\mathbf{x})c(\mathbf{x};t) + v \quad rc \quad bc^{2};$$
(5)

W ith no convection and hom ogeneous, positive a this equation supports F isher front propagation with velocity 2 Da. The experimental situation corresponds to D 10 6 cm²=s and a 10 3 =s. The F isher velocity is of order 0:1 1 m=s, as has been found experimentally. The F isher width, which is the characteristic scale of spatial correlations in their system, is D = a 10 2 cm, much smaller than the petri-dish radius of few centimeters.

In cylindrical geom etry, Eq. (5) takes the form ,

$$\frac{\partial c(\mathbf{r}; ;t)}{\partial t} = Dr^{2}c(\mathbf{r}; ;t) + a()c(\mathbf{r}; ;t) + v rc \hat{b}\mathbf{r}$$



FIG.1. Pie geom etry: the growth rate in the shaded region is a; while any bacteria outside this area are dying instantly due to the UV light. The shaded region is then rotated at angular velocity !.

and for rotating petri-dish the convection term is [11],

v
$$rc = \frac{lec}{le}$$
: (7)

Piegeometry is de ned by,

$$a() = \begin{cases} a & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & elsewhere \end{cases}$$
; (8)

i.e., we have absorbing boundary conditions [14]:

$$c(r; _{0};t) = c(r;0;t) = 0:$$
 (9)

As for the boundary conditions on the petri-dish edge at r = R; it is reasonable to take Von-Neum ann boundary and to impose the no-slip condition on the bacterial density at the surface. However, the data [4] seem s to indicate extinction of the colony at the edge of the dish. This is perhaps due to the fact that the width of the boundary layer (which is expected due to the no slip condition) is about the F isher width, which has been shown above to be very small. A coordingly, we further simplify the problem by using,

$$c(R; t) = 0:$$
 (10)

D ropping the term bc^2 at Eq. (5), one has the linearized evolution operator, and for the no-drift (! = 0) case, the density of bacteria at time t is given by:

$$c(\mathbf{r}; t) = \begin{bmatrix} X \\ A_{m,n} e^{a} & m, n \\ m, n \end{bmatrix} (\mathbf{r}; t);$$
(11)

with the eigenstates of the evolution operator,

$$q = \frac{q}{D = m_{jn}} \sin(n_{jn}) \sin(n$$

where m;n is norm alization factor

$$n_{m} = \frac{2}{R^{\frac{1}{0}} J_{\left[\frac{n}{0} + 1\right]}(R = \frac{1}{D = m_{m}})};$$
 (13)

and the constants $A_{m;n}$ are determ ined by the initial density distribution c(r; ;t=0): The eigenvalues of the H erm mitian problem are:

$$m_{n} = D - \frac{J_{n}^{m}}{R}^{2};$$
 (14)

where $j_n^m = 0$ is the m -th zero of the corresponding B essel function.

(6)

Let us get an order of m agnitude estim ate for the tim e scales which are relevant to the experim ent [4]. The characteristic tim es needed for the \ground state" to control the system is given by the typical di erence between two eigenvalues. In our case, since the rst zeroes of the Bessel functions are of order 1, the tim es involved are

 $\frac{R^2}{D}$. For an experimental system with R 0.01m and D 10 10 m²=s, the typical relaxation times are 0 (10⁶ sec) 11 days, which is larger than the typical time of the actual experiment.

N ow I look at the non-H em itian case, where ! \notin 0: U nlike its C artesian analogy [8,9], no sim ple gauge solves the problem, and separation of variables is impossible. Spanning the space of norm alizable functions by a set of H em itian eigenstates, the perturbative term ! @ m ixes both quantum numbers m and n. The matrix elements of the convection term are:

hn;m j!
$$0_{jk}$$
; li = 2! R² nm kl : (15)

where nm kl is:

 ${}_{nm \ kl} = \begin{array}{c} k + n = \text{ even } & 0 \\ k + n = \text{ odd } \frac{2kn}{n^2 \ k^2} \ n \text{ , m } \ k \text{ , l} I_{nm \ kl} \end{array}$ (16)

and

$$I_{nm \ kl} = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} J_{n} (j_{n}^{m} = 0) J_{k} (j_{k}^{l} = 0) Y (j_{k}^{$$

In order to get the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions at nite angular velocity one should diagonalize the full non-Herm itian Liouville operator, and the extinction transition takes place as the ground state (sm allest) eigenvalue, 1:1, becomes larger than the grow th rate a on the pie.

As the rotating system is not integrable, it should be studied numerically using some computer diagonalization of the linearized evolution operator. E scentially, one should look at the ground state of this operator, since this state dom inates the system close to the extinction transition.

This num erical analysis, however, may lead to erroneous results if the continuum limit is not taken carefully. In the most general case, a discretized version of a model with local grow th rate and hopping between sites m ay be realized num erically as a m atrix, where the grow th rates are the coe cients on the diagonal and the hopping process gives the o -diagonal term s. As any hopping term is positive sem i-de nite, the only negative term sare the local grow th rate, and for any nite matrix, by adding an appropriate multiplication of the unit matrix, one may get a positive sem i-de nite matrix with the same eigenvectors. Perron-Frobenius theorem [13] then in plies that ground state should be a nodeless, positive eigenvector. There is a simple physical interpretation to this result: since the ground state dom inates the system at long times, and the number of bacteria should

not become negative, Perron-Frobenius theorem should hold. D isgonalizing num erically the evolution operator, one m ay get a ground state with nodes, which is physically impossible.



FIG.2. Contour P lot of the bacterial density at $_0 =$. (upper panel): $\frac{!}{_{D=R^2}} = 0$, (m iddle): $\frac{!}{_{D=R^2}} = 10$ and (lower panel) at $\frac{!}{_{D=R^2}} = 30$:



FIG. 3. First 100 spectral points $[Im (\frac{1}{D-R^2}) vs]$. Re $(\frac{1}{D-R^2})$] at $_0 = .$ (upper panel): $\frac{1}{D-R^2} = 0$, (m iddle): $\frac{1}{D-R^2} = 10$ and (lower panel) at $\frac{1}{D-R^2} = 30$:

In order to solve this problem one should carefully take the discrete limit of the continuum theory. For our case, as is discretized to quanta of , the hopping rate due to di usion becomes $D = (t^2 \ ^2)$ and the hopping rate due to the drift is ! = . In order to avoid the (physically in possible) negative hopping rates, one should keep

sm all enough. If the e ective discretization is given by $= _0 = n$, one should truncate the matrix (16) only as

n
$$\frac{! R^2}{D}$$
: (18)

A lthough (18) seem s to indicate that the num erical diagonalization of (15) becomes simpler as $_0$! 0; this, in fact, is not the case. As the eigenvalues of the unperturbed problem are related to the zeroes of the corresponding Bessel functions, and the rotation operator adm its matrix elements only between eigenvalues related to Bessel functions of di erent order, it is much simpler to diagonalize (15) as $_0 >> 0$. As $_0$! 0; the higherm zeroes of any Bessel of order n are smaller than the m = 1 zero of the n + 1 state and the condition (18) in plies the diagonalization of an in nite matrix. A coordingly, I present here the num erical results for the case $_0 = :$ This situation does not coincide with the experimental conditions at [4], but there seem s to be no prevention to perform the same experiment with large shielded area.

In Fig. (2), contour plots of the ground state for different angular velocities are shown. One may identify clearly the large deviations from the ground state from its shape at ! = 0: The largest 100 spectral points for any case are shown in Fig. (3).

Fig. (4) presents the ground state eigenvalue, $_0$; in units of D = R²; as a function of the angular velocity of the dish. The extinction transition takes place as this eigenvalue is larger than the growth rate on the \pie", $\frac{a}{D=R^2}$; as has been found above.



FIG.4. Highest eigenvalue, $\frac{0}{D=R^2}$; as a function of the angular velocity, $\frac{1}{D=R^2}$; for 0 = : The extinction happens as this eigenvalue is larger than a, the grow th rate inside the pie.



FIG.5. Narrow shell geometry, where the two-dimensional problem converges to the *\integrable* case.

Let us show now how to get a problem equivalent to (1,2) on a rotating petri-dish. In order to do that, the geometry should be taken on a narrow shell as in Fig. (5), i.e., the boundary conditions are,

$$c(r; _{0};t) = c(r;0;t) = 0:$$

 $c(R_{1}; _{0};t) = c(R_{2};0;t) = 0:$
(19)

with $R = R_2$ R_1 . In the limit R_1 ! 1 at constant n, the asymptotic expansion of the Bessel functions J and Y at large argument gives the eigenfunctions of the unperturbed Liouville operator,

$$m_{in}(\mathbf{r};) = \frac{\left(\begin{array}{c} n_{in} m_{in} = D \right)^{1-4}}{R^{\frac{p}{2}} \overline{R_{1 0}}} \sin\left(\frac{m_{in} r}{R} + n_{in}\right) \sin\left(\frac{n_{in}}{0}\right);$$

(20)

where the phase n ensures the boundary conditions at R_1 and the eigenvalues, $n_{\pi\pi} = D \frac{m^{2/2}}{(R)^2}$, are independent of n: The matrix elements of the operator ! @ are given by

$$hn;mj!$$
 @ $k;li = !_{m;l nk}$: (21)

with

$$_{n\,k} = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} k+n = even & 0 \\ k+n = odd & \frac{2kn}{n^2 & k^2} \end{array}}$$
 (22)

where the approxim ation

7

$$\sum_{R_{1}}^{Z_{R_{2}}} \sin\left(\frac{m}{R}r + \frac{1}{R}r\right) \sin\left(\frac{l}{R}r + \frac{1}{R}r\right) \frac{p}{r} dr$$

$$p \frac{1}{R_{1}} \sum_{R_{2}}^{Z_{R_{2}}} \sin\left(\frac{m}{R}r + \frac{1}{R}r\right) \sin\left(\frac{l}{R}r + \frac{1}{R}r\right) dr \quad (23)$$

for $\frac{R}{R_1} << 1$ has been used. Accordingly, for any m sector, both the diagonal and the o diagonal matrix elements are identical with the corresponding one dimensional problem, and the results should be the same.

In conclusion, the m athem atical problem which corresponds to the experiment by [4] has been found to be non-integrable, and no simple gauge transform ation connects the eigenvectors of the static and the dynamic problem s. The actual critical velocity and ground state properties have to be studied numerically, and the limit of very narrow sector ($_0$! 0) involves diverging numerical load. The time scales needed for the ground state to dom inate the system are larger than the duration of the actual experiment, and this explains the observed inequilebration.

I wish to thank A.K udrolli, D.R.N elson and K.D ahm en for helpful discussions and com m ents.

- [1] E.Ben-Jacob et al, Nature 368, 46 (1994).
- [2] J.-I.W akita et al., J. Phys. Soc. Japan 63, 1205 (1994).
- [3] E.O.Budrene and H.C.Berg, Nature 376, 49 (1995).
- [4] T.Neicu, A.Pradhan, D.A.Larochelle and A.Kudrolli, cond-m at/0001023, Phys Rev. E (in press).
- [5] J. D. Murray, Mathematical Biology (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993).
- [6] R.A.Fisher, Ann.Eugenics 7, 353 (1937).
- [7] A.Kolmogoro, I.Petrovsky and N.Piscouno, Moscow Univ.Bull.Math.1,1 (1937).
- [8] D.R. Nelson and N.M. Shnerb, Phys. Rev. E 58 1383 (1998).
- [9] K.A.Dahmen, D.R.Nelson and N.M. Shnerb, condmat/9807394 (Jour.of Mathematical Biology, in press).
- [10] See also: N. Hatano and D R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 570 (1996); J. Feinberg and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. E 59, 6433 (1999).
- [11] For a discussion of rotating quantum systems see: M. Abraham, B.Galanti and Z.Olami, Phys. Rev. A 54, 2659 (1996); M Abraham and Z.Olami, Physica A 233, 503 (1996).
- [12] For detailed discussion of the numerical instabilities which characterized the analysis of non-Herm itian problem like that see: S.C.Reddy and L.N.Trefethen, SIAM Jour. Appl. M ath. 54, 1634 (1994); K.A.Dahmen, D. R.Nelson and N.M. Shnerb, in Statistical Mechanics of Biocom plexity, D.Reguera, J.M.G.Vilar and J.M.Rubi (Eds.), (Springer, Berlin, 1999).
- [13] See, e.g., F. R. G antm acher, The Theory of M atrices (Chelsea Publishing Com pany, New York, 1974).
- [14] These boundary conditions are exact if any bacteria becom es in m otile at the UV light. This corresponds to the actual experim ent -A.K udrolli, private com m unication.