

From: Tatjana Petrov <tatjana.petrov@gmail.com>
Subject: Fwd: TACAS 2015 notification for paper 79
Date: December 19, 2014 at 11:14 PM
To: Marinela Milinov <tpetrov@ist.ac.at>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: TACAS 2015 <tacas2015@easychair.org>
Date: Fri, Dec 19, 2014 at 7:39 PM
Subject: TACAS 2015 notification for paper 79
To: Tatjana Petrov <tatjana.petrov@gmail.com>

Dear Tatjana,

On behalf of the Program Committee of TACAS 2015 we are pleased to inform you that your submission

Model Checking Gene Regulatory Networks

was accepted for publication in the TACAS 2015 proceedings. Feedback from reviewers on your submission is enclosed below. We trust that you will find their comments useful and constructive. Please take them into account as you prepare the final version of your submission.

You will receive instructions for the preparation of the camera-ready final version soon.

Best Regards,

Cesare & Christel,
TACAS 2015 PC Chairs

----- REVIEW 1 -----

PAPER: 79
TITLE: Model Checking Gene Regulatory Networks
AUTHORS: Tatjana Petrov, Ashutosh Gupta, Mirco Giacobbe, Calin Guet, Thomas Henzinger and Tiago Paixao

OVERALL EVALUATION: 2 (accept)

----- REVIEW -----

This paper describes a new approach for automatically analyzing gene regulatory networks (GRNs) described using Wagner's model (extended with varying weights) used in evolutionary biology. GRNs are modeled as networks of genes connected via activation and inhibition edges labeled by weights, which may change during mutations.

The new analysis method proposed is based on encoding (families of) GRNs using parameterized transition systems, and synthesizing the constraints on parameters (weights) that yield those GRNs satisfying a given LTL-X formula. The constraint generation algorithm, which combines LTL model checking and SMT solving, is applied for computing robustness of GRNs in presence of mutations. The proposed method is compared experimentally with more classical simulation-based methods on a set of 8 of GRN examples taken from literature. On 6 among 8 examples, the model checking based method is faster than the simulation-based one, and has a better accuracy.

The topic is of interest for both the synthetic biology and formal verification communities. The approach used is sound and relies on modern SMT verification technology; however, one may worry about the scalability of the method for large GRNs (the examples in the paper are very simple w.r.t. GRN models corresponding to cell processes in system biology).

The paper is clearly written and structured. The comparison with related work deserves to be extended (there is only a little paragraph at the end of the introduction). Some bibliographic references dealing with discrete models of GRNs and the same temporal properties considered in the paper (bistability and oscillations) are indicated below

and oscillations, are indicated below.

Minor comments:

- p. 2, 1st par., last sentence: at that point, it is rather surprising to state that verification-type methods ensure a better scalability than simulation-based ones (which precisely avoid the construction of state spaces). Please clarify; the answer does not seem to occur later in the paper, since there is no evidence that the proposed method has a better scalability than simulation-based methods.
- p. 4, last but one par.: the fact that the proposed method allows one to verify GRNs without executing them is not clearly argued at this point. This paragraph states that the GRN is first translated into an LTS, as indicated in Fig. 1(b), but it is not stated that this translation is made without executing the GRN (this is explained later in Sec. 5.1). Please clarify.
- p. 5, Sec. 2.1, 1st par.: the boldface notation for vectors does not seem to be used later in the paper.
- p. 7, title of Sec. 3: "synthesis" -> "synthesis"
- p. 8 at bottom: "synthetize" -> "synthesize"
- p. 15, Sec. 6, 2nd par.: "recently proposed point counting algorithm" refers to the paper [5] published 15 years ago.

References:

G. Batt, C. Belta, and R. Weiss. "Model Checking Genetic Regulatory Networks with Parameter Uncertainty". Proc. of Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control HSCC'07, LNCS 4416, pp. 61-75. Springer Verlag, 2007.

R. Mateescu, P. T. Monteiro, E. Dumas, and H. de Jong. "CTRL: Extension of CTL with Regular Expressions and Fairness Operators to Verify Genetic Regulatory Networks". Theoretical Computer Science 412(26) 2854-2883, June 2011.

----- REVIEW 2 -----

PAPER: 79

TITLE: Model Checking Gene Regulatory Networks

AUTHORS: Tatjana Petrov, Ashutosh Gupta, Mirco Giacobbe, Calin Guet, Thomas Henzinger and Tiago Paixao

OVERALL EVALUATION: 3 (strong accept)

----- REVIEW -----

The idea is to check an LTL property of a Gene Regulatory Network (GRN) with some variability in the weights of the transitions. The approach uses bounded model checking and SMT solving to generate a number of linear integer constraints on the weights that describe the family of valid GRNs that will satisfy the property. These GRNs are then analyzed to check how robust they are to mutations, but doing a statistical sampling over the constraints. The technique is evaluated on previously used examples from the literature and three GRNs known to oscillate.

A very nice paper. I enjoyed reading it and from about page 2 I was hoping the authors would realize that recent advances in counting for linear integer constraints can replace the statistical sampling component and make it precise. Had to wait till the end of the conclusion section, but the authors also made the connection. The authors should look for a tool called GREEN (green-solver.googlecode.com) that will do the counting for them (using Latte).

The approach to come up with the constraints sounds good and is mostly well described. However in Example 1. there is some odd notation " $\forall \wedge \Rightarrow \dots$ " and " $\sim \forall \wedge \Rightarrow \dots$ " what does this mean, or is the " \wedge " a typo?

Seems to me that although full LTL is a nice to have, that most of the properties really used is more custom to this field and involves reaching some form of stability.

The results look good, but could have been spectacular if only you didn't need the sampling. It is clear that the constraints helps the sampling rather than just sampling from the complete space.

----- REVIEW 3 -----

PAPER: 79

TITLE: Model Checking Gene Regulatory Networks

AUTHORS: Tatjana Petrov, Ashutosh Gupta, Mirco Giacobbe, Calin Guet, Thomas Henzinger and Tiago Paixao

OVERALL EVALUATION: 2 (accept)

----- REVIEW -----

The paper studies gene regulatory networks (GRNs), focusing in particular on the problem of symbolically determining the set of parameter values under which the corresponding GRNs satisfy a temporal logic (LTL) property. This is used to study "mutational robustness" of the GRNs. The paper formalises the problem and then proposes an approach that reduces it to SMT solving and model checking. An implementation has been developed and applied to various benchmark GRNs. Experimental results illustrate improvements over the standard sampling-based approach to solving the problem.

The work studies an interesting topic which seems like a very nice application of verification techniques and ideas to (evolutionary) biology. The paper itself is very well written and easy to read - it does a good job of motivating the work and of explaining how the various aspects of it function. The experimental results also seem impressive and the tool is made available online. Overall, I would vote for acceptance.