

# A Modified Iterative IOM Approach for Optimization of Biochemical Systems

Gongxian Xu<sup>a,\*</sup>, Cheng Shao<sup>a</sup>, Zhilong Xiu<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Research Center of Information and Control, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, China

<sup>b</sup>Department of Bioscience and Biotechnology, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, China

---

**Abstract:** The presented previously indirect optimization method (IOM) developed within biochemical systems theory (BST) provides a versatile and mathematically tractable optimization strategy for biochemical systems. However, due to the local approximations nature of the BST formalism, the iterative version of this technique possibly does not yield the truth optimum solution. In this work, an algorithm is proposed to obtain the correct and consistent optimum steady-state operating point of biochemical systems. The existing linear optimization problem of the direct IOM approach is modified by adding an equality constraint of describing the consistency of solutions between the S-system and the original model. Lagrangian analysis is employed to derive the first order necessary optimality conditions for the above modified optimization problem. This leads to a procedure that may be regarded as a modified iterative IOM approach in which the optimization objective function includes an extra linear term. The extra term contains a comparison of metabolite concentration derivatives with respect to the enzyme activities between the S-system and the original model and ensures that the new algorithm is still carried out within linear programming techniques. The presented framework is applied to tryptophan biosynthesis in bacteria and shown to the tractability and effectiveness of the method. The simulation is also studied to investigate the convergence properties of the algorithm and to give a performance comparison of standard and modified iterative IOM approach.

**Keywords:** Optimization; Linear programming; S-system; Lagrangian multiplier; Biochemical systems;

---

## 1. Introduction

In recent years, the model-based optimization of biochemical and biotechnological systems has become a crucial component of metabolic engineering. From a technological point of view, mathematical optimization provides a systematic and efficient tool that helps to analyze and optimize these processes to predict the maximum yield or production rate of some desired product. Moreover, by such optimization, it is convenient to obtain some important data about general properties of biochemical systems (Vera et al., 2003a). Once this valuable information is achievable, it will be possible to derive their optimal operation policies of studied biotechnological systems.

Much research has been directed toward the development of model-based optimization strategies, including the mathematical foundations of such approaches (Voit, 1992; Regan et al., 1993; Hatzimanikatis et al., 1996a, 1996b; Torres et al., 1996, 1997; Petkov and Maranas, 1997; Voit and Del Signore, 2001; Torres and Voit, 2002; Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2003; Vera et al.,

---

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +86-411-84707577; fax: +86-411-84707579.

E-mail addresses: [dutxgx@163.com](mailto:dutxgx@163.com) (Gongxian Xu), [cshao@dlut.edu.cn](mailto:cshao@dlut.edu.cn) (Cheng Shao).

2003a; Chang and Sahinidis, 2005) and their application to some processes (Heinrich et al., 1991; Hatzimanikatis et al., 1998; Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2000, 2002; Alvarez-Vasquez et al., 2000; Vera et al., 2003b). One successful approach to the optimization of biochemical systems is the indirect optimization method (IOM) (Torres et al., 1996, 1997; Voit, 1992; Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2003; Vera et al., 2003a), which is based on the approximation of the original nonlinear differential equation models describing the biochemical process as an S-system or a GMA system. The S-system models are founded on the Biochemical Systems Theory (BST) introduced by Savageau and co-workers (Savageau 1969a, 1969b, 1970, 1976; Savageau et al., 1987a, 1987b). In this mathematical formalism, the change in each metabolite is represented by two competing power law functions describing aggregation and consumption. The advantage of this representation is that the steady-state equations are linear when the variables of the models are expressed in logarithmic coordinates. This enables the use of linear programming techniques.

When the above-mentioned IOM approach is used to optimize a biochemical system, a possible outcome is that some of the metabolite concentrations exceed significantly the imposed limits or that the original model is unstable. If such a situation occurs, we can apply the iterative IOM version (Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2000) to find a consistent steady-state. In fact it is a repetition of the direct IOM approach. However, the iterative IOM strategy is strictly valid only near the reference steady-state. The reason for this is that the BST formalism is based on first order Taylor's approximations, which is a local representation of the original system. An example of such a case is the application of the above optimization method to the tryptophan biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*. (Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2000). The authors attained a solution similar to the S-system, where the tryptophan flux is more than 3 times the basal flux. But this result is inferior to that of calculating with a rate of tryptophan production increased more than 4 times by the direct IOM approach. Clearly, the former is not a true optimum solution but a local one. To overcome this difficulty of running into a range of local solution and enhance the effectiveness of the iterative IOM approach, it is necessary to make an improvement in its scheme.

For this purpose, in the present study we propose to transform the existing linear optimization problem of the iterative IOM approach into a nonlinear problem with an additional equality constant to account for the consistency of solutions between the S-system and the original model. Using the general Lagrangian multiplier method, the resulting optimization problem is modified as an equivalent problem that can be solved with available linear optimization techniques. To demonstrate the validity of the new algorithm, we apply this modified method to a metabolic pathway.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the formalism of the standard iterative IOM approach. In section 3, a modified iterative IOM version is developed. Numerical simulation is shown in Section 4. Finally, brief conclusions are followed in Section 5.

## 2. Standard iterative IOM approach

### 2.1 Optimization problem statement

Consider the following problem of optimizing a biochemical system:

$$\max J(X, Y) \tag{1}$$

subject to satisfying:

$$F_i(X, Y) = 0 \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \tag{2}$$

$$X_i^L \leq X_i \leq X_i^U \tag{3}$$

$$Y_k^L \leq Y_k \leq Y_k^U \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m \quad (4)$$

$$G_l(X, Y) \leq 0 \quad l = 1, 2, \dots, p \quad (5)$$

where  $X = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)^T \in R^n$ ,  $Y = (Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_m)^T \in R^m$ ; the objective function  $J$  is usually a flux or a particular metabolite concentration; constraint (2) is the steady-state condition (i.e.,  $dX_i/dt = 0$ ); constraint (3) and (4) keep the metabolite concentrations  $X_i$  and the enzyme activities  $Y_k$  to stay within certain limits; and (5) constraints the fluxes or other relations between the variables.

## 2.2 The direct IOM approach

The implementation of the method include mainly four steps:

### (1) Translation the original model to the S-system formalism

The S-system formalism is based on BST which proposes the use of power law functions to describe the nonlinear nature of biochemical processes (Savageau, 1976). Under this representation, the elementary fluxes consisting of input fluxes and output ones are grouped into aggregate fluxes that pass into and out of metabolic pools. These aggregate fluxes have forms given by ‘‘accumulation’’ flux  $V_i^+$  and ‘‘consumption’’  $V_i^-$ . Then the original model:

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = F_i(X, Y) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (6)$$

can be expressed as:

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = V_i^+ - V_i^- \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (7)$$

If each of these rate laws is represented in the power law formalism, then yields the S-system model of Eq. (6):

$$\frac{dX_i}{dt} = \alpha_i \prod_{j=1}^n X_j^{g_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^m Y_k^{g_{ik}} - \beta_i \prod_{j=1}^n X_j^{h_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^m Y_k^{h_{ik}} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (8)$$

where the model parameters  $g_{ij}$ ,  $g_{ik}$ ,  $h_{ij}$  and  $h_{ik}$  are the kinetic orders, and  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$  are the rate constants. The kinetic orders are defined as:

$$g_{ij} = \left( \frac{\partial V_i^+}{\partial X_j} \frac{X_j}{V_i^+} \right)_0 \quad g_{ik} = \left( \frac{\partial V_i^+}{\partial Y_k} \frac{Y_k}{V_i^+} \right)_0 \quad h_{ij} = \left( \frac{\partial V_i^-}{\partial X_j} \frac{X_j}{V_i^-} \right)_0 \quad h_{ik} = \left( \frac{\partial V_i^-}{\partial Y_k} \frac{Y_k}{V_i^-} \right)_0$$

And the rate constants are defined as:

$$\alpha_i = (V_i^+)_0 \prod_{j=1}^n (X_j)_0^{-g_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^m (Y_k)_0^{g_{ik}} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_i = (V_i^-)_0 \prod_{j=1}^n (X_j)_0^{-h_{ij}} \prod_{k=1}^m (Y_k)_0^{-h_{ik}}$$

where the subscript 0 indicates that the results are evaluated at the steady-state of metabolite concentrations. Based on Eq. (8) the objective function  $J$  can also be written as the following S-system form:

$$J = \gamma \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{f_i} \prod_{k=1}^m Y_k^{f_k} \quad (9)$$

In Eq. (9)  $f_i$  and  $f_k$  terms stand for the kinetic orders, and  $\gamma$  represents the corresponding rate constant.

### (2) Quality assessment of the S-system model

The S-system formalism has a significant advantage in that it facilitates the analytical and numerical quality assessment. Firstly, it allows us to detect the local stability of the steady-state, which can be computed by solving the characteristic equation of the following matrix (Savageau, 1976; Chen, 1984):

$$\begin{bmatrix} d_{11} & d_{12} & \cdots & d_{1n} \\ d_{21} & d_{22} & \cdots & d_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_{n1} & d_{n2} & \cdots & d_{nn} \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

where

$$d_{ij} = \left( \frac{V_i^+}{X_i} \right)_0 (g_{ij} - h_{ij})$$

If all real parts of the eigenvalues are negative, then the steady-state is locally stable.

Secondly, the robustness analysis of the model can be done, indicating whether the model is able to tolerate small structural changes. The system sensitivity theory provides important methods for characterizing the quality of a model. There are three types of sensitivity coefficients, which are defined as follows.

#### *Rate constant sensitivities*

The rate constant sensitivities are defined as the ratio of the percentage change in a systemic variable to an infinitesimal percentage change in a rate constant:

$$S(X_i, \alpha_j) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \alpha_j} \frac{\alpha_j}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad S(X_i, \beta_j) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial \beta_j} \frac{\beta_j}{X_i} \right)_0$$

$$S(V_i, \alpha_j) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial \alpha_j} \frac{\alpha_j}{V_i} \right)_0 \quad S(V_i, \beta_j) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial \beta_j} \frac{\beta_j}{V_i} \right)_0$$

where  $V_i$  represents a given flux. These sensitivities can be calculated by differentiation of the explicit solution. It is easy to know that these sensitivities are only dependent upon the kinetic orders of the system. So they are properties of the integrated system and not its isolated components.

#### *Kinetic order sensitivities*

A kinetic order sensitivity coefficient is defined as the ratio of the percentage change in a systemic variable to an infinitesimal percentage change in a kinetic order,  $g_{ij}$ ,  $g_{ik}$ ,  $h_{ij}$  or  $h_{ik}$ :

$$S(X_i, g_{aj}) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial g_{aj}} \frac{g_{aj}}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad S(V_i, g_{aj}) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial g_{aj}} \frac{g_{aj}}{V_i} \right)_0$$

$$S(X_i, g_{qk}) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial g_{qk}} \frac{g_{qk}}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad S(V_i, g_{qk}) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial g_{qk}} \frac{g_{qk}}{V_i} \right)_0$$

$$S(X_i, h_{aj}) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial h_{aj}} \frac{h_{aj}}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad S(V_i, h_{aj}) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial h_{aj}} \frac{h_{aj}}{V_i} \right)_0$$

$$S(X_i, h_{qk}) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial h_{qk}} \frac{h_{qk}}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad S(V_i, h_{qk}) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial h_{qk}} \frac{h_{qk}}{V_i} \right)_0$$

where  $q=1,2,\dots,n$ . Again, these sensitivities are properties of the integrated system and not its isolated components, but here the sensitivities are a function of both rate constants and kinetic orders. The kinetic order sensitivities can also be calculated by differentiation of the explicit solution. In a good model the sensitivities must be small, otherwise high sensitivities (i.e., absolute

values upper than 50) (Vera et al., 2003b) indicate that the model is ill-determined. Once such a bad case happens, the portions of investigated model need to be given a more attention.

### Logarithmic Gains

The logarithmic gains are specific types of sensitivity coefficients that are defined as:

$$L(X_i, Y_k) = \left( \frac{\partial X_i}{\partial Y_k} \frac{Y_k}{X_i} \right)_0 \quad \text{and} \quad L(V_i, Y_k) = \left( \frac{\partial V_i}{\partial Y_k} \frac{Y_k}{V_i} \right)_0$$

The former is called concentration logarithmic gains and the latter is called flux logarithmic gains. Like the previous sensitivities, the logarithmic gains should have low values (less than 10 in absolute value) (Vera et al., 2003b).

Thirdly, we can check the dynamic features that characterize the transient responses to temporary perturbations or permanent alterations. Such analyses often identify problems of consistency and reliability of the mathematical representation (Shiraishi and Savageau, 1992; Ni and Savageau, 1996a; Ni and Savageau, 1996b).

### (3) Linear programming and optimization

Although S-system models are nonlinear, the steady-state equations are linear when the variables are expressed in logarithmic coordinates (Savageau, 1969b). This allows us to use the linear programming techniques (Voit, 1992; Regan et al., 1993; Torres et al., 1996).

At steady-state the S-system (8) reduces to the following nonlinear equations:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (g_{ij} - h_{ij}) \ln(X_j) + \sum_{k=1}^m (g'_{ik} - h'_{ik}) \ln(Y_k) = \ln \left( \frac{\beta_i}{\alpha_i} \right) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (11)$$

Let  $x_j = \ln(X_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,  $y_k = \ln(Y_k)$ ,  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and  $b_i = \ln(\beta_i/\alpha_i)$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , then Eq. (11) can be recast in a form of linear algebraic equations:

$$A_d x + A_{id} y = b \quad (12)$$

where the matrixes  $A_d = (g_{ij} - h_{ij})_{n \times n}$ ,  $A_{id} = (g'_{ik} - h'_{ik})_{n \times m}$ , the vectors  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^T$ ,  $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_m)^T$  and  $b = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)^T$ . If the matrix  $A_d$  is non-singular, then  $x$  can be solved by Eq. (12):

$$x = -A_d^{-1} A_{id} y + A_d^{-1} b \quad (13)$$

**Remark 1.** The inverse of the matrix  $A_d$  exists if the system has a non-zero steady-state point (Savageau, 1976).

Due to the fact that the logarithmic transformation does not change the locations of maximum of a function, the nonlinear optimization problem in section 2.1 can be transformed to the following linear programming formulations:

$$\max \quad \bar{J}(x, y)$$

subject to satisfying:

$$A_d x + A_{id} y = b$$

$$\ln(X_i^L) \leq x_i \leq \ln(X_i^U) \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (14)$$

$$\ln(Y_k^L) \leq y_k \leq \ln(Y_k^U) \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, m$$

$$\bar{G}(x, y) \leq 0$$

where the new objective function  $\bar{J} = \ln(J')$ , and the vector function  $\bar{G} \in R^1$  is the linear representations of constraint (5) in logarithmic space. Note that, to ensure that the optimum solution is within the physiologically acceptable range of values, the following relations are imposed:

$$X_i^L = 0.8(X_i)_0 \quad \text{and} \quad X_i^U = 1.2(X_i)_0 \quad (15)$$

where  $(X_i)_0$  is the basal steady-state of  $X_i$ .

#### (4) Transfer of results to the original model

The S-system (8) has been derived as an approximation of the model (6), and it is interesting to explore to what degree any optimized solution is consistent between the two models. To do this, after substituting the enzyme activities  $Y_k$  of the optimized S-solution into Eq. (6), the metabolite concentrations  $X_i$  are uniquely specified. Since the result is computed via S-system approximation, it is possibly an approximate optimum of the original optimization problem. Still the differences between the steady-states of the original and the S-system models are often small in comparison to the experimental accuracy and in light of other uncertainties involved in any modeling effort (Torres et al., 1996). A possible outcome of the present step is that some of the metabolite concentrations exceed the imposed limits or that Eq. (6) is unstable. In these cases, some of the constraints in step (4) must be changed accordingly.

#### 2.3 The iterative IOM approach

When such a situation occurs or significant discrepancies between the S-system and the original model are detected, an efficient perform can be applied (Voit, 1992) to obtain a consistent steady-state, which is an iterative process of the IOM approach. Each iteration will find a new steady-state. Eventually, this procedure will finish until a satisfactory result is achieved.

### 3. Modified iterative IOM approach

Since the S-system formalism is a local description of the original system at a basal steady-state based on first order Taylor's approximations, the iterative IOM strategy is strictly effective around this steady-state. It has been shown (Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2000) that the above approach will not achieve the correct optimum steady-state. Although the authors attained a solution similar to the S-system, where the tryptophan flux is more than 3 times the basal flux, this result is lower than that of finding with a rate of tryptophan production increased more than 4 times by the direct IOM approach. In this study, we propose a modification scheme of this strategy to improve the effectiveness of the iterative IOM approach. This proposed framework just modifies the linear optimization problem in section 2.2 grounded on the similar thought of integrated system optimization and parameter estimation (ISOPE) (Roberts, 1995).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } \rho &= (\alpha, \beta, g, g', h, h')^T \in R^{2(n^2+nm+n)}, \text{ where} \\ \alpha &= (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T, \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n)^T, \\ g &= (g_{11}, g_{12}, \dots, g_{1n}, g_{21}, g_{22}, \dots, g_{2n}, \dots, g_{n1}, g_{n2}, \dots, g_{nn})^T, \\ g' &= (g'_{11}, g'_{12}, \dots, g'_{1m}, g'_{21}, g'_{22}, \dots, g'_{2m}, \dots, g'_{n1}, g'_{n2}, \dots, g'_{nm})^T, \\ h &= (h_{11}, h_{12}, \dots, h_{1n}, h_{21}, h_{22}, \dots, h_{2n}, \dots, h_{n1}, h_{n2}, \dots, h_{nn})^T, \\ h' &= (h'_{11}, h'_{12}, \dots, h'_{1m}, h'_{21}, h'_{22}, \dots, h'_{2m}, \dots, h'_{n1}, h'_{n2}, \dots, h'_{nm})^T. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that the solution vector  $X$  of Eq. (6) is determined by the function  $Q$ , i.e.:

$$X = Q(Y) \quad (16)$$

then Eq. (16) in logarithmic coordinates can be expressed as:

$$x = Q_1(y) \quad (17)$$

Write the right side of Eq. (13) as:

$$Q_2(y, \rho) = -A_d^{-1} A_{id} y + A_d^{-1} \rho \quad (18)$$

then by Eq. (13) we have  $x = Q_2(y, \rho)$ .

Define  $\tilde{J}(y, \rho) = \bar{J}(Q_2(y, \rho), y)$ .

Now let us introduce an additional variable  $w \in R^m$ , and add the constraint  $Q_1(y) = Q_2(y, \rho)$  into the linear optimization problem in section 2.2. In addition, ignore the steady-state constraint and the inequality constrains, then we have the following modified form:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \quad \tilde{J}(y, \rho) \\ & \text{subject to satisfying:} \\ & Q_1(w) = Q_2(w, \rho) \\ & w = y \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The optimization problem can then be considered as that of determining the stationary point of the Lagrangian function:

$$L_a = \tilde{J}(y, \rho) + \lambda^T (w - y) + \mu^T [Q_1(w) - Q_2(w, \rho)] \tag{20}$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  are Lagrangian multipliers.

Assuming that the required derivatives exist and are continuous, the necessary optimality conditions for the modified optimization problem are:

$$\frac{\partial^T L_a}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial^T \tilde{J}(y, \rho)}{\partial y} - \lambda = 0 \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{\partial^T L_a}{\partial w} = \lambda + \left[ \frac{\partial Q_1(w)}{\partial w} - \frac{\partial Q_2(w, \rho)}{\partial w} \right]^T \mu = 0 \tag{22}$$

$$\frac{\partial^T L_a}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial^T \tilde{J}(y, \rho)}{\partial \rho} - \frac{\partial^T Q_2(w, \rho)}{\partial \rho} \mu = 0 \tag{23}$$

$$\frac{\partial^T L_a}{\partial \mu} = Q_1(w) - Q_2(w, \rho) = 0 \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{\partial^T L_a}{\partial \lambda} = w - y = 0 \tag{25}$$

Eq. (21) is satisfied by solving the modified optimization problem:

$$\max \quad \tilde{J}(y, \rho) - \lambda^T y \tag{26}$$

By Eq. (22) and (23), eliminating the Lagrangian multiplier  $\mu$  and using the relation:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{J}(w, \rho)}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial \tilde{J}(Q_2(w, \rho), w)}{\partial x} \frac{\partial Q_2(w, \rho)}{\partial \rho} \tag{27}$$

the Lagrangian multiplier  $\lambda$  can be expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(w, \rho) &= \left[ \frac{\partial Q_2(w, \rho)}{\partial w} - \frac{\partial Q_1(w)}{\partial w} \right]^T \frac{\partial^T \tilde{J}(Q_2(w, \rho), w)}{\partial x} \\ &= \left[ -A_d^{-1} A_{id} - \frac{\partial Q_1(w)}{\partial w} \right]^T \frac{\partial^T \tilde{J}(Q_2(w, \rho), w)}{\partial x} \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Reintroducing the equality and inequality constrains, the optimization problem (14) can be modified as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max \quad \tilde{J}(y, \rho) - \lambda^T y \\ & \text{subject to satisfying:} \\ & A_d x + A_{id} y = b \\ & \ln(X_i^L) \leq x_i \leq \ln(X_i^U) \\ & \ln(Y_k^L) \leq y_k \leq \ln(Y_k^U) \\ & \bar{G}(x, y) \leq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Evidently, (29) is a linear programming problem.

Now we summarize the modified iterative IOM algorithm presented in this paper. Starting from

some reference steady-state point  $w^0$  and some solution accuracy  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the  $r$ th iteration is described as follows:

*Step 1.* Apply  $w^r$  to the system (6) and find the concentrations  $X^r$ . Transfer (6) to the S-system form and determine a new parameter value  $\rho^r$ .

*Step 2.* Perform quality assessments of the S-system model. If it is a valid model, then go to *Step 3*. Else return to *Step 1* and modify  $w^r$ .

*Step 3.* For  $w = w^r$ ,  $\rho = \rho^r$  and  $\lambda(w, \rho) = \lambda(w^r, \rho^r)$ , solve the modified optimization problem (29). Let  $y^r$  be a solution.

*Step 4.* Set  $w^{r+1} = w^r + E(y^r - w^r)$ . If  $\|w^{r+1} - w^r\| < \varepsilon$  where  $E$  is a diagonal matrix of gain parameters with  $0 < e_k < 1$ , then transfer the results to the original model and stop. Otherwise, set  $r = r + 1$  and continue from *Step 1*.

**Remark 2.** In the practical implementation of the algorithm *Step 2* can be considered until the condition  $\|w^{r+1} - w^r\| < \varepsilon$  is held. This requires that  $\ln(X_i^L)$  and  $\ln(X_i^U)$  of the  $r$ th iteration should satisfy  $\ln(X_i^L) = \ln(0.8) + x^{r-1}$  and  $\ln(X_i^U) = \ln(1.2) + x^{r-1}$ , where  $x^{r-1} = Q_2(y^{r-1}, \rho^{r-1})$ .

## 4. Case study

### 4.1 Optimization of tryptophan biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*.

To verify the calculation algorithm, we will apply the proposed method to tryptophan biosynthesis in *Escherichia coli*. A schematic network of the simplified metabolic pathway is depicted graphically in Fig. 1. A complete description of the metabolic pathway can be found in [Xiu et al. \(1997\)](#). In this work the mathematical model considers both feedback inhibition of the biosynthetic enzymes and repression of the *trp* operon by tryptophan and explicitly takes into account the growth rate and the demand of tryptophan for protein synthesis. The differential equations in dimensionless variables are given as:

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = \frac{X_3 + 1}{1 + (1 + Y_2)X_3} - (Y_8 + Y_1)X_1 \quad (30)$$

$$\frac{dX_2}{dt} = X_1 - (Y_9 + Y_1)X_2 \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{dX_3}{dt} = \frac{X_2 Y_3^2}{Y_3^2 + X_3^2} - (Y_{10} + Y_1)X_3 - \frac{X_3 Y_4}{1 + X_3} - \frac{Y_5 (1 - Y_6 Y_1) Y_1 X_3}{X_3 + Y_7} \quad (32)$$

Here,  $X_1$  is used for mRNA concentration,  $X_2$  is used for enzyme concentration and  $X_3$  is used for tryptophan concentration. As we need positive variables to make the required logarithmic transformation,  $Y_6$  will be taken as positive and it will be preceded by a minus sign in Xiu's model.




Fig. 1. Diagram of the simplified pathway for tryptophan biosynthesis.

The above-mentioned model does not explicitly account for the tryptophan rate production, but the last term of the right hand of Eq. (32), which is an accumulative term accounting for both consumption and secretion of tryptophan, can be selected as the objective function. This leads to the following optimization problem (Marín-Sanguino and Torres, 2000):

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & J = \frac{Y_5(1-Y_6Y_1)Y_1X_3}{X_3+Y_7} \\ \text{subject to satisfying:} \\ & \frac{X_3+1}{1+(1+Y_2)X_3} = (Y_8+Y_1)X_1 \\ & X_1 = (Y_9+Y_1)X_2 \\ & \frac{X_2Y_3^2}{Y_3^2+X_3^2} = (Y_{10}+Y_1)X_3 + \frac{X_3Y_4}{1+X_3} + \frac{Y_5(1-Y_6Y_1)Y_1X_3}{X_3+Y_7} \\ & 0.8X_{i0} \leq X_i \leq 1.2X_{i0} \quad i = 1,2,3 \\ & 0 < Y_1 \leq 0.00624 \\ & 4 \leq Y_2 \leq 10 \\ & 500 \leq Y_3 \leq 5000 \\ & Y_4 = 0.0022Y_2 \\ & 0 < Y_5 \leq 1000 \\ & (Y_6, Y_7, Y_8, Y_9, Y_{10}) = (7.5, 0.005, 0.9, 0.02, 0) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

By Xiu et al. (1997), there is a unique positive steady-state solution satisfying Eq. (30), (31) and (32), which can be expressed as:

$$X_1 = \frac{1}{Y_8+Y_1} \frac{1+X_3}{1+(1+Y_2)X_3} \quad (34)$$

$$X_2 = \frac{1}{Y_8+Y_1} \frac{1}{Y_9+Y_1} \frac{1+X_3}{1+(1+Y_2)X_3} \quad (35)$$

$$\frac{1}{Y_8+Y_1} \frac{1}{Y_9+Y_1} \frac{1+X_3}{1+(1+Y_2)X_3} \frac{Y_3^2}{Y_3^2+X_3^2} = (Y_{10}+Y_1)X_3 + \frac{X_3Y_4}{1+X_3} + \frac{Y_5(1-Y_6Y_1)Y_1X_3}{X_3+Y_7} \quad (36)$$

Given a set of fixed parameters,  $X_3$  is uniquely determined by Eq. (36).

At the basal steady-state (see Table 1), the dynamical model of the pathway is first transformed into an S-system and studied for optimization of tryptophan production by Marín-Sanguino and Torres (2000). Here the S-system representation is modified slightly as:

$$\frac{dX_1}{dt} = 0.6403X_3^{-5.87 \times 10^{-4}} Y_2^{-0.8332} - 1.0233X_1^{0.0035} Y_8^{0.9965} \quad (37)$$

$$\frac{dX_2}{dt} = X_1 - 1.4854X_2Y_1^{0.1349} Y_9^{0.8651} \quad (38)$$

$$\frac{dX_3}{dt} = 0.5534X_2X_3^{-0.5573} Y_3^{0.5573} - 1.7094X_3^{0.7684} Y_1^{0.9904} Y_4^{0.0042} Y_5^{0.2274} Y_6^{-5.45 \times 10^{-3}} Y_7^{-0.8 \times 10^{-6}} \quad (39)$$

where the parameter  $Y_{10}$  is omitted.

Since the objective function  $J$  does not include the variables  $X_1$  and  $X_2$ , both the first and the second column of  $\partial \bar{J}(Q_2(w, \rho), w) / \partial x$  equal to zero. This implies that the Lagrangian multiplier  $\lambda$  has the following formalism:

$$\lambda(w, \rho) = \left[ -A_d^{-1} A_{id} - \frac{\partial Q_1(w)}{\partial w} \right]^T \frac{\partial^T \bar{J}(Q_2(w, \rho), w)}{\partial x}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left[ -A_d^{-1} A_{id} - \frac{\partial Q_1(w)}{\partial w} \right]^T (0, 0, f_3)^T \\
&= -f_3 \frac{\partial^T x_3(w)}{\partial w} - (A_d^{-1} A_{id})^T (0, 0, f_3)^T
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

where  $\partial x_3(w)/\partial w$  can be obtained from  $w = y$  and the following relation:

$$\frac{\partial x_3(y)}{\partial y} = \frac{\partial X_3}{\partial Y} \frac{Y}{X_3}$$

where  $\partial X_3/\partial Y$  can be calculated by Eq. (36).

#### 4.2 Performance of the standard iterative IOM approach

Fig. 2 shows the corresponding variation in enzyme activities  $Y_1$ ,  $Y_2$ ,  $Y_3$  and  $Y_5$ , metabolite concentrations  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$  and  $X_3$ , and optimized flux  $J$  during the standard iterative IOM approach. The variation in  $Y_4$  is not shown because this parameter is proportional to  $Y_2$ . From Fig. 2, we can see that the standard iterative IOM strategy yields an optimum steady-state solution with an objective index increased less than four times its basal value (see Table 1). Although the obtained steady-state is robust enough and stable (results not shown), the final optimization flux is smaller than the one attained by using the direct IOM approach (see Table 2). These results clearly show the unsatisfactory behavior of the standard iterative IOM approach when applied to the present problem. The method finds an approximately consistent steady-state except for the variable  $X_3$ , but fails to determine the correct optimum steady-state solution.

Table 1

Optimal solutions obtained by using the standard iterative IOM approach

Variables	Basal steady-state	Optimized solutions (20 iterations)	
		S-system	Iterative IOM
$X_1$	0.184654	1.198 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.198 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_2$	7.986756	1.095 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.095 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_3$	1418.931944	0.372 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>	0.465 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$Y_1$	0.00312	0.0053	0.0053
$Y_2$	5	4	4
$Y_3$	2283	5000	5000
$Y_5$	430	1000	1000
$J$	1.310202	3.883 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>	3.883 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>

Table 2

Optimal solutions obtained by using the direct IOM approach

Variables	Basal steady-state	Optimized solutions	
		S-system	Direct IOM
$X_1$	0.184654	1.200 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.196 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_2$	7.986756	1.103 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.070 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_3$	1418.931944	0.800 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>	0.347 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$Y_1$	0.00312	0.00584	0.00584
$Y_2$	5	4.008	4.008
$Y_3$	2283	5000	5000
$Y_5$	430	1000	1000
$J$	1.310202	4.287 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>	4.261 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>




Fig. 2. Variation of enzyme activities, metabolite concentrations and optimization index during the standard iterative IOM approach.

#### 4.3 Performance of the modified iterative IOM approach

Fig. 3 and 4 illustrate the corresponding variation of enzyme activities, metabolite concentrations, optimization index and Lagrangian multipliers during the modified iterative IOM

approach. It can be observed that the method shows a rapid convergence behavior and produces a




Fig. 3. Variation of enzyme activities, metabolite concentrations and optimization index during the modified iterative IOM approach. The gain parameters  $e_k$  are selected as 0.9.




Fig. 4. Variation of Lagrangian multipliers during the modified iterative IOM approach.

higher rate of tryptophan production than the standard iterative IOM approach. The optimized results within 11 iterations are given in Table 3. Compared with the direct and standard iterative IOM approach, the only difference in parameter values is detected in growth rate  $Y_1$ . However, unlike the former two approaches, the modified iterative IOM algorithm eventually converges to the correct final optimum steady-state solution.

Table 3

Optimal solutions obtained by using the modified iterative IOM approach

Variables	Basal steady-state	Optimized solutions (11 iterations)	
		S-system	Modified iterative IOM
$X_1$	0.184654	1.199 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.198 ( $X_1$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_2$	7.986756	1.055 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>	1.055 ( $X_2$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$X_3$	1418.931944	0.172 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>	0.273 ( $X_3$ ) <sub>0</sub>
$Y_1$	0.00312	0.00624	0.00624
$Y_2$	5	4	4
$Y_3$	2283	5000	5000
$Y_5$	430	1000	1000
$J$	1.310202	4.539 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>	4.540 ( $J$ ) <sub>0</sub>

Now we will test the quality of the above achieved new steady-state representation in terms of its stability, robustness and dynamic behavior. By solving the characteristic equation of the matrix (10), we can obtain the following eigenvalues: -0.906241, -0.026179 and -0.006558. This implies that the optimum steady-state is locally stable.

The results of the sensitivity analysis are shown in Fig. 5. Since  $S(X_i, \alpha_j) = -S(X_i, \beta_j)$ , Fig. 5A only shows the absolute values of sensitivities  $S(X_i, \alpha_j)$ . Among a total of 18 values, 15 are less than 1 and the remaining are below 3.3. Fig. 5B addresses the concentration and flux logarithmic gains. Here,  $X_3$  is the most sensitive variable, and  $Y_2$ ,  $Y_8$  and  $Y_9$  play an important role in the biochemical system while  $Y_1$  is the determinant parameter for the tryptophan level. The

influence of the kinetic orders on the metabolite concentrations and the fluxes are illustrated in Fig. 5C, where  $C_p$  are given in Table 4. The variable  $X_3$  exhibits the most sensitive to changes in kinetic orders while  $S(X_3, h_{3,1}) = 16.15$  and  $S(X_3, h_{3,5}) = -16.19$  are the highest sensitivities.




Fig. 5. Sensitivities of metabolite concentrations and fluxes with respect to changes in rate constants, kinetic orders and enzyme activities at the optimum steady-state obtained by using the modified iterative IOM approach. The 3D bar charts display the absolute magnitudes of the sensitivities and logarithmic gains. Panel A: Rate constant sensitivities. Panel B: Logarithmic gains. Panel C: Kinetic order sensitivities.

Table 4

Assignments of the kinetic orders

$C_1$	$C_2$	$C_3$	$C_4$	$C_5$	$C_6$	$C_7$	$C_8$	$C_9$	$C_{10}$	$C_{11}$	$C_{12}$	$C_{13}$	$C_{14}$	$C_{15}$	$C_{16}$	$C_{17}$	$C_{18}$
$g_{1,3}$	$g_{2,1}$	$g_{3,2}$	$g_{3,3}$	$g_{1,2}$	$g_{3,3}$	$h_{1,1}$	$h_{2,2}$	$h_{3,3}$	$h_{1,1}$	$h_{1,8}$	$h_{2,1}$	$h_{2,9}$	$h_{3,1}$	$h_{3,4}$	$h_{3,5}$	$h_{3,6}$	$h_{3,7}$

The dynamic response curves to a twofold increase in tryptophan concentration are plotted in Fig. 6. It can be seen that the increased tryptophan level does not have a significant effect on the mRNA concentration  $X_1$  and the enzyme concentration  $X_2$ . The metabolites  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  exhibit negligible deviations from the optimum steady-state (below 0.1%). The tryptophan concentration  $X_3$  shows a rapid initial decrease and asymptotically returns to within 5% of its optimum steady-state value after about 7 hours.

From the above given discussion on the analysis in local stability, robustness and dynamic behavior of the steady-state, we can conclude that the S-system structure provides a reasonably robust model description of the pathway at the optimum steady-state.




Fig. 6. Dynamic system response to a twofold increase in tryptophan concentration ( $X_3$ ). At initial time  $X_3$  is increased to twice its optimum steady-state.

## 5. Conclusions

In this paper, an algorithm for optimization of biochemical systems has been presented. Using a modification of the existing iterative IOM approach to account for differences of metabolite concentration derivatives with respect to enzyme activities between the S-system and the original model enables the modified method to achieve the correct optimal steady-state solution and ensures the modified algorithm to be implemented within the linear optimization techniques. The proposed framework has been applied to tryptophan biosynthesis in bacteria. The simulation results show that the modified iterative IOM strategy rapidly and successfully maximizes the rate of tryptophan production, whereas the standard iterative IOM approach fails to obtain the correct optimum steady-state point. The quality assessment of the S-system representation at the new steady-state illustrates the S-system formulation is a robust model structure.

## Acknowledgements

Support from State Science and Technology Project (No. 2001BA204B01) of P. R. China is gratefully acknowledged.

## References:

- Alvarez-Vasquez, F., González-Alcón, C., Torres, N.V., 2000. Metabolism of citric acid production by *Aspergillus niger*: Model definition, steady state analysis, dynamic behavior and constrained optimization of citric acid production rate. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 70, 82-108.
- Chang, Y.-J., Sahinidis, N.V., 2005. Optimization of metabolic pathways under stability considerations. *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 29, 447-458.
- Chen C.-T., 1984. *Linear System Theory and Design*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, New York.
- Hatzimanikatis, V., Floudas, C.A., Bailey, J.E., 1996a. Analysis and design of metabolic reaction networks via mixed-integer linear optimization. *AIChE Journal* 42, 1277-1292.
- Hatzimanikatis, V., Floudas, C.A., Bailey, J.E., 1996b. Optimization of regulatory architectures in metabolic reaction networks. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 52, 485-500.
- Hatzimanikatis, V., Emmerling, M., Sauer, U., Bailey, J.E., 1998. Application of mathematical tools for metabolic design of microbial ethanol production. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 58, 154-161.

- Heinrich, R., Schuster, S., Holzhütter, H.G., 1991. Mathematical analysis of enzymatic reaction systems using optimization principles. *European Journal of Biochemistry* 210, 1-21.
- Marín-Sanguino, A., Torres, N.V., 2000. Optimization of tryptophan production in bacteria design of a strategy for genetic manipulation of the tryptophan operon for tryptophan flux maximization. *Biotechnology Progress* 16, 133-145.
- Marín-Sanguino, A., Torres, N.V., 2002. Modelling, steady state analysis and optimization of the catalytic efficiency of the triosephosphate. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 64, 301-326.
- Marín-Sanguino, A., Torres, N.V., 2003. Optimization of biochemical systems by linear programming and general mass action model representations. *Mathematical Biosciences* 184, 187-200.
- Ni, T.-C., Savageau, M.A., 1996a. Application of Biochemical Systems Theory to metabolism in human red blood cells. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 271, 7927-7941.
- Ni, T.-C., Savageau, M.A., 1996b. Model assessment and refinement using strategies from Biochemical Systems Theory: application to metabolism in human red blood cells. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 179, 329-368.
- Petkov, S.B., Maranas, C.D., 1997. Quantitative assessment of uncertainty in the optimization of metabolic pathways. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 56, 145-161.
- Regan, L., Bogle, I.D.L., Dunnill, P., 1993. Simulation and optimization of metabolic pathways. *Computers and Chemical Engineering* 17, 627-637.
- Roberts, P.D., 1995. Coping with model-reality differences in industrial process optimization — A review of integrated system optimization and parameter estimation (ISOPE). *Computers in Industry* 26, 281-290.
- Savageau, M.A., 1969a. Biochemical systems analysis, I: Some mathematical properties of the rate law for the component enzymatic reactions. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 25, 365-369.
- Savageau, M.A., 1969b. Biochemical systems analysis, II: The steady-state solutions for an n-pool system using a power-law approximation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 25, 370-379.
- Savageau, M.A., 1970. Biochemical systems analysis, III: Dynamic solutions using a power-law approximation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 26, 215-226.
- Savageau, M.A., 1976. *Biochemical Systems Analysis: a Study of Function and Design in Molecular Biology*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Savageau, M.A., Voit, E.O., Irvine, D.H., 1987a. Biochemical systems theory and metabolic control theory: 1. fundamental similarities and differences. *Mathematical Biosciences* 86, 127-145.
- Savageau, M.A., Voit, E.O., Irvine, D.H., 1987b. Biochemical systems theory and metabolic control theory: 2. the role of summation and connectivity relationships. *Mathematical Biosciences* 86, 147-169.
- Shiraishi, F., Savageau, M.A., 1992. The tricarboxylic acid cycle in *Dictyostelium discoideum*. II. Evaluation of model consistency and robustness. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 267, 22919-22925.
- Torres, N.V., Voit, E.O., González-Alcón, C., 1996. Optimization of nonlinear biotechnological processes with linear programming: application to citric acid production by *Aspergillus niger*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 49, 247-258.
- Torres, N.V., Voit, E.O., González-Alcón, C., Rodríguez, F., 1997. An indirect optimization method for biochemical systems: Description of method and application to the maximization of the rate of ethanol, glycerol and carbohydrate production in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.
- Torres, N.V., Voit, E.O., 2002. *Pathway Analysis and Optimization in Metabolic Engineering*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- Vera, J., De Atauri, P., Cascante, M., Torres, N.V., 2003a. Multicriteria optimization of biochemical systems by linear programming: Application to the production of ethanol by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 83, 335-343.

- 
- Vera, J., Torres, N.V., Moles, C.G., Banga, J., 2003b. Integrated nonlinear optimization of bioprocesses via linear programming. *AIChE Journal* 49, 3173-3187.
- Voit, E.O., 1992. Optimization of integrated biochemical systems. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 40, 572-582.
- Voit, E.O., Del Signore, M., 2001. Assessment of effects of experimental imprecision on optimized biochemical systems. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 74, 443-448.
- Xiu, Z.-L., Zeng, A.-P., Deckwer, W.-D., 1997. Model analysis concerning the effects of growth rate and intracellular tryptophan level on the stability and dynamics of tryptophan biosynthesis in bacteria. *Journal of Biotechnology* 58, 125-140.