Modelling and computational approaches to investigate heterogeneous innate immune responses to cancers

Raluca Effimie

University of Franche-Comté, France

Workshop: "NEW TRENDS IN BIOMATHEMATICS: Applications in Oncology and Immunology"

(Reggio Calabria, 21 June, 2024)



Innate immunity in the context of cancer...

Most of the current immunotherapies for cancer focus on adaptive immune responses (immune checkpoint inhibitors, chimeric antigen receptors, ...)

But innate immune cells infiltrating the Tumour Micro Environment (TME) can interfere with adaptive immune responses...

& macrophages play a central role in regulating both innate & adaptive immune responses (Th1&Th2 responses, modulate NK cells, ...)

Macrophage barrier in the tumor microenvironment and potential clinical applications





Pires et al, (2011). Ch. 10 in "Melanoma in the clinic: Diagnosis, management and complications of malignancy"



Tumour progression

ages?

ost common cell types in solid tumours, of total tumour mass (breast cancer,

ation of tumours is patient prognosis ...

of phenotypes (in Jes) 🞓

Anti-tumour treatment: re-polarisation



Pires et al, (2011). Ch. 10 in "Melanoma in the clinic: Diagnosis, management and complications of malignancy"



Cristina Belgiovine ^{1,*}, Elisabeth Digifico ¹, Clément Anfray ¹, Aldo Ummarino ²

Why focus on macrophages?

- Tumour elimination (directly or through recruitment of T cells)
- Tumour growth
- Tumour cell migration and invasion
- Tumour metastasis
- Angiogenesis
- Suppression of innate and adaptive immune responses (T cell exhaustion/ suppression, ...)

Macrophages as tools and targets in cancer therapy

Alberto Mantovani $\mathbb{D}^{1,2,3}$, Paola Allavena^{1,2}, Federica Marchesi $\mathbb{D}^{2,4}$ and Cecilia Garlanda $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$

Tumour growth/metastasis

"
macrophages are doubleedged swords with dual potential in cancer, a reflection of their plasticity in response to environmental cues..."

Immunosuppression





their localization inside the tumour...

Contraction of the

Goal of this talk: review some mathematical models derived over the past few years to investigate the roles of various TAMs on tumour dynamics

Single-scale models

discrete macrophage populations: M1 vs M2

Multi-scale models

phenotype heterogeneity (continuous phenotype variable)

• space heterogeneity (& discrete populations M1 vs M2)





0.6 Single-scale models for cancer: 0.4 Oestumour roles of 2 discrete macrophag â2vary parameters identified as important

(a)

(i) ₁₁

0.8-

0.4

0.2-

(ii)

0

 $\mathbb{F}^{0.8}_{\otimes 0.6}$

₹0.4 ≈0.2

0.8

Cells Cells



0.8

microenvironment orchestrates tumor

n tubadi

JE & EDI

The heterogeneity of macro

- Phenotypic heterogeneity
- Spatial heterogeneity

nature reviews immunology

Explore content 🖌 About the journal 🖌 Publish wi

nature > nature reviews immunology > review articles >

Review Article Published: 04 February 2019

Macrophages as regulators of to immunotherapy

David G. DeNardo ⊠ & Brian Ruffell ⊠

Nature Reviews Immunology 19, 369–382 (2019) Cite this article

46k Accesses | 1219 Citations | 201 Altmetric | Metrics

Abstract

Macrophages are critical mediators of tissue homeostasis, with tumours distorting this proclivity to stimulate proliferation, angiogenesis and metastasis. This had led to an interest in targeting macrophages in cancer, and preclinical studies have demonstrated efficacy across therapeutic modalities and tumour types. Much of the observed efficacy can be traced to the suppressive capacity of macrophages, driven by microenvironmental cues such as hypoxia and fibrosis. As a result, tumour macrophages display an ability to suppress T cell recruitment and function as well as to regulate other aspects of tumour immunity. With the increasing impact of cancer immunotherapy, macrophage targeting is now being evaluated in this context. Here, we discuss the results of clinical trials and the future of combinatorial immunotherapy.

 Sections
 Figures
 References

 Abstract

 References

 Acknowledgements

 Author information

 Ethics declarations

 Additional information

 Glossary

 Rights and permissions

 About this article is cited by



This is a preview of subscription content, access via your institution

Access options

Access through your institution	
Access Nature and 54 other Nature Portfolio journals Get Nature+, our best-value online-access subscription	
24,99 € / 30 days cancel any time	
Learn more	
Buy this article	Subscribe to this journal Receive 12 print issues and online access
 Purchase on Springer Link 	
Instant access to full article PDF	206,07 € per year only 17,17 € per issue
Buy now	Learn more
Prices may be subject to local taxes which are calculated during checkout	

The heterogeneity of macro

- Phenotypic heterogeneity
- **Spatial heterogeneity**

PUBLISHED 10 August 2023

Exploratory study of macrophage polarization and spatial distribution in colorectal cancer liver metastasis: a pilot study

Isha Khanduri¹, Dipen M. Maru² and Edwin R. Parra

Digital Image Analysis:

raw image scanning & preparation, tissue segmentation, cell detection & segmentation

phenotyping



nature reviews immunology

Explore content V About the journal V Publish wi

nature > nature reviews immunology > review articles >

Review Article Published: 04 February 2019

Macrophages as regulators of t immunotherapy

David G. DeNardo 🖾 & Brian Ruffell

Nature Reviews Immunology 19, 369–382 (2019) Cite this article

46k Accesses | 1219 Citations | 201 Altmetric | Metrice

Abstract

Macrophages are critical mediators of tissue homeostasis, with tumours distorting this proclivity to stimulate proliferation, angiogenesis and metastasis. This had led to an interest in targeting macrophages in cancer, and preclinical studies have demonstrated efficacy across therapeutic modalities and tumour types. Much of the observed efficacy can be traced to the suppressive capacity of macrophages, driven by microenvironmental cues such as hypoxia and fibrosis. As a result, tumour macrophages display an ability to suppress T cell recruitment and function as well as to regulate other aspects of tumour immunity. With the increasing impact of cancer immunotherapy, macrophage targeting is now being evaluated in this context. Here, we discuss the results of clinical trials and the future of combinatorial immunotherapy

Sections Abstract References Acknowledgements Author information Ethics declarations Additional information Glossary Rights and permissions About this article This article is cited by

Advertisemen

References



-like phenotyr -like phenotyr





CD68+MRP8-14+ M1 macrophages)





Cancer Res 2020;80:4414-25

Spatial Density and Distribution of Tumor-Associated Macrophages Predict Survival in Non-Small Cell Lung Carcinoma

Xiang Zheng¹, Andreas Weigert², Simone Reu³, Stefan Guenther¹, Siavash Mansouri¹, Birgit Bassaly⁴, Stefan Gattenlöhner⁴, Friedrich Grimminger⁵, Soni Savai Pullamsetti^{1,5}, Werner Seeger^{1,5,6}, Hauke Winter⁷, and Rajkumar Savai^{1,5,6,8}





Multiplex staining showed that spatial density and distribution of TAMs are independent predictors of lung cancer survival

Multi-scale models for cancer: integro-partial-differential equations for the spatial distribution of macrophages inside tumours



Multi-scale models for cancer: integro-partial-differential equations for the spatial distribution of macrophages inside tumours



S. Suveq

OPEN ACCI

Re-polarisation of Macrophages Within Collective Tumour Cell Migration: A Multiscale Moving Boundary Approach

Szabolcs Suveges¹, Raluca Eftimie² and Dumitru Trucu^{1*}

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [D^{c}(\mathbf{u}) \nabla c - c \mathbf{A}_{c}(x,t,\mathbf{u},\theta_{f}) + P_{c}(\mathbf{u}) - Q_{c}(\mathbf{u}), \quad (23a)$$

$$\frac{\partial M_{1}}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [D^{M}(\mathbf{u}) \nabla M_{1} - M_{1} \mathbf{A}_{M}(x,t,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{S}_{M_{1}M}) + P_{M_{1}}(\mathbf{u}) - Q_{M_{1}}(\mathbf{u}) - T_{12}(\mathbf{u}) + T_{21}(\mathbf{u}) + M_{I}, \quad (23b)$$

$$\frac{\partial M_{2}}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot [D^{M}(\mathbf{u}) \nabla M_{2} - M_{1} \mathbf{A}_{M}(x,t,\mathbf{u},\mathbf{S}_{M_{2}M}) + P_{M_{2}}(\mathbf{u}) - Q_{M_{2}}(\mathbf{u}) + T_{12}(\mathbf{u}) - T_{21}(\mathbf{u}), \quad (23c)$$

$$\frac{\partial I}{\partial t} = -l(\beta_{Ic}c + \beta_{IM_{1}}M_{1} + \beta_{IM_{2}}M_{2}) + (\gamma_{0} + \gamma_{M_{2}}M_{2})(1 - \rho(\mathbf{u})), \quad (23d)$$

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} = -F(\beta_{Fc}c + \beta_{FM_{1}}M_{1} + \beta_{FM_{2}}M_{2}), \quad (23e)$$

$$0 = D_{\sigma} \Delta \sigma - d_{\sigma}(c + M_{1} + M_{2}), \quad (23f)$$

K(y): kernel for the spatial ranges of cell-cell and cellmatrix interactions S = S + S = -; strength of cell-cell and cell-matrix adhes

 S_{cc} , S_{cl} , S_{cF} ... : strength of cell-cell and cell-matrix adhesive interactions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{c}(x,t,\mathbf{u},\theta_{f}) &:= \frac{1}{R} \underbrace{\mathcal{K}(y)}_{\mathbf{B}(0,R)} n(y) \big(\mathbf{S}_{cc} c(x+y,t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl} l(x+y,t) \\ &+ \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{cM}}_{\mathbf{B}(0,R)} M_{1}(x+y,t) + M_{2}(x+y,t)) \big) \\ &+ \widehat{n}(y,\theta_{f}(x+y,t)) \underbrace{\mathbf{S}_{cF}}_{F} F(x+y,t) \Big[1 - \rho(\mathbf{u}) \Big]^{+}, \end{aligned}$$

/hycaon-local cell-cell and cell-matrix interactions?

Tunneling Nanotubes and Tumor Microtubes in Cancer

Cora Roehlecke ^{1,*} and Mirko H. H. Schmidt ^{1,2,3}

Specialized intercellular communications via cytonemes and nanotubes.

Yukiko M. Yamashita¹, Mayu Inaba², and Michael Buszczak³

Thin, long membrane protrusions:

- Tunneling nanotubes (TNT): up to $100 \ \mu m$
- Cytonemes: up to $700 \ \mu m$
- Average cell diameter: 10-40 μm



$$\mathcal{A}_{c}(x, t, \mathbf{u}, \theta_{f}) := \frac{1}{R} \underbrace{\mathcal{K}(y)}_{\mathbf{B}(0,R)} n(y) \big(\mathbf{S}_{cc} c(x+y, t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl} l(x+y, t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl} l(x+y, t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl} l(x+y, t) \big) \big) \\ + \mathbf{S}_{cM} \big(M_{1}(x+y, t) + M_{2}(x+y, t) \big) \big) \\ + \widehat{n}(y, \theta_{f}(x+y, t)) \mathbf{S}_{cF} F(x+y, t) \big[1 - \rho(\mathbf{u}) \big]^{+}, \\ \mathbf{S}_{cc}(x, t) := \mathbf{S}_{min} + (\mathbf{S}_{max} - \mathbf{S}_{min}) \exp \Big[1 - \frac{1}{1 - (1 - l(x, t))^{2}} \Big]$$

Inverse Interactions?

 T_{\perp}

Tunneling Nanotubes and Tumor Microtubes in Cancer

Specialized intercellular communications via cytonemes and anotubes.

Cora Roehlecke ^{1,*} and Mirko H. H. Schmidt ^{1,2,3}

Yukiko M. Yamashita¹, Mayu Inaba^{21,02} nd Michael Buszczak³

Thin, long membrane protrusions:

- Tunneling nanotubes (TNT): up to $100 \ \mu m$
- Cytonemes: up to $700 \,\mu m$
- Average cell diameter: $10-40 \ \mu m$

Long-distance traction forces:



Physical forces during collective cell migration

Xavier Trepat^{1,2}*, Michael R. Wasserman¹, Thomas E. Angelini³, Emil Millet¹, David A. Weitz³, James P. Butler^{1,4} and Jeffrey J. Fredberg¹*

$$\mathcal{A}_{c}(x,t,\mathbf{u},\theta_{f}) := \frac{1}{R} \underbrace{\mathcal{K}(y)}_{\mathbf{B}(0,R)} n(y) \left(\mathbf{S}_{cc}c(x+y,t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t) \right) + \mathbf{S}_{cM}(M_{1}(x+y,t) + M_{2}(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cM}(M_{1}(x+y,t) + M_{2}(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cM}(M_{1}(x+y,t) + M_{2}(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t)) + \mathbf{S}_{cl}l(x+y,t) + \mathbf{S}_{cl$$



Multi-scale models for cancer: integro-differential equations for the spatial dist inside tumours (& random para













0.12

0.08 2

0.06

0.04 1

0.02

0

00

0.1

macrophages

Re-polarisation of Macrophages Within Collective Tumour Cell **Migration: A Multiscale Moving Boundary Approach**







ECM degraded

Nutrients consumed in the tumour core area

Many parameters & functions need to be estimated from data...

Identification of an unknown function: only for tumour-ECM interactions...

True mutation law (synthetic data)



Reconstructed mutation law (3% noise in measured data)





Inverse problem approaches for mutation laws in heterogeneous tumours with local and nonlocal dynamics

Maher Alwuthaynani¹, Raluca Eftimie² and Dumitru Trucu^{1,*}



Only tumour & ECM:



$$\mathcal{A}_p(x,t,\mathbf{u}(\cdot,t)) := \frac{1}{R} \int_{\mathbf{B}((0,0),R)} n(y) \cdot \mathcal{K}(||y||_2) \cdot g_p(\mathbf{u}(x+y,t),t) \chi_{\Omega}(x+y) dy.$$

• Tikhonov regularization with K=forward operator: minimization of functionals J_{α} to identify the unknown function $m^{c1,c2,\nu}$

$$J_{\alpha}:\mathfrak{M}^{1}\to\mathbb{R},\quad\forall\alpha>0,$$

defined by

$$J_{\alpha}(m) := \left\| K(m) - \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{c}_1^* \\ \tilde{c}_2^* \\ \tilde{v}^* \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2^2 + \alpha \|m\|_2^2, \quad \forall m \in \mathfrak{M}^1.$$

Many more disorders where macrophages play important roles...

Work in progress: keloids, abnormal wounds or benign tumours?

Hypertrophic scars and keloids: Overview of the evidence and practical guide for differentiating between these abnormal scars

Grace C. Limandjaja¹ | Frank B. Niessen² | Rik J. Scheper³ | Susan Gibbs^{1,4}



Abnormal wound healing

- Hypertrophic scars (raised scars)
- hypertrophic scar



keloid scar

 Keloid scars (raised scars that invade the surrounding tissue, beyond the primary injured area)

Nicholas RS, et al. BMJ Case Rep 2014. doi:10.1136/bcr-2014-203600

An important case of misdiagnosis: keloid scar or high-grade soft-tissue sarcoma?

Rebecca Spenser Nicholas,¹ Matthew Stodell²





Figures 1–3 show a lesion on the anterior chest of a 49-year-old woman which was originally misdiag-nosed as a keloid scar.

Work in progress: keloids, abnormal wounds or benign tumours?

Hypertrophic scars and keloids: Overview of the evidence and practical guide for differentiating between these abnormal scars

Grace C. Limandjaja¹ | Frank B. Niessen² | Rik J. Scheper³ | Susan Gibbs^{1,4}



Abnormal wound healing

- Hypertrophic scars (raised scars)
- hypertrophic scar
- Keloid scars (raised scars that invade the surrounding tissue, beyond the primary injured area)

The epigenetics of keloids

keloid scar

Experimental Dermatology. 2021;30:1099–111

Andrew W. Stevenson¹ | Zhenjun Deng¹ | Amira Allahham¹ | Cecilia M. Prêle² Fiona M. Wood^{1,3} | Mark W. Fear^{1,4} $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$ ther models use implantation "Keloid scars are unique to humans, and thus an accurate animal model is not easily available, making studying the disease difficult. Existing models have succeeded in inducing hypertrophic (but not keloid) scar in wild-type and immunedeficient mice, rabbits and red duroc pigs, but although similar in appearance to keloids, they don't grow beyond the wound boundary. "



Mark W. Fear^{1,4} "Other models use implantation of human keloid scar or tissue-engineered keloid cells on immunedeficient mice. While these models have found success in replicating a 'keloid-like' wound that grows beyond the wound boundary, there are inherent issues. Firstly, with immune-deficient mice, the role of the immune system in keloids cannot be explored ..."

Single-scale models for wound healing: normal vs abnormal wounds & tumours



G. Rolin

- Growth factor (TGF β): $\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = D_g \Delta g + F_g(f,m)$
- Fibroblasts: $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left(D_f \nabla f \mu_f f A_f[g, f, m, e] \right) + F_f(g, f, m, e)$

• Macrophages:
$$\frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_m \nabla m - \mu_m m A_m[g, f, m, e]) + F_m(g, f, m, e)$$

• ECM (collagen):
$$\frac{\partial e}{\partial t} = F_e(g, f, m, e)$$

Nonlocal flux due to adhesive cell-cell & cell-matrix interactions:

 $A_{f,m}[g, f, m, e] = \frac{1}{R} \int_{B(0, R)} K(||y||_2) \iota(y) (1 - \rho(u))^{+} \Gamma_{f,m}(x + y, t) dy$

Research article

Mathematical investigation of normal and abnormal wound healing dynamics: local and non-local models

O. E. Adebayo¹, S. Urcun², G. Rolin^{3,4}, S. P. A. Bordas², D. Trucu⁵ and R. Eftimie^{1,5,*}

- Focus on the role of inflammation : macrophages & TGF β
- **Biomechanical forces:** considered implicitly through nonlocal flux terms for cell-cell and cell-ECM adhesion (same as for solid tumours)

$$\mathbf{K}(\|\mathbf{y}\|_{2}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{y}\|_{2}}{2\pi\sigma^{2}} e^{-\|\mathbf{y}\|_{2}^{2}/2\sigma^{2}}$$



Single-scale models for wound healing: normal vs abnormal wounds & tumours



G. Rolin

- Growth factor (TGF β): $\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = D_g \Delta g + F_g(f,m)$ Ο
- Fibroblasts: $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot \left(D_f \nabla f \mu_f f A_f[g, f, m, e] \right) + F_f(g, f, m, e)$ 0
- Macrophages: $\frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_m \nabla m \mu_m m A_m[g, f, m, e]) +$ 0 $F_m(g, f, m, e)$

• ECM (collagen):
$$\frac{\partial e}{\partial t} = F_e(g, f, m, e)$$

Nonlocal flux due to adhesive cell-cell & cell-matrix interactions:

$$A_{f,m}[g,f,m,e] = \frac{1}{R} \int_{B(0,R)} K\left(||y||_2 \right) n(y) (1 - \rho(u))^+ \Gamma_{f,m}(x+y,t) dy$$

Research article

Mathematical investigation of normal and abnormal wound healing dynamics: local and non-local models

O. E. Adebayo¹, S. Urcun², G. Rolin^{3,4}, S. P. A. Bordas², D. Trucu⁵ and R. Eftimie^{1,5,*}

Normal wound healing:





ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION OF A NON-LOCAL MATHEMATICAL MODEL FOR NORMAL AND ABNORMAL WOUND HEALING

 $4 \Rightarrow$

Single-scale models for wound healing: normal vs abnormal wounds & tumours



Abnormal wound healing: hypertrophic scars/keloids (high fibroblast densities in the wound area @t=20)



- Growth factor (TGF β): $\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = D_g \Delta g + F_g(f,m)$
- Fibroblasts: $\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_f \nabla f \mu_f f A_f[g, f, m, e])) + F_f(g, f, m, e)$
- Macrophages: $\frac{\partial m}{\partial t} = \nabla \cdot (D_m \nabla m \mu_m m A_m[g, f, m, e])$

100-

80

20

 $K_1(z) = \frac{1}{2L}$

0.5 0.5

Ó

- ECM (collagen): $\frac{\partial e}{\partial t} = F_e(g, f, m, e)$
- Nonlocal flux due to adhesive cell-cell & cell matrix interactions:

 $A_{f,m}[g,f,m,e] = \frac{1}{R} \int_{B(0,R)} K\left(\left|\left|y\right|\right|_{2}\right) n(y) \left(1 + y,t\right) dy$



Summary and open questions:

- Building models in steps (single-scale =>multi-scale) to address various questions related to complex biological interactions
- Local/Non-local spatial interactions between TAMs & tumour cells (& other types of cells) seem to be important
- Spatial data is being generated and can be used for model parametrization
 - Dynamic spatio-temporal changes in cells distributions and their phenotype (=>their functionality) => spatio-temporal data available...?

Cancer Cell

Perspective

A temporal perspective for tumor-associated macrophage identities and functions

Camille Blériot,^{1,2} Garett Dunsmore,¹ Direna Alonso-Curbelo,^{3,*} and Florent Ginhoux^{1,4,5,6,*}

Cancer Cell 42, May 13, 2024

"Clinical observations and experimental systems support that their heterogeneity, plasticity, and pleiotropic functions are influenced by multiple parameters, including ontogeny, spatial context, and several temporal determinants -- from macrophage individual experience and lifespan to the organism's age and exposome. Herein, we propose to integrate the dimension of time into the current framework to better understand the roles of macrophages interconnecting inflammation and cancer and their dynamism within developing and evolving tumoral niches."

Summary and open questions:

- Building models in steps (single-scale =>multi-scale) to address various questions related to complex biological interactions
- Local/Non-local spatial interactions between TAMs & tumour cells (& other types of cells) seem to be important
- Spatial data is being generated and can be used for model parametrization
- Dynamic spatio-temporal changes in cells distributions and their phenotype (=>their functionality) => spatio-temporal data available...?
 Cancer Cell

Perspective

A temporal perspective for tumor-associated macrophage identities and functions

Camille Blériot,^{1,2} Garett Dunsmore,¹ Direna Alonso-Curbelo,^{3,*} and Florent Ginhoux^{1,4,5,6,*}

Cancer Cell 42, May 13, 2024

$$A_{f,m}[g, f, m, e](\mathbf{x}, t) = \frac{1}{R} \int_{\mathbf{B}(0,R)} \mathbf{K}(||\mathbf{y}||_2) \mathbf{n}(\mathbf{y})(1 - \rho(u))^{+} \mathbf{\Gamma}_{f,m}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, t) \, \mathrm{d}\mathbf{y}.$$
$$\mathbf{\Gamma}_{f}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, t) := \mathbf{S}_{ff} f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, t) + \mathbf{S}_{fm} m(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, t) + \mathbf{S}_{fe} e(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}, t)$$
$$\mathbf{S}_{j} := \mathbf{S}_{j}^{\max} \frac{e + g}{1 + e + g}, \quad j \in \{ff, fm, mm, mf, fe, me\}.$$

Summary and open questions:

 New mathematical/computational approaches need to be developed for estimating parameters & functions/functionals in multi-scale local/nonlocal models ...

Quantifying tissue growth, shape and collision via continuum models and Bayesian inference

Carles Falcó¹, Daniel J. Cohen^{2,3}, José A. Carrillo¹ and Ruth E. Baker¹

Bayesian Parameter Identification for Turing Systems on Stationary and Evolving Domains

Eduard Campillo-Funollet¹ · Chandrasekhar Venkataraman¹ Anotida Madzvamuse¹

 $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_{\infty}(\Psi) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{0}^{T} \int_{\mathbb{T}^{d}} \|\nabla \Psi * \rho - \nabla W * \rho\|^{2} \rho(t, \boldsymbol{x}) \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{x} \mathrm{d}t$

data

Variational

with

(2024 ArXiV preprint)

Sparse identification of nonlocal interaction kernels in nonlinear gradient flow equations via partial inversion

José A. Carrillo¹, Gissell Estrada-Rodriguez², László Mikolás¹ and Sui Tang³

Thank you !

Everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler.



• Chrysalides (UBFC; 2022)

0

0

