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1. Introduction

Wnt signalling is a conserved biochemical cell-to-cell signalling pathway controlling embryonic development, stem cell biology and disease, such as cancer (Nusse et al., 2013; Hoppler and Moon, 2014; Nusse and Clevers, 2017). The best understood branch of Wnt signalling, canonical or Wnt/β-catenin signalling, functions to control downstream gene expression (Hoppler and Nakamura, 2014). During embryonic development, Wnt signalling regulates key processes, such as pluripotency, embryonic axis and germ layer induction, cell proliferation and differentiation (Nusse et al., 2013; Hoppler and Moon, 2014).

Using Xenopus as an experimental model organism, two sources of Wnt/β-catenin signalling were identified in early vertebrate embryos (Hoppler and Kühl, 2022): before the onset of zygotic gene expression, also called Zygotic Gene Activation (ZGA), maternal Wnt signalling induces a dorsal axis; and then after the onset of zygotic gene expression, zygotic Wnt8 signalling promotes ventral and lateral mesoderm development; thus suggesting that we might also expect just two corresponding classes of direct Wnt target genes (Hamilton et al., 2001; Zykiewicz et al., 2014; Hikasa and Sokol, 2013). Molecular identification of direct Wnt/β-catenin target genes in recent transcriptomics and genomics studies (Nakamura et al., 2016; Nakamura and Hoppler, 2017; Afouda et al., 2020), however, reveals considerable complexity among Wnt target genes in early development; partly due to co-regulation by other signalling pathways, such as nodal, BMP and Wnt/β-catenin signalling (Nakamura et al., 2016; Afouda et al., 2020).

Based on these studies a useful definition of five classes of direct Wnt target genes can be proposed: two classes of direct maternal Wnt/β-catenin target genes, both of which are co-regulated by Nodal signalling, but with one class (e.g. siamois) expressed before the other (e.g. goosecoid) (Afouda et al., 2020). A third class of apparently ubiquitous Wnt target genes is regulated by maternal and zygotic Wnt signalling (e.g. axin2) (Nakamura et al., 2016; Afouda et al., 2020). As well as regulating this third class, zygotic wnt8a/β-catenin signalling also directly regulates at least two further classes of target genes (Nakamura et al., 2016); a fourth class is co-regulated by zygotic BMP signalling (e.g. msx1) and a fifth class is co-regulated by zygotic FGF signalling (e.g. cdx2).

Functional experiments have also revealed cross- and feedback regulation in this system (Afouda et al., 2020): among the maternal Wnt/β-catenin target genes, gene products of the first class (e.g. SIAMOIS, NODAL) are required for expression of genes of the second class in a coherent feed forward loop (Afouda et al., 2020; Mangan and Alon, 2003), recently reviewed by Cho and Blitz (2022). Some gene products of this second class of maternal Wnt/β-catenin target genes are known to negatively regulate zygotic wnt8a/β-catenin signalling (e.g. FRZB (Wang et al., 1997)) or BMP signalling (e.g. CHD, chordin Piccolo et al., 1996), which will have consequences for the expression of Wnt target genes of the fourth and fifth class. Some gene products of the third class (i.e. AXIN2) regulate the Wnt/β-catenin pathway in a negative feedback loop (Lee et al., 2003). The complete Gene Regulatory Network model inferred from previous experimental findings (Nakamura et al., 2016;
be simplified by introducing artificial constructs - ''super-genes''. This approach facilitates the understanding of the model without losing key information. However, while the key features of the biological system are easily reproduced in our mathematical model, it also shows the need for further experiments to elucidate the expression dynamics of certain genes, even suggesting the existence of more classes than those five currently proposed.

2. Materials and methods

The model outline was first drawn using BioTapestry (Paquette et al., 2016). In a further step, to describe the dynamics of each gene expression and function in our model we construct an ODE with a production and degradation term for each gene product. The production term includes regulation of gene expression by other components in the Gene Regulatory Network and incorporates Hill/Michaelis–Menten kinetics. Although normally used to represent enzyme kinetics, Hill/Michaelis–Menten kinetics can be adopted to model gene regulation and expression to assess the saturating effect of each reaction between the components in the gene regulatory network, and is different for activators and repressors (Saka, 2012; Blossey and Giuraniuc, 2008; Russo et al., 2009).

Gene expression of the nodal gene is regulated by maternal Nodal-like TGFβ protein (autoregulation) and also by β-catenin while being repressed by LEFTY (Eq. (1)). A similar gene expression equation can be written for siamois (Eq. (2)). Note that in order to account for differences in chromatin accessibility during the maternal and zygotic phase (Nakamura et al., 2016; Afouda et al., 2020), in the model the rate constants for NODAL and SIAMOIS are time dependent, modelled as logistic sigmoid functions \( k_{\text{Ma}}(t) = 1-\text{e}^{(t-10)} \) and \( k_{\text{Ma}}(t) = \text{e}^{(t-10)} \).

The dynamics of FRZB, GOOSECoid, CHORDIN and LEFTY are also similar, all being positively regulated by β-catenin, NODAL and GOOSECoid (Eqs. (3)–(6)). Eq. (16) corresponds to AXIN2 production from the axin2 gene, which is regulated only by β-catenin. Eq. (17) represents the production of nuclear β-catenin, whose production is regulated by WNT8a, and inhibited by AXIN2. Note that this is actually an approximation, to keep it in line with the modelling of the other variables. In reality β-catenin is constantly and ubiquitously produced and degraded, but degradation is inhibited by WNT8a, and AXIN2 reinstates degradation of β-catenin, in other words WNT8a represses the degradation, while AXIN promotes the degradation (Hoppler and Nakamura, 2014).

Eq. (18) corresponds to the production of BMP, which is inhibited by CHORDIN but also degraded. Eq. (19) is similar to Eq. (18), except WNT8a is inhibited by FRZB. The Eq. (20) is for FGF production and it simply includes constant production and degradation terms, because in our model of the gene regulatory network (Fig. 1), the protein is simply produced from the FGF signalling pathway. Again, note that the rate constants for BMP, WNT8a and FGF are again time dependent to account for differences in chromatin accessibility during the maternal and zygotic phase (Nakamura et al., 2016; Afouda et al., 2020).

Eq. (21) represents the production of MSX1 co-regulated by β-catenin and BMP signalling while the final equation, (22), represents the production of CDX2, which is co-regulated by β-catenin and FGF signalling.

\[
\begin{align*}
NO^i(t) &= k_{\text{Ma}} NO^{ih} + k_{\text{Ma}} BC1^{ih} NO(t) + BC1(t) + E(t) + 1 - \gamma_1 NO(t) \\
S^i(t) &= k_{\text{Ma}} NO^{ih} + k_{\text{Ma}} BC1^{ih} NO(t) + BC1(t) + E(t) + 1 - \gamma_2 S(t) \\
F^i(t) &= k_{\text{Ma}} BC1(t) + k_{\text{Ma}} NO^{ih} + k_{\text{Ma}} GSC(t) BC1(t) + NO(t) + GSC(t) + 1 - \gamma_3 F(t) \\
CH^i(t) &= k_{\text{Ma}} BC1(t) + k_{\text{Ma}} NO^{ih} + k_{\text{Ma}} GSC(t) BC1(t) + NO(t) + GSC(t) + 1 - \gamma_3 CH(t) \\
GSC^i(t) &= k_{\text{Ma}} BC1(t) + k_{\text{Ma}} NO^{ih} + k_{\text{Ma}} GSC(t) BC1(t) + NO(t) + GSC(t) + 1 - \gamma_3 GSC(t)
\end{align*}
\]
Considering only one “super-gene” per class leads to the network represented in Fig. 4 and the following simplified system of ODEs:

\[ N S(t) = k_{1k} M A N S(t)^h + k_{2k} M S N(t)^h + k_{3} S S(t)^h \]
\[ FCGL(t) = k_{4} S C(t)^h + k_{5} S N(t)^h + k_{6} FCGL(t)^h \]

We focus on the Gene Regulatory Network (GRN) architecture and as such we choose arbitrary values for the parameters, since it has been shown that in Wnt signalling, fold-change is important rather than absolute values (Goentoro and Kirschner, 2009). However we consider that the effect of β-catenin is subtle, thus the corresponding rate constants are smaller than the others, consistent with biochemical findings (Hoppler and Nakamura, 2014). We also assume that β-catenin is more unstable than the other proteins, resulting in the following set of parameters: 
\[ k_1 = k_3 = k_5 = k_7 = k_{10} = k_{12} = k_{13} = k_{15} = k_{16} = k_{18} = k_{19} = k_{20} = k_{22} = 1, k_2 = k_4 = k_8 = k_{11} = k_{14} = k_{17} = k_{21} = 0.1, k_6 = 1, h = 1.8 \]

Our assumptions for parameter values are in agreement with existing literature, in both the rate constants being generally of the same order of magnitude and β-catenin having a subtle effect combined with a high degradation rate (Lee et al., 2003; Peshkin et al., 2015; de Man et al., 2021).

We consider first the ventral tissue, in which the initial concentrations for NODAL and β-CATENIN are set to 0 (Fig. 2).

For modelling dorsal tissue, the initial concentrations for NODAL is very small while β-CATENIN is set to high (Fig. 3).

The results are in agreement with the experimental findings (Nakamura et al., 2016; Afouda et al., 2020), however one can also easily observe in Figs. 2 and 3 that the dynamics of genes belonging to the same class is very similar and it is very difficult to distinguish them. The model is unnecessarily complex hence we explored whether we could simplify it (see Figs. 5 and 6).

3.1. Simplified model with artificial conglomerate “super-genes”

Considering only one “super-gene” per class leads to the network represented in Fig. 4 and the following simplified system of ODEs:

\[ L(t) = k_{14} B C(t)^h + k_{15} N O(t)^h + k_{16} G S C(t)^h \]
\[ B C(t)^h + N O(t)^h + G S C(t)^h + 1 - \gamma_L L(t) \] (6)
\[ A'(t) = \frac{k_{17} B C(t)^h}{B C(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_A A(t) \] (7)
\[ B C_1(t) = \frac{k_{19} W N(t)^h}{A(t)^h + W N(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_B B C_1(t) \] (8)
\[ B M'(t) = \frac{k_{19} Z Y(t)^h}{B R(t)^h + C F(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_B B M(t) \] (9)
\[ W N'(t) = \frac{k_{20} Z Y(t)^h}{F(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_W W N(t) \] (10)
\[ F F'(t) = k_{21} Z Y(t)^h - \gamma_F F(t) \] (11)
\[ M'(t) = \frac{k_{22} B C(t)^h + k_{23} B M(t)^h}{B C(t)^h + B M(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_M M(t) \] (12)
\[ C D X'(t) = \frac{k_{24} B C(t)^h + k_{25} F F(t)^h}{B C(t)^h + F F(t)^h + 1} - \gamma_C C D X(t) \] (13)
As a result of increasing the amount of our "NS" gene products, GOOSECOID and LEFTY in a coherent feed-forward regulatory loop, these genes co-regulate the production of Spemann organiser genes products (from Class II Wnt target genes), FRZB, CHORDIN, and time are arbitrary. Note that the modelling results in simulated high expression of msx1 and cdx.

3.2. Over-expression and suppression of genes

We also studied the predictions of our model in the case of experiments involving over-expression or knock-down of genes. The use of mathematical modelling enables us to study the effect of over-activation of a gene by changing the starting value of its corresponding product, mimicking the actual experimental procedure. Similarly, the knock-down of genes can be modelled by setting the corresponding rate constants to zero. This allows us to probe the dynamics of the GRN and observe the effects that changing the amount of available protein product (or several proteins, if desired) has on the other constituents in the system. Keeping the initial concentration of "FCGL" to 0, the modelling results confirm the correctness of the conclusions in Afouda et al. (2020) based on the experimental inhibition of siamois and rescue (Fig. 3 in the above cited paper) as well as inhibition of nodal/TGF-β signalling (Fig. 4 K+L, ibid.).

In the next step we modelled the knock-down of Class II genes. In spite of keeping the initial values of both β-CATENIN and NS high, the result is similar to ventral tissue (Fig. 8).

Contrarily, when the initial concentration of "FCGL" is set to 1, although we start from NS and β-CATENIN at 0, the modelling essentially simulates a dorsal response with high expression of the FrzB/Chordin/Goosecoid/Lefty "super gene". This "dorsalizing effect" of the Class II genes has been documented previously (Sasai et al., 1994; De Robertis et al., 2001) (see Fig. 9).

Experimental over-activation of BMP, by starting from initial concentration 1, also suffices for the generation of a dorsal response, although some expression of msx1 is present. The equivalent experiment had been performed by Nakamura et al. (2016) and results similar to ours are presented in their Fig. 5 A (see Fig. 10).

However, a high initial FGF level results only in a mixed response, with high expression of the FrzB/Chordin/Goosecoid/Lefty "super gene" and cdx. High expression of cdx when FGF is over-expressed had been observed experimentally by Keenan et al. see Fig. 2C in Keenan et al. (2006) (see Fig. 11).

4. Discussion

Molecular identification of direct target genes of Wnt/β-catenin signalling (Afouda et al., 2020; Nakamura et al., 2016) suggests a useful definition of five classes of such Wnt target genes in early Xenopus development, which additionally regulate each other (as illustrated in Fig. 1). In order to test the logic and possible dynamics of this proposed
Fig. 7. Simulation of the over-expression of NS by setting initial NS concentration to 1 while keeping initial $\beta$-CATENIN at 0. Note that the modelling results in simulated high expression of the FrzB/Chordin/Goosecoid/Lefty “super gene”.

Fig. 8. Simulation of the knock-down of Class II genes by setting $k_5 = k_6 = k_7 = 0$ with high initial NS and $\beta$-CATENIN concentration.

Fig. 9. Simulation of the experimental over-activation of Class II genes by setting initial “FCGL” concentration to 1 while keeping initial NS and $\beta$-CATENIN at 0. Note the high level of FCGL product.

Fig. 10. Simulation of the experimental over-activation of BMP by setting its initial concentration to 1 with initial NODAL and $\beta$-CATENIN at 1. Note that modelling essentially simulates a dorsal response with high expression of the FrzB/Chordin/Goosecoid/Lefty “super gene” despite some expression of $msx1$.

Gene Regulatory Network (GRN) architecture, we created a mathematical model to describe and simulate this network. We initially picked one or two genes from each target class of Wnt genes. $siamois$ and $nodal$ were picked from class I. $frzb$, $chordin$, $goosecoid$ and $lefty$ were picked from class II and were referred to as the organiser genes, as they were involved in the induction of the Spemann organiser (De Robertis et al., 2001). $axin2$ was chosen to represent the third class of genes. $msx1$ represents the fourth class of genes (these were co-regulated by...
BMP signalling) and hoxb1 was chosen for the fifth class of target Wnt genes (this was co-regulated by FGF signalling). A gene regulatory network (Fig. 1) was then created to represent these genes and their respective proteins and their proposed interactions with each other and their involvement in the canonical Wnt/β-catenin signalling pathway, as suggested by the previous experiments. The context-specific mechanism, including co-regulation by nodal/TGFβ/activin/Vg1, BMP and FGF signalling (Nakamura et al., 2016) was also a very important aspect of our model and this was incorporated into the gene regulatory network; maternal Wnt/β-catenin signalling regulated the class I, II and III genes, whereas after Zygotic Gene Activation, the zygotic Wnt8A/β-catenin signalling regulated class III, class IV and class V genes. Note that the current proposed Gene Regulatory Network is based on experiments providing snapshots of analysis of direct Wnt target genes at ZGA (Afouda et al., 2020) and gastrulation (Nakamura et al., 2016). Analysis at other stages could suggest additional classes of direct Wnt target genes thus future research may well uncover further distinct classes of Wnt/β-catenin target genes in early Xenopus development. It should be noted that only a limited number of genes from each class of Wnt target genes was included in the gene regulatory network. Many components were missing so as not to make it unnecessarily complicated which would defeat the point of mathematically modelling this system to simplify and enhance our understanding. We anticipated that further model reduction would help us understand the new concept of five classes of Wnt target genes in a context-specific framework and it would help us create a model which is easy to understand without losing the overall understanding of the dynamics of the biology. Model reduction was achieved by excluding certain components of the gene regulatory network, excluding the separate steps of transcription and translation of genes, and the stabilisation of β-catenin (including the canonical Wnt signalling pathway destruction complex). We have therefore also followed the assumption of all gene regulation occurring at the transcriptional level and therefore ignoring here additional potential regulatory steps at the level of RNA processing or translation.

Our model displays bistability — the system we have modelled has two states, i.e., dorsal and ventral. We first need to look into how the dorsal and ventral mesoderm is established in a Xenopus embryo. The unfertilised egg has an animal and vegetal pole (where the biological system.

The unfertilised egg has an animal and vegetal pole (where the nodal/TGFβ-related VegT mRNA and also dorsal determinants are co-localised) and is therefore cylindrically symmetrical. This symmetry is broken post-fertilisation as when the sperm enters the egg, cortical rotation is initiated, and the dorsal determinants (namely β-catenin activators) are shifted to the prospective dorsal side of the embryo (Zylikiewicz et al., 2014).

The nodal gene is activated in a higher level on the dorsal side than the ventral side of the embryo, but this still means that some nodal protein is produced everywhere, but in varying amounts depending on the region. Where this overlap is strongest between β-catenin and nodal is where the promoters of the organiser genes are activated, which results in accumulation of gene products of the organiser genes in the dorsal region (which in our model alludes to FzbB, chordin, goosecoid and lefty). Essentially, the synergistic relationship between nodal and β-catenin leads to organiser formation (Xanthos et al., 2002). This relationship is reflected in our model, such that in the dorsal response, β-catenin and nodal were set to initial conditions of 100 (see Results section). However, in the ventral response, β-catenin was set to a value of zero (see Results section). Our model assumes that the gene expression pattern (i.e., high initial β-catenin for the dorsal response, and low initial β-catenin concentration for the ventral response) supports binary cell fates – either dorsal or ventral – but in biological reality, this is not completely stable. As time progresses, permissive induction is important and further signals specify an already dorsal or ventral cell fate to complete its differentiation into, for example, the notochord. Our model therefore only considers the initial binary-like dorsoventral mesoderm gene expression, but a more elaborate model may in the future consider the later more dynamic gene expression regulating dorsoventral axis induction in Xenopus. For example, the 5th class gene hoxb1 is more specifically expressed in the ventral tissue compared to its classmate cdx (Nakamura et al., 2016) in our current model, suggesting additional regulatory mechanisms, which need further experiments to inform building of an improved model.

With our model we are able to observe the dynamics of the system based on interactions between the components in our gene regulatory network. With the system concerned here, qualitative information is more advantageous than quantitative information.

The software we chose, Mathematica, to simulate our system of ODEs, was particularly useful with the Manipulate function (see Materials and Methods), since we were able to see the effects of increasing or decreasing production rate constants on the production of components in the system instantly, which allowed us to make observations, predictions and highlight possible inconsistencies within our model.

The model here, as with any other model representing a biological system, was based on a set of simplifying assumptions. Although this may initially appear disadvantageous, this should be viewed as a strength instead (Ganusov, 2016). Since no assumptions were made for the exact values of the parameters, the predictions were compared to what is currently known, allowing identification of consistencies and inconsistencies with the current knowledge. A recurring and justified criticism of mathematical modelling of biological processes is the overfitting of a model with too many parameters. The fabled von Neumann’s elephant can be fitted with four parameters and the fifth makes it wiggle its trunk, as proven relatively recently, more than half a century after it was stated (Mayer et al., 2010). Note however that by imposing the rate constants of different processes to have the same value we effectively reduce the number of parameters in our model from 39 to only 5. Also our results remain valid for arbitrary variations of up to 50% in the values of these parameters. This is one of the great advantages of mathematical modelling, as it can provide insight into biological systems even where exact values of the biological parameters are difficult or currently impossible to determine, and propose experiments that can be carried out to further our understanding of the biological system.
5. Conclusion and perspectives

The model created here is the first attempt at mathematical modeling of the five classes of direct Wnt target genes recently proposed in early embryonic development (Afouda et al., 2020). It displays clear interactions of each class, providing a platform for further research in the future.
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