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SUMMARY

Signaling networks are nonlinear and complex, involving a large ensemble of dynamic interaction states that fluctuate in space and time. However, therapeutic strategies, such as combination chemotherapy, rarely consider the timing of drug perturbations. If we are to advance drug discovery for complex diseases, it will be essential to develop methods capable of identifying dynamic cellular responses to clinically relevant perturbations. Here, we present a Bayesian dose-response framework and the screening of an oncological drug matrix, comprising 10,000 drug combinations in melanoma and pancreatic cancer cell lines, from which we predict sequentially effective drug combinations. Approximately 23% of the tested combinations showed high-confidence sequential effects (either synergistic or antagonistic), demonstrating that cellular perturbations of many drug combinations have temporal aspects, which are currently both underutilized and poorly understood.

INTRODUCTION

Combination therapies naturally extend the possible cellular perturbations that can be applied as treatment for diseased cells. It is known that the coordination of multiple drugs acting synergistically can improve therapeutic specificity (Lehár et al., 2009) and, for cancer, can increase the effectiveness of chemotherapy (DeVita et al., 1975; Chabner and Roberts, 2005). Thus, it is becoming increasingly evident that more complex treatment strategies will be required in order to remedy complex diseases and, in particular, to improve patient specificity.

Recently, several studies have reported time dependency of drug combinations—also known as schedule dependency, time staggering, sequence dependency, or simply sequential treatment. For example, erlotinib treatment in triple-negative breast cancer models has been shown to rewire an apoptosis-related signaling network, introducing a vulnerability to DNA damage by doxorubicin (Lee et al., 2012). In addition to time-dependent synergy, it has been shown that transient chemoresistance in breast cancer cells can be overcome by sequential treatment with taxanes followed by SFK/Hck inhibition (Goldman et al., 2015). Concurrent with these observations, nanoparticle delivery systems have been developed that provide the practical means for delivering small-molecule perturbations sequentially (Sengupta et al., 2005; Morton et al., 2014). Altogether, these provide compelling examples of how cellular dynamics can be exploited to increase cancer specificity, understand drug mechanisms, and overcome drug resistance.

Prior experiments assessing time dependency of anti-cancer drug combinations have typically been restricted to a small subset of drugs, timings, and cancer types. While hypothesis and candidate approaches can be useful systematic, high-throughput screening strategies provide a complimentary and unbiased approach for identifying combinatorial candidates (Al-Lazikani et al., 2012). To this end, we report a systematic cell-imaging screen and global Bayesian analysis of 10,000 sequential combinations of 100 United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved anti-cancer therapies in two cancer cell lines of melanoma and pancreatic origin. To assess cell-line specificity, we tested a subset of combinations in 4 additional pancreatic cancer cell lines. This represents the largest such screen to date, providing a collection of candidate combinations, along with experimental and analytical precedents for carrying out similar screens in other contexts.

RESULTS

Quantification of Cell Number following Treatment with Sequential Drug Combinations

Time-dependent synergy or antagonism can be viewed as sequential manipulations of cellular attractor states (Figure 1A). By measuring changes in cell number, we aimed to identify sequential drug combinations eliciting cytotoxic or proliferative
A375 (malignant melanoma) and PANC1 (pancreatic adenocarcinoma) cells were treated with the 100 drugs that constitute the Approved Oncology Drug Set IV (Developmental Therapeutics Program, National Cancer Institute). Cells were exposed to single drugs in an 8-point dose-response curve. In separate experiments, cells were also exposed to sequential drug combinations where the first drug ($\alpha$) was given at a single dose and the second drug ($\beta$) was given 24 hr later in a 4-point dose-response curve. Cell nuclei were then stained with Hoechst 33342 and imaged on the PerkinElmer Opera High-Content Screening System. Nuclei were quantified using the Acapella image analysis software (Figure 1B). Thus, for each of the 10,000 possible drug combinations, nuclei counts were measured after single-dose drug exposure ($\alpha_0$, $\alpha\beta$, $\beta\alpha$, and $\beta\beta$) and sequential combination in both orders ($\alpha\beta$ and $\beta\alpha$) (Figure 1C). While simultaneous treatments were not directly measured, and thus cannot be definitively excluded, it is likely that order-specific observations ($\alpha\beta$ versus $\beta\alpha$) have some time dependency. All measurements were performed in triplicate, generating, in total, approximately 250,000 data points. These data represent an initial sparse screen, from which we selected 193 combinations with high synergy for validation experiments.

**Global Bayesian Model of Pretreated Dose-Response Curves**

To detect sequential effects of drug combinations, we took a global, probabilistic approach for modeling dose-response curves. First, the effects of sequential drug treatments were assumed to be Bliss independent (Al-Lazikani et al., 2012; Fouquier and Guedj, 2015), with a residual effect from the first drug, capturing delays in the effect on nuclei numbers (Figure 2A). This amounted to a 3-factor model capable of modeling both the single and combinatorial experiments. We then introduced the possibility for the combinatorial response curves of the second drug to deviate from the baseline response, which we used to define a synergy measure (Figure 1B). In total, the model consisted of 45,000 parameters, where inferential dependencies can be expressed as a Bayesian network (Figure S1A). We also assumed prior distributions for all parameters, which improved fitting convergence while avoiding overfitting. Finally, we modeled probability distributions over all parameters given both single and combinatorial drug experiments using Bayes’s theorem.

Posterior probability distributions of the parameters were fitted using a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm—a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method, which was run for 500,000 iterations with a burn-in period of 100,000 iterations and a 1/200 sample rate. Hence, each parameter fit consisted of 2,000 samples representing the uncertainty and posterior probabilities given all relevant nuclei count data. An example fit showing convergent parameter estimates is shown in Figure S1B. Based on this, we defined a “synergy measure” representing the average difference between the baseline and effective dose-response curve, where positive values indicated synergistic interactions between drugs, and negative values indicated an antagonistic interaction (Figure 2B). The global nature and integrative structure of the model facilitated the testing of multiple hypotheses simultaneously. As such, each of the 10,100 dose-response curves could be viewed in the context of a subset of relevant data and parameters. This facilitated the drawing of cross-inferences, handled automatically through Bayes’s theorem. For example, Figure 2C illustrates the average posterior fits following
treatment of A375 cells with lomustine alone and amifostine followed by lomustine. The model utilized a combination of data from single-drug and combinatorial treatments to fit the baseline dose-response curves. In this way, the inherent biological and technical variations inherent in the assay were taken into account, resulting in more conservative estimates of sequential effects; in this case, that amifostine pretreatment was synergistic with lomustine.

**Sequential Effects Are Mostly Time-Dependent and Cell-Line-Specific**

The global dose-response model identified 1,258 synergistic drug combinations (p < 0.05; 551 in PANC1 and 707 in A375) and 3,309 antagonistic combinations (p < 0.05; 1,464 in PANC1 and 1,845 in A375); in total, approximately 23% of all combinations tested (Figures 2D and S2). The temporal synergy measures of PANC1 and A375 were weakly correlated (r = 0.19, Pearson’s correlation), with the majority of the correlation measures of PANC1 and A375 were weakly correlated (r = 0.19, Pearson’s correlation; Figure S3C). While PANC1 was more correlated to the other pancreatic cancer cell lines than it was to A375, Capan1 and AsPC-1 were even more highly correlated (r = 0.74), as were DAN-G and BXPC3 (r = 0.81). There does not appear to be an obvious genomic explanation for these observations; however, DAN-G and BXPC3 had similar growth characteristics in this screen, proliferating significantly faster than Capan-1 and AsPC-1 (doubling times of 1 to 2 days for DAN-G and BXPC3 versus 2 to 3 days for Capan-1 and AsPC-1). These observations suggest that cell lines broadly respond differently to sequential treatment, yet some drug-driven network state changes may be conserved between cells of similar phenotype. Further investigations in more, well-characterized cell lines would be required to determine whether this observation has clinical relevance, yet it may suggest a potential role for patient-derived xenograph models in order to identify patient-specific temporal combinations.

To better assess the cell-line specificity of the sequential effects, we screened a subset of 193 drug combinations in four pancreatic cancer cell lines: AsPC-1, BXPC3, Capan1, and DAN-G (Figures S3A and S3B). The majority of the concurrent drug interactions were, again, found in the antagonistic domain; overall, the correlations with PANC1 were higher than for the melanoma cell line, ranging from r = 0.50 to r = 0.67 (Pearson’s correlation; Figure S3C). While PANC1 was more correlated to the other pancreatic cancer cell lines than it was to A375, Capan1 and AsPC-1 were even more highly correlated (r = 0.74), as were DAN-G and BXPC3 (r = 0.81). There does not appear to be an obvious genomic explanation for these observations; however, DAN-G and BXPC3 had similar growth characteristics in this screen, proliferating significantly faster than Capan-1 and AsPC-1 (doubling times of 1 to 1.5 days for DAN-G and BXPC3 versus 2 to 3 days for Capan-1 and AsPC-1). These observations suggest that cell lines broadly respond differently to sequential treatment, yet some drug-driven network state changes may be conserved between cells of similar phenotype. Further investigations in more, well-characterized cell lines would be required to determine whether this observation has clinical relevance, yet it may suggest a potential role for patient-derived xenograph models in order to identify patient-specific temporal combinations.

We also compared reversed treatments in each cell line (e.g., αβ versus βα) in order to discern whether the identified sequential effects were time-dependent. For all reversed...
combinations, synergy measures were only weakly correlated for both A375 ($r = 0.25$) and PANC1 ($r = 0.23$), concordant with widespread time dependency of sequential drug combinations.

Iterative Model Improvement and Validation Increase the Discovery Rate

Model-based experimentation is known to increase the search efficiency for combinatorial treatments; by first performing a sparse screen and then conducting additional experiments in selected regions, positive results are more likely to be found (Creixell et al., 2012; Janes and Yaffe, 2006). Accordingly, based on preliminary model predictions of highly synergistic and antagonistic drug combinations, we carried out validation experiments for 192 drug combinations in each cell line where the first drug was given at a single dose and the second drug was given 24 hr later in 5-point dose response. Overall, we found the model predictions to be reproducible (Figure S4A), even though the selected top combinations represent a worst-case validation, with any experimental outliers having a disproportional effect on the model fit. These validation results were used to further refine the model so that the updated synergy measures, presented throughout this study, take into account both the primary screen and validation data.

Drug Mechanisms Predict Temporal Synergy and Antagonism

Clustering the first and second drugs by their synergy measures identified clusters of synergy and antagonism (Figure 3A) that associated with broad classes of drug mechanisms collated from DrugBank (Law et al., 2014). Most prominently, antagonistic drug clusters associated with secondary tubulin modulator treatment (Figures 3B). This time-dependent antagonistic interaction between tubulin modulators and other drugs has been previously reported (Vanhoefer et al., 1995; Xiong et al., 2007) and suggested to be cell-cycle-dependent. In addition, we found a synergistic tendency for secondary treatment with alkylating drugs (Figure 3B), which corroborates previous findings of induced sensitivity to DNA damage (Lee et al., 2012).

In addition to drug mechanisms, we investigated whether synergy measures clustered by protein targets (Kuhn et al., 2014) and National Cancer Institute pathway associations (Schaefer et al., 2009). Drug combinations with shared targets (Law et al., 2014) were more likely to be antagonistic (Figure S4B), indicating that using drug target overlap to propose novel sequential combinations in silico (Zhao et al., 2011) may be prone to adaptive cellular responses. In cross-validated predictions of synergy measures, drug mechanism was consistently the most predictive, with the inclusion of protein targets and pathways further increasing predictive power (Figure 4A). By including all model components that improved cross-validation performance (Figure 4A), regression coefficients were used to dissect molecular mechanisms underlying sequential synergy and antagonism in terms of protein targets, pathways, and mechanisms (Figure 4B).

These observations suggest that drug annotations of combinatorial treatments are predictive of sequential synergy and antagonism. This may, in turn, indicate that drugs inducing similar states possibly reflect shared dynamic mechanisms. It should, thus, be expected that functional efforts to better characterize the dynamics of drug perturbations would enable more precise models of sequential treatments.

DISCUSSION

The systematic screen and global statistical model described here effectively identified synergistic, time-dependent temporal
Figure 4. Regression-Based Interpretation of Schedule-Dependent Synergy in Terms of Drug Mechanisms, Protein Targets, and Associated Molecular Pathways

(A) Cross-validation error of classes of regression models for the first (α) and second (β) drugs, illustrating that drug protein targets and/or pathway activity did not significantly improve predictive power over mechanism alone. However, some particular meta-features, such as the protein target of the pretreatment combined with the mechanism of the secondary treatment, did increase predictive power. The line represents the greedy conjunction of the best performing models added one at a time in the order of their individual cross-validation performance. All fits were controlled for overfitting by using the hyperparameter value yielding the lowest 10-fold cross-validation error.

(B) Mean synergy measures quantified by repression coefficients illustrating synergistic and antagonistic effects from individual drugs and drugs grouped according to their described mechanism, as either the first (α) or the second (β) treatment.
treatments in cancer cell lines. Factors contributing to this efficiency include the use of Bayesian statistics and a strategy of sparse systematic experimentation followed by model-based follow-up experiments and validation. To our knowledge, it has not previously been shown that a global probabilistic model for drug combinations would be a practical analysis scheme. Hence, that such a model was algorithmically feasible was a remarkable result in itself.

Alternative methods for quantifying drug synergy, such as the Chou-Talalay Combination Index (Chou and Talalay, 1984), assume dose equivalence, which is invalid when drugs are not administered simultaneously. In contrast, the sequential Bliss independence model used here does not assume dose equivalence but allows for self-synergy and antagonism, the meaning of which is related to sustained drug treatment but not strictly a combinatorial synergy or antagonism. For these reasons, classical theory of synergism must be handled carefully for sequential treatment.

Using this model, we have identified several time-dependent combinations that could potentially have clinical relevance. The finding that amifostine pretreatment is synergistic with temozolomide was noteworthy, since amifostine was originally designed as a cytoprotectant, reducing kidney damage from cisplatin (Kouaris et al., 2007). However, it has now been shown that amifostine has a complex mechanism of action that can mimic hypoxia and promote vascular endothelial growth factor expression (Dedieu et al., 2010). It is, therefore, not surprising that it could, in a time-dependent manner, promote the efficacy of other drugs in some cellular contexts.

Clinical trials have shown improved survival in patients with pancreatic cancer following treatment with gemcitabine and cisplatin (Ouyang et al., 2016), a well-established synergistic combination (Bergman et al., 1996), and gemcitabine and capecitabine (Neoptolemos et al., 2016), combinations that were both found to be synergistic in this study. In the case of gemcitabine and cisplatin, we found equal synergy regardless of treatment order (gemcitabine then cisplatin: $\lambda = 0.724$; and cisplatin then gemcitabine: $\lambda = 0.805$) and self-synergy for cisplatin alone ($\lambda = 0.735$). In contrast, gemcitabine was found to be highly self-antagonistic ($\lambda = -1$). For the combination of gemcitabine and capecitabine, synergy was only observed when gemcitabine was administered first ($\lambda = 0.69$). These examples illustrate cases of classical synergy with and without time dependency of sequential application. Recently, sequential application of gemcitabine, followed by erlotinib 18–24 hr later, has been shown to be efficacious in in vitro models of pancreatic cancer (Ubezio et al., 2016). Our study supports this finding, with gemcitabine followed by erlotinib found to be highly synergistic in Panc1 cells ($\lambda = 0.996$). While gemcitabine and erlotinib combination therapies have shown some efficacy in the clinic (Moore et al., 2007), the effect of sequential applications of these drugs is yet to be determined.

For malignant melanoma, combinations of bortezomib and vemurafenib have previously been reported to be synergistic in a panel of 7 melanoma cell lines (Bolomsky et al., 2013). Our model validated this synergistic effect, but only when bortezomib was given first ($\lambda = 0.926$). If vemurafenib was given first, the combination was, instead, highly antagonistic ($\lambda = -1$), as was bortezomib alone ($\lambda = -1$). Interestingly, we also noted a synergistic effect from combinations of erlotinib and vemurafenib, if erlotinib was given first ($\lambda = 0.725$). It is well known that vemurafenib resistance in colon cancer is driven by feedback activation of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and that combination therapies of vemurafenib and erlotinib are, thus, synergistic in both in vitro and in vivo models (Prahallad et al., 2012). Melanoma cells, however, usually express low levels of EGFR, but this is not the case for A375, which has relatively high EGFR expression (Mirmohammadsadegh et al., 2007), and a subset of human tumors (Sun et al., 2014). Therefore, the dynamics of EGFR inhibition by erlotinib in A375 might explain the sensitization to subsequent treatment with vemurafenib in this study.

Temporal order is rarely considered when designing clinical trials and optimal treatment schedules for combination therapies, yet the results presented here, and in other more focused studies, clearly show that sequential synergy and antagonism are common and highly time-dependent among approved anti-cancer therapies. It is, thus, becoming increasingly clear that time-dependent synergy is a crucial consideration to maximize efficacy and that time-dependent antagonism could be particularly important to avoid resistance.

Our understanding of adaptation, compensation, and network rewiring is currently insufficient to allow accurate ab initio predictions of the cellular response in any cell type. However, once we unravel how cells rewire and reach new network states, it will be feasible to attempt to force tumor cells out of these states in order to kill or “normalize” them through drug-induced dynamic rewiring of signaling networks.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

Further details and an outline of resources used in this work can be found in the Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

**Dose-Response Parameterization and Priors**

Individual cell viabilities were modeled according to classical sigmoidal drug-response curves, where a parameter, $K$, represents the inverse of half of the maximal inhibitory concentration ($IC_{50}$), $h$ determines slope, and $x$ represents the maximum effect on cell viability. The global model consisted of dose-response curve parameters for each of the 100 small-molecule compounds and for each of the 10,000 sequential combinations. Cell growth was assumed to be a discrete two-step process with residual effect from the first treatment during the second treatment. Assuming Bliss independence, the baseline response was, thus, considered a product of 3 factors: the viability effects of the first and second drugs and the residual effect of the first drug. Selector variables were defined as Boolean variables, which determined whether the combinatorial effect is explained by the single-drug parameters or by a new set of parameters modeling the synergy or antagonism.

The precision of the cell counts (variance $\sigma^2$) was assumed to follow a Gamma distribution. Hence, the sufficient statistics—namely, the experimental mean and variance of normalized cell counts across experimental repeats—were used to fit the model parameters. For the global Bayesian curve fit, we assumed the following prior probability distributions: $K \sim \log N(0.1, 0.2)$; $h \sim \log N(1.5, 2.0)$; $x \sim \beta(1.3)$; $\epsilon \sim \gamma(0.6, 0.02)$, where $\epsilon$ is the cell-count precision. All concentration-specific parameters were expressed in micromolar amounts.

**Estimation of Posterior Distribution**

To evaluate the posterior density of the model parameters given the observed data, we simulated a chain of complete parameter sets according to a modified Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. We used a modified Gibbs sampling
For calculating the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance ratios, we considered proposals of 4 cases based on the previous and proposed selector variables. This simplified the proposal correction for the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance ratios under particular choices of proposal distributions, enabling a scheme where curve parameters were only explored if a selector variable remains on.

For the parameters K, h, and \( \alpha \), we used Gaussian proposal distributions, with reject for negative outcomes and SDs 2.0, 0.5, and 3.0, respectively. For each curve parameter set, the selector variable was drawn from a Bernoulli distribution with 0.1 probability of switching state. If the selector variable remained on, then 1 out of 3 parameters was chosen randomly for proposal as described. The MCMC simulation was implemented in C++11 using the <random> library for sampling numbers following the described probability distributions. At every 200th iteration of parameters, sets were sampled after a burn-in period of 100,000 and for a total of 500,000 iterations. Finally, an aggregate synergy measure was evaluated as the average area between the baseline and combined dose-response curves along with \( \alpha \), defined as the average value of the selector variable for each drug combination.

**Data and Software Availability**

The source code for the program fitting sequential, combinatorial dose-response curves through MCMC samples from the posterior distribution is available at the following URL, under a GNU General Public License Version 3: https://github.com/skoplev/d-chain.

Additional documentation can be found at https://dchain.lindinglab.org.

Aggregate model data from the combinatorial and validation screens can be found at: http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/wgybvcvjwf.1.
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