FEEDBACKS AND TIPPING POINTS IN ORGANISMAL RESPONSE TO OXIDATIVE STRESS

Tin Klanjscek^{a,b}, Erik B. Muller^a, Roger M. Nisbet^a

May 23, 2016

^a University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

^b Ruder Boskovic Institute, Zagreb, Croatia

e-mail of the corresponding author: tin@irb.hr

Abstract

Biological feedbacks play a crucial role in determining effects of toxicants, radiation, and other environmental stressors on organisms. Focusing on reactive oxygen species (ROS) that are increasingly recognized as a crucial mediator of many stressor effects, we investigate how feedback strength affects the ability of organisms to control negative effects of exposure. We do this by developing a general theoretical framework for describing effects of a wide range of stressors and species. The framework accounts for positive and negative feedbacks representing cellular processes: (i) production of ROS due to metabolism and the stressor, (ii) ROS reactions with cellular compounds that cause damage, and (iii) cellular control of both ROS and damage. We suggest functional forms that capture generic properties of cellular control mechanisms constituting the feedbacks, assess stability of equilibrium states in the resulting models, and investigate tipping points at which cellular control breaks down causing unregulated increase of ROS and damage. Depending on the chosen functional forms, the

models can have zero, one, or two positive steady states; except in one singular case, the steady state with lowest values of ROS and damage is locally stable. We found two types of tipping points: those induced by changes in the parameters (including the stressor intensity), and those induced by the history of exposure, i.e. ROS and damage levels. The relatively simple models effectively describe several patterns of cellular responses to stress, such as the covariation of ROS and damage, the break-down of cellular control leading to explosion of ROS and/or damage, increase in damage even when ROS is (near)-constant, and the effects of exposure history on the ability of the cell to handle additional stress. The models quantify dynamics of cellular control, and could therefore be used to estimate the metabolic costs of stress and help integrate them into models that use energetic considerations to model organism's response to the environment. Although developed with unicellular organisms in mind, our models can be applied to all multicellular organisms that utilize similar feedbacks when dealing with stress.

0.2 Keywords

reactive oxygen species (ROS), cellular damage, organismal response to stress, modeling damage repair, stability, runaway ROS and damage.

1 Introduction

The cell's attempt to reduce deleterious effects of ROS such as membrane, DNA, and protein damage by regulating levels of both ROS and damage. Exposure to environmental stressors, including toxic exposure to transition metal ions and engineered nano-particles (ENPs), results in greatly enhanced ROS production rates that, in turn, require increase in control of ROS and damage. Accordingly, several empirical studies in eco- and nano-toxicology report simultaneous measurements of ROS and of some proxy for cellular damage (e.g. Nel et al. 2006, Priester et al. 2009, Priester et al. 2012, Ivask et al. 2014, Kaweeteerawat et al. 2015). These studies and others, found distinct correlation between ROS, the proxies for damage, and (for bacteria) reduction in population growth.

With toxic effect models, we have previously demonstrated that simultaneous measurements of ROS and of responses to ROS in bacteria, exposed to cadmium and cadmium-based ENPs, aid in elucidating the potential modes of toxicant action at the suborganismal to population levels of organization (Klanjscek et al. 2012; Klanjscek et al. 2013). Our previous work was based on Dynamic Energy Budget (DEB) theory (Kooijman, 2010), a unifying and relatively abstract modelling framework with many applications in ecotoxicology (e.g. Jager and Zimmer 2012, Martin et al. 2013, Jager et al. 2014a, Jager et al. 2014b). The resulting models were able to use the patterns of ROS and damage accumulation at a constant exposure to predict toxicity, but were of limited use for modeling dynamics of repairable damage, and investigating key features of cellular control.

Known cellular control mechanisms instigate negative feedbacks that reduce ROS and damage levels. ROS levels are reduced using antioxidant enzymes such as catalases, glutathionperoxidases and peroxiredoxins, and non-enzymatic radical scavengers (e.g. Bannister et al. 1987, Jamet et al. 2003, Giorgio et al. 2007, Culotta and Daly 2013), while damage is controlled using repair pathways ranging from protein (see Chondrogianni et al. (2014) for a review) to DNA repair (e.g. Gros et al. 2002, Zahradka et al. 2006). The negative feedbacks are subject to physiological and biochemical constraints including energy and materials available to them. The constraints may be

72 the reason why many studies (e.g. Priester et al. 2009, Kriško and Radman 2010) note a fairly
73 small increase in ROS and/or damage for a range of exposure levels, followed by a large increase
74 in both for a relatively small additional increase in exposure: for sufficiently high ROS and/or
75 damage production rates, the negative feedbacks may not be able to keep up, the control breaks,
76 and ROS and damage experience a runaway, i.e. an accelerated and unbounded increase of ROS
77 and damage leading to rapid mortality.

78 To account for these biomolecular defense and repair mechanisms, and their breakage, we
79 develop simple models to explore the effects of positive and negative feedbacks on the dynamics of
80 damage and damage-inducing compounds in response to environmental stressors. We investigate
81 how particular control mechanisms affect the long-term dynamics, and identify contexts that may
82 cause a runaway increase in ROS and/or damage that would lead to rapid mortality. We discuss
83 potential applications and limitations of the new models, and analyze some of the ways in which
84 duration of experiments and combinations of stressor intensities might affect results.

2 Models

86

87 Figure 1: Outline of oxidative stress network that inspired the development of our models.
 88 Metabolism and various environmental stressors give rise to the production of compounds with
 89 high oxidative potential, such as radicals and hydrogen peroxide. For example, reduced metabolites
 90 (XH_2) donate electrons to components of electron transport chains that, under the influence of the
 91 environmental stressor, achieve relatively high redox potentials and thereby facilitate the produc-
 92 tion of superoxide radicals. This initiates a cascade of reactions involving reactive oxygen species
 93 (ROS) that are mediated by enzymes such as superoxide dismutase, catalase, glutathion peroxidase
 94 and peroxiredoxins, and more haphazardly by metalloenzymes (Fenton-like reactions in the figure).
 95 These reactions do not directly result in cellular damage. However, ROS may spontaneously react
 96 with cellular compounds such as lipids, DNA and proteins. These reactions can inflict damage.
 97 Damage can also be inflicted directly by environmental stressors such as ionizing radiation and
 98 transition metals. Intermediate steps in the radical cascade, as well as actual damage, can serve as
 99 signals for up-regulation of defense and/or repair mechanisms (among other mechanisms not dealt
 100 with here, such as degenerative and developmental processes). Damaged molecular machinery may
 101 not be as efficient in controlling ROS production (e.g. damaged mitochondria leak more ROS).

102 Our models aim at generality, but they have been inspired by specific mechanisms (see Figure
 103 1). Metabolism and environmental stressor impact yield a variety of damage-inducing compounds
 104 with different physicochemical properties and damaging potentials. Given the prevalence of ROS
 105 as damage-inducing compounds in the literature (see Imlay 2003 for a review on pathways of oxida-
 106 tive damage), we will use these terms interchangeably. In order to keep our representation of the

107 dynamics of reactive compounds tractable, we assume that each physiological process (metabolism
108 and impact of each distinct stressor) generates a set of reactive compounds whose relative pro-
109 portions are approximately constant. This enables us to aggregate compounds with significant
110 oxidative potential into a single, abstract “generalized” entity, i.e. damage-inducing compounds
111 or ROS. Similarly, there are many forms of damage, but for the present work we aggregate these
112 forms into a generalized damage compound. We denote concentrations of ROS and damage in a
113 cell by Z and D , respectively. We leave the term “concentration” deliberately vague; the actual
114 units can be chosen to best fit a particular application.

115 In most of what follows, we assume that - given sufficient time, energy, and material resources
116 - damage can be repaired. In reality, some damage is irreparable. Examples of irreparable damage
117 include permanent loss of information through DNA damage and/or loss of epigenetic information,
118 proteins wrongly produced because of permanent loss of information, as well as irreparable organ
119 and/or tissue damage in multicellular organisms. We discuss the implication of irreparable damage
120 in the Discussion.

2.1 Choice of variables and balance equations

Figure 2: **Model structure.** Metabolism and environmental stressor produce ROS. In part, ROS is ultimately reduced to harmless compounds, such as water, through controlled reactions without causing damage to the cell. However, ROS also inflicts damage through spontaneous, uncontrolled reactions with cellular compounds. Damage is reduced by regulated repair mechanisms, while non-repaired damage may enhance ROS production.

Figure 2 describes the basic relationships of the processes determining the dynamics of ROS and damage: environmental stressors and metabolism produce ROS (of concentration Z) that, unless inactivated, can produce damage (of concentration D). Damage may enhance ROS production, but can also be repaired. The rate of ROS inactivation, as well as the rate of damage repair, can be regulated by the cell. In general terms, the system can be described by the following mass balance equations:

$$\frac{dZ}{dt} = j_{Z,prod} - j_{Z,out} - \delta_Z^G, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = j_{D,prod} - j_{D,out} - \delta_D^G, \quad (2)$$

where $\delta_{Z,D}^G$ accounts for dilution, i.e. changes in concentrations of Z and D due to growth or shrinking of the organism. Fluxes j_{prod} and j_{out} represent, respectively, production and loss rates.

136 For the current presentation, we assume that organismal growth (or shrinking) is a slow process
 137 relative to the dynamics of ROS and damage and set the dilution terms to zero ($\delta_{Z,D}^G = 0$), but
 138 note that growth may need to be considered in some applications (see Klanjscek et al. (2012,
 139 2013)). The production and loss rates are discussed below.

140 **The ROS production flux** ($j_{Z,prod}$) is assumed to be an increasing function of metabolically
 141 induced ROS, stressor-induced ROS, and ROS production enhanced by cellular damage. We
 142 compound the first two sources of ROS into a production term, P_Z :

$$P_Z = P_0 + \gamma_{ZS}S, \quad (3)$$

143 where P_0 and S represent respectively the metabolic ROS production flux and stressor intensity.
 144 The relationship between P_Z and S will depend on the actual stress mechanism; for this study,
 145 we assume a linear functional dependence where the coefficient γ_{ZS} quantifies how much ROS is
 146 produced given some stressor intensity.

147 Damage can affect ROS production in a myriad of ways. We consider a linear combination of
 148 multiplicative and additive effects:

$$j_{Z,prod} = (1 + g_{ZD}D)P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}D, \quad (4)$$

149 where g_{ZD} is the multiplicative, and γ_{ZD} the additive damage interaction coefficient. The multi-
 150 plicative term ($g_{ZD}P_ZD$) accounts for increases in ROS production due to metabolic inefficiencies
 151 resulting from damage, and the additive term ($\gamma_{ZD}D$) accounts for other damage-related sources
 152 of ROS.

153 **The ROS removal flux** ($j_{Z,out}$) is a consequence of reactions with cellular components. Some
 154 ROS is removed by controlled reactions without creating damage. ROS *not* removed by the
 155 controlled reactions can react with other cellular components and cause damage. Since at any
 156 given time the number of ROS molecules is minuscule compared to the number of potential target
 157 sites (Giorgio et al.2007), spontaneous ROS reactions are limited by the concentration of ROS only,

158 and the can be assumed to be proportional to the ROS concentration. The total ROS removal flux
 159 is thus the sum of the two, controlled and spontaneous, reaction fluxes:

$$j_{Z,out} = k_Z Z + R_Z, \quad (5)$$

160 where k_Z is a rate coefficient for the spontaneous flux, and R_Z represents the flux resulting from
 161 controlled reactions (see Appendix A for details).

162 **The damage production flux** ($j_{D,prod}$) has two components: direct, stress-induced damage
 163 production, P_D , and damage created by spontaneous ROS reactions. The direct stressor-induced
 164 damage production term is represented by

$$P_D = \gamma_{DS} S, \quad (6)$$

165 where the damage stress coefficient, γ_{DS} , quantifies the yield of damage due to direct stressor
 166 action. For simplicity, we assume that the damage yield from oxidative stress is constant, y_D ; the
 167 total damage creation flux is then:

$$j_{D,prod} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D. \quad (7)$$

168 **The damage removal flux** ($j_{D,out}$) accounts for all cellular repair processes, including the
 169 metabolic turnover of damaged macromolecules. We assume that spontaneous damage repair is
 170 negligible, and that all damage repair is regulated:

$$j_{D,out} = R_D, \quad (8)$$

171 where R_D represents regulated damage repair.

172 The regulatory networks exerting the control of damage repair and of ROS are context-specific
 173 and can be extremely complex, so we approximate their dynamics through simple, stylized negative
 174 feedback loops (see Zhang and Andersen (2007) and Drengstig et al. (2012) for examples). Such

175 general feedback loops have at minimum one controller variable describing the controller compound,
 176 and one controlled variable describing the controlled compound. The rate of change of each
 177 controller X controlling a variable Y is governed by a balance equation

$$\frac{dX}{dt} = j_{X,prod} - j_{X,out}. \quad (9)$$

178 We assume that:

- 179 • $j_{X,prod}$ can be represented by a Michaelis-Menten type saturating function, $j_{X,prod} = \frac{v_X Y}{K_X + Y}$,
 180 because we expect:
 - 181 – $j_{X,prod}$ is an increasing function of Y : production rates of the controllers increase as ROS
 182 and damage concentrations increase (for example, cells up-regulate defenses against ROS
 183 as ROS concentrations increase (Giorgio et al. 2007), e.g. by initiating the SOS gene
 184 pathway when damage accumulates (Friedman et al. 2005), and
 - 185 – $j_{X,prod}$ is a saturating function of Y : the cellular capacity to produce controller com-
 186 pounds is bounded, i.e. there is an upper limit to the rate of controller production.
- 187 • $j_{X,out}$ is an increasing function of X : controllers are inactivated due to cellular turnover and to
 188 interactions with the controlled compounds; we assume a simple linear, passive inactivation:
 189 $j_{X,out} = k_X X$.

190 We introduce two additional variables, E and A , to represent respectively the concentrations
 191 of the compounds controlling ROS and damage. We consider two types of interaction between
 192 the controller compounds (E , A) and the controlled compounds (Z , D): bilinear and saturating
 193 Michaelis-Menten kinetics (see Table 1 and Appendix A for details). Dynamics of Z and D are of
 194 special importance because there are many experimental contexts where ROS and some measure
 195 of damage play a role and where data are available. We therefore focus on dynamics of Z and D
 196 by assuming the transients of controllers are not important ($dE/dt = dA/dt = 0$), which results in
 197 implicit representations of control (R_Z and R_D) listed in Table 1, with details of their derivation in

198 Appendix A. This assumption may not hold if a sudden, acute exposure causes massive increase
 199 in ROS and/or damage in a time span much shorter than the response time of the controls.

200 Table 1: Summary of functional forms of ROS and damage production fluxes, ROS inactivation,
 201 and damage repair. Extremes cases of the production flux are: additive ($g_{ZD} = 0$, $\gamma_{ZD} > 0$),
 202 and multiplicative ($g_{ZD} > 0$, $\gamma_{ZD} = 0$). Repair of ROS (Z) and damage (D) are regulated by
 203 control variables E and A , respectively; interaction terms and the resulting implicit forms are
 204 listed. Compound control parameters are used for simplicity: $v_Z = g_Z v_E / k_E$, and $v_D = g_D v_A / k_A$,
 205 where v_E and v_A are the maximum production rates of E and A ; g_Z and g_D quantify control
 206 strength, while k_E and k_A are inactivation rates of the controller. K_E and K_A are half-saturation
 207 constants for production of E and A ; K_Z and K_D are half-saturation constants for control of Z
 208 and D .

ROS production, $j_{Z,prod}$		
additive		$P_Z + \gamma_{ZD} D$
multiplicative		$(1 + g_{ZD} D) P_Z$
controlled ROS inactivation, R_Z		
interaction term		implicit form
linear	$g_Z E Z$	$\frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}$
saturating	$g_Z E Z \frac{K_Z}{K_Z + Z}$	$\frac{v_Z Z^2}{(K_E + Z) (1 + Z/K_Z)}$
Damage repair, R_D		
interaction term		implicit form
linear	$g_D A D$	$\frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D}$
saturating	$g_D A D \frac{K_D}{K_D + D}$	$\frac{v_D D^2}{(K_A + D) (1 + D/K_D)}$

210 2.2 Steady state analysis

211 The steady state analysis, performed using implicit form of ROS and damage control (R_Z and
 212 R_D), is greatly facilitated by quantification of feedbacks by their strength. We define the feedback

213 strength, Φ_{XY} , of a state variable Y on dynamics of state variable X as:

$$\Phi_{XY} = \frac{\partial dX/dt}{\partial Y}. \quad (10)$$

214 Our system has two state variables and, therefore, four possible feedbacks with the associated
 215 strengths: (i) a negative feedback that increases ROS removal in response to ROS concentration
 216 ($\Phi_{ZZ}^- = -(k_Z + \partial R_Z/\partial Z)$), (ii) a positive feedback that increases damage production in response
 217 to ROS concentration ($\Phi_{DZ}^+ = y_D k_Z$), (iii) a positive feedback that increases ROS production in
 218 response to damage ($\Phi_{ZD}^+ = \partial j_{Z,prod}/\partial D$), and (iv) a negative feedback that increases damage repair
 219 in response to damage ($\Phi_{DD}^- = -\partial R_D/\partial D$). Feedbacks (i) and (iii) are considered positive because
 220 they increase Z and/or D , and feedbacks (ii) and (iv) are negative because they reduce Z and D .

221 Seven model variants with different combinations of ROS production, ROS control, and damage
 222 control were analyzed. Depending on the model variant and the feedback strengths, the system
 223 may have had zero, one, or two steady states. An overview of the six model variants and results
 224 for which ROS and/or damage control are linear are included in Table 2. The model variant in
 225 which both ROS and damage control are saturating does not qualitatively differ from the models
 226 with saturating damage control, so was omitted from the overview.

239 In Appendix C we show that for each of our six model variants, there is a unique positive stable
 240 equilibrium (UPSE) if and only if the combined effect of the negative feedbacks is stronger than
 241 those of the positive feedbacks as Z and D approach infinity:

$$\lim_{Z,D \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{ZD}^+ \Phi_{DZ}^+ < \lim_{Z,D \rightarrow \infty} \Phi_{ZZ}^- \Phi_{DD}^-. \quad (11)$$

242 The left-hand side of (11) can be interpreted as *susceptibility* to stress, and the right-hand side
 243 as *resistance* to stress; the condition (11) then simply states that there is a UPSE whenever
 244 resistance is greater than susceptibility to stress. Functional forms of the feedbacks and UPSE
 245 existence conditions for each of the six model variants are summarized in Table 2.

246 When effects of damage on ROS are multiplicative and damage repair (R_D) is linear, the UPSE

Table 2: Model equations, feedbacks, conditions for the unique positive stable equilibrium (UPSE), and the number of equilibria possible for the six investigated models. The positive feedback ($\Phi_{DZ}^+ = y_D k_Z$) is not listed in the table because it is the same for all models. When displaying conditions for UPSE, we group production-related parameters on the left, and removal-related parameters on the right. Consistent with expectations, the UPSE condition is harder to satisfy for higher yield (y_{ZD}), higher effects of damage on ROS production (g_{ZD} , γ_{ZD}), and/or lower compound control rates (v_Z , v_D). Less obviously: (i) the UPSE condition is harder to satisfy for higher uncontrolled ROS clearance rate (k_Z) when ROS control is linear; (ii) direct damage production (P_D) does not affect the existence of the UPSE; (iii) stress-related ROS production (P_Z) affects the UPSE condition only for multiplicative effect of damage on ROS production, and linear R_D ; (iv) compound control rates (v_Z , v_D for nonlinear control of Z , D) do not affect the existence of the UPSE; (v) when the effect of damage on ROS production is multiplicative, systems with linear damage and ROS control can always attain a single steady state for low enough ROS production; (vi) if damage repair saturates, the UPSE cannot be attained for any parameter values (only double equilibria are possible). Please see text for the discussion on the double equilibria, and Appendix C.2 for analysis and discussion of steady states for the model with saturating control of both ROS and damage.

	linear R_Z , linear R_D	$\Phi_{ZD}^+ _\infty$	$\Phi_{ZZ}^- _\infty$	$\Phi_{DD}^- _\infty$	UPSE condition	possible equilibria
multiplicative $j_{Z,prod}$	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = (1 + g_{ZD}D)P_Z - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D}$	$g_{ZD}P_Z$	$-(k_Z + v_Z)$	$-v_D$	$y_D g_{ZD}P_Z < \frac{(k_Z + v_Z)v_D}{k_Z}$	0, 1
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = (1 + g_{ZD}D)P_Z - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{(K_E + Z)(1 + z/K_Z)}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D}$	$g_{ZD}P_Z$	$-k_Z$	$-v_D$	$y_D g_{ZD}P_Z < v_D$	0, 1, 2
	linear R_Z , saturating R_D					
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = (1 + g_{ZD}D)P_Z - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{(K_A + D)(1 + D/K_D)}$	$g_{ZD}P_Z$	$-(k_Z + v_Z)$	0	impossible	0, 2
	linear R_Z , linear R_D					
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}D - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D}$	γ_{ZD}	$-(k_Z + v_Z)$	$-v_D$	$y_D \gamma_{ZD} < \frac{(k_Z + v_Z)v_D}{k_Z}$	0, 1
additive $j_{Z,prod}$	saturating R_Z , linear R_D					
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}D - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{(K_E + Z)(1 + z/K_Z)}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D}$	γ_{ZD}	$-k_Z$	$-v_D$	$y_D \gamma_{ZD} < v_D$	0, 1, 2
	linear R_Z , saturating R_D					
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}D - k_Z Z - \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}$ $\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z Z + P_D - \frac{v_D D^2}{(K_A + D)(1 + D/K_D)}$	γ_{ZD}	$-(k_Z + v_Z)$	0	impossible	0, 2

247 condition can always be satisfied for low enough stressor intensities, i.e. when $P_Z < P_Z^\Phi$ where:

$$P_Z^\Phi = \begin{cases} \frac{(k_Z + v_Z)v_D}{k_Z y_D g_{ZD}} & \text{if ROS control is linear,} \\ \frac{v_D}{y_D g_{ZD}} & \text{if ROS control is saturating.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

248 When effects of damage on ROS are additive, the UPSE condition does not depend on stressor
 249 intensities. For saturating R_D , a UPSE is never possible, so the system can never have a UPSE.
 250 Note that both types of stressor effects (P_Z and P_D) affect the equilibrium values of ROS and
 251 damage, even if they cannot affect the conditions for the existence of a UPSE.

252 When UPSE condition is satisfied, the organism's cellular control mechanisms are, in principle,
 253 able to cope with any amount of ROS and damage. If the condition is not satisfied, there are two
 254 possibilities:

- 255 1. The system has two equilibria: one stable with lower Z and D values, and one unstable with
 256 higher Z and D values. If Z and D are lower than the values for the unstable equilibrium,
 257 the system approaches the stable equilibrium, and ROS and damage are controlled. If Z and
 258 D increase above the values for unstable equilibrium, ROS and damage increase indefinitely.
 259 Only models with saturating control can have two equilibria.
- 260 2. There are no equilibria. ROS and damage increase indefinitely at all stressor intensities.

261 2.3 Tipping points

262 We use the term “tipping point” to characterize a transition from a stable state to runaway dy-
 263 namics by which we mean continuous, unbounded increase over time of Z and D . We distinguish
 264 between two types of tipping points.

265 Type 1 tipping point (TP1) is caused by changes in parameters and/or forcing (stressor inten-
 266 sity), and can appear in systems with both linear and saturating control. In systems with linear
 267 ROS control and damage repair (linear R_Z and R_D), any changes in parameters or forcing that
 268 leads to invalidation of the UPSE condition causes a transition from a system with a unique stable

equilibrium to a system with runaway dynamics (see the steady state analysis in Section 2.2).
 When the control is saturating, and the system has two equilibria, change in parameters or forcing
 can cause a saddle node bifurcation in which the two equilibria approach each other, combine into
 a single neutral equilibrium, and then disappear causing runaway dynamics (see Appendix C).

Type 2 tipping point (TP2) only exists in two-equilibria systems. The tipping point is caused
 by high values of Z and D resulting from high initial values or large transients. In two-equilibrium
 systems, the organism is able to control ROS and damage indefinitely if the initial values of Z
 and D are low enough; if Z and/or D increase above a threshold (see Appendix C), positive
 feedbacks take over, control mechanisms are overwhelmed, and ROS (Z) and damage (D) increase
 indefinitely at an accelerating rate.

We illustrate these possibilities using a reduced model that follows what is arguably the most
 important state variable - damage. Recognizing that ROS and control typically operate on much
 shorter time scales than damage, we separate the time scales and set $dZ/dt = 0$. Expressing R_Z in
 terms of Z , and solving (1) for the quasi-equilibrium value of Z , Z^* , gives:

$$Z^* = \xi(D, P_Z). \quad (13)$$

where the function ξ normally has to be evaluated numerically. Inserting Z^* into (2) gives just
 one - albeit complicated - ODE describing the slow dynamics of a general form:

$$\frac{dD}{dt} = y_D k_Z \xi(D, P_Z) + P_D - R_D. \quad (14)$$

For illustration, we choose a model with $P_D = 0$ (no direct damage production), multiplicative
 $j_{Z,prod}$, saturating R_Z , and linear R_D . The choice enables us to investigate the widest range of
 possible dynamics, as well as analyze the tipping points as a function of stress. We calculated a
 “canonical” parameter set (gu)estimated from a number of different studies. These parameters do
 not represent any one system, but their foundation in data suggests that we explored “plausible”
 regions of parameter space. Details and a summary of all state variables and parameter values are

291 in Appendix B.

292 Increase in stress can cause two types of bifurcation: from an UPSE to a double equilibrium at
293 $P_Z = P_Z^\Phi$ (making TP2 possible), and the transition from a two-equilibria system to a runaway at
294 $P_Z = P_Z^C$ (TP1). The critical stress P_Z^Φ was calculated by equating the limits in (11) and solving
295 for P , and P_Z^C was estimated numerically. Since P_Z^Φ is a linear function of y_D , γ_{ZD} , and $1/v_D$
296 (see (12) for saturating ROS control), increasing y_D and γ_{ZD} , or reducing v_D can cause the same
297 transition to a double-equilibrium dynamics as increasing P_Z .

298 Three regions delineated by the UPSE condition and the saddle-node bifurcation are illus-
299 trated in Figure 3, with further details and trajectories shown in Figure 4. Trajectories $D(t)$ with
300 $P_Z < P_Z^\Phi$, as expected for a unique positive stable equilibrium (UPSE), eventually attain a finite
301 equilibrium value of D for all considered values of initial damage $D(0)$; if an additional stressor
302 temporarily increases D , the organism will be able to repair the excess damage once the additional
303 stress stops. The exact value of the equilibrium in our example depends on the stress intensity,
304 but is always less than D_Φ , the equilibrium value of D for P_Z^Φ ($D_\Phi = 0.248$ in Figure 4).

305 As exposure (P_Z) increases, non-linear effects become increasingly important, and the system
306 has two equilibria. The lower equilibrium is stable; the higher one (D_U) is unstable. The organism
307 will still be able to control additional short-term stress, but not as effectively as for $P_Z < P_Z^\Phi$: if
308 damage due to the additional stressor increases above D_U , the organism will not be able to return
309 to any equilibria even if the additional stressor disappears. The higher the value of P_Z , the
310 lower the range of damage for which the organism can successfully accommodate additional stress:
311 the stable equilibrium increases, while D_U decreases. Eventually, the two equilibria overlap for
312 $P_Z = P_Z^C$ (saddle node bifurcation point).

313 The reduced ability to recover from significant damage is especially important when the or-
314 ganism is exposed to multiple and/or time-varying stressors (Figure 5). For example, even small
315 (potentially unknown) additional stress can completely reverse the outcome of an experiment (Fig-
316 ure 5, left plot). The outcome can likewise be affected by small changes in timing of a time-varying
317 (e.g. pulsed) stressor. For example, small changes in the duration of the stress pulses can com-

318 pletely reverse the outcome: even if stress is greater than P_Z^C , the organism can repair damage if
319 the pulse is short. If, on the other hand, the duration of the pulse is long enough that damage
320 increases past the unstable equilibrium ($D > D_U$), the organism cannot repair damage even after
321 the pulsed stress stops (Figure 5, right plot).

322 The duration of a hypothetical experiment can also affect the perceived critical stress intensity
323 (Figure 6). The model predicts that large increases of damage in short experiments will appear only
324 for stress intensities that are significantly higher than the critical intensity, leading to a significant
325 *overestimate* of the critical stress intensity and, therefore, potential overestimate of the safe levels
326 of exposure.

327 The effects of stressors that directly produce damage (P_D) can be understood from the analysis
328 in Appendix C. The analysis shows that P_D can cause saddle node bifurcations only. Consequently,
329 stress increasing directly both ROS and damage ($P_Z, P_D > 0$) in two-steady state systems causes
330 qualitatively the same effects as the stress directly affecting ROS only ($P_Z > 0, P_D = 0$); the
331 addition of direct damage production (P_D) only reduces the range of exposure levels for which the
332 two steady states exist, and reduces the ability of the organism to recover from additional damage
333 (reduces the damage and/or ROS necessary for TP2).

334

335 Figure 3: Three types of qualitative dynamics for effects of stress on damage production. Rate
 336 of change of damage (dD/dt) as a function of damage (D) for P_Z^Φ and P_Z^C (solid lines), and an
 337 intermediate value of P_Z (dashed line). Intersections of the lines with $y = 0$ (dotted line) represent
 338 equilibria ($dD/dt = 0$). If the line crosses from positive to negative dD/dt as D increases, the
 339 equilibrium is stable; otherwise, it is unstable. Stressor intensities P_Z^Φ are characterized by an
 340 UPSE with low equilibrium values of D (and, therefore, Z). As P_Z increases above P_Z^Φ , the stable
 341 equilibrium moves to the right (attained for larger D), the line curves up, and the second, unstable
 342 equilibrium is reached for high values of D . For $P_Z = P_Z^C$, TP1 is reached (second solid line) with
 343 only one neutral equilibrium (at $D = D_C = 1.86$). All stressor intensities higher than P_Z result in
 344 a runaway. Parameter values listed in Table B.1 used, only P_Z varied.

345

346 Figure 4: Tipping points and typical trajectories. **Top left:** rate of change of damage (dD/dt)
 347 as a function of damage (D). Consecutive lines represent increasing stressor intensities: $P_Z =$
 348 P_Z^Φ , $3.5P_Z^\Phi$, P_Z^C , $4P_Z^\Phi$, and $4.5P_Z^\Phi$. Unstable equilibrium $D_U = 5.11$ appears for $P_Z = 3.5P_Z^\Phi$. Note
 349 that the rate of accumulation of damage for stressor intensities only slightly higher than P_C still
 350 have a minimum, hence a proximate reduction in the damage increase rate does not necessarily
 351 imply successful damage regulation. **Other plots:** trajectories corresponding to P_Z used in the top
 352 left plot with different initial values of D . **Top right:** $D(t)$ for $D(0) = 0$. Trajectories for $P_Z < P_Z^C$
 353 eventually equilibrate. **Bottom left:** $D(t)$ for $D(0) = 2$. Since $D(0) > D_C$, the trajectory for
 354 $P = P_Z^C$ diverges; since $D(0) < D_U$, the trajectory for intermediate stressor intensities equilibrates.
 355 **Bottom right:** $D(t)$ for $D(0) = 5.3$. Since $D(0) > D_C$, all trajectories with $P_Z > P_Z^\Phi$ diverge.
 356 Parameter values listed in Table B.1 used, only P_Z varied.

357

358 Figure 5: Interpretation of transient dynamics. **Left plot:** Simulation of an experiment with a
 359 target stressor intensity $P_Z^0 = 0.95P_Z^C$ (dashed line), and an additional stress resulting from the
 360 details of the experimental setup. Additional stress is 7% of target (solid line). Although the
 361 organism manages to control damage when exposed to target stressor intensity, D experiences
 362 a runaway when the stressors are combined. The closer to P_Z^C the target stressor intensity is,
 363 the smaller the additional stress needed to cause the runaway. Therefore, even small additional
 364 stress can completely change the dynamics, especially if target experimental stress (P_Z^0) is close
 365 to the critical stress (P_Z^C). **Right plot:** Simulations of an experiment with a stress pulse in
 366 addition to the background stress. Background stress: $1.1P_Z^0$; additional stress: P_Z^C starting at
 367 $t=5$. Damage levels equilibrate if the additional stress ends at $t_1 = 8.5$ minutes. If the stress
 368 lasts just half a minute more (ending at $t_2 = 9$), D crosses the initial value-related tipping point
 369 (TP2), and the damage levels spiral out of control. Therefore, duration of pulsed studies matters,
 370 especially if multiple pulses are investigated: in case the time between pulses does not allow for a
 371 full recovery, the organism may experience a ratcheting mechanism: each cycle leaves more damage
 372 in the organism, eventually tipping the system. Parameter values listed in Table B.1 used, only
 373 P_Z varied.

374

375 Figure 6: Transients affect perceived effects of stress depending on duration of observation, t .
 376 Damage at time t (log scale) shown for a range of stressor intensity (P_Z). Critical stress ($P_Z^C =$
 377 16370) can be estimated by looking at the pattern of damage accumulation: once $P > P_Z^C$, damage
 378 accumulates indefinitely, thus if given enough time to accumulate resulting in a marked increase
 379 in accumulated damage (a 'kink' in the damage vs. exposure curve). Short observation periods
 380 do not leave enough time for ROS and damage to spiral out of control even when $P > P_Z^C$, so
 381 the transition (from slow to fast accumulation of damage) seems to happen for larger stress. As
 382 a result, P_Z^C could be significantly overestimated; in this example, the estimate would be 22000,
 383 18000, and 17000 for $t = 1, 5$, and 10 , respectively). A longer observation period ($t=30$), however,
 384 correctly estimates $P_Z^C \approx 16400$. Parameter values listed in Table B.1 used, only P_Z varied.

385 3 Discussion

386 We developed simple models for two generic types of indicators of cellular stress: proxies for
 387 damage (e.g. carbonylation, membrane permeability, electron transport function), and proxies
 388 for damage-inducing compounds (notably ROS). The models offer a minimal representation of

389 currently accepted understanding of dominant processes in the cell to describe ROS creation due
390 to metabolism and exposure to environmental stressors, regulation of ROS, damage inflicted by
391 ROS and directly by environmental stressors, and regulation of damage. The complexity of cellular
392 regulatory networks is condensed into simple negative feedback loops requiring one 'controller' for
393 each controlled variable. The full model has four state variables (ROS, ROS control, damage, and
394 damage control/repair), but model reduction is possible by recognizing that the damage dynamics
395 are slow relative to other processes.

396 Although damage is the true "slow" variable, we focused much of our analysis on two state
397 variables (ROS and damage) because these (or proxies) relate to quantities frequently measured
398 in ecotoxicological studies. The analysis showed the possibility of: (i) tight regulation of ROS and
399 damage in some conditions, and (ii) unbounded (runaway) increase of ROS and damage in others.
400 The relationship between susceptibility and resistance to exposure defined by (11) inform about
401 the conditions in which stable equilibrium can be achieved.

402 Runaway dynamics are a consequence of a positive feedback between ROS and damage resulting
403 in uncontrolled increase in both: more ROS begets more damage, and more damage begets more
404 ROS. Transitions from a stable, controlled state to runaway dynamics involve one of two types of
405 tipping points:

- 406 • Type 1: parameter or forcing-induced tipping point. Type 1 tipping point can be reached
407 by either bifurcation of a unique positive stable equilibrium (UPSE) into runaway dynamics
408 (interpretable as a saddle node bifurcation at $D = \pm\infty$ or $D^{-1} = 0$), or a saddle-node
409 bifurcation as two equilibria approach and annihilate each other. The tipping point can be
410 caused by changes in stressor intensity, but only if the effects of damage on ROS production
411 are multiplicative or if the stressor directly affects ROS production or cell damage.
- 412 • Type 2: related mathematically to initial condition dependence or biologically to the history
413 of the system under study: accumulation of damage and/or ROS above a critical level can
414 cause a runaway of an otherwise controllable system. The transition can be induced by
415 fluctuating stressors, for example a long and/or intense stress pulse, or by a ratchet-like

response to periodic stress if damage from one cycle is not fully repaired before another cycle starts. This tipping point is of particular importance because it can occur in all investigated (non-linear) models whenever two steady states exist (see Table 2), and because it depicts long-term sensitivity to multiple and recurring stressors.

Our models were motivated by the large, and growing body of literature reporting simultaneously enhanced levels of ROS and of some measure of damage in response to environmental stress. Each of our models predicts that increase in direct stressor effects on ROS (P_Z) or damage (P_D) can cause long-term increase in *both* ROS and damage, irrespective of whether there are runaway dynamics or a stable steady state (Appendix D). Strong correlation between observed ROS and cellular damage may be caused by either direct contribution to ROS production, or direct damage production. Distinguishing between the two possibilities is possible in principle by comparing transients, but this requires time series rather than just endpoints. We know of no experimental study where this has been attempted. Note that lack of observable correlation between changes in ROS and cellular damage does not preclude direct stressor contribution to ROS production. Depending on the parameter values, the ratio of ROS and damage can increase, decrease, or remain constant with time and/or exposure (Appendix D). Also, the type of control mechanism might influence these results; although only one family of control mechanisms was considered here, others are possible and can be substituted in place of R_Z and R_D (e.g. integral control (Drengstig et al. 2012) or rein control (Saunders et al., 1998; Saunders et al., 2000), which could cause ROS to remain constant under stress).

Indeed, our analysis (Appendix C) highlights dynamic features that might be most susceptible to the choice of type of control. While all investigated types of control permit at least one steady state, details of the control determine the number and character of steady states. Interestingly, the analysis (Appendix C.2.2) shows that qualitative dynamics of a model with saturating damage control does not depend on whether ROS control is saturating or not. Since our analysis largely relied on generic properties common to many regulatory mechanisms (e.g. increase of regulation with stress, and possibility of overwhelming regulation), we expect that alternative functional

443 forms based on the same consideration follow similar qualitative patterns. Choices of the details
444 in any particular application are best informed by the prior knowledge of the modeled system, and
445 experimental data.

446 The key to using our models to interpret experimental data is to have *time resolved* measure-
447 ments of ROS and damage. Damage creation and repair are *dynamical* processes; even when ROS
448 and control dynamics equilibrate rapidly, transients can still have significant consequences. For
449 example, critical exposure can be overestimated due to transients (Figure 6); time-resolved mea-
450 surements would show whether ROS and damage levels equilibrated, thus preventing masking of
451 runaway dynamics by slow transients. That said, we appreciate the practical difficulty in obtaining
452 the time resolved measurements, as the relevant procedures are commonly destructive.

453 Our model analyses used a time-scale separation argument to focus on the relatively slow dy-
454 namics of damage, so our conclusions only relate to the slow (long time scale) dynamics. Therefore,
455 when modeling acute exposures, the validity of the time separation argument has to be scrutinized.
456 The full four-dimensional model can exhibit very large transients in the 'fast dynamics' resulting
457 from inclusion of all four state variables, but these are almost certainly biologically unrealistic as
458 a wide range of mechanisms not included in the model may be implicated in ROS regulation over
459 very short times. Therefore, a more detailed, context-specific characterization of ROS dynamics is
460 necessary if aiming to model the fast dynamics.

461 Even in this minimal representation, all our models have at least one tipping point and could
462 be used in conjunction with other process-based models, such as those of Dynamic Energy Budget
463 (DEB) theory (see Leeuwen et al. 2010 for an example). With such combinations, ecologically
464 relevant but experimentally elusive stressor impacts can be assessed. For example, a toxicokinetic
465 model may require energy fluxes defined by a DEB model to properly account for effects of exposure.
466 Since our models specify control and repair fluxes, the required energetic costs could be calculated
467 and included in a DEB model to calculate sub-lethal stressor impacts such as those on growth and
468 reproduction and, subsequently, on population dynamics.

469 The latter requires a model relating environmental stress to mortality, for which the concept

470 of hazard in the DEB theory might be used. Hazard represents the instantaneous probability of
471 dying caused by accumulation of irreversible damage, whose accumulation is essentially a mech-
472 anism of physiological aging. Adapting the model presented here to track irreversible damage is
473 straightforward. Mathematically, it amounts to setting damage repair to zero ($g_D = 0$), but the
474 interpretation of damage (D) and damage yield (y_D) subtly changes: only irreparably damaged
475 cellular components are considered damage (e.g. irreparably damaged DNA, and reduced function
476 of proteins produced by such DNA). The definition of yield changes accordingly to include only
477 the production of newly created *irreparable* damage. Our model can track both repairable and
478 irreparable damage using a different state variable for each type of damage, but special attention
479 should be given to interaction between the two types of damage.

480 Although state variables were defined with distinct cellular processes in mind, simplification
481 required a significant level of abstraction that comes with a cost in ability to relate state variables
482 to measurable quantities. For example, damage produced by ROS is affected both by the species
483 and the location of the ROS. The model framework set up here could easily be adapted to include
484 some heterogeneity in ROS and account for various types of proxies for damage without affecting
485 the qualitative dynamics leading to tipping points.

486 Although abstraction of state variables and cellular control processes creates challenges in
487 applying the model to particular systems, it increases generality of the approach. All organisms
488 have developed strategies to mitigate consequences of environmental stress and stress created
489 by their own metabolism. These strategies more often than not rely on negative and positive
490 feedbacks that impact the dynamics of damage and damage-inducing compounds. Therefore, with
491 reinterpretation of the state variables, the model (or similar models) - as well as the concepts
492 of susceptibility and resistance to exposure - becomes applicable to more complex, multicellular
493 organisms.

494 4 Acknowledgements

495 This work had its origins in many discussions with Gary Cherr, Hunter Lenihan, Robert Miller
496 Patricia Holden, John Priester and other colleagues in the University of California Center for En-
497 vironmental Implications of Nanotechnology. We also thank Jelena Repar for help with molecular
498 biology. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation and the
499 Environmental Protection Agency under Cooperative Agreement Number DBI-0830117. There
500 was also partial support from (i) the US Environmental Protection Agency through STAR grant
501 835797, and (ii) Croatian National Science Foundation (HRZZ) project ACCTA grant 2202. Any
502 opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the
503 author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, or the En-
504 vironmental Protection Agency. This work has not been subjected to EPA review and no official
505 endorsement should be inferred.

506 5 REFERENCES

- 507 Bannister J.V., Bannister W.H., Rotilio G. 1987. Aspects of the structure, function, and applica-
508 tions of superoxide dismutase. *CRC Critical Reviews in Biochemistry* 22 (2): 111–80.
- 509 Chondrogianni, N., Isabelle Petropoulos, Stefanie Grimm, Konstantina Georgila, Betul Catal-
510 gol, Bertrand Friguet, Tilman Grune, Efstathios S. Gonos. 2014. Protein damage, repair and
511 proteolysis. *Molecular Aspects of Medicine* 35:1-71
- 512 Culotta, V.C. and Daly, M.J. (2013) Manganese Complexes: Diverse Metabolic Routes to
513 Oxidative Stress Resistance in Prokaryotes and Yeast. *Antioxidants & Redox Signaling*, 19(9),
514 933-944.
- 515 Drengstig, T., Jolma, I.W., Ni, X.Y., Thorsen, K., Xu, X.M., and Ruoff, P. 2012. A Basic Set
516 of Homeostatic Controller Motifs. *Biophysical Journal* 103(9):2000-2010
- 517 Friedman N., Vardi S., Ronen M., Alon U. and Stavans, J. 2005 Precise temporal modulation
518 in the response of the SOS DNA repair network in individual bacteria. *PLoS Biol* 3(7):e238

519 Giorgio, M., Trinei, M., Migliaccio, E. and Pelicci, P.G.. 2007. Hydrogen peroxide: a metabolic
 520 by-product or a common mediator of ageing signals? *Nature reviews: molecular cell biology*
 521 8(9):722-728.

522 Gros, L., Murat K Saparbaev and Jacques Laval 2002. Enzymology of the repair of free
 523 radicals-induced DNA damage. *Oncogene* 21:8905-8925.

524 Imlay, J.A. 2003. Pathways of Oxidative Damage. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* 57:395–418.

525 Ivask, A., ElBadawy, A., Kaweeteerawat, C., Boren, D., Fischer, H., Ji, Z., Chang, C.H., Liu,
 526 R., Tolaymat, T., Telesca, D., Zink, J.I., Cohen, Y., Holden, P.A. and Godwin, H.A. 2014. Toxicity
 527 Mechanisms in Escherichia coli Vary for Silver Nanoparticles and Differ from Ionic Silver. *ACS*
 528 *Nano* 8(1):374–386. DOI:10.1021/nn4044047

529 Jager, T. and Zimmer E.I. 2012. Simplified Dynamic Energy Budget model for analysing
 530 ecotoxicity data. *Ecological Modelling* 225:74-81 DOI:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2011.11.012

531 Jager, T., Barsi A., Hamda, N.T., Martin, B.T., Zimmer, E.I. and Ducrot, V. 2014a. Dy-
 532 namic energy budgets in population ecotoxicology: applications and outlook. *Ecological Modelling*
 533 280:140-147 DOI:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.06.024

534 Jager, T., Gudmundsdóttir, E.M. and Cedergreen, N. 2014b. Dynamic modeling of sub-lethal
 535 mixture toxicity in the nematode Caenorhabditis elegans. *Environ Sci Technol* 48:7026-7033
 536 DOI:10.1021/es501306t

537 Jamet, A., Sigaud, S. Van de Sype, G., Puppo, A. and Hérouart, D. 2003. Expression of
 538 the Bacterial Catalase Genes During Sinorhizobium meliloti–Medicago sativa Symbiosis and Their
 539 Crucial Role During the Infection Process. *The American Phytopathological Society* 16(3):217-225.

540 Kaweeteerawat, C., Chang, C.H., Roy, K.R., Liu, R., Li, R., Toso, D., Fischer, H., Ivask,
 541 A., Ji, Z., Zink, J.I., Zhou, Z.H., Chanfreau, G.F., Telesca, D., Cohen, Y., Holden, P.A., Nel,
 542 A.E. and Godwin, H.A. 2015. Cu Nanoparticles Have Different Impacts in *Escherichia coli* and
 543 *Lactobacillus brevis* than Their Microsized and Ionic Analogues. *ACS Nano* 9(7):7215–7225. DOI:
 544 10.1021/acs.nano.5b02021

545 Klanjscek, T., Nisbet, R.M., Priester, J.H., Holden, P.A. 2012. Modeling physiological pro-

cesses that relate toxicant exposure and bacterial population dynamics. *PLoS ONE* 7(2):e26955
 DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0026955

Klanjscek, T., Nisbet, R.M., Priester, J.H. and Holden, P.A. 2013. Dynamic energy budget approach to modeling mechanisms of CdSe quantum dot toxicity. *Ecotoxicology* 22:319–330
 DOI:10.1007/s10646-012-1028-7

Kooijman, S.A.L.M. 2010. Dynamic Energy Budget Theory for Metabolic Organisation, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press, Great Britain. ISBN 9780521131919.

van Leeuwen, I.M., Vera, M.J. and Wolkenhauer, O.. 2010. Dynamic energy budget approaches for modelling organismal ageing. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 365:3443–3454

Martin, B., Jager, T., Nisbet, R.M., Preuss, T.G. and Grimm V. 2013. Predicting population dynamics from the properties of individuals: a cross-level test of Dynamic Energy Budget theory. *American Naturalist* 181(4):506-519 DOI: 10.1086/669904

Nel, A., Xia, T., Mädler, L. and Li, N. 2006. Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel *Science* 311(5761): 622-7.

Priester, J.H., Stoimenov, P.K., Mielke, R.E., Webb, S.M., Ehrhardt, C., Zhang, J.P., Stucky, G.D. and Holden, P.A. 2009. Effects of soluble cadmium salts versus CdSe quantum dots on the growth of planktonic *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Environmental Science & Technology* 43(7):2589–2594.
 DOI:10.1021/es802806n

Priester, J.H., Ge, Y., Mielke, R.E., Horst, A.M., Cole-Moritz, S., Espinosa, K., Gelb, J., Walker, S.L., Nisbet, R.M., An, Y.J., Schimel, J.P., Palmer, R.G.; Hernandez-Viezcas, J.A.; Zhao, L., Gardea-Torresdey, J. L. and Holden, P.A. 2012. Soybean susceptibility to manufactured nanomaterials with evidence for food quality and soil fertility interruption. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 109(37):E2451-E2456.

Saunders, P.T., Koeslag, J.H. and Wessels, J.A. 1998. Integral rein control in physiology. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 194(2):163-173

Saunders, P.T., Koeslag, J.H. and Wessels, J.A. 2000. Integral rein control in physiology II: a general model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 206(2):211-220

573 Zahradka, K., Slade, D., Bailone, A., Sommer, S., Averbeck, D., Petranovic, M., Lindner, A.B.
574 and Radman, M. 2006. Reassembly of shattered chromosomes in *Deinococcus radiodurans*. *Nature*
575 443, 569-573

576 Zhang, Q. and Andersen, M.E. 2007. Dose Response Relationship in Anti-Stress Gene Regu-
577 latory Networks. *PLoS Computational Biology* 3(3):e24 DOI:10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030024

578 6 APPENDICES

579 A Dynamics of controller compounds

580 In our model, ROS inactivation and damage repair function as controls of ROS and damage. The
581 control is mediated by controller compounds (controllers) that are produced by the cell, interact
582 with the controlled compounds (inactivate ROS and/or repair damage), and decay (see Table
583 A.1). We considered two types of mechanisms for the control, depending on the type of interaction
584 between controllers and ROS/damage: linear and saturating. The ROS controller dynamics and
585 control of ROS is detailed below; the rationale of damage control is similar.

586 Table A.1: ROS and damage dynamics, complete with the dynamics of their respective controllers,
587 *E* and *A*.

	dynamics	fluxes	
	$\frac{dZ}{dt} = j_{Z,prod} - k_Z Z - j_{ZE}$	$j_{Z,prod}$	ROS production due to metabolism and stress
		$k_Z Z$	spontaneous ROS reaction flux (causing damage)
		j_{ZE}	controlled ROS removal flux (mediated by <i>E</i>)
588	$\frac{dE}{dt} = j_{E,prod} - j_{E,out}$	$j_{E,prod}$	saturating production flux of <i>E</i> in response to ROS
		$j_{E,out}$	inactivation flux of the controller compound <i>E</i>
	$\frac{dA}{dt} = j_{A,prod} - j_{A,out}$	$j_{A,prod}$	saturating production flux of <i>A</i> in response to damage
		$j_{A,out}$	inactivation flux of the controller compound <i>A</i>
	$\frac{dD}{dt} = j_{D,prod} - j_{DA}$	$j_{D,prod}$	damage production due to spontaneous ROS reactions
		j_{DA}	damage repair (mediated by <i>A</i>)

589 We assume that the production of *E*, the ROS controller, is induced in the presence of ROS.
590 Therefore, the production of *E* increases as ROS levels increase but, recognizing that the upregu-

591 lation potential of a cell is finite, we assume a Michaelis-Menten type of saturating dynamics:

$$j_{E,prod} = \frac{v_E Z}{K_E + Z}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

592 where v_E is the maximum production rate of E , and K_E is the induction saturation constant.

593 Controller compounds are inactivated due to cellular turnover, interactions with controlled
594 compounds, and/or targeted degradation mechanisms. We choose simple, linear dynamics:

$$j_{E,out} = k_E E, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

595 where k_E is the controller inactivation rate.

596 In the case of linear control of ROS inactivation, we assumed that controlled ROS inactivation
597 depends on the contact rate between the controller, E , and ROS, Z , resulting in a simple bilinear
598 collision term:

$$j_{ZE}^{linear} = g_Z E Z, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

599 with g_Z signifying the ROS control strength coefficient.

600 For the saturating control of ROS inactivation, we considered that there may be an appreciable
601 'handling time' for inactivation of ROS by E and, consequently, assumed that:

$$j_{ZE}^{saturating} = g_Z E Z \frac{K_Z}{K_Z + Z}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

602 where K_Z is the relative saturation coefficient.

603 If stress intensities change slowly relative to the dynamics of controllers, e.g. because the
604 bioaccumulation of toxic stressors is gradual, and if stress intensities do not exceed a value that
605 would cause rapid unbounded increase in ROS and damage, we can set $dE/dt = 0$ and solve the
606 corresponding equation in Table A.1 for a quasi-equilibrium value of E :

$$E^* = \frac{v_E}{k_E} \frac{Z}{K_E + Z}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

607 Inserting A.5 into the equation for dZ/dt in Table A.1 gives

$$R_Z = \begin{cases} \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z} & \text{for } j_{ZE}^{linear} \\ \frac{v_Z Z^2}{(K_E + Z)(1 + Z/K_Z)} & \text{for } j_{ZE}^{saturating} \end{cases}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

608 where $v_Z = g_Z v_E / k_E$. Equivalently, with $v_D = g_D v_A / k_A$,

$$R_D = \begin{cases} \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D} & \text{for } j_{DA}^{linear} \\ \frac{v_D D^2}{(K_A + D)(1 + D/K_D)} & \text{for } j_{DA}^{saturating} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

609 B Parameter values

610 Table B.1: Symbols, state variables, parameters, and reference values. The reference values were
 611 used in simulations unless otherwise noted. The acronym “u.of” stands for “units of”.

symbol	meaning	reference values
State variables and flux symbols		
Z	damage-inducing compounds (ROS)	-
D	cellular damage	-
E	controller variable - ROS control	-
A	controller variable - damage repair	-
S	stressor intensity	-
P_0	metabolic ROS production flux	-
P_Z	stress-related ROS production flux	-
P_D	stress-related damage production flux	-
R_Z	regulated ROS clearance	-
R_D	regulated damage repair	-
parameters (alphabetical order)		
g_D	damage repair coefficient	0.001 minute ⁻¹
g_Z	ROS control strength coefficient	25 minute ⁻¹
612 g_{ZD}	multiplicative damage interaction coeff.	0.1 (u.of D) ⁻¹
γ_{DS}	stress-related damage production coeff.	0
γ_{ZD}	additive damage interaction coefficient	0
γ_{ZS}	stress-related ROS production coefficient	included in P_Z
K_A	half-saturation constant for production of A	1 u.of A
K_D	relative saturation coefficient of damage repair	1 u.of D
K_E	half-saturation constant for production of E	1 u.of E
K_Z	relative saturation coefficient of ROS control	1 u.of Z
k_A	clearance/turnover rate of A	0.012 minute ⁻¹
k_E	clearance/turnover rate of E	0.012 minute ⁻¹
k_Z	passive ROS clearance rate coefficient	50 minute ⁻¹
v_A	maximum production rate of A	5 u.of A /minute
v_D	damage control rate coefficient	$g_D v_A / k_A$
v_E	maximum production rate of E	5 u.of E /minute
v_Z	ROS control rate coefficient	$g_Z v_E / k_E$
y_D	damage yield from passive ROS reactions	0.001

613 Although we aimed at characterizing the dynamics of our model variants qualitatively, we used
 614 plausible parameter values whenever possible. All parameter values, and state variables are listed
 615 in Table B.1.

616 Here we show our reasoning for choosing particular values for clearance rates (k_Z , k_E , and k_A),

617 and maximum production/collision rates: (v_E , v_A , g_Z , and g_D). For this purpose, we take the
618 SOS DNA repair network in *Escherichia coli* as a paradigm for our system and assume that the
619 dynamics of the RecA protein of this repair network, as quantified by Friedman et al. (2005), are
620 representative for those of the controller compounds in our system.

621 Friedman et al. (2005) used UV radiation as a stressor to induce the promoter activity of
622 a fusion product of the RecA promoter and a fluorescent protein. At saturating levels of UV
623 radiation, the expression rate of this fusion product is about 5 arbitrary unites (au) per minute
624 (see Figure 1C in Friedman). Accordingly, we take $v_E = v_A = 5^{au}/min$.

625 Nath and Koch (1971) estimated the half-life of proteins in starved E. coli at about 60 minutes.
626 Assuming a similar half-life for the controllers in our system,

$$k_A = k_E = \frac{\ln(2)}{60} = 0.012 \text{ per minute.} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

627 This rate is consistent with RecA decay measured after a peak in expression in *Deinococcus radio-*
628 *durans* (Vlašić et al. 2008).

629 Panel F from Friedman's et al. (2005) Figure 1 shows that - for low exposures - promoter
630 activity starts to decline within 35 minutes, consistent with the estimate of 40 minutes for the
631 repair response of the SOS gene cascade (Michel 2005). If the decline in promoter activity results
632 from successful damage repair (i.e. no need for the expression of repair mechanism proteins once
633 the damage is repaired), we can use the time of decline as a proxy for time to successful repair.
634 Assuming double the exposure creates double the damage, we can then use panels D and G to
635 estimate the repair rate at maximum expression. Following a $20 \text{ J}/m^2$ exposure (Panel D), it takes
636 about 70 minutes for the reduction in promoter activity to start; following a $50 \text{ J}/m^2$ exposure,
637 the time to reduction is approximately 130 minutes. Hence, the half-life of damage is about 60
638 minutes *when regulation is at the maximum*, i.e. when

$$A_{max} = \frac{v_A}{k_A} \approx 420, \text{ and} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$g_D = \frac{\ln(2)}{\tau_{0.5} A_{max}} = \frac{0.70}{60 \cdot 500} = 3 \cdot 10^{-5}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Such a low value of made the equilibrium hard to attain, so we used a larger value of 0.001 per minute. The ROS clearance rate (k_Z) and interaction coefficient (g_Z) should be significantly higher because ROS dynamics is extremely fast; we arbitrarily set them to 25 per minute and 50 per minute, respectively. The following values were used for other parameters: yield coefficient $y_D = 0.001$, strength of effect of damage on ROS production $g_{ZD} = 0.1$. All saturation constants were set to unity.

B.1 REFERENCES

- Friedman N., Vardi S., Ronen M., Alon U. and Stavans, J. 2005. Precise temporal modulation in the response of the SOS DNA repair network in individual bacteria. *PLoS Biol* 3(7):e238
- Nath, K. and Koch, A.L. 1971. Chemistry and Metabolism of Macromolecules: Protein Degradation in *Escherichia coli* : II. Strain Differences in the Degradation of Protein and Nucleic Acid Resulting from Starvation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 246:6956-6967
- Michel, B. 2005. After 30 years of study, the bacterial SOS response still surprises us. *PLoS Biol* 3(7):e255.
- Vlašić, I., Ivančić-Baće, I., Imešek, M., Mihaljević, B. and Brčić-Kostić, K. 2008. RecJ nuclease is required for SOS induction after introduction of a double-strand break in a RecA loading deficient *recB* mutant of *Escherichia coli*. *Biochimie* 90:1347-1355.

656 C Equilibrium states and stability

657 The models in Table 2 can be written in a general form:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dZ}{dt} &= P_Z + D(\gamma_{ZD} + g_{ZD}P_Z) - k_Z Z - R_Z, \\ \frac{dD}{dt} &= y_D k_Z Z + P_D - R_D,\end{aligned}\tag{C.1}$$

658 where R_Z and R_D have one of the implicit forms shown in Table 1 (see also Appendix A). The
659 feedbacks defined by (10) form a Jacobian:

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_{ZZ}^- & \Phi_{ZD}^+ \\ \Phi_{DZ}^+ & \Phi_{DD}^- \end{bmatrix}\tag{C.2}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} -(k_Z + \partial R_Z / \partial Z) & g_{ZD}P_Z + \gamma_{ZD} \\ y_D k_Z & -\partial R_D / \partial D \end{bmatrix},\tag{C.3}$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{where the matrix} \\ \text{elements have signs} \end{array} = \begin{bmatrix} < 0 & > 0 \\ > 0 & \leq 0 \end{bmatrix}.\tag{C.4}$$

660 Since each of the functions R_Z and R_D in Table (1) is a monotonic increasing function of its
661 argument, the respective partial derivatives are positive, and both Φ_{ZZ}^- and Φ_{DD}^- are negative for
662 any combination of parameters (with $k_Z, v_Z, v_D > 0$), i.e. $\Phi_{ZZ}^- + \Phi_{DD}^- < 0$. From the Bendixson
663 criterion (McCluskey and Muldowney 1998), there can therefore never be periodic solutions of the
664 equations. Thus, the only possible attractors are fixed points (equilibria).

665 An equilibrium (Z^*, D^*) is stable if the trace of the Jacobian evaluated at the equilibrium is
666 negative and the determinant is positive, i.e.

$$\Phi_{ZZ}^- + \Phi_{DD}^- < 0, \text{ and } \Phi_{ZZ}^- \Phi_{DD}^- - \Phi_{ZD}^+ \Phi_{DZ}^+ > 0\tag{C.5}$$

667 when evaluated at (Z^*, D^*) . Since the first inequality is always satisfied, the stability is determined
668 by the second inequality, which has a simple graphical interpretation in the Z-D plane. First, let

669 us consider the two isoclines:

$$D(Z) = \frac{1}{g_{ZD}P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}} (k_Z Z + R_Z - P_Z), \text{ the "Z-isocline" (in Z-D space)} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$\text{and } Z(D) = \frac{1}{y_D k_Z} (R_D - P_D), \text{ the "D-isocline" (in D-Z space),} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

670 whose slopes (in Z-D plane) are

$$a_Z = \frac{\partial D(Z)}{\partial Z} = \frac{k_Z + \partial R_Z / \partial Z}{g_{ZD}P_Z + \gamma_{ZD}} = \frac{-\Phi_{ZZ}^-}{\Phi_{ZD}^+}, \quad (\text{C.8})$$

$$a_D^{-1} = \frac{\partial Z(D)}{\partial D} = \frac{\partial R_D / \partial Z}{y_D k_Z} = \frac{-\Phi_{DD}^-}{\Phi_{DZ}^+}, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

671 where a_D in Z-D plane is an inverse of the slope calculated in D-Z plane. Reorganizing the second
672 inequality in (C.5), while taking the known signs from (C.4) into the account, gives:

$$\frac{|\Phi_{ZZ}^-|}{|\Phi_{ZD}^+|} > \frac{|\Phi_{DZ}^+|}{|\Phi_{DD}^-|}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$a_Z > a_D, \quad (\text{C.11})$$

673 i.e. when evaluated in the Z-D plane at the equilibrium, the slope of the Z-isocline must be greater
674 than the slope of the D-isocline.

675 Note that $R_Z(0) = R_D(0) = 0$, implying that for any $P_Z > 0$ and $P_D \geq 0$, $D(0) < 0$ and
676 $Z(0) \leq 0$. Hence, the intercepts of the D-isocline on the D axis and of the Z-isocline on the Z axis
677 are both positive. Furthermore, if (C.11) holds in the limit as $Z, D \rightarrow \infty$, then for sufficiently large
678 values of Z , the value of D on the Z-isocline always exceeds its value on the D-isocline. Since the
679 opposite holds when $Z = 0$, there must be at least one intersection. Thus, a sufficient condition
680 for the existence of at least one steady state is

$$\lim_{D, Z \rightarrow \infty} (\Phi_{ZZ}^- \Phi_{DD}^- - \Phi_{ZD}^+ \Phi_{DZ}^+) > 0, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

681 i.e. equation (11) in the text. To determine the number of possible equilibria, we continue to use

the isoclines in the positive quadrant of the Z-D plane, but further analysis requires specification of R_Z and R_D .

C.1 Linear interaction terms

When the interaction terms defining ROS inactivation and damage repair are linear in Z and D respectively, the functions R_Z and R_D from Table 1 are

$$R_Z = \frac{v_Z Z^2}{K_E + Z}; \quad R_D = \frac{v_D D^2}{K_A + D} . \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Starting with the Z-isocline in the Z-D plane

$$\frac{\partial^2 D(Z)}{\partial Z^2} \propto \frac{\partial^2 R_Z}{\partial Z^2} > 0, \quad (\text{C.14})$$

thus the Z-isocline is concave upward (convex) in the Z-D plane. Similarly, the D-isocline is concave upward in the D-Z plane:

$$\frac{\partial^2 Z(D)}{\partial D^2} \propto \frac{\partial^2 R_D}{\partial D^2} > 0, \quad (\text{C.15})$$

i.e. concave downward in the Z-D plane. Since i) both isoclines increase with Z (equations (C.8) and (C.9)), ii) the Z-isocline is concave upward while the D-isocline is concave downward, and iii) the Z-isocline has a positive intercept on the D-axis, and the D-isocline has a positive intercept on the Z-axis, the isoclines can only intersect once in the positive quadrant of the Z-D plane. Therefore, at most one (unique) positive steady state exists, provided that for sufficiently large Z inequality (C.11) is satisfied, i.e. $a_Z > a_D$. This unique steady state also must be stable because the concavity of both isoclines remains the same, so if (C.11) is true for any $Z > 0$, the UPSE condition (11) is also necessarily true. Note that the proof of this result relies only on the concavity of the isoclines, not on our specific choice of functional forms (C.13).

699 C.2 Saturating interaction terms

700 In this section, we investigate steady states and stability of models with one or both saturating
 701 terms. First, we investigate the double-saturating model (saturating control of both ROS and
 702 damage). In addition to the equations above, we will need:

- 703 1. first derivatives of the isoclines with respect to the independent variable:

$$g_{ZD} \frac{\partial D}{\partial Z} = k_Z + \frac{v_Z Z (Z(K_E + K_Z^{-1}) + 2K_E K_Z^{-1})}{(K_E + Z)^2 (K_Z^{-1} + Z)^2} > 0 \text{ for } Z > 0. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

$$y_D k_Z \frac{\partial Z}{\partial D} = \frac{v_D D (D(K_A + K_D^{-1}) + 2K_A K_D^{-1})}{(K_A + D)^2 (K_D^{-1} + D)^2} > 0 \text{ for } D > 0 \quad (\text{C.17})$$

- 704 2. second derivatives of the isoclines with respect to the independent variable:

$$g_{ZD} \frac{\partial^2 D}{\partial Z^2} = \frac{2v_Z (2K_E^2 K_Z^{-2} - 3K_Z^{-1} K_E Z^2 - (K_E + K_Z^{-1}) Z^3)}{(K_E + Z)^3 (K_Z^{-1} + Z)^3} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

$$y_D k_Z \frac{\partial^2 Z}{\partial D^2} = \frac{2v_D (2K_A^2 K_D^{-2} - 3K_D^{-1} K_A D^2 - (K_A + K_D^{-1}) D^3)}{(K_A + D)^3 (K_D^{-1} + D)^3} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

- 705 3. more convenient definitions of the isoclines:

706 (a) we re-define the Z-isocline (C.6) as $D_1(Z) = D(Z)$, and

707 (b) since the D-isocline in D-Z plane (C.7) is monotonic and therefore has an inverse, we
 708 can define it in Z-D plane as $D_2(Z)$.

709 During the analysis, we utilize the following **statements** regarding the Z-isocline (Z_{ISO}) and
 710 D-isocline (D_{ISO}):

- 711 1. Except in a singular case of a touching intersection, models with saturating damage repair
 712 can only have an even number of steady states (0, 2, 4...) for $Z, D > 0$. Proof: for $Z = 0$,
 713 $D_1(Z) < D_2(Z)$. Furthermore, note that D_2 diverges at $Z_C = \lim_{D \rightarrow \infty} Z(D)$, so the domain
 714 of D_2 in the first quadrant is $[0, Z_C]$. Also, $\exists \epsilon_C > 0 | D_1(Z_C - \epsilon) < D_2(Z_C - \epsilon) \forall \epsilon < \epsilon_C$. Hence,

on the both ends of the domain $(0, Z_C)$, $D_1(Z) < D_2(Z)$. This is only possible if isoclines intersect an even number of times, or if $D_1(Z) \leq D_2(Z) \forall Z \in [0, Z_C]$. The latter is satisfied when there are no intersections, or in the singular case of a touching intersection ($a_Z = a_D$ at the intersection).

2. The positive steady state at (for Z_1^*) closest to the origin is stable. Proof: since $D_1(Z) < D_2(Z) \forall Z \in [0, Z_1^*)$, $dD_1/dZ|_{Z_1^*} > dD_2/dZ|_{Z_1^*}$. Therefore, unless the slopes are exactly equal, the condition (C.11) is satisfied, and the **first equilibrium in the first quadrant** (i.e. the equilibrium for the smallest $Z > 0$) **is stable**.

3. In the first quadrant ($Z, D > 0$), the second derivatives of the isoclines are decreasing functions of their respective independent variables. This is readily discernible from equations (C.18) and (C.19): the greater the independent variable, the smaller the nominator, and the larger the denominator. Note that this means that d^2D_1/dZ^2 can only decrease, and that d^2D_2/dZ^2 can only increase.

4. Isoclines with saturating control can have only one inflection point. Proof: since, when evaluated at 0, both second derivatives ((C.18) and (C.19)) are greater than zero, statement 3 guarantees that, as Z and D increase, (C.18) and (C.19) can intersect the x-axis only once. Hence, the second derivatives have only one positive root and, therefore, the isoclines have only one inflection point.

C.2.1 Model with saturating control of both ROS and damage

We start the analysis by noting that for $Z = 0$, $D_1 < D_2$ and $0 = dD_1/dZ < dD_2/dZ$. For the isoclines to intersect, dD_1/dZ has to increase, and dD_2/dZ has to decrease. Since (at $Z = 0$) $d^2D_1/dZ^2 > 0$ and $d^2D_2/dZ^2 < 0$, the intersection is possible. As Z increases, d^2D_1/dZ^2 decreases, while d^2D_2/dZ^2 increases until at least one isocline reaches the inflection point (second derivative equal to zero). If the isoclines intersect once, the second intersection (at Z_2^*) is only possible if at least one of the isoclines switches concavity for $Z < Z_2^*$ (otherwise the isoclines would continue to diverge).

740 Note that, at the second intersection, $dD_1/dZ|_{Z_2^*} < dD_2/dZ|_{Z_2^*}$. For the third intersection to exist, the
 741 reverse would have to be true; hence, either dD_1/dZ would have to increase, and/or dD_2/dZ would
 742 have to decrease.

743 Depending on which isocline(s) reached the inflection point, we distinguish three possibilities:

- 744 • P1: Only D_2 reached the inflection point: both isoclines are concave upwards ($d^2D_1/dZ^2, d^2D_2/dZ^2 > 0$).
 745 Since D_2 has to remain concave upwards (statement 4), dD_2/dZ can only increase further.
 746 Hence, only a sufficient increase in dD_1/dZ could cause a third intersection. Such an increase
 747 is, however, impossible (statement 3).
- 748 • P2: Only D_1 reached the inflection point: both isoclines are concave downwards ($d^2D_1/dZ^2, d^2D_2/dZ^2 < 0$).
 749 Since D_1 has to remain concave downwards (statement 4), only a sufficient decrease in dD_2/dZ
 750 could cause a third intersection; such an increase is impossible (statement 3).
- 751 • P3: Both isoclines reached the inflection point, so D_1 is concave downwards and D_2 is concave
 752 upwards. Since there are no additional inflection points, the isoclines will continue to diverge,
 753 making a third intersection impossible.

754 Therefore, the third intersection is impossible, i.e. there is a maximum of two intersections. State-
 755 ment 1 then guarantees that (barring the singular case), there are either zero or two intersections;
 756 if two states exist, the one closer to the origin is stable (statement 2).

757 C.2.2 Model with linear control of ROS and saturating control of damage

758 Here, only D_2 can have an inflection point; D_1 remains concave upwards. However, all statements
 759 and steps in the analysis of the double-saturating model apply, with the exception that P2 and P3
 760 need not be considered. Therefore, the results are the same: ignoring the singular case, this model
 761 can have either zero or two steady states, and the steady state closest to the origin is stable.

762 Note that models with saturating control of damage have a similar qualitative dynamics (in
 763 terms of existence of steady states) regardless of whether ROS control saturates or not. This is
 764 because, even when ROS control is saturated, ROS continues to be inactivated in the process of

765 damage creation: mathematically, the inactivation ($\sim Z$) is (in terms of dynamics) indistinguish-
766 able from linear control for large Z ($\lim_{Z \rightarrow \infty} R_Z \sim Z$). Hence, even when the ROS control is
767 saturated for large Z , the inactivation term assumes the dynamical role equivalent to that of linear
768 ROS control. Clearly, the actual dynamics will differ due to the positive feedback loop between
769 ROS and damage.

770 C.2.3 Model with saturating control of ROS and linear control of damage

771 Here, D_1 can have an inflection point, but D_2 cannot. Therefore, statement 1 is not applicable,
772 and condition (11) needs to be considered. Two cases are possible:

- 773 1. Condition (11) is satisfied. Then, $D_1 < D_2$ for small and $D_1 > D_2$ for large values of Z .
774 This is only possible if there is an odd number of intersections (1, 3, 5...). Since more than
775 two intersection are not possible, there is one and only one intersection whenever condition
776 (11) is satisfied.
- 777 2. Condition (11) is *not* satisfied. Then, $D_1 < D_2$ for both small and large values of Z . Therefore
778 (ignoring the singular case and recognizing that the third steady state is impossible), either
779 zero or two intersections exist. Statement 2 holds, so the steady state closer to the origin is
780 stable.

781 C.3 REFERENCES

782 McCluskey, C.C. and Muldowney, J.S. 1998. Stability Implications of Bendixson's Criterion. *SIAM*
783 *Review* 40(4):931-934

784 D Correlations between ROS and damage

785 Here we look at how Z changes relative to D by a qualitative analysis of 1) equilibrium values of
786 Z and D as forcing (P_Z or P_D) increases, and 2) the ratio of Z and D in a runaway.

787 D.1 Changes in the equilibrium as forcing increases

788 Let $a = \partial Z(D)/\partial Z|_*$ be the rate of change of Z -isocline (C.6) with respect to Z , and $b = \partial Z(D)/\partial(D)|_*$
 789 the rate of change of D isocline (C.7) with respect to D at the stable equilibrium. For the
 790 equilibrium to exist, the two isoclines need to intersect, and for the equilibrium to be stable, the
 791 Z -isocline has to be steeper than the D -isocline ($a > b^{-1}$).

792 We start by linearizing the isoclines at the steady state, Z^* and D^* , and consider an infinitesimal
 793 increase in P_Z resulting in changes of the equilibrium, δZ^* and δD^* . Since P_Z affects only the Z
 794 isocline, it is appropriate to observe the shift of the equilibrium along the D isocline,

$$\delta Z^* = b \delta D^*. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

795 The ratio of δD^* and δZ^* is, therefore, equal to b^{-1} :

$$b^{-1} = \left(\frac{\partial Z(D)}{\partial D} \right)_*^{-1} = y_D k_Z \left(\frac{\partial R_D}{\partial D} \right)_*^{-1} = y_D k_Z \begin{cases} \frac{(K_A + D^*)^2}{D^* v_D (D^* + 2K_A)} & \text{for } j_{DA}^{\text{linear}} \\ \frac{(K_A + D^*)^2 (K_D + D^*)^2}{D^* K_D v_D (D^* (K_D + K_A) + 2K_D K_A)} & \text{for } j_{DA}^{\text{saturating}} \end{cases}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

796 For linear control (linear j_{DA}), b^{-1} starts very high and approaches a constant as D^* increases.
 797 We can therefore expect, as stress increases, supra-linear correlation between D^* and Z^* for small
 798 stressor intensities, and a constant ratio for D^* significantly higher than $2K_A$.

799 For saturating j_{DA} , b^{-1} is again extremely large when D^* is small (small P_Z), reduces for
 800 intermediate D^* , and approaches infinity as D^* increases further. We could, therefore, expect
 801 that the correlation between Z^* and D^* , as stress intensity increases, is first supra-linear, then
 802 sub-linear, and then supra-linear again. Consequently, the type of correlation between Z^* and D^*
 803 will depend on parameter values.

804 Next, let us consider changes in effects of increase in P_D . Since P_D only affects the D isocline,
 805 it is opportune to look at the shift of the equilibrium along the Z -isocline:

$$\delta D^* = a \delta Z^*. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

806 Consequently,

$$a = \frac{\partial D(Z)}{\partial Z} = \frac{1}{\Phi_{ZD}^+} \left(k_Z + \frac{\partial R_Z}{\partial Z} \right) = \frac{1}{\Phi_{ZD}^+} \begin{cases} k_Z + \frac{Z^* v_Z (Z^* + 2K_E)}{(K_E + Z^*)^2} & \text{for } j_{ZE}^{linear} \\ k_Z + \frac{Z^* K_Z v_Z (Z^* (K_Z + K_E) + 2K_Z K_E)}{(K_E + Z^*)^2 (K_Z + Z^*)^2} & \text{for } j_{ZE}^{saturating} \end{cases}. \quad (D.4)$$

807 For linear j_{ZE} , the correlation between Z^* and D^* increases until it reaches a constant value.
 808 Therefore, we can expect sub-linear (smaller increase in D^* than Z^*) correlation for small, and
 809 linear correlation for large Z^* .

810 For non-linear j_{ZE} , a increases with Z^* for small values of Z^* , then decreases for intermediate
 811 Z^* , and finally approaches a constant for large Z^* . Hence, conditioned on the existence of the
 812 equilibrium, the type of correlation will depend on the parameters.

813 D.2 The ratio of Z and D in a runaway

814 Starting from the general dynamics (C.1), we first investigate three combinations of control types
 815 (see also Table 2): (1) linear R_Z and R_D , (2) saturating R_Z and linear R_D , and (3) linear R_Z and
 816 saturating R_D . Next, we investigate how dynamics changes when the positive feedback from D to
 817 Z is negligible ($g_{ZD} = \gamma_{ZD} = 0$).

818 Since in a runaway Z and D can be expected to be high enough that $Z \gg K_E, K_Z$ and
 819 $D \gg K_A, K_D$, we approximate (C.1) with a non-homogeneous linear system of ODEs and recast
 820 it into a matrix form:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ D \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{A}_i \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ D \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{g}_i, \quad (D.5)$$

821 where the subscript $\mathbf{i} = 1, 2, 3$ represents one of the three cases, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{A}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} -(k_Z + v_Z) & \gamma_{ZD} + g_{ZD}P_Z \\ y_D k_Z & -v_D \end{bmatrix}, & \mathbf{g}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} P_Z \\ P_D \end{bmatrix}; \\
 \mathbf{A}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} -(k_Z + v_Z) & \gamma_{ZD} + g_{ZD}P_Z \\ y_D k_Z & 0 \end{bmatrix}, & \mathbf{g}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} P_Z \\ P_D - v_D \end{bmatrix}; \\
 \mathbf{A}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} -k_Z & \gamma_{ZD} + g_{ZD}P_Z \\ y_D k_Z & -v_D \end{bmatrix}, & \mathbf{g}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} P_Z - v_Z \\ P_D \end{bmatrix}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{D.6}$$

822 Provided the matrix A_i is not singular, and P_Z and P_D are constants, the particular integral
 823 of (D.5) is a constant and can be ignored for large enough Z and D . Furthermore, only solutions
 824 to the homogeneous equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ D \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{A}_i \begin{bmatrix} Z \\ D \end{bmatrix} \tag{D.7}$$

825 are of interest. The solutions for either state variable are a sum of two exponential functions of
 826 time ($a_{Z,D}^i e^{\lambda_1^i t} + b_{Z,D}^i e^{\lambda_2^i t}$) where $\lambda_{1,2}^i$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{A}_i$, and $a_{Z,D}$ and $b_{Z,D}$ the corresponding
 827 coefficients for Z and D . Eventually, the dominant eigenvalue (λ_1^i by convention) will prevail, and
 828 the ratio of Z and D will be constant:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z}{D} = \frac{a_Z^i}{a_D^i}. \tag{D.8}$$

829 Analytic solutions are cumbersome, but solutions for specific sets of parameters can easily be
 830 calculated by solving (D.7), and the accuracy increased by taking into the account the complete
 831 solution of (D.5).

832 Removing the positive feedback of D on Z changes the runaway dynamics considerably. When
 833 $g_{ZD} = \gamma_{ZD} = 0$, runaway is impossible for linear R_D (the left-hand side of UPSE condition in Table
 834 2 is zero). When R_D is saturating, although Z always has steady state, a runaway is inevitable
 835 whenever damage production ($y_D k_Z Z + P_D$) is greater than the maximum damage repair (v_D), i.e.

836 whenever $y_D k_Z Z + P_D > v_D$. Then, ROS remains constant at $Z^* = P_Z(k_Z + v_Z)^{-1}$, and damage
837 increases linearly with the asymptotic rate of $(y_D k_Z Z + P_D - v_D)$.