

## Stochastic events and their contributions to biological evolution and cancer

Mubenstein P, Watel EM

**Corresponding author**

Mubenstein P, Hektoen Institute, 627 S Wood Street, Chicago, USA.

**Email:** mubensteinp@sbcglobal.net**Received Date:** January 20 2022**Accepted Date:** January 24 2022**Published Date:** February 21 2022**Abstract**

Stochastic genetic and epigenetic events are basic in causative to the event of manifold life-forms, past and gift. the event of malignant cell clones and therefore the role of irregularity as a drive in neoplastic cell evolution enhances, in an exceedingly perverse method proof for the role of probability in traditional cellular development and evolution. random events at multiple levels of cellular management associated implementation represent a primary drive and an final filter through that organic process innovation happens. irregularity provides the chance for a random assortment of disparate genetic and epigenetic events, in some instances leading to altered metabolic and biological process capabilities of ample stability and singularity to contribute to settled sequelae that promote the viability and reproduction of cells below stress. Cellular evolution has up to now resulted in an exceedingly "survival of a (sic) fittest", usually dependent mechanistically on and determined by random events. The implications of this area unit reflected within the evolution of malignant amendment, to some extent as a variant of "reverse engineering" of adjustment. Efforts to scale back the incidence of malignant amendment can got to soak up to account its random nature and any the understanding of this feature.

**Keywords**

stochastic events; biological evolution; cancer prime movers; epigenetic events; malignant cell clones

**Introduction**

In a recent report it absolutely was instructed that the chance of cancer poignant numerous tissues was a operate of their range of vegetative cell divisions [1]. essentially it absolutely was a correlative study relating associate degree calculable range of vegetative cell divisions in tissues of interest over a subjects' period of time to the variation in incidence of cancer in these tissues. The authors complete that excluding transmissible and environmentally-induced cancers, the chance of experiencing DNA mutations contributive to malignant amendment in these cancers was associated with the amount of vegetative cell divisions over a period of time.

A backlash of criticism of the paper and its' coverage was aforementioned to possess resulted [2, 3]. Criticisms enclosed, among others, over simplification and also the omission of breast and prostate

cancers, due but to insufficient knowledge and also the generation of undue pessimism concerning tries to avoid cancer. however, there's an excellent deal of proof in support of the first thesis. For the generation of variant cells, particularly those exhibiting major biological process, organic process or malignant amendment, random (random) genetic and epigenetic mutations offer the key impetus for his or her creation [4-6]. Unless cells exposed to doubtless deadly environmental or intrinsic genetic, metabolic or therapeutic stress circumvent them, their survival, separately and of the clone, or maybe the organism is in danger. Cells undergoing malignant amendment expertise a series of mutations tending to confirm their continued proliferation and their increasing freeing from traditional cell- to- cell constraints.

Much of what follows is renowned and has been championed by several [4-13]. nonetheless there looks to be a widespread reluctance to settle for the role of probability at basically each level of life, as all members of the part expertise it. For this, among different reasons, there is some worth in a very temporary summary of elect components associated with the projected thesis [1]. we tend to review some biological implications of "randomness", particularly because it affects evolving cancer cells and its impact on cellular evolution, a minimum of as way as we tend to know it. No intensive literature review is meant however a range from the references offered to United States of America is provided. Table one presents a top level view of the topics mentioned. First, some comments regarding philosophical doctrine and randomness.

**Determinism, randomness and irregularity**

Deterministic programs and events square measure thought of to be sure provided ample understanding of their underlying mechanism is on the market. In distinction, random events and processes don't have known, mechanistic properties and square measure thought by several to be entirely random or "free" [14]. Some see a distinction between many kinds of randomness, apparently dependent upon context [15]. Randomness represents incomplete data, inaccessible thanks to the shortcoming to spot uncontrolled causes. A chaotic system (deterministic chaos) will have sure properties though they'll be tough or maybe not possible to spot [15]. random circuits are developed that manufacture fairly duplicable behavior [16]. The relative chance of an occurrence needn't be absolutely the single shaping feature, and rare events is settled. A random event could have some overall, however unknown chance, dependent upon the previous "state" of the system, depending on its history. Certainly, "random" life events rely upon unknown options whose mechanisms haven't been known. However, as associate degree approximation, and keeping exceptions in mind, it looks helpful mentally to distribute most settled, stochastic, and random events on some type of chance coordinate axis. characteristic settled events dependent upon doubtless identifiable causes from multiple events thanks to a typical cause is typically achieved by the utilization of controls.

Internal and external noise and stochasticityIn studies with E. coli [17] and after by others with class cells [18], alien noise was outlined as an occurrence that identically affects 2 genes that embody copies of an equivalent promotor, one driving the expression of a cyan-fluorescent supermolecule and also the different yellow-fluorescence promotor [17]. Intrinsic noise thanks to randomness in transcription or translation was thought of to have an effect on only 1 of the promotors. alien noise was ascribed to variations within the numbers of polymerases, mRNAs or ri-

bosomes affected and variability in rate constants associated with these events. Each kind of noise was thought to be influenced by random thermal fluctuations.

A study of single cell polymer sequences in 430 cells from 5 primary glioblastomas incontestably they varied within the expression of oncogenic communication, proliferation, immunologic response and drive [18]. There was a time of stemness-related expression states and tumour/brain tumour subtypes were expressed across individual cells inside a tumor, all proof of intra-tumoral nonuniformity. In higher eukaryotes it had been found that episodic supermolecule and particularly informational RNA expression may be a major contributor to cell to cell variations [19].

Chromatin modeling may be a primary intrinsic contributor to individual cellular behavior [20, 21]. The distribution between eu and heterochromatin and also the epigenomic transitions providing access to or suppression of genomic sites is beneath complicated regulation. A way that enables a variety of single cell identification with the employment of a combinatorial cellular assortment applied to fifteen,000 cells incontestably totally different/completely different/ coordinated body substance in single cells between and among different cell kind body substance accessibility landscapes [22]. The power to live fluorescent supermolecule synthesis, mRNA, exome and whole ordering DNA and polymer sequences, eventually in single cells, has been instrumental in studies of cellular noise.

The relation between intrinsic or unessential noise and random cellular events has been studied. Some authorities relate intrinsic and unessential noise with a possible prevalence of random events [23]. Others determine "gene intrinsic noise" as molecular-level noise related to organic phenomenon [24]. Still others target the impact of noise on genes regulated at a system network level [25]. Multiple interactions between class-conscious (stem cell-related) and random (somatic cell-related) noise are unreal [26].

When 414 essential yeast genes were replaced by human orthologs, forty seven % of the human genes replaced their yeast orthologs [27]. Curiously, initiation of DNA synthesis wasn't similar whereas alcohol biogenesis was. Similar sequence modules cared-for be similar and this didn't need marked similarity in sequence.

Stochastic events while not associate known "cause" and so thought of as "random", appear extremely to be not absolutely random, related to properties distinctive to the system thought of. Their identification needs procedures to discover and distinguish them from settled noise. A random event relying upon noise seems as a singular event(s) that presumptively persists, not to mention and able to alter the metabolic, restrictive and organic process history of the affected cell and its' issue. Presumptively most random thermal noise doesn't win levels of intensity and persistence of random noise able to alter the programming of differentiation, the metabolism, genotype and composition of the affected cells.

The intersection of random events and cellular elements A style of factors are involved within the suppression [28] or accentuation of intrinsic noise [29]. Presumptively these outcomes will vary from frequent minor progressive changes to less frequent, persistent alterations. Some might cause changes in organic process history, as well as terribly rare however essentially radical changes in cellular genotype and composition, with altered cell differentiation resulting in basic changes in body arrange and also the creation of recent species. Oncogenesis has been

viewed as a re-ordering of cellular differentiation, either hierarchically via indiscriminately aberrant somatic cell development or stochastically with retrogression and adoption or reactivation by differentiated cells of evolutionarily a lot of older functions embedded within the ordering that will be transiently active however are suppressed.

It is tempting to recommend many gradations of random events tributary to distinct if overlapping outcomes (Table 2). Random Level I events may embody effects on housework events: copy, differentiation and cellular aging, in step with well-established, ancient, antecedently established organic process programs. Level II random events may well be viewed as having the impact of "Tactical" random events that embody responses to additional complicated stresses; Level III random events may well be diagrammatical by terribly rare Strategic random singularities involving genetic and epigenetic parts moving essentially vital metabolic or organic process networks and interactions. Those would lead to major, even radical organic process modifications, presumptively requiring persistent activation energies supporting additional complicated and intensive molecular interaction, several of them having been related to terribly ancient organic process events. Their chance of prevalence was and is way but events within the 1st 2 classes.

One will imagine associate increasing quality of response because the levels are ascended, culminating in major duplications in regions of, if not whole genomes [7, 8, 12, 13, 30]. This is able to give a vast increase within the potential genetic recombination and sites for additional genetic amendment over time. Duplicated genes during which one is absolute to diverge from the opposite, termed paralogues, are gift within the HOX, haematohiston and albuminoid sequence families. Random events related to malignant amendment would appear seemingly to have an effect on additional restricted changes occurring within the 1st 2 planned classes. Neutering behavior of 1 or additional of the twelve known organic process signal transduction pathways [31], modifying the readout of polymer or supermolecule parts related to management of organic process programs, or inter-cellular interactions able to alter cellular behavior and promote cellular survival may well be enclosed among these additional restricted transitions.

These prompt classes needn't be bolt compartmentalised and vital effects would possibly originate in any of them, relying upon context. There's proof that a lot of, most likely most random events are sometimes null whereas others represent "passenger" events while not vital effects on cell viability or proliferation [32, 33]. Some would be harmful [4-6]; sure inborn errors of metabolism or structure and fossil proof of extinct species conjointly inhabit that class. For associate affected clone, oncological adjustment represents a unleash from the constraints of differentiation; for the host a possible threat to its survival.

Duplication and mutation of HOX and alternative genes with the gradual establishment (over biological process time) of bi-laterality, antero-posterior segmentation, dorsal-ventral differentiation and formation of the pinnacle [5, 7, 8, 12, 13, 30] square measure putting samples of what square measure thought-about to possess been basically random biological process events associated with intensive cistron duplication and ensuing widespread genomic modification. These ought to characterize the additional complicated and intensive changes in Level three. As judged from fossil proof [34], several ultimately unsuccessful makes an attempt by cellular organisms and their stressed cells to market cell, organism and system survival have occurred. Lack of effective settled and random responses to cellular stresses or activation of harmful responses ought to consign stressed cells and organisms unable to avoid environmental or alternative challenges to extinction. It's been

incontestable that actively replicating cells [35] expertise additional random mutations than quiescent cells. Random events of this type presumptively were associated with intensive cistron duplications within the past, resulting in development of HOX and alternative duplicated genes [7, 8, 12, 30]. The condition to “errors” occurring throughout DNA synthesis and cellular replication is well established [36].

These errors represent the physical basis for random changes within the ordination and its expression. The additional widespread the changes, the bigger the likelihood of associate degree underlying intensive genetic and resulting makeup result. within the case of HOX cistron duplication, the argument is that at it slow within the distant past, intensive duplications of regions of associate degree ancient ordination gave rise to makeup changes together with body segmentation, this partly because of mutation over time of paralogues [7, 8, 12, 30].

The argument that stochasticism is associate degree final thrust of cellular evolution, in operation for a few by a town random assortive combination of genetic and epigenetic events has been advanced by several with interest during this space [5, 10, 11, 13, 39-43]. the trendy synthesis of organic process biology that developed throughout the Nineteen Forties grounded the variety of a population within the random look of mutations [7]. Major organic process events involve additional radical alterations within the ordination, for this discussion selected level three strategic modifications through that major future biological process developments ought to pass (Table 2). Lesser genetic and epigenetic changes (levels one and 2), maybe additional seemingly involved within the additional restricted organic process responses of malignant cells, might not possess sufficiently complicated combinatorial choices to underwrite radical departures in organic process programming. As the level of random events and their complexness will increase it appears seemingly that a bigger variety of alternative molecular partners could also be needed for his or her implementation. These concerns conjointly appear relevant for random events in non-malignant cells. all told these things, a random trial and error, a sort of “stochastic optimization” [44] provides the arbitration of likelihood because it operates in a very biological atmosphere to market, leave unaffected or impair the survival and fruitful “fitness” of the topic organism beneath stress. Paradoxically, the booming outcome of random alterations on the ordination ultimately depends upon the settled implementation of these events. combos and re-assortments that contribute to a survival of a fittest endure; the opposite outcomes consign stressed cells either to stasis or oblivion.

As regards random events doubtless touching emergent cancer cells, random alterations together with increase, decrease or absence of operate of potential targets may embrace participants from among the 120-plus known oncogenes, suppressor genes gene/ enzyme/ protein/ protein/ DNA/ ribonucleic acid (mRNA, sRNA and untranslated small and alternative RNAs), macromolecule moieties, operators, repressors, co-repressors, enhancers and connected entities, signal transduction processes as they’ll comingle in numerous configurations [31], the nodes, modules and cassettes contributory to the hubs and kernels of networks central to programming of cellular replication, differentiation, quiescence and death.

Stochasticity and therefore the law of huge numbers applied to biological events it’s going to appear odd that random genomic events will cause populations of cells exhibiting settled outcomes touching their survival. If affected cells at the start square measure few in variety, random effects will be disproportionately important. though the ultimate composition of atiny low population of replicating cells is unsure because of genetic drift, the modification within the frequency of

a cistron variant in a very population because of sampling [37], were proliferation of 1 clone sufficiently sturdy to outgrow their unaffected companions, it may eventually become the dominant organism representative.

The “law of huge numbers”, basically the addition of tiny mathematician uncertainties [15], is usually invoked to cut back the result of aberrant cells on a population’s ensuant composition. Individual variations, some associated with noise, are summed, in bulk, in a very reasonably mass-action averaging, the end result but showing as settled because of the big variety of cells expressing behaviors near to some broad average. to use a previous analogy [38], individual molecules of H<sub>2</sub>O in a very wave square measure distinctive in many ways, maybe even somewhat chaotic, however the wave eventually reaches the shore, a settled outcome. It will therefore because of associate degree overall structure associated with the relationships between the a lot of larger numbers of additional average molecules of water, a structure ample to dilute out effects of the lesser variety of outliers, unless their result or numbers were sufficiently riotous to disturb the forces maintaining the behaviors of the way more varied average molecules.

A current read is that comparatively stable biological process programs have evolved to get similar, deeply embedded and usually reliable settled outcomes. In one comparison of epigenetic identification of human, macaque Old World monkey and mouse system corticogenesis, promoters and enhancers were enriched in modules related to human somatic cell proliferation, migration and organization [50]. These correlate programs were per common regulative mechanisms. the flexibility of HOX genes to manage the quantity of digits in an exceedingly mouse limb, delineated with a mathematician reaction-diffusion mechanism, by a lot of} reducing Hoxa13 and Hoxd11-Hoxd13 genes from Gli-null background mice light-emitting diode to increasingly more intensive birth defect [51]. different studies indicate a progressive central to peripheral development of the extremities, indicative of the settled progression of associate degree evolutionarily eminent “program” of development [52]. Deeply “embedded”, evolutionarily ancient, preserved “programs” could also be less subjected to random variation. Had they been transiently active however became functionally silent in heterochromatin, they still may be reactivated by associate degree epigenetic mechanism.

In studies of differentiation, random interventions don’t appear to possess characteristically intruded on basic housework cell functions to differentiate the new blessed with cell clone from dissimilar ones. the general consistency of eminent human embryological development, calculable at regarding seventy p.c of inseminated ova, doesn’t represent a typical incidence of major phenotypical intrusions by random events in eminent live births. These typically eminent outcomes area unit extremely settled, a minimum of at the amount of the makeup, nonetheless important genomic variations between identical twins are reportable. whereas major programmatic themes of human development typically proceed on what seem to be phenotypically settled venues, excluding the incidence of spontaneous abortions and varied inborn or nonheritable biological process “errors”, the extent to that such development is changed by random events, usually with apparently restricted overall effects on development, is a smaller amount apparent. Disruptions in development thanks to activation of oncogenes or inaction of suppressor genes give a window into that associate degree estimate of a frequency with that hurtful effects of stochasticism on the host will occur [6, 53]. in an exceedingly study of single SW480 cancer cells, single ester and replica range variations particularly moving purine to pyrimidine exchanges within the former were discovered [53]. From this it absolutely was attainable to live mutation rates of forty four candidate

genes of this neoplastic cell line.

Literature regarding the event of cancer cells, whether or not via somatic cells (a forward development stem cell theory) or retrogression of differentiated cells supported mutations of bodily cells, termed by some the “stochastic” theory, provides any proof for the role of random genetic and epigenetic amendment within the dysdifferentiation of malignant cancer cells.

Individual cancers generally contain variety of genetically distinct clones associated with the parental strain [54]. A recent study of potential bodily mutations in daylight exposed protective fold cuticle demonstrates from 2 to 6 bodily mutations per megabase per cell with absolutely elect mutations in eighteen to thirty two p.c of traditional skin cells with regarding a hundred and forty driver mutations per sq. cm of skin [6]. Multiregion sequencing of primary urinary organ carcinomas and their metastases found from sixty three to sixty nine p.c of all bodily mutations weren't detected across each neoplasm region sampled [55]. in an exceedingly study of primary and pathologic process carcinoma, bodily mutations were separated into founder and progressor mutations. the odds detected among the tumors and between metastases to the liver and respiratory organ differed [56]. These biological process events were thought-about to possess occurred over a amount of up to ten years. somatic cell proliferation was incontestable to be affected haphazardly by random events occurring throughout proliferation [57].

Many of the reportable studies correlate the behavior of cancers studied with mathematical analyses per the intrusion of random (unidentified) events. pathologic process human carcinoma is reportable to contain clonally derived cancer cells that, once injected into mice initiated tumors resembling the initial cancer [43]. distinctive (stochastic) and organism (hierarchical) body changes were gift. carcinoma metastases are modelled victimization human autopsy knowledge analyzed with a Makov chain three-card monte Carlo- based mostly program yielding results per a multidirectional framework [58]. Mouse malignant melanoma cells either develop animal pigment or not per a stochastically derived program [59]. supported such data, representative of the many extra studies, the conclusion is that neoplastic cell development, whereas relying upon a powerful part of maintained philosophical theory, is subject to the driving force mutations of proto- oncogenes, proto-suppressor genes and progressor mutations, as could also be haphazardly activated or suppressed, relying upon context. The argument that random interventions area unit the final word permissive actuation of traditional and pathologic (oncogenic) cellular evolution, operational by a form of town random assortive, random optimisation, re- combination of genetic and epigenetic events has been advanced by several with interest during this subject [39-44]. A type of settled and random back- and- forth, trial and error, subject to the arbitration of likelihood, to either promote or impair the survival and generative fitness of the topic organism is projected. solely those combos and re-assortments promoting these twin outcomes, facilitate survival of the (really a) fittest; different outcomes either consigned stressed cells to oblivion or to stasis. Efforts to spot the result of random variation because it might move among potential genetic partners in *C. elegans* are given [60]. however whether or not affected cells area unit associated with deviant stem cells or derived from bodily cells by a type of adaptation [61], a serious role for likelihood is unreal.

### Summary and comments

To come back to the initial question: ar several and presumably even a majority of cancers thanks to random organic process and differentiation-related errors, rendering them troublesome if not not possible to

circumvent? within the original formulation, the event of the many cancers is believed thanks to the prevalence over a life of random mutations in replicating stem cells [1]. In essence,  $M$  (total corporeal mutations) =  $u$  (mutation rate)  $\times$   $D$  (# cell divisions). during a recent modification,  $M = (u + ue)$  (epigenetic changes)  $\times$   $D$  [62]. Since it's not clear however  $D$ , the amount of cell divisions of a actively proliferating organ like the large intestine system, is manipulated, genetic and epigenetic mutation rates considerably dependent upon random events ar the factors doubtless offered for makes an attempt at modification.

The wide proof, a number of that was alluded to, for the random prevalence genetic and epigenetic cell “events” underlying malignant amendment, associated particularly with cellular replication in aging people, provides a robust argument for this formulation. as a result of random events ar believed to occur a lot of usually in actively proliferating cells, numerous leukemias would appear prime candidates to be a lot of rife in the slightest degree ages, thanks to the big generation of organic process cells over a life, a lot of in unison with large intestine carcinoma, however this doesn't appear to be the case. maybe these cells ar Associate in Nursing exception proving the rule, and organic process cells, having undergone distinctive routes to their various cellular fates somehow suppress the prevalence of the many random events throughout proliferation.

The elements of the argument apply to mechanisms underlying biological evolution, as exemplified by the afore-mentioned fashionable synthesis within the organic process biology of the Nineteen Forties within which random mutations were thought of to account for diversity in populations [7]. probability organic process and organic process events occur at several levels, as in one example, determination of cell varieties within which a random event in *C. elegans* causes accumulated production of 1 variety of cell instead of another [7]. Major organic process events like evolution appear to own needed major genomic re-organization dependent upon intensive initial and subsequent random interventions. Through a mechanism of successive genetic refinement via what appears to be a type of random optimisation [44], members of the part have developed to the extent we discover them and ourselves. Applying this general argument to the to the evolution Associate in Nursing mal-differentiation of malignant cells doesn't appear an unreasonable stretch; cells evolve with success or not, related to and every now and then as a result of random interventions as they permit affected cells to reply to environmental and different stresses.

Presently we tend to perceive that DNA synthesis and organic process ar inherently a lot of erring and as individuals age, increase the likelihood of malignant amendment with increasing additive numbers of cells that have proliferated. It doesn't seem that accumulated random mutation happens all told actively metabolizing cells, a minimum of as exemplified by internal organ and different active body fluid cells with ordinary rates of cancer and low rates of proliferation. a vital initial question is whether or not mechanisms to correct replicative errors ar less error- prone in cells from younger, compared with those from a lot of older people. This determination needs assays for estimating the numbers of apparently random genetic events in proliferating cells. If DNA repair processes do degrade with age, ar there suggests that of maintaining or augmenting the repair mechanisms of cells in each young and older individuals? Any important reduction in additive mutation rate over variety of years may extend the time a clinically necessary cancer would have developed by sufficient further years, ideally well once a personal died from natural causes. This represents a unique set of queries for analysis, presumably eventually involving some type of genome-related decide to cut back the speed of cellular aging, stabilize repetitive DNA, maintain the integrity of telomeres, cut back cellular

aerophilic stress Associate in Nursingd otherwise maintain or restore the interior surroundings of aging cells to it of an earlier state.

A review of obtainable comparative studies of worldwide cancer incidence in numerous national and ethnic teams and of the following cancer histories of migrant teams to North America and Europe ought to offer insight into doubtless useful dietary and different life- vogue practices, particularly once correlate with assays for random mutations related to cellular proliferation of target organs. Studies of parabiosed young and older animals suggests a job for growth differentiation issue eleven, that declines with age, in reducing internal organ hypertrophy within the older animals [63], though this result has been challenged. Modifying the perform of sirtuins [64] by resveratrol [65] or different agents and proof of decay of heterochromatin with aging [66, 67] represent collateral studies associated with the consequences of aging that may have implications for the frequency of random events in proliferating cells.

## Conclusion

Benign random responses in stressed cells have promoted organism and species evolution to this state. To be in danger from the chance of malignant randomness, as all doubtless ar, needn't essentially mandate extreme pessimism.

## References

1. Tomasetti C, Vogelstein B. Cancer etiology. Variation in cancer risk among tissues can be explained by the number of stem cell divisions. *Science*. 2015; 347(6217):78–81.
2. Coluzin-Frankel J. Backlash greets 'bad luck' cancer study and coverage. *Science* 2015; 347(6219):224.
3. Sills J. (ed). Cancer risk: Role of environment and letters following. *Science* 2015; 347:727–731.
4. Weinberg RA. Chapter 1. The biology and genetics of cells and organisms, in the *Biology of Cancer*, Garland Science, New York, NY., 2007; pg 1–24.
5. Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, Aparicio SA, Behjati S, et al. Signature of mutational processes in human cancer. *Nature*. 2013; 500(7463):415–421.
6. Martincorena I, Roshan A, Gerstong M, Ellis P, van Loo P, et al. Tumor evolution. High burden and pervasive positive selection of somatic mutations in normal human skin. *Science*. 2015; 348(6237):880–886.
7. Gilbert SF. *Developmental Biology*. 8th ed. Sinauer Assoc. Sunderland, MA. 2006.
8. Taylor JS, Raes J. Duplication and Divergence: The Evolution of New Genes and Old Ideas. *Annu Rev Genet*. 2004; 38:615–643.
9. Davidson EH. *The Regulatory Genome*. Acad Press, Elsevier, 2006.
10. Raj A, van Oudenaarden A. Nature, nurture, or chance: stochastic gene expression and its consequences. *Cell*. 2008; 135(2):216–226.
11. Capp JP. Noise-driven heterogeneity in the rate of genetic-variant generation as a basis for evolvability. *Genetics*. 2010; 185(2):395–404.
12. Soshnikova N, Dewaele R, Janvier P, Krumlauf R and Duboule D. Duplications of hox gene clusters and the emergence of vertebrates. *Dev Biol*. 2013; 378(2):194–199.
13. Kupiec JJ. Cell differentiation is a stochastic process subjected to natural selection. In Minelli A, Pradeu T (eds) *Toward a Theory of Development*. Chapt 10. Oxford U Press, 2014; 155–173.
14. Gleich J. *The Information*. Pantheon Books, N.Y., 2011; 225.
15. Taleb NN. *The Black Swan*. Random House, N.Y., 2007; 197–198.
16. Scott M, Hwa T, Ingalls B. Deterministic characterization of stochastic genetic circuits. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2007; 104(18):7402–7427.
17. Bowitz MB, Levine AJ, Siggia ED, Swain PS. Stochastic gene expression in a single cell. *Science*. 2002; 297(5584):1183–1186.
18. Patel AP, Tirosh I, Trombetta JJ, Shalek AK, Gillespie SM, et al. Single-cell RNA-seq highlights intra-tumoral heterogeneity in primary glioblastoma. *Science*. 2014; 344(6190):1396–1401.
19. Levine JH, Lin Y, Elowitz MB. Functional roles of pulsing in genetic circuits. *Science*. 2013; 342(6163):1193–1200.
20. Jones PA, Michels KB. Epigenetics of cancer in *Primer of the Molecular Biology of Cancer*. Chapter 3, Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott/William and Wilkens, Philadelphia, PA, 2011; 49–57.
21. Suva ML, Riggi N, Bernstein BE. Epigenetic reprogramming in cancer. *Science*. 2013; 339(6127):1567–1570.
22. Cusanovich DA, Daza R, Adey A, Pliner HA, Christianson L, et al. Multiplex single-cell profiling of chromatin accessibility by combinatorial cellular indexing. *Science*. 2015; 348(6237):910–914.
23. Swain PS, Elowitz MB and Siggia ED. Intrinsic and extrinsic contributions to stochasticity in gene expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99(20):12795–12800.
24. Pilpel Y. Noise in biological systems: pros, cons, and mechanisms of control. *Methods Mol Biol*. 2011; 759:407–425.
25. MacNeil LT, Walhout AJ. Gene regulatory networks and the role of robustness and stochasticity in the control of gene expression. *Genome Res*. 2011; 21(5):645–657.
26. Wang W, Quan Y, Fu Q, Liu Y, Liang Y, et al. Dynamics between cancer cell subpopulations reveals a model coordinating both hierarchical and stochastic concepts. *PLOS One*. 2014; 9(1):e84654.

27. Kachroo AH, Laurent JM, Yellman CM, Meyer AG, Wilke CO, et al. Systematic humanization of yeast genes reveals consensual functions and genetic modularity. *Science*. 2015; 348(6237):921–925.
28. Hoffman Y, Pilpel Y. Gene expression. MicroRNAs silence the noisy genome. *Science*. 2015; 348(6230):41–42.
29. Eldar A, Elowitz MB. Functional roles for noise in genetic circuits. *Nature*. 2010; 467(7312):167–173.
30. Ohno S. *Evolution of Gene Duplication*, Springer. 1970.
31. Vogelstein B, Papadopoulos N, Velculescu VE, Zhou S, Diaz LA Jr, et al. Cancer genome landscapes. *Science*. 2013; 339(6127):1546–1558.
32. Samuels Y, Bardelli A, Lopez-Otin C. The Cancer Genome. In DeVita VT., Lawrence TS., Rosenberg, S.A., (eds): *Cancer: Principles & Practice of Oncology*, 9th ed. 2011, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
33. Brash DE. Cancer: Preprocarcinogen. *Science*. 2015; 348(6237):867–868.
34. Walker C, Ward D. *Fossils*. Smithsonian Handbooks. Dorling Kindersley Inc., N.Y., 2002.
35. Pires IM, Bencokova Z, Milani M, Folkes LK, Li JL, et al. Effect of acute and chronic hypoxia on DNA damage and genomic instability. *Can Res*. 2010; 70(3):925–930.
36. Beckman RA, Loeb LA. Genetic instability in cancer: Theory and experiment. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*. 2005; 15(6):423–435.
37. Griffiths AJF, Wessler SR, Lewontin RC, Gelbart WM, Suzuki DT et al. *Introduction to Genetic Analysis*, 8th ed. Chapt 23. Population genetics, W H Freeman, N.Y., 2005; 611–642.
38. Anderson KM, Rubenstein M, Guinan P, Patel MK. Oncogenic mutational/epigenetic events: Deterministic, stochastic or random: Implications for hypoxic cancer cells and tumor heterogeneity. *Integr Cancer Sci Therap* 2015; 2(1):61–65.
39. Andrecut M, Cloud D, Kauffman SA. Monte Carlo simulation of a simple gene network yields new evolutionary insights. *J Theor Biol*. 2008; 250(3):468–74.
40. Rice SH, Papadopoulos A and Harting J. Stochastic processes driving directional evolution. in Pontaroti P (ed). *Evolutionary Biology- Concepts, Biodiversity, Macroevolution and Genome Evolution*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011.
41. Shmulevich I, Aitchison JD. Deterministic and stochastic models of genetic regulatory networks. *Methods Enzymol*. 2009; 467:335–56.
42. Tuckwell W, Bezak E, Yeoh E, Marcu L. Efficient Monte Carlo modelling of individual tumor cell propagation for hypoxic head and neck cancer. *Phys Med Biol*. 2008; 53(17):4489–4507.
43. Odoux C, Fohrer H, Hoppo T, Guzik L, Stolz DB, et al. A stochastic model for cancer stem cell origin in metastatic colon cancer. *Cancer Res*. 2008; 68(17):6932–6941.
44. Spall JC. Stochastic optimization in *Handbook of Computational Statistics*. Gentle J, Hardle W and Mori Y (eds). Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, 2004; 170–197
45. Deng Q, Ramskold D, Reinius B, Sandberg R. Single-cell RNA-seq reveals dynamic, random monoallelic gene expression in mammalian cells. *Science*. 2014; 343(6167):193–196.
46. Cai X, Yuan ZM. Stochastic modeling and simulation of the p53-MDM2/ MDMX loop. *J Comput Biol*. 2009; 16(7):917–933.
47. Quante T, Otto B, Brazdova M, Kejnovska I, Deppert W, et al. Mutant p53 is a transcriptional co-factor that binds to G-rich regulatory regions of active genes and generates transcriptional plasticity. *Cell cycle*. 2012; 11(17):3290–3303.
48. Leenders GB, Tuszynski JA. Stochastic and deterministic models of cellular p53 regulation. *Front Oncol*. 2013; 3:64.
49. Bouchard F, Rosenberg A. Fitness, Probability and the Principles of natural selection. *Brit J Phil Sci*. 2004; 55:693–702.
50. Reilly SK, Yin J, Ayoub AE, Emera D, Leng J, et al. Evolutionary changes in promoters and enhancers activity during human corticogenesis. *Science*. 2015; 347(6226):1155–1159.
51. Sheth R, Marcon L, Bastida MF, Junco M, Quintana L, et al. Hox genes regulate digital patterning by controlling the wavelength of a Turing-type mechanism. *Science*. 2012; 338(6113):1476–1480.
52. Roensch K, Tazaki A, Chara O, Tanaka EM. Progressive specification rather than intercalation of segments during limb regeneration. *Science*. 2013; 342(6164):1375–1379.
53. Zong C, Lu S, Chapman AR, Xie XS. Genome-wide detection of single nucleotide and copy number variations of a single human cell. *Science*. 2012; 338(6114):1627–1626.
54. Allison KH, Sledge GW. Heterogeneity and cancer. *Oncology*, 2014; 28(9):772–778.
55. Gerlinger M, Rowan AJ, Horswell S, Math M, Larkin J, et al. Intratumor heterogeneity and branching evolution revealed by multiregion sequencing. *N Engl J Med*. 2012; 366(10):883–892.
56. Yachida S, Jones S, Bozic I, Antal, Leary R, et al. Distant metastasis occurs late during the genetic evolution of pancreatic cancer. *Nature*. 2010; 462(7319):1114–1117.
57. Till JE, McCulloch EA, Siminovitch L. A stochastic model of spleen cell proliferation based on the growth of spleen colony-forming cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1964; 51:29–36.
58. Newton PK, Mason J, Bethel, Bazhenova L, Nieva J, et al. Spreaders and sponges define metastasis in lung cancer: A Markov chain Monte Carlo mathematical model. *Cancer Res*. 2013; 73(9):2760–2769.

59. Bennett DC. Differentiation of mouse melanoma cells: initial reversibility and an on-off stochastic model. *Cell*. 1983; 34(2):445–453.
60. Burga A, Casanueva MO and Lehner B. Predicting mutation outcomes from early stochastic variation in genetic interaction partners. *Nature*. 2011; 480(7376):250–255.
61. Friedmann-Morvinsk, D Bushong EA, Ke E, Soda Y, Muramoto T, et al. Dedifferentiation of neurons and astrocytes by oncogenes can induce gliomas in mice. *Science* 2012; 338:1080–1084.
62. Luzzatto L, Pandolfi PP. Causality and chance in the development of cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2015; 373(1):84–88.
63. Loffredo FS, Steinhauser ML, Jay SM, Gannon J, Pancoast JR, et al. Growth differentiation factor 11 is a circulating factor that reverses age-related cardiac hypertrophy. *Cell*. 2013; 153(4):828–893.
64. Westphal CH, Dipp MA, Guarente L. A therapeutic role for sirtuins in diseases of aging *Trends Biochem Sci*. 2007; 32(12):555–560.
65. Gertz M, Nguyen GT, Fischer F, Suenkel B, Schlicker C, et al. A molecular mechanism for direct sirtuin activation of resveratrol. *PLoS One*. 2012; 7(11):e49761.
66. Rando TA, Chang HY. Aging, rejuvenation, and epigenetic reprogramming: Resetting the aging clock. *Cell*. 2012; 148(1-2):46–57.
67. Zhang W, Li J, Suzuki K, Qu J, Wang P, et al. A Werner syndrome stem cell model unveils heterochromatin alterations as a driver of human aging. *Science*. 2015; 348(6239):1160–1163.