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Synopsis

Volume limitations and low yield thresholds of biological fluids have led to widespread use of passive microparticle rheology. The mean-squared-displacement (MSD) statistics of bead position time series (bead paths) are transformed to determine dynamic storage and loss moduli [Mason and Weitz (1995)]. A prevalent hurdle arises when there is a non-diffusive experimental drift in the data. Commensurate with the magnitude of drift relative to diffusive mobility, quantified by a Péclet number, the MSD statistics are distorted, and thus the path data must be “corrected” for drift. The standard approach is to estimate and subtract the drift from particle paths, and then calculate MSD statistics. We present an alternative, parametric approach using maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) that simultaneously fits drift and diffusive model parameters from the path data; the MSD statistics (and dynamic moduli) then follow directly from the best-fit model. We illustrate and compare both methods on simulated path data over a range of Péclet numbers, where exact answers are known. We choose fractional Brownian motion as the numerical model because it affords tunable, sub-diffusive MSD statistics consistent with several biological fluids. Finally, we apply and compare both methods on data from human bronchial epithelial cell culture mucus.
I. INTRODUCTION

Particle tracking microrheology focuses on the movement of tracer particles embedded in the fluid of interest [Qian et al. (1991); Crocker and Grier (1994); Crocker et al. (2000); Levine and Lubensky (2002); Gardel et al. (2003); Weih et al. (2006); Crocker and Hoffman (2007); Hohenegger and Forest (2008); Houghton et al. (2008); Aufderhorst-Roberts et al. (2012); Bertseva et al. (2012); Tassieri et al. (2012); Fong et al. (2013); Gal et al. (2013); Hill et al. (2014)] while “endogenous” microrheology analyzes the motion of particulates or cellular constituents [Dieterich et al. (2008); Bronstein et al. (2009); Kenwright et al. (2012); Verdaasdonk et al. (2013); Mak et al. (2014)] in situ. Particle tracking microrheology can be subdivided into passive [Qian et al. (1991); Gardel et al. (2003); Houghton et al. (2008); Aufderhorst-Roberts et al. (2012); Fong et al. (2013); Hill et al. (2014)] (where particle motion arises from thermal fluctuations) and active [Crocker and Grier (1994); Bertseva et al. (2012); Tassieri et al. (2012); Cribb et al. (2013)] (where the particles are manipulated by an external force). Two-particle, also known as two-point, microrheology [Crocker et al. (2000); Levine and Lubensky (2002); Crocker and Hoffman (2007); Hohenegger and Forest (2008)] focuses on the auto- and cross-correlations of particle pairs as a means to screen uniform drift or to screen the modified fluid properties due to chemical interactions of the probe particle with the host fluid sample. In some fluids, however, concentrations required to get sufficient nearby pairs of particles can modify the sample properties.

Faithful inference of the linear viscoelastic properties of a host fluid via single particle passive microrheology requires that particles are sufficiently dispersed and have neutral interactions with the surrounding medium. Passive microrheology is employed to infer the diffusive mobility of foreign particles of diverse size and surface chemistry, e.g., for controlled delivery of drug carrier particles through mucus barriers (cf. the recent review article by Schuster et al. (2015)). Uniting all of these applications of passive microbead microrheology is the analysis of the mean squared displacement (MSD) statistics of a tracked particle in order to estimate either the particle’s diffusive transport properties or the physical viscoelastic properties of the particle’s local environment [Mason (2000)]. The analysis of the MSD in this context stems from the seminal work of Einstein (1905) for viscous fluids where the MSD scales linearly with time, and the pre-factor $D$ provides a direct inference of the fluid viscosity $\eta$ given the temperature $T$ and hydrodynamic radius $a$ of the probe, $D = k_B T \langle 6 \pi \eta a \rangle^{-1}$, where $k_B$ is the Boltzmann constant.

The primary application that motivates this work is the determination of the linear viscoelastic properties (frequency-dependent dynamic storage and loss moduli) of biological soft matter, and human mucus in particular. Inferring linear viscoelastic moduli involves the MSD of tracked passive microbead position time series (which we refer to as “paths”) coupled with the Mason-Weitz protocol [Mason and Weitz (1995); Mason (2000)]. Video microscopy in combination with passive microbead particle tracking (MPT) has been used to explore the physical properties of a wide range of mucus biogels, including cervicovaginal [Lai et al. (2009); das Neves et al. (2012); Wang et al. (2013)] pulmonary [Hill et al. (2014); Schuster et al. (2015)] and gastrointestinal...
mucus. Often in passive MPT experiments, the observed particles exhibit drift: a persistent, inadvertent, driven motion potentially due to the light source [Schuster et al. (2015)], movement of the optical stage [Adler and Pagakis (2003); Dangaria et al. (2007)], or some other source [Aufderhorst-Roberts et al. (2014)]. Thus the particle observations are a superposition of drift and diffusion. In active biological fluids such as living cells where endogenous DNA domains are fluoresced and tracked, cell translocation and active cellular processes induce additional forcing. In viral trafficking within cells, the virus may hijack directed motion along microtubules. Since drift can significantly alter the MSD of tracked particles, and thereby distort the inference of the viscous and elastic moduli of the particle’s local environment [Mason et al. (1995); Mason et al. (1997)], as well as distort the inferred mobility, the question naturally arises as to how drift should be accounted for in the analysis of MPT data.

In the case of optical stage drift, each particle in the field of view exhibits the same magnitude and direction of movement. Thus, if enough particles are present, the driven motion may be removed by estimating the ensemble average movement of the particles within the field of view and subtracting this drift from each particle path [Hasnain and Donald (2006)]. Other scenarios pose a more difficult challenge due to the potential for temporal and spatial heterogeneity in the drift force. In highly heterogeneous biological fluids such as mucus, regions of high elasticity, due to high local mucin concentrations, may cause some particles to appear immobile while neighboring particles are clearly undergoing net transport due to some local flow. In this scenario, if one were to subtract the ensemble-averaged movement of the particles in the field of view from each particle path, one would be adding directed motion to the less mobile particles while subtracting directed motion from the more mobile particles. In Fong et al. (2013) the authors introduce a "de-trending" method for Brownian motion in heterogeneous fluids that is applied to each particle path individually, where the data is reduced by half through restricting analysis to the movement orthogonal to the estimated drift direction. Here we also analyze individual paths, allowing for independent drift per path, for both Brownian and fractional Brownian motion. In Lysy et al. (2014) a de-trending method is applied to a larger class of diffusive and sub-diffusive processes with drift in two space dimensions, where the full 2d observations are used to simultaneously estimate the diffusive or sub-diffusive model parameters and the drift. The present article aims to introduce and illustrate the parametric, maximum likelihood estimation approach in one-dimensional data; for a more rigorous treatment, including comparisons of competitive models on the basis of the available data, see Lysy et al. (2014).

We point out that the debate over the optimal way to remove drift tacitly assumes that directed motion must be removed prior to analyzing the path data. Historically, this assumption is natural because of the focus on the scaling of the ensemble particle MSD due to purely diffusive dynamics [Einstein (1905); Qian et al. (1991); Michalet (2010); Gal et al. (2013)], a statistic that can be extremely sensitive to drift [Weihs et al. (2007)]. In this article, we take a different approach and show that deterministic drift does not need to be removed a priori from particle path data to determine the MSD statistics if one posits and exploits a fully parametric statistical model for the...
underlying drift-diffusion process. In particular, we focus on fractional Brownian motion (fBm), a parametric statistical model for sub-diffusive processes that has been shown to accurately describe diffusion in mucus gels [Hill et al. (2014); Lysy et al. (2014)] and other biological soft matter [Kou et al. (2004); Kou et al. (2008)]. Using numerical simulations of drift coupled with sub-diffusive fractional Brownian motion (consistent with data from mucus gels), we show that one can easily and accurately estimate the diffusive or sub-diffusive model parameters by maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) -- for a wide range of deterministic drift, and without removing the drift a priori as is typically done to estimate the MSD statistics of single or ensemble paths. The advantage of MLE arises because drift is treated as a model parameter to be estimated jointly with the diffusive or sub-diffusive parameters rather than sequentially, thereby increasing the precision of all parameter estimates. With all parameters thus estimated jointly, it is then straightforward to use fBm parameter estimates to generate the MSD of the purely diffusive dynamics and thereby infer the dynamic viscoelastic moduli by the Mason-Weitz protocol. We illustrate the procedure for a range of Péclet numbers by introducing a dimensionless ratio of the drift (advection) component relative to the diffusive mobility, for both normal and sub-diffusive processes.

The benefit of numerical simulation is that the exact diffusive parameters and linear viscoelastic moduli are known, so that the error induced by relative drift (parametrized by Péclet number), for any method of estimating these quantities, can be directly measured and compared to any other method. We are thus able to compare the errors in the inference of diffusive process parameters and in dynamic storage and loss moduli among our proposed parametric maximum likelihood estimation method and the standard approach in the passive microrheology literature based on a least-squares estimate of the MSD after removal of drift. We also show, for posterity, the dramatic errors in the diffusion parameters and viscoelastic moduli if one simply ignores the presence of drift. Finally, we apply MLE and the standard drift-subtracted MSD estimate approaches to experimental particle path data in human bronchial epithelial cell culture mucus.

The structure of the article is as follows. First, we discuss drawbacks of MSD-based approaches and cursory drift removal. We then introduce a canonical model (fractional Brownian motion) for tunable particle diffusion or sub-diffusion with drift, and provide details on how to simulate particle paths in accordance with this model. Next, we review MSD-based approaches to the recovery of diffusive parameters and present our MLE method. The methods are then compared on simulated data sets for a practical range of Péclet numbers. Finally we illustrate the methods on data from human lung cell culture mucus.

II. MEAN SQUARED DISPLACEMENT STATISTICS

Give observations \( X(0), X(\Delta t), X(2\Delta t), \ldots, X(M\Delta t) \) of a particle’s position, the MSD statistic is calculated as
\[ \langle r_\tau \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{M - i + 1} \sum_{j=0}^{M-i} [X(i\Delta t + j\Delta t) - X(j\Delta t)]^2, \]  

(1)

where \( \tau = i\Delta t \) is the lag time and \( \Delta t \) is the time between observations. For many diffusive processes, theory and observation suggest that the MSD of particles undergoing diffusion exhibits a power law scaling: \([\text{Caspi et al. (2000); Mason (2000); Seisenberger et al. (2001); Valentine et al. (2001); das Neves et al. (2012); Hill et al. (2014)}]\)

\[ E[\langle r_\tau \rangle^2] = 2dD \tau^\alpha, \]  

(2)

where the prefactor \( D \) is the “diffusivity” by analogy with simple diffusion, \( \alpha \) is a real number in the interval \([0, 2]\), and \( d \) is the dimensionality. For standard Brownian motion without drift, the power-law exponent is \( \alpha = 1 \). From an accurate estimation of \( D \) one infers the fluid viscosity \( \eta \) from the Stokes-Einstein relation. \([\text{Weihns et al. (2007)}]\) illustrated via simulated Brownian motion that linear (i.e. constant) drift causes a log-log plot of MSD versus lag time \( \tau \) to tend toward a slope of 2 at large lag times (Figure 1). That is, as \( \tau \) increases, \( \alpha \rightarrow 2 \) and the larger the drift velocity, the smaller the lag time at which this transition occurs.

When one attempts to correct for directed motion by subtracting the mean increment, i.e., the mean of the step-size distribution at the shortest lag time (Figure 2), one inadvertently changes the structure of the entire particle path; e.g., every such modified path is constrained to begin and end at the same spatial position. To see this, consider a one-dimensional Brownian path, where \( X_i = X(i\Delta t) \) is the location of the particle at time \( i\Delta t \) with \( i = 1, 2, 3 \ldots M \). The increments of this process are given by

\[ x_i = X_{i+1} - X_i. \]  

(3)

For Brownian motion, the \( x_i \) are normally distributed with mean \( \mu \Delta t \) and variance \( 2D\Delta t \), where \( \mu \) is the drift velocity. When no drift is present, the sample mean of \( x_i \),

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{1}{M-1} \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} x_i, \]  

(4)

converges to zero as the number of particle positions increases, i.e. as \( M \rightarrow \infty \). The fact that the distribution of \( x_i \) is symmetric with \( \bar{x} \) converging to zero intuitively indicates that the particle is
expected to make an equal number of steps to the left and right. This however, is *not to say* that a particle diffusing via Brownian motion never travels a net distance. The mean incremental displacement is $\bar{x}$, and when we subtract $\bar{x}$ from each increment, $x_i$, we “snap” the distribution of $X_M$ to zero, inadvertently stipulating that the first and final positions of the particle are the same. Indeed, suppose that $\bar{x}$ is subtracted from each increment to “remove drift,” centering the distribution of increments at zero. The resulting modified position process is computed by taking the cumulative sum of the shifted increments, denoted by $\tilde{X}_i$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{X}_1 &= X_1 \\
\tilde{X}_2 &= X_1 + (x_1 - \bar{x}) \\
\tilde{X}_3 &= X_1 + (x_1 - \bar{x}) + (x_2 - \bar{x}) \\
\tilde{X}_4 &= X_1 + (x_1 - \bar{x}) + (x_2 - \bar{x}) + (x_3 - \bar{x}) \\
&\vdots
\end{align*}
$$

Following this pattern, we collect terms and write the final position $\tilde{X}_M$ as,

$$
\tilde{X}_M = X_1 - (M - 1)\bar{x} + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} x_i,
$$

which can be simplified further,

$$
\tilde{X}_M = X_1 - (M - 1)\left(1 - \frac{1}{M-1}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{M-1} x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{M-1} x_i
$$

and thus we see that the final position has been constrained to the initial position (Figure 3). It is worth noting that a standard Brownian motion constrained to have coincident initial and final positions is called a *Brownian bridge* [Steele (2001)], which has completely different correlation structure than the unconstrained motion. While this does not make a difference in the estimation procedure if the paths are from a standard Brownian motion (and thus the increments are independent), it becomes relevant when the paths are from fractional Brownian motion where the increments may be highly correlated.

An additional drawback of an MSD-based approach to diffusive parameter estimation is the unreliability in the MSD at large lag times. As the lag time increases, the number of increments included in the mean of the squared increments decreases and thus becomes less stable. Weihs
et al. (2007) estimate that only the initial two-thirds of the MSD is statistically reliable. Due to experimental factors (particles exiting the focal plane of the microscope) limiting the ability to collect data over long time scales, the uncertainty in the MSD for large lag times can have a pronounced impact on the accurate recovery of diffusive and viscoelastic properties.

Figure 1: Path-wise MSD for simulated particles from the Brownian motion (Bm) (a) and fractional Brownian motion (fBm) (b). MSD curves for 40 representative data sets are shown for varying drift characterized by the Péclet number (Pe), the ratio of the advective and diffusive transport rates (Eqn. (13)). The color scheme represents increasing Péclet from $Pe_{\text{min}} = 0$ (blue) to $Pe_{\text{max}} = 0.73$ (red), for the Bm data set, and from $Pe_{\text{min}} = 0$ (blue) to $Pe_{\text{max}} = 0.52$ (red) for the fBm data set. The upper and lower black dashed lines indicate slopes of 2 (ballistic motion) and 1 (normal diffusion), respectively. The fBm paths (b) are simulated with $\alpha = 0.6$; the "diffusivity" pre-factor is chosen to have the same numerical value in the two data sets.

Figure 2: Impact of drift-subtraction on the distribution of increments and MSD for a representative sub-diffusive fractional Brownian motion path with true parameter values $\alpha = 0.60$ and $D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu m^2 s^{-\alpha}$. The estimated parameter values based on a simple least-squares fit to the drift subtracted MSD are $\alpha = 0.53$ and $D = 5.30 \times 10^{-4} \ \mu m^2 s^{-\alpha}$. The distribution of increments (a) is shown at $\tau = 5$ s for a single particle path with $Pe = 0.5$ before (blue) and after (red) drift subtraction. Before drift subtraction, the mean of the distribution of increments (solid blue line) is $9.40 \times 10^{-3} \ \mu m$. Subtracting drift centers the distribution at zero (solid red line). The MSD is also shown for this path before and after drift subtraction (b).
Figure 3: Sample Brownian path with drift (a) and after the drift has been removed by subtracting the mean displacement from each increment (b). The beginning and end of the path have been marked with a blue x and a red circle, respectively.
III. FRACTIONAL BROWNIAN MOTION AND DRIFT

Recently, Lysy et al. (2014) considered fractional Brownian motion (fBM) as a model for the movement of micron-scale particles over a 30 second observation time at 60 frames per second temporal resolution in human bronchial epithelial mucus. Under this model, the particle’s position process $X(t)$ in one dimension is written as the sum of a deterministic term representing the drift and a stochastic term representing the particle’s thermally activated diffusive movements:

$$X(t) = \mu t + \sqrt{2D} W_\alpha(t),$$

(10)

where $W_\alpha(t)$ is a continuous Gaussian process with mean zero and covariance

$$\text{cov}[W_\alpha(t), W_\alpha(s)] = \frac{1}{2} (|t|^\alpha + |s|^\alpha - |t-s|^\alpha), \quad 0 < \alpha < 2.$$  

(11)

For $\alpha = 1$, Eqn. (10) reduces to Brownian motion with drift, and the increment process is uncorrelated: $\text{cov}[x_i, x_{i+k}] = D\Delta t$. For $\alpha \neq 1$, the increment process for fBm has correlation

$$\text{cov}[x_i, x_{i+k}] = D\Delta t^\alpha (|k+1|^\alpha + |k-1|^\alpha - 2|k|^\alpha).$$

(12)

For fBm processes, the MSD has the same scaling relation as Brownian motion [Mandelbrot and Van Ness (1968)], i.e., $\langle r_t \rangle^2 \sim D\Delta t^\alpha$, although, unlike Brownian motion, the power-law exponent is not necessarily unity. When $\alpha < 1$, the fBm increments are negatively correlated and the position process exhibits subdiffusive behavior. When $\alpha > 1$, the fBm increments are positively correlated and the position process exhibits superdiffusive behavior.

Calculating the increments $x_i$ provides a simple way to estimate the drift exhibited by a particle since the mean, or expected value, of the increments is $E[x_i] = \mu \Delta t$, for both Brownian and fractional Brownian processes. To generalize our analysis, we characterize results in terms of a Péclet number ($Pe$), a dimensionless ratio of the advective and diffusive transport rates. Given the increments of a particle path computed for a given lag time $\Delta t$, our choice of Péclet number is calculated by dividing the mean increment, $E[x_i]$ or the expectation of $x_i$, by the standard deviation $SD[x_i]$ of the increments,
\[ Pe \equiv \frac{E[x_i]}{SD[x_i]} \quad (13) \]

**IV. SIMULATION DESIGN**

To generate a particle path exhibiting linear drift and fractional Brownian dynamics, we first generate the increment process for an fBm path without drift, then add the desired drift to the path. To generate fBm observations \( X_1, \ldots, X_M \) for a particular choice of \( \alpha \), we first construct the covariance matrix \( S \) of the increment process according to Eqn. (12). That is, the \( i, j \)th elements of \( S \) is

\[ S_{i,j} = \text{cov}[x_i, x_j] \quad (14) \]

for \( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, M \). Let \( LL' = S \) be the Cholesky decomposition of \( S \) and let \( u \) be a vector of \( M \) independent and identically distributed draws from a standard normal distribution. A simulated particle path is generated as \( x = \sqrt{2D}Lu, \ X_j = \sum_{i=1}^j x_i \). Using this method, two sets of simulated data are generated. The first set is subdiffusive with \( \alpha = 0.6 \) and \( D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu m^2 s^{-\alpha} \), mimicking the estimated parameter values based on experimental observations of 1 \( \mu m \) diameter particles in 4 weight percent human bronchial epithelial mucus [Hill et al. (2014)]. The second data set has the same numerical value of the diffusivity of the subdiffusive data set, but exhibits standard Brownian motion, i.e., \( \alpha = 1 \) and \( D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu m^2 s^{-1} \). This diffusivity corresponds to a 1 \( \mu m \) diameter particle in a fluid with viscosity of 1.86 Pa s at 23 °C. Each simulated path is generated with a temporal resolution of 5 frames per second and a length of \( M = 2,992 \) steps, mimicking experimental conditions for the experimental data presented in Section VII.

Linear drift is added to the simulated paths by calculating the increments, adding directed motion, then taking the cumulative sum of the result. We consider directed motion up to twenty times the diffusivity of the particle, matching the range in drift observed in experimental data (Section VII). Therefore, a position process with linear drift is given by,

\[ X_j = \sum_{i=1}^j (x_i + DA), \quad (15) \]

where \( \Lambda \) is a scaling factor with units \( s^{\alpha} \mu m^{-1} \). We generate 100 simulated paths with drift for \( \Lambda \) spanning the interval \([0, 20]\) in increments of 0.5 \( s^{\alpha} \mu m^{-1} \), resulting in 4,100 simulated fBm paths (\( \alpha = 0.6 \)) and 4,100 simulated Brownian paths (\( \alpha = 1 \)). These data sets will be referred to as
the fractional Brownian motion (fBm) and Brownian motion (Bm) data sets. The Péclet number for the Bm data set ranged from 0 to 0.73 and 0 to 0.52 for the fBm data set.

V. APPROACHES TO PARAMETER ESTIMATION

We consider three approaches to diffusive parameter estimation.

Simple least squares Noting that the subdiffusive MSD is linear on the log-scale,

\[ \log(E[(r_t)^2]) = \log(2D) + \alpha \log(\tau), \]

a longstanding approach to estimate \( D \) and \( \alpha \) is to minimize the least squares (LS) objective function

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{M} (y_i - c - \alpha t_i)^2, \tag{16} \]

in terms of \( c \) and \( \alpha \) where,

\[ y_i = \ln[(r_t)_i^2], \quad c = \ln[2D], \quad t_i = \ln[r_i]. \tag{17} \]

The minimum of Eqn. (16) is obtained at \( \bar{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} y_i t_i / \sum_{i=1}^{M} t_i^2 \) and \( \bar{c} = \bar{y} - \bar{\alpha} \bar{t} \).

Drift-Subtracted Least Squares The drift-subtracted least squares (DLS) approach subtracts \( \bar{x} \), the mean increment, from each \( x_i \), centering the distribution of increments at zero, constraining the equivalence of the initial and final position, before applying the approach described above for least squares estimation.

Full Model MLE This approach applies maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) to Eqn. (10) to estimate \( \mu \), \( D \) and \( \alpha \) directly from the raw data without first estimating the MSD statistic. The fBm model (10) specifies that the increments \( x_i \) have a multivariate Gaussian distribution,

\[ x \sim N(\mu \Delta t, \sigma^2 V_{\alpha}), \quad \sigma^2[V_{\alpha}]_{i,j} = \text{cov}[x_i, x_{i+(j-i)}], \tag{18} \]

where \( \text{cov}[\cdot] \) is given by Eqn. (11) and \( \sigma = 2D \). The likelihood function is thus \( \mathcal{L}(\theta|x) = p(x|\theta) \), the probability of observing the data given the model parameters \( \theta = (\mu, \sigma, \alpha) \). The MLE of the
model parameters is denoted $\hat{\theta} = \arg\max_\theta L(\theta|x)$, the value of $\theta$ which maximizes $L(\theta|x)$. The three-dimensional optimization problem can be reduced to a one-dimensional problem by maximizing in $(\mu, \sigma)$ for fixed $\alpha$. That is, let

$$y = [V_\alpha]^{-1/2} x \quad \text{and} \quad z = \Delta t [V_\alpha]^{-1/2} 1_M,$$

where $1_M = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)$. Then we have

$$y_i = \mu z_i + \epsilon_i \quad \epsilon_i \sim iid \, N(0, \sigma^2).$$

such that the likelihood function $L_\alpha(\mu, \sigma|x)$ for fixed $\alpha$ is

$$\exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum (y_i - \mu z_i)^2 - M \log(\sigma) \right].$$

Therefore, the values $(\hat{\mu}_\alpha, \hat{\sigma}_\alpha)$ that maximize $L_\alpha(\mu, \sigma|x)$ are

$$\hat{\mu}_\alpha = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M z_i y_i}{\sum_{i=1}^M z_i^2}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_\alpha = \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^M (y_i - \hat{\mu}_\alpha z_i)^2}{M} \right)^{1/2}.$$

The MLE of $\alpha$ for Eqn. (10) is then obtained by maximizing the one-dimensional profile likelihood [e.g., Davidson (2003)] function

$$L_{\text{prof}}(\alpha|x) = L(\hat{\mu}_\alpha, \hat{\sigma}_\alpha, \alpha|x).$$

Specifically, we find the $\hat{\alpha}$ that maximizes $\ell_{\text{prof}}(\alpha|x) = \log \left( L_{\text{prof}}(\alpha|x) \right)$, where

$$\ell_{\text{prof}}(\alpha|x) = -\frac{1}{2} \left[ M \log(\hat{\sigma}_\alpha^2) + \log(|V_\alpha|) \right].$$

The resulting parameter estimates $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\mu}_\alpha, \hat{\alpha}, \hat{\sigma}_\alpha)$ are precisely those that maximize the full likelihood $L(\theta|x)$, thereby reducing the numerical optimization problem from three parameters to one. Moreover, we note that for arbitrary variance matrix $V$, the linear systems in Eqn. (19) are solved in $O(M^3)$ operations. However, since $V_\alpha$ is a Toeplitz matrix [Bareiss (1969)], the systems can be solved in $O(M^2)$ operations using the Durbin-Levinson algorithm [Durbin (1960); Ljung (1987)].

Much like the least squares approach involving the sample MSD, the maximum likelihood approach we have described hinges on the minimization of a quadratic objective function. However, whereas the least squares approach estimates the drift only once, the MLE estimates the "optimal" drift and diffusivity for every value of $\alpha$. That is, the least squares estimate of the drift by $\bar{x}$ would be optimal if the increments were uncorrelated, whereas the MLE approach
estimates the drift by a weighted average of the increments, \( \hat{\mu}_a \) that accounts for their correlation. Indeed, \( \hat{\mu}_a = \bar{x} \) only when fBm reduces to ordinary diffusion with \( \alpha = 1 \).

VI. RESULTS: Simulated Data

For each simulated path, we compute the path-wise MSD given by Eqn. (1). To estimate the viscous and elastic moduli, we follow Mason and Weitz (1995) where the complex modulus is

\[
G^*(\omega) = i\omega \eta^*(\omega) = G'(\omega) + iG''(\omega) = \frac{k_B T}{\pi a i \omega \Im\{\langle r_t \rangle^2\}},
\]

where \( \Im\{g(\tau)\} = \int g(\tau) e^{-\omega t + \tau} d\tau \) denotes the Fourier transform. Note, the dynamic viscosity \( \eta'(\omega) \) is related to the viscous modulus via \( \omega \eta'(\omega) = G''(\omega) \).

Figure 4 shows pathwise estimates of the diffusivity \( D \) and the power-law exponent \( \alpha \) as a function of the Péclet number (\( Pe \)) over the range \( Pe = [0, 0.73] \) using the three methods described in Section V. The solid red line in each panel is the value used to generate the simulated data, which is reasonably recovered by each technique when no drift is present, i.e. \( Pe = 0 \). For Brownian paths when drift is present, ignoring drift completely leads to dramatically incorrect results. In Figure 5, the relative error in the estimation of the viscosity for the Bm data found by applying the Stokes-Einstein relation is reported for each estimation approach. The mean relative error in the estimation of the viscosity when not accounting for drift is 39.5%. When applying a drift-subtracted least squares (DLS) approach and a parametric MLE approach the mean relative error is 11.1% and 3.6%, respectively.

Figure 6 illustrates the impact of drift on the pathwise estimates of \( G' \) and \( G'' \) for the fBm data for various values of \( Pe \). In Figure 7, the ensemble average estimates \( G' \) and \( G'' \) are compared when applying Eqn. (20) to the empirical MSD when ignoring drift and subtracting drift, and applying Eqn. (20) to the parametric scaling of the MSD predicted by our MLE approach for \( \Lambda = 20 \text{ s}^\alpha \mu\text{m}^{-1} \), corresponding to \( Pe = [0.48, 0.52] \) for the fBm data. The ensemble average relative error in the estimation of \( G' \) and \( G'' \) for the fBm data set is reported for the DLS and MLE approaches in Figure 8. This figure shows that the MLE method more accurately recovers the exact \( G' \) and \( G'' \), uniformly over all frequencies, whereas the DLS method leads to errors in the low frequency range. The global distortion of individual paths by drift subtraction, the so-called Brownian bridge, foreshadows the modification of path statistics over long lag times, and therefore at low frequencies in transform space.

We now turn to the underlying challenge to estimate the diffusivity \( D \) and the power-law exponent \( \alpha \) when the data indicates fractional Brownian motion as a good model. The LS, DLS, and full model MLE estimates are shown in Figure 9 as a function of the Péclet number. Recall, the true values of each parameter are \( \alpha = 0.6 \) and \( D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu\text{m}^2\text{s}^{-\alpha} \). Failing to account for drift when drift is present leads to highly erroneous results. As \( Pe \) increases, \( \alpha \) converges to
2, as expected based on the simulation results presented in Figure 1. Drift has a nonlinear impact on the estimate of $D$, initially under-estimating, and later over-estimating the parameter value. In contrast, both the DLS and MLE estimates of $D$ and $\alpha$ are independent of drift and exhibit a similar level of accuracy, however the parametric approach is the more precise estimator due to the decreased spread about the mean predicted parameter values.

\[ \alpha = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu m^2 s^{-1}. \]

**Figure 4:** Estimated values of $\alpha$ (a) and $D$ (b) ignoring drift (black circles), subtracting drift (blue circles) and our maximum likelihood method (violet circles). The true values of $\alpha$ and $D$ are shown in solid red lines. The true values of each parameter are $\alpha = 1$ and $D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu m^2 s^{-1}$.
Figure 5: Relative error in estimates of the viscosity ($\eta$) given by the Stokes-Einstein relation based on the three approaches for the Brownian motion data set as a function of the Péclet number (Pe). The mean error in the estimation of $\eta$ when not accounting for drift is 39.5%. When applying a drift-subtracted least squares approach and a parametric approach the mean error is 11.1% and 3.6%, respectively.

Figure 6: Pathwise dynamic storage, $G'(\omega)$ (a), and loss, $G''(\omega)$ (b) moduli for the fBm data found by transforming the pathwise MSD without accounting for drift. The change in color of the data corresponds to a transition from $Pe_{\text{min}} = 0$ (blue) to $Pe_{\text{max}} = 0.52$ (red). The true values of $G'$ and $G''$ are indicated by the black dashed lines.
Figure 7: Ensemble averaged dynamic storage, $G'(\omega)$ (a), and loss, $G''(\omega)$ (b) moduli for the fBm data with subdiffusive exponent $\alpha = 0.6$ by applying Eqn. (20) to the empirical MSD when ignoring drift (black circles) and subtracting drift (blue circles), and applying Eqn. (20) to the parametric scaling of the MSD predicted by our maximum likelihood method (violet circles). Exact $G'(\omega)$ and $G''(\omega)$ are shown in solid red lines. The ensemble-averaged results over 100 paths are shown for Pe values in the range $[0.48, 0.52]$. 
Figure 8: Ensemble averaged relative error in the storage modulus, $G'(\omega)$ (a), and loss modulus, $G''(\omega)$ (b) for the fBm data with subdiffusive exponent $\alpha = 0.6$ when applying Eqn. (20) to the empirical MSD after subtracting drift (blue) and applying Eqn. (20) to the parametric scaling of the MSD predicted by our maximum likelihood method (violet). The ensemble average is computed using all 4,100 simulated paths.

Figure 9: Estimated values of $\alpha$ (a) and $D$ (b) ignoring drift (black circles), subtracting drift (blue circles) and our maximum likelihood method (violet circles). The true values of $\alpha$ and $D$ are shown in solid red lines. The true values of each parameter are $\alpha = 0.6$ and $D = 4.67 \times 10^{-4} \mu m^2 s^{-\alpha}$. 
VII. RESULTS: Experimental Data

Here, we analyze twenty-two representative 1 μm diameter particles in 4 weight percent human bronchial epithelial (HBE) mucus using the previously outlined methods. Each path consists of 2,992 increments with a temporal resolution of 0.2 seconds (five observations per second). The ensemble-averaged storage and loss moduli are calculated when ignoring drift, subtracting drift by applying Eqn. (20) to the empirical MSD, and applying Eqn. (20) to the parametric scaling of the MSD of the pure fBm process determined from our maximum likelihood method.

![Figure 10](image)

*Figure 10: Estimates of the dynamic storage modulus, $G'(\omega)$, left figure, and loss modulus, $G''(\omega)$, right figure, for experimental data for 3 approaches: applying Eqn. (20) to the empirical MSD ignoring drift (black circles) and subtracting drift (blue circles), and applying Eqn. (20) to the parametric scaling of the MSD predicted by our maximum likelihood approach (violet circles).*

The three estimation methods for $D$ and $\alpha$ were applied to the experimental particle paths. Figure 11 shows the least squares ($LS$) and drift-subtracted least squares ($DLS$) estimates relative to the full model maximum likelihood estimation approach ($MLE$). The estimates for $\alpha$ are presented in Figure 11a. The $MLE$ predictions of $\alpha$ are shown along the x-axis and the $LS$ and $DLS$ estimates are shown on the y-axis. The domain of each axis is from 0, representing stuck particles, to 1, representing normal diffusion exponents. A dashed line indicates the diagonal. Each data point represents the predicted parameter value for one of the 22 experimental paths. A data point falling on the diagonal indicates that the $MLE$ and $LS$ (or $DLS$) approaches agree for that particle path. A data point above the diagonal indicates that the $LS$ (or $DLS$) approach overestimated $\alpha$ compared to the $MLE$ approach. Conversely, a data point below the diagonal indicates that the $LS$ (or $DLS$) approach underestimated $\alpha$ compared to the $MLE$ approach. The
size of each data point is directly proportional to the calculated drift for the corresponding particle.

In Figure 11a, the DLS and MLE approaches exhibit strong agreement in their predictions of $\alpha$, as evidenced by the distribution of data points (blue) along the diagonal dashed line. In contrast, the LS estimates of $\alpha$ (black) fall above the diagonal, indicating an overestimation of $\alpha$ relative to the MLE approach. The amount of overestimation is directly proportional to the amount of drift in the experimental data (larger markers are further from the diagonal than smaller markers).

Figure 11b presents the estimates of the diffusivity ($D$). All data points fall above the diagonal, thus both the LS and DLS approach estimate larger values of $D$ compared with the MLE approach. Here, the amount of overestimation is inversely proportional to the amount of drift (larger markers are closer to the diagonal). We note that this is not a scenario observed in the simulated data. Returning to Figure 9, we see that the only time the LS estimates of $D$ are in increasing correspondence to the MLE values with increasing drift is when the LS method underestimates $D$ and $0.1 < Pe < 0.3$. Furthermore, according to Figure 9, the DLS estimate of $D$ relative to the MLE values should be independent of $Pe$. We hypothesize that these incongruences between the simulated and experimental data may be the result of non-linear drift, an interesting issue but beyond the scope of the present paper.

Figure 11: Ratio of the LS and DLS predictions to the MLE predictions of the power-law exponent $\alpha$ (a) and the prefactor $D$ (b) for experimental data. The LS estimates of both $\alpha$ and $D$ are higher than the MLE estimates. The DLS estimates agree with the MLE estimates for $\alpha$ but are larger for $D$. The size of the marker is proportional to the amount of drift experienced by the particle.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Persistent linear drift over the course of a particle path is compounded at large lag times, resulting in an asymptotic (long lag time) bending of the MSD curve toward a slope of 2. The use
of MSD curves for inference of mobility or linear viscoelastic moduli, without recognizing there is drift and accounting for it, is obviously problematic. We use a simple calculation of the mean and standard deviation of the step size distribution for a given experimental or numerical particle path to determine the drift relative to diffusion, or Péclet number $Pe$.

When $Pe$ increases, the slope of the path-wise MSD approaches 2 at increasingly smaller lag times, causing the least squares ($LS$) estimate of the power law exponent, $\alpha$, to converge to 2. By subtracting the mean increment of each particle from the particle’s path, the least squares ($DLS$) estimate of each parameter is more stable. However, the unanticipated correlation in the increment process induced by drift subtraction over increasingly large lag times leads to an error in the estimation of the diffusive parameters that is on the order of 10%. Accordingly, these discrepancies at large lag times produce errors in the dynamic moduli at low frequencies.

To address this issue, we advocate for a parametric maximum likelihood estimation ($MLE$) approach that identifies the best-fit drift parameter $\mu$ simultaneously while estimating $D$ and $\alpha$. We demonstrate on numerically generated particle paths, with physically relevant diffusive parameters from human bronchial epithelial mucus studies, that the use of the parametric maximum likelihood approach results in approximately a 2/3 reduction in the error in $D$ and $\alpha$ compared to the standard drift-subtraction least squares approach. These diffusive mobility parameters are routinely used in drug delivery to compare various drug delivery particle formulations for passage through mucosal layers [Lai et al. (2009); Wang et al. (2013); Schuster et al. (2015)]. With respect to inference of linear viscoelasticity from the MSD statistics of particle paths, we have illustrated that accuracy in storage and loss moduli deteriorates at low frequencies for the standard drift-subtraction, least squares methods. The gains in accuracy by the MLE method have been shown for fractional Brownian numerical data typical of experimentally observed data in mucus gels. Furthermore, we note that the statistical properties of the $MLE$ method are well understood in the statistics community, and have further value beyond that illustrated here, e.g., for testing model assumptions against experimental data as in Lysy et al. (2014).

To close, the $MLE$, least squares and drift-subtracted least squares parameter estimation approaches were applied to experimental paths of 1 $\mu$m diameter beads in human bronchial epithelial cell culture mucus [Hill et al. (2014)]. Relative to the parametric maximum likelihood approach, the drift-subtracted least squares method predicts a higher elasticity above $\sim$0.3 Hz and a lower viscosity for all frequencies; thus, the standard approach in the literature appears to bias cell culture mucus toward being more sol-like than gel-like [Winter (1987); Hill et al. (2014)].
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