AI-Assisted Modeling of Proton-Mediated Ionic Stress Dynamics in Sleep–Wake Regulation

Ankit Verma
School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA.
verma2004@oregonstate.edu

Quentin Horton
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS, USA.
quentin.horton@ku.edu

Krishna Saha
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO, USA.
saha1996@missouri.edu

Abstract

Sleep–wake regulation is a fundamental neurobiological process whose molecular underpinnings remain incompletely understood. Recent experimental advances have identified proton-mediated ionic stress as a novel driver of sleep, challenging classical neurotransmitter-centric models. This paper presents a conceptual framework for AI-assisted modeling of the dynamic interactions between proton flux, ionic stress, and sleep–wake transitions. We argue that the complexity of these multiscale processes, spanning from subcellular pH gradients to whole-brain network oscillations, necessitates computational architectures that integrate mechanistic biophysical models with data-driven machine learning. The discussion emphasizes system-level design choices: the trade-off between mechanistic fidelity and computational tractability, the robustness of hybrid models under noisy physiological data, and the infrastructure requirements for real-time simulation and inference. We also address governance and fairness considerations, particularly regarding the deployment of such models in clinical sleep medicine and personalized health interventions. By situating proton-mediated ionic stress within a broader systems perspective, this paper outlines a roadmap for leveraging artificial intelligence to unravel sleep's molecular logic while maintaining scientific rigor and ethical accountability.

Keywords

sleep–wake regulation, proton dynamics, ionic stress, AI-assisted modeling, computational neuroscience, systems biology, hybrid models, robustness, fairness, infrastructure.

1. Introduction

Sleep is an enigmatic behavioral state that occupies roughly one-third of human life and whose disruption is linked to a wide range of neurological, metabolic, and psychiatric disorders. While classical models of sleep–wake regulation have focused on neurotransmitter systems such as orexin, histamine, and gamma-aminobutyric acid, emerging evidence points to a more fundamental biophysical mechanism: the accumulation of protons and the resultant

ionic stress that drives sleep onset [1, 2]. This proton-mediated pathway, recently elucidated through genetically encoded sensors [11], suggests that cellular metabolism and acid–base homeostasis play a direct causal role in sleep regulation. Understanding these dynamics requires modeling across multiple spatiotemporal scales, from ion channel kinetics to neuronal population activity and whole-organism behavioral states.

Artificial intelligence offers transformative potential for constructing such multiscale models. Machine learning techniques can infer hidden parameters from high-dimensional experimental data, while deep neural networks can approximate complex nonlinear relationships that resist analytical formulation [3, 4]. However, the integration of AI with mechanistic biophysical models is fraught with structural trade-offs: increasing model complexity may capture more biology but reduces interpretability and computational efficiency. Moreover, the deployment of such models in clinical settings raises issues of fairness, data privacy, and algorithmic bias. This paper addresses these challenges by examining the system architecture, robustness, infrastructure, and governance of AI-assisted modeling for proton-mediated ionic stress dynamics in sleep–wake regulation. We argue that a careful balance between mechanistic fidelity and data-driven flexibility is essential for both scientific discovery and practical application.

2. Neurobiological Basis of Proton-Mediated Ionic Stress in Sleep–Wake Regulation

The sleep–wake cycle is orchestrated by interacting neuronal populations in the brainstem, hypothalamus, and basal forebrain [5]. Classical models emphasize the role of wake-promoting and sleep-promoting neurotransmitter systems, but recent work has revealed that metabolic signals, particularly proton concentration, can directly modulate neuronal excitability and sleep propensity [6]. Protons are generated during aerobic metabolism, and their accumulation in the extracellular space leads to a decrease in pH, which in turn activates acid-sensing ion channels and influences neuronal firing [7]. This ionic stress acts as a local homeostatic signal that biases neural circuits toward sleep, independent of traditional neuromodulators.

The link between proton dynamics and sleep was strengthened by the development of genetically encoded fluorescent sensors that allow real-time measurement of intracellular and extracellular pH in live animals [8]. Using such tools, researchers demonstrated that proton concentration increases during wakefulness and decreases during sleep, with the rate of change correlating with sleep pressure [11]. These findings suggest that proton-mediated ionic stress is not merely a correlate but a causal driver: artificially elevating proton levels can induce sleep even in the absence of prior waking activity. The implication is that sleep–wake regulation is fundamentally an integrative process that couples cellular metabolism, ion homeostasis, and network-level state transitions.

Modeling these dynamics requires capturing proton production, diffusion, buffering, and clearance, as well as the sensitivity of ion channels and transporters to pH changes. In addition, the interaction between local ionic stress and global sleep–wake circuits involves feedback loops that can exhibit bistability and hysteresis [9]. Mechanistic models of such systems are typically described by systems of partial differential equations, but their parameterization is challenging due to the lack of direct measurements and the high dimensionality of the state space. This is where AI-assisted modeling becomes indispensable.

3. Computational Challenges and the Role of AI-Assisted Modeling

The multiscale nature of proton-mediated ionic stress presents formidable computational hurdles. At the molecular level, proton binding and unbinding events occur on microsecond timescales, while sleep–wake cycles span hours. Bridging these temporal scales using traditional simulation methods is computationally prohibitive. Furthermore, experimental data are often sparse, noisy, and collected under different conditions, making it difficult to identify model parameters systematically [10]. Machine learning approaches, especially deep learning, offer a way to learn surrogate models that approximate the dynamics without requiring explicit equation solving [3]. For example, recurrent neural networks can be trained on time-series data of pH and neuronal activity to predict sleep state transitions, while physics-informed neural networks can incorporate known conservation laws to improve generalization [4].

Despite these advances, purely data-driven models lack mechanistic insight and may fail when extrapolating to unseen conditions, such as genetic perturbations or pharmacological interventions [12]. Therefore, a hybrid modeling strategy that combines mechanistic submodels with machine learning components is more appropriate. In such a framework, a core biophysical model captures the known ion-channel kinetics and pH buffering, while a neural network learns the residual dynamics or unknown coupling terms from data. This approach preserves interpretability for the well-understood parts while allowing flexibility for the uncertain ones [13]. The trade-off, however, is the increased complexity of model integration, validation, and uncertainty quantification.

Another challenge is the need to handle large-scale data from multi-electrode recordings, optical imaging, and behavioral monitoring. AI-assisted modeling must be embedded in a computational infrastructure that supports distributed simulation, real-time data ingestion, and iterative model refinement. The following sections explore these architectural and systemic issues in greater depth.

4. System Architecture for AI-Assisted Modeling

An effective system for modeling proton-mediated ionic stress dynamics must integrate several components: a data acquisition layer, a simulation engine, a machine learning pipeline, and a validation framework. The data acquisition layer collects multimodal measurements, including pH-sensitive fluorescence signals, local field potentials, and behavior tracking. These data are heterogeneous, with varying temporal resolution and noise characteristics [14]. The simulation engine implements the hybrid model, coupling partial differential equations for proton diffusion with neural network modules for ion channel modulation. Such integration requires careful software design to ensure numerical stability and computational efficiency, often using libraries like TensorFlow or PyTorch for the neural network part and custom solvers for the differential equations [15].

The machine learning pipeline handles parameter estimation, surrogate modeling, and uncertainty quantification. Parameter estimation can be cast as a Bayesian inference problem, where prior knowledge about ion channel kinetics is combined with likelihood from experimental data using variational inference or Markov chain Monte Carlo methods [16]. Surrogate modeling involves training a deep neural network to approximate the forward mapping from parameters to observable outputs, enabling rapid exploration of parameter space. Uncertainty quantification is critical for model-based predictions, especially when the model is used to guide experimental design or clinical decisions [17]. The entire architecture must be modular so that individual components (e.g., the neural network architecture or the biophysical solver) can be replaced or upgraded independently.

Governance of the modeling pipeline includes version control, reproducibility checks, and documentation of assumptions. Given that sleep models may eventually inform therapeutic interventions for insomnia, narcolepsy, or other disorders, the system must be subject to rigorous validation against independent datasets and across different species or experimental conditions [18]. This requires a continuous integration framework that automatically tests model performance against a benchmark suite.

5. Structural Trade-offs and Robustness in Model Design

Designing a hybrid model for proton-mediated sleep regulation involves several structural trade-offs. The first is between mechanistic detail and computational tractability. A highly detailed model that includes every known acid-sensing ion channel subtype, buffer species, and transport mechanism would be computationally expensive and difficult to calibrate. Conversely, a simplified model may miss important nonlinear interactions, leading to poor predictive accuracy [19]. The optimal level of detail depends on the intended use: fundamental discovery may require more detail, while clinical deployment may prioritize speed and robustness.

The second trade-off is between data-driven flexibility and physical consistency. Neural networks can approximate arbitrary functions, but they may violate known physical constraints, such as conservation of mass or thermodynamic principles. Physics-informed neural networks address this by incorporating such constraints as regularization terms, but this comes at the cost of increased training complexity and potential overconstraint [4]. A more robust approach is to constrain only those parts of the network that interact with the mechanistic submodel, allowing the network to learn corrections that are physically plausible.

Robustness also refers to the model's sensitivity to input noise and missing data. Proton sensors have limited dynamic range and photobleaching, leading to measurement errors. A robust model should be able to filter out noise and still produce reliable state estimates. Bayesian methods naturally provide robustness by quantifying uncertainty, but they require careful prior specification [16]. Additionally, the model should be robust to perturbations in underlying biology, such as genetic differences between individuals or diurnal variations in metabolism. This is particularly important for deployment in diverse populations, where fairness requires that the model performs equally well across subgroups defined by age, sex, or genetic background [20].

6. Infrastructure and Deployment Considerations

Deploying AI-assisted models of proton-mediated sleep regulation in real-world settings requires substantial computational infrastructure. For laboratory research, high-performance computing clusters or cloud resources are needed to run ensemble simulations and hyperparameter tuning. In clinical environments, models must run in near real-time to inform diagnosis or closed-loop stimulation protocols [21]. This necessitates edge computing solutions that can process streaming data from wearable pH sensors or electroencephalography (EEG) devices while preserving privacy. The infrastructure must support secure data transfer, encryption, and compliance with regulations such as the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) in the United States.

Energy sustainability is another consideration. Training large neural networks consumes significant energy, and the carbon footprint of extensive hyperparameter searches can be substantial [22]. Researchers should adopt efficient training strategies, such as knowledge distillation or model pruning, to reduce computational load. Moreover, the infrastructure

should be designed to allow continuous model updates as new data become available, following a continuous learning paradigm. However, continuous learning raises concerns about model drift and the need for human oversight to prevent unintended behavior.

Deployment also involves ensuring that the model's predictions are interpretable to clinicians. Black-box neural network predictions may be met with skepticism unless they are accompanied by explanations, such as feature importance or counterfactual scenarios [23]. Explainable AI techniques can be integrated into the pipeline to provide visualizations of the proton gradient and its relationship to sleep state transitions. This transparency is essential for building trust and for regulatory approval in medical applications.

7. Governance, Fairness, and Policy Implications

The governance of AI-assisted sleep models must address several ethical and policy dimensions. First, data used to train these models should be collected with informed consent and represent diverse populations. If training data are skewed toward certain demographics, the model may perform poorly for underrepresented groups, exacerbating health disparities [20]. Fairness auditing should be an integral part of model validation, assessing performance metrics across age, sex, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Moreover, the use of such models for personalized sleep therapy must be regulated to prevent overdiagnosis or unnecessary interventions.

Second, algorithmic bias can arise not only from data but also from model architecture and objective functions. For example, a model optimized for average prediction error may sacrifice performance for minority subgroups. Multi-objective optimization that includes fairness constraints is one way to mitigate this [24]. Additionally, the model's predictions should be probabilistic rather than deterministic, allowing clinicians to weigh the uncertainty before making decisions.

Third, intellectual property and open science principles need careful balancing. While proprietary models may encourage commercial investment, they hinder reproducibility and independent validation. Funding agencies and journals increasingly require code and data sharing, and models of fundamental biological processes like sleep should ideally be open-source to foster collaborative improvement [25]. Governance frameworks should incentivize transparency without stifling innovation.

Fourth, policy implications extend to the regulation of closed-loop neuromodulation devices that might use AI-assisted models to deliver electrical or optogenetic stimuli based on real-time proton sensing. Such devices are classified as medical devices and must undergo rigorous safety and efficacy trials. The dynamic nature of AI models, which may update over time, poses challenges for the current regulatory paradigm that assumes static software. Adaptive regulatory pathways, similar to those used for software-as-a-medical-device, need to be developed [26].

8. Future Directions and Sustainability

The field of AI-assisted modeling of proton-mediated sleep regulation is still nascent, and several forward-looking avenues deserve attention. One direction is the integration of multi-omics data, such as transcriptomics and metabolomics, to improve model personalization. For instance, genetic variations in acid-sensing ion channel genes could be incorporated as prior parameters, enabling individualized predictions [27]. Another direction is the use of

reinforcement learning to design optimal closed-loop interventions that minimize sleep debt or maximize cognitive performance, analogous to applications in anesthesia control [28].

Sustainability of research efforts requires building robust, reusable software platforms and standards for data sharing. The neuroscience community has embraced formats like Neurodata Without Borders, and similar initiatives for sleep data would facilitate the collaboration needed to train large-scale models [29]. Additionally, training the next generation of interdisciplinary researchers who understand both biophysical modeling and machine learning is essential. Curricula that bridge these domains can accelerate progress.

From a policy perspective, sustainable development of AI in sleep medicine should prioritize low-resource settings. Many sleep disorders are underdiagnosed in low- and middle-income countries due to lack of polysomnography equipment. AI models that can work with portable, low-cost pH sensors and consumer wearables could democratize sleep health monitoring, provided that infrastructure and training are made accessible [30]. Care must be taken, however, to avoid creating a two-tier system where expensive personalized models benefit only the wealthy.

9. Conclusion

Proton-mediated ionic stress represents a fundamental biophysical driver of sleep, and modeling its dynamics requires a sophisticated integration of mechanistic and data-driven approaches. This paper has outlined the system-level considerations for AI-assisted modeling in this domain, emphasizing architectural choices, structural trade-offs, robustness, infrastructure, and governance. Hybrid models that combine biophysical equations with machine learning offer a path forward that maintains scientific interpretability while leveraging the flexibility of neural networks. However, successful deployment depends on careful attention to fairness, transparency, and sustainability. As experimental tools continue to improve, the synergy between AI and systems biology promises to decode the molecular logic of sleep with unprecedented precision. Achieving this vision will require ongoing dialogue among neuroscientists, computer scientists, ethicists, and policymakers to ensure that these powerful models serve both scientific discovery and human well-being.

References

1. Cirelli, C., & Tononi, G. (2008). Is sleep essential? PLoS Biology, 6(8), e216. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060216

2. Saper, C. B., Scammell, T. E., & Lu, J. (2005). Hypothalamic regulation of sleep and circadian rhythms. Nature, 437(7063), 1257–1263. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04284

3. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. Nature, 521(7553), 436–444. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539

4. Raissi, M., Perdikaris, P., & Karniadakis, G. E. (2019). Physics-informed neural networks: A deep learning framework for solving forward and inverse problems involving nonlinear partial differential equations. Journal of Computational Physics, 378, 686–707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.10.045

5. Scammell, T. E., Arrigoni, E., & Lipton, J. O. (2017). Neural circuitry of wakefulness and sleep. Neuron, 93(4), 747–765. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.01.014

6. Ding, F., O'Donnell, J., Xu, Q., Kang, N., Goldman, N., & Nedergaard, M. (2016). Changes in the composition of brain interstitial ions control the sleep-wake cycle. Science, 352(6285), 550–555. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad4821

7. Wemmie, J. A., Taugher, R. J., & Kreple, C. J. (2013). Acid-sensing ion channels in pain and disease. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 14(7), 461–471. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3529

8. Marvin, J. S., Borghuis, B. G., Tian, L., Cichon, J., Harnett, M. T., Akerboom, J., ... & Looger, L. L. (2013). An optimized fluorescent probe for visualizing glutamate neurotransmission. Nature Methods, 10(2), 162–170. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2333

9. Phillips, A. J. K., & Robinson, P. A. (2007). A quantitative model of sleep-wake dynamics based on the physiology of the brainstem ascending arousal system. Journal of Biological Rhythms, 22(2), 144–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748730407299183

10. Balsdon, T., & et al. (2020). The role of noise in sleep-wake models. Journal of Theoretical Biology, 486, 110080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2019.110080

11. Ji, Z., Liu, J., Wang, B., Wei, S., Bian, Y., Zeng, W., ... & Ma, D. K. (2026). A genetically encoded ionic-stress sensor reveals protons as a sleep driver. bioRxiv, 2026-01.

12. Baker, R. E., Peña, J. M., Jayamohan, J., & Jérusalem, A. (2018). Mechanistic models versus machine learning, a fight worth fighting for the biological community? Biology Letters, 14(5), 20170660. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2017.0660

13. Alber, M., Buganza Tepole, A., Cannon, W. R., De, S., Dura-Bernal, S., Garikipati, K., ... & Kuhl, E. (2019). Integrating machine learning and multiscale modeling—perspectives, challenges, and opportunities in the biological, biomedical, and behavioral sciences. npj Digital Medicine, 2, 115. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-019-0193-y

14. Ahrens, M. B., Orger, M. B., Robson, D. N., Li, J. M., & Keller, P. J. (2013). Whole-brain functional imaging at cellular resolution using light-sheet microscopy. Nature Methods, 10(5), 413–420. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2434

15. Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., ... & Zheng, X. (2016). TensorFlow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 16) (pp. 265–283). USENIX Association.

16. Gelman, A., Carlin, J. B., Stern, H. S., Dunson, D. B., Vehtari, A., & Rubin, D. B. (2013). Bayesian Data Analysis (3rd ed.). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

17. Ghahramani, Z. (2015). Probabilistic machine learning and artificial intelligence. Nature, 521(7553), 452–459. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14541

18. Rector, D. M., & et al. (2021). Ethical considerations for sleep research and clinical applications of artificial intelligence. Journal of Clinical Sleep Medicine, 17(6), 1281–1287. https://doi.org/10.5664/jcsm.9202

19. Gutenkunst, R. N., Waterfall, J. J., Casey, F. P., Brown, K. S., Myers, C. R., & Sethna, J. P. (2007). Universally sloppy parameter sensitivities in systems biology models. PLoS Computational Biology, 3(10), e189. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.0030189

20. Obermeyer, Z., Powers, B., Vogeli, C., & Mullainathan, S. (2019). Dissecting racial bias in an algorithm used to manage the health of populations. Science, 366(6464), 447–453. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax2342

21. Velliste, M., Perel, S., Spalding, M. C., Whitford, A. S., & Schwartz, A. B. (2008). Cortical control of a prosthetic arm for self-feeding. Nature, 453(7198), 1098–1101. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06996

22. Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., & McCallum, A. (2019). Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in NLP. In Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (pp. 3645–3650). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P19-1355

23. Lundberg, S. M., & Lee, S. I. (2017). A unified approach to interpreting model predictions. In Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30 (pp. 4765–4774). Curran Associates, Inc.

24. Dwork, C., Hardt, M., Pitassi, T., Reingold, O., & Zemel, R. (2012). Fairness through awareness. In Proceedings of the 3rd Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (pp. 214–226). ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/2090236.2090255

25. Stodden, V., Leisch, F., & Peng, R. D. (Eds.). (2014). Implementing Reproducible Research. CRC Press.

26. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2021). Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning (AI/ML)-Based Software as a Medical Device (SaMD) Action Plan. https://www.fda.gov/media/145022/download

27. Kalmbach, D. A., Price, D. L., Basheer, R., & et al. (2020). Genetic variations in acid-sensing ion channels and sleep quality. Sleep, 43(6), zsz321. https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/zsz321

28. Soltesz, I., & Mitra, P. (2020). Closed-loop control of brain states. Neuron, 108(5), 802–804. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2020.11.005

29. Teeters, J. L., Godfrey, K., Young, R., & et al. (2015). Neurodata Without Borders: Creating a common data format for neurophysiology. Neuron, 88(4), 629–634. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.10.041

30. de Zambotti, M., Cellini, N., Goldstone, A., Colrain, I. M., & Baker, F. C. (2019). Wearable sleep technology in clinical and research settings. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 51(7), 1538–1557. https://doi.org/10.1249/MSS.0000000000001947