

Remarks on Feedforward Circuits, Adaptation, and Pulse Memory

Eduardo D. Sontag
Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Abstract

This note studies feedforward circuits as models for perfect adaptation to step signals in biological systems. A global convergence theorem is proved in a general framework, which includes examples from the literature as particular cases. A notable aspect of these circuits is that they do not adapt to pulse signals, because they display a memory phenomenon. Estimates are given of the magnitude of this effect.

1 Introduction

Feedforward circuits have been often proposed for adaptation to constant signals in biological systems. For example, the review paper [5] gives a chemical reaction model, called there a “sniffer” and shown in Fig. 1, as the paradigm for perfect adaptation (the vertical interaction




Figure 1: “Sniffer” network, from [5]

is inhibitory). The chemical species S acts as a ‘signal’, and the species R is viewed as a “response” element. The third species, X , is an intermediate species.

Mathematically, the model is described in [5] by differential equations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{r} &= k_1 s - k_2 x r \\
 \dot{x} &= k_3 s - k_4 x
 \end{aligned}$$

where we are using dot to indicate time derivative and lower case letters for concentrations of the respective species. The key fact is that in steady state and for nonzero constant signals S , the concentration of R equals $\frac{k_1 k_4}{k_2 k_3}$, and this value is independent of the actual value of S . (This follows simply by setting the right-hand sides of the equations to zero.)

A similar construction is given in [6], representing various possible chemical networks proposed for modeling adaptation by the chemotaxis pathway of *Dictyostelium*.

A common feature of all these models is that they have the form of a stable linear system which in turn drives a one-dimensional (generally nonlinear) system, whose state-variable represents the response that should adapt. The interconnection is set up so that the whole system becomes a “feedforward circuit” [1]. Let us denote the strength of the input signal (a non-negative real number) by u , the state of the linear system (an n -dimensional vector) by x , and the state of the driven response (a real number) by y . Then, a mathematical description of the evolution of concentrations of the various signals is given by a set of differential equations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= Ax + bu \\ \dot{y} &= c(y)x + d(y)u\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where A and b are a constant square matrix and column vector respectively, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $b \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$, and $c(y)$ and $d(y)$ are continuous functions of y so that, for each y , $c(y) \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ and $d(y) \in \mathbb{R}$. For example, in the “sniffer” reactions from [5], and writing u , x , and y instead of s , x , and r respectively, we have $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $A = -k_4$, $b = k_3$, $c(y) = -k_2y$, and $d(y) = k_1$ (constant). We may view system (1) as a control system [3].

The state variables $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ take values in some subsets $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ respectively, where \mathcal{Y} is a closed, possibly unbounded, interval. The sets \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} can be used in order to impose non-negativity and/or mass conservation constraints. We will assume that enough regularity has been imposed so that, for every non-negative constant input u_0 , and every initial condition $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, the equations (1) have a unique solution $(x(t), y(t)) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ defined for all $t \geq 0$.

For each *nonzero* constant input u_0 , the steady states (x_0, y_0) of this system are obtained by setting $\dot{x} = 0$, which gives us $x_0 = -A^{-1}bu_0$ (the inverse is well-defined because the x -system was assumed to be asymptotically stable, so that all eigenvalues of A are nonzero), and then substituting into the left-hand side of the y -equation, to obtain the following algebraic equation:

$$d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b = 0\tag{2}$$

(after canceling out $u_0 \neq 0$). The key hypothesis that we make from now on (and which is satisfied in all the cited examples) is that *there is a unique solution* $y = y_0$ of the algebraic equation (2), and that this solution is an asymptotically stable state for the reduced system $\dot{y} = (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b)u_0$ that would result if $x(t)$ were already at its steady state $-A^{-1}bu_0$. In other words, we make the following hypothesis:

$$(\exists y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}) (\forall y \in \mathcal{Y}) [(y - y_0) (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b) < 0]\tag{H}$$

(that is, $\dot{y} = (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b)u_0$ is positive when $y < y_0$ and negative when $y > y_0$). It is fundamental to observe that y_0 (though not, of course, x_0) is independent of the particular numerical value of u_0 .

We show below (Proposition 2.1) that, assuming boundedness of trajectories, systems (1) “adapt” to nonzero constant signals u_0 (“step signals”), in the sense that all the solutions of system (1) converge to the above steady state (x_0, y_0) , where y_0 is independent of u_0 .

Our main purpose in this note, however, is to bring attention to the following facts. When $u_0 = 0$, that is, in the absence of an external signal, steady states are no longer unique. Indeed, any vector of the form $(0, y)$ is a steady state. This has an important consequence for the

behavior of system (1) when a *pulse* input is used. By a pulse, we mean an input u which has the following form: $u(t) = u_0 \neq 0$ for some interval $t \in [0, T]$, and $u(t) = 0$ for $t > T$. Suppose that the interval is long enough ($T \gg 1$) so that we may assume that $x(T)$ and $y(T)$ are (approximately) in steady state: $x(T) \approx -A^{-1}bu_0$ and $y(T) \approx y_0$. Upon removing the external excitation at time T , the equations for the system become $\dot{x} = Ax$ and $\dot{y} = c(y)x$ for $t > T$, with initial conditions $x(T)$ and $y(T)$, so $x(t) \approx -e^{(t-T)A}A^{-1}bu_0$ for $t \geq T$. The solution of $\dot{y} = c(y)x$ starts at y_0 but adds a quantity which integrates the effect of the nonzero function $x(t)$. For example, if $n = 1$, $A = -1$ and $b = 1$, and $c(y) \equiv -1$, then $\dot{y} \approx -e^{T-t}u_0$, so $y(t) \rightarrow y_0 - u_0 \neq y_0$. Thus, feedforward systems for adaptation as those discussed here exhibit a *memory* effect with respect to pulses. This phenomenon apparently was not remarked upon earlier, and we discuss it in this note.

The rest of this note is organized as follows. Section 2 has statements of the convergence results. In Section 3, we will show how to obtain estimates of the magnitude of the pulse memory effect. Section 4 has the proofs of the convergence results. Section 5 revisits the motivating examples. Finally, it is known that, under appropriate technical assumptions, perfect adaptation implies that the system may be written, after a suitable nonlinear change of coordinates, as system in which the integral of the regulated quantify is fed-back, see for instance [4]. This fact is not incompatible with the system being a feedforward system, as we remark in Section 6.

2 Statements of convergence results

The main convergence result is as follows. Note that, since the x -coordinate of a solution $(x(t), y(t))$ for constant u always converges (because of the stability assumption on the linear system) and hence is bounded, asking that $(x(t), y(t))$ is bounded is the same as asking that $y(t)$ is.

Proposition 2.1 Suppose that Property **(H)** holds. Then, for each step input $u \equiv u_0 \neq 0$, and every initial condition, if the corresponding solution $(x(t), y(t))$ of (1) is bounded, then it converges to (x_0, y_0) .

Boundedness is automatically satisfied if \mathcal{Y} is itself a bounded interval, as is the case if mass conservation laws constrain the system dynamics. More generally, the following condition can be helpful. It is a stronger form of Property **(H)**:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\forall u_0 > 0)(\exists \bar{\varepsilon} > 0) \\
& (\exists y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}) (\forall y_2 < y \in \mathcal{Y}) [|c(y)| \bar{\varepsilon} + u_0 (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b) < 0] \quad (\mathbf{H}^*) \\
& (\exists y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}) (\forall y_1 > y \in \mathcal{Y}) [-|c(y)| \bar{\varepsilon} + u_0 (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b) > 0]
\end{aligned}$$

(where $|c|$ denotes the norm of the vector c) and it says that the inequality in **(H)** is preserved under small enough perturbations proportional to $c(y)$, as long as y is large or small enough.

Lemma 2.2 Suppose that **(H)** and **(H*)** are satisfied. Then, for each step input $u \equiv u_0 \neq 0$, and every initial condition, the corresponding solution $(x(t), y(t))$ of (1) is bounded.

From Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have the following immediate consequence:

Corollary 2.3 Suppose that **(H)** and **(H*)** are satisfied. Then, for each step input $u \equiv u_0 \neq 0$, and every initial condition, the corresponding solution $(x(t), y(t))$ of (1) converges to (x_0, y_0) .

Condition **(H*)** is often automatically satisfied in examples:

Lemma 2.4 Suppose that $c(y)$ and $d(y)$ are affine in y . That is, there are two row vectors $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$ and two scalars d_0, d_1 such that $c(y) = c_0 + yc_1$ and $d(y) = d_0 + yd_1$. Then, Property **(H)** implies Property **(H*)**.

3 Pulse memory effects

As remarked in the Introduction, when a pulse input $u(t)$ is applied to the system (1), the asymptotic value of y does not typically return to its adapted value, there is a “memory” effect as the asymptotic value of y depends on the magnitude of the step. Thus, in this section we analyze the effect of a pulse input, that is $u(t) = u_0 \neq 0$ for some interval $t \in [0, T]$, and $u(t) = 0$ for $t > T$. We suppose that the interval is long enough ($T \gg 1$) so that $x(T)$ and $y(T)$ are (approximately) in steady state: $x(T) \approx -A^{-1}bu_0$ and $y(T) \approx y_0$. This means that $x(t) \approx -e^{(t-T)A}A^{-1}bu_0$ for $t \geq T$, and y approximately solves $\dot{y} = -c(y)e^{(t-T)A}A^{-1}bu_0$ starting at the adapted value y_0 .

Therefore, and changing for simplicity the origin of time to $t = T$, we wish to estimate the limiting value of the solution of the initial-value problem:

$$\dot{y} = -c(y)e^{tA}A^{-1}bu_0, \quad y(0) = y_0. \quad (3)$$

In general, such a differential equation, even though scalar, is not easy to solve, because of the time dependence. We consider two special cases.

Affine case

When $c(y) = c_0 + yc_1$ is affine in y , one may write it as

$$\dot{y} + \alpha(t)y = \beta(t)$$

where $\alpha(t) = c_1e^{tA}A^{-1}bu_0$ and $\beta(t) = -c_0e^{tA}A^{-1}bu_0$. This is a linear differential equation, which can be solved in a standard manner by using the integrating factor $e^{\int \alpha(t)dt}$.

Separable case

Another special case is that in which one may decompose $c(y)$ as follows:

$$c(y) = \theta(y)c \quad (4)$$

where $\theta(y)$ is a nowhere vanishing scalar continuous function of y , and c is a row vector. We work out more details in this special case.

Separating variables,

$$\int_{y_0}^{y(t)} \frac{dz}{\theta(z)} = -c \left(\int_0^t e^{sA} ds \right) A^{-1}bu_0 = c(I - e^{tA})A^{-2}bu_0.$$

The function $\Theta_0(y) := \int_{y_0}^y \frac{dz}{\theta(z)}$ is strictly increasing or strictly decreasing if θ is positive or negative respectively, so its inverse $\Theta := \Theta_0^{-1}$ is well defined, as is also strictly increasing or strictly decreasing respectively.

We conclude that:

$$\hat{y}_{u_0} = \Theta(cA^{-2}bu_0)$$

is the steady-state value of y after the system has been subjected to a long pulse of amplitude u_0 and the pulse is removed. Recalling the conditions under which Θ is increasing or decreasing, we may summarize as follows:

Proposition 3.1 Assuming the form in (4), with $\theta(y)$ nonzero and continuous on \mathcal{Y} , the steady state value \hat{y}_{u_0} is:

- (a) an increasing function of u_0 if $\theta(y_0)cA^{-2}b > 0$, and
- (b) a decreasing function of u_0 if $\theta(y_0)cA^{-2}b < 0$.

Notice that $\Theta(0) = y_0$, so the steady state \hat{y}_{u_0} after a pulse is smaller (respectively, larger) than the adaptation steady state y_0 (that results after a step input) provided that $\theta(y_0)cA^{-2}b < 0$ (respectively, > 0).

4 Proofs

We first state an elementary observation about scalar differential equations.

Lemma 4.1 Consider the scalar time-dependent differential equation

$$\dot{y} = F(t, y) + \varphi(y)$$

where F and φ are differentiable functions. We assume that $F(t, y) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly on $y \in K$, where $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a closed and bounded interval, and that there is some $y_0 \in K$ such that $\varphi(y) > 0$ for all $y < y_0$ and $\varphi(y) < 0$ for all $y > y_0$. Then, every solution $y : [0, \infty) \rightarrow K$ is so that $y(t) \rightarrow y_0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Let $y(t)$ be a solution with values in K , and pick any open neighborhood N of y_0 . We must show that, for some T , $y(t) \in N$ for all $t > T$. The set $K \setminus N$ is the union of two closed and bounded sets A_- and A_+ (either of which might possibly be empty, if y_0 is an endpoint of K) such that $y \in A_- \Rightarrow y < y_0$ and $y \in A_+ \Rightarrow y > y_0$. By continuity of the function φ , there is some positive number δ such that $\varphi(y) > \delta$ for all $y \in A_-$ and $\varphi(y) < -\delta$ for all $y \in A_+$. For some t_0 , $|F(t, y)| < \delta/2$ for all $y \in K \setminus N$ and all $t \geq t_0$. Thus, for $t \geq t_0$ we have that $\dot{y}(t) > \delta/2$ if $y(t) \in A_-$ and $\dot{y}(t) < -\delta/2$ if $y(t) \in A_+$. This means that for some $T > t_0$ it will hold that $y(t)$ exits $K \setminus N$ and does not enter again, as needed. ■

Proof of Proposition 2.1

We will apply Lemma 4.1. Suppose that Property **(H)** holds. Pick any step input $u \equiv u_0 \neq 0$ and an initial condition of (1), and suppose that the corresponding solution $(x(t), y(t))$ of (1) is so that $y(t)$ is bounded. Since \mathcal{Y} is a closed set, this is the same as saying that $y(t) \in K$ for all t , for some closed and bounded interval $K \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. We have that $x(t) = \theta(t) - A^{-1}bu_0$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $\theta(t) = e^{tA}(x_0 + A^{-1}bu_0)$ and therefore y satisfies:

$$\dot{y} = F(t, y) + \varphi(y) = c(y)\theta(t) + \varphi(y) \tag{5}$$

where $\varphi(y) = (d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b)u_0$. Property **(H)** gives the property needed for φ in the Lemma. On the other hand, $\theta(t) \rightarrow 0$ (as $e^{tA} \rightarrow 0$, by stability), so $F(t, y) \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $y \in K$. Thus, Lemma 4.1 gives the desired conclusion. ■

Proof of Lemma 2.2

We pick any initial condition, and want to show that the corresponding solution $(x(t), y(t))$ of (1) is such that $y(t)$ is bounded. We will prove that $y(t)$ is upper-bounded, the lower bound proof being similar, and assume that \mathcal{Y} is not upper bounded, since otherwise we are done. By Property **(H*)**, we may pick $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $|c(y)|\bar{\varepsilon} + \varphi(y) < 0$ for all $y > y_2$, where the function φ is as in the proof of Proposition 2.1. By (5), we know that $\dot{y}(t) < 0$ as long as $y(t) > y_2$ and $t \geq t_0$, where t_0 is picked so that $|\theta(t)| < \varepsilon$ for all $t \geq t_0$. This clearly implies that $y(t)$ is upper bounded. ■

Proof of Lemma 2.4

Suppose that $c(y)$ and $d(y)$ are affine in y , $c(y) = c_0 + yc_1$ and $d(y) = d_0 + yd_1$. As Property **(H)** holds,

$$\mu + \nu y = d_0 + yd_1 - (c_0 + yc_1)A^{-1}b < 0$$

for $y > y_0$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, where we are writing $\mu := d_0 - c_0A^{-1}b$ and $\nu := d_1 - c_1A^{-1}b$.

Fix any $u_0 > 0$. We need to show that Property **(H*)** holds. We will show the existence of $\bar{\varepsilon}$ and y_2 ; existence of y_2 is proved in a similar way. Our goal is to pick $y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}$ in such a way that

$$|c(y)|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0(d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b) < 0 \tag{6}$$

whenever $y > y_2$ is an element of \mathcal{Y} . If the interval \mathcal{Y} is upper bounded, we may pick y_2 equal to its right endpoint, and this property is satisfied vacuously. Thus, we assume from now on that \mathcal{Y} is not upper bounded.

We claim that $\nu < 0$. Indeed, if $\nu \geq 0$ then $\mu + \nu y \geq \mu + \nu y_0 = 0$ for any $y > y_0$, $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, which would contradict Property **(H)**. (Note that there exist such $y > y_0$, because y_0 cannot be the right endpoint of \mathcal{Y} , because \mathcal{Y} is not upper bounded.)

For (6) to be satisfied, and assuming we pick $y_2 \geq 0$, it is enough that this inequality should hold:

$$(|c_0|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0\mu) + y(|c_1|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0\nu) < 0 \tag{7}$$

(because $|c_0 + c_1y| \leq |c_0| + |c_1|y$). We let $\bar{\varepsilon} := -\frac{\nu}{2|c_1|u_0}$. Then, for $y > 0$,

$$(|c_0|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0\mu) + y(|c_1|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0\nu) < (|c_0|\bar{\varepsilon} + u_0\mu) + yu_0\nu/2$$

and, since the upper bound is a linear function with negative slope, it will be negative for large y . ■

5 Examples

We show here how the results apply, in particular, to the models in the papers [5] and [6].

“Sniffer” model

The “perfect adaptation” model in [5] is, after a renaming of variables and a slight rearranging to bring into our form (1):

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= -k_4x + k_3u \\ \dot{y} &= -k_2yx + k_1u\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $A = -k_4$, $b = k_3$, $c(y) = -k_2y$, and $d(y) = k_1$ (constant). Here $y_0 = \frac{k_1k_4}{k_2k_3}$, and **(H)** is satisfied because $d(y) - c(y)A^{-1}b = k_1 - \frac{k_2k_3}{k_4}y$ changes sign at $y = y_0$. This example has the form in Lemma 2.4, so convergence holds.

To study the effect of pulses, we write $c(y)$ in the form (4) using $c = -k_2$ and $\theta(y) = y$. So $\Theta_0(y) = \int_{y_0}^y dz/z = \ln(y) - \ln(y_0) = \ln(y/y_0)$. It follows that $\Theta(r) = y_0e^r$, so

$$\hat{y}_{u_0} = y_0 \exp\left(-\frac{k_2k_3}{k_4^2}u_0\right)$$

which decreases with u_0 .

Dictyostelium chemotaxis models from [6]

There are several models given in [6], but they all have the same general interpretation. The authors of [6], based on previous work [2], postulate the existence of a “response regulator” R, a variable that correlates to the chemotactic activity of the system, that can be in an “active” or in an “inactive” form. The activation and inactivation of R are regulated by a pair of opposing processes: an excitation process that induces an increase in the level of the response R, and an inhibition process that lowers this response. The input to the system is the extracellular chemoattractant concentration, and it is assumed that this signal triggers increases in concentrations in both the activation and inactivation elements. We denote by $y(t)$ the concentration of active regulator, by $\alpha - y(t)$ the concentration of inactive regulator, where α is the total concentration (active+inactive), assumed constant, and by $x_1(t)$ and $x_2(t)$ the concentrations of the activation and inactivation elements respectively.

There are several alternative models given in [6]. The first one is, in our notations:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_1 &= -k_1x_1 + k_2u \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -k_3x_2 + k_4u \\ \dot{y} &= k_5(\alpha - y)x_1 - k_6yx_2\end{aligned}$$

where the k_i 's are positive constants. This has the form (1), with $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, $\mathcal{Y} = [0, \alpha]$, $c(y) = (k_5(\alpha - y), -k_6y)$, and $d(y) = 0$. To simplify notations, let us write $P = \frac{k_2k_5}{k_1}$ and $B = \frac{k_4k_6}{k_3}$. Note that Property **(H)** is satisfied, as the solution y_0 of

$$P(\alpha - y) - Qy = 0 \tag{8}$$

belongs to the interval $(0, \alpha)$, and the algebraic expression changes there from positive to negative. The y -dynamics is bounded, by definition, so we have convergence.

Since the y equation is affine, the memory effect of pulses can be obtained by solving an appropriate linear differential equation, as explained earlier, but the expression for the solution is algebraically very involved. We can, however, make some qualitative remarks.

Lemma 5.1 The solution of the initial-value problem

$$\dot{y} = P(\alpha - y)e^{-k_1 t}u_0 - Qye^{-k_3 t}u_0, \quad y(0) = y_0 \quad (9)$$

has a limit \hat{y}_{u_0} . If $k_3 > k_1$ then $\hat{y}_{u_0} > y_0$, and if $k_3 < k_1$ then $\hat{y}_{u_0} < y_0$.

Proof. We assume that $k_3 > k_1$; the case $k_3 < k_1$ is proved in an analogous fashion. Since $y(t)$ is bounded, it will be enough to show that there cannot exist two limit points $0 \leq \bar{y}_1 < \bar{y}_2 \leq \delta$ of the solution. So assume that such points exist, and let $0 < t_1 < s_1 < t_2 < s_2 \dots \rightarrow \infty$ be so that $y(t_i) \rightarrow \bar{y}_1$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$ and $y(s_i) \rightarrow \bar{y}_2$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$. Pick $\varepsilon := \frac{1}{2}(\bar{y}_2 - \bar{y}_1) + (\alpha - \bar{y}_2) > 0$ and some time $\bar{t} > 0$ such that $P\varepsilon > \alpha Qe^{(k_1 - k_3)\bar{t}}$ (there is such a \bar{t} because $k_1 - k_3 < 0$).

Note the following property:

$$y(t) < \alpha - \varepsilon \text{ and } t \geq \bar{t} \Rightarrow \dot{y}(t) > 0. \quad (10)$$

Indeed,

$$\frac{e^{-k_1 t}}{u_0} \dot{y} = P(\alpha - y(t)) - Qy(t)e^{(k_1 - k_3)t} > P\varepsilon - Q\alpha e^{(k_1 - k_3)t} > 0$$

because $\alpha - y(t) > \varepsilon$ and $y(t) < \alpha$, so $\dot{y}(t) > 0$ as claimed.

Since $\bar{y}_2 > \alpha - \varepsilon$, there is some i so that $y(s_i) > \alpha - \varepsilon$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that s_i was picked larger than \bar{t} . Then,

$$t > s_i \Rightarrow y(t) \geq \alpha - \varepsilon. \quad (11)$$

(Otherwise, there would exist some $a < \alpha - \delta$ and some $T > s_i$ such that $y(T) = a$, and we can assume that T has been picked smallest possible with this property, for the given a . Pick $\delta > 0$ so that $s_i < T - \delta$ and so that the interval $I = (T - \delta, T]$ has the property that $y(I) \subseteq [0, \alpha - \varepsilon]$. Then, by property (10), $\dot{y}(t) > 0$ for all $t \in I$. So $y(t) < y(T)$ for all $t \in I$, which contradicts the minimality of T .)

On the other hand, since $\bar{y}_1 < \alpha - \varepsilon$, $y(t_j) < \alpha - \varepsilon$ for all sufficiently large j . This contradicts (11) if $j > i$. The contradiction shows that such $\bar{y}_1 < \bar{y}_2$ cannot exist, so the function $y(t)$ is convergent as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

We must now prove that $\hat{y}_{u_0} > y_0$. Since y_0 solves (8), and $e^{(k_1 - k_3)t} < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$, it follows that $P(\alpha - y_0)e^{-k_1 t} - Qy_0e^{-k_3 t} > 0$ for all $t \geq 0$. Thus:

$$\dot{y}(t) = P(\alpha - y(t))e^{-k_1 t} - Qy(t)e^{-k_3 t} \geq P(\alpha - y_0)e^{-k_1 t} - Qy_0e^{-k_3 t} > 0$$

whenever $t \geq 0$ is such that $y(t) \leq y_0$. This implies that $y(t) > y(0) = y_0$ for all $t > 0$. Therefore the limit also satisfies $\hat{y}_{u_0} > y_0$. \blacksquare

The interpretation of Lemma 5.1 is obvious: $k_3 > k_1$ means that the inhibitor (x_2) degrades at a faster rate than the activator (x_1). Thus, when the external signal is turned-off, there is a residual effect due to the additional activator still present, which implies a positive memory effect. Similarly, when $k_3 < k_1$, there is additional repressor present and the memory effect is negative.

The other models from [6] are similar, differing only in the placement of the feedforward terms in the y equation, and the stability results apply equally well. Let us consider one of the variants:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= -k_1 x_1 + k_2 u \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -k_3 x_2 + k_4 x_1 \\ \dot{y} &= k_5 (\alpha - y) u - k_6 y x_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the activator now acts so as to enhance the inhibitor, and the input signal acts directly on the response element. This has the form (1), with $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, $\mathcal{Y} = [0, \alpha]$, $c(y) = (0, -k_6 y)$, and $d(y) = k_5(\alpha - y)$. Note that Property **(H)** is satisfied, as $k_5(\alpha - y) - \frac{k_2 k_4 k_6}{k_1 k_3} y$ changes sign at a $y_0 \in (0, \alpha)$. The y -dynamics is bounded, by definition, so we have convergence.

Once again, since the y equation is affine, the memory effect of pulses can be computed using linear differential equations theory. *The memory effect is in this case decreasing in u_0 , independently of the parameters $k_i > 0$.* This is because the initial value problem after the signal has been turned-off has the form:

$$\dot{y}(t) = -y(t)\theta(t)$$

for some positive function $\theta(t)$, so $y(t) < 0$ for all t . Intuitively: the activation effect (u) turns-off immediately, but there is a residual inhibition effect (x_2).

As an concrete illustration, let us work out the case in which all constants are equal to 1. In this case, solving $(1 - y) - y = 0$ gives $y_0 = 1/2$, and \hat{y}_{u_0} is the limiting value of the solution of:

$$\dot{y} = -ye^{-t}(t+1)u_0$$

(because $x_2(t) = e^{-t}(t+1)u_0$). Thus, $y(t) = \frac{1}{2}e^{[(2+t)e^{-t}-2]u_0}$ and therefore $\hat{y}_{u_0} = \frac{1}{2}e^{-2u_0}$, so that, indeed, the memory effect is negative.

A Michaelis-Menten model

Non-affine variant of the above examples may be obtained by using Michaelis-Menten dynamics for activation and inhibition reactions. For instance, we may write:

$$\dot{y} = \frac{V_1(\alpha - y)}{K_1 + (\alpha - y)}u - \frac{V_2 y}{K_2 + y}x_2$$

for some positive constants V_i and K_i . Once again, our hypotheses apply, and there is convergence to y_0 .

We study memory effects for pulses for this example, but only in the special case in which all constants are equal to 1 and for a 1-dimensional x -system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -x + u \\ \dot{y} &= \frac{(1 - y)}{1 + (1 - y)}u - \frac{y}{1 + y}x. \end{aligned}$$

We have that $y_0 = 1/2$ and $x_0 = u_0$, and $c(y) = -y/(1 + y)$. We are in the separable situation described earlier, and so solve $\dot{y} = c(y)e^{-t}u_0$ using separation of variables. Writing

$$\ln y(t) + \ln 2 + y(t) - 1/2 = \int_{1/2}^{y(t)} \left(\frac{1}{s} + 1\right) ds = - \int_0^t e^{-s} ds u_0 = (e^{-t} - 1)u_0$$

we have, taking limits, that \hat{y}_{u_0} is the solution of the algebraic equation:

$$\ln \hat{y}_{u_0} + \hat{y}_{u_0} = 1/2 - \ln 2 - u_0$$

and so decreases with u_0 . For example, of $u_0 = 1$ then $\hat{y}_{u_0} \approx 0.24$, which is less than one-half of the adapted value $y_0 = 0.5$.

6 Remarks on integral feedback

We close this note with a remark about integral feedback. The “internal model principle” (see e.g. [4]) states that, if a system perfectly adapts to all steps, then it may be written, after a suitable nonlinear change of coordinates, as system in which the integral of the regulated quantity is fed-back. A feedforward system that exhibits perfect adaptation might appear to be a counter-example to this fact. However, there is no contradiction, as a change of coordinates may allow one to transform a feedforward into a feedback system. As an illustration, consider the following two-dimensional linear system:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= -x + u \\ \dot{y} &= x - u - y\end{aligned}$$

which has the property that all solutions, when $u \equiv u_0$, converge to $(u_0, 0)$. Thus, $y(t) \rightarrow y_0 = 0$ no matter what is the value of u_0 . This is a feedforward system in the obvious sense (although it is not exactly of the type in (1) because of the additive, not multiplicative, term $-y$). However, the same system is also an integral feedback system, in the following sense. Suppose that we choose to represent the system using the state variables $z = -x - y$ and y instead of x and y . In the new set of equations:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{z} &= y \\ \dot{y} &= -z - 2y - u\end{aligned}$$

which can be viewed as a system in which the rate of change of the regulated quantity y depends on y itself (proportional feedback) as well as on z , which is an integral of y ,

Notice that, especially when seen as an integral feedback system, it is immediately obvious that for *every* step input $u \equiv u_0$ (not merely nonzero steps), any steady state has the value $y = 0$, since $0 = \dot{z} = y$ at steady states. So, when using a pulse, the system will eventually also converge to the adapted value (since we can see the behavior after the end of the pulse as that corresponding to a zero step). Thus, the memory effect discussed in this note will not occur for a true integral feedback system.

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Yuan Wang for many useful comments on a draft of this manuscript.

References

- [1] U. Alon. *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits*. Chapman & Hall, 2006.
- [2] A. Levchenko and P.A. Iglesias. Models of eukaryotic gradient sensing: Application to chemotaxis of amoebae and neutrophils. *Biophys J.*, 82:50–63, 2002.
- [3] E.D. Sontag. *Mathematical Control Theory. Deterministic Finite-Dimensional Systems*, volume 6 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1998.
- [4] E.D. Sontag. Adaptation and regulation with signal detection implies internal model. *Systems Control Lett.*, 50(2):119–126, 2003.
- [5] J.J. Tyson, K. Chen, and B. Novak. Sniffers, buzzers, toggles, and blinkers: dynamics of regulatory and signaling pathways in the cell. *Curr. Opin. Cell. Biol.*, 15:221–231, 2003.
- [6] L. Yang and P.A. Iglesias. Feedback induced biphasic response in the chemotaxis pathway of Dictyostelium. In *Proc. 2005 American Control Conference, IEEE Publications*, pages 4393–4398, 2005.