

Global convergence of quorum-sensing networks

Giovanni Russo* and Jean-Jacques Slotine†

September 19, 2018

Abstract

In many natural synchronization phenomena, communication between individual elements occurs not directly, but rather through the environment. One of these instances is bacterial quorum sensing, where bacteria release signaling molecules in the environment which in turn are sensed and used for population coordination. Extending this motivation to a general non-linear dynamical system context, this paper analyzes synchronization phenomena in networks where communication and coupling between nodes are mediated by shared dynamical quantities, typically provided by the nodes' environment. Our model includes the case when the dynamics of the shared variables themselves cannot be neglected or indeed play a central part. Applications to examples from systems biology illustrate the approach.

Keywords: Synchronization, quorum-sensing, systems biology

1 Introduction

Many dynamical phenomena in biology involve some form of *synchronization*. Synchronization has attracted much research both from the theoretical, see e.g. (Strogatz 2003),(You et al. 2004),

*G. Russo is with the Department of Systems and Computer Engineering, University of Naples Federico II, Italy. Work done while visiting the Nonlinear Systems Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. E-mail: giovanni.russo2@unina.it

†J.J. Slotine is with the Nonlinear Systems Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, United States. E-mail: jjslot@mit.edu

(McMillen et al. 2002) to cite just a few, and experimental (Yagamuchi et al. 2003), (Pye 1969) viewpoints. The particular case of synchronized *time-periodic* processes, where time-scales can range from a few milliseconds to several years (Winfree 2001, Newman et al. 2006), includes e.g. circadian rhythms in mammals (Gonze et al. 2005), the cell cycle (Tyson et al. 2002), spiking neurons (Izhikevich 2006) and respiratory oscillations (Henson 2004).

When modelling such networks, it is often assumed that each node communicates directly with other nodes in the network, see e.g. (Park et al. 2008, Bohn & Gracia-Ojalvo 2008) and references therein. In many natural instances, however, network nodes do not communicate directly, but rather by means of noisy and continuously changing environments. Bacteria, for instance, produce, release and sense signaling molecules (so-called autoinducers) which can diffuse in the environment and are used for population coordination. This mechanism, known as *quorum sensing* (Miller & Bassler 2001, Nardelli et al. 2008, Ng & Bassler 2009) is believed to play a key role in bacterial infection, as well as e.g. in bioluminescence and biofilm formation (Anetzberger et al. 2009), (Nadell et al. 2008). In a neuronal context, a mechanism similar to that of quorum sensing may involve *local field potentials*, which may play an important role in the synchronization of clusters of neurons, (Pesaran et al. 2002, Boustani et al. 2009, Tabareau et al. 2010, Anastassiou et al. 2010).

From a network dynamics viewpoint, the key characteristic of quorum sensing-like mechanisms lies in the fact that communication between nodes (e.g. bacteria) occurs by means of a shared quantity (e.g. autoinducer concentration). Furthermore, the production and degradation rates of such a quantity are affected by all the nodes of the network. Therefore, a detailed model of such a mechanism needs to keep track of the temporal evolution of the shared quantity, resulting in an additional set of ordinary differential equations.

Mathematical work on such quorum sensing topologies is relatively sparse (e.g., (Garcia-Ojalvo et al. 2004, Tabareau et al. 2010, Russo & di Bernardo 2009b, Katriel 2008)) compared to that on diffusive topologies, and often neglects quorum variable dynamics or the dynamics of the environment. This sparsity of results is somewhat surprising given that, besides its biological pervasiveness, quorum sensing may also be viewed as an astute “computational” tool. Specifically, use of a shared variable in effect significantly reduces the number of links required to achieve a given connectivity (Tabareau et al. 2010).

In this paper, we derive sufficient conditions for the coordination of nodes communicating through dynamical quorum sensing mechanisms. These results can be used both to analyse natural networks, and to guide design of communication mechanisms in synthetic or partially synthetic networks. We first consider, in Section 3.1, the case where the network nodes (e.g., the biological entities populating the environment) are all identical or nearly identical. We then focus, in Section 3.2, on networks composed of heterogeneous nodes, i.e., nodes of possibly diverse dynamics. In this

case we provide sufficient conditions ensuring that all the network nodes sharing the same dynamics converge to a common behavior, a particular instance of so-called concurrent synchronization (Pham & Slotine 2007). In Section 3.3, the results are further extended to a distributed version of quorum sensing, where multiple groups of possibly heterogeneous nodes communicate by means of multiple media. Finally, in Section 4, we propose a strategy for controlling the common asymptotic evolution of the network nodes. Section 5 studies the dependence of synchronization properties on the number of nodes, a question of interest e.g. in the context of cell proliferation. Section 6 illustrates the general approach with a set of examples.

Our proofs are based on nonlinear contraction theory ((Lohmiller & Slotine 1998)), a viewpoint on incremental stability which we briefly review in Section 2, and which has emerged as a powerful tool in applications ranging from Lagrangian mechanics to network control. Historically, ideas closely related to contraction can be traced back to (Hartman 1961) and even to (Lewis 1949) (see also (Pavlov et al. 2004, Angeli 2002), and e.g. (Lohmiller & Slotine 2005) for a more exhaustive list of related references). As pointed out in (Lohmiller & Slotine 1998), contraction is preserved through a large variety of systems combinations, and in particular it represents a natural tool for the study and design of nonlinear state observers, and by extension, of synchronization mechanisms (Wang & Slotine 2005).

2 Contraction theory tools

2.1 Basic results

The basic result of nonlinear contraction analysis (Lohmiller & Slotine 1998) which we shall use in this paper can be stated as follows.

Theorem 1 (Contraction). *Consider the m -dimensional deterministic system*

$$\dot{x} = f(x, t) \tag{1}$$

where f is a smooth nonlinear function. The system is said to be contracting if any two trajectories, starting from different initial conditions, converge exponentially to each other. A sufficient condition for a system to be contracting is that there exists a constant invertible matrix Θ such that the so-called generalized Jacobian

$$F(x, t) = \Theta \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, t) \Theta^{-1} \tag{2}$$

verifies

$$\exists \lambda > 0, \forall x, \forall t \geq 0, \mu(F(x, t)) \leq -\lambda$$

where μ is one of the standard matrix measures in Table 1. The scalar λ defines the contraction rate of the system.

For convenience, in this paper we will also say that a function $f(x, t)$ is contracting if the system $\dot{x} = f(x, t)$ satisfies the sufficient condition above. Similarly, we will then say that the corresponding Jacobian matrix $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, t)$ is contracting.

Table 1: Standard Matrix measures

vector norm, $ \cdot $	induced matrix measure, $\mu(A)$
$ x _1 = \sum_{j=1}^m x_j $	$\mu_1(A) = \max_j \left(a_{jj} + \sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij} \right)$
$ x _2 = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n x_j ^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$\mu_2(A) = \max_i \left(\lambda_i \left\{ \frac{A+A^*}{2} \right\} \right)$
$ x _\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq m} x_j $	$\mu_\infty(A) = \max_i \left(a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij} \right)$

We shall also use the following two properties of contracting systems, whose proofs can be found in (Lohmiller & Slotine 1998, Slotine 2003).

Hierarchies of contracting systems Assume that the Jacobian of (1) is in the form

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, t) = \begin{bmatrix} J_{11} & J_{12} \\ 0 & J_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

corresponding to a hierarchical dynamic structure. The J_{ii} may be of different dimensions. Then, a sufficient condition for the system to be contracting is that (i) the Jacobians J_{11}, J_{22} are contracting (possibly with different Θ 's and for different matrix measures), and (ii) the matrix J_{12} is bounded.

Periodic inputs Consider the system

$$\dot{x} = f(x, r(t)) \quad (4)$$

where the input vector $r(t)$ is periodic, of period T . Assume that the system is contracting (i.e., that the Jacobian matrix $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, r(t))$ is contracting for any $r(t)$). Then the system state $x(t)$ tends exponentially towards a periodic state of period T .

2.2 Partial Contraction

A simple yet powerful extension to nonlinear contraction theory is the concept of *partial* contraction (Wang & Slotine 2005).

Theorem 2 (Partial contraction). *Consider a smooth nonlinear m -dimensional system of the form $\dot{x} = f(x, x, t)$ and assume that the so-called system $\dot{y} = f(y, x, t)$ is contracting with respect to y . If a particular solution of the auxiliary y -system verifies a smooth specific property, then all trajectories of the original x -system verify this property exponentially. The original system is said to be partially contracting.*

Indeed, the virtual y -system has two particular solutions, namely $y(t) = x(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and the particular solution with the specific property. Since all trajectories of the y -system converge exponentially to a single trajectory, this implies that $x(t)$ verifies the specific property exponentially.

2.3 Networks of contracting nodes

This section introduces preliminary results on concurrent synchronization of networks, which will be used in the rest of the paper.

Consider a network consisting of N heterogeneous nodes:

$$\dot{x}_i = f_{\gamma(i)}(x_i, t) + \sum_{j \in N_i} [h_{\gamma(i)}(x_j) - h_{\gamma(i)}(x_i)] \quad (5)$$

where N_i denotes the set of neighbors of node i and γ is a function defined between two set of indices (not necessarily a permutation), i.e.

$$\gamma : \{1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, s\} \quad s \leq N \quad (6)$$

Thus, two nodes of (5), e.g. x_i and x_j , share the same dynamics and belong to the p -th group (denoted with \mathcal{G}_p), i.e. $x_i, x_j \in \mathcal{G}_p$, if and only if $\gamma(i) = \gamma(j) = p$. The dimension of the nodes' state variables belonging to group p is $n_{\gamma(i)}$, i.e. $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\gamma(i)}}$ for any $x_i \in \mathcal{G}_p$. In what follows we assume that the Jacobian of the coupling functions $h_{\gamma(i)}$ are diagonal matrices with nonnegative diagonal elements. We will derive conditions ensuring *concurrent synchronization* of (5), i.e. all nodes belonging to the same group exhibit the same regime behavior.

In what follows the following standard assumption (see (Pham & Slotine 2007) and references therein) is made on the interconnections between the agents belonging to different groups, (Golubitsky et al. 2005).

Definition 1. *Let i and j be two nodes of a group G_p , and if they receive their input from elements i' , j' respectively, then: (i) i' and j' belong to the same group $G_{p'}$; (ii) the coupling functions between i - i' and j - j' are the same; (iii) the inputs to i and j coming from different groups are the same. If these assumptions are satisfied, then nodes i and j are said to be input-equivalent.*

Given this definition, we can state the following theorem, which generalizes results in (Pham & Slotine 2007) to the case of arbitrary norms. Its proof is provided in the Appendix.

Theorem 3. *Assume that in (5) the nodes belonging to the same group are all input-equivalent and that the nodes dynamics are all contracting. Then, all node trajectories sharing the same dynamics converge towards each other, i.e. for any $x_i, x_j \in \mathcal{G}_p, p = 1, \dots, s,$*

$$|x_j(t) - x_i(t)| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty$$

In the case of networks of identical nodes dynamics, the above result amounts to only requiring contraction for each node.

3 Main Results

In this Section we present our main results. We first provide sufficient conditions for the synchronization of a network composed by N nodes communicating over a common medium, which is characterized by some nonlinear dynamics. We then extend the analysis to a number of cases, by providing sufficient conditions for the convergence of networks composed of nodes having different dynamics (non-homogeneous nodes) and communicating over multiple (possibly non-homogeneous) media.

3.1 The basic mathematical model and convergence analysis

In the following, we analyze the convergent behavior of the network schematically represented in Figure 1 (left). In such a network, the N nodes are assumed to all share the same smooth dynamics and to communicate by means of the same common medium, characterized by some smooth dynamics:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f(x_i, z, t) & i &= 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N), t) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

A simplified version of the above model was recently analyzed by means of a graphical algorithm in (Russo & di Bernardo 2009a). In the above equation, the set of state variables of the nodes is x_i , while the set of the state variables of the common medium dynamics is z . Notice that the nodes dynamics and the medium dynamics can be of different dimensions (e.g. $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$). The dynamics of the nodes affect the dynamics of the common medium by means of some (coupling, or

input) function, $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^{Nn} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. These functions may depend only on some of the components of the x_i or of z (as the example in Section 6.1 illustrates).

The following result is a sufficient condition for convergence of all nodes trajectories of (7) towards each other.

Theorem 4. *All nodes trajectories of network (7) globally exponentially converge towards each other if the function $f(x, v(t), t)$ is contracting for any $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. The proof is based on partial contraction (Theorem 2). Consider the following *reduced order* virtual system

$$\dot{y} = f(y, z, t) \quad (8)$$

Notice that now $z(t)$ is seen as an exogenous input to the virtual system. Furthermore, substituting x_i to the virtual state variable y yields the dynamics of the i -th node. That is, x_i , $i = 1, \dots, N$, are particular solutions of the virtual system. Now, if such a system is contracting, then all of its solutions will converge towards each other. Since the nodes state variables are particular solutions of (8), contraction of the virtual system implies that, for any $i, j = 1, \dots, N$:

$$|x_i - x_j| \rightarrow 0$$

as $t \rightarrow +\infty$.

The Theorem is proved by noting that by hypotheses the function $f(x, v(t), t)$ is contracting for any exogenous input $v(t)$. This in particular implies that $f(y, z, t)$ is contracting, i.e. (8) is contracting. \square

Remarks

- The function $\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is often of the form

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N) := \sum_{i=1}^N u(x_i)$$

where $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and all network nodes affect the medium dynamics in a similar way.

- In applications, the coupling between the nodes and the common medium is often assumed to be diffusive. Model (7) then reduces to:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f(x_i, t) + k_z(z) - k_x(x_i) & i = 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, t) + \sum_{i=1}^N [u_x(x_i) - u_z(z)] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

That is, the nodes and the common medium are coupled by means of the smooth coupling functions $k_z : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $k_x : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $u_x : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $u_z : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. These functions may depend only on some of the components of the x_i or of z (as the example in Section 6.1 illustrates). In this case, Theorem 4 implies that synchronization is attained if $f(x, t) - k_x(x)$ is contracting. Similar results are easily derived for the generalizations of the above model presented in what follows.

- The result also applies to the case where the quorum signal is based not on the x_i 's themselves, but rather on variables deriving from the x_i 's through some further nonlinear dynamics. Consider for instance the system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f(x_i, z, t) & i &= 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{r}_i &= h(r_i, x_i, z, t) & i &= 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(r_1, \dots, r_N), t) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4 can be applied directly by describing each network node by the augmented state (x_i, r_i) , and using property (3) on hierarchical combinations to evaluate the contraction properties of the augmented network dynamics;

- Similarly, each network "node" may actually be composed of several subsystems, with each subsystem synchronizing with its analogs in other nodes.

3.2 Multiple systems communicating over a common medium

We now generalize the mathematical model analyzed in the previous Section, by allowing for $s \leq N$ groups (or clusters) of nodes characterized by different dynamics (with possibly different dimensions) to communicate over the same common medium (see Figure 1, right panel). We will prove a sufficient condition for the global exponential convergence of all nodes trajectories belonging to the same group towards each other. This regime is called concurrent synchronization (Pham & Slotine 2007).

The mathematical model analyzed here is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f_{\gamma(i)}(x_i, z, t) \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N), t) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where: i) γ is defined as in (6); ii) x_i denotes the state variables of the network nodes (nodes belonging to different clusters may have different dimensions, say $n_{\gamma(i)}$) and z denotes the state variables for the common medium ($z \in \mathbb{R}^d$); iii) Ψ , defined analogously to the previous Section, denotes the coupling function of the cluster $\gamma(i)$ with the common medium dynamics ($\Psi : \mathbb{R}^{n_{\gamma(1)}} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{n_{\gamma(N)}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$).

Theorem 5. *Concurrent synchronization is achieved in network (10) if the functions $f_{\gamma(i)}(x, v(t), t)$ are all contracting for any $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Proof. Recall that (10) is composed by N nodes having dynamics f_1, \dots, f_s . Now, in analogy with the proof of Theorem 4, consider the following virtual system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_1 &= f_1(y_1, z, t) \\ \dot{y}_2 &= f_2(y_2, z, t) \\ &\vdots \\ \dot{y}_s &= f_s(y_s, z, t) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $z(t)$ is seen as an exogenous input to the virtual system. Let $\{X_i\}$ be the set of state variables belonging to the i -th cluster composing the network, and denote with $X_{i,j}$ any element of $\{X_i\}$. We have that $(X_{1,j}, \dots, X_{s,j})$ are particular solutions of the virtual system. Now, contraction of the virtual system implies that all of its particular solutions converge towards each other, which in turn implies that all the elements within the same cluster $\{X_i\}$ converge towards each other. Thus, contraction of the virtual system (11) implies concurrent synchronization of the real system (10).

To prove contraction of (11), compute its Jacobian,

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1(y_1, z, t)}{\partial y_1} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\partial f_2(y_2, z, t)}{\partial y_2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial f_s(y_s, z, t)}{\partial y_s} \end{bmatrix}$$

Now, by hypotheses, we have that all the functions $f_i(x, v(t), t)$ are contracting for any exogenous input. This in turn implies that the virtual system (11) is contracting, since its Jacobian matrix is block diagonal with diagonal blocks being contracting. \square

3.3 Systems communicating over different media

In the previous Section, we considered networks where some (possibly heterogeneous) nodes communicate over a common medium. We now consider a *distributed* version of such topology, where each of the $s \leq N$ groups composing the network have a private medium. Communication between the groups is then obtained by coupling only their media (see Figure 2). The objective of this Section, is to provide a sufficient condition ensuring (concurrent) synchronization of such network topology.




Figure 1: A schematic representation of networks analyzed in Section 3.1 (left panel) and Section 3.2 (right panel). The nodes are denoted with circles have a different dynamics from those indicated with squares. The dynamics of the common media is denoted with a rectangle.

Note that the network topology considered here presents a layer structure. In analogy with the terminology used for describing the topology of the Internet and World-Wide-Web (see e.g. (Boccaletti et al. 2006), (Newman 2003)), we term as *medium* (or private) level the layer consisting of the nodes of the network and their corresponding (private) media; we then term as *autonomous* level, the layer of the interconnections between the media. That is, the autonomous level is an *abstraction* of the network, where its nodes' dynamics consists of the network nodes and their private medium. This in turn implies that in order for two nodes of the autonomous level to be identical they have to share: i) the same dynamics and number of nodes; ii) the same medium dynamics (see Figure 2).

In what follows we will denote with \mathcal{G}_p the set of homogeneous nodes communicating over the medium z_p . We will denote with N_p the set of media which are linked to the medium z_p . Each medium communicates with its neighbors diffusively. The mathematical model is then:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f_p(x_i, z_p, t) & x_i \in \mathcal{G}_p \\ \dot{z}_p &= g_p(z_p, \Psi(X_p), t) + \sum_{j \in N_p} [\phi_p(z_j) - \phi_p(z_p)] & x_i \in \mathcal{G}_p \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $p = 1, \dots, s$ and X_p is the stack of all the vectors $x_i \in \mathcal{G}_p$. We assume that the dynamical equations for the media have all the same dimensions (e.g. $z_p \in \mathbb{R}^d$), while the nodes belonging to different groups can have different dimensions (e.g. $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, for any $i \in \mathcal{G}_p$). Here, the coupling functions between the media, $\phi_p : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, are assumed to be continuous and to have a diagonal Jacobian matrix with diagonal elements being nonnegative and bounded. All the matrices $\partial f_p / \partial z$ are assumed to be bounded.

Theorem 6. *Concurrent synchronization is attained in network (12) if: i) the nodes of its autonomous level sharing the same dynamics are input equivalent; ii) $f_p(x_i, v(t), t)$, $g_p(z_p, v(t), t)$ are all contracting functions for any $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$; iii) $\frac{\partial f_p}{\partial z_p}$ are all uniformly bounded matrices.*

Proof. Consider the following $2s$ -dimensional virtual system, analogous to the one used for proving Theorem 5:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_{1,p} &= f_p(y_{1,p}, y_{2,p}, t) \\ \dot{y}_{2,p} &= g_p(y_{2,p}, v_p(t), t) + \sum_{k \in N_p} [\phi_p(y_{2,k}) - \phi_p(y_{2,p})] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $p = 1, \dots, s$, and $v_p(t) := \Psi(X_p)$. Notice that the above system is constructed in a similar way as (11). In particular, solutions of (12) are particular solutions of the above virtual system (see the proof of Theorem 5). That is, if cluster synchronization is attained for (13), then all the nodes sharing the same dynamics will converge towards each other. Now, Theorem 3 implies that cluster synchronization is attained for system (13) if: i) its nodes are contracting; ii) the coupling functions have a nonnegative bounded diagonal Jacobian; iii) nodes sharing the same dynamics are input equivalent. Since the last two conditions are satisfied by hypotheses, we have only to prove contraction of the (virtual) network nodes. In this view, differentiation of nodes dynamics in (13) yields the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f_p(y_{1,p}, y_{2,p}, t)}{\partial y_{1,p}} & \frac{\partial f_p(y_{1,p}, y_{2,p}, t)}{\partial y_{2,p}} \\ 0 & \frac{\partial g_p(y_{1,p}, v_i(t), t)}{\partial y_{2,p}} \end{bmatrix}$$

The above Jacobian has the structure of a hierarchy. Thus (see Section 2) the virtual system is contracting if:

1. $\frac{\partial f_p(y_{1,p}, y_{2,p}, t)}{\partial y_{1,p}}$ and $\frac{\partial g_p(y_{2,p}, v_i(t), t)}{\partial y_{2,p}}$ are both contracting
2. $\frac{\partial f_p(y_{1,p}, y_{2,p}, t)}{\partial y_{2,p}}$ is bounded

The above two conditions are satisfied by hypotheses. Thus, the virtual network achieves cluster synchronization (Theorem 3). This proves the Theorem. \square

Note that Theorems 4 and 5 do not make any hypotheses on the medium dynamics – synchronization (or concurrent synchronization) can be attained by the network nodes independently of the particular dynamics of the single medium, provided that the function f (or the f_i 's) is contracting. By contrast, Theorem 6 shows that the media dynamics becomes a key element for achieving concurrent synchronization in networks where different groups communicate over different media.




Figure 2: A schematic representation of the network analyzed Section 3.3. The connections between media (and hence the connections of the autonomous level) are pointed out. Notice that only two nodes of the autonomous level are input equivalent since: i) their media have the same dynamics (in red); ii) both media are shared by the same number of nodes, sharing the same dynamics (in yellow).

4 Synchronization control

In Section 3, we derived several criteria ensuring node synchronization for networks where multiple nodes exchange their state variables using (multiple) media. The above results also allow dimensionality reduction in the analysis of the system's final behavior by treating each cluster as a single element, similarly to (Chung et al. 2007), a point we will further illustrate in Section 5.

The objective of this Section is to provide a sufficient condition guaranteeing some desired periodic behavior for the network nodes. Specifically, we will guarantee a desired period for the steady state oscillations. A related problem has been recently addressed in (Russo, di Bernardo & Sontag n.d.), where entrainment of individual biological systems to periodic inputs was analyzed. We will now show the following result,

Theorem 7. *Consider the following network*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f(x_i, z, t) & i = 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N), t) + r(t) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $r(t)$ is a T -periodic signal. All the nodes of the network synchronize onto a periodic orbit of period T if: *i) $f(x_i, v(t), t)$ and $g(z, v(t), t)$ are contracting functions for any $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$; ii) $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}$ is bounded.*

Proof. Consider the following virtual system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_1 &= f(y_1, y_2, t) \\ \dot{y}_2 &= g(y_2, v(t), t) + r(t) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $v(t) := \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N)$. We will prove the Theorem by showing that such a system is contracting. Indeed, in this case, the trajectories of (15) will globally exponentially converge to a unique T -periodic solution, implying that also x_i will exhibit a T -periodic steady state behavior. Differentiation of the virtual system yields:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f(y_1, y_2, t)}{\partial y_1} & \frac{\partial f(y_1, y_2, t)}{\partial y_2} \\ 0 & \frac{\partial g(y_2, v(t), t)}{\partial y_2} \end{bmatrix}$$

The above Jacobian has the structure of a hierarchy. Thus (see Section 2) the virtual system is contracting if:

1. $\frac{\partial f(y_1, y_2, t)}{\partial y_1}$ and $\frac{\partial g(y_2, v(t), t)}{\partial y_2}$ are both contracting

2. $\frac{\partial f(y_1, y_2, t)}{\partial y_2}$ is bounded

The first condition is satisfied since, by hypotheses, the functions $f(x, v(t), t)$ and $g(z, v(t), t)$ are contracting for any $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. The second condition is also satisfied since we assumed $\partial f/\partial z$ to be bounded. The Theorem is then proved. \square

The results can be extended to the more general case of networks of non homogeneous nodes communicating over non homogeneous media.

Theorem 8. *Consider the following network*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f_p(x_i, z_p, t) & x_i &\in \mathcal{G}_p \\ \dot{z}_p &= g_p(z_p, \Psi(X_p), t) + \sum_{k \in N_p} [\phi(z_k) - \phi(z_p)] + r(t) & x_j &\in \mathcal{G}_p \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where X_p is the stack of all the $x_i \in \mathcal{G}_p$ and $r(t)$ is a T -periodic signal. Concurrent synchronization is attained, with a steady state periodic behavior of period T if:

1. the nodes of the autonomous level sharing the same dynamics are input equivalent;
2. the coupling functions ϕ have bounded diagonal Jacobian with nonnegative diagonal elements;
3. $f_p(x_i, v(t), t)$ and $g_p(z_p, v(t), t)$ are contracting functions for any $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^d$;
4. $\frac{\partial f_p}{\partial z_p}$ are all uniformly bounded matrices.

Proof. The proof is formally the same as that of Theorem 6 and Theorem 7, and it is omitted here for the sake of brevity. \square

A simple example

Consider a simple biochemical reaction, consisting of a set of $N > 1$ enzymes sharing the same substrate. We denote with X_1, \dots, X_N the concentration of the reaction products. We also assume that the dynamics of S is affected by some T -periodic input, $r(t)$ (the behavior of networks where the medium dynamics is affected by an exogenous input will be analyzed in Section 4). We assume that the total concentration of X_i , i.e. $X_{i,T}$, is much less than the initial substrate concentration, S_0 . In these hypotheses, a suitable mathematical model for the system is given by (see e.g. (Szallasi et al. 2006)):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{X}_i &= -aX_i + \frac{K_1 S}{K_2 + S} & i &= 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{S} &= -\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_1 S}{K_2 + S} + r(t) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

with K_1 and K_2 be positive parameters. Thus, a suitable virtual system for the network is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_1 &= -ay_1 + \frac{K_1 y_2}{K_2 + y_2} \\ \dot{y}_2 &= -\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_1 y_2}{K_2 + y_2} + r(t) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Differentiation of the above system yields the Jacobian matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} -a & \frac{K_2}{(K_2 + y_1)^2} \\ 0 & -N \frac{K_2}{(K_2 + y_1)^2} \end{bmatrix} \tag{19}$$

It is straightforward to check that the above matrix represents a contracting hierarchy. Thus, all the trajectories of the virtual system globally exponentially converge towards a unique T -periodic solution. This, in turn, implies that $X_i, i = 1, \dots, N$, globally exponentially converge towards each other and towards the same periodic solution.

Figure 3 illustrates the behavior for $N = 3$. Notice that, as expected from the above theoretical analysis, X_1, X_2 and X_3 synchronize onto a periodic orbit of the same period as $r(t)$.




Figure 3: Simulation of (17), with $N = 3$ and $r(t) = 1.1 + \sin(0.1 * t)$. System parameters are set as follows: $a = 1, K_2 = 1, K_1 = 2$.

5 Emergent properties as N increases

In this Section, we analyze how the convergence properties of a given quorum sensing network vary as the number N of nodes increases. We show that for typical quorum sensing networks, as N becomes sufficiently large, synchronization always occurs. One particular modeling context where these results have important implications is that of cell proliferation in biological systems.

5.1 A lower bound on N ensuring synchronization

It is well known (Wang & Slotine 2005) that for all-to-all diffusively coupled networks of the form

$$\dot{x}_i = f(x_i, t) + \sum_{j=1}^N k(x_j - x_i) \quad (20)$$

the minimum coupling gain k required for synchronization is inversely proportional to the number of nodes composing the network. That is,

$$k_{\min} \propto \frac{1}{N}$$

We now show that a similar bound holds for nodes coupled by means of quorum sensing of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_i &= f(x_i, t) + kN(z - x_i) & i = 1, \dots, N \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_N), t) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

To simplify notations, the above model assumes that z and all x_i have the same dimensions. Also note that in (21) the dependence of the coupling gain on the number of nodes, N , is given explicitly.

Theorem 9. *Assume that the Jacobian $\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right)$ is upper-bounded by α for some matrix measure μ , i.e.,*

$$\exists \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x, \forall t \geq 0, \quad \mu\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}\right) \leq \alpha$$

Then, network (21) synchronizes if

$$k > \frac{\alpha}{N}$$

That is, $k_{\min} \propto 1/N$.

Proof. Consider the virtual system

$$\dot{y} = f(y, t) + kN(z - y) \quad (22)$$

Synchronization is attained if the virtual system is contracting. Now, computing the matrix measure of the Jacobian of (22) yields

$$\forall x, \forall t \geq 0, \quad \mu \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} - kNI \right) \leq \mu \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial y} \right) + kN\mu(-I) \leq \alpha - kN$$

Thus, the virtual system is contracting if $k > \frac{\alpha}{N}$. \square

5.2 Dependence on initial conditions

We now consider the basic quorum sensing model (7). We derive simple conditions for the final behavior of the network to become independent of initial conditions (in the nodes and the medium) as N becomes large.

Theorem 10. *Assume that for (7) the following conditions hold:*

- $\mu \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} \right) \rightarrow -\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$
- $g(z, v_2(t), t)$ is contracting (for any $v_2(t)$ in \mathbb{R}^d)
- $\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \right\|$ and $\left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial v_2} \right\|$ are bounded for any x, z, v_2 (where $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm)

Then, there exists some N^ such that for any $N \geq N^*$ all trajectories of (7) globally exponentially converge towards a unique synchronized solution, independent of initial conditions.*

Proof. We know that contraction of $f(x, v_1(t), t)$ for any $v_1(t)$ (which the first condition implies for N large enough) ensures network synchronization. That is, there exists a unique trajectory, $x_s(t)$, such that, as $t \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$|x_i - x_s| \rightarrow 0, \quad \forall i$$

Therefore, the final behavior is described by the following lower-dimensional system:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_s &= f(x_s, z, t) \\ \dot{z} &= g(z, \Psi(x_s), t) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

If in turn this reduced-order system (23) is contracting, then its trajectories globally exponentially converge towards a unique solution, say $x_s^*(t)$, regardless of initial conditions. This will prove the Theorem (similar strategies are extensively discussed in (Chung et al. 2007)).

To show that (23) is indeed contracting, compute its Jacobian matrix,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_s} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_s} & \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} \end{bmatrix}$$

Lemma 1 in the Appendix shows that the above matrix is contracting if there exists some strictly positive constants θ_1, θ_2 such that

$$\mu\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_s}\right) + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} \left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_s} \right\| \quad \text{and} \quad \mu\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial z}\right) + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2} \left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \right\| \quad (24)$$

are both uniformly negative definite.

Now, $\mu\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_s}\right)$ and $\mu\left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial z}\right)$ are both uniformly negative by hypotheses. Furthermore, $\mu\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_s}\right)$ tends to $-\infty$ as N increases: since $\left\| \frac{\partial f}{\partial z} \right\|$ and $\left\| \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_s} \right\|$ are bounded, this implies that there exists some N^* such that for any $N \geq N^*$ the two conditions in (24) are satisfied. \square

Also, assume that actually the dynamics f and g do not depend explicitly on time. Then, under the conditions of the above Theorem, the reduced system is both contracting and autonomous, and so it tends towards a unique equilibrium point (Lohmiller & Slotine 1998). Thus, the original system converges to a unique equilibrium, where all x_i 's are equal.

In addition, note that when the synchronization rate and the contraction rate of the reduced system both increase with N , this also increases robustness (Pham & Slotine 2007) to variability and disturbances.

5.3 How synchronization protects from noise

In this section, we discuss briefly how the synchronization mechanism provided by dynamical quorum sensing protects from noise and variability in a fashion similar to the static mechanism studied in (Tabareau et al. 2010). We show that the results of (Tabareau et al. 2010), to which the reader is referred for details about stochastic tools, extend straightforwardly to the case where the dynamics of the quorum variables cannot be neglected or indeed may play a central part, as studied in this paper.

Assume that the dynamics of each network element x_i in (21) is subject to noise, and consider, similarly to (Tabareau et al. 2010), the corresponding system of individual elements in Ito form

$$dx_i = (f(x_i, t) + kN(z - x_i)) dt + \sigma dW_i \quad i = 1 \dots N \quad (25)$$

where the all-to-all coupling in (Tabareau et al. 2010) has been replaced by a more general quorum sensing mechanism. The subsystems are driven by independent noise processes, and for simplicity the noise intensity σ in the equations above is assumed to be constant. We make no assumptions about noise acting directly on the dynamics of the environment/quorum vector z .

Proceeding exactly as in (Tabareau et al. 2010) yields similar results on the effect of noise. In particular, let x^\bullet be the center of mass of the x_i , that is

$$x^\bullet = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i x_i$$

Notice that when all the nodes are synchronized onto some common solution, say $x_s(t)$, then, by definition, $x^\bullet = x_s(t)$.

Adding up the dynamics in (25) gives

$$dx^\bullet = \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_i f(x_i, t) \right) dt + kN(z - x^\bullet)dt + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \sigma dW_i \quad (26)$$

Let

$$\epsilon = f(x^\bullet, t) - \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N f(x_i, t) \right)$$

Note that $\epsilon = 0$ when all the nodes are synchronized.

By analogy with (25), equation (26) can then be written

$$dx^\bullet = (f(x^\bullet, t) + kN(z - x^\bullet) + \epsilon) dt + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \sigma dW_i \quad (27)$$

Using the Taylor formula with integral remainder exactly as in (Tabareau et al. 2010) yields a bound on the distortion term ϵ , as a function of the nonlinearity, the coupling gain k , and the number of cells N ,

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\epsilon\|) \leq \lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2} \right) \rho(kN)$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2})$ is a uniform upper bound on the spectral radius of the Hessian $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x^2}$, and $\rho(kN) \rightarrow 0$ as $kN \rightarrow +\infty$. In particular, in (27), both the distortion term ϵ and the average noise term $\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \sigma dW_i$ tend to zero as $N \rightarrow +\infty$.

Note that an additional source of noise may be provided by the environment on the quorum variables themselves. We made no assumptions above about such noise, which acts directly on the dynamics of the environment/quorum vector z . How it specifically affects the common quantity z in (25) could be further studied.

Similar results hold for the effects of bounded disturbances and dynamic variations.

6 Examples

6.1 Controlling synchronization of genetic relaxation oscillators

We now consider the problem of synchronizing a population of genetic oscillators. Specifically, we consider the genetic circuit analyzed in (Kuznetsov et al. 2004) (a variant of (Kobayashi et al. 2004)), and schematically represented in Figure 4. Such a circuit is composed of two engineered gene networks that have been experimentally implemented in *E. coli*; namely: the toggle switch (Gardner et al. 2000) and an intercell communication system (You et al. 2004). The toggle switch is composed of two transcription factors: the *lac* repressor, encoded by gene *lacI*, and the temperature-sensitive variant of the *lacI* repressor, encoded by the gene *cI857*. The expressions of *cI857* and *lacI* are controlled by the promoters P_{trc} and P_{L^*} respectively (for further details see (Kuznetsov et al. 2004)). The intercell communication system makes use of components of the quorum-sensing system from *Vibrio fischeri* (see e.g. (Ng & Bassler 2009) and references therein). Such a mechanism allows cells to sense population density through the transcription factor LuxR, which is an activator of the genes expressed by the P_{lux} promoter, when a small molecule *AI* binds to it. This small molecule, synthesized by the protein LuxI, is termed as autoinducer and it can diffuse across the cell membrane.

In (Kuznetsov et al. 2004), the following dimensionless simplified model is analyzed (see Figure 5):

$$\dot{u}_i = \frac{\alpha_1}{1 + v_i^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_i^\eta}{1 + w_i^\eta} - d_1 u_i \quad (28a)$$

$$\dot{v}_i = \frac{\alpha_2}{1 + u_i^\gamma} - d_2 v_i \quad (28b)$$




Figure 4: A schematic representation of the genetic circuit: detailed circuit.

$$\dot{w}_i = \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1 + u_i^\gamma} - d_3 w_i \right) + 2d(w_e - w_i) \quad (28c)$$

$$\dot{w}_e = \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - w_e) - d_e w_e \quad (28d)$$

where u_i , v_i and w_i denotes the (dimensionless) concentrations of the *lac* repressor, λ repressor and LuxR-AI activator respectively. The state variable w_e denotes instead the (dimensionless) concentration of the extracellular autoinducer.

In (Kuznetsov et al. 2004), a bifurcation analysis is performed for the above model, showing that synchronization can be attained for some range of the biochemical parameters of the circuit. However, as the objective of that paper was to analyze the onset of synchronization, the problem of guaranteeing a desired oscillatory behavior was not addressed. In what follows, using the results derived in the previous sections, we address the open problem of guaranteeing a desired period for the steady state oscillatory behavior of network (28).

The control mechanism that we use here is an exogenous signal acting on the extracellular autoinducer concentration, see also (Russo, di Bernardo & Sontag n.d.). That is, the idea is to modify (28d) as follows

$$\dot{w}_e = \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - w_e) - d_e w_e + r(t) \quad (29)$$




Figure 5: Simplified circuit using for deriving the mathematical model (28). Both the promoters and transcription factors are renamed.

where $r(t)$ is some T -periodic signal. The set up that we have in mind here is illustrated in Figure 6, where multiple copies of the genetic circuit of interest share the same surrounding solution, on which $r(t)$ acts. From the technological viewpoint, $r(t)$ can be implemented by controlling the temperature of the surrounding solution, and/or using e.g. the recently developed microfluidics technology (see e.g. (Beebe et al. 2002) and references therein).

In what follows, we will use Theorem 4 to find a set of biochemical parameters that ensure synchronization of (28a)-(28d). This, using the results of Section 4, immediately implies that the forced network (28a)-(28c), (29) globally exponentially converges towards a T -periodic steady state behavior.

System (28) has the same structure as (9), with $x_i = [u_i, v_i, w_i]^T$, $z = w_e$, and:

$$f(x_i, t) = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\alpha_1}{1+v_i^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_i^\eta}{1+w_i^\eta} - d_1 u_i \\ \frac{\alpha_2}{1+u_i^\gamma} - d_2 v_i \\ \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1+u_i^\gamma} - d_3 w_i \right) \end{bmatrix} \quad k_z(z) - k_x(x_i) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2d(w_e - w_i) \end{bmatrix}$$

$$g(z, t) = -d_e w_e \quad \sum_{i=1}^N [u_x(x_i) - u_z(z)] = \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_i - w_e)$$

We know from Theorem 4 that all nodes trajectories converge towards each other if:

1. $f(x_i, t) - k_x(x_i)$ is contracting;
2. $g(z, t) - Nu_z(z)$ is contracting.




Figure 6: Network control setup.

That is, contraction is ensured if there exist some matrix measures, μ_* and μ_{**} , such that

$$\mu_*((x_i, t) - k_x(x_i)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{**}(g(z, t) - Nu_z(z))$$

are uniformly negative definite. We use the above two conditions in order to obtain a set of biochemical parameters ensuring node convergence. A possible choice for the above matrix measures is $\mu_* = \mu_{**} = \mu_1$ (see (Russo, di Bernardo & Slotine n.d., Russo, di Bernardo & Sontag n.d.)). Clearly, other choices for the matrix measures μ_* and μ_{**} can be made, leading to different algebraic conditions, and thus to (eventually) a different choice of biochemical parameters.

We assume that $\beta = \eta = \gamma = 2$, and show how to find a set of biochemical parameters satisfying the above two conditions.

Condition 1. Differentiation of $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial k}{\partial x_i}$ yields the Jacobian matrix (where the subscripts have been omitted)

$$J_i := \begin{bmatrix} -d_1 & \frac{-2\alpha_1 v}{(1+v^2)^2} & \frac{2\alpha_3 w}{(1+w^2)^2} \\ \frac{-2\alpha_2 u}{(1+u^2)^2} & -d_2 & 0 \\ \frac{-2\varepsilon\alpha_4 u}{(1+u^2)^2} & 0 & -\varepsilon d_3 - 2d \end{bmatrix} \quad (30)$$

Now, by definition of μ_1 , we have:

$$\mu_1(J_i) = \max \left\{ -d_1 + \frac{2\alpha_2 u}{(1+u^2)^2} + \frac{2\varepsilon\alpha_4 u}{(1+u^2)^2}, -d_2 + \frac{2\alpha_1 v}{(1+v^2)^2}, -\varepsilon d_3 - 2d + \frac{2\alpha_3 w}{(1+w^2)^2} \right\}$$

Thus, J_i is contracting if $\mu_1(J_i)$ is uniformly negative definite. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & -d_1 + \frac{2\alpha_2 u}{(1+u^2)^2} + \frac{2\varepsilon\alpha_4 u}{(1+u^2)^2} \\ & -d_2 + \frac{2\alpha_1 v}{(1+v^2)^2} \\ & -\varepsilon d_3 - 2d + \frac{2\alpha_3 w}{(1+w^2)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

are all uniformly negative. Notice now that the maximum of the function $a(v) = \frac{\bar{a}v}{(1+v^2)^2}$ is $\hat{a} = \frac{3\sqrt{3}\bar{a}}{16}$.

Thus, the set of inequalities (31) is fulfilled if:

$$\begin{aligned} & -d_1 + \frac{6\alpha_2\sqrt{3}}{16} + \frac{6\varepsilon\alpha_4\sqrt{3}}{16} \\ & -d_2 + \frac{6\alpha_1\sqrt{3}}{16} \\ & -\varepsilon d_3 - 2d + \frac{6\alpha_3\sqrt{3}}{16} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

are all uniformly negative.

Condition 2 In this case it is easy to check that the matrix $J_e := \frac{\partial g}{\partial z} - N\frac{\partial u}{\partial z}$ is contracting for any choice of the (positive) biochemical parameters D_e, d_e .

Thus, we can conclude that any choice of biochemical parameters fulfilling (32) ensures synchronization of the network onto a periodic orbit of period T . In (Kuznetsov et al. 2004), it was shown that a set of parameters for which synchronization is attained is: $\alpha_1 = 3$, $\alpha_2 = 4.5$, $\alpha_3 = 1$, $\alpha_4 = 4$, $\varepsilon = 0.01$, $d = 2$, $d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 1$. We now use the guidelines provided by (32) to make a minimal change of the parameters values ensuring network synchronization with steady state oscillations of period T . Specifically, such conditions can be satisfied by setting $d_1 = 6$, $d_2 = 2$. Figure 7 shows the behavior of the network for such a choice of the parameters.




Figure 7: Behavior of (28a)-(28c), (29), when forced by $r(t) = 1 + \sin(0.1t)$. Notice that the nodes have initial different conditions, and that they all converge onto a common asymptotic having the same period as $r(t)$.

6.1.1 Biological oscillators communicating over different media

In the above Section, we assumed that all the genetic circuits shared the same surrounding solution. We now analyze the case where two different clusters of genetic circuits are surrounded by two different media. The communication between clusters is then left to some (eventually artificial) communication strategy between the two media (see Figure 8).

Notice that only one of the two media is forced by the exogenous T -periodic signal $r(t)$ (thus the dynamics of the two clusters are not the same), while the two media communicate with each




Figure 8: Two clusters of genetic circuits communicating over two different media

other in a diffusive way. The mathematical model that we analyze here is then:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{u}_{i1} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{1+v_{i1}^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_{i1}^\eta}{1+w_{i1}^\eta} - d_1 u_{i1} \\
 \dot{v}_{i1} &= \frac{\alpha_2}{1+u_{i1}^\gamma} - d_2 v_{i1} \\
 \dot{w}_{i1} &= \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1+u_{i1}^\gamma} - d_3 w_{i1} \right) + 2d(w_{e1} - w_{i1}) \\
 \dot{w}_{e1} &= \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{i1} - w_{e1}) - d_e w_{e1} + r(t) + \phi(w_{e2}) - \phi(w_{e1}) \\
 \dot{u}_{i2} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{1+v_{i2}^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_{i2}^\eta}{1+w_{i2}^\eta} - d_1 u_{i2} \\
 \dot{v}_{i2} &= \frac{\alpha_2}{1+u_{i2}^\gamma} - d_2 v_{i2} \\
 \dot{w}_{i2} &= \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1+u_{i2}^\gamma} - d_3 w_{i2} \right) + 2d(w_{e2} - w_{i2}) \\
 \dot{w}_{e2} &= \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{i2} - w_{e2}) - d_e w_{e2} + \phi(w_{e1}) - \phi(w_{e2})
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $x_{i1} = [u_{i1}, v_{i1}, w_{i1}]^T$ and $x_{i2} = [u_{i2}, v_{i2}, w_{i2}]^T$ denote the set of state variables of the i -th oscillator of the first and second cluster respectively. Analogously, w_{e1} and w_{e2} denote the extracellular autoinducer concentration surrounding the first and second cluster of genetic circuits. In the above model we assume that the biochemical parameters of the two genetic circuits and media are the same.

To ensure concurrent synchronization, we tune the biochemical parameters of the two clusters of oscillators and design the coupling function between the media ($\phi(\cdot)$) by using the guidelines provided by Theorem 6. Furthermore, using Theorem 8 we can conclude that the steady state behavior of the two clusters is T -periodic.

It is straightforward to check that the hypotheses of Theorem 6 are all satisfied if:

- the biochemical parameters of the two clusters fulfill the conditions in (32);
- the coupling function $\phi(\cdot)$ is increasing.

In fact, the topology of the autonomous level of the network is input equivalent by construction. Figure 9 shows the behavior of (33) when the biochemical parameters of the oscillators are tuned as in the previous Section, and $\phi(x) = Kx$, with $K = 0.1$.




Figure 9: Behavior of (33) when $r(t) = 1 + \sin(0.1t)$. Notice that network nodes have different initial conditions. concurrent synchronization is attained for the network. Both the clusters exhibit a steady state behavior having the same period as $r(t)$

6.1.2 Co-existence of multiple node dynamics

We analyze the case where the two clusters in the previous Section are now both connected to a third cluster composed of Van der Pol oscillators coupled by means of a quorum-sensing mechanism. The three clusters have three different media, and communication between them occurs by means

of some coupling function. The mathematical model considered here is then:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{u}_{i1} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{1+v_{i1}^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_{i1}^\eta}{1+w_{i1}^\eta} - d_1 u_{i1} \\
 \dot{v}_{i1} &= \frac{\alpha_2}{1+u_{i1}^\gamma} - d_2 v_{i1} \\
 \dot{w}_{i1} &= \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1+u_{i1}^\gamma} - d_3 w_{i1} \right) + 2d(w_{e1} - w_{i1}) \\
 \dot{w}_{e1} &= \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{i1} - w_{e1}) - d_e w_{e1} + \phi(w_{e3}) - \phi(w_{e1}) \\
 \dot{u}_{i2} &= \frac{\alpha_1}{1+v_{i2}^\beta} + \frac{\alpha_3 w_{i2}^\eta}{1+w_{i2}^\eta} - d_1 u_{i2} \\
 \dot{v}_{i2} &= \frac{\alpha_2}{1+u_{i2}^\gamma} - d_2 v_{i2} \\
 \dot{w}_{i2} &= \varepsilon \left(\frac{\alpha_4}{1+u_{i2}^\gamma} - d_3 w_{i2} \right) + 2d(w_{e2} - w_{i2}) \\
 \dot{w}_{e2} &= \frac{D_e}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (w_{i2} - w_{e2}) - d_e w_{e2} + \phi(w_{e3}) - \phi(w_{e2}) \\
 \dot{y}_{1i} &= y_{2i} \\
 \dot{y}_{2i} &= -\alpha (y_{1i}^2 - \beta) y_{2i} - \omega^2 y_{1i} + K (w_{e3} - y_{1i}) \\
 \dot{w}_{e3} &= \frac{K}{N_{vdp}} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_{2i} - w_{e3}) + g(w_{e3}) + \phi(w_{e1}) + \phi(w_{e2}) - 2\phi(w_{e3})
 \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

with $[y_{1i}, y_{2i}]^T$ denoting the state variables of the i -th Van der Pol oscillator, and with N_{vdp} indicating the number of Van der Pol oscillators in the network. In the above model the Van der Pol oscillators are coupled by means of the medium $w_{e3} \in \mathbb{R}$. The three media, i.e. w_{e1} , w_{e2} , w_{e3} , communicate by means of the coupling function $\phi(\cdot)$. We assume that the function g governing the intrinsic dynamics of the medium w_{e3} is smooth with bounded derivative. The parameters for the Van der Pol oscillator are set as follows: $\alpha = \beta = \omega = 1$. Notice that now no external inputs is applied on the network.

Recall that Theorem 6 ensures synchronization under the following conditions:

1. contraction of each cluster composing the network;
2. topology of the autonomous level of the network connected and input equivalent.

Notice that the second condition is satisfied for the network of our interest. Furthermore, contraction of the two clusters composed of genetic oscillators is ensured if the their biochemical parameters satisfy the inequalities in (32).

To guarantee the convergent behavior of the cluster composed of Van der Pol oscillators, we have to check that there exist two matrix measures, μ_* and μ_{**} , showing contraction of the following two matrices:

$$J_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -\alpha (y_{2i}^2 - \beta) - \omega^2 & -2\alpha y_{2i} y_{1i} - K \end{bmatrix} \tag{35a}$$

$$J_2 = \frac{\partial g}{\partial w_{e3}} - K \quad (35b)$$

Now, in (Wang & Slotine 2005), by using the Euclidean matrix measure, i.e. μ_2 , it is shown that the matrix (35a) is contracting if $K > \alpha$. On the other hand, to ensure contraction of J_2 , we have to choose $K > \bar{G}$, where \bar{G} is the maximum of $\frac{\partial g}{\partial w_{e3}}$. Thus, contraction of the cluster composed of Van der Pol oscillators is guaranteed if the coupling gain, K , is chosen such that:

$$K > \max \{ \alpha, \bar{G} \}$$

In Figure 10, we set $g(x) = \sin(x)$, $K = 2.5$, $N_{vdp} = 2$ and $\phi(x) = Kx$, with $K = 3$. Such a Figure shows that concurrent synchronization of (34) is attained, in agreement with the theoretical analysis.




Figure 10: Behavior of (34). The two clusters of genetic oscillators (not directly connected) converge onto the same common evolution. Synchronization for the cluster composed of Van der Pol oscillators is also attained.

6.2 Analysis of a general Quorum-Sensing pathway

In the previous Section, we showed that our results (with appropriate choice of matrix measure) can be used to derive easily verifiable conditions on the biochemical parameters of the genetic oscillator ensuring contraction, and hence synchronization (onto a periodic orbit of desired period)

and concurrent synchronization. We now show that our methodology can be applied to analyze a wide class of biochemical systems involved in cell-to-cell communication.

We focus on the analysis of the pathway of the quorum sensing mechanism that uses as autoinducers, molecules from the AHL (acyl homoserine lactone) family. The quorum sensing pathway implemented by AHL (see Figure 11) is one of the most common for bacteria and drives many transcriptional systems regulating their basic activities.




Figure 11: The quorum sensing pathway implemented by *AHL*

We now briefly describe the pathway of our interest (see (Muller et al. 2006) for further details). The enzyme LuxI produces AHL at (approximately) a constant rate. AHL in turn diffuses into and out of the cell and forms (in the cytoplasm) a complex with the receptor LuxR. Such complex polymerizes and then acts as a transcription factor, by binding the DNA. This causes the increase of the production of LuxI, generating a positive feedback loop.

The pathway can be described by a set of ordinary differential equations (using the law of mass action, see (J.Dockery & Keener 2004), (Muller et al. 2006)). Specifically, denoting with x_e the mass of AHL outside of the cell and with x_c the mass of AHL within the cell, we have the following

mathematical model:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_c &= \alpha + \frac{\beta x_e^n}{x_{thresh}^n + x_c^n} - \gamma_c x_c - d_1 x_c - d_2 x_e \\ \dot{x}_e &= d_1 x_c - d_2 x_e - \gamma_e x_e\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

The physical meaning of the parameters in (36) is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Biochemical parameters for system (36)

Parameter	physical meaning
α	Low production rate of <i>AHL</i>
β	Increase of production rate of <i>AHL</i>
γ_c	Degradation rate of <i>AHL</i> in the cytosol
γ_e	Degradation rate of <i>AHL</i> outside the cell
d_1	Diffusion rate of the extracellular <i>AHL</i>
d_2	Diffusion of the intracellular <i>AHL</i>
x_{thresh}	Threshold of <i>AHL</i> between low and increased activity
n	Degree of polymerization

Now, contraction of the above system is guaranteed if

1. $-\gamma_c + \frac{2\beta x_{thresh}^2 x_c}{(x_{thresh}^2 + x_c^2)^2}$ is uniformly negative definite;
2. $-d_2 - \gamma_e$ is uniformly negative definite.

Recall that x_c and x_e are both scalars. Now, the second condition is satisfied since system parameters are all positive. That is, to prove contraction we have only to guarantee that

$$-\gamma_c + \frac{2\beta x_{thresh}^2 x_c}{(x_{thresh}^2 + x_c^2)^2}$$

is uniformly negative. Since

$$-\gamma_c + \frac{2\beta x_{thresh}^2 x_c}{(x_{thresh}^2 + x_c^2)^2} \leq -\gamma_c + \frac{3\beta\sqrt{3}}{8x_{thresh}}$$

contraction is ensured if the biochemical parameters β , g and x_{thresh} fulfill the following condition

$$\frac{\beta}{x_{thresh}} < \frac{8\gamma_c}{3\sqrt{3}}$$

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we presented a systematic methodology to derive conditions for the global exponential convergence of biochemical models modeling quorum sensing systems. To illustrate the effectiveness of our results and to emphasize the use of our techniques in synthetic biology design, we analyzed a set of biochemical networks where the quorum sensing mechanism is involved as well as a typical pathway of the quorum sensing. In all such cases we showed that our results can be used to determine system parameters and dynamics ensuring convergence.

A Proofs

To prove Theorem 3 we need the following Lemma, which is a generalization of a result proven in (Russo, di Bernardo & Sontag n.d.):

Lemma 1. *Consider the block- partition for a square matrix J :*

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} A(x) & B(x, y) \\ C(x, y) & D(y) \end{bmatrix}$$

where A and D are square matrices of dimensions $n_A \times n_A$ and $n_D \times n_D$ respectively. Assume that A and B are contracting with respect to μ_A and μ_D (induced by the vector norm $|\bullet|_A$ and $|\bullet|_D$). Then, J is contracting if there exists two positive real numbers θ_1, θ_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_A(A) + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} \|C(x, y)\|_{A,D} &\leq -c_A^2 \\ \mu_D(D) + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2} \|B(x, y)\|_{D,A} &\leq -c_B^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\bullet\|_{A,D}$ and $\|\bullet\|_{D,A}$ are the operator norms induced by $|\bullet|_A$ and $|\bullet|_D$ on the linear operators C and B . Furthermore, the contraction rate is $c^2 = \max\{c_A^2, c_B^2\}$.

Proof. Let $z := (x, y)^T$. We will show that, with the above hypotheses, J is contracting with respect to the matrix measure induced by the following vector norm:

$$|z| := \theta_1 |x|_A + \theta_2 |y|_D$$

with $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$. In this norm, we have

$$|(I + hJ)z| = \theta_1 |(I + hA)x + hBy|_A + \theta_2 |(I + hD)y + hCx|_D$$

Thus,

$$|(I + hJ)z| \leq \theta_1 |(I + hA)x|_A + h\theta_1 |By|_{D,A} + \theta_2 |(I + hD)y|_D + h\theta_2 |Cx|_{A,D}$$

Pick now $h > 0$ and a unit vector z (depending on h) such that $\|(I + hJ)z\| = |(I + hJ)z|$. We have, dropping the subscripts for the norms:

$$\frac{1}{h}(\|I + hJ\| - 1) \leq \frac{1}{h} \left(\|I + hA\| - 1 + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} h \|C\| \right) |x| \theta_1 + \frac{1}{h} \left(\|I + hD\| - 1 + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2} h \|B\| \right) |y| \theta_2$$

Since $1 = |z| = \theta_1 |x|_A + \theta_2 |y|_B$, we finally have

$$\frac{1}{h}(\|I + hJ\| - 1) \leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{h} \left(\|I + hA\| - 1 + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} h \|C\| \right), \frac{1}{h} \left(\|I + hD\| - 1 + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2} h \|B\| \right) \right\}$$

Taking now the limit for $h \rightarrow 0^+$:

$$\mu(J) \leq \max \left\{ \mu(A)_A + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} \|C\|, \mu(D)_D + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_2} \|B\| \right\}$$

thus proving the result. \square

Following the same arguments, Lemma 1 can be straightforwardly extended to the case of a real matrix J partitioned as

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} J_{11} & J_{12} & \dots & J_{1N} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ J_{N1} & J_{N2} & \dots & J_{NN} \end{bmatrix}$$

where the diagonal blocks of J are all square matrices. Then J is contracting if

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(J_{11}) + \frac{\theta_2}{\theta_1} \|J_{12}\| + \dots + \frac{\theta_N}{\theta_1} \|J_{1N}\| &\leq -c_{11}^2 \\ \dots & \\ \mu(J_{NN}) + \frac{\theta_1}{\theta_N} \|J_{N1}\| + \dots + \frac{\theta_{N-1}}{\theta_N} \|J_{1N}\| &\leq -c_{NN}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

(where subscripts for matrix measures and norms have been neglected).

Proof of Theorem 3

The assumption of input equivalence for the nodes implies the existence of a linear invariant subspace associated to the concurrent synchronization steady state regime. We will prove convergence towards such a subspace, by proving that the network dynamics is contracting. Let μ_f be the matrix measure

where the nodes dynamics is contracting and define: $X := (x_1^T, \dots, x_N^T)^T$, $F(X)$ as the stack of all intrinsic nodes dynamics, $H(X)$ the stack of nodes coupling functions. We want to prove that there exist a matrix measure, μ , (which is in general different from μ_f) where the whole network dynamics is contracting. Denote with $L := \{l_{ij}\}$ the Laplacian matrix (Godsil & Royle 2001) of the network and define the matrix $\tilde{L}(X)$, whose ij -th block, $\tilde{L}_{ij}(X)$, is defined as follows:

$$\tilde{L}_{ij}(X) := l_{ij} \frac{\partial h_{\gamma(i)}}{\partial x_j}$$

(Notice that if all the nodes are identical and have the same dynamics and the same coupling functions, then \tilde{L} can be written in terms of the Kronecker product, \otimes , as $(L \otimes I_n) \frac{\partial H}{\partial X}$, with n denoting the dimension of the nodes and I_n the $n \times n$ identity matrix.)

The Jacobian of (5) is then:

$$J := \left[\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} - \tilde{L}(X) \right] \tag{38}$$

The system is contracting if

$$\mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} - \tilde{L}(X) \right)$$

is uniformly negative definite. Now:

$$\mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} - \tilde{L}(X) \right) \leq \mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} \right) + \mu \left(-\tilde{L}(X) \right)$$

Notice that, by hypotheses, the matrix $-\tilde{L}(X)$ has negative diagonal blocks and zero column sum. Thus, using (37) with $\theta_i = \theta_j$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, $i \neq j$ yields

$$\mu \left(-\tilde{L}(X) \right) = 0$$

Thus:

$$\mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} - \tilde{L}(X) \right) \leq \mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} \right)$$

Since the matrix $\frac{\partial F}{\partial X}$ is block diagonal, i.e. all of its off-diagonal elements are zero, (37) yields:

$$\mu \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial X} \right) = \max_{x,t,i} \left\{ \mu_f \left(\frac{\partial f_{\gamma(i)}}{\partial x} \right) \right\}$$

The theorem is then proved by noticing that by hypothesis the right hand side of the above expression is uniformly negative.

References

- Anastassiou, C., Montgomery, S. M., Barahona, M., Buzsaki, G. & Koch, C. (2010). The effect of spatially inhomogeneous extracellular electric fields on neurons, *The Journal of Neuroscience* **30**: 1925–1936.
- Anetzberger, C., Pirch, T. & Jung, K. (2009). Heterogeneity in quorum sensing-regulated bioluminescence of *Vibrio harveyi*, *Molecular Microbiology* **2**: 267–277.
- Angeli, D. (2002). A Lyapunov approach to incremental stability properties, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **47**: 410–421.
- Beebe, D. J., Mensing, G. & Walker, G. (2002). Physics and applications of microfluidics in biology, *Annual Reviews of Biomedical Engineering* **4**: 261–286.
- Boccaletti, S., Latora, V., Moreno, Y., Chavez, M. & Hwang, D. (2006). Complex networks: structure and dynamics, *Physics Report* **424**: 175–308.
- Bohn, A. & Gracia-Ojalvo, J. (2008). Synchronization of coupled biological oscillators under spatially heterogeneous environmental forcing, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **250**: 37–47.
- Boustani, S. E., Marre, O., Behuret, P., Yger, P., Bal, T., Destexhe, A. & Fregnac, Y. (2009). Network- state modulation of power-law frequency-scaling in visual cortical neurons, *PLoS Computational Biology* **5**: e1000519.
- Chung, S., Slotine, J. & Miller, D. (2007). Nonlinear model reduction and decentralized control of tethered formation flight, *A.I.A.A. Journal of Guidance, Control and Dynamics* **30**: 390–400.
- Garcia-Ojalvo, J., Elowitz, M. B. & Strogatz, S. H. (2004). Modeling a synthetic multicellular clock: Repressilators coupled by quorum sensing, *Proc. of the Natl. Acad. of Sci.* **101**: 10955–10960.
- Gardner, T., Cantor, C. & Collins, J. (2000). Construction of a genetic toggle in *Escherichia coli*, *Nature* **403**: 339–342.
- Godsil, C. & Royle, G. (2001). *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer Verlag (New York).
- Golubitsky, M., Stewart, I. & Torok, A. (2005). Patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks with multiple arrows, *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* **4**: 78–100.
- Gonze, D., Bernard, S., Waltermann, C., Kramer, A. & Herzerl, H. (2005). Spontaneous synchronization of coupled circadian oscillators, *Biophysical Journal* **89**: 120–129.

- Hartman, P. (1961). On stability in the large for systems of ordinary differential equations, *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **13**: 480–492.
- Henson, M. A. (2004). Modeling synchronization of yeast respiratory oscillations, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **231**: 443–458.
- Izhikevich, E. M. (2006). *Dynamical Systems in Neuroscience: The Geometry of Excitability and Bursting*, MIT Press (Cambridge, MA, USA).
- J.Dockery & Keener, J. (2004). A mathematical model for quorum sensing in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **63**: 95–116.
- Katriel, G. (2008). Synchronization of oscillators coupled through an environment, *Physica D* **237**: 2933–2944.
- Kobayashi, H., Kaern, M., Araki, M., Chung, K., Gardner, T., Cantor, C. & Collins, J. (2004). Programmable cells: interfacing natural and engineered gene networks, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **101**: 8414–8419.
- Kuznetsov, A., Kaern, M. & Kopell, N. (2004). Synchrony in a population of hysteresis-based genetic oscillators, *SIAM Journal of Applied Mathematics* **65**: 392–425.
- Lewis, D. C. (1949). Metric properties of differential equations, *American Journal of Mathematics* **71**: 294–312.
- Lohmiller, W. & Slotine, J. J. (2005). Contraction analysis of non-linear distributed systems, *International Journal of Control* **78**: 678–688.
- Lohmiller, W. & Slotine, J. J. E. (1998). On contraction analysis for non-linear systems, *Automatica* **34**: 683–696.
- McMillen, D., Kopell, N., Hasty, J. & Collins, J. (2002). Synchronization of genetic relaxation oscillators by intercell signaling, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **99**: 679–684.
- Miller, M. & Bassler, B. (2001). Quorum sensing in bacteria, *Annual Review of Microbiology* **55**: 165–199.
- Muller, J., Kuttler, C., Hense, B., Rothballer, M. & Hartmann, A. (2006). Cell-cell communication by quorum sensing and dimension reduction, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **53**: 672–702.
- Nadell, C. D., Xavier, J., Levin, S. A. & Foster, K. R. (2008). The evolution of quorum sensing in bacteria biofilms, *PLoS Computational Biology* **6**: e14.

- Nardelli, C., Bassler, B. & Levin, S. (2008). Observing bacteria through the lens of social evolution, *Journal of Biology* **7**: 27.
- Newman, M., Barabasi, A. & Watts, D. (2006). *The structure and dynamics of complex networks*, Princeton University Press (Princeton, NJ, USA).
- Newman, M. E. (2003). The structure and function of complex networks, *SIAM Review* **45**: 167–256.
- Ng, W. & Bassler, B. (2009). Bacterial quorum-sensing network architectures, *Annual Review of Genetics* **43**: 197–222.
- Park, E., Feng, Z. & Durand, D. M. (2008). Diffusive coupling and network periodicity: a computational study, *Biophysical Journal* **95**: 1126–1137.
- Pavlov, A., Pogromovsky, A., van de Wou, N. & Nijmeijer, H. (2004). Convergent dynamics, a tribute to Boris Pavlovich Demidovich, *Systems and Control Letters* **52**: 257–261.
- Pesaran, B., Pezaris, J., Sahani, M., Mitra, P. & Andersen, R. (2002). Temporal structure in neuronal activity during working memory in macaque parietal cortex, *Nature* **5**: 805–811.
- Pham, Q. C. & Slotine, J. J. E. (2007). Stable concurrent synchronization in dynamic system networks, *Neural Networks* **20**: 62–77.
- Pye, E. (1969). Biochemical mechanisms underlying the metabolic oscillations in yeast, *Canadian Journal of Botany* **47**: 271–285.
- Russo, G. & di Bernardo, M. (2009a). An algorithm for the construction of synthetic self synchronizing biological circuits, *International Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, p. 305–308.
- Russo, G. & di Bernardo, M. (2009b). How to synchronize biological clocks, *Journal of Computational Biology* **16**: 379–393.
- Russo, G., di Bernardo, M. & Slotine, J. (n.d.). A graphical algorithm to prove contraction of nonlinear circuits and systems. Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I.
- Russo, G., di Bernardo, M. & Sontag, E. D. (n.d.). Global entrainment of transcriptional systems to periodic inputs. PLoS Computational Biology: accepted for publication.
- Slotine, J. (2003). Modular stability tools for distributed computation and control, *International Journal of Adaptive Control and Signal Processing* **17**: 397–416.
- Strogatz, S. (2003). *Sync: the emerging science of spontaneous order*, Hyperion (New York, USA).

- Szallasi, Z., Stelling, J. & Periwal, V. (2006). *System Modeling in Cellular Biology: From Concepts to Nuts and Bolts*, The MIT Press.
- Tabareau, N., Slotine, J. & Pham, Q. (2010). How synchronization protects from noise, *PLoS Computational Biology* **6**: e1000637.
- Tyson, J. J., Csikasz-Nagy, A. & Novak, B. (2002). The dynamics of cell cycle regulation, *Bioessays* **24**: 1095–1109.
- Wang, W. & Slotine, J. J. E. (2005). On partial contraction analysis for coupled nonlinear oscillators, *Biological Cybernetics* **92**: 38–53.
- Winfree, A. (2001). *The geometry of biological time, 2nd Ed.*, Springer (New York).
- Yagamuchi, S., Isejima, H., Matsuo, T., Okura, R. & Yagita, K. (2003). Photic induction of Mper1 and Mper2 in cry-deficient mice lacking a biological clock, *Science* **302**: 2531 – 2534.
- You, L., 3rd, R. C., Weiss, R. & Arnold, F. (2004). Programmed population control by cell-cell communication and regulated killing, *Nature* **428**: 868–871.

