

# A technique for determining the signs of sensitivities of steady states in chemical reaction networks

Eduardo D. Sontag


## ABSTRACT

We present a computational procedure to characterize the signs of sensitivities of steady states to parameter perturbations in chemical reaction networks.

## 1 Introduction

An important question in the mathematical analysis of chemical reaction networks is the characterization of sensitivities of steady states to perturbations in parameters. An example of a parameter is the total concentration of an enzyme in its various activity states. Its value might be manipulated experimentally in various forms, through expression knock-downs via interference RNA methods, or up-regulation, titration of inducers, pharmacological interventions through small-molecule inhibitors, or other modifications. Often, one wants to predict the effect of such perturbations, in a manner that depends only on the structure of the network of reactions and not on the actual values of other parameters, such as kinetic constants, which are typically very imperfectly known.

Let us start with a very trivial example. Suppose that we study the following reversible bimolecular reaction:



Let us write lower case letters  $a, b, c$  for the concentrations of  $A, B$ , and  $C$  respectively. Modeling with deterministic mass-action kinetics, the steady states of the associated ordinary differential equation are obtained by solving

$$k_1ab - k_2c = 0 \tag{1}$$

subject to two conservation laws:

$$a + c = A_T \quad \text{and} \quad b + c = B_T,$$

where  $A_T$  and  $B_T$  are two positive constants denoting the total (bound and unbound) forms of  $A$  and  $B$  respectively. For the associated set of ordinary differential equations, all solutions converge to a unique positive steady state determined by (1) and the conservation laws.

Suppose that we now perform the following experiment. First, the system is allowed to relax to steady state, starting from the concentrations  $a(0) = A_T$ ,  $b(0) = B_T$ , and  $c(0) = 0$ . The final concentrations  $a_f$ ,  $b_f$ , and  $c_f$  are measured. Next, the experiment is repeated, but the total amount  $A_T$  is now set to a slightly larger value, while  $B_T$  is kept constant. Let us call the final concentrations obtained in this new experiment, with larger  $A_T$ , as  $a'_f$ ,  $b'_f$ , and  $c'_f$ . What

can we say about the signs of the differences  $\Delta a = a'_f - a_f$ ,  $\Delta b = b'_f - b_f$ , and  $\Delta c = c'_f - c_f$ ? One approach to answering this question is to substitute the conservation laws into the steady state equation (1), for instance eliminating  $a$  and  $b$  so that  $c = c_f$  can be found by solving the quadratic equation:

$$k_1(A_T - c)(B_T - c) - k_2c = 0$$

for the unique root that is between 0 and  $\min\{A_T, B_T\}$ :

$$\frac{k_1(A_T + B_T) + k_2 - \sqrt{(k_1(A_T + B_T) + k_2)^2 - 4k_1^2 A_T B_T}}{2k_1}$$

and then  $a_f$  and  $b_f$  are obtained from  $a_f = A_T - c_f$  and  $b_f = B_T - c_f$ . A similar solution can be obtained for the larger value of  $A_T$ , and the differences  $\Delta a$ ,  $\Delta b$ , and  $\Delta c$  can be computed. Obviously, this is not a practical, or even possible, approach for large networks. On the other hand, a more conceptual and generalizable approach to this problem is as follows.

Suppose that we view the vector of steady states  $x = (a_f, b_f, c_f)$  as a curve which is parametrized by  $A_T$ , which we write as an abstract parameter  $\lambda$ . Thus, for all values of this parameter  $\lambda$ , we have that the following three equations must hold:

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 a(\lambda) b(\lambda) - k_2 c(\lambda) &= 0 \\ a(\lambda) + c(\lambda) &= \lambda \\ b(\lambda) + c(\lambda) &= B_T. \end{aligned}$$

Taking derivatives with respect to  $\lambda$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 a'(\lambda) b(\lambda) + k_1 a(\lambda) b'(\lambda) - k_2 c'(\lambda) &= 0 \\ a'(\lambda) + c'(\lambda) &= 1 \\ b'(\lambda) + c'(\lambda) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting  $b'(\lambda) = -c'(\lambda)$  and  $a'(\lambda) = 1 - c'(\lambda)$  in the first equation, we have that:

$$k_1(1 - c'(\lambda))b(\lambda) - k_1 a(\lambda) c'(\lambda) - k_2 c'(\lambda) = 0,$$

which may be re-arranged as:

$$k_1 b(\lambda) = M c'(\lambda), \quad \text{where } M = k_1 a(\lambda) + k_2 + k_1 b(\lambda).$$

Since  $M > 0$  and  $k_1 b(\lambda) > 0$ , we conclude that  $c'(\lambda) > 0$ . In other words,  $\Delta c > 0$  for an increase in  $\lambda = A_T$ . Since  $b'(\lambda) = -c'(\lambda)$ , we also know that  $\Delta b < 0$ . What about  $\Delta a$ ? If we only substitute  $b'(\lambda) = -c'(\lambda)$  in the first equation, we have that:

$$k_1 a'(\lambda) b(\lambda) = (k_1 a(\lambda) + k_2) c'(\lambda)$$

and so, using  $k_1 b(\lambda) > 0$  and  $k_1 a(\lambda) + k_2 > 0$ , we conclude that  $a'(\lambda)$  has the same sign as  $c'(\lambda)$ . Finally, since we also know that  $a'(\lambda) + c'(\lambda) = 1 > 0$ , this implies that  $a'(\lambda) > 0$ , so  $\Delta a > 0$ .

The rest of this paper shows how to extend this conceptual argument to more arbitrary networks.

## 2 Preliminaries

We start with arbitrary systems of ordinary differential equations (ODE's)

$$\dot{x}(t) = f(x(t)). \quad (2)$$

The vectors  $x$  are assumed to lie in the positive orthant  $\mathbb{R}_+^{n_s}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ , that is,  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_s})^T$  with each  $x_i > 0$ , and  $f$  is a differentiable vector field, mapping  $\mathbb{R}_+^{n_s}$  into  $\mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ . We later specialize to ODE's that describe chemical reaction networks (CRN's), for which the abstract procedure to be described next can be made computationally explicit. In the latter context, we think of the coordinates  $x_i(t)$  of  $x$  as describing the concentrations of various chemical species  $S_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n_s$ .

Suppose that  $x^\lambda$  describes a  $\lambda$ -parametrized smooth curve of steady states for the system (2), where  $\lambda$  is a scalar parameter ranging over some open interval  $\Lambda$ . The steady state condition amounts to asking that

$$f(x^\lambda) = 0 \quad (3)$$

for all values of the parameter  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ .

In addition to (3), we also assume that the steady states of interest are constrained by a set of algebraic equations

$$g_1(x^\lambda) = 0, g_2(x^\lambda) = 0, \dots, g_{n_c}(x^\lambda) = 0 \quad (4)$$

where  $n_c$  is some positive integer (which we take to be zero when there are no additional constraints). We write simply  $g(x^\lambda) = 0$ , where  $g : \mathbb{R}_+^{n_s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_c}$  is a differentiable mapping whose components are the  $g_i$ 's. Some or all  $g_i$  might be linear functions, representing moieties or stoichiometric constraints, but nonlinear constraints will be useful when treating certain examples, as will be discussed later.

Let us denote by

$$\xi^\lambda := \frac{\partial x^\lambda}{\partial \lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times 1}$$

the derivative of the vector function  $x^\lambda$  with respect to  $\lambda$ , viewed as a function  $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times 1}$ .

We are interested in answering the following question:

what are the signs of the entries of  $\xi^\lambda$ ?

Obviously, the answer to this question will, generally speaking, depend on the chosen  $\lambda$ . The computation of the steady state  $x^\lambda$  as a function of  $\lambda$  generally will involve the numerical approximate solution of nonlinear algebraic equations, and has to be repeated for each individual parameter  $\lambda$ . Our aim is, instead, to provide conditions that allow one to find these signs independently of the specific  $\lambda$ , and, even independently of other parameters that might appear in the specification of  $f$  and of  $g$ , such as kinetic constants, and to do so using only linear algebraic and logical operations, with no recourse to numerical approximations.

Proceeding in complete generality, we take the derivative with respect to  $\lambda$  in (3), so that, by the chain rule, we have that  $f'(x^\lambda)\xi^\lambda = 0$ , where  $f'(x)$  denotes the Jacobian matrix of  $f$  evaluated at a state  $x$ . In other words,

$$\xi^\lambda \in \mathcal{N}(f'(x^\lambda)), \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(f'(x))$  denotes the nullspace of the matrix  $f'(x)$ . Similarly, we have that

$$\xi^\lambda \in \mathcal{N}(g'(x^\lambda)). \quad (6)$$

The reason for introducing separately  $f$  and  $g$  will become apparent later: we will be asking that each of the  $n_c \times n_s$  entries of the Jacobian matrix of  $g$  should not change sign over the state space (which happens, in particular, when  $g$  is linear, as is the case with stoichiometric constraints). No similar requirement will be made of  $f$ , but instead, we will study the special case in which  $f$  represents the dynamics of a CRN.

### Notations for signs of vectors and of subspaces

For any (row or column) vector  $u$  with real entries, we introduce the vector of signs of entries of  $u$ , denoted  $\text{sign } u$ , as the (row or column) vector with entries in the set  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$  whose  $i$ th coordinate satisfies:

$$(\text{sign } u)_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } u_i < 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } u_i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } u_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

(The function  $\text{sign}$  is sometimes called the “signature function” when viewed as a map  $\mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ .) More generally, for any subspace  $\mathcal{W}$  of vectors with real entries, we define

$$\text{sign } \mathcal{W} = \{\text{sign } v \mid v \in \mathcal{W}\}.$$

Computing  $\text{sign } \mathcal{W}$  amounts to the combinatorial problem of determining which orthants are intersected by  $\mathcal{W}$ .\*

We also introduce the positive and negative parts of a vector  $u$ , denoted by  $u^+$  and  $u^-$  respectively, as follows:

$$(u^+)_i = \begin{cases} u_i & \text{if } u_i > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } u_i \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (u^-)_i = \begin{cases} -u_i & \text{if } u_i < 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } u_i \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $u = u^+ - u^-$ ,  $\text{sign } u = \text{sign } u^+ - \text{sign } u^-$ , and:

$$(\text{sign } u)^+ = \text{sign}(u^+), \quad (\text{sign } u)^- = \text{sign}(u^-). \quad (7)$$

Suppose that  $u \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n}$  and  $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$ , for some positive integer  $n$ . The equality:

$$\text{sign}(uv) = \text{sign}(\text{sign}(u) \text{sign}(v)). \quad (8)$$

need not hold for arbitrary vectors: for example, if  $u = (1, -1/4, -1/4, -1/4)$  and  $v = (1, 1, 1, 1)^T$  then  $\text{sign}(uv) = \text{sign}(1/4) = 1$ , but

$$\text{sign}(\text{sign}(u) \text{sign}(v)) = \text{sign}((1, -1, -1, -1)(1, 1, 1, 1)^T) = \text{sign}(-2) = -1.$$

However, equality (8) is true provided that we assume that (a)  $u^- = 0$  or  $u^+ = 0$  (that is, either  $u_i \geq 0$  for all  $i$ , or  $u_i \leq 0$  for all  $i$ , respectively), and also that (b)  $v^- = 0$  or

---

\*We do not need to use this fact, but it is worth noting that, given a basis of  $\mathcal{W}$ , the signs of  $\mathcal{W}$  represent the “oriented matroid” associated to a matrix that lists the basis as its columns, which is the set of “covectors” of this basis. This topic is central to the theory of oriented matroids.

$v^+ = 0$ . This is proved as follows. Take first the case  $u^- = 0$  and  $v^- = 0$ . Each term in the sum  $uv = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i$  is non-negative. Thus,  $uv > 0$ , that is,  $\text{sign}(uv) = 1$ , if and only if  $u_i > 0$  and  $v_i > 0$  for some common index  $i$ , and  $uv = \text{sign}(uv) = 0$  otherwise. Similarly, as  $\text{sign}(u)\text{sign}(v) = \sum_{i=1}^n \text{sign}(u_i)\text{sign}(v_i)$ , we know that  $\text{sign}(u)\text{sign}(v) > 0$ , i.e.  $\text{sign}(\text{sign}(u)\text{sign}(v)) = 1$ , if and only if  $\text{sign}(u_i) = \text{sign}(v_i) = 1$  for some  $i$ , and  $\text{sign}(u)\text{sign}(v) = 0$  otherwise. But  $\text{sign}(u_i) = \text{sign}(v_i) = 1$  is the same as  $u_i > 0$  and  $v_i > 0$ . Thus (8) is true. The case  $u^+ = 0$  and  $v^- = 0$  can be reduced to  $u^- = 0$  and  $v^- = 0$  by considering  $-u$  instead of  $u$ :  $\text{sign}(uv) = -\text{sign}((-u)v) = -\text{sign}(\text{sign}(-u)\text{sign}(v)) = \text{sign}(\text{sign}(u)\text{sign}(v))$ . Similarly for the remaining two cases.

## A parameter-dependent constraint set

Denoting

$$\mathcal{W}(x^\lambda) = \mathcal{N}(f'(x^\lambda)) \cap \mathcal{N}(g'(x^\lambda))$$

we have that (5) and (6) can be summarized as follows, in terms of the sign notations just introduced:

$$\pi^\lambda := \text{sign } \xi^\lambda \in \text{sign } \mathcal{W}(x^\lambda).$$

Therefore, one could in principle determine the possible values of  $\pi^\lambda$  once that  $\mathcal{W}(x^\lambda)$  is known. However, in applications one typically does not know explicitly the curve  $x^\lambda$ , which makes the problem difficult because the subspace  $\mathcal{W}(x^\lambda)$  depends on  $\lambda$ , and even computing the steady states  $x^\lambda$  is a hard problem. As discussed below, for the special case of ODE systems arising from CRN's, a more systematic procedure is possible. Before turning to CRN's, however, we discuss general facts true for all systems.

For every positive concentration vector  $x$  define:

$$\Sigma(x) := \{ \text{sign}(\nu f'(x)) \mid \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s} \} \cup \{ \text{sign}(e_i^T g'(x)) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n_c\} \} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}. \quad (9)$$

Here  $e_i^T$  denotes the canonical row vector  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$  with a "1" in the  $i$ th position and zeroes elsewhere. The row vectors  $\nu$  are used in order to generate an arbitrary linear combination of the rows of the Jacobian matrix of  $f$ , a set rich enough to, ideally, permit the unique determination of the sign of  $\xi^\lambda$ . As we will use  $g$  to introduce constraints of constant sign, and the constant sign property is not preserved under arbitrary linear combinations of rows, we only allow  $\nu = e_i^T$  for  $g$ , that is to say, we simply look at the signs of the rows of  $g'(x)$ . Since at a steady state  $x = x^\lambda$ ,  $f'(x^\lambda)\xi^\lambda = 0$  and  $g'(x^\lambda)\xi^\lambda = 0$ , we also have that:

$$v \xi^\lambda = 0 \quad (10)$$

for each linear combination  $v = \nu f'(x^\lambda)$  and each row  $v = e_i^T g'(x^\lambda)$ .

An easy yet key observation is that the sign vectors in the set  $\Sigma(x^\lambda)$  strongly constrain the possible signs  $\pi^\lambda = \text{sign } \xi^\lambda = \text{sign } \frac{\partial x^\lambda}{\partial \lambda}$ . For simplicity in notations, we drop  $\lambda$  in  $\pi^\lambda$  and in  $\xi^\lambda$  when  $\lambda$  is clear from the context, and write simply  $\pi$  or  $\xi$ , with coordinates  $\pi_i$  and  $\xi_i$  respectively.

**Lemma 2.1** Pick any  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . For every  $\sigma \in \Sigma(x^\lambda)$ , and  $\pi = \pi^\lambda$ , it must hold that either:

$$\forall i \sigma_i \pi_i = 0 \quad (11)$$

or:

$$(\exists i \sigma_i \pi_i > 0) \text{ and } (\exists j \sigma_j \pi_j < 0) \quad (12)$$

(where  $i$  and  $j$  range over  $\{1, \dots, n_s\}$  in all quantifiers). In other words, either all the coordinates of the vector

$$(\sigma_1 \pi_1, \sigma_2 \pi_2, \dots, \sigma_{n_s} \pi_{n_s})$$

are zero, or the vector must have both positive and negative entries.

*Proof.* Pick  $\sigma = \text{sign } v \in \Sigma(x^\lambda)$ ,  $\pi = \pi^\lambda$ ,  $\xi = \xi^\lambda$ . Suppose that (11) is false. Then, either there is some  $i$  such that  $\sigma_i \pi_i > 0$  or there is some  $j$  such that  $\sigma_j \pi_j < 0$ . If  $\sigma_i \pi_i > 0$  for some  $i$ , then also  $v_i \xi_i > 0$ . As (10) holds,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n_s} v_i \xi_i = 0$ , so that there must exist some other index  $j$  for which  $v_j \xi_j < 0$ , which means that  $\sigma_j \pi_j < 0$ . Similarly, if there is some  $j$  such that  $\sigma_j \pi_j < 0$ , necessarily there is some  $i$  such that  $\sigma_i \pi_i > 0$ , by the same argument. ■

We may express the conclusion of Lemma 2.1 in formal logic terms as follows. Let  $p_{\sigma,\pi}$  and  $q_{\sigma,\pi}$  be the following logical disjunctions:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\sigma,\pi} &= \exists i \sigma_i \pi_i > 0 \\ q_{\sigma,\pi} &= \exists j \sigma_j \pi_j < 0 \end{aligned}$$

and observe that condition (11) is equivalent to asking that both  $p_{\sigma,\pi}$  and  $q_{\sigma,\pi}$  are false. Thus, Lemma 2.1 says that, for each  $\sigma \in \Sigma$ , either both  $p_{\sigma,\pi}$  and  $q_{\sigma,\pi}$  are false or both  $p_{\sigma,\pi}$  and  $q_{\sigma,\pi}$  are true. The ‘‘XNOR( $p,q$ )’’ binary function has value ‘‘true’’ if and only if  $p$  and  $q$  are simultaneously true or false. Thus, Lemma 2.1 asserts that this logical statement is true, for  $\pi = \pi^\lambda$ :

$$\text{XNOR}(p_{\sigma,\pi}, q_{\sigma,\pi}) \quad \forall \sigma \in \Sigma. \quad (13)$$

Given any two sign vectors  $\sigma, \pi$ , testing this property is simple in any programming language. For example, in MATLAB® syntax, one may write:

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta &= \sigma .* \pi \\ p &= \text{sign}(\text{sum}(\zeta > 0)) \\ q &= \text{sign}(\text{sum}(\zeta < 0)) \\ \text{XNOR} &= \text{sign}(p * q + (1 - p) * (1 - q)) \end{aligned}$$

and the variable XNOR will have value 1 if XNOR( $p_{\sigma,\pi}, q_{\sigma,\pi}$ ) is true, and value 0 otherwise.

The basis of our approach will be as follows. We will show how to obtain a state-independent set  $\Sigma_0$  which is a subset of  $\Sigma(x)$  for all states  $x$ . In particular, for all steady states  $x^\lambda$ , we will have:

$$\Sigma_0 \subseteq \bigcap_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \Sigma(x^\lambda). \quad (14)$$

Compared to the individual sets  $\Sigma(x^\lambda)$ , which depend on the particular steady state  $x^\lambda$ , the elements of this subset are obtained using only linear algebraic operations; the computation of  $\Sigma_0$  does not entail solving nonlinear equations nor simulating differential equations. Once that this set  $\Sigma_0$  (or even just some large subset of it, which is easier to compute) has been obtained, we may ask, for each potential sign vector  $\pi$ , if (13) is true or not. Thus, for each  $\pi$ , we need to test if the conjunction of the clauses in (13):

$$\bigwedge_{\sigma \in \Sigma_0} \text{XNOR}(p_{\sigma,\pi}, q_{\sigma,\pi}) \quad (15)$$

(or the conjunction only over a more easily computed subset) is true or false. In other words, we are interested in computing the subset of sign vectors  $\pi$  for which (15) is valid. This question is one of propositional logic (there are only  $3^{n_s}$  possible sign vectors), and as such is decidable algorithmically, although it has large computational complexity.

We prefer to carry out a sieve procedure for restricting the possible sign vectors, by testing each  $\pi$  one at a time. For moderate numbers of species, this is easy and fast to perform computationally. So we test for each  $\pi$  if (15) is valid. If false, then the sign vector  $\pi$  is ruled out as a possible sign and eliminated from the list. The surviving  $\pi$ 's are the possible sign vectors. Of course, since (13) is only a necessary, and not a sufficient, condition, we are not guaranteed to find a minimal set of signs. However, we find for many examples that the procedure indeed leads to a unique, or close to unique, solution, after deleting the zero solution (since  $\sigma = 0$  is always a solution) and also deleting one element in the pair  $\{\sigma, -\sigma\}$  for each  $\sigma$  (since  $\nu\xi = 0$  implies  $\nu(-\xi) = 0$ , solutions appear always in pairs).

Testing (15), for a fixed  $\pi$ , is itself a hard computational problem (NP-hard on the number of species) and hence infeasible for large-scale networks. Good heuristics, such as the Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland (DPLL) algorithm for clauses in conjunctive normal form, are extensively discussed in the rich literature on satisfiability. However, we have found that a straightforward exhaustive testing of all possibilities is quite useful, as long as the number of species is reasonably small.

The key issue, then, is to find a way to explicitly generate a state-independent subset  $\Sigma_0$  of  $\Sigma(x^\lambda)$ , and we turn to that problem next.

### 3 CRN terminology and notations

We consider a collection of chemical reactions that involves a set of  $n_s$  “species”:

$$S_i, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_s\}.$$

The “species” might be ions, atoms, or large molecules, depending on the context. A *chemical reaction network* (“CRN” for short) involving these species is a set of chemical reactions  $\mathcal{R}_j$ ,  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_r\}$ , represented symbolically as:



where the  $a_{ik}$  and  $b_{ik}$  are some non-negative integers that quantify the number of units of species  $S_i$  consumed, respectively produced, by reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ . Thus, in reaction 1,  $a_{11}$  units of species  $S_1$  combine with  $a_{21}$  units of species  $S_2$ , etc., to produce  $b_{11}$  units of species  $S_1$ ,  $b_{21}$  units of species  $S_2$ , etc., and similarly for each of the other  $n_r - 1$  reactions.

We will assume the following “non autocatalysis” condition: no species  $S_i$  can appear on both sides of the same reaction. With this assumption, either  $a_{ik} = 0$  or  $b_{ik} = 0$  for each species  $S_i$  and each reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$  (both are zero if the species in question is neither consumed nor produced). Note that we are not excluding autocatalysis which occurs through one or more intermediate steps, such as the autocatalysis of  $S_1$  in  $S_1 + S_2 \rightarrow S_3 \rightarrow 2S_1 + S_4$ , so this assumption is not as restrictive as it might at first appear.

Suppose that  $a_{ik} > 0$  for some  $(i, k)$ ; then we say that species  $S_i$  is a *reactant* of reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ , and by the non autocatalysis assumption,  $b_{ik} = 0$  for this pair  $(i, k)$ . If instead  $b_{ik} > 0$ , then we say that species  $S_i$  is a *product* of reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ , and again by the non autocatalysis assumption,  $a_{ik} = 0$  for this pair  $(i, k)$ .

It is convenient to arrange the  $a_{ik}$ 's and  $b_{ik}$ 's into two  $n_s \times n_r$  matrices  $A, B$  respectively, and introduce the *stoichiometry matrix*  $\Gamma = B - A$ . In other words,

$$\Gamma = (\gamma_{ij})_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_r}$$

is defined by:

$$\gamma_{ij} = b_{ij} - a_{ij}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_s, \quad j = 1, \dots, n_r. \quad (17)$$

The matrix  $\Gamma$  has as many columns as there are reactions. Its  $k$ th column shows, for each species (ordered according to their index  $i$ ), the net “produced–consumed” by reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ . The symbolic information given by the reactions (16) is summarized by the matrix  $\Gamma$ . Observe that  $\gamma_{ik} = -a_{ik} < 0$  if  $S_i$  is a reactant of reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ , and  $\gamma_{ik} = b_{ik} > 0$  if  $S_i$  is a product of reaction  $\mathcal{R}_k$ .

To describe how the state of the network evolves over time, one must provide in addition to  $\Gamma$  a rule for the evolution of the vector:

$$\begin{pmatrix} [S_1(t)] \\ [S_2(t)] \\ \vdots \\ [S_{n_s}(t)] \end{pmatrix},$$

where the notation  $[S_i(t)]$  means the concentration of the species  $S_i$  at time  $t$ . We will denote the concentration of  $S_i$  simply as  $x_i(t) = [S_i(t)]$  and let  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_s})^T$ . Observe that only non-negative concentrations make physical sense. A zero concentration means that a species is not present at all; we will be interested in *positive vectors*  $x$  of concentrations, those for which  $x_i > 0$  for all  $i$ , meaning that all species are present.

Another ingredient that we require is a formula for the actual rate at which the individual reactions take place. We denote by  $R_k(x)$  be algebraic form of the  $k$ th reaction. We postulate the following two axioms that the reaction rates  $R_k(x)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n_r$  must satisfy:

- for each  $(i, k)$  such that species  $S_i$  is a reactant of  $\mathcal{R}_k$ ,  $\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_i}(x) > 0$  for all (positive) concentration vectors  $x$ ;
- for each  $(i, k)$  such that species  $S_i$  is not a reactant of  $\mathcal{R}_k$ ,  $\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_i}(x) = 0$  for all (positive) concentration vectors  $x$ .

These axioms are natural, and are satisfied by every reasonable model, and specifically by mass-action kinetics, in which the reaction rate is proportional to the product of the concentrations of all the reactants:

$$R_k(x) = \kappa_k \prod_{i=1}^{n_s} x_i^{a_{ij}} \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, n_r$$

(the positive coefficients  $\kappa_k$  are the reaction, or kinetic, constants;  $x_i^{a_{ij}} = 1$  when  $a_{ij} = 0$ ).



Recall that  $a_{ik} > 0$  and  $b_{ik} = 0$  if and only if  $S_i$  is a reactant of  $\mathcal{R}_k$ . Therefore the above axioms state that, for every positive  $x$ ,

$$\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_i}(x) > 0 \iff a_{ik} > 0 \quad (18)$$

and also

$$\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_i}(x) = 0 \iff a_{ik} = 0 \quad (19)$$

because the expressions on both sides are either zero or positive.

We arrange reactions into a column vector function  $R(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r}$ :

$$R(x) := \begin{pmatrix} R_1(x) \\ R_2(x) \\ \vdots \\ R_{n_r}(x) \end{pmatrix}.$$

With these conventions, the system of differential equations associated to the CRN is given as follows:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = f(x) = \Gamma R(x). \quad (20)$$

Observe that  $f'(x) = \Gamma R'(x)$ , where  $R'(x)$  is the Jacobian matrix of  $R$ , which is the matrix whose  $(k, j)$ th entry is  $\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_j}(x)$ .

We will assume from now also specified a differentiable mapping

$$g : \mathbb{R}_+^{n_s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_c},$$

where  $n_c$  is some positive integer (possibly zero, to indicate the case where there are no additional constraints), and  $g$  has the property that

$$\text{all } n_c \times n_s \text{ entries of the Jacobian matrix } g'(x) \text{ have constant sign.} \quad (21)$$

This happens in the special case when  $g$  is linear, as is the case for stoichiometric constraints. It is perfectly fine to add linear combinations of those rows of  $g$  that are linear, since that will not change the constant sign assumption on  $g'$ . We assume in the theoretical discussion that  $g$  has been extended by possibly adding one or more such combinations. Observe that a nonlinear  $g$  may also have the constant sign property. For example, suppose that  $n_s = 5$ ,  $n_c = 1$ , and

$$g(x) = ax_1x_3 - bx_2^2$$


where  $a$  and  $b$  are positive constants. Then the Jacobian matrix (gradient, since  $n_c = 1$ ) is:

$$g'(x) = \nabla g(x) = (ax_3, -2bx_2, ax_1, 0, 0)$$

which has constant sign  $(1, -1, 1, 0, 0)$ .

For chemical reaction networks, it is not necessary for the entries of  $f'(x)$ , and much less the entries of the products  $\nu f'(x)$  for vectors  $\nu$ , to have constant sign. Our next task will be to introduce algebraic conditions that allow one to check if the sign is constant, for any given

vector  $\nu$ . Before proceeding, however, we give an example of non-constant sign. Take the following CRN, with  $n_s = 4$  and  $n_r = 2$ :



which is formally specified, assuming mass-action kinetics, as follows:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R(x) = (k_1 x_1 x_2, k_2 x_2 x_3)^T.$$

Thus the ODE set  $\dot{x} = f(x) = \Gamma R(x)$  corresponding to this CRN has:

$$f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 x_1 x_2 + k_2 x_2 x_3 \\ -k_1 x_1 x_2 - k_2 x_2 x_3 \\ -k_2 x_2 x_3 \\ k_1 x_1 x_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let  $\nu = e_1^T$ . Observe that  $\nu f'(x) = (-k_1 x_2, -k_1 x_1 + k_2 x_3, k_2 x_2, 0)$  does not have constant sign, because its second entry, which is the same as the  $(1, 2)$  entry of  $f'(x)$ , is the function  $-k_1 x_1 + k_2 x_3$ , which changes sign depending on whether  $x_1 > k_2 x_3 / k_1$  or  $x_1 < k_2 x_3 / k_1$ . Ruling out vectors  $\nu$  that lead to such ambiguous signs is the purpose of our algorithm to be described next.

## 4 Sensitivities for CRN's

Introduce the following space:

$$\mathbf{V} := \text{row span of } \Gamma = \{ \nu \Gamma \mid \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s} \} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_r}.$$

Since  $f'(x) = \Gamma R'(x)$ , the definition (9) of  $\Sigma$  becomes:

$$\Sigma(x) := \{ \text{sign}(v R'(x)) \mid v \in \mathbf{V} \} \cup \{ \text{sign}(e_i^T g'(x)) \mid i \in \{1, \dots, n_c\} \} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}$$

when specialized to CRN.

As we assumed Property (21), the expressions  $\text{sign}(e_i^T g'(x))$  are actually independent of  $x$ . On the other hand, the sign vectors  $\sigma = \text{sign } v R'(x)$  generally depend on the particular  $x$ . The following Lemma shows that, for vectors  $\rho$  with non-negative entries, the sign of the vector  $\rho R'(x)$  is the same, no matter what the state  $x$  is, and moreover, this sign can be explicitly computed using only stoichiometry information. We denote by

$$A_j = (a_{j1}, \dots, a_{jn_r})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n_r \times 1}$$

the  $j$ th column of the transpose  $A^T$ , i.e.. the transpose of the  $j$ th row of  $A$ .

**Lemma 4.1** For any positive concentration vector  $x$ , any non-negative row vector  $\rho$  of size  $n_r$ , and any species index  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ :

$$\rho A_j = 0 \iff \rho \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0. \quad (23)$$

Thus, also

$$\rho A_j > 0 \iff \rho \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) > 0, \quad (24)$$

since the expressions in each side of (23) can only be zero or positive.

*Proof.* We have that

$$\rho A_j = \sum_{k \in K_\rho} \rho_k a_{jk}$$

where  $K_\rho := \{k | \rho_k > 0\}$ . Since every  $a_{jk} \geq 0$ , the equality  $\rho A_j = 0$  holds if and only if  $a_{jk} = 0$  for all  $k \in K_\rho$ . Similarly, from

$$\rho \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = \sum_{k \in K_\rho} \rho_k \frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_j}(x)$$

and  $\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_j}(x) \geq 0$  we have that  $\rho \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial R_k}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0$  for all  $k \in K_\rho$ . From (19), we conclude (23).  $\blacksquare$

Lemma 4.1 is valid for all non-negative  $\rho$ . When specialized to  $v = \nu \Gamma \in \mathbf{V}$ , and defining  $\sigma = \text{sign } vR'(x)$ , it says that  $\sigma$  does not depend on  $x$ . However, elements of the form  $v = \nu \Gamma \in \mathbf{V}$  will generally not be non-negative (nor non-positive), so the lemma cannot be applied to them. Instead, we will apply Lemma 4.1 to the positive and negative parts of such a vector, but only when such positive and negative parts satisfy a certain ‘‘orthogonality’’ property, as defined by the subset of  $\mathbf{V}$  introduced below.

### A state-independent subset of $\Sigma$

For any  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ , consider the sign vector  $\tilde{\mu}_v := \text{sign } vA^T \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}$ , whose  $j$ th entry is  $vA_j = \nu \Gamma A_j$  if  $v = \nu \Gamma$  with  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s}$ , as well as the positive and negative parts of  $v$ ,  $v^+$  and  $v^-$ . Define the following set of vectors (‘‘G’’ for ‘‘good’’):

$$\mathbf{V}_G := \{v \in \mathbf{V} \mid \text{for each } j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\} \text{ either } v^+ A_j = 0 \text{ or } v^- A_j = 0\}.$$

Observe that, if  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ , then

$$vA_j = (v^+ - v^-)A_j = v^+ A_j - v^- A_j = \begin{cases} v^+ A_j & \text{if } v^- A_j = 0 \\ -v^- A_j & \text{if } v^+ A_j = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } v^+ A_j = v^- A_j = 0. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Consider the following set of sign vectors  $\tilde{\mu}_v$  parametrized by elements of  $\mathbf{V}_G$ :

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_0 := \{\tilde{\mu}_v = \text{sign}(vA^T) \mid v \in \mathbf{V}_G\} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}. \quad (26)$$

The key fact is that this is a subset of  $\Sigma(x)$  for all  $x$ , as shown next.

**Lemma 4.2** For every positive concentration vector  $x$ ,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_0 \subseteq \Sigma(x).$$

*Proof.* Pick any  $\tilde{\mu}_v \in \tilde{\Sigma}_0$ , where  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G \subseteq \mathbf{V}$ , and fix any positive concentration vector  $x$ . We must prove that  $\tilde{\mu}_v \in \Sigma(x)$ . As  $\Sigma(x)$  includes all expressions of the form  $\text{sign}(vR'(x))$ , for  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ , it will suffice to show that, for this same vector  $v$ ,

$$\text{sign} \left( v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) \right) = \text{sign}(vA_j) \quad (27)$$

for each species index  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ . For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ , we will show the following three statements:

$$v^- A_j > 0 \text{ (and so } v^+ A_j = 0) \implies v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = -v^- \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) < 0, \quad (28)$$

$$v^+ A_j > 0 \text{ (and so } v^- A_j = 0) \implies v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = v^+ \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) > 0, \quad (29)$$

and

$$v^- A_j = v^+ A_j = 0 \implies v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0. \quad (30)$$

Suppose first that  $v^- A_j > 0$ . Applying (23) with  $\rho = v^+$ , we have that  $v^+ \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0$ . Applying (24) with  $\rho = v^-$ , we have that  $v^- \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) > 0$ . Therefore

$$v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = (v^+ - v^-) \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = v^+ \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) - v^- \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = -v^- \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) < 0,$$

thus proving (28). If, instead,  $v^- A_j = 0$  and  $v^+ A_j > 0$ , a similar argument shows that (29) holds. Finally, suppose that  $v^+ A_j = v^- A_j = 0$ . Then, again by (23), applied to  $\rho = v^+$  and  $\rho = v^-$ ,

$$v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = (v^+ - v^-) \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0,$$

and so (30) holds. The desired equality (27) follows from (28)-(30). Indeed, we consider three cases: (a)  $vA_j < 0$ , (b)  $vA_j > 0$ , and (c)  $vA_j = 0$ . In case (a), (25) shows that  $vA_j = -v^- A_j$  (because the first and third cases would give a non-negative value), and therefore  $-v^- A_j < 0$ , that is,  $v^- A_j > 0$ , so (28) gives that  $v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x)$  is also negative. In case (b), similarly  $v^+ A_j = vA_j > 0$ , and so (29) shows (27). Finally, consider case (c),  $vA_j = 0$ . If it were the case that  $v^+ A_j$  is nonzero, then, since  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ ,  $v^- A_j = 0$ , and therefore (25) gives that  $vA_j = v^+ A_j > 0$ , a contradiction; similarly,  $v^- A_j$  must also be zero. So, (30) gives that  $v \frac{\partial R}{\partial x_j}(x) = 0$  as well. ■

**Remark 4.3** To interpret the set  $\mathbf{V}_G$ , it is helpful to study the special case in which  $v$  is simply a row of  $\Gamma$ , that is,  $v = \nu\Gamma$  and  $\nu = e_i^T$ , the canonical row vector  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$  with a “1” in the  $i$ th position and zeroes elsewhere. Since

$$e_i^T B - e_i^T A = e_i^T (B - A) = e_i^T \Gamma = v^+ - v^-,$$

and the vectors  $e_i^T B$  and  $e_i^T A$  have non-overlapping positive entries (by the non autocatalysis assumption), we have that  $v^+ = e_i^T B$  and  $v^- = e_i^T A$ . Since  $e_i^T B A_j = \sum_k b_{ik} a_{jk}$ , asking that this number be positive amounts to asking that

$$i \text{ is a product of some reaction } \mathcal{R}_k \text{ which has } j \text{ as a reactant.} \quad (31)$$

Since  $e_i^T AA_j = \sum_k a_{ik}a_{jk}$ , asking that this number is positive amounts to asking that

$$i \text{ and } j \text{ are both reactants in some reaction } \mathcal{R}_{k'}. \quad (32)$$

Thus, if the network in question has the property that (31) and (32) cannot both hold simultaneously for any pair of species  $i, j$ , then we cannot have that both  $e_i^T BA_j > 0$  and  $e_i^T AA_j > 0$  hold. In other words,  $e_i^T \in \mathbf{V}_G$  for all  $i$ .

As an illustration, take the CRN  $\mathcal{R}_1 : X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow X_4$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2 : X_2 + X_3 \rightarrow X_1$  treated in (22). We claim that  $e_1^T \notin \mathbf{V}_G$ , which reflects the fact that  $e_1^T f'(x)$  does not have constant sign. Indeed, in this case we have that, with  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$ ,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are reactants in  $\mathcal{R}_1$  but  $X_1$  is also a product of reaction  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , which has  $X_2$  as a reactant. Algebraically,  $e_1^T \Gamma = (-1, 1) = (0, 1) - (1, 0) = v^+ - v^-$  and  $A_2 = (1, 1)^T$ , so  $v^+ A_2 = 1$  and  $v^- A_2 = 1$ . This means that  $\nu = e_1^T \notin \mathbf{V}_G$ , since the property defining  $\mathbf{V}_G$  would require that at least one of  $v^+ A_2$  or  $v^- A_2$  should vanish. We have re-derived, in a purely algebraic manner, the fact that  $-k_1 x_1 + k_2 x_3$  changes sign.  $\square$

Testing whether a given vector  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ ,  $v = \nu \Gamma$  with  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s}$ , belongs to  $\mathbf{V}_G$  is easy to do. For example, in MATLAB®-like syntax, one may write:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \nu * \Gamma \\ v^+ &= (v > 0) .* v \\ v^- &= -(v < 0) .* v \\ v_A^+ &= \text{sign}(v^+ * A') \\ v_A^- &= \text{sign}(v^- * A') \end{aligned}$$

and we need to verify that the vectors  $v_A^+$  and  $v_A^-$  have disjoint supports, which can be done with the command

$$\text{sum}(v_A^+ .* v_A^-) == 0$$

which returns 1 (true) if and only if  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ , in which case we accept  $v$  and we may use  $\sigma = \text{sign}(vA^T)$  to test the conditions in Lemma 2.1.

### Explicit generation of elements of $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$

The set  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$  defined in (26) is constructed in such a way as to be independent of states  $x$ , which makes it more useful than the sets  $\Sigma(x)$  from a computational standpoint. Yet, in principle, computing this set potentially involves the testing of the conditions “ $v^+ A_j = 0$  or  $v^- A_j = 0$ ” that define the set  $\mathbf{V}_G$ , for every  $v = \nu \Gamma$ , that is, for every possible real-valued vector  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s}$  (and each  $j$ ). We describe next a more combinatorial way to generate the elements of  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ .

We introduce the set of signs associated to the row span  $\mathbf{V}$  of  $\Gamma$ :

$$\mathbf{S} := \text{sign } \mathbf{V} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}. \quad (33)$$

Denote:

$$\alpha := \text{sign } A^T \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r \times n_s}$$

so that the  $j$ th column of  $\alpha$  is  $\alpha_j = \text{sign } A_j \in \{0, 1\}^{n_r \times 1}$ .

**Lemma 4.4** Pick any  $s \in \mathbf{S}$ ,  $s = \text{sign } v$ , where  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ . Then, for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ :

$$\text{sign}(v^+ A_j) = \text{sign}(s^+ \alpha_j), \quad \text{sign}(v^- A_j) = \text{sign}(s^- \alpha_j).$$

*Proof.* By (8), applied with  $u = v^+$  and  $v = A_j$ ,  $\text{sign}(v^+ A_j) = \text{sign}(\text{sign}(v^+) \alpha_j)$ . By (8) applied with  $u = v^-$  and  $v = A_j$ ,  $\text{sign}(v^- A_j) = \text{sign}(\text{sign}(v^-) \alpha_j)$ . Since, by (7) applied with  $u = v$ ,  $s^+ = \text{sign}(v^+)$  and  $s^- = \text{sign}(v^-)$ , the conclusion follows. ■

In analogy to the definition of the set  $\mathbf{V}_G$ , we define (“G” for “good”):

$$\mathbf{S}_G := \{s \in \mathbf{S} \mid \text{for each } j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\} \text{ either } s^+ \alpha_j = 0 \text{ or } s^- \alpha_j = 0\}.$$

Observe that, if  $s \in \mathbf{S}_G$ , then

$$s \alpha_j = (s^+ - s^-) \alpha_j = s^+ a_j - s^- a_j = \begin{cases} s^+ \alpha_j & \text{if } s^- \alpha_j = 0 \\ -s^- \alpha_j & \text{if } s^+ \alpha_j = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } s^+ \alpha_j = s^- \alpha_j = 0. \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Consider the following set of sign vectors parametrized by elements of  $\mathbf{S}_G$ :

$$\Sigma_0 := \{\mu_s = \text{sign}(s \alpha) \mid s \in \mathbf{S}_G\} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}. \quad (35)$$

**Proposition 4.5** Pick any  $s \in \mathbf{S}$ ,  $s = \text{sign } v$ , where  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ . Then

$$s \in \mathbf{S}_G \text{ if and only if } v \in \mathbf{V}_G$$

and for such  $s$  and  $v$ ,

$$\text{sign}(v A^T) = \text{sign}(s \alpha). \quad (36)$$

*Proof.* Let  $s = \text{sign } v$ ,  $v \in \mathbf{V}$ , and pick any  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ . We claim that  $s^\pm \alpha_j = 0$  if and only if  $v^\pm A_j = 0$ . Since  $j$  is arbitrary, this shows that  $s \in \mathbf{S}_G$  if and only if  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ . Indeed, suppose that  $s^+ \alpha_j = 0$ . By Lemma 4.4,  $\text{sign}(v^+ A_j) = \text{sign}(s^+ \alpha_j) = 0$ , so  $v^+ A_j = 0$ . Conversely, if  $v^+ A_j = 0$  then  $s^+ \alpha_j = 0$ , for the same reason. Similarly,  $s^- \alpha_j = 0$  is equivalent to  $v^- A_j = 0$ .

Suppose now that  $s \in \mathbf{S}_G$  and  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ , and pick any  $j \in \{1, \dots, n_s\}$ . Assume that  $s^+ \alpha_j = 0$ . Since, by (34) and (25),  $s \alpha_j = -s^- \alpha_j$  and  $v A_j = -v^- A_j$ , we have, again by Lemma 4.4, that

$$\text{sign}(s \alpha_j) = -\text{sign}(s^- \alpha_j) = -\text{sign}(v^- A_j) = \text{sign}(v A_j).$$

If, instead,  $s^- \alpha_j = 0$  (and thus  $v^- A_j = 0$ ),

$$\text{sign}(s \alpha_j) = \text{sign}(s^+ \alpha_j) = \text{sign}(v^+ A_j) = \text{sign}(v A_j).$$

As  $j$  was arbitrary, and we proved that the  $j$ th coordinates of the two vectors in (36) are the same, the vectors must be the same. ■

**Corollary 4.6**  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0 = \Sigma_0$ .

*Proof.* Pick any element of  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ ,  $\tilde{\mu}_v = \text{sign}(vA^T)$ ,  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ . By Corollary 4.5,  $s = \text{sign } v \in \mathbf{S}_G$ . Moreover, also by Corollary 4.5,  $\tilde{\mu}_v = \text{sign}(s\alpha)$ , so we know that  $\tilde{\mu}_v \in \Sigma_0$ . Conversely, take an element  $\mu_s \in \Sigma_0$ . This means that  $\mu_s = \text{sign}(s\alpha)$  for some  $s \in \mathbf{S}_G \subseteq \mathbf{S} = \text{sign } \mathbf{V}$ . Let  $v \in \mathbf{V}$  be such that  $s = \text{sign } v$ . By Corollary 4.5,  $v \in \mathbf{V}_G$ , and also  $\mu_s = \text{sign}(vA^T)$ . By definition of  $\tilde{\Sigma}_0$ , this means that  $\mu_s \in \tilde{\Sigma}_0$ . ■

We can simplify the definition of  $\Sigma_0$  a bit further, by noticing that the finite subset  $\mathbf{S}$  can be in fact be generated using only *integer* vectors. The definition in (33) says that:

$$\mathbf{S} = \{ \text{sign}(\nu\Gamma) \mid \nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s} \} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}.$$

**Lemma 4.7**

$$\mathbf{S} = \{ \text{sign}(\nu\Gamma) \mid \nu \in \mathbb{Z}^{1 \times n_s} \} \subseteq \{-1, 0, 1\}^{1 \times n_s}.$$

*Proof.* Pick any  $s \in \mathbf{S}$ . Thus  $s = \text{sign } v$ , where  $v = \nu\Gamma$  for some  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times n_s}$ . Consider the set of indices of the coordinates of  $v$  that vanish (equivalently,  $s_i = 0$ ),  $I = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n_s\} \mid v_i = 0\}$ . Suppose that  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$ . Let  $e_i$  denote the canonical column vector  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$  with a “1” in the  $i$ th position and zeroes elsewhere, and introduce the  $n_s \times p$  matrix  $E_I = (e_{i_1}, e_{i_2}, \dots, e_{i_p})$ . The definition of  $I$  means that  $\nu\Gamma E_I = vE_I = 0$  and  $\nu\Gamma e_j = ve_j = v_j \neq 0$  for all  $j \notin I$ . The matrix  $D = \Gamma E_I$  has integer, and in particular rational, entries. Thus, the left nullspace of  $D$  has a rational basis, that is, there is a set of rational vectors  $\{u_1, \dots, u_q\}$ , where  $q$  is the dimension of this nullspace, such that  $u_i D = 0$  and  $u D = 0$  if and only if  $u$  is a linear combination of the  $u_i$ 's. In particular, since  $\nu D = 0$ , there are real numbers  $r_1, \dots, r_q$  such that  $\nu = \sum_i r_i u_i$ . Now pick sequences of rational numbers  $r_i^{(k)} \rightarrow r_i$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and define  $\nu^{(k)} := \sum_i r_i^{(k)} u_i$ . This sequence converges to  $\nu$ , and, being combinations of the  $u_i$ 's,  $\nu^{(k)} D = 0$  for all  $k$ . Let  $v^{(k)} := \nu^{(k)} \Gamma$ , so we have that  $v^{(k)} \rightarrow v$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $v^{(k)} E_I = 0$  for all  $k$ . On the other hand, for each  $j \notin I$ , as  $ve_j \neq 0$ , for all large enough  $k$ ,  $(v^{(k)})_j$ , the  $j$ th coordinate of  $v^{(k)}$ , has the same sign as  $v_j$ . In conclusion, for large enough  $k$ ,  $\text{sign } v^{(k)} = \text{sign } v = s$ . Multiplying the rational vector  $\nu^{(k)}$  by the least denominator of its coordinates, the sign does not change, but now we have an integer vector with the same sign. ■

## 5 Summary and implementations

Our procedure for finding signs  $\pi^\lambda$  of derivatives  $\xi^\lambda$  consists of the following steps:

1. Construct a subset  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ .
2. For each element  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , test the property  $(s^+ \alpha_j) \cdot (s^- \alpha_j) = 0$ , which defines  $\mathbf{S}_G$ . The  $s$ 's that pass this test are collected into a set  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , which is known to be a subset of  $\mathbf{S}_G$ .
3. Take the set of elements of the form  $\mu_s = \text{sign}(s\alpha)$ , for  $s$  in  $\mathcal{S}_G$ , and add to these the signs of the rows of the Jacobian  $g'$  of  $g$  (by assumption, these sign vectors are independent of  $x$ ). Let us call this set  $\mathcal{T}$ .
4. Now apply the sieve procedure, testing (15) over elements of  $\mathcal{T}$  (which is a subset of  $\Sigma_0$ ). The elements  $\pi$  that pass this test are reported as possible signs of derivatives of steady states with respect to the parameter  $\lambda$ , in the sense that they have not been eliminated when checking (15) over elements of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

5. If a unique (after eliminating 0 as well as one element of each pair  $\{\pi, -\pi\}$ ) solution remains, we stop. If there is more than one sign that passed all tests, and if  $\mathcal{S}$  was a proper subset of  $\mathbf{S}$ , we generate a larger set  $\mathcal{S}$ , and hence a potentially larger  $\mathcal{T}$ , and repeat the subsequent steps for the larger subset.
6. If multiple solutions exist, we may also add additional linear combinations of those coordinates of  $g$  that are linear functions, and enlarge  $g$  in that manner. (Without loss of generality, arguing in the same manner as for  $\mathbf{S}$ , we only need to add integer combinations.)

The first step, constructing  $\mathbf{S}$ , or a large subset  $\mathcal{S}$  of it, can be done in various ways. Since, by Lemma 4.7, we can generate  $\mathbf{S}$  using integer vectors, the elements of  $\mathbf{S}$  have the form  $\text{sign } v$  where we may assume, without loss of generality, that each entry of  $v = \nu\Gamma$  is either zero or, if nonzero, is either  $\geq 1$  or  $\leq -1$ . Thus, testing whether a sign vector  $s$  belongs to  $\mathbf{S}$  amounts to testing the feasibility of a linear program (LP): we need that  $\nu\Gamma e_i = 0$  for those indices  $i$  for which  $s_i = 0$ , that  $\nu\Gamma e_i \leq -1$  for those indices  $i$  for which  $s_i = -1$ , and that  $\nu\Gamma e_i \geq 1$  for those indices  $i$  for which  $s_i = 1$ . (These are closed, not strict, conditions, as needed for an LP formulation.) This means that one can check each of the  $3^n$  possible sign vectors efficiently.

One can combine the testing of LP feasibility with the search over the  $3^n$  possible sign vectors into a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) formulation, by means of the technique called in the MILP field a “big  $M$ ” approximation. This is a routine reduction: one first fixes a large positive number  $M$ , and then formulates the following inequalities:


$$\nu\Gamma e_i - ML_i + U_i \leq 0, \quad -\nu\Gamma e_i - MU_i + L_i \leq 0, \quad L_i + U_i \leq 1,$$

where the vector  $\nu$  is required to be real and the variables  $L_i, U_i$  binary ( $\{0, 1\}$ ). Given any solution, we have that  $-M \leq \nu\Gamma e_i \leq -1$  (so  $s = -1$ ) for those  $i$  for which  $(L_i, U_i) = (0, 1)$ ,  $1 \leq \nu\Gamma e_i \leq M$  (so  $s = 1$ ) for indices for which  $(L_i, U_i) = (1, 0)$ , and  $\nu\Gamma e_i = 0$  (i.e.,  $s_i = 0$ ) when  $(L_i, U_i) = (0, 0)$ . (This trick will miss any solutions for which  $\nu\Gamma e_i \leq -1$  but  $M$  was not taken large enough that  $-M \leq \nu\Gamma e_i$ , or  $\nu\Gamma e_i \geq 1$  but  $M$  was not taken large enough that  $\nu\Gamma e_i \leq M$ .) The resulting MILP can be solved using relaxation-based cutting plane methods, branch and bound approaches, or heuristics such as simulated annealing.

Often, however, simply testing sparse integer vectors in the integer-generating form in Lemma 4.7 works well. In practice, we find that starting with  $\nu = \pm e_i^T$  (canonical basis vectors and their negatives) and sums of pairs of such vectors, in addition to using the appropriate conservation laws, is typically enough to uniquely determine the sign vector  $\pi$  (up to all signs being reversed, and except for the trivial solution  $\pi = 0$ ), provided that steady states are uniquely determined from conservation laws.

## 6 Example

**Example 6.1** We consider the following reaction network:





Here  $E$  is a kinase that is constitutively activated and inactivated. Its active form drives a phosphorylation reaction in which a substrate,  $S$  is converted to an active form  $P$ , which can be dephosphorylated back into inactive form by a constitutively active phosphatase  $F$ . There are two intermediate enzyme-substrate complexes as well. Consider the following three conservation laws:

$$e_0 + e + c = e_T \tag{37}$$

$$f + d = f_T \tag{38}$$

and

$$s + c + p + d = s_T. \tag{39}$$

We may think of  $e_T$  as total amount of enzyme,  $f_T$  as total amount of phosphatase, and  $s_T$  as total amount of substrate. We will study what happens when each of these total amounts is varied while keeping the other two fixed. We are also interested in the total concentration of active kinase, free or bound,  $x = e + c$  and the total concentration of product, free or bound,  $y = p + d$ . In order to obtain this information, we add these variables and add “virtual” stoichiometric constraints  $p + d - y = 0$  and  $e_0 + x = e_T$  (from (37)) to constrain these variables.

The program returns this outputs:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ e_0 & e & s & c & d & f & p & x & y \end{array}$$

when perturbing only  $e_T$ ,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ e_0 & e & s & c & d & f & p & x & y \end{array}$$

when perturbing only  $f_T$ , and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ e_0 & e & s & c & d & f & p & x & y \end{array}$$

when perturbing only  $s_T$ .

□