

FUNDAMENTAL LIMITATIONS OF NETWORK RECONSTRUCTION

MARCO TULLIO ANGULO^{1,2}, JAIME A. MORENO³, ALBERT-LÁSZLÓ BARABÁSI^{1,4,5}, YANG-YU LIU^{2,4}

¹*Center for Complex Networks Research, Northeastern University, Boston MA 02115, USA*

²*Channing Division of Network Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, and Harvard Medical School, Boston MA 02115, USA*

³*Instituto de Ingeniería, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Distrito Federal 04510, México*

⁴*Center for Cancer Systems Biology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston MA 02115, USA*

⁵*Center for Network Science, Central European University, Budapest 1052, Hungary*

ABSTRACT. Network reconstruction helps us understand, diagnose and control complex networked systems by inferring properties of their interaction matrices, which characterize how nodes in the systems directly interact with each other. Despite a decade of extensive studies, network reconstruction remains an outstanding challenge. The fundamental limitations on which properties of the interaction matrix can be inferred from accessing the dynamics of individual nodes remain unknown. Here we characterize these fundamental limitations by deriving the necessary and sufficient condition to reconstruct any property of the interaction matrix. Counterintuitively, we prove that inferring less information — such as the sign/connectivity pattern or the degree sequence— does not make the network reconstruction problem easier than recovering the interaction matrix itself (i.e. the traditional parameter identification problem). Our analysis also reveals that using prior information of the interaction matrix —such as bound on the edge-weights— is the only way to circumvent these fundamental limitations of network reconstruction. This sheds light on designing new algorithms with practical improvements over parameter identification methods.

From engineering or chemistry to biology and medicine, networks are taking a central role in our understanding of complex systems [1–3]. Networks reveal the interconnection architecture of complex systems, and when they also serve as conduit to the system dynamics, the network’s properties affect the dynamic behavior of the associated system; examples include epidemic spreading [4, 5], synchronization phenomena [6, 7] and controllability [8, 9]. But in order to study any dynamical process on a network we must infer the properties of the underlying *interaction matrix* $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, which encodes the direct interactions between the n nodes of the network. Here, a_{ij} gives the strength of interaction (or link weight) of node j over node i —zero if the link ($j \rightarrow i$) is absent (i.e., node j does not directly affect node i), positive if the link is excitatory, and negative if the link is inhibitory. For many networked systems, measuring the dynamic behavior of individual nodes—proteins, genes or neurons, for example—is becoming easier. Yet, a systematic and accurate mapping of their interactions remains largely impossible. In fact, many networks in literature are still constructed from correlation or association matrices—obtained by statistical correlation analysis and temporal aggregation—which are fundamentally different because they cannot be readily used to understand, predict or control the system’s dynamics [10].

Network reconstruction (NR) aims to infer some property of the interaction matrix A of a networked system from accessing the dynamics of its nodes [10, 11]. If we want to infer A itself, then NR can be reduced to a *parameter identification* (PI) problem [12], as discussed below. But in many cases, instead of reconstructing A , we may want to reconstruct properties like its *sign pattern* $S = [s_{ij}] = [\text{sign}(a_{ij})] \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, *connectivity pattern* $C = [c_{ij}] = [|s_{ij}|] \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$, or *in-degree sequence* $\mathbf{d} = (d_i) = (\sum_j c_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Indeed, a key insight of Network Science is that many properties of networked systems—from stability, to structural controllability/observability or epidemic thresholds—can be determined by S , C or \mathbf{d} without knowing A [4–9, 13–15]. Furthermore, intuition suggests that it should be possible to solve NR under weaker conditions than PI, because the difficulty to infer some property of A should increase with the information it reveals. In other words, it should be easier to reconstruct S , C or \mathbf{d} than A itself, simply because we are recovering less information.

NR plays a central role in order to understand, diagnose and control diverse complex networked systems, allowing us—for example—to deepen our understanding of human diseases and ecological networks, or build more resilient power grids or wireless sensor networks [16–32]. Yet, despite a decade of extensive studies, NR remains an outstanding challenge [10, 11, 33]. Many existing algorithms do not perform significantly better than random guesses [11, 34], and even well-established methods can provide contradictory results for relatively simple networks [35]. In addition, it is often unclear if a NR algorithm fails due to its intrinsic design limitations, or due to limitations imposed by the available data, SI-2.1.

To our surprise, the fundamental limitations on what properties of the interaction matrix can be reconstructed from available data of the system remain unknown. It is thus unclear if NR actually

has advantages over PI, as our intuition suggests. Here we characterize these fundamental limitations of NR by deriving necessary and sufficient conditions to reconstruct *any* desired property of the interaction matrix A . In particular, we prove a rather counterintuitive result: trying to recover less information about A does not make NR easier. Consequently, NR cannot be solved under weaker conditions than classical parameter identification problem, and inferring S , C , or \mathbf{d} is as difficult as inferring A itself. This fundamental limitation in NR prompts us to reconsider using prior information for better NR [36]. We proved that using priori information of the interaction matrix is the only way to make the fundamental limit of NR weaker to that of PI. For example, with known bounds of the interaction strengths (link weights) we can reconstruct the connectivity pattern C even if we cannot reconstruct the interaction matrix A .

We consider the dynamics of a general deterministic networked system with pairwise interactions, described by a set of ordinary differential equations:

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} f_{ij}(x_i(t), x_j(t)) + u_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1)$$

Here $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ is the state variable of node i at time t , which is assumed to be known in a time interval $[t_0, t_1]$. The argument t is often omitted if clear from the context. The state variable x_i may represent the amount of traffic that passes through node i in a communication network, the biomolecule concentration in a biological network, or the species abundance in an ecological network, and so on. The continuous functions $f_{ij} : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ specify the intrinsic dynamics (when $i = j$), or the pairwise interactions between nodes (when $i \neq j$). The term $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}$ represents known signals or control inputs that can influence the state variable x_i . By appropriately choosing the functions f_{ij} , Eq.(1) can model a wide variety of networked systems, including power generation/distribution networks, gene/protein interactions, population dynamics, birth-death process, among others [37]. When these functions are unknown, they can be discovered using symbolic regression when the data is rich enough [38]. In the main text we consider systems with pairwise interaction only, but our results hold for more general systems, e.g. with arbitrary-order interactions or nonlinear parametrizations (SI-1.1).

The goal of NR is to recover some property \mathcal{P} of the interaction matrix A using the knowledge of $\{x_i(t), u_i(t)\}_{i=1}^n$ on a time interval $[t_0, t_1]$. A property $\mathcal{P}(A)$ can be reconstructed if and only if (iff) any two interaction matrices $A_1 \neq A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with different values of their properties $\mathcal{P}(A_1) \neq \mathcal{P}(A_2)$ produce different node trajectories, a notion of *distinguishability* or *identifiability* [39] extended to consider a given property, see Fig. 1. Otherwise, it is impossible to infer the property simply because we cannot decide if a network with property $\mathcal{P}(A_1)$ or with property $\mathcal{P}(A_2)$ produced the observed node trajectories.

To study the network distinguishability, we define the *interconnection vector* of node i as $\mathbf{a}_i = (a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which is just the transpose of A 's i -th row, characterizing how node i is affected by the rest of the network. We also define the *regressor vector* $\mathbf{f}_i(t) = (f_{i1}(x_i(t), x_1(t)), \dots,$




FIGURE 1. **Networks producing the same node trajectories are indistinguishable.** Two drastically different networks shown in the left —representing two different interspecific interaction matrices— produce identical node trajectories $x(t)$ under the generalized Lotka-Volterra (GLV) model, despite they have different edge-weights, sign-pattern, connectivity and degree sequence. It is impossible to reconstruct any of these properties of the network, simply because we cannot decide which one of the two networks produced the observed node trajectories. Here the node dynamics is given by the GLV model $\dot{x}_i = r_i x_i + \sum_j a_{ij} x_i x_j$ that has the form (1) taking $f_{ij} = x_i x_j$ and $u_i(t) = r_i x_i(t)$, with r_i a known species growth rate. See Fig.S2 for additional details.

$f_{in}(x_i(t), x_n(t))^\top$ of node i . Then (1) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = \mathbf{f}_i^\top(t) \mathbf{a}_i + u_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2)$$

Choosing two candidate interconnection vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for node i , they will be *indistinguishable* in the time interval $[t_0, t_1]$ if they produce the same node trajectories $\{x_i(t)\}_{i=1}^n$ with $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, or equivalently, if they satisfy $\mathbf{f}_i^\top(t) \mathbf{v}_1 + u_i(t) = \mathbf{f}_i^\top(t) \mathbf{v}_2 + u_i(t), \forall t \in [t_0, t_1]$. This yields $\mathbf{f}_i^\top(t) (\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) = 0, \forall t \in [t_0, t_1]$. Multiplying this equation by $\mathbf{f}_i(t)$ from the left and integrating over the time interval $[t_0, t_1]$, we have

$$M_i(t_0, t_1) (\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) = \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}, \quad (3)$$

where $M_i(t_0, t_1) = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \mathbf{f}_i(t) \mathbf{f}_i^\top(t) dt$ is a constant $n \times n$ matrix. In the rest of the paper we write M_i instead of $M_i(t_0, t_1)$, unless the specific time interval is important for the discussion. From (3), the set of all pairs of indistinguishable interconnection vectors for node i is given by

$$\left\{ (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \mid (\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \in \ker M_i \right\}.$$

In other words, \mathbf{v}_1 is indistinguishable from \mathbf{v}_2 if the line (or more generally, hyperplane) passing through them is parallel to the kernel of M_i , or equivalently, if this line is a *fiber* of the quotient space $\mathbb{R}^n / \ker M_i$ (see Fig. 2).

Now let $\mathcal{P} : \mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ be the property of the interconnection vector we want to reconstruct, where \mathbb{V} is its domain and \mathbb{Y} its image. For example, $\mathbb{Y} = \{-1, 0, 1\}^n$ if \mathcal{P} is the sign pattern, or $\mathbb{Y} = \{0, 1\}^n$ if \mathcal{P} is the connectivity pattern. The domain \mathbb{V} becomes smaller than \mathbb{R}^n when we use




FIGURE 2. Distinguishability of a property of the interconnection vector. In this toy example, it is impossible to distinguish if $\mathcal{P}(a_i) = y_1, y_2$ or y_3 because the sets P_{y_1}, P_{y_2} and P_{y_3} are ‘joined’ by a fiber parallel to $\ker M_i$ (shown in red) and thus are indistinguishable. Indeed, the vectors v_1 and v_2 are indistinguishable (because $(v_1 - v_2) \in \ker M_i$) and their properties have different values $y_1 = \mathcal{P}(v_1) \neq \mathcal{P}(v_2) = y_2$. In contrast, it is possible to distinguish if $\mathcal{P}(a_i) = y_4$ or not, because P_{y_4} can be separated from the sets P_{y_1}, P_{y_2} and P_{y_3} by the blue fiber. Indeed, under this condition, there cannot be a vector $v_4 \in P_{y_4}$ that is indistinguishable from a vector $v \in P_{y_1} \cup P_{y_2} \cup P_{y_3}$.

prior information to discard some interconnection vectors. The property \mathcal{P} can be reconstructed iff any two interconnection vectors $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{V}$ that have different properties $y_1 = \mathcal{P}(v_1) \neq \mathcal{P}(v_2) = y_2$ are distinguishable, i.e. $(v_1 - v_2) \notin \ker M_i$. Denote $P_y = \mathcal{P}^{-1}(y) = \{v \in \mathbb{V} | \mathcal{P}(v) = y\}$ as the set of all interconnection vectors $v \in \mathbb{V}$ that satisfy $\mathcal{P}(v) = y$. Since the indistinguishable vectors are ‘joined’ by a fiber parallel to $\ker M_i$, vectors $v_1 \in P_{y_1}$ are indistinguishable to those $v_2 \in P_{y_2}$ iff there exists a fiber that intersects the two sets P_{y_1} and P_{y_2} . Equivalently, P_{y_1} is distinguishable from P_{y_2} iff they can be separated with a fiber. Therefore, the property $\mathcal{P}(a_i)$ can be reconstructed iff all two sets in the collection $\mathcal{C} = \{P_y \subseteq \mathbb{V} | y \in \mathbb{Y}\}$ can be separated by a fiber parallel to $\ker M_i$, see Fig.2.

Now we specialize the result above to some commonly used properties of the interaction matrix, in the case of no prior information $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{R}^n$. First consider reconstructing the interaction matrix A itself, that is $\mathcal{P} = \text{Identity}$ implying that $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{V}$. Therefore, the necessary and sufficient condition to reconstruct A is to distinguish between any two different interconnection vectors in \mathbb{V} . This is possible iff

$$\ker M_i = \{\mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}\}, \quad (4)$$

which guarantees that any interconnection vector $v \in \mathbb{V}$ is indistinguishable only from itself. In system identification literature, condition (4) is known as *Persistent Excitation* (PE), Ref. [40]. Hence, the necessary and sufficient condition for reconstructing the interaction matrix A is that the regressor vector of each node $f_i(t)$ satisfies the PE condition (4).

Then, a fundamental question naturally arises: Is PE also *necessary* to reconstruct the sign pattern S , the connectivity pattern C , or the degree sequence d ? We approach this question as follows. For $\mathcal{P} = \text{sign}$, the collection \mathcal{C} has $|\{-1, 0, 1\}^n| = 3^n$ different sets, and we need to distinguish between all of them by using separating hyperplanes. Then, in particular, we will need to separate three sets: two orthants $P_+, P_- \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ associated with ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ sign patterns, and one hyperplane P_0 associated to ‘zero’ sign pattern, by an hyperplane parallel to $\ker M_i$ (see Fig.3a). But there is no gap between an orthant and P_0 and thus it is impossible to separate them with *any* hyperplane. Therefore, it is necessary again that $\ker M_i$ is the single point $\{\mathbf{0}_{n \times 1}\}$, proving that PE is also necessary to reconstruct the sign pattern S . A similar argument can be used to prove that PE is also necessary to reconstruct the connectivity pattern, because we will need to separate the hyperplane P_0 from the union of the two orthants $P_+ \cup P_-$ which is of course also impossible.

What if we give up reconstructing the topological information of the interaction matrix and only reconstruct some local structure, such as the in-degree of each node? Note that if the sign pattern cannot be reconstructed, then there exists two interconnection vectors v_1, v_2 in ‘opposite’ sides of at least one orthant that are indistinguishable (see Fig.3a). Any other vector which ends in the fiber between v_1 and v_2 is also indistinguishable. Because this fiber goes from the positive to the negative portion of at least one orthant, it necessarily crosses zero at some point (red line in Fig.3a), and let v_0 be this vector. Note that the in-degree of v_0 is different from the in-degree of v_1 or v_2 , but all three interconnection vectors are indistinguishable. Therefore, PE is also necessary to reconstruct the in-degree of each node in the network.

The analysis above illustrates that the PE condition cannot be relaxed by trying to recover less details about the interaction matrix A . The reason behind this is that no ‘gap’ can be created between the sets P_y in \mathcal{C} when we change the property \mathcal{P} from Identity to any other properties we may want to reconstruct—thus *no* hyperplane can separate the sets P_y . Note that this phenomenon is not restricted to those specific properties \mathcal{P} discussed above, but applies to any other property that maps infinitesimally close interconnection vectors (close in \mathbb{R}^n) to different values of y . For example, it also applies to the ‘causality graph’ of the system, which defines ‘ j causes i ’ if there is a directed path from j to i in the network structure encoded in the interaction matrix A .

Taken together, recovering any property of A is not easier than reconstructing A itself. This fundamental limitation of NR prompted us to study any practical improvement we can make. In what follows we show that knowing prior information about the interaction matrix A can shrink the domain \mathbb{V} of a property \mathcal{P} , create gaps between the sets P_y in \mathcal{C} and hence relax the PE condition. Only when these gaps emerge can our initial intuition be correct: recovering less information about A makes NR easier, because the number of sets in \mathcal{C} decreases. When prior information combines appropriately with the data of the system, in the sense that the separating fibers fit in the gaps created by prior information, then it is possible to reconstruct a property of A —such as connectivity or sign pattern—even if we cannot reconstruct A itself (i.e., even if the PI problem cannot be solved).




FIGURE 3. Prior information makes NR easier. **a.** The two interconnections $v_1, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are indistinguishable since $(v_1 - v_2) \in \ker M_i$. In other words, they are indistinguishable since the line connecting them (shown in red) is parallel to $\ker M_i$, and it is a fiber of $\mathbb{R}^n / \ker M_i$. It is impossible to find a hyperplane separating $P_+ = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n | v_1 > 0 \text{ and } v_n > 0\}$ from $P_0 = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n | v_1 > 0 \text{ and } v_n = 0\}$, or P_+ from $P_- = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^n | v_1 > 0 \text{ and } v_n < 0\}$, or $P_+ \cup P_-$ from P_0 . Therefore, it is necessary that $\ker M_i$ is the trivial vector $\mathbf{0}_n$, which is the PE condition, in order to distinguish either the sign pattern or connectivity pattern of the interconnection vector. **b.** When the link weights a_{ij} take a finite-number of values, the set \mathbb{V} is discrete (shown in grey). Then distinguishability of the link weights is generic, since it is true with probability one that only one element of \mathbb{V} (grey points) lies in each fiber of $\mathbb{R}^n / \ker M_i$ (shown in blue). **c.** Example for the sets P_y (shown in grey) in the case of known bounds of the link weight (6). Despite the link weights can not be distinguished, the sign-pattern (and connectivity) can be distinguished since there exist hyperplanes parallel to $\ker M_i$ (shown in blue) separating every P_y .

The simplest prior information of A is that the interconnection vectors satisfy:

$$\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{V}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbb{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is a known set. Two typical cases are: (i) a_{ij} takes a finite number of values (e.g. binary signed interactions $a_{ij} \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$) implying that $\mathbb{V} = \cup_y P_y$ is a discrete set since each P_y is a point, Fig.3b; and (ii) a_{ij} are bounded as

$$a_{ij} \in [-a_{\max}, -a_{\min}] \cup [-\epsilon, \epsilon] \cup [a_{\min}, a_{\max}] \quad (6)$$

for some known constants $0 \leq \epsilon < a_{\min} < a_{\max}$. In this case $\mathbb{V} = \cup_y P_y$, where P_0 is an ϵ neighborhood of zero (which can be associated to ‘zero’ sign-pattern), and each of the $3^n - 1$ remaining sets lies in a different orthant \mathbb{R}^n (and thus be associated to distinct sign patterns), see Fig.3c. Other existing NR algorithms use ‘simplicity’ (e.g. network sparsity) as prior information of the interaction matrix A , Refs. [32, 41]. This prior is useful to recover A without PE, but in contrast to (6), it is impossible to test algorithmically if it makes the NR problem solvable or not (SI-1.4).

In case (i), A itself can be reconstructed without PE if we can separate each point composing \mathbb{V} with a fiber parallel to $\ker M_i$. This will be possible under generic conditions, in the sense that the

probability that a hyperplane with random orientation contains two given points of \mathbb{V} is zero. In case (ii), the sign or connectivity pattern can be reconstructed without PE if there is a gap between the sets P_y such that a parallel fiber can separate them, Fig.3c. If this gap increases ($a_{\min} - \epsilon$ increases and $a_{\max} - a_{\min}$ decreases), it becomes easier for the fibers to fit. Note that since the sets P_y are polyhedral, it is numerically efficient to decide if a fiber exists or not (SI-2.3). Yet, the interaction matrix A itself cannot be reconstructed because it is impossible to separate two points inside one P_y . Indeed, the link weights cannot be estimated with an error lower than $\max\{a_{\max} - a_{\min}, \epsilon\}$.

Our analysis of fundamental limitations of network reconstruction points out the use of prior information as the only way to make practical improvements in network reconstruction. This, in turn, calls for the design of new algorithms (SI-2.2) that *best* incorporate diverse prior information of the underlying network, and that provide a guarantee of correct network reconstruction.

Author contributions: M.T.A. and Y.-Y. L. conceived the project. All authors did the research. M.T.A. and J.A.M. did the theoretical analysis. M.T.A. and Y.-Y. L. wrote the manuscript. J.A.M. and A.L.B. edited the manuscript.

Author information: Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Y.-Y.L. (yyl@channing.harvard.edu).

Acknowledgements: This work was supported by the CONACyT postdoctoral grant 207609; Army Research Laboratories (ARL) Network Science (NS) Collaborative Technology Alliance (CTA) grant: ARL NS-CTA W911NF-09-2- 0053; DARPA Social Media in Strategic Communications project under agreement number W911NF-12-C-002; the John Templeton Foundation: Mathematical and Physical Sciences grant no. PFI-777; and the European Union grant no. FP7 317532 (MULTIPLEX).

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, “Statistical mechanics of complex networks,” *Reviews of modern physics*, vol. 74, no. 1, p. 47, 2002.
- [2] M. E. Newman, “The structure and function of complex networks,” *SIAM review*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 167–256, 2003.
- [3] S. N. Dorogovtsev, A. V. Goltsev, and J. F. F. Mendes, “Critical phenomena in complex networks,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 80, no. 4, p. 1275, 2008.
- [4] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, “Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 86, pp. 3200–3203, 2001.
- [5] R. Cohen, K. Erez, D. ben Avraham, and S. Havlin, “Resilience of the internet to random breakdowns,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 85, pp. 4626–4628, Nov 2000.
- [6] T. Nishikawa, A. E. Motter, Y.-C. Lai, and F. C. Hoppensteadt, “Heterogeneity in oscillator networks: Are smaller worlds easier to synchronize?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 91, p. 014101, Jul

2003.

- [7] W. Wang and J.-J. Slotine, “On partial contraction analysis for coupled nonlinear oscillators,” *Biological Cybernetics*, vol. 92, pp. 38–53, Jan 2005.
- [8] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási, “Controllability of complex networks,” *Nature*, vol. 473, no. 7346, pp. 167–173, 2011.
- [9] J. Ruths and D. Ruths, “Control profiles of complex networks,” *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, vol. 343, pp. 1373–6, 2014.
- [10] M. Timme and J. Casadiego, “Revealing networks from dynamics: an introduction,” *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, vol. 47, no. 34, p. 343001, 2014.
- [11] A. F. Villaverde and J. R. Banga, “Reverse engineering and identification in systems biology: strategies, perspectives and challenges,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, vol. 11, no. 91, p. 20130505, 2014.
- [12] L. Ljung, *System identification*. Springer, 1998.
- [13] M. Feinberg, “The existence and uniqueness of steady states for a class of chemical reaction networks,” *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 132, no. 4, pp. 311–370, 1995.
- [14] G. Shinar and M. Feinberg, “Structural sources of robustness in biochemical reaction networks,” *Science*, vol. 327, no. 5971, pp. 1389–1391, 2010.
- [15] Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási, “Observability of complex systems,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 110, no. 7, pp. 2460–2465, 2013.
- [16] R. Kinney, P. Crucitti, R. Albert, and V. Latora, “Modeling cascading failures in the north american power grid,” *The European Physical Journal B-Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 101–107, 2005.
- [17] S. Arianos, E. Bompard, A. Carbone, and F. Xue, “Power grid vulnerability: A complex network approach,” *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 013119, 2009.
- [18] A. Pinar, J. Meza, V. Donde, and B. Lesieutre, “Optimization strategies for the vulnerability analysis of the electric power grid,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1786–1810, 2010.
- [19] W. Wang and B. Bhargava, “Visualization of wormholes in sensor networks,” in *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM workshop on Wireless security*, pp. 51–60, ACM, 2004.
- [20] S. Laxman, B. Shadid, P. Sastry, and K. Unnikrishnan, “Temporal data mining for root-cause analysis of machine faults in automotive assembly lines,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0904.4608*, 2009.
- [21] M. Lenzen, “Structural path analysis of ecosystem networks,” *Ecological Modelling*, vol. 200, no. 3, pp. 334–342, 2007.
- [22] G. Sugihara, R. May, H. Ye, C.-h. Hsieh, E. Deyle, M. Fogarty, and S. Munch, “Detecting causality in complex ecosystems,” *science*, vol. 338, no. 6106, pp. 496–500, 2012.

- [23] J. Heymans, R. Ulanowicz, and C. Bondavalli, “Network analysis of the south florida everglades graminoid marshes and comparison with nearby cypress ecosystems,” *Ecological Modelling*, vol. 149, no. 1, pp. 5–23, 2002.
- [24] M. S. Carro, W. K. Lim, M. J. Alvarez, R. J. Bollo, X. Zhao, E. Y. Snyder, E. P. Sulman, S. L. Anne, F. Doetsch, H. Colman, *et al.*, “The transcriptional network for mesenchymal transformation of brain tumours,” *Nature*, vol. 463, no. 7279, pp. 318–325, 2009.
- [25] A. A. Margolin, I. Nemenman, K. Basso, C. Wiggins, G. Stolovitzky, R. D. Favera, and A. Califano, “Aracne: an algorithm for the reconstruction of gene regulatory networks in a mammalian cellular context,” *BMC bioinformatics*, vol. 7, no. Suppl 1, p. S7, 2006.
- [26] X. Wang, N. Gulbahce, and H. Yu, “Network-based methods for human disease gene prediction,” *Briefings in functional genomics*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 280–293, 2011.
- [27] G. Ciriello, E. Cerami, C. Sander, and N. Schultz, “Mutual exclusivity analysis identifies oncogenic network modules,” *Genome research*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 398–406, 2012.
- [28] K.-C. Chou, “Applications of graph theory to enzyme kinetics and protein folding kinetics: Steady and non-steady-state systems,” *Biophysical chemistry*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 1–24, 1990.
- [29] I. W. Althaus, J. J. Chou, A. J. Gonzales, M. R. Deibel, K. C. Chou, F. J. Kezdy, D. L. Romero, J. R. Palmer, and R. C. Thomas, “Kinetic studies with the non-nucleoside hiv-1 reverse transcriptase inhibitor u-88204e,” *Biochemistry*, vol. 32, no. 26, pp. 6548–6554, 1993.
- [30] S. Bazzani, “Promise and reality in the expanding field of network interaction analysis: Metabolic networks,” *Bioinformatics and biology insights*, vol. 8, p. 83, 2014.
- [31] M. J. Keeling and K. T. Eames, “Networks and epidemic models,” *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 295–307, 2005.
- [32] Z. Shen, W.-X. Wang, Y. Fan, Z. Di, and Y.-C. Lai, “Reconstructing propagation networks with natural diversity and identifying hidden sources,” *Nature communications*, vol. 5, 2014.
- [33] M. Filosi, R. Visintainer, S. Riccadonna, G. Jurman, and C. Furlanello, “Stability indicators in network reconstruction,” *PloS one*, vol. 9, no. 2, p. e89815, 2014.
- [34] R. J. Prill, D. Marbach, J. Saez-Rodriguez, P. K. Sorger, L. G. Alexopoulos, X. Xue, N. D. Clarke, G. Altan-Bonnet, and G. Stolovitzky, “Towards a rigorous assessment of systems biology models: the dream3 challenges,” *PloS one*, vol. 5, no. 2, p. e9202, 2010.
- [35] S. Prabakaran, J. Gunawardena, and E. Sontag, “Paradoxical results in perturbation-based signaling network reconstruction,” *Biophysical journal*, vol. 106, no. 12, pp. 2720–2728, 2014.
- [36] A. F. Villaverde, J. Ross, F. Morán, and J. R. Banga, “Mider: network inference with mutual information distance and entropy reduction,” *PloS one*, vol. 9, no. 5, p. e96732, 2014.
- [37] B. Barzel and A.-L. Barabási, “Universality in network dynamics,” *Nature physics*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 673–681, 2013.
- [38] J. Bongard and H. Lipson, “Automated reverse engineering of nonlinear dynamical systems,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 104, no. 24, pp. 9943–9948, 2007.

- [39] E. Walter and L. Pronzato, "Identification of parametric models," *Communications and Control Engineering*, 1997.
- [40] K. S. Narendra and A. M. Annaswamy, *Stable adaptive systems*. Courier Dover Publications, 2012.
- [41] R. Bonneau, D. J. Reiss, P. Shannon, M. Facciotti, L. Hood, N. S. Baliga, and V. Thorsson, "The inferelator: an algorithm for learning parsimonious regulatory networks from systems-biology data sets de novo," *Genome biology*, vol. 7, no. 5, p. R36, 2006.