

Negative local feedbacks in Boolean networks

Paul Ruet

CNRS, Laboratoire Preuves, Programmes et Systèmes
 Université Paris Diderot - Paris 7, Case 7014
 75205 Paris Cedex 13, France

`ruet@pps.univ-paris-diderot.fr`

November 24, 2018

Abstract

We study the relationships between negative local cycles and asymptotic dynamical properties of Boolean networks. The two main results are the following: we show that and-nets without local negative cycle may have no fixed point, and that Boolean networks without local negative cycle may have antipodal attractive cycles.

1 Introduction

A Boolean network is a map f from \mathbb{F}_2^n to itself, where n is a positive integer and \mathbb{F}_2 is the two-element field. We view f as representing the dynamics of n interacting components which can take two values, 0 and 1: at a state $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, the degrees of freedom of x are the integers $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $f_i(x) \neq x_i$. Several dynamical systems can therefore be associated to f , depending on the choice of update scheme. In the synchronous dynamics [6, 2], all degrees of freedom are updated simultaneously (it is simply the iteration of f), while in the (nondeterministic) asynchronous dynamics [20], one degree of freedom is updated at a time, if any. Other dynamics are considered in the literature (e.g. random [5]), as well as comparisons between update schemes [4].

Boolean networks have plenty of applications. In particular, they have been extensively used as discrete models of various biological networks, since the early works of McCulloch and Pitts [7], S. Kauffman [5] and R. Thomas [18].

To a Boolean network f , it is possible to associate, for each state x , a signed directed graph $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ representing local influences between components $1, \dots, n$ and defined in a way similar to Jacobian matrices for differentiable maps. Local feedbacks, *i.e.* cycles in these local interaction graphs $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$, have an impact on fixed points of f : for instance, Boolean networks with no local cycle have a unique fixed point [16], and networks with no local positive cycle (the sign being the product of the signs of edges) have at most one fixed point [11]. This suggests that the absence of local negative cycle might be related to the existence of fixed points. On the other hand, the above statement on positive cycles is a local version of a rule relating positive cycles to multistationarity, proposed in [19, 21] by the biologist R. Thomas, who also proposed a rule on negative cycles and sustained oscillations. These dynamical properties make sense in particular in the field of gene regulatory networks, where multistationarity corresponds to cellular differentiation, and sustained oscillations to a form of homeostasis.

We shall be essentially interested here in relationships between local negative cycles and asymptotic properties of the synchronous and asynchronous dynamics: fixed points and more generally several kinds of attractors. It is known that if f has an attractive cycle (an asynchronous cycle which cannot be escaped), or more generally a cyclic attractor, then the global interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ obtained by taking the union of the local graphs $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ must have a negative cycle [11, 12]. Some partial results are also known for local negative cycles of Boolean networks [13, 14, 15]. In the more general discrete case (with more than two values), [12] shows that a network with no local negative cycle may have an attractive cycle.

This paper contains two main results. We first prove that Boolean networks without local negative cycle may have no fixed point (Theorem 2 in Section 6), thus a cyclic attractor in the asynchronous dynamics. We actually show that this result holds even for the subclass of and-nets, for which all dependencies are conjunctions. We then prove that Boolean networks without local negative cycle may have (antipodal) attractive cycles (Theorem 4 in Section 7). The proofs rely on essentially three ingredients: a trick for delocalizing cycles in and-nets (Lemma 3), some results about reductions and expansions of networks (Section 3) and equivariance under isometries of \mathbb{F}_2^n (Section 4). Let us remark that the metric structure of \mathbb{F}_2^n was the main ingredient for unsigned cycles and positive cycles too (see [15]), though the proofs were apparently very different.

Section 5 also includes remarks on non-expansive Boolean networks, hoopings and invertible Jacobian matrices, and Section 6.4 mentions a consequence for kernels in graph theory (Theorem 3).




Figure 1: A map $f : \mathbb{F}_2^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^3$ and the asynchronous dynamics $\Gamma(f)$ associated to it.

2 Basic definitions

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the canonical basis of the vector space \mathbb{F}_2^n , and for each subset I of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, let $e_I = \sum_{i \in I} e_i$, where the sum is the sum of the field \mathbb{F}_2 . We may remove some brackets and write $e_{1,2}$ for $e_{\{1,2\}}$ for instance. For $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, $v(x, y)$ denotes the subset $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $x + y = e_I$, and the Hamming distance $d(x, y)$ is the cardinality of $v(x, y)$.

2.1 Boolean networks

A Boolean network is a map $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$. To such a map, it is possible to associate several dynamics, in particular the *synchronous dynamics* which is simply the iteration of f , and the *asynchronous* one, which is an orientation $\Gamma(f)$ of the Boolean cube \mathbb{F}_2^n , *i.e.* a directed graph with vertex set \mathbb{F}_2^n and an edge from x to y when for some i , $y = x + e_i$ and $f_i(x) \neq x_i$. The asynchronous dynamics, illustrated in Figure 1, is therefore a nondeterministic dynamics in which at most one variable is updated at a time. The coordinates i such that $f_i(x) \neq x_i$ may naturally be viewed as the *degrees of freedom* of x .

It is easily seen that f can be recovered from $\Gamma(f)$: $f(x) = x + e_I$, where $\{(x, x + e_i), i \in I\}$ is the set of edges leaving x in $\Gamma(f)$.

We shall be essentially interested in asymptotic dynamical properties. Both dynamics agree on fixed points. On the other hand, a *trajectory* will be a path in the asynchronous dynamics $\Gamma(f)$, and an *attractor* a terminal strongly connected component of $\Gamma(f)$. An attractor which is not a singleton (*i.e.* which does not consist in a fixed point) is called a *cyclic attractor*. In particular, a network with no fixed point must have at least one cyclic attractor. In the case of the fixed-point-free network f of Figure 1, the unique cyclic attractor consists in the subgraph of $\Gamma(f)$ induced by $\mathbb{F}_2^3 \setminus \{(1, 1, 1)\}$.

A network f is *weakly terminating* when for any $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, some trajectory leaving x leads to a fixed point: therefore f has a cyclic attractor if and only if it is not weakly terminating.

Attractive cycles, i.e., cyclic trajectories θ such that for each point $x \in \theta$, $d(x, f(x)) = 1$, are examples of cyclic attractors. Observe that attractive cycles are deterministic, since any point in θ has a unique degree of freedom, hence they can also be defined as cycles of the synchronous dynamics in which exactly one variable is updated at a time.

The *antipode* of $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is $\bar{x} = x + e_{1,\dots,n}$. *Antipodal* attractive cycles are those obtained from the attractive cycle

$$\begin{aligned} & (0, e_1, e_{1,2}, \dots, e_{1,\dots,n-1}, e_{1,\dots,n}, e_{2,\dots,n}, \dots, e_n, 0) \\ & = (0, e_1, e_{1,2}, \dots, e_{1,\dots,n-1}, \bar{0}, \bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_{1,2}, \dots, \bar{e}_{1,\dots,n-1}, 0) \end{aligned}$$

by translations and permutations of coordinates.

2.2 Interaction graphs

As the network terminology suggests, a Boolean network $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ induces directed graphs which represent interactions between its variables x_1, \dots, x_n .

Given $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the *discrete i^{th} partial derivative* $\partial\varphi/\partial x_i = \partial_i\varphi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ maps each $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ to

$$\partial_i\varphi(x) = \varphi(x) + \varphi(x + e_i),$$

where the $+$ here is again the addition of the field \mathbb{F}_2 , so that $\partial_i\varphi(x) = 1$ if and only if $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi(x + e_i)$. In that case, the influence of variable x_i on φ at x is either covariant when the map

$$\mathbb{F}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2, \alpha \mapsto \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, \alpha, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

is increasing, or contravariant when it is decreasing. Given $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$, the *discrete Jacobian matrix* $\mathcal{J}(f)(x)$ is the $n \times n$ matrix with entries $\mathcal{J}(f)(x)_{i,j} = \partial_j f_i(x)$.

A *signed directed graph* is a directed graph with a sign, $+1$ or -1 , attached to each edge, and the *sign* of a cycle (or more generally the sign of a path) is defined to be the product of the signs of its edges. The *interaction graph of f at x* , is defined [11] to be the signed directed graph $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ on vertex set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ which has an edge from j to i when $\mathcal{J}(f)(x)_{i,j} = 1$, with positive (resp. negative) sign when the influence of x_j on f_i is covariant (resp. contravariant). It is straightforward to verify that the condition for an edge to be positive is equivalent to:

$$x_j = f_i(x).$$

The *global interaction graph* $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has the same vertices, and a positive (resp. negative) edge from j to i when for some x , $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has. A cycle, or more generally a path, of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ is said to be *local* when it lies in $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ for some x .

2.3 Subcubes and subnetworks

Given $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, the subset $x[I]$ consists of all points y such that $y_i = x_i$ for each $i \notin I$; subsets of the form $x[I]$ are called *I-subcubes*, or simply *subcubes* of \mathbb{F}_2^n . They are examples of affine subspaces. If $y = x + e_I$, the subcube $x[I]$ is also denoted by $[x, y]$.

For any subcube κ , let $\pi_\kappa : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \kappa$ be the projection onto κ , defined as follows: if $\kappa = x[I]$,

$$(\pi_\kappa(y))_i = \begin{cases} y_i & \text{if } i \in I \\ x_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $\iota_\kappa : \kappa \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the inclusion map, so that $\pi_\kappa \circ \iota_\kappa$ is the identity. For any $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$, let

$$f \upharpoonright_\kappa = \pi_\kappa \circ f \circ \iota_\kappa : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa.$$

A *subnetwork* of f is a map $f \upharpoonright_\kappa$ for some subcube κ . The asynchronous dynamics $\Gamma(f \upharpoonright_\kappa)$ is easily shown to be the subgraph of $\Gamma(f)$ induced by vertices in κ , a characterization which may be taken as an alternative, more intuitive, definition of subnetworks. Moreover, if κ is an *I*-subcube and $x \in \kappa$, $\mathcal{G}(f \upharpoonright_\kappa)(x)$ is the signed subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(f)(\iota_\kappa(x))$ induced by *I*.

2.4 And-nets

In Section 6, we shall be interested in a class of Boolean networks called and-nets. A map $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is called an *and-net* when for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, f_i is a product of literals, i.e., there exist disjoint subsets P_i and N_i of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that

$$f_i(x) = \prod_{j \in P_i} x_j \prod_{j \in N_i} (x_j + 1),$$

with the convention that the empty product is 1. Indices in P_i (resp. in N_i) are called the positive (resp. negative) *inputs* of f_i : they are indeed the vertices j of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ such that (j, i) is a positive (resp. negative) edge of $\mathcal{G}(f)$.

The network of Figure 1 is an example of and-net. As explained in [14], in the case of and-nets, the global interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ actually determines f (a statement which obviously does not hold for arbitrary Boolean networks):




Figure 2: External or internal delocalizing triple of a cycle in a signed directed graph. Usual arrows denote positive edges, while arrows ending with a $-$ denote negative edges.

given a signed directed graph G which is *simple* (*i.e.* without parallel edges), define the and-net f by

$$f_i(x) = \prod_{(j,i) \in E^+(G)} x_j \prod_{(j,i) \in E^-(G)} (x_j + 1),$$

where $E^+(G)$ (resp. $E^-(G)$) denotes the set of positive (resp. negative) edges of G . Then f is the unique and-net such that $\mathcal{G}(f) = G$.

Proposition 1, which is proved in [14], shows that, for an and-net f , locality of a cycle C of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ can be expressed as the absence of certain specific subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ called delocalizing triples, the definition of which we recall now. Given a simple signed directed graph G and a cycle C of G , a triple $(i, j, k) \in \{1, \dots, n\}^3$ is said to be a *delocalizing triple* of C when j, k are distinct vertices of C and $(i, j), (i, k)$ are two edges of G that are

- not edges of C ,
- and of different signs.

A delocalizing triple (i, j, k) of C is said to be *internal* when i is a vertex of C , *external* otherwise. See Figure 2.

Proposition 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be an and-net. Given a cycle C of $\mathcal{G}(f)$, C is local of and only if it has no delocalizing triple [14].*

3 Reduction and expansion

We adapt the definition of [8] to our notation.

If $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is a Boolean network whose global interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no *loop* on n (no edge (n, n)), it is possible to define a *reduced* Boolean network $f' : \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1}$ by substitution:

$$f'(x) = f(x, f_n(x, 0)) = f(x, f_n(x, 1))$$

for each $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1}$, because the hypothesis on $\mathcal{G}(f)$ entails $f_n(x, 0) + f_n(x, 1) = \partial_n f(x, 0) = \partial_n f(x, 1) = 0$. We shall therefore write $f'(x) = f(x, f_n(x, -))$. If f reduces to f' , we shall also say that f is *expanded* from f' . For any $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1}$, let

$$x' = (x, f_n(x, -)) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n,$$

so that $f'(x) = f(x')$. If $\pi : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1}$ is the projection, then clearly, $\pi(x') = x$.

In the above definition, for simplicity, we have considered only reductions obtained by substituting variable x_n , but reductions over any variable x_i is obviously possible and will be considered later in the paper.

Proposition 2. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a Boolean network whose global interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no loop on n .*

1. *Fixed points are preserved by reduction and expansion: x is a fixed point of f' if and only if x' is a fixed point of f [8].*
2. *Attractive cycles are preserved by reduction: π maps attractive cycles of f to attractive cycles of f' [8].*

Notice that attractive cycles are not preserved by expansion: for instance, $f : \mathbb{F}_2^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^3$ defined by $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_2 + 1, x_1, x_1 + x_2)$ has no attractive cycle, but reduces to $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_2 + 1, x_1)$ which clearly has one. It is also observed in [8] that arbitrary cyclic attractors are not generally preserved by reduction. It is not difficult to show that they are not preserved by expansion either.

The following Lemma describes the behaviour of reduction w.r.t. local interaction graphs.

Proposition 3. *If $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no loop on n , $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^{n-1}$, then $\partial_j f'_i(x) = \partial_j f_i(x') + \partial_j f_n(x') \cdot \partial_n f_i(x' + e_j)$.*

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_j f'_i(x) &= f'_i(x) + f'_i(x + e_j) \\ &= f_i(x, f_n(x, -)) + f_i(x + e_j, f_n(x + e_j, -)) \\ \partial_j f_i(x') &= f_i(x') + f_i(x' + e_j) \\ &= f_i(x, f_n(x, -)) + f_i(x + e_j, f_n(x, -)) \\ \partial_n f_i(x' + e_j) &= \partial_n f_i(x + e_j, f_n(x, -)) \\ &= f_i(x + e_j, 0) + f_i(x + e_j, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_j f'_i(x) &= \partial_j f_i(x') + f_i(x + e_j, f_n(x, -)) + f_i(x + e_j, f_n(x + e_j, -)) \\ &= \partial_j f_i(x') + \partial_j f_n(x') \cdot \partial_n f_i(x' + e_j).\end{aligned}$$

□

This has an immediate consequence for global interaction graphs: an edge (j, i) of $\mathcal{G}(f')$ is either an edge (j, i) of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ or the result of a pair of consecutive edges (j, n) and (n, i) in $\mathcal{G}(f)$. In Section 6.2, we shall say that the edges $(j, i), (j, n), (n, i)$ in $\mathcal{G}(f)$ are *above* the edge (j, i) of $\mathcal{G}(f')$, and more generally that a path or a cycle of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ is *above* a path or a cycle of $\mathcal{G}(f')$ when it consists of edges above those of $\mathcal{G}(f')$.

When moreover f and n are such that for any i, j , either (j, n) or (j, i) is not an edge of the global graph $\mathcal{G}(f)$, we may then note that $\partial_j f'_i(x)$ equals

$$\begin{aligned}\text{either } &\partial_j f_i(x') \\ \text{or } &\partial_j f_n(x') \cdot \partial_n f_i(x' + e_j) = \partial_j f_n(x') \cdot \partial_n f_i(x').\end{aligned}$$

This is because:

$$\partial_n f_i(x' + e_j) + \partial_n f_i(x') = \partial_{n,j} f_i(x') = \partial_j f_i(x' + e_n) + \partial_j f_i(x') = 0,$$

where we use second order derivatives as in [15]. In that case, more can be said about local interaction graphs: an edge (j, i) in $\mathcal{G}(f')(x)$ is then the result of either an edge (j, i) in $\mathcal{G}(f)(x')$ or a pair of consecutive edges (j, n) and (n, i) in $\mathcal{G}(f)(x')$.

4 Isometries of \mathbb{F}_2^n

We shall need the following remarks in Section 7.

Lemma 1. *If U is an isometry of \mathbb{F}_2^n , there exists a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ such that for any $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ and $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$:*

$$U(x + e_I) = U(x) + e_{\sigma(I)},$$

where $\sigma(I) = \{\sigma(i), i \in I\}$.

Proof. The lemma holds trivially for $I = \emptyset$.

For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $d(U(x + e_i), U(x)) = 1$ since U is an isometry, hence $U(x + e_i) = U(x) + e_{i'}$ for some i' . This i' does not depend on x because unit squares in \mathbb{F}_2^n such as:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} x & \xrightarrow{k_1} & x + e_{k_1} & \xrightarrow{k_2} & x + e_{k_1, k_2} & \cdots \\ i \downarrow & & i \downarrow & & i \downarrow & \\ x + e_i & \xrightarrow{k_1} & x + e_{i, k_1} & \xrightarrow{k_2} & x + e_{i, k_1, k_2} & \end{array}$$

must be mapped by the isometry U to unit squares:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U(x) & \xrightarrow{k'_1} & U(x + e_{k_1}) & \xrightarrow{k'_2} & U(x + e_{k_1, k_2}) & \cdots \\ i' \downarrow & & i' \downarrow & & i' \downarrow & \\ U(x + e_i) & \xrightarrow{k'_1} & U(x + e_{i, k_1}) & \xrightarrow{k'_2} & U(x + e_{i, k_1, k_2}) & \end{array}$$

so that for any y , letting $e_K = x + y$, we have $U(y + e_i) = U(x + e_K + e_i) = U(x + e_K) + e_{i'}$. Hence we may define $\sigma(i) = i'$. The function σ thus defined is a permutation because it is injective: if $\sigma(i) = \sigma(j)$, then $U(e_i) = U(0) + e_{\sigma(i)} = U(e_j)$ and $i = j$.

We now proceed by induction on the cardinality of $I \neq \emptyset$. Let $i \in I$:

$$\begin{aligned} U(x + e_I) &= U(x + e_i + e_{I \setminus \{i\}}) \\ &= U(x + e_i) + e_{\sigma(I \setminus \{i\})} \quad \text{by induction} \\ &= U(x) + e_{\sigma(i)} + e_{\sigma(I \setminus \{i\})} \\ &= U(x) + e_{\sigma(I)} \end{aligned}$$

concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2. *If U is an isometry of \mathbb{F}_2^n and $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is U -equivariant, then for any x , $\mathcal{G}(f)(U(x))$ and $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ have isomorphic underlying directed graphs. Moreover, corresponding cycles have the same sign.*

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ be the permutation given by Lemma 1. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i f(U(x)) &= f(U(x)) + f(U(x) + e_i) \\ &= f(U(x)) + f(U(x + e_k)) \quad \text{for } k = \sigma^{-1}(i) \\ &= U(f(x)) + U(f(x + e_k)) \quad \text{by equivariance} \\ &= U(f(x)) + U(f(x) + e_J) \quad \text{where } e_J = \partial_k f(x) \\ &= e_{\sigma(J)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (k, j) is an edge of $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ if and only if $(\sigma(k), \sigma(j))$ is an edge of $\mathcal{G}(f)(U(x))$: σ is an isomorphism of directed graphs.

To show that it preserves the signs of cycles, it suffices to observe that it preserves the degrees of freedom: if $f(x) + x = e_I$, then $U(f(x)) + U(x) = e_{\sigma(I)}$. A cycle C of $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ with vertex set J corresponds to the cycle $\sigma(C)$ of $\mathcal{G}(f)(U(x))$ with vertex set $\sigma(J)$: it is well-known [15] that C is positive if and only if $I \cap J$ has even cardinality, if and only if $\sigma(I) \cap \sigma(J)$ has even cardinality, *i.e.* when $\sigma(C)$ is positive. \square

5 Known results and preliminary remarks

Let $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a Boolean network. Shih and Dong have proved in [16] that if $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no local cycle, then f has a unique fixed point. But the sign of cycles matters too. For instance, [9] shows that when the interaction graph $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ is independent of x and is a positive (resp. negative) cycle, f has 2 fixed points and no cyclic attractor (resp. f has no fixed point and a unique attractive cycle). So, in this somehow elementary case, the dynamics associated with positive and negative cycles are very different.

Based on these results, [11] proved that, for an arbitrary network f , if $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no local *positive* cycle, then f has at most one fixed point. This motivated interest in investigating dynamical properties related to local *negative* cycles, suggesting in particular that the absence of a local negative cycle might imply the existence of a fixed point, or some related property.

Let us review the known partial results on negative cycles.

Theorem 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a Boolean network.*

1. *If f has an attractive cycle, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a negative cycle [11].*
2. *If f has a cyclic attractor (in particular if f has no fixed point), then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a negative cycle [12].*
3. *If f is non-expansive ($d(f(x), f(y)) \leq d(x, y)$ for all x, y) and has no fixed point, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a local negative cycle [13].*
4. *If f is an and-net and has no fixed point, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has an internally local negative cycle (a negative cycle without internal delocalizing triple) [14].*
5. *If f is an and-net and has an antipodal attractive cycle, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a local negative cycle [15].*

On the other hand, in the more general discrete case (for maps from a finite set $\{0, \dots, d\}^n$ to itself, with analogous definitions of local interaction graphs), [12] shows that, even for $d = 3$ and $n = 2$, there exists a network with no local negative cycle, no fixed point and an attractive cycle.

Before turning to the main results of this paper in Sections 6 and 7, let us mention some preliminary simple remarks.

5.1 Non-expansive networks

In the non-expansive case, it is actually possible to slightly improve the result in [13] (point 3 of Theorem 1) as follows.

Remark 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a non-expansive Boolean network. If f has a cyclic attractor, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a local negative cycle.*

Proof. Assume that f has a cyclic attractor. Let κ be a minimal subcube such that $f|_{\kappa}$ has a cyclic attractor, and let I be such that κ is an I -subcube. Since f is non-expansive, $g = f|_{\kappa}$ has to be non-expansive as well [13].

Besides, for any $i \in I$, there exist $x, y \in \kappa$ such that $x_i \neq y_i$ and $g(x) + x = g(y) + y = e_i$. To see this, let A be the set of points of a cyclic attractor of g , and let κ^0 (resp. κ^1) be the subcube of κ defined by $x_i = 0$ (resp. $x_i = 1$). By minimality of κ , κ^0 and κ^1 are weakly terminating, hence, in particular, any point in $A \cap \kappa^0$ (resp. $A \cap \kappa^1$) is the beginning of a trajectory to some fixed point x of $g|_{\kappa^0}$ (resp. y of $g|_{\kappa^1}$). Since $x, y \in A$, they are not fixed points of g , thus $g(x) = x + e_i$ and $g(y) = y + e_i$, as required.

By [13], the existence of such a pair x, y suffices to entail a local negative cycle in $\mathcal{G}(g)$, hence in $\mathcal{G}(f)$, as the signed graphs $\mathcal{G}(g)(z)$ are induced subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}(f)(\iota_{\kappa}(z))$. \square

5.2 Hoopings and invertible Jacobian matrices

This is a minor remark on one of the few techniques proposed for proving the existence of a local negative cycle.

It is proved in [15] that if x has odd degree in $\Gamma(f)$ and the Jacobian matrix $\mathcal{J}(f)(x)$ is invertible, then $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has a negative cycle. Actually, if a *hooping* is a spanning subgraph consisting of disjoint cycles [17], whose *sign* is the product of the sign of its edges (the definition of signs here differs from [17]), then a network with $\mathcal{J}(f)(x)$ invertible at some odd-degree x must have an odd number of negative hoopings, thus at least one, hence it has a negative cycle.

But for large enough n , if $\Gamma(f)$ consists of the antipodal attractive cycle $(0, \dots, e_{1, \dots, n-1}, \overline{0}, \dots, \overline{e_{1, \dots, n-1}}, 0)$ and all other points fixed, then all local

interaction graphs $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ have several equal columns (thus no hooping) and are consequently not invertible. Showing one of these two sufficient conditions for a local negative cycle is therefore hopeless, at least for general Boolean networks.

6 And-nets without fixed point

Theorem 2. *There exist and-nets with no local negative cycle and no fixed point (hence with a cyclic attractor).*

6.1 Chords

Let us start with a remark on point 5 of Theorem 1.

If an and-net f has an antipodal attractive cycle θ , we may assume that θ is $(0, \dots, e_{1, \dots, n-1}, \bar{0}, \dots, \overline{e_{1, \dots, n-1}}, 0)$ up to translation and a permutation of coordinates, so that $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has a negative cycle $C = (1, 2, \dots, n, 1)$: [15] proves that this cycle is local, but it is easy to observe that it is actually chordless. Indeed, if C has a negative chord (i, j) , then $f_j(e_{1, \dots, i}) = 0$, hence either j is a degree of freedom of $e_1 + \dots + e_i$ (when $j < i$), or j is not a degree of freedom of $e_1 + \dots + e_{j-1}$ (when $i < j - 1$). In both cases we have a contradiction, and a similar argument applies for a positive chord at $\overline{e_{1, \dots, i}}$. We thus have the following:

Remark 2. *If an and-net f has an antipodal attractive cycle, then $\mathcal{G}(f)$ is a chordless Hamiltonian negative cycle.*

Since chordless Hamiltonian cycles are local [10], this entails point 5 of Theorem 1.

Now, remember that a *kernel* of a directed graph is an independent and absorbent set of vertices [22, 1], and that fixed points of a *negative* and-net (all edges negative) are in one-to-one correspondence with kernels of the transpose of the underlying directed graph [14]. It is well-known that there exist graphs G without kernel such that every odd cycle of G has a chord, even as many chords as desired, actually: [3] defines, for every $k \geq 2$, a graph without kernel whose odd cycles all have at least k chords.

These graphs correspond to negative and-nets without fixed point, whose negative cycles all have chords. Is it true that if all negative cycles have a chord, they are non local? Of course not in general, but we show below that in the case of negative and-nets, if these chords are suitably distributed, the network can be deformed (expanded) so as to delocalize all negative cycles. Since expansion preserves fixed points (Section 3), we end up with and-nets with no local negative cycle and no fixed point, as claimed by Theorem 2.




Figure 3: The trick of Lemma 3.

6.2 Quasi-delocalizing functions

Definition 1. Let f be a negative and-net and S be a set of cycles of $\mathcal{G}(f)$. An S -quasi-delocalizing function of f is a function χ from S to the set of pairs of edges of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ such that:

- $\chi_1(C)$ is a chord (i, k) of C ;
- $\chi_2(C)$ is an edge (i, j) of C ;
- $\text{Im}(\chi_1) \cap \text{Im}(\chi_2) = \emptyset$.

Note that in this definition, $\chi_2(C)$ is determined by $\chi_1(C)$: it is the unique edge of C starting from the same vertex as $\chi_1(C)$. But it is more convenient to define $\chi(C)$ as a pair of edges.

Lemma 3. Let f be a negative and-net and S be a set of cycles of $\mathcal{G}(f)$. If f has an S -quasi-delocalizing function, then f can be expanded to an and-net g such that every cycle of $\mathcal{G}(g)$ above a cycle of S is delocalized.

Proof. Let χ be an S -quasi-delocalizing function of f . We proceed in two steps, as illustrated in Figure 3. We first define an and-net f' by replacing in $\mathcal{G}(f)$ each edge $(i, j) \in \text{Im}(\chi_2)$ by two edges (i, i') , (i', j) , where i' is a new vertex, (i, i') is positive and (i', j) is negative. Since $\text{Im}(\chi_1) \cap \text{Im}(\chi_2) = \emptyset$, $\text{Im}(\chi_1)$ is a set of negative edges of f' .

We then define g by adding to f' , for each $(i, k) \in \text{Im}(\chi_1)$, three edges (i, i'') , (i'', i') , (i'', k) , where i'' is a new vertex, (i, i'') , (i'', i') are positive and (i'', k) is negative.

Now, f' reduces to f and g reduces to f' , so these two steps are expansions, as required. Finally, a cycle of $\mathcal{G}(g)$ which is above (Section 3)

$$C = (i, j, \dots, k, \dots, i) \in S,$$

where $\chi(C) = ((i, k), (i, j))$, is

$$\text{either } (i, i', j, \dots, k, \dots, i) \text{ or } (i, i'', i', j, \dots, k, \dots, i).$$




Figure 4: The and-nets f, g of Theorem 2. On the right, g is a fixed-point-free and-net without local negative cycle.

The first one is delocalized by the triple (i'', i', k) , the second one by (i, i', k) . \square

Lemma 4. *Let f be a negative and-net and S be the set of positive (resp. negative) cycles of $\mathcal{G}(f)$. If f has an S -quasi-delocalizing function, then f can be expanded to an and-net without local positive (resp. negative) cycle.*

Proof. Let g be the and-net given by expansion of f in Lemma 3. Each elementary positive (resp. negative) cycle of $\mathcal{G}(g)$ is above some cycle of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ with the same sign, thus above a cycle of S : it is therefore delocalized. \square

6.3 Definition of a counter-example

Let us now prove Theorem 2.

Let f be the negative and-net defined on the left side of Figure 4. The transpose of the underlying directed graph is an example of graph without kernel, whose odd cycles all have a chord. The set S of elementary negative cycles of $\mathcal{G}(f)$ consists of the 4 cycles $C_i = (i, i + 1, i + 2, i)$ for $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ (where numbers are taken modulo 4). The unique S -quasi-delocalizing function χ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\chi_1(C_i) &= (i, i + 2) \\ \chi_2(C_i) &= (i, i + 1).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4, f can then be expanded to an and-net g without local negative cycle, which is pictured on the right side of Figure 4.

On the other hand, f has no fixed point: indeed, $(0, 0, 0, 0)$ is clearly not a fixed point of f , and if $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^4$ is fixed point such that $x_i = 1$, then $x_{i+1} = x_{i+2} = 0$, whence $x_{i+3} = 1$ and $f_i(x) = 0 \neq x_i$, contradiction. Since g is an expansion of f , it has no fixed point either. This concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

Notice that some negative cycles of $\mathcal{G}(g)$ have only external delocalizing triples, for instance $(0, 5, 1, 7, 2, 0)$ has an external delocalizing triple $(4, 5, 2)$, and no internal one. The network g is therefore not in contradiction with [14].

On the other hand, the 4-dimensional negative and-net f of Figure 4 has an attractive cycle

$$(e_3, e_{3,2}, e_2, e_{2,1}, e_1, e_{1,0}, e_0, e_{0,3}, e_3),$$

which gives rise to the cyclic attractor of the 12-dimensional and-net g of Figure 4: it is obtained by replacing each trajectory of the above attractive cycle of the form $(e_i, e_{i-1,i}, e_{i-1})$ by the two trajectories from $e_{i,4+2i,5+2i}$ to $e_{i-1,2+2i,3+2i}$ with strategies

$$(i-1, 2+2i, 3+2i, i, 4+2i, 5+2i)$$

and $(i-1, 2+2i, 3+2i, i, 5+2i, 4+2i)$.

Here, the *strategy* of a trajectory (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^k) in \mathbb{F}_2^n is the sequence of updated degrees of freedom, *i.e.* the sequence (m_1, \dots, m_k) , such that $x^j + x^{j+1} = e_{m_j}$ for all j . This cyclic attractor is therefore not an attractive cycle, but almost in a certain sense: adding new variables $4+2i$ and $5+2i$ has delocalized all negative cycles, but decreasing i now forces the two updates of $4+2i$ and $5+2i$ at the same time, whence a critical pair which is immediately convergent.

We do not know whether and-nets with an attractive cycle must have a local negative cycle, but we shall see in Section 7 that, in general, arbitrary Boolean networks may have an attractive cycle and no local negative cycle.

6.4 Reformulation in terms of kernels

Let us first insert a consequence of Theorem 2 in graph theory.

Let G be a directed graph. Given vertices u, v of G (not necessarily distinct), recall from [14] that a vertex $w \neq u, v$ is said to be a *subdivision of* (u, v) when (u, w) and (w, v) are arcs of G , (u, v) is not an arc of G , and the in-degree and out-degree of w both equal 1. A vertex is called a *subdivision* when it is a subdivision of some pair of vertices. Given a cycle C of G and vertices u, v_1, v_2 of G , (u, v_1, v_2) is called a *killing triple* of C when:

- v_1 and v_2 are distinct vertices of C ,
- (v_1, u) has a subdivision in G , but no subdivision of (v_1, u) belongs to C .
- (v_2, u) is an arc of G that is not in C ,

A killing triple (u, v_1, v_2) of C is *internal* when u is a vertex of C .

Killing triples mimic delocalizing triples by replacing the positive edge by a pair of consecutive edges through a new point, the subdivision.

In [14], we proved that directed graphs in which every odd cycle has an internal killing triple must have a kernel. This may be contrasted with the following result, which is as an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.

Theorem 3. *There exist kernel-free directed graphs in which every odd cycle has a killing triple.*

7 Boolean networks with attractive cycles

Theorem 4. *There exist Boolean networks with no local negative cycle and an attractive cycle.*

Before proving Theorem 4, we first discuss in Section 7.1 how to devise a counterexample. For the actual definition of a counterexample, the reader may wish to go directly to Section 7.2.

7.1 Padding around an attractive cycle

We begin with a remark in [15]: the fact that a Boolean network $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ has an attractive cycle θ , even an antipodal one, does not imply that for some x on the cycle θ , $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has a negative cycle. A counterexample f to this statement is defined in [15] by starting with an antipodal attractive cycle

$$\theta = (0, \dots, e_{1, \dots, n-1}, \bar{0}, \dots, \overline{e_{1, \dots, n-1}}, 0)$$

and adding moves (oriented edges of $\Gamma(f)$) to delocalize negative cycles at points of θ . The network solely consisting of θ and no other moves has many small negative cycles: a negative cycle $(i, i+1, i)$ in $\mathcal{G}(f)(e_{1, \dots, i-1})$ and $\mathcal{G}(f)(\overline{e_{1, \dots, i-1}})$ for each i . The way they are delocalized in [15] creates new local negative cycles (outside of θ), so we may wonder if there exist alternatives.

The following lemma shows that the first steps of this delocalization process amount to essentially two choices.




Figure 5: The two subgraphs H_i (left) and K_i (right) of Lemma 5.

Lemma 5. *Let $k \geq 2$, $n \geq k + 2$ and $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be a Boolean network such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $f(e_{1,\dots,i-1}) = e_{1,\dots,i}$, where $e_{1,\dots,i-1} = 0$ when $i = 1$. If $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no local negative cycle, then for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, the subnetwork*

$$\Gamma(f) \upharpoonright_{e_{1,\dots,i-1}[i,i+1,i+2]}$$

obtained by restricting to the subcube $e_{1,\dots,i-1}[i, i + 1, i + 2]$ contains as a subgraph one of the two graphs H_i, K_i of Figure 5.

Proof. $\Gamma(f) \upharpoonright_{e_{1,\dots,i-1}[i,i+1,i+2]}$ contains the two edges

$$(w, e_{1,\dots,i+1}) \text{ and } (x, e_{1,\dots,i+2})$$

(see Figure 5) because otherwise $\mathcal{G}(f)(e_{1,\dots,i-1})$ has a negative cycle $(i, i + 1, i)$ or $\mathcal{G}(f)(e_{1,\dots,i})$ has a negative cycle $(i + 1, i + 2, i + 1)$.

Then, to delocalize the resulting negative cycle $(i, i + 2, i)$ of $\mathcal{G}(f)(w)$, we must add

$$\text{either } (v, e_{1,\dots,i+2}) \text{ or } (w, v).$$

In the first case, we obtain H_i . In the second case, to delocalize the resulting negative cycle $(i, i + 1, i + 2, i)$ of $\mathcal{G}(f)(e_{1,\dots,i-1})$, we must add (u, x) . And finally, to delocalize the new negative cycle $(i, i + 1, i)$ of $\mathcal{G}(f)(u)$, we must add

$$\text{either } (v, e_{1,\dots,i+2}) \text{ or } (u, v).$$

We thus obtain a supergraph of H_i again in the first case, and K_i in the second case. \square

Containing H_i or K_i as a subgraph for all i is certainly not a sufficient condition for f to have no local negative cycle. For instance, the network with an antipodal attractive cycle which is defined in [15] is obtained by




Figure 6: Padding around an attractive cycle θ in Sections 7.1 and 7.4. The 2 large dashed circles enclose $N(\theta, 2)$, and the 4 small circles represent $N(\{a^i\}, 1)$, $N(\{b^j\}, 1)$, $N(\{c^k\}, 1)$ and $N(\{d^\ell\}, 1)$.

adding, for all x on the cycle such that $f(x) = x + e_i$ and all $j \neq i$, the edges $(x + e_j, x)$. In particular, H_i is the systematic choice, and the resulting network still has local negative cycles.

In general, starting with an antipodal attractive cycle θ , the consecutive choices of H_i or K_i delocalize some negative cycles by creating new ones. The question is therefore whether this non-deterministic process of padding the asynchronous dynamics with new moves can terminate by delocalizing all negative cycles.

Actually, it suffices to show that there is a constant r such that, for any linear deterministic trajectory L as in Lemma 5, adding moves only at points $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ with $d(x, L) \leq r$ eventually delocalizes all negative cycles. Indeed, if $N(X, \ell)$ denotes, for any $X \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^n$, the ℓ -neighborhood of X (the set of points x such that $d(x, X) \leq \ell$), the interaction graph at $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ depends on moves starting from points in $N(\{y\}, 1)$, and for n sufficiently larger than r ,

$$N(\{y\}, 1) \cap N(\theta, r) = N(\{y\}, 1) \cap N(L, r)$$

for some linear segment L of θ . See Figure 6. We shall now make this intuition precise. We show that systematically choosing K_i -type graphs and then padding $N(\theta, r)$ up to $r = 2$ delocalizes all negative cycles if $n \geq 8$.

7.2 Definition of a counter-example

We now assume $n \geq 6$.

Consider the Boolean network $f : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ defined as follows. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let

$$a^i = e_{1, \dots, i-1} \text{ and } a^{n+i} = \overline{a^i}.$$

Hence $a^1 = 0$, and the antipodal attractive cycle θ is $(a^1, \dots, a^{2n}, a^1)$. Let $e_{i+kn} = e_i$ for $i \geq 1$ and any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, and for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, let

$$\begin{aligned} b^i &= a^i + e_{i+1} \\ c^i &= a^i + e_{i+2} \\ d^i &= a^i + e_{i+2, i+3}, \end{aligned}$$

so that $b^{n+i} = \overline{b^i}$, $c^{n+i} = \overline{c^i}$ and $d^{n+i} = \overline{d^i}$. To simplify later notations, these four sequences of points of length $2n$ are extended to \mathbb{Z} -indexed sequences by letting $a^{i+2kn} = a^i$ for $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ and any k , and similarly for $(b^i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $(c^i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$, $(d^i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

- For $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, define $f(a^i) = a^{i+1}$: in particular, $f(a^{2n}) = a^1$ and θ is an antipodal attractive cycle of f .
- For $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, define

$$\begin{aligned} f(b^i) &= a^{i+3} \\ f(c^i) &= a^{i+3} \\ f(d^i) &= a^{i+4} + e_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In other terms:

$$\begin{aligned} f(b^i) + b^i &= e_{i, i+2} \\ f(c^i) + c^i &= e_{i, i+1} \\ f(d^i) + d^i &= e_i, \end{aligned}$$

therefore, for $1 \leq i \leq n$, b^i and its antipode b^{n+i} have 2 degrees of freedom in $\Gamma(f)$, i and $i+2$, c^i and its antipode have 2 degrees of freedom, i and $i+1$, and d^i and its antipode have 1 degree of freedom, i .

- Any other point $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ is fixed: $f(x) = x$.

This definition is illustrated in Figure 7. Before proving in Proposition 4 that the Boolean network f is indeed well-defined, let us make a few comments. First, the points b^i, c^i with 2 degrees of freedom correspond to the choice of subgraphs K_i (Figure 5). Then the overlapping of these successive subgraphs




Figure 7: Partial illustration of the definition of f in Section 7.2. Dashed edges in dimension $i + 3$ are simply meant to facilitate visualization.

K_i creates, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, a negative cycle $(i, i + 3, i)$ in $\mathcal{G}(f)(c^i)$ and $\mathcal{G}(f)(c^{n+i})$: the purpose of the degree of freedom i of the $2n$ points d^i is to delocalize these negative cycles. Also, as it is announced, only points at distance at most 2 from θ are not fixed points.

Now, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$A_i = \{a^i, b^i, c^i, d^i\}.$$

Proposition 4. *If $n \geq 6$ and $1 \leq i, j, k, \ell \leq 2n$ are all different, then so are a^i, b^j, c^k, d^ℓ . Therefore, the Boolean network f is well-defined.*

Proof. Firstly, the intrinsic metric on the Riemannian circle S^1 suggests to define, for $1 \leq i, j \leq 2n$,

$$\delta(i, j) = \min(|i - j|, 2n - |i - j|),$$

a metric on $\{1, \dots, 2n\}$. Since points in A_i are within distance 2 of a^i , it is clear that $\delta(i, j) \geq n$ entails $d(a^i, a^j) \geq n \geq 6 \geq 5$, hence $d(x, y) \geq 1$ for all $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$. As a consequence, it suffices to verify the claim for $i < j$ and $\delta(i, j) \leq n$.

The six cases we have to check amount to solve equations between multisets of integers modulo n . This makes use of the hypothesis $n \geq 6$ and is postponed to Appendix A.1. \square

To prove Theorem 4, it remains to show that $\mathcal{G}(f)$ has no local negative cycle. Since all points outside $A = \bigcup_1^{2n} A_i$ are fixed points, no negative cycle may be localized at these points, therefore it suffices to check that $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has no negative cycle for $x \in A$. To reduce the number of points to verify, we shall use the following equivariance property of f .

7.3 Equivariance

Let $S : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^n$ be the cyclic permutation of coordinates defined by $S(x) = (x_n, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and T be the fixed-point-free isometry of \mathbb{F}_2^n defined by $T(x) = S(x) + e_1$.

Lemma 6. *The Boolean network f defined in Section 7.2 is T -equivariant: $f \circ T = T \circ f$.*

Proof. For any i , $T(a^i) = a^{i+1}$, $T(b^i) = b^{i+1}$ and $T(c^i) = c^{i+1}$. Since $T(x + e_k) = T(x) + e_{k+1}$ for any x and k , we also have $T(d^i) = d^{i+1}$. Therefore:

$$(f \circ T)(a^i) = f(a^{i+1}) = a^{i+2} = T(a^{i+1}) = (T \circ f)(a^i),$$

and

$$(f \circ T)(b^i) = f(b^{i+1}) = a^{i+4} = T(a^{i+3}) = (T \circ f)(b^i).$$

Similarly, $(f \circ T)(c^i) = (T \circ f)(c^i)$ and $(f \circ T)(d^i) = (T \circ f)(d^i)$. Finally, we have noticed in particular that

$$T(A_i) = A_{i+1}$$

for any i , whence $T(A) = A$. Therefore, if x is a fixed point, so is $T(x)$, and then $(f \circ T)(x) = f(x) = (T \circ f)(x)$. \square

As a consequence of Lemmas 6 and 2, to prove Theorem 4, it suffices to check that for some i and any $x \in A_i$, $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has no negative cycle.

7.4 No local negative cycle

We shall show that, when n is large enough, for any $x \in A_0 = \{a^0, b^0, c^0, d^0\}$, $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ has no negative cycle. We wish to reduce the number of calculations of signed graphs, using the fact that $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ depends only on the values of f at neighbors of x , *i.e.* points $\in N(\{x\}, 1)$ within distance 1 from x .

For all $x \in A_i$ and $y \in A_j$, $\delta(i, j) \geq 6$ (cf proof of Proposition 4) entails $d(a^i, a^j) \geq 6$, thus $d(x, y) \geq 2$. Hence, if $\delta(i, 0) \geq 6$, no neighbor of a point of A_0 belongs to A_i . See Figure 6. Lemma 7 goes further by listing, when $n \geq 8$, all neighbors of points in A_0 which belong to A .

Lemma 7. *If $n \geq 8$, then:*

$$\begin{aligned} A \cap N(\{a^0\}, 1) &= \{a^{-1}, a^0, a^1, b^{-2}, b^0, c^0\} \\ A \cap N(\{b^0\}, 1) &= \{a^0, a^2, b^0, c^{-1}\} \\ A \cap N(\{c^0\}, 1) &= \{a^0, b^1, c^0, d^0\} \\ A \cap N(\{d^0\}, 1) &= \{c^0, d^0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Like the proof of Proposition 4, the proof of Lemma 7 amounts to solve equations between multisets of integers modulo n . It is postponed to Appendix A.2.

Let therefore assume $n \geq 8$.

By Lemma 7, we know $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ for any $x \in A_0$. We actually do not need a full computation of $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$, but simply of its possible negative cycles: as we have already recalled at the end of Section 4, these are cycles of $\mathcal{G}(f)(x)$ through an odd number of degrees of freedom of x .

(a^0) Since $f(a^0) = a^1 = a^0 + e_0$, a negative cycle of $\mathcal{G}(f)(a^0)$, if any, must pass through 0. But $\partial_0 f(a^0) = f(a^0) + f(a^1) = e_1$, hence in $\mathcal{G}(f)(a^0)$, 0 has only one outgoing edge (0, 1). Then:

$$\partial_1 f(a^0) = f(a^0) + f(a^0 + e_1) = f(a^0) + f(b^0) = a^1 + a^3 = e_{1,2},$$

hence 1 has only two outgoing edges (1, 1) and (1, 2). Finally,

$$\partial_2 f(a^0) = f(a^0) + f(a^0 + e_2) = f(a^0) + f(c^0) = a^1 + a^3 = e_{1,2},$$

and 2 has only two outgoing edges (2, 1) and (2, 2). Therefore no path in $\mathcal{G}(f)(a^0)$ starting from 0 may loop, and $\mathcal{G}(f)(a^0)$ has no negative cycle.

(b^0) Since b^0 has two degrees of freedom, 0 and 2, we are interested in paths in $\mathcal{G}(f)(b^0)$ starting from 0 or 2. First:

$$\partial_0 f(b^0) = f(b^0) + f(b^0 + e_0) = f(b^0) + f(a^2) = a^3 + a^3 = 0$$

hence 0 has no outgoing edge, and:

$$\partial_2 f(b^0) = f(b^0) + f(b^0 + e_2) = a^3 + b^0 + e_2 = e_0,$$

because by Lemma 7, $b^0 + e_2$ is a fixed point, hence 2 has only one outgoing edge (2, 0). Therefore $\mathcal{G}(f)(b^0)$ has no negative cycle.

(c^0) Similarly, since c^0 has two degrees of freedom, 0 and 1, we are interested in paths in $\mathcal{G}(f)(c^0)$ starting from 0 or 1:

$$\partial_0 f(c^0) = f(c^0) + f(c^0 + e_0) = f(c^0) + f(b^1) = a^3 + a^4 = e_3$$

$$\partial_3 f(c^0) = f(c^0) + f(c^0 + e_3) = f(c^0) + f(d^0) = a^3 + a^4 + e_1 = e_{1,3}$$

$$\partial_1 f(c^0) = f(c^0) + f(c^0 + e_1) = a^3 + c^0 + e_1 = e_0$$

because by Lemma 7, $c^0 + e_1$ is a fixed point, hence the only cycle though 0 or 1 in $\mathcal{G}(f)(c^0)$ passes though both 0 and 1, and is therefore positive.

(d^0) Since d^0 has one degree of freedom, 0, we need to compute:

$$\partial_0 f(d^0) = f(d^0) + f(d^0 + e_0) = d^0 + e_0 + d^0 + e_0 = 0$$

because by Lemma 7, $d^0 + e_0$ is a fixed point, hence 0 has no outgoing edge and $\mathcal{G}(f)(d^0)$ has no negative cycle.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.

We do not claim that 8 is the minimal value of n for which the above construction works.

A Appendix

A.1 End of the proof of Proposition 4

We generalize the notation e_I for subsets I of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ to multisets: if $M : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a multiset over $\{1, \dots, n\}$, we let $e_M = \sum_{i=1}^n e_{M(i)}$, so that $e_{1,1,2} = e_1 + e_1 + e_2 = e_2$ for instance.

Assume $i < j$ and $\delta(i, j) \leq n$, and let

$$[i, j[= \{i, i+1, \dots, j-1\}.$$

As $\delta(i, j) \leq n$, the numbers $i, i+1, \dots, j-1$ are all different modulo n , *i.e.* $d(0, e_{[i, j[}) = j - i$, and we consider these indices modulo n .

- Since $a^i + b^j = a^i + a^j + e_{j+1} = e_{[i, j[} + e_{j+1}$, we have $a^i + b^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i, j[} = e_{j+1}$. But $[i, j[$ is a singleton only if $j = i+1$, and then $e_{[i, j[} = e_i \neq e_{i+2} = e_{j+1}$ because $i+2 \neq i \pmod n$ for $n \geq 6 > 2$. Hence $a^i + b^j \neq 0$ and $a^i \neq b^j$.
- Similarly, $a^i + c^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i, j[} = e_{j+2}$, which is impossible, because $i+3 \neq i \pmod n$ for $n \geq 6 > 3$. Hence $a^i \neq c^j$.
- $a^i + d^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i, j[} = e_{j+2, j+3}$. But $[i, j[$ is a pair only if $j = i+2$, and then $e_{[i, j[} = e_{i, i+1} \neq e_{i+4, i+5} = e_{j+2, j+3}$ because $i+4 \neq i \pmod n$ for $n \geq 6 > 4$. Hence $a^i \neq d^j$.
- Since $b^i + c^j = a^i + a^j + e_{i+1, j+2}$, $b^i + c^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i, j[} = e_{i+1, j+2}$. If $j = i+1$, $[i, j[$ is a singleton and $i+1 = j+2 \pmod n$, but then $2 = 0 \pmod n$. $i+1 = i+3 \pmod n$, which is impossible for $n \geq 6 > 2$. Otherwise $j = i+2$ and $[i, j[$ is a pair, thus $e_{[i, j[} = e_{i, i+1} = e_{i+1, j+2} = e_{i+1, i+4}$: this is impossible because $4 \neq 0 \pmod n$. Hence $b^i \neq c^j$.

- $b^i + d^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i,j]} = e_{i+1,j+2,j+3}$. If $j = i + 1$, $[i, j[$ is a singleton and $i + 1 = j + 2 \pmod n$ or $j + 3 \pmod n$: this is impossible because $3 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$ and $4 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$. Otherwise $j = i + 3$ and $[i, j[$ has cardinality 3, hence $e_{[i,j]} = e_{i,i+1,i+2} = e_{i+1,j+2,j+3} = e_{i+1,i+5,i+6}$: this is impossible too, because 0 and 2 cannot be consecutive numbers modulo n . Hence $b^i \neq d^j$.
- $c^i + d^j = 0$ if and only if $e_{[i,j]} = e_{i+2,j+2,j+3}$. If $j = i + 1$, $[i, j[$ is a singleton and $i + 2 = j + 2 \pmod n$ or $j + 3 \pmod n$: this is impossible because $3 \not\equiv 2 \pmod n$ and $4 \not\equiv 2 \pmod n$. Otherwise $j = i + 3$ and $[i, j[$ has cardinality 3, hence $e_{[i,j]} = e_{i,i+1,i+2} = e_{i+2,j+2,j+3} = e_{i+2,i+5,i+6}$, which is impossible because $5 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$ for $n \geq 6 > 5$. Hence $b^i \neq d^j$.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 7

The argument is analogous to the proof of Proposition 4. We observe that knowing the b^i 's neighbors of a^0 gives, by symmetry, the a^i 's neighbors of b^0 , etc, so that only $4 + 3 + 2 + 1$ cases need to be considered.

(a^0 and a^i) If a^i is a neighbor of a^0 , then clearly a^i is a^{-1}, a^0 or a^1 .

(a^0 and b^i) 1. If $i \geq 0$, $a^0 + b^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{i+1}$, so b^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if $a^0 + b^i = e_\ell$ for some ℓ , if and only if $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,i+1}$. If $i = 0$, $[0, i[$ has cardinality 1 and the solution $\ell = i + 1 = 1$ corresponds to the point $b^0 \in A \cap N(\{a^0\}, 1)$. Otherwise $i = 2$, but $e_{[0,i]} = e_{0,1} = e_{\ell,3}$ has no solution in ℓ because $3 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$ and $3 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$.

2. If $i < 0$, $a^0 + b^i = e_{[i,0]} + e_{i+1}$, thus b^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,i+1}$ for some ℓ . Hence $i = -2$ and $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-2,-1} = e_{\ell,i+1} = e_{\ell,-1}$ has a solution: $\ell = -2$, whence $b^{-2} \in A \cap N(\{a^0\}, 1)$.

(a^0 and c^i) 1. If $i \geq 0$, $a^0 + c^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{i+2}$, so c^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,i+2}$. If $i = 0$, the solution $\ell = i + 2 = 2$ corresponds to the point $c^0 \in A \cap N(\{a^0\}, 1)$. Otherwise $i = 2$, but $e_{[0,i]} = e_{0,1} = e_{\ell,4}$ has no solution in ℓ because $4 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$ and $4 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$.

2. If $i < 0$, $a^0 + c^i = e_{[i,0]} + e_{i+2}$, thus c^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,i+2}$ for some ℓ . Hence $i = -2$, but $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-2,-1} = e_{\ell,i+2} = e_{\ell,0}$ has no solution because $-2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$ and $-1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$.

- (a^0 and d^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $a^0 + d^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{i+2,i+3}$, so d^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = 1$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_0 = e_{\ell,3,4}$ has no solution because $3 \neq 0 \pmod n$ and $4 \neq 0 \pmod n$. Otherwise $i = 3$, but $e_{0,1,2} = e_{\ell,i+2,i+3} = e_{\ell,5,6}$ has no solution either, because $5 \neq 1 \pmod n$ and $5 \neq 0 \pmod n$.
2. If $i < 0$, d^i is a neighbor of a^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = -1$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-1} = e_{\ell,1,2}$ has no solution because $1 \neq -1 \pmod n$ and $2 \neq -1 \pmod n$. Otherwise $i = -3$, but $e_{-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,i+2,i+3} = e_{\ell,-1,0}$ has no solution either, because $-3 \neq 0 \pmod n$ and $-2 \neq 0 \pmod n$.
- (b^0 and b^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $b^0 + b^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{1,i+1}$, so b^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,1,i+1}$. If $i = 1$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_0 = e_{\ell,1,2}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = 3$, but $e_{0,1,2} = e_{\ell,1,4}$ has no solution either, because $4 \neq 2 \pmod n$ and $4 \neq 0 \pmod n$.
2. If $i < 0$, b^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,1,i+1}$. If $i = -1$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-1} = e_{\ell,1,0}$ has no solution because $0 \neq -1 \pmod n$ and $1 \neq -1 \pmod n$. Otherwise $i = -3$, but $e_{-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,1,-2}$ has no solution either, because $-3 \neq 1 \pmod n$ and $-1 \neq 1 \pmod n$.
- (b^0 and c^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $b^0 + c^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{1,i+2}$, so c^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,1,i+2}$. If $i = 1$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_0 = e_{\ell,1,3}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = 3$, but $e_{0,1,2} = e_{\ell,1,5}$ has no solution either, because $5 \neq 2 \pmod n$ and $5 \neq 0 \pmod n$.
2. If $i < 0$, c^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,1,i+2}$. If $i = -1$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-1} = e_{\ell,1,1} = e_{\ell}$ has a solution $\ell = -1$: this corresponds to the point $c^{-1} \in A \cap N(\{b^0\}, 1)$. Otherwise $i = -3$, but $e_{-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,1,-1}$ has no solution, because $-3 \neq 1 \pmod n$ and $-2 \neq 1 \pmod n$.
- (b^0 and d^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $b^0 + d^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{1,i+2,i+3}$, so d^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,1,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = 0$, $e_{[0,i]} = 0 = e_{\ell,1,2,3}$ has no solution. If $i = 2$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_{0,1} = e_{\ell,1,4,5}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = 4$, but $e_{0,1,2,3} = e_{\ell,1,6,7}$ has no solution either.
2. If $i < 0$, d^i is a neighbor of b^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,1,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = -2$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-2,-1} = e_{\ell,1,0,1} = e_{\ell,0}$ has no solution because $0 \neq -1 \pmod n$ and $0 \neq -2 \pmod n$. Otherwise $i = -4$, but $e_{-4,-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,1,-2,-1}$ has no solution either.

- (c^0 and c^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $c^0 + c^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{2,i+2}$, so c^i is a neighbor of c^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,2,i+2}$. If $i = 1$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_0 = e_{\ell,2,3}$ has no solution because $2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$ and $3 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$. Otherwise $i = 3$, but $e_{0,1,2} = e_{\ell,2,5}$ has no solution either, because $5 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$ and $5 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$.
2. If $i < 0$, c^i is a neighbor of c^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,2,i+2}$. If $i = -1$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-1} = e_{\ell,2,1}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = -3$, but $e_{-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,2,-1}$ has no solution either.
- (c^0 and d^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $c^0 + d^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{2,i+2,i+3}$, so d^i is a neighbor of c^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,2,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = 0$, $e_{[0,i]} = 0 = e_{\ell,2,2,3} = e_{\ell,3}$ has a solution $\ell = 3$, which corresponds to the point $d^0 \in A \cap N(\{c^0\}, 1)$. If $i = 2$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_{0,1} = e_{\ell,2,4,5}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = 4$, but $e_{0,1,2,3} = e_{\ell,2,6,7}$ has no solution either because $6 \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$ for $n \geq 7$.
2. If $i < 0$, d^i is a neighbor of c^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,2,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = -2$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-2,-1} = e_{\ell,2,0,1}$ has no solution. Otherwise $i = -4$, but $e_{-4,-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,2,-2,-1}$ has no solution either because $-3 \not\equiv 2 \pmod n$ and $-4 \not\equiv 2 \pmod n$ for $n \geq 7$.
- (d^0 and d^i)** 1. If $i \geq 0$, $d^0 + d^i = e_{[0,i]} + e_{2,3,i+2,i+3}$, so d^i is a neighbor of d^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[0,i]} = e_{\ell,2,3,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = 1$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_0 = e_{\ell,2,3,3,4} = e_{\ell,2,4}$ has no solution. If $i = 3$, $e_{[0,i]} = e_{0,1,2} = e_{\ell,2,3,5,6}$ has no solution either. Otherwise $i = 5$, but $e_{0,1,2,3,4} = e_{\ell,2,3,7,8}$ has no solution because $8 \not\equiv 1 \pmod n$ for $n \geq 8$.
2. If $i < 0$, d^i is a neighbor of d^0 if and only if, for some ℓ , $e_{[i,0]} = e_{\ell,2,3,i+2,i+3}$. If $i = -1$, $e_{[i,0]} = e_{-1} = e_{\ell,2,3,1,2} = e_{\ell,3,1}$ has no solution. If $i = -3$, $e_{-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,2,3,-1,0}$ has no solution either. Finally, if $i = -5$, $e_{-5,-4,-3,-2,-1} = e_{\ell,2,3,-3,-2}$ has no solution for $n \geq 8$.

References

- [1] C. Berge. *Graphes et hypergraphes*. Dunod, 1970.
- [2] J. Demongeot, A. Elena, and S. Sené. Robustness in regulatory networks: a multi-disciplinary approach. *Acta Biotheoretica*, 56(1-2):27–49, 2008.
- [3] H. Galeana-Sánchez. A counterexample to a conjecture of Meyniel on kernel-perfect graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 41:105–107, 1982.

- [4] E. Goles and L. Salinas. Comparison between parallel and serial dynamics of Boolean networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 396:247–253, 2008.
- [5] S. A. Kauffman. Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 22:437–467, 1969.
- [6] S. A. Kauffman. *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. Oxford University Press, 1993.
- [7] W. S. McCulloch and W. Pitts. A Logical Calculus of Ideas Immanent in Nervous Activity. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biophysics*, 5(4):115–133, 1943.
- [8] A. Naldi, E. Remy, D. Thieffry and C. Chaouiya. Dynamically consistent reduction of logical regulatory graphs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 412:2207–2218, 2011.
- [9] E. Remy, B. Mossé, C. Chaouiya and D. Thieffry. A description of dynamical graphs associated to elementary regulatory circuits. *Bioinformatics*, 19(2):172–178, 2003.
- [10] E. Remy and P. Ruet. From minimal signed circuits to the dynamics of Boolean regulatory networks. *Bioinformatics*, 24:i220–i226, 2008.
- [11] E. Remy, P. Ruet, and D. Thieffry. Graphic requirements for multistability and attractive cycles in a Boolean dynamical framework. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 41(3):335–350, 2008.
- [12] A. Richard. Negative circuits and sustained oscillations in asynchronous automata networks. In *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 44(4):378–392, 2010.
- [13] A. Richard. Local negative circuits and fixed points in non-expansive Boolean networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 159:1085–1093, 2011.
- [14] A. Richard and P. Ruet. From kernels in directed graphs to fixed points and negative cycles in Boolean networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 161:1106–1117, 2013.
- [15] P. Ruet. Local cycles and dynamical properties of Boolean networks. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 2014. doi:10.1017/S096012951400036X.

- [16] M.-H. Shih and J.-L. Dong. A combinatorial analogue of the Jacobian problem in automata networks. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 34(1):30–46, 2005.
- [17] C. Soulé. Graphic requirements for multistationarity. *ComplexUs*, 1:123–133, 2003.
- [18] R. Thomas. Boolean formalization of genetic control circuits. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 42:563–585, 1973.
- [19] R. Thomas. On the relation between the logical structure of systems and their ability to generate multiple steady states and sustained oscillations. In *Series in Synergetics*, volume 9, pages 180–193. Springer, 1981.
- [20] R. Thomas. Regulatory networks seen as asynchronous automata: a logical description. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 153:1–23, 1991.
- [21] R. Thomas and M. Kaufman. Multistationarity, the basis of cell differentiation and memory. I. Structural conditions of multistationarity and other non-trivial behaviour. *Chaos*, 11:170–179, 2001.
- [22] J. von Neumann and O. Morgenstern. *Theory of games and economic behavior*. Princeton University Press, 1944.