

Structural Bifurcation Analysis in Chemical Reaction Networks

Takashi Okada¹, Je-Chiang Tsai², and Atsushi Mochizuki^{1,3}

¹*Theoretical Biology Laboratory, RIKEN, Wako 351-0198, Japan*

²*Department of Mathematics, National Tsing Hua University, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan*

³*CREST, JST 4-1-8 Honcho, Kawaguchi 332-0012, Japan* *

In living cells, chemical reactions form a complex network. Complicated dynamics arising from such networks are the origins of biological functions. We propose a novel mathematical method to analyze bifurcation behaviors of a reaction system from the network structure alone. The whole network is decomposed into subnetworks based on “buffering structures”. For each subnetwork, the bifurcation condition is studied independently, and the parameters that can induce bifurcations and the chemicals that can exhibit bifurcations are determined. We demonstrate our theory using hypothetical and real networks.

arXiv:1711.00250v2 [q-bio.MN] 6 Nov 2017

* E-mail address: takashi.okada@riken.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

In a living cell, a large set of chemical reactions are connected by sharing their products and substrates, and constructing a large network. Biological functions are believed to arise from dynamics of chemical concentrations based on the networks. It is also considered that regulations and adaptations of biological systems are realized by modulations of amount/activities of enzymes mediating reactions. In previous studies [7, 10], we developed a mathematical method, by which the sensitivity responses of chemical reaction networks to perturbations of enzyme amount/activities are determined from network structures alone. Our method is based on an augmented matrix \mathbf{A} (see Eq. (3)), in which the distribution of nonzero entries directly reflects network structures. One of the striking result is the *law of localization* [10]. A substructure (subset of chemicals and reactions) in a reaction network satisfying a topological condition is called *buffering structure* (Fig. 1(1), (2)), and has the property that perturbations of reaction rate parameters inside a buffering structure influence only (steady-state) concentrations and fluxes inside this structure, and the outside remains unchanged under the perturbations.




FIG. 1: Summary of the structural bifurcation analysis. (1) Buffering structures (red boxes) in an example network. (2) Buffering structure corresponds to nonzero square blocks in \mathbf{A} . (3) Bifurcations in the whole system are governed by a product of buffering structures with subtraction of their inner buffering structures. (4) For each subnetwork, parameters in shadowed area can induce bifurcations associated with the subnetwork. (5) For each subnetwork, chemicals in shadowed area exhibit bifurcations.

In this paper, we study another aspect governed by buffering structures: bifurcation behaviors of reaction systems. We prove that the determinant of the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{J} of a reaction system is equivalent to that of the augmented matrix \mathbf{A} for the corresponding network structure. Based on this equivalence, we study steady-state bifurcations of reaction systems from network structures. In this paper, our usage of “parameter” always means a parameter associated with a reaction rate.

From the *structural bifurcation analysis* based on the matrix \mathbf{A} , we obtain the following general results on steady-state bifurcations in reaction networks.

(i) *Factorization*: \mathbf{A} is factorized into submatrices based on the buffering structures (Fig. 1(3)). It implies that bifurcation behaviors in a complex network can be studied by decomposing it into smaller subnetworks, which are buffering structures with subtraction of their inner buffering structures. For each subnetwork, the condition of bifurcation occurrence is determined from the structure of the subnetwork.

(ii) *Inducing parameters*: For each subnetwork, bifurcation is induced by parameter changes which are neither in buffering structures inside the subnetwork nor those non-intersecting with the subnetwork (Fig. 1 (4)).

(iii) *Bifurcating chemicals (and fluxes)*: When the condition of bifurcation associated with a subnetwork is satisfied, the bifurcation of steady-state concentrations (and fluxes) appears only inside the (minimal) buffering structure containing the subnetwork (Fig. 1 (5)).

These findings make it possible to study behaviors of a whole reaction system including multiple bifurcations based on inclusion relations of buffering structures. We apply our method to hypothetical and real networks, and demonstrate the practical usefulness to analyze behaviors of complex systems.

II. STRUCTURAL SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS.—

We label chemicals by m ($m = 1, \dots, M$) and reactions by n ($n = 1, \dots, N$). A state of a spatially homogeneous chemical reaction system is specified by the concentrations $x_m(t)$, and obeys the differential equations [7–9]:

$$\frac{dx_m}{dt} = \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{mn} r_n(\mathbf{x}; k_n), \quad m = 1, \dots, M. \quad (1)$$

Here, the $M \times N$ matrix ν is called the stoichiometric matrix, and its component ν_{mn} is defined as follows: Let the stoichiometry of the n -th reaction among chemical molecules X_m be given by $\sum_{m=1}^M y_m^n X_m \rightarrow \sum_{m=1}^M \bar{y}_m^n X_m$. Then the ν_{mn} is given by $\nu_{mn} = \bar{y}_m^n - y_m^n$. The reaction rate function (flux) r_n depends on the concentration vector \mathbf{x} and also on rate parameters k_n .

To present the key idea, we start by assuming that the stoichiometric matrix ν does not have nonzero cokernel vectors, which in turn implies that $\text{rank}(\nu) = M \leq N$ and the steady state concentration \mathbf{x}^* and fluxes \mathbf{r}^* are continuous functions of rate parameters $\{k_n\}_{n=1}^N$. The general case will be presented in the Supplemental Material (SM). For steady state \mathbf{x}^* , one can choose $\{\mu^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^{N-M}$ such that the corresponding steady state flux \mathbf{r}^* is expressed, in terms of the basis $\{\mathbf{c}_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^{N-M}$ of the kernel space of ν , as

$$\mathbf{r}^* = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \mu^\alpha \mathbf{c}_\alpha, \quad K := N - M = \dim \ker \nu. \quad (2)$$

Now we review the *structural sensitivity analysis* [7] and the *law of localization* [10]. Under the perturbation $k_{\hat{n}} \rightarrow k_{\hat{n}} + \delta k_{\hat{n}}$ ($\hat{n} = 1, \dots, N$), the corresponding concentration changes $\delta_{\hat{n}} x_m$ and the flux changes $\delta_{\hat{n}} r_n$ at the steady state \mathbf{x}^* are determined simultaneously by solving the following equation

$$\mathbf{A} \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 \mathbf{x} & \dots & \delta_N \mathbf{x} \\ \delta_1 \boldsymbol{\mu} & \dots & \delta_N \boldsymbol{\mu} \end{pmatrix} = -\text{diag} \left(\frac{\partial r_1}{\partial k_1} \delta k_1, \dots, \frac{\partial r_N}{\partial k_N} \delta k_N \right),$$

where the horizontal line denotes the structure of block matrices, the derivatives are evaluated at the steady state \mathbf{x}^* , $\delta_{\hat{n}} \boldsymbol{\mu} = (\delta_{\hat{n}} \mu^1, \dots, \delta_{\hat{n}} \mu^K)^T$ is the change of the coefficients μ^α in (2) under the perturbation: $k_{\hat{n}} \rightarrow k_{\hat{n}} + \delta k_{\hat{n}}$, and the matrix \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*} - \mathbf{c}_1 \dots - \mathbf{c}_K \right). \quad (3)$$

Here the entry $\partial r_n / \partial x_m$ in the left part of \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \neq 0 & \text{if } x_m \text{ influences reaction } n, \\ \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} = 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Note that whether each entry of \mathbf{A} is zero or nonzero is determined structurally, that is, independently of detailed forms of rate functions and quantitative values of concentrations and parameters.

For a given network Γ , we consider a pair $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ of a chemical subset \mathbf{m} and a reaction subset \mathbf{n} satisfying the condition that \mathbf{n} includes all reactions influenced by chemicals in \mathbf{m} (in the sense of (4)). We call such a $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ as *output-complete*. For a subnetwork $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, we define the *index* $\chi(\Gamma_s)$ as

$$\chi(\Gamma_s) = |\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{n}| + (\#cycle). \quad (5)$$

Here, $|\mathbf{m}|$ and $|\mathbf{n}|$ are the numbers of elements of the sets \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} , respectively. The $\#cycle$ is the number of independent kernel vectors of the matrix ν whose supports are contained in \mathbf{n} . In general, $\chi(\Gamma_s)$ is non-positive (see [10]). Then a *buffering structure* is defined as an output-complete subnetwork Γ_s with $\chi(\Gamma_s) = 0$.

Suppose that $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ is a buffering structure. By permutating the column and row indices, the matrix \mathbf{A} can be written as follows: [10]

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{|\mathbf{m}|+(\#cycle)} \\ \downarrow \\ \uparrow \\ \end{array} \\ |\mathbf{n}| \updownarrow \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} & * \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} \end{array} \right), \end{array} \quad (6)$$

where the rows (columns) of \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} are associated with the reactions (chemicals and cycles) in Γ_s . Similarly, those of $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ are associated with the complement $\bar{\Gamma}_s := \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_s$.

The *law of localization* [10] is a direct consequence of the block structure (6) of the matrix \mathbf{A} : *Steady-state concentrations and fluxes outside of a buffering structure does not change under any rate parameter perturbations in \mathbf{n} .* In other words, all effects of perturbations of $k_{\hat{n}}$ in \mathbf{n} are indeed localized within Γ_s .

III. STRUCTURAL BIFURCATION ANALYSIS.—

We shortly sketch the conventional bifurcation analysis. Set $J := \nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$. Let the eigenvalues $\{\sigma_m\}_{m=1}^M$ of J be ordered so that $\text{Re } \sigma_1 \geq \text{Re } \sigma_2 \dots$. Then the state \mathbf{x}^* is stable if all $\text{Re } \sigma_m < 0$, whereas, the state \mathbf{x}^* is unstable if $\text{Re } \sigma_1 > 0$. Moreover, a bifurcation occurs if $\text{Re } \sigma_1$ changes its sign as some parameter $k_{\hat{n}}$ is varied through some critical value, say $\bar{k}_{\hat{n}}$. Since $\det J = \prod_{m=1}^M \sigma_m$, a bifurcation occurs if $\det J$ changes its sign as $k_{\hat{n}}$ is varied through $\bar{k}_{\hat{n}}$. Thus, the study of the onset of bifurcation is reduced to the search of the zeros of $\det J$.

Now, we explain *structural bifurcation analysis*. The following relation is the key to our method:

$$\det J \propto \det \mathbf{A}, \quad (7)$$

where the proportionality constant depends only on the stoichiometric matrix ν . See the SM for the proof. Then (B23) implies that the study of the onset of bifurcation of system (A1) can be reduced to the search of the zeros of $\det \mathbf{A}$. Further, the existence of the buffering structure Γ_s of the network Γ guarantees the following relation

$$\det J \propto \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \cdot \det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}. \quad (8)$$

An extension of (8) to a nested sequence of buffering structures $\Gamma_1 \subset \dots \subset \Gamma_L$ gives the relation $\det J \propto \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1} \prod_{s=1}^{L-1} \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_{s+1} \setminus \Gamma_s}$.

There are several implications of the factorization (8). First, from the equality $\det J = 0$, we have either $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ or $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$. In other words, the possibility of bifurcation occurrences in the whole system can be studied by examining the possibility for each of the subnetworks from their structures.

Second, from the law of localization (see the SM for details), $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ depends only on parameters outside Γ_s , whereas $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ depends on parameters in the whole network Γ . Thus, bifurcations associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ are triggered only by tuning parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, while bifurcations associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ can be induced by both parameters in Γ_s and those in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (see inducing parameters in Fig. 1 (4)). In particular, in the former case, critical values (values at bifurcation points) of parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are independent of parameters in Γ_s .

Third, as shown in the SM, the null vector of the Jacobian J at a bifurcation point with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ has nonzero components only for chemicals in Γ_s . This implies that only chemicals in Γ_s exhibit bifurcations at this bifurcation point. By contrast, for bifurcations associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$, all chemicals in Γ exhibit bifurcation behaviors (see bifurcating chemicals in Fig. 1 (5)). These three arguments are generalized into multiple buffering structures, as stated in the introductory part of this paper.




FIG. 2: System consisting of five reactions, $\xrightarrow{k_1} A$, $A \xrightleftharpoons[k_2]{k_3} B$, $B \xrightarrow{k_4} C$, $C \xrightarrow{k_5}$. The three blue dashed arcs indicate the regulations explained in the text. The red box indicates a buffering structure Γ_s .

IV. HYPOTHETICAL NETWORK

We demonstrate the structural bifurcation analysis in the system shown in Fig. 2. The stoichiometry matrix ν and the kernel vectors are

$$\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{c}_1 = (0, 1, 1, 0, 0)^T, \mathbf{c}_2 = (1, 1, 0, 1, 1)^T. \quad (9)$$

Every reaction rate depends on the substrate concentration. Reaction rates r_3 , r_5 , and r_4 are also regulated by A, B, and C, respectively. Then, $\Gamma_s = (\{A\}, \{2, 3\})$ is a buffering structure since $\chi(\Gamma_s) = 1 - 2 + 1 = 0$.




FIG. 3: Steady-state values of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$, $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$, x_A^* , x_C^* versus $k_{5,B}$ in (a), $k_{3,A}$ in (b), $k_{5,B}$ in (c). Red and blue curves correspond to two choices of parameters in Γ_s in (a) and (c), two choices of parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ in (b). In the top panel of each case, the dark-colored region indicates the subnetwork whose determinant changes its sign at the bifurcation point, and the green- and purple-shaded regions indicate the inducing parameters and bifurcating chemicals, respectively. See the SM for the specific parameter values used for the plots.

By permutating the row index as $\{2, 3, 1, 4, 5\}$ and the column index as $\{A, c_1, B, C, c_2\}$, the matrix \mathbf{A} and the determinant are given by

$$\mathbf{A} = \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} & * & & \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} & & \end{array} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} r_{2,A} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ r_{3,A} & 1 & r_{3,B} & 0 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{4,B} & r_{4,C} & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{5,B} & r_{5,C} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \underbrace{(r_{2,A} - r_{3,A})}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}} \underbrace{(r_{5,B}r_{4,C} - r_{4,B}r_{5,C})}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}}, \quad (10)$$

where nonzero $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m}|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ is written by $r_{n,m}$, $m = A, B, C$. Due to the expression of $\det \mathbf{A}$, we conclude that the regulations corresponding to $r_{3,A}$ and $(r_{4,C}, r_{5,B})$ are necessary for bifurcations associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$, respectively. In this way, the possibility of bifurcation occurrences can be examined structurally for each subnetwork.

For numerical demonstration, we assume the following kinetics:

$$\mathbf{r} = \left(k_1, k_2 x_A, k_3 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{3,A} x_A^2}{x_A^2 + 5} \right), k_4 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{4,C} x_C^2}{x_C^2 + 5} \right), k_5 x_C \left(1 + \frac{k_{5,B} x_B^2}{x_B^2 + 5} \right) \right). \quad (11)$$

The parameters are classified into $\{k_2, k_3, k_{3,A}\} \in \Gamma_s$, and $\{k_1, k_4, k_5, k_{4,C}, k_{5,B}\} \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$.

First, we consider a bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$. The inducing parameters for the subnetwork $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are the parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (the green-shaded region in the top panel of Fig. 3a). As seen from the plots of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$




FIG. 4: Central carbon metabolic network of *E. coli*. Dashed curve indicates a regulation from PEP to reaction 11 ($r_{11,PEP} > 0$). The right panel shows simplified inclusion relation of buffering structures.

in Fig. 3a, the parameter $k_{5,B}$ in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ actually induces sign changes of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ but not those of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ (two saddle-node bifurcations). The bifurcating chemicals for $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are all chemicals $\{A, B, C\}$ (see the purple-shaded region of the top panel). Fig. 3a actually shows that both chemicals A and C exhibit steady-state bifurcations. On the other hand, varying parameters in Γ_s changes only concentrations in Γ_s , due to the law of localization. This is illustrated by the blue and red curves in Fig. 3a. We see that only the concentration of chemical A changes as parameters in Γ_s are varied, while the critical value of the bifurcation parameter $k_{5,B}$ is independent of parameters in Γ_s .

Next, we consider the other bifurcation, which is associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$. The inducing parameters for the subnetwork Γ_s consist of all parameters in Γ_s and $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (see the green-shaded region in the top panels of Fig. 3b). The plots of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ in Fig. 3b show that the parameter $k_{3,A} \in \Gamma_s$ indeed induces bifurcations associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$. The bifurcating chemicals for Γ_s are the chemicals in Γ_s , i.e. $\{A\}$ (the purple-shaded region in the top panel). This can be confirmed from the plots for x_A^*, x_C^* in Fig. 3b, where only the steady-state of chemical $A \in \Gamma_s$ bifurcates at the bifurcation point, while chemical $C \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$ remains constant as $k_{3,A} \in \Gamma_s$ is varied, due to the law of localization. The law of localization also implies that varying parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ can change concentrations of all chemicals. This is illustrated by the two curves in Fig. 3b, where two different values of parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ result in different concentration values for both of chemicals A and C. In addition, varying parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ also influences the critical value of the bifurcation parameter $k_{3,A}$.

There is another choice of bifurcation parameter for the bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$, as the inducing parameters for Γ_s are not only parameters in Γ_s but also those in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (see the green-shaded region in the top panel of Fig. 3c). The parameter $k_{5,B} \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$, which was chosen as a bifurcation parameter in Fig. 3a, also induces the bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ (see the plots for $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ in Fig. 3c). This implies that the same parameter may induce bifurcations for different sets of chemicals depending on which factor of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ changes its sign at the critical points. As in the case of Fig. 3b, the bifurcating chemicals are in Γ_s (see the purple-shaded region in the top panel of Fig. 3c). Thus we see that only chemical $A \in \Gamma_s$ bifurcates at the critical point in Fig. 3c. In particular, $k_{5,B}$ does not induce the bifurcations of chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, unlike the case of Fig. 3a. On the other hand, because of the law of localization, parameters in Γ_s influence only chemical $A \in \Gamma_s$, as illustrated by the two curves in Fig. 3c, corresponding to two different values of parameters in Γ_s . By contrast to Fig. 3a, the critical value of the bifurcation parameter $k_{5,B} \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$ is influenced by parameters in Γ_s .

V. E. COLI NETWORK

Finally, as a real example, we study the network of the central carbon metabolism of *E. coli* [10] shown in Fig. 4, consisting of 28 chemicals and 46 reactions. The network possesses 17 buffering structures in it. As shown in the SM, there is only one single subnetwork (colored in red in Fig. 4) that can satisfy the bifurcation condition. Reactions associated with the inducing parameters for the red subnetwork are colored in red and green. The bifurcating chemicals (and fluxes) are colored in red and blue. We confirmed this behavior numerically (see Fig. S4 in the SM).

Our method is applicable to any steady-state bifurcations of reaction systems even if systems have cokernel vectors. In the SM, we apply our theory to a phosphorylation system [13] with cokernel vectors (i.e. conserved concentrations), and the First Schlögl Model [12], exhibiting transcritical bifurcations.

VI. CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVES

In this paper we propose a mathematical method to study bifurcation behaviors of reaction systems from network structures alone. In our method, bifurcations of the whole complex system are studied by factorizing it into smaller substructures defined from buffering structures. For each substructure, the bifurcation condition is studied, and a set of parameters possibly inducing onset of bifurcation is determined.

Biological functions and their regulations are considered to arise from dynamics based on reaction networks and modulation of the enzymes. On the other hand, the complexity of networks has been a large obstacle to understand such systems. Our theory should be strongly effective to study dynamical behaviors of complex networks and promote systematic understandings of biological systems.

This work was supported partly by the CREST program (Grant No. JPMJCR13W6) of the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST), by iTHES Project/iTHEMS Program RIKEN, by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Innovative Area, Logics of Plant Development (Grant No. 25113001), by NCTS and MOST of Taiwan. We express our sincere thanks to Gen Kurosawa, and Masashi Tachikawa for their helpful discussions and comments.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL STRUCTURAL BIFURCATION ANALYSIS IN CHEMICAL REACTION NETWORKS

Takashi Okada, Je-Chiang Tsai, and Atsushi Mochizuki

Appendix A: Notation

- $\mathbb{X} = \{X_1, \dots, X_M\}$: the set of chemicals in the network. To ease the discussion, we also use the number index m to identify the m -th chemical X_m . The reader can distinguish this difference from the context.
- x_m : the concentration of the m -th chemical, $m = 1, \dots, M$.
- $\mathbb{E} = \{E_1, \dots, E_N\}$: the set of reactions in the network. Again, in order to ease the notations, we also use the number index to identify the reaction.
- r_n : the reaction rate function associated with the n -th reaction, $n = 1, \dots, N$.
- k_n : the rate parameter associated with the reaction rate function r_n , $n = 1, \dots, N$. Note that the reaction rate function r_n is a function of x_m , $m = 1, \dots, M$. Here we assume that the n -th reaction rate function r_n has only one rate parameter k_n involved. But the analysis performed here indicates that we do not need this assumption. We do this just for the ease of presentation. Thus $r_n = r_n(\mathbf{x}; k_n)$ where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_M)^T$ and T denotes the transpose operator of a matrix.

- ODE

$$\frac{dx_m}{dt} = f_m(x_1, \dots, x_M; k_1, \dots, k_N) := \sum_{n=1}^N \nu_{mn} r_n(\mathbf{x}; k_n), \quad m = 1, \dots, M. \quad (\text{A1})$$

- $\{\mathbf{c}^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^K$ is the basis of the kernel space of the matrix $\nu = (\nu_{mn})_{M \times N}$. $K := \dim \ker \nu$. The steady state value \mathbf{r}^* of the reaction is given by a linear combination of them. We write the coefficient of \mathbf{c}^α by μ_α , i.e. $\mathbf{r}^* = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \mu_\alpha \mathbf{c}^\alpha$.
- $\{\mathbf{d}_\beta\}_{\beta=1}^{K_c}$ is the basis of the cokernel space of the matrix ν (i.e., $\mathbf{d}_\beta^T \nu = 0$ for each $\beta = 1, \dots, K_c$). $K_c := \dim \text{coker } \nu$. For each \mathbf{d}_β , using (A1) the quantity $l_\beta \equiv \mathbf{d}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is conserved with respect to time t .

Set

$$\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_M)^T, \quad \mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_N)^T, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_N)^T.$$

Then we can rewrite (A1) as follows:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{k}) := \nu \mathbf{r}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Appendix B: The equivalence between the Jacobian matrix and the matrix \mathbf{A}

In this section, we prove the equivalence between the Jacobian and the matrix \mathbf{A} . Systems with $K_c := \dim \text{coker } \nu = 0$ are discussed in section B 1 (see (B6)) and those with $K_c > 0$ in section B 2 (see (B23)).

1. The proof of the equivalence when $K_c = 0$

To establish (B6), we first note that the assumption $K_c = 0$ implies that $N \geq M$ and $K = N - M$, where $K := \dim \ker \nu$.¹ Then employing the QR decomposition to the matrix ν^T , we can factor the ν^T as the product of an $N \times N$ unitary matrix \mathbf{Q} and an $N \times M$ upper triangular matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T$ is the transpose of the matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}$. As the bottom K rows of an $N \times M$ upper triangular matrix consist entirely of zeroes, we thus have

$$\nu^T = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T = [\mathbf{Q}_1 \ \mathbf{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^T \\ \mathbf{0}_{K \times M} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{S}^T, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where \mathbf{S}^T is an $M \times M$ upper triangular matrix, $\mathbf{0}_{K \times M}$ is the $K \times M$ zero matrix, \mathbf{Q}_1 is a $N \times M$ matrix, \mathbf{Q}_2 is a $N \times K$ matrix, and both \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_2 have orthogonal columns. Further, the column space of \mathbf{Q}_1 is equal to the row space of ν , whereas the column space of \mathbf{Q}_2 is equal to the null space of ν , which follows from the fact that the row space of any nontrivial matrix is the orthogonal complement to its null space. To summarize, we have $\nu = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T$. For simplicity, we let the basis $\{-\mathbf{c}_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^K$ consist of the columns of \mathbf{Q}_2 .

Set $\mathbf{w} = [\mathbf{w}_1 \ \mathbf{w}_2]^T := \mathbf{Q}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$, where \mathbf{w}_1 is a $M \times M$ matrix, and \mathbf{w}_2 is a $K \times M$ matrix. Recall that $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^T = I_N$. Then we can rewrite the matrix $\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ of \mathbf{r} at the steady state \mathbf{x}^* as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}^T \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}) = [\mathbf{Q}_1 \ \mathbf{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{w}_2. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Together with (B1) and the orthogonal property of \mathbf{Q} , we can deduce that

$$J = \nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T)(\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{w}_2) = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{w}_1. \quad (\text{B3})$$

This in turn implies $\det(J) = \det(\mathbf{S}) \det(\mathbf{w}_1)$. Recall that the rank ($\text{rank}(\nu)$) of the matrix ν is M . Then we have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T) = \text{rank}(\nu) = M$. Hence \mathbf{S} is a square matrix of full rank, and so we can conclude that

$$\det(\mathbf{w}_1) = (\det(\mathbf{S}))^{-1} \det(J). \quad (\text{B4})$$

On the other hand, in view of the orthogonal properties of \mathbf{Q} , \mathbf{Q}_1 , and \mathbf{Q}_2 , the matrix \mathbf{A} (defined in the main text) can be written as

$$\mathbf{A} = \left[\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \ \mathbf{Q}_2 \right] = [\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w} \ \mathbf{Q}_2] = \mathbf{Q}[\mathbf{w} \ \mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q}_2] = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{M \times K} \\ \mathbf{w}_2 & I_K \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since \mathbf{Q} is a square orthogonal matrix with $\det(\mathbf{Q}) = \pm 1$, we can thus deduce

$$\det(\mathbf{w}_1) = \pm \det(\mathbf{A}). \quad (\text{B5})$$

Then from (B4) and (B5), we obtain the following result.

Theorem 1

$$\det(\mathbf{A}) = \pm \frac{\det(J)}{\det(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

¹ In general, for any $M \times N$ matrix ν , the identity $M + \dim \ker \nu = N + \dim \text{coker } \nu$ holds.

2. The proof of the equivalence when $K_c > 0$

a. The Jacobian matrix \tilde{J} for $K_c > 0$

To study the stability of (A2) around a steady state, we need to compute the associated Jacobian matrix $J = D\mathbf{x}\mathbf{f} = \nu \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$. On the other hand, when $K_c > 0$, there are only $\tilde{M} \equiv M - K_c$ independent variables in the set $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^M$. Thus we need to eliminate K_c redundant variables from the set $\{x_m\}_{m=1}^M$ before computing the Jacobian matrix J .

Indeed, when $K_c > 0$, without loss of generality, we may assume that the first K_c rows of ν are linearly dependent. Then we can rewrite ν in the following form [14],

$$\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\nu} \\ L\tilde{\nu} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\tilde{M}} \\ L \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\nu}, \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $\tilde{\nu}$ is a $\tilde{M} \times N$ matrix, and L (called a *link matrix*) is a $K_c \times \tilde{M}$ matrix. Here the matrix $I_{\tilde{M}}$ is the $\tilde{M} \times \tilde{M}$ identity matrix. In the remaining of this appendix, the terminology for the $n \times n$ identity matrix I_n with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is employed.

Decompose $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{ind} \\ \mathbf{x}_{dep} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{ind} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{M}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{dep} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_c}$. With these notations defined as above, we can rewrite the ODE system (A1) (or (A2)) in the following form,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = \frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{ind} \\ \mathbf{x}_{dep} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\tilde{M}} \\ L \end{pmatrix} \tilde{\nu} \mathbf{r}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Note $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x}_{dep} = L\tilde{\nu} \mathbf{r} = L \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x}_{ind}$. Then an integration of this identity indicates that the ODE system (B8) is equivalent to the following system:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{x}_{ind} = \tilde{\nu} \mathbf{r}, \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$-L\mathbf{x}_{ind} + \mathbf{x}_{dep} = \text{constant}. \quad (\text{B10})$$

Now we compute the Jacobian matrix \tilde{J} associated with the ODE system (B9). To proceed, let $\mathbf{x}^* = (\mathbf{x}_{ind}^*, \mathbf{x}_{dep}^*)$ be a steady state of (B8). Note that the reaction function \mathbf{r} depends not only on \mathbf{x}_{ind} , but also on \mathbf{x}_{dep} . Then the Jacobian matrix \tilde{J} associated with the ODE system (B9) around \mathbf{x}_{ind}^* is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J} &= \tilde{\nu} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}} := \tilde{\nu} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} \cdot \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*} \\ &= \tilde{\nu} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} L \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*} \\ &= \tilde{\nu} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} \right) \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I_{\tilde{M}} \\ L \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B11})$$

Note that the size of \tilde{J} is $\tilde{M} \times \tilde{M}$, that of $\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}}$ is $N \times \tilde{M}$, and that of $\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}}$ is $N \times K_c$.

b. QR decomposition of the stoichiometric matrix ν for $K_c > 0$

Consider the QR decomposition of the $\tilde{M} \times N$ matrix $\tilde{\nu}$. First, since $\tilde{\nu}$ is of full rank, we have $N \geq \tilde{M}$. Then employing the QR decomposition to the matrix $\tilde{\nu}^T$, we can factor the $\tilde{\nu}^T$ as the product of an $N \times N$ unitary matrix \mathbf{Q} and an $N \times \tilde{M}$ upper triangular matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T$ is the transpose of the matrix \mathbf{S} . As the bottom $(N - \tilde{M})$ rows of an $N \times \tilde{M}$ upper triangular matrix consist entirely of zeroes, we thus have

$$\tilde{\nu}^T = \mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{S}}^T = [\mathbf{Q}_1 \ \mathbf{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{S}^T \\ \mathbf{0}_{(N-\tilde{M}) \times \tilde{M}} \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{S}^T,$$

where \mathbf{S}^T is an $\tilde{M} \times \tilde{M}$ upper triangular matrix, $\mathbf{0}_{(N-\tilde{M}) \times \tilde{M}}$ is the $(N-\tilde{M}) \times \tilde{M}$ zero matrix, \mathbf{Q}_1 is a $N \times \tilde{M}$ matrix, \mathbf{Q}_2 is a $N \times (N-\tilde{M})$ matrix, and both \mathbf{Q}_1 and \mathbf{Q}_2 have orthogonal columns. Further, the column space of \mathbf{Q}_1 is equal to the row space of $\tilde{\nu}$, whereas the column space of \mathbf{Q}_2 is equal to the null space of $\tilde{\nu}$. The second statement follows from the fact that the row space of any nontrivial matrix is the orthogonal complement to its null space. To summarize, we have

$$\tilde{\nu} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T. \quad (\text{B12})$$

c. The matrix \mathbf{A} for $K_c > 0$ (review of [11])

We review the definition of the matrix \mathbf{A} for $K_c > 0$ [11] and express it by using the bases of the kernel and cokernel spaces of ν , introduced in the previous two sections. For a chemical reaction system with $K_c > 0$, the steady state depends continuously on the reaction rate $k_n (n = 1, \dots, N)$ and also on the initial values of conserved concentrations, $l_\beta (\beta = 1, \dots, K_c)$. Thus, we consider $N + K_c$ perturbations, in total. The sensitivity to the $N + K_c$ perturbations can be determined at once by solving the following equation,

$$\mathbf{A} \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 \mathbf{x} & \dots & \delta_{N+K_c} \mathbf{x} \\ \delta_1 \boldsymbol{\mu} & \dots & \delta_{N+K_c} \boldsymbol{\mu} \end{pmatrix} = - \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{E}_N & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{E}'_{K_c} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{B13})$$

where \mathbf{E}_N and \mathbf{E}'_{K_c} are $N \times N$ and $K_c \times K_c$ diagonal matrices, respectively, whose components are proportional to the perturbations; the n -th component of \mathbf{E}_N is given by $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial k_n} \delta k_n$, and the β -th component of \mathbf{E}'_{K_c} is given by δl_β . The matrix \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\mathbf{A} := \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ N \\ \downarrow \end{array} \\ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} & -\mathbf{c}^1 \dots -\mathbf{c}^K \\ \hline -(\mathbf{d}_1)^T & \\ \vdots & \\ -(\mathbf{d}_{K_c})^T & \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K} \end{array} \right), \quad (\text{B14}) \\ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ K_c \\ \downarrow \end{array} \end{array}$$

$\xleftarrow{M} \qquad \qquad \qquad \xleftarrow{K}$

where $\mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K}$ is a $K_c \times K$ zero matrix. With a direct computation, one can see that the row vectors of the following $K_c \times M$ matrix,

$$D := (-L \ I_{K_c}) \quad (\text{B15})$$

spans the cokernel space of ν . Recall that $\{\mathbf{d}_\beta\}_{\beta=1}^{K_c}$ is the basis of the cokernel space of the matrix ν . To facilitate the computation, we set

$$\begin{pmatrix} -(\mathbf{d}_1)^T \\ \vdots \\ -(\mathbf{d}_{K_c})^T \end{pmatrix} = D.$$

Also recall that $\{\mathbf{c}^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^K$ is the basis of the kernel $\ker(\nu)$ of the matrix ν , and that the column space of \mathbf{Q}_2 is the kernel $\ker(\tilde{\nu})$ of the matrix $\tilde{\nu}$. One can show that $\ker(\nu) = \ker(\tilde{\nu})$. Motivated by this, we set

$$(-\mathbf{c}^1, \dots, -\mathbf{c}^K) = \mathbf{Q}_2.$$

Taken together, the matrix \mathbf{A} takes the following form:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ N \\ \downarrow \end{array} \\ \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} & \mathbf{Q}_2 \\ \hline -L & I_{K_c} & \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K} \end{array} \right). \quad (\text{B16}) \\ \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ K_c \\ \downarrow \end{array} \end{array}$$

$\xleftarrow{M} \qquad \qquad \qquad \xleftarrow{K}$

d. The relation between the Jacobian matrix \tilde{J} and the matrix \mathbf{A} for $K_c > 0$

Set

$$\mathbf{w} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}_2 \end{bmatrix} := \mathbf{Q}^T \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}} = \mathbf{Q}^T \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} L \right), \quad (\text{B17})$$

where \mathbf{w}_1 is a $\tilde{M} \times \tilde{M}$ matrix, and \mathbf{w}_2 is a $(N - \tilde{M}) \times \tilde{M}$ matrix. Recall that $\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^T = I_N$. Then we can rewrite the matrix $\frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}} &= \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}^T \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}}), \\ &= [\mathbf{Q}_1 \ \mathbf{Q}_2] \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 \\ \mathbf{w}_2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{w}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B18})$$

Recall that $\tilde{\nu} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T$. Together with the fact that $\mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{Q}_1 = I_{\tilde{M}}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{Q}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{M} \times (N - \tilde{M})}$ where $\mathbf{0}_{\tilde{M} \times (N - \tilde{M})}$ is the $\tilde{M} \times (N - \tilde{M})$ zero matrix, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{J} &= \tilde{\nu} \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{d\mathbf{x}_{ind}} = (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T)(\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w}) \\ &= (\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T)(\mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{w}_1 + \mathbf{Q}_2 \mathbf{w}_2). \\ &= \mathbf{S}\mathbf{w}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B19})$$

This in turn implies

$$\det(\tilde{J}) = \det(\mathbf{S}) \det(\mathbf{w}_1).$$

Recall that the rank of the matrix $\tilde{\nu}$ is $\text{rank}(\tilde{\nu}) = \tilde{M}$. Then we have $\text{rank}(\mathbf{S}) = \text{rank}(\mathbf{S}\mathbf{Q}_1^T) = \text{rank}(\tilde{\nu}) = \tilde{M}$. Hence \mathbf{S} is a square matrix of full rank. Thus we can conclude that

$$\det(\mathbf{w}_1) = \frac{\det(\tilde{J})}{\det(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (\text{B20})$$

On the other hand, using (B17) we have

$$\mathbf{A} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} & \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} & \mathbf{Q}_2 \\ \hline -L & I_{K_c} & \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} L & \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} & \mathbf{Q}_2 \\ \hline -L & I_{K_c} & \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K} \end{array} \right).$$

To compute $\det(\mathbf{A})$, consider the matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w} & \mathbf{Q}_2 & \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times \tilde{M}} & \mathbf{0}_{K_c} & I_{K_c} \end{array} \right).$$

It is verified that $\det(\mathbf{A}) = (-1)^{K_c(K_c+1)/2} \det(\mathbf{B})$. Thus it suffices to consider the matrix

$$\mathbf{C} := [\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w} \ \mathbf{Q}_2].$$

In view of the fact that $\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q} = I_N$, $\mathbf{Q}_1^T \mathbf{Q}_2 = \mathbf{0}_{\tilde{M} \times (N - \tilde{M})}$, and $\mathbf{Q}_2^T \mathbf{Q}_2 = I_{N - \tilde{M}}$, we have

$$\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{C} = [\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{w} \ \mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q}_2] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{0}_{M \times (N - \tilde{M})} \\ I_{N - \tilde{M}} & \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{M \times (N - \tilde{M})} \\ \mathbf{w}_2 & I_{N - \tilde{M}} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This in turn implies

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{Q} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{w}_1 & \mathbf{0}_{M \times (N - \tilde{M})} \\ \mathbf{w}_2 & I_{N - \tilde{M}} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B21})$$

Since \mathbf{Q} is a square orthogonal matrix with $\det(\mathbf{Q}) = \pm 1$, we can thus deduce

$$\det(\mathbf{w}_1) = \pm \det(\mathbf{A}). \quad (\text{B22})$$

Then from (B20) and (B22), we can conclude the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *The following equality holds.*

$$\det(\mathbf{A}) = \pm \frac{\det(\tilde{\mathbf{J}})}{\det(\mathbf{S})}. \quad (\text{B23})$$

Appendix C: Structural Factorization of $\det \mathbf{A}$

Here, we explain the factorization of \mathbf{A} in detail, after reviewing buffering structures and the law of localization. Systems with $K_c = 0$ are discussed in section C 1, and those with $K_c > 0$ in section C 2.

1. Structural Factorization when $K_c = 0$

a. Buffering structure and the law of localization when $K_c = 0$ (review of [10])

We construct a *subnetwork* $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, a pair of chemicals and reactions, as follows:

1. Choose a subset $\mathbf{m} \subseteq \mathbb{X}$ of chemicals.
2. Choose a subset $\mathbf{n} \subseteq \mathbb{E}$ of reactions such that \mathbf{n} includes all reactions whose reaction rate functions $r_n(\mathbf{x})$ depend on at least one member in \mathbf{m} . Namely, we can construct \mathbf{n} by collecting all reactions n that are regulated by \mathbf{m} ² plus any other reactions.

Below, we consider only subnetworks constructed in this way and call them subnetworks. To proceed, we introduce the definition that a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ has support contained in \mathbf{n} . Indeed, for the reaction subset \mathbf{n} , we can associate the vector space $V(\mathbf{n})$:

$$V(\mathbf{n}) := \text{span} \{ \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{v} \in \ker \nu, P^n \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \}.$$

Here, P^n is an $N \times N$ projection matrix onto the space associated with \mathbf{n} defined by

$$P_{n,n'}^n = \delta_{n,n'} \text{ if } n, n' \in \mathbf{n}. \text{ Otherwise } P_{n,n'}^n = 0.$$

Then we say that a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ has support contained in \mathbf{n} if $\mathbf{v} \in V(\mathbf{n})$.

For a subnetwork $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, we define the *index* $\chi(\Gamma_s)$ by the relation

$$\chi(\Gamma_s) = |\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{n}| + (\#cycle). \quad (\text{C1})$$

Here, $|\mathbf{m}|$ and $|\mathbf{n}|$ are the number of elements in the sets \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} , respectively. The *#cycle* is the number of independent kernel vectors of the matrix ν whose supports are contained in \mathbf{n} . In general, $\chi(\Gamma_s)$ is non-positive (see [10]).

Then a *buffering structure* is defined as a subnetwork Γ_s with $\chi(\Gamma_s) = 0$.

It was proved in [10] that, for a buffering structure $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, the steady state values of chemical concentrations and reaction rates outside Γ_s are independent of the reaction rate parameters k_n of reactions in \mathbf{n} . Specifically, let $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_M^*)$ be the steady state of (A1). Note that \mathbf{x}^* depends on the parameter vector $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_N)^T$. Set

$$\mathbf{r}^* = (r_1^*, \dots, r_N^*) := (r_1(\mathbf{x}^*; k_1), \dots, r_N(\mathbf{x}^*; k_N)).$$

Then, for any $n' \in \mathbf{n}$, and any $m \in \mathbf{m}^c$ and $n \in \mathbf{n}^c$, one has

$$\frac{\partial x_m^*}{\partial k_{n'}} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial r_n^*}{\partial k_{n'}} = 0, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where $\mathbf{m}^c = \mathbb{X} \setminus \mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{n}^c = \mathbb{E} \setminus \mathbf{n}$ are the complementary set of \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{n} , respectively. For ease of notation, we set

$$\bar{\Gamma}_s := (\mathbf{m}^c, \mathbf{n}^c).$$

We remark that a whole network Γ always satisfies the condition of the law of localization because $\chi(\Gamma) = M - N + K = K_c = 0$.

² The phrase that the reaction n is regulated by the chemical m means that $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \neq 0$.

b. Factorization of the matrix \mathbf{A} when $K_c = 0$

Suppose that Γ_s is a buffering structure. Then, by permuting the columns and rows of the matrix \mathbf{A} , the resulting matrix (still denoted by \mathbf{A} for simplicity) can be written in the following form [10]:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s, \bar{\Gamma}_s} \\ \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{n}^c| \times |\mathbf{n}|} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

The entries of \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} consist of components of the constant vectors $\mathbf{v} \in V(\mathbf{n})$, and the term $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ with $(m, n) \in \Gamma_s$ ³ which corresponds to self-regulations inside Γ_s (regulations from chemicals in Γ_s to reaction rate functions in Γ_s). Similar characteristics for the entries of $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ can be observed, which corresponds to self-regulations inside the complementary part $\bar{\Gamma}_s$. The non-constant entries of the upper-right matrix $\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s, \bar{\Gamma}_s}$ correspond to regulations from $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ to Γ_s . Finally, the lower-left block in (C3) is the zero matrix because (i) the kernel vectors in Γ_s do not have support on reactions in \mathbf{n}^c and (ii) $\partial r_n / \partial x_m = 0$ for $n \in \mathbf{n}^c$, $m \in \mathbf{m}$ follows from the condition that Γ_s is output-complete (see also [10]).

Therefore, we have the following results.

Theorem 3 *The following hold for a buffering structure Γ_s in a network Γ .*

(i) *The determinant of the matrix \mathbf{A} can be factorized as follows:*

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \times \det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Note that $\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s, \bar{\Gamma}_s}$ does not contribute to $\det \mathbf{A}$.

(ii)

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}}{\partial k_n} = 0 \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbf{n}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

Thus the complementary part $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ is independent of the rate parameters k_n with $n \in \mathbf{n}$.

The assertion (ii) can be proved as follows: The entries of $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ consist of the term $\frac{\partial r_{n'}}{\partial x_{m'}} \big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ with $(m', n') \in (\mathbf{m}^c, \mathbf{n}^c)$ and the components of the kernel vectors of the matrix ν , which is obviously independent of k_n for each $n = 1, \dots, N$. From the construction of the subnetwork Γ_s , $r_{n'}$ are functions of variables $x_{m'}$ with $m' \in \mathbf{m}^c$ ⁴, and so the derivatives $\frac{\partial r_{n'}}{\partial x_{m'}} \big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ can be written in terms of $x_{m'}^*$ with $m' \in \mathbf{m}^c$. Then, these derivatives $\frac{\partial r_{n'}}{\partial x_{m'}} \big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$ are independent of k_n for $n \in \mathbf{n}$ due to (C2).

An important remark is that the above theorem can be applied not only to a single buffering structure but also for nested buffering structures. For example, a buffering structure within another larger buffering structure is studied similarly, by regarding Γ as a larger buffering structure and Γ_s as a smaller buffering structure in it.⁵

In summary, for a buffering structure Γ_s inside a network Γ , we have proved

$$\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma} = \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}}_{\text{independent of } k_{\Gamma_s}}, \quad (\text{C6})$$

where k_{Γ_s} denotes the set of parameters of reactions inside Γ_s .

c. Factorization for multiple buffering structures when $K_c = 0$

We generalize the above factorization formula (C6) into multiple buffering structures.

First, we consider a network Γ containing L non-intersecting buffering structures $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_L$. We write the complement of the buffering structures as $\bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L} := \Gamma \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_L)$;

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \dots \cup \Gamma_L \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}. \quad (\text{C7})$$

³ For ease of presentation, for a subnetwork $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, if no confusions can arise, we write $(m, n) \in \Gamma_s$ instead of “ $m \in \mathbf{m}$ and $n \in \mathbf{n}$ ”.

⁴ If the function $r_{n'}$ depended also on x_m with $m \in \mathbf{m}$, such a reaction n' should be included into Γ_s , by construction of the subnetwork Γ_s .

⁵ Recall that a whole network Γ is always a buffering structure.




FIG. S1: Example network Γ . Rectangular boxes, Γ_1 , Γ_2 , Γ_3 , indicate buffering structures. The law of localization indicates that k_{Γ_1} influences (steady-state values of chemicals and fluxes in) Γ_1 , k_{Γ_3} influences Γ_3 , $k_{\Gamma_3 \setminus 2}$ influences Γ_2 , and $k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}$ influences the whole network Γ .

In this case, the matrix \mathbf{A} can be written in the following form⁶;

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1, \bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_2, \bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_L} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_L, \bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C8})$$

where each shaded block \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} ($s = 1, \dots, L$) is an square matrix associated with Γ_s , defined as

$$\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = \left(\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)_{\Gamma_s} \middle| \mathbf{c}^{s_1} \ \dots \ \mathbf{c}^{s_{K_s}} \right). \quad (\text{C9})$$

Here, the left block, $\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)_{\Gamma_s}$, consists of $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m}$ with $(m, n) \in \Gamma_s$, and the right block corresponds to the independent kernel vectors of ν whose support are on reactions in Γ_s (K_s is the number of the kernel vectors).

Then, we can prove that

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \left(\prod_{s=1}^L \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}}_{\text{dependent on } k_{\Gamma_s} \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}}} \right) \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}}}_{\text{dependent on } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1, \dots, L}}}, \quad (\text{C10})$$

where $k_{\Gamma'}$ denotes the set of parameters associated with reactions inside a subnetwork Γ' . The parameter dependence is determined by using (C6) for every buffering structure Γ_s ($s = 1, \dots, L$). For example, (C6) for the buffering structure Γ_1 implies that the determinant factors except for $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1}$ is independent of k_{Γ_1} and so on.

We can also factorize a nested sequence of buffering structures. Consider a network Γ consisting of a nested sequence of L buffering structures $\Gamma_1 \subset \dots \subset \Gamma_L := \Gamma$. In this case, the matrix \mathbf{A} can be written as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1} & * & * & \cdots & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_2 \setminus \Gamma_1} & * & \cdots & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_3 \setminus \Gamma_2} & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_L \setminus \Gamma_{L-1}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

where $*$'s indicate nonzero blocks and the gradation of shade indicates the nested sequence of buffering structures, $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_L$. By using (C6) iteratively, we can prove

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1}}_{\text{dependent on } k_{\Gamma_L}} \prod_{s=1}^{L-1} \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_{s+1} \setminus \Gamma_s}}_{\text{dependent on } k_{\Gamma_{s+1} \setminus \Gamma_s}}. \quad (\text{C12})$$

⁶ For each structure Γ_s , the columns associated with chemicals and cycles in Γ_s have nonzero entries only for reactions in Γ_s , by the same reason explained below (C3). Thus, zero matrices appear in the non-diagonal blocks in (C8).

By using (C10) and (C12), we can factorize the determinant of \mathbf{A} for multiple buffering structures and determine the parameter dependence of each factor. We illustrate the procedure of factorization in an example network (see Fig. S1): Suppose that a whole network Γ contains two non-intersecting buffering structures Γ_1 and Γ_3 , and Γ_3 further contains a smaller buffering structure Γ_2 inside it;

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma &= \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3 \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{1,3} \\ &= \Gamma_1 \cup (\Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_{3\setminus 2}) \cup \bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}.\end{aligned}\tag{C13}$$

Here, $\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3} := \Gamma \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3)$ and $\Gamma_{3\setminus 2} := \Gamma_3 \setminus \Gamma_2$. In this case, the matrix \mathbf{A} can be written as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1} & \mathbf{0} & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_3} & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_2} & * & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_{3\setminus 2}} & * \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}} \end{pmatrix},\tag{C14}$$

and the determinant of \mathbf{A} is factorized as

$$\begin{aligned}\det \mathbf{A} &= \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\Gamma_1} \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_3}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\Gamma_3} \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \\ &= \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_1}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\Gamma_1} \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \times \left(\underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_2}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\Gamma_2}, k_{\Gamma_{3\setminus 2}}, \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_{3\setminus 2}}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\Gamma_{3\setminus 2}} \text{ and } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}} \right) \times \underbrace{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}}_{\text{depends on } k_{\bar{\Gamma}_{1,3}}}.\end{aligned}\tag{C15}$$

In the first line, we have used (C10) with $L = 2$ for the whole network Γ . In the second line, we have used (C12) with $L = 2$, namely (C6), for the buffering structure Γ_3 , where the factor $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_3}$ is factorized further and its dependence on k_{Γ_3} is determined more finely.

2. Structural Factorization when $K_c > 0$

a. Buffering structure and the law of localization when $K_c > 0$ (review of [11])

The law of localization also holds when $K_c > 0$ if we modify the definition of the index χ appropriately. Note that the construction of a subnetwork is the same as in the case $K_c = 0$.

For a subnetwork $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$, we define χ as

$$\chi(\Gamma_s) = |\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{n}| + (\#\text{cycle}) - (\#\text{conserved concentration}).\tag{C16}$$

Here, $(\#\text{conserved concentration})$ counts conserved quantities in Γ_s , and is, more precisely, defined as the dimension of the vector space

$$V(\mathbf{m}) := \text{span} \{ P^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{u} \mid \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^M, \mathbf{u}^T \boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{0} \},\tag{C17}$$

where $P^{\mathbf{m}}$ is an $M \times M$ projection matrix for chemicals in \mathbf{m} ;

$$P_{m,m'}^{\mathbf{m}} = \delta_{m,m'} \text{ if } m, m' \in \mathbf{m}, \text{ otherwise } P_{m,m'}^{\mathbf{m}} = 0.\tag{C18}$$

Then, we again call a subnetwork Γ_s a buffering structure when it satisfies $\chi(\Gamma_s) = 0$, where χ is defined by (C16).

Recall that, when $K_c > 0$, steady states generally depend on reaction rate parameters k_n and the initial concentrations l_β . In [11], it was proved that, *for a buffering structure Γ_s , the values of the steady state concentrations and fluxes outside of Γ_s are independent of the reaction rate parameters and conserved quantities (initial conditions)*⁷ associated with Γ_s . This is the generalized version of the law of localization into the case of $K_c > 0$.

⁷ We say that a conserved concentration l_β is associated with Γ_s , if it can be written as $l_\beta = \mathbf{d}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{x}$ with $\mathbf{d}_\beta \in \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{m})$.

b. Factorization of the matrix \mathbf{A} when $K_c > 0$

As discussed in [11], when $K_c > 0$, by taking appropriate bases for the kernel and cokernel spaces of ν and permutating indices of the matrix, the matrix \mathbf{A} can be again expressed as

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} & \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s, \bar{\Gamma}_s} \\ \mathbf{0}_{|\mathbf{m}^c| \times |\mathbf{n}^c|} & \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C19})$$

where \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} is a square matrix, whose column (resp. row) indices correspond to chemicals and cycles (resp. reactions and conserved concentrations) associated with Γ_s .

Then, we obtain the following results.

Theorem 4 *The following hold for a buffering structure Γ_s .*

(i) *The determinant of the matrix \mathbf{A} can be factorized as follows:*

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \times \det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}. \quad (\text{C20})$$

Thus $\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s, \bar{\Gamma}_s}$ does not contribute to $\det \mathbf{A}$.

(ii)

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}}{\partial k_n} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}}{\partial l_\beta} = 0 \quad (\text{C21})$$

for reaction rate parameters k_n and conserved concentrations l_β associated with Γ_s .

(ii) can be proved in the same way as in (C5): $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ is a function of chemical concentrations in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, whose steady-state values are independent of reaction rate parameters and conserved concentrations associated with Γ_s , due to the law of localization.

c. Factorization for multiple buffering structures when $K_c > 0$

The factorization for multiple buffering structures is performed in the same way as in the case with $K_c = 0$, except that, in the case of $K_c > 0$, determinant factors in $\det \mathbf{A}$ depend not only on k_n but also on that of l_β . From the law of localization, we can determine how parameters k_n and conserved concentrations l_β influences determinant factors, $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$, in (C20) structurally.

Appendix D: Null vectors of the matrix \mathbf{A} and the Jacobian matrix, and bifurcating chemicals

Suppose that a chemical reaction system Γ exhibits steady-state bifurcations. At a bifurcation point, there exist null vectors⁸ for the matrix \mathbf{A} and the Jacobian matrix, since $\det \mathbf{A} = \det J = 0$. In the presence of a buffering structure Γ_s , the bifurcation is associated with either $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ or $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$.

In this section, we show that, for a bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$, the null vector \mathbf{v} of the Jacobian matrix satisfies

$$v_m = 0 \quad \text{for chemical } m \in \bar{\Gamma}_s. \quad (\text{D1})$$

Namely, \mathbf{v} has support inside chemicals in Γ_s . This implies that, for a bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$, only chemicals inside Γ_s undergo a bifurcating behavior.

⁸ For J and \mathbf{A} , we call their eigenvectors with eigenvalue 0 null vectors, rather than kernel vectors, in order to distinguish them from kernel vectors of ν .

1. Null vectors of the matrix \mathbf{A} and the Jacobian matrix when $K_c = 0$

The strategy for showing (D1) is to use the null vectors of \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} to construct the associated null vector \mathbf{v} of the Jacobian matrix J .

We consider a chemical reaction system of M chemicals and N reactions where the cokernel space of ν consists only of the zero vector. Suppose that $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ whose associated buffering structure $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ contains $|\mathbf{m}|$ chemicals, $|\mathbf{n}|$ reactions, and $K_s = |\mathbf{n}| - |\mathbf{m}|$ kernel vectors, $\{\mathbf{c}^1, \dots, \mathbf{c}^{K_s}\}$, of ν . By construction, each $\mathbf{c}^\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N$ ($\alpha = 1, \dots, K_s$) has support on reactions inside Γ_s , and thus has the following form,

$$\mathbf{c}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}'^\alpha \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{D2})$$

where the upper $|\mathbf{n}|$ components (resp. lower $N - |\mathbf{n}|$ components) are associated with reactions in Γ_s (resp. $\bar{\Gamma}_s$). By using \mathbf{c}'^α , \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} in (C3) can be written as

$$\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = \left(\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)_{\Gamma_s} \left| \begin{array}{c} -\mathbf{c}'^1 \dots -\mathbf{c}'^{K_s} \end{array} \right. \right), \quad (\text{D3})$$

where $\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \right)_{\Gamma_s}$ is an $|\mathbf{n}| \times |\mathbf{m}|$ matrix whose (n, m) component is given by $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m}$ with $n \in \mathbf{n}$ and $m \in \mathbf{m}$.

Since $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$, there exist a null vector $\mathbf{u}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{m}|+K_s}$ such that

$$\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \mathbf{u}_s = 0. \quad (\text{D4})$$

If we write $\mathbf{u}_s = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{|\mathbf{m}|}, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{K_s})$ and substitute \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} in (D3) into Eq. (D4), we obtain

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \eta_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}'^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0 \quad (\text{D5})$$

for any reaction $n \in \mathbf{n}$. Note that all indices in (D5) are associated with Γ_s .

In order to relate (D5) with the Jacobian matrix J of the whole system Γ , we rewrite (D5) using indices of the whole system. First, by using (D2) and $\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} = 0$ for $m \in \mathbf{m}, n \in \mathbf{n}^c$, corresponding to the fact that chemical concentrations in a buffering structure does not appear in the arguments of rate functions of reactions outside the buffering structure, we can rewrite (D5) as

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \eta_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0, \quad (\text{D6})$$

where n is any reaction in the whole system $\Gamma = (\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{E})$. Note that \mathbf{c}' has been replaced by \mathbf{c} . Furthermore, by introducing an M -dimensional vector \mathbf{v} as $\mathbf{v} = (\underbrace{\boldsymbol{\eta}, 0, \dots, 0}_{M-|\mathbf{m}|})$, (D6) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} \eta_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0, \quad (\text{D7})$$

where the summation of m is taken over all chemicals in Γ . Finally, by multiplying (D7) with the stoichiometry matrix ν and using the fact that \mathbf{c}^α is a kernel vector of ν , we obtain

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{E}} \nu_{m',n} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} v_m = 0, \quad (\text{D8})$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}} J_{m',m} v_m = 0. \quad (\text{D9})$$

Thus, we have proved that $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ is associated with the null vector \mathbf{v} of the Jacobian matrix J , whose support is inside chemicals in Γ_s . Thus, (D1) is proved.

A similar argument cannot be applied into a bifurcation associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$. This difference comes from the nonsymmetric structure of the matrix \mathbf{A} in (C3); while columns associated with chemicals and kernels in Γ_s do not have support on reactions in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (see zero entries in the lower-left block in (C3)), those associated with $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ generally have support on both reactions in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ and those in Γ_s (see nonzero entries in the upper-right block in (C3)). This implies that, while null vectors of J associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ do not have support on chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, those associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$ generally have support on both chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ and those in Γ_s .

2. Null vectors of the matrix \mathbf{A} and the Jacobian matrix when $K_c > 0$

A similar result can also be proved when $K_c > 0$. Let Γ be a network system of M chemicals and N reactions whose corresponding stoichiometry matrix ν has K kernel vectors and $K_c > 0$ cokernel vectors (conserved concentrations).

Suppose that the subnetwork $\Gamma_s = (\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n})$ is a buffering structure. We separate the set of all chemicals \mathbb{X} into two groups, \mathbb{X}_{dep} and \mathbb{X}_{ind} , as in section B2. Note that $K_c = |\mathbb{X}_{dep}|$ since each of cokernel vectors of ν corresponds to a chemical in \mathbb{X}_{dep} .⁹ Accordingly, we also separate the set of chemicals \mathbf{m} in Γ_s into two groups, $\mathbf{m}_{dep} := \mathbf{m} \cup \mathbb{X}_{dep}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{ind} := \mathbf{m} \cup \mathbb{X}_{ind}$. Then, this buffering structure consists of $|\mathbf{m}| = |\mathbf{m}_{dep}| + |\mathbf{m}_{ind}|$ chemicals, $|\mathbf{n}|$ reactions, K_s kernel vectors of ν , and $|\mathbf{m}_{dep}|$ conserved concentrations, satisfying $|\mathbf{m}| - |\mathbf{n}| + K_s - |\mathbf{m}_{dep}| = 0$.

The matrix \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} in (C19) has the following form,

$$\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} \right)_{\Gamma_s} & \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} \right)_{\Gamma_s} & -\mathbf{c}'^1 \dots - \mathbf{c}'^{K_s} \\ \hline -L_{\Gamma_s} & \mathbf{1}_{K_c} & \mathbf{0}_{K_c \times K_s} \end{array} \right). \quad (\text{D10})$$

Here, the column indices are associated with \mathbf{m}_{ind} , \mathbf{m}_{dep} , and kernel vectors of ν in Γ_s , from left to right, and the row indices are associated with \mathbf{n} and cokernel vectors associated with Γ_s . The left two blocks of \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} are obtained by taking columns and rows associated with Γ_s from the left two block of the matrix \mathbf{A} in (B16): $\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ind}} \right)_{\Gamma_s}$ is an $N_s \times |\mathbf{m}_{ind}|$ matrix, $\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{dep}} \right)_{\Gamma_s}$ is an $N_s \times |\mathbf{m}_{dep}|$ matrix. L_{Γ_s} is an $|\mathbf{m}_{dep}| \times |\mathbf{m}_{ind}|$ matrix, which is the submatrix of the matrix L in (B16), obtained by taking the rows associated with \mathbf{m}_{dep} and columns associated with \mathbf{m}_{ind} .

Suppose that $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$. We denote the null vector $\mathbf{u}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{m}|+K_s}$ of \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} as

$$\mathbf{u}_s = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{|\mathbf{m}_{ind}|}, \tilde{\eta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\eta}_{|\mathbf{m}_{dep}|}, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{K_s})^T. \quad (\text{D11})$$

The equation $\mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} \mathbf{u}_s = 0$ leads to the following two equations;

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbf{m}_{ind}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{ind,m}} \eta_m + \sum_{m \in \mathbf{m}_{dep}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{dep,m}} \tilde{\eta}_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}'^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0 \quad (\text{D12})$$

for any reaction $n \in \mathbf{n}$, and

$$\tilde{\eta}_m = \sum_{m' \in \mathbf{m}_{ind}} (L)_{m,m'} \eta_{m'}, \quad (\text{D13})$$

for any chemical $m \in \mathbf{m}_{dep}$.

By plugging (D13) into (D12), we obtain

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbf{m}_{ind}} \left(\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{ind,m}} + \sum_{m' \in \mathbf{m}_{dep}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{dep,m'}} L_{m',m} \right) \eta_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}'^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0, \quad (\text{D14})$$

for any reaction $n \in \mathbf{n}$.

As in the case of $K_c = 0$, we rewire (D14) using indices of the whole systems. We introduce an $|\mathbb{X}_{ind}| (= M - K_c)$ dimensional vector,

$$\mathbf{v} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}, \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\tilde{M} - |\mathbf{m}_{ind}|}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{M}}. \quad (\text{D15})$$

⁹ More explicitly, this correspondence is expressed by the identity matrix $\mathbf{1}_{K_c}$ in (B16), where the columns are associated with \mathbb{X}_{dep} and the rows with the cokernel vectors.

Then, by using the same reasoning used to derive (D7) from (D5) and the relation $L_{m'm} = 0$ for $m' \in \mathbb{X}_{dep} \setminus \mathbf{m}_{dep}$, $m \in \mathbf{m}_{ind}$,¹⁰ (D14) can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}_{ind}} \left(\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{ind,m}} + \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{X}_{dep}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{dep,m'}} L_{m',m} \right) v_m - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{K_s} (\mathbf{c}^\alpha)_n \zeta_\alpha = 0, \quad (\text{D16})$$

where we have replaced N_s -dimensional vectors $\mathbf{c}^{\prime\alpha}$ by N -dimensional vectors \mathbf{c}^α (see (D2)), and the summations over m, m' are taken over all chemicals in Γ .

Finally, by multiplying (D16) with \tilde{v} , we obtain

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{E}} \tilde{v}_{m'',n} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}_{ind}} \left(\frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{ind,m}} + \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{X}_{dep}} \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_{dep,m'}} L_{m',m} \right) v_m = 0, \quad (\text{D17})$$

or, equivalently,

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{X}_{ind}} \tilde{J}_{m',m} v_m = 0, \quad (\text{D18})$$

where \tilde{J} is defined in (B11). Thus, the null vector \mathbf{v} of \tilde{J} associated with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s} = 0$ has support in chemicals in Γ_s .

Appendix E: Parameters used in Fig. 3 in the main text

The dynamics of the hypothetical example in the main text is given by the following ODEs,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_A &= k_1 - k_2 x_A + k_3 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{3,A} x_A^2}{x_A^2 + 5} \right) \\ \dot{x}_B &= k_2 x_A - k_3 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{3,A} x_A^2}{x_A^2 + 5} \right) - k_4 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{4,C} x_C^2}{x_C^2 + 5} \right) \\ \dot{x}_C &= k_4 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{4,C} x_C^2}{x_C^2 + 5} \right) - k_5 x_C \left(1 + \frac{k_{5,B} x_B^2}{x_B^2 + 5} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E1})$$

In Fig. 3 in the main text, we used the following parameters. For the bifurcation associated with $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (Fig. 3 (a)), we used the following parameter sets. For the plot of the curve of red squares, $\vec{k} = (80, \underline{81}, \underline{25}, 46, 43)$, $(k_{3,A}, k_{4,C}) = (\underline{1}, 70)$, while for the plot of the curve of blue circles, $\vec{k} = (80, \underline{85}, \underline{20}, 46, 43)$ and $(k_{3,A}, k_{4,C}) = (\underline{5}, 70)$. Note that we use the underlines to emphasize which components in the parameter sets are different in these two considered cases.

For the bifurcation associated with Γ_s (Fig. 3 (b)), we used the following parameter sets. For the plot of the curve of red squares, $\vec{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_5) = (7, 54, 8, \underline{22}, \underline{45})$, $(k_{4,C}, k_{5,B}) = (\underline{0}, \underline{0})$, while for the plot of the curve of blue circles, $\vec{k} = (7, 54, 8, \underline{25}, \underline{40})$ and $(k_{4,C}, k_{5,B}) = (\underline{5}, \underline{5})$. As before, we use the underlines to emphasize the different components between these two considered parameter sets.

For the bifurcation associated with $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ (Fig. 3 (c)), we used the following parameter sets. For the plot of the curve of red squares, $\vec{k} = (7, 54, 8, 25, 40)$, $(k_{3,A}, k_{4,C}) = (\underline{100}, 5)$, while for the plot of the curve of blue circles, $\vec{k} = (7, 54, 8, 25, 40)$, $(k_{3,A}, k_{4,C}) = (\underline{99.9}, 5)$. The use of the underlines can be explained as before.

Appendix F: Structural bifurcation analysis for the E. coli network

1. Reaction list of the E. coli network

The central carbon metabolism of the E. coli in the main text consists of the following reactions:

- 1: Glucose + PEP \rightarrow G6P + PYR.
- 2: G6P \leftarrow F6P.

¹⁰ This can be proved from the condition of a buffering structure: If $L_{m'm}$ was nonzero for some $m' \in \mathbb{X}_{dep} \setminus \mathbf{m}_{dep}$, $m \in \mathbf{m}_{ind}$, nonzero entries would appear in the lower-right block of \mathbf{A} in (C19) and Γ_s would not be a buffering structure, which contradicts our assumption.

- 3: F6P \rightarrow G6P.
- 4: F6P \rightarrow F1,6P.
- 5: F1,6P \rightarrow G3P + DHAP.
- 6: DHAP \rightarrow G3P.
- 7: G3P \rightarrow 3PG.
- 8: 3PG \rightarrow PEP.
- 9: PEP \rightarrow 3PG.
- 10: PEP \rightarrow PYR.
- 11: PYR \rightarrow PEP.
- 12: PYR \rightarrow AcCoA + CO2.
- 13: G6P \rightarrow 6PG.
- 14: 6PG \rightarrow Ru5P + CO2.
- 15: Ru5P \rightarrow X5P.
- 16: Ru5P \rightarrow R5P.
- 17: X5P + R5P \rightarrow G3P + S7P.
- 18: G3P + S7P \rightarrow X5P + R5P.
- 19: G3P + S7P \rightarrow F6P + E4P.
- 20: F6P + E4P \rightarrow G3P + S7P.
- 21: X5P + E4P \rightarrow F6P + G3P.
- 22: F6P + G3P \rightarrow X5P + E4P.
- 23: AcCoA + \rightarrow CIT.
- 24: CIT \rightarrow ICT.
- 25: ICT \rightarrow 2-KG + CO2.
- 26: 2-KG \rightarrow SUC + CO2.
- 27: SUC \rightarrow FUM.
- 28: FUM \rightarrow MAL.
- 29: MAL \rightarrow OAA.
- 30: OAA \rightarrow MAL.
- 31: PEP + CO2 \rightarrow OAA.
- 32: OAA \rightarrow PEP + CO2.
- 33: MAL \rightarrow PYR + CO2.
- 34: ICT \rightarrow SUC + Glyoxylate.
- 35: Glyoxylate + AcCoA \rightarrow MAL.
- 36: 6PG \rightarrow G3P + PYR.
- 37: AcCoA \rightarrow Acetate.
- 38: PYR \rightarrow Lactate.
- 39: AcCoA \rightarrow Ethanol.
- 40: R5P \rightarrow (output).
- 41: OAA \rightarrow (output).
- 42: CO2 \rightarrow (output).
- 43: (input) \rightarrow Glucose.
- 44: Acetate \rightarrow (output).
- 45: Lactate \rightarrow (output).
- 46: Ethanol \rightarrow (output).

2. Buffering structures in the E. coli network

Assuming that each reaction rate function depends on its substrate concentrations, we find 17 independent¹¹ buffering structures in the E. coli system [10]. The inclusion relation between them is summarized in Fig. S2. For each box in Fig. S2, the set of chemicals and reactions (indicated by numbers) in the box plus those in its downward boxes gives a buffering structure. In other words, the set of chemicals and reactions in each box gives a subnetwork, which is a buffering structure with subtraction of its inner buffering structures.¹² The determinant $\det \mathbf{A}$ are factorized according to these 17 subnetworks.

We write down explicitly the 17 buffering structures:

$$\Gamma_1 = (\{\text{Glucose}\}, \{1\}).$$

¹¹ In general, the union of buffering structures is also a buffering structure. Therefore, precisely speaking, these 17 buffering structures should be regarded as “generators” of buffering structures, since we can construct all buffering structures in the system by taking all possible unions of these 17 buffering structures.

¹² Remark that, in Fig. S2, while a box without emanating arrows from it, such as $(\{\text{Glucose}\}, \{1\})$, corresponds to a buffering structure, a box with emanating arrows from it, such as $(\{\text{R5P}\}, \{40\})$, itself is not a buffering structure.




FIG. S2: The set of chemicals and reactions, (indicated by numbers) in each box corresponds to a buffering structure with subtraction of its inner buffering structures.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Gamma_2 &= (\{3PG\}, \{8\}) \\
 \Gamma_3 &= (\{CIT\}, \{24\}), \\
 \Gamma_4 &= (\{2-KG\}, \{26\}), \\
 \Gamma_5 &= (\{SUC\}, \{27\}), \\
 \Gamma_6 &= (\{FUM\}, \{28\}), \\
 \Gamma_7 &= (\{Glyoxylate\}, \{35\}), \\
 \Gamma_8 &= (\{Acetate\}, \{44\}), \\
 \Gamma_9 &= (\{Lactate\}, \{45\}), \\
 \Gamma_{10} &= (\{Ethanol\}, \{46\}), \\
 \Gamma_{11} &= (\{Glucose, PEP, 3PG, PYR, AcCoA, OAA, CIT, ICT, \\
 &2-KG, SUC, FUM, MAL, CO_2, Glyoxylate, Acetate, Lactate, \\
 &Ethanol\}, \{1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, \\
 &32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46\}), \\
 \Gamma_{12} &= (\{X5P, S7P, E4P\}, \{17, 18, 19, 20, 21\}), \\
 \Gamma_{13} &= (\{G3P, X5P, S7P, E4P\}, \{7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22\}) \\
 \Gamma_{14} &= (\{X5P, R5P, S7P, E4P\}, \{17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 40\}), \\
 \Gamma_{15} &= (\{F1, 6P\}, \{5\}), \\
 \Gamma_{16} &= (\{DHAP\}, \{6\}), \\
 \Gamma_{17} &= (\{Glucose, PEP, G6P, F6P, F1, 6P, DHAP, G3P, 3PG, \\
 &PYR, 6PG, Ru5P, X5P, R5P, S7P, E4P, AcCoA, OAA, CIT, \\
 &ICT, 2-KG, SUC, FUM, MAL, CO_2, Glyoxylate, Acetate, \\
 &Lactate, Ethanol\}, \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, \\
 &16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, \\
 &34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46\}).
 \end{aligned}$$

3. Structural bifurcation analysis

For the *E. coli* system, we construct the matrix \mathbf{A} . Up to a constant factor,¹³ the determinant $\det \mathbf{A}$ is factorized as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \det \mathbf{A} &= r_{1, \text{Glucose}} r_{5, \text{F1,6P}} r_{6, \text{DHAP}} r_{8, \text{3PG}} r_{44, \text{Acetate}} r_{45, \text{Lactate}} r_{46, \text{Ethanol}} \\
 &\quad \times r_{24, \text{CIT}} r_{26, \text{2-KG}} r_{27, \text{SUC}} r_{28, \text{FUM}} r_{35, \text{Glyoxylate}} \\
 &\quad \times r_{7, \text{G3P}} r_{40, \text{R5P}} (r_{17, \text{X5P}} r_{19, \text{S7P}} r_{21, \text{E4P}} + r_{18, \text{S7P}} r_{20, \text{E4P}} r_{21, \text{X5P}}) \\
 &\quad \times \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma'} \times \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}
 \end{aligned} \tag{F1}$$

Here, $r_{n,m} = \frac{\partial r_n}{\partial x_m} |_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}^*}$. Each of the 17 factors in (F1) is associated with a subnetwork in Fig. S2. Here, the first two lines is the product of the factors $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}$ ($s = 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17$), each of which is associated with a buffering structure Γ_s with a single chemical. In the third line, $r_{7, \text{G3P}}$, $r_{40, \text{R5P}}$, and the factor inside (...) are associated with the three subnetworks, $(\{G3P\}, \{7\})$, $(\{R5P\}, \{40\})$, and $\Gamma_{12} = (\{X5P, S7P, E4P\}, \{17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22\})$

¹³ The overall constant of $\det \mathbf{A}$, which depends on normalization of kernel vectors of ν in \mathbf{A} , is irrelevant for our discussion.

in Fig S2, respectively. The factor $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma'}$ in the last line of (F1) is associated with the subnetwork $\Gamma' := (\{G6P, F6P, 6PG, Ru5P\}, \{2, 3, 4, 13, 14, 15, 16, 36, 43\})$ (the green box in Fig. S2) and given by

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma'} = & r_{2,G6P} r_{4,F6P} (r_{15,Ru5P} + r_{16,Ru5P}) (r_{14,6PG} + r_{36,6PG}) \\ & + r_{13,G6P} \left(r_{4,F6P} (r_{15,Ru5P} + r_{16,Ru5P}) (r_{14,6PG} + r_{36,6PG}) \right. \\ & \left. + r_{3,F6P} (r_{14,6PG} r_{16,Ru5P} + (r_{15,Ru5P} + r_{16,Ru5P}) r_{36,6PG}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (F2)$$

The last factor $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}$ in (F1) is associated with the subnetwork $\Gamma'' := (\{PEP, PYR, AcCoA, OAA, ICT, MAL, CO2\}, \{10, 11, 12, 23, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42\})$ (the red box in Fig. S2) and given by

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''} = & r_{10,PEP} (r_{38,PYR} (r_{23,OAA} (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA}) (r_{25,ICT} (2r_{29,MAL} r_{31,CO2} \\ & + r_{33,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} - r_{42,CO2}) + r_{34,ICT} (r_{31,CO2} - r_{42,CO2}) + r_{29,MAL} (r_{31,CO2} + r_{42,CO2}))) \\ & - (r_{23,AcCoA} (r_{25,ICT} + 2r_{34,ICT}) + (r_{25,ICT} + r_{34,ICT}) (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA})) (r_{29,MAL} (r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} \\ & + (r_{32,OAA} + r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2}) + r_{33,MAL} (r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{30,OAA} + r_{32,OAA} + r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2})) \\ & + r_{12,PYR} (- (r_{25,ICT} + r_{34,ICT}) (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA}) (r_{29,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} \\ & + (r_{32,OAA} + r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2}) + r_{33,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{30,OAA} + r_{32,OAA} + r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2})) \\ & + r_{23,OAA} (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA}) (r_{25,ICT} (2r_{29,MAL} r_{31,CO2} + r_{33,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} - r_{42,CO2})) \\ & + r_{34,ICT} (r_{33,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} - r_{42,CO2}) + r_{29,MAL} (2r_{31,CO2} + r_{42,CO2}))) \\ & - r_{23,AcCoA} (r_{25,ICT} (r_{33,MAL} (4r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{30,OAA} \\ & + r_{32,OAA}) r_{42,CO2}) + r_{29,MAL} (4r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{32,OAA} + r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2})) \\ & + r_{34,ICT} (r_{33,MAL} (4r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{30,OAA} + r_{32,OAA}) r_{42,CO2}) \\ & + r_{29,MAL} (4r_{31,CO2} r_{41,OAA} + (r_{32,OAA} + 2r_{41,OAA}) r_{42,CO2})))) \\ & - r_{31,PEP} (-r_{11,PYR} (r_{29,MAL} + r_{33,MAL}) (r_{23,OAA} r_{34,ICT} (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA}) \\ & - (r_{23,AcCoA} (r_{25,ICT} + 2r_{34,ICT}) + (r_{25,ICT} + r_{34,ICT}) (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA})) r_{41,OAA}) \\ & + r_{38,PYR} (r_{23,AcCoA} (r_{25,ICT} + 2r_{34,ICT}) (r_{30,OAA} r_{33,MAL} + (r_{29,MAL} + r_{33,MAL}) r_{41,OAA}) \\ & + (r_{37,AcCoA} + r_{39,AcCoA}) (r_{23,OAA} (r_{25,ICT} r_{33,MAL} + (r_{33,MAL} - r_{29,MAL}) r_{34,ICT}) \\ & + (r_{25,ICT} + r_{34,ICT}) (r_{30,OAA} r_{33,MAL} + (r_{29,MAL} + r_{33,MAL}) r_{41,OAA}))) \\ & + r_{12,PYR} (r_{23,AcCoA} (r_{25,ICT} (r_{30,OAA} r_{33,MAL} \\ & + r_{29,MAL} r_{41,OAA}) + r_{34,ICT} (r_{30,OAA} r_{33,MAL} + 2r_{29,MAL} r_{41,OAA})) + (r_{37,AcCoA} \\ & + r_{39,AcCoA}) (r_{23,OAA} (r_{25,ICT} r_{33,MAL} + (r_{33,MAL} - r_{29,MAL}) r_{34,ICT}) \\ & + (r_{25,ICT} + r_{34,ICT}) (r_{30,OAA} r_{33,MAL} + (r_{29,MAL} + r_{33,MAL}) r_{41,OAA})))) r_{42,CO2}. \end{aligned} \quad (F3)$$

Since $r_{n,m} > 0$, we see that, among the 17 factors in (F1), only the last factor $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}$ contains both of plus and minus signs. Therefore, if this system exhibits a steady-state bifurcation (under parameter change), it should be the subnetwork Γ'' whose determinant changes its sign at the bifurcation point.

4. Numerical analysis

In the discussion so far, we have not assumed any specific kinetic for reaction rates. To numerically demonstrate bifurcation behaviors in the *E. coli* system, we first consider the case that all the reactions obey the mass-action kinetics with reaction rate constant k_n ($n = 1, \dots, 47$). In this case, we found that, for any parameter choices, the *E. coli* system has either a single stable solution or a blow up solution, and no steady-state bifurcations were observed. We also performed the same analysis in the case of the Michaelis-Menten kinetics, and no bifurcations were observed.

We next consider the case that the reaction 11 : $PYR \rightarrow PEP$ is positively regulated by PEP. Specifically, we modified the rate of reaction 11 from $r_{11} = k_{11} x_{PYR}$ into

$$r_{11} = k_{11} x_{PYR} \left(1 + k_{11,PEP} \frac{x_{PEP}^2}{x_{PEP}^2 + K} \right) \quad (F4)$$

where $k_{11,PEP}$ represents the strength of the regulation. All reactions except reaction 11 obey the mass-action kinetics as before.

We remark that the regulation from PEP to reaction 11 does not change the buffering structures in section F 2

since adding this regulation does not ruin the condition of output-completeness.¹⁴ Thus, the inclusion relation of buffering structures shown in Fig. F2 is also intact under the modification (F4) of the kinetics.

As explained previously, only bifurcations associated with Γ'' (the red box in Fig S2) are possible for this system. The inducing parameters are then given by parameters associated with reactions in the green and red boxes in Fig S2. As a candidate bifurcation parameter, we choose the parameter $k_{11,PEP}$, which is associated with reaction 11 and an inducing parameter for Γ'' . The reaction rate constants of the mass-action kinetics were set as

$$(k_1, \dots, k_{47}) = (18.9, 55.9, 20.5, 5.17, 8.14, 107, 15.7, 2.38, 32, 3.08, 38.8, 471, 7.54, 1.28, 24.4, 84.9, 23.1, 1.64, 90.6, 132, 65, 47, 237, 1.19, 11.7, 1.80, 98.5, 27, 1090, 3.15, 484, 1.44, 543, 12.2, 20, 89.5, 2.98, 7.23, 48.9, 2.96, 21.6, 37.6, 85, 131, 28.2, 2.37). \quad (\text{F5})$$





FIG. S3: $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}$ versus $k_{11,PEP}$. The red curves correspond to two stable solutions, and the blue curve corresponds to an unstable solution.

Fig. S3 shows the numerical result for $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}$ versus $k_{11,PEP}$. For large $k_{11,PEP}$, there are two stable solutions (red curves) and one unstable solution (blue curve). As $k_{11,PEP}$ is decreased, the values of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma''}$ for a stable and unstable solutions decreases and eventually approach zero. Thus, the parameter $k_{11,PEP}$, which is one of the inducing parameters for Γ'' , actually induces a bifurcation associated with Γ'' .

The bifurcating chemicals for Γ'' are those in the blue and red boxes. Fig. S4 shows the numerical results for the steady-state concentrations versus the parameter $k_{11,PEP}$. We see that saddle-node bifurcations are observed only for the bifurcating chemicals.

Appendix G: An example exhibiting transcritical bifurcation

Consider the system in Fig. S5. This system is designed by modifying the First Schlögl Model [12]. It consists of reactions



The stoichiometry matrix ν is

$$\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{G2})$$

¹⁴ This is generally the case, if an additional regulation is within a buffering structure Γ_s , i.e. from a chemical in Γ_s to a reaction in Γ_s .




FIG. S4: Steady-state concentrations versus $k_{11,PEP}$ (the horizontal axis) in the *E. coli* system. Each box corresponds to the one in Fig. S2. A saddle-node bifurcation is observed for each of the bifurcating chemicals (the red and blue boxes) for Γ'' : Each chemical in the red and blue boxes has one stable branch when $k_{11,PEP}$ is small, and has two stable and one unstable branches when $k_{11,PEP}$ is large. Each chemical in the green and black boxes is independent of $k_{11,PEP}$, due to the law of localization, and has one stable branch.




FIG. S5: System consisting of six reactions, $U \xrightarrow{k_1} U + A$, $A \xrightarrow{k_2} B$, $B \xrightarrow{k_3} U$, $U \xrightarrow{k_4} A$, $2U \xrightarrow{k_5} U$, $U \xrightarrow{k_6}$. The red box indicates a buffering structure.

which has three independent kernel vectors $\mathbf{c}_1 = (1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1)^T$, $\mathbf{c}_2 = (1, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0)^T$, $\mathbf{c}_3 = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0)^T$.

The system contains a buffering structure $\Gamma_s = (\{A, B\}, \{2, 3\})$, since $\chi = 2 - 2 + 0 = 0$. By permuting the row index as $\{2, 3, 1, 4, 5, 6\}$ and the column index as $\{A, B, U, \mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2, \mathbf{c}_3\}$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{2,A} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & r_{3,B} & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{1,U} & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{4,U} & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{5,U} & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_{6,U} & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{G3})$$

where the upper-left block and the lower-right block correspond to \mathbf{A}_{Γ_s} and $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$, respectively. Thus, the determinant becomes

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \underbrace{r_{2,A} r_{3,B}}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}} \underbrace{(-r_{1,U} + r_{5,U} + r_{6,U})}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}}. \quad (\text{G4})$$

Thus, a steady-state bifurcation can occur when $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ changes its sign.

1. The mass-action kinetics case

The inducing parameters for $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are those associated with reaction in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, that is, $\{k_1, k_4, k_5, k_6\}$. Fig. S6 shows the bifurcation diagram, where the mass-action kinetics is assumed as in [12]. The determinant $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ and the steady-state concentrations versus the parameter k_1 are shown for three different sets of parameters inside Γ_s , i.e. k_2, k_3 . From the plots for $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$, we see the parameter k_1 , which is an inducing parameter for $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, actually induces the bifurcation associated with $\bar{\Gamma}_s$.

As for steady-state concentrations, the bifurcations are observed in all chemicals in the system, since the bifurcating chemicals for $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are all chemicals. In the plots for concentrations in Fig. S6, we see that, for small k_1 , the system




FIG. S6: Concentrations and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ for different values of (k_2, k_3) . All three cases have the solution $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$. The dashed blue line, the solid orange line, and the dotted green line correspond to $(k_2, k_3) = (10, 10)$, $(20, 15)$, $(40, 50)$, while (k_4, k_5, k_6) are fixed as $(k_4, k_5, k_6) = (65, 47, 80)$ in all of the three cases. The solid purple lines indicate that the plots for these three parameter choices coincide with each other.

has a single stable solution $\mathbf{x}^* = \mathbf{0}$ and an (unphysical negative) unstable solution. For large k_1 , the former becomes an unstable solution and the latter becomes a positive stable solution. Thus, the system in Fig. S6 exhibits the transcritical bifurcation. We can also see that both steady-state value of x_U^* and the critical value of $k_1 \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$ are independent of parameters inside Γ_s .

In the case of the mass-action kinetic, we can explicitly obtain the analytic solutions. Indeed, the steady state is given by

$$(x_A^*, x_B^*, x_U^*) = (0, 0, 0), \quad \left(\frac{(k_1 + k_4)(k_1 - k_6)}{k_2 k_5}, \frac{(k_1 + k_4)(k_1 - k_6)}{k_3 k_5}, \frac{k_1 - k_6}{k_5} \right), \quad (\text{G5})$$

and the determinant of \mathbf{A} is given by

$$\det \mathbf{A} = \underbrace{k_2 k_3}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\Gamma_s}} \underbrace{(-2k_5 x_U^* + k_1 - k_6)}_{\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}} = \pm k_2 k_3 (k_1 - k_6), \quad (\text{G6})$$

where $+$ and $-$ corresponds to the first and the second solution in (G5), respectively. The critical point is given by $k_1 = k_6$, which is indeed independent of $k_2, k_3 \in \Gamma_s$.

2. The modified mass-action kinetics case

Finally, we show the result for a more complicated kinetics. Specifically, instead of the mass-action kinetics, we consider the following reaction rate functions,

$$(r_1, \dots, r_6) = \left(k_1 x_U, k_2 x_A \left(1 + \frac{k_{2,B} x_B^2}{x_B^2 + K} \right), k_3 x_B \left(1 + \frac{k_{3,A} x_A^2}{x_A^2 + K} \right), k_4 x_U, k_5 x_U^2, k_6 x_U \right) \quad (\text{G7})$$

This system reduces to the case of the mass-action kinetic when $k_{2,B} = 0$ and $k_{3,A} = 0$.

Fig. S7 shows the numerical results of concentrations and $\det \mathbf{A}$ for different values of $k_{2,B}$ and $k_{3,A}$. For the plot of the curve of filled circle, $k_{2,B} = 5$ and $k_{3,A} = 5$. For the plot of the curve of empty circle, $k_{2,B} = 10$ and $k_{3,A} = 15$. The other parameters are the same for the two plots; $(k_1, \dots, k_6) = (40, 10, 80, 70, 90, 10)$ and $K = 5$. Note that only non-negative physical solutions are shown in Figure S7. We observe that the qualitative behavior is the same as the case of the mass-action kinetics: x_U^* , $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}}$, and the critical value of k_1 is independent of the parameters inside the buffering structure. On the other hand, the positive solutions of x_A^* and x_B^* depend on these parameters.





FIG. S7: Concentrations and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ for different values of $k_{2,B}$ and $k_{3,A}$. The solution $\mathbf{x}^* = 0$ exists for all parameters. The plots for $A, B \in \Gamma_s$ depend on the parameters $k_{2,B}, k_{3,A} \in \Gamma_s$, while those of $U \in \bar{\Gamma}_s$ and $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ do not.

Appendix H: Example network with $K_c > 0$

The following system is known to exhibit a saddle-node bifurcation, when mass-action kinetics is assumed [13].



Here, we consider an extended system by coupling the above system (H1) with the following four reactions,



In this extended system, the extended part $\Gamma_s = (B, Bp, F, 13, 14, 15, 16)$ is a buffering structure because $\chi = 3 - 4 + 2 - 1$. The complement subnetwork $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ in the extended system consists of all the chemicals and reactions existing in the original system.




FIG. S8: Values of $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s}$ versus k_1 .

structure. Therefore, the bifurcation points of this extended system are completely the same as the original system (H1). Below, we demonstrate these expectations by numerical computation.

The inducing parameters for the subnetwork $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are parameters in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$. Fig. S8 shows that the determinant of \mathbf{A} versus the parameter k_1 , which is the parameter in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$. The other rata parameters are chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} (k_2, \dots, k_{12}) &= (30, 30, 20, 2, 2, 800, 1, 1, 500, 14, 14), \\ (k_{13}, \dots, k_{16}) &= (3, 2, 10, 7) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H8})$$

and the values of conserved concentrations are chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} x_A + x_{AE1} + x_{Ap} + x_{ApE1} + x_{ApE2} + x_{App} + x_{AppE2} &= 10 \\ x_{AE1} + x_{ApE1} + x_{E1} &= 3 \\ x_{ApE2} + x_{AppE2} + x_{E2} &= 4 \\ x_B + x_{BF1} + x_{Bp} &= 6 \\ x_{BF1} + x_{F1} &= 4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{H9})$$

In Fig. S8, we see that, as we change the parameter k_1 , there are two bifurcation points with $\det \mathbf{A}_{\bar{\Gamma}_s} = 0$. Thus, the parameter k_1 indeed acts as a bifurcation parameter associated with the subnetwork $\bar{\Gamma}_s$.

The bifurcation chemicals for $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are all chemicals in the extended system. This is illustrated in Fig. S9, where the steady-state concentrations for A , App and Bp versus k_1 are shown. We also see that the original and extended systems have exactly the same critical value of k_1 , as expected. Furthermore, for chemicals existing in the original system (H1), or equivalently chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$, the plots for the extended system exactly coincides with those in the original system. This can be understood from the law of localization: The original system can be obtained from the extended system, by taking the limit that the parameters in Γ_s (i.e. $k_{13}, k_{14}, k_{15}, k_{16}$) go to zero. However, the chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$ are not influenced in the limiting procedure because the law of localization states that changing the parameters in Γ_s does not influence the chemicals in $\bar{\Gamma}_s$.




FIG. S9: (Left,Center) Steady-state concentrations of A , App for the original and the extended system. (Right) Concentration of Bp in the extended system.

-
- [1] A.A. Andronov, E.A. Leontovich, I.I. Gordon, A.G. Maier, "Theory of bifurcations of dynamical systems on a plane", Israel Program Sci. Transl. (1971). (In Russian)
 - [2] V.I. Arnol'd, "Geometrical methods in the theory of ordinary differential equations" , Grundlehren math. Wiss., **250**, Springer (1983). (In Russian)
 - [3] J. Carr, "Applications of center manifold theory", Springer (1981).
 - [4] J. Guckenheimer and Ph. Holmes, "Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems and bifurcations of vector fields", Springer (1983).
 - [5] Klipp, Edda, et al. Systems biology: a textbook. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
 - [6] Yu.A. Kuznetsov, "Elements of applied bifurcation theory", Springer (1995).
 - [7] Mochizuki, A., Fiedler, B., Journal of theoretical biology, 367, 189-202 (2015).
 - [8] Craciun G., Feinberg M. SIAM J. App. Math. 66:4,1321-1338 (2006).
 - [9] Feinberg M. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 132, 311-370 (1995) .
 - [10] T. Okada and A. Mochizuki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**.4 (2016), 048101.
 - [11] T. Okada and A. Mochizuki, Phys. Rev. E 96, 022322.
 - [12] F. Schlögl, Zeitschrift für Physik A Hadrons and Nuclei 253.2 (1972): 147-161.
 - [13] Conradi, Carsten, Dietrich Flockerzi, and Jorg Raisch. American Control Conference, 2007. ACC'07. IEEE, 2007.
 - [14] Klipp, Edda, et al. Systems biology: a textbook. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
 - [15] A. Vanderbauwhede, Centre manifolds, normal forms and elementary bifurcations, Dynamics Reported, **2** (1989,) pp. 89–169.
 - [16] D.C. Whitley, Discrete dynamical systems in dimensions one and two, Bull. London Math. Soc. , **15** (1983), pp. 177–217.

This figure "detAinv.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1711.00250v2>

This figure "ex1v2.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1711.00250v2>

This figure "ex2_detA.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1711.00250v2>