

Inference on the Structure of Gene Regulatory Networks

Yue Wang^{*1,2} and Zikun Wang³

¹Department of Computational Medicine, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095, United States

²Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques (IHÉS), 91440, Bures-sur-Yvette, France

³Laboratory of Genetics, The Rockefeller University, New York, NY 10065, United States

Abstract

In this paper, we conduct theoretical analyses on inferring the structure of gene regulatory networks. Depending on the experimental method and data type, the inference problem is classified into 20 different scenarios. For each scenario, we discuss the problem that with enough data, under what assumptions, what can be inferred about the structure. For scenarios that have been covered in the literature, we provide a brief review. For scenarios that have not been covered in literature, if the structure can be inferred, we propose new methods. Otherwise, we prove that the structure cannot be inferred.

Keywords.

Inference; Gene regulatory network; Independence; Differential equation.

Frequently used abbreviations:

GRN: gene regulatory network.

DAG: directed acyclic graph.

ODE: ordinary differential equation

1 Introduction

In living cells, most genes are transcribed to mRNAs and then translated to proteins. Some proteins serve as transcription factors that regulate the transcription of other gene(s). Broadly speaking, a gene regulatory network (GRN) consists of various molecular regulators that govern gene expression, namely, levels of mRNAs and corresponding proteins [39, 7].

*Corresponding author. E-mail address: yuewang@ihes.fr (Y. Wang). ORCID: 0000-0001-5918-7525

For example, in fruit flies, CLOCK (CLK) and CYCLE (CYC) are transcription factors that promote transcription of *period* (*per*) and *timeless* (*tim*), the protein products of which in return inhibit CLK/CYC. Such transcription-translation negative feedback loop plays a central role in circadian rhythm [22]. Additionally, the expression of one gene could promote its own expression, which is called autocatalysis [5]. In this paper, the major focus is the regulatory relationship between genes.

The central question of this paper is to infer the GRN structure using experimental data (also called “reverse-engineering”): For any two genes V_i, V_j , does the expression of V_i regulate (activate or repress) the expression of V_j ? For any gene V_i , does the expression of V_i regulate itself (autocatalysis)?

Most subjects of a GRN are large molecules confined within living cells. Therefore, it is difficult or even impossible to directly verify a regulatory network among a group of genes with biochemical methods. On the other hand, a large amount of data that are related to GRNs have been collected and documented, such as single-cell observational gene expression data [4] and bulk level interventional phenotype data [12]. For different data types, we need different mathematical tools to infer the GRN structure.

We classify the inference problem into different scenarios by data types. For each scenario, we discuss what can be inferred about the GRN structure, and what assumptions are needed. Since certain scenarios have been extensively studied regarding the GRN structure inference, we only introduce a few representatives to show what we can infer in these scenarios. Other scenarios will be thoroughly discussed: whether and how the GRN can be inferred. We will also develop novel mathematical methods if necessary. Through this analysis, the existing mathematical methods, our novel methods, and potential methods that will be invented in the future can be treated in the same unified paradigm. This paradigm can be generalized to fit new data types.

This paper is not a review of all important existing mathematical methods. For example, machine learning methods and Bayesian type methods are not covered. Besides, this paper focuses on theoretical results, not practical algorithms.

Section 2 briefly introduces possible biological data types regarding GRNs. Section 3 discusses mathematical setup and related assumptions. Section 4 presents the main results of this paper: with what data, under what assumptions, what we can infer about the GRN structures. Section 5 discusses biological background and concerns about GRN and related measurements, as a continuation of Section 2. Section 6 contains some classical mathematical results related to GRN structure inference. In Section 7, we develop some novel results that are used in the inference of GRN structures. Section 8 provides a detailed explanation for the results in Section 4. We finish with some discussions in Section 9.

This paper is written to draw attention from readers with various backgrounds: applied mathematicians, mathematical biologists, experimental biologists, etc. We encourage readers to skip certain sections if they are not interested in corresponding topics or do not have certain backgrounds. Readers who only want to understand the main results could stop at Section 4. Readers who are not interested in mathematical details could skip Sections




Figure 1: Dependence relations of all sections in this paper.

6-9. Readers who are not interested in biological discussions could skip Section 5. Fig. 1 describes the dependence relations of all sections.

2 Biological Setup

Various types of experimental data can be used to infer GRN structures. They can be classified in four major dimensions: (1) Modality. We can directly measure gene expression levels or phenotypes that depend on gene expression. (2) Granularity. We can measure certain quantities for a single cell and repeat many times, so as to obtain a probability distribution of such quantities. We can also measure these quantities for a large population of cells (bulk level). (3) Intervention. We can measure certain quantities after interfering with the expression of some genes, so that these genes and downstream genes are affected (not fully muted in general). We can just observe without any intervention. (4) Temporal resolution. We can measure at a single time point or multiple time points (time series). When we measure at single-cell level at multiple time points, there is an extra dimension: Can we measure the same cell multiple times, so that we can obtain the joint distribution for multiple time points, or we need to measure different cells at different time points, so that we just have multiple marginal distributions for each time point?

For these four major dimensions, we have $2^4 = 16$ different scenarios. Each scenario is named with a combination of four labels: (1) Gene expression or Phenotype; (2) Single-cell or Bulk; (3) Non-interventional or Interventional; (4) One-time or Time series. In four scenarios (Single-cell + Time series), there is an extra dimension of Joint distribution or Marginal distribution, meaning a total of 20 scenarios.

For each dimension, there is one type that is more informative: Gene expression > Phenotype, Single-cell > Bulk, Interventional > Non-interventional, Time series > One-time, Joint distribution > Marginal distribution. In fact, given data of the more informative type, we can calculate the data of the other type. Nevertheless, for more informative data types, generally the experiments are more difficult, more expensive, and less accurate.

3 Mathematical Background and Setup

In this section, we introduce some necessary mathematics for understanding the problem of inferring GRN structures. We also introduce seven assumptions, where four are used in certain scenarios, and the other three are always applied. Under these assumptions, the underlying GRN is simple enough, or the experimental data are regular enough, so that they follow certain mathematical models. We shall discuss under different assumptions, what GRN structures can be inferred from experimental data. Nevertheless, all assumptions are more or less unrealistic in biology. We will discuss concerns about these assumptions in Subsection 5.2.

Four assumption are used in certain scenarios: (1) **Path Blocking (PB)**: the intervention on one gene has no effect on another gene (or a phenotype), if and only if other intervened genes block all paths; (2) **Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG)**: the GRN can be described by a directed graph without cycles; (3) **Markov and Faithful (MF)**: the distribution of gene expression properly reflects the underlying DAG through conditional independence relations; (4) **Linear System (LS)**: the gene expression (and possibly phenotype) time series data satisfy a linear ODE system. Three assumptions are always applied: (a) every related factor is concerned; (b) the concerned set of factors is not too large; (c) the condition for each regulation is satisfied, so that each regulation can be observed. Most contents of this section, except the path blocking property, are from standard textbooks [8, 24, 20].

3.1 Graph Theory and Path Blocking Property

In graph theory, a **directed graph** consists of several vertices $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\}$ and some directed edges between two vertices, such as $V_i \rightarrow V_j$.

A GRN can be represented as a directed graph. Each vertex V_i represents a gene, and each directed edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ means that the expression of gene V_i can regulate the expression of gene V_j . We require that the graph is connected.

If there are edges $V_i \rightarrow V_j, V_j \rightarrow V_k, \dots, V_l \rightarrow V_m$, then $V_i \rightarrow V_j \rightarrow V_k \cdots \rightarrow V_l \rightarrow V_m$ is called a **path** from V_i to V_l . Although the GRN might have cycles, we do not allow a path to pass a vertex more than once. The number of edges in a path is called the **length** of this path. If there exist paths from V_i to V_j , the minimal length of such paths is called the **distance** from V_i to V_j .

If there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then V_i is a **parent** of V_j , and V_j is a **child** of V_i . If there is a path from V_i to V_j , then V_i is an **ancestor** of V_j , and V_j is a **descendant** of V_i .

If we can only measure a phenotype V_0 , then the concerned GRN consists of V_0 and genes V_1, \dots, V_n that have paths leading to V_0 . We assume there is no edge starting from V_0 .

Consider any two vertices V_i, V_j and a set $\mathcal{S} \subset \{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i, V_j\}$. If all paths from V_i to V_j need to pass through \mathcal{S} , we say that \mathcal{S} **blocks** V_i to V_j . Specifically, if there is no

path from V_i to V_j , then any set, including the empty set \emptyset , blocks V_i to V_j .

Assume we can interfere with any genes and measure the expression levels of all genes. This means we can interfere with different sets of genes, and compare if they have the same effect on certain genes. The **path blocking property** means that for any V_i, V_j and any set $\mathcal{S} \subset \{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i, V_j\}$, after interfering with all genes in \mathcal{S} , intervention on V_i cannot provide extra influence on the expression of V_j , if and only if \mathcal{S} blocks V_i to V_j . An equivalent expression is that the intervention on \mathcal{S} and the intervention on $\mathcal{S} \cup \{V_i\}$ have the same effect on V_j . The path blocking property in this case means a set of genes that blocks V_i to V_j in the directed graph (GRN) also blocks the influence of V_i to V_j in gene expression, and vice versa. Therefore, by comparing the gene expression levels under different interventions, we can obtain partial information about the graph structure. For example, assume the GRN is $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, and the path blocking property holds. After interfering with V_2 , adding intervention on V_1 cannot further affect V_3 , meaning that $\{V_2\}$ blocks V_1 to V_3 . After interfering with V_1 , adding intervention on V_2 can further affect V_3 , meaning that $\{V_1\}$ does not block V_2 to V_3 .

Assume we can interfere with any genes and measure one phenotype V_0 . This means we can interfere with different sets of genes, and compare if they have the same effect on the measured phenotype. The **path blocking property** means that for any V_i and any set $\mathcal{S} \subset \{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i\}$, after interfering with all genes in \mathcal{S} , intervention on V_i cannot provide extra influence on the expression of V_0 , if and only if \mathcal{S} blocks V_i to V_0 . Similarly, by comparing the phenotype under different interventions, we can obtain partial information about the graph structure.

3.2 Directed Acyclic Graph, Markov Property, and Faithful Property

A **directed acyclic graph** (DAG) is a directed graph that has no directed cycles. For example, if we have edges $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ and $V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, then we cannot have edge $V_3 \rightarrow V_1$, but edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_3$ is allowed. Specifically, an edge from a vertex V_i to itself ($V_i \rightarrow V_i$) is regarded as a cycle.

In a **causal DAG** (also called Bayesian network) \mathcal{G} with n vertices, each vertex V_i has an associated random variable X_i , which represents the stochastic expression level of gene V_i in a single cell. The joint distribution of these variables is denoted as \mathbb{P} .

\mathbb{P} is said to be **Markov** to \mathcal{G} , if $\mathbb{P}(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(X_i | \pi_{X_i})$, where π_{X_i} means the expression levels of V_i 's parents. If all the conditional independence relations in \mathbb{P} also appear in any other \mathbb{P}' that is Markov to \mathcal{G} , then we say that \mathbb{P} is **faithful** to \mathcal{G} . If a distribution \mathbb{P} is Markov and faithful to \mathcal{G} , then the structure of \mathcal{G} properly reflects the causal relations in \mathbb{P} .

Consider a DAG \mathcal{G} . A common model that fits this DAG is $X_i = f_i(\pi_{X_i}) + \epsilon_i$. This means the value of V_i depends on the values of its parents, plus an independent noise. In general, the joint distribution generated by this model is Markov and faithful to \mathcal{G} .

3.3 Linear System

If we measure the bulk level gene expression time series, the expression level of a gene V_i can be regarded as a variable x_i that changes continuously. If we measure the single-cell level gene expression X_i , then its expectation is x_i . The expression levels $\{x_i\}$ of all genes along time satisfy a **linear system**, or have the **linearity** property, if the following linear ordinary differential equations (ODEs) hold.

$$\begin{aligned} dx_1/dt &= a_{11}x_1 + a_{12}x_2 + \cdots + a_{1n}x_n + b_1, \\ &\cdots \\ dx_n/dt &= a_{n1}x_1 + a_{n2}x_2 + \cdots + a_{nn}x_n + b_n. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

This system can be rewritten as $d\vec{x}/dt = A\vec{x} + \vec{b}$, where $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)'$, $A = [a_{ij}]$, $\vec{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)'$. Here b_i describes the base synthesis rate of gene V_i , a_{ii} describes the degradation (and possibly autocatalysis) of V_i , and a_{ij} describes the effect of V_j on the expression of V_i . If $a_{ij} > 0$, V_j activates V_i ; if $a_{ij} < 0$, V_j inhibits V_i ; if $a_{ij} = 0$, V_j does not affect V_i .

4 Inferring GRN Structure with Different Data Types

We have discussed different data types in Section 2, and different mathematical assumptions in Section 3. In this section, we present the main results of this paper: with what data type, under what assumptions, what can we infer about the GRN structure. See Table 1 for a summary of all the results. For example, in Scenario 6 (Gene, Bulk, One-time, Interventional), we can fully infer the GRN structure under the path blocking assumption, and we can partially infer the GRN structure under the directed acyclic graph assumption, while autocatalysis cannot be determined. These results are explained in Section 8, based on the mathematical methods in Section 6 and Section 7.

The identification of autocatalysis is possible only with single-cell gene expression data. Although autocatalysis is generally masked by degradation, we can find evidence in probability distributions.

The basic method of establishing causal relation is to vary one variable and examine if the other variable changes. When we cannot interfere with gene expression, the only chance is to profile gene expression on single-cell level. Within a single cell, the stochastic fluctuation of gene expression plays a similar role as intervention. Nevertheless, by comparing Scenario 1 vs. Scenario 2 and comparing Scenario 3 vs. Scenario 4, we can see that the stochastic fluctuation is less informative than intervention.

With interventional phenotype data (Scenarios 10, 12, 14, 16), the GRN is analogous to a black box. Although the gene expression levels are unknown, we can interfere by manipulating certain genes and use the resulting phenotype as output. Under different assumptions, we can partially reconstruct the GRN structure.

		One-Time		Time Series	
		Non-Intervention	Intervention	Non-Intervention	Intervention
Gene Expression	Single-Cell	Scenario 1 MF+DAG: partial Partial AC	Scenario 2 PB: full MF+DAG: full Partial AC	Scenario 3 Joint: UC: full Marginal: MF+DAG: partial Partial AC	Scenario 4 Joint: UC: full Marginal: MF+DAG: full LS: full PB: full DAG: partial Full AC
	Bulk	Scenario 5 No	Scenario 6 PB: full DAG: partial	Scenario 7 No	Scenario 8 LS: full DAG: partial PB: full
Phenotype	Single-Cell	Scenario 9 No	Scenario 10 PB: partial	Scenario 11 No	Scenario 12 LS+DAG: partial PB: partial
	Bulk	Scenario 13 No	Scenario 14 PB: partial	Scenario 15 No	Scenario 16 LS+DAG: partial PB: partial

Table 1: GRN structure inference with different data types: under what assumptions, what structures can be inferred. There are 16 scenarios classified by the following dimensions of data types: Gene Expression vs. Phenotype; Single-Cell vs. Bulk; One-Time vs. Time Series; Non-Interventional vs. Interventional. In Scenario 3 and Scenario 4, there is an extra dimension of Joint vs. Marginal. There are different assumptions: PB: path blocking; DAG: directed acyclic graph; MF: Markov and faithful; LS: linear system; UC: unconditional. Full/partial/no means all/some/no GRN structures can be inferred (autocatalysis not included). For example, “LS+DAG: partial” means under LS assumption and DAG assumption, GRN structure can be partially inferred. Full/partial AC means autocatalysis can be identified for all/some genes. If not mentioned, autocatalysis cannot be identified.

We can evaluate the performance of each scenario based on the level of GRN structures that can be inferred. Fully recovered GRN means 2 points, and partially recovered GRN means 1 point. Besides, fully/partially recovered autocatalysis is worth 1/0.5 point, respectively. For example, Scenario 1 (partial GRN and partial autocatalysis) has 1.5 points. The summation over eight scenarios (1-8) with gene expression data is 13.5 points, and the summation over eight scenarios with phenotype data (9-16) is 4 points. We compare the overall score for each data dimension. Gene expression vs. Phenotype: 13.5 vs. 4; Single-cell vs. Bulk: 11.5 vs. 6; Time series vs. One-time: 9.5 vs. 8; Interventional vs. Non-interventional: 13.5 vs. 4. We can see that the gene expression data and interventional data are much more informative.

Scenario 4 (Gene, Single-cell, Time series, Interventional) is the most informative case. We can see that in Scenario 4, the GRN structure can be fully inferred under various assumptions, and the existence of autocatalysis can be identified for each gene.

5 Biological Details and Concerns

In this section, we present biological details about GRN and corresponding measurements in Section 2, and discuss biological concerns about the assumptions in Section 3.

5.1 Measurements Related to GRN

In this subsection, we briefly introduce biological experiments related to inferring GRN structures and their restrictions. We do not aim at covering all important related papers. Readers may refer to some review papers for detailed summaries on related biological techniques [9, 36, 26].

The expression of a protein-coding gene consists of transcription (DNA to mRNA) and translation (mRNA to protein). Therefore, to measure the expression level of a given gene, we can either measure the amount of the corresponding mRNA or measure the amount of the corresponding protein. There are many methods with various reliabilities and accuracies to measure the amount of mRNA and/or protein on the bulk level and the single-cell level [1, 43, 32]. By now (2021), these methods are not 100% accurate, especially on single-cell level [34]. A more important problem is that most mRNAs and proteins are confined within living cells (except for secreted proteins). This means cells have to be killed before these molecules can be harvested, and then some analytical methods can be applied to quantify the abundance of these molecules. Therefore, with these methods, a cell or a cell population can be measured only once [1].

Many mRNAs have less than 20 copies in one cell [33]. Thus the gene expression of a single cell is too stochastic to be described by a deterministic model. We can repeat the gene expression measurement experiment over multiple single cells and obtain a probability distribution of single-cell gene expression [17]. When the observation is based on a large number of cells (bulk level), stochasticity is averaged out, so that the dynamics should be

deterministic. Theoretically, repeating the gene expression measurement experiment over a large number of cells should produce the same result. In reality, various technical issues weaken the repeatability of measuring gene expression [30]. For example, external factors affecting gene expression are hardly the same for two cell populations. Therefore, when we sample two populations from the same cell line (especially if we sample at different time points), their gene expression profiles might not be exactly the same.

Traditional approaches in the studies of gene expression are observational, meaning that we directly measure cell(s) at stationary without interfering with gene expression. Recent techniques like gene knockdown or gene knockout allow us to temporarily or permanently alter the expression of genes of interest [21, 27, 13]. Most interventions decrease the expression of corresponding genes, but increasing is also possible [37]. After the intervention, we can measure the gene expression data at a certain time point. By now (2021), on bulk level, commonly used knockdown interventions cannot robustly decrease the expression of targeted genes to zero [19]. For example, Hurley et al. applied siRNA to disrupt certain genes. For only around 70% genes, the bulk-level expression decreases to less than 40% of the original level. For around 10% genes, siRNA even increases their bulk expression levels [15]. On the single-cell level, we can select cells that are successfully intervened. However, the measurement is not 100% accurate, so that the selection is not always correct. Besides, selection might be biased towards cells with low baseline expression levels of targeted genes. Interventions cannot be used to maintain gene expression to fixed non-zero levels.

After the intervention, we hope to measure how the gene expression evolves over time. Under current technologies, we can only measure a cell or a cell population once. Therefore, at the bulk level, we can measure different populations at different time points after the same intervention. The gene expression level at the bulk level is a single number. Thus theoretically, measuring different populations at different time points is equivalent to measuring the same population at different time points. At the single-cell level, we can repeat the measurement for different cells at the same time point to obtain the marginal distribution of gene expression at each time point. However, since we can only measure a cell once, we cannot obtain the joint distribution of gene expression at different time points. The joint distribution can provide extra information (correlation coefficient, etc.) than marginal distributions. Regardless of technology restrictions, we discuss both cases, depending on whether the joint distribution can be measured.

Some phenotypes, such as growth rate, number of molecules released, and drug resistance, could be used to reflect gene expression levels [12]. These phenotypes can be measured on bulk level or single-cell level. Besides, some phenotypes can be measured without perturbing or even killing the cells. This means such phenotypes can be measured at different time points for the same cell(s). Nevertheless, phenotypic transitions involve complicated phenomena and mechanisms [16]. Therefore, we need to be cautious when utilizing phenotypes in determining GRN structures.

5.2 Concerns about GRN Assumptions

To correctly infer the GRN structure, we need to assume that all related factors are concerned (not necessarily measured). For example, if the true GRN is $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, but V_2 is not concerned (thus not measured), then we can observe that varying V_1 in any case would lead to the change of V_3 . Therefore, we would obtain a false edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_3$. When some factors are concerned but not measured, we might (partially) infer the GRN structure by interfering with them. In reality, it is extremely difficult to measure all possible factors with high accuracy.

Besides the assumption that all related factors are concerned, we also need to assume that the set of concerned factors is not too large. The amount of data needed and computational time cost for GRN structure inference methods grow fast with the number of factors considered. If we cannot exclude most factors that are irrelevant to the target gene beforehand, then either the inference methods behave poorly, or the cost (time and money) is unbearable. In order to exclude irrelevant factors, we could refer to prior studies or conduct certain experiments that could determine which factors might be relevant.

The regulation of one factor on another factor might occur only under specific conditions. For example, when *E. coli* is not exposed to lactose, varying the glucose concentration does not affect the expression of *lac* operon; when there is enough lactose, decreasing the glucose concentration would increase the expression of *lac* operon [18]. We need to assume that such conditions are satisfied, so that all regulations can be observed.

The Path Blocking (PB) assumption states that the intervention on one gene has no effect on another gene (or a phenotype), if and only if other intervened genes block all paths. Consider a GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$. Some interventions (e.g., siRNA) are not strong enough, so that after interfering with V_2 , V_1 can still affect V_2 , then V_3 . On the other hand, if we assume that V_1 is necessary for the expression of V_2 , then as we knock out V_1 , V_2 cannot express. In this case, interventions on V_2 have no extra effect on V_3 , although the path $V_2 \rightarrow V_3$ is not blocked. Even though the path blocking assumption is powerful in the GRN structure inference, it is not very realistic.

The directed acyclic graph (DAG) assumption states that the GRN has no cycle, which is crucial in many scenarios. Nevertheless, in reality, it is common for a GRN to have directed cycles. In fact, there are some pairs of genes that could mutually regulate each other [2].

The Markov and faithful (MF) assumption states that the conditional independence relations in the distribution of gene expression are consistent with the causal DAG. Under this assumption, conditional independence should be correctly identified. However, due to the heterogeneity of cells [38], there might be multiple cell types, each of which has its own gene expression distribution, and the measured gene expression distribution might be the combination of multiple distributions. Such mixing might make independent genes show pseudo dependence. Mathematically, assume X_1, X_2 (expression of two genes for cell type 1) are independent, and X'_1, X'_2 (expression of two genes for cell type 2) are independent.

Define $\bar{X}_1 = X_1$ with probability 0.5, and $\bar{X}_1 = X'_1$ with probability 0.5, and \bar{X}_2 is defined similarly (overall expression of two genes for mixed cell population). Then \bar{X}_1 and \bar{X}_2 might not be independent.

The linear system (LS) assumption states that the net change rate of one gene (corresponding mRNA or protein) linearly depends on the quantity of another gene, regardless of other factors. In reality, the regulation of gene expression might be highly nonlinear. Specifically, if gene V_1 represses gene V_2 , then when the level of V_2 is 0, the net change rate of V_2 might still be negative, a contradiction.

6 Existing Related Mathematical Results

In this section, we introduce some known mathematical results that will be used to infer GRN structures.

6.1 Use Conditional Independence to Infer DAG Structure

This subsection is a standard topic in causal inference. Readers may refer to related monographs for background and details [24].

For a distribution \mathbb{P} that is Markov and faithful to a causal DAG, there is an edge between V_i and V_j if and only if V_i and V_j are independent conditioned on some other variables. However, we still need to determine the direction of this edge.

For two causal DAGs $\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2$ with a bijection between vertices, if any distribution \mathbb{P} that is Markov and faithful to \mathcal{G}_1 is also Markov and faithful to \mathcal{G}_2 , and vice versa, then we say that \mathcal{G}_1 and \mathcal{G}_2 are **Markov equivalent**. With this relation, all causal DAGs can be classified into different Markov equivalent classes. For example, the following three DAGs form an equivalent class: $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3, V_1 \leftarrow V_2 \leftarrow V_3, V_1 \leftarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$. If \mathbb{P} is Markov and faithful to an unknown causal DAG \mathcal{G} , then we can only find the Markov equivalent class that contains \mathcal{G} . DAGs in this equivalent class are indistinguishable under \mathbb{P} . Markov equivalent causal DAGs have the same edges, except that some edges have opposite directions. Therefore, with the information of \mathbb{P} , we can determine all edges of the unknown \mathcal{G} , but some edge directions are unknown.

When we have confirmed the existence of directed edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, one question is to determine whether this regulation is activation or inhibition. Consider a GRN that V_i strongly activates V_k , V_k strongly activates V_j , and V_i weakly inhibits V_j . If V_i increases, the weak inhibition of $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ is covered by the strong activation of $V_i \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow V_j$, meaning that V_j also increases. If we naively calculate the correlation coefficient of V_i and V_j , we would obtain the false conclusion that V_i activates V_j . Since there are multiple paths from V_i to V_j , we need to control other variables to determine the direct regulation from V_i to V_j . Therefore, we propose to calculate the conditional covariance (or conditional correlation, partial correlation, etc.) between V_i and V_j , conditioned on other possible parents of V_j . Positive conditional covariance means activation, and negative conditional covariance

means inhibition. If there is only one path from V_i to V_j , namely the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then we can directly check the effect of V_i on V_j , such as calculating the correlation coefficient.

6.2 Inferring GRN Structure with ODE Model

For the linear ODE system Eq. 1, if we know the value of $x_i(t)$ at different time points, we can calculate dx_i/dt , and then calculate the coefficients $\{a_{ij}\}$ and $\{b_i\}$ by solving a linear algebraic equation system [28]. If the genes in a GRN satisfy such a linear system, then $a_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if there is an edge $V_j \rightarrow V_i$.

6.3 Stochastic Process Model

On single-cell level, gene expression is stochastic. If we can only measure each cell once, and repeat for many different cells, we obtain some random variables, where each variable corresponds to the expression level of a gene. If we can measure the same cell at different time points, then we obtain the joint distribution of a stochastic process. We consider a discrete-time stochastic process that describes the evolution of multiple variables. For example, we consider three variables at different time points, $[X_1(0), X_2(0), X_3(0)]$, $[X_1(1), X_2(1), X_3(1)]$, $[X_1(2), X_2(2), X_3(2)] \dots$. Here $X_1(t), X_2(t), X_3(t)$ are the expression levels of genes V_1, V_2, V_3 at time t . We assume there is no latent variable. One interpretation is to define $[X_1(t+1), X_2(t+1), X_3(t+1)]$ as a stochastic function of $[X_1(t), X_2(t), X_3(t)]$:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(t+1) &= f[X_1(t), X_2(t), X_3(t)] + \epsilon_{1,t}, \\ X_2(t+1) &= g[X_1(t), X_2(t), X_3(t)] + \epsilon_{2,t}, \\ X_3(t+1) &= h[X_1(t), X_2(t), X_3(t)] + \epsilon_{3,t}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here different $\epsilon_{i,t}$ are independent noise terms. This interpretation implies that the process is Markov, meaning that if we condition on the variables at one time point ($[X_1(2), X_2(2), X_3(2)]$), then the past ($[X_1(1), X_2(1), X_3(1)]$) and the future ($[X_1(3), X_2(3), X_3(3)]$) are independent. For a continuous-time Markov process, if we can only observe at discrete time points, then the observed variables form a discrete-time Markov process. Thus we can focus on discrete-time processes.

Assume the underlying GRN is $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, then this means current X_1 can directly affect future X_1 , current X_1, X_2 can directly affect future X_2 , and current X_2, X_3 can directly affect future X_3 . The equations of $[X_1(t+1), X_2(t+1), X_3(t+1)]$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(t+1) &= f[X_1(t)] + \epsilon_{1,t}, \\ X_2(t+1) &= g[X_1(t), X_2(t)] + \epsilon_{2,t}, \\ X_3(t+1) &= h[X_2(t), X_3(t)] + \epsilon_{3,t}. \end{aligned}$$

The causal relations between different variables in this process are shown in Fig. 2. An arrow can only point from a variable at time t to a variable at time $t+1$. Therefore, this




Figure 2: Stochastic process model. $X_1(0)$ can affect $X_1(1)$ and $X_2(1)$; $X_2(0)$ can affect $X_2(1)$ and $X_3(1)$; $X_3(0)$ can affect $X_3(1)$. The right most $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$ is the corresponding GRN.




Figure 3: Stochastic process model. $X_1(0)$ can affect $X_1(1)$ and $X_2(1)$; $X_2(0)$ can affect $X_2(1)$ and $X_3(1)$; $X_3(0)$ can affect $X_3(1)$ and $X_1(1)$. The right most $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$ with an arrow $V_3 \rightarrow V_1$ is the corresponding GRN.

illustration is a DAG. We can project this process DAG along the time axis to obtain the underlying GRN. In Fig. 3, the underlying GRN has a cycle. We can still use the process DAG to illustrate the causal relations.

6.4 Determining GRN in Stochastic Process Model

If we have the joint distribution of two neighboring time points, then we can use conditional independence to infer the structure of the process DAG, and thus the underlying GRN. Here we need to introduce the notion of **Markov boundary**. For a set of random variables \mathcal{S} and another random variable X , a Markov boundary \mathcal{S}_1 of X in \mathcal{S} is a subset of \mathcal{S} , such that (1) $X \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{S}_1$; (2) for any $\mathcal{S}_2 \subsetneq \mathcal{S}_1$, $X \not\perp\!\!\!\perp \mathcal{S} \mid \mathcal{S}_2$. Here $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2 \mid X_3$ or $X_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_2 \mid X_3$ means X_1 and X_2 are (not) independent conditioned on X_3 . A Markov boundary is a minimal subset that fully preserves the information of V in \mathcal{S} . It is possible to have multiple Markov boundaries in reality [10], and such multiplicity causes severe problems in identifying causal relations [41]. For simplicity, we shall assume the Markov boundary is unique. In Fig. 2, if we set $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1(0), X_2(0), X_3(0)\}$, then the Markov boundary of $X = X_3(1)$ in \mathcal{S} is $\{X_2(0), X_3(0)\}$. This means that we should have arrows from the Markov boundary to X ,

namely, $X_2(0) \rightarrow X_3(1)$ and $X_3(0) \rightarrow X_3(1)$. Similarly, the Markov boundary of $X_2(1)$ is $\{X_1(0), X_2(0)\}$, meaning arrows $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_2(1)$ and $X_2(0) \rightarrow X_2(1)$. The Markov boundary of $X_1(1)$ is $\{X_1(0)\}$, meaning an arrow $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_1(1)$. When we project this process DAG along the time axis, we obtain the underlying GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$. Similar to the discussion in Subsection 6.1, we can use conditional covariance to determine whether an arrow represents activation or inhibition. Since $X_i(t+1)$ naturally depends on $X_i(t)$, we do not project this edge as $V_i \rightarrow V_i$, unless we can confirm the existence of autocatalysis.

We have shown that for a causal DAG, we can use conditional independence to discover all the edges, except that the directions of some edges are unknown. For the stochastic process model, each arrow in the process DAG has a predetermined direction (from an earlier time to a later time). Therefore, with the help of the time arrow, we can fully determine the structure of the process DAG, and thus the underlying GRN.

In order to correctly recover the GRN, we need to require that the observation time step is small enough, so that the conditional independence correctly reflects the process (DAG). For example, in Fig. 2, if the observation time step is 2, so that $X_1(1), X_2(1), X_3(1), X_1(3), X_2(3), X_3(3), \dots$ are invisible, then the structure of the process DAG is shown in Fig. 4. Here an indirect relation from X_1 to X_3 , $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_2(1) \rightarrow X_3(2)$, is misinterpreted as a direct relation $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_3(2)$, so that the projected GRN has an extra arrow $V_1 \rightarrow V_3$. Similarly, if the process in Fig. 3 has observation time step 2, then as shown in Fig. 5, the inferred GRN has several extra arrows. In this case, we can determine whether one gene affects another gene, but we cannot determine whether this influence is direct or indirect.

We denote $\mathbb{E}X_1(t), \mathbb{E}X_2(t), \mathbb{E}X_3(t)$ by $x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)$. In Eq. 2, if the functions f, g, h are all linear, and $\mathbb{E}\epsilon_{i,t} = 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t+1) &= f[x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)], \\ x_2(t+1) &= g[x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)], \\ x_3(t+1) &= h[x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)]. \end{aligned}$$

This is a discretized version of Eq. 1. Therefore, when the dynamics is linear, we can regard the ODE model as the expectation of the stochastic process model. When the dynamics is nonlinear, we might not have $\mathbb{E}f(X_1) = f(\mathbb{E}X_1)$, and the evolution of $x_1(t+1)$ is essentially more complicated, such that it does not only depend on $x_1(t), x_2(t), x_3(t)$, and the ODE model fails.

For GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, from Fig. 2, we can see that conditioned on $[X_2(0), X_2(1), \dots]$, $[X_1(0), X_1(1), \dots]$ and $[X_3(0), X_3(1), \dots]$ are independent. However, for any t , even if the process has reached stationary, we might not have $X_1(t) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3(t) \mid X_2(t)$. Therefore, in the stochastic process model, if we only have the stationary distribution, we cannot use conditional independence to infer the GRN structure. The causal DAG model discussed in Subsection 6.1 might not be regarded as the stationary situation of the stochastic process model.




Figure 4: Stochastic process model. It is the same as Fig. 2, except that the observation time step is 2, so that $X_1(1), X_2(1), X_3(1), X_1(3), X_2(3), X_3(3), \dots$ are invisible. Therefore, there is a direct arrow $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_3(2)$. The right most $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$ with an arrow $V_1 \rightarrow V_3$ is the corresponding (fake) GRN.




Figure 5: Stochastic process model. It is the same as Fig. 3, except that the observation time step is 2, so that $X_1(1), X_2(1), X_3(1), X_1(3), X_2(3), X_3(3), \dots$ are invisible. Therefore, there are direct arrows $X_1(0) \rightarrow X_3(2)$, $X_2(0) \rightarrow X_1(2)$, and $X_3(0) \rightarrow X_2(2)$. The right most $V_1 \leftrightarrow V_2 \leftrightarrow V_3$ with an arrow $V_1 \leftrightarrow V_3$ is the corresponding (fake) GRN.



Figure 6: Two equivalent GRNs in the sense of path blocking.

7 Novel Related Mathematical Results

In this section, we introduce some novel mathematical results that will be used to infer GRN structures.

7.1 Use Path Blocking Relation to Infer GRN Structure

For a GRN, assume for each V_i, V_j and each subset \mathcal{S} of $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i, V_j\}$, we know whether \mathcal{S} blocks V_i to V_j , meaning that any directed path from V_i to V_j passes at least one vertex in \mathcal{S} . In this case, we can infer the whole GRN: there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ if and only if other vertices cannot block V_i to V_j . When other paths from V_i to V_j are blocked by intervened genes, then V_i activates V_j if the decrease of V_i leads to the decrease of V_j , and V_i inhibits V_j if the decrease of V_i leads to the increase of V_j .

In the following, consider a GRN with vertices V_0, V_1, \dots, V_n , and there is a directed path from each V_i to V_0 . There is no edge starting from V_0 . Assume for each V_i and each subset \mathcal{S} of $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i\}$, we know whether \mathcal{S} blocks V_i to V_0 . In this case, the GRN structure can be partially inferred (at least n edges).

If a subset \mathcal{S} of $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i\}$ blocks V_i to V_0 , but any proper subset of \mathcal{S} cannot block V_i to V_0 , then \mathcal{S} is called a minimal blocking set. If a blocking set \mathcal{S} is not minimal, then \mathcal{S} contains a blocking subset that is minimal. Define $\beta(V_i)$ to be all minimal subsets that block V_i to V_0 . If two GRNs have the same path blocking relations, then they have the same $\beta(V_i)$ for each V_i , and vice versa.

For the two GRNs in Fig. 6, $\beta(V_1) = \{\{V_3\}\}$, $\beta(V_2) = \{\{V_3\}\}$, $\beta(V_0) = \emptyset$. Thus they are equivalent in the sense of path blocking. If a directed edge appears in all equivalent GRNs, we can determine that this edge exists; if a directed edge appears in none of equivalent GRNs, we can determine that this edge does not exist; if a directed edge appears in some but not all equivalent GRNs, we cannot determine whether this edge exists.

Proposition 1. *The following procedure describes how to determine certain edges. (1) There is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_0$ if and only if $\beta(V_i) = \emptyset$. (2) If there exists $\mathcal{S} \in \beta(V_i)$, so that $V_j \notin \mathcal{S}$, and \mathcal{S} cannot block V_j to V_0 , then there is no edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$. (3) If (2) is not satisfied, but there exists $\mathcal{S} \in \beta(V_i)$, so that $V_j \in \mathcal{S}$, then there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$. (4) If for any $\mathcal{S} \in \beta(V_i)$, we have $V_j \notin \mathcal{S}$, and \mathcal{S} blocks V_j to V_0 , then we cannot determine whether $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ exists.*

Proof. (1) If there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_0$, then other vertices cannot block this path. If there is no edge $V_i \rightarrow V_0$, then $\{V_1, \dots, V_n\} \setminus \{V_i\}$ can block V_i to V_0 , and it contains a minimal blocking subset.

(2) Choose a path $V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$ that cannot be blocked by \mathcal{S} . If there exists an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then the path $V_i \rightarrow V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$ cannot be blocked by \mathcal{S} , a contradiction.

(3) Define $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S} \setminus \{V_j\}$. Assume there is no edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$. Since \mathcal{S}' cannot block V_i to V_0 , there is a path $V_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow V_j$ that is not blocked by \mathcal{S}' , and there is a path $V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$ that is not blocked by \mathcal{S}' .

V_k cannot appear in the path $V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. Otherwise, we can combine these two paths and shrink out V_j , to obtain a path $V_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. This path from V_i to V_0 does not pass through V_j , and it cannot be blocked by \mathcal{S}' , which means it cannot be blocked by \mathcal{S} , a contradiction.

Find all possible V_l with the property that there exists a path $V_i \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_l \rightarrow V_j$ that is not blocked by \mathcal{S}' , then V_l also cannot appear in the path $V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. Define the set of all such V_l (including V_k) to be \mathcal{T} . $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S}'$ blocks any path from V_i to V_0 , and it cannot block the path $V_j \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. We can find a minimal blocking subset in $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S}'$, which belongs to $\beta(V_i)$, and it cannot block V_j to V_0 . Thus the condition of (2) is satisfied, a contradiction.

(4) If the condition of (4) is satisfied, we show that when the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ does not exist, adding this edge into the GRN does not change path blocking relations, and when the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ exists, deleting this edge from the GRN does not change path blocking relations. Therefore, we cannot determine whether the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ exists.

Assume the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ is not in the GRN. Consider \mathcal{S} that blocks V_i to V_0 , and \mathcal{R} that cannot block V_i to V_0 . Since \mathcal{S} contains a minimal subset, and this subset blocks V_j to V_0 , after adding the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, it can still block V_i to V_0 . After adding the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ in the GRN, \mathcal{R} still cannot block V_i to V_0 . For V_k that has a path to V_i , we can use the same argument to show that blocking subsets of V_k to V_0 are not changed.

Assume the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ is in the GRN. We prove that after deleting this edge, the condition of (4) still holds. Then using the above argument, we can see that after deleting this edge, adding it back does not change the path blocking relations. After deleting this edge, if there is a minimal subset \mathcal{T} that contains V_j and blocks V_i to V_0 , then before deleting the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, \mathcal{T} is still a minimal subset that blocks V_i to V_0 , contradicting to the condition of (4). After deleting this edge, assume there is a minimal subset \mathcal{R} that blocks V_i to V_0 but does not contain V_j and does not block V_j to V_0 . Then before deleting the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, $\mathcal{R} \cup \{V_j\}$ blocks V_i to V_0 , and it contains a minimal blocking subset \mathcal{R}' that contains V_j . The reason for $V_j \in \mathcal{R}'$ is that \mathcal{R} cannot block V_j to V_0 after deleting the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$. Such \mathcal{R}' violates the condition of (4). In sum, after deleting the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, $\beta(V_i)$ is not changed. Similarly, for another V_k , $\beta(V_k)$ is not changed. □

Consider the shortest path from V_i to V_0 , $V_i \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. Define \mathcal{S} to be the set of



Figure 7: Two equivalent GRNs in the sense of ancestor-descendant relations.

all children vertices of V_i , then \mathcal{S} blocks V_i to V_0 . Since vertices in $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{V_k\}$ cannot be closer to V_0 than V_k , $\mathcal{S} \setminus \{V_k\}$ cannot block the path $V_i \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_0$. Therefore, a minimal subset of \mathcal{S} that blocks V_i to V_0 must contain V_k . This means that the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ can be identified. Therefore, we can identify at least one edge starting from each V_i . For an unknown GRN, we can identify at least n edges. Consider the GRN $V_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V_0$. We can identify exactly n edges in this GRN. Thus n is the minimal number of edges that could be identified.

Consider a GRN that there is an edge from each vertex in $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{V_{n/2+1}, \dots, V_n\}$ to each vertex in $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{V_1, \dots, V_{n/2}\}$, and there is an edge from each vertex in \mathcal{S}_1 to V_0 . All $n^2/4 + n/2$ edges in this GRN can be identified. We guess $n^2/4 + n/2$ is the maximal number of edges that could be identified.

7.2 Use Ancestor-Descendant Relation to Infer GRN Structure

Consider an unknown GRN with vertices V_1, \dots, V_n . We only know whether a vertex V_i is a descendant of another vertex V_j , namely, whether there is a directed path from V_i to V_j . The question is to infer the GRN structure with such ancestor-descendant relations. The answer is that we can partially reconstruct the GRN: at least $n - 1$ edges can be identified.

For the two GRNs in Fig. 7, V_1 has descendants V_2, V_3, V_4 ; V_2 has descendants V_3, V_4 ; V_3 has descendant V_4 ; V_4 has no descendant. Thus they are equivalent in the sense of ancestor-descendant relations. If a directed edge appears in all equivalent GRNs, we can determine that this edge exists; if a directed edge appears in none of equivalent GRNs, we can determine that this edge does not exist; if a directed edge appears in some but not all equivalent GRNs, we cannot determine whether this edge exists.

Proposition 2. *The following procedure describes how to determine certain edges. (1) If V_j is not a descendant of V_i , then we can determine that the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ does not exist. (2) If V_j is a descendant of V_i , and V_i has another descendant V_k , which is an ancestor of V_j , then we cannot determine the existence of the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$. (3) If V_j is a descendant of V_i , and V_i does not have another descendant V_k , which is an ancestor of V_j , then we can determine that the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ exists.*

Proof. (1) If there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then V_j is a descendant of V_i .

(2) Since V_i is an ancestor of V_k , we can add an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ if it does not exist, and the ancestor-descendant relations are not affected. Since V_k is an ancestor of V_j , we can

add an edge $V_k \rightarrow V_j$ if it does not exist, and the ancestor-descendant relations are not affected. Since we have a path $V_i \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow V_j$, if there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, we can delete it without affecting the ancestor-descendant relations. Since V_i is an ancestor of V_k , if the edge $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ does not exist, we can add it, and the ancestor-descendant relations are not affected.

(3) If there is no edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then there is a path $V_i \rightarrow V_k \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow V_j$. Thus V_k is a descendant of V_i , and V_j is a descendant of V_k , a contradiction. \square

When we can confirm the existence of edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, there is no other path from V_i to V_j . Therefore, when we interfere with V_i , the change of V_j is directly from V_i . Assume we can measure gene expression profiles. After the intervention on V_i , if the change of V_i and the change of V_j have the same sign, V_i activates V_j ; otherwise, V_i inhibits V_j .

Consider $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{V_1, \dots, V_{n/2}\}$, $\mathcal{S}_2 = \{V_{n/2+1}, \dots, V_n\}$. There is an edge from each vertex in \mathcal{S}_1 to each vertex in \mathcal{S}_2 , and no other edge exists. Then all these $n^2/4$ edges can be identified. We guess this is the maximal number of edges that could be identified. When the GRN is a DAG, we can see that identified edges cannot form a triangle: if $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ and $V_j \rightarrow V_k$ can be identified, then $V_i \rightarrow V_k$ cannot be identified. Due to Turán's Theorem [8], a triangle-free graph with n vertices can have at most $n^2/4$ edges. Therefore, in the DAG case, $n^2/4$ is the maximal number of edges that could be identified.

If the GRN has cycles, we might recover no edge. For example, consider a GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3 \rightarrow V_4 \rightarrow V_5$ with an edge $V_5 \rightarrow V_1$, and a GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_3 \rightarrow V_5 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_4$ with an edge $V_4 \rightarrow V_1$. In both GRNs, any vertex is a descendant of any vertex. Therefore, these two GRNs have the same ancestor-descendant relations, but share no edge.

Proposition 3. *If the GRN is a DAG with n vertices, then we can use ancestor-descendant relations to identify at least $n - 1$ edges.*

Proof. The DAG is associated with a natural partial order: if there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$, then $V_i < V_j$. This partial order can be extended to a total order. If $V_i < V_j$ in the total order, then V_i cannot be a descendant of V_j .

When $n = 2$, this proposition is trivial. Assume this proposition is true for any $n < K$. When $n = K$, find a vertex V_i which has no child. Assume that after deleting V_i and edges linked to V_i , the DAG is divided into m connected components $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_m$. For the parents of V_i in each \mathcal{S}_j , choose the largest one V'_j under the total order. There is no other path from V'_j to V_i . Thus the edge $V'_j \rightarrow V_i$ can be identified. With m connected components, we can identify m edges that lead to V_i . An edge that can be identified in each connected component should be able to be identified in the original DAG. Thus deleting V_i does not affect identifying edges in each connected component. Apply this proposition to each connected component with size n_j , then we can identify at least $n_j - 1$ edges. In sum, we can identify at least $\sum_j n_j - m + m = K - 1$ edges. \square

7.3 Use Conditional Independence and Ancestor-Descendant Relation to Infer DAG Structure

Assume the joint distribution is Markov and faithful to a DAG. With the conditional independence relations, we can find all edges of this DAG, but some edge directions cannot be determined. With the ancestor-descendant relations, we can determine the direction of each edge. Therefore, combining these two data types, we can reconstruct the full DAG.

7.4 Partially Measured ODE Under Intervention

Consider a DAG with phenotype V_0 and genes V_1, \dots, V_k . Each V_i is an ancestor of V_0 . Assume the levels of V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k , $x_0(t), x_1(t), \dots, x_k(t)$, satisfy a linear ODE system. There is a partial order on V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k , associated with edges in this DAG. We can extend it into a total order and reorder the genes, so that in the linear ODE system $d\vec{x}/dt = A\vec{x} + \vec{b}$, A is upper-triangular. This means there is no edge from V_i to V_j if $i < j$. The diagonal elements of A are the degradation rates, which are negative. Therefore, the linear system has a unique fixed point $-A^{-1}\vec{b}$, which is stable.

Assume the system starts from the fixed point, and each time, we intervene with the value of one gene V_i . This means that $\vec{x}(0) = -A^{-1}\vec{b} + \vec{\delta}_i$, where $\vec{\delta}_i$ is a zero vector except its i th component. After the intervention, we can observe how $x_0(t)$ changes. We consider a question: based on only $x_0(t)$ under different interventions, can we partially infer the DAG? Surprisingly, the answer is yes. We can determine whether a gene V_i is an ancestor of another gene V_j .

Assume the diagonal elements of A are different. Then the solution of x_0 is

$$x_0(t) = c_0 e^{a_{00}t} + c_1 e^{a_{11}t} + \dots + c_k e^{a_{kk}t} + d,$$

where the coefficients c_i and d depend on $A, \vec{b}, \vec{x}(0)$. Assume in V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k , the descendants of V_i are V_0, V_1, \dots, V_{i-1} . Since we start from the fixed point, except that V_i is perturbed, those V_j with $j > i$ shall be fixed, and the solution of x_0 is

$$x_0(t) = c_0 e^{a_{00}t} + c_1 e^{a_{11}t} + \dots + c_i e^{a_{ii}t} + d.$$

The coefficients c_0, c_1, \dots, c_i are all non-zero, unless A satisfies an algebraic equation. However, such A is a zero-measured set in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ [47]. Therefore, when we perturb $x_i(0)$, we can observe $x_0(t)$ as a linear combination of $i + 1$ exponential functions. We can numerically determine the values of $a_{00}, a_{11}, \dots, a_{ii}$. This means that when we perturb x_i , we can find $a_{00}, a_{11}, \dots, a_{ii}$, which should correspond to V_i and its descendants. The question is to find the correspondence between a_{ii} and V_i . If a component a_{kk} only appears after perturbing x_k , then we can make sure that a_{kk} corresponds to V_k . Then if a_{jj} only appears after perturbing x_k and x_j , then we know that a_{jj} corresponds to V_j . Since there is a total order on V_0, V_1, \dots, V_k , determined by the underlying DAG, we can determine the correspondence

one by one. With the established correspondence, for each V_i , we can determine which genes are the descendants of V_i , by observing which components appear in $x_0(t)$.

For example, consider one phenotype V_0 and three genes V_1, V_2, V_3 , and we can measure $x_0(t)$ after perturbing any one gene. If we perturb x_1 , $x_0(t)$ has two exponential components λ_0, λ_1 . If we perturb x_2 , $x_0(t)$ has two exponential components λ_0, λ_2 . If we perturb x_3 , $x_0(t)$ has four exponential components $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$. Since component λ_3 only appears after perturbing x_3 , λ_3 corresponds to V_3 . Since component λ_2 only appears after perturbing x_2 or x_3 , and V_3 already corresponds to λ_3 , we know that λ_2 corresponds to V_2 . Since component λ_1 only appears after perturbing x_1 or x_3 , and V_3 already corresponds to λ_3 , we know that λ_1 corresponds to V_1 . Finally, λ_0 corresponds to V_0 . Therefore, we know that V_1 has descendant V_0 ; V_2 has descendant V_0 ; V_3 has descendants V_0, V_1, V_2 . We can determine that the DAG has edges $V_3 \rightarrow V_2, V_3 \rightarrow V_1, V_2 \rightarrow V_0, V_1 \rightarrow V_0$, with a possible edge $V_3 \rightarrow V_0$.

In sum, assume that we can observe the phenotype variable $x_0(t)$ under the intervention on each ancestor gene V_i of V_0 . Then we can determine whether one gene V_i is an ancestor of another gene V_j . As discussed in Subsection 7.2, this ancestor-descendant relation can partially determine the DAG. Certainly, the calculation of $a_{00}, a_{11}, \dots, a_{ii}$ from $x_0(t)$ is numerically infeasible, and requires unreasonable accuracy for $x_0(t)$. Therefore, this method is not applicable, unless the DAG is very small.

7.5 How to Examine the Existence of Autocatalysis

In determining the structure of a GRN, an important problem is whether there exists autocatalysis, namely whether the synthesis rate of one mRNA increases with the current expression level. In a graph model, this means an edge from a gene to itself. To simplify this problem, we assume that the synthesis rate has a base value k , and increases linearly with the expression level x . This means that the synthesis rate is $k + bx$, where b is the coefficient of autocatalysis. We also assume that the degradation rate is linear with the expression level x . This means that the degradation rate is cx , where c is the coefficient of degradation. We assume that all other genes have fixed expression levels, so that we can focus on one gene. We can assume $b < c$. Otherwise, the amount of this mRNA would grow endlessly.

In ODE models, the existence of autocatalysis is masked by the existence of degradation, whose rate also increases with the expression level. When the expression level is x , the change rate of x is $dx/dt = k - (c - b)x$. Since dx/dt and x are known, we can calculate k and $(c - b)$. However, we cannot determine whether $b = 0$ or $b > 0$, since $c = 10, b = 7$ and $c = 3, b = 0$ are equivalent in this model.

In stochastic process models, we can examine the existence of autocatalysis just with the stationary distribution. The idea is that if we increase both b and c , the variance would increase [38]. With the assumptions above, when the expression level $X = n$, the synthesis rate, namely the transition rate from $X = n$ to $X = n + 1$, is $bn + k$; the degradation rate,

namely the transition rate from $X = n$ to $X = n - 1$, is cn . At stationary, define P_n to be the probability that the expression level $X = n$. Since $\{P_n\}$ is stationary, we have

$$[b(n - 1) + k]P_{n-1} = cnP_n. \quad (3)$$

In Eq. (3), take the summation from $n = 1$ to ∞ to obtain $b\mathbb{E}(X) + k = c\mathbb{E}(X)$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X) = k/(c-b)$. Now multiply Eq. (3) by $n-1$, and take the summation from $n = 1$ to ∞ . Then we have $b\mathbb{E}(X^2) + k\mathbb{E}(X) = c\mathbb{E}(X^2) - c\mathbb{E}(X)$. Thus $\mathbb{E}(X^2) = (k^2 + ck)/(c - b)^2$, and $\sigma^2(X) = ck/(c - b)^2$. We can see that the mean and variance of X satisfy $\sigma^2(X)/\mathbb{E}(X) = c/(c - b)$. If $\sigma^2(X) = \mathbb{E}(X)$, then $b = 0$; if $\sigma^2(X) > \mathbb{E}(X)$, then $b > 0$. We have reached a criterion for autocatalysis: **at stationary, if the variance of X is larger than the mean of X , then X has autocatalysis.** To apply this method, we need the single-cell level distribution of gene expression profiles.

This criterion is valid only if other genes are fixed, or do not interfere with the concerned gene. In reality, all genes in the same GRN reach stationary as a network. Thus the marginal distribution of a gene at stationary might be different from the distribution discussed above. In this case (Scenarios 1-3), we might not be able to apply such a simple criterion, except for genes that have no parents.

If we have single-cell level interventional gene expression time series data (Scenario 4), we can assume linearity, and calculate the values of $c_i - b_i$ and k_i for each gene, as discussed in Subsection 6.2. Then we can use the variance and covariance of gene expression to solve the value of each b_i and c_i , similar to the one-dimensional case. Since the system is much more complicated, the condition of $b_i = 0$ might explicitly depend on the values of $c_i - b_i$ and k_i . Therefore, we have to concretely calculate all b_i to see if they equal 0, not just comparing mean and variance.

8 Different Scenarios of Inferring GRN Structure

In this section, we discuss the question that with each possible data type, whether the GRN structure can be inferred. As introduced in Section 2, each scenario (data type) is described in the following four dimensions: (1) Do we measure **Gene** expression or **Phenotype**? (2) Do we measure on **Single-cell** level or **Bulk** level? (3) Do we measure at a single time point (**One-time**) or at multiple time points (**Time series**)? (4) Is the measurement **Interventional** or **Non-interventional**? When the measurement is interventional and on the single-cell level, we need to discuss whether we can measure the joint distribution for multiple time points.

In order to place each discussion to the most proper scenario, this section might not be read fully in order. For example, Scenario 4 partially depends on the discussions in Scenario 6 and Scenario 8.

We shall mainly focus on methods that could use accurate data to produce a determined GRN, not various Bayesian type methods that produce a posterior distribution on possible

GRNs. Nevertheless, Bayesian type methods have the advantage that they could easily utilize prior information [25].

For each scenario, there are different approaches to infer the GRN structure, corresponding to different models and different assumptions. We do not aim at exhausting all existing and potential approaches.

8.1 Scenario 1: Gene, Single-cell, One-time, Non-interventional

In this scenario, we have the joint distribution of steady-state expression levels for all genes. As discussed in Subsection 6.1, if the GRN is a DAG, and the joint distribution is Markov and faithful to this DAG, then we can partially determine the GRN structure: all edges can be identified, except that the directions of some edges are unknown.

This method has been applied in determining GRN structures [11]. Various algorithms utilize experimental data to determine conditional independence relations [14, 46], and then infer DAG structures [23].

There are also other approaches to model this scenario. In a network, we can use neighboring relations to predict the characters associated with each node [42]. Reversely, we can use the node characters (gene expression profiles) to infer the network structures. This approach can only provide a rough guess among different possibilities. Structural equation model is also used to infer GRN structures in this scenario [44]. This method does not determine the true GRN, but evaluates all possible GRNs. Linearity is required for this method.

If the underground dynamics satisfies the stochastic process model in Subsection 6.3, then at stationary, the joint distribution might not satisfy the Markov and faithful condition. For example, if the true GRN is $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3$, then we only have $X_1(t-1) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3(t+1) \mid [X_2(0), \dots, X_2(t)]$, or at most $X_1(t-1) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3(t+1) \mid X_2(t)$, but not $X_1(t) \perp\!\!\!\perp X_3(t) \mid X_2(t)$. In this case, we will obtain fewer conditional independence relations.

If we can confirm that a gene is not affected by other genes (which is not true in general), then we can use the criterion in Subsection 7.5 to determine whether autocatalysis exists.

8.2 Scenario 2: Gene, Single-cell, One-time, Interventional

Scenario 2 is a combination of Scenario 1 and Scenario 6. Assume the GRN is a DAG, and the stationary joint distribution is Markov and faithful to this DAG. From the stationary distribution, we can obtain the conditional independence relations. From the interventions, we can obtain the ancestor-descendant relations. As discussed in Subsection 7.3, we can combine these two kinds of relations to fully reconstruct the DAG.

If the path blocking property holds under the interventions, similar to Scenario 6, we can fully determine the GRN.

If we can confirm that a gene is not affected by other genes (which is not true in general), then we can use the criterion in Subsection 7.5 to determine whether autocatalysis exists.

8.3 Scenario 3: Gene, Single-cell, Time series, Non-interventional

In this scenario, we measure the single-cell gene expression profiles at multiple time points without intervention.

If we can only measure the marginal distribution for each time point, then this is essentially the same as Scenario 1. If the GRN is a DAG, and the joint distribution is Markov and faithful to this DAG, then we can partially determine the GRN structure.

If we can measure the joint distribution for different time points, then as discussed in Subsection 6.4, we can fully reconstruct the GRN, even if there are cycles. If the measurement time step is too large, we can only obtain the ancestor-descendant relations, and we can only partially recover the GRN if it is a DAG.

This method has been applied in determining GRN structures [45]. There are some other approaches, such as Granger causality [3] and Boolean networks [31]. Readers may refer to a review paper [25] for different methods applicable for this scenario.

If we can confirm that a gene is not affected by other genes (which is not true in general), then we can use the criterion in Subsection 7.5 to determine whether autocatalysis exists.

8.4 Scenario 4: Gene, Single-cell, Time series, Interventional

If we can measure the joint distribution for different time points, then similar to Scenario 3, we can fully reconstruct the GRN.

If we can only measure the marginal distribution for each time point, there are different approaches. If we take expectations for expression profiles, this scenario moves to Scenario 8, and we can use the ODE model to fully recover the GRN under the linearity assumption. If the path blocking property holds under the interventions, similar to Scenario 6, we can use the blocking relations to fully recover the GRN. If the GRN is a DAG, and the stationary joint distribution is Markov and faithful to this DAG, similar to Scenario 2, we can use the conditional independence relations and the ancestor-descendant relations to fully recover the GRN. If the GRN is a DAG, similar to Scenario 6, we can use the ancestor-descendant relations to partially recover the GRN.

Under the linearity assumption, we can use the ODE model to calculate related parameters, then use variance and covariance to determine the existence of autocatalysis for any gene, as discussed in Subsection 7.5. Under other assumptions, if we can confirm that a gene is not affected by other genes (which is not true in general), then we can use the criterion in Subsection 7.5 to determine whether autocatalysis exists.

8.5 Scenario 5: Gene, Bulk, One-time, Non-interventional

In this scenario, we can only observe the bulk level expression profile. Since there is no intervention, and the expression level of each gene is just a single number, we cannot infer the structure of GRN. One might propose an approach that we can repeat the experiments on different cell populations, whose results might differ due to random noise. Then we can obtain a joint distribution of expression. This approach looks like Scenario 1, but it does not work. In Scenario 1, if there is an edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$, the expression levels X_1 and X_2 might be $X_1 = C + \epsilon_1$, $X_2 = f(X_1) + \epsilon_2 = f(C + \epsilon_1) + \epsilon_2$. Since the noise ϵ_1 can transmit through the edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$, we have $X_1 \not\perp\!\!\!\perp X_2$. In this scenario, the expression levels of V_1 and V_2 might be $X_1 = C + \epsilon_1$, $X_2 = f(C) + \epsilon_2$. The noise ϵ_1 is external, so that it cannot transmit through the edge $V_1 \rightarrow V_2$, and we have $X_1 \perp\!\!\!\perp X_2$.

8.6 Scenario 6: Gene, Bulk, One-time, Interventional

In this scenario, we can interfere with any genes, then measure the bulk level expression profile. We can compare whether two different interventions produce the same result.

If the path blocking property holds under the interventions, then there is an edge $V_i \rightarrow V_j$ if and only if they cannot be blocked by all other vertices. This means that we can fully determine the GRN even if it has cycles.

If the path blocking property does not hold, then through intervention, we can only obtain the ancestor-descendant relation: the intervention on V_i leads to the change of V_j , if and only if V_i is an ancestor of V_j . From Subsection 7.2, we can partially infer the GRN structure (at least $n - 1$ edges for a GRN with n vertices), if the GRN is a DAG. If the GRN has cycles, we might not infer any edge.

8.7 Scenario 7: Gene, Bulk, Time series, Non-interventional

Without intervention, the cell population is in equilibrium. Thus multiple observations at different time points should provide the same information. Scenario 7 is essentially the same as Scenario 5. We cannot infer the GRN structure.

8.8 Scenario 8: Gene, Bulk, Time series, Interventional

In this scenario, we can measure how the bulk expression level of each gene changes over time. Assume the dynamics is linear, meaning that the expression levels satisfy a linear ODE system. As discussed in Subsection 6.2, we can use the observed data to calculate the parameters, then determine the GRN structure [2, 37].

We can add some nonlinear terms in the ODE system to allow for more complicated dynamics. Certainly, this increases the quantity of data needed. When there are not enough data, we might need to assume that the coefficient matrix is sparse.

If we do not assume the dynamics is linear (or satisfying any other specified forms), then we meet the same situation as Scenario 6. If the path blocking property holds, we can fully determine the GRN. If the DAG assumption holds, we can partially infer the GRN structure through ancestor-descendant relations.

8.9 Scenario 9: Phenotype, Single-cell, One-time, Non-interventional

In this scenario, we can neither perturb a gene nor measure the expression level of a gene. Since there is no information about genes in the data, we cannot infer the structure of GRN.

8.10 Scenario 10: Phenotype, Single-cell, One-time, Interventional

We assume the path blocking property holds from any gene to the phenotype: the intervention on one gene V_i does not change the phenotype V_0 , if and only if all paths from V_i to V_0 are blocked by the intervened genes. For example, consider the GRN $V_1 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow V_3 \rightarrow V_0$. If V_3 is already intervened, then the intervention on V_2 does not affect V_0 . If just V_1 is intervened, then the intervention on V_2 could affect V_0 .

For the concerned genes, we intervene with one gene each time, so as to find out which genes are the ancestors of the phenotype. For these ancestor genes, we need to intervene with any subset of them, so that we can determine whether a gene is blocked by this subset. As discussed in Subsection 7.1, we can use the path blocking relation to partially determine the GRN. We can determine at least n edges if the GRN has n genes.

8.11 Scenario 11: Phenotype, Single-cell, Time series, Non-interventional

Similar to Scenario 9, there is no information about genes in the data, and we cannot infer the structure of GRN. In this scenario, whether we can measure the joint distribution for multiple time points does not change the conclusion.

8.12 Scenario 12: Phenotype, Single-cell, Time series, Interventional

This scenario is almost the same as Scenario 16. The only difference is that we measure single-cell level phenotype data, which have higher accuracy in detecting differences. For a GRN with n genes, we can identify at least n edges if either (1) the path blocking property holds; or (2) the dynamics is linear, and the GRN is a DAG. In this scenario, whether we can measure the joint distribution for multiple time points does not change the conclusion.

8.13 Scenario 13: Phenotype, Bulk, One-time, Non-interventional

Similar to Scenario 9, there is no information about genes in the data, and we cannot infer the structure of GRN.



Figure 8: Two equivalent GRNs in the sense of ancestor-descendant relations and path blocking relations.

8.14 Scenario 14: Phenotype, Bulk, One-time, Interventional

This scenario is almost the same as Scenario 10. The only difference is that we measure bulk level phenotype data, which have lower accuracy in detecting differences. We can partially determine the GRN (at least n edges if the GRN has n genes).

8.15 Scenario 15: Phenotype, Bulk, Time series, Non-interventional

Similar to Scenario 9, there is no information about genes in the data, and we cannot infer the structure of GRN.

8.16 Scenario 16: Phenotype, Bulk, Time series, Interventional

If the path blocking property holds, then as discussed in Subsection 7.1, we can partially determine the GRN structure (at least n edges for a GRN with n genes).

If the dynamics is linear, and the GRN is a DAG, then as discussed in Subsection 7.4, we can determine the ancestor-descendant relations. Subsection 7.2 shows that we can partially determine the GRN structure (at least n edges for a GRN with n genes).

If the path blocking property holds, the dynamics is linear, and the GRN is a DAG, then we might infer more but not all edges. For example, the two GRNs in Fig. 8 cannot be distinguished by path blocking relations and ancestor-descendant relations.

9 Discussion

In this paper, we introduce the problem of GRN structure inference and provide complete answers to all situations. To handle some less discussed scenarios, we develop some novel mathematical methods.

This paper does not cover all mathematical approaches of GRN structure inference, and there will be new mathematical methods for scenarios discussed in this paper. With the development of biological technologies, there will be new data types that are not included in our 16 scenarios. This work just provides a general paradigm of inferring GRN (or general networks) structures: given what type of data, under what assumptions, what we can infer about the GRN structure.

We only focus on theoretical inference methods, but not practical algorithms that work on real data. The designing of such algorithms is related to some mathematical fields not covered in this paper: statistical inference [6], numerical computing [29], etc.

For well-studied Scenarios 1, 3, 8, we mention multiple algorithms that work on finite experimental data. Although the principles of different algorithms are more or less the same, the efficiencies are different. The reason is that we only have measured data, not accurate values/distributions, so that different approaches might introduce different levels of errors and have different computation time costs [41]. (A classical result in numerical linear algebra: In theory, Gaussian elimination and Cramer’s rule can both solve a linear equation system. In practice, Gaussian elimination is significantly faster and more accurate [35].) Besides, some algorithms have certain assumptions, under which the computation is much faster, and the data required is much less. For example, if we need to determine the independence of two random variables, and it is assumed that they are joint Gaussian, then we only need to check whether their correlation coefficient is 0.

ODE-based models (including dynamical system methods) have an advantage: once the parameters are determined, we can directly predict the behavior under new perturbations. To derive ODE models, we assume there are infinitely many identical cells living in a stationary environment, and the underlying dynamics is time-homogeneous. These assumptions are not always true: we only have finitely many cells; cells have heterogeneity; the environment keeps changing; cells are mutating over time. Besides, this derivation might fail in nonlinear cases. For a nonlinear function f and a variable X , the expectation cannot cross f : $\mathbb{E}[f(X)] \neq f(\mathbb{E}X)$. Therefore, the ODE-based models cannot match the reality with extremely high accuracy, which conflicts with the fact that some ODE-based models (such as the method in Subsection 7.4) are numerically sensitive to perturbations.

When there are not enough data, one solution is to produce more data through interpolation [2]. With this method, the dynamics is already stipulated by the data interpolation method. The new data can only be used to confirm that their dynamics follow the interpolation method. Therefore, this approach is essentially equivalent to adding more assumptions (e.g., linearity) in the model. We need to be cautious not to regard assumptions as conclusions.

In Scenario 6 and Scenario 8, we have the bulk level gene expression profiles after different interventions. One approach of determining possible regulations is to directly calculate the correlation coefficient or mutual information of two genes [15]. Here data after different interventions are regarded as samples from the same distribution. We provide a simple example to show that this approach might build a fake relation between two independent genes. Assume there are three independent genes V_1, V_2, V_3 . After intervention on V_1 , the expression levels of V_1, V_2 are 0.5 and 1; after intervention on V_2 , the expression levels of V_1, V_2 are 1 and 0.5; after intervention on V_3 , the expression levels of V_1, V_2 are 1 and 1. Then the correlation coefficient of V_1, V_2 is -0.5 , although V_1, V_2 are independent.

When we measure bulk level gene expression and repeat several times, due to various external noise, the measured quantities might not be exactly equal. When we measure at

multiple time points (time series), and each cell population can be measured only once, we cannot match the quantity at one time point to the quantity at another time point. For example, assume for the same population, one quantity fluctuates periodically like a sine wave. Different populations have the same frequency but different phases. Since we cannot measure the same population more than once, we can only observe that the marginal distribution at each time point is the same, and the fluctuation cannot be identified. This problem is even related to the thermodynamic side of gene expression dynamics: if we do not know the joint distribution of multiple time points, then we cannot distinguish equilibrium steady state and non-equilibrium steady state (which differ by entropy productions) [40]. This problem also appears for the single-cell level time series data.

For the methods in Subsection 6.1 (causal DAG), Subsection 6.4 (stochastic process), when the number of genes in the GRN increases, the conditional independence tests need to concern more variables, and the quantity of data needed grows exponentially. Besides, the computational time cost also grows exponentially. For the method in Subsection 7.1 (path blocking), the number of experiments and computational time cost also grow exponentially with the number of genes. To avoid such problems, we need to assume the GRN is sparse, or just consider a few genes. Nevertheless, such solutions might lead to unreliable results, since GRNs in reality might be large and dense [2].

Acknowledgements

Y.W. would like to thank Dr. Nadya Morozova and Dr. Andrey Minarsky for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Tallulah S Andrews and Martin Hemberg. Identifying cell populations with scRNASeq. *Mol. Aspects Med.*, 59:114–122, 2018.
- [2] Mukesh Bansal, Giusy Della Gatta, and Diego Di Bernardo. Inference of gene regulatory networks and compound mode of action from time course gene expression profiles. *Bioinformatics*, 22(7):815–822, 2006.
- [3] Lionel Barnett, Adam B Barrett, and Anil K Seth. Granger causality and transfer entropy are equivalent for Gaussian variables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 103(23):238701, 2009.
- [4] Junyue Cao, Diana R O’Day, Hannah A Pliner, Paul D Kingsley, Mei Deng, Riza M Daza, Michael A Zager, Kimberly A Aldinger, Ronnie Blecher-Gonen, Fan Zhang, et al. A human cell atlas of fetal gene expression. *Science*, 370(6518), 2020.
- [5] Trent A Carrier and Jay D Keasling. Investigating autocatalytic gene expression systems through mechanistic modeling. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 201(1):25–36, 1999.

- [6] George Casella and Roger L Berger. *Statistical inference*. Cengage Learning, 2021.
- [7] Thomas J Cunningham and Gregg Duester. Mechanisms of retinoic acid signalling and its roles in organ and limb development. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell. Biol.*, 16(2):110–123, 2015.
- [8] Reinhard Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition, 2000.
- [9] Jiarui Ding, Xian Adiconis, Sean K Simmons, Monika S Kowalczyk, Cynthia C Hession, Nemanja D Marjanovic, Travis K Hughes, Marc H Wadsworth, Tyler Burks, Lan T Nguyen, et al. Systematic comparison of single-cell and single-nucleus RNA-sequencing methods. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 38(6):737–746, 2020.
- [10] Liat Ein-Dor, Itai Kela, Gad Getz, David Givol, and Eytan Domany. Outcome signature genes in breast cancer: is there a unique set? *Bioinformatics*, 21(2):171–178, 2004.
- [11] Frank Emmert-Streib, Galina Glazko, Gökmen Altay, and Ricardo De Matos Simoes. Statistical inference and reverse engineering of gene regulatory networks from observational expression data. *Front. Genet.*, 3:8, 2012.
- [12] Lorenzo Galluzzi, Ilio Vitale, Laura Senovilla, Ken André Olaussen, Guillaume Pinna, Tobias Eisenberg, Aïcha Goubar, Isabelle Martins, Judith Michels, Gueorgui Kratassiouk, et al. Prognostic impact of vitamin B6 metabolism in lung cancer. *Cell Rep.*, 2(2):257–269, 2012.
- [13] Taranjit Singh Gujral, Leonid Peshkin, and Marc W Kirschner. Exploiting polypharmacology for drug target deconvolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 111(13):5048–5053, 2014.
- [14] Tzee-Ming Huang. Testing conditional independence using maximal nonlinear conditional correlation. *Ann. Stat.*, 38(4):2047–2091, 2010.
- [15] Daniel Hurley, Hiromitsu Araki, Yoshinori Tamada, Ben Dunmore, Deborah Sanders, Sally Humphreys, Muna Affara, Seiya Imoto, Kaori Yasuda, Yuki Tomiyasu, et al. Gene network inference and visualization tools for biologists: application to new human transcriptome datasets. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 40(6):2377–2398, 2012.
- [16] Da-Quan Jiang, Yue Wang, and Da Zhou. Phenotypic equilibrium as probabilistic convergence in multi-phenotype cell population dynamics. *PLOS ONE*, 12(2):e0170916, 2017.
- [17] Mads Kaern, Timothy C Elston, William J Blake, and James J Collins. Stochasticity in gene expression: from theories to phenotypes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 6(6):451–464, 2005.

- [18] Benno Müller-Hill. *The lac Operon*. de Gruyter, 2011.
- [19] Gyöngyi Munkácsy, Zsófia Sztupinszki, Péter Herman, Bence Bán, Zsófia Pénczváltó, Nóra Szarvas, and Balázs Györffy. Validation of RNAi silencing efficiency using gene array data shows 18.5% failure rate across 429 independent experiments. *Mol. Ther. Nucleic Acids*, 5:e366, 2016.
- [20] James D Murray. *Mathematical Biology I: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001.
- [21] Rahul R Nikam and Kiran R Gore. Journey of siRNA: clinical developments and targeted delivery. *Nucleic Acid Ther.*, 28(4):209–224, 2018.
- [22] Alina Patke, Michael W Young, and Sofia Axelrod. Molecular mechanisms and physiological importance of circadian rhythms. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.*, 21(2):67–84, 2020.
- [23] Judea Pearl. *Probabilistic Inference in Intelligent Systems*. Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, 1988.
- [24] Judea Pearl, Madelyn Glymour, and Nicholas P Jewell. *Causal inference in statistics: A primer*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [25] Christopher A Penfold and David L Wild. How to infer gene networks from expression profiles, revisited. *Interface Focus*, 1(6):857–870, 2011.
- [26] Norbert Perrimon, Jian-Quan Ni, and Lizabeth Perkins. In vivo RNAi: today and tomorrow. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.*, 2(8):a003640, 2010.
- [27] Adrian Pickar-Oliver and Charles A Gersbach. The next generation of CRISPR–Cas technologies and applications. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.*, 20(8):490–507, 2019.
- [28] Mark Pollicott, Hao Wang, and Howard Weiss. Extracting the time-dependent transmission rate from infection data via solution of an inverse ODE problem. *J. Biol. Dyn.*, 6(2):509–523, 2012.
- [29] Constantine Pozrikidis. *Numerical computation in science and engineering*. Oxford university press New York, 1998.
- [30] Matthew T Rondina, Deepak Voora, Lukas M Simon, Hansjörg Schwertz, Julie F Harper, Olivia Lee, Seema C Bhatlekar, Qing Li, Alicia S Eustes, Emilie Montenont, Robert A Campbell, Neal D Tolley, Yasuhiro Kosaka, Andrew S Weyrich, Paul F Bray, and Jesse W Rowley. Longitudinal RNA-Seq analysis of the repeatability of gene expression and splicing in human platelets identifies a platelet SELP splice QTL. *Circ. Res.*, 126(4):501–516, 2020.

- [31] Ilya Shmulevich, Edward R Dougherty, and Wei Zhang. Gene perturbation and intervention in probabilistic Boolean networks. *Bioinformatics*, 18(10):1319–1331, 2002.
- [32] Elly Sinkala, Elodie Sollier-Christen, Corinne Renier, Elisabet Rosas-Canyelles, James Che, Kyra Heirich, Todd A Duncombe, Julea Vlassakis, Kevin A Yamauchi, Haiyan Huang, Stefanie S Jeffrey, and Amy E Herr. Profiling protein expression in circulating tumour cells using microfluidic western blotting. *Nat. Commun.*, 8(1):1–12, 2017.
- [33] Lok-Hang So, Anandamohan Ghosh, Chenghang Zong, Leonardo A Sepúlveda, Ronen Segev, and Ido Golding. General properties of transcriptional time series in *Escherichia coli*. *Nat. Genet.*, 43(6):554–560, 2011.
- [34] Valentine Svensson. Droplet scRNA-seq is not zero-inflated. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 38(2):147–150, 2020.
- [35] Lloyd N Trefethen and David Bau III. *Numerical Linear Algebra*. SIAM, 1997.
- [36] Tianyu Wang, Boyang Li, Craig E Nelson, and Sheida Nabavi. Comparative analysis of differential gene expression analysis tools for single-cell RNA sequencing data. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 20(1):1–16, 2019.
- [37] Yi Kan Wang, Daniel G Hurley, Santiago Schnell, Cristin G Print, and Edmund J Crampin. Integration of steady-state and temporal gene expression data for the inference of gene regulatory networks. *PLOS ONE*, 8(8):e72103, 2013.
- [38] Yue Wang. *Some Problems in Stochastic Dynamics and Statistical Analysis of Single-Cell Biology of Cancer*. PhD thesis, University of Washington, 2018.
- [39] Yue Wang, Jérémie Kropp, and Nadya Morozova. Biological notion of positional information/value in morphogenesis theory. *Int. J. Dev. Biol.*, 64(10-11-12):453–463, 2020.
- [40] Yue Wang and Hong Qian. Mathematical representation of Clausius’ and Kelvin’s statements of the second law and irreversibility. *J. Stat. Phys.*, 179:808–837, 2020.
- [41] Yue Wang and Linbo Wang. Causal inference in degenerate systems: An impossibility result. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3383–3392. PMLR, 2020.
- [42] Yue Wang, Boyu Zhang, Jérémie Kropp, and Nadya Morozova. Inference on tissue transplantation experiments. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 520:110645, 2021.
- [43] Zhong Wang, Mark Gerstein, and Michael Snyder. Rna-seq: a revolutionary tool for transcriptomics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*, 10(1):57–63, 2009.

- [44] Momiao Xiong, Jun Li, and Xiangzhong Fang. Identification of genetic networks. *Genetics*, 166(2):1037–1052, 2004.
- [45] Jing Yu, V Anne Smith, Paul P Wang, Alexander J Hartemink, and Erich D Jarvis. Advances to Bayesian network inference for generating causal networks from observational biological data. *Bioinformatics*, 20(18):3594–3603, 2004.
- [46] Kun Zhang, Jonas Peters, Dominik Janzing, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Kernel-based conditional independence test and application in causal discovery. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 804–813, 2011.
- [47] Da Zhou, Yue Wang, and Bin Wu. A multi-phenotypic cancer model with cell plasticity. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 357:35–45, 2014.