

# On the Innocuousness of Deterministic p-type Integral Controllers Arising in Integral Rein Control

Corentin Briat and Mustafa Khammash  
D-BSSE - ETH-Zürich, Switzerland

## Abstract

The innocuousness property of a controller is that property that makes the closed-loop system stable regardless the values of the controller parameters. In other words, the closed-loop system exhibits some structural stability property with respect to the parameters of the controller. The innocuousness property was first emphasized in [1] where it was shown that for stochastic unimolecular networks, the Antithetic Integral Controller (AIC) is innocuous under very mild conditions on the controlled network; namely the ergodicity and the output-controllability of the open-loop network, and the admissibility of the set-point value. We show here that the class of p-type AIC controllers arising in the use of Antithetic Integral Rein Controllers (AIRC) also exhibit such a property. It is shown in the unimolecular reaction network case that the closed-loop network is structurally stable with respect to the controller parameters provided that the open-loop dynamics is stable and that the set-point is admissible. Those results are then extended to the case of so-called output unstable linear systems and to stable nonlinear networks. Analogous results are obtained for exponential and logistic integral controllers. Some examples are given for illustration.

## 1 Introduction

The antithetic integral control [1] has been shown to be an important, yet simple, mechanism for ensuring perfect adaptation in biochemical systems. The core mechanism is that of molecular sequestration which can be seen as a way to perform a subtraction operation at a molecular level. The theoretical properties of the Antithetic Integral Controller (AIC) and its leaky versions have now been well-studied, in both the deterministic [2–9] and the stochastic [1, 10] settings. In particular, it was proven in the latter case that the AIC has the surprising innocuousness property provided that the open-loop network is unimolecular, ergodic and output-controllable, and that the set-point is admissible. While it was known that certain properties for the open-loop network ensure the closed-loop system stability for all the controllers within a given class, this result was dramatically different in the sense that the system itself did not need any extra-ordinary property rather than ergodicity (i.e. stability) and output-controllability. In the deterministic case, those properties are simply not enough to ensure the stability of the closed-loop system for all the controllers within a considered class. Usual extra properties that are required are those of passivity and dissipativity, as it was often considered in adaptive control; see e.g. [11, 12].

The Antithetic Integral Rein Controller (AIRC) has been more recently introduced in [13] and exploits the possibility of using the second molecular species in the AIC in order to actuate the network at a different point, namely at the degradation level of the controlled species. In this regard, the AIRC combines an AIC of p- and n-type – the former directly degrading the controlled species while the latter actively produces a molecular species that will in turn produce

the controlled species. This control topology offers certain advantages such as the possibility for considering a wider range of set-points for the controlled species or the possibility for improving the transient behavior of the controlled network. It was indeed observed in [1] that acting at degradation levels led to faster responses for the closed-loop network. The AIRC has also been considered in [14] where it is shown that such a controller always ensures the existence of a nonnegative equilibrium point for the closed-loop dynamics thanks to the possibility of actuating both positively (production) and negatively (degradation) the controlled species. However, the stability of the closed-loop dynamics has only been addressed in [13] on a simple gene expression network and this problem remains mostly open in the general setting.

The objective of this article is to provide preliminary results to the stability analysis problem of more general networks controlled by AIRCs and, more specifically, to state a beginning of an answer regarding their structural stability. Under mild conditions in the unimolecular networks case, we first recover the result that all positive set-points are admissible, meaning that all positive set-points lead to nonnegative equilibrium points for the closed-loop dynamics. On the top of that, we also show that the AIRC exhibits an interesting equilibrium switching behavior in the strong binding limit. In this regime, all the work is done through production of the controlled species whenever the set-point is larger than the basal level whereas all the work is done through degradation of the controlled species whenever the set-point is smaller than the basal level. In other words, this means that in the strong binding limit, the AIRC either behaves like an n-type AIC or as a p-type AIC. The n-type AIC has been already thoroughly studied in the past and its properties are pretty much all fairly known now; see e.g. [3,4,7]. The second scenario, in which all the work is done through degradation, is not yet fully understood and is thus far more interesting. This motivates the consideration of a reduced problem where the actuation through production of the AIRC is simply removed, resulting then in a p-type AIC structure acting directly on the degradation of the controlled species. Considering this reduced problem also restricts the admissible class of set-points which must be now less than the basal level to be admissible. Linearizing the reduced problem about the unique equilibrium point notably shows that, due to the nonlinearity between the state and the control input, this p-type AIC locally behaves as a Proportional-Integral (PI) controller; see e.g. [8,9] for similar comments on other controller architectures.

Some existence results analogous to those obtained [7] are first obtained to establish whether there exists a controller that always makes the unique equilibrium point of the closed-loop system locally exponentially stable. By observing that the Hurwitz stability of the Jacobian is equivalent to the stability of the negative interconnection of an LTI system and an integrator with arbitrarily large positive gain, a structural stability result is obtained. More specifically, we show that under the mild assumptions that 1) the open-loop network is stable and that 2) the set-point is admissible, then the unique equilibrium point of the closed-loop dynamics is locally exponentially stable regardless the values of the controller parameters. To prove this result, we extensively use ideas from linear positive systems theory [15], the property of positive realness of transfer functions, and the passivity of dynamical systems [11,12,16]. This allows us to state very general results about the stability of linear networks controlled by a p-type AIC acting directly on the degradation of the controlled species. An extension of this result is also provided in the context of output unstable linear systems for which it is shown that the p-type AIC is always stabilizing under the very mild condition that the basal gain is non-zero. Interestingly enough, it is also shown in this case that all positive set-points are admissible.

For completeness, we also state analogous results for nonlinear networks where some of the assumptions used in the linear case break down. In particular, the Jacobian matrix of the system may not be Metzler anymore and the results relying on the theory of linear positive systems can not be applied anymore. In spite of that, we are still able to provide a way to check

whether structural stability holds in that setting. The condition is stated in terms of the input strict passivity of a linear dynamical system or the strict positive realness of a certain transfer function. Those conditions can be either checked numerically by solving a convex optimization problem or by checking the conditions theoretically for more generality.

Analogous results are finally obtained for exponential and logistical integral controllers. The former class of controllers, considered for instance in [7, 17, 18], can be seen as standard integral controllers with an exponentiated output, which makes the control input positive. This exponential function is one of many possible positively regularizing functions [7] which can make an integral controller positive. We show here that when such a controller is used to act on the degradation of the output species, structural stability also holds under the assumption that the set-point is admissible. The second class of controllers, introduced in [7], add a saturation to the exponential version. Again, we prove the local structural stability of the closed-loop network under the assumption that the set-point is admissible.

**Outline.** A preliminary analysis of the AIRC is carried out in Section 3 and a justification for considering an AIC of p-type is provided. Preliminary definitions and results are given in Section 3 and are utilized in Section 4 to obtain structural stability results for unimolecular reaction networks controlled by p-type AICs. Those results are then extended in Section 5 to nonlinear networks. Finally, exponential integral controllers and logistic integral controllers are treated in Section 6 and Section 7, respectively.

**Notations.** The cone of symmetric positive (semi)definite matrices of dimension  $n$  is denoted by  $(\mathbb{S}_{>0}^n, \mathbb{S}_{\geq 0}^n)$ . For two symmetric matrices  $A, B$  with same dimension,  $A \succ B$  ( $A \succeq B$ ) means that  $A - B \succ 0$  ( $A - B \succeq 0$ ); i.e.  $A - B$  is positive (semi)definite. The natural basis for  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ .

## 2 Antithetic integral rain control

### 2.1 Control of unimolecular reaction networks

Let us consider the following bilinear system with single output

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + e_1 u_1(t) - e_n x_n(t) u_2(t) + b_0 \\ y(t) &= e_n^T x(t) \\ x(0) &= x_0 \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where  $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ ,  $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , and  $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  are the state of the system, the initial condition, the control input, the measured output, and the basal input vector. This model can be seen as a simple unimolecular reaction network where the first input acts on the production of the first molecular species and the second one as the degradation of the state that corresponds to the output of the system. This setup is a generalization of that considered in [13] where the second-order system case was only considered. The matrix  $A$  is assumed to be Metzler (i.e. all its off-diagonal elements are nonnegative) which is a necessary sufficient condition for the internal positivity of the system.

We consider the following Antithetic Integral Rein Controller

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}_1(t) &= \mu - \eta z_1(t) z_2(t) \\ \dot{z}_2(t) &= \theta x_n(t) - \eta z_1(t) z_2(t) \\ u_1(t) &= k_i z_1(t) \\ u_2(t) &= k_p z_2(t) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  are the states of the controller,  $\eta, k_p, k_i > 0$  are the parameters of the controller and where  $\mu, \theta > 0$  define the set-point  $r := \mu/\theta$  for the equilibrium output. The resulting closed-loop system is then given by

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + e_1 k_i z_1(t) - e_n x_n(t) k_p z_2(t) + b_0 \\ \dot{z}_1(t) &= \mu - \eta z_1(t) z_2(t) \\ \dot{z}_2(t) &= \theta x_n(t) - \eta z_1(t) z_2(t)\end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

where we can see that the species  $z_1$  of the controller acts on the production of  $x_n$  by acting on  $x_1$  whereas  $z_2$  acts on the degradation of the controlled species.

We need the following definition of admissibility of a set-point:

**Definition 1** *The set-point  $r := \mu/\theta$  is set to be admissible if there exists a nonnegative equilibrium point  $(x^*, z_1^*, z_2^*)$  for (2.3) such that  $x_n^* = r$ .*

This admissibility property simply defines what set-points can be achieved. It was previously considered in [7] as a necessary condition for the regulation of the output around a desired set-point. Non-admissibility of a set-point may be often due to the presence of saturations and/or basal levels which will place upper and lower limits on molecular levels. The proposition below states that all positive set-points are admissible for the system (2.1):

**Proposition 2** *Assume that  $A$  is Hurwitz stable and that  $-e_n^T A^{-1} e_1 \neq 0$ . Then, the equilibrium point  $(x^*, z_1^*, z_2^*)$  of the closed-loop system (2.3) is unique and is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}x^* &= -A^{-1} \left( e_1 k_i z_1^* - \frac{e_n r k_p \mu}{\eta z_1^*} + b_0 \right) \\ z_2^* &= \frac{\mu}{\eta z_1^*}\end{aligned}\tag{2.4}$$

and  $z_1^*$  is the unique positive root to the polynomial

$$P_1(z_1) := \eta g_1 k_i z_1^2 + (g_0 - r) \eta z_1 - g_n k_p \mu r,\tag{2.5}$$

where  $r := \mu/\theta$ ,  $g_1 := -e_n^T A^{-1} e_1$ ,  $g_n := -e_n^T A^{-1} e_n$ , and  $g_0 := -e_n^T A^{-1} b_0$ .

Alternatively, the equilibrium point for the controller species can be characterized as  $z_1^* = \mu/(\eta z_2^*)$  where  $z_2^*$  is the unique positive root of the polynomial

$$P_2(z_2) = -\eta g_n k_p r z_2^{*2} + (g_0 - r) \eta z_2^* + g_1 k_i \mu.\tag{2.6}$$

*Proof*: Solving for the equilibrium points we get

$$\begin{aligned}Ax^* + e_1 k_i z_1^* - e_n x_n^* k_p z_2^* + b_0 &= 0, \\ \mu - \eta z_1^* z_2^* &= 0, \\ \theta x_n^* - \eta z_1^* z_2^* &= 0.\end{aligned}\tag{2.7}$$

This implies that  $x_n^* = r$  and that

$$\begin{aligned}Ax^* + e_1 k_i z_1^* - e_n r k_p z_2^* + b_0 &= 0, \\ \mu - \eta z_1^* z_2^* &= 0,\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

and, hence,

$$x^* = -A^{-1} (e_1 k_i z_1^* - e_n k_p r z_2^* + b_0).\tag{2.9}$$

So, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
r &= e_n^T x^* \\
&= -e_n^T A^{-1} (e_1 k_i z_1^* - e_n r k_p z_2^* + b_0) \\
&= g_1 k_i z_1^* - g_n r k_p z_2^* + g_0.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Substituting  $z_2^* = \mu/(\eta z_1^*)$  and multiplying the resulting expression by  $\eta z_1^*$  yields

$$\eta g_1 k_i z_1^{*2} + (g_0 - r)\eta z_1^* - g_n k_p \mu r = 0 \text{ and } z_2^* = \mu/(\eta z_1^*). \tag{2.11}$$

Using the fact that  $g_1, g_n > 0$ , then one can see that there is exactly one change of sign in the coefficients of the polynomial. From Descartes' rule of sign, this implies that there exists one positive root to this polynomial. The alternative statement is proven analogously.  $\diamond$

The closed-loop system exhibits an interesting switching behavior in the case large  $\eta$  limit as stated in the following result:

**Proposition 3** *We have the following switching behavior in the large  $\eta$  limit:*

1. *If  $r > g_0$ , then we have that  $(z_1^*, z_2^*) \rightarrow (u_*/k_i, 0)$  where  $u_* = (r - g_0)/g_1$  when  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ .*
2. *If  $r < g_0$ , then we have that  $(z_1^*, z_2^*) \rightarrow (0, u_*/k_p)$  where  $u_* = (g_0 - r)/(g_n r)$  when  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$ .*
3. *If  $r = g_0$ , then*

$$z_1^* = \sqrt{\frac{g_n k_p \mu r}{\eta g_1 k_i}} \text{ and } z_2^* = \sqrt{\frac{\theta g_1 k_i}{\eta g_n k_p}} \tag{2.12}$$

*and they both tend to 0 when  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$  while keeping the product  $\eta z_1^* z_2^*$  constant and equal to  $\mu$ .*

*Proof:* Assuming that  $r > g_0$  and letting  $\eta \rightarrow \infty$  in (2.5) make its positive root go to  $z_1^* = c_1/k_i$ . The other statements are proven analogously.  $\diamond$

This result can be interpreted as follows: when the set-point  $r$  is set beyond the basal level  $g_0$  and  $\eta$  is large, the AIRC works like a n-type AIC whereas when the set-point is set below the basal level  $g_0$ , it mostly functions like an p-type AIC. When the set-point is exactly equal to the basal level – a rather pathological case – a fragile balancing coexists between these two extreme behaviors. Since the analysis of n-type AICs controlling linear and nonlinear positive systems has been already addressed in [3, 4, 7], it will not be considered any further here. Instead, we will focus on the other case which still remains largely unexplored and, to simplify the analysis, we will consider a reduced version of the AIRC in which we only keep the p-type AIC part.

## 2.2 A reduced controller - The p-type AIC

Following Proposition 3 and the discussions in the previous section, we consider here the following variation of the system (2.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) - e_n x_n(t) k_p z_2(t) + b_0 \\
\dot{z}_1(t) &= \mu - k_p \eta z_1(t) z_2(t) \\
\dot{z}_2(t) &= \theta x_n(t) - k_p \eta z_1(t) z_2(t)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

where we have removed the n-type part of the AIRC and where we have slightly changed the structure of the AIC for technical reasons which will be explained later; see also [7] for a discussion about this.

The following result states under what condition the set-point is admissible:

**Proposition 4** Assume that  $A$  is Hurwitz stable. Then, the equilibrium point  $(x^*, z_1^*, z_2^*)$  of the closed-loop system (2.13) given by

$$(x^*, z_1^*, z_2^*) = \left( -A^{-1}(-e_n r u_* + b_0), \frac{\mu}{\eta u_*}, \frac{u_*}{k_p} \right), \quad u_* = \frac{g_0 - r}{g_n r} \quad (2.14)$$

is unique and positive if and only if  $r < g_0$ .

*Proof :* At equilibrium, we have that  $x_n^* = r$ ,  $z_1^* = \mu/(k_p \eta z_2^*)$ , and hence

$$Ax^* - e_n r k_p z_2^* + b_0 = 0. \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore, we get

$$x^* = -A^{-1}(-e_n r k_p z_2^* + b_0) \quad (2.16)$$

which implies that  $r = -g_n r k_p z_2^* + g_0$  and

$$z_2^* = \frac{g_0 - r}{r k_p g_n} = \frac{u_*}{k_p}. \quad (2.17)$$

Substituting this into the expression  $z_1^* = \mu/(k_p \eta z_2^*)$  and (2.16) yields  $z_1^* = \mu/(\eta u_*)$  and the final expression for the unique equilibrium point. The positivity of the equilibrium point simply follows from the fact that of  $u_*$ . The proof is completed.  $\diamond$

The linearized dynamics of the system about that equilibrium point is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_1(t) \\ \dot{\tilde{z}}_2(t) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & 0 & -e_n k_p r \\ 0 & -\eta u_* & -\mu k_p / u_* \\ e_n^T & -\eta u_* & -\mu k_p / u_* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{x}(t) \\ \tilde{z}_1(t) \\ \tilde{z}_2(t) \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.18)$$

where  $\bar{A} := A - e_n e_n^T u_*$ . One can observe that due to the coupling term  $z_2 x_n$ , the controller has both an integral and a proportional action, the latter being the term  $-e_n e_n^T u_*$  acting on the  $A$  matrix of the system.

### 3 Preliminary definitions and results

This section is devoted to introducing the main definitions and results that will prove instrumental in proving the main results of the paper.

#### 3.1 Positive real definitions and results

We consider the following definitions which can be found in [12]:

**Definition 5** Let us consider a SISO transfer function  $H(s)$ . It is said to be

(1) *Positive Real (PR)* if

- (a) all the poles of  $H(s)$  are in the closed left half-plane,
- (b)  $\Re[H(j\omega)] \geq 0$  for all  $\omega \in [0, \infty)$ , and
- (c) any pure imaginary pole  $j\omega$  is simple and  $\lim_{s \rightarrow j\omega} (s - j\omega)H(s) \geq 0$ .

(2) *Weakly Strictly Positive Real (WSPR)* if

- (a) all the poles of  $H(s)$  are in the open left half-plane, and
- (b)  $\Re[H(j\omega)] > 0$  for all  $\omega \in [0, \infty)$ .

(3) *Strictly Positive Real (SPR) if*

- (a) it is weakly strictly positive real, and
- (b)  $H(\infty) > 0$  or  $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \omega^2 \Re[H(j\omega)] > 0$ .

(4) *Strong Strictly Positive Real (Strong SPR) if*

- (a) it is weakly strictly positive real, and
- (b) there exists a  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\Re[H(j\omega)] \geq \delta$  for all  $\omega \in [0, \infty]$ .

We also have the following result about the stability of interconnections of certain types of positive-real transfer functions:

**Theorem 6 ([12, Lemma 3.37])** *The negative feedback interconnection of a SISO strictly/weakly positive real transfer function  $H_1$  and a positive real transfer function  $H_2$  is internally stable.*

This result states conditions under which a transfer function is WSPR:

**Proposition 7** *Let us consider a system  $(A, B, C)$  and let  $H(s)$  be the associated transfer function. Assume that*

- (1)  $H(s)$  has no zero on the imaginary axis, and
- (2) there exist a matrix  $P \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^n$  and an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $PB - C^T = 0$  and  $A^T P + PA + 2\varepsilon C^T C \prec 0$ .

Then,

- (a) the matrix  $A$  is Hurwitz stable, and
- (b)  $\Re[H(j\omega)] > 0$  for all  $\omega \in [0, \infty)$  or, equivalently,  $H(s)$  is weakly strictly positive real.

*Proof :* Note that  $A^T P + PA + 2\varepsilon C^T C \prec 0$  for some  $P \succ 0$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  implies that  $A$  is Hurwitz stable, which proves statement (a). To prove the second one, first note that under the conditions of the result, the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} A^T P + PA + 2\varepsilon C^T C & PB - C^T \\ B^T P - C & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A^T P + PA & PB \\ B^T P & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} 2\varepsilon I & -I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

is negative semidefinite. From the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov Lemma [19,20], this is equivalent to saying that

$$\begin{bmatrix} H(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix}^* \begin{bmatrix} 2\varepsilon C^T C & -I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H(j\omega) \\ I \end{bmatrix} = 2\varepsilon |H(j\omega)|^2 - 2\Re[H(j\omega)] \leq 0, \text{ for all } \omega \in [0, \infty). \quad (3.2)$$

This implies that  $\Re[H(j\omega)] \geq \varepsilon |H(j\omega)|^2$  for  $\omega \in [0, \infty)$  and since  $H(s) \neq 0$  on the imaginary axis, then statement (b) holds.  $\diamond$

### 3.2 Other instrumental results

**Lemma 8** *Let us consider the following linear system*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= Mx + e_n w \\ z &= e_n^T x \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  Hurwitz stable. Then, the  $n-1$  zeros of the transfer function  $H(s) = e_n^T (sI_n - M)e_n$  coincide with the roots of the polynomial  $\det(sI_{n-1} - S^T M S)$  where  $S = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & \dots & e_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$ .

If, additionally,  $M$  is a Metzler matrix, then the zeros are all located in the open left half-plane.

*Proof :* The transmission zeros of the system (3.3) are given by the values  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} M - sI_n & e_n \\ e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Defining

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} \\ M_{21} & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S^T \\ e_n^T \end{bmatrix} M \begin{bmatrix} S & e_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (3.5)$$

then the expression (3.4) becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix} M - sI_n & e_n \\ e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} - sI_n & M_{12} & 0 \\ M_{21} & M_{22} - s & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.6)$$

Using now the properties of the determinant on the last row, we get that

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} - sI_n & M_{12} & 0 \\ M_{21} & M_{22} - s & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = -\det \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} - sI_n & 0 \\ M_{21} & 1 \end{bmatrix} = -\det(M_{11} - sI_n) = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

which proves the first statement of the result.

Assuming now that the matrix  $M$  is Metzler, then it is immediate to see that

$$M_d := \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{22} \end{bmatrix} \leq M \quad (3.8)$$

where the inequality is entry-wise. From Perron-Frobenius theory, we have that  $M_d \leq M$  implies that  $\lambda_{\text{PF}}(M_d) \leq \lambda_{\text{PF}}(M)$  where  $\lambda_{\text{PF}}(\cdot)$  denotes the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue<sup>1</sup>. Since  $M$  is Hurwitz stable, then  $\lambda_{\text{PF}}(M) < 0$ , which implies that  $M_d$ ,  $M_{11}$  and  $M_{22}$  are all Hurwitz stable matrices. This proves the statement on the stability of the zeros of  $H(s)$  in the Metzler case. This complete the proof.  $\diamond$

**Lemma 9** *Let us consider a SISO transfer function  $H(s) = KN(s)/D(s)$  where  $K \in \mathbb{R}$ , where  $N(s), D(s)$  are monic polynomials such that  $\deg(D) = n$  and  $\deg(N) = n-1$ . Then, we have that*

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \omega^2 K \Re[H(j\omega)] = K \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} z_i - \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \right) \quad (3.9)$$

where the  $p_i$ 's are the poles and the  $z_i$ 's are the zeros of the transfer function  $H$ .

<sup>1</sup>The Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue is the rightmost eigenvalue, which is always real in the case of Metzler matrices; see [21].



*Proof:* We have that  $\Re[N(j\omega)/D(j\omega)] = \Re[N(j\omega)D(j\omega)^*]/|D(j\omega)|^2 = \Re[N(j\omega)D(-j\omega)]/|D(j\omega)|^2$ . Since the degree of  $N(s)D(s)$  is  $2n - 1$ , we need to find the coefficients in  $\omega^{2n-2}$ . So, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Re[N(j\omega)D(-j\omega)] &= \Re\left[\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} N_i(j\omega)^i\right)\left(\sum_{i=0}^n D_i(-j\omega)^i\right)\right] \\ &= N_{n-1}(j\omega)^{n-1}D_{n-1}(-j\omega)^{n-1} + N_{n-2}(j\omega)^{n-2}D_n(-j\omega)^n + R(\omega) \\ &= (N_{n-1}D_{n-1} - N_{n-2}D_n)\omega^{2n-2} + R(\omega),\end{aligned}\tag{3.10}$$

where  $R(\omega)$  is the reminder containing even powers of  $\omega$  less than  $2n - 2$ . Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \omega^2 K \Re[H(j\omega)] &= \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \omega^2 K \frac{(N_{n-1}D_{n-1} - N_{n-2}D_n)\omega^{2n-2} + R(\omega)}{\omega^{2n}} \\ &= K(N_{n-1}D_{n-1} - N_{n-2}D_n)\end{aligned}\tag{3.11}$$

where we have used the fact that  $R(\omega)/\omega^{2n} \rightarrow 0$  as  $\omega \rightarrow \infty$ . As  $N(s)$  and  $D(s)$  are both monic polynomials, we have that  $D_n = N_{n-1} = 1$ , and this, together with the fact that  $-D_{n-1}$  coincides with the sum of the poles whereas  $-N_{n-2}$  coincides with the sum of the zeros, the result follows.  $\diamond$

## 4 Structural stability of the p-type AIC - Unimolecular case

This section is devoted to the local structural stability analysis of the equilibrium point of the system (2.13). Some existence results are first derived and a full solution is then provided.

### 4.1 Existence results

The following result states that the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently small  $k_p > 0$ .

**Proposition 10** *Assume that  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, and let  $\eta, \mu, \theta > 0$  be given and such that  $r < g_0$ . Then, the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently small  $k_p > 0$ .*

*Proof:* We can rewrite the matrix of the linearized dynamics (2.18) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\eta u_* & 0 \\ e_n^T & -\eta u_* & 0 \end{bmatrix} + k_p \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -e_n r \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu/u_* \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu/u_* \end{bmatrix}.\tag{4.1}$$

The matrix to the left is marginally stable with one eigenvalue at 0. To show the existence of a  $k_p$  that makes the matrix in (2.18) Hurwitz stable, we use a perturbation argument [22] and check at what happens when we slightly increases  $k_p$  from 0 to (small) positive values. The normalized left- and right-eigenvectors associated with the zero eigenvalue are given by

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} -e_n^T \bar{A}^{-1} & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \text{ and } v = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T.\tag{4.2}$$

Therefore, the zero eigenvalue bifurcates according to the expression [22]

$$\lambda_0(k_p) = 0 + k_p u^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -e_n r \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu/u_* \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu/u_* \end{bmatrix} v + o(k_p) = k_p r e_n^T \bar{A}^{-1} e_n + o(k_p).\tag{4.3}$$

Since  $\bar{A}$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, then  $\bar{A}^{-1} \leq 0$  with negative diagonal entries, and we have that  $e_n^T \bar{A}^{-1} e_n < 0$ . Therefore, the zero eigenvalue moves inside the open left half-plane when positively perturbing  $k_p$  from the 0 value, which implies that for any sufficiently small  $k_p > 0$  the matrix in (2.18) is Hurwitz stable.  $\diamond$

Similarly, the following result states that the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ .

**Proposition 11** *Assume that  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, and let  $\eta, \mu, \theta > 0$  be given and such that  $r < g_0$ . Then, the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ .*

*Proof*: Similarly, one can rewrite the matrix in (2.18) as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & 0 & -e_n k_p r \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \\ e_n^T & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \end{bmatrix} + \eta \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.4)$$

Again the matrix on the left is marginally stable with one eigenvalue at zero. The normalized left- and right-eigenvectors associated with the zero eigenvalue are given by

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} * & 1 & * \end{bmatrix}^T \quad \text{and} \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}^T \quad (4.5)$$

where  $*$  means that the entries are unimportant here. The zero eigenvalue bifurcates according to the expression [22]

$$\lambda_0(\eta) = 0 + \eta u^T \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \end{bmatrix} v + o(k_p) = -u_* \eta + o(\eta). \quad (4.6)$$

Since  $r < g_0$ , then we have that  $u^* > 0$  and, as a result, the matrix in (2.18) is Hurwitz stable for any sufficiently small  $\eta > 0$ .  $\diamond$

Conversely, the following result states that the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently large  $\eta > 0$  provided that an extra conditions are met.

**Proposition 12** *Assume that  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, and let  $\eta, \mu, \theta > 0$  be given and such that  $r < g_0$ . Assume further that the matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & -e_n k_p r \\ e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.7)$$

*is Hurwitz stable. Then, the equilibrium point of the closed-loop network (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for any sufficiently large  $\eta > 0$ .*

*Proof*: The matrix in (2.18) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \\ 0 & -u_* & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \varepsilon \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & 0 & -e_n k_p r \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \\ e_n^T & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \end{bmatrix} \right) \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\varepsilon := 1/\eta$ . Therefore, one can study the stability of the above matrix in brackets for small positive values which are close to  $\varepsilon = 0$ . The matrix on the left is marginally stable with a semisimple eigenvalue at 0 of multiplicity  $n + 1$ . The normalized left- and right-eigenvectors associated with the zero eigenvalue are given by

$$u = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T \quad \text{and} \quad v = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T. \quad (4.9)$$

Therefore, the zero eigenvalues bifurcate according to the expression [22]

$$\lambda_0(\eta) = 0 + \varepsilon \lambda_i \left( u^T \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & 0 & -e_n k_p r \\ 0 & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \\ e_n^T & 0 & -\mu k_p / u_* \end{bmatrix} v \right) + o(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon \lambda_i \left( \begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & -e_n k_p r \\ e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) + o(\varepsilon) \quad (4.10)$$

where  $\lambda_i(\cdot)$  denotes the  $i$ -th eigenvalue of the matrix. Therefore, under the condition of the result, the real part of the eigenvalues of the matrix are negative and all the zero eigenvalues bifurcate inside the open left half-plane when increasing  $\varepsilon$  from 0 to small positive values. As this corresponds to moving  $\eta$  from infinity to large positive values, the result is proven.  $\diamond$

## 4.2 Structural stability analysis

This section is divided in two parts. The first one addresses the case where the matrix  $A$  in (2.13) is Metzler and Hurwitz stable whereas the second part considers the case where the matrix  $A$  is output weakly unstable.

### 4.2.1 The stable open-loop system case

This result is instrumental in proving the main result of the section:

**Theorem 13** *Assume that  $M$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable. Then, the transfer function  $H(s) := e_n^T (sI - M)^{-1} e_n$  is strictly positive real.*

*Proof:* Since  $M$  is Hurwitz stable, then the poles of  $H(s)$  have all negative real part, and the condition (2a) of Definition 5 is met.

Using now Lemma 8, the zeros are given by the eigenvalues of  $S^T M S$  which have all negative real part, and we have  $H(s) = N(s)/D(s)$  with  $D(s) = \det(sI - M)$  and  $N(s) = \det(sI - S^T M S)$  together with  $\deg(D) = n$  and  $\deg(N) = s$ . As a result, we have that  $H(0) > 0$  and  $H(\infty) = 0$ . So, we need to check the second property of the statement (3b) of Definition 5. To this aim, we use Lemma 9 and note that all the assumptions of this result are verified with  $K = 1$ . Therefore, we get that

$$\text{I am fine } \lim_{\omega \rightarrow \infty} \omega^2 \Re[H(j\omega)] = \text{trace}(S^T M S) - \text{trace}(M) = -e_n^T M e_n. \quad (4.11)$$

Since  $M$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, then  $-e_n^T M e_n > 0$  and the conclusion follows; i.e. the condition (3b) of Definition 5 is verified.

We now check the condition (2b) of Definition 5. To this aim, we consider Proposition 7. Adapted to our problem, we need to find a matrix  $P \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^d$  such that  $M^T P + P M + 2\varepsilon e_n e_n^T \prec 0$  and  $P e_n - e_n = 0$ . The equality constraint imposes that  $P = \text{diag}(P_1, 1)$  where  $P_1 \in \mathbb{S}_{>0}^{n-1}$ . Clearly, we have that if  $M^T P + P M \prec 0$  holds, then  $M^T P + P M + 2\varepsilon e_n e_n^T \prec 0$  holds for any sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Using now the fact that  $M$  is Hurwitz stable and Metzler, then this is




Figure 1: Equivalent negative interconnection

equivalent [15] to say that there exists a diagonal matrix  $D$  with positive diagonal entries such that  $M^T D + DM \prec 0$ . Dividing this inequality by  $e_n^T D e_n > 0$  and letting  $P_s := D/e_n^T D e_n$ , we get that  $M^T P_s + P_s M \prec 0$ . Observing that this  $P_s$  satisfies the conditions of the result shows that the condition (2b) of Definition 5 is met. Therefore, the transfer function  $H(s)$  is SPR.  $\diamond$

We are now in position to prove the main result of the section:

**Theorem 14** *Let  $\mu, \theta > 0$  be given and such that  $r < g_0$  and assume that  $A$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable. Then, the unique equilibrium point of the system (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\eta, k_p > 0$ .*

*Proof :* To analyze the stability of the matrix in (2.18) for all  $k_p > 0$ , we can reformulate the problem as the stability analysis of the negative feedback interconnection (see Figure 1) of the integrator  $k_p/s$  with the transfer function

$$\begin{aligned} G_\eta(s) &:= \begin{bmatrix} e_n^T & -\eta u_* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} sI - \bar{A} & 0 \\ 0 & s + \eta u_* \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} e_n r \\ \mu/u_* \end{bmatrix} + \mu/u_* \\ &= H_n(s)r + \frac{-\eta\mu}{s + \eta u_*} + \frac{\mu}{u_*} \\ &= H_n(s)r + G(s) \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} G(s) &:= \frac{\mu s}{u_*(s + \eta u_*)} \\ H_n(s) &:= e_n^T (sI - \bar{A})^{-1} e_n. \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Since,  $k_p/s$  is positive real for all  $k_p > 0$ , if we can prove that  $G_{k_p}(s)$  is (weakly) strictly positive real, then from Theorem 6, the feedback interconnection will be stable for all  $k_p > 0$ . From Theorem 13, the transfer function  $H_n(s)$  is SPR. One can also observe that  $G(s)$  is stable for all  $\eta > 0$ , positive real since  $\Re[G(j\omega)] = \omega^2/(\omega^2 + \eta^2 u_*^2) \geq 0$  for all  $\omega \geq 0$ , and such that  $G(\infty) = \mu/u_* > 0$ . As a result, the sum of those transfer functions is SPR for all  $\eta > 0$  and, therefore, the feedback interconnection is stable for all  $k_p, \eta > 0$ . This proves the result.  $\diamond$

For illustration, we consider the following example:

**Example 15** *Let us consider the following gene expression network with maturation and positive feedback:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \dot{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma_1 & 0 & \alpha \\ k_2 & -\gamma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & k_3 & -\gamma_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.14)$$

where  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  are the mRNA, protein, and matured protein concentrations, respectively, and where the parameters are all positive. This matrix is Metzler by construction and is Hurwitz stable provided that  $\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 - k_2k_3\alpha > 0$  (Routh-Hurwitz criterion). Therefore, we can apply Theorem 14 to state that the equilibrium point of the closed-loop system is locally exponentially stable for all  $0 < r < g_0$  where

$$g_0 = \frac{bk_2k_3}{\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3 - k_2k_3\alpha} > 0. \quad (4.15)$$

This result is quite powerful in the sense that with very limited assumptions on the system, we can state a very general structural stability result. It is also interesting to discuss about how close the conditions of this result are to necessity. It is clear that if  $G_\eta(s)$  fails to be weakly strictly passive, then there will exist a  $k_p > 0$  such that the equilibrium point is unstable. This follows from a simple Nyquist criterion argument. However, the condition on the Hurwitz stability of  $A$  could be relaxed by exploiting the fact that only the Hurwitz stability of  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is necessary. This assumption is relaxed in the next section.

#### 4.2.2 The unstable open-loop system case

In order to relax the stability assumption on the  $A$  matrix considered in the previous section, we introduce the following class of matrices:

**Definition 16** We say that a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  is output unstable if

- (a)  $S^T M S$  is Hurwitz stable, and
- (b)  $e_n^T M e_n > 0$ .

The following result characterizes the sign pattern of the inverse matrix  $M^{-1}$  as well as the sign of the gains  $g_n$  and  $g_0$  defined in Proposition 4:

**Lemma 17** Assume that the matrix  $M$  is Metzler, output unstable, and nonsingular. Then, the following statements hold:

- (a) The inverse matrix exhibits the sign-pattern  $S^T M^{-1} e_n \geq 0$ ,  $e_n^T M^{-1} S \geq 0$ , and  $e_n^T M^{-1} e_n > 0$ ; and
- (b) The gains  $g_0$  and  $g_n$  are such that  $g_0 = -e_n^T M^{-1} b_0 \leq 0$  and  $g_n = -e_n^T M^{-1} e_n < 0$ .

*Proof*: From the block matrix inversion formula, we have that

$$M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \star & -M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} (M_{22} - M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12})^{-1} \\ -(M_{22} - M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12})^{-1} M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} & (M_{22} - M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12})^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.16)$$

Since  $M_{22} > 0$  and  $M_{11}$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable, then we have both  $M_{11}^{-1} \leq 0$  and  $M_{22} - M_{21} M_{11}^{-1} M_{12} > 0$ . This implies that  $S^T M^{-1} e_n \geq 0$ ,  $e_n^T M^{-1} S \geq 0$ , and  $e_n^T M^{-1} e_n > 0$ . Since  $e_n^T M^{-1} \geq 0$ , then we have that  $e_n^T M^{-1} b_0 \geq 0$ , and the result follows.  $\diamond$

It is important to mention here that unlike in the stable case, the gains  $g_0$  and  $g_n$  are not positive anymore. This will have an immediate implication on the admissibility of the set-points as stated below:

**Lemma 18** *Assume that the matrix  $A$  is Metzler, output unstable, and nonsingular, then any set-point  $r > 0$  is admissible for the system (2.13).*

*Proof :* The equilibrium point satisfies the same expression as in Proposition 4 and for it to be positive, we need  $u^*$  to be positive. This is equivalent to saying that  $(g_0 - r)/(g_n r) > 0$ . Since  $g_0 \leq 0$  and  $g_n < 0$  (from Lemma 17), then the positivity of the equilibrium holds for all  $r > 0$ .  $\diamond$

We have now characterized under what conditions on the set-point the equilibrium is positive. However, this is not enough since we also need the matrix  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  to be Hurwitz stable. The conditions under which this is the case are given below:

**Lemma 19** *Assume that the matrix  $A$  is Metzler and output unstable and that  $r > 0$ . Then, the control input is stabilizing (i.e.  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is Hurwitz stable) if and only if  $g_0 < 0$ .*

*Proof :* The control law is stabilizing if and only if there exist a vector  $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-1}$  and scalar  $w_2 > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} - u_* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 \\ v_2 \end{bmatrix} = - \begin{bmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.17)$$

for some  $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-1}$  and  $w_2 > 0$ . Solving for the first row yields

$$v_1 = -A_{11}^{-1}(w_1 + A_{12}v_2) \quad (4.18)$$

where  $v_1 > 0$  since  $A_{11}$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable (so its inverse is a nonpositive matrix). Substituting the value for  $v_1$  in the second row yields

$$(A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12} - u_*)v_2 = A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}w_1 - w_2 \leq -w_2 < 0 \quad (4.19)$$

The above inequality can only hold if  $A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12} - u_* < 0$ . Noting that  $A_{22} - A_{21}A_{11}^{-1}A_{12} = -1/g_n$  the stability condition can be rewritten as  $-1/g_n - u_* < 0$  or, equivalently,

$$\frac{-1}{g_n} - \frac{g_0 - r}{g_n r} = \frac{-g_0}{g_n r} < 0 \quad (4.20)$$

where the inequality holds provided that  $g_0 < 0$  since  $g_n < 0$ . This proves the result.  $\diamond$

We are now in position to state the main result of this section:

**Theorem 20** *Let  $\mu, \theta > 0$  be given and assume that  $g_0 < 0$ . Assume further that  $A$  is Metzler, and nonsingular. Then, the unique equilibrium point of the system (2.13) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\eta, k_p > 0$ .*

*Proof :* Under the condition that  $r > 0$  then the equilibrium point is positive by virtue of Lemma 18. Under the extra condition that  $g_0 < 0$ , then the matrix  $\bar{A} = A - e_n e_n^T u_*$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable from Lemma 19. The rest of the proof is then identical to that of Theorem 14 as we are now in the exactly the same setting.  $\diamond$

Interestingly, the set of admissible set-points is much bigger than in the stable case. The reason for that is simple. In the unstable case, we can always let the output diverge until it reaches the desired set-point of value and only then we stabilize the value to that desired set-point.

It is also interesting to discuss whether the result is non-conservative for local exponential stability. The assumption on the stability of the matrix has now be relaxed and it is clear that if  $G_\eta(s)$  fails to be weakly strictly passive, then there will exists a  $k_p > 0$  such that the equilibrium point is unstable. In this regard, there is strong evidence that the above result states a necessary and sufficient condition for the structural stability of the equilibrium point in the Metzler case, which is non-conservative in the linear case.

As a conclusion for the section, we consider the following example:

**Example 21** *Let us consider the following gene expression network with maturation, positive feedback and autocatalytic reaction on the matured species:*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \\ \dot{x}_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma_1 & 0 & \alpha \\ k_2 & -\gamma_2 & 0 \\ 0 & k_3 & \sigma - \gamma_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} b \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.21)$$

where  $x_1, x_2, x_3$  are the mRNA, protein, and matured protein concentrations, respectively, and where the parameters are all positive. In particular, the autocatalytic parameter is supposed to exceed the degradation rate of the matured protein; i.e.  $\sigma - \gamma_3 > 0$ . We have that  $S^T A S$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable and that  $\sigma - \gamma_3 > 0$ . Therefore, the matrix is Metzler and output unstable. Computing  $g_0$  yields

$$g_0 = -\frac{bk_2k_3}{k_2k_3\alpha + \gamma_1\gamma_2(\sigma - \gamma_3)} < 0. \quad (4.22)$$

Therefore, from Theorem 20, the equilibrium point of the closed-loop system is structurally stable provided that  $r > 0$ .

## 5 Structural stability of the p-type AIC - Nonlinear case

### 5.1 Model

Let us consider here the following nonlinear system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t)) - e_n u(t) x_n(t) + b_0, \quad x(0) = x_0 \\ y(t) &= x_n(t) \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where  $x, x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $u \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  are the state of the process, the initial condition, the control input and the measured output, respectively.

**Proposition 22** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (a) *The system (5.1) is internally positive; i.e. for any  $x_0, b_0 \geq 0$  and  $u(t) \geq 0$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ , we have that  $x(t) \geq 0$  and  $y(t) \geq 0$ , for all  $t \geq 0$ .*
- (b) *We have that  $f_i(x) \geq 0$  whenever  $x_i = 0$  and  $x_j \geq 0$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $j \neq i$  and for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .*

Define now the following sets where  $f_c(x, u) := f(x) - e_n x_n u + b_0$ :

$$\mathcal{Y} := \{e_n^T x : \exists u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \text{ s.t. } f_c(x, u) = 0\}, \quad (5.2)$$

$$\mathcal{U}(y) := \{u : \exists u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \text{ s.t. } f_c(x, u) = 0, x_n = y\}, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\mathcal{X}(y) := \{x : \exists u \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \text{ s.t. } f_c(x, u) = 0, x_n = y\}, \quad (5.4)$$

which characterize the set of equilibrium output values for any given input value, the set of all constant inputs associated with a given equilibrium output value and the set of the equilibrium state values given an equilibrium value for the output. We assume for simplicity that

**Assumption 23** *For all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the sets  $\mathcal{U}(y)$  and  $\mathcal{X}(y)$  are singletons and their only elements are denoted by  $u_*(y)$  and  $x^*(y)$ , respectively. Additionally, the map  $F(u) := \{e_n^T x : \exists x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : f_c(x, u) = 0\}$  is continuous and strictly monotonic.*

**Assumption 24** *For all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the matrix*

$$\left. \frac{\partial f_c}{\partial x} \right|_{(x,u) \in \mathcal{X}(y) \times \mathcal{U}(y)} \quad (5.5)$$

*is invertible.*

We are now in position to properly define the linearized system associated with (5.1) about an equilibrium point uniquely defined by the value of the output at steady-state:

**Proposition 25** *Let us consider the system (5.1) that is assumed to be internally positive and to satisfy Assumption 23 and Assumption 24. Then, the equilibrium point associated with the steady-state output  $y^* = r \in \mathcal{Y}$  of the nonlinear system (5.1) is given by*

$$u_*(r) = F^{-1}(r), \quad x^*(r) = g(F^{-1}(r)) \quad (5.6)$$

where  $F^{-1}$  is the inverse function of the nonlinear gain  $F$  defined as  $F(u) = e_n^T g(u)$  and  $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  is such that  $f(g(u), u) = 0$ . We denote the set of all equilibrium points by  $\mathcal{X}^*$ .

*Proof:* Assumption 23 imposes the existence of a unique steady-state for every possible steady-state output value whereas Assumption 24 implies that, by virtue of the implicit function theorem, that the function  $g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^n$  mapping steady-state input values to steady-state state values is locally well-defined. Since the function  $F$  is monotonic, it is invertible. The result then follows.  $\diamond$

Introducing now the closed-loop network

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= f(x(t)) - e_n z_2(t) x_n(t) + b_0, \quad x(0) = x_0 \\ \dot{z}_1(t) &= \mu - \eta k_p z_1(t) z_2(t), \quad z_1(0) = z_{0,1} \\ \dot{z}_2(t) &= \theta e_n^T x - \eta k_p z_1(t) z_2(t), \quad z_2(0) = z_{0,2} \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

leads us to the following result:

**Proposition 26** *Assume that Assumption 23 and Assumption 24 are satisfied for the system (5.1) and assume that this system is internally positive. Then, the equilibrium point of the closed-loop system (5.7) is given by*

$$x^*(r) = g(F^{-1}(r)), \quad z_1^*(r) = \frac{\mu}{\eta F^{-1}(r)} \quad \text{and} \quad z_2^*(r) = \frac{F^{-1}(r)}{k_p} \quad (5.8)$$



and the linearized dynamics about that equilibrium point is governed by the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} J^*(r) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T & 0 & -k_p e_n r \\ 0 & -\eta F^{-1}(r) & -\mu k_p / F^{-1}(r) \\ e_n^T & -\eta F^{-1}(r) & -\mu k_p / F^{-1}(r) \end{bmatrix} \quad (5.9)$$

where  $J^*(r)$  is the Jacobian of the function  $f$  evaluated at  $x^*(r)$  and to which we associate the following transfer function

$$H_n(s, r) = e_n^T (sI - (J^*(r) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T))^{-1} e_n. \quad (5.10)$$

*Proof*: The proof follows from the previous results and standard linearization.  $\diamond$

As in the linear case, it is important to check whenever there exists a  $k_p > 0$  such that the linearized dynamics is stable. This is stated in the result below:

**Proposition 27** *Assume that  $r$  is admissible (i.e.  $r \in \mathcal{Y}$ ) and that  $H_n(0, r) > 0$ . Then, there exists a sufficiently small  $k_p > 0$  such that the equilibrium point (5.8) is locally exponentially stable.*

*Proof*: The proof follows from the same arguments as the proof of Proposition 10. In the present case, however, the zero-eigenvalue bifurcates following  $0 + k_p e_n^T (J^*(r) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T)^{-1} e_n + o(k_p)$ . The linear term in  $k_p$  must be negative to imply stabilization. Noting then that this term is also equal to  $-H(0, r)$  yields the result.  $\diamond$

We are now ready to state the main result of this section:

**Theorem 28** *Let  $\mu, \theta > 0$ ,  $r := \mu/\theta$ , be given and assume that  $r$  is admissible (i.e.  $r \in \mathcal{Y}$ ) and that  $H_n(0, r) > 0$ . Assume further that one of the following equivalent statements hold:*

(a) *There exists a matrix  $P_1 \succ 0$  such that*

$$(J(x^*) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T)^T P + P(J(x^*) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T) \prec 0 \quad (5.11)$$

where

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5.12)$$

(b) *The system  $(J_{11}(x^*), J_{12}(x^*), -J_{21}(x^*), u_* - J_{22})$  is SPR.*

*Then, the equilibrium point (5.8) of the system (5.7) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\eta, k_p > 0$ . If it holds for all  $r \in \mathcal{Y}$ , then the closed-loop system is also structurally stable for all admissible set-point.*

*Proof*: The equivalence between the statements follows from the fact that the condition (5.11) in the first statement can be written as

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_1 J_{11}(x^*) + J_{11}(x^*)^T P_1 & P_1 J_{12}(x^*) + J_{21}(x^*)^T \\ \star & 2(J_{22} - u_*) \end{bmatrix} \prec 0 \quad (5.13)$$

which is a time-domain characterization of the SPR condition; i.e. input strict passivity or strong strict positive realness. Now, let us prove that all the conditions for SPR are met. First of all, the condition (5.11) implies that  $J(x^*) - F^{-1}(r)e_n e_n^T$  is Hurwitz stable (stable poles).

Moreover, the condition (5.13) implies that  $J_{22} - u_* < 0$  and that  $J_{11}(x^*)$  is Hurwitz stable (stable zeros). Those two properties all together implies that the condition at infinity holds. Finally, from the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov Lemma we have that  $\Re[H_n(j\omega, r)] \geq |H_n(j\omega, r)|^2$  and since the poles and zeros are stable, then we have that  $H_n(0, r) \geq |H_n(0, r)|^2 > 0$ . The conclusion then follows.  $\diamond$

**Corollary 29** *Assume that the function  $f$  is cooperative and such that  $J(x^*)$  is Hurwitz stable for all  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$ . Then, the equilibrium point (5.8) of the system (5.7) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\eta, k_p > 0$  provided that  $r \in \mathcal{Y}$ .*

*Proof* : This follows from the fact that when  $f$  is cooperative, then  $J(x^*)$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable for all  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}^*$ . Applying then Theorem 14 yields the result.  $\diamond$

**Corollary 30** *Assume that  $J_{12}(x^*) = 0$  or  $J_{21}(x^*) = 0$ , and that  $J(x^*)$  is Hurwitz stable. Then, the equilibrium point (5.8) of the system (5.7) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\eta, k_p > 0$  provided that  $r \in \mathcal{Y}$ .*

*Proof* : First note that since  $J(x^*)$  is Hurwitz stable, then  $J_{22}(x^*) < 0$  and, therefore,  $J_{22}(x^*) - u_* < 0$ . Therefore, the LMI (5.13) holds if and only if

$$P_1 J_{11}(x^*) + J_{11}(x^*)^T P_1 + \frac{1}{2(u_* - J_{22}(u_*))} (P_1 J_{12}(x^*) + J_{21}(x^*)^T) (J_{12}(x^*)^T P_1 + J_{21}(x^*)) \prec 0. \quad (5.14)$$

Assume now that  $J_{12}(x^*) = 0$ . Therefore, the above expression reduces to

$$P_1 J_{11}(x^*) + J_{11}(x^*)^T P_1 + \frac{1}{2(u_* - J_{22}(u_*))} J_{21}(x^*)^T J_{21}(x^*) \prec 0. \quad (5.15)$$

and, as a result, it is possible to find a sufficiently large  $P_1 \succ 0$  such that the LMI (5.15) is negative definite. The result then follows.

Assume on the other hand that  $J_{21}(x^*) = 0$  and let  $Q_1$  be such that  $Q_1 J_{11}(x^*) + J_{11}(x^*) Q_1 = -R_1$  for some  $R_1 \succ 0$ . Such a  $Q_1$  exists as  $J_{11}(x^*)$  is Hurwitz stable. Let  $P_1 = \varepsilon Q_1$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then, the condition (5.14) reduces to

$$-\varepsilon R_1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2(u_* - J_{22}(u_*))} Q_1 J_{12}(x^*) J_{12}(x^*)^T Q_1 \prec 0. \quad (5.16)$$

Dividing by  $\varepsilon > 0$ , this equivalent to say that

$$-R_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2(u_* - J_{22}(u_*))} Q_1 J_{12}(x^*) J_{12}(x^*)^T Q_1 \prec 0. \quad (5.17)$$

This inequality is readily shown to be negative definite provided that  $\varepsilon > 0$  is small enough. This proves the desired result.  $\diamond$

We now illustrate the main result through an example:

**Example 31** *Let us consider a gene expression network where the protein represses its own production*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= -\gamma x_1 + \frac{\alpha}{1 + x_2} + b_0, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= k x_1 - \gamma x_2 - u x_2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.18)$$

whose equilibrium point is given by

$$x_1^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \frac{\alpha}{1+r} + b_0 \right), \quad x_2^* = r, \quad \text{and} \quad u^* = \frac{\gamma r - kx_1^*}{r} > 0. \quad (5.19)$$

The control input is positive if and only if

$$r > r_{\min} \quad (5.20)$$

where  $r_{\min}$  is the unique positive root of the polynomial

$$Q(r) := \gamma^2 r^2 + r(\gamma^2 - kb_0) - k(\alpha + b_0). \quad (5.21)$$

The Jacobian evaluated at that equilibrium point is given by

$$J(x^*) = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma & -\frac{\alpha}{(1+r)^2} \\ k & -\gamma \end{bmatrix}$$

and the associated transfer function is

$$H_n(s, r) = \frac{s + \gamma}{s^2 + (2\gamma + u^*)s + \gamma(\gamma + u^*) + k\alpha/(1+r)^2}.$$

Clearly, we have that  $H_n(s, r)$  is stable and has stable zeros,  $H(0, r) > 0$ ,  $-\gamma - u^* < 0$  for all  $r > r_{\min}$ . Therefore, we just need to show the existence of a  $P > 0$  such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} -2\gamma P & -\frac{\alpha}{(1+r)^2} P + k \\ -\frac{\alpha}{(1+r)^2} P + k & -2(\gamma + u^*) \end{bmatrix} \prec 0.$$

Alternatively, we may check whether the system  $\left(-\gamma, -\frac{\alpha}{(1+r)^2}, -k, \gamma + u^*\right)$  is SPR. It can be seen that this is the case since it is a first order stable transfer function of relative degree 0 with stable zeros, and with positive gain and positive feedthrough. Therefore, the closed-loop system consisting of (5.18) and the p-type AIC is structurally stable with respect to  $k_p, \eta > 0$  and  $r > r_{\min}$ .

## 6 Structural stability of p-type exponential integral controllers

We now consider the following class of exponential integral controller [7, 18, 23]

$$\dot{z}(t) = -\alpha z(t)(\mu - e_n^T x(t)) \quad (6.1)$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  is a positive parameter of the controller. The closed-loop system is given in this case by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) - e_n x_n(t) k_p z(t) + b_0 \\ \dot{z}(t) &= -\alpha z(t)(\mu - e_n^T x(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

Similar calculations as in the antithetic case yield the following result:

**Proposition 32** *The closed-loop network (6.2) has the following equilibrium points:*

(a) A positive equilibrium point defined as

$$x^* = -\bar{A}^{-1}(-e_n k_p \mu z^* + b_0) \text{ and } z^* = \frac{g_0 - \mu}{g_n \mu k_p}, \quad (6.3)$$

where  $\mu < g_0$ .

(b) A zero-equilibrium point given by

$$x^* = -A^{-1}b_0 \text{ and } z^* = 0. \quad (6.4)$$

It is known from [7] that the zero-equilibrium point is structurally unstable. So, we just need to focus on proving the structural stability of the positive equilibrium point. This is stated in the following result:

**Theorem 33** *Assume that  $A$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable. Then the unique positive equilibrium point of the system (6.2) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\alpha, k > 0$  and  $\mu < g_0$ .*

*Proof*: The linearized dynamics are governed by the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & -e_n k_p \mu \\ \frac{\alpha(g_0 - \mu)}{g_n \mu k_p} e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.5)$$

This can be interpreted as the negative interconnection of the transfer function  $H_n(s)$  and the integrator  $\alpha(g_0 - \mu)/(g_n s)$ . By virtue of the previously obtained result, we know that this interconnection is asymptotically stable. This proves the result.  $\diamond$

We have the following immediate extension to the case where the matrix  $A$  is Metzler and output unstable:

**Theorem 34** *Assume that  $A$  is Metzler, output unstable, and non-singular. Then, the unique positive equilibrium point of the system (6.2) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\mu, \alpha, k > 0$ .*

## 7 Structural stability of p-type logistic integral controllers

We now consider the following class of logistic integral controller [7]

$$\dot{z}(t) = -\frac{k}{\beta} z(t)(\beta - z(t))(r - e_n^T x(t)) \quad (7.1)$$

where  $k > 0$  is the gain of the controller and  $\beta > 0$  is the saturation level. The closed-loop system is given in this case by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) - e_n x_n(t) z(t) + b_0 \\ \dot{z}(t) &= -\frac{k}{\beta} z(t)(\beta - z(t))(r - e_n^T x(t)). \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

We have the following result:

**Proposition 35** *The closed-loop network (7.2) has the following equilibrium points:*

- A positive equilibrium point given by

$$(x^*, z^*) = \left( -\bar{A}^{-1}(-e_n r z^* + b_0), \frac{g_0 - r}{g_n r} \right), \quad (7.3)$$

where  $r \in (g_0/(1 + \beta g_n), g_0)$ .

- A zero-equilibrium point given by

$$(x^*, z^*) = (-A^{-1}b_0, 0). \quad (7.4)$$

- A saturating equilibrium point given by

$$(x^*, z^*) = -((A - e_n e_n^T \beta)^{-1} b_0, \beta). \quad (7.5)$$

It is known from [7] that the zero and saturating equilibrium points are structurally unstable. Therefore, we just need to focus on proving the structural stability of the positive equilibrium. This is stated in the following result:

**Theorem 36** *Assume that  $A$  is Metzler and Hurwitz stable and that  $\beta > 0$ . Then the unique positive equilibrium point of the system (7.2) is locally exponentially stable for all  $\alpha > 0$  and all*

$$r \in \left( \frac{g_0}{1 + \beta g_n}, g_0 \right).$$

*Proof:* The linearized dynamics are governed by the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{A} & -e_n k_p r \\ \frac{k}{\beta} z^* (\beta - z^*) e_n^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7.6)$$

This can be interpreted as the negative interconnection of the transfer function  $H_n(s)$  and the integrator  $k\beta z^*(\beta - z^*)/(\beta s)$ . Since the gain of the integrator is always positive, then the transfer function is positive real and the results obtained in the previous section apply. This proves the result.  $\diamond$

We have the following immediate extension to the case where the matrix  $A$  is Metzler and output unstable:

**Theorem 37** *Assume that  $A$  is Metzler, output unstable, and non-singular. Then, the unique positive equilibrium point of the system (7.2) is locally exponentially stable for all  $k > 0$  and all  $r > g_0/(1 + \beta g_n)$ .*

## 8 Concluding statements

While the results obtained in this paper state some conditions under which the closed-loop network is structurally stable, they do not say how to properly choose the parameters of the controller so that certain performance criteria, such as the settling-time, are met. The results also unfortunately do not apply directly to the AIRC as the parameter dependence of the Jacobian matrix is in this case much more complex. In this regard, novel results may need to be developed for this case. In spite of that, the results obtained here shed some new light on the properties of this controller structure.

Another limitation of the approach is that it is only local, that is, it is only valid locally, in a neighborhood of an equilibrium point. A nonlinear adaptation of the approach that would rely on the concept of passivity instead of positive realness and using the correspondence between those concept could lead to a way to deal with the current problem in a non-local way, perhaps even globally. Those problems go beyond the scope of this paper and are kept for future research.

## References

- [1] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash, “Antithetic integral feedback ensures robust perfect adaptation in noisy biomolecular networks,” *Cell Systems*, vol. 2(1), pp. 15–26, 2016.
- [2] Y. Qian and D. D. Vecchio, “A singular singular perturbation problem arising from a class of biomolecular feedback controllers,” *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, vol. 3(2), pp. 236–241, 2019.
- [3] N. Olsman, A.-A. Baetica, F. Xiao, Y. P. Leong, and R. M. Murray, “Hard limits and performance tradeoffs in a class of antithetic integral feedback networks,” *Cell Systems*, vol. 9, pp. 1–15, 2019.
- [4] N. Olsman, F. Xiao, and J. C. Doyle, “Architectural principles for characterizing the performance of antithetic integral feedback networks,” *iScience*, vol. 14, pp. 277–291, 2019.
- [5] C. Briat and M. Khammash, “Perfect adaptation and optimal equilibrium productivity in a simple microbial biofuel metabolic pathway using dynamic integral control,” *ACS Synthetic Biology*, vol. 7(2), pp. 419–431, 2018.
- [6] —, “Ergodicity, output-controllability, and antithetic integral control of uncertain stochastic reaction networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 66(5), pp. 2087–2098, 2020.
- [7] C. Briat, “A biology-inspired approach to the positive integral control of positive systems - the antithetic, exponential, and logistic integral controllers,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 19(1), pp. 619–664, 2020.
- [8] M. Filo and M. Khammash, “A class of simple biomolecular antithetic proportional-integral-derivative controllers,” *bioRxiv*, 2021.
- [9] M. Filo, S. Kumar, and M. Khammash, “A hierarchy of biomolecular proportional-integral-derivative feedback controllers for robust perfect adaptation and dynamic performance,” *bioRxiv*, 2021.
- [10] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash, “Variance reduction for antithetic integral control of stochastic reaction networks,” *Journal of the Royal Society: Interface*, vol. 15(143), p. 20180079, 2018.
- [11] S. Dasgupta and B. D. O. Anderson, “The square root of linear time varying systems with applications,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 43(12), pp. 973–986, 1996.
- [12] B. Brogliato, R. Lozano, B. Maschke, and O. Egeland, *Dissipative Systems Analysis and Control*. Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [13] A. Gupta and M. Khammash, “An antithetic integral rein controller for bio-molecular networks,” in *58th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Nice, France, 2019, pp. 2808–2813.
- [14] T. Plesa, A. Dack, and T. Oulridge, “Integral feedback in synthetic biology: Negative-equilibrium catastrophe,” *arXiv:2102.10668*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.10668>
- [15] L. Farina and S. Rinaldi, *Positive Linear Systems: Theory and Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2000.

- [16] N. Kottenstette, M. J. McCourt, M. Xia, V. Gupta, and P. J. Antsaklis, “On relationships among passivity, positive realness, and dissipativity in linear systems,” *Automatica*, vol. 50(4), pp. 1003–1016, 2014.
- [17] O. Shoval, U. Alon, and E. Sontag, “Symmetry invariance for adapting biological systems,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 10(3), pp. 857–886, 2011.
- [18] C. Briat, C. Zechner, and M. Khammash, “Design of a synthetic integral feedback circuit: dynamic analysis and DNA implementation,” *ACS Synthetic Biology*, vol. 5(10), pp. 1108–1116, 2016.
- [19] J. C. Willems, “Least squares stationary optimal control and algebraic Riccati equation,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 16(6), pp. 621–634, 1971.
- [20] A. Rantzer, “On the Kalman-Yakubovich-Popov lemma,” *Systems & Control Letters*, vol. 28(1), pp. 7–10, 1996.
- [21] A. Berman and R. J. Plemmons, *Nonnegative matrices in the mathematical sciences*. Philadelphia, USA: SIAM, 1994.
- [22] A. P. Seyranian and A. A. Mailybaev, *Multiparameter stability theory with mechanical applications*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2003.
- [23] F. Xiao and J. C. Doyle, “Robust perfect adaptation in biomolecular reaction networks,” pp. 4345–4352, 2018.