

Unstable Cores are the source of instability in chemical reaction networks

Nicola Vassena ^a, Peter F. Stadler ^{a,b,c,d,e}

March 6, 2024

Abstract

In biochemical networks, complex dynamical features such as superlinear growth and oscillations are classically considered a consequence of autocatalysis. For the large class of parameter-rich kinetic models, which includes Generalized Mass Action kinetics and Michaelis-Menten kinetics, we show that certain submatrices of the stoichiometric matrix, so-called unstable cores, are sufficient for a reaction network to admit instability and potentially give rise to such complex dynamical behavior. The determinant of the submatrix distinguishes unstable-positive feedbacks, with a single real-positive eigenvalue, and unstable-negative feedbacks without real-positive eigenvalues. Autocatalytic cores turn out to be exactly the unstable-positive feedbacks that are Metzler matrices. Thus there are sources of dynamical instability in chemical networks that are unrelated to autocatalysis. We use such intuition to design non-autocatalytic biochemical networks with superlinear growth and oscillations.

Keywords: *Autocatalysis, Stoichiometric Matrix, Parameter-rich kinetic model, Non-autocatalytic instabilities*

[a] Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics, Universität Leipzig, Germany. [b] Bioinformatics Groups, Department of Computer Science; Competence Center for Scalable Data Services and Solutions Dresden/Leipzig (scaDS.AI); German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv); Leipzig Research Center for Civilization Diseases; School of Embedded and Compositive Artificial Intelligence, Universität Leipzig, Germany. [c] Department of Theoretical Chemistry, University of Vienna, Austria. [d] Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Bogotá, Colombia. [e] Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, New Mexico

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Chemical reaction networks, dynamics, and stability	4
3	Parameter-rich kinetic models	6
4	Child-Selections, CB-summands, elementary CB-components	8
5	Unstable cores and D-unstable cores	10
6	Unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks	11
7	Autocatalytic cores as unstable cores and Metzler matrices	12
8	Examples	14
9	NC-networks and what is special about autocatalysis	16
10	Conclusion	17
11	Proof of Theorem 23	18
	SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL	23

1 Introduction

Chemical Reaction Network theory has striven to elucidate the connection between the structure of a (bio)chemical reaction network and its dynamical behavior since Rutherford Aris’ seminal work [1]. A question of particular interest for applications in biological systems is whether, for a given reaction network, there is a choice of kinetic parameters that renders an equilibrium dynamically unstable and thus may give rise to complex dynamical behavior.

Well-known examples of such instabilities, such as the famous Belusov–Zhabotinsky reactions [2, 3], typically involve autocatalysis, i.e., the presence of a species that catalyzes its own production. The concept of autocatalysis introduced by Wilhelm Ostwald [4] in the context of chemical kinetics refers to a temporary speed-up of the reaction before it settles down to reach equilibrium, see e.g. [5, 6]. Autocatalysis plays a key role both in extant metabolic networks and in models of the origin of life. Autocatalytic pathways, such as glycolysis, contain reactions that consume some of the pathway’s products and exhibit positive feedback [7, 8]. In order to explain the emergence of self-replicating organisms, “collectively autocatalytic” networks of interacting molecules have been proposed [9]. In the setting of metabolic reaction networks, the importance of “network autocatalysis” has been emphasized [10, 11]. In a more general setting, such structures have been studied as self-maintaining chemical organizations [12, 13]. Despite the central role of autocatalysis, however, its formal, mathematical understanding is limited. Different concepts of autocatalysis have been proposed [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]; for a comparison see [19].

Even though autocatalysis has played a central role in investigations of complex dynamics, including deterministic chaos [20], dynamical systems theory does not seem to imply that autocatalysis has to be necessarily invoked to explain the existence of dynamic instabilities. In fact, the unstable manifold theorem [21] suggests superlinear divergence from an unstable equilibrium, while in a supercritical Hopf bifurcation [22, 21] a stable equilibrium loses stability and generates a stable periodic orbit. Neither of these situations requires assumptions that even vaguely resemble autocatalysis. In both cases, the key property is the loss of stability of an equilibrium. This begs the question whether the existence of unstable equilibria can be explained in terms of the structure of the chemical reaction network, or more precisely, in terms of its stoichiometric matrix. Since autocatalytic cores are also characterized in terms of the stoichiometric matrix [17], we set out here to disentangle instability and autocatalysis in terms of a purely structural view on chemical reaction networks. On the one hand, we confirm that autocatalysis has always the potential to destabilize an equilibrium. Autocatalysis is thus a sufficient condition for instability in certain parameter regions. On the other hand, we establish that autocatalysis is not necessary for superlinear growth or oscillations.

In more detail, we shall see that small unstable subsystems are sufficient to imply that an entire reaction network admits instability in kinetic models that are sufficiently ‘rich’ in parameters (Def. 3), such as Michaelis-Menten [23], Hill [24], and Generalized Mass Action [25] kinetics. A key ingredient towards this result are the so-called Child-Selections (CS). Conceptually, a CS κ is a square submatrix of the stoichiometric matrix S comprising k species and k reactions such that there is a 1-1 association between species m and reactions $j(m)$ for which m is a reactant for $j(m)$. From this submatrix, we obtain the *Child-Selection matrix* $S[\kappa]$ by reordering the columns so that species and their associated reactions correspond to the diagonal entries. The existence of an unstable Child-Selection matrix is sufficient for a network Γ with a parameter-rich kinetic model to admit instability (Cor. 13). Since Child-Selections can be “concatenated”, minimal unstable Child-Selections are well defined, in the sense that the Child-Selection matrix $S[\kappa]$ does not contain again a proper principal submatrix that is an unstable Child-Selection matrix, which leads to the main definition of this paper (Def. 14):

An unstable core is an Hurwitz-unstable Child-Selection matrix for which no principal submatrix is Hurwitz-unstable.

Unstable cores come in two flavors: An unstable core is an *unstable-negative feedback* if $\text{sign det } S[\kappa] = (-1)^k$ and *unstable-positive feedback* if $\text{sign det } S[\kappa] = (-1)^{k-1}$. This terminology is inspired by positive and negative feedback cycles, where the sign of the feedback is typically defined as the sign of

the product of the off-diagonal entries. The condition on the determinants translates into a structural difference in their spectra: Unstable-positive feedbacks have a single real-positive eigenvalue, while unstable-negative feedbacks have no real-positive eigenvalues at all (Lemma 20). The presence of related “positive feedbacks” is known to be *necessary* for multistationarity [26, 27] (see also **EXAMPLE A**). Oscillations, on the other hand, can be induced both by unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks (see **EXAMPLE B** and **EXAMPLE C**).

We then shall turn our attention to autocatalysis and autocatalytic cores in particular, and formally define an *autocatalytic matrix* (Def. 21), inspired by [17]. Autocatalytic cores are then autocatalytic submatrices of the stoichiometric matrix that do not contain any autocatalytic submatrix. Our main result (Thm. 23) characterizes autocatalytic cores in terms of unstable cores and Metzler matrices, i.e., matrices with nonnegative off-diagonal entries, and can be expressed as follows:

An autocatalytic core is an unstable-positive feedback that in addition is a Metzler matrix.

Recalling that autocatalytic networks must contain an autocatalytic core leads to a convenient characterization of general autocatalytic networks (Cor. 26):


A network is autocatalytic if and only if there is a Child-Selection matrix that is a Hurwitz-unstable Metzler matrix.

Our results show in particular that *every autocatalytic network admits instability*. The converse clearly is not true, i.e., *autocatalysis is not necessary for instability*: First, unstable-negative feedbacks are never autocatalytic (Cor. 25 and **EXAMPLE C**). Second, it is straightforward to construct unstable-positive feedbacks that are not Metzler matrices and thus not autocatalytic (see **EXAMPLES A, B, and EXAMPLE D** where we list non-autocatalytic unstable-positive feedbacks in the sequential and distributive double phosphorylation).

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the general setting of reaction networks and Section 3 the definition of parameter-rich models. Section 4 introduces Child-Selections and employs a Cauchy–Binet analysis to expand each coefficient of the characteristic polynomial by Child-Selections: This is used to connect the topology of the network to stability properties. Section 5 introduces the definition of *unstable cores* and its generalization, *D-unstable cores*. Section 6 addresses unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks. In Section 7 we focus on autocatalytic cores and we show in Theorem 23 that they are a special case of unstable cores. Section 8 presents four examples of non-autocatalytic networks that shows either multistationarity (with superlinear growth) or oscillations. We refer to the Supplementary Material (SM) for a full analysis and explanation of such examples. Albeit our paper shows that autocatalysis is not necessary for complex behavior as oscillations or superlinear growth, in Section 9 we nevertheless provide an informal indication why autocatalysis has been the typical source of instability in well-known examples. Section 10 concludes the paper, discussing the results in a general context. The technical proof of Theorem 23 is presented in Section 11.

2 Chemical reaction networks, dynamics, and stability

A chemical reaction network Γ is a set M of *species* together with a set E of *reactions*. A reaction $j \in E$ is a pair of formal linear combinations



with *stoichiometric* coefficients $s_m^j \geq 0$ and $\tilde{s}_m^j \geq 0$. Usually, one assumes $s_m^j, \tilde{s}_m^j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, although this restriction is not relevant here. A species m is a *reactant* of j if $s_m^j > 0$ and a *product* of j if $\tilde{s}_m^j > 0$. Note that (1) assigns a fixed order to any reaction j , so that we treat all reactions as *irreversible*.

However, reversible processes such as $j : A \rightleftharpoons B$ can be naturally taken into account by considering two opposite reactions $j_1 : A \rightarrow B$ and $j_2 : B \rightarrow A$. In biological systems, reaction networks are often *open*: They exchange chemicals with the outside environment. For this reason, we also consider reactions with no outputs (*outflow reactions*) or with no inputs (*inflow reactions*). These describe the exchange of material between the system and its environment.

A reaction j_C is *explicitly catalytic* if a species m is both a reactant and a product of the reaction j_C , i.e., $s_m^{j_C} \tilde{s}_m^{j_C} \neq 0$. The net change of chemical composition in a reaction network is described by the $|M| \times |E|$ *stoichiometric matrix* S defined as

$$(2) \quad S_{mj} := \tilde{s}_m^j - s_m^j,$$

Note that for explicit catalysts m with $s_m^{j_C} = \tilde{s}_m^{j_C}$, the stoichiometric coefficients cancel and thus do not appear in the entry S_{mj_C} of the stoichiometric matrix.

The time-evolution $x(t) \geq 0$ of an $|M|$ -vector of the concentrations under the assumption of spatial homogeneity, e.g. in a well-mixed reactor, obeys the system of ordinary differential equations

$$(3) \quad \dot{x} = f(x) := Sr(x),$$

where $r : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|M|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{|E|}$ is a vector of reaction rate functions. In this contribution, we will in particular be concerned with *equilibria* or *fixed points*, i.e., $|M|$ -vectors \bar{x} satisfying $f(\bar{x}) = 0$. Throughout, we assume that the stoichiometric matrix S admits a strictly positive kernel vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^{|E|}$, i.e. $S\mathbf{r} = 0$, which is in turn a basic necessary condition for the existence of any equilibrium in the first place. Networks satisfying this standard assumption have been called *consistent* in the literature, see for example [28]. Assuming that f is a continuously differentiable vector field, the stability of an equilibrium \bar{x} is determined by the Jacobian matrix G evaluated at \bar{x} , which has entries $G_{hm}(\bar{x}) := \partial f_h(x) / \partial x_m |_{x=\bar{x}}$. A real square matrix A is *Hurwitz-stable* if all its eigenvalues λ satisfy $\text{Re } \lambda < 0$. It is *Hurwitz-unstable* if there is at least one eigenvalue λ_u with $\text{Re } \lambda_u > 0$. It is well known that an equilibrium \bar{x} is dynamically stable if $G(\bar{x})$ is Hurwitz-stable, and unstable if $G(\bar{x})$ is Hurwitz unstable [21].

We consider all reactions to be directional. Thus the rate r_j of a reaction j is a non-negative function. We further assume that it depends only on the concentrations of its reactants, i.e., the molecular species m with stoichiometric coefficients $s_m^j > 0$. Finally, a reaction can only take place if all its reactants are present, in which case the rate increases with increasing reactant concentrations. We capture these conditions in the following formal definition of a kinetic model for a given chemical reaction network:

Definition 1. Let $\mathbf{\Gamma} = (M, E)$ be a chemical reaction network. A differentiable function $r : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^E$ is a *kinetic model* for $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ if

1. $r_j(x) \geq 0$ for all x ,
2. $r_j(x) > 0$ implies $x_m > 0$ for all m with $s_m^j > 0$,
3. $s_m^j = 0$ implies $\partial r_j / \partial x_m \equiv 0$,
4. if $x > 0$ and $s_m^j > 0$ then $\partial r_j / \partial x_m > 0$.

For $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^M$ we write

$$(4) \quad r'_{jm}(\bar{x}) := \left. \frac{\partial r_j(x)}{\partial x_m} \right|_{x=\bar{x}}.$$

The $|E| \times |M|$ matrix $R(\bar{x})$ with entries $R_{jm} := r'_{jm}(\bar{x})$ is called the *reactivity matrix*. By construction, we have $r'_{jm}(\bar{x}) \geq 0$ for all $m \in M$ and $j \in E$, i.e., $R(\bar{x})$ is a non-negative matrix. For $\bar{x} > 0$, moreover, $r'_{jm}(\bar{x}) > 0$ if and only if $s_m^j > 0$. Thus, for any strictly positive equilibrium $\bar{x} > 0$, the signs of $R(\bar{x})$

are completely determined by the reactants in the network. Together, the stoichiometric matrix S and the reactivity matrix R determine the stability of an equilibrium, since (3) implies that the Jacobian G is of the form

$$(5) \quad G(\bar{x}) = SR(\bar{x}).$$

Prominent examples of kinetic models include *Mass Action kinetics* [29]

$$(6) \quad r_j(x) := a_j \prod_{m \in M} x_m^{s_m^j}$$

and *Michaelis–Menten kinetics* [23]

$$(7) \quad r_j(x) := a_j \prod_{m \in M} \left(\frac{x_m}{1 + b_m^j x_m} \right)^{s_m^j}.$$

Note that Mass Action kinetics appears as the limiting case of Michaelis–Menten kinetics with $b_m^j = 0$ for all j, m . Here, $r_j(x)$ depends on parameters (a_j and b_m^j). In general, we write $r(x; p)$ for a parametric kinetic model that depends on parameters p . In this contribution we are not interested in concrete choices of such parameters. Instead, we are interested in the existence of unstable equilibria given a suitable choice of parameters.

Definition 2. A network $\Gamma = (M, E)$ with a parametrized kinetic model $r(x; p)$ admits instability if there exists a choice \bar{p} of parameters such that there is a positive equilibrium \bar{x} of $\dot{x} = Sr(x; \bar{p})$ with a Hurwitz-unstable Jacobian $G(\bar{x})$.

3 Parameter-rich kinetic models

We are particularly interested in kinetic models $r(x; p)$ that have a sufficient number of free parameters p such that the equilibrium \bar{x} and $R(\bar{x})$ can be chosen independently. We formalize this idea as follows:

Definition 3. A kinetic rate model $r(x; p)$ is *parameter-rich* if, for every positive equilibrium $\bar{x} > 0$ and every $|E| \times |M|$ matrix R with entries satisfying $r'_{jm} > 0$ if $s_m^j > 0$ and $r'_{jm} = 0$ if $s_m^j = 0$, there are parameters $\bar{p} = p(\bar{x}, R)$ such that $\left. \frac{\partial r_j(x; \bar{p})}{\partial x_m} \right|_{x=\bar{x}} = r'_{jm}$.

For any choice of a positive vector \bar{x} and matrix entries r'_{jm} with $s_m^j > 0$, in parameter-rich models it is possible to find parameter values \bar{p} such that \bar{x} is a fixed point and the r'_{jm} are the partial derivatives at the equilibrium \bar{x} . The only constraints on the Jacobian, therefore, derives from the stoichiometry of the network. In the following we write \mathbf{r}' for an arbitrary non-zero choice of the r'_{jm} with $s_m^j > 0$. It is then convenient to think of the partial derivatives r'_{jm} themselves as *symbols* that can be specialized to particular positive values at our convenience. We write $R(\mathbf{r}')$ for the corresponding symbolic *reactivity matrix*. The Jacobian $G(\mathbf{r}') = SR(\mathbf{r}')$ thus can also be viewed as a symbolic matrix. Combining this with Def. 2 and Def. 3 we immediately arrive at the following

Observation 4. A network Γ with a parameter-rich kinetic model admits instability if and only if there is a choice of symbols \mathbf{r}' such that the symbolic Jacobian $G(\mathbf{r}')$ is Hurwitz-unstable.

Def. 3 requires parameter-rich kinetic models to have enough parameters to simultaneously satisfy constraints at two levels: at the level of the functions $r(x, p)$ and at the level of their first derivatives. The former comes from the equilibrium constraints, i.e. $Sr(x) = 0$, while the latter comes from the matrix R that – jointly with the stoichiometric matrix S – prescribes the Jacobian. This fact suggests that at least two parameters for each reaction rate r_j must be present in order to account for both

levels of constraints. Mass action kinetics, Eq.(6), presents one single parameter for each reaction rate, while Michaelis–Menten kinetics, Eq.(7), at least two. This observation indicates that mass action kinetics is not parameter-rich, while Michaelis–Menten is. Theorem 6.1 in [30] confirms this expectation regarding Michaelis–Menten kinetics:

Lemma 5. *Michaelis–Menten kinetics, Eq.(7), is parameter-rich.*

In the SM, Section 1.1, we include a short proof of Lemma 5 to make this contribution self-contained. Clearly, any kinetic model that contains Michaelis–Menten kinetics as a special case is also parameter-rich, e.g. Hill kinetics [24]. In contrast, we formally confirm that mass action is *not* parameter-rich: The derivative of the reaction rate of j with respect to the concentration x_m of one of its reactants m reads

$$(8) \quad r'_{jm}(x) = s_m^j x_m^{(s_m^j-1)} k_j \prod_{n \neq m} x_n^{s_n^j} = \frac{s_m^j}{x_m} r_j(x).$$

For a fixed equilibrium $\bar{x} > 0$, the relation $r'_{jm}(\bar{x}) = \frac{s_m^j}{\bar{x}_m} r_j(\bar{x})$ shows the absence of parameter freedom to harness the value of the derivatives $r'_{jm}(\bar{x})$ independently from the values of the fluxes $r_j(\bar{x})$ and the concentration \bar{x} . Thus, if the fluxes $\bar{r}_j = r_j(\bar{x})$ of a fixed concentration \bar{x} solve the equilibrium constraints $S\bar{r} = 0$, the values of the derivatives $r'_{jm}(\bar{x})$ cannot be chosen independently and with freedom, contradicting Def. 3. In particular, the set of Jacobian matrices of an equilibrium of a mass-action system on a network $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is a *subset* of the set of Jacobian matrices of an equilibrium of any parameter-rich models on $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. This has two important consequences: The fact that $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ endowed with parameter-rich kinetics admits instability does not imply that the same network $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ with mass-action kinetics admits instability. In contrast, the fact that $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ with parameter-rich kinetics does not admit instability implies that $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ does not admit instability with mass-action kinetics as well.

On the other hand, *Generalized Mass Action kinetics* considers the stoichiometric exponent s_m^j appearing in mass action to be an additional positive parameter itself. Such kinetics has been proposed to model intra-cellular reactions where the assumption of spatial homogeneity fits less. See [25] for more details. Let $c_m^j \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the real parametric exponent of the species m in the reaction j and assume that $c_m^j > 0$ if and only if $s_m^j > 0$, and zero otherwise. Generalized Mass Action kinetics reads

$$(9) \quad r_j(x) := a_j \prod_{m \in M} x_m^{c_m^j}, \quad \text{with } c_m^j \neq 0 \text{ if and only if } s_m^j \neq 0.$$

Analogously to Lemma 5, we have the following.

Lemma 6. *Generalized mass action, (9), is parameter-rich.*

Proof. The same computation as (8) leads to

$$(10) \quad r'_{jm}(x) = \frac{c_m^j}{x_m} r_j(x),$$

where now c_m^j is not a fixed integer value but a real-valued parameter. Thus, as in the proof of Lemma 5, we can fix any concentration $\bar{x} > 0$, equilibrium fluxes $\bar{r} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|E|}$ with $S\bar{r} = 0$ and any choice of symbols \bar{r}' . For the positive choice of parameters

$$(11) \quad \begin{cases} c_m^j := \bar{x}_m \bar{r}'_{jm}(\bar{r}_j)^{-1}, \\ a_j := \bar{r}_j \left(\prod_{m \in M} \bar{x}_m \right)^{-\bar{x}_m \bar{r}'_{jm}(\bar{r}_j)^{-1}} \end{cases}$$

the generalized mass-action functions $r_j(x) := a_j \prod_{m \in M} x_m^{c_m^j}$ satisfy $Sr(\bar{x}) = 0$, i.e. \bar{x} is an equilibrium, with prescribed partial derivatives \bar{r}' . Thus Generalized Mass Action kinetics is parameter-rich. \square

Finally, we point out that some parameter-rich kinetics can themselves be derived as a singular limit of mass-action systems: This should not create confusion. To clarify this in an explicit example, consider Michaelis–Menten kinetics. It is well known that a reaction $A \rightarrow B$ endowed with Michaelis–Menten kinetics can be seen as the singular limit of the three-reactions mass-action network $A + E \rightleftharpoons I \rightarrow B + E$. In this latter network, however, three reactions instead of one appear. Consequently, the associated mass-action system presents three parameters, not one. In contrast, the very network $A \rightarrow B$ presents only one parameter when endowed with mass action. In this viewpoint, the parameter-richness of Michaelis–Menten is inherited by such expanded slow-fast mechanism under mass-action constraints. Def. 3 treats nevertheless the structure of the network as given and fixed, and it does not consider expanded ‘elementary’ versions of the same network.

4 Child-Selections, CB-summands, elementary CB-components

A central tool in this work are bijective associations between molecular species and reactions that give rise to square submatrices of S .

Definition 7. Let $\mathbf{\Gamma} = (M, E)$ be a network with stoichiometric matrix S . A *k-Child-Selection triple*, or *k-CS* for short, is a triple $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa, E_\kappa, J)$ such that $|\kappa| = |E_\kappa| = k$, $\kappa \subseteq M$, $E_\kappa \subseteq E$, and $J : \kappa \rightarrow E_\kappa$ is a bijection satisfying $s_m^{J(m)} > 0$ for all $m \in \kappa$. We call J a *Child-Selection bijection*.

Note that since J is a bijection between two ordered sets, we can naturally consider the *signature* (or parity) $\text{sign } J$ of the map J , where J is seen as a permutation of a set of cardinality k . For an $|M| \times |E|$ matrix A , and subsets $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\iota \subseteq E$, the notation $A[\kappa, \iota]$ refers to the submatrix of A with rows in κ and columns in ι . For square matrices, principal submatrices with $\kappa = \iota$ are indicated as $A[\kappa]$. A *k-CS* $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ identifies a $k \times k$ submatrix $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ of S . Its columns can be reordered such that the reactions $J(m)$ appear in the same order as their corresponding species m . This gives rise to a matrix $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ with entries

$$(12) \quad S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]_{ml} := S[\kappa, E_\kappa]_{m, J(l)} = \tilde{s}_m^{J(l)} - s_m^{J(l)},$$

where the permutation of the columns of $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ from $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ is described by the Child-Selection bijection J with signature $\text{sign } J$. In particular,

$$(13) \quad \det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = \text{sign } J \det S[\kappa, E_\kappa],$$

since the determinant is a multilinear and alternating form of the columns of a matrix. We call a matrix $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ arising from a *k-CS* $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ a *Child-Selection matrix*.

Let $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa, E_\kappa, J)$ be a *k-CS*. Consider $\kappa' \subseteq \kappa$, $E_{\kappa'} = \{J(m) \mid m \in \kappa'\}$ and $J' : \kappa' \rightarrow E_{\kappa'}$ with $J'(m) = J(m)$. Clearly, $E_{\kappa'} \subseteq E_\kappa$ and $J' : \kappa' \rightarrow E_{\kappa'}$ is the restriction of J to κ' , and thus bijective. In particular $\boldsymbol{\kappa}' = (\kappa', E_{\kappa'}, J')$ is a $|\kappa'|$ -CS. We say that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}'$ is a *restriction* of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. Child-Selections come thus with a natural notion of minimality w.r.t. some property \mathbb{P} .

Definition 8. A *k-CS* $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ is minimal w.r.t. \mathbb{P} if there is no restriction $\boldsymbol{\kappa}'$ of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ with $\kappa' \subsetneq \kappa$ such that $\boldsymbol{\kappa}'$ has property \mathbb{P} .

From a matrix perspective, we have the following observation.

Observation 9. Let $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ be a *k-CS* and set $A := S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$. Then every principal submatrix of A satisfies $A[\kappa'] = S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}']$, where $\boldsymbol{\kappa}'$ is the restriction of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ to $\kappa' \subseteq \kappa$. Suppose \mathbb{P} is a matrix property. A Child-Selection matrix $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ is minimal w.r.t. \mathbb{P} if no proper principal submatrix of $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ has the property \mathbb{P} .

As addressed in [30], the k -CS triples and their associated matrices provide sufficient conditions for instability in a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. We only sketch here the relevant results, based on the Cauchy–Binet formula. To make this contribution self-contained, we refer to the SM Section 1.2 for detailed proofs in the present setting. First, a definition:

Definition 10 (Cauchy–Binet summands, elementary Cauchy–Binet components). We call the *Cauchy–Binet (CB) summands* of G the matrices

$$(14) \quad G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)] := S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[E_\kappa, \kappa],$$

where $E_\kappa \subseteq E$ are reaction sets for which there exists at least one Child-Selection bijection J with $J(\kappa) = E_\kappa$. We call *elementary Cauchy–Binet (CB) components* of G the matrices

$$(15) \quad G[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] := S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]R[\boldsymbol{\kappa}],$$

where $R[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $R[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]_{mm} = r'_{J(m)m}$ and J is the Child-Selection bijection of $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$.

Note that the CB-summands of G can be seen as the symbolic Jacobian matrices of the subnetworks comprising species in κ and reactions in E_κ . In contrast, the elementary CB-components have a more algebraic nature and lack an analogous network interpretation. For matrices that are symbolic Jacobians of networks, the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial can be expanded along CB-summands and elementary CB-components. Let

$$(16) \quad g(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{|M|} (-1)^k c_k \lambda^{|M|-k}$$

be the characteristic polynomial of the symbolic Jacobian matrix $G(\mathbf{r}') = SR(\mathbf{r}')$. The coefficients c_k are the sum of the principal minors $\det G[\kappa]$ for all sets $|\kappa| = k$ and the following expansion holds

$$(17) \quad c_k = \sum_{(\kappa, E_\kappa)} \det G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)] = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\kappa}} \det G[\boldsymbol{\kappa}],$$

where the first sum runs over all pairs of sets (κ, E_κ) with cardinality k for which there exists at least one Child-Selection bijection $J(\kappa) = E_\kappa$. The second sum runs over all k -CS triples $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$. The first equality is a consequence of the Cauchy–Binet formula, while the second a consequence of the Leibniz’ expansion of the determinant. The expansion (17) in particular shows that the characteristic polynomial is independent of the labeling of the network. The following lemma and corollary state respectively that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ admits instability for parameter-rich kinetic models whenever any CB-summand or elementary CB-component admits instability.

Lemma 11. *Assume that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = (M, E)$ is a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. Assume there exists a choice of positive symbols \mathbf{r}' such that a CB-summand $G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)]$ is Hurwitz-unstable. Then the network admits instability.*

Corollary 12. *Assume that $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = (M, E)$ is a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. Assume there exists a choice of positive symbols \mathbf{r}' such that an elementary CB-component $G[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ is Hurwitz-unstable. Then there is also a choice of positive symbols such that the CB-summand $G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)]$ is Hurwitz-unstable and, in particular, the network admits instability.*

5 Unstable cores and D-unstable cores

The results of Section 4 can now be used to obtain more convenient sufficient topological conditions for a network to admit instability. A matrix A is said to be *D-stable* if AD is Hurwitz-stable for every positive diagonal matrix D [31]. It is *D-unstable* if there is a positive diagonal matrix D such that AD is Hurwitz-unstable. Clearly, an elementary CB-component is Hurwitz-unstable for some choice of parameters if and only if $S[\kappa]$ is D-unstable. In particular, *D-unstable* Child-Selection matrices $S[\kappa]$ are sufficient for the network to admit instability. Unfortunately, D-stability is non-trivial to check algorithmically [32]. However, choosing D to be the identity matrix immediately shows that Hurwitz-instability implies D-instability. Thus Lemma 11 in particular recovers

Corollary 13 (Prop. 5.12 of [30]). *Let $\Gamma = (M, E)$ be a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model and stoichiometric matrix S . If κ is a k -CS such that $S[\kappa]$ is unstable then Γ admits instability.*

Since unstable Child-Selection matrices imply network instability, it is of interest to consider minimal unstable Child-Selection matrices.

Definition 14. An *unstable core* is an unstable Child-Selection matrix $S[\kappa]$ for which no proper principal submatrix is unstable.

By Obs. 9, an unstable core is thus an unstable Child-Selection matrix that has no unstable restriction. We recall that the eigenvalues of a reducible matrix are the union of the eigenvalues of its irreducible diagonal blocks. In particular, if a reducible matrix is Hurwitz-unstable, then one of its diagonal blocks is Hurwitz-unstable. Since a diagonal block is a proper principal submatrix, this yields the irreducibility of unstable cores. We state this in an observation for later use.

Observation 15. An unstable core is an irreducible matrix.

Unstable cores are sufficient but not necessary causes of instability. A natural generalization arises from considering D-instability instead of Hurwitz-instability:

Definition 16. A *D-unstable core* is a D-unstable Child-Selection matrix $S[\kappa]$ for which no proper principal submatrix is D-unstable.

An immediate consequence of the definition and the fact that Hurwitz-instability implies D-instability is that every unstable core contains a D-unstable core. Note that a D-unstable core may be Hurwitz-stable: In this case, it can be a proper submatrix of an unstable core. It remains an open question whether or under which network conditions the converse of Cor. 12 is also true:

Conjecture 17. *Suppose that the network does not possess any D-unstable core. Then $G(\mathbf{r}')$ cannot be Hurwitz-unstable and thus the network Γ does not admit instability.*

6 Unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks

Definition 18. Let Γ be a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. An *unstable-positive feedback* is an unstable core satisfying $\text{sign det } S[\kappa] = (-1)^{k-1}$; an *unstable-negative feedback* is an unstable core satisfying $\text{sign det } S[\kappa] = (-1)^k$.

Observation 19. If $S[\kappa]$ is an unstable-positive feedback then the associated elementary CB-component $G[\kappa] = S[\kappa]R[\kappa]$ satisfies $\text{sign det } G[\kappa] = \text{sign det } S[\kappa] = (-1)^{k-1}$ and thus $G[\kappa]$ is unstable for any choice of symbols in $R[\kappa]$.

As an example, consider two networks with the following stoichiometric matrices

$$(18) \quad S^+ = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad S^- = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\det S^+ = 31$ and $\det S^- = -33$, corresponding to unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks, respectively. In fact: the Hurwitz-instability of S^+ is clear from the sign of its determinant, while the instability of S^- can be checked by computing its eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5) \approx (-3, -1.63 \pm 1.90i, 0.62 \pm 1.18i)$, where λ_4, λ_5 have positive-real part. Any proper principal submatrix of both S^+ and S^- is triangular with negative diagonal; thus Hurwitz-stable. This concludes that both matrices are unstable cores: S^+ an unstable-positive feedback, S^- an unstable-negative feedback.

Lemma 20. *Unstable-positive feedbacks have a single real-positive eigenvalue, unstable-negative feedbacks have no real-positive eigenvalues.*

Proof. The characteristic polynomial of a real $|M| \times |M|$ matrix A can be written as $p(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{|M|} (-1)^k c_k \lambda^{|M|-k}$ where c_k is the sum of the principal minors of size k . If A is an unstable core, then no proper principal submatrix of A has one single positive eigenvalue, and thus the sign of every principal minor of size $k < |M|$ is either $(-1)^k$ or 0. Thus $(-1)^k c_k \geq 0$. The coefficients of the characteristic polynomial p therefore exhibit at most one sign change. All coefficients have the same sign if $(-1)^{|M|} \det A > 0$ and thus $\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{|M|}$, i.e., if A is an unstable-negative feedback. Otherwise, $(-1)^{|M|} \det A < 0$ and thus $\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{|M|-1}$ and A is an unstable-positive feedback. Descartes' Rule of Sign, see e.g. [33], states that the number of positive roots of a polynomial is either the number of sign-changes between consecutive coefficients, ignoring vanishing coefficients, or is less than it by an even number. Thus an unstable core has a single real-positive eigenvalue if it is an unstable-positive feedback and no real-positive eigenvalues if it is an unstable-negative feedback. \square

We emphasize that Lemma 20 does not exclude additional unstable pairs of complex conjugated eigenvalues. In particular, the unstable dimension of an unstable-positive feedback may be greater than one. For an example, see SM Section 4. It is necessarily odd, comprising one real eigenvalue and pairs of complex conjugated eigenvalues. Consider finally the matrix property \mathbb{P}_{Re} of having one real-positive eigenvalue. We refer to Child-Selection matrices $S[\kappa]$ that are minimal w.r.t. \mathbb{P}_{Re} as *generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks*. We include in the SM, Section 2, few further observations on generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks.

7 Autocatalytic cores as unstable cores and Metzler matrices

A reaction j_A is *explicitly autocatalytic* if it is explicitly catalytic and $0 < s_m^{j_A} < \tilde{s}_m^{j_A}$, for a species m . Autocatalysis can also be distributed over a sequence of reactions that collectively exhibit “network autocatalysis” [34, 11]. The literature does not provide a single, widely accepted definition of “network autocatalysis”, see [19]. Here we are inspired by the approach by Blokhuis, Lacoste, and Nghe [17], albeit with some adjustments in formalism and terminology.

Definition 21. Let $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\iota \subseteq E$. A $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ submatrix S' of the stoichiometric matrix S is an *autocatalytic matrix* if the following two conditions are satisfied:

1. there exists a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that $S'v > 0$,
2. for every reaction column j there exist entries m, \tilde{m} , not necessarily distinct, such that m is a reactant of j , i.e., $s_m^j > 0$ and \tilde{m} is a product of j , i.e. $\tilde{s}_m^j > 0$.

For the case $m = \tilde{m}$, Def. 21 recovers the definition of an explicitly-autocatalytic reaction j_A , where S' is a 1×1 matrix $S' = S_{mj_A} = \tilde{s}_m^{j_A} - s_m^{j_A} > 0$. Analogously to Def. 14 we can consider ‘core’ matrices that are minimal with the property of being autocatalytic.

Definition 22. A stoichiometric submatrix A is an *autocatalytic core* if it is autocatalytic and it does not contain a proper submatrix that is autocatalytic.

We recall that a square matrix with non-negative off-diagonal elements is known as a Metzler matrix (see e.g. [35]). We are now ready to state the main theorem.

Theorem 23. *A submatrix \tilde{A} of the stoichiometric matrix S is an autocatalytic core if and only if \tilde{A} is a $k \times k$ matrix with a reordering A of its columns such that $A = S[\kappa]$ is a Metzler matrix and an unstable-positive feedback.*

We postpone the lengthy proof to Section 11. Thm. 23 directly implies the following observation and corollary.

Observation 24. A reaction j_{aut} , explicitly autocatalytic in a species m , is thus a 1×1 autocatalytic core $A := \tilde{s}_m^{j_{aut}} - s_m^{j_{aut}} > 0$. Also the converse is true: If $S[\kappa]$ has a positive diagonal entry $S[\kappa]_{mm} > 0$, then $J(m)$ is an explicitly-autocatalytic reaction in m . Minimality then implies that a $k \times k$ autocatalytic core A with $k > 1$ always identifies a Metzler matrix with non-positive diagonal.

Corollary 25. *No unstable-negative feedback is an autocatalytic matrix.*

Proof. An unstable-negative feedback is never an unstable-positive feedback. Thus, they are never autocatalytic. \square

We call a network Γ *autocatalytic* if its stoichiometric matrix S contains a submatrix that is an autocatalytic core. This can also be expressed as a corollary from Thm. 23.

Corollary 26. *A network is autocatalytic if and only if there exists a k -CS κ such that the associated Child-Selection matrix $S[\kappa]$ is an unstable Metzler matrix.*

Proof. If a network is autocatalytic, Thm. 23 implies the existence of a matrix $S[\kappa]$ that is both a Metzler matrix and unstable. Conversely, reasoning as in the proof of Thm. 23, if $S[\kappa]$ is an unstable Metzler matrix, it contains an irreducible Metzler matrix that is also unstable, i.e. autocatalytic, and thus S contains an autocatalytic core and the network is autocatalytic. \square

We now draw the final dynamical conclusion from Cor. 26 together with Cor. 12:

Corollary 27. *Every autocatalytic network admits instability.*

Clearly, the converse is not true: Autocatalysis is not necessary for instability. Both the presence of an unstable-positive and an unstable-negative feedback are sufficient conditions for the network to admit instability, again as a consequence of Cor. 12. By Cor. 25, furthermore, unstable-negative feedbacks are never autocatalytic. Moreover, it is easy to construct unstable-positive feedbacks that are not Metzler matrices and thus not autocatalytic. Consider for instance the following three examples:

$$(19) \quad S_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -2 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad S_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad S_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

All three matrices are unstable with a real-positive eigenvalue, since $\det S_1 = -1$, $\det S_2 = 1$, and $\det S_3 = -2$. They do not contain proper unstable submatrices. This is straightforward to see for S_1 and S_2 , since all the proper principal submatrices are weakly diagonally dominant with negative diagonal, and thus by Gershgorin's circle theorem [36] no proper principal submatrix can have an eigenvalue with a positive-real part. The same argument applies to the principal submatrices of S_3 with sizes 1 and 2. A direct computation (omitted here for brevity) shows that none of the four principal submatrices of S_3 with size 3 is Hurwitz-unstable. Hence S_3 does not contain an unstable proper submatrix. Then, considering $S_1 = S[\kappa_1]$, $S_2 = S[\kappa_2]$, $S_3 = S[\kappa_3]$, for k -Child-Selections κ_1 , κ_2 , κ_3 , we conclude that S_1 , S_2 , and S_3 are unstable-positive feedbacks. On the other hand, they are not autocatalytic because they are not Metzler matrices.

The matrices S_1 and S_2 have “twin” autocatalytic cores

$$(20) \quad A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

in the following sense:

Definition 28. A pair (A, B) of $k \times k$ matrices is called a *twin-pair* if $\prod_{m \in \kappa'} A_{m\gamma(m)} = \prod_{m \in \kappa'} B_{m\gamma(m)}$ holds for every cyclic permutation γ on a set κ' of size $k' = 1, \dots, k$.

Twin matrices are in particular similar as they share the same characteristic polynomial and thus the same eigenvalues, but even more is true.

Lemma 29. *Let (A, B) be a twin-pair of matrices and D be any diagonal matrix D . Then (AD, BD) is a twin pair of matrices.*

Proof. We have


$$\prod_{m \in \kappa'} A_{m\gamma(m)} d_{mm} = \prod_{m \in \kappa'} A_{m\gamma(m)} \prod_{m \in \kappa'} d_{mm} = \prod_{m \in \kappa'} B_{m\gamma(m)} \prod_{m \in \kappa'} d_{mm} = \prod_{m \in \kappa'} B_{m\gamma(m)} d_{mm}$$

whenever γ is a cyclic permutation on κ' . \square

The unstable-positive feedback S_3 , on the other hand, has no twin autocatalytic core. Since only a single off-diagonal entry is negative, Def. (28) can never hold for a pair (S_3, A_3) where A_3 is a Metzler matrix because the parity of the negative signs can never match. See SM, Section 3.1 and 3.2, for examples of pairs of networks that contain twins unstable core (S_1, A_1) and (S_2, A_2) . The definition of twins does not seem to offer a clear chemical interpretation behind sharing the stability features. This underlines that similarities in the global dynamics of networks possessing twin cores are not to be expected, a priori.

8 Examples


EXAMPLE A: Superlinear growth with unstable-positive feedback.



The unique unstable core


$$(21) \quad \begin{array}{c} A \\ B \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

is an unstable-positive feedback. It is not a Metzler matrix, thus the network is non-autocatalytic. The associated parameter-rich system admits multistationarity in the form of two equilibria, one stable and one unstable. On the heteroclinic orbit connecting the two equilibria, we see superlinear growth of the concentration x_A .



See SM, Section 3.1.



EXAMPLE B: Oscillations with unstable-positive feedback.



The unique unstable core


$$(22) \quad \begin{array}{c} A \\ B \\ C \end{array} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is an unstable-positive feedback. It is not a Metzler matrix and thus the network is non-autocatalytic. The associated parameter-rich system admits oscillations.



See SM, Section 3.2.



EXAMPLE C: Oscillations with unstable-negative feedback.



The unique unstable core


$$\begin{array}{c}
 A \\
 B \\
 C \\
 D \\
 E
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
 -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0
 \end{pmatrix}$$

is an unstable-negative feedback, hence non-autocatalytic. The associated parameter-rich system admits oscillations.



See SM, Section 3.3, where we also present a mass-action variation of the same example.

EXAMPLE D: Non-autocatalytic unstable-positive feedbacks in the dual futile cycle.



The network has only three unstable-positive feedbacks.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 A \\
 E_1 \\
 I_3 \\
 B \\
 I_2
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 1 & 7 & 9 & 4 & 6 \\
 -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1
 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 C \\
 E_2 \\
 I_2 \\
 B \\
 I_3
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 10 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 9 \\
 -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1
 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
 A \\
 E_1 \\
 I_3 \\
 C \\
 E_2 \\
 I_2
 \end{array}
 \begin{pmatrix}
 1 & 7 & 9 & 10 & 4 & 6 \\
 -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
 -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\
 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1
 \end{pmatrix}$$

They are all non-autocatalytic since they are not Metzger-matrices, but they all admit an autocatalytic twin. Even when endowed with a kinetics that is not parametric-rich, as Mass Action kinetics, the network is indeed known to admit instability in the form of two stable and one unstable equilibria [37]. See SM, Section 3.4.

9 NC-networks and what is special about autocatalysis

Lemma 29 together with Cor. 12 suggests that an autocatalytic unstable-core is indistinguishable from a non-autocatalytic unstable-core, as far as its (in)stability properties are concerned. The special role of autocatalysis in chemical reaction networks thus is not captured by spectral properties. In this section we provide an intuitive explanation. To this end, we limit our attention to networks without explicitly catalytic reactions, i.e., without reactions where a species is both a reactant and a product. We refer to such networks as non-explicitly-catalytic networks (in brief, NC-networks) and we list few advantages of restricting attention to NC-networks. First, by Eq. (2), the stoichiometric matrix S unambiguously represents the stoichiometry of the system. Second, by Def. 1, the reactivity matrix R has positive entries $R_{jm} > 0$ if and only if s_m^j is negative and thus if and only if S_{mj} is negative. As a direct consequence, by Eq. (12), Child-Selection matrices $S[\kappa]$ have always strictly negative diagonal in NC-networks. Consider now a CB-summand $G([\kappa, E_\kappa]) = S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[\kappa, E_\kappa]$. Our second observation above implies that there exists a reordering of the columns of $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ that is a Metzler-matrix if and only if there exists a reordering of the columns of $R[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ that is diagonal. Expanding on the above considerations, the following two corollaries of Thm. 23 point at the peculiarity of autocatalysis among unstable cores.

Corollary 30. *Let Γ^{NC} be a NC-network. Consider a CB-summand $G([\kappa, E_\kappa]) = S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[\kappa, E_\kappa]$. If $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ is an autocatalytic core, then*

$$(23) \quad \det R[\kappa, E_\kappa] = \text{sign}(J) \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{J(m)m} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{sign}(\det S[\kappa, E_\kappa]) = \text{sign}(J)(-1)^{k-1},$$

for a unique Child-Selection bijection J .

Proof. By Thm.23, there exists a reordering A of the columns of $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ such that A is a Metzler matrix and an unstable-positive feedback. Since Γ^{NC} is a NC-network, there exists a diagonal reordering of $R[\kappa, E_\kappa]$. The reordering follows precisely from the unique Child-Selection bijection J that associates a species m in κ to the unique reaction $J(m)$ in E_κ with $s_m^{J(m)} < 0$. In particular, there is a unique CS-triple $\kappa = (\kappa, E_\kappa, J)$ defined on the pair of sets (κ, E_κ) . Thus, since the determinant is an alternating form, we conclude that $\det R[\kappa, E_\kappa] = \text{sign}(J) \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{J(m)m}$. Since the reordering $A = S[\kappa]$ of $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ is an unstable-positive feedback, (13) implies that $\text{sign}(\det S[\kappa, E_\kappa]) = \text{sign}(J)(-1)^{k-1}$. \square

Corollary 30 implies that the stability of the CB-summand associated with the stoichiometry of an autocatalytic core corresponds to the stability of a single elementary CB-component. An interesting consequence of Cor. 30 is the following.

Corollary 31. *Let Γ^{NC} be a NC-network. Consider a CB-summand $G([\kappa, E_\kappa]) = S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[\kappa, E_\kappa]$, where $S[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ is an autocatalytic core. Then, $G([\kappa, E_\kappa])$ is unstable for any choice of symbols r'_{jm} with $m \in \kappa, j \in E_\kappa$.*

Proof. From Cor. 30 we compute the sign of the determinant of the CB-summand $G([\kappa, E_\kappa])$,

$$(24) \quad \text{sign} \det G([\kappa, E_\kappa]) = \text{sign}(\det S[\kappa, E_\kappa] \det R[\kappa, E_\kappa]) = \text{sign}(J) \text{sign}(J)(-1)^{k-1} = (-1)^{k-1},$$

and thus $G([\kappa, E_\kappa])$ is always unstable, independently of the choice of symbols r'_{jm} . \square

In essence, autocatalysis provides an “always-unstable” subnetwork, independent of any parameter choice. This has relevant consequences for the dynamical analysis, in particular when dealing with realistic parameter values or with kinetic models that are not parameter-rich, such as mass action. For non-autocatalytic unstable-cores, in fact, the subnetwork identified by the associated CB-summand does not need to be unstable for all parameter values: It requires a careful tuning of the parameters

to achieve instability, as addressed in Cor. 12, and such tuning may not be possible in contexts that are not parameter-rich. We further remark, however, that the converse of Cor. 31 is not true: There are also non-autocatalytic subnetworks whose associated Jacobian is unstable for every choice of parameters. To see this, consider the stoichiometric matrix S_3 , already discussed in the previous section, and associated reactivity matrix R_3

$$(25) \quad S_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad R_3 = \begin{pmatrix} r'_{1A} & r'_{1B} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r'_{2B} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r'_{3C} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r'_{4D} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\det S_3 = -1$ and $\det R_3 = r'_{1A}r'_{2B}r'_{3C}r'_{4D} > 0$, we have that $\text{sign det } G_3 = \text{sign}(\det S_3 \det R_3) = -1$, and thus G_3 is unstable irrespective of the choices of symbols.

As a final caveat, we caution the reader about exchanging statements between NC-networks and general networks. Such exchanges may work well for considerations based on the stoichiometry, as we will address in Section 11. In general, however, the exchanges fail for the dynamics, which also depends explicitly on the reactivity matrix R . In particular, both Cor. 30 and Cor. 31 do not hold for general networks with explicitly-catalytic reactions. The only viable way to extend this point of view to general networks would be to enforce the statement of Cor. 30 as the starting definition of autocatalytic cores, and we do not pursue this approach here. Still, even in the present context, both corollaries offer a qualitative hint and explanation of the special nature of autocatalysis and a possible reason for the omnipresence of autocatalysis in networks that have been of interest in the literature.

10 Conclusion

For a broad class of kinetic models, which includes Michaelis–Menten and Generalized Mass Action kinetics (but not classical Mass Action kinetics), we have shown here that an inspection of the topology of a chemical reaction network may be conclusive on whether the network admits dynamical instability. More precisely, we found that unstable cores, characterized as certain minimal submatrices of the stoichiometric matrix that are Hurwitz unstable, provide a sufficient condition for network instability by Cor. 13. Moreover, we conjecture that the slightly more general D-unstable cores are even necessary; Conjecture 17.

The present study thus complements investigations into sufficient conditions for universal stability as *deficiency zero* [38], or exclusion of multiple equilibria as *injectivity* [27, 39] and *concordance* [40]. See [41, 42] for two comprehensive overviews on such topics. Note, however, that injectivity and concordance only concern the uniqueness of equilibria, but not their stability, while the conditions for the deficiency-zero theorem are quite restrictive and they only hold for weakly-reversible mass-action networks. See [25] for generalizations and failures of the deficiency statements for a parameter-rich model such as Generalized Mass Action kinetics.

We observed that there are two classes of unstable cores, unstable-positive and unstable-negative feedbacks, distinguished by the sign of their determinant as well as the presence of real-valued positive eigenvalue. Autocatalytic cores, as defined in [17], turn out to be exactly (after a suitable permutation of the columns) unstable-positive feedbacks that are Metzler matrices. This simple characterization lends support to this particular definition of autocatalysis, which also has been adapted e.g. in [43, 44].

While positive and negative feedbacks are distinguished by spectral properties, this is not the case for autocatalytic versus non-autocatalytic unstable cores. The existence of twins shows that there are both types of cores sharing the same characteristic polynomial. Nevertheless, autocatalysis is the source of instability in well-known examples of chemical networks with “interesting” dynamics. This is probably a consequence of the fact that an autocatalytic core is dynamically unstable irrespective of the parameter choices (Cor. 30 and Cor. 31). In order to design an example of dynamic instability, it therefore suffices to pick an autocatalytic core and complement it with feed and waste product to

achieve a modicum of chemical realism. This, together with chemists' intuition on the importance of autocatalysis, may explain why non-autocatalytic examples do not appear to be widely known.

11 Proof of Theorem 23

For a proof of Thm. 23, it is convenient to remove momentarily explicit catalysis from the network. As addressed in Sec. 9, this has the advantage that the definition of autocatalysis then relies on the sign structure of the matrix alone and does not require a reference to the numerical values of the stoichiometric coefficients. To this end, we split every explicitly-catalytic reaction j_C , with $s_m^{j_C} \tilde{s}_m^{j_C} \neq 0$ for at least one species m , into two reactions j_{C1}, j_{C2} such that $s_m^{j_{C1}} = s_m^{j_C}$, and $\tilde{s}_m^{j_{C2}} = \tilde{s}_m^{j_C}$, for every m . That is, the reactants of j_C coincide with the reactants of j_{C1} and the products of j_C coincide with the products of j_{C2} . An *intermediate species* m_I is added, so that m_I is the single product of reaction j_{C1} and the single reactant of reaction j_{C2} . For instance, the explicitly-catalytic reaction j_C



is split into j_{C1}, j_{C2} as



with the addition of the intermediate species m_I . We call the replacement of an explicitly-catalytic reaction j_C with the *non-explicitly-catalytic triple* (m_I, j_{C1}, j_{C2}) a *non-explicitly-catalytic extension* of j_C . Clearly, we can generalize this procedure to all explicitly-catalytic reactions in the network.

Definition 32 (Non-explicitly-catalytic extension). A network $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$ is a *non-explicitly-catalytic extension* (in short, NC-extension) of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ if $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$ is obtained from $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ by substituting all explicitly-catalytic reactions j_C with triples (m_I, j_{C1}, j_{C2}) . Let S be the stoichiometric matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Then S^{NC} indicates the stoichiometric matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$.

Observation 33. Let $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ be a network with $|M|$ species and $|E|$ reactions, of which n are explicitly-catalytic. Then $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$ is a network with $(|M| + n)$ species and $(|E| + n)$ reactions. Moreover, if S is the $|M| \times |E|$ stoichiometric matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, the stoichiometric matrix S^{NC} of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$ is an $(|M| + n) \times (|E| + n)$ matrix. In particular, if S is a square matrix, so it is S^{NC} .

The notion of NC-extension is consistent with the definition of autocatalytic core. Let A be an autocatalytic core in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ and call A^{NC} the NC-extension of A in $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 34. A is an autocatalytic core of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ if and only if A^{NC} is an autocatalytic core of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$.

Proof. Let A be a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ stoichiometric submatrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Without loss of generality, we can consider that $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ has one single explicitly-catalytic reaction j_C in ι , since we can inductively iterate the argument for any explicitly-catalytic reaction. Then, let (m_I, j_{C1}, j_{C2}) be its associated non-explicitly-catalytic triple. A^{NC} is a $(|\kappa| + 1) \times (|\iota| + 1)$ matrix.

Assume first that A is an autocatalytic matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$. Consider the positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that $Av > 0$ and define $\tilde{v}(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|+1}$ as

$$(28) \quad \tilde{v}_j(\varepsilon) := \begin{cases} v_j & \text{for } j \neq j_{C1}, j \neq j_{C2} \\ v_{j_C} + \varepsilon & \text{for } j = j_{C1} \\ v_{j_C} & \text{for } j = j_{C2} \end{cases},$$

for positive $\varepsilon > 0$. This implies that $(A^{NC}\tilde{v})_m = (Av)_m - \varepsilon$ for $m \neq m_I$ with $s_m^{j_C} = s_m^{j_{1C}} > 0$, $(A^{NC}\tilde{v})_m = (Av)_m$ for $m \neq m_I$ with $s_m^{j_C} = s_m^{j_{1C}} = 0$, and $(A^{NC}\tilde{v})_{m_I} = \varepsilon$. In particular, for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$, we have that $A^{NC}\tilde{v} > 0$. Moreover, the column j_C of A has an entry m with $s_m^{j_C} > 0$. This implies that the entry m of the column j_{1C} of A^{NC} satisfies $s_m^{j_{1C}} > 0$. On the other hand the entry m_I of the column j_{1C} satisfies $\tilde{s}_{m_I}^{j_{1C}} > 0$. Similarly, the column j_C has an entry \tilde{m} with $\tilde{s}_{\tilde{m}}^{j_C} > 0$; thus the entry \tilde{m} of the column j_{2C} of A^{NC} satisfies $\tilde{s}_{\tilde{m}}^{j_{2C}} > 0$. On the other hand the entry m_I of the column j_{2C} satisfies $s_{m_I}^{j_{2C}} > 0$, concluding that A^{NC} is an autocatalytic matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$.

Assume now that A^{NC} is an autocatalytic matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$. There exists a positive vector $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|+1}$ with $A^{NC}\tilde{u} > 0$. Consider the positive vector $\tilde{v} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|+1}$ defined as $\tilde{v}_j := \tilde{u}_j$ for all $j \neq j_{1C}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j_{1C}} := \tilde{v}_{j_{2C}} = \tilde{u}_{j_{2C}}$. We show that $(A^{NC}\tilde{v})_m \geq (A^{NC}\tilde{u})_m > 0$ for all $m \neq m_I$. In fact, note that $\tilde{u}_{j_{1C}} > \tilde{u}_{j_{2C}}$, otherwise $(A^{NC}\tilde{u})_{m_I} \leq 0$ would contradict $A^{NC}\tilde{u} > 0$. On the other hand, the column j_{1C} of A^{NC} has only negative entries, with the single exception of the entry m_I with $A_{m_I j_{1C}}^{NC} = 1$. This yields $\tilde{v}_{j_{2C}}(A_{m j_{1C}}^{NC} + A_{m j_{1C}}^{NC}) \geq \tilde{u}_{j_{1C}}A_{m j_{1C}}^{NC} + \tilde{u}_{j_{2C}}A_{m j_{2C}}^{NC}$ and thus $(A^{NC}\tilde{v})_m \geq (A^{NC}\tilde{u})_m > 0$ for all $m \neq m_I$. Since m_I is not a species in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$, it does not appear as a row in A . Thus we conclude that for the positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ defined as $v_j := \tilde{v}_j$ for $j \neq j_C$ and $v_{j_C} := \tilde{v}_{j_{1C}} = \tilde{v}_{j_{2C}}$ we obtain $Av > 0$. Moreover, the column j_{1C} of A^{NC} contains an entry $m \neq m_I$ with $s_m^{j_{1C}} > 0$ and the column j_{2C} contains an entry $\tilde{m} \neq m_I$ with $\tilde{s}_{\tilde{m}}^{j_{2C}} > 0$. This implies that the column j_C of A has as well the entry m with $s_m^{j_C} > 0$ and the entry \tilde{m} with $\tilde{s}_{\tilde{m}}^{j_C} > 0$, and concludes that A is an autocatalytic matrix of $\mathbf{\Gamma}$.

The above proves that a matrix A is autocatalytic in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ if and only if A^{NC} is autocatalytic in $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$. The preservation of minimality follows from a straightforward observation. B is a submatrix of A in $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ if and only if B^{NC} is a submatrix of A^{NC} in $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$. Thus, A does not contain any autocatalytic proper submatrix if and only if A^{NC} does not contain any autocatalytic proper submatrix. \square

Since the autocatalytic cores of a network $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ can be studied in its NC-extension $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$ as a consequence of Lemma 34, we proceed now by considering NC-networks, only. The advantage, we repeat, is that in NC-networks the stoichiometric matrix S fully determines the reactivity matrix R , $R_{jm} \neq 0$ if and only if $S_{mj} < 0$. A first consequence of this approach is that autocatalytic matrices and cores can be defined purely at the matrix level, without reference to the stoichiometric coefficients. We have indeed the following proposition.

Proposition 35. *Consider a NC-network $\mathbf{\Gamma}^{NC}$. Let $\kappa \subseteq M$, $\iota \subseteq E$. Then a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ submatrix A of the stoichiometric matrix S is an autocatalytic core if the following three conditions are satisfied:*

1. *there exists a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that $Av > 0$,*
2. *for every column j there exist both positive and negative entries, i.e., there is m, \tilde{m} such that $A_{mj} > 0$ and $A_{\tilde{m}j} < 0$,*
3. *A does not contain any proper submatrix satisfying conditions (i) and (ii).*

Proof. For NC-networks, a reactant m of a reaction j always appears as a strictly negative entry $A_{mj} < 0$, whereas a product \tilde{m} of reaction j always appears as a strictly positive entry $A_{\tilde{m}j} > 0$. The rest follows from the definition of autocatalytic cores. \square

Prop. 35 is clearly equivalent to Def. 22 for the case of NC-networks. In [17] the analysis focused on NC-networks, and the conditions in Prop. 35 were indeed given as the definition of autocatalytic cores. We further note that in NC-networks autocatalysis requires at least two species and two reactions, since explicit (auto)catalysis is excluded.

Lemma 36. *If S is a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ autocatalytic matrix of a NC-network, then $|\kappa| \geq 2$ and $|\iota| \geq 2$.*

Proof. Condition 2 in Prop. 35 implies that there are at least 2 rows: $|\kappa| \geq 2$. Then $|\iota| = 1$ is impossible since we would have $S_{m1} < 0$, and thus condition 1 could not be satisfied; hence $|\iota| \geq 2$. \square

For NC-networks, [17] proves that autocatalytic cores necessarily satisfy relevant conditions, as stated in the following Lemma:

Lemma 37 (Blokhuis et al. [17]). *Let \tilde{A} be an autocatalytic core of a NC-network. Then \tilde{A} is square, invertible, and irreducible. Moreover, there exists an autocatalytic core A , obtained by re-ordering the columns of \tilde{A} , such that A is a Metzler matrix with negative diagonal.*

For completeness, we prove Lemma 37 in our own setting and notation in the SM, Section 1.3. A straightforward corollary follows.

Corollary 38. *Let \tilde{A} be an autocatalytic core of a NC-network. Then, there exists a unique autocatalytic core A with negative diagonal obtained by reordering the columns of \tilde{A} .*

Proof. Since A is a Metzler matrix, each column and row has a unique negative entry. Thus each column and each row of \tilde{A} has a unique negative entry, and the permutation of the columns with negative diagonal is uniquely defined. \square

In summary, an autocatalytic core of a NC-network uniquely identifies an invertible, irreducible Metzler matrix A with negative diagonal. Hurwitz-stability of Metzler matrices has been extensively studied in the literature, see e.g. [45] and the references therein. The notorious Frobenius–Perron theorem is typically stated for non-negative matrices N , i.e., with $N_{mj} \geq 0$ for all m and j . By considering $\alpha \geq \max_m |A_{mm}|$ and the non-negative matrix $N := A + \alpha \text{Id}$, some important consequences of the theorem generalize to Metzler matrices. In particular, the Frobenius–Perron theorem guarantees that any Metzler matrix A has one real eigenvalue λ^* such that $\lambda^* > \text{Re } \lambda$ for all other eigenvalues λ . Moreover, if A is irreducible, then the eigenvector v of λ^* can be chosen positive. Another straightforward consequence is that $Av \geq av$ for some $a > 0$ implies $\lambda \geq a$. See e.g. [46], where also the following consequent statement can be found.

Lemma 39. *Let A be an invertible, irreducible, Metzler matrix. Then A is Hurwitz-unstable if and only if there exists a positive $v > 0$ such that $Av > 0$.*

To make this document self-contained, we include a short proof in the SM, Section 1.4. Lemma 39 implies that within the set of invertible and irreducible Metzler matrices with negative diagonal, Hurwitz-instability characterizes autocatalytic matrices. We expand on such an idea in the last lemma of this section, where we characterize autocatalytic cores among the Metzler matrices with negative diagonal.

Lemma 40. *Let A be a $k \times k$ Metzler matrix with negative diagonal. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

1. *A is an autocatalytic core;*
2. *$\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{k-1}$ and for every $\emptyset \neq \kappa' \subsetneq \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|}$ or $\text{det } A[\kappa'] = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose A is an autocatalytic core. The proof of Lemma 39 shows that A is Hurwitz-unstable with at least one real-positive eigenvalue λ^* . Descartes' rule of sign therefore implies that the coefficients c_n of the characteristic polynomial $p(\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^k (-1)^n c_n \lambda^{k-n}$ of A do not all have the same sign. Since $c_1 = \text{tr } A < 0$, there exists a smallest n , $1 < n \leq k$ and $\kappa' \subset \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $|\kappa'| = n$ such that the submatrix $A[\kappa']$ satisfies $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|-1}$ and $\text{sign det } A[\kappa''] = (-1)^{|\kappa''|}$ or $\text{sign det } A[\kappa''] = 0$ for all non-empty $\kappa'' \subsetneq \kappa'$. We proceed by showing that $A[\kappa']$ is an autocatalytic core. If $A[\kappa']$ is not irreducible, the rows and columns can be simultaneously reordered such that $A[\kappa']$ has a block-triangular form. Thus there is $\kappa'' \subsetneq \kappa'$ such that $\text{sign det } A[\kappa''] = (-1)^{|\kappa''|-1}$, contradicting minimality of κ' . Thus $A[\kappa']$ is irreducible and thus every column contains a non-zero off-diagonal entry. Since A is a Metzler matrix with negative diagonal, every column in particular contains both a positive and a negative entry. Since $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|-1} \neq 0$, $A[\kappa']$ is invertible. It is unstable, since by construction its characteristic polynomial has exactly one sign change. Lemma 39 now implies the existence of a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\kappa'|}$ such that $A[\kappa']v > 0$. Thus $A[\kappa']$ is an autocatalytic core and cannot be a proper submatrix of the network autocatalytic core A . Hence $A[\kappa'] = A$ and $|\kappa'| = k$.

Conversely, assume that condition 2 holds. We first show that A is invertible and irreducible. Invertibility trivially follows from $\det A \neq 0$. Indirectly assume now that A is reducible; then the determinant of A can be expressed as a product of determinants of principal submatrices, which would imply the existence of a proper principal submatrix $A[\kappa']$ with $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|-1}$, contradicting the assumption; thus A is irreducible. The sign of its determinant further implies that A is unstable and thus Lemma 39 implies the existence of a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^k$ such that $Av > 0$. Moreover, the irreducibility of A again guarantees that every column of A has one negative diagonal entry and at least one positive off-diagonal entry. Thus A is autocatalytic. It remains to show that there are no autocatalytic submatrices. The only submatrices that could be autocatalytic cores are the principal ones since an autocatalytic core uniquely identifies a square matrix with one negative entry in each column by Cor. 38. Moreover, we can restrict to the irreducible ones, by Lemma 37. Again, all invertible and irreducible principal $|\kappa'|$ -submatrices $A[\kappa']$ with $|\kappa'| < k$ satisfy $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|}$ by assumption. By Lemma 20, none of them has any positive real eigenvalue. Following the arguments in the proof of Lemma 39, $A[\kappa']$ is Hurwitz-stable and thus there is no positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\kappa'|}$ such that $A[\kappa']v > 0$. Therefore, A does not contain a proper submatrix that is autocatalytic and hence it is an autocatalytic core. \square

We are now in the position to state the main result for NC-networks.

Lemma 41. *Let S be a stoichiometric matrix of a NC-network. Then a submatrix \tilde{A} of S is an autocatalytic core if and only if \tilde{A} is a $k \times k$ submatrix of S whose columns can be rearranged in a matrix A that satisfies the following conditions:*

1. A is a Metzler matrix with negative diagonal;
2. $\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{k-1}$;
3. no principal submatrix $A[\kappa']$ with $|\kappa'| < k$ is Hurwitz-unstable.

Proof. By Cor. 38, an autocatalytic core \tilde{A} uniquely identifies a matrix A that is a Metzler matrix with negative diagonal. Lemma 40 implies that among the Metzler matrices with negative diagonal, the autocatalytic cores are exactly those that satisfy $\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{k-1}$ and for every $\emptyset \neq \kappa' \subsetneq \{1, \dots, k\}$ we have $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|}$ or $\det A[\kappa'] = 0$. From Descartes' rule of sign an identical argument as in the proof of Lemma 40 implies that no proper principal submatrix $A[\kappa']$ with $|\kappa'| < k$ is Hurwitz-unstable.

Conversely, assume that A satisfies conditions 1-3. Condition 3 implies that for all principal submatrices $A[\kappa']$ we have $\text{sign det } A[\kappa'] = (-1)^{|\kappa'|}$ or $\det A[\kappa'] = 0$. Lemma 40 concludes that A is an autocatalytic core. \square

We focus on the relationship between autocatalytic cores and unstable cores. We first note a straightforward corollary of Lemma 37.

Corollary 42. *Let A be a $k \times k$ autocatalytic core of an NC-network, with rows in $\kappa \subseteq M$ and columns in $\iota \subseteq E$. For any $m \in \kappa$, let $J(m) \in \iota$ indicate the unique reaction such that $A_{mJ(m)} < 0$. Then $\kappa := (\kappa, \iota, J)$ is a k -CS.*

Proof. It is sufficient to notice that $A_{mJ(m)} < 0$ implies $s_m^{J(m)} > 0$. The statement follows from the definition of k -Child-Selection triples. \square

Thus the notion of autocatalytic cores in [17] is consistent with our notion of cores as minimal Child-Selections, even though the definition of autocatalytic cores does not require a fixed order of the columns: Any \tilde{A} obtained by reordering the columns of an autocatalytic core A is also an autocatalytic core. In turn, the ordering of the columns in the Child-Selection perspective plays a crucial role to draw dynamical conclusions. In fact, as an immediate consequence of Cor. 42 we get that $A := S[\kappa]$ is the unique matrix with negative diagonal obtained by reordering the columns of an autocatalytic core \tilde{A} . In particular, A is a Metzler matrix.

We are finally ready to prove Theorem 23

Proof of Theorem 23. Assume firstly $A = S[\kappa]$ is a Metzler matrix and an unstable-positive feedback; thus A is irreducible, by Obs. 15. Lemma 39 implies that there exists a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^k$ such that $Av > 0$. By construction of $S[\kappa]$, the diagonal entries correspond to positive stoichiometric coefficients $s_m^{J(m)} > 0$. If $k = 1$, the instability of the 1×1 matrix $S[\kappa]$ simply implies that $S[\kappa] > 0$, and thus $\tilde{s}_m^{J(m)} > 0$. This concludes that $J(m)$ is an explicitly-autocatalytic reaction in m , and in particular $S[\kappa]$ is an autocatalytic core. Consider now $k \geq 2$: A is irreducible and thus every column j as at least a positive non-diagonal entry m . In particular $\tilde{s}_m^j \geq A_m^j > 0$; thus A is autocatalytic. Finally, any proper principal submatrix of A is also a Metzler matrix. By minimality of unstable-positive feedbacks, it does not contain any other unstable proper principal submatrix, i.e., for all κ' there is no positive v' such that $A[\kappa']v' > 0$, again by Lemma 39. This implies that A does not contain any autocatalytic submatrix, which concludes that A is an autocatalytic core.

Conversely assume that $A = S[\kappa]$ is an autocatalytic core. We have to show that A is a Metzler matrix. Lemma 34 states that A is an autocatalytic core if and only if its NC-extension A^{NC} is an autocatalytic core. Using Lemma 41, A^{NC} is a Metzler matrix with negative diagonal. Consider a column j_C in A associated to an explicitly-catalytic reaction j_C and its associated non-explicitly-catalytic triple (m_I, j_{C1}, j_{C2}) in A^{NC} . The column j_{C1} has a single negative entry, i.e., a single reactant m^* (by Lemma 37) and a single product m_I , via the construction of NC-extension. Moreover, the single reactant m^* corresponds to the diagonal entry $A_{m^*m^*} = S[\kappa]_{m^*m^*} = S_{m^*J(m^*)}$, since $J(m^*) = j_C$. The column j_{C2} has a single negative entry, i.e., a single reactant m_I , again via the construction of NC-extension. The column j_C in A , then, has entries $A_{mj_C} = A_{mj_{C1}}^{NC} + A_{mj_{C2}}^{NC}$, for $m \neq m_I$ since m_I is not a species in A . Such sum has always non-negative summands, except for $m = m^*$, and $m = m_I$. The first corresponds to a diagonal entry in A , the second does not appear in A at all, therefore $A_{mj_C} \geq 0$ for all $m \neq m^*$. Repeating such argument for all explicitly-catalytic reactions yields that A_{mj} is non-negative for all non-diagonal entries $j \neq m$; thus A is a Metzler matrix. Finally, since A is autocatalytic, there exists $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^k$ such that $Av > 0$. Applying Lemma 39 yields instability of A with $\text{sign det } A = (-1)^{k-1}$ and the minimality of A as an autocatalytic matrix translates into the minimality of A as an unstable matrix, just as discussed above in this same proof. Hence, A is an unstable-positive feedback and a Metzler matrix. \square

Supplementary Material

The Supplementary Material (SM) is organized as follows. Section 11 contains the proofs omitted from the main text; Section 11 discusses in more detail *generalized-unstable-positive-feedbacks*. Section 11 analyzes the four examples of the main text; Section 11 presents an example of an unstable-positive feedback with unstable dimension greater than one.

Proofs omitted from the main text

Proof of Lemma 5

Proof. Consider a positive right-kernel vector $\bar{r} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|E|}$ of the stoichiometric matrix S :

$$(29) \quad S\bar{r} = 0.$$

Choose a sufficiently large scalar $K > 0$ such that

$$(30) \quad b_m^j := \left(\frac{K\bar{r}_j}{\bar{r}'_{jm}} \frac{s_m^j}{\bar{x}_m} - 1 \right) \frac{1}{\bar{x}_m} > 0,$$

for all m with $s_m^j > 0$. Set

$$(31) \quad a_j := K\bar{r}_j \prod_{m \in M} \left(\frac{\bar{x}_m}{(1 + b_m^j \bar{x}_m)} \right)^{-s_m^j},$$

Inserting these parameter choices into the Michaelis–Menten nonlinearity, Eq.(7) of the main text,

$$r_j(x) := a_j \prod_{m \in M} \left(\frac{x_m}{(1 + b_m^j x_m)} \right)^{s_m^j}.$$

yields $r_j(\bar{x}) = K\bar{r}_j > 0$ and $\frac{\partial r_j(x)}{\partial x_m} \Big|_{x=\bar{x}} = \bar{r}'_{jm}$ for all reactants m of any reaction j . In particular,

$$Sr(\bar{x}) = K \cdot S\bar{r} = 0,$$

and \bar{x} is an equilibrium of the system. Thus the conditions of Def. 3 are satisfied. \square

Detailed Cauchy-Binet analysis of Section 4 of the main text

In this section we present the detailed Cauchy-Binet analysis leading to Lemma 11 and Corollary 12 of the main text. The instability of a matrix is characterized by the sign of the real part of its eigenvalues, i.e., of the roots of its characteristic polynomial. For matrices that are symbolic Jacobians of networks, the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial can be expanded along Child Selections: Let

$$(32) \quad g(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{|M|} (-1)^k c_k \lambda^{|M|-k}$$

be the characteristic polynomial of the symbolic Jacobian matrix $G(\mathbf{r}') = SR(\mathbf{r}')$. The coefficients c_k are the sum of the principal minors $\det G[\kappa]$ for all sets $|\kappa| = k$. Applying the Cauchy–Binet formula to any principal submatrix $G[\kappa]$ of G we obtain

$$(33) \quad \det G[\kappa] = \det S[\kappa, E]R[E, \kappa] = \sum_{|\iota|=k} \det S[\kappa, \iota] \det R[\iota, \kappa].$$

A central observation is that all nonzero summands are associated with Child-Selections:

Lemma 43. Let $R[\iota, \kappa]$ be a submatrix of the reactivity matrix with $|\iota| = |\kappa| = k$. Then $\det R[\iota, \kappa] \neq 0$ only if $\iota = E_\kappa = J(\kappa)$ for some k -CS triple (κ, E_κ, J) . In particular,

$$(34) \quad \det R[\iota, \kappa] = \sum_{J: \kappa \rightarrow \iota} \text{sign } J \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{J(m)m},$$

where the sum runs on all Child-Selection bijections J between κ and $E_\kappa := \iota$.

Proof. The Child-Selection bijections $J : \kappa \rightarrow \iota$ identify permutations of the columns; thus (34) coincides with the Leibniz formula for the determinant. To prove that this is the case, consider the general form of the Leibniz formula

$$\det R[\iota, \kappa] = \sum_{\pi: \kappa \rightarrow \iota} \text{sign } \pi \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{\pi(m)m},$$

where π is now any bijection between κ and ι , not necessarily a Child-Selection bijection. The statement follows by noting that $\det R[\iota, \kappa] \neq 0$ requires the existence of at least one permutation $\bar{\pi} : \kappa \rightarrow \iota$ with $\prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{\bar{\pi}(m)m} \neq 0$. Such a product is non-zero if and only if $r'_{\bar{\pi}(m)m} \neq 0$ for all $m \in \kappa$. By the definitions of R and k -Child-Selection, this is the case if and only if $\bar{\pi}$ is a Child-Selection bijection $J : \kappa \rightarrow \iota$. In fact, $r'_{\bar{\pi}(m)m} = R_{\bar{\pi}(m)m} \neq 0$ if and only if m is a reactant of $j = \bar{\pi}(m)$, i.e., $s_m^{\bar{\pi}(m)} \neq 0$. On the other hand, for a bijection $\bar{\pi} : \kappa \rightarrow \iota$, the condition $s_m^{\bar{\pi}(m)} \neq 0$ for every $m \in \kappa$ precisely defines a Child-Selection bijection $J = \bar{\pi}$. \square

Lemma 43 implies that we can rewrite the Cauchy–Binet expansion in the form

$$(35) \quad \det G[\kappa] = \sum_{E_\kappa} \det(S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[E_\kappa, \kappa]),$$

where the sum runs precisely on all sets $E_\kappa \subseteq E$ for which there exists at least one Child-Selection bijection J with $E_\kappa = J(\kappa)$. We call the matrices

$$(36) \quad G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)] := S[\kappa, E_\kappa]R[E_\kappa, \kappa]$$

the *Cauchy–Binet (CB) summands* of G . We emphasize again that a pair of sets (κ, E_κ) does not uniquely identify a Child-Selection bijection, as there may be more than one bijection $J : \kappa \rightarrow \iota$ such that (κ, ι, J) is a k -CS. Applying Lemma 43, however, we can further expand the determinant of CB summands along k -CS:

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} \det G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)] &= \det S[\kappa, E_\kappa] \sum_{J: \kappa \rightarrow E_\kappa} \text{sign } J \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{J(m)m} \\ &= \sum_{\kappa} \det S[\kappa] \prod_{m \in \kappa} r'_{J(m)m} = \sum_{\kappa} \det(S[\kappa]R[\kappa]). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $R[\kappa]$ is the diagonal matrix with entries $R[\kappa]_{mm} = r'_{J(m)m}$. We call the matrices $G[\kappa] := S[\kappa]R[\kappa]$ *elementary Cauchy–Binet (CB) components* of G .

Observation 44. Putting together (35), (36), and (37), the k^{th} coefficient c_k of the characteristic polynomial $g(\lambda)$ of G can be expanded along CB summands and elementary CB components as

$$(38) \quad c_k = \sum_{(\kappa, E_\kappa)} \det G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)] = \sum_{\kappa} \det G[\kappa],$$

where the first sum runs on all pairs of sets (κ, E_κ) with cardinality k for which there exists at least one Child-Selection bijection $J(\kappa) = E_\kappa$. The second sum runs on all k -CS triples κ . This in particular proves that the characteristic polynomial is independent of the labeling of the network.

The following technical lemma shows that Γ admits instability for parameter-rich kinetic models whenever any CB summand admits instability.

Lemma 45 (Lemma 11 of the main text). *Assume that $\Gamma = (M, E)$ is a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. Assume there exists a choice of positive symbols \mathbf{r}' such that a CB summand $G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)]$ is Hurwitz-unstable. Then the network admits instability.*

Proof. Since the kinetic model is parameter rich, we can choose the non-zero symbolic entries \mathbf{r}' of the reactivity matrix R as a function of a parameter ε as follows: For $m \in \kappa$ and $j \in E_\kappa$ choose $r'_{jm} > 0$ independent of ε and set $r'_{jm} = \varepsilon \rho_{jm}$ for all other j and m with $s_m^j > 0$, with $\rho_{jm} > 0$ any positive value. By construction, the square submatrix $R[E_\kappa, \kappa]$ of R comprising the rows $j \in E_\kappa$ and columns $m \in \kappa$ is independent of ε . Observation 44 guarantees that the stability does not depend on the labeling of the network. Therefore, without loss of generality, consider $\kappa = \{1, \dots, k\}$: in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, the symbolic Jacobian of Γ becomes

$$G(\mathbf{r}'(0)) = \begin{pmatrix} G[\kappa, E_\kappa] & 0 \\ \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus $G(\mathbf{r}'(0))$ is Hurwitz-unstable whenever the CB summand $G[\kappa, E_\kappa]$ is Hurwitz-unstable. Appealing to the continuity of eigenvalues, Hurwitz-instability of $G(\mathbf{r}'(0))$ implies Hurwitz instability of $G(\mathbf{r}'(\varepsilon))$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. This in turn implies that Γ admits instability. \square

Moreover, fix a k -CS $\kappa = \{\kappa, E_\kappa, J\}$. We can further choose arbitrarily small symbols $r'_{jm} = \varepsilon \rho_{jm}$ with $m \in \kappa$, $j \in E_\kappa$, and $j \neq J(m)$. The same argument as in the proof of Lemma 45 above yields the following.

Corollary 46 (Corollary 12 of the main text). *Assume that $\Gamma = (M, E)$ is a network with a parameter-rich kinetic model. If there is a choice of positive symbols \mathbf{r}' such that an elementary CB component $G[\kappa]$ is Hurwitz-unstable, then there is also a choice of positive symbols such that the CB summand $G[(\kappa, E_\kappa)]$ is Hurwitz-unstable. Then, in particular, the network admits instability.*

Proof of Lemma 37

Here we prove Lemma 37 of the main text. We follow in essence the arguments of Blokhuis et al. [17], in part with alternative proofs.

Lemma 47 (Prop. 1 in the SI of [17]). *If A is a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ autocatalytic core of a NC-network, then for every $m \in \kappa$, there are $j, j' \in \iota$ such that $A_{mj} < 0$ and $A_{mj'} > 0$.*

Proof. Since there is a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that $\sum_j A_{mj} v_j > 0$ we have $A_{mj} > 0$ for some j . Now indirectly suppose there exists m such that $A_{mj} \geq 0$ for all j . Denote by P the set of such m , and consider the matrix A' obtained from A by removing rows $m \in P$. Then $\sum_j A_{m'j} v_j = \sum_j A'_{m'j} v_j > 0$ for all $m' \notin P$. Moreover, for every j , there is $m' \notin P$ such that $A_{m'j} = A'_{m'j} < 0$. Denote by $I = \{j \mid A_{m'j} \leq 0 \text{ for all } m' \notin P\}$ the set of reactions for which all the products lie in P . If $I = \emptyset$, then A' is an autocatalytic proper submatrix of A , contradicting minimality of A as an autocatalytic matrix. If $I = E$, then $\sum_j A_{m'j} v_j \leq 0$ for all positive vectors v and all $m' \notin P$, contradicting the assumption that A is autocatalytic. If $\emptyset \subsetneq I \subsetneq E$, denote by A'' the matrix obtain from A' by removing all columns $j \in I$. Then $0 < \sum_j A'_{m'j} v_j \leq \sum_{j \notin I} A'_{m'j} v_j$, and for every $j \notin I$ there is $m' \notin P$ such that $A''_{m'j} = A'_{m'j} < 0$ and, by construction a $m'' \notin P$ such that $A''_{m''j} > 0$. Hence A'' is an autocatalytic proper submatrix of A , again contradicting the assumption that A is an autocatalytic core. Thus there exists no m such that $A_{mj} \geq 0$ for all j , concluding the proof. \square

Lemma 48. *Let A be a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ matrix such that there is a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that $Av > 0$. If $\text{rank } A < |\iota|$, then there is a column j in A such that the $|\kappa| \times (|\iota| - 1)$ matrix A^* obtained by removing the column j admits a positive vector $v^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|-1}$ such that $A^*v^* > 0$.*

Proof. Since $\text{rank } A < |\iota|$, there is a non-zero right kernel vector c satisfying $Ac = 0$. Thus there is $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $w = v - \tau c \geq 0$ and $w_j = 0$ for some $j \in \iota$. Note that j is not necessarily uniquely defined. There is, however, an open neighborhood $N(v)$ of v in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{|\iota|}$ such that for all $v' \in N(v)$ it holds $Av' > 0$ and $v' > 0$. In particular, we can choose $v' \in N(v)$ and a unique $j \in \iota$ such that $v'_i > v_i$ for all $i \neq j$ and $v'_j = v_j$. The vector $v'' = v' - \tau c$ now satisfies $v''_j = 0$, $v''_i > 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and thus the vector $v^* \in \mathbb{R}^{|\iota|-1}$ obtained from v'' by deleting row j is positive, i.e., $v^* > 0$. Moreover, we have $A^*v^* = Av'' = Av' + \tau Ac = Av' > 0$. \square

Lemma 49 (Prop. 2 in the SI of [17]). *If A is a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ autocatalytic core of a NC-network, then A is square and invertible. Moreover, for every species $m \in \kappa$ there is a unique reaction $j = j(m) \in \iota$ such that $A_{mj} < 0$ and $A_{mj'} \geq 0$ for all $j' \neq j$. Moreover, $j(m)$ is uniquely determined by m .*

Proof. Let A be a $|\kappa| \times |\iota|$ autocatalytic core. If $\text{rank } A < |\iota|$, then by Lemma 48 above there is a column j such that the matrix A^* obtained by deleting j still affords a positive vector v^* such that $(A^*v^*)_m > 0$ for all $m \in \kappa$. Hence A^* is an autocatalytic proper submatrix of A , contradicting minimality. Therefore $\text{rank } A = |\iota|$. Now suppose there is $m \in \kappa$ such that for every $j \in \iota$ with $A_{mj} < 0$ there is a species $m_j \neq m$ with $A_{m_j j} < 0$ and let A' be the matrix obtained by removing row m . Then $(A'v)_{m'} = (Av)_{m'}$ for all $m' \neq m$ and every column j of A' still contains a positive and a negative entry. Thus A' is an autocatalytic proper submatrix of A , contradicting minimality. Hence, for every $m \in \kappa$ there is a column $j \in E$ for which A_{mj} is the only negative entry. This implies $|\kappa| \leq |\iota|$. Taken together we have $\text{rank } A \leq |\kappa| \leq |\iota| = \text{rank } A$, and thus $|\kappa| = |\iota| = \text{rank } A$, i.e., A is square and invertible. Since for row m there is a column j such that A_{mj} is the only negative entry in the column, $|\kappa| = |\iota|$ implies that $A_{mj'} \geq 0$ for all $j' \neq j$ and thus $j = j(m)$ is uniquely determined by m . Moreover, every row and column of A thus contains a unique negative entry $A_{mj(m)}$, and thus $m \mapsto j(m)$ is bijective. \square

Lemma 50 (Prop. 4 in the SI of [17]). *If \tilde{A} is an autocatalytic core of a NC-network, then \tilde{A} is irreducible.*

Proof. Indirectly suppose that \tilde{A} is reducible. Consider the unique matrix A with negative diagonal obtained by reordering the columns of \tilde{A} . Clearly, A is also reducible and the rows and columns can be simultaneously reordered such that $A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & 0 \\ X & Y \end{pmatrix}$, where A' is an irreducible matrix corresponding to the subset $\kappa' \subseteq \kappa$ of reactant indices. Note that A' has negative diagonal. By assumption, A' is a proper submatrix of A . Let v be a positive vector such that $(Av)_m > 0$ for all $m \in \kappa$. Then the restriction v' of v to κ' is a positive vector such that $(A'v')_m = (Av)_m > 0$ for all $m \in \kappa'$. Furthermore, the irreducibility of A' yields that every column $j \in \kappa'$ has a non-zero (positive!) off-diagonal entry. Hence A' is an autocatalytic proper submatrix of A , in contradiction with the assumptions. Thus A is irreducible and so it is \tilde{A} . \square

Lemma 37 follows as a straightforward consequence of above Lemma 47, Lemma 49, and Lemma 50.

Proof of Lemma 39

Proof. If A is Hurwitz-unstable, then $\lambda^* > 0$ and hence for its positive eigenvector $v > 0$ we have $Av = \lambda^*v > 0$. For the converse, if $v > 0$ is a positive vector with $Av > 0$ then there always exists $a > 0$ small enough such that the implication $Av \geq av$ holds and hence A has in particular a real-positive eigenvalue $\lambda \geq a > 0$ and it is Hurwitz-unstable. \square

Generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks

We collect here few further observations and results on generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks. First, it is worthwhile noting that a matrix may be a generalized-unstable-positive feedback and not be an unstable core as it may contain an unstable-negative feedback as a proper submatrix. To see this, consider the following matrix:

$$(39) \quad S_g^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\text{sign det } S_g^+ = -1 = (-1)^{4-1}$ and all proper principal $k' \times k'$ submatrices $S_g^+[\kappa']$ satisfy either $\text{sign det } S_g^+[\kappa'] = (-1)^{k'}$ or $\text{det } S_g^+[\kappa'] = 0$. With the same reasoning of Lemma 20 in the main text, we get that S_g^+ has one real-positive eigenvalue and no proper principal submatrix have a real-positive eigenvalue. However, the 3×3 principal submatrix

$$(40) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

has eigenvalues $(-1, 0.5 \pm 0.87i)$, hence it is an unstable-negative feedback. Using Cor. 12 of the main text, the presence of a generalized-positive-unstable feedback in the stoichiometry of the network implies that the network admits instability. Moreover, minimality w.r.t. \mathbb{P}_{Re} can be checked based on the sign of the principal minors, alone. As a consequence, finding generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks present computational advantages compared to finding unstable-positive feedbacks. Finally, following the arguments in Lemma 11 and Lemma 20 in the main text, the presence of a generalized-unstable-positive feedback characterizes the existence of a choice of parameters such that at least one coefficient c_k of the characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian $p(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{|M|} (-1)^k c_k \lambda^{|M|-k}$ satisfies $c_k (-1)^k < 0$, which is in turn a necessary condition for multistationarity [42].

As noted above, checking whether a generalized-unstable-positive feedback is an unstable-positive feedback may be computationally expensive, in practice. We provide here a simple sufficient criterion that implies that a generalized-unstable-positive feedback is an unstable-positive feedback, by considering the related autocatalytic twin matrix, as defined in Def. 28. Firstly, we state a lemma, which confirms that autocatalytic generalized-positive-feedbacks are always autocatalytic core.

Lemma 51. *Every autocatalytic generalized-unstable-positive feedback is an autocatalytic core, i.e., it is an unstable-positive feedback.*

Proof. As addressed in detail in Sec. 11 of the main text, it is well-known that every unstable Metzler matrix has at least one real-positive eigenvalue. Thus, if an autocatalytic matrix A is a generalized-unstable-positive feedback, i.e., A is minimal with the property \mathbb{P}_{Re} of having a real-positive eigenvalue, then A is minimal with the property of being unstable, and thus it is an unstable-positive feedback. \square

Corollary 52. *Let S be a generalized-unstable-positive feedback, i.e., minimal with the property \mathbb{P} of having a real-positive eigenvalue. If S possesses an autocatalytic twin A , then S is an unstable-positive feedback.*

Proof. A is a generalized-unstable-positive feedback and autocatalytic; thus it is an unstable-positive feedback via Lemma 51. S is a twin-matrix of A , which implies that any principal submatrix of S shares the same Leibniz expansion as the respective principal submatrix of A . In particular, then, S contains a proper unstable principal submatrix if and only if A does. From the fact that A is an unstable-core, i.e., A does not contain any proper unstable principal submatrix, it follows that S is an unstable-positive feedback. \square

The four examples in detail

We discuss in more detail the examples presented in **EXAMPLES A, B, C, D** of the main text. The examples are all non-autocatalytic and they show multistationarity, superlinear growth, or oscillations as a consequence of instability. The instability can follow from two distinct features: an unstable-positive feedback (single real-positive eigenvalue) or an unstable-negative feedback (conjugated pairs of positive-real-part eigenvalues). An unstable-positive feedback can produce both multistationarity and oscillations, while unstable-negative feedbacks do not trigger multistationarity. For the sake of exemplification, we endow the systems with Michaelis–Menten kinetics, which is in particular parameter-rich. Without a kinetics that is parameter-rich, we are not guaranteed that we can achieve any instability, of course. For example, as addressed in Section 3 of the main text, the spectral configurations of the equilibrium Jacobian of the associated mass action system is a subset of its spectral configurations in parameter-rich kinetic models. Thus, a dynamical feature spotted when the system is endowed with parameter-rich kinetics may not occur in mass action systems. We nevertheless provide here a mass action variation of **EXAMPLE C**, to foster discussion.

The ubiquitous mathematical intuition is that the presence of an unstable core allows the detection of an unstable equilibrium for a certain choice of Michaelis–Menten constants. The spectral type of instability of the Jacobian at the equilibrium, i.e. one single real unstable eigenvalue vs a complex pair of unstable eigenvalues, suggests multistationarity (superlinear growth) and oscillations respectively. Note however that the instability-type of the Jacobian need not be the same as the instability-type of the unstable core generating it. In particular, we stress again that an unstable-positive feedback can indeed trigger oscillatory behavior, as it is seen in celebrated autocatalytic examples as the *Oregonator* [47], or more modestly in our **EXAMPLE B** in 11. We further warn the reader that the analysis of the unstable core alone is inconclusive with regard to the global dynamics of the system, for which we resort to standard numerical simulations.

EXAMPLE A: Superlinear growth with unstable-positive feedback

Consider four species A, B, C, D and six reactions:



The stoichiometric matrix S reads:

$$(41) \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is straightforward to check that the matrix S contains a single, non-autocatalytic, unstable core:

$$(42) \quad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -2 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is an unstable-positive feedback. The idea behind the design of this example is indeed based on the following pair of reactions:






Figure 1: The system in (45) possesses an unstable equilibrium E_u at $x = (1, 1, 1, 1)$. In the figure, nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1.01, 1, 1, 1)$ converge to the stable equilibrium $E_s = (2, 0.25, 1, 1)$. The trajectory of x_A has a sigmoid shape with alternating regimes of superlinear, linear, and sublinear growth.

This is sufficient for the presence of the unstable-positive feedback of (42). The inflow reactions F_A, F_B guarantee the existence of a positive equilibrium. Chemical realism requires products C, D with their own degradation: outflow reactions 3, 4. Consider the associated dynamical system of the concentrations:

$$(44) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = F_A - r_1(x_A, x_B) - 2r_2(x_A, x_B), \\ \dot{x}_B = F_B - r_1(x_A, x_B) - r_2(x_A, x_B), \\ \dot{x}_C = r_1(x_A, x_B) - r_3(x_C), \\ \dot{x}_D = r_2(x_A, x_B) - r_4(x_D). \end{cases}$$

We endow the system with Michaelis–Menten kinetics and we find multistationarity for a proper choice of kinetic constants. Such multistationarity appears in the form of two equilibria, one stable E_s and one unstable E_u . The dynamical intuition behind this is that the system admits a saddle-node bifurcation [48], implying a parameter area where an unstable equilibrium coexists with a stable equilibrium. We then simply consider initial conditions close to the unstable equilibrium E_u . On the heteroclinic orbit connecting the two equilibria, we see superlinear growth of the concentration x_A . More specifically, we consider:

$$(45) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = 3 - 3 \frac{x_A x_B}{1+2x_B} - 2x_A^2 x_B, \\ \dot{x}_B = 2 - 3 \frac{x_A x_B}{1+2x_B} - x_A^2 x_B, \\ \dot{x}_C = 3 \frac{x_A x_B}{1+2x_B} - x_C, \\ \dot{x}_D = x_A^2 x_B - x_D. \end{cases}$$

$E_s := (x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D) = (2, 0.25, 1, 1)$ is a stable equilibrium while $E_u := (x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$ is unstable. With initial conditions $x(0) = (1.01, 1, 1, 1)$ we get the plot in Figure 1, where we find superlinear growth in the concentration of x_A .

The unstable-positive feedback in (42) admits an autocatalytic twin

$$(46) \quad \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$





Figure 2: The system in (47) possesses an unstable equilibrium $(x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D, x_E) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. In the figure, nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1.01, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ show superlinear growth and convergence to a limit stable equilibrium.

With similar intuition, we can construct an example with superlinear growth, based on (46), instead of (42). Consider two species A and B , and the following four reactions.




Endowing the system with Michaelis–Menten kinetics, the following choice of constants

$$(47) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = -\frac{12x_A}{1+x_A} + 8x_B - 2x_A, \\ \dot{x}_B = \frac{12x_A}{1+x_A} - 4x_B - \frac{8x_B}{1+3x_B}, \end{cases}$$

shows multistationarity with superlinear growth, see Figure 2. As already pointed out, the dynamics of the system in (45) and in (47) is indeed different. This is no surprise since the networks must be different for stoichiometric reasons. E.g., enlarging the stoichiometry of the non-autocatalytic unstable-core in (42) to a network that admits equilibria requires inflow-reactions, while for the autocatalytic core in (46) the same construction requires outflow-reactions.

EXAMPLE B: Oscillations with unstable-positive feedback

Consider five species A, B, C, D, E , and the following eight reactions.



The stoichiometric matrix reads

$$(48) \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the 3-CS κ defined as

$$(49) \quad \kappa = (\{A, B, C\}, \{1, 2, 3\}, \{J(A) = 1, J(B) = 2, J(C) = 3\})$$

The network possesses a unique unstable-core,

$$(50) \quad S[\kappa] = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which is a non-autocatalytic unstable-positive feedback. In fact, $\det S[\kappa] = 1 = (-1)^{3-1}$, and no principal submatrix is unstable. The uniqueness can be checked via an elementary computation, omitted here for brevity. Note also that $S[\kappa]$ has a twin autocatalytic core A of the form

$$(51) \quad A = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The associated dynamical system of the concentrations is:

$$(52) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = F_A - r_1(x_A, x_B) + r_3(x_C, x_D), \\ \dot{x}_B = F_B - r_1(x_A, x_B) - r_2(x_B, x_C) - 2r_4(x_B, x_D), \\ \dot{x}_C = r_1(x_A, x_B) - r_2(x_B, x_C) - r_3(x_C, x_D), \\ \dot{x}_D = F_D - r_3(x_C, x_D) - r_4(x_B, x_D) \\ \dot{x}_E = r_1(x_A, x_B) + r_2(x_B, x_C) + r_3(x_C, x_D) + r_4(x_B, x_D) - r_5(x_E). \end{cases}$$

We endow the system with Michaelis–Menten kinetics and we find oscillations for a certain choice of constants. For example, the following choice

$$(53) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = 1 - 8 \frac{x_A x_B}{(1+x_A)(1+x_B)} + 91 \frac{x_C x_D}{1+90x_D}, \\ \dot{x}_B = 5 - 8 \frac{x_A x_B}{(1+x_A)(1+x_B)} - 91 \frac{x_B x_C}{1+90x_C} - 20 \frac{x_B^2 x_D}{(1+x_B)^2(1+1.5x_D)}, \\ \dot{x}_C = 8 \frac{x_A x_B}{(1+x_A)(1+x_B)} - 91 \frac{x_B x_C}{1+90x_C} - 91 \frac{x_C x_D}{1+90x_D}, \\ \dot{x}_D = 2 - 91 \frac{x_C x_D}{1+90x_D} - 10 \frac{x_B^2 x_D}{(1+x_B)^2(1+1.5x_D)}, \\ \dot{x}_E = 8 \frac{x_A x_B}{(1+x_A)(1+x_B)} + 91 \frac{x_B x_C}{1+90x_C} + 91 \frac{x_C x_D}{1+90x_D} + 10 \frac{x_B^2 x_D}{(1+x_B)^2(1+1.5x_D)} - 5x_E, \end{cases}$$

shows an unstable equilibrium for $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. Nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1.01, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ converge to a stable periodic orbit. See Figure 3 and Figure 4.

The designing idea behind the example is that any Child-Selection matrix that is both Hurwitz-stable and D -unstable allows the detection of purely imaginary eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix of networks with parameter-rich kinetic models, see [30]. Specifically, this example enlarges the matrix in (50) to a 4×4 Hurwitz-stable stoichiometric matrix:

$$(54) \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & -2 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$




Figure 3: The system in (53) possesses an unstable equilibrium $(x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D, x_E) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. In the figure, nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1.01, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ shows convergence to a limit cycle.




Figure 4: The picture shows numerical simulations for the system in (53). The initial condition $x(0) = [1.10433115, 1.0969183, 1.15016837, 0.57719267, 1.05835769]$ is chosen in proximity of the periodic orbit. The plot on the left shows the time-evolution of the concentrations $x(t)$, while the plots in the center and on the right depict in 3d the periodic orbit for (x_A, x_B, x_C) and (x_A, x_D, x_E) , respectively.

which indeed possesses four negative-real-part eigenvalues. However, it is clear that the matrix

$$(55) \quad B(\varepsilon) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 0 & -2\varepsilon \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & -\varepsilon \end{pmatrix}$$

loses stability with $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, in a similar fashion as the arguments in Lemma 11 of the main text (Lemma 45 here in the SM). Moreover, the matrix $B(\varepsilon)$ is invertible for any ε (multiplying a column just multiplies the determinant), and thus the only possibility for the loss of stability is a crossing of a pair of purely imaginary eigenvalues. The full example inherits this core feature via a proper choice of Michaelis-Menten parameters. Likely this results in a Hopf bifurcation [21] and luckily it results in a supercritical Hopf bifurcation, generating a stable periodic orbit.

An oscillatory example based on the autocatalytic twin in (51) has been presented in [30], and we omit here the full details. We just report the example for completeness, made of 5 species A, B, C, D, E , and 8 reactions.




The following Michaelis–Menten system has an unstable equilibrium at $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$, with nearby initial conditions converging to a stable periodic orbit.

$$(56) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = -2x_A + 8\frac{x_C x_D}{1+3x_D}, \\ \dot{x}_B = 2x_A - 8\frac{x_B}{1+x_B} + 4\frac{x_D}{1+x_D}, \\ \dot{x}_C = 2x_A + 8\frac{x_B}{1+x_B} - 8\frac{x_C x_D}{1+3x_D} - 64\frac{x_C}{1+15x_C}, \\ \dot{x}_D = -8\frac{x_C x_D}{1+3x_D} - 2\frac{x_D}{1+x_D} - 512\frac{x_D}{1+63x_D} \frac{x_E}{1+3x_E} + 5, \\ \dot{x}_E = 64\frac{x_C}{1+15x_C} + 512\frac{x_D}{1+63x_D} \frac{x_E}{1+3x_E} - 72\frac{x_E}{1+11x_E}. \end{cases}$$

EXAMPLE C: Oscillations with unstable-negative feedback and mass-action variation

Consider six species A, B, C, D, E, F and the following eleven reactions.



The stoichiometric matrix S is

$$(57) \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$




Figure 5: The system in (60) possesses an unstable equilibrium at $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. In the figure, nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1.01, 1)$ shows convergence to a limit cycle.

Reactions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been chosen explicitly catalytic to reduce as much as possible the number of reactions and species. Clearly, the network contains only the unstable-core

$$(58) \quad S_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which constitutes an unstable-negative feedback and thus not-autocatalytic. In fact, S_u has a pair of complex-conjugated unstable eigenvalues, and all its strict principal submatrices have only zero eigenvalues; thus they are not Hurwitz-unstable. The dynamical systems of the concentrations is

$$(59) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = F_A - r_5(x_A, x_E), \\ \dot{x}_B = F_B - r_1(x_A, x_B), \\ \dot{x}_C = F_C - r_2(x_B, x_C), \\ \dot{x}_D = F_D - r_3(x_C, x_D), \\ \dot{x}_E = F_E - r_4(x_D, x_E), \\ \dot{x}_F = r_1(x_A, x_B) + r_2(x_B, x_C) + r_3(x_C, x_D) + r_4(x_D, x_E) + r_5(x_A, x_E) - r_6(x_F). \end{cases}$$

The system in (59) admits oscillations when endowed with Michaelis–Menten kinetics. For example, for the choice of parameters

$$(60) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = 1 - 2\frac{x_E x_A}{1+x_A}, \\ \dot{x}_B = 1 - 2\frac{x_A x_B}{1+x_B}, \\ \dot{x}_C = 1 - 2\frac{x_B x_C}{1+x_C}, \\ \dot{x}_D = 1 - 2\frac{x_C x_D}{1+x_D}, \\ \dot{x}_E = 1 - 2\frac{x_D x_E}{1+x_E}, \\ \dot{x}_F = 2\frac{x_E x_A}{1+x_A} + 2\frac{x_A x_B}{1+x_B} + 2\frac{x_B x_C}{1+x_C} + 2\frac{x_C x_D}{1+x_D} + 2\frac{x_D x_E}{1+x_E} - 5x_F, \end{cases}$$

the point $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ is an unstable equilibrium. Nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1.01, 1)$ converge to a stable periodic orbit. See Figure 5 and Figure 6.

An identical construction as above can be also used in a mass-action context. We just substitute the catalysts (A, B, C, D, E) with $(2A, 2B, 2C, 2D, 2E)$. This does not change the stoichiometric matrix





Figure 6: The picture shows numerical simulations for the system in (60). The initial condition $x(0) = [0.15944159, 4.70616422, 0.12197977, 2.0658755, 3.29519854, 6.33865963]$ is chosen in proximity of the periodic orbit. The plot on the left shows the time-evolution of the concentrations of the species A, B, C, D, E in the negative feedback, while the plots in the center and on the right depict in 3d the periodic orbit for (x_A, x_B, x_C) and (x_A, x_D, x_E) , respectively.

of the network, but it changes the Jacobian to our advantage:



It is easy to check that we get indeed the same stoichiometric matrix as (57). Again, there is an unstable-negative feedback of the form in (58). We underline that in a mass-action setting the presence of an unstable core does not automatically guarantee that there exists an unstable equilibrium, even if it is the case in this example. The mass-action system reads

$$(61) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{x}_A = F_A - k_5 x_A x_E^2, \\ \dot{x}_B = F_B - k_1 x_A^2 x_B, \\ \dot{x}_C = F_C - k_2 x_B^2 x_C, \\ \dot{x}_D = F_D - k_3 x_C^2 x_D, \\ \dot{x}_E = F_E - k_4 x_D^2 x_E, \\ \dot{x}_F = k_5 x_A x_E^2 + k_1 x_A^2 x_B + k_2 x_B^2 x_C + k_3 x_C^2 x_D + k_4 x_D^2 x_E - k_6 x_F. \end{cases}$$

For the choice of mass-action constants

$$(62) \quad (k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5, k_6, F_A, F_B, F_C, F_D, F_E) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 5, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1),$$

the equilibrium $(x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D, x_E, x_F) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ is unstable and nearby trajectory converges to a stable periodic orbit. For the initial conditions $(x_A, x_B, x_C, x_D, x_E, x_F) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1.01, 1)$ the simulation shows convergence to a limit cycle. See Figure 7 and 8.




Figure 7: The system in (61) with reaction rates (62) possesses an unstable equilibrium at $x = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$. In the figure, nearby initial conditions $x(0) = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1.01, 1)$ converge to a limit cycle.





Figure 8: The picture shows numerical simulations for the system in (61) with reaction rates (62). The initial condition $x(0) = [2.68177111, 0.12190425, 2.52781617, 0.20023526, 1.05389654, 0.97774366]$ is chosen in proximity of the periodic orbit. The plot on the left shows the time-evolution of the concentrations of the species A, B, C, D, E in the negative feedback, while the plots in the center and on the right depict in 3d the periodic orbit for (x_A, x_B, x_C) and (x_A, x_D, x_E) , respectively.

EXAMPLE D: Non-autocatalytic unstable-positive feedbacks in the dual futile cycle

The dual futile cycle



is a relevant example of a phosphorylation system; it is constituted by two blocks of distributive and sequential phosphorylation steps, where A, B, C are the core molecules, E_1 and E_2 are the enzymes, and I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4 are intermediates. Phosphorylation is widespread in biochemical processes [49], and it is ubiquitous in cell-signaling in general and specifically in the MAPK cascade [50]. Such networks can also be seen as a special case of post-translational modification systems [51]. Hence it is no surprise that they have attracted great interest from the mathematical community, and we do not aim here at an exhaustive literature review. A general framework of analysis for such type of networks has been addressed in [52], and more recently lead to the definition of MESSI networks [53].

Specifically the dual futile cycle, moreover, has posed quite challenging problems as a mathematical toy model. When endowed with Mass Action kinetics, the dual futile cycle has been analyzed via a singular perturbation to a *monotone system* [54]. It was proven that the network admits a *toric equilibrium* [55]. It was also shown that the system admits a *cusplike bifurcation* and consequent bistability [37]. Next, the region of parameters that admits multistationarity has been fully described [56]. In contrast, it is still an open question whether or not the system admits a Hopf bifurcation [57], with some numerical evidence that such bifurcation cannot occur, but no analytical or computer-algebra proof.

The stoichiometric matrix reads

$$(64) \quad S = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} A \\ B \\ C \\ E_1 \\ E_2 \\ I_1 \\ I_2 \\ I_3 \\ I_4 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

We firstly note an obvious \mathbb{Z}_2 -symmetry σ in the network. For species,

$$(65) \quad \sigma(A, B, C, E_1, E_2, I_1, I_2, I_3, I_4) = (C, B, A, E_2, E_1, I_4, I_3, I_2, I_1),$$

and for reactions

$$(66) \quad \sigma(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) = (10, 11, 12, 7, 8, 9, 4, 5, 6, 1, 2, 3).$$

The Jacobian matrix G of the associated dynamical system of the concentrations is a 9×9 matrix. A direct computer-algebra computation of the characteristic polynomial

$$(67) \quad g(\lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^9 (-1)^k c_k \lambda^{9-k}$$

shows that $c_7 = c_8 = c_9 \equiv 0$, implying that G is at most of rank $\text{rank}(G) = 6$. In particular, there are three linear conserved quantities:

$$(68) \quad \begin{cases} w_1 = x_{E_1} + x_{I_1} + x_{I_3}; \\ w_2 = x_{E_2} + x_{I_4} + x_{I_2}; \\ w_3 = x_A + x_B + x_C + x_{I_1} + x_{I_2} + x_{I_3} + x_{I_4}, \end{cases}$$

that correspond to three independent left kernel vectors of the stoichiometric matrix. Note that $\sigma(w_1) = w_2$ and $\sigma(w_3) = w_3$. We expand the remaining coefficients in elementary CB-components as in (38). The expansion for the first four coefficients surprisingly shows that $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = (-1)^k$ or $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = 0$ for all k -CS $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$, $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$. This implies that $\text{sign}(c_1) = \text{sign}(c_2) = \text{sign}(c_3) = \text{sign}(c_4) = 1$ for all choices of parameters, and that in particular there are no generalized-unstable-positive feedbacks (and thus no unstable-positive feedbacks) with less than 5 species. The same expansion for c_5 shows that $|\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]| = 1$ or $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = 0$ for all 5-CS. Moreover, there are only two generalized-positive-feedbacks with $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = (-1)^{5-1}$:

$$(69) \quad S_1 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & 7 & 9 & 4 & 6 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} A \\ E_1 \\ I_3 \\ B \\ I_2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 10 & 4 & 6 & 7 & 9 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} C \\ E_2 \\ I_2 \\ B \\ E_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{matrix}$$

with $\det S_1 = \det S_2 = 1$. We note again that $\sigma(S_1) = S_2$, which is reflected in the fact that the matrices are indeed identical. The same expansion for the coefficient c_6 again shows $|\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]| = 1$ or $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = 0$, for all 6-CS, which concludes that $|\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]| = 1$ for all invertible Child-Selection matrices in the network. Moreover, there are eleven 6-Child-Selection matrices $S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}]$ with $\det S[\boldsymbol{\kappa}] = (-1)^{6-1} = -1$. Among those eleven, five matrices contain as a proper principal submatrix S_1 , and five contain S_2 (again related by the symmetry σ) and thus these are not unstable-cores. The last remaining Child-Selection matrix identifies the following generalized-unstable-positive feedback:

$$(70) \quad S_3 = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & 7 & 9 & 10 & 4 & 6 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} A \\ E_1 \\ I_3 \\ C \\ E_2 \\ I_2 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{matrix}$$

with $\det S_3 = (-1)^{6-1} = -1$, and that satisfies $\sigma(S_3) = S_3$. We then note that S_1, S_2, S_3 are not Metzler matrices, and thus they are non-autocatalytic. However, they all possess autocatalytic twins of the following form:

$$(71) \quad A_1 = A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

which, via Cor. 52, implies that S_1, S_2 , and S_3 are unstable-positive feedbacks. Finally, we conjecture that the above features hold for any n -futile cycles, built iteratively by adding further distributive and

sequential phosphorylation steps. That is, we conjecture that only unstable-positive feedbacks with matrices as $S_1 = S_2$ or S_3 appear and that $|\det S[\kappa]| = 1$ for all invertible Child-Selection matrices. We hope that such a striking structure may help a further understanding of this remarkable family of networks.

Unstable-positive feedback with unstable dimension greater than one

Consider the following unstable-positive feedback:

$$(72) \quad S_1^+ := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 \\ 4 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 4 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 4 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is straightforward to check that S_1^+ is indeed an unstable-positive feedback using the same arguments as for S^+ in the main text, Section 6. Moreover, S_1^+ has two eigenvalues with a negative-real part and three eigenvalues with a positive-real part:

$$(73) \quad (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5) \approx (-4.23607 \pm 2.35114i, 0.236068 \pm 3.80423i, 3).$$

References

- [1] Aris R. Prolegomena to the rational analysis of systems of chemical reactions. *Arch Rational Mech An.* 1965;19:81-99.
- [2] Zhabotinsky AM. Periodical oxidation of malonic acid in solution (a study of the Belousov reaction kinetics). *Biofizika.* 1964;9:306-11. (russian).
- [3] Cassani A, Monteverde A, Piumetti M. Belousov–Zhabotinsky type reactions: the non-linear behavior of chemical systems. *J Math Chem.* 2021;59:792-826.
- [4] Ostwald W. Über Autokatalyse. *Ber Verh Kgl Sächs Ges Wiss Leipzig, Math Phys Class.* 1890;42:189-91.
- [5] Bissette AJ, Fletcher SP. Mechanisms of Autocatalysis. *Angew Chem Int Ed.* 2013;52:12800-26.
- [6] Schuster P. What is special about autocatalysis? *Monatsh Chem.* 2019;150:763-75.
- [7] Kun Á, Papp B, Szathmáry E. Computational identification of obligatorily autocatalytic replicators embedded in metabolic networks. *Genome Biology.* 2008;9:R51.
- [8] Siami M, Motee N, Buzi G, Bamieh B, Khammash M, Doyle JC. Fundamental Limits and Tradeoffs in Autocatalytic Pathways. *IEEE Trans Automat Contr.* 2020;65:733-40.
- [9] Kauffman SA. Autocatalytic Sets of Proteins. *J Theor Biol.* 1986;119:1-24.
- [10] Smith E, Morowitz HJ. Universality in intermediary metabolism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2004;101:13168-73.
- [11] Braakman R, Smith E. The compositional and evolutionary logic of metabolism. *Physical Biology.* 2013;10:011001.
- [12] Kaleta C, Centler F, Dittrich P. Analyzing molecular reaction networks: from pathways to chemical organizations. *Mol Biotechnol.* 2006;34:117-23.

- [13] Benkő G, Centler F, Dittrich P, Flamm C, Stadler BMR, Stadler PF. A Topological Approach to Chemical Organizations. *Alife*. 2009;15:71-88.
- [14] Andersen JL, Flamm C, Merkle D, Stadler PF. Maximizing output and recognizing autocatalysis in chemical reaction networks is NP-complete. *J Syst Chem*. 2012;3:1.
- [15] Deshpande A, Gopalkrishnan M. Autocatalysis in reaction networks. *Bull Math Biol*. 2014;76:2570-95.
- [16] Barenholz U, Davidi D, Reznik E, Bar-On Y, Antonovsky N, Noor E, et al. Design principles of autocatalytic cycles constrain enzyme kinetics and force low substrate saturation at flux branch points. *eLife*. 2017;6:e20667.
- [17] Blokhuis A, Lacoste D, Nghe P. Universal motifs and the diversity of autocatalytic systems. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2020;117(41):25230-6.
- [18] Unterberger J, Nghe P. Stoichiometric and dynamical autocatalysis for diluted chemical reaction networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 2022;85(3):26.
- [19] Andersen JL, Flamm C, Merkle D, Stadler PF. Defining Autocatalysis in Chemical Reaction Networks. *J Systems Chem*. 2020;8:121-33.
- [20] Gyorgyi L, Field RJ. Simple models of deterministic chaos in the Belousov-Zhabotinskii reaction. *J Phys Chem*. 1991;95(17):6594-602.
- [21] Hsu SB, Chen KC. Ordinary differential equations with applications. vol. 23. World scientific; 2022.
- [22] Guckenheimer J, Holmes P. Nonlinear oscillations, dynamical systems and bifurcations of vector fields. Springer; 1984.
- [23] Michaelis L, Menten ML. Die Kinetik der Invertinwirkung. *Biochem Z*. 1913;49:333-69.
- [24] Hill AV. The possible effects of the aggregation of the molecules of haemoglobin on its dissociation curves. *J Physiol*. 1910;40:4-7.
- [25] Müller S, Regensburger G. Generalized mass action systems: Complex balancing equilibria and sign vectors of the stoichiometric and kinetic-order subspaces. *SIAM J Appl Math*. 2012;72(6):1926-47.
- [26] Soulé C. Graphic requirements for multistationarity. *ComplexUs*. 2003;1(3):123-33.
- [27] Banaji M, Donnell P, Baigent S. P matrix properties, injectivity, and stability in chemical reaction systems. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*. 2007;67(6):1523-47.
- [28] Angeli D, De Leenheer P, Sontag ED. A Petri net approach to the study of persistence in chemical reaction networks. *Mathematical biosciences*. 2007;210(2):598-618.
- [29] Guldberg CM, Waage P. Etudes sur les affinités chimiques. Imprimerie de Brøgger & Christie; 1867.
- [30] Vassena N. Symbolic hunt of instabilities and bifurcations in reaction networks. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems B*. 2023.
- [31] Arrow KJ, McManus M. A note on dynamical stability. *Econometrica*. 1958;26:448-54.
- [32] Kushel OY. Unifying matrix stability concepts with a view to applications. *SIAM Review*. 2019;61(4):643-729.
- [33] Wang X. A Simple Proof of Descartes's Rule of Signs. *American Mathematical Monthly*. 2004;111(6):525-6.

- [34] Smith E, Morowitz HJ, Copley SD. Core Metabolism as a Self-Organized System. In: Rasmussen S, Bedau MA, Chen L, Deamer D, Krakauer DC, Packard NH, et al., editors. *Protocells: Bridging Nonliving and Living Matter*. MIT Press; 2008. p. 432-60.
- [35] Duan X, Jafarpour S, Bullo F. Graph-Theoretic Stability Conditions for Metzler Matrices and Monotone Systems. *SIAM J Control Opt.* 2021;59(5):3447-71.
- [36] Gershgorin SA. Über die Abgrenzung der Eigenwerte einer Matrix. *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS Classe des sciences mathématiques et naturelles.* 1931;6:749-54.
- [37] Hell J, Rendall AD. A proof of bistability for the dual futile cycle. *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications.* 2015;24:175-89.
- [38] Feinberg M. Chemical reaction network structure and the stability of complex isothermal reactors—I. The deficiency zero and deficiency one theorems. *Chemical Engineering Science.* 1987;42(10):2229-68.
- [39] Banaji M, Craciun G. Graph-theoretic criteria for injectivity and unique equilibria in general chemical reaction systems. *Advances in Applied Mathematics.* 2010;44(2):168-84.
- [40] Shinar G, Feinberg M. Concordant chemical reaction networks. *Mathematical Biosciences.* 2012;240(2):92-113.
- [41] Feinberg M. *Foundations of Chemical Reaction Network Theory*. Springer; 2019.
- [42] Banaji M, Pantea C. Some results on injectivity and multistationarity in chemical reaction networks. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems.* 2016;15(2):807-69.
- [43] Despons A, De Decker Y, Lacoste D. Structural constraints limit the regime of optimal flux in autocatalytic reaction networks. *arXiv*; 2023.
- [44] Gagrani P, Blanco V, Smith E, Baum D. The geometry and combinatorics of an autocatalytic ecology in chemical and cluster chemical reaction networks. *arXiv*; 2023.
- [45] Narendra KS, Shorten R. Hurwitz Stability of Metzler Matrices. *IEEE Trans Automatic Control.* 2010;55(6):1484-7.
- [46] Bullo F. *Lectures on network systems*. vol. 1. Kindle Direct Publishing; 2020.
- [47] Field RJ, Noyes RM. Oscillations in chemical systems. IV. Limit cycle behavior in a model of a real chemical reaction. *J Chem Phys.* 1974;60(5):1877-84.
- [48] Vassena N. Structural Conditions for Saddle-Node Bifurcations in Chemical Reaction Networks. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems.* 2023;22(3):1639-72.
- [49] Cohen P. The structure and regulation of protein phosphatases. *Annual Review Biochemistry.* 1989;58(1):453-508.
- [50] Huang CY, Ferrell Jr JE. Ultrasensitivity in the mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 1996;93(19):10078-83.
- [51] Thomson M, Gunawardena J. The rational parameterisation theorem for multisite post-translational modification systems. *J Theor Biology.* 2009;261(4):626-36.
- [52] Thomson M, Gunawardena J. Unlimited multistability in multisite phosphorylation systems. *Nature.* 2009;460(7252):274-7.
- [53] Pérez Millán M, Dickenstein A. The Structure of MESSI Biological Systems. *SIAM J Appl Dyn Syst.* 2018;17(2):1650-82.
- [54] Wang L, Sontag ED. Singularly Perturbed Monotone Systems and an Application to Double Phosphorylation Cycles. *J Nonlinear Science.* 2008;18(5):527-50.

- [55] Pérez Millán M, Dickenstein A, Shiu A, Conradi C. Chemical reaction systems with toric steady states. *Bull Math Biol.* 2012;74:1027-65.
- [56] Feliu E, Kaihnsa N, de Wolff T, Yürük O. The kinetic space of multistationarity in dual phosphorylation. *J Dynamics Diff Eqns.* 2020;34:1-28.
- [57] Conradi C, Feliu E, Mincheva M. On the existence of Hopf bifurcations in the sequential and distributive double phosphorylation cycle. *Mathematical biosciences and engineering: MBE.* 2019;17(1):494-513.