

mpbn: a simple tool for efficient edition and analysis of elementary properties of Boolean networks

Van-Giang Trinh¹, Belaid Benhamou¹, and Loïc Paulevé²

¹LIRICA team, LIS, Aix-Marseille University, Marseille 13397, France

²Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR5800, F-33400 Talence, France

Abstract. *The tool mpbn offers a Python programming interface for an easy interactive editing of Boolean networks and the efficient computation of elementary properties of their dynamics, including fixed points, trap spaces, and reachability properties under the Most Permissive update mode. Relying on Answer-Set Programming logical framework, we show that mpbn is scalable to models with several thousands of nodes and is one of the best-performing tool for computing minimal and maximal trap spaces of Boolean networks, a key feature for understanding and controlling their stable behaviors. The tool is available at <https://github.com/bnediction/mpbn>.*

1 Introduction

Boolean Networks (BNs) are fundamental models of gene regulation and signalling networks dynamics [1, 2, 3], with decades of extensive theoretical and practical research. The community developed numerous software tools which implement various algorithms for their analysis [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10], and their edition [4, 5, 6]. Over the years, BNs have become a versatile formal modeling framework, and many analysis algorithms have been built on elementary properties of BNs, such as fixed points, trap spaces, and dynamical properties [9]. However, with the constant increase in model size and complexity of Boolean update functions, these previous tools show their performance limitations. Moreover, most of them do not support interactive and easy-to-use edition and revision of Boolean network definitions, which, coupled with basic dynamical analyses, would enable seamless experimentation, including for teaching.

Motivated by the above factors, mpbn offers a simple interface for manipulating BNs and for performing efficient analysis of elementary properties, namely fixed points, trap spaces, as well as transition graph computation with various update modes, and including most permissive reachability [9].

2 Features

Formally, a BN is a function from binary vectors of dimension n to themselves, i.e., of the form $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$. These binary vectors are the states (or configurations) of the BN. In practice, BNs are specified by n Boolean functions $f_i : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for each component $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Most of the time, f_i is expressed

as a propositional logic formula, i.e., with Boolean variables x_1, \dots, x_n and logical connectors. For example, $f_2(x) = x_1 \vee \neg(x_3 \wedge x_4)$, where \wedge, \vee, \neg are respectively the conjunction, disjunction, and negation operators. Also, instead of numbers, components are usually referred to as names (e.g., gene name). In that case, we often write a specification like “ $B := A \vee \neg(C \wedge D)$ ” instead of the former f_2 expression.

mpbn is an open-source Python module which offers both a simple programming interface, and command line utilities. We present here its main features.

2.1 Model edition

In mpbn, a BN is implemented as a map associating component names to their Boolean functions, expressed in propositional logic. It directly supports loading models from the BooleanNet format [4] (`.bnet`) that is prevalent in the BN research community, and most other usual formats through the `biolqm` library [11]. A model can be created *ab initio* in mpbn and the map can be updated as standard Python map (`dict`) objects using the BooleanNet format. For example:

```
f = mpbn.MPBooleanNetwork("file.bnet")
f["B"] = "A | !(C & D)"
```

The internal representation of functions can be controlled. By default, mpbn will convert the expression to its Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF), i.e., disjunction of conjunctions with negation only in front of variables. If a variable appears both with and without a negation, mpbn will represent the function using a Binary Decision Diagram (BDD). mpbn also offers the possibility to preserve the structure as given. The internal representation can influence the efficiency of the analysis. Model edited with mpbn can then be exported to text files in the BooleanNet format for analysis with other tools.

2.2 Most permissive dynamics

From a state of the BN, an *update mode* enables to compute the next possible states according to f . Traditionally, these update modes reflect the different interleavings and simultaneous applications of component updates: in *synchronous*, all the components are updated at the same time, i.e., there is one single next state being $f(x)$; in *asynchronous*, only one component is updated, leading to several choices for next states, of the

form $x_1 \cdots x_{i-1} f_i(x) x_{i+1} \cdots x_n$. These dynamics can be summarized by a State Transition Graph (STG), being a directed graph with an edge from state x to y if the update mode enables that transition. In `mpbn` it can be computed using `f.dynamics("asynchronous")` for instance. Other classical update modes are also supported, and custom ones can be defined using `mpbn` programming interface.

However, it has been shown in [9] that (a)synchronous dynamics can preclude trajectories between states which are actually feasible with quantitative models. The recently-introduced *Most Permissive* (MP) update mode overcomes this limitation, by guaranteeing to capture the trajectories of any quantitative model being a *refinement* of the BN, i.e., obtained by introducing threshold, quantities, and kinetics [9]. Besides the computation of the full MP dynamics with `f.dynamics("mp")`, `mpbn` also implements efficient reachability tests: `f.reachability(x,y)` returns True if there exists an MP trajectory from state x to state y . Whereas this checking can be rapidly intractable with the (a)synchronous mode, it has been demonstrated that in the MP mode, it can scale to BNs with hundreds of thousands of nodes [9]. It is worth noting that attractors in the MP mode of a BN (computed by `f.attractors()`) are identical to minimal trap spaces of this BN [9]. In addition, we can easily compute reachable MP attractors: `f.attractors(reachable_from=x)` returns all the MP attractors reachable from state x .

BNs employing the MP mode (MPBNs) have attracted much attention from researchers in the field of logical modeling of biological systems, such as in [12] using MPBNs to unravel new regulatory mechanisms of hematopoietic stem cell aging, and in [13] for prioritization of candidate genes influencing epilepsies.

2.3 Fixed points and trap spaces

A *fixed point* of a BN is a state x such that $f(x) = x$. Fixed points are extensively studied in biological modeling as the stable states of the system; their analysis has been a starting point and a standard way for the BN analysis. A trap space is a particular subcube of $\{0,1\}^n$ [14, 15]. A subcube is characterized by a set of components having a fixed value and can be represented as vectors c in $\{0,1,*\}^n$. Its vertices are the binary vectors $x = \{0,1\}^n$ where the components fixed in c have the same value in x . A subcube $c \in \{0,1,*\}^n$ is a *trap space* if, for each of its vertices x , $f(x)$ is also one of its vertices. Intuitively, a trap space represents a “well-structured” part of the state space from which it is impossible to escape by applying the functions of the BN. Notably, trap spaces of a BN are *independent* of its update mode. An *attractor* is a non-empty set of states such that once entered it, the BN’s dynamics cannot escape from it. In contrast to trap spaces, attractors are *dependent* of the employed update mode of the BN. Note however that attractor computation is the major analysis on BNs because attractors are linked to biological phenotypes [2, 3], and there is a rich history of methods developed for it [16].

A trap space is *minimal* if it does not contain any other trap space. Fixed points are particular cases of minimal trap spaces where all components are fixed [14]. Mini-

mal trap spaces have been studied as good approximations of attractors of BNs with the asynchronous update mode [7, 9, 17]. A trap space is *maximal* if it is not included in any other trap space, except the full cube $\{0,1\}^n$ [14]. Maximal trap spaces are also employed for the computation of attractors and for the computation of control strategies to drive the system towards specific attractors [16], which play a role in systems medicine. Furthermore, both minimal and maximal trap spaces (also ones restricted to specific subcubes) have been used in several phenotype-based control approaches of biological models [18, 19].

`mpbn` implements the enumeration of fixed points, minimal and maximal trap spaces in BNs, possibly restricted to specific subcubes. Furthermore, it is possible to perform a partial enumeration of them. Under the hood, the computation is performed using logic programming with Answer-Set Programming and the solver `clingo` [20].

From extensive benchmarks on real-world and randomly generated models, we observed that `mpbn` is the sole tool able to address the computation of minimal and maximal trap spaces and fixed points on the full range of models, and with substantially better performance than state-of-the-art tools, especially in large and complex models. Table 4 shows a summary of benchmark results for minimal trap spaces on four sets of models with different properties: First, the BBM repository [21] that consists of 212 published *biologically relevant* BNs, ranging up to 321 variables. Second, the set of 23 other non-trivial and *biologically relevant* BNs collected from various bibliographic sources in the literature, ranging up to 4691 variables (see Table 3 of Supplement for more details). Third, a dataset of Very Large Boolean Networks (VLBN) [9] consisting of 28 *random* BNs, ranging up to 100,000 variables. And fourth, a dataset (namely AEON) of 100 *random* BNs of up to 1016 variables, generated by using the generator provided in [22]. In our experiments, we compared `mpbn` with `pyboolnet` [7] and `trapmvn` [23], which are to our best knowledge the most recent and efficient tools for trap space and fixed point enumeration in BNs. In addition, we only measured the time to compute the first result, which we believe to make the most fair comparison among the considered techniques because when there are multiple solutions, a benchmark is often testing the technical ability of the implementation to enumerate them quickly, instead of the actual problem-solving. Note that we here omit the benchmark results for maximal trap spaces and fixed points because they do not reveal any conclusions that are not covered by the minimal trap space case. All details of the experiments are given in Section “Experiments” of Supplement.

2.4 Example of usage

For illustration, Figure 1 shows an example of usage for these computations using the Python API. The command line utility of `mpbn` offers similar features.

We consider a BN with three nodes (a , b , and c) and three associated Boolean functions: $f_a = \neg b$, $f_b = \neg a$, and $f_c = \neg(a \wedge \neg b) \wedge \neg c$. `mpbn` can load this BN from an input file in the BooleanNet format. The input file

Table 1: Summary of tool performance when computing the first minimal trap space. Columns 2-7 give the number of models completed within the respective time limit.

212 BBM models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	141	167	186	190	200	200
trapmvn	206	208	211	211	211	211
mpbn	207	211	212	212	212	212
23 selected models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	4	5	5	8	10	10
trapmvn	14	15	16	22	23	23
mpbn	15	20	23	23	23	23
28 VLBN models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	0	7	8	14	20
mpbn	4	8	16	20	28	28
100 AEON models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	6	47	96	100	100
mpbn	100	100	100	100	100	100

can be located in the local machine or online. For convenience, `mpbn` also supports inline initialization, and we use it here (see Row In [2]). The list of Boolean functions of this BN is printed out in DNF when typing `f` (see Row Out [2]). The influence graph of a BN is a signed directed graph where a vertex denotes a node of the BN and an edge $(u, sign, v)$ denotes the effect (activating if $sign = +$ and inhibiting if $sign = -$) of node u on node v [24]. By typing `f.influence_graph()`, the graphical representation of this graph is displayed (see Row Out [3]). Then we can compute all minimal and maximal trap spaces of the BN by typing `f.minimal_trapspaces()` and `f.maximal_trapspaces()`, respectively. Rows Out [4] and Out [5] show the tabular representations of the results, respectively. By typing `f.dynamics("asynchronous")`, the STG of the BN under the asynchronous update mode is obtained and displayed graphically (see Row Out [7]). Finally, we check if state x reaches state y in the STG by typing `f.reachability(x, y)`. For the present STG, 000 reaches 111 and 010 does not reach 100. Hence, the function returns `True` (see Row Out [8]) and `False` (see Row Out [9]), respectively.

3 Conclusion

`mpbn` is distributed as a Python PyPi package (`pip install mpbn`) and conda package (`conda install -c colomoto -c potassco mpbn`) under the BSD free software license. It is also included in the CoLoMoTo Docker distribution [8]. Its source code is available at <https://github.com/bnediction/mpbn> together with documen-

```
In [1]: import mpbn

In [2]: #f = mpbn.Load("file.bnet") # can be url
# or ab initio:
f = mpbn.MPBooleanNetwork({
    "a": "!b",
    "b": "!a",
    "c": "!(a & !b) & !c",
})
f

Out[2]: a <- !b
        b <- !a
        c <- !(a&!c)|(b&!c)

In [3]: f.influence_graph()

Out[3]:
    graph TD
      a((a)) -- "-" --> b((b))
      b -- "+" --> c((c))
      a -- "+" --> c
      c -- "+" --> c
```

```
In [4]: from pandas import DataFrame
        DataFrame(f.minimal_trapspaces())

Out[4]:
   a b c
0  1  0  0
1  0  1  *
```

```
In [5]: DataFrame(f.maximal_trapspaces())

Out[5]:
   a b c
0  0  1  *
1  1  0  *
```

```
In [7]: f.dynamics("asynchronous")

Out[7]:
    graph TD
      110((110)) --> 111((111))
      110 --> 010((010))
      110 --> 000((000))
      111 --> 101((101))
      111 --> 011((011))
      010 --> 101
      010 --> 011
      000 --> 001((001))
      000 --> 011
      001 --> 100((100))
      011 --> 100
      101 --> 100
      100 --> 110
```

```
In [8]: f.reachability({a: 0 for a in f}, {a:1 for a in f})

Out[8]: True

In [9]: f.reachability({"a": 0, "b": 1, "c": 0}, {"a":1,"b":0,"c":0})

Out[9]: False
```

Figure 1: Example of usage within a Jupyter notebook

tation and examples. Models and scripts used for the benchmarks are provided at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10781704>.

Combining a simple interface with state-of-the-art resolution algorithms, `mpbn` is suited for all (1) Boolean model

elementary analysis with state-of-the-art performance; (2) tool development, as a base (Python) library for implementing advanced analysis, such as attractor analysis and control; and (3) teaching, with interactive edition of BNs, analysis of their basic features, including computation of STGs with different update modes. We believe that `mpbn` can become a standard toolbox in the field of Boolean network research and has the great potential to promote the study of mechanisms and control of biological processes.

Acknowledgements

Work of L.P is supported by the French Agence Nationale pour la Recherche (ANR) in the scope of the project “BNe-Diction” (grant number ANR-20-CE45-0001). Work of V-G.T is supported by Institute Carnot STAR, Marseille, France.

References

- [1] Leon Glass and Stuart A Kauffman. The logical analysis of continuous, non-linear biochemical control networks. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 39(1):103–129, 1973.
- [2] René Thomas. Boolean formalisation of genetic control circuits. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 42:565–583, 1973.
- [3] Rui-Sheng Wang, Assieh Saadatpour, and Reka Albert. Boolean modeling in systems biology: an overview of methodology and applications. *Phys. Biol.*, 9(5):055001, 2012.
- [4] Christoph Müssel, Martin Hopfensitz, and Hans A. Kestler. BoolNet - an R package for generation, reconstruction and analysis of Boolean networks. *Bioinform.*, 26(10):1378–1380, 2010.
- [5] Claudine Chaouiya, Aurélien Naldi, and Denis Thieffry. Logical modelling of gene regulatory networks with GINSim. In *Bacterial Molecular Networks*, pages 463–479. Springer, 2012.
- [6] Tomás Helikar, Bryan M. Kowal, Sean McClenathan, et al. The Cell Collective: Toward an open and collaborative approach to systems biology. *BMC Syst. Biol.*, 6:96, 2012.
- [7] Hannes Klärner, Adam Streck, and Heike Siebert. Py-BoolNet: a python package for the generation, analysis and visualization of Boolean networks. *Bioinform.*, 33(5):770–772, 2017.
- [8] Aurélien Naldi, Céline Hernandez, Nicolas Levy, et al. The CoLoMoTo interactive notebook: accessible and reproducible computational analyses for qualitative biological networks. *Front. Physiol.*, 9:680, 2018.
- [9] Loïc Paulevé, Juraj Kolčák, Thomas Chatain, et al. Reconciling qualitative, abstract, and scalable modeling of biological networks. *Nat. Commun.*, 11(1):1–7, August 2020.
- [10] Van-Giang Trinh, Belaid Benhamou, Kunihiko Hiraishi, et al. Minimal trap spaces of logical models are maximal siphons of their Petri net encoding. In *International Conference on Computational Methods in Systems Biology*, pages 158–176. Springer, 2022.
- [11] Claudine Chaouiya, Duncan Bérenguier, Sarah M. Keating, et al. SBML qualitative models: a model representation format and infrastructure to foster interactions between qualitative modelling formalisms and tools. *BMC Syst. Biol.*, 7(1):1–15, 2013.
- [12] Léonard Héroult, Mathilde Poplineau, Estelle Duprez, et al. A novel Boolean network inference strategy to model early hematopoiesis aging. *Comput. Struct. Biotechnol. J.*, 21:21–33, 2023.
- [13] Clémence Réda and Andrée Delahaye-Duriez. Prioritization of candidate genes through Boolean networks. In *International Conference on Computational Methods in Systems Biology*, pages 89–121. Springer, 2022.
- [14] Hannes Klärner, Alexander Bockmayr, and Heike Siebert. Computing maximal and minimal trap spaces of Boolean networks. *Nat. Comput.*, 14(4):535–544, 2015.
- [15] Kyungduk Moon, Kangbok Lee, and Loïc Paulevé. Computational complexity of minimal trap spaces in Boolean networks, 2023.
- [16] Jordan C. Rozum, Jorge Gómez Tejada Zañudo, Xiao Gan, et al. Parity and time reversal elucidate both decision-making in empirical models and attractor scaling in critical Boolean networks. *Sci. Adv.*, 7(29):eabf8124, July 2021.
- [17] Van-Giang Trinh, Kunihiko Hiraishi, and Belaid Benhamou. Computing attractors of large-scale asynchronous Boolean networks using minimal trap spaces. In *ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Health Informatics*, pages 13:1–13:10. ACM, 2022.
- [18] Laura Cifuentes Fontanals, Elisa Tonello, and Heike Siebert. Control strategy identification via trap spaces in Boolean networks. In *International Conference on Computational Methods in Systems Biology*, pages 159–175. Springer, 2020.
- [19] Jordan C Rozum, Dávid Deritei, Kyu Hyong Park, et al. pystablemotifs: Python library for attractor identification and control in Boolean networks. *Bioinform.*, 38(5):1465–1466, 2021.
- [20] Martin Gebser, Benjamin Kaufmann, Roland Kaminski, et al. Potassco: The Potsdam answer set solving collection. *AI Commun.*, 24(2):107–124, 2011.
- [21] Samuel Pastva, David Safranek, Nikola Benes, et al. Repository of logically consistent real-world Boolean network models. *bioRxiv*, 2023.
- [22] Nikola Benes, Lubos Brim, Samuel Pastva, et al. Computing bottom SCCs symbolically using transition guided reduction. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 505–528. Springer, 2021.
- [23] Van-Giang Trinh, Belaid Benhamou, Thomas Henzinger, et al. Trap spaces of multi-valued networks: definition, computation, and applications. *Bioinf.*, 39(Supplement_1):i513–i522, 2023.
- [24] Loïc Paulevé and Adrien Richard. Static analysis of Boolean networks based on interaction graphs: a survey. *Electron. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 284:93–104, 2012.

Supplement

A Methods

In the tool `mpbn`, the computation of fixed points and minimal and maximal trap spaces is performed by the means of Answer-Set Programming (ASP), a declarative logic framework, and the solver `clingo` [20]. Essentially, fixed point and trap space identification problems are translated as logic satisfiability problems, where each solution corresponds to a fixed point or trap space of the input Boolean network. In this section, we detail a slightly simplified version of the ASP encoding using in `mpbn`, and which extends the one presented in [Supp2] by adding support to non-monotone Boolean functions, i.e., functions that depend both positively and negatively on a same variable (e.g., exclusive-or functions).

A.1 Basic definitions

A *Boolean Network* (BN) is specified by a function $f: \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$, where $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$ is the Boolean domain. A Boolean function $f_i: \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is *unate* (or *monotone*) if, for each component $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, one of the two following properties holds:

- for every vector $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$,

$$f_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 0, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n) \leq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 1, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

- for every vector $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$,

$$f_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 0, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n) \geq f_i(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, 1, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n)$$

If a Boolean function is not monotone, it is said non-monotone. E.g., the function “ $x \mapsto (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2) \vee (\neg x_1 \wedge x_2)$ ” is non-monotone, whereas $x \mapsto \neg x_1 \vee x_2$ is monotone. If, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the (local) function f_i is monotone, then the BN f is said to be *locally-monotone*; otherwise, the BN f is said non-monotone.

A (sub)*cube* is a set of Boolean vectors which is characterized by a vector in $X \subseteq \{0, 1, *\}^n$ and has vertices $\{x \in \mathbb{B}^n \mid \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, X_i \neq * \implies x_i = X_i\}$. A cube X is a *trap space* for the BN f if it is closed by f , i.e., for each vertex $x \in X$ of the cube, $f(x)$ is also one of its vertices.

In the scope of this supplement, a *Binary Decision Diagram* (BDD) is a directed acyclic graph with a single root node and two leaf nodes. Each leaf node is associated to a value in \mathbb{B} and each non-leaf node is associated to a BN component in $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Each non-leaf node has two children, and every path from the root to a leaf traverses at most one node associated to each BN component.

A.2 ASP encoding

We give a very brief overview of Answer-Set Programming (ASP) syntax and semantics that we use in the next sections; see [Supp3] for more details.

An ASP program is a Logic Program (LP) being a set of logical rules with first order logic predicates of the form:

$$a_0 \leftarrow a_1, \dots, a_n, \text{ not } a_{n+1}, \dots, \text{ not } a_{n+k}.$$

where a_i are (variable-free) atoms, i.e., elements of the Herbrand base, which is built from all the possible predicates of the LP. The Herbrand base is built by instantiating the LP predicates with the LP terms (constants or elements of the Herbrand universe).

Essentially, such a logical rule states that when all a_1, \dots, a_n are true and none of a_{n+1}, \dots, a_{n+k} can be proven to be true, then a_0 has to be true as well. Whenever a_0 is \perp (false), the rule, also called an *integrity constraint*, becomes:

$4 \leftarrow a_1, \dots, a_n, \text{ not } a_{n+1}, \dots, \text{ not } a_{n+k}.$

Such a rule is satisfied only if the right hand side of the rule is false (at least one of a_1, \dots, a_n is false or at least one of a_{n+1}, \dots, a_{n+k} is true). On the other hand, $a_0 \leftarrow \top$ (a_0 is always true) is abbreviated as a_0 .

Because our encoding does not involve default negation (not), a solution (answer) is a subset-minimal Herbrand model (see [Supp4]), that is, a minimal set of true atoms where all the logical rules are satisfied.

ASP allows using variables (starting with an upper-case) instead of terms/predicates: these *template* declarations will be expanded to the corresponding propositional logic rules prior to the solving, in the *grounding* phase.

We also use the notations $\mathbf{a}((\mathbf{x};\mathbf{y}))$ which is expanded to $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{y}); n \{ \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}) : \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X}) \} m$ which is satisfied when at least n and at most m $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X})$ are true where \mathbf{X} ranges over the true $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X})$; and $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X}) : \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X})$ which is satisfied when for each $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X})$ true, $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{X})$ is true. If any term follows such a condition, it is separated with $;$. Finally, rules of form

$5 \{ \mathbf{a} \} \leftarrow \text{body}.$

leave the choice to make \mathbf{a} true or not whenever the body is satisfied.

In the following, we assume fixing a BN $f: \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$.

A.2.1 Encoding of Boolean functions

For each node a of the BN, we declare an atom

$6 \text{ node}(a).$

Let $\text{DNF}[f_a] = C_1 \vee \dots \vee C_k$ be a Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) of f_a , where C_i is a clause of the form $C_i^1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_i^{l_i}$ ($l_i \geq 1$) where each literal $C_i^m, m \in \{1, \dots, l_i\}$ is either a node of the BN or the negation of a node. We require that the DNF is well formed in the sense that no clause subsumes another (i.e., there are no $C_i, C_j, i \neq j$ such that $\{C_i^1, \dots, C_i^{l_i}\} \subseteq \{C_j^1, \dots, C_j^{l_j}\}$), and there is no clause containing a literal and its negation. Whenever $k = 0$, i.e., f_a has no clause, f_a is the constant False function and is declared in our encoding as

$7 \text{ constant}(a, -1).$

Whenever $C_1 = \emptyset$, i.e., f_a has an empty clause, f_a is the constant True function and is declared in our encoding as:

$8 \text{ constant}(a, 1).$

Otherwise, for each clause $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and each $m \in \{1, \dots, l_i\}$, if the literal C_i^m is positive, i.e., it is a node b , it is declared as:

$9 \text{ clause}(a, i, b, 1).$

otherwise, i.e., it is the negation of a node b , it is declared as:

$10 \text{ clause}(a, i, b, -1).$

If there is no node b which appears both positively in one clause C_i and negatively in another clause C_j , f_a is unate (montone). Note that this is only a sufficient condition. In that case, we add the atom

$11 \text{ unate}(a).$

Otherwise, `mpbn` computes a reduced-ordered BDD representation of f_a we denote as BDD_a and encode its graph representation. For each non-leaf node d of the BDD testing the BN component b of the BN and having respectively d_0 and d_1 as low and high children, we declare the following atom:

$12 \text{ bdd}(z, b, (a, d_0), (a, d_1)).$

where $z = a$ if d is the root node, otherwise $z = (a, d)$. Finally, only the leaf node d for value False is declared:

13 `bdd((z,d),-1)`.

where z is defined as above.

It is required that each path from the root to a leaf node of the BDD never traverses two nodes testing a same BN component. This is the case for the BDDs computed in `mpbn` by employing the `pyeda` Python library¹.

A.2.2 Encoding of Boolean function application

The following encoding ensures that, for a defined cube X , `eval(X,N,-1)` (resp. `eval(X,N,1)`) is derived if and only if there exists a vertex in the cube where the Boolean function of node N is False (resp. True).

The first case is whenever the Boolean function is constant:

14 `eval(X,N,V) ← cube(X), node(N), constant(N,V)`.

Otherwise, the Boolean function is encoded as DNF using the atoms defined above. We separated two cases: the evaluation to True, which is always performed using the DNF, and the evaluation to False, which is performed using the DNF representation only whenever the Boolean function is unate. Otherwise, the evaluation to False is performed by the means of the BDD representation of the Boolean function.

The evaluation from the DNF is performed as follows: `evaldnf(X,N,C,1)` is derived if and only if each literal of the C -th clause is in the cube, i.e., there is one vertex in the cube for which the clause is satisfied. Similarly, `evaldnf(X,N,C,-1)` is derived if and only if at least the *negation* of one literal C -th clause is in the cube, i.e., there is one vertex in the cube for which the clause is not satisfied:

15 `evaldnf(X,N,C,1) ← cube(X,M,V) : clause(X,M,V); cube(X), clause(N,C,_,_)`.

16 `evaldnf(X,N,C,-1) ← cube(X,M,-V), clause(N,C,M,V)`.

Then, `eval(X,N,1)` is derived whenever at least one of its clause has been satisfied. And, whenever the Boolean function is unate, `eval(X,N,-1)` is derived if all the clause can be unsatisfied:

17 `eval(X,N,1) ← evaldnf(X,N,C,1), clause(N,C,_,_)`.

18 `eval(X,N,-1) ← evaldnf(X,N,C,-1) : clause(N,C,_,_); node(N), cube(X), clause(N,_,_,_); unate(N)`.

Finally, whenever the BDD is present, i.e., whenever the Boolean function is not unate, `eval(X,N,-1)` is derived if and only if there exists a path in the BDD which matches with the cube and which leads to the negative (-1) leaf:

19 `eval(X,N,-1) ← evalbdd(X,N,-1), node(N), cube(X)`.

20 `evalbdd(X,V,V) ← cube(X), V=-1`.

21 `evalbdd(X,B,V) ← bdd(B,N,_,HI), cube(X,N,1), evalbdd(X,HI,V)`.

22 `evalbdd(X,B,V) ← bdd(B,N,LO,_), cube(X,N,-1), evalbdd(X,LO,V)`.

23 `evalbdd(X,B,V) ← cube(X), bdd(B,V), V=-1`.

A.2.3 Encoding of fixed points

We take advantage of the generic evaluation of Boolean functions over cubes to encode the fixed point identification problem as follows: we declare a cube `fb` which consists of a single vertex, together with an integrity constraint which ensures that the evaluation of each Boolean function on that cube does not lead to a different value:

24 `cube(fb)`.

25 `1 { cube(fb,N,(-1;1)) } 1 ← node(N)`.

26 `← cube(fb,N,V), eval(fb,N,-V)`.

The list of fixed points is then obtained by enumerating all the answer sets projected to the atoms of the form `cube(fb,N,V)`.

¹<https://pyeda.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

A.2.4 Encoding of trap spaces

Recall that trap spaces are cubes closed by Boolean functions. Therefore, starting from a first non-empty cube \mathbf{ts} , $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{V})$ is derived whenever $\mathbf{eval}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{V})$ can be derived from the cube.

```

27 cube(ts) .
28 1 { cube(ts, N, (-1;1)) } ← node(N) .
29 cube(ts, N, V) ← eval(X, N, V) .

```

Then the set of all trap spaces of the BN one-to-one corresponds to the set of all answer sets projected over the atoms of the form of $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{V})$. From such an answer set, one can reconstruct the associated trap space X by setting each node a as free (i.e., $X_a = *$) whenever the answer set contains both $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, a, -1)$ and $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, a, 1)$, otherwise, it is fixed to the corresponding value: $X_a = 1$ (resp. $X_a = 0$) if only $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, a, 1$ (resp. $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, a, -1)$) is in the answer set.

The minimal and maximal trap spaces are then enumerated by exploiting the domain heuristics of `clingo` which allows listing only the subset-minimal and subset-maximal answer sets, corresponding exactly and respectively to minimal and maximal trap spaces.

Note that in the case of maximal trap spaces, we need to add a cardinality constraint to exclude from the solution space the trivial trap space \mathbb{B}^n where n is the number of nodes of the BN:

```

30 { cube(ts, N, (-1;1)) : node(N) } (2n - 1).

```

Example. Let us consider the BN:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1 &= \neg x_2 \\
 f_2 &= \neg x_1 \\
 f_3 &= \neg(x_1 \wedge \neg x_2) \wedge \neg x_3
 \end{aligned}$$

We have that $\text{DNF}[f_1] = \neg x_2$, $\text{DNF}[f_2] = \neg x_1$, and $\text{DNF}[f_3] = (\neg x_1 \wedge \neg x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge \neg x_3)$. All the Boolean functions are unate. Then the information about this BN is represented by the set of rules as follows:

```

31 unate(1) .
32 unate(2) .
33 unate(3) .
34
35 clause(1,1,2,0) .
36 clause(2,1,1,0) .
37 clause(3,1,1,0) .
38 clause(3,1,3,0) .
39 clause(3,2,2,1) .
40 clause(3,2,3,0) .

```

Note that the rules for the Boolean function evaluation are fixed. The characterizing rules are fixed for the cases of fixed points and minimal trap spaces. For the case of maximal trap spaces, the cardinality constraint is not fixed, it depends on the number of nodes of the BN. For the considered BN, it is

```

41 { cube(ts, N, (-1;1)) : node(N) } 5.

```

We only consider answer sets projected over the atoms of the form of $\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{V})$. Regarding fixed points, the respective ASP encoding has one answer set $\{\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 1, 1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 2, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, -1)\}$ that corresponds to the fixed point 100 of the BN. Regarding minimal trap spaces, the respective ASP encoding has two subset-minimal answer sets $(\{\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 1, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 2, 1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, 1)\}$ and $\{\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 1, 1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 2, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, -1)\})$ that correspond to two minimal trap spaces (01* and 100) of the BN, respectively. Regarding maximal trap spaces, the respective ASP encoding has two subset-maximal answer sets $(\{\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 1, 1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 2, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, 1)\}$ and $\{\mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 1, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 2, 1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, -1), \mathbf{cube}(\mathbf{ts}, 3, 1)\})$ that correspond to two maximal trap spaces (10* and 01*) of the BN, respectively.

B Experiments

To evaluate the efficiency of `mpbn`, we compared it with other state-of-the-art methods regarding three prominent analysis problems on BNs: minimal trap space enumeration, maximal trap space enumeration, and fixed point enumeration. For each problem instance, we only measured the time to compute the first result, which we believe to make the most fair comparison among the considered methods. Since we tested a large number of both real-world and random models, we set up a time limit of *one hour* for each method on a problem instance.

All the compared tools are available as Python libraries. These libraries along with all benchmark scripts and used data are available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10781704>. All experiments were performed using a desktop computer running Linux on an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6244 CPU at 3.60GHz. We ran the experiments sequentially and in general only used a single core, limited to 32GB of RAM. The running time was measured internally by each experiment script (i.e., it did not count the overhead of starting the Python interpreter). However, it included the time for all steps of the computation.

B.1 Tested tools

We tested a variety of tools that support the enumeration of trap spaces and fixed points in BNs. For each tool, we used its best method for a specific problem type. Regarding `mpbn`, we considered two “milestone” versions where `mpbn` 1.6 is the version described in the original paper [9], and `mpbn` 3.3 is the latest version that provides many new methodological materials (see Section A), especially the ability for handling non-monotone BNs, which was not the case for `mpbn` 1.6.

Table 2 summarizes the existing tools of which we are aware and their supported features for BN analysis. Regarding the minimal trap space enumeration, we omitted `trappist` because `trapmvm` is its successor. `trapmvm` iterates on `trappist` by adding heuristics to improve the Petri net encoding process. We also omitted `biolqm` [Supp6] that relies on BDDs because it always requires to compute all results, in contrast to other ASP-based methods. Moreover, due to the inherent drawbacks of both BDDs and the method itself, `biolqm` is not expected to handle BNs with large size and complex update functions [Supp7]. With the same reasons, we omitted `biolqm` for the maximal trap space enumeration and the fixed point enumeration. Note however that there are three other notable tools that only support the fixed point enumeration: `an-asp` [Supp8], `bns` [Supp9], and `fpcollector` [Supp10]. The approaches of `an-asp` and `trapmvm` are similar as they rely on the transition-based representations of the original BN, and the constructions both rely on the computation of DNFs of Boolean functions. In addition, it has been shown in [23] that `trapmvm` is comparable to `an-asp`, even better on average. `bns` only supports enumerating all fixed points, and it is limited by the complexity of update functions. Indeed, it only handles Boolean functions with less than 20 input variables. When exceeding this bound, it does not compute anything. Similarly, `fpcollector` only supports enumerating all fixed points and it is indeed not expected to handle large and complex BNs. Hence, we omitted `an-asp`, `bns`, and `fpcollector` for the fixed point enumeration. Overall, we have four tested tools for each of the three problem types: `mpbn` 1.6, `mpbn` 3.3, `pyboolnet`, and `trapmvm`. It is worth noting that to our best knowledge `pyboolnet` and `trapmvm` are the most recent and efficient methods for such kinds of analysis on BNs, which is justified by the extensive experiments conducted by [14, Supp7, 23].

B.2 Tested models

We tested the tools on a wide range of real-world and random models. In particular, we used:

Biodivine Boolean Models (BBM) The BBM repository [21] provides a wide variety of published *biologically relevant* BN models. Here, we used the August 2022 edition² that consists of 212 models, ranging up to 321 variables and 1100 regulations.

²<https://github.com/sybila/biodivine-boolean-models/releases/tag/august-2022>

Table 2: Summary of existing tools and their supported features for BN analysis. Columns 2-4 indicate the minimal trap space enumeration, the maximal trap space enumeration, and the fixed point enumeration, respectively.

Tool	Minimal	Maximal	Fixed point
<code>mpbn</code>	yes	yes	yes
<code>pyboolnet</code> [7]	yes	yes	yes
<code>trappist</code> [10, Supp7]	yes	no	no
<code>trapmvn</code> [23]	yes	yes	yes
<code>biolqm</code> [Supp6]	yes	yes	yes
<code>an-asp</code> [Supp8]	no	no	yes
<code>bns</code> [Supp9]	no	no	yes
<code>fpcollector</code> [Supp10]	no	no	yes

Manually selected models To supplement the BBM dataset, we also performed a separate survey of related literature and found 23 additional *biologically relevant* models. These models are non-trivial, even contain a very large number of nodes. A summary of these models, ranging up to 4691 variables, is given in Table 3.

Very Large Boolean Networks (VLBN) The VLBN dataset³ provides 28 *random* BNs with scale-free topology and inhibitor-dominant update functions [9]. The models range up to 100.000 variables. They are very large, but have rather simple non-monotone update functions.

Manually generated models To supplement the VLBN dataset, we also used a dataset (namely AEON) of 100 *random* BNs generated by the generator of [22], ranging up to 1016 variables. This generator uses a degree distribution based on the BBM dataset to sample the network topology. For update functions, it samples from a subset of nested-canalizing unate functions. Compared to the VLBN dataset, it thus covers a smaller range of sizes, but a wider range of update functions.

B.3 Results on minimal trap spaces

Regarding the minimal trap space enumeration, Table 4 summarizes the obtained results. We here reported the number of models completed within a specific time limit for each tool on each dataset. To better visualize the performance scaling of individual tools on the real-world and random models, we prepared Figures 2 and 3, respectively. These figures show in detail how many models can be completed by each tool within a specific time limit. There are 235 models come from the BBM repository and the selected models and 128 random models come from the VLBN and AEON datasets.

For real-world models, we first observed that `mpbn` 3.3 completely overcomes the limitation on non-monotone BNs of `mpbn` 1.6. `mpbn` 3.3 completed much more models than `mpbn` 1.6 for every time limit and all such extra models are non-monotone. This result confirms the efficacy of the new methodological materials that we proposed and implemented in `mpbn` 3.3. Second, we can see that `mpbn` 3.3 is the fastest tool as it completed more models than all the other tools for every time limit. In particular, it is the sole tool that can handle all the BBM models with the time limit 1h. Actually, it completed every BBM model (also selected model) within 10s. Third, although `mpbn` 3.3 is better than `pyboolnet` and `trapmvn`, their performance differences are not much exhibited. This can be explained by the fact that in most of the real-world models, update functions have quite simple forms, even sometimes just simple conjunctions or disjunctions of literals.

For random models, the performance difference between `mpbn` 1.6 and `mpbn` 3.3 is negligible because all the considered random models are locally-monotone. Second, `pyboolnet` could not handle any random model. It is not surprising because these models have complex update functions, which is the main weakness of the ASP encoding based on prime implicants [Supp7]. Third, `trapmvn` completed all the AEON models with the time limit of 10min, but it completed only 20

³<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3714875>

Table 3: Selected real-world models. The table lists total variable count n , the number of source (i.e., input) variables s , and the respective bibliographic reference.

No.	Filename	n	s	Source
1	Rho-family_GTPases_signaling	33	1	[Supp17]
2	tca_cycle	69	35	[Supp18]
3	Executable_...mast_cell_..._BCC	73	19	[Supp19]
4	Leukaemia.free-inputs	107	6	[23]
5	EMT_Mechanosensing	136	4	[Supp20]
6	angiofull	142	28	[Supp21]
7	EMT_Mechanosensing_TGFbeta	150	6	[Supp20]
8	VPC.free-inputs	169	7	[23]
9	InVivo.free-inputs	179	7	[23]
10	Executable_...MAPK_model_BCC	181	37	[Supp19]
11	InVitro.free-inputs	185	9	[23]
12	T-cell_co-receptor_molecules_calcium_channel	206	39	[Supp22]
13	SkinModel.free-inputs	300	10	[23]
14	Leishmania	342	81	[Supp23]
15	Metabolism_demo.free-inputs	355	9	[23]
16	Executable_file_for_cholocystokinin_model_BCC	383	74	[Supp19]
17	ra_map	447	125	[Supp24]
18	CAF-model	463	62	[Supp25]
19	Executable_file_for_Alzheimer_model_BCC	762	237	[Supp19]
20	S1_Table	1659	521	[10]
21	Human_network	1953	669	[10]
22	SN5	2746	829	[10]
23	turei_2016	4691	1257	[10]




Figure 2: Cumulative minimal trap space experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 235 real-world models.

VLBN models (it failed with all 50.000-node and 100.000-node models) with the time limit of 1h. The reason is that for random models, the number of transitions of the Petri net encoding is large, making the ASP encoding more complicated. Moreover, for the majority of the succeeded models, it took more than 10s each. Finally, `mpbn 3.3` vastly outperforms `trapmvn`. It completed much more models than `trapmvn` for every time limit in the case of VLBN models and for all time limits

Table 4: Summary of tool performance when computing the first minimal trap space. Columns 2-7 give the number of models completed within the respective time limit.

212 BBM models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	141	166	187	190	200	200
trapmvn	206	208	211	211	211	211
mpbn 1.6	99	99	99	99	99	99
mpbn 3.3	207	211	212	212	212	212
23 selected models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	4	5	5	8	12	14
trapmvn	14	15	16	22	23	23
mpbn 1.6	5	8	9	9	9	9
mpbn 3.3	15	20	23	23	23	23
28 VLBN models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	0	7	8	14	20
mpbn 1.6	1	7	15	20	28	28
mpbn 3.3	4	8	16	20	28	28
100 AEON models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	6	47	96	100	100
mpbn 1.6	100	100	100	100	100	100
mpbn 3.3	100	100	100	100	100	100




Figure 3: Cumulative minimal trap space experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 128 randomly generated models.

of at most 10s in the case of AEON models. In particular, it is the sole tool that can handle all

VLBN models with the time limit of 1h (actually it can handle every such model within 10min) and it can handle every AEON model within only 0.5s.

B.4 Results on maximal trap spaces

Regarding the maximal trap space enumeration, the results are presented in Table 5 and Figures 4 and 5. These results do not reveal any conclusions that are not covered by the minimal trap space case.

Table 5: Summary of tool performance when computing the first maximal trap space. Columns 2-7 give the number of models completed within the respective time limit.


212 BBM models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	140	166	188	190	200	200
trapmvn	206	208	211	211	211	211
mpbn 1.6	99	99	99	99	99	99
mpbn 3.3	207	211	212	212	212	212
23 selected models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	4	5	5	8	12	14
trapmvn	14	15	16	22	23	23
mpbn 1.6	5	8	9	9	9	9
mpbn 3.3	15	19	23	23	23	23
28 VLBN models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	0	7	10	16	16
mpbn 1.6	1	8	15	20	28	28
mpbn 3.3	4	8	16	23	28	28
100 AEON models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	7	52	96	100	100
mpbn 1.6	100	100	100	100	100	100
mpbn 3.3	100	100	100	100	100	100

B.5 Results on fixed points

Regarding the fixed point enumeration, the results are presented in Table 6 and Figures 6 and 7. These results do not reveal any conclusions that are not covered by the minimal trap space case.


Supplement references

- [Supp1] Martin Gebser, Benjamin Kaufmann, Roland Kaminski, et al. Potassco: The Potsdam answer set solving collection. *AI Commun.*, 24(2):107–124, 2011.
- [Supp2] Stéphanie Chevalier, Christine Froidevaux, Loïc Paulevé, et al. Synthesis of Boolean networks from biological dynamical constraints using answer-set programming. In *International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence*, pages 34–41. IEEE, 2019.



pyboolnet ■ / trapmvm ■ / mpbn 1.6 ■ / mpbn 3.3 ■

Figure 4: Cumulative maximal trap space experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 235 real-world models.



pyboolnet ■ / trapmvm ■ / mpbn 1.6 ■ / mpbn 3.3 ■

Figure 5: Cumulative maximal trap space experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 128 randomly generated models.

- [Supp3] M. Gebser, R. Kaminski, B. Kaufmann, et al. *Answer Set Solving in Practice*. Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. Morgan and Claypool Publishers, 2012.
- [Supp4] Teodor C. Przymusiński. Stable semantics for disjunctive programs. *New Gener. Comput.*, 9(3/4):401–424, 1991.
- [Supp5] Loïc Paulevé, Juraj Kolčák, Thomas Chatain, et al. Reconciling qualitative, abstract, and scalable modeling of biological networks. *Nat. Commun.*, 11(1):1–7, August 2020.
- [Supp6] Aurélien Naldi. BioLQM: a Java toolkit for the manipulation and conversion of logical qualitative models of biological networks. *Front. Physiol.*, 9:1605, 2018.
- [Supp7] Van-Giang Trinh, Belaid Benhamou, and Sylvain Soliman. Trap spaces of Boolean networks are conflict-free siphons of their petri net encoding. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 971:114073, September 2023.

Table 6: Summary of tool performance when computing the first fixed point. Columns 2-7 give the number of models completed within the respective time limit.

212 BBM models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	139	162	185	189	199	199
trapmvn	207	209	211	211	211	211
mpbn 1.6	99	99	99	99	99	99
mpbn 3.3	209	211	212	212	212	212
23 selected models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	3	5	5	8	11	13
trapmvn	15	15	16	23	23	23
mpbn 1.6	5	8	9	9	9	9
mpbn 3.3	15	19	23	23	23	23
28 VLBN models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	0	7	12	18	22
mpbn 1.6	1	5	10	16	20	20
mpbn 3.3	4	8	12	16	24	28
100 AEON models						
Method	<0.5s	<2s	<10s	<1min	<10min	<1h
pyboolnet	0	0	0	0	0	0
trapmvn	0	14	56	96	100	100
mpbn 1.6	99	100	100	100	100	100
mpbn 3.3	100	100	100	100	100	100




Figure 6: Cumulative fixed point experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 235 real-world models.




Figure 7: Cumulative fixed point experiments completed (y-axis) until a specific time point (x-axis, logarithmic). Concerns the 128 randomly generated models.

for the enumeration of attractors in non-deterministic synchronous and asynchronous multi-valued networks. *Algorithms Mol. Biol.*, 12(1):20:1–20:23, 2017.

- [Supp9] Elena Dubrova and Maxim Teslenko. A SAT-based algorithm for finding attractors in synchronous Boolean networks. *IEEE ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.*, 8(5):1393–1399, 2011.
- [Supp10] Julio Aracena, Luis Cabrera-Crot, and Lilian Salinas. Finding the fixed points of a Boolean network from a positive feedback vertex set. *Bioinform.*, 37(8):1148–1155, 2021.
- [Supp11] Van-Giang Trinh, Belaid Benhamou, Thomas Henzinger, et al. Trap spaces of multi-valued networks: definition, computation, and applications. *Bioinf.*, 39(Supplement_1):i513–i522, 2023.
- [Supp12] Hannes Klarner, Alexander Bockmayr, and Heike Siebert. Computing maximal and minimal trap spaces of Boolean networks. *Nat. Comput.*, 14(4):535–544, 2015.
- [Supp13] Hannes Klarner, Adam Streck, and Heike Siebert. PyBoolNet: a python package for the generation, analysis and visualization of Boolean networks. *Bioinform.*, 33(5):770–772, 2017.
- [Supp14] Van-Giang Trinh, Belaid Benhamou, Kunihiko Hiraishi, et al. Minimal trap spaces of logical models are maximal siphons of their Petri net encoding. In *International Conference on Computational Methods in Systems Biology*, pages 158–176. Springer, 2022.
- [Supp15] Samuel Pastva, David Safranek, Nikola Benes, et al. Repository of logically consistent real-world Boolean network models. *bioRxiv*, 2023.
- [Supp16] Nikola Benes, Lubos Brim, Samuel Pastva, et al. Computing bottom SCCs symbolically using transition guided reduction. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*, pages 505–528. Springer, 2021.
- [Supp17] Claus Kadelka, Taras-Michael Butrie, Evan Hilton, et al. A meta-analysis of Boolean network models reveals design principles of gene regulatory networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01216*, 2020.
- [Supp18] Ahmed Abdelmonem Hemedan, Reinhard Schneider, and Marek Ostaszewski. Applications of Boolean modeling to study the dynamics of a complex disease and therapeutics responses. *Front. Bioinf.*, 3:1189723, 2023.
- [Supp19] Sara Sadat Aghamiri, Vidisha Singh, Aurélien Naldi, et al. Automated inference of Boolean models from molecular interaction maps using CaSQ. *Bioinform.*, 36(16):4473–4482, 2020.

- [Supp20] Emmalee Sullivan, Marlayna Harris, Arnav Bhatnagar, et al. Boolean modeling of mechanosensitive Epithelial to Mesenchymal Transition and its reversal. *bioRxiv*, September 2022.
- [Supp21] Nathan Weinstein, Luis Mendoza, Isidoro Gitler, et al. A network model to explore the effect of the micro-environment on endothelial cell behavior during angiogenesis. *Front. Physiol.*, 8:960, November 2017.
- [Supp22] Piyali Ganguli, Saikat Chowdhury, Rupa Bhowmick, et al. Temporal protein expression pattern in intracellular signalling cascade during T-cell activation: A computational study. *J. Biosci.*, 40(4):769–789, September 2015.
- [Supp23] Piyali Ganguli, Saikat Chowdhury, Shomeek Chowdhury, et al. Identification of Th1/Th2 regulatory switch to promote healing response during leishmaniasis: a computational approach. *EURASIP J. Bioinform. Syst. Biol.*, 2015:13, 2015.
- [Supp24] Vidisha Singh, Aurelien Naldi, Sylvain Soliman, et al. A large-scale Boolean model of the rheumatoid arthritis fibroblast-like synoviocytes predicts drug synergies in the arthritic joint. *npj Syst. Biol. Appl.*, 9(1), July 2023.
- [Supp25] Sahar Aghakhani, Sacha E Silva-Saffar, Sylvain Soliman, et al. Hybrid computational modeling highlights reverse Warburg effect in breast cancer-associated fibroblasts. *bioRxiv*, 2023.