

# A necessary condition for non-monotonic dose response, with an application to a kinetic proofreading model – Extended version

Polly Y. Yu<sup>1</sup> and Eduardo Sontag<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

Steady state non-monotonic (“biphasic”) dose responses are often observed in experimental biology, which raises the control-theoretic question of identifying which possible mechanisms might underlie such behaviors. It is well known that the presence of an incoherent feedforward loop (IFFL) in a network may give rise to a non-monotonic response. It has been conjectured that this condition is also necessary, i.e. that a non-monotonic response implies the existence of an IFFL. In this paper, we show that this conjecture is false, and in the process prove a weaker version: that either an IFFL must exist or both a positive loop and a negative feedback loop must exist. Towards this aim, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for when minors of a symbolic matrix have mixed signs. Finally, we study in full generality when a model of immune T-cell activation could exhibit a steady state non-monotonic dose response.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A dose response curve plots the steady state value of an output (the “response”) for a given input (the “dose”). A non-monotonic, or biphasic, dose response curve is either a bell-shaped or U-shaped, characterized by low (respectively high) responses at both low dosage and high dosage. Such curves are commonly observed in biology, including the activation of immune T-cells [1]. In this work, we study what mechanisms underlie steady state biphasic responses.

It is well-known that the presence of an incoherent feedforward loop (IFFL) can result in a steady state response that is non-monotonic; see e.g. [2] or the references in [3]. Negative feedback loops (NFBLs) or IFFLs are necessary, as otherwise the theory of monotone systems implies that the steady state response (“input to state characteristic”) will be monotonic on input values [4], [5]. (In fact, for monotone systems, even transient responses at any given time also behave monotonically on input magnitude.)

It has been argued that IFFLs are also necessary. For example, in [1, main text & SI section “Negative feedback cannot produce a bell-shaped dose-response”], the authors stated that “models without an incoherent feed-forward loop but with negative feedback... cannot produce a bell-shaped dose-response.” That is, the authors conjectured that a biphasic response implies the existence of an IFFL. They justified this claim by performing a numerical search over network architectures, concluding in the statement that “examining these 274 networks showed that the basic mechanism underlying all compatible networks was KPL-IFF” (which is an IFFL from an input to an output). We show that this conjecture is false for general ODE systems by providing a counterexample. Furthermore we prove that a weaker version is true: either an IFFL must exist, or both a positive and a negative feedback loop must exist.


Towards this aim, we define the notions of *quasi-adaptation* (when the steady state response curve has a vanishing derivative), *biphasic response* (when the derivative changes sign), and finally *stable biphasic response* (where the relevant steady state curve is a stable branch). Biphasic response is an algebraic property, in contrast to stable biphasic response, which is dynamical in nature. We also give necessary and sufficient conditions for when

This work was partially supported by grants AFOSR FA9550-22-1-0316 and NSF/DMS-2052455.

<sup>1</sup>University of Illinois Urbana Champaign pollyyuwy@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Northeastern University e.sontag@northeastern.edu

minors of a symbolic matrix have mixed signs, thereby giving necessary conditions for quasi-adaptation. Necessary conditions for stable biphasic response follow from monotone systems theory. The following implication diagrams summarize our results, where all the relevant terms will be defined rigorously.



Finally, inspired by [1], we consider a model for T-cell activation that consists of two components: a kinetic proofreading network whereby antigens bind to T-cell receptors (TCRs), and a downstream network consisting solely of activation and inhibition (defined in Section IV). We show that in order for an output from the downstream network to exhibit stable biphasic response to TCR complexes, it is necessary that either this network contains an IFFL, or it contains both a PFBL and a NFBL.

### A. Notations

The following are some notations used throughout this paper.

- $\mathbb{R}_{\geq}^n$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{>}^n$  are sets of vectors with non-negative and positive components respectively.
- $\hat{e}_i$  is the  $i$ th orthonormal vector of Euclidean space.
- $\hat{e}_{ij}$  is the matrix with a 1 in the  $(i, j)$  position, and zero everywhere else.
- $\mathbf{J}(\gamma, \delta)$  is the submatrix with rows indexed by  $\gamma$  and columns by  $\delta$ ;  $\hat{i}$  refers to all indices except  $i$ . If  $\gamma = \delta$ , we write  $\mathbf{J}(\gamma)$ .
- $\mathbf{J}[\gamma, \delta] = \det \mathbf{J}(\gamma, \delta)$ . We write  $\mathbf{J}[\gamma]$  for  $\mathbf{J}[\gamma, \gamma]$ .

In Section II, we work exclusively with a **signed symbolic matrix**  $\mathcal{J}$ , which is a matrix whose  $(i, j)$  entry is either  $a_{ij}$ ,  $-a_{ij}$ , or 0, where  $a_{ij}$  is a variable. A polynomial, e.g.,  $\det \mathcal{J}$ , is said to have **mixed signs** if, after all possible cancellations, it has both a positive and a negative term.

## II. GRAPH-THEORETIC CONDITIONS FOR MIXED SIGNS IN MINORS OF A SIGNED SYMBOLIC MATRIX

In this section, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for when a (principal or non-principal) minor of a signed symbolic matrix with negative diagonals

$$\mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} - & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ * & - & * & \cdots & * \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ * & \cdots & \cdots & * & - \end{pmatrix}$$

has mixed signs. Typically,  $\mathcal{J}$  comes from the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$  of an ODE system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ ; in such cases, we assume  $[\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})]_{ij} = \partial_j f_i(\mathbf{x})$  is constant in sign for all  $\mathbf{x}$ .

<sup>1</sup>An IFFL from input to output, defined only when input and output are distinct.

<sup>2</sup>When the input is output, a positive feedback loop (PFBL) that is disjoint from the input node. When the input and output are distinct, a PFBL that is vertex-disjoint from an input-output path.

<sup>3</sup>A NFBL that is reachable from the input and to the output.

### A. Graph of a signed symbolic matrix

Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a  $n \times n$  signed symbolic matrix with negative diagonals. We associate it to its **J-graph**  $G$ , a directed graph with  $n$  nodes and signed edges in the typical sense: for any nodes  $i, j$ , there is a positive (respectively negative) edge from  $i$  to  $j$  if  $[\mathcal{J}]_{ji} > 0$  (respectively  $[\mathcal{J}]_{ji} < 0$ ); otherwise there is no edge from  $i$  to  $j$ . We denote such an edge as  $(i, j)$ . By assumption on  $\mathcal{J}$ , every node has a negative self-loop.

We recall some terms commonly used when working with a signed directed graph. A **walk** is a non-empty sequence of directed edges which join a sequence of vertices. A **path** is a simple walk, i.e., no repeating vertices possibly with the exception of the first and last node, in which case, it is a **cycle**. The **sign** of a subset of edges  $E$  is the product of signs of all edges in  $E$ . A subset  $X$  of nodes or edges is said to be **reachable from node**  $i$  (respectively **to node**  $j$ ) if there exists a walk from  $i$  to each element of  $X$  (respectively from every element of  $X$  to  $j$ ). A subset of edges  $E$  is a **disjoint cycle cover** of  $G$  if each connected component is a cycle, and  $E$  covers all the nodes of  $G$ . Note that cycles in a disjoint cycle cover are vertex-disjoint, and some cycles may be self-loops.

A **feedback loop** is a cycle of length at least two. It is a **positive** (respectively **negative**) **feedback loop** if its sign is positive (respectively negative). A **feedforward loop (from  $i$  to  $j$ )** is a pair of paths  $P_1 \neq P_2$  that originate from node  $i$ , and terminate at node  $j \neq i$ . It is a **coherent** (respectively **incoherent**) feedforward loop if the signs of  $P_1, P_2$  are the same (respectively opposite). For simplicity, we refer to the above as PFBL, NFBL, CFFL, and IFFL. Designating  $i$  as input, and  $j \neq i$  as output, we call any path from  $i$  to  $j$  an **input-output path** (I/O path).

Finally, by a subgraph of  $G$ , we mean a subset of edges and all the vertices incident on them. Denote by  $G(\hat{i}, \hat{j})$  the subgraph obtained by deleting all incoming edges to  $i$  and all outgoing edges from  $j$ . Where  $\gamma$  is a subset of nodes, by  $G(\gamma)$  we mean the subgraph obtained by keeping only the nodes in  $\gamma$  and edges incident on those nodes. For example  $G(\hat{1})$  is the subgraph obtained by deleting the node 1 along with any edges coming into or going out of 1.

### B. Mixed signs in minors of a signed symbolic matrix

Consider a principal minor  $\mathcal{J}[\gamma]$ . If  $\gamma = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{J}[\gamma] = \det \mathcal{J}$ . Previous works on multiple steady states gave conditions for when  $\mathcal{J}[\gamma]$  has mixed signs [6], [7].

**Lemma II.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a  $n \times n$  signed symbolic matrix with negative diagonals, and let  $G$  be its J-graph. Let  $\gamma \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The polynomial  $\mathcal{J}[\gamma]$  has mixed signs if and only if  $G(\gamma)$  has a positive feedback loop.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\gamma = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . By Leibniz formula

$$\det \mathcal{J} = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n [\mathcal{J}]_{\sigma(i), i} =: \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} T_\sigma,$$

where the term  $T_\sigma$  is a monomial, and it is nonzero if and only if  $[\mathcal{J}]_{\sigma(i), i} \neq 0$  for all  $i$ . In other words, any nonzero term  $T_\sigma$  is in a one-to-one correspondence with a disjoint cycle cover  $E_\sigma$  of  $G$ . Moreover, the monomials for different  $\sigma$  are algebraically independent, so  $\mathcal{J}$  has mixed signs if and only if there are  $\sigma, \eta \in S_n$  such that  $\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) \text{sgn}(T_\eta) = -1$ .

For any  $T_\sigma \neq 0$ , let  $\sigma = \tau_1 \cdots \tau_p$  be its non-trivial cycle decomposition. Let  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_q$  be its fixed points, and  $\Theta := \{i : \sigma(i) = i\}$ . Recall that  $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = \prod_j \text{sgn}(\tau_j)$  and  $\text{sgn}(\tau_j) = (-1)^{|\tau_j|+1}$ . Since  $[\mathcal{J}]_{\sigma(i), i} \neq 0$  if and only if  $(i, \sigma(i))$  is an edge in  $G$ , each  $\tau_j$  corresponds to a FBL  $C_j$  in  $E_\sigma$ , and each  $\theta_j$  corresponds to a self-loop. The

sign of  $T_\sigma$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sgn}(T_\sigma) &= \left[ \prod_{i \in \Theta} \text{sgn}([\mathcal{J}]_{i,i}) \right] \left[ \prod_{j=1}^p (-1)^{|\tau_j|+1} \text{sgn}(C_j) \right] \\ &= (-1)^n (-1)^p \prod_{j=1}^p \text{sgn}(C_j), \end{aligned}$$

where the product is determined by the number of NFBL among the  $p$  feedback loops in  $E_\sigma$ . Thus

$$\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) = (-1)^n (-1)^{\#\text{PFBL in } E_\sigma}.$$

The fact that every node has a self-loop implies that there is a term  $T_{\text{id}}$  with sign  $(-1)^n$ . Clearly the lack of PFBL would imply that all terms have sign  $(-1)^n$ , and so  $\det \mathcal{J}$  has no mixed signs. Conversely, if there is at least one PFBL  $C$ , the collection of  $C$  and self-loops on nodes not traversed by  $C$  form a disjoint cycle cover, whose corresponding term has sign  $(-1)^{n+1}$ .

The proof for when  $|\gamma| < n$  is identical when considering the subgraph  $G(\gamma)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma II.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a  $n \times n$  signed symbolic matrix with negative diagonals, and let  $G$  be its J-graph. Designate  $i$  as input and  $j$  as output with  $j \neq i$ .*

- 1) *The non-principal minor  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{i}, \hat{j}]$  is identically zero if and only if  $G$  has no input-output path.*
- 2) *Suppose  $G$  has an input-output path. Then  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{i}, \hat{j}]$  has mixed signs if and only if either  $G$  has an incoherent feedforward loop from  $i$  to  $j$ , or  $G$  has a positive feedback loop and an input-output path that are vertex-disjoint.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $i = 1$  and  $j = n$ . Then

$$\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] = (-1)^{n+1} \det \left( \begin{array}{ccc|c} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ \hline & & & 0 \\ & \mathcal{J}(\hat{1}, \hat{n}) & & \vdots \\ & & & 0 \end{array} \right).$$

Denote the above matrix as  $\mathcal{A}$ . Its J-graph  $\tilde{G}$  can be obtained from  $G(\hat{1}, \hat{n})$  adding a positive edge from  $n$  to  $1$ . Again by Leibniz formula,  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{n+1} \text{sgn}(\sigma) [\mathcal{A}]_{\sigma(i), i}$ , where we denote each term as  $T_\sigma$ . Clearly  $T_\sigma \neq 0$  implies that  $\sigma(n) = 1$ , in which case let  $\sigma = \tau_1 \cdots \tau_p$  be its non-trivial cycle decomposition, where  $\tau_1(n) = 1$ . Since any I/O path  $P$  in  $G$  is associated to the cycle  $P \cup (n, 1)$  in  $\tilde{G}$ , the presence of an I/O path implies  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] \neq 0$ . Conversely,  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] \neq 0$  implies  $\tau_1$  corresponds to a cycle  $C_1$  in  $\tilde{G}$  containing the edge  $(n, 1)$ , but then  $C_1 \setminus (n, 1)$  is an I/O path in  $G$ . This proves 1.

Now suppose  $G$  has an I/O path, and consider any  $T_\sigma \neq 0$ , which corresponds to a disjoint cycle cover  $\tilde{E}_\sigma$  of  $\tilde{G}$ . Let  $E_\sigma = (\tilde{E}_\sigma \setminus C_1) \cup P$ ; this is a vertex-disjoint collection of cycles and an I/O path in  $G(\hat{1}, \hat{n})$ . Each  $T_\sigma \neq 0$  is uniquely associated to such a subgraph  $E_\sigma$ . Clearly there is a one-to-one correspondence between self-loops in  $\tilde{E}_\sigma$  and those in  $E_\sigma$ ; between the cycles  $C_2, \dots, C_p$ ; between  $C_1$  and  $P$ . So  $\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) = \text{sgn}(P) (-1)^{\#\text{PFBL in } E_\sigma}$  because

$$\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) = (-1)^{n+1} \left[ (-1)^n (-1)^p \text{sgn}(P) \prod_{j=2}^p \text{sgn}(C_j) \right].$$

To prove one direction of 2, suppose two I/O paths  $P, Q$  form an IFFL. Choosing  $P$  and self-loops on all nodes not visited by  $P$  returns a vertex-disjoint collection  $E_\sigma$  of  $G$  that covers all nodes. Similarly, let  $E_\eta$  be such a

collection containing  $Q$ . As neither collection has any FBL at all,  $\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) \text{sgn}(T_\eta) = \text{sgn}(P) \text{sgn}(Q) = -1$ . If instead, suppose there is a PFBL  $C$  that is vertex-disjoint from the I/O path  $P$ . The subgraph  $E_\xi$  consisting of  $P, C$  and self-loops for all remaining nodes is associated to a nonzero term  $T_\xi$ . Moreover,  $\text{sgn}(T_\sigma) \text{sgn}(T_\xi) = -1$ .

To prove the other direction of 2, suppose that  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}]$  has mixed signs, say  $T_\sigma T_\eta < 0$ . Let  $E_\sigma, E_\eta$  be the corresponding subgraphs, where  $E_\sigma$  contains the I/O path  $P$ , and  $E_\eta$  contains  $Q$ . If  $P$  and  $Q$  form an IFFL, we are done. Suppose instead that  $\text{sgn}(P) = \text{sgn}(Q)$ . Then

$$-1 = \text{sgn}(T_\sigma) \text{sgn}(T_\eta) = (-1)^{\#\text{PFBL in } E_\sigma} (-1)^{\#\text{PFBL in } E_\eta}.$$

Consequently, there is at least one PFBL in either  $E_\sigma$  or  $E_\eta$ , which is disjoint from  $P$  or  $Q$  respectively.  $\square$

### III. QUASI-ADAPTATION AND BIPHASIC RESPONSE FOR INPUT-OUTPUT SYSTEMS

In this section, we consider the steady state response curves of input-output systems with single input, by which we mean that the control affects only one variable. Without loss of generality, let the control affect  $x_1$ .

Throughout this work, we consider the following system with output  $y = x_j$  for some  $j$ :

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, u) := \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 g(u), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is  $C^1$ ,  $u \in J$  for some interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}$ . We assume that for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ , the entries in the Jacobian matrix  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$  have constant signs, and that the diagonal entries are negative. We denote a solution to (1) with initial state  $\mathbf{x}(0)$  by  $\phi(t, \mathbf{x}(0), u)$ .

In addition, we assume

$$\forall u_0 \in J \exists \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{X} \text{ such that } \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, u_0) = \mathbf{0}, \text{ and } \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_0, u_0) \text{ has full rank.} \quad (\text{A0})$$

Sometimes we make the stronger assumption:

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall u_0 \in J \exists \mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbf{X} \text{ such that } \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, u_0) = \mathbf{0}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}_0, u_0) \text{ is Hurwitz, and} \\ &\exists \epsilon > 0: \forall u \in B_\epsilon(u_0) \forall \mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathbf{X} \exists \mathbf{x}^*(u) \in \mathbf{X}: \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}^*(u), u) = \mathbf{0} \text{ and } \phi(t, \mathbf{x}(0), u) \rightarrow \mathbf{x}^*(u). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Assumption (A0) insures the existence of smooth curves of equilibria: by the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT), we know that for every  $u_0$  and every  $\mathbf{x}_0$  such that  $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_0, u_0) = \mathbf{0}$ , there is an  $\epsilon > 0$  and a continuously differentiable steady state curve  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  for  $u \in B_\epsilon(u_0)$  with  $\mathbf{x}^*(u_0) = \mathbf{x}_0$ .

The set of assumptions in (A0) and (A1) are somewhat redundant. Clearly assumption (A1) implies (A0), since a Hurwitz matrix has full rank. In addition, since eigenvalues depend continuously on matrix entries, the Hurwitz property implies that the curve of equilibria  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$ , insured to exist by the IFT, has the property that  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  is an asymptotically stable equilibrium for each  $u$  in a possibly smaller neighborhood of  $B_\epsilon(u_0)$ . Moreover, one could use a converse Lyapunov theorem to guarantee an invariant region for small variations in the nominal  $u_0$ .

For now, we assume that the control has the simplest form:  $g(u) = u$ . As is often done, we can depict the input and output of (1) on the J-graph of  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ , by adding an input edge and an output edge. Since  $\partial_u g > 0$ , the input edge is positive. We call the resulting graph the **J-graph of the input-output system** (1).

Intuitively, a non-monotonic steady state response for  $x_j$  requires  $\partial_u x_j^*$  to change sign. We define *quasi-adaptation* as when the derivative vanishes, a phenomenon also known as *infinitesimal homeostasis* [8].

**Definition III.1.** The input-output system (1) under assumption (A0) with output  $x_j$  is said to be *quasi-adaptive* if there exists  $u_0 \in J$  such that  $\partial_u x_j^*(u_0) = 0$ . The system is said to exhibit *biphasic response* if there exist  $u_1, u_2 \in J$  such that  $[\partial_u x_j^*(u_1)][\partial_u x_j^*(u_2)] < 0$ .

Quasi-adaptation and biphasic response are properties of a branch of steady states. There is no a priori assumption of uniqueness or stability. We present in Example III.9 a system with two branches of steady states, where the unstable branch is biphasic (Fig. 3(b)). For the purpose of applications, one is often interested in a stable biphasic branch.

**Definition III.2.** The input-output system (1) under assumption (A1) with output  $x_j$  is said to exhibit *stable biphasic response* if  $x_j^*(u)$  is biphasic and asymptotically stable.

*A. Conditions for quasi-adaptation and biphasic response*

Theorems III.5 and III.6 below contain necessary conditions for quasi-adaptation, and also biphasic response by the smoothness of  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  granted by assumption (A0). The two theorems consider separately when the input and output are the same vs. distinct.

**Lemma III.3.** Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A0). Let  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  be a steady state curve defined for all  $u \in J$ , and  $\mathbf{J}^* = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^*(u))$ . Let  $x_j$  be the output for a fixed  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then

$$\frac{\partial x_j^*}{\partial u} = \frac{(-1)^j \mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]}{\det \mathbf{J}^*},$$

*Proof.* Along the steady state curve  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$ ,  $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 u$ . Implicitly differentiating,  $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{J}^* \partial_u \mathbf{x}^* + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1$ , which when solved using Cramer's rule gives the result.  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the signed symbolic matrix consistent with  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ , i.e.,  $[\mathcal{J}]_{ij} > 0$  if and only if  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} > 0$  and similarly for zero and negative entries. If  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}] \equiv 0$ , then  $\mathbf{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}](\mathbf{x}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$ ; for  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{x})$  coming from (1), this implies that  $x_j^*(u)$  is independent of  $u$ , i.e.,  $x_j^*$  exhibits ‘‘perfect adaptation’’ (in control-theoretic terms, zero DC gain, or disturbance rejection of constant disturbances). Lemma III.3 gives necessary conditions for quasi-adaptation and biphasic response.

**Lemma III.4.** Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A0). Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the signed symbolic matrix consistent with  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ . Let  $x_j$  be the output for any fixed  $j$ . If the polynomial  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$  is not identically zero and it has no mixed signs, then the system cannot be quasi-adaptive, nor can it exhibit biphasic response.

*Proof.* Under assumption (A0), the steady state curve  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  is smooth thus  $C^1$ , so  $\partial_u x_j^*$  cannot be singular, and the denominator in the expression in Lemma III.3 cannot be zero or change sign. Thus, quasi-adaptation occurs if and only if the numerator vanishes in the expression for  $\partial_u x_j^*$ . Similarly, biphasic response occurs if and only if the numerator changes sign, which by continuity of  $\partial_u x_j^*$ , necessarily means vanishing. Thus, quasi-adaptation and biphasic response both depend on the minor  $\mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$  of the Jacobian matrix of (1). Because of the assumption on  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$ ,  $\mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$  is constant in sign and non-zero.  $\square$

We proved more than what we claimed in Lemma III.4: if  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$  is not zero and has no mixed signs, then as a function of  $\mathbf{x}$ ,  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$  can never vanish.

**Theorem III.5.** Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A0) with output  $x_1$ , and let  $G$  be its J-graph. If  $G$  has no positive feedback loop disjoint from the node  $x_1$ , the system cannot be quasi-adaptive, nor can it exhibit biphasic response.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the signed symbolic matrix consistent with  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ . By Lemma III.4, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{1}] \neq 0$  and it has no mixed signs. Let  $\tilde{G}$  be the J-graph of  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ , and thus the J-graph of  $\mathcal{J}$ . By Lemma II.1,  $\mathcal{J}$  has no mixed if and only if  $\tilde{G}(\hat{1})$  has no PFBL. This is equivalent to  $G$  having no PFBL that is disjoint from the input/output node  $x_1$ , since  $\tilde{G}$  is  $G$  without the input/output edges.  $\square$

**Theorem III.6.** Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A0) with output  $x_j$  where  $j \neq 1$ , and let  $G$  be its J-graph.

- 1) If  $G$  has no input-output path, then the steady state response  $x_j^*(u)$  is independent of  $u$ .
- 2) Suppose  $G$  has an input-output path. If  $G$  has neither an incoherent feedforward loop from input to output, nor a positive feedback loop that is vertex-disjoint from some input-output path, then the system cannot be quasi-adaptive, nor can it exhibit biphasic response.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, let  $x_n$  be the output. Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be the signed symbolic matrix consistent with  $\mathbf{J}^* = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^*(u))$ , and let  $\tilde{G}$  be the J-graph of  $\mathcal{J}$ , obtained from  $G$  by deleting the input and output edges. There is an I/O path, i.e., from  $x_1$  to  $x_j$ , in  $\tilde{G}$  if and only if there is one in  $G$ . So if  $G$  has no I/O path,  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] \equiv 0$ , hence  $\mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] = 0$  for all  $u$ . Claim 1 follows from Lemma III.3.

Suppose  $G$  has an I/O path, so  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}] \neq 0$ . By Lemma III.4, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}]$  has no mixed signs. The subgraphs listed in 2 are in  $G$  if and only if they are in  $\tilde{G}$ , so by Lemma II.2 we conclude that  $\mathcal{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{n}]$  has no mixed signs.  $\square$

**Remark III.7.** The classical adapting integral feedback and IFFL linear systems (see for example [9, Section 6.1]) do not fall under our results. For the integral feedback system, whose J-graph is shown in Fig. 1(a), there is no self-loop on  $x$ . The IFFL linear system, whose J-graph is in Fig. 1(b), is not a single-input system.




Fig. 1: Our theorems are silent on the (a) adapting integral feedback and (b) IFFL linear systems.

**Example III.8.** We present counterexamples to the claim in [1] that an IFFL is necessary for stable biphasic response; this example first appeared in [10]. Consider the input-output system on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq}^4$  with control  $u \in [0.4, 0.6]$  and output  $x_3$  (and another system with output  $x_4$ ):

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{x}_1 &= -x_1 + f(x_2) \\
 \dot{x}_2 &= h(x_1) - x_2 + x_3 \\
 \dot{x}_3 &= h(x_2) - 2x_3 + u \\
 \dot{x}_4 &= x_3 - x_4,
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where  $f(s) = e^{1-\sigma(s)}$ ,  $h(s) = \frac{1}{2}e^{2(1-\sigma(s))}$ , and

$$\sigma(s) = \begin{cases} 0.8 & 0 \leq s < 0.8 \\ s & 0.8 \leq s \leq 1.2 \\ 1.2 & 1.2 \leq s \end{cases} .$$

Both  $x_3$  and  $x_4$  exhibit stable biphasic response curves where  $x_3^*(u) = x_4^*(u)$ , as shown in Fig. 2(b). Moreover, the J-graph, shown in Fig. 2(a), has no IFFL. Whether the output is  $x_3$  or  $x_4$ , the PFBL between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and the NFBL between  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  are necessary for stable biphasic response. (Full detail can be found in Appendix B.)




Fig. 2: (a) The J-graph of the input-output systems from Example III.8, with  $x_3$  being the output in one, and  $x_4$  in the other. (b) The system exhibits stable biphasic response in  $x_3$  and  $x_4$ . The positive feedback loop between  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  and negative feedback loop between  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  are necessary for the non-monotonic steady state response curve.

**Example III.9.** This example illustrates that Theorems III.5 and III.6 do not assume stability of the response curve. Consider the following system on  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq}^4$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{x}_1 &= u - 2x_1 \\
 \dot{x}_2 &= x_1 + x_3 - 2x_2^2 + \frac{x_3^2}{4} \\
 \dot{x}_3 &= -\frac{7x_3}{4} + x_2^2 \\
 \dot{x}_4 &= x_1 + \frac{3x_3}{4} - x_4,
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where  $u \in [0, 12.5]$  is the control parameter, and  $x_4$  the output. Fig. 3(a) shows the J-graph of the system, which does not have an IFFL. The system has two branches of steady states (Fig. 3(b)), one of which is stable, and the other unstable. The unstable branch is non-monotonic. Without the PFBL between  $x_2$  and  $x_3$ , this system cannot exhibit biphasic response. (Full detail can be found in Appendix C.)




Fig. 3: (a) The J-graph of the system from Example III.9. (b) The system has two branches of steady states: a stable monotonic branch and an unstable non-monotonic branch. The positive feedback loop between  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  is necessary for biphasic response.

### B. Necessary conditions for stable biphasic response

The theory of monotone systems predicts that stable branches of steady states will be nondecreasing or nonincreasing depending on the net sign of the “input-output characteristic” of the system, while unstable branches may be decreasing or increasing, irrespective of the sign of the characteristic. These facts are well illustrated by the example of a genetic autoregulatory transcription network analyzed in [11]. In Fig. 3a of that paper, one can



see four stable branches (drawn in solid blue lines) as well as four unstable branches of equilibria (drawn in dotted red lines); of the four unstable branches, three are decreasing functions of  $u$ .

To obtain necessary conditions for *stable* biphasic responses, we use Theorem 1 from [12], which concerns a system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}, u(t))$ , initially at steady state, with piecewise continuous input  $u(t)$  that is monotonic in time. It states that if all walks (without self-loops) from the input node<sup>4</sup>  $u$  to the output node  $x_j$  have the same sign, then  $x_j(t)$  is monotonic in time. Moreover, suppose  $u(t)$  is nondecreasing in time, then  $x_j(t)$  is nondecreasing (respectively nonincreasing) if any walk from input to output is positive (respectively negative).

**Theorem III.10.** *Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A1), and let  $G$  be its J-graph. Let  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  be a stable branch of steady states.*

- 1) *Suppose  $x_1$  is the output. If there is no negative feedback loop in  $G$  that is reachable to and from the node  $x_1$ , then  $x_1^*(u)$  is monotonic.*
- 2) *Suppose  $x_j$  is the output where  $j \neq 1$ . If  $G$  neither has an incoherent feedforward loop from input to output, nor a negative feedback loop that is reachable from the input and to the output, then  $x_j^*(u)$  is monotonic.*

*Under the assumption stated above, the output cannot exhibit stable biphasic response.*

*Proof.* We first show that the conditions listed imply that any walk (with no self-loops) from input to output has the same sign, and thus by [12, Theorem 1], the solution  $x_j(t)$  is monotonic in time. For the rest of the proof, by a walk, we mean a walk without self-loops.

(1) Let  $\tilde{G}$  be the graph obtained by adding to  $G$  the node  $u$  and edge  $(u, x_1)$  that is signed<sup>5</sup>. There are two oppositely signed walks from  $u$  to  $x_1$  in  $\tilde{G}$  if and only if there is a closed walk  $W$  in  $G$  in the strongly connected component of  $x_1$  such that  $W$  traverses a NFBL, the two walks being  $(u, x_1)$  and  $(u, x_1) \cup W$ . Thus, the hypothesis in 1 implies that  $x_1(t)$  is nondecreasing (nonincreasing) if the sign of  $(u, x_1)$  is positive (negative) by [12, Theorem 1].

(2) If  $G$  does not have an I/O path, then the response  $x_j^*$  is independent of  $u$  by Theorem III.6, hence it cannot be biphasic. So suppose that  $G$  has an I/O path. Clearly an IFFL from  $x_1$  to  $x_j$ , when joined with  $(u, x_1)$  constitute two walks with opposite signs. Similarly, a walk from  $x_1$  to  $x_j$  that traverses a NFBL generates a different walk with the NFBL omitted; these are two walks with opposite signs. Conversely, any walk from  $u$  to  $x_j$  contains an I/O path, possibly with appendages. If any of the appendages are NFBLs, we are done. Otherwise, trimming away all such appendages leaves two paths from  $u$  to  $x_j$  of the same parity, i.e., any FFL must be coherent. Under the hypotheses in 2, by [12, Theorem 1]  $x_j(t)$  is nondecreasing (nonincreasing) if any walk from  $u$  to  $x_j$  is positive (negative).

Next, we show that  $x_j(t)$  being monotonic in time implies the steady state response  $x_j^*(u)$  is monotonic. In what follows, we assume that any walk from  $u$  to  $x_j$  in  $\tilde{G}$  is positive; the case where any walk is negative requires appropriate changes in signs and inequalities. The system (1) is  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 g(u(t))$ , where  $u(t) = u_0 + \epsilon$  for all  $t \geq 0$  and any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $u_0 + \epsilon \in J$ . Suppose the system is initially at  $\mathbf{x}^*(u_0)$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}(t)$  be the solution, defined for all  $t \geq 0$ . Since  $x_j(t)$  is monotonically nondecreasing,  $x_j^*(u_0 + \epsilon) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t) \geq x_j^*(u_0)$ , where the convergence to  $x_j^*(u_0 + \epsilon)$  is guaranteed by (A1). So the  $C^1$  steady state curve must have nondecreasing derivative at  $u_0$ . Since  $u_0$  was arbitrary, we conclude that  $\partial_u x_j^*(u) \geq 0$  for all  $u \in J$ .  $\square$

The implication diagram in the introduction is a corollary of Theorems III.5, III.6 and III.10.

<sup>4</sup>In [12], the control  $u$  is given its own node. In our context, for flow, this is equivalent to adding a node for  $u$  in the J-graph of (1); for activation/inhibition,  $\mathbf{C}$  is the node for the control.

<sup>5</sup>Even though this edge is positive for  $g(u) = u$ , we allow for negative  $\partial_u g$  in anticipation of Section IV.

**Corollary III.11.** Consider the input-output system (1) under assumption (A1). Necessary conditions for stable biphasic response are,

- when  $x_1$  is output, the existence of a positive feedback loop disjoint from the node  $x_1$  and a negative feedback loop that is reachable to and from the node  $x_1$ ;
- when  $x_j$  is output where  $j \neq 1$ , either (i) the existence of an incoherent feedforward loop from  $x_1$  to  $x_j$ , or (ii) the existence of a positive feedback loop vertex-disjoint from some input-output path and a negative feedback loop that is reachable from  $x_1$  and to  $x_j$ .

#### IV. ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF CONTROL

Up to this point, we worked with  $\dot{x} = f(x) + \hat{e}_1 g(u, x_1)$ , where  $g(u, x_1) = u$ . In the context of biochemistry or biology, such a term with  $u \geq 0$  could represent inflow or production of the species modelled by  $x_1$ . However, there could be other forms of controls. For example, suppose  $x_1$  represents the concentration of a protein  $X_1$  in its *active* form, and its inactive form could be enzymatically activated by another species, e.g., see the systems explored in [1], [13]. Then the control would take the form  $g(u, x_1) = (k_{\text{on}} + u)(T - x_1) - k_{\text{off}}x_1$ , where  $u$  is proportional to the concentration of this other species, and  $T$  is the total amount of  $X_1$  in the system. Throughout this work, we assume the activation/inhibition reactions follow mass-action kinetics.

**Definition IV.1.** We say  $C$  *activates*  $X$  to refer to the reactions  $X_I \rightleftharpoons X$  and  $C + X_I \rightarrow C + X$ , along with the conservation law  $x_I + x = x_T$ , where  $X_I$  is the inactive form of  $X$ . Similarly, we say  $C$  *inhibits*  $X$  to refer to the reactions  $X_I \rightleftharpoons X$  and  $C + X \rightarrow C + X_I$ , along with the conservation law  $x_I + x = x_T$ .

We now consider a biochemical system involving species  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ . We assume each of these has an active form (with concentration  $x_i$ ) and an inactive form (with concentration  $z_i$ ). Suppose  $X_1$  is activated (respectively inhibited) by an external species  $C$ . In addition, suppose some of the  $X_i$  is activated or inhibited by  $X_j$ 's. For any  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\text{act}}^i &= \{(i, j) : X_i \text{ activates } X_j, j \neq i\}, \\ \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i &= \{(i, j) : X_i \text{ inhibits } X_j, j \neq i\},\end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda_{\text{act}}^i \cap \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i = \emptyset$ . By an abuse of notation, we also write  $j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i$  for  $(i, j) \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i$ ; similarly with  $\Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i$ . Interesting dynamics occurs when  $\bigcup_{i=1}^n (\Lambda_{\text{act}}^i \cup \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i) \neq \emptyset$ . We call such a system an **activation-inhibition network**. See Appendix A for a concrete example.

Let  $k_c > 0$  be a catalytic rate constant. In the case of where  $X_1$  is activated by  $C$ , let  $\tilde{g}(C, x_1, z_1) = k_c C z_1$ , while in the case of inhibition, let  $\tilde{g}(C, x_1, z_1) = -k_c C x_1$ . Under mass-action kinetics, the dynamics is governed by

$$\begin{aligned}-\dot{z}_1 &= \dot{x}_1 = k_{\text{on}}^1 z_1 - k_{\text{off}}^1 x_1 + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^1} k_{\text{cat}}^{1j} x_j z_1 - \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^1} k_{\text{cat}}^{1j} x_j x_1 + \tilde{g}(C, x_1, z_1) \\ -\dot{z}_i &= \dot{x}_i = k_{\text{on}}^i z_i - k_{\text{off}}^i x_i + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_j z_i - \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_j x_i,\end{aligned}$$

for all  $i \neq 1$ , and where the rate constants  $k_{\text{on}}^i$ ,  $k_{\text{off}}^i$ , and  $k_{\text{cat}}^{ij}$  with  $j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i \cup \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i$  are positive. For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , there is a conservation law  $x_i + z_i = T_i$  for some fixed constant  $T_i > 0$ . Hence, we can eliminate the variables

$z_1, \dots, z_n$ . The resulting system  $\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 g(C, x_1)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= \left( k_{\text{on}}^1 + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^1} k_{\text{cat}}^{1j} x_j \right) (T_1 - x_1) - \left( k_{\text{off}}^1 + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^1} k_{\text{cat}}^{1j} x_j \right) x_1 + g(C, x_1) \\ \dot{x}_i &= \left( k_{\text{on}}^i + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_j \right) (T_i - x_i) - \left( k_{\text{off}}^i + \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_j \right) x_i, \quad \text{for } i \neq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $g(C, x_1) = k_c C (T_1 - x_1)$  in the case of activation, and  $g(C, x_1) = -k_c C x_1$  in the case of inhibition.

We make two observations about (4). First,  $0 \leq x_i \leq T_i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , because  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq}^{2n}$  is forward-invariant for  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$ , and  $x_i + z_i = T_i$ . Second, the system has no boundary steady state, i.e., either  $x_i = 0$  or  $x_i = T_i$  for some  $i$ . This follows because if  $x_i = 0$ , then  $\dot{x}_i > 0$ ; if  $x_i = T_i$ , then  $\dot{x}_i < 0$ . In fact, for mass-action systems, the strictly positive orthant is forward-invariant [14, Lemma II.1]; therefore, we assume  $0 < z_i, x_i < T_i$  for all  $i$ .

We can compute the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}$  of  $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$  directly:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i} &= -k_{\text{on}}^i - k_{\text{off}}^i - \sum_{j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_j, \\ \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} &= \begin{cases} k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} (T_i - x_i) & \text{if } j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i \\ -k_{\text{cat}}^{ij} x_i & \text{if } j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j \neq i. \end{aligned}$$

The diagonal entries of  $\mathbf{J}$  are negative. The off-diagonal  $(i, j)$  entry of  $\mathbf{J}$  is positive if and only if  $j \in \Lambda_{\text{act}}^i$  since  $T_i - x_i > 0$ , and it is negative if and only if  $j \in \Lambda_{\text{inh}}^i$ . In other words,  $\mathbf{J}$  is a signed matrix with negative diagonals. Note that when  $\mathbf{X}_1$  is activated by  $\mathbf{C}$ ,  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial C} = k_c (T_1 - x_1) > 0$ , and  $\frac{\partial g}{\partial C} = -k_c x_1 < 0$  in the case of inhibition.

As a result of the signed structure of  $\mathbf{J}$ , its J-graph  $G$  is well-defined. Moreover, we can define the J-graph of the input-output system (4) by adding an output edge from  $x_j$  and an input edge to  $x_1$ , where the input edge is positive (respectively negative) if  $\mathbf{X}_1$  is activated (respectively inhibited) by  $\mathbf{C}$ .

The system (4) has the same form as (1), but for a more complicated control function  $g$ . Assuming (4) satisfies assumption (A0) and that  $C$  has reached steady state, we can carry out the same analysis as in Lemma III.3, and obtain formulae for  $\partial_C x_j^*$ . Since  $\mathbf{0} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^*(C)) + \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 g(C, x_1^*(C))$ ,  $\mathbf{0} = \left[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^*(C)) \right] \partial_C \mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{e}}_1 k_C (x_1^* + C \partial_C x_1^* - \delta_{\text{act}} k_c T_1)$ , where  $\delta_{\text{act}} = 1$  for activation, and 0 for inhibition. Therefore, in the case of activation,

$$\frac{\partial x_j^*}{\partial C} = \frac{(-1)^j k_c (T_1 - x_1^*) \mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]}{\det(\mathbf{J}^* - \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{11} k_c C)},$$

and in the case of inhibition,

$$\frac{\partial x_j^*}{\partial C} = \frac{(-1)^{j+1} k_c x_1^* \mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]}{\det(\mathbf{J}^* - \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{11} k_c C)},$$

where  $\mathbf{J}^* = \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{x}^*(C))$ . Since  $x_1^* \neq 0, T_1$  for any  $C$ , whether  $\partial_C x_j^*$  vanishes or changes sign depends only on  $\mathbf{J}^*[\hat{1}, \hat{j}]$ . In particular, Lemma III.4 and Theorems III.5 and III.6 hold for (4) under assumption (A0), and Theorem III.10 holds under assumption (A1). In other words, we have necessary conditions for quasi-adaptation and (stable) biphasic response of  $x_j$  to the steady state concentration of the species  $\mathbf{C}$ .

**Corollary IV.2.** *The necessary conditions for stable biphasic response stated in Corollary III.11 apply to the system (4) under assumption (A1).*

## V. APPLICATION TO IMMUNE T-CELL ACTIVATION

In this section, we study in full generality a model of immune T-cell activation. Following [1], our model consists of two parts. The first part is a network for kinetic proofreading (Fig. 4), whereby an antigen  $L$  binds to a T-cell receptor (TCR)  $R$ , and the resulting TCR complexes  $C_i$  can be at various stages of phosphorylation. The second half of the model is a downstream input-output system, where one or more of  $C_i$ 's act as input to the species  $X_1$ . We give necessary conditions on the downstream network for when the output of this network could exhibit stable biphasic response.

In what follows, we let  $L(t), R(t)$  denote the concentrations of  $L$  and  $R$ . Similarly, let  $C_i(t)$  be the concentration of  $C_i$ , and  $C_T(t) = \sum_{j=0}^N C_j(t)$ . Where there is no ambiguity, we drop the explicit dependence on  $t$ . The system has two conservation laws:  $L_T = L + C_T$  and  $R_T = R + C_T$ , with  $L_T, R_T > 0$ .




Fig. 4: Kinetic proofreading network upstream of immune T-cell activation.

Let the kinetic proofreading network in Fig. 4 evolve according to  $\dot{z} = \mathbf{F}(z; L_T)$  under mass-action kinetics, where  $z = (L, R, C_0, \dots, C_N)^\top$ . The form of  $\mathbf{F}(z; L_T)$  is shown in (D7) of Appendix D. This system has a globally attracting steady state within its stoichiometric compatibility class for any  $L_T, R_T > 0$  [14]. The steady state response  $C_i^*(L_T)$  is monotonically increasing. In fact  $C_i^* = A_i C_T^*$ , where we derive in Appendix D.1 an analytical expression for  $C_T^*$ :

$$\frac{L_T + R_T + \frac{A}{k}}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{L_T + R_T + \frac{A}{k}}{2}\right)^2 - L_T R_T}, \quad (5)$$

with constants  $A_i, A > 0$ . Appendix D.2 contains a proof that  $\frac{\partial C_i^*}{\partial L_T} > 0$  for all  $L_T > 0$ .

### A. Necessary conditions for stable biphasic response in immune T-cell activation

Inspired by [1], we consider a system where one or more of the TCR complexes  $C_i$  either all activate or all inhibit  $X_1$ , and the species  $X_i$  could either activate or inhibit each other. The full system has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= \mathbf{F}(z; L_T) \\ \dot{x} &= \mathbf{f}(x) + \hat{e}_1 g(z, x_1), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathbf{f}(x)$  comes from an activation-inhibition network (e.g., see (4)), and  $g(z, x_1)$  is either

$$\sum_{i \in \Lambda} k_i C_i (x_T - x_1)$$

in the case of activation, or in the case of inhibition

$$- \sum_{i \in \Lambda} k_i C_i x_1$$

for some  $\emptyset \neq \Lambda \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ . We make the same assumptions as before: the entries of  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial x}$  are constant in sign, the diagonals are negative, and (6) satisfies (A1).

**Theorem V.1.** *Consider (6) with activation (respectively inhibition). Let  $(z^*(L_T), x^*(L_T))$  be a stable branch of steady states for  $L_T$  in some interval  $J \subset \mathbb{R}_{>}$ . Let  $G$  be the  $J$ -graph of  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial x}$ . Suppose  $x_j^*(L_T)$  is stable biphasic.*

- 1) If  $j = 1$ , then  $G$  has a positive feedback loop and a negative feedback loop.
- 2) If  $j \neq 1$ , then  $G$  either has an incoherent feedforward loop, or it has a positive feedback loop and a negative feedback loop.

*Proof.* Since  $z^*(L_T)$  is globally stable for each  $L_T > 0$ , we are interested only in the downstream system. Consider an alternative system  $\dot{x} = f(x) + \hat{e}_1 g^*(C_T^*, x_1)$  where  $g^*(C_T^*, x_1) = KC_T^*(x_T - x_1)$  in the case of activation, and  $-KC_T^*x_1$  in the case of inhibition, where  $K = \sum_{i \in \Lambda} k_i A_i > 0$ . The original ODEs for  $x$  and this alternative system share  $x^*(L_T)$  as a stable branch of steady states. The alternative system is precisely of the form (4), but where the activating/inhibiting “species”  $C_T$  is at steady state. Applying Corollary IV.2 to this alternative system gives us the result we desire.  $\square$

## VI. DISCUSSION

We were initially motivated to provide a rigorous proof for the claim in [1]: that IFFL is necessary for what we now call stable biphasic response. Against this claim, we gave counterexamples (e.g., Example III.8), which were not among the 58’905 networks computationally explored in [1]. Instead we proved a weaker version: that either an IFFL must exist, or both a PFBL and a NFBL must exist.

Our results are phrased for systems with one control and one input variable, but as Theorem V.1 shows, there are easy extensions, such as when the different controls are all scalar multiples of a function. Furthermore, if a control  $u$  affects two or more variables, we can redefine  $u$  as a variable, and formally introduce a new control  $v$ , i.e.,  $x_0 := u$ ,  $\dot{x}_0 = -x_0 + v$  where  $x_0(0) = v$ . Then our results hold for the extended system  $(x_0, x)$ . Clearly in this case, the J-graph should include  $x_0$  as a variable node. See Appendix E for details.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Lever, H.-S. Lim, P. Kruger, J. Nguyen, N. Trendel, E. Abu-Shah, P. K. Maini, P. A. Van Der Merwe, and O. Dushek, “Architecture of a minimal signaling pathway explains the T-cell response to a 1 million-fold variation in antigen affinity and dose,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 113, no. 43, 2016.
- [2] D. Kim, Y.-K. Kwon, and K.-H. Cho, “The biphasic behavior of incoherent feed-forward loops in biomolecular regulatory networks,” *BioEssays*, vol. 30, no. 11-12, pp. 1204–1211, 2008.
- [3] E. D. Sontag, “Remarks on feedforward circuits, adaptation, and pulse memory,” *IET Systems Biology*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 39–51, 2010.
- [4] D. Angeli and E. Sontag, “Monotone control systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 48, no. 10, pp. 1684–1698, 2003, Errata at <http://sontaglab.org/FTPDIR/angeli-sontag-monotone-TAC03-typus.txt>.
- [5] D. Angeli and E. D. Sontag, “Behavior of responses of monotone and sign-definite systems,” in *Mathematical System Theory - Festschrift in Honor of Uwe Helmke on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, K. Hüper and J. Trumpf, Eds. CreateSpace, 2013, pp. 51–64.
- [6] M. Banaji, “Graph-theoretic conditions for injectivity of functions on rectangular domains,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, vol. 370, no. 1, pp. 302–311, 2010.
- [7] C. Soulé, “Graphic requirements for multistationarity,” *Complexus*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 123–133, 2003.
- [8] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart, “Homeostasis, singularities, and networks,” *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, vol. 74, no. 1-2, pp. 387–407, 2017.
- [9] O. Shoval, U. Alon, and E. Sontag, “Symmetry invariance for adapting biological systems,” *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 857–886, 2011.
- [10] E. D. Sontag, “Bell-shaped dose response for a system with no IFFLs,” *bioRxiv 2020.11.17.387605*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2020/11/20/2020.11.17.387605>
- [11] G. Enciso and E. Sontag, “Monotone bifurcation graphs,” *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, vol. 2, pp. 121–139, 2008.
- [12] J. A. Ascensao, P. Datta, B. Hancioglu, E. Sontag, M. L. Gennaro, and O. A. Igoshin, “Non-monotonic response to monotonic stimulus: Regulation of glyoxylate shunt gene-expression dynamics in Mycobacterium tuberculosis,” *PLOS Computational Biology*, vol. 12, no. 2, p. e1004741, 2016.
- [13] V. Ramesh, T. Suwanmajo, and J. Krishnan, “Network regulation meets substrate modification chemistry,” *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, vol. 20, no. 199, p. 20220510, 2023.
- [14] E. D. Sontag, “Structure and stability of certain chemical networks and applications to the kinetic proofreading model of T-cell receptor signal transduction,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1028–1047, 2001.

## A. An example of activation-inhibition network





Fig. A1: An activation-inhibition network with 3 species and an external species C.

We give a concrete example of an activation-inhibition network as described in Section IV. Consider the network given by the J-graph in Fig. A1. This represents the following reactions



where  $Z_i$  is the inactive form of  $X_i$ .

Under mass-action kinetics, the concentrations evolve according to

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\dot{z}_1 &= \dot{x}_1 = k_{\text{on}}^1 z_1 - k_{\text{off}}^1 x_1 - k_{21} x_1 x_2 + k_c C z_1 \\
 -\dot{z}_2 &= \dot{x}_2 = k_{\text{on}}^2 z_2 - k_{\text{off}}^2 x_2 + k_{32} x_3 z_2 \\
 -\dot{z}_3 &= \dot{x}_3 = k_{\text{on}}^3 z_3 - k_{\text{off}}^3 x_3 + k_{13} x_1 z_3.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since  $z_i + x_i = A_i$  for some total concentration  $A_i > 0$ , we can eliminate  $z_i$ . The reduced system is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{x}_1 &= k_{\text{on}}^1 (A_1 - x_1) - k_{\text{off}}^1 x_1 - k_{21} x_1 x_2 + k_c C (A_1 - x_1) \\
 \dot{x}_2 &= k_{\text{on}}^2 (A_2 - x_2) - k_{\text{off}}^2 x_2 + k_{32} x_3 (A_2 - x_2) \\
 \dot{x}_3 &= k_{\text{on}}^3 (A_3 - x_3) - k_{\text{off}}^3 x_3 + k_{13} x_1 (A_3 - x_3),
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $0 < x_i < A_i$ , since the positive orthant is forward-invariant under mass-action kinetics [1, Lemma II.1]. Its Jacobian matrix is

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -k_{\text{on}}^1 - k_{\text{off}}^1 - k_{21} x_2 - k_c C & -k_{21} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -k_{\text{on}}^2 - k_{\text{off}}^2 - k_{32} x_3 & k_{32} (A_2 - x_2) \\ k_{13} (A_3 - x_3) & 0 & -k_{\text{on}}^3 - k_{\text{off}}^3 - k_{13} x_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $(A_i - x_i) > 0$ , the J-graph in Fig. A1 (without the colors and texts) contains the J-graph of  $\mathbf{J}$ .

## B. Details of Example III.8

This example first appeared in [2], which also contains its derivation.

A small technical issue is that the saturation  $\sigma$  in the system (2), while a (globally) Lipschitz function (insuring unique and everywhere defined solutions of the ODE) is not differentiable at those states for which either  $x_1$  or  $x_2$  equals exactly 0.8 or 1.2, which happens only a set of measure zero. Thus the Jacobian is not well-defined at every state in the classical sense. However, it is well-defined in the sense of non-smooth analysis, and in any event the signs of interactions reflect the increasing or decreasing influence of each variable on each other

variable, and this can be defined with no need to take derivatives. The saturation function  $\sigma$  could be replaced by an approximating differentiable function, but use of  $\sigma$  makes calculations somewhat simpler.

Fig. B2 shows the steady state response curves for all variables, as well as the eigenvalues along the steady state curve, indicating asymptotic stability. Fig. B2(b), of course, shows stable biphasic response of  $x_3$  and  $x_4$ . Global stability was indicated by simulations with random initial conditions.




Fig. B2: (a) Steady state curves of Example III.8. (b)  $x_3^* = x_4^*$  exhibit biphasic responses. (c) Real parts of eigenvalues, demonstrating that the response is stable biphasic.

1) **Existence and uniqueness of steady state:** We show that for each  $u \in [0.4, 0.6]$ , there exists a unique positive steady state. For example, one can easily check that for  $u_0 = 0.5$ , the point  $(1, 1, 0.5, 0.5)$  is a steady state for Example III.8. More generally, from  $\dot{x}_4 = 0$ , we know that  $x_4 = x_3$  at steady state. From  $\dot{x}_1 = 0$ , we have

$$x_1 = e^{1-\sigma(x_2)}. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Solving  $\dot{x}_3 = 0$  for  $x_3$ , and using (B2) so that  $(e^{1-\sigma(x_2)})^2 = x_1^2$ , we obtain

$$x_3 = x_4 = \frac{x_1^2}{4} + \frac{u}{2}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Finally, we set  $\dot{x}_2 = 0$ , substituting the above  $x_3$ , to obtain an equation relating  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ , and  $u$ :

$$\frac{e^{2(1-\sigma(x_1))}}{2} - x_2 + \frac{u}{2} + \frac{x_1^2}{4} = 0.$$

This equation is equivalent to

$$u = U(x_1, x_2) := -\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2x_2 - e^{2(1-\sigma(x_1))}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Now we will show that, for each  $u \in [0.4, 0.6]$ , there is a unique solution  $(x_1, x_2)$  for  $U(x_1, x_2) = u$ , and, moreover,  $x_1 \in [0.8, 1.2]$  and  $x_2 \in [0.8, 1.2]$ , i.e., in the non-saturation regime, case (1A) below. We do this by analyzing various cases.

**Case 1:**  $0.8 \leq x_2 \leq 1.2$ . In this case, (B2) gives  $x_2 = 1 - \ln x_1$ , so

$$U(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2 - 2 \ln x_1 - e^{2(1-\sigma(x_1))}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

For  $0.8 \leq x_1 \leq 1.2$ , the above expression is  $U(x_1, 1 - \ln x_1) = -\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2 - 2 \ln x_1 - e^{2(1-\sigma(x_1))}$ , a plot of which is shown in Fig. B3(a), middle, blue segment. This is a decreasing function on the interval  $x_1 \in [0.8, 1.2]$ . For

each  $u \in [0.4, 0.6]$ , there exists a unique  $x_1 \in [0.8, 1.2]$  solving (B4); see the shaded blue band in Fig. B3(a). This also returns  $x_2 = 1 - \ln x_1$ , and  $x_3, x_4$  via (B3).

If instead,  $x_1 < 0.8$ , then  $U(x_1, 1 - \ln x_1) = -\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2 - 2 \ln x_1 - e^{0.4}$ , which is decreasing on  $x_1 \in [0, 0.8]$  with minimum value of  $U \approx 0.63$  (Fig. B3(a), left, orange segment). Finally, if  $x_1 > 1.2$ , then  $U(x_1, 1 - \ln x_1) = -\frac{x_1^2}{2} + 2 - 2 \ln x_1 - e^{-0.4}$ , which is decreasing on  $x_1 \in [1.2, \infty)$ , with maximum value of  $U \approx 0.245$  (Fig. B3(a), right, green segment). So (B4) has no corresponding solution for which  $x_1 < 0.8$  or  $x_1 > 1.2$ .




Fig. B3: Graph of (B4) in different cases. (a)  $U(x_1, x_2)$  when  $0.8 \leq x_2 \leq 1.2$  (case 1), as given by (B5). (b)  $U(x_1, x_2)$  when  $x_2 < 0.8$  (case 2), and when  $x_2 > 1.2$  (case 3). Shaded region is the range  $[0.4, 0.6]$  in which  $u$  lies. Solution exists only when  $0.8 \leq x_1, x_2 \leq 1.2$ .

**Case 2:**  $x_2 < 0.8$ . In this case, (B2) gives  $x_1 = e^{0.2} \approx 1.22$ , and  $\sigma(x_1) = 1.2$ . Then (B4) with

$$U(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{e^{0.4}}{2} + 2x_2 - e^{-0.4}$$

has no solution for  $x_2 < 0.8$ , since  $U(x_1, x_2) < 0.19$  (Fig. B3(b), left, orange segment).

**Case 3:**  $1.2 < x_2$ . In this case, (B2) gives  $x_1 = e^{-0.2} \approx 0.81$ , and  $\sigma(x_1) = x_1$ . Then (B4) with

$$U(x_1, x_2) = -\frac{e^{-0.4}}{2} + 2x_2 - e^{2(1-e^{-0.2})}$$

has no solution for  $x_2 > 1.2$ , since  $U(x_1, x_2) > 0.62$  (Fig. B3(b), right, green segment).

We conclude that steady states are unique, and occur only when  $0.8 \leq x_1, x_2 \leq 1.2$ , when neither variable is saturated. In this case, we solve (B4) numerically to get  $x_1 = x_1^*(u)$  for each constant input  $u$  in the interval  $[0.4, 0.6]$  and back substitute to obtain the remaining variables, obtaining the steady state curve  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  in Fig. B2(a).

2) **Stability of steady state response curve:** It is not difficult to see that, along the steady state curve, the Jacobian matrix of (2) is


$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -C & 0 & 0 \\ -e^{2(1-C)} & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -C^2 & -2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $C := e^{1-x_2^*} > 0$ . Its J-graph is the one in Fig. 2(a). The real part of the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{J}$  (Fig. B2(c)) is always negative, showing asymptotic stability. Simulations from random initial states indicate that the state  $\mathbf{x}^*(u)$  for  $u \in [0.4, 0.6]$  is globally asymptotically stable.



### C. Details of Example III.9

Example III.9 is generated by the reactions



which under mass-action kinetics, is governed by (3). Its Jacobian matrix is

$$\mathbf{J} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -4x_2 & 1 + x_3/2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2x_2 & -7/4 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 3/4 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can solve for the non-negative steady states, or check that

$$\begin{aligned}
 x_1^*(u) &= \frac{u}{2}, \\
 x_2^*(u) &= \frac{\sqrt{7}}{2} \sqrt{5 \pm \sqrt{25 - 2u}}, \\
 x_3^*(u) &= 5 \pm \sqrt{25 - 2u}, \\
 x_4^*(u) &= \frac{u}{2} + \frac{15}{4} \pm \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{25 - 2u}
 \end{aligned} \tag{C6}$$

are two branches of steady states.

Using Mathematica or other tools, we can compute the eigenvalues along the steady state curves. Fig. C4 are the plots of the eigenvalues.




Fig. C4: Eigenvalues along the steady state curves (C6). (a) Corresponding to the unstable branch in Fig. 3, and (b) the stable branch.

1) **Derivation of steady state:** For completeness, we derive the expression (C6) for the steady state curve for the system (3). Substituting  $x_1 = u/2$  from  $\dot{x}_1 = 0$  and  $x_2^2 = 7x_3/4$  from  $\dot{x}_3 = 0$  into  $\dot{x}_2 = 0$ , we see that

$$\frac{u}{2} + x_3 - \frac{7}{2}x_3 + \frac{x_3^2}{4} = 0,$$

which we rescale and then solve using the quadratic formula

$$x_3 = \frac{10 \pm \sqrt{100 - 8u}}{2} = 5 \pm \sqrt{25 - 2u}.$$

Then

$$x_2 = \frac{\sqrt{7}}{2} \sqrt{5 \pm \sqrt{25 - 2u}}.$$

Finally from  $\dot{x}_4 = 0$ , we have

$$x_4 = \frac{u}{2} + \frac{15}{4} \pm \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{25 - 2u}.$$

2) **Expressions for the eigenvalues along steady state curve:** Plotted in Fig. C4(a) are the eigenvalues of the (unstable) branch  $x_4^*(u) = \frac{3}{4} \left( \frac{2u}{3} + 5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u} \right)$ :

$$\lambda_1 = -2$$

$$\lambda_2 = -1$$

$$\lambda_3 = \frac{1}{8} \left( -\sqrt{49 - 48\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}} + 448(5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}) + 32\sqrt{7}(5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u})^{3/2}} - 8\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}} - 7 \right)$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{8} \left( \sqrt{49 - 48\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}} + 448(5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}) + 32\sqrt{7}(5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u})^{3/2}} - 8\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 + \sqrt{25 - 2u}} - 7 \right).$$

Plotted in Fig. C4(b) are the eigenvalues of the (stable) branch  $x_4^*(u) = \frac{3}{4} \left( \frac{2u}{3} + 5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u} \right)$ :

$$\lambda_1 = -2$$

$$\lambda_2 = -1$$

$$\lambda_3 = \frac{1}{8} \left( -\sqrt{49 - 48\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}} + 448(5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}) + 32\sqrt{7}(5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u})^{3/2}} - 8\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}} - 7 \right)$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{1}{8} \left( \sqrt{49 - 48\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}} + 448(5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}) + 32\sqrt{7}(5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u})^{3/2}} - 8\sqrt{7}\sqrt{5 - \sqrt{25 - 2u}} - 7 \right).$$

These expressions were obtained using Mathematica.

#### D. Dynamics of the core kinetic proofreading network

Under mass-action kinetics, the system governing the dynamics of the core network (Fig. 4) is

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL}{dt} &= -kLR + \ell_0 C_0 + \ell_1 C_1 + \cdots + \ell_N C_N \\
\frac{dR}{dt} &= -kLR + \ell_0 C_0 + \ell_1 C_1 + \cdots + \ell_N C_N \\
\frac{dC_0}{dt} &= kLR - (k_0 + \ell_0)C_0 \\
&\vdots \\
\frac{dC_i}{dt} &= k_{i-1}C_{i-1} - (k_i + \ell_i)C_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N-1 \\
&\vdots \\
\frac{dC_N}{dt} &= k_{N-1}C_{N-1} - \ell_N C_N,
\end{aligned} \tag{D7}$$

where  $C_T := \sum_{i=0}^N C_i$ ,  $L_T = L + C_T$ , and  $R_T = R + C_T$ .

1) **Analytical expression for the steady states of TCR complexes:** We claimed in Section V that  $C_i^* = A_i C_T^*$  and

$$C_T^* = \frac{L_T + R_T + \frac{A}{k}}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{L_T + R_T + \frac{A}{k}}{2}\right)^2 - L_T R_T},$$

where the constants  $L_T, R_T, A, k$  are positive. We derive the above expression by following the idea in [3].

Suppose the system is at steady state. We drop the asterisk to simplify notation. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{N-1} &= \frac{\ell_N}{k_{N-1}} C_N, \\
C_{i-1} &= \frac{k_i + \ell_i}{k_{i-1}} C_i, \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, N-1, \\
C_0 &= \frac{k_1 + \ell_1}{k_0} C_1, \\
kLR &= (\ell_0 + k_0)C_0 = \sum_{j=0}^N \ell_j C_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the equations involving  $C_i$  can be calculated recursively:

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0 &= \frac{k_1 + \ell_1}{k_0} C_1, \quad C_1 = \frac{k_2 + \ell_2}{k_1} C_2, \quad \dots \\
\implies C_0 &= \frac{k_1 + \ell_1}{k_0} \frac{k_2 + \ell_2}{k_1} C_2, \quad \dots
\end{aligned}$$

resulting in the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{N-1} &= \frac{\ell_N}{k_{N-1}} C_N, \\
C_i &= \frac{\ell_N \prod_{j=i+1}^{N-1} (k_j + \ell_j)}{\prod_{j=i}^{N-1} k_j} C_N, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N-2 \\
C_1 &= \frac{\ell_N \prod_{j=2}^{N-1} (k_j + \ell_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{N-1} k_j} C_N = \frac{(k_2 + \ell_2)(k_3 + \ell_3) \cdots (k_{N-1} + \ell_{N-1}) \ell_N}{k_1 k_2 \cdots k_{N-1}} C_N \\
C_0 &= \frac{(k_1 + \ell_1)(k_2 + \ell_2) \cdots (k_{N-1} + \ell_{N-1}) \ell_N}{k_0 k_1 k_2 \cdots k_{N-1}} C_N.
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we will denote the above as  $C_i = a_i C_N$ , where  $a_i > 0$  is the appropriate product.

Now consider the definition of  $C_T$ , and substitute for  $C_j = a_j C_N$ :

$$C_T = C_0 + C_1 + \cdots + C_N = (a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{N-1} + a_N) C_N,$$

where  $a_N = 1$ . This means that ,

$$\begin{aligned}
C_N &= \frac{1}{\sum_{j=0}^N a_j} C_T =: A_N C_T, \\
C_i &= \frac{a_i}{\sum_{j=0}^N a_j} C_T =: A_i C_T, \quad \forall i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we have the conservation laws  $L_T = L + C_T$ , and  $R_T = R + C_T$ , so

$$LR = (L_T - C_T)(R_T - C_T) = C_T^2 - C_T(L_T + R_T) + L_T R_T.$$

On one hand, substituting the expression for  $C_i$ , we see that

$$kLR = \sum_{i=0}^N \ell_i C_i = \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{a_i \ell_i}{\sum_{j=0}^N a_j} C_T =: AC_T.$$

On the other hand, this is equal to  $k(C_T^2 - C_T(L_T + R_T) + L_T R_T)$ . Thus,

$$C_T^2 - C_T(L_T + R_T + A/k) + L_T R_T = 0.$$

By the quadratic formula,

$$C_T = \frac{L_T + R_T + A/k}{2} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{L_T + R_T + A/k}{2}\right)^2 - L_T R_T}, \quad (\text{D8})$$

where the positive root is rejected because  $C_T \leq \min\{L_T, R_T\}$ .

2) **Monotonic dependence on total antigen at steady state:** To show that  $\frac{\partial C_T}{\partial L_T} > 0$  for all  $L_T > 0$ , it suffices to show that the function  $g(x) = \frac{x+a+b}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(x+a+b)^2 - 4ax}$  has positive derivative for all  $x > 0$ . This is a simple calculation, as  $g'(x) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2(x+a+b)-4a}{4\sqrt{(x+a+b)^2-4ax}}$ . Thus,  $g'(x) > 0$  if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sqrt{(x+a+b)^2 - 4ax} > (x+a+b) - 2a \\
\iff &(x+a+b)^2 - 4ax > (x-a+b)^2 \\
\iff &(x+b)^2 + a^2 + 2a(x+b) - 4ax > (x+b)^2 + a^2 - 2a(x+b) \\
\iff &-2ax + 2ab > -2ax - 2ab,
\end{aligned}$$

which is clearly true. Thus  $\frac{\partial C_T}{\partial L_T} > 0$  holds.

### E. System with multiple inputs

Here we give in detail how to extend our results to a system with multiple inputs. We take an abstract system with 3 variables, in which 2 of them are influenced by  $u$ . Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_1 &= f_1(\mathbf{x}) + u \\ \dot{x}_2 &= f_2(\mathbf{x}) + u \\ \dot{x}_3 &= f_3(\mathbf{x}),\end{aligned}\tag{E9}$$

where we assume  $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i} < 0$  for each  $i$ . We define an extended system by treating  $u$  as a variable  $x_0$ , resulting in the system with control  $v$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_0 &= -x_0 + v, & x_0(0) &= v \\ \dot{x}_1 &= f_1(\mathbf{x}) + x_0 \\ \dot{x}_2 &= f_2(\mathbf{x}) + x_0 \\ \dot{x}_3 &= f_3(\mathbf{x}).\end{aligned}\tag{E10}$$

Then along a steady state curve  $(x_0(v), \mathbf{x}^*(v))$ , which we assume it exists, we can implicitly differentiate with respect to  $v$  and obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & \partial_1 f_1 & \partial_2 f_1 & \partial_3 f_1 \\ 1 & \partial_1 f_2 & \partial_2 f_2 & \partial_3 f_2 \\ 0 & \partial_1 f_3 & \partial_2 f_3 & \partial_3 f_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial_v x_0^* \\ \partial_v x_1^* \\ \partial_v x_2^* \\ \partial_v x_3^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{J}$  be the matrix above. Then Cramer's rule tells us that for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ ,

$$\partial_v x_j^* = \frac{(-1)^{j+1} \mathbf{J}[\hat{1}, \hat{j+1}]}{\det \mathbf{J}}.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{J}$  is *not*  $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial \mathbf{x}}$ , but contains it as a submatrix.

From (E10), clearly  $x_0(t) = v$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . So for  $j = 1, 2, 3$ , the derivative of  $x_j^*$  with respect to  $v$  in (E10) is equal to the derivative of  $x_j^*$  with respect to  $u$  in (E9), where the values of  $u$  and  $v$  are chosen to be the same constant.

1) **An example with multiple inputs:** As a concrete example, consider the system with output  $z$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x} &= -x + u \\ \dot{y} &= -y + u \\ \dot{z} &= -z + x - y^2 z.\end{aligned}\tag{E11}$$

The J-graph of this system is shown in Fig. E5(a), since its Jacobian matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -2yz & -1 - y^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This system is stable biphasic in  $z$ ; see Fig. E5(b). At first sight, it seems as though our results are silent on this system; however, we can extend our results by treating  $u$  as a variable.

Consider the following system with control  $v$  instead:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{x}_0 &= -x_0 + v, & x_0(0) &= v \\
 \dot{x} &= -x + x_0 \\
 \dot{y} &= -y + x_0 \\
 \dot{z} &= -z + x - y^2 z.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{E12}$$

The J-graph of this extended input-output system is Fig. E5(c). Corollary III.11 applies;  $z^*(v)$ , where  $u = v$ , is stable biphasic implies the existence of an IFFL, or both types of FBLs. Note the presence of an IFFL from  $x_0$  (formally the control  $u$ ) to the output  $z$ . Thus, to apply our results, we need to include in the J-graph a node for any control that influences more than one variable.




Fig. E5: (a) J-graph of the input-output system (E11) with multiple inputs. (b) Its steady state response  $z^*(u)$  is non-monotonic. (c) The J-graph of the extended input-output system (E12), where  $x_0 = u$ . It contains an IFFL, which is necessary for the biphasic response.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. D. Sontag, “Structure and stability of certain chemical networks and applications to the kinetic proofreading model of T-cell receptor signal transduction,” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 1028–1047, 2001.
- [2] —, “Bell-shaped dose response for a system with no IFFLs,” *bioRxiv 2020.11.17.387605*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/early/2020/11/20/2020.11.17.387605>
- [3] M. Lever, H.-S. Lim, P. Kruger, J. Nguyen, N. Trendel, E. Abu-Shah, P. K. Maini, P. A. Van Der Merwe, and O. Dushek, “Architecture of a minimal signaling pathway explains the T-cell response to a 1 million-fold variation in antigen affinity and dose,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 113, no. 43, 2016.