

CLASSIFICATION OF 3-NODE RESTRICTED EXCITATORY-INHIBITORY NETWORKS

MANUELA AGUIAR, ANA DIAS, AND IAN STEWART

ABSTRACT. We classify connected 3-node restricted excitatory-inhibitory networks, extending our previous paper ('Classification of 2-node Excitatory-Inhibitory Networks', *Mathematical Biosciences* **373** (2024) 109205). We assume that there are two node-types and two arrow-types, excitatory and inhibitory; all excitatory arrows are identical and all inhibitory arrows are identical; and excitatory (resp. inhibitory) nodes can only output excitatory (resp. inhibitory) arrows. The classification is performed under the following two network perspectives: ODE-equivalence and minimality; and valence ≤ 2 . The results of this and the previous work constitute a first step towards analysing dynamics and bifurcations of excitatory-inhibitory networks and have potential applications to biological network models.

1. INTRODUCTION

Motifs, small subnetworks that carry out specific functions and occur unusually often, are important building blocks of biological networks. See, for example, [4, 16, 21]. Therefore, the classification of small excitatory-inhibitory networks and their dynamical analysis is a fundamental step in the understanding of the dynamics of biological networks and, consequently, in obtaining answers to important biological questions. Figure 1 illustrates nontrivial 3-node motifs present in real biological networks. More concretely, it shows eight 3-node motifs from the gene regulatory network of *Escherichia coli*, an organism whose genetic regulatory network, compiled by RegulonDB, has been characterized in considerable detail [7]. For more detail and examples of biological network motifs, see [3].

The importance of biological network motifs, and their dynamics and bifurcations, leads to our interest in formalizing the structure of excitatory-inhibitory (EI) networks and to investigate small examples systematically. This was the motto for our work in [3], where we classify connected 2-node excitatory-inhibitory networks under various conditions.

Date: June 26, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 92C42, 37N25, 37C20; Secondary: 92B20.

Key words and phrases. excitatory-inhibitory network, excitatory and inhibitory connections, ODE-equivalence.




FIGURE 1. Eight 3-node motifs realized in *E. coli*: (a) Autoregulation loop involved in biosynthesis of tryptophan, regulated by *trpR* [11], which represses itself, the gene *aroH*, and the *trpLEDCBA* operon, which codes for the enzymes of the tryptophan biosynthesis pathway. From [15]. (b) Example of a SAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network. From [12] Fig.1 E. (c) Example of an UNSAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network. From [12] Fig.2 F. (d) Example of a 2-FF network showing quotient by synchrony of genes *uxuR* and *IgoR* in a 4-node network in *E. coli*. From [17] Fig. 3B. (e) Example of a 3-FF network showing quotient by synchrony of genes *rcsB* and *adiY* in a 4-node network in *E. coli*. From [17] Fig. 3B. (f) Example of a network where a node feeds forward into one node of a toggle-switch. From [13]. (g) In the sugar utilisation transcriptional system [24], the arabinose metabolism [25] involves the regulation of the *araBAD* operon (composed of genes *araB*, *araA*, and *araD*) by two transcription factors *araC* and *crp* expressed by genes *araC* and *crp*, respectively. From [18]. (h) Example of a network where a node feeds forward into both nodes of a toggle-switch. From [18].

We work in the coupled cell network formalism of [6, 8, 9, 10, 20], in which nodes (cells) and arrows (connections, directed edges) are partitioned into one or more types. In biological networks it is common to distinguish between two types of connection: *excitatory* and *inhibitory*. In standard models these have different dynamic effects. In the coupled cell formalism we represent this distinction by assuming that nodes and arrows have two distinct types. For convenience, we call these ‘excitatory’ and ‘inhibitory’, but the classification is independent of their dynamics.

In the general theory, the dynamics of the network can be prescribed by any system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) that respects both its topology and




FIGURE 2. Two 3-node REI networks which are ODE-equivalent to the 3-gene GRN motif in Figure 1 (f) where a node feeds forward into one node of a toggle-switch. The network on the right is minimal.

the distinction between different types of node or arrow. Such systems of ODEs are said to be *admissible* for the network. The dynamical interpretation of nodes or arrows as being excitatory (tending to activate the nodes to which they connect) or inhibitory (tending to suppress such activity) is not built into the definition of admissible ODEs, because connections can differ in other ways. See [3, Section 1.3] for remarks on how excitation and inhibition can be defined within the formalism for specific ODE models.

The classification of 2-node excitatory-inhibitory networks in [3] considers different possibilities regarding whether the distinction between the two types of node is maintained, or they are identified, and regarding whether a node can send only one type of output, excitatory or inhibitory, or can have both excitatory and inhibitory outputs. This leads to four different types of excitatory-inhibitory networks: restricted, partially restricted, unrestricted and completely unrestricted. For each type we give in [3] two different classifications. Using results on ODE-equivalence and minimality, we classify the ODE-classes and present a minimal representative for each ODE-class. We also classify all the networks with valence ≤ 2 .

In this work, as a continuation of [3], we extend the classification to 3-node excitatory-inhibitory networks. However, here we assume the type of connection is determined by its tail node, as happens for general neuronal networks. In other words, excitatory nodes output excitatory signals and inhibitory nodes output inhibitory signals. This is what we call restricted excitatory-inhibitory (REI) networks in Definition 2.1 below. In Figure 1, networks (a)-(b) have arrows (and nodes) of a single type. Networks (c)-(f) are REI networks. Networks (g)-(h) are not REI networks: some node outputs arrows of both types.

An Example. The 3-node network motif (f) of Figure 1 is an example of an REI network. The black shaded nodes are of one type (say, inhibitory) and the third node is of different type (say, excitatory). Both inhibitory nodes send two inhibitory outputs, which in this network, are directed to the two inhibitory nodes; the excitatory node sends an excitatory signal to one of the inhibitory nodes. In the coupled cell network formalism the main features we retain from this particular network are

that it has 3 nodes, two of them are of one type and the third one is of different type. The equal type nodes output arrows of the same type. Different node types output different arrow types. See Figure 2 left. A general admissible system of ODEs consistent with this network has the form

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= f(x_1; \overline{x_1, x_2}), \\ \dot{x}_2 &= g(x_2; \overline{x_2, x_1}, x_3), \\ \dot{x}_3 &= h(x_3), \end{aligned}$$

where f, g, h are smooth functions. Each such function captures how the evolution of each node depends on the other nodes. The overbar notation over two variables in the functions f and g denotes their invariance under permutation of the two variables, which occurs because the corresponding input arrows have the same type. Assuming nodes 1, 2 have internal phase space \mathbb{R}^k and node 3 has internal phase space \mathbb{R}^l , then $f : (\mathbb{R}^k)^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$, $g : (\mathbb{R}^k)^3 \times \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and $h : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$.

Interpreting the network as a 3-gene *Escherichia coli* GRN, we may assume that the variable $x_i = (x_i^R, x_i^P) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is associated with gene i , for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Here, x_i^R is the concentration of mRNA in gene i and x_i^P is the concentration of protein in gene i . We also assume that the time evolution of the cellular concentration of proteins and mRNA molecules is determined by an ODE. (We use this term for a single ODE and for a system.) Moreover, there must be the constraint that a concentration cannot be negative. In this modeling approach, two components of the ODE are associated with each gene i . The equation for x_i^R determines the rate of change of the concentration of the transcribed mRNA; the equation for x_i^P describes the rate of change of the concentration of its corresponding translated protein. As in [14], a simple example of an admissible system of the form (1.1), where all 3 genes have 2-dimensional node spaces (that is, $k = l = 2$), arises by choosing the following functions f, g, h :

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x_1; \overline{x_1, x_2}) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_1 x_1^R \\ \beta_1 x_1^R - \alpha_1 x_1^P \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_1^-(x_2^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\ g(x_2; \overline{x_2, x_1}, x_3) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_2 x_2^R \\ \beta_2 x_2^R - \alpha_2 x_2^P \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} H_2^-(x_2^P) + H_2^-(x_1^P) + H_2^+(x_3^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\ h(x_3) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_3 x_3^R \\ \beta_3 x_3^R - \alpha_3 x_3^P \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, as genes 1, 2 are of the same type, we take $\beta_1 = \beta_2$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ and $\delta_1 = \delta_2$. Also, δ_i, α_i represent, respectively, degradation of mRNA and protein for gene i , and are assumed to be independent of the concentrations of the other molecules in the cell. The function $H_i^-(x_j^P)$ (resp. $H_i^+(x_j^P)$) in the equation for gene i describes how

protein j inhibits (resp. activates) mRNA i . In this model equation we assume that the effects of the proteins are additive; an alternative typical modeling assumption is that they are multiplicative. See for example [19]. These functions H_i^- and H_i^+ are generally nonlinear. Typical choices for H_i^- are the Hill functions:

$$H_i^-(z) = \frac{1}{1 + z^{n_i}}$$

where n_i is a positive integer. Assuming $z \geq 0$, since it represents a concentration, $H_i^-(z)$ converges to 0 as z converges to $+\infty$ and $H_i^-(0) = 1$. This property encodes inhibition into the equations. Assuming the inhibitory edges to be of the same type corresponds to taking $H_1^- = H_2^- = H_3^-$. A choice for excitation is the function

$$H_i^+(z) = 1 - H_i^-(z) = \frac{z^{n_i^*}}{1 + z^{n_i^*}},$$

where n_i^* is not necessarily equal to n_i . With the functions f, g, h as in (1.2), and taking into account the structure of network on the left of Figure 2 (or the 3-gene GRN motif in Figure 1 (f)), equations (1.1) take the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^R &= -\delta_1 x_1^R + H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_1^-(x_2^P), \\ \dot{x}_1^P &= \beta_1 x_1^R - \alpha_1 x_1^P, \\ \dot{x}_2^R &= -\delta_1 x_2^R + H_1^-(x_2^P) + H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_2^+(x_3^P) \\ \dot{x}_2^P &= \beta_1 x_2^R - \alpha_1 x_2^P, \\ \dot{x}_3^R &= -\delta_3 x_3^R, \\ \dot{x}_3^P &= \beta_3 x_3^R - \alpha_3 x_3^P. \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

Thus, for $i = 1, 2$, the rate of change of the concentration of the transcribed mRNA i , given by x_i^R , is the difference between the ‘synthesis term’ ($H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_1^-(x_2^P)$ for $i = 1$ and $H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_1^-(x_2^P) + H_2^+(x_3^P)$ for $i = 2$), and the ‘degradation term’ $\delta_1 x_i^R$. In fact, we can think that the evolution of gene i given by $x_i = (x_i^R, x_i^P)$ is a sum of two parts: one determines the internal dynamics of the gene i and the other determines the coupling effect. For $i = 1$, we can consider the internal dynamics to be determined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\delta_1 x_1^R \\ \beta_1 x_1^R - \alpha_1 x_1^P \end{bmatrix},$$

and the coupling part by

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_1^-(x_2^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Alternatively, we can consider the internal dynamics to be determined by

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\delta_1 x_1^R + H_1^-(x_1^P) \\ \beta_1 x_1^R - \alpha_1 x_1^P \end{bmatrix},$$

and the coupling part by

$$\begin{bmatrix} H_1^-(x_2^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This can be interpreted as considering different gene internal dynamics of gene 1. Similarly, we have two analogous options for the internal dynamics of gene 2. Taking the second option for the internal dynamics of genes 1 and 2, we may rewrite (1.2) as

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1; \overline{x_1}; x_2) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_1 x_1^R + H_1^-(x_1^P) \\ \beta_1 x_1^R - \alpha_1 x_1^P \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} H_1^-(x_2^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\ (1.4) \quad g(x_2; \overline{x_2}, \overline{x_1}, x_3) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_1 x_2^R + H_1^-(x_2^P) \\ \beta_1 x_2^R - \alpha_1 x_2^P \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} H_1^-(x_1^P) + H_2^+(x_3^P) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\ h(x_3) &= \begin{bmatrix} -\delta_3 x_3^R \\ \beta_3 x_3^R - \alpha_3 x_3^P \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In the coupled cell network formalism, the vector field (1.4) determines an admissible coupled cell system for the network on the right of Figure 2, which has the general form

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= F(x_1; x_2), \\ \dot{x}_2 &= G(x_2; x_1, x_3), \\ \dot{x}_3 &= h(x_3), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F(x_1; x_2) = f(x_1; \overline{x_1}, x_2), \quad G(x_2; x_1, x_3) = g(x_2; \overline{x_2}, \overline{x_1}, x_3).$$

In the coupled cell network formalism, we say that the two networks of Figure 2 are ODE-equivalent, precisely because every admissible ODE for the network on the right of Figure 2 can be seen as an admissible ODE for the network on the left of Figure 2, and conversely, assuming the node phase spaces of the two networks are the same. Moreover, the network on the right of Figure 2 is the minimal network in terms of number of edges among all 3-node networks that are ODE-equivalent to the networks in Figure 2. See Subsection 2.2 for formal definitions and main results on network admissible ODEs, ODE-equivalence and minimality. In this paper, we use results on network ODE-equivalence and minimality to classify the set of 3-node REI networks into ODE-classes and present minimal representatives for each ODE-class.

Our classification of 3-node REI networks is made under a variety of extra conditions, summarized in Table 1. This classification, together with that for connected 2-node EI networks in [3], are a preparatory step towards a systematic analysis of dynamics and bifurcations in EI networks.

Summary of Paper and Main Results. We characterize and classify connected 3-node REI networks. We give a classification under the relation of ODE-equivalence, where two networks are ODE-equivalent if they have the same space of admissible ODEs. Sometimes we consider a restriction on the valence of the nodes. To organize and summarize these results, Table 1 lists the main classifications obtained in this paper, with columns for type of network, bounds on the valence, number of networks in the classification, plus references to associated Figures, Tables and Theorems.

network type	number of networks	figure	theorem
REI	∞	Figure 5 Table 2	Proposition 3.1
REI (ODE)	∞	Figure 5	Proposition 3.2
REI (ODE) val ≤ 2 no auto 2 arrow-types	92	Figure 5 Table 3	Proposition 3.3
REI (ODE) val ≤ 2 no auto 1 arrow-type	38	Figure 5 Table 4	Proposition 3.3
REI (ODE) val ≤ 2 auto 2 arrow-types	62	Figure 5 Table 5	Proposition 3.3
REI (ODE) val ≤ 2 auto 1 arrow-type	35	Figure 5 Table 6	Proposition 3.3
REI val ≤ 2	> 227	Figure 6	Proposition 3.5
REI val = 2, different conditions	—	Figures 12, 15, 18, 21	Propositions 3.8, 3.11, 3.14, 3.17

TABLE 1. List of classifications of connected 3-node REI networks and their locations. (ODE): ODE-equivalence classes. val: valence. auto: with autoregulation. no auto: without autoregulation. In the penultimate line of the table, the exact number of 3-node connected REI networks of valence ≤ 2 can be obtained by taking all combinations of the multiplicities in Figure 6.

Section 2 discusses REI networks from the point of view of the general network formalism of [9, 10, 20]. Subsection 2.1 gives a formal definition of ‘restricted excitatory-inhibitory’ (REI) networks. Subsection 2.2 defines the class of admissible ODEs associated with an REI network. Adjacency matrices are also discussed.

Section 3 characterizes connected 3-node REI networks and classifies them up to ODE-equivalence. Corresponding admissible ODEs are not listed, for reasons of space, but can be deduced algorithmically from the network diagrams. Subsection

3.2 classifies the connected 3-node REI networks with valence ≤ 2 and also classifies their ODE-classes. Subsection 3.3 classifies connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2 under four different conditions: (i) every node receives one arrow of each type; (ii) only the two excitatory nodes receive one arrow of each type; (iii) only the inhibitory node and one excitatory node receive one arrow of each type; (iv) given any two nodes there is no arrow-type preserving bijection between their input sets.

2. RESTRICTED EXCITATORY-INHIBITORY NETWORKS

In this section we define the class of *restricted* EI-networks (REI). We assume the networks have two distinct node-types N^E, N^I and two different arrow-types A^E, A^I , which we may think of as excitatory/inhibitory nodes and excitatory/inhibitory arrows. Moreover, we make the standard simplified modeling assumption that all excitatory arrows are identical and all inhibitory arrows are identical. Without this last assumption, the lists of networks becomes much larger, already for the class of 3-node networks.

In some areas of biology, notably neuroscience, a given node cannot output both an excitatory arrow and an inhibitory one. We make that assumption here. Also, as in [3], we work in the modified network formalism presented in [9], which allows arrows of the same type to have heads of different types. This differs from the formalism of [10, 20], in which arrows of the same type have heads (and tails) of the same type. We remove that condition so that an excitatory (resp. inhibitory) node can send excitatory (resp. inhibitory) arrows to excitatory and/or inhibitory nodes. See [9, Section 9.3] for technical details where it is pointed out that the main network theorems and their proofs remain valid in the more general formalism. See also [3, Remarks 2.1] for a discussion of this approach.

2.1. Formal Definitions. We define restricted excitatory-inhibitory (REI) networks, state our conventions for representing them in diagrams, and give examples.

Definition 2.1. A network \mathcal{G} is a *restricted excitatory-inhibitory network* (REI network) if it satisfies the following four conditions:

- (a) There are two distinct node-types, N^E and N^I .
- (b) There are two distinct arrow-types, A^E and A^I .
- (c) If $e \in A^E$ then $\mathcal{T}(e) \in N^E$.
- (d) If $e \in A^I$ then $\mathcal{T}(e) \in N^I$,

where $\mathcal{T}(e)$ indicates the tail node of arrow e . ◇

Conventions. The following conventions are used throughout the paper without further mention, except as an occasional reminder for clarity.

- (a) We represent type N^E nodes by white circles and type N^I nodes by grey circles. Type A^E arrows are solid and type A^I arrows are dashed. (Various other

conventions for excitatory/inhibitory arrows are found in the literature; this one is chosen for convenience.)

(b) All classifications are stated up to *renumbering* of nodes and *duality*; that is, interchange of ‘excitatory’ and ‘inhibitory’ on nodes and arrows: $N^E \leftrightarrow N^I$ and $A^E \leftrightarrow A^I$. \diamond

Example 2.2. The networks (c)-(f) in Figure 1 are REI networks. However, networks (g)-(h) are not REI networks as some node (the *araC* gene in network (g) and the *crp* gene in network (h)) outputs arrows of both types. \diamond

Definition 2.3. (a) In an REI network, every node i can receive excitatory and inhibitory arrows: here, the sets of excitatory and inhibitory arrows directed to i are denoted by $I^E(i)$ and $I^I(i)$, and called the *excitatory* and *inhibitory input sets* of i , respectively. The union $I(i) = I^E(i) \cup I^I(i)$ is the *input set* of i and the cardinality $\#I(i)$ of $I(i)$ is the *valence (degree, in-degree)* of i .

(b) Two nodes i and j with the same node-type and valence are said to be *input equivalent* when $\#I^E(i) = \#I^E(j)$ and $\#I^I(i) = \#I^I(j)$. We write $i \sim_I j$. Trivially, the relation \sim_I is an equivalence relation, which partitions the set of nodes into disjoint *input classes*.

(c) A network where the nodes are not all input equivalent is *inhomogeneous*. Otherwise, it is *homogeneous*. \diamond

Remarks 2.4. (a) Every REI network is inhomogeneous as by definition it has two distinct node-types, N^E and N^I .

(b) The definition of (robust) synchrony in [9, 10, 20] implies that synchronous nodes must be input equivalent. Thus for EI networks, nodes of type N^E cannot synchronize with nodes of type N^I . See also Subsection 2.4. \diamond

In this paper we consider *connected* networks in the sense there is an undirected path between every pair of nodes. We distinguish connected networks according to the existence of a closed directed arrow-path containing every node, or not. In the first case, the network is *transitive*. Otherwise, it is *feedforward*.

Example 2.5. Consider the two networks (e)-(f) in Figure 1. Network (e) is transitive and network (f) is feedforward. \diamond

2.2. Admissible ODEs. We adopt the general form of admissible ODEs for a network as defined in [9, 10, 20] with the assumption in this paper that all nodes have the same state space, say $P = \mathbb{R}^m$ for some $m > 0$. Given an EI network with a finite set of nodes, node i is represented in the ODE system by the variable x_i which is governed by a system of ordinary differential equations. The word ‘admissible’ is used in the sense that the ODE system encodes information about the node and arrow types. Specifically, when two input equivalent nodes have the same numbers,

say n_e , of excitatory arrows and n_i of inhibitory arrows, targeting the two nodes, we specify their dynamics by the same smooth function, say $f : P^{k+1} \rightarrow P$, evaluated at the node and at the corresponding tail nodes of the arrows targeting the node. We follow [3, Definition 2.8]:

Definition 2.6. A system of ODEs is *admissible* for an EI network if it has the form

$$\dot{x}_i^s = f_i(x_i^s; \overline{x_{i_1}^+}, \dots, \overline{x_{i_{n_e}}^+}; \overline{x_{i_{n_e+1}}^-}, \dots, \overline{x_{i_{n_e+n_i}}^-})$$

where $x_i^s \in \{x_i^+, x_i^-\}$ and the overlines indicate that the function f_i is symmetric in the overlined variables. The node variables are indexed by i . The *multiset* of all tail nodes of input arrows is the union of two subsets: the multiset $\{i_1, \dots, i_{n_e}\}$ of all tail nodes of the excitatory input set of node i , and the multiset $\{i_{n_e+1}, \dots, i_{n_e+n_i}\}$ of all tail nodes of the inhibitory input set of node i . The functional notation converts these multisets into tuples of the corresponding variables. We use the superscripts $+$ and $-$, as a notation convention, to make the distinction between the input variables corresponding to tail nodes in the excitatory and in the inhibitory input sets, respectively. Analogously, when there are two distinct node-types N^E and N^I , we use the superscripts $+$ and $-$ to make the distinction between the state variable of excitatory and inhibitory nodes.

Moreover, if nodes i, j of the same node-type are in the same input class, that is, there is an arrow-type preserving bijection between the corresponding input sets, then $f_i = f_j$. The evolution of nodes in different input classes is governed by different functions f_i , one for each input class. \diamond

Remark 2.7. Observe that *multiple arrows* are permitted as there can be distinct excitatory (resp. inhibitory) arrows with the same tail node directed to the same node. Moreover, *self-loops* are also permitted as a node can input an arrow to itself. In biology, the term *autoregulation* is used when a node influences its own state. \diamond

Example 2.8. The UNSAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network in Figure 1 (c), which is one of the 3-node motifs from the gene regulatory network of *Escherichia coli*, is an REI (inhomogeneous) network. Nodes ‘crp’ and ‘tam’ are type N^E and node ‘IsrR’ is type N^I . We number them as nodes 1, 2 and 3, respectively. There are two type A^E arrows; one from 1 to 2 and the other from 1 to 3. There are two type A^I arrows; one from 3 to itself and the other from 3 to 2.

Node 1 has empty input set. Nodes 2 and 3 have excitatory and inhibitory input sets with cardinality 1. Node 3 is autoregulatory. Thus, although nodes 1 and 2 are of same type, they are not input equivalent, since they have different valences. On the other hand, although nodes 2 and 3 have same excitatory and inhibitory input valences, they are not input equivalent, since they are of different types.

Admissible ODEs are:

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^+ &= f(x_1^+) \\ \dot{x}_2^+ &= g(x_2^+; x_1^+; x_3^-) \\ \dot{x}_3^- &= h(x_3^-; x_1^+; x_3^-) \end{aligned} .$$

Here, $x_1^+, x_2^+, x_3^- \in P$, where P is the node state space, and $f : P \rightarrow P$ and $g, h : P^3 \rightarrow P$ are smooth functions. \diamond

An n -node network can be represented by its *adjacency matrix*, which is the $n \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ such that a_{ij} is the number of arrows from node j to node i . (In the graph-theoretic literature the opposite convention is often used, which gives the transpose of the adjacency matrix defined here.) For an REI network, conditions (c)-(d) of Definition 2.1 allow us to deduce the arrow-types from its adjacency matrix, provided we know the node-types of nodes i and j . In fact, we consider two *node-type* $n \times n$ matrices, which are both diagonal: given one node-type matrix, the diagonal entry ii is 1 if node i is of that type and zero otherwise. When we need to distinguish the different arrow-types, as is the case in this paper when classifying networks using ODE-equivalence, see Subsection 2.3, we consider *arrow-type* adjacency matrices, one for each arrow type. For example, for REI-networks, we will consider two arrow-type adjacency matrices, one for excitatory arrows and the other for inhibitory arrows.

Example 2.9. The adjacency matrix of the UNSAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network in Figure 1 (c) is

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$

We may also distinguish node- and arrow-types and equip each with its own adjacency matrix. Here there are four:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Node-type } N^E: & \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; & \text{Node-type } N^I: & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}; \\ \text{Arrow-type } A^E: & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; & \text{Arrow-type } A^I: & \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned}$$

\diamond

2.3. ODE-equivalent Networks. As mentioned and exemplified in the Introduction, different networks with the same number of nodes are said to be *ODE-equivalent* if they have the same set of admissible ODEs, for any choice of node state spaces,




FIGURE 3. The minimal 3-node network ODE-equivalent to the UNSAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network in Figure 1 (c).

when their nodes are identified by a suitable bijection that preserves node state spaces. See [5, 9, 10].

Remarks 2.10. (a) A necessary and sufficient condition for two networks to be ODE-equivalent, using the associated node and arrow adjacency matrices, is proved in [5, Theorem 7.1, Corollary 7.9]. Specifically, two networks with the same number of nodes are ODE-equivalent if and only if, for a suitable identification of nodes, they have the same vector spaces of *linear* admissible maps when node state spaces are \mathbb{R} . Equivalently, the adjacency matrices of all node- and arrow-types span the same space.

(b) For REI networks, as mentioned above, the node-types determine the arrow-types, which implies that the adjacency matrices naturally decompose into four blocks. The linear condition in (a) preserves this decomposition, so two REI networks are ODE-equivalent if and only if these components are separately ODE-equivalent.

(c) In fact, using the results in [1, 2] on network minimality, it follows that given an ODE-class of REI networks, we can distinguish a subclass containing the REI networks in the ODE-class that have a minimal number of arrows. This is a *minimal subclass* which in general need not be a singleton. \diamond

Examples 2.11. (a) The REI network in Figure 3 is ODE-equivalent to the REI UNSAT-Feed-Forward-Fiber network in Figure 1 (c) and it is minimal. Moreover, the admissible ODE (2.6) determines an arbitrary dynamical system in (x_1^+, x_2^+, x_3^-) . (b) The REI network on the right of Figure 2 is ODE-equivalent to the REI 3-gene GRN motif in Figure 1 (f) and it is minimal. \diamond

2.4. Robust Network Synchrony Subspaces. Consider the 3-node REI network on the left of Figure 4. The two excitatory nodes 1, 2 are input equivalent as both receive only one inhibitory arrow. A general admissible ODE-system associated with this network has the form

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^+ &= f_1(x_1^+; x_3^-), \\ \dot{x}_2^+ &= f_2(x_2^+; x_3^-), \\ \dot{x}_3^- &= f_3(x_3^-; x_1^+), \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 4. (Left) A 3-node minimal REI network where nodes 1, 2 can synchronize robustly. (Right) A 2-node REI network which is the quotient of the 3-node network on the left by taking the equivalence relation on the 3-node network set with classes $\{1, 2\}$ and $\{3\}$.

where $f_1, f_3 : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^l$ are smooth functions. We see that any solution $(x_1^+(t), x_2^+(t), x_3^-(t))$ of (2.7) with initial condition satisfying say $x_1^+(0) = x_2^+(0)$ has nodes 1, 2 synchronized for all time, that is,

$$x_1^+(0) = x_2^+(0) \Rightarrow x_1^+(t) = x_2^+(t), \quad \forall t.$$

This property does not depend on the choices of the functions f_1, f_3 neither the internal node phase spaces \mathbb{R}^l . It is determined *only* by the structure of the network on the left of Figure 4; concretely, the two nodes 1, 2 are of the same node type and each receives one inhibitory arrow from the inhibitory node 3, which in this example is the unique inhibitory node. Equivalently, we see that the vector field $F(x_1; x_2; x_3) = (f_1(x_1; x_3), f_1(x_2; x_3); f_3(x_3; x_1))$ leaves invariant the space $\Delta = \{(x_1, x_1, x_3)\}$, that is,

$$F(\Delta) \subseteq \Delta.$$

In this case, we say that Δ is a *robust network synchrony space*. Restricting (2.7) to Δ , we obtain the system

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1^+ &= f_1(x_1^+; x_3^-), \\ \dot{x}_3^- &= f_3(x_3^-; x_1^+), \end{aligned}$$

which is admissible for the 2-node network on the right of Figure 4 which is also an REI network. In the terminology of [20], the 2-node network on the right of Figure 4 is the *quotient* of the network on the left of Figure 4 by the equivalence relation on the node set of the 3-node network with equivalence classes $\{1, 2\}$ and $\{3\}$. This relation is said to be *balanced*, which is equivalent to the invariance of Δ under the node and arrow adjacency matrices.

These ideas generalize to n -node networks and it is proved in [20] that the admissible vector fields for a network leave invariant a linear subspace defined in terms of equalities of certain node coordinates if and only if the equivalence relation on the network node set with classes given by the clusters of nodes whose coordinates are identified is balanced. See [20, Definition 6.4] for the definition of network balanced




FIGURE 5. 3-node REI network: nodes 1 and 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory. The nonnegative integer arrow multiplicities are $\alpha, \delta, \tau, \beta_i, \gamma_j, i = 1, 2, 3, 4, j = 1, 2$.

relation, [9, Proposition 10.20] or [10, Section 5], and [20, Theorem 6.5] for the definition of quotient network by a balanced equivalence relation.

For REI networks, it is trivial to show that the restriction of any admissible ODE for an REI network to a robust synchrony subspace is admissible for a smaller network, which is also an REI network. That is, the quotient of an REI network by a balanced equivalence relation on the network node set is also an REI network.

3. CLASSIFICATION OF CONNECTED 3-NODE REI NETWORKS

We now classify REI networks with three nodes, which we assume are connected. Moreover, up to duality and numbering of the nodes, we can assume that the networks have nodes 1 and 2 of type N^E and node 3 of type N^I .

3.1. Connected 3-node REI Networks. In this section we characterize the connected 3-node REI networks, without imposing any restrictions, and classify them up to ODE-equivalence.

Up to duality any 3-node REI network is as shown in Figure 5, for a suitable choice of nonnegative integer arrow multiplicities $\alpha, \delta, \tau, \beta_i, \gamma_j$, where $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, j = 1, 2$.

The adjacency matrices are

$$\text{Node-type } N^E: A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \text{Node-type } N^I: A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix};$$

$$\text{Arrow-type } A^E: A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & \beta_3 & 0 \\ \beta_2 & \delta & 0 \\ \beta_1 & \beta_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \text{Arrow-type } A^I: A_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \tau \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proposition 3.1. *Any 3-node REI network is as shown in Figure 5, for a suitable choice of nonnegative integer arrow multiplicities $\alpha, \delta, \tau, \beta_i, \gamma_j$, where $i = 1, 2, 3, 4,$*

$j = 1, 2$. A 3-node REI network is connected if and only if its nonzero arrow multiplicities, excluding autoregulation arrows, are listed in Table 2.

Proof. A 3-node REI network is connected if and only if the union of the input and output sets of each node, excluding self-coupling arrows, is nonempty. That is, if and only if at least one multiplicity is nonzero in each of the sets

$$\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \gamma_1\}, \quad \{\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \{\beta_1, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}.$$

The possible combinations are listed in Table 2. \square

β_1, β_2	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_4$
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_2$	β_1, β_3	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \beta_4$	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
$\beta_1, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_3, \gamma_2$	β_1, β_4
$\beta_1, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_1, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	$\beta_1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	β_1, γ_2
$\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$	$\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	β_2, β_4
$\beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_2, \beta_4, \gamma_2$	β_2, γ_1	$\beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
β_2, γ_2	β_3, β_4	$\beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1$	$\beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	$\beta_3, \beta_4, \gamma_2$
β_3, γ_1	$\beta_3, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$	β_3, γ_2	β_4, γ_1	$\beta_4, \gamma_1, \gamma_2$
γ_1, γ_2				

TABLE 2. Possible nonzero multiplicities of the arrows of a connected REI network as shown in Figure 5.

Proposition 3.2. *The 3-node REI networks are those in Figure 5, for a suitable choice of nonnegative integer arrow multiplicities $\alpha, \delta, \tau, \beta_i, \gamma_j$, where $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $j = 1, 2$.*

Up to ODE-equivalence and minimality, we can assume that τ is zero and at least one of α or δ is zero.

Moreover, either

*γ_1 and γ_2 are coprime, if both nonzero, or
 $\gamma_1 = 1$ and $\gamma_2 = 0$, or $\gamma_1 = 0$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$, or
 $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0$.*

If $\alpha = \delta = 0$, then

*the nonzero $\beta_i, i = 1, \dots, 4$, are coprime, or
 $\beta_i = 1$, if $\beta_j = 0, j \neq i, i, j = 1, \dots, 4$, or
 $\beta_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, 4$.*

If $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\delta = 0$, then

α and the nonzero β_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are coprime, or $\beta_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$.

Proof. Up to ODE-equivalence, we can assume that $\tau = 0$, so

$$\langle A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \rangle = \left\langle A_1, A_2, A_3, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle.$$

Thus, if $\gamma_2 = 0$, we can set $\gamma_1 = 1$, and *vice versa*. If both γ_1 and γ_2 are nonzero, we can assume they are coprime.

Moreover, up to ODE-equivalence, we can assume that, at least one, of α or δ is zero. If $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\delta = 0$ we can assume that α and the nonzero β_i , for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, are coprime.

If both α and δ are zero then

$$\langle A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \rangle = \left\langle A_1, A_2, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \beta_3 & 0 \\ \beta_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \beta_1 & \beta_4 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle,$$

then we can assume that the nonzero β_i , for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are coprime. \square

3.2. Connected 3-node REI Networks with Valence ≤ 2 . In this section we classify the connected 3-node REI networks with valence ≤ 2 . We start by classifying them up to ODE-equivalence.

Proposition 3.3. *Any connected 3-node REI network with valence ≤ 2 is ODE-equivalent to the network in Figure 5, where, under minimality, $\delta = \tau = 0$ and*

- (a) *If there is no autoregulation, the nonzero arrow multiplicities β_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and γ_j ($j = 1, 2$) appear in Tables 3 and 4.*
- (b) *If there is autoregulation, the nonzero arrow multiplicities α , β_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and γ_j ($j = 1, 2$), appear in Tables 5 and 6.*

Proof. The result follows from Propositions 3.1 and 3.2, since a 3-node REI network with valence ≤ 2 must satisfy

$$0 \leq \alpha + \beta_3 + \gamma_1 \leq 2, \quad 0 \leq \tau + \beta_1 + \beta_4 \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq \delta + \beta_2 + \gamma_2 \leq 2.$$

\square

Lemma 3.4. *If \mathcal{G} is a connected 3-node REI network with input valence ≤ 2 , where nodes 1, 2 are of type N^E and node 3 is of type N^I , then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing nodes 2, 3 and all arrows between these two nodes is a 2-node REI network with input valence ≤ 2 .*

nonzero multiplicities	# ODE-classes
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_3 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_3 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2, \leq 2, \text{excluding } \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2, \gamma_1 = 1$	3
$1 \leq \beta_1, \gamma_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_1 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_3 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_3 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \beta_1 = \beta_3 = 2, \gamma_2 = 1$	3
$\beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	3
$\beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$\beta_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2, \beta_1 = 1$	3
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_3, \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \beta_2 = \beta_4 = 2, \gamma_1 = 1$	3
$1 \leq \beta_4, \gamma_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_2 = \gamma_1 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_4, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_3, \beta_4 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 2, \gamma_2 = 1$	3
$\beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \gamma_1 = 1$	2
$\beta_3 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$\beta_4 = \gamma_1 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2, \beta_4 = 1$	3

TABLE 3. The 92 ODE-classes of connected 3-node REI networks with valence ≤ 2 without autoregulation having both excitatory and inhibitory arrows. See Figure 5.

Proof. The subnetwork S of \mathcal{G} containing nodes 2, 3 is a 2-node network where node 2 is of type N^E and node 3 is of type N^I . Since \mathcal{G} is REI then node 2 outputs only excitatory arrows and node 3 outputs only inhibitory arrows. Therefore S is also an REI network. \square

nonzero multiplicities	# ODE-classes
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2$	3
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 2$	7
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2$, $\beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_3 \leq 2$, $\beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 2$	7
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_2 = \beta_4 = 2$	3
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_3 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_1 = \beta_3 = 2$	3
$1 \leq \beta_3 \leq 2$, $\beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_3, \beta_4 \leq 2$, excluding $\beta_3 = \beta_4 = 2$	3
$\beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2$, excluding $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2$	3

TABLE 4. The 38 ODE-classes of connected REI networks with valence ≤ 2 without autoregulation having only excitatory or inhibitory arrows. See Figure 5

Proposition 3.5. *The set of connected 3-node REI networks with valence ≤ 2 comprises the networks in Figure 6.*

Proof. We enumerate the set of connected 3-node REI networks \mathcal{G} with valence ≤ 2 using Lemma 3.4. We can assume that nodes 1 and 2 have type N^E and node 3 has type N^I .

Consider the subnetwork S of \mathcal{G} containing node 2 (of type N^E) and node 3 (of type N^I) and all arrows between these nodes. This is a 2-node REI network with valence ≤ 2 . If S is connected then it is one of the 15 networks in Figure 7 (Figure 7 in [3]), where node 2 is of type N^E and node 3 is of type N^I . If S is not connected then S is one of the 9 networks in Figure 8. The options for arrows from S to node 1 and from node 1 to S are shown in Figure 9.

Since node 1 has valence ≤ 2 , multiplicities c, d, e satisfy $c+d+e \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Also, $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ (respectively $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$) is such that the sum of a (respectively b) and the valence of node 2 (respectively node 3) in S is up to two. Combining this information with the networks in Figures 7 and 8 we obtain Figure 6. \square

3.3. Connected 3-node REI Networks with Valence 2. In this section we classify connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2. We consider four different cases:

- (i) Every node receives one arrow of each type;
- (ii) Only the two excitatory nodes receive one arrow of each type;
- (iii) Only the inhibitory node and one excitatory node receive one arrow of each type;
- (iv) Given any two nodes there is no arrow-type preserving bijection between their input sets.




FIGURE 6. The connected 3-node REI networks with valence ≤ 2 . Here c, d, e are nonnegative integers such that $c + d + e \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Also, $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ (respectively $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$) is such that the sum of a (respectively b) and the valence of node 2 (respectively node 3) is ≤ 2 .

nonzero multiplicities	# ODE-classes
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2, \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$\beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_1 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \alpha = \beta_1 = 2, \gamma_2 = 1$	3
$1 \leq \beta_1, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	2
$\gamma_1 = \alpha = 1, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \alpha \leq 2, \beta_2 = \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \gamma_2 = 1$	2
$\beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \gamma_2 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_4, \gamma_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 2, \gamma_1 = \alpha = 1$	2

TABLE 5. The 62 ODE-classes of connected REI networks with valence ≤ 2 with autoregulation having both excitatory and inhibitory arrows. See Figure 5.

nonzero multiplicities	# ODE-classes
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \alpha = \beta_1 = \beta_2 = 2$	7
$1 \leq \beta_1, \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	4
$1 \leq \beta_2 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2
$1 \leq \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1$	4
$1 \leq \alpha, \beta_2, \beta_4 \leq 2, \text{excluding } \alpha = \beta_2 = \beta_4 = 2$	7
$1 \leq \beta_1 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1$	2
$\beta_3 = \alpha = 1, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	1
$1 \leq \beta_4 \leq 2, \beta_3 = \alpha = 1$	2
$1 \leq \alpha \leq 2, \beta_1 = \beta_4 = 1$	2

TABLE 6. The 35 ODE-classes of connected REI networks with valence ≤ 2 with autoregulation having only excitatory or inhibitory arrows. See Figure 5.




FIGURE 7. Connected 2-node REI networks with input valence ≤ 2 . This corresponds to [3, Figure 7].




FIGURE 8. The 2-node disconnected REI networks with valence ≤ 2 .

We start by classifying the 3-node REI networks of valence 2 that are *almost homogeneous*; that is, where every node receives exactly one excitatory and one




FIGURE 9. Options for arrows from S to node 1 and from node 1 to S .

inhibitory arrow. (The obstacle to exact homogeneity is that the nodes have different types.)

Lemma 3.6. *If \mathcal{G} is an almost homogeneous connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$ and $N^I = \{3\}$ and arrow-types A^E and A^I , then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrows of type A^I is the network in Figure 10.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is an almost homogeneous REI and node 3 is the only one of type N^I , every node receives one arrow of type A^I from node 3. \square




FIGURE 10. A 3-node network where node 3 outputs an inhibitory arrow to every node.

Lemma 3.7. *If \mathcal{G} is an almost homogeneous connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$ and $N^I = \{3\}$, and arrow-types A^E and A^I , then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrows of type A^E is one of the networks in Figure 11.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is an almost homogeneous REI and node 3 is the only of type N^I , every node receives one arrow of type A^E from nodes 1 or 2. \square

Proposition 3.8. *Any almost homogeneous connected 3-node REI network of valence 2 with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, and two arrow-types A^E and A^I , is one of the 4 networks in Figure 12. These are not ODE-equivalent. Each of these networks has a unique 2-dimensional robust synchrony subspace where only nodes 1, 2 are synchronized; see Remark 2.4(b) and Subsection 2.4.*




FIGURE 11. The 3-node networks in which every node receives an excitatory arrow, which can be from node 1 or node 2.




FIGURE 12. The almost homogeneous connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2, where nodes 1, 2 are of type N^E , node 3 is of type N^I , and there are two arrow-types A^E and A^I . All networks have a unique 2-dimensional robust synchrony space where only nodes 1, 2 are synchronized.

Proof. We can assume that REI networks have nodes 1 and 2 of type N^E and node 3 of type N^I . If \mathcal{G} is an almost homogeneous connected 3-node REI network with valence 2 then the subnetwork containing only the arrow-type A^I is the network in Figure 10, see Lemma 3.6, and the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^E is one of the networks listed in Figure 11, see Lemma 3.7. The subnetwork containing only arrow-type A^I is symmetric under transposition of nodes 1 and 2. We obtain the networks in Figure 12. \square

We consider now 3-node REI networks \mathcal{G} of valence 2 which are inhomogeneous, where nodes 1, 2 are input equivalent, each receives one arrow of each type, but node 3 does not receive one arrow of each type.

Lemma 3.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, and arrow-types A^E and A^I . Assume that nodes 1 and 2 are input equivalent, receiving one arrow of each type. Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only the arrow-type A^I is the network in Figure 13.*

Proof. Since nodes 1, 2 of \mathcal{G} are input equivalent and \mathcal{G} is REI, node 3 is the only one of type N^I , and nodes 1, 2 receive one arrow of type A^I from node 3. \square




FIGURE 13. A 3-node network in which node 3 sends an inhibitory arrow to nodes 1, 2. Here $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ is the number of inhibitory self-inputs of node 3.

Lemma 3.10. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2 with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, and arrow-types A^E and A^I . Assume that nodes 1 and 2 are input equivalent, each receiving one arrow of each type. Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only the arrow-type A^E is one of the networks in Figure 14.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is REI and nodes 1 and 2 are of type N^E , each of nodes 1, 2 receives one arrow of type A^E from nodes 1 or 2. \square

Proposition 3.11. *Any connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, where the two excitatory nodes are input equivalent receiving one arrow of each type and the inhibitory node does not receive one arrow of each type, is one of the networks in*




FIGURE 14. The 3-node networks where nodes 1, 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, and where nodes 1, 2 receive an excitatory arrow which can be from node 1 or node 2. Here b, c are nonnegative integers such that $b + c \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, representing the total number of excitatory inputs that node 3 receives (from nodes 1, 2).




FIGURE 15. The connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2, two arrow-types A^E and A^I , and where nodes 1, 2 are input equivalent receiving one input of each arrow-type. Here a, b, c are nonnegative integers such that $a + b + c = 2$ and $a \neq 1$. That is, $a = 2, b = c = 0$ or $a = 0, b + c = 2$.

Figure 15. *All these networks have exactly one 2-dimensional robust synchrony subspace where nodes 1 and 2 are synchronized.*

Proof. We can assume that the REI network has nodes 1 and 2 of type N^E and node 3 of type N^I . Suppose that \mathcal{G} is a minimal connected 3-node REI network with valence 2, input equivalence relation $\sim_I = \{\{1, 2\}, \{3\}\}$, and where nodes 1 and 2 receive one arrow of each type. Then the subnetwork containing only arrow-type A^I is the network in Figure 13, see Lemma 3.9, and the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^E is one of the networks in Figure 14, see Lemma 3.10. The subnetwork containing only arrow-type A^I is symmetric under transposition of nodes 1 and 2. We obtain the networks in Figure 15. Clearly the only possible robust synchrony subspace must have nodes 1 and 2 synchronized. \square

We consider 3-node REI networks of valence 2, where we assume now that all three nodes are not input equivalent, but nodes 1, 3 receive one arrow of each type.

Lemma 3.12. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2 with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, and arrow-types A^E and A^I . Assume that $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$ and that nodes 1 and 3 receive one arrow of each type. Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^I is the network in Figure 16.*




FIGURE 16. 3-node network in which nodes 1, 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, and node 3 sends an inhibitory arrow to nodes 1, 3. Here, $a \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ is the number of inhibitory inputs to node 2 (from node 3).

Proof. Since nodes 1, 3 of \mathcal{G} receive both an arrow of type A^I and \mathcal{G} is REI, node 3 is the only one of type N^I , and nodes 1, 3 receive one arrow of type A^I from node 3. \square

Recall from Definition 2.3 that \sim_I denotes input equivalence. We now prove:

Lemma 3.13. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, and arrow-types A^E and A^I . Assume that $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$ and that nodes 1 and 3 receive one arrow of each type. Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^E is one of the networks in Figure 17.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{G} is REI and nodes 1 and 2 are those of type N^E , every node 1, 3 receives one arrow of type A^E from node 1 or 2. \square

Proposition 3.14. *Any connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, where two nodes are excitatory, one node is inhibitory, and all three nodes are not input equivalent but where one excitatory node and the inhibitory node receive one arrow of each type, is one of the networks listed in Figure 18.*

Proof. We can assume that nodes 1 and 2 have type N^E and node 3 has type N^I . Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network with valence 2, and input equivalence relation $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{3\}, \{2\}\}$, where nodes 1 and 3 receive one arrow of each type.




FIGURE 17. The 3-node networks in which nodes 1, 2 are excitatory, node 3 is inhibitory, and nodes 1, 3 receive an excitatory arrow which can be from node 1 or node 2. Here $b \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ represents the total number of excitatory inputs that node 2 receives (from nodes 1, 2).




FIGURE 18. The connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2, where nodes 1, 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, there are two arrow-types A^E and A^I , all nodes are not input equivalent, and nodes 1, 3 receive one input of each arrow-type. For networks (NH.5) – (NH.11), a, b are nonnegative integers such that $a + b = 2$ and $a \neq b$. That is, $a = 0, b = 2$ or $a = 2, b = 0$.




FIGURE 19. The 3-node networks in which nodes 1, 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, only two nodes receive arrows, and one node receives one arrow and another node receives two arrows. The arrows are inhibitory and are outputs from node 3.

Then the subnetwork containing only arrow-type A^I is the network in Figure 16, see Lemma 3.12 and the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^E is one of the networks listed in Figure 17, see Lemma 3.13. We obtain the networks in Figure 18. \square

We consider 3-node REI networks of valence 2, where we now assume that, given any two nodes, there is no arrow-type preserving bijection between their input sets:

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{One node receives one arrow of each type } A^E \text{ and } A^I, \\ &\text{another node receives two arrows of type } A^E \\ &\text{and the other node receives two arrows of type } A^I. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, each node lies in a different input equivalence class, that is, $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$.

Lemma 3.15. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with node set $N^E \cup N^I$ where $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, arrow-types A^E , A^I and satisfying (3.9). Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow type A^I is one of the networks in Figure 19.*

Proof. The network \mathcal{G} is REI and node 3 is the only one of type N^I . By (3.9), only two nodes receive arrows of type A^I from node 3. Moreover, one receives one arrow and the other two arrows. \square




FIGURE 20. The 3-node networks where nodes 1, 2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, only two nodes receive arrows, and one node receives one arrow and another node receives two arrows. The arrows are of type A^E and are outputs from nodes 1 and/or 2.

Lemma 3.16. *Let \mathcal{G} be a connected 3-node REI network of valence 2, with $N^E = \{1, 2\}$, $N^I = \{3\}$, two distinct arrow-types A^E , A^I , and satisfying (3.9). Then the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow-type A^E is one of the networks in Figure 20.*

Proof. The network \mathcal{G} is REI and nodes 1 and 2 are those of type N^E . By (3.9) only two nodes receive arrows of type A^E from nodes 1 and 2. Moreover, one receives one arrow and the other receives two arrows. \square




FIGURE 21. The connected 3-node REI networks with valence 2, in which nodes 1,2 are excitatory and node 3 is inhibitory, having two arrow-types A^E and A^I , input equivalence relation $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$, and satisfying (3.9).

Proposition 3.17. *The set of connected 3-node REI networks of valence 2 with input equivalence relation $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$ and satisfying (3.9) is listed in Figure 21.*

Proof. Up to duality, REI networks have nodes 1 and 2 of type N^E and node 3 of type N^I . If \mathcal{G} is a connected 3-node REI network with valence 2, input equivalence relation $\sim_I = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}\}$ and satisfying (3.9), then the subnetwork containing only arrow-type A^I is one of the networks listed in Lemma 3.15, and the subnetwork of \mathcal{G} containing only arrow type A^E is one of the networks listed in Lemma 3.16. We obtain the networks in Figure 21. \square

4. CONCLUSIONS

Motivated by the growing interest in network motifs and their functionality in biological networks, and following the work in [3], we give a characterization of the connected 3-node restricted excitatory-inhibitory networks. Our classifications are up to renumbering of the nodes and duality – switch nodes and arrows types from ‘excitatory’ to ‘inhibitory’, and vice versa. Although there is an infinity of connected 3-node restricted excitatory-inhibitory networks, when we restrict to networks with valence less or equal to 2 – each node receives at most 2 inputs – we get a finite number. Taking our characterization further, we also list those networks with valence exactly equal to 2, under different conditions on the input arrows of the 3 nodes,

ranging from all nodes receiving an arrow of each type to all having non-isomorphic input sets. Both, for all connected 3-node restricted excitatory-inhibitory networks and those with valence less or equal to 2, we give their characterization under ODE-equivalence. Moreover, we give a minimal representative for each ODE-class.

The next step for future work in our systematic study is to explore the dynamics, in particular the bifurcations, of these 3-node restricted excitatory-inhibitory motifs. This will be in line to what is done in [14] for six particular motifs that occur as functional building blocks in gene regulatory networks, where the state of each gene is modeled in terms of two variables: mRNA and protein concentration. The study in [14] explores the patterns of synchrony (fibration symmetries) of the motifs and considers both all possible network admissible models as well as special specializations to simple models based on Hill functions and linear degradation.

Acknowledgments

MA and AD were partially supported by CMUP, member of LASI, which is financed by national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the projects with reference UIDB/00144/2020 and UIDP/00144/2020.

REFERENCES

- [1] M.A.D. Aguiar and A.P.S. Dias. Minimal coupled cell networks, *Nonlinearity* **20** (2007) 193–219; doi:10.1088/0951-7715/20/1/012.
- [2] M.A.D. Aguiar and A.P.S. Dias. Coupled cell networks: minimality, *Proc. Appl. Math. Mech.* **7** (2007) 1030501–1030502; doi:10.1002/pamm.200700991.
- [3] M. Aguiar, A. Dias, and I. Stewart. Classification of 2-node excitatory-inhibitory networks, *Mathematical Biosciences* **373** (2024) 109205; doi: 10.1016/j.mbs.2024.109205.
- [4] E. Borriello. The local topology of dynamical network models for biology, *Journal of Complex Networks*, **12** (2) (2024) cnae007; <https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnae007>.
- [5] A.P.S. Dias and I. Stewart. Linear Equivalence and ODE-equivalence for coupled cell networks, *Nonlinearity* **18** (2005) 1003–1020; doi:10.1088/0951-7715/18/3/004
- [6] M. Field. Combinatorial dynamics, *Dynamical Systems* **19** (2004) 217–243; doi:10.1080/14689360410001729379.
- [7] S. Gama-Castro *et al.* RegulonDB version 9.0: high-level integration of gene regulation, coexpression, motif clustering and beyond, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44** (2016) D133–D143.
- [8] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart. Nonlinear dynamics of networks: the groupoid formalism, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **43** (2006) (3) 305–364; doi:10.1090/S0273-0979-06-01108-6.
- [9] M. Golubitsky and I. Stewart. *Dynamics and Bifurcation in Networks: Theory and Applications of Coupled Differential Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia 2023; doi:10.1137/1.9781611977332.
- [10] M. Golubitsky, I. Stewart, and A. Török. Patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks with multiple arrows, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Sys.* **4** (2005) 78–100; doi:10.1137/0406126.
- [11] C.L. Grove and R.P. Gunsalus. Regulation of the *aroH* operon of *Escherichia coli* by the tryptophan repressor, *J Bacteriol.* **169** (1987) 21582164.

- [12] I. Leifer, F. Morone, S.D.S. Reis, J.S. Andrade Jr., M. Sigman, and H.A. Makse. Circuits with broken fibration symmetries perform core logic computations in biological networks, *PLOS Computational Biology* (2020); doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1007776 0.
- [13] H.A. Makse, Genetic circuits, preprint 2020.
- [14] H.A. Makse, S.D.S. Reis, and I. Stewart. Dynamics and bifurcations in genetic circuits with fibration symmetries, *J. R. Soc. Interface*, to appear.
- [15] H.A. Makse, I. Stewart, P. Boldi, and F. Sorrentino. *Symmetries of Living Systems: Graph Fibrations and Cluster Synchronization in Biological Networks*, Cambridge University Press, to appear.
- [16] R. Milo, S. Shen-Orr, S. Itzkovitz, N. Kashtan, D. Chklovskii, and U. Alon. Network motifs: simple building blocks of complex networks, *Science* **298** (2002) 824–827; doi:10.1126/science.298.5594.824.
- [17] F. Morone, I. Leifer, and H.A. Makse. Fibration symmetries uncover the building blocks of biological networks, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **117** (2020) 8306–8314; doi:10.1073/pnas.191462811.
- [18] F. Morone, and H.A. Makse. Network symmetries of living systems, preprint.
- [19] A. Polynikis, S.J. Hogan and M. di Bernardo. Comparing different ODE modelling approaches for gene regulatory networks, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **261** (2009) (4) 511–530; doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.07.040.
- [20] I. Stewart, M. Golubitsky and M. Pivato. Symmetry groupoids and patterns of synchrony in coupled cell networks, *SIAM J. Appl. Dynam. Sys.* **2** (2003) 609–646; doi:10.1137/S1111111103419896.
- [21] J.J. Tyson and B. Novák. Functional motifs in biochemical reaction networks, *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **61** (2010) 219–240; doi:10.1146/annurev.physchem.012809.103457.

MANUELA AGUIAR, CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA DA UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO (CMUP), FACULDADE DE CIÊNCIAS, UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO, RUA DO CAMPO ALEGRE S/N, 4169-007 PORTO, PORTUGAL
 FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA, UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO, RUA DR ROBERTO FRIAS, 4200-464 PORTO, PORTUGAL

Email address: maguiar@fep.up.pt

ANA DIAS, CENTRO DE MATEMÁTICA DA UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO (CMUP), DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, FACULDADE DE CIÊNCIAS, UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO, RUA DO CAMPO ALEGRE S/N, 4169-007 PORTO, PORTUGAL

Email address: apdias@fc.up.pt

IAN STEWART, MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, COVENTRY CV4 7AL, UNITED KINGDOM

Email address: i.n.stewart@warwick.ac.uk