
IMMEDIATE NEIGHBOURS OF MONOTONE BOOLEAN FUNCTIONS

A PREPRINT

✉ José E. R. Cury^{*1}, Patrícia Tenera Roxo^{*2}, ✉ Vasco Manquinho², ✉ Claudine Chaouiya^{†3}, and ✉ Pedro T. Monteiro^{‡2}

¹DAS, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, Brazil

²INESC-ID / IST - Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

³Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, I2M, Marseille, France

July 2, 2024

ABSTRACT

Boolean networks constitute relevant mathematical models to study the behaviours of genetic and signalling networks. These networks define regulatory influences between molecular nodes, each being associated to a Boolean variable and a regulatory (local) function specifying its dynamical behaviour depending on its regulators. However, existing data is mostly insufficient to adequately parametrise a model, that is to uniquely define a regulatory function for each node. With the intend to support model parametrisation, this paper presents results on the set of Boolean functions compatible with a given regulatory structure, *i.e.* the partially ordered set of monotone non-degenerate Boolean functions. More precisely, we present original rules to obtain the direct neighbours of any function of this set. Besides a theoretical interest, presented results will enable the development of more efficient methods for Boolean network synthesis and revision, benefiting from the progressive exploration of the vicinity of regulatory functions.

Keywords Regulatory networks · Boolean functions · Partial order · Discrete dynamics

1 Introduction

Boolean or multi-valued models have been successfully employed to assess dynamical properties of biological regulatory networks [2]. Seminal work by S. Kauffman [19] and R. Thomas [37] have been pursued with a significant range of studies leading to theoretical results or formalism extensions (e.g., among many others [1, 4, 5, 12, 14, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40]) and to computational tools for model development and analyses (e.g., [24, 26, 27]). There is also a long history of modelling studies for a wide variety of biological processes such as cell division cycle [22, 13], cell differentiation during the fly development [3, 35, 34], immune T helper cell differentiation [23, 25], tumour cell migration [8, 31], and many more. While the definition of such models does not require quantitative kinetic parameters, it still implies the specification of the transition (logical) regulatory functions to describe the combined effects of regulators upon their targets. Data on the mechanisms underlying regulatory mechanisms are still scarce, and modellers often rely on generic regulatory functions; for instance, a component is activated if at least one activator is present and no inhibitors are present [23], or if the weighted sum of its regulator activities is above a specific threshold (e.g., [6, 22]).

Here, we focus on Boolean models, and we address the following questions: 1) how complex is the parametrisation of a Boolean model consistent with the regulatory structure defined by a digraph with no multiple edges, and 2) how to modify the parametrisation so as to minimise the changes in the model dynamical properties. The later question amounts to disclose the structure of the set of candidate functions that is, as argued below, the set of non-degenerate monotone Boolean functions.

*These authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

†Claudine.Chaouiya@univ-amu.fr

‡Pedro.Tiago.Monteiro@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Given a gene g , element of a Boolean model, we characterise the set \mathcal{F}_g of the Boolean regulatory functions compatible with its regulatory structure, *i.e.*, with the number and signs of its regulators, which are either activators or inhibitors. Generically, if a gene g has n regulators, one can in principle define 2^{2^n} potential Boolean regulatory functions. This number is then reduced when imposing the functionality of the interactions (*i.e.*, all variables associated with the regulators are essential), and a fixed sign of these interactions. We focus on monotone Boolean functions [36, 15], *i.e.*, each interaction has a fixed sign (positive when its source is an activator, or negative when its source in an inhibitor), and signs of the literals correspond to those of the associated interactions. However, there is no closed expression of the number of monotone increasing Boolean functions on n variables, known as the Dedekind number [20, 33]. Actually, it is even unknown for $n > 9$, and its value for $n = 9$ was determined only very recently [17, 18]. Hence, even if the functionality constraint further restricts the number of Boolean functions compatible with a given regulatory structure, this number can still be astronomical. The set \mathcal{F}_g is the set of the monotone (positive or negative in each of its variables), non-degenerate Boolean functions. As set inclusion defines a partially ordered set (\mathcal{F}_g, \preceq) by considering the True sets of the Boolean functions, the resulting lattice can be visualised on a Hasse diagram. In this work, we propose an original algorithm to explore paths in this diagram, that is to determine the local neighbouring functions of any function in the set (\mathcal{F}_g, \preceq) .

Section 2 introduces some preliminaries on sets, partial orders, Boolean functions and Boolean networks. In Section 3, we characterise the set \mathcal{F}_g of regulatory functions consistent with the regulatory structure of a given gene g . Sections 4 and 5 characterise the immediate neighbours of any function in (\mathcal{F}_g, \preceq) . Section 6 proposes two algorithms to compute the immediate parents and children of any function in \mathcal{F}_g . The paper ends with some conclusions and prospects in Section 7.

2 Background

This section introduces basic concepts and notation used in the remainder of the paper.

2.1 Sets and Partial Orders

For further detail on the notions introduced here, we refer to relevant text books [7, 11].

Given a set S , a *Partial Order* on S is a binary relation \preceq on S that is reflexive, antisymmetric and transitive.

The pair (S, \preceq) defines a *Partially Ordered Set (poset)* in which two elements s, s' of S are said *comparable* if either $s \preceq s'$ or $s' \preceq s$.

A poset (S, \preceq) can be graphically represented as a *Hasse Diagram (HD)*, where each element of S is a vertex in the plane, and an edge connects a vertex $s \in S$ to a vertex $s' \in S$ placed above iff: $s \preceq s'$, and $\nexists s'' \in S$ such that $s \preceq s'' \preceq s'$.

Given $A \subseteq S$, $u \in S$ is an *upper bound* (resp. *lower bound*) of A in the poset (S, \preceq) if $s \preceq u$ (resp. $l \preceq s$) for all $s \in A$. A least upper bound (resp. greatest lower bound) of A is called a *supremum* (resp. an *infimum*) of A . (S, \preceq) is *bounded* if S has both an infimum and a supremum.

A *chain* in a poset (S, \preceq) is a subset of S in which all the elements are pairwise comparable. The counterpart notion is an *antichain*, defined as a subset of S in which any two elements are incomparable.

Furthermore, an element $s \in S$ is *independent* of an antichain $A \subsetneq S$ if $A \cup \{s\}$ remains an antichain, namely, s is incomparable to any element of A .

Let us now consider the specific case of 2^S , the set of all subsets of a set S . Obviously $(2^S, \subseteq)$ defines a poset. A set of elements of 2^S whose union contains S is called a *cover* of S .

Given $A \subset 2^S$, $s \in (2^S \setminus A)$ is *dominated* by A if $\exists a \in A$ such that $s \subsetneq a$ (*i.e.*, s is contained by at least one element of A). Furthermore, $s \in 2^S \setminus A$ is a *maximal set dominated* by A if $\forall s'$ dominated by A , $s' \not\subset s$. Finally, $s \in 2^S \setminus A$ is a *maximal set independent* of A if s is independent of A , and $\forall x \in S, x \notin s, \exists a \in A$ such that $a \subset (s \cup \{x\})$.

Figure 1 illustrates the different notions introduced above on the HD of the poset $(2^{\{1,2,3,4\}}, \subseteq)$.

2.2 Boolean Functions

Considering the set $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$, let \mathbb{B}^n denote the set of n -dimensional vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with entries in \mathbb{B} .

A Boolean function $f : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is *positive* (resp. *negative*) in x_i if $f|_{x_i=0} \leq f|_{x_i=1}$ (resp. $f|_{x_i=0} \geq f|_{x_i=1}$), where $f|_{x_i=0}$ (resp. $f|_{x_i=1}$) denotes the value of $f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ (resp. $f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 1, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$).




Figure 1: Hasse diagram of the poset $(2^{\{1,2,3,4\}}, \subseteq)$. It is clearly bounded (\emptyset being its infimum, and $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ its supremum). The orange vertices define an anti-chain $A = \{\{1, 2, 3\}, \{2, 4\}\}$, which is a cover of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$; green vertices indicate the sets independent of A (with $\{1, 3, 4\}$ being maximal); blue vertices dominate A , and violet vertices are dominated by A (with $\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}$ being maximal).

We say that f is *monotone in x_i* if it is either positive or negative in x_i . It is *monotone* if it is monotone in x_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and it is *positive* (resp. *negative*) if it is positive in all its variables [9].

Determining the number $M(n)$ of positive Boolean functions for n variables is known as *Dedekind's problem*. This number, also called Dedekind number, is equivalent to the number of antichains in the poset $(2^{\{1, \dots, n\}}, \subseteq)$. $M(n)$ has been computed for values of n up to 9, while asymptotic estimates have been proposed for higher values [7].

A variable x_i is an *essential* variable of a Boolean function f if there is at least one $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n$ such that $f|_{x_i=0} \neq f|_{x_i=1}$. A Boolean function is said to be *non-degenerate* if it has no fictitious variables, *i.e.*, all variables are *essential* [32].

Given a Boolean function $f : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$, $\mathbb{T}(f)$ denotes the set of vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n$ for which $f(\mathbf{x}) = 1$; in other words, $\mathbb{T}(f)$ is the *True set* of f [9, 20].

There are many ways to represent a Boolean function. One such way is by means of a Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF). A function is said to be in DNF if it is expressed as a disjunction of conjunctions of literals. An elementary conjunction is an *implicant* of a Boolean function f , if it implies f . It is a *prime implicant*, if it is minimal (*i.e.* the removal of any literal results in a non-implicant of f). As a DNF of a function is in general not unique, we focus on the *Complete Disjunctive Normal Form* (CDNF) variation, which is the disjunction of all its *prime implicants*. Any Boolean function can be uniquely represented by its CDNF [9], and in the remainder of this paper, Boolean functions are thus assumed to be expressed in their CDNFs.

When working with DNFs, it is customary to represent conjunctions as sets and the DNF itself as a set of sets. This representation eases manipulating DNFs, and is mathematically consistent with the original objects.

2.3 Boolean Networks

A *Boolean Network* (BN) is fully defined by a triplet $\mathcal{R} = (G, R, \mathcal{F})$, where:

- $G = \{g_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ is the set of n regulatory components, each g_i being associated with a Boolean variable x_i in \mathbb{B} that denotes the activity state of g_i , *i.e.*, g_i is active (resp. inactive) when $x_i = 1$ (resp. $x_i = 0$). The set \mathbb{B}^n defines the state space of \mathcal{R} , and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{B}^n$ defines a state of the model;
- $R \subseteq G \times G \times \{+, -\}$ is the set of interactions, (g_i, g_j) , together with the effect gene g_i has in gene g_j . $(g_i, g_j, +)$ denotes that g_i has an activatory effect on g_j , and $(g_i, g_j, -)$ denotes that g_i has an inhibitory effect of g_j ;
- $\mathcal{F} = \{f_i\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$ is the set of regulatory Boolean functions; $f_i : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ defines the target level of component g_i for each state $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n$.

In the corresponding *regulatory graph* (G, R) , nodes represent regulatory components (*e.g.* genes) and directed edges represent signed regulatory interactions (positive for activations and negative for inhibitions). Figure 2 shows an example of a regulatory graph with 3 components: a mutual inhibition between g_2 and g_3 , and a self-activation of g_1 , which is further activated by g_2 and repressed by g_3 .




Figure 2: Example of a Boolean Network with: (A) the regulatory graph, where normal (green) arrows represent activations and hammerhead (red) arrows represent inhibitions; (B-C) asynchronous state transition graphs, considering Boolean regulatory functions consistent with the regulatory graph in (A). Sole the function of g_1 differs, leading to the loss of a transition from panel (B) to (C). Stable states (fixed points of the regulatory functions) are denoted in red.

The set of the regulators of a component g_i is denoted $G_i = \{g_j \in G, (g_j, g_i, +) \in R \text{ or } (g_j, g_i, -) \in R\}$. Note that the regulatory function of a component g_i may be defined over the states of its regulators (rather than over the states of the full set of components): $\forall g_i \in G, f_i : \mathbb{B}^{|G_i|} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$; it thus specifies how regulatory interactions are combined to affect the state of g_i . In other words, one can define the regulatory functions over only their essential variables.

A BN defines a dynamics represented by a *State Transition Graph* (STG), where each node represents a state $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n$, and directed edges represent transitions between states. It depends on an updating mode, which can be synchronous, asynchronous as defined by R. Thomas [38], or others [2, 21, 38, 29]. For instance, the asynchronous STG encompasses a transition between a state \mathbf{x} to a state \mathbf{x}' iff

$$\begin{cases} \exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \neg x_i = x'_i, \\ \forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, j \neq i, f_j(\mathbf{x}) = x_j. \end{cases}$$

Properties of interest in the STG of a BN are the attractors (terminal strongly components) and their reachability properties [2, 30, 38]. As illustrated in Figure 2, changing the regulatory function of a component leads to the addition or the loss of transitions.

3 Characterising the set of consistent regulatory functions

In this section, given a generic component g_i of a BN, we first characterise the regulatory functions that comply with the interactions targeting g_i . We then discuss properties of the set of such functions, as well as its cardinality.

3.1 Consistent regulatory functions are non-degenerate monotone Boolean functions

Let us consider $\mathcal{R} = (G, R, \mathcal{F})$ a BN and $g_i \in G$ with G_i its set of p regulators ($p = |G_i|$).

There are 2^{2^p} potential Boolean functions over the p variables associated to the regulators of g_i . However, these functions can be restricted to some extent, by considering solely functions that comply with the regulatory structure of g_i , *i.e.* that reflect the signs and functionalities of the regulations affecting g_i [36, 2, 15]. Note that we consider the restricted class of BN with no dual regulations, *i.e.*, all the regulators are either activators or inhibitors.

An interaction (g_j, g_i) is said to be *functional* if $\exists \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n : f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=0} \neq f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=1}$, and positive (respectively, negative) if $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n : f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=0} \leq f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=1}$ (resp. if $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^n : f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=0} \geq f_i(\mathbf{x})|_{x_j=1}$). Whenever g_j is a regulator for g_i , interaction (g_j, g_i) must necessarily be functional. Moreover, as (g_j, g_i) must comply with a prescribed sign interaction from the regulatory graph, (g_j, g_i) is either positive or negative. In other words, whenever g_j is a regulator of g_i , x_j is an essential variable of f_i and f_i is monotone in x_j .

The set of regulators G_i can thus be partitioned as $G_i = G_i^+ \cup G_i^-$, where G_i^+ is the set of positive regulators of g_i (activators), while components in G_i^- are negative regulators of g_i (inhibitors). Considering the example in Figure 2,

p	$M(p)$	$N(p) = \mathcal{F}_g = \mathcal{S}_p $
1	3	1
2	6	2
3	20	9
4	168	114
5	7 581	6 894
6	7 828 354	7 785 062
7	2 414 682 040 998	2 414 627 396 434
8	56 130 437 228 687 557 907 788	56 130 437 209 370 320 359 968
9	286 386 577 668 298 411 128 469 151 667 598 498 812 366	286 386 577 668 298 410 623 295 216 696 338 374 471 993

Figure 3: Numbers of positive Boolean functions (Dedekind number $M(p)$) and of non-degenerate positive Boolean functions ($N(p)$) of $p = 1, \dots, 9$ variables. $N(p)$ is also the number of antichain covers of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.

we have the following sets of regulators: $G_1 = \{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$, $G_1^+ = \{g_1, g_2\}$ and $G_1^- = \{g_3\}$, $G_2 = G_2^- = \{g_3\}$, $G_3 = G_3^- = \{g_2\}$ and $G_2^+ = G_3^+ = \emptyset$.

Given the component g_i , let \mathcal{F}_i be the set of all *consistent Boolean regulatory functions*, i.e. the functions that comply with the regulatory structure defined by (G_i^+, G_i^-) . The following definition characterises \mathcal{F}_i .

Definition 1. *The set \mathcal{F}_i of consistent Boolean regulatory functions of component g_i is the set of non-degenerate monotone Boolean functions f_i such that, f_i is positive in x_k for $g_k \in G_i^+$ and negative in x_k for $g_k \in G_i^-$.*

Monotonicity derives from the non-duality assumption (an interaction is either positive or negative), and the sign of the interaction from a regulator g_k enforces the positiveness (if $g_k \in G_i^+$) or negativeness (if $g_k \in G_i^-$). Finally, regulatory functions must be non-degenerate due to the requirement of the functionality of all $g_k \in G_i$.

Let $\text{CDNF}(f_i) = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \left(\bigwedge_{k \in s_j} u_k \right)$ denote the CDNF of the regulatory function f_i . $\text{CDNF}(f_i)$ satisfies:

- (i) $\forall g_k \in G_i, \exists j$ such that $k \in s_j$;
- (ii) $\forall j, \forall k \in s_j, u_k = \begin{cases} x_k, & \text{if } g_k \in G_i^+, \\ \neg x_k, & \text{if } g_k \in G_i^-. \end{cases}$

Both conditions (i) and (ii) agree with Definition 1: (i) enforces the functionality of all regulators in G_i ; (ii) guarantees the consistency of the function with the sign of the regulatory interaction (g_k, g_i) . Note that by the definition of CDNF no two s_j, s_l ($j \neq l$) are such that $s_j \subset s_l$.

3.2 Set representation and number of consistent regulatory functions

Given the regulatory structure defined by G_i , any function $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ can be unambiguously represented by its set-representation, as defined below.

Definition 2. *Given a component g_i with $G_i = G_i^+ \cup G_i^-$ its set of p regulators, the set-representation $S(f_i) \subseteq 2^{\{1, \dots, p\}}$ of the regulatory function $f_i \in \mathcal{F}_i$ is such that $s_j \in S(f_i)$ if and only if $\left(\bigwedge_{k \in s_j} u_k \right)$ is a conjunctive clause of the CDNF representation of f_i .*

In the definition above, $S(f_i)$ represents the structure of f_i as its elements indicate which variables (regulators) are involved in each of the clauses defining f_i . The literals (non-complemented and complemented variables) are then unambiguously determined by G_i^+ and G_i^- . For example, the set-representation of $f_1(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1 \vee (x_2 \wedge \neg x_3)$ is $S(f_1) = \{\{1\}, \{2, 3\}\}$. Thus, each set in the set representation accounts for a prime implicant of the CDNF of the function.

Since elements of $S(f_i)$ are pairwise incomparable subsets of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, for the \subseteq relation, it is easy to verify that $S(f_i)$ is an antichain in the poset $(2^{\{1, \dots, p\}}, \subseteq)$. Moreover, $S(f_i)$ is also a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ since all indices in $\{1, \dots, p\}$ must appear in at least one element of $S(f_i)$. Finally, any antichain in $(2^{\{1, \dots, p\}}, \subseteq)$ which is a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ is the set representation of a unique function in \mathcal{F}_i . Therefore, \mathcal{F}_i , the set of consistent Boolean regulatory functions of g_i is isomorphic to the set \mathcal{S}_p of antichains in $(2^{\{1, \dots, p\}}, \subseteq)$.

As "when a monotone function is neither positive nor negative, it can always be brought to one of these two forms by an elementary change of variables" [9], from now on, we will restrict ourselves to (monotone) positive functions.




Figure 4: Hasse Diagram representing the set of all possible functions composed of 3 regulators (e.g. functions in red of the component g_1 of the model in Figure 2).

The cardinality $N(p)$ of \mathcal{F}_i , set of all non-degenerate monotone positive Boolean functions of p variables, is smaller than 2^{2^p} , the number of all Boolean functions of p variables and also than $M(p)$, the Dedekind number of monotone positive Boolean functions (including degenerate functions). Indeed, one can easily show that:

$$N(p) = M(p) - 2 - \sum_{k=1}^{p-1} \frac{p!}{k!(p-k)!} N(k).$$

Nevertheless, as illustrated in Figure 3, the cardinality of \mathcal{F}_i dramatically increases with the number of variables (regulators of g_i) and thus constitutes a major computational challenge. Any approach relying on the exploration of the full set \mathcal{F}_i where g_i has more than 5 regulators, would be intractable. In this context, the possibility to iteratively navigate within \mathcal{F}_i is crucial to assess the impact of particular regulatory functions on the dynamics of the corresponding BN, in a computational tractable manner.

3.3 Partially Ordered Set of non-degenerate monotone Boolean functions

In this section, we show that given a component g_i with p regulators, the set of its consistent regulatory functions \mathcal{F}_i is a poset. To this end, we consider the binary relation \preceq on $\mathcal{F}_i \times \mathcal{F}_i$ defined by:

$$\forall f, f' \in \mathcal{F}_i, f \preceq f' \iff \mathbb{T}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{T}(f').$$

It is easy to verify that (\mathcal{F}_i, \preceq) is a poset. Figure 4 shows the Hasse Diagram (HD) of the poset (\mathcal{F}_1, \preceq) of g_1 , a component of the model presented in Figure 2.

Observe that, while the functions in \mathcal{F}_i depend on the specific regulatory structure (i.e., the signs of the regulations), the topology of the HD and the relation between its nodes, when seen as set-representations, only depend on p , the number of regulators of g_i . In other words, the HD shown in Figure 4 represents the set of consistent regulatory functions for any component with 3 regulators.

In fact, one can consider the relation \preceq on the set \mathcal{S}_p of antichains in $(2^{\{1, \dots, p\}}, \subseteq)$:

$$\forall S, S' \in \mathcal{S}_p, S \preceq S' \iff \forall s \in S, \exists s' \in S' \text{ such that } s' \subseteq s.$$

The set s' is said to be a *witness* in S' for s . The above equivalence can be restated as follows: $S \preceq S'$, if and only if, every set in S has a witness in S' .

Recall that (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) is also a poset. Its HD has the same structure as the HD of (\mathcal{F}_i, \preceq) , where its nodes are the set-representations $S(f) \in \mathcal{S}$. This is because:

$$f \preceq f' \iff S(f) \preceq S(f'). \quad (1)$$

Summarising, the poset (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) can be used as a template for all posets (\mathcal{F}_i, \preceq) of regulatory functions of a component g_i with p regulators, considering any possible regulatory structures, *i.e.*, all pairs $(G_i^+, G_i^-) \in G$. In what follows, properties of posets (\mathcal{F}_i, \preceq) will thus be derived from those of (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) .

Given a generic component g_i with p regulators, we introduce the following terminology on the relationships between elements in the HD of the poset (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) . This terminology also applies to (\mathcal{F}_i, \preceq) .

Given $S, S' \in \mathcal{S}_p$:

- S' is a *parent* of S in (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) if and only if $S \preceq S'$;
- S' is an *immediate parent* of S in (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) if and only if S' is a parent of S and $\nexists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S \preceq S'' \preceq S'$;
- S' is a *child* of S in (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) if and only if $S' \preceq S$;
- S' is an *immediate child* of S in (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) if and only if S' is a child of S and $\nexists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S' \preceq S'' \preceq S$.

The next two sections characterise the immediate neighbours of elements in (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) . Section 4 introduces rules to determine the set of immediate parents of a given $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$, and Section 5 introduces rules to determine the set of immediate children of a given $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$.

4 Characterising the immediate parents of an element of (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq)

4.1 Rules to compute immediate parents

Given an element S of \mathcal{S}_p , a parent S' of S is obtained by applying one of the following rules.

RULES TO COMPUTE PARENTS
RULE 1 $S' = S \cup \{\sigma\}$ where $\sigma \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ is a maximal set independent of S .
RULE 2 $S' = (S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}) \cup \{\sigma\}$, where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) σ is a maximal set dominated by S; (b) σ is not contained in any maximal set independent of S; (c) $\forall i = 1, \dots, k, \sigma$ is contained in s_i; (d) S' is a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.
RULE 3 $S' = (S \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$, where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Both σ_1 and σ_2 are maximal sets dominated by S; (b) Both σ_1 and σ_2 are not contained in any maximal set independent of S; (c) Both σ_1 and σ_2 are contained in s; (d) Neither $(S \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_1\}$ nor $(S \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_2\}$ are a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.

Theorem 1. S' is an immediate parent of S in \mathcal{S}_p if and only if S' is generated by one of the 3 rules to compute parents presented above.

Proof. Notice that the sets S and S' in the three rules satisfy $S \preceq S'$. Moreover, S' defined in Rules 1 and 2 clearly yields a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$. This is also the case in Rule 3 because σ_1 and σ_2 are maximal sets dominated by S contained in s thus: $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, i \notin \sigma_2 : \{i\} \cup \sigma_1 = s$ and $\exists j \in \{1, \dots, p\}, j \notin \sigma_1 : \{j\} \cup \sigma_2 = s$ thus $S' = S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ is a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.

Hence, for the 3 rules, S' is a *valid parent* of S in \mathcal{S}_p when S' can be defined, *i.e.*, when each rule can be applied.

Let $S' = S \cup \{\sigma\}$ be a set generated by Rule 1. To show that it is an *immediate parent* of S , let us assume by contradiction that: $\exists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S \preceq S'' \preceq S'$. Then, by definition,

$$\begin{cases} \forall s \in S, \exists s'' \in S'' : s'' \subseteq s, & (1) \\ \forall s'' \in S'', \exists s' \in S' : s' \subseteq s''. & (2) \end{cases}$$

One of two things can happen, either S'' is of the form: (a) $S'' = S \cup \{s''_1, \dots, s''_l\}$ with $l \geq 1$ and $\forall i = 1, \dots, l, s''_i$ independent of S ; or (b) $S \not\subseteq S''$.

The first case (a) implies that σ is contained in all the sets s_i'' , $i = 1, \dots, l$, a contradiction with the fact that σ is a maximal set independent of S . In the second case (b), there must be at least one set $s \in S$, such that $s \notin S''$. However, (1) implies that there must be a set $s'' \in S''$ such that $s'' \subset s$. Condition (2) then enforces this s'' to have a witness in S' , which must necessarily be σ . However this entails $\sigma \subseteq s'' \subseteq s$, a contradiction with σ being a maximal set independent of S . Therefore sets generated by Rule 1 are immediate parents of S in \mathcal{S}_p .

Proving the immediacy of parents generated by Rule 2 and Rule 3 is less straightforward. Note that by construction, parents generated by Rule 1 can never lie between S and a parent of S generated by Rule 2 or Rule 3. In fact, a stronger statement can be made: if $\exists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S \preccurlyeq S'' \preccurlyeq S'$, where S' is a parent generated by Rule 2 or Rule 3, then $S \not\subseteq S''$.

To show this, suppose towards a contradiction that S' is a parent generated by Rule 2 such that $S \preccurlyeq S'' \preccurlyeq S'$ where S'' contains S . As $S \subseteq S''$, S'' is of the form $S'' = S \cup \{s_1'', \dots, s_l''\}$ for some $l \geq 1$. Each set in S'' needs its witness in S' to ensure $S'' \preccurlyeq S'$. As $S \subseteq S''$ and $S \preccurlyeq S'$, each set s shared between S and S'' already has its witness in S' . As for sets s_1'', \dots, s_l'' , they can only have σ as their witness, otherwise some s_i'' would not be independent of S . This means that $\sigma \subsetneq s_i''$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$, a contradiction with σ not being contained in any maximal set independent of S . The result for parents generated by Rule 3 follows similarly. The only possible witnesses for any set in S'' not in S are σ_1 and σ_2 , meaning at least one of them must be contained in some maximal set independent of S , a contradiction with condition (b) of Rule 3.

Let us now prove the immediacy of parents generated by Rule 2. Let $S' = (S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}) \cup \{\sigma\}$ be a parent of S generated by Rule 2 and suppose S' is not an immediate parent of S : $\exists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S \preccurlyeq S'' \preccurlyeq S'$. Conditions (1) and (2) above apply again. By our previous remark, $S \not\subseteq S''$ and so $\exists s \in S$ such that $s \notin S''$. By (1), this set s needs a witness in S'' which we denote by s_1'' ($s_1'' \subsetneq s$). In turn, this s_1'' requires a witness in S' and the only candidate for this role is σ because all sets in S' other than σ are in S . Therefore $\sigma \subseteq s_1'' \subsetneq s$. By hypothesis, σ is a maximal set dominated by S , thus if $\sigma \subsetneq s$, and $|s| = q$, then $|\sigma| = q - 1$. This enforces $|s_1''| = q - 1$ and hence s_1'' must coincide with σ ($s_1'' = \sigma$, thus $\sigma \in S''$).

As $S'' \neq S'$, there must be some other set s_2'' in S'' , such that $s_2'' \notin S'$.

Again by (2), s_2'' requires a witness in S' . This witness can only be some set s belonging to both S and S' . That is $\exists s \in S, s \in S' : s \subseteq s_2''$, which results in a contradiction since this same $s \in S$ would no longer have its witness in S'' , failing to meet condition (1). This proves that sets generated by Rule 2 are immediate parents of S in \mathcal{S}_p .

To prove that immediacy of parents generated by Rule 3, let $S' = (S \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ be a parent of S generated by Rule 3 and assume towards a contradiction that $\exists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S \preccurlyeq S'' \preccurlyeq S'$. Since $S \not\subseteq S''$, we have that $\exists s_i \in S : s_i \notin S''$. Let s_1'' be a witness for s_i in S'' (i.e. $s_1'' \subsetneq s_i$). Condition (2) establishes that s_1'' requires a witness in S' , which can only be σ_1 or σ_2 since all other sets in S' are also elements of S . Without loss of generality assume that s_1'' is this witness: $\sigma_1 \subseteq s_1'' \subsetneq s$. Given that by hypothesis σ_1 is maximal dominated by S and $\sigma_1 \subsetneq s_i$, if $|s_i| = q$ then $|\sigma_1| = q - 1$. This enforces $|s_1''| = q - 1$, and thus s_1'' must coincide with σ_1 ($s_1'' = \sigma_1$ and hence $\sigma_1 \in S''$).

In order to have $S'' \neq S'$, there must then exist some other set $s_2'' \in S''$, such that $s_2'' \notin S'$ (thus $s_2'' \neq \sigma_1$ and $s_2'' \neq \sigma_2$). This set s_2'' cannot be s , the set removed from S , since we have just concluded that $\sigma_1 \in S''$ and given that $\sigma_1 \subseteq s$ by Rule 3 condition (c), this would entail that S'' contained comparable sets. The end of the proof now follows similarly to that of Rule 2. This s_2'' needs a witness in S' , and this witness can only be a common set of S and S' , which leads to a contradiction by leaving this witness without its own witness in S'' . This proves that sets generated by Rule 3 are indeed immediate parents of S in \mathcal{S}_p .

Lastly, we prove that no other possible immediate parents of S in \mathcal{S}_p exist.

Let us consider S' an immediate parent of S in \mathcal{S}_p ($S \preccurlyeq S'$), either S is integrally contained in S' , that is every set $s \in S$ is also in S' , or there is at least one set in S that is not in S' . Towards a contradiction, let us suppose that S' is an immediate parent of S not generated by any of our three rules.

If S is integrally contained in S' then $S' = S \cup \{s_1', \dots, s_l'\}$ for some $l \geq 1$. Given that by hypothesis, S' is not generated by any of the 3 rules, either $k \geq 2$ or $k = 1$ and s_1' is not a maximal set independent of S .

If $k \geq 2$ then removing any set in $\{s_1', \dots, s_l'\}$ yields a child of S' that is also a parent of S , hence S' is not an immediate parent of S .

If $k = 1$ and s_1' is not a maximal set independent of S , then there exists σ , a maximal set independent of S such that $s_1' \subsetneq \sigma$. The set $S \cup \{\sigma\}$ obtained from $S' = S \cup \{s_1'\}$ by replacing s_1' by σ yields a child of S' that is a parent of S , hence S' is once again not an immediate parent of S .

Now let us suppose that S' is an immediate parent of S such that S is not integrally contained in S' . Let s be a set of S that is not in S' , and let s' be its witness in S' . This tells us that S' is either of the form $S' = S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \cup \{s'\}$ for some $k \geq 1$, or of the form $S' = S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \cup \{s', s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_l\}$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $l \geq 1$, where $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ contains s , all sets in S that contain s' and possibly other sets of S as well.

If $S' = S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \cup \{s'\}$, then s' must be a witness for all sets s_1, \dots, s_k . As S' is not generated by any of the rules, either s' is not a maximal set dominated by S or it is contained in some maximal set independent of S . If s' is contained in a maximal set independent of S , σ , then $S \preceq S \cup \{\sigma\} \preceq S'$, which leads to a contradiction with the assumption that S' is an immediate parent of S . If s' is not a maximal set dominated by S , it is contained in a maximal set dominated by S , σ , and $S \preceq S \setminus \{s \in S : d \subseteq s\} \cup \{d\} \preceq S''$, which again leads to a contradiction with the assumption that S' is an immediate parent of S .

A similar reasoning applies if $S' = S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \cup \{s', s'_1, s'_2, \dots, s'_l\}$ for some $k \geq 1$ and $l \geq 1$. Let us suppose that s' is not a maximal set dominated by S and let σ be a maximal set dominated by S that contains s' . This implies: $S \preceq S \setminus (\{s \in S : \sigma \subseteq s\}) \cup \{\sigma\} \cup \{s'_i \in S' : s'_i \not\subseteq \sigma\} \preceq S'$. This set laying between S and S' is necessarily distinct from S' because it contains σ , and it is a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ because it is endowed with the sets in $\{s'_i \in S' : s'_i \not\subseteq \sigma\}$. Hence, we again have a contradiction with the assumption that S' is an immediate parent of S .

Therefore, there is no other form of immediate parent than those defined by our 3 rules. \square

4.2 Quantifying the cardinality of the True set of an immediate parent

Recall that, by definition, $f \preceq f'$ if and only if $\mathbb{T}(f) \subseteq \mathbb{T}(f')$. This section quantifies $|\mathbb{T}(f') \setminus \mathbb{T}(f)|$, where f' is an immediate parent of f . Each set appearing in $S(f)$, set representation of f , corresponds to a prime implicant of that function. Therefore, by assigning the literals appearing in that set to True, we can enquire about the cardinality of the True set of an element of \mathcal{F}_i directly from its set representation. More precisely, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}(f)$ if and only if $\exists s \in S(f) : \forall i \in s, x_i = 1$ (recall that we consider positive functions). In other words, \mathbf{x} belongs to the True set of f if and only if there is at least one prime implicant in the set representation of f that testifies this fact.

When it is clear from context, we may use the set representation of a function or clause in place of the function or clause itself.

Proposition 1. *If S' is an immediate parent of S generated by Rule 1, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 1$.*

Proof. Let $S' = S \cup \{\sigma\}$ be an immediate parent of S derived from Rule 1 (σ is a maximal set independent of S). Because $S \subseteq S'$, and because σ is independent of S , we have that $|\mathbb{T}(S)| < |\mathbb{T}(S')|$. Furthermore, as σ is maximal, we have that $\forall k \notin \sigma, \exists s \in S$ such that $s \subseteq \sigma \cup \{k\}$. Therefore $\mathbb{T}(\sigma \cup \{k\}) \subseteq \mathbb{T}(\{s\})$, which means that every state \mathbf{x} satisfying $\sigma \cup \{k\}$ (i.e., evaluating $\sigma \cup \{k\}$ to True) also satisfies s . Hence, the only $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{T}(S')$ such that $\mathbf{x} \notin \mathbb{T}(S)$ verifies $\forall i \in \sigma, x_i = 1, \forall i \notin \sigma, x_i = 0$. This proves that $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 1$. \square

Proposition 2. *If S' is an immediate parent of S generated by Rule 2, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 1$.*

Proof. Let $S' = S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\} \cup \{\sigma\}$ be an immediate parent of S derived from Rule 2, where σ is a maximal set dominated by S , and not contained in any maximal set independent of S . For all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, we have that $|\sigma| = |s_i| - 1$, because σ is a maximal set dominated by $\{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$. Without loss of generality, let $\sigma = \{1, \dots, q\}$, and consider $\sigma' = \sigma \cup \{j\}$ with $j \in \{q+1, \dots, p\}$. If $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $\sigma' = s_i$, then $\mathbb{T}(\sigma') \subset \mathbb{T}(S)$. Otherwise, if $\exists j \in \{q+1, \dots, p\}$ such that $\sigma' = (\sigma \cup \{j\}) \not\subseteq \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ then: either (a) $\exists s \in S \setminus \{s_1, \dots, s_k\}$ such that $s \subsetneq \sigma'$ and thus $\mathbb{T}(\sigma') \subset \mathbb{T}(S)$ or, (b) $\forall s \in S, \sigma' \not\subseteq s$, which contradicts the fact that σ is a maximal set independent of S . Hence, the True set of any set defined as σ augmented by one element of $\{q+1, \dots, p\}$ is included in $\mathbb{T}(S)$, which means that $\sigma = \{1, \dots, q\}$ adds a single True state to $\mathbb{T}(S)$, which is $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^p, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, q\}, x_i = 1$, and $\forall i \in \{q+1, \dots, p\}, x_i = 0$, in other words $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 1$. \square

Proposition 3. *If S' is an immediate parent of S generated by Rule 3, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 2$.*

Proof. Let $S' = S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2\}$ be an immediate parent of S derived from Rule 3, where σ_1 and σ_2 are distinct maximal sets dominated by S , not contained in any maximal set independent of S , and contained in s . Without loss of generality, let $\sigma_1 = \{1, \dots, q, q+1\}$, $\sigma_2 = \{1, \dots, q, q+2\}$, and $s = \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2 = \{1, \dots, q, q+1, q+2\}$. Similar to the previous proofs, we will show that exactly one state is added by σ_1 (resp. by σ_2), to the True set of the parent function.

Let us consider $\sigma' = \sigma_1 \cup \{i\}$ with $i \in \{q+2, \dots, p\}$. There must exist a set $s' \in S$ such that $s' \subseteq \sigma'$, otherwise there would be a maximal set independent of S containing σ_1 , a contradiction with Rule 3 item (b). Hence, $\mathbb{T}(\sigma') \subseteq \mathbb{T}(S)$, that is the True set of any set defined as σ_1 augmented by one element of $\{q+2, \dots, p\}$ is included in $\mathbb{T}(s)$.

A similar argument can be made for σ_2 . Since both σ_1 and σ_2 differ from s by a single, distinct element, this proves that $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| + 2$, where the two added states are: (1) $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{B}^p$ such that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, q+1\}, x_i = 1$ and $\forall i \in \{q+2, \dots, p\}, x_i = 0$, and (2) $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{B}^p$ such that $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, q, q+2\}, x'_i = 1$ and $\forall i \in \{q+1, q+3, \dots, p\}, x'_i = 0$. \square

5 Characterising the immediate children of an element of (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq)

5.1 Rules to compute immediate children

In turn, given an element S of the poset (\mathcal{S}_p, \preceq) , a child S' of S is obtained by applying one of the following rules:

RULES TO COMPUTE CHILDREN
<p>RULE 1: $S' = S \setminus \{s\}$ where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) $S \setminus \{s\}$ yields a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$; (b) s is a maximal set independent of $S \setminus \{s\}$.
<p>RULE 2: $S' = (S \setminus \{s\}) \cup_{i=1 \dots k} \{\sigma_i\}$ with $k \geq 1$ where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) $\forall i = 1, \dots, k, \sigma_i = (s \cup \{l_i\})$ with $l_i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and is independent of $S \setminus \{s\}$; (b) All σ_i complying with (a) are present in S'.
<p>RULE 3: $S' = (S \setminus \{s_i, s_j\}) \cup \{\sigma\}$ where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) $\sigma = s_i \cup s_j$; (b) s_i is a maximal set independent of $S \setminus \{s_i\}$; (c) s_j is a maximal set independent of $S \setminus \{s_j\}$; (d) $s_i \setminus s_j = 1 = s_j \setminus s_i$; (e) Neither $S \setminus \{s_i\}$ nor $S \setminus \{s_j\}$ yields a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$.

Lemma 1. *The set S' defined from $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$ by Rule X to compute children above ($X=1,2,3$) is such that S is an immediate parent of S' as specified by the corresponding Rule X to compute parents.*

Proof. It is clear that each proposed form of children leads to a set S' that is an element of \mathcal{S}_p because it originates from S by removing one or two elements and possibly adding others that are non-comparable with the remaining elements. Furthermore, by checking the removed and added sets involved in constructing S' it is easy to see that S' is a cover of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ and that $S' \preceq S$.

Let $S' = S \setminus \{s\}$ be a set defined by Rule 1 above. It then follows that $S = S' \cup \{s\}$ is an immediate parent of S' as specified by Rule 1 to compute immediate parents as s is a maximal set independent of S' by hypothesis.

Let $S' = (S \setminus \{s\}) \cup \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\}$ with $k \geq 1$ be a set as defined by Rule 2 above. It then follows that $S = S' \setminus \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\} \cup \{s\}$ is an immediate parent of S' defined by Rule 2 to compute immediate parents. Indeed, since $\forall i = 1, \dots, k, \sigma_i = s \cup \{l_i\}$ is independent of $S \setminus \{s\}$, with $l_i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, s is by construction contained in all σ_i , and is a maximal set dominated by S' . Finally, it is not contained in any maximal set independent of S' because all possible extensions of s are comparable to some $s \cup \{l_i\} = \sigma_i$ already present in S' .

Lastly, let $S' = (S \setminus \{s_i, s_j\}) \cup \{\sigma\}$ be a child of S defined by Rule 3. Then $S = S' \setminus \{\sigma\} \cup \{s_i, s_j\}$ is an immediate parent of S' defined by Rule 3 to compute immediate parents.

Indeed, s_i and s_j are maximal sets dominated by S' because they are maximal dominated by σ and no other set in S' contains them. They are not contained in any maximal set independent of S' because by hypothesis s_i is already a maximal set independent of $S \setminus \{s_i\}$ and s_j is already a maximal independent set of $S \setminus \{s_j\}$. Furthermore, s_i and s_j are contained in σ by construction and as $S \setminus \{s_i\}$ nor $S \setminus \{s_j\}$ yield covers of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ by hypothesis, neither $(S' \setminus \{\sigma\}) \cup \{s_1\}$ nor $(S' \setminus \{\sigma\}) \cup \{s_2\}$ yield covers of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, proving our statement that $S = S' \setminus \{\sigma\} \cup \{s_i, s_j\}$ is an immediate parent of S' defined by Rule 3 to compute immediate parents. \square

Theorem 2. *S' is an immediate child of S in \mathcal{S}_p if and only if S' is generated by one of the 3 rules to compute children presented above.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 2 follows directly from Lemma 1, which states that if set S' is defined by one of the rules to compute children from a given set S , then S' is a child of S and S is an immediate parent of S' . By theorem 1 there are no other possible forms of children and $\nexists S'' \in \mathcal{S}_p$ such that $S' \preceq S'' \preceq S$, therefore making S' an immediate child of S in \mathcal{S}_p . \square

5.2 Quantifying the cardinality of the True set of an immediate child

Section 4.2 shows that the cardinality difference between the True set of an immediate parent of a function S and the True set of S is either one or two (depending on the rules used to generate the immediate parent). This section capitalises on this result and Theorems 1 and 2 to establish the converse result for immediate children.

Proposition 4. *If S' is an immediate child of S generated by Rule 1, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| - 1$.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 1 and Proposition 1 because S is an immediate parent of S' generated by Rule 1 to compute immediate parents, therefore $|\mathbb{T}(S)| = |\mathbb{T}(S')| + 1$. \square

Proposition 5. *If S' is an immediate child of S generated by Rule 2, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| - 1$.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 1 and Proposition 2 because S is an immediate parent of S' generated by Rule 2 to compute immediate parents, therefore $|\mathbb{T}(S)| = |\mathbb{T}(S')| + 1$. \square

Proposition 6. *If S' is an immediate child of S generated by Rule 3, then $|\mathbb{T}(S')| = |\mathbb{T}(S)| - 2$.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Lemma 1 and Proposition 3 because S is an immediate parent of S' generated by Rule 3 to compute immediate parents, therefore $|\mathbb{T}(S)| = |\mathbb{T}(S')| + 2$. \square

6 Implementation

Here, we propose two Algorithms to compute the set of immediate parents and the immediate children, following the rules presented above receiving as an input a Boolean function f in its set-representation $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$. These algorithms are made available as a dedicated Python library in <https://github.com/ptgm/pyfunctionhood>, under the GNU General Public License v3.0 (GPL-3.0).

6.1 Algorithm to compute immediate parents

To compute the immediate parents, Algorithm 1 starts by computing the set \mathcal{C} of maximal sets independent of S (line 2), which in the worst case has to explore the whole powerset, *i.e.* $O(2^p)$ time complexity, dominating the overall running time. Lines 3–5 iterate over this maximal set \mathcal{C} , generating one new immediate parent for each $c \in \mathcal{C}$, following Rule 1. Each new immediate parent generated is kept in \mathcal{P} .

Line 6 computes the set \mathcal{D} of maximal sets dominated by S , where each element of \mathcal{D} is not contained in another element of \mathcal{D} . Lines 7–11 ensure that each element of \mathcal{D} is not contained in any element of \mathcal{C} , *i.e.*, in any maximal set independent of S . Elements of \mathcal{D} are candidates to be considered afterwards in the generation of immediate parents by Rule 2 or by Rule 3. Line 12 initialises a map relating elements $s \in S$ (the map keys) with elements of $d \in \mathcal{D}$ (the map values) which are included in s and where not used by Rule 2.

Lines 13–23 iterate over each element $d \in \mathcal{D}$, trying to find one complying with conditions from Rule 2. If S deprived with elements containing d and augmented with d remains a cover, is it generated as a new immediate parent by Rule 2. Otherwise, the element d is added to the map $\mathcal{D}notused$, associated to every set of S that contains it (lines 18–20). These elements in $\mathcal{D}notused$ will be candidates for Rule 3.

Finally, lines 23–31 iterate over the elements of S , the keys of $\mathcal{D}notused$, with associated elements of \mathcal{D} that were not used by Rule 2, due to insufficient cover. The two inner for loops (lines 24–29) do a pairwise combination of these associated elements, ensuring cover and therefore generating a new immediate parent by Rule 3. If a given $s \in S$ is not present as a key in the map $\mathcal{D}notused$, or if it is present with a single associated d , then it has no immediate parent generated by Rule 3.

Algorithm 1: Algorithm to Compute Immediate Parents

```

input : An element  $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$ 
output: A set  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_p$  containing all immediate parents of  $S$  in  $\mathcal{S}_p$ 
// getMaximalIndependent( $S$ ) returns the set of all maximal sets independent of  $S$ 
// getMaximalDominated( $S$ ) returns the set of all maximal sets dominated by  $S$ 
// getContaining( $d, S$ ) returns the set of all sets in  $S$  containing  $d$ 
// isCover( $S$ ) returns True if the set  $S$  is a cover of  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ 

1  $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \text{getMaximalIndependent}(S)$ ;
3 for  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  do
4    $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{S \cup \{c\}\}$ ;           // Immediate parent generated by Rule 1
5 end
6  $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \text{getMaximalDominated}(S)$ ;
7 for  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  do
8   if  $|\text{getContaining}(d, \mathcal{C})| > 0$  then
9      $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \setminus \{d\}$ ;
10  end
11 end
12  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
13 for  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  do
14    $\text{Containing} \leftarrow \text{getContaining}(d, S)$ ;
15   if  $\text{isCover}(S \setminus \text{Containing} \cup \{d\})$  then
16      $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{S \setminus \text{Containing} \cup \{d\}\}$ ;           // Immediate parent generated by Rule 2
17   else
18     for  $s \in \text{Containing}$  do
19        $\mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s] \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s] \cup \{d\}$ ; //  $d$  not used by Rule 2, candidate for Rule 3
20     end
21   end
22 end
23 for  $s \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}$  do
24   for  $i = 0 \rightarrow |\mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s]| - 2$  do
25      $d_i \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s][i]$ ;
26     for  $j = i + 1 \rightarrow |\mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s]| - 1$  do
27        $d_j \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{notused}}[s][j]$ ;
28        $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{d_i, d_j\}\}$ ;           // Immediate parent generated by Rule 3
29     end
30   end
31 end
32 return  $\mathcal{P}$ 

```

6.2 Algorithm to compute immediate children

To compute the immediate children, Algorithm 2 iterates over each element $s \in S$ (lines 3–27), considering $S \setminus \{s\}$ as the working child candidate. It then iterates over each of the missing literals in s (lines 7–16) to verify if each new element $s \cup \{l\}$ contains one, two or more elements of S .

If $s \cup \{l\}$ contains only one element, it has to be s itself, meaning that the working child candidate can be extended with the new element $s \cup \{l\}$. The iteration over all missing literals ensures that each time the child candidate is extended with $s \cup \{l\}$. In this case, the flag *isExtendable* is set to add the extended child candidate as a valid immediate child (lines 17–19).

On the other hand, if $s \cup \{l\}$ contains exactly two elements of S , s and another element in S , it means that these two elements of S can potentially be replaced by $s \cup \{l\}$. The *mergeable* set keeps all these elements grouped by size (line 24), as candidates to be used by Rule 3.

Finally, if $s \cup \{l\}$ contains more than two elements of S , does not fall into any of the previous cases for every missing literal, and is still a cover, then it is because s is a maximal set independent of $S \setminus \{s\}$. The working child candidate $S \setminus \{s\}$ is then considered a valid immediate child (lines 20–21).

Algorithm 2: Algorithm to Compute Immediate Children

```

input : An element  $S \in \mathcal{S}_p$ 
output: A set  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_p$  containing all immediate children of  $S$  in  $\Sigma$ 

// getContainedBy( $s, S$ ) returns the set of all sets in  $S$  that are contained in  $s$ 
// getMissingLits( $s$ ) returns the set of literals in  $\{1, \dots, p\}$  missing in  $s$ 
// isCover( $S$ ) returns True if the set  $S$  is a cover of  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ 

1  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2 mergeable  $\leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 for  $s \in S$  do
4   toMerge  $\leftarrow$  false;
5   isExtendable  $\leftarrow$  false;
6   childCandidate  $\leftarrow S \setminus \{s\}$ ;
7   for  $l \in \text{getMissingLits}(s)$  do
8     contained  $\leftarrow \text{getContainedBy}(s \cup \{l\}, S)$ ;
9     if  $|\text{contained}| = 1$  then
10      isExtendable  $\leftarrow$  true; // contained only contains s itself
11      childCandidate  $\leftarrow \text{childCandidate} \cup \{s \cup \{l\}\}$ ;
12    end
13    if  $|\text{absorbed}| = 2$  then
14      toMerge  $\leftarrow$  true;
15    end
16  end
17  if isExtendable then
18     $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{\text{childCandidate}\}$ ; // Immediate child generated by Rule 2
19  else
20    if isCover(childCandidate) then
21       $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{\text{childCandidate}\}$ ; // Immediate child generated by Rule 1
22    else
23      if toMerge then
24        mergeable[ $\text{len}(s)$ ]  $\leftarrow \text{mergeable}[\text{len}(s)] \cup \{s\}$ ; // Candidate s for Rule 3
25      end
26    end
27  end
28 end
29 for  $sz \in \text{mergeable}$  do
30   while mergeable[ $sz$ ]  $\neq \emptyset$  do
31      $s \leftarrow \text{mergeable}[sz].\text{top}()$ ;
32     for  $l \in \text{getMissingLits}(s)$  do
33       contained  $\leftarrow \text{getContainedBy}(s \cup \{l\}, \text{mergeable}[sz])$ ;
34       if  $|\text{contained}| = 2$  then
35          $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \{S \setminus \text{contained} \cup \{s \cup \{l\}\}\}$  // Immediate child generated by Rule 3
36       end
37     end
38     mergeable[ $sz$ ].pop();
39   end
40 end
41 return  $\mathcal{C}$ 

```

Lines 29–40 iterate over the sizes of *mergeable* elements of S found previously. For each existing size sz , if extending one of the elements in *mergeable*[sz] with a given literal $\{l\}$ contains exactly two elements, Rule 3 can be applied, considering $S \setminus \text{absorbed} \cup \{s \cup \{l\}\}$ as a new valid immediate child (line 35).

6.3 Performance

To assess the performance of the proposed algorithms, we computed 100 random walks starting at the infimum to the supremum functions, considering increasing dimensions (from 2 to 11). For a given trace, all neighbouring parents of a given function are computed, and one of these parents is randomly (uniformly) chosen to be the next function to be part of the trace. This is repeated until the trace reaches the supremum function. At each step, for statistics, we keep the number of parents generated by each of the three Rules, as well as the size and time of each trace.

Figure 6 shows in the first Y-axis the average (over 100 traces) cumulative number of generated parents (or children) per rule. Interestingly, we observe that the number of functions generated by Rule 1 is exponential, in a logscale histogram. Also, we observe that the number of functions generated by Rule 3 is not exponential, and that proportionally to the other rules, the number of functions generated by Rule 3 is much smaller for higher dimensions.

Additionally, we plot in the second Y-axis of Figure 6 the average number of parents (in solid lines) and children (in dashed lines) generated per rule, by dividing the average number of functions per rule over the 100 traces by the average trace size. We observe that indeed, not only there are more functions generated by Rule 1 due to an exponential increase in the trace size, but also that each function generates more neighbouring parents (or children) with increasing dimensions. Also, we confirm that the cumulative number of functions generated by Rule 3, along a trace, when divided by the trace size is close to 0, due to the exponential increase of the trace size.

In terms of performance, we observe in the first Y-axis of Figure 7 that the time to compute a given trace increases exponentially with increasing dimensions. The main contributing factor is the exponential increase of the trace size, which is shown in the second Y-axis. However, the time to compute a given trace is not only dependent on the trace size, but also on the number of parents (or children) generated per function (see Figure 6), as we can observe that the time increases slightly more than linear in logscale. When comparing the trace times when generating parents against the trace times when generating children, we can observe that the average time to generate children is higher than to generate parents, also with a slightly higher dispersion.

7 Conclusion and prospects

When defining Boolean models of regulatory networks, the choice of regulatory functions that ensures a desired dynamics is inherently hard due to the lack of regulatory data. In this work, we have characterised the set of monotone Boolean functions complying with a fixed topology of a regulatory network. In particular, we have specified its cardinal and its structure as a Partial Ordered set (poset). Exploiting the poset structure, we re-defined the set of rules proposed in Cury *et al.* [10] to compute the direct neighbours of any monotone Boolean function. These rules permit to navigate locally in the function space without having to generate the whole set of functions and subsequently compare them, which would unnecessarily use memory and CPU resources.

A dedicated Python library is freely available, under the GNU General Public License v3.0 (GPL-3.0), implementing both the three rules to compute the immediate parents given a reference monotone non-degenerate Boolean function, as well as the three rules to compute its immediate children. It can be used in three distinct manners: as a library integrated in other tools, in the command line passing the reference function as an argument, or using a graphical interface developed with Tkinter. A small tutorial is presented in <https://github.com/ptgm/pyfunctionhood>.

As prospects, the rules to obtain neighbouring regulatory functions turn out to be useful for Probabilistic Boolean Networks as introduced by Shmulevich *et al.* [32]. In contrast with Boolean models in which each component is associated with a unique regulatory function, PBN introduce uncertainty in the regulatory functions governing the behaviours of model components. This is done by providing, for each component, a set of regulatory functions, each with a given probability. We propose to associate a reference regulatory function with a certain probability, and to distribute the remaining probability to the neighbouring functions (possibly at varying distances). This could be used to study the robustness of a given reference function with respect to the desired observations.

Furthermore, when a model does not meet specific requirements, the knowledge of the direct neighbourhood of regulatory functions could allow to perform local searches to improve model outcomes, with a minimal impact on the regulatory structure. Additionally, it would allow for the qualification of the set of models complying with certain requirements, such as: models that have the same regulatory network, but different functions; or models capable of satisfying similar dynamical restrictions. This has a huge impact in tools like ModRev [16], which proposes minimal repairs that are as close as possible to the original reference functions.

Finally, numerous tools are provided and integrated in the context of the CoLoMoTo (Consortium for Logical Models and Tools) at <https://colomoto.github.io> [27]. This new library will be made available as part of these tools, as well as potentially being integrated in existing ones.

Funding

JC acknowledges the support from the Brazilian agency CAPES, with a one year research fellowship to visit IGC. This work has been further supported by the Portuguese national agency Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) with reference PTDC/EEI-CTP/2914/2014 (project ERGODiC) and UIDB/50021/2020 (DOI:10.54499/UIDB/50021/2020).

References

- [1] Wassim Abou-Jaoudé and Pedro T. Monteiro. On logical bifurcation diagrams. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, January 2019.
- [2] Wassim Abou-Jaoudé, Pauline Traynard, Pedro T. Monteiro, Julio Saez-Rodriguez, Tomáš Helikar, Denis Thieffry, and Claudine Chaouiya. Logical Modeling and Dynamical Analysis of Cellular Networks. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 7, May 2016.
- [3] Réka Albert and Hans G Othmer. The topology of the regulatory interactions predicts the expression pattern of the segment polarity genes in drosophila melanogaster. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 223:1–18, 7 2003.
- [4] Julio Aracena, Jacques Demongeot, and Eric Goles. On limit cycles of monotone functions with symmetric connection graph. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 322(2):237–244, 2004. Discrete Applied Problems - Florilegium for E. Goles.
- [5] Julio Aracena, Adrien Richard, and Lilian Salinas. Number of fixed points and disjoint cycles in monotone boolean networks. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 31(3):1702–1725, 2017.
- [6] Stefan Bornholdt. Boolean network models of cellular regulation: prospects and limitations. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 5(suppl.1), August 2008.
- [7] Nathalie Caspard, Bruno Leclerc, and Bernard Monjardet. *Finite ordered sets: concepts, results and uses*. Number 144 in Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [8] David P. A. Cohen, Loredana Martignetti, Sylvie Robine, Emmanuel Barillot, Andrei Zinovyev, and Laurence Calzone. Mathematical modelling of molecular pathways enabling tumour cell invasion and migration. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 11:e1004571, 11 2015.
- [9] Yves Crama and Peter L Hammer. *Boolean functions: Theory, algorithms, and applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [10] José E. R. Cury, Pedro T. Monteiro, and Claudine Chaouiya. Partial Order on the set of Boolean Regulatory Functions, 2019.
- [11] Brian A Davey and Hilary A Priestley. *Introduction to lattices and order*. Cambridge university press, 2002.
- [12] Gilles Didier, Elisabeth Remy, and Claudine Chaouiya. Mapping multivalued onto Boolean dynamics. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 270(1):177–184, 2011. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [13] Adrien Fauré, Claudine Chaouiya, Andrea Ciliberto, and Denis Thieffry. Logical modelling and analysis of the budding yeast cell cycle. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 8, 2007.
- [14] Abhishek Garg, Kartik Mohanram, Alessandro Di Cara, Giovanni De Micheli, and Ioannis Xenarios. Modeling stochasticity and robustness in gene regulatory networks. *Bioinformatics*, 25(12):i101–i109, 2009. Publisher: Oxford University Press.
- [15] Tomáš Gedeon. Lattice structures that parameterize regulatory network dynamics. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 374:109225, 8 2024.
- [16] Filipe Gouveia, Inês Lynce, and Pedro T. Monteiro. ModRev - model revision tool for Boolean logical models of biological regulatory networks. In *18th Intl. Conf. on Computational Methods in Systems Biology (CMSB'20)*, volume 12314 of *LNBI*, pages 1–10, 2020.
- [17] Lennart Van Hirtum, Patrick De Causmaecker, Jens Goemaere, Tobias Kenter, Heinrich Riebler, Michael Lass, and Christian Plessl. A computation of $d(9)$ using fpga supercomputing, 2023.
- [18] Christian Jäkel. A computation of the ninth dedekind number. *Journal of Computational Algebra*, 6-7:100006, 9 2023.
- [19] Stuart A. Kauffman. Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 22(3):437–467, 1969.

- [20] Aleksey Dmitrievich Korshunov. Monotone Boolean functions. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 58(5):929, 2003. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [21] Nicolas Le Novère. Quantitative and logic modelling of molecular and gene networks. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 16(3):146–158, 2015. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [22] Fangting Li, Tao Long, Ying Lu, Qi Ouyang, and Chao Tang. The yeast cell-cycle network is robustly designed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 101(14):4781–4786, 2004.
- [23] Luis Mendoza and Ioannis Xenarios. A method for the generation of standardized qualitative dynamical systems of regulatory networks. *Theoretical Biology and Medical Modelling*, 3(1):1–18, 2006.
- [24] Christoph Müssel, Martin Hopfensitz, and Hans A Kestler. BoolNet—an R package for generation, reconstruction and analysis of Boolean networks. *Bioinformatics*, 26(10):1378–1380, 2010. Publisher: Oxford University Press.
- [25] Aurélien Naldi, Jorge Carneiro, Claudine Chaouiya, and Denis Thieffry. Diversity and plasticity of th cell types predicted from regulatory network modelling. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 6, 2010.
- [26] Aurélien Naldi, Celine Hernandez, Wassim Abou-Jaoudé, Pedro T. Monteiro, Claudine Chaouiya, and Denis Thieffry. Logical modeling and analysis of cellular regulatory networks with ginsim 3.0. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9, 2018.
- [27] Aurélien Naldi, Céline Hernandez, Nicolas. Levy, Gautier Stoll, Pedro T. Monteiro, Claudine Chaouiya, Tomas Helikar, Andrei Zinovyev, Laurence Calzone, Sarah Cohen-Boulakia, Denis Thieffry, and Loïc Paulevé. The colomoto interactive notebook: Accessible and reproducible computational analyses for qualitative biological networks. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9, 2018.
- [28] Loïc Paulevé, Juraj Kolčák, Thomas Chatain, and Stefan Haar. Reconciling qualitative, abstract, and scalable modeling of biological networks. *Nature Communications*, 11, 2020.
- [29] Loïc Paulevé and Sylvain Sené. Non-Deterministic Updates of Boolean Networks. In *International Workshop on Cellular Automata and Discrete Complex Systems (AUTOMATA 2021)*, volume 90. Schloss Dagstuhl- Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH, Dagstuhl Publishing, 6 2021.
- [30] Assieh Saadatpour, István Albert, and Réka Albert. Attractor analysis of asynchronous Boolean models of signal transduction networks. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 266(4):641–656, 2010. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [31] Gianluca Selvaggio, Sara Canato, Archana Pawar, Pedro T. Monteiro, Patrícia S. Guerreiro, M. Manuela Brás, Florence Janody, and Claudine Chaouiya. Hybrid epithelial–mesenchymal phenotypes are controlled by microenvironmental factors. *Cancer Research*, 80, 2020.
- [32] Ilya Shmulevich, Edward R Dougherty, Seungchan Kim, and Wei Zhang. Probabilistic Boolean networks: a rule-based uncertainty model for gene regulatory networks. *Bioinformatics*, 18(2):261–274, 2002. Publisher: Oxford University Press.
- [33] Tamon Stephen and Timothy Yusun. Counting inequivalent monotone Boolean functions. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 167:15–24, 2014. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [34] Lucas Sánchez, Claudine Chaouiya, and Denis Thieffry. Segmenting the fly embryo: Logical analysis of the role of the segment polarity cross-regulatory module. *International Journal of Developmental Biology*, 52, 2008.
- [35] Lucas Sánchez and Denis Thieffry. A logical analysis of the drosophila gap-gene system. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 211:115–141, 7 2001.
- [36] Denis Thieffry and David Romero. The modularity of biological regulatory networks. *Biosystems*, 50(1):49–59, 1999. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [37] René Thomas. Boolean formalization of genetic control circuits. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 42(3):563–585, 1973.
- [38] René Thomas. Regulatory networks seen as asynchronous automata: a logical description. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 153(1):1–23, 1991. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [39] Jorge G. T. Zañudo and Réka Albert. An effective network reduction approach to find the dynamical repertoire of discrete dynamic networks. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 23(2):025111, 2013.
- [40] Élisabeth Remy, Paul Ruet, and Denis Thieffry. Graphic requirements for multistability and attractive cycles in a Boolean dynamical framework. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 41(3):335–350, 2008.




Figure 5: Panels 1 to 4 illustrate different functions using the set representation on the Hasse diagram of the poset $(2^{\{1,2,3,4\}}, \subseteq)$. Orange vertices correspond to the elements of the starting sets $(S_i, i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$; green vertices correspond to independent sets, among which oval ones are maximal; violet vertices correspond to dominated sets, among which oval ones are maximal and not included in any independent set. Panels 1 to 2 illustrate examples of parents determination. Panels 3 to 4 illustrate examples of children determination. Panel 5 illustrates a subset of the Hasse diagram representing the partial order between the functions represented in Panels 1 to 4, as well as some of their neighbouring relationships.




Figure 6: Left Y-axis: Average (from 100 traces) cumulative number of generated parents (from the infimum to the supremum) and children (from supremum to infimum) per rule, left and right stacked histograms, respectively. Right Y-axis: Average (from 100 traces) number of generated parents (solid lines) and children (dashed lines) per rule, divided by average trace size.




Figure 7: Box plot distribution over 100 traces both from the infimum to the supremum (generating parents) and from the supremum to the infimum (generating children). For each dimension, left box plots for parents and right box plots for children.