

A fluctuation-sensitivity-timescale trade-off in feedback-controlled dynamics

Ka Kit Kong¹, Feng Liu^{2*}

¹ *The State Key Laboratory for Artificial Microstructures and Mesoscopic Physics, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing, 100871, China*

² *Key Laboratory of Hebei Province for Molecular Biophysics, Institute of Biophysics, School of Health Science & Biomedical Engineering, Hebei University of Technology, Tianjin, 300130, China*

**Corresponding author, email: liufeng@hebut.edu.cn*

Abstract

Feedback control is a renowned mechanism for attenuating intrinsic fluctuation in regulatory networks. However, its impact on the response sensitivity to external signals and the response timescale, which are also critical for signal transmission, has yet to be understood. In this letter, we study a general feedback-controlled network in which the feedback is achieved by a complex interactive module. By comparing the solution of Langevin equations with and without feedback, we analytically derive a fundamental trade-off between fluctuation, sensitivity, and timescale altered by the feedback. We show that feedback control cannot infinitely suppress fluctuation without the cost of reducing sensitivity or response speed. Furthermore, the lower bound for this trade-off can be reduced up to half in non-gradient dynamical systems compared to gradient systems. We validate this trade-off as a tight bound for high-dimensional systems in nonlinear regime through numerical simulations. These results elucidate the fundamental limitation of feedback control in enhancing the information transmission capacity of regulatory networks.

Noise control is critical in signal transmission processes. While intrinsic fluctuation due to the small copy number of molecules and stochastic processes, e.g., birth and death of molecules, is inevitable in a variety of biochemical networks [1–3], feedback control has been proposed to be a prominent mechanism in suppressing this fluctuation [4–8].

However, effective signal transmission necessitates not only small fluctuation, but also a high response sensitivity to external signals. The relation between intrinsic fluctuation and response sensitivity limits the information transmission capacity of dynamical systems [9–13]. The fluctuation-dissipation theorem (FDT) is a potential candidate for this relation, which is, however, derived from near-equilibrium systems and it is still challenging to be extended to far-from-equilibrium systems [14–17]. The energy dissipation of nonequilibrium systems has been proposed to be crucial in attenuating noise while maintaining high sensitivity [18–21], thus breaking the FDT. For dynamical systems, non-gradient dynamics implies the existence of a rotational flux field [22,23], which usually breaks the detailed balance in the steady-state, leading to nonequilibrium.

Furthermore, dynamic timescale also plays a crucial role in signal transmission, especially in finite time scenario. For example, the thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) connects the current fluctuation to dissipation in far-from-equilibrium systems, infinite time is, however, required to achieve the predicted lower bound for fluctuation [24,25]. It has also been proposed that increasing the dynamic timescale can exploit the temporal average effect, breaking the noise-sensitivity relation in considering external signal noise [26].

In this letter, we thoroughly re-evaluate the renowned feedback control mechanism in suppressing intrinsic fluctuation. We first demonstrate that fluctuation suppression is sometimes achieved by sacrificing the response sensitivity in feedback systems, using a one-dimensional (1D) textbook toy model as an example. For general feedback control, we further identify a fundamental triplet trade-off between intrinsic fluctuation, response sensitivity, and response timescale, indicating that fluctuation cannot be infinitely suppressed without sacrificing the other two factors by feedback. Moreover, we find that the optimal signal transmission set by this triplet trade-off varies with the degree of non-gradient and the effective dimension of the dynamics.

Negative feedback may suppress intrinsic fluctuation at the cost of reducing external signal sensitivity. We study the signal transmission of dynamical systems described by the N -dimensional Langevin equations:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = f_i(\{x_j\}, I) - \beta_i x_i + \eta_i, i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where I is the external input signal, $f_i(\{x_j\}, I)$ is the regulatory function corresponding to the synthesis term of a regulatory network, β_i is the decay rate, η_i is the white noise term that arises from the intrinsic fluctuation with the amplitude: $\langle \eta_i(t)\eta_j(t') \rangle = D_i \delta(t - t') \delta_{ij}$, and $D_i = (f_i + \beta_i x_i)$ [27–30], where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the temporal average, $\delta(t - t')$ is the Dirac delta function and δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta. Without losing generality, we consider the external signal to be transmitted through the first node (of which the state is x_1), while the other nodes compose a complex feedback module (Fig. 1), thus $\partial f_i / \partial I \equiv 0, \forall i \neq 1$. The fluctuation is defined as the variance of the response at the steady-state, denoted as $\sigma^2 = \langle (x_1 - \langle x_1 \rangle)^2 \rangle$ (Fig. 1); the response sensitivity is defined as the steady-state response to a small perturbation of the input signal, denoted as $\kappa = d\langle x_i \rangle / dI$, following the spirit of the FDT and the linear response theory (Fig. 1); the timescale is defined as the slowest relaxation timescale of the dynamics near a fixed point (Fig. 1), which is the inverse of the minimal negative real part of eigenvalues of the Jacobian, denoted as $T = (\min(-\text{Re}(\lambda_i)))^{-1}$, where λ_i is the eigenvalues of the Jacobian \mathbf{J} which is defined as $J_{ij} = (\partial(f_i - \beta_i x_i) / \partial x_j)_{x_i = x_{i,s.s.}}$. Since we assume the steady-state response is achieved by a stable fixed point, all eigenvalues of \mathbf{J} have negative real parts.

With these definitions, the fluctuation, sensitivity, and timescale of a 1D textbook toy model ($N = 1$ for Eq. (1)) follows:

$$\begin{cases} \sigma^2 &= \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_1 - \partial f_1 / \partial x_1} \langle x_1 \rangle \\ \kappa &= \frac{1}{\beta_1 - \partial f_1 / \partial x_1} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial I}, \\ T &= \frac{1}{\beta_1 - \partial f_1 / \partial x_1} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

using the linear approximation, where $\partial f_1 / \partial x_1$ denotes the strength of autoregulation. This result indicates that negative feedback ($\partial f_1 / \partial x_1 < 0$) sacrifices the response sensitivity κ to reduce the

intrinsic fluctuation σ^2 to a level below the Poisson noise (i.e., $\sigma^2 \leq \langle x \rangle$), and speed up the response when assuming the response level $\langle x_1 \rangle$, the decay rate β_1 , and the derivative $\partial f_1 / \partial I$ are fixed. While the fluctuation suppression and response speed up are well-known properties of negative feedback [4,5], how feedback affects the response sensitivity is less understood, especially for high-dimensional systems.

A triplet trade-off between fluctuation, sensitivity, and timescale in feedback-controlled network. Since the three factors σ^2 , κ , and T have a high degree of freedom even in no-feedback systems, to better isolate and evaluate the contribution of feedback in high-dimensional systems, we normalize them by the corresponding values in the no-feedback condition denoted by a subscript “0” as σ_0^2 , κ_0 , and T_0 . In our framework, such a no-feedback condition is always a 1D system without autoregulation following $\sigma_0^2 = \langle x_1 \rangle = \frac{D_1}{2\beta_1}$, $\kappa_0 = \frac{1}{\beta_1} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1}$, and $T_0 = \frac{1}{\beta_1}$ by letting $\partial f_1 / \partial x_1 = 0$ in Eq. (2). A similar protocol has been proposed recently in studying the role of feedback in adaptation [31,32]. To further perform a fair comparison between the no-feedback and feedback network, no additional source of fluctuation is considered in the feedback module, i.e., $D_i = 0, \forall i \neq 1$ in Eq. (1). Relaxing this assumption does not affect our main conclusion as a lower bound for fluctuation is still a lower bound when additional independent fluctuation is considered (see Discussion for more details).

With this normalization scheme applied to Eq. (2), the contribution of feedback in 1D systems follows:

$$\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} = \frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} = \frac{T}{T_0}, \quad (3)$$

implying fluctuation suppression ($\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} < 1$) always requires the same fold of sensitivity reduction ($\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} = \frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} < 1$). This result resembles one prediction of the FDT: the steady-state response to a signal perturbation is proportional to its intrinsic fluctuation, i.e., $\kappa \propto \sigma^2$. However, it remains unclear whether this relation is valid for high-dimensional, generally non-gradient, systems.

For 2D systems, we find $\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} / \left| \frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} \right| \geq 2 \frac{\sqrt{T/T_{\min}}}{1+T/T_{\min}}$ with a similar mathematical derivation (see Supplementary Note 1 for details). This inequality implies that no fundamental lower bound exists

for $\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2}$ given $\left|\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right|$, as long as the system exhibits a timescale separation $\frac{T}{T_{\min}} \gg 1$, where T_{\min} is the fastest timescale of the dynamics (see Supplementary Fig. 1(a)), indicating fluctuation can be suppressed infinitely without affecting the sensitivity through feedback control. This conclusion is extensible to higher dimensional systems based on the validation via numerical simulations (Supplementary Fig. 1(b)).

Although there is no trade-off between fluctuation and sensitivity for 2D systems, we find a closed-form triplet trade-off between fluctuation, sensitivity, and timescale following (see Supplementary Note 1 for details):

$$\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2 > \frac{1}{2}. \quad (4)$$

This triplet trade-off indicates that the fluctuation can only be suppressed up to half without affecting either the sensitivity or the timescale by feedback control, i.e., $\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} > \frac{1}{2}$ when $\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} = 1$ and $\frac{T}{T_0} = 1$; further suppression of fluctuation ($\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} < \frac{1}{2}$) always sacrifices the response sensitivity ($\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} < 1$) or response speed ($\frac{T}{T_0} > 1$); infinite suppression of fluctuation ($\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} \rightarrow 0$) without affecting the sensitivity ($\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} = 1$) generally requires infinite slow dynamics ($\frac{T}{T_0} \rightarrow \infty$). Although the lower bound appears to follow $\sigma^2 \propto \kappa^2$, it cannot be explained by the error propagation since the source of fluctuation considered here is intrinsic to the system rather than inherited from the input signal. A numerical simulation of 2D systems based on the Monod-Wyman-Changeux (MWC) model [33–36] with 100,000 randomly sampled parameter sets confirms that this is a tight bound (Fig. 2(a), see Supplementary Note 4 for model and parameter sampling details). For systems with higher dimensions, numerical results show that the triplet trade-off relation (Eq.(4)) is still valid and tight (Fig. 2(b)), suggesting that Eq. (4) is a fundamental trade-off for dynamics following the feedback-controlled framework in Fig. 1.

The optimal performance is bound by the degree of non-gradient. While the triplet trade-off (Eq. (4)) is valid for high dimensional systems, defining a lower bound for $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2$ being $\frac{1}{2}$, 1D systems exhibit a worse performance following $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2 = 1$ (Eq. (3)). This may result

from the fact that 1D dynamics are always gradient. To verify this connection, we next focus on high-dimensional gradient systems. With similar derivation for arbitrary dimensions, we find that for gradient systems, the trade-off relation is altered (see Supplementary Note 2 for details):

$$\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} \right)^2 \geq 1. \quad (5)$$

The lower bound is now increased to 1, indicating that the suppression of fluctuation ($\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2} < 1$) *always* sacrifices response sensitivity ($\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} < 1$) or response speed ($\frac{T}{T_0} > 1$). This result implies that gradient systems perform worse than non-gradient systems regarding signal transmission. Numerical simulations of local gradient systems support that this closed-form is a tight bound in both 2D and 10D dynamics (Supplementary Fig. 2).

So far, we have found that the lower bound for $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0} \right)^2$ in gradient and non-gradient systems is 1 and $\frac{1}{2}$, respectively. Next, we investigate how this bound relies on the degree of non-gradient of a dynamical system. However, as far as we know, no common method exists to quantify the degree of non-gradient, hence we propose one based on the symmetric-antisymmetric decomposition of the Jacobian.

The Jacobian of a dynamical system (Eq. (1)) near a steady-state can always be decomposed into a symmetric and an antisymmetric part, i.e., $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{J}^s + \mathbf{J}^{as}$, where the symmetric part $\mathbf{J}^s = (\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{J}^T)/2$ represents the gradient component, and the antisymmetric part $\mathbf{J}^{as} = (\mathbf{J} - \mathbf{J}^T)/2$ represents the rotational component. For a gradient field determined by \mathbf{J}^s , the eigen dimension with the maximal eigenvalue $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^s)$ defines its stability and is decisive: if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^s) < 0$, \mathbf{J}^s represents a stable dynamic, whose relaxation timescale is given by $(-\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^s))^{-1}$; if $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^s) \geq 0$, \mathbf{J}^s represents an unstable dynamic, even though \mathbf{J} can represent stable dynamics, and $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^s)$ corresponds to the most unstable dimension and defines its reactivity [37]. For a rotational field determined by \mathbf{J}^{as} , whose eigenvalues are all pure imaginary, the eigenvalue with the maximal imaginary part $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{as})$ determines the maximal flux speed as $\text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{as})) > 0$. Accordingly, we quantify the degree of non-gradient by a non-negative scalar χ defined as:

$$\chi = \frac{\text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{as}}))}{\text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{as}})) - \lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{s}})}. \quad (6)$$

A large value of χ indicates a potentially high degree of non-gradient. For gradient systems, $\text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{as}})) = 0$ and thus $\chi = 0$; for systems with $-\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{s}}) \gg \text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{as}})) > 0$, its gradient part is stable and dominant, thus the degree of non-gradient is small, i.e., $\chi \sim 0$; for systems with $\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{s}}) \gg 0$, its gradient part is highly unstable and the non-gradient part is necessary to stabilize the system, implying a high degree of non-gradient and $\chi > 1$. With numerical simulations, we confirm that $\text{im}(\lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{as}})) > \lambda_1(\mathbf{J}^{\text{s}})$ always holds for stable systems, thus $\chi \geq 0$. It is worth noting that the decomposition of dynamical systems into a gradient and a non-gradient field is not unique, e.g., decomposition based on the steady-state distribution, the Helmholtz decomposition, etc. [22,38,39]. We use the symmetric-antisymmetric decomposition as it depends only on the Jacobian and thus facilitates further analytical derivation. Moreover, the rotational component of the symmetric-antisymmetric decomposition is always a curl field when projected onto any 2D subspace in which the curl operator is well defined.

Based on this quantification, we find that for 2D systems, the lower bound for $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2$ depends on χ , following (see Supplementary Note 3 for details):

$$\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2 \geq \mathcal{B}_G(\chi) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \left(\frac{1}{1 + \chi} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (7)$$

For gradient systems, the lower bound is $\mathcal{B}_G(0) = 1$ and for systems with a high degree of non-gradient, $\mathcal{B}_G(+\infty) \rightarrow 1/2$. It is worth noting that $\mathcal{B}_G(\chi) > \frac{1}{2}$ is a monotonically decreasing function, implying that a high level of non-gradient always improves the optimal performance. Numerical simulations support that Eq. (7) sets a tight lower bound for 2D systems (Fig. 3(a)) and it is also valid for high-dimensional systems (Supplementary Fig. 3(a)).

The lower bound for the triplet trade-off is affected by the effective dimension. While the dimension of the *de facto* dynamical trajectory is usually lower than that of the whole variable space, it is critical to characterize the effective dimension of the actual dynamics because a lower bound for the triplet trade-off less than 1 necessitates a dimension higher than 1. To have an effective dimension higher than 1 requires, at least, the two slowest relaxation modes to occur at a similar timescale. This condition can be quantified by a ratio T/T_2 , where T is the slowest

timescale as defined before, and T_2 is the second slowest timescale. In 2D systems, we find a lower bound for $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2$ depending on T/T_2 (see Supplementary Note 3 for details):

$$\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2 > \mathcal{B}_D \left(\frac{T}{T_2}\right) = \frac{T/T_2}{1 + T/T_2}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_D(T/T_2) \geq 1/2$ since $T \geq T_2$. Eq. (8) implies that when $T/T_2 \rightarrow +\infty$, the lower bound $\mathcal{B}_D(+\infty) \rightarrow 1$, which is reasonable since this timescale separation implies the central manifold of the dynamic is effectively 1D. When $T/T_2 \sim 1$, the two underlying dimensions are on the same timescale, allowing the system to exploit a 2D phase space and achieve a lower bound $\mathcal{B}_D(1) = 1/2$. Numerical simulations support that Eq. (8) sets a tight lower bound for both 2D systems (Fig. 3(b)) and high dimensional systems (Supplementary Fig 3(b)).

Discussion. While noise attenuation is admittedly a crucial task in regulatory networks, the performance of signal transmission equally depends on response sensitivity, timescale, along with fluctuation, and probably more factors. In this letter, we identify a fundamental triplet trade-off in feedback-controlled dynamics (Eq. (4)), highlighting the limitation of feedback in enhancing information transmission capacity. Specifically, we discover that the lower bound for this trade-off can be reduced from 1 to, at most, 1/2 by increasing the degree of non-gradient (Eq. (7)) which is closely connected to the degree of nonequilibrium in dynamical systems. Notably, this trade-off cannot be lifted by any other means such as increasing energy dissipation, in contrast to the other trade-offs discovered in the biological information processing (e.g., [18–20,40–42]).

In our derivation, we focus on quantities assessing the effect of feedback, i.e., $\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2}$, $\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}$, and $\frac{T}{T_0}$. This normalization scheme can exclude other effects, e.g., changing the average level $\langle x_1 \rangle$ is well known to affect the intrinsic fluctuation, changing the derivative $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial I}$ and the decay rate β_1 can evidently alter the response sensitivity and timescale, respectively. This change of fluctuation, sensitivity, and timescale is not unique to, even independent of, feedback control, and can be eliminated by the employed normalization scheme.

Several assumptions have been used in the derivation for simplification. We validate that our conclusions still hold when these assumptions are relaxed. Firstly, if the feedback module *per se* also suffers from intrinsic fluctuation, the trade-off relation (Eq. (1)) is still valid as the inclusion

of any additional sources of fluctuation does not affect the lower bound. Numerical simulations support this deduction (Supplementary Fig. (4)). Secondly, our derivation is based on the small noise limit. We find that if we increase the fluctuation amplitude by 10-fold in simulations, the triplet trade-off is still valid (Supplementary Fig (5)).

The relation between fluctuation and response sensitivity is still extensively studied in a variety of processes. We explicitly quantified the effect of timescale, which is a less understood factor, resonating with the spirit of finite-time thermodynamics, in which revealing “the cost of haste” [43,44] is the central task. Our results show that only infinitely slow processes, akin to the quasi-static processes in classic thermodynamics, can achieve arbitrary small fluctuation with given sensitivity in feedback-controlled signal transmission (Eq.(4)).

Our study, as an attempt to re-evaluate the feedback mechanism in suppressing fluctuation, focuses on a specific feedback-controlled framework shown in Fig. 1. While many properties of feedback control have been revealed over the past decades in networks with relatively simple feedback pathways [5–7,11,26,30,45], biological feedback is usually more complex than being simply described as positive-feedback or negative-feedback. In our studied framework, the feedback pathway can be composed of an arbitrarily complex network, and therefore we take a step further into the regime of general complex feedback. One can imagine that similar relationships between the key parameters controlling signal transmission could be revealed for other even more complex signaling frameworks in the future. These findings could help understand the real biological signaling processes, and serve as a guiding principle in designing regulatory networks for synthetic biology.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Dr. J. Wang, Dr. J. Lin, Dr. Q. Ouyang and D. Li for their helpful discussion. This project is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China 32271293 and 11875076. The numerical calculation was performed on the High-Performance Computing Platform of the Center for Life Sciences, Peking University.

References

- [1] G. Chalancon, C. N. J. Ravarani, S. Balaji, A. Martinez-Arias, L. Aravind, R. Jothi, and M. M. Babu, Interplay between gene expression noise and regulatory network architecture, *Trends Genet.* **28**, 221 (2012).
- [2] M. B. Elowitz, Stochastic gene expression in a single cell, *Science* **297**, 1183 (2002).
- [3] M. Kærn, T. C. Elston, W. J. Blake, and J. J. Collins, Stochasticity in gene expression: from theories to phenotypes, *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **6**, 451 (2005).
- [4] U. Alon, *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits*, 0 ed. (Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2006).
- [5] U. Alon, Network motifs: theory and experimental approaches, *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **8**, 450 (2007).
- [6] I. Lestas, G. Vinnicombe, and J. Paulsson, Fundamental limits on the suppression of molecular fluctuations, *Nature* **467**, 174 (2010).
- [7] L. Qiao, W. Zhao, C. Tang, Q. Nie, and L. Zhang, Network topologies that can achieve dual function of adaptation and noise attenuation, *Cell Syst.* **9**, 271 (2019).
- [8] W. A. Lim, C. M. Lee, and C. Tang, Design principles of regulatory networks: searching for the molecular algorithms of the cell, *Mol. Cell* **49**, 202 (2013).
- [9] A. Rhee, R. Cheong, and A. Levchenko, The application of information theory to biochemical signaling systems, *Phys. Biol.* **9**, 045011 (2012).
- [10] G. Tkačik, A. M. Walczak, and W. Bialek, Optimizing information flow in small genetic networks, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 031920 (2009).
- [11] G. Tkačik, A. M. Walczak, and W. Bialek, Optimizing information flow in small genetic networks. III. A self-interacting gene, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 041903 (2012).
- [12] J. O. Dubuis, G. Tkacik, E. F. Wieschaus, T. Gregor, and W. Bialek, Positional information, in bits, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **110**, 16301 (2013).
- [13] K. K. Kong, C. Luo, and F. Liu, A phase diagram structure determines the optimal sensitivity-precision trade-off in signaling systems, *Commun. Phys.* **7**, 80 (2024).
- [14] U. Seifert and T. Speck, Fluctuation-dissipation theorem in nonequilibrium steady states, *EPL Europhys. Lett.* **89**, 10007 (2010).
- [15] J. Prost, J.-F. Joanny, and J. M. R. Parrondo, Generalized Fluctuation-Dissipation Theorem for Steady-State Systems, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 090601 (2009).
- [16] A. Dechant and S. Sasa, Fluctuation–response inequality out of equilibrium, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **117**, 6430 (2020).
- [17] K. Sato, Y. Ito, T. Yomo, and K. Kaneko, On the relation between fluctuation and response in biological systems, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **100**, 14086 (2003).
- [18] C. Fei, Y. Cao, Q. Ouyang, and Y. Tu, Design principles for enhancing phase sensitivity and suppressing phase fluctuations simultaneously in biochemical oscillatory systems, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1434 (2018).
- [19] Y. Cao, H. Wang, Q. Ouyang, and Y. Tu, The free-energy cost of accurate biochemical oscillations, *Nat. Phys.* **11**, 772 (2015).

- [20] P. Sartori and Y. Tu, Free energy cost of reducing noise while maintaining a high sensitivity, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 118102 (2015).
- [21] H.-M. Chun and J. M. Horowitz, Trade-offs between number fluctuations and response in nonequilibrium chemical reaction networks, *J. Chem. Phys.* **158**, 174115 (2023).
- [22] J. Wang, Potential landscape and flux framework of nonequilibrium biological networks, *Annu. Rep. Comput. Chem.* **7**, 3 (2011).
- [23] J. Wang, L. Xu, and E. Wang, Potential landscape and flux framework of nonequilibrium networks: Robustness, dissipation, and coherence of biochemical oscillations, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **105**, 12271 (2008).
- [24] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, Thermodynamic uncertainty relation for biomolecular processes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [25] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, Thermodynamic uncertainty relations constrain non-equilibrium fluctuations, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 15 (2020).
- [26] G. Hornung and N. Barkai, Noise propagation and signaling sensitivity in biological networks: a role for positive feedback, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **4**, e8 (2008).
- [27] D. T. Gillespie, The chemical Langevin equation, *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 297 (2000).
- [28] D. T. Gillespie, Stochastic simulation of chemical kinetics, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **58**, 35 (2007).
- [29] J. Paulsson, Models of stochastic gene expression, *Phys. Life Rev.* **2**, 157 (2005).
- [30] J. Paulsson, Summing up the noise in gene networks, *Nature* **427**, 415 (2004).
- [31] M. Gómez-Schiavon and H. El-Samad, CoRa—A general approach for quantifying biological feedback control, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **119**, e2206825119 (2022).
- [32] H. El-Samad, Biological feedback control—Respect the loops, *Cell Syst.* **12**, 477 (2021).
- [33] J. Monod, J. Wyman, and J.-P. Changeux, On the nature of allosteric transitions: A plausible model, *J. Mol. Biol.* **12**, 88 (1965).
- [34] R. Grah, B. Zoller, and G. Tkačik, Nonequilibrium models of optimal enhancer function, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 202006731 (2020).
- [35] A. M. Walczak, G. Tkačik, and W. Bialek, Optimizing information flow in small genetic networks. II. Feed-forward interactions, *Phys. Rev. E* **81**, 041905 (2010).
- [36] T. R. Sokolowski, T. Gregor, W. Bialek, and G. Tkačik, *Deriving a Genetic Regulatory Network from an Optimization Principle*, arXiv:2302.05680.
- [37] M. G. Neubert and H. Caswell, Alternatives to resilience for measuring the responses of ecological systems to perturbations, *Ecology* **78**, 653 (1997).
- [38] M. A. Coomer, L. Ham, and M. P. H. Stumpf, Noise distorts the epigenetic landscape and shapes cell-fate decisions, *Cell Syst.* **13**, 83 (2022).
- [39] J. X. Zhou, M. D. S. Aliyu, E. Aurell, and S. Huang, Quasi-potential landscape in complex multi-stable systems, *J. R. Soc. Interface* **9**, 3539 (2012).
- [40] C. C. Govern and P. R. Ten Wolde, Energy Dissipation and Noise Correlations in Biochemical Sensing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 258102 (2014).

- [41] A. J. Tjalma, V. Galstyan, J. Goedhart, L. Slim, N. B. Becker, and P. R. Ten Wolde, Trade-offs between cost and information in cellular prediction, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **120**, e2303078120 (2023).
- [42] S. J. Bryant and B. B. Machta, Physical Constraints in Intracellular Signaling: The Cost of Sending a Bit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 068401 (2023).
- [43] R. Berry, P. Salamon, and B. Andresen, How It All Began, *Entropy* **22**, 908 (2020).
- [44] B. Andresen and P. Salamon, Future Perspectives of Finite-Time Thermodynamics, *Entropy* **24**, 690 (2022).
- [45] L. Wang, J. Xin, and Q. Nie, A critical quantity for noise attenuation in feedback systems, *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **6**, e1000764 (2010).

Figure Captions




Fig. 1. The fluctuation, response sensitivity, and response timescale of feedback-controlled networks. The feedback module can be composed of multiple interactive nodes. The number and form of interactions between the feedback module and the response node (x_1) is not restricted. The response sensitivity (κ) is defined as the change in the steady-state average of x_1 under a perturbation of the input signal I . The response fluctuation (σ^2) is defined as the variance of x_1 at the steady-state. The timescale (T) represents the speed of relaxing to the steady-state after a perturbation, which equals the slowest mode of the dynamics.




Fig. 2. The fluctuation-sensitivity-timescale trade-off in 2D and 10D dynamical systems. (a, b) Numerical results of 2D (a) and 10D (b) dynamics, in which the feedback module is composed of 1 and 9 nodes, respectively (see Supplementary Note 4 for details). The results show that the predicted lower bound (Eq. (4)) is a tight lower bound (dashed line).




Fig. 3. The lower bound for $\frac{\sigma^2 T}{\sigma_0^2 T_0} / \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^2$ is determined by the degree of non-gradient χ (Eq. (6)) (a) and the ratio between the two slowest timescales T/T_2 (b) in 2D systems. (a, b) Numerical results of 2D systems show that the predicted lower bound in Eqs. (7) and (8) (dashed curve in (a) and (b), respectively) are tight lower bounds.