

LU TP 03-21

June 29, 2003

Random Boolean Network Models and the Yeast Transcriptional Network

Stuart Kauffman¹, Carsten Peterson²,
Björn Samuelsson² and Carl Troein²

¹Department of Cell Biology and Physiology,
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA

²Complex Systems Division, Department of Theoretical Physics
Lund University, Sölvegatan 14A, S-223 62 Lund, Sweden
<http://www.thep.lu.se/complex/>

Submitted to *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*

Corresponding author: C. Peterson; carsten@thep.lu.se

Subject Category: Biological Sciences: Biophysics.

Keywords: genetic networks, yeast, Boolean rules, dynamical systems.

Manuscript information: 6 text pages, 4 figures and 0 tables; 95 words in abstract;
29248 total characters in the paper; supporting information for the web.

Abstract

The recently measured yeast transcriptional network is analyzed in terms of simplified Boolean network models, with the aim of determining feasible rule structures, given the requirement of stable solutions of the generated Boolean networks. We find that for ensembles of generated models, those with canalizing Boolean rules are remarkably stable, whereas those with random Boolean rules are only marginally stable. Furthermore, substantial parts of the generated networks are frozen, in the sense that they reach the same state regardless of initial state. Thus, our ensemble approach suggests that the yeast network shows highly ordered dynamics.

1 Introduction

The regulatory network for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* was recently measured [1] for 106 of the 141 known transcription factors by determining the bindings of transcription factor proteins to promoter regions on the DNA. Associating the promoter regions with genes yields a network of directed gene-gene interactions. As described in [1,2] the significance of measured bindings with regard to inferring putative interactions are quantified in terms of P values. The authors of [1] did not infer interactions having P values above a threshold value $P_{\text{th}} = 0.001$ for most of their analysis. Small threshold values P_{th} correspond to a small number of inferred interactions with high quality, whereas larger values correspond to more inferred connections but of lower quality. It was found that for the $P_{\text{th}} = 0.001$ network, the fan-out from each transcription factor to its regulated targets is substantial, on the average 38 [1]. From the underlying data (website: http://web.wi.mit.edu/young/regulatory_network) one finds that fairly few signals feed into each of them; on the average 1.9. The experiments yield the regulatory network architecture but neither the interaction rules at the nodes, nor the dynamics of the system, nor its final states.

With no direct experimental results on the states of the system, there is of course no systematic method to pin down the interaction rules, not even within the framework of simplified and coarse-grained genetic network models, e.g. ones where the rules are Boolean. One can nevertheless attempt to investigate to what extent the measured architecture can select between classes of Boolean models [3], based upon criteria of stability.

We generate ensembles of different model networks on the given architecture, and analyze their behavior with respect to stability. In a stable system small initial perturbations should not grow in time. This is investigated by monitoring how the Hamming distances between different initial states evolve in a ‘‘Derrida plot’’ [4]. If small Hamming distances diverge in time, the system is unstable and vice versa. Based upon this criterion we find that synchronously updated random Boolean networks (with a flat rule distribution) are marginally stable on the transcriptional network of yeast.

Using a subset of Boolean rules, *nested canalyzing functions* (see sect. 2.2), the ensemble of networks exhibits remarkable stability. The notion of nested canalyzing functions is introduced to provide a natural way of generating canalyzing rules, which

are abundant in biology [5]. Furthermore, it turns out that for these networks, there exists a fair amount of *forcing structures* [3], where non-negligible parts of the networks are frozen to fixed final states regardless of the initial conditions. Also, we investigate the consequences of rewiring the network while retaining the local properties; the number of inputs and outputs for each node [6].

To accomplish the above, some novel tools and techniques were developed and used. In order to include more interactions than those in the $P_{\text{th}} = 0.001$ network [1], we investigate how network properties, local and global, change as P_{th} is increased. We find a transition slightly above $P_{\text{th}} = 0.005$, indicating the onset of noise in the form of biologically irrelevant inferred connections. In [5] extensive literature studies revealed that, for eukaryotes, the rules seem to be canalizing. We develop a convenient method to generate a distribution of canalizing rules, that fits well with the list of rules in [5].

2 Methods and Models

2.1 Choosing Network Architecture

In [1], P values were calculated as measures of confidence in the presence of an interaction. With further elucidation of noise levels, one might increase the threshold for P values from the value 0.001 used in [1]. To this end we compute various network properties, to investigate if there is any value of P_{th} for which these properties exhibit a transition that can be interpreted as the onset of noise. In Fig. 1 the number of nodes, mean connectivity, mean pairwise distance (radius) and fraction of node pairs connected are shown. As can be seen, there appears to be a transition slightly above $P_{\text{th}} = 0.005$. In what follows we therefore focus on the network defined by $P_{\text{th}} = 0.005$. Furthermore, we (recursively) remove genes which have no outputs to other genes, since these are not relevant for the network dynamics. The resulting network is shown in Fig. 2.

2.2 Generating Rules

In [1], the architecture of the network is determined, but not the specific rules for the interactions. In order to investigate the dynamics on the measured architecture,

we repeatedly assign a random Boolean rule to each node in the network. We use two rule distributions; one null-hypothesis and one distribution that agrees with rules compiled from the literature [5] (see *Supporting Information*). In both cases we ensure that every rule depends on all of its inputs, since the dependence should be consistent with the network architecture.

As a null-hypothesis, we use a flat distribution among all Boolean functions that depend on all inputs. For rules with a few inputs, this will create rules that can be expressed with normal Boolean functions in a convenient way. In the case of many inputs, most rules are unstructured and the result of toggling one input value will appear random.

In biological systems, the distribution of rules is likely to be structured. Indeed all of the compiled rules in [5] are canalyzing [3]; a canalyzing Boolean function [3] has at least one input, such that for at least one input value, the output value is fixed. It is not straightforward to generate biologically relevant canalyzing functions. A canalyzing rule implies some structure, but the function of the non-canalyzing inputs (when the canalyzing inputs are clamped to their non-canalyzing values) could be as disordered as the full set of random Boolean rules. However, the canalyzing structure is repeated in a nested fashion for almost all rules in [5]. Hence, we introduce the concept of *nested canalyzing functions* (see *Appendix*), which can be used to generate distributions of canalyzing rules. Actually, of the 139 rules in [5] only 6 are not nested canalyzing functions (see *Supporting Information*).

A special case of nested canalyzing functions is the recently introduced notion of *chain functions* [7] (see *Appendix*). Chain functions are the most abundant form of nested canalyzing functions, but 32 of the 139 rules in [5] fall outside this class.

It turns out that the rule distribution of nested canalyzing functions in [5] can be well described by a model with only one parameter (see *Appendix*). Hence, we use this model to mimic the compiled rule distribution. The free parameter determines the degree of asymmetry between active and inactive states, and its value reflects the fact that most genes are inactive at any given time in a gene regulatory system.

2.3 Analyzing the Dynamics

A biological system is subject to a substantial amount of noise, making robustness a necessary feature of any model. We expect a transcriptional network to be stable,

in that a random disturbance can not be allowed to grow uncontrollably. Gene expression levels can be approximated as Boolean, as genes tend to be either active or inactive. This approximation for genetic networks is presumably easier to handle for stability issues than for general dynamical properties. Using synchronous updates is computationally and conceptually convenient though it may at first sight appear unrealistic. However, in instances of strong stability, the update order should not be very important.

To study the time development of small fluctuations in this discrete model with synchronous updating, we investigate how the Hamming distance between two states evolves with time. In a Derrida plot [4] pairs of initial states are sampled at defined initial distances $H(0)$ from the entire state space, and their mean Hamming distance $H(t)$ after a fixed time t is plotted against the initial distance $H(0)$. The slope in the low- H region indicates the fate of a small disturbance. If the curve is above/below the line $H(t) = H(0)$ it reflects instability/stability in the sense that a small disturbance tend to increase/decrease during the next t time steps (see Fig. 3).

It is not uncommon that transcription factors control their own expression. In some cases genes up-regulate themselves, with the effect that their behavior becomes less linear and more switch-like. This is readily mimicked in a Boolean network. However, in the other case, where a transcription factor down-regulates itself, the system will be stabilized in a model with continuous variables, provided that the time delay of the self-interaction is not too large. Boolean networks can only model the limit of large time delays, which gives rise to nodes that in an unbiological manner repeatedly flip between no activity and full activity without requiring any external input. Thus, the self-interactions need to be treated as a special case in the Boolean approximation. To this end, we consider three different alternatives:

1. View the self-interactions as internal parts of the rules; all self-interactions are removed.
2. Remove the possibility for self-interactions to be down-regulating.
3. No special treatment of self-interactions.

It is natural to use alternative 1 as a reference point in order to understand the effect of the self-interactions in alternatives 2 and 3.

We want to examine how the geometry of networks influence the dynamics. It is known [3] that the distributions of in- and out-connectivities of the nodes strongly

affect the dynamics in Boolean networks, but how important is the overall architecture? If for each node we preserve the connectivities, but otherwise rewire the network randomly [6], how is the dynamics affected? For a Derrida plot with $t = 1$, there is no change. If we only take a single time step from a random state, the outputs will not have time to be used as inputs. There will be correlations between nodes, but the measured quantity $H(1)$ is a mean over all nodes, and this is not affected by these correlations. Hence, $H(1)$ is not changed by the rewiring. In order to get a better picture of the dynamics we need to increase t . However, if we go high enough in t to probe larger structures in the networks, we lose sight of the transient effects of a perturbation.

To remedy this, we opt to select a fixed initial Hamming distance $H(0)$, and examine the expectation value of the distance as a function of time, using the nested canalyzing rules. As noise entering the biological network would act on the current state of the system rather than on an entirely random one, we select one of the states to be a fixed point of the dynamics, and let the probability of any given fixed point be proportional to the size of its attractor basin. A graph of $H(t)$ shows the relaxation behavior of the perturbed system where the self-interactions have been removed (see Fig. 4a). We investigate the role of the self-interactions both in terms of relaxation of a perturbed fixed point (see Fig. 4b) and in terms of probabilities for random trajectories to end up in distinct fixed points and cycles.

The assumption that the typical state of these networks is a fixed point can be motivated. A forcing connection [3] is a pair of connected nodes, such that control over a single input to one node is sufficient to force the output of the other node to one of the Boolean values. With canalyzing rules, this is fulfilled when the canalyzed output of the first node is a canalyzing input to the second. The existence of forcing structures implies stability, as a (forcing) signal traveling through such a structure will block out other inputs and is thereby likely to cause information loss. Abundant forcing structures should tend to favor fixed points.

3 Results and Discussion

Despite absence of knowledge about initial and final states, we have been able to get a hint about possible interaction rules within a Boolean network framework for the yeast transcriptional network. Our findings are:

- Canalyzing Boolean rules confer far more stability than rules drawn from a flat distribution as is clear from the Derrida plots in Fig. 3. Yet, even a flat distribution of Boolean functions yields marginal stability.
- The dynamical behavior around fixed points is more stable for the measured network than for the rewired ones, though only in the early time evolution (2–3 time steps) of the systems (see Fig. 4a). The behavior at this time scale can be expected to depend largely on small network motifs, whose numbers are systematically changed by the rewiring [6].
- The removal of self-couplings increases the stability in these networks. However, the relaxation is only changed significantly if we allow the toggling of self-interacting nodes (see Fig. 4b). This means that a node with a switch-like self-interaction is not likely to be toggled by its inputs during the relaxation. Nor do the down-regulating self-interactions alter the relaxation. This means that the overall properties of relaxation to fixed points can be investigated regardless of how the self-interactions should be modeled.
- The number of attractors and their length distribution are strongly dependent on how the self-interactions are modeled. The average numbers of distinct fixed points per rule assignments found in 1000 trials of different trajectories are 1.02, 4.33 and 3.79, respectively, for the three self-interaction models. The numbers of 2-cycles are 0.02, 0.09 and 0.38, respectively. Longer cycles are less common; in total they sum up to 0.03, 0.11 and 0.11, respectively.
- Forcing structures [3] are prevalent for this architecture with canalyzing rules, as is evident from Fig. 2. On average 56% of the couplings belong to forcing structures. As a consequence, most nodes will be forced to a fixed state regardless of the initial state of the network. Even the highly connected nodes (in the center of the network) will be forced to a fixed state for a vast majority of the random rule assignments. In most cases, the whole network will be forced to a specific fixed state. At first glance this might seem un-biological. However, in the real world there are more inputs to the system than the measured transcription factors, and to study a process such as the cell cycle, one may need to consider additional components of the system. With more inputs such

a strong stability — of the measured part of the network — may be necessary for robustness of the entire system.

Future reverse engineering projects in transcriptional networks may be based on the restricted pool of nested canalizing rules, which have been shown to generate very robust networks in this case. It should be pointed out that the notion of nested canalizing functions is not intrinsically Boolean. For instance, the same concept can be applied to nested sigmoids.

Acknowledgments

We thank Stephen Harris for providing us with details underlying reference [5]. This research was initiated at the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics in Santa Barbara (CP and SK) and was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY99-07949. CT acknowledges the support from the Swedish National Research School in Genomics and Bioinformatics.

Appendix: Nested Canalyzing Functions

The notion of nested canalyzing functions is a natural extension of canalyzing functions. Consider a K -input Boolean rule R with inputs i_1, \dots, i_K and output o . R is canalyzing on the input i_m if there are Boolean values I_m and O_m such that $i_m = I_m \Rightarrow o = O_m$. I_m is the canalyzing value, and O_m is the canalyzed value for the output.

For each canalyzing rule R , renumber the inputs in a way such that R is canalyzing on i_1 . Then, there are Boolean values I_1 and O_1 such that $i_1 = I_1 \Rightarrow o = O_1$. To investigate the case $i_1 = \text{NOT } I_1$, fix i_1 to this value. This defines a new rule R_1 with $K - 1$ inputs; i_2, \dots, i_K . In most cases, when picking R from compiled data, R_1 is also canalyzing. Then, renumber the inputs in order for R_1 to be canalyzing on i_2 . Fixing $i_2 = \text{NOT } I_2$ renders a rule R_2 with the inputs i_3, \dots, i_K . As long as the rules R, R_1, R_2, \dots are canalyzing, we can repeat this procedure until we find R_{K-1} which has only one input i_K and hence is trivially canalyzing. Such a rule R is a *nested canalyzing function* and can be described by the canalyzing input values I_1, \dots, I_K together with their respective canalyzed output values O_1, \dots, O_K and an additional value O_{default} . The output is given by

$$o = \begin{cases} O_1 & \text{if } i_1 = I_1 \\ O_2 & \text{if } i_1 \neq I_1 \text{ AND } i_2 = I_2 \\ O_3 & \text{if } i_1 \neq I_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \neq I_2 \text{ AND } i_3 = I_3 \\ \vdots & \\ O_K & \text{if } i_1 \neq I_1 \text{ AND } \dots \text{ AND } i_{K-1} \neq I_{K-1} \text{ AND } i_K = I_K \\ O_{\text{default}} & \text{if } i_1 \neq I_1 \text{ AND } \dots \text{ AND } i_K \neq I_K . \end{cases}$$

The notion of *chain functions* in [7] is equivalent to nested canalyzing functions that can be written on the form $I_1 = \dots = I_{K-1} = \text{FALSE}$.

We want to generate a distribution of rules with K inputs, such that all rules depend on every input. The dependency requirement is fulfilled if and only if $O_{\text{default}} = \text{NOT } O_K$. Then, it remains to choose values for I_1, \dots, I_K and O_1, \dots, O_K . These values are independently and randomly chosen with the probabilities

$$p(I_m = \text{TRUE}) = p(O_m = \text{TRUE}) = \frac{\exp(-2^{-m}\alpha)}{1 + \exp(-2^{-m}\alpha)}$$

for $m = 1, \dots, K$. For all generated distributions, we let $\alpha = 7$.

The described scheme is sufficient to generate a well-defined rule distribution, but each rule has more than one representation in I_1, \dots, I_K and O_1, \dots, O_K . In *Supporting Information* we describe how to obtain a unique representation, which is applied to the rules compiled in [5]. This enables us to present a firm comparison between the generated distribution and the list of rules in [5].

References

- [1] Lee, T.I., Rinaldi, N.J., Robert, F., Odom, D.T., Bar-Joseph, Z., Gerber, G.K., Hannett, N.M., Harbison, C.T., Thompson, C.M., Simon, I. *et al.* (2002) *Science* **298**, 799-804.
- [2] Hughes, T.R., Marton, M.J., Jones, A.R., Roberts, C.J., Stoughton, R., Armour, C.D., Bennett, H.A., Coffey, E., Dai, H., He, Y.D. *et al.* (2000) *Cell* **102**, 109-126.
- [3] Kauffman, S.A. *Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*, Oxford University Press, 1993.
- [4] Derrida, B. & Weisbuch, G. (1986) *J. Physique* **47**, 1297-1303.
- [5] Harris, S.E., Sawhill, B.K., Wuensche, A. & Kauffman, S. (2002) *Complexity* **7**(4), 23-40.
- [6] Maslov, S. & Sneppen, K. (2002) *Science* **296**, 910-913.
- [7] Gat-Viks, I. & Shamir, R. (2003) *Bioinformatics* **19** Suppl. 1, 1108-1117.

Figure captions

Fig. 1. Topological properties of the yeast regulatory network in [1] for different P value thresholds: Number of nodes (solid line), mean connectivity (dotted line), mean pairwise distance [radius] (dotted-solid line) and fraction of node pairs that are connected (dashed line). The right y -axis corresponds to the number of nodes with no outputs, whereas the other quantities are indicated on the left y -axis. Self-couplings were excluded, but the figure looks similar when they are included. The dashed vertical line marks the threshold $P_{\text{th}} = 0.005$.

Fig. 2. The $P_{\text{th}} = 0.005$ network excluding nodes with no outputs to other nodes than itself. The filled areas in the arrow-heads are proportional to the probability of each coupling to be in a forcing structure when the nested canalyzing rules are used on the network without self-interactions. This probability ranges from approximately 1/4 for the inputs to YAP6 to 1 for the inputs to one-input nodes. Nodes that will reach a frozen state (on or off) in the absence of down-regulating self-interactions, regardless of the choice of rules, are shown in dashed. For the other nodes, the grey scale indicates the probability of being frozen in the absence of self-interactions, ranging from just under 97% (bold black) to over 99.9% (gray).

Fig. 3. Evolution of different Hamming distances $H(0)$ with one time step to $H(1)$ (Derrida plots [4]) for random rules (dark grey) and nested canalyzing rules (light grey) with and without self-couplings (dashed borders) respectively. (Down-regulating self-couplings are allowed.) The bands correspond to 1σ variation among the different rule assignments generated on the architecture in Fig. 2. Statistics were gathered from 1000 starts on each of 1000 rule assignments.

Fig. 4. The average time evolution of perturbed fixed points for nested canalyzing rules, starting from Hamming distance $H(0) = 5$; (a) impact of the network architecture and (b) impact of the self-interactions. The lines marked with circles in both figures correspond to the network in Fig. 2 without self-interactions. The grey lines in (a) show the relaxation for 26 different rewired architectures with no self-interactions, with 1σ errors of the calculated means indicated by the line widths. The black lines in (b) correspond to the network in Fig. 2 with self-interactions. The upper line

shows the case when it is allowed to toggle nodes with self-interactions as a state at $H(0) = 5$ is picked, while the lower line shows the relaxation if this is not allowed. The widths of these lines show the difference between allowing self-interactions to be repressive or not.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3




Fig. 4a




Fig. 4b

Supporting Information

Random Boolean Network Models and the Yeast Transcriptional Network

S. Kauffman, C. Peterson, B. Samuelsson and C. Troein

Confronting Nested Canalyzing Functions with Compiled Data

In order to compare compiled and generated distributions of rules, we must ensure that every nested canalyzing function is always represented by the same set of parameters I_1, \dots, I_K and O_1, \dots, O_K (see Appendix in the printed article). All ambiguities in the choice of the representation can be derived from the following operations:

1. The transformation $I_K \rightarrow \text{NOT } I_K$ together with $O_K \rightarrow \text{NOT } O_K$ and $O_{\text{default}} \rightarrow \text{NOT } O_{\text{default}}$.
2. Permutations among a set of inputs i_m, \dots, i_{m+p} such that $O_m = \dots = O_{m+p}$. The values of I_m, \dots, I_{m+p} are permuted in the same way as i_m, \dots, i_{m+p} .

A unique representation is created from any choice of parameters in two steps. First, 1. is applied if $O_K \neq O_{K-1}$, which ensures that $O_K = O_{K-1}$. In order to handle the special case $K = 1$ in a convenient way we define $O_0 = \text{FALSE}$. Second, all intervals of inputs i_m, \dots, i_{m+p} such that 2. can be applied are identified and permuted so that $I_m = \dots = I_{m+q} = \text{FALSE}$ and $I_{m+q+1} = \dots = I_{m+p} = \text{TRUE}$ for some q , $0 \leq q \leq p$.

Using the above described procedure, we can compare a generated rule distribution with the compiled distribution. First, we take away all redundant inputs of each observed rule. An input is redundant if the output is never dependent on that input. Starting from 66, 45 and 22 nested canalyzing rules with 3, 4 and 5 inputs respectively, the reduction renders 2, 9, 71, 35 and 16 such rules with 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 inputs respectively. Second, we let $\alpha = 7$ and generate rule distributions for each number of inputs. ($\alpha = 7$ is not based on a precise fit, it was picked by hand to fit the distribution of I_1, \dots, I_K .) Table 1 shows the result for the most frequently observed rules, and Fig. 1 is a plot of the full rule distribution. The calculated distribution fits surprisingly well to the compiled one, considering that the model has only one free parameter, α .

	n_{obs}	n_{calc}	$(I_1 \rightarrow O_1), \dots, (I_K \rightarrow O_K)$	Boolean expression
A	30	28	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3$
B	20	26	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } i_3$
C	10	6	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4$
d	9	1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (i_2 \text{ OR } i_3)$
E	7	10	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND NOT } i_4$
F	6	6	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2$
G	6	2	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } (i_3 \text{ AND } i_4)$
H	5	4	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } (i_2 \text{ AND } i_3)$
I	5	2	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4$ AND NOT i_5
J	3	2	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } i_2$
k	3	4	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } (i_2 \text{ OR } i_3)$
L	3	6	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (\text{NOT } i_2 \text{ OR } i_3)$
M	3	4	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } (\text{NOT } i_3 \text{ OR } i_4)$
n	3	0	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } i_2 \text{ AND } (i_3 \text{ OR } i_4)$
O	3	1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4 \text{ AND } i_5$
P	2	2	$(0 \rightarrow 0)$	i_1
q	2	4	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } (i_3 \text{ OR } i_4)$

Table 1: The list of nested canalizing rules observed more than once in [5]. n_{obs} is the number of observations in the compiled list of rules, whereas n_{calc} is the average number of rules in the generated distribution. Each rule is described both as an ordinary Boolean expression, and with the parameters I_1, \dots, I_K and O_1, \dots, O_K , where $O_{\text{default}} = \text{NOT } O_K$. 0 and 1 correspond to FALSE and TRUE, respectively. The labels serve as references in Fig. 1, and capital labels mark rules that are chain functions. (NOT has higher operator precedence than AND, whereas the precedences of OR and XOR are lower.)

n_{obs}	$(I_1 \rightarrow O_1), \dots, (I_K \rightarrow O_K)$	Boolean expression
2	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (\text{non-canalyzing})$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } (\text{NOT } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4$ $\text{OR NOT } i_4 \text{ AND } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$\text{NOT } i_1 \text{ OR } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } (i_2 \text{ OR } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (i_2 \text{ OR } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (i_2 \text{ OR } i_3 \text{ OR } i_4)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$\text{NOT } i_1 \text{ OR } i_2 \text{ OR } i_3 \text{ AND NOT } i_4$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND NOT } (i_4 \text{ AND } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND NOT } (i_4 \text{ OR } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND } (i_4 \text{ OR } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } (i_3 \text{ AND } i_4 \text{ AND } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } (i_3 \text{ OR } i_4 \text{ AND } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND NOT } i_3 \text{ AND } (i_4 \text{ OR NOT } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 1), (1 \rightarrow 1)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } (i_2 \text{ AND } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4$ $\text{AND NOT } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 1), (0 \rightarrow 0), (1 \rightarrow 0)$	$i_1 \text{ AND NOT } i_2 \text{ AND } (i_3 \text{ OR } i_4 \text{ AND NOT } i_5)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (0 \rightarrow 0), (\text{non-canalyzing})$	$i_1 \text{ AND } i_2 \text{ AND } (i_3 \text{ XOR } i_4)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (\text{non-canalyzing})$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (i_2 \text{ XOR } i_3 \text{ AND } i_4)$
1	$(0 \rightarrow 0), (\text{non-canalyzing})$	$i_1 \text{ AND } (2 \leq)(i_2, i_3, \text{NOT } i_4)$
1	$(1 \rightarrow 0), (\text{non-canalyzing})$	$\text{NOT } i_1 \text{ AND } (i_2 \text{ AND NOT } i_3$ $\text{OR } i_3 \text{ AND NOT } (i_4 \text{ OR } i_5))$

Table 2: Continuation of Table 1, containing the remainder of rules listed in [5]. The Boolean function $(2 \leq)$ is TRUE if at least two of its arguments are TRUE.




Figure 1: Compiled and generated rule distributions of nested analyzing functions. The gray half-circles have an area proportional to the number of times each rule has been observed, while their black counterparts reflect the calculated distribution. The labeled rules are listed in Table 1. Capital labels mark rules that are chain functions. Each rule is assigned a coordinate in the unit square above (having $(0, 0)$ as its lower left corner), according to $x = 1/2 + \sum_{m=1}^K 2^{-m} \phi(I_m)$, $y = 1/2 + \sum_{m=1}^K 2^{-m} \phi(O_m)$, where $\phi(\text{TRUE}) = 1/2$ and $\phi(\text{FALSE}) = -1/2$. The crosses mark the possible coordinates for a rule that is represented in its unique form. The lines indicate how the coordinates can change when new inputs are added to an existing rule.