

Coarse-Graining and Self-Dissimilarity of Complex Networks

Shalev Itzkovitz^{1,2}, Reuven Levitt^{1,2}, Nadav Kashtan^{1,2}, Ron Milo^{1,2}, Michael Itzkovitz^{1,2}, Uri Alon^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics of Complex Systems, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel 76100*

²*Department of Molecular Cell Biology, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, Israel 76100*

Can complex engineered and biological networks be coarse-grained into smaller and more understandable versions in which each node represents an entire pattern in the original network? To address this, we define coarse-graining units (CGU) as connectivity patterns which can serve as the nodes of a coarse-grained network, and present algorithms to detect them. We show that this approach can systematically reverse-engineer electronic circuits, forming understandable high-level maps from incomprehensible transistor wiring: first, a coarse-grained version in which each node is a gate made of several transistors is established, and then a high-level blueprint in which each node is a circuit-module made of many gates is found. We apply our approach also to a mammalian protein-signaling network, to find a simplified coarse-grained network with three main signaling channels that correspond to cross-interacting MAP-kinase cascades. We find that both biological and electronic networks are 'self-dissimilar', with different network motifs found at each level. This approach can be used to simplify a wide variety of natural and designed networks.

PACS numbers: 05, 89.75

In both engineering and biology it is of interest to understand the design of complex networks, a task known as 'reverse-engineering'. In electronics, digital circuits are top-down-engineered starting from functional blocks, which are implemented using logic gates, which in turn are implemented using transistors [1]. Reverse-engineering of an electronic circuit means starting with a transistor map and inferring the gate and block levels. Current approaches to reverse-engineering of electronic circuits usually require prior knowledge of the library of modules used for forward-engineering [2],[3]. In biology, increasing amounts of interaction networks are being experimentally characterized, yet there are few approaches to simplify them into understandable blueprints [4]-[12]. Here we address these challenges by presenting an approach for simplifying networks by creating coarse-grained networks in which each node is a pattern in the original network. This approach is based on network motifs, significant patterns of connections that recur throughout the network, which can be detected by comparing the network to suitably randomized networks [13]-[16]. We define coarse-graining units, CGUs, as network motifs which can be used as nodes in a coarse-grained version of the network. We demonstrate this approach by coarse-graining an electronic and a biological network.

Definition of CGUs: CGUs are network motifs which can optimally serve as nodes in a coarse-grained network. One can think of CGUs as elementary circuit components with defined input and output ports, and internal computational nodes. The set of CGUs comprise a dictionary of elements from which a coarse-grained version of the original network is built. Our approach to define CGUs is loosely analogous to coding principles and to dictionary text compression techniques [17], [18]. The goal is to choose a set of CGUs that (a) is as small as possible, (b) each of which is as simple as possible, and which (c) make the coarse-grained network as small as

possible. These three properties can be termed 'conciseness', 'simplicity' and 'coverage'. Conciseness is defined by the number of total CGU types in the dictionary set. Coverage is the number of nodes and edges eliminated by coarse-graining the network using the CGUs. To define simplicity, we describe each occurrence of the subgraph, G , as a 'black box'. The black box has input ports and output ports, which represent the connections of G to the rest of the network, R (Fig 1). There can be four types of nodes in G : input nodes that receive only incoming edges from R , output nodes that have only outgoing edges to R , internal nodes with no connection to R , and mixed nodes with both incoming and outgoing edges to R . To obtain a minimal loss of information, a coarse-grained version of G includes ports, which carry out the interface to the rest of the network. The number of ports in the black box representing G is:

$$H = I + O + 2M \quad (1)$$

where I is the number of input nodes, O the number of output nodes and M the number of mixed nodes (internal nodes do not contribute ports and each mixed node contributes two ports). The lower H is the more 'simple' the CGU. A coarse-grained description of the network is a new network with fewer elements, in which some of the nodes are replaced by CGUs, and a dictionary describing the topology of the CGUs.

After defining simplicity, coverage and conciseness, one can choose the optimal set of CGUs. There is potentially a huge number of subgraphs that can serve as candidate CGUs. To reduce the number of candidate subgraphs, and to focus on those likely to play functional roles, we consider only subgraphs that occur in the network significantly more often than in randomized networks: network motifs [13]-[16]. To choose the optimal set of CGUs, we maximize a scoring function which is defined for every

dictionary set of N CGUs:

$$S = E_{covered} + \alpha \Delta P - \beta N - \gamma \sum_{i=1}^N T_i \quad (2)$$

$E_{covered}$ is the number of edges covered by all occurrences of the CGUs, and therefore eliminated in the coarse-grained network. N is the number of distinct CGUs, T_i is the number of internal nodes in the i -th CGU. ΔP is the difference between the number of nodes in the original network and the number of nodes and ports in the coarse-grained network:

$$\Delta P = P_{covered} - \sum_{i=1}^N n_i H_i \quad (3)$$

where $P_{covered}$ is the number of nodes covered by all occurrences of the CGUs, n_i is the number of occurrences in the network of unit i , and H_i is the number of ports of unit i . Using this we obtain:

$$S = [E_{covered} + \alpha P_{covered}] - [\alpha \sum_{i=1}^N n_i H_i + \beta N + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^N T_i] \quad (4)$$

The scoring function is thus separated into two terms. The first term, corresponding to coverage, corresponds




FIG. 1: Black box representation of a subgraph and the classes of nodes and ports. The nodes of the subgraph are classified into input, output, internal and mixed nodes according to the edges that connect them to the rest of the network (dashed arrows). The subgraph is represented as a black box with input and output ports (right side of figure). The complexity-measure H is the total number of ports. **a.** Subgraph with no mixed nodes. **b.** subgraph with a mixed node.

to the simplification gained by coarse-graining, while the second term, corresponding to simplicity and conciseness, quantifies the complexity of the dictionary. Maximizing S favors use of a small set of CGUs, preferentially those that appear often, with many internal nodes and few mixed nodes (since internal nodes do not contribute ports to H_i , and mixed nodes contribute two ports). The last term in the scoring function, which is the total number of internal nodes in the dictionary, bounds the CGU size and prevents the trivial solution where the entire network is replaced by a single, albeit complex node. α, β, γ are parameters that can be set for various degrees of coarse-graining (The present results are insensitive to these parameters, which can vary over 3 orders of magnitude). We use a simulated annealing approach [19] to find the optimal set of CGUs for coarse-graining: A candidate set of CGUs is obtained by first detecting all network motifs of 3 – 6 nodes. The nodes of every occurrence of this motif are classified to one of the 4 types (input/output/internal/mixed). This defines a profile for each occurrence. The occurrences are then grouped together according to their profile to form a CGU candidate. A CGU candidate of n nodes is thus characterized by its topology (an $n * n$ adjacency matrix) and by a n -length vector of node classifications. Each CGU candidate is assigned a random spin variable which is either 1 if all its occurrences participate in the coarse-graining or 0 otherwise. CGU candidates with spin 1 compose the "active set". At each step a spin is randomly chosen and flipped, and the coarse-graining score for the new active set is computed. The active set is updated according to a Metropolis Monte-Carlo procedure [20],[47].




FIG. 2: Transistor level map of an 8-bit binary counter, (IS-CAS89 circuit S208 [22]). Nodes are junctions between transistors, and directed edges represent wire connections. Highlighted is a subgraph that represents the transistors that make up one NOT gate.

Note that the coarse-graining problem is quite different from the well-studied circuit partitioning problem [21], which seeks to divide the circuit into subgraphs




FIG. 3: A partial set of the network motif candidate CGUs for the transistor level network. The number of occurrences of each motif in the transistor network is shown. The optimal CGU dictionary consists of 4 units (solid box - CGU set 1). A second optimal solution consisting of 2 units, which is found for high values of β is also shown (dashed box - CGU set 2).




FIG. 4: The CGUs found in the different coarse-grained levels of the electronic circuit. At the gate level the CGUs are the TTL implementation of AND, OR, NAND, NOR and NOT gates (NAND and NOT differ by the type of transistor at the input). At the flip-flop level, a single CGU, occurring 8 times is found. This CGU corresponds to the 5-gate implementation of a D-flip-flop with an additional gate at the input. At the counter level, two CGU topologies are found: Seven occurrences of a 3-node feedback loop+mutual edge, and one occurrence of a 4-node feedback loop+mutual edge, representing CGU4.

with minimal interconnections, usually resulting in a set of distinct and rather complex subgraphs. In contrast, coarse-graining seeks a small dictionary of simple subgraph types in order to help understand the function of the network in terms of recurring independent building blocks. An interesting analogy is the detection of words from a text, in which spaces and punctuation marks have been removed, without prior knowledge of the language.

A. Coarse graining of an electronic circuit

To demonstrate the coarse-graining approach we analyzed an electronic circuit derived from the ISCAS89 benchmark circuit set [22],[23]. The circuit is a module used in a digital fractional multiplier (*S208* [22]). The circuit is given as a netlist of 5 gate types (AND, OR, NAND, NOR, NOT) and a D-flipflop (DFF). To synthesize a transistor level implementation of this circuit (Fig 2) we first replaced every DFF occurrence with a standard implementation using 4 NAND gates and one NOT gate [1]. All gates were then replaced with their standard transistor-transistor logic (TTL) implementation [24], where nodes represent junctions between transistors (for this purpose resistors and diodes were ignored, as were ground and Vcc). The resulting transistor network (Fig 2) has 516 nodes and 686 edges.

Four CGUs were detected in the transistor level, each with five or six nodes (Fig 3,4). These patterns correspond to the transistor implementations of the five basic logic gates AND, NAND, NOR, OR and NOT (Fig 4, gate level). We then applied the algorithm to the simplified coarse-grained version of the network in which each of the nodes is one of these CGUs. The coarse-grained 'gate-level' network has 99 nodes and 153 edges. In this network, one CGU with six nodes was detected. This CGU corresponds to a D-flip-flop with an additional logic gate (Fig 4, flip-flop level). A 'flip-flop level' coarse grained network was then formed with nodes which are either gates or flip-flops. This network has 59 nodes and 97 edges. In this network, we discovered two types of CGUs (Fig 4, counter level), which correspond to units of a digital counter. Using these CGUs, we construct the highest-level coarse grained network in which each node is either a CGU or a gate. This network has 42 nodes and 56 edges. Thus, the highest-level coarse-grained network has 12-fold fewer nodes and edges than the original transistor-level network. This high-level map corresponds to sequential connections of binary counter units, each of which halves the frequency of the binary stream obtained from the previous unit. This map thus describes an 8-bit counter [25]. In other electronic circuits, we find other CGUs, including a XOR built of 4 NAND gates [1] (data not shown). Thus, the CGU approach can automatically detect favorite modules used by electronic engineers.




FIG. 5: Four levels of representation of the electronic circuit. In the transistor level, nodes represent transistor junctions. In the gate level, nodes are CGUs made of transistors, each representing a logic gate. In the flip-flop level, nodes are either gates or a CGU made of gates that corresponds to a D-type flip-flop. In the counter level, each node is a gate or a CGU of gates/flip-flops that corresponds to a counter subunit. Numbers of nodes (P) and edges (E) at each level are shown.

B. Coarse graining of biological networks

Recent studies have shown that biological networks contain significant network motifs [13]-[16], [31]. Theoretical and experimental studies have demonstrated that each network motif performs a key information processing function [13], [26]-[30]. A coarse-grained version of biological networks is of interest because it would provide a simplified representation, focused on these important sub-circuits. However, whereas electronic circuits are composed of exact copies of library units, in biology the recurring black boxes may not be of precisely the same structure. In addition, the characterization of signaling and regulatory networks is currently incomplete due to experimental limitations. Thus a softer definition of CGUs is needed [31]. To address these issues we modify our algorithm by allowing each CGU to represent a family of subgraphs, which share a common architectural theme. Thus, the CGUs are *probabilistically generalized network motifs (PGNM)*: network motifs of different sizes which approximately share a common connectivity pattern.

Probabilistic generalization of network motifs:

To define probabilistically generalized network motifs (PGNM), we must first discuss the concept of block-

models [32]-[34]. A block-model is a simplified representation of a subgraph. It consists of two elements : 1) a partition of the subgraph nodes into discrete subsets, or *roles*[16]. 2) a statement about the presence or absence of a connection between roles (Fig 6). A subgraph of n nodes can be described by an adjacency matrix G , where $G_{ij} = 1$ if a directed edge exists from node i to node j , and $G_{ij} = 0$, if there is no connection. A block-model partitions these n nodes into $m \leq n$ roles according to *structural equivalence*. Two nodes are structurally equivalent if they share exactly the same connections to all other nodes. The relations between the different roles are described by an image matrix A , an $m * m$ matrix, where $A_{IJ} = 1$ means that all nodes which share role I have a directed connection to all nodes which share role J (Fig 6). Labelling the subgraph nodes according to the role partition enables a representation of the subgraph adjacency matrix as $m * m$ blocks of either 0/1. In large subgraphs of real-world networks, perfect structural equivalence is not always seen. A block-model can still be used as an idealized structure which can be compared to a given subgraph. The distance between a subgraph and a proposed block-model, can be defined as [34]:

$$d = \frac{WBSS}{TSS} \quad (5)$$

where $WBSS$ is the within-block sum of squares :

$$WBSS = \sum_I \sum_J \sum_{i \in I, j \in J} (G_{ij} - \langle G_{IJ} \rangle)^2 \quad (6)$$

$\langle G_{IJ} \rangle$ is the mean of the adjacency matrix values in block $\{I, J\}$, and TSS is the total sum of squares :

$$TSS = \sum_{i,j} (G_{ij} - \langle G \rangle)^2 \quad (7)$$

where $\langle G \rangle = \sum G_{ij}/n^2$ is the mean value of G [48]. A subgraph with $d = 0$ has an adjacency matrix with blocks which are all either 1 or 0. For example, subgraph $G1$




FIG. 6: A block-model image matrix (top) and two subgraphs, one which fits the block-model ($G1$, bottom left) and one which does not ($G2$, bottom right). $G1$ has 7 nodes and 2 roles (nodes 1 – 4 share role 1 and nodes 5 – 7 share role 2). Its adjacency matrix is shown below, with lines indicating the block-model partition. An edge between node 3 and node 6 is missing for a perfect fit to the proposed block-model. The distance between the block matrix and the connectivity matrix is $d = 0.1075$. The right subgraph, $G2$ does not fit the proposed block-model. The distance between the block matrix and the connectivity matrix is $d = 0.7538$. An alternative block-model with 3 roles - ($\{1, 2\}$, $\{3, 4\}$, $\{5, 6, 7\}$) would perfectly fit this subgraph, with $d = 0$. Both of these subgraphs are aggregates of a 4-node bifan subgraph (Fig 7).

in Fig 6 has $n = 7$ nodes. It can be described by a block-model with $m = 2$ roles. Nodes 1 – 4 are assigned the first role and nodes 5 – 7 are assigned the second role. The

image matrix is a 2×2 matrix. The distance between the subgraph and the proposed block-model is $d = 0.1075$. Fig 6 also shows a subgraph, $G2$, which is far from the proposed block model ($d = 0.7538$).

Finding the best block-model to fit arbitrary connectivity data is a combinatorially complex problem [32]-[34], requiring exhaustive testing of different assignments of nodes to roles. However, it has recently been shown that small network motifs in biological networks aggregate to form *network motif topological generalizations* [16],[35]. These are subgraphs obtained from smaller network motifs, by replicating one or more of their roles, together with its connections [16] (Fig 7). Such an operation does not increase the number of roles in the resulting generalized subgraph, which maintains a perfect fit to the block-model of the network motif [49].

Network motif generalizations, obtained by role replications, are subgraphs of different sizes, all sharing the same image matrix (Fig 7). A *perfect generalization* has a distance of $d = 0$ from its corresponding block-model representation (Fig 7). Probabilistically generalized network motifs (PGNM) are generalizations of network motifs with $d \geq 0$. Subgraph $G1$ in Fig 6 contains 12 occurrences of the 4-node bifan subgraph (Fig 7). It deviates from a *perfect generalization* of the bifan subgraph by




FIG. 7: A bifan subgraph has two roles - nodes 1, 2 share role 1 and nodes 3, 4 share role 2, and its adjacency matrix. Lines indicate the block-model partition. Below are two generalized subgraphs obtained by role replication [16]. Subgraph $G1$ (left) is obtained by replicating the first role, with its connections. Subgraph $G2$ (right) is obtained by replicating the second role, with its connections. Adjacency matrix and block-model partition are shown. The role-duplication operation extends a subgraph while keeping a perfect fit to the block-model of the original subgraph.

only one edge (the edge between nodes 3 and 6), and has a short distance from it's corresponding block-model. An algorithm to detect PGNMs is described in Appendix A.




FIG. 8: A network of signal-transduction pathways in mammalian cells.

To determine the optimal dictionary of CGUs, including the PGNMs, we use the following modified version of the scoring function of Eq 2 :

$$S = E_{covered} + \alpha\Delta P - \beta N - \gamma \sum_{i=1}^N T_i - \delta \sum_{i \in \{CGU_g\}} d_i \quad (8)$$

N , the number of CGUs, is the number of basic motifs used. CGU_g includes the set of all PGNMs based on the CGUs. Each CGU can give rise to several PGNMs of different sizes.[50].

C. CGUs in protein-signaling networks

We analyzed a database of mammalian signal transduction pathways [36]-[44] based on the Signal Transduction Knowledge Environment [44]. This dataset contains 94 proteins and 209 directed interactions (Fig 8). The optimal coarse graining is based on a single motif - the 4-node bifan (Fig 9). Thus $N = 1$. We find 9 occurrences of a PGNMs based on the bifan, labelled CGU0-CGU8 which share a common design consisting of a row of input nodes with overlapping interactions to a row of output nodes (Fig 9). The input and output rows in these CGUs sometimes represent proteins from the same sub-family (eg. JNK1, JNK2 and JNK3 in CGU 3), and in other cases they represent proteins from different sub-families (ERK and p38 in CGU 6). This type of structure allows hard wired combinatorial activation and inhibition of outputs. Similar structures were described in transcription regulation networks ('dense overlapping regulons' [13]). Using this CGU, the signaling network can be coarse-grained (Fig 10a), showing three major

signaling channels (Fig 10b). These channels correspond to the well-studied ERK, JNK and p38 MAP-kinase cascades, which respond to stress signals and growth factors [36] - [43]. Each channel is made of three CGUs in a cascade. In each cascade, the top and bottom CGUs contain only positive (kinase) interactions, and the middle CGU contains both positive and negative (phosphatase) interactions. The p38 and ERK channels intersect at CGU 6. The MAPK phosphatase 2 (MKP2) participates in both the JNK pathway (CGU2) and the ERK pathway (CGU8), whereas MAPK phosphatase 5 (MKP5) participates in both JNK pathway (CGU2) and the P38 pathway (CGU5). The MAPKKK ASK1 and TAK1 are shared by both the JNK pathway (CGU1) and P38 pathway (CGU4) [41], [42]. In the coarse grained network one can easily visualize feedback loops. The present approach allows a simplified coarse-grained view of this important signaling network, showing the major signaling channels, and specifies the recurring circuit element (CGU) that may characterize protein signaling pathways in other cellular systems and organisms.

D. Self-Dissimilarity of network structure

Interestingly, the coarse-grained signaling network displays a different set of network motifs than the original network, with prominent cascades (Fig 10c) and more frequent feedforward loops, where X interacts with Y and both X and Y interact with Z [13]. Similarly, the electronic network displayed different CGUs at each level (Fig 4). These networks are therefore *self-dissimilar* [45], [46]: the structure at each level of resolution is different. This contrasts with views based on statistical-mechanics near phase-transition points which emphasize self-similarity of complex systems .

E. Discussion

We presented a method for coarse-graining networks in which a complex network can be represented by a compact and more understandable version. Performing an optimization on the space of network motifs of different sizes, we found optimal units for coarse-graining, CGUs, which allow a maximal reduction of the network, while keeping a concise and simple dictionary of elements. We demonstrated that this method can be used to fully reverse-engineer electronic circuits, from the transistor level to the highest module level, without prior knowledge of the library components used to create them. In biology, where modularity is less stringent than electronic circuits, we modified the algorithm to seek a coarse-grained network, using a small set of structures of different sizes that form probabilistic network motif generalizations. Using this, a coarse-grained version of




FIG. 9: A Network of signal-transduction pathways in mammalian cells. One CGU is found, the 4-node bifan with 9 PGNM occurrences, numbered CGU0-CGU8. Solid arrows represent positive (kinase) interactions, dashed arrows represent negative interactions (phosphatase). Empty circles represent duplicated nodes (nodes which participate in more than one PGNM). K , K^2 , K^3 and K^4 represent MAP-kinase, kinase-kinase, kinase-kinase-kinase etc.




FIG. 10: **a.** Coarse grained version of the signal-transduction network. Three signaling channels made of cascades of the CGU occurrences are highlighted. Solid arrows represent positive (kinase) interactions, dashed arrows represent negative interactions (phosphatase). EGFR has been drawn more than once for clarity. **b.** The three signaling channels. **c.** The network motifs [14] found at the two levels.

mammalian signaling network was established, using one CGU composed of cross-activating MAP-Kinases of different levels. Biological and electronic networks are both self-dissimilar, showing different network motifs on different levels. It is important to stress that not every network can be effectively coarse-grained, only networks with particular modularity and topology. It would be interesting to apply this approach to additional biological networks, to study the systems-level function of each CGU, and to study which networks evolve to have a topology that can be coarse-grained.

We thank J. Doyle, H. McAdams, J. E. Ferrell, Y. Srebro, E. Dekel, and all members of our lab for valuable discussions, and support from the Israel Science Foundation, NIH and Minerva.

APPENDIX A: ALGORITHM FOR DETECTING PGNMS

To detect PGNMs we start with a network motif μ . The nodes of each occurrence of μ are partitioned into roles. We then form a non-directed graph R_μ in which each node, r_μ^i is an occurrence of μ in the original network R , and a non-directed edge between two nodes r_μ^i and r_μ^j is set if a) any of the nodes of these occurrences in the original network R are connected by

an edge, or b) any of the nodes in the original network overlap. After establishing R_μ we begin with each node r_μ^i and perform a search, consecutively adding one node in R_μ which provides the best fit to the block model based on the image matrix of μ (the resulting joined subgraph with the smallest increase in d). We stop when d is greater than a threshold (we use 0.3). When calculating the fit to the block-model, we partition the nodes of the joined subgraph according to their role assignment in μ . If a node in R has different roles in two different occurrences of μ , when calculating d for the joined subgraph, we take the smallest distance obtained from all possible labelling of this node (for example, nodes 3, 4 in subgraph $G2$ of Fig 6 share role 1 in the bifan (3, 4, 5, 6) and role 2 in the bifan (1, 2, 3, 4)). We iterate this procedure by beginning with each r_μ , establishing a list of embedded subgraphs (if two embedded structures have the same d we keep only the larger one). These subgraphs are probabilistic generalizations of μ , tagged by their distance from a perfect generalization, d . In finding the optimal coarse-graining we perform a simulated annealing algorithm, sequentially generating a new active set of CGUs, recalculating the scoring function (Eq. 8) and accepting the new active set with a Metropolis Monte-Carlo probability. During the optimization, we also test the resulting score from coarse-graining only subsets of the PGNMs of each CGU.

-
- [1] P. Horowitz and W. Hill, *The Art of Electronics* (Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 1989).
 - [2] S. Kundu, in *Proc. IEEE Int'l Test Conf.* (IEEE CS Press, 1998), p. 372.
 - [3] M. C. Hansen, H. Yaclin, and J. P. Hayes, *IEEE Design and Test*, 72 (1999).
 - [4] H. H. McAdams and L. Shapiro, *Science* 269, 650 (1995).
 - [5] L. H. Hartwell, J. J. Hopfield, S. Leibler, et al., *Nature* 402, C47 (1999).
 - [6] P. D'Haeseleer, S. Liang, and R. Somogyi, *Bioinformatics* 16, 707 (2000).
 - [7] K. W. Kohn, *Chaos* 11, 84 (2001).
 - [8] E. Ravasz, A. L. Somera, D. A. Mongru, et al., *Science* 297, 1551 (2002).
 - [9] M. E. Csete and J. C. Doyle, *Science* 295, 1664 (2002).
 - [10] A. W. Rives and T. Galitski, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100, 1128 (2003).
 - [11] J. J. Tyson, K.C. Chen, B. Novak, *Curr Opin Cell Biol* 15(2) (2003).
 - [12] T. S. Gardner, D. di Bernardo, D. Lorenz, et al., *Science* 301, 102 (2003).
 - [13] S. Shen-Orr, R. Milo, S. Mangan, et al., *Nat Genet* 31, 64 (2002).
 - [14] R. Milo, S. Shen-Orr, S. Itzkovitz, et al., *Science* 298, 824 (2002).
 - [15] R. Milo, S. Itzkovitz, N. Kashtan, et al., *Science* 303, 5663 (2004).
 - [16] N. Kashtan, S. itzkovitz, R. Milo, et al., *q-bio.MN/0312019* (2004).
 - [17] A. R. Barron, J. Rissanen, and B. Yux, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 44, 2743 (1998).
 - [18] T. C. Bell, J. G. Cleary, and I. H. Witten, *Text Compression* (Prentice Hall Advanced Reference Series, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1990).
 - [19] S. Kirkpatrick, C. Gelatt, and M. Vecchi, *Science* 220, 671 (1983).
 - [20] M. Newman and G. Barkema, *Monte Carlo methods in statistical physics* (Oxford university press, 1999).
 - [21] C. J. Alpert and A. B. Kahng, *Integration: the VLSI Journal* 19 (1995).
 - [22] F. Brglez, D. Bryan, and K. Kozminski, *Proc. IEEE Int. Symposium on Circuits and Systems*, 1929 (1989).
 - [23] R. F. Cancho, C. Janssen, and R. V. Sole, *Phys Rev E* 64, 046119 (2001).
 - [24] <http://focus.ti.com/docs/logic/logichomepage.jhtml>.
 - [25] H. T. Nagle, B. D. Carrol, and J. D. Irwin, *An Introduction to Computer Logic* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1975).
 - [26] S. Mangan and U. Alon, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100, 11980 (2003).
 - [27] M. Ronen, R. Rosenberg, B. I. Shraiman, et al., *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99, 10555 (2002).
 - [28] S. Mangan, A. Zaslaver, and U. Alon, *JMB* 334, 197 (2003).
 - [29] A. Zaslaver, A. Mayo, R. Rosenberg, et al., *Nat Genet* 36, 486 - 491 (2004).
 - [30] N. Rosenfeld, M. B. Elowitz, and U. Alon, *J Mol Biol* 323, 785 (2002).

- [31] J. Berg, M. Lässig, cond-mat/0308251.
- [32] H. C. White, S. A. Boorman, R. L. Breiger, *American Journal of Sociology*, 18 (1976).
- [33] S. Wasserman, K. Faust, *Social Network Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994).
- [34] W. H. Panning, *Social Networks* 4, 81-101 (1982).
- [35] R. Dobrin, Q. K. Beg and A. L. Barabasi, *BMC Bioinformatics* 5: 10 (2004)
- [36] C. Y. Huang and J. E. Ferrell, Jr., *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 93, 10078 (1996).
- [37] U. S. Bhalla and R. Iyengar, *Science* 283, 381 (1999).
- [38] S. J. Charette, J. N. Lavoie, H. Lambert, et al., *Mol Cell Biol* 20, 7602 (2000).
- [39] A. J. Levine, *Cell* 88, 323 (1997).
- [40] G. Pearson, F. Robinson, T. Beers Gibson, et al., *Endocr Rev* 22, 153 (2001).
- [41] H. Ichijo, E. Nishida, K. Irie, et al., *Science* 275,5296 (1997).
- [42] W. Wang, G. Zhou, M.C. Hu, et al., *J. Biol. Chem.*, 272,36 (1997).
- [43] J. M. Kyriakis and J. Avruch, *Physiol Rev* 81, 807 (2001).
- [44] stke.sciencemag.org.
- [45] D. H. Wolpert and W. G. Macready, in *Unifying Themes in Complex Systems*, Y. Bar-Yam (Ed.), 626 (2000).
- [46] J. M. Carlson and J. Doyle, *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99, 2538 (2002).
- [47] The new active set is accepted with probability $\min\{1, e^{\Delta S/T}\}$, where ΔS is the score difference from the previous active set, and T is an effective temperature, lowered by a factor of 5% between sweeps.
- [48] This distance measure accounts for the size of the generalized subgraph, and is more appropriate than measures such as the Hamming distance (number of edges which have to be added or removed to obtain a perfect fit to a block-model).
- [49] Additionally each node has the same role in both the generalized subgraph and in every occurrence of the basic motif, included in it. The role assignment is thus automatically defined.
- [50] As opposed to the coarse-graining of electronic circuits, we ignore the connectivity profile of subgraphs when establishing the CGU candidate set. This further softens the CGU criteria. This scoring function still favors units with few mixed nodes, because they affect the number of ports, P in the coarse-grained network.