

Analytical Solution of a Stochastic Model for Gene Regulation

Muhittin Mungan¹, Alkan Kabakcıoğlu², Duygu Balcan³, Ayşe Erzan^{3,4}

¹Department of Physics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Bogazici University, 34342 Bebek Istanbul, Turkey

²Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Padova, I-35131 Padova, Italy

³Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences and Letters

Istanbul Technical University, Maslak 34469, Istanbul, Turkey and

⁴Gursey Institute, P.O.B. 6, Cengelkoy, 34680 Istanbul, Turkey

(dated: May 23, 2019)

We define and completely solve a content-based directed network whose nodes consist of random words and an adjacency rule involving exact or approximate matches, for an alphabet with an arbitrary number of letters. The out-degree distribution shows a crossover from a power law to a log-periodic regime, where the scaling behaviour has a weak dependence on the mean word length, and an even weaker dependence on the alphabet size. The in-degree distribution, on the other hand, is much narrower and does not show scaling behaviour. The results are of interest for modelling genomic interaction networks, which rely on similar mechanisms based on sequence matching, and exhibit similar global features, indicating that random strings might have served as a starting point for subsequent fine-tuning by evolution.

PACS Nos: 87.10.+e, 02.10.Ox, 89.75.-k

I. INTRODUCTION

Gene regulation networks [1] are examples of content-based networks, which may involve cross-textual searching and referencing, including matching very complex codes, such as at sites of the World Wide Web [2]. Such interactions typically involve dynamical [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8] as well as static global features [9, 10]. Since the genome is a linear code, interactions between genes calls for direct or indirect matching between regulatory sequences controlling the expression of these genes. [11] For example, in post-transcriptional gene regulation, Watson-Crick base-pairing between RNA fragments called "micro RNA" (miRNA) or "short interfering RNA" (siRNA) and parts of the targeted messenger RNA (mRNA), result in an inhibitory interaction which suppresses the expression of the protein coded by the mRNA. [12, 13]

In a previous paper, two of us (Balcan and Erzan) [14] introduced and numerically simulated a null model of genomic interactions, where the chromosomes were completely random. An interaction between two "genes" was postulated to result whenever the base sequence of one "gene" occurred at least once in the base sequence forming the other one. The simplification resulting from taking congruence rather than complementarity to furnish the interaction rule we believe to be immaterial, since both are one-to-one. A more realistic portrayal of the process would denote these sequences not as the complete genes themselves, but the "regulatory sequences" associated with each gene.

Simulations [14] of the Balcan and Erzan model displayed many of the qualitative features of genomic and protein interaction networks found in nature [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], namely qualitatively different in- and out-degree distributions, with the out-degree distribution exhibiting power law decay, and a localised in-degree distribution. For small out-degree d , the distribution scaled

like $n(d) \sim d^{-1}$ with $\alpha \approx 1$, whereas, for larger d , log-periodic oscillations were found superposed on a power law with $\alpha \approx 1=2$.

The purpose of this paper is to extend the model of Balcan and Erzan [14] to a broader class of models in which the random strings are derived from an $r+1$ letter alphabet and where partial matches are allowed. In the context of the genomic interaction networks, the motivation for both of these generalisations is obvious. The genetic code utilises a four-letter alphabet, whereas the proteins make use of 21 amino acids. Moreover, in many interactions, partial, or non-specific matches play a role.

We obtain analytical expressions for the in- and out-degree distribution and investigate the scaling behaviour of the out-degree distribution in these models. We are able to describe in detail the finite size corrections to the infinite chromosome limit. Comparison of our analytical predictions with the numerical data [14] for the $r=2$ random bit string model with perfect matches shows very good agreement.

The paper is organized as follows: In the next section we reformulate the random string model of [14] for an alphabet of $r+1$ letters. Our analytical results depend on the matching probability $p(l;k)$ that a string of length l selected randomly from the set of all strings of length l is contained at least once in a string of length k , $k \geq l$, that has been selected randomly from the set of all strings of length k . In Section III we derive an approximate form for this probability that is valid for moderately long strings $k < r^l$ and that allows for partial matches. Using the results of Section III, we obtain in Section IV analytical expressions for the in- and out-degree distributions. We investigate the scaling behavior of the out-degree distribution in these models and compare our results with the numerical data of [14]. We conclude this paper with a discussion of our results, Section V.

II. THE RANDOM STRING MODEL

We define a \chromosome\ C to be a random sequence of letters from an alphabet A and of fixed length L . The alphabet A is assumed to consist out of $r + 1$ letters x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r which are independently and identically distributed according to

$$P(x) = p_r(x = r) + (1 - p_r) \prod_{m=0}^{r-1} p_m(x = m): \quad (1)$$

We define a \gene\ G to be a substring of a chromosome that consists of the letters x_0, \dots, x_r only, sandwiched in between the i^{th} and $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$ occurrences of the letter \textit{r}. For convenience, we assume that a letter \textit{r} has been placed at the 0^{th} and $(L + 1)^{\text{th}}$ positions. With these definitions, the i^{th} gene is denoted by

$$G_i = x_{i,1}; x_{i,2}; \dots; x_{i,l_i}; \quad i = 1; 2; \dots; N \quad (2)$$

where N is the number of genes, the \textit{base} $x_i, x_j \in \{x_0, \dots, x_r\}$, $l_i = 1; \dots; l$, and l_i is the length of the i^{th} gene G_i . Let n_ℓ be the number of genes of length ℓ and $q = 1 - p_r$. It follows that

$$\sum_i l_i = L N; \quad \sum_i n_\ell = N; \quad (3)$$

$$\langle l \rangle = p_r^{-1} - 1; \quad \langle l^2 \rangle = L p_r^{-2} q; \quad \langle N \rangle = L p_r: \quad (4)$$

Unless noted otherwise, we will assume that L and $L p_r$ are sufficiently large so that fluctuations in the number and length of the genes for different realizations of the chromosome can be neglected when calculating statistical properties of quantities of interest. We will also discard the cases with $\ell = 0$ and construct the gene network on the remaining genes (the nodes) through the adjacency matrix (the edges) defined by the matching condition

$$w_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & G_i \text{ matches } G_j; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

By $G_i \text{ matches } G_j$ we mean that there exists an integer l such that $0 \leq l < l_i$ and

$$x_{i,l+1} = x_{j,l}; \quad l = 1; \dots; l_i: \quad (6)$$

Thus, two genes are said to interact if the sequence G_i appears as a subsequence of G_j , or in other words G_j matches G_i . Thus $w_{ij} = 1$ indicates a directed link from G_i to G_j . We will also consider in perfect matches, where Eq. (6) is valid only for some values of l rather than all values. In order to avoid ambiguity we will refer to the latter case as a \textit{perfect match}.

The resulting network was numerically studied earlier by Balcan and Erzan in [14], where it was shown that




FIG. 1: Scaling behavior of the out-degree distribution. The numerical data (circles) shows a cross-over in the scaling behavior from small values of the out-degree to larger values. The solid line is the theoretical expression. The dashed lines serve as a guide to the eye for the predicted scaling behavior and have been offset for clarity. The cross over occurs at $d_c = 6.6$ and has been shown as a vertical line.

the out-degree distribution has a power-law decay at low degree values with an exponent -1 . Beyond a crossover point, the distribution spreads with an oscillating behavior enveloped from above by another power-law with exponent -1.2 . The numerically obtained scaling behavior [14] is shown in Figure (1) for $L = 15000$, $p_r = 0.05$, $r = 2$ and perfect matches, Eq. (6). The distributions were obtained by averaging the out-degree distributions of 500 randomly generated \textit{chromosomes}. Notice the strong oscillatory behavior. It turns out that each peak in the out-degree distribution is supported predominantly by the out-degrees of genes with corresponding common length l .

The typical gene length is of the order of 10^3 nucleotides, whereas in our study the relevant lengths are 10 . On the other hand, the expression regulation is typically carried out through recognition of sequences 5 to 26 nucleotides long. We therefore postulate that what we term a \textit{gene} in our model represents in truth the regulation-related key sequence of a particular gene.

In order to proceed with the analytical treatment, it is convenient to group the G_i into subsets according to their lengths and we define

$$G_l = \{G_i | l_i = l\}: \quad (7)$$

It turns out that that the central quantity determining the behavior of the in- and out-degree distributions is the probability $p(l;k)$ that a \textit{gene} in G_l has an outgoing edge terminating in a member of G_k . We therefore turn next to the derivation of $p(l;k)$. The discussion of the

degree distributions will then be taken up in Section IV.

III. ANALYTICAL RESULTS FOR THE MATCHING PROBABILITY

Let x , and y be variables such that $x; y; 2 f_0; \dots; r; 1 g$. Define an interaction $u(x; y)$ between x and y as

$$u(x; y) = 1 \quad (x = y): \quad (8)$$

Let $x = (x_1; x_2; x_3; \dots; x_l)$ and $y = (y_1; y_2; y_3; \dots; y_l)$, be two strings of l letters and define their interaction $U(x; y)$ as

$$U(x; y) = \prod_{a=1}^l u(x_a; y_a): \quad (9)$$

The function $U(x; y)$, as defined above, counts the number of unmatched letters between strings x and y .

Introduce an "inverse temperature" β and consider the Boltzmann factor $e^{-\beta U}$. In the "zero temperature" limit we have

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\beta U(x; y)} = \begin{cases} 1; & \text{if } x = y \\ 0; & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

We see that the limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ is a "no tolerance" limit [21], enforcing perfect matching of x and y . Let $y = (y_1; y_2; \dots; y_k)$ be a string of length $k \geq l$ and denote by $Y_{a;l} = (y_{a+1}; y_{a+2}; \dots; y_{a+l})$ the substring of length l starting at position a , $a = 0; 1; \dots; k-l$. Furthermore let

$$f_a(x; y;) = e^{-\beta U(x; Y_{a;l})}: \quad (11)$$

so that we have

$$\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} f_a(x; y;) = \begin{cases} 1; & x = Y_{a;l} \\ 0; & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

With the above definitions, we can write down an expression for $p(l; k; x)$, the probability that a randomly drawn k -string y contains a given l -string x , as follows:

$$p(l; k; x) = \lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} p(l; k; x;); \quad (13)$$

where

$$p(l; k; x;) = \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} \prod_{a=0}^{k-l} [f_a(x; y;)]: \quad (14)$$

Expanding the products in equation (14), we obtain a Meier-like sum

$$p(l; k; x;) = \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} \prod_{a=0}^{k-l} f_a + \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} \prod_{a < b} f_a f_b + \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} \prod_{a < b < c} f_a f_b f_c + \dots; \quad (15)$$

which we can write as

$$p(l; k; x;) = \sum_{a < b} W^{(1)}(a; x) \sum_{a < b} W^{(2)}(a; b; x) + \sum_{a < b < c} W^{(3)}(a; b; c; x) + \dots; \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(1)}(a; x) &= \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} f_a(x; y;) \\ W^{(2)}(a; b; x) &= \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} f_a(x; y;) f_b(x; y;) \\ W^{(3)}(a; b; c; x) &= \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_{y=0}^{k-l} f_a(x; y;) f_b(x; y;) f_c(x; y;) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Using equations (8) and (11), we obtain

$$W^{(1)}(a; x) = \frac{1}{r^l} [1 + (r-1)e^{-\beta} W^{(1)}]: \quad (18)$$

Note that $W^{(1)}(a; x)$ is independent of a , and x .

Let us now turn to the second order term, $W^{(2)}(a; b; x)$ in Eqs. (16) and (17). Here, we need to distinguish two cases, (i) $b \geq a+l$ and (ii) $b < a+l$.

In case (i), the set of indices of $y_{a;l}$ and $y_{b;l}$ are distinct and the evaluation of the partition sum proceeds analogously to equation (18) yielding

$$W^{(2)}(a; b; x) = \frac{1}{r^{2l}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-2\beta}; \prod_{a_j < l}: \quad (19)$$

In case (ii), $\prod_{a_j < l}$, there is an overlap between the indices of $y_{a;l}$ and $y_{b;l}$. Letting $\prod_{a_j < l} = m$, we find

$$W^{(2)}(a; b; x) = \frac{1}{r^{l+m}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-2\beta m} \sum_{t=1}^{m-l} \prod_{a_j < l} e^{-\beta t} u(x; x_{m+t})]; \quad (20)$$

Note that $W^{(2)}(a; b; x)$, as defined Eqs. (19) and (20), depends on x only when $\prod_{a_j < l} < l$. Next, we perform the x average of $W^{(2)}(l; k; x)$,

$$\frac{1}{r^l} \sum_x W^{(2)}(a; b; x) = \frac{1}{r^{2l}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-2\beta}]: \quad (21)$$

The calculations leading to Eqs. (20) and (21) are a little involved and can be found in the appendix.

Comparing Eqs. (18) and (21), we see that once averaged over x , $W^{(2)}$ factorizes as

$$W^{(2)} = \sum_x W^{(2)}(a; b; x) = W^{(1)2}; \quad (22)$$

or equivalently,

$$hf_a f_b i_{y;x} = hf_a i_{y;x} hf_b i_{y;x}; \quad a \notin b; \quad (23)$$

where, for simplicity, we have introduced the shorthand notation $h::i_{y;x}$ to denote averaging first over y then x .

Let us therefore make the approximation that all higher moments factorize similarly,

$$hf_{a_1} f_{a_2} \dots f_{a_s} i_{y;x} \approx hf_{a_1} i_{y;x} hf_{a_2} i_{y;x} \dots hf_{a_s} i_{y;x}; \quad (24)$$

with f_{a_s} being distinct. It can be readily shown that Eq. (24) is exact when $a_{i+1} - a_i > l$, i.e., there are no overlaps between the segments at position a_i . Upon substituting Eq. (24) into Eq. (15) and performing the x average we obtain the matching probability

$$p(l;k) = hp(l;k;x) i_x; \quad (25)$$

with

$$p(l;k) = 1 - \frac{1}{r^l} [1 + (r-1)e^{-l} r^{k-l+1}]; \quad (26)$$

In the "zero temperature" limit ($r \rightarrow 1$), this becomes

$$p(l;k) = 1 - \frac{1}{r^l} r^{k-l+1}; \quad (27)$$

For $r \rightarrow 1$, $k, p(l;k)$ has the asymptotic form

$$p(l;k) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{k-l+1}{r^l} (r-1)\right]; \quad (28)$$

which for $r \rightarrow 1$ becomes

$$p(l;k) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{k-l+1}{r^l}\right]; \quad (29)$$

For very large l this further reduces to

$$p(l;k) = \frac{k-l+1}{r^l}; \quad (30)$$

Note that a finite r acts like an enhanced matching probability, i.e., a false positive match. In the limit $r \rightarrow 1$, the matching probability becomes

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} p(l;k) = 1 - \exp\left[-\frac{k-l+1}{r^l}\right]; \quad (31)$$

Hence the "high-temperature" limit of our model corresponds to indiscriminate matches.

Of course, the crucial approximation, Eq. (24), is not correct in general and one expects corrections coming from higher order correlations contained in Eq. (16). These correlations are due to the fact that if a given string x is matched at a position a , this affects the likelihood of matching the same string at any nearby location b with $|b-a| < l$. Nevertheless, the approximate result for $p(l;k)$, Eq. (27), is surprisingly good. Fig. (2) shows a comparison of the matching probability obtained from

exact enumeration carried out computationally, with the analytical expression (27) for $r=2$ and perfect matches. As can be seen from the figure, there are only very small discrepancies for small l when $k > 2^l$, e.g. data points around $k=16;14;12$ with $l=4;3;2$. Since our expression for $p(l;k)$, Eq. (27), is exact for $l=1$, there are no discrepancies at $l=1$.

Notice that Eq. (30) is the matching probability that can alternatively be obtained by assuming the probabilities of matching a string of length l at any position in a string of length k are independent, and equal, $1/r^l$. Eq. (27), on the other hand, is the matching probability that can also be found assuming the probabilities of not matching a string of length l at any position in a string of length k are independent and equal, $1 - 1/r^l$. Thus the factorization approximation, Eq. (24), leading to Eq. (26) implies that the probabilities of not matching at a given position are independent.




FIG. 2: Comparison of the exact matching probability $p(k;l)$ (circles) with the approximate expression (27) (lines) for $r=2$ and perfect matches. The curves are (from top to bottom) for values of $k=16;14;12;10;8;6;4;2$.

For the regime of interest, $k < 2^l$, this approximation leading to Eq. (27) is extremely good. We think that this is due to the fact that the factorization property underlying our approximation, Eq. (24), is exact for the two-point correlation function ($s=2$), Eq. (22). This means that any corrections to this result must be coming from higher order correlations with strongly overlapping segments, since non-overlapping segments will factorize and thus reduce to lower order correlators. This is very similar to the connected cluster expansion in statistical mechanics. Indeed, such an expansion can be set up, however the calculations are rather tedious due to the

discreteness of the problem and beyond the scope of this paper. Yet it is clear that the weight of an s -point correlation function with s overlapping (connected) segments must be very small for large s , since the overlap imposes very strong conditions on the structure of the string x to be matched.

For the remainder of the paper it is convenient to define the quantities t and z as

$$t = \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)e^{-1}} = \frac{1}{r} z \quad (32)$$

$$z = \frac{1}{r} \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)e^{-1}}; \quad (33)$$

where we have suppressed the l , r and l dependence for clarity. Notice that the effect of the number of letters in the alphabet r and the extent of mismatch as parametrized by the "inverse temperature" enter into the expression for $p(l;k;z)$ as a single parameter, z , as defined above. With the above definitions, Eq. (26) becomes

$$p(l;k;z) = \frac{1}{r^l} \frac{1}{1 + (r-1)e^{-1}} = \frac{1}{r^l} z^{k-l+1}; \quad (34)$$

The "zero-temperature" limit is given by $z = r^{-1}$, while the "high-temperature" limit is $z = 1$. The range of z is therefore, $z \in (r^{-1}, 1)$, which for $r \geq 1$, approaches $z \in (0; 1)$.

We now turn to the calculation of the in- and out-degree distributions.

IV. THE DEGREE DISTRIBUTIONS

In Section II we showed that the genes $fg_i g$ of a chromosome C generate a network whose nodes are the genes and whose edges are defined by the matching relation Eq. (5). In this section we will derive the in- and out-degree distribution associated with this network.

Consider a randomly selected gene G_i . The in- and out-degree of the corresponding node, $d_{in}(i)$ and $d_{out}(i)$, are defined by the total number of edges terminating in and originating from that node, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{in}(i) &= \sum_j w_{ji} \\ d_{out}(i) &= \sum_j w_{ij}; \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The corresponding in- and out-degree distribution are given by

$$\begin{aligned} n_{in}(d) &= \sum_i (d = d_{in}(i)) \\ n_{out}(d) &= \sum_i (d = d_{out}(i)); \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

A. The Out-Degree Distribution

Letting G_1 denote the set of genes of length l , we can rewrite the out-degree distribution Eq. (36) as

$$n_{out}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^L \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{j \in G_1} (d = d_{out}(j)) \quad (37)$$

For large n_1 , the quantity in parentheses will approach the (conditional) probability $P_{out}(X_l = d|j)$ that a randomly selected gene whose length is given to be l has an out-degree d . We can therefore write X_l as

$$X_l = \sum_{i \in G_1} \sum_{k=1}^L \sum_{j \in G_k} w_{ij}; \quad (38)$$

or,

$$X_l = \sum_{k=1}^L \frac{1}{n_1 n_k} \sum_{i \in G_1} \sum_{j \in G_k} w_{ij} \quad (39)$$

In the limit $L; N \rightarrow \infty$, such that $N = L = p$, the ratio of the number of genes N to the length of the chromosome L remains constant, all the possible r^L realizations of genes of a given length l will be present with equal respective weights and we have,

$$\lim_{L, N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_1 n_k} \sum_{i \in G_1} \sum_{j \in G_k} w_{ij} = p(l;k); \quad (40)$$

We will refer to this limit as the large- L limit.

The quantity $p(l;k)$, as defined in the above equation, is the probability that a randomly selected gene of given length l matches another independently and randomly selected gene of length k . This probability has been calculated in Section III for the general case of imperfect matches, Eq. (26), as well as perfect matches, Eq. (27). Eqs. (37) and (40) show the self-averaging property of the degree distribution in the large- L limit.

Define the random variable X_{lk} , as the number of edges originating from a randomly selected gene of length l that terminate in genes of length k . Then X_l can be written as a sum of the random variables X_{lk} ,

$$X_l = \sum_k X_{lk}; \quad (41)$$

We see from Eqs. (39) and (40) that in the large- L limit

$$\langle X_{lk} \rangle = n_k p(l;k); \quad (42)$$

and

$$\langle X_l \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^L n_k p(l;k); \quad (43)$$

where $\overline{}$ denotes an average over all the genes of length l in the chromosome. Note that in the large- L limit X_{lk} is binomially distributed,

$$P(X_{lk} = dj) = \binom{n_k}{d} p(l;k)^d (1 - p(l;k))^{n_k - d}; \quad (44)$$

As can be seen from Eq. (41), X_1 is a sum of the random variables X_{lk} and thus in the large- L limit the central limit theorem assures that the distribution for X_1 will approach a Gaussian distribution,

$$P_{\text{out}}(X_1 = dj) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} \exp\left(-\frac{(d - \overline{d_1})^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right); \quad (45)$$

whose mean $\overline{d_1}$ and standard deviation σ_1 are given by those of X_{lk} , Eq. (41), according to:

$$\overline{d_1} = \overline{X_1} = \sum_k \overline{X_{lk}}; \quad (46)$$

$$\sigma_1^2 = \overline{X_1^2} - \overline{X_1}^2 = \sum_k \overline{X_{lk}^2} - \overline{X_{lk}}^2; \quad (47)$$

where

$$\overline{X_{lk}^2} = \overline{X_{lk}}^2 + \overline{X_{lk}^2} - \overline{X_{lk}}^2; \quad (48)$$

For binomially distributed X_{lk} we have

$$\overline{X_{lk}} = n_k p(l;k) \quad (49)$$

$$\overline{X_{lk}^2} = n_k p(l;k) (1 - p(l;k)) + n_k p(l;k)^2; \quad (50)$$

Using Eq. (34), one can readily carry out the sums in Eqs. (46) and (47) to find

$$\overline{d_1} = \frac{N}{p + qz} (qz)^l; \quad (51)$$

$$\sigma_1^2 = \overline{d_1} \frac{pq}{q^2}; \quad (52)$$

Noting also that the probability of selecting a gene of length l is pq^l , the total out-degree distribution is given by

$$P_{\text{out}}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^L pq^l P_{\text{out}}(X_1 = dj); \quad (53)$$

and thus in the large- L limit we obtain

$$P_{\text{out}}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^L pq^l \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1} \exp\left(-\frac{(d - \overline{d_1})^2}{2\sigma_1^2}\right); \quad (54)$$

with $\overline{d_1}$ and σ_1 given by Eqs. (51) and (52), respectively.

As l becomes large, $p(l;k)$ decreases towards zero. Thus with increasing l the binomial distribution of X_{lk} , Eq. (44), will approach a Poisson distribution of the same mean. Note that the sum of independent and Poisson distributed random variables is also Poisson distributed with mean equal to the sum of the individual means.

Thus for large l , X_1 as defined in Eq. (41), is Poisson. For a Poisson distributed random variable the variance equals to its mean so that for large l we expect

$$\sigma_1^2 = \overline{d_1}; \quad (55)$$

as can also be directly verified by taking the appropriate limit in Eq. (52).

1. Ensemble Averages and Finite Size Effects

The numerical data of [14] has been obtained from averaging over 500 realizations of a chromosome of length $L = 15000$ with $N = 750$. A finite sample size will cause sample to sample fluctuations in the number of genes. An average over a large ensemble of different realisations will yield the same average values for the out-degrees as those obtained from a single chromosome of infinite length. However averaging over many realizations will increase the fluctuations around the mean. It is not hard to see that this will affect predominantly nodes with large out-degrees, (short genes) where there is already self-averaging within the chromosome, but with a distribution which varies from sample to sample.

Nodes with small out-degrees (long genes) correspond to rare matches and thus for these nodes there is no self-averaging within the sample. To see this, consider the extreme case, where a sample contains on average one or less matches for such a node. When an ensemble average is taken, the dominant contribution to the variance of the out-degree will come from the sample to sample fluctuations.

Denoting the mean and variance of the out-degree of a node of length l , that has been corrected for the finite size, by $\overline{d_1}$ and σ_1^2 , respectively, we have

$$\overline{d_1} = \overline{d_1}; \quad \sigma_1^2 \sim \overline{d_1} \quad \text{for large } l; \quad (56)$$

In what follows we will re-calculate previously introduced statistics, taking into account the fluctuations in n_k . In order to avoid confusion, these quantities will be denoted with a tilde.

We can estimate σ_1^2 as follows. The random variable X_{lk} itself is a sum of random variables:

$$X_{lk} = \sum_{j \in G_k} Y_{1j}; \quad (57)$$

where $Y_{1j} = 1$ if the gene G_j of length k matches the (given) gene of length l and zero otherwise. Such an event constitutes a Bernoulli trial and its probability is $p(l;k)$. The mean and variance of Y_{1j} are given by

$$\overline{Y_{1j}} = p(l;k) \quad (58)$$

$$\overline{Y_{1j}^2} - \overline{Y_{1j}}^2 = p(l;k) (1 - p(l;k)) \quad (59)$$

The number of such trials is n_k , the number of elements of G_k , and hence n_k itself is a random variable. For sufficiently large N and for values of n_k near the mean, the

constraints, Eq. (4), can be neglected and the probability of finding n_k genes of length k is approximately binomially distributed

$$P(n_k = n) = \binom{N}{n} p q^k n^{-1} p q^k N^{-n} : \quad (60)$$

We thus find

$$\langle n_k \rangle = N p q^k \quad (61)$$

$$\langle n_k^2 \rangle = p q^k (1 + p q^k) : \quad (62)$$

Finding the distribution of a sum over a finite random number n of independently distributed random variables Y can be readily worked out using moment generating functions (see for example Feller [22]). In the case when both n_k and Y_{lj} are binomial it turns out that the resulting distribution is binomial again, and we find

$$P(X_{lk} = dj) = \binom{N}{d} p q^k p(l;k)^d (1 - p q^k p(l;k))^{N-d} ; \quad (63)$$

with mean and variance

$$\langle X_{lk} \rangle = N p q^k p(l;k) \quad (64)$$

$$\langle X_{lk}^2 \rangle = N p q^k p(l;k) (1 + p q^k p(l;k)) : \quad (65)$$

Thus Eq. (63) is the finite size result replacing Eq. (44), which is valid in the large- L limit. As remarked before, the means of the two distributions in Eqs. (46) and (64) are equal, i.e., $\langle X_{lk} \rangle = \langle n_{lk} \rangle$. However, the variances are different and $\langle X_{lk}^2 \rangle < \langle n_{lk}^2 \rangle$. Note that the second term in Eq. (65) is of the order of $(1-p)^{-1}$ for small p . Thus we find to order p

$$\langle X_{lk}^2 \rangle = \langle n_{lk}^2 \rangle ; \quad (66)$$

and consequently to this order the mean and variance of X_1 become

$$\langle X_1^2 \rangle = \langle n_1^2 \rangle = \langle n_1 \rangle = d_1 ; \quad (67)$$

where d_1 is the same mean out-degree that was previously obtained in the large L -limit, Eq. (51). The out-degree distribution corrected for finite-size effects thus becomes, c.f., Eq. (54),

$$P_{\text{out}}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^L p q^l \frac{1}{2 d_1} \exp\left(-\frac{(d-d_1)^2}{2 d_1}\right) : \quad (68)$$

Comparing this expression with the distribution obtained in the large- L limit, Eq. (54), we find that finite size corrections are only present for small l , since we have already shown that the relation $d_1 = \frac{2}{1}$ is also valid (viz. Eq. (55)) in the large l region for the large- L case. Figure (3) shows a comparison of the numerically obtained out-degree distribution (circles) with the theoretical expressions with and without finite size corrections. The

solid line is the analytical result for the out-degree distribution, Eq. (68), that takes into account finite size corrections, while the dotted line corresponds to the case where the network is assumed to be self-averaging, i.e., Eq. (54) is satisfied, and thus sample to sample fluctuations can be neglected. Note the large difference from the observed behaviour for $l < 6$, ($d > 200$) in the height and broadness of the distributions, when finite size effects are not taken into account. The agreement of the finite size corrected distribution with the numerical data, on the other hand, is rather good, and we conclude that finite size effects present in the numerical data for short nodes are satisfactorily accounted for.

The location of the peaks, d_1 , coincide very well with the numerical data and we find indeed that each peak corresponds to the out-degree of nodes of a given length l . The locations of the peaks decrease exponentially with increasing l . The labels next to each peak show the string lengths l contributing predominantly to that peak.

We turn next to a discussion of the scaling behavior.




FIG. 3: Comparison of the theoretical out-degree distributions with numerical data (circles). The dotted line shows the theoretical result for a network in the large L -limit, where the network is self-averaging and thus all possible realizations of a string of a given length l can be found. The number to the right of each peak refers to the node length l that contributes predominantly to that peak. The solid line is obtained after correcting for finite size effects (see text for details). In both cases, the locations of the peaks are accurately predicted. Note that the results for the large- L limit differ strongly in their predictions for the width and height of each peak for small l , (large d). It is evident that the numerical data exhibits finite size effects for short nodes, $l < 6$.

2. Scaling Behavior

Our analysis shows that the out-degree distribution is a superposition of Gaussian peaks with mean d_1 and a variance that depends on the strength of finite size effects, as discussed in the previous section. For large values of d , (small l) these peaks are well separated and one can readily obtain the envelope for the peaks. From Eq. (68) we see that the height E_1 of a peak centered at d_1 is

$$E_1 = \frac{N pq^l}{2 d_1} \quad (69)$$

Using Eq. (51), we obtain the scaling behavior

$$E(d) \sim d^{-2} \quad (70)$$

with

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln z - \ln q}{\ln z + \ln q} \quad (71)$$

For the bit string model with exact matches, i.e., for $r = 2$ and in the $l \rightarrow 1$ limit, we find

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln 2 + \ln q}{\ln 2 - \ln q} \quad (72)$$

For the numerical data shown, $q = 0.95$, yielding $\alpha_2 = 0.43$.

For smaller values of d (large l), the analysis presented above ceases to be valid, since the peaks start to overlap. In this regime, the contributions to the out-degree distributions come predominantly from matches between long strings which are rare. As was remarked previously, in this regime the distribution of X_1 will be Poisson, so that we have

$$p(d|l) = \frac{d_1^d}{d!} e^{-d_1}; \quad (73)$$

with d_1 as given before in (51). The out-degree distribution for small d is thus given by

$$p(d) = \sum_{l=1}^X \frac{1}{pq^l} \frac{d_1^d}{d!} e^{-d_1} \quad (74)$$

Since for small l the d_1 values are quite large, the contributions from the small l terms will be suppressed heavily by the exponential factor, and therefore moving the cut-off in the above sum down to 1 will not change the result of the summation significantly. Noting that for large l

$$d_1 = \frac{N}{p} (qz)^l; \quad (75)$$

we see that d_1 and $d_{l+1} = d_1 - d_l$ approach zero in a geometric fashion. Thus the summation over l in Eq. (74),

can be converted to an integration over $x = d_1$ with $x = d_1 - d_{l+1}$ and we obtain

$$p(d) = \frac{c}{d!} \int_0^X x^d z^{-x} \frac{1}{2} e^{-x} dx; \quad (76)$$

where $x = d_1$ and c is an overall numerical constant,

$$c = \frac{p}{\ln qz} \frac{N}{p} \frac{1}{2} z^{-2}; \quad (77)$$

The dominant contribution to the integrand comes from $x = d < x$ and we therefore extend the upper limit to infinity obtaining

$$p(d) = c \frac{\Gamma(d + \frac{1}{2})}{(d+1)}; \quad (78)$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the gamma function. The leading order behaviour of $\ln \Gamma(x)$ is given asymptotically, for large x , by

$$\ln \Gamma(x) = x \ln x - x + \frac{1}{2} \ln 2 + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right); \quad (79)$$

Using the above expansion, we obtain after a little bit of algebra

$$\ln p(d) = \text{const} - \alpha_2 + \frac{1}{2} \ln d + O\left(\frac{1}{d}\right); \quad (80)$$

It can be readily checked that this approximation for $\ln p(d)$ is good even for small values of d and thus $p(d)$ exhibits scaling behavior, $p(d) \sim d^{-1}$, with scaling exponent

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2 \quad (81)$$

For the numerical data with $z = 1/2$ and $q = 0.95$ we find $\alpha_1 = 0.93$.

As we have pointed out above, the cross-over between the two scaling regimes occurs when the depression (minimum) between consecutive peaks disappears. This occurs roughly when

$$d_{l+1} + \frac{1}{2d_{l+1}} > d_l - \frac{1}{2d_l} \quad (82)$$

yielding, using Eq. (51),

$$d_1 > \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 - qz}; \quad (83)$$

For the values of the parameters employed in the numerical simulations, this gives $d_1 > 6.59$, $\ln d_1 > 1.9$, which is consistent with the data shown in figure (1).

We can also infer the large r behavior of α_1 and α_2 for perfect matches. This corresponds to the case $z = 1/r$, eq. (33). We find

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\ln r + \ln q}{\ln r - \ln q}; \quad (84)$$

and hence

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 1} \alpha_2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad (85)$$

and correspondingly $\alpha_1 = 2 + \alpha_2 = 1.5$ in this limit. Thus, as the number of letters in the alphabet is increased, the scaling exponents α_1 and α_2 , approach the values 1 and 1.5, respectively. Comparing with the values for $r = 2$, we see that the dependence of α_1 and α_2 on r , the number of letters in the alphabet, is rather weak.

B. The In-Degree Distribution

Consider a randomly selected gene G_i of length l . Then the random variable $X_{k;l}$ that was introduced before, counts the number of edges originating from a gene of length $k-1$ and terminating in G_i . Thus the in-degree of G_i is given by

$$X_{in;l} = \sum_{k=1}^X X_{k;l} \quad (86)$$

The statistics of $X_{k;l}$ and hence of $X_{in;l}$ has been already obtained before and we find in the large- L limit,

$$d_{in;l} = \sum_{k=1}^X n_k p(k;l) \quad (87)$$

$$\tilde{d}_{in;l}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^X n_k p(k;l) (1 - p(k;l)) \quad (88)$$

Noting also that the probability of selecting a gene of length l is p_l^1 , the total in-degree distribution in the large- L limit is given by

$$P_{in}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^X p_l^1 p \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-\frac{(d - d_{in;l})^2}{2 \tilde{d}_{in;l}^2} \right) \quad (89)$$

When taking into account finite size effects, the in-degree distribution becomes

$$\tilde{P}_{in}(d) = \sum_{l=1}^X p_l^1 p \frac{1}{2} \exp \left(-\frac{(d - d_{in;l})^2}{2 \tilde{d}_{in;l}^2} \right); \quad (90)$$

where

$$\tilde{d}_{in;l}^2 = \sum_{k=1}^X N p_k^k p(k;l) (1 - p(k;l)) \quad (91)$$

Figure (4) shows a comparison of the two theoretical predictions, Eqs. (89) and (90) with the numerical data of Balcan and Erzan [14].

The in-distribution Eq. (89), and its finite-size corrected form, Eq. (90), capture the qualitative features seen in the simulations. Although there are deviations for small and large values of d , we will not pursue this any further in the present paper.




FIG. 4: Comparison of the theoretical in-degree distributions with numerical data (circles). The dotted line shows the theoretical result for a network in the large- L limit, where the network is self-averaging and thus almost all possible realisations of a string of a given length l can be found. The solid line is obtained after correcting for finite size effects (see text for details).

V. DISCUSSION

We have generalized the gene interaction model of Balcan and Erzan [14] and obtained analytical expressions for the in- and out-degree distribution. We have shown that these generalizations, allowing in perfect matches or considering an alphabet of r letters, do not alter the main numerical findings of Balcan and Erzan which involved a model with a two-letter ($r = 2$) alphabet and perfect matches. The scaling behaviour which we have found, and even the numerical values of the scaling exponents α_2 and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 + 0.5$ are robust under these generalisations. It should be noted that, in

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{1 \ln z - \ln q}{2 \ln z + \ln q}; \quad (92)$$

we have $z \rightarrow 1=r$ for $\beta \rightarrow 1$, while $z \rightarrow 1$ in the "high temperature" limit $\beta \rightarrow 0$, thus $\alpha_1 \rightarrow z - 1$. In the "low temperature," or perfect matching, limit $\beta \rightarrow 1$,

$$\alpha_2 \rightarrow (1-2)(1 - p = \ln r); \quad (93)$$

which depends very weakly on r , and p is a small number by assumption [14]. (On the other hand, for either $r \rightarrow 1$, the trivial limit where no information is coded, or the high temperature limit, where no matching conditions are satisfied, the scaling relation is altered qualitatively, with $\alpha_2 \rightarrow 1=2$.)

The favorable comparison of our results with experiments [23] implies that the model also captures the con-

tribution from the indirect matches between the regulatory sequences, such as the operator sequences and the DNA segments coding the portions of the transcription factors recognizing them.

We would finally like to remark that the present model points the way to a very large class of networks with interesting scaling relations, with the classical random graphs of Erdos and Renyi [24] in the background. The present model can be seen as just a superposition of classical random graphs with a large variety of nodes indexed by l , without any specific reference to a length. Each l th type of node has a classical degree distribution which is Poisson, with mean d_l and variance $d_l^2 = d_l$. The resulting overall degree distribution in Eq.(73) is just a sum over the respective Poisson distributions, weighted by the distribution of nodes of type l , namely n_l .

In our particular model, both d_l and n_l depend exponentially on l , but the source of this behaviour is widely different for the two quantities. While d_l is determined by the adjacency rule based on sequence matching, and therefore depends on the length of the sequence to be matched, the distribution of nodes of index l could have been chosen in many different ways. The exponential dependence happily turns out to be algebraically tractable, but it could be conjectured that any distribution which has a tail that is decaying exponentially with l would give rise, all else remaining equal, to essentially the same scaling behaviour for the out-degree distribution in the large l regime, and therefore that $d_l \sim 1$ has a high degree of universality.

Acknowledgements

One of us (AE) gratefully acknowledges partial support from the Turkish Academy of Sciences. MM gratefully acknowledges partial support from the Hediye and Mustafa Saydan Foundation. AK acknowledges support of FIRB 01.

APPENDIX

In this section we outline the calculations leading to Eqs. (20) and (24). In Section III, we defined the function $W^{(2)}(a;b;x)$ as, Eq. (17),

$$W^{(2)}(a;b;x) = \frac{1}{r^k} \sum_y f_a(x;y) f_b(x;y) \quad (94)$$

As we pointed out in the text, when performing the sum over y , two cases must be distinguished: (i) $\exists a_j = l$ and (ii) $\nexists a_j = l$. In case (i), the set of indices of $y_{a,l}$ and $y_{b,l}$ are distinct and the evaluation of the partition sum proceeds in a manner analogous to Eq. (18) yielding

$$W^{(2)}(a;b;x) = \frac{1}{r^{l+1}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-x}]; \exists a_j = l \quad (95)$$

In case (ii) there is an overlap between the indices of $y_{a,l}$ and $y_{b,l}$. Defining $\exists a_j = m$, we find that there are $l-m$ overlapping indices, and thus there are $k-(l+m)$ distinct variables y that are neither in $y_{a,l}$ nor in $y_{b,l}$, so that a sum over the values of these indices will give $r^{k-(l+m)}$. Next, it is convenient to partition the remaining indices, $y_{a+1} \dots y_{b+1}g$, into the three disjoint sets, $S_1 = \{y_{a+1} \dots y_{a+m}g\}$, $S_2 = \{y_{a+m+1} \dots y_{b+1}g\}$ and $S_3 = \{y_{b+1} \dots y_{b+1}g\}$. Figure (5) shows an example for $l=7$, with $a=2$ and $b=5$ along with the sets, $S_1 = \{y_3; y_4; y_5g\}$, $S_2 = \{y_6; y_7; y_8; y_9g\}$ and $S_3 = \{y_{10}; y_{11}; y_{12}g\}$. With the definitions above, we find for $\exists a_j < l$,

$$W^{(2)}(a;b;x) = \frac{1}{r^{l+m}} \sum_{S_1} e^{\sum_{t=1}^k u(x_t; y_{a+t})} \sum_{S_2} e^{\sum_{t=1}^m u(x_{b+1+m+t}; y_{b+1+m+t})} \sum_{S_3} e^{\sum_{t=1}^{l-m} [u(x_t; y_{b+t}) + u(x_{m+t}; y_{b+t})]} \quad (96)$$

and carrying out the sums over the y variables, we obtain ($\exists a_j < l$),

$$W^{(2)}(a;b;x) = \frac{1}{r^{l+m}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-2m} \sum_{t=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^l u(x_t; x_{t+m})] e^{-2} \quad (97)$$

Next, it is useful to introduce the correlation matrix, $M(x;y)$ as

$$M(x;y) = 1 + (r-1)e^{-2} u(x;y) e^{-2}; \quad (98)$$

with $x, y \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, r-1\}g$. From the properties of u , Eq. (8), we find that

$$M(x;y) = \frac{1 + (r-1)e^{-2}}{(r-2)e^{-2} + 2e^{-2}}; \quad x=y \quad (99)$$

and Eq. (97) can therefore be written as

$$W^{(2)}(a;b;x) = \frac{1}{r^{l+m}} [1 + (r-1)e^{-2m} \sum_{t=1}^m M(x_t; x_{t+m})]; \quad (100)$$

Proceeding to perform the average over x ,

$$W^{(2)}(a;b) = \frac{1}{r^l} \sum_x W^{(2)}(a;b;x); \quad (101)$$




FIG. 5: Schematic representation of the y and x averages for the function $W^{(2)}(a; b; r)$ as defined in the text. The case shown in the figure corresponds to $l = 7$ with $a = 2$ and $b = 5$. The number of overlapping indices in the figure is $l - m = 4$, with $m = b - a = 3$. Because of the overlapping, when averaging over x , these indices fall into $m = 3$ disjoint sets: $fx_1; x_4; x_7g$, $fx_2; x_5g$ and $fx_3; x_6g$.

observe that in eq. (100) the variables x can be partitioned into k disjoint sets X with the additional property that if $x_t \in X$, by implication $x_{t+m} \in X$. The situation is shown schematically in Fig. (5) for $m = 3$, where we have the 3 disjoint sets, $fx_1; x_4; x_7g$, $fx_2; x_5g$ and $fx_3; x_6g$. Denoting these sets as $X_1; X_2; \dots; X_m$, and their respective number of elements as $n_1; n_2; \dots; n_m$ ($n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_m = l$), we see that the product in Eq.(100) can be factorized as

$$\prod_{t=1}^{ly^m} M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \prod_{x_t \in X_1}^Y M(x_t; x_{t+m}) \prod_{x_t \in X_2}^Y M(x_t; x_{t+m}) \dots \prod_{x_t \in X_m}^Y M(x_t; x_{t+m}) \quad (102)$$

Performing the summation over each of the factors we have for the first factor

$$\prod_{x_1 \in X_1}^Y M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \prod_{x_1 \in X_1}^Y (M^{n_1-1})_{xy} \quad (103)$$

It can be easily shown that the sum over the variables $x_t \in X_1$ reduces to an $n_1 - 1$ fold matrix product. Denoting the matrix elements of the matrix M^n by $(M^n)_{xy}$, we therefore find

$$\prod_{x_1 \in X_1}^Y M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \prod_{x_1 \in X_1}^X (M^{n_1-1})_{xy} \quad (104)$$

and hence

$$\prod_{x_t \in X_1}^X M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \prod_{s=1}^X (M^{n_s-1})_{xy} \quad (105)$$

Owing to the structure of the matrix M , Eq. (99), powers of M retain the same structure, as can be readily shown, and we therefore have

$$(M^n)_{(xy)} = \begin{cases} A_n; & x = y \\ B_n; & x \neq y \end{cases} \quad (106)$$

The quantities A_n and B_n can be evaluated recursively, and one finds after a little algebra,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{n+1} &= Q_n A_1 \\ B_{n+1} &= Q_n B_1 \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

where

$$Q_n = \frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right)^n + \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right)^n \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right)^n + \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right)^n \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right)^n; \quad (108)$$

and

$$A_1 = 1 + e^{-2} \quad (109)$$

$$B_1 = 1 + (r-1)e^{-2}; \quad (110)$$

We therefore find,

$$\prod_{x,y} (M^n)_{xy} = r A_n + r(r-1) B_n; \quad (111)$$

and thus

$$\prod_{x,y} (M^n)_{xy} = r \left[1 + (r-1)e^{-2n} \right]; \quad (112)$$

Substituting eq. (112) back into eq. (105) we have

$$\prod_{x_t \in X_1}^X M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \frac{1}{r^{l-1}} \prod_{s=1}^X \left[1 + (r-1)e^{-2(n_s-1)} \right]; \quad (113)$$

and noting that $n_1 + n_2 + \dots + n_m = l$, we finally obtain

$$\prod_{x_t \in X_1}^X M(x_t; x_{t+m}) = \frac{1}{r^{l-1}} r^m \left[1 + (r-1)e^{-2(l-m)} \right]; \quad (114)$$

which when substituted into Eqs. (101) and (100) yields the final result, Eq. (21),

$$\prod_{x_t \in X_1}^X W^{(2)}(a; b; x) = \frac{1}{r^{2l}} \left[1 + (r-1)e^{-2l} \right]; \quad (115)$$

Note that we obtain the same result as for the case $l = a > 1$, Eq. (5). In particular, we see that once averaged over x , $W^{(2)}$ is independent of a and b .

-
- [1] R. V. Sole and R. Pastor-Satorras, "Complex Networks in Genomics and Proteomics," S. Bornholdt and H.G. Schuster eds., Handbook of Graphs and Networks (Wiley-VCH Verlag, Berlin 2002).
- [2] R. Pastor-Satorras and A. Vespignani, Evolution and Structure of the Internet- A statistical physics approach (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004)
- [3] O. Wolkenhauer, BioSystem s 65, 1 (2002).
- [4] S.A. Kauffman, J. Theor. Biol. 22, 437 (1969).
- [5] S. Kauffman, The Origins of Order: Self-organization and Selection in Evolution (Oxford University Press, N.Y. 1993)
- [6] B. Derrida, G. Weisbuch, J. Phys. (Paris) 47, 1297-1303 (1986).
- [7] B. Derrida and Y. Pomeau, Europhys. Lett. 1, 45 (1986).
- [8] B. Derrida, H. Flyvberg, J. Phys. A 20 L1107 (1987).
- [9] S.N. Dorogovtsev and J.F.F. Mendes, Adv. Phys. 51, 1079 (2002).
- [10] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabasi, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74 47 (2002).
- [11] B. Alberts et al., Molecular Biology of the Cell (Garland Science, N.y., 2002).
- [12] G.J. Hannon, Nature 418, 244 (2002).
- [13] N. A. Grawal, P.V. D. asaradhi, A. M. oham med, P. M. alho-
tra, R.K. Bhatnagar and S.K. Mukherjee, Microbiol. Mol. Bio. Rev. 67, 657 (2003).
- [14] D. Balcan and A. Erzan, Eur. Phys. J. B 38, 253 (2004).
- [15] S. Maslov and K. Sneppen, Science 296, 910 (2002).
- [16] A. Wagner, Mol. Biol. Evol. 18, 1283 (2001).
- [17] A. Hin Yan Tong et al., Science 303, 808 (2004).
- [18] M. Gustafsson, M. Homquist and A. Lombardi, Large-scale reverse engineering by the Lasso, q-bioM N /0403012
- [19] S. Bergmann, Jan Ihm els, Naama Barkai, PloS Biology, 2,0085 (2004). <http://biology.plosjournals.org>
- [20] V. Spirin and L.A. Mirny, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 100, 12123 (2003).
- [21] S. Ozcelik and A. Erzan, Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. C, 14 (2003) 169.
- [22] W. Feller, An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications, (Wiley, N.Y. 1971).
- [23] A. Kabakcoglu, M. Mungan, D. Balcan, A. Erzan, in preparation.
- [24] P. Erdos and A. Renyi, Publ. Mat. (Debrecen) 6, 290 (1959); Publ. Mat. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci. 5, 17 (1960) and Bull. Inst. Int. Stat. 38, 343 (1961), cited in R. Albert and A.-L. Barabasi, Rev. Mod. Phys. 74 47 (2002).