

Dynamical stability of threshold networks over undirected signed graphs

Eric Goles¹, Pedro Montealegre¹, Martín Ríos-Wilson¹, and Sylvain Sené^{2,3}

¹ Facultad de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez

² Université publique, Marseille, France

³ Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS, LIS, Marseille, France

Abstract. In this paper, we explore the dynamic behavior of threshold networks on undirected signed graphs. Much attention has been dedicated to understand the convergence and long-term behavior of this model. Yet, an open question persists: How does the underlying graph structure impact network dynamics? Similar studies have been carried out for threshold networks and other types of networks, but these primarily focus on unsigned networks. Here, we address the question on signed threshold networks. We introduce the *stability index* of a graph, related to the concepts of frustration and balance in signed graphs, to establish a connection between the structure and the dynamics of such networks. We show that graphs which present a negative stability index exhibit stable dynamics, i.e., the dynamics converges to fixed points regardless of its threshold parameters. Conversely, if at least one subgraph has a positive stability index, oscillations in long term behavior may appear. Furthermore, we generalize the analysis to network dynamics under periodic update modes and explore the case of the existence of some subgraph with a positive stability index, for which we find that attractors of super-polynomial period in the size of the network may appear.

1 Introduction

Originating from McCulloch and Pitts [16], threshold networks were conceived as an initial model for the nervous system. These networks feature units interconnected by threshold functions, emulating neuron behavior [22,17,13]. In addition, Thomas and Kauffman applied similar principles to gene interaction modeling using Boolean functions [14,25]. Actually, threshold functions play a vital role in gene interaction models, with multiple studies exploring dynamics and resilience of cell cycle networks for instance [15,4,23]. In this paper, we study threshold networks of entities where the interactions between the latter are either friendly or unfriendly. The model is defined by an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, with V the set of entities (or vertices) and E the set of interactions (or edges) between them. To each of these edges, a *weight* in $\{-1, +1\}$ is assigned depending on the nature of the interaction, friendly or unfriendly respectively. In this framework, each node holds an internal state from the set $\{-1, +1\}$. This state evolves over discrete time-steps according to a deterministic local threshold transition function. More precisely, a vertex adopts a $+1$ state (it is activated) if the weighted

sum of the weights coming from its activated neighbors surpasses its predefined threshold; otherwise, the node adopts a -1 state.

Studying the dynamics of such networks requires to define when the entities execute their local function over time, namely an update mode. The primary (or canonical) update mode is the parallel one, where all nodes undergo synchronous updates. However, we are also interested in a broader spectrum of update modes, with a particular emphasis on periodic update modes. The latter are defined by a finite family (a list) of sets $\mu = (A_1, \dots, A_p)$, where each A_i is a subset of V . During each time step, updates occur sequentially across sets, from the first to the last, with parallel updates within each set. A single entity may belong to multiple sets, which can make it change its state several times within a single time step. The question of the relations between the structure of interaction networks and their dynamic properties has been first addressed in [21,10,7] and then developed from both combinatorial [18,11] and complexity standpoints [8,2]; that of (a)synchronism sensitivity (the impact of update modes on network dynamics) which underlies is, for its part, more recent [24,1,19,20,5].

In this context, this work focuses on the links between signed threshold networks and their dynamics, according to these two latter described dimensions: firstly, the structural landscape given by the structure of the graph; secondly, the dynamic evolution of the latter depending on diverse update modes.

To do so, we introduce the stability index which is a function of parameters characterizing the undirected graph G such as its number of vertices, its number of edges, its number of positive (resp. negative) loops, and another one related to the anti-balance of G . Taking advantage of this stability index leads to two relevant and promising results for the domain. The first one states that, given a threshold network \mathcal{T} defined over an undirected signed graph G and a periodic update mode μ , the negativity of the stability index of G is a sufficient condition for the underlying dynamic system \mathcal{T}_μ to have only fixed points. The second result underlines that it is possible to construct threshold networks which have super-polynomial limit cycles.

In Section 3.1, we study the synchronous update mode. In particular, we show that the negativity of the stability index is a sufficient condition for the network to admit only fixed points, and present results on what can happen when this index is not negative. In Section 3.2, we study the stability of the network under general periodic update modes. We deduce from the previous section that the main theorem for synchronous update modes can be extended to this setting. Then, we explore what happens when the negativity of the stability index is not fulfilled by presenting an example of a very simple network which exhibits attractors with non-polynomial period on the size of the network.

2 Preliminaries

Signed graphs

A *signed graph* is a tuple $G = ((V, E \cup D), z)$, where G is a non-directed graph with set of nodes V , set of edges E and set of self-loops D , and $z : E \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$




Fig. 1. Examples of frustrated and non-frustrated graphs.

is an *assignment of signs* for each edge in G . In the rest of the paper, we will denote by (G, z) a signed graph without self-loops. In addition, we will denote by n the number of nodes of G , i.e., $n = |V|$, m its number of edges, i.e. $m = |E|$, and finally d^+ (resp. d^-) its number of positive (resp. negative) self-loops.

Given a signed graph G , we denote by $W(G) = (w_{ij})$ its *interaction matrix*, such that:

$$w_{ij} = \begin{cases} \varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\} & \text{if } \{i, j\} \in E, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Stability index of a graph

Let (G, z) be a signed graph. The *sign of a subgraph H of G* is the product of the signs of its edges. A cycle in G is called to be *even* (resp. *odd*) if it has an even (resp. an odd) number of edges. A graph (G, z) is known to be *balanced* if none of its cycles is negative. We say that (G, z) is *antibalanced* if any even (resp. odd) cycle of G is positive (resp. negative).

In this context, let (G, z) be a signed graph. Let us consider the signed graph $-G$ built from (G, z) in which the sign of every edge has been switched, i.e, every positive (resp. negative) edge has become a negative (resp. positive) edge. It is not hard to see that (G, z) is antibalanced if and only if $-G$ is balanced.

Often, in the literature, it is defined the number $\phi(G)$ as the minimum size of a set of edges $X \subseteq E$ such that $G - X$ is balanced. This parameter is called the *frustration index* of the graph [26,19]. In this paper, we will work with the parameter $\rho(G)$ (or simply ρ when the context is clear) which corresponds to the minimum size of a set of edges $X \subseteq E$ such that $G - X$ is antibalanced. Observe that $\rho(G) = \phi(-G)$, and that we derive that a graph is *frustrated* if it is not antibalanced, i.e., if $\rho(G) > 0$. Examples of frustrated cycles are depicted in Figure 1.

Finally, we define the *stability index* of a signed graph (G, z, D) as the number

$$\mathcal{S}(G) = -n - d^+ + d^- + 2m - 4\rho.$$

In Figure 2, we show the value of \mathcal{S} for some examples. We observe that in the first graph, the value of ρ is 1 since we need to remove only an edge in order to have an antibalanced graph. Thus, $\mathcal{S} = -1$. In the second graph, the cycle is antibalanced, so $\rho = 0$ and $\mathcal{S} = 5$. Finally, for the last one, we need to remove




Fig. 2. Values for the stability index in different graphs. From left to right: in the first graph, $\rho = 1$; in the second one, $\rho = 0$; and in the last one, $\rho = 2$.

two edges in order to have an antibalanced graph. Thus, $\rho = 2$ and $\mathcal{S} = -3$. We will see in the next section that this graph parameter is closely related to the dynamics of threshold networks.

Threshold networks

A *threshold network* is a tuple $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$, where G is a signed graph, $W(G)$ is the signed interaction matrix of G , $b \in \mathbb{Z}^{|V|}$ is a *threshold vector* and $f = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ is a collection of *threshold local functions* $f_i : \{-1, 1\}^{|V|} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ which are defined as:

$$x(t+1) = f_i(x(t)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{j \in V} w_{ij} x(t)_j - b_i > 0, \\ x(t)_i & \text{if } \sum_{j \in V} w_{ij} x(t)_j - b_i = 0, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $x(t) \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ denotes the configuration of \mathcal{T} at time step t , i.e., the assignation of values of $\{-1, 1\}$ to each node of the network at time t . Given $i \in V$ a node of \mathcal{T} , let us denote by $N(i)$ the set of neighbors of i , i.e., its *neighborhood* defined as $\{j \in V : \{i, j\} \in E\}$. Remark that the second case in the previous expression defines what to do in a tie case scenario, i.e., the case in which for some node i , the sum of the states of its neighbors is exactly b_i . For example, in the case of the majority rule, i.e., when $b_i = 0$, a tie case scenario happens if for some node i the number of neighbors in state 1 is the same as that of neighbors in state -1 . Of course, this can only happen if a node has even degree. In that case, the previous definition can be modeled as positive loops in each node in the network. When the majority rule is defined in this way, it is usually called *stable*. In addition, other *tie-breaking* functions can be defined (see for example [3]). A very well studied case for the majority rule is known in the literature as *crazy spin* or *unstable*, in which a node changes its state if it is in a tie-case scenario instead of preserving it. Observe that when the degree of a node is even, this tie-breaking rule can be modeled as a negative loop. Unsurprisingly, the choice of the tie breaking rule has a great impact in the dynamics. We illustrate this with the example in Figure 3.




Fig. 3. Example of a stable majority rule dynamics and of an unstable majority rule dynamics defined on the same graph (in which all the edges are positive and not explicitly labeled): on the left panel, the dynamics reaches a fixed point; on the right panel, the dynamics reaches a two-cycle.

Periodic dynamics over a threshold network

Let $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ be a configuration of a threshold network \mathcal{T} . Let $I \subseteq V$ be a subset of vertices. The *transition function* associated to I is defined as the function:

$$f_I(x) = \begin{cases} f_i(x) & \text{if } i \in I, \\ x_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In simple words, f_I assigns a new state to any node in I according to its local threshold function. We say that nodes in I are being *updated*. Consider now $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence $\mu = (I_1, \dots, I_\ell)$ such that $I_k \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, where $\mathcal{P}(V)$ is the power set of V . Now, given a configuration x , we define the *global transition function* of the network $F_\mu : \{-1, 1\}^{|V|} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ by

$$F_\mu(x) = (f_{I_\ell} \circ f_{I_{\ell-1}} \circ \dots \circ f_{I_2} \circ f_{I_1})(x).$$

The update mode μ induces via F a dynamics on the set of configurations $\{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ as follows: given an initial condition $x^0 = x$, we define $x^t = F_\mu^t(x)$ for all $t \geq 1$. We say that μ is a *periodic update mode* for the network \mathcal{T} .

Generally speaking, function F_μ assigns a new configuration for the network by sequentially applying the transition function associated to each set $I \in \mu$ according to the order defined in μ . For the sake of clarity, notice that first, all the nodes in I_1 are updated simultaneously, then, the ones in I_2 are, and so on. When the nodes in the set I_ℓ are updated, the next configuration of the network has been completely computed, and in order to compute the next state, the same process is repeated. The *size* of an update mode is the smallest integer $r > 0$ such that $|I_k| \leq r$ for each $k \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.

Formally speaking, the map F_μ induces a dynamical system in the set of all the possible configurations of \mathcal{T} . An *orbit* is a sequence of configurations x^t, \dots, x^{t+k} , with $k, t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^{i+1} = F_\mu(x^i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., each term in the sequence is obtained by applying F_μ to the previous term. Since the number of possible configurations is finite, each orbit is *eventually periodic*, i.e., there





Fig. 4. The asymptotic parallel (or synchronous) dynamics of two majority networks on some graphs. In the upper panel, a majority network exhibiting a total two cycle; in the lower panel, a majority network exhibiting a two-cycle. In this case, two of the nodes in the triangle are always in state 1 and the rest of the nodes are switching.

exists some $t, p \geq 0$ such that $x^{t+p} = x^t$. This means that after some time, each configuration will reach eventually a periodic orbit. Any periodic orbit of period p is called an *attractor* of period p . In the case in which $p = 1$ the attractors are called *fixed points*. Some abuse of notation is introduced in the literature and the attractors of a threshold network are also called (limit) *cycles*. In this work, we refer to cycles in graphs and cycles in dynamics without making an explicit difference whenever the context is clear. We distinguish the case in which $p = 2$. This special type of attractors are called *two-cycles*. In the case of a two-cycle in which each node changes its state, i.e., $x_i \neq F_\mu(x)_i$ for all $i \in V$, we call it a *total two-cycle* or simply a *total-cycle* when the context is clear. Figure 4 depicts a total-cycle and a two-cycle. We say that a threshold network is *stable* if it has only fixed points. Otherwise, we say that the network is *unstable*.

There are some important particular cases of periodic update modes such as the case of the parallel update mode in which each node updates its state at the same time, i.e. $\mu = (\{V\})$. In this case, we simply write f instead of F_μ . Another interesting case is that of the *block-sequential update modes*, in which μ is an ordered partition of V . An important subfamily of block-sequential update modes is that of *sequential update modes*. In sequential update modes, each $I \in \mu$ is such that $I = \{v\}$, i.e., each set is a singleton. In this case, we can see μ as a permutation of set V of the nodes of the network.

An example of a threshold network \mathcal{T}_{ex} over a cyclic undirected signed graph $C = (V, E)$, with $|V| = 4$, in which all the thresholds are fixed to 0, i.e., $\forall i \in V, b_i = 0$, and such that the local rules correspond to the unstable majority rule. Figure 5 depicts the evolution of configuration $x = (-1, 1, -1, 1)$ under three distinct periodic update modes: the parallel one, the sequential one defined by $(\{1\}, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{3\})$, and the block-sequential one defined by $(\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\})$. Differences of the dynamics associated to these three update modes are emphasized. Indeed, x converges toward a total two-cycle under the parallel update mode, and toward a fixed point under the other update modes.



$ \begin{array}{l} t = 0 : (-1, 1, -1, 1) \\ t = 1 : (1, -1, 1, -1) \\ t = 2 : (-1, 1, -1, 1) \\ t = 3 : (1, -1, 1, -1) \\ t = 4 : (-1, 1, -1, 1) \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} t = 0 : (-1, 1, -1, 1) \\ t = 1 : (1, 1, -1, 1) \\ t = 2 : (1, -1, -1, 1) \\ t = 3 : (1, -1, -1, -1) \\ t = 4 : (1, -1, -1, -1) \\ t = 5 : (-1, -1, -1, -1) \end{array} $	$ \begin{array}{l} t = 0 : (-1, 1, -1, 1) \\ t = 1 : (1, 1, -1, -1) \\ t = 2 : (1, -1, -1, -1) \\ t = 3 : (-1, -1, -1, -1) \end{array} $
(a)	(b)	(c)

Fig. 5. Threshold network based on the unstable majority rule whose associated graph is depicted on the upper panel. On the lower panel, three distinct evolution of configuration $(-1, 1, -1, 1)$ according to (a) the parallel update mode, (b) the sequential update mode $(\{1\}, \{2\}, \{4\}, \{3\})$, (c) the block-sequential update mode $(\{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\})$.

Finally, let o be an attractor of \mathcal{T} according to a global transition function F_μ . We denote by $G'(x) = G[V']$ the graph induced by nodes that have switching states, i.e., such that $V'(o) = \{v \in V : x_v \neq F(x)_v\}$. Whenever the context is clear, we write only G' or V' .

3 Results

In this section, we study the link between the stability index of a signed graph $G = (V, E \cup D, z)$ and the dynamics induced by a threshold network defined over G . In particular, we give a sufficient condition for stability as well as necessary conditions for it. We study stability from two approaches. Firstly, we study the synchronous dynamics, i.e., the ones induced by the parallel update modes, and we focus on the existence of fixed points as only attractors of the dynamics and continue with the existence of total two cycles. Secondly, we study the dynamics from a more general standpoint, by focusing on periodic update modes. We show notably that with no assumptions, long cycles (i.e., super polynomial cycles in the size of the network) may appear.

3.1 Synchronous dynamics

A sufficient condition for stability

Theorems 1 and 2 presented below are well known results on threshold networks.

Theorem 1 ([10]). *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network, where G is an undirected signed graph, whose interaction matrix $W(G)$ is symmetric with coefficients in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Then, for all $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^t(x) = f^{t+2}(x)$.*

Theorem 2 ([7]). *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network, where G is an undirected signed graph, whose interaction matrix $W(G)$ is symmetric. If $W(G)$ is non-negative definite, i.e., such that $x^T W x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$, then for all $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^t(x) = f^{t+1}(x)$.*

This latter result is based on the non-increasing energy functional

$$L(x) = -\frac{1}{2}x^T W x + b^T x.$$

Actually, if the following functional is defined:

$$\Delta L(x^t) = L(x^{t+1}) - L(x^t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i - \frac{1}{2}(x^{t+1} - x^t)W(x^{t+1} - x^t),$$

where $\delta_i = -(x_i^{t+1} - x_i^t)(\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij}x_j^t - b_i)$, it is shown in [7,11] that this difference is negative. In other terms, the energy function is a non-increasing function. This has an important consequence on the dynamics, limiting the long-term behavior of the system to only fixed points and attractors of period 2. Moreover, if the energy delta is strictly negative, \mathcal{T} admits only fixed points. In [11], the authors explore under which conditions attractors of period 2 may appear. More precisely, they explore a sufficient and necessary conditions on the interaction graph of \mathcal{T} in which the latter situation holds. In this section, we present a generalization of their result to signed graphs. To do so, we start by stating technical Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network. Suppose that there exists a configuration $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ such that for all $i \in V$, $x_i \neq x'_i$ where $x' = f(x) = F_\pi(x)$, with $\pi = (V)$. Then, $\Delta L(x) \leq 2\mathcal{S}(G'(x))$ holds.*

Proof. We have that $\Delta L(x) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i - \frac{1}{2}(x' - x)W(x' - x)$. From [11], we derive that $\delta_i \leq -2$. Thus, $\Delta L(x) \leq -2n - \frac{1}{2}(x' - x)W(x' - x)$. Then, by expanding the term $\frac{1}{2}(x' - x)W(x' - x)$, we get the following bound for the energy difference:

$$\Delta L(x) \leq -2n - 2d^+ + 2d^- + 4\varphi(x),$$

where $\varphi(x) = \sum_{i < j} -w_{ij}x_i x_j = \sum_{i < j} \overline{w_{ij}}x_i x_j$. In the previous quadratic form, we have change the terms $y_i = (x'_i - x_i) \in \{-2, 2\}$ to $x_i \in \{-1, 1\}$. Hence, a factor of 2 has appeared multiplying φ . Furthermore, observe that if $-G$ is balanced, the configuration x^* in which vertices of the same color are connected by positive edges maximizes φ and in the general case, the amount of frustrated edges will

decrease the value of φ . In fact, for x (and, actually, for any configuration) we can define the sets $E^{\pm\pm} = E^{\pm\pm}(x) = \{e = (i, j) : (x_i = x_j = \pm 1), \overline{w}_{ij} = \pm 1\}$ and $\delta^\pm = \delta^\pm(x) = \{e = (i, j) : x_i \neq x_j, \overline{w}_{ij} = \pm 1\}$. Observe that if $-G$ is balanced, we have that $E^{+-} = E^{-+} = \delta^+ = \emptyset$.

Then, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x) = \sum_{E^{++}} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{E^{+-}} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{E^{-+}} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j + \\ \sum_{E^{--}} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{\delta^+} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j + \sum_{\delta^-} \overline{w}_{ij} x_i x_j. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\varphi(x) = (|E^{++}| + |E^{-+}| + |\delta^-|) - (|E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|),$$

and since $m = |E^{++}| + |E^{-+}| + |\delta^-| + |E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|$, the following holds:

$$\varphi(x) = m - 2(|E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|).$$

Finally, since the number of frustrated edges in configuration x is exactly $|E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|$, $\rho = \phi(-G) \leq |E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|$ and $\max_{x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}} \varphi(x) = m - 2\rho$, from which we deduce that

$$\Delta L(x) \leq -2n - 2d^+ + 2d^- + 4m - 8\rho = 2\mathcal{S}(G),$$

which is the expected result. \square

Now Lemma 1 is clarified, we can present the main theorem of this section.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network. If $\mathcal{S}(G) < 0$ for each subgraph $G' \subseteq G$, then \mathcal{T} admits only fixed points.*

Proof. Observe that, by Theorems 1 and 2, \mathcal{T} can only admit attractors of period 2 and fixed points. Let us assume that \mathcal{T} admits some attractor of period 2. Let us define $V' = \{i \in V : x_i \neq x'_i\}$ which induces a subgraph G' of G . From Lemma 1, we have that $\Delta L(X) = L(x') - L(x) \leq 2\mathcal{S}(G') < 0$, and thus $L(x') < L(x)$. Similarly, since x has period 2, we deduce $L(x) < L(x')$, which is a contradiction. \square

Around necessary conditions for stability

Now, we face the problem of studying what happens if the hypothesis of the previous theorem does not hold in order to make a step closer to stability characterization. In particular, we are interested in the case in which there exists some $G' \subseteq G$ such that $\mathcal{S}(G') \geq 0$. First, notice that if G is just a length 1 negative path, i.e., $E = \{i, j\}$ and $w_{ij} = -1$ then, $\mathcal{T} = (G, b)$ where $b_i = b_j = 0$ is a threshold automata network which admits a two-cycle. In fact, for $x_i = x_j = 1$, we have the cycle $(1, 1) \leftrightarrow (-1, -1)$. Generally speaking, we give in the next result a sufficient condition for the existence of two-cycles. This condition is given in the following lemma and illustrated in Figure 6.

Lemma 2. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network. \mathcal{T} admits a two-cycle if and only if there exists a configuration $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ such that, for all $i \in V$ we have:*

$$w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1 + |b_i|,$$

where $B(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = +1\}$, $B(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$, $P(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = +1\}$, and $P(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$.

Proof. (\implies) First, let us assume that G admits a two-cycle $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$. Let us define $B(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = +\}$, $B(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$, $P(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = +1\}$, and $P(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$. Since x is a total cycle, for each $i \in V$, we have that:

1. if $x_i = 1$, then $F(x)_i = -1$; and
2. if $x_i = -1$, then $F(x)_i = 1$.

By using the definition of local rules, the latter cases are equivalent to the following conditions:

1. if $x_i = 1$, then $\sum_{x \in V} w_{ij} x_j - b_i > 0$; and
2. if $x_i = -1$, then $\sum_{x \in V} w_{ij} x_j - b_i < 0$.

Finally, if we rewrite the latter conditions in terms of the sets P and B , we obtain the following conditions:

1. if $x_i = 1$, then $w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1 + b_i$;
and
2. if $x_i = -1$, then $w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1 - b_i$.

(\impliedby) Now, suppose that there exists a configuration x such that $w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1 + |b_i|$. Then, in particular, the latter condition implies that:

1. if $x_i = 1$ then, $F(x)_i = -1$; and
2. if $x_i = -1$ then, $F(x)_i = 1$,

which means that x belongs to a two-cycle, and that the lemma holds. \square

From Lemma 2, we deduce the following result.

Corollary 1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a signed graph and $W(G)$ its associated interaction matrix. There exists a threshold vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the threshold network $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, F)$ admits a total cycle if and only if there exists a configuration $x \in \{0, 1\}^{|V|}$ such that:*

$$\forall i \in V, w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1,$$

where $B(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = +1\}$, $B(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$, $P(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = +1\}$ and $P(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = -1\}$.




Fig. 6. An example of a network that exhibits a two cycle that is not a total cycle. Nodes in black are in state 1 and nodes in white are in state -1 . Sets B and P in Lemma 2 are given explicitly for this particular configuration. Observe that $\mathcal{S} = 1 \geq 0$ but the network does not exhibit total two-cycles.

Proof. (\implies) First, assume that there exists b such that T admits two-cycles. Let x be part of a two-cycle of T . Let us define $B(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = +\}$, $B(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j = x_i, w_{ij} = -\}$, $P(x, i)^+ = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = +\}$, and $P(x, i)^- = \{j \in N(i) : x_j \neq x_i, w_{ij} = -\}$. By Lemma 2, we have:

$$w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1 + |b_i|.$$

Thus:

$$w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1.$$

(\impliedby) Conversely, if we have

$$w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1$$

for some configuration x , we can define $b_i = 0$ for all $j \in V$ and thus, by the previous remark, we have that x is a two-cycle. \square

Remark 1. Observe that the condition in the previous corollary implies that a signed graph admits attractors of period 2 if and only if $b_i = 0$ for all $i \in V$. In the case in which the edges have only positive weight, this latter threshold defines the majority rule. Thus, in the case of an unsigned graph, another way to interpret the previous corollary is that if a graph does not admit attractors of period 2 for the majority rule, it will have only fixed points for any other threshold.

Theorem 4. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a signed graph and $W(G)$ be its associated interaction matrix, and let us consider the parallel update mode. If there exists a threshold vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ admits a total cycle, then $\mathcal{S}(G) \geq 0$. Conversely, if $\mathcal{S}(G) \geq 0$, then there exists a threshold vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that \mathcal{T} admits an attractor of period 2.

Proof. (\implies) First, observe that, for each configuration $x \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in V} (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) = \\ 2 (|E^{++}| + |E^{-+}| + |\delta^-|) - (|E^{+-}| + |E^{--}| + |\delta^+|) = 2\varphi(x). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 1, we have that:

$$\forall i \in V, w_{ii} + (|B(x, i)^+| - |B(x, i)^-|) - (|P(x, i)^+| - |P(x, i)^-|) \geq 1,$$

from which we deduce that:

$$d^+ - d^- + 2\varphi(x) \geq n,$$

and thus that:

$$\mathcal{S}(G) \geq -n + d^+ - d^- + 2\varphi(x) \geq 0.$$

(\impliedby) Conversely, let us assume that $\mathcal{S}(G) \geq 0$. Then, there exists some configuration $x^* \in \{-1, 1\}^{|V|}$ such that $\varphi(x^*) \geq \phi(x)$. Again, observe that $\varphi(x^*) = m - 2p$. Thus, we have that $\mathcal{S}(G) = -n + d^+ - d^- + 2\phi(x^*) \geq 0$. By rearranging the latter term we get that:

$$\sum_{i \in V} (w_{ii} + (|B(x^*, i)^+| - |B(x^*, i)^-|) - (|P(x^*, i)^+| - |P(x^*, i)^-|) - 1) \geq 0.$$

Thus, there must exist some subset $V' \subseteq V$ such that, for every $i \in V'$, we have that:

$$w_{ii} + (|B(x^*, i)^+| - |B(x^*, i)^-|) - (|P(x^*, i)^+| - |P(x^*, i)^-|) - 1 > 0.$$

Then, thanks to Corollary 1, there exists some threshold vector $b' \in \mathbb{Z}^{|V'|}$ such that b' induces a total cycle y on the subgraph V' . We are going to extend b' to a threshold vector on G named b such that there exists some x which is an attractor of period 2 for \mathcal{T} . The idea is that we fix in state -1 any node outside of V' by defining a large enough value for its threshold (for example, a value greater than the degree of the node) and we slightly change the value of b'_i for any node in V' so that it can change its state without being affected by the state of its neighbors in $G \setminus V'$. More precisely, let us define $b_i = b'_i - (|N_G(i)| - |N_{G'}(i)|)$, i.e., for each node in V' , we consider the same threshold b'_i but we subtract the number of neighbors that do not belong to V' . In addition, we define $b_i = 2|N_G(i)|$ whenever $i \in V \setminus V'$. We define also $x_i = y_i$ whenever $i \in V'$ and $x_i = -1$ whenever $i \notin V'$. Observe that x is an attractor of period 2 for \mathcal{T} . Hence, for each node $i \in V'$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in V} w_{ij}x_j - b_i = \\ \sum_{i \in V'} w_{ij}x_j - (|N(i)|_G - |N(i)'_G|) - b'_i + (|N(i)|_G - |N(i)'_G|) = \\ \sum_{i \in V'} w_{ij}y_j - b'_i, \end{aligned}$$

and that, for every node $i \in V \setminus V'$:

$$\sum_{i \in V} w_{ij} x_j - b_i = \sum_{i \in V} w_{ij} x_j - 2|N(i)_G| < 0,$$

and we get the expected result. \square

Remark 2. 1. As it is shown in [8], there are some cases in which $\mathcal{S}(G) \geq 0$ and there are no total cycles.

2. If there is at least one node with a negative loop then, there exists a total cycle. In fact, let us call i a node having a negative loop. We can fix in state -1 all the nodes in $G - \{i\}$ by using the same technique as the one used above and by defining $b_i = -|N(i)|$. By doing this, we have that $\sum_{j \in V} w_{ji} x_j - b_i = -x_i - |N(i)| + |N(i)| = -x_i$. Thus, if $x_i = 1$, node i changes its state to -1 , and if it is in state -1 , it changes to 1 .

3.2 Generalisation to periodic dynamics

We extend the latter results to the more general case of periodic update modes. Remember that a periodic update mode is a sequence $\mu = (I_1, \dots, I_\ell)$ such that $I_k \in \mathcal{P}(V)$, where $\mathcal{P}(V)$ is the power set of V . From now on, for a periodic update mode $\mu = (I_1, \dots, I_\ell)$, we call $G(I_k)$ the subgraph induced by the set of nodes I_k .

A sufficient condition for stability

The following theorem is a direct extension of Theorem 4 to the general family of periodic update modes.

Theorem 5. *Let $\mathcal{T} = (G = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$ be a threshold network and let us consider a periodic update mode $\mu = (I_1, \dots, I_\ell)$. If for any $1 \leq k \leq \ell$, we have that for all subgraph $G' \subseteq G(I_k)$, $\mathcal{S}(G') < 0$ then, \mathcal{T} admits only fixed points.*

Proof. The result holds as a consequence of the fact that for each $k \in \{0, \dots, \ell\}$, the nodes that may change state are the nodes in I_k whereas all the other remains in their current state. Thus, since any subgraph $G' \subseteq G(I_k)$ satisfies $\mathcal{S}(G') < 0$ then, the energy is decreasing and the network converges consequently to fixed points. \square

Attractors with superpolynomial period in cycle graphs

We show that if there are some graph such that $\mathcal{S}(G)$ attractors with period $p > 2$ may appear when we restrict to cycle graphs.

In order to illustrate this, let us take as an example the “unstable majority” elementary cellular automaton (ECA) composed of eight cells with periodic boundary conditions (see Figure 7). As explained above at the end of Section 2, this is equivalent to considering a threshold network defined over a cyclic graph




Fig. 7. Dynamics of an attractor of period 5 of the ECA “unstable majority” under the update mode $\mu = (\{3, 5\}, \{1, 2, 7, 8\}, \{4, 6\}, \{1, 2, 7, 8\})$, depicted by its space-time diagram (time going from left to right). A checkmark on a cell indicates that it is going to update its state. The configurations obtained at each time step are depicted by lines with cells at state 1 in black. Lines with cells at state 1 in light gray represent the configurations obtained at time substeps generated by the update mode. Cells at state -1 are in white.

with all thresholds equaling 0 and where every node induces a negative loop. As can be noted in Figure 7 which illustrates the dynamics of a specific configuration, after applying a particular periodic update mode, attractors of period 5 may appear. Observe that in this case, $\mathcal{S}(G) = -8 - 0 + 8 + 16 - 4 \times 0 = 16 > 0$ since $\rho = 0$ and $n = m$ and each node has a negative loop. Observe also that this construction can be done for each even number n such that $n \geq 8$. Thus, one can exhibit networks with attractors of period $n - 3$ for each even $n \geq 8$, as stated in Lemma 3.

Lemma 3. *For each $n \geq 8$ such that n is even, there exists a periodic update mode μ and a threshold network $\mathcal{T} = (C_n = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$, with C_n a cyclic graph with negative loops on each node, such that \mathcal{T} admits attractors of period $n - 3$.*

Proof. By a straightforward induction argument, the example presented in Figure 7, which corresponds to the case $n = 8$, can be extended to any greater even n . \square

We present now a technical lemma (see from [12] for more details) that will be used to show the final result of this section.

Lemma 4 ([12]). *Let $m \geq 2$ and $P(m) = \{k \leq m : k \text{ is prime}\}$. If we define $\pi(m) = |P(m)|$ and $\theta(m) = \sum_{k \in P(m)} \log(k)$, then we have $\pi(m) \sim \frac{m}{\log(m)}$ and $\theta(m) \sim m$.*

Now, we generalize the idea presented above in order to show that for $n > 0$ there exists a threshold network of size n admitting attractors of super-polynomial period. In order to show this result, we use Lemma 3 together with the previous technical result. This is a classical technique used in [11,9,6]. Another technique leading to the same result is given in [5].

Theorem 6. *There exists an threshold network over an undirected signed graph $\mathcal{T} = (C_n = (V, E), W(G), \{-1, 1\}, b, f)$, with $n = |V|$ nodes, that admits attractors of super-polynomial period in n .*

Proof. Let us fix $n > 1$ which induces that $m > 0$. Now, as a consequence of Lemma 4, we have that for each $k_i \in P(m)$, there exists a threshold network \mathcal{T}_i of size $2n_i$ defined over a cyclic graph with a negative loop on each node, such that \mathcal{T}_i has attractors of period k_i . Indeed, it suffices to define $n_i = \frac{k_i+3}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, let us construct a cycle of size C_n by “concatenating” each cycle C_{2n_i} . The idea here simply to cut each cycle in order to obtain a chain composed of the same number of nodes, to concatenate then all chains with each other, and to close up this final chain by adding an edge between its two extreme nodes. In addition, we define a threshold network \mathcal{T} over C_n in which each node will have the same local rule than in \mathcal{T}_i , i.e., each node in \mathcal{T} is equipped with the unstable majority rule. Remark that if we define a configuration x as the concatenation of each of the attractors x_i defined over \mathcal{T}_i and consider μ as the update mode obtained by the union of the sets in each update mode μ_i , the dynamics of each cycle is completely independent of the rest. Thus, we obtain a threshold network \mathcal{T} on C_n which admits an attractor of period $p \geq \exp(\theta(m))$. Moreover, remark that $n = \sum_{i=1}^{\pi(m)} p_i + 3\pi(m)$. Using the latter technical lemma, we deduce that $m = \pi(m) \log(m)$ and that $n = \pi(m)^2 \log(m)$. Consequently, we have that $p \geq 2^{\Omega(\sqrt{n \log(N)})}$, which show the existence of an attractor of super-polynomial period in n . \square

4 Discussion

In this paper, we have presented a graph parameter, the stability index, which relates the dynamics of a threshold network with the structure of the underlying signed graph. The sign of this parameter for subgraphs allow us to determine whether the dynamics is stable or not. However, as mentioned at the beginning of the article, computing this index could be very impractical (computing ρ is **NP-hard** in general). In this sense, a particularly interesting approach, could consist in studying update modes induced by sets of bounded size. For example, it is simple to see that if one study the family of all update modes with at most 3 nodes, the stability for connected graphs can be characterized in terms of forbidden subgraphs (notably signed triangles). In this context, an exhaustive study of different subgraphs could be a promising approach. Finally, it could be also interesting to study the structure of particular graph structures that may be of interest of some applications such as regulatory networks or social networks.

References

1. Aracena, J., Gómez, L., Salinas, L.: Limit cycles and update digraphs in boolean networks. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **161**, 1–12 (2013)

2. Bridoux, F., Durbec, A., Perrot, K., Richard, A.: Complexity of fixed point counting problems in Boolean networks. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **126**, 138–164 (2022)
3. Concha-Vega, P., Goles, E., Montealegre, P., Ríos-Wilson, M.: On the complexity of stable and biased majority. *Mathematics* **10**(18), 3408 (2022)
4. Davidich, M.I., Bornholdt, S.: Boolean network model predicts cell cycle sequence of fission yeast. *PloS one* **3**(2), e1672 (2008)
5. Donoso Leiva, I., Goles, E., Rios-Wilson, M., Sené, S.: Asymptotic (a)synchronism sensitivity and complexity of elementary cellular automata. In: *Proceedings of LATIN'24. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer (2024), to appear
6. Goles, E., Montealegre, P., Ríos-Wilson, M., and: On the effects of firing memory in the dynamics of conjunctive networks. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - A* **40**(10), 5765–5793 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2020245>, <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcds.2020245>
7. Goles, E.: Fixed point behavior of threshold functions on a finite set. *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods* **3**(4), 529–531 (1982)
8. Goles, E., Montealegre, P.: The complexity of the majority rule on planar graphs. *Advances in Applied Mathematics* **64**, 111–123 (2015)
9. Goles, E., Montealegre, P., Salo, V., Törmä, I.: Pspace-completeness of majority automata networks. *Theoretical Computer Science* **609**, 118–128 (2016)
10. Goles, E., Olivos, J.: Periodic behaviour of generalized threshold functions. *Discrete mathematics* **30**(2), 187–189 (1980)
11. Goles, E., Ruz, G.A.: Dynamics of neural networks over undirected graphs. *Neural Networks* **63**, 156–169 (2015)
12. Hardy, G.H., Wright, E.M.: *An introduction to the theory of numbers*. Oxford university press (1979)
13. Hopfield, J.J.: Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **79**(8), 2554–2558 (1982)
14. Kauffman, S.A.: Metabolic stability and epigenesis in randomly constructed genetic nets. *Journal of theoretical biology* **22**(3), 437–467 (1969)
15. Li, F., Long, T., Lu, Y., Ouyang, Q., Tang, C.: The yeast cell-cycle network is robustly designed. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101**(14), 4781–4786 (2004)
16. McCulloch, W.S., Pitts, W.: A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity. *The bulletin of mathematical biophysics* **5**, 115–133 (1943)
17. Minsky, M., Papert, S.: *An introduction to computational geometry*. Cambridge tiass., HIT **479**(480), 104 (1969)
18. Noual, M.: *Updating automata networks*. Ph.D. thesis, École Normale Supérieure de Lyon (2012)
19. Noual, M., Sené, S.: Synchronism versus asynchronism in monotonic Boolean automata networks. *Natural Computing* **17**, 393–402 (2018)
20. Rios-Wilson, M.: *On automata networks dynamics: an approach based on computational complexity theory*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Chile and Aix-Marseille Université (2021)
21. Robert, F.: Itérations sur des ensembles finis et automates cellulaires contractants. *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **29**, 393–412 (1980)
22. Rosenblatt, F.: The perceptron: a probabilistic model for information storage and organization in the brain. *Psychological review* **65**(6), 386 (1958)

23. Ruz, G.A., Goles, E., Montalva, M., Fogel, G.B.: Dynamical and topological robustness of the mammalian cell cycle network: A reverse engineering approach. *Biosystems* **115**, 23–32 (2014)
24. Salinas, L.: Estudio de modelos discretos: estructura y dinámica. Ph.D. thesis, Universidad de Chile (2008)
25. Thomas, R.: Boolean formalization of genetic control circuits. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **42**, 563–585 (1973)
26. Toulouse, G.: Theory of the frustration effect in spin glasses: I. *Spin Glass Theory and Beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications* **9**, 99 (1987)