

---

# ON THE FEASIBILITY OF DYNAMICAL ANALYSIS OF NETWORK MODELS OF BIOCHEMICAL REGULATION

---

**Luis M. Rocha**<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Systems Science and Industrial Engineering,  
Binghamton University, State University of New York, Binghamton, NY, USA.

<sup>2</sup>Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência, 2780-156, Oeiras, Portugal

<sup>3</sup>Center for Social and Biomedical Complexity,  
Luddy School of Informatics, Computing & Engineering,  
Indiana University, Bloomington IN, USA  
rocha@binghamton.edu

January 20, 2022

To the Editor: A recent article by Weidner et al. [2021] presents a method to extract graph properties that are predictive of the dynamical behavior of multivariate, discrete models of biochemical regulation. In other words, a method that uses only features from the structure of network interactions to predict which nodes are most involved in automata network dynamics. However, the authors claim that dynamical analysis of large automata network models is “not even feasible.” To make sure that others are not discouraged from working on this problem, it is important to clarify that effective dynamical analysis of automata network models, to the contrary, is feasible. Unlike what is suggested in the article, graph-based analysis of static features is not the only analytical avenue for large systems biology models of regulation and signaling dynamics because there are dynamical methods that are, indeed, *scalable*<sup>1</sup>.

There has been much interest recently in predicting multivariate dynamics from static network structure alone, especially in regard to the controllability of systems biology models of gene regulation, signalling, and cellular differentiation [Liu et al., 2011, Nacher and Akutsu, 2013, Fiedler et al., 2013, Zanudo et al., 2017]. These are quite welcome methods because we often lack information about the underlying causal interaction dynamics. However, two very popular (and scalable) methods in network science lead to very erroneous predictions of the subsets of (driver) variables that control dynamics [Gates and Rocha, 2016]. The most accurate of these methods are based on feedback vertex set theory [Fiedler et al., 2013, Zanudo et al., 2017], which does not scale well and can only make predictions about the entire ensemble of dynamical systems that fits the same static interaction graph [Gates et al., 2021].

Another putative reason for pursuing structure-only methods is that even when the underlying interaction dynamics of each variable is known, it is not feasible to compute the dynamical (or attractor) landscape of the entire multivariate system when the interaction network is sufficiently large. This prevents us from exhaustively enumerating all possible interventions that can control the dynamics from one attractor basin to another<sup>2</sup>. Still, it is also true that enumeration of all possible interventions is infeasible in a simple graph of sufficient size. The computational complexity of finding all possible subsets of the set of nodes, or generating the powerset, is at least  $\mathcal{O}(2^n)$  [Moore, 1971]. Therefore, exhaustive search of all possible interventions in any network is ultimately infeasible for large graphs whether one uses structure- or dynamics-based methods.

---

<sup>1</sup>By *scalable* we mean that the computational complexity of methods employed to analyze multivariate dynamical systems in regard to their dynamical behavior (e.g., controllability, convergence to attractors, robustness to perturbations, etc.) is manageable. That is, a given method is *scalable* if results can be computed in finite (and reasonable) time, with finite memory, for a system of a reasonable size—ideally for network models in Systems Biology, up to thousands of nodes.

<sup>2</sup>The most important scalability constraint in the analysis of automata networks is the number of node variables,  $n$ , as the dynamical landscape of such systems is comprised of  $s^n$  possible configurations of states  $s$  [Gates and Rocha, 2016]. For instance, a well-known Boolean network model of intracellular signaling networks in generic fibroblasts is comprised of 130 nodes [Helikar et al., 2008], thus it can be in one of  $2^{130}$  possible state configurations—a dynamical landscape that is too large to be exhaustively searched.

Computing the full dynamics of a multivariate system certainly adds to the complexity of exhaustively searching all possible interventions. But many software tools exist—and are collected in repositories such as the CoLoMoTo Consortium [Naldi et al., 2015]—that allow for the identification of attractors in automata networks without full enumeration of their dynamical landscapes, such as PyBoolNet [Klamer et al., 2016] and Boolink [Karanam et al., 2021]. In particular, recent developments in attractor identification algorithms and code (PyStableMotifs) now allow the dynamical analysis of thousands of networks, some with over 15,000 nodes [Rozum et al., 2021]. From another angle, a novel update scheme for asynchronous automata networks has been shown to reduce the complexity of attractor identification, enabling the modelling and dynamical analysis of genome-scale networks [Paulevé et al., 2020].

Moreover, various computational approaches have been developed and applied to extract the key drivers of collective dynamics of biochemical network models without going through every possible subset of nodes, much less the entire dynamical landscape, in a brute force manner [Hari et al., 2021, Zañudo and Albert, 2015, Biane and Delaplace, 2018, Su and Pang, 2020, Rozum et al., 2021]. Indeed, scalable methods exist that remove the redundancy of the dynamics of each variable (micro-level) to allow for a characterization of the entire causal macro-level dynamics, in both complete [Marques-Pita and Rocha, 2013] and probabilistic [Gates et al., 2021] manners. These scalable methods, and the associated software tool CANA [Correia et al., 2018], provide causal graph representations of automata networks that synthesize both structure and dynamics. They are exhaustive in the sense that they preserve all effective interactions of the micro-level dynamics—only redundant interactions are disregarded. Thus, it is very feasible to analyze systems biology models without disregarding their dynamics, allowing the precise study of any putative intervention that controls the dynamics just as easily as structure-only methods, but with additional accuracy afforded by information about the dynamics.

## Acknowledgements

The author is indebted to the anonymous reviewers for their most valuable comments and references which have considerably strengthened this letter.

## References

- C. Biane and F. Delaplace. Causal reasoning on boolean control networks based on abduction: theory and application to cancer drug discovery. *IEEE/ACM transactions on computational biology and bioinformatics*, 16(5):1574–1585, 2018.
- R. B. Correia, A. J. Gates, X. Wang, and L. M. Rocha. Cana: A python package for quantifying control and canalization in boolean networks. *Frontiers in Physiology*, 9:1046, 2018. ISSN 1664-042X. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2018.01046. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fphys.2018.01046>.
- B. Fiedler, A. Mochizuki, G. Kurosawa, and D. Saito. Dynamics and control at feedback vertex sets. i: Informative and determining nodes in regulatory networks. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 25(3):563–604, 2013.
- A. J. Gates and L. M. Rocha. Control of complex networks requires both structure and dynamics. *Scientific Reports*, 6:24456, Apr 2016.
- A. J. Gates, R. B. Correia, X. Wang, and L. M. Rocha. The effective graph reveals redundancy, canalization, and control pathways in biochemical regulation and signaling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(12), 2021.
- K. Hari, U. Ram, and M. K. Jolly. Identifying “more equal than others” edges in diverse biochemical networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(16), 2021. ISSN 0027-8424. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2103698118. URL <https://www.pnas.org/content/118/16/e2103698118>.
- T. Helikar, J. Konvalina, J. Heidel, and J. A. Rogers. Emergent decision-making in biological signal transduction networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(6):1913–1918, 2008. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0705088105.
- A. Karanam, D. He, P.-K. Hsu, S. Schulze, G. Dubeaux, R. Karmakar, J. I. Schroeder, and W.-J. Rappel. Boolink: a graphical interface for open access Boolean network simulations and use in guard cell CO<sub>2</sub> signaling. *Plant Physiology*, 07 2021. ISSN 0032-0889. doi: 10.1093/plphys/kiab344. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/plphys/kiab344>. kiab344.
- H. Klamer, A. Streck, and H. Siebert. PyBoolNet: a python package for the generation, analysis and visualization of boolean networks. *Bioinformatics*, 33(5):770–772, 12 2016. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btw682. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btw682>.
- Y.-Y. Liu, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabási. Controllability of complex networks. *Nature*, 473:167–173, May 2011.

- M. Marques-Pita and L. M. Rocha. Canalization and control in automata networks: body segmentation in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PloS ONE*, 8(3):e55946, 2013.
- F. Moore. On the bounds for state-set size in the proofs of equivalence between deterministic, nondeterministic, and two-way finite automata. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, C-20(10):1211–1214, 1971. doi: 10.1109/T-C.1971.223108.
- J. C. Nacher and T. Akutsu. Structural controllability of unidirectional bipartite networks. *Scientific Reports*, 3:1647, 2013.
- A. Naldi, P. T. Monteiro, C. Müssel, C. for Logical Models, Tools, H. A. Kestler, D. Thieffry, I. Xenarios, J. Saez-Rodriguez, T. Helikar, and C. Chaouiya. Cooperative development of logical modelling standards and tools with colomoto. *Bioinformatics*, 31(7):1154–1159, 2015.
- L. Paulevé, J. Kolčák, T. Chatain, and S. Haar. Reconciling qualitative, abstract, and scalable modeling of biological networks. *Nature communications*, 11(1):1–7, 2020.
- J. C. Rozum, J. Gómez Tejeda Zañudo, X. Gan, D. Deritei, and R. Albert. Parity and time reversal elucidate both decision-making in empirical models and attractor scaling in critical boolean networks. *Science Advances*, 7(29): eabf8124, 2021.
- C. Su and J. Pang. A dynamics-based approach for the target control of boolean networks. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM International Conference on Bioinformatics, Computational Biology and Health Informatics*, pages 1–8, 2020.
- F. M. Weidner, J. D. Schwab, S. D. Werle, N. Ikonomi, L. Lausser, and H. A. Kestler. Capturing dynamic relevance in Boolean networks using graph theoretical measures. *Bioinformatics*, 05 2021. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btab277. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btab277>. btab277.
- J. G. T. Zanudo, G. Yang, and R. Albert. Structure-based control of complex networks with nonlinear dynamics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(28):7234–7239, Jul 2017.
- J. G. T. Zañudo and R. Albert. Cell fate reprogramming by control of intracellular network dynamics. *PLOS Computational Biology*, 11(4):e1004193, Apr 2015.