



HAL
open science

Learning Boolean controls in regulated metabolic networks: a case-study

Kerian Thuillier, Caroline Baroukh, Alexander Bockmayr, Ludovic Cottret,
Loïc Paulevé, Anne Siegel

► **To cite this version:**

Kerian Thuillier, Caroline Baroukh, Alexander Bockmayr, Ludovic Cottret, Loïc Paulevé, et al..
Learning Boolean controls in regulated metabolic networks: a case-study. 2021. hal-03207589v2

HAL Id: hal-03207589

<https://hal.science/hal-03207589v2>

Preprint submitted on 6 May 2021 (v2), last revised 2 Sep 2021 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Learning Boolean controls in regulated metabolic networks: a case-study

Kerian Thuillier¹, Caroline Baroukh², Alexander Bockmayr³, Ludovic Cottret², Loïc Paulevé⁴, and Anne Siegel¹

¹ Univ Rennes, Inria, CNRS, IRISA, F-35000 Rennes, France

² LIPME, INRAE, CNRS, Université de Toulouse, Castanet-Tolosan, France

³ Freie Universität Berlin, Institute of Mathematics, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

⁴ Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux INP, CNRS, LaBRI, UMR5800, F-33400 Talence, France

Abstract. Many techniques have been developed to infer Boolean regulations from a prior knowledge network and experimental data. Existing methods are able to reverse-engineer Boolean regulations for transcriptional and signaling networks, but they fail to infer regulations that control metabolic networks. This paper provides a formalisation of the inference of regulations for metabolic networks as a satisfiability problem with two levels of quantifiers, and introduces a method based on Answer Set Programming to solve this problem on a small-scale example.

Keywords: Inference · Regulated metabolism · Satisfiability problem.

1 Introduction

During the last twenty years, both the amount and the type of available data have allowed scientists to consider intracellular processes as a whole. Boolean networks have been refined to include non-deterministic dynamics in order to model the response of regulatory interactions [16,2,5]. Similarly, the study of metabolism at steady state has led to various constraint-based approaches [19,17], which usually assume that internal metabolites are in a quasi-steady-state (QSS). The classical approach to analyze metabolic networks at steady state is flux balance analysis (FBA) [19]. In this approach, a linear function, e.g. biomass production is optimized with respect to stoichiometric and thermodynamic constraints, resulting in a linear programming problem (LP).

However, both the Boolean approach for regulation and the QSS approximation for metabolism are often developed “*in solo*”, without considering that cellular biology is multi-layered in the sense that the metabolic layer interacts through feed-forward and feedback loops with the regulatory layer [4,27,21,9]. Indeed, cellular metabolism transforms nutrients into biomass constituents. Metabolic reactions are catalysed by enzymes, which themselves are controlled by a cascade of regulations involving other proteins, metabolites and abiotic factors, such as temperature and pH. A biological system thus has several layers of control, which mutually depend on each other. It cannot be simply viewed as a

purely hierarchical system because there are regulatory feed-forward and feedback mechanisms to inform each layer on the state of the other ones. In concrete terms, some compounds produced by the metabolic layer have the capability to block or induce signaling regulation cascades, which themselves can block or induce transcription of genes leading to changes in the control of the initial metabolic process.

To figure out how gene expression triggers specific phenotypes depending on the environmental constraints [3], several constraint-based approaches for integrating metabolic and regulatory networks have been developed that combine Boolean dynamics for the regulatory layer with quasi-steady-state approximations of the metabolic layer (see [17] for an overview), one of them being FLEXFLUX [18], which implements the rFBA framework [9].

A major limitation when using such frameworks to analyse regulated metabolic models is that they require a precise description of the regulatory and signaling layers in the form of Boolean rules. A noticeable exception is [24], where RBA is used to deduce regulations according to perturbations of the environment. However, to induce regulations, the authors assume that no feedback from metabolism to regulation occurs, which does not correspond to the functioning of most systems. In practice, these rules are manually curated from the literature or experimental data. This has been done for example in the case of *E. coli* [8,7] and a few other organisms. But, the need for a manual curation of Boolean rules of regulated metabolism is a strong limitation to the use of these frameworks.

Signaling and regulatory rules can be identified from transcriptomic or phosphoproteomics data by solving combinatorial or MILP problems in order to optimize data-fitting and parsimony hypotheses [23,20,26,22,25]. In this direction, the caspoTS and the BoNesis approaches [22,20,26,6] were developed for inferring Boolean rules to model the response of regulatory and signaling networks from multiple time-series data. The goal of this paper is to lay foundation for the extension of these approaches to the inference of regulatory rules driving metabolism. This is done by discretizing both the rFBA framework (especially the QSS approximation) and the metabolic data used as input of the inference procedure.

Notations The cardinality of a finite set X is denoted by $|X|$. Given a vector $x \in D^n$ and a set of indices $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, x_I denotes the vector of dimension $|I|$ equal to $(x_i)_{i \in I}$. The Boolean domain is denoted by $\mathbb{B} = \{0, 1\}$. Given two Boolean vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{B}^n$, we write $x \preceq y$ iff $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, x_i \leq y_i$. Finally, given a non-negative real vector $s \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, we denote by $\beta(s) \in \mathbb{B}^n$ its *binarization*, i.e. $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \beta(s)_i = 1$, if $s_i > 0$, and $\beta(s)_i = 0$, if $s_i = 0$.

2 Background: regulated metabolic networks

2.1 Coupling metabolic and regulatory networks

A *regulated metabolic network* consists of two layers. The regulatory layer is modelled by a Boolean network, which controls the metabolites and fluxes of

the metabolic layer, which is characterized by linear equations. Feedbacks are provided by the components of the metabolic network, which are involved in the Boolean functions associated with the regulatory layer.

Formally, a metabolic network is given by a set of biochemical reactions linked together by the metabolites that they consume and produce.

Definition 1. A metabolic network is a tuple $\mathcal{N} = (\text{Int}, \text{Ext}, \mathcal{R}, S)$ with a set of internal metabolites Int , a set of external metabolites Ext , a set \mathcal{R} of irreversible reactions, and a stoichiometric matrix $S \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\text{Int}| + |\text{Ext}|) \times |\mathcal{R}|}$.

Given flux bounds $l_r, u_r \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq l_r \leq u_r$, for each $r \in \mathcal{R}$, a metabolic steady state is a flux vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|}$ with $S_{\text{Int}, \mathcal{R}} \cdot v = 0$ and $l_r \leq v_r \leq u_r$, for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Here $S_{\text{Int}, \mathcal{R}}$ denotes the submatrix of S whose rows correspond to the internal metabolites.

For the sake of simplicity, we assume that all reactions are irreversible. Reversible reactions may be split into a forward and backward reaction if necessary.

Definition 2 (Input and output metabolites). For an external metabolite $m \in \text{Ext}$, we denote by $w_m = w_m(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ the concentration of m at time $t \geq 0$.

An external metabolite $m \in \text{Ext}$ is called an input (resp. output) metabolite if there exists a reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$ with $S_{mr} < 0$ (resp. $S_{mr} > 0$). The set of all input metabolites is denoted by $\text{Inp} \subseteq \text{Ext}$.

A regulatory network is a set of biological entities (e.g. genes, reactions, metabolites) or even abiotic entities (e.g. temperature, pH) that are linked by causal effects: the activity of some nodes can affect positively or negatively the activity of other nodes. This activity can be represented by a Boolean network.

Definition 3. A Boolean network (BN) of dimension n is a function $f : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^n$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the i -th component $f_i : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is called the local function of i .

The influence graph $G(f)$ of f is a signed digraph (V, E) with $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $E \subseteq V \times \{-, +\} \times V$ such that $(i, s, j) \in E$ if and only if there exists $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$ with $x_i = 0$ such that $s \cdot f_j(x) < s \cdot f_j(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 1, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$. In the following we will slightly abuse notation by identifying $G(f)$ with its edge set, i.e. $G(f) = E$.

A BN f is locally monotone whenever for each influence $(i, s, j) \in G(f)$, there is no influence with opposite sign, i.e. $(i, -s, j) \notin G(f)$.


We assume here that the fluxes of a metabolic network can be controlled by the activity of the input metabolites and additional regulatory proteins. More precisely, the activity of some reactions can be blocked (forced to have a zero flux) whenever certain conditions on the activity of input metabolites and regulatory proteins are met. Moreover, we assume that the activity of regulatory proteins is mediated by the metabolic network only. The resulting model is then supposed to run on two time scales: the metabolic network is a fast system, which, depending on the activity of input metabolites and regulatory proteins will converge to a steady state of the reactions fluxes; the regulatory network is a slow system, which gets updated once the metabolic network is in steady state.

Definition 4 (Regulated metabolic network). A regulated metabolic network is a triplet $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f)$ composed of:

- a metabolic network $\mathcal{N} = (\text{Int}, \text{Ext}, \mathcal{R}, S)$ with k input metabolites $\text{Inp} = \{e_1, \dots, e_k\} \subseteq \text{Ext}$ and m reactions $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, \dots, r_m\}$;
- a set of d regulatory proteins $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_d\}$
- a BN f of dimension $n = |\text{Inp}| + |\mathcal{R}| + |\mathcal{P}|$ where $\{1, \dots, n\} = \text{Inp} \cup \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{P}$ such that $G(f)$ is a bipartite graph between \mathcal{P} and $\text{Inp} \cup \mathcal{R}$.

In this work, local functions for input metabolites in the BN f are never used (although the local functions of reactions may depend on them). Therefore we set arbitrarily $f_e = 0, \forall e \in \text{Inp}$.

The BN f models the regulation of the fluxes in the metabolic network \mathcal{N} . This regulation is always in one direction: either a flux v_r is only restricted by the flux bounds $l_r \leq v_r \leq u_r$, whenever $f_r(x) = 1$, or it is blocked, $v_r = 0$, whenever $f_r(x) = 0$. Following this convention, a reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is never regulated whenever $f_r(x) = 1$. As we will define formally in the next section, the regulations impact the steady states of the metabolic network.



	Regulatory proteins		Input metabolites		
Local function	$f_{\text{RPO2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{RPr1}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Carbon1}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Carbon2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Oxygen}}(x)$
Boolean rule	$\neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$	x_{Carbon1}	0	0	0

	Reactions								
Local function	$f_{\text{Tc1}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Tc2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{To2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Td}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Te}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Growth}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Rres}}(x)$	$f_{\text{R6}}(x)$	$f_{\text{R7}}(x)$
Boolean rule	1	$\neg x_{\text{RPr1}}$	1	1	1	1	$\neg x_{\text{RPO2}}$	1	1

(c) Boolean Network. All Boolean functions equal to 1 correspond to reactions which are not regulated by the Boolean network.

Fig. 1: Example of regulated metabolic network. In the metabolic network (a), each node represents a metabolite and each hyperedge a reaction. For instance, the hyperedge R7 linking $\{A; \text{NADH}\}$ to $\{E\}$ models the reaction $A + 3 \text{NADH} \rightarrow 3 E$. Integer values over hyperedges are stoichiometric coefficients, the default value is 1. (b) shows the influence (or regulatory) graph of the Boolean network in (c), with square nodes denoting the regulatory proteins. (c) defines the Boolean network regulating the metabolic network in (a), with $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$ and $n = 14$.

An example of regulated metabolic network is shown in Fig. 1. This example is based on a highly simplified model of core carbon metabolism, originally proposed in [9]. At the metabolic level (Fig. 1a), there are 9 metabolites and $m = 9$ reactions. The internal metabolites are $\text{Int} = \{A, D, E, O_2, \text{ATP}, \text{NADH}\}$, the external metabolites are $\text{Ext} = \{\text{Carbon1}, \text{Carbon2}, \text{Oxygen}\}$. All the $k = 3$ external metabolites are input metabolites, $\text{Ext} = \text{Inp}$. The set of irreversible reactions is $\mathcal{R} = \{\text{Tc1}, \text{Tc2}, \text{To2}, \text{Td}, \text{Te}, \text{Growth}, \text{Rres}, \text{R6}, \text{R7}\}$. The stoichiometric coefficients are also given in Fig. 1a. By default, they are set to 1, except for the reactions $R6$ and $R7$.

The regulatory level (Fig. 1c) of the regulated metabolism introduces $d = 2$ regulatory proteins: $\mathcal{P} = \{\text{RPcl}, \text{RPO2}\}$. Thus, the Boolean network f is of dimension $n = k + m + d = 14$. It consists of 14 functions (see Fig. 1c) which map a Boolean vector $x = (x_{\text{Carbon1}}, x_{\text{Carbon2}}, x_{\text{Oxygen}}, x_{\text{RPcl}}, x_{\text{RPO2}}, x_{\text{Tc1}}, x_{\text{Tc2}}, x_{\text{To2}}, x_{\text{Td}}, x_{\text{Te}}, x_{\text{Growth}}, x_{\text{Rres}}, x_{\text{R6}}, x_{\text{R7}}) \in \mathbb{B}^n$ to a Boolean value in \mathbb{B} . The local functions associated with regulatory proteins in \mathcal{P} involve only external metabolite variables. Among the 9 functions associated with reactions, only two (Tc2 , Rres) are non-constant: they involve the two regulatory proteins.

The influence graph of the network is shown in Fig. 1b. Only the shown nodes (RPcl , RPO2 , Tc2 , Rres) have a non-constant local function or are used in the local function of another node (Carbon1 , Oxygen). The influence graph shows the multi-layered regulations of the network: external input metabolites (Carbon1 , Oxygen) regulate regulatory proteins (RPcl , RPO2), which regulate reactions (Tc2 , Rres).

2.2 Dynamic rFBA

Flux Balance Analysis (FBA) [19] returns an *optimal* metabolic steady state, according to a given linear objective function in the reaction fluxes. In the following, we assume that the objective function is to maximize the flux through a reaction *Growth*. For regulated metabolic networks, the rFBA framework [9] allows defining a discrete time series of optimal steady states, where regulatory variables can force reaction fluxes to be zero and input metabolite concentrations define upper bounds on uptake fluxes.

Definition 5. *Let $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f)$ be a regulated metabolic network with flux bounds $l_r, u_r \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq l_r \leq u_r$, for $r \in \mathcal{R}$. A metabolic-regulatory steady state is a triple $(v, w, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{R}|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\text{Ext}|} \times \mathbb{B}^{|\text{Inp}|+|\mathcal{R}|+|\mathcal{P}|}$ such that*

- $S_{\text{Int}, \mathcal{R}} \cdot v = 0$,
- for each reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $l_r \cdot x_r \leq v_r \leq u_r \cdot x_r$,
- for each input metabolite $m \in \text{Inp}$ and each reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$ with $S_{mr} < 0$, $v_r \leq \text{uptake_bound}(w_m)$, where $\text{uptake_bound}(w_m)$ denotes the maximum flux through uptake reaction r , given the input metabolite concentration w_m .

Two successive metabolic-regulatory steady states (v^k, w^k, x^k) at time t^k , and $(v^{k+1}, w^{k+1}, x^{k+1})$ at time t^{k+1} , are linked by the following relations:

1. The external metabolite concentrations w^{k+1} are obtained from the previous concentrations w^k by assuming the constant uptake/secretion fluxes v^k for the whole time period $[t^k, t^{k+1}]$.
2. The Boolean state x^{k+1} is obtained by applying the regulatory function f to the binarized input metabolites concentrations $x'_{\text{Inp}} = \beta(w_{\text{Inp}}^{k+1})$ at time t^{k+1} , together with the binarized reaction fluxes $x'_{\mathcal{R}} = \beta(v^k)$ and the Boolean values $x'_{\mathcal{P}} = x_{\mathcal{P}}^k$ of the regulatory proteins at time t^k , *i.e.*,

$$x^{k+1} = f(x')$$

3. $(v^{k+1}, w^{k+1}, x^{k+1})$ is a metabolic-regulatory steady state maximizing the flux through the *Growth* reaction, *i.e.*, there is no metabolic-regulatory steady state (v', w^{k+1}, x^{k+1}) such that $v'_{\text{Growth}} > v_{\text{Growth}}^{k+1}$.

In this paper, we rely on the FLEXFLUX implementation of rFBA [18], which assumes a fixed time step τ between successive metabolic-regulatory steady states ($t^{k+1} - t^k = \tau$ for any k). The *Growth* reaction is assumed to reflect the growth of the cell. FLEXFLUX computes the evolution of the total biomass of the cell as $\text{biomass}^{k+1} = \text{biomass}^k \cdot e^{v_{\text{Growth}}^k \cdot \tau}$ (from a given initial biomass^0). The maximum uptake fluxes of input metabolites $m \in \text{Inp}$ at step k are defined as

$$\text{uptake_bound}(w_m) = w_m / (\text{biomass}^k \cdot \tau).$$


Finally, the update of the external metabolite concentrations is computed as

$$w_m^{k+1} = w_m^k - (S_{mr} v_r^k / v_{\text{Growth}}^k) \cdot (\text{biomass}^k - \text{biomass}^{k+1}),$$

where $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is the uptake/secretion reaction for the external metabolite m ($S_{mr} < 0$ or $S_{mr} > 0$), which is assumed to be unique.

An example of a dynamic rFBA simulation using FLEXFLUX of the regulated metabolic network of Fig. 1 is shown in Fig. 2. It uses a time step of $0.01h$ and is initialized with 100 mM of Oxygen, 20 mM of Carbon1 and 20 mM of Carbon2. The simulation shown in Fig. 2a is composed of 70 metabolic steady states. By applying the binarization β , these 70 metabolic steady states correspond to 5 different binarized metabolic steady states, which are shown in Tab. 1. These binarized metabolic steady states capture the main features of the simulation.

More precisely, the simulation shows that until $0.5h$ only Carbon1 and Oxygen are consumed to produce biomass. This corresponds to a first time period where the behavior of the system is monotone: the binarized metabolic steady states are equal on this time range. The presence of Carbon1 activates the regulatory protein RPcl inhibiting the reaction Tc2 according to the regulatory rules. At $0.5h$, Carbon1 is depleted and the current Boolean state $x \in \mathbb{B}^{15}$ is such that $x_{\text{Carbon1}} = 0$, $x_{\text{RPcl}} = 1$, $x_{\text{Tc2}} = 0$ (second qualitative behavior with equal binarization of the metabolic steady states). At $0.51h$, as shown in Fig. 2b, the Boolean state x is updated to x' so that the Boolean state of RPcl becomes $x'_{\text{RPcl}} = f_{\text{RPcl}}(x) = x_{\text{Carbon1}} = 0$. The Boolean state of Tc2 remains unchanged because $x_{\text{RPcl}} = 1$. No biomass is produced at $0.51h$. This corresponds to a



(a) Simulation showing the evolution of the concentrations of the external metabolites (Oxygen, Carbon1, Carbon2) and the production of biomass by the Growth reaction.

Time	External metabolites				Regulatory proteins		Reaction flows								
	w_{biomass}	w_{Carbon1}	w_{Carbon2}	w_{Oxygen}	x_{RPO2}	x_{RPcl}	v_{Tc1}	v_{Tc2}	v_{Te2}	v_{Td}	v_{Te}	v_{Growth}	v_{Rres}	v_{R6}	v_{R7}
0.49	17.05	2.95	20.0	82.95	0	1	10.5	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0
0.50	18.95	1.05	20.0	81.05	0	1	6.15	0.0	6.15	0.0	0.0	6.15	6.15	0.0	0.0
0.51	20.10	0.0	20.0	79.90	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.52	20.10	0.0	20.0	79.90	0	0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0
0.53	22.35	0.0	17.76	77.65	0	0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.5	0.0	0.0

(b) Focus on the times from 0.49h to 0.53h in the simulation, showing the switch from Carbon1 to Carbon2 for biomass production.

Fig. 2: Dynamic rFBA simulation of the regulated metabolic network in Fig. 1. The simulation is done with FLEXFLUX and is initialized with 100mM of Oxygen, 20 mM of Carbon1, and 20 mM Carbon2. The time step is set to 0.01h. The flux bounds are $\forall r \in \{\text{Tc1}, \text{Tc2}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 10.5)$, $\forall r \in \{\text{Td}, \text{Te}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 12.0)$, $\forall r \in \{\text{R6}, \text{R7}, \text{Rres}, \text{Growth}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 9999)$ and for Oxygen, $(l_r, u_r) = (0, 15.0)$.

third qualitative behavior. At 0.52h, the Boolean state x' is updated to x'' : all the node states remain unchanged except for $x''_{\text{Tc2}} = f_{\text{Tc2}}(x') = \neg x'_{\text{RPcl}} = 1$. This corresponds to a fourth qualitative behavior. The reaction Tc2 is not inhibited anymore, and biomass is produced due to the uptake of Carbon2 and Oxygen (through Tc2 , Growth and Rres) until Carbon2 depletion at $t = 0.59h$ (fifth qualitative behavior).

3 Boolean abstraction of dynamic rFBA

In the previous example, we illustrated how the simulation of a regulated metabolic network may generate time-periods for which the qualitative behavior is similar, meaning that the variation of all the metabolic variables is monotone and the Boolean values of the regulatory proteins are constant. In this section, we introduce a discrete definition of steady states to capture the monotone behaviors observed in rFBA simulations. This allows introducing a discretized form of

Time	External metabolites				Regulatory proteins		Reactions								
	w_{Biomass}	w_{Carbon1}	w_{Carbon2}	w_{Oxygen}	\bar{x}_{RPO2}	\bar{x}_{RPc1}	\bar{v}_{Tc1}	\bar{v}_{Tc2}	\bar{v}_{Tc2}	\bar{v}_{Td}	\bar{v}_{Te}	\bar{v}_{Growth}	\bar{v}_{Res}	\bar{v}_{R6}	\bar{v}_{R7}
0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
0.51	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0.52	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
0.59	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1: Binarization of the metabolic steady states of simulation in Fig. 2. It contains the binarized values of the metabolic steady state computed by the rFBA simulation. A timepoint t appears in the table if and only if the binarization of the simulated steady state is different from the binarized metabolic steady state of time $t - 1$.

rFBA, which will be used in the next section for the reverse-engineering framework.

3.1 Boolean metabolic steady states

Given a metabolic network $\mathcal{N} = (\text{Int}, \text{Ext}, \mathcal{R}, S)$, we derive a logical characterization of the notion of steady state, considering that reactions are either inactive or active, and metabolites either absent or present. This will result in a set of *Boolean* metabolic steady states that form an over-approximation of the continuous steady states.

We associate all reactions with propositional variables $\mathcal{V} = \{\bar{v}_r\}_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$. For each metabolite $m \in \text{Int} \uplus \text{Ext}$, we introduce a variable \bar{z}_m^+ as a Boolean abstraction of the production of m and a variable \bar{z}_m^- as a Boolean abstraction of the consumption of m :

$$\forall m \in \text{Int} \uplus \text{Ext}, \quad \bar{z}_m^+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{\substack{r \in \mathcal{R}, \\ S_{mr} > 0}} \bar{v}_r, \quad \bar{z}_m^- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigvee_{\substack{r \in \mathcal{R}, \\ S_{mr} < 0}} \bar{v}_r,$$

(where an empty disjunction is considered to be false.)

For each internal metabolite m , we introduce a variable \widehat{z}_m which is equal to 1 iff m is in a logical steady state:

$$\forall m \in \text{Int}, \quad \widehat{z}_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\bar{z}_m^+ \leftrightarrow \bar{z}_m^-).$$

For the external metabolites, we introduce propositional variables $\mathcal{V}_{\text{ext}} = \{\bar{z}_m\}_{m \in \text{Ext}}$ indicating whether or not m is present in the environment. The formula

$$\widehat{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{Ext}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_{m \in \text{Ext}} (\bar{z}_m^- \Rightarrow \bar{z}_m)$$

then states that an external metabolite can only be consumed if it is present in the environment.

Definition 6 (Boolean metabolic steady state). A Boolean metabolic steady state of a metabolic network $\mathcal{N} = (\text{Int}, \text{Ext}, \mathcal{R}, S)$ is a Boolean vector $\hat{v} \in \mathbb{B}^{|\text{Ext}|+|\mathcal{R}|}$ which is a satisfying assignment of the following logical steady state formula:

$$\hat{\mathcal{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{Ext}} \wedge \bigwedge_{m \in \text{Int}} \hat{z}_m$$

We denote by $\text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N}) \subseteq \mathbb{B}^{|\text{Ext}|+|\mathcal{R}|}$ the set of all the Boolean metabolic steady states of the metabolic network \mathcal{N} .

Property 1. For each metabolic-regulatory steady state (v, w, x) of the regulated metabolic network $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f)$, the binarized value $\beta(w, v)$ of the external metabolite concentrations w and the reaction fluxes v is a Boolean metabolic steady state, i.e., $\beta(w, v) \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N})$.

Note that the converse property is not true: since the logical characterization neglects the stoichiometry, Boolean metabolic steady states may have no real-valued counterpart.

Applied to the example, the internal metabolic constraints are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{z_A^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{Tc1}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Tc2}}}, & \overline{z_A^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{R6}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{R7}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}} \\ \overline{z_D^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{R6}}}, & \overline{z_D^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{Td}}}, & \overline{z_E^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{R7}}}, & \overline{z_E^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{Te}}} \\ \overline{z_{\text{O2}}^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{To2}}}, & \overline{z_{\text{O2}}^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}} \\ \overline{z_{\text{ATP}}^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{R6}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}}, & \overline{z_{\text{ATP}}^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}} \\ \overline{z_{\text{NADH}}^+} &= \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}}, & \overline{z_{\text{NADH}}^-} &= \overline{v_{\text{R7}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}} \end{aligned}$$

The logical steady state constraints equivalent to $\hat{\mathcal{N}} = 1$ are obtained by gathering constraints on internal and external metabolites:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{v_{\text{Tc1}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Tc2}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{R6}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{R7}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}} \\ \overline{v_{\text{R6}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{Td}}} & \overline{v_{\text{R7}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{Te}}} & \overline{v_{\text{To2}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}} \\ \overline{v_{\text{R6}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}} & \overline{v_{\text{R7}}} \vee \overline{v_{\text{Rres}}} &= \overline{v_{\text{Growth}}} \\ \overline{v_{\text{Tc1}}} &\Rightarrow \overline{z_{\text{Carbon1}}} & \overline{v_{\text{Tc2}}} &\Rightarrow \overline{z_{\text{Carbon2}}} & \overline{v_{\text{To2}}} &\Rightarrow \overline{z_{\text{Oxygen}}} \end{aligned}$$

From these equations, we deduce that there are 38 Boolean metabolic steady states for the example shown in Fig. 1. These Boolean metabolic steady states are detailed in Appendix A. Among them, we recover the five binarized metabolic-regulatory steady states (Table 1) appearing in the rFBA simulations of Fig.2.

3.2 Boolean dynamics

Using the logical characterization of metabolic steady states, we define a Boolean counterpart of dynamic rFBA (Sect. 2.2). A Boolean state of the regulated metabolic network $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f)$ assigns a Boolean value to external metabolites, reactions, and regulatory proteins, which gives a Boolean vector of dimension $n = k + m + d$. Such a Boolean state $x \in \mathbb{B}^n$ should match with a Boolean metabolic steady state. Denoting by $\mathcal{M} = \text{Ext} \cup \mathcal{R}$ the external metabolites and reactions, $x_{\mathcal{M}}$ should verify the Boolean metabolic steady state constraints

described in the previous section ($x_{\mathcal{M}} \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N})$). The general idea is then to capture the possible successions of such Boolean states, subject to the regulations through the regulatory proteins specified by the Boolean network f .

A key ingredient of dynamic rFBA is the objective function to maximize, typically the fluxes of reactions producing biomass. However, at the Boolean level, it is not possible to directly rank metabolic steady states according to their biomass production, as this will be either absent or present. Thus, a specific *Boolean objective function* has to be provided to score a Boolean metabolic steady state. This takes the form of a function \hat{o} mapping Boolean metabolic steady states to natural numbers: $\hat{o} : \mathbb{B}^{k+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$. The Boolean dynamics will only select Boolean metabolic steady states maximizing this supplied objective.

When considering possible next states, it is crucial to account for those where the input metabolites change their value. Hereafter, we consider any possible change.

The Boolean dynamic rFBA is formalized by a function $\text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \hat{o})}^{\mathbb{B}}$ which associates any Boolean state of the regulated metabolic network to a set of admissible next states:

Definition 7 (Boolean dynamic rFBA: $\text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \hat{o})}^{\mathbb{B}} : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{B}^n}$). For any Boolean states $x, y \in \mathbb{B}^n$, $y \in \text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \hat{o})}^{\mathbb{B}}(x)$ if and only if for $x' = (y_{\text{Inp}}, x_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{P}}) \in \mathbb{B}^n$,

1. the values of the regulatory proteins are computed synchronously from x' according to f : $y_{\mathcal{P}} = f_{\mathcal{P}}(x')$,
2. y matches with a Boolean metabolic steady state: $y_{\mathcal{M}} \in Z(x')$, and
3. the matching Boolean metabolic steady state maximizes the supplied objective function: $\forall y'_{\mathcal{M}} \in Z(x'), \hat{o}(y_{\mathcal{M}}) \geq \hat{o}(y'_{\mathcal{M}})$.

Here $Z(x') = \{z \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N}) \mid z_{\text{Inp}} = x'_{\text{Inp}}, z_{\mathcal{R}} \preceq f_{\mathcal{R}}(x')\}$ is the set of Boolean metabolic steady states that match with the value of external metabolites and with the regulations from x' .

Let us consider the regulated metabolic network from Fig. 1. It appears that the steady states maximizing the growth maximize the input fluxes. Thus, we set the Boolean objective function \hat{o} as the sum of input reactions:

$$\hat{o}(x) = x_{\text{Tc1}} + x_{\text{Tc2}} + x_{\text{To2}} .$$

Consider the Boolean state from Table 1 at time 0, which we name x , and the next Boolean state at time 0.51, which we name y , with the same input metabolite values ($x_{\text{Inp}} = y_{\text{Inp}}$). Using the notation from the above definition, we set $x' = x$. Imagine the case where no reaction is regulated, i.e., the regulatory BN is of the form $f'_r(x) = 1$ for every $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Among the Boolean metabolic steady states z matching the input values ($z_{\text{Inp}} = x'_{\text{Inp}}$), the ones that maximize \hat{o} always verify $z_{\text{Tc2}} = 1$ (Boolean metabolic steady states 26, 29, 32, 38 in the Table 3 in Appendix A), which does not match with y . Thus y would not be an admissible next state.

Considering now the regulatory BN f of Fig. 1, we obtain $f_{\text{Tc2}}(x') = \neg x'_{\text{RPcl}} = 0$ and for each other reaction $r \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\text{Tc2}\}$, $f_r(x') = 1$. The set $Z(x')$ contains 4 matching optimal Boolean steady states (rows 25, 28, 31, 37 of Table A.3), among them the one matching with y . Thus $y \in \text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \delta)}^{\mathbb{B}}(x)$.

Let x be now the Boolean state at time 0.1, and y the next Boolean state at time 0.51, where the input metabolites have a different state (Carbon1 switched to 0). Let x' be equal to x except for the input metabolites, which are equal to y_{Inp} . We obtain that $f_{\text{RPO2,RPcl}}(x') = (\neg x'_{\text{Oxygen}}, x'_{\text{Carbon1}}) = (0, 0) = y_{\text{RPO2,RPcl}}$. Moreover, $f_{\text{Tc2}}(x') = \neg x'_{\text{RPcl}} = 0$ and for each other reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$, $r \neq \text{Tc2}$, $f_r(x') = 1$. In this case, there is only one Boolean metabolic steady state z such that $z_{\text{Inp}} = x'_{\text{Inp}}$ and $z_{\mathcal{R}} \preceq f_{\mathcal{R}}(x')$. It appears that it matches with y , i.e., $z = y_{\mathcal{M}}$; thus $y \in \text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \delta)}^{\mathbb{B}}(x)$.

4 Inference of regulations from rFBA time series

Given sequences of metabolic-regulatory steady states obtained by dynamic rFBA from a ground-truth regulated metabolic network under different conditions, our objective is to infer all the regulatory Boolean networks that can reproduce the observed behaviors. Besides the ground-truth model, the inference may suggest alternative regulatory logics.

Definition 8 (Search domain for BNs). *The search domain for BNs, denoted by \mathbb{F} , is constrained by an influence graph \mathcal{G} : any candidate $f \in \mathbb{F}$ should satisfy $G(f) \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, i.e. uses at most the influences allowed in \mathcal{G} . Moreover, we assume that f is locally monotone.*

Typically, \mathcal{G} contains the putative influences from and to regulatory proteins. In our case study, \mathcal{G} is obtained from the ground-truth regulatory model f° by “forgetting” the sign of influences (for each $(i, s, j) \in G(f^\circ)$, $\{(i, +, j), (i, -, j)\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$), and adding putative influences.

Our inference problem mixes both linear constraints for characterizing the optimal steady states of the metabolic network with Boolean constraints for characterizing the value changes of regulatory proteins. To express the inference problem, we rely on the Boolean abstraction of dynamic rFBA presented in the previous section .

4.1 Approximation as a Boolean satisfiability problem

We propose a relaxation of the inference problem by the means of the Boolean dynamic rFBA interpretation given in Sect. 3.

Inputs of the relaxed inference problem. The inputs of the problem are **(i)** a metabolic network \mathcal{N} and a set of regulatory proteins \mathcal{P} , **(ii)** sequences of metabolic-regulatory steady states, represented by sets of pairs (s^t, s^{t+1}) , with $s^t = (v^t, w^t, x^t)$ $s^{t+1} = (v^{t+1}, w^{t+1}, x^{t+1})$ following the notation from Def. 5: the

observed changes of metabolic-regulatory steady states are given as $T \subseteq \mathbb{S} \times \mathbb{S}$ with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}^{|\text{Inp}|+|\mathcal{R}|} \times \mathbb{B}^{|\mathcal{RPs}|}$, **(iii)** a domain of putative regulatory BNs \mathbb{F} of dimension $n = |\text{Inp}| + |\mathcal{R}| + |\mathcal{P}|$, **(iv)** a Boolean state objective score $\hat{o} : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$.

Relaxed inference problem The relaxed inference problem consists then in identifying the $f \in \mathbb{F}$ such that for each $(s, s') \in T$,

$$\beta(s') \in \text{next}_{(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{P}, f, \hat{o})}^{\mathbb{B}}(\beta(s)).$$

Formulation as a satisfiability problem. Relying on the Boolean dynamic rFBA abstraction, the inference problem boils down to a satisfiability problem in propositional Boolean logic using two levels of quantifiers (2-QBF):

$$\begin{aligned} \exists f \in \mathbb{F}, \forall (s, s') \in T, \exists y \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N}), y_{\text{Inp}} = x'_{\text{Inp}}, y_{\mathcal{P}} = f_{\mathcal{P}}(x'), y_{\mathcal{R}} \preceq f_{\mathcal{R}}(x'), \\ \forall z \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N}), (z_{\text{Inp}} \neq x'_{\text{Inp}} \vee z_{\mathcal{P}} \neq f_{\mathcal{P}}(x') \vee z_{\mathcal{R}} \not\preceq f_{\mathcal{R}}(x') \vee \hat{o}(z) \leq \hat{o}(y)) \end{aligned}$$

with $x' \in \mathbb{B}^n$ defined as $x'_{\text{Inp}} = \beta(s')_{\text{Inp}}$ and $x'_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{P}} = \beta(s)_{\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{P}}$.

Note that without the Boolean optimization criteria \hat{o} (equivalently $\hat{o}(z) = c$), the problem reduces to a SAT problem where the only constraints relate to the local functions of the regulatory proteins:

$$\exists f \in \mathbb{F}, \exists y \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N}), y_{\text{Inp}} = x'_{\text{Inp}}, y_{\mathcal{P}} = f_{\mathcal{P}}(x')$$

Indeed, $y_{\mathcal{R}} \preceq f_{\mathcal{R}}(x')$ is always verified whenever $f_r(x) = 1$ for each $r \in \mathcal{R}$.

Since the Boolean dynamic rFBA gives an over-approximation of metabolic steady states, and even assuming that the Boolean objective function \hat{o} matches with the optimal metabolic steady states, our formulation leads to an approximation of admissible regulatory BN f : it may happen that a spurious Boolean metabolic steady state (having no real counter part) has a strictly higher value with \hat{o} than non-spurious ones.

4.2 Implementation in Answer-Set Programming

Answer-Set Programming (ASP) [1,12] is a declarative framework allowing solving combinatorial satisfaction problems. It relies on the stable model semantics [10]. The basic idea of ASP is to express a problem in a logical format so that the (logic) models of its representation provide the solutions to the original problem. Problems are expressed as logic programs (first order logic predicates expressed with rules with the shape **<head> :- <body> .**). Stable models of the logic programs are referred to as *answer sets*. Although determining whether a program has an answer set is the fundamental decision problem in ASP, modern ASP solvers like clingo [13] support various combinations of reasoning modes, among them, regular and projective enumeration, intersection and union, multi-criteria optimization and subset minimal and maximal model enumeration [15].

The stable model semantics of ASP combined with disjunctive programming are the key ingredients that enable expressing two quantification levels Boolean

formulas (2-QBF problem), *i.e.* $\exists x, \forall y, \phi(x, y)$ where $\phi(x, y)$ is a quantifier-free propositional formula (Σ_2^P -complete) [10]. The encoding of 2-QBF relies on the so-called *saturation technique* [11,14]. Essentially, for fixed x and y , the encoding ensures that a maximal (saturated) answer-set is returned if and only if $\phi(x, y)$. Thus, whenever there exists y such that $\phi(x, y)$ does not hold (counter-example), a smaller answer-set is returned. Following the subset-minimal stable semantics, the 2-QBF problem is satisfiable if and only if only saturated answer-set are subset-minimal.

Our implementation of the Boolean dynamic rFBA inference problem is available at <https://github.com/bioasp/boolean-caspo-flux>. We rely on the solver CLINGO [13], which enables an efficient enumeration of compatible BNs f . Moreover, it gives the possibility to project the solution on each node of the BN, *i.e.* enumerating only the local functions of a given node. This is particularly handy to capture a large set of solutions: by enumerating the solutions node per node, we can approximate the solution space by their Cartesian product.


5 Case study

Considering the regulated metabolic network from Fig. 1, six experiments were designed to reproduce the simulations studied in [9]. Each experiment is based on a different set $A \subseteq \text{Inp} = \{\text{Carbon1}, \text{Carbon2}, \text{Oxygen}\}$ of initially available input metabolites. The initialisation of each experiment is detailed in Table 3a. For instance, Experiment 1 is initialized by assuming that all input metabolites ($\{\text{Carbon1}, \text{Carbon2}, \text{Oxygen}\}$) are available. Experiment 2 assumes that $\{\text{Carbon1}, \text{Carbon2}\}$ are present at initialization but not Oxygen.

The search domain \mathbb{F} for the inferred BNs is delimited by the influence graph \mathcal{G} of Fig. 3b. Because the influence graph $G(f)$ of the ground truth BN f is

Experiment	Input Metabolite			Regulatory Protein	
	\bar{x}_{Carbon1}	\bar{x}_{Carbon2}	\bar{x}_{Oxygen}	\bar{x}_{RPcl}	\bar{x}_{RPO2}
1	1	1	1	1	0
2	1	1	0	1	1
3	0	1	0	0	1
4	1	0	0	1	1
5	1	0	1	1	0
6	0	1	1	0	0

(a) Initial states of the six rFBA simulations used to create the dataset for the case study.



(b) Influence graph \mathcal{G} delimiting the domain of putative regulatory BNs \mathbb{F} . Nodes without in-going or out-going edges are not represented. Black regular tipping arrows are unsigned edges, *i.e.* both positive and negative edges.

Fig. 3: Input data for the case study. The table (a) summarizes the experimental conditions used to generate the input simulations. The figure (b) shows the influence graph delimiting the domain of search for the inference problem.

	$f_{\text{RPO2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{RPcl}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Tc1}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Tc2}}(x)$	$f_{\text{Rres}}(x)$	Subset minimal	Ground truth
Model 1	$\neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$	x_{Carbon1}	1	$\neg x_{\text{RPcl}}$	1	✓	
Model 2	$\neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$	x_{Carbon1}	1	$\neg x_{\text{RPcl}}$	$\neg x_{\text{RPO2}}$		✓
Model 3	$\neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$	x_{Carbon1}	x_{RPcl}	$\neg x_{\text{RPcl}}$	1		
Model 4	$\neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$	x_{Carbon1}	x_{RPcl}	$\neg x_{\text{RPcl}}$	$\neg x_{\text{RPO2}}$		

Table 2: Inferred models having subset minimal local functions. Not shown local functions ($f_{\text{Carbon1}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Carbon2}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Oxygen}}(x)$, $f_{\text{To2}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Td}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Te}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Growth}}(x)$, $f_{\text{R6}}(x)$, $f_{\text{R7}}(x)$) are set to 1.

included in \mathcal{G} , $f \in \mathbb{F}$. Moreover, \mathbb{F} contains all the BNs such that $\forall i \in \text{Inp} \cup \mathcal{R} \setminus \{\text{Tc1}, \text{Tc2}, \text{Rres}\}$, $f_i(x) = 1$, and where f_{RPcl} can depend on Carbon1, Carbon2, Tc1, and Tc2; f_{RPO2} can depend on Oxygen, Rres; f_{Tc1} and f_{Tc2} can depend on RPcl; and f_{Rres} can depend on Rres. Overall, \mathbb{F} contains 1 944 320 BNs.

For each experiment, we used FLEXFLUX with an initial *biomass* value of 0.1, a time step of 0.01 to simulate the system behavior. Each of the 6 simulations has 200 metabolic steady states. For a given experiment initialized with the external metabolite values (\bar{z}_{Carbon1} , \bar{z}_{Carbon2} , \bar{z}_{Oxygen}), regulatory proteins were initialized such that $x_{\text{RPcl}} = \bar{z}_{\text{Carbon1}}$ and $x_{\text{RPO2}} = \neg \bar{z}_{\text{Oxygen}}$ (Table 3a). Each simulation $S = \{(v, w, x)_0, \dots, (v, w, x)_{200}\}$ contained 201 continuous metabolic-regulatory steady states (1 for the initialisation and 200 for the simulation). The simulations were then binarized as $S^{\mathbb{B}} = \{(\bar{v}_t, \bar{z}_t) = \beta((v_t, w_t)) \mid \forall v_t \in S\}$, and consecutive identical Boolean states were removed. Table 1 shows the binarized metabolic-regulatory steady states from the simulation of the first experiment. From the 201 initial continuous metabolic steady states, 5 Boolean metabolic-regulatory steady states are remaining corresponding to the time steps $\{0, 1, 51, 52, 59\}$. See Table 4 in Appendix B for the obtained states in each simulation.

To solve the inference problem, one must supply an objective function \hat{o} . Given the set of input metabolites $\text{Inp} = \{\text{Carbon1}, \text{Carbon2}, \text{Oxygen}\}$, the objective function was defined as $\forall x \in \text{MSS}^{\mathbb{B}}(\mathcal{N})$, $\hat{o}(x) = \sum_{e \in \text{Inp}} x_e$. This function was motivated by the fact that maximization of biomass production often corresponds to the maximisation of inputs according to the QSS constraints. Therefore, if an available input metabolite is not used in the observed Boolean metabolic network, then it must be explained by at least one regulation. This objective function allows to capture more refined behaviors at the discrete level than a usual biomass optimization function which may be too rough when we consider discretized values.

Applying the constraints described before allows inferring 40 models. All these models share 3 local functions whose value is not 1 ($f_{\text{RPO2}}(x)$, $f_{\text{RPcl}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Tc2}}(x)$), 9 local functions set to 1 ($f_{\text{Carbon1}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Carbon2}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Oxygen}}(x)$, $f_{\text{To2}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Td}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Te}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Growth}}(x)$, $f_{\text{R6}}(x)$, $f_{\text{R7}}(x)$) and 2 functions which can be both set to 1 or different from 1. The 4 smallest inferred models are described in Table 2. Each local function f_i of these 4 models is contained in the local function f_i of the 36 others models. Note that the ground truth, *i.e.* the model used to generate the input data, is correctly inferred (model 2).

Adding the subset minimal constraint infers the model 1. The two functions ($f_{\text{Rres}}(x)$, $f_{\text{Tc1}}(x)$) are set to 1 due to the subset minimal constraint. The inferred

model is thus $f_{\text{RPO}_2}(x) = \neg x_{\text{Oxygen}}$, $f_{\text{RPcl}}(x) = x_{\text{Carbon1}}$, $f_{\text{Tc2}}(x) = \neg x_{\text{RPcl}}$ and all the others local functions are set to 1. Note that only $f_{\text{Rres}}(x)$ differs between the inferred subset minimal model and the ground truth model.

In order to check whether the regulated metabolism model inferred by our approach (model 1 in nTable 2) could be considered as an alternative to the original one, we performed an rFBA simulation of the inferred regulated metabolism model (*i.e.* without the regulation on the reaction *Rres*) according to the six experimental conditions described in Table 3a. We observed that these quantitative time-series simulations were strictly identical to the simulations of the toy example used to generate the dataset. This suggests that the regulation on *Rres* is not necessary to explain the dataset. The proposed model allows to fully infer all the needed regulations and can be considered as the simplest regulated metabolic model matching with the experimental conditions of Table 3a. Already in [9], the authors recognize that, unlike others regulations, *Rres* “regulation is not necessary for the solution” . The regulation is biologically present only to ensure that unnecessary enzymes decay. However, since enzyme concentrations are not explicitly represented in the rFBA framework, the dataset does not reflect this biologic behavior, making it impossible to infer properly the regulation. Taking into account enzymes, using methods such as r-deFBA [17], should allow to solve this issue. However, the inference approach will also have to be adapted to this kind of extended metabolic modeling approaches.

6 Discussion

We proposed a framework to infer Boolean rules for the regulation of a metabolic network. The formulation of dynamic rFBA as sequences of steady states of the regulated metabolic network enables inferring the Boolean rules from time series under multiple conditions. A proof of concept was performed on the simulation of the diauxic shift in carbon metabolism on a small model.

Our method builds on a Boolean abstraction of the dynamic rFBA framework. It enables a formulation of the inference problem as a pure Boolean satisfiability problem using 2 levels of quantifiers, which can be efficiently solved using Answer-Set Programming. One important parameter of the abstraction is the Boolean objective function, which aims at identifying Boolean metabolic steady states that match with the optimal real-valued ones. This function is currently specified manually, from expertise on the network. Future work may explore how to derive it automatically. An alternative direction is to solve directly the inference problem by mixing linear programming and Boolean constraints.

Several perspectives are available from this first approach. First, all regulations were considered as synchronous, which is obviously not the case *in vivo*, where regulations are activated in a stochastic way. Second, the activation and degradation times of the regulatory and enzymatic proteins are not taken into account. Moreover, the regulations are considered here as binary. But, we already know that metabolism proceeds by finer regulations than what we proposed here, as captured for instance by the regulatory dynamic enzyme-cost FBA [17].

References

1. Baral, C.: Knowledge Representation, Reasoning and Declarative Problem Solving. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA (2003)
2. Bernot, G., Comet, J.P., Richard, A., Guespin, J.: Application of formal methods to biological regulatory networks: extending thomas' asynchronous logical approach with temporal logic. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **229**(3), 339–347 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2004.04.003>
3. Buescher, J.M., Liebermeister, W., Jules, M., Uhr, M., Muntel, J., Botella, E., Hessling, B., Kleijn, R.J., Chat, L.L., Lecointe, F., Mader, U., Nicolas, P., Piersma, S., Rugheimer, F., Becher, D., Bessieres, P., Bidnenko, E., Denham, E.L., Dervyn, E., Devine, K.M., Doherty, G., Drulhe, S., Felicori, L., Fogg, M.J., Goelzer, A., Hansen, A., Harwood, C.R., Hecker, M., Hubner, S., Hultschig, C., Jarmer, H., Klipp, E., Leduc, A., Lewis, P., Molina, F., Noirot, P., Peres, S., Pigeonneau, N., Pohl, S., Rasmussen, S., Rinn, B., Schaffer, M., Schnidder, J., Schwikowski, B., Dijn, J.M.V., Veiga, P., Walsh, S., Wilkinson, A.J., Stelling, J., Aymerich, S., Sauer, U.: Global network reorganization during dynamic adaptations of bacillus subtilis metabolism. *Science* **335**(6072), 1099–1103 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1206871>
4. Chaves, M., Oyarzún, D.A., Gouzé, J.L.: Analysis of a genetic-metabolic oscillator with piecewise linear models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **462**, 259–269 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2018.10.026>
5. Chaves, M., Tournier, L., Gouzé, J.L.: Comparing boolean and piecewise affine differential models for genetic networks. *Acta Biotheor* **58**(2-3), 217–232 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10441-010-9097-6>
6. Chevalier, S., Froidevaux, C., Pauleve, L., Zinovyev, A.: Synthesis of boolean networks from biological dynamical constraints using answer-set programming. In: 2019 IEEE 31st International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI). IEEE (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1109/ictai.2019.00014>
7. Covert, M.W., Knight, E.M., Reed, J.L., Herrgard, M.J., Palsson, B.O.: Integrating high-throughput and computational data elucidates bacterial networks. *Nature* **429**(6987), 92–96 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02456>
8. Covert, M.W., Palsson, B.Ø.: Transcriptional regulation in constraints-based metabolic models of Escherichia coli. *J Biol Chem* **277**(31), 28058–28064 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1462-2920.2002.00282.x>
9. Covert, M.W., Schilling, C., Palsson, B.: Regulation of gene expression in flux balance models of metabolism. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **213**(1), 73–88 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1006/jtbi.2001.2405>
10. Eiter, T., Gottlob, G.: On the computational cost of disjunctive logic programming: Propositional case. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* **15**(3-4), 289–323 (sep 1995). <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf01536399>
11. Eiter, T., Ianni, G., Krennwallner, T.: Answer Set Programming: A Primer, pp. 40–110. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg (2009). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-03754-2_2
12. Gebser, M., Kaminski, R., Kaufmann, B., Schaub, T.: Answer Set Solving in Practice. Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning, Morgan and Claypool Publishers (2012)
13. Gebser, M., Kaminski, R., Kaufmann, B., Schaub, T.: Clingo = ASP + control: Preliminary report. *CoRR* **abs/1405.3694** (2014)


14. Gebser, M., Kaminski, R., Schaub, T.: Complex optimization in answer set programming. *Theory and Practice of Logic Programming* **11**(4-5), 821–839 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1471068411000329>
15. Gebser, M., Kaufmann, B., Romero, J., Otero, R., Schaub, T., Wanko, P.: Domain-specific heuristics in answer set programming. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* **27**(1) (Jun 2013), <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/8585>
16. de Jong, H.: Modeling and simulation of genetic regulatory systems: A literature review. *Journal of Computational Biology* **9**, 67–103 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1089/10665270252833208>
17. Liu, L., Bockmayr, A.: Regulatory dynamic enzyme-cost flux balance analysis: A unifying framework for constraint-based modeling. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **501**, 110317 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2020.110317>
18. Marmiesse, L., Peyraud, R., Cottret, L.: FlexFlux: combining metabolic flux and regulatory network analyses. *BMC Systems Biology* **9**(1) (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12918-015-0238-z>
19. Orth, J.D., Thiele, I., Palsson, B.Ø.: What is flux balance analysis? *Nat Biotechnol* **28**(3), 245–248 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1614>
20. Ostrowski, M., Paulevé, L., Schaub, T., Siegel, A., Guziolowski, C.: Boolean network identification from perturbation time series data combining dynamics abstraction and logic programming. *Biosystems* **149**, 139–153 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystems.2016.07.009>
21. Oyarzún, D.A., Chaves, M., Hoff-Hoffmeyer-Zlotnik, M.: Multistability and oscillations in genetic control of metabolism. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **295**, 139–153 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2011.11.017>
22. Razzaq, M., Paulevé, L., Siegel, A., Saez-Rodriguez, J., Bourdon, J., Guziolowski, C.: Computational discovery of dynamic cell line specific boolean networks from multiplex time-course data. *PLOS Computational Biology* **14**(10), e1006538 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006538>
23. Saez-Rodriguez, J., Alexopoulos, L.G., Epperlein, J., Samaga, R., Lauffenburger, D.A., Klamt, S., Sorger, P.K.: Discrete logic modelling as a means to link protein signalling networks with functional analysis of mammalian signal transduction. *Mol Syst Biol* **5**(1), 331 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1038/msb.2009.87>
24. Tournier, L., Goelzer, A., Fromion, V.: Optimal resource allocation enables mathematical exploration of microbial metabolic configurations. *J. Math. Biol.* **75**(6-7), 1349–1380 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00285-017-1118-5>
25. Tsiantis, N., Balsa-Canto, E., Banga, J.R.: Optimality and identification of dynamic models in systems biology: an inverse optimal control framework. *Bioinformatics* **34**(14), 2433–2440 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty139>
26. Videla, S., Saez-Rodriguez, J., Guziolowski, C., Siegel, A.: caspo: a toolbox for automated reasoning on the response of logical signaling networks families. *Bioinformatics* p. btw738 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btw738>
27. Zañudo, J.G.T., Yang, G., Albert, R.: Structure-based control of complex networks with nonlinear dynamics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **114**(28), 7234–7239 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1617387114>

A Binarized metabolic steady state


	External metabolites			Reactions									Experimentation
	z_{Carbon1}	z_{Carbon2}	z_{Oxygen}	v_{Tc1}	v_{Tc2}	v_{To2}	v_{Td}	v_{Te}	v_{Growth}	v_{Res}	v_{R6}	v_{R7}	
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2, 3, 4
2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1, 5, 6
3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2, 3
4	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	2, 3
5	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1, 6
6	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1, 6
7	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	
8	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
9	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
10	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
11	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
12	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	4
13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
14	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
15	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	
16	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
17	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
18	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
19	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
20	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
21	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	2
22	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
23	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
24	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	
25	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
26	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	
27	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	
28	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	
29	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	
30	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
31	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
32	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	
33	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
34	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
35	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	
36	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
37	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
38	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	

Table 3: All the Boolean metabolic steady states admissible for the metabolic network \mathcal{N} show Fig. 1a. The external metabolite *Biomass* is not shown since its value can be both 0 and 1 for each Boolean metabolic steady state. The experimentation column indicates the numbers of the experiments where the Boolean metabolic steady states occurs.


B Experiments and simulations




(a) Simulation of experiment 1.




(b) Simulation of experiment 2.




(c) Simulation of experiment 3.



(d) Simulation of experiment 4.



(e) Simulation of experiment 5.



(f) Simulation of experiment 6.

Fig. 4: Simulation made with FLEXFLUX of the regulated metabolic network in Fig. 1 for each experiment (Table 3a). Time step is set to 0.01. Reaction domains are $\forall r \in \{\text{Tc1}, \text{Tc2}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 10.5)$, $\forall r \in \{\text{Td}, \text{Te}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 12.0)$, $\forall r \in \{\text{R6}, \text{R7}, \text{Rres}, \text{Growth}\}, (l_r, u_r) = (0, 9999)$ and for Oxygen, $(l_r, u_r) = (0, 15.0)$.

The same simulation graphs are obtained using the local function $f_{\text{Rres}} = \neg x_{\text{RPO2}}$ and $f_{\text{Rres}} = 1$.

Experiment	Time	External metabolites				Regulatory proteins		Reactions								
		\bar{z}_{Biomass}	\bar{z}_{Carbon1}	\bar{z}_{Carbon2}	\bar{z}_{Oxygen}	\bar{x}_{RPO2}	\bar{x}_{RPF1}	\bar{v}_{Tc1}	\bar{v}_{Tc2}	\bar{v}_{Td}	\bar{v}_{Te}	\bar{v}_{Growth}	\bar{v}_{Res}	\bar{v}_{R6}	\bar{v}_{R7}	
1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	51	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	52	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
2	59	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
	83	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	84	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
	97	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
4	83	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
	83	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
	51	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0

Table 4: All the different binarized metabolic steady states of each experiment. They are the input data used to solve the inference problem.