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1. Introduction

Metabolism and gene expression are two fundamental levels of cellular regulation. They are tightly interconnected, as gene expression can impact metabolic activity through changes in enzyme concentrations and, conversely, metabolic species can control gene transcription and modulate enzyme expression. These two levels have specific functions and properties, and it remains a challenge to identify the properties that emerge from their interaction (Kotte et al., 2010; Yeang, 2010). Metabolic-genetic interactions can lead to a diverse range of dynamic behaviors, each one of which defines a specific metabolic phenotype. Our understanding of natural regulatory circuits is important not only for revealing the design principles that underlie observed metabolic dynamics, but also for our ability to design circuits that enable new phenotypes (Fung et al., 2005).

A number of recent studies have demonstrated the importance of crosstalk interactions between genetic and metabolic systems. For example, the works in Bettenbrock et al. (2006), Goelzer et al. (2008) developed integrated metabolic-genetic models for catalytic repression in Escherichia coli and the central metabolism of Bacillus subtilis, respectively, whereas transcriptional regulatory principles were discussed in Kotte et al. (2010), Shlomi et al. (2007). These studies have focused on large scale models that allow for useful simulation-based predictions, but their complexity hinders the analysis of the mechanisms by which metabolic phenotypes emerge from the interconnection between the metabolic and genetic domains.

A specific metabolic phenotype depends on the regulatory topology, which defines which metabolites regulate which enzymes, and the regulatory logic, which specifies whether a metabolite activates or represses gene expression. The main objective of this paper is to investigate the phenotypes generated by a one-to-all regulatory topology under different configurations of activation and repression feedback loops.

In a one-to-all topology, a single metabolic species modulates the activity of all enzymes via metabolite-responsive transcription factors. One-to-all regulatory motifs are also referred to as “single input modules” and were identified as one of the building blocks in genome-wide bacterial networks (Shen-Orr et al., 2002). Metabolic networks under one-to-all transcriptional regulation appear in uptake and utilization/biosynthesis systems, whereby enzyme expression is controlled by intracellular metabolites, as in the case of the lactose operon (Yildirim and Mackey, 2003; Wong et al., 1997), and amino acid biosynthesis, e.g. the tryptophan operon (Santillán and Mackey, 2001) and the arginine synthesis network (Zaslaver et al., 2004).

We focus on a model that integrates classical kinetic equations for metabolite dynamics and piecewise affine (PA) differential
equations to describe switch-like transcriptional regulation exerted by the metabolite (Section 2). The metabolic subsystem describes the evolution of \( n \) metabolites through a chain of \((n+1)\) enzymatic reactions with a generic class of enzyme kinetics that includes Michaelis–Menten and Hill equation as special cases. The genetic circuit models enzyme concentrations in response to the back-fed metabolite and can account for any combination of activation or repression regulatory loops.

The use of PA models for biochemical systems was pioneered by Glass and Kauffman (1973) and has lead to a number of extensions (Edwards, 2000; Gouze and Sari, 2002; Casey et al., 2006; Veltingstad and Plahne, 2007) and the development of dedicated simulation tools (de Jong et al., 2004). They provide a convenient way of encoding switch-like regulation with a small parameter set (i.e. only expression rates and regulatory thresholds). The analysis of PA models, however, has been limited to purely genetic networks and their impact on protein concentrations. In this paper we develop a new framework to analyze a PA genetic system coupled with a metabolic network. Our specific goal is to identify what types of metabolic phenotypes can appear and how they depend on the gene regulatory circuit. The main contributions of this work are:

Model reduction and analysis: We show that under a time scale separation the complete system reduces to a planar PA system defined in three conic domains (Section 3). The conic geometry of the reduced system contrasts with PA systems for purely genetic systems (which are defined on rectangular grids, Glass and Kauffman, 1973; Gouze and Sari, 2002; Casey et al., 2006), and is a consequence of the metabolic-genetic crosstalk. The 3-cone model can be studied as a pair of 2-cone ones, and therefore we provide a rigorous analysis of a PA system in a 2-cone partition. To this end we use Filippov’s (1988) construction for discontinuous dynamical systems and establish geometric conditions for the existence of equilibria and limit cycles (Section 4).

Multistability and oscillatory behavior: We use the derived conditions to detect multiple equilibria and oscillations in the metabolic network subject to one-to-all transcriptional feedback (Section 5). The analysis suggests that one-to-all regulation can generate a wide range of metabolic phenotypes: mono-, multistability, and oscillatory behavior. For given metabolic network and regulatory logic, a particular phenotype appears as a function of gene expression parameters and enzyme degradation rates. We observe that under different activation or repression thresholds, the regulatory circuit can exhibit multiple equilibrium fluxes, whereas oscillatory behavior can emerge only under identical regulatory thresholds in two key reactions.

Operon regulation: We apply our methodology to the special case of bacterial operons, whereby a set of genes are collectively controlled by a single transcription factor (Section 6). The analysis predicts nutrient-induced bistability, which was experimentally observed in the lactose operon (Ozbudak et al., 2004), and also suggests the emergence of nutrient-induced oscillations.

2. Generic model for an unbranched metabolic network under transcriptional regulation

We consider an unbranched metabolic network under one-to-all transcriptional regulation from a metabolite. A schematic diagram of such class of networks is shown in Fig. 1A, where \( s_i \) denotes the concentration of the \( i \)th metabolite and \( v_i \) is the rate of the \( i \)th reaction (catalyzed by an enzyme with concentration \( e_i \)).

As a way of accounting for the mass exchange between the network and its environment, we assume that the metabolic substrate \( s_0 \) is constant. For the sake of generality, in this paper we deal with networks of \( n \) metabolites and \( n+1 \) enzymes regulated by metabolite \( s_{l-1} (l > 1) \). The rate of change of both metabolite and enzyme concentrations can be described by the differential equations:

\[
\dot{s}_i = v_i(s_{l-1}, e_i) - v_{i+1}(s_i, e_{i+1}),
\]

\[
\dot{e}_i = \kappa_i^0 + \kappa_i^1 \sigma_i(s_{l-1}, \theta_i) - \gamma_i e_i,
\]

where \( \kappa_i^0, \kappa_i^1, \theta_i, \gamma_i \) are positive parameters. The metabolic model (1) arises from the mass balance between the reactions that produce and consume \( s_i \), whereas the model for the enzyme concentrations (2) comes from the balance between protein synthesis and degradation (modeled as a linear process with kinetic constant \( \gamma_i \)). The constant \( \kappa_i^0 \) represents a basal expression level of protein \( e_i \), whereas \( \kappa_i^1 \) and the functions \( \sigma_i \) model the effect of the regulator on the synthesis rates.

The regulatory function \( \sigma_i(s_{l-1}, \theta_i) \) represents the lumped effect of gene expression control by a transcription factor, together with its interaction with the regulator \( s_{l-1} \). This kind of transcriptional regulation appears, for example, in bacterial uptake and utilization systems, whereby enzyme expression is controlled by metabolite-responsive transcription factors (Fig. 1B), e.g. the lactose operon (Yildirim and Mackey, 2003; Wong et al., 1997), and also in amino acid biosynthesis, e.g. the tryptophan operon (Santillan and Mackey, 2001) and arginine synthesis (Zaslaver et al., 2004).

We approximate the usual sigmoidal characteristic of transcriptional regulation (Yagil and Yagil, 1971; de Jong, 2002) by a step function; depending on whether gene expression is activated or repressed by \( s_{l-1} \), we assign \( \sigma_i = \sigma_i^+ \) or \( \sigma_i = \sigma_i^- = 1 - \sigma_i^+ \), respectively, with

\[
\sigma_i^+ (s_{l-1}, \theta_i) = \begin{cases} 
0, & s_{l-1} < \theta_i \\
1, & s_{l-1} > \theta_i
\end{cases}
\]
This class of regulatory functions is widely used in the analysis of genetic networks (Ropers et al., 2006; Casey et al., 2006) and was first suggested by Glass and Kauffman (1973). Under this regulatory model, genes can be switched ON or OFF depending on the metabolic regulator: in the OFF state gene $i$ is transcribed at a constitutive rate $k_i^0$ and the protein concentration will approach:

$$ E_{i}^\text{OFF} = k_i^0 / \gamma_i, $$

whereas in the ON state its transcription rate jumps to $k_i^0 + k_i^1$ and the concentration approaches:

$$ E_{i}^\text{ON} = (k_i^0 + k_i^1) / \gamma_i. $$

The enzyme kinetics are comprised in the reaction rates $v_i(s_{i-1}, e_i)$, and in the sequel we will not presuppose a specific form for them. Instead, to keep the analysis as general as possible, we make the following generic assumption on the enzyme kinetics.

**Assumption 1.** The metabolic reaction rates are linear in the enzyme concentrations and non-decreasing functions of the metabolite concentrations. The enzyme kinetics can then be written as:

$$ v_i(s_{i-1}, e_i) = g_i(s_{i-1}) e_i,$$

where $g_i$ is the enzyme turnover rate (i.e. the reaction rate per unit of enzyme concentration) and satisfies

$$ \frac{\partial g_i(s_{i-1})}{\partial s_{i-1}} \geq 0. $$

The monotonicity condition in (7) accounts for a broad class of saturable enzyme kinetics that includes, in particular, Michaelis-Menten and Hill kinetics (Cornish-Bowden, 2004). The saturable form of the enzyme kinetics limits the parameter space that yields a valid equilibrium. This is discussed in Appendix A. Our aim in the rest of the paper is to characterize the dynamic properties of the regulatory circuit, including the detection of multiple equilibria and oscillatory behavior.

3. **Model reduction**

3.1. **Quasi steady state approximation**

Metabolic dynamics operate in a much shorter time scale than their genetic counterpart (Alon, 2006). This property allows for the approximation of the nonlinear dynamics in (1) by an algebraic relationship between the enzymes and metabolite concentrations. If the metabolites are assumed to be in quasi steady state (QSS) with respect to the enzyme concentrations, then we set $s_i(t) = 0$ for all $t \geq 0$ to obtain

$$ g_i(s_{i-1}, t) := g_i(s_{i-1}) e_i(t) / e_i(t) = 0. $$

Eq. (8) holds for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots , n$ and hence it is equivalent to

$$ g_i(s_{i-1}, t) = g_i(s_0) e_i(t) / e_i(t) $$

for $i = 2, 3, \ldots , n$. The above is an algebraic equation for the metabolites as a function of the enzyme levels. The existence of a solution to (9) is discussed in Appendix A and depends on the initial conditions and the saturation values of the enzyme kinetics. From the approximation in (9), we can compute the trajectory of the regulator by solving the equation:

$$ g_i(s_{i-1}, t) = g_i(s_0) e_i(t) / e_i(t). $$

A key aspect of this approximation is that the solution of (10) depends only on two enzymes. The dynamics of the complete feedback system can thus be characterized with the 2-dimensional phase plane of the differential equations:

$$ \dot{e}_1 = k_1^0 + k_1^1 \sigma_1(s_{t-1}, \theta_t) - \gamma_1 e_1, $$

$$ \dot{e}_t = k_t^0 + k_t^1 \sigma_t(s_{t-1}, \theta_t) - \gamma_t e_t, $$

subject to $s_{t-1}$ satisfying (10). Note that in the case of product feedback ($s_{t-1} = s_n$), the above approximation also applies to reversible metabolic reactions.

3.2. **Reduction to a piecewise affine system in conic domains**

The algebraic equation in (10) can be interpreted as a mapping from $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$ to $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$, whereby each value of the regulator $s_{t-1}$ maps into a half-line in the $(e_1,e_t)$ plane. Moreover, as a consequence of the monotonicity of $g_i$, the partition of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ induced by the thresholds can be mapped into a partition of $\mathbb{R}^2_{>0}$: if $s_{t-1} < \theta_t$ then

$$ g_i(s_{t-1}) < g_i(\theta_t), $$

which combined with (10) yields

$$ e_t > \beta e_1, $$

with $\beta_i = g_i(s_0)/g_i(\theta_t)$. The relation in (13) defines a cone in the $x = (e_1,e_t)$ plane

$$ D_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0} : x_2 > \beta x_1 \}, $$

and we define its complementary cone as $\overline{D_1} = \mathbb{R}^2_{>0} \setminus (D_1 \cup S_1)$ with $S_1$ the half-line

$$ S_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2_{>0} : x_2 = \beta x_1 \}. $$

The half-line $S_1$ is a subset of the $(e_1,e_t)$ plane where the regulator reaches the switching threshold $\theta_t$. The dynamics of the reduced system in (11) depend on the value of $s_{t-1}$ with respect to the thresholds $\theta_1$ and $\theta_t$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\theta_1 < \theta_t$ (the problem can be treated analogously in the case $\theta_1 > \theta_t$, and the case $\theta_1 = \theta_t$ can be treated as later in Section 4). With the previous definitions we can establish the following relations:

$$ s_{t-1} < \theta_1 \implies x \in R_1, $$

$$ \theta_1 < s_{t-1} < \theta_t \implies x \in R_1 \cap S_1, $$

$$ s_{t-1} > \theta_t \implies x \in R_t, $$

where $R_1 = D_1$, $R_1 \cap S_1 = D_1 \cap D_t$, and $R_t = \overline{D_1}$. In the sequel we refer to $S_1$ as a switching domain, whereas the cones $R_i$ are called regular domains (see Casey et al., 2006 for detailed definitions). The system in (11) is equivalent to a piecewise affine (PA) system (Habets and van Schuppen, 2004) in three conic domains:

$$ x = h(x) - \Gamma x, $$

where

$$ h(x) = \begin{cases} h^1 & x \in R_1 \\ h^T & x \in R_1 \cap S_1 \\ h^t & x \in R_t \end{cases}, \quad \Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_1 & 0 \\ \gamma^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}. $$

The vectors $h^1$, $h^T$, and $h^t$ are constant and their values depend on whether $s_{t-1}$ activates or represses the expression of enzymes $e_i$. 
and $e_l$. For example, in the case of repression of both enzymes (i.e. $\sigma_1 = \sigma^-$ and $\sigma_l = \sigma^-$) we have

$$h^1 = \begin{bmatrix} k_0^1 + k_1^1 \\ k_0^1 + k_1^1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad h^2 = \begin{bmatrix} k_0^2 \\ k_0^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$  \tag{19}$$

whereas in the case of activation (i.e. $\sigma_1 = \sigma^+$ and $\sigma_l = \sigma^+$):

$$h^1 = \begin{bmatrix} k_0^1 \\ k_0^1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad h^2 = \begin{bmatrix} k_0^2 + k_1^2 + k_1^1 \\ k_0^2 + k_1^2 + k_1^1 \end{bmatrix}.$$  \tag{20}$$

These vectors determine the location of the focal points of the PA system, defined as

$$\phi^1 = \Gamma^{-1}h^1, \quad \phi^2 = \Gamma^{-1}h^2, \quad \phi^l = \Gamma^{-1}h^l.$$  \tag{21}$$

By definition the focal points are combinations of the ON and OFF enzyme concentrations in (4) and (5), and their particular location depends exclusively on the type of feedback regulation. Fig. 2 shows the possible locations of the focal points for each combination of transcriptional regulation. In what follows we will assume that the focal points do not lie in the switching domains. For any $\kappa(t_0)$ in a regular domain, e.g. $\kappa(t_0) \in R_1$, the right-hand side of (17) is well defined and its solution satisfies a standard affine differential equation, that is

$$\kappa(t) = \phi^1 + e^{t-t_0}(-\phi^1 - \kappa(t_0)), \quad t \geq t_0, $$  \tag{22}$$

so that $\kappa(t)$ monotonically approaches $\phi^1$, possibly reaching the switching domain $S_1$, where the vector field of (17) is not defined, and thus a specialized analysis is required. As we shall see in the next section, the location of the focal points plays a major role in the dynamics of (17).

4. Identical regulatory thresholds: the two cone case

We first focus on the case when the regulatory thresholds of enzymes $e_1$ and $e_l$ are identical. This case is simpler because if $\theta_1 = \theta_l$, the cone $R_{1l}$ in Fig. 2 vanishes and the system is defined only in two cones. In this section we state the fundamental properties of a 2-cone PA system, which we will use later (Section 5) for the more general 3-cone case that appears under different regulatory thresholds. Our analysis of the 2-cone problem has been partly reported in Oyarzú and Chaves (2011), and we have included the proofs in Appendix B.

Here we use a more general notation and consider the PA system:

$$\dot{x} = \begin{cases} f(x) & x \in D_f \\ g(x) & x \in D_g, \end{cases}$$  \tag{23}$$

with $f(x) = [f_1(x) f_2(x)]^T = h^f - \Gamma x$, and $g(x) = [g_1(x) g_2(x)]^T = h^g - \Gamma x$, respectively. The vectors $h^f$ and $h^g$ are entry wise nonnegative and in terms of the notation of (17), we have $h^f = h^1, h^g = h^l$ with focal points $\phi^f = \phi^1, \phi^g = \phi^l$, and two cones $D_f = R_1$ and $D_g = R_l$ separated by the half-line $S = S_1 = S_{\gamma}$, with slope $\beta = \beta_1 = \beta_l$. Previous studies of the 2-cone problem can be found in Giannakopoulos and Pliete (2001), but their results are limited to the case where $h^g = -h^l$, and therefore they are not directly applicable to our case.

4.1. Geometric definitions

For the forthcoming analysis it is convenient to define the sets:

$$\Omega^-_f = \{ x \in D_f \cup S : f_2(x) - \beta f_1(x) \leq 0 \},$$

$$\Omega^-_g = \{ x \in D_g \cup S : g_2(x) - \beta g_1(x) \leq 0 \},$$  \tag{24}$$

and $\Omega^+_f = (D_f \cup S) \Omega^-_f$, $\Omega^+_g = (D_g \cup S) \Omega^-_g$, respectively. Alternatively, we can construct these sets by defining the normal vector of $S$ as $\eta^1 = [-\beta 1]^T$, so that, for example, the set $\Omega^-_f$ contains all points satisfying $\langle f(x), \eta^1 \rangle \leq 0$, or equivalently $\langle \Gamma (x - \phi^1), \eta^1 \rangle \geq 0$. Analogous definitions can be constructed for the other sets in (24).

The boundary between $\Omega^-_f$ and $\Omega^+_f$ is the half-line

$$C_f = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ : \langle \Gamma (x - \phi^1), \eta^1 \rangle = 0 \},$$  \tag{25}$$

whereas the boundary between $\Omega^-_g$ and $\Omega^+_g$ is the half-line

$$C_g = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2_+ : \langle \Gamma (x - \phi^1), \eta^1 \rangle = 0 \}.$$  \tag{26}$$

The half-lines $C_f$ and $C_g$ are parallel with slope $\beta_1/\gamma$, and each one contains one of the focal points, i.e. $\phi^f \in C_f$ and $\phi^g \in C_g$. The
intersection points $x^f = C_f \cap S$ and $x^g = C_g \cap S$ have horizontal coordinates:

$$x^f_i = \langle h^f, \eta^+ \rangle_{\frac{g(\gamma_f - \gamma_1)}{b(\gamma_f - \gamma_1)}}$$

$$x^g_i = \langle h^g, \eta^+ \rangle_{\frac{g(\gamma_f - \gamma_1)}{b(\gamma_f - \gamma_1)}}$$

(27)

4.2. Solutions in the switching domain

The vector field of PA system (23) is discontinuous at the switching domain $S$, intuitively, the behavior of solutions at $S$ will depend on the relative direction of the vector fields $f$ and $g$ in a vicinity of $S$. Trajectories can cross between cones if the vector fields point in a similar direction, slide along the switching surface, and be repelled from $S$ if the vector fields point in opposite directions away from $S$. The last two cases are known as stable and unstable sliding motion along the switching surface, and (b) whether the focal points belong to or lie outside their respective regular domain. Point (a) can be resolved with the simple angle condition in Theorem 1, but the effect of (b) requires a more detailed analysis. Since there are two focal points, two cones, and two kinds of possible sliding motion, there are eight possible configurations, all of which are studied in the next sections.

Theorem 1 (Solutions in the switching domain). The solutions of (23):

(a) cross from $D_g$ to $D_f$ in the segment $L_{gd} = \Omega_f \cap \Omega_g \subseteq S$.
(b) cross from $D_f$ to $D_g$ in the segment $L_{sd} = \Omega_f \cap \Omega_g \subseteq S$.
(c) exhibit stable sliding motion in the segment $L_s = \Omega_f \cap \Omega_g^+ \subseteq S$.
(d) exhibit unstable sliding motion in the segment $L_u = \Omega_f^+ \cap \Omega_g \subseteq S$.

Moreover, define the angle $\theta_1 = \angle (h^f - h^g, \eta^+)$, then

$$L_T = \emptyset \iff \theta_1 \in \left[-\pi, -\frac{\pi}{2}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right].$$

(28)

$$L_s = \emptyset \iff \theta_1 \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

(29)

According to Theorem 1 the behavior of solutions in the switching domain depends essentially on the different intersections between the $\Omega$ sets; this can be seen in Fig. 3, whereby the sets $L_T$ and $L_s$ are the intersection between $S$ and the band generated by the half-lines $C_f$ and $C_g$. A necessary condition for sliding motion (stable or unstable) is therefore that the band between $C_f$ and $C_g$ intersects $S$ in the positive quadrant. Moreover, the geometry in Fig. 3 shows that at least one of the sets $L_T$ and $L_s$ must be empty, which precludes the existence of stable and unstable sliding motion in the same switching domain. We can distinguish between these two scenarios with the condition for $\theta_1$ in (28) and (29). The particular case when $\theta_1 = \pm \pi/2$ is not covered by Theorem 1, and will be treated later in Section 4.4.

4.3. Equilibria

The focal points are locally stable equilibria of the PA system provided that they belong to their respective cone, i.e. $\phi^f \in D_f$ or $\phi^g \in D_g$ (stability follows from $\gamma_f, \gamma_g > 0$). In this case the focal points are referred to as regular equilibria. However, when using Filippov's method (as we did in Theorem 1, see Appendix B.1), it is possible that the trajectories reach equilibria that lie in the switching domain, which are sometimes called singular equilibria (Casey et al., 2006).

The existence of regular and/or singular equilibria in the PA system depends on two aspects: (a) the existence of stable or unstable sliding motion along the switching surface, and (b) whether the focal points belong to or lie outside their respective regular domain. Point (a) can be resolved with the simple angle condition in Theorem 1, but the effect of (b) requires a more detailed analysis. Since there are two focal points, two cones, and two kinds of possible sliding motion, there are eight possible configurations, all of which are studied in the next sections.

4.3.1. Monostability with regular equilibrium

Four configurations are such that only one focal point is a regular equilibrium, for example, when $\phi^f, \phi^g \in D_f$ or $\phi^f, \phi^g \in D_g$. In each of these four cases (and regardless of whether the sliding motion is stable or unstable), the PA system is monostable with a regular equilibrium point.

4.3.2. Bistability with regular equilibria

Two configurations are such that both focal points are regular equilibria, that is, $\phi^f \in D_f$ and $\phi^g \in D_g$ with a stable sliding motion (i.e. $L_s \neq \emptyset$ because the angle $\theta_1$ satisfies condition (28)), or an unstable sliding motion ($L_s \neq \emptyset$ because the angle $\theta_1$ satisfies condition (29)). In these two cases, the PA system is bistable with two regular equilibria; see Fig. 4A and B.

4.3.3. Monostability with singular equilibria

In the remaining two configurations both focal points lie outside their regular domains, i.e. $\phi^f \in D_g$ and $\phi^g \in D_f$. In these cases the system has a subtler behavior that depends on the type of sliding motion in $S$. In case of stable sliding motion (Fig. 4C), the

![Fig. 3. Partition of the enzyme state space for PA system in two conic domains. Case with stable (A) and unstable (B) sliding motion; the cases shown are for degradation rates $\gamma_f > \gamma_g$.](image-url)
The system has a singular equilibrium, the location and stability of which are studied in the next result. On the contrary, when there exists an unstable sliding motion (Fig. 4D), solutions follow stable periodic orbits, which is a topic we leave for the next section.

**Theorem 2 (Singular equilibrium).** Assume that \( L_s \neq 0 \) and let \( L_f \) be the line containing \( f^f \) and \( f^g \) and \( \theta_2 = L_f - \phi^f, \eta^f \). The point

\[
\phi_s = L_s \cap L_f
\]

is a singular equilibrium of (23). Moreover, if

\[
\theta_2 \in \left( -\frac{\pi}{2}, -\frac{\pi}{2} \right) \cup \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi \right).
\]

then \( \phi_s \) is locally stable, and if

\[
\theta_2 \in \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, \pi \right),
\]

then \( \phi_s \) is unstable.

We can therefore check the existence of a singular equilibrium simply by locating the point \( \phi_s \), whereas its local stability can be graphically checked with the condition for angle \( \theta_2 \). The stable case is shown in Fig. 5A, and the case of an unstable singular equilibrium, shown in Fig. 5B, corresponds to the bistable scenario described earlier in Section 4.3.2 and shown in Fig. 4A. Moreover, in Fig. 5C we observe that \( L_s \cap L_g = \emptyset \) only when \( \phi^f, \phi^g \notin \phi^f \) or \( \phi^f, \phi^g \notin \phi^g \), and therefore Theorem 2 also accounts for the monostable case with regular equilibrium described earlier in Section 4.3.1. In the cases of Fig. 5B and C, solutions may slide along \( L_s \) but eventually escape to one of the regular domains.

**4.4. Oscillations**

If both focal points lie outside their domain and there is unstable sliding motion (as in Fig. 4D), trajectories starting in \( D_f \) can cross to \( D_g \) in the segment \( L_{fg} \), and can cross back to \( D_f \) in \( L_{gf} \). On the segment \( L_s \), the vector fields on both \( D_f \) and \( D_g \) point away from \( S \) and towards the interior of the domains, and therefore are pulled away from the switching domain. These qualitative observations suggest that trajectories can follow a periodic orbit around the
The focal points satisfying valid when means that trajectories starting on always has cross the switching domain only in the segments they hit the segment . These positivity conditions are met when (recall the expressions in (27)): \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_r, \quad \langle h^r, h^+ \rangle < 0, \quad \langle h^c, h^+ \rangle < 0, \) or \( \gamma_1 < \gamma_r, \quad \langle h^r, h^+ \rangle > 0, \quad \langle h^c, h^+ \rangle > 0. \) (33) (34)

Conditions (33) and (34) indicate that, depending on the balance between the degradation rates \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_r \), there are two different settings that can lead to oscillations. Later in Section 5.3 we will examine how Assumption 2 constrains the class of transcriptional feedback that can induce oscillations.

It should be also pointed out that if Assumption 2 is not satisfied then there are three possibilities: there is stable sliding motion (or no sliding motion), trajectories never cross the switching boundary (in case both crossing domains are empty), or trajectories can cross only in one direction (in case one crossing domain is nonempty). From the results in the previous section, in all these cases a periodic orbit is not possible and trajectories will converge to a stable equilibrium.

From Fig. 6 we observe that if the focal point \( \phi^f \) lies outside its regular domain (i.e. \( \phi^f \notin D_g \)), then \( \phi^f < \phi^f_1 \) and substituting the intersection point \( C_f \cap S = (x^f_1, b^f_1) \) for the function \( C_f (25) \) we get

\[ 0 = -\gamma_1 (b^f_1 - \phi^f_1) + \gamma_r (b^f_1 - \phi^f_1) > \beta (\gamma_1 - \gamma_r) (b^f_1 - \phi^f_1), \]

and therefore when \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_r \) we always have that \( x^f_1 > \phi^f_1 \). A similar argument shows that \( \phi^g \notin D_f \) and \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_r \) imply \( x^c_1 < \phi^g_1 \). We thus define the line segments:

\[ S^f = \{ x \in S : \ x_1 \in [\phi^f_1, x^f_1] \}, \]

\[ S^g = \{ x \in S : \ x_1 \in [x^g_1, \phi^g_1] \}, \]

and their projections onto the \( x_1 \) axis

\[ S^f_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \ x \in [\phi^f_1, x^f_1] \}, \]

\[ S^g_1 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R} : \ x \in [x^g_1, \phi^g_1] \}. \]

The segments \( S^f \) and \( S^g \) are shown in Fig. 6; their definition is valid when \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_r \), but analogous versions can be defined in the converse case \( \gamma_1 < \gamma_r \) (the only difference is that their limits need to be reversed). The region \( x_1 \in [\phi^f_1, \phi^g_1] \), shown as shaded area in Fig. 6, is an invariant set since at \( x_1 < \phi^f_1 \) (resp. \( x_1 > \phi^g_1 \)) one always has \( x_1 > 0 \) (resp. \( x_1 < 0 \)). Periodic solutions can therefore cross the switching domain only in the segments \( S^f \) and \( S^g \). This means that trajectories starting on \( x^c \in S^c \) will evolve in \( D_g \) until they hit the segment \( S^c_1 \), re-enter \( D_f \) and then return to the segment \( S^f \). By constructing the Poincaré map from \( S_f \) onto itself, we can prove the next result (details in B.3).

Theorem 3 (Stable periodic orbit). Under Assumption 2 and with the focal points satisfying \( \phi^g \in D_g \), \( \phi^g \in D_f \), the PA system has a unique stable limit cycle.

In all the previous results we have assumed that the region for sliding motion is a line segment, i.e. \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) are not isolated points. When the lines \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) coincide these segments collapse to the point \( L_1 = L_2 = \phi^g \). Recalling (27), \( C_1 \) and \( C_2 \) match when \( \langle h^r, h^+ \rangle = 0 \), which is equivalent to \( \beta \pi = \pm \pi / 2 \).

This is a somewhat special case that is not covered by Theorems 1–3. If at least one of the focal points lies in its regular domain, then the solutions behave as described in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. On the contrary, if both focal points lie outside their regular domains, they will reach a singular equilibrium. This is stated in the next result, which is a consequence of Theorem 3.

Corollary 1 (No sliding motion). If \( \phi^g \in D_g \), \( \phi^g \in D_f \), and the angle \( \beta \pi = \pm \pi / 2 \), then the point \( \phi^g \in (30) \) is a stable singular equilibrium of the PA system.

5. Detection of equilibria and oscillations

In the case of different regulatory thresholds \( (\theta_1 \neq \theta_1) \), the metabolic-genetic circuit can be reduced to a PA system defined in three cones (Section 3). Although this scenario is more complex than the 2-cone case, it can be analyzed by splitting the 3-cone problem into a pair of 2-cone ones. In the notation of Section 4, this approach translates into a 2-cone problem with:

\[ S = S_1 \] focal points \( \phi^1 = \phi^1, \] \( \phi^g = \phi^g \),

and another one with:

\[ S = S_2 \] focal points \( \phi^1 = \phi^1, \] \( \phi^g = \phi^g \).

The location of the focal points \( (\phi^1, \phi^g, \phi^f) \) depends on the regulatory logic and the protein degradation rates. However, from the different cases in Fig. 2 we see that, regardless of the feedback logic and protein degradation, one pair of focal points will share the vertical coordinate and another pair will share the horizontal coordinate. With this simple observation and the two angle conditions in Theorems 1 and 2 we can systematically detect all possible equilibria for any configuration of repression and activation feedback loops. In what follows we illustrate our approach: in Sections 5.1 and 5.2 we study two cases that exhibit monostability and bistability, respectively, whereas in Section 5.3 we examine which regulatory configurations can generate metabolic oscillations.

5.1. Single stable steady state

Consider the case \( \sigma = \sigma^\prime \) and \( \sigma = \sigma^\prime \), \( \theta_1 < \theta_1 \). We will show that this configuration has a single steady state regardless of the location of the focal points. The fact that the pair \( (\phi^1, \phi^g) \) share the horizontal coordinate, and \( (\phi^1, \phi^g) \) share the vertical one (see Fig. 2c), limits the possible configurations of equilibria. There are five possible configurations:

\[ (a) \] \( \phi^1 \in R_1, \phi^g \in R_1 \); \( \phi^1 \notin R_1 \); \( \phi^g \notin R_1 \); 
\[ (b) \] \( \phi^1 \in R_1, \phi^g \in R_1 \); 
\[ (c) \] \( \phi^1 \in R_1, \phi^g \notin R_1 \); 
\[ (d) \] \( \phi^g \in R_1, \phi^g \notin R_1 \); 
\[ (e) \] \( \phi^g \in R_1, \phi^g \notin R_1 \).

In cases (a)–(c), the focal point that lies in its own regular domain (that is, \( \phi^f \), \( \phi^g \) and \( \phi^f \) for cases (a), (b) and (c), respectively) is the only locally stable equilibrium (see discussion in Section 4.3.1). This equilibrium is also globally stable because, from any initial condition in \( \mathbb{R}^2_{+\infty} \), trajectories will eventually enter the cone that contains its own focal point, from where they cannot escape because each coordinate is strictly monotone.
In configuration (d) no focal point belongs to its own regular domain, and therefore the only option is to look for singular equilibria in $S_1$ or $S_\ell$. Denote the normal vectors to $S_1$ and $S_\ell$ as $\eta_1^f$ and $\eta_\ell^f$, respectively. For the 2-cone problem defined by $S_1$, we note that focal points $\phi^f = \phi^1$ and $\phi^\ell = \phi^\ell$ are aligned horizontally: we also have that

$$\angle (h^1 - h^\ell, \eta_1^f) \in \left[-\pi, -\frac{\pi}{2}\right),$$

and therefore the angle condition (28) in Theorem 1 indicates that $S_1$ can contain a region with stable sliding motion. If we define $L_\phi$ as the line segment containing $\phi^1$ and $\phi^\ell$, then from Theorem 2 we conclude that the point

$$\phi^1_1 = L_\phi \cap S_1$$

is a singular equilibrium; it is stable because the angle condition (31) is satisfied:

$$\angle (\phi^1 - \phi^\ell, \eta_1^f) \in \left[-\pi, -\frac{\pi}{2}\right).$$

For the pair of cones defined by $S_\ell$, the focal points $\phi^f = \phi^\ell$ and $\phi^\ell = \phi^\ell$ are aligned vertically. Moreover

$$\angle (h^\ell - h^\ell, \eta_\ell^f) \in \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, \pi\right].$$

which by Theorem 1 implies that $S_\ell$ also contains a region for sliding motion. However, in this case the line segment containing $\phi^\ell$ and $\phi^\ell$ does not intersect the switching domain $S_\ell$. Therefore, by Theorem 2, $S_\ell$ does not contain a singular equilibrium. We therefore conclude that $\phi^\ell_1$ is the only equilibrium of the system. Configuration (e) can be analyzed similarly show that it can only have one stable singular equilibrium in $S_\ell$.

Simulated trajectories of configuration (d) are shown in Fig. 7 for a system with $n=2$ metabolites and regulation from the product ($S_{n-1} = S_2$). We have deliberately used enzyme kinetics that are faster than protein degradation. To validate the effectivity of the timescale separation, the protein trajectories of the PA system (black) are shown together with those of the original system in (1) and (2) (without the QSS approximation, in blue). We are able to predict the equilibrium of both the original system and its PA reduction, located at $\phi^1_1$ (marked with a square in Fig. 7).

5.2. Bistability

Consider the case of positive regulation ($\sigma_1 = \sigma^+$ and $\sigma_\ell = \sigma^+$) with $\theta_1 < \theta_\ell$, and the focal points located as in Fig. 8. In the 2-cone problem for $R^1$ and $R^\ell$, we note that $\phi^f = \phi^1 \in R_1$ and $\phi^\ell = \phi^\ell \not\in R_1 \cup R_\ell$, and therefore $\phi^1$ is the only locally stable...
equilibrium. In the 2-cone problem for $R^T_i$ and $R^T_f$, both $\phi^f = \phi^T_f$ and $\phi^g = \phi^T_g$ lie outside their regular domains, and they are aligned vertically. The angle condition (28):

$$-\pi \leq \angle(h^{Tf}-h^{Tg},\eta^{Tf}) \leq -\frac{\pi}{2}$$

holds, and so by Theorem 1 the switching domain $S_1$ can contain a region with stable sliding motion. If we define $L_0$ as the line segment containing $\phi^T_f$ and $\phi^T_g$, then from Theorem 2 we conclude that the point

$$\phi^1_s = L_0 \cap S_1$$

is a singular equilibrium; it is stable because the angle condition (31) is satisfied:

$$\angle(\phi^T_f-\phi^T_g,\eta^T_f) \in \left[-\pi, -\frac{\pi}{2}\right].$$

We therefore conclude that the system has two locally stable equilibria located at $\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$. The simulation results in Fig. 8 verify our predictions, showing two sample trajectories that converge to the different equilibrium points (marked with squares).

5.3. Oscillations

A special feature of the 3-cone system is that its focal points are pairwise aligned vertically or horizontally (see Fig. 2). In view of the analysis in Section 4.4, two of the necessary conditions for oscillations in the 2-cone system are that (i) there exists unstable sliding motion in the switching domain and (ii) the focal points are located outside their regular domains. Once we split the 3-cone problem into a pair 2-cone ones, from Fig. 3 we see that if (ii) is satisfied and a pair of focal points are aligned vertically or horizontally, then the angle $\theta_1 \in [-\pi, -\pi/2) \cup (\pi/2, \pi]$ and so (i) cannot be satisfied because $L_0 = \emptyset$ (by Theorem 1).

The above discussion indicates that because the focal points in the 3-cone case are geometrically constrained, conditions (i) and (ii) cannot be simultaneously satisfied in any of the feedback configurations of Fig. 2. However, under equal regulatory thresholds ($\theta_1 = \theta_2$) the 3-cone problem reduces a 2-cone one with focal points ($\phi^1$ and $\phi^2$) that can be located anywhere in the positive quadrant, and hence oscillations are possible. The regulatory logic plays a critical role on the location of these two focal points. This is reflected in the next result, which identifies which regulatory configurations can lead to metabolic oscillations for different enzyme degradation rates.

**Corollary 2 (Metabolic oscillations).** Consider the 3-cone system in (17) with $\theta_1 = \theta_2$ and the focal points outside their regular domains ($\phi^1 \in R_2$ and $\phi^2 \in R_1$). The system exhibits a unique stable limit cycle if:

A. $\sigma_1 = \sigma^-, \sigma_f = \sigma^- \cdot \gamma_1 < \gamma_f$, or
B. $\sigma_1 = \sigma^+, \sigma_f = \sigma^+ \cdot \gamma_1 > \gamma_f$.

The proof of the above result has been omitted for brevity, but it follows directly from the conditions in Section 4.4. In terms of regulatory logic, Corollary 2 indicates that there are only two scenarios where oscillations can appear (these are the ones shown in Fig. 2A and D), and mixed logic configurations (shown Fig. 2B and C) do not allow for oscillatory behavior. In Fig. 9 we show two sample oscillatory responses of a system with $n=2$ metabolites and negative regulation from the product ($s_{T-1} = s_2$).

6. Regulation via an operon: substrate-induced bifurcations

A common regulatory structure in bacteria are gene operons, whereby several genes are controlled by the same promoter and thus transcribed in response to the same activity threshold (examples are the lac and trp operons Wong et al., 1997; Santillan and Mackey, 2001). The previous case studies (Section 5) demonstrate that the ordering of the activity thresholds ($\theta_1, \theta_2$) defines fundamental properties of the system dynamics. In particular, distinct threshold values always lead to (multi-)stability, whereas the case of equal thresholds introduces the possibility of oscillatory behavior.

In this section we focus on the behavior of metabolic networks controlled via an operon, and how this affects the bifurcation diagram of the metabolic flux as a function of the substrate. A widely studied instance of this type of regulatory structure is the lac operon, with a range of mathematic models developed in the literature (see Yildirim and Mackey, 2003; Wong et al., 1997 and the references therein). For our purposes, a simplified description of the lac operon in the form of the generic model in (1) and (2) can be constructed by (see Fig. 10) setting $s_0 =$ lactose (extracellular), $s_1 =$ lactate (internal), and $s_2 =$ allolactose, with the enzymes defined by $e_p =$ permease (coded by lacY), and $e_1 = \beta$-galactosidase (coded by lacZ). The regulator is $s_2$ (allolactose), which binds the transcription factor (TF) and prevents it from blocking operon transcription, which in terms of our model translates into setting $\sigma_i = \sigma^+$ with thresholds $\theta_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

In the previous sections we have shown how to detect the equilibria and limit cycles of the regulatory system. We now use
observations in protein half-lives; regulatory parameters are over rate of the first enzyme transcribed the types of cells were observed: those that do and those that do not response of the population was shown to be bimodal, as two high) levels. For an intermediate range of external lactose, the concentration, the work it was shown that under low (resp. high) external lactose bistable behavior in the bistable region can display low and high flux regimes. The metabolic flux that increases with the nutrient availability, and stable and bistable regions. The monostable regions exhibit a for a bounded range of nutrient concentrations. In this scenario, the nutrient concentration scales the slope $g_i(0)$ through the turnover rate of the first enzyme $g_i(0)$. For a given combination of protein expression and degradation rates (i.e. fixed focal points), changes in the extracellular substrate can modify the relative location of the focal points and regular domains. This phenomenon therefore induces bifurcations in the dynamics as a function of the nutrient availability.

In Fig. 11A we observe the case of nutrient-induced bistability for a bounded range of nutrient concentrations. In this scenario, the nutrient availability can drive the system between monostable and bistable regions. The monostable regions exhibit a metabolic flux that increases with the nutrient availability, and the bistable region can display low and high flux regimes. The bistable behavior in Fig. 11A is consistent with experimental observations in E. coli populations (Ozbudak et al., 2004). In that work it was shown that under low (resp. high) external lactose concentration, the lac operon genes were expressed at low (resp. high) levels. For an intermediate range of external lactose, the response of the population was shown to be bimodal, as two types of cells were observed: those that do and those that do not transcribed the lac genes—without an “intermediate level transcription” (see Figs. 2 and 4 in Ozbudak et al., 2004.)

The analysis in Section 5.3 showed that oscillatory behavior can appear under positive or negative regulation. As shown in Fig. 11B, operon regulation can induce metabolic oscillations, but this depends on the balance between protein half lives (see the conditions in Corollary 2). Oscillatory flux may only appear when the half-life of the nutrient-uptake enzyme is shorter than that of the proteins that breakdown or consume it (blue line in Fig. 11B). Otherwise the system exhibits a unique metabolic flux.

7. Discussion

In this paper we have investigated how genetic regulation of enzyme activity can generate different phenotypes in an unbranched metabolic network. The two key elements in our analysis are (i) the use of a piecewise affine (PA) model for gene regulation and (ii) the time scale separation between metabolism and gene expression. The PA model describes how gene expression is switched ON or OFF in response to a metabolite that acts as a global regulator, whereas the time scale separation allows the reduction of the PA model to a 2-dimensional system.

The chosen formalism allowed for a complete theoretical analysis of the mechanisms by which one-to-all gene regulatory circuits can generate different metabolic phenotypes. In the reduced model we found that only two enzymes are needed to characterize the system: the one catalyzing the first reaction step, and the one catalyzing the reaction that consumes the regulator. Since the regulator can either activate or repress each enzyme, there are four different combinations of regulatory logic. For each

---

**Fig. 10.** Representation of the lac operon in terms of the generic model in Fig. 1A.

**Fig. 11.** Bifurcation diagrams for operon-controlled unbranched metabolic network. (A) Positive regulation can lead to bistability; regulatory parameters are $\theta = 0.5$, $\kappa_0 = (0.3, 1)$, $\kappa = (3, 2)$, and equal protein degradation $\gamma_i = 1$, $i=1,2$. (B) Positive regulation can also lead to oscillatory behavior, but this depends on the balance between protein half-lives; regulatory parameters are $\theta = 0.5$, $\kappa_0 = (0.4, 0.3)$, $\kappa = (1.6, 4.2)$; protein degradation rates are $\gamma_i = (1, 2)$ (black line), and $\gamma_i = (2, 1)$ (blue line), respectively. Both bifurcation diagrams were generated using the results for PA systems for a network with one metabolite and $n=2$ enzymes. The enzyme kinetics have been chosen much faster than protein half-lives (Michaelis–Menten kinetics with parameters $k_{cat,i} = 100$ and $K_{m,i} = 10$, $i=1,2$). (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
of these configurations, the enzyme phase plane can be partitioned into three conic regions (see Fig. 2). The location of the focal points relative to these regions determine the existence of stable equilibria and periodic oscillations in the complete system.

In general, we observe that multistable behavior can appear for specific combinations of enzyme expression rates and regulatory thresholds. Among the four possible feedback configurations, only one (namely, \( \sigma_i = \sigma^-, \sigma_i = \sigma^+ \)) leads to the existence of a single steady state independently of the parameter values (see Section 5.1). All other combinations allow mono- or multistability for specific parameter values; in particular, the logic \( \sigma_i = \sigma^+, \sigma_i = \sigma^- \) can display up to three equilibria (see Fig. 2B, whereby each of the three focal points belongs to its own regular domain). These observations suggest that a feedback logic of the form (\( \sigma_i = \sigma^- \), \( \sigma_i = \sigma^+ \)) is optimal to guarantee a unique phenotype that is robust to parameter values and environmental conditions (encoded in the substrate concentration \( s_0 \)). Intuitively, the (\( \sigma_i = \sigma^- \), \( \sigma_i = \sigma^+ \)) logic causes the regulator to self-repress, in the sense that it blocks its own production and accelerates its transformation, and therefore leads to only one possible phenotype.

Our analysis also reveals fundamental differences between the regulation of gene expression through operons and individual genes. Individual gene regulation translates into a 3-cone partition of the enzyme state space, and therefore the metabolic flux can exhibit complex bifurcations as a function of the regulatory parameters (these in turn affect the location of the focal points). In contrast, an operon architecture translates into a 2-cone partition that displays a simpler bifurcation structure: parameters can change in broader regions without necessarily changing the location of the focal points with respect to the cones. As a consequence, an operon structure can provide sharp metabolic regulation by allowing specific phenotypes (mono- or oscillatory behavior) to be conserved across a larger parameter range than individual gene regulation.

The conclusions drawn from our formalism exploit the switch-like form of the model for gene expression. Because of the discontinuous nature of this class of models, solutions may not depend continuously on model parameters (in contrast with classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems). As a consequence, our theory predicts that metabolic oscillations emerge only under identical conditions (classical continuous systems).

### Appendix A. Valid equilibria and quasi steady state approximation

**Existence of metabolic equilibria:** If the enzymatic and metabolic equilibria are denoted as \( \bar{\pi} \) and \( \pi \), respectively, then the mass balance model (1) under Assumption 1 leads to

\[
\hat{g}_{i+1}(\bar{\pi}, \pi_{i+1}) = g_i(s_0, \pi_1)
\]

for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \). The above is an implicit equation for the enzymatic equilibrium \( \pi_{i+1} \) as a function of the enzymatic equilibrium. The existence of a valid (i.e. nonnegative) solution of (49) depends on the saturation value of the enzyme kinetics, denoted as \( \hat{g}_i = \max g_i(s, \pi_{i+1}) \). For given enzymatic equilibrium, a nonnegative solution of (49) exists only when

\[
\pi_i \geq \frac{g_i(s_0)}{\hat{g}_i} \pi_1
\]

for each \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n \). Geometrically, condition (50) means that the enzyme equilibrium vector must belong to the \((n+1)\)-dimensional cone

\[
\hat{R} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{n+1} : x_i \geq \frac{g_i(s_0)}{\hat{g}_i} x_1, i \geq 2 \right\}.
\]

Since we do not know a priori the location of the enzymatic equilibria, we cannot give tight conditions under which (50) holds. However, we can obtain bounds for the parameter space by looking at the limit case of (50). In a worst-case scenario, the OFF levels \( e_{\text{off}}^{(i)} \) must satisfy (50) against the ON level of the first enzyme, \( e_{\text{on}}^{(1)} \). This condition becomes

\[
e_{\text{off}}^{(i)} \geq \frac{g_i(s_0)}{\hat{g}_i} e_{\text{on}}^{(1)}
\]

for \( i = 2, 3, \ldots, n+1 \), and provides bounds (albeit conservative) for both the synthesis and degradation rates that ensure the existence of a metabolic equilibrium. As a consequence of the feedback interaction between the genetic and metabolic subsystems, the bounds in (52) relate purely genetic parameters with metabolic properties such as enzyme kinetics and substrate concentration.

**Solvability of the quasi steady state approximation:** For the same reasons discussed above, a positive solution \( s_{i-1}(t) \) of (9) exists only when

\[
e(t) \in \hat{R} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0
\]

The cone \( \hat{R} \) therefore defines a region in the enzyme state space that guarantees the solvability of the QSS approximation. This constraint is stronger than condition (50), which is required to
hold in equilibrium only. Nevertheless, if the protein trajectories start in $\tilde{R}$ (i.e. $e_0 \in \tilde{R}$), as $s_{i,1}$ grows the pair $(e_i, e_{i'})$ in (9) will approach the boundary of $\tilde{R}$, but by continuity it cannot leave $\tilde{R}$. Moreover, $e_0 \in \tilde{R}$ can be ensured by picking any initial equilibrium flux $V = v_0(0)$ for all $i$, together with consistent initial enzyme concentrations:

$$e_i(0) = \frac{V}{g_i(s_{i,1}(0))} = \frac{g_1(s_0)}{g_i(s_{i,1}(0))}e_i(0).$$

(54)

Since $g_i(s_{i,1}(0)) < \tilde{g}_i$ for any finite $s_{i,1}(0)$, we see that initial enzyme concentrations that are consistent with an equilibrium flux are enough to guarantee that $e(0) \in \tilde{R}$ and therefore ensure solvability of the QSS approximation.

**Appendix B. Piecwise affine systems in cones**

**B.1. Proof of Theorem 1**

Solutions of differential equations with discontinuous vector fields are typically characterized with a construction due to Filippov (1988). This method proceeds by extending (23) to a differential inclusion

$$\dot{x} \in H(x), \forall x \in S,$$

(55)

where $H(x)$ is a set-valued function defined as the closed convex hull of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, i.e.

$$H(x) = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^2 : z = af(x) + (1-\alpha)g(x), 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1\}.$$ 

The solutions of (55) are understood in the following sense (see also Gouezé and Sari, 2002; Casey et al., 2006) for more details.

**Definition 1.** For a given $\rho_0$, a solution of (55) in $[0,T]$ is an absolutely continuous function $\rho : [0,T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\rho(0) = \rho_0$ and $\rho(t) \in H(\rho(t))$ for almost all $t \in [0,T]$.

Depending on the directions of the vector fields $f(x)$ and $g(x)$, Filippov's (1988) construction may not allow for uniqueness of solutions in the switching domains. When uniqueness can be guaranteed, then solutions can: (a) cross to a regular domain or (b) slide along the switching surface $S$. Roughly speaking, case (a) occurs when $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ point in similar directions in a vicinity of $S$, so that there are no $H(x)$ points toward a regular domain irrespective of $x$. In case (b) both vector fields point towards the switching domain, so that one can find a unique value of $x$ such that $H(x)$ points in the direction of $S$ (in this case we say that the solution exhibits stable sliding motion in $S$).

Uniqueness of solutions is lost when both vector fields point away from the switching domain, in which case solutions starting at $S$ cannot be uniquely defined and any small perturbation will drive $x$ away from $S$ (referred to as an unstable sliding motion).

**Part (a)** From Filippov's construction, the vector field in $S$ has the form:

$$\dot{x} = \begin{cases} af(x) + (1-\alpha)g_1(x), \\ af(x) + (1-\alpha)g_2(x), \end{cases}$$

(56)

with $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. By the definition of $\Omega_1^-$ and $\Omega_2^-$, for any point $x \in \Omega_i^-$ we have that

$$af(x) + (1-\alpha)g_1(x) > \beta f_1(x) + (1-\alpha)g_1(x),$$

$$> \beta f_2(x) + (1-\alpha)g_2(x),$$

(57)

which implies that the vector field points to $D_i$ for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. In other words, the set $H(x)$ in (55) is fully contained in the regular domain $D_i$ and hence the trajectory crosses the switching domain.

**Part (b)** Analogous to part (a).

**Part (c)** We first prove by contradiction that for all $x(t_0) \in L_{a}$, the vector fields are such that $x(t)$ cannot leave the switching domain in an interval $(t_0,t_0+\Delta]$. Define the absolutely continuous function

$$z : [t_0,t_0+\Delta] \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

$$z(t) = x_2(t) - \beta x_1(t).$$

(58)

Suppose that there exists $t > 0$ such that $z(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta]$.

If $x(t_0) \in S$ we have that $z(t_0) = 0$, so by continuity it must be that $z(t) > 0$ for $t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta]$ and some $0 < \Delta < \Delta_1$. In addition, from the definition of the PA system in (23), if $z(t) > 0$ then $\dot{x} = f(x)$ for $t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta]$ and so

$$z = f_2(x) - \beta f_1(x), \quad \text{for } t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta].$$

(59)

However, the right-hand side of (59) is continuous in $t$, and when $x(t_0) \in L_a$ it follows that $z(\Delta) \leq 0$ for $t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta]$, which is a contradiction. The converse argument can be used to show that $z(t) < 0$ for $t \in (t_0,t_0+\Delta]$ leads to a contradiction. We thus conclude that $z(t) = 0$ for $t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta]$, and so $x(t) \in L_a$ for $t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta]$.

The proof follows by checking that the vector fields for $x \in L_a$ are compatible with Filippov's construction, see Gouezé and Sari (2002). If there is sliding motion in $L_a$ then there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that

$$z = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta].$$

(60)

Since $z(x)$ must be a solution in Filippov's sense for $t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta]$, then there must exist $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ such that

$$\dot{x} = af(x) + (1-\alpha)g(x) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta].$$

(61)

Combining (60) and (61) we get

$$0 = x_2 - \beta x_1,$$

$$= af_2 + (1-\alpha)g_2 - \beta (af_1 + (1-\alpha)g_1),$$

$$= af_2(\Delta) + (1-\alpha)g_2(\Delta) \quad \text{for } t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta].$$

(62)

Solving for $x$ in (62) gives

$$x(\Delta) = \frac{g_2(\Delta) - g_1(\Delta)}{(g_2(\Delta) - \beta g_1(\Delta)) - (f_2(\Delta) - \beta f_1(\Delta))},$$

(63)

For $x \in L_a$ it holds that $(f_2 - \beta f_1) < 0$ and $(g_2 - \beta g_1) > 0$, therefore $x(\Delta)$ is unique for all $x \in L_a$ and satisfies $0 \leq x(\Delta) \leq 1$.

Part (d) Consider the function $\tilde{z}$ defined in (58). As opposed to the proof of part (c), in this case it can be shown that for $x(t_0) \in L_a$ both $z(t) > 0$ and $z(t) < 0$ for $t \in [t_0,t_0+\Delta]$ are possible solutions. Note that another possible solution can be picked by picking $\tilde{z}$ as in (63) so that $x(t)$ slides along $S$.

The angle conditions in (28) and (29) can be obtained as follows. The lines $G_1$ and $G_2$ intercept the vertical axis of $\mathbb{R}^2$ at $p'_1 = \gamma_1 L H$, $p_s' = \gamma_1 L H$, respectively. From Fig. 3 we see that whether $L_a = 0$ or $L_a = 0$ depends on $\text{sgn}(p'_2 - p'_1) = \text{sgn}(H L H)$, which leads to the conditions in (28) and (29).

**B.2. Proof of Theorem 2**

A singular equilibrium must be understood in Filippov's sense, i.e. at a singular equilibrium the convex hull $H(x)$ in (55) contains the origin. The proof follows by looking at the form of the vector field along $S$ when solutions are defined with Filippov's method. When $x \in L_a$ the solution satisfies

$$\dot{x} = af(x) + (1-\alpha)g(x),$$

(64)

with $\alpha = \Delta x(\Delta)$ given in (63). Substituting $x(x)$ in (64) we get

$$\dot{x} = \frac{A_g(\Delta x)(\Delta x)}{(g_2(\Delta) - \beta g_1(\Delta)) - (f_2(\Delta) - \beta f_1(\Delta))},$$

(65)

where $A_g(\Delta x)$ is given by

$$A_g(\Delta x) = \gamma_1 \Delta \gamma^T [\phi(\phi' - \phi^T) + \phi^T P \phi],$$

(66)
with \( P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \) so that \( x^T P x = 0 \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \). A point \( \phi_x \in L_0 \) is a singular equilibrium of (23) if it satisfies \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_x) = 0 \). The equation \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = 0 \) is satisfied by both focal points, i.e. 
\[
A_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi^f) = A_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi^b) = 0,
\]
and so the curve 
\[
L_0 = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \geq 0 : A_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = 0 \}
\]
is the line containing both focal points. We thus conclude that any singular equilibrium must be located at \( \phi_x = L_0 \cap L_0 \). The stability of \( \phi_x \) follows by examining the direction of the vector field in (65). We know that 
\[
(g_t \mathcal{G} - \beta \mathcal{G})(x) - (g_t \mathcal{G} - \beta f)(x) > 0,
\]
for all \( x \in L_0 \), and hence the direction of the right-hand side of (65) depends only on the sign of \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \) along \( L_0 \). The function \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \) evaluated along \( L_0 \) (i.e. when \( x = x_1 \cdot \eta \)) defines a line 
\[
A_{\mathcal{G}}(x)|_{x \in L_0} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \langle \phi^f - \phi^b, \eta^+ \rangle x_1 + \phi^f P \phi^b,
\]
with slope 
\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} A_{\mathcal{G}}(x)|_{x \in L_0} = \gamma_1 \gamma_2 \langle \phi^f - \phi^b, \eta^+ \rangle.
\]
Note that the line in (69) is transversal to the line \( L_0 \) and they intersect at \( \phi_x \) (because \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_x) = 0 \) and \( \phi_x \in L_0 \)). Therefore \( A_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \) changes sign at \( x = \phi_x \), so the local stability of \( \phi_x \) depends on the sign of the slope in (70); namely 
\[
\phi_x \in \begin{cases} 
\text{stable} & \text{if } \langle \phi^f - \phi^b, \eta^+ \rangle < 0 \\
\text{unstable} & \text{if } \langle \phi^f - \phi^b, \eta^+ \rangle > 0,
\end{cases}
\]
which are equivalent to the angle conditions in (31) and (32) (note that \( \langle \phi^f - \phi^b, \eta^+ \rangle \neq 0 \) since \( \phi^f, \phi^b \notin S \) by assumption). \( \square \)

### B.3. Proof of Theorem 3

In what follows we restrict the proof to the case where \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_t \) (shown in Fig. 6), but the converse case can be treated analogously. To construct the Poincaré map from \( S' \) onto itself, we first note that every point on \( S' \) satisfies \( x_2 = \beta x_1 \), and so it is enough to analyze a one-dimensional Poincaré map that maps the segment \( S'_1 \) onto itself. We write this map, \( P \), as the composition of two scalar functions: 
\[
P : S'_1 \to S'_1,
\]
\[
r \mapsto P_0 \circ P_0(r),
\]
where 
\[
P_0 : S'_1 \to S'_1
\]
\[
r \mapsto P_0(r),
\]
\[
P_0 : S'_1 \to S'_1
\]
\[
r \mapsto P_0(r).
\]
The function \( P_0 \) maps a point in \( S'_1 \) onto a “hit-point” in the segment \( S'_1 \), whereas the function \( P_0 \) maps points in \( S'_1 \) back onto a hit-point in \( S'_1 \). In the cones \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) the trajectories follow standard linear dynamics, and therefore \( P_0 \) and \( P_0 \) can be written as 
\[
P_0(r) = \begin{bmatrix} r e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} + \phi^b (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) \\
\phi^f (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) 
\end{bmatrix},
\]
\[
P_0(r) = \begin{bmatrix} r e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} + \phi^f (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) \\
\phi^b (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) 
\end{bmatrix},
\]
whereby the functions \( T_0(r) \) and \( T_0(r) \) are the time it takes to hit the segment \( S' \) (resp. \( S'' \)) to hit the segment \( S' \) (resp. \( S'' \)). Next we proceed by parts showing that:

(i) the set \( S'_1 \) is invariant under the Poincaré map,
(ii) the map is continuous in \( S'_1 \),
(iii) the map is non-decreasing in \( S'_1 \), and
(iv) the map is convex in \( S'_1 \).

We will then show that these four statements imply that the Poincaré map has a unique stable fixed-point and hence, our statement holds.

#### B.3.1. Invariance

From the qualitative analysis of Fig. 6 we see that 
\[
P_0(S'_1) \in S'_1 \quad \text{and} \quad P_0(S''_1) \in S'_1,
\]
which together imply that \( S'_1 \) is invariant under the map \( P = P_0 \circ P_0 \).

#### B.3.2. Continuity

From the definitions in (74) and (75), the maps \( P_0 \) and \( P_0 \) are continuous in the time-to-hit, \( T_0 \) and \( T_0 \), and therefore it suffices to show that both \( T_0(r) \) and \( T_0(r) \) are continuous for \( r \in S'_1 \) and \( r \in S''_1 \), respectively. Starting from \( x(0) = x_0 \) in \( S'_1 \), at time \( t = T_0 \) the state is 
\[
x_1(T_0) = x_0 e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} + \phi^b (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}),
\]
x\_2(T_0) = \( x_0 e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} + \phi^f (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) \).

If we impose the condition that \( x(T_0) \in S''_1 \) (i.e. \( x_2(T_0) = \beta x_1(T_0) \)), then we get an implicit equation for the time-to-hit \( T_0(r) \):
\[
F_0(T_0, r) = (\phi^f - \beta r) (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) - \beta (\phi^f - r) (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) = 0,
\]
with \( r \in S'_1 \). Likewise, we can obtain an implicit equation for the time-to-hit \( T_0 \):
\[
F_0(T_0, r) = (\phi^f - \beta r) (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) - \beta (\phi^f - r) (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) = 0,
\]
with \( r \in S''_1 \). Both equations, \( F_0(T_0, r) = 0 \) and \( F_0(T_0, r) = 0 \), have a unique non-trivial solution \( T_0 = T_0_0(r) \) and \( T_0 = T_0_0(r) \) (see Fig. 6), and therefore we need to show that these are continuous for \( r \in S'_1 \) and \( r \in S''_1 \), respectively. We will prove this only for \( T_0(r) \) (the case of \( T_0(r) \) can be shown with symmetrical arguments). Rewrite the implicit equation in (77) as:
\[
\tilde{G}_0(r) = \tilde{G}_0 T_0(r),
\]
with the functions 
\[
\tilde{G}_0(r) = \phi^f - \beta r \quad \tilde{G}_0(r) = r \in S'_1,
\]
\[
G_0 T_0 = 1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} \quad T_0 > 0.
\]
It is easy to see that \( G_0 T_0 \) is continuous in \( S'_1 \) (because \( \phi^f - r > 0 \) for \( r \in S'_1 \), see Fig. 6) and \( G_0 T_0 \) is continuous for \( T_0 > 0 \). Moreover, the derivative of \( G \) is 
\[
\frac{dG}{dT_0} = \frac{N(T_0)}{DT_0} = \frac{\gamma_1 e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0}) - \gamma_1 e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} (1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0})}{(1 - e^{-\gamma_1 T_0})^2},
\]
where 
\[
N(T_0) = \gamma_1 e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} e^{-\gamma_1 T_0} (N_2(T_0) - N_1(T_0)),
\]
with \( N_1(T_0) = (\gamma_1 T_0 - 1)/\gamma_1 \) and \( N_2(T_0) = (\gamma_1 T_0 - 1)/\gamma_1 \). Since \( \gamma_1 > \gamma_t \), we have that \( N_1(T_0) > N_2(T_0) \) for all \( T_0 > 0 \), and consequently \( dG/dT_0 \) is bounded for all \( T_0 > 0 \). The function \( G_0 T_0 \) is then continuous and strictly decreasing for \( T_0 > 0 \) and, therefore, admits a well-defined, continuous and strictly decreasing inverse function \( H \circ G_0 T_0 = T_0 \). From the implicit equation in (78) we then get
the time-to-hit as
\[ T_A(r) = H \circ \tilde{G}_A(r), \] (82)
which is a composition of two continuous functions, and hence continuous. This implies that the Poincaré map is continuous for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \).

B.3.3. Monotonicity
By the chain rule the derivative of \( P = P_b \circ P_A \) is
\[ P'(r) = P_b'(P_A(r)) \cdot P_A'(r) \] (83)
A sufficient condition for \( P(r) \) to be non-decreasing is that both \( P_b \) and \( P_A \) are non-increasing. i.e. \( dP_b/dr \leq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \) and \( dP_A/dr \leq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \). These two statements can be proven by contradiction. If \( dP_b/dr > 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{S}'_1 \), two trajectories starting at different points in the projection of \( \mathcal{R} \) onto \( \mathcal{S}' \) would intersect in the cone \( D_b \), which is a contradiction because in \( D_b \) the vector field is uniquely defined. With the same argument, one concludes that \( dP_A/dr \leq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \), and hence \( P'(r) \geq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \).

B.3.4. Convexity
From (92) we see that \( P_b(r) \) is a composition of two continuous functions, and hence uniquely defined. With the same argument, one concludes that \( dP_b/dr \leq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \), and hence \( P'(r) \geq 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \).

We thus conclude that \( Q(T_A) > 0 \) for \( T_A > 0 \), and so \( (\gamma_1 + F(T_A(r))) > 0 \) for all \( T_A > 0 \). In addition we know that \( (\phi_1^2 - r) > 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \) (Fig. 6), which from the expression for \( P_b(r) \) in (89) implies that \( P_b(r) \) is concave for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \) (i.e. \( P_b(r) < 0 \) for \( r \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \)).

B.3.5. Fixed point
A stable fixed point of the Poincaré map, i.e. a point \( r^* \) such that \( P(r^*) = r^* \) with \( (dP/dr)|_{r^*} \) < 1, indicates a stable periodic orbit passing through \( r^* \). We will show that \( P \) has a unique stable fixed point in \( \mathcal{S}'_1 = [\phi_1^1, \phi_1^2] \). We first analyze the Poincaré map at the endpoints of the segment \( \mathcal{S}'_1 \). The image of the segment \( \mathcal{S}'_1 \) under the map \( P_b \) satisfies
\[ P_b(\mathcal{S}'_1) > \phi_1^1, \] (99)
because in \( D \), the coordinate \( x_1 \) can only reach \( \phi_1^1 \) asymptotically (when time tends to infinity, see Fig. 6). Now, since \( P_b(\phi_1^1) \in \mathcal{S}'_1 \), (99) implies that
\[ P(\phi_1^1) > \phi_1^1. \] (100)
We also know that \( \mathcal{S}'_1 \) is invariant under \( P \), and hence for the other endpoint, \( r = \tilde{x}_1 \), we have that
\[ P(\tilde{x}_1) \leq \tilde{x}_1. \] (101)
Since \( P \) is a continuous map defined on a bounded and invariant set \( \mathcal{S}'_1 \), it must have at least one fixed point in \( \mathcal{S}'_1 \). Moreover, \( P \) is also convex and therefore it can have at most two fixed points (these can be seen as intersections between the curve \( y = \gamma(T_A(r)) \) and the identity line \( y = r \), and therefore more than two fixed points would require \( P \) to be concave in some interval, see Fig. 12). From (100) and (101) we identify two cases:

(a) One fixed point: If (101) holds as strict inequality, we have a unique fixed point at \( \phi_1^1 < r^* < \tilde{x}_1 \). Moreover, by (100) we know that \( P(r) \) starts above the identity line, so that
which implies that \( r^* = x_1^* \) is the only fixed point (by the same arguments as in case (b) of Appendix B.3.5, existence of two fixed points would imply that \( P(x_1^*) > 1 \), which contradicts (108)). Stability follows from the monotonicity and convexity of \( P \). Therefore, \( r^* = x_1^* \) is the unique stable fixed point of \( P \) (see the analysis before Fig. 12), and thus it corresponds to a degenerate stable oscillation collapsed to the point \( (x_1^*, P(x_1^*)) \).
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