

# UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



## CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA (CI<sup>2</sup>MA)



Maximum number of fixed points in AND-OR Boolean network

JULIO ARACENA, ADRIEN RICHARD,  
LILIAN SALINAS

PREPRINT 2013-02

### SERIE DE PRE-PUBLICACIONES



# Maximum number of fixed points in AND-OR Boolean networks.

J. Aracena<sup>a,\*,1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*CI<sup>2</sup>MA and Departamento de Ingeniería Matemática, Universidad de Concepción, Av. Esteban Iturra s/n, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile*

A. Richard<sup>b,2</sup>

<sup>b</sup>*Laboratoire I3S, UMR CNRS 7271 & Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis, 2000 route des Lucioles, 06903 Sophia Antipolis, France*

L. Salinas<sup>c,3</sup>

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Computer Sciences and CI<sup>2</sup>MA, University of Concepción, Edmundo Larenas 215, Piso 3, Concepción, Chile*

---

## Abstract

We are interested in the number of fixed points in AND-OR Boolean networks, *i.e.* Boolean networks in which the update function of each component is either a conjunction or a disjunction of positive or negative literals. As main result, we prove that the maximum number of fixed points in a loop-less connected AND-OR Boolean network with  $n$  components is at most the maximum number of maximal independent sets in a loop-less connected graph with  $n$  components, a quantity already known.

*Key words:* Boolean network, AND-OR network, fixed point, maximal independent set.

---

---

\* Corresponding author.

*Email addresses:* jaracena@dim.uchile.cl (J. Aracena), richard@unice.fr (A. Richard), lilisalinas@udec.cl (L. Salinas).

<sup>1</sup> Partially supported by FONDECYT project 1131013, ANILLO ACT-87, BASAL project CMM, Universidad de Chile and by Centro de Investigación en Ingeniería Matemática (CI<sup>2</sup>MA), Universidad de Concepción.

<sup>2</sup> Partially supported by the French National Agency for Research (ANR-10-BLANC-0218 BioTempo project).

<sup>3</sup> Partially supported by FONDECYT project 1131013

## 1 Introduction

A Boolean network is a system of  $n$  interacting Boolean variables, which evolve, in a discrete time, according to a predefined rule. The structure of such a network is often represented by a digraph, called interaction graph: vertices are network components, and there is an arc from one component to another when the evolution of the latter depends on the evolution of the former.

Boolean networks have many applications. In particular, from the seminal works of Kauffman [11,12] and Thomas [21,22], they are extensively used as models of gene networks. In this context (as in many other applicative contexts) fixed points are of special interests: they correspond to the stable states of the systems and often have biological interpretations. Since experimental data often concern the structure of the network, it is interesting to try to extract, from this structure, information on fixed points (and in particular on the number of fixed points). Several works have been done in this direction, see [1,2,6,14,18,20,23] for example.

In this paper, we are interested in the number of fixed points in AND-OR Boolean networks (AND-OR-nets for short). These are Boolean networks in which the update function associated with each component is a conjunction or a disjunction of positive or negative literals. Our interest for this class of Boolean networks is twofold. Firstly, every Boolean network can be represented, up to an increase of the number of components, under the form of an AND-OR-net. So the “AND-OR-net hypothesis” does not decrease the variety of dynamical behaviors that Boolean networks can exhibit. Secondly, an AND-OR-net can be represented, without loss of information, by a labelled digraph obtained from the interaction graph by labeling each arc by a sign (positive or negative) and each vertex by a type (AND or OR). This makes easier the study of the relationships between structure and dynamics, in particular because graph theoretic tools and results can be used.

The main result of this paper, the following, illustrates this:

- (1) *For every AND-OR-net  $N$  with  $n$  components and a loop-less connected interaction graph, there exists a connected graph  $G$  with at most  $n$  vertices such that the number of fixed points in  $N$  is at most the number of maximal independent sets in  $G$ .*

The maximum number  $\mu(n)$  of maximal independent sets in a connected graph with  $n$  vertices is known [7]. According to (1),  $\mu(n)$  is an upper-bound on the number of fixed points in an AND-OR-net with  $n$  components; and few additional arguments are needed to show that this upper bound is tight.

Two papers are particularly close to this work. Recently, Veliz-Cuba and Laubenbacher [23] study the number of fixed points in AND-nets (*i.e.* AND-OR-nets without OR-vertex) and in negative AND-nets, *i.e.* AND-nets in which each update function is a conjunction of negative literals. Mainly, they show two easy but interesting results that we independently obtain:

- (2) *If a negative AND-net  $N$  has a loop-less symmetric interaction graph, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between the fixed points of  $N$  and the maximal independent sets of its interaction graph [23].*
- (3) *The number of fixed points in a negative AND-net is at most the number of maximal independent sets in its interaction graph [23].*

As an immediate consequence, the authors pointed out that the number of fixed points in a negative AND-net with  $n$  components and a loop-less connected interaction graph is at most  $\mu(n)$ ; this is a particular case the bound that we get with (1). Besides, the authors show that, given an AND-net with  $n$  components, there exists a negative AND-net with at most  $2n$  components and the same number of fixed points. Consequently, an AND-net with  $n$  components and a loop-less connected interaction graph has at most  $\mu(2n)$  fixed points. However, this is far from the right upper bound  $\mu(n)$  given by (1), and  $\mu(2n)$  does not really make sense because  $2^n < \mu(2n)$  when  $n \geq 9$ .

The second close paper, by the first author, Demongeot and Goles [2], is behind this work (and likely behind the work of Veliz-Cuba and Laubenbacher). It concerns positive AND-OR-nets (each update function is a conjunction or a disjunction of positive literals). The main result is the following:

- (4) *For each positive AND-OR-net  $N$  with  $n$  components and a loop-less connected interaction graph, there exists a loop-less connected bipartite graph  $G$  with  $n$  vertices such that the number of fixed points in  $N$  is at most the number of maximal independent sets in  $G$  [2].*

The maximum number  $\eta(n)$  of maximal independent sets in a loop-less connected bipartite graph with  $n$  vertices is known [13]. According to (4),  $\eta(n)$  is an upper-bound on the number of fixed points in a positive AND-OR-net with  $n$  components; and again, few additional arguments are needed to show that this upper bound is tight. It is worth noting that even if positive AND-OR-nets are particular AND-OR-nets, our result is not a generalization of this one, because  $\eta(n)$  is much smaller than  $\mu(n)$ .

In [2], the proof of the existence of the bipartite graph  $G$  with the property given in (4) is constructive: starting from  $N$  and using successively three graph transformations,  $G$  is obtained in polynomial time. Here, we use successively five polynomial graph transformations to obtain the graph  $G$  with the properties given in (1). Unfortunately none of the three graph transformations

introduced in [2] is used; these transformations seem to be useless for the class of AND-OR-nets. Nevertheless, we think that some of the transformations introduced here could be of independent interest. To illustrate this we show, using one of the transformations, the following property about the minimum number of fixed points:

- (5) *Given a directed graph  $G$  with at least one cycle, there always exists an AND-net without fixed points and with  $G$  as interaction graph.*

The paper is organized as follows. Definitions and notations are given in Section 2. The main results is formally stated and discuss in Section 3, and it is proved in Section 4. In Section 6 deals with the presence of loop in the interaction graph. In Section 7, (5) is established thanks to a graph transformations introduced in Section 4. A conclusion and some future research directions are given in Section 8.

## 2 Definitions and notations

A *digraph* (or *directed graph*)  $G$  consists in a finite set *vertices* (or *nodes*)  $V(G)$  and a set of *arcs* (or *directed edges*)  $E(G) \subseteq V(G) \times V(G)$ ; for convenience, we always assume that  $V(G) = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Paths and cycles are always directed and seen as subdigraphs. An arc from a vertex to itself is a *loop*. A vertex of in-degree zero is a *sink*. A digraph  $G$  is *symmetric* if  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  for all  $(v, u) \in E(G)$  with  $u \neq v$ ; and *trivial* if it has a unique vertex and no arc. A *graph* is a loop-less symmetric digraph. The *underlying graph* of a digraph  $G$  is the graph  $H$  defined as follows:  $V(H) = V(G)$ , and  $(u, v) \in E(H)$  if and only if  $u \neq v$  and  $(u, v) \in E(G)$  or  $(v, u) \in E(G)$ . An *independent set* of  $G$  is a subset  $I \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $(u, v) \notin E(G)$  for all distinct  $u, v \in I$ . The set of independent sets of  $G$  is denoted  $\text{IS}(G)$ , and the set of maximal independent sets of  $G$  (w.r.t. inclusion) is denoted  $\text{MIS}(G)$ . Clearly, if  $H$  is the underlying graph of  $G$  then  $\text{IS}(H) = \text{IS}(G)$  and  $\text{MIS}(H) = \text{MIS}(G)$ .

A *signed digraph* is a digraph  $G$  in which each arc is either *positive* or *negative*; the set of positive (resp. negative) arcs of  $G$  is denoted by  $E^+(G)$  (resp.  $E^-(G)$ ). If  $(u, v)$  is a positive (resp. negative) arc of  $G$ , we say that  $u$  is a *positive* (resp. *negative*) *predecessor* of  $v$ . The set of positive (resp. negative) predecessors of  $v$  in  $G$  is denoted  $P_G^+(v)$  (resp.  $P_G^-(v)$ ). The set of predecessor of  $v$  in  $G$  is  $P_G(v) = P_G^+(v) \cup P_G^-(v)$ . A cycle of  $G$  is *positive* (resp. *negative*) if it has an even (resp. odd) number of negative arcs.

An *AND-OR-net* is a signed digraph  $G$  in which each vertex is either an *AND-vertex* or a *OR-vertex*; the set of AND-vertices (resp. OR-vertices) is denoted by  $V_{\text{AND}}(G)$  (resp.  $V_{\text{OR}}(G)$ ). Vertices of  $G$  are often called *components*. Two

vertices have the same *type* if they are both AND-vertices or both OR-vertices. An *AND-net* is an AND-OR-net with only AND-vertices (thus, AND-nets may be identified with signed digraphs). A AND-net is *negative* if every arc that is not a loop is negative (thus, loops-less negative AND-nets may be identified with digraphs).

AND-OR-nets (which are simply labelled digraphs) take a sense in the light of the following definitions. Let  $G$  be an AND-OR-net. The set of possible *configurations* of  $G$  is the set of maps  $x$  from  $V(G)$  to  $\{0, 1\}$ ; it is denoted  $\{0, 1\}^n$ . The *update function* associated with a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is the Boolean function  $f_v^G$  from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  to  $\{0, 1\}$  defined by:

- (1) If  $v \in V_{\text{AND}}(G)$ , then  $f_v^G(x) = 0$  if and only if  $v$  has a positive predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 0$  or a negative predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 1$ .
- (2) If  $v \in V_{\text{OR}}(G)$ , then  $f_v^G(x) = 1$  if and only if  $v$  has a positive predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 1$  or a negative predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 0$ .

In other words, if  $v$  is an AND-vertex then  $f_v^G$  is an AND-function (a conjunction of positive or negative literals corresponding to the positive or negative predecessors of  $v$ ); and if  $v$  is an OR-vertex, then  $f_v^G$  is an OR-function (a disjunction of positive or negative literals).

The *global transition function* associated with  $G$  is the function  $f^G$  from  $\{0, 1\}^n$  to  $\{0, 1\}^n$  defined by  $f^G(x)(v) = f_v^G(x)$  for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $v \in V(G)$ . The (parallel) dynamics of an AND-OR-net is described by the successive iterations of  $f^G$ . The fixed points of  $f^G$  then correspond to the stable configurations of the network. In this paper, we are only interested in the number of fixed points of  $f^G$ . The set of fixed points of  $f^G$  is denoted  $\text{FP}(G)$ . In the following, we abusively refer  $\text{FP}(G)$  as the set of fixed points of  $G$ .

### 3 Maximum number of fixed points

We are interested in the following question: what is the maximum number of fixed points that a loop-less connected AND-OR-nets with  $n$  vertices can have? Our starting point is the following easy but fundamental observation:

**Proposition 1** *If  $H$  is a loop-less symmetric negative AND-net, then*

$$|\text{FP}(H)| = |\text{MIS}(H)|.$$

Thus, for loop-less negative and-nets, our question is equivalent to the following question: what is the maximum number of maximal independent sets that

a connected graph with  $n$  vertices can have? This question has been answered more than twenty years ago.

**Theorem 1** [4,7] *The maximum number  $\mu(n)$  of maximal independent sets in connected graph with  $n$  vertices is defined as follows: if  $n < 6$  then  $\mu(n) = n$ , and otherwise*

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 3^{s-1} + 2^{s-1} & \text{if } n = 3s \\ 3^s + 2^{s-1} & \text{if } n = 3s + 1 \\ 4 \cdot 3^{s-1} + 3 \cdot 2^{s-2} & \text{if } n = 3s + 2 \end{cases}$$

The main result of this paper is the following. Together with Proposition 1 and Theorem 1, it answers our question.

**Theorem 2 (Main result)** *For every loop-less connected AND-OR-net  $G$ , there exists a loop-less connected symmetric negative AND-net  $H$  such that*

$$|V(H)| \leq |V(G)| \quad \text{and} \quad |\text{FP}(H)| \geq |\text{FP}(G)|.$$

**Corollary 3** *The maximum number of fixed points in a connected AND-OR-net with  $n$  vertices is  $\mu(n)$ .*

In [7], it was showed that for every  $n \geq 6$ , there exists (up to isomorphism) a unique graph  $H_n$  with  $n$  vertices such that  $|\text{MIS}(H_n)| = \mu(n)$ . So following Proposition 1, for all  $n \geq 6$ , the loop-less symmetric negative AND-net  $G_n$  with  $H_n$  as underlying graph is such that  $|\text{FP}(G_n)| = \mu(n)$ . So the upper-bound given in Corollary 3 is the best possible.

Actually, the maximum number of maximal independent sets has been established for several classes of graphs (see [16,17,4,7,15,9,13,10,8,3,5] for instance); and the first class that has been treated is naturally the class of graphs with  $n$  vertices.

**Theorem 4** [16] *The maximum number  $\lambda(n)$  of maximal independent sets in a graph with  $n$  vertices is defined as follows: if  $n = 1$  then  $\mu(n) = 1$ , and otherwise*

$$\lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 3^s & \text{if } n = 3s \\ 4 \cdot 3^{s-1} & \text{if } n = 3s + 1 \\ 2 \cdot 3^s & \text{if } n = 3s + 2 \end{cases}$$

Clearly, Theorem 2 remains valid if “connected” is removed from the statement (in the condition and the conclusion). From this observation Theorem 4 and Proposition 1, we get:



**Corollary 5** *The maximum number of fixed points in a loop-less AND-OR-net with  $n$  vertices is  $\lambda(n)$ .*

It was showed that there exists (up to isomorphism) a unique graph  $H'_n$  with  $n$  vertices such that  $|\text{MIS}(H'_n)| = \lambda(n)$  [16]. So, as above, we deduce that the upper-bound given in Corollary 5 is the best possible.

## 4 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is constructive. It involves five AND-OR-net transformations, denoted from  $T_0$  to  $T_4$ . The first transformation  $T_0$  gives, from any loop-less connected AND-OR-net  $G$  with  $n$  vertices, a loop-less connected AND-net  $G^0$  with  $n$  vertices and the same number of fixed points. The four other transformations are transformations on AND-nets. Each of them keeps the connectivity, never increases the number of vertices, and never decreases the number of fixed points. Moreover, the AND-net obtain from  $G^0$  by applying successively  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$  and  $T_4$  is always loop-less, symmetric and negative AND-net, and from this the theorem follows.

Before defining these transformations and their properties, we first state a lemma that will be used several times.

**Lemma 6** *Let  $G$  be an AND-net, and let  $H$  be a strongly connected component of  $G \setminus E^-(G)$ . Then  $x(u) = x(v)$  for every  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $u, v \in V(H)$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . If  $x(v) = 0$  for some  $v \in V(H)$ , then  $x(u) = 0$  for every successor  $u$  of  $v$  in  $H$ , and since  $H$  is strong, we deduce that  $x(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in V(H)$ . If  $x(v) = 1$  for some  $v \in V(H)$ , then  $x(u) = 1$  for every predecessor  $u$  of  $v$  in  $H$ , and since  $H$  is strong, we deduce that  $x(v) = 1$  for all  $v \in V(H)$ . Thus  $x(u) = x(v)$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $u, v \in V(H)$ .  $\square$

### 4.1 Transformation $T_0$ (making AND-nets from AND-OR-nets)

Transformation  $T_0$  maps every AND-OR-net  $G$  to the AND-net  $G^0$  obtained from  $G$  by changing the sign of each arc linking vertices of different type, and by changing the type of OR-vertices. Formally, denoting  $E_0^+(G)$  (resp.  $E_0^-(G)$ ) the set of positive (resp. negative) arcs  $(u, v)$  of  $G$  such that  $u$  and  $v$  have not

the same type,  $G^0$  is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} V(G^0) &= V_{\text{AND}}(G^0) = V(G) \\ E^+(G^0) &= (E^+(G) \setminus E_0^+(G)) \cup E_0^-(G) \\ E^-(G^0) &= (E^-(G) \setminus E_0^-(G)) \cup E_0^+(G) \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma is an easy exercise.

**Lemma 7** *For every AND-OR-net  $G$  we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^0)|$ .*

#### 4.2 Transformation $T_1$ (removing constant vertices)

Let  $G$  be an AND-net. Transformation  $T_1$  is a technical step allowing AND-nets to have some properties making possible the use of the other transformations. Roughly speaking, it consists in gluing together vertices with a constant level in fixed points.


Let  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) = V_{\text{cst}0}(G) \cup V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$ , where  $V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$  and  $V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$  are the sets of  $V(G)$  inductively defined in the following way:

- (1) If there exists two strongly connected components  $H$  and  $H'$  in  $G \setminus E^-(G)$  (not necessarily distinct) such that  $G$  has both a positive and a negative arc from  $V(H')$  to  $V(H)$ , then  $V(H) \subseteq V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$ ; and all the sinks of  $G$  are in  $V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$ .
- (2) For all  $v \in V(G)$ : if  $v$  has a positive predecessor in  $V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$  or a negative predecessor in  $V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$ , then  $v \in V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$ ; and if all the positive predecessors of  $v$  are in  $V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$  and all the negative predecessors of  $v$  are in  $V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$ , then  $v \in V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$ .

**Lemma 8** *Let  $G$  be an AND-net and  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . If  $v \in V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$  then  $x(v) = 0$ , and if  $v \in V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$  then  $x(v) = 1$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . We proceed by induction (following the inductive definition of  $V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ ), and we only prove the base case, since the induction step is obvious. If  $v$  is a sink, then by definition,  $f_v^G = \text{cst} = 1$  thus  $x(v) = 1$ . Now, suppose that there exists two strongly connected components  $H$  and  $H'$  in  $G \setminus E^-(G)$  such that  $G$  has a positive arc  $(u', u)$  and a negative arc  $(w', w)$  with  $u', w' \in V(H')$  and  $u, w \in V(H)$ . Let  $v \in V(H)$ . If  $x(u') = 0$  then  $f_u^G(x) = 0 = x(u)$  and we deduce from Lemma 6 that  $x(v) = x(u) = 0$ . Otherwise,  $x(u') = 1$  thus by Lemma 6 we have  $x(w') = 1$ , so thus  $f_w^G(x) = 0 = x(w)$  and we deduce from Lemma 6 that  $x(v) = x(w) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 9** Let  $v \in V(G)$ , and suppose that there exists a constant  $c \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $x(v) = c$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Then  $v$  is not necessarily in  $V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . Indeed, for instance, for the following AND-net  $G$ , which has two fixed points, we have  $x(3) = 0$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) = \emptyset$ .



Transformation  $T_1$  maps every AND-net  $G$  to the AND-net  $G^1$  defined in the following way. If  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) = \emptyset$ , then  $G^1 = G$ , and otherwise:

$$\begin{aligned}
V(G^1) &= (V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)) \cup \{v^*\} \\
E^+(G^1) &= E^+(G \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)) \\
E^-(G^1) &= E^-(G \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)) \cup \{(u, v^*) \mid u \in V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)\}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus when  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) \neq \emptyset$ ,  $G^1$  is obtained from the sub-AND-net  $G \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$  by adding a new vertex  $v^*$  and a negative arc from  $u$  to  $v^*$  for each vertex  $u$  not in  $V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . Clearly, in all cases  $|V(G^1)| \leq |V(G)|$ .

**Lemma 10** For every AND-net  $G$  we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^1)|$ .

**PROOF.** If  $G = G^1$  there is nothing to prove, so assume that  $G \neq G^1$ . Consider the function that maps every configuration  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  to the configuration  $\tilde{x}$  of  $G^1$  defined as follows:  $\tilde{x}(v) = x(v)$  for all  $v \neq v^*$ , and

$$\tilde{x}(v^*) = \prod_{v \in V(G^1) \setminus v^*} (1 - \tilde{x}(v)).$$

Clearly,  $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$  is an injective function: if  $x, y \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $x \neq y$ , then following Lemma 8,  $x(v) \neq y(v)$  for some  $v \in V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G) \subseteq V(G^1)$ , and it follows that  $\tilde{x}(v) \neq \tilde{y}(v)$ . Thus, it is sufficient to prove that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(G^1)$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $v \in V(G^1) \setminus v^*$ .

- (1) Suppose that  $x(v) = 1$ . Then, there is no  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$  and no  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Since  $G^1 \setminus v^* = G \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$  and since  $v^* \notin P_{G^1}^+(v)$ , we deduce that  $P_{G^1}^+(v) \subseteq P_G^+(v)$  and  $P_{G^1}^-(v) \subseteq P_G^-(v)$ . Since  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(u)$  for all  $u \neq v^*$  we deduce that  $f_v^{G^1}(\tilde{x}) = 1 = x(v) = \tilde{x}(v)$ .
- (2) Suppose that  $x(v) = 0$ . Then either there exists  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$  or  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Suppose that there exists  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ , the other case is similar. Since  $v \notin V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , we have

$u \notin V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$ , and since  $x(u) = 0$ , by Lemma 8, we have  $u \notin V_{\text{cst}1}(G)$ . Thus  $u \notin V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . Consequently  $u \in P_{G^1}^+(v)$  and since  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(u) = 0$ , it follows that  $f_v^{G^1}(\tilde{x}) = 0 = x(v) = \tilde{x}(v)$ .

Thus  $f_v^{G^1}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G^1) \setminus v^*$ . By the definition  $f_{v^*}^{G^1}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v^*)$ , thus  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(G^1)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 11** *Actually,  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^1)|$  for every AND-net  $G$ , as showed in Appendix A. However,  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^1)|$  is sufficient for our propose.*

An AND-net  $G$  has the *property*  $P_1$  if it is connected, has no loop, has no sink, and satisfies the following *property*  $Q_1$ : for every strongly connected components  $H$  and  $H'$  of  $G \setminus E^-(G)$  (not necessarily distinct), all the arcs of  $G$  from  $V(H)$  to  $V(H')$  are either positive or negative.

**Lemma 12** *If  $G$  is a loop-less connected AND-net, then either  $G^1$  is trivial or it has the property  $P_1$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $G^1$  is not trivial, and let us prove that it has the property  $P_1$ . If  $G^1 = G$ , then  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) = \emptyset$  thus  $G$  has no sink and the property  $Q_1$ ; and since (by hypothesis)  $G$  is connected and has no loop,  $G^1$  has the property  $P_1$ . So suppose that  $G^1 \neq G$ , that is,  $V_{\text{cst}}(G) \neq \emptyset$ .

Clearly,  $G^1$  is connected since  $V(G^1) \setminus v^*$  is the set of predecessors of  $v^*$ . Also, there is no loop on  $v^*$ , and since  $G$  has no loop,  $G^1 \setminus v^* = G \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$  has no loop. So  $G^1$  has no loop. Suppose that  $G^1$  has a sink  $v$ . Since  $G^1$  is not trivial  $v^*$  is not a sink thus  $v \in V(G)$ . Since  $v \notin V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ ,  $v$  is not a sink of  $G$ , and we deduce that, in  $G$ , all the predecessors of  $v$  are in  $V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . But then  $v \in V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $G^1$  has no sink.

Suppose finally that  $G^1$  has not the property  $Q_1$ . Let  $H$  and  $H'$  be strongly connected components of  $G^1 \setminus E^-(G^1)$  (not necessarily distinct) such that  $G^1$  has both a positive and a negative arc from  $V(H)$  to  $V(H')$ . Then  $H$  and  $H'$  are distinct strongly connected components of  $(G^1 \setminus E^-(G^1)) \setminus v^*$ . Since  $(G^1 \setminus E^-(G^1)) \setminus v^* = (G \setminus E^-(G)) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , there exists strongly connected components  $L$  and  $L'$  in  $G \setminus E^-(G)$  with  $V(H) \subseteq V(L)$  and  $V(H') \subseteq V(L')$  ( $L$  and  $L'$  are not necessarily distinct). But then  $G$  has both a positive and a negative arc from  $V(L)$  to  $V(L')$ , thus  $V(H') \subseteq V(L') \subseteq V_{\text{cst}0}(G) \subseteq V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , a contradiction. So  $G^1$  has the property  $Q_1$ , and we deduce that it has the property  $P_1$ .  $\square$

### 4.3 Transformation $T_2$ (removing cycles with only positive arcs)

Transformation  $T_2$  maps every AND-net  $G$  with the property  $Q_1$  to the AND-net  $G^2$  defined in the following way. Let  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  be the strongly connected components of  $G \setminus E^-(G)$ . For every  $1 \leq k \leq r$ , let  $v_k$  be the smallest vertices in  $V(H_k)$ . Let  $E_2^+(G)$  (resp.  $E_2^-(G)$ ) be the set of couples  $(v_k, v_l)$  with  $k \neq l$  such that  $G$  has at least one positive (resp. negative) arc from  $V(H_k)$  to  $V(H_l)$ . Since  $G$  has the property  $Q_1$ ,  $E_2^+(G) \cap E_2^-(G) = \emptyset$ . This allows us to define  $G^2$  by

$$V(G^2) = V(G)$$

$$E^+(G^2) = E_2^+(G)$$

$$E^-(G^2) = E_2^-(G) \cup \{(v_k, u), (u, v_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq r, u \in V(H_k) \setminus v_k\}$$

See Figure 1 for an illustration. Note that for every  $u \in V(H_k)$ , if  $u \neq v_k$  then  $f_u^{G^2}(x) = 1 - x(v_k)$ .

An AND-net  $G$  has the *property*  $P_2$  if it is connected, has no sink, and has no cycle with only positive arcs (note that for every AND-net  $G$  with the property  $Q_1$ ,  $G^2$  has no cycle with only positive arcs).

**Lemma 13** *If  $G$  is an AND-net with the property  $P_1$ , then  $G^2$  has the property  $P_2$  and  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^2)|$ .*

**PROOF.** Since  $G$  has the property  $P_1$ , it is connected and has no sink, and so  $G^2$  has clearly the property  $P_2$ . Let us prove that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^2)|$ . Let  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  be the strongly connected components of  $G \setminus E^-(G)$ . For every  $1 \leq k \leq r$ , let  $v_k$  be the smallest vertices in  $V(H_k)$ . Let  $U = V(G) \setminus \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$ . Consider the permutation mapping each configuration  $x$  of  $G$  to the configuration  $\tilde{x}$  of  $G$  defined by:

$$\tilde{x}(u) = \begin{cases} 1 - x(u) & \text{if } u \in U \\ x(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We prove that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(G^2)$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $1 \leq k \leq r$ .

We first prove that  $f_u^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(u)$  given any  $u \in V(H_k) \setminus v_k$ . Indeed, if  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$  then  $x(u) = 1$  thus, by Lemma 6,  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = x(v_k) = 1$  and we deduce that  $f_u^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 1 - \tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ . Similarly, if  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$  then  $x(u) = 0$  thus, by Lemma 6,  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = x(v_k) = 0$  and we deduce that  $f_u^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 1 - \tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ . Thus  $f_u^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(u)$  in all cases.

We now prove that  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ . Suppose first that  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ . If  $H_k$  is not trivial then there exists  $u \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k) \cap V(H_k)$  and since, by Lemma 6,  $x(u) = x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ , we have  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$  and we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Suppose that  $H_k$  is trivial. Since  $x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ , one of the following two condition holds:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_G^+(v_k)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ . Then  $u \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$  so  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^+(v_k)$ . Since, by Lemma 6, we have  $\tilde{x}(v_l) = x(v_l) = x(u) = 0$  we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 0$ .
- (2) There exists  $u \in P_G^-(v_k)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Then  $u \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$  so  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k)$ . Since, by Lemma 6, we have  $\tilde{x}(v_l) = x(v_l) = x(u) = 1$  we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 0$ .

So in all cases,  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ . Suppose now that  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Then one of the following two conditions holds:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_{G^2}^+(v_k)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$ . Then  $u = v_l$  for some  $l \neq k$ , thus there exists an arc  $(w, t) \in E^+(G)$  with  $w \in V(H_l)$  and  $t \in V(H_k)$ . Since, by Lemma 6,  $x(w) = x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(v_l) = \tilde{x}(u) = 0$ , we have  $f_t^G(x) = 0$ . But, by Lemma 6, we have  $x(t) = x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ , a contradiction.
- (2) There exists  $u \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$ . Suppose that  $u \in V(H_k)$ . Then  $u \in U$  so  $x(u) \neq \tilde{x}(u) = 1$ , but by Lemma 6,  $x(u) = x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ , a contradiction. So  $u = v_l$  for some  $l \neq k$ , thus there exists an arc  $(w, t) \in E^-(G)$  with  $w \in V(H_l)$  and  $t \in V(H_k)$ . Since, by Lemma 6,  $x(w) = x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(v_l) = \tilde{x}(u) = 1$ , we have  $f_t^G(x) = 0$ . But, by Lemma 6, we have  $x(t) = x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ , a contradiction.

Since there is a contradiction in both cases,  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(\tilde{x}) = 1 = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 14** *Actually, we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^2)|$ , as showed in Appendix B, but  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^2)|$  is enough for our propose.*

#### 4.4 Transformation $T_3$ (removing positive arcs)

The transformation  $T_3$  maps every AND-net  $G$  to the AND-net  $G^3 = T_3(G)$  defined in the following way. Let  $E_3^-(G)$  denotes the set of couples of vertices  $(u, v)$  such that for at least one vertex  $w$ ,  $(u, w) \in E^-(G)$  and  $G$  has a path

from  $w$  to  $v$  with only positive arcs. Then

$$\begin{aligned} V(G^3) &= V(G) \\ E^+(G^3) &= \emptyset \\ E^-(G^3) &= E^-(G) \cup E_3^-(G) \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 2 for an illustration.

An AND-net  $G$  has the *property*  $P_3$  if it connected, has no sink, and has no positive arc.

**Lemma 15** *If  $G$  is an AND-net with the property  $P_2$ , then  $G^3$  has the property  $P_3$  and  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^3)$ .*

**PROOF.** We first prove that  $G^3$  has no sink, using the fact that  $G$  has no sink and no cycle with only positive arcs. Let  $v \in V(G)$ , and let  $P$  be the longest path of  $G$  with only positive arcs and with  $v$  as terminal vertex. Let  $u$  be the initial vertex of  $P$  (if  $v$  has only negative predecessors, then the path is of length zero and  $u = v$ ). Suppose that  $u$  has a positive predecessor  $w$ . If  $w \notin V(P)$ , then  $P$  is not of maximal length, and if  $w \in V(P)$  then  $G$  has a cycle with only positive arcs, a contradiction. Thus  $u$  has only negative predecessors in  $G$ . Let  $w$  be one of them. Then  $(w, v) \in E_3^-(G)$  so  $v$  is not a sink of  $G^3$ .

We now prove that  $G^3$  is connected. Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $G^3$  is not connected. Since  $G$  is connected,  $G^3$  has two connected components, say  $G_1^3$  and  $G_2^3$ , such that  $G$  has at least one arc  $(v_1, v_2)$  with  $v_1 \in V(G_1^3)$  and  $v_2 \in V(G_2^3)$ . Since  $(v_1, v_2)$  is not an arc of  $G^3$ , we have  $(v_1, v_2) \in E^+(G)$ . Let  $P$  be the longest path of  $G$  with only positive arcs and with  $(v_1, v_2)$  as final arc. Let  $u$  be the initial vertex of  $P$ . As above we show that  $u$  has only negative predecessors in  $G$ . Let  $w$  be one of them. Then  $(w, v_1)$  and  $(w, v_2)$  are negative arcs of  $G^3$ , thus  $G_1^3$  and  $G_2^3$  are connected, a contradiction.

Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , and let us prove that  $x \in \text{FP}(G^3)$ . Let  $v \in V(G)$ . If  $x(v) = 0$ , then one of the two following cases holds:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ . Let  $P$  be the longest path of  $G$  with only positive arcs, with  $u$  as final vertex, and such that  $x(w) = 0$  for all  $w \in V(P)$ . Let  $w$  be the initial vertex of  $P$ . If there exists  $t \in P_G^-(w)$  with  $x(t) = 0$ , then  $t \in V(P)$  (since  $P$  is of maximal length) and so  $G$  has a cycle with only positive arcs, a contradiction. Thus  $x(t) = 1$  for all  $t \in P_G^-(w)$ . Since  $x(w) = 0$ , we deduce that there exists  $t \in P_G^-(w)$  with  $x(t) = 1$ . Then  $(t, v) \in E^-(G^3)$  thus  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = 0 = x(v)$ .





- (2) There exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Then  $(u, v) \in E^-(G^3)$  thus  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = 0 = x(v)$ .

Suppose now that  $x(v) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = 0$ . Then there exists  $u \in P_{G^3}^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . If  $(u, v) \in E^-(G)$  then  $f_v^G(x) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus  $(u, v) \in E_3^-(G)$ , that is,  $G$  has a negative arc  $(u, w)$  and a path  $P$  from  $w$  to  $v$  with only positive arcs. Since  $x(u) = 1$ , we have  $f_w^G(x) = 0 = x(w)$  and (following the path  $P$ ) we deduce that  $f_t^G(x) = 0 = x(t)$  for all  $t \in V(P)$ . In particular,  $x(v) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus in all cases  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = x(v)$  and so  $x \in \text{FP}(G^3)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 16** *Actually, we have  $\text{FP}(G) = \text{FP}(G^3)$ , as showed in Appendix C, but  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^3)$  is enough for our purpose.*

#### 4.5 Transformation $T_4$ (symmetrization)

The transformation  $T_4$  maps every signed digraph  $G$  to the AND-net  $T_4(G) = G^4$  defined by

$$V(G^4) = V(G)$$

$$E^+(G^4) = \emptyset$$

$$E^-(G^4) = (E^-(G) \cup \{(u, v) \mid (v, u) \in E^-(G)\}) \setminus \{(v, v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$$

**Lemma 17** *If  $G$  is an AND-net with the property  $P_3$ , then  $G^4$  is a loop-less connected symmetric AND-net with only negative arcs such that  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^4)$ .*

**PROOF.** It is obvious that  $G^4$  is symmetric, has no loop, and no positive arcs. Then, since  $G$  is connected and has no positive arc,  $G^4$  is connected too. It remains to prove that  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^4)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and  $v \in V(G)$ . If  $x(v) = 0$  then there exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Thus  $u \neq v$ , so  $u \in P_{G^4}^-(v)$  and we deduce that  $f_v^{G^4}(x) = 0$ . Suppose now that  $x(v) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_v^{G^4}(x) = 0$ . Then there exists  $u \in P_{G^4}^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . If  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  then  $f_v^G(x) = 0 \neq x(v)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $v \in P_G^-(u)$ , and since  $x(v) = 1$ , we have  $f_u^G(x) = 0 \neq x(u)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $f_v^{G^4}(x) = 1 = x(v)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 18** *The inclusion in Lemma 17 is sometimes strict. For instance, if  $C_n$  is a cycle of length  $n$  with only negative arcs then  $|\text{FP}(C_n)| \leq 2$  (since  $C_n$  has no fixed point if  $n$  is odd and two fixed points otherwise) while the number of fixed points in  $C_n^4 = T_4(C_n)$  grows exponentially with  $n$ :  $|\text{FP}(C_n^4)| \sim p^n$  where  $p > 1, 3$  is the plastic number [4].*

#### 4.6 Proof of Theorem 2

Let  $G$  be a loop-less connected AND-OR-net. Let  $G^0 = T_0(G)$ . If  $G^1 = T_1(G^0)$  is trivial, then the theorem is obvious. So suppose that  $G^1$  is not trivial. Following Lemmas 7, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 17: AND-nets  $G^2 = T_2(G^1)$ ,  $G^3 = T_3(G^2)$  and  $G^4 = T_4(G^3)$  are well defined;  $G^4$  is loop-less, connected, symmetric and negative. Furthermore

$$|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^0)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^1)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^2)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^3)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^4)|.$$

Since it is clear that

$$|V(G)| = |V(G^0)| \geq |V(G^1)| = |V(G^2)| = |V(G^3)| = |V(G^4)|$$

the theorem is proved. Note that according to Remarks 11, 14 and 16:

$$|\text{FP}(G^0)| = |\text{FP}(G^1)| = |\text{FP}(G^2)| = |\text{FP}(G^3)|.$$

### 5 Extremal AND-nets

In this section, we characterize AND-OR-nets reaching the upper bound given in Corollaries 3 and 5, that is, we characterize loop-less connected AND-OR-nets with  $\mu(n)$  fixed points, and loop-less AND-OR-nets with  $\lambda(n)$  fixed points.

Let  $n = 3s + r$  with  $0 \leq r \leq 2 \leq s$ . Let  $H_n$  be the graph described in Figure 3. It has been proved in [7] that  $H_n$  is the unique connected graph with  $n$  vertices and  $\mu(n)$  maximal independent sets. Let  $G_n$  be the loop-less symmetric negative AND-net with  $H_n$  as underlying graph. According to Proposition 1,  $G_n$  is the unique loop-less symmetric connected negative AND-net with  $n$  vertices and  $\mu(n)$  fixed points. Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  be the family of AND-nets containing  $G_n$  and all the connected AND-nets that we can obtain from  $G_n$  by removing some arcs that does not belong to a triangle (cycle of length three); since there are  $2(s - 1)$  such arcs,  $|\mathcal{G}_n| = 3^{s-1}$ .

**Theorem 19** *Let  $G$  be a loop-less connected AND-net with  $n$  vertices. If  $n \geq 6$ , then  $G$  has  $\mu(n)$  fixed points if and only if  $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . If  $n \leq 5$ , then  $G$  has  $\mu(n)$  fixed points if and only if  $G$  is isomorphic to one of the AND-nets given in Figure 4.*

**PROOF.** Graphs with at most five vertices that maximize the number of maximal independent sets are given [7], and from this it is easy to check the case  $n \leq 5$ . Suppose that  $n \geq 6$ . It is also easy to check that  $|\text{FP}(G)| = \mu(n)$




Fig. 3. Graphs  $H_n$  (a line between two nodes  $u$  and  $v$  means that both  $(v, u)$  and  $(u, v)$  are arcs of the graph). Note that in every case, there are  $2(s - 1)$  arcs that does belong to no triangles.

if  $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . So suppose that  $|\text{FP}(G)| = \mu(n)$ , and let us prove that  $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . Let  $G^1 = T_1(G)$ . It is clear that  $G^1$  is not trivial, thus  $G^2 = T_2(G^1)$ ,  $G^3 = T_3(G^2)$  and  $G^4 = T_4(G^3)$  are well defined. Following Corollary 3 and Lemmas 10, 12, 13, 15 and 17, we have

$$|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^1)| = |\text{FP}(G^2)|, \quad \text{FP}(G^2) = \text{FP}(G^3) = \text{FP}(G^4).$$

Since  $G^4$  is loop-less, connected, symmetric and negative,  $G^4$  is isomorphic to  $G_n$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $G^4 = G_n$ .

Let us prove that  $G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . It is easy to check that, for all vertex  $v$ , there exists  $x, y \in \text{FP}(G_n)$  such that  $x(v) \neq y(v)$ . We deduce that  $G^3$  has no negative loops. Since  $G^3$  is negative, it follows that  $G^3$  is a sub-AND-net of  $G_n$ , which is connected since  $G^4$  is. Let  $(u, v)$  be an arc that belong to at least one triangle of  $G_n$ . It is also easy to check that every sub-AND-net  $G_n$  that does not contain  $(u, v)$  cannot have the same set of fixed points than  $G_n$ . Consequently,  $G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ .

We now prove that  $G = G^1 = G^2 = G^3$ . Suppose, for a contradiction, that  $G^2 \neq G^3$ . Then  $G^2$  has at least one positive arc. Since  $G^2$  has no cycles with only positive arcs,  $G^2$  has at least one positive arc  $(u, v)$  such that  $u$  has no positive predecessors. Then, it is clear that  $P_{G^3}^-(u) = P_{G^2}^-(u)$ . Since  $G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$  and since each vertex of each AND-net in  $\mathcal{G}_n$  has in-degree at least two, we deduce that  $P_{G^2}^-(u)$  contains at least two vertices, say  $w_1$  and  $w_2$ . Consequently,




Fig. 4. Extremal loop-less connected AND-nets with at most five vertices.

$(w_1, u)$ ,  $(w_2, u)$ ,  $(w_1, v)$  and  $(w_2, v)$  are arcs of  $G^3$ , and since  $G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , it follows that  $(v, u) \in E^-(G^3)$ . Since  $P_{G^2}^-(u) = P_{G^3}^-(u)$ , we have  $(v, u) \in E^-(G^2)$ , and since  $(u, v) \in E^+(G^2)$ , we deduce that  $G^3$  has a loop on  $v$ , a contradiction. This proves that  $G^2 = G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . If  $G^1 \neq G^2$ , then  $G^1 \setminus E^-(G^1)$  contains at least one non-trivial strongly connected component  $H$ . But, then  $|V(H)| - 1 > 0$  vertices of  $H$  has in-degree one in  $G^2$ , a contradiction with the fact that  $G^2 = G^3 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . Thus  $G^1 = G^2 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . Clearly,  $|V(G^4)| = |V(G^1)| = n$ , thus if  $G \neq G^1$  then  $G^1$  contains a vertex of in-degree  $n - 1$ , a contradiction with the fact that  $G^1 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ . Thus  $G = G^1 \in \mathcal{G}_n$ .  $\square$

From this characterization and Lemma 7, we deduce that a loop-less connected AND-OR-net  $G$  with  $n \geq 6$  vertices has  $\mu(n)$  fixed points if and only if it has the following property: its underlying graph  $H$  is isomorphic to  $H_n$ ; every arc of  $H$  that is not in a triangle is an arc of  $G$ ; an arc of  $G$  is negative if and only if it connects vertices with the same type. We can also derived easily from Figure 4 and Lemma 7, the extremal loop-less connected AND-OR-nets with at most five vertices.

To characterize extremal loop-less AND-OR-nets, additional definitions are needed. Given two graphs  $H$  and  $H'$ , let  $H \cup H'$  denotes the disjoint union of  $H$  and  $H'$ , and let  $nH$  denotes the disjoint union of  $n$  copies of  $H$ . As usual,  $K_n$  is the complete graph with  $n$  vertices. For  $n \geq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{H}_n$  be the set of graphs defined as follows: if  $n = 3s$  then  $\mathcal{H}_n$  only contains  $3K_n$ ; if  $n = 3s + 1$  then  $\mathcal{H}_n$  contains  $K_4 + (s-1)K_3$  and  $2K_2 + (s-1)K_3$ ; and if  $n = 3s + 2$  then  $\mathcal{H}_n$  only contains  $K_2 + (s-1)K_3$ . In [16] the following is proved: a graph  $H$  with

$n$  vertices has  $\eta(n)$  maximal independent sets if and only if  $H$  is isomorphic to a graph in  $\mathcal{H}_n$ . Using this characterization and arguments similar to the ones used in the proof of Theorem 20, we can prove the following.

**Theorem 20** *If  $G$  is a loop-less AND-net with  $n \geq 2$  vertices, then  $G$  has  $\eta(n)$  fixed points if and only if  $G$  has the following properties: (i) the underlying graph  $H$  of  $G$  is isomorphic to a graph in  $\mathcal{H}_n$ ; (ii)  $G$  is symmetric (so  $H$  is actually the underlying digraph of  $G$ ); (iii) copies of  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  have only negative arcs; and copies of  $K_2$  have either two negative arcs or two positive arcs.*

From this characterization and Lemma 7, we deduce that a loop-less connected AND-OR-net  $G$  with  $n \geq 2$  vertices has  $\eta(n)$  fixed points if and only if it has the properties (i) and (iii) given above and the following property: an arc in a copy of  $K_3$  and  $K_4$  is negative if and only if it connects vertices with the same type.

## 6 Allowing loops

In this section, we establish the maximal number of fixed points in a connected AND-OR-nets when the presence of loops is allowed.

**Lemma 21** *Let  $G$  be an AND-net. If  $H$  is an AND-net obtained from  $G$  by removing a positive loop, then  $\text{FP}(H) \subseteq \text{FP}(G)$ ; and if  $H$  is an AND-net obtained from  $G$  by removing a negative loop, then  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(H)$ .*

**PROOF.** Suppose that  $G$  has a positive loop on  $v$ , and let  $H$  be the AND-net obtained from  $G$  by removing this loop. Let  $x \in \text{FP}(H)$ . If  $x(v) = 0$  then  $f_v^G(x) = 0$  because of the presence of the positive loop, and it follows that  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . If  $x(v) = 1$ , then, in  $H$ ,  $x(u) = 1$  for all positive predecessors of  $v$ , and  $x(u) = 0$  for all negative predecessors of  $v$ . Since this situation remains true in  $G$ , we have  $f_v^G(x) = 1$ , so  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ .

Suppose that  $G$  has a negative loop on  $v$ , and let  $H$  be the AND-net obtained from  $G$  by removing this loop. Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Clearly, since  $G$  has a negative loop on  $v$ , we have  $x(v) = 0$ . Thus, in  $G$ ,  $v$  has a positive predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 0$  or a negative predecessor  $u$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . So  $u \neq v$  and we deduce that  $f_v^H(x) = 0$ . Thus  $x \in \text{FP}(H)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 22** *These inclusions are sometimes strict. Indeed: the AND-net with one vertex and a positive loops has two fixed points; the AND-net with one vertex and a negative loop has no fixed point; and the AND-net with one vertex and no arc has a unique fixed point.*

**Lemma 23** *Let  $G$  be an AND-net with a positive loop on each vertex, let  $v$  be a vertex of  $G$ , and let  $H$  be the AND-net obtained from  $G$  by making negative each arc starting from  $v$ . Then  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(H)|$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $U$  be the set of vertices  $u \in V(G) \setminus v$  such that  $(v, u) \in E^+(G)$ . For each  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , let  $\tilde{x}$  be the configuration defined as follows:  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(u)$  for all  $u \neq v$ , and

$$\tilde{x}(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \exists u \in U \text{ with } x(u) = 1 \\ x(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us prove that the map  $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$  is an injection. Let  $x, y \in \text{FP}(G)$  with  $x \neq y$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $\tilde{x} = \tilde{y}$ . Then  $x(u) = y(u)$  for all  $u \neq v$ , thus  $x(v) \neq y(v)$ . If  $x(u) = y(u) = 0$  for all  $u \in U$ , then  $\tilde{x}(v) = x(v) \neq y(v) = \tilde{y}(v)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $x(u) = y(u) = 1$  for some  $u \in U$ . Since  $G$  has a positive arc  $(v, u)$ , we deduce that  $x(v) = y(v) = 1$ , a contradiction. This prove that  $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$  is an injection.

Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$  and let us prove that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(H)$ . Let  $u \in U$ . If  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$  then  $f_u^H(\tilde{x}) = 0$  since, in  $H$ ,  $u$  has a positive loop. If  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$  then  $f_u^G(x) = x(u) = \tilde{x}(u) = 1$  and  $\tilde{x}(v) = 0$ . So, if, in  $H$ ,  $u$  has a positive predecessor  $w$  with  $\tilde{x}(w) = 0$  or a negative predecessor  $w$  with  $\tilde{x}(w) = 1$ , then  $w \neq v$ , thus  $x(w) = \tilde{x}(w)$  and we deduce that  $f_v^G(x) = 0$ , a contradiction. Thus, in  $H$ ,  $u$  has no positive predecessor  $w$  with  $\tilde{x}(w) = 0$  and no negative predecessor  $w$  with  $\tilde{x}(w) = 1$ . Thus  $f_u^H(\tilde{x}) = 1 = \tilde{x}(u)$ . So for all  $u \in U$ , we have  $f_u^H(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(u)$ . It remains to prove that  $f_v^H(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$ . If  $\tilde{x}(v) = 0$  then  $f_v^H(\tilde{x}) = 0$  since  $H$  has a positive loop on  $v$ . If  $\tilde{x}(v) = 1$  then  $\tilde{x} = x$  and since  $f_v^H = f_v^G$  we have  $f_v^H(\tilde{x}) = f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$ . Thus  $f_v^H(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$  in all cases, and we deduce that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(H)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 24** *The inequality is sometimes strict. For instance, consider the following AND-nets  $G$  and  $H$ :*



$G$  satisfies the conditions of the statement,  $H$  is obtained from  $G$  by making negative each arc starting from vertex 1, and  $|\text{FP}(G)| = 4 < |\text{FP}(H)| = 5$ .

The following observation is straightforward.

**Lemma 25** *If  $G$  is a negative AND-net with a positive loop on each vertex, then  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{IS}(G)|$ .*

**Remark 26** *If  $G$  is a loop-less negative AND-net, then applying transformation  $T_4$  consists in a symmetrization of  $G$  that may increase the number of fixed points (cf. Remark 18). However, if  $G$  is as in the previous lemma, a symmetrization does not change fixed points. To see this, let  $G$  be a negative AND-net with a positive loop on each vertex, and consider the symmetric version  $G^s$  of  $G$ , obtained from  $G$  by adding a negative arc  $(u, v)$  for each  $(v, u) \in E^-(G)$  (such that  $(u, v) \notin E^-(G)$ ). Clearly, the symmetrization has no influence on independent sets:  $|\text{IS}(G^s)| = |\text{IS}(G)|$ . Hence, according to Lemma 25,  $|\text{FP}(G^s)| = |\text{FP}(G)|$ .*

A *star* is a graph  $G$  that contains a vertex  $v$ , called *center*, such there is an arc  $(u, w)$  if and only if  $v = u \neq w$  or  $u \neq w = v$ . Thus, a star with  $n + 1$  vertices is isomorphic to  $K_{1,n}$  (the complete bipartite graph with a part of size 1 and a part of size  $n$ ), and a star has a unique center when  $n \neq 2$ .

Clearly, if  $G$  is a connected graph and  $T$  a spanning tree of  $G$ , then  $|\text{IS}(T)| \geq |\text{IS}(G)|$ . Besides, in [17] it was proved that among all trees on  $n$  vertices,  $K_{1,n-1}$  is the one that maximizes the number of independent sets. As a consequence, we have the following property:

**Lemma 27** *If  $G$  is a connected graph with  $n$  vertices, then  $|\text{IS}(G)| \leq 2^{n-1} + 1$ , and the bound is reached if and only if  $G$  is a star.*

For each  $n > 1$ , let  $S_n$  be the AND-net defined as follows: there are  $n$  vertices, denoted from 1 to  $n$ , a positive loop on each vertex, and a positive arc  $(1, k)$  for each  $1 < k \leq n$ . Note that the underlying graph of  $S_n$  is a star. We are now in position to state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 28** *If  $G$  is a connected AND-net with  $n$  vertices, then*

$$|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{n-1} + 1.$$

*The bound is reached if and only if  $G$  is isomorphic to  $S^n$  or has the following properties: (i) a positive loop on each vertex; (ii) no negative cycles; (iii) a star as underlying graph; (iv) no positive arc leaving the center of this star.*

**PROOF.** Let  $G$  be a connected AND-net with  $n$  vertices. Let  $G'$  be the AND-net obtained from  $G$  by: (1) removing all the negative loops; (2) adding a positive loop on each vertex (if it does not already exist); and (3) making negative each arc that is not a loop. Clearly,  $G$  and  $G'$  have the same underlying graph; we denote it by  $H$ . According to Lemmas 21, 23, 25 and 27,

$$|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G')| = |\text{IS}(G')| = |\text{IS}(H)| \leq 2^{n-1} + 1.$$

This prove the first assertion. Let us prove the second. Suppose that  $H$  is a star, and let  $v$  be the center of  $H$ . If  $G$  is isomorphic to  $S_n$  or has the properties (i)–(iv), then it is easy to check that  $G$  has  $2^{n-1}$  fixed points  $x$  such that  $x(v) = 0$ , and a (unique) fixed point  $x$  such that  $x(v) = 1$ . So finally, suppose that  $|\text{FP}(G)| = 2^{n-1} + 1$ , suppose that  $G$  is not isomorphic to  $S_n$ , and let us prove that this implies that  $G$  has the properties (i)–(iv).

- (iii) We have already seen that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{IS}(H)|$ , and it follows from Lemma 27 that  $H$  is a star (thus  $G$  satisfies (iii)); let  $v$  be its the center.
- (i) It has been proved in [1] that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{|U|}$  for every  $U \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $G \setminus U$  has no positive cycles. Let  $v \in V(G)$  and  $U = V(G) \setminus v$ . If  $G$  has no positive loop on  $v$ , then  $G \setminus U$  has no positive cycles, thus  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{|U|} = 2^{n-1}$ , a contradiction. Thus  $G$  has the property (i).
- (ii) Suppose that  $G$  has a negative cycle. It follows from (ii) and (iii) that there exists  $u \neq v$  such that  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$  are arcs of  $G$  with opposite signs. Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Suppose that  $(v, u)$  is positive (and  $(u, v)$  negative); the other case being similar. Then,  $x(v) = 0$  implies  $x(u) = 0$ , and  $x(v) = 1$  implies  $x(u) = 0$ . Thus  $x(u) = 0$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , so that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{n-1}$ , a contradiction. Thus  $G$  has the property (ii).
- (iv) We first need to prove the following property: for all  $u \neq v$ ,

$$(v, u) \in E^+(G) \Rightarrow (u, v) \notin E(G). \quad (1)$$

Indeed, suppose that  $(v, u) \in E^+(G)$  with  $u \neq v$ . By (ii)  $(u, v) \notin E^-(G)$ , and if  $(u, v) \in E^+(G)$ , then it is easy to see that  $x(v) = x(u)$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , so that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{n-1}$ , a contradiction. Now suppose, for a contradiction, that  $G$  has a positive arc  $(v, u)$  leaving the center ( $u \neq v$ ). Suppose first that there exists  $w \neq u, v$  such that  $(v, w) \in E^-(G)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ . Then  $x(v) = 0$  implies  $x(u) = 0$  and  $x(v) = 1$  implies  $x(w) = 0$ . Thus there are at most  $2^{n-2}$  fixed points  $x$  such that  $x(v) = 1$  and at most  $2^{n-2}$  fixed points  $x$  such that  $x(v) = 0$ . Thus  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{n-1}$ , a contradiction. We deduce that all the arcs leaving  $v$  are positive. From (1) and the fact that  $G$  is not isomorphic to  $S_n$ , we deduce that there exists  $w \neq u, v$  such that  $(w, v) \in E(G)$ . Let  $c = 1$  if this arc is positive, and  $c = 0$  otherwise. Then,  $x(v) = 0$  implies  $x(u) = 0$ , and  $x(v) = 1$  implies  $x(w) = c$ . Hence, as above, we deduce that  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 2^{n-2} + 2n - 2 = 2^{n-1}$ , a contradiction. Thus there is no positive arc leaving the center  $v$ .  $\square$

## 7 Minimum number of fixed points

In this section we study, given a digraph  $H$ , which is the minimum number of fixed points that an AND-OR-net  $G$  with underlying digraph  $H$  can have. In



[1] it was proved that the presence of a positive cycle in the interaction digraph of a Boolean network is a necessary condition to the existence of fixed points. In particular, if an AND-OR-net  $G$  has no positive cycle, then  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq 1$ . However, there are some families of digraphs, such as the complete digraphs, for which any assignment of signs on the arcs yields a positive cycle. Despite this, the following result ensures that for any connected digraph  $H$ , there exists an AND-net  $G$  with underlying digraph  $H$  and without fixed points. The proof is mainly based on transformation  $T_3$ . This shows that transformations introduced in the proof of Theorem 2 may be interesting in other contexts.

**Theorem 29** *Let  $H$  be a connected digraph without sink. There exists an AND-net  $G$  with underlying digraph  $H$  such that  $|\text{FP}(G)| = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $F \subseteq V(H)$  be a minimal feedback vertex set of  $H$ ; that is a minimal set of vertices intersecting each cycle (since  $H$  has no sink, it has at least one cycle, thus  $F \neq \emptyset$ ). We define  $G$  to be the AND-net such that

$$\begin{aligned} V(G) &= V(H) \\ E^-(G) &= \{(u, v) \mid (u, v) \in E(H), u \in F\} \\ E^+(G) &= \{(u, v) \mid (u, v) \in E(H), u \notin F\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $E^-(G)$  is a feedback arc set of  $G$ : every cycle of  $G$  has at least one arc in  $E^-(G)$ . So  $G$  has the property  $P_2$ . Let  $G^3 = T_3(G)$ . By Lemma 15,  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^3)$ . See Figure 5 for an illustration.

We claim that each vertex  $v \in F$  has a negative loop in  $G^3$ . Indeed, if  $v \in F$  has a negative loop in  $G$  then it has a negative loop in  $G^3$  (since  $E^-(G) \subseteq E^-(G^3)$ ). So suppose that  $v$  has no negative loop in  $G$ . Then it has no loop in  $G$  since  $G$  has the property  $P_2$ . Because  $F$  is minimal, for every  $v \in F$  there exists a cycle  $C$  in  $G$  such that  $V(C) \cap F = \{v\}$ . Let  $w$  be the successor of  $v$  in  $C$  ( $w \neq v$  by hypothesis). Then by the definition of  $G$ ,  $(v, w) \in E^-(G)$  and all the other arcs of  $C$  are positive arcs of  $G$ . Thus,  $G$  has a path from  $w$  to  $v$  with only positive arcs. Thus  $(v, v) \in E_3^-(G) \subseteq E^-(G^3)$ .

Furthermore, since  $(u, v) \in E^-(G)$  implies that  $u \in F$ , we deduce that  $(u, v) \in E^-(G^3)$  implies that  $u \in F$ . Thus every arc of  $G^3$  is an arc starting from  $F$ . In this way, if  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , then  $x \in \text{FP}(G^3)$ , and  $x(v) = 0$  for all  $v \in F$ , because  $(v, v) \in E^-(G^3)$ . So for all  $v \in F$ , there exists an arc  $(u, v) \in E^-(G^3)$  such that  $x(u) = 1$ , but this is not possible since  $u \in F$ .  $\square$

Actually, the hypothesis “ $H$  is connected” can be simply removed from the statement: if  $H$  has no sink, then by applying the previous theorem on each




Fig. 5. Illustration for the proof of Theorem 30.

connected component of  $H$ , we obtain an AND-net  $G$  with underlying digraph  $H$  and without fixed point.

Besides, the hypothesis “ $H$  has no sink” can be replaced by the weaker hypothesis “ $H$  has at least one cycle”. Indeed, let  $H$  be a digraph with at least one cycle, and let  $G$  the AND-net defined, as in the previous proof, from  $H$  and a minimal feedback vertex set  $F$ . Suppose that  $H$  has a sink  $v$ . Then  $x(v) = 1$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G)$ , and since all the arcs starting from  $v$  are positive (because  $v \notin F$ ), it is clear that  $G \setminus v$  and  $G$  have the same number of fixed points. Also,  $F$  is clearly a minimal feedback vertex set of  $H \setminus v$ . Repeating this process, we obtain a AND-net  $G'$  with underlying digraph  $H'$  such that:  $G'$  and  $G$  has the same number of fixed points,  $H'$  has no sink, and  $F$  is a minimal feedback vertex set of  $H'$ . Then, using the previous proof,  $G'$  has no fixed point, and we deduce that  $G$  has no fixed point too.

On the other hand, according to a theorem of Robert [19,20], if  $H$  has no cycle then every AND-OR-net with underlying digraph  $H$  has a unique fixed point. Hence, we obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 30** *Let  $H$  be a digraph. There exists an AND-net  $G$  with underlying digraph  $H$  such that  $|\text{FP}(G)| = 0$  if and only if  $H$  has at least one cycle.*

## 8 Conclusion and perspectives

We have proved that the number of fixed points in a connected AND-OR-net  $G$  with  $n$  vertices is bounded above by: the maximal number of maximal independent sets in a connected graph with  $n$  vertices if  $G$  has no loops; and the maximal number of independent sets in a connected graph with  $n$  vertices otherwise. In this way, using results on independent sets, we obtain tight upper-bounds on the number of fixed points in AND-OR-nets.

Considering AND-OR-nets reaching the bounds is interesting. For example,

in the loop-less case, AND-nets reaching the bounds are symmetric, contains only negative arcs, and a lot of “triangles” that is cycles of length 3. Thus, in the loop-less case, to reach the bound, a lot of negative cycles are necessary, and this is not very intuitive since negative cycles are mostly known to be unfavorable to fixed points. Now, when loops are allowed, AND-nets reaching the bound contains have no negative cycles. This shows that the influence of negative cycles on the number of fixed points is subtle, not yet well understood (while the influence of positive cycle is rather well understand: to have many fixed points, a lot of “rather disjoint” positive cycles are necessary).

## A More on transformation $T_1$

**Proposition 2** *For every AND-net  $G$  we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^1)|$ .*

**PROOF.** By Lemma 10 we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^1)|$ . Suppose that  $G \neq G^1$ , and let us prove that  $|\text{FP}(G^1)| \leq |\text{FP}(G)|$ . Consider the function that maps every configuration  $x \in \text{FP}(G^1)$  to the configuration  $\tilde{x}$  of  $G$  defined by:

$$\tilde{x}(v) = \begin{cases} x(v) & \text{if } v \in V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G) \\ 1 & \text{if } v \in V_{\text{cst}1}(G) \\ 0 & \text{if } v \in V_{\text{cst}0}(G) \end{cases}$$

Since  $x \mapsto \tilde{x}$  is clearly an injection, it is sufficient to show that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(G)$  for all  $x \in \text{FP}(G^1)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G^1)$ , let  $v \in V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , and let us prove that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$ .

- (1) Suppose that  $x(v) = 1 = \tilde{x}(v)$  and, for a contradiction, that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Then there exists  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$  or there exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$ . Suppose first that there exists  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$ . Then  $u \notin V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$  since otherwise  $v \in V_{\text{cst}0}(G)$ . Thus  $u \notin V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ , and we deduce that  $u \in P_{G^1}^+(v)$ . Since  $x(u) = \tilde{x}(u) = 0$  we have  $f_v^{G^1}(x) = 0$ , a contradiction. If there exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$ , then we obtain a contradiction in a similar way. Thus  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 1 = \tilde{x}(v)$ .
- (2) Suppose that  $x(v) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ . If there exists  $u \in P_{G^1}^+(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ , then  $u \neq v^*$ , thus  $u \in P_G^+(v)$ . Since  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(u) = 0$ , we deduce that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Similarly, if there exists  $u \in P_{G^1}^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ , then  $u \neq v^*$ , thus  $u \in P_G^-(v)$ . Since  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(u) = 1$ , we deduce that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Thus  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$  in all cases.

So we have proved that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$  for all  $v \in V(G) \setminus V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . We now prove, by induction (following the inductive definition of  $V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ ), that the

same equality holds for  $v \in V_{\text{cst}}(G)$ . Actually, we only prove the base case, since the induction step is straightforward. Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G^1)$ .

- (1) Suppose that there exists strong components  $H$  and  $H'$  in  $G \setminus E^-(G)$  such that  $G$  has both a positive and a negative arc from  $V(H')$  to  $V(H)$  (so  $V(H) \subseteq V_{\text{cst0}}(G)$ ). Let  $v \in V(H)$ . If  $H$  is not trivial,  $v$  has a positive predecessor  $u \in V(H)$ . Thus  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$  and we deduce that  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ . So suppose that  $H$  is trivial. If  $V(H') \cap V_{\text{cst0}}(G) \neq \emptyset$  then  $V(H') \subseteq V_{\text{cst0}}(G)$  thus  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$  for all  $u \in V(H')$ , and since  $v$  has a positive predecessor in  $V(H')$  we have  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ . Similarly, if  $V(H') \cap V_{\text{cst1}}(G) \neq \emptyset$  then  $V(H') \subseteq V_{\text{cst1}}(G)$  thus  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$  for all  $u \in V(H')$ , and since  $v$  has a negative predecessor in  $V(H')$  we have  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ . So finally, suppose that  $V(H') \cap V_{\text{cst}}(G) = \emptyset$ . Then  $f_u^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(u)$  for all  $u \in V(H')$ , and we deduce, as in Lemma 6, that there exists  $c \in \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\tilde{x}(u) = c$  for all  $u \in V(H')$ . If  $c = 0$  then  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ , because  $v$  has a positive predecessor in  $V(H')$ , and if  $c = 1$  then  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v)$ , because  $v$  has a negative predecessor in  $V(H')$ . Thus  $f_v^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v)$  in all cases.
- (2) If  $v$  is a sink, then  $v \in V_{\text{cst1}}(G)$  thus  $f_v^G = \text{cst} = 1 = \tilde{x}(v)$ .  $\square$

## B More on transformation $T_2$

**Proposition 3** *If  $G$  is an AND-net satisfying the property  $P_1$ , then  $|\text{FP}(G)| = |\text{FP}(G^2)|$ .*

**PROOF.** By Lemma 13 we have  $|\text{FP}(G)| \leq |\text{FP}(G^2)|$ . Let us prove that  $|\text{FP}(G^2)| \leq |\text{FP}(G)|$ . Let  $H_1, \dots, H_r$  be the strongly connected components of  $G \setminus E^-(G)$ . For every  $1 \leq k \leq r$ , let  $v_k$  be the smallest vertices in  $V(H_k)$ . Let  $U = V(G) \setminus \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r\}$ . Consider the permutation mapping each configuration  $x$  of  $G$  to the configuration  $\tilde{x}$  of  $G$  defined by:

$$\tilde{x}(u) = \begin{cases} 1 - x(u) & \text{if } u \in U \\ x(u) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We prove that  $\tilde{x} \in \text{FP}(G)$  for each  $x \in \text{FP}(G^2)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G^2)$  and  $1 \leq k \leq r$ . If  $u \in V(H_k) \setminus v_k$ , then  $f_u^{G^2}(x) = 1 - x(v_k)$  and thus  $x(u) \neq x(v_k)$ . Consequently

$$\forall u \in V(H_k), \quad \tilde{x}(u) = x(v_k).$$

We first prove that  $f_u^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(u)$  given any  $u \in V(H_k) \setminus v_k$ . Suppose that

$\tilde{x}(u) = 0$ . Since there exists  $w \in P_G^+(u) \cap V(H_k)$ , and since  $\tilde{x}(w) = \tilde{x}(u) = 0$ , we have  $f_u^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(u)$ . Suppose now that  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_u^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Then one of the following two conditions holds:

- (1) There exists  $w \in P_G^+(u)$  with  $\tilde{x}(w) = 0$ . Then  $\tilde{x}(w) \neq \tilde{x}(u)$  so  $w \notin V(H_k)$  thus  $w \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$ . Then,  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^+(v_k)$  and  $x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(w) = 0$  thus  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(x) = 0 = x(v_k) \neq \tilde{x}(u)$ , a contradiction.
- (2) There exists  $w \in P_G^-(u)$  with  $x(w) = 1$ . Since  $G$  satisfies the condition  $Q_1$ ,  $w \notin V(H_k)$  thus  $w \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$ . Then,  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k)$  and  $x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(w) = 1$  thus  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(x) = 0 = \tilde{x}(u)$ , a contradiction.

Since there is a contradiction in both cases,  $f_u^G(\tilde{x}) = 1 = \tilde{x}(u)$ .

We now prove that  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ . Suppose first that  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ . If  $H_k$  is not trivial then there exists  $u \in P_G^+(v_k) \cap V(H_k)$  and since  $\tilde{x}(u) = x(v_k) = 0$  we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Suppose that  $H_k$  is trivial. Since  $x(v_k) = \tilde{x}(v_k) = 0$ , one of the following two condition holds:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_{G^2}^+(v_k)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ . Then  $u = v_l$  for some  $l \neq k$ , so there exists  $w \in P_G^+(v_k) \cap V(H_l)$ . Since  $\tilde{x}(w) = x(v_l) = 0$  we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ .
- (2) There exists  $u \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Then  $u = v_l$  for some  $l \neq k$ , so there exists  $w \in P_G^-(v_k) \cap V(H_l)$ . Since  $\tilde{x}(w) = x(v_l) = 1$  we deduce that  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ .

So in all cases,  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0 = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ . Suppose now that  $\tilde{x}(v_k) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 0$ . Then one of the following two conditions holds:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_G^+(v_k)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 0$ . Then  $\tilde{x}(u) \neq \tilde{x}(v_k) = x(v_k)$  so  $u \notin V(H_k)$  thus  $u \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$ . Then,  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^+(v_k)$  and  $x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(u) = 0$  thus  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(x) = 0 \neq \tilde{x}(v_k) = x(v_k)$ , a contradiction.
- (2) There exists  $u \in P_G^-(v_k)$  with  $\tilde{x}(u) = 1$ . Since  $G$  satisfies the condition  $Q_1$ ,  $u \notin V(H_k)$  thus  $u \in V(H_l)$  for some  $l \neq k$ . Then,  $v_l \in P_{G^2}^-(v_k)$  and  $x(v_l) = \tilde{x}(u) = 1$  thus  $f_{v_k}^{G^2}(x) = 0 \neq \tilde{x}(v_k) = x(v_k)$ , a contradiction.

Since there is a contradiction in both cases,  $f_{v_k}^G(\tilde{x}) = 1 = \tilde{x}(v_k)$ .  $\square$

## C More on transformation $T_3$

**Proposition 4** *If  $G$  is an AND-net with the property  $P_2$  then  $\text{FP}(G) = \text{FP}(G^3)$ .*

**PROOF.** By Lemma 15 we have  $\text{FP}(G) \subseteq \text{FP}(G^3)$ , so we just prove that  $\text{FP}(G^3) \subseteq \text{FP}(G)$ . Let  $x \in \text{FP}(G^3)$  and  $v \in V(G)$ .

Suppose that  $x(v) = 0$ . Then there exists  $u \in P_{G^3}^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . If  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  then  $f_v^G(x) = 0 = x(v)$ . Otherwise, there exists  $w$  such that  $(u, w) \in E^-(G)$  and such that  $G$  has a path  $P$  from  $w$  to  $v$  with only positive arc. Then,  $(u, t) \in E^-(G^3)$  for all  $t \in V(P)$ , and thus  $f_t^{G^3}(x) = 0 = x(t)$  for all  $t \in V(P)$ . Thus, there exists  $t \in P_G^+(v) \cap V(P)$  with  $x(t) = 0$  and we deduce that  $f_v^G(x) = 0 = x(v)$ .

Suppose now that  $x(v) = 1$ , and suppose, for a contradiction, that  $f_v^G(x) = 0$ . Then one of the following two conditions hold:

- (1) There exists  $u \in P_G^+(v)$  with  $x(u) = 0$ . Let  $P$  be the longest path of  $G$  with only positive arcs, with  $u$  as final vertex, and such that  $x(w) = 0$  for all  $w \in V(P)$ . Let  $w$  be the initial vertex of  $P$ . If there exists  $t \in P_G^+(w)$  then  $t \in V(P)$  (since  $P$  is of maximal length) thus  $G$  has a cycle with only positive arcs, in contradiction with the property  $P_2$ . Thus  $x(t) = 1$  for all  $t \in P_G^-(w)$ . Since  $x(w) = 0$  we have, according to the arguments above,  $f_w^G(x) = 0$ . Thus, there exists  $t \in P_G^-(w)$  with  $x(t) = 1$ . But then  $(t, v) \in E^-(G^3)$  so  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = 0 \neq x(v)$ , a contradiction.
- (2) There exists  $u \in P_G^-(v)$  with  $x(u) = 1$ . Then  $u \in P_{G^3}^-(v)$  thus  $f_v^{G^3}(x) = 0 \neq x(v)$ , a contradiction.

We deduce that  $f_v^G(x) = 1 = x(v)$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. Aracena. On the number of fixed points in regulatory boolean networks. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 70 (2008) 1398-1409.
- [2] J. Aracena, J. Demongeot, and E. Goles. Fixed points and maximal independent sets in AND-OR-networks, *Discrete App. Math.* 138 (2004) 277-288.
- [3] J. Cutler and A. J. Radcliffe, Extremal problems for independent set enumeration, *Electronic Journal of Combinatorics* 18(1) (2011), #P169.
- [4] Z. Füredi, The number of maximal independent sets in connected graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 11 (1987), 463-470.
- [5] D. Galvin, Two problems on independent sets in graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* 311 (2011), 2105-2112.
- [6] E. Goles, G. Hernández, Dynamical Behavior of Kauffman Networks with AND-OR gates, *Journal of Biological Systems* 8 (2000) 151-175.

- [7] J. R. Griggs, C. M. Grinstead, and D. R. Guichard, The number of maximal independent sets in a connected graph, *Discrete Math.* 68(1988), 211-220.
- [8] H. Hua, A sharp upper bound for the number of stable sets in graphs with given number of cut edges, *Applied Mathematics Letters* 22 (2009), 1380-1385.
- [9] M. Hujter and Z. Tuza, The number of maximal independent sets in triangle-free graphs, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 6 (1993), 284-288.
- [10] J. Kahn, An entropy approach to the hard-core model on bipartite graphs, *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* 10 (2001), 219-237.
- [11] S.A. Kauffman, Metabolic Stability and Epigenesis in Randomly Constructed Genetics nets, *J. Theoretical Biology* 22(1969) 437-467.
- [12] S.A. Kauffman, *The Origins of Order, Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution* (Oxford University Press, 1993).
- [13] J. Liu, Maximal independent sets in bipartite graphs, *J. Graph Theory* 17(1993) 495-507.
- [14] A. Melkman, T. Tamura, T. Akutsu, Determining a singleton attractor of an AND/OR Boolean network in  $O(1.587^n)$  time, *Information Processing Letters* 110 (2010) 565-569.
- [15] A. Meir and J. W. Moon, On maximal independent sets of nodes in trees, *J. Graph Theory* 12 (1988), 265-283.
- [16] J. W. Moon and L. Moser, On cliques in graphs, *Israel J. Math.* 3 (1965) 23-28.
- [17] H. Prodinger and R. Tichy, Fibonacci numbers of graphs, *The Fibonacci Quarterly* 20 (1982), 16-21.
- [18] E. Remy, P. Ruet and D. Thieffry, Graphic requirements for multistability and attractive cycles in a boolean dynamical framework, *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 41 (2008) 335 - 350.
- [19] F. Robert, Iterations sur des ensembles finis et automates cellulaires contractants, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* 29 (1980) 393-412.
- [20] F. Robert, *Discrete iterations: a metric study*, Series in Computational Mathematics 6, Springer, 1986.
- [21] R. Thomas, Boolean formalization of genetic control circuits, *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 42 (1973) 563-585.
- [22] R. Thomas and R. d'Ari, *Biological Feedback*, CRC Press, 1990.
- [23] A. Veliz-Cuba and R. Laubenbacher. On the computation of fixed points in Boolean networks, *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computing* 39 (2012) 145-153.
- [24] Y. Zhao, The Number of Independent Sets in a Regular Graph, *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing* 19 (2010), 315-320.

# Centro de Investigación en Ingeniería Matemática (CI<sup>2</sup>MA)

## PRE-PUBLICACIONES 2012 - 2013

- 2012-17 GABRIEL N. GATICA, ANTONIO MARQUEZ, WALTER RUDOLPH: *A priori and a posteriori error analyses of augmented twofold saddle point formulations for nonlinear elasticity problems*
- 2012-18 RAIMUND BÜRGER, ENRIQUE D. FERNÁNDEZ NIETO, EL HADJI KONÉ, TOMÁS MORALES DE LUNA: *A multilayer shallow water system for polydisperse sedimentation*
- 2012-19 FABIÁN FLORES-BAZÁN, GIANDOMENICO MASTROENI: *Strong duality in cone constrained nonconvex optimization: a general approach with applications to nonconvex variational problems*
- 2012-20 ALFREDO BERMÚDEZ, DOLORES GÓMEZ, RODOLFO RODRÍGUEZ, PILAR SALGADO, PABLO VENEGAS: *Numerical solution of a transient non-linear axisymmetric eddy current model with non-local boundary conditions*
- 2012-21 RAIMUND BÜRGER, PEP MULET, LUIS M. VILLADA: *Implicit-explicit methods for diffusively corrected multi-species kinematic flow models*
- 2012-22 RAIMUND BÜRGER, STEFAN DIEHL: *Convexity-preserving flux identification for scalar conservation laws modelling sedimentation*
- 2012-23 RAIMUND BÜRGER, ILJA KRÖKER, CHRISTIAN ROHDE: *A hybrid stochastic Galerkin method for uncertainty quantification applied to a conservation law modelling a clarifier-thickener unit*
- 2012-24 FELIPE LEPE, DAVID MORA, RODOLFO RODRÍGUEZ: *Locking-free finite element method for a bending moment formulation of Timoshenko beams*
- 2012-25 RAIMUND BÜRGER, PEP MULET, LUIS M. VILLADA: *A diffusively corrected multi-class Lighthill-Whitham-Richards traffic model with anticipation lengths and reaction times*
- 2012-26 MARGARETH ALVES, JAIME MUÑOZ-RIVERA, MAURICIO SEPÚLVEDA, OCTAVIO VERA: *Exponential and the lack of exponential stability in transmission problems with localized Kelvin-Voigt dissipation*
- 2013-01 JORGE CLARKE, CIPRIAN A. TUDOR: *Wiener integrals with respect to the Hermite random field and applications to the wave equation*
- 2013-02 JULIO ARACENA, ADRIEN RICHARD, LILIAN SALINAS: *Maximum number of fixed points in AND-OR Boolean network*

Para obtener copias de las Pre-Publicaciones, escribir o llamar a: DIRECTOR, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN, CASILLA 160-C, CONCEPCIÓN, CHILE, TEL.: 41-2661324, o bien, visitar la página web del centro: <http://www.ci2ma.udec.cl>





**CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN  
INGENIERÍA MATEMÁTICA (CI<sup>2</sup>MA)  
Universidad de Concepción**



Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile  
Tel.: 56-41-2661324/2661554/2661316  
<http://www.ci2ma.udec.cl>

