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Abstract—A significant problem when building complex biomolecular circuits is due to context-dependence: the dynamics of a system are altered upon changes to its context, potentially degrading the system’s performance. Here, we study retroactivity, a specific type of context-dependence, by analyzing the effects of loads on a transcription factor applied by the transcription factor target sites. In particular, we study this loading effect on the model of an activator-repressor oscillator, an important motif in synthetic biology. Our analysis indicates that strong activation and weak repression are key for a stable limit cycle. Repression can be effectively weakened by adding load to the repressor, while activation can be effectively weakened by adding load to the activator. Therefore, loading the repressor can be employed as a design parameter to establish a stable limit cycle. In contrast, loading the activator is deleterious to the clock.

I. INTRODUCTION

Modularity is the property that allows components to be designed independently such that their input/output behavior remains unchanged upon interconnection with other modules. Modularity is, however, not universal and the dynamics of engineering systems typically change when loaded. Recently, it has been experimentally shown that biomolecular systems, such as genetic circuits, experience these loading effects [1]-[2], also called retroactivity [3]. Several types of simple biomolecular circuits and motifs, such as the toggle switch [4]-[6], gene oscillators [7]-[9], and logic gates [10]-[11] have been modularly designed and experimentally validated, and a major challenge in synthetic biology is to combine these modules to construct complex circuits [12] for applications including biofuel technology [13], biosensors [14], and various medical technologies [15]-[16].

To address the deleterious effects of retroactivity that cause modularity to fail, insulation devices have been designed to be placed between upstream and downstream systems to act as a buffer. Such devices include using high gain negative feedback [3], [17] and time scale separation [2], [18]. However, retroactivity can be viewed as an additional design parameter and in fact, all natural systems have some form of load. Signal transduction networks often regulate many downstream gene targets and in gene transcription networks, transcription factors often have many DNA sites to which they bind. Many of these sites do not even have regulatory functionalities [19], and therefore it is plausible that they are being used to tune the level and temporal dynamics of transcription factors [1].
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Recent theoretical work has considered the effect of loading on synthetic biological circuits and networks. It has been theoretically shown that loading a genetic clock through the use of additional DNA promoter binding sites can switch it on or off and also enable frequency tuning [19]. Retroactivity has been shown to affect the relative stability of toggle switches, enabling the engineering of biased switches [20]. The loading effects due to intramodular and intermodular connections leading to internal, scaling, and mixing retroactivity are studied in [21]. In this paper, we consider the activator-repressor clock built in [9]. In particular, we identify parametric conditions for the existence of a stable limit cycle and analyze the effect of load on the clock’s dynamics with regard to activating and quenching oscillations using standard tools from dynamical systems theory.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we derive a deterministic ODE model of the activator-repressor clock from biochemical reactions. In Section III, we consider a reduced system model and provide conditions for the existence of a stable limit cycle. In Sections IV and V, the effect of load to the activation and repression branches on the dynamics of the oscillator, respectively is studied.

II. MODEL

A representation of the core network of the genetic oscillator described in [9] is given in Fig. 1. The mRNA of the activator protein (A) and repressor protein (R) are denoted by mA and mR, respectively. Protein A positively regulates its own production by activating itself through the production of mA and the production of R by activating mR. Conversely, R negatively regulates its own production by repressing itself through the repression of mR and the production of A by repressing mA.

A deterministic ODE model can be derived from considering the biochemical reactions of activation, repression, multimerization, transcription, and translation of a generic protein (P) which, due to the symmetry of the model (both proteins are activated by A and repressed by R) can be used.
to describe the evolution of the concentration of both A and R. These reactions are given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
A + A + \ldots + A & \xrightarrow{\beta_A} A_n, \\
R + R + \ldots + R & \xrightarrow{\beta_R} R_m, \\
R_m + \text{DNA}^P & \xrightarrow{a^*} \text{DNA}^P, \\
A_n + \text{DNA}^P & \xrightarrow{a^*} A_n : \text{DNA}^P, \\
\text{DNA}^P & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} m_p + A_n : \text{DNA}^P, \\
m_p & \xrightarrow{\kappa} m_p + \text{DNA}^P, \\
m_p & \xrightarrow{\delta} 0, \\
\text{DNA}^P & \xrightarrow{\gamma} 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Let A and R multimerize with cooperativity n and m, with forward rates of \( \beta_A, \beta_R \) and reverse rates of \( \beta_A', \beta_R' \), respectively, leading to reactions (1)-(2). Since activation and repression are assumed to take place at the transcriptional level, the complex formed by the reversible reaction (with forward rate \( a^* \) and reverse rate \( d^* \)) between \( R_m \) and DNA promoter (\( \text{DNA}^P \)), denoted \( R_m: \text{DNA}^P \), does not contribute to transcription and effectively sequesters free DNA\(^P\), as given in (3). Conversely, \( A_n: \text{DNA}^P \) is the complex formed by the reversible reaction (with forward rate \( a' \) and reverse rate \( d' \)) between \( A_n \) and DNA\(^P\), as shown in (4). This complex undergoes translation at rate \( \alpha_1 \) to produce an mRNA molecule, leading to (5). The model also assumes that some transcription can occur without A bound to DNA\(^P\) (i.e., transcriptional leakiness), described by (6). Translation occurs at a rate \( \kappa \), given in (7), and mRNA and protein decay at a rate \( \delta \) and \( \gamma \), respectively, given in (8)-(9). The ODE model for the mRNA and protein dynamics is given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m}_P &= \alpha_1 [A_n : \text{DNA}^P] + \alpha_2 [\text{DNA}^P] - \delta m_P, \\
\dot{P} &= \kappa m_P - \gamma P. 
\end{align*}
\]

Assuming the total concentration of DNA is constant, the following conservation law holds:

\[
\text{DNA}_{\text{tot}} = \text{DNA}^P + [R_m : \text{DNA}^P] + [A_n : \text{DNA}^P].
\]

Assuming complex formation occurs significantly faster than mRNA and protein dynamics [22], setting their respective rate equations at quasi-steady state (i.e., \( \dot{A}_n, \dot{R}_m, [A_n : \text{DNA}^P], [R_m : \text{DNA}^P] = 0 \)) and solving for \([A_n : \text{DNA}^P] \) and \([\text{DNA}^P] \) in terms of \( A, R \) yields:

\[
\begin{align*}
[A_n : \text{DNA}^P] &= \frac{a'^* \beta_A D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} A^n}{1 + a'^* \beta_A D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} A^n + a^* \beta_R D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} R_m^n}, \\
[\text{DNA}^P] &= \frac{a^* \beta_A D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} A^n}{1 + a^* \beta_A D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} A^n + a^* \beta_R D \text{NA}_{\text{tot}} R_m^n}.
\end{align*}
\]

Equation (10) represents the dynamics of a general mRNA and protein system with transcriptional activation and repression by A and R, respectively. Substituting (11)-(12) in (10) and then using the subscripts “R” or “A” to denote parameters corresponding to R or A production and decay, respectively yields the final model equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m}_A &= \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \delta_A m_A, \\
\dot{m}_R &= \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \delta_R m_R, \\
\dot{A} &= \kappa_A m_A - \gamma_A A, \\
\dot{R} &= \kappa_R m_R - \gamma_R R. 
\end{align*}
\]

The parameter \( \alpha = \alpha_1 \text{DNA}_{\text{tot}} \) is a measure of the maximum transcriptional activation by \( \text{DNA}^P \) to mRNA and \( \alpha_0 = \alpha_2 \text{DNA}_{\text{tot}} \) represents transcriptional leakiness (or basal transcriptional expression) of mRNA. Since the promoters controlling the expression of A and R are the same, given the symmetry of the system, we can assume that \( \alpha \) and \( \alpha_0 \) are equal for both the mRNA and DNA\(^P\) dynamics. The contribution of basal transcription to the production of mRNA is assumed to be small in magnitude compared to that of the promoter (i.e., \( \frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha} \ll 1 \)). The parameters \( k_A = (\frac{a'^* \beta_A}{\alpha^* \beta_R})^\gamma \) and \( k_R = (\frac{a'^* \beta_A}{\alpha^* \beta_R})^\gamma \) indicate the relative affinity for complex formation. The protein translation and decay rate are given by \( \kappa \) and \( \gamma \), respectively and the mRNA decay rate is denoted by \( \delta \).

### III. Two-state approximation

Due to the time scale separation between transcription of DNA to mRNA and translation, the original four-state system (13) can be reduced to a two-state system by considering \( m_A \) and \( m_R \) at their quasi-steady state [23]:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{m}_A &= \frac{1}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A A = f(A, R), \\
\dot{m}_R &= \frac{1}{\delta_R} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_R R = g(A, R).
\end{align*}
\]

Substituting (14)-(15) in the \( \dot{A}, \dot{R} \) equations of (13) yields the two-state approximation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{A} &= \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0 - \gamma_A A = f(A, R), \\
\dot{R} &= \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0 - \gamma_R R = g(A, R).
\end{align*}
\]

To determine sufficient conditions for oscillatory behavior, the Poincaré-Bendixson theorem [24] is used to infer the existence of a stable limit cycle. This requires (i) the existence of a unique equilibrium point and (ii) that this equilibrium point is unstable and not a saddle.

Since the system is two-dimensional, analyzing the expression for the nullclines provides a convenient way of determining conditions for a unique equilibrium point. The nullclines are defined by setting \( \dot{A} = 0 \) and \( \dot{R} = 0 \) and are
given by:

\[ R = k_R \left[ \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A \gamma_A} \left[ \alpha \left( \frac{A}{k_A} \right)^n + \alpha_0 \right] - \left( 1 + \left( \frac{A}{k_A} \right)^n \right) \right] \frac{1}{n}, \]

(18)

\[ A = k_A \left[ -\kappa_R \alpha_0 + \gamma_R \delta_R R (1 + \left( \frac{R}{k_R} \right)^m) \right] \frac{1}{m}. \]

(19)

Claim: If \( \alpha_0 \) is sufficiently large, system (16)-(17) has a unique equilibrium point.

Proof: Solving for \( \alpha \) in (16)-(17) and equating the resulting expressions yields:

\[ \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A \gamma_A} A = \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R \gamma_R} R. \]

(20)

This results in the equilibrium point lying on the line defined by:

\[ A = cR, \quad c = \frac{\kappa_A \delta_R \gamma_R}{\kappa_R \delta_A \gamma_A}. \]

(21)

Substituting (21) in (19) yields:

\[ P(R) = \left( \frac{\kappa_R \gamma_R \delta_R}{\kappa_A} \right) R^{m+1} + (\gamma_R \delta_R c^n) R^n - (\kappa_R \alpha c^n) R^n + (k_A^n \gamma_R \delta_R) R - k_A \kappa_R \alpha_0 = 0. \]

(22)

For \( n, m > 1 \), the coefficients of \( P(R) \) change signs three times when arranged in descending powers of \( R \) (regardless of the value of \( n \) or \( m \)). By Descartes’ rule of signs, \( P(R) = 0 \) has either one or three positive root(s). Since the coefficient of the terms with the largest exponent (either \( m + 1 \) or \( n + 1 \)) is always positive, as \( R \to \infty \), \( P(R) \to \infty \). To ensure a single positive root, it is enough to translate \( P(R) \) sufficiently vertically downwards.

To this end, let \( R_M \) be any value of \( R \) sufficiently large such that there are no more inflection points for \( P(R) > R_M \) and let \( M = \sup_{R \in [0, R_M]} P(R) \). By the Extreme Value Theorem, \( M \) must be finite since \( P(R) \) is a continuous function of \( R \).

The parameter, \( \alpha_0 \), which corresponds to the basal expression rate of mRNA does not appear in any of the coefficients of \( P(R) \) except for the constant term. Therefore, increasing \( \alpha_0 \) translates \( P(R) \) downwards and so for any \( M, P(0) \) can be set sufficiently negative so that \( P(R) \) only crosses the \( R \)-axis once. This crossing corresponds to the terms with exponents of \( n + 1 \) or \( m + 1 \) dominating the value of \( P(R) \), resulting in a unique equilibrium point.

Fig. 2 plots the nullclines for a small and large value of \( \alpha_0 \), leading to a change in number of equilibrium points from 3 to 1, respectively. In the sequel, a sufficiently large \( \alpha_0 \) was used to ensure a unique equilibrium point.

By the Poincaré-Bendixson theorem, if the equilibrium point is unstable and not a saddle point, there exists a limit cycle. Since this system approximation is two dimensional, the eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix and the condition for the existence of a limit cycle is given as where \( J \) is the Jacobian matrix, \( Tr \) is trace, and \( det \) is determinant:

\[ \lambda_{1,2} = \frac{Tr(J) \pm \sqrt{Tr(J)^2 - 4det(J)}}{2}, \]

(23)

\[ Re[\lambda_{1,2}] > 0 \iff Tr(J) > 0, det(J) > 0. \]

(24)

The Jacobian \( J \) is given by:

\[ J = \begin{vmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} & \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial A} & \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} \end{vmatrix} \bigg|_{(A, R)} \]

The determinant of \( J \) is given by (evaluated at the equilibrium point):

\[ det(J) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} \frac{\partial g}{\partial A}. \]

Since \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} > 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} \frac{\partial g}{\partial A} < 0 \), we have that \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} \) is always negative and \( -\frac{\partial f}{\partial R} \frac{\partial g}{\partial A} \) is always positive. To see how \( det(J) > 0 \) can be graphically verified, we consider how these conditions translate in terms of the nullcline slopes at the equilibrium point. From (16)-(17), the nullclines satisfy:

\[ f(A, R) = 0, \]

\[ g(A, R) = 0. \]

Let \( X_A(A), X_R(A) \) be the locally unique solution to \( f(A, R) = 0 \) and \( g(A, R) = 0 \) about the equilibrium point:

\[ R = X_A(A) \implies f(A, X_A(A)) = 0, \]

\[ R = X_R(A) \implies g(A, X_R(A)) = 0. \]

The nullclines are therefore defined by \( R = X_A(A) \) and \( R = X_R(A) \). By the Implicit Function Theorem:

\[ \frac{dX_A}{dA} \bigg|_{(A, R_e)} = -\left( \frac{\partial f/\partial A}{\partial f/\partial R} \right)_{(A, R_e)}, \]

\[ \frac{dX_R}{dA} \bigg|_{(A, R_e)} = -\left( \frac{\partial g/\partial A}{\partial g/\partial R} \right)_{(A, R_e)}. \]
Since \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} < 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial R}{\partial R} < 0 \):

\[
\frac{dX_A}{dA} \bigg|_{(A_e,R_e)} = \frac{(\partial f/\partial A)_{(A_e,R_e)}}{(\partial f/\partial R)_{(A_e,R_e)}}.
\]

\[
\frac{dX_R}{dA} \bigg|_{(A_e,R_e)} = \frac{(\partial g/\partial A)_{(A_e,R_e)}}{(\partial g/\partial R)_{(A_e,R_e)}}.
\]

\[
det(J) > 0 \text{ requires (at the equilibrium point)}: \quad \frac{\partial g}{\partial A} \bigg|_{(A_e,R_e)} \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \bigg|_{(A_e,R_e)} \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} > 0,
\]

that is:

\[
\frac{\partial g}{\partial A} \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} > \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} \frac{\partial g}{\partial R},
\]

which, from (25)-(26), is equivalent to:

\[
\frac{dX_R}{dA} > \frac{dX_A}{dA}.
\]

Therefore, the condition \( det(J) > 0 \) is guaranteed if the slope of the nullcline defined by \( g = 0 \) is larger than the slope of the nullcline defined by \( f = 0 \) at the equilibrium point.

The four qualitatively different types of unique equilibrium points are given in Fig. 3. In Fig. 3a, 3c, 3d, the slope of \( X_A(A) \) at the equilibrium point is negative. Given equality (25), this implies that \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial R} < 0 \). Since \( Tr(J) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial A} + \frac{\partial g}{\partial R} \) and \( \frac{\partial g}{\partial A} < 0 \), it follows that in these cases, the equilibrium point is stable. An unstable equilibrium point can occur only when the nullclines intersect as in Fig. 3b. We therefore focus on this case in the sequel.

To determine which parameter values can make the trace positive, we observe its analytical expression which is given by:

\[
Tr(J) = \frac{\alpha k_A}{\delta A} \left( \frac{n(A_e/k_A)^{n-1}}{k_A[1+(A_e/k_A)^n+(R_e/k_R)^m]^2} \right) - \frac{\gamma A}{\delta R} \left( \frac{m(R_e/k_R)^{m-1}(A_e/k_A)^n+\delta R}{k_R[1+(A_e/k_A)^n+(R_e/k_R)^m]^2} \right) - \gamma R.
\]

The last three terms are always negative. The expression for "Tr(J)" can be made positive by increasing \( \frac{\alpha k_A}{\delta A} \). This ratio is the maximum production rate of \( A \), which corresponds to having a fully active promoter (i.e., \( A \to \infty \)) leading to a steady-state \( m_A \) value of \( \frac{\alpha}{\delta A} \). Increasing \( \frac{\alpha k_A}{\delta A} \), however, does not guarantee that the two-state system approximation exhibits sustained oscillations, since \( \alpha, \kappa_A, \delta_A \) affect the value of the equilibrium point, making it difficult to identify their effect on the trace. Furthermore, increasing \( \alpha \) would also increase the third term. Nevertheless, Fig. 4 demonstrates that increasing \( \kappa_A \) does lead to oscillations. For a stable limit cycle, \( \alpha \) was set an order of magnitude larger than \( \alpha_0 \) (corresponding to Fig. 3b) and \( \kappa_A \) was set sufficiently high to ensure a positive trace. Relatively large values of \( \alpha_0 \) were found to make the equilibrium point stable (i.e., for \( \alpha_0 \approx \alpha \) as in Fig. 3a).

To summarize our findings, the system given by (16)-(17) has a unique equilibrium point for sufficiently large \( \alpha_0 \). The conditions for an unstable equilibrium point include (i) the nullclines need to intersect with positive slope at the equilibrium point (\( \alpha_0 \) should not be too large), (ii) the slope of the nullcline defined by \( g = 0 \) should be greater than the slope of the nullcline of \( f = 0 \) at the equilibrium point, and (iii) sufficiently large maximum production rate of \( A \) (\( \kappa_A \)) compared to that of \( R \).

IV. DOWNSTREAM LOAD TO A

Consider \( A \) transcriptionally regulating downstream promoter sites represented schematically in Fig. 5.
This transcriptional regulation occurs by A binding to the DNA promoter sites. Let the free promoter sites be denoted as \( C_{10} \) and the sites bound to A be denoted as \( C_{11} \). Since DNA does not decay, the total concentration of promoter sites is conserved, that is \( C_{10} + C_{11} = C_{11} \), where \( C_{11} \) represents the total concentration of the free and bound promoter sites. The complex formation reaction is given by:

\[
K_a \frac{C}{A} + K_d \frac{A}{R} \]

The dynamics of A change in the new three-state system, which are now given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{A} &= \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A A - \dot{C}_{11}, \\
\dot{R} &= \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_R R, \\
\dot{C}_{11} &= a(C_{11} - C_{11})A - dC_{11}.
\end{align*}
\]

(28)

Increased loading to \( A \) (increased \( C_{11} \)) decreases the amplitude of oscillations to the point of quenching oscillations as shown in Fig. 6. The response of \( R \) is qualitatively similar to that of \( A \): higher \( C_{11} \) values cause smaller amplitude oscillations and increased frequency until the clock is quenched.

To understand the reason for this, we analyze how the eigenvalues of the linearized system change due to the addition of \( C_{11} \). To simplify the system, using the assumption that complex formation \( (C_{11}) \) occurs relatively faster than protein dynamics \((A,R)\) [22], the three-state system can be reduced to two states. To this end, we employ singular perturbation and introduce the new (slow) variable \( Z \), defined as

\[
Z = A + C_{11}.
\]

Rewrite the system by defining \( \epsilon = \frac{A}{K} \), \( K_{d1} = \frac{d}{a} \), and \( a = \frac{\gamma_A}{K_{d1}} \). Substituting these expressions into (28) yields the system in standard singular perturbation form given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{Z} &= \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{Z - C_{11}}{k_A}\right)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A (Z - C_{11}), \\
\dot{R} &= \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{Z - C_{11}}{k_A}\right)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_R R, \\
\epsilon \dot{C}_{11} &= \frac{\gamma_A}{K_{d1}} (C_{11} - C_{11}) (Z - C_{11}) - \gamma_A C_{11}.
\end{align*}
\]

(29)

Setting \( \epsilon = 0 \) and solving for \( C_{11} \) in terms of \( A \) yields the slow manifold:

\[
C_{11} = \frac{C_{11} A/K_{d1}}{1 + A/K_{d1}} = g_1(A),
\]

which can be shown to be locally exponentially stable [25]. Since \( Z = A + C_{11} \), we have \( \dot{Z} = \dot{A} + \dot{C}_{11} \), and so:

\[
\dot{Z} = \dot{A} + \frac{dg_1(A)}{dA} \dot{A}.
\]

(28)

Solving for \( \dot{A} \) yields:

\[
\dot{A} = \frac{Z}{1 + \frac{dg_1(A)}{dA}},
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{A}{k_A}\right)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A A \right) \frac{(1 + \frac{A}{K_{d1}})^2}{(1 + \frac{A}{K_{d1}})^2 + \frac{C_{11}}{K_{d1}}},
\]

The resulting reduced model of the clock with load on \( A \) is thus given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{A} &= \frac{(1 + \frac{A}{K_{d1}})^2}{(1 + \frac{A}{K_{d1}})^2 + \frac{C_{11}}{K_{d1}}} \left( \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{A}{k_A}\right)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A A \right), \\
\dot{R} &= \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + \left(\frac{A}{k_A}\right)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_R R.
\end{align*}
\]

(30)

Note that when there is no load (i.e., \( C_{11} = 0 \)), we recover (16)-(17). The dynamics of \( R \) have not changed from (17). The new \( \dot{A} \) equation is the product of a loading term (always positive and less than 1) and (16) and so the dynamics of \( A \) are effectively slower due to the load. The new system nullclines are identical to that of (16)-(17), since the nullcline defined by \( \dot{A} = 0 \) is independent of the loading term. Therefore, the equilibrium point \((A_c, R_c)\) for the unloaded two-state system and for the loaded reduced model system is the same.

To analytically investigate what the effect of the load is on the clock’s behavior, we analyze the stability of the equilibrium point for the two state system (30). Since the sign of \( det(J) \) is not affected by the presence of the load, as before we can guarantee that \( det(J) > 0 \) by requesting that the slope of the nullcline defined by \( \dot{R} = 0 \) is greater than the slope of the nullcline defined by \( \dot{A} = 0 \) at the equilibrium point. If this is satisfied, the real part of the eigenvalues of the
reduced system can be made positive if $Tr(J) > 0$, which is given by:

$$\begin{align*}
Tr(J) &= \left( \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \left( \frac{n(\frac{A}{k_A})^{n-1}(\alpha + \alpha_0)}{k_A[1 + (\frac{A}{k_A})^n + (A/k_R)^m]^2} \right) - \gamma_A \right) \\
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following reduced two-state model:

\[
\dot{A} = \frac{\kappa_A}{\delta_A} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_A A,
\]

\[
\dot{R} = \frac{1 + \frac{R}{K_{d_2}}}{(1 + \frac{R}{K_{d_2}})^2 - \frac{C_{12}}{K_{d_2}}} \left( \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \frac{\alpha(A/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{1 + (A/k_A)^n + (R/k_R)^m} - \gamma_R R \right),
\]

As before, \( det(J) > 0 \) can be verified graphically by ensuring that the slope of the nullcline defined by \( \dot{R} = 0 \) is greater than that of the nullcline defined by \( \dot{A} = 0 \) at the equilibrium point. Furthermore, the equilibrium point remains the same since the loading term to \( \dot{R} \) is always positive. The expression for the trace of the linearized system with downstream load to \( \dot{R} \) is given by:

\[
Tr(J) = \frac{\kappa_A \alpha}{\delta_A} \left( n(A/e/k_A)^{n-1} \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha_0}{A} \right] + \left( \frac{R}{K_{d_2}} \right)^m \right) - \frac{\kappa_R}{\delta_R} \left( \frac{m(R_e/k_R)^{m-1} \alpha(A/e/k_A)^n + \alpha_0}{k_R[1 + (\frac{R}{K_{d_2}})^{m}]} - \gamma_R R \right).
\]

The first term is always positive due to the assumption that the contribution to transcription due to leakiness is significantly less than that due to \( A \),DNA apprent (i.e., \( \frac{\alpha_0}{A} \ll 1 \)). For sufficiently large \( \frac{k_A}{\delta_A} \), the first term is larger in magnitude than \( \gamma_A \). The value of the third term is 0 since it contains the expression for \( \dot{R} \), which at the equilibrium point is 0. The last term is always negative, but as \( C_{12} \) increases, its magnitude decreases. Therefore, if the value of the trace for the two-state reduced model system with load to \( R \) is initially negative (system trajectories converge to an equilibrium point), we would expect it to become positive for sufficiently large \( C_{12} \) as shown in Fig. 10, leading to linearized system eigenvalues with positive real part and limit cycle behavior.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

A deterministic ODE model of an activator-repressor clock was derived from biochemical reactions to determine conditions for a stable limit cycle. The effects of load on the oscillator indicate that robust, sustained oscillations are achieved when there is strong activation and comparatively weak repression. Loading provides a means to tune the relative strengths of the activation and repression branches by changing the number of downstream DNA binding sites for either the activator or repressor protein, respectively. We have shown it is possible to activate a quenched oscillator by sequestering enough repressor protein, effectively slowing repression dynamics. Similar conclusions were reached in [19], for an activator-repressor clock with no self-repression dynamics: in fact, the effect of retroactivity was found to be qualitatively similar with respect to the change in the expression of the trace of the linearized reduced model. This suggests that the qualitative behavior of genetic networks where there is interplay of positive and negative feedback may be effectively tuned by appropriately adjusting loads to the network’s transcription factors.

The ability to tune the strength of the clock for stronger or weaker oscillations using additional DNA binding sites is useful in the context of synthetic circuits since it is easier to implement than changing the promoter regions or using degradation tags. Furthermore, this mechanism may already be used in natural systems: transcription factors have multiple DNA binding sites, not all of which serve regulatory functions [26]. One possible use of these binding sites could be to tune the dynamics of transcription networks.
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