

1 **AR(2) Eigenvalue Modulus as a Measure of Temporal**
2 **Persistence in Gene Expression: Circadian Hierarchy**
3 **Emerges from Two Coefficients**

4 Michael Whiteside^{1,*}

5 ¹Independent Researcher, United Kingdom

6 *Corresponding author: mickwh@msn.com
ORCID: 0009-0000-0643-5791

7 February 2026

8 **Abstract**

9 **Background:** The mammalian circadian clock organizes gene expression into a hierarchical
10 architecture, but no single quantitative metric has previously captured this hierarchy from ex-
11 pression data alone without biological labels.

12 **Methods:** We apply second-order autoregressive (AR(2)) modeling to gene expression time
13 series and extract the eigenvalue modulus $|\lambda|$ as a measure of temporal persistence—the degree
14 to which a gene's past expression determines its future. We analyze 37 datasets spanning 4
15 species (mouse, human, baboon, *Arabidopsis*), 12 mouse tissues, and multiple experimental
16 conditions. An eleven-analysis robustness suite, five canonical ODE model validations, and
17 AR(1)/AR(2)/AR(3) model order comparisons assess reliability.

18 **Results:** The eigenvalue modulus $|\lambda|$ blindly recovers the known circadian hierarchy: clock
19 genes ($|\lambda| = 0.70 \pm 0.05$) > target genes ($|\lambda| = 0.63 \pm 0.04$) > genome background ($|\lambda| = 0.55 \pm$
20 0.08). This hierarchy is preserved across all 12 mouse tissues (12/12), human blood, baboon tis-
21 sures, and *Arabidopsis* (14/14 datasets with hierarchy preserved). Cross-species replication con-
22 firms conservation across >400 million years of evolution. The hierarchy survives sub-sampling
23 (to $N = 8$), bootstrap resampling (2,000 iterations, clock ranked #1 in 100%), linear detrending
24 (12/12 tissues), permutation testing ($p < 0.001$, 10,000 shuffles), and leave-one-tissue-out cross-
25 validation (12/12 stable). Bmal1-knockout data (GSE70499) provides causal validation: genetic
26 ablation of the core oscillator collapses the hierarchy (gap: $+0.152 \rightarrow -0.005$). AIC/BIC model
27 comparison across 6 datasets confirms AR(2) is preferred over AR(1) and AR(3) for >70% of
28 genes. Five canonical ODE models (Goodwin, Leloup-Goldbeter, FitzHugh-Nagumo, Lotka-
29 Volterra, Tyson-Novak) produce eigenvalues consistent with their known biological dynamics
when discretized and fitted with AR(2). Negative controls (random noise, stock market data,
bacterial growth curves) are correctly rejected.

30 **Conclusions:** The AR(2) eigenvalue modulus is a valid, robust, and biologically meaningful
31 measure of temporal persistence in gene expression. A two-coefficient model recovers circadian
32 hierarchy without prior biological knowledge, validated across species, tissues, and experimental
33 perturbations. The eigenvalue connects gene expression dynamics to the same mathematical
34 framework used in control theory, economics, and climate science, suggesting temporal persis-
35 tence is a fundamental axis of biological variation.

36 **Keywords:** autoregressive model, eigenvalue modulus, circadian rhythm, temporal persistence,
37 gene expression memory, cross-species validation, robustness

38 **1 Introduction**

39 The mammalian circadian clock orchestrates rhythmic gene expression across virtually all tissues,
40 with approximately 43% of protein-coding genes showing circadian oscillation in at least one tis-
41 sue (?). The core transcription-translation feedback loop (TTFL) creates a hierarchical archi-
42 tecture: core clock genes (BMAL1, CLOCK, PER1-3, CRY1-2) drive thousands of downstream
43 clock-controlled genes (CCGs) that execute tissue-specific circadian programs (?).

44 While this hierarchy is well-established through decades of molecular biology, it has typically
45 been characterized qualitatively (clock genes “drive” targets) or through labor-intensive experiments
46 (ChIP-seq, knockout studies, reporter assays). No single quantitative metric has previously captured
47 the hierarchy from expression data alone.

48 Here we propose the eigenvalue modulus $|\lambda|$ of a second-order autoregressive model as such a
49 metric. The AR(2) model:

$$x_t = \phi_1 x_{t-1} + \phi_2 x_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

50 fits two coefficients (ϕ_1, ϕ_2) to a gene’s expression time series. The eigenvalue modulus, computed
51 from the roots of the characteristic polynomial $z^2 - \phi_1 z - \phi_2 = 0$, measures temporal persistence:
52 how strongly a gene’s past expression determines its future.

53 This metric has a long history outside biology. In economics, Sims, Engle, and Granger received
54 the Nobel Prize for developing vector autoregressive models with identical eigenvalue interpretation
55 (?). In control theory, eigenvalue modulus determines system stability (?). In climate science,
56 Hasselmann’s 2021 Nobel Prize work uses eigenvalues to measure climate system memory (?). We
57 apply the same mathematics to gene expression.

58 **2 Methods**

59 **2.1 Datasets**

60 We analyzed 37 circadian gene expression datasets:

- 61 • **Mouse (GSE54650):** 12 tissues, 48-hour time course, 2-hour sampling, $n = 24$ timepoints
62 per tissue (?)
- 63 • **Mouse liver (GSE11923):** 48 hourly timepoints, the gold-standard high-resolution circa-
64 dian dataset (?)
- 65 • **Human blood (GSE48113):** Forced desynchrony protocol, aligned and misaligned condi-
66 tions (?)
- 67 • **Human blood (GSE39445):** Sleep restriction vs. sufficient sleep (?)
- 68 • **Baboon (GSE98965):** Multi-tissue circadian profiling (?)
- 69 • **Arabidopsis (GSE242964):** Three biological replicates under constant conditions
- 70 • **Mouse organoids (GSE157357):** WT, APC-mutant, BMAL1-mutant, and double-mutant
71 genotypes
- 72 • **Neuroblastoma (GSE221103):** MYC-ON and MYC-OFF conditions

73 **2.2 AR(2) Model Fitting**

74 For each gene with ≥ 8 timepoints, we fit the AR(2) model by ordinary least squares (OLS).
75 Expression values are mean-centered prior to fitting. The characteristic polynomial yields roots
76 r_1, r_2 , and the eigenvalue modulus is $|\lambda| = \max(|r_1|, |r_2|)$.

77 When roots are complex conjugates ($r = \rho e^{\pm i\theta}$), the gene exhibits oscillatory dynamics with:

- 78 • Natural period: $T = \frac{2\pi}{\theta} \times \Delta t$ (where Δt is sampling interval)
79 • Damping rate: $\gamma = -\ln(\rho)$

80 When roots are real, the gene exhibits overdamped (monotonic decay) dynamics.

81 **2.3 Gene Classification**

82 Genes are classified using established circadian gene lists:

- 83 • **Clock genes** ($n = 13\text{--}15$ depending on species): BMAL1, CLOCK, PER1-3, CRY1-2, REV-
84 ERBa/ β , ROR $\alpha/\beta/\gamma$, NPAS2, DBP, TEF, HLF
85 • **Target genes** ($n = 23$): Cancer-relevant and metabolic genes with known circadian regulation
86 (WEE1, MYC, TP53, CCND1, ATM, etc.)
87 • **Other genes:** All remaining genes in the dataset

88 Crucially, gene classification is used only for *evaluation*, not for model fitting. The AR(2) model
89 is fitted identically to all genes without knowledge of their biological category.

90 **2.4 Model Order Selection**

91 AR(1), AR(2), and AR(3) models are fitted to all genes in 6 datasets. Akaike Information Criterion
92 (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) determine the preferred model order for each gene.
93 The proportion of genes preferring each order is computed.

94 **2.5 Robustness Suite**

95 Eleven complementary analyses assess robustness:

- 96 1. Sub-sampling recovery (reducing to $N = 8, 12, 16, 20$ timepoints)
- 97 2. Bootstrap confidence intervals (2,000 resampled iterations)
- 98 3. Linear detrending (removing linear trends before AR(2) fitting)
- 99 4. Gap permutation ($p < 0.001$ threshold, all datasets)
- 100 5. Cross-dataset replication (GSE54650 vs. GSE11923)
- 101 6. Leave-one-tissue-out cross-validation
- 102 7. Multi-category permutation (10,000 label shuffles, Kruskal-Wallis)
- 103 8. Multi-category bootstrap (2,000 iterations, rank stability)
- 104 9. Multi-category detrending (rank correlation after detrending)
- 105 10. Multi-category leave-one-tissue-out
- 106 11. Bmal1-knockout causal validation (GSE70499)

107 **2.6 ODE Model Validation**

108 Five canonical ODE models are simulated, discretized at appropriate sampling intervals, and fitted
109 with AR(2). Eigenvalues from the AR(2) fit are compared to eigenvalues computed directly from
110 the ODE Jacobian linearization:

- 111 1. Goodwin oscillator (negative feedback, $n = 10$)
- 112 2. Leloup-Goldbeter circadian clock
- 113 3. FitzHugh-Nagumo (excitable system)
- 114 4. Lotka-Volterra (predator-prey)
- 115 5. Tyson-Novak cell cycle

116 **3 Results**

117 **3.1 Eigenvalue Hierarchy Across Mouse Tissues**

118 Across all 12 mouse tissues (GSE54650), the eigenvalue hierarchy clock > target > other was
119 preserved in 12/12 tissues. Mean eigenvalues:

- 120 • Clock genes: $|\lambda| = 0.70 \pm 0.05$ (range: 0.65–0.75 across tissues)
- 121 • Target genes: $|\lambda| = 0.63 \pm 0.04$ (range: 0.59–0.67)
- 122 • Other genes: $|\lambda| = 0.55 \pm 0.08$ (range: 0.50–0.60)

123 The “gearbox gap” (clock – target eigenvalue difference) averaged +0.07 across tissues, with
124 narrow cross-tissue coefficient of variation (CV = 0.124 for clock, 0.236 for target), confirming that
125 clock gene persistence is more conserved than target gene persistence.

126 **3.2 Cross-Species Conservation**

127 The hierarchy was preserved across 4 species spanning >400 million years of evolution:

- 128 • **Mouse** (12 tissues): 12/12 preserved
- 129 • **Human blood** (3 conditions): 3/3 preserved
- 130 • **Baboon**: Preserved
- 131 • **Arabidopsis** (3 replicates): Preserved

132 Total: 14/14 datasets with hierarchy preserved (after stability filtering). This cross-species
133 conservation is consistent with Mure et al. (2018), who showed conserved circadian architecture
134 across mammals, and extends it to a quantitative dynamical metric.

135 **3.3 Model Order Preference**

136 AIC/BIC analysis across 6 datasets confirmed AR(2) as the preferred model order for >70% of
137 genes. AR(1) was preferred for ~20% of genes (those with simple exponential decay), and AR(3) for
138 <10% (no significant improvement from the third lag). This supports the biological interpretation:
139 gene expression carries approximately two-step memory, consistent with the ~12-hour half-cell-cycle
140 timescale.

141 **3.4 ODE Model Validation**

142 All five ODE models produced AR(2) eigenvalues consistent with their known dynamics:

- 143 Goodwin oscillator: $|\lambda| \approx 1.0$ (sustained oscillation)
- 144 Leloup-Goldbeter: $|\lambda| \approx 0.98$ (circadian oscillation with slight damping)
- 145 FitzHugh-Nagumo: $|\lambda| \approx 0.85$ (excitable dynamics)
- 146 Lotka-Volterra: $|\lambda| \approx 1.0$ (conservative oscillation)
- 147 Tyson-Novak: $|\lambda| \approx 0.90$ (cell cycle oscillation)

148 This confirms that AR(2) eigenvalues faithfully recover the dynamical regime of known biological
149 systems when applied to their simulated time series.

150 **3.5 Robustness**

151 The eleven-analysis robustness suite confirmed:

- 152 Sub-sampling: Hierarchy preserved down to $N = 8$ timepoints
- 153 Bootstrap: Clock genes ranked #1 in 100% of 2,000 iterations (CI: [0.685, 0.752])
- 154 Detrending: 12/12 tissues preserved after linear detrend
- 155 Permutation: $p < 0.001$ (10,000 shuffles)
- 156 Leave-one-tissue-out: 12/12 stable
- 157 Bmal1 knockout: Hierarchy collapses (gap: $+0.152 \rightarrow -0.005$), confirming causal dependence
158 on core clock

159 **3.6 Negative Controls**

160 The method correctly rejects non-biological data:

- 161 Random noise: No hierarchy detected
- 162 Stock market data: No hierarchy detected
- 163 Bacterial growth curves: No circadian structure detected

164 **3.7 Nine-Category Fine-Grained Hierarchy**

165 Beyond the binary clock/target split, classification of $\sim 1,594$ genes into nine functional categories
166 revealed a fine-grained persistence hierarchy:

167 Clock ($|\lambda| = 0.70$) $>$ Chromatin (0.67) $>$ Metabolic (0.66) $>$ Housekeeping (0.66) $>$ Immune
168 (0.66) $>$ Signaling (0.65) $>$ DNA Repair (0.64) $>$ Target (0.63) $>$ Stem Cell (0.63)

169 Kruskal-Wallis $H = 144.8$, $p < 0.001$, confirmed by 10,000-permutation label shuffle. Notably,
170 chromatin remodeling genes outranked housekeeping genes, and stem cell markers showed the lowest
171 persistence—consistent with stemness as a low-memory state enabling rapid fate transitions.

172 **4 Discussion**

173 We have shown that the AR(2) eigenvalue modulus $|\lambda|$ is a valid, robust measure of temporal
174 persistence in gene expression that blindly recovers known circadian hierarchy. The method requires
175 no biological knowledge as input—gene classification is used only for evaluation—and produces a
176 single interpretable number per gene.

177 The eigenvalue connects gene expression to the same mathematical framework used across
178 physics, engineering, economics, and climate science. In all these fields, the eigenvalue modulus
179 of a dynamical system determines its persistence, stability, and characteristic response timescale.
180 PAR(2) recognizes that gene expression is a dynamical system and applies this universal toolkit.

181 **4.1 Limitations**

- 182 1. AR(2) assumes linearity and stationarity, which may not hold for all genes
- 183 2. Short time series ($N < 12$) produce unreliable eigenvalue estimates
- 184 3. The method measures persistence, not rhythmicity—high $|\lambda|$ does not necessarily mean circa-
185 dian oscillation
- 186 4. Cross-species comparisons are complicated by different sampling protocols

187 **4.2 Implications**

188 The eigenvalue hierarchy suggests that temporal persistence is organized along functional lines in
189 the genome: genes that need stable, self-correcting dynamics (clock genes) carry more memory
190 than genes that need flexible, context-dependent responses (targets and stem cell markers). This
191 functional organization may have implications for drug targeting, aging research, and understanding
192 circadian disruption in disease.

193 **5 Data Availability**

194 All datasets are publicly available from NCBI GEO. Complete AR(2) results for all genes across all
195 datasets are provided as supplementary JSON and CSV files. The PAR(2) Discovery Engine web
196 application is available at [URL].

197 **6 Code Availability**

198 Source code for the PAR(2) Discovery Engine is available at [repository URL].

199 **References**

200 Zhang R, Lahens NF, Ballance HI, Hughes ME, Hogenesch JB. A circadian gene expression atlas in
201 mammals: implications for biology and medicine. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2014;111(45):16219–
202 16224.

203 Takahashi JS. Transcriptional architecture of the mammalian circadian clock. *Nat Rev Genet*.
204 2017;18(3):164–179.

- ²⁰⁵ Hughes ME, DiTacchio L, Hayes KR, et al. Harmonics of circadian gene transcription in mammals.
²⁰⁶ *PLoS Genet.* 2009;5(4):e1000442.
- ²⁰⁷ Archer SN, Laing EE, Möller-Levet CS, et al. Mistimed sleep disrupts circadian regulation of the
²⁰⁸ human transcriptome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2014;111(6):E682–E691.
- ²⁰⁹ Möller-Levet CS, Archer SN, Bucca G, et al. Effects of insufficient sleep on circadian rhythmic-
²¹⁰ ity and expression amplitude of the human blood transcriptome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.*
²¹¹ 2013;110(12):E1132–E1141.
- ²¹² Mure LS, Le HD, Benegiamo G, et al. Diurnal transcriptome atlas of a primate across major neural
²¹³ and peripheral organs. *Science.* 2018;359(6381):eaao0318.
- ²¹⁴ Sims CA. Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica.* 1980;48(1):1–48.
- ²¹⁵ Ogata K. *Modern Control Engineering.* 5th ed. Prentice Hall; 2010.
- ²¹⁶ Hasselmann K. Stochastic climate models Part I. Theory. *Tellus.* 1976;28(6):473–485.
- ²¹⁷ Alon U. *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits.* Chapman &
²¹⁸ Hall/CRC; 2006.