

Energetic and entropic analysis of mirror symmetry breaking process in recycled microreversible chemical system

Raphaël Plasson^{1*}, *Hugues Bersini*²

¹Nordita, Stockholm, Sweden, ²IRIDIA, ULB, Brussels, Belgium.

Abstract

Understanding how homochirality emerged remains a challenge for the researchers interested in the origin of life. During the last decades, stable non-racemic steady states of non-equilibrium chemical systems have been discussed as a possible response to this problem. More recently, the description of recycled systems was provided, in which stable products can be activated back to reactive compounds, leading to the continuous maintaining of unidirectional reaction loops. The previous models were based on irreversible reaction. As a consequence, the question of the relevance of such systems in the presence of real microreversible reactions has been addressed. To face this skepticism, a full thermodynamic study of recycled systems based on only microreversible reactions is presented here. We argue that what really matters is the way the energy is transferred and distributed through the system and the subsequent production on entropy. As a consequence, the kinetics and thermodynamics of the systems will be carefully introduced and detailed in this paper. Recycled non-equilibrium systems appear to be interesting instances of self organized systems through the consumption of external sources of chemical energy. More than simple providers of hypothetical new materials for the early emergence of homochirality, such protometabolic systems are important paths towards the self-organizing systems underlying the origin of life.

Keywords: Homochirality, origin of life, thermodynamic, kinetic, reversibility, protometabolism

arXiv:0804.4834v1 [q-bio.BM] 30 Apr 2008

*rplasson@nordita.org

Introduction

The early origin of life can be described as the self-organization of chemical networks^{1,2} in which the emergence of network autocatalysis becomes of fundamental importance.³ Such chemical networks are especially interesting to understand the emergence of properties like homochirality, as they may result from a competition between enantiomers amplification processes and eventually the destabilization of the racemic state.⁴

The emergence of homochirality can be construed as a symmetry breaking phenomenon occurring in a non-equilibrium autocatalytic systems and leading to stable non-racemic steady states.⁵ Recent developments are aiming at the description of recycled systems⁶⁻⁸ rather than open-flow systems.⁹ In the recycled systems, there is a constant number of chiral subunits that are driven away from the equilibrium state by an active process allowing to transform low-potential chiral subunits to high-potential ones.⁴ While the traditional systems are totally open, the energy input being brought by fluxes of the chiral subunits themselves, the recycled system is closed to the chiral subunits, but rather coupled to a flux of energetic compounds. Some criticisms about the thermodynamic relevance of that kind of models, including recycling mechanisms, have been raised.¹⁰ They are grounded on the idea that such systems should only be based on non-microreversible mechanisms, made possible by physical⁸ or photochemical processes.¹¹ It has been discussed how this point of view is reductive, as microreversible chemical exchanges can perfectly play similar roles.¹²

Actually, several studies of kinetic systems neglect the microreversibility of reaction, describing irreversible unidirectional cycle of reaction and arguing that this is justified by the non-equilibrium state of the system.¹³⁻¹⁵ Of course, such studies have to comply with the thermodynamic constraints that prevent the kinetic parameters to be chosen independently of the thermodynamic parameters. Caution must be taken when dealing with theoretical models since, as this article explains, failing to respect the relationships between thermodynamics and kinetics amounts to hide some implicit energy source inside the system.

However, a totally microreversible system must not be rejected as a effective non-equilibrium system. Coupling a system with a chemical source of energy is a valuable if not the favorite option for self-organization of prebiotic chemical networks. Such coupling are actually ubiquitous in actual biosystems, where many endergonic biochemical reactions are coupled to the hydrolysis of ATP. Some non-equilibrium abiotic systems also function on the basis of chemical energy transfer. The classical Belousov-Zhabotinskii reaction¹⁶ is the most famous example. In this system, closed reaction loops based on the reaction of different cerium cations are maintained by the continuous consumption of bromide and malonic acid. All these non-equilibrium systems are characterized by a closed system of given chemical compounds, performing unidirectional loops through the consumption of an excess (or clamped) of "fuel" molecule. Their kinetics can turn out to be rather sophisticated, showing oscillations or bifurcation between multiple steady states.


The question can be separated in two distinct parts. First, how can we transfer chemical energy to a system, while keeping microreversibility? Then, how can such a system lead to the emergence of non-racemic stable steady states. In order to tackle these two sub-questions, the thermodynamic analysis of a general chemical reaction communicating with its surrounding will first be performed. The purpose is to understand how chemical dynamic systems can be built still obeying the thermodynamic laws. Our conceptual framework will put an

important emphasis on the entropic exchanges.¹⁷ Departing from that, a non-equilibrium Onsager's triangle of reactions¹⁸ will be analyzed, in order to point out how chemical energy can be transferred into a chemical system. This will lead to the description of non-equilibrium systems in terms of the reaction flux (that is the *dynamic* of the systems), rather than the concentration (that is their *static* parameters). Finally, the APED system (Activation-Polymerization-Epimerization-Depolymerization system⁷) will be analyzed, showing how a recycled system of chiral subunits can be maintained in a non-racemic state by consuming chemical energy. An energetic and entropic analysis will show how this source of energy can be consumed and efficiently used in such a system.

Theoretical

Single Chemical Reaction

Description: Let us consider a system constituted by one chemical reaction j between n compounds X_i . When this reaction is embedded inside a reaction network, n fluxes of matter f_i in each compound X_i can be established with the rest of the reaction network and its surrounding:



$$\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{i,j}^- X_i \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-j}]{} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{i,j}^+ X_i. \quad (2)$$

The global stoichiometric coefficient is

$$\nu_{i,j} = \nu_{i,j}^+ - \nu_{i,j}^-. \quad (3)$$

If $\nu_{i,j}^+ = 0$ and $\nu_{i,j}^- \neq 0$, X_i is a reactant of the reaction j . If $\nu_{i,j}^+ \neq 0$ and $\nu_{i,j}^- = 0$, X_i is a product. If $\nu_{i,j}^+ = \nu_{i,j}^- \neq 0$, X_i is a catalyst. If $\nu_{i,j}^+ \neq 0$, $\nu_{i,j}^- \neq 0$ and $\nu_{i,j} \neq 0$, X_i is an autocatalyst. If $\nu_{i,j}^- = \nu_{i,j}^+ = 0$, X_i does not participate in the reaction j .

Kinetic Relationship. The system exchanges matter with its surrounding. The variation in concentration due to external exchanges is:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = f_i. \quad (4)$$

Internal transformations occur through the chemical process. The variation in concentration due to the internal transformations is:

$$i_j^+ = k_j \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-} \quad (5)$$

$$i_j^- = k_{-j} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^+} \quad (6)$$

$$i_j = i_j^+ - i_j^- \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \nu_{i,j} i_j. \quad (8)$$

The total variation in concentration is thus given by:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \frac{dx_i}{dt} + \frac{dx_i}{dt}. \quad (9)$$

Thermodynamic Relationship. A given state of this system is characterized by the chemical affinity \mathcal{A}_j :

$$\mathcal{A}_j = -RT \ln \left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-}}{K_j} \right). \quad (10)$$

K_j is the thermodynamic equilibrium constant. The relationship with the standard Gibbs energies of formation $\Delta_f G_i^0$, or the related constant of formation $K_{f,i}$, can be established:

$$RT \ln(K_j) = -\Delta_r G_j^0 \quad (11)$$

$$= -\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{i,j} \Delta_f G_i^0 \quad (12)$$

$$RT \ln(K_{f,i}) = -\Delta_f G_i^0 \quad (13)$$

$$K_j = \prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}}. \quad (14)$$

We have from Eq. 10 and Eq. 14:

$$\mathcal{A}_j = -RT \ln \left(\frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-}}{\prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^-}} \right) \quad (15)$$

$$= -RT \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{i,j} \ln \frac{x_i}{K_{f,i}}. \quad (16)$$

This relation is directly related to the chemical potential by:

$$\mu_i = RT \ln \frac{x_i}{K_{f,i}} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_j = -\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_{i,j} \mu_i. \quad (18)$$

Link Between Kinetic and Thermodynamic Properties.

When $f_i = i_j = 0$, the system is at equilibrium, so that:

$$K_j = \prod_{i=1}^n x_{i,eq}^{\nu_{i,j}} \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_j = 0 \quad (20)$$

$x_{i,eq}$ are the concentrations at the equilibrium state.

As $i_j = 0$, Eq. 7 and Eq. 19 link the thermodynamic and kinetic parameters by:

$$k_j \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-} = k_{-j} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^+} \quad (21)$$

$$K_j = \frac{k_j}{k_{-j}}. \quad (22)$$

Combining Eq. 14 and Eq. 22 gives:

$$\frac{k_j}{k_{-j}} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^+}}{\prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^-}} \quad (23)$$

$$\frac{1}{k_{-j} \prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^+}} = \frac{1}{k_j \prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^-}} = R_j. \quad (24)$$

R_j is a characteristic parameter of the reaction, combining kinetic and thermodynamic properties. The expression of i_j given

in Eq. 7 can then be expressed as:

$$i_j = k_j \prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^-} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-}}{\prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^-}} - k_{-j} \prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^+} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\nu_{i,j}^+}}{\prod_{i=1}^n K_{f,i}^{\nu_{i,j}^+}} \quad (25)$$

$$R_j i_j = \prod_{i=1}^n V_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-} - \prod_{i=1}^n V_i^{\nu_{i,j}^+}, \quad (26)$$

each V_i being equal to:

$$V_i = \frac{x_i}{K_{f,i}} \quad (27)$$

$$= e^{\frac{\mu_i}{RT}}. \quad (28)$$

In this equation, the parameters relative to the reaction ($R_j i_j$) have been separated from the parameters relative to reactants ($V_i^{\nu_{i,j}^-}$) and from the parameters relative to the products ($V_i^{\nu_{i,j}^+}$). This equation is analogous to a ‘‘Ohm’s law’’, in which the intensity of a reaction (i_j) becomes a function of the potential between reactants and products (V_i parameters). This expression is exact in all cases, even in non steady states. Similar laws are given in the literature, but the relationship is sometimes given as a function of chemical potential μ_i rather than the V_i parameters, in which case this law becomes true only close to equilibrium.¹⁹ The description we are giving here is true even in non-equilibrium states, and is rather similar to the description of Peusner *et al.*,²⁰ except that the V_i potentials are calculated relatively to the standard state — thus the introduction of the $K_{f,i}$ — rather than relatively to one arbitrary node. The advantage of this description is to be totally symmetric for all compounds, not depending on any numbering, and is thus more general.

In this context, in order to totally describe a thermodynamically consistent system, there is the need for one characteristic parameter per element: the ‘‘chemical resistance’’ R_j of each reaction, and the constant of formation $K_{f,i}$ for each compound. A given state of the system is totally described by one variable for each element: the intensity i_j for the reaction and the potential V_i for each compound, these variable being linked by Eq. 26.

Energetic Analysis. The system will continuously dissipate energy, through the chemical reaction. The variation of the extent of reaction ξ_j relative to the chemical transformation j is:

$$\frac{d\xi_j}{dt} = \frac{1}{\nu_{i,j}} \frac{d_i x_i}{dt} \quad (29)$$

$$= i_j. \quad (30)$$

As a consequence, the instant quantity of free energy dissipated as a function of time is :

$$\left(\frac{\partial G_j}{\partial t} \right)_{P,T} = \left(\frac{\partial G_j}{\partial \xi_j} \right)_{P,T} \left(\frac{\partial \xi_j}{\partial t} \right)_{P,T} \quad (31)$$

$$P_j = -\mathcal{A}_j \cdot i_j. \quad (32)$$

Entropic Analysis. The entropy production by unit of time σ_j is equal to:

$$\sigma_j = \left(\frac{\partial_i S_j}{\partial t} \right)_{P,T} \quad (33)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{T} \left(\frac{\partial G_j}{\partial t} \right)_{P,T} \quad (34)$$

$$= i_j \frac{A_j}{T} \quad (35)$$

$$= -R i_j \ln \left(\prod_{i=1}^n V_i^{\nu_{i,j}} \right) \quad (36)$$

$$= R(i_j^+ - i_j^-) \ln \frac{i_j^+}{i_j^-}. \quad (37)$$

It can be noted that whatever the sign of i_j , in accordance with the second principle, σ_j is always positive (zero in the limit case $i_j = 0$).

At the same time, the system exchanges entropy through matter exchange with the surrounding:

$$\sigma_e = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \frac{d_e x_i}{dt} \quad (38)$$

$$= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i f_i. \quad (39)$$

The entropy balance can be computed by:

$$\sigma_{bal} = \sigma_e - \sigma_j. \quad (40)$$

The global energy exchange being $\varepsilon = T\sigma_{bal}$. When $\sigma_{bal} > 0$, the system consumes energy. When $\sigma_{bal} < 0$, the system releases energy.

At equilibrium P_j , σ_j , σ_e and σ_{bal} are all zero. An equilibrium state does not exchange anything with its surrounding, nor produce entropy.

Steady State. A steady state corresponds to:

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = 0 \quad (41)$$

which leads to, because of Eq. 9:

$$f_i = -\nu_{i,j} i_j \quad (42)$$

The exchanges with the surrounding can compensate an unbalance of the reaction, maintaining a continuous flux of reaction i_j . The equilibrium state is just a special case of steady state with $i_j = 0$ and $f_i = 0$, in which case the absence of exchanges leads to detailed balance.

The exchange of entropy thus becomes, according to Eq. 39:

$$\sigma_e = -\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \nu_{i,j} i_j \quad (43)$$


$$= \frac{i_j A_j}{T} \quad (44)$$

$$= \sigma_j. \quad (45)$$

In this case, $\sigma_{bal} = 0$. The system exactly dissipates what it receives, maintaining constant its internal state. The maintaining of this state is active, and is different from the unique equilibrium state. The matter flux f_i implies a continuous creation of entropy during the transformation. The matter flux maintains the reaction, allowing a continuous reaction being performed.

Non-Equilibrium Onsager's Triangle

Description of the System. The onset of unidirectional reaction loops is extremely interesting, as a source of network autocatalysis.^{1,3} As shown by Onsager¹⁸ a reaction loop can't be subject to an unidirectional flux of reactions at equilibrium. In order to understand what happens in a non-equilibrium steady state, let us consider the following system:



A flux of X and Y forces the reaction from C to A , and thus maintains the system $\{A, B, C\}$ out of equilibrium. The whole network is represented in fig. 1A.




Figure 1: A: Schematic representation of the reaction network relative to a non-equilibrium Onsager triangle. B: Steady state potential of the system. a, spontaneous transformation from A to C ; b, activated transformation from C to A ; c, spontaneous transformation from X to Y , coupled to the activated transformation b, the process c forcing the process b to compensate the process a. C: Detailed distribution of the entropic fluxes inside the whole network. D: Simplified description of the system, emphasizing the coupling between the external compounds X, Y and the internal compounds A, B, C .

The reaction fluxes can be expressed as:

$$R_a i_a = V_c V_x - V_a V_y \quad (47)$$

$$R_1 i_1 = V_a - V_b \quad (48)$$

$$R_2 i_2 = V_b - V_c \quad (49)$$

$$R_3 i_3 = V_c - V_a. \quad (50)$$

Steady State. In the steady state, we have:

$$\frac{db}{dt} = 0 \Rightarrow i_1 = i_2 = i \quad (51)$$

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = \frac{dy}{dt} = 0 \Rightarrow i_a = i_e \quad (52)$$

$$\frac{dc}{dt} = \frac{da}{dt} = 0 \Rightarrow i_e + i_3 = i \quad (53)$$

We can note that this comes down to apply the equivalent of the Kirchoff law for a steady state chemical system.²¹

The relationship between the several fluxes is thus:

$$(R_1 + R_2)i = V_a - V_c \quad ((48) + (49)) \quad (54)$$

$$R_3i_3 = -(R_1 + R_2)i \quad ((50) = -(54)) \quad (55)$$

$$i = \frac{R_3}{R_1 + R_2 + R_3} i_e \quad ((53)\&(55)) \quad (56)$$

From these relations, we can see that for a positive exchange flux i_e , i is positive and i_3 is negative. There is a net continuous transformation around the cycle, initiated from A to B , transmitted from B to C and from C to A . $i_3 = i_e + i_3$ is the effective flux induced in the cycle. i_3 is a “leak” of the activation flux. We can find $i_3 \simeq i_e$ when $R_3 \gg R_1 + R_2$, that is when the kinetic of the reaction 3 can be neglected compared to reactions 1 and 2.

At equilibrium, all the V_i are equal. In this non-equilibrium steady state, the exchange of chemical energy allows to maintain $V_a > V_b$ (Eq. 48), $V_b > V_c$ (Eq. 49), $V_a > V_c$ (Eq. 50), and $V_c V_x > V_a V_y$ (Eq. 48) which comes down to:

$$\frac{V_x}{V_y} > \frac{V_a}{V_c} > 0 \quad (57)$$

and thus $V_x > V_y$. It is important to note here that despite the fact that A is of higher potential than C , there is a net conversion from C to A as $i_a + i_3 = i > 0$. The transfer of chemical energy allows the recycling of low potential compound C back to high potential compound A , counteracting the spontaneous evolution in the opposite direction (see fig. 1B).

Entropic Analysis. The different entropy produced or exchanged during the processes are:

$$\sigma_e = R i_e \ln \frac{V_x}{V_y} \quad (58)$$

$$\sigma_a = R i_e \ln \frac{V_c V_x}{V_a V_y} \quad (59)$$

$$\sigma_1 = R i \ln \frac{V_a}{V_b} \quad (60)$$

$$\sigma_2 = R i \ln \frac{V_b}{V_c} \quad (61)$$

$$\sigma_3 = R (i_e - i) \ln \frac{V_a}{V_c} \quad (62)$$

These exchanges are represented in fig. 1C.

Simplified Description. If we focus on the $\{A, B, C\}$ system, we can see that there is a global transformation from A to B at the rate $i_e + i_3 = i$. The system can then just be seen as in fig. 1D. Globally, there is an unidirectional loop of transformations from A to B , then to C , and back to A , performed at a constant rate i . $\{A, B, C\}$ act as a closed system, maintained in a non-equilibrium activity thanks to its coupling with the open-flow system $\{X, Y\}$. The incoming chemical energy $T\sigma_e$ is transferred from $\{X, Y\}$ to $\{A, B, C\}$, and dissipated by continuous entropy creation:

$$\sigma_{tot} = \sigma_a + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 \quad (63)$$

$$= \sigma_e. \quad (64)$$

If the system $\{X, Y\}$ is such as the concentrations x and y can be considered as constant (e.g. in the case of a large reservoir of energy compared to a small system $\{A, B, C\}$), the system $\{A, B, C\}$ is mathematically equivalent to a closed system, in which we have first order reactions in A , B and C . The corresponding *apparent* kinetic rates would seem not to respect the microreversibility, as they implicitly depend on the concentrations x and y . Each time such theoretical chemical network is built, it is fundamental to realize that there is a hidden source of energy in the system. This result is similar to what Peusner *et al.* described as the necessity to introduce “independent flow or force sources” into the network to allow the possibility of obtaining a non-equilibrium steady state in such systems.²⁰

Time Evolution. Numerical integration of the several subset of the system were performed using Xppaut,²² with $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = 1 \text{ s}^{-1}$, $k_a = 10 \text{ s}^{-1}$. The reverse kinetic rates were calculated using the thermodynamics data $K_1 = \frac{b_{eq}}{a_{eq}} = 2$, $K_2 = \frac{c_{eq}}{b_{eq}} = 2$ and $K_a = \frac{y_{eq}}{x_{eq}} = 10$, so that we have:

$$k_{-a} = \frac{k_a K_1 K_2}{K_a} \quad (65)$$

$$k_{-1} = \frac{k_1}{K_1} \quad (66)$$

$$k_{-2} = \frac{k_2}{K_2} \quad (67)$$

$$k_{-3} = k_3 K_1 K_2 \quad (68)$$

Initial conditions were $a_0 = 3 \text{ M}$, $b_0 = 2 \text{ M}$, $c_0 = 2 \text{ M}$. x and $y = 10^{-5} \text{ M}$ were maintained constant. The parameter x was kept as a variable, allowing to tune the quantity of incoming energy.




Figure 2: Time evolution of a non-equilibrium reaction loop. A and B: $x = 0 \text{ M}$, C and D: $x = 0.01 \text{ M}$, E and F: $x = 0.5 \text{ M}$

Three kind of different evolutions can be observed (see Fig. 2):

Equilibrium ($x = 0$): There is no energy source. The system initially dissipates its excess of energy, to evolve spontaneously towards the equilibrium state ($a = 1 \text{ M}$, $b = 2 \text{ M}$,

$c = 4$ M) where the entropy production is zero (i.e. the system reaches a maximum of entropy). As only spontaneous reactions are possible in absence of coupling, the reaction is observed from A to B and from B to C ($i_1 > 0$, $i_2 > 0$) and from A to C ($i'_3 < 0$). When the equilibrium is reached, all the fluxes are zero: all reactions are detailed balanced.

Close to equilibrium ($x = 0.01$): There is a weak source of energy. The evolution is very similar, the system evolves towards a steady state that is very close to the equilibrium state ($a = 1.07$ M, $b = 2.01$ M, $c = 3.92$ M). The major difference is observed after some time. The entropy production does not go to zero, but diminishes until reaching the incoming entropy, so that the incoming energy is totally dissipated. The system thus reaches a minimum of entropy production. The fluxes also follow a similar evolution as previously ($i_1 > 0$, $i_2 > 0$, $i'_3 < 0$), except that they now reach a non zero positive flux i , i'_3 reversing its direction when approaching the steady state.

Far from equilibrium ($x = 0.5$): There is a strong source of energy. This time, the entropy production increases before the decrease towards the steady state ($a = 2.6$ M, $b = 2.4$ M, $c = 2.0$ M). During all the evolution, the entropy production remains actually quite close to the incoming entropy. An unidirectional cycle of reaction is almost instantaneously obtained in the system, ($i_1 > 0$, $i_2 > 0$, $i'_3 > 0$). The far-from-equilibrium system is almost only ruled by the energy flow.

The repartition of the fluxes for different values of x is given in Tab. 1. The incoming entropy grows with the availability of the energy source X . It can be seen that the great majority of the energy is dissipated by the activation reaction, only a small fraction of energy being transmitted to the cycle (from 1% to 16% in the performed experiments). In accordance with Eq. 56, it can be checked that the forced circular flux i always represent 14% of the XY exchange flux i_e , whatever the value of the incoming flux.

The APED Model

Energy Diagram

The APED model describes a system based on the activation of monomers (that can typically be amino acids), the polymerization of activated monomers with unactivated monomers or polymers, the epimerization of one end-residue of the polymers, and the depolymerization of the polymers.^{4,7} All these reactions take place at the same time, in a system that is closed in terms of amino acids residues (none never enters nor leaves the system). The activation reaction is coupled to the consumption of chemical energy, maintaining the system in a non-equilibrium state. It was shown that such a system can lead to a stable non-racemic steady, but with the approximation that most of the reaction are irreversible.⁷

Let us analyze the behavior of the APED system, limited to dimers for sake of simplicity, taking into account the microreversibility of all the reactions. In order to keep the new system close to the irreversible system, it will be necessary to choose correctly the parameters so that the previously irreversible reaction remains at least quasi-irreversible; the previously neglected reverse reactions must be slow compared to the direct reactions reactions. As a consequence, these reactions must have a very negative $\Delta_r G^0$. This corresponds to a huge difference of energy between amino acids and activated amino acids,

between activated amino acids and dipeptides, and between dipeptides and amino acids. The diagram of Fig. 3 summarizes the energetic profile of the system.




Figure 3: Thermodynamic diagram of the different compounds engaged in the APED system.

A simple source of energy is now explicitly introduced to show the origin and repartition of fluxes inside the system. In that scope, we have to take into account an activating agent X that allows the transformation of amino acid into activated amino acid. The activation reaction will thus become $L + X \rightleftharpoons L^*$, in majority displaced to the right. Additionally, the spontaneous deactivation of the activated amino acid will release a low potential molecule Y as a waste. This can be done either via a direct deactivation back to amino acid $L^* \rightleftharpoons L + Y$, or an indirect one through polymerization $L^* + L \rightleftharpoons LL + Y$, these two reactions being in majority displaced to the right. A huge difference of energy must exist between X and Y to guarantee the quasi-irreversibility of the reactions. The transfer of energy is globally brought by the transformation of X into Y , as a result of the activation/deactivation process.

This kind of activation can correspond — as stated in the original articles^{4,7} — to the activation of amino acids into NCA (N-carboxyanhydride of α -amino acids). Several activating agent X can be used. In this scope, carbonyldiimidazole (CDI) is a commonly used compound, but not a prebiotic one.²³ Other prebiotic agents are also often cited in the literature, like activation by isocyanate and nitrogen oxides,²⁴ or carbon monoxides in conjunction with sulfide compounds.^{25,26} When the activation leads to NCA formation, the waste compound Y resulting from the spontaneous hydrolysis of NCA is CO_2 . As required, all these X compounds are very reactive (i.e. they possess a high formation potential), while Y is a very stable compound (i.e. it possess a low formation potential).²⁷

One could focus on the phenomenon that leads to the presence and maintaining of X compounds on prebiotic Earth (like maintaining non-equilibrium concentrations of nitrogen oxides or carbon monoxide in the atmosphere,^{28,29} or the production of sulfides by geochemical processes³⁰). As long as these external phenomenon are present, a chemical source of energy is present, maintaining the chemical system of amino acids in an active non-equilibrium state.

It is of course necessary to introduce a source of energy inside the system to be able to reach a non-equilibrium system, and this must be kept in mind when introducing the microreversibility. The model described by Blackmond *et al.*¹⁰ fails in this process, as they also remove the energy source, by confus-

Table 1: Entropy production at the steady state in non-equilibrium Onsager triangle for different incoming flux.

x (M)	σ_e (J.K ⁻¹ .s ⁻¹ .l ⁻¹)	σ_1 (%)	σ_2 (%)	σ_3 (%)	σ_a (%)	i (M.s ⁻¹)	i_e (M.s ⁻¹)	a (M)	b (M)	c (M)
0	0	—	—	—	—	0	0	1	2	4
0.01	30	0.08	0.04	0.8	99.1	0.056	0.392	1.07	2.01	3.92
0.1	318	0.5	0.3	4.6	94.6	0.475	3.32	1.6	2.1	3.3
0.5	1080	0.8	1.0	10.8	87.3	1.41	9.90	2.6	2.4	2.0
1	1511	0.9	1.40	14.0	83.6	1.88	13.15	3.1	2.5	1.3

ing the activation reaction with the microreversible inverse of the reaction of deactivation.¹² Obviously, the resulting isolated system can thus only lead to a racemization process.

All the further relations will be written as a function of the following parameters:

$$K_{act} = \frac{K_{f,L^*}}{K_{f,L}} \ll 1 \quad (69)$$

$$K_{dim} = \frac{K_{f,LL}}{K_{f,L}^2} \ll 1 \quad (70)$$

$$K_{epi} = \frac{K_{f,LD}}{K_{f,LL}} = \gamma \quad (71)$$

K_{act} depends on the difference of energy between L^* and L . K_{dim} depends on the difference of energy between L and LL . K_{epi} depends on the difference of energy between LD and DD . All these values are of course totally symmetrical with respect to interchanges between L and D . The ensemble of kinetic parameters relative to all the chemical reactions involved in the system are given in Tab. 2.

The system can thus be totally characterized, while remaining perfectly compatible with thermodynamic and kinetic relations, by the following independent parameters:

- Thermodynamic: K_{act} , K_{dim} , γ
- Kinetic: k_A , k_H , k_P , k_D , k_E , k_R , α , β
- External conditions: V_x , V_y
- Internal conditions: l , d , l^* , d^* , ll , ld , dl and dd

The system being closed for amino acid residues, the internal concentrations are linked by the mass conservation equation:

$$c_{tot} = l + d + l^* + d^* + 2 \cdot ll + 2 \cdot ld + 2 \cdot dl + 2 \cdot dd \quad (72)$$

By choosing the parameters so that all the back reactions are negligible comparing to the direct reaction, the system described in the previous study⁷ will be the correct approximation of the complete reversible framework described here. We thus need, in accordance with the first assumption of energy levels:

$$V_x \gg \frac{1}{K_{act}} \quad (73)$$

$$K_{act} \cdot V_y \ll K_{dim} \ll 1 \quad (74)$$

This corresponds to a huge difference of energy between amino acids and dipeptides, a yet larger difference between amino acids and activated amino acids, and a very high potential of the activating agent X . Assuming that x and y are constant — maintained by external phenomenon, or present in a large excess — the reactions involving X and Y compounds corresponds correctly to pseudo first order reaction in monomers or dimers. Mathematically, the system is equivalent to a closed system in amino acid derivatives, maintained in a non-equilibrium state by a continuous flux of chemical energy brought by the spontaneous reaction from X to Y , these compounds being maintained by other external processes.

The system is subject to a continuous flux of chemicals:

$$\sigma_e = \frac{1}{T} \left(\mu_x \frac{d_e x}{dt} + \mu_y \frac{d_e y}{dt} \right) \quad (75)$$

In the steady state, the incoming flux of X is equal to the outgoing flux of Y , so that:

$$\frac{d_e x}{dt} = -\frac{d_e y}{dt} \quad (76)$$

It will be compensated by the consumption rate of X :

$$\frac{d_e x}{dt} = -\frac{d_i x}{dt} \quad (77)$$

$$= k_A(l + d) - k_{-A}(l^* + d^*) \quad (78)$$

As a consequence, the steady-state incoming energy flux is:

$$\sigma_e = Rk_A \left((l + d) - \frac{1}{K_{act}V_x} (l^* + d^*) \right) \ln \frac{V_x}{V_y}. \quad (79)$$

Analysis of the System

Simulations were performed with $c_{tot} = 2$ M, $k_A = 1$ s⁻¹, $k_H = 1$ s⁻¹, $k_P = 1$ s⁻¹.M⁻¹, $k_D = 1$ s⁻¹, $k_E = 1$ s⁻¹, $k_R = 0.0001$ s⁻¹, $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.1$, $\gamma = 0.1$, $K_{act} = 10^{-6}$, $K_{dim} = 10^{-3}$ M⁻¹, $K_{f,x} = 10^{-9}$ M and $V_y = 1$. The parameter x was kept as a variable, indicating the distance from equilibrium.




Figure 4: Entropy production of APED systems during the early evolution. A, $x = 0$ M; B, $x = 2.10^{-4}$ M; C, $x = 10^{-3}$ M; D, $x = 10^{-2}$ M; E, $x = 0.5$ M; F, $x = 10$ M. See text for the other parameter values.

Table 2: Kinetic and thermodynamic parameters of the reactions of the APED system. Kinetic parameters of reaction involving X or Y compounds are apparent kinetic rates, assuming constant concentration x and y . The exact symmetrical of each of these reaction is also included in the whole network, with of course exactly the same parameters.

Reaction	k_i	K_i	k_{-i}	$\frac{\sigma_i}{R}$
Activation:				
$X + L \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-A}]{k_A} L^*$	k_A	$\frac{K_{act}}{K_{f,x}}$	$\frac{k_A}{K_{act}V_x}$	$k_A(l - \frac{1}{K_{act}V_x} \cdot l^*) \ln \frac{K_{act}V_x l}{l^*}$
Deactivation:				
$L^* \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-H}]{k_H} L + Y$	k_H	$\frac{K_{f,y}}{K_{act}}$	$k_H K_{act} V_y$	$k_H(l^* - K_{act}V_y l) \ln \frac{l^*}{K_{act}V_y l}$
Polymerization:				
$L^* + L \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-P,1}]{k_{P,1}} LL + Y$	k_P	$\frac{K_{dim}K_{f,y}}{K_{act}}$	$k_P \frac{K_{act}V_y}{K_{dim}}$	$k_P(l \cdot l^* - \frac{K_{act}V_y ll}{K_{dim}}) \ln \frac{K_{dim}l \cdot l^*}{K_{act}V_y ll}$
$L^* + D \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-P,2}]{k_{P,2}} LD + Y$	αk_P	$\gamma \frac{K_{dim}K_{f,y}}{K_{act}}$	$k_P \frac{\alpha}{\gamma} \frac{K_{act}V_y}{K_{dim}}$	$\alpha k_P(d \cdot l^* - \frac{K_{act}V_y ld}{\gamma K_{dim}}) \ln \frac{\gamma K_{dim}d \cdot l^*}{K_{act}V_y ld}$
Depolymerization:				
$LL \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-D,1}]{k_{D,1}} L + L$	k_D	$\frac{1}{K_{dim}}$	$k_D K_{dim}$	$k_D(ll - K_{dim} \cdot l^2) \ln \frac{ll}{K_{dim}l^2}$
$LD \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-D,2}]{k_{D,2}} L + D$	βk_D	$\frac{1}{\gamma K_{dim}}$	$\beta \gamma k_D K_{dim}$	$\beta k_D(ld - \gamma K_{dim} \cdot l \cdot d) \ln \frac{ld}{\gamma K_{dim}l \cdot d}$
Epimerization:				
$DL \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-E}]{k_E} LL$	k_E	$\frac{1}{\gamma}$	γk_E	$k_E(dl - \gamma \cdot ll) \ln \frac{dl}{\gamma ll}$
Racemization:				
$L \xrightleftharpoons[k_{-R}]{k_R} D$	k_R	1	k_R	$k_R(l - d) \ln \frac{l}{d}$

Fig. 4 represents the early evolution of the system reaching quickly the racemic steady state, from an initial state composed exclusively by a quasi-racemic mixture of amino acids (initial enantiomeric excess 10^{-5}):

- Fig. 4A: there is no energy source, the system reaches the equilibrium state. The entropy production decreases towards zero. This system is temporarily dissipative, before reaching the isolated equilibrium state.
- Fig. 4B: there is a weak energy source, so that the system remains close to the equilibrium state. The evolution is very similar to the preceding one, except that the entropy production decreases until a minimal value, so that the system continuously dissipates the incoming energy.
- Fig. 4C and 4D: while the energy source is increasing, the evolution of the entropy production becomes more complex. Previously, the entropy production was only decreasing monotonously towards the value of the incoming entropy, so that the balance is always negative or zero (i.e. the system is only dissipative, or at the limit isolated). Now, the entropy production quickly crosses the incoming entropy, so that the balance becomes quickly positive. The system is thus stocking chemical energy (by acquiring high concentrations of high potential compounds), before reaching the steady state.
- Fig. 4E and 4F: when the system is very far from the equilibrium state, the incoming energy is also decreasing as a function of time. This is related to the fact that the more stable compounds, the unactivated monomers, are consumed in a large part, so that they are less to react with the available incoming X , as it can be seen in Eq. 79. The balance is now always positive, the system always stocking energy.

Following a longer period, we observe the bifurcation for some values of x (see Fig. 5). The enantiomeric excess abruptly

changes to a non-zero value, reaching a stable non-racemic state. This transition is followed by a decrease of entropy production. The system switches from the unstable racemic branch towards the stable non-racemic branch. A similar behavior was observed through a bifurcation of a Frank model.¹⁷




Figure 5: Decrease of the entropy production during the bifurcation, in the case $x = 0.5$ M.

A New Bifurcation Pattern

General Observations. The same system was studied in details for different values of x , ranging from 10^{-3} M to 10^3 M. The details of the evolutions are given in Fig. 6. A different bifurcation pattern that the one usually met is then observed:

- For lower values of x , the system remains racemic. As expected, this corresponds to a state where the system remains close to the equilibrium, when not sufficiently energy is available.
- Then, from a critical value of $x = 0.0105$ M, a bifurcation point is observed. The system switches to a non racemic branch, a far-from-equilibrium state that becomes more stable than the close-to-equilibrium one. This corresponds to the expected behavior, corresponding to the classical

description, happening when sufficiently energy is available.

- However for the value $x = 0.15$ M, the enantiomeric excess actually reaches a maximum, and then decreases back to a second bifurcation point at $x = 2.11$ M. The system then switches back to the racemic branch as the only remaining stable steady state.




Figure 6: Enantiomeric excess and entropy production in the steady states as a function of the incoming flux of energy in APED systems (see text for parameters).

Variation of Entropy Production during the Bifurcation. A monotonous increase of the incoming energy $T\sigma_e$ as a function of x is observed. In the non racemic stable state — when it exists — the system consumes up to 2% less energy than on the racemic branch. This corresponds to the decrease of the total entropy production during the bifurcation. This decrease is mostly due to a decrease of entropy production by activation/deactivation reactions, and by the epimerization reactions. These decreases are low in absolute value, but the relative variation of entropy production is very important for the epimerization reactions (up to 60%).

We thus observe a low change on the global energy/entropy of the system, that allows a very high local change centered in the epimerization reaction — the motor of the deracemization process — and a local increase of the entropy production by the polymerization/depolymerization processes — that is a redirection a larger part of the energy fluxes towards the autocatalytic loops. Globally, the switch to the far-from-equilibrium branch allows the use of the incoming energy to both produce more peptides, and to spontaneously evolve to a stable non-racemic state.

Evolution of the Entropy Production with the Energy Flux. The global entropy production follows the global energy consumption, and thus also monotonously increases as a function of x . For all systems, the energy is mostly dissipated by the activation and deactivation reactions. More interestingly, the entropies produced by the polymerization, depolymerization and epimerization reactions are actually increasing when stable non-racemic steady states exists, but decrease to zero after the second bifurcation point. That is, after the second bifurcation point, the activation/polymerization/epimerization/depolymerization loops disappear, giving place to only activation/deactivation loops.

Interpretation. When more and more energy is introduced inside the system, more and more compounds will be maintained in high level of energy. As the key compounds (i.e. the peptides, as they allow differences of energy between the diastereoisomers) are of intermediate level of energy, the deracemization will only be able to occur for an interval of energy flux. Too low energy can not produce enough peptides, to much energy destroys the peptides in favor of activated monomers.

Before the first bifurcation, the system is very close to the equilibrium, the most populated states being the lower energy states (i.e. the free amino acids). There is just not enough energy to be directed towards the autocatalytic cycles.

After the second bifurcation point, the situation is reversed. The high flow of energy is almost only directed to the activation/deactivation loops. The most populated states are the higher energy states. This is characterized by a saturation phenomenon, most of the amino acids being maintained in the activated form rather than in peptides or free monomers. Only a small amount of energy is directed towards the autocatalytic loops.

It is only between the two bifurcation points that the autocatalytic loops can be efficiently performed. A substantial quantity of dipeptides is maintained, so that the epimerization reaction can effectively be performed. The energy is thus efficiently used to generate homochirality.

Conclusion

The full thermodynamic study of the APED system emphasizes the great importance of the problem of the energy transfer. Energy must flow into the system, in order to stabilize the non racemic state. But the only consumption of energy is not sufficient: energy must be used *efficiently*. Energy must be directed towards the interesting elements of the reaction network, that is the autocatalytic loops, able to induce feedbacks inside the system.

This redirection of some part of the free energy that is available in the environment (here, the difference of chemical potentials maintained between X and Y compounds) towards some “mechanisms” (here, the chiral autocatalytic cycles) is one of the major key allowing the emergence of non-equilibrium property (here, a non-racemic steady state). Such processes should have been natural at the origin of life, and played a fundamental role for its emergence. Real chemical systems are generally away from the equilibrium state, as they are continuously communicating with their surrounding. Several abiotic systems can be found, in very different environments that can be space,³¹ planet crust³⁰ or atmosphere.^{28,29} Available free energy can be maintained in lots of environments: external energy sources can maintain non-equilibrium concentrations of activated compounds.

In this scope, the challenge in the origin of life is to understand how this available energy can be passed down to other chemical system and used in a way leading to self-organization, in a similar way that it is performed by metabolisms. This corresponds to understanding the emergence of protometabolic systems.³² When a chemical system is connected to chemical source of energies, internal reaction loops can be maintained,³³ potentially leading to the emergence of autocatalytic behaviors. Such non-equilibrium chemical systems are prone to self-organization and self-maintaining.^{1,3,34} Understanding the transition of such protometabolic systems towards replicative systems can be seen as a process of spontaneous self-organization under energetic pressures. Rather than opposing self-organization and natural selection,³⁵ it leads to understand and how natural selection emerges from self-organization.³⁶ Avoid-

ing a vitalist idea of biochemical systems behaving on a fundamental different way than abiotic chemical systems, it leads to the description of general chemical systems with similar underlying principles.

Acknowledgment: K. Asakura, R. Pascal, D.K. Kondepudi and A. Brandenburg are gratefully acknowledged for comments and discussions.

References and Notes

1. Farmer, J. D.; Kauffman, S. A.; Packard, N. H. *Physica D* **1986**, *22*, 50–67.
2. Bergareche, A. M.; Ruiz-Mirazo, K. *Biosys.* **1999**, *49*, 45–61.
3. Mossel, E.; Steel, M. *J. Theor. Biol.* **2005**, *233*, 327–336.
4. Plasson, R.; Kondepudi, D. K.; Bersini, H.; Commeyras, A.; Asakura, K. *Chirality* **2007**, *19*, 589–600.
5. Kondepudi, D. K.; Nelson, G. W. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **1983**, *50*, 1023–1026.
6. Saito, Y.; Hyuga, H. *J Phys Soc Jpn* **2004**, *73*, 33–35.
7. Plasson, R.; Bersini, H.; Commeyras, A. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* **2004**, *101*, 16733–16738.
8. Viedma, C. *Phys Rev Lett* **2005**, *94*, 065504.
9. Frank, F. C. *Biochem Biophys Acta* **1953**, *11*, 459–463.
10. Blackmond, D. G.; Matar, O. K. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2008**, *112*, 5098–5104.
11. Careri, G.; Wyman, J. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **1985**, *82*, 4115–4116.
12. Plasson, R., submitted for publication.
13. Di Cera, E.; Phillipson, P. E.; Wyman, J. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **1989**, *86*, 142–146.
14. Basu, S.; Dutta, C.; Das, J. *Biophys. Chem.* **1999**, *76*, 1–11.
15. Mauksch, M.; Tsogoeva, S. B.; Wei, S.; Martynova, I. *Chirality* **2007**, *19*, 816–825.
16. Field, R. J.; Körös, E.; Noyes, R. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1972**, *94*, 8649–8664.
17. Kondepudi, D.; Kapcha, L. *Chirality* **2008**, *20*, 524–528.
18. Onsager, L. *Phys. Rev.* **1931**, *37*, 405–426.
19. Qian, H.; Beard, D. A. *Biophys. Chem.* **2005**, *114*, 213–220.
20. Peusner, L.; Mikulecky, D. C.; Bunow, B.; Caplan, S. R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1985**, *83*, 5559–5566.
21. Schnakenberg, J. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1976**, *48*, 571–585.
22. XPP-Aut v5.85, <http://www.math.pitt.edu/~bard/xpp/xpp.html>.
23. Hitz, T.; Luisi, P. L. *Helv. Chem. Acta* **2003**, *86*, 1423–1434.
24. Taillades, J.; Collet, H.; Garrel, L.; Beuzelin, I.; Boiteau, L.; Choukroun, H.; Commeyras, A. *J. Mol. Evol.* **1999**, *48*, 638–645.
25. Huber, C.; Wächtershäuser, G. *Science* **1998**, *281*, 670–672.
26. Leman, L.; Orgel, L.; Ghadiri, M. R. *Science* **2004**, *306*, 283–286.
27. It must be noted that the real activation and deactivation reactions are actually more complex than the simple reactions described in the model, involving more compounds. However, the real reactions can easily be reduced to the simplified one. Typically, the implicit chemical compounds are such as water molecules, compounds resulting from acido-basic exchanges, or additional waste molecules having neglectable influence on the kinetics.
28. Mancinelli, R. L.; McKay, C. P. *Orig. Life Evol. Biosph.* **1988**, *18*, 311–325.
29. Kasting, J. F. *Orig. Life Evol. Biosph.* **1990**, *20*, 199–231.
30. Cody, G. D. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **2004**, *32*, 569–599.
31. Le Bourlot, J.; Pineau des Forêts, G.; Roueff, E. *Astron. Astrophys.* **1995**, *297*, 251–260.
32. de Duve, C. *Chem. Biodev.* **2007**, *4*, 574–583.
33. Plasson, R.; Bersini, H.; Brandenburg, A., submitted for publication.
34. Jain, S.; Krishna, S. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2001**, *98*, 543–547.
35. Fernando, C.; Rowe, J. *J. Theor. Biol.* **2007**, *247*, 152–167.
36. Hoelzer, G. A.; Smith, E.; Pepper, J. W. *J. Evol. Biol.* **2006**, *19*, 1785–1794.