

A scalable computational framework for establishing long-term behavior of stochastic reaction networks*

Corentin Briat[†], Ankit Gupta[†], Mustafa Khammash^{†‡}

April 7, 2022

Abstract

Reaction networks are systems in which the populations of a finite number of species evolve through predefined interactions. Such networks are found as modeling tools in many biological disciplines such as biochemistry, ecology, epidemiology, immunology, systems biology and synthetic biology. It is now well-established that, for small population sizes, stochastic models for biochemical reaction networks are necessary to capture randomness in the interactions. The tools for analyzing such models, however, still lag far behind their deterministic counterparts. In this paper, we bridge this gap by developing a constructive framework for examining the long-term behavior and stability properties of the reaction dynamics in a stochastic setting. In particular, we address the problems of determining ergodicity of the reaction dynamics, which is analogous to having a globally attracting fixed point for deterministic dynamics. We also examine when the statistical moments of the underlying process remain bounded with time and when they converge to their steady state values. The framework we develop relies on a blend of ideas from probability theory, linear algebra and optimization theory. We demonstrate that stability properties of a wide class of biological networks can be assessed from theoretical results that can be recast as efficient and scalable linear programs, well-known for their tractability. It is notably shown that the computational complexity is often linear in the number of species. We illustrate the validity, the efficiency and the universality of our results on several reaction networks arising in biochemistry, systems biology, epidemiology and ecology. The biological implications of the results as well as an example of a non-ergodic biological network are also discussed.

*Corentin Briat and Ankit Gupta contributed equally to this work.

[†]Department of Biosystems Science and Engineering (D-BSSE), Swiss Federal Institute of Technology–Zürich (ETH-Z), 4058 Basel, Switzerland

[‡]Corresponding author; e-mail: mustafa.khammash@bsse.ethz.ch

Author Summary

In many biological disciplines, computational modeling of interaction networks is the key for understanding biological phenomena. Deterministic models have been traditionally used to represent and analyze these networks. However, it has been recently recognized that when the populations are small in size, the inherent random effects become significant and to incorporate them, a stochastic modeling paradigm is necessary. In this respect, stochastic models of reaction networks have started to be broadly adopted. Such a paradigm has notably been able to describe biological processes that deterministic models were unable to characterize. Stochastic models form, for instance, a cornerstone for studying heterogeneity in clonal cell populations.

In biological applications, one is often interested in knowing the long-term behavior and stability properties of reaction networks, even in presence of uncertain knowledge of the network parameters. However, whereas tools for deterministic models are widely available, no analytical tools are known for this purpose for stochastic ones. This lack of theoretical framework forces many researchers to use a simulation-based approach, which is highly unsatisfactory since it cannot be used to draw general conclusions on the network properties. To compensate this, we propose a theoretical and computational framework for determining the long-term behavior and stability properties for stochastic reaction networks. Our approach is based on a mixture of ideas from probability theory, linear algebra and optimization theory. We illustrate the broad applicability of our results by considering examples from various biological areas. The biological implications of our results are discussed in details as well.

Introduction

Reaction networks represent a modeling paradigm that finds applications in many areas of science. Examples include, chemical reaction networks [1], cell signalling networks [2], gene expression networks [3], metabolic networks [4], pharmacological networks [5], epidemiological networks [6] and ecological networks [7]. Traditionally, reaction networks are mathematically analyzed by expressing the dynamics as a set of ordinary differential equations. Such a deterministic model is reasonably accurate when the number of network participants is *large*. However, when this is not the case, the discrete nature of the interactions becomes important and the dynamics is inherently *noisy*. This *random* component of the dynamics cannot be ignored as it can have a significant impact on the macroscopic properties of the system [8–10]. To account for this randomness and study its effects, a stochastic formulation of the dynamics is necessary. The most common approach is to model the dynamics as a continuous-time Markov process whose states denote the current population size. Many recent articles have been devoted to stochastic models and their analysis in view of understanding the role of noise and its impact on the system’s behavior [11–14].

Among the two modeling approaches, the deterministic approach is far more tractable than the stochastic approach. This is not surprising since our knowledge of ordinary differential equations is fairly advanced. For deterministic models, there are many tools that allow us to study the system without simulating the trajectories. Unfortunately, this is not the case for stochastic models and one generally has to analyze them by simulating several trajectories of the reaction dynamics. Performing such simulations can be computationally burdensome. More importantly, it does not provide a satisfactory method to assess the long-term behavior and stability properties of the system. In this paper, we overcome this problem and find a direct way to examine such properties for the stochastic model, without the need of simulations. Our approach combines stochastic analysis along with linear algebra, polynomial analysis and optimization techniques.

Reaction networks. Now we formally describe our reaction network. Motivated by the literature on chemical kinetics, we refer to the network participants as *molecules* which may belong to one of d species $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_d$. There are K reactions in the network and for any $k = 1, \dots, K$, the *stoichiometric* vector $\zeta_k = (\zeta_{k,1}, \dots, \zeta_{k,d})$ denotes the change in the number of molecules in each of the species due to the k -th

reaction. When the *state* of the system is x , the k -th reaction fires at rate $\lambda_k(x)$. The functions $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ are known as the *propensity* functions in the literature. The notion of *state* is different for deterministic and stochastic approaches. In the deterministic setting, the state is a vector of *concentrations* of the d species, while in the stochastic setting, the state refers to the vector of molecular counts of the d species.

Deterministic models. Consider the deterministic model for the reaction network described above. If the initial state is x_0 , then the evolution of concentrations is given by $(\phi_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ which satisfies the Reaction Rate Equations (RRE) of the form

$$\frac{d\phi_{x_0}(t)}{dt} = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(\phi_{x_0}(t)) \zeta_k \quad \text{with} \quad \phi_{x_0}(0) = x_0. \quad (1)$$

We are interested in the long-term behavior and stability of our reaction dynamics. More precisely, we would like to check if the following conditions are satisfied.

DC1 For any x_0 , there is a compact set $\mathcal{K}(x_0)$ such that $\phi_{x_0}(t) \in \mathcal{K}(x_0)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

DC2 There exists a compact set \mathcal{K}_0 such that for any x_0 , we have $\phi_{x_0}(t) \in \mathcal{K}_0$ for large values of t .

DC3 There is a x_{eq} such that for any x_0 we have $\phi_{x_0}(t) \rightarrow x_{\text{eq}}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The first condition, **DC1**, says that for any x_0 , the entire trajectory $(\phi_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ stays within some compact set. We would expect this to be true for most *realistic* systems. Hence a violation of this property may suggest a *flaw* in the deterministic model. The second condition, **DC2**, says that there is an *attractor* set for the dynamics, where all the trajectories eventually lie, irrespective of their starting point. The last condition, **DC3**, says that there is a globally attracting fixed point for the deterministic model. Using techniques from the theory of dynamical systems [15, 16], one can verify these conditions, without the need of simulating the deterministic model. There is also a general theory to check condition **DC3** for reaction networks satisfying mass-action kinetics (see [17–20]). Our goal in this paper is to develop a theoretical and computational framework for verifying conditions similar to **DC1**, **DC2** and **DC3** for stochastic models of reaction networks.

Stochastic models. Consider the stochastic model corresponding to the reaction network described above. In this setting the firing of reactions are discrete events. When the state of the system is x , the k -th reaction fires after a random time which is exponentially distributed with rate $\lambda_k(x)$. The dynamics can be represented by the Markov process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ where x_0 is the initial state. Note that if $X_{x_0}(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_d(t))$, then $X_i(t)$ is the *number* of molecules of \mathbf{S}_i at time t . It is important to choose a suitable state space \mathcal{S} for this Markov process. If \mathbb{N}_0 is the set of non-negative integers, then let \mathcal{S} be the smallest non-empty subset of \mathbb{N}_0^d satisfying the following property: if $x \in \mathcal{S}$ and $\lambda_k(x) > 0$ for some $k = 1, \dots, K$, then $x + \zeta_k \in \mathcal{S}$. Observe that if $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ then we also have that $X_{x_0}(t) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Hence \mathcal{S} can be taken to be the state space of all the Markov processes described as above with the initial state in \mathcal{S} .

Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ denote the space of probability distributions over \mathcal{S} , endowed with the weak topology (see [21]). For any $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$ let $p_x(t, y)$ denote the following probability

$$p_x(t, y) = \mathbb{P}(X_x(t) = y). \quad (2)$$

Defining $p_x(t, A) = \sum_{y \in A} p_x(t, y)$ for any $A \subset \mathcal{S}$, we can view $p_x(t)$ as an element in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$. In fact, $p_x(t)$ is the distribution at time t of the Markov process $(X_x(t))_{t \geq 0}$. The dynamics of $p_x(t)$ is given by Kolmogorov's forward equation which is also called the Chemical Master Equation (CME) in the literature. It has the following form:

$$\frac{dp_x(t, y)}{dt} = \sum_{k=1}^K (p_x(t, y - \zeta_k) \lambda_k(y - \zeta_k) - p_x(t, y) \lambda_k(y)), \quad (3)$$

where $p_x(0, y) = 1$ if $x = y$ and $p_x(0, y) = 0$ for all $y \neq x$. Theoretically, one can find $p_x(t, y)$ for any $t \geq 0$ and $y \in \mathcal{S}$, by solving this system. However this system consists of as many equations as the number of elements in \mathcal{S} . Hence an explicit solution is only possible when \mathcal{S} is finite, which only happens in very restrictive cases where all the reactions preserve some conservation relation. Typically, \mathcal{S} is infinite and solving this system analytically or even numerically is difficult, if not impossible; see e.g. [22]. From now on, we assume that \mathcal{S} is infinite.

The above discussion shows that at the level of distributions, we can view the stochastic dynamics $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ as the deterministic dynamics $(p_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$, which satisfies the CME. However, the major difficulty in analyzing this deterministic dynamics is that it occurs over an infinite dimensional space $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$. Nevertheless we can recast the conditions **DC1**, **DC2** and **DC3** in the stochastic setting as below.

SC1 For any x_0 , there is a compact set $\mathcal{K}(x_0) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $p_{x_0}(t) \in \mathcal{K}(x_0)$ for all $t \geq 0$.

SC2 There exists a compact set $\mathcal{K}_0 \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ such that for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $p_{x_0}(t) \in \mathcal{K}_0$ for large values of t .

SC3 There is a $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ such that for any x_0 we have $p_{x_0}(t) \rightarrow \pi$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Each of the above conditions give an important insight about the long-term behavior and stability of the stochastic dynamics. The first condition, **SC1**, says that for every $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ we can find a finite set $A_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{S}$ such that each $p_{x_0}(t)$ puts at least $(1 - \epsilon)$ of its mass in A_ϵ . This implies that the underlying Markov process remains bounded with time, which should be true for most realistic models. If condition **SC2** holds then the evolution of distributions have a compact attractor set in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$, where all the trajectories eventually lie irrespective of their starting point. This suggests that in the long run, the family of processes $\{(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0} : x_0 \in \mathcal{S}\}$, spend most of their time on the same set of states. The last condition **SC3** says that the evolution of distributions have a globally attracting fixed point π . If this holds, then the Markov process representing the reaction dynamics is *ergodic* with π as the unique stationary distribution. For understanding the long-term behavior of a stochastic process, ergodicity is a desirable property to have. In the long-run, the proportion of time spent by any trajectory of an ergodic process, in any subset of the state space is equal to the stationary probability of that subset (see (12)). In other words, information about the stationary distribution can be obtained by observing just one trajectory for a sufficiently long time. Such a result can have important applications. For example, consider a culture with a large number of identical cells with each cell having the same reaction network. If we can show that this intracellular network is ergodic, then by observing the long-term reaction dynamics in a single cell, using e.g. time-lapse microscopy, we can obtain statistical information about all the cells at stationarity. Conversely, ergodicity allows us to obtain the stationary distribution of a single-cell by observing the distribution over the population, using e.g. flow cytometry.

In this paper we develop a general framework for checking conditions **SC1**, **SC2** and **SC3**. However the scope of our paper is broader than that. We obtain easily computable bounds for the statistical moments of the underlying Markov process and investigate when these moments converge with time. We also present conditions for the distribution of the process to be *light-tailed*. The significance of these results is mentioned in the next section.

Results

Preliminaries

In this section we discuss the main results of our paper. In particular, we explain how conditions **SC1**, **SC2** and **SC3** can be verified without having to simulate the trajectories of the Markov process representing the reaction dynamics. Intuitively, these conditions can only hold if the Markov process has a low probability of hitting states that have a very large *size*. In our case, the states are vectors in

\mathbb{R}^d and so we can measure their *size* by using any norm on \mathbb{R}^d . The central theme of this paper is to demonstrate that for many networks, long-term behavior can be easily analyzed by choosing the *right* norm for measuring the state sizes. This *right* norm has the form

$$\|x\|_v = \sum_{i=1}^d v_i |x_i|, \quad (4)$$

where v is a positive vector in \mathbb{R}^d satisfying the following condition.

Condition 1 (Drift-Diffusivity Condition) For a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exist positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, c_5 such that for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle \leq c_1 - c_2 \langle v, x \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad (5a)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle^2 \leq c_3 + c_4 \langle v, x \rangle + c_5 \langle v, x \rangle^2. \quad (5b)$$

Here $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product on \mathbb{R}^d . If we consider the process $(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|)_{t \geq 0}$, then its dynamics can be seen to have two components *drift* and *diffusion* which have the form $\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle^2$ respectively when $X_{x_0}(t) = x$. Condition 1 gives upper-bounds for the magnitude of these two components and hence we call it the *drift-diffusivity condition* (abbreviated to Condition **DD** from now on). Observe that when the process $(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|)_{t \geq 0}$ goes above c_1/c_2 then it experiences a negative drift, suggesting that it will move downwards. This fact will be crucial for our analysis.

For now, we assume that a vector v satisfying Condition **DD** has been found. In later sections we demonstrate how v can be determined for a large class of networks by solving suitably constructed optimization problems.

For any positive integer r , let $m_{x_0}^r(t)$ denote the r -th moment of $\|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v$ defined by

$$m_{x_0}^r(t) = \mathbb{E}(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v^r) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \|y\|_v^r p_{x_0}(t, y). \quad (6)$$

Similarly let $\Psi^r(x_0, t)$ denote the r -th moment of $X_{x_0}(t)$ at time t . Then $\Psi^r(x_0, t)$ is a tensor of rank r whose entry at index $(i_1, \dots, i_r) \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}^r$ is given by

$$\Psi_{i_1 \dots i_r}^r(x_0, t) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} y_{i_1} \dots y_{i_r} p_{x_0}(t, y), \quad (7)$$

where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$ and $p_{x_0}(t)$ is the distribution of $X_{x_0}(t)$. Using Markov's inequality (see [23]) one can show that condition **SC1** holds if for some $r > 0$ and some constant $C_r(x_0)$ we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} m_{x_0}^r(t) \leq C_r(x_0). \quad (8)$$

Similarly, condition **SC2** holds if for some $r > 0$ there exists a constant \hat{C}_r such that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} m_{x_0}^r(t) \leq \hat{C}_r \quad \text{for all } x_0 \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (9)$$

Relations (8) and (9) give uniform and asymptotic upper-bounds for $m_{x_0}^r(t)$. Using these relations we can also obtain uniform and asymptotic upper-bounds for the entries of $\Psi^r(x_0, t)$. Such moment bound

results have applications in queuing theory and control theory (see [24]). In Theorem 2 we show that under certain conditions, (8) and (9) hold and the upper-bounds can be easily computed.

Instead of the r -th moment of the process $(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v)_{t \geq 0}$, one can ask if the exponential moment of this process is uniformly bounded from above. This will happen if for some $\gamma > 0$ we have

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\gamma \|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v} \right) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\gamma \|y\|_v} p_{x_0}(t, y) < \infty. \quad (10)$$

If (10) holds, then the distribution $p_{x_0}(t)$ is *light-tailed*¹ uniformly in t . This shows that all the cumulants of the distribution $p_{x_0}(t)$ exist, which is an important result for the following reason. There is a considerable body of research dedicated to estimating the moments of the process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ directly without computing the distribution functions $p_{x_0}(t)$. For any integer $r > 0$, one can easily write the differential equations for the dynamics of the first r moments. However when the reaction network has nonlinear interactions, this system of equations is not closed for any r . Various moment closure methods (see [25, 26]) exist that specify ways to close these equations artificially and estimate the moments approximately. A popular moment closure method is the cumulant-neglect method which ignores the higher order cumulants of the distribution $p_{x_0}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Of course this method is only valid when the higher order cumulants exist. This is guaranteed if (10) holds. In Theorem 3 we give conditions for verifying (10).

We now come to the question of checking condition **SC3** which says that the process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic. This can only happen if the state space \mathcal{S} is *irreducible*, which means that all the states are accessible from each other. Recall the definition of $p_x(t, y)$ from (2). Mathematically, we say that \mathcal{S} is irreducible if for all $x, y \in \mathcal{S}$, we have $p_x(t_1, y) > 0$ and $p_y(t_2, x) > 0$ for some $t_1, t_2 > 0$. In order to check the irreducibility of \mathcal{S} , one has to verify that there is no proper subset $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \mathcal{S}$, such that once the process reaches a state in \mathcal{S}_1 , it stays in \mathcal{S}_1 forever. For reaction networks, this can often be easily checked from the stoichiometry of the reactions. We mentioned before that the vector v is chosen so that the process $(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v)_{t \geq 0}$ has a negative drift at large values. Assuming irreducibility, this is sufficient to verify ergodicity of $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ (see Proposition 4).

Suppose that condition **SC3** is satisfied and the process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic with stationary distribution π . For any positive integer r , let Π^r denote the r -th moment of the stationary distribution π . Then Π^r is a tensor of rank r defined in the same way as $\Psi^r(x_0, t)$ (see (7)), with $p_{x_0}(t, y)$ replaced by $\pi(y)$. Using Theorem 2 we can determine the values of r for which Π^r is finite (componentwise) and $\Psi^r(x_0, t) \rightarrow \Pi^r$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (see Theorem 5). We can also identify functions $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for which

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f(X_{x_0}(t))) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} f(y)\pi(y) < \infty \quad (11)$$

holds for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. If f is such a function, then the ergodic theorem for Markov processes (see [27]) says that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X_{x_0}(s)) ds = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} f(y)\pi(y) \text{ almost surely,} \quad (12)$$

for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$. Lastly, we also obtain conditions to check if the stationary distribution π is *light-tailed* (see Theorem 6).

General Results

In this section, we formally present the main results of our paper. Their proofs are given in the *Supplementary Material*.

¹A distribution is called light-tailed if its tails are majorized by an exponential decay

Moment bounds. Our first result establishes that for certain values of r , we can obtain uniform and asymptotic moment bounds for the r -th moment of the process $(\|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v)_{t \geq 0}$.

Theorem 2 *Let r_{\max} be given by*

$$r_{\max} = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{2c_2}{c_5} & \text{if } c_5 > 0 \\ \infty & \text{if } c_5 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

For any positive integer r , if $r < r_{\max}$ then there exist positive constants $C_r(x_0)$ and \hat{C}_r such that (8) and (9) hold.

The values of the constants $C_r(x_0)$ and \hat{C}_r can be explicitly computed using a recursive relationship (see *Supplementary Material*). Note that if $v = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$, then for any $y = (y_1, \dots, y_d) \in \mathcal{S}$ we have $y_i \leq \|y\|_v / v_i$ for any i . Hence for any $i_1, \dots, i_r \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ we have $\Psi_{i_1 \dots i_r}^r(x_0, t) \leq m_{x_0}^r(t) / \prod_{j=1}^r v_{i_j}$. Therefore using Theorem 2, we can obtain uniform and asymptotic moment bounds for the reaction dynamics $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ (see the *Supplementary Material*).

Observe that if $c_5 = 0$ then $r_{\max} = \infty$. In this case, Theorem 2 says that for each positive integer r and $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ there exists a constant $C_r(x_0)$ such that (8) holds. By showing that we have a $C > 0$ such that $C_r(x_0) \leq r!C^r$ for all positive integers r , we obtain our next result, which gives sufficient conditions to check (10).

Theorem 3 (Uniform Light-Tailedness) *Suppose that Condition DD holds with $c_5 = 0$. Then there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(e^{\gamma \|X_{x_0}(t)\|_v} \right) = \sup_{t \geq 0} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\gamma \|y\|_v} p_{x_0}(t, y) < \infty.$$

Ergodicity and Moment Convergence. The next result verifies the ergodicity of a reaction network satisfying Condition DD. It follows from Theorem 7.1 in Meyn and Tweedie [28].

Proposition 4 (Ergodicity) *Assume that the state space \mathcal{S} of the Markov process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is irreducible. Then this process is exponentially ergodic in the sense that there exists a unique distribution $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ along with constants $B, c > 0$ such that for any $x_0 \in \mathcal{S}$*

$$\sup_{A \subset \mathcal{S}} |p_{x_0}(t, A) - \pi(A)| \leq B e^{-ct} \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

This result says that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution $p_{x_0}(t)$ converges to π exponentially fast. Henceforth we assume that the process $(X_{x_0}(t))_{t \geq 0}$ is ergodic with stationary distribution π .

Let $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that for some positive integer $r < (r_{\max} - 1)$, there exists a $C > 0$ satisfying $|f(x)| \leq C(1 + \|x\|_v^r)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{S}$. Using Theorem 2 we can prove that for such a f , the relations (11) and (12) hold. As a consequence we obtain the following result about the convergence of moments with time.

Theorem 5 (Moment Convergence) *Let r be any positive integer satisfying $r < (r_{\max} - 1)$. Then Π^r is finite (componentwise) and $\Psi^r(x_0, t) \rightarrow \Pi^r$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

If $f(x) = \|x\|_v^r$ then Theorem 2 and (11) imply that for any positive integer $r < (r_{\max} - 1)$ there exists a positive constant \hat{C}_r such that

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} \|y\|_v^r \pi(y) \leq \hat{C}_r. \quad (14)$$

In particular, if $c_5 = 0$ then $r_{\max} = \infty$ and (14) holds for each r . By proving the existence of a constant $C > 0$ such that $\hat{C}_r \leq r!C^r$ for all positive integers r we get our last result which shows that the stationary distribution is *light-tailed*.


Theorem 6 (Light-Tailedness at stationarity) *Suppose that Condition DD holds with $c_5 = 0$. Then there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that*

$$\sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} e^{\gamma \|y\|_v} \pi(y) < \infty.$$

The framework described above is very general and can be applied to any type of networks that satisfy Condition DD. In what follows, we specialize the results for two wide classes of networks with mass-action kinetics, namely reaction networks with monomolecular and bimolecular reactions. It will be, however, pointed out in the examples that the scope is much broader since more general propensities, such as those involving Hill functions, can be considered.

Results for affine stochastic reaction networks

Using the analysis tools developed in the previous sections, several general results can be stated for the class of affine reaction networks. Let us then consider an affine reaction network which involves d species that interact through K reaction channels of the form:



where $i, j = 1, \dots, d$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu_i^{j\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The reaction rates k_0^i , k_i^0 and k_i^ℓ are positive real numbers. In accordance with (3), the reactions are indexed from $n = 1$ to K , and corresponding propensities and stoichiometries are denoted by $\lambda_n(x)$ and ζ_n , respectively.

Theoretical results. Let us start with several theoretical results that characterize the long-term behavior of affine networks of the form (15).

Proposition 7 (Ergodicity of affine networks) *Let us consider the general affine reaction network (15) and assume the state-space of the underlying Markov process is irreducible. Let the matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ be further defined as*

$$\sum_{n=1}^K \lambda_n(x) \langle v, \zeta_n \rangle = x^\top A v + b^\top v. \quad (16)$$

Then, the following statements are equivalent:

1. The matrix A is Hurwitz, i.e. all its eigenvalues lie in the open left half-plane.
2. There exists a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^d$ such that $Av < 0$.
3. The stochastic reaction network has all its moments bounded and converging.

Moreover, when one of the above statements holds, the Markov process describing the reaction network is exponentially ergodic. \diamond

The above result shows that, for affine networks, ergodicity and the existence of moment bounds can be directly inferred from the properties of the matrix A defined in (16). The second statement, which characterizes Hurwitzness of A in an implicit way, will turn out to play a key role in the analysis of affine and quadratic reaction networks since checking whether $Av < 0$ for some $v > 0$ is a linear programming problem.

In the case that the structure of network (the reactions and stoichiometries) is exactly known, but that the reaction rates are subject to uncertainties, the above theorem can be robustified to account for these uncertainties. To this aim, let us then assume first that the matrix

$$A_+ := \sup_{\delta \in [-1, 1]^n} \{A(\delta)\} \quad (17)$$

is well-defined in the componentwise sense, i.e. $A_+ \geq A(\delta)$ for $\delta \in [-1, 1]^\eta$ where the inequality is componentwise and there exists $\delta^* \in [-1, 1]^\eta$ for which we have $A_+ = A(\delta^*)$. Note that such an A_+ may not exist, especially when some entries are not independent. However, when this is the case we have the following result:

Theorem 8 (Robust ergodicity) *Let us consider the general affine reaction network (15) described by some uncertain matrix $A(\delta)$ that we assume to admit the upper-bound A_+ defined in (17). Assume further that the state-space of the underlying Markov process is irreducible for all uncertain parameter values $\delta \in [-1, 1]^\eta$. Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. The matrix $A(\delta)$ is Hurwitz for all $\delta \in [-1, 1]^\eta$.
2. The matrix A_+ is Hurwitz.
3. There exists a positive vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $A_+v < 0$.
4. The stochastic reaction network has all its moments bounded and converging.

Moreover, when one of the above statements holds, the Markov process describing the reaction network is robustly exponentially ergodic. \diamond

By observing that it is necessary and sufficient that the matrix A_+ be Hurwitz, we can conclude that, in this case, *checking ergodicity of a family of networks is not more complicated than checking ergodicity of a single network*. The case when the matrix A_+ is not defined is more complicated and is discussed in the supplementary material.

Computational results. Several computational results accompanying the theoretical results of the previous section are described in the following. Many computational results can be extracted from the previous sections, however, only ergodicity verification and first-order moment bounds computation are addressed. The asymptotic first-order moment bound, defined in Theorem 2, is given by $\widehat{C}_1 = c_1/c_2$. So the question is, what is the smallest value for such a ratio? Or, in other words, what is the smallest attractive compact set for the first-order moment of $\langle v, X(t) \rangle$? Several numerical methods, solving exactly or approximately this problem, are discussed in the supplementary material. One of them is given below:

The following optimization problem is *fully equivalent to Proposition 7*:

Optimization problem 9 *Let us consider the general affine reaction network (15) and assume that the optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z,v} z \quad \text{s.t.} \quad & z > 0, v > \varepsilon \\ & (zI + A)v \leq 0 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$


is feasible, with (z^, v^*) as minimizer, for some $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$. Then, we have $\widehat{C}_1 \leq b^\top v^*/z^*$ and Proposition 7 holds.*

Since the feasibility of the above optimization problem is equivalent to Proposition 7, this means that when the optimization problem is not feasible (or feasible for some nonpositive z), then all the moments go unbounded.

A striking point concerning the above optimization program is that the numbers of variables and constraints are given by $d + 1$ and $2d + 1$, respectively. This means that the optimization problem scales *linearly* with respect to the number d of species in the network, and is independent of the number of reactions K . Therefore, from the point of view of this optimization problem, the size of an affine network can be assimilated to the number of species, not the number of reactions. The above optimization problem can be efficiently solved using a bisection algorithm over z that is globally and geometrically converging to z^* . Each iteration consists of solving a linear program, a class of optimization problems known to be very tractable, and for which numerous advanced solvers exist [29]. These properties, all together, make the overall approach highly scalable, a necessary property for dealing with very large networks.

Results for quadratic stochastic reaction networks

Similar results are now presented for quadratic stochastic reaction networks which, in addition to the affine reactions (15), also involve quadratic reactions of the form:



defined for $i, j, m = 1, \dots, d$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu_{ij}^{m\ell} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The reaction rates k_{ij}^ℓ and k_{ij}^0 are positive real numbers.

Theoretical results for quadratic networks. When quadratic reaction networks of the form (15)-(19) are considered, the left-hand side of condition (5a) can be expressed as

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle = x^\top M(v)x + x^\top Av + b^\top v \quad (20)$$

where $M(v) \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is symmetric, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$. Let $S := [\zeta_1 \ \dots \ \zeta_K]$ be the stoichiometry matrix of the quadratic reaction network (15)-(19), and let S_q be the restriction of S to quadratic reactions, only. Define further the set

$$\mathcal{N}_q := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^d : v > 0, v^\top S_q = 0\}.$$

When $v \in \mathcal{N}_q$, the quadratic term $x^\top M(v)x$ in (20) vanishes, and equality (20) reduces to

$$\sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_k(x) \langle v, \zeta_k \rangle = x^\top Av + b^\top v$$

which is exactly the same expression as in the case of affine networks. This means that, with the additional constraint that $v \in \mathcal{N}_q$, all the results derived for affine networks directly apply to quadratic networks as well. Along these lines, we obtain the following result:

Proposition 10 (Ergodicity of quadratic networks) *Let us consider the quadratic reaction network of the form (15)-(19) which we assume to admit a non-empty \mathcal{N}_q .*

Then, if there exists a vector $v \in \mathcal{N}_q$ such that the inequality $Av < 0$ holds, the stochastic quadratic reaction network (15)-(19) is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging. \diamond

It is important to mention that the existence of a non-empty set \mathcal{N}_q is primordial for utilizing the above result. A necessary and sufficient condition for \mathcal{N}_q to be non-empty is that S_q is rank-deficient. This condition may seem restrictive at first sight, but it will be shown that several important reaction networks from the literature actually fall into this category.

Whenever \mathcal{N}_q is empty or there is no $v \in \mathcal{N}_q$ such that $Av < 0$ holds, linear algebraic condition can still be obtained, as stated in the result below:

Proposition 11 (Ergodicity of quadratic networks) *Let us consider the quadratic reaction network of the form (15)-(19) and assume further that one of the following statements holds:*

1. *There exists $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ such that $Av < 0$ and $M(v) \leq 0$ hold.*
2. *There exists $v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^d$ such that $M(v)$ is negative definite.*

Then, the quadratic stochastic reaction network is ergodic and has its moments up to order $\lfloor 1 + 2c_2/c_5 \rfloor - 1$ bounded and converging. \diamond

In the result above, the first statement is a linear program since the inequalities are componentwise. The second statement, however, is a semidefinite program, a more general convex program, that can be solved using solvers such as SeDuMi [30] and SDPT3 [31]. More details on the above result can be found in the supplementary material.

Computational results for quadratic networks. It is shown here that, once again, the theoretical results can be easily turned into linear programs that can be checked in a very efficient way. The following result is the numerical translation of Theorem 10:

Optimization problem 12 *Let us consider a quadratic reaction network (15)-(19) admitting a nonempty set \mathcal{N}_q . Assume that the optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z,v} z \quad \text{s.t.} \quad & z > 0, v > \varepsilon \\ & (zI + A)v \leq 0 \\ & v^\top S_q = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

is feasible with (z^, v^*) as minimizer. Then, we have $\widehat{C}_1^* \leq b^\top v^* / z^*$ and Theorem 10 holds.*

The computational complexity of this results also scales linearly with the number of species and can be therefore applied to large networks.

The following optimization problem is the computational counterpart of the first statement of Theorem 11:

Optimization problem 13 *Let us consider a quadratic reaction network of the form (15)-(19). Assume further that the nonlinear optimization problem*


$$\begin{aligned} \max_{z,v} z \quad \text{s.t.} \quad & z > 0, v > \varepsilon \\ & (zI + A)v \leq 0 \\ & M(v) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

is feasible with (z^, v^*) as minimizer. Then, we have $\widehat{C}_1^* \leq b^\top v^* / z^*$ and Theorem 11 holds.*

The above optimization problem does not scale as nicely as the optimization problem (22) since, in the worst case, the number of constraints related to $M(v)$ is worst-case quadratic in the number of species. The problem, however, remains tractable due to the linear program structure.

Finding an attractive compact set for the first-order moments trajectories

The goal of this section is to compute a compact set that is attractive for the first-order moment of $\langle v, X(t) \rangle$ using the optimization problems (18) or (21). Due to the moment closure problem [25], analytical expressions for the steady-state values of the moments of quadratic networks are not available. This class of networks is, therefore, the most interesting class to consider. Let us then consider the following quadratic network



representing a dimerization process, i.e. S_1 dimerizes in S_2 . It is easily seen that this network is irreducible since any point in the state-space can be reached from any other point in a finite number of reactions having nonzero propensities. Choosing v in \mathcal{N}_q yields that $c_1^* = k$ and $c_2^* = \min\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$, hence the network is exponentially ergodic, and all the moments are bounded and converging. Solving now the optimization problem (21) with numerical values $k = 1$, $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 0.2$ (the values of k_{12} and k_{21}

are unimportant here), we get that $c^* = 5$, which coincides with the theoretical value. To validate the compact set calculation, Monte-Carlo simulations are performed and yield that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\langle v, X(t) \rangle] = 5.024 \pm 0.05, \quad (24)$$

showing that the compact set agrees very well with the equilibrium values. To illustrate these results, several trajectories for $E[X_1(t)]$ and $E[X_2(t)]$ for different initial conditions are plotted in Figure 1.





Figure 1: **Trajectories of the first order moments $\mu_1(t) = \mathbb{E}[X_1(t)]$ and $\mu_2(t) = \mathbb{E}[X_2(t)]$ of network (23) for different initial conditions (averaging is performed over 5000 cells).** The trajectories converge to the unique steady-state value located inside the compact set (the surface below the dashed line), very close to the boundary.

Feedback loop

Let us consider the feedback loop network of Figure 2 represented by the reaction network



where \mathbf{S}_1 is mRNA and \mathbf{S}_2 is the corresponding protein. The dimer \mathbf{S}_3 acts back on the gene expression through the bounded function $f(\cdot)$ which is arbitrary.

We have the following result:

Result 14 *For any values of the rate parameters and any bounded function $f(\cdot)$, the feedback loop with dimerization (25) is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.*





Figure 2: Feedback loop with arbitrary feedback rule.

Stochastic switch

Let us consider the stochastic switch of [32] described by the affine stochastic reaction network



Above S_i^0 and S_i^1 represent mRNAs and proteins of gene i , respectively. The functions $f_1(\cdot)$ and $f_2(\cdot)$ are arbitrary bounded functions. We have the following result:

Result 15 *For any values of the rate parameters and any bounded functions $f_1(\cdot)$ and $f_2(\cdot)$, the stochastic switch (26) is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.*

Repressilator

We consider here the stochastic repressilator of Figure 3 (see also [33]) involving N genes and a negative feedback implemented in terms of Hill functions denoted by $f_i(\cdot)$, where i corresponds to the gene number. We have the following result:

Result 16 *For any values of the rate parameters and any functions $f_i(\cdot)$'s, the stochastic N -gene repressilator is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.*





Figure 3: N -gene repressilator.

Stochastic SIR model

We consider here the following SIR-model, similar to the one in [34], defined as



where birth and death reactions represent people entering and leaving the process, respectively. The only quadratic reaction is the contamination reaction which turns one susceptible person into an infectious one. The two last reactions represent how infectious people are recovering and how recovered people become susceptible again. We then have the following result:

Result 17 *For any values of the rate parameters, the SIR-model (27) is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.*

Circadian clock

Let us consider the circadian oscillator of [35], depicted in Figure 4, which is a network involving 9 species and 18 reactions.




Figure 4: Circadian clock model of [35].




Figure 5: Sample-path of the species of the circadian clock model.

Applying the developed theory on this model, we obtain the following result:

Result 18 For any values of the rate parameters, the circadian clock model of [35] is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.

Using, for instance, the values of [35] and solving² for the optimization problem (21), we find that $c_1 = 402.5768$ and $c_2 = 0.1992$. Typical trajectories for the proteins **A**, **R** and **C** are depicted in Figure 5 where we can observe the expected oscillatory behavior. When averaging the populations of the proteins **A**, **R** and **C** over a population of 2000 cells, we obtain the sample-average trajectories depicted in Figure 6. Convergence to stationary values is easily seen. Moreover, from the ergodicity property, we can even state that these fixed points for the sample-averages are globally attracting and that they coincide with the asymptotic time-average (dashed lines). The steady-state average values for the proteins **A**, **R** and **C** are given by 222.1797, 534.8853 and 549.7195, respectively.





Figure 6: **Time evolution of the sample averages of the species A (top), R (left) and C (right) of the circadian clock model (2000 cells averaging).** The dashed-lines correspond to the (asymptotic) time-average.

p53 model

Let us consider one of the oscillatory p53 models of [37], which is described by the reactions




²The optimization problem is solved using the linear programming solver ‘linprog’ which is called from the toolbox Yalmip [36].

where \mathbf{S}_1 is the number of p53 molecules, \mathbf{S}_2 the number of precursor of Mdm2 molecules and \mathbf{S}_3 the number of molecules of Mdm2. The function $f(x, y) = \frac{k_3 y}{x + k_7}$ implements a nonlinear feedback on the degradation rate of p53. We have the following result:

Result 19 *For any values of the rate parameters, the oscillatory p53 model (28) is ergodic and has all its moments bounded and converging.*

Lotka-Volterra model

We consider here the stochastic reaction network



which is an open analogue of the deterministic Lotka-Volterra system of [38]. The first set of reactions represent immigration, the second one reproduction, the third one competition due to overpopulation and the last one deaths/migrations. We obtain then the following result, which is a stochastic analogue of the results in [39] obtained in the deterministic setting:

Theorem 20 *Let us define $\Gamma(v) = [v_i \gamma_{ij}]$ and assume that one of the following conditions hold:*

1. *there exists $v > 0$ such that the matrix $\Gamma(v) + \Gamma(v)^\top$ is positive definite;*
2. *there exists $v > 0$ such that the $\Gamma(v) + \Gamma(v)^\top$ is copositive³ and $\beta_i - \delta_i < 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Then, the stochastic reaction network (29) is ergodic and all the moments up to order $\left\lceil 1 + \frac{2c_2}{c_5} \right\rceil - 1$ are bounded and converging.


³A matrix Z is said to be copositive if $x^T Z x \geq 0$ for all $x \geq 0$.

Discussion

The central theme of this paper is to verify the ergodicity and moment boundedness of reaction networks in the stochastic setting. These results have several interesting and important biological implications.

For example, the ergodicity of a network shows that population-level information could be obtained by observing a single trajectory for a long time. Such an insight can be used to leverage different experimental techniques for a given application. For example, consider a clonal cell population with each cell having a gene-expression network that is ergodic. Then the stationary distribution (at the population level) of the species involved in this network can be ascertained by *observing a single cell* over time. In other words, to obtain stationary distributions one can either collect samples over time from a single cell (e.g. using time-lapse microscopy) or one can take a snapshot of the entire cell population at some fixed time (e.g. using flow-cytometry). Due to ergodicity, both these approaches will yield the same information. Hence, far from being a technical condition, ergodicity can have far reaching experimental implications.

As a property of a network, ergodicity also sheds important light on the long range behaviors that can be exhibited by that network. One may expect that most endogenous biochemical networks to be ergodic in order to achieve robustness with respect to variability in initial conditions and kinetic parameters, thus ensuring proper biological functions in spite of environmental disturbances. However, ergodicity is a non-trivial property which needs to be carefully established and cannot be generically assumed. To illustrate this, let us consider a simplified version of the model of carcinogenesis considered in [40] which is given by



where $f(x) = \frac{\gamma_2}{\alpha + x_2}$, $\alpha > 0$. When $k_1 > \gamma_2$, the trajectories of the species grow unbounded, as shown in Figure 7, emphasizing then non-ergodicity of the model for this choice of parameters.

When $k_1 > \gamma_2$, the trajectories of the species grow unbounded, as shown in Figure 7, emphasizing then the non-ergodicity of the model for this choice of parameters. In this sense, carcinogenesis can be seen as an inherently non-ergodic process.

The ideas we use for analysis can also be applied for rationally designing circuits in synthetic biology, where it is important that the network be (structurally) ergodic in order to ensure that the dynamics has the desired behavior irrespective of the initial conditions. Such a design is crucial because the initial conditions are usually unknown or difficult to control at certain times, e.g. after cell division or after the transfection of plasmids in the cell.

Our results on boundedness and convergence of statistical moments enable verification of the suitability of a stochastic model and to characterize the properties of its steady-state distributions, even if such a distribution is not explicitly computable. One application of this is to provide justifications and insights for using moment closure techniques which have been extensively used to study stochastic chemical reaction networks. Some of these techniques [41, 42] are based on manipulations of the moment generating function of the underlying stochastic process. The existence of this moment generating function is implicitly assumed in such techniques but it may not always hold, thereby jeopardizing the validity of the technique. In this article, we show that under certain conditions, the distribution of the stochastic process is uniformly light-tailed, which proves that the moment generating function exists for all time. Certain moment closure techniques (see [43, 44]) prescribe ways to approximate higher order moments as a function of lower order moments. Such an approximation is, however, only reasonable if the higher order moments are bounded over time. This can be easily assessed with our approach and one can even quantify the error by explicitly computing the moment bounds as described in this article.

Finally, the techniques developed here will prove invaluable for designing synthetic biological control systems and circuits whose objective is to steer the moments of the network of interest to a specific




Figure 7: **State trajectories of the carcinogenesis model (30) with the parameters $k_1 = 5$, $k_{12} = 1$, $k_{21} = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 4$ and $\alpha = 1$.** The dashed lines correspond to the average trajectories computed over 1000 cells.

steady-state value. Until now, no theory has provided guidance for such a design. The specifics are outside the scope of this article and will be pursued elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Stephanie Aoki who spent some of her precious time in producing several illustrative pictures.

Author contributions

C.B., A.G. and M.K. devised the research; C.B. and A.G. carried out the research; C.B., A.G. and M.K. wrote the paper; A.G. developed the mathematical framework; C.B. developed the results for affine and quadratic reaction networks, and applied them to the examples.

Funding

This work has been supported by ETH and the Human Frontier Science Program Grant RGP0061/2011.

References

- [1] Érdi P, Tóth J (1989) *Mathematical models of chemical reactions. Nonlinear Science: Theory and Applications*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, xxiv+259 pp. Theory and applications of deterministic and stochastic models.
- [2] Papin JA, Hunter T, Palsson BO, Subramaniam S (2005) Reconstruction of cellular signalling networks and analysis of their properties. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 6: 99–111.
- [3] Thattai M, van Oudenaarden A (2001) Intrinsic noise in gene regulatory networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98: 8614-8619.
- [4] Schuetz R, Zamboni N, Zampieri M, Heinemann M, Sauer U (2012) Multidimensional optimality of microbial metabolism. *Science* 336: 601-604.
- [5] Berger SI, Iyengar R (2009) Network analyses in systems pharmacology. *Bioinformatics* 25: 2466-2472.
- [6] Hethcote H (2000) The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM Review* 42: 599-653.
- [7] Bascompte J (2010) Structure and dynamics of ecological networks. *Science* 329: 765-766.
- [8] Goutsias J (2007) Classical versus stochastic kinetics modeling of biochemical reaction systems. *Biophysical Journal* 92: 2350–2365.
- [9] McAdams HH, Arkin A (1999) It's a noisy business! Genetic regulation at the nanomolar scale. *Trends in genetics : TIG* 15: 65–69.
- [10] Levin MD, Morton-Firth CJ, Abouhamad WN, Bourret RB, Bray D (1998) Origins of individual swimming behavior in bacteria. *Biophysical Journal* 74: 175 - 181.
- [11] Elowitz MB, Levine AJ, Siggia ED, Swain PS (2002) Stochastic gene expression in a single cell. *Science* 297: 1183-1186.
- [12] Arkin AP, Rao CV, Wolf DM (2002) Control, exploitation and tolerance of intracellular noise. *Nature* 420: 231–237.
- [13] Kierzek AM, Zaim J, Zielenkiewicz P (2001) The effect of transcription and translation initiation frequencies on the stochastic fluctuations in prokaryotic gene expression. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* 276: 8165-8172.
- [14] McAdams HH, Arkin A (1997) Stochastic mechanisms in gene expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci, Biochemistry* 94: 814–819.
- [15] Khalil HK (1992) *Nonlinear systems*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, xii+564 pp.
- [16] Smale S (2004) *Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems & an introduction to Chaos*. Academic Press.
- [17] Feinberg M (1972/73) Complex balancing in general kinetic systems. *Arch Rational Mech Anal* 49: 187–194.
- [18] Feinberg M (1995) The existence and uniqueness of steady states for a class of chemical reaction networks. *Arch Rational Mech Anal* 132: 311–370.
- [19] Horn F, Jackson R (1972) General mass action kinetics. *Arch Rational Mech Anal* 47: 81–116.

- [20] Horn F (1972/73) Necessary and sufficient conditions for complex balancing in chemical kinetics. *Arch Rational Mech Anal* 49: 172–186.
- [21] Ethier SN, Kurtz TG (1986) *Markov processes : Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., x+534 pp.
- [22] Jahnke T, Huisinga W (2007) Solving the chemical master equation for monomolecular reaction systems analytically. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 54: 1–26.
- [23] Kallenberg O (2002) *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). New York: Springer-Verlag, second edition, xx+638 pp.
- [24] Pemantle R, Rosenthal JS (1999) Moment conditions for a sequence with negative drift to be uniformly bounded in l_r . *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 82: 143–155.
- [25] Hespanha JP (2008) Moment closure for biochemical networks. In: *3rd International Symposium on Communications, Control and Signal Processing*. St. Julian’s, Malta, pp. 142–147.
- [26] Pendar H, Platini T, Kulkarni RV (2013) Exact protein distributions for stochastic models of gene expression using partitioning of poisson processes. *Physical Review E* 87: 042720.
- [27] Norris JR (1998) Markov chains, volume 2 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xvi+237 pp. Reprint of 1997 original.
- [28] Meyn SP, Tweedie RL (1993) Stability of Markovian processes. III. Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Adv in Appl Probab* 25: 518–548.
- [29] Boyd S, Vandenberghe L (2004) *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge, MA, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- [30] Sturm JF (2001) Using SEDUMI 1.02, a Matlab Toolbox for Optimization Over Symmetric Cones. *Optimization Methods and Software* 11: 625–653.
- [31] Tütüncü RH, Toh KC, Todd MJ (2003) Solving semidefinite-quadratic-linear programs using SDPT3. *Mathematical Programming Ser B* 95: 189–217.
- [32] Tian T, Burrage K (2006) Stochastic models for regulatory networks of the genetic toggle switch. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 103(22): 8372–8377.
- [33] Elowitz MB, Leibler S (2000) A synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators. *Nature* 403: 335–338.
- [34] Chen WY, Bokka S (2005) Stochastic modeling of nonlinear epidemiology. *J theor Biol* 234: 455–470.
- [35] Vilar JMG, Kueh HY, Barkai N, Leibler S (2002) Mechanisms of noise-resistance in genetic oscillator. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 99(9): 5988–5992.
- [36] Löfberg J (2004) Yalmip : A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In: *Proceedings of the CACSD Conference*. Taipei, Taiwan. URL <http://control.ee.ethz.ch/~joloef/yalmip.php>.
- [37] Geva-Zatorsky N, Rosenfeld N, Itzkovitz S, Milo R, Sigal A, et al. (2006) Oscillations and variability in the p53 system. *Molecular Systems Biology* 2: 2006.0033.

- [38] Gopalsamy K (1984) Global asymptotic stability in volterra’s population systems. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 19: 157–168.
- [39] Champagnat N, Jabin P, Raoul G (2010) Convergence to equilibrium in competitive Lotka-Volterra and chemostat systems. *Compte Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences - Mathématique* 348(23-24): 1267–1272.
- [40] Bois FY, Zeise L, Tozer TN (1990) Precision and sensitivity of pharmacokinetic models for cancer risk assessment: Tetrachloroethylene in mice, rats, and humans. *Toxicology and applied pharmacology* 102: 300–315.
- [41] Lee C, Kim KH, Kim P (2009) A moment closure method for stochastic reaction networks. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 130(13): 134107.
- [42] Ale A, Kirk P, Stumpf MP (2013) A general moment expansion method for stochastic kinetic models. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 138(17): 174101.
- [43] Gomez-Uribe CA, Verghese GC (2007) Mass fluctuation kinetics: Capturing stochastic effects in systems of chemical reactions through coupled mean-variance computations. *The Journal of Chemical Physics* 126(2): 024109.
- [44] Singh A, Hespanha JP (2011) Approximate moment dynamics for chemically reacting systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 56(2): 414–418.

Figure legends

Figure 1

Trajectories of the first order moments $\mu_1(t) = \mathbb{E}[X_1(t)]$ and $\mu_2(t) = \mathbb{E}[X_2(t)]$ of network (23) for different initial conditions (averaging is performed over 5000 cells). The trajectories converge to the unique steady-state value located inside the compact set (the surface below the dashed line), very close to the boundary.

Figure 2

Feedback loop with arbitrary feedback rule.

Figure 3

N -gene repressilator.

Figure 4

Circadian clock model of [35].

Figure 5

Sample-path of the species of the circadian clock model.

Figure 6

Time evolution of the sample averages of the species **A** (top), **R** (left) and **C** (right) of the circadian clock model (2000 cells averaging). The dashed-lines correspond to the (asymptotic) time-average.

Figure 7

State trajectories of the carcinogenesis model (30) with the parameters $k_1 = 5$, $k_{12} = 1$, $k_{21} = 1$, $\gamma_2 = 4$ and $\alpha = 1$. The dashed lines correspond to the average trajectories computed over 1000 cells.