

# A scalable method for finding irreducible state-spaces for stochastic models of biochemical reaction networks

Ankit Gupta and Mustafa Khammash  
Department of Biosystems Science and Engineering  
ETH Zurich  
Mattenstrasse 26  
4058 Basel, Switzerland.

December 3, 2024

## Abstract

In stochastic models of biochemical reaction networks, the dynamics is usually represented by a Markov process which describes the evolution of the copy-numbers or molecular counts of the constituent species. It is often of biological interest to determine if this Markov process has a unique stationary distribution and for this to hold, it is necessary that the state-space is *irreducible* in the sense that all the states are reachable from each other in a finite time, with a positive probability. Finding such irreducible state-spaces is quite challenging, because the Markovian dynamics can usually access infinitely many states and the presence of conservation relations among species can constrain the dynamics in complicated ways. The aim of this paper is to develop a computational framework for finding irreducible state-spaces for reaction networks that typically arise in Systems and Synthetic Biology. Our results can help in assessing the long-term behavior of a network and also in explicitly obtaining the stationary distributions in certain cases. The framework we present relies only on elementary linear algebra and linear programming, which makes it highly scalable and efficient, even for very large networks. We illustrate the wide applicability of our framework through several examples.

Keywords: Stochastic Systems; Markov Models; Reaction Networks; Irreducibility; Stationarity; Ergodicity.  
Mathematical Subject Classification (2010): 60J22; 60J27; 60H35; 65C05.

## 1 Introduction

Many biological processes can be described as reaction networks, where certain species interact with each other through a fixed number of predetermined reaction channels. Such reaction networks can be found in Epidemiology [22], Pharmacology [6], Ecology [5] and most prominently, in Systems and Synthetic Biology [1, 35, 42, 14]. Traditionally, models based on reaction networks have been mathematically studied by expressing the dynamics as a set of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). However it is well-known that these deterministic formulations become highly inaccurate when the copy-numbers of the reacting species are *small*. This is because the random timing of reactions introduces *noise* into the dynamics, which cannot be neglected as it can significantly change the behavior of the system being modeled [18, 29]. Such situations arise naturally in Systems and Synthetic Biology, where a strong focus has been on understanding and designing intracellular networks that drive gene-expression [12, 29, 40, 30], signalling mechanisms [35] or metabolic pathways [38]. Typically such networks involve certain species, like gene-transcripts, signaling proteins, messenger RNAs, transcription factors etc., that are present in low copy-numbers. Presence of these low copy-number species generates biochemical noise which can be taken into account using stochastic formulations of the dynamics of reaction networks. A common approach is to represent the dynamics as a continuous-time Markov process whose states denote the population size or copy-numbers of the constituent species. In recent years, these stochastic models have been extensively used for understanding the role of noise in various biological mechanisms [4, 12]. We now review some of the methods that have been developed for analyzing these stochastic models and we also discuss how our paper fits into the existing literature.

Consider the stochastic model of a reaction network in which the dynamics is given by a Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  whose states represent the copy-number vectors of the constituent species. This process evolves on a *discrete* state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  which includes all the copy-number vectors that are *accessible* by the random dynamics. This state-space may not be unique, and for most examples of interest it is countably infinite. To study the role of noise in biological systems, one is often interested in the probability distribution  $p(t)$  of the random state  $X(t)$  at time  $t$ . The time-evolution of this probability distribution is given by a system of ODEs, known as the *Chemical Master Equation* (CME) in the literature [16]. This system has one ODE for each element of the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  and hence the total number of ODEs is typically infinite, making the CME practically impossible to solve. Approximate solutions to CME can be efficiently obtained by appropriately constructing finite truncations of the state-space [33] or using other numerical techniques such as Tensor Train representations [24]. However such methods usually work well only for small problems or they require networks to have a special structure. Generally, rather than attempting to solve a CME, one resorts to estimating its solution by generating a large sample of  $X(t)$  and computing its empirical distribution. To obtain such a sample, one can either simulate the exact Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  using schemes such as Gillespie’s *Stochastic Simulation Algorithm* (SSA) [15], or one can employ computationally faster methods that simulate an approximate process which arises by combining several reaction-firings in small suitably chosen time intervals [17, 9]. Another way to approximate the dynamics is by exploiting the copy-number scales of the constituent species. It is known that when the copy-numbers of all the species are uniformly *large* - i.e. they are of order  $N$  where  $N$  denotes the system’s size or volume - then a rescaled version of the Markov process representing the stochastic model converges as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  to the solution of the ODE representing the deterministic model of the reaction network [27]. Under a similar scaling, it is also possible to approximate the stochastic dynamics, for a large  $N$ , with stochastic differential equations (SDEs) that capture *some* effects of noise and are simpler to simulate than the exact process [41, 28]. Note that such ODE or SDE approximation results only hold under certain restrictive assumptions, and even then the approximation is only valid over compact time intervals.

In order to investigate how noise, generated by the random timing of reaction events, affects a biological system in the long-run, we need to understand the long-term behavior of the Markov process representing its stochastic model. Specifically, it is important to determine the possible state-spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  on which such a Markov process is *ergodic* [31]: i.e. there exists a stationary distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathcal{E}$ , such that for any initial state  $X(0) = x_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ , the distribution  $p_{x_0}(t)$  of the (random) state  $X(t)$  at time  $t$ , converges to  $\pi$  in an appropriate sense as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Ergodicity represents a strong notion of stability for the stochastic model that is similar to having an attracting fixed point for the deterministic model. Whenever the stochastic model of a biological system is ergodic on some state-space, one can draw many desirable conclusions about the long-term behavior of the underlying stochastic dynamics. For example, the long-run proportion of time spent by the stochastic trajectories in any subset of the state-space is equal to the stationary probability of that subset (see (2.18)). Hence observing the whole population of biological systems (such as cells) at stationarity is equivalent to observing just one stochastic trajectory of a single system for a sufficiently long time. Such an insight can be used to leverage different experimental techniques such as *flow-cytometry* and *time-lapse microscopy*, for biological applications. Ergodicity also implies that certain statistical quantities associated with the underlying Markov process, like means or variances, converge to their steady-state values with time (see (2.17)). This can be used to synthetically design biological controllers that steer these statistical quantities to specific steady state values [8].

We now come to the issue of finding state-spaces on which the stochastic reaction dynamics is ergodic. If the reaction network can only access finitely many states, then such state-spaces can be easily identified using matrix methods or state transition diagrams [34, 26]. However most biological networks we encounter do not satisfy this property, and as a consequence all the state-spaces must be necessarily infinite. In such a setting, finding the “right” state-spaces and checking the ergodicity of the associated Markov process is indeed a difficult problem. A naive approach for this problem would be to somehow enlist the likely state-spaces, and for each such state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ , check if there exists a stationary distribution  $\pi$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  such that  $p_{x_0}(t) \rightarrow \pi$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $x_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ . Clearly this naive approach is fraught with many complications due to infiniteness of the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  and the lack of solvability of the CME which governs the evolution of  $p_{x_0}(t)$ . One can try to counter the latter problem by estimating the solutions of the CME using finite state-space truncations [33], Monte Carlo simulations [15] or SDE approximations [41, 28]. However these approaches are unsatisfactory in assessing the long-term behavior because they either work only for a finite

time, or they work under restrictive assumptions on the species copy-numbers or they involve approximation errors (due to sampling, truncation etc.) that may not remain bounded as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . Even if the CME can be solved explicitly for each initial state  $x_0 \in \mathcal{E}$ , one will still have to solve infinitely many CMEs to check the ergodicity of the associated  $\mathcal{E}$ -valued Markov process. Since this is clearly impossible, an indirect approach is needed for the purpose of finding state-spaces on which the stochastic reaction dynamics is ergodic.

A necessary condition for ergodicity is that the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  is *irreducible*, which means that for any two states  $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$ , there is a positive probability for the stochastic reaction dynamics to start at  $x$  and reach  $y$  in finite time. Irreducibility of state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  ensures that the underlying Markov process has a unique stationary distribution [31] and we can prove its ergodicity by constructing a Foster-Lyapunov function [32] that shows that the reaction dynamics has an attractive tendency towards some compact set in  $\mathcal{E}$ . Recently it has been demonstrated that such Foster-Lyapunov functions can be easily constructed using optimization techniques, for a large class of reaction networks which includes many well-known examples from Systems and Synthetic Biology [20]. Hence once we check state-space irreducibility, the results in [20] provide an indirect way for establishing ergodicity, without the need for solving the associated CMEs. The goal of this paper is to develop a computational framework for finding irreducible state-spaces for a given reaction network. Therefore this paper nicely complements the work in [20] and facilitates the task of understanding the long-term behavior of stochastic models of reaction networks. Moreover for certain type of networks, finding the irreducible state-spaces can give us an explicit form for the stationary distribution leading to novel biological insights (see Example 6.3).

In situations where only finitely many states are accessible by the reaction network, the irreducible state-spaces coincide with the state-spaces on which the stochastic reaction dynamics is ergodic, and they can be found using matrix methods [26] as mentioned before. However the aim of this paper is to address the problem of finding irreducible state-spaces for biological networks that can access infinitely many states. To understand the challenges that lie ahead let us consider a simple birth-death network of the form



Here the molecules of a single-species  $\mathbf{S}$  are produced and degraded at some positive rates  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  respectively. Let  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  be the Markov process representing the reaction dynamics in the stochastic setting, where  $X(t)$  is the number of molecules at time  $t$ . This process evolves on the state-space  $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . When the state is  $X(t) = n$ , then with probability  $p_+(n) = \theta_1/(\theta_1 + \theta_2 n)$ , the next reaction is a production reaction and the state increases to  $(n + 1)$  and with probability  $p_-(n) = 1 - p_+(n) = (\theta_2 n)/(\theta_1 + \theta_2 n)$ , the next reaction is a degradation reaction and the state decreases to  $(n - 1)$ . From these probabilities, it is immediate that for any two distinct states  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the reaction dynamics starting at  $x$  can reach  $y$ , either via a sequence of  $(y - x)$  production reactions if  $x < y$ , or via a sequence of  $(x - y)$  degradation reactions if  $x > y$ . In both these cases, the appropriate sequence of reactions has a positive probability of firing in a finite time, and hence the state-space  $\mathbb{N}_0$  is irreducible for the reaction network. For a general reaction network with  $d \gg 1$  species and a countable state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ , constructing such positive-probability sequences of reactions between every two states in  $\mathcal{E}$  is nearly impossible and hence the irreducibility of  $\mathcal{E}$  is hard to verify directly. The main contribution of this paper is to provide an approach that avoids this construction of positive-probability reaction-sequences and still finds irreducible state-spaces for many reaction networks.

Our approach is inspired by the simple observation that many biological reaction networks have *cascaded birth and death subnetworks*. This means that there is a set of species that are produced *directly* due to reactions of the form  $\emptyset \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}$ . These species then produce another set of species which in turn produce another set of species and so on, creating a *birth cascade*. Similarly there is a set of species that are degraded *directly* due to reactions of the form  $\mathbf{S} \longrightarrow \emptyset$ . These species are then responsible for degrading another set of species which in turn cause degradation of another set of species and so on, forming a *death cascade*. In many networks all the species can be arranged in birth and death cascades. For example in a simple gene-expression network (see Example 4.8), messenger RNAs (or mRNAs) are produced directly by a gene transcript and these mRNAs then produce proteins, forming a birth cascade involving all the network species (mRNA and protein). On the other hand both mRNA and protein molecules degrade directly, creating a trivial death cascade with all the network species. We show that under some mild linear-algebraic conditions, if all the  $d$  species in a general reaction network are included in a birth and a death cascade, then the nonnegative integer orthant  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is the unique irreducible state-space for the reaction network (see Section 4). In this situation all the species are *free* in the sense that their copy-numbers can take any nonnegative integer value,

irrespective of the copy-numbers of other species. This is of course not true if the reaction network consists of *conservation relations*, which are linear relationships among species copy-numbers that are preserved by the dynamics. Presence of such conservation relations can constrain the species copy-numbers and introduce dependencies among them, thereby complicating the task of finding irreducible state-spaces. In Section 5 we shall explore how these conservation relations can be taken into account for constructing a list of likely candidates for irreducible state-spaces and how the irreducibility of each such state-space can be verified using a suitable combination of matrix methods [26] and the cascade construction procedure mentioned earlier.

We now discuss the role of conservation relations in limiting the copy-number ranges of the involved species. Some conservation relations can cause a species to be *bounded*, which means that its copy-numbers have a bounded range. For example, in a gene-expression network (see Example 5.18) where a single gene transcript can occur in *active* or *inactive* forms, there is a conservation relation which says that the copy-numbers of these two species (active-gene and inactive-gene) must sum to 1, thereby ensuring that these species are *bounded* as their copy-numbers can either be 0 or 1. Conservation relations can also force certain species to be *restricted*, in the sense that their copy-numbers are an *affine* function of the copy-numbers of the *free* species. As an example, consider a simple two-species network where molecules of both the species are produced or degraded together (see Example 5.5), and hence the difference of their copy-numbers is a conservation relation. If this difference is initially 0, then the copy-number of both the species will remain identical throughout the dynamics. Therefore we can declare one of the species as *free* and then the other will become *restricted* because its copy-number is simply equal to the copy-number of the *free* species. This also suggests that there is a certain degree of flexibility in choosing the *free* and the *restricted* species. We shall see later how this flexibility can be exploited to facilitate the search for irreducible state-spaces.

For large reaction networks each species can be involved in several conservation relations and hence identifying its copy-number range is not a straightforward task. We will use standard linear-algebraic methods for this purpose and classify each species as one of three types, *free*, *bounded* or *restricted*, depending on the limitations on its copy-numbers or lack thereof. Such a classification allows us to express the possible irreducible state-spaces for a network in a special form, in which the copy-number range of each species is explicitly discernible, thereby allowing us to check its irreducibility via a simple procedure. The linear-algebraic methods that we shall use in our paper are restricted to basic matrix manipulations, solving systems of linear equations and solving Linear Programming Problems (LPPs) [7]. Since these methods can be efficiently applied in very high dimensions, our framework is highly scalable and can easily handle large reaction networks with several species and reactions.

The main ideas behind this paper are generalized from our recent conference paper [21]. However the framework presented in [21] has many shortcomings that limit its applicability. For example, it only considers *mass-action* kinetics [2, 18] and it cannot handle absorbing states or conservation relations that create *restricted* species. Moreover it can easily become computationally infeasible when the network has many *bounded* species. In contrast the framework presented in this paper is more scalable and more generally applicable. In particular, it allows for certain forms of *non-mass-action* kinetics, it can detect absorbing states and it can also handle *restricted* species. More importantly when a large number of *bounded* species are present, then it remains computationally efficient by exploiting the dynamical independence of such species. The theoretical underpinnings of both [21] and this paper are provided by some recent results on irreducibility of Discrete Reaction Networks given in [36]. Note however that unlike our paper, the results in [36] do not apply when the network has conservation relations.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the relevant mathematical background for this paper. We formally describe the stochastic model of a reaction network, explain the notion of state-space irreducibility and discuss its importance. In Section 3 we introduce many preliminary concepts and definitions that will be used throughout the paper. Sections 4 and 5 contain the main results of this paper which provide a procedure to find irreducible state-spaces for general reaction networks. In Section 6 we illustrate the applicability of our framework by considering examples from Systems and Synthetic Biology.

## Notation

We now introduce some notation that will be used throughout the paper. Let  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{N}_0$  denote the sets of all reals, nonnegative reals, integers, positive integers and nonnegative integers respectively. For any set  $A$ , we denote its cardinality by  $|A|$ . The vectors of all zeros and all ones in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  are written as  $\bar{0}_n$  and  $\bar{1}_n$  respectively. Moreover  $e_i^{(n)}$  denotes a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  whose  $i$ -th entry is 1 while the rest are 0. The set of vectors  $\{e_1^{(n)}, \dots, e_n^{(n)}\}$  forms the *standard basis* for  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . For any vector  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we define its support as the set  $\text{supp}(v) = \{i = 1, \dots, n : v_i \neq 0\}$ . For any two vectors  $v, w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we say  $v > w$  or  $v \geq w$  if the corresponding inequality holds component-wise. A vector  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is called nonnegative, nonnegative and strictly positive if  $v \neq \bar{0}_n$ ,  $v \geq \bar{0}_n$  and  $v > \bar{0}_n$  respectively. A vector which is both nonnegative and nonzero is simply called positive. We denote the standard inner product in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ .

While multiplying a matrix with a vector we always regard the vector as a column vector. Let  $\mathbb{M}(m, n)$  refer to the set of all  $m \times n$  matrices with real entries. For any matrix  $M \in \mathbb{M}(m, n)$ , we denote its rank by  $\text{Rank}(M)$ , its transpose by  $M^T$  and its left nullspace by

$$\mathcal{L}(M) = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^m : \gamma^T M = \bar{0}_n\}.$$

Given  $n$  vectors  $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$  the matrix in  $\mathbb{M}(m, n)$  with these vectors as its columns is denoted by


$$\text{Col}(v_1, \dots, v_n).$$

Moreover for any  $M \in \mathbb{M}(m, n)$  and any  $k \leq l \leq m$ , the projection matrix  $\text{Proj}(M, k, l) \in \mathbb{M}(l - k + 1, n)$  is the submatrix formed by rows  $(k + 1), (k + 2), \dots, l$  of matrix  $M$ . For any positive integer  $n$ ,  $I_n$  represents the  $n \times n$  identity matrix. The dimension of any vector space  $V$  is denoted by  $\dim(V)$  and this vector space is called trivial or nontrivial depending on whether  $\dim(V) = 0$  or  $\dim(V) > 0$ . If  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  are the columns of  $M$  then for any  $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ , the set  $\text{Colspan}_A(M)$  stands for

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^m : x = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i v_i \text{ for some } a_1, \dots, a_n \in A \right\}.$$

## 2 Stochastic model of a reaction network

Consider a reaction network with  $d$  species  $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_d$ . These species interact through  $K$  reaction channels of the form



where  $\nu_{ik}$  and  $\rho_{ik}$  denote the number of molecules of  $\mathbf{S}_i$  that are consumed and produced by reaction  $k$ . Define vectors  $\nu_k$  and  $\rho_k$  in  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  as

$$\nu_k = (\nu_{1k}, \dots, \nu_{dk}) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_k = (\rho_{1k}, \dots, \rho_{dk}). \quad (2.2)$$

Under the classical well-stirred assumption [15], the state of the network at any time is given by a vector in  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$ , whose  $i$ -th component is the number of molecules (or copy-number) of  $\mathbf{S}_i$ . When the state is  $x$ , the  $k$ -th reaction fires with rate  $\lambda_k(x)$  and it displaces the state to  $y = x - \nu_k + \rho_k$ . The functions  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$  are called *propensity* functions for the reaction network. We assume that these functions satisfy the following property: for any  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$

$$\text{if } \lambda_k(x) > 0 \quad \text{then} \quad x \geq \nu_k - \rho_k. \quad (2.3)$$

This property ensures that the reaction dynamics never leaves the nonnegative integer orthant  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$ .

Let  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  be  $d \times K$  matrices given by

$$\mathcal{V} = \text{Col}(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_K) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O} = \text{Col}(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_K). \quad (2.4)$$

We define the *propensity* map  $\Lambda : \mathbb{N}_0^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^K$  by

$$\Lambda(x) = (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_K(x)). \quad (2.5)$$

The above reaction network with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions can be fully described by the *triplet*

$$\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda). \quad (2.6)$$

In the stochastic model for network  $\mathcal{N}$  we represent the reaction dynamics as a  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$ -valued Markov process with generator<sup>1</sup> given by

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(x) (f(x - \nu_k + \rho_k) - f(x)),$$

where  $f$  is any bounded real-valued function on  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$ . Under mild conditions on the propensity functions, one can show that for any initial state  $x_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ , there exists a well-defined Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  with generator  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $X(0) = x_0$ . A convenient way to represent this process is through its random time-change representation [13]

$$X(t) = x_0 + \sum_{k=1}^K Y_k \left( \int_0^t \lambda_k(X(s)) ds \right) (\rho_k - \nu_k), \quad (2.7)$$

where  $\{Y_k : k = 1, \dots, K\}$  is a family of independent unit rate Poisson processes. Note that if  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_d(t))$ , then  $X_i(t)$  is the number of molecules of  $\mathbf{S}_i$  at time  $t$ . A state-space for the stochastic model of a reaction network is any subset of the nonnegative integer orthant which is *closed* under the reaction dynamics. The formal definition of a state-space is provided below.

**Definition 2.1** Consider the reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions. A non-empty set  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^d$  is called a *state-space* for this network if the following is satisfied for each  $x \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $k = 1, \dots, K$ :

$$\text{if } \lambda_k(x) > 0 \quad \text{then} \quad (x + \rho_k - \nu_k) \in \mathcal{E}.$$

Observe that according to this definition,  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is always a state-space for any network with  $d$  species, because the propensity functions are always assumed to satisfy (2.3). However depending upon the network structure and reaction stoichiometries, there may exist smaller state-spaces for a given reaction network. Once a state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  has been selected for a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ , any Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  with generator  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and initial state  $X(0) \in \mathcal{E}$ , will satisfy  $X(t) \in \mathcal{E}$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{E}$  serves as a generic state-space for all Markov processes representing the reaction dynamics and starting with an initial state in  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Assume that a suitable state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  has been found for network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ . Let  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  be the space of all probability distributions on  $\mathcal{E}$ . We endow this space with the Prohorov metric which generates the weak topology [13]. Pick a  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  and let  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  be the Markov process with generator  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and initial distribution  $\mu$ . Hence  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  represents the reaction dynamics and the initial state  $X(0)$  is distributed according to  $\mu$ . For any  $y \in \mathcal{E}$ , the probability that the reaction dynamics is at state  $y$  at time  $t$  is

$$p_\mu(t, y) = \mathbb{P}(X(t) = y). \quad (2.8)$$

The dynamics of  $p_\mu(t)$  is given by the Chemical Master Equation (CME) [16] which has the following form. For each  $y \in \mathcal{E}$

$$\frac{dp_\mu(t, y)}{dt} = \sum_{k=1}^K (p_\mu(t, y - \rho_k + \nu_k) \lambda_k(y - \rho_k + \nu_k) - p_\mu(t, y) \lambda_k(y)) \quad (2.9)$$

where  $p_\mu(0, y) = \mu(\{y\})$ . Observe that this system consists of as many equations as the number of elements in  $\mathcal{E}$ , which is typically infinite, and hence solving the CME is nearly impossible for most examples.

<sup>1</sup>The generator of a stochastic process is an operator which captures the rate of change of the distribution of the process. See Chapter 4 in [13] for more details.

By defining  $p_\mu(t, A) = \sum_{y \in A} p_\mu(t, y)$  for any  $A \subset \mathcal{E}$ , we can view  $p_\mu(t)$  as a probability distribution over  $\mathcal{E}$  and hence as an element in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . A distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  is called a *stationary distribution* for the reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  if

$$p_\pi(t, y) = \pi(y) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \text{ and } y \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (2.10)$$

where  $\pi(y) = \pi(\{y\})$ . This means that if the initial distribution is  $\pi$ , then the distribution of the network state at any time  $t$  is also  $\pi$ . The form of the CME (2.9) implies that (2.10) can hold if and only if for each  $y \in \mathcal{E}$  we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \pi(y - \rho_k + \nu_k) \lambda_k(y - \rho_k + \nu_k) = \pi(y) \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k(y). \quad (2.11)$$

If the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  is compact (or finite) such a stationary distribution certainly exists (see Section 1.7 in [34]). However its existence cannot be guaranteed in the more common scenario of  $\mathcal{E}$  being countably infinite. In this situation, the existence of a stationary distribution can be checked using the results by Meyn and Tweedie [31, 32]. In particular, Theorem 4.5 in [32] shows that a stationary distribution  $\pi$  will exist if one can construct a *norm-like*<sup>2</sup> function  $V : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , a positive function  $f : \mathcal{E} \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ , a compact set  $C \subset \mathcal{E}$  and some constants  $c, d > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}} V(x) \leq -cf(x) + d\mathbb{1}_C(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{E}. \quad (2.12)$$

This condition is called *Foster-Lyapunov* criterion in the literature [32] and it essentially says that the Markovian dynamics experiences a *negative drift* outside some compact set  $C \subset \mathcal{E}$ . The strength of this negative drift is given by the function  $f$  and the expectation of this function is finite under the stationary distribution (see Theorem 4.5 in [32]).

In a recent paper [20] we develop a computational framework for constructing such norm-like functions  $V$  satisfying the above Foster-Lyapunov criterion for a large class of biochemical reaction networks which includes several well-known examples from Systems and Synthetic Biology. Interestingly these functions have a simple *linear* form given by

$$V(x) = \langle v, x \rangle$$

where  $v \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$  is a positive vector which is suitably chosen using optimization techniques, such as Linear or Semidefinite Programming [7]. Once the existence of a stationary distribution has been established, the natural question arises is whether this stationary distribution is unique or not. This brings us to the issue of state-space irreducibility which is defined and discussed in the next section.

## 2.1 Irreducibility

Consider the reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ . For any  $x \in \mathcal{E}$ , let  $\delta_x$  be the Dirac distribution concentrated at  $x$ . Define  $p_x(t)$  to be  $p_\mu(t)$  for  $\mu = \delta_x$ . For any  $y \in \mathcal{E}$ ,  $p_x(t, y)$  is the probability that the stochastic dynamics starts at  $x$  and reaches  $y$  at time  $t$ . If  $p_x(t, y) > 0$  for some  $t \geq 0$ , then we say that state  $y$  is *reachable* from state  $x$ , and we denote this relation as

$$x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} y. \quad (2.13)$$

Since we are in the continuous-time setting,  $p_x(t, y) > 0$  for some  $t \geq 0$  if and only if  $p_x(t, y) > 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$  (see Theorem 3.2.1 in [34]). Hence the condition for reachability  $p_x(t, y) > 0$  does not depend on a particular time-value  $t$ .

We say that the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  for a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  is *irreducible* if all the states in  $\mathcal{E}$  are reachable from each other, i.e. relation (2.13) holds between any two states  $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$ . Proving the irreducibility of  $\mathcal{E}$  has many important consequences that will be discussed in Section 2.2. For now we focus on the problem of checking irreducibility, which can be quite challenging when  $\mathcal{E}$  is countably infinite. The

<sup>2</sup>A positive real-valued function  $x \mapsto V(x)$  is called *norm-like* if  $V(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ .

main difficulty arises due to the fact that some reaction channels may *switch-off* at certain states, and hence the set of possible transition directions is not the same for all states in  $\mathcal{E}$ . When the state is  $x$ , the reaction channel  $k$  will switch-off if its propensity  $\lambda_k(x)$  is 0. This switching off of reactions must be taken into account while checking the irreducibility of  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Observe that (2.13) certainly holds if  $x = y$ . In order to prove this relation between two distinct states  $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$ , we need to show that there is a sequence of  $n$  reactions  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that:

$$y = x + \sum_{i=1}^n (\rho_{k_i} - \nu_{k_i}) \quad (2.14)$$

and for each  $j = 1, \dots, n$

$$\lambda_{k_j}(z_j) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad z_j = x + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (\rho_{k_i} - \nu_{k_i}). \quad (2.15)$$

Equation (2.14) implies that if the initial state of the network is  $x$  and reactions  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  fire in this order, then the final state of the network will be  $y$ . Of course the sequence of reactions  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  can only fire in this order, if at all the *intermediate* states ( $z_j$ -s), the propensity for the next reaction in this sequence is positive. This is equivalent to condition (2.15). Proving the existence of a sequence of reactions that simultaneously satisfy (2.14) and (2.15) is technically difficult. Hence it is hard to directly verify that (2.13) holds for every pair of states  $x$  and  $y$  which also explains why proving the irreducibility of a state-space is a complicated task.

To avoid the difficulties mentioned above, we adopt an indirect approach for checking state-space irreducibility for reaction networks. Our approach is inspired by the structure of networks commonly found in Systems and Synthetic Biology. We describe this approach in detail in Sections 4 and 5 and it does not involve finding sequences of reactions connecting states in the state-space. Instead it only relies on elementary linear algebra and linear programming, which makes it highly scalable for large reaction networks. We end this section with a proposition regarding relation (2.13) and a remark on the property of irreducibility.

**Proposition 2.2** *Consider a reaction network  $\mathcal{N}$  with state space  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^d$ . The relation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}}$  is **transitive**: i.e. for any  $x, y, z \in \mathcal{E}$ , if  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} y$  and  $y \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} z$  then  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} z$ .*

**Proof.** See Chapter 6 in [19]. □

**Remark 2.3** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{E}_1$  and  $\mathcal{E}_2$  are two state-spaces for a network such that  $\mathcal{E}_2$  strictly contains  $\mathcal{E}_1$ . Then the states in  $\mathcal{E}_2$  that are outside  $\mathcal{E}_1$  cannot be accessible from the states within  $\mathcal{E}_1$ . As a result, the bigger state-space  $\mathcal{E}_2$  cannot be irreducible. This also allows us to conclude that two distinct irreducible state-spaces must be necessarily disjoint because the intersection of two state-spaces is a state-space as well (see Definition 2.1). This disjointness is useful for checking if all the irreducible state-spaces have been found.*

## 2.2 Applications

Suppose that an irreducible state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  has been found for a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$ . Assuming that a stationary distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  exists for the stochastic reaction dynamics, this stationary distribution must be necessarily unique in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  (see Theorem 3.5.2 in [34]). In such a scenario, the stochastic reaction dynamics is called *ergodic*, which is the same as saying that for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ , the  $\mathcal{E}$ -valued Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  with generator  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and initial distribution  $\mu$  is *ergodic* [31]. In other words, the probability distribution  $p_{\mu}(t)$ , defined by (2.8), converges to the stationary distribution  $\pi$  in the *total-variation* norm on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ :

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{A \subset \mathcal{S}} |p_{\mu}(t, A) - \pi(A)| = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

for any  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . Therefore for any  $A \subset \mathcal{E}$ , the probability of the event  $\{X(t) \in A\}$  converges to  $\pi(A)$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , irrespective of the initial distribution  $\mu$ .

From (2.11) it is clear that a stationary distribution  $\pi$  can be viewed as a fixed point for the CME (2.9) which describes the time-evolution of the probability distributions  $(p_\mu(t))_{t \geq 0}$  in the space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . Relation (2.16) shows that if we have ergodicity, then  $\pi$  is a globally attracting fixed point (in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ ) for this CME. Hence ergodicity is a strong notion of *stability* for stochastic reaction dynamics, which can have many practical applications as we now discuss. Ergodicity implies that for any bounded real-valued function  $f$  on  $\mathcal{E}$  we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f(X(t))) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} f(y)\pi(y) \quad (2.17)$$

and the following limit holds with probability 1

$$\text{and } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X(s))ds = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{S}} f(y)\pi(y), \quad (2.18)$$

where  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is any Markov process with generator  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{N}}$  and any initial distribution  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . For a proof of these relations see Theorem 1.10.2 in [34]. Even though these relations generally hold only for the class of bounded functions, for many reaction networks it is possible to extend this class to include all polynomially growing functions [20]. This extension allows us to use (2.17) to show that all the moments (means, variances, covariances etc.) of the stochastic reaction dynamics converge to their *steady state* values as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  (see [20]). These results can be used to design synthetic controllers that robustly steer the moments of certain species to specific steady-state values [8]. Relation (2.18) shows that the stationary distribution of the population can be computed by evaluating the proportion of time spent in various states by a single stochastic trajectory  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  over a long period of time. Such an insight can help in leveraging experimental or computational techniques for estimating the long-term behavior of a population of identical cells, where each cell includes the same reaction network with ergodic Markovian dynamics. For example, the steady-state behavior of a cell population (r.h.s. of (2.18)), as observed by *Flow-Cytometry*, will closely resemble the time-averaged behavior of a single cell (l.h.s. of (2.18)), as observed by *Time-Lapse Microscopy*. Hence the “right” experimental technique can be chosen for a given situation, based on convenience, and the long-term behavior of the stochastic system can be studied. Similarly one can use (2.18) to *speed-up* the estimation of the stationary distribution  $\pi$  using computer simulations.

We have argued above that ergodicity is a desirable stability property of stochastic models of reaction networks. However checking this property directly is difficult because the CME (2.9) for  $(p_\mu(t))_{t \geq 0}$  cannot be solved in most cases (see Section 1) and even if we can solve it or estimate its solutions using Monte Carlo simulations, it is impossible to verify that for some stationary distribution  $\pi$ , (2.16) holds for any initial distribution  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ . Having an irreducible state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  for a reaction network guarantees uniqueness of the stationary distribution in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  (see Theorem 8.18 in [23]) which is necessary for establishing ergodicity. This paper develops a method to find such irreducible state-spaces and together with [20], it provides an indirect way for verifying ergodicity, which is far more tractable than the direct approach for checking this property.

The results in [3] prove that a large class of reaction networks have the following property: for each irreducible state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ , the unique stationary distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  for the stochastic dynamics is given by the product-form

$$\pi(x) = M_{\mathcal{E}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{c_i^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-c_i} \quad \text{for } x = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathcal{E}, \quad (2.19)$$

where  $d$  is the number of species,  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_d)$  is a positive vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $M_{\mathcal{E}}$  is the normalizing constant given by

$$M_{\mathcal{E}} = \left( \sum_{x \in \mathcal{E}} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{c_i^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-c_i} \right)^{-1}. \quad (2.20)$$

The method we present in this paper not only finds the irreducible state-spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  on which this result can be applied, but it also expresses  $\mathcal{E}$  in such a way that the countable sum in (2.20) can be replaced

by a finite sum. This allows the normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}}$  to be easily calculated without incurring any truncation errors (see Example 6.3), thereby yielding the exact stationary distribution for a given irreducible state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ . Moreover for many networks our method can provably find *all the irreducible state-spaces*  $\mathcal{E}_1, \dots, \mathcal{E}_Q$  and then we can exactly compute the stationary distribution  $\pi_q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_q)$  of the form (2.19), for each  $q = 1, \dots, Q$ . These distributions  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_Q$  form the *extremal points* of the simplex formed by all the stationary distributions of the network (see [3]). In other words, every stationary distribution  $\pi$  can be written as

$$\pi = \sum_{q=1}^Q \alpha_q \pi_q, \quad (2.21)$$

where  $\alpha_q \geq 0$  and  $\sum_{q=1}^Q \alpha_q = 1$ . Therefore for certain networks our method can help in finding all the stationary distributions corresponding to its stochastic model. Observe that if  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{N}_0^d$  is the unique irreducible state-space, then  $M_{\mathcal{E}} = 1$  and the unique stationary distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}_0^d)$  is just a product of Poisson distributions. In this case, the species copy-numbers are independent at stationarity, and the copy-number of species  $i$  has Poisson distribution with some rate  $c_i > 0$ . Having this independence of species copy-numbers is quite remarkable considering that the species are always dynamically interacting through various reactions. We discuss the problem of showing that  $\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{N}_0^d$  is the unique irreducible state-space for a reaction network in Section 4.

### 3 Preliminaries

In this section we present some preliminary concepts that will be used throughout the paper. We begin by imposing some restrictions on the form of the propensity functions (Section 3.1) and defining the *inverse* of a reaction network (Section 3.2). Often it will be difficult to find irreducible state-spaces for the original network directly, and we would need to construct an *equivalent* reaction network which is easier to work with. We describe this construction in Section 3.3. In Section 3.4 we discuss how the presence of *conservation relations* in the network complicates the search for irreducible state-spaces. We also describe the notion of *conservation data* for a network, and explain how it must be taken into account while choosing a state-space for a network.

#### 3.1 Form of the propensity functions

Recall the definition of a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions of the form (2.1) (see Section 2). Here  $\Lambda(x) = (\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_K(x))$  is a positive vector denoting the rates of the  $K$  reactions at state  $x$ . Throughout the paper we only consider networks that satisfy the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.1** *For each reaction  $k = 1, \dots, K$  and each  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ , we have  $\lambda_k(x) > 0$  if and only if  $x \geq \nu_k$ .*

Note that this assumption is *stronger* than (2.3) and it essentially means that when the state is  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ , reaction  $k$  has a positive probability of firing if and only if for each species  $\mathbf{S}_i$ , the number of available molecules ( $x_i$ ) exceeds the number of molecules consumed by the reaction ( $\nu_{ik}$ ). Observe that the “only if” part of this condition is nearly always satisfied, because a reaction cannot fire unless for each species, the required number of molecules are present for consumption, but the “if” part of this condition may get violated if there is a reaction  $k$  and a state  $x$  satisfying  $x \geq \nu_k$  and  $\lambda_k(x) = 0$ . However such a situation does not typically arise for most biochemical reaction networks as we now explain.

Most networks found in the literature assume *mass-action kinetics* [18] which means that each propensity function  $\lambda_k : \mathbb{N}_0^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is given by

$$\lambda_k(x) = \theta_k \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{x_i(x_i - 1) \dots (x_i - \nu_{ik} + 1)}{\nu_{ik}!}, \quad (3.22)$$

where  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  is the state vector and  $\theta_k > 0$  is the rate constant for the  $k$ -th reaction. Note that Assumption 3.1 is certainly satisfied if all the propensity functions are of this form. Apart from mass-action

kinetics, networks in Systems and Synthetic Biology generally have propensity functions describing either Michaelis–Menten or Hill-type kinetics [25]. Michaelis–Menten kinetics usually appears when the network involves enzyme-substrate interactions [37] while Hill type kinetics usually arises in gene-expression networks with feedback regulation [39]. In both these cases, the propensity functions have a rational form given by

$$\lambda_k(x) = \frac{p_k(x)}{q_k(x)},$$

where the denominator  $q_k(x)$  is always positive and the numerator  $p_k(x)$  satisfies the criterion :  $p_k(x) > 0$  if and only if  $x \geq \nu_k$ . As a consequence, the network satisfies Assumption 3.1 even though its propensity functions are not of *mass-action* type. Finally we point out that certain networks may not satisfy Assumption 3.1 at first glance, but they can be modified in such a way that their dynamics remains the same and the modified network satisfies Assumption 3.1 (see Example 4.8). We end this section with a simple consequence of Assumption 3.1.

**Proposition 3.2** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N}$  is a reaction network satisfying Assumption 3.1 and let  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^d$  be a state-space for this network. Then relation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}}$  is **additive**: i.e. for any  $x, y \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $z \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ , if  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} y$ ,  $(x + z) \in \mathcal{E}$  and  $(y + z) \in \mathcal{E}$  then  $(x + z) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} (y + z)$ .*

**Proof.** Note that due to Assumption 3.1, for any reaction  $k$  and state  $u \in \mathcal{E}$  if  $\lambda_k(u) > 0$  then  $\lambda_k(u + z) > 0$  for any  $z \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ . Therefore if  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  is the sequence of reactions satisfying (2.14) and (2.15), then the same sequence of reactions will also satisfy (2.14) and (2.15) with  $x$  and  $y$  replaced by  $(x + z)$  and  $(y + z)$  respectively. This proves  $(x + z) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} (y + z)$  and completes the proof of this proposition.  $\square$

## 3.2 Inverse of a reaction network

Consider a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions of the form (2.1). We now define another reaction network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  which can be viewed as the *inverse* of  $\mathcal{N}$ . This new network has the same number of species and reactions, but its reactions are obtained by *flipping* the arrows in (2.1). In other words, the  $K$  reactions in  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  are given by

$$\sum_{i=1}^d \rho_{ik} \mathbf{S}_i \longrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^d \nu_{ik} \mathbf{S}_i, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (3.23)$$

To each reaction  $k$  we assign the propensity function  $\lambda_{k,\text{inv}}$  by the mass-action form (3.22) with  $\theta_k = 1$  and  $\nu_{ik}$  replaced by  $\rho_{ik}$  for each  $i$ . Let the propensity map  $\Lambda_{\text{inv}} : \mathbb{N}_0^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^K$  be given by

$$\Lambda_{\text{inv}}(x) = (\lambda_{1,\text{inv}}(x), \dots, \lambda_{K,\text{inv}}(x)).$$

Setting  $\mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}} = \mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}} = \mathcal{V}$ , the inverse reaction network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  can be formally described by the *triplet*

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}} = (\mathcal{V}_{\text{inv}}, \mathcal{O}_{\text{inv}}, \Lambda_{\text{inv}}). \quad (3.24)$$

Note that we have chosen the propensity map  $\Lambda_{\text{inv}}$  in such a way, that network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  will satisfy Assumption 3.1 even if network  $\mathcal{N}$  does not.

Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  are two states such that the stochastic dynamics under the original reaction network  $\mathcal{N}$  can reach state  $y$  from state  $x$  by a single firing of reaction  $k$ . In such a scenario we have  $\lambda_k(x) > 0$  and  $y = x - \nu_k + \rho_k$ . Assuming that network  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies Assumption 3.1, we must have  $x \geq \nu_k$  which implies that  $y \geq \rho_k$  and hence  $\lambda_{k,\text{inv}}(y) > 0$ . Since  $x = y - \rho_k + \nu_k$  and  $\lambda_{k,\text{inv}}(y) > 0$ , under the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$ , the stochastic dynamics can reach state  $x$  from state  $y$  by a single firing of reaction  $k$ . Extending this idea to incorporate a sequence of intermediate states and reactions, one can easily see that

$$x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} y \quad \text{if and only if} \quad y \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}} x, \quad (3.25)$$

where the relation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}}$  is defined in the same way as relation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}}$  (see Section 2.1). A simple consequence of this relationship is given as a remark below.

**Remark 3.3** *Assume that  $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{N}_0^d$  serves as a state-space for both networks  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  (see Definition 2.1). Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is irreducible for network  $\mathcal{N}$  if and only if it is irreducible for network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$ .*

### 3.3 Reaction network under a permutation

Recall that we consider networks with  $d$  species that are called  $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_d$ . In the rest of the paper we refer to  $\mathbf{S}_i$  as “species  $i$ ” and denote the set of all species by

$$\mathcal{D} = \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (3.26)$$

Let  $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be any permutation (one-to-one and onto) map. For any subset  $A = \{\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(m)\} \subset \mathcal{D}$ , when we say that  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$  is the state vector for species in  $A$  under permutation  $\sigma$ , we imply that  $x_i$  denotes the copy-number of species  $\sigma(i)$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Essentially the map  $\sigma$  defines the correspondence between the species and the location of their copy-numbers in the state vector.

Consider a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $K$  reactions and  $d$  species in the set  $\mathcal{D}$ . In our original set-up (see Section 2) we described the Markovian state-dynamics  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  under the identity permutation  $\sigma_{\text{id}}$  given by  $\sigma_{\text{id}}(i) = i$  for each  $i \in \mathcal{D}$ . In other words, if the state at time  $t$  is  $X(t) = x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$  then  $x_i$  is the copy-number of species  $i$ . In order to facilitate the search for irreducible state-spaces for a network  $\mathcal{N}$ , we will often need to work with an equivalent network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  which describes the dynamics under a suitably constructed permutation map  $\sigma$ .

We now define  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  formally. Let  $P_\sigma$  be the following  $d \times d$  permutation matrix

$$P_\sigma = \text{Col} \left( e_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}^{(d)}, \dots, e_{\sigma^{-1}(d)}^{(d)} \right),$$

where  $e_1^{(d)}, \dots, e_d^{(d)}$  are the standard basis vectors in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and let  $\sigma^{-1}$  denote the inverse of map  $\sigma$ . Note that  $P_\sigma$  is an orthogonal matrix and so its inverse satisfies

$$P_\sigma^{-1} = P_\sigma^T = P_{\sigma^{-1}}.$$

From now on, for any  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ , the set  $P_\sigma A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  is defined as

$$P_\sigma A = \{P_\sigma x : x \in A\}.$$

For each reaction  $k$  let vectors  $\nu_k^\sigma, \rho_k^\sigma \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  and the propensity function  $\lambda_k^\sigma : \mathbb{N}_0^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be given by

$$\nu_k^\sigma = P_\sigma \nu_k, \quad \rho_k^\sigma = P_\sigma \rho_k \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_k^\sigma(x) = \lambda_k(P_\sigma^T x). \quad (3.27)$$

Moreover let the *propensity* map  $\Lambda^\sigma : \mathbb{N}_0^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^K$  be as in (2.5) with each  $\lambda_k$  replaced by  $\lambda_k^\sigma$ . Setting the two  $d \times K$  matrices  $\mathcal{V}^\sigma$  and  $\mathcal{O}^\sigma$  as

$$\mathcal{V}^\sigma = P_\sigma \mathcal{V} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}^\sigma = P_\sigma \mathcal{O},$$

we define the new *permuted* reaction network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  by the triplet

$$\mathcal{N}^\sigma = (\mathcal{V}^\sigma, \mathcal{O}^\sigma, \Lambda^\sigma). \quad (3.28)$$

**Remark 3.4** *Suppose that network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  satisfies Assumption 3.1. Then the permuted network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  will also satisfy this assumption since for each reaction  $k$  and state  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  we have*

$$\lambda_k^\sigma(x) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lambda_k(P_\sigma^T x) > 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad P_\sigma^T x \geq \nu_k \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad P_\sigma P_\sigma^T x \geq P_\sigma \nu_k \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x \geq \nu_k^\sigma,$$

where ‘ $\Leftrightarrow$ ’ denotes “if and only if”.

We now discuss the sense in which the networks  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  are dynamically equivalent. Let  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  denote the stochastic reaction dynamics under network  $\mathcal{N}$  and let  $(X^\sigma(t))_{t \geq 0}$  be the process defined by

$$X^\sigma(t) = P_\sigma X(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (3.29)$$

Then it is easy to see that  $(X^\sigma(t))_{t \geq 0}$  represents the stochastic reaction dynamics under the permuted network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$ . This shows that the dynamics under network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  is essentially the same as the dynamics under network  $\mathcal{N}$ , once we alter the mapping between the species and the location of their copy-numbers in the state vector according to permutation  $\sigma$ . Due to relation (3.29) we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.5** *A state-space  $\mathcal{E}^\sigma$  is irreducible for reaction network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  if and only if the state-space  $\mathcal{E}$  is irreducible for reaction network  $\mathcal{N}$ , where*

$$\mathcal{E} = P_\sigma^T \mathcal{E}^\sigma. \quad (3.30)$$

In Section 5 we will construct a permutation map  $\sigma$  such that the irreducible state-spaces for the permuted network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  can be easily found. Then this proposition will help us in recovering the corresponding irreducible state-spaces for the original network  $\mathcal{N}$ .

### 3.4 Incorporating conservation relations into the network dynamics

In Section 1, we mentioned that the presence of *conservation relations* in a network can introduce complex dependencies among the copy-numbers of various species. We now discuss how these dependencies must be taken into account while choosing a suitable state-space for the network.

Fix a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions. We define its  $d \times K$  *stoichiometry matrix* by

$$S = \text{Col}(\rho_1 - \nu_1, \dots, \rho_K - \nu_K) = \mathcal{O} - \mathcal{V}.$$

Note that the  $k$ -th column of  $S$  contains the displacement  $(\rho_k - \nu_k)$  caused by reaction  $k$  to the state of the network. A conservation relation for the network  $\mathcal{N}$  is any nonzero vector in the *left nullspace* of  $S$ :

$$\mathcal{L}(S) = \{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^d : \gamma^T S = \bar{0}_K^T\}. \quad (3.31)$$

To see why any nonzero  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(S)$  is a conservation relation, observe that the displacement vector  $(\rho_k - \nu_k)$  of each reaction  $k$  is orthogonal to  $\gamma$ : i.e.  $\langle \gamma, \rho_k - \nu_k \rangle = 0$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Hence any Markov process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  representing the stochastic reaction dynamics will satisfy

$$\langle \gamma, X(t) \rangle = \langle \gamma, X(0) \rangle \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (3.32)$$

thereby showing that  $\gamma$  describes a conservation relation between the copy-numbers of species included in the set  $\text{supp}(\gamma)$  which is nonempty because  $\gamma$  is nonzero. If the total number of species is equal to the rank of matrix  $S$

$$d = \text{Rank}(S), \quad (3.33)$$

then the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S)$  will be trivial and there are no conservation relations. In such a scenario, the copy-numbers of all the species can be arbitrary and hence it is possible that the whole nonnegative integer orthant  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is an irreducible state-space for the reaction network  $\mathcal{N}$ . We provide a simple procedure to check this possibility in Section 4.

Now suppose that  $\text{Rank}(S) < d$  and so the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S)$  is nontrivial. Let  $n = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S))$  denote its dimension and let  $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\}$  be a *basis* for  $\mathcal{L}(S)$ . These basis vectors denote linearly independent conservation relations which together span  $\mathcal{L}(S)$ . Define a  $d \times n$  matrix by

$$\Gamma = \text{Col}(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n).$$

We know from (3.32) that for each  $\gamma_i$ , the quantity  $\langle \gamma_i, X(t) \rangle$  will have a constant value  $c_i$  throughout the dynamics. These constant values  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  must be chosen at the outset according to the initial conditions or other system specific parameters (see Examples 5.18 and 6.2). We will refer to  $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  as the *conservation vector*,  $\Gamma \in \mathbb{M}(d, n)$  as the *conservation matrix* and the pair  $(\Gamma, c)$  as the *conservation data*. A network  $\mathcal{N}$  along with its conservation data  $(\Gamma, c)$  is called a *conservation network* and it is denoted by the triplet  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . If the process  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  represents the reaction dynamics for such a network, then using (3.32) we obtain

$$\Gamma^T X(t) = c \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (3.34)$$

This implies that any state-space for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  must be contained in the following set

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \Gamma^T x = c\}. \quad (3.35)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is certainly a state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$  (see Definition 2.1) because  $\Gamma^T(\rho_k - \nu_k) = \bar{0}_n$  for each reaction  $k$ . In fact there is also a possibility that  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$ . However the form (3.35) of  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is difficult to work with, as it does not clearly express the constraints on the range of copy-numbers of each species. This causes problems in proving its irreducibility and also in other applications such as the calculation of the normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}_0}$  (2.20) for the stationary distribution  $\pi$  (2.19) (see Example 6.3). To remedy this problem we will construct a permutation map  $\sigma$  such that for the equivalent permuted network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  (see Section 3.3), the set  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}_0$  (see (3.30)) has a simpler form. In particular, the ranges for the species copy-numbers appear explicitly in  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma$  allowing for the elements of this set to be easily enumerated. More importantly, the irreducibility of  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma$  can be checked by a simple procedure. This approach is described in detail in Section 5. We end this section with a remark about the *conservation data* for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$ .

**Remark 3.6** Consider a conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . For a permutation map  $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  let  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  be the equivalent reaction network constructed as in Section 3.3 and let  $S_\sigma$  be its stoichiometry matrix. Then conservation relations for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  are nonzero vectors in the left nullspace

$$\mathcal{L}(S_\sigma) = P_\sigma \mathcal{L}(S).$$

Moreover relations (3.34) and (3.29) imply that the conservation data for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  must be  $(\Gamma_\sigma, c)$  where

$$\Gamma_\sigma = P_\sigma \Gamma. \quad (3.36)$$

We refer to  $(\mathcal{N}^\sigma, \Gamma_\sigma, c)$  as the permuted conservation network.

## 4 Networks without conservation relations

Consider a network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions, satisfying Assumption 3.1. In this section we assume that (3.33) holds. Hence there are no conservation relations and each species is *free* in the sense that its copy-number can take any value in  $\mathbb{N}_0$ , irrespective of the copy-number values of the other species. In such a situation, for most networks arising in Systems and Synthetic Biology, there are two distinct possibilities: either there exist *absorbing states* for the network or the whole nonnegative orthant  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is an irreducible state-space. We check both these possibilities below.

### 4.1 Finding the *absorbing states*

A state  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  is called an *absorbing state* for the network  $\mathcal{N}$  if the stochastic dynamics *essentially stops* upon reaching  $x$ . In other words  $\lambda_k(x) = 0$  for each reaction  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Due to Assumption 3.1, this condition is equivalent to saying that

$$\text{for each reaction } k = 1, \dots, K \text{ there exists a } i \in \{1, \dots, d\} \text{ such that } x_i < \nu_{ik}.$$

Let  $A_{k,1} = \{z \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : z_1 < \nu_{1k}\}$  and for each  $i = 2, \dots, d$  let

$$A_{k,i} = \{z \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : z_1 \geq \nu_{1k}, z_2 \geq \nu_{2k}, \dots, z_{(i-1)} \geq \nu_{(i-1)k}, z_i < \nu_{ik}\}.$$

Then any state  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  in the set

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}} = \bigcap_{k=1}^K \bigcup_{i=1}^d A_{k,i}$$

is an absorbing state for network  $\mathcal{N}$ . Note that this set of absorbing states  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  can be empty, finite or even countably infinite.

**Proposition 4.1** *Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  is nonempty. Then for any  $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  the set  $\mathcal{E}_x = \{x\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

**Proof.** Since  $\lambda_k(x) = 0$  for each reaction  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , the set  $\mathcal{E}_x = \{x\}$  is certainly a state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$  (see Definition 2.1). Moreover  $x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} x$  holds trivially because  $p_x(t, x) = 1$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . Hence  $\mathcal{E}_x = \{x\}$  is irreducible for network  $\mathcal{N}$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Checking the irreducibility of $\mathbb{N}_0^d$

Note that if the set of absorbing states  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  is nonempty then the state-space  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  cannot be irreducible due to Remark 2.3. We now consider the situation  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}} = \emptyset$  and test the irreducibility of  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  by adopting a simple scheme that attempts to arrange all the species into *birth and death cascades*, as mentioned before in Section 1. We begin by formalizing the notion of birth-cascades for a network  $\mathcal{N}$  with  $K$  reactions of the form (2.1). For each reaction  $k$  recall the definition of vectors  $\nu_k$  and  $\rho_k$  from (2.2). For each  $l = 1, 2, \dots$  we define the  $l$ -th birth-cascade by the following set of species

$$B_l = \{i \in \mathcal{D} : i \notin H_l, \quad \text{supp}(\nu_k) \subset H_l \text{ and } i \in \text{supp}(\rho_k) \text{ for some } k = 1, \dots, K\},$$

where

$$H_l = \bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} B_j$$

is the set of species that belong to any of the previous birth-cascades  $B_1, \dots, B_{l-1}$ . The set  $B_l$  consists of those species that do not belong to  $H_l$  and that are produced by a reaction which only *consumes* species in  $H_l$ . We say that network  $\mathcal{N}$  is *birth-exhaustive* if

$$\mathcal{D} = H_{l_0} \quad \text{for some } l_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.37}$$

which means that all the  $d$  species can be arranged into birth-cascades. The birth-exhaustivity of  $\mathcal{N}$  implies that the reaction dynamics can lead to arbitrarily high copy-numbers for the constituent species, as shown by the next lemma.

**Lemma 4.2** *Suppose that network  $\mathcal{N}$  is birth-exhaustive. Then for any  $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}^d$  there exists a vector  $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$  such that  $x \geq r_0$  and*

$$\bar{0}_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} x.$$

**Remark 4.3** *Observe that from this lemma we can conclude that if a network  $\mathcal{N}$  is birth-exhaustive then it cannot have any absorbing states and hence  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}} = \emptyset$ . This is because if  $x_0 \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$ , then from this lemma and Proposition 3.2 we have  $x_0 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} (x + x_0)$  for some  $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$  which contradicts the fact that  $x_0$  is an absorbing state.*

**Proof.** We prove this lemma by mathematical induction. Throughout this proof we denote relation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $\longrightarrow$ . Let  $\bar{B}_l = B_l \cup H_l$  for any  $l$ . We say that a level  $l$  is *satisfiable* if for any  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  with  $\text{supp}(r) \subset \bar{B}_l$ , we can find a  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  such that  $x \geq r$  and  $\bar{0}_d \longrightarrow x$ . Certainly level 1 is satisfiable, because  $\bar{B}_1 = B_1$  consists of those species that are produced from nothing. Suppose that level  $(l-1)$  is satisfiable. Pick any  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  with  $\text{supp}(r) \subset \bar{B}_l$ . We can write it as  $r = r_1 + r_2$  where  $\text{supp}(r_1) \subset \bar{B}_{l-1} = H_l$  and  $\text{supp}(r_2) \subset B_l$ . Note that the species in  $B_l$  are produced by consuming the species in  $H_l$ . Hence we can find  $x_2, y_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  such that  $x_2 \geq r_2$ ,  $\text{supp}(y_2) \subset H_l$  and  $y_2 \longrightarrow x_2$ . Satisfiability of level  $(l-1)$  implies that there exists a  $\delta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  such that  $\delta \geq (r_1 + y_2)$  and  $\bar{0}_d \longrightarrow \delta$ . Due to Propositions 2.2 and 3.2, relations  $\bar{0}_d \longrightarrow \delta$  and  $y_2 \longrightarrow x_2$  imply that  $\bar{0}_d \longrightarrow x$  where  $x = (\delta - y_2 + x_2) \geq r = (r_1 + r_2)$ . Therefore we have proved that level  $l$  is satisfiable and hence we can conclude by induction that all levels are satisfiable. Now the birth-exhaustivity of network  $\mathcal{N}$  proves this lemma.  $\square$

We now define the death-cascades for network  $\mathcal{N}$  by looking at the corresponding birth-cascades for the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  described in Section 3.2. Formally, the  $l$ -th death-cascade  $D_l$  for network  $\mathcal{N}$  is the

$l$ -th birth-cascade for network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$ . If all the  $d$  species can be arranged into death-cascades, then we say that network  $\mathcal{N}$  is *death-exhaustive* which is equivalent to the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  being *birth-exhaustive*. Relation (3.25) shows that for any  $x' \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  we have

$$x' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \bar{0}_d \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \bar{0}_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}} x'.$$

Therefore if the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  is birth-exhaustive then Lemma 4.2 will imply the existence of a strictly positive vector  $x' \in \mathbb{N}^d$  such that  $\bar{0}_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}} x'$  holds and so  $x' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \bar{0}_d$  also holds. Hence we can conclude that if network  $\mathcal{N}$  is both birth and death exhaustive then the following is satisfied:

$$\bar{0}_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} x \quad \text{and} \quad x' \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} \bar{0}_d \quad \text{for some} \quad x, x' \in \mathbb{N}^d. \quad (4.38)$$

Observe that for  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  to be irreducible we must have

$$x \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} y \quad \text{for all} \quad x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0^d. \quad (4.39)$$

As relation (2.14) shows, this can only hold if

$$\text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S) = \mathbb{Z}^d. \quad (4.40)$$

In other words, the positive-integer linear combinations of the columns of the stoichiometry matrix  $S$  must generate the whole integer lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$ . Note that for (4.40) to hold, it is necessary that (3.33) holds which is our starting assumption in this section. Condition (4.40) is hard to check directly, but we will assume a weaker condition which is more readily verifiable for biological networks (see Remark 4.4) and it also turns out to be identical to (4.40) for birth-exhaustive networks (see Lemma 4.5). This condition can be stated as

$$-\mathbb{N}_0^d \subset \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S), \quad (4.41)$$

or equivalently as

$$-e_i^{(d)} \in \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S) \quad \text{for each} \quad i = 1, \dots, d, \quad (4.42)$$

where  $e_i^{(d)}$  denotes the  $i$ -th standard basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . We can easily check this condition by computing a modified Hermite normal form<sup>3</sup> of the  $K \times d$  integer matrix  $-S^T$ . For obtaining this normal form, the only admissible operation is the addition of one row to another, possibly after multiplication by a positive integer. If the Hermite normal form is such that for each  $i = 1, \dots, d$  there exists a row with the leading entry of 1 at column  $i$ , then we can conclude that (4.42) or (4.41) holds.

**Remark 4.4** *In many biological networks, all the species degrade naturally due to reactions of the form  $S_i \rightarrow \emptyset$  and in this case condition (4.41) is trivially satisfied (see (4.42)). Furthermore even for networks where this does not happen, we find that (4.41) continues to hold because each species generally undergoes a sequence of conversions, eventually resulting in a set of naturally degrading species.*

We now show how (4.40) and (4.41) are related.

**Lemma 4.5** *Suppose that network  $\mathcal{N}$  is birth-exhaustive. Then conditions (4.40) and (4.41) are equivalent.*

**Proof.** It is immediate that (4.40) implies (4.41). We now prove the converse. Pick any  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ . Due to Lemma 4.2 we can find a vector  $x \in \mathbb{N}^d$  such that  $(x - y) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  and

$$\bar{0}_d \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} x.$$

This shows that  $x \in \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S)$  and since  $-(x - y) \in -\mathbb{N}_0^d$ , from (4.41) we obtain

$$-(x - y) \in \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S).$$

However the set  $\text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S)$  is closed under addition and so we must have

$$y = -(x - y) + x \in \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S),$$

which proves (4.40) because  $y \in \mathbb{Z}^d$  was arbitrary. □

This gives us the main result for this section.

---

<sup>3</sup>The Hermite normal form is an analogue of the row-reduced echelon form for integer matrices. For more details see [10].

**Theorem 4.6** Consider a network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions, satisfying Assumption 3.1. Assume that (4.41) holds and network  $\mathcal{N}$  is both birth and death exhaustive. Then  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is the unique irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$ .

**Remark 4.7** The conclusion of this theorem will continue to hold if instead of (4.41) the following is satisfied:

$$\mathbb{N}_0^d \subset \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(S). \quad (4.43)$$

To see this, note that if network  $\mathcal{N}$  is birth and death exhaustive, then the same will also be true for the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$ . Moreover the stoichiometry matrix  $S_{\text{inv}}$  for network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  is related to the stoichiometry matrix  $S$  for network  $\mathcal{N}$  by  $S_{\text{inv}} = -S$ . Therefore condition (4.41) for network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  is same as condition (4.43) for network  $\mathcal{N}$ . Hence if (4.43) holds instead of (4.41), then by applying Theorem 4.6 for the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  we can show that  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is the unique irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  which is equivalent to showing the same for network  $\mathcal{N}$  due to Remark 3.3.

**Proof.** Since network  $\mathcal{N}$  is both birth and death exhaustive, (4.38) is satisfied as explained above. Moreover from Lemma 4.5 we can conclude that (4.40) also holds. In such a scenario, Theorems 3.4 and 3.8 in [36] prove that (4.39) is indeed satisfied and hence  $\mathbb{N}_0^d$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}$ . The uniqueness then follows from Remark 2.3.  $\square$

We end this section with an example that illustrates the results in this section.

**Example 4.8** Consider the gene expression network given in [40] with three species: Gene ( $G$ ), mRNA ( $M$ ) and protein ( $P$ ). The four reactions in this network are as follows:



These reactions are numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 in the order they appear above. The first reaction is the transcription of mRNA by the gene, the second reaction expresses the translation of mRNA into protein, while the last two reactions signify the degradation of mRNA and protein respectively. For now we assume that all the propensity functions ( $\lambda_k$ -s) have the *mass-action* form (3.22). Since the copy-numbers of  $G$  are not changed by these reactions, we do not need to consider its dynamics. Hence this network has effectively only two species  $\mathbf{S}_1 = M$  and  $\mathbf{S}_2 = P$ , and by scaling the rate-constant by the (fixed) copy-number of  $G$ , we can rewrite the first reaction as  $\emptyset \longrightarrow M$ . With this modification, the consumption vectors ( $\nu_k$ -s) of the four reactions are:  $\nu_1 = (0, 0)$ ,  $\nu_2 = (1, 0)$ ,  $\nu_3 = (1, 0)$  and  $\nu_4 = (0, 1)$ . Observe that the network satisfies Assumption 3.1 and condition (4.41) holds, because both species degrade naturally (see Remark 4.4).

One can easily check that for this network  $\mathcal{N}$  the first two birth-cascades are:  $B_1 = \{M\}$  and  $B_2 = \{P\}$ . Hence network  $\mathcal{N}$  is birth-exhaustive. Moreover the first death-cascade of this network, or the first birth-cascade of the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}$  is  $D_1 = \{M, P\}$ , which shows that  $\mathcal{N}$  is also death-exhaustive. Therefore by Theorem 4.6 we conclude that  $\mathbb{N}_0^2$  is the unique irreducible state-space for this network.

We now change the network to incorporate transcriptional feedback by the protein molecules. The propensity of the mRNA transcription reaction is now given by Hill-type kinetics with a *basal* production rate  $\theta_1$ :

$$\lambda_1(x_1, x_2) = \theta_1 + \theta_{\text{fb}} \frac{x_2^n}{c + x_2^n}. \quad (4.45)$$

Here  $x_2$  is the number of protein molecules, and we assume that constants  $\theta_{\text{fb}}, c$  and the Hill coefficient  $n$  are strictly positive. Observe that if  $\theta_1 > 0$  then this modified network, denoted by  $\mathcal{N}'$ , still satisfies Assumption 3.1, and we can check the irreducibility of state-space  $\mathbb{N}_0^2$  for network  $\mathcal{N}'$  in exactly the same way as we checked it for the original network  $\mathcal{N}$ . However if  $\theta_1 = 0$ , then network  $\mathcal{N}'$  violates Assumption 3.1. To see this, observe that for  $(x_1, x_2) = (1, 0)$  we have  $x \geq \nu_1 = (0, 0)$  but  $\lambda_1(x_1, x_2) = 0$ .

In the case  $\theta_1 = 0$ , we can ensure that network  $\mathcal{N}'$  satisfies Assumption 3.1 by changing the mRNA transcription reaction to  $G + P \rightarrow G + P + M$  (or  $P \rightarrow P + M$  after ‘‘dropping’’ species  $G$ ). Note that the dynamics remains unaffected by this change and Assumption 3.1 holds for this network because  $\nu_1$  is now  $(0, 1)$ . One can check that the set of absorbing states  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  is nonempty and in fact it is equal to  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}} = \{(0, 0)\}$ . Therefore  $\{(0, 0)\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\mathcal{N}'$  (Proposition 4.1) and  $\mathbb{N}_0^2$  cannot be irreducible for this network (Remark 2.3).

## 5 Networks with conservation relations

Consider a network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{O}, \Lambda)$  with  $d$  species and  $K$  reactions, satisfying Assumption 3.1. In this section we relax the condition that (3.33) holds, and hence the space of conservation relations  $\mathcal{L}(S)$  (see (3.31)) is nontrivial. The presence of conservation relations create complex dependencies among the species copy-numbers and also puts constraints on their possible values. In what follows, we will use linear-algebraic techniques to *unravel* these dependencies and explicitly identify the copy-number range for each species. This enables us to classify each species as *free*, *bounded* or *restricted* (see Section 1) according to its copy-number range. We then choose a permutation map  $\sigma$  so that the irreducible state-spaces for the equivalent permuted network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  (see Section 3.3) can be easily found. Furthermore the irreducible state-spaces we find will have a simple form which clearly expresses the possible copy-number values of each species along with the relationships among them. This simple form is useful for certain applications such as explicit calculation of the stationary distribution (see Example 6.3).

For networks with conservation relations, our approach for finding irreducible state-spaces can be loosely described as follows. We first identify the *bounded* species and compute the optimal upper-bounds for their copy-numbers using linear-programming (Section 5.1). Using these upper-bounds we then define a suitable *finite* state-space for the dynamics of the *bounded* species (Section 5.1). The species that are not *bounded* can either be *free* or *restricted*. The numbers of *free* and *restricted* species are fixed by the network stoichiometries, but there is generally some *flexibility* in choosing which species are *free* and which are *restricted*. This flexibility can be really useful for our purpose as we shall discuss in Section 5.2. Once we have chosen the sets of *free* and *restricted* species, we can show that throughout the dynamics, the copy-numbers of the *restricted* species are “locked” in a fixed affine relationship with the copy-numbers of the *free* species. This allows us to “remove” the *restricted* species and obtain a simpler network whose dynamics is essentially equivalent to the original network (Section 5.3). This “reduced” network only has *free* and *bounded* species, and we can find irreducible state-spaces for this network by extending the ideas presented in Section 4 to incorporate the dynamics of *bounded* species (Section 5.4). Often for networks with several *bounded* species, one can realize significant savings in the required computational effort by first partitioning the set of *bounded* species in such a way that species in different sets do not interact directly. We discuss this approach in Section 5.5.

In the rest of this section we fix a *conservation data*  $(\Gamma, c)$  (see Section 3.4) for the network  $\mathcal{N}$ . Hence any state-space for this conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  must be contained inside the set  $\mathcal{E}_0$  defined by (3.35).

### 5.1 Identifying the *bounded* species and their state-space

Recall that a species is called *bounded* if its copy-numbers are constrained to lie in a finite set. We now discuss how such *bounded* species can arise in a network with conservation relations. Note that if  $n = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S))$ , then  $\Gamma$  is a  $d \times n$  matrix whose columns span  $\mathcal{L}(S)$ . Therefore we can write

$$\mathcal{L}(S) = \{\Gamma\alpha : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Suppose for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\gamma = \Gamma\alpha \in \mathcal{L}(S)$  is a conservation relation such that all its nonzero entries have the same sign. Without loss of generality, we can assume that this sign is positive by replacing  $\alpha$  with  $-\alpha$  if necessary. If  $(X(t))_{t \geq 0}$  is the Markov process representing the reaction dynamics under network  $\mathcal{N}$ , then relation (3.34) implies that

$$\langle \gamma, X(t) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i X_i(t) = \langle c, \alpha \rangle \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (5.46)$$

Hence for any  $i \in \text{supp}(\gamma)$  (i.e.  $\gamma_i > 0$ ), species  $i$  is *bounded* because throughout the dynamics its copy-number  $X_i(t)$  is bounded above by  $\langle c, \alpha \rangle / \gamma_i$ .

Of course each *bounded* species may be involved in several positive conservation relations and this must be taken into account for computing a *sharp* upper-bound for its copy-numbers. This sharpness is necessary for finding irreducible state-spaces, because we cannot have irreducibility of a state-space if certain copy-numbers are unreachable. For each species  $i \in \mathcal{D}$ , we find the optimal upper-bound  $b_i$  for its copy-number

by solving the following LPP:

$$\begin{aligned} b_i &= \min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n} \langle c, \alpha \rangle \\ &\text{subject to } \Gamma \alpha \geq \bar{0}_d \\ &\quad \langle e_i^{(d)}, \Gamma \alpha \rangle = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.47}$$

Note that the optimal value  $b_i$  is set to  $\infty$  if the feasible region of this LPP is empty, and in this case species  $i$  is not bounded because  $i$  does not lie in the support of any positive conservation relation. From now on, we denote the set of *bounded* species by

$$\mathcal{D}_b = \{i \in \mathcal{D} : b_i < \infty\} \tag{5.48}$$

and the set of *unbounded* species by its complement

$$\mathcal{D}_u = \mathcal{D}_b^c = \{i \in \mathcal{D} : b_i = \infty\}. \tag{5.49}$$

Let  $d_b = |\mathcal{D}_b|$  and  $d_u = |\mathcal{D}_u| = d - d_b$  be the cardinalities of these two sets. Choose a permutation map  $\sigma_1 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  satisfying

$$\sigma_1(l) \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_b & \text{for } l = 1, \dots, d_b \\ \mathcal{D}_u & \text{for } l = (d_b + 1), \dots, d. \end{cases} \tag{5.50}$$

It will soon become evident that unlike the species in  $\mathcal{D}_b$ , the species in  $\mathcal{D}_u$  *do not* have a finite range for their copy-number values. We shall later partition the set  $\mathcal{D}_u$  into sets of *free* and *restricted* species based on the reaction stoichiometries.

Suppose we view the reaction dynamics under permutation  $\sigma_1$  (see Section 3.3). Then the first  $d_b$  entries of the state vectors will contain the copy-numbers of *bounded* species in  $\mathcal{D}_b$  under permutation  $\sigma_1$ . These copy-numbers, arranged as vectors in  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_b}$ , will always lie in the finite rectangular set

$$\mathcal{R}_b^{\sigma_1} = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d_b}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_b} : x_l \leq b_{\sigma_1(l)} \text{ for each } l = 1, \dots, d_b\}. \tag{5.51}$$

Observe that all the elements in  $\mathcal{R}_b^{\sigma_1}$  may not be accessible due to the conservation relations among *bounded* species (see Example 5.18). We deal with these conservation relations now.

Let  $\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_1}$  be the network that represents the reaction dynamics under permutation  $\sigma_1$  (see Section 3.3) and let  $S_{\sigma_1}$  be its stoichiometry matrix. Also define  $(\Gamma_{\sigma_1}, c)$  to be the conservation data for this network (see Remark 3.6). Let  $S_{\sigma_1}^b = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_1}, 1, d_b)$  be the matrix consisting of the first  $d_b$  rows of  $S_{\sigma_1}$ . Then the set of conservation relations among the  $d_b$  *bounded* species in  $\mathcal{D}_b$  are given by the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^b)$  of this matrix. Define

$$n_b = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^b)) \tag{5.52}$$

and if  $n_b \geq 1$ , let  $\{\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{n_b}\}$  denote a *basis* for  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^b)$ . For each  $j = 1, \dots, n_b$ , let  $\bar{\gamma}_j = (\hat{\gamma}_j, \bar{0}_{d_u}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and set

$$\hat{c}_j = \langle \alpha_j, c \rangle \tag{5.53}$$

where  $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the unique solution of the following system of linear equations

$$\Gamma_{\sigma_1} \alpha_j = \bar{\gamma}_j.$$

Such a solution  $\alpha_j$  exists uniquely because the vector  $\bar{\gamma}_j$  lies in the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1})$  which is spanned by the columns of matrix  $\Gamma_{\sigma_1}$ . Relation (3.34) implies that the state vectors for the *bounded* species in  $\mathcal{D}_b$  under permutation  $\sigma_1$  will always lie in the finite set

$$\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_1} = \{x \in \mathcal{R}_b^{\sigma_1} : \langle \hat{\gamma}_j, x \rangle = \hat{c}_j \text{ for each } j = 1, \dots, n_b\}. \tag{5.54}$$

## 5.2 Identifying the *free* and the *restricted* species

We now partition the set  $\mathcal{D}_u$  of *unbounded* species, into a set  $\mathcal{D}_f$  of *free* species and a set  $\mathcal{D}_r$  of *restricted* species. Let  $S_{\sigma_1}^u = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_1}, d_b + 1, d) \in \mathbb{M}(d_u, K)$ , where  $S_{\sigma_1}$  is the stoichiometry matrix of network  $\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_1}$ . Define the number of *free* species  $d_f$  and the number of *restricted* species  $d_r$  by

$$d_f = \text{Rank}(S_{\sigma_1}^u) \quad \text{and} \quad d_r = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)). \quad (5.55)$$

From the fundamental theorem of linear algebra we have

$$d_f + d_r = d - d_b = d_u. \quad (5.56)$$

We assume  $d_r \geq 1$  for now and so the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)$  is nontrivial. The nonzero vectors in  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)$ , which correspond to conservation relations among the *unbounded* species in network  $\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_1}$ , will create the *restricted* species as we shall soon see. As the next proposition shows, unlike the *bounded* species (see Section 5.1), these *restricted* species arise due to conservation relations whose components are not all of the same sign.

**Proposition 5.1** *Any nonzero vector  $\delta \in \mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)$  must have at least one strictly positive and at least one strictly negative entry.*

**Proof.** We prove this claim by contradiction. Suppose all the nonzero entries of  $\delta$  have the same sign. Replacing  $\delta$  by  $-\delta$  if necessary, we can assume that this sign is positive. The  $d$ -dimensional vector  $\bar{\delta} = (\bar{0}_{d_b}, \delta)$  belongs to the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}) = P_{\sigma_1} \mathcal{L}(S)$  (see Remark (3.6)) and hence  $\tilde{\delta} = P_{\sigma_1}^T \bar{\delta}$  is a positive conservation relation for network  $\mathcal{N}$ . Since there exists a  $j \in \{1, \dots, d_u\}$  such that  $\delta_j > 0$ , we have  $\tilde{\delta}_{d_b+j} = \tilde{\delta}_{\sigma_1(d_b+j)} > 0$  which implies that for  $i = \sigma_1(d_b + j)$  the optimal upper-bound  $b_i$  for LPP (5.47) is finite. This contradicts (5.50) and proves our claim that  $\delta$  must have at least one strictly positive and at least one strictly negative entry.  $\square$

Let  $\{\delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_{d_r}\}$  be a *basis* for  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)$ . For any subset  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_{d_f}\} \subset \{1, \dots, d_u\}$  with  $|I| = d_f$  elements, let  $A_I \in \mathbb{M}(d_u, d_u)$  be the matrix given by

$$A_I = \text{Col} \left( e_{i_1}^{(d_u)}, \dots, e_{i_{d_f}}^{(d_u)}, \delta'_1, \dots, \delta'_{d_r} \right). \quad (5.57)$$

Define another set

$$\mathcal{I}_f = \{I \subset \{1, \dots, d_u\} : |I| = d_f \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Rank}(A_I) = d_u\}. \quad (5.58)$$

Note that this set is nonempty and its cardinality is bounded above by  $\binom{d_u}{d_f}$ .

Fix a  $I \in \mathcal{I}_f$  and let  $I^c$  denote its complement in the set  $\{1, \dots, d_u\}$ . We define the set  $\mathcal{D}_f$  of *free* species and the set  $\mathcal{D}_r$  of *restricted* species as

$$\mathcal{D}_f = \{\sigma_1(d_b + i) : i \in I\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_r = \{\sigma_1(d_b + i) : i \in I^c\}.$$

These two sets are certainly disjoint and from (5.50) it is immediate that  $\mathcal{D}_u = \mathcal{D}_f \cup \mathcal{D}_r$ . We now choose another permutation map  $\sigma_2 : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  satisfying

$$\sigma_2(l) = \sigma_1(l) \quad \text{for } l = 1, \dots, d_b \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2(l) \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{D}_f & \text{for } l = (d_b + 1), \dots, (d_b + d_f) \\ \mathcal{D}_r & \text{for } l = (d_b + d_f + 1), \dots, d. \end{cases} \quad (5.59)$$

Let  $\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}$  be the network under permutation  $\sigma_2$  (see Section 3.3), and let  $S_{\sigma_2}$  and  $(\Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$  be its stoichiometry matrix and conservation data respectively (see Remark 3.6). For each  $i = 1, \dots, d_r$ , the vector  $\bar{\delta}_i = (\bar{0}_{d_b}, \delta'_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1})$  and hence the vector  $\hat{\delta}_i = P_{\sigma_2} P_{\sigma_1}^T \bar{\delta}_i$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$ . Since the permutations  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  are identical on  $\{1, \dots, d_b\}$ , each  $\hat{\delta}_i$  must have the form  $\hat{\delta}_i = (\bar{0}_{d_b}, \delta_i^{(1)}, \delta_i^{(2)})$  for some vectors  $\delta_i^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f}$  and  $\delta_i^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$ . Define matrices  $\Delta_1 \in \mathbb{M}(d_f, d_r)$  and  $\Delta_2 \in \mathbb{M}(d_r, d_r)$  by

$$\Delta_1 = \text{Col}(\delta_1^{(1)}, \dots, \delta_{d_r}^{(1)}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta_2 = \text{Col}(\delta_1^{(2)}, \dots, \delta_{d_r}^{(2)}).$$

Observe that if  $A_I$  is the matrix given by (5.57), then there exists a permutation matrix  $P \in \mathbb{M}(d_u, d_u)$  such that matrix  $PA_I$  has the form

$$PA_I = \begin{bmatrix} I_{d_f} & \Delta_1 \\ 0 & \Delta_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (5.60)$$

where  $I_{d_f}$  is the identity matrix in  $\mathbb{M}(d_f, d_f)$  and 0 is the matrix of all zeroes in  $\mathbb{M}(d_r, d_f)$ . Matrix  $A_I$  is invertible because  $I \in \mathcal{I}_f$ , and hence matrix  $\Delta_2$  is also invertible.

From now on let  $S_{\sigma_2}^b = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_2}, 1, d_b)$ ,  $S_{\sigma_2}^u = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_2}, d_b + 1, d)$ ,  $S_{\sigma_2}^f = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_2}^u, 1, d_f)$  and  $S_{\sigma_2}^r = \text{Proj}(S_{\sigma_2}^u, d_f + 1, d_f + d_r)$ . Since for each  $i = 1, \dots, d_r$ , the vector  $\widehat{\delta}_i = (\overline{0}_{d_b}, \delta_i^{(1)}, \delta_i^{(2)})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$  we must have

$$\Delta_1^T S_{\sigma_2}^f + \Delta_2^T S_{\sigma_2}^r = 0, \quad (5.61)$$

where 0 denotes the  $d_r \times K$  matrix of zeroes. This allows us to write

$$S_{\sigma_2}^r = -(\Delta_2^T)^{-1} \Delta_1^T S_{\sigma_2}^f = -(\Delta_2^{-1})^T \Delta_1^T S_{\sigma_2}^f, \quad (5.62)$$

which also shows that

$$\text{Rank}(S_{\sigma_2}^f) = d_f. \quad (5.63)$$

This is because  $d_f = \text{Rank}(S_{\sigma_1}^u) = \text{Rank}(S_{\sigma_2}^u)$  by definition (see (5.55)) and due to (5.62), matrix  $S_{\sigma_2}^u$  has the form

$$S_{\sigma_2}^u = \begin{bmatrix} S_{\sigma_2}^f \\ S_{\sigma_2}^r \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{d_f} \\ -(\Delta_2^{-1})^T \Delta_1^T \end{bmatrix} S_{\sigma_2}^f.$$

Let  $(X^{\sigma_2}(t))_{t \geq 0}$  denote the stochastic reaction dynamics representing the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$ . Then at any time  $t$  we can write

$$X^{\sigma_2}(t) = (X_b^{\sigma_2}(t), X_f^{\sigma_2}(t), X_r^{\sigma_2}(t)), \quad (5.64)$$

where  $X_b^{\sigma_2}(t)$ ,  $X_f^{\sigma_2}(t)$  and  $X_r^{\sigma_2}(t)$  denote the state vectors for species in  $\mathcal{D}_b$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_f$  and  $\mathcal{D}_r$  under permutation  $\sigma_2$ . Since the columns of  $\Gamma_{\sigma_2}$  span  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$ , for each  $i = 1, \dots, d_r$ , there exists a unique  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$  such that

$$\Gamma_{\sigma_2} \alpha_i = \widehat{\delta}_i.$$

Let  $\widehat{c} = (\langle \alpha_1, c \rangle, \dots, \langle \alpha_{d_r}, c \rangle) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$ . Relations (3.34) and (5.61) imply that for all  $t \geq 0$  we must have  $\Delta_1^T X_f^{\sigma_2}(t) + \Delta_2^T X_r^{\sigma_2}(t) = \Delta_1^T X_f^{\sigma_2}(0) + \Delta_2^T X_r^{\sigma_2}(0) = \widehat{c}$  which shows that

$$X_r^{\sigma_2}(t) = \phi(X_f^{\sigma_2}(t)), \quad (5.65)$$

where the *affine* map  $\phi : \mathbb{R}^{d_f} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d_r}$  is defined by

$$\phi(x) = (\Delta_2^T)^{-1} \widehat{c} - (\Delta_2^T)^{-1} \Delta_1^T x. \quad (5.66)$$

We already know that  $X_b^{\sigma_2}(t)$  will lie in the set  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2} := \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_1}$  given by (5.54) for all  $t \geq 0$ . Therefore the following set serves as a *maximal* state-space for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$

$$\mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2} = \{(x_b, x_f, x_r) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : x_b \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}, \quad x_f \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} \quad \text{and} \quad x_r = \phi(x_f)\}. \quad (5.67)$$

**Remark 5.2** *A state-space for a conservation network is called maximal if it includes every other state-space for the network.*

Recall that  $n = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S)) = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2}))$ ,  $n_b = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^b)) = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2}^b))$  and  $d_r = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^u)) = \dim(\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2}^u))$ . Moreover  $\{\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{n_b}\}$  (see Section 5.1) and  $\{\hat{\delta}_1, \dots, \hat{\delta}_{d_r}\}$  are sets of independent vectors in  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$ , and each  $\bar{\gamma}_i$  is orthogonal to each  $\hat{\delta}_j$  because they are supported on disjoint sets. Hence  $n \geq n_b + d_r$ , which implies that  $\mathcal{E}_0 \subset P_{\sigma_2}^T \mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2}$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  be the state-space defined by (3.35) for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . For now we assume

$$n = n_b + d_r, \quad (5.68)$$

and we later discuss how this condition can be checked (see Lemma 5.11). Under this assumption any conservation relation  $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$  is in the linear span of  $\{\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{n_b}, \hat{\delta}_1, \dots, \hat{\delta}_{d_r}\}$  and in this case we have

$$\mathcal{E}_0 = P_{\sigma_2}^T \mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2}. \quad (5.69)$$

Observe that in comparison to  $\mathcal{E}_0$ , the state-space  $\mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2}$  has a simpler form in which the three types of species (free, bounded and restricted) appear explicitly along with their copy-number ranges. As we shall soon see, such a form helps in checking irreducibility, or finding smaller state-spaces contained inside, and also in computing the stationary distributions for certain networks (see Example 6.3). We end this section with an important remark.

**Remark 5.3** *Note that the classification of unbounded species into free and restricted species depends on the set  $I$  which can be chosen to be any element in the set  $\mathcal{I}_f$  given by (5.58). This flexibility in the choice of  $I$  can be quite useful for our purpose as we shall explain in the next section.*

### 5.3 Network reduction by elimination of the *restricted* species

From the discussion in the previous section it is immediate that the *restricted* species have no independent dynamics of their own and they essentially *mimic* the *free* species according to some mapping  $\phi$ . This suggests that for finding irreducible state-spaces we can simply remove the *restricted* species and concentrate on the dynamics of the *bounded* and the *free* species. In other words we can construct a “reduced” network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  with  $(d_b + d_f)$  species in the set  $\mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{D}_f$  where

$$\mathcal{D}_b = \{\sigma_2(1), \dots, \sigma_2(d_b)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_f = \{\sigma_2(d_b + 1), \dots, \sigma_2(d_b + d_f)\}.$$

We now describe the network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  more formally. For each reaction  $k = 1, \dots, K$  define a function  $\tilde{\lambda}_k^{\sigma_2} : \mathbb{N}_0^{d_b} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_k^{\sigma_2}(x_b, x_f) = \lambda_k^{\sigma_2}(x_b, x_f, \phi(x_f))$$

where  $x_b \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_b}$ ,  $x_f \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  and the function  $\lambda_k^{\sigma_2}$  is defined by (3.27). Let the *propensity* map  $\tilde{\Lambda}^{\sigma_2} : \mathbb{N}_0^{d_b + d_f} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^K$  be as in (2.5) with each  $\lambda_k$  replaced by  $\tilde{\lambda}_k^{\sigma_2}$ . Define  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\sigma_2} = \text{Proj}(\mathcal{V}^{\sigma_2}, 1, d_b + d_f)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\sigma_2} = \text{Proj}(\mathcal{O}^{\sigma_2}, 1, d_b + d_f)$  to be the matrices containing the first  $(d_b + d_f)$  rows of  $\mathcal{V}^{\sigma_2}$  and  $\mathcal{O}^{\sigma_2}$  respectively (see Section 3.3). We define the reduced network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  by the triplet

$$\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2} = (\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\Lambda}^{\sigma_2}). \quad (5.70)$$

Let  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2} \in \mathbb{M}(d_b + d_f, K)$  be the stoichiometry matrix for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  and let  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^b = \text{Proj}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}, 1, d_b)$  and  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f = \text{Proj}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}, d_b + 1, d_b + d_f)$ . Observe that  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^b = S_{\sigma_2}^b$  and  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f = S_{\sigma_2}^f$ , where the matrices  $S_{\sigma_2}^b$  and  $S_{\sigma_2}^f$  were defined in Section 5.2. One can check that  $\mathcal{D}_b$  is exactly the set of *bounded* species for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Moreover (5.63) shows that

$$\text{Rank}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f) = d_f, \quad (5.71)$$

which implies that there are no conservation relations among the species in  $\mathcal{D}_f$  and hence  $\mathcal{D}_f$  is the set of *free* species for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Also the reduced network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  does not contain any *restricted* species.

Let  $\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{\gamma}_b, \tilde{\gamma}_f) \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2})$  be any conservation relation for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ , for some  $\tilde{\gamma}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{d_b}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_f \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f}$ . Then  $\gamma = (\tilde{\gamma}_b, \tilde{\gamma}_f, \bar{0}_{d_r}) \in \mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2})$ , and condition (5.68) implies that  $\gamma$  is in the linear span of  $\{\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{n_b}, \hat{\delta}_1, \dots, \hat{\delta}_{d_r}\}$ . Since the supports of  $\bar{\gamma}_i$ -s and  $\hat{\delta}_j$ -s are  $\{1, \dots, d_b\}$  and  $\{d_b + 1, \dots, d\}$  respectively, we must have that  $(\tilde{\gamma}_b, \bar{0}_{d_f}, \bar{0}_{d_r})$  is in the linear span of  $\{\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{n_b}\}$  and  $(\bar{0}_{d_b}, \tilde{\gamma}_f, \bar{0}_{d_r})$  is in the linear span of  $\{\hat{\delta}_1, \dots, \hat{\delta}_{d_r}\}$ . However using (5.61) we get  $\tilde{\gamma}_f^T S_{\sigma_2}^f = \bar{0}_K^T$  which allows us to conclude that  $\tilde{\gamma}_f = \bar{0}_{d_f}$  because of (5.63). Therefore any conservation relation for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  cannot involve any of the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f$ . This discussion shows that condition (5.68) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}) = \mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2}^b) \times \{\bar{0}_{d_f}\}. \quad (5.72)$$

Recall that permutations  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  agree on the set  $\{1, \dots, d_b\}$  (see (5.59)) and hence  $\mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_2}^b) = \mathcal{L}(S_{\sigma_1}^b)$  and this left nullspace is spanned by the set of vectors  $\{\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{n_b}\}$  (see Section 5.1). For each  $j = 1, \dots, n_b$  define  $\tilde{\gamma}_j = (\hat{\gamma}_j, \bar{0}_{d_f})$  and  $\tilde{c}_j = \hat{c}_j$  (see (5.53)). This discussion shows that the conservation data for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is simply  $(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$  where  $\tilde{c} = (\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_{n_b})$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2} \in \mathbb{M}(d_b + d_f, n_b)$  is the matrix given by

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2} = \text{Col}(\tilde{\gamma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\gamma}_{n_b}).$$

Note that the conservation relations for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ , specified by conservation data  $(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$ , are automatically satisfied if the dynamics of the *bounded* species lies in the set  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2} := \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_1}$  defined by (5.54). Therefore the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma_2} = \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$$

is a *maximal* state-space (see Remark 5.2) for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . We now come to the main result of this section which allows us to use the reduced network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  to find the irreducible state-spaces for the original network.

**Proposition 5.4** *For any  $A_1 \subset \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and  $A_2 \subset \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ , the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_1^{\sigma_2} = A_1 \times A_2$  is an irreducible state-space for conservation network  $(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$  if and only if the set*

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2} = \{(x_b, x_f, x_r) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2} : x_b \in A_1, \quad x_f \in A_2 \quad \text{and} \quad x_r = \phi(x_f)\}$$

*is an irreducible state-space for conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$ .*

**Proof.** The proof follows simply from the construction of the reduced network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  and the fact that the dynamics of the *restricted* species is “tied” to the dynamics of the *free* species according to map  $\phi$  (see (5.65)).  $\square$

Note that a state-space  $\mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2}$  is irreducible for conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$  if and only if the state-space  $\mathcal{E}_1 = P_{\sigma_2}^T \mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2}$  is irreducible for conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  (see Proposition 3.5). Hence Proposition 5.4 allows us to shift the problem of finding irreducible state-spaces for the original network to an equivalent problem of finding irreducible state-spaces for the reduced network which does not have any *restricted* species. As the next example illustrates, this reduced network may not satisfy Assumption 3.1 even if the original network does. This is a problem because our approach for finding irreducible state-spaces only works for networks satisfying Assumption 3.1. Fortunately for most networks, one can deal with this problem by exploiting the *flexibility* in the choice of set  $I$  (see Remark 5.3) which determines the reduced network by classifying each *unbounded* species as *free* or *restricted*. Note that different choices of  $I$  will yield different reduced networks but they correspond to the same dynamics for the original network. Therefore irreducible state-spaces for the original network can be found with any choice of  $I$  and one can sequentially examine each element in the finite set  $\mathcal{I}_f$  (see (5.58)) until one finds a  $I$  for which the reduced network satisfies Assumption 3.1. Of course such a  $I$  is not guaranteed to exist, but this scheme works for most networks. The next example demonstrates how the flexibility in the choice of  $I$  can be useful.

**Example 5.5** Consider a reaction network with two species  $\mathbf{S}_1$  and  $\mathbf{S}_2$ , and two reactions given by



In this network both the species are produced and degraded together by reaction 1 and 2 respectively. We assume mass-action kinetics (3.22) and so the propensity functions for the two reactions are:

$$\lambda_1(x_1, x_2) = \theta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_2(x_1, x_2) = \theta_2 x_1 x_2,$$

for some rate constants  $\theta_1, \theta_2 > 0$ . One can check that  $\gamma = (1, -1)$  is the solitary (independent) conservation relation for this network. We define  $(\Gamma, c)$  to be the conservation data for this network, where  $\Gamma$  is the  $2 \times 1$  matrix with column  $\gamma$  and  $c$  is any integer. This conservation data says that throughout the dynamics the copy-number  $X_1(t)$  of species  $\mathbf{S}_1$  and copy-number  $X_2(t)$  of species  $\mathbf{S}_2$  satisfy

$$X_1(t) - X_2(t) = c.$$

This shows that each species “mimics” the dynamics of the other one. We have the flexibility of declaring any of the two species as *free* and then the other one will be *restricted*. There are no *bounded* species in this network.

Formally this flexibility manifests in the choice of  $I$  from the set  $\mathcal{I}_f$  (5.58) which has two elements  $\{1\}$  and  $\{2\}$  in this case. If we select  $I$  to be  $\{1\}$  then the reduced network consists of one *free* species  $\mathbf{S}_1$  and two reactions given by  $\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_1$  and  $\mathbf{S}_1 \rightarrow \emptyset$  with propensity functions

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1(x_1) = \theta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2(x_1) = \theta_2 x_1 (x_1 - c).$$

Note that if  $c \leq 0$ , then this reduced network satisfies Assumption 3.1 and using Theorem 4.6 one can conclude that  $\mathbb{N}_0$  is the only irreducible state-space for the reduced network and hence by Proposition 5.4

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 : x_2 = x_1 - c\} \tag{5.73}$$

is the only irreducible state-space for the original network. On the other hand if  $c > 0$  then this reduced network does not satisfy Assumption 3.1 because  $\tilde{\lambda}_2(x_1) = 0$  for  $x_1 = c > 0$ . However in this case we can choose  $I$  to be  $\{2\}$  to obtain another reduced network with one *free* species  $\mathbf{S}_2$  and two reactions  $\emptyset \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_2$  and  $\mathbf{S}_2 \rightarrow \emptyset$  with propensity functions

$$\tilde{\lambda}_1(x_2) = \theta_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\lambda}_2(x_2) = \theta_2 x_2 (x_2 + c)$$

respectively. Observe that this new reduced network satisfies Assumption 3.1 and we can use Theorem 4.6 as before to arrive at the same conclusion that  $\mathcal{E}_1$  given by (5.73) is the unique irreducible state-space for the original network.

## 5.4 Networks with only *free* and *bounded* species

We now assume that we have a “reduced” network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2} = (\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\Lambda}^{\sigma_2})$  not involving any *restricted* species, and satisfying Assumption 3.1 with  $(d_b + d_f)$  species that are in the set  $\mathcal{D}_b \cup \mathcal{D}_f$ . The conservation data for this network is  $(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$  and the associated conservation relations are automatically satisfied if the dynamics lies in the set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma_2} = \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$$

which is a *maximal* state-space for the network. Therefore all its irreducible state-spaces must necessarily belong to this set  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma_2}$ . Note that if the number of *free* species ( $d_f$ ) is zero, then the stochastic dynamics representing the network is essentially a Markov process over the finite state-space  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma_2} = \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$ , and hence the irreducible state-spaces can be found using elementary matrix manipulations [26]. On the other hand, if the number of *bounded* species ( $d_b$ ) is zero, then we can find irreducible state-spaces using the results in Section 4, and in particular we can check the irreducibility of  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  by arranging all the species into birth and death cascades. In this section we combine these two approaches (matrix methods and cascade construction) to locate the irreducible state-spaces for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  within the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma_2}$ . Our first task is to generalize the notion of *absorbing states* from Section 4.1 to include the dynamics of the *bounded* species. From now on network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  refers to the conservation network  $(\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}, \tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$ .

### 5.4.1 Finding absorbing sets

An *absorbing set* is a subset of  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_0^{\sigma^2}$  of the form  $C \times \{x_f\}$ , for some  $C \subset \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}$  and  $x_f \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ , which essentially traps the stochastic dynamics for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma^2}$ . This means that under permutation  $\sigma_2$ , the state of the *free* species is fixed at  $x_f$  while the dynamics of the *bounded* species evolves in the set  $C$ . We now discuss how such *absorbing sets* can be located.

For each  $k = 1, \dots, K$  let  $\tilde{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2}$  denote the  $k$ -th column of matrices  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\sigma^2}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\sigma^2}$  respectively. We decompose each  $\tilde{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2}$  as

$$\tilde{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2} = (\overline{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}, \widehat{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2} = (\overline{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2}, \widehat{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2}), \quad (5.74)$$

where  $\overline{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}, \overline{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_b}$  and  $\widehat{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}, \widehat{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . Let  $\mathcal{K}_f$  be the set of reactions that modify the state of the *free* species

$$\mathcal{K}_f = \{k = 1, \dots, K : \widehat{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2} \neq \widehat{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2}\}.$$

Define the set of *absorbing states* for the *free* species as

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f = \{x \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} : \text{for each } k \in \mathcal{K}_f \text{ there exists a } i \in \{1, \dots, d_f\} \text{ such that } x_i < \widehat{\nu}_{ik}^{\sigma^2}\}.$$

This set can be computed in the same way as the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}$  in Section 4.1. Note that due to Assumption 3.1, for any  $x_f \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  we have  $\lambda_k^{\sigma^2}(y, x_f) = 0$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}$  and  $k \in \mathcal{K}_f$ . Hence only the reactions that do not influence the *free* species are allowed to fire and this shows that elements in  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  are *absorbing* states for the *free* species. However note that even when the state of the *free* species is *stuck* at some  $x_f \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$ , the states of the *bounded* species can evolve according to a Markov chain on the finite set  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}$ . If  $N_b = |\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}|$  and

$$\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2} = \{y_1, \dots, y_{N_b}\},$$

then the *zero-pattern* matrix<sup>4</sup> of this Markov chain is the matrix  $Z(x_f) \in \mathbb{M}(N_b, N_b)$  defined by

$$Z_{mn}(x_f) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y_n = y_m + \overline{\rho}_k^{\sigma^2} - \overline{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2} \text{ for some } k \in \mathcal{K}(y_m, x_f) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5.75)$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}(y, x_f) = \{k = 1, \dots, K : x_f \geq \widehat{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2} \text{ and } y \geq \overline{\nu}_k^{\sigma^2}\}$$

is the set of reactions that have a positive probability of firing when the state is  $(y, x_f)$ . Note that since  $x_f \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  we will have  $\mathcal{K}(y, x_f) \subset \mathcal{K}_f^c$ , which shows that  $\mathcal{K}(y, x_f)$  can only consist of those reactions that do not move the state of the *free* species. The reachability relations and class-structure of the Markov chain describing the dynamics of the *bounded* species can be determined from the matrix  $Z(x_f)$ . For any  $y_i, y_j \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}$ , state  $y_i$  is reachable from state  $y_j$  if and only if  $\Omega_{ij}(x_f) > 0$ , where  $\Omega_{ij}(x_f)$  is the  $ij$ -th entry of the *reachability* matrix  $\Omega(x_f) \in \mathbb{M}(N_b, N_b)$  defined by

$$\Omega(x_f) = (I_{N_b} + Z(x_f))^{N_b - 1}. \quad (5.76)$$

**Remark 5.6** We can efficiently compute the matrix  $\Omega(x_f)$  by repeatedly squaring (see [11]) the matrix  $(I_{N_b} + Z(x_f))$ . Since squaring a  $N_b \times N_b$  matrix takes roughly  $N_b^3$  operations, the whole computation of matrix  $\Omega(x_f)$  would require roughly  $N_b^3 \log_2(N_b)$  operations.

Based on the matrix  $\Omega(x_f)$  we can define an *equivalence* relation  $\Theta(x_f)$  on  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2}$  as

$$\Theta(x_f) = \{(y_i, y_j) \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2} \times \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma^2} : \Omega_{ij}(x_f) > 0 \text{ and } \Omega_{ji}(x_f) > 0\}. \quad (5.77)$$

<sup>4</sup>The *zero-pattern* matrix corresponding to a finite Markov chain is obtained by setting all the positive entries in its probability transition matrix to 1 and all the rest to 0.

The equivalence classes for this relation are known as *communication classes* in the literature. A communication class  $C$  is called *closed* if for any  $y_i \in C$  and  $y_j \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$ ,  $Z_{ij}(x_f) = 1$  implies that  $y_j \in C$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}(x_f)$  be the set of all closed communication classes for relation  $\Theta(x_f)$ . This set can be easily computed by performing simple operations on the matrix  $\Omega(x_f)$  (see [26]). Observe that for any  $C \in \mathcal{C}(x_f)$ , the set  $C \times \{x_f\}$  is an *absorbing* set for the network because the class  $C$  is closed and  $x_f$  is an absorbing state for the *free* species. Moreover since  $C$  is a communication class, the set  $C \times \{x_f\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . This gives us the next result which generalizes Proposition 4.1 to include the dynamics of the *bounded* species.

**Proposition 5.7** *Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  is nonempty. Then for any  $x_f \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  and any closed communication class  $C \in \mathcal{C}(x_f)$ , the set  $C \times \{x_f\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ .*

**Remark 5.8** *Note that if  $C \times \{x_f\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Then by Proposition 5.4,  $\mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2} = C \times \{x_f\} \times \{\phi(x_f)\}$  is an irreducible state-space for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$ . Hence by Proposition 3.5, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{E}_1 = P_{\sigma_2}^T \mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2}$  is an irreducible state-space for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ .*

We now consider the situation when the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  is empty. We mentioned before that the *free* species do not participate in any conservation relations and hence their copy-numbers are not constrained in any way. Therefore we can expect state-spaces of the form  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  to be irreducible for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ , for certain choices of the set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \subset \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . This is generally the case for most biological networks of interest and we now develop a strategy for locating such state-spaces and checking their irreducibility. This strategy involves arranging all the *free* species into suitably constructed *birth and death cascades*.

#### 5.4.2 Finding irreducible state-spaces of the form $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ for network $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$

Our next task is identify the candidate sets  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \subset \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  for which the set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  has the possibility of being an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . We need some notation for this purpose. Let  $F = \{1, \dots, d_f\}$  and for any  $A \subset F$  let  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A) \subset \mathcal{D}_f$  be the set of *free* species given by

$$\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A) = \{\sigma_2(d_b + i) : i \in A\}.$$

From now on, when we say that the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  are *abundantly available* we mean that the copy-number of each species  $\sigma_2(d_b + i) \in \mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  is greater than

$$\max\{\hat{\nu}_{ik}^{\sigma_2} : k = 1, \dots, K\},$$

which is the maximum number of molecules of this species that are consumed by any reaction. For any  $A \subset F$  and any  $y \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  let

$$\mathcal{K}(y, A) = \{k = 1, \dots, K : \text{supp}(\hat{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2}) \subset A \text{ and } y \geq \bar{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2}\}, \quad (5.78)$$

be the set of reactions that have a positive probability of firing when the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  are abundantly available and when the dynamics of *bounded* species is at state  $y$ . Let  $Z(A) \in \mathbb{M}(N_b, N_b)$  be the *zero-pattern* matrix given by (5.75) with  $\mathcal{K}(y_m, x_f)$  replaced by  $\mathcal{K}(y_m, A)$ . Similarly by replacing  $x_f$  by  $A$ , we define the reachability matrix  $\Omega(A)$  and the equivalence relation  $\Theta(A)$  by (5.76) and (5.77) respectively. Let  $\mathcal{C}(A)$  be the set of all closed equivalence (or communication) classes for relation  $\Theta(A)$ . Note that  $Z(A)$  is the zero-pattern matrix of the Markov chain describing the dynamics of the *bounded* species when the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  are abundantly available. In the long-run such a Markov chain will get *trapped* in one of the closed equivalence classes in  $\mathcal{C}(A)$ .

Observe that for  $A_1 \subset A_2$  we have  $\mathcal{K}(y, A_1) \subset \mathcal{K}(y, A_2)$  for any  $y \in \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . Hence as more *free* species become abundantly available, more transition channels open up for the Markov chain describing the *bounded* species dynamics. This also shows that if  $A_1 \subset A_2$  then  $|\mathcal{C}(A_2)| \leq |\mathcal{C}(A_1)|$ . Therefore the number of closed equivalence classes ( $|\mathcal{C}(A)|$ ) is least when all the *free* species are abundantly available ( $A = F$ ). Observe that for a set of the form  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  to be an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  it is necessary that  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \in \mathcal{C}(F)$ . This motivates our definition of candidate state-spaces whose irreducibility will be subsequently checked.

**Definition 5.9** For any  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \in \mathcal{C}(F)$ , the set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is called a *Candidate Irreducible State-Space (CISS)* for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ .

Note that each CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is certainly a state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  (recall Definition 2.1) because the copy-number vector for the *free* species can never leave the nonnegative integer orthant  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  and for any  $y \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  the set of possible transitions is always a subset of  $\mathcal{K}(y, F)$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  is a closed communicating class with respect to the transitions in  $\mathcal{K}(y, F)$ . Observe that if the number of *free* species ( $d_f$ ) is zero, then each CISS is definitely an irreducible state-space, and we do not need any additional work to verify its irreducibility. In this case our results are not very useful as they boil down to the standard approach for finding irreducible state-spaces for finite Markov chains (see [26]). On the other hand if the number of *bounded* species ( $d_b$ ) is zero, then there is only one CISS ( $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ ) whose irreducibility can be verified using the cascade construction approach described in Section 4.2. In the rest of the section, we consider the situation when both *bounded* and *free* species are present, and develop a procedure to check the irreducibility of each CISS.

We start by fixing a CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  according to Definition 5.9. Let  $A$  be any subset of  $F$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \in \mathcal{C}(F)$ , for any  $C \in \mathcal{C}(A)$  we either have  $C \cap \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} = \emptyset$  or  $C \subset \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(A) = \{C \in \mathcal{C}(A) : C \subset \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}\} \quad (5.79)$$

be the set of closed communicating classes for relation  $\Theta(A)$  restricted on the set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \subset \mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . Note that this set  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(A)$  can be directly computed by replacing  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  with  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ , in the definitions of the zero-pattern matrix  $Z(A)$ , the reachability matrix  $\Omega(A)$  and the equivalence relation  $\Theta(A)$ .

As in Section 4.2 we check the irreducibility of  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  by arranging the *free* species into *birth and death cascades*. However the definition of these *cascades* needs to be modified to account for the dynamics of the *bounded* species in  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . For any  $A \subset F$  and any closed communication class  $C \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(A)$  let

$$\mathcal{K}(C, A) = \bigcup_{y \in C} \mathcal{K}(y, A),$$

be the set of reactions that have the possibility of firing when the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  are abundantly available and when the dynamics of *bounded* species is inside  $C$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{D}_f = \mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(F)$  is the set of all *free* species. For each  $l = 1, 2, \dots$  we define a subset of  $F$  by

$$G_l = \left\{ i \in F : i \notin H_l \text{ and for each } C \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(H_l) \text{ there exists a } k \in \mathcal{K}(C, H_l) \text{ such that } i \in \text{supp}(\tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma_2}) \right\}, \quad (5.80)$$

where

$$H_l = \bigcup_{j=1}^{l-1} G_j. \quad (5.81)$$

Note that the sets  $G_1, G_2, \dots$  are mutually disjoint. The set of *free* species in the  $l$ -th birth-cascade for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is given by  $B_l = \mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(G_l)$ . This set contains all the *free* species that do not belong to any of the previous birth-cascades  $B_1, \dots, B_{l-1}$  and that get produced by some reaction in  $\mathcal{K}(C, H_l)$  for any closed communication class  $C$  in  $\mathcal{C}(H_l)$ . The network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is called *birth-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  if (4.37) holds with  $\mathcal{D}$  replaced by  $F$ , which means that all the *free* species can be arranged into birth-cascades constructed according to the scheme described above. The next lemma is analogous to Lemma 4.2.

**Lemma 5.10** Suppose that network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is birth-exhaustive for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . Then for any  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and any  $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}^d$  there exists a vector  $x \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  such that  $x \geq r_0$  and

$$(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}} (z_2, x).$$

**Proof.** We prove this lemma by induction. Throughout this proof we denote the relation  $\xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}}$  by  $\longrightarrow$  and the finite set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  by  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let sets  $G_l$  and  $H_l$  be as defined above. We say that level  $l$  is *satisfiable* if for

any  $z_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  with  $\text{supp}(r) \subset H_l \cup G_l$ , there exists a  $z_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  such that  $x \geq r$  and  $(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \rightarrow (z_2, x)$ .

Assume that the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(H_l)$  are abundantly available and pick any  $i \in G_l$ . For any initial state  $y_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ , the Markov chain on  $\mathcal{F}$  describing the dynamics of *bounded* species will lie in a closed communication class  $C \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(H_l)$  after finitely many reactions. After some more reactions, the dynamics will be at a state  $y_1 \in C$  for which there exists a reaction  $k \in \mathcal{K}(y_1, H_l)$  which produces the *free* species  $\sigma_2(d_b + i)$ . Note that all these reactions will only consume the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(H_l)$  which are abundantly available. Repeating this sequence of reactions multiple times, we can obtain as many molecules of species  $\sigma_2(d_b + i)$  as needed. Performing this procedure for each  $i \in G_l$  proves that level  $l$  is satisfiable. Since level 1 is trivially satisfiable, by induction we can conclude that all levels are satisfiable.

Now the birth-exhaustivity of the network implies that there exists a  $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $H_{l_0} = F = \{1, \dots, d_f\}$ . Satisfiability of level  $l_0$  guarantees that for any  $z_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  there exists a  $z_3 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $x' \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  such that  $x' \geq r$  and  $(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \rightarrow (z_3, x')$ . Since  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{C}(F)$  is a closed communication class, all the states in  $\mathcal{F}$  are accessible from each other when all the *free* species are abundantly available. Therefore for any  $z_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  we can pick the components of  $r$  large enough to ensure that  $(z_3, x') \rightarrow (z_2, x)$  for some vector  $x \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  satisfying  $x \geq r_0$ . The transitivity of relation  $\rightarrow$  (see Proposition 2.2) proves this lemma.  $\square$

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}$  be the inverse of network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  (see Section 3.2). Note that the stoichiometry matrix for  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}$  is just the negative of the stoichiometry matrix  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}$  for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Hence the conservation relations of both these networks are the same, and hence their sets of *bounded* and *free* species are the same. Moreover the set of closed communication classes  $\mathcal{C}(A)$  remains unchanged for any  $A \subset F$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is also a CISS for the inverse network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}$ . As in Section 4.2, we define the  $l$ -th *death-cascade*  $D_l$  for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  as the  $l$ -th birth-cascade for the inverse network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}$ . We say that network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is *death-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  if and only if the inverse network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}$  is *birth-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . If this exhaustivity condition is satisfied, then Lemma 5.10 and relation (3.25) imply that for any  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and  $r'_0 \in \mathbb{N}^d$  there exists a vector  $x' \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  satisfying  $x' \geq r'_0$ ,

$$(z'_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_2}} (z'_2, x') \quad \text{and} \quad (z'_2, x') \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}} (z'_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}). \quad (5.82)$$

A necessary condition for  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  to be irreducible is that the dynamics of the *free* species can reach any state in  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  from any other state in  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  through a combination of displacements in directions  $(\hat{\rho}_k^{\sigma_2} - \hat{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2})$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . This condition can be formulated as

$$\text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f) = \mathbb{Z}^{d_f}, \quad (5.83)$$

where  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f \in \mathbb{M}(d_f, K)$  is the matrix defined in Section 5.3. Note that for (5.83) to hold, it is necessary that (5.71) holds which is indeed the case. As in Section 4.2, rather than assuming (5.83), we will assume another condition which can be more easily checked for biological networks and which implies (5.83) when the network is birth-exhaustive (see Lemma 5.11). Define the set of those reactions that *only involve* the *free* species as

$$\mathcal{K}_f^0 = \{k = 1, \dots, K : \text{supp}(\bar{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2}) = \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad \text{supp}(\bar{\rho}_k^{\sigma_2}) = \emptyset\}.$$

Let  $K_f^0 = |\mathcal{K}_f^0|$  be the number of such reactions and let  $\hat{S}_{\sigma_2} \in \mathbb{M}(d_f, K_f^0)$  be the matrix consisting of only those columns of matrix  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f$  which correspond to reactions in  $\mathcal{K}_f^0$ . Then it is immediate that

$$\text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\hat{S}_{\sigma_2}) \subset \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f). \quad (5.84)$$

The condition we assume instead of (5.83) can be stated as

$$-\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} \subset \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\hat{S}_{\sigma_2}) \quad (5.85)$$

and it can be checked in the same way as (4.41) by computing a modified Hermite normal form (see Section 4.2). For most biological networks (5.85) is satisfied because the *free* species either degrade naturally or they convert into other *free* species that degrade naturally (see Remark 4.4).

In the rest of the section we denote  $e_i^{(d_f)}$  by  $e_i$  which is  $i$ -th standard basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{d_f}$ . The next two lemmas demonstrate the usefulness of (5.85).

**Lemma 5.11** *Suppose that network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is birth-exhaustive for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  and (5.85) holds. Then conditions (5.83) and (5.68) are satisfied. As a consequence relation (5.69) also holds.*

**Proof.** Using the birth-exhaustivity of network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ , along with (5.85) and (5.84), we can show (5.83) holds in exactly the same way as we showed that (4.41) implies (4.40) in the proof of Lemma 4.5. We can simply ignore the *bounded* species for obtaining this result.

We now prove (5.68). Let  $\tilde{\gamma} = (\tilde{\gamma}_b, \tilde{\gamma}_f) \in \mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2})$  be any conservation relation for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ , for some  $\tilde{\gamma}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{d_b}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_f \in \mathbb{R}^{d_f}$ . Then

$$0 = \tilde{\gamma}^T \tilde{S}_{\sigma_2} = \tilde{\gamma}_b^T \tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^b + \tilde{\gamma}_f^T \tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f. \quad (5.86)$$

Note that the columns of  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}$  are those columns of  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f$  which correspond to reactions in  $\mathcal{K}_f^0$ . Since the reactions in  $\mathcal{K}_f^0$  do not involve any *bounded* species, due to (5.85), for each  $i \in F = \{1, \dots, d_f\}$  we can find a vector  $n_i \in \mathbb{N}_0^K$  such that  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^b n_i = \bar{0}_{d_b}$  and  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^f n_i = -e_i$ . Multiplying equation (5.86) on the right by the  $K \times d_f$  matrix

$$N = \text{Col}(n_1, \dots, n_{d_f})$$

we can conclude that  $\tilde{\gamma}_f = \bar{0}_{d_f}$ . This shows that the *free* species cannot participate in any conservation relation for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  and so we must have (5.72). As explained in Section 5.3, (5.72) is equivalent to (5.68) and (5.69) follows directly from (5.68). This completes the proof of this lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.12** *Suppose that (5.85) is satisfied. Then there exists a vector  $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  such that for any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  satisfying  $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq r_0$  we have*

$$(z, x_1) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}} (z, x_2)$$

for any  $z \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ .

**Proof.** The proof of this lemma is inspired by the proof of Theorem 3.4 in [36]. Throughout this proof we denote relation  $\xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}}$  by  $\longrightarrow$ . We first show that for each  $i \in F = \{1, \dots, d_f\}$  there exists a  $r_i \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  such that

$$(z, r_i) \longrightarrow (z, r_i - e_i) \quad (5.87)$$

for any  $z \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ .

Fix any  $i \in F$ . Note that since (5.85) holds we have  $-e_i \in \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2})$ . This implies that there is a sequence of reactions  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathcal{K}_f^0$  such that

$$-e_i = \sum_{j=1}^n (\hat{\rho}_{k_j}^{\sigma_2} - \hat{\nu}_{k_j}^{\sigma_2}).$$

Let  $y_1 = \bar{0}_{d_f}$  and for each  $m = 2, \dots, n$  let  $y_m = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (\hat{\rho}_{k_j}^{\sigma_2} - \hat{\nu}_{k_j}^{\sigma_2})$ . By choosing a  $r_i \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  with large enough entries we can ensure that  $(r_i + y_m) \geq \hat{\nu}_{k_m}^{\sigma_2}$  for each  $m = 1, \dots, n$ . Since the reactions in  $\mathcal{K}_f^0$  do not involve the *bounded* species and Assumption 3.1 is satisfied, such a choice of  $r_i$  also ensures that each reaction  $k_m$  has a positive probability of firing when the state of the *free* species is  $(r_i + y_m)$ . This shows that (5.87) holds for any  $z \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ .

Let  $r_0 = \max_{i \in F} r_i$  and let  $x \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  be any vector satisfying  $x \geq r_0$ . Using Proposition 3.2 we can conclude that

$$(z, x) \longrightarrow (z, x - e_i) \quad (5.88)$$

for any  $z \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and any  $i \in F$ . Now select any  $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N}^{d_f}$  satisfying  $x_1 \geq x_2 \geq r_0$  and fix any  $z \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$ . Let  $\alpha = (x_1 - x_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  and express it as  $\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{d_f} \alpha_i e_i$ . Exploiting the transitivity of relation  $\longrightarrow$  (see Proposition 2.2) and using  $(z, x) \longrightarrow (z, x - e_i)$ ,  $\alpha_i$  times for each  $i$  we obtain

$$(z, x_2 + \alpha) \longrightarrow (z, x_2 + \alpha - \alpha_1 e_1) \longrightarrow (z, x_2 + \alpha - \alpha_1 e_1 - \alpha_2 e_2) \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow (z, x_2 + \alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{d_f} \alpha_i e_i).$$

But  $x_2 + \alpha = x_1$  and  $(x_2 + \alpha - \sum_{i=1}^{d_f} \alpha_i e_i) = x_2$  and hence the proof of this lemma is complete.  $\square$

We now have all the required tools to prove the main result of this section.

**Theorem 5.13** *Suppose that (5.85) holds and network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is both birth and death exhaustive for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ .*

Before we provide a proof of this result, a few remarks are in order.

**Remark 5.14** *Note that Theorem 5.13 reduces to Theorem 4.6, when the numbers of bounded and restricted species ( $d_b$  and  $d_r$ ) are zero. Hence Theorem 5.13 can be viewed as an extension of Theorem 4.6 which incorporates the conservation relations.*

**Remark 5.15** *Recall the definitions of the set  $\mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2}$  and the mapping  $\phi$  from Section 5.2. Suppose the conditions of Theorem 5.13 hold and we can show that  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Then by Proposition 5.4*

$$\mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2} = \{(x_b, x_f, x_r) \in \mathcal{E}_0^{\sigma_2} : x_b \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}, \quad x_f \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} \quad \text{and} \quad x_r = \phi(x_f)\},$$

an irreducible state-space for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^{\sigma_2}, \Gamma_{\sigma_2}, c)$ . Hence by Proposition 3.5 we can conclude that  $\mathcal{E}_1 = P_{\sigma_2}^T \mathcal{E}_1^{\sigma_2}$  is an irreducible state-space for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . Lemma 5.11 shows that relation (5.69) is satisfied and so we must have  $\mathcal{E}_1 \subset \mathcal{E}_0$  where  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is defined by (3.35).

**Remark 5.16** *The conclusion of Theorem 5.13 will continue to hold if instead of (5.85) the following is satisfied:*

$$\mathbb{N}_0^{d_f} \subset \text{Colspan}_{\mathbb{N}_0}(\hat{S}_{\sigma_2}). \quad (5.89)$$

*The reasons for this are essentially the same as those given in Remark 4.7.*

We now come to the proof of Theorem 5.13.

**Proof.** Throughout this proof we denote the relation  $\xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}}$  by  $\longrightarrow$ . Note that to prove the theorem it suffices to show that for any  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  we have

$$(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \longrightarrow (z_2, x) \longrightarrow (z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}). \quad (5.90)$$

If this holds then  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is irreducible because for any  $(z_1, x_1), (z_2, x_2) \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  we have  $(z_1, x_1) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_2)$ . This is due to the following chain of accessibility relations

$$(z_1, x_1) \longrightarrow (z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_2)$$

and the fact that relation  $\longrightarrow$  is transitive (see Proposition 2.2).

We now prove (5.90) for any fixed  $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . Let  $r_0$  be as in Lemma 5.12. Using (5.82) we can find a vector  $x' \geq r_0$  such that  $(z_2, x') \longrightarrow (z_2, \bar{0}_{d_f})$  which also implies  $(z_2, x + x') \longrightarrow (z_2, x)$  due to Proposition 3.2. From Lemma 5.10 we can find a vector  $y \geq (x + x')$  satisfying  $(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \longrightarrow (z_2, y)$ . Since  $(x + x') \geq r_0$ , using Lemma 5.12 we obtain  $(z_2, y) \longrightarrow (z_2, x + x')$ . We now have an accessibility chain

$$(z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \longrightarrow (z_2, y) \longrightarrow (z_2, x + x') \longrightarrow (z_2, x)$$

and since  $\longrightarrow$  is transitive we have the first part of (5.90). We now show the second part  $(z_2, x) \longrightarrow (z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f})$ . Using (5.82) and Lemma 5.10 we can find vectors  $x_1, x_2 \geq r_0$  such that  $(z_2, x_2) \longrightarrow (z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f})$ ,  $x_1 \geq x_2$  and  $(z_2, \bar{0}_{d_f}) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_1)$ . The last relation also implies  $(z_2, x) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_1 + x)$  due to Proposition 3.2. Since  $(x_1 + x) \geq x_2 \geq r_0$  we have  $(z_2, x_1 + x) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_2)$  due to Lemma 5.12. This gives us the following chain of accessibility relations

$$(z_2, x) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_1 + x) \longrightarrow (z_2, x_2) \longrightarrow (z_1, \bar{0}_{d_f})$$

which shows the second part of (5.90) and completes the proof of this result.  $\square$

Remark 5.15 explains how Theorem 5.13 can help us locate an irreducible state-space for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . We now come to the question of determining *all the irreducible state-spaces* for  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . Observe that if the number of closed communication classes in the set  $\mathcal{C}(F)$  is  $\eta = |\mathcal{C}(F)|$ , then there are  $\eta$  possible choices for CISS (see Definition 5.9). These choices are given by  $\mathcal{F}_{b,1}^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}, \mathcal{F}_{b,2}^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{b,\eta}^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  if  $\mathcal{C}(F) = \{\mathcal{F}_{b,1}^{\sigma_2}, \mathcal{F}_{b,2}^{\sigma_2}, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{b,\eta}^{\sigma_2}\}$ . Suppose using Theorem 5.13 we can show that each of these CISS is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . Then correspondingly we will obtain  $\eta$  disjoint irreducible state-spaces  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_\eta$  for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  (see Remark 5.15). The next remark gives the condition for these sets to be the only irreducible state-spaces for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ .

**Remark 5.17** *If the following relation holds:*

$$\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\eta} \mathcal{F}_{b,i}^{\sigma_2}$$

*then  $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \dots, \mathcal{E}_\eta$  are the only irreducible state-spaces for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ . This is because the above relation implies  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\eta} \mathcal{E}_i$  (see (3.35)) and since  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is the maximal state-space for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ , we cannot have any other irreducible state-spaces due to reasons mentioned in Remark 2.3.*

The next example illustrates how Theorem 5.13 can be applied.

**Example 5.18** We consider the gene expression network as in Example 4.8 with one modification. Now the Gene ( $G$ ) can spontaneously switch between an active ( $G^*$ ) and an inactive ( $G^0$ ) form, and the transcription of mRNA ( $M$ ) is only possible in the active form. This modified network has four species: active Gene ( $\mathbf{S}_1 = G^*$ ), inactive Gene ( $\mathbf{S}_2 = G^0$ ), mRNA ( $\mathbf{S}_3 = M$ ) and protein ( $\mathbf{S}_4 = P$ ). The six reactions in this network are:



These reactions are numbered 1, ..., 6 in the order they appear above. We assume that the propensity functions of all the reactions have mass-action form (3.22). One can check that  $\gamma = (1, 1, 0, 0)$  is the only (independent) conservation relation for this network. Let  $\Gamma$  be the  $4 \times 1$  matrix whose single column is  $\gamma$  and let  $c = 1$ . We define  $(\Gamma, c)$  to be the conservation data for this network, and it implies that throughout the dynamics the copy-number  $X_1(t)$  of species  $\mathbf{S}_1$  and the copy-number  $X_2(t)$  of species  $\mathbf{S}_2$  satisfy

$$X_1(t) + X_2(t) = 1.$$

In other words, only one copy of the Gene ( $G$ ) is present which can either exist in active or inactive form. Note that  $\gamma$  is a positive conservation relation and it causes the species  $G^*$  and  $G^0$  to be *bounded*. The other two species are *free* and there are no *restricted* species in the network. The dynamics of the *bounded* species evolves on the set  $\mathcal{E} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  and one can verify that  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{N}_0^2$  is the only CISS for the network. Moreover this network is *birth-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{N}_0^2$  as the first two birth-cascades are  $B_1 = \{M\}$  and  $B_2 = \{P\}$  (as in Example 4.8) and they cover the set of *free* species. Similarly this network is also *death-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{N}_0^2$  because the first death-cascade is  $D_1 = \{M, P\}$ . Condition 5.85 is satisfied and hence using Theorem 5.13 along with Remark 5.17, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{N}_0^2$  is the unique irreducible state-space for this network.

## 5.5 Exploiting the sparsity in interactions among *bounded* species

Consider the  $n$ -gene version of the gene expression network in Example 5.18. In this version there are  $n$  genes, denoted by  $G_1, \dots, G_n$ , and each gene  $G_i$  independently expresses itself according to network (5.91) involving its corresponding four species  $G_i^*$ ,  $G_i^0$ ,  $M_i$  and  $P_i$ . Overall the network has  $4n$  species and  $6n$  reactions. Since the genes express independently, simple intuition suggests that under a suitable permutation  $\sigma_2$  the unique irreducible state-space for the network must be  $\mathcal{E}^n \times \mathbb{N}_0^{2n}$  where  $\mathcal{E} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$  as in Example 5.18. If we apply Theorem 5.13 then we will certainly arrive at this conclusion. However we will run into computational problems if  $n$  is large. This is because the dynamics of *bounded* species evolves on the set  $\mathcal{E}_b = \mathcal{E}^n$  of size  $2^n$ . Therefore for constructing each birth or death cascade for the network (see (5.80)) we would have to evaluate a reachability matrix (see (5.76)) by computing the  $(2^n - 1)$ -st power of a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix. If we perform this computation by repeated squaring (see Remark 5.6) then it would need roughly  $2^{3n}n$  operations, which can be huge for large  $n$ .

The computational difficulties in this  $n$ -gene example arise mainly because we did not *exploit* the fact that different genes express independently and so we should be able to efficiently *partition* our task of arranging the *free* species into birth and death cascades. More generally, for many large biological networks it is possible to partition the *bounded* species in such a way, that species in different partitions do not *interact directly* with each other, even though they can interact through the *free* species. With this approach we can exploit the sparsity in interactions among the *bounded* species to derive a version of Theorem 5.13 which is computationally much easier to use. We now describe this approach formally.

Recall from (5.59) that the set of *bounded* species for the network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  can be expressed as  $\mathcal{D}_b = \{\sigma_2(1), \dots, \sigma_2(d_b)\}$ . For each reaction  $k$ , let vectors  $\tilde{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2}$  and  $\tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma_2}$  be columns of matrices  $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}^{\sigma_2}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}^{\sigma_2}$  defined in Section 5.3. Let  $E = \{1, \dots, d_b\}$  and for any  $C \subset E$  let  $\mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(C) \subset \mathcal{D}_b$  be the set of *bounded* species given by

$$\mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(C) = \{\sigma_2(i) : i \in C\}.$$

We define an *interaction* relation  $I_b \subset E \times E$  by

$$I_b = \{(i, j) \in E \times E : \{i, j\} \subset \text{supp}(\tilde{\nu}_k^{\sigma_2}) \cup \text{supp}(\tilde{\rho}_k^{\sigma_2}) \text{ for some } k = 1, \dots, K\}. \quad (5.92)$$

Two *bounded* species  $\sigma_2(i), \sigma_2(j) \in \mathcal{D}_b$  are said to *interact* if  $(i, j) \in I_b$  which occurs when both these species are *involved* in some reaction  $k$ , either as products or as reactants. Note that relation  $I_b$  is *reflexive* and *symmetric*. Hence its *transitive closure*  $I_b^*$  is an equivalence relation which partitions  $E$  into  $M$  disjoint equivalence classes denoted by  $E_1, \dots, E_M$ . These equivalence classes partition the set of *bounded* species  $\mathcal{D}_b$  into disjoint subsets  $\mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(E_1), \dots, \mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(E_M)$  according to their interaction relationships. From now on we refer to  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m} = \mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(E_m)$  as the  $m$ -th *interaction class*.

For each  $m = 1, \dots, M$  let  $d_{b,m} = |E_m|$  and let  $s_m = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} d_{b,j}$ . Let  $\sigma_3 : E \rightarrow E$  be any permutation map satisfying the following for each  $m$

$$\sigma_3(j) \in E_m \text{ for all } j = s_m + 1, \dots, s_m + d_{b,m}. \quad (5.93)$$

We extend the map  $\sigma_3$  to the set  $\{1, \dots, (d_f + d_b)\}$  by letting  $\sigma_3(j) = j$  for each  $j = (d_b + 1), \dots, (d_b + d_f)$ . Note that now  $\sigma_3$  is a permutation map on the set  $\{1, \dots, (d_f + d_b)\}$  due to (5.59). Moreover we can express the set of *free* species as  $\mathcal{D}_f = \{\sigma_2(\sigma_3(d_b + 1)), \dots, \sigma_2(\sigma_3(d_b + d_f))\}$  and the  $m$ -th interaction class as

$$\mathcal{D}_{b,m} := \mathcal{D}_b^{\sigma_2}(E_m) = \{\sigma_2(\sigma_3(s_m + 1)), \dots, \sigma_2(\sigma_3(s_m + d_{b,m}))\}.$$

Using this permutation  $\sigma_3$  we can define another network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  which is equivalent to  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  (see Section 3.3). Let  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}$  be the  $(d_b + d_f) \times K$  stoichiometry matrix for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  and let  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b = \text{Proj}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}, 1, d_b)$ . Relation (5.72) implies that

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}) = \mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b) \times \{\bar{0}_{d_f}\}. \quad (5.94)$$

For each  $m = 1, \dots, M$  let  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,m} = \text{Proj}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b, s_m + 1, s_m + d_{b,m})$  be the  $d_{b,m} \times K$  matrix containing the reaction stoichiometries for the *bounded* species in the  $m$ -th interaction class  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$ . Since the *bounded*

species in different interaction classes do not *interact*, the columns of matrices  $\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,1}, \dots, \tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,M}$  have *disjoint supports* which shows that the left nullspace  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b)$  can be expressed as the cross-product

$$\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^M \mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,m}). \quad (5.95)$$

Recall from Section 5.3 that  $\dim(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b)) = \dim(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_2}^b)) = n_b$  and the conservation data for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  is given by  $(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}, \tilde{c})$  where  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}$  is a  $(d_b + d_f) \times n_b$  matrix and  $\tilde{c}$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^{n_b}$ . Then the conservation data for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  must be  $(\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_3}, \tilde{c})$  for  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_3} = P_{\sigma_3} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_2}$  (see Remark 3.6). For each  $m$ , let

$$n_{b,m} = \dim(\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,m}))$$

denote the number of independent conservation relations among the *bounded* species in the  $m$ -th interaction class  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$ . Then  $n_b = \sum_{m=1}^M n_{b,m}$  due to relation (5.95). Moreover if  $\{\hat{\gamma}_1^{(m)}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{n_{b,m}}^{(m)}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^{b,m})$  then  $\{\bar{\gamma}_j^{(m)} : j = 1, \dots, n_{b,m} \text{ and } m = 1, \dots, M\}$  becomes a basis for  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b)$  where each  $\bar{\gamma}_j^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_b + d_f}$  is defined by

$$\bar{\gamma}_j^{(m)} = [\bar{0}_{s_m}, \hat{\gamma}_j^{(m)}, \bar{0}_{s'_m}]$$

for  $s_m = (d_b + d_f - s_{m+1})$ . Since the columns of  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_3}$  span  $\mathcal{L}(\tilde{S}_{\sigma_3}^b)$  there exists a unique  $\alpha_j^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_b}$  such that

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{\sigma_3} \alpha_j^{(m)} = \bar{\gamma}_j^{(m)}.$$

For each  $m = 1, \dots, M$  define

$$\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3} = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{R}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3} : \langle x, \hat{\gamma}_j^{(m)} \rangle = \langle \alpha_j^{(m)}, \tilde{c} \rangle \text{ for each } j = 1, \dots, n_{b,m} \right\}$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  is the rectangle defined analogously to (5.51) with  $d_b$  replaced by  $d_{b,m}$  and  $b_{\sigma_1(j)}$  replaced by  $b_{\sigma_2(\sigma_3(s_m+j))}$ . The finite set  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  serves as a state-space for the dynamics of the *bounded* species in the interaction class  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$  for the network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$ . Hence the state-space for the *bounded* species in all the interaction classes is

$$\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_3} = \mathcal{E}_{b,1}^{\sigma_3} \times \dots \times \mathcal{E}_{b,M}^{\sigma_3}. \quad (5.96)$$

One can check that  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  given by (5.54) is the image of  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_3}$  under the permutation matrix  $P_{\sigma_3}^T$ . Hence these two sets have the same number of elements  $N_b = |\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_3}| = |\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}|$  and if we let  $N_{b,m} = |\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}|$  for each  $m$ , then we must have

$$N_b = \prod_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}. \quad (5.97)$$

Note that unlike  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2^{\sigma_2}$ , the set  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_2^{\sigma_3}$  has a *fragmented* structure in which each fragment corresponds to an interaction class. Such a fragmentation simplifies our search for irreducible state-spaces as it allows us to deal with *one interaction class* at a time. This enables us to exploit the *sparsity* in the interaction relationships among the *bounded* species and obtain significant reductions in the required computational effort, as we shall soon demonstrate.

We now discuss how the *absorbing sets* (see Section 5.4.1) can be efficiently calculated using our new approach. Suppose that the set  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  is nonempty. Pick any  $x_f \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{abs}}^f$  and any  $m = 1, \dots, M$ . Consider the network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_m^{\sigma_3}$  formed by only those species that are in the set  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m} \cup \mathcal{D}_f$  and only those reactions that involve these species. Essentially we “hide” all the *bounded* species in this network that do not belong to the interaction class  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$ . Replacing  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  by  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  we follow the procedure in Section 5.4.1 and compute the set of closed communication classes  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(x_f)$  for the relation  $\Theta^{(m)}(x_f)$  defined analogously to (5.77)

for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_m^{\sigma_3}$ . This requires computation of the reachability matrix  $\Omega^{(m)}(x_f)$  (see (5.76)) which needs roughly  $N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m})$  operations (see Remark 5.6).

Repeating these steps for each  $m = 1, \dots, M$  we obtain the sets  $\mathcal{C}^{(1)}(x_f), \dots, \mathcal{C}^{(M)}(x_f)$ . This allows us to compute the corresponding set of closed communication classes  $\mathcal{C}(x_f)$  for the entire network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  due to the following relationship

$$\mathcal{C}(x_f) = \{C_1 \times C_2 \times \dots \times C_M : C_m \in \mathcal{C}^{(m)}(x_f) \text{ for each } m = 1, \dots, M\}. \quad (5.98)$$

The next remark explains why our new strategy of dealing with only one interaction class at a time will be computationally more efficient in computing  $\mathcal{C}(x_f)$ .

**Remark 5.19** *Observe that if we were to compute  $\mathcal{C}(x_f)$  directly then we would need roughly  $N_b^3 \log_2(N_b)$  operations. However in the new approach we instead compute  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(x_f)$  for each  $m$ , which requires roughly  $\sum_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m})$  operations. If we define an efficiency factor by*

$$\rho_{\text{eff}} = \frac{N_b^3 \log_2(N_b)}{\sum_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m})} \quad (5.99)$$

then due to (5.97) we must have  $\rho_{\text{eff}} \geq 1$  because

$$N_b^3 \log_2(N_b) = \sum_{m=1}^M N_b^3 \log_2(N_{b,m}) \geq \sum_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m}).$$

Hence we are guaranteed to realize computational savings by adopting this new approach. Note that we are not taking into account the computational effort required for classifying the bounded species into distinct interaction classes. This is because this classification step is only needed once for the network and it only requires approximately  $d_b K$  operations. This number  $d_b K$  is generally much smaller than  $N_b^3 \log_2(N_b)$ .

Once  $\mathcal{C}(x_f)$  has been computed, for each  $C \in \mathcal{C}(x_f)$ , the set  $C \times \{x_f\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  and the set  $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_3}^T C \times \{x_f\}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  (see Proposition 3.5), where  $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_3}^T$  is the  $d_b \times d_b$  matrix consisting of the first  $d_b$  rows and columns of the permutation matrix  $P_{\sigma_3}^T$ . Remark 5.15 informs us how we can recover the corresponding irreducible state-spaces for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ .

We now discuss how our new approach can help in applying the procedure described in Section 5.4.2 for finding irreducible state-spaces of the form  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$ . We will find such state-spaces for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  and then later recover the corresponding state-spaces for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  using Proposition 3.5. We start by identifying the appropriate CISSs (see Definition 5.9) for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$ .

For each  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , we consider the network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_m^{\sigma_3}$  described above, in which the *bounded* species in interaction classes other than  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$  are completely ignored. We replace  $\mathcal{E}_b^{\sigma_2}$  by  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  and as in Section 5.4, for any  $A \subset F = \{1, \dots, d_f\}$  we define a  $N_{b,m} \times N_{b,m}$  *zero-pattern* matrix  $Z^{(m)}(A)$  for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_m^{\sigma_3}$ . This matrix captures the transitions in the Markovian dynamics of the *bounded* species in  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$ , over the set  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$ , when the *free* species in  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(A)$  are abundantly available. Let  $\Omega^{(m)}(A)$  be the reachability matrix (see (5.76)) corresponding to  $Z^{(m)}(A)$  and let  $\Theta^{(m)}(A)$  be the associated equivalence relation on  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  (see (5.77)) whose set of closed communication classes is  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(A)$ .

Once  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(A)$  has been computed for each  $m$ , the set of closed communication classes  $\mathcal{C}(A)$  for the entire network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  is simply given by (5.98) with  $x_f$  replaced by  $A$ . For  $A = F$  we obtain the set  $\mathcal{C}(F)$  which allows us to construct all possible CISSs for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  (see Definition 5.9). Note that identifying the CISSs with our new approach is computationally more efficient than the direct approach of Section 5.4 due to the reasons given in Remark 5.19. Pick a CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  for some  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \in \mathcal{C}(F)$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3}$  must have the form

$$\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} = \mathcal{F}_{b,1}^{\sigma_3} \times \mathcal{F}_{b,2}^{\sigma_3} \times \dots \times \mathcal{F}_{b,M}^{\sigma_3},$$

where each  $\mathcal{F}_{b,m}^{\sigma_3}$  belongs to  $\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(F)$ . We now discuss how the irreducibility of CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  can be verified for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  using a modified form of cascade construction.

For any  $A \subset F$  and  $m$ , let  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{(m)}(A)$  be the set of closed communicating classes for relation  $\Theta^{(m)}(A)$  restricted on the set  $\mathcal{F}_{b,m}^{\sigma_2}$  according to (5.79). Pick any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $H_l \subset F$ . For each  $m = 1, \dots, M$ , define the subset  $G_l^{(m)} \subset F$  by (5.80) with  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(H_l)$  replaced by  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{(m)}(A)$  and  $\mathcal{K}(C, H_l)$  restricted to only those reactions that influence the species in the set  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m} \cup \mathcal{D}_f$ . Define the set  $G_l \subset F$  by

$$G_l = \bigcup_{m=1}^M G_l^{(m)}$$

and the set  $H_l$  by (5.81). The set  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(G_l^{(m)})$  of *free* species can be regarded as the  $l$ -th birth cascade for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_m^{\sigma_3}$  and hence  $\mathcal{D}_f^{\sigma_2}(G_l)$  is the  $l$ -th birth cascade for the full network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$ . One can check that this birth cascade is identical to the  $l$ -th birth cascade for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  constructed in Section 5.4.2. However the computational effort needed for constructing this birth cascade can be significantly less with our new approach. This is because instead of computing  $\mathcal{C}(H_l)$  (which requires  $N_b^3 \log_2(N_b)$  operations) we only need to compute  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}^{(m)}(H_l)$  for each  $m$  (which requires  $\sum_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m})$  operations). Since the computation of these communication classes is the major portion of the total computational costs, the gain in efficiency by adopting our new approach is roughly  $\rho_{\text{eff}}$  defined by (5.99).

As before  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  is called *birth-exhaustive* for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  if (4.37) holds with  $\mathcal{D}$  replaced by  $F$ , which essentially means that all the *free* species can be arranged into birth-cascades constructed according to the scheme described above. The criterion for death-exhaustivity of the network is the same as the criterion for birth-exhaustivity of the inverse network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{\text{inv}}^{\sigma_3}$ . The next result gives us a version of Theorem 5.13 which exploits the sparsity in interactions among the *bounded* species and can therefore be computationally much easier to use (see Remark 5.19).

**Theorem 5.20** *Suppose that (5.85) holds and network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  is both birth and death exhaustive for CISS  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$ .*

**Remark 5.21** *Note that this theorem reduces to Theorem 5.13 when the total number of interaction classes ( $M$ ) is one and  $\sigma_3$  is the identity permutation on the set  $\{1, \dots, (d_f + d_b)\}$ . Moreover if  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_3}$  then for  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} = \tilde{P}_{\sigma_3}^T \mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_3}$ , the set  $\mathcal{F}_b^{\sigma_2} \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  is an irreducible state-space for network  $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}^{\sigma_2}$  (see Proposition 3.5), where  $\tilde{P}_{\sigma_3}^T$  is the  $d_b \times d_b$  matrix consisting of the first  $d_b$  rows and columns of the permutation matrix  $P_{\sigma_3}^T$ . Remark (5.15) explains how the corresponding irreducible state-space for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  can be obtained.*

**Proof.** The proof of this result is essentially the same as that of Theorem 5.13. The main difference is that we can deal with one interaction class as a time because the sets of reactions that influence the *bounded* species in different interaction classes are mutually exclusive.  $\square$

We now return to the  $n$ -gene version of the gene expression network in Example 5.18, that we discussed at the start of this section. For this network the state-space for the dynamics of *bounded* species is  $\mathcal{E}_b = \mathcal{E}^n$  where  $\mathcal{E} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Hence  $N_b = |\mathcal{E}_b| = 2^n$  and as explained above, if we apply Theorem 5.13 then each cascade construction would need roughly  $N_b^3 \log_2(N_b) = 2^{3n} n = 8^n n$  operations. On the other hand, if we use the approach of this section then we have  $M = n$  interaction classes, and the *bounded* species in each interaction class have state-space  $\mathcal{E} = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\}$ . Therefore for each  $m = 1, \dots, M$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{b,m} = \mathcal{E}$  and  $N_{b,m} = |\mathcal{E}_{b,m}| = 2$ , which shows that each cascade construction would require roughly  $\sum_{m=1}^M N_{b,m}^3 \log_2(N_{b,m}) = 8n$  operations. This corresponds to the efficiency factor of  $\rho_{\text{eff}} = 8^{n-1}$  (see (5.99)) which can be huge even if  $n$  is moderately large. Hence this example illustrates that for big networks with many *bounded* species, application of Theorem 5.21 can be computationally much easier than application of Theorem 5.13.

## 6 Biological Examples

**Example 6.1 (Genetic toggle switch)** Consider the network of a synthetic toggle switch given in [14]. This network has two species  $\mathbf{S}_1 = \mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_2 = \mathcal{V}$  that interact through the following four reactions



These reactions are numbered 1, 2, 3, 4 in the order they appear above. The propensity functions for these 4 reactions are given by

$$\lambda_1(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\alpha_1}{1 + x_2^\beta}, \quad \lambda_2(x_1, x_2) = x_1, \quad \lambda_3(x_1, x_2) = \frac{\alpha_2}{1 + x_1^\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_4(x_1, x_2) = x_2,$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$  and  $\gamma$  are certain positive parameter values. Note that this network satisfies Assumption 3.1 even though certain propensity functions do not have the mass-action form (3.22). Moreover this network has no conservation relations and hence there are no *bounded* or *restricted* species, and so the results from Section 4 are applicable. One can check that this network is both birth and death exhaustive because the first birth and death cascades are  $B_1 = D_1 = \{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}\}$ . Condition (4.41) is also satisfied and hence by Theorem 4.6 we can conclude that  $\mathbb{N}_0^2$  is the unique irreducible state-space for the network.

**Example 6.2 (Circadian clock network)** We now consider the example of a circadian clock oscillator described in [42]. It has 9 species  $\mathbf{S}_1, \dots, \mathbf{S}_9$  and 16 reactions given in the table below.

No.	Reaction	No.	Reaction
1	$\mathbf{S}_6 + \mathbf{S}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_7$	9	$\mathbf{S}_2 \longrightarrow \emptyset$
2	$\mathbf{S}_7 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_6 + \mathbf{S}_2$	10	$\mathbf{S}_9 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_9 + \mathbf{S}_3$
3	$\mathbf{S}_8 + \mathbf{S}_2 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_9$	11	$\mathbf{S}_8 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_8 + \mathbf{S}_3$
4	$\mathbf{S}_9 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_8 + \mathbf{S}_2$	12	$\mathbf{S}_3 \longrightarrow \emptyset$
5	$\mathbf{S}_7 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_7 + \mathbf{S}_1$	13	$\mathbf{S}_3 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_3 + \mathbf{S}_4$
6	$\mathbf{S}_6 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_6 + \mathbf{S}_1$	14	$\mathbf{S}_4 \longrightarrow \emptyset$
7	$\mathbf{S}_1 \longrightarrow \emptyset$	15	$\mathbf{S}_2 + \mathbf{S}_4 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_5$
8	$\mathbf{S}_1 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_1 + \mathbf{S}_2$	16	$\mathbf{S}_5 \longrightarrow \mathbf{S}_4$

This network  $\mathcal{N}$  has two independent conservation relations given by  $\gamma_1 = e_6 + e_7$  and  $\gamma_2 = e_8 + e_9$ , where  $e_i$  is the  $i$ -th standard basis vector in  $\mathbb{R}^9$ . Let  $\Gamma = \text{Col}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$  and  $c = (1, 1)$ . We define  $(\Gamma, c)$  to be the conservation data for this network, thereby indicating that throughout the dynamics, the sum of the copy-numbers of species  $\mathbf{S}_6$  and  $\mathbf{S}_7$  is 1, and the sum of the copy-numbers of species  $\mathbf{S}_8$  and  $\mathbf{S}_9$  is also 1. The species  $\mathbf{S}_6$  and  $\mathbf{S}_7$  correspond to the *bound* and the *unbound* form of an activator gene, while the species  $\mathbf{S}_8$  and  $\mathbf{S}_9$  correspond to the *bound* and the *unbound* form of a promotor gene. Therefore our conservation data  $(\Gamma, c)$  implies that a single copy of both these genes is present which can either exist in *bound* or *unbound* form.

Due to the conservation relations, the species in the set  $\mathcal{D}_b = \{6, 7, 8, 9\}$  are *bounded* while the rest of the species  $\mathcal{D}_f = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  are *free*. There are no *restricted* species in this network. Let  $\sigma : \{1, \dots, 9\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, 9\}$  be the permutation map defined by  $\sigma(1) = 6, \sigma(2) = 7, \sigma(3) = 8, \sigma(4) = 9$  and  $\sigma(i) = (i - 4)$  for  $i = 5, 6, 7, 8$  and 9. We will consider network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  under permutation  $\sigma$ . Observe that the state-space for the four *bounded* species is  $\mathcal{E}_b^\sigma = \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$  where  $\mathcal{E} = \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$ . Hence the set  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma = \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathbb{N}_0^5$  is a *maximal* state-space for the network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$ . One can check that this network has no *absorbing sets* and  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma$  is the only CISS for the network (see Definition 5.9).

We will use the approach of Section 5.5 to check if  $\mathcal{E}_0^\sigma$  is irreducible. Note that the species  $\mathbf{S}_6$  and  $\mathbf{S}_7$  do not directly interact with species  $\mathbf{S}_8$  and  $\mathbf{S}_9$ , i.e. there is no reaction involving species from both the sets  $\mathcal{D}_{b,1} = \{6, 7\}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{b,2} = \{8, 9\}$ . Hence  $\mathcal{D}_{b,1}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{b,2}$  are two interaction classes that partition the set  $\mathcal{D}_b$  of *bounded* species. The dynamics of the two *bounded* species in each interaction class  $\mathcal{D}_{b,m}$  will only induce one closed equivalence class, which is either  $\mathcal{E}$  or  $\{(1, 0)\}$  depending on whether species  $\mathbf{S}_2$  is *abundantly available* or not. In other words for any  $A \subset F = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  and each  $m = 1, 2$  we have

$$\mathcal{C}^{(m)}(A) = \begin{bmatrix} \{\mathcal{E}\} & \text{if } 2 \in A \\ \{(1, 0)\} & \text{otherwise} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6.100)$$

Using (6.100) we now construct the birth cascades for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  as in Section 5.5. One can check that  $B_1^{(1)} = \{1\}$  and  $B_1^{(2)} = \{3\}$  and hence the first birth cascade is  $B_1 = B_1^{(1)} \cup B_1^{(2)} = \{1, 3\}$ . Similarly the second and third birth cascades are  $B_2 = \{2, 4\}$  and  $B_3 = \{5\}$  implying that network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  is *birth-exhaustive* because  $\mathcal{D}_f = B_1 \cup B_2 \cup B_3$ . Performing this cascade construction for the inverse network  $\mathcal{N}_{\text{inv}}^\sigma$  we find that the first two death cascades for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  are  $D_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  and  $D_2 = \{5\}$  implying that network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$  is also *death-exhaustive* because  $\mathcal{D}_f = D_1 \cup D_2$ . Since condition (5.85) is satisfied, using Theorem 5.20, Remark 5.21 and Remark 5.17, we can conclude that  $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathbb{N}_0^5 \times \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$  is the unique irreducible state-space for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$ .

**Example 6.3 (Explicit computation of the stationary distribution)** We mentioned in Section 2.2 that for a large class of reaction networks, the unique stationary distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  corresponding to any irreducible state-space  $\mathcal{E}$ , has the product form (2.19) (see Theorem 4.3 in [3]), where the normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}}$  (2.20) can be evaluated by computing a sum over all the states in  $\mathcal{E}$ . This suggests that in order to practically apply the results in [3], we need to deal with a couple of challenging issues. Firstly we must be able to find the irreducible state-spaces  $\mathcal{E}$  and secondly we should be able to evaluate the summation needed for computing the normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}}$ . Note that the second issue is nontrivial because for most networks  $\mathcal{E}$  will be countably infinite, and replacing the infinite sum in (2.20) by a truncated finite sum may lead to errors that are hard to quantify. We now discuss how the results in this paper can help in overcoming these practical challenges.

Consider a conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  with  $d$  species. Suppose that this network has no *restricted* species and using Theorem 5.13 or 5.20 we can find an irreducible state-space of the form  $\mathcal{E}^\sigma = \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  for the permuted conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^\sigma, \Gamma_\sigma, c)$  with respect to some permutation  $\sigma$ . Here  $d_f$  is the number of *free* species,  $\mathcal{F}_b^\sigma$  is a finite subset of  $\mathbb{N}_0^{d_b}$  and  $d_b = (d - d_f)$  is the number of *bounded* species. If network  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.3 in [3], then the same will be true for network  $\mathcal{N}^\sigma$ , and using this result we can conclude that the stationary distribution  $\pi_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}^\sigma)$  has the product form (2.19). Moreover the corresponding normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}^\sigma}$  can be easily computed since the form  $\mathcal{E}^\sigma = \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma \times \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}$  of the state-space allows us to substitute the infinite sum in (2.20) by a finite sum (6.101) as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\mathcal{E}^\sigma}^{-1} &= \sum_{x=(y,z) \in \mathcal{E}^\sigma} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{c_i^{x_i}}{x_i!} e^{-c_i} = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{d_b} \frac{c_i^{y_i}}{y_i!} e^{-c_i} \right) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{d_f} \frac{\tilde{c}_j^{z_j}}{z_j!} e^{-\tilde{c}_j} \right) \\
&= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{d_b} \frac{c_i^{y_i}}{y_i!} e^{-c_i} \right) \left( \sum_{z \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_f}} \prod_{j=1}^{d_f} \frac{\tilde{c}_j^{z_j}}{z_j!} e^{-\tilde{c}_j} \right) \\
&= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{d_b} \frac{c_i^{y_i}}{y_i!} e^{-c_i} \right) \left[ \prod_{j=1}^{d_f} \left( \sum_{z_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{c}_j^{z_j}}{z_j!} e^{-\tilde{c}_j} \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{F}_b^\sigma} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{d_b} \frac{c_i^{y_i}}{y_i!} e^{-c_i} \right), \tag{6.101}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{c}_j = c_{d_b+j}$  and we have used the following equality in arriving at the last expression

$$\sum_{z_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{c}_j^{z_j}}{z_j!} e^{-\tilde{c}_j} = 1.$$

Once the normalizing constant  $M_{\mathcal{E}^\sigma}$  has been evaluated using the finite sum (6.101), the product form stationary distribution  $\pi_\sigma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}^\sigma)$  can be easily computed. Thereafter from Proposition 3.5 we can conclude that the state-space  $\mathcal{E} = P_\sigma^T \mathcal{E}^\sigma$  is irreducible for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  and the corresponding stationary distribution  $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$  is given by

$$\pi(x) = \pi_\sigma(P_\sigma x),$$

where  $P_\sigma$  is the permutation matrix defined in Section 3.3. Note that even though all the species are dynamically interacting, the product form of the stationary distribution implies that at stationarity, the distribution of copy-numbers of each *free* species is independent of the rest of the species. Obtaining such interesting insights is yet another application of our results.

In some examples our method can compute *all the irreducible state-spaces* for the conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}^\sigma, \Gamma_\sigma, c)$  (see Remark 5.17). If these state-spaces are given by  $\{\mathcal{E}_q^\sigma : q = 1, \dots, Q\}$  then all the state-spaces for the original conservation network  $(\mathcal{N}, \Gamma, c)$  are  $\{\mathcal{E}_q = P_\sigma^T \mathcal{E}_q^\sigma : q = 1, \dots, Q\}$ . We can compute the stationary distribution  $\pi_q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E}_q)$  for each  $q$  as demonstrated above, and then we can obtain all possible stationary distributions using relationship (2.21). This shows that for certain networks our method can help in finding all the stationary distributions corresponding to its stochastic model.

## References

- [1] U. Alon. *An introduction to systems biology : design principles of biological circuits*. Chapman & Hall/CRC mathematical and computational biology series. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (Fla.), 2007. 1
- [2] D. Anderson and T. Kurtz. Continuous time Markov chain models for chemical reaction networks. In H. Koepl, G. Setti, M. di Bernardo, and D. Densmore, editors, *Design and Analysis of Biomolecular Circuits*. Springer-Verlag, 2011. 1
- [3] D. F. Anderson, G. Craciun, and T. G. Kurtz. Product-form stationary distributions for deficiency zero chemical reaction networks. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 72(8):1947–1970, 2010. 2.2, 2.2, 6.3
- [4] A. P. Arkin, C. V. Rao, and D. M. Wolf. Control, exploitation and tolerance of intracellular noise. *Nature*, 420:231–237, 2002. 1
- [5] J. Bascompte. Structure and dynamics of ecological networks. *Science*, 329(5993):765–766, 2010. 1
- [6] S. I. Berger and R. Iyengar. Network analyses in systems pharmacology. *Bioinformatics*, 25(19):2466–2472, 2009. 1
- [7] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2004. 1, 2
- [8] C. Briat, A. Gupta, and M. Khammash. A new motif for robust perfect adaptation in noisy biomolecular networks. *ArXiv*, 2015. 1, 2.2
- [9] Y. Cao, D. T. Gillespie, and L. R. Petzold. Efficient step size selection for the tau-leaping simulation method. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 124(4), 2006. 1
- [10] H. Cohen. *A course in computational algebraic number theory*, volume 138 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993. 3
- [11] T. Cormen, C. Leiserson, R. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, New York, second edition, 2003. 5.6
- [12] M. B. Elowitz, A. J. Levine, E. D. Siggia, and P. S. Swain. Stochastic gene expression in a single cell. *Science*, 297(5584):1183–1186, 2002. 1
- [13] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes : Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics: Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1986. 2, 2, 1
- [14] T. S. Gardner, C. R. Cantor, and J. J. Collins. Construction of a genetic toggle switch in escherichia coli. *Nature*, 403(6767):339–342, 2000. 1, 6.1
- [15] D. T. Gillespie. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry*, 81(25):2340–2361, 1977. 1, 2

- [16] D. T. Gillespie. A rigorous derivation of the chemical master equation. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 188(13):404–425, 1992. [1](#), [2](#)
- [17] D. T. Gillespie. Approximate accelerated stochastic simulation of chemically reacting systems. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 115(4):1716–1733, 2001. [1](#)
- [18] J. Goutsias. Classical versus stochastic kinetics modeling of biochemical reaction systems. *Biophysical Journal*, 92(7):2350–2365, 2007. [1](#), [3.1](#)
- [19] G. R. Grimmett and D. R. Stirzaker. *Probability and random processes*. Oxford University Press, New York, third edition, 2001. [2.1](#)
- [20] A. Gupta, C. Briat, and M. Khammash. A scalable computational framework for establishing long-term behavior of stochastic reaction networks. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 10(6):e1003669, 06 2014. [1](#), [2](#), [2.2](#)
- [21] A. Gupta and M. Khammash. Determining the long-term behavior of cell populations: A new procedure for detecting ergodicity in large stochastic reaction networks. In *Proceedings of the 19th IFAC World Congress*, 2014. [1](#)
- [22] H. Hethcote. The mathematics of infectious diseases. *SIAM Review*, 42(4):599–653, 2000. [1](#)
- [23] O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability*. Probability and its Applications (New York). Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002. [2.2](#)
- [24] V. Kazeev, M. Khammash, M. Nip, and C. Schwab. Direct solution of the chemical master equation using quantized tensor trains. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 10(3):e1003359, 03 2014. [1](#)
- [25] J. P. Keener and J. Sneyd. *Mathematical physiology*, volume Interdisciplinary applied mathematics. Springer, 2009. [3.1](#)
- [26] J. G. Kemeny and J. L. Snell. *Finite Markov chains*. The University Series in Undergraduate Mathematics. D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N.J.-Toronto-London-New York, 1960. [1](#), [5.4](#), [5.4.1](#), [5.4.2](#)
- [27] T. G. Kurtz. The relationship between stochastic and deterministic models for chemical reactions. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 57(7):2976–2978, 1972. [1](#)
- [28] T. G. Kurtz. Strong approximation theorems for density dependent Markov chains. *Stochastic Processes Appl.*, 6(3):223–240, 1977/78. [1](#)
- [29] H. H. McAdams and A. Arkin. Stochastic mechanisms in gene expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci., Biochemistry*, 94:814–819, 1997. [1](#)
- [30] H. H. McAdams and A. Arkin. It’s a noisy business! Genetic regulation at the nanomolar scale. *Trends in genetics : TIG*, 15(2):65–69, Feb. 1999. [1](#)
- [31] S. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. *Markov chains and stochastic stability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2009. With a prologue by Peter W. Glynn. [1](#), [2](#), [2.2](#)
- [32] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie. Stability of Markovian processes. III. Foster-Lyapunov criteria for continuous-time processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 25(3):518–548, 1993. [1](#), [2](#), [2](#)
- [33] B. Munsky and M. Khammash. The finite state projection algorithm for the solution of the chemical master equation. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 124(4), 2006. [1](#)
- [34] J. R. Norris. *Markov chains*, volume 2 of *Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. Reprint of 1997 original. [1](#), [2](#), [2.1](#), [2.2](#), [2.2](#)
- [35] J. A. Papin, T. Hunter, B. O. Palsson, and S. Subramaniam. Reconstruction of cellular signalling networks and analysis of their properties. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*, 6(2):99–111, 02 2005. [1](#)

- [36] L. Pauleve, G. Craciun, and H. Koepl. Dynamical properties of discrete reaction networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, pages 1–18, 2013. [1](#), [4.2](#), [5.4.2](#)
- [37] S. Schnell and C. Mendoza. Closed form solution for time-dependent enzyme kinetics. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 187(2):207 – 212, 1997. [3.1](#)
- [38] R. Schuetz, N. Zamboni, M. Zampieri, M. Heinemann, and U. Sauer. Multidimensional optimality of microbial metabolism. *Science*, 336(6081):601–604, 2012. [1](#)
- [39] P. Smadbeck and Y. Kaznessis. Stochastic model reduction using a modified hill-type kinetic rate law. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 137(23), 12 2012. [3.1](#)
- [40] M. Thattai and A. van Oudenaarden. Intrinsic noise in gene regulatory networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(15):8614–8619, 2001. [1](#), [4.8](#)
- [41] N. G. van Kampen. A power series expansion of the master equation. *Canadian Journal of Physics*, 39(4):551–567, 1961. [1](#)
- [42] J. M. G. Vilar, H. Y. Kueh, N. Barkai, and S. Leibler. Mechanisms of noise-resistance in genetic oscillator. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 99(9):5988–5992, 2002. [1](#), [6.2](#)