

Limiting energy dissipation induces glassy kinetics in single cell high precision responses

Jayajit Das

Battelle Center for Mathematical Medicine, The Research Institute at the Nationwide Children's Hospital, and, the departments of Pediatrics, and, Physics, the Biophysics Program, the Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43205

Single cells often generate precise responses by involving dissipative out-of-thermodynamic equilibrium processes in signaling networks. The available free energy to fuel these processes could become limited depending on the metabolic state of an individual cell. How does limiting dissipation affect the kinetics of high precision responses in single cells? I address this question in the context of a kinetic proofreading scheme used in a simple model of early time T cell signaling. I show using exact analytical calculations and numerical simulations that limiting dissipation qualitatively changes the kinetics in single cells marked by emergence of slow kinetics, large cell-to-cell variations of copy numbers, temporally correlated stochastic events (dynamic facilitation), and, ergodicity breaking. Thus, constraints in energy dissipation, in addition to negatively affecting ligand discrimination in T cells, create a fundamental difficulty in interpreting single cell kinetics from cell population level results found in the literature regarding the connection between high precision responses and dissipation.

Introduction

Living systems generate surprisingly precise responses in noisy environments(1-5). For example, T cells, a major orchestrator of adaptive immunity in jawed vertebrates, can distinguish few pathogenic ligands from thousands of self-ligands expressed on the surface of antigen presenting cells (APCs) with exquisite sensitivity(2, 6). This high precision is achieved by involvement of (free) energy dissipating thermodynamic non-equilibrium processes in the discrimination program(7, 8).

However, the amount of energy (e.g., the ATP pool) available for high precision responses can widely vary depending on other functions a multitasking cell attempts to execute simultaneously(9, 10). For example, similar to the Warburg effect in tumor cells, effector T cells opt for a less efficient ATP producing glucose metabolism compared to memory or naïve T cells to prioritize cell proliferation(10). The availability of energy has been observed to critically affect cell signaling and the ensuing cell activation in T cells as well as in other cells(11).

The mechanistic details regarding how variation of energy supply affects energy consuming responses in single cells are not well understood. In a population of cells, relation between energy dissipation, and, speed and error of a high precision response such as kinetic proof reading (KPR) (7, 8, 12) or chemotaxis(4) has been investigated in mathematical models. These studies suffer from two major drawbacks: (1) It is unclear to what extent the results obtained at the level of cell populations will generalize to single cells as single cell responses could widely vary due to the intrinsic stochastic fluctuations in biochemical reactions and cell-to-cell variations of total protein abundances(1). (2) Some of these studies are carried out at the steady states of the kinetics, and since energy restriction could slow down the kinetics, the steady state results might not apply to a biologically realistic time scale. I address the above issues here in the context of a KPR model of ligand discrimination in single immune cells (T cells) and demonstrate that the single cell responses in the dissipation limited case are fundamentally different than their counterparts with unrestricted dissipation.

This concept of KPR, originally proposed by Hopfield(3) and Ninio(5), was applied by McKeithan(6) to explain the remarkably sensitive antigen discrimination property of immune cells such as T and B cells. These cells are able to distinguish between close enough antigens whose half-lives differ only by few seconds. A key biochemical step in McKeithan's scheme is that upon ligand (antigen) unbinding from the receptor any activated state of the receptor is reset to the neutral state (Fig. 1A). While this step increases the sensitivity of the response it also breaks detailed balance and requires a constant supply of (free) energy that is dissipated away to sustain a non-vanishing probability current in the biochemical network.

The dissipation of energy in systems functioning outside equilibrium can be quantified by the rate of entropy production in an ensemble of stochastic trajectories generated by microscopic processes(13-16). Seifert extended this formalism for single stochastic trajectories that could represent time evolution of copy numbers of proteins/lipids due to biochemical signaling reactions in single cells(17). I investigated the role of limiting energy dissipation in a minimal model involving a KPR scheme for ligand discrimination in single T cells using semi-analytical calculations and continuous time Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. I specifically investigated cases with a fixed or a growing pool of medium entropy, representing situations with a fixed or a rate limited energy pool available for dissipation, respectively. The results showed limiting dissipation in the KPR scheme in individual cells is marked by emergence of slow kinetics, large cell-to-cell variations of signaling kinetics, dynamic facilitation(18), and, ergodicity breaking(19). This reveals a novel mechanism for emergence of glassy kinetics in non-equilibrium systems. Moreover, these results imply a fundamental disconnect regarding the nature of the signaling kinetics in a dissipation limited situation between single cells and its cell population averaged counterpart. The emergent kinetics bears an interesting similarity to that in facilitated models for glass formers (e.g., supercooled liquids) below the glass transition temperature(18). The results are likely to generalize in a large variety of non-equilibrium systems where kinetic constraints in the dynamics are imposed by limiting dissipation.

Model

The minimal model describes early time signaling kinetics in a single T cell (Fig. 1A). In the model, membrane bound T cell receptors (TCRs) interact with antigens or peptide-Major Histocompatibility Complex (pMHC) molecules on APCs with an affinity characterized by the binding (k_{on}) and unbinding rate (k_{off}). A single TCR (T) binds to a pMHC molecule (M) to form a complex, TM. The complex TM could transition to an activated state TM^* . The reaction, $TM \rightarrow TM^*$, represents kinase mediated phosphorylation of the tyrosine residues in motifs of amino acids (also known as ITAMs) associated with TCRs. The deactivation reaction, $TM^* \rightarrow TM$, is executed by phosphatases. Both the activation (occurs at a rate k_p) and deactivation (occurs at a rate k_d) transitions are assumed to be first order reactions where the action of kinases and phosphatases are accounted for implicitly. A key step proposed by McKeithan, which I will call the kinetic proofreading (KPR) step leads to complete deactivation of the activated complex TM^* (occurs with a rate k_{off}') upon ligand unbinding, i.e., $TM^* \rightarrow T+M$. Unless mentioned, I will assume $k_{off}' = k_{off}$. In order to keep the entropy calculations finite, a transition $T+M \rightarrow TM$ (rate k_1) is assumed to occur at a much larger time scale than any biologically realistic time scale. I will designate the above model sans the KPR step as the non-KPR (NKPR) model hereafter. For a range of parameters, the concentration of TM^* at the steady state of the deterministic mass-action kinetics in the above KPR model varies as $(1/k_{off})^2$ as opposed to $1/k_{off}$ in the NKPR model. Thus, the KPR step endows the model with a higher discriminatory power for selecting the higher affinity pathogen derived peptide ligands from the low affinity naturally occurring ligands (self-ligands) in the host.

Kinetics and dissipation

The biochemical kinetics of the copy numbers of the molecular species in the model is subject to intrinsic stochastic fluctuations arising due to the thermal noise(1). I will consider the molecules to be well mixed in a small volume ($1\mu m^2$ (plasma membrane area) \times $0.01\mu m$ (depth in the cytosol)) in the membrane proximal region, which is a reasonable approximation. The stochastic kinetics of the biochemical reactions is

described by the Master equation (Eq. (1)) in terms of the conditional probability distribution $P(i,t|i_0,0)$ (denoted as $P_i(t)$ from now on for brevity) which is the probability for the system to be in the state i at time t given the system started at the state i_0 at time $t=0$. $P_i(t)$ follows the kinetics below(16):

$$\frac{dP_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j(j \neq i)} [w_j^i P_j(t) - w_i^j P_i(t)] \quad (1)$$

where, w_j^i is the rate of the transition $i \rightarrow j$. I will follow a notation scheme where the system always transitions top \rightarrow bottom, i.e., from the state in the superscript to that in the subscript. In the model, any state i is specified by a pair of numbers N_{TM} and N_{T^*M} , denoting copy numbers of the species TM and T^*M , respectively. The copy numbers of other two species T and M are related to N_{TM} and N_{T^*M} via the total numbers of TCRs (N_{T0}) and MHCs (N_{M0}) in the model, i.e., $N_{T0} = N_T + N_{TM} + N_{T^*M}$ and $N_{M0} = N_M + N_{TM} + N_{T^*M}$. Since, N_{T0} and N_{M0} do not change in the biochemical reactions, the stochastic kinetics in the model can be represented by a continuous time random walker (CTRW) (20) moving on a two dimensional square lattice of lattice spacing unity where a lattice point (n,m) denotes the state with $N_{TM} = n$ and $N_{T^*M} = m$. When a reaction occurs, the random walker instantaneously steps to one of the four neighboring sites from the current site (n,m) . The walker waits for a duration τ at the current site (n,m) before taking the step where the values of the waiting time τ are drawn from a continuous probability distribution function determined by Eq. (1). A particular stochastic trajectory in the CTRW model describes the kinetics of the molecular species in a single cell, and, since I assume the total numbers of TCRs and pMHCs do not change from cell to cell, averaging over an ensemble of stochastic trajectories (denoted by the angular brackets, $\langle \dots \rangle$, hereafter) also implies averaging over a cell population which is the same as averaging over $P(i,t|i_0,0)$ when the cell population contains a large number of single cells. The CTRW representation will be utilized later for analyzing stochastic trajectories from MC simulations.

The energy dissipation is characterized by the entropy production in the kinetics. The system entropy is defined as, $S_{\text{sys}} = -\sum_i P_i(t)\ln[P_i(t)]$, where the sum over i also denotes a sum over single cells in a cell population (or an ensemble of stochastic trajectories). S_{sys} follows the kinetics(13, 16)

$$\frac{dS_{\text{sys}}(t)}{dt} = -\underbrace{\sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}} w_i^j P_j \ln\left(\frac{w_j^i P_i}{w_i^j P_j}\right)}_{\frac{dS_{\text{total}}}{dt}} - \underbrace{\sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}} w_i^j P_j \ln\left(\frac{w_j^i}{w_i^j}\right)}_{\frac{dS_{\text{med}}}{dt}} = \frac{dS_{\text{total}}}{dt} - \frac{dS_{\text{med}}}{dt} \quad (2)$$

According to Eq. (2), the entropy S_{total} never decreases, i.e., $dS_{\text{total}}/dt \geq 0$, and thus quantifies dissipation in the system. In the steady state, $dS_{\text{sys}}/dt=0$, and, consequently, $dS_{\text{total}}/dt=dS_{\text{med}}/dt$. dS_{med}/dt denotes the rate of entropy exchange between the system and the reservoir. Dissipative systems (e.g., the minimal model with the KPR step) receive entropy from the reservoir at a fixed rate (i.e., $dS_{\text{med}}/dt \approx v > 0$) in the steady state to maintain a constant probability current. In contrast, $dS_{\text{med}}/dt=0$ at the steady state in the NKPR model due to the vanishing steady state probability current in the absence of the KPR step. Thus, the steady state kinetics in the NKPR state is dissipationless, i.e., $dS_{\text{total}}/dt=0$. Following Seifert(15), it is possible to construct different entropies for single stochastic trajectories or kinetics in single cells that correspond to, S_{total} , S_{med} , and, S_{sys} , defined above. Due to the relevance of the medium entropy (S_{med}) in characterizing dissipation in a cell population I will focus on the entropy exchanges for single cells or single stochastic trajectories. For a sequence of N biochemical reaction events in a time interval t the total amount of medium entropy that flows into the system from the reservoir is given by(15),

$$Q(t) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \Delta S_{m_{i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha}} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \ln\left(\frac{w_{i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha}}{w_{j_\alpha}^{i_\alpha}}\right), \quad (3)$$

where, the α th stochastic transition, $j_\alpha \rightarrow i_\alpha$, occurring at time t_α is associated with an entropy flow, $\Delta S_{m_{i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha}} = \ln(w_{i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha} / w_{j_\alpha}^{i_\alpha})$, from the reservoir to the system. $\Delta S_{m_{i_\alpha}^{j_\alpha}}$ will be denoted by ΔS_i^j from now on. $Q(t)$ in Eq. (3) is also a stochastic variable that varies

between stochastic trajectories or single cells and will be used to quantify dissipation in a single trajectory or a single cell.


The joint probability distribution, $\phi(i,Q,t|i_0,0,0)$, (denoted as $\phi_i(Q,t)$ hereafter) describes the conditional probability of the system to be at the state i at time t , after taking Q amount of medium entropy from the reservoir in the time interval t , starting at $t=0$ from the state i_0 and a state of zero entropy exchange. $\phi_i(Q,t)$ follows the equation(13),

$$\frac{\partial \phi_i(Q,t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{j(\neq i)} [w_i^j \phi_j(Q - \Delta s_i^j, t) - w_j^i \phi_i(Q, t)] \quad (4)$$

Eq (4) can be used to monitor the kinetics of entropy exchanges in individual cells in a cell population. I investigated dissipation limited situations where the entropy exchange required for carrying out the stochastic transition become restricted. I consider two scenarios: (i) the total amount of entropy (E) available for exchange with the reservoir is fixed. This represents a situation where the total amount of energy available for dissipation is fixed. (ii) E increases at a fixed rate which is lower than that required to maintain the probability current in the steady state of Eq. (1). Under these constraints the system cannot make a transition $j \rightarrow i$ if that leads to crossing of E , i.e., $\phi(i,Q,t|j,Q-Q',t-\tau)=0$ when $Q > E(t)$. This particular reaction ($j \rightarrow i$) is then replaced by a different reaction ($j \rightarrow k$) satisfying $Q \leq E(t)$. Thus, the dissipation limit E imposes a reflecting boundary condition(21) at $Q=E$ in Eq. (4). It is possible to solve Eq. (4) under this boundary condition exactly semi-analytically for simple cases when E is a constant, however, for large number of receptors and ligands or a time dependent E , such calculations become intractable. A continuous time MC method, akin to the standard Gillespie method (22), was developed to simulate stochastic trajectories in these cases.

An exactly solvable case: Consider a single TCR interacting with a pMHC in the minimal model. The signaling kinetics then involves first order transition between three different

states representing the unbound TCR and pMHC (state T_1), the TCR-pMHC complex (state T_2), and, the activated TCR-pMHC complex (state T_3). The biochemical reactions are described by,



This simple example is amenable to analytical calculations and provides valuable insights into the kinetics in the dissipation limited case. The probabilities $P_1(t)$, $P_2(t)$, and $P_3(t)$ for this example can be calculated exactly by solving Eq. (1) and the mean value and the higher order moments of Q can be calculated analytically or semi-analytically at all times using Eq.(4) (web supplement). As expected, at the steady

state, $P_3(t \rightarrow \infty) \sim 1/(k_{\text{off}})^2$ for weak affinity ligands ($k_{\text{off}} \gg k_{\text{on}}$, $k_{\text{off}} \gg k_d$) and $k_p > k_d$. The average rate of dissipation ($d\langle Q(t) \rangle / dt$) in the steady state is a constant and shows a peak

at intermediate values of k_{off} ($\sim \sqrt{k_d k_{\text{on}}}$) (web supplement). The ligand discrimination costs more energy at intermediate k_{off} values because system executes the KPR step more frequently compared to the low affinity or high affinity ligands. This also implies that the ligands with intermediate values of k_{off} will arrive at a dissipation limit faster than the other ligand affinities. Eq. (4) with a reflective boundary condition at $Q=E=\text{const}$ was analyzed with two goals in mind: (i) Find the general structure of the equation (equivalent of Eq. (4)) that the system should satisfy under this condition. This can be further used to formulate a continuous time MC method (or Gillespie's method) to simulate stochastic trajectories in dissipation limited cases. (ii) Explore if any non-trivial behavior emerges even in this simple set up.

Analysis of Eq. (4) in the presence of a reflective boundary condition at $Q(t)=E$ showed that imposing the boundary condition for a system at a state (j, Q) at time t , is the same as setting the transition rates ($\{w_{i,j}^j\}$) to zero when those transitions $\{j \rightarrow i'\}$ lead to the

crossing of the dissipation limit E (web supplement). It is easy to construct a continuous time MC method following Gillespie's algorithm(22) to simulate stochastic trajectories in this situation (see Materials and Methods section). The comparison between the exact solution of Eq. (4) with reflective boundary conditions at two boundaries $Q=E_1$ and $Q=E_2$ and the Monte Carlo simulations showed an excellent agreement (Fig 1B).

Results

Arrested states arise when dissipation is limited. Analysis of Eq. (4) for the case of a single TCR and a single pMHC with a fixed dissipation limit at $Q=E$ shows the presence of arrested states in the kinetics, where, the system becomes confined to single state (e.g., state 1) or multiple states (e.g., states 1 and 2) for a very long time ($\sim 1/k_1$). The specific nature of the arrested state and the time when it occurs depend on the values of the rate constants and the dissipation limit E . The physical origin of the arrested states is discussed below (Fig. 1C). Suppose, the system reaches the energy dissipation limit ($Q=E$) when it arrives at state 1 at time t . The value of t will particularly depend on how often the KPR step was executed in stochastic trajectory before it reached the limit because this step induces a non-zero probability current flow in the kinetics and its execution requires a much larger entropy flow ($\ln(k_{\text{off}}/k_1)$) compared to the other transitions for a biologically relevant model ($k_1 \ll (k_{\text{off}}, k_{\text{on}}, k_p, k_d)$). The possible transitions at state 1, $1 \rightarrow 2$ and $1 \rightarrow 3$, will need entropy flows to the system, $\Delta s^1_2 = \ln(k_{\text{on}}/k_{\text{off}})$ and $\Delta s^1_3 = \ln(k_1/k_{\text{off}})$, respectively. Since, $k_1 \ll k_{\text{off}}$, $\Delta s^1_3 < 0$, the system can release entropy to the reservoir and move below the dissipation limit E by executing the reaction $1 \rightarrow 3$, however, the probability for this event to occur within a time scale of $1/k_1$ is very small. In the time scale of $1/k_1$, which can be much longer than any time scale of biological or physical interest, different scenarios can arise for high affinity, and, moderate and low affinity ligands (Fig. 1B). *High affinity ($k_{\text{off}} \leq k_{\text{on}}$) ligands.* Since,

$\Delta s^1_2 > 0$, the transition $1 \rightarrow 2$ cannot occur without crossing the limit at $Q=E$. Thus, the system will remain in state 1 for a time scale of $1/k_1$. *Moderate and low affinity ($k_{\text{off}} \geq k_{\text{on}}$) ligands.* $\Delta s^1_2 < 0$, thus, the transition $1 \rightarrow 2$ could occur without crossing the limit at $Q=E$. However, after the system reaches state 2, the possible transitions, $2 \rightarrow 3$ and $2 \rightarrow 1$, are associated with with entropic flows, $\Delta s^2_3 = \ln(k_p/k_d) > 0$ (since $k_p > k_d$) and $\Delta s^2_1 = -\Delta s^1_2 = -\ln(k_{\text{on}}/k_{\text{off}})$, respectively. When, $\Delta s^2_3 \leq \Delta s^1_2$ or $\ln(k_p/k_d) \leq \ln(k_{\text{on}}/k_{\text{off}})$ or $k_{\text{off}} \leq k_{\text{on}}(k_d/k_p)$, the transition to $2 \rightarrow 3$ can occur without breaching the limit $Q=E$ and the system stays mobile between the states 1,2, and 3, without executing the the KPR step ($3 \rightarrow 1$). However, when $\Delta s^2_3 > \Delta s^1_2$ or $k_{\text{off}} > k_{\text{on}}(k_d/k_p)$, the entropy gain from the previous $1 \rightarrow 2$ transition is not sufficient to support the $2 \rightarrow 3$ transition but can support the $2 \rightarrow 1$ transition, as a result, the system becomes confined between the states 1 and 2. The above described properties of the kinetics are also present when the system reaches the dissipation limit after arriving at other states or there is a small gap between the dissipation limit and $Q(t)$.

How do the properties of the arrested and the mobile states change when there are multiple ligand and receptor molecules? I investigate this question in the next sections using MC simulations of Eq. (4) (see Materials and Methods for details). Interestingly, the results show the kinetics in the KPR model in these situations are similar to that of tagged molecules in models of glass formers at low temperatures marked by temporal clustering of stochastic events describing transitions between mobile and immobile states or dynamic facilitation(18).

Kinetics with a fixed dissipation limit displays dynamic facilitation. First, I studied the case in the presence of a fixed dissipation limit at $Q=E=\text{const.}$. MC simulation of stochastic trajectories showed three key differences with its counterpart without the dissipation limit (Fig. 2A). (i) The kinetics slowed down substantially once the system

reaches the dissipation limit. (ii) Large copy number fluctuations (Fig. 2A and Fig. S1). (iii) Stochastic events in the neighborhood of low and high activation states appeared to be bunched in time. Since, similar kinetic features are also observed in tagged molecules in models of glass formers below the glass transition temperature, I analyzed the above features further by calculating quantities that are frequently used in characterizing kinetics in glass formers(18). I used the CTRW representation of the biochemical stochastic kinetics for this purpose. I calculated the following quantities. (1) The waiting time distribution, $P_w(\tau)$, which is the distribution of the time τ the random walker stays put at any state before making the next jump. $P_w(\tau)$ decays exponentially for a Poisson process. (2) Distributions of the persistence (t_p) and the exchange times (t_x)(23). t_p is the duration an initial state does not change, and, t_x is the time interval between any two subsequent reaction events or random steps in the CTRW model. For a Poisson process $P(t_p)=P(t_x)$. In supercooled liquids, $P(t_p) \neq P(t_x)$ indicates a decoupling between relaxation ($\propto t_p$) and diffusion time scales($\propto t_x$)(24). (3) Correlation ($C(n)$) between subsequent waiting times. $C(n)$ is defined as, $C(n)=\langle 1/M \sum_{m=1}^M \tau_m \tau_{n+m} \rangle - \langle 1/M \sum_{m=1}^M \tau_m \rangle^2$, where, τ_n represents the waiting time at the nth step taken by the random walker. A finite $C(n)$ for $n \neq 0$ would indicate temporally correlated movements (19)or dynamic facilitation. (4) Ensemble averaged mean squared distance, $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$, defined as, $\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \langle (m-m_0)^2 \rangle + \langle (n-n_0)^2 \rangle$, where, the random walker starts from the position $\vec{r}(0) \equiv (m_0, n_0)$ at time $t=0$ and reaches at $\vec{r}(t) \equiv (m, n)$ at time t . $\langle r^2(t) \rangle$ is compared with the time averaged mean squared distance for a single stochastic trajectory

$$\overline{\delta^2(t, T)} = 1/(T-t) \int_0^{T-t} d\tau (\vec{r}(t+\tau) - \vec{r}(\tau))^2. \quad \overline{\delta^2(t, T)} = \langle r^2(t) \rangle \text{ at large } T \text{ implies}$$

equivalence between the time and the ensemble averages or the presence of ergodicity in the system(19, 25). The canonical Brownian motion maintains the above equality(25), however, correlated time steps in CTRW models lead to ergodicity breaking(19).

The calculation showed an exponential decaying $P_w(\tau)$ in the absence of any dissipation limit (Fig. S2). This is expected as the waiting time, τ , at any state in the CTRW is distributed exponentially with a mean value (μ) equal to inverse of the sum of the

propensities of the outgoing transitions, thus, $P_w(\tau)$ for a time interval of t is given by the superposition of exponential distributions with appropriate weights $g(\mu)$, i.e., $\sum_{\mu_{\min}}^{\mu_{\max}} g(\mu)e^{-\mu\tau}$. When $g(\mu)$ does not change with μ appreciably, the smallest μ ($=\mu_{\min}$) makes the largest contribution to the sum producing an exponential form for $P_w(\tau)$. However, in the presence of the dissipation limit the distribution displayed a much slower decay (non-Debye) than the exponential decay. This can occur when $g(\mu)$ varies with μ with a particular form pertaining to hierarchically constrained dynamics(26). The slower decay of $P_w(\tau)$ in the dissipation limited case is a manifestation of increased occurrences of longer waiting times characterizing the slow kinetics. However, the non-Debye exponential form of $P_w(\tau)$ alone does not establish dynamic facilitation or ergodicity breaking in the kinetics.

Calculations showed $P(t_p)=P(t_x)$ in the absence of the dissipation limit demonstrating the equivalence between the time scales t_p and t_x (Fig.2B, inset). Imposing the dissipation limit broke the equality (i.e., $P(t_p) \neq P(t_x)$) and both $P(t_p)$ and $P(t_x)$ displayed non-Debye decays, and, $P(t_p)$ agreed well with a stretched exponential decay ($\propto \exp(-a\tau^\beta)$) for over 3 decades (Fig. 2B). t_p is associated with the relaxation time scale of the initial state, and, in glass formers it corresponds to relaxation of spatial structures. Whereas, t_x is associated with the diffusive time scale of the random walker. The emergence of the stretched exponential or non-Debye relaxation times in glassy systems are accompanied with hierarchical activation of underlying microscopic processes(18, 26). When the system reaches the dissipation limit, certain reactions can take place only when appropriate amount of entropy is released by a concerted execution of a series of reactions, this provides a source for hierarchical activation in the system. In the simulations, $\langle t_p \rangle$ is about three times larger than $\langle t_x \rangle$. Similar behavior ($\langle t_p \rangle > \langle t_x \rangle$) in glass formers indicates breakdown of the Stokes-Einstein relationship relating dissipative and diffusion timescales in liquids(18, 24). The non-equivalence of t_p and t_x , as in glass formers, points to the presence of dynamic facilitation or clustering of mesoscopic events in time.

The correlation function, $C(n)$, further characterized the nature of the dynamic facilitation in the KPR model. Calculation of $C(n)$ showed that waiting times separated by multiple

events are more correlated in the dissipation limited case compared to that with no dissipation limit (Fig. 2C). $C(n)$ decreases substantially within a single step when there was no dissipation limit. Next, I investigated if these correlations are able to generate ergodicity breaking as found in the models of CTRW with correlated time steps. The calculations showed that $\langle r^2(t) \rangle \neq \overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$ in the KPR model with the dissipation limit demonstrating a breakdown of ergodicity in the kinetics due to the confinement of stochastic trajectories in specific regions in the state space for very long times ($\sim 1/k_1$) (Fig. 2D). Removing the dissipation limited restored ergodicity (Fig. 2D), i.e., $\langle r^2(t) \rangle = \overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$.

Kinetics with a fixed rate of energy supply. This case was investigated by including a variable in the biochemical reactions that increased the medium entropy (or the available energy for dissipation) in the reservoir at a constant rate (e_r) (see Materials and Methods for details). The simulations were performed for the cases where the required rate of energy dissipation (v) was larger than that available from the reservoir. Analysis of the kinetics revealed the presence of two dynamically distinct regions (Fig. 3A). (i) For times $0 < t \leq \tau_{\text{trans}}$, most of the medium entropy produced in the reservoir flowed into the system to fuel the reactions. At the end of τ_{trans} , when the total medium entropy inflow into the system became comparable to the medium entropy required to bring the initial state to the steady state of the NKPR model (Fig. S3), the kinetics moved into the second regime. (ii) For $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$, the entropy received by a single cell (or single trajectory) did not change appreciably over a time scale τ_{diss} despite medium entropy being produced in the reservoir. Beyond τ_{diss} , the KPR step is executed and the medium entropy flow into the system changes abruptly by $\sim \ln(k_{\text{off}}/k_1)$. A possible mechanism explaining the above behavior is when $t \leq \tau_{\text{trans}}$, the medium entropy produced in the reservoir is fully spent on carrying out the biochemical reactions, however, since the KPR step requires the largest amount of entropy influx ($\sim \ln(k_{\text{off}}/k_1)$) it rarely takes place in this regime, and consequently, the system evolves as the dissipation limited NKPR model. Towards the end of τ_{trans} , when the stochastic trajectories in the system are close to the dissipationless steady state of the NKPR model, the system does not draw much medium entropy from

the reservoir over a time scale of τ_{diss} . This results in accumulation of sufficient medium entropy in the reservoir to fuel the execution of the KPR step at the end of τ_{diss} (or $\tau_{\text{diss}}e_r \geq \ln(k_{\text{off}}/k_1)$). Thus, the time evolution for $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$ can be intuitively thought of as successions of time segments of scale τ_{diss} where the kinetics is similar to that of the dissipationless steady state of the NKPR model. Further analysis of the simulation results confirmed the above picture.

Calculation of $P(t_p)$ and $P(t_x)$ showed that for $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$, $P(t_p) \neq P(t_x)$, suggesting similarities of the kinetics to that of the fixed dissipation limit case (Fig. 3B). For $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$, I found $P(t_p) \approx P(t_x)$, and both the distributions decayed exponentially as in unlimited dissipation cases (Fig. 3B, inset). Distributions of N_{T^*M} and N_{TM} demonstrated that the system closely follows the steady state of the NKPR model for $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (Fig. S4). The value of τ_{trans} is roughly related to e_r , the available medium entropy (Q_0) at $t=0$, and, the total medium entropy required to change the initial state to the steady state of the NKPR model ($Q^{\text{NKPR}}_{\text{steady}}$) as, $\tau_{\text{trans}} \approx (Q^{\text{NKPR}}_{\text{steady}} - Q_0)/e_r$. $C(n)$ and $\overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$ showed the emergence (or absence) of dynamic facilitation and ergodicity breaking for $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (or $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$) (Figs. S5 and S6). The difference between $\langle t_p \rangle$ and $\langle t_x \rangle$ calculated at increasing values of e_r showed that at $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ increasing e_r decreased the magnitude of the difference which reaches zero as e_r increases to $e_r \geq v$ (Fig. S7). Similarly, dynamic facilitation and ergodicity breaking disappears at $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ for $e_r \geq v$. Thus, at $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ increasing e_r appears to generate a qualitatively similar effect as increasing the temperature across the glass transition in glass formers.

Implications for ligand discrimination: Emergence of glassy kinetics in the dissipation limited case will have a profound effect on ligand discrimination. Arrested states slow down the kinetics in addition to making an undesired state (e.g., TM for low k_{off}) persist in single cells over a long time scale ($\sim 1/k_1$ for fixed dissipation limit or τ for a fixed rate of entropy increase). Both would negatively affect the discrimination program. Without the dissipation limit, the biochemical kinetics reached the steady state in a short time scale (\sim mins), where the cell population average of the activated species decreased with the ligand affinity $\langle N_{T^*M} \rangle \sim 1/k_{\text{off}}^2$ allowing the cells to discriminate between pathogenic

(low k_{off}) and self ligands (high k_{off}) with a greater sensitivity (Fig. 4). Limiting dissipation qualitatively changed this pattern where at $\langle N_{T^*M} \rangle$ displayed a non-monotonic variation with k_{off} at short times (\sim mins) (Fig. 4). At longer time scales ($t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$), when medium entropy is produced at the reservoir at a fixed rate, the system responds with a lower precision ($\langle N_{T^*M} \rangle \sim 1/k_{\text{off}}$) which is similar to that of the NKPR model. However, depending on the initial (basal) signaling state of the single cells τ_{trans} could be much longer than biologically relevant time scales (\sim mins) in this context.

In addition, large cell-to-cell variations in numbers of activated species in the dissipation limited cases will hinder discrimination between multiple type ligands presented simultaneously to a T cell population. For example, for a successful discrimination program T cells should be able to recognize a small fraction ($f = f_{\text{path}}$) of pathogenic ligands (say, $k_{\text{off}} = k_{\text{path}}$) in a large population ($f = f_{\text{self}} \gg f_{\text{path}}$) of self-ligands ($k_{\text{off}} = k_{\text{self}}$). This demands that a successful discrimination program generates widely different distributions (or $P(k_{\text{off}}, N_{T^*M})$) of the active species (T^*M) in a T cell population when the ligands are presented with input distributions,

$$P_{\text{ligand}}(k_{\text{off}}) = f_{\text{path}} \delta_{k_{\text{off}}, k_{\text{path}}} + f_{\text{self}} \delta_{k_{\text{off}}, k_{\text{self}}} \text{ VS } P_{\text{ligand}}(k_{\text{off}}) = \delta_{k_{\text{off}}, k_{\text{self}}} \cdot f_{\text{path}}(f_{\text{self}})$$

$f_{\text{path}}(f_{\text{self}})$ denotes the fraction of pathogenic (self) ligands presented to the T cells. The large variation in N_{T^*M} in the dissipation limited cases will produce a wide spread in $P(k_{\text{off}}, N_{T^*M})$ (Fig. S8). Thus, there will be a substantial overlap between the above input distributions leading to a much poorer discrimination (Fig. S8) in the dissipation limited case.

Discussion

The study showed that restricting energy dissipation qualitatively changes signaling kinetics of high precision responses functioning outside equilibrium. The changes are marked by advent of slow kinetics, long-lived arrested states, dynamic facilitation, and, ergodicity breaking. The origin of this emergent behavior is purely dynamical and arises due to the dynamical constraints imposed by limited dissipation. The appearance of the glassy kinetics rectifies the naïve intuition that in the presence of a dissipation limit the

system will fall back its dissipationless counterpart (e.g., the steady state kinetics without the KPR step). For a fixed dissipation limit, though the kinetics is dissipationless (i.e., $d\langle Q(t)\rangle/dt=0$) after the system arrives at the dissipation limit, the kinetics becomes confined to specific biochemical states due to the constraints imposed on the kinetics, and, when energy for dissipation is supplied at a fixed rate, depending on the supply rate and initial state of the system, the kinetics can behave similar to that of the fixed dissipation limit case for a long time. The breakdown of ergodicity in the dissipation limited cases points to a fundamental disconnect between the kinetics at the single cell and the cell population level.

The framework does not explicitly include activation energy(27). Thus, if the system resides at the free-energy limit (i.e., $Q=E$) and a particular reaction (say, $1\rightarrow 2$) releases medium entropy to the reservoir (e.g., $\Delta s_m^{1/2}=\ln(w^1_2/w^2_1) < 0$), the reaction is then assumed to take. However, it is possible that the reaction also requires crossing of an activation barrier and thus might not occur in this situation. This would impose a stricter restriction on the reactions that can potentially take place at the dissipation limit. Therefore, realistically there could a larger number of arrested states and a greater degree of dynamic facilitation in the kinetics.

The kinetics in the dissipation limited cases in the KPR model demonstrates similarities with that in glass formers in terms of the appearance of slow kinetics and dynamic facilitation. However, the glassy kinetics in the two systems also shows few important contrasts including the differences regarding the shapes of $P(t_p)$ and $P(t_x)$ (18). In glass formers, the transition to the glassy kinetics occurs due to lowering the temperature past the glass transition temperature where the system goes through a phase transition in the space and time of stochastic trajectories(18, 28). In the KPR model, the notion of temperature or any phase transition is not evident. In simple networks violating detailed balance reveal dynamical phase transitions between localized and de-localized states in the limit of large system sizes induced by increasing entropy production rate(29). Increasing the rate (e_r) of medium entropy supply in the minimal model produces changes

in the kinetics like the temperature, however, further work is required to make this connection transparent or establish any presence of a phase transition in the KPR model.

Materials and Methods

MC simulations: A continuous time MC method was used to simulate stochastic trajectories in the minimal model for multiple receptor and ligands. The construction of the Master equation for $\phi_i(Q,t)$ for the dissipation limited case shows that the propensities ($\{w_j^i\}$) of the reactions that take the system over the dissipation limit ($Q(t)=E$) should be set to zero. This result was used to construct a Gilliespie(22) like algorithm by calling two uniform random numbers (r_1 and r_2) in the unit interval for simulating the trajectories. In the simulations, a variable, $Q(t)$, keeps track of the entropy that flows into the system from the reservoir. The time for the next reaction (τ) in the system residing at state i at time t with a total entropy exchange $Q(t)$ is given by $\tau=1/a_{total} \ln(1/r_1)$, where the total propensity, $a_{total} = \sum_j w_j^i$. The next reaction ($i \rightarrow \mu$) is chosen by calculating μ satisfying the condition, $\sum_{j=1}^{\mu-1} w_j^i \leq a_{total} r_2 < \sum_{j=1}^{\mu} w_j^i$. Any propensity ($w_{j'}^i$) that results in $Q(t)+\ln(w_{j'}^i/w_i^{j'}) > E$ is set to zero for the calculations of τ and μ in the above steps. $Q(t)$ is updated to $Q(t+\tau)=Q(t)+\ln(w_{\mu}^i/w_i^{\mu})$ after the transition $i \rightarrow \mu$ is executed. When there is a supply of medium entropy at a constant rate (e_r) in the reservoir, a stochastic variable q , decoupled from rest of the variables in the minimal model, is introduced. q increases by unity ($q \rightarrow q+1$) with a propensity $w_{q+1}^q = e_r$, increasing the reservoir medium entropy (i.e., $E(t+\tau) \rightarrow E(t)+1$) by unity at every execution. w_{q+1}^q is used along with other propensities in the model for the calculations of τ and μ . The condition, $Q(t)+\ln(w_{j'}^i/w_i^{j'}) > E(t)$ is used to set a reaction ($i \rightarrow j'$) propensity that crosses the dissipation limit to zero. w_{q+1}^q is not considered in evaluation of the above condition and is never set to zero.

Calculations of (i) $P_w(\tau)$, (ii) $P(t_p)$, (iib) $P(t_x)$, (iii) $C(n)$, and, (iv) $\overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$: (i) Waiting times (τ) in a time interval $T (\gg \tau)$ are calculated for each CTRW stochastic trajectory and $P_w(\tau)$ is calculated using all the τ 's collected in a large ensemble of stochastic trajectories. (ii) A start time t_{start} was chosen. If the next reactions in a CTRW

stochastic trajectory occurred at times, t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots , then t_p for the trajectory is defined as,

$t_p = t_1 - t_{\text{start}}$, and, t_x is calculated using $t_2 - t_1, t_3 - t_2$, and, so on(23). t_{start} is chosen at times after the system reaches the dissipation limit for the fixed dissipation limit. When the dissipation limit increases with a rate e_r , t_{start} is chosen either at $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ or $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$. Values of t_p and t_x are collected over a large number of stochastic trajectories ($> 10^4$) for the evaluating $P(t_p)$ and $P(t_x)$. (iii) If the reactions that take place after time t_{start} are indexed as 1, 2, ..., $n+1$ at times, $t_1, t_2, t_3, \dots, t_{n+1}$, respectively, the waiting times $\tau_1 (=t_2-t_1), \tau_2$

$(=t_3-t_2), \dots, \tau_n (=t_{n+1}-t_n)$ are used to calculate $C(n)$ using the formula shown in the main text for a large ensemble of stochastic trajectories. For the fixed dissipation limit, $t_{\text{start}}=0$, and, when the dissipation limit increases with a rate e_r , t_{start} is chosen either at $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ or $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$.

(iv) A stochastic trajectory of the CTRW, simulated for a long time $T (\sim 2 \times 10^4 \text{s})$, is assigned positions $(r(t_i) = (m_i, n_i))$ at regular time intervals of Δt ($t = \{t_1, \dots, t_N = T_N\}$). The time averaged $\overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$ is calculated by replacing the integral shown in the main text by

$$\overline{\delta^2(n\Delta t, T_N)} = 1 / (N - n) \sum_{i=1}^{N-n} (\overline{r(t_i + n\Delta t) - r(t_i)})^2 \quad \overline{\delta^2(t, T)}, \text{ calculated for different}$$

stochastic trajectories, are shown in Fig. 2 and 3.

Model parameters: The data shown in the main text are carried out for $k_{\text{on}}=0.003\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_p=1.0\text{s}^{-1}$, $k_d=0.1\text{s}^{-1}$, and, $k_1=10^{-8}\text{s}^{-1}$ in a volume of $1\mu\text{m}^2 \times 0.01\mu\text{m}$. k_{off} is varied between 0.001s^{-1} to 10s^{-1} . The total concentrations of TCRs and pMHCs are taken as 100 molecules/ μm^2 for each species. All the simulations are started off with $N_{\text{TM}}=N_{\text{T}^*\text{M}}=0$.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. (A) Schematic diagram displaying the biochemical reactions in the minimal model. The KPR step is shown in green. The transition $T+M \rightarrow T^*M$ (dotted line), occurring with a much smaller rate than the rest of the reactions, is assumed to keep the entropy calculations finite. (B) The exact solution (solid line) with two boundary

conditions at $E=3$ and $E=1$ for $N_{T0}=N_{M0}=1$, $k_{on}=1/e$, $k_{off}=1/e^2$, $k_p=1$, $k_d=1/e$, $k_l=1/e^2$, $k_{off}'=1/e$ (rate for the KPR step), is compared with the developed continuous time MC scheme for $P_2(t)$ (\circ) and $P_3(t)$ (\square). (C) Schematic diagrams showing the arrested and mobile states in the case with a TCR(T) interacting with a single pMHC(M) molecule. The arrows indicate the states where the system arrives at the dissipation limit.

Figure 2. (A) Stochastic trajectories obtained from the MC simulation for the copy numbers of T*M (N_{T*M}) in the presence (red) and absence (black) of the fixed dissipation limit ($E=500$). The parameters are set to values shown in the Materials and Methods section with the $k_{off}=0.001s^{-1}$. (B) Variation of $P(t_p)$ (red) and $P(t_x)$ (magenta) with their arguments for the dissipation limited case. The solid line shows a fit to $P(t_p)$ with a stretched exponential function ($f(t)=5.17\exp(-at^\beta)$, $a=3.418$, $\beta=0.5622$). (Inset) The differences between $P(t_p)$ (black) and $P(t_x)$ (brown) disappear when there is no restriction for energy dissipation. Both the distributions decay exponentially. The parameters are the same as in (A). (C) Variation of $C(n)$ with n for the dissipation limited (red) and the unrestricted case (black). $C(n)$ is scaled with $C(0)$ to bring both the data on the same scale. The inset shows a close up of the main figure at smaller values of n . $C(n)$ reaches $1/3$ of $C(0)$ in $n\approx 10$ when the dissipation is limited, whereas, for the case with unlimited dissipation, $C(n)$ falls much below $C(0)/3$ at $n=1$. The parameters are the same as in (A). (D) Variation of $\overline{\delta^2(t,T)}$ with t for 20 different stochastic trajectories for the dissipation limited (red) and the unlimited case (black, inset). The parameters are the same as in (A) with $T=10^6s$. The spread in $\overline{\delta^2(t,T)}$ for different configurations indicate ergodicity breaking which disappears when the dissipation is unlimited (inset). Over 10^4 trajectories were used for the all calculations above.

Figure 3. (A) Kinetics of the total amount of medium entropy influx (black) into the system and the total amount of medium entropy produced in the reservoir (blue) corresponding to a single stochastic trajectory or a single cell. The parameters are the same as that given in the Materials and Methods section, and, $k_{off}=0.001s^{-1}$ and $e_r=0.01s^{-1}$. For $t<\tau_{trans}$ all the produced medium entropy is consumed by the system, and, for $t>\tau_{trans}$

, medium entropy accumulates in the reservoir for a time scale of τ_{diss} . The corresponding kinetics (red) for N_{T^*M} is shown in the inset. (Inset) The kinetics of N_{T^*M} (grey) for the NKPR model is shown for comparison. (B) Variation of $P(t_p)$ (red) and $P(t_x)$ (magenta) with their arguments for data collected at a time t ($=20,000s < \tau_{\text{trans}}$). The solid line shows a fit to $P(t_p)$ with a stretched exponential function ($f(t)=14.4913\exp(-at^\beta)$, $a=10.543$, $\beta=0.836$). (Inset) The differences between $P(t_p)$ (red) and $P(t_x)$ (magenta) disappear at a later time $t=50,000s \gg \tau_{\text{trans}}$. The solid line shows a fit close to an exponential decay ($\propto \exp(-x^{1.045}/0.0535)$). The parameters are the same as in (A). Over 10^4 trajectories were used for all the calculations above.



Figure 4. Variation of N_{T^*M} , averaged over a population of single cells ($n=10,000$) at $t=5$ mins, with k_{off} . The data are shown for the cases of a fixed dissipation limit ($E=500$, shown in red \circ), a fixed rate of medium entropy production ($e_r=0.01s^{-1}$, shown in \square), unlimited dissipation (shown in open \circ), and, the NKPR model (shown in filled \circ). The dissipation limited cases offer a poorer discrimination with a decreased range of variation of $\langle N_{T^*M} \rangle$ and a non-monotonic variation with k_{off} . To illustrate, T cells following the KPR model are able to discriminate between the ligand affinities (shown in red and green lines) by crossing the activation threshold (teal horizontal line) for the stronger ligand, however, limiting dissipation abrogates this discrimination.

Acknowledgement: JD is partially supported by the Research Institute at the Nationwide Children's Hospital. JD thanks Ashok Prasad for helpful discussions.


1. Bialek WS (2012) *Biophysics : searching for principles* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).
2. Francois P, Voisinne G, Siggia ED, Altan-Bonnet G, & Vergassola M (2013) Phenotypic model for early T-cell activation displaying sensitivity, specificity, and antagonism. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 110(10):E888-E897.
3. Hopfield JJ (1974) Kinetic proofreading: a new mechanism for reducing errors in biosynthetic processes requiring high specificity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 71(10):4135-4139.

4. Lan G, Sartori P, Neumann S, Sourjik V, & Tu YH (2012) The energy-speed-accuracy trade-off in sensory adaptation. *Nat Phys* 8(5):422-428.
5. Ninio J (1975) Kinetic Amplification of Enzyme Discrimination. *Biochimie* 57(5):587-595.
6. McKeithan TW (1995) Kinetic proofreading in T-cell receptor signal transduction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 92(11):5042-5046.
7. Murugan A, Huse DA, & Leibler S (2014) Discriminatory Proofreading Regimes in Nonequilibrium Systems. *Phys Rev X* 4(2).
8. Qian H (2006) Reducing intrinsic biochemical noise in cells and its thermodynamic limit. *J Mol Biol* 362(3):387-392.
9. Heiden MG, Cantley LC, & Thompson CB (2009) Understanding the Warburg Effect: The Metabolic Requirements of Cell Proliferation. *Science* 324(5930):1029-1033.
10. Pearce EL, Poffenberger MC, Chang CH, & Jones RG (2013) Fueling immunity: insights into metabolism and lymphocyte function. *Science* 342(6155):1242-1245.
11. Richter C, Schweizer M, Cossarizza A, & Franceschi C (1996) Control of apoptosis by the cellular ATP level. *FEBS Lett* 378(2):107-110.
12. Sartori P & Pigolotti S (2013) Kinetic versus Energetic Discrimination in Biological Copying. *Phys Rev Lett* 110(18).
13. Imperato A & Peliti L (2007) The distribution function of entropy flow in stochastic systems. *J Stat Mech-Theory E*.
14. Qian H (2007) Phosphorylation energy hypothesis: Open chemical systems and their biological functions. *Annu Rev Phys Chem* 58:113-142.
15. Seifert U (2012) Stochastic thermodynamics, fluctuation theorems and molecular machines. *Rep Prog Phys* 75(12).
16. Zia RKP & Schmittmann B (2007) Probability currents as principal characteristics in the statistical mechanics of non-equilibrium steady states. *J Stat Mech-Theory E*.
17. Seifert U (2005) Entropy production along a stochastic trajectory and an integral fluctuation theorem. *Phys Rev Lett* 95(4).
18. Chandler D & Garrahan JP (2010) Dynamics on the Way to Forming Glass: Bubbles in Space-Time. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry, Vol 61* 61:191-217.
19. Tejedor V & Metzler R (2010) Anomalous diffusion in correlated continuous time random walks. *J Phys a-Math Theor* 43(8).
20. Klafter J & Sokolov IM (2011) *First steps in random walks : from tools to applications* (Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York).
21. Vankampe.Ng & Oppenhei.I (1972) Expansion of Master Equation for One-Dimensional Random-Walks with Boundary. *J Math Phys* 13(6):842-&.
22. Gillespie DT (1977) Exact Stochastic Simulation of Coupled Chemical-Reactions. *J Phys Chem-Us* 81(25):2340-2361.
23. Hedges LO, Maibaum L, Chandler D, & Garrahan JP (2007) Decoupling of exchange and persistence times in atomistic models of glass formers. *J Chem Phys* 127(21).
24. Jung YJ, Garrahan JP, & Chandler D (2004) Excitation lines and the breakdown of Stokes-Einstein relations in supercooled liquids. *Phys Rev E* 69(6).





25. Barkai E, Garini Y, & Metzler R (2012) Strange Kinetics of Single Molecules in Living Cells. *Phys Today* 65(8):29-35.
26. Palmer RG, Stein DL, Abrahams E, & Anderson PW (1984) Models of Hierarchically Constrained Dynamics for Glassy Relaxation. *Phys Rev Lett* 53(10):958-961.
27. Chandler D & Wu D (1987) *Introduction to modern statistical mechanics* (Oxford University Press, New York ; Oxford).
28. Merolle M, Garrahan JP, & Chandler D (2005) Space-time thermodynamics of the glass transition. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* 102(31):10837-10840.
29. Vaikuntanathan S, Gingrich TR, & Geissler PL (2014) Dynamic phase transitions in simple driven kinetic networks. *Phys Rev E* 89(6).






(A)



(C)








Supplementary Material for “Limiting energy dissipation induces glassy kinetics in single cell high precision responses”

I. Exact Solution for the one receptor one ligand case

The kinetics is described by the reaction scheme,



If the probabilities for being at the states 1,2, and, 3 are given by, p_1 , p_2 , and, p_3 , then the corresponding Master equation is given by,

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^3 L_{ij} p_j \quad (\text{S1})$$

where,

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} -k_1 - k_{\text{on}} & k_{\text{off}} & k_{\text{off}} \\ k_{\text{on}} & -k_{\text{off}} - k_{\text{p}} & k_{\text{d}} \\ k_1 & k_{\text{p}} & -k_{\text{d}} - k_{\text{off}} \end{bmatrix}$$

I assumed $k_{\text{off}}' = k_{\text{off}}$ in Eq. (S1). One can scale the time with k_{p} to render it dimensionless, e.g., $t = \tilde{t} / k_{\text{p}}$, then all the other rates can also be transformed into dimensionless variables, e.g., $\tilde{k}_1 = k_1 / k_{\text{p}}$, $\tilde{k}_{\text{off}} = k_{\text{off}} / k_{\text{p}}$, and so on. For simplicity we do not display the tildes in the equation, thus, hereafter, all the rates will denote their dimensionless counterparts. The dimensionless, L , now takes the form,

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} -k_1 - k_{\text{on}} & k_{\text{off}} & k_{\text{off}} \\ k_{\text{on}} & -k_{\text{off}} - 1 & k_{\text{d}} \\ k_1 & 1 & -k_{\text{d}} - k_{\text{off}} \end{bmatrix}$$

The above equation can be easily solved. The solution for the initial condition, $p_1(0)=1$, $p_2(0)=p_3(0)=0$ is given by,

$$p_1(t) = \frac{e^{-(k_1+k_{off}+k_{on})t} (k_1+k_{on}) + k_{off}}{k_1+k_{off}+k_{on}} \quad (S2)$$

$$p_3(t) = A/B$$

$$A = k_{on} + e^{-(k_1+k_{off}+k_{on})t} (k_1-1)(1+k_d+k_{off})(k_1+k_{on}) + e^{-(1+k_d+k_{off})t} (k_{on}-k_1k_d)(k_1+k_{off}+k_{on})$$

$$+(k_d+1-k_1)k_1(1+k_{off}) + k_dk_{on} - k_1k_{on}(2+k_{off}) - k_{on}^2$$

$$B = (1+k_d+k_{off})(k_1+k_{on}+k_{off})(1+k_d-k_1-k_{on})$$

$$p_2 = 1 - p_1 - p_3$$

At the steady state ($t \rightarrow \infty$),

$$p_1^s = \frac{k_{off}}{k_1+k_{off}+k_{on}} \quad (S3)$$

$$p_3^s = \frac{k_{on} + k_1(1+k_{off})}{(k_1+k_{off}+k_{on})(k_d+k_{off}+1)}$$

$$p_2^s = 1 - p_1^s - p_3^s$$

Estimation of dissipation

The system entropy (S_{sys}) for the system is given by,

$$S_{sys}(t) = -\sum_{i=1}^3 p_i(t) \ln p_i(t) .$$

The rate of change in S_{sys} is given by,

$$\frac{dS_{sys}(t)}{dt} = -\sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}}^3 w_i^j p_j \ln \left(\frac{w_j^i p_i}{w_i^j p_j} \right) - \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}}^3 w_i^j p_j \ln \left(\frac{w_j^i}{w_i^j} \right)$$

The first term (dS_{total}/dt) on the RHS is always non-negative and is associated with energy dissipation in the system. w_i^j describes the rate of transition for the change, $j \rightarrow i$. The second term (dS_{med}/dt) gives the rate of entropy exchanged with the reservoir. Using the solution for Eq. (S1) the above rates can be easily calculated. At the steady state,

$$\begin{aligned}
dS_{med} / dt|_{steady} &= - \sum_{\substack{i,j \\ j \neq i}}^3 w_i^j p_j \ln \left(\frac{w_j^i}{w_i^j} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{(k_1 + k_{off} + k_{on})(k_d + k_{off} + 1)} \left[k_{off}(k_{on} - k_1 k_d) \ln \frac{k_1}{k_{off}} + k_{off}(k_{on} - k_1 k_d) \ln \frac{k_{off}}{k_{on}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + k_{off}(k_{on} - k_1 k_d) \ln k_d \right] \\
&= \frac{k_{off}(k_{on} - k_1 k_d) \ln \frac{k_1 k_d}{k_{on}}}{(k_1 + k_{off} + k_{on})(k_d + k_{off} + 1)} \tag{S4}
\end{aligned}$$

$dS_{med}/dt|_{steady}$ first increases and then decreases with increasing k_{off} peaking at, $k_{off} = \sqrt{k_{on} k_d}$ (when $k_1 \rightarrow 0$).

II. A scheme to calculate moments of the distribution, P(Q,t)

Consider the Master Eq.

$$\frac{dp_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_j L_{ij} p_j \quad (S5)$$

L satisfies the condition, $\sum_i L_{ij} = 0$, which guarantees that $\sum_i p_i(t) = \text{const}$.

The joint distribution $\phi_i(Q,t)$, defined in the main text follows the kinetics (Eq. (4))

$$\frac{\partial \phi_i(Q,t)}{\partial t} = \sum_{j(\neq i)} [w_j^i \phi_j(Q - \Delta s_i^j, t) - w_i^j \phi_i(Q, t)]$$

P(Q,t) is calculated by defining a moment generating function,

$$\psi_i(\lambda, t) = \int dQ e^{\lambda Q} \phi_i(Q, t) \quad (S6)$$

which follows the linear set of equations given by,

$$\frac{\partial \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial t} = \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda) \psi_j(\lambda, t) \quad (S7)$$

where,

$$H_{ij}(\lambda = 0) = L_{ij}.$$

Eq. (S7) can become non-trivial to solve even when the Master equation (Eq. (S5)) can be solved analytically. However, it is possible to solve for the moments of Q(t) using the solutions of the Master equation and thus avoid the direct solution of Eq. (S7). The scheme is described below.

$$\left. \frac{\partial^n \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda^n} \right|_{\lambda=0} = \int dQ Q^n \phi_i(Q, t) = \langle Q^n \rangle_i$$

which gives the nth moment of the entropy exchanged by the state i until time t.

Therefore,

$$\sum_i \left. \frac{\partial^n \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda^n} \right|_{\lambda=0} = \langle Q^n \rangle \text{ gives the nth moments of the total entropy exchanged up to time}$$

t.

These moments can be calculated from Eq. (S7) recursively as follows.

Calculation of $\langle Q \rangle(t)$:

Taking the derivative of Eq. (S7) with λ produces,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda} \right) = \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda) \frac{\partial \psi_j(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda} + \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \psi_j(\lambda, t)$$

Setting $\lambda = 0$ on both the sides of the above equation we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda} \right) \Big|_{\lambda=0} &= \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda) \frac{\partial \psi_j(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} + \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \psi_j(\lambda, t) \Big|_{\lambda=0} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle Q \rangle_i}{\partial t} &= \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda=0) \langle Q \rangle_j + f_i(t) = \sum_j L_{ij} \langle Q \rangle_j + f_i(t) \end{aligned} \quad (S8)$$

$$\text{where, } f_i(t) = \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \psi_j(\lambda, t) \Big|_{\lambda=0} = \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \psi_j(\lambda=0, t) = \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} p_j(t)$$

In deriving the last equation I used $\psi_j(\lambda=0, t) = p_j(t)$, which follows from Eq. S6.

Therefore, one can calculate $f_i(t)$ from the solution of the Master equation in Eq. (S5).

Summing over all the states in Eq. (S8) we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \frac{\partial \langle Q \rangle_i}{\partial t} &= \sum_i [L_{ij} \langle Q \rangle_j] + \sum_i f_i(t) = 0 + \sum_i f_i(t) = f_T(t) \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle Q \rangle}{\partial t} &= f_T(t) \end{aligned} \quad (S9)$$

This is subject to the initial condition, $\langle Q \rangle(t=0) = 0$.

f_T can be calculation from the solutions of Eq. (S5).

Calculation of $\langle Q^2 \rangle(t)$:

Taking the second derivative of Eq. (S7) with λ produces,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\frac{\partial^2 \psi_i(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda^2} \right) = \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda) \frac{\partial^2 \psi_j(\lambda, t)}{\partial \lambda^2} + \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda^2} \psi_j(\lambda, t) + 2 \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \lambda}$$

Setting $\lambda = 0$ on both the sides of the above equation we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \langle Q^2 \rangle_i}{\partial t} &= \sum_j H_{ij}(\lambda=0) \langle Q^2 \rangle_j + \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda^2} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \psi_j(\lambda=0, t) + 2 \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle Q^2 \rangle_i}{\partial t} &= \sum_j L_{ij} \langle Q^2 \rangle_j + f_i^{(2)}(t) \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$f_i^{(2)}(t) = \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda^2} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \psi_j(\lambda=0, t) + 2 \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \frac{\partial \psi_j}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} = \sum_j \frac{\partial^2 H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda^2} \Big|_{\lambda=0} p_j(t) + 2 \sum_j \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=0} \langle Q \rangle_j(t)$$

which can be calculated from the solutions of Eqs. (S5) and (S8).

Summing over all the states,


$$\frac{\partial \langle Q^2 \rangle}{\partial t} = f^{(2)}(t) \quad (\text{S10})$$

where, $f^{(2)}(t) = \sum_i f_i^{(2)}(t)$ and the initial condition is, $\langle Q^2 \rangle_i(t=0) = 0$.

In the same way the higher order moments can be calculated recursively.

III. Derivation of the Master equation with a fixed entropy exchange limit

I consider the three state minimal model described in the main text for this derivation. The resulting equations can be generalized for multiple states. The minimal model is described by the following first order reactions.



The kinetics is described by the Master Equation,

$$\frac{dP_i}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^3 L_{ij} P_j = \sum_{j(j \neq i)}^3 (w_i^j P_j - w_j^i P_i)$$

w_i^j

denotes the transition rate of change state j to state i . The w matrix is given by,

$$\begin{bmatrix} w_1^1 & w_1^2 & w_1^3 \\ w_2^1 & w_2^2 & w_2^3 \\ w_3^1 & w_3^2 & w_3^3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & k_{off} & k_{off} \\ k_{on} & 0 & k_d \\ k_1 & k_p & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

The amount of entropy flowing *into* the system from the reservoir when the transition $j \rightarrow i$

is executed following the Master equation is given by,

$$\Delta s_i^j = \ln \left(\frac{w_i^j}{w_j^i} \right)$$

,and, the Δs matrix is given by,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Delta s_1^1 & \Delta s_1^2 & \Delta s_1^3 \\ \Delta s_2^1 & \Delta s_2^2 & \Delta s_2^3 \\ \Delta s_3^1 & \Delta s_3^2 & \Delta s_3^3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n.d. & \ln \left(\frac{k_{off}}{k_{on}} \right) & \ln \left(\frac{k_{off}}{k_1} \right) \\ \ln \left(\frac{k_{on}}{k_{off}} \right) & n.d. & \ln \left(\frac{k_d}{k_p} \right) \\ \ln \left(\frac{k_1}{k_{off}} \right) & \ln \left(\frac{k_p}{k_d} \right) & n.d. \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n.d. & -\Delta_1 & \Delta_3 \\ \Delta_1 & n.d. & -\Delta_2 \\ -\Delta_3 & \Delta_2 & n.d. \end{bmatrix}$$

where, $\Delta_1 = \ln(k_{on}/k_{off})$, $\Delta_2 = \ln(k_p/k_d)$, and, $\Delta_3 = \ln(k_{off}/k_1)$, and, $n.d. \equiv$ not defined.

Next, I proceed to describe the time evolution of the joint probability distribution $\varphi_i(Q, t | i_0, 0, 0)$, which is the conditional probability of the system being at the state i at time t after receiving a total amount of entropy Q from the reservoir in the time interval 0 to t starting from an initial state i_0 with zero entropy received at time $t=0$. For brevity, I will

denote $\varphi_i(Q,t|i_0,0,0)$ by $\varphi_i(Q,t)$ for rest of the calculation. The probability distribution, $\varphi_i(Q,t)$, follows the Master equation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial\phi_1(Q,t)}{\partial t} &= w_1^2\phi_2(Q+\Delta_1,t)+w_1^3\phi_3(Q-\Delta_3,t)-(w_2^1+w_3^1)\phi_1(Q,t) \\
\frac{\partial\phi_2(Q,t)}{\partial t} &= w_2^1\phi_1(Q-\Delta_1,t)+w_2^3\phi_3(Q+\Delta_2,t)-(w_1^2+w_3^2)\phi_2(Q,t) \\
\frac{\partial\phi_3(Q,t)}{\partial t} &= w_3^1\phi_1(Q+\Delta_3,t)+w_3^2\phi_2(Q-\Delta_2,t)-(w_1^3+w_2^3)\phi_3(Q,t)
\end{aligned} \tag{S11}$$

The limit on the total amount of entropy (E) that can be exchanged with the reservoir is implemented by imposing a reflecting boundary condition in entropy exchange in the above equations. Thus, when a stochastic trajectory reaches the limit E, a reaction that releases entropy to the reservoir is executed, and, the stochastic trajectory is not lost forever as in the case of an absorbing boundary condition. The result of imposing the reflective boundary condition is analyzed for a simple example where specific rates are chosen so that the entropy exchanges can be described by changes on a regular lattice. Without any loss of generality a set of rates are chosen such that $\Delta_1>0$, $\Delta_2>0$, and, $\Delta_3>0$, and, and $\Delta_2/\Delta_1=p$ (integer) and $\Delta_3/\Delta_1=q$ (integer), and, $Q=n\Delta_1$. I also assume, $\Delta_3>\Delta_2>\Delta_1$. Eq.(S11) now can be described on a grid of a unit entropy exchange Δ_1 as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial\phi_1(n,t)}{\partial t} &= w_1^2\phi_2(n+1,t)+w_1^3\phi_3(n-q,t)-(w_2^1+w_3^1)\phi_1(n,t) \\
\frac{\partial\phi_2(n,t)}{\partial t} &= w_2^1\phi_1(n-1,t)+w_2^3\phi_3(n+p,t)-(w_1^2+w_3^2)\phi_2(n,t) \\
\frac{\partial\phi_3(n,t)}{\partial t} &= w_3^1\phi_1(n+q,t)+w_3^2\phi_2(n-p,t)-(w_1^3+w_2^3)\phi_3(n,t)
\end{aligned} \tag{S12}$$

Eq. (S12) describes the time evolution of the states (1,2, or 3) as the system moves on the lattice (unit lattice size = Δ_1) of the total entropy exchange. The step sizes for increasing (or decreasing) the total entropy exchange depends on the particular state undergoing the transition. The state 3 increases (or decreases) entropy exchange with a step size of q (or p), the state 2 increases (or decreases) moves on the lattice with a step size of p (or 1) , and, the state 1 increases (or decreases) moves on the lattice with a step size of 1 (or q). Therefore, $\phi_1(n,t)$, $\phi_2(n,t)$ and $\phi_3(n,t)$ evolves on the lattice according to those rules.

A reflecting boundary condition at $n=E$ is imposed, for simplicity E is taken to be a multiple of the least common multiple (lcm) of p and q , so that all the states are able to access the limit exactly. The reflecting boundary condition demands(1),
 $\phi_1(E+1,t) = \phi_1(E+2,t) = .0$; $\phi_2(E+1,t) = \phi_2(E+2,t) = .0$; $\phi_3(E+1,t) = \phi_3(E+2,t) = .0$;

The time evolution at $n=E$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\phi_1(E,t)}{\partial t} &= W_{13}\phi_3(E-q,t) - (c_1W_{21} + c_2W_{31})\phi_1(E,t) \\ \frac{\partial\phi_2(E,t)}{\partial t} &= W_{21}\phi_1(E-1,t) - (c_3W_{12} + c_4W_{32})\phi_2(E,t) \\ \frac{\partial\phi_3(E,t)}{\partial t} &= W_{32}\phi_2(E-p,t) - (c_5W_{13} + c_6W_{23})\phi_3(E,t)\end{aligned}\tag{S13}$$

The the parameters, c_1, \dots, c_6 , in Eq. (S13) are introduced to determine the transition rates at which the system leaves once it reaches the limit at E . The parameters, c_1, \dots, c_6 , are determined by using the condition that the total probability is conserved in the time evolution. This condition holds for reflecting boundary conditions where no stochastic trajectory is lost. We define variables,

$$\bar{\phi}_1(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_1(n,t), \bar{\phi}_2(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_2(n,t), \bar{\phi}_3(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \phi_3(n,t)$$

and the above condition implies,

$$\frac{\partial(\bar{\phi}_1(t) + \bar{\phi}_2(t) + \bar{\phi}_3(t))}{\partial t} = 0$$

From Eqs. (S12) and (S13),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\bar{\phi}_1(t)}{\partial t} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^E (w_1^2\phi_2(n+1,t) + w_1^3\phi_3(n-q,t) - (w_2^1 + w_3^1)\phi_1(n,t)) \\ &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^{E-1} w_1^2\phi_2(n+1,t) + \sum_{n=-\infty}^E w_1^3\phi_3(n-q,t) - \sum_{n=-\infty}^{E-1} (w_2^1 + w_3^1)\phi_1(n,t) - (c_1w_2^1 + c_2w_3^1)\phi_1(E,t) \\ &= w_1^2\bar{\phi}_2(t) + w_1^3\bar{\phi}_3(t) - w_{13}\phi_3(E,t) - (w_{21} + w_{31})\bar{\phi}_1(t) - ((c_1 - 1)w_{21} + (c_2 - 1)w_{31})\phi_1(E,t)\end{aligned}$$

In deriving the last step I have used the fact that state 3 increases entropy exchange with a step size of q . Similarly, we can now derive the equations for ϕ_2 and ϕ_3 :

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\bar{\phi}_2(t)}{\partial t} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^E (w_2^1\phi_1(n-1,t) + w_2^3\phi_3(n+p,t) - (w_1^2 + w_3^2)\phi_2(n,t)) \\ &= w_2^1\bar{\phi}_1(t) - w_2^1\phi_1(E,t) + w_2^3\bar{\phi}_3(t) - (w_1^2 + w_3^2)\bar{\phi}_2(t) - ((c_3 - 1)w_1^2 + (c_4 - 1)w_3^2)\phi_2(E,t)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_3(t)}{\partial t} &= \sum_{n=-\infty}^E (w_3^1 \phi_1(n+q,t) + w_3^2 \phi_2(n-p,t) - (w_1^3 + w_2^3) \phi_3(n,t)) \\ &= w_3^1 \bar{\phi}_1(t) + w_3^2 \bar{\phi}_2(t) - w_3^2 \phi_2(E,t) - (w_1^3 + w_2^3) \bar{\phi}_3(t) - ((c_5 - 1)w_1^3 + (c_6 - 1)w_2^3) \phi_3(E,t)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial [\bar{\phi}_1(t) + \bar{\phi}_2(t) + \bar{\phi}_3(t)]}{\partial t} &= -w_1^3 \phi_3(E,t) - ((c_1 - 1)w_2^1 + (c_2 - 1)w_3^1) \phi_1(E,t) \\ &\quad - w_2^1 \phi_1(E,t) - ((c_3 - 1)w_1^2 + (c_4 - 1)w_3^2) \phi_2(E,t) \\ &\quad - w_3^2 \phi_2(E,t) - ((c_5 - 1)w_1^3 + (c_6 - 1)w_2^3) \phi_3(E,t)\end{aligned}$$

If the right hand side of the above equation is set zero as required by the conservation of the total probability, then the parameters assume the values,

$c_1=0, c_2=1, c_3=1, c_4=0, c_5=0, c_6=1$. This shows that at $n=E$, any reaction step that requires

flow of entropy from the reservoir are not executed (or the transition probabilities are

zero). Thus the kinetics at $n=E$ is given by,

The kinetics at $n=E$ is given by,

$$\frac{\partial \phi_1(E,t)}{\partial t} = w_1^3 \phi_3(E-q,t) - w_3^1 \phi_1(E,t)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_2(E,t)}{\partial t} = w_2^1 \phi_1(E-1,t) - w_1^2 \phi_2(E,t)$$

$$\frac{\partial \phi_3(E,t)}{\partial t} = w_3^2 \phi_2(E-p,t) - w_2^3 \phi_3(E,t)$$

(S14)

IV. Exact solution for the joint distribution $\phi_i(\mathbf{Q},t)$ for a simple case

I consider the system with one TCR and one pMHC here as described in section I. The transition, $T_3 \rightarrow T_1$ (the KPR step) is executed at a rate, k'_{off} . The rate constants are chosen as, $k_{\text{on}}=\exp(-1)=1/e$, $k_{\text{off}}=\exp(-2)=1/e^2$, $k_p=1$, $k_d=\exp(-1)=1/e$, and, $k_i=\exp(-2)=1/e^2$ and $k_{\text{off}}=\exp(-1)$. The above choice of the rates makes the entropy exchanges in each reactions integer valued, thus, as the system evolves in time, the medium entropy exchange moves the system on a lattice of size 1. Two reflective boundary conditions at $Q=3$ and $Q=1$ are imposed. This keeps the system confined within 9 states, each state denoting the pair (i,Q) , where, the chemical state of the complex (T_1 , T_2 , or, T_3) is designated by i and the entropy exchanged is given by Q (1, 2, or, 3). In this case, with a finite number of states in the kinetics, Eq.(4) is amenable to analytical methods. Eq. (S12) and Eq. (S14) calculated at the reflective boundaries of $Q=3$ and $Q=1$ can be used to describe the above kinetics which is summarized by the linear equation

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_\alpha}{\partial t} = \sum_{\beta} S_{\alpha\beta} \varphi_\beta \quad (\text{S15})$$

In the above equation, each α corresponds to a state, (i,Q) , and α assumes integer values 1 to 9. The 9x9 matrix $S_{\alpha\beta}$ contains the elements in Eq. (S12) and Eq. S(14) for the two boundary conditions. Eq. (S15) can be solved by standard methods that involve calculation of the eigenvector and eigenvalues of S . I briefly describe the method below.

$S_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | L | \beta \rangle$. If the right and left eigenvectors of S are, $|R_n\rangle$ and $\langle L_n|$, respectively, such that, $S|R_n\rangle = \lambda_n |R_n\rangle$ and $\langle L_n|S = \lambda_n \langle L_n|$, then we can expand $\varphi_\alpha = \langle \alpha | \varphi \rangle$ as,

$|\varphi(t)\rangle = \sum_n a_n(t) |R_n\rangle$. Thus, we can write Eq. (S15) as,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \langle \alpha | \varphi \rangle}{\partial t} &= \sum_{\beta} \langle \alpha | S | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | \varphi \rangle \\ \Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | \varphi \rangle}{\partial t} &= \sum_{\beta} \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | L | R_m \rangle b_m^{-1} \langle L_m | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | \varphi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where, repeated n and m indices are summed over, and we use the identity

$$\sum_n |R_n\rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n| = 1, \text{ or, } \langle L_n | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | R_n \rangle = \langle L_n | R_n \rangle \Rightarrow \langle L_n | R_n \rangle = b_n$$

The vectors are orthogonal to each other, i.e.,

$$\langle L_n | R_m \rangle = b_n \delta_{mn}$$

Since $|R_n\rangle$ and $\langle L_n|$ are the eigenvectors, we get from the above equation,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | \varphi \rangle}{\partial t} &= \sum_{\beta} \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \lambda_n \langle L_n | \beta \rangle \langle \beta | \varphi \rangle \\
\Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | \varphi \rangle}{\partial t} &= \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \lambda_n \langle L_n | \varphi \rangle \\
\Rightarrow \frac{\partial \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} a_n(t)}{\partial t} &= \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \lambda_n a_n(t)
\end{aligned}$$

Since the eigenvectors form a complete orthogonal set, the equality will be valid for each term in the above equation, i.e.,

$$\frac{\partial a_n(t)}{\partial t} = \lambda_n a_n(t) \quad (\text{S16})$$

As, $\langle \alpha | \varphi(0) \rangle = \varphi_{\alpha}(0)$ is given by the initial condition that the system starts from the state

T_1 at $Q=1$ at $t=0$. This is used to calculate $a_n(0)$ from $|\varphi(0)\rangle = \sum_n a_n(0) |R_n\rangle$

The solution for Eq. (S16) is given by, $a_n(t) = a_n(0)e^{\lambda_n t}$

$$\text{Thus, } \varphi_{\alpha}(t) = \langle \alpha | \varphi(t) \rangle = \sum_n \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} \langle L_n | \varphi(t) \rangle = \sum_n \langle \alpha | R_n \rangle b_n^{-1} a_n(0) e^{\lambda_n t} \quad (\text{S17})$$

Using the above solution the probability of the particle to be in a particular chemical state is calculated as,

$$p_i(t) = \sum_{Q=1}^3 \phi_i(Q, t) .$$

The above equations can be solved using Mathematica (code available at <http://planetx.nationwidechildrens.org/~jayajit>). The solution for the above example is given by,

$$p_2(t) = (1 - e^{-yt}) / (ye) \quad (\text{S17a})$$

$$p_3(t) = (1 + e^2 + e^{1-yt} (1 - e^{t+t/e^2+1} y)) / (y(1 + e^2)) \quad (\text{S17b})$$

$$\text{and, } p_1(t) = 1 - p_2(t) - p_3(t)$$

$$\text{where, } y = (1 + e + e^2) / e .$$

The comparisons of Eqs. (S17a,b) with the corresponding MC simulations are shown in Fig. 2B.




Fig. S1. Distributions of N_{T^*M} at $t=20,000s$ for the dissipation limited ($E=500$) and the unlimited dissipation cases. $P(N_{T^*M})$ are calculated using 10^6 stochastic trajectories. In the simulations, $k_{off}=0.001s^{-1}$, and, rest of the parameters are given in the Materials and Methods section.




Fig. S2. Waiting time distributions, $P_w(\tau)$, for the limited (A) and the unlimited dissipation (B) cases, calculated using over 10^4 stochastic trajectories. The parameters are the same as in Fig. S1. The data in (A) show a non-Debye decay but cannot be fitted well with a stretched exponential form. In contrast, the data in (B) show an exponential decay.




Fig. S3. Kinetics of the total medium entropy received by the system ($Q(t)$), corresponding to a single stochastic trajectory, for the NKPR model. $Q(t)$ reaches saturation ($\sim Q_s$) after a short time scale.




Fig. S4. Distributions of N_{T^*M} KPR model at $e_r=0.01s^{-1}$. The distributions are calculated at times $t < \tau_{trans}$ (dashed red line) and $t > \tau_{trans}$ (solid red line) using over 10^4 stochastic trajectories. The data for the NKPR model are shown for comparison. In the simulations, $k_{off}=0.001s^{-1}$, and, rest of the parameters are given in the Materials and Methods section.




Fig. S5. $C(n)$ vs n , calculated using over 10^4 stochastic trajectories, for the KPR model for $e_r=0.01\text{s}^{-1}$ for times $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (red circle) and $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (magenta squares). The data for the NKPR model (black diamonds) are shown for comparison.




Fig. S6. Variation of $\overline{\delta^2(t, T)}$ with t for 20 different stochastic trajectories for the KPR model for $e_r=0.01\text{s}^{-1}$ for times $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (A) and $t > \tau_{\text{trans}}$ (B). (A) $t_{\text{start}}=0$ and data are collected until $t=20,000$. (B) $t_{\text{start}}=50,000\text{s}$, and, the data are collected until $t=10^6$.




Fig. S7. Variation of $\langle t_p \rangle$ and $\langle t_x \rangle$ with e_r for the KPR model. $P(t_p)$ and $P(t_x)$ for each e_r is calculated for times $t < \tau_{\text{trans}}$ using over 10^4 stochastic trajectories.




Fig. S8. Distributions of N_{T^*M} for the KPR model calculated using over 10^4 stochastic trajectories at $t=300\text{s}$. Data are shown for cases at a fixed dissipation limit ($E=500$) for $k_{\text{off}}=0.001\text{s}^{-1}$ and $k_{\text{off}}=0.1\text{s}^{-1}$. The data for the unlimited dissipation cases for the same ligand affinities are shown for comparison. In the presence of limited dissipation $P(N_{T^*M})$ for different ligand affinities show substantial overlap.

1. Vankampe.Ng & Oppenhei.I (1972) Expansion of Master Equation for One-Dimensional Random-Walks with Boundary. *J Math Phys* 13(6):842-&.