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#### Abstract

The quasi-steady state approximation and time-scale separation are commonly applied methods to simplify models of biochemical reaction networks based on ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The concentrations of the "fast" species are assumed effectively to be at steady state with respect to the "slow" species. Under this assumption the steady state equations can be used to eliminate the "fast" variables and a new ODE system with only the slow species can be obtained.

We interpret a reduced system obtained by time-scale separation as the ODE system arising from a unique reaction network, by identification of a set of reactions and the corresponding rate functions. The procedure is graphically based and can easily be worked out by hand for small networks. For larger networks, we provide a pseudo-algorithm. We study properties of the reduced network, its kinetics and conservation laws, and show that the kinetics of the reduced network fulfil realistic assumptions, provided the original network does. We illustrate our results using biological examples such as substrate mechanisms, post-translational modification systems and networks with intermediates (transient) steps.
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## 1 Introduction

Biochemical reaction networks often involve many biochemical species that interact through many reactions. The mathematical models that are used to describe such networks can be quite complex and analytically intractable, both in terms of variables (species concentrations) as well as (unknown) parameters such as reaction rate constants. It is therefore commonplace to reduce the dimensions of the models by various means.

One way to simplify a model is by time-scale separation [13, 9]. To apply time-scale separation, the species in the system are divided into fast and slow species. Fast species are assumed to be at equilibrium (a so-called quasi-equilibrium) even though the system as a whole has not reached a state of equilibrium. For example, if degradation of a species proceeds at high rate, then it is short lived and becomes a 'fast' species. It is thus reasonable to assume that the species is in a state of (quasi-)equilibrium. Being at equilibrium, the fast species might be eliminated from the system, resulting in a simpler, reduced system with only the slow species. Tikhonov's theorem [8, 21] might be used to conclude that the original and the reduced system have similar dynamics (over a compact time interval).

Our aim is to interpret the reduced system as an ODE system arising from a reaction network with only the slow species. We follow some ideas in [3, 4]. The starting point is a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) arising from a reaction network with a given kinetics. We assume that a set of species ('the fast species') is given and that these species effectively are at steady state. If the species do not interact with each other (i.e. they are not on the same side of a reaction), then a relationship between the concentrations of the fast and the slow species can be derived under certain conditions [3]. Using this relationship, a reduced ODE system for the slow species in which the fast species have been eliminated is obtained.

The next step is to interpret the ODE system for the slow species as the ODE system associated with a reduced reaction network. This step could be carried out in various ways. We identify sequences of reactions in the original network, by means of a specific graph (see example below), such that the net production of the fast species is zero. By contracting the sequence into a single reaction and removing the fast species, a reduced reaction is obtained. A non-trivial issue is to determine the reaction rate of the reduced reaction. For small networks, the procedure can easily be carried out by hand.

Subsequently, we establish that the reduced reaction network has some desirable basic properties. For example, if the reactions of the original reaction network cannot take place in the absence of their reactant species, then this also holds for the reduced reaction network.

Graphical means to re-interpret a reaction network under quasi-stationarity are not new. The King-Altman procedure is a systematic way to eliminate enzymes and intermediate species, in an enzyme catalysed system with mass-action kinetics [12]. Later, Wong and Hanes [23] gave a systematic method to find the production rates of the slow species, avoiding much of the algebraic manipulations in [12]; see also [9]. These approaches can be seen as instances of a general linear (graphical) elimination procedure [3, 4].

None of the mentioned approaches specifically identifies a reduced reaction network, except for [4], where a reduced reaction network is obtained after elimination of intermediate species. A related approach by Horiuti, Temkin and co-workers, is based on a graphical procedure to identify, not one but many, reduced reaction networks [14, 17]. The procedure is similar in spirit to our method and we will contrast the two approaches in Subsection 7.1. In [7] an algorithmic method to obtain possible reaction networks corresponding to a rational ODE system is described. In [15] a graphical method for the elimination of complexes (not species) is presented.

To illustrate the results and methods of the paper, consider a ping-pong bi-bi mechanism [6], described by the reaction network

$$
E+S_{1} \underset{k_{2}}{\stackrel{k_{1}}{k_{1}}} Y_{1} \underset{k_{4}}{\stackrel{k_{3}}{\rightleftharpoons}} E^{*}+P_{1} \quad E^{*}+S_{2} \underset{k_{6}}{\stackrel{k_{5}}{\rightleftharpoons}} Y_{2} \underset{k_{8}}{\stackrel{k_{7}}{\rightleftharpoons}} E+P_{2}
$$

where $E, E^{*}$ are two forms of an enzyme, $S_{1}, S_{2}$ are substrates, $Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ intermediates and $P_{1}$, $P_{2}$ products. The molar concentrations of the species are denoted as: $x_{1}=[E], x_{2}=\left[E^{*}\right]$, $x_{3}=\left[S_{1}\right], x_{4}=\left[S_{2}\right], x_{5}=\left[P_{1}\right], x_{6}=\left[P_{2}\right], x_{7}=\left[Y_{1}\right]$ and $x_{8}=\left[Y_{2}\right]$. With this notation and assuming mass-action kinetics, the evolution of the species concentrations is described by the ODE system (cf. Equation (6)):

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\dot{x}_{1}=k_{2} x_{7}+k_{7} x_{8}-\left(k_{1} x_{3}+k_{8} x_{6}\right) x_{1} & \dot{x}_{2}=k_{3} x_{7}+k_{6} x_{8}-\left(k_{4} x_{5}+k_{5} x_{4}\right) x_{2} \\
\dot{x}_{3}=k_{2} x_{7}-k_{1} x_{1} x_{3} & \dot{x}_{4}=k_{6} x_{8}-k_{5} x_{2} x_{4} \\
\dot{x}_{5}=k_{3} x_{7}-k_{4} x_{2} x_{5} & \dot{x}_{6}=k_{7} x_{8}-k_{8} x_{1} x_{6} \\
\dot{x}_{7}=k_{1} x_{1} x_{3}+k_{4} x_{2} x_{5}-\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right) x_{7} & \dot{x}_{8}=k_{5} x_{2} x_{4}+k_{8} x_{1} x_{6}-\left(k_{6}+k_{7}\right) x_{8}
\end{array}
$$

The main interest is on the conversion of substrates into products [2]. It is thus sensible to eliminate the set of species $\mathcal{U}=\left\{E, E^{*}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}\right\}$ to obtain a reduced reaction network on the species $S_{1}, S_{2}, P_{1}, P_{2}$ alone. Assuming that $E, E^{*}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ are at steady state and using the conservation law for the total amount of enzyme, $T=x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{7}+x_{8}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{1}=q(x)\left(\left(k_{6}+k_{7}\right) k_{2} k_{4} x_{5}+\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right) k_{5} k_{7} x_{4}\right) \\
& x_{2}=q(x)\left(\left(k_{6}+k_{7}\right) k_{1} k_{3} x_{3}+\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right) k_{6} k_{8} x_{6}\right)  \tag{1}\\
& x_{7}=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{5} k_{7} x_{3} x_{4}+\left(k_{6}+k_{7}\right) k_{1} k_{4} x_{3} x_{5}+k_{4} k_{6} k_{8} x_{5} x_{6}\right) \\
& x_{8}=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{3} k_{5} x_{4} x_{3}+k_{2} k_{4} k_{8} x_{5} x_{6}+\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right) k_{5} k_{8} x_{4} x_{6}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(x) & =T /\left(k_{1} k_{5}\left(k_{3}+k_{7}\right) x_{3} x_{4}+\left(k_{6}+k_{7}\right)\left(k_{1} k_{4} x_{3} x_{5}+k_{1} k_{3} x_{3}+k_{2} k_{4} x_{5}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+k_{4} k_{8}\left(k_{2}+k_{6}\right) x_{5} x_{6}+\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right)\left(k_{5} k_{8} x_{4} x_{6}+k_{5} k_{7} x_{4}+k_{6} k_{8} x_{6}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Conditions that guarantee existence and positivity of functions expressing the concentrations of the species in a set $\mathcal{U}$ in terms of the remaining species, were given in [3]. These are reviewed in Section 3. The form of the expressions is the content of Theorem 11.

After substitution of (11) into the ODE system, we obtain the production rates of $P_{1}, P_{2}$ and the consumption rates of $S_{1}, S_{2}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{x}_{5}=\dot{x}_{6}=-\dot{x}_{3}=-\dot{x}_{4}=q(x)\left(-k_{2} k_{4} k_{6} k_{8} x_{5} x_{6}+k_{1} k_{3} k_{5} k_{7} x_{4} x_{3}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

This ODE system might be interpreted as arising from a reaction network with one reversible reaction with the following rate functions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1}+S_{2} \underset{\kappa_{2}}{\stackrel{\kappa_{1}}{\rightleftharpoons}} P_{1}+P_{2}, \quad \kappa_{1}=q(x) k_{1} k_{3} k_{5} k_{7} x_{3} x_{4}, \quad \kappa_{2}=q(x) k_{2} k_{4} k_{6} k_{8} x_{5} x_{6} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this particular case, it seems straightforward to identify reasonable reactions that explain (2). However, in general this might not be so. A procedure to systematically find a reduced reaction network is presented in Section 4. At the core of the procedure is a graph that relates the species in $\mathcal{U}$ (Definition 7). The graph of the example is


Each edge in the graph corresponds to a reaction in the original network. For example, the edge $E \xrightarrow{k_{8} x_{6}} Y_{2}$ corresponds to the reaction $E+P_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{8}} Y_{2}$.

Our main result is Theorem 16 that establishes the reduced reaction network. Essentially, it has two types of reactions: The reactions of the original network that do not involve species in $\mathcal{U}$, and reactions found by considering certain cycles of the graph. The reactant (resp. product) of such a reduced reaction is the sum of the reactants (resp. products) of the original reactions defining the cycle, after removing the species in $\mathcal{U}$. For example, the above graph has two cycles that give rise to two reduced reactions. The clockwise cycle involves the reactions corresponding to the labels $k_{1} x_{3}, k_{3}, k_{5} x_{4}$ and $k_{7}$ :

$$
E+S_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} Y_{1} \quad Y_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} E^{*}+P_{1} \quad E^{*}+S_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{5}} Y_{2} \quad Y_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{7}} E+P_{2} .
$$

Adding the reactants and products together and removing $E, E^{*}, Y_{1}$, and $Y_{2}$, we obtain the reaction $S_{1}+S_{2} \rightarrow P_{1}+P_{2}$. Similarly, the anti-clockwise cycle gives the reaction $P_{1}+P_{2} \rightarrow$ $S_{1}+S_{2}$ (consistent with (31)). The rate function of each reaction is determined from the edge labels of the graph. We describe an algorithm to find the reduced reaction network and the rate functions after Theorem 16 ,

Note that the reduced rate functions in (3) have 'mass-action form' in the sense that the reactions can only occur in the presence of the reactant species. This holds generally for the reduced reaction network (cf. Section 5).

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we introduce background material. In Section 3 we recall some results concerning elimination of variables in [3]. The reduced reaction network is derived in Section 4 . Properties of the reduced reaction network in relation to the kinetics (including mass-action) and conservation laws are presented in Section 5. This concludes the core of the paper. Sections 6, 7 and 8 discuss respectively iterative elimination, comparison with previous results (the approach in [17] and networks with intermediates) and post-translational modification networks. Finally, Section 9 contains proofs.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce necessary concepts from graph theory and reaction network theory.
We let $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ denote the sets of nonnegative and positive real numbers respectively, and define $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n}$ accordingly. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n}, x \cdot y$ denotes the scalar product associated with the Euclidean norm. Further, $\left\langle v_{1}, \ldots, v_{r}\right\rangle$ denotes the vector subspace generated by $v_{1}, \ldots, v_{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$.

Graphs, multidigraphs and spanning trees. Let $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be a directed graph (digraph) with node set $\mathcal{N}$ and edge set $\mathcal{E}$. By abuse of notation, we write $e \in \mathcal{G}$ whenever $e \in \mathcal{E}$. A spanning tree $\tau$ is a directed subgraph of $\mathcal{G}$ with node set $\mathcal{N}$ and such that the underlying undirected graph is connected and acyclic. A spanning tree is rooted at the node $N$ if $N$ is the only node with no outgoing edges.

The graph $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected if there is a directed path from $N_{1}$ to $N_{2}$ for any pair of nodes $N_{1}, N_{2}$. Any directed path from $N_{1}$ to $N_{2}$ in a strongly connected graph can be extended to a spanning tree rooted at $N_{2}$. A cycle is a closed directed path $N_{i_{1}} \rightarrow N_{i_{2}} \rightarrow$ $\cdots \rightarrow N_{i_{n}} \rightarrow N_{i_{1}}$ with no repeated nodes apart from the initial and terminal nodes. By definition all cycles are directed.

If $\pi: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow R$ is a labeling of $\mathcal{G}$ with values in some $\operatorname{ring} R$, then any subgraph $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ inherits a labeling from $\mathcal{G}$. We extend the function $\pi$ to the set of subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}$ by defining

$$
\pi(\mathcal{H})=\prod_{e \in \mathcal{H}} \pi(e)
$$

A multidigraph $\mathcal{G}$ is a pair of finite $\operatorname{sets}(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ equipped with two functions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
s: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} \quad t: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{N} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The elements of $\mathcal{N}$ are called nodes, the elements of $\mathcal{E}$ are called edges, and the functions $s, t$ are the source and target function, respectively. The function $s$ assigns to each edge the source node of the edge and the function $t$ assigns to each edge the target node of the edge. In a multidigraph both self-edges (edges $e$ with $t(e)=s(e)$ ) and parallel edges (edges $e_{1}, e_{2}$ with $t\left(e_{1}\right)=t\left(e_{2}\right)$ and $\left.s\left(e_{1}\right)=s\left(e_{2}\right)\right)$ are possible.

Spanning trees, cycles and labels for a multidigraph are defined analogous to those of a digraph. Note that the unique spanning tree of a multidigraph with one node and one self-edge is the node itself.

We associate a digraph $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ with a multidigraph $\mathcal{G}$ by removing self-edges and collapsing parallel edges into one edge. That is, only one of the parallel edges between two nodes is kept. If $\mathcal{G}$ is labeled, then so is $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ and the label of an edge in $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is the sum of the labels of the parallel edges in $\mathcal{G}$ with the same source and target. If a node in $\mathcal{G}$ is only connected to itself then it is not included in $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$. A formal definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is given in Subsection 9.1.

Reaction networks. A reaction network on a finite set $\mathcal{S}$ is a multidigraph $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ where
(i) $\mathcal{S}=\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{n}\right\}$ is called the species set. It is equipped with an order that provides a canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{n}$.
(ii) $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n}$ is called the set of complexes.
(iii) $\mathcal{R}=\left\{r_{1}, \ldots, r_{\ell}\right\}$ is called the set of reactions.

The source function in (4) is denoted as $y: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and assigns to each reaction $r_{i}$ its reactant $y_{r_{i}}$. The target function in (4) is denoted as $y^{\prime}: \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ and assigns to each reaction $r_{i}$ its product $y_{r_{i}}^{\prime}$.

Elements of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ are identified with linear combinations of species. Hence, under the isomorphism $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}} \cong \mathbb{R}^{n}$ in (i), we write a complex as a linear combination of the species. For instance, the complex $(1,0,1) \in \mathcal{C}$, which corresponds to the element in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{S}}$ assigning 1 to $S_{1}$ and $S_{3}$ and 0 to $S_{2}$, is written as $S_{1}+S_{3}$.

It is assumed that $y_{r} \neq y_{r}^{\prime}$ for all reactions $r \in \mathcal{R}$, and that every complex $\eta \in \mathcal{C}$ is either the reactant or the product of some reaction $r \in \mathcal{R}$. That is, the multidigraph $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ contains no self-edges and no isolated nodes.

Given a complex $\eta \in \mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n}$ we call $\eta_{i}$ the stoichiometric coefficient of $S_{i}$ in $\eta$. We say that $\eta$ involves $S_{i}$ if $\eta_{i} \neq \overline{0}$, and that a reaction $r$ involves $S_{i}$ if $S_{i}$ is involved in the reactant or product of $r$. We say that a pair of species $S_{i}, S_{j} \in \mathcal{S}, i \neq j$, interact if they are both involved in the same reactant or product of a reaction. Equivalently, if $\eta_{i}, \eta_{j} \neq 0$, for some complex $\eta$.

It is not common to allow for multiple reactions between the same reactant and product. It is however mathematically convenient for our purposes, as will be clear in Section 4. Note that, if $\mathcal{G}$ is a reaction network in our sense, then $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is a reaction network in the standard sense.

We often give a reaction network by listing its reactions. The set of complexes $\mathcal{C}$ and the set of species $\mathcal{S}$ is easily found from the reactions.

Example 1. The following

$$
S_{1}+S_{4} \rightleftharpoons S_{5} \longrightarrow S_{2}+S_{4} \longrightarrow S_{3}+S_{4}
$$

is a reaction network on the set of species $\mathcal{S}=\left\{S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}, S_{4}, S_{5}\right\}$ with set of complexes $\mathcal{C}=\left\{S_{1}+S_{4}, S_{5}, S_{2}+S_{4}, S_{3}+S_{4}\right\}$.

Dynamical systems. A kinetics for a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ is a function

$$
\kappa: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\ell} \quad x \mapsto\left(\kappa_{r_{1}}(x), \ldots, \kappa_{r_{\ell}}(x)\right)
$$

where $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n} \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{n}$, such that $\kappa\left(\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n}\right) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{\ell}$. The component $\kappa_{r_{i}}(x)$ of $\kappa(x)$ is called the rate function of the reaction $r_{i} \in \mathcal{R}$.

Mass-action kinetics is defined by the following rate functions:

$$
\kappa_{r}(x)=k_{r} x^{y_{r}}=k_{r} \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_{i}^{\left(y_{r}\right)_{i}}, \quad r \in \mathcal{R}
$$

where $k_{r}>0$ is called the reaction rate constant of the reaction $r$. By convention, $0^{0}=1$.
The kinetics $\kappa$ provides a labeling of the reaction network. Since the set of reactions is ordered, we often denote the rate functions as $\kappa_{i}(x)$ instead of $\kappa_{r_{i}}(x)$. In the examples, we label reactions with their rate functions. In the particular case of mass-action kinetics, we simply use the reaction rate constants $k_{i}$ as labels.

We denote by $x_{i}$ the concentration of species $S_{i}$ and let $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$ be the vector of concentrations. In specific examples, the species are denoted by letters such as $E, P$ and the concentrations are denoted by $x_{E}, x_{P}$, respectively.

For a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ on $\mathcal{S}$ and a kinetics $\kappa(x)$, we let

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{i}(x)=\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \kappa_{r}(x)\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right)_{i}, \quad i=1, \ldots, n, \quad x \in \Omega . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

The evolution of the species concentration in time is modelled by the following system of ODEs:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{x}=g(x), \quad x \in \Omega, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\dot{x}=\left(\dot{x}_{1}, \ldots, \dot{x}_{n}\right), g(x)=\left(g_{1}(x), \ldots, g_{n}(x)\right)$, and where the derivative is with respect to time. Explicit reference to time is omitted.

The steady states of the system (6) are the solutions to the system

$$
g(x)=0, \quad x \in \Omega .
$$

Remark 2. Consider a reaction network $\mathcal{G}$ with a kinetics $\kappa$ and the associated reaction network $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ with the induced kinetics $\widehat{\kappa}$ (the induced labeling of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ ). Then the ODE system associated with $(\mathcal{G}, \kappa)$ agrees with the ODE system associated with $(\widehat{\mathcal{G}}, \widehat{\kappa})$.
Remark 3. In typical models of biochemical reaction systems, the rate function of a reaction vanishes whenever the concentration of one of the reactant species is zero. In particular, this guarantees invariance of the non-negative orthant under (6). However, we do not need this assumption for our results to hold. In Section 5.1 we discuss some results that follow from making this assumption.

Conservation laws. The stoichiometric subspace of a network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ is the vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$ given by

$$
S=\left\langle y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r} \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\right\rangle \subset \mathbb{R}^{n} .
$$

If $\omega=\left(\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{n}\right) \in S^{\perp}$, then it follows from (5) and (6) that $\omega \cdot \dot{x}=0$. Thus, for any trajectory there is a constant $T \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$
T=\omega \cdot x=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_{i} x_{i} .
$$

This equation is called the conservation law with total amount $T \in \mathbb{R}$, corresponding to $\omega \in S^{\perp}$. We also say that $\omega \cdot x$ is conserved. A set of conservation laws

$$
\left\{T_{1}=\omega^{1} \cdot x, \ldots, T_{l}=\omega^{l} \cdot x\right\}
$$

is minimal if $\omega^{1}, \ldots, \omega^{l}$ form a basis of $S^{\perp}$. Then, the trajectory with initial concentration $x_{0}$ is confined to the linear space with equations

$$
T_{i}=\omega^{i} \cdot x, \quad \text { with } \quad T_{i}=\omega^{i} \cdot x_{0}, \quad \text { for } i=1, \ldots, l
$$

Example 4. Consider Example 1 and let $\kappa$ be a kinetics:

$$
S_{1}+S_{4} \underset{\kappa_{2}(x)}{\kappa_{1}(x)} S_{5} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3}(x)} S_{2}+S_{4} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{4}(x)} S_{3}+S_{4} .
$$

The corresponding ODE system is:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\dot{x}_{1}=-\kappa_{1}(x)+\kappa_{2}(x), & \dot{x}_{2}=\kappa_{3}(x)-\kappa_{4}(x), & \dot{x}_{3}=\kappa_{4}(x), \\
\dot{x}_{4}=-\kappa_{1}(x)+\kappa_{2}(x)+\kappa_{3}(x), & \dot{x}_{5}=\kappa_{1}(x)-\kappa_{2}(x)-\kappa_{3}(x), &
\end{array}
$$

and a minimal set of conservation laws consists of

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}+x_{5}=T_{1}, \quad x_{4}+x_{5}=T_{2} . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since concentrations are nonnegative, $T_{1}, T_{2} \geq 0$.

## 3 Elimination of variables

In this section we introduce some results from [3] about linear elimination of variables. The goal in [3] is to express the concentrations of some of the species at steady state in terms of the concentrations of the other species. This is done for sets of species, say $\mathcal{U}$, that form a noninteracting set (Definition (5), assuming the kinetics is linear with respect to the concentrations of the species in $\mathcal{U}$ (Definition 6). The elimination makes use of a special multidigraph, called $\mathcal{G U}$, which is defined in Definition 7 (see also Theorem 11). This multidigraph is also used to define the reduced reaction network in Section 4,

Let a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ on a set $\mathcal{S}$ be given.
Definition 5. A subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is noninteracting if it contains no pair of interacting species, and the stoichiometric coefficients of the species in $\mathcal{U}$ in all complexes are either 0 or 1 .

Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a noninteracting subset of species. For simplicity we let $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, \ldots, U_{m}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{U}^{c}=\mathcal{S} \backslash \mathcal{U}=\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{p}\right\}$ (with $p=n-m$ ), such that $\mathcal{S}=\mathcal{U}^{c} \cup \mathcal{U}$. We order $\mathcal{S}$ as $\mathcal{S}=\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{p}, U_{1}, \ldots, U_{m}\right\}$. From now on, we let $x_{i}$ be the concentration of $S_{i} \in \mathcal{U}^{c}$ and $x=\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{p}\right)$. Similarly, we let $u_{i}$ be the concentration of $U_{i} \in \mathcal{U}$ and $u=\left(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\right)$. Hence, the rate functions are functions of $(x, u): \kappa_{r}(x, u)$.

We let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p}, \quad \rho: \mathbb{R}^{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

be the projections onto the first $p$ coordinates and last $m$ coordinates of $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, respectively. Further, we let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be the set of reactions that involve species in $\mathcal{U}$ in the reactant and/or in the product:

$$
\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}=\left\{r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \rho\left(y_{r}\right) \neq 0 \text { or } \rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right) \neq 0\right\} .
$$

Any reaction in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$ involves at most one species in $\mathcal{U}$ in the reactant and at most one in the product. Hence, the vectors $\rho\left(y_{r}\right)$ and $\rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right)$ have at most one nonzero component (equal to one) for any $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

We next impose some regularity conditions on the rate functions, namely, that the rate functions are linear in the concentrations of the species in $\mathcal{U}$ in a specific way. We assume $\Omega$ takes the form $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$, where $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{p} \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p}$ (making an abuse of notation).
Definition 6. Let $\kappa: \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{\ell}$ be a kinetics with $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{p} \subseteq \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p}$. The kinetics $\kappa$ is $\mathcal{U}$-linear if, for each $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, there exists a function $v_{r}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $v_{r}(x)>0$ for all $x \in \Omega$ and

$$
\kappa_{r}(x, u)= \begin{cases}u_{i} v_{r}(x) & \text { if } r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}\right)_{i}=1 \\ v_{r}(x) & \text { if } r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}\right)=0 .\end{cases}
$$

A $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics can be interpreted as being mass-action with respect to the species in $\mathcal{U}$.

Definition 7. Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a set of noninteracting species and $\kappa$ a $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics. We define the labeled multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}=\left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}}\right)$ by

$$
\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}= \begin{cases}\mathcal{U} & \text { if } \rho\left(y_{r}\right) \neq 0 \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right) \neq 0 \text { for all } r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \mathcal{U} \cup\{*\} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}}= & \left\{U_{i} \xrightarrow{v_{r}(x)} U_{j} \mid r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \text { with } \rho\left(y_{r}\right)_{i} \neq 0 \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right)_{j} \neq 0\right\} \cup \\
& \left\{U_{i} \xrightarrow{v_{r}(x)} * \mid r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \text { with } \rho\left(y_{r}\right)_{i} \neq 0 \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right)=0\right\} \cup \\
& \left\{* \xrightarrow{v_{r}(x)} U_{i} \mid r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} \text { with } \rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right)_{i} \neq 0 \text { and } \rho\left(y_{r}\right)=0\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last two subsets in the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are empty when $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{U}}=\mathcal{U}$.
Observe that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ might contain parallel edges between any pair of nodes and self-edges for nodes other than $*$. Each edge $e$ in the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ corresponds to a reaction in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, $r(e)$. Moreover, since $\mathcal{U}$ is noninteracting, the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ has exactly one edge $e(r)$ for each reaction $r$ in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$. This gives rise to two bijective functions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}} \stackrel{r}{\underset{e}{\rightleftarrows}} \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}, \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that $r \circ e=\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ and $e \circ r=\operatorname{id}_{\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{U}}}$. In the examples, the functions $r, e$ are implicitly given by the subindices of the functions $v_{r}(x)$ : the edge label $v_{i}(x)$ indicates that the edge corresponds to the reaction $r_{i}$.

The graph $\widehat{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (not taking into account the labelling) agrees with the embedded network of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ given by $\mathcal{U}$, as defined in [11] considering $*$ as the zero complex.

Example 8. Consider the network

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
S_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{1}(x, u)} S_{2} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{2}(x, u)} U_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3}(x, u)} U_{2} & S_{3}+U_{1}{ }^{\kappa_{4}(x, u)} U_{3}+S_{1} \\
S_{3}+U_{2} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{5}(x, u)} S_{2}+U_{3} & U_{3} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{6}(x, u)} S_{3} .
\end{array}
$$

The set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}$ is noninteracting. A $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics $\kappa(x, u)$ takes the form

$$
\kappa(x, u)=\left(\kappa_{1}(x, u), v_{2}(x), u_{1} v_{3}(x), u_{1} v_{4}(x), u_{2} v_{5}(x), u_{3} v_{6}(x)\right)
$$

and the corresponding multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is


Example 9. Consider a phosphorylation mechanism for a substrate $S$ such that phosphorylation may be catalyzed by two different enzymes, $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$, with mass-action kinetics:

$$
S+E_{1} \underset{k_{2}}{\stackrel{k_{1}}{\rightleftharpoons}} Y_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{p}+E_{1} \quad S+E_{2} \underset{k_{5}}{\stackrel{k_{4}}{\rightleftharpoons}} Y_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{6}} S_{p}+E_{2}
$$

We consider the noninteracting set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{E_{1}, E_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}\right\}$. Since we assumed mass-action kinetics, the kinetics is $\mathcal{U}$-linear. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is


Define the support of a vector $\omega=\left(\omega_{1}, \ldots, \omega_{n}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$ as

$$
\operatorname{supp}(\omega)=\left\{S_{i} \mid \omega_{i} \neq 0\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S} .
$$

A subset $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ of a noninteracting set is itself a noninteracting set and a $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics is $\mathcal{H}$-linear. Hence the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is defined.

Any connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ agrees with $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for some $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. If $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$, then the reactant and the product of any reaction in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{H}}$ involve each exactly one species in $\mathcal{H}$. In this case there is a vector $\omega^{\mathcal{H}} \in S^{\perp}$ such that

$$
\zeta\left(\omega^{\mathcal{H}}\right)=0 \quad \text { and } \quad \rho\left(\omega^{\mathcal{H}}\right)_{i}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
0 & \text { if } U_{i} \notin \mathcal{H}  \tag{10}\\
1 & \text { if } U_{i} \in \mathcal{H}
\end{array} \quad i=1, \ldots, m\right.
$$

that is, the coordinates of $\omega^{\mathcal{H}}$ corresponding to the species in $\mathcal{H}$ are all one and only these are non-zero.

According to [3], any vector in $S^{\perp}$ with support in $\mathcal{U}$ is a linear combination of the vectors $\omega^{\mathcal{H}}$ for all connected components $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Since these connected components are disjoint, the vectors $\omega^{\mathcal{H}}$ are linearly independent. These vectors give rise to conservation laws:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i \mid U_{i} \in \mathcal{H}} u_{i}=T_{\mathcal{H}} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Example 9 , there are two connected components without the node $*$. They give rise to two conservation laws, namely, $x_{E_{1}}+x_{Y_{1}}=T_{1}$ and $x_{E_{2}}+x_{Y_{2}}=T_{2}$. Any other conservation law involving only the concentrations of $E_{1}, E_{2}, Y_{1}, Y_{2}$ is a linear combination of these two conservation laws. The only connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ in Example 8 contains *. Hence there is no conservation law involving only concentrations of species in $\mathcal{U}$.

Let $N$ be a node of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the connected component that contains it, that is $N \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Let $\Theta(N)$ be the set of spanning trees of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ rooted at $N$.

Definition 10. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ be a reaction network on a set $\mathcal{S}$ and $\kappa$ a kinetics. A set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is said to be linearly eliminable if
(i) $\mathcal{U}$ is noninteracting.
(ii) For every connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ it holds: $\Theta(*) \neq \emptyset$ if $* \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and $\cup_{N \in \mathcal{H}} \Theta(N) \neq$ $\emptyset$ if $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$.
(iii) $\kappa$ is $\mathcal{U}$-linear.

Condition (ii) states that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ admits a spanning tree rooted at $*$, if $* \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$, and rooted at an arbitrary node, if $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Any strongly connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ fulfills this condition.

Let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ be a linearly eliminable set. For each connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, let $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ be the function

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=\frac{T_{\mathcal{H}}}{\sum_{N \in \mathcal{H}, \tau \in \Theta(N)} \pi(\tau)}, & \text { if } * \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}, \text { where } T_{\mathcal{H}} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \\
q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)=\frac{1}{\sum_{\tau \in \Theta(*)} \pi(\tau)}, & \text { if } * \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}} . \tag{13}
\end{array}
$$

The function $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ is a function of $x$ since $\pi(\tau)$ depends on $x$. We omit the explicit reference to $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ in $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ and to $x$ in $\pi(\tau)$ for convenience. When the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected, we omit the subscript $\mathcal{H}=\mathcal{U}$.

Definition 10(ii) guarantees that the denominators are never empty sums. By positivity of $v_{r}(x)$, the function $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ is positive for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{p}$. However, the denominator of $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ might vanish at points at the boundary of $\Omega$. Henceforth, we let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ be the domain where $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ is well defined for all connected components $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$. We have $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{p} \subseteq \widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$.

We will make use of [3, Propositions 8.4, 8.6], but reformulate them in the terminology of this paper (see also Section 9.2).
Theorem 11 (Elimination [3). Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ be a reaction network on a set $\mathcal{S}, \kappa$ a kinetics and assume $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ is a linearly eliminable set. Consider the system of equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{u}=0, \quad \text { and } \quad T_{\mathcal{H}}=\sum_{i \mid U_{i} \in \mathcal{H}} u_{i}, \quad T_{\mathcal{H}} \geq 0, \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ with $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Equation (14) holds for $(x, u) \in \widetilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$ if and only if

$$
u_{i}=q_{\mathcal{H}(i)}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{i}\right)} \pi(\tau), \quad \text { for all } i=1 \ldots m,
$$

where $q_{\mathcal{H}(i)}(x)$ is given by (12) or (13), and $\mathcal{H}(i) \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is such that $U_{i} \in \mathcal{H}(i)$ for $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(i)}$ a connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

The theorem states that if the species in $\mathcal{U}$ are at steady state with respect to the species in $\mathcal{U}^{c}$, then the concentrations $u_{i}$ can be given as rational functions in the labels of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, for fixed total amounts $T_{\mathcal{H}}$. The labels are independent of the concentrations of the species in $\mathcal{U}$. In virtue of the non-negativity of the labels of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, the concentrations of the species in $\mathcal{U}$ are also non-negative for $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$.

For future reference, we define the function $\varphi: \widetilde{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(x)=\left(\varphi_{1}(x), \ldots, \varphi_{m}(x)\right), \quad \varphi_{i}(x)=q_{\mathcal{H}(i)}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{i}\right)} \pi(\tau) . \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

If a connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected, then there is at least one spanning tree rooted at each node, and hence $\varphi(x)$ is not identically zero in any coordinate corresponding to a species in $\mathcal{H}$. If $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is not strongly connected, then at least one node is not the root of a spanning tree, and hence at least one component of $\varphi(x)$ is identically zero. In the latter case, all steady states lay at the boundary of the positive orthant.

Example 12. Consider the network in Example $\square$ and the noninteracting set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{S_{4}, S_{5}\right\}$. To adapt the notation to the present setting, we let $U_{1}=S_{4}$ and $U_{2}=S_{5}$. We assume the network is endowed with a $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics

$$
\kappa(x, u)=\left(u_{1} v_{1}(x), u_{2} v_{2}(x), u_{2} v_{3}(x), u_{1} v_{4}(x)\right) .
$$

The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is

$$
\stackrel{v_{4}(x)}{\overbrace{v_{3}(x)}^{U_{1}} \underset{v_{2}(x)}{v_{1}(x)}} U_{2} .
$$

The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected and thus the set $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable. We apply Theorem 11 to conclude that $\dot{u}_{1}=0, \dot{u}_{2}=0$ and $u_{1}+u_{2}=T_{2}$ hold if and only if:

$$
u_{1}=q(x)\left(v_{3}(x)+v_{2}(x)\right), \quad u_{2}=q(x) v_{1}(x), \quad q(x)=\frac{T_{2}}{v_{1}(x)+v_{2}(x)+v_{3}(x)} .
$$

Example 13. The set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}$ in Example 8 endowed with $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics is linearly eliminable since $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected. By Theorem [11, at steady state it holds that:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
u_{1}=q(x) v_{2}(x) v_{5}(x) v_{6}(x), & u_{2}=q(x) v_{2}(x) v_{3}(x) v_{6}(x), \\
u_{3}=q(x) v_{2}(x)\left(v_{3}(x)+v_{4}(x)\right) v_{5}(x), & q(x)=\frac{1}{\left(v_{3}(x)+v_{4}(x)\right) v_{5}(x) v_{6}(x)} .
\end{array}
$$

## 4 Reduced reaction network

Assume that a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ on a set $\mathcal{S}$, a kinetics $\kappa$ and a linearly eliminable set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ are given. If $u=\varphi(x)$, as given in (15), is substituted into the ODE system $(\dot{x}, \dot{u})=g(x, u)$, given in (6), then $\dot{u}=0$ by construction and an ODE system in the variables $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{p}$ is obtained:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{x}=\tilde{g}(x), \quad x \in \widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p}, \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\tilde{g}(x)=\zeta(g(x, \varphi(x))) .
$$

That is, for $i=1, \ldots, p$,

$$
\tilde{g}_{i}(x)=g_{i}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{p}, q_{\mathcal{H}(1)}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{1}\right)} \pi(\tau), \ldots, q_{\mathcal{H}(m)}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{m}\right)} \pi(\tau)\right) .
$$

In this section we prove that the ODE system (16) is the ODE system associated with a reaction network on the species set $\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{p}\right\}$. The reactions and the kinetics of this
reaction network are graphically obtained from the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, following the procedure given below Theorem 16 ,

The intuition is as explained in the introduction. Cycles in the multidigraph correspond to sequences of reactions such that the net production of the species in $\mathcal{U}$ is zero. However, not all cycles give rise to a reduced reaction. In order to give the precise formulation of the reduced reaction network (Definition 15, Theorem 16), we will need the following. For a cycle $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$ be the connected component that contains the cycle. In particular, the nodes of $\sigma$ form a subset of $\mathcal{H}(\sigma)$. Let $\Gamma(\sigma)$ be the set of subgraphs $G$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $\sigma \subseteq G$ and such that removing any edge $e \in \sigma$ from $G$ creates a spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$, rooted at the source $s(e)$ of $e$. Specifically, given an edge $e \in \sigma$, define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma(\sigma)=\{\tau \cup e \mid \sigma \backslash e \subset \tau, \tau \in \Theta(s(e))\} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The set $\Gamma(\sigma)$ does not depend on the chosen edge $e$ (Proposition 41 in Section 9.3). We further define the function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi(\sigma)=\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma)=\pi(\sigma) \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash \sigma), \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

which is the sum of the labels of the graphs in $\Gamma(\sigma)$.
Remark 14. To find $\Gamma(\sigma)$, it is sufficient to consider any edge $e \in \sigma$ and find all spanning trees rooted at $s(e)$, containing $\sigma \backslash e$. Therefore, $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if the path $\sigma \backslash e$ can be extended to a spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$ rooted at $s(e)$. In particular, if $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$ is strongly connected, then $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$.

If $\sigma$ is a cycle that contains all nodes of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$, then $\Gamma(\sigma)=\{\sigma\}$ and thus $\Pi(\sigma)=\pi(\sigma)$. Indeed, in this case $\sigma \backslash e$ is the unique spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$ containing $\sigma \backslash e$.

Let $\Delta$ be the set of cycles $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that

$$
\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \neq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad \Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset .
$$

The first condition states that the net-production of some species in $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ is non-zero over the reactions associated with the edges of the cycle.

Definition 15. Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ be a reaction network on a set $\mathcal{S}$, $\kappa$ a kinetics and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ a linearly eliminable set. The reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ is the reaction network ( $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ ) on the species set $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ with kinetics $\widetilde{\kappa}$ defined on $\widetilde{\Omega}$, such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}=\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1} \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1} & =\left\{\widetilde{r}: \zeta\left(y_{r}\right) \rightarrow \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right) \mid r \in \mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}\right\}, \\
\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2} & =\left\{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}: \sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right) \rightarrow \sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}\right) \mid \sigma \in \Delta\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

$\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is the set of source and target nodes of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$,

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x):= \begin{cases}\kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x)) & \text { if } \widetilde{r}=\zeta\left(y_{r}\right) \rightarrow \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}, \text { for } r \in \mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}, \\ q_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}(x) \Pi(\sigma) & \text { if } \widetilde{r}=\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2} .\end{cases}
$$

and $\widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \Omega$ is the maximal set for which $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ is well defined for all connected components $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

In short, $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ consists of the reactions that do not involve species in $\mathcal{U}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ consists of new reactions defined by the cycles in $\Delta$. The procedure outlined below Theorem 16 clarifies how the reactions in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ are obtained.

We are now ready to present our main result: the interpretation of the ODE system (16) as the ODE system of the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ defined above. The proof is given in Subsection 9.3 .

Theorem 16 (Reduced reaction network). Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ be a reaction network on a set $\mathcal{S}$, $\kappa$ a kinetics and $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ a linearly eliminable set. Then the $O D E$ system in (16),

$$
\dot{x}_{i}=g_{i}(x, \varphi(x)), \quad x \in \widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p}, \quad i=1, \ldots, p
$$

is the ODE system associated with the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$.
The fact that we can find a reaction network for the reduced ODE system implies that the system does not have negative cross effects in the sense of [16].

Procedure. We provide the following procedure to determine the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of a set of species $\mathcal{U}$, in virtue of Definition 15 and Theorem 16:
(1) Check whether $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable:
(i) Check that the set $\mathcal{U}$ is noninteracting and that $\kappa$ is $\mathcal{U}$-linear.
(ii) Compute the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (as in Definition 7) and check that each connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ admits a spanning tree rooted at an arbitrary node, if $*$ is not a node of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and rooted at $*$ otherwise.

If either (i) or (ii) fails, stop.
(2) ${ }^{*}$ Compute $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ for each connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\varphi(x)$, using (12), (13) and (15).
(3) Compute the reactions in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ : for each reaction that is not in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$ do
(i) Add the projection of the reaction by $\zeta$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$.
(ii) *Compute its rate function by replacing $u$ by $\varphi(x)$ in the original rate function.
(4) Compute the reactions in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ : for each cycle $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G U}_{\mathcal{U}}$ do
(i) List the reactions corresponding to the edges in the cycle and add the species in $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ in the reactants and products to obtain the reactant and product of the new candidate reaction $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$.
(ii) If $y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}} \neq y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}$ proceed. Otherwise go to the next cycle.
(iii) Compute $\Gamma(\sigma)$. If $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$, add $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ and proceed. Otherwise go to the next cycle.
(iv) ${ }^{*}$ The rate function of the new reaction is $q_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}(x) \Pi(\sigma)$, cf. (18).

If we are only interested in the reactions of the reduced reaction network and not the kinetics, then the steps marked with ${ }^{*}$ can be ignored. Further, in this case, if $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}$ is strongly connected, then $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$ and we do not need to find $\Gamma(\sigma)$ explicitly.

Remark 17. Let $r_{i_{1}}, \ldots, r_{i_{l}} \in \mathcal{R}$ be reactions in a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ that form a cycle in the network. Then,

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{l}\left(y_{r_{i_{j}}}^{\prime}-y_{r_{i_{j}}}\right)=0
$$

Hence, step (4iii) is not fulfilled and the cycle does not belong to $\Delta$. This applies in particular to any cycle arising from a reversible reaction $\eta_{1} \rightleftharpoons \eta_{2}$.

Example 18. For illustration, we apply the method to the reaction network in Example 亿 with $\mathcal{U}=\left\{S_{4}, S_{5}\right\}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}\right\}$ and a $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics.
(1) $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable: see Example 12 ,
(2) $q(x)$ and $\varphi(x)$ are given in Example 12
(3) $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}=\mathcal{R}$. Therefore $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}=\emptyset$.
(4) We compute the reactions in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$. $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ has three cycles:
(i) $\quad r_{1}: S_{1}+V_{1} \longrightarrow \quad r_{2}$

| $r_{3}:$ | $V_{2}$ | $\longrightarrow$ | $S_{2}+Y_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}:$ | $S_{1}$ | $\longrightarrow$ | $S_{2}$ |


(ii) $y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}=S_{1} \neq S_{2}=y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}$.
(iii) $\Gamma\left(\sigma_{1}\right)=\left\{\sigma_{1}\right\} \neq \emptyset$ (see also Remark (14). The reaction $S_{1} \longrightarrow S_{2}$ belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$.
(iv) Rate function: $q(x) v_{1}(x) v_{3}(x)$

(ii) $y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}=S_{1}=S_{1}=y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}$ (see also Remark [17). $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ is not added to $\mathcal{R}_{2}$.
(i)

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
r_{4}: & S_{2}+Y_{1} & \longrightarrow & S_{3}+y_{1} \\
\hline \widetilde{r}_{\sigma}: & S_{2} & \longrightarrow & S_{3}
\end{array}
$$

(ii) $y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}=S_{2} \neq S_{3}=y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}$.
$\sigma_{3}: \bigcap_{\neq}^{v_{4}(x)}$
(iii) $\Gamma\left(\sigma_{3}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}v_{4}(x) \\ \Omega_{v_{2}} \\ U_{1}, \overbrace{v_{2}(x)}^{v_{4}(x)}, \overbrace{v_{3}(x)}^{U_{1}}\end{array} U_{2}\right\} \neq \emptyset \quad$ The reaction $S_{2} \longrightarrow S_{3}$ belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$.
(iv) Rate function: $q(x)\left(v_{2}(x)+v_{3}(x)\right) v_{4}(x)$

Hence, the reduced reaction network consists of two reactions:

$$
S_{1} \xrightarrow{q(x) v_{1}(x) v_{3}(x)} S_{2} \xrightarrow{q(x)\left(v_{2}(x)+v_{3}(x)\right) v_{4}(x)} S_{3} .
$$

Remark 19. If $\mathcal{U}$ is noninteracting, each reaction involves at most one species in $\mathcal{U}$ in the reactant and product. Each node $U_{i}$ of a cycle $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the source (respectively, target) of exactly one edge of $\sigma$. Therefore, in step (4iil), each species in $\mathcal{U}$ that is a node of a cycle appears exactly once as reactant and once as product.
Remark 20. We have defined a reaction network as a multidigraph to simplify the presentation, in particular in connection with Theorem 16, and hence also allowed multiple reactions between the same complexes. The reduced reaction network might, however, be further simplified by collapsing multiple reactions into one reaction without changing the ODE system, that is, using $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ as explained in Remark 2. The rate function of a collapsed reaction is the sum of the rate functions being joined. See Example 21,

Example 21. We continue with Example9, The two components of the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are strongly connected, thus $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable. The set $\Delta$ consists of two cycles: $\sigma_{1}$, with the edges with labels $k_{1} x_{S}$ and $k_{3}$, and $\sigma_{2}$, with the edges with labels $k_{4} x_{S}$ and $k_{6}$. Both cycles give rise to the reaction $S \longrightarrow S_{p}$ and the rate functions are respectively

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)=q_{1}(x) k_{1} k_{3} x_{S} \quad \text { and } \quad \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)=q_{2}(x) k_{4} k_{6} x_{S},
$$

for $q_{1}(x)=T_{1} /\left(k_{1} x_{S}+k_{2}+k_{3}\right)$ and $q_{2}(x)=T_{2} /\left(k_{4} x_{S}+k_{5}+k_{6}\right)$. By Remark 20, we might further simplify the network to $S \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)+\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)} S_{p}$.
Example 22. Consider the following reaction network:

$$
S_{1}+U_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{1}(x, u)} S_{2}+U_{2} \quad S_{3}+U_{2} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{2}(x, u)} S_{4}+U_{1} \quad S_{4}+U_{2} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3}(x, u)} S_{3}+U_{3} .
$$

For the noninteracting set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}$ and a $\mathcal{U}$-linear kinetics, the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$

$$
U_{1} \xlongequal[v_{2}(x)]{v_{1}(x)} U_{2} \xrightarrow{v_{3}(x)} U_{3}
$$

has a spanning tree rooted at $U_{3}$. Thus $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable. Consider the unique cycle $\sigma$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. The graph $\sigma \backslash e$ with $e: U_{1} \rightarrow U_{2}$ cannot be extended to a spanning tree rooted at $s(e)=U_{1}$. Therefore, $\Gamma(\sigma)=\emptyset$ and the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ has no reactions. Since the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not have a spanning tree rooted at a node other than $U_{3}$, we have that $\varphi(x)=(0,0, T)$, for the conservation law $u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}=T$. Since the kinetics is $\mathcal{U}$-linear and $U_{3}$ is not involved in any reactant, it follows that $\kappa(x, \varphi(x))=(0,0,0)$. Thus the ODE system of the reduced reaction network (16) is $\dot{x}=0$.

## 5 Basic properties of the reduced reaction network

In this section we study some basic properties of the reduced reaction network in Definition [15. In particular, Section 5.1 is concerned with the kinetics of the reduced reaction network. Section 5.2 is concerned with conservation laws.

In what follows, a reaction network $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ on $\mathcal{S}$, a kinetics $\kappa$ and a linearly eliminable set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ are given. We let $(\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{R}})$ be the reduced reaction network on $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$.

### 5.1 Rate functions and kinetics

In this section we prove that if the original rate functions vanish whenever one of the concentrations of a reactant is zero, then so do the rate functions of the reduced reaction network (Proposition 233). A refined result is obtained when the kinetics of the original reaction network is mass-action (Proposition [25). The proofs of Propositions 23, 24) and 25 are given in Subsection 9.4 .

As noted in Remark [3, a biochemically meaningful rate function fulfils $\kappa_{r}(x)=0$ whenever the concentration of one of the reactant species is zero, that is, $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{r}\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x)$ implies $\kappa_{r}(x)=0$. Based on this, we say that a function $f$ defined on a subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n}$ is standard for $r \in \mathcal{R}$ if

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { for all } \quad x \in V: \quad \operatorname{supp}\left(y_{r}\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x) \quad \Rightarrow \quad f(x)=0 . \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

We say that the function is fully standard if the reverse implication in (19) holds as well . The rate function $\kappa_{r}$ is (fully) standard if it is a (fully) standard function for $r$. Similarly, the kinetics $\kappa$ is (fully) standard if the rate function of all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ is (fully) standard.

The next proposition states that if $\kappa(x, u)$ is standard, then so is $\widetilde{\kappa}(x)$.
Proposition 23 (Standard kinetics). (i) Let $\sigma \in \Delta$ and consider the reaction $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$. If the kinetics $\kappa(x, u)$ is standard (resp. fully standard) on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$, then $\pi(\sigma)$ is standard (resp. fully standard) on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ for $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$.
(ii) If the kinetics $\kappa(x, u)$ is standard, then so is $\widetilde{\kappa}(x)$.

The kinetics of the reduced reaction network might not be fully standard, even if the kinetics of the original network is fully standard. For a reaction $\widetilde{r} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ defined by $r \in \mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, the rate function $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\tilde{r}}(x)$ is fully standard provided $\kappa_{r}(x, u)$ is. However, other things might occur for reactions $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$, where the rate function might vanish if

$$
\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash \sigma)=0 \quad \text { for some } \quad x \in \widetilde{\Omega},
$$

cf. equation (18). We characterise when this happens in Proposition 24 below. Let $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ be a reaction and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{p}$ be positive in the coordinates corresponding to the reactants in $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$. We show below that the rate function of $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ vanishes at $x$, if and only if, the steady state concentrations of the species in the cycle $\sigma$ are zero whenever the concentrations of the species in $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ are given by $x$.

Proposition 24 (Fully standard kinetics). Assume that $\kappa(x, u)$ is fully standard on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$. Let $\sigma \in \Delta$ and $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$ be such that $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{supp}(x)$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:
(i) $\Pi(\sigma)$ vanishes at $x$.
(ii) $\varphi_{j}(x)=0$, for all $j \in\{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $U_{j} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a node in $\sigma$.

It follows from the proposition that the rate function of $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ vanishes if and only if $\kappa_{r(e)}(x, \varphi(x))=$ 0 for all $e \in \sigma$ with $s(e)=U_{j} \in \mathcal{U}$. Indeed, the kinetics is $\mathcal{U}$-linear and hence $u_{j}$ is a factor of the rate function of the reaction $r(e)$.

If the vectors $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$ for which Proposition 24 applies are precisely those that satisfy $x_{i}=0$ for a certain $i \in\{1, \ldots, p\}$, then the reaction $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ can be modified by adding $S_{i}$ to its
reactant and product, such that $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}$ becomes fully standard for the modified reaction. This modification does not alter the ODE system. We do not apply this modification here.

If the original reaction network is endowed with mass-action kinetics, then we have a sharper result than Proposition 23. In particular, the function $\pi(\sigma)$ has the form of a massaction rate function for $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$. Whether or not the rate function $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}(x)$ of the reaction is of mass-action type depends on the specific form of $q_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}(x)$ and $\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash \sigma)$.

Proposition 25 (Mass-action kinetics). Assume that the reaction network ( $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}$ ) is endowed with mass-action kinetics. For $\sigma \in \Delta$,

$$
\pi(\sigma)=k_{\sigma} x^{y_{\widetilde{r}}}, \quad x \in \widetilde{\Omega}
$$

for some constant $k_{\sigma}>0$. Moreover, if the reactant of $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ involves the species $S_{i}$, then the concentration $x_{i}$ is a factor of $\Pi(\sigma)$ with exponent at least $\left(y_{\tilde{r}_{\sigma}}\right)_{i}$.

The proposition says that the exponents of the concentrations in $\Pi(\sigma)$ might be larger than their stoichiometric coefficients, for the species involved in the reactant of $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$. There might also be factors that depend on concentrations of species that are not involved in the reactant, as illustrated in the next example. The example illustrates also the following phenomenon: when two identical reactions arising from different cycles in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are joined and their respective rate functions are added (cf. Remark 20), then the rate function of the reaction might become fully standard.

Example 26. Consider the reaction network with mass-action kinetics:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1}+U_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} S_{2}+U_{2} \quad U_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} U_{1} \quad S_{3}+U_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{1}+U_{2} \quad U_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{4}} U_{3} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the noninteracting set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}$. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is

$$
U_{1} \underset{k_{2}}{\stackrel{k_{1} x_{1}}{\gtrless}} U_{2} \stackrel{k_{4}}{\underset{k_{3} x_{3}}{\rightleftarrows}} U_{3}
$$

The reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)} S_{2} \quad S_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)} S_{1} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\widetilde{\kappa}(x)=\left(\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x), \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)\right)$ is

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}(x)=q(x) k_{1} k_{3}\left(k_{2} x_{1} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{3}}, k_{4} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{1}} x_{3}\right), \quad q(x)=\frac{T}{k_{2} k_{3} x_{3}+k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} x_{3}+k_{1} k_{4} x_{1}}
$$

Concentrations that appear with an exponent larger than the stoichiometric coefficient of the corresponding species are marked in bold.

We have $\widetilde{\Omega}=\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{3} \backslash\left\{x \mid x_{1}=x_{3}=0\right\}$. The rate function of the first reaction in (21) vanishes for $x_{3}=0$, even though $S_{3}$ is not in the reactant. This reaction corresponds to the left-cycle of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, which involves $U_{1}, U_{2}$. By Proposition 24, the functions $\varphi_{1}(x), \varphi_{2}(x)$ must vanish when $x_{3}=0$. Indeed:

$$
\varphi(x)=q(x)\left(k_{2} k_{3} \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{3}}, k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} \boldsymbol{x}_{\boldsymbol{3}}\right)
$$

Consider now the reaction network (20) with an additional reaction:

$$
S_{1}+U_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{5}} S_{2}+U_{3}
$$

The set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}$ is also noninteracting. The new reaction defines a self-edge at $U_{3}$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ with label $k_{5} x_{1}$, and hence the reactions in (21) are also reactions of the new reduced reaction network with the same kinetics. The cycle given by the self-edge belongs to $\Delta$ and gives rise to an additional reaction $S_{1} \longrightarrow S_{2}$ with rate function $q(x) k_{1} k_{4} k_{5} x_{1}^{2}$. This reaction is considered now twice with different rate functions. After joining the two reactions $S_{1} \longrightarrow S_{2}$, the reduced reaction network is (21) with the rate function $\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)$ replaced by:

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)=q(x) k_{1} k_{2} k_{3} x_{1} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{3}}+q(x) k_{1} k_{4} k_{5} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{1}}^{\mathbf{2}}=q(x) k_{1}\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbf{2}} \boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbf{3}} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{3}}+\boldsymbol{k}_{\boldsymbol{4}} \boldsymbol{k}_{\mathbf{5}} \boldsymbol{x}_{\mathbf{1}}\right) x_{1} .
$$

With this transformation, the kinetics of (21) is fully standard in $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

### 5.2 Conservation laws of the two networks

Let $\widetilde{S} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{p}$ be the stoichiometric subspace of the reduced reaction network. In this section we compare the orthogonal complement of the stoichiometric subspaces, $S^{\perp}$ and $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}$, which define the conservation laws of the reaction networks. We show in Theorem 27 that the projection of $S^{\perp}$ on $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ is contained in $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}$, and that the two spaces agree if the connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are strongly connected. For example if $x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}=T$ is a conservation law of the original reaction network and $S_{3}$ is eliminated, then $x_{1}+x_{2}=\widetilde{T}$ is a conservation law of the reduced reaction network.

Let $W$ be the vector subspace of $S^{\perp}$ generated by the vectors $\omega^{\mathcal{H}}$ defined in (10) for each connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $* \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Any vector in $S^{\perp}$ with support in $\mathcal{U}$ belongs to $W$. That is, $W$ is the kernel of the map $\zeta: S^{\perp} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p}$ (the restriction of the projection $\zeta$ in (8) to $S^{\perp}$ ). The proof of the next theorem is given in Subsection 9.4 .

Theorem 27 (Conservation laws). (i) $\zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right) \subseteq \widetilde{S}^{\perp}$.
(ii) If every connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected, then $\zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right)=\widetilde{S}^{\perp}$.

Theorem 27 gives that $\zeta$ induces an injective map from the quotient vector space $S^{\perp} / W$ to $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}$, which is an isomorphism when all connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are strongly connected. In this case, a minimal set of conservation laws of the reduced reaction network is simply obtained from a minimal set of conservation laws of the original reaction network by "deleting" $u_{i}, i=1, \ldots, m$, from each conservation law, and any conservation law only in $u$.

Example 28. By deleting $u_{1}=x_{4}$ and $u_{2}=x_{5}$ from the first equation in the minimal set of conservation laws (7) in Example [4, we obtain the minimal set of conservation laws of the reduced reaction network in Example 18 that consists of

$$
x_{1}+x_{2}+x_{3}=\widetilde{T}
$$

Example 29. We consider a mechanism that consists of two substrates $A, B$ that are converted into two products $P, Q$ through a series of reactions catalysed by an enzyme $E$ [2, Chapter 5]. It is an example of a $b i-b i$ model in the notation of Cleland [6]:

$$
E+A \underset{k_{2}}{\stackrel{k_{1}}{1}} E A \quad E A+B \underset{k_{4}}{\stackrel{k_{3}}{\rightleftharpoons}} E A B \underset{k_{6}}{\stackrel{k_{5}}{\rightleftharpoons}} E P Q \underset{k_{8}}{k_{7}} E Q+P \quad E Q \underset{k_{10}}{\stackrel{k_{9}}{9}} E+Q
$$

We let $U_{1}=E, U_{2}=E A, U_{3}=E A B, U_{4}=E P Q$ and $E_{5}=E Q$. We assume mass-action kinetics. A minimal set of conservation laws is

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{E} & =u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}+u_{4}+u_{5} & & T_{A+Q}=x_{A}+x_{Q}+u_{2}+u_{3}+u_{4}+u_{5} \\
T_{B+Q} & =x_{B}+x_{Q}+u_{3}+u_{4}+u_{5} & & T_{B+P}=x_{B}+x_{P}+u_{4}+u_{5} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We consider the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of the set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}, U_{4}, U_{5}\right\}$. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected


By Theorem 27, a minimal set of conservation laws for the reduced reaction network is

$$
x_{A}+x_{Q}=\widetilde{T}_{A+Q}, \quad x_{B}+x_{Q}=\widetilde{T}_{B+Q}, \quad x_{B}+x_{P}=\widetilde{T}_{B+P}
$$

Let us find the reduced reaction network. $\Delta$ contains two cycles: the cycle with the edges with labels $k_{1} x_{A}, k_{3} x_{B}, k_{5}, k_{7}$ and $k_{9}$ that meets all nodes clockwise, and the cycle with the edges with the rest of the labels that meets all nodes anti-clockwise. For both cycles, $\Gamma(\sigma)=\{\sigma\}$ (Remark (14) and the reduced reaction network is:

$$
A+B \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)}{\stackrel{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)}{\rightleftharpoons}} P+Q
$$

where $\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)=q(x) k_{1} k_{3} k_{5} k_{7} k_{9} x_{A} x_{B}, \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)=q(x) k_{2} k_{4} k_{6} k_{8} k_{10} x_{P} x_{Q}$ and $q(x)$ equals $T_{E}$ divided by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(k_{4} k_{6}+k_{4} k_{7}+k_{5} k_{7}\right)\left(k_{2} k_{9}+k_{1} k_{9} x_{A}+k_{2} k_{10} x_{Q}\right)+k_{4} k_{6} k_{8} x_{P}\left(k_{1} x_{A}+k_{2}\right) \\
& +k_{3} k_{5} k_{7} x_{B}\left(k_{9}+k_{10} x_{Q}\right)+\left(k_{7}\left(k_{5}+k_{9}\right)+\left(k_{5}+k_{6}\right)\left(k_{9}+k_{8} x_{P}\right)\right) k_{1} k_{3} x_{A} x_{B} \\
& +\left(k_{4}\left(k_{2}+k_{6}\right)+\left(k_{5}+k_{6}\right)\left(k_{2}+k_{3} x_{B}\right)\right) k_{8} k_{10} x_{P} x_{Q} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case $\widetilde{\Omega}=\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{4}$. The reduced reaction networks for this example and for the ping-pong $b i$-bi mechanism considered in the introduction have the same reactions. The two networks differ only in the factor $q(x)$.

If some connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ are not strongly connected, then the cases $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}=\zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right)$ and $\widetilde{S}^{\perp} \neq \zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right)$ are both possible.

Example 30. Consider the reaction network in Example [22. A minimal set of conservation laws consists of

$$
u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}=T_{1}, \quad x_{1}+x_{2}=T_{2}, \quad x_{3}+x_{4}=T_{3}, \quad x_{1}-x_{3}-u_{1}+u_{3}=T_{4} .
$$

By Theorem 27, the following are conservation laws of the reduced reaction network:

$$
x_{1}+x_{2}=\widetilde{T}_{2}, \quad x_{3}+x_{4}=\widetilde{T}_{3}, \quad x_{1}-x_{3}=\widetilde{T}_{4} .
$$

However, the reduced reaction network has no reactions and therefore $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}=\mathbb{R}^{4}$. Here, the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is not strongly connected and $\zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right) \subsetneq \widetilde{S}^{\perp}$.

Example 31. Consider the reaction network

$$
S_{1}+U_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{1}(x, u)} S_{2}+U_{2} \quad S_{2} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{2}(x, u)} S_{1}
$$

and the set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}\right\}$. A minimal set of conservation laws of the reaction network consists of $u_{1}+u_{2}=T_{1}$ and $x_{1}+x_{2}=T_{2}$. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is

$$
U_{1} \xrightarrow{v_{1}(x)} U_{2}
$$

which is acyclic. The reduced reaction network has one reaction $S_{2} \longrightarrow S_{1}$, and a minimal set of conservation laws consists of $x_{1}+x_{2}=T_{2}$. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is not strongly connected and $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}=\zeta\left(S^{\perp}\right)$.

## 6 Iterative elimination

In this section we discuss stepwise elimination and show that in certain cases one might obtain different reduced reaction networks, depending on the order by which species are eliminated. This naturally has practical implications. Biologically, it relates to the situation in which species at different time-scales are eliminated from the network. The fastest species are removed first, then the second fastest and so on. As the resulting network might differ from the network obtained by removing the species all at once, a proper partitioning of species into time-scales might be warranted.

The setting is the following: Let

$$
\emptyset=\mathcal{U}_{0} \subset \mathcal{U}_{1} \subset \mathcal{U}_{2} \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{U}_{l}=\mathcal{U}
$$

be an increasing sequence of linearly eliminable sets. We compare the situation where $\mathcal{U}$ is eliminated at once (direct elimination) to the situation where the sets $\mathcal{U}_{i} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{i-1}, i=1, \ldots, l$, are eliminated iteratively (iterative elimination).

If each set $\mathcal{U}_{i} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{i-1}, i=1, \ldots, l$, is the node set of a connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ (or a union of such sets), then direct and iterative elimination yield the same result by construction: both elimination of variables and the reduced reaction network consider the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ componentwise.

Another scenario in which iterative and direct elimination coincide is as follows. Consider the connected component $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ that contains $*$ (if any) and let $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}^{*}$ be the multidigraph obtained by removal of the node $*$ and all the edges that have $*$ as source or target. This multidigraph might now have several connected components. The next proposition (proven in Subsection (9.5) states that elimination of the species in $\mathcal{H}$ or iterative elimination of the species in the connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}^{*}$ yield the same reduced reaction network.

Proposition 32 (Splitting the connected component with node $*$ ). Assume that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected and contains $*$. Let $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{H}_{1} \sqcup \mathcal{H}_{2}$ be a decomposition of $\mathcal{U}$ into two disjoint subsets such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{*}=\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}^{*} \sqcup \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}^{*}$. Then the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ agrees with the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{H}_{1}$ followed by elimination of $\mathcal{H}_{2}$.

See Example 36 in Subsection 7.2 for an illustration.
In general, iterative elimination might not yield the same reaction network as direct elimination. We present some examples below.

Example 33. Consider the reaction network with mass-action kinetics

$$
S_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} U_{1}+S_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} U_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} U_{1}+S_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{4}} S_{4},
$$

and the linearly eliminable sets $\mathcal{U}_{1}=\left\{U_{1}\right\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{2}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}\right\}$ with multidigraphs


The four cycles of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}$ give that the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{1}$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{1}+S_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}\left(x, u_{2}\right)} S_{2}+U_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}\left(x, u_{2}\right)} S_{3}+U_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}\left(x, u_{2}\right)} S_{3}+S_{4}  \tag{22}\\
& S_{1}+S_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}\left(x, u_{2}\right)} S_{2}+S_{4}
\end{align*}
$$

with kinetics

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}\left(x, u_{2}\right)=\left(\frac{k_{1} k_{2} x_{1} x_{2}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}, \frac{k_{2} k_{3} x_{2} u_{2}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}, \frac{k_{3} k_{4} x_{3} u_{2}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}, \frac{k_{1} k_{4} x_{1} x_{3}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}\right) .
$$

Here $\widetilde{\Omega}=\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{5} \backslash\left\{x_{2}=x_{3}=0\right\}$. The set $\mathcal{U}_{2} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{1}=\left\{U_{2}\right\}$ is linearly eliminable for the reaction network (22). Its elimination yields the reduced reaction network:

$$
S_{1}+S_{2}+S_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)} S_{2}+S_{3}+S_{4} \quad S_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)} S_{3} \quad S_{1}+S_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}^{\prime}(x)} S_{2}+S_{4}
$$

with rate functions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)=\frac{k_{1} k_{2} k_{3} k_{4} x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} /\left(k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}\right)^{2}}{k_{3} k_{4} x_{3} /\left(k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}\right)}=\frac{k_{1} k_{2} x_{1} x_{2}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}, \\
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)=\frac{k_{2} k_{3} x_{2} /\left(k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}\right)}{k_{3} k_{4} x_{3} /\left(k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}\right)}=\frac{k_{2} x_{2}}{k_{4} x_{3}} \\
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{3}^{\prime}(x)=\frac{k_{1} k_{4} x_{1} x_{3}}{k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}}=\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}\left(x, \widetilde{\varphi}_{u_{2}}(x)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

In this case $\widetilde{\Omega}^{\prime}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{4} \geq 0 \mid x_{3} \neq 0\right\}$. Since $k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3} \neq 0$ for all $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}^{\prime}$ we might simplify $k_{2} x_{2}+k_{4} x_{3}$ from $\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)$ and $\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)$, as shown above.

The reduced reaction network obtained by direct elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{2}$ is:

$$
S_{2} \xrightarrow{\bar{\kappa}_{1}(x)} S_{3} \quad S_{1}+S_{3} \xrightarrow{\bar{\kappa}_{2}(x)} S_{2}+S_{4}
$$

with rate functions

$$
\bar{\kappa}_{1}(x)=\frac{k_{2} k_{3} x_{2}}{k_{3} k_{4} x_{3}}=\frac{k_{2} x_{2}}{k_{4} x_{3}}, \quad \bar{\kappa}_{2}(x)=\frac{k_{1} k_{4} x_{1} x_{3}}{k_{3} k_{4} x_{3}}=\frac{k_{1} x_{1}}{k_{3}},
$$

which is clearly different from the reduced reaction network obtained by first eliminating $\mathcal{U}_{1}$ and then $\mathcal{U}_{2} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{1}$.

When $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected and contains $*$, elimination of $u$ only involves the equation $\dot{u}=0$ and no conservation laws. Therefore, iterative elimination is equivalent to solving a system of linear equations iteratively. It follows that the function $\varphi$ in (15) does not depend on the chosen procedure and thus neither does the ODE system (16). However, as shown in the above example, the reduced reaction network may depend on the procedure, even though their associated ODE systems agree.

The next example provides an example where direct and iterative elimination result in the same reduced reaction network, and an example where the reactions but not the kinetics of the two reduced reaction networks agree.

Example 34. Consider the reaction network with mass-action kinetics:

$$
S_{1}+U_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{1}} U_{2} \xrightarrow{k_{2}} U_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} S_{2}+U_{1},
$$

and the sets of noninteracting species:

$$
\mathcal{U}_{1}=\left\{U_{1}\right\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{2}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}\right\} \subset \mathcal{U}_{3}=\left\{U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right\}
$$

The multidigraphs $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}_{i}}$ are


The reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{1}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1}+U_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}\left(x, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)} S_{2}+U_{2} \quad U_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}\left(x, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)} U_{3} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

with rate functions

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}\left(x, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)=\frac{k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} u_{3}}{k_{1} x_{1}}=k_{3} u_{3}, \quad \quad \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}\left(x, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)=k_{2} u_{2}
$$

Since $\widetilde{\Omega}=\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{4} \mid x_{1} \neq 0\right\}, x_{1}$ can be canceled in $\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}\left(x, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)$.
The set $\mathcal{U}_{2} \backslash \overline{\mathcal{U}_{1}}=\left\{U_{2}\right\}$ is linearly eliminable for the reaction network (23). The multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}_{2} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{1}}$ is

$$
U_{2} \underset{k_{3} u_{3}}{k_{2}} *
$$

Elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{2} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{1}$ yields the reduced reaction network

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1}+U_{3} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}\left(x, u_{3}\right)} S_{2}+U_{3}, \quad \widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}\left(x, u_{3}\right)=\frac{k_{2} k_{3} u_{3}}{k_{2}}=k_{3} u_{3} . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is also the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{2}$ directly, as it can easily be seen by considering $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}_{2}}$. Therefore, in this case both eliminations yield the same result.

We compare now direct elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{3}$ with elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{3} \backslash \mathcal{U}_{2}=\left\{U_{3}\right\}$ from (24). Both approaches provide the reduced reaction network

$$
S_{1} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime \prime}(x)} S_{2} .
$$

However, the kinetics differ: $\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime \prime}(x)=k_{3} T$, for iterative elimination, using the conservation law $u_{3}=T$, and

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime \prime}(x)=\frac{k_{1} k_{2} k_{3} T x_{1}}{k_{1} k_{2} x_{1}+k_{2} x_{3}+k_{1} k_{3} x_{1}}, \quad \text { using } \quad u_{1}+u_{2}+u_{3}=T,
$$

for direct elimination. Therefore, the kinetics of the reduced reaction network depends on whether the elimination is performed iteratively or not.

In general, when conservation laws are involved in the elimination procedure, then the kinetics obtained after direct and iterative elimination differ, even though the reactions of the two reduced reaction networks might be the same. The reason is that the reduced ODE systems $\dot{x}=\zeta(x, \varphi(x))$ in (16) obtained by iterative or direct elimination are different.

To understand why, let $\mathcal{U}=\left\{U_{1}, \ldots, U_{m}\right\}$ be a linearly eliminable set such that $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected and does not contain the node $*$. Then $u_{1}+\cdots+u_{m}$ is conserved. The set $\mathcal{U}_{1}=\left\{U_{1}, \ldots, U_{m-1}\right\}$ is linearly eliminable and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}_{1}}$ contains the node $*$. Theorem [1] thus guarantees that the system of equations $\dot{u}_{1}=\cdots=\dot{u}_{m_{1}}=0$ in $u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m-1}$ has a unique solution $\varphi^{1}\left(x, u_{m}\right)$. The reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}_{1}$ has, by Theorem [27, the conservation law

$$
u_{m}=\widetilde{T} .
$$

This implies that in the ODE system $\dot{x}=\zeta(x, \varphi(x))$ obtained by iterative elimination of the set $\mathcal{U}_{1}$ followed by $\left\{U_{m}\right\}, \varphi_{m}(x)$ is constant equal to $T$, and the first $m-1$ components of $\varphi$ agree with $\varphi^{1}(x, \widetilde{T})$.

If $\mathcal{U}$ is directly eliminated, then $\varphi(x)$ is found by solving the system of equations

$$
\dot{u}_{1}=\cdots=\dot{u}_{m-1}=0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_{i}=T .
$$

The first $m-1$ equations give $u_{i}=\varphi_{i}^{1}\left(x, u_{m}\right)$ for $i=1, \ldots, m-1$, and the last equation determines $u_{m}$ as the solution to

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varphi_{i}^{1}\left(x, u_{m}\right)+u_{m}=T
$$

Unless $\sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varphi_{i}^{1}\left(x, u_{m}\right)$ is constant, $u_{m}=\varphi_{m}(x)$ is not constant. Hence the function $\varphi(x)$ used in $\dot{x}=\zeta(x, \varphi(x))$ depends in general on the chosen approach, and as a consequence so does the kinetics of the reduced reaction network.

## 7 Relation to previous work

Ideas similar ideas to ours have been proposed in the literature. In the first part of this section we focus on the techniques proposed in [10, 17]; see also [18, 19]. We will discuss similarities and differences to our approach following the exposition in [18]. In the second part of the section, we justify that our construction generalises the reduction of intermediates in [4].

### 7.1 Horiuti-Temkin approach

In [18] the authors outline some applications of graph theory to the theory of reaction networks and introduce reduction of reaction networks by graphical means. In that work, the reversible reactions are treated as one reaction, while we treat them as two separate reactions in the present paper.

The authors introduce a graph called the kinetic graph (see [17]) whose nodes are the so called intermediates. The kinetic graph coincides with the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ introduced in Definition (up to the treatment of reversible reactions) and the so called intermediates form a noninteracting set in our terminology. Their goal is to eliminate intermediates from a reaction network and find a minimal mechanism that allows the computation of the production rates of the remaining species. The differences between their approach and our work arise from the details in the treatment of the reactions and the rates.

First, in [18] not only one reduced reaction network is obtained, as in our case, but an infinite number of them. Any linear combination of the original reactions that cancel the intermediates is a possible reaction in a reduced reaction network. The set of such reactions defines a vector subspace of $S$, of which a basis is chosen. Therefore, the reduced reactions are independent vectors in the stoichiometric subspace, and their number is minimal.

Second, the conditions imposed for the computation of the rate functions are different. In [18], the rate functions are found by imposing the Horiuti-Temkin equation (see (25)), which involves the rate functions of the original and reduced reaction networks but does not relate to the stoichiometry of the reactions. As a consequence of the Houriti-Temkin equation, the ODE system (16) is also satisfied for the reactions and rate functions given in [18]. We discuss next in further detail the differences on this particular point. Assume for the discussion below that $\mathcal{R}=\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$.

For $\sigma \in \Delta$, let $\nu_{\sigma}$ be the vector with $\left(\nu_{\sigma}\right)_{i}=1$ if $e_{i}$ is an edge of the cycle and $\left(\nu_{\sigma}\right)_{i}=$ 0 otherwise. Choose an order for the set of edges in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and for the set of cycles $\Delta=$ $\left\{\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{|\Delta|}\right\}$, and let $\widetilde{H}$ be the $|\Delta| \times \ell$ matrix whose $i$ th row is $\nu_{\sigma_{i}}$. With this notation, the Horiuti-Temkin equation for the reduced reaction network in Definition 15, considering reversible reactions as two irreversible reactions, reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
\kappa(x, \varphi(x))=\widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{\kappa}(x) . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Componentwise, this condition is in our notation

$$
\kappa_{i}(x, \varphi(x))=\sum_{\left(\nu_{\sigma_{j}}\right)_{i} \neq 0} \widetilde{\kappa}_{j}(x)=q(x) \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta, e\left(r_{i}\right) \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) \quad i=1, \ldots, \ell .
$$

This condition might not be satisfied by the rate functions in Definition (15. We show this in the case where $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected and does not contain $*$. We let $q(x)=q_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$.

Let $i \in\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ and $U_{j} \in \mathcal{U}$ be involved in the reactant of $r_{i} \in \mathcal{R}$ (it exists because $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected and does not contain $*$ ). Then

$$
\kappa_{i}(x, \varphi(x))=\varphi_{j}(x) v_{i}(x)=q(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{j}\right)} \pi(\tau) v_{i}(x)=(\star) .
$$

Each term $\pi(\tau) v_{i}(x)$ in the sum is the label of an element in $\Gamma(\sigma)$ for some cycle $\sigma$ that contains the edge $e\left(r_{i}\right)$. Let $\Delta^{\prime}$ be the set of all cycles of $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{U}$. Using the definition of $\Gamma(\sigma)$ we
have

$$
(\star)=q(x) \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}, \Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset, e\left(r_{i}\right) \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) \geq q(x) \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta, e\left(r_{i}\right) \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) .
$$

The inequality arises because $\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \neq 0$ for $\sigma \in \Delta$ and thus the sum on the left-hand side might involve more terms than the sum on the right-hand side. Hence, the Horiuti-Temkin equation is not necessarily satisfied.

Our rate functions fulfil an equation similar to the Horiuti-Temkin equation, once stoichiometry is introduced. To understand this, write the ODE system (6) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(x)=A \kappa(x), \quad x \in \Omega \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $A=\left(a_{i j}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}$ is the stoichiometric matrix with $a_{i j}=\left(y_{r_{j}}^{\prime}-y_{r_{j}}\right)_{i}$. The stoichiometric matrix of the reduced reaction network is by Definition $15 A^{c} \tilde{H}^{t}$, where $A^{c}$ is the matrix given by the first $p$ rows of $A$. By equation (26) and Theorem (16, the kinetics in Definition 15 satisfies

$$
\zeta(A \kappa(x, \varphi(x)))=A^{c} \widetilde{H}^{t} \widetilde{\kappa}(x)
$$

Finally, the kinetics obtained in [18] is not necessarily standard if the kinetics of the original reaction network is, contrary to our kinetics (cf. Section 5.1). This is illustrated using the main example in 18 .

Example 35. Consider the reaction network with mass-action kinetics

$$
S_{1}+S_{2}+S_{6} \underset{k_{2}}{\stackrel{k_{1}}{\rightleftharpoons}} S_{3}+S_{7} \quad S_{7} \underset{k_{4}}{\stackrel{k_{3}}{\rightleftharpoons}} S_{4}+S_{6} \quad S_{4}+S_{7} \underset{k_{6}}{\stackrel{k_{5}}{\rightleftharpoons}} S_{1}+S_{5}+S_{6}
$$

The correspondence with [18] is as follows: $S_{1}=\mathrm{C}, S_{2}=\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}, S_{3}=\mathrm{H}_{2}, S_{4}=\mathrm{CO}, S_{5}=\mathrm{CO}_{2}$, $S_{6}=\mathrm{Z}_{1}$ and $S_{7}=\mathrm{COZ}_{1}$. We consider the linearly eliminable set $\mathcal{U}=\left\{S_{6}, S_{7}\right\}$ with the conservation law $x_{6}+x_{7}=T$. The reduced reaction network obtained by our procedure is

$$
S_{1}+S_{2} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)}{\stackrel{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)}{\rightleftharpoons}} S_{3}+S_{4} \quad S_{1}+S_{2}+S_{4} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}(x)}{\stackrel{\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}(x)}{\rightleftharpoons}} S_{1}+S_{3}+S_{5} \quad 2 S_{4} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{6}(x)}{\widetilde{\kappa}_{5}(x)} S_{1}+S_{5}
$$

with kinetics

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}(x)=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} x_{2}, k_{2} k_{4} x_{3} x_{4}, k_{1} k_{5} x_{1} x_{2} x_{4}, k_{2} k_{6} x_{1} x_{3} x_{5}, k_{4} k_{5} x_{4}^{2}, k_{3} k_{6} x_{1} x_{5}\right)
$$

where $q(x)=T\left(k_{1} x_{1} x_{2}+k_{6} x_{1} x_{5}+k_{2} x_{3}+\left(k_{4}+k_{5}\right) x_{4}+k_{3}\right)^{-1}$. The kinetics is standard for the reduced reaction network, because each rate function vanishes when one of the concentrations of the species in the reactant is zero.

One of the reduced reaction networks obtained in [18] is

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{1}+S_{2} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)}{\stackrel{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)}{2}} S_{3}+S_{4} \quad S_{2}+S_{4} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}^{\prime}(x)}{\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}^{\prime}(x)} S_{3}+S_{5} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

In 18 the rates of the reactions are considered by pairs of reversible reactions and we obtain by their algorithm that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)-\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} x_{2}-k_{2} k_{4} x_{3} x_{4}+k_{3} k_{6} x_{1} x_{5}-k_{4} k_{5} x_{4}^{2}\right) \\
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{3}^{\prime}(x)-\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}^{\prime}(x)=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{5} x_{1} x_{2} x_{4}-k_{2} k_{6} x_{1} x_{3} x_{5}-k_{3} k_{6} x_{1} x_{5}+k_{4} k_{5} x_{4}^{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

with $q(x)$ as above. By collecting the terms according to their signs, we find

$$
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{\prime}(x)=q(x)\left(k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} x_{2}+k_{3} k_{6} x_{1} x_{5}\right), \quad \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{\prime}(x)=q(x)\left(k_{2} k_{4} x_{3} x_{4}+k_{4} k_{5} x_{4}^{2}\right) .
$$

This kinetics is not standard for the reaction network (27).

### 7.2 Intermediates

Our construction generalises the reduction of intermediates in 4]. In 4], an intermediate is defined as a species $Y$ in a reaction network that is produced in at least one reaction, consumed in at least one reaction and is not involved in any complex other than $Y$. A set of intermediates $\mathcal{Y}$ is a subset of the species set and at the same time a subset of the set of complexes (under the identification of complexes with linear combinations of species).

Any set of intermediates is noninteracting. The multidigraph $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{Y}$ contains the node $*$ and is strongly connected. Thus, assuming mass-action kinetics, $\mathcal{Y}$ is a linearly eliminable set. The reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{Y}$ has the following properties.

Any cycle $\sigma \in \Delta$ must contain the node $*$, because at least one reaction $r(e)$ with $e$ in $\sigma$ must involve a species in $\mathcal{Y}^{c}$. Then the reactant (resp. product) of $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ is the reactant $y_{r(e)}$ (resp. product $\left.y_{r(e)}^{\prime}\right)$ of the reaction corresponding to the edge $e$ with source $s(e)=*$ (resp. target $t(e)=*)$.

The label of an edge in $\mathcal{G Y}$ whose source is not $*$ is constant. Thus if $\tau$ is a spanning tree rooted at $*$, then $\pi(\tau)$ is a product of reaction rate constants $k_{i}$. If $\tau$ is a spanning tree rooted at $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then $\pi(\tau)$ is a product of reaction rate constants and the label $x^{y_{r(e)}}$ of the edge $e$ with $s(e)=*$ in the tree. Thus

$$
q(x)=G(k)^{-1}, \quad \text { and } \quad \Pi(\sigma)=x^{y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}} F(k)
$$

where $G(k), F(k)$ are polynomials in the reaction rate constants, such that $q(x)$ is constant in $x$. Therefore, the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{Y}$ is a reaction network with mass-action kinetics. There is a reaction between two complexes in $\mathcal{C} \backslash \mathcal{Y}$ in the reduced reaction network if and only if the reaction is already in the original network or there is a directed path between the two complexes through intermediates.

Example 36. Consider the reaction network with mass-action kinetics:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
S_{1}+S_{2} \underset{k_{2}}{k_{1}} Y_{1} \xrightarrow{k_{3}} Y_{2} \xrightarrow[k_{5}]{k_{4}} S_{1}+S_{3} & Y_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{9}} Y_{5} \xrightarrow{k_{10}} S_{4}+S_{6} \\
S_{2}+S_{4} \xrightarrow{k_{6}} Y_{3} \xrightarrow{k_{7}} Y_{4} \xrightarrow{k_{8}} S_{4}+S_{5} & S_{3}+S_{7} \xrightarrow{k_{11}} S_{2}+S_{7} .
\end{array}
$$

A set of intermediates of this network is $\mathcal{Y}=\left\{Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{5}\right\}$. The corresponding multidigraph $\mathcal{G Y}_{y}$ is


By Proposition 32, the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{Y}$ can be found by iteratively eliminating the sets of nodes $\mathcal{Y}_{1}=\left\{Y_{1}, Y_{2}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_{2}=\left\{Y_{3}, Y_{4}, Y_{5}\right\}$. The multidigraphs $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Y}_{1}}, \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{Y}_{2}}$ correspond to the left-subgraph and right-subgraph of $\mathcal{G} \mathcal{Y}$, respectively. We obtain the following reduced reaction network with the specified rate functions:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
S_{1}+S_{2} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)} S_{1}+S_{3} & S_{2}+S_{4} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)} S_{4}+S_{5} \\
S_{2}+S_{4} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}(x)} S_{4}+S_{6} & S_{3}+S_{7} \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\kappa}_{4}(x)} S_{2}+S_{7}
\end{array}
$$

where

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}(x)=\frac{k_{1} k_{3} k_{4} x_{1} x_{2}}{k_{4}\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right)}=\frac{k_{1} k_{3} x_{1} x_{2}}{\left(k_{2}+k_{3}\right)}, & \widetilde{\kappa}_{2}(x)=\frac{k_{6} k_{9} k_{10} x_{5} x_{7}}{k_{8} k_{10}\left(k_{7}+k_{9}\right)}=\frac{k_{6} k_{9} x_{5} x_{7}}{k_{8}\left(k_{7}+k_{9}\right)}, \\
\widetilde{\kappa}_{3}(x)=\frac{k_{6} k_{7} k_{8} x_{5} x_{7}}{k_{8} k_{10}\left(k_{7}+k_{9}\right)}=\frac{k_{6} k_{7} x_{5} x_{7}}{k_{10}\left(k_{7}+k_{9}\right)} & \widetilde{\kappa}_{4}(x)=k_{11} x_{3} x_{7} .
\end{array}
$$

There is indeed a reaction between every pair of complexes in $\mathcal{C} \backslash \mathcal{Y}$ that are connected by a directed path through intermediates. Further, the reduced reaction network has mass-action kinetics as well.

## 8 Post-translational modification networks (PTMs)

We conclude by discussing reduction of PTMs. In this section we abuse notation and use $x$ for the vector of concentrations of the original species set as well as for the concentrations in the reduced reaction network.

A common feature of signalling systems is the incorporation of PTMs, the attachment of some chemical group to a protein, after it has been translated. The most common example is phosphorylation. A mathematical formalism to study PTM networks, that is, a network combining several PTMs, was introduced in [20].

In [20, 5 PTMs are considered from the point of view of variable elimination, where socalled substrates and intermediates are eliminated. This provides a system of equations that depends on the enzyme concentrations only. Here we study the reduced reaction network on the set of substrates obtained by elimination of the sets of enzymes and intermediates.

We start by giving the definition of a PTM network, which is slightly more general than the one in [20, 5]. The species set of a PTM network is the disjoint union of three non-empty species sets:

- a set of substrates $\mathcal{S}=\left\{S_{1}, \ldots, S_{p}\right\}$,
- a set of enzymes $\mathcal{E}=\left\{E_{1}, \ldots, E_{m_{1}}\right\}$ and
- a set of intermediates $\mathcal{Y}=\left\{Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{m_{2}}\right\}$, in the sense of Subsection 7.2,

Allowed reactions, taken with mass-action kinetics, are of these five types:

$$
\begin{array}{rrr}
S_{i}+E_{j} & \longrightarrow Y_{l}, & Y_{l}
\end{array} \longrightarrow_{i}+E_{j}, \quad Y_{i} \longrightarrow Y_{j},
$$

The bottom types are not considered in [20, 5]. We assume that any path

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{i_{1}}+E_{j_{1}} \longrightarrow Y_{l_{1}} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow Y_{l_{t}} \longrightarrow S_{i_{2}}+E_{j_{2}} \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

through intermediates satisfies $j_{1}=j_{2}$. This provides a decomposition of $\mathcal{Y}$ into at most $m_{1}$ disjoint subsets according to the enzyme that ultimately produces them, or to which they dissociate.

With $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{Y}$, the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ has a connected component for each enzyme, which is strongly connected by the hypothesis and does not contain $*$. Thus $\mathcal{U}$ is linearly eliminable.

The next proposition (proven in Subsection 9.6) describes the reactions of the reduced reaction network ( $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ ) obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$. Recall the decomposition $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}=\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1} \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ given in Definition 15, A reaction $S_{i} \rightarrow S_{j}$ in the reduced reaction network belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ if it already belongs to $\mathcal{R}$. Therefore, we only consider $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ in the proposition below.

Proposition 37 (PTM networks). Let $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ be a PTM network and ( $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}, \widetilde{\mathcal{R}})$ be the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{Y}$. Let $S_{i_{1}}, S_{i_{2}} \in \mathcal{S}$ be two substrates. The reaction $S_{i_{1}} \rightarrow S_{i_{2}}$ belongs to $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ if and only if there is a path as (28) from $S_{i_{1}}+E$ to $S_{i_{2}}+E$ in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ for some $E \in \mathcal{E}$.

We conclude that if two substrates do not interact with a common enzyme $E$, there is no reaction between them in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$.

Example 38. Consider the network in Example 36, which is a PTM network with $\mathcal{Y}$ as in the example, $\mathcal{E}=\left\{S_{1}, S_{4}, S_{7}\right\}$ a set of enzymes and $\mathcal{S}=\left\{S_{2}, S_{3}, S_{5}, S_{6}\right\}$ a set of substrates. By Proposition [37, the reactions of the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{E} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ are

$$
S_{2} \rightleftharpoons S_{3} \quad S_{2} \longrightarrow S_{5} \quad S_{2} \longrightarrow S_{6} .
$$

Example 39 ( $n$-site phosphorylation system). We consider an $n$-site sequential distributive phosphorylation mechanism, which consists of a substrate $S$ that contains $n$ ordered phosphorylation sites. We let $S_{0}$ denote the unphosphorylated form and $S_{i}$ denote the phosphorylated form in which sites 1 to $i$ are phosphorylated. We assume there is a kinase $E$ that catalyses all phosphorylation steps and, similarly, a phosphatase $F$ that catalyses dephosphorylation steps. The reaction network associated with this system is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{0}+E \underset{\kappa_{2}^{1}(x)}{\kappa_{1}^{1}(x)} Y_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3}^{1}(x)} S_{1}+E \underset{\kappa_{5}^{1}(x)}{\kappa_{4}^{1}(x)} Y_{2} \longrightarrow \ldots \rightleftharpoons Y_{n} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3 n}^{1}(x)} S_{n}+E \\
& S_{n}+F \underset{\kappa_{2}^{2}(x)}{\kappa_{1}^{2}(x)} Z_{1} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3}^{2}(x)} S_{n-1}+F \underset{\kappa_{5}^{2}(x)}{\stackrel{\kappa_{4}^{2}(x)}{ }} Z_{2} \longrightarrow \cdots \rightleftharpoons Z_{n} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{3 n}^{2}(x)} S_{0}+F
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mathcal{U}=\left\{E, F, Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{n}, Z_{1}, \ldots, Z_{n}\right\}$ and assume the kinetics is $\mathcal{U}$-linear. By Proposition 37, the reduced reaction network obtained by elimination of $\mathcal{U}$ is:

$$
S_{0} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{n}^{2}(x)}{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{1}(x)} S_{1} \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{n-1}^{2}(x)}{\widetilde{\kappa}_{2}^{1}(x)} \cdots \underset{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{2}(x)}{\widetilde{\kappa}_{1}^{1}(x)} S_{n} .
$$

In order to find the kinetics, we consider the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$, which has two connected components:


The rate functions $v_{i}$ depend on $x$. The connected components give rise to conservation laws with total amount $T^{1}$ and $T^{2}$, respectively. The elements of $\Delta$ are:

$$
\sigma_{i}^{1}: E \underset{v_{3 i}^{1}}{v_{3 i-2}^{1}} Y_{i}
$$

$$
\sigma_{i}^{2}: F \underset{v_{3 i}^{2}}{\stackrel{v_{3 i}^{2}-2}{\Longrightarrow}} Z_{i}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$. For $l=1,2$ and $i=1, \ldots, n$ the reaction with rate function $\widetilde{\kappa}_{i}^{l}(x)$ corresponds to the cycle $\sigma_{i}^{l}$ and is as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widetilde{\kappa}_{i}^{l}(x)=q_{l}(x) v_{3 i}^{l} v_{3 i-2}^{l} \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n}\left(v_{3 j-1}^{l}+v_{3 j}^{l}\right) \\
& q_{l}(x)=T^{l}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(v_{3 j-1}^{l}+v_{3 j}^{l}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_{3 i-2}^{l} \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^{n}\left(v_{3 j-1}^{l}+v_{3 j}^{l}\right)\right)^{-1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## 9 Proofs

In this section we present the technical details and proofs of the results stated in the previous sections. This section is organised such that it follows the structure of the rest of the paper.

### 9.1 Preliminaries

We give the precise definition of the digraph $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ introduced in Section 2 and some associated functions that will be used later on.

Definition 40. Let $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled multidigraph and let $\mathcal{E}^{\prime}=\{e \in \mathcal{E} \mid s(e) \neq t(e)\}$ be the set of edges that are not self-edges. The labeled digraph $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}=(\widehat{\mathcal{N}}, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$ associated with $\mathcal{G}$ is the graph with

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathcal{N}} & =\left\{N \in \mathcal{N} \mid \exists e \in \mathcal{E}^{\prime} \text { with } t(e)=N \text { or } s(e)=N\right\} \\
\widehat{\mathcal{E}} & =\left\{N_{1} \rightarrow N_{2} \mid \exists e \in \mathcal{E}^{\prime} \text { with } s(e)=N_{1} \text { and } t(e)=N_{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that by definition $\widehat{\mathcal{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ and that the inclusion might be strict if there is a node in $\mathcal{G}$ that is only connected to itself. We define a surjective map from $\mathcal{E}^{\prime}$ to $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}$ as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{rlcc}
\beta: \quad \mathcal{E}^{\prime} & \rightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{E}}  \tag{29}\\
e & \mapsto & s(e) & \rightarrow t(e) .
\end{array}
$$

Using this map, the labeling $\widehat{\pi}$ for $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ is defined as

$$
\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{e})=\sum_{e \in \beta^{-1}(\widehat{e})} \pi(e)
$$

### 9.2 Elimination of variables

Theorem 11 is stated and proven in [3] using the digraph $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{\mathcal{U}}$ instead of the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ as we do here. This affects the definition of $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ as well as the sets of spanning trees. Either way the functions $\varphi$ agree because the computations performed using $\widehat{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ or $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ agree. It is shown in the next lemma.

Lemma 1. Let $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be a labeled multidigraph and let $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}=(\widehat{\mathcal{N}}, \widehat{\mathcal{E}})$ be the associated digraph given in Definition 40. Let $N \in \widehat{\mathcal{N}}$ and let $\widehat{\Theta}(N), \Theta(N)$ be the set of spanning trees rooted at $N$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\mathcal{G}$, respectively. Then

$$
\sum_{\widehat{\tau} \in \widehat{\Theta}(N)} \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\tau})=\sum_{\tau \in \Theta(N)} \pi(\tau)
$$

Proof. Since a spanning tree cannot contain a self-edge, the map $\beta$ in (29) extends to a surjective map from $\Theta(N)$ to $\widehat{\Theta}(N)$. In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Theta(N)=\coprod_{\widehat{\tau} \in \widehat{\Theta}(N)} \beta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau}) \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\widehat{\tau}$ be a spanning tree rooted at $N$ in $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}$. Then,

$$
\widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\tau})=\prod_{\widehat{e} \in \widehat{\tau}} \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{e})=\prod_{\widehat{e} \in \widehat{\tau}} \sum_{e \in \beta^{-1}(\widehat{e})} \pi(e)=\sum_{\tau \in \beta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau})} \prod_{e \in \tau} \pi(e)=\sum_{\tau \in \beta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau})} \pi(\tau)
$$

Therefore, using (30) we obtain

$$
\sum_{\tau \in \Theta(N)} \pi(\tau)=\sum_{\widehat{\tau} \in \widehat{\Theta}(N)} \sum_{\tau \in \beta^{-1}(\widehat{\tau})} \pi(\tau)=\sum_{\widehat{\tau} \in \widehat{\Theta}(N)} \widehat{\pi}(\widehat{\tau})
$$

### 9.3 Reduced Network

In this section we first prove that the definition of $\Gamma(\sigma)$ in (17),

$$
\Gamma(\sigma)=\{\tau \cup e \mid \sigma \backslash e \subset \tau, \tau \in \Theta(s(e))\}
$$

is independent of the chosen edge $e$, cf. Proposition 41, Subsequently, we prove Theorem 16 ,
We define the following set of sub-multidigraphs of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Gamma:=\{\gamma=\tau \cup e \mid \tau \in \Theta(s(e)), \quad e \in \mathcal{G} \mathcal{U}\} \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

Each element of $\Gamma$ is the union of an edge $e$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and a spanning tree (of the connected component in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ that contains $e$ ) that is rooted at the source of the edge, $s(e)$. Any multidigraph $\gamma \in \Gamma$ contains a unique cycle. Indeed, for $\gamma=\tau \cup e$ as in (31), the cycle is obtained by joining $e$ and the path in $\tau$ from $t(e)$ to $s(e)$, which exists because $\tau$ is rooted at $s(e)$. In particular, the cycle contains the edge $e$.

Proposition 41. Let $\sigma$ be a cycle of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. For any edge $e \in \sigma$,

$$
\{\tau \cup e \mid \sigma \backslash e \subset \tau, \tau \in \Theta(s(e))\}=\{\gamma \in \Gamma \mid \sigma \subset \gamma\}
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected. If $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $\sigma \subset \gamma$, then $\gamma=\tau \cup e$ with $\tau \in \Theta(s(e))$ and $e \in \sigma$. Clearly $\tau$ is a spanning tree that contains $\sigma \backslash e$. Conversely, if $\tau \in \Theta(s(e))$ is a spanning tree containing $\sigma \backslash e$, then $\tau \cup e \in \Gamma$ and $\sigma \subset \tau \cup e$.

Therefore, $\Gamma(\sigma)$ is the subset of $\Gamma$ whose elements contain $\sigma$. This shows that the definition of $\Gamma(\sigma)$ in (17) is independent of the choice of edge $e$. Note that $\Gamma$ is the disjoint union of $\Gamma(\sigma)$ for all cycles $\sigma$.

The next proof shows that the reduced ODE system (16) is the ODE system associated with the reduced reaction network in Definition 15.

Proof of Theorem 16: Reduced reaction network. Let

$$
f(x)=\sum_{\widetilde{r} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}} \widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)\left(y_{\widetilde{r}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}}\right)+\sum_{\widetilde{r} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}} \widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)\left(y_{\widetilde{r}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}}\right)
$$

We want to prove that $f(x)=\widetilde{g}(x)=\zeta(g(x, \varphi(x)))$. Observe that

$$
\widetilde{g}(x)=\sum_{r \notin \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}} \kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x)) \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right)+\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}} \kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x)) \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right) .
$$

By definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ and $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)$ for $\widetilde{r} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$, the first summand of $f(x)$ and that of $\widetilde{g}(x)$ agree. Using the definition of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$, all we need to prove is that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\sigma \in \Delta} q_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}(x) \Pi(\sigma) \sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)=\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}} \kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x)) \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right) \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

The sums on the right- and left-hand sides can be decomposed into sums over the connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ that contain $\sigma$ or $e(r)$, respectively. Therefore, it is enough to show that (32) holds when $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected. We let $q(x)=q_{\mathcal{H}(\sigma)}(x)=q_{\mathcal{U}}(x)$.

Given $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, either $s(e(r))=U_{i}$ for some $i$ if $\rho\left(y_{r}\right) \neq 0$, or $s(e(r))=*$ if $\rho\left(y_{r}\right)=0$. In the former case $U_{i}$ is the only species in $\mathcal{U}$ involved in the reaction $r$. Since the kinetics $\kappa$ is $\mathcal{U}$-linear, we have for $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$

$$
\kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x))=\left\{\begin{array}{lll}
\varphi_{i}(x) v_{r}(x) & \text { if } & s(e(r))=U_{i} \\
v_{r}(x) & \text { if } & s(e(r))=*
\end{array}\right.
$$

By the definition of $q(x)$ in (13) and of $\varphi_{i}(x)$ in (15), we have

$$
\kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x))=q(x)\left(\sum_{\tau \in \Theta(s(e(r)))} \pi(\tau)\right) v_{r}(x), \quad \text { for all } r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}
$$

Comparing this equality with (32), the statement follows if the following holds:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta(s(e(r)))} \pi(\tau) v_{r}(x) \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right)=\quad \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta} \sum_{e \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

We show the equality from right to left. Let $\Delta^{\prime}$ be the set of cycles in the multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since either $\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)=0$ or $\Pi(\sigma)=0$ for $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime} \backslash \Delta$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\sigma \in \Delta} \sum_{e \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)=\sum_{\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}} \sum_{e \in \sigma} \Pi(\sigma) \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \\
&=\sum_{\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}} \sum_{e \in \sigma} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash e) \pi(e) \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)=(\star)
\end{aligned}
$$

Each digraph $\gamma \backslash e$ in the sum is a spanning tree rooted at $s(e)$. There is a bijection between the set of triplets $(\sigma, e, \gamma)$ such that $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}, e \in \sigma, \gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)$ and the set of pairs $(e, \tau)$ such that $e$ is an edge of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $\tau$ is a spanning tree rooted at $s(e)$. Using further that $\pi(e)=v_{r(e)}(x)$ and the correspondence (9), we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\star) & =\sum_{e \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta(s(e))} \pi(\tau) \pi(e) \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \\
& =\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}} \sum_{\tau \in \Theta(s(e(r)))} \pi(\tau) v_{r}(x) \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that (33) holds, which concludes the proof.

### 9.4 Basic properties of the reduced network

In this section we prove the results about the kinetics and the conservation laws of the reduced reaction network in relation to the original reaction network.

## Kinetics.

Proof of Proposition [23: Standard kinetics. (i) By definition

$$
\pi(\sigma)=\prod_{e \in \sigma} v_{r(e)}(x), \quad y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}=\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right) .
$$

Hence, $\pi(\sigma)=0$ if and only if $v_{r(e)}(x)=0$ for some $e \in \sigma$. Further, we have that $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}\right)=$ $\bigcup_{e \in \sigma} \operatorname{supp}\left(\zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right)\right)$. Assume that the kinetics $\kappa$ is standard on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$. For $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\dddot{r}_{\sigma}}\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x) & \Leftrightarrow \exists e \in \sigma: \operatorname{supp}\left(\zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right)\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x) \\
& \Rightarrow \exists e \in \sigma: v_{r(e)}(x)=0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \pi(\sigma)=0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that $\pi(\sigma)$ is standard on $\widetilde{\Omega}$ for $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$. If the kinetics is fully standard, then the reverse of the second implication holds, showing that $\pi(\sigma)$ is also fully standard for $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$.
(ii) For $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ defined by $\sigma \in \Delta$ we have $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{\sigma}_{\sigma}}(x)=q(x) \Pi(\sigma)$. By equation (18), $\pi(\sigma)$ is a factor of $\Pi(\sigma)$ and hence $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}$ is standard on $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

For $\widetilde{r}=\zeta\left(y_{r}\right) \rightarrow \zeta\left(y_{r}^{\prime}\right) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ with $r \in \mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, we have $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)=\kappa_{r}(x, \varphi(x))$ by Definition 15 , Since $r \notin \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, then $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{r}\right)=\operatorname{supp}\left(\zeta\left(y_{r}\right)\right)=\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\widetilde{r}}\right)$. Since $\kappa_{r}$ is standard on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{m}$, then $\kappa_{r}(x, u)$ vanishes if $x \in \Omega$ fulfils $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\widetilde{r}}\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x)$. Since the denominators of $q_{\mathcal{H}}(x)$ do not vanish for $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$, we have $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)=0$ whenever $\operatorname{supp}\left(y_{\tilde{r}}\right) \nsubseteq \operatorname{supp}(x)$ and $x \in \widetilde{\Omega}$, showing that $\widetilde{\kappa}_{\widetilde{r}}(x)$ is standard on $\widetilde{\Omega}$.

Proof of Proposition 24; Fully standard kinetics. Throughout the proof all functions are assumed to be evaluated at $x$. Assume that statement (ii) holds. Let $e \in \sigma$ be an edge such that $s(e)=U_{j} \in \mathcal{U}$. Then

$$
\Pi(\sigma)=\pi(e) \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash e) \leq \pi(e) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{j}\right)} \pi(\tau)=\pi(e) \frac{\varphi_{j}(x)}{q_{\mathcal{H}(j)}(x)} .
$$

Since $\varphi_{j}(x)=0, \Pi(\sigma)=0$ and statement (i) holds.
Assume now that statement (i) holds. Let $U_{j} \in \mathcal{U}$ be a node in $\sigma, \tau$ a spanning tree rooted at $U_{j}$ and $e \in \sigma$ the edge with source $U_{j}$. We construct a new tree $\widehat{\tau}$ as follows: for every $U_{l} \neq U_{j}$ in $\sigma$, replace the only edge with source $U_{l}$ in the tree $\tau$ by the edge in $\sigma$ with source node $U_{l}$. The obtained subgraph $\widehat{\tau}$ is also a spanning tree rooted at $U_{j}$ that satisfies $\widehat{\tau} \cup e \in \Gamma(\sigma)$.

By assumption (i) and the definition of $\Pi(\sigma), \pi(\widehat{\tau} \cup e)=0$. Since $\kappa(x, u)$ is fully standard, $\pi\left(e^{\prime}\right) \neq 0$ for all $e^{\prime} \in \sigma$ by Proposition 23. Therefore there must be an edge $\widehat{e}$ of $\widehat{\tau}$ that does not belong to $\sigma$ and such that $\pi(\widehat{e})=0$. By construction, this edge is also an edge of $\tau$ and hence $\pi(\tau)=0$.

This proves that $\pi(\tau)=0$ for all $\tau \in \Theta\left(U_{j}\right)$, which implies that $\varphi_{j}(x)=0$ (cf. (15)). Hence statement (ii) holds.

Proof of Proposition 25: Mass-action kinetics. The label of an edge of $\sigma$ is $k_{r(e)} x^{x^{\zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right)} \text {, }}$ where $k_{r(e)}>0$ is the reaction rate constant of reaction $r(e)$. Using the definition of $y \widetilde{r}_{\sigma}$ in Definition (15), we obtain

$$
\pi(\sigma)=\prod_{e \in \sigma} k_{r(e)} x^{\zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right)}=\left(\prod_{e \in \sigma} k_{r(e)}\right) x^{\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}\right)}=\left(\prod_{e \in \sigma} k_{r(e)}\right) x^{y_{\tilde{\tau}}} .
$$

Hence $\pi(\sigma)$ has the claimed form with $k_{\sigma}=\prod_{e \in \sigma} k_{r(e)}$. The last statement is a consequence of (18).

Conservation laws. We prove here Theorem [27, Before that, we introduce some graphical constructions and a technical lemma necessary for the proof.

Let $\mathcal{G}=(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{E})$ be a multidigraph and assume that the sets $\mathcal{N}=\left\{N_{1}, \ldots, N_{n}\right\}$ and $\mathcal{E}=\left\{e_{1}, \ldots, e_{\ell}\right\}$ are ordered. We define the following objects:

1. The incidence matrix $C_{\mathcal{G}}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ is the $n \times \ell$ real matrix such that

$$
\left(C_{\mathcal{G}}\right)_{i j}=\left\{\begin{aligned}
1 & \text { if } \quad N_{i}=t\left(e_{j}\right) \neq s\left(e_{j}\right) \\
-1 & \text { if } \quad N_{i}=s\left(e_{j}\right) \neq t\left(e_{j}\right) \\
0 & \text { otherwise. }
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

2. The cycle space of $\mathcal{G}$ is the kernel of the incidence matrix.

Let $\Delta^{\prime}$ be the set of cycles of $\mathcal{G}$. For $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}$, the vector $\nu_{\sigma}$ with $\left(\nu_{\sigma}\right)_{i}=1$ if $e_{i}$ is an edge of the cycle and $\left(\nu_{\sigma}\right)_{i}=0$ otherwise, belongs to the cycle space of $\mathcal{G}$. Moreover, the elements $\nu_{\sigma}$ correspond to the irreducible elements in the cycle space with all non-zero components equal to one. That is, $\nu_{\sigma}$ cannot be expressed as the positive sum of two vectors in the cycle space with non-negative integer coordinates. The elements in $\Delta^{\prime}$ are also called elementary cycles in the literature [22]. We choose an order for the set of cycles $\Delta^{\prime}=\left\{\sigma_{1}, \ldots, \sigma_{\left|\Delta^{\prime}\right|}\right\}$, and let $H$ be the $\left|\Delta^{\prime}\right| \times \ell$ matrix whose $i$ th row is $\nu_{\sigma_{i}}$.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be a strongly connected multidigraph. Then $\operatorname{ker} H=\operatorname{im} C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}$.
Proof. By duality it is enough to show that im $H^{t}=\operatorname{ker} C_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since for all $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}, \nu_{\sigma}$ belongs to the cycle space, we have $C_{\mathcal{G}} H^{t}=0$, that is, im $H^{t} \subseteq \operatorname{ker} C_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is strongly connected, then there exists a basis of $\operatorname{ker} C_{\mathcal{G}}$ whose elements are of the form $\nu_{\sigma}$ for $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime}$ (see [1]). Hence im $H^{t} \supseteq \operatorname{ker} C_{\mathcal{G}}$ as desired.

We have now all necessary tools to prove the relation between $S^{\perp}$ and $\widetilde{S}^{\perp}$.
Proof of Theorem [27; Conservation laws. (ii) Let $\omega \in S^{\perp}$ and $\widetilde{r} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ be a reaction corresponding to $r \in \mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since $\omega \cdot\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right)=0$ and $\rho\left(y_{r}^{\prime}-y_{r}\right)=0$, we deduce that $\zeta(\omega) \cdot\left(y_{\tilde{r}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}}\right)=0$.

Let $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$ for $\sigma \in \Delta$ and $\eta=\sum_{e \in \sigma}\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)$. By Remark 19, $\rho(\eta)=0$ and by definition $\zeta(\eta)=y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}$. Thus we have

$$
\zeta(\omega) \cdot\left(y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}\right)=\zeta(\omega) \cdot \zeta(\eta)+\rho(\omega) \cdot \rho(\eta)=\omega \cdot \eta=0
$$

This proves (ii).
(iii) Assume that each connected component of $\mathcal{G}$ 位 strongly connected. Given $\widetilde{\omega} \in \widetilde{S}^{\perp}$, we want to prove that there exist $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}$ such that

$$
\omega=\left(\widetilde{\omega}_{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\omega}_{p}, \alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}\right) \in S^{\perp} .
$$

That is, such that $\omega A=0$, where $A$ is the stoichiometric matrix of $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ (see Subsection 7.1). Let $\bar{\ell}=\left|\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}\right|$. We order the set $\mathcal{R}$ in such a way that $\mathcal{R} \backslash \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}=\left\{r_{\bar{\ell}+1}, \ldots, r_{\ell}\right\}$. Then, $A$ can be written in block form as

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
A_{1} & A_{3} \\
A_{2} & 0_{m \times(\ell-\bar{\ell})}
\end{array}\right) \quad \text { with } A_{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times \bar{\ell}}, A_{2} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \bar{\ell}} \text { and } A_{3} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times(\ell-\bar{\ell})} .
$$

The columns of $A_{3}$ correspond to the reactions in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{1}$ and are thus vectors of $\widetilde{S}$ by Definition 15. Hence, $\omega\binom{A_{3}}{0_{m \times(\ell-\bar{\ell})}}=0$ for any choice of $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}$. It follows that

$$
\begin{align*}
\omega A=0 & \Leftrightarrow\left(\widetilde{\omega}_{1}, \ldots, \widetilde{\omega}_{p}\right) A_{1}+\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}\right) A_{2}=0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow A_{2}^{t}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\alpha_{m}
\end{array}\right)=-\left(\begin{array}{c}
\widetilde{\omega} \cdot \zeta\left(y_{r_{1}}^{\prime}-y_{r_{1}}\right) \\
\vdots \\
\widetilde{\omega} \cdot \zeta\left(y_{r_{\bar{\ell}}}^{\prime}-y_{r_{\bar{\ell}}}\right)
\end{array}\right)=: v . \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

We can further reorder the species in $\mathcal{U}$ and the reactions in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}}$, such that $A_{2}$ is a block diagonal matrix, where each block corresponds to one connected component of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Due to this block structure, system (34) decomposes into subsystems given by the connected components of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Therefore, it is enough to prove the existence of $\alpha$ for a strongly connected graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. Hence we assume $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is strongly connected.

Let $C_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the incidence matrix of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $H$ as defined above Lemma 2. We prove that $H v=0$. For $\sigma \in \Delta$, we have that $\widetilde{r}_{\sigma} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ and hence

$$
0=\widetilde{\omega} \cdot\left(y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}^{\prime}-y_{\widetilde{r}_{\sigma}}\right)=\sum_{e \in \sigma} \widetilde{\omega} \cdot \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right)
$$

For $\sigma \in \Delta^{\prime} \backslash \Delta$, strong connectedness and Remark 14 imply that $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$. Thus, by definition of $\Delta$,

$$
0=\sum_{e \in \sigma} \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) \quad \text { and hence } \quad 0=\sum_{e \in \sigma} \widetilde{\omega} \cdot \zeta\left(y_{r(e)}^{\prime}-y_{r(e)}\right) .
$$

This shows that $v \in \operatorname{ker} H$ and hence by Lemma 2 we have $v \in \operatorname{im} C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}$.
If $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ does not contain $*$, then $A_{2}=C_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since $v \in \operatorname{im} C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}$ we deduce that system (34) has a solution $\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{m}\right)$. If $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ contains $*$, then $A_{2}=\widetilde{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$, with $\widetilde{C}_{\mathcal{G}}$ being the matrix obtained from $C_{\mathcal{G}}$ by removing the last row, corresponding to the node $*$. We can then rewrite the system of equations (34) as

$$
v=A_{2}^{t}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_{1}  \tag{35}\\
\vdots \\
\alpha_{m}
\end{array}\right)=C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_{1} \\
\vdots \\
\alpha_{m} \\
0
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Since $v \in \operatorname{im} C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}$, there exists a vector $b=\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m+1}\right)^{t}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ such that $C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t} b=v$. Since the column sums of $C_{\mathcal{G}}$ are all zero by definition, $(1, \ldots, 1)^{t} \in \operatorname{ker} C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}$. Thus

$$
v=C_{\mathcal{G}}^{t}\left(b-b_{m+1}(1, \ldots, 1)^{t}\right) .
$$

Therefore, $\alpha_{i}=b_{i}-b_{m+1}$, for $i=1 \ldots, m$ is a solution to (35).

### 9.5 Iterative elimination

In this section we prove Proposition 32. We start with an auxiliary lemma.
Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a linearly eliminable set such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is connected and contains $*$. Let $\mathcal{U}=\mathcal{H}_{1} \sqcup \mathcal{H}_{2}$ be a decomposition of $\mathcal{U}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}^{*}=\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}^{*} \sqcup \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}^{*}$. Let $\Theta_{1}(N)$ be the set of spanning trees rooted at $N \in \mathcal{H}_{1} \cup\{*\}$ in the sub-multidigraph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$. For any set of edges $W$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$, it holds

$$
q_{\mathcal{U}}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta(N), W \subseteq \tau} \pi(\tau)=q_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}(x) \sum_{\tau \in \Theta_{1}(N), W \subseteq \tau} \pi(\tau) .
$$

Proof. Let $\Theta_{2}(*)$ be the set of spanning trees of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}$ rooted at $*$. Let $\tau \in \Theta(N)$ be a spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ rooted at $N$. The path from any node $N^{\prime} \in \mathcal{H}_{2}$ to $N$ contains $*$ by hypothesis. Therefore, $\tau$ is the union of a spanning tree $\tau_{1}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$ rooted at $N$ and a spanning tree $\tau_{2}$ of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}$ rooted at $*$. Reciprocally, the union of any pair of spanning trees $\tau_{1} \in \Theta_{1}(N), \tau_{2} \in \Theta_{2}(*)$ is a spanning tree of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ rooted at $N$. As subgraphs of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}, \tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ intersect at $*$. Hence $\pi(\tau)=\pi\left(\tau_{1}\right) \pi\left(\tau_{2}\right)$ and we obtain

$$
\sum_{\tau \in \Theta(N), W \subseteq \tau} \pi(\tau)=\left(\sum_{\tau_{1} \in \Theta_{1}(N), W \subseteq \tau_{1}} \pi\left(\tau_{1}\right)\right)\left(\sum_{\tau_{2} \in \Theta_{2}(*)} \pi\left(\tau_{2}\right)\right)
$$

where we use that $W$ is contained in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$. Using this computation with $W=\emptyset$ and $N=*$, we also have that

$$
q_{\mathcal{U}}(x)^{-1}=\left(\sum_{\tau_{1} \in \Theta_{1}(*)} \pi\left(\tau_{1}\right)\right)\left(\sum_{\tau_{2} \in \Theta_{2}(*)} \pi\left(\tau_{2}\right)\right)=q_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}(x)^{-1}\left(\sum_{\tau_{2} \in \Theta_{2}(*)} \pi\left(\tau_{2}\right)\right) .
$$

Using these expressions the statement of the lemma follows.
Note that we can write

$$
\Pi(\sigma)=\pi(e) \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\sigma)} \pi(\gamma \backslash e)
$$

for any edge $e$ in $\sigma$. The sum is over all spanning trees rooted at $s(e)$ that contain the edges of $\sigma \backslash e$. Lemma 3 guarantees that the computation of $\varphi(x)$ and the rate functions $q_{\mathcal{u}}(x) \Pi(\sigma)$ of the reduced reaction network is independent of whether we consider $\mathcal{G U}_{\mathcal{U}}$, or $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}$ separately. Proposition 32 now follows because the sets of cycles of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{1}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}_{2}}$ are disjoint.

### 9.6 Post-translational modification networks

Proof of Proposition 377; PTM networks. The only edges in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ whose associated reaction involves a substrate (that is, a species in $\mathcal{U}^{c}$ ) are those with $E$ as source or target.
$\Leftarrow)$ Let $S_{i_{1}}+E \longrightarrow Y_{j_{1}} \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow Y_{j_{s}} \longrightarrow E+S_{i_{2}}, s \geq 0$, be a path in $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$. This path defines a cycle $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{U}}$ with nodes $E, Y_{j_{1}}, \ldots, Y_{j_{s}}$ (it is a self-edge if $s=0$ ). This cycle is such that $\Gamma(\sigma) \neq \emptyset$ ( $\sigma$ belongs to a strongly connected component) and gives rise to a reaction $S_{i_{1}} \longrightarrow S_{i_{2}}$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$.
$\Rightarrow)$ If $S_{i_{1}} \longrightarrow S_{i_{2}} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{2}$, then there is a cycle $\sigma \in \Delta$ defining it. The cycle $\sigma$ must contain a unique enzyme $E \in \mathcal{E}$. It follows that one of the edges in $\sigma$ corresponds to a reaction with reactant $S_{i_{1}}+E$, and one of edges corresponds to a reaction with product $S_{i_{2}}+E$. All other edges correspond to reactions between intermediates. The reactions corresponding to the edges in the cycle give the claimed path from $S_{i_{1}}+E$ to $S_{i_{2}}+E$.
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