

Quasi-steady-state approximations derived from the stochastic model of enzyme kinetics

Hye-Won Kang*

Wasiur R. KhudaBukhsh[†] 

Heinz Koepl[‡]

Grzegorz A. Rempala[§] 

November 9, 2017

In this paper we derive several quasi steady-state approximations (QSSAs) to the stochastic reaction network describing the Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetics. We show how the different assumptions about chemical species abundance and reaction rates lead to the standard QSSA (sQSSA), the total QSSA (tQSSA), and the reverse QSSA (rQSSA) approximations. These three QSSAs have been widely studied in the literature in deterministic ordinary differential equation (ODE) settings and several sets of conditions for their validity have been proposed. By using multiscaling techniques introduced in [1, 2] we show that these conditions for deterministic QSSAs largely agree with the ones for QSSAs in the large volume limits of the underlying stochastic enzyme kinetic network.

*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Maryland Baltimore County, USA, email:hwkang@umbc.edu

[†]Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, email:wasiur.khudabukhsh@bcs.tu-darmstadt.de

[‡]Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, email:heinz.koepl@bcs.tu-darmstadt.de

[§]Division of Biostatistics and Mathematical Biosciences Institute, The Ohio State University, USA, email:rempala.3@osu.edu

1 Introduction

In chemistry and biology, we often come across chemical reaction networks where one or more of the species exhibit a different intrinsic time scale and tend to reach an equilibrium state quicker than others. Quasi steady state approximation (QSSA) is a commonly used tool to simplify the description of the dynamics of such systems. In particular, QSSA has been widely applied to the important class of reaction networks known as the Michaelis-Menten models of enzyme kinetics [3, 4, 5].

Traditionally the enzyme kinetics has been studied using systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). The ODE approach allows one to analyze various aspects of the enzyme dynamics such as asymptotic stability. However, it ignores the fluctuations of the enzyme reaction network due to intrinsic noise and instead focuses on the averaged dynamics. If accounting for this intrinsic noise is required, the use of an alternative stochastic reaction network approach may be more appropriate, especially when some of the species have low copy numbers or when one is interested in predicting the molecular fluctuations of the system. It is well-known that such molecular fluctuations in the species with small numbers, and stochasticity in general, can lead to interesting dynamics. For instance, in a recent paper [6], Perez et al. gave an account of how intrinsic noise controls and alters the dynamics, and steady state of morphogen-controlled bistable genetic switches. Stochastic models have been strongly advocated by many in recent literature [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. In this paper, we consider such stochastic models in the context of QSSA and the Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetics and relate them to the deterministic ones that are well-known from the chemical physics literature.

The QSSAs are very useful from a practical perspective. They not only reduce the model complexity, but also allow us to better relate it to experimental measurements by averaging out the unobservable or difficult-to-measure species. A substantial body of work has been published to justify such QSSA reductions in deterministic models, typically by means of perturbation theory [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. In contrast to this approach, we derive here the QSSA reductions using stochastic multiscale techniques [1, 2]. Although our approach is applicable more generally, we focus below on the three well established enzyme kinetics QSSAs, namely the standard QSSA (sQSSA), the total QSSA (tQSSA), and the reverse QSSA (rQSSA) for the Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetics. We show that these QSSAs are a consequence of the law of large numbers for the stochastic reaction network under different scaling regimes. A similar approach has been recently taken in [19] with respect to a particular type of QSSA (tQSSA, see below in Section 2). However, our current derivation is different in that it entirely avoids a spatial averaging argument used in [19]. Such an argument requires additional assumptions that are difficult to verify in practice.

The paper is organized as follows. We first review the Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetics in the deterministic setting and discuss corresponding QSSAs in Section 2. The alternative model in the stochastic setting is introduced in Section 3, where we also briefly describe the multiscale approximation technique proposed in [1]. Following this, we derive the Michaelis-Menten deterministic sQSSA, the tQSSA and the rQSSA approximations from the stochastic model analysis in the Sections 4, 5, and 6 respectively. We conclude the paper with a short discussion in Section 7.

2 QSSAs for deterministic Michaelis-Menten kinetics

The Michaelis-Menten enzyme-catalyzed reaction networks have been studied in depth over past several decades [3, 4, 5] and have been described in various forms. Although the methods discussed below certainly apply to more general networks of reactions describing enzyme kinetics, in this paper, we adopt the simplest (and minimal) description for illustration purpose. In its simplest form, the Michaelis-Menten enzyme-catalyzed network of reactions describes reversible binding of a free enzyme (E) and a substrate (S) into an enzyme-substrate complex (C), and irreversible conversion of the complex to the product (P) and the free enzyme. The enzyme-catalyzed reactions are schematically described as



where k_1 and k_{-1} are the reaction rate constants for the reversible enzyme binding in the units of $M^{-1}s^{-1}$ and s^{-1} while k_2 is the rate constant for the product creation in the unit of s^{-1} . Applying the law of mass action to (2.1), temporal changes of the concentrations are described by the following system of ODEs:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d[S]}{dt} &= -k_1[S][E] + k_{-1}[C], \\ \frac{d[E]}{dt} &= -k_1[S][E] + k_{-1}[C] + k_2[C], \\ \frac{d[C]}{dt} &= k_1[S][E] - k_{-1}[C] - k_2[C], \\ \frac{d[P]}{dt} &= k_2[C], \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where the bracket notation $[\cdot]$ refers to the concentration of species. In a closed system, there are two conservation laws for the total amount of enzyme and substrate

$$\begin{aligned} [E_0] &\equiv [E] + [C], \\ [S_0] &\equiv [S] + [C] + [P]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

These conservation laws not only reduce (2.2) to two equations, but also play an important role in the analysis of the reaction network given in (2.1). It is worth mentioning that some authors also consider an additional reversible reaction in the form of binding of the product (P) and the free enzyme (E) to produce the enzyme-substrate complex (C), i.e., $P + E \rightleftharpoons C$. We remark that should we expand the model in (2.1) to include such a reaction, our discussion in later sections would remain largely the same requiring only simple modifications.

Leonor Michaelis and Maud Menten investigated the enzymatic kinetics in (2.1) and proposed a mathematical model for it in [20]. They suggested an approximate solution for the initial velocity of the enzyme inversion reaction in terms of the substrate concentrations. Following their work, numerous attempts have been made to obtain approximate solutions of (2.2) under various quasi-steady-state assumptions. Several conditions on the rate constants have also been proposed for the validity of such approximations. For example, Briggs and Haldane

mathematically derived the Michaelis-Menten equation, which is now known as sQSSA [21]. The sQSSA is based on the assumption that the complex reaches its steady state quickly after a transient time, i.e., $d[C]/dt \approx 0$ [13]. This approximation is found to be inaccurate when the enzyme concentration is large compared to that of the substrate. The condition for the validity of the sQSSA was first suggested as $[E_0] \ll [S_0]$ by Laidler [22], and a more general condition was derived as $[E_0] \ll [S_0] + K_M$ by Segal [23] and Segel and Slemrod [13], where $K_M \equiv (k_2 + k_{-1})/k_1$ is the so-called Michaelis-Menten constant.

Borghans et al. later extended the sQSSA to the case with an excessive amount of enzyme and derived the tQSSA by introducing a new variable for total substrate concentration [24]. In the tQSSA, one assumes that the total substrate concentration changes on a slow time scale and that the complex reaches its steady state quickly after a transient time, $d[C]/dt \approx 0$. Then, the complex concentration $[C]$ is found as a solution of a quadratic equation. Approximating $[C]$ in a simple way, they proposed a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of tQSSA as

$$([E_0] + [S_0] + K_M)^2 \gg K[E_0], \quad (2.4)$$

where $K = k_2/k_1$ is the so-called Van Slyke-Cullen constant [25]. Later, Tzafiriri [26] revisited the tQSSA and derived another set of sufficient conditions for the validity of the tQSSA as $\varepsilon \equiv (K/(2[S_0]))f(r([S_0])) \ll 1$ where $f(r) = (1-r)^{-1/2} - 1$ and $r([S_0]) = 4[E_0][S_0]/([E_0] + [S_0] + K_M)^2$. He argued that this sufficient condition was always roughly satisfied by showing ε was less than 1/4 for all values of $[E_0]$ and $[S_0]$. The tQSSA was later improved by Dell'Acqua and Bersani [27] at high enzyme concentrations when (2.4) is satisfied.

The rQSSA was first suggested as an alternative to the sQSSA by Segel and Slemrod [13]. In the rQSSA, the substrate, instead of the complex, was assumed to be at steady state, $d[S]/dt \approx 0$, and the domain of the validity of the rQSSA was suggested as $[E_0] \gg K$. Then, Schnell and Maini showed that at high enzyme concentration, the assumption $d[S]/dt \approx 0$ was more appropriate in the rQSSA than the assumption $d[C]/dt \approx 0$ used in the sQSSA or tQSSA due to possibly large error during the initial stage of the reactions [28]. They derived necessary conditions for the validity of the rQSSA as $[E_0] \gg K$ and $[E_0] \gg [S_0]$. In the following sections, we will provide alternative derivations of these different conditions.

3 Multiscale stochastic Michaelis-Menten kinetics

Let X_S , X_E , X_C , and X_P denote the copy numbers of molecules of the substrates (S), the enzymes (E), the enzyme-substrate complex (C), and the product (P) respectively. We assume the evolution of these copy numbers is governed by a Markovian dynamics given by the fol-

lowing stochastic equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_S(t) &= X_S(0) - Y_1 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_1 X_S(s) X_E(s) ds \right) + Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_{-1} X_C(s) ds \right), \\
X_E(t) &= X_E(0) - Y_1 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_1 X_S(s) X_E(s) ds \right) + Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_{-1} X_C(s) ds \right) + Y_2 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_2 X_C(s) ds \right), \\
X_C(t) &= X_C(0) + Y_1 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_1 X_S(s) X_E(s) ds \right) - Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_{-1} X_C(s) ds \right) - Y_2 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_2 X_C(s) ds \right), \\
X_P(t) &= X_P(0) + Y_2 \left(\int_0^t \kappa'_2 X_C(s) ds \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where Y_1, Y_{-1} and Y_2 are independent unit Poisson processes and $t \geq 0$. We denote $X_{E_0} \equiv X_E(t) + X_C(t)$ and $X_{S_0} \equiv X_S(t) + X_C(t) + X_P(t)$, and as in the deterministic model (2.2) in previous section assume that the total substrate and enzymes copy numbers, X_{S_0} and X_{E_0} , are conserved in time. As shown in [1, 2], the representation (3.1) is especially helpful in analyzing systems with multiple time scales or involving species with abundances varying over different orders of magnitude. Unlike the chemical master equations, (3.1) explicitly reveals the relations between the species abundances and the reaction rates.

In the reaction system (2.1), various scales can exist in the species numbers and reaction rate constants, which determine time scales of the species involved. In order to relate these scales, we first define a scaling parameter N to express the orders of magnitude of species copy numbers and rate constants as powers of N . We note that $1/N$ plays a similar role as ε in the singular perturbation analysis of deterministic models [13]. Denoting scaling exponents for the species i and the k th rate constant by α_i and β_k respectively, we express unscaled species copy numbers and rate constants as some powers of N as

$$\begin{aligned}
X_i(t) &= N^{\alpha_i} Z_i^N(t), \text{ for } i = S, E, C, P \\
\text{and } \kappa'_k &= N^{\beta_k} \kappa_k, \text{ for } k = 1, -1, 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

so that the scaled variables and constants, $Z_i^N(t)$ and κ_k , are approximately of order 1 (denoted as $O(1)$). In Z_i^N , the superscript represents the dependence of the scaled species numbers on N . To express different time scales as powers of N , we apply a time change by replacing t with $N^\gamma t$. The scaled species number after the time change is given by

$$X_i(N^\gamma t) = N^{\alpha_i} Z_i^N(N^\gamma t) \equiv N^{\alpha_i} Z_i^{N,\gamma}(t).$$

Applying the change of variables, $\{Z^{N,\gamma}\} \equiv \left\{ \left(Z_S^{N,\gamma}, Z_E^{N,\gamma}, Z_C^{N,\gamma}, Z_P^{N,\gamma} \right) \right\}$ becomes a parametrized

family of stochastic processes satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_S^N(0) + N^{-\alpha_S} \left[-Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_1+\gamma} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) + Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_{-1}+\gamma} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \right], \\
Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_E^N(0) + N^{-\alpha_E} \left[-Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_1+\gamma} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) + Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_{-1}+\gamma} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_2+\gamma} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \right], \\
Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_C^N(0) + N^{-\alpha_C} \left[Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_1+\gamma} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) - Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_{-1}+\gamma} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_2+\gamma} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \right], \\
Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_P^N(0) + N^{-\alpha_P} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_2+\gamma} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where $\rho_1 \equiv \alpha_S + \alpha_E + \beta_1$, $\rho_{-1} \equiv \alpha_C + \beta_{-1}$, and $\rho_2 \equiv \alpha_C + \beta_2$. As seen from (3.3), the values of ρ 's, α 's and γ 's determine the temporal dynamics of the scaled random processes. For example, consider the limiting behavior of the scaled process for the first reaction in the equation for S ,

$$N^{-\alpha_S} Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_1+\gamma} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right). \tag{3.4}$$

Assuming that $Z_S^{N,\gamma}$ and $Z_E^{N,\gamma}$ are $O(1)$ in the time scale of interest, the limiting behavior of the scaled process depends upon ρ_1 , α_S , and γ . If the $\rho_1 + \gamma < \alpha_S$, the scaled process converges to zero as N goes to infinity. This means that the number of occurrences of the first reaction is outweighed by the order of magnitude of the species copy number for S . When $\rho_1 + \gamma = \alpha_S$, the number of occurrences of the first reaction is comparable to the order of magnitude of the species copy number for S . Then, using the law of large numbers for the Poisson processes¹, the limiting behavior of (3.4) is approximately the same as that of

$$\int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds. \tag{3.5}$$

Lastly, when $\rho_1 + \gamma > \alpha_S$, the first reaction occurs so frequently that the scaled process in (3.4) tends to infinity. The limiting behaviors of other scaled processes are determined similarly. Using the scaled processes involving the reactions where S is produced or consumed, we can choose γ so that $Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t)$ becomes $O(1)$. Therefore, we have $\alpha_S = \max(\rho_1 + \gamma, \rho_{-1} + \gamma)$, and the *time scale* of S is given by

$$\gamma = \alpha_S - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}). \tag{3.6}$$

¹The strong law of large numbers states that, for a unit Poisson process Y , $\frac{1}{N}Y(Nu) \rightarrow u$ almost surely as $N \rightarrow \infty$, (see [29]).

Therefore, the time scales of the species numbers and their limiting behaviors are decided by the scaling exponents for species numbers and reactions, that is, they are dictated by the choice of α 's and β 's.

In order to prevent the system from vanishing to zero or exploding to infinity in the scaling limit, the parameters α 's and β 's must satisfy what are known as the balance conditions [1]. Essentially, these conditions ensure that the scaling limit is $O(1)$. Intuitively, the largest order of magnitude of the production of species i should be the same as that of consumption of species i . For instance, in the Michaelis-Menten reaction network described in Section 2, balance for the substrate S can be achieved in two ways. First, through the equation $\rho_1 = \rho_{-1}$, which *balances* the binding and unbinding of the enzyme to the substrate; and second, by making α_S large enough so that the imbalance between the occurrences of the reversible binding of the enzyme to substrate can be nullified. This gives a restriction on the time scale γ as $\gamma + \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}) \leq \alpha_S$. Combining the equality and inequality for each species, we get species balance conditions as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 = \rho_{-1} & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \alpha_S - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}), \\ \rho_1 = \max(\rho_{-1}, \rho_2) & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \alpha_E - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2), \\ \rho_1 = \max(\rho_{-1}, \rho_2) & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \alpha_C - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2), \\ \rho_2 + \gamma = 0 & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \alpha_P - \rho_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Even with conditions (3.7) satisfied, additional conditions are often required to make the scaled species numbers asymptotically $O(1)$. For each linear combination of species, the collective production and consumption rates should be balanced. Otherwise, the time scale of the new variable consisting of the linear combination of the scaled species will be restricted up to some time. The additional conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_2 + \gamma = 0 & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C) - \rho_2, \\ \rho_1 = \rho_{-1} & \quad \text{or} \quad \gamma \leq \max(\alpha_C, \alpha_P) - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}), \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

which are obtained by comparing collective production and consumption rates of $S + C$ and $C + P$, respectively.

In the following sections, we use a stochastic model of the Michaelis-Menten kinetics (3.1) and derive the deterministic quasi-steady-state approximate models by applying the multiscale approximations with different scaling subject to (3.7) and (3.8).

4 Standard quasi-steady-state approximation (sQSSA)

In the deterministic sQSSA, one assumes that the substrate-enzyme complex C reaches its steady-state quickly after a brief transient phase while the other species are still in their transient states. Therefore, by setting $d[C]/dt \approx 0$, one approximates the steady state concentration of the complex. The steady state equation of the complex in (2.2) and the conservation of the total enzyme concentration in (2.3) give

$$[C] = \frac{[E_0][S]}{K_M + [S]}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$. The substrate concentration is then given by

$$\frac{d[S]}{dt} = -\frac{k_2[E_0][S]}{K_M + [S]}. \quad (4.2)$$

The corresponding differential equations for $[E]$ and $[P]$ can be written similarly. This approximation is known as the sQSSA of the Michaelis-Menten kinetics (2.1) under the deterministic setting.

Now, we use stochastic equations for the species copy numbers in (3.1) and apply the multiscale approximation to derive an analogue of (4.1)-(4.2). Equations like (4.2) have been previously derived from the stochastic reaction network [30, 31]. It was also revisited specifically using the multiscale approximation method in [1, 32]. However, for the sake of completeness, we furnish a brief description below. Assuming that E and C are on the faster time scale than S and P , consider the following scaled processes:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_S(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_P(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) &= X_E(N^\gamma t), & Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) &= X_C(N^\gamma t), \\ \kappa'_1 &= \kappa_1, & \kappa'_{-1} &= N\kappa_{-1}, & \kappa'_2 &= N\kappa_2, \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_S &= \alpha_P = 1, & \alpha_E &= \alpha_C = 0, \\ \beta_1 &= 0, & \beta_{-1} &= \beta_2 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

We are interested in the time scale of S given in (3.6). Plugging in the scaling exponent values in (4.4), the time scale of S we are interested in corresponds to $\gamma = 0$. Setting $\gamma = 0$ in the scaled stochastic equations in (3.3) and writing Z_i^N instead of $Z_i^{N,\gamma}$ for $i = S, E, C, P$ one obtains from (4.4)

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S^N(t) &= Z_S^N(0) - \frac{1}{N}Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_1 Z_S^N(s)Z_E^N(s) ds \right) + \frac{1}{N}Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_{-1}Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_E^N(t) &= Z_E^N(0) - Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_1 Z_S^N(s)Z_E^N(s) ds \right) + Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_{-1}Z_C^N(s) ds \right) \\ &\quad + Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_C^N(t) &= Z_C^N(0) + Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_1 Z_S^N(s)Z_E^N(s) ds \right) - Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_{-1}Z_C^N(s) ds \right) \\ &\quad - Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_P^N(t) &= Z_P^N(0) + \frac{1}{N}Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N\kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Define $M \equiv Z_E^N(t) + Z_C^N(t)$ and

$$Z_C^N(t) \equiv \int_0^t Z_C^N(s) ds = Mt - \int_0^t Z_E^N(s) ds.$$

Note that $M = Z_E^N(0) + Z_C^N(0) = X_E(0) + X_C(0)$, and that M does not depend on the scaling parameter N . As done in [1, 32], assume that $Z_S^N(0) \rightarrow Z_S(0)$. The scaled variables Z_S^N and Z_C^N are bounded so they are relatively compact in the finite time interval $[0, \mathcal{T}]$, where $0 < \mathcal{T} < \infty$. Then, (Z_S^N, Z_C^N) converges to (Z_S, Z_C) as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and satisfies for every $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S(t) &= Z_S(0) - \int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S(s) (M - \dot{Z}_C(s)) ds + \int_0^t \kappa_{-1} \dot{Z}_C(s) ds, \\ 0 &= \int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S(s) (M - \dot{Z}_C(s)) ds - \int_0^t (\kappa_{-1} + \kappa_2) \dot{Z}_C(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Note that we get (4.6) by dividing the equation for $Z_C^N(t)$ in (4.5) by N and taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$. From (4.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Z}_S(t) &= -\frac{\kappa_2 M Z_S(t)}{\kappa_M + Z_S(t)}, \\ \dot{Z}_C(t) &= \frac{M Z_S(t)}{\kappa_M + Z_S(t)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where $\kappa_M = (\kappa_{-1} + \kappa_2)/\kappa_1$, which is precisely the sQSSA.

Note that we only use a law of large numbers and the conservation law to derive (4.7). In Figure 1, we compare the limit $Z_S(t)$ in (4.7) with the scaled substrate copy number $Z_S^N(t)$ in (4.5), obtained from 1000 realizations of the stochastic simulation using Gillespie's algorithm [33]. Figure 1 shows the agreement between the scaled process $Z_S^N(t)$ and its limit $Z_S(t)$.

Conditions for sQSSA in the deterministic system. We have shown that the scaling exponents (4.4) indeed yielded the sQSSA. We now show how the conditions (4.4) are related to the conditions proposed in the literature for the validity of the deterministic sQSSA. First, we consider a general condition derived by Segal [23] and Segal and Slemrod [13],

$$[E_0] \ll [S_0] + K_M, \quad (4.8)$$

where $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$ is the Michaelis-Menten constant. We rewrite (4.8) in terms of the species copy numbers and the stochastic reaction rate constants. The stochastic and the deterministic reaction rates are related as

$$(k_1, k_{-1}, k_2) = (V \kappa'_1, \kappa'_{-1}, \kappa'_2), \quad (4.9)$$

where V is the system volume multiplied by the Avogadro's number [34]. We also use the relation between molecular numbers and molecular concentrations as

$$[i] = X_i(t)/V, \quad i = S, E, C, P. \quad (4.10)$$

Applying (4.9) and (4.10) in (4.8), and canceling out V , we get

$$X_{E_0} \ll X_{S_0} + \frac{\kappa'_{-1} + \kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}. \quad (4.11)$$

Plugging our choice of the scaled variables and rate constants given in (4.3) in (4.11) gives

$$Z_E^N(t) + Z_C^N(t) \ll N(Z_S^N(t) + Z_P^N(t)) + Z_C^N(t) + \frac{N(\kappa_{-1} + \kappa_2)}{\kappa_1}. \quad (4.12)$$

Since $Z_i^N(t) \approx O(1)$ and $\kappa_k \approx O(1)$, the left and the right sides of (4.12) become of order 1 and N , respectively. We see that our choice of the scaling in the stochastic model is in agreement with the conditions for the validity of the sQSSA in the deterministic model (4.8).




Figure 1: Michaelis-Menten kinetics with sQSSA. The limit of the scale substrate copy number, $Z_S(t)$ in (4.7), is drawn in orange dotted line and the scaled substrate copy number, $Z_S^N(t)$ in (4.5), is expressed in blue dotted line. The light blue shaded region represents one standard deviation of $Z_S^N(t)$ from the mean. The parameter values, $N = 1000$, and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_{-1}, \kappa_2) = (1, 1, 0.1)$, and the initial conditions, $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (1, 10, 0, 0)$, $M = 10$, and $(0.75, 20, 0, 0)$, $M = 20$, respectively for the upper and the lower curves, are used. Two different choices of initial conditions are used to reflect the fact that convergence can be achieved under varying values of the conservation constant M .

Note that the choice of scaling exponents in (4.4) is, in general, not unique. We now derive more general conditions on the scaling exponents, α 's and β 's, leading to the sQSSA limit (4.7). Note that for (4.7) to hold the time scale of C should be faster than that of S , so that we can obtain (4.6) from the equation of C , i.e.,

$$\alpha_C - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2) < \alpha_S - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}), \quad (4.13)$$

which is an analogue of $d[C]/dt \approx 0$. Moreover, for E to be expressed in terms of C and retained in the limit, the species copy number of C has to be greater than or equal to that of E in the conservation equation of the total enzyme

$$\alpha_E \leq \alpha_C. \quad (4.14)$$

Finally, all reaction propensities are of the same order so that all the terms are present in (4.7)

$$\rho_1 = \rho_{-1} = \rho_2. \quad (4.15)$$

Combining (4.13), (4.14), and (4.15) together, we get the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_E &\leq \alpha_C < \alpha_S, \\ \alpha_S + \beta_1 &= \beta_{-1} = \beta_2. \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

The second condition in (4.16) can be rewritten as $\alpha_S = \beta_{-1} - \beta_1 = \beta_2 - \beta_1$ and so (4.16) implies

$$\begin{aligned} X_{E_0} &\ll X_{S_0}, \\ X_{E_0} &\ll \frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1} \approx \frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is comparable to the general condition (4.8) on the deterministic sQSSA.

5 Total quasi-steady-state approximation (tQSSA)

In the deterministic tQSSA, we define the total substrate concentration as $[T] \equiv [S] + [C]$. Assuming that $[T]$ changes on the slow time scale, the equations (2.2)-(2.3) give the following reduced model [24, 26],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d[T]}{dt} &= -k_2[C], \\ \frac{d[C]}{dt} &= k_1 \{([T] - [C])([E_0] - [C]) - K_M[C]\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$. Assuming that $d[C]/dt \approx 0$ and using $[C] \leq [E_0]$, the unique solution is found as the positive root of a quadratic equation

$$[C] = \frac{([E_0] + K_M + [T]) - \sqrt{([E_0] + K_M + [T])^2 - 4[E_0][T]}}{2}, \quad (5.2)$$

and the evolution of the total substrate concentration obeys

$$\frac{d[T]}{dt} = -k_2 \frac{([E_0] + K_M + [T]) - \sqrt{([E_0] + K_M + [T])^2 - 4[E_0][T]}}{2}. \quad (5.3)$$

The above approximation is the tQSSA of the Michaelis-Menten kinetics (2.1) in the deterministic setting.

Now, consider the stochastic model (3.1). Our goal is to apply the multiscale approximation with the appropriate scaling so that we can consider (5.3) as the limit of the stochastic

Michaelis-Menten system (3.3) as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We assume that S , E , and C are on the faster time scale than P . Our choice of scaling is

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_S(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_E(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_C(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_P(N^\gamma t)}{N}, \\ \kappa'_1 &= \kappa_1, & \kappa'_2 &= \kappa_2, & \kappa'_{-1} &= N\kappa_{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_S &= \alpha_E = \alpha_C = \alpha_P = 1, \\ \beta_1 &= \beta_2 = 0, & \beta_{-1} &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

We are interested in the stochastic model in the time scale of T . Adding unscaled equations for S and C and dividing by $N^{\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C)}$ from (3.3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N^{\alpha_S} Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) + N^{\alpha_C} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t)}{N^{\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C)}} &= \frac{N^{\alpha_S} Z_S^N(0) + N^{\alpha_C} Z_C^N(0)}{N^{\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C)}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N^{\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C)}} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\rho_2 + \gamma} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the time scale of T is given by

$$\gamma = \max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C) - \rho_2. \quad (5.6)$$

Using (5.5) gives $\gamma = 0$. For simplicity, we set the time scale exponent as $\gamma = 0$ and denote $Z_i^{N,\gamma}$ as Z_i^N for $i = S, E, C, P$ as we did in Section 4.

With the scaling exponents in (5.5), the scaled equations in (3.3) become

$$\begin{aligned} Z_S^N(t) &= Z_S^N(0) - \frac{1}{N} Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_1 Z_S^N(s) Z_E^N(s) ds \right) + \frac{1}{N} Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_{-1} Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_E^N(t) &= Z_E^N(0) - \frac{1}{N} Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_1 Z_S^N(s) Z_E^N(s) ds \right) + \frac{1}{N} Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_{-1} Z_C^N(s) ds \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{N} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N \kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_C^N(t) &= Z_C^N(0) + \frac{1}{N} Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_1 Z_S^N(s) Z_E^N(s) ds \right) - \frac{1}{N} Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^2 \kappa_{-1} Z_C^N(s) ds \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{N} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N \kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right), \\ Z_P^N(t) &= Z_P^N(0) + \frac{1}{N} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N \kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

Define the new slow variable

$$Z_T^N(t) \equiv Z_S^N(t) + Z_C^N(t),$$

which satisfies

$$Z_T^N(t) = Z_T^N(0) - \frac{1}{N} Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N \kappa_2 Z_C^N(s) ds \right). \quad (5.8)$$

We have two conservation laws for the total amount of substrate and enzyme, $m^N \equiv Z_E^N(t) + Z_C^N(t)$ and $k^N \equiv Z_T^N(t) + Z_P^N(t)$, and we denote their limits as $N \rightarrow \infty$ by m and k , respectively. We also define

$$\mathbb{Z}_C^N(t) \equiv \int_0^t Z_C^N(s) ds = m^N t - \int_0^t Z_E^N(s) ds.$$

Since $Z_T^N(t) \leq k^N \rightarrow k$ and $Z_C^N(t) \leq m^N t \rightarrow mt$, Z_T^N and Z_C^N are bounded, they are also relatively compact in the finite time interval $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$ where $0 < \mathcal{T} < \infty$. Since the law of large numbers implies that $Z_T^N(0) \rightarrow Z_T(0)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ then (Z_T^N, Z_C^N) (possibly along a subsequence only) converges to (Z_T, \mathbb{Z}_C) which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} Z_T(t) &= Z_T(0) - \int_0^t \kappa_2 \dot{\mathbb{Z}}_C(s) ds, \\ 0 &= \int_0^t \kappa_1 (Z_T(s) - \dot{\mathbb{Z}}_C(s)) (m - \dot{\mathbb{Z}}_C(s)) ds - \int_0^t \kappa_{-1} \dot{\mathbb{Z}}_C(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

Note that (5.9) is the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$ when we divide the equation for the scaled variable of C in (5.7) by N . Hence, we obtain

$$\dot{\mathbb{Z}}_C(t) = \frac{(m + \kappa_D + Z_T(t)) - \sqrt{(m + \kappa_D + Z_T(t))^2 - 4mZ_T(t)}}{2}, \quad (5.10)$$

$$\dot{Z}_T(t) = -\kappa_2 \frac{(m + \kappa_D + Z_T(t)) - \sqrt{(m + \kappa_D + Z_T(t))^2 - 4mZ_T(t)}}{2}, \quad (5.11)$$

where $\kappa_D \equiv \kappa_{-1}/\kappa_1$. The equations (5.10) and (5.11) are analogous to (5.2) and (5.3), respectively. Note that we only have κ_D in (5.10)-(5.11) instead of $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$ in (5.2)-(5.3). The reaction rate κ_2 disappears, since the propensity of the second reaction is of order of N , which is slower than the other two reactions whose propensities are of order N^2 as shown in (5.7). In Figure 2, we compare the limit $Z_T(t)$ in (5.11) and the scaled total substrate copy number $Z_T^N(t)$ in (5.8), obtained from 1000 realizations of the stochastic simulation using Gillespie's algorithm [33]. The plot indicates close agreement between the scaled process $Z_T^N(t)$ and its proposed limit $Z_T(t)$.

Conditions for tQSSA in the deterministic system. To derive tQSSA from (5.1), it is assumed that the total substrate concentration changes in the slow time scale and that the complex reaches its steady state quickly after some transient time, that is, $d[C]/dt \approx 0$. The complex concentration $[C]$ is then found as the nonnegative solution of a quadratic equation. As mentioned earlier, Borghans et al. [24] approximated $[C]$ in a form simpler than the exact

solution in (5.2) and found a necessary and sufficient condition for the validity of the tQSSA as

$$K[E_0] \ll ([E_0] + [S_0] + K_M)^2, \quad (5.12)$$

where $K = k_2/k_1$ and $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$. The condition (5.12) is equivalent to

$$1 \ll \left(1 + \frac{[E_0] + [S_0]}{K} + \frac{k_{-1}}{k_2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{[S_0] + K_M}{[E_0]}\right) \quad (5.13)$$

and is implied by any one of the following

$$\begin{aligned} K &\ll [E_0] + [S_0], \\ k_2 &\ll k_{-1}, \\ [E_0] &\ll [S_0] + K_M. \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

We convert concentrations and deterministic rate constants to molecular numbers and stochastic rate constants using (4.9)-(4.10). After simplification, the condition in (5.12) becomes

$$\frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1} X_{E_0} \ll \left(X_{E_0} + X_{S_0} + \frac{\kappa'_{-1} + \kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}\right)^2, \quad (5.15)$$

by using the same argument as in (4.11). Plugging our choice of the scaled variables and rate constants as specified in (5.4) yields

$$\frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} N (Z_E^N(t) + Z_C^N(t)) \ll \left(N (Z_E^N(t) + Z_C^N(t)) + N (Z_S^N(t) + Z_C^N(t) + Z_P^N(t)) + \frac{N\kappa_{-1} + \kappa_2}{\kappa_1}\right)^2.$$

Since in the above expression the term on the left is $O(N)$ and the term on the right is $O(N^2)$, our choice of scaling in the stochastic model is in agreement with the condition (5.12) for the validity of the tQSSA in the deterministic model.

We may also derive more general conditions on the scaling exponents, α 's and β 's, which lead to tQSSA limit in (5.11). To this end note that the time scale of C is faster than that of T so that we can derive an analogue of $d[C]/dt \approx 0$ in (5.9)

$$\alpha_C - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2) < \max(\alpha_S, \alpha_C) - \rho_2. \quad (5.16)$$

Moreover, the species copy number of C has an order greater than or equal to that of S , since otherwise C would disappear in the limit of T . Similarly, the species copy number of C has an order greater than or equal to that of E so that the limit for E can be expressed in terms of a conservation constant and C . Therefore, we have

$$\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_E) \leq \alpha_C. \quad (5.17)$$

Finally, to obtain a quadratic equation with a square root solution in the limit, the enzyme binding reaction rate should be equal to the unbinding reaction rate. That is,

$$\rho_1 = \rho_{-1}. \quad (5.18)$$




Figure 2: Michaelis-Menten kinetics with tQSSA. The limit of the scaled total substrate copy number, $Z_T(t)$ in (5.11), is drawn in orange dotted line and the scaled total substrate copy number, $Z_T^N(t)$ in (5.8), is shown in blue. The parameter values, $N = 1000$, and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_{-1}, \kappa_2) = (1, 4, 1)$, and the initial conditions, $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (1, 0.1, 0, 0)$, $m = 0.1$, and $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (0.75, 0.25, 0, 0)$, $m = 0.25$, respectively for the upper and the lower curves, are used. Two different choices of initial conditions are used here to show convergence under varying values of the conservation constant m .

Combining (5.16), (5.17), and (5.18), we get the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \max(\alpha_S, \alpha_E) &\leq \alpha_C, \\ \beta_2 &< \beta_{-1} = \alpha_C + \beta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (5.19)$$

Note that due to $\beta_2 < \beta_{-1}$ in (5.19), we have the discrepancy between κ_D in (5.11) and K_M in (5.3). The condition (5.19) implies

$$\begin{aligned} X_{S_0} &\approx X_{E_0}, \\ \frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1} &\ll \frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1} \approx X_{E_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.20)$$

which is consistent with the condition $k_2 \ll k_{-1}$ in (5.14) that was also suggested for the stochastic system tQSSA in [35].

6 Reverse quasi-steady-state approximation (rQSSA)

In the deterministic rQSSA, it is assumed that the enzyme is in high concentration. In this approximation, two time scales are considered. Starting with an initial condition $([S], [E], [C], [P]) =$

$([S_0], [E_0], 0, 0)$ in (2.2), the enzyme concentration is $[E] \approx [E_0]$ during the initial transient phase. Since there is almost no complex during this time, we get an approximate model as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d[S]}{dt} &= -k_1[E_0][S], \\ \frac{d[C]}{dt} &= k_1[E_0][S].\end{aligned}\tag{6.1}$$

After the initial transient phase, the substrate is depleted. Therefore, we assume that $d[S]/dt \approx 0$ in (2.2) and obtain

$$[S] = \frac{k_{-1}[C]}{k_1([E_0] - [C])},\tag{6.2}$$

so that the differential equation for the complex becomes

$$\frac{d[C]}{dt} = -k_2[C].\tag{6.3}$$

We refer to the approximation of the system (2.2) by (6.1)-(6.3) as the rQSSA of the Michaelis-Menten kinetics in the deterministic setting.

As in the previous sections, let us consider the stochastic equations for the Michaelis-Menten kinetics given by (3.1) and again apply yet another multiscale approximation with time change, to derive the rQSSA in (6.1)-(6.3). We assume that S and C are on faster time scale than E and P . The following scales are chosen

$$\begin{aligned}Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_S(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_E(N^\gamma t)}{N^2}, & Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_C(N^\gamma t)}{N}, & Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) &= \frac{X_P(N^\gamma t)}{N}, \\ \kappa'_1 &= \kappa_1, & \kappa'_{-1} &= N\kappa_{-1}, & \kappa'_2 &= N\kappa_2,\end{aligned}\tag{6.4}$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_S &= \alpha_C = \alpha_P = 1, & \alpha_E &= 2, \\ \beta_1 &= 0, & \beta_{-1} &= \beta_2 = 1.\end{aligned}$$

Then, the reduced system is obtained from (3.3) using (6.4) as

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_S^N(0) - \frac{1}{N}Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+3} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) + \frac{1}{N}Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right), \\
Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_E^N(0) - \frac{1}{N^2}Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+3} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) + \frac{1}{N^2}Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{N^2}Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right), \\
Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_C^N(0) + \frac{1}{N}Y_1 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+3} \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,\gamma}(s) Z_E^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) - \frac{1}{N}Y_{-1} \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{N}Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right), \\
Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) &= Z_P^N(0) + \frac{1}{N}Y_2 \left(\int_0^t N^{\gamma+2} \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,\gamma}(s) ds \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Note that this choice of scaling does not satisfy the balance equations introduced in (3.7). The inequalities for S and C give $\gamma \leq -2$ and those for E and P give $\gamma \leq -1$. These conditions suggest the first and the second time scales as $\gamma = -2$ when S and C become $O(1)$ and $\gamma = -1$ when E and P are $O(1)$. Define the following conservation constants

$$\begin{aligned}
m^N &= Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) + \frac{1}{N}Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t), \\
k^N &= Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) + Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) + Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

which we assume to converge to some limiting values m and k as $N \rightarrow \infty$, respectively. In this setting, $Z_S^{N,\gamma}$, $Z_E^{N,\gamma}$, $Z_C^{N,\gamma}$, and $Z_P^{N,\gamma}$ are bounded so that they are relatively compact for $t \in [0, \mathcal{T}]$, where $0 < \mathcal{T} < \infty$. In the first time scale when $\gamma = -2$, the scaled species for E and P converge to their initial conditions, $Z_E^{N,-2}(t) \rightarrow Z_E(0)$ and $Z_P^{N,-2}(t) \rightarrow Z_P(0)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$, since the scaling exponents in the propensities are greater than those of species copy numbers in this time scale. Therefore $(Z_S^{N,-2}, Z_C^{N,-2})$ converges to $(Z_S^{(-2)}, Z_C^{(-2)})$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_S^{(-2)}(t) &= Z_S(0) - \int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S^{(-2)}(s) Z_E(0) ds, \\
Z_C^{(-2)}(t) &= Z_C(0) + \int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S^{(-2)}(s) Z_E(0) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

Since $Z_C^{N,-2}(t)$ is bounded by k^N from (6.6), the remaining reaction terms for the unbinding of the complex and for the product production vanish as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The equations (6.7) are seen as the integral version of (6.1), that is, the rQSSA for the first (transient) time scale.

Next, consider the second time scale when $\gamma = -1$. Plugging $\gamma = -1$ in the equation for S in (6.5), and applying the law of large numbers, we obtain

$$Z_S^{N,-1}(t) \approx Z_S^N(0) - \int_0^t \left(N \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,-1}(s) Z_E^{N,-1}(s) - \kappa_{-1} Z_C^{N,-1}(s) \right) ds. \tag{6.8}$$

Using (6.8), the equations for E and C in (6.5) become

$$Z_C^{N,-1}(t) \approx Z_C^N(0) + Z_S^N(0) - Z_S^{N,-1}(t) - \int_0^t \kappa_2 Z_C^{N,-1}(s) ds, \quad (6.9)$$

$$Z_E^{N,-1}(t) \approx Z_E^N(0) - \int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,-1}(s) Z_E^{N,-1}(s) ds, \quad (6.10)$$

since the remaining reaction terms are asymptotically equal to zero. Dividing (6.8) by N , we obtain

$$\int_0^t \kappa_1 Z_S^{N,-1}(s) Z_E^{N,-1}(s) ds \rightarrow 0, \quad (6.11)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, since all other terms vanish asymptotically. Due to (6.10) and (6.11), $Z_E^{N,-1}(t) \rightarrow Z_E(0)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Defining $Z_S^{N,-1}(t) \equiv \int_0^t Z_S^{N,-1}(s) ds$ and using (6.11) and (6.9), we conclude that $(Z_S^{N,-1}, Z_C^{N,-1})$ converges to $(Z_S^{(-1)}, Z_C^{(-1)})$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_0^t \kappa_1 \dot{Z}_S^{(-1)}(s) Z_E(0) ds, \\ Z_C^{(-1)}(t) &= Z_C(0) + Z_S(0) - \dot{Z}_S^{(-1)}(t) - \int_0^t \kappa_2 Z_C^{(-1)}(s) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{Z}_S^{(-1)}(t) &= 0, \\ \dot{Z}_C^{(-1)}(t) &= -\kappa_2 Z_C^{(-1)}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

which is the analogue of the rQSSA in the second time scale (6.2)-(6.3) as derived from the deterministic model.

We illustrate the quality of rQSSA in the stochastic Michaelis-Menten system with some simulations. In Figure 3, we compare the limit $Z_S^{(-2)}(t)$ in (6.7) and the scaled substrate copy number $Z_S^{N,-2}(t)$ in (6.5) using 1000 runs of the Gillespie's algorithm. In Figure 4, we compare the limit $Z_C^{(-1)}(t)$ in (6.13) and the scaled complex copy number $Z_C^{N,-1}(t)$ in (6.5) using 10000 runs of the Gillespie's algorithm. Note that the initial condition of $Z_C^{(-1)}(t)$ is $Z_C(0) + Z_S(0)$ in (6.12). However, this does not affect since $Z_S(0) = 0$ in our simulation in Figure 4. In both time scales, the scaled processes are in close agreement with the proposed limits.

Conditions for rQSSA in the deterministic system. Consider the general condition for the validity of the rQSSA at high enzyme concentrations suggested by Schnell and Maini [28],

$$K \ll [E_0] \quad \text{and} \quad [S_0] \ll [E_0], \quad (6.14)$$

where $K = k_2/k_1$. Rewriting (6.14) in terms of molecular copy numbers and stochastic rate constants using (4.9)-(4.10) gives

$$\frac{\kappa_2'}{\kappa_1'} \ll X_{E_0} \quad \text{and} \quad X_{S_0} \ll X_{E_0}, \quad (6.15)$$




Figure 3: Michaelis-Menten kinetics with rQSSA in the first time scale: The limit of the scaled substrate copy number, $Z_S^{(-2)}(t)$ in (6.7), is drawn in orange dotted line and the scaled substrate copy number, $Z_S^{N,-2}(t)$ in (6.5), is shown in blue line. The parameter values, $N = 1000$, and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_{-1}, \kappa_2) = (1, 1, 0.1)$, and the initial conditions, $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (0.9, 1, 0.01, 0)$, $m = 1.01$, and $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (0.5, 0.75, 0.11, 0)$, $m = 0.86$, respectively for the upper and the lower curve, are used. Given the scaling assumptions, the convergence is not sensitive to the exact values of the initial conditions. The only purpose of the two different sets of initial conditions is to illustrate convergence under varying values of the conservation constant m .

since V 's all cancel out. Using our choice of scaling in (6.4), the conditions (6.15) become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} &\ll \left(N^2 Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) + N Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) \right) \quad \text{and} \\ N \left(Z_S^{N,\gamma}(t) + Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) + Z_P^{N,\gamma}(t) \right) &\ll \left(N^2 Z_E^{N,\gamma}(t) + N Z_C^{N,\gamma}(t) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.16)$$

Since the inequalities in (6.16) hold for large N , our choice of scaling is seen to satisfy the conditions (6.14).

As seen in the previous sections, we may also derive more general conditions on the scaling exponents, α 's and β 's, leading to (6.7) and (6.13). In the first scaling, the time scales of S and C are the same and faster than the time scale of E . Therefore it follows that

$$\alpha_S - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}) = \alpha_C - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2) < \alpha_E - \max(\rho_1, \rho_{-1}, \rho_2). \quad (6.17)$$

Since the binding reaction rate of the enzyme is faster than the rates of the other two reactions as we see in the limit (6.7), we have

$$\max(\rho_{-1}, \rho_2) < \rho_1. \quad (6.18)$$




Figure 4: Michaelis-Menten kinetics with rQSSA in the second time scale: The limit of the scaled complex copy number, $Z_C^{(-1)}(t)$ in (6.13), is drawn in orange dotted line and the scaled complex copy number, $Z_C^{N,-1}(t)$ in (6.5), is shown in blue line. The parameter values, $N = 10000$ and $(\kappa_1, \kappa_{-1}, \kappa_2) = (1, 1, 0.1)$, and the initial conditions, $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (0, 0.01, 1, 0)$, $m = 1.01$, and $(Z_S^N(0), Z_E^N(0), Z_C^N(0), Z_P^N(0)) = (0, 0.0075, 0.75, 0)$, $m = 0.7575$ respectively for the upper and the lower curves, are used. Given the scaling assumptions, the convergence is not sensitive to the exact values of the initial conditions. The two different sets of initial conditions only illustrate convergence under varying values of the conservation constant m .

Combining (6.17) and (6.18), the conditions in the first time scale are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_S = \alpha_C &< \alpha_E, \\ \max(\beta_{-1}, \beta_2) &< \alpha_E + \beta_1. \end{aligned} \quad (6.19)$$

Then, the condition in (6.19) implies

$$\begin{aligned} X_{S_0} &\ll X_{E_0}, \\ \max\left(\frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1}, \frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}\right) &\ll X_{E_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.20)$$

which is comparable to (6.14).

Next, consider the second time scale and the condition on the scaling exponents that yields (6.13). Note that the conditions (6.17)-(6.18) are already sufficient to derive the limiting process in the second time scale. The condition (6.17) implies the time scales of S and C are the same. Since $\rho_2 < \rho_1$ as in (6.18), the time scale of $S + C$ is slower than that of S . Setting the time scale of $S + C$ as the reference one, we see that on that timescale S will be rapidly

Table 1: Comparison of conditions for the quasi-steady-state approximations in the stochastic and deterministic Michaelis-Menten kinetics.

Conditions on	sQSSA	tQSSA	rQSSA
stochastic scaling	$\alpha_E \leq \alpha_C < \alpha_S$ $\alpha_S = \beta_{-1} - \beta_1 = \beta_2 - \beta_1$	$\max(\alpha_S, \alpha_E) \leq \alpha_C$ $\beta_2 < \beta_{-1} = \alpha_C + \beta_1$	$\alpha_S = \alpha_C < \alpha_E$ $\max(\beta_{-1}, \beta_2) < \alpha_E + \beta_1$
stochastic abundance	$X_{E_0} \ll X_{S_0}$ $X_{E_0} \ll \frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1} \approx \frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}$	$X_{E_0} \approx X_{S_0}$ $\frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1} \ll \frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1} \approx X_{E_0}$	$X_{S_0} \ll X_{E_0}$ $\max\left(\frac{\kappa'_{-1}}{\kappa'_1}, \frac{\kappa'_2}{\kappa'_1}\right) \ll X_{E_0}$
deterministic abundance	$[E_0] \ll [S_0] + K_M$	$K[E_0] \ll ([E_0] + [S_0] + K_M)^2$	$K \ll [E_0]$ and $[S_0] \ll [E_0]$

The parameters are $K = k_2/k_1$ and $K_M = (k_{-1} + k_2)/k_1$.

depleted and then approximated by zero in view of the discrepancy between the consumption and production rates of S , due to $\rho_{-1} < \rho_1$ in (6.18). Therefore, the conditions in (6.17)-(6.18) are sufficient to obtain the limit in (6.13) on the second time scale as well. Finally, note that the stochastic Michaelis-Menten system with (6.19) does not provide an analogue equation for S in (6.2) due to the condition, $\rho_{-1} < \rho_1$, as shown in (6.18). Assuming $\rho_{-1} = \rho_1$ will balance production and consumption of S , but in this case we can no longer claim the relative compactness of S .

7 Discussion

In this paper, we derived the sQSSA, the tQSSA and the rQSSA for the Michaelis-Menten model of enzyme kinetics from general stochastic equations describing interactions between enzyme, substrate and enzyme-substrate complex in terms of a jump Markov process. We have shown that these various QSSAs are a consequence of the law of large numbers for the stochastic chemical reaction network under appropriately chosen scaling regimes. Our derivation relies on the multiscale approximation approach [1, 2] that is quite general and could be used to obtain similar types of QSSAs in other stochastic chemical reaction systems. One possible example is a model of signal transduction into protein phosphorylation cascade, such as the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) signaling pathway [36, 37, 38]. In MAPK signaling pathway, the product of one level of the cascade may act as the enzyme at the next level, with different Michaelis-Menten QSSAs found to be appropriate at different levels [36, 37, 38, 39].

Since the dynamics of enzyme kinetics plays such a central role in many problems of modern biochemistry, it is important to understand the precise conditions for the QSSA's discussed here. For convenience, in Table 1, we summarize the conditions for different QSSAs in terms of their scaling exponents as well as the stochastic and deterministic species abundances. The conditions for the stochastic scalings presented in the first row of the table clearly separate the range of parameter values into three regimes. As we can see, the exponent α_S should be greater than the other exponents for species copy numbers in the sQSSA while α_E is greater

than the other exponents for species copy numbers in the rQSSA. In the tQSSA, α_C needs to be greater than or equal to the other exponents. For the sQSSA and the rQSSA, the stochastic species abundance conditions (listed in the second row) are seen to also imply the deterministic abundance conditions (listed in the third row). However, the necessary condition for the tQSSA derived from the stochastic model is slightly different from the corresponding deterministic condition as it requires the similar order of magnitude for the total amount of enzyme and the total amount of substrate. Note, however, that the condition on the deterministic rates $k_2 \ll k_{-1}$, which is an analog of the stochastic rates condition $\kappa'_2 \ll \kappa'_{-1}$, implies both the deterministic and the stochastic abundance conditions for the tQSSA.

Our derivations of the QSSAs from the stochastic Michaelis-Menten kinetics provide approximate ODE models where reaction propensities follow rational or square-root functions and hence violate the law of mass action. Such non-standard propensity functions are often useful for building efficient reduced model also in the stochastic settings where they may be used as intensity functions in the random time change representation of the Poisson processes. For instance, Grima et al.[40], Chow et al. [41], as well as some others [42, 43] have applied this idea to construct approximate, stochastic Michaelis-Menten enzyme kinetic networks and even the gene regulatory networks [44]. As some of the authors of this article argued in their recent work ([19]), such approximate stochastic models using intensities derived from the deterministic limits may in some sense be better approximations of the underlying stochastic networks than the deterministic QSSAs. Our derivations presented here could be used to further justify this statement, at least for networks satisfying certain scaling conditions [45, 46, 47], including those presented in Table 1. We therefore hope that the results in the current paper will further contribute to developing more accurate approximations of models for enzyme kinetics in biochemical networks.

8 Acknowledgements

This work has been co-funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) as part of project C3 within the Collaborative Research Center (CRC) 1053 – MAKI (WKB) and the National Science Foundation under the grants RAPID DMS-1513489 (GR) and DMS-1620403 (HWK). This research has also been supported in part by the University of Maryland Baltimore County under grant UMBC KAN3STRT (HWK). This work was initiated when HWK and WKB were visiting the Mathematical Biosciences Institute (MBI) at the Ohio State University in Winter 2016-17. MBI is receiving major funding from the National Science Foundation under the grant DMS-1440386. HWK and WKB acknowledge the hospitality of MBI during their visits to the institute.

References

- [1] H.-W. Kang and T. G. Kurtz. Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic reaction networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 23(2):529–583, 2013.

- [2] K. Ball, T. G. Kurtz, L. Popovic, and G. A. Rempala. Asymptotic analysis of multiscale approximations to reaction networks. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 16(4):1925–1961, 2006.
- [3] A. Cornish-Bowden. *Fundamentals of enzyme kinetics*. Portland Press, 2004.
- [4] I. H. Segel. *Enzyme kinetics*, volume 360. Wiley, New York, 1975.
- [5] G. Hammes. *Enzyme catalysis and regulation*. Elsevier, 2012.
- [6] R. Perez-Carrasco, P. Guerrero, J. Briscoe, and K. M. Page. Intrinsic noise profoundly alters the dynamics and steady state of morphogen-controlled bistable genetic switches. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 12(10):1–23, 2016.
- [7] P. C. Bressloff. Stochastic switching in biology: from genotype to phenotype. *J. Phys. A*, 50(13):133001, 2017.
- [8] M. Assaf and B. Meerson. WKB theory of large deviations in stochastic populations. *J. Phys. A*, 50(26):263001, 2017.
- [9] J. M. Newby. Bistable switching asymptotics for the self regulating gene. *J. Phys. A*, 48(18):185001, 2015.
- [10] T. Biancalani and M. Assaf. Genetic toggle switch in the absence of cooperative binding: exact results. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115:208101, 2015.
- [11] P. C. Bressloff and J. M. Newby. Metastability in a stochastic neural network modeled as a velocity jump markov process. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12(3):1394–1435, 2013.
- [12] J. M. Newby. Isolating intrinsic noise sources in a stochastic genetic switch. *Phys. Biol.*, 9(2):026002, 2012.
- [13] L. A. Segel and M. Slemrod. The quasi-steady-state assumption: a case study in perturbation. *SIAM Rev.*, 31(3):446–477, 1989.
- [14] K. R. Schneider and T. Wilhelm. Model reduction by extended quasi-steady-state approximation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 40(5):443–450, 2000.
- [15] M. Stiefenhofer. Quasi-steady-state approximation for chemical reaction networks. *J. Math. Biol.*, 36(6):593–609, 1998.
- [16] J. W. Dingee and A. B. Anton. A new perturbation solution to the Michaelis-Menten problem. *AIChE J.*, 54(5):1344–1357, 2008.
- [17] S. Schnell and C. Mendoza. Closed form solution for time-dependent enzyme kinetics. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 187(2):207–212, 1997.
- [18] A. M. Bersani and G. Dell’Acqua. Asymptotic expansions in enzyme reactions with high enzyme concentrations. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.*, 34(16):1954–1960, 2011.

- [19] J. K. Kim, G. A. Rempala, and H.-W. Kang. Reduction for stochastic biochemical reaction networks with multiscale conservations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.05628*, 2017.
- [20] L. Michaelis and M. L. Menten. Die kinetik der invertinwirkung. *Biochem. Z.*, 49(333-369):352, 1913.
- [21] G. E. Briggs and J. B. S. Haldane. A note on the kinetics of enzyme action. *Biochem. J.*, 19(2):338, 1925.
- [22] K. J. Laidler. Theory of the transient phase in kinetics, with special reference to enzyme systems. *Can. J. Chem.*, 33(10):1614–1624, 1955.
- [23] L. A. Segel. On the validity of the steady state assumption of enzyme kinetics. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 50(6):579–593, 1988.
- [24] J. A. M. Borghans, R. J. De Boer, and L. A. Segel. Extending the quasi-steady state approximation by changing variables. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 58(1):43–63, 1996.
- [25] D. D. Van Slyke and G. E. Cullen. The mode of action of urease and of enzymes in general. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 19(2):141–180, 1914.
- [26] A. R. Tzafriri. Michaelis-Menten kinetics at high enzyme concentrations. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 65(6):1111–1129, 2003.
- [27] G. Dell’Acqua and A. M. Bersani. A perturbation solution of Michaelis–Menten kinetics in a “total” framework. *J Math Chem.*, 50(5):1136–1148, 2012.
- [28] S. Schnell and P. K. Maini. Enzyme kinetics at high enzyme concentration. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 62(3):483–499, 2000.
- [29] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*, volume 282. John Wiley & Wiley, 1986.
- [30] T. A. Darden. A pseudo-steady-state approximation for stochastic chemical kinetics. *Rocky Mt. J. Math.*, 9(1):51–71, 1979.
- [31] T. A. Darden. Enzyme kinetics: stochastic vs. deterministic models. In *Instabilities, bifurcations, and fluctuations in chemical systems*, pages 248–272. University of Texas Press, Austin, 1982.
- [32] D. F. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz. Continuous time markov chain models for chemical reaction networks. In *Design and analysis of biomolecular circuits*, pages 3–42. Springer, 2011.
- [33] D. T. Gillespie. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. *J. Phys. Chem.*, 81(25):2340–2361, 1977.
- [34] T. G. Kurtz. The relationship between stochastic and deterministic models for chemical reactions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 57(7):2976–2978, 1972.

- [35] D. Barik, M. R. Paul, W. T. Baumann, Y. Cao, and J. J. Tyson. Stochastic simulation of enzyme-catalyzed reactions with disparate timescales. *Biophys. J.*, 95(8):3563–3574, 2008.
- [36] A. M. Bersani, M. G. Pedersen, E. Bersani, and F. Barcellona. A mathematical approach to the study of signal transduction pathways in MAPK cascade. *Ser. Adv. Math. Appl. Sci.*, 69:124, 2005.
- [37] C. A. Gómez-Uribe, G. C. Verghese, and L. A. Mirny. Operating regimes of signaling cycles: statics, dynamics, and noise filtering. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 3(12):e246, 2007.
- [38] G. Dell’Acqua and A. M. Bersani. Quasi-steady state approximations and multistability in the double phosphorylation-dephosphorylation cycle. In *International joint conference on biomedical engineering systems and technologies*, pages 155–172. Springer, 2011.
- [39] H. M. Sauro and B. N. Kholodenko. Quantitative analysis of signaling networks. *Prog. Biophys. Mol. Biol.*, 86(1):5–43, 2004.
- [40] R. Grima, D. R. Schmidt, and T. J. Newman. Steady-state fluctuations of a genetic feedback loop: An exact solution. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 137(3):035104, 2012.
- [41] Boseung Choi, Grzegorz A. Rempala, and Jae Kyoung Kim. Beyond the michaelis-menten equation: Accurate and efficient estimation of enzyme kinetic parameters. In revision, 2017.
- [42] T. Tian and K. Burrage. Stochastic models for regulatory networks of the genetic toggle switch. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 103(22):8372–8377, 2006.
- [43] H. Kim and E. Gelenbe. Stochastic gene expression modeling with hill function for switch-like gene responses. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinform.*, 9(4):973–979, 2012.
- [44] S. Smith, C. Cianci, and R. Grima. Analytical approximations for spatial stochastic gene expression in single cells and tissues. *J. Royal Soc. Interface*, 13(118), 2016.
- [45] C. V. Rao and A. P. Arkin. Stochastic chemical kinetics and the quasi-steady-state assumption: application to the Gillespie algorithm. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 118(11):4999–5010, 2003.
- [46] K. R. Sanft, D. T. Gillespie, and L. R. Petzold. Legitimacy of the stochastic Michaelis–Menten approximation. *IET Syst. Biol.*, 5(1):58–69, 2011.
- [47] J. K. Kim, K. Josić, and M. R. Bennett. The relationship between stochastic and deterministic quasi-steady state approximations. *BMC Syst. Biol.*, 9(1):87, 2015.