

Improved estimation for energy dissipation in biochemical oscillations

Zhiyu Cao and Zhonghuai Hou*

Department of Chemical Physics & Hefei National Laboratory for Physical Sciences at Microscales, iChEM, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

(Dated: March 17, 2022)

Biochemical oscillations, regulating the timing of life processes, need consume energy to achieve good performance on crucial functions, such as high accuracy of phase period and high sensitivity to external signals. However, it is a great challenge to precisely estimate the energy dissipation in such systems. Here, based on the stochastic normal form theory (SNFT), we calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient between the oscillatory amplitude and phase, and a trade-off relation between transport efficiency and phase sensitivity can then be derived, which serves as a tighter form than the estimator resulting from the conventional thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR). Our findings demonstrate that a more precise energy dissipation estimation can be obtained by enhancing the sensitivity of the biochemical oscillations. Moreover, the internal noise and amplitude power effects have also been discovered.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a, 05.70.Ln, 02.50.Ey

I. INTRODUCTION

To achieve good performance of certain functions, living systems are inherently nonequilibrium and dissipative. Recently, the relationship between biochemical functions and nonequilibrium thermodynamics has been an active area in statistical physics community [1–20]. For instance, Lan *et al.* have revealed a powerful trade-off relation between energy dissipation rate, adaption speed and the maximum adaption accuracy underlying many sensory systems [3, 4]. Lang *et al.* have investigated the fundamental thermodynamic constraints on statistical inference and learning of biochemical signaling networks [6]. Particularly, for biochemical oscillations which are essential in regulating the timing of life processes, such as the cell cycle, circadian clocks, and glycolysis, both accuracy of the period and sensitivity to external cues can be ensured by dissipative processes simultaneously [21–26]. Therefore, it is important to measure the free energy dissipation in biochemical oscillation systems that maintains the cyclic dynamics. However, in actual experiments, how to infer the energy dissipation is of great challenge [27, 28].

Recent progress in this topic is the thermodynamic uncertainty relation (TUR) [29–37], quantifying the trade-off between energy dissipation ΔW , the average $\langle R \rangle$ and variance $\text{Var}(R) = \langle (R - \langle R \rangle)^2 \rangle$ of a time-integrated current observable R in nonequilibrium steady states (here $\beta = k_B T$, T is the temperature of the environment and k_B is the Boltzmann constant):

$$\eta(R) = \frac{2 \langle R \rangle^2}{\beta \text{Var}(R) \Delta W} \leq 1, \quad (1)$$

where $\eta(R)$ is the transport efficiency to properly quan-

tify the performance of living systems working with high accuracy, but low energy dissipation [34]. Directly, TUR yields that the magnitude of current fluctuation provides a lower bound of energy dissipation as $\Delta W \geq \Delta W_{\text{TUR}} \equiv 2k_B T \langle R \rangle^2 / \text{Var}(R)$ with $\eta(R) = \Delta W_{\text{TUR}} / \Delta W$. If $\eta(R)$ is close to 1, the TUR acts as a powerful tool for energy dissipation inference [38–44]. For instance, recently Li *et al.* have showed that the fluctuations in nonequilibrium currents can be utilized to infer the dissipation rate for the bead-spring model [38]. Otsubo *et al.* have developed a framework for dissipation estimation by using the TUR along with machine learning techniques [41], to list just a few.

However, since the TUR is an inequality, only a rough bound can be provided in many cases. For instance, it has been revealed by Hwang and Hyeon that the TUR is generally not tight for several types of molecular motors [45]. Jack *et al.* have found that the TUR only yields a weak bound for molecular-scale energy conversion [46]. Also, in our recent work [47], we have established the TUR for general biochemical oscillations by calculating the transport efficiency $\eta(\theta) = 2 \langle \theta \rangle^2 / \beta \text{Var}(\theta) \Delta W < 1$, where the observable oscillatory phase $\theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta}(t) dt$ is the current observable. Both the analytical and numerical results have shown that the TUR is far from tight for models of chemical oscillators ($\eta(\theta) \approx 0.4$ for the Brusselator as an example), providing typically lower estimation on energy dissipation than the actual value. Therefore, how to obtain a qualified estimation than the conventional TUR for biochemical oscillation systems is still a open question.

In the presented paper, we try to address this question by revealing a trade-off relation between transport efficiency and phase sensitivity [9, 48, 49]. The basic idea is to improve the conventional TUR by considering the Pearson correlations between the chosen current and another state-dependent observable, based on a strategy proposed by Dechant and Sasa very recently [50]. For practical purpose in biochemical oscillation


*E-mail: hzhlj@ustc.edu.cn

systems, we choose the time integral of the oscillatory amplitude r as the state-dependent observable, which reads $Q_2(\tau) = \int_0^\tau r^2(t)dt$. By using the stochastic normal form theory (SNFT) we established before [51–54], explicit theoretical expressions of the Pearson correlations between Q_2 and θ can be derived, which allows us to obtain the efficiency-sensitivity trade-off relation as $\eta(\theta) \leq 1 - 2\alpha\kappa^2$ with κ the phase sensitivity characterizing the ability for biochemical circuits to respond to external signals and $\alpha > 0$ the control parameter denoting the distance to the bifurcation point. Remarkably, this trade-off relation provides a tighter dissipation estimator for biochemical oscillations than the conventional TUR, and the precision of this estimator can be further improved by enhancing the sensitivity. Finally, we demonstrate our statements by detailed numerical simulations in a circadian clock model.

II. IMPROVED ESTIMATION OF THE ENERGY DISSIPATION

A. Stochastic Normal Form Theory (SNFT)

We consider a general biochemical system of size V including N well-stirred species and M reactions as (R_1, \dots, R_M) . Generally, the reaction R_ρ can be written as:



where $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_N)$ with X_j the number of species j , and $\mathbf{v}_\rho = (v_\rho^1, v_\rho^2, \dots, v_\rho^N)$ with v_ρ^j the stoichiometric change of species j in R_ρ . In a mesoscopic system wherein intrinsic noise cannot be neglected, with the assumption of existence of a “macro-infinitesimal” time scale [52, 55], the system’s dynamics can be described by the chemical Langevin equations (CLEs) as

$$\dot{x}_j = \sum_{\rho=1}^M v_\rho^j w_\rho(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\rho=1}^M v_\rho^j \sqrt{w_\rho(\mathbf{x})} \xi_\rho(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)^T = \mathbf{X}/V$ denotes the concentration vector, $w_\rho(\mathbf{x})$ is the reaction rate of R_ρ as a function of the concentrations \mathbf{x} , and $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t) = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_M)^T$ is a vector of independent Gaussian white noises with zero means and correlations $\langle \xi_\rho(t) \xi_{\rho'}(s) \rangle = \delta_{\rho\rho'} \delta(t-s)$.

In the thermodynamic limit with $V \rightarrow \infty$, the noise term disappears and the dynamics is described by the deterministic equation

$$\dot{x}_j = F_j(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \sum_{\rho=1}^M v_\rho^j w_\rho(\mathbf{x}) \quad (3)$$

Generally, to the occurrence of biochemical oscillation, we assume that the system undergoes a supercritical Hopf bifurcation (HB) with the change of a certain control parameter μ . Eq.(3) has a unique stable point \mathbf{x}_s with

$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_s) \equiv 0$, which loses stability at the HB point $\mu = \mu_c$, in the way that the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{J} with components $J_{ij} = (\partial f_i / \partial x_j)|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_s}$ has a pair of conjugate eigenvalues $\lambda_\pm = \alpha(\mu) \pm i\omega$ with $\alpha(\mu_c) = 0$. In the so-called supercritical region $\mu > \mu_c$ ($\alpha > 0$), the deterministic system shows a stable oscillation with frequency given by ω and amplitude growing from zero. In the subcritical region with $\mu < \mu_c$ ($\alpha < 0$), no deterministic oscillation can be observed. In the case where the system size is not large such that the internal noise term in Eq.(2) can not be ignored, such as for intracellular biochemical oscillation systems considered here, an interesting phenomenon known as noise induced oscillations (NIOs) has been observed even in the subcritical region where $\alpha < 0$, demonstrating the constructive role of internal noise in mesoscopic chemical oscillation systems [56]. In addition, an optimal system size exists where the NIO shows best performance, known as internal noise coherence resonance (INCR) [57–59].

In our previous works [51–54], we have developed a stochastic normal form theory (SNFT) to successfully elucidate the mechanism underlying NIO and INCR. When the system locates near the HB, the motion of the oscillatory mode is much slower than the other $N-2$ stable modes due to time-scale separation. Hence, the system’s dynamics will be dominated by the oscillatory motion on a 2D center manifold. According to SNFT, the stochastic dynamics governing the evolution of the oscillation amplitude r and phase angle θ can be described by (see Appendix A for details)

$$\dot{r} = \alpha r + C_r r^3 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2Vr} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{V}} \eta_r(t), \quad (4)$$

$$\dot{\theta} = \omega + C_i r^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{r\sqrt{V}} \eta_\theta(t) \quad (5)$$

wherein $C_r < 0$ and $C_i > 0$ are system-dependent constants determined by the nonlinear terms of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$ at the stable point, η_r and η_θ are independent Gaussian white noises with zero mean and unit variance, ε denotes an effective noise intensity determined by the details of $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$. According to Eqs.(4) and (5), the steady-state (SS) distribution of r reads

$$p_{ss}(r) = N_r \exp \left[-\frac{V}{4\varepsilon^2} (2\alpha r^2 + C_r r^4) + \ln r \right] \quad (6)$$

and θ is uniformly distributed with $[0, 2\pi]$. Therefore, the system exhibits a stochastic oscillation with most-probable amplitude given by

$$r_m = \left(-\frac{\sqrt{\alpha^2 - 2C_r \varepsilon^2 / V} + \alpha}{2C_r} \right)^{1/2} \quad (7)$$

satisfying $\partial p_{ss}(r) / \partial r|_{r_m} = 0$.

Clearly, in the deterministic limit ($V \rightarrow \infty$), $r_m = \sqrt{-\alpha/C_r}$ corresponding to a stable limit cycle and frequency $\omega_s = \omega + C_i r_m^2 = \omega + \alpha |C_i/C_r|$, which only

exists for $\alpha > 0$ in the supercritical region. If the system size is finite, however, the internal term $2C_r\varepsilon^2/V$ in the square-root will take effect and r_m is not zero even for $\alpha < 0$ (subcritical region), corresponding to the occurrence of NIO. In the case $|\alpha| \gg 2C_r\varepsilon^2/V$, one has for NIO $r_m \simeq \varepsilon/\sqrt{-2\alpha V}$ which scales as $V^{-1/2}$, and the frequency is approximately $\omega_s \simeq \omega + C_i\varepsilon^2/(2|\alpha|V)$. Therefore,

$$\omega_s = \begin{cases} \omega + \alpha|C_i/C_r| & (\alpha > 0) \\ \omega + C_i\varepsilon^2/(2|\alpha|V) & (\alpha < 0) \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

B. Transport Efficiency and Phase Sensitivity

The purpose of the present work is to figure out a way to improve the estimation of energy dissipation (or entropy production) related to the stochastic oscillations. As mentioned in the introduction, one usually uses the thermodynamic uncertain relation (TUR) as an inference of the real energy dissipation via $\Delta W \geq \Delta W_{\text{TUR}} \equiv 2k_B T \langle R \rangle^2 / \text{Var}(R)$ wherein R is some well-defined current variable, and $\text{Var}(R) = \langle R^2 \rangle - \langle R \rangle^2$ denotes the variance of R . Correspondingly, the transport efficiency for R reads $\eta(R) = \Delta W_{\text{TUR}} / \Delta W = 2k_B T \langle R \rangle^2 / \text{Var}(R) \leq 1$. For the oscillatory dynamics considered here, it is convenient to choose R as the change of phase angle within a given time interval $(0, \tau)$, i.e., $R(\tau) \rightarrow \theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta}(t) dt$. By simply rewriting and setting $k_B T = 1$ from now on, the transport efficiency can be expressed as $\eta(\theta) = 2k_B T \langle \theta \rangle^2 / [\text{Var}(\theta)\Delta W] = v_\theta^2 / D_\theta \dot{W}$ where $v_\theta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \theta \rangle / t$ is the phase speed, $D_\theta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (\langle \theta^2 \rangle - \langle \theta \rangle^2) / 2t$ is the phase diffusion constant, and $\dot{W} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Delta W / t$ is the dissipation rate.

By using the SNFT, the mean and variance of the phase $\theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta} dt$ can be calculated as $\langle \theta(t) \rangle \simeq \omega_s t$ and $\langle (\theta(t) - \langle \theta(t) \rangle)^2 \rangle \approx \varepsilon^2 t / V r_m^2$. Hence the velocity v_θ is simply ω_s and the phase diffusion constant is given by $D_\theta \simeq \varepsilon^2 / 2V r_m^2$. It is also possible to obtain the theoretical expression for \dot{W} by using the SNFT, which is after some manipulation given by $\dot{W} \simeq (L_{12} - L_{21}) V \omega_s^2 r_m^2$, where L_{12} and L_{21} are model-dependent parameters determined by the linear transformation of $F(\mathbf{x})$ at the fixed point \mathbf{x}_s (see Appendix A for more details), and being independent of the control parameter α and system size. Consequently, the transport efficiency reads

$$\eta_\theta \simeq \frac{\omega_s}{\varepsilon^2 (L_{12} - L_{21})} = \frac{\omega + \alpha|C_i/C_r|}{\varepsilon^2 (L_{12} - L_{21})} \quad (9)$$

and the TUR asserts that $\eta_\theta \leq 1$. Although the expression of η_θ , Eq.(9), gives no hint that the TUR holds, we indeed demonstrate numerically in our previous work that for the well-known Brusselator, $\eta_\theta \sim 0.4$ which is far below the upper bound 1.0 in the vicinity of the Hopf bifurcation.

For oscillation systems, another important quantity is the phase sensitivity quantifying the ability of the biochemical circuits to respond to external signal [48, 49]. Instead of dealing with the entire system, we employ the phase reduction method [60, 61] to reduce the whole state space to a single phase variable ϕ characterizing the timing of oscillation, and the phase sensitivity κ can be obtained by comparing the phase shift after perturbations. The phase ϕ in Eq.(6) is defined on the limit cycle of the unperturbed oscillations, and the definition can be expanded into the entire \mathbf{x} -space by introducing the isochron (the two states are assigned the same phase if trajectories originated from two states converge onto the limit cycle at the same time). Following this definition, the deterministic phase evolution equation can be expressed as $\dot{\phi} = \Omega = \nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi \cdot \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x})$. For a weak external signal $\beta(t)$, the deterministic term reads $\mathbf{F}_\alpha(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) + k\beta(t)$ with k the control parameter, and the phase shift incurred by a parametric perturbation $k \rightarrow k + \delta k$ can be obtained as $\dot{\phi} = \Omega + \delta k [\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi \cdot \beta(t)]$. Then, the global phase sensitivity parameter κ can be defined as the normalized value of signal-independent factor $\nabla_{\mathbf{x}} \phi$ along the limit cycle with $r = r_m$. For oscillations near the Hopf bifurcation with $\sqrt{-2C_r\varepsilon^2/V} < |\alpha| \ll |C_r/C_i|$, the phase sensitivity κ can be approximately calculated as $\kappa \approx \partial\omega_s/\partial\alpha$ [9, 47], i.e. (see Eq.8)

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{|C_i|\varepsilon^2}{2\alpha^2 V} & \alpha < 0 \\ \frac{C_i}{C_r} & \alpha > 0 \end{cases}. \quad (10)$$

C. Pearson Correlation Coefficient

Here, we investigate the formulation of a scheme for the characterization of correlations between the oscillatory amplitude and phase based on a statistical measure known as the Pearson correlation coefficient, which has been commonly used in the context of quantum entanglement [62–64] and filtering theorem [65, 66]. The Pearson correlation coefficient for any two random variables R and Q is defined as $\chi(R, Q) = \text{Cov}(R, Q) / \sqrt{\text{Var}(R)\text{Var}(Q)}$ with $\text{Cov}(R, Q) = \langle RQ \rangle - \langle R \rangle \langle Q \rangle$ the covariance. The values of Pearson correlation coefficient lie between -1 and 1 .

Then, we start to calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi_n^2 = \chi^2(r^n, \theta)$ between the two observables $R(\tau) = \theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta}(t) dt$ and $Q_{r,n} = \int_0^\tau r^n(t) dt$, where the exponent n quantifies the order of correlation between the oscillatory amplitude and phase. By using the SNFE, we find that the change rate of the covariance between oscillatory phase and amplitude is related to the higher-order moment of the amplitude as

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \text{Cov}(r^n, \theta; \tau) &= \left\langle \left\langle r^n \dot{\theta} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} - \left\langle \left\langle \dot{\theta} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} \left\langle \left\langle r^n \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^\infty dr r^n \dot{\theta} P_{ss}(r) - (\omega + C_i \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}) \langle r^n \rangle_{ss} \\
&\approx C_i \left(\langle r^{n+2} \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^n \rangle_{ss} \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss} \right). \tag{11}
\end{aligned}$$

Particularly, we choose $n = 2$ to calculate the covariance between oscillatory phase and amplitude. According to Eq.(6), the change rate of covariance is (see Appendix B for detailed derivation)

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \text{Cov}(r^2, \theta; \tau) = \begin{cases} -\frac{2C_i C_r r^4 \varepsilon^2}{\alpha^2 V} & \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \alpha < 0 \end{cases}. \tag{12}$$

Here, we need to emphasize that our theoretical expression for normal oscillations ($\alpha > 0$) holds in the region near the Hopf bifurcation where $\sqrt{-2C_r \varepsilon^2 / V} < \alpha \ll |C_r / C_i|$. It can be found that the phase and amplitude are highly decoupled with the covariance $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cov}(r^n, \theta; \tau) / \tau \approx 0$ in the subcritical region ($\alpha < 0$). The highly decoupling feature is also the reason why the sensitivity for noise-induced oscillations ($\kappa \sim V^\delta, \delta = -1$) is typically smaller than the normal oscillations ($\kappa \sim V^\delta, \delta = 0$), i.e., the oscillatory amplitude's adaptation to phase shift incurred by perturbation in the subcritical region is much slower in the subcritical region.

Then, we start to calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi_2^2 = \chi^2(r^2, \theta)$, which reads as

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_2^2 &= \frac{[\text{Cov}(r^2, \theta)]^2}{\text{Var}(r^2) \text{Var}(\theta)} \\
&\approx \frac{C_i^2 \left| \langle r^4 \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}^2 \right|}{D_\theta}. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

From Eqs. (12) and (13), the Pearson correlation coefficient χ_2^2 for normal oscillations ($\alpha > 0$) can be obtained as

$$\chi_2^2 = \begin{cases} 2\alpha \left(\frac{C_i}{C_r} \right)^2 & \alpha > 0 \\ 0 & \alpha < 0 \end{cases}. \tag{14}$$

which is independent of the system size V . The Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi_n^2 = \chi^2(r^n, \theta)$ for $n \neq 2$ can be calculated numerically.

D. Improved TUR

Recently, it was proposed by Dechant and Sasa that increasing the number of observables will achieve tighter

bounds than the conventional TUR [50, 67]. To be precise, they defined a generalized transport efficiency as $\eta(R, Q) = \eta(R) + \chi^2(R, Q)$, where $Q = \int_0^\tau dt q(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is the time-integral of a state-dependent (non-current) observable $q(\mathbf{x}, t)$, and $\chi(R, Q)$ is the Pearson correlation coefficient between Q and the current observable R . Interestingly, they found that the generalized transport efficiency, $\eta(R, Q)$, is also smaller than 1 just like the conventional one, $\eta(R)$. Therefore, the generalized transport efficiency $\eta(R, Q) \geq \eta(R)$ provides an improved estimator for energy dissipation than the conventional one,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta W_{\text{TUR}} &= \frac{2k_B T \langle R \rangle^2}{\text{Var}(R)} \\
&\leq \Delta W_{\text{I}} = \frac{2k_B T \langle R \rangle^2}{\text{Var}(R)[1 - \chi^2(R, Q)]} \\
&\leq \Delta W. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

It can be found that how much the estimation can be improved is directly related to the value of Pearson correlation coefficient between the chosen observables, and the two observables we chose above, the oscillatory amplitude and oscillatory phase, meet the conditions of use.

Based on Eq.(14) and (15), the explicit expression for the generalized transport efficiency can be obtained as $\eta(r^2, \theta) = \eta(\theta) + 2\alpha(C_i/C_r)^2 \leq 1$ when $\alpha > 0$. Therefore, we eventually get an efficiency-sensitivity trade-off relation for normal oscillations,

$$\eta(\theta) + 2\alpha\kappa^2 = \frac{v_\theta^2}{D_\theta \dot{W}} + 2\alpha\kappa^2 \leq 1, \tag{16}$$

which is the main result of our paper, showing that both phase accuracy D_θ^{-1} and phase sensitivity κ can be improved simultaneously only by increasing the energy dissipation rate \dot{W} without sacrificing the phase speed v_θ [15]. More importantly, such trade-off relation provides an improved estimator for the dissipation rate,

$$\Delta W_{\text{I},2} = \frac{2k_B T \langle \theta \rangle^2}{\text{Var}(\theta)(1 - \chi_2^2)}, \tag{17}$$

than the conventional TUR, and the improvement of it is

$$\frac{\Delta W_{\text{I},2}}{\Delta W_{\text{TUR}}} = \frac{\dot{W}_{\text{I},2}}{\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}} = \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha\kappa^2} > 1 \tag{18}$$




FIG. 1: (a) Pearson correlations χ_2^2 as a function of the control parameter α for the circadian clock model. The value of χ_2^2 changes sharply near the critical point $\alpha = 0$, due to the bifurcation phenomenon. Line: theory. Dots: simulation. (b) The Pearson correlations χ_2^2 as a function of the phase sensitivity $\kappa = |C_i/C_r|$ (green and pink dots). The slopes ν for $\chi_2^2 \propto \kappa^\nu$ have been calculated from fitting the numerical data. The system size $V = 1.6 \times 10^5$.

with the TUR estimator $\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \Delta W_{\text{TUR}}/\tau$ and the improved estimator $\dot{W}_{\text{I},2} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \Delta \dot{W}_{\text{I},2}/\tau$. Several conclusions can be obtained as follows. Firstly, according to the trade-off relation Eq.(16), it can be found that the precision of dissipation inference will be further improved by enhancing the phase sensitivity of biochemical oscillations. In actual experimental design, a feasible strategy to achieve a higher phase sensitivity of the networks is to enhance the phase-amplitude coupling strength C_i by maximizing the net flux of the phase-advancing pathway relative to that of the phase-retreating pathway [9]. Thus, we believe that our analyses provide realizable guidelines for improving the precision of dissipation estimation for biochemical oscillations.

Secondly, we find that the generalized transport efficiency $\eta(r^2, \theta) = \eta(\theta) + 2\alpha(C_i/C_r)^2$ is independent of the system size V . Since the magnitude of the internal noise is proportional to $V^{-1/2}$, it can be revealed that our improved scheme is not negatively affected by the internal noise in the system.

Thirdly, since the phase and amplitude are highly decoupled in subcritical region ($\alpha < 0$), such scheme cannot be applied to improve the estimation of the energy dissipation for noise-induced oscillations.




FIG. 2: (a) Estimations of the dissipation rate as a function of the exact dissipation rate. It can be observed that the improved estimator $\dot{W}_{\text{I},2}$ outperforms the TUR estimator \dot{W}_{TUR} . (b) The improvement of the tighter bound $\dot{W}_{\text{I},2}/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ as a function of the phase sensitivity $\kappa = |C_i/C_r|$. The numerical results (dots) verify our analytical expressions (lines). The system size $V = 1.6 \times 10^5$.

III. SIMULATIONS

In this section, we illustrate the formal analytical results of the above section within numerical simulations of the circadian clock model [57], describing how living systems keep an internal sense of time. The circadian clock model considered here incorporates the transcription of the gene (G) involved in the biochemical clock and transport of the mRNA (R) into the cytosol where it is translated into clock proteins (P_C) and degraded. The protein can be degraded or transported into the nucleus (P_N) where it exerts a negative regulation on the expression of its gene. For the parameters we examine (see Appendix C for details), the Hopf bifurcation point locates at $v_s \simeq 0.25725$. In addition, parameter values used in the stochastic normal form theory can be calculated from simulations as $C_r \simeq -0.3474$, $C_i \simeq 0.5722$ and $\varepsilon^2 \simeq 0.3556$. By adjusting the transition rates, the values of C_i and C_r will change, and can also be obtained.

By using the Euler methods, we numerically calculate Eqs.(4) and (5) with a time step of 0.002. Generally, after a long time, 2×10^5 trajectories are used to get the Pearson correlation coefficient, $\chi_n^2 = \chi^2(r^n, \theta) =$

$[\text{Cov}(r^n, \theta)]^2 / \text{Var}(r^n) \text{Var}(\theta)$ for $Q_{r,n} = \int_0^\tau r^n(t) dt$ with $n > 0$ the power, which yields the corresponding improved estimator as

$$\Delta W_{I,n} = \frac{2k_B T \langle \theta \rangle^2}{\text{Var}(\theta)(1 - \chi_n^2)}.$$

Then, the TUR estimator $\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \Delta W_{\text{TUR}} / \tau$ and the improved estimator $\dot{W}_{I,n} = \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \Delta W_{I,n} / \tau$ can be obtained numerically. The corresponding improvement reads as

$$\frac{\dot{W}_{I,n}}{\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}} = \frac{1}{1 - \chi^2(r^n, \theta)} > 1.$$

On the other hand, the exact dissipation rate \dot{W} is obtained from the simulation data of Eq.(2) (see Appendix A for details).

In Fig.1(a), the dependence of the Pearson correlations χ_n^2 ($n = 1, 2, 3$) on the control parameter α are depicted for the circadian clock model. The value range of the control parameter α ensures the establishment of the SNFT. For noise-induced oscillations in the subcritical region ($\alpha < 0$), the Pearson correlation coefficients are almost zero, and they increase significantly after the control parameter crossing the critical point $\alpha = 0$ to reach the supercritical region for normal oscillations ($\alpha > 0$). Those results verify our prediction that the correlation between oscillatory phase and amplitude is highly decoupled and not sufficient to improve the estimation of energy dissipation for noise-induced oscillations. In addition, we notice that numerical results (dots) of the Pearson correlations are in good agreement with our theoretical predictions, Eq.(13) (line). Further, in Fig.1(b), we plot the Pearson correlations χ_2^2 as a function of the phase sensitivity $\kappa = |C_i/C_r|$. The scaling behaviors are consistent with our analytical result $\chi_2^2 \propto \kappa^2$, further confirming our theory. It can be found that the slope ν for $\chi_2^2 \propto \kappa^\nu$ is closer to the analytical prediction $\nu = 2$ for smaller α , showing that our theory is more accurate for near Hopf bifurcation region.

In Fig.2(a), we show both the TUR estimator \dot{W}_{TUR} and the improved estimator \dot{W}_I for the circadian clock model to demonstrate how much the estimation of energy dissipation can be improved. The conventional TUR, while a commonly used dissipation estimator, only provides a trivial bound, and the improved estimator \dot{W}_I is much closer to the exact value. On the other hand, it can be found that $\dot{W} \geq \dot{W}_I$, which verifies the efficiency-sensitivity trade-off relation we proposed [Eq.(16)]. In Fig.2(b), we show the relationship between the improvement of the tighter bound $\dot{W}_I/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ and phase sensitivity $\kappa = |C_i/C_r|$. The theoretical predictions $\dot{W}_I/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}} = \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha(C_i/C_r)^2}$ are in good agreement with the numerical results, which demonstrates that the estimation of the dissipation can be improved by enhancing the phase sensitivity of biochemical oscillations.

In Fig.3 (a), we have shown that the improvements of the dissipation estimation $\dot{W}_{I,n}/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ change little with




FIG. 3: (a) The improvements of the dissipation estimation $\dot{W}_I/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ ($n = 1, 2, 3$) as a function of the system size V for the circadian clock model in normal oscillation region ($\alpha > 0$). The control parameter $\alpha = 0.05$. (b) The improvements of the dissipation estimation $\dot{W}_I/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ as a function of the power of the amplitude, n , for the circadian clock model. The values are independent of the power. Each thick line's width is comparable to the average standard deviation in simulations. The system size $V = 1.6 \times 10^5$.

the system size V in normal oscillations ($\alpha > 0$). Moreover, we numerically test whether the power of amplitude observables n affect the improvement $\dot{W}_{I,n}/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ in details. In Fig.3 (b), it can be observed that values of $\dot{W}_{I,n}/\dot{W}_{\text{TUR}}$ change little for different choices of the power of the amplitude observable $Q_{r,n}(\tau) = \int_0^\tau r^n(t) dt$.

IV. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we proposed an improved estimation for the energy dissipation of biochemical oscillations by using the Pearson correlations between oscillatory phase and amplitude, which are easily accessible in experimental observations. Both the analytical and numerical results demonstrate that such scheme can be further improved by enhancing the phase sensitivity of systems. In addition, it has been revealed by us that the validity of our scheme is independent of the system size and the power of oscillatory amplitude.

In our previous work [47], we have found that the dissipation rate $\dot{W} \sim V^\gamma$, with $\gamma = 1$ for supercritical region ($\alpha > 0$), $\gamma = 1/2$ for the critical point ($\alpha = 0$) and $\gamma = 0$ for subcritical region ($\alpha < 0$), showing that biochemical oscillations have a much lower energy dissipation for noise-induced oscillation. Intuitively, one might think that less dissipation will lead to an easier estimation, however, the estimator $\Delta W_{I,n}$ introduced by us is not applicable for improving the estimation of dissipation due to the highly decoupling of the phase and amplitude, which is deserved for further study. As stochastic normal form equations can be extended to other oscillatory systems related to other types of bifurcations, such as relaxation oscillations, we believe that our scheme may have a wider range of applications.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by MOST(2018YFA0208702), NSFC (32090044, 21790350, 21521001).

Supplementary information

Appendix A: Stochastic normal form theory

In this section, we introduce the derivation of the stochastic normal form equation and the calculation of the conventional transport efficiency for self-consistency.

1. Stochastic normal form theory

Firstly, we assume that the deterministic form of the chemical Langevin equation, Eq.(2), has a unique stable point \mathbf{x}_s with $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_s) \equiv 0$, which loses stability at the supercritical HB $\mu = \mu_c$, where μ is the control parameter. Based on the Hopf theorem [68], the Jacobian matrix \mathbf{J} , whose components $J_{ij} = (\partial f_i / \partial x_j)|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_s}$, has a pair of conjugate eigenvalues $\lambda_{\pm} = \alpha(\mu) \pm i\omega$ with $\alpha(\mu_c) = 0$. The other $N-2$ eigenvalues of \mathbf{J} , $-\lambda_{j(\geq 3)}$, all have negative real parts with absolute values considerably larger than 0. Performing the variable transformation $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{T}^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_s)$, the linear part of Eq.(2) can be transformed to Jordan form as $\dot{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{u} + O(\mathbf{u}^2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}}\boldsymbol{\eta}(t)$, where $\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & -\omega \\ \omega & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \oplus \text{diag}(-\lambda_1, \dots, -\lambda_N)$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{T}^{-1}\zeta(\mathbf{x}_s, t)$ with $\zeta(\mathbf{x}, t) = \sum_{\rho} v_{\rho}^j \sqrt{w_{\rho}(\mathbf{x})} \xi_{\rho}(t)$. The variances of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ are $\langle \eta_i(t) \eta_j(s) \rangle = 2D_{ij} \delta(t-s)$ with $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{T}^{-1}\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{T}^{-1})^T$. When the system locates near the HB ($|\alpha| \ll 1$), the emotion of the oscillatory mode related to (u_1, u_2) is much slower than the other $N-2$ stable modes due to the time-scale separation. Hence, the system's dynamics will be dominated by the slow motion on a 2D center manifold spanned by the eigenvectors of λ_{\pm} . The oscillatory mode are ruled by a normal form equation involving the time evolution of a complex variable $Z = u_1 + iu_2$, or a pair of coupled equations for the oscillation amplitude r and phase θ via $Z = r e^{i\theta}$. We follow the standard procedure to get the normal form,

$$\frac{dZ}{dt} = (\alpha + i\omega)Z + (C_r + iC_i)|Z|^2 Z + \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\rho} (v'_{1\rho} + i v'_{2j\rho}) \sqrt{w_{\rho}} \xi_{\rho}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $v'_{j\rho} = (T^{-1}\mathbf{v})_{j\rho}$, i.e.,

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = (\alpha r + C_r r^3) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\rho} \chi_{r\rho} \circ \xi_{\rho}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} = (\omega + C_i r^2) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{V}} \sum_{\rho} \chi_{\theta\rho} \circ \xi_{\rho} \quad (\text{A3})$$

with

$$\chi_{r\rho} = (v'_{1\rho} \cos \theta + v'_{2j\rho} \sin \theta) \sqrt{w_{\rho}}, \quad \chi_{\theta\rho} = \frac{1}{r} (-v'_{1\rho} \sin \theta + v'_{2j\rho} \cos \theta) \sqrt{w_{\rho}}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

By using the ‘‘stochastic averaging’’ method [69], the following equation can be obtained

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = \alpha r + C_r r^3 + \frac{K(r)}{V} + \frac{\varepsilon_r}{\sqrt{V}} \xi_r, \quad (\text{A5})$$

and

$$\frac{d\theta}{dt} = \omega + C_i r^2 + \frac{K(\theta)}{V} + \frac{\varepsilon_{\theta}}{r\sqrt{V}} \xi_{\theta}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Here,

$$K(r) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\rho} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta (\chi_{r\rho} \partial_r \chi_{r\rho} + \chi_{\theta\rho} \partial_{\theta} \chi_{r\rho}), \quad K(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\rho} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta (\chi_{r\rho} \partial_r \chi_{\theta\rho} + \chi_{\theta\rho} \partial_{\theta} \chi_{\theta\rho}), \quad (\text{A7})$$

which is related to the coupling effects between amplitude and phase. $\varepsilon_r^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\rho} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \chi_{r\rho}^2$ and $\varepsilon_{\theta}^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\rho} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \chi_{\theta\rho}^2$ are the averaged noise intensities. Further, by expanding the reaction rates, $w_{\rho} = \sum_{i+j=0}^n w_{\rho}^{ij} (r \cos \theta)^i (r \sin \theta)^j$, $K(\theta)$ is zero [51]. Thus, the averaged noise intensities read as

$$\varepsilon_r^2 = \varepsilon_{\theta}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\rho} [(v'_{1\rho})^2 + (v'_{2\rho})^2] w_{\rho}^{00} \quad (\text{A8})$$

near the Hopf bifurcation point, i.e., the stochastic normal form equation can be obtained as

$$\dot{r} = \alpha r + C_r r^3 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2Vr} + \frac{\varepsilon}{\sqrt{V}} \eta_r(t), \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\dot{\theta} = \omega + C_i r^2 + \frac{\varepsilon}{r\sqrt{V}} \eta_{\theta}(t), \quad (\text{A10})$$

where the $i + j \geq 2$ terms are neglected.

2. Steady state dissipation rate and conventional transport efficiency

In order to obtain the transport efficiency, we start to calculate the steady state dissipation rate \dot{W} . Based on the framework of stochastic thermodynamics [70–74], the entropy balance equation reads as $\dot{s}_{tot}(\tau) = \dot{s}_m(\tau) + \dot{s}(\tau)$, where $s_{tot}(\tau)$ $s(\tau)$ is the Shannon entropy and $s_m(\tau)$ is the entropy flux. As $s(\tau) = -\ln p(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$, the change rate of the Shannon entropy is

$$\dot{s}(\tau) = \left[-\partial_{\tau} p(\mathbf{x}, \tau) + \frac{2V}{p(\mathbf{x}, \tau)} \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{ij} J_j |_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)} \dot{x}_i \right] - V \sum_i H_i \dot{x}_i, \quad (\text{A11})$$

where $H_j = 2 \sum_k \Gamma_{jk} f'_k$ ($\mathbf{\Gamma} = \mathbf{G}^{-1}$) with $\tilde{f}_k = f_k - 1/(2V) \sum_j (\partial G_{kj}) / (\partial x_j)$. Then, the entropy production rate and entropy flux rate can be identified as $\dot{s}_{tot}(\tau) = -\partial_{\tau} p(\mathbf{x}, \tau) + \frac{2V}{p(\mathbf{x}, \tau)} \sum_{i,j} \Gamma_{ij} J_j |_{\mathbf{x}(\tau)} \dot{x}_i$ and $\dot{s}_m(\tau) = V \sum_i H_i \dot{x}_i$. As $\dot{s}(\tau) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Delta s \rangle / t$ vanishes in the steady state, the averaged entropy production rate can be obtained as

$$\dot{S}_{tot} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle \Delta s_m \rangle / t = V \sum_i \langle \langle H_i \dot{x}_i \rangle \rangle_{ss} \quad (\text{A12})$$

with $\langle \langle \cdot \rangle \rangle_{ss}$ denotes the average over time and steady state [54]. Eq.(A12) allows us to numerically calculate the entropy production rate, i.e., the dissipation rate. By using the variable transform, the theoretical expression of the entropy production rate can be calculated in terms of \mathbf{u} , which reads $\dot{S}_{tot} = 2V \langle \langle \tilde{\mathbf{f}}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \dot{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \rangle_{ss}$. By approximating $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) \approx \mathbf{J}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{u}$, the entropy production reads

$$\dot{S}_{tot} = 2V \langle \langle \mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{L} \dot{\mathbf{u}} \rangle \rangle_{ss} = 2V \sum_{i,j} L_{ij} h_{ij} \quad (\text{A13})$$

with $h_{ij} = \langle \langle u_i \dot{u}_j \rangle \rangle_{ss}$. $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{T}^T \mathbf{J}^T \mathbf{\Gamma}^T \mathbf{T}$ are model-dependent parameters taken the value at the stable point \mathbf{x}_s . Note that in the steady state, $\frac{d}{dt} \langle \langle u_i \dot{u}_j \rangle \rangle_{ss} = 0$, thus we have $h_{ij} = -h_{ji}$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} h_{12} &= -h_{21} = \left\langle \left\langle r \cos \theta \frac{d}{dt} (r \sin \theta) \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \dot{\theta} \cos^2 \theta d\theta \cdot \int_0^{\infty} r^2 p_{ss}(r) dr \approx \frac{1}{2} \omega_s \langle r^2 \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A14})$$

where the time average is substituted by averaging over θ due to dominant oscillatory mode. $\omega_s = \omega + C_i r_m^2$ is the effective phase angular velocity. Meanwhile, for $j > 2$, we have $h_{1j} = \langle \langle r \cos \theta \dot{u}_j \rangle \rangle_{ss} \approx 0$ and $h_{2j} = \langle \langle r \sin \theta \dot{u}_j \rangle \rangle_{ss} \approx 0$. For $i, j > 2$, one can obtain that $h_{ij} = \langle \langle u_i \dot{u}_j \rangle \rangle_{ss} = (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) D_{ij} / [(\lambda_i + \lambda_j)V]$. Therefore, the averaged entropy production rate is

$$\dot{S}_{tot} = V (L_{12} - L_{21}) \omega_s \langle r^2 \rangle + 2 \sum_{i,j>2} L_{ij} D_{ij} \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_j}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j}. \quad (\text{A15})$$

Here, r_m is the most probable value of the amplitude in the steady state with $\partial_r P_{ss}(r)|_{r=r_m} = 0$. Based on the framework of stochastic thermodynamics, the steady state dissipation rate (here we set $k_B T = 1$)

$$\dot{W} = k_B T \dot{S}_{tot} \approx V (L_{12} - L_{21}) \omega_s r_m^2 \quad (\text{A16})$$

Now, we start to calculate the transport efficiency η_θ . The mean and variance of the phase $\theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta} dt$ can be calculated as $\langle \theta(t) \rangle \approx \omega_s t$ and $\langle (\theta(t) - \langle \theta(t) \rangle)^2 \rangle \approx \varepsilon^2 t / V r_m^2$, and the phase diffusion constant is given by $D_\theta = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \langle (\theta(t) - \langle \theta(t) \rangle)^2 \rangle / 2t \approx \varepsilon^2 / 2V r_m^2$. The transport efficiency reads as

$$\eta_\theta = \frac{v_\theta^2}{D_\theta \dot{W}} \approx \frac{2\omega_s}{\varepsilon^2 (L_{12} - L_{21})}. \quad (\text{A17})$$

Appendix B: Pearson correlation coefficient

In this section, we calculate the Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi^2(R, Q)$ between the phase $R(\tau) = \theta(\tau) = \int_0^\tau \dot{\theta}(t) dt$ and the amplitude $Q(\tau) = \int_0^\tau r^2(t) dt$. The change rate of the covariance, $C(r^2, \theta) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \text{Cov}_{r^2, \theta}(\tau)$, of these two variables can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} C(r^2, \theta) &= \langle \langle r^2 \dot{\theta} \rangle \rangle_{ss} - \langle \langle \dot{\theta} \rangle \rangle_{ss} \langle \langle r^2 \rangle \rangle_{ss} \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^\infty dr r^2 \dot{\theta} P_{ss}(r) \right] - (\omega + C_i \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}) \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss} \\ &\approx C_i \left(\langle r^4 \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

Note that the integrals (averages) we are going to calculate all take the form $I_n = \int_0^\infty r^{2n} \exp[V\varepsilon^{-2}(\frac{\alpha}{2}r^2 + \frac{C_r}{4}r^4)] dr^2 = \int_0^\infty x^n \exp[V\varepsilon^{-2}(\frac{\alpha}{2}x + \frac{C_r}{4}x^2)] dx$. By setting $y = \rho(x/A - 1) = \sqrt{-\frac{VC_r}{4\varepsilon^2}}(x + \frac{\alpha}{C_r})$ with $\rho = \alpha/2\sqrt{-C_r\varepsilon^2/V}$ and $A = -\alpha/C_r \approx r_s^2$ (for $\alpha > 0$), we have

$$I_n = \exp(\rho^2) (r_m^2/\rho)^{n+1} \int_{-\rho}^\infty (y + \rho)^n e^{-y^2} dy. \quad (\text{B2})$$

For $\alpha > 0$, integrals $\int_{-\rho}^\infty p_n(y) e^{-y^2} dy$ ($p_n(y)$ are polynomials of degree n) can be obtained by simple Gaussian integrals $\int_{-\infty}^\infty p_n(y) e^{-y^2} dy$, for $\alpha = 0$ integrals read $\int_0^\infty p_n(y) e^{-y^2} dy$ and for $\alpha < 0$ integrals are approximately zero. For $\alpha > 0$, the covariance reads

$$C(r^2, \theta) \approx C_i \left[r_m^4 \left(1 + \frac{1}{2\rho^2} \right) - (r_m^2)^2 \right] = -\frac{2C_i C_r r_m^4 \varepsilon^2}{\alpha^2 V}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

We need to emphasize that such equation holds in the region where $\sqrt{-2C_r\varepsilon^2/V} < \alpha \ll |C_r/C_i|$ due the above approximation. Thus, for normal oscillation region ($\alpha > 0$), the Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi^2(r^2, \theta)$ can be calculated as

$$\chi^2(r^2, \theta) \approx 2\alpha(C_i/C_r)^2 < 1, \quad (\text{B4})$$

which means that such scheme works well for oscillators with high value of C_i/C_r (independent of the system size).

Generally, for $Q_{r,n} = \int_0^\tau r^n(t) dt$ with n the power of oscillatory amplitude, the change rate of the covariance between oscillatory phase and amplitude is related to the higher-order moment of amplitude as

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \text{Cov}(r^n, \theta; \tau) &= \left\langle \left\langle r^n \dot{\theta} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} - \left\langle \left\langle \dot{\theta} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} \left\langle \left\langle r^n \right\rangle \right\rangle_{ss} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \int_0^\infty dr r^n \dot{\theta} P_{ss}(r) \\ &\quad - (\omega + C_i \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}) \langle r^n \rangle_{ss} \\ &\approx C_i (\langle r^{n+2} \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^n \rangle_{ss} \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B5})$$

and the Pearson correlation coefficient $\chi_n^2 = \chi^2(r^n, \theta)$ can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_n^2 &= \frac{[\text{Cov}(r^n, \theta)]^2}{\text{Var}(r^n) \text{Var}(\theta)} \\ &\approx \frac{C_i^2 (\langle r^{n+2} \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^n \rangle_{ss} \langle r^2 \rangle_{ss})^2}{D_\theta (\langle r^{2n} \rangle_{ss} - \langle r^n \rangle_{ss}^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

Appendix C: Circadian clock model

Here, we set $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ to stand for the concentrations of (R, P_C, P_N). The transcription rate of mRNA is chosen as the control parameter, represented by v_s . The deterministic reaction equations for the current model reads with \mathbf{w} the transition rates

$$\frac{dx_1}{dt} = w_1 - w_2,$$

$$\frac{dx_2}{dt} = w_3 - w_4 - w_5 + w_6,$$

$$\frac{dx_3}{dt} = w_5 - w_6.$$

The descriptions of the reaction channels and values of parameters are listed in Table I.

TABLE I: Descriptions of the circadian clock model

	Reaction	Transition rate	Biochemical function
1	G → R + G	$w_1 = v_s k_I^n (k_I^n + x_3^n)^{-1}$	Transcription
2	R →	$w_2 = v_m x_z^n (k_m + x_1)^{-1}$	R degradation
3	R → R + P _C	$w_3 = k_s x_1$	Translation
4	P _C →	$w_4 = v_d x_2 (k_d + x_2)^{-1}$	Degradation of P _C
5	P _C → P _R	$w_5 = k_1 x_2$	Transport of P _C into the nucleus
6	P _N → P _C	$w_6 = k_2 x_3$	Transport of P _N out of the nucleus
$k_I = 2.0$ nM, $n = 4$, $v_m = 0.3$ nM h ⁻¹ , $k_m = 0.2$ nM, $k_s = 2.0$ h ⁻¹ , $v_d = 1.5$ nM h ⁻¹ , $k_d = 0.1$ nM, $k_1 = k_2 = 0.2$ h ⁻¹			

[1] W. Bialek and S. Setayeshgar, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **102**, 10040 (2005).

- [2] B. Hu, W. Chen, W.-J. Rappel, and H. Levine, *Physical review letters* **105**, 048104 (2010).
- [3] G. Lan, P. Sartori, S. Neumann, V. Sourjik, and Y. Tu, *Nature physics* **8**, 422 (2012).
- [4] G. Lan and Y. Tu, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **10**, 20130489 (2013).
- [5] M. Skoge, S. Naqvi, Y. Meir, and N. S. Wingreen, *Physical review letters* **110**, 248102 (2013).
- [6] A. H. Lang, C. K. Fisher, T. Mora, and P. Mehta, *Physical review letters* **113**, 148103 (2014).
- [7] P. Sartori and Y. Tu, *Physical review letters* **115**, 118102 (2015).
- [8] Y. Cao, H. Wang, Q. Ouyang, and Y. Tu, *Nature physics* **11**, 772 (2015).
- [9] C. Fei, Y. Cao, Q. Ouyang, and Y. Tu, *Nature communications* **9**, 1434 (2018).
- [10] T. Mora and I. Nemenman, *Physical review letters* **123**, 198101 (2019).
- [11] D. Zhang, Y. Cao, Q. Ouyang, and Y. Tu, *Nature physics* **16**, 95 (2020).
- [12] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Physical Review X* **6**, 041053 (2016).
- [13] S. Lee, C. Hyeon, and J. Jo, *Physical Review E* **98**, 032119 (2018).
- [14] Y. Hasegawa, *Physical Review E* **98**, 032405 (2018).
- [15] Y. Hasegawa and T. Van Vu, *Physical Review E* **99**, 062126 (2019).
- [16] R. Marsland III, W. Cui, and J. M. Horowitz, *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **16**, 20190098 (2019).
- [17] C. Del Junco and S. Vaikuntanathan, *Physical Review E* **101**, 012410 (2020).
- [18] S. Guan, L. Xu, Q. Zhang, and H. Shi, *Physical Review E* **101**, 012409 (2020).
- [19] C. Del Junco and S. Vaikuntanathan, *The Journal of chemical physics* **152**, 055101 (2020).
- [20] Z. Cao, H. Jiang, and Z. Hou, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **155**, 234901 (2021).
- [21] J. E. Ferrell Jr, T. Y.-C. Tsai, and Q. Yang, *Cell* **144**, 874 (2011).
- [22] G. Buzsáki and A. Draguhn, *science* **304**, 1926 (2004).
- [23] M. Nakajima, K. Imai, H. Ito, T. Nishiwaki, Y. Murayama, H. Iwasaki, T. Oyama, and T. Kondo, *science* **308**, 414 (2005).
- [24] B. Novák and J. J. Tyson, *Nature reviews Molecular cell biology* **9**, 981 (2008).
- [25] A. Goldbeter, *Biochemical oscillations and cellular rhythms: the molecular bases of periodic and chaotic behaviour* (Cambridge university press, 1997).
- [26] J.-L. Martiel and A. Goldbeter, *Biophysical journal* **52**, 807 (1987).
- [27] F. Gnesotto, F. Mura, J. Gladrow, and C. P. Broedersz, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **81**, 066601 (2018).
- [28] U. Seifert, *Annual Review of Condensed Matter Physics* **10**, 171 (2019).
- [29] A. C. Barato and U. Seifert, *Physical review letters* **114**, 158101 (2015).
- [30] T. R. Gingrich, J. M. Horowitz, N. Perunov, and J. L. England, *Physical review letters* **116**, 120601 (2016).
- [31] P. Pietzonka, A. C. Barato, and U. Seifert, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2016**, 124004 (2016).
- [32] P. Pietzonka, F. Ritort, and U. Seifert, *Physical Review E* **96**, 012101 (2017).
- [33] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, *Physical Review E* **97**, 062101 (2018).
- [34] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2018**, 063209 (2018).
- [35] B. K. Agarwalla and D. Segal, *Physical Review B* **98**, 155438 (2018).
- [36] Y. Hasegawa and T. Van Vu, *Physical review letters* **123**, 110602 (2019).
- [37] J. M. Horowitz and T. R. Gingrich, *Nature Physics* **16**, 15 (2020).
- [38] J. Li, J. M. Horowitz, T. R. Gingrich, and N. Fakhri, *Nature communications* **10**, 1 (2019).
- [39] S. K. Manikandan, D. Gupta, and S. Krishnamurthy, *Physical review letters* **124**, 120603 (2020).
- [40] T. Van Vu, Y. Hasegawa, et al., *Physical Review E* **101**, 042138 (2020).
- [41] S. Otsubo, S. Ito, A. Dechant, and T. Sagawa, *Physical Review E* **101**, 062106 (2020).
- [42] D. J. Skinner and J. Dunkel, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).
- [43] D. J. Skinner and J. Dunkel, *Physical review letters* **127**, 198101 (2021).
- [44] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, *Physical Review Research* **3**, L042012 (2021).
- [45] W. Hwang and C. Hyeon, *The journal of physical chemistry letters* **9**, 513 (2018).
- [46] M. Jack, N. López-Alamilla, and K. Challis, *Physical Review E* **101**, 062123 (2020).
- [47] Z. Cao, H. Jiang, and Z. Hou, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 043331 (2020).
- [48] Y. Hasegawa and M. Arita, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **11**, 20131018 (2014).
- [49] Y. Hasegawa and M. Arita, *Physical review letters* **113**, 108101 (2014).
- [50] A. Dechant and S.-i. Sasa, *Physical Review X* **11**, 041061 (2021).
- [51] Z. Hou, T. J. Xiao, and H. Xin, *Chemphyschem: a European journal of chemical physics and physical chemistry* **7**, 1520 (2006).
- [52] T. Xiao, J. Ma, Z. Hou, and H. Xin, *New Journal of Physics* **9**, 403 (2007).
- [53] J. Ma, T. Xiao, Z. Hou, and H. Xin, *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science* **18**, 043116 (2008).
- [54] T. Xiao, Z. Hou, and H. Xin, *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B* **113**, 9316 (2009).
- [55] D. T. Gillespie, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **113**, 297 (2000).
- [56] C. H. Ko, Y. R. Yamada, D. K. Welsh, E. D. Buhr, A. C. Liu, E. E. Zhang, M. R. Ralph, S. A. Kay, D. B. Forger, and J. S. Takahashi, *PLoS biology* **8**, e1000513 (2010).
- [57] Z. Hou and H. Xin, *The Journal of chemical physics* **119**, 11508 (2003).
- [58] C. Zhou and J. Kurths, *Physical review letters* **88**, 230602 (2002).
- [59] P. Hänggi, *ChemPhysChem* **3**, 285 (2002).
- [60] Y. Kuramoto, *Chemical oscillations, waves, and turbulence* (Courier Corporation, 2003).
- [61] D. S. Goldobin, J.-n. Teramae, H. Nakao, and G. B. Ermentrout, *Physical review letters* **105**, 154101 (2010).
- [62] L. Maccone, D. Bruß, and C. Macchiavello, *Physical review letters* **114**, 130401 (2015).

- [63] V. Pozsgay, F. Hirsch, C. Branciard, and N. Brunner, *Physical Review A* **96**, 062128 (2017).
- [64] C. Jebarathinam, D. Home, and U. Sinha, *Physical Review A* **101**, 022112 (2020).
- [65] J. Benesty, J. Chen, Y. Huang, and I. Cohen, in *Noise reduction in speech processing* (Springer, 2009), pp. 1–4.
- [66] J. Benesty, J. Chen, and Y. Huang, *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing* **16**, 757 (2008).
- [67] A. Dechant, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **52**, 035001 (2018).
- [68] B. D. Hassard, B. Hassard, N. D. Kazarinoff, Y.-H. Wan, and Y. W. Wan, *Theory and applications of Hopf bifurcation*, vol. 41 (CUP Archive, 1981).
- [69] L. Arnold, N. Sri Namachchivaya, and K. R. Schenk-Hoppé, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **6**, 1947 (1996).
- [70] U. Seifert, *Physical review letters* **95**, 040602 (2005).
- [71] U. Seifert, *Reports on progress in physics* **75**, 126001 (2012).
- [72] K. Sekimoto, *Stochastic energetics*, vol. 799 (Springer, 2010).
- [73] C. Jarzynski, *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **2**, 329 (2011).
- [74] P. Gaspard, *The Journal of chemical physics* **120**, 8898 (2004).