

On structural contraction of biological interaction networks

M. Ali Al-Radhawi, David Angeli, and Eduardo Sontag

July 26, 2023

Abstract

In previous work, we have developed an approach for characterizing the long-term dynamics of classes of Biological Interaction Networks (BINs), based on “rate-dependent Lyapunov functions”. In this work, we show that stronger notions of convergence can be established by proving *structural contractivity* with respect to non-standard norms. We illustrate our theory with examples from signaling pathways.

1 Introduction

Biological systems function via intricate dynamical networks such as signaling pathways, gene regulatory networks and metabolic networks [1, 2]. Such networks are amenable, in principle, to rational analysis and design using the mathematical language of Biological Interaction Networks (BINs), also known as Chemical Reaction Networks (CRNs) [3, 4, 5]. However, unlike systems that are engineered by humans, biological networks exhibit many complicating factors. First, biology pervasively employs nonlinear *binding* events to relay information. Examples include the binding of enzymes to substrates, ligands to receptors, transcription factors to promoters, small molecules to proteins, etc. Such events are intrinsically nonlinear, and linearization is often unhelpful. Second, BINs suffer from severe forms of uncertainty. For instance, the kinetics governing the speed of binding events and biochemical transformations are seldom known. Such uncertainty is not limited to the difficulty in measuring the relevant parameters and identifying the functional forms, also it includes the fact that BINs operate in highly variable environments with time-varying kinetics. Nevertheless, despite the uncertainty and nonlinearity, biological networks are known for their remarkable ability for maintaining homeostasis and robustness against perturbations. This latter property has been used as a *defining* characteristic of biological networks [6]. A common framework to explain such robustness postulates that biology employs robust *motifs* [7], which means that the uniform qualitative behavior is endowed by the graphical structure regardless of the parameters [8, 9, 10].

The effort for characterizing the qualitative *global* long-term behavior of a BIN without knowledge of its kinetics has been strikingly successful for some classes of BINs. A notable example is Horn-Jackson-Feinberg’s (HJF) theory of complex-balanced networks [11, 3] which employs the sum of all the chemical pseudo-energies stored in species as a Lyapunov function, and it can establish *global stability* in many cases [5, 12]. Other notions of global behavior have been studied. *Persistence* precludes species from asymptotically going extinct during the course of reaction [13], while *monotonicity* ensures that trajectories preserve a partial order, which guarantees generic convergence under mild conditions [14]. More recently, many important BINs have been shown to admit piecewise linear Lyapunov functions in reaction [15, 16] and concentration coordinates [17, 18, 16]. These methods only require a list of reactions to rule that the steady states of a network are unique and globally asymptotically stable relative to their stoichiometric classes. Such functions can either be constructed computationally [15, 18, 16] or graphically [19], where a dedicated computational package is available [16]. Such methods have also been generalized to show that a given network can never admit oscillations [20].

Contraction analysis. In this paper, we are interested in studying the notion of *contraction*. Informally, a dynamical system is strictly contractive with respect to a given metric if the distance between any two trajectories converges exponentially to zero, while it is called *non-expansive* if that distance is non-increasing. Early results were developed in the late 1950s using the notion of logarithmic norms [21, 22]. More recently, there has been an explosion of interest in this form of analysis [23, 24, 25, 26, 27].

Contraction can be contrasted with Lyapunov-based globally stability analysis, where the latter merely requires that all trajectories converge to a steady-state. In other words, the distance between trajectories in a globally stable system can overshoot, and may not exponentially decrease to zero. Therefore, contraction is a much stronger notion compared to global stability. This offers few advantages. First, it has been argued [27] that the properties enjoyed by contractive systems are more akin to linear systems, and hence they offer a powerful general framework to analyze a much wider class of nonlinear systems with the same ease that we can analyze linear systems. Second, contractive systems *entrain to periodic inputs* [28, 29], which means that the state of a contractive system will asymptotically oscillate with the same frequency of a periodic input. Third, using contraction analysis methods, a system with unbounded trajectories can sometimes be shown to be non-expansive, which greatly constrains its unstable behavior, while Lyapunov analysis does not offer further information when the trajectories are unbounded.

In the context of BINs, contraction has been only studied with respect to standard norms or with respect to diagonal scaling of such norms [30, 31]. Contraction with respect to non-standard norms has been studied recently for monotone systems [32]. In this paper we show that the existence of the rate-dependent Lyapunov functions proposed in [15, 16] for a given reaction network implies structural non-expansivity with respect to weighted ℓ_∞ norms, and contractivity under additional easily verifiable conditions. Therefore, the computational package **LEARN** [16] will attempt at finding an appropriate contraction metric for a given network.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses preliminaries including extensions of previous results that are relevant to our current analysis. Section 3 shows that non-expansivity follows from the existence of an appropriate rate-dependent Lyapunov function. Section 4 establishes contraction over compact sets. Initial versions of these results have been presented in the PhD dissertation [33].

2 Preliminaries


2.1 Notation

Let S be a set, then $|S|$ denotes its cardinality. The set of n -tuples of positive numbers is denoted by \mathbb{R}_+^n , while the set of n -tuples of non-negative numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. The set of $n \times m$ matrices with real entries is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, then \bar{U} denotes its closure with respect to the standard Euclidean topology. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ be a matrix, then $\ker(A)$ is its kernel or null space, while $\text{Im } A$ is its image space. Let $V : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function, then $\ker V := \{x \in \mathcal{X} | V(x) = 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{X}$, then $\ker V|_{\mathcal{Y}} := \{x \in \mathcal{Y} | V(x) = 0\}$. Let $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then $\|x\|_\infty := \max_i |x_i|$. The notation $x \gg 0$ means that $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, then $\sigma_i(A) := a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\mu_\infty(A) := \max_i \sigma_i(A)$.

2.2 Biological Interaction Networks

We review standard material [3, 4, 5, 16].

Definition.. A Biological Interaction Network (BIN) (a.k.a, Chemical Reaction Network (CRN)) \mathcal{N} is a pair $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ where $\mathcal{S} := \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ is the set of species, and $\mathcal{R} := \{\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_\nu\}$ is the set of reactions. Each reaction is written in the following form:



where $\alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij} \geq 0$ are stoichiometric coefficients. The net loss or gain of the i th species in the j th reaction is $\gamma_{ij} = \beta_{ij} - \alpha_{ij}$. These numbers can be collected in a matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \nu}$ defined entry-wise as $[\Gamma]_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}$. The matrix Γ is customarily called the *stoichiometry matrix*.

Kinetics.. In order to quantify elements of the network, the species X_1, \dots, X_n are assigned non-negative numbers known as the *concentrations* x_1, \dots, x_n , while reactions $\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_\nu$ are assigned *rates* $R_j : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\nu, j = 1, \dots, \nu$. A popular form of reaction rates is known as Mass-action kinetics written as $R_j(x) = \prod_{i=1, \alpha_{ij} > 0}^n k_j x^{\alpha_{ij}}$, where $k_j > 0$ is known as the kinetic constant. However, we do not assume a specific

form of kinetics. Instead we only assume that R is monotone with respect to its reactants. More precisely, a reaction rate R is *admissible* if it satisfies the following general properties:

AK1. each reaction varies smoothly with respects to its reactants, i.e $R(x)$ is \mathcal{C}^1 ;

AK2. a reaction requires all its reactants to occur, i.e., if $\alpha_{ij} > 0$, then $x_i = 0$ implies $R_j(x) = 0$;

AK3. if a reactant increases, then the reaction rate increase, i.e $\partial R_j / \partial x_i(x) \geq 0$ if $\alpha_{ij} > 0$ and $\partial R_j / \partial x_i(x) \equiv 0$ if $\alpha_{ij} = 0$. Furthermore, the aforementioned inequality is strict whenever the reactants are strictly positive.

In our paper, we assume that each network \mathcal{N} is always equipped with a set of monotone kinetics satisfying AK1-AK3.

The admissible kinetics can be interpreted alternatively via a sign-pattern constraint on the Jacobian $\partial R / \partial x \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times n}$. More formally, let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ denote the set of reactant-reaction pairs, i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}} := \{(i, j) | X_i \text{ is a reactant of } \mathbf{R}_j\}$, and let $s = |\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}|$. We define the set of all matrices that have an admissible sign pattern as $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}} := \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times n} | [K]_{ji} > 0 \text{ if } (i, j) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}, \text{ and } [K]_{ji} = 0 \text{ otherwise}\}$. Therefore, when R is admissible, we have $\partial R / \partial x(x) \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ and $\partial R / \partial x(x) \in \overline{\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.

A third formulation is stated by decomposing R into a conic sum of indicator matrices. To that end, let $E_{ji} \in \{0, 1\}^{\nu \times n}$ be an indicator matrix, i.e, E_{ji} is zero everywhere except for the (j, i) th entry where it is equal to 1. In addition, let the elements of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{N}}$ be indexed as $(i_1, j_1), \dots, (i_s, j_s)$. Therefore, we can write

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}} = \{K \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times n} | K = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_{\ell} E_{j_{\ell} i_{\ell}}, \text{ for some } \bar{\rho}_1, \dots, \bar{\rho}_s > 0\}. \quad (1)$$

Hence, the admissibility of R implies the existence of continuous functions $\rho_1(x), \dots, \rho_s(x) \geq 0$ such that

$$\frac{\partial R}{\partial x}(x) = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}(x) E_{j_{\ell} i_{\ell}}, \quad (2)$$

and $\rho_{\ell}(x) > 0$ whenever $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$.

Dynamics. The time evolution of the concentration vector $x = [x_1, \dots, x_n]$ as a function of time can be described using the following Ordinary Differential Equation (ODE):

$$\dot{x} = \Gamma R(x), x(0) = x_0. \quad (3)$$

The ODE above is an instance of what is known as a *positive system*, which means that the trajectory $x(t)$ remains non-negative if the initial condition $x(0)$ is non-negative. A non-zero vector $w \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is called a *conservation law* if $w^T \Gamma = 0$, and it corresponds to a conserved quantity that stays invariant, i.e., $w^T x(t) \equiv w^T x(0)$. In such cases, the trajectory will be confined to translates of $\text{Im } \Gamma$ as can be seen by integrating (3) to get $x(t) = x_0 + \Gamma \int_0^t R(x(\tau)) d\tau$. Therefore, $x(t) \in \mathcal{C}_{x_0}$ for all $t \geq 0$ where

$$\mathcal{C}_{x_0} := (\{x_0\} + \text{Im } \Gamma) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n.$$

The invariant manifold \mathcal{C}_{x_0} is known as the *stoichiometric class* corresponding to x_0 .

Fluxes.. A vector v is called a *flux* if $\Gamma v = 0$. In order to simplify the treatment, we will assume the following about the stoichiometry of the network:

AS1. There exists a positive flux, i.e., $\exists v \in \ker \Gamma$ such that $v \gg 0$.

Assumption AS1 is necessary for the existence of positive steady states for the corresponding dynamical system (3).

Extent-of-reaction system.. A different representation of the dynamics uses the concept of the extent of reaction ξ defined as $\xi(t) := \int_0^t R(x(\tau)) d\tau + \xi(0)$ for $\xi(0)$ to be decided. By integrating both sides of (3), we get

$$x(t) - x(0) = \Gamma(\xi(t) - \xi(0)). \quad (4)$$

Using the latter equation we can write the dynamics of ξ in several forms by choosing $\xi(0)$. Assume $x(0) = x_0$, pick a point $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{C}_{x_0}$, then there exists ξ_0 such that $x_0 - \bar{x} = \Gamma\xi_0$. By a simple algebraic manipulation, write $x(t) - x_0 = x(t) - \bar{x} + \bar{x} - x_0 = x(t) - \bar{x} - \Gamma\xi_0$. Substituting in (4), we get $x(t) - \bar{x} = \Gamma\xi(t)$. Since $\dot{\xi} = R(x)$, we can write:

$$\dot{\xi} = R(\bar{x} + \Gamma\xi), \xi(0) = \xi_0. \quad (5)$$

Example. Let us consider the following nonlinear network which represents a simplified post-translational modification cycle:



We define the state vector as $x = [s, e, c_1, p, d, c_2]^T$. The corresponding ODEs can be written as:

$$\dot{x} = \frac{d}{dt} \begin{bmatrix} s \\ e \\ c_1 \\ p \\ d \\ c_2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_1(s, e) \\ R_2(c_1) \\ R_3(p, d) \\ R_4(c_2) \end{bmatrix} = \Gamma R(x). \quad (7)$$

The network admits three conservation laws which are $s + c_1 + p + c_2 = s_{tot}$, $e + c_1 = e_{tot}$, $d + c_2 = d_{tot}$. Hence, any given vector $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^6$ determines, $s_{tot}, e_{tot}, d_{tot}$, and hence it determines the stoichiometric class $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$ which is three dimensional, polyhedral, and compact.

As mentioned before, R only need to satisfy AK1-AK3. Hence, its Jacobian $\partial R/\partial x \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$, where $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is set of all matrices with the following sign pattern over the positive orthant:

$$\begin{bmatrix} + & + & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & + & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & + & + & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & + \end{bmatrix}$$

For a given \bar{x} , the corresponding extent-of-reaction dynamics can be written as:

$$\dot{\xi} = \begin{bmatrix} R_1(\bar{x}_1 - \xi_1 + \xi_4, \bar{x}_2 - \xi_1 + \xi_2) \\ R_2(\bar{x}_3 + \xi_1 - \xi_2) \\ R_3(\bar{x}_4 + \xi_2 - \xi_3, \bar{x}_5 - \xi_3 + \xi_4) \\ R_4(\bar{x}_6 + \xi_3 - \xi_4) \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.3 Graphical Lyapunov Functions

Example (continued). Let us consider (3) with an admissible R . Using results from [17, 15, 16], it can be shown that the following function: $V(x) = \max \mathcal{R} - \min \mathcal{R}$ [16], where $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1(s, e), R_2(c_1), R_3(p, d), R_4(c_2)\}$ is positive-definite with respect to the set of steady states and non-increasing for any choice of R . In addition, note that it can be written as $V = \tilde{V} \circ R$, where \tilde{V} is given as:

$$\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_{\infty} = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} r \right\|_{\infty}. \quad (8)$$

In the above example, the function \tilde{V} depends only on the graphical nature of a given network, we call it a robust Lyapunov function or a graphical Lyapunov function. In order to offer a formal definition of \tilde{V} , we examine the non-increasingness condition for $V = \tilde{V} \circ R$. This amounts to $(\partial\tilde{V}/\partial r)(\partial R/\partial x)\Gamma R(x) \leq 0$ for all x . Since we need \tilde{V} to work for any admissible rate R , it can be verified with the stronger condition $(\partial\tilde{V}/\partial r)K\Gamma r \leq 0$ for all r and for any admissible Jacobian matrix $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$. This motivates the following definition:

Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be given. A locally Lipschitz function $\tilde{V} : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a Graphical Lyapunov Function (GLF) for \mathcal{N} if the following holds:

1. it is structurally positive-definite with respect to the set of steady states, i.e., $\exists \hat{V} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which is locally Lipschitz, $\ker \hat{V}|_{\text{Im} \Gamma} = \{0\}$, and $\tilde{V} \equiv \hat{V} \circ \Gamma$, and
2. $\forall r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^\nu, \forall K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}, \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial r}(r) K \Gamma r \leq 0$.

Remark 1. Since V is not assumed to be continuously differentiable, the gradient above is defined in terms of the upper Dini's derivative.

Remark 2. If the $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|$ for some norm, then condition 1 is satisfied if there exists a matrix B such that $C = B\Gamma$ and $\ker(B\Gamma) = \ker(\Gamma)$.

In order to characterize GLFs, we write the non-increasingness condition using (2) as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial r} K \Gamma r = \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial r} \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_\ell E_{i_\ell j_\ell} \Gamma r = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_\ell \overbrace{(e_{j_\ell} \gamma_{i_\ell}^T)}^{Q_\ell} r = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_\ell Q_\ell r \leq 0, \quad (9)$$

where e_j is a member of the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^ν , and γ_i is the i th row of Γ . Since the coefficients $\bar{\rho}_1, \dots, \bar{\rho}_s$ are arbitrary nonnegative numbers, this motivates the following definition:

Definition 2. Let $\tilde{V} : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a locally-Lipschitz function, and let $Q_1, \dots, Q_s \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times \nu}$. Then, we say that \tilde{V} is a common Lyapunov function for the set of linear systems $\dot{r}_1 = Q_1 r, \dots, \dot{r}_s = Q_s r$ if:

1. $\ker \tilde{V} = \bigcap_{\ell=1}^s \ker Q_\ell$, and
2. $(\partial \tilde{V} / \partial r) Q_\ell r \leq 0$ for all $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

We are ready to state our the characterization as follows:

Theorem 1 ([17, 16]). A function \tilde{V} is an GLF for a given network iff \tilde{V} is a common Lyapunov function for the set of linear systems $\dot{r} = Q_1 r, \dots, \dot{r} = Q_s r$.

Example (continued). We are still considering the network (6). Note that we can write the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} \Gamma &= \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_5 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_6 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \rho_1 \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \rho_2 \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \rho_3 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &+ \rho_4 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \rho_5 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \rho_6 \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=1}^6 \rho_\ell Q_\ell \end{aligned}$$

It can be verified that the function \tilde{V} defined in (8) is indeed a common Lyapunov function for the set of rank-one linear systems $\dot{r} = Q_\ell r, \ell = 1, \dots, 6$.

2.3.1 Application to concentration and extent-of-reaction dynamics

Concentration dynamics. The next result shows that the GLF will give us a concrete Lyapunov function for each given R .

Proposition 2 ([17, 16]). Consider a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$, and consider (3) with a fixed admissible R . Assume that \tilde{V} is a GLF for \mathcal{N} . Then, $V = \tilde{V} \circ R$ is Lyapunov function for (3), i.e., it is positive definite with respect to the set of steady states, and $\dot{V}(x) \leq 0$ for all x .

Remark 3. The function \dot{V} is defined as $\dot{V}(x) := \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} (V(x + h\Gamma R(x)) - V(x))/h$, and it exists everywhere since V is locally-Lipschitz [34].

Extent-of-reaction dynamics. We first define what it means for an extent-of-reaction system to admit a Lyapunov function:

Definition 3. Consider the extent-of-reaction system (5) $\dot{\xi} = R(\bar{x} + \Gamma\xi)$. Then, a locally-Lipschitz function $\tilde{V} : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to be a Lyapunov function for (5) if:

1. $\tilde{V}(\xi) \geq 0$ for all ξ and $\ker \tilde{V} = \ker \Gamma$, and
2. $\dot{\tilde{V}}(\xi) \leq 0$ for all ξ .

As might be expected, we show that a GLF gives us a Lyapunov function for the extent-of-reaction system as stated below, and is proved in the appendix:

Proposition 3. Consider a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$, and let R be an admissible rate. Consider the extent-of-reaction system (5) $\dot{\xi} = R(\bar{x} + \Gamma\xi)$. Assume that \bar{x} is a steady state for (3). If \tilde{V} is a GLF for \mathcal{N} , then \tilde{V} a Lyapunov function for the extent-of-reaction system (5).

2.4 Concentration dynamics as a quotient of extent-of-reaction dynamics

The extent-of-reaction system has some peculiarities. Considering (5), note that $\xi(0) = \xi^* + v$ will give rise to the same exact trajectory for any $v \in \ker \Gamma$. Moreover, when the system (3) is at a steady-state, the system (5) exhibits an unbounded trajectory which is linear in time. Therefore, in this subsection, we study the relationship between concentration dynamics (3) and extent-of-reaction dynamics (5) more formally.

Fix a vector $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Consider a system $\dot{\xi} = g(\xi) = R(\bar{x} + \Gamma\xi)$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$, and let $\psi_t : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ be the associated flow for a given $t \geq 0$. Similarly, consider the system $\dot{x} = f(x) = \Gamma R(x)$, $\xi \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} := \bar{x} + \text{Im } \Gamma$, and let $\varphi_t : \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$ be the associated flow. Define the following mapping $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$ as

$$\Phi(\xi) := \bar{x} + \Gamma\xi. \quad (10)$$

Using (4), we have $\Phi \circ \psi_t = \varphi_t$ for all $t \geq 0$. We are interested now in finding an inverse $\Psi : \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$. To that end, let us think of the stoichiometry matrix Γ as a surjective linear operator $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \text{Im } \Gamma$. Hence, there exists another linear operator $G : \text{Im } \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ which satisfies $\Gamma G(z) = z$ for all $z \in \text{Im } \Gamma$. Note that G is not necessarily unique.¹ From now on, we fix the choice of G . Hence, we can write $\Psi : \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ as

$$\Psi(x) = G(x - \bar{x}), \quad (11)$$

We can summarize our construction as follows:

Theorem 4. Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be a network, and fix $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$. Denote $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} := \bar{x} + \text{Im } \Gamma$. Let φ_t, ψ_t be the flows corresponding to (3), (5), respectively. Let Φ be defined as in (10), and let Ψ be given as in (11) for some G satisfying $\Gamma G(z) = z$ for all $z \in \text{Im } \Gamma$. Let $\tilde{V} : \mathbb{R}^\nu \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a locally Lipschitz function. Then, the following diagram commutes:

¹A particular construction of G is as follows. Let $q = \text{rank}(\Gamma)$, then let $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times q}$ be any full-column rank matrix whose columns form a basis for $(\ker \Gamma)^\perp$, and let $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu \times \nu - q}$ be a matrix whose columns form a basis for $\ker \Gamma$. Then, any vector $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^\nu$ can be written as $\xi = U_1\xi_1 + U_2\xi_2$. Recall that $x - \bar{x} = \Gamma\xi$. Substituting the decomposition of ξ , we get $x - \bar{x} = \Gamma U_1\xi_1 + \Gamma U_2\xi_2 = \Gamma U_1\xi_1$. Since ΓU_1 has full-column rank, then it has a left inverse, which is not necessarily unique. Let $(\Gamma U_1)^\dagger$ be such an inverse, e.g. the Moore-Penrose pseudoinverse. Hence, we can write $\xi_1 = (\Gamma U_1)^\dagger(x - \bar{x})$. Then, we get $\xi = U_1(\Gamma U_1)^\dagger(x - \bar{x}) + U_2\xi_2$ where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\nu - q}$ is any arbitrary vector. Finally, we get $G : \text{Im } \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\nu$ as $G(z) = U_1(\Gamma U_1)^\dagger z + U_2\xi_2$, where ξ_2 is arbitrary. In particular, we can set $\xi_2 = 0$ and get the linear operator $G = U_1(\Gamma U_1)^\dagger$ satisfying $\Gamma Gz = z$ for all $z \in \text{Im } \Gamma$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathbb{R}^\nu & \xrightarrow{\psi_t} & \mathbb{R}^\nu & \xrightarrow{\tilde{V}} & \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \\
\Psi \updownarrow \Phi & & \Psi \updownarrow \Phi & & \nearrow \Psi \\
\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_t} & \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{V} \circ \Psi} &
\end{array}$$

The dual GLF. Given a network \mathcal{N} and a GLF \tilde{V} , note that $(\tilde{V} \circ \Psi)(x)$ is also a Lyapunov function on $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$. We formalize this next.

Definition 4. Given a network \mathcal{N} and a GLF \tilde{V} . Let $G : \text{Im } \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Im } \Gamma$ be any operator that satisfies $\Gamma G(z) = z$. Then, $\hat{V} := \tilde{V} \circ G$ is called a dual GLF.

Since G is non-unique, then \hat{V} is non-unique. Consider a network \mathcal{N} with a given \bar{x} that has a steady state \bar{x} . Then, we claim that $V(x) = \hat{V}(x - \bar{x})$ is a Lyapunov function for (3) whenever $x(0) \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$. Positive definiteness is evident. We can verify non-increasingness of \tilde{V} by writing:

$$\frac{d}{dt}V(\varphi_t(x)) = \frac{d}{dt}\hat{V}(\varphi_t(x) - \bar{x}) = \frac{d}{dt}\tilde{V}(\psi_t(\Psi(x))) \leq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from Proposition 3.

Immediate results of the discussion above can be written as follows:

Corollary 5. Let \mathcal{N} be given, and let $G : \text{Im } \Gamma \rightarrow \text{Im } \Gamma$ be any operator that satisfies $\Gamma G(z) = z$. Then,

1. if \tilde{V} is a GLF for \mathcal{N} , then $\hat{V} := \tilde{V} \circ G$ is a dual GLF for \mathcal{N} .
2. if \hat{V} is a dual GLF for \mathcal{N} , then $\tilde{V} := \hat{V} \circ \Gamma$ is a GLF for \mathcal{N} .

Corollary 6. Consider a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$, and consider (3) with a fixed admissible R and a steady state \bar{x} . Assume that \hat{V} is a dual GLF for \mathcal{N} . Then, $V(x) = \hat{V}(x - \bar{x})$, $x \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$ is Lyapunov function for (3).

Example (cont'd). Consider the BIN (6) and the introduced GLF (8). Then, the dual GLF is given as follows $\hat{V}(z) = \|Bz\|_\infty$, where B is any matrix satisfying $C = B\Gamma$, which is not unique in this case. One possible choice is the following,

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, for any given steady state $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, $\hat{V}(x - \bar{x})$ is a Lyapunov function for (3) on $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$.

2.5 The class of ℓ_∞ -norm GLFs.

We focus now on GLFs of the form $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_\infty$ for some matrix $C = [c_1, \dots, c_m]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times \nu}$, $m > 0$. We assume, without loss of generality, that C is a minimal representation of \tilde{V} which means that for all $k = 1, \dots, m$, the set $\{r | \tilde{V}(r) = c_k^T r\}$ has non-empty interior. This is since if C is not minimal, we can remove rows from C to make it a minimal representation.

In our previous work, we had the following characterization:

Theorem 7 ([17, 16]). Given a network $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R})$. Then, the following two statements are equivalent:

1. $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_\infty$ is a GLF for \mathcal{N} ,

2. $\ker C = \ker \Gamma$ and there exist Metzler matrices $\tilde{\Lambda}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$ such that

$$\tilde{C}Q_\ell = \tilde{\Lambda}_\ell \tilde{C}, \text{ and } \tilde{\Lambda}_\ell \mathbf{1} = 0, \ell = 1, \dots, s, \quad (13)$$

where $\tilde{C} = [C^T, -C^T]^T$.

In this paper, we will use an alternative form of Theorem 7 which is stated and proven in the appendix:

Corollary 8. *Given a network $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{R})$. Then, the following two statements are equivalent:*

- $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_\infty$ is a GLF,
- $\exists B$ with $\text{rank} \Gamma = \text{rank}(B\Gamma)$ such that $C = B\Gamma$ and there exist matrices $\Lambda_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$ such that

$$CQ_\ell = \Lambda_\ell C \text{ and } \mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) \leq 0, \ell = 1, \dots, s.$$

The dual ℓ_∞ GLF. Using Corollary 9, and recalling that C can be written as $C = B\Gamma$, we get the function \hat{V} as:

$$\hat{V}(z) = \|CG(x)\|_\infty = \|B\Gamma Gz\|_\infty = \|Bz\|_\infty, \quad (14)$$

where the last equality follows since $\Gamma G(z) = z$ for all $z \in \text{Im} \Gamma$.

Corollary 9. *Let \mathcal{N} be given. Then,*

1. If $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_\infty$ is a GLF for \mathcal{N} , then $\hat{V}(z) = \|Bz\|_\infty$ is a dual GLF for \mathcal{N} where $C = B\Gamma$.
2. If $\hat{V}(z) = \|Bz\|_\infty$ is a dual GLF for \mathcal{N} , then $\tilde{V}(r) = \|B\Gamma r\|_\infty$ is a GLF for \mathcal{N} .

Remark 4. *A version of Corollary 9 was proven in [17, 16] using a different argument.*

Example (cont'd). Consider the BIN (6) and the introduced GLF (8). Corollary 8 asserts the existence of six matrix Λ_ℓ , $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. Using the algorithms developed in [15, 16] we can find the matrices as follows:

$$\Lambda_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Lambda_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda_5 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \Lambda_6 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

3 Contraction and Nonexpansivity

3.1 Preliminaries

There are several formulations of contraction theory. We are going to present the formulation that utilizes logarithmic norms (a.k.a, matrix measures).

Definition 5 (Logarithmic Norms). *Let $(\mathbb{R}^n, \|\cdot\|)$ be a normed space, and let $\|\cdot\|_*$ be the corresponding induced matrix norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then, the associated matrix measure (a.k.a, logarithmic norm) can be defined as follows for a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$:*

$$\mu_*(A) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|I + hA\|_* - 1}{h}. \quad (15)$$

Remark 5. *The logarithmic norm can be evaluated explicitly for the standard norms. For instance, the following expression can be used for the ℓ_∞ norm:*

$$\mu_\infty(A) = \max_i \left(a_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}| \right). \quad (16)$$

For a dynamical system, negativity of the logarithmic norm can be linked to contraction. This result has been stated in different forms, we state the result as follows.

Theorem 10 ([25]). *Consider a dynamical system $\dot{x} = f(x)$ defined on a convex subset X of \mathbb{R}^n . Let $|\cdot|_*$ be a norm in \mathbb{R}^n and $\|\cdot\|_*$ the induced matrix norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Assume that*

$$\forall x \in X, \quad \mu_* \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x) \right) \leq c.$$

Then for any two solutions $\varphi(t; x), \varphi(t; y)$ of the dynamical system, the following condition holds:

$$|\varphi(t; x) - \varphi(t; y)|_* \leq e^{ct} |x - y|_*. \quad (17)$$

Note that if $c < 0$ the solutions of the system are exponentially contracting. If $c = 0$, then the system is non-expansive.

3.2 Nonexpansion in concentration coordinates

We state our first major result, and then develop the required theory to prove it.

Theorem 11. *Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be a given network, and let $\tilde{V}(r) = \|B\Gamma r\|_\infty$ be a GLF. Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ be any positive state, and define $|x|_B := \|B(x - \bar{x})\|_\infty$. Then, $|\cdot|_B$ is a norm on $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} := (\bar{x} + \text{Im } \Gamma) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, and for any two solutions $x_1(\cdot)$ and $x_2(\cdot)$ of $\dot{x} = \Gamma R(x)$ in $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$, we have*

$$|x_1(t) - x_2(t)|_B \leq |x_1(0) - x_2(0)|_B \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

In other words, the dynamics of \mathcal{N} are non-expansive in each stoichiometric class with respect to the B -norm.

Our approach to prove the theorem is to show that the appropriate logarithmic norm is non-positive. However, since Theorem 11 is stated with respect to the functional $|\cdot|_B$ on the vector space $\text{Im } \Gamma$, we need to introduce the necessary notions.

3.2.1 Norms with non-square weightings

Let $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ be a normed space. Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. We are interested in studying the pair $(\mathcal{V}, |\cdot|_B)$ where \mathcal{V} is a vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^n and $|\cdot|_B$ is the weighted operator $|\cdot|_B : z \mapsto |Bz|$. Such operators are usually studied using the notion of Minkowski functionals or gauge functions [35]. However, to keep the discussion self-contained, we develop the required notions here. For easier future reference, we state a simple equivalency first:

Lemma 12. *Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector subspace, and let Γ be any matrix such that $\text{Im } \Gamma = \mathcal{V}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. $B\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$.
2. $\text{Im}(B\Gamma) = \text{Im}(\Gamma)$.
3. $\ker(B\Gamma) = \ker(\Gamma)$.
4. $\ker B|_{\text{Im } \Gamma} = \{0\}$.

Next, we show next that the pair $(\mathcal{V}, |\cdot|_B)$ is indeed a normed space.

Lemma 13. *Let $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ be a normed space. Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, and let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector subspace. If $B\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$, then the pair $(\mathcal{V}, |\cdot|_B)$ is a normed space.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{V} is a vector subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , we immediately get that $|\cdot|_B$ is semi-norm on \mathcal{V} . To show that it is a norm, we need to show that for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $|x|_B = 0$ iff $x = 0$. But this follows immediately from the previous lemma since we assumed that $B\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$. \square

3.2.2 Induced matrix norms and logarithmic norms restricted to a subspace

Let $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$ be a normed Euclidean space, and let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector space. Next, we can define the \mathcal{V} -induced matrix norm of a matrix $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as $\|J\|_{\mathcal{V}} := \sup_{|z|=1, z \in \mathcal{V}} |Jz|$, which is well-defined since the set $\{z : |z|=1, z \in \mathcal{V}\}$ is compact.

Similarly, we need to define the corresponding induced (B, \mathcal{V}) -matrix norm of a matrix $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ as we did above. As in Lemma 13, we assume that $B\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$, i.e., the dimension of \mathcal{V} does not reduce if we multiple each vector by B from the left. Using Lemma 12, any vector $z \in \mathcal{V}$ can be also written as LBz for some matrix $L \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$. Therefore, we can write:

$$\sup_{\substack{|Bz|=1 \\ z \in \mathcal{V}}} |BJz| = \sup_{\substack{|Bz|=1 \\ z \in \mathcal{V}}} |BJLBz| \leq \|BJL\| \sup_{\substack{|Bz|=1 \\ z \in \mathcal{V}}} |Bz| = \|BJL\| < \infty,$$

which ensures that we show that the induced (B, \mathcal{V}) -matrix norm of any matrix J is well-defined. Therefore, we have the following definition.

Definition 6. Consider the normed space $(\mathbb{R}^n, |\cdot|)$. Let $\mathcal{V} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector space, and let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix satisfying $B\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$. Then,

1. The induced (B, \mathcal{V}) -norm of a matrix $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ restricted to \mathcal{V} is defined as:

$$\|J\|_{B, \mathcal{V}} := \sup_{|z|_B=1, z \in \mathcal{V}} |BJz|.$$

2. The (B, \mathcal{V}) -logarithmic norm of a matrix $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is defined as:

$$\mu_{B, \mathcal{V}}(J) := \lim_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|I + hJ\|_{B, \mathcal{V}} - 1}{h}.$$

3.2.3 Computation of the logarithmic norm

In order to proof Theorem 11, we set $\mathcal{V} = \text{Im } \Gamma$. Hence, we need to show that the $(B, \text{Im } \Gamma)$ -logarithmic norm of the Jacobian is non-positive. This is stated as follows.

Lemma 14. Let a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$ be given. Fix an arbitrary $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. Assume that there exists an GLF for \mathcal{N} of the form $\tilde{V}(r) = \|B\Gamma r\|_{\infty}$. Then,

$$\forall K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}, \mu_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma}(\Gamma K) \leq 0.$$

Before proceeding to the proof of Lemma 14, we need to decompose matrices of the form ΓK , where $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$ into a sum of rank-one matrices as we did in (9). Using (1), we can write :

$$\Gamma K = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_{\ell} \Gamma E_{j_{\ell} i_{\ell}} = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_{\ell} \overbrace{(\Gamma_{j_{\ell}} e_{i_{\ell}}^T)}^{J_{\ell}} = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \bar{\rho}_{\ell} J_{\ell}, \quad (18)$$

where $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_n$ are the columns of Γ . In addition, we need the following basic lemma:

Lemma 15. Given a network \mathcal{N} . Let $J_{\ell}, Q_{\ell}, \ell_1, \dots, s$ be defined as above.

1. $\forall \ell, \Gamma Q_{\ell} = J_{\ell} \Gamma$.
2. Let $C, B, \Lambda_{\ell}, \ell = 1, \dots, s$ be defined as in Corollary 8, and let D be matrix whose rows form a basis for the left null space of Γ . then there exist matrices Y_1, \dots, Y_s such that $B J_{\ell} = \Lambda_{\ell} B + Y_{\ell} D$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$.

Proof. 1. $\Gamma Q_{\ell} = \Gamma e_{j_{\ell}} \gamma_{i_{\ell}}^T = \Gamma_{j_{\ell}} \gamma_{i_{\ell}}^T = \Gamma_{j_{\ell}} e_{i_{\ell}}^T \Gamma = J_{\ell} \Gamma$.

2. Using Corollary 8, we have $CQ_\ell = \Lambda_\ell C$. Then we get:

$$B\Gamma Q_\ell = \Lambda_\ell B\Gamma \implies BJ_\ell \Gamma = \Lambda_\ell B\Gamma \implies (BJ_\ell - \Lambda_\ell B)\Gamma = 0.$$

Therefore, the rows of $BJ_\ell - \Lambda_\ell B$ belong to the left null space of Γ . Hence, there exist matrices Y_1, \dots, Y_s such that $BJ_\ell - \Lambda_\ell B = Y_\ell D$, $\ell = 1, \dots, s$. By rearranging we get the required expression. \square

Proof of Lemma 14. Using the previous definitions, we are interested in bounding the following expression:

$$\mu_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma}(\Gamma K) := \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\|I + h\Gamma K\|_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma} - 1}{h},$$

where $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$. We proceed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|I + h\Gamma K\|_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma} &= \sup_{\substack{\|Bz\|_\infty=1 \\ z \in \text{Im } \Gamma}} \|B(I + h\Gamma K)z\|_\infty \stackrel{(\star)}{=} \sup_{\substack{\|Bz\|_\infty=1 \\ z \in \text{Im } \Gamma}} \left\| Bz + h \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell BJ_\ell z \right\|_\infty \\ &\stackrel{(\clubsuit)}{=} \sup_{\substack{\|Bz\|_\infty=1 \\ z \in \text{Im } \Gamma}} \left\| Bz + h \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell (\Lambda_\ell B + Y_\ell D)z \right\|_\infty \stackrel{(\spadesuit)}{=} \sup_{\substack{\|Bz\|_\infty=1 \\ z \in \text{Im } \Gamma}} \left\| \left(I + h \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda_\ell \right) Bz \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\|Bz\|_\infty=1 \\ z \in \text{Im } \Gamma}} \left\| I + h \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda_\ell \right\|_\infty \|Bz\|_\infty = \left\| I + h \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda_\ell \right\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality (\star) follows from (18), equality (\clubsuit) follows from Lemma 15, and equality (\spadesuit) follows since $Dz = 0$ for all $z \in \text{Im } \Gamma$.

Therefore, the expression of the logarithmic norm above can be written as:

$$\mu_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma}(\Gamma K) \leq \mu_\infty \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda_\ell \right) \leq \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) = 0, \quad (19)$$

where the inequalities follow by the subadditivity of the logarithmic norm and Corollary 8. \square

Proof of Theorem 11. It follows immediately from combining Theorem 10 and Lemma 14 since the Jacobian of (3) can always be written as ΓK for some $K \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{N}}$ as in (2). \square

3.2.4 Boundedness

A BIN that is not conservative is not guaranteed to have bounded trajectories. In fact, non-expansivity does not preclude unboundedness. Nevertheless, if a network admits a steady state then we get boundedness as the following corollary shows.

Corollary 16. *Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be a network that admits a GLF. Then, if a steady state \bar{x} exists, then all trajectories in $\mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$ are bounded.*

Proof. We apply Theorem 11 by comparing an arbitrary trajectory with $x_2(t) \equiv \bar{x}$. \square

Remark 6. *If a network admits a GLF, it has been shown [36] that the existence of a non-degenerate positive steady state, implies global asymptotic stability. Non-degeneracy of the Jacobian can be tested easily as shown in [18, 16]. However, Corollary 16 does not assume non-degeneracy to show boundedness.*

3.2.5 Alternative statement

The results can be stated explicitly in the stoichiometric class by using a transformation. We provide the details below for completeness. Recall that D is a matrix whose rows form a basis for the left null space of Γ . Hence, let $S = [S_1^T, D^T]^T$ where S_1 is any matrix chosen so S is invertible. Consider (3) with a fixed vector \bar{x} . We will use the following coordinate change:

$$\tilde{z} = S(x - \bar{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} S_1(x - \bar{x}) \\ D(x - \bar{x}) \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}_1 \\ \tilde{z}_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The dynamics of (3) can be written as:

$$\dot{\tilde{z}} = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 \\ D \end{bmatrix} \Gamma R(x) = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 \Gamma R(S^{-1} \tilde{z} + \bar{x}) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where the second entry is zero since $D\Gamma = 0$.

Since we have $x(0) \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$, then $x(t) - \bar{x} \in \text{Im } \Gamma$ for all t , and we immediately get that $\tilde{z}_2(t) = D(x - \bar{x}) = 0$ for all t . Furthermore, let us write $S^{-1} =: [U_1, U_2]$, where $U_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n-d)}$, $U_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $d = \dim(\ker(\Gamma^T))$.

Therefore,

$$S^{-1} \tilde{z} + \bar{x} = [U_1, U_2] \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{z}_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + \bar{x} = U_1 \tilde{z}_1 + \bar{x}.$$

Finally we get the dynamics on the $n - d$ manifold as:

$$\dot{\tilde{z}}_1 = S_1 \Gamma R(U_1 \tilde{z}_1 + \bar{x}), \quad \tilde{z}_1(0) \text{ satisfies } U_1 \tilde{z}_1(0) + \bar{x} \geq 0. \quad (20)$$

In the new coordinates, the problem reduces to checking contraction of (20) with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{BU_1} : \tilde{z}_1 \mapsto \|BU_1 \tilde{z}_1\|_\infty$. Hence, we state the following corollary.

Corollary 17. *Let a network \mathcal{N} be given. Let S, S_1, U_1 be a matrices defined as above. Consider the ODE (20) whose Jacobian is $S_1 \Gamma \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} U_1$. Consider the norm $\|\cdot\|_{BU_1} : \hat{z}_1 \mapsto \|BU_1 \hat{z}_1\|_\infty$ and the associated logarithmic norm μ_{BW_1} . Then, $\mu_{BW_1}(S_1 \Gamma \frac{\partial R}{\partial x} U_1) = \mu_{B, \text{Im } \Gamma}(\Gamma \frac{\partial R}{\partial x}) \leq 0$. In other words, the logarithmic norm of the reduced system is independent of the choice of S_1 and is non-positive. In addition, consider any two solutions $\hat{\varphi}(t; \hat{z}_{1a}), \hat{\varphi}(t; \hat{z}_{1b})$ of (20), then the following condition holds:*

$$|\hat{\varphi}(t; \hat{z}_{1a}) - \hat{\varphi}(t; \hat{z}_{1b})|_{BW_1} \leq |\hat{z}_{1a} - \hat{z}_{1b}|_{BW_1}, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

3.3 Nonexpansion of the extent-of-reaction system

We can perform similar contraction analysis for the extent-of-reaction system, but thanks to Theorem 4, we can use Theorem 11 to show the following immediately:

Theorem 18. *Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be a given network, and let $\tilde{V}(r) = \|Cr\|_\infty$ be a GLF. Let $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ be any positive state, and define $|\xi|_C := \|C\xi\|_\infty$. Then, for any two solutions $\xi_1(\cdot)$ and $\xi_2(\cdot)$ of $\dot{\xi} = R(\bar{x} + \Gamma\xi)$, we have*

$$|\xi_1(t) - \xi_2(t)|_C \leq |\xi_1(0) - \xi_2(0)|_C \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Proof. With reference to the commutativity diagram in Theorem 4 we have $x_1(t) = \Gamma\xi_1(t) + \bar{x}$, and $x_2(t) = \Gamma\xi_2(t) + \bar{x}$. Note that $x_1(t), x_2(t) \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}}$. Then, we can write the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi_1(t) - \xi_2(t)|_C &= \|C(\Psi(x_2(t)) - \Psi(x_1(t)))\|_\infty = \|B\Gamma(G(x_2(t) - \bar{x}) - G(x_1(t) - \bar{x}))\|_\infty \\ &= \|B(x_2(t) - \bar{x} - x_1(t) + \bar{x})\|_\infty = \|B(x_2(t) - x_1(t))\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|B(x_2(0) - x_1(0))\|_\infty = \|B\Gamma(\xi_2(0) - \xi_1(0))\|_\infty = |x_2(0) - x_1(0)|_C, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality uses the commutativity diagram in Theorem 4, while the second equality uses (11), the third equality uses the property that $\Gamma G(z) = z$ for all $z \in \text{Im } \Gamma$, and the inequality follows from Theorem 11. \square




Figure 1: Nonexpansivity for two examples (a) The B -distance between 500 pairs of randomly generated trajectories for the PTM system with $R(x) = [se, c_1, pd, c_2]^T$, and its numerically-calculated time-derivative using MATLAB's `diff` subroutine. (b) An unbounded nonexpansive system. The time-derivative of the B -distance between 500 pairs of randomly generated trajectories for the system (21) with $R(x) = [c, 1, ab]^T$, and a plot of the unbounded trajectories.

3.4 Examples and discussion

3.4.1 The PTM cycle (cont'd)

Let us consider again the PTM cycle (6). Using Theorem 11 the network is non-expansive with respect to the norm $|\cdot|_B$ in each stoichiometric class, where B is given by (12). Figure 1 shows a numerical simulation of the distance between pairs of trajectories where it can be seen that they are approaching each other. In the next section, we will show that the system is strictly contractive over any compact set in the positive orthant.

3.4.2 An unstable system

Non-expansivity does not imply boundedness. For example, let us consider an example studied in [15]:



This system admits the GLF $\tilde{V}(r) = \|B\Gamma r\|_\infty$, where

$$B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note, however, that the trajectories of the system can become unbounded when a steady state fails to exist. Figure 1-b) shows unbounded trajectories. Nevertheless, the distance between the trajectories never increases.

4 Strict contraction over compact sets

In the previous section we have shown that any network admitting a GLF is non-expansive. In this section, we will strengthen this to show strict contraction over arbitrary compact sets.

4.1 Background: siphons and persistence

We introduce the concept of siphons, which will assist us in establishing strict contraction over compact sets. A dynamical system defined over the positive orthant is said to be persistent if trajectories that start in the

interior of the positive orthant do not approach the boundary asymptotically [13]. This is also known as non-extinction since it is tantamount to asking that species are initially present in the BIN do not go extinct.

An approach that can be used to establish persistence is based on the theory of siphons [13].

Definition 7. Let $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be a network. A set $P \subset \mathcal{S}$ is said to be a siphon if it satisfies the following statement: $\forall X \in P$, if X is a product of some reaction \mathbf{R}_j , then $\exists X' \in P$ such that X' is a reactant of \mathbf{R}_j . In addition, a siphon is trivial if it contains no support of a conservation law, and it is critical otherwise.

If a network contains only trivial siphons, then its trajectories that start in the positive orthant do not approach the boundary asymptotically for any choice of kinetics, which is known as structural persistence [13]. In fact, a slightly stronger statement can be established. If we choose all our initial conditions from a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, then the corresponding trajectories are uniformly separated from the boundary. This is shown in the following result which is a modification of a corresponding result in [20]:

Lemma 19. Consider a BIN with uniformly bounded solution, i.e., for all compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$, there exists \tilde{K}_1 compact such that $\varphi(t, K) \subset \tilde{K}_1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Assume that all siphons are trivial. Then, for any compact $K \subset (0, +\infty)^n$, there exist a number $\varepsilon > 0$ and a convex and compact \tilde{K} in $[\varepsilon, +\infty)^n$ such that $\varphi(t, K) \in \tilde{K}$ for all $t \geq 0$.


Proof. Using [20, Lemma 5], there exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and \tilde{K}_1 compact in $[\varepsilon, +\infty)^n$ such that $\varphi(t, K) \in \tilde{K}_1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Our desired convex \tilde{K} is any compact and convex set that satisfies $\tilde{K}_1 \subset \tilde{K} \subset [\varepsilon, \infty)^n$. One such set is the closed box $[\varepsilon, x_1^*] \times \dots \times [\varepsilon, x_n^*]$, where $x^* \in \tilde{K}_1$ is the supremum point of \tilde{K}_1 . \square

Remark 7. Using Corollary 16, boundedness follows for networks admitting a GLF whenever a steady state exists.

4.2 Strict contraction over positive compact sets

Recall that the upper bound in (19) is $\mu_\infty(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda^\ell)$ which is written in term of the partial derivatives of R . Therefore, we if can establish a *lower bound* on the partial derivatives of R , then we can hope to show strict contraction. However, for networks that contain bimolecular reactions, this is not generally possible since the partial derivatives of R can get arbitrarily small when we get close to the boundary. Hence, our technique will be to establish contraction with respect to *compact sets*. If we assume the absence of trivial siphons, then Lemma 19 assures us that there is a uniform positive lower bound on all the states. We will show that this can be applied to few examples and then we state the general result.

Example 1: Three-body binding. Unlike standard two-body binding, three-body binding [37] requires to a bridging molecule B for the formation of a trimeric complex ABC . The reaction network can be written as follows:



The network admits the GLF $\tilde{V}(r) = \|\Gamma r\|_\infty$, so $B = I$. The certificate matrices $\Lambda_\ell, \ell = 1, \dots, 8$ can be computed via Corollary 8, and hence the upper bound (19) can be computed explicitly.

For that purpose, let $x_1 = [A], x_2 = [C], x_3 = [B], x_4 = [AB], x_5 = [BC], x_6 = [ABC]$, and define $\rho_{ji} := \partial R_j / \partial x_i$, then (19) gives us:

$$\mu_{\infty, \text{Im } \Gamma}(J) \leq -\min\{\rho_{11} + \rho_{21}, \rho_{32} + \rho_{42}, \rho_{13} + \rho_{43}, \rho_{34} + \rho_{54}, \rho_{65} + \rho_{75}, \rho_{26} + \rho_{86}\} := \rho(x) < 0,$$

where the last inequality holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ by assumption AK3. Therefore, this establishes that the Jacobian has a strictly negative logarithmic norm over the positive orthant, however, this falls short of proving strict contraction. Nevertheless, the situation can be remedied for compact sets by using Lemma 19. So, let $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be any positive compact. By Lemma 19 there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and a convex and compact \tilde{K}

such that $\varphi(t; K) \in \tilde{K} \subset [\varepsilon, \infty)^n$ for all $t \geq 0$. So let $c := \min_{x \in \tilde{K}} \rho(x) > 0$. So if $x(0), y(0) \in K \subset \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}$, then we get strict contraction

$$|x(t) - y(t)|_{\infty} \leq e^{-ct} |x(0) - y(0)|_{\infty} \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

Example 2: PTM cycle (continued). Let us continue considering the PTM cycle. In order to bound the logarithmic norm using (19), we need to examine the expression $\mu_{\infty}(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}(x)\Lambda^{\ell})$. By substituting the values of $\Lambda_{\ell}, \ell = 1, \dots, 6$ we get: (the dependence on x is dropped for notational simplicity)

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\rho_1 - \rho_2 - \rho_6 & 0 & -\rho_6 & 0 & -\rho_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\rho_1 - \rho_2 - \rho_3 & 0 & 0 & \rho_1 & 0 \\ -\rho_5 & -\rho_4 & -\rho_1 - \rho_2 - \rho_4 - \rho_5 & \rho_2 & 0 & -\rho_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_3 & -\rho_3 - \rho_4 - \rho_5 & \rho_5 & 0 \\ -\rho_3 & 0 & 0 & \rho_6 & -\rho_3 - \rho_6 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_4 & -\rho_4 - \rho_5 - \rho_6 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let J be a square matrix, remember that $\mu_{\infty}(J) = \max_i \sigma_i(J)$, where $\sigma_i(J) = [J]_{ii} + \sum_{j \neq i} |J_{ij}|$. For the matrix above, note that $\sigma_3(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}\Lambda_{\ell})$ and $\sigma_5(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}\Lambda_{\ell})$ are both *identically* zero. Hence, $\mu_{\infty}(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}\Lambda^{\ell}) = 0$ for all possible choices of ρ_1, \dots, ρ_6 . This situation precludes using an argument similar to the previous example. Nevertheless, we can adapt a trick used in [29] by using a non-singular diagonal matrix P to define a scaled norm $|\cdot|_{PB}$. Hence, the equation $B\Gamma(\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell}Q_{\ell}) = (\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell}\Lambda_{\ell})B\Gamma$, can be written as

$$PB\Gamma\left(\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell}Q_{\ell}\right) = \left(\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell}P\Lambda_{\ell}P^{-1}\right)B\Gamma. \quad (22)$$

Hence, we can evaluate $\mu_{\infty}(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}P\Lambda^{\ell}P^{-1})$ for the scaled norm. In our case, let $P = \text{diag}([1 + \theta, 1 + \theta, 1, 1 + \theta, 1, 1 + \theta])$ for some small $\theta > 0$. Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\infty}\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}P\Lambda^{\ell}P^{-1}\right) &= -\min\{\rho_1 - \theta(\rho_2 + \rho_6), \rho_3 + \rho_2 - \theta\rho_1, (\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_4 + \rho_5)\frac{\theta}{1+\theta}, \\ &\quad \rho_4 - \theta(\rho_3 + \rho_5), (\rho_3 + \rho_6)\frac{\theta}{1+\theta}, \rho_5 + \rho_6 - \theta\rho_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

We are going to show that it is always possible to choose θ such that the expression above is negative over an appropriate set. So let K be a positive compact set. By Lemma 19 there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ and a convex and compact \tilde{K} such that $\varphi(t; K) \in \tilde{K} \subset [\varepsilon, \infty)^n$ for all $t \geq 0$. Define the following constant:

$$\bar{\theta} = \min_{x \in \tilde{K}} \left\{ \frac{\rho_1}{\rho_2 + \rho_6}, \frac{\rho_3 + \rho_2}{\rho_1}, \frac{\rho_4}{\rho_3 + \rho_5}, \frac{\rho_5 + \rho_6}{\rho_4} \right\} > 0,$$

which exists and is well-defined due to the positivity and compactness of \tilde{K} . Therefore, for any choice of $\theta \in (0, \bar{\theta})$, the logarithmic norm $\mu_{\infty}(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}P\Lambda^{\ell}P^{-1})$ is negative over \tilde{K} , and is upper bounded by $-c$ for some $c > 0$. Therefore, if $x(0), y(0) \in K \subset \mathcal{C}_{\tilde{x}}$, then we get strict contraction

$$|x(t) - y(t)|_{PB} \leq e^{-ct} |x(0) - y(0)|_{PB} \text{ for all } t \geq 0.$$

4.2.1 General results

Weakly contractive matrices. As seen in the last example, a matrix whose logarithmic norm is identically zero can be scaled using a diagonal transformation into a matrix with a *negative* logarithmic norm. We state this more generally using the following definition:

Definition 8. Let $J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be matrix that satisfies $\sigma_i(J) \leq 0, i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $S_- := \{i \in 1, \dots, n | \sigma_i(J) < 0\}$, and $S_0 := \{i \in 1, \dots, n | \sigma_i(J) = 0\}$. Assume that for any $i \in S_0$ there exists an index $k_i \in S_-$ such that $J_{ik_i} > 0$, then J is said to be weakly contractive.

Since we want to apply this to matrices of the form $\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \Lambda_{\ell}$, then we state the following basic Lemma which follows immediately.

Lemma 20. *Let square matrices $\Lambda_{\ell}, \ell = 1, \dots, s$ be given such that $\mu_{\infty}(\Lambda_{\ell}) \leq 0$, and denote $J(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s) = \sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \Lambda_{\ell}$. Then, $J(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s)$ is weakly contractive for all ρ_1, \dots, ρ_s iff $J(\rho_1, \dots, \rho_s)$ is weakly contractive for at least one positive tuple (ρ_1, \dots, ρ_s) .*

Therefore, we can verify that $\sum_{\ell} \rho_{\ell} \Lambda_{\ell}$ is weakly contractive by checking that $\sum_{\ell} \Lambda_{\ell}$ is weakly contractive. We state our result next.

Theorem 21. *Let a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be given and assume that it admits a GLF $\tilde{V}(r) = \|\Theta \Gamma r\|_{\infty}$. Let $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_s$ be the corresponding matrices defined in Corollary 8. Furthermore assume that $J = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \Lambda_{\ell}$ is weakly contractive. Let S_0, S_- be as in Definition 8.*

Let $K \subset \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be any compact set, and assume that $\varphi(t, K)$ is uniformly bounded. Then for any two solutions $x_1(\cdot)$ and $x_2(\cdot)$ of $\dot{x} = \Gamma R(x)$ that start in K , there exists $\theta > 0, c > 0$ such that

$$|x_1(t) - x_2(t)|_{PB} \leq e^{-ct} |x_1(0) - x_2(0)|_{PB} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,$$

where P is a diagonal matrix defined as $p_{ii} = 1$ if $i \in S_0$, and $p_{ii} = 1 + \theta$ if $i \in S_-$.

Recall the three-body binding example. Remember that we did not need to scale the norm. In general, if a GLF takes the form $\tilde{V}(r) = \|\Theta \Gamma r\|_{\infty}$ for some diagonal matrix Θ , then no scaling is required. This is stated by the following theorem which is proved in the appendix.

Theorem 22. *Let a network $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R})$ be given and assume that it admits a GLF $\tilde{V}(r) = \|\Theta \Gamma r\|_{\infty}$ for some non-negative diagonal matrix Θ .*

Let $K \subset \mathcal{C}_{\bar{x}} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n$ be any compact set, and assume that $\varphi(t, K)$ is uniformly bounded. Then for any two solutions $x_1(\cdot)$ and $x_2(\cdot)$ of $\dot{x} = \Gamma R(x)$ that start in K , there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$|x_1(t) - x_2(t)|_{\Theta} \leq e^{-ct} |x_1(0) - x_2(0)|_{\Theta} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

Appendix: Additional Proofs

Proof of Proposition 3. Remember that \tilde{V} is locally Lipschitz function. Hence, the gradient of \tilde{V} exists almost everywhere. When it exists, write $\dot{\tilde{V}}(\xi)$ as follows:

$$\dot{\tilde{V}}(\xi) = \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial \xi} R(\bar{x} + \Gamma \xi) = \frac{\partial \hat{V}}{\partial \xi} \left(R(\bar{x}) + \frac{\partial R}{\partial x}(x_{\xi}^*) \Gamma \xi \right) = \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial \xi} \frac{\partial R}{\partial x}(x_{\xi}^*) \Gamma \xi,$$

where $x_{\xi}^* := \bar{x} + \varepsilon \Gamma \xi$ for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. The second equality above follows from applying the Mean-value theorem to the single-valued function $h(\varepsilon) = R(\bar{x} + \varepsilon \Gamma \xi)$. The third equality can be shown as follows: By definition, $\exists \hat{V}$ such that $\tilde{V} = \hat{V} \circ \Gamma$. Since the gradient of \hat{V} exists, we can write $\partial \tilde{V} / \partial \xi = (\partial \hat{V} / \partial z) \Gamma$, but since \bar{x} is a steady state, then $\Gamma R(\bar{x}) = 0$, and hence the first term vanishes. Similar to (18), we can decompose the Jacobian as follows:

$$\dot{\tilde{V}}(\xi) = \sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_{\ell}(x_{\xi}^*) \frac{\partial \tilde{V}}{\partial \xi} Q_{\ell} \xi \leq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows since \tilde{V} is a common Lyapunov function for the systems $\dot{r}_1 = Q_1 r, \dots, \dot{r}_s = Q_s r$. The inequality holds for all ξ using Lemma 9 in [20]. \square

Proof of Corollary 8. The first statement is equivalent to the statement that $\ker \Gamma = \ker C$. Hence, we focus on the second statement. For the first direction, assume that the statement in Theorem 7 holds. Fix ℓ . Since $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\ell} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m \times 2m}$, then we can write: (we drop the dependence on ℓ to simplify the notation)

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{\ell} = \begin{bmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \Lambda_{12} \\ \Lambda_{21} & \Lambda_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where $\Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{12}, \Lambda_{21}, \Lambda_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. By the statement in Theorem 7, $\Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{22}$ are Metzler and $\Lambda_{12}, \Lambda_{21}$ are non-nonnegative. In addition, (13) can be written as:

$$CQ_\ell = (\Lambda_{11} - \Lambda_{12})C \quad (24)$$

$$CQ_\ell = (\Lambda_{22} - \Lambda_{21})C \quad (25)$$

Note that we can assume, w.l.o.g, that $\Lambda_{22} = \Lambda_{11}$, $\Lambda_{21} = \Lambda_{12}$. Hence, we define $\Lambda_\ell := \Lambda_{11} - \Lambda_{12}$. It remains to show that $\mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) \leq 0$. To that end, recall that $\mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) = \max_i \lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sum_{j \neq i} |\lambda_{ij}^{(\ell)}|$. Hence, we write:

$$\lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sum_j |\lambda_{ij}^{(\ell)}| = \lambda_{ii}^{11} - \lambda_{ii}^{12} + \sum_{j \neq i} |\lambda_{ij}^{11} - \lambda_{ij}^{12}| \stackrel{(\star)}{\leq} \lambda_{ii}^{11} + \lambda_{ii}^{12} + \sum_{j \neq i} (\lambda_{ij}^{11} + \lambda_{ij}^{12}) \stackrel{(\clubsuit)}{=} 0, \quad (26)$$

where the inequality (\star) follows since $\lambda_{ii}^{12}, \lambda_{ij}^{11}, \lambda_{ij}^{12}$ are nonnegative, and equality (\clubsuit) follows from $\tilde{\Lambda}_\ell \mathbf{1} = 0$. Hence, we have found a matrix Λ_ℓ that satisfy $\mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) \leq 0$.

Next, we show the other direction. Fix ℓ . Assume we have a matrix Λ_ℓ that satisfies $\mu_\infty(\Lambda_\ell) \leq 0$. Hence, for all i we have $\lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} \leq 0$ and $\sigma_i := -(\lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sum_j |\lambda_{ij}^{(\ell)}|) \geq 0$. We are going to construct two matrices $\Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{12}$ elementwise as follows assuming $i \neq j$: $\lambda_{ij}^{(11)} := \max\{\lambda_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 0\} + \sigma_i/(2n)$, $\lambda_{ij}^{(12)} := \max\{-\lambda_{ij}^{(\ell)}, 0\} + \sigma_i/(2n)$, $\lambda_{ii}^{(12)} := \sigma_i/(2n)$, $\lambda_{ii}^{(11)} := \lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sigma_i/(2n)$, where the latter is non-positive since $\lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sigma_i/(2n) \leq \lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} + \sigma_i \leq \lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} - \lambda_{ii}^{(\ell)} = 0$. Finally, we define $\Lambda_{22} := \Lambda_{11}, \Lambda_{21} := \Lambda_{12}$. Define $\tilde{\Lambda}_\ell$ as in (23) which can be verified to be a Metzler matrix satisfying $\tilde{\Lambda}_\ell \mathbf{1} = 0$ and (24)-(25). \square

Proof of Theorem 22. Remember that ρ_1, \dots, ρ_s correspond to the nonzero entries of $\partial R/\partial x$ which are strictly positive in \mathbb{R}_+^n by AK3, hence the proof can be accomplished by showing that $\mu_\infty(\sum_{\ell=1}^s \rho_\ell \Lambda_\ell) < 0$ for any positive ρ_1, \dots, ρ_s . Assume $\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$. Since Θ might have zero rows, the function can be written (by reordering species if necessary) as $\tilde{V}(r) = \|[\Theta_d, O]\Gamma r\|_\infty$, where Θ_d is an $n_d \times n_d$ positive diagonal matrix for some $n_d \leq n$. Hence, $\tilde{V}(r) = \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n_d\}} \gamma_i^T r$. To show the statement, it is sufficient to show that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n_d\}$, there exists $\ell \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $\lambda_\ell^{(ii)} + \sum_{j \neq i} |\lambda_\ell^{(ik)}| < 0$.

By AS1, γ_i is orthogonal to a positive vector, and hence must have a strictly negative element, say γ_{ij} . Hence, this implies that X_i is a reactant of \mathbf{R}_j , and $\partial R_j/\partial x_i$ is nonzero. Let Λ_ℓ the matrix (defined in Corollary 8) corresponding to the reactant-reactant pair (X_i, \mathbf{R}_j) . Therefore, it can be seen it is possible to choose the i th row of Λ_ℓ as follows: $\lambda_\ell^{(ii)} = -\theta_{ii}$ and $\lambda_\ell^{(ij)} = 0, i \neq j$. Hence, $\lambda_\ell^{(ii)} + \sum_{j \neq i} |\lambda_\ell^{(ij)}| = -\theta_{ii} < 0$. \square

References

- [1] Trey Ideker, Timothy Galitski, and Leroy Hood. A new approach to decoding life: systems biology. *Annual review of genomics and human genetics*, 2(1):343–372, 2001.
- [2] Uri Alon. *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, London, United Kingdom, 2006.
- [3] M. Feinberg. Chemical reaction network structure and the stability of complex isothermal reactors–I. The deficiency zero and deficiency one theorems. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 42(10):2229–2268, 1987.
- [4] P. Érdi and J. Tóth. *Mathematical models of chemical reactions: theory and applications of deterministic and stochastic models*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, United Kingdom, 1989.
- [5] E. D. Sontag. Structure and stability of certain chemical networks and applications to the kinetic proofreading model of T-cell receptor signal transduction. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 46(7):1028–1047, 2001.

- [6] Mineo Morohashi, Amanda E Winn, Mark T Borisuk, Hamid Bolouri, John Doyle, and Hiroaki Kitano. Robustness as a measure of plausibility in models of biochemical networks. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 216(1):19–30, 2002.
- [7] Robert J Prill, Pablo A Iglesias, and Andre Levchenko. Dynamic properties of network motifs contribute to biological network organization. *PLoS biology*, 3(11):e343, 2005.
- [8] J. E. Bailey. Complex biology with no parameters. *Nature Biotechnology*, 19(6):503–504, 2001.
- [9] Ankit Gupta and Mustafa Khammash. Universal structural requirements for maximal robust perfect adaptation in biomolecular networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(43):e2207802119, 2022.
- [10] Robyn P Araujo and Lance A Liotta. Universal structures for adaptation in biochemical reaction networks. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2251, 2023.
- [11] F. Horn and R. Jackson. General mass action kinetics. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 47(2):81–116, 1972.
- [12] D. F. Anderson. A proof of the global attractor conjecture in the single linkage class case. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 71(4):1487–1508, 2011.
- [13] D. Angeli, P. De Leenheer, and E. D. Sontag. A Petri net approach to the study of persistence in chemical reaction networks. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 210(2):598–618, 2007.
- [14] D. Angeli, P. De Leenheer, and E. Sontag. Graph-theoretic characterizations of monotonicity of chemical networks in reaction coordinates. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 61(4):581–616, 2010.
- [15] M. Ali Al-Radhawi and David Angeli. New approach to the stability of chemical reaction networks: Piecewise linear in rates Lyapunov functions. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 61(1):76–89, 2016.
- [16] M Ali Al-Radhawi, David Angeli, and Eduardo D Sontag. A computational framework for a Lyapunov-enabled analysis of biochemical reaction networks. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 16(2):e1007681, 2020.
- [17] M. Ali Al-Radhawi and D. Angeli. Robust Lyapunov functions for complex reaction networks: An uncertain system framework. In *Proceedings of the IEEE 53rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 3101–3106, Dec 2014.
- [18] F. Blanchini and G. Giordano. Piecewise-linear Lyapunov functions for structural stability of biochemical networks. *Automatica*, 50(10):2482 – 2493, 2014.
- [19] M Ali Al-Radhawi. Graphical characterizations of robust stability in biological interaction networks. *Mathematics of Control, Signals, and Systems, In press*, 2023.
- [20] David Angeli, Muhammad Ali Al-Radhawi, and Eduardo D Sontag. A robust Lyapunov criterion for nonoscillatory behaviors in biological interaction networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 67(7):3305–3320, 2021.
- [21] Germund Dahlquist. *Stability and error bounds in the numerical integration of ordinary differential equations*. PhD thesis, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958.
- [22] Sergei Mikhailovich Lozinskii. Error estimate for numerical integration of ordinary differential equations. i. *Izvestiya Vysshikh Uchebnykh Zavedenii. Matematika*, (5):52–90, 1958.
- [23] W. Lohmiller and J-J. Slotine. On contraction analysis for non-linear systems. *Automatica*, 34(6):683–696, 1998.
- [24] A. V. Pavlov, N. Wouw, and H. Nijmeijer. *Uniform output regulation of nonlinear systems: a convergent dynamics approach*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

- [25] Z. Aminzare and E. D. Sontag. Contraction methods for nonlinear systems: A brief introduction and some open problems. In *Proc. 53rd IEEE Conf. on Decision and Control*, pages 3835–3847, 2014.
- [26] Fulvio Forni and Rodolphe Sepulchre. A differential Lyapunov framework for contraction analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 59(3):614–628, 2014.
- [27] F Bullo. Contraction theory for dynamical systems. *Kindle Direct Publishing*, 1:979–8836646806, 2022.
- [28] Eduardo D Sontag. Contractive systems with inputs. *Perspectives in Mathematical System Theory, Control, and Signal Processing: A Festschrift in Honor of Yutaka Yamamoto on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, pages 217–228, 2010.
- [29] Michael Margaliot, Eduardo D Sontag, and Tamir Tuller. Contraction after small transients. *Automatica*, 67:178–184, 2016.
- [30] G. Russo, M. Di Bernardo, and E. D. Sontag. Global entrainment of transcriptional systems to periodic inputs. *PLoS computational biology*, 6(4):e1000739, 2010.
- [31] Mihály A Vághy and Gábor Szederkényi. Persistence and stability of generalized ribosome flow models with time-varying transition rates. *Plos one*, 18(7):e0288148, 2023.
- [32] Saber Jafarpour and Samuel Coogan. Monotonicity and contraction on polyhedral cones. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.11576*, 2022.
- [33] M. Ali Al-Radhawi. *New Approach to the Stability and Control of Reaction Networks*. PhD thesis, Imperial College London, December 2015.
- [34] T. Yoshizawa. *Stability theory by Liapunov’s Second Method*. Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1966.
- [35] Anthony C Thompson. *Minkowski geometry*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [36] F. Blanchini and G. Giordano. Polyhedral Lyapunov functions structurally ensure global asymptotic stability of dynamical networks iff the jacobian is non-singular. *Automatica*, 86:183–191, 2017.
- [37] Eugene F Douglass Jr, Chad J Miller, Gerson Sparer, Harold Shapiro, and David A Spiegel. A comprehensive mathematical model for three-body binding equilibria. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 135(16):6092–6099, 2013.