

# Open reaction-diffusion systems: bridging probabilistic theory across scales

Mauricio J. del Razo<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Freie Universität Berlin, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Berlin, Germany*  
(Dated: April 11, 2024)

Reaction-diffusion processes are the foundational model for a diverse range of complex systems, ranging from biochemical reactions to social agent-based phenomena. The underlying dynamics of these systems occur at the individual particle/agent level, and in realistic applications, they often display interaction with their environment through energy or material exchange with a reservoir. This requires intricate mathematical considerations, especially in the case of material exchange since the varying number of particles/agents results in “on-the-fly” modification of the system dimension. In this work, we first overview the probabilistic description of reaction-diffusion processes at the particle level, which readily handles varying numbers of particles. We then extend this model to consistently incorporate interactions with macroscopic material reservoirs. Based on the resulting expressions, we bridge the probabilistic description with macroscopic concentration-based descriptions for linear and nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems, as well as for an archetypal open reaction-diffusion system. This establishes a methodological workflow to bridge particle-based probabilistic descriptions with macroscopic concentration-based descriptions of reaction-diffusion in open settings, laying the foundations for a multiscale theoretical framework upon which to construct theory and simulation schemes that are consistent across scales.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Living cells constantly exchange material and energy with their environment; they consume chemical energy and dissipate heat. Namely, they operate in an open non-equilibrium setting. In terms of physical chemistry, every living system must be an open system—a closed system has no life [32]. At biological cell scales, biochemical reaction systems can be characterized as an interplay between the spatial transport (diffusion) of molecules and their chemical kinetics (reaction) [30, 42]. Thus, the mathematical modeling of biochemical reaction systems in living cells requires the formulation of reaction-diffusion processes in open settings [33]. Beyond applications in biochemical systems, reaction-diffusion offers a mathematical baseline to model a diverse range of complex systems, including the spread of diseases [3, 29, 43], innovations [14], opinions [20] and other agent-based social systems. In real-world applications, it is prevalent that the systems of interest are open and operate in non-equilibrium regimes.

The formal description of reaction-diffusion dynamics as a stochastic process at the particle level is cumbersome due to the need to handle changes to the system’s dimension as the dynamics evolve. The diffusion of individual particles/molecules is governed by Brownian dynamics while reactions can change the number of particles/molecules of the system, resulting in an “on the fly” modification of the system’s dimension/degrees of freedom. This greatly complicates formulating the governing equations as one cannot simply write the stochastic differential equations of the dynamical system. In recent work [6, 8, 12], by formalizing previous approaches [15], the authors derived a Master equation for reaction-diffusion systems that describes the evolution of the probability distribution dynamics of reaction-diffusion processes in the phase space (see also [23, 24] for related work). In other words, instead of focusing on the non-linear dynamics of individual particles, the dynamics are lifted to an infinite-dimensional phase space with a very peculiar structure—symmetric with respect to particle permutations of the same type, continuous regarding particle’s positions and discrete in particle numbers. In this space, the dynamics of the evolution of the probability distribution are conveniently linear. This is analogous to the Fokker-Planck equations for stochastic dynamical systems with a constant number of particles, with the main difference that this Master equation can handle a varying number of particles [6] and thus can handle modeling reaction and diffusion jointly as one stochastic process. We refer to this master equation as the chemical diffusion master equation (CDME) [8, 12].

Our main focus is to investigate reaction-diffusion dynamics in an open systems context. In general, an open system refers to a system that exchanges matter and energy with an external system or reservoir [33]. Energy exchanges are often easier to model since they don’t change the dimension of the system and can often be modeled by incorporating some form of thermostat into the diffusion. However, material exchanges involve adding or removing particle/molecules/agents to the system and thus require changing the dimension of the system. In reaction events, the exchange of energy and matter with an external system is implicitly modeled through the rate function. For instance,

---

\* [m.delrazo@fu-berlin.de](mailto:m.delrazo@fu-berlin.de)

reactions such as spontaneous creation  $\emptyset \rightarrow A$  implicitly assume the particles are coming from somewhere or created given some energetic input, otherwise they would violate conservation laws. Moreover, spatially inhomogeneous systems in contact with a reservoir must incorporate particles/molecules in ways that are physically consistent with the diffusion process (or even hydrodynamics) across the contact boundary. To study and simulate open reaction-diffusion systems, we need to model energy and material exchange with reservoirs. As heat exchanges have been thoroughly studied in the literature [21, 44], we mainly focus on reservoir interactions that change the number of particles in the system through reactions or contact boundaries, while maintaining spatial resolution.

In this work, we first present an overview of the CDME showing how reactions are coupled to the diffusion process. Then, we demonstrate how to incorporate interactions with a macroscopic reservoir while maintaining physical consistency. This is achieved by modeling diffusion exchanges across the contact boundary with the reservoir as “reactions” with specific characteristics. Finally, we introduce a methodology to recover macroscopic concentration-based descriptions from particle-based probabilistic descriptions and showcase the methodology for three examples: linear and nonlinear reactions, as well as for an open reaction-diffusion system. In the last example, starting from the formulation of the CDME that incorporates reservoir interaction through contact boundaries, we use statistical limits to derive diffusion-influenced reactions models as a limiting case. Diffusion-controlled/influenced reactions are an archetypal model of an open reaction-diffusion system. In its original presentation, also known as Smoluchowski’s model [4, 38]—a seminal work in physical chemistry—it consists of a system with a concentration gradient that is in contact with a constant concentration reservoir in the far-field and a reactive boundary close to the origin. It would be pointless to establish a theory of open reaction-diffusion systems if we do not establish a connection to this influential work. This methodology establishes mathematical relations between the models at different scales and enables the development of multiscale numerical schemes for open reaction-diffusion systems that are consistent across multiple scales. This result is only one example of how the CDME is the ideal framework to bridge theory and simulation of reaction-diffusion processes across scales.

In what follows, we present the CDME overview in section II, along with two representative examples. In section III, we incorporate interactions between particle-based systems and macroscopic reservoirs through a contact boundary. Section IV focuses on recovering concentration-based descriptions of reaction-diffusion systems as a limiting case of the CDME for three representative examples: creation and degradation (linear), mutual annihilation (nonlinear) and diffusion-influenced reaction systems (linear, open). The last one is the main result in the context of open systems. We close the paper with concluding remarks and the future impact of this work in the context of general and physically consistent multiscale numerical methods for open reaction-diffusion systems.

## II. PROBABILISTIC THEORY FOR REACTION-DIFFUSION PROCESSES: THE CHEMICAL DIFFUSION MASTER EQUATION

The chemical diffusion master equation (CDME) [8, 12, 15] describes the probabilistic dynamics of reaction-diffusion processes at the particle level. As reactions can change the number of particles in the system, the degrees of freedom of the system change with time. Thus, one cannot write the dynamics of the system in terms of stochastic differential equations and one has to instead describe the dynamics in terms of the evolution of the probability distribution of the system, i.e. in terms of a master equation (or a Kolmogorov forward equation). This translates into a master equation with a complex and rich mathematical structure (the CDME), which describes the evolution of the probability distribution corresponding to a stochastic dynamical system with varying degrees of freedom. This probability distribution lives in a phase space with a peculiar structure that combines continuous and discrete degrees of freedom, see fig. 1.

We consider a system of a varying number of diffusing particles of the same chemical species in a finite space domain  $\mathbb{X}$ . The diffusion process changes the spatial configuration of the particles (continuous) while the reaction process can change the number of particles (discrete) in the system. The configuration of the system is thus given by the number of particles and their positions. The probability distribution of such a system is given as a family/hierarchy of densities

$$\rho = \left( \rho_0, \rho_1(x^{(1)}), \rho_2(x^{(2)}), \dots, \rho_n(x^{(n)}), \dots \right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho_n(x^{(n)})$  is the probability density of finding  $n$  particles at positions  $x^{(n)} = (x_1^{(n)}, \dots, x_n^{(n)})$ . We further assume each of these densities is symmetric in its arguments since the particles are statistically indistinguishable from each other. This further simplifies the structure of the phase space as the ordering is not relevant (fig. 1). The normalization condition is

$$\rho_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{X}^n} \rho_n(x^{(n)}) dx^{(n)} = 1 \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1. Structure of the phase space of the CDME. **a.** Phase space for a system with one chemical species  $A$ . The structure of the phase space consists of discrete sets of continuous diffusion domains  $\mathbb{X}$  depending on the number of particles. The transitions between sets depend on the specific reaction system. The arrows denote all possible first neighbor transitions between sets; transitions between farther apart neighbors are also possible but not shown. **b.** Analogous phase space but for a system with two chemical species  $A$  and  $B$ . As the phase space is symmetrized, particles of the same species are statistically indistinguishable, and thus their ordering is not relevant.

In general,  $\rho$  will also depend on time, but for simplicity, we omit this dependence from the notation. As a remark, the density  $\rho$  lives in a function space called Fock space [8, 15, 18].

For  $m$  reactions, the CDME then has the general form

$$\partial_t \rho = \left( \mathcal{D} + \sum_{r=1}^m \mathcal{R}^{(r)} \right) \rho. \quad (3)$$

It is commonly assumed that diffusion is isotropic and without drift, so the  $n$ th component of the diffusion term simply corresponds to standard Brownian motion,  $\mathcal{D}_n \rho_n = \sum_i^n D_i \rho_n$ , where  $D_i = D \nabla_i^2$  with a scalar diffusion constant  $D > 0$  and where  $\nabla_i^2$  acts on the  $i$ th component. Moreover, we assume the particles are contained in  $\mathbb{X}$ , so we impose a reflective boundary condition to the diffusion process, i.e. to each density  $\rho_n$ .

Each of the reaction operators  $\mathcal{R}^{(r)}$  corresponds to one possible reaction, and it is conveniently split into loss and gain operators,

$$\mathcal{R}^{(r)} = \mathcal{G}^{(r)} - \mathcal{L}^{(r)},$$

which yields the probability loss or gain to the current state due to the corresponding reaction. We can also write the CDME component-wise. For a system with one reaction given by a general one species reaction  $kA \rightarrow lA$ , we can write the CDME as (see fig. 2)

$$\partial_t \rho_n = \mathcal{D}_n \rho_n + \mathcal{G}_n \rho_{n+k-l} - \mathcal{L}_n \rho_n, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_n \rho_n$  yields the probability loss of the  $n$ -particle configuration into the  $n - k + l$  one. Analogously,  $\mathcal{G}_n \rho_{n+k-l}$  will yield the probability gain into the  $n$ -particle configuration due to a reaction happening at the  $n + k - l$  one, as shown in fig. 2. This will be further clarified in the examples below.

If the diffusion averages out, we lose the spatial dependence, and one would recover the well-known chemical master equation [33, 42]. Alternatively, if there are no reactions, each component of the CDME simplifies to a Fokker-Planck equation for the diffusion of a fixed number of particles. For a more detailed explanation of how to derive the CDME for general systems, the reader is referred to [12] and to [8] for a detailed account of the mathematical details of this equation. Below we formulate the equation at once for a couple of relevant examples.




FIG. 2. Diagram representing loss from and gain into the  $n$  particle state due to the reaction  $kA \rightarrow lA$  assuming  $k > l$ . The loss  $\mathcal{L}_n \rho_n$  must depend on the reactant's positions, so it is a function of  $x^{(n)}$ , while the gain  $\mathcal{G}_n \rho_{n+k-l}$  depends on the positions of the products, and thus must also be a function of  $x^{(n)}$ . Conservation of probability establishes that the total probability loss of one state must correspond to the total probability gain of the receiving state, i.e.  $\int \mathcal{L}_m \rho_m dx^{(m)} = \int \mathcal{G}_{m-k+l} \rho_m dx^{(m-k+l)}$  for any valid  $m$ . This was proved in [8].




FIG. 3. Schematic calculation of how to obtain the loss and gain terms of the CDME for degradation and creation reactions for the  $n$ -particle configuration. In all cases, it follows the same procedure: 1. calculate the loss or gain due to one possible reaction in terms of the rate function. 2. calculate the total loss due to any possible reaction. Note the rate function for the degradation case is a function of the reactant position, while for the creation is a function of the product position. In general, both the loss and gain are functions of the current particle configuration  $x^{(n)}$ . The loss depends on the reactant's positions, while it integrates over the product's positions (if any). Conversely, the gain depends on the product's positions while it integrates over the reactant's positions (if any).

### A. Degradation and creation

To derive the loss and gain terms of the CDME for degradation and creation reactions, we follow the schematic presented in fig. 3. For a simple degradation reaction,  $A \rightarrow \emptyset$ , with rate function  $\lambda_d(x)$ , where  $x$  is the position of the reactant, the  $n$ th component of the CDME has the following form (also see [8, 12]),

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n(x^{(n)}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_d(x_i^{(n)}) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_d(y) \rho_{n+1}(x^{(n)}, y) dy, \quad (5)$$

where  $D_i = D \nabla_i^2$ , the second term corresponds to the loss and the third term to the gain. Analogously, following fig. 3 again, for a simple creation reaction  $\emptyset \rightarrow A$  with rate function  $\lambda_c(x)$ , where  $x$  is the positions of the product, the CDME is given by

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n(x^{(n)}) - \rho_n(x^{(n)}) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_c(x) dx + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{n-1}(x_{/i}^{(n)}) \lambda_c(x_j^{(n)}), \quad (6)$$

where the subscript  $\{i\}$  means that the entry with index  $i$  is excluded from the tuple  $x^{(n)}$  of particle positions.

## B. Bimolecular reactions

Consider the reaction



with rate function  $\lambda(z; x, y)$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  are the locations of one pair of reactants and  $z$  is the location of the product. The stochastic dynamics of the system are described in terms of the distributions  $\rho_{n,m,l}(x^{(n)}; y^{(m)}; z^{(l)})$ , where  $n, m, l$  indicate the number of  $A, B$  and  $C$  particles, respectively, and  $x^{(n)}$  indicates positions of the  $A$  particles,  $y^{(m)}$  of the  $B$  particles and  $z^{(l)}$  of the  $C$  particles. The normalization condition is generalized to

$$\sum_{n,m,l=0}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{(n+m+l)}} \rho_{n,m,l}(x_A^{(n)}; x_B^{(m)}; x_C^{(l)}) dx_A^{(n)} dx_B^{(m)} dx_C^{(l)} = 1.$$

The CDME for this reaction has the same structure as before,  $\partial\rho/\partial t = \mathcal{D}\rho + \mathcal{R}\rho$ . The derivation follows a similar logic to fig. 3 but with additional complexity due to handling multiple species and bimolecular reactions. A detailed and general derivation of the CDME for this reaction is shown in [12]; the  $n, m, l$ th component has the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_{n,m,l} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_i^A \rho_{n,m,l} + \sum_{j=1}^m D_j^B \rho_{n,m,l} + \sum_{k=1}^l D_k^C \rho_{n,m,l} \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{n,m,l}(x^{(n)}; y^{(m)}; z^{(l)}) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda(z'; x_i^{(n)}, y_j^{(m)}) dz' \\ &+ \frac{(n+1)(m+1)}{l} \sum_{k=1}^l \int_{\mathbb{X}^2} \rho_{n+1,m+1,l-1}(x^{(n)}, x'; y^{(m)}, y'; z_{/k}^{(l)}) \lambda(z_k^{(l)}; x', y') dx' dy', \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where to simplify notation, we skipped the explicit dependence of  $\rho_{n,m,l}$  on positions and time if clear from the context. The operators  $D_i^A, D_j^B$  and  $D_k^C$  correspond to the one particle diffusion operators acting on the  $i$ th particle of the corresponding species. The second line corresponds to the loss and the third one to the gain.

To derive the CDME for more complex reaction-diffusion systems we point the reader to [8, 12, 15], where one can even use creation and annihilation operators to write down the equation [12].

## III. OPEN BOUNDARIES AND RESERVOIRS AT THE PARTICLE LEVEL

The mathematical formulation of the CDME can readily handle a variable number of particles. In this section, we show how to incorporate boundaries in contact with a reservoir that has a given bulk concentration. For simplicity, consider a system of particles of one chemical species diffusing with diffusion coefficient  $D$  in a finite one-dimensional domain  $\mathbb{X}$ . The right end of the domain ( $x = R$ ) is an open boundary in contact with the reservoir, which has a constant concentration  $c_R$ . while the left end,  $x = 0$ , is closed (reflective). To model the diffusion of incoming and outgoing particles at the open boundary, we need to add or remove particles from the system in the correct amounts, thus in principle, we can model them as creation/degradation reactions with a smart choice of rate functions.

To model the interaction with the reservoir we get inspiration from numerical approaches; we use a boundary layer glued at the right boundary. Particles move from the reservoir into the boundary layer with effective rate  $\lambda_{\text{in}}$ , and each particle can also go from the boundary layer into the reservoir with rate  $\lambda_{\text{out}}$ , see fig. 4a. To obtain explicit expressions, first consider a boundary layer  $\Omega$  of length  $\Delta x$ , i.e.  $\Omega = \{x | R - \Delta x \leq x \leq R\}$ . Each particle in the boundary layer can go into the reservoir by doing an outward “diffusive jump”. As studied in [10, 11, 26], this corresponds to  $D/\Delta x^2$ , so

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{out}}(x) = \frac{D}{\Delta x^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega}$  is the indicator function, giving a value of 1 in the boundary layer and 0 otherwise. We denote this rate with a tilde because it can be understood as a discrete approximation to a “continuous” rate acting on an infinitesimally small boundary layer. This expression hints that this rate should be given in terms of a “derivative” of a Dirac delta function (in the distributional sense)

$$\lambda_{\text{out}}(x) = D\delta'(x - R), \quad (9)$$




FIG. 4. Discretizations diagrams. **a.** Illustration of the interaction between the system and the reservoir assuming the use of discrete rates from eq. (14). The boundary layer  $\Omega$  is shown as well as its mirror region in the reservoir domain  $\hat{\Omega}$ . **b.** Diagram of one possible discretization of the Dirac delta and its derivative as a function of a small parameter  $\epsilon$ . The discretization of the Dirac delta is denoted as  $\delta_\epsilon(x)$ , and its discretized derivative as  $\delta'_\epsilon(x)$ .

such that a discretization yields  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{out}}(x)$ . This can be shown by first doing a simple discretization of the Dirac delta and its derivative in terms of a small parameter  $\epsilon$ . These are denoted by  $\delta_\epsilon(x)$  and  $\delta'_\epsilon(x)$  respectively

$$\delta_\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\epsilon - |x|}{\epsilon^2} & \text{if } |x| < \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \delta'_\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \text{sgn}(x) & \text{if } |x| < \epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The plots of these discretizations are shown in fig. 4b. If we apply this discretization to  $\delta'(x - R)$  with  $\epsilon = \Delta x$  and centered at  $R$ , the only contribution to the system domain  $(0, R)$  is the positive part. This can be written as  $\mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega} / \Delta x^2$ , which matches eq. (8). Alternative discretizations are also possible, which emphasize the utility of writing it in the form of eq. (9).

Analogously, one can imagine particles within a mirrored region of the boundary layer,  $\hat{\Omega} = \{x | R \leq x \leq R + \delta x\}$ , can jump from the reservoir into the boundary layer, each with the diffusive jump rate  $D / \Delta x^2$ . As the reservoir concentration is  $c_R$ , the number of particles within the mirrored region of the boundary layer (in the reservoir) will be  $n_R = V_{\hat{\Omega}} c_R$ , where  $V_{\hat{\Omega}}$  is the volume of  $\hat{\Omega}$ . In the one-dimensional case, the volume  $V_{\hat{\Omega}}$  is  $\delta x$ . The effective rate of incoming particles from the reservoir into the boundary layer is the sum of all the individual jump rates, thus

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{in}}(x) = \frac{1}{V_{\hat{\Omega}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_R} \frac{D}{\Delta x^2} \mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega} = \frac{D}{\Delta x^2} c_R \mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega}, \quad (11)$$

where we need to divide by  $V_{\hat{\Omega}}$  to get the right scaling with volume changes of the boundary layer. Analogously to the previous case,  $\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{in}}(x)$  can be understood as a discretization of a “continuous” rate of incoming particles

$$\lambda_{\text{in}}(x) = c_R D \delta'(x - R). \quad (12)$$

Following the CDMÉ expressions for creation and degradation reactions (eqs. (5) and (6)), we can substitute the rates we just derived and write the CDMÉ for one diffusive species with an open boundary in contact with a reservoir

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_n = & \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\text{out}}(x_i^{(n)}) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{out}}(y) \rho_{n+1}(x^{(n)}, y) dy \\ & - \rho_n(x^{(n)}) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{in}}(x) dx + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{n-1}(x_j^{(n)}) \lambda_{\text{in}}(x_j^{(n)}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

In principle, it should be possible to remove the rate  $\lambda_{\text{out}}$  and change the boundary condition for the diffusion process to be absorbing on the corresponding boundary. However, we don’t cover this case in detail. Although the “continuous” rates are more adequate to perform calculations with the CDMÉ, the discrete rates will often be more useful to perform numerical simulations. In general, if the individual diffusive particle jumping rates are  $\gamma_{\text{out}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{in}}$ , the discrete rates will be given by

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{\text{out}}(x) = \gamma_{\text{out}} \mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega} \quad \tilde{\lambda}_{\text{in}}(x) = \gamma_{\text{in}} c_R \mathbb{1}_{x \in \Omega} \quad (14)$$

These discrete rates are valid for discretizations in rectangular grids. However, if the geometry of the boundary with the reservoir is curved, this should be taken into account in the discretization. The beauty of having these expressions in terms of Dirac deltas is not only we can use them for analytical calculation, but we can also discretize them for different geometries using standard techniques [28, 31]. In [10, 11], it is shown how the diffusion discrete rates are corrected for a spherical boundary, similar approaches can be used for more complex geometries.

### A. Handling reactions at the reservoir interface

Zeroth and first-order reaction depend on zero or one particle, and thus they do not require any additional consideration at the reservoir interface. However, second-order reactions depend on two particles, so a reactant in the particle domain can react with another reactant in the reservoir. Thus, if the particle type from the reservoir is involved in a second-order reaction, we need to take these reactions into account, otherwise, we risk losing accuracy in the boundary region and consequently in the entire domain.

One can incorporate these effects by adding a term into the CDME. Consider a system with  $A$  and  $B$  particles in contact with a reservoir of  $B$  particles with concentration  $c_B$ . The particles react following  $A + B \rightarrow \emptyset$  with  $\lambda(x, y)$ , where  $x$  is the position of an  $A$  particle and  $y$  of a  $B$  particle. To emulate a reaction between an  $A$  particle in the system with a  $B$  particle from the reservoir, we add a reaction  $A \rightarrow \emptyset$  with rate  $\hat{\lambda}(x)$  given by

$$\hat{\lambda}(x) = c_B \int_{\mathcal{R}} \lambda(x, y) dy,$$

where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the reservoir domain. Following section II B and [12], the resulting CDME will be

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho_{n,m}}{\partial t} &= \sum_{i=1}^n D_{A_i} \rho_{n,m} + \sum_{j=1}^m D_{B_j} \rho_{n,m} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{n,m} \left( x^{(n)}; y^{(m)} \right) \lambda \left( x_i^{(n)}, y_j^{(m)} \right) \\ &+ (n+1)(m+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^2} \rho_{n+1,m+1} \left( x^{(n)}, x'; y^{(m)}, y' \right) \lambda \left( x', y' \right) dx' dy', \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_{\text{out}} \left( y_i^{(n)} \right) \rho_{n,m} \left( x^{(n)}; y^{(m)} \right) + (m+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{out}} \left( y' \right) \rho_{n+1} \left( x^{(n)}; y^{(m)}, y' \right) dy' \\ &- \rho_{n,m} \left( x^{(n)}; y^{(m)} \right) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{in}} \left( y \right) dy + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \rho_{n,m-1} \left( x^{(n)}; y_{/j}^{(m)} \right) \lambda_{\text{in}} \left( y_j^{(m)} \right) \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\lambda} \left( x_i^{(n)} \right) \rho_{n,m} \left( x^{(n)}; y^{(m)} \right) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \hat{\lambda} \left( y \right) \rho_{n+1,m} \left( x^{(n)}, y \right) dy, \end{aligned}$$

where the first two lines correspond to the standard CDME for  $A + B \rightarrow \emptyset$  (see [12]); the next two lines correspond to the interaction with a reservoir of  $B$  particles as derived in section III; and the last line incorporates possible reactions across the boundary with the reservoir in the form of a degradation reaction with rate  $\hat{\lambda}$ . Although the equation is cumbersome, this will facilitate the development of numerical schemes [5].

## IV. BRIDGING REACTION-DIFFUSION ACROSS SCALES

The CDME is a probabilistic description of the process at the particle level, and it thus contains all the information of the underlying process required to recover coarser descriptions. In short, it serves as a ground model to derive models at coarser scales. In principle, one can derive not only macroscopic and mesoscopic models from the CDME but also information on the stochastic fluctuations and their relations between parameters at multiple scales.

As the scope of this paper is in open systems, we focus on bridging the CDME to macroscopic open reaction-diffusion systems. This will be fundamental to developing consistent multiscale simulations of particle systems coupled with reservoirs. As the properties of reservoirs are often defined by macroscopic thermodynamic quantities, such as concentrations or temperature, we need to ensure that the particle interaction with the reservoir is consistent with the macroscopic description of the process.

In this section, we present how to—starting from the CDME—recover a well-known class of physically relevant models of macroscopic reaction-diffusion in an open setting: diffusion-influenced reactions models. To recover this type of models, we first need to show how to recover the macroscopic reaction-diffusion equations for simple creation




FIG. 5. Diagram of connections between the CDME and the reaction-diffusion PDEs (RD-PDEs) for three examples, as well as the connection between the parameters at the different scales. The PDE descriptions are recovered by taking the mean-field. Note that for linear systems the mean-field is equivalent to the large copy number limit [11, 26]. **a.** For simple linear reactions, like creation and degradation, the parameters at the particle level match those at the concentration description. **b.** For nonlinear reactions involving two reactants, such as mutual annihilation and bimolecular reactions, we choose the volume reactivity model for the rate function [16]. This depends on a microscopic rate  $\lambda_0$  and reactive distance  $\sigma$ . Our work yields the macroscopic rate in the RD-PDE in terms of the microscopic parameters. Note in this case one also requires to assume large copy numbers to neglect the covariance arising from the nonlinear reaction [26]. **c.** Although the reaction modeled is in principle nonlinear, the model focuses on the concentration of  $B$  modulated by one reservoir on one edge and a reactive boundary on the other, so the particle dynamics are effectively linear, i.e. there are no pair interactions. Our approach shows how to consistently choose the microscopic rate functions to match the macroscopic description of the open system.

and degradation reactions. For the sake of completeness, we also show this last calculation for mutual annihilation—the most simple nonlinear reaction—before jumping into the main result of this section. A summary of the results is shown in fig. 5.

### A. Degradation and creation

The starting point of this section is the CDME for degradation and creation reactions eqs. (5) and (6). The average concentration at point  $y$ ,  $c(y)$ , can be recovered from the CDME for one species using the following formula in the appendix A and [8]):

$$c(y, t) = \mathbb{E}[C(y)] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}, t) dx^{(n-1)}. \quad (15)$$

This equation is obtained by calculating the expected number of particles in a ball of radius  $\epsilon$  centered at  $y$ , dividing by the volume of the ball and taking the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . The quantity  $C(y)$  corresponds to the stochastic concentration. Applying this formula to eqs. (5) and (6), respectively, we obtain the following macroscopic reaction-diffusion equations for the average concentration for the degradation and creation cases respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t c(y, t) &= D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - \lambda_d(y) c(y, t), \\ \partial_t c(y, t) &= D \nabla^2 c(y, t) + \lambda_c(y). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

The calculation details are shown in appendix A. For higher-order reactions, these calculations become more involved and yield relations between the equation parameters at different scales. In the next section, we show an analogous calculation for the simplest bimolecular case.



## B. Mutual annihilation

To simplify the presentation, instead of using the multispecies bimolecular reaction from section II B, we focus on the mutual annihilation reaction  $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$ , which is the simplest since it only involves one chemical species. However, the result holds for the multispecies case as well. Assuming the rate function of the reaction is  $\lambda(x_1, x_2)$  where  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are the positions of the reactants, the CDME is derived analogously as before [8, 12]

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) = & \mathcal{D}_n \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{X}^2} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \rho_{n+2}(z_1, z_2, x^{(n)}) dz_1 dz_2 \\ & - \rho_n(x^{(n)}) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \lambda(x_i^{(n)}, x_j^{(n)}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We can again apply formula eq. (15) and following the steps in appendix A, we obtain the resulting equation:

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \lambda(y, x_1^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)}. \quad (18)$$

This equation is not closed since we still have the dependence on  $\rho_n$ . However, the term with the integral can be simplified further if we assume the reaction rate function has the form of an indicator function like in the well-known Doi model [16], i.e.  $\lambda(y, z) = \lambda_0 \mathbb{1}_{|y-z| \leq \sigma}$ , which means the rate is  $\lambda_0$  if particles are closer than a distance  $\sigma$  or zero otherwise. In this case, the reaction term of eq. (18) simplifies to

$$-\lambda_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-2}} \rho_n(y, z, x^{(n-2)}) dx^{(n-2)} dz = -\lambda_0 \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} \mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] dz, \quad (19)$$

where for the last equality one recognizes the expectation similarly to eq. (A1), see eq. (A2). This already allows us to write a PDE in terms of concentrations

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - \lambda_0 \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} \mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] dz \quad (20)$$

An analogous expression to this one was obtained by Doi [16] and more rigorously analyzed in [24], but the following analysis and results were not. The expected value of the product of the stochastic concentrations at  $y$  and  $z$  can be rewritten as  $\mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] = \mathbb{E}[C(y)]\mathbb{E}[C(z)] + \text{cov}[C(y), C(z)]$ . In the large volume and large copy number limit, the covariance is negligible in comparison to the product of the means [26], so we can approximate  $\mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] \approx \mathbb{E}[C(y)]\mathbb{E}[C(z)] = c(y)c(z)$ , then the reaction term simplifies further

$$-\lambda_0 \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} c(y)c(z) dz \approx -\lambda_0 c(y)^2 \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} dz \quad (21)$$

$$= -\frac{4}{3} \pi \sigma^3 \lambda_0 c(y)^2 \quad (22)$$

where the approximation in the first line consists of assuming  $\sigma$  is small enough, so the concentration  $c(z)$  in  $|y-z| \leq \sigma$  is well approximated by  $c(y)$ . The macroscopic rate is then given in terms of the microscopic parameters by the relation

$$k = \frac{4}{3} \pi \sigma^3 \lambda_0 = V_\sigma \lambda_0.$$

We recognize  $V_\sigma$  is simply the volume of the reactive region  $|y-z| \leq \sigma$ , so this result remains true in any other dimension other than three. Also note this is consistent with previous results and numerical studies based on a convergent RDME [26]. The reaction-diffusion PDE is then

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - k c(y)^2. \quad (23)$$

Note we obtained this result based on the Doi model of the reaction rate function as an indicator function and with two approximations: covariance is zero and  $c(z) \approx c(y)$  in the region  $|x-z| \leq \sigma$ . However, based on the integral term in eq. (18), we could in principle make different choices and derive alternative meso- and macroscopic models that are more adequate for the application at hand, while maintaining consistency with the processes at the particle level. To finalize this section, we will show macroscopic diffusion-influenced reactions models can also be recovered from the CDME.

### C. Diffusion-influenced reactions as a limit of the CDME

Classic examples of macroscopic reaction-diffusion models in an open setting are given by diffusion-influenced reaction models [1, 4, 16, 25, 34, 35, 38]. These models have been fundamental in the development and understanding of reaction-rate theory [19], as well as in the development of experimental techniques [9, 17]. They describe the reaction between a macromolecule  $A$  and smaller molecules  $B$ :  $A + B \rightarrow C$ . The setup is as follows: assume there is one  $A$  fixed at the origin and many  $B$  molecules diffuse freely in three dimensions around  $A$  with a diffusion coefficient  $D$ . If a  $B$  molecule reaches  $A$ , it can react with some given rate  $\kappa$ . On the far field, we assume there is a reservoir of  $B$  molecules with constant concentration  $c_R$ , so the system is open. Given the symmetry of the problem, we can focus on the dynamics of chemical  $B$  along the radial variable  $r$ . The concentration gradient of  $B$  molecules around  $A$  is denoted by  $c(r, t)$ , and it obeys the Smoluchowski equation [4, 38]

$$\partial_t c(r, t) = D\nabla^2 c(r, t), \quad (24)$$

where the Laplacian is in spherical coordinates and with boundary conditions

$$4\pi\sigma^2 D\partial_r c(r, t)\Big|_{r=\sigma} = \kappa c(\sigma, t), \quad c(R, t) = c_R. \quad (25)$$

The reaction is modeled by the first boundary condition at the reaction boundary  $r = \sigma$  given by the sum of the molecules  $A$  and  $B$  radii. It states that the flux of  $B$  particles across this boundary is proportional to the concentration at the boundary. At the particle level, this means that whenever a  $B$  molecule reaches  $\sigma$  by diffusion, a reaction occurs with rate  $\kappa$ , which controls the degree of diffusion influence in the reaction rate. The purely diffusion-controlled result  $c(\sigma, t) = 0$  [38] is recovered as a special case in the limit  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ . The second boundary condition models the system being in contact with the reservoir at  $r = R$  with constant concentration  $c_R$ .

One can recast this problem probabilistically at the particle level by writing a CDME in an open setting. Assume an arbitrary and variable number of  $B$  particles diffuse in a three-dimensional domain delimited by the spherical region  $r \in [\sigma, R]$ . We further assume the diffusion process itself is reflective at both boundaries  $r = \sigma$  and  $r = R$ . However, if a  $B$  particle reaches  $r = \sigma$ , a degradation reaction can occur with rate  $\kappa$ . Moreover, in the far-field  $r = R$ , the system is in contact with a reservoir with constant concentration  $c_R$ . Following section III, this can be modeled as a combination of one creation and one degradation reaction (section II A). Thus, we can now write the CDME for this system; its  $n$ th component is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho_n}{\partial t} = & D \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_i^2 \rho_n - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_r(x_i^{(n)}) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_r(y) \rho_{n+1}(x^{(n)}, y) dy \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{\text{out}}(x_i^{(n)}) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{out}}(y) \rho_{n+1}(x^{(n)}, y) dy \\ & - \rho_n(x^{(n)}) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_{\text{in}}(x) dx + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{n-1}(x_{/j}^{(n)}) \lambda_{\text{in}}(x_j^{(n)}), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with

$$\lambda_r(x) = \kappa \delta(x - x_\sigma), \quad \lambda_{\text{out}}(x) = D\nabla \delta(x - x_R), \quad \lambda_{\text{in}}(x) = c_R D\nabla \delta(x - x_R), \quad (27)$$

with  $\|x_\sigma\| = \sigma$  and  $\|x_R\| = R$ . The rate function  $\lambda_r$  models that as soon as a particle is at  $r = \sigma$ , it reacts with rate  $\kappa$ . The interaction with the reservoir is modulated by  $\lambda_{\text{out}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{in}}$  as done in section III, where the derivatives were switched to gradients since now we are in three dimensions. This CDME is more general than the original diffusion-influenced reaction model as it describes the evolution of the whole probability distribution of the open system. Note we kept the equation in Cartesian coordinates instead of spherical ones to facilitate the following calculation.

As the interaction at the boundaries is regulated by the reaction and the reservoir, they are all modeled through creation or degradation reactions. Thus, to recover eq. (24), we first apply the results from section IV A for diffusion and creation/degradation reactions, which yields an equation for the average concentration

$$\partial_t c(x, t) = D\nabla^2 c(x, t) - \lambda_r(x)c(x, t) - \lambda_{\text{out}}(x)c(x, t) + \lambda_{\text{in}}(x). \quad (28)$$

The diffusion term is already analogous to the one in eq. (24). We only need to show that the source terms of this equation are equivalent to the boundary conditions from eq. (25). Due to the spherical symmetry of the problem neither the concentration nor the rates depend on the angular coordinates, so the equation in spherical coordinates is

$$\partial_t (c(r, t)) = \frac{D}{r^2} \partial_r (r^2 \partial_r c(r, t)) - \lambda_r(r)c(r, t) - \lambda_{\text{out}}(r)c(r, t) + \lambda_{\text{in}}(r), \quad (29)$$

with

$$\lambda_r(r) = \kappa \frac{\delta(r - \sigma)}{4\pi r^2}, \quad \lambda_{\text{out}}(r) = D \partial_r \left( \frac{\delta(r - R)}{4\pi r^2} \right), \quad \lambda_{\text{in}}(r) = c_R D \partial_r \left( \frac{\delta(r - R)}{4\pi r^2} \right), \quad (30)$$

where there is an additional rescaling per unit area due to the geometry that goes inversely to the spherical surface of the reactive or reservoir boundary. To recover the first boundary condition at  $r = \sigma$ ; we integrate eq. (29) across the boundary from  $\sigma - \epsilon$  to  $\sigma + \epsilon$  in spherical coordinates, which yields

$$\partial_t \int_{\sigma - \epsilon}^{\sigma + \epsilon} c(r, t) 4\pi r^2 dr = 4\pi D \left[ r^2 \partial_r c(r, t) \right]_{\sigma - \epsilon}^{\sigma + \epsilon} - \int_{\sigma - \epsilon}^{\sigma + \epsilon} \kappa c(r, t) \delta(r - \sigma) dr, \quad (31)$$

since all the other terms are zero close to  $r = \sigma$ . Due to continuity, as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , then

$$4\pi \sigma^2 D \partial_r c(r, t) \Big|_{r=\sigma} = \kappa c(\sigma, t), \quad (32)$$

where we assumed the concentration at  $r < \sigma$  is zero and thus  $\partial c / \partial r$  is also zero in this region. One can show this formally by solving the PDE in the domain  $r \in [0, R]$  and use the jump of the derivative at  $r = \sigma$  as an interface condition. This recovers the first boundary condition from eq. (25).

To recover the second boundary condition, we do not get useful information if we simply integrate across the boundary  $r = R$ . Instead, we first do a spatial indefinite integral of eq. (29)

$$\partial_t \int c(r, t) 4\pi r^2 dr - 4\pi D r^2 \frac{\partial c(r, t)}{\partial r} - \int \lambda_r c(r, t) 4\pi r^2 dr + A = D \int \partial_r \left( \frac{\delta(x - R)}{r^2} \right) (c_R - c(r, t)) r^2 dr, \quad (33)$$

with  $A$  an integration constant. The integral on the right-hand side is solved by using integration by parts ( $\int \delta'(x) f(x) dx = f(0) \delta(x) - f'(0) H(x) + \text{constant}$ ). Then, we integrate again from  $R - \epsilon$  to  $R + \epsilon$ , and as we take the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , all the terms on the left-hand side as well as constants will vanish due to continuity. Thus, we are left with

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{R - \epsilon}^{R + \epsilon} \left[ \delta(x - R) (c_R - c(R, t)) - H(r - R) \left( \frac{2}{R} c_R - \frac{2}{R} c(R, t) - c'(R, t) \right) \right] 4\pi D r^2 dr = 0 \quad (34)$$

with  $c'(r, t) = \partial_r c(r, t)$  and  $H(x)$  the Heaviside function. The terms with the Heaviside function also vanish as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , and we are left with the integral with the Dirac delta, which implies

$$c(R, t) = c_R, \quad (35)$$

yielding the second boundary condition from eq. (25). We just showed eq. (28) is equivalent to the original formulation of diffusion-influenced reactions (eq. (24) with boundary conditions given by eq. (25)). Thus, the original formulation of diffusion-influenced reactions can be understood as the macroscopic limit that emerges when taking average concentrations of the corresponding CDME. It can also be shown this is equivalent to the large copy number limit [11]. Other formulations of diffusion-influenced reaction theory, including [1, 39, 40] can be reformulated as special cases of the CDME following similar procedures.

From a computational perspective, we just showed that particle-based reaction-diffusion schemes based on the CDME should yield consistent behavior with macroscopic descriptions, particularly regarding reservoir interactions.

### 1. A remark about the interpretation of diffusion-influenced reactions models

In its original formulation, the theory of diffusion-influenced reactions is applied to the system  $A + B \rightarrow C$  to obtain an effective diffusion-influenced reaction rate. This is calculated as the flux at the reactive boundary  $r = \sigma$  of the steady state solution to eqs. (24) and (25) as  $R \rightarrow \infty$  [10]. This yields the diffusion-influenced reaction rate

$$k_D = \frac{\kappa k_S}{\kappa + k_S}, \quad \text{with } k_S = 4\pi \sigma D, \quad (36)$$

where in the limit  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $k_D$  tends to the diffusion-controlled rate  $k_S$ , original Smoluchowski's result [38]. In the formulation of the problem,  $C$  is not relevant and  $A$  is centered at the origin, so the same result would hold for the system  $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$ . Then the question arises: what is the connection between this theory and the formulation of

mutual annihilation from section IV B? This question was asked by Doi in [16], and it remains a relevant issue. In short, diffusion-influenced reaction theory managed to compress many probabilistic arguments into a simple model, and thus a clear interpretation at the particle level was not trivial [16, 40].

One can reinterpret the theory in terms of the first reaction time between a pair of particles [40], one fixed at the origin ( $A$ ) and one diffusing ( $B$ ). The inner boundary of the domain ( $r = \sigma$ ) is reactive while the outer boundary ( $r = R$ ) is reflective. One can then calculate the mean first passage time (average time at which  $B$  reacts). The rate eq. (36) is simply the inverse of this mean first passage time as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ , which is conveniently independent of the initial position. This problem can also be rewritten as a CDME for one diffusive particle with one reactive and one reflective boundary, which is indeed the starting point in [40]. As there are no particle interactions except for those emulated by the reactive boundary, the system is linear, so studying the ensemble average of many of these systems is equivalent to studying the mean behavior of the corresponding many-particle system. The probabilistic model based on the CDME from eq. (26) is indeed this many-particle system, and its mean behavior thus matches that of the first passage time theory [40]. However, there is one crucial difference: the boundary condition in the outer boundary is only equivalent as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . The limit  $R \rightarrow \infty$  corresponds to the large copy number limit, as the number of particles must go to infinity to cover an infinite volume. In our work, we are interested in open finite-size systems that are coupled to a reservoir, so it is a substantial difference since we truly model the open system probabilistically. This is essential to develop consistent particle-based simulations in open settings.

Now that we clarified the particle interpretation, one should be able to recover, at least approximately, the diffusion-influenced reaction rate (eq. (36)) from the equation for the dynamics of the mean concentration of the mutual annihilation example (eq. (37)) by integrating the spatial degrees of freedom, i.e.

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}} \left( D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - \lambda_0 \int_{|y-z| \leq \sigma} \mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] dz \right) dy \rightarrow k_{\text{D}} c(t)^2 \quad (37)$$

with  $c(t) = \int_{\mathbb{X}} c(y, t) dy$  as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . To the best of our knowledge, this has not been shown analytically, but its convergence can be tested numerically as  $R \rightarrow \infty$ . For the special case  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ , this was shown analytically by Doi [16].

## V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

To summarize, we extended the CDME—the master equation for the probabilistic dynamics of reaction-diffusion processes at the particle level—to incorporate interactions with macroscopic material reservoirs. This is achieved by emulating the flux of particles into and out of the reservoir through creation and degradation reactions using localized rate functions with a specific form. We further presented a methodology to recover macroscopic concentration-based descriptions from particle-based probabilistic descriptions. This consists of taking an expectation on the CDME that yields an equation for the average concentration field. We showcased the methodology for linear and nonlinear reactions, as well as for an archetypal model of an open reaction-diffusion system: diffusion-influenced reactions. The linear case is relatively straightforward, while the nonlinear case requires additional considerations to obtain closed equations, such as restricting the form of the rate function and large copy number limits. Both recovered well-known reaction-diffusion PDEs for the evolution of the concentration. For the diffusion-influenced reactions case, we built the particle-based description based on the CDME with reservoir interaction developed at the start of this work. The resulting concentration-based model matches the well-known macroscopic model, Smoluchowski's equation, with its corresponding boundary conditions. We finally showed how the CDME is used to interpret other formulations of diffusion-influenced reactions. The results in this work thus bridge probabilistic theory for open reaction-diffusion systems across scales, laying the foundations for a multiscale framework for reaction-diffusion processes.

The framework not only connects microscopic probabilistic models at the particle level with macroscopic deterministic concentration-based models but also yields connections between the parameters at the different scales. The bridging between the micro and the macroscopic scales requires taking certain limits and approximations. By imposing restrictions on these approximations, the framework has the potential to yield mesoscopic models. For instance, in the case of mutual annihilation of section IV B, one could keep the covariance term in eq. (37) and approximate it differently or perhaps obtain an additional equation for the covariances by taking the second moment of the CDME. Such a model could potentially be re-framed in the form of a stochastic PDE, which works at the concentration level but still preserves information about fluctuations. More generally, one can use this framework to construct consistent multiscale models. A representative example is already within this work. In section IV C, the CDME (microscopic) is coupled with a reservoir with constant concentration (macroscopic). We thus know how to model the particle-based system in contact with a macroscopic reservoir consistently such that in the mean-field/large copy number limit the expected macroscopic dynamics are recovered.

This work has natural applications in the development of numerical schemes, e.g. [2, 7, 13, 27, 36, 37, 42]. The CDME provides a ground truth for the particle-based model from which one can derive coarser models, yielding mathematical bridges between the models and parameters at different scales. Based on these “bridges”, one can in principle construct multiscale simulation schemes for reaction-diffusion processes that are consistent across scales. For instance, one can apply a Galerkin discretization to the CDME [8] and recover the reaction-diffusion master equation [22] or the spatiotemporal master equation [41], both spatially discretized forms of the CDME. As the discretization is built based on the underlying CDME, one organically obtains a convergent equation in the continuous limit, so one can construct multiscale schemes with adaptive resolution. Another example is on section IV B where we obtain a connection between the rates of the particle-based dynamics and the concentration-based PDE. This could be used to couple particle-based simulations with reaction-diffusion PDEs [11, 26]. A full second paper is being written devoted exclusively to the development of multiscale numerical schemes for these processes [5].

As a closing remark, the multiscale framework/workflow introduced here can be extended to much more complex settings. As mentioned in the work [6], one can extend the CDME to a master equation for general dynamical systems with varying particle numbers. For instance, the diffusion part can model classical systems by incorporating the velocity into the dynamics, while the reaction part can be any process that changes the particle numbers, such as reactions or reservoir interactions, as emphasized in this work. This would yield a master equation for Langevin dynamics with varying particle numbers with potential applications to molecular systems. In such a case, one can in principle also apply similar procedures to yield multiscale models and simulations that are consistent across scales.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) grant no. RA 3601/1-1. The author also thanks Stefanie Winkelmann, Felix Höfling and Luigi Delle Site for insightful discussions.

## Appendix A: CDME to concentration descriptions

We can recover the mean concentration from the CDME for one species using the following formula (see eq. (115) in ref. 8):

$$\begin{aligned} c(y, t) &= \mathbb{E}[C(y)] = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\text{vol}(B_\epsilon)(y)} \mathbb{E}[N_B(y)] \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}, t) dx^{(n-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

This equation is derived in [8] by calculating the expected number of particles  $\mathbb{E}[N_B(y)]$  in a ball of radius  $\epsilon$  centered at  $y$ :  $B_\epsilon(y)$ . Then one divides by the volume of the ball and takes the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ , which is the average molecular concentration at point  $y$ . One can similarly obtain the covariances

$$\mathbb{E}[C(y)C(z)] = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-2}} \rho_n(y, z, x^{(n-2)}, t) dx^{(n-2)}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Note in all calculations below we often omit the explicit dependence of  $\rho_n(x^{(n)}, t)$  and  $c(y, t)$  on time to simplify notation.

### 1. Degradation

Let us consider the degradation reaction  $A \rightarrow \emptyset$ . The corresponding CDME reads

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n(x^{(n)}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_d(x_i^{(n)}) + (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_d(y) \rho_{n+1}(x^{(n)}, y) dy \rho_n(x^{(n)}). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Following eq. (A1), we can integrate and apply the sum to obtain an evolution equation for the mean concentration. For simplicity, we omit time dependence from the notation in the calculations below, and instead of  $(x^{(n)})$ , we often

write  $(y, x^{(n-1)})$ . The left-hand side is

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \partial_t \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} = \partial_t c(y). \quad (\text{A4})$$

The diffusion term simplifies as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \mathcal{D}_n \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} D_1 \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=2}^n D_i \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= \mathcal{D}c(y) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=2}^n D_i \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where  $D_i$  is the diffusion operator acting on the  $i$ th component of  $\rho_n$ . Assuming  $D_i \rho_n = D\nabla \cdot \nabla_i \rho_n$ , we can apply Gauss theorem to the core of the second term

$$\int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} D\nabla \cdot \nabla_i \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} = \int_{\partial \mathbb{X}^{n-1}} D\nabla_i \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \cdot \hat{\nu} dS. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Assuming there is no flux across the domain boundary, this term is zero and the diffusion is simply  $\mathcal{D}c(y, t) = D\nabla^2 c(y, t)$ . Applying the same operations to the reaction terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \left( (n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_d(z) \rho_{n+1}(y, z, x^{(n-1)}) dz - \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_d((y, x^{(n-1)})_i) \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \right) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n+1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^n} \lambda_d(z) \rho_{n+1}(y, z, x^{(n-1)}) dz dx^{(n-1)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_d((y, x^{(n-1)})_i) \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_d(z) \rho_n(y, z, x^{(n-2)}) dz dx^{(n-2)} \\ &\quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_d(y) \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_d(z) \rho_n(y, z, x^{(n-2)}) dz dx^{(n-2)} \\ &= - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_d(y) \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\ &= -\lambda_d(y)c(y), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the two terms in the second and third line were handled as follows: for the first one, we adjusted the index of the sum and for the second one, we split the inner sum into its first component and the rest. Gathering all the results above, we recover the PDE for the mean concentration

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D\nabla^2 c(y, t) - \lambda_d(y)c(y, t). \quad (\text{A8})$$

## 2. Creation

Analogously, for the spontaneous creation,  $\emptyset \longrightarrow A$ , the CDME is

$$\partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n D_i \rho_n(x^{(n)}) - \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_c(y) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) dy + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{n-1}(x_{/i}^{(n)}) \lambda_c(x_i^{(n)}). \quad (\text{A9})$$

Applying eq. (A1) again, we can obtain an equation for the mean concentration. The diffusion will have the same form as in the example before, so we concentrate on the reaction terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_c(x_i^{(n)}) \rho_{n-1}(x_{\setminus\{i\}}^{(n)}) - \int_{\mathbb{X}} \lambda_c(y) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) dy \right) dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} \\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_c(x_1^{(n)}) \rho_{n-1}(x_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)}) dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda_c(x_2^{(n)}) \rho_{n-1}(x_{\setminus\{2\}}^{(n)}) dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^n} \lambda_c(y) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) dy dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} \\
&= \lambda_c(x_1^{(n)}) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_{n-1}(x_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)}) dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^n} \lambda_c(x_2^{(n+1)}) \rho_n(x_{\setminus\{2\}}^{(n+1)}) dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n+1)} \\
&\quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^n} \lambda_c(y) \rho_n(x^{(n)}) dy dx_{\setminus\{1\}}^{(n)} \\
&= \lambda_c(x_1^{(n)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

In the second line, we split the first term into two parts, one for the first term of the inner sum and the other one for the rest. We later rearranged the index of the second term and used that the total probability sums to one in the first term. The PDE for the mean concentration is then

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D \nabla^2 c(y, t) + \lambda_c(y). \tag{A11}$$

### 3. Mutual annihilation

Let us consider the mutual annihilation reaction  $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$  with rate function  $\lambda(x_1, x_2)$  depending on the reactant's positions. The corresponding CDME is given in eq. (17), and it reads [8, 12],

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho_n(x^{(n)}) &= \mathcal{D}_n \rho_n(x^{(n)}) + \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{X}^2} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \rho_{n+2}(z_1, z_2, x^{(n)}) dz_1 dz_2 \\
&\quad - \rho_n(x^{(n)}) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \lambda(x_i^{(n)}, x_j^{(n)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{A12}$$

We apply eq. (A1) again. The diffusion will have the same form as before, so we focus on the reaction terms. The calculations follow a similar logic as in the examples before. The reaction term is the sum of the gain term and the loss term. Applying eq. (A1) to the gain term yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \left( \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{X}^2} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \rho_{n+2}(y, z_1, z_2, x^{(n-1)}) dz_1 dz_2 \right) dx^{(n-1)} \\
&= \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda(z_1, z_2) \rho_n(y, z_1, z_2, x^{(n-3)}) dz_1 dz_2 dx^{(n-3)},
\end{aligned} \tag{A13}$$

where we simply adjusted the index of the sum and rewrote the integrals under one sign. Analogously, for the loss

term

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \left( \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \lambda \left( [y, x^{(n-1)}]_i, [y, x^{(n-1)}]_j \right) \right) dx^{(n-1)} \\
& = - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \left( \sum_{j=2}^n \lambda \left( y, x_{j-1}^{(n-1)} \right) + \sum_{2 \leq i < j \leq n} \lambda \left( x_{i-1}^{(n-1)}, x_{j-1}^{(n-1)} \right) \right) dx^{(n-1)} \\
& = - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \lambda(y, x_1^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)} \\
& \quad - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2} \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \lambda(x_1^{(n-1)}, x_2^{(n-1)}) \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)},
\end{aligned} \tag{A14}$$

where in the first step we separated the sum into the  $i = 1$  term and the rest. In the second step, we simply used the symmetry within the rate functions because particles of the same species are indistinguishable. We obtain the reaction term by summing up the gain and loss terms from eq. (A13) and eq. (A14). Only one term survives:

$$- \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \lambda(y, x_1^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)}, \tag{A15}$$

so the resulting equation is

$$\partial_t c(y, t) = D \nabla^2 c(y, t) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n(n-1) \int_{\mathbb{X}^{n-1}} \rho_n(y, x^{(n-1)}) \lambda(y, x_1^{(n-1)}) dx^{(n-1)}. \tag{A16}$$

This is not yet a closed equation, but it can be simplified further if we make additional assumptions on the form of the rate function. Analogous derivations for higher moments will be studied in other work that concentrates exclusively on calculating moment expansions of the CDME.

- 
- [1] N. Agmon and A. Szabo. Theory of reversible diffusion-influenced reactions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 92(9):5270–5284, 1990.
  - [2] D. F. Anderson and T. G. Kurtz. *Stochastic analysis of biochemical systems*, volume 674. Springer, 2015.
  - [3] T. Britton and E. Pardoux, editors. *Stochastic Epidemic Models with Inference*. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
  - [4] F. C. Collins and G. E. Kimball. Diffusion-controlled reaction rates. *J. Colloid Sci.*, 4(4):425–437, 1949.
  - [5] M. J. del Razo. Open reaction-diffusion systems II: bridging simulations across scales. (*in preparation*), 2024.
  - [6] M. J. del Razo and L. Delle Site. Dynamics of systems with varying number of particles: from liouville equations to general master equations for open systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14517*, 2024.
  - [7] M. J. Del Razo, M. Dibak, C. Schütte, and F. Noé. Multiscale molecular kinetics by coupling markov state models and reaction-diffusion dynamics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 155(12), 2021.
  - [8] M. J. del Razo, D. Frömberg, A. V. Straube, C. Schütte, F. Höfling, and S. Winkelmann. A probabilistic framework for particle-based reaction-diffusion dynamics using classical Fock space representations. *Lett. Math. Phys.*, 112(3):Paper No. 49, 59, 2022.
  - [9] M. J. Del Razo, W. Pan, H. Qian, and G. Lin. Fluorescence correlation spectroscopy and nonlinear stochastic reaction-diffusion. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 118(25):7037–7046, 2014.
  - [10] M. J. del Razo and H. Qian. A discrete stochastic formulation for reversible bimolecular reactions via diffusion encounter. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 14(6):1741–1772, 2016.
  - [11] M. J. Del Razo, H. Qian, and F. Noé. Grand canonical diffusion-influenced reactions: A stochastic theory with applications to multiscale reaction-diffusion simulations. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 149(4):044102, 2018.
  - [12] M. J. del Razo, S. Winkelmann, R. Klein, and F. Höfling. Chemical diffusion master equation: Formulations of reaction-diffusion processes on the molecular level. *J. Math. Phys.*, 64(1):013304, 2023.
  - [13] M. Dibak, M. J. Del Razo, D. De Sancho, C. Schütte, and F. Noé. Msm/rd: Coupling markov state models of molecular kinetics with reaction-diffusion simulations. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 148(21), 2018.
  - [14] N. Djurdjevic Conrad, L. Helfmann, J. Zonker, S. Winkelmann, and C. Schütte. Human mobility and innovation spreading in ancient times: a stochastic agent-based simulation approach. *EPJ Data Science*, 7:1–22, 2018.
  - [15] M. Doi. Second quantization representation for classical many-particle system. *J. Phys. A Math. Gen.*, 9(9):1465, 1976.
  - [16] M. Doi. Stochastic theory of diffusion-controlled reaction. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 9(9):1479, 1976.
  - [17] E. L. Elson. Fluorescence correlation spectroscopy: past, present, future. *Biophys. J.*, 101(12):2855–2870, 2011.



- [18] P. Grassberger and M. Scheunert. Fock-space methods for identical classical objects. *Fortschritte der Physik*, 28(10):547–578, 1980.
- [19] P. Hänggi, P. Talkner, and M. Borkovec. Reaction-rate theory: fifty years after kramers. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 62(2):251, 1990.
- [20] L. Helfmann, N. Djurdjevic Conrad, P. Lorenz-Spreen, and C. Schütte. Modelling opinion dynamics under the impact of influencer and media strategies. *Sci. Rep.*, 13(1):19375, 2023.
- [21] C. Hijón, P. Español, E. Vanden-Eijnden, and R. Delgado-Buscalioni. Mori–zwanzig formalism as a practical computational tool. *Faraday Discuss.*, 144:301–322, 2010.
- [22] S. A. Isaacson and D. Isaacson. Reaction-diffusion master equation, diffusion-limited reactions, and singular potentials. *Phys. Rev. E*, 80(6):066106, 2009.
- [23] S. A. Isaacson, J. Ma, and K. Spiliopoulos. How reaction-diffusion pdes approximate the large-population limit of stochastic particle models. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 81(6):2622–2657, 2021.
- [24] S. A. Isaacson, J. Ma, and K. Spiliopoulos. Mean field limits of particle-based stochastic reaction-diffusion models. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 54(1):453–511, 2022.
- [25] J. Keizer. Diffusion effects on rapid bimolecular chemical reactions. *Chem. rev.*, 87(1):167–180, 1987.
- [26] M. Kostré, C. Schütte, F. Noé, and M. J. del Razo. Coupling particle-based reaction-diffusion simulations with reservoirs mediated by reaction-diffusion pdes. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 19(4):1659–1683, 2021.
- [27] C. Lester, C. A. Yates, M. B. Giles, and R. E. Baker. An adaptive multi-level simulation algorithm for stochastic biological systems. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 142(2), 2015.
- [28] Z. Li and K. Ito. *The immersed interface method: numerical solutions of PDEs involving interfaces and irregular domains*. SIAM, 2006.
- [29] N. Malysheva, J. Wang, and M. von Kleist. Stochastic simulation algorithm for effective spreading dynamics on time-evolving adaptive networkx (ssatan-x). *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.*, 17:35, 2022.
- [30] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical Biology*, volume 1,2. Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [31] C. S. Peskin. The immersed boundary method. *Acta Numer.*, 11:479–517, 2002.
- [32] H. Qian. Phosphorylation energy hypothesis: open chemical systems and their biological functions. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 58:113–142, 2007.
- [33] H. Qian and L. M. Bishop. The chemical master equation approach to nonequilibrium steady-state of open biochemical systems: Linear single-molecule enzyme kinetics and nonlinear biochemical reaction networks. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, 11(9):3472–3500, 2010.
- [34] S. A. Rice. *Diffusion-limited reactions*. Elsevier, 1985.
- [35] D. Shoup and A. Szabo. Role of diffusion in ligand binding to macromolecules and cell-bound receptors. *Biophys. J*, 40(1):33–39, 1982.
- [36] C. A. Smith and C. A. Yates. The auxiliary region method: a hybrid method for coupling pde-and brownian-based dynamics for reaction–diffusion systems. *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, 5(8):180920, 2018.
- [37] C. A. Smith and C. A. Yates. Spatially extended hybrid methods: a review. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 15(139):20170931, 2018.
- [38] M. v. Smoluchowski. Versuch einer mathematischen theorie der koagulationskinetik kolloider lösungen. *Z. Phys. Chem.*, 92(1):129–168, 1918.
- [39] A. Szabo. Theory of diffusion-influenced fluorescence quenching. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 93(19):6929–6939, 1989.
- [40] A. Szabo, K. Schulten, and Z. Schulten. First passage time approach to diffusion controlled reactions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 72(8):4350–4357, 1980.
- [41] S. Winkelmann and C. Schütte. The spatiotemporal master equation: Approximation of reaction-diffusion dynamics via markov state modeling. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 145(21), 2016.
- [42] S. Winkelmann and C. Schütte. *Stochastic dynamics in computational biology*, volume 645. Springer, 2020.
- [43] S. Winkelmann, J. Zonker, C. Schütte, and N. D. Conrad. Mathematical modeling of spatio-temporal population dynamics and application to epidemic spreading. *Math. Biosci.*, 336:108619, 2021.
- [44] R. Zwanzig. *Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*. Oxford university press, 2001.