

Determining the Possibility of Multistationarity in a Model of the Earth Carbon Cycle with Direct Air Capture

Noel T. Fortun¹, Angelyn R. Lao^{1,2,3}, Eduardo R. Mendoza^{1,2,4}, and Luis F. Razon⁵

¹Department of Mathematics and Statistics, De La Salle University, Manila 0922, Philippines

²Systems and Computational Biology Research Unit, Center for Natural Sciences and Environmental Research, De La Salle University, Manila 0922, Philippines

³Center for Complexity and Emerging Technologies, 2401 Taft Avenue, Manila, 0922, Metro Manila, Philippine

⁴Max Planck Institute of Biochemistry, Martinsried near Munich, Germany

⁵Department of Chemical Engineering, De La Salle University, Manila 0922, Philippines

Correspondence: Noel T. Fortun (noel.fortun@dlsu.edu.ph)

Abstract. The multistationarity or the existence of steady-state multiplicity in the Earth System raises the possibility that the Earth may reach a “tipping point” and rapidly transition to a warmer steady-state from which recovery may be practically impossible. In detailed Earth models that require extensive computation time, it is difficult to make an a priori prediction of the possibility of multistationarity. In this study, we demonstrate Chemical Reaction Network Theory (CRNT) analysis of a simple heuristic box model of the Earth System carbon cycle with the human intervention of Direct Air Capture. The analysis reveals necessary conditions for the combination of system parameters where steady-state multiplicity may exist. With this method, other negative emissions technologies (NET) may be screened in a relatively simple manner to aid in the priority setting by policymakers.

1 Introduction

Carbon dioxide removal (CDR) technologies play a crucial role in mitigating climate change by removing CO₂ from the atmosphere. These technologies encompass a variety of methods such as afforestation, reforestation, direct air capture, and bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (Galan-Martin et al., 2021; Kerner et al., 2023). Implementing CDR technologies is vital in achieving the goals set out in the Paris Agreement, which aims to keep the global mean surface temperature well below 2°C and target 1.5°C (IPCC, 2022).

Specifically, Direct Air Carbon Capture (DAC) represents a state-of-the-art solution in the fight against climate change. By capturing carbon dioxide directly from the atmosphere, DAC may help reduce the levels of this greenhouse gas, thereby lessening the impact of global warming. In this technology, carbon dioxide is directly captured from the atmosphere using chemical absorbents. The captured carbon is securely stored in geological formations, preventing its release back into the atmosphere (Kerner et al., 2023; Qiu et al., 2022).

As researchers delve deeper into the complexities of climate change, the concept of climate tipping points has emerged as a key area of interest (Dakos et al., 2024; Foley, 2005; Anderies et al., 2013, 2023). These tipping points represent moments when

the climate system reaches a threshold and undergoes self-perpetuating changes, leading to profound and possibly irreversible impacts on our planet. Understanding and anticipating these tipping points is essential to formulate successful approaches for lessening the impact of climate change. Researchers have developed sophisticated models, primarily utilizing numerical simulations, to simulate the intricate dynamics of multistationarity in the global carbon system (Dakos et al., 2024). However, the challenge lies in pinpointing the precise conditions that can trigger multistationarity within the system (Qiu et al., 2022; Realmonte et al., 2019; Lehtveer and Emanuelsson, 2021; Anderies et al., 2023).

In this study, we investigate the potential of the global carbon system with DAC intervention to exhibit multiple steady states using a methodology based on reaction networks. The initial step involves constructing a “chemical reaction” network that mirrors the dynamic behavior and characteristics of the particular global carbon system being studied. Through the utilization of chemical reaction network theory (CRNT), essential features such as the system’s potential for multiple steady states swiftly come to light.

CRNT offers a distinctive advantage as it concentrates on the topological properties and kinetics of the network itself, without the need to specify system rate constants. This attribute is particularly valuable when analyzing systems where such parameter values remain unknown. By providing a rate-constant-free analysis, CRNT emerges as a powerful tool for unraveling the complexities of systems with uncertain rate-constant information, thereby enhancing our understanding of the dynamic behavior within the global carbon system.

2 Method

2.1 The DAC model

The pre-industrial system of Anderies et al. (2013) forms the building block for developing and examining the global carbon cycle system with DAC intervention. The modeling framework utilized here relies on ordinary differential equations (ODEs) where all processes are modeled by products of power law functions. More precisely, a Generalized Mass Action (GMA) system is an ODE system established by individually approximating each process in the system with a power-law term Savageau (1998, 1969); Voit (2000); Voit and Schwacke (2006); Voit (2013); Torres and Voit (2002). These terms are then aggregated, with incoming fluxes indicated by a plus sign and outgoing fluxes by a minus sign.

The procedure for deriving power-law approximations of rate functions is based on Taylor linearization in logarithmic coordinates. Consider a rate function that relies on two variables, for instance, $v(A_1, A_2)$. When calculating the power-law estimation, start by selecting a reference point, such as a steady state. By linearizing in logarithmic coordinates, v can be approximated as a product of power-law functions formatted as

$$v(A_1, A_2) \approx \kappa A_1^p A_2^q. \tag{1}$$

The kinetic orders p and q represent the slopes of the approximating function in logarithmic coordinates. These values are calculated by taking partial derivatives of v with respect to A_1 or A_2 :

$$p = \frac{\partial v}{\partial A_1} \cdot \frac{A_1}{v} \text{ and } q = \frac{\partial v}{\partial A_2} \cdot \frac{A_2}{v}. \quad (2)$$

These are evaluated at some operating point (A_1, A_2) of choice, which is typically the steady state. The factor κ is given by $\kappa = v(A_1, A_2) \cdot A_1^{-p} \cdot A_2^{-q}$, which is derived from Equation (1). Its value is computed at the same chosen operating point, and p and q are evaluated from Equations (2).


Note, however, that while the numerical values of kinetic order and rate constant may vary based on the operating point chosen, the structure of the approximation remains consistent as a power-law function of the form $\kappa A_1^p A_2^q$. This suggests that one can symbolically establish the approximation without a detailed knowledge of the exact structure of the underlying process (Torres and Voit, 2002).

In this study, we analyze the ODE system of a carbon cycle model with DAC intervention specified in Figure 1(b). This system is an extension of the GMA system of the pre-industrial carbon cycle of Anderies et al. (2013), which was derived and described by Fortun et al. (2018). Building upon the initial three-box model that considers carbon interactions in the land-atmosphere-ocean system of Anderies et al. (2013), denoted by A_1 , A_2 and A_3 respectively, the model extension shown schematically in Figure 1(a) includes the industrial carbon transfer activities, such as fossil fuel combustion, that lead to the transfer of carbon geological stock (A_4) to the atmosphere. DAC intervention is introduced by incorporating an extra box to store carbon directly sequestered from the atmosphere (A_5). The rate of transfer is also assumed to be linear. The system also introduces a possible leak, which can be used to assess the CDR performance of the system even in the presence of such a leak.

Table 1 provides a summary of the crucial parameters that will be referenced in the model's specification and analysis.

2.2 Chemical reaction networks

A chemical reaction network or CRN is a finite set of interdependent reactions that happen simultaneously. In an abstract sense, it can serve as a representation of any system whose evolution is driven by the transformation of its elements into different elements. The fundamental element of a chemical reaction is the *species*. The chemical species can encompass a range of entities, including chemical elements, molecules, or proteins. In the present context, the species represent various carbon pools involved in the system. A *complex* is a nonnegative linear combination of the species. Put another way, a complex is the set of species with associated nonnegative coefficients (called *stoichiometric coefficients*). A chemical reaction is typically written as



where the set of species on the left side of the equation (*reactant complex*) are consumed or transformed to form the set of species on the right side (*product complex*). We can view every complex in a CRN as a vector in a vector space called *species space*, whose coordinates refer to the coefficients or stoichiometry of the different species. In this way, every reaction may also be associated with a vector, called *reaction vector*. A *reaction vector* is formed by subtracting the reactant complex vector from the product complex vector. For example, the following network is a CRN with five species (A_1 , A_2 , A_3 , A_4 , and A_5) and seven reactions.

Table 1. Model parameters

Symbol	Description
p_1 and p_2	Kinetic orders of land interaction p_1 : Kinetic order of land photosynthesis interaction (p -interaction) p_2 : Kinetic order of land respiration interaction (r -interaction)
q_1 and q_2	Kinetic orders of atmosphere interaction q_1 : Kinetic order of atmosphere photosynthesis interaction (p -interaction) q_2 : Kinetic order of atmosphere respiration interaction (r -interaction)
$p_2 - p_1$	Land r - p -interaction difference
$q_2 - q_1$	Atmosphere r - p -interaction difference
$R_p = \frac{p_2 - p_1}{q_2 - q_1}$	Land-atmosphere r - p -interaction difference ratio
$R_q = \frac{q_2 - q_1}{p_2 - p_1}$	Atmosphere-land r - p -interaction difference ratio


Reaction	Reactant	Product	Reaction vector
$A_1 + 2A_2 \rightarrow 2A_1 + A_2$	$[1, 2, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[2, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[1, -1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$
$2A_1 + A_2 \rightarrow A_1 + 2A_2$	$[2, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[1, 2, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[-1, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$
$A_2 \rightarrow A_3$	$[0, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, 0, 1, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, -1, 1, 0, 0]^\top$
$A_3 \rightarrow A_2$	$[0, 0, 1, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, 1, -1, 0, 0]^\top$
$A_4 \rightarrow A_2$	$[0, 0, 0, 1, 0]^\top$	$[0, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, 1, 0, -1, 0]^\top$
$A_2 \rightarrow A_5$	$[0, 1, 0, 0, 0]^\top$	$[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]^\top$	$[0, -1, 0, 0, 1]^\top$
$A_5 \rightarrow A_4$	$[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]^\top$	$[0, 0, 0, 1, 0]^\top$	$[0, 0, 0, 1, -1]^\top$

(3)

Viewed as a directed graph, a CRN is said to be *weakly reversible* if the existence of a path from one complex C_i to complex C_j implies the existence of a path from C_j to C_i . A group of complexes that are connected by arrows is referred to as a *linkage class*. The CRN above system has two linkage classes: $\{A_1 + 2A_2 \rightleftharpoons 2A_1 + A_2\}$ and $\{A_2 \rightleftharpoons A_3, A_4 \rightarrow A_2, A_2 \rightarrow A_5, A_5 \rightarrow A_4\}$.

The span or the set of all possible linear combinations of the reaction vectors is called the *stoichiometric subspace* of the network. The *rank* of a CRN refers to the dimension of the stoichiometric subspace (i.e., the maximum number of linearly independent reaction vectors). Therefore, the stoichiometric subspace of the CRN in (3) has 4 basis vectors. That is, the rank of the CRN is 4.

(a) Box model of the DAC system



(b) Ordinary differential equations (after power law approximation)

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{A}_1 &= k_1 A_1^{p_1} A_2^{q_1} - k_2 A_1^{p_2} A_2^{q_2} \\ \dot{A}_2 &= k_2 A_1^{p_2} A_2^{q_2} - k_1 A_1^{p_1} A_2^{q_1} - a_m A_2 \\ &\quad + a_m \beta A_3 + k_4 A_4 - k_5 A_2 \\ \dot{A}_3 &= a_m A_2 - a_m \beta A_3 \\ \dot{A}_4 &= k_6 A_5 - k_4 A_4 \\ \dot{A}_5 &= k_5 A_2 - k_6 A_5\end{aligned}$$

(c) Dynamically equivalent CRN with power law kinetics (as indicated in the kinetic order matrix)




Figure 1. The power law kinetic representation of the DAC model. In the box model, the boxes represent the different pools, solid arrows indicate the transfer of carbon from one pool to another, and dashed arrows indicate the pools that influence a carbon transfer.

The evolution of a network is dictated by the system of nonlinear ordinary differential equations (ODEs), which is obtained from the CRN, taken with the specification of the reaction rate functions or *kinetics*. The system of ODEs may be written in vector form that encodes a system of scalar equations, with one equation of each species in the CRN. Formally, the system may be expressed as:

$$\dot{c} = \sum_{\mathcal{R}} \kappa_{y \rightarrow y'}(c)(y' - y) \quad (4)$$

where c denotes the vector of species composition. The overdot indicates differentiation with respect to time. The scalar $\kappa_{y \rightarrow y'}(c)$ encodes the rate at which the reaction $y \rightarrow y'$ occurs. The quantity $(y' - y)$ pertains to the reaction vector associated with the reaction $y \rightarrow y'$. The symbol \mathcal{R} denotes the set of all reactions in the given CRN and its presence under the summation sign tells that the sum is taken over the reactions in the CRN. A *positive steady state* of the system is a positive species composition c for which $\dot{c} = 0$.

Equation (4) displays the importance of the role of the stoichiometric subspace of a CRN setting bounds on the dynamics of the system. Even though the compositions of the species evolve with time, its trajectories cannot arbitrarily wander through the species space. Ultimately, the species concentrations are constrained within the translations of the stoichiometric subspace called *stoichiometric compatibility classes*. A system is *multistationary* (or has the capability for multiple steady states) if

there is at least one stoichiometric compatibility class with at most two distinct positive steady states. Otherwise, the system is *monostationary*.


Many important results in CRNT center on the nonnegative structural index called *deficiency*. The CRN's deficiency is the non-negative integer calculated by subtracting the number of linkage classes and the rank from the number of complexes. This index is independent of the network's size. Large or intricate CRNs may have a deficiency of zero. The deficiency indicates the level of 'linear independence' in reactions; a higher deficiency suggests less linear independence (Shinar and Feinberg, 2012).

2.3 A power law kinetic representation of the DAC model

The analysis of the power-law model of the global carbon cycle with DAC (referred to as the *DAC system* hereafter) begins by constructing a *power-law kinetic representation*. A power-law kinetic representation of a given dynamical system refers to a chemical reaction network (CRN) with power-law kinetics that is dynamically equivalent to the given system; i.e., they have identical ODEs.

The idea is to understand the dynamics of the DAC system by analyzing its power-law kinetic representation in a way that bypasses the numerical computations and simulations typically associated with nonlinear ODEs. By leveraging existing tools and results in CRNT, the DAC system is analyzed with minimal reliance on specific parameters, as the method is not dependent on rate constants and deals with kinetic orders symbolically. In particular, the system's capacity to attain positive steady states can be promptly determined by analyzing the graphical and kinetic characteristics of its power-law kinetic representation.

The desired CRN to represent the DAC system can be set up using the procedure proposed by Arceo et al. (2015). In this approach, one associates the reaction $A_i \rightarrow A_j$ to the carbon transfer from pool A_i to pool A_j . Moreover, if the carbon transfer is influenced by some carbon pools (as indicated by the dashed arrows in the schematic diagram), say $\sum A_k$, all these species are added to both sides of $A_i \rightarrow A_j$ to form the chemical reaction



This process preserves the coordinates of the reaction vectors, which is important in describing the dynamics of the whole system.

In the current system, as shown in Figure 1(a), the transfer of carbon from the atmosphere A_2 to land A_1 is influenced by A_1 and A_2 . Thus, the reaction associated with this process is $A_2 + \{A_1 + A_2\} \rightarrow A_1 + \{A_1 + A_2\}$ or simply $A_1 + 2A_2 \rightarrow 2A_1 + A_2$. The carbon transfer from land to atmosphere is represented by the reaction $A_1 + A_2 \rightarrow 2A_2$ because the process is influenced by A_2 . This reaction can be translated (as described in Johnston (2014)), but without changing the stoichiometry, by adding A_1 to both sides of the reaction. Therefore, the atmosphere-land carbon transfer is depicted by the reversible reaction $A_1 + 2A_2 \rightleftharpoons 2A_1 + A_2$. In summary, the CRN representation of the DAC system is precisely the network in (3) and in Figure 1(c).

The CRN representation of the DAC system must be endowed with *power law kinetics* in order to reflect the dynamics described in the previous section; that is, the functions that govern all the reactions are power-law functions, which are derived

from the terms of the GMA systems. The power law functions of a CRN representation are encoded using the kinetic order matrix F , where entry F_{ij} encodes the kinetic order of the j -th species in the i -th reaction. The power-law kinetics of the DAC system is encoded in the kinetic order matrix in Figure 1(d).

The CRN representation of the DAC system has zero deficiency since it has 6 complexes, 2 linkage classes, and its rank is 4. Since the power-law kinetic representation of the DAC system is weakly reversible and has zero deficiency, the current theorems on power law kinetic systems on deficiency-zero networks, namely those of Talabis et al. (2017) and Mendoza et al. (2018), ensure the presence of a set of positive steady state of the DAC system.

3 Results

3.1 Necessary conditions for steady state multiplicity

The capacity of the DAC system to admit multiple steady states depends on values of the kinetic orders p_1, p_2, q_1 , and q_2 . More precisely, the multistationarity property is quickly decided based on the sign of the ratio R_p or R_q defined in Table 1. The discussion centers around these two values due to the structure of the so-called *kinetic flux subspace* \tilde{S} of the system. Essentially, the kinetic flux subspace of a system is the kinetic analogue of the stoichiometric subspace. If the stoichiometric subspace is the span of the reaction vectors, the kinetic flux subspace is the span of the fluxes in terms of the kinetic vectors. Interestingly, a mathematical description of the set of positive steady states of a chemical kinetic system can be written as a vector element of the space that is perpendicular (i.e., orthogonal complement) to the system's kinetic flux subspace.

In technical terms, if the vector x^* is any positive steady state of a system, the set of positive equilibria consists of vectors x such that the vector $\log(x) - \log(x^*)$ resides in the orthogonal complement of kinetic flux subspace.

For the kinetic representation of the DAC system, its orthogonal complement is given by

$$(\tilde{S})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ R_p \\ R_p \\ R_p \\ R_p \end{pmatrix} \right\} \text{ where } R_p := \frac{p_2 - p_1}{q_2 - q_1}, q_2 \neq q_1.$$

This space can also be expressed in the following manner:

$$(\tilde{S})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -R_q \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \text{ where } R_q := \frac{q_2 - q_1}{p_2 - p_1}, p_2 \neq p_1.$$

Müller and Regensburger (2012) provide a simple criterion to assess the uniqueness of a (complex balanced) steady state in a deficiency zero network. This is done by analyzing the sign vector connections between the stoichiometric subspace and the

orthogonal complement of the kinetic flux subspace. This method conclusively shows that when R_p or R_q is positive, the DAC system can admit multiple steady states. The computational details are presented in Appendix A1.

Chemical reaction networks that are described to be injective do not have the capacity to admit multiple positive steady states for any rate constants. Wiuf and Feliu (2013) provided a criterion to determine if a system is injective (or not). Their method suggests that for some cases where R_p or R_q is negative, the system is injective (see Appendix A2). This implies that in these scenarios, monostationarity is assured.

Finally, for DAC system with either R_p or R_q equals 0, the independent decomposition of the system suggests that each steady state of the whole network is a steady state of each subnetwork. A network decomposition is said to be *independent* if its stoichiometric subspace is a direct sum of the subnetwork stoichiometric subspaces. Feinberg (1987) showed that, in an independent decomposition, the intersection of the set of steady states of the subnetworks is identical to the set of steady states of the main network. The independent decomposition of DAC contains two subnetworks:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}_1 &= \{A_1 + 2A_2 \rightleftharpoons 2A_1 + A_2, A_2 \rightleftharpoons A_3\}, \\ \mathcal{N}_2 &= \{A_4 \rightarrow A_2, A_2 \rightarrow A_5, A_5 \rightarrow A_4\}\end{aligned}$$

The subnetwork \mathcal{N}_1 is identical to the kinetic representation of the pre-industrial system of the Anderies et al. system. Fortun and Mendoza (2023) showed that this system does not have the capacity to exhibit multiple steady-states or monostationary. The other subnetwork (\mathcal{N}_2) is also monostationary since this subnetwork is a mass action system that is weakly reversible and has zero deficiency. Since both subsystems are monostationary, then the whole system is also monostationary.

3.2 Absolute concentration robustness in DAC system

Another interesting property that can be quickly revealed from the values of R_p and R_q is absolute concentration robustness or ACR of species in a system. This property refers to a condition where the concentration of a species in a network attains the same value in every positive steady state set by parameters, regardless of initial conditions. This means that if an important variable like A_2 (CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere) exhibits ACR, we may be assured that it will remain stable even if the other variables are not.

The *Species Hyperplane Criterion* Lao et al. (2022) states that a system has ACR species if and only if the vector coordinates corresponding to these species are zero for all basis vectors in space $(\tilde{S})^\perp$. As noted earlier, for the DAC system, $(\tilde{S})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -1 & R_p & R_p & R_p & R_p \end{bmatrix}^\top \right\}$ or $(\tilde{S})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -R_q & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^\top \right\}$. Hence, a DAC system with positive or negative R_p or R_q has no ACR species. The DAC system with $R_p = 0$ has ACR species consisting precisely of A_2 , A_3 , A_4 and A_5 . If $R_q = 0$, the system has ACR in A_1 .

This means that if we desire that A_2 (CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere) be stable irrespective of the initial conditions we would like R_p to be equal to zero. To achieve this, p_1 (the kinetic order of land photosynthesis interaction) must be equal to p_2 (the kinetic order of land respiration interaction) but q_1 (the kinetic order of atmosphere photosynthesis interaction) must not be equal to q_2 (the kinetic order of atmosphere respiration interaction).

Property	DAC system
Existence of at least one steady state	True for all systems
Capacity for multiple steady states	$R_p = 0$: only one steady state
	$R_q = 0$: only one steady state
	R_p or $R_q > 0$: all parameter combinations result in more than one steady state
	R_p or $R_q < 0$: some parameter combinations may result in more than one steady state
ACR	$R_p = 0$: ACR in A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5
	$R_q = 0$: ACR in A_1
	R_p or $R_q > 0$: no ACR in any species
	R_p or $R_q < 0$: no ACR in any species

Table 2. Summary of the dynamic properties of the DAC system.

4 Discussion

Examining a dynamically equivalent reaction network of a global carbon cycle system with DAC technology, this study efficiently identified three crucial dynamic features: the existence of positive steady states, the possibility of multiple steady states, and the absolutely robust concentration levels of carbon pools. Irrespective of kinetic orders and rate constants, the DAC system is expected to exhibit a positive steady state. Additionally, assessments concerning the system’s multistationarity and ACR traits are based on the sign of ratios R_p and R_q . Table 2 outlines the results discussed earlier, connecting the signs of R_p and R_q to the dynamic characteristics of the associated DAC system.

It can be seen from Table 2, that the desirable outcome of a unique and stable concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere may be realized if $R_p = 0$. No tipping points from the existence of multistationarity would be expected.

5 Conclusions

We analyzed a global carbon cycle system that incorporates direct air capture technology by utilizing the tools and insights in chemical reaction network theory. The analysis provides necessary conditions for the elimination of multiple steady states. The innovative aspect of this approach lies in its ability to promptly offer crucial insights into the system’s long-term dynamics by focusing on the network’s topological structure and kinetics alone, eliminating the necessity to specify system rate constants or explicitly calculate steady-state values from ordinary differential equations.

The method may be useful for quickly screening other negative emission technologies (NETs). By examining a dynamically equivalent power law kinetic system that includes a NET, one can efficiently determine if the system fails to meet specified

crucial criteria (such as the absence of a positive steady state in the long run or bistability), prompting a reassessment of the technology's deployment.

Although the network examined is currently limited in scope, there is potential to refine and transfer the suggested framework to more complex carbon cycle models. When dealing with a broader or CRN representation of a carbon cycle, incorporating network decomposition theory in CRNT to dissect the system into smaller elements could be a promising approach.

The idea of "planetary boundaries," highlighted by Anderies et al. (2013), has had a profound influence on the global sustainability community, as demonstrated in the research conducted by Steffen et al. (2015). Our ongoing research efforts focus on developing kinetic representations for various CDR methods such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage and ocean fertilization. Tan et al. (2022) have stressed the significance of optimizing combinations or "portfolios" of NETs. To address this challenge, we aim to investigate other combinations of NETs to determine if these may exhibit steady-state multiplicity.

Appendix A: Multiple steady state analysis of the DAC system: Computations

A1 Müller and Regensburger criterion

In a weakly reversible network such as the CRN representation of the DAC system, $\tilde{S} = \text{Im}(\tilde{Y} \cdot I_a)$. Here,

$$\tilde{Y} = \begin{matrix} & A_1+2A_2 & 2A_1+A_2 & A_2 & A_3 & A_4 & A_5 \\ \begin{matrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \\ A_3 \\ A_4 \\ A_5 \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} p_1 & p_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ q_1 & q_2 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix} \text{ and } I_a = \begin{matrix} & A_1+2A_2 & 2A_1+A_2 & A_2 & A_3 & A_4 & A_5 \\ \begin{matrix} R_1 \\ R_2 \\ R_3 \\ R_4 \\ R_5 \\ R_6 \\ R_7 \end{matrix} & \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \end{matrix}$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{Y} \cdot I_a = \begin{bmatrix} p_2 - p_1 & p_1 - p_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ q_2 - q_1 & q_1 - q_2 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\implies \tilde{S} = \text{Im}(\tilde{Y} \cdot I_a) = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} p_2 - p_1 \\ q_2 - q_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}$$

Its orthogonal complement is given by

$$(\tilde{S})^\perp = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ R_p \\ R_p \\ R_p \\ R_p \end{bmatrix} \right\} = \text{span} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} -R_q \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\} \quad \text{where } R_p := \frac{p_2 - p_1}{q_2 - q_1}, R_q := \frac{q_2 - q_1}{p_2 - p_1}.$$

The set of steady states of the DAC system is also complex-balanced. Müller and Regensburger (2012) provided a criterion for the uniqueness of complex balancing steady state in stoichiometric class in terms of sign vector relationships between stoichiometric subspace S and kinetic flux subspace \tilde{S}^\perp :

Theorem 1. Müller and Regensburger (2012) *If for a weakly reversible generalized mass action system with $\text{sign}(S) \cap \text{sign}(\tilde{S})^\perp \neq \{0\}$, then there is a stoichiometric class with more than one complex balanced steady state.*

For the positive DAC system where $R > 0$, $\text{sign}(\tilde{S})^\perp = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} - \\ + \\ + \\ + \\ + \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} + \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \end{bmatrix} \right\}$. The stoichiometric subspace S is spanned by the

following vectors:

$$\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Let $x \in S$ where

$$x = a_1 \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + a_2 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + a_3 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} + a_4 \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 \\ -a_1 - a_2 + a_3 - a_4 \\ a_2 \\ -a_3 \\ a_4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Choose $a_1 > 0, a_2 < 0, a_3 > 0, a_4 < 0$, and $a_1 + a_2 > a_3 - a_4$ so that $\text{sign}(x) = \begin{bmatrix} + \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \end{bmatrix}$ and thus, $\text{sign}(S) \cap \text{sign}(\tilde{S})^\perp \neq \{0\}$.

Therefore, any positive DAC system is multistationary. A specific scenario where this occurs is illustrated in Fortun et al. (2018).

For negative DAC system where $R < 0$, we have $\text{sign}(\tilde{S})^\perp = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} - \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} + \\ + \\ + \\ + \\ + \end{pmatrix} \right\}$. In order for $x \in S$ to have similar signs for all

its components, say positive, necessarily

$$a_1 > 0, a_2 > 0, a_3 < 0, a_4 > 0.$$

However, the second component $-a_1 - a_2 + a_3 - a_4 < 0$. Hence, it is not possible for a uniform positive sign for all components of x . Similarly, it is not possible to obtain a vector $x \in S$ with negative signs in all its components. Thus, $\text{sign}(S) \cap \text{sign}(\tilde{S})^\perp = \{0\}$.

A2 Wiuf and Feliu criterion

The stoichiometric matrix N of a CRN is a matrix whose columns are the reaction vectors. A CRN with stoichiometric matrix N is injective if for any distinct stoichiometrically compatible species vectors x and y , we have $NK(x) \neq NK(y)$ for all kinetics K endowed on the CRN. Note that if a CRN is injective, then it is monostationary. However, if the CRN is not injective, multistationarity does not necessarily follow.

We identify two subsets of injective systems, which are necessarily monostationary by applying the following result of Wiuf and Feliu (2013):

Theorem 2. *Wiuf and Feliu (2013) The interaction network with power law kinetics and fixed kinetic orders is injective if and only if the determinant of M^* is a non-zero homogeneous polynomial with all coefficients being positive or all being negative.*

In the above statement, the matrix M^* is obtained by considering symbolic vectors $k = (k_1, \dots, k_m)$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_r)$ and letting $M = N \text{diag}(z) F \text{diag}(k)$, where N is the stoichiometric matrix and F is the kinetic order matrix of the PLK system. Let $\{\omega^1, \dots, \omega^d\}$ be a basis of the left kernel of N and i_1, \dots, i_d be row indices. The $m \times m$ matrix M^* is defined by replacing the i_j -th row of M by ω^j . The matrix M^* is a symbolic matrix in z_* and k_* .

Using the computational approach and Maple script Feliu and Wiuf (2013) provided by the authors, we obtain the determinant of M^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \det = & -p_1 k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4 z_1 z_4 z_5 z_6 - p_1 k_1 k_2 k_3 k_5 z_1 z_4 z_6 z_7 - p_1 k_1 k_2 k_4 k_5 z_1 z_3 z_5 z_7 \\ & - p_1 k_1 k_3 k_4 k_5 z_1 z_4 z_5 z_7 + p_2 k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4 z_2 z_4 z_5 z_6 + p_2 k_1 k_2 k_3 k_5 z_2 z_4 z_6 z_7 \\ & + p_2 k_1 k_2 k_4 k_5 z_2 z_3 z_5 z_7 + p_2 k_1 k_3 k_4 k_5 z_2 z_4 z_5 z_7 + q_1 k_2 k_3 k_4 k_5 z_1 z_4 z_5 z_7 \\ & - q_2 k_2 k_3 k_4 k_5 z_2 z_4 z_5 z_7 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $p_1 < 0, p_2 > 0, q_1 > 0$, and $q_2 < 0$, all the terms are positive, and for $p_1 > 0, p_2 < 0, q_1 < 0$, and $q_2 > 0$, all the terms are negative.

In both cases, the networks are injective by Theorem 2 and hence, monostationary. In all other cases, the systems are non-injective, which is a necessary condition for multistationarity.

Author contributions. EM designed the study. All authors developed the model. LR and AL provided insights for the literature review. NF drafted the paper, with contributions from LR and AL. All authors contributed to the analysis, as well as in reviewing and editing the final document.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Anderies, J., Carpenter, S., Steffen, W., and Rockström, J.: The topology of non-linear global carbon dynamics: from tipping points to planetary boundaries, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 8, 044–048, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/4/044048>, 2013.
- Anderies, J. M., Barfuss, W., Donges, J. F., Fetzer, I., Heitzig, J., and Rockström, J.: A modeling framework for World-Earth system resilience: exploring social inequality and Earth system tipping points, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 18, 095001, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ace91d>, 2023.
- Arceo, C. P., Jose, E., Marín-Sanguino, A., and Mendoza, E.: Chemical reaction network approaches to Biochemical Systems Theory., *Mathematical biosciences*, 269, 135–52, 2015.
- Dakos, V., Boulton, C. A., Buxton, J. E., Abrams, J. F., Arellano-Nava, B., Armstrong McKay, D. I., Bathiany, S., Blaschke, L., Boers, N., Dylewsky, D., López-Martínez, C., Parry, I., Ritchie, P., van der Bolt, B., van der Laan, L., Weinans, E., and Kéfi, S.: Tipping point detection and early warnings in climate, ecological, and human systems, *Earth System Dynamics*, 15, 1117–1135, <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-15-1117-2024>, 2024.
- Feinberg, M.: Chemical reaction network structure and the stability of complex isothermal reactors I: The deficiency zero and deficiency one theorems, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 42, 2229–2268, [https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509\(87\)80099-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0009-2509(87)80099-4), 1987.
- Feliu, E. and Wiuf, C.: A computational method to preclude multistationarity in networks of interacting species, *Bioinformatics*, 29, 2327–2334, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btt400>, 2013.
- Foley, J. A.: Tipping points in the tundra, *Science*, 310, 627–628, 2005.
- Fortun, N., Mendoza, E., Razon, L., and Lao, A.: A Deficiency-One Algorithm for power-law kinetic systems with reactant-determined interactions, *J. Math. Chem.*, 56, 2929–2962, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10910-018-0925-2>, 2018.
- Fortun, N. T. and Mendoza, E. R.: Comparative analysis of carbon cycle models via kinetic representations, *J. Math. Chem.*, 61, 896–932, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10910-022-01442-8>, 2023.
- Galan-Martin, A., Vazquez, D., Cobo, S., Mac Dowell, N., Caballero, J. A., and Guillen-Gosalbez, G.: Delaying carbon dioxide removal in the European Union puts climate targets at risk, *Nat. Commun.*, 12, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-26680-3>, 2021.
- IPCC: Climate Change 2022 - Mitigation of Climate Change: Working Group III Contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, ISBN 9781009157926, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157926>, 2022.
- Johnston, M. D.: Translated chemical reaction networks, *Bulletin of mathematical biology*, 76, 1081–1116, 2014.
- Kerner, C., Thaller, A., and Brudermann, T.: Carbon dioxide removal to combat climate change? An expert survey on perception and support, *Environmental Research Communications*, 5, 041003, 2023.
- Lao, A., Lubenia, P. V., Magpantay, D., and Mendoza, E.: Concentration robustness in LP kinetic systems, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 88, 29–66, <https://doi.org/10.46793/match.88-1.029L>, 2022.
- Lehtveer, M. and Emanuelsson, A.: BECCS and DACCS as Negative Emission Providers in an Intermittent Electricity System: Why Levelized Cost of Carbon May Be a Misleading Measure for Policy Decisions, *Front. Clim.*, 3, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2021.647276>, 2021.
- Mendoza, E. R., Talabis, D. A. S., and Jose, E. C.: Positive equilibria of weakly reversible power law kinetic systems with linear independent interactions, *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, 56, 2643–2673, 2018.

- Müller, S. and Regensburger, G.: Generalized mass action systems: Complex balancing equilibria and sign vectors of the stoichiometric and kinetic-order subspaces, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 72, 1926–1947, <https://doi.org/10.1137/110847056>, 2012.
- Qiu, Y., Lamers, P., Daioglou, V., McQueen, N., de Boer, H.-S., Harmsen, M., Wilcox, J., Bardow, A., and Suh, S.: Environmental trade-offs of direct air capture technologies in climate change mitigation toward 2100, *Nat. Commun.*, 13, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-31146-1>, 2022.
- Realmonte, G., Drouet, L., Gambhir, A., Glynn, J., Hawkes, A., Köberle, A. C., and Tavoni, M.: An inter-model assessment of the role of direct air capture in deep mitigation pathways, *Nat. Commun.*, 10, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10842-5>, 2019.
- Savageau, M.: Biochemical systems analysis: I. Some mathematical properties of the rate law for the component enzymatic reactions, *Am. J. Sci.*, 25, 365–369, [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5193\(69\)80026-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5193(69)80026-3), 1969.
- Savageau, M.: Development of fractal kinetic theory for enzyme-catalysed reactions and implications for the design of biochemical pathways, *BioSystems*, 47, 9–36, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647\(98\)00020-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647(98)00020-3), 1998.
- Shinar, G. and Feinberg, M.: Concordant chemical reaction networks, *Math. Biosci.*, 240, 92–113, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2012.05.004>, 2012.
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C. A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., and Sörlin, S.: Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet, *Science*, 347, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1259855>, 2015.
- Talabis, D. A., Arceo, C. P., and Mendoza, E.: Positive equilibria of a class of power-law kinetics, *J. Math. Chem.*, 56, 358–394, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10910-017-0804-2>, 2017.
- Tan, R. R., Aviso, K. B., Foo, D. C. Y., Migo-Sumagang, M. V., Nair, P. N. S. B., and Short, M.: Computing optimal carbon dioxide removal portfolios, *Nat. Comput. Sci.*, 2, 465–466, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43588-022-00286-1>, 2022.
- Torres, N. V. and Voit, E. O.: *Pathway analysis and optimization in metabolic engineering*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Voit, E.: *Computational analysis of biochemical systems: A practical guide for biochemists and molecular biologists*, Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom, 2000.
- Voit, E.: Biochemical Systems Theory: A Review, *ISRN Biomath.*, 2013, 1–53, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/897658>, 2013.
- Voit, E. and Schwacke, J.: Understanding through Modeling A Historical Perspective and Review of Biochemical Systems Theory as a Powerful Tool for Systems Biology, in: *Systems Biology: Principles, Methods, and Concepts*, edited by Konopka, A., pp. 27–82, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 2006.
- Wiuf, C. and Feliu, E.: Power-Law Kinetics and Determinant Criteria for the Preclusion of Multistationarity in Networks of Interacting Species, *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12, 1685–1721, <https://doi.org/10.1137/120873388>, 2013.