

FAST-SLOW CHEMICAL REACTIONS: CONVERGENCE OF HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATION AND VARIATIONAL REPRESENTATION

YUAN GAO

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 47906, USA

ARTUR STEPHAN

*Vienna University of Technology, Institute of Analysis and Scientific Computing,
Wiedner Hauptstr. 8-10, A-1040 Wien, Austria*

ABSTRACT. Microscopic behaviors of chemical reactions can be described by a random time-changed Poisson process, whose large-volume limit determines the macroscopic behaviors of species concentrations, including both typical and non-typical trajectories. When the reaction intensities (or fluxes) exhibit a separation of fast-slow scales, the macroscopic typical trajectory is governed by a system of ε -dependent nonlinear reaction rate equations (RRE), while the non-typical trajectories deviating from the typical ones are characterized by an ε -dependent exponentially nonlinear Hamilton-Jacobi equation (HJE). In this paper, for general chemical reactions, we study the fast-slow limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for the viscosity solutions of the associated HJE with a state-constrained boundary condition. We identify the limiting effective HJE on a slow manifold, along with an effective variational representation for the solution. Through the uniform convergence of the viscosity solutions and the Γ -convergence of the variational solution representations, we rigorously show that all non-typical (and also typical) trajectories are concentrated on the slow manifold and the effective macroscopic dynamics are described by the coarse-grained RRE and HJE, respectively. This approach for studying the fast-slow limit is applicable to, but not limited to, reversible chemical reactions described by gradient flows.

1. INTRODUCTION

In practical biochemical reactions, the separation of time scales among different reactions is a common phenomenon. For instance, a gene in its active state transcribes mRNA at a much faster rate than when it is inactive [LX11, GQX15]. An important modeling question is to find an accurate and effective description of the system on the slow time scale such that the essential features,

E-mail addresses: gao662@purdue.edu, artur.stephan@tuwien.ac.at.

Date: December 20, 2024.

Key words and phrases. Large deviation principle, non-equilibrium chemical reactions, singular limit, variational formula with state-constraint, degenerate Lipschitz continuity.

including macroscopic typical and non-typical behaviors, are still present. The mathematical question then is to show that both the multiscale and the effective descriptions are close to each other in the practical limit.

In this paper, we are interested not only in the macroscopic typical behavior of chemical reaction systems, but rather the non-typical fluctuations deviating from the typical dynamics. To be more precise, various macroscopic behaviors of the chemical reactions result from a multiscale stochastic random time-changed Poisson representation (see reaction process X^h in (2.2)). In the law of large numbers regime, the typical trajectory in terms of the concentration of species is described by a nonlinear ODE for the concentrations x_i^ε of species $i \in \mathcal{I}$, known as the *reaction-rate equation* (RRE)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(RRE}_\varepsilon) \quad \frac{dx^\varepsilon}{dt} &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^+(x) - \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^-(x)) \gamma_r \\ &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} (\Psi_r^+(x^\varepsilon) - \Psi_r^-(x^\varepsilon)) \gamma_r + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} (\Psi_r^+(x^\varepsilon) - \Psi_r^-(x^\varepsilon)) \gamma_r, \end{aligned}$$

where Ψ_r^\pm represents the forward/backward intensity functions and γ_r is the reaction vector for the r -th fast or slow reaction with $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}$ or $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$, respectively. Here, we assume that only two time scales are present, and that the fast intensity functions are all on the $O(1/\varepsilon)$ scale. In the large deviation regime, the non-typical trajectory can be characterized by a Hamilton-Jacobi equation (HJE) with its variational solution representation: given initial data $u_0^\varepsilon \in C^1(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(HJE}_\varepsilon) \quad \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) &\leq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, +\infty); \\ \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) &\geq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \bar{\Omega} \times (0, +\infty); \\ u^\varepsilon(x, t) &= \inf_{x \in \text{AC}([0, t]; \bar{\Omega}), x(t) = x} (u_0^\varepsilon(x(0)) + \int_0^t L_\varepsilon(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds). \end{aligned}$$

This HJE results from the nonlinear semigroup solution in the WKB expansion (cf. [KMK73, Gan87, GL22]) of the chemical master equation (see Section 2.5 for details). The multiscale Hamiltonian H_ε and Lagrangian L_ε are related by the Legendre transform, and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(1.1)} \quad H_\varepsilon(x, p) &:= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} \Psi_r^+(x) (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} - 1) + \Psi_r^-(x) (e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p} - 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \Psi_r^+(x) (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} - 1) + \Psi_r^-(x) (e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

We refer to Section 5 for more details, where viscosity solutions of state constrained HJE on bounded domains Ω are defined in Definition 5.2.

In the above descriptions, ε is fixed. To derive the effective descriptions, we analyze the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ for (RRE $_\varepsilon$) and (HJE $_\varepsilon$).

For the typical behaviors described by (RRE $_\varepsilon$) with multiscale reaction intensities, [Bot03] obtained the effective reduced RRE using methods from deterministic dynamical system theory for singularly perturbed systems. The slow manifold $\mathcal{M}_S = \{x : \Psi_r^+(x) = \Psi_r^-(x), \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}\}$, to which solutions of (RRE $_\varepsilon$) converge, was determined in [Bot03]. On the slow manifold the effective

dynamics can either be described by projected coordinates, or by coarse-grained variables that parametrize the slow manifold. [KK13] established a systematic probabilistic approach to determine effective chemical master equations and RRE applicable to large chemical networks. Under the detailed balance assumption, i.e., assuming the existence of an invariant measure such that the reaction process corresponding to (RRE_ε) is reversible, gradient flow approach is used to study the convergence of (RRE_ε) to the effective dynamics on the slow manifold; see [MS20] for linear reaction systems and see [MPS21] for nonlinear reversible reaction systems.

In this paper, for general non-equilibrium chemical reactions, we study the convergence of the corresponding (HJE_ε) with state constraints and the characterization of its solution representation in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In particular, we are going to show that solutions u^ε of (HJE_ε) converge to u^* , where the limit u^* solves a corresponding HJE involving an effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} . This tracks and identifies the limiting behavior of the large deviation rate function for non-typical paths as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. The effective Hamiltonian dynamics for non-typical trajectories also recovers the effective RRE.

Challenges and strategies: The challenges are brought by (i) the large deviation from the typical path described by RRE, (ii) the irreversibility of general reactions, and (iii) the singularity in both the variational representation and HJE due to fast-scale reactions. First, to capture the multiscale dynamics for non-typical path, we study directly (HJE_ε) . The typical trajectories solving (RRE_ε) or the effective RRE can then be recovered as a special bi-characteristic for the (HJE_ε) or the effective HJE. In contrast to solutions of the RRE, where the boundary is repelling, we have to assume that non-typical paths stay away from the boundary to rule out degeneracy of the paths due to the loss of coercivity in the Hamiltonian. This is done by restricting the analysis to a suitable working domain. Secondly, for the irreversibility issue, one loses the gradient flow structures in RRE, so the convergence to the effective dynamics on the slow manifold can not be obtained via the limiting behavior of gradient flows. We propose a weaker fast detailed balance condition (see (FDB)), which requires the existence of a $x_s^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^I := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^I; x_i > 0 \text{ for all } i\}$ such that $\Psi_r^+(x_s^*) = \Psi_r^-(x_s^*)$ holds for all $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$. This condition allows linking the effective dynamics on slow manifold to projected and coarse-grained dynamics via a uniquely determined analytic reconstruction map \mathbf{R} . An important step for identifying the limiting variational representation, is the Γ -convergence for the action functionals \mathcal{L}_ε . Using the (FDB) condition, the compactness for the sequence of non-typical trajectories with finite action cost $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon < \infty$ can be obtained without the reversibility condition. Relying on this compactness and an explicitly reconstruction of the reactive fluxes for the fast-slow system from the effective action functional \mathcal{L}_{eff} , we are able to show Γ -convergence of the action functionals \mathcal{L}_ε . Finally, due to the singularity in the coefficients of Hamiltonian H_ε , the variational representation for the state-constraint solution is not uniform in ε . We take the singular limit in both the viscosity solutions to (HJE_ε) and the variational representation for the solutions. The convergence of viscosity solutions is obtained via a Lipschitz estimate uniformly in ε and the convergence of the variational representation follows from the Γ -convergence of the action functional. Particularly, these two convergences are matched together on the slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S , which finally gives the effective HJE on the slow manifold and the corresponding variational representation. Moreover, we use the reconstruction map \mathbf{R} to express the effective functionals and the variational representation by coarse-grained variables.

Main result: Below, we state our main result in a concrete way, with reference to the conditions, notations, and explicit functionals provided later (see L_{eff} in (3.2), H_{eff} in (3.3), Assumption 1 and \mathcal{M}_S in (4.2)).

Main Theorem. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^I$ an bounded open domain such that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$. Let initial data u_0^ε be well-prepared satisfying Assumption I, and assume (FDB). Then the viscosity solutions u^ε to the ε -HJE (2.9) converges uniformly to u^* on the slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S . Particularly, for $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$, the variational representation of viscosity solution*

$$u^\varepsilon(x, t) = \inf \left\{ u_0^\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon(0)) + \int_0^t L_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon(s), \dot{x}_\varepsilon(s)) ds : x_\varepsilon \in \text{AC}([0, t], \overline{\Omega}), x_\varepsilon(t) = x \right\}$$

converges uniformly to the limiting variational representation

$$u^*(x, t) = \inf \left\{ u_0^*(x(0)) + \int_0^t L_{\text{eff}}(x(s), \dot{x}(s)) ds : x \in \text{AC}([0, t], \mathcal{M}_S), x(t) = x \right\}.$$

Moreover, u^ solves the effective HJE in the viscosity sense*

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t u(x, t) + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u(x, t)) &\leq 0, & (x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_S^o \times (0, +\infty), \\ \partial_t u(x, t) + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u(x, t)) &\geq 0, & (x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_S \times (0, +\infty), \\ u(x, 0) &= u_0(x), & x \in \mathcal{M}_S = \overline{\mathcal{M}_S}. \end{aligned}$$

The main theorem will be proved via the following procedures. In Section 2, after reviewing the motivation and basic setup for RRE and HJEs, we state the (FDB) condition, define necessary spaces separating fast-slow dynamics, and introduce the reconstruction map R . The effective dynamics on the slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S will then be equivalently connected to the coarse-grained or projected dynamics. In Section 3, we explicitly compute the fast-slow Hamiltonian and Lagrangian with some lower bound estimates. We also compute the effective and coarse-grained Hamiltonian and Lagrangian as a preparation for later sections. In Section 4, we prove the Γ -convergence of ε -dependent action functional of absolutely continuous curves on any bounded working domain with a distance away from $\partial\mathbb{R}_+^I$ in Theorem 4.2. This consists of the compactness for curves with finite action (see Proposition 4.3), the lower bound estimates for the action functional for any curve that converges weakly in $L^1([0, T]; \overline{\Omega}_L)$ (see Proposition 4.4), and the upper bound estimate via the construction of a strongly convergent recovery sequence (see Proposition 4.5). The resulting effective action functional regulates the trajectory staying on slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S . In Section 5, we prove the convergence of viscosity solutions u^ε to the state-constraint (HJE $_\varepsilon$) in Corollary 5.6. Due to the degeneracy of H_ε in the momentum variable p in some directions, it is necessary to establish the coercivity and Lipschitz estimates in a non-degenerate subspace. Based on well-prepared initial data with uniform C^1 bounds and a vanishing gradient in the direction of fast reactions, we first obtain the uniform Lipschitz estimates in time-space for u^ε separately for fast/slow directions (see Theorem 5.5). This ensures the uniform convergence to a limiting solution u^* . In Section 6, we connect the convergence of solutions of (HJE $_\varepsilon$) and the Γ -convergence of the solution representation to finally identify the limiting solution $u^*(x, t)$ for $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$ and its variational representation via the effective action functional (see Proposition 6.1). This limiting characterization proves that u^* solves the effective HJE (1.2).

In summary, we obtain the convergence of (HJE_ε) , without the reversibility assumption for the chemical reactions, and thus allowing applications of non-equilibrium biochemical systems. The justification of this convergence not only helps the identification of slow manifold and the effective RRE dynamics, more rich information comes along including the limiting behavior of the fluctuation estimates and the fluctuations for the effective dynamics itself. The developed Γ -convergence approach and Hamilton-Jacobi method for characterizing effective non-typical dynamics and fluctuation information does not require reversibility or linearity, so we believe it can be extended to other stochastic systems. We also point out that our framework does not work for domains that include the boundary of the positive quadrant, and the variational characterization of the limiting solution fails away from the slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S .


In previous works, Γ -convergence has been used to derive effective systems in the context of fast-slow chemical reaction systems. For gradient-flows, Γ -convergence for the functionals that define a gradient structure is derived in [MS20] for linear reaction systems, in [MPS21] for nonlinear reversible reaction systems and in [Ste21] for linear reaction-diffusion systems. There, the detailed-balance assumption is crucial to apply gradient flow approaches. In terms of large deviations for multiscale chemical reactions, the formal WKB expansion approach has been extensively studied and applied in biochemical systems, cf. [GQX15, BCC10, BN13]. Rigorous large deviation results for chemical reaction processes are limited to specific two-scale system [LL17] or under linear reaction assumptions. Γ -convergence for the large-deviation rate functional of both concentration and fluxes is shown in [PR23] for general irreversible but linear fast-slow reactions. In terms of singular limit of general HJEs raising from optimal control problem with two time scales, there are thorough studies via similar PDE approach such as asymptotic expansions or Γ -convergence, cf. [BD⁺97, ABM07]. However, due to the separation of fast-slow domain variables in HJEs with or without periodic assumptions, those fall under homogenization problems, so reviewing such literature goes beyond the scope of our paper.

The remaining paper is outlined as follows. In Section 2, we review the basic setup and motivations for studying the singular limit of (HJE_ε) . In Section 3, we compute explicitly the fast-slow, effective and coarse-grained Hamiltonian/Lagrangian. In Section 4, we prove the Γ -convergence of ε -dependent action functional to the effective one. In Section 5, we obtain the convergence of the viscosity solution to (HJE_ε) . In Section 6, we obtain the variational representation for the limiting viscosity solution and identify the effective HJE.

2. SETUP AND BASIC PROPERTIES FOR ε -DEPENDENT FAST-SLOW CHEMICAL REACTION SYSTEM

In this section, we review the basic setup for ε -dependent fast-slow chemical reaction system with the associated (RRE_ε) and (HJE_ε) . First, we introduce definitions and properties of fast-slow RRE with conserved quantities. We also introduce the fast-detailed balance assumption and provide preliminary propositions on characterization of the effective RRE and the reconstruction map. Finally, we derive the HJE using WKB expansion for the chemical master equation.

2.1. Chemical reaction systems. Chemical reactions involving I species X_i , $i \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, I\}$ and R reactions, indexed as $r \in \mathcal{R} = \{1, \dots, R\}$, can be kinematically described as



where the nonnegative integers $\gamma_{ri}^\pm \geq 0$ are stoichiometric coefficients and $k_r^\pm \geq 0$ are the reaction rates for the r -th forward and backward reactions. The column vector $\gamma_r := \gamma_r^- - \gamma_r^+ := (\gamma_{ri}^- - \gamma_{ri}^+)_{i=1:I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ is called the reaction vector for the r -th reaction, counting the net change in molecular numbers for species X_i . Let \mathbb{N} be the set of natural numbers including zero. In this paper, all vectors $X = (X_i)_{i=1:I} \in \mathbb{N}^I$ and $(\Psi_r)_{r \in \mathcal{R}}, (k_r)_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \in \mathbb{R}^R$ are column vectors.

Let \mathbb{N} be the state space for the counting process $X_i(t)$, representing the number of each species $i = 1, \dots, I$ in the biochemical reactions. With the reaction container size $1/h \gg 1$, the process $X_i^h(t) = hX_i(t)$ can be modeled as the random time-changed Poisson representation for chemical reactions (see [Kur80, AK15]):

$$(2.2) \quad X^h(t) = X^h(0) + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \gamma_r h \left(Y_r^+ \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \Psi_r^+(X^h(s)) ds \right) - Y_r^- \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \Psi_r^-(X^h(s)) ds \right) \right).$$

Here, for the r -th reaction channel, $Y_r^\pm(t)$ are i.i.d. unit-rate Poisson processes, and $\Psi_r^\pm(X^h)$ is the intensity function. We will use the common form for the intensity function $\Psi_r^\pm(X^h)$ that is given by the macroscopic law of mass action (LMA):

$$(2.3) \quad \Psi_r^\pm(\vec{x}) = k_r^\pm \prod_{i=1}^I (x_i)^{\gamma_{ri}^\pm}.$$

Throughout the paper we will assume the following type of weak-reversibility: $\forall r \in \mathcal{R}$ we have $k_r^+ = 0$ if and only if $k_r^- = 0$.

Macroscopically, the change of concentration can be described by the so-called *reaction-rate equation* (RRE), given by

$$\dot{x}(t) = R(x(t)) := \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (\Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)) \gamma_r, \quad \Psi_r^\pm(x) = k_r^\pm \prod_i x_i^{\gamma_i^{\pm,r}},$$

where the natural state space of concentrations is given by $\mathbb{C} := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^I := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^I; x_i \geq 0 \text{ for all } i\}$ as the largest living space for x . We also recall $\mathbb{R}_+^I = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^I; x_i > 0 \text{ for all } i\}$.

Although the (RRE) is not our primary objective of investigations, we collect here some properties, which will also be important later. Important quantities that help to analyze the (RRE) are the so-called *conserved quantities* $q \in \mathbb{R}^I$ such that $q \in \Gamma^\perp = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^I : \forall \gamma \in \Gamma : q \cdot \gamma = 0\}$, where we define the stoichiometric subspace $\Gamma := \text{span}\{\gamma_r : r \in \mathcal{R}\}$. (Note that we do not assume that they are linearly independent.) In particular, for the RRE, $q \cdot x(t)$ is not changed along the evolution (which also clarifies their name).

Fixing a basis q_1, \dots, q_m of Γ^\perp , we define the matrix $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times I}$ by its adjoint $Q^T = (q_1, \dots, q_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times m}$. By construction, Q^T is injective, Q is surjective and $\ker(Q) = \Gamma$.

2.2. Fast-slow RRE and conserved quantities. As explained in the introduction, we assume the rate k_r for all reactions appear to be only two scales. That is, the fast reaction has a $1/\varepsilon$ order while the slow reaction has order $O(1)$. To be more precise, we split

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}} + \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$$

such that

$$k_r^\pm = k_r^\pm(\varepsilon) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} k_r^\pm, & r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}} \\ k_r^\pm, & r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}. \end{cases}$$

Then the fast-slow RRE becomes (RRE $_\varepsilon$), i.e.,

(2.4)

$$\dot{x}^\varepsilon(t) = R_{\text{slow}}(x(t)) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} R_{\text{fast}}(x(t)) := \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} (\Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)) \gamma_r + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} (\Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)) \gamma_r.$$

Similar to the general system, we define the fast stoichiometric subspace $\Gamma_{\text{fast}} = \text{span} \{\gamma_r : r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}\}$. Then, we have $\Gamma^\perp \subset \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$, and $m_{\text{fast}} = \dim \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp \geq m = \dim \Gamma^\perp$. Extending the basis q_1, \dots, q_m of Γ^\perp to a basis $q_1, \dots, q_{m_{\text{fast}}}$ of $\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$, we define the conservation matrix $Q_{\text{fast}} : \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}}$ by $Q_{\text{fast}}^T = (q_1, \dots, q_{m_{\text{fast}}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times m_{\text{fast}}}$. Moreover, we set $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_{\text{fast}} x \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}} : x \in \mathcal{C}\}$. In particular, we have

$$\ker Q_{\text{fast}} = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}, \quad \text{range } Q_{\text{fast}}^T = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp.$$

In the following we will call, elements $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathcal{Q}$ *fast conserved quantities* because they are the slow dynamic variables and not changed for the fast part of the evolution.

Heuristically, for small times the fast part $R_{\text{fast}}(c(t))$ will dominate, while for larger times ($t > \varepsilon$) the slow reactions drive the evolution and the fast parts are in equilibrium.

We define the set of fast equilibria that defines later the slow manifold of the evolution:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} := \{x \in \mathcal{C} : \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}} : \Psi_r^+(x) = \Psi_r^-(x)\}.$$

For consistency, we state the following classical convergence result, which goes back to D. Botto [Bot03].

Theorem 2.1 ([Bot03]). *Let x^ε , be the solution of the fast-slow (RRE $_\varepsilon$) with initial values $x^\varepsilon(0) = x_0^\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that $x_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0^* > 0$. Then we have $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^* \in C([0, T], \mathbb{R}_+^I)$, where x^* solves the following effective RRE: we have $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ for $t > 0$ and its evolution is described by the slow reactions only and a Lagrange parameter that forces the evolution to stay on that set, i.e.*

$$(2.5) \quad \dot{x}^* = R_{\text{slow}}(x^*(t)) + \lambda(t), \quad x^*(t) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}, \quad \lambda(t) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}, \quad x^*(0) = x_0^*.$$

This theorem characterizes the effective evolution. Moreover, we will see in Proposition 2.5 that the effective evolution can also be described in other ways by using projections, or coarse-grained variables.

2.3. The fast-detailed balance assumption. Instead of analyzing the (RRE), we are going to investigate the fluctuations around the solutions. For that we need some assumptions that simplifies the set of fast-equilibria drastically.

Fast-detailed balance assumption (FDB): Suppose there is an equilibrium state $x_s^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$, such that for fast reactions are in detailed balance, i.e.

$$(FDB) \quad \exists x_s^* \in \mathbb{R}_+^I \text{ such that } \Psi_r^+(x_s^*) = \Psi_r^-(x_s^*), \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}.$$

The assumption implies that the fast reaction part $x' = R_{\text{fast}}(x)$ is a detailed-balance reaction system with equilibrium x_s^* . Note that x_s^* may not be an equilibrium of the whole system.

A direct calculation shows that the fast detailed balance condition (FDB), can be rewritten in the following equivalent ways.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose (FDB) holds. Then*

$$(1) \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}} : \Psi_r^+(x_s^*) = k_r^+ \prod_i x_{s,i}^{*\gamma_i^{+,r}} = k_r^- \prod_i x_{s,i}^{*\gamma_i^{-,r}} = \Psi_r^-(x_s^*) \text{ and } \log(k_r^+/k_r^-) = \gamma_r \cdot \log x_s^*.$$

$$(2) \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}, \forall x \in \mathbb{C} : \gamma_r \cdot \log(x/x_s^*) = \log(\Psi_r^-(x)/\Psi_r^+(x)).$$

In particular, we have the following equivalent characterization of the set of fast equilibria:

$$(2.6) \quad x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^I \Leftrightarrow \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}} : \gamma_r \cdot \log(x/x_s^*) = 0 \Leftrightarrow D\mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^T,$$

where $\mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*)$ is the relative entropy, i.e., $\mathcal{H}(x|y) := \sum_{i=1}^I x_i \log(x_i/y_i) - x_i + y_i$.

In particular, it is convenient to define the positive part of the fast equilibria by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast},+} := \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^I.$$

2.4. The reconstruction map. Recall the set of fast conserved quantities \mathbf{Q} from Section 2.2, and define the resolution of the state space \mathbb{C} by \mathbf{Q} , i.e.,

$$\forall \mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Q} : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{fast}} := \{x : Q_{\text{fast}}x = \mathbf{q}\}.$$

Now, we define the reconstruction map $\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as

$$\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) := \text{is the unique minimizer of } x \mapsto \mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*) \text{ on } \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{fast}}.$$

The next lemma shows that this is indeed a proper definition and summarizes some properties of the function \mathbf{R} . For more details we refer to [MPS21], where also the relation to boundary equilibria has been investigated (which we exclude here) and the surjectivity of $\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ has been discussed.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (FDB) be satisfied. The function $\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is well-defined, continuous and analytic in the interior. Moreover, we have $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast},+}$.*

Proof. Since $x \mapsto \mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*)$ is strictly convex there is a unique minimizer on the convex and bounded set $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\text{fast}}$. Since the slope of \mathcal{H} is $-\infty$ at the boundary the minimizer is indeed in the interior, and thus showing that \mathbf{R} is well-defined. To see that \mathbf{R} maps into the fast-equilibria, we consider the fast detailed-balance RRE $x' = R_{\text{fast}}(x)$. For this system $\mathcal{H}(\cdot|x_s^*)$ is a Lyapunov function, and hence, so its minimizer is an equilibrium, denoted by x_e . This implies by Lemma 2.2, that $\Psi_r^+(x_e) = \Psi_r^-(x_e)$ for all fast reactions, i.e. $x_e \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast},+}$ and $D\mathcal{H}(x_e|x_s^*) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$. The analyticity of \mathbf{R} follows since the minimum can be rewritten as a constraint minimization problem of the analytic function $L(x, \mu) = \mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*) - \mu(Q_{\text{fast}}x - \mathbf{q})$. \square

The reconstruction map will play a crucial role in our analysis as it allows to reconstruct useful properties from the effective system from the fast conserve quantities $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbf{Q}$. The next proposition summarizes its properties.

Proposition 2.4. *Let (FDB) be satisfied. Then:*

- (1) For all $\mathbf{q} \in \text{int}\mathbf{Q}$ we have $Q_{\text{fast}}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{q}$. In particular, we have that $Q_{\text{fast}}\text{DR}(\mathbf{q}) = I_{m_{\text{fast}}}$, and $Q_{\text{fast}}^T\text{DR}(\mathbf{q})^T$ is a projection on $\text{im}(Q_{\text{fast}}^T) = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$.
- (2) For all $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast},+}$ the tangent space of the manifold of equilibria is given by $T_x\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} = \mathbb{H}(x)^{-1}\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$, where $\mathbb{H}(x) := \text{D}^2\mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*) = \text{diag}(1/x_1, \dots, 1/x_I)$.
- (3) Define the projection $\mathbb{P}(x)$ by $\text{im}\mathbb{P}(x) = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}$, $\ker\mathbb{P}(x) = \mathbb{H}^{-1}(x)\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$. Then, we have the identity $(I - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}))) = \text{DR}(\mathbf{q})Q_{\text{fast}}$ and the operator $\mathbb{P}(x)$ is uniformly bounded on compact subsets of $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$.

Proof. (1) This follows directly from the definition of \mathbf{R} and Q_{fast} .

- (2) Recall (2.6). Resolving the constraint $\text{D}\mathcal{H}(x|x_s^*) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$, we differentiate a curve $s \mapsto x(s) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ with $\text{D}\mathcal{H}(x(s)|x_s^*) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$ to get $\dot{x}(s) \in T_{x(s)}\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ and $\text{D}^2\mathcal{H}(x(s)|x_s^*)\dot{x}(s) \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$. Hence, the tangent space is given by $T_x\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} = \mathbb{H}(x)^{-1}\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$.

- (3) First, we observe that the projector $\mathbb{P}(x)$ is uniquely defined because for positive $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^I$ the matrix $\mathbb{H}(x)$ is positive and thus provides a direct decomposition of \mathbb{R}^I . We obtain the identity $(I - \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}))) = \text{DR}(\mathbf{q})Q_{\text{fast}}$ by relating the reduced equation to the projected equation

$$(I - \mathbb{P}(x))R_{\text{slow}}(x) = \dot{x} = \frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}(t)) = \text{DR}(\mathbf{q})Q_{\text{fast}}R_{\text{slow}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}(t))),$$

and varying over $R_{\text{slow}}(x)$. It is also clear that $\max_{x \in K} \|\mathbb{P}(x)\| < \infty$.

□

Using the reconstruction map $\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$, we can now equivalently describe the effective evolution in Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 2.5. *Let $x(0) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast},+}$. Then the effective dynamics (2.5) from Theorem 2.1 can be equivalently described in two ways:*

- (1) *Projected dynamics:* $\dot{x} = (I - \mathbb{P}(x))R_{\text{slow}}(x)$.
- (2) *Coarse-grained dynamics:* $\dot{\mathbf{q}}(t) = Q_{\text{fast}}R_{\text{slow}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}(t)))$.

2.5. Fast-slow HJE for non-typical paths resulted from the large deviation principle.

In order to study the large fluctuations in the chemical reaction process (2.2) that deviate from the typical path in RRE, the WKB expansion in the chemical master equation (Kolmogorov forward equation) is a commonly used method, cf. [KMK73, Gan87, GQ17, QG21]. The time marginal law of $X^h(t)$, denoted as $p_h(x_i, t)$, for x_i in a discrete domain, satisfies forward equation [AK15, GL23]

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}p_h(x_i, t) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (\Psi_r^+(x_i - \gamma_r h)p_h(x_i - \gamma_r h, t) - \Psi_r^-(x_i)p_h(x_i, t)) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (\Psi_r^-(x_i + \gamma_r h)p_h(x_i + \gamma_r h, t) - \Psi_r^+(x_i)p_h(x_i, t)). \end{aligned}$$

The exponential tilt for the probability density $p_h(x_i) = e^{-\frac{u_h(x_i)}{h}}$ provides a Hamiltonian viewpoint for studying the non-typical paths of the fast-slow dynamics, which happens with exponentially small probability compared with the typical path described RRE, cf. [Gan87, GQ17, GL22]. Using the exponential tilt, u_i satisfies a discrete HJE (nonlinear ODE)

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u_h(x_i, t) + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} [\Psi_r^+(x_i - \gamma_r h) e^{\frac{u_h(x_i, t) - u_h(x_i - \gamma_r h, t)}{h}} - \Psi_r^-(x_i)] \\ + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} [\Psi_r^-(x_i + \gamma_r h) e^{\frac{u_h(x_i, t) - u_h(x_i + \gamma_r h, t)}{h}} - \Psi_r^+(x_i)] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Formally, as $h \rightarrow 0$, Taylor's expansion of u_h with respect to h leads to the following HJE

$$(2.8) \quad \partial_t u(x, t) + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \left(\Psi_r^+(x) \left(e^{\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u(x, t)} - 1 \right) + \Psi_r^-(x) \left(e^{-\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u(x, t)} - 1 \right) \right) = 0.$$

The rigorous proof of the large deviation principle using the convergence of discrete nonlinear semigroup to the continuous one can be done through the WKB expansion in the backward equation for process X^h and the convergence of the resulted monotone scheme for the first order continuous HJE, which we refer to [GL23].

In this paper we start from the continuous HJE (2.8) with fast-slow multiscale intensity functions: Ψ_r^\pm with $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}$ and $\Psi_{r, \varepsilon}^\pm = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Psi_r^\pm$ with $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$. Then the Hamiltonian in (2.8) becomes H_ε in (1.1). If one considers chemical reactions restricted in a bounded domain Ω_L , i.e., the probability p_h outside a bounded domain Ω_L is zero, then the associated HJE on a bounded domain with state-constraint boundary condition becomes

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) &\leq 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega_L \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) &\geq 0, & (x, t) \in \overline{\Omega_L} \times (0, T), \\ u^\varepsilon(x, 0) &= u_0^\varepsilon(x), & x \in \Omega_L. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of viscosity solution to (2.9) will be given in Definition 5.2.

3. FAST-SLOW, EFFECTIVE, AND COARSE-GRAINED HAMILTONIAN AND LAGRANGIAN

Before we study the limit of (HJE $_\varepsilon$), we first recall the functionals, i.e. the Hamiltonian and the Lagrangian from the introduction, see (1.1). In particular, we state explicitly the fast-slow Hamiltonian H_ε and Lagrangian L_ε for the fast-slow chemical reaction system, followed by the effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} and Lagrangian L_{eff} , which will be a part of the Γ -convergence result in Section 4. Finally, we define coarse-grained functionals \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{L} , which will be the expression of the effective functionals in coarse-grained variables. Note that throughout the section the functionals are defined on subsets of the euclidean space and the canonical inner product is denoted by $x \cdot p = \sum_i x_i p_i$.

3.1. Fast-slow action Hamiltonian and Lagrangian. Throughout this section, $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed. Recall from (1.1) the fast-slow Hamiltonian $H_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^I \times \mathbb{R}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By Legendre transform (see Lemma 3.1 below), the fast-slow Lagrangian is given by

$$(3.1) \quad L_\varepsilon(x, v) = \inf_{v = \gamma^T J} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_{r, \varepsilon}^+(x), \Psi_{r, \varepsilon}^-(x)),$$

where the discrete continuity equation $v = \gamma^T J$ is given by the adjoint of the Wegscheider matrix $\gamma = (\gamma_{r,i})$, i.e. $v = \sum_r J_r \gamma_r$, $(\gamma^T J)_i = \sum_r \gamma_{r,i} J_r$, and $(\gamma p)_r := \gamma_r \cdot p$. Above, we define for $\alpha, \beta > 0$ the respective function

$$S(J|\alpha, \beta) := \sqrt{\alpha\beta} \cdot \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{\alpha\beta}} \right) - J \frac{1}{2} \log(\alpha/\beta) + \left(\sqrt{\alpha} - \sqrt{\beta} \right)^2,$$

as the Legendre transform of the function $(\alpha, \beta, p) \mapsto S_{\alpha, \beta}^*(p) := \alpha(e^p - 1) + \beta(e^{-p} - 1)$ with respect to the variable $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Here \mathcal{C} is the Legendre transform of the cosh-function $\mathcal{C}^*(p) = 2(\cosh(p) - 1)$. In Proposition 3.2, properties of the functions S and S^* will be summarized. Before that, we first show that indeed the Hamiltonian H_ε and the Lagrangian L_ε are dual to each other.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $x \in \mathcal{C}$, $v \in \mathbb{R}^I$, we have $H_\varepsilon(x, \cdot)^*(v) = \sup_p (p \cdot v - H_\varepsilon(x, p)) = L_\varepsilon(x, v)$.*

Note, that in particular, we have $L_\varepsilon(x, v) = +\infty$ if $v \notin \Gamma$. Recalling the definition of the matrix Q of conserved quantities from Section 2.1, this means that for a trajectory $t \mapsto x(t)$ with bounded $L_\varepsilon(x(t), \dot{x}(t))$ we necessarily have that $Q\dot{x} = 0$.

Proof. For simplicity, we neglect the explicit ε -dependence in the reaction intensities $\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^\pm$. We compute the Legendre transform of L_ε from (3.1) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_\varepsilon^*(x, p) &= \\ &= \sup_v \left\{ v \cdot p - \inf_{v=\gamma^T J} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} = \sup_{v, J: v=\gamma^T J} \left\{ v \cdot p - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_J \left\{ \gamma^T J \cdot p - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} = \sup_J \left\{ J \cdot \gamma p - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_J \left\{ \sum_r J_r (\gamma p)_r - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S^*((\gamma p)_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) = H_\varepsilon(x, p). \end{aligned}$$

□

In the later sections we need some properties of the function S , which will be summarized and proved in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $[0, \infty[\times [0, \infty[\times \mathbb{R} \ni (\alpha, \beta, p) \mapsto S_{\alpha, \beta}^*(p) := \alpha(e^p - 1) + \beta(e^{-p} - 1)$, and define its Legendre transform by $S(J|\alpha, \beta) = \sup_{p \in \mathbb{R}} (p \cdot J - S_{\alpha, \beta}^*(p))$. The function S has the following properties:*

- (1) *For all $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$, $J \in \mathbb{R}$, we have $S(J|\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$ and $S(J|\alpha, \beta) = S(-J|\beta, \alpha)$.*
- (2) *For $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we have the the following equivalent characterizations*

$$\begin{aligned} S(J|\alpha, \beta) &= \sqrt{\alpha\beta} \cdot \mathcal{C} \left(\frac{J}{\sqrt{\alpha\beta}} \right) - J \frac{1}{2} \log(\alpha/\beta) + \left(\sqrt{\alpha} - \sqrt{\beta} \right)^2 \\ &= \inf_{J=u-w} \mathcal{H}(u|\alpha) + \mathcal{H}(w|\beta), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{C} is the Legendre transform of the cosh-function $\mathcal{C}^*(p) = 2(\cosh(p) - 1)$ and \mathcal{H} is the relative entropy. In particular, we have

$$S(J|\alpha, \beta) \geq -J \frac{1}{2} \log(\alpha/\beta) + \left(\sqrt{\alpha} - \sqrt{\beta} \right)^2.$$

(3) For $M > 0$ satisfying $\alpha, \beta \leq M$, we have that $S(J|\alpha, \beta) \geq MC(J/M) - 2M$.

Proof. The first two claims follow directly from the definition by the Legendre transform. For the third claim, we observe that

$$S_{\alpha, \beta}^*(p) = \alpha(e^p - 1) + \beta(e^{-p} - 1) \leq M(e^p + e^{-p}) \leq 2M \cosh(p) = M(C^*(p) + 2).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} S(J|\alpha, \beta) &= \sup_p \{p \cdot J - S_{\alpha, \beta}^*(p)\} \geq \sup_p \{p \cdot J - M(C^*(p) + 2)\} \geq M \sup_p \left\{ p \cdot \frac{J}{M} - C^*(p) \right\} - 2M \\ &= MC(J/M) - 2M. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. Effective Lagrangian and Hamiltonian. As we will see from the Γ -convergence result (Theorem 4.2), the effective Lagrangian L_{eff} is restricted to the slow reactions and takes into account the set of fast equilibria $\mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$. It is defined as

$$(3.2) \quad L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) := \inf_{J_r} \left\{ \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) : Q_{\text{fast}} v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r \right\}$$

for $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$; and $L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) := +\infty$ if $x \notin \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$. Later we will restrict the domain of definition to $x \in \mathcal{M}_S \subset \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$, see Section 4. Note that L_{eff} contains the slow part of the ε -dependent Lagrangian without its fast-part. However the continuity equation is now contracted through the fast-conservation matrix Q_{fast} .

The explicit expression of effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} is computed in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.3. For $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$, we have $L_{\text{eff}}(x, \cdot)^*(p) =: H_{\text{eff}}(x, p)$,

$$(3.3) \quad H_{\text{eff}}(x, p) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S_{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)}^*((\gamma p)_r) + \chi_{\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp}(p),$$

where the characteristic function of convex analysis $p \mapsto \chi_A(p)$ is defined as 0, if $p \in A$ and $+\infty$ otherwise. In particular, we have that $H_{\text{eff}}(x, p) = \infty$ if $p \notin \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp = \text{range} Q_{\text{fast}}^T$. Moreover, for all $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ and $p \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$ the Legendre transform $H_{\text{eff}}(x, p)$ is attained by taking the supremum over $v \in T_x \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} = \text{Ker}(\mathbb{P}(x))$, i.e.

$$H_{\text{eff}}(x, p) = \sup_{v \in T_x \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}} \{p \cdot v - L_{\text{eff}}(x, v)\},$$

where the projection is defined by $\text{Ker}(\mathbb{P}(x)) = T_x \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$, $\text{range}(\mathbb{P}(x)) = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}$ (see Proposition 2.4).

Proof. Let us fix $x \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$. We compute the Legendre transform of L_{eff} and show that it is given by H_{eff} . For this we observe first that

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{eff}}^*(x, p) &= \sup_v \{v \cdot p - L_{\text{eff}}(x, v)\} = \sup_{v, J: Q_{\text{fast}} v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r} \left\{ v \cdot p - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{v: Q_{\text{fast}} v = 0} v \cdot p = \chi_{\Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp}(p). \end{aligned}$$

For $p = Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}$, a direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} (L_{\text{eff}}(x, \cdot))^*(p = Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) &= \sup_v \left\{ v \cdot Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p} - \inf_{J_r: Q_{\text{fast}} v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r} \left\{ \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{v, Q_{\text{fast}} v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r} \left\{ Q_{\text{fast}} v \cdot \mathbf{p} - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side depends on v only via $Q_{\text{fast}} v$. However, using the projection $\mathbb{P}(x)$, we decompose $v = (I - \mathbb{P}(x))v + \mathbb{P}(x)v$, where $(I - \mathbb{P}(x))v \in T_x \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ and observe $Q_{\text{fast}} v = Q_{\text{fast}}(I - \mathbb{P}(x))v$. Hence, it suffices to compute the supremum only for $v \in T_x \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$. Computing further we get

$$\begin{aligned} (L_{\text{eff}}(x, \cdot))^*(p = Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) &= \sup_J \left\{ \sum_r J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r \cdot \mathbf{p} - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_J \left\{ \sum_r J_r \gamma_r \cdot p - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_J \left\{ \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r (\gamma p)_r + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} J_r (\gamma p)_r - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\} \\ &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S_{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)}^* ((\gamma p)_r) = H_{\text{eff}}(x, p). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

3.3. Coarse-grained Hamiltonian and Lagrangian. As we have seen the effective Lagrangian and Hamiltonian both contain constraints. These constraint can be resolved by using coarse-grained variables. For this, recall the reconstruction map \mathbf{R} from Section 2.4.

The effective Lagrangian L_{eff} is finite if evaluated at $x = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$. Moreover for the constraint in the Hamiltonian, we observe that $p \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp$ is equivalent to $p \in \text{range}(Q_{\text{fast}}^T)$, i.e. there is $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}}$ such that $p = Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\text{eff}}(x, p = Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) &= H_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}), Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S_{\Psi_r^+(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})), \Psi_r^-(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}))}^* (\gamma_r \cdot Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) = \\ (3.4) \quad &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S_{\Psi_r^+(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})), \Psi_r^-(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}))}^* (Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r \cdot \mathbf{p}) =: \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \end{aligned}$$

where we call $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ as the coarse-grained Hamiltonian on $\mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}} \times \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}}$. This Hamiltonian corresponds to a RRE with reaction intensities $\Psi_r^\pm \circ \mathbf{R}$ and stoichiometric vectors $Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r \in \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}}$, meaning that it contains linear stoichiometric vectors, however mass-action law might be violated (as already observed in [MPS21]). The induced RRE of that Hamiltonian is then the coarse-grained evolution equation

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} = Q_{\text{fast}} R_{\text{slow}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}(t))),$$

which we have seen from Proposition 2.1.

For $x = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$, the coarse-grained Lagrangian is then defined by the following contraction:

$$(3.5) \quad \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{v}) := \inf_{v: \mathbf{v} = Q_{\text{fast}} v} L_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}), v)$$

$$(3.6) \quad = \inf_{v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r |\Psi_r^+(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})), \Psi_r^-(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}))).$$

Indeed, computing the Legendre transform of the right-hand side, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_v \{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{p} - \inf_{v: Q_{\text{fast}} v = \mathbf{v}} L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) \} &= \sup_{\mathbf{v}, v: Q_{\text{fast}} v = \mathbf{v}} \{ \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{p} - L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) \} \\ &= \sup_v \{ Q_{\text{fast}} v \cdot \mathbf{p} - L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) \} = \sup_v \{ v \cdot Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p} - L_{\text{eff}}(x, v) \} = H_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{q}, Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{H}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p}), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the convex and continuous functions \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{L} are both Legendre duals.

4. Γ -CONVERGENCE RESULT OF FAST-SLOW ACTION FUNCTIONAL \mathcal{L}_ε

In this section we state and prove the Γ -convergence result of fast-slow action functional \mathcal{L}_ε , which will later be also applied to identify the limit of the HJE. To do so, we fix a bounded working domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$ such that $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$ is compact. As a consequence, the reaction coefficients $\Psi_r^\pm(x)$ defined in (2.3) are continuous on $\bar{\Omega}$ and there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for all reactions $r \in \mathcal{R}$,

$$(4.1) \quad \min\{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)\} \geq c_0 > 0, \quad \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}.$$

We also have an upper bound $\max\{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)\} \leq c_1, \forall x \in \bar{\Omega}$. Since we have restricted the set of admissible concentrations, we also have to restrict the set of conserved quantities. For this we define $\mathbf{Q}_{\bar{\Omega}} := \{Q_{\text{fast}} x : x \in \bar{\Omega}\}$. The restriction of the reconstruction map \mathbf{R} on $\mathbf{Q}_{\bar{\Omega}}$ is still denoted by \mathbf{R} ; its image provides the compact slow-manifold of the evolution

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{M}_S := \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{Q}_{\bar{\Omega}}) \subset \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}} \subset \mathcal{C}.$$

Note that by definition $\mathbf{R} : \mathbf{Q}_{\bar{\Omega}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ is surjective.

For the Γ -convergence result, we fix a time-interval $[0, T]$, $T > 0$. Moreover, we are interested in trajectories $\mathbf{x} : [0, T] \mapsto \mathbf{x}(t)$ with final point $\mathbf{x}(T) = x \in \Omega$, fixed throughout the section. To fix the functional analytic setting, we introduce the function space

$$\text{AC}_x([0, T], \bar{\Omega}) := \{ \mathbf{x} \in \text{AC}([0, T], \bar{\Omega}) : \mathbf{x}(T) = x \}.$$

The ε -dependent Lagrangian L_ε defines the fast-slow action functional by

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} \int_0^T L_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}(t), \dot{\mathbf{x}}(t)) dt, & \mathbf{x} \in \text{AC}_x([0, T], \bar{\Omega}), \\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that later we will rely on the flux representation of the L^1 -velocity $\dot{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \sum_r J_r(t) \gamma_r$. As we will see, the Γ -convergence on $L^1([0, T], \bar{\Omega})$ is a type of Mosco-convergence, defined as follows.

Definition 4.1. *We say \mathcal{L}_ε converges to \mathcal{L}_{eff} in the sense of Mosco-convergence, denoted as $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{M} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$, if (i) there is a liminf-estimate for all weakly-converging sequences:*

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in \text{AC}_x([0, T], \bar{\Omega}) \quad \forall \mathbf{x}^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{x} \text{ in } L^1([0, T], \bar{\Omega}) : \quad \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}^\varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{x});$$

and (ii) there exists a recovery sequence converging in $C([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$:

$$\forall x \in AC_x([0, T], \overline{\Omega}) \quad \exists x^\varepsilon \in AC_x([0, T], \overline{\Omega}), \quad x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x \text{ in } C([0, T], \overline{\Omega}) : \quad \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x).$$

Theorem 4.2 (Γ -convergence of action functional). *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^I$ be an open domain such that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$ is compact. Moreover, assume (FDB) holds. Then, we have the Mosco-convergence $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{M} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$ on $L^1([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$, as defined in Definition (4.1), where*

(4.4)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x) := \begin{cases} \int_0^T L_{\text{eff}}(x(t), \dot{x}(t)) dt, & x \in C([0, T], \overline{\Omega}), \quad Q_{\text{fast}}x \in W^{1,1}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}}), \quad x(t) \in \mathcal{M}_S, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and the effective Lagrangian L_{eff} is defined by (3.2). In particular, continuous curves x with finite action $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x) < \infty$ satisfy $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$.

As usual the Γ -convergence is done in the following three steps: first showing the necessary compactness, then the liminf-estimate, finally constructing the recovery sequence.

Proposition 4.3 (Compactness). *Let a sequence $(x^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$, $x^\varepsilon \in AC_x([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$ satisfying $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \leq C$ be given. Moreover, assume the (FDB). Then there exists a function $x^* \in L^1([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$ with the following properties:*

- (1) $(Q_{\text{fast}}x^*) \in W^{1,1}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}})$ and $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{slow}}$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$;
- (2) $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^*$ in any $L^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^I)$, $p \in [1, \infty[$;
- (3) $x^*(t) = \mathbf{R}(Q_{\text{fast}}x^*(t))$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$, which implies that $x^* \in W^{1,1}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}})$, i.e. x has an absolutely continuous representative.

Proof. The proof is performed in several steps. To derive the time regularity, we use the explicit formula $L_\varepsilon(x, v) = \inf_{v=\gamma^T J} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} S(J_r | \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon,+}(x), \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon,-}(x))$. Hence, we may assume the existence of fluxes $J_r^\varepsilon : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that are measurable, such that $\dot{x}^\varepsilon(t) = \sum_r J_r^\varepsilon(t) \gamma_r$ holds weakly in time and we have for all $r \in \mathcal{R}$ that

$$\int_0^T S(J_r^\varepsilon(t) | \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon,+}(x^\varepsilon(t)), \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon,-}(x^\varepsilon(t))) dt \leq C.$$

Here we used the non-negativity of S .

Step 1: Since the state space $\overline{\Omega}$ is compact, we have convergence almost everywhere in time, i.e. there exists $x^* \in L^\infty([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$ such that for almost every $t \in [0, T]$, $x^\varepsilon(t) \rightarrow x^*(t)$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (not relabeled).

Step 2: Compactness of slow fluxes:

Let $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}$, and let $M := \max \{ \Psi_r^\pm(x) : r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}, x \in \overline{\Omega} \} < \infty$. By Proposition 3.2, we have $C \geq \int_0^T \left(MC \left(\frac{J_r^\varepsilon}{M} \right) - 2M \right) dt$ which implies that $\left\{ \frac{J_r^\varepsilon}{M} \right\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is uniformly bounded in the Orlicz space $L^C([0, T])$. Because it is a Banach space we also get that

$$(4.5) \quad J_r^\varepsilon \text{ is uniformly bounded in } L^C([0, T]),$$

and hence we get weak compactness

$$(4.6) \quad J_r^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup J_r^* \quad \text{in } L^1([0, T]) \text{ for all } r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}.$$

Step 3: By the continuity equation, we get

$$Q_{\text{fast}} \dot{x}^\varepsilon = Q_{\text{fast}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r = Q_{\text{fast}} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r,$$

because $\Gamma_{\text{fast}} = \ker Q_{\text{fast}}$. Hence, we conclude that $(Q_{\text{fast}} \dot{x}^\varepsilon) \in L^{\mathcal{C}}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}})$, and in particular, we have strong convergence of $Q_{\text{fast}} x^\varepsilon =: \mathbf{q}^\varepsilon$ in $L^1([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}})$ to $\mathbf{q}^* := Q_{\text{fast}} x^*$, where we have used that the terminal point $x(T)$ is fixed.

Step 4: Next, we show that $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ for almost all $t \in [0, T]$, which is later refined to \mathcal{M}_S . To see this we exploit the specific form of S and rely on (FDB). Using (4.1) and Proposition 3.2, we have for all $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$ a bound on

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T S(J_r^\varepsilon | \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^+(x^\varepsilon), \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^-(x^\varepsilon)) dt \\ & \geq \int_0^T -J_r^\varepsilon \frac{1}{2} \log(\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^+(x^\varepsilon) / \Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^-(x^\varepsilon)) + \left(\sqrt{\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^+(x^\varepsilon)} - \sqrt{\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^-(x^\varepsilon)} \right)^2 dt \\ & = \int_0^T \frac{J_r^\varepsilon}{2} \gamma_r \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \left(\sqrt{\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^+(x^\varepsilon)} - \sqrt{\Psi_{r,\varepsilon}^-(x^\varepsilon)} \right)^2 dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the (FDB) and Lemma 2.2 in the last step. Summing over all $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$, we get the uniform bound

$$\frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \int_0^T \left(\sqrt{\Psi_r^+(x^\varepsilon)} - \sqrt{\Psi_r^-(x^\varepsilon)} \right)^2 dt \leq C.$$

We are going to show, that the first term is uniformly bounded. Indeed, using the continuity equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt &= \int_0^T \left(\dot{x}^\varepsilon - \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r \right) \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt \\ &= \int_0^T \dot{x}^\varepsilon \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt - \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The last term is bounded, because we already know that the slow fluxes J_r^ε are uniformly bounded in $L^1([0, T])$ and $x^\varepsilon \in L^\infty([0, T], \mathbb{R}^I)$. Moreover, the first term can be rewritten into

$$\int_0^T \dot{x}^\varepsilon \cdot \log(x^\varepsilon / x_s^*) dt = \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{H}(x^\varepsilon(t) | x_s^*) dt = \mathcal{H}(x^\varepsilon(T) | x_s^*) - \mathcal{H}(x^\varepsilon(0) | x_s^*),$$

which is also bounded. Here, we have used that the chain rule holds for the absolutely continuous curves x^ε . Summarizing, we get that

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \int_0^T \left(\sqrt{\Psi_r^+(x^\varepsilon)} - \sqrt{\Psi_r^-(x^\varepsilon)} \right)^2 dt \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Since the integrand

$$F_{\text{fast}}(x^\varepsilon(t)) := \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \left(\sqrt{\Psi_r^+(x^\varepsilon(t))} - \sqrt{\Psi_r^-(x^\varepsilon(t))} \right)^2$$

is non-negative, in the following denoted by $f_\varepsilon = F_{\text{fast}}(x^\varepsilon(t))$, we conclude that the bounded sequence f_ε converges (up to relabing) to zero a.e. in $[0, T]$. Since F_{fast} is continuous, we conclude that $F_{\text{fast}}(x^*) = 0$ a.e., which means that $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{fast}}$ a.e. in $t \in [0, T]$.

Step 5: Since the slow manifold is characterized by the map $R : \mathcal{Q}_{\overline{\Omega}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$, we get that $x^*(t) = R(q(t)) = R(Q_{\text{fast}}x^*(t))$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, $q(t)$ is indeed in $\mathcal{Q}_{\overline{\Omega}}$ since applying Q_{fast} , we have $q(t) = Q_{\text{fast}}R(q(t)) = Q_{\text{fast}}x^*(t) \in \mathcal{Q}_{\overline{\Omega}}$. It also shows that $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$. This proves absolute continuity of the limit trajectory, and moreover, also strong convergence $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^*$ in any $L^p([0, T], \mathbb{R}^I)$, $p \in [1, \infty[$ by dominated convergence. \square

Proposition 4.4 (Liminf estimate). *Let $(x^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ be any sequence such that $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^*$ in $L^1([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$. Then, we have the estimate $\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \geq \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*)$.*

Proof. W.l.o.g we may assume that the sequence $(x_\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \leq C$, since otherwise the claim is trivial. By the compactness result Proposition 4.3, we conclude that the limit satisfies $x^* \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for a.e. $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, there are fluxes $J^\varepsilon = (J_r^\varepsilon)_{r \in \mathcal{R}}$ such that the continuity equation $\dot{x}^\varepsilon = \sum_r J_r^\varepsilon \gamma_r$ is satisfied, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) + \varepsilon &\geq \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r^\varepsilon | \Psi_r^+, \Psi_r^-) dt + \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} S(J_r^\varepsilon | \frac{\Psi_r^+}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\Psi_r^-}{\varepsilon}) dt. \\ &\geq \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r^\varepsilon | \Psi_r^+, \Psi_r^-) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Recall by (4.6), that the slow fluxes we have weak convergence of $J_r^\varepsilon \rightharpoonup J_r^*$ in $L^1([0, T])$. Moreover, Ψ_r^\pm are bounded continuous, and we have strong convergence $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^*$ in $L^p([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$. Also note that the function $(J, x) \mapsto S(J | \Psi^+(x), \Psi^-(x))$ is lower semicontinuous as a Legendre transform. Hence, we get the liminf estimate by Ioffe's theorem (see e.g. [Fonseca-Leonie 07, Th. 7.5]), i.e.

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \geq \int_0^T \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r^* | \Psi_r^+, \Psi_r^-) dt.$$

Applying the coarse-graining map Q_{fast} to the continuity equation and taking the limit in the continuity equation, we get that

$$(4.7) \quad Q_{\text{fast}} \dot{x}^* = \sum_r J_r^* Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r.$$

Hence, we can contract over all these fluxes and obtain the desired liminf-estimate involving \mathcal{L}_{eff} . \square

Proposition 4.5 (Construction of recovery sequence). *Let $x^* \in L^1([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$. Then, there exists a family $(x^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon>0}$ such that $x^\varepsilon \rightarrow x^*$ in $C([0, T], \mathbb{C})$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*)$.*

Proof. The proof is done in several steps.

Step 1: First, we may assume that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*) < \infty$, because if $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*) = \infty$ we take the constant sequence $x^\varepsilon = x^*$ and the liminf provides that also $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \infty$. Hence, we may assume that $x^* \in \text{AC}_x([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$, $q := Q_{\text{fast}}x^* \in W^{1,1}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^{m_{\text{fast}}})$ and that $x^*(t) \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{slow}}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, we have fluxes J_r and the coarse-grained continuity equation of the form $\dot{q} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r Q_{\text{fast}} \gamma_r$ (see (4.7)).

The aim is to construct a continuity equation for the whole system $\dot{x}^\varepsilon = \sum_r J_r \gamma_r$, i.e. to find fluxes

$J = (J_r)_r$ and show that this sequence provides $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*)$.

Step 2: We define the constant sequence $x^\varepsilon = \mathbf{R}(q) = \mathbf{R}(Q_{\text{fast}}x^*)$. Then, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}x^\varepsilon = \mathbf{DR}(q)\dot{q} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r (\mathbf{DR}(q)Q_{\text{fast}})\gamma_r.$$

By the definition of the projection \mathbb{P} in Proposition 2.4, this can be rewritten as

$$\dot{x}^\varepsilon = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r (I - \mathbb{P}(x(t)))\gamma_r = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r \gamma_r + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r \mathbb{P}(x(t))\gamma_r.$$

For the last term, we use that $\text{range}(\mathbb{P}) = \Gamma_{\text{fast}}$. Hence, there are (time-dependent) coefficients $(J_r = J_r(t))_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}}$ such that $\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} J_r \mathbb{P}(x(t))\gamma_r = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} J_r(t)\gamma_r$. The map $J_r \mapsto J_r$ is linear and uniformly bounded by Proposition 2.4. Hence, defining the slow fluxes $J_r := J_r$ for $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}$, we have the exact continuity equation involving all reaction r

$$\dot{x}^\varepsilon = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} J_r \gamma_r.$$

By the compactness argument for slow fluxes in (4.5), we may assume that the slow fluxes J_r , $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}$ are in $L^C([0, T])$. Since the fast fluxes J_r , $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$ are linearly dependent of J_r and obtained by a bounded map, they are also in $L^C([0, T])$.

Step 3: With the above construction, the ε -dependent Lagrangian is given by

$$L_\varepsilon(x, v) = \inf_{v = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} J_r \gamma_r} \left\{ \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} S(J_r | \Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)) + \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} S(J_r | \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Psi_r^+(x), \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Psi_r^-(x)) \right\},$$

and it suffices to show that for all fast reactions $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$, we have

$$\int_0^T S(J_r | \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Psi_r^+(x), \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Psi_r^-(x)) dt = \int_0^T \frac{\Psi_r(x^*)}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(\frac{\varepsilon J_r}{\Psi_r(x^*)}) dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Here we have used that on the slow manifold we have $\Psi_r^+ = \Psi_r^- =: \Psi_r$. Indeed, to see this convergence holds true, we use the estimate

$$\frac{1}{2}|r| \log(|r| + 1) \leq \mathcal{C}(r) \leq 2|r| \log(|r| + 1).$$

Denoting $\Psi_r(x^*) = \rho$ with $0 < \frac{1}{M} \leq \rho \leq M < \infty$, we have for small $\varepsilon > 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(\frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho}) &\leq \frac{\rho}{\varepsilon} \left\{ 2 \left| \frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho} \right| \log \left(\left| \frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho} \right| + 1 \right) \right\} = 2 |J_r(t)| \log \left(\left| \frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho} \right| + 1 \right) \\ &\leq 2 |J_r(t)| \log(|J_r(t)| + 1) \leq 4\mathcal{C}(J_r(t)), \end{aligned}$$

which is integrable. Moreover, we have that $\log \left(\left| \frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho} \right| + 1 \right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} |J_r(t)|$, which is also integrable and converges pointwise to 0 for almost all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, also $|J_r(t)| \log \left(\left| \frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\rho} \right| + 1 \right)$ converges pointwisely to zero for almost all $t \in [0, T]$, which implies, by the dominated convergence theorem, that also

$$\int_0^T \frac{\Psi_r(x^*)}{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}(\frac{\varepsilon J_r(t)}{\Psi_r(x^*)}) dt \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence, we have that the constant sequence satisfies $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x^*) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x^*)$, which proves the claim. \square

We remark that because $\overline{\Omega}$ has a positive distance to the boundary, we do not need a regularization for the construction of the recovery sequence as e.g. in [MRP14]. Once, the compactness is shown, a similar Γ -convergence result should hold true on the full state space \mathbb{C} .

Putting the above results together, Theorem 4.2 can now be proved.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The claim now follows from Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 4.5. \square

5. CONVERGENCE OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS OF ε -DEPENDENT HJE

In this section, we fix any bounded domain Ω_L such that $\overline{\Omega} \subset \Omega_L$ and $\overline{\Omega_L} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^I$. Thus for $\overline{\Omega_L}$, we still have the estimate (4.1). Recall the Hamiltonian $H_\varepsilon(x, p)$ from (1.1) on $\Omega_L \times \mathbb{R}^I$. Recalling the stoichiometric subspace $\Gamma = \text{span}\{\gamma_r : r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ and $\Gamma^\perp = \{q \in \mathbb{R}^I : \forall \gamma \in \Gamma : q \cdot \gamma = 0\}$, it is easy to see for any $p \in \mathbb{R}^I$, we have that

$$(5.1) \quad H_\varepsilon(x, p) = H_\varepsilon(x, p + p^\perp), \quad \forall p^\perp \in \Gamma^\perp.$$

In particular H_ε is degenerate because for $p \in \Gamma^\perp$ we have $H_\varepsilon(x, p) \equiv \partial_x H_\varepsilon(x, p) \equiv 0$. Note that we have already seen this degeneracy for the corresponding Lagrangian L_ε because if $v \notin \Gamma$ then $L_\varepsilon(x, v) = +\infty$; while when $v \in \Gamma$

$$L_\varepsilon(x, v) = \sup_{p \in \Gamma} \{v \cdot p - H_\varepsilon(x, p)\}.$$

From the above degeneracy of H , one can expect that the usual assumptions on Hamiltonian for the wellposedness of Hamilton-Jacobi equation will only be effective for p evaluated (or measured) in the direction of γ_r , i.e. for the quantities $\gamma_r \cdot p$, which is shown in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have the uniform coercivity of H_ε on $\Omega_L \subset \mathbb{R}^I$ and in the directions of $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^I$, i.e.,*

$$(5.2) \quad \inf_{x \in \Omega_L} H_\varepsilon(x, p) \rightarrow +\infty \quad \text{whenever } |\gamma_r \cdot p| \rightarrow +\infty \text{ for some } r \in \mathcal{R}.$$

Proof. From the definition of H_ε and (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_\varepsilon(x, p) &= \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} (\Psi_r^+(x) e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} - \Psi_r^+(x) + \Psi_r^-(x) e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p} - \Psi_r^-(x)) \\ &\geq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} [\min\{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)\} (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} + e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p}) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} [\min\{\Psi_r^+(x), \Psi_r^-(x)\} (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} + e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p}) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] \\ &\geq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} [c_0 (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} + e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p}) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} [c_0 (e^{\gamma_r \cdot p} + e^{-\gamma_r \cdot p}) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] \\ &\geq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} [2c_0 |\gamma_r \cdot p| - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} [2c_0 |\gamma_r \cdot p| - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x)] \rightarrow +\infty \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in $x \in \Omega_L$, whenever $|\gamma_r \cdot p| \rightarrow +\infty$ for some $r \in \mathcal{R}$. \square

Recall the fast-slow HJE problem for the Hamiltonian H_ε in Ω_L with state constraints is given in (2.9), i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x)) &\leq 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega_L \times (0, T), \\ \partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t) + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x)) &\geq 0, & (x, t) \in \overline{\Omega_L} \times (0, T), \\ u^\varepsilon(x, 0) &= u_0^\varepsilon(x), & x \in \Omega_L. \end{aligned}$$

The specific assumptions on initial data u_0^ε will be given below in Assumption 1. Here we recall the definition of viscosity solutions to (2.9) [CD88].

Definition 5.2. *Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, a function u^ε is a viscosity solution to (2.9) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and supersolution in the following sense: u^ε is a viscosity subsolution of*

$$\partial_t u^\varepsilon + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) \leq 0$$

on $\Omega_L \times (0, T)$, if for every $\phi \in C^1(\Omega_L \times (0, T))$ and every $(x_0, t_0) \in \Omega_L \times (0, T)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a maximum at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_\varepsilon(x_0, \nabla \phi(x_0, t_0)) \leq 0;$$

u^ε is a viscosity supersolution of

$$\partial_t u^\varepsilon + H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)) \geq 0$$

on $\overline{\Omega_L} \times (0, T)$, if for every $\phi \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_L} \times (0, T))$ and every $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{\Omega_L} \times (0, T)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a minimum at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_\varepsilon(x_0, \nabla \phi(x_0, t_0)) \geq 0.$$

For fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the variational representation for the state-constraint viscosity solution to (2.9) follows by [Mit08] and is given by

$$(5.3) \quad u^\varepsilon(x, t) = \inf_{x \in \text{AC}([0, t]; \overline{\Omega_L}), x(t) = x} (u_0^\varepsilon(x(0)) + \int_0^t L_\varepsilon(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds).$$

These existence and representation results are however not uniform in ε . We also note that for fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we have $H_\varepsilon \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L \times B_R)$ for any $R > 0$. However, the fast-slow Hamiltonian H_ε is not uniformly bounded when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

We introduce a smaller function space

$$(5.4) \quad \Pi := \{u \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L); \gamma_r \cdot \nabla u = 0, \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}\} = \{u \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L); \nabla u \in \Gamma_{\text{fast}}^\perp\}$$

and we propose the following conditions for the initial data:

Assumption 1 (Well prepared initial data). *The family of initial data $(u_0^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ of the HJE (2.9) satisfies the following conditions*

- (i) $\forall \varepsilon > 0, u_0^\varepsilon(\cdot) \in \Pi$;
- (ii) *there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|u_0^\varepsilon\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})} \leq C$ uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$;*
- (iii) *there exists $u_0^* \in C^1(\overline{\Omega_L})$ such that $u_0^\varepsilon \rightarrow u_0^*$ in $C(\overline{\Omega_L})$.*

With the above assumption, we can derive ε -uniform Lipschitz continuity of the solution.

Proposition 5.3. *Under Assumption 1, let $u^\varepsilon \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L \times [0, T])$ be a viscosity solution to ε -HJE (2.9), then we have the uniform Lipschitz estimates for u^ε , i.e., there exists a constant $C_L > 0$ such that*

$$(5.5) \quad |\partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t)| + |\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)| \leq C_L, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega_L \times [0, T], \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}.$$

Proof. The proof is performed in three steps.

Step 1: Existence of u^ε :

One can directly verify that $u^\varepsilon \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L \times [0, T])$ given by (5.3) is a viscosity solution to (2.9) for fixed ε . It indeed can be proved via Perron's method [Mit08, Theorem 5.2].

Step 2: u^ε is Lipschitz continuous in time for all $t \in [0, T]$ uniformly in ε :

Since $\|\nabla u_0^\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} \leq C$ and $\gamma_k \cdot \nabla u_0^\varepsilon = 0$, $\forall k \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$, then we know there exists some constant $C^* > 0$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad |H_\varepsilon(x, \nabla u_0^\varepsilon(x))|_{L^\infty} \leq C^* \quad \text{uniformly in } \varepsilon.$$

Thus one can verify that

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \underline{\varphi}(x, t) &:= u_0^\varepsilon - C^* t \quad \text{is a classical subsolution;} \\ \overline{\varphi}(x, t) &:= u_0^\varepsilon + C^* t \quad \text{is a classical supersolution.} \end{aligned}$$

Then based on the comparison principle [Mit08, Theorem 3.5], we have

$$(5.8) \quad \underline{\varphi}(x, t) \leq u^\varepsilon(x, t) \leq \overline{\varphi}(x, t) \quad \text{uniformly in } \varepsilon.$$

In particular, together with Assumption 1 for u_0^ε , we have that u^ε is bounded uniformly in $\varepsilon > 0$ and $(x, t) \in \Omega_L \times [0, T]$. Then we have

$$(5.9) \quad -C^* \leq \frac{u^\varepsilon(x, t) - u_0^\varepsilon}{t} \leq C^*.$$

Taking the supremum for $t \geq 0$, we obtain the Lipschitz continuity in time at $t = 0$. Moreover, since the Hamiltonian is time homogeneous, thus any time translation of a solution is still a solution, so one can obtain the Lipschitz continuity in time at any t

$$(5.10) \quad |\partial_t u^\varepsilon(x, t)| \leq C^* \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega_L \times [0, T].$$

Step 3: u^ε is Lipschitz continuous in space uniformly in ε :

First fix any $x \in \Omega_L$ and $t \in (0, +\infty)$. Given any $R > 0$ such that $\overline{B_R}(x) \subset \overline{\Omega_L}$, for any $y \in (x + \Gamma) \cap \overline{B_R}(x)$, consider the function

$$(5.11) \quad \varphi(y, s) = u^\varepsilon(y, s) - M|s - t| - C_L|y - x| - \frac{\delta}{R^2 - |x - y|^2},$$

where $C_L, M > 0$ are constants large enough to be chosen later and $\delta > 0$ is an arbitrary constant.

Then due to the boundedness of u^ε and $\varphi \rightarrow -\infty$ as $y \rightarrow \partial B_R(x)$, there exists $y^* \in (x + \Gamma) \cap B_R(x)$ and $t^* \in (0, +\infty)$ such that

$$(5.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi(y^*, t^*) &= u^\varepsilon(y^*, t^*) - M|t^* - t| - C_L|y^* - x| - \frac{\delta}{R^2 - |x - y^*|^2} \\ &\geq \varphi(y, s) = u^\varepsilon(y, s) - M|s - t| - C_L|y - x| - \frac{\delta}{R^2 - |x - y|^2} \end{aligned}$$

for any $y \in (x + \Gamma) \cap \overline{B_R(x)}$ and any $s \in (0, +\infty)$. Since u is Lipschitz in time, for sufficient large $M > 0$, one must have $t^* = t$. Otherwise, one can take $y = y^*$ and $s = t$ in (5.12) to obtain

$$u^\varepsilon(y^*, t^*) - M|t^* - t| \geq u^\varepsilon(y^*, t).$$

Using the Lipschitz constant C^* in time in (5.10), we further have

$$u^\varepsilon(y^*, t) + (C^* - M)|t^* - t| > u^\varepsilon(y^*, t^*) - M|t^* - t| \geq u^\varepsilon(y^*, t),$$

which is impossible for large $M > 0$.

Now we show that $y^* = x$ for C_L sufficiently large. To show this by the arguments of contradiction, we first assume $y^* \neq x$. From the Lipschitz estimate in time (5.10), and because u^ε is a viscosity subsolution and $|y - x|$ is differentiable at any $y \neq x$, we know

$$(5.13) \quad H_\varepsilon(y^*, C_L \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|} + \frac{2\delta(y^* - x)}{(R^2 - |x - y^*|^2)^2}) \leq C,$$

where C is a constant depending only on C^* . Then using the same estimate of Lemma 5.1, we have

$$(5.14) \quad \begin{aligned} C &\geq H_\varepsilon(y^*, C_L \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|} + \frac{2\delta(y^* - x)}{(R^2 - |x - y^*|^2)^2}) \\ &\geq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} \left[2c_0(C_L |\gamma_r \cdot \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|}| - \left| \frac{2\delta\gamma_r \cdot (x - y^*)}{(R^2 - |x - y^*|^2)^2} \right|) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \left[2c_0(C_L |\gamma_r \cdot \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|}| - \left| \frac{2\delta\gamma_r \cdot (x - y^*)}{(R^2 - |x - y^*|^2)^2} \right|) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since Ψ_r^\pm is bounded and y^* is in the interior of $B_R(x)$, we have

$$(5.15) \quad \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \left[2c_0 C_L |\gamma_r \cdot \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|}| - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x) \right] \leq \varepsilon C.$$

Taking C_L sufficiently large, this implies

$$(5.16) \quad \gamma_r \cdot (y^* - x) = 0, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}.$$

Therefore, plugging (5.16) into the original Hamiltonian (5.13), the summation for the fast reaction vanish, so (5.13) implies

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}} \left[2c_0(C_L |\gamma_r \cdot \frac{y^* - x}{|y^* - x|}| - \left| \frac{2\delta\gamma_r \cdot (x - y^*)}{(R^2 - |x - y^*|^2)^2} \right|) - \Psi_r^+(x) - \Psi_r^-(x) \right] \leq C.$$

With the same arguments as (5.16), we obtain

$$(5.18) \quad \gamma_r \cdot (y^* - x) = 0, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{slow}}.$$

Combining (5.16) and (5.18), notice also $y^* - x \in \Gamma$, thus we must have $y^* = x$. Therefore, for such a sufficient large C_L , (5.12) yields

$$(5.19) \quad u^\varepsilon(y, s) - u^\varepsilon(x, t) \leq C_L|y - x| + M|s - t| - \frac{\delta}{R^2} + \frac{\delta}{R^2 - |x - y|^2}.$$

Taking $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $s = t$ and then exchanging x, y shows

$$(5.20) \quad |u^\varepsilon(y, t) - u^\varepsilon(x, t)| \leq C_L|y - x|, \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0, T], x, y \in \Omega_L \text{ with } x - y \in \Gamma.$$

This implies

$$(5.21) \quad |\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon(x, t)| \leq C_L, \quad \text{for a.e. } (x, t) \in \Omega_L \times [0, T], \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}.$$

Combining (5.10) and (5.21), we finish the proof. \square

Remark 5.4. *We remark that the bound in (5.5) can be refined for the fast reactions. Indeed, we know*

$$|H_\varepsilon^{\text{fast}}| = \left| \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} \Psi_r^+(x) (e^{\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon} - 1) + \Psi_r^-(x) (e^{-\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon} - 1) \right| \leq C\varepsilon.$$

Then for $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$, $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$,

$$0 \leq 2\Psi_r(x)(\cosh(\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon) - 1) \leq \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}} 2\Psi_r(x)(\cosh(\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon) - 1) = |H_\varepsilon^{\text{fast}}(x, \nabla u^\varepsilon)| \rightarrow 0.$$

This, together with (4.1), yields that for $r \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{fast}}$,

$$\gamma_r \cdot \nabla u^\varepsilon \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } t \in [0, T], x \in \mathcal{M}_S.$$

Based on the above Lipschitz estimates for the viscosity solution, which is uniform in ε , we have the following uniqueness theorem. With the Lipschitz estimates, the uniqueness is standard, however, we still give a brief proof since our Hamiltonian is degenerate on Γ^\perp and the Lipschitz estimate is in the sense of (5.5).

Theorem 5.5. *Under Assumption 1, HJE (2.9) has a unique Lipschitz viscosity solution $u^\varepsilon(x, t)$, for which, uniform Lipschitz estimate (5.5) holds.*

Proof. Based on Lipschitz estimates in Proposition 5.3, we can introduce a modified Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}_\varepsilon \in C(\Omega_L \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ such that

$$(5.22) \quad \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) = \begin{cases} H_\varepsilon(x, p), & \text{if } |\gamma_r \cdot p| \leq C_L \text{ for all } r \in \mathcal{R}; \\ |p|, & \text{if } |\gamma_r \cdot p| \geq 2C_L \text{ for some } r \in \mathcal{R}, \end{cases}$$

and continuously connected otherwise. We point out that although the modified Hamiltonian is based on the spatial Lipschitz estimates only in the directions of Γ , it still satisfies the usual assumptions for Hamiltonian (cf. [BD⁺97, Tra21]): for any $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^I$ and $x, y \in \Omega_L$:

$$(5.23) \quad |\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(y, p)| \leq C(1 + |p|)|x - y|, \quad |\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, q)| \leq C|p - q|.$$

Indeed, whenever $|\gamma_r \cdot p| \leq C_L, \forall r \in \mathcal{R}$, we have $|\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(y, p)| \leq C|x - y|$; and otherwise $|\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(y, p)| \leq C(1 + |p|)|x - y|$. Moreover, if $|\gamma_r \cdot p| \leq C_L, \forall r \in \mathcal{R}$, we have $|\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, q)| \leq C \sum_r |\gamma_r \cdot (p - q)| \leq C|p - q|$; and otherwise $|\tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, p) - \tilde{H}_\varepsilon(x, q)| \leq C|p - q|$.

Thus for any $u^\varepsilon \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L \times [0, T])$ solves (2.9) with the Lipschitz estimate (5.5) will also solve the HJE with H_ε replaced by \tilde{H}_ε . Then by (5.23), one has the uniqueness of viscosity solution to (2.9) with H_ε replaced by \tilde{H}_ε , so u^ε is the unique Lipschitz viscosity solution to (2.9). \square

Using the ε -uniform Lipschitz estimate and the ε -uniform boundedness, we then apply the Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem in the Banach space $C(K \times [0, T])$ for any compact subset $K \subset \Omega_L$ to obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *Let u^ε be the unique Lipschitz viscosity solution obtained in Theorem 5.5. For any compact subset $K \subset \Omega_L$, there exists $u^* \in \text{BUC}(\Omega_L \times [0, T])$ such that u^ε converges to u^* uniformly in $C(K \times [0, T])$.*

6. IDENTIFICATION OF LIMITING HJE WITH SEMIGROUP REPRESENTATION

The aim of the section is to identify the limit u^* of the sequence of solutions u^ε from Corollary 5.6 by the Γ -convergence result from Section 4. The viscosity solutions u^ε in the representation formula (5.3) is given as an infimum and Γ -convergence is tailored to provide convergence of minimizers. In particular, we want to show that u^* satisfies the variational representation (6.2) and solves the Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the effective H_{eff} . Finally, combining Theorem 6.4 and the limit u^* of the sequence of solutions u^ε from Corollary 5.6, we finish the proof of **Main Theorem** in the introduction.

6.1. Consequence of the Γ -convergence result. Before we connect u^* with a representation formula, we first recall how Γ -convergence provides the identification of the limit of minimizers of functionals. For that, let $F_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\Gamma} F_0$ and let x_ε be s.t. $F_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) = \inf F_\varepsilon$ and $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0$. Then we have that $x_0 = \inf F_0$. Indeed, we have by the Γ -liminf, that $\inf F_0 \leq F_0(x_0) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon$. Moreover, for any x there is a recovery sequence, $\bar{x}_\varepsilon \rightarrow x$ such that $F_0(x) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon) \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon$. Since, x is arbitrary, we obtain that $\inf F_0 \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon$ which thus concludes that $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon = \inf F_0 = F_0(x_0)$.

In our situation, we have on $L^1([0, T], \bar{\Omega})$ that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{M} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$ provided that the final point of the trajectories is fixed, see (4.2). For fixed $u_0^\varepsilon \in C(\bar{\Omega})$, $T > 0$ and $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, we recast the viscosity solution u^ε , represented in (5.3), as

$$u^\varepsilon(x, T) = \inf \left\{ u_0^\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon(0)) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) : x_\varepsilon \in \text{AC}([0, T], \bar{\Omega}), x_\varepsilon(T) = x \right\}.$$

Combining the Γ -convergence result 4.2 and the uniform convergence from Corollary 5.6, we give a representation formula for the limit u^* in the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *Assume the initial data u_0^ε satisfies Assumption 1 and u^ε is the viscosity solution to (2.9). Let \mathcal{L}_{eff} be defined by (4.4), and let u^* be the limit of u^ε in Corollary 5.6. Then we have for all $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$,*

$$\begin{aligned} u^*(x, T) &= \inf \left\{ u_0^*(x(0)) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x) : x \in \text{AC}([0, T], \bar{\Omega}), x(T) = x \right\} \\ &= \inf \left\{ u_0^*(x(0)) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x) : x \in \text{AC}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_S), x(T) = x \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us fix $(x, T) \in \bar{\Omega} \times (0, +\infty)$. To simplify notation, we define $X := \{x \in \text{AC}([0, T], \bar{\Omega}), x(T) = x\}$ and

$$F_\varepsilon(x) := u_0^\varepsilon(x(0)) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x), \quad F_0(x) := u_0^*(x(0)) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x).$$

Let x_ε such that $F_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) = \inf F_\varepsilon$. Then, we have that $F_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) < \infty$. Since, u_0^ε is uniformly bounded and $x_\varepsilon(0) \in \bar{\Omega}$ we conclude that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) < \infty$. By the compactness results in Proposition 4.3, we conclude that there is a limit x_0 such that $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0$ in $C([0, T], \bar{\Omega})$, and moreover, $x_0 \in \text{AC}_x([0, T], \mathcal{M}_S)$. We want to show that $F_0(x_0) = \inf F_0$.

Indeed, we have

(6.1)

$$\inf F_0 \leq F_0(x_0) = u_0^*(x_0(0)) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x_0) \leq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_0^\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon(0)) + \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\varepsilon(x_\varepsilon) = \liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon,$$

where we have used the Γ -convergence of $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$, the equicontinuity of u_0^ε , and the convergence $x_\varepsilon \rightarrow x_0$ in $C([0, T], \overline{\Omega})$. Moreover by the construction of the recovery sequence (see 4.5), for any $x \in X$ there is sequence $\bar{x}_\varepsilon \rightarrow x$ in X (in particular $x_\varepsilon(0) \rightarrow x(0)$) such that $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x)$. Hence, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(x) &= u_0^*(x(0)) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(x) \geq \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_0^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon(0)) + \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon) \\ &\geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_0^\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon(0)) + \mathcal{L}_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon) = \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\varepsilon(\bar{x}_\varepsilon) \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the infimum w.r.t. $x \in X$ we conclude that $\inf F_0 \geq \limsup_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon$. This, together with (6.1), hence implies that

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} F_\varepsilon = \inf F_0, \quad \text{and } F(x_0) = \inf F_0.$$

This means that for $x \in \mathcal{M}_S \subset \Omega_L$ we have $u^*(x, T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} u_\varepsilon(x, T) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \inf F_\varepsilon = \inf F_0$ and thus provides the least-action formulation of the limit u_* . \square

The above characterization provides that the limit u^* can be expressed on the compact manifold \mathcal{M}_S (possibly with boundary) by the least-action representation

$$(6.2) \quad u^*(x, t) = \inf_{x \in \text{AC}_x([0, t]; \mathcal{M}_S)} \left\{ u_0^*(x(0)) + \int_0^t L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) \, ds \right\}.$$

Remark 6.2. *The above identification provides a formula for u^* on the slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S . A natural question is, how u^* looks like away from \mathcal{M}_S , because the variational representation is not applicable. Corollary 5.6 only shows that u^* is continuous, however a more detailed characterization is open and left for further analysis.*

6.2. Viscosity solution of effective HJE with H_{eff} . Recall the compact slow manifold \mathcal{M}_S defined in (4.2). We are going to verify by the dynamic programming that u^* from (6.2) satisfied the effective state-constraint HJE (1.2) on the manifold \mathcal{M}_S , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u(x, t) + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u(x, t)) &\leq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_S^o \times (0, +\infty), \\ \partial_t u(x, t) + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u(x, t)) &\geq 0, \quad (x, t) \in \mathcal{M}_S \times (0, +\infty), \\ u(x, 0) &= u_0(x), \quad x \in \mathcal{M}_S = \overline{\mathcal{M}_S}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{M}_S^o denotes the interior of \mathcal{M}_S . Here, recall that the differential $d_x u$ in differential geometry of a smooth function $u(\cdot, t) : \mathcal{M}_S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at the point $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}_S$ is defined by

$$d_x u(x_0, t)[v] := \lim_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \frac{u(x(\tau), t) - u(x_0, t)}{\tau},$$

where $x : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_S$ is a smooth curve with $x(0) = x_0$, $\dot{x}(0) = v \in T_x \mathcal{M}_S$. (Note that the differential acts only in the first argument $x \in \mathcal{M}_S$.) Viscosity solutions of (1.2) on manifolds $\mathcal{M}_S \times (0, +\infty)$ are understood as follows, which we recall from [Fat12, CD88]:

Definition 6.3. A function u is a viscosity solution to (1.2) if it is both a viscosity subsolution and supersolution in the following sense: u is a viscosity subsolution of

$$\partial_t u + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u) \leq 0$$

on $\mathcal{M}_S^o \times (0, +\infty)$, if for every $\phi \in C^1(\mathcal{M}_S \times (0, +\infty))$ and every $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{M}_S^o \times (0, +\infty)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a maximum at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_{\text{eff}}(x_0, d_x \phi(x_0, t_0)) \leq 0;$$

u is a viscosity supersolution of

$$\partial_t u + H_{\text{eff}}(x, d_x u) \geq 0$$

on $\overline{\mathcal{M}_S} \times (0, +\infty)$, if for every $\phi \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}_S} \times (0, +\infty))$ and every $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}_S} \times (0, +\infty)$ such that $u - \phi$ has a minimum at (x_0, t_0) , we have

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_{\text{eff}}(x_0, d_x \phi(x_0, t_0)) \geq 0.$$

Theorem 6.4. The limiting function u^* represented as (6.2) is a viscosity solution to the effective HJE (1.2) on the manifold \mathcal{M}_S in the sense of Definition 6.3.

Proof. We verify both conditions separately.

Step 1: u^* is a subsolution:

Let $\phi \in C^1(\mathcal{M}_S \times (0, +\infty))$ such that $u - \phi$ attains its maximum at $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{M}_S^o \times (0, +\infty)$. Then for any $x \in \text{AC}_{x_0}([0, t_0]; \mathcal{M}_S)$ with $x(t_0) = x_0$, we have

$$\phi(x_0, t_0) \leq \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds + u(x(\tau), \tau) \leq \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds + \phi(x(\tau), \tau).$$

Rearranging and dividing by $t_0 - \tau$, we have for any $v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{M}_S$,

$$(6.3) \quad \frac{\phi(x_0, t_0) - \phi(x(\tau), \tau)}{t_0 - \tau} \leq \frac{1}{t_0 - \tau} \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s^v, \dot{x}_s^v) ds,$$

where x_s^v is any curve on \mathcal{M}_S such that $x_{s=t_0}^v = x_0, \dot{x}_{s=t_0}^v = v$. Taking $\tau \rightarrow t_0$, we have

$$(6.4) \quad \partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + d_x \phi(x_0, t_0)[v] - L_{\text{eff}}(x_0, v) \leq 0, \quad \forall v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{M}_S.$$

Taking supremum with respect to $v \in T_{x_0} \mathcal{M}_S$ using Lemma 3.3, this proves

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_{\text{eff}}(x_0, d_x \phi(x_0, t_0)) \leq 0.$$

Step 2: u^* is a supersolution:

Let $\phi \in C^1(\overline{\mathcal{M}_S} \times (0, +\infty))$ such that $u - \phi$ attains its minimum at $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{\mathcal{M}_S} \times (0, +\infty)$. Then we have

$$\phi(x_0, t_0) = \inf \left\{ \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds + u(x(\tau), \tau) \right\} \geq \inf \left\{ \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds + \phi(x(\tau), \tau) \right\},$$

where $x(\cdot) \in \text{AC}_{x_0}([0, t_0]; \overline{\mathcal{M}_S})$. Thus

$$0 \leq \sup \left\{ \phi(x_0, t_0) - \phi(x(\tau), \tau) - \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds \right\}.$$

Hence

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{t_0 - \tau} \sup \left\{ \int_{\tau}^{t_0} (\partial_t \phi + d_x \phi[\dot{x}_s]) ds - \int_{\tau}^{t_0} L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s) ds \right\}.$$

By the definition of supremum, for any ε , there exists x such that

$$-\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{t_0 - \tau} \int_{\tau}^{t_0} [\partial_t \phi + d_x \phi(x_s)[\dot{x}_s] - L_{\text{eff}}(x_s, \dot{x}_s)] ds \leq \frac{1}{t_0 - \tau} \int_{\tau}^{t_0} [\partial_t \phi + H_{\text{eff}}(x_s, d_x \phi(x_s))] ds.$$

Taking $\tau \rightarrow t_0$, we have

$$\partial_t \phi(x_0, t_0) + H_{\text{eff}}(x_0, d_x \phi(x_0, t_0)) \geq 0.$$

Thus, we conclude u^* is a viscosity solution to (1.2). \square

6.3. Coarse-grained HJE. We have seen that the limit functionals L_{eff} and H_{eff} can also be expressed in terms of coarse-grained variables, which in turn define coarse-grained functionals L and H , see (3.5) and (3.4), respectively. We are going to show that also the limit u^* of solutions of $(\text{HJE}_{\varepsilon})$ as a function on \mathcal{M}_S can be expressed in coarse-grained variables, which then solves the coarse-grained HJE. Indeed, using the explicit parametrization of the slow-manifold \mathcal{M}_S , we define a new continuous function

$$u : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad u(\mathbf{q}) := u^*(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})).$$

Proposition 6.5. *The function $u = u^* \circ \mathbf{R}$ is a viscosity solution of the HJE with the Hamiltonian H in (3.4) on the (flat) manifold \mathbb{Q} in the sense of Definition 5.2.*

Proof. We only show how the derivatives of u^* translate by the chain-rule. We have $\partial_t u(\mathbf{q}, t) = \partial_t u^*(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}), t)$. Moreover, we know that $H_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q}), p) = H(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ if $Q_{\text{fast}}^T \mathbf{p} = p$. Hence, it suffices to show that $d_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} u^* = Q_{\text{fast}}^T d_{\mathbf{q}} u$, or, equivalently, $d_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} u^*[v] = Q_{\text{fast}}^T d_{\mathbf{q}} u[v]$ for all $v \in T_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} \mathcal{M}_S$. Using the projection onto the tangent space $T_x \mathcal{M}_S$ and its explicit characterization, we have $v = d_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{R} \circ Q_{\text{fast}}[v]$ (see Proposition 2.4). Hence, by the chain rule

$$d_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} u^*[v] = d_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} u^* \circ d_{\mathbf{q}} \mathbf{R} \circ Q_{\text{fast}}[v] = d_{\mathbf{q}} u \circ Q_{\text{fast}}[v] \quad \Rightarrow \quad d_{\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{q})} u^* = Q_{\text{fast}}^T d_{\mathbf{q}} u.$$

\square

We finally remark that again u has an integral representation. To see this, we define:

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{q}, t) = \inf_{y \in \text{AC}([0, t]; \mathbb{Q}), y(t) = \mathbf{q}} \left(u_0(\mathbf{R}(y(0))) + \int_0^t L(y_s, \dot{y}_s) ds \right).$$

Using the same procedure as in Theorem 6.4, we can prove that $\tilde{u}(\mathbf{q}, t)$ is a viscosity solution of HJE with the Hamiltonian H . By uniqueness of viscosity solution, we obtain the representation formula for $u(\mathbf{q}, t) = \tilde{u}(\mathbf{q}, t)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Yuan Gao was partially supported by NSF under Award DMS-2204288.

REFERENCES

- [ABM07] Olivier Alvarez, Martino Bardi, and Claudio Marchi. Multiscale problems and homogenization for second-order hamilton–jacobi equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 243(2):349–387, 2007.
- [AK15] David F. Anderson and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Stochastic Analysis of Biochemical Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [BCC10] Michael A Buice, Jack D Cowan, and Carson C Chow. Systematic fluctuation expansion for neural network activity equations. *Neural computation*, 22(2):377–426, 2010.
- [BD⁺97] Martino Bardi, Italo Capuzzo Dolcetta, et al. *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, volume 12. Springer, 1997.
- [BN13] Paul C Bressloff and Jay M Newby. Metastability in a stochastic neural network modeled as a velocity jump markov process. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 12(3):1394–1435, 2013.
- [Bot03] Dieter Bothe. Instantaneous limits of reversible chemical reactions in presence of macroscopic convection. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 193(1):27–48, 2003.
- [CD88] Italo Capuzzo-Dolcetta. Hamilton-Jacobi equations with constraints. In *Stochastic Differential Systems, Stochastic Control Theory and Applications*, pages 99–106. Springer, 1988.
- [Fat12] Albert Fathi. Weak kam from a pde point of view: viscosity solutions of the Hamilton–jacobi equation and Aubry set. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics*, 142(6):1193–1236, 2012.
- [Gan87] Hu Gang. Stationary solution of master equations in the large-system-size limit. *Physical Review A*, 36(12):5782–5790, Dec 1987.
- [GL22] Yuan Gao and Jian-Guo Liu. Revisit of macroscopic dynamics for some non-equilibrium chemical reactions from a Hamiltonian viewpoint. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 189(2):1–57, 2022.
- [GL23] Yuan Gao and Jian-Guo Liu. Large deviation principle and thermodynamic limit of chemical master equation via nonlinear semigroup. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 21(4):1534–1569, 2023.
- [GQ17] Hao Ge and Hong Qian. Mathematical formalism of nonequilibrium thermodynamics for nonlinear chemical reaction systems with general rate law. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 166(1):190–209, 2017.
- [GQX15] Hao Ge, Hong Qian, and X. Sunney Xie. Stochastic phenotype transition of a single cell in an intermediate region of gene state switching. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 114:078101, Feb 2015.
- [KK13] By Hye-Won Kang and Thomas G Kurtz. Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic reaction networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 23(2):529–583, 2013.
- [KMK73] Ryogo Kubo, Kazuhiro Matsuo, and Kazuo Kitahara. Fluctuation and relaxation of macrovariables. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 9(1):51–96, Sep 1973.
- [Kur80] Thomas G Kurtz. Representations of Markov processes as multiparameter time changes. *The Annals of Probability*, pages 682–715, 1980.
- [LL17] Tiejun Li and Feng Lin. Large deviations for two-scale chemical kinetic processes. *Communications in Mathematical Sciences*, 15(1):123–163, 2017.
- [LX11] Gene-Wei Li and X Sunney Xie. Central dogma at the single-molecule level in living cells. *Nature*, 475(7356):308–315, 2011.
- [Mit08] Hiroyoshi Mitake. Asymptotic solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations with state constraints. *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 58:393–410, 2008.
- [MPS21] Alexander Mielke, Mark A Peletier, and Artur Stephan. EDP-convergence for nonlinear fast–slow reaction systems with detailed balance. *Nonlinearity*, 34(8):5762, jul 2021.
- [MRP14] Alexander Mielke, D. R. Michiel Renger, and Mark A. Peletier. On the relation between gradient flows and the large-deviation principle, with applications to Markov chains and diffusion. *Potential Analysis*, 41(4):1293–1327, Nov 2014.
- [MS20] Alexander Mielke and Artur Stephan. Coarse-graining via EDP-convergence for linear fast-slow reaction systems. *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences*, 30(09):1765–1807, 2020.
- [PR23] Mark A. Peletier and D. R. Michiel Renger. Fast reaction limits via Γ -convergence of the flux rate functional. *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 35, 2023.

- [QG21] Hong Qian and Hao Ge. *Stochastic Chemical Reaction Systems in Biology*. Lecture Notes on Mathematical Modelling in the Life Sciences. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [Ste21] Artur Stephan. EDP-convergence for a linear reaction-diffusion system with fast reversible reaction. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 60(6):226, 2021.
- [Tra21] Hung Vinh Tran. *Hamilton-Jacobi equations: theory and applications*, volume 213. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.