

Thermodynamic Circuits 4: Modeling chemical reaction networks with nonequilibrium conductance matrices

Paul Raux,^{1,2} Christophe Goupil,² and Gatién Verley¹

¹*Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, IJCLab, 91405 Orsay, France*

²*Université Paris Cité, CNRS, LIED, F-75013 Paris, France*

(Dated: December 20, 2024)

We derive the nonequilibrium conductance matrix for open stationary Chemical Reaction Networks (CRNs) described by a deterministic mass action kinetic equation. As an illustration, we determine the nonequilibrium conductance matrix of a CRN made of two sub-networks, called chemical modules, in two different ways: First by computing the nonequilibrium conductances of the modules that are then serially connected. Second by computing directly the nonequilibrium conductance of the CRN directly. The two approaches coincide, as expected from our theory of thermodynamic circuits. We end by discussing the advantages of splitting a CRN into smaller chemical modules.

I. INTRODUCTION

Open Chemical Reaction networks (CRNs) are paradigmatic examples of complex out of equilibrium systems. Over the last decades, they have attracted a long standing attention as they combine the theory of graphs and hypergraphs [1–3], dynamical systems theory [4, 5] and thermodynamics [6–8]. CRNs are of various complexity, from pseudo-linear dynamics highly similarity to Markov jump processes [9], to non-linear dynamics with interacting species (beyond interaction through chemical reactions) [10], passing by complex balance dynamics for deficiency zero CRNs [11]. Given their complexity, the circuit decomposition of CRNs is appealing to simplify the study of each chemical module separately. For instance, each chemical module can be deficiency zero separately, although the CRN is not [12]. Hence, complexity can emerge from modules association. Moreover, each chemical module once characterized can be reused in other CRNs without further studies while the global investigation of a CRN would required to restart from scratch upon any minor modification of the network.

Existing circuits approach relies on chemical modules modeled by current-force characteristics [13]. However, the coupling between chemical currents falls out of such description. It is albeit crucial for optimizing the efficiency of chemical transduction [14–16]. The description of chemical modules by nonequilibrium conductance matrices combines the simplification of circuit decomposition with the ability to lift the coupling information between chemical currents to the level of the CRN. Moreover, the approach using nonequilibrium resistance/conductance matrices is convenient to study CRN in a linear algebra framework. To use our theory of thermodynamics circuits in this context [17], we derive the general expression for the nonequilibrium conductance matrix of an open stationary CRN. This provides a model for chemical transduction within irreversible thermodynamics that accounts for chemical current coupling. Then, following our work on modeling [18] and associat-

ing [19] thermoelectric converters, we illustrate on chemical module the law of resistance matrix addition upon serial association.

The paper is organized as follows: In the first section, we derive the nonequilibrium resistance/conductance matrices at various level of description of CRN. To do so, we start by recalling the theory of chemical kinetics emphasizing its thermodynamic consistency [20]. Then, given their prominence in our work, we determine the conservation laws relating the physical currents that are received by the CRN from the chemostats. This approach transfers Schnakenberg’s decomposition of reaction currents on cycle currents [1] to higher level where physical currents are decomposed on fundamental currents [17]. This allows for an effective description of the stationary CRN that does not rely on emergent cycles [13, 20], i.e. a set of reactions that upon completion do not change the internal concentrations and only transfer matter between chemostats. Instead, we consider a set of physical currents (i.e. from chemostats) that, when injected into the system in this exact proportion, does not change the internal concentrations. This simple change of viewpoint makes easier the connection with our theory of thermodynamic circuits and has greater similarity with the framework of Markov jump processes. In the second section, we illustrate the calculation of the chemical nonequilibrium conductance matrix on the two first chemical modules appearing in Ref. [13]. Then, we compute the nonequilibrium conductance matrix for the serial association of the aforementioned chemical modules, either directly for the CRN or by serial association using the law of resistance matrix addition.

II. CHEMICAL NONEQUILIBRIUM CONDUCTANCE MATRIX

In this first section, we fix the notation by recalling the stochastic thermodynamic of CRNs. Whenever possible, we make connection with stationary Markov jump processes as studied in the first section of Ref. [17]. In

the same spirit, we review the description of conservation laws and conserved quantities existing in closed and opened CRNs. Finally, we build the nonequilibrium conductance matrix describing the current-force characteristics of the CRN.

A. Chemical kinetic of closed and open networks

We describe a chemical reaction network by a set of chemical species of concentration Z_α , identified by $\alpha \in \mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{S}|\}$ that are transformed through via chemical reactions denoted by the index $\rho \in \mathcal{R} = \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{R}|\}$. Each reaction ρ is assumed to be reversible and follows a chemical equation of the form:

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}} \nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^+ Z_\alpha \rightleftharpoons \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{S}} \nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^- Z_\alpha \quad (1)$$

where $-\nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^+$ (respectively $\nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^-$) is the number of molecules α consumed (respectively produced) for a given forward reaction ρ [8]. The evolution of the concentrations of species α follows the kinetic equation

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Z}}{dt} = \nabla \mathbf{j} + \mathcal{I} \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{Z} is the concentration vector of components Z_α , $\nabla_{\alpha, \rho} = \nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^- - \nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^+$ the stoichiometric matrix, \mathbf{j} the vector of reaction currents and \mathcal{I} the currents exchanged with the chemostats. We remark that Eq. (2) is a continuity equation for the species concentrations analogous to the master equation describing Markov processes. In this analogy, the species concentrations correspond to state probabilities, the stoichiometric matrix ∇ to the incidence matrix of the graph on which lives the Markov jump process, and the reaction currents \mathbf{j} to the edge probability currents. The source term \mathcal{I} is the main difference between the kinetic and master equations. This term fixes the concentration of the chemostated species. There is no such term for Markov jump processes: the reservoirs constrains the transition rates and not the state occupancy directly.

Assuming mass action law, the reaction fluxes read

$$j_\rho \equiv k_\rho^+ \mathbf{Z}_\alpha^{\nabla_\rho^+} - k_\rho^- \mathbf{Z}_\alpha^{\nabla_\rho^-} \quad (3)$$

where we denote k_ρ^\pm the kinetic rates and ∇_ρ^\pm the column ρ of the matrix of directed stoichiometric coefficients $\nabla_{\alpha, \rho}^\pm$. We use the notation $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{y}} = \prod_i x_i^{y_i}$. The kinetic rates are chosen according to the local detailed balance [9]:

$$RT \log \frac{k_\rho^+}{k_\rho^-} = -(\nabla^T \boldsymbol{\mu}^0(T))_\rho \quad (4)$$

where ∇^T is the transpose of the stoichiometric matrix, $\boldsymbol{\mu}^0$ the column vector of standard chemical potential for species in \mathcal{S} , T the temperature of the isothermal CRN

and R the perfect gaz constant. With words, local detailed balance relates dynamics to thermodynamics, i.e. kinetic rates k_ρ^\pm to standard chemical potentials. It does so in order to ensure dynamically consistent equilibrium or stationary nonequilibrium states. We define the force conjugated to the reaction currents j_ρ as

$$f_\rho \equiv RT \log \frac{k_\rho^+ \mathbf{Z}_\alpha^{\nabla_\rho^+}}{k_\rho^- \mathbf{Z}_\alpha^{\nabla_\rho^-}} = -(\nabla^T \boldsymbol{\mu})_\rho = -\Delta_\rho G \quad (5)$$

where the vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ gathers the chemical potential of the species in \mathcal{S} and $\Delta_\rho G$ is the Gibbs free energy change caused by reaction ρ . The component α of the chemical potential vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ reads

$$\mu_\alpha = \mu_\alpha^0 + RT \log(Z_\alpha). \quad (6)$$

By definition, chemostats set to constant values the concentrations Y_α , for α in a subset of species denoted \mathcal{S}_Y and corresponding to external species. On the opposite, the free concentrations are X_α , for α in a subset of species denoted \mathcal{S}_X and corresponding to internal species. The total set of species is the disjoint union of these two sets

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_X \cup \mathcal{S}_Y, \quad (7)$$

meaning that internal species are not exchanged with the chemostats while external ones do. Accordingly, the stoichiometric matrix writes

$$\nabla = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_X \\ \nabla_Y \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The rate equation rewrites as

$$\frac{d\mathbf{Z}}{dt} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_X \\ \nabla_Y \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{j} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where we use $\frac{d\mathbf{Y}}{dt} = \mathbf{0}$ for chemostated species. Hence, the splitting between external and internal species of Eq. (9) leads to a definition of the currents received by the open CRN from the chemostats

$$\mathbf{i} = -\nabla_Y \mathbf{j}, \quad (10)$$

and a kinetic equation for internal species with no source term

$$\frac{d\mathbf{X}}{dt} = \nabla_X \mathbf{j} \quad (11)$$

since internal species are not exchanged with the environment, i.e. $\mathcal{I} = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{i})^T$ by definition.

B. Conservation laws

We assume that the stoichiometric matrix ∇ has a non zero cokernel, i.e., it exists \mathbf{L} such that

$$\mathbf{L} \nabla = \mathbf{0}. \quad (12)$$

Then, each row of matrix \mathbf{L} is a left eigenvector of the stoichiometric matrix with null eigenvalue. We denote by $|\mathcal{L}_{\text{cl}}|$ the number of row of matrix \mathbf{L} , label them with $\lambda \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{L}_{\text{cl}}|\}$. The subscript cl stands for “close” as we consider here the cokernel of the stoichiometric matrix for the complete CRN, without splitting between internal and external species that is possible for open CRNs. Indeed, we can split \mathbf{L} blockwise by columns as

$$\mathbf{L} = [\ell_x \ \ell_y], \quad (13)$$

as the first lines of ∇ are for the internal species, and the final ones for external species. Multiplying the rate equation Eq. (9) by \mathbf{L} yields:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{M}}{dt} = \ell_y \mathbf{i}, \quad (14)$$

where we have introduced the moiety vector \mathbf{M} defined as

$$\mathbf{M} \equiv \ell_x \mathbf{X}. \quad (15)$$

A way to interpret Eq. (14) is to consider the closed CRN case. Indeed, in this case $\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{0}$ and Eq. (14) reveals that \mathbf{M} gathers the conserved quantities of the dynamics. \mathbf{L} is thus the matrix whose lines are the conservation laws of the CRN if it was closed. By abuse of language, we will refer from now on to \mathbf{L} as the matrix of conservation laws. For open CRNs, a conserved quantity M_λ remains conserved after opening the network if $(\ell_y \mathbf{i})_\lambda = 0$. But, for an open CRN, $\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{0}$ by definition. Then, M_λ is a conserved quantity of the dynamics only if $\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{S}_Y$, $(\ell_y)_{\lambda\alpha} = \mathbf{0}$ (case u) or if $(\ell_y \mathbf{i})_\lambda = 0$ with λ th line of ℓ_y having at least one non zero component (case b). According to these two cases, we split linewise the matrices \mathbf{L} and \mathbf{M} as

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{bmatrix} \ell^u \\ \ell^b \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} M^u \\ M^b \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

The matrix ℓ^u gathers the conservation laws such that the components of M^u remain conserved whatever the current incoming from the reservoir: Opening the CRN always preserves the conservation laws ℓ^u that are said “unbroken”. By definition $\ell_y^u = \mathbf{0}$ and the unbroken conservation laws take the form

$$\ell^u = [\ell_x^u \ \ell_y^u] = [\ell_x^u \ 0]. \quad (17)$$

On the contrary, ℓ^b gathers the conservation laws that can be associated to conserved quantities only when taking into account the matter exchanged with the chemostats. In this case, a particular combination of the currents incoming from the reservoirs is required to get a constant moiety. If not, the moiety is not conserved (e.g., stationary growth) explaining the qualifying “broken”. Applying now the broken conservation laws $\ell^b = [\ell_x^b \ \ell_y^b] = [\ell_x^b \ \ell]$ on Eq. (9), we obtain

$$\ell \mathbf{i} = 0, \quad (18)$$

since ℓ^b is in the cokernel of ∇ . We shorten the notation with ℓ_y^b by ℓ for consistency with Ref. [17]. Indeed, the $|\mathcal{L}|$ rows of matrix ℓ are the conservation laws for the currents of chemostated species compatible with a (non-growing) stationary state. We end by commenting that we focused in this section on the cokernel of the stoichiometric sub-matrix for external species. Indeed, $\ell \mathbf{i} = -\ell \nabla_y \mathbf{j} = 0$ imposes $\ell \nabla_y = 0$. On the contrary, Ref. [13, 20] focuses on vectors in the kernel of the stoichiometric sub-matrix for internal species that are not in the kernel of the stoichiometric sub-matrix for external species. Those basis vectors are called emergent cycles. They are vectors in the space of reactions that indicate a set of reactions that upon completion do not change the internal concentrations but do change the external ones.

C. Cycles and selection matrix

1. Cycles

From now on, we assume that the open CRN has reached a non equilibrium stationary state. Then, Eq. (11) reduces to

$$\nabla_x \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{0} \quad (19)$$

and the reaction currents are linearly dependent: the lines of ∇_x contains the coefficients of a vanishing linear combination of reaction currents. Hence, it exists sequences of reactions, called cycles, that let the concentrations of internal species unchanged. We thus have

$$\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{J} \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{C} is the cycle matrix whose columns are basis vector of $\ker(\nabla_x)$. We denote as usual the cycle currents \mathbf{J} : it is the vector of independent currents among the reaction currents in \mathbf{j} . As already emphasized [17–19], \mathbf{C} is also analogous to a selection matrices.

2. Selection matrix

We apply now the same reasoning at the level of physical and fundamental currents. The conservation laws write

$$\ell \mathbf{i} = 0 \quad (21)$$

and the physical currents are linearly dependent. Like for cycle currents, we can select a subset of linearly independent currents as

$$\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{S}\mathbf{I} \quad (22)$$

where \mathbf{S} is the selection matrix whose columns are basis vector of $\ker(\ell)$. We denote as usual \mathbf{I} the fundamental currents: it is the vector of independent currents among

the physical currents in \mathbf{i} . By definition, the matrix \mathbf{S} has linearly independent columns and admits a pseudo inverse \mathbf{S}^+ . The fundamental current vector then write $\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{S}^+ \mathbf{i}$. We emphasize that the currents in \mathbf{I} is a choice of linearly independent currents among the chemostat currents which are themselves a subset of the reaction currents. Depending on the CRN, we might have identical cycle and fundamental currents $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{I}$, in which case $\mathbf{S} = -\nabla_Y \mathbf{C}$.

D. Entropy production and thermodynamic forces

In this section, we determine the thermodynamic forces conjugated to reaction, cycle, chemostat and fundamental currents for a stationary open CRN. This is done by ensuring thermodynamic consistency, i.e., identical Entropy Production Rate (EPR) at all levels of description of the CRN [1]. We start from the EPR σ at the level of reaction force and currents given (up to the temperature factor) by

$$T\sigma = \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{j} \quad (\text{reaction level}). \quad (23)$$

We switch to the cycle level by inserting the definition of the cycle currents Eq. (20) in the EPR Eq. (23). The EPR then reads

$$T\sigma = \mathbf{F}^T \mathbf{J} \quad (\text{cycle level}) \quad (24)$$

where we have introduced the cycle affinity

$$\mathbf{F}^T = \mathbf{f}^T \mathbf{C}. \quad (25)$$

Another decomposition of the EPR follows from inserting the definition of the reaction affinity Eq. (5) in Eq. (23). Using in addition that the rate equation in stationary state yields $\mathcal{I} = -\nabla \mathbf{j}$, we obtain

$$T\sigma = \boldsymbol{\mu}^T \mathcal{I} \quad (26)$$

in agreement with $\mathbf{f}^T = -\boldsymbol{\mu}^T \nabla$ of Eq. (5). This EPR further simplifies by noting that $\mathcal{I}^T = (\mathbf{0} \ \mathbf{i})$ and by using the X/Y splitting of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^T = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_X^T \ \mathbf{a}^T)$ as

$$T\sigma = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{i} \quad (\text{physical level}). \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{a} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_Y$ is the vector of chemical potentials for chemostated species. We can finally use the redundancy of the chemostat currents to write the EPR as

$$T\sigma = \mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{I} \quad (\text{fundamental level}) \quad (28)$$

where we have identified the fundamental force vector

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{S}^T \mathbf{a} \quad (29)$$

conjugated to the fundamental current vector \mathbf{I} . This ends the identification of the four relevant current-force decompositions preserves the EPR.

E. Non equilibrium conductance matrix

We now turn to the determination of the current-force characteristics based at each level of description on a nonequilibrium conductance matrix. We first define the reaction conductance by the diagonal matrix

$$\mathbf{r} = \text{diag}(r_1, \dots, r_{|\mathcal{R}|}) \quad \text{with } r_\rho = \frac{j_\rho}{j_\rho}. \quad (30)$$

The thermodynamic force at the level of reactions writes as a function of reaction currents

$$\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{r} \mathbf{j}. \quad (31)$$

Then, the cycle currents and forces are related by

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{J}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{R} \equiv \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{r} \mathbf{C} \quad (\text{cycle level}) \quad (32)$$

since

$$\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{r} \mathbf{j} = (\mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{r} \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{J} \quad (33)$$

where we use Eqs. (20,25). The matrix \mathbf{R} is symmetric and semi-positive definite by non-negativity of the EPR. Assuming an inverse matrix exists, we call \mathbf{R}^{-1} the cycle conductance matrix. It relates the cycle currents to its conjugated affinities as

$$\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{F} \quad (34)$$

Another conductance matrix exists relating stationary currents \mathcal{I} and chemical potential via

$$\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{G} \boldsymbol{\mu}, \quad \text{with } \mathcal{G} \equiv \nabla \mathbf{r}^{-1} \nabla^T, \quad (35)$$

since

$$\mathcal{I} = -\nabla \mathbf{j} = -\nabla \mathbf{r}^{-1} \mathbf{f} = (\nabla \mathbf{r}^{-1} \nabla^T) \boldsymbol{\mu}. \quad (36)$$

In a similar way, we obtain the conductance matrices at the level of physical forces and currents, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{g} \mathbf{a}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{g} \equiv (\nabla_Y \mathbf{C}) \mathbf{R}^{-1} (\nabla_Y \mathbf{C})^T. \quad (37)$$

(physical level)

To do so, we start from Eq. (10) and use Eqs. (20,34,25) to get

$$\mathbf{i} = -\nabla_Y \mathbf{C} \mathbf{R}^{-1} \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{f}. \quad (38)$$

The last step involves the reaction affinity of Eq. (5) in vector notation

$$\mathbf{f} = -\nabla_X^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_X - \nabla_Y^T \mathbf{a} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbf{C}^T \mathbf{f} = -\mathbf{C}^T \nabla_Y^T \mathbf{a}, \quad (39)$$

since $\nabla_X \mathbf{C} = 0$ by definition. As for Markov jump processes [17, 21], we can introduce in the context of CRN the matrix $\boldsymbol{\phi} \equiv \nabla_Y \mathbf{C}$ with relative integer components, whose columns (each associated to an oriented cycle) provide the matter exchanges with chemostats (when performing the cycle of reactions once).




FIG. 1. CRN decomposed into chemical modules (1) and (2) as proposed in Ref. [13]. The modules are associated in series. Module (1) has 2 external species S, N_a and 3 internal species $E_a, E_a S, E_a S_2$. Module (2) has 4 external species N_a, F, W, N_b and 4 internal species $E_b, E_b F, E_b^*, E_b W$. The serial association is implemented by ensuring the conservation of the reaction currents $j_2 = j_7$ and the equality of the stationary concentration of N_a computed in modules (1) and (2).

Finally, the conductance for fundamental currents and forces writes

$$\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}, \text{ with } \mathbf{G} \equiv \mathbf{S}^+ \mathbf{g} \mathbf{S}^{T+} \quad (\text{fundamental level}) \quad (40)$$

starting from Eq. (37) and using Eqs. (22,29) in pseudo-inverse forms. This concludes our derivation of the nonequilibrium conductance matrix associated to a CRN at any level of description. Once identifying the correct matrix of physical exchange ϕ and recognizing that the cycle matrix \mathbf{C} must involve the internal species only, the analogy with Markov jump processes comes out clearly.

III. ILLUSTRATION

We illustrate now our theory of thermodynamic circuits [17]. Inspired by Ref. [13], we consider the serial association of two chemical reaction modules appearing in the CRN of Fig. 1. We start by describing the modules by providing their stoichiometric matrices and their sub-matrices for internal/external species. Then, we determine the currents and their conjugated forces at all levels of description by exploiting cycles and conservation laws. The modules having pseudo first order dynamics, the stationary concentrations can be computed exactly [22]. Using those, the resistance matrix at the reaction level follows. We propagate it to get the con-

ductance matrices at all level of description. Finally, using the law of resistance matrix addition derived in [17], we determine the conductance matrix for the serial association of modules (1) and (2). We compare our result with the direct computation of the conductance matrix at fundamental level.

A. Stoichiometry and reaction currents

The stoichiometric matrices describing the reactions for modules (1) and (2) read

$$\nabla^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_x^{(1)} \\ \nabla_y^{(1)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (41)$$

$$\nabla^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_x^{(2)} \\ \nabla_y^{(2)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (42)$$

The columns (reaction number ρ) are ordered respectively as $\mathcal{R}^{(1)} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{R}^{(2)} = \{4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$. The rows (species labels Z_α) are respectively ordered as $\mathcal{S}^{(1)} = \{E_a, E_a S, E_a S_2, S, N_a\}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{(2)} = \{E_b, E_b F, E_b W, E_b^*, N_a, N_b, F, W\}$. The internal species are $\mathcal{S}_x^{(1)} = \{E_a, E_a S, E_a S_2\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_x^{(2)} = \{E_b, E_b F, E_b W, E_b^*\}$. The external species are $\mathcal{S}_y^{(1)} = \{S, N_a\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_y^{(2)} = \{N_a, N_b, F, W\}$. The horizontal line separates the stoichiometric matrices into two submatrices: the upper block $\nabla_x^{(m)}$ and the lower block $\nabla_y^{(m)}$ for $m = 1, 2$. We express the currents at all levels of description in terms of the reaction currents that read according to Eq. (3)

$$\mathbf{j}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_1 \\ j_2 \\ j_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_1^+ S [E_a] - k_1^- [E_a S] \\ k_2^+ [E_a S] - k_2^- N_a [E_a] \\ k_3^+ S [E_a S] - k_3^- [E_a S_2] \end{pmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

$$\mathbf{j}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_4 \\ j_5 \\ j_6 \\ j_7 \\ j_8 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} k_4^+ F [E_b] - k_4^- [E_b F] \\ k_5^+ [E_b F] - k_5^- [E_b W] \\ k_6^+ [E_b W] - k_6^- W [E_b] \\ k_7^+ N_a [E_b F] - k_7^- [E_b^*] \\ k_8^+ [E_b^*] - k_8^- N_b [E_b W] \end{pmatrix}. \quad (44)$$

B. From reaction to cycle currents

As aforementioned, the reaction currents are linearly dependent: A basis of linearly independent cycle currents can thus be chosen. Looking for a basis of the kernel of

$\nabla_x^{(m)}$ for $m = 1, 2$, we find the cycle matrices

$$\mathbf{C}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (45)$$

$$\mathbf{C}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

Applying Eq. (19) to both modules yields the following relation between their reaction currents:

$$j_1 = j_2, \quad j_3 = 0, \quad (47)$$

$$j_4 = j_6, \quad j_5 = j_6 - j_8, \quad j_7 = j_8 \quad (48)$$

We remark that equation $j_3 = 0$ is due to our assumption of (non-growing) stationary state: a non zero current would lead to an accumulation of $E_a S_2$ in the system. We notice also that these relations between reaction currents are an instance of Kirchhoff's current law applied to each species of the CRN. Then, since the cycle matrices are pseudo-invertible ($\mathbf{C}^{(1)}$ is a vector and $\mathbf{C}^{(2)}$ has linearly independent columns), we can invert Eq. (20) for both modules and obtain the following cycle currents

$$\mathbf{J}^{(1)} = \mathbf{C}^{(1)+} \mathbf{j}^{(1)} = j_1, \quad (49)$$

$$\mathbf{J}^{(2)} = \mathbf{C}^{(2)+} \mathbf{j}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_8 \\ j_6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (50)$$

compatible with $\mathbf{j}^{(m)} = \mathbf{C}^{(m)} \mathbf{J}^{(m)}$ by using the constraints of Eqs. (47–48).

C. From physical to fundamental currents

The left null eigenvectors of $\nabla_x^{(m)}$ for $m = 1, 2$ constitute the rows of matrices

$$\mathbf{L}^{(1)} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc|cc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right] = \begin{bmatrix} \ell^{(1)u} & \mathbf{0} \\ \ell^{(1)b} & \ell^{(1)} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (51)$$

$$\mathbf{L}^{(2)} = \left[\begin{array}{cccc|ccc} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{array} \right] = \begin{bmatrix} \ell_x^{(2)u} & \mathbf{0} \\ \ell_x^{(2)b} & \ell^{(2)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (52)$$

We separate the unbroken and the conservation laws (respectively internal and external species) by an horizontal (respectively vertical) line. We identify the matrices $\ell^{(m)}$ of conservation laws for the chemical currents received from the chemostats

$$\ell^{(1)} = [1 \ 1], \quad (53)$$

$$\ell^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (54)$$

These physical currents follow from Eq. (10) and read for both modules

$$\mathbf{i}^{(1)} = -\nabla_Y^{(1)} \mathbf{j}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_1 \\ -j_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (55)$$

$$\mathbf{i}^{(2)} = -\nabla_Y^{(2)} \mathbf{j}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_8 \\ -j_8 \\ j_6 \\ -j_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (56)$$

Their components follow the order of chemostated species in $\mathcal{S}^{(m)}$. They are chosen positive when matter flows from the chemostat to the system as one can check on Fig. 2. Finally, we can select linearly independent currents called fundamental currents by choosing a vector basis for the kernels of the conservation law matrices in Eqs. (53–54). This leads to selection matrices

$$\mathbf{S}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (57)$$

$$\mathbf{S}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (58)$$

One can check Eq. (22) with the above selection matrices for the following fundamental currents

$$\mathbf{I}^{(1)} = j_1, \quad (59)$$

$$\mathbf{I}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} j_8 \\ j_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (60)$$

In the end, module 1 is described by an effective reaction converting S into N_a and one reaction current j_1 . Similarly, module 2 is described by two coupled effective reactions and two reaction currents j_6 and j_8 . Fig. 2 summarizes this effective description for modules 1 and 2 in serial association [13].

D. Thermodynamic forces

We now turn to the derivation of the conjugated thermodynamics forces in terms of the reaction affinities defined in Eq. (5) and which read for modules 1 and 2

$$\mathbf{f}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ f_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{E_a} + \mu_S - \mu_{E_a S} \\ \mu_{E_a S} - \mu_{N_a} - \mu_{E_a} \\ \mu_{E_a S} + \mu_S - \mu_{E_a S_2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (61)$$

$$\mathbf{f}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} f_4 \\ f_5 \\ f_6 \\ f_7 \\ f_8 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{E_b} + \mu_F - \mu_{E_b F} \\ \mu_{E_b F} - \mu_{E_b W} \\ \mu_{E_b W} - \mu_W - \mu_{E_b} \\ \mu_{E_b F} + \mu_{N_a} - \mu_{E_b^*} \\ \mu_{E_b^*} - \mu_{N_b} - \mu_{E_b W} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (62)$$




FIG. 2. Effective description of modules (1), (2) and (3). In modules (2) and (3), a coupling exists between currents j_6 and j_8 , although it does not appear on this graphical representation of conservation laws.

Using these reaction affinities for modules (1) and (2) in the definition of cycle forces Eq. (25), we obtain

$$F^{(1)} = \mathbf{C}^{(1)T} \mathbf{f}^{(1)} = f_1 + f_2 = \mu_S - \mu_{N_a}, \quad (63)$$

$$\mathbf{F}^{(2)} = \mathbf{C}^{(2)T} \mathbf{f}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} f_7 + f_8 - f_5 \\ f_4 + f_5 + f_6 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{N_a} - \mu_{N_b} \\ \mu_F - \mu_W \end{pmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

Those cycle forces are conjugated to the currents of Eqs. (49–50). The physical forces are the chemical potential associated to the chemostated species

$$\mathbf{a}^{(1)T} = (\mu_S \quad \mu_{N_a}) \quad (65)$$

$$\mathbf{a}^{(2)T} = (\mu_{N_a} \quad \mu_{N_b} \quad \mu_F \quad \mu_W) \quad (66)$$

Finally, the fundamental forces are obtained by applying the definition of Eq. (29) with the selection matrices of

Eqs. (57–58) and the physical forces of Eqs. (65–(66))

$$\mathbf{A}^{(1)} = \mathbf{S}^{(1)T} \mathbf{a}^{(1)} = \mu_{N_a} - \mu_S, \quad (67)$$

$$\mathbf{A}^{(2)} = \mathbf{S}^{(2)T} \mathbf{a}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{N_b} - \mu_{N_a} \\ \mu_W - \mu_F \end{pmatrix}. \quad (68)$$

Note that this with this choice of selection matrices, the fundamental forces for both models are opposite to the cycle forces.

E. Conductance matrices

We compute now the resistance and the conductance matrices at all levels for module (1) and (2). First, at the reactions level, the resistance matrices are denoted

$$\mathbf{r}^{(1)} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (69)$$

$$\mathbf{r}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} r_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & r_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & r_6 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & r_7 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r_8 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (70)$$

Using Eq. (32), the cycle resistance matrices for each module read

$$\mathbf{R}^{(1)} = r_1 + r_2, \quad (71)$$

$$\mathbf{R}^{(2)} = \begin{bmatrix} r_5 + r_7 + r_8 & -r_5 \\ -r_5 & r_4 + r_5 + r_6 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (72)$$

As expected, since there is a single cycle current for module (1), the cycle resistance is scalar. Module (2) has two cycles, its resistance matrix is thus a 2×2 matrix. Its diagonal elements displays the resistance addition of the reaction involved in each cycles. Its off-diagonal elements characterize the coupling between the transport of chemical species along the cycles pathways. Looking at the CRN of module (2) on Fig. 1, one expects that reaction for $\rho = 5$ couples the two reaction cycles. Using equation Eq. (37), the conductance matrices at physical level read

$$\mathbf{g}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{r_1 + r_2} \mathbf{U} \text{ with } \mathbf{U} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (73)$$

$$\mathbf{g}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{R}^{(2)}} \begin{bmatrix} (r_4 + r_5 + r_6) \mathbf{U} & r_5 \mathbf{U} \\ r_5 \mathbf{U} & (r_5 + r_7 + r_8) \mathbf{U} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (74)$$

Finally, the conductance matrices at fundamental level are obtained from Eq. (40):

$$\mathbf{G}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{r_1 + r_2}, \quad (75)$$

$$\mathbf{G}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{R}^{(2)}} \begin{bmatrix} r_1 + r_2 + r_3 & r_2 \\ r_2 & r_2 + r_4 + r_5 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (76)$$

In other words the cycle and fundamental resistance matrices are equal for this CRN.

F. Law of resistance matrix addition

We call module (3) the serial association of module (1) and (2) through the chemical species N_a . In this serial association, module (1) and (2) are studied separately first, i.e., as if reactions occur into separate reactors. Upon connection, all reactions occur in the same reactor with conservation of the chemical current for N_a exchanged by the two modules. Moreover, the concentration of the species $[N_a]$ at the “interface” between the modules reaches a unique nonequilibrium stationary state. In other words, the serial connection implies $j_1 = j_8$ and chemical potential continuity at the module’s “interface” for N_a . Then, we can apply our general method to compute the non equilibrium conductance matrix of module (3), see Ref. [17]. As a start, we determine the conservation laws of module (3) and provide the currents at the interface between the two module as a function of the external current of module (3). The left/right splitting of physical currents reads

$$\mathbf{i}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} i_l^{(1)} \\ i_r^{(1)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} j_1 \\ -j_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (77)$$

$$\mathbf{i}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} i_l^{(2)} \\ i_r^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} j_8 \\ -j_8 \\ j_6 \\ -j_6 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (78)$$

where $\mathbf{i}_r^{(2)}$ is the vector made with the last three components of $\mathbf{i}^{(2)}$. By construction, the physical currents from the chemostats of module (3) are

$$\mathbf{i}^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} i_l^{(1)} \\ i_r^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} j_1 \\ -j_8 \\ j_6 \\ -j_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (79)$$

Using the conservation laws Eqs. (53–54) yields

$$\mathbf{L}_i \mathbf{i}_r^{(1)} = \mathbf{L}_e \mathbf{i}^{(3)} \quad (80)$$

which is the equation at the core of the association of subdevices in serial connection [17] and where

$$\mathbf{L}_i = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{L}_e = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (81)$$

The rows of matrix \mathbf{v} are basis vectors of the cokernel of \mathbf{L}_i . Here, this matrix reads

$$\mathbf{v} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (82)$$

This allows to left multiply Eq. (80) by \mathbf{v} to obtain the conservation laws for physical currents of module (3)

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}^{(3)} \mathbf{i}^{(3)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (83)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\ell}^{(3)} = \mathbf{v} \mathbf{L}_e = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (84)$$

It turns out that the conservation law matrices for module (2) and (3) are equal. This expected since a single pin connection doesn’t decrease the number of external species. In practice, module (1) puts one pin of module (2) in mixed boundary conditions. A choice of selection matrix associated to the conservation law matrix of Eq. (84) is thus

$$\mathbf{S}^{(3)} = \mathbf{S}^{(2)}. \quad (85)$$

In the same line, the equivalent description of module (3) is very similar to the one of module (2) as shown on Fig. 2. Going back to Eq. (80), we can solve for $i_r^{(1)}$ expressing it in terms of $\mathbf{i}^{(3)}$ as

$$i_r^{(1)} = \boldsymbol{\pi} \mathbf{i}^{(3)} = \mathbf{L}_i^+ \mathbf{L}_e \mathbf{i}^{(3)} = \frac{1}{2} [-1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0] \mathbf{i}^{(3)}. \quad (86)$$

Inserting this last relation in Eqs. (77–78) yields the following relation between the physical currents of modules (1) and (2) in terms of those of module (3)

$$\mathbf{i}^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(m,3)} \mathbf{i}^{(3)} \quad (87)$$

for $m = 1, 2$ and where

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(1,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (88)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{(2,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (89)$$

Finally, the relation between the fundamental currents of module (1) and (2) and those of module (3) is obtained by using Eq. (22) with selection matrix of Eq. (85) in Eq. (87)

$$\mathbf{i}^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(m,3)} \mathbf{S}^{(3)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)}. \quad (90)$$

Then, since the selection matrices for module (1) and (2) are pseudo-invertible, we finally obtain

$$\mathbf{I}^{(m)} = \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{(m,3)} \mathbf{I}^{(3)} \quad (91)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{\Pi}^{(1,3)} = [1 \ 0] \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{(2,3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (92)$$

Using the additive structure for resistance matrices [17]

$$\mathbf{G}^{(3)-1} = \sum_{m=1}^2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{(m,3)T} \mathbf{G}^{(m)-1} \boldsymbol{\Pi}^{(m,3)}, \quad (93)$$

we get the fundamental resistance matrix of module (3)

$$\mathbf{G}^{(3)-1} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 + r_2 + r_5 + r_7 + r_8 & -r_5 \\ -r_5 & r_4 + r_5 + r_6 \end{bmatrix} \quad (94)$$

describing the force-current characteristics. Interestingly the coupling between the fundamental currents for module (3), i.e., the off diagonal elements in $\mathbf{G}^{(3)-1}$, emerges solely from the chemical reaction coupling the two cycles of module (2). The intensity of the first diagonal element is the sum of the resistance of the two cycles involved in the serial association. The second diagonal coefficient is equal to the cycle resistance of the cycle that is not involved in the serial association.

G. Conductance matrix for the full network

In this section, we provide an alternative derivation of the conductance matrix of Eq. (94) for module (3). We compute this matrix directly from the stoichiometric matrix of the entire CRN. This latter reads

$$\nabla^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} \nabla_x^{(3)} \\ \nabla_y^{(3)} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{array}{c} \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \hline \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}. \quad (95)$$

In this matrix, the columns are numbered by the reaction index $\rho = 1, \dots, 8$. The rows correspond to the chemical species ordered as in $\mathcal{S}^{(3)} = \{E_a, E_a S, E_a S_2, N_a, E_b, E_b F, E_b W, E_b^*, S, N_b, F, W\}$.

The upper left 3×3 matrix is $\nabla_x^{(1)}$. The lower right 4×5 matrix above the horizontal line is $\nabla_x^{(2)}$. The lower right 3×5 matrix is $\nabla_y^{(2)}$. The fourth row that corresponds to N_a appears now in the internal species (upper part) of the stoichiometric matrix. The ninth row that correspond to S remains in the external species (lower part). The whole networks admits the two following cycles

$$\mathbf{C}^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (96)$$

The reaction resistance matrix is the diagonal matrix:

$$\mathbf{r}^{(3)} = \text{diag}(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5, r_6, r_7, r_8). \quad (97)$$

The cycle resistance matrix thus reads

$$\mathbf{R}^{(3)} = \begin{bmatrix} r_1 + r_2 + r_5 + r_7 + r_8 & -r_5 \\ -r_5 & r_4 + r_5 + r_6 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (98)$$

To obtain the conservation laws, we look for the cokernel of the stoichiometric matrix which takes the form

$$\mathbf{L}^{(3)} = \left[\begin{array}{cccccccc|cccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ -2 & -1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right]. \quad (99)$$

The two first line correspond to the broken conservation laws since they have non zero coefficients for the chemostated species. The chemostat conservation laws are recovered as the upper right block in $\mathbf{L}^{(3)}$. Up to a line relabeling this is the result already found in Eq. (84). Since the conservation law matrix is the same, the same choice of selection matrix can be made leading to the expression of the fundamental resistance matrix equation (94).

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have defined for the four levels of description (reaction, cycle, physical and fundamental) the nonequilibrium conductance matrix of a CRN in its (unique) stationary nonequilibrium state. This definition involves the reaction cycles for internal species, the matrix providing the matter exchanges with the chemostats and the conservation laws of the CRN leading to a choice of selection matrix associated to a given basis of fundamental currents and forces. Once these objects have been identified in the framework of CRNs, the definition for the conductance matrix is analogous to the one for Markov jump processes [17, 21]. The main difference between Markov jump processes and CRNs comes from source term in the CRN's kinetic equation that is absent in the master equation. This source term, equal to the vector of matter currents received from the chemostats, is central for identifying the currents conservation laws as being left eigenvector of the substochimetric matrix associated to chemostated species only. This approach leads straightforwardly to a reduced description of the CRN in terms of fundamental currents, in the spirit of Ref. [17], as compared to the approach based on emergent cycles [13, 20].

The nonequilibrium conductance matrix is uniquely defined when assuming that the CRN reaches a unique nonequilibrium stationary state. This is guaranteed for pseudo-first order kinetics which are linear, although we remark that the notion of linearity depends on the decomposition of the CRN into chemical modules. It may happen that non-linearity reappears upon connection of linear modules, as it is the case for our illustrative example. In this case, the problem of non-unicity may reappear when solving for the concentration of the species at

the module's interface. This problem of multiple solutions deserves further investigations, for instance regarding stability criteria. Borrowing from the theory of electronic circuits will certainly be useful in this direction, all the more so for emergent phenomena commonly ap-

pearing in non-linear systems. This may help to advance on the description of nonequilibrium phase transitions given the crucial lack of nonequilibrium thermodynamic potentials and associated variational principles.

-
- [1] J. Schnakenberg, *Reviews of Modern physics* **48**, 571 (1976).
- [2] T. L. Hill, *Free energy transduction and biochemical cycle kinetics* (Courier Corporation, 2013).
- [3] S. Dal Cengio, V. Lecomte, and M. Poletti, *Physical Review X* **13**, 021040 (2023).
- [4] J. Ross, *Thermodynamics and Fluctuations far from Equilibrium* (Springer, 2008).
- [5] N. G. V. Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry, Third Edition (North-Holland Personal Library) (North-Holland Personal Library)* (North Holland, 2007) p. 464.
- [6] G. Nicolis and I. Prigogine, *Self organization in nonequilibrium systems* (John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1977).
- [7] T. Schmiedl and U. Seifert, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **126** (2007), 10.1063/1.2428297.
- [8] R. Rao and M. Esposito, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041064 (2016).
- [9] F. Avanzini, M. Bilancioni, V. Cavina, S. Dal Cengio, M. Esposito, G. Falasco, D. Forastiere, J. N. Freitas, A. Garilli, P. E. Harunari, V. Lecomte, A. Lazarescu, S. G. Marehalli Srinivas, C. Moslonka, I. Neri, E. Penocchio, W. D. Piñeros, M. Poletti, A. Raghu, P. Raux, K. Sekimoto, and A. Soret, *SciPost Physics Lecture Notes* (2024), 10.21468/scipostphyslectnotes.80.
- [10] F. Avanzini, G. Falasco, and M. Esposito, *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 093040 (2020).
- [11] D. F. Anderson, G. Craciun, M. Gopalkrishnan, and C. Wiuf, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **77**, 1744 (2015).
- [12] S. Krishnamurthy, Nordita, Measuring and manipulating non-equilibrium systems (2024), private communication.
- [13] F. Avanzini, N. Freitas, and M. Esposito, *Physical Review X* **13**, 021041 (2023).
- [14] R. S. Caplan, *J. Theor. Biol.* **10**, 209 (1966).
- [15] A. Wachtel, R. Rao, and M. Esposito, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **157** (2022), 10.1063/5.0091035.
- [16] M. Bilancioni and M. Esposito, (2024), arXiv:2405.17960 [q-bio.MN].
- [17] P. Raux, C. Goupil, and G. Verley, (2023), 10.48550/ARXIV.2309.12922, arXiv:2309.12922 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [18] P. Raux, C. Goupil, and G. Verley, (2024), 10.48550/ARXIV.2405.11886, arXiv:2405.11886 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
- [19] P. Raux, C. Goupil, and G. Verley, (2024).
- [20] M. Poletti and M. Esposito, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **141**, 024117 (2014).
- [21] H. Vroylandt, D. Lacoste, and G. Verley, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* **2018**, 023205 (2018).
- [22] P. Raux, *Circuit theory for thermodynamic devices in stationary nonequilibrium*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris Cité (2024).