

VARIANCE BOUNDS FOR A CLASS OF BIOCHEMICAL BIRTH/DEATH LIKE PROCESSES VIA A DISCRETE EXPANSION AND SPECTRAL PROPERTIES OF THE MASTER EQUATION *

GIOVANNI PUGLIESE CARRATELLI[†] AND IOANNIS LESTAS[†]

Abstract. We consider a class of birth/death like process corresponding to coupled biochemical reactions and consider the problem of quantifying the variance of the molecular species in terms of the rates of the reactions. In particular, we address this problem in a configuration where a species is formed with a rate that depends nonlinearly on another spontaneously formed species. By making use of an appropriately formulated expansion based on the Newton series, in conjunction with spectral properties of the master equation, we derive an analytical expression that provides a hard bound for the variance. We show that this bound is exact when the propensities are linear, with numerical simulations demonstrating that this bound is also very close to the actual variance. An analytical expression for the covariance of the species is also derived.

Key words. biochemical reactions, birth-death processes, master equation, variance bounds, Newton series.

MSC codes. 93E03, 92C40, 92C42

1. Introduction. Biochemical reactions are often modeled as birth/death like processes with rates that depend on other molecular species. This leads to continuous time jump Markov process, that can be analysed by means of their forward Kolmogorov equation, known as the Chemical Master Equation (CME), or via stochastic simulations [7]. Quantifying the moments of molecular species is important as this affects the functionality of various biochemical pathways within cells. Assessing variance in enzymatic networks [10] can for instance help understand how enzyme kinetics pathways are an effective signalling configuration and clarify how cells modulate protein activity in response to external stimuli. When the rates of the reactions depend nonlinearly on other molecular species however, analytical expressions for the moments are in general not feasible. There are many computational tools that have been developed in the literature for approximating the moments, based on either time simulations or numerical approximations to solutions of the master equation and its corresponding moments. The latter include the derivation of expressions that provide characterisations of the stationary distributions [3], computational methods for level-dependent quasi-birth-and-death processes with finite [5] and infinite number of states [14], and the Finite State Projection algorithm [22]. Optimization based formulations by means of semidefinite programming have been addressed in [17], [19], [6, 4, 30], and approximate moment dynamics with closure properties have been studied in [11], [32] and [33].

Nevertheless, obtaining analytical expressions for the variance in terms of biological observables, such as expectations of the rates and molecule numbers, is important as this can facilitate the physical understanding of such processes and also motivate design in synthetic biology. Linear Noise Approximation [36] is a tool frequently used in this context, whereby the nonlinear reaction rates are linearised about the equilibrium values for the mean, *i.e.* the first two terms of their Taylor series expansion are

*This manuscript is a significantly extended version of conference paper [28] and includes the proofs of the results, which are centred upon spectral properties of the master equation used in conjunction with the Newton Series expansion, and includes also additional discussion.

[†]Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge, Trumpington Street - CB2 1PZ Cambridge, United Kingdom ({gp459,icl20}@cam.ac.uk).

retained. Such approximations are valid when the reaction rates are approximately nonlinear or when there are large molecule numbers. They are, however, usually not very accurate in intermediate and low molecule numbers as is often the case in biology.

In this paper we present an alternative approach whereby an appropriately formulated expansion based on the *Newton series* [24], [23], a discrete analog of the Taylor series, is used to derive a hard lower bound for the variance for a class of biochemical reactions. In particular, the bound is derived for a species that is formed with bursts with a nonlinear rate that is a function of another spontaneously formed species.

A key idea in our analysis is to exploit the eigenfunctions of the considered master equation and show that these can form a basis for the Newton series expansion. The latter is then used to obtain an analytical expression that provides a bound for the variance in the molecule numbers. We also show that the bound is exact when the reaction rates are linear.

Furthermore, a side result associated with the covariance of the molecule number of the species under consideration is derived, whereby the *Newton series* expansion is exploited to provide an exact analytical expression for the covariance.

In the paper we also use numerical computations of the variance to investigate how close the bound derived is to the actual variance, and we find that, unlike with the Linear Noise Approximation, this is very close to the true variance even in regimes where the reaction rate is highly nonlinear.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we provide the problem formulation. The main results are given in Section 3. The proofs of the results are provided in the Section 4. A numerical evaluation of the results is provided in Section 5. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

Notation. The following list introduces various symbols used within the manuscript

$\mathbb{R}_{>}$ Set of positive real numbers $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$

\mathbb{Z}_{\geq} Set of non-negative integers $\{0, 1, 2, 3 \dots\}$

\mathbb{R}_{\geq} Set of non-negative real numbers $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$

$\mathbb{Z}_{>}$ Set of positive integers $\{1, 2, 3 \dots\}$

$\mathbb{P}_Q(q)$ Probability integer-valued random variable Q takes value q

$A \sim \mathcal{P}(x)$ Random variable A has Poisson probability distribution with mean x

$\mathbb{R}[A]$ Set of polynomials in A with real coefficients

$\mathbb{E}[X]$ Expectation of random variable X

$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\cdot]$ Expectation with respect to probability distribution \mathcal{P} .

$var(X)$ Variance of random variable X

$cov(X, Y)$ Covariance of random variables X and Y

ρ_{AB} Pearson correlation coefficient between random variables A and B , *i.e.*

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{cov(A, B)}{\sqrt{var(A)}\sqrt{var(B)}}$$

$dom(f)$ Domain of function f

$\Delta_k[\cdot]$ k step finite difference of a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, defined as $\Delta_k[f](A) := f(A + k) - f(A)$

$\Delta_k^p[\cdot]$ pk step finite difference operator defined for $p > 1, p \in \mathbb{Z}_{>}$, via the recursion $\Delta_k^1[\Delta_k^{p-1}[\cdot]]$ with $\Delta_k^0[\cdot]$ the identity operator, and $\Delta_k^1[\cdot] := \Delta_k[\cdot]$.

$(A)_k$ Falling factorial of $A \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$: if $k \neq 0$ then $(A)_k = \prod_{n=0}^{k-1} A - n$, if $k = 0$ then $(A)_0 = 1$

\mathbb{I} Identity operator: $\mathbb{I}[X] = X$

\cdot^T Matrix transpose operator


$\delta_{a,b}$ $\delta_{a,b} = 1$, if $a = b$, 0 otherwise

$\mathcal{U}\{a, b\}$ Discrete uniform probability distribution with support $\{a, \dots, b\}$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$

$\mathcal{G}(p)$ Geometric probability distribution, with parameter $p \in (0, 1]$

$\mathcal{B}(n, p)$ Binomial probability distribution, with parameters $p \in [0, 1]$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>}$

2. Problem formulation. We consider the following system of coupled biochemical reactions



where A and B are two biochemical species, with species A affecting the rate of formation of species B via a nonlinear function $R(A)$. This will be modelled as a continuous time jump Markov Process, where its forward Kolmogorov equation, known as the Chemical Master Equation (CME), is provided in (2.2) below.

More precisely, random variable $A(t)$ denotes the number of molecules of species A at time t and similarly random variable $B(t)$ denotes the number of molecules of species B at time t . The random variable Q denotes the increase in the number of molecules of species B when a birth takes place. The parameter $F \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$ is a constant that denotes the rate at which the species A is produced, $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ is a function that determines the rate of production of the species B and constants $\gamma_A \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$ and $\gamma_B \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$ represent the death rate of each molecule of species A and B respectively.

For any $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$, we denote by $\mathbb{P}(a, b, t)$ the probability $A(t) = a$, $B(t) = b$. Random variable Q takes values in $\mathbb{Z}_{>}$ and we denote by $\mathbb{P}_Q(q)$ the probability $Q = q$. In our results random variable Q can have any discrete probability distribution defined on the support $\mathbb{Z}_{>}$ satisfying Assumption 2.3 stated below. The CME, a version of the Chapman Kolmogorov equation for Markov processes, for system (2.1) is

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbb{P}(a, b, t)}{\partial t} &= \gamma_A [(a + 1)\mathbb{P}(a + 1, b, t) - a\mathbb{P}(a, b, t)] + F[\mathbb{P}(a - 1, b, t) - \mathbb{P}(a, b, t)] \\ &+ \gamma_B [(b + 1)\mathbb{P}(a, b + 1, t) - b\mathbb{P}(a, b, t)] \\ &+ R(a) \left[\sum_{q=1}^b \mathbb{P}_Q(q)\mathbb{P}(a, b - q, t) - \mathbb{P}(a, b, t) \right] \end{aligned}$$

Mathematical models as in (2.1) are relevant in order to quantify noise levels where a spontaneously formed species A affects the rate of formation of species B . Such models are of particular interest for studies of various biological processes within cells. These appear, for example, in cellular signalling [10] where external receptors stimulate enzymatic reactions that modulate protein activity in response to external stimuli. Quantifying variance and correlation in this signaling cascade contributes significantly in improving our understanding of the efficiency of these signaling pathways and the extent of noise amplification in these processes [15]. The variable Q also captures an effect known as *bursts* that has been observed experimentally in gene transcription [8] and in the expression of proteins [27]. Such a model has been shown in the literature to follow when there is a timescale separation between various processes, such as when the degradation rate of the mRNAs is much larger than that of proteins, which is often the case in practice [31].

The problem we address is to find an expression of the mean and variance of B at steady state, expressed in terms of the expected value of the rates of the reactions. This is a non-trivial problem due to the nonlinear rate $R(A)$.

In this manuscript we derive an analytical expression that provides a bound on the variance of B , by making use of a discrete expansion of $R(A)$ based on the *Newton* series [21, 13] and the eigenfunctions of the CME. The bound becomes exact when $R(A)$ is linear. Furthermore, we show via numerical computations of the variance that the bound is very close to the true variance even in regimes where $R(A)$ is highly nonlinear, in contrast to the Linear Noise Approximation (LNA) for the variance.

It should be noted that the methodology used to derive the bound, differently from the LNA, exploits the discrete states of the system via the Newton series.

The Newton series has also been recently studied in the field of quantum mechanics [18] while filtering problems associated with (2.1) have also been studied in the literature. The optimal causal filter for estimating A when B is observed was derived in [34], the average squared estimation error was quantified in [12], and a close to optimal version was deployed *in vitro* in [37].

The results that will be presented are associated with the equilibrium distribution of species A and B and we therefore make the following assumption [9].

Assumption 2.1. System (2.2) reaches a stationary distribution denoted by $\mathbb{P}(a, b)$

$$(2.3) \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(a, b, t) = \mathbb{P}(a, b)$$

Note that from the CME (2.2) $\mathbb{P}(a, b)$ satisfies the following equation

$$(2.4) \quad \gamma_A[(a+1)\mathbb{P}(a+1, b) - a\mathbb{P}(a, b)] + F[\mathbb{P}(a-1, b) - \mathbb{P}(a, b)] \\ + \gamma_B[(b+1)\mathbb{P}(a, b+1) - b\mathbb{P}(a, b)] + R(a) \left[\sum_{q=1}^b \mathbb{P}_Q(q)\mathbb{P}(a, b-q) - \mathbb{P}(a, b) \right] = 0$$

For convenience in the notation we denote by A the random variable representing the number of molecules of species A at equilibrium, and its probability distribution is denoted by \mathbb{P}_A . Similarly, we denote by B the random variable representing the number of molecules of species B at equilibrium. It should also be noted that

$$(2.5) \quad A \sim \mathcal{P}(F/\gamma_A)$$

i.e. random variable A has a Poisson distribution with expected value F/γ_A which is a known result that follows from the fact that F and γ_A are constant, see [36].

Remark 2.2. We would like to note that when random variable Q has a finite support and $\mathbb{E}[R(A)]$ is finite, the validity of Assumption 2.1 follows from the ergodicity results in [3]. In particular, system (2.2) belongs in this case in the class of reactions for which the [3, Theorem 6.1] holds, and Assumption 2.1 follows from this ergodicity result.

We also assume that random variables B and Q have finite first and second moments as stated below.

Assumption 2.3. The first and second moments of random variables B and Q are finite, *i.e.* $\mathbb{E}[B^2] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[Q^2] < \infty$ which implies also $\mathbb{E}[B] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}[Q] < \infty$. We also assume $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} b^2 \mathbb{P}(a, b) < \infty$ which is implied by $\mathbb{E}[AB^2] < \infty$.

3. Results. Before we present our results, we define the following quantities:

DEFINITION 3.1. *Let A be a random variable with Poisson distribution as specified in (2.5). The quantities σ_0 and σ_1 are defined as follows*

$$(3.1) \quad \sigma_0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)], \quad \sigma_1 = -\sigma_0 + \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[AR(A)]}{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}$$

The quantities defined above will be needed in the variance bound presented in Proposition 3.2 and the analytical expression for the covariance in Proposition 3.4. Their significance is also discussed in Remark 3.3 after Proposition 3.2 is stated.

It should be noted that the parameters σ_0, σ_1 are finite under the assumption that the variance of B is bounded, as follows from the variance bound (3.2) in Proposition 3.2. Also in Definition 3.1 $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\cdot]$ is the expectation with respect to a Poisson distribution with a known mean and can be computed to an arbitrarily high precision.

We would also like to note that no assumptions are imposed on function $R(A)$ apart from the fact that this takes values in \mathbb{R}_{\geq} and leads to a random variable B in (2.1), (2.4) with finite first two moments.

We now give our main result which is an expression that provides a lower bound on the variance of B .

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Consider the system in (2.4) with Assumption 2.3 satisfied. Then the following inequality holds*

$$(3.2) \quad \text{var}(B) > \frac{\sigma_0(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q]) + \sigma_1^2 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_B + \gamma_A)}$$

where σ_0 and σ_1 are given in Definition 3.1.

Proof. See Section 4.1. □

Remark 3.3. It is shown in the derivation of Proposition 3.2 that σ_0 and σ_1 in (3.2) are the first two coefficients of an appropriate formulation of the Newton series expansion of $R(A)$. In particular, $R(A) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \psi_n(A)$ where the functions $\psi_n(A)$, defined in Proposition 4.1, are a variant of the Poisson-Charlier polynomials [26].

Remark 3.4. As follows from Proposition 3.2, σ_0 and σ_1 , *i.e.* the first two coefficients in the Newton series expansion of $R(A)$ lead to a lower bound for the variance of B , as this is quantified in the Proposition. This is in contrast to LNA approaches whereby $R(A)$ is approximated with the first two terms of its Taylor series expansion. The latter leads only to an approximate expression for the variance that is not a bound. Furthermore, numerical computations illustrate that the bound in Proposition 3.2 is also very close to the actual variance even when $R(A)$ is highly nonlinear, a regime where LNA approaches can be very inaccurate. Such examples will be provided in Section 5.

Remark 3.5. If $R(A)$ is a linear function then equation (3.2) holds with equality. This is stated in Proposition 3.6 below.

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Consider the system in (2.4) with Assumption 2.3 satisfied. If $R(A) = R_c A$, where $R_c \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$ is a constant, then the bound for the variance in Proposition 3.2 holds with equality and is given by*

$$(3.3) \quad \text{var}(B) = \frac{R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A](\gamma_A + \gamma_B)(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q]) + R_c^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)}$$

Proof. See Section 4.3. □

Remark 3.7. The fact that the bound in (3.2) is equal in this case to the expression in (3.3) can be shown by explicitly computing σ_0 and σ_1 in Definition 3.1 and using them in (3.2) with $R(A) = R_c A$. The equality of this expression with the variance of B is obtained by deriving an exact expression for the variance analytically using LNA approaches, see *e.g.* [36] and [20].

Finally, we give a result on the covariance of A and B .

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Consider the system in (2.4) with Assumption 2.3 satisfied. Then $\text{cov}(A, B) = \text{cov}(B, A)$ satisfies*

$$(3.4) \quad \text{cov}(A, B) = \mathbb{E}[Q] \frac{\sigma_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{\gamma_A + \gamma_B}$$

where σ_1 is given in (3.1).

Proof. See Section 4.4. □

Remark 3.9. Note that Proposition 3.8 holds with equality also when $R(A)$ is nonlinear.

Remark 3.10. An immediate consequence of Proposition 3.8 and Proposition 3.2 is a bound for the correlation coefficient $\rho_{AB} \in [-1, 1]$ of A and B as stated below

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} &= \frac{\text{cov}(A, B)}{\sqrt{\text{var}(A)} \sqrt{\text{var}(B)}} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q] \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] \sigma_1}{(\gamma_A + \gamma_B) \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_0(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q]) + \sigma^2 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)}}} \end{aligned}$$

The results stated above have a number of useful properties relative to other more conventional approaches for quantifying the variance by means of analytical expressions involving the reaction rates. As mentioned in Section 1, Proposition 3.2 provides a bound for the variance when the transition rate $R(a)$ is nonlinear whereas existing methods like LNA approaches give only approximate values. As will be shown in Section 5 the variance calculation through the LNA is not as close to the variance of B as is the bound provided in Proposition 3.2. This is especially important in the case of highly nonlinear propensity functions where LNAs become less accurate. Furthermore, the numerical investigation in Section 5 demonstrates that the bound maintains its accuracy despite the presence of bursts.

The methodology used to derive these results is also of independent interest, based on the use of the *Newton series* expansion and an appropriate exploitation of *spectral properties* of the master equation.

4. Proofs. In this section we provide the proofs of the results presented in the previous section. To facilitate readability, we give an overview first of the corresponding derivations. The detailed derivations are given in the subsections that follow.

Overview of proof of Proposition 3.2. The proof is provided in Section 4.1 and makes use of an intermediate result derived in Section 4.2 and auxiliary algebraic results derived in Section 4.5.

In particular, the proof starts by defining the Probability Generating Functions $T_a(z)$ and $M(z)$ in (4.1) associated with $\mathbb{P}(a, b)$ and $\mathbb{P}_Q(q)$, respectively; we then express the first two moments of B as a function of those and their derivatives $T'_a(1)$ and $M'(1)$.

We then derive an expression for $T'_a(1)$ in terms of the eigenfunctions ψ_n and the corresponding eigenvalues of the considered CME. We show that $T'_a(1)$ can be expressed by means of a reformulation of the *Newton series* expansion of $R(A)$ on a basis provided by the eigenfunctions ψ_n . This therefore yields a connection between the variance of B and the *Newton series* expansion of $R(A)$.

We then proceed to show that the resulting expression for the variance of B in terms of $T'_a(1)$ is the sum of non-negative terms involving the coefficients σ_n appearing in the *Newton* series expansion of $R(A)$. By retaining the first two terms we deduce a bound for $\text{var}(B)$ in terms of σ_0 and σ_1 , as stated in Proposition 3.2.

Overview of proof of Proposition 3.6. The proof is provided in Section 4.3. We derive first an expression for the bound in (3.2) when the $R(A)$ is a linear function by substituting in (3.2) the form of $R(A)$ under consideration. We then make use of known results for the moments of the CME when the rates are linear to derive an expression for the actual variance of B . The latter coincides with the expression for the variance bound previously derived, thus showing that the variance bound in Proposition 3.2 is exact in this case.

Overview of proof of Proposition 3.8. The proof is provided in Section 4.4. We show that $\text{cov}(A, B)$ can also be represented as a function of the quantity $T'_a(1)$ that was used in the proof of Proposition 3.2. By making use of results derived in the proof of Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.3 we express the considered quantity as a function of the coefficient σ_1 .

In Section 4.5 we state and prove two auxiliary results that are used in the derivations and lead also to the quantities introduced in Definition 3.1. We first present Proposition 4.2 an intermediate result on the moments of $\psi_n(a)$. In Proposition 4.3, we use Proposition 4.2 to show that the coefficients σ_n can be expressed as an expectation with respect to a Poisson distribution.

4.1. Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Consider the probability generating functions defined below, associated with B and Q , respectively

$$(4.1) \quad T_a(z) := \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} z^b \mathbb{P}(a, b), \quad M(z) := \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} z^q \mathbb{P}_Q(q)$$

with $\text{dom}(T_a) = \text{dom}(M) \subseteq \{z \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq} \mid |z| \leq 1\}$. We consider (2.4) and under the transformations in (4.1) we deduce the following equation

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_A[(a+1)T_{a+1}(z) - aT_a(z)] + F[T_{a-1}(z) - T_a(z)] \\ + \gamma_B(1-z)T'_a(z) + R(a)(M(z) - 1)T_a(z) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Note that by setting $z = 1$ we have $T_a(1) = \mathbb{P}_A(a)$, where A in the considered case has a Poisson distribution (see [36]) as discussed in the main text. Secondly, we can deduce moments of B given that $A = a$ by differentiating (4.2) with respect to z and setting $z = 1$. In particular, we have

$$(4.3) \quad T'_a(1) = \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} b \mathbb{P}(a, b), \quad T''_a(1) = \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} b(b-1) \mathbb{P}(a, b)$$

Hence by differentiating (4.2) with respect to z and then setting $z = 1$ we obtain the following equation involving the first moment

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \gamma_A[(a+1)T'_{a+1}(1) - aT'_a(1)] + F[T'_{a-1}(1) - T'_a(1)] \\ - \gamma_B T'_a(1) + R(a)(M'(1)T_a(1)) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $M'(1) = \mathbb{E}[Q]$.

For the second moment we have

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \gamma_A [(a+1)T''_{a+1}(1) - aT''_a(1)] + F[T''_{a-1}(1) - T''_a(1)] \\ & - 2\gamma_B T''_a(1) + R(a)(M''(1)T_a(1) + 2M'(1)T'_a(1)) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $M''(1) = \mathbb{E}[Q^2] - \mathbb{E}[Q]$.

By summing (4.4) over all a and using the property $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} b \mathbb{P}(a, b) < \infty$, which follows from Assumption 2.3, we get

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} T'_a(1) = \frac{M'(1)}{\gamma_B} \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} R(a)T_a(1)$$

Note that the left hand side of (4.6) is the expectation of B and the right hand side is a scaled version (by a factor of $M'(1)/\gamma_B$) of the expectation of $R(A)$ with respect to the known distribution of A since $T_a(1) = \mathbb{P}_A(a)$. Hence (4.6) can be written as

$$(4.7) \quad \mathbb{E}[B] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)]$$

For the second moment of B we proceed analogously with the first moment by summing (4.5) over all a and using the property $\lim_{a \rightarrow \infty} a \sum_{b=0}^{\infty} b^2 \mathbb{P}(a, b) < \infty$, which follows from Assumption 2.3, and obtain

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} T''_a(1) = \frac{1}{2\gamma_B} \left(M''(1) \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} R(a)T_a(1) + 2M'(1) \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} R(a)T'_a(1) \right)$$

From (4.3) and (4.8) we obtain

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[B^2] - \mathbb{E}[B] = \frac{1}{2\gamma_B} (M''(1)\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] + 2M'(1)\mathbb{E}[BR(A)])$$

where for the last term on the right hand side of (4.8) we have applied the definition of $T'_a(1)$ in (4.3).

We now seek in the remainder of the proof to derive an expression for the last term in (4.9).

Consider the following representation of $T'_a(1)$

$$(4.10) \quad T'_a(1) = \frac{T_a(1)G(a)}{\gamma_B}$$

We seek to determine a representation of the function $G(a)$ (4.10) in terms of the known probability distribution of A and the moments of Q . We substitute (4.10) into (4.4) and obtain

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B} [(a+1)T_{a+1}(1)G(a+1) - aT_a(1)G(a)] \\ & + \frac{F}{\gamma_B} [T_{a-1}(1)G(a-1) - T_a(1)G(a)] \\ & - G(a)T_a(1) + M'(1)R(a)T_a(1) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Note that from the definition of the Poisson distribution we have

$$(4.12) \quad T_{a+1}(1) = \frac{F}{\gamma_A(a+1)}T_a(1), \quad T_{a-1}(1) = \frac{a\gamma_A}{F}T_a(1)$$

By rearranging (4.11) and using (4.12) leads to

$$(4.13) \quad T_a(1)[(\mathbb{S} - \mathbb{I})G(a) + M'(1)R(a)] = 0$$

where \mathbb{S} , defined in (4.14), is an operator acting upon $G(a)$ and is given by

$$(4.14) \quad \mathbb{S} = \gamma_B^{-1}(\gamma_A a \Delta_{-1} + F \Delta_1) = \frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}(a \Delta_{-1} + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] \Delta_1)$$

By making use of (4.13) we find that $G(a)$ satisfies

$$(4.15) \quad (\mathbb{I} - \mathbb{S})G(a) = M'(1)R(a)$$

where \mathbb{I} is the identity operator.

We now seek to exploit spectral properties of \mathbb{S} in order to derive an expression for $G(a)$ and hence of $T'_a(1)$. In particular we will derive an expression for $G(a)$ in terms of the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of operator \mathbb{S} . We derive those below, following the approach in [29].

Let us note that $\Delta_1[(a)_k] = k(a)_{k-1}$ and $a\Delta_{-1}[(a)_k] = -k(a)_k$ and hence we can write $\mathbb{S}[(a)_k]$ as

$$(4.16) \quad \mathbb{S}[(a)_k] = -\frac{k\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}[(a)_k - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A](a)_{k-1}]$$

To facilitate the analysis of (4.16) we introduce an operator \mathbb{F} that is acting on polynomials in variable a , with real coefficients, with a taking values in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} . In particular, operator \mathbb{F} is defined as follows. For a monomial a^k , $a, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$ we have $\mathbb{F}[a^k] = (a)_k$. Furthermore, \mathbb{F} is defined to be linear, *i.e.* $\mathbb{F}[a^{k_1} + a^{k_2}] = (a_1)_{k_1} + (a_2)_{k_2}$, $\mathbb{F}[\lambda a^k] = \lambda(a)_k$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$.

We can hence rewrite (4.16) as

$$(4.17) \quad \mathbb{S}[\mathbb{F}[a^k]] = -\frac{k\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}\mathbb{F}[a^{k-1}(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])]$$

which can also be written as

$$(4.18) \quad \mathbb{S}[\mathbb{F}[a^k]] = -\frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}\mathbb{F}\left[\frac{d}{da}[a^k](a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])\right]$$

We now apply the composition of operator \mathbb{S} with operator \mathbb{F} to $(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k$ which yields

$$(4.19) \quad \mathbb{S}[\mathbb{F}[(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k]] = -\frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}\mathbb{F}\left[\frac{d}{da}[(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k](a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])\right]$$

By observing that $\frac{d}{da}[(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k] = k(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^{k-1}$ we have

$$(4.20) \quad \mathbb{S}[\mathbb{F}[(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k]] = -k\frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}\mathbb{F}[(a - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k]$$

We now use the binomial expansion to rewrite the eigenfunctions and corresponding eigenvalues, which take the form

$$(4.21) \quad \lambda_n = -n \frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}$$

$$(4.22) \quad \psi_n(a) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k (a)_{n-k}$$

Using the expressions derived for the eigenfunctions and eigenvalues of \mathbb{S} we now proceed to derive an expression for $G(a)$. In particular, by noting the decomposition of $R(a)$ in terms of the eigenfunctions ψ_n given in Proposition 4.1 (stated in Section 4.2) we make the following ansatz on $G(a)$

$$(4.23) \quad G(a) = M'(1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \zeta(n) \psi_n(a)$$

where $\zeta(n)$ is a function to be determined and σ_n are as defined in Proposition 4.1. By substituting (4.23) in (4.15) we obtain

$$(4.24) \quad M'(1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \left(1 + n \frac{\gamma_A}{\gamma_B}\right) \zeta(n) \psi_n(a) = M'(1) R(a)$$

Noting the series expansion of $R(a)$ in Proposition 4.1 with $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$ we deduce that

$$(4.25) \quad \zeta(n) = \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B}$$

Therefore from (4.10), (4.23), (4.25) we deduce the following expression for $T'_a(1)$

$$(4.26) \quad T'_a(1) = \frac{T_a(1)M'(1)}{\gamma_B} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_n(a)$$

We now make use of the series expansion of $T'_a(1)$ in (4.26) to compute the moments of B .

We evaluate first the unknown term in the right hand side of (4.9). In particular, by noting that $\mathbb{E}[BR(A)] = \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} R(a)T'_a(1)$ and from the expression of $T'_a(1)$ in (4.26) we have

$$(4.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[BR(A)] &= \frac{M'(1)}{\gamma_B} \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} R(a) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_n(a) T'_a(1) \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \left[\sum_{n'=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{n'} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_{n'}(A) \psi_n(A) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $M'(1) = \mathbb{E}[Q]$ and in the second step we have used the results of Proposition 4.1. We now evaluate the expectation in (4.27) as follows

$$(4.28) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \left[\sum_{n'=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{n'} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_{n'}(A) \psi_n(A) \right] = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n^2 \frac{\gamma_B n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B}$$

where the equality holds given the results of Proposition 4.2 (stated in Section 4.5). Hence we can now write the following expression for $\mathbb{E}[BR(A)]$

$$(4.29) \quad \mathbb{E}[BR(A)] = \frac{M'(1)}{\gamma_B} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n^2 \frac{\gamma_B n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B}$$

We finally express $\text{var}(B)$ as in (4.30) by making use of (4.7), (4.9), and (4.29)

$$(4.30) \quad \text{var}(B) = \frac{1}{2\gamma_B} \left[(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] - \mathbb{E}[Q]) \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] + \frac{2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2}{\gamma_B} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n^2 \frac{\gamma_B n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \right] \\ + \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] \mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} - \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] \mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \right)^2$$

It should be noted that from Proposition 4.2 we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)] = \delta_{n,0}$ and hence by computing the expectation with respect to the Poisson distribution on both sides of (4.34) we have that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] = \sigma_0$. By substituting σ_0 in (4.30) and through some manipulation we obtain

$$(4.31) \quad \text{var}(B) = \frac{1}{2\gamma_B} \left[(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] - \mathbb{E}[Q]) \sigma_0 + \frac{2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2}{\gamma_B} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\gamma_B \sigma_n^2 n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \right] + \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \sigma_0$$

Since all terms in the summation in (4.31) are positive, using only the first term we obtain

$$(4.32) \quad \text{var}(B) > \frac{(\gamma_A + \gamma_B) \sigma_0 (\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q]) + 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2 \sigma_1^2 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_B + \gamma_A)} \quad \square$$

4.2. Expansion of $R(A)$.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *Consider a function $R(A)$, $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq}$ and the function*

$$(4.33) \quad \psi_n(A) = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-r)^k (A)_{n-k}$$

where $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>}$. Then the following equality holds

$$(4.34) \quad R(A) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \psi_n(A)$$

where

$$(4.35) \quad \sigma_n = \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k}{n} \frac{\Delta_1^k [R](A)}{k!} \Big|_{A=0} r^{k-n}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We consider the Newton series expansion of the function $R(A)$

$$(4.36) \quad R(A) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \rho_k (A)_k, \quad \rho_k = \frac{\Delta_1^k [R](A)}{k!} \Big|_{A=0}$$

It should be noted that the Newton series in (4.36) exists for all integer numbers $A \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$ for any function $R : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>}$, see [13, Ch. VII, p.358/360], [18], [35].

We now make use of the fact that the falling factorial can be expressed in terms of the functions $\psi_n(A)$. In particular, the following relation holds which can be verified by substituting $\psi_n(A)$ in the right hand side of (4.37).

$$(4.37) \quad (A)_k = \sum_{n=0}^k \binom{k}{n} r^{k-n} \psi_n(A)$$

Substituting (4.37) into (4.36) yields

$$(4.38) \quad \begin{aligned} R(A) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \psi_n(A) \\ \sigma_n &= \sum_{k=n}^{\infty} \binom{k}{n} \frac{\Delta_1^k [R](A)}{k!} \Big|_{A=0} r^{k-n} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

4.3. Proof of Proposition 3.6.

Proof of Proposition 3.6. When $R(A) = R_c A$ the series (4.34), has $\sigma_n = 0, \forall n \geq 2$. From (4.35) and (4.33), by setting $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$, we compute σ_0, σ_1 and $\psi_0(A), \psi_1(A)$ as follows

$$(4.39) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma_0 &= R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] \\ \sigma_1 &= R_c \\ \psi_0(A) &= 1 \\ \psi_1(A) &= A - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] \end{aligned}$$

By substituting the expressions above in the right-hand side (RHS) of (3.2) we obtain the RHS of (3.3).

The covariance matrix of the vector of random variables $[A, B]^T$ for a linear $R(A) = R_c A$ satisfies at steady state a Lyapunov equation [36] of the form (4.40)

$$(4.40) \quad P\Sigma + \Sigma P^T + D = 0$$

The precise definition of matrices P, D can be found in¹ [36] and [20]. In particular, for the case under consideration the matrices P and D are defined as follows

$$(4.41) \quad P = \begin{bmatrix} -\gamma_A & 0 \\ \mathbb{E}[Q]R_c & -\gamma_B \end{bmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{bmatrix} F + \gamma_A \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{E}[Q^2]R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] + \gamma_B \mathbb{E}[B] \end{bmatrix}$$

and it follows that the solution to (4.40) is

$$(4.42) \quad \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] & \mathbb{E}[Q] \frac{R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)} \\ \mathbb{E}[Q] \frac{R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)} & \frac{R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A][R_c 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2 + (\gamma_A + \gamma_B)(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q])]}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)} \end{bmatrix}$$

The element $\Sigma_{2,2} = \frac{R_c \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A][R_c 2(\mathbb{E}[Q])^2 + (\gamma_A + \gamma_B)(\mathbb{E}[Q^2] + \mathbb{E}[Q])]}{2\gamma_B(\gamma_A + \gamma_B)}$ is the variance of B which proves the statement in Proposition 4.3. \square

¹Note that while bursts are not explicitly taken into account in these works they may be easily incorporated.

4.4. Proof of Proposition 3.8.

Proof of Proposition 3.8. We use first an first an expression for $\mathbb{E}[AB]$ involving $T'_a(1)$ derived in Section 4.1 and write this by means of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\cdot]$, where \mathcal{P} is the Poisson distribution in (2.5). In particular, note that $\mathbb{E}[AB] = \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} aT'_a(1)$. Hence from the expression of $T'_a(1)$ in (4.26) we have

$$(4.43) \quad \mathbb{E}[AB] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \left[A \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_n(A) \right]$$

By noting that $A = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]\psi_0(A) + \psi_1(A)$ we have

$$(4.44) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \left[A \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \frac{\gamma_B}{n\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \psi_n(A) \right] = \\ & = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_n \left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_0(A)\psi_n(A)] + \frac{\gamma_B}{\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_1(A)\psi_n(A)] \right] \\ & = \sigma_0 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] + \sigma_1 \frac{\gamma_B}{\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Proposition 4.2 (stated in Section 4.5). From the definition of covariance we have

$$(4.45) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{cov}(A, B) &= \mathbb{E}[AB] - \mathbb{E}[A]\mathbb{E}[B] \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}[Q]}{\gamma_B} \left[\sigma_0 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] + \sigma_1 \frac{\gamma_B}{\gamma_A + \gamma_B} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[Q] \frac{\sigma_1 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]}{\gamma_B + \gamma_A} \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the relation $\sigma_0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[R(A)]$. \square

4.5. Properties of ψ_n and σ_n . The proof of the following proposition is based on ideas in [25].

PROPOSITION 4.2. *Consider function $\psi_n(A)$ as in Proposition 4.1 with $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$, where A is a random variable with Poisson distribution \mathcal{P} . Then the following equalities hold*

$$(4.46) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)] = \delta_{n,0}, \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)\psi_{n'}(A)] = n!(\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n \delta_{n',n}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.2. The first equality can be derived from the definition of $\psi_n(A)$ in Proposition 4.1 with $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$, and the fact that for a random variable that has a Poisson distribution it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[(A)_k] = (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^k$. By taking the expectation on both sides of (4.33) with respect to the Poisson distribution one obtains

$$(4.47) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)] = \delta_{n,0}$$

In order to prove the second equality we make use of the *Chu-Vandermonde* identity [29]

$$(4.48) \quad (x+y)_m = \sum_{n=0}^m \binom{m}{n} (x)_{m-n} (y)_n$$

For any $m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq}$ with $x = A - m'$ and $y = m'$ equation (4.48) yields

$$(4.49) \quad \begin{aligned} (A)_m &= \sum_{n=0}^m \binom{m}{n} (A - m')_{m-n} (m')_n \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^m n! \binom{m}{n} \binom{m'}{n} (A - m')_{m-n} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation is obtained from the fact that $(m)_n = n! \binom{m}{n}$. Multiplying by $(A)_{m'}$ we obtain

$$(4.50) \quad \begin{aligned} (A)_{m'} (A)_m &= \sum_{n=0}^m n! \binom{m}{n} \binom{m'}{n} (A)_{m'} (A - m')_{m-n} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^m n! \binom{m}{n} \binom{m'}{n} (A)_{m+m'-n} \end{aligned}$$

where we have made use that for falling factorials $(A)_{i+j} = (A)_i (A - i)_j$ [16]. Taking expectations on both sides of (4.50) leads to the following equality

$$(4.51) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[(A)_{m'} (A)_m] = \sum_{n=0}^m n! \binom{m}{n} \binom{m'}{n} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^{m+m'-n}$$

Another expression for the left-hand side of (4.51) can be obtained by plugging the expression of the falling factorial from (4.37) in both $(A)_m$ and $(A)_{m'}$, with $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$. This leads to the following equality

$$(4.52) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[(A)_{m'} (A)_m] = \sum_{n=0}^m \sum_{n'=0}^{m'} \binom{m'}{n'} \binom{m}{n} (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^{(m+m'-n-n')} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A) \psi_{n'}(A)]$$

By equating (4.52) and (4.51) and by expanding the summations we obtain

$$(4.53) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A) \psi_{n'}(A)] = n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n \delta_{n,n'} \quad \square$$

We now give the following result that provides an interpretation of the coefficients σ_n in (4.35) as expectations with respect to a Poisson distribution. The expressions for σ_0, σ_1 in Definition 3.1 are an immediate consequence of the following Proposition.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Consider function $R(\cdot)$, coefficients σ_n , and functions $\psi_n(\cdot)$ as in Proposition 4.1 with $r = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$, where A is a random variable with Poisson distribution \mathcal{P} . Then the following relation holds*

$$(4.54) \quad \sigma_n = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A) R(A)]}{n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.3. Consider the expansion in (4.34), and let us multiply both sides by $\psi_n(A)$ yielding

$$(4.55) \quad \psi_n(A) R(A) = \sum_{n'=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{n'} \psi_{n'}(A) \psi_n(A)$$

We now take expectations with respect to the Poisson distribution on both sides

$$(4.56) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)R(A)] = \sum_{n'=0}^{\infty} \sigma'_n \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi'_n(A)\psi_n(A)]$$

Using Proposition 4.5 it follows that

$$(4.57) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)R(A)] = \sigma_n n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n$$

and from the previous relation we obtain

$$(4.58) \quad \sigma_n = \frac{\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[\psi_n(A)R(A)]}{n! (\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A])^n}$$

□

5. Numerical examples. We evaluate the conservativeness of the bound for the variance given in (3.2) by numerically computing how close this is to the actual variance. We make use of the Stochastic Simulation Algorithm software GillesPy2 available in [1].

We select as function $R(A)$ a Hill function that is commonly found in several biological processes

$$(5.1) \quad R(a) = \frac{(a/A_0)^{n_h}}{1 + (a/A_0)^{n_h}}, n_h \in \mathbb{R}_>, A_0 \in \mathbb{R}_>$$

In Fig. 1 we compute $var(B)$, the bound in (3.2), and the LNA for (2.4) for the considered $R(a)$ with $n_h = 9$ and $A_0 = 100$ and $F = 1$. We consider four different distributions for Q corresponding to the binomial and uniform distributions and truncated and shifted versions of Poisson and geometric burst distributions [2] as defined below. In particular, we consider Q to take values in the set $M = \{1, \dots, m_N\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_>$ and the following probability mass function is used as an approximate Poisson distribution for Q with parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_>$

$$(5.2) \quad \mathbb{P}_Q(q) = \frac{\frac{\lambda^{q-1} e^{-\lambda}}{(q-1)!}}{\sum_{k=1}^{m_N} \frac{\lambda^{k-1} e^{-\lambda}}{(k-1)!}}, \forall q \in M$$

We also consider the following truncated version of the geometric distribution $\mathcal{G}(p)$ with parameter p

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{P}_Q(q) = \frac{p(1-p)^{q-1}}{\sum_{k=1}^{m_N} p(1-p)^{k-1}}, \forall q \in M$$

It should be noted that the Hill function (5.1) is bounded yielding that $\mathbb{E}[R(A)]$ is finite, and also the considered burst distributions have finite support. Hence Remark 2.2 applies and Assumption 2.1 holds.

The diagrams show that (3.2) is not conservative regardless of Q and it is very close to $var(B)$ for a large range of values of $var(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$. The figures display also a comparison of the bound with the variance of B computed through the LNA of (2.4). Note that the LNA and the bound in (3.2) are accurate when A is predominantly in the linear regime of $R(a)$, *i.e.* for high and low values of A .

The LNA performs however particularly poorly for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] = var(A) \approx A_0$, *i.e.* A is with high probability in the nonlinear regime of $R(A)$. The differences are due to




Fig. 1: Numerical simulation showing the bound obtained from (3.2) and the computed variance of B for varying $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A] = F/\gamma_A$ with $F = 1, \gamma_B = 10^{-2}$ and for different distributions of Q ($\mathcal{P}(\lambda)$, $\mathcal{G}(p)$ refer to the distributions in (5.2), (5.3) respectively with $m_N > 20$). $R(a)$ is a Hill function with parameters $n_h = 9$ and $A_0 = 100$. (—) displays the bound computed from (3.2) and (---) displays the variance obtained from numerical simulations of (2.4). The variance computed through a LNA of system (2.4) is displayed as (-·-·-)

the effect of the coefficients σ_0 and σ_1 of the reformulated Newton Expansion which account more precisely for the highly nonlinear regimes of $R(A)$. The left hand side of Fig. 2 shows the relative error, expressed as a percentage, between the variance of B and the bound corresponding to different values of $\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}}[A]$ (obtained by varying γ_A) and γ_B when Q has the distribution in (5.3) with $p = 0.5$. The right hand side of Fig.2 displays the relative error between the variance of B and the variance obtained through LNA. We find that the bound is still not conservative and performs consistently better than variance obtained through LNA for different values of γ_A and γ_B .




Fig. 2: The left hand side of the figure shows the relative error between the variance of B , obtained through a numerical simulation, and the bound in Proposition 3.2. The right hand side displays the relative error between the variance of B , and the LNA. $R(a)$ is set to be a Hill function with parameters $n_h = 9$ and $A_0 = 100$, and $F = 1$. The considered burst distribution is (5.3) with $p = 0.5$.

6. Conclusions. We have derived an analytical expression that provides a hard bound for the variance in the molecule numbers of a species formed with bursts, with a nonlinear rate that depends on another spontaneously formed species. The bound follows from a discrete expansion based on the *Newton series*, and exploits spectral properties of the master equation. We have also shown that the bound holds with equality if the propensity functions are linear. The accuracy of the bound has been investigated with numerical simulations which demonstrate that this is very close to the actual variance also when the rate of formation of the species is highly nonlinear, and despite the presence of bursts. We have also shown that the *Newton series* expansion allows to obtain an exact analytical expression for the covariance of the species under consideration. Directions for future work include an investigation of whether the results in the paper can be extended to more broad classes of reactions, where the Newton series expansion is used as an alternative to Linear noise approximations (which are based on Taylor series expansions), for generating more accurate approximate expressions for the variance.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. H. ABEL, B. DRAWERT, A. HELLANDER, AND L. R. PETZOLD, *GillesPy: A python package for stochastic model building and simulation*, IEEE Life Sciences Letters, 2 (2016), pp. 35–38, <https://doi.org/10.1109/lis.2017.2652448>.
- [2] C. H. L. BEENTJES, R. PEREZ-CARRASCO, AND R. GRIMA, *Exact solution of stochastic gene expression models with bursting, cell cycle and replication dynamics*, Physical Review E, 101 (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physreve.101.032403>.
- [3] D. CAPPELLETTI, A. PAL MAJUMDER, AND C. WIUF, *The dynamics of stochastic mono-*

- molecular reaction systems in stochastic environments*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 137 (2021), pp. 106–148, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2021.03.010>.
- [4] G. R. DOWDY AND P. I. BARTON, *Bounds on stochastic chemical kinetic systems at steady state*, The Journal of Chemical Physics, 148 (2018), p. 084106, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5009950>.
- [5] D. P. GAVER, P. A. JACOBS, AND G. LATOUCHE, *Finite birth-and-death models in randomly changing environments*, Advances in Applied Probability, 16 (1984), pp. 715–731, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1427338>.
- [6] K. R. GHUSINGA, C. A. VARGAS-GARCIA, A. LAMPERSKI, AND A. SINGH, *Exact lower and upper bounds on stationary moments in stochastic biochemical systems*, Physical Biology, 14 (2017), p. 04LT01, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1478-3975/aa75c6>.
- [7] D. T. GILLESPIE, *Stochastic simulation of chemical kinetics*, Annual Review of Physical Chemistry, 58 (2007), pp. 35–55, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.physchem.58.032806.104637>.
- [8] I. GOLDING, J. PAULSSON, S. M. ZAWILSKI, AND E. C. COX, *Real-time kinetics of gene activity in individual bacteria*, Cell, 123 (2005), pp. 1025–1036.
- [9] A. GUPTA, C. BRIAT, AND M. KHAMMASH, *A scalable computational framework for establishing long-term behavior of stochastic reaction networks*, PLoS Computational Biology, 10 (2014), p. e1003669, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003669>.
- [10] R. HEINRICH, B. G. NEEL, AND T. A. RAPOPORT, *Mathematical models of protein kinase signal transduction*, Molecular Cell, 9 (2002), pp. 957–970, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765\(02\)00528-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1097-2765(02)00528-2).
- [11] J. P. HESPANHA AND A. SINGH, *Stochastic models for chemically reacting systems using polynomial stochastic hybrid systems*, International Journal of Robust and Nonlinear Control, 15 (2005), pp. 669–689, <https://doi.org/10.1002/rnc.1017>.
- [12] M. HINCZEWSKI AND D. THIRUMALAI, *Cellular signaling networks function as generalized wiener-kolmogorov filters to suppress noise*, Physical Review X, 4 (2014), <https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevx.4.041017>.
- [13] C. JORDAN, *Calculus of Finite Differences*, American Mathematical Society, 1965.
- [14] J. P. KHAROUFEH, *Level-dependent quasi-birth-and-death processes*, Jan. 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470400531.eorms0460>.
- [15] E. KLIPP AND W. LIEBERMEISTER, *Mathematical modeling of intracellular signaling pathways*, BMC Neuroscience, 7 (2006), <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2202-7-s1-s10>.
- [16] D. E. KNUTH, *The art of computer programming (3rd ed.): fundamental algorithms*, vol. Volume 1 of The @classic work, Addison-Wesley, Boston, third edition, forty-fifth printing [ff.] ed., 2021. Hier auch später erschienene, unveränderte Nachdrucke.
- [17] J. KUNTZ, P. THOMAS, G.-B. STAN, AND M. BARAHONA, *Bounding the stationary distributions of the chemical master equation via mathematical programming*, The Journal of Chemical Physics, 151 (2019), p. 034109, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5100670>.
- [18] J. KÖNIG AND F. HUCHT, *Newton series expansion of bosonic operator functions*, SciPost Physics, 10 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.21468/scipostphys.10.1.007>.
- [19] J. B. LASSERRE, *Moments, Positive Polynomials and Their Applications*, Imperial College Press, oct 2009, <https://doi.org/10.1142/p665>.
- [20] I. LESTAS, J. PAULSSON, N. E. ROSS, AND G. VINNICOMBE, *Noise in gene regulatory networks*, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, 53 (2008), pp. 189–200, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2007.911347>.
- [21] L. M. MILNE-THOMSON, *The calculus of finite differences*, Chelsea Publ., New York, NY, 2nd ed. ed., 1981.
- [22] B. MUNSKY AND M. KHAMMASH, *The finite state projection algorithm for the solution of the chemical master equation*, The Journal of Chemical Physics, 124 (2006), p. 044104, <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.2145882>.
- [23] I. NEWTON, *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Jussu Societatis Regiæ ac Typis Joseph Streater, 1687, <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/PR-ADV-B-00039-00001/1>.
- [24] I. NEWTON, A. MOTTE, AND N. W. CHITTENDEN, *Sir Isaac Newton's Mathematical principles of natural philosophy and his System of the world / translated into English by Andrew Motte in 1729; the translations revised, and supplied with an historical appendix, by N. Chittenden*, 1850, https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_KaAIAAAIAAJ/page/466/mode/2up.
- [25] H. OGURA, *Orthogonal functionals of the poisson process*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 18 (1972), pp. 473–481, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.1972.1054856>.
- [26] E. OMEN, NEJLA; ERKUS-DUMAN, *On the poisson-charlier polynomials*, Serdica Mathematical Journal, 41 (2015), pp. 457–470, <http://eudml.org/doc/295047>.
- [27] J. PAULSSON, *Models of stochastic gene expression*, Physics of Life Reviews, 2 (2005), pp. 157–

- 175, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plrev.2005.03.003>.
- [28] G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI AND I. LESTAS, *Variance bounds for a class of biochemical reactions with bursts using a discrete expansion*, in 2020 59th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), IEEE, Dec. 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1109/cdc42340.2020.9304384>.
- [29] S. ROMAN, *The umbral calculus*, Academic Press, New York, 1984.
- [30] Y. SAKURAI AND Y. HORI, *Optimization-based synthesis of stochastic biocircuits with statistical specifications*, *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 15 (2018), p. 20170709, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2017.0709>.
- [31] V. SHAHREZAEI AND P. S. SWAIN, *Analytical distributions for stochastic gene expression*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105 (2008), pp. 17256–17261.
- [32] A. SINGH AND J. P. HESPANHA, *Approximate moment dynamics for chemically reacting systems*, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56 (2011), pp. 414–418, <https://doi.org/10.1109/tac.2010.2088631>.
- [33] P. SMADBECK AND Y. N. KAZNESSIS, *A closure scheme for chemical master equations*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110 (2013), pp. 14261–14265, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1306481110>.
- [34] D. L. SNYDER, *Random Point Processes*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, 1975.
- [35] M. R. SPIEGEL, *Schaum's outline of theory and problems of calculus of finite differences and difference equations*, @Schaum's outline series, McGraw-Hill, New York [u.a.], 10. print ed., 1994.
- [36] N. G. VAN KAMPEN, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry*, Elsevier LTD, Oxford, 2007.
- [37] C. ZECHNER, G. SEELIG, M. RULLAN, AND M. KHAMMASH, *Molecular circuits for dynamic noise filtering*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113 (2016), pp. 4729–4734, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517109113>.