

A MACROSCOPICALLY CONSISTENT REACTIVE LANGEVIN DYNAMICS MODEL*

SAMUEL A. ISAACSON[†], QIANHAN LIU[‡], KONSTANTINOS SPILIOPOULOS[‡], AND CHEN YAO[‡]

Abstract. Particle-based stochastic reaction-diffusion (PBSRD) models are a popular approach for capturing stochasticity in reaction and transport processes across biological systems. In some contexts, the overdamped approximation inherent in such models may be inappropriate, necessitating the use of more microscopic Langevin Dynamics models for spatial transport. In this work we develop a novel particle-based Reactive Langevin Dynamics (RLD) model, with a focus on deriving reactive interaction kernels that are consistent with the physical constraint of detailed balance of reactive fluxes at equilibrium. We demonstrate that, to leading order, the overdamped limit of the resulting RLD model corresponds to the volume reactivity PBSRD model, of which the well-known Doi model is a particular instance. Our work provides a step towards systematically deriving PBSRD models from more microscopic reaction models, and suggests possible constraints on the latter to ensure consistency between the two physical scales.

Key words. Particle-based Stochastic Reaction-Diffusion Models, Langevin Dynamics, overdamped Limit

MSC codes. 92C05, 92C40, 92C45

1. Introduction. The macroscopic, population-level dynamics of systems across cell, synthetic, and systems biology often arises from the stochastic movements of large collections of discrete entities or agents with short-range interactions [2, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26]. One popular framework to depict such dynamics are particle-based stochastic reaction-diffusion (PBSRD) models [2, 18, 23, 25]. PBSRD models are appropriate for studying chemical systems in cells containing millions of particles, over timescales of minutes to days. These models provide an intermediate framework between more microscopic quantum mechanical or molecular dynamics models, which are typically limited in scale and computationally intensive [22], and more macroscopic mean-field chemical kinetics models described by deterministic reaction-diffusion PDEs. Volume reactivity (VR) models as popularized by Doi [6, 7, 27] are a commonly used PBSRD model. They model the movements of particles by Brownian Dynamics, and particle interactions by reactive interaction kernels, which encode the probability density per time that a reaction occurs based on the current positions of substrates and the potential positions of products.

Though VR PBSRD models provide an effective description for stochastic reaction-diffusion systems, inertial forces have been shown to be a crucial component for accurately modeling interacting populations of cells [5, 10, 19], swarming and flocking behavior in insects and robots [1, 8], the mass-dependence of effective diffusivities for multiple binding site particles that can reversibly bind to surface receptors [17], and the spread of disease among populations [24]. Spatial movement in such phenomena are more accurately captured by Langevin Dynamics (LDs), which provide a more microscopic description than Brownian Dynamics by incorporating individual velocities and inertial forces [10]. While PBSRD models have been extensively studied and

*

Funding: This work was partially supported by ARO W911NF-20-1-0244 and National Science Foundation DMS-2325185, DMS-2311500, and DMS-1902854.

[†]Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University, Boston, MA (isaacsas@bu.edu, liuq19@bu.edu, kspiliop@bu.edu, c2yao@bu.edu).

validated against experimental data [12] and more macroscopic theories [9, 11, 16], the literature on how to represent reactions in LD-scale models is more limited [3, 4, 15]. In this paper, we therefore focus on developing particle-based reactive Langevin Dynamics (RLD) models which are consistent with VR PBSRD models in the overdamped limit.

The core of developing RLD models is then in constructing reactive interaction kernels for which solutions to the RLD model converge in the overdamped limit to solutions of the VR PBSRD model with standard (overdamped) reactive interaction kernels. The desired RLD kernels can be decomposed into two components: (a) reactive rate functions, representing the probability per time that substrates will react based on their current positions, and (b) placement densities, which represent the probability density that reaction products are placed at specific locations with specific velocities, given the locations and velocities of substrates.

The contribution of this work is two-fold. First, assuming conservation of momentum and pointwise detailed balance of reaction fluxes at equilibrium for reversible reactions, we derive concrete, novel formulas for reactive interaction kernels in general reactive Langevin dynamics models. For the reader's convenience, we have summarized the formulas we derive for three common reversible systems in Table 1-Table 3. Second, using these kernels, we derive the (high-friction/small-mass) overdamped limit via asymptotic expansions of solutions to the RLD model, and show that the leading order terms satisfy the equations of the VR PBSRD model. This establishes that our RLD models are consistent with VR PBSRD models in the overdamped limit. While we propose a particular family of reactive interaction kernels in this work, for example assuming conservation of momentum during reactive collisions, the scalings we obtain also suggest how alternative kernels could be constructed that still maintain consistency with standard overdamped VR PBSRD models.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we establish the basic setting for RLD models in a multi-particle system for general mass action reactions. We present motivating examples to introduce the new reactive rate functions and placement densities. In section 3, we construct the forward Kolmogorov equation governing the evolution of the probability density for the system to be in a given state, we derive the general reversible reaction detailed balance condition at equilibrium, we illustrate how detailed balance constrains reversible reaction interaction kernels, and we state our assumptions on the reactive interaction kernels for general systems. In section 4, we derive the overdamped limit of RLD models by developing asymptotic expansions of the solution to the forward equation in the limit of large damping constant. We demonstrate that to leading order, the asymptotic expansion of the marginal density that projects out the velocity component satisfies the standard forward equation for the overdamped VR PBSRD model. In section 5, we demonstrate how our theory translates in the case of the common reversible reactions $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$ and $A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$. In particular, we derive the detailed-balance consistent forward and backward reactive interaction kernels presented in section 2. We also sketch how the overdamped limit of the RLD model in each of these special cases recovers the VR PBSRD model, giving a less notationally-heavy sketch of the more general calculation of section 4. To validate our theoretical results, numerical simulations are carried out for the $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$ reaction in section 6. Conclusions and pointers to future work are included in section 7.

2. Notation and motivation. Let's consider a system of J biochemical species, labeled by S_1, \dots, S_J , with $N_j(t)$ denoting the stochastic process for the number of

particles of species j at time t , and $\mathbf{N}(t) = (N_1(t), \dots, N_J(t))$ the population state vector for all species. We denote n_j as a value for $N_j(t)$ and $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_J)$ as a value for $\mathbf{N}(t)$. Denote the positions and velocities of n_j particles of S_j at time t by

$$X^{(j)}(t) = (X_1^{(j)}(t), \dots, X_{n_j}^{(j)}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j d}, \quad V^{(j)}(t) = (V_1^{(j)}(t), \dots, V_{n_j}^{(j)}(t)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j d}.$$

Each particle moves within a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ according to the Langevin equations

$$(2.1) \quad \dot{X}_l^{(j)}(t) = V_l^{(j)}(t), \quad \dot{V}_l^{(j)}(t) = -\beta_j V_l^{(j)}(t) + \beta_j \sqrt{2D_j} \dot{W}_l^{(j)}(t),$$

where, each $W_l^{(j)}$ is a standard Brownian Motion, β_j is the scaled friction constant of species- j with ‘‘per time’’ units, and D_j is the diffusion coefficient constant of species j . We further assume that these constants are related via Einstein’s relation

$$(2.2) \quad m_j D_j \beta_j = k_B T,$$

where, m_j denotes the mass of particles of type j , k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is a fixed constant representing temperature. In what follows, unless stated otherwise, we will assume that Ω is finite, with particles experiencing a reflecting Neumann boundary condition on the domain boundary.

Possible values for the stochastic processes $X^{(j)}(t)$ and $V^{(j)}(t)$ are denoted by

$$\mathbf{x}^{n_j} = (x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_{n_j}^{(j)}) \in \Omega^{n_j}, \quad \mathbf{v}^{n_j} = (v_1^{(j)}, \dots, v_{n_j}^{(j)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_j d}.$$


We define the state of a particle by the collective position and velocity pair, labeled by $\xi_l^{(j)} := (x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})$. The collection of states of all particles given the population state vector, \mathbf{n} , is then denoted by $\xi^{\mathbf{n}} = (\xi^{n_1}, \dots, \xi^{n_J})$. Similarly, we can define $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{n}}$ as the collection of positions and velocities of all particles. Assume particles of the same species are indistinguishable, i.e., a state $\tilde{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}$ is equivalent to $\xi^{\mathbf{n}}$ if, for each specie j , the state vector $\tilde{\xi}^{n_j}$ is simply a reordering of ξ^{n_j} .

For any given population state \mathbf{n} , we let $p^{\mathbf{n}}(\xi^{\mathbf{n}}, t)$ denote the probability density that $\mathbf{N}(t) = \mathbf{n}$ with the particles located at some state equivalent to $\xi^{\mathbf{n}}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{N}(t) = \mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{n}|}} p^{\mathbf{n}}(\xi^{\mathbf{n}}, t) d\xi^{\mathbf{n}},$$

where, the factorial terms arise from overcounting indistinguishable particle states. Finally, we let $\mathbf{P}(t) = \{p^{\mathbf{n}}(\xi^{\mathbf{n}}, t)\}_{\mathbf{n}}$ represent the vector of probability densities over all possible states at time t .

In addition to the spatial motion of each particle given by the scaled Langevin dynamics, we also consider allow particles to react via the reversible reaction



where, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_J)$ labels the substrate stoichiometry vector and $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_J)$ labels the product stoichiometry vector. As we will frequently encounter Maxwell-Boltzmann (i.e. Gaussian) distributions, to ease notation and make explicit the Gaussian nature of the distribution, we shall denote the corresponding probability density (with zero mean) by

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{G}_p(x; \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\sigma^2)^{p/2}} e^{-\frac{|x|^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \text{ for } x \in \mathbb{R}^p,$$

where $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p$ is the variance-covariance matrix and p is the dimension.

To illustrate the setting and introduce the notion of reactive interaction functions, we next present some specific examples.

Example 2.1 ($A + B \rightleftharpoons C$). Consider a system consisting of species A, B and C, which can undergo the reversible reaction $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$. For the forward reaction $A + B \rightarrow C$, denote the forward reaction rate function by $K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2)$, representing the probability per time that an A particle at ξ_1 binds with a B particle at ξ_2 . Here, the β superscript indicates a possible dependency on the friction constant. Analogously, for the reverse reaction $A + B \leftarrow C$, we can define backward rate function $K_-^\beta(\xi_3)$ representing the probability per time that a C particle at ξ_3 unbinds.

To determine the positions and velocities of reaction products, let $m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2)$ denote the forward placement density that a product C particle is placed at ξ_3 given the substrates' states ξ_1 and ξ_2 . $m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2)$ is assumed to be normalized so that

$$\int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2) d\xi_3 = 1.$$

The backward placement density $m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3)$ is defined analogously. We further assume the placement densities can be decomposed into a product as follows

$$\begin{aligned} m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2) &= m_+(x_3|x_1, x_2)m_+^\beta(v_3|v_1, v_2), \\ m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3) &= m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3)m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2|v_3), \end{aligned}$$

where, $m_+(x_3|x_1, x_2)$ and $m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3)$ are placement densities for positions, and $m_+^\beta(v_3|v_1, v_2)$ and $m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2|v_3)$ are placement densities for velocities. In the remainder, each of these placement densities are assumed to be properly normalized.

Remark 2.2. For the sake of brevity, we use the same notation $m_+^\beta(\cdot | \cdot)$ to represent the probability density of the first argument given the second argument, regardless of whether these arguments pertain to position, velocity, or state. Additionally, we assume that the placement densities of positions are independent of the friction constant β , which will be demonstrated with the following specific choices.

A common choice for $K_-^\beta(\xi_3)$ in the overdamped case would be a constant rate, i.e., $K_-^\beta(\xi_3) := K_-(x_3) = \lambda_-$. To define the forward rate function, a common model is that the two particles bind with some constant rate, λ_+ , when their distance falls within a specified reaction radius $\varepsilon > 0$, i.e. the Doi model [6, 7]

$$(2.5) \quad K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2) := K_+(x_1, x_2) = \lambda_+ \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(|x_1 - x_2|).$$

Note, both rate functions depend solely on positions, and are independent of the friction constant β .

For the forward position placement density, the product C is chosen to lie at some point along the line segment connecting A and B, i.e.

$$(2.6) \quad m_+(x_3|x_1, x_2) = \delta(x_3 - (\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2)),$$

where, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ is fixed. One common choice for α is the diffusion weighted center of mass, $D_2/(D_1 + D_2)$, see [29]. For the forward velocity placement, we assume conservation of momentum holds, and hence we have

$$(2.7) \quad m_+^\beta(v_3|v_1, v_2) = \delta\left(v_3 - \frac{m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2}{m_3}\right),$$

where, m_1 , m_2 and m_3 are masses of particles A, B and C respectively.

For the backward $C \rightarrow A + B$ reaction, specifying the center of mass for the products via (2.6) is insufficient to uniquely determine their positions. We therefore also require that their separation, $x_1 - x_2$, is uniformly distributed within B_ε , the ball of radius ε (with volume $|B_\varepsilon|$). Hence, $m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3)$ has the following form

$$(2.8) \quad m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3) = \frac{1}{|B_\varepsilon|} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(|x_1 - x_2|) \delta(x_3 - (\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2)).$$

Let K_d denote the dissociation constant for the reaction. As shown in [29], using the preceding choice for m_- and setting $\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+ |B_\varepsilon|$ is consistent with detailed balance of pointwise reaction fluxes holding at equilibrium for the overdamped problem.

Similarly, conservation of momentum is insufficient to uniquely specify the velocities of the A and B particles. We therefore derive one additional constraint from enforcing consistency with detailed balance of pointwise reaction fluxes holding at equilibrium, which we show in section 3 and section 5 gives that

$$(2.9) \quad m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2|v_3) = \delta\left(v_3 - \frac{(m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)}{m_3}\right) \mathcal{G}_d(v_1 - v_2; (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d).$$

This models placing the reaction products such that total momentum is preserved, and the particles' velocity separation is from the equilibrium Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution, i.e. $v_1 - v_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d)$.

Finally, we note a useful scaling property of these specific velocity placement densities that we will later exploit in establishing the overdamped, i.e. $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, limit. Assume that $\beta_i = \beta \hat{\beta}_i$ and define $\gamma_i := D_i \hat{\beta}_i$. By the Einstein Relation (2.2) and assuming conservation of mass, $m_1 + m_2 = m_3$, we have for $i \in \{1, 2\}$

$$(2.10) \quad \frac{m_i}{m_3} = \frac{D_3 \beta_3}{D_i \beta_i} = \frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_i}, \quad \text{and} \quad D_3 \beta_3 = \frac{D_1 \beta_1 D_2 \beta_2}{D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2} \Leftrightarrow \gamma_3 = \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}.$$

Consider the change of variables, $v_i = \sqrt{\beta \gamma_i} \eta_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, representing a non-dimensional coordinate system in which we will study the over-damped limit in section 4. In these coordinates we have

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} m_+^\beta(v_3|v_1, v_2) &= \frac{1}{(\beta \gamma_3)^{d/2}} \delta\left(\eta_3 - \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_1}} \eta_1 + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_2}} \eta_2\right)\right) \\ &=: \frac{1}{(\beta \gamma_3)^{d/2}} \tilde{m}_+(\eta_3|\eta_1, \eta_2), \end{aligned}$$

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{aligned} m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2|v_3) &= \frac{1}{\beta^d (2\pi \gamma_1 \gamma_2)^{d/2}} \delta\left(\eta_3 - \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_1}} \eta_1 + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_2}} \eta_2\right)\right) e^{(|\eta_3|^2 - |\eta_1|^2 - |\eta_2|^2)/2} \\ &=: \frac{1}{\beta^d (\gamma_1 \gamma_2)^{d/2}} \tilde{m}_-(\eta_1, \eta_2|\eta_3). \end{aligned}$$

The new coordinate system factors out the β scaling from the β -dependent densities m_\pm^β . Consequently, the transformed densities \tilde{m}_\pm become independent of β . We will observe this scaling property for each of the specific reversible reactions we consider.

Example 2.3 ($A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$). Consider a system consisting of species A, B, C and D, which can undergo the reversible reaction $A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$. Similar to the previous example, we define the rate functions as

$$\begin{aligned} K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2) &:= K_+(x_1, x_2) = \lambda_+ \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(|x_1 - x_2|), \\ K_-^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4) &:= K_-(x_3, x_4) = \lambda_- \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(|x_3 - x_4|), \end{aligned}$$

where, $\varepsilon > 0$ represents the reaction radius. For the placement densities, we again assume the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} m_+^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4 | \xi_1, \xi_2) &= m_+(x_3, x_4 | x_1, x_2) m_+^\beta(v_3, v_4 | v_1, v_2), \\ m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2 | \xi_3, \xi_4) &= m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_4) m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3, v_4). \end{aligned}$$

Given two positions x_1 and x_2 , the ordered pair (x_3, x_4) coincides with positions pair (x_1, x_2) or (x_2, x_1) with the probability p and $(1 - p)$ respectively, that is

$$(2.13) \quad m_+(x_3, x_4 | x_1, x_2) = p \delta_{(x_1, x_2)}(x_3, x_4) + (1 - p) \delta_{(x_1, x_2)}(x_4, x_3).$$

The backward position placement density $m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_4)$ is defined analogously by symmetry of the reaction. Let K_d now denote the dissociation constant for this reaction. By an analogous derivation to that in [29] for the preceding example, choosing m_- symmetrically to (2.13) and setting $\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+$ is consistent with detailed balance of pointwise reaction fluxes holding at equilibrium for the overdamped problem.

When considering the velocity placement of the forward reaction, the constraint of conservation of momentum is insufficient to uniquely specify the velocities v_3 and v_4 of the product C and D particles. Similar to Example 2.1, enforcing consistency with detailed balance fully determines the velocity placement density as (see section 3 and section 5)

$$(2.14) \quad m_+^\beta(v_3, v_4 | v_1, v_2) = (m_3 + m_4)^d \delta((m_3 v_3 + m_4 v_4) - (m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)) \\ \times \mathcal{G}_d(v_3 - v_4; (D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4) \mathbf{I}_d).$$

In this form, we can see that m_+^β corresponds to placing the products such that total momentum is preserved, and their velocity separation is sampled from the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution, i.e. $v_3 - v_4 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4) \mathbf{I}_d)$. The backward placement density $m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3, v_4)$ can be defined analogously via the symmetry of the reaction. We show in section 5 that this choice is consistent with pointwise detailed balance of the reaction fluxes holding at equilibrium.

Finally, we demonstrate the β scaling behavior of the velocity placement densities. Assume that $\beta_i = \beta \hat{\beta}_i$ and define $\gamma_i := D_i \hat{\beta}_i$. The Einstein relation (2.2) can be rewritten as $m_i \gamma_i \beta = k_B T$, which implies $m_i / m_j = \gamma_j / \gamma_i$, for any $i \neq j$. Then, the Einstein relations and conservation of mass give that

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} k_B T (m_1 + m_2) &= D_1 \beta_1 m_1^2 + D_2 \beta_2 m_2^2 = \frac{1}{\beta} (k_B T)^2 \frac{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}{\gamma_1 \gamma_2} \\ &= k_B T (m_3 + m_4) = D_3 \beta_3 m_3^2 + D_4 \beta_4 m_4^2 = \frac{1}{\beta} (k_B T)^2 \frac{\gamma_3 + \gamma_4}{\gamma_3 \gamma_4} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(2.16) \quad \frac{D_3 \beta_3 D_4 \beta_4}{D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4} = \frac{k_B T}{m_3 + m_4} = \frac{k_B T}{m_1 + m_2} = \frac{D_1 \beta_1 D_2 \beta_2}{D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2}.$$

Let $v_i = \sqrt{\beta \gamma_i} \eta_i$, for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. After some algebra, we find that the velocity

placement densities transform as

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_+^\beta(v_3, v_4|v_1, v_2) &= \frac{1}{\beta^d} \left(\frac{\gamma_3 + \gamma_4}{2\pi\gamma_3^2\gamma_4^2} \right)^{d/2} e^{-\frac{|\eta_3|^2}{2} - \frac{|\eta_4|^2}{2} + \frac{|\frac{\eta_3}{\sqrt{\gamma_3}} + \frac{\eta_4}{\sqrt{\gamma_4}}|^2}{2(\frac{\gamma_3 + \gamma_4}{\gamma_3\gamma_4})}} \\
 &\quad \times \delta \left(\left(\frac{\eta_3}{\sqrt{\gamma_3}} + \frac{\eta_4}{\sqrt{\gamma_4}} \right) - \left(\frac{\eta_1}{\sqrt{\gamma_1}} + \frac{\eta_2}{\sqrt{\gamma_2}} \right) \right) \\
 &=: \frac{1}{\beta^d(\gamma_3\gamma_4)^{d/2}} \tilde{m}_+(\eta_3, \eta_4|\eta_1, \eta_2),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{m}_+(\eta_3, \eta_4|\eta_1, \eta_2)$ is of order one with respect to β . We can verify a similar scaling property holds for $m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2|v_3, v_4)$.

Similar to the previous two examples, we can derive rate functions K_\pm and placement densities m_\pm^β that are consistent with detailed balance for the $A \rightleftharpoons B$ reversible reaction (again assuming conservation of mass and momentum). In this case the velocity placement density is just a δ -function, which under the non-dimensional change of coordinate $v_i = \sqrt{\beta\gamma_i}\eta_i$, $i = 1, 2$, scales as

$$m_+^\beta(v_2|v_1) = \delta(v_1 - v_2) = \frac{1}{(\beta\gamma_2)^{d/2}} \delta\left(\eta_2 - \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_1}{\gamma_2}}\eta_1\right) =: \frac{1}{(\beta\gamma_2)^{d/2}} \tilde{m}_+(\eta_2|\eta_1).$$

For all three of the preceding reactions, our concrete choices of rate functions and placement densities are summarized in [Table 1](#) through [Table 3](#). We emphasize that these choices are both consistent with detailed balance of pointwise reaction fluxes holding at equilibrium, while also maintaining consistency in the overdamped limit with common choices used in PBSRD models (i.e. the rate functions of [Table 1](#) and the placement densities of [Table 2](#)). In addition to detailed balance, they each arise from also assuming conservation of mass and momentum during reactions.

TABLE 1
Rate Rate Functions (with K_d the dissociation constant of the reaction)

Reaction	$K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n)$	$K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n)$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C$	$\lambda_+ \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(x_1 - x_2)$	$\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+ B_\varepsilon $
$A \rightleftharpoons B$	λ_+	$\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$	$\lambda_+ \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(x_1 - x_2)$	$\lambda_- \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(x_3 - x_4)$, $\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+$

TABLE 2
Position Placement Densities

Reaction	$m_+^\beta(\mathbf{x}_b^n \mathbf{x}_a^{n+})$	$m_-^\beta(\mathbf{x}_a^n \mathbf{x}_b^{n-})$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C$	$\delta(x_3 - (\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2))$	$\frac{1}{ B_\varepsilon } \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(x_1 - x_2)$ $\times \delta(x_3 - (\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2))$
$A \rightleftharpoons B$	$\delta(x_2 - x_1)$	$\delta(x_1 - x_2)$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$	$p\delta_{(x_1, x_2)}(x_3, x_4)$ $+ (1 - p)\delta_{(x_1, x_2)}(x_4, x_3)$	$p\delta_{(x_3, x_4)}(x_1, x_2)$ $+ (1 - p)\delta_{(x_3, x_4)}(x_2, x_1)$

Remark 2.4. In all three examples, in the non-dimensional coordinate system we find that β factors out from the β -dependent velocity placement density m_\pm^β ,

TABLE 3

Velocity Placement Densities (assuming conservation of mass). Let $p_{ij} = m_i v_i + m_j v_j$, $(i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (3, 4)\}$.

Reaction	$m_+^\beta(\mathbf{v}_b^n \mathbf{v}_a^{n+})$	$m_-^\beta(\mathbf{v}_a^n \mathbf{v}_b^{n-})$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C$	$\delta\left(v_3 - \frac{m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2}{m_3}\right)$	$\delta\left(v_3 - \frac{(m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)}{m_3}\right) \times \mathcal{G}_d(v_1 - v_2; (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d)$
$A \rightleftharpoons B$	$\delta(v_2 - v_1)$	$\delta(v_1 - v_2)$
$A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$	$(m_3 + m_4)^d \delta(p_{34} - p_{12}) \times \mathcal{G}_d(v_3 - v_4; (D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4) \mathbf{I}_d)$	$(m_1 + m_2)^d \delta(p_{12} - p_{34}) \times \mathcal{G}_d(v_1 - v_2; (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d)$

only modulating its amplitude. The transformed densities \tilde{m}_\pm are independent of β . Inspired by these observations, we now assume a generalization of this scaling property to study general reversible reactions. In section 4, we demonstrate that this scaling property plays a key role in deriving the overdamped limit of reactive Langevin Dynamics, enabling its consistency with overdamped models.

3. Formulation of Reactive Langevin Dynamics for General Reversible Reactions. In this section, we first introduce additional notations and definitions for modeling general reversible reactions. We then introduce the detailed balance relation and assumptions about rate functions and placement densities inspired from the examples in section 2, which are key components for deriving the overdamped, $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, limit of RLD models in section 4.

3.1. Preliminary Definitions. Recall the generic reaction (2.3). Consider the population vector $\mathbf{N}(t) = \mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_J)$. We denote \mathbf{n}^- as the population state vector transitioned from the population state \mathbf{n} after a forward reaction occurs, i.e. $\mathbf{n}^- = \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$, and, \mathbf{n}^+ as the population state vector transitioned from the population state \mathbf{n} after a backward reaction occurs $\mathbf{n}^+ = \mathbf{n} - \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}$.

Next, we introduce a system of notations to encode substrate and particle states and configurations that are needed to later specify reaction processes.

DEFINITION 3.1. For the generic reversible reaction (2.3), let $\mathbb{I}_+(\mathbf{n}) \subset (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^{|\mathbf{a}|}$ denote the substrate index space of the forward reaction when $\mathbf{N}(t) = \mathbf{n}$. Denote by $\mathbf{i}_a^n \in \mathbb{I}_+(\mathbf{n})$ the indices for one possible set of substrates, i.e.

$$\mathbf{i}_a^n = (i_1^{(1)}, \dots, i_{a_1}^{(1)}, \dots, i_1^{(J)}, \dots, i_{a_J}^{(J)}).$$

Here, $i_l^{(j)} \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_j\}$ labels the index of the l -th substrate particle of species j , and we assume $i_1^{(j)} \leq i_2^{(j)} \leq \dots \leq i_{a_j}^{(j)}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, J$. The substrate index space $\mathbb{I}_-(\mathbf{n})$ and specific substrate indices, \mathbf{i}_b^n , of the backward reaction can be defined analogously.

DEFINITION 3.2. For the generic reversible reaction (2.3), corresponding to the substrate index space $\mathbb{I}_+(\mathbf{n})$, we can define the forward substrate state space $\Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n) \subset (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{a}|}$. Denote $\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)$ as the state vector for the set of substrate particles with indices \mathbf{i}_a^n , so that

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n = (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{a_1}^n, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{a_2}^n, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{a_J}^n) = \left(\left(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_1^{(1)}}^n, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_{a_1}^{(1)}}^n \right), \left(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_1^{(2)}}^n, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_{a_2}^{(2)}}^n \right), \dots, \left(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_1^{(J)}}^n, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_{a_J}^{(J)}}^n \right) \right).$$

We can similarly define substrate position vectors, \mathbf{x}_a^n , and velocity vectors, \mathbf{v}_a^n . The

backward reaction substrate state space $\Xi_-(\xi^n)$ and the sampled vectors ξ_b^n , x_b^n , and v_b^n are defined analogously.

3.2. Kolmogorov Forward Equation. Recall $P(t) = \{p^n(\xi^n, t)\}_n$ representing the collection of probability densities over all possible states at time t . The evolution equation for each probability density $p^n(\xi^n, t)$, based on the dynamics (2.1) and the generic reaction (2.3), follows the Kolmogorov forward equation

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{\partial p^n}{\partial t}(\xi^n, t) = (\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{R}_+ + \mathcal{R}_-)p^n(\xi^n, t),$$

where, the transport operator \mathcal{L} is defined by

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{L}p^n(\xi^n, t) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})} \right) p^n(\xi^n, t)$$

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})} = \beta_j \nabla_{v_l^{(j)}} \cdot [v_l^{(j)} + \beta_j D_j \nabla_{v_l^{(j)}}] - v_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}}.$$

To define the reaction operators, \mathcal{R}_+ and \mathcal{R}_- , we introduce notations for adding or removing a particle from a given state ξ^n . Let

$$\xi^n \cup \tilde{\xi}^{(j)} = (\xi^{n_1}, \dots, \xi^{n_{j-1}}, (\xi^{n_j}, \tilde{\xi}^{(j)}), \xi^{n_{j+1}}, \dots, \xi^{n_J})$$

represent adding a new particle of species j with state $\tilde{\xi}^{(j)}$ into the current system ξ^n . This notation can be naturally extended to adding multiple particles in a system. For example, $\xi^n \cup \tilde{\xi}$ denotes adding multiple particles with states given by the combined vector $\tilde{\xi}$ to a system ξ^n . We use the notation

$$\xi^n \setminus \xi_l^{n_j} = (\xi^{n_1}, \dots, (\xi_1^{n_j}, \dots, \xi_{l-1}^{n_j}, \xi_{l+1}^{n_j}, \dots, \xi_{n_j}^{n_j}), \dots, \xi^{n_J})$$

to represent removing the l th particles of species j in the system ξ^n , which can be also extended to removing multiple particle from a given system.

With these notations, the forward, $A + B \rightarrow C$, reaction operator, \mathcal{R}_+ , is

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_+ p^n(\xi^n, t) = & - \left(\sum_{\xi_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} K_+^\beta(\xi_a^n) \right) p^n(\xi^n, t) \\ & + \sum_{\xi_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|a|}} m_+^\beta(\xi_b^n | \xi_a^{n+}) K_+^\beta(\xi_a^{n+}) p^{n+}((\xi^n \setminus \xi_b^n) \cup \xi_a^{n+}, t) d\xi_a^{n+}, \end{aligned}$$

where reaction rate function $K_+^\beta(\xi_a^n)$ represents the probability per time the the substrates at ξ_a^n react, and the placement density $m_+^\beta(\xi_b^n | \xi_a^{n+})$ represents the probability density that products are created at ξ_b^n given that substrates at ξ_a^{n+} reacted. The superscript β is to indicate functions which may depend on β . We analogously define the backward, $C \rightarrow A + B$, reaction operator \mathcal{R}_- as

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_- p^n(\xi^n, t) = & - \left(\sum_{\xi_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} K_-^\beta(\xi_b^n) \right) p^n(\xi^n, t) \\ & + \sum_{\xi_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|b|}} m_-^\beta(\xi_a^n | \xi_b^{n-}) K_-^\beta(\xi_b^{n-}) p^{n-}((\xi^n \setminus \xi_a^n) \cup \xi_b^{n-}, t) d\xi_b^{n-}. \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Abstract Detailed Balance Relation. As in the over-damped case [29], when the system is closed (i.e. Ω is finite with a reflecting Neumann, or periodic, boundary condition), at equilibrium the *principle of detailed balance* should hold for the pointwise reaction fluxes. That is, the equilibrium solutions $\bar{\mathbf{P}} = \{\bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})\}_{\mathbf{n}}$ should satisfy

$$(3.6) \quad m_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+}) K_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+}) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}+}((\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}} \setminus \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+}) = m_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) K_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}),$$

$$(3.7) \quad m_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}-}) K_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}-}) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}-}((\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}} \setminus \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}}) \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}-}) = m_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}-} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}}) K_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}}) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}).$$

Substituting (3.6) into the forward reaction operator (3.4), we have

$$(3.8) \quad \mathcal{R}_+ \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) = \left(- \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}} \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})} K_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}} \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})} K_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) \right) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})$$

Similarly, substituting (3.7) into (3.5) gives

$$(3.9) \quad \mathcal{R}_- \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) = \left(- \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}} \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})} K_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}} \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}})} K_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}}) \right) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}).$$

Combining (3.8) and (3.9), we have $(\mathcal{R}_+ + \mathcal{R}_-) \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) = 0$, which implies that

$$(3.10) \quad \mathcal{L} \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) = 0.$$

The appropriate equilibrium solution of equation (3.10), coming from the long-time behavior in the absence of reactions, is a uniform distribution in space and Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution in velocity

$$(3.11) \quad \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) = \frac{\mathbf{n}! \pi(\mathbf{n})}{|\Omega|^{|\mathbf{n}|}} \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{l=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{G}_d(v_l^{(j)}; (D_j \beta_j) \mathbf{I}_d),$$

where, $\pi(\mathbf{n})$ denotes the equilibrium probability to have the population state \mathbf{n} , i.e.

$$\pi(\mathbf{n}) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{N}(t) = \mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}!} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{n}|}} \bar{p}^{\mathbf{n}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\mathbf{n}}.$$

Let K_d denote the equilibrium dissociation constant of the reaction. As the system is spatially well-mixed at equilibrium, $\pi(\mathbf{n})$ satisfies the corresponding non-spatial, well-mixed, equilibrium chemical master equation model, from which we have that $K_d = |\Omega|^{(|b|-|a|)} \frac{\mathbf{n}^+! \pi(\mathbf{n}^+)}{\mathbf{n}! \pi(\mathbf{n})}$ (see (3) of [28]). Substituting the equilibrium solution (3.11) into the detailed balance relation (3.6) then gives

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & K_d m_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+}) K_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+}) \prod_{j=1}^J \mathcal{G}_{a_j d}(\mathbf{v}_{a_j}^{\mathbf{n}+}; (D_j \beta_j) \mathbf{I}_{a_j d}) \\ &= m_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{\mathbf{n}+} | \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) K_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{\mathbf{n}}) \prod_{j=1}^J \mathcal{G}_{b_j d}(\mathbf{v}_{b_j}^{\mathbf{n}}; (D_j \beta_j) \mathbf{I}_{b_j d}), \end{aligned}$$

3.4. Assumptions on Reaction Functions and Placement Densities. Motivated by the examples in [section 2](#), we make the following assumptions regarding the rate functions and placement densities.

ASSUMPTION 3.3. *The reaction rate functions only depend on positions and are independent of the friction constant β : $K_+^\beta(\xi_a^n) = K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n)$ and $K_-^\beta(\xi_b^n) = K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n)$.*

ASSUMPTION 3.4. *Assume each placement density can be decomposed into the product of two placement densities, one depending on positions and the other on velocities only, that is*

$$\begin{aligned} m_+^\beta(\xi_b^n | \xi_a^{n+}) &= m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) m_+^\beta(\mathbf{v}_b^n | \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}), \\ m_-^\beta(\xi_a^{n+} | \xi_b^n) &= m_-(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{x}_b^n) m_-^\beta(\mathbf{v}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{v}_b^n). \end{aligned}$$

As we mentioned in [Remark 2.2](#), here we use the same notation $m_\pm^\beta(\cdot | \cdot)$ to represent the probability density of the first argument given the second one, regardless of whether these arguments pertain to particle position, velocity, or state. Additionally, we assume that the placement densities of positions are independent of β .

ASSUMPTION 3.5. *We assume all placement densities are probability densities, which are non-negative and can be integrated to one, i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega^{|\mathbf{b}|}} m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) d\mathbf{x}_b^n &= \int_{\Omega^{|\mathbf{a}|}} m_-(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{x}_b^n) d\mathbf{x}_a^{n+} = 1 \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{b}|d}} m_+^\beta(\mathbf{v}_b^n | \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}) d\mathbf{v}_b^n &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{a}|d}} m_-^\beta(\mathbf{v}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{v}_b^n) d\mathbf{v}_a^{n+} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

ASSUMPTION 3.6. *Consider the non-dimensional coordinates $v_i^{(j)} = \sqrt{\beta\gamma_j}\eta_i^{(j)}$. Based on the observations in [section 2](#), we assume that the velocity placement densities have the following scalings in β when non-dimensionalized*

$$\begin{aligned} m_+^\beta(\mathbf{v}_b^n | \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}) &= \left(\prod_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{(\beta\gamma_j)^{b_j d/2}} \right) \tilde{m}_+(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}), \\ m_-^\beta(\mathbf{v}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{v}_b^n) &= \left(\prod_{j=1}^J \frac{1}{(\beta\gamma_j)^{a_j d/2}} \right) \tilde{m}_-(\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+} | \boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n). \end{aligned}$$

Note, [Assumption 3.5](#) then implies that $\tilde{m}_+(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+})$ and $\tilde{m}_-(\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+} | \boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n)$ are normalized densities in $\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}$ respectively.

Let us now revisit the detailed balance relation (3.6). Considering the assumptions above, we integrate both sides of equation (3.12) against \mathbf{v}_b^n and \mathbf{v}_a^{n+} and get

$$(3.13) \quad K_d m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) = m_-(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+} | \mathbf{x}_b^n) K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n),$$

which is the detailed balance relation of the overdamped model [29]. Using (3.13) to simplify (3.12), and converting to non-dimensional velocity coordinates, we get

$$(3.14) \quad (2\pi)^{\sum_{j=1}^J (b_j - a_j) d/2} \exp\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}|^2}{2}\right) \tilde{m}_+(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}) = \tilde{m}_-(\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+} | \boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n).$$

Integrating with respect to $\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}$, we find the identity that

$$(3.15) \quad (2\pi)^{\sum_{j=1}^J (b_j - a_j) d/2} \int_{\Omega^{|\mathbf{a}|}} \exp\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}|^2}{2}\right) \tilde{m}_+(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}) d\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n = 1.$$

Similarly, using the detailed balance relation (3.7), the same procedure gives

$$(3.16) \quad (2\pi)^{\sum_{j=1}^J (a_j - b_j)d/2} \int_{\Omega^{|b|}} \exp\left(\frac{|\eta_a^n|^2 - |\eta_b^n|^2}{2}\right) \tilde{m}_-(\eta_a^n | \eta_b^n) d\eta_a^n = 1.$$

It can be verified that (3.15)-(3.16) hold for each example in section 2. As we will see in the next section, these identities are key components in ensuring reaction terms have the right order in β so that we recover the over-damped reaction model as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$.

4. Overdamped Limit of Reactive Langevin Dynamics. In this section, we show via asymptotic expansion that the overdamped limit, $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, of the solution to the RLD model (5.1) is the solution to the VR PBSRD model.

4.1. (5.1) in Non-Dimensionalized Variables. Let

$$\bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n) = \prod_{j=1}^J \prod_{l=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{G}_d(v_l^{(j)}; (D_j \beta_j) \mathbf{I}_d)$$

denote the Maxwell-Boltzmann velocity distributions associated with the velocity equilibria components in the non-reactive case. We factor

$$(4.1) \quad p^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) := \bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n) \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t).$$

To substitute the factorization (4.1) into the forward Kolmogorov equation (3.1), let's first consider the transport operator \mathcal{L} . For each summand of \mathcal{L} , we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})} p^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) = \bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n) \left[\left(\mathcal{L}_{v_l^{(j)}}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})}^{(2)} \right) \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) \right],$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{v_l^{(j)}}^{(1)} = \beta_j (\beta_j D_j \Delta_{v_l^{(j)}} - v_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{v_l^{(j)}})$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})}^{(2)} = -v_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}}$. Hence, the transport operator becomes

$$\mathcal{L} p^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) = \bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n) \left(\mathcal{L}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}^{(2)} \right) \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t)$$

where, we denote $\mathcal{L}^{(1)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{L}_{v_l^{(j)}}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{L}^{(2)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})}^{(2)}$. With these definitions, the Kolmogorov forward equation (3.1) transforms to

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho^n}{\partial t}(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) &= (\mathcal{L}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}^{(2)} + \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger + \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger) \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) \\ &- \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n) \right) \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t). \end{aligned}$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) &:= \frac{1}{\bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|a|}} m_+^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{n+}) K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) \\ &\quad \bar{u}^{n+}((\mathbf{v}^n \setminus \mathbf{v}_b^n) \cup \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}) \rho^{n+}((\boldsymbol{\xi}^n \setminus \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n) \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{n+}, t) d\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{n+}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) &:= \frac{1}{\bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|b|}} m_-^\beta(\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n | \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{n-}) K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^{n-}) \\ &\quad \bar{u}^{n-}((\mathbf{v}^n \setminus \mathbf{v}_a^n) \cup \mathbf{v}_b^{n-}) \rho^{n-}((\boldsymbol{\xi}^n \setminus \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^n) \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{n-}, t) d\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^{n-}. \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\beta_j = \beta \hat{\beta}_j$ and define $\gamma_j = D_j \hat{\beta}_j$. Analogously to [4], we introduce non-dimensional velocities, $v_l^{(j)} = \sqrt{\beta_j D_j} \eta_l^{(j)} = \sqrt{\beta \gamma_j} \eta_l^{(j)}$. In the new coordinates, we denote the rescaled transport operators by

$$(4.3) \quad \mathcal{L}_{v_l^{(j)}}^{(1)} \rightarrow \beta \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\eta_l^{(j)}}^{(1)}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\eta_l^{(j)}}^{(1)} := \hat{\beta}_j (\Delta_{\eta_l^{(j)}} - \eta_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{\eta_l^{(j)}})$$

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{L}_{(x_l^{(j)}, v_l^{(j)})}^{(2)} \rightarrow \sqrt{\beta} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_l^{(j)}, \eta_l^{(j)})}^{(2)}, \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_l^{(j)}, \eta_l^{(j)})}^{(2)} := -(\sqrt{\gamma_j} \eta_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}}),$$

and define $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\eta_l^{(j)}}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_l^{(j)}, \eta_l^{(j)})}^{(2)}$.

Let $\zeta^n := (\mathbf{x}^n, \boldsymbol{\eta}^n)$ and $f^n(\zeta^n, t) := \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t)$. Using Assumption 3.6 we have

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) &= \frac{1}{\bar{u}^n(\mathbf{v}^n)} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{a}|}} m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) \\ &\quad \times \bar{u}^{n+}((\mathbf{v}^n \setminus \mathbf{v}_b^n) \cup \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}) \rho^{n+}((\boldsymbol{\xi}^n \setminus \boldsymbol{\xi}_b^n) \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{n+}, t) m_+^\beta(\mathbf{v}_b^n | \mathbf{v}_a^{n+}) d\boldsymbol{\xi}_a^{n+} \\ &= (2\pi)^{\sum_{j=1}^J (b_j - a_j)d/2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_b^n \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{a}|}} m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}|^2}{2}\right) f^{n+}((\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n \setminus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_b^n) \cup \boldsymbol{\zeta}_a^{n+}, t) \tilde{m}_+(\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_a^{n+}) d\boldsymbol{\zeta}_a^{n+} \\ &=: \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger [f^{n+}](\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger \rho^n(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n, t) &= (2\pi)^{\sum_{j=1}^J (a_j - b_j)d/2} \sum_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_a^n \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\mathbf{b}|}} m_-(\mathbf{x}_a^n | \mathbf{x}_b^{n-}) K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^{n-}) \\ &\quad \times \exp\left(\frac{|\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^n|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\eta}_b^{n-}|^2}{2}\right) f^{n-}((\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n \setminus \boldsymbol{\zeta}_a^n) \cup \boldsymbol{\zeta}_b^{n-}, t) \tilde{m}_-(\boldsymbol{\eta}_a^n | \boldsymbol{\eta}_b^{n-}) d\boldsymbol{\zeta}_b^{n-} \\ &=: \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger [f^{n-}](\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t). \end{aligned}$$

Note the key property that both reaction operators are now $O(1)$ in β .

Using the transformed operators, the forward equation (4.2) becomes

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f^n}{\partial t}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) &= (\beta \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} + \sqrt{\beta} \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)}) f^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) + \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger [f^{n+}](\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) + \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger [f^{n-}](\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_a^n \in \Xi_+(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n) + \sum_{\boldsymbol{\zeta}_b^n \in \Xi_-(\boldsymbol{\xi}^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n) \right) f^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t), \end{aligned}$$

4.2. Overdamped, $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, limit. We now develop an asymptotic expansion of f^n as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ of the form

$$(4.8) \quad f^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) \sim f_0^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} f_1^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) + \frac{1}{\beta} f_2^n(\boldsymbol{\zeta}^n, t) + \dots,$$

Substituting the expansion into the forward equation (4.7) and equating terms of the same order in β , we find

$$(4.9) \quad O(\beta) : \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} f_0^n = 0,$$

$$(4.10) \quad O(\sqrt{\beta}) : \quad -\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} f_1^n = \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_0^n,$$

$$(4.11) \quad O(1) : \quad -\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} f_2^n = \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_1^n - \frac{\partial f_0^n}{\partial t} + \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger[f_0^{n+}](\zeta^n, t) + \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger[f_0^{n-}](\zeta^n, t) \\ - \left(\sum_{\zeta_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n) + \sum_{\zeta_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n) \right) f_0^n.$$

At $O(\beta)$, since the operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)}$ only depends on $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, and represents the generator of a standard Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process, analogous to the expansions in [21] we have that $f_0^n(\cdot)$ is a function depending only on position \mathbf{x} , i.e.

$$f_0^n(\zeta^n, t) = g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t),$$

for some $g^n(\cdot)$. Likewise, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)}$ has an associated invariant density ρ^∞ satisfying

$$(4.12) \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)*} \rho^\infty = 0.$$

Here, $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)*}$ is the adjoint operator of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)}$ with the following form

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)*} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\eta_l^{(j)}}^{(1)*}, \quad \text{where} \quad \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\eta_l^{(j)}}^{(1)*} = \hat{\beta}_j \nabla_{\eta_l^{(j)}} \cdot [\boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)} + \nabla_{\eta_l^{(j)}}].$$

The velocity normalized invariant density solving (4.12) is then the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution $\rho^\infty(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n) = \mathcal{G}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n; \mathbf{I}_d) \propto \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} |\boldsymbol{\eta}^n|^2\right)$.

Continuing with the expansion in β , the $O(\sqrt{\beta})$ equation (4.10) becomes

$$(4.13) \quad -\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(1)} f_1^n = \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} g^n.$$

By the solvability condition for Poisson equations, e.g. [20, 21], (4.13) has a solution if

$$(4.14) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{n}|d}} \hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \cdot \rho^\infty(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n) d\boldsymbol{\eta}^n = 0.$$

We find the solvability condition (4.14) holds as the velocity components of the integrand, $\eta_l^{(j)} \rho^\infty(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n)$, are odd functions of $\eta_l^{(j)}$. Furthermore, we can find an explicit solution of (4.13) as

$$f_1^n(\zeta^n, t) = - \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_j}}{\hat{\beta}_j} \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \right) + \chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t)$$

for some function $\chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t)$.

For the $O(1)$ equation, (4.11), to be well posed, we again need the solvability condition that the right side of (4.11) is orthogonal to the invariant measure, i.e.

$$(4.15) \quad 0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{n}|d}} \left[\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_1^n - \frac{\partial g^n}{\partial t} + \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger[g^{n+}](\mathbf{x}^n, t) + \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger[g^{n-}](\mathbf{x}^n, t) \right. \\ \left. - \left(\sum_{\zeta_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n) + \sum_{\zeta_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n) \right) g^n \right] \rho^\infty(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n) d\boldsymbol{\eta}^n,$$

where, by the integration properties (3.15) and (3.16),
(4.16)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_+^\dagger[g^{n^+}](\mathbf{x}^n, t) &= \sum_{\zeta_{\mathbf{b}}^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} \int_{\Omega^{|\mathbf{a}|}} m_+(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n | \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n) K_+(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n) g^{n^+}((\mathbf{x}^n \setminus \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n) \cup \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n, t) d\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n, \\ \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger[g^{n^-}](\mathbf{x}^n, t) &= \sum_{\zeta_{\mathbf{a}}^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} \int_{\Omega^{|\mathbf{b}|}} m_-(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n | \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n) K_-(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n) g^{n^-}((\mathbf{x}^n \setminus \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n) \cup \mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n, t) d\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n.\end{aligned}$$

To simplify the solvability condition (4.15), we first simplify $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_1^n$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_k^{(i)}, \eta_k^{(i)})}^{(2)} f_1^n &= - \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_j}}{\hat{\beta}_j} \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_k^{(i)}, \eta_k^{(i)})}^{(2)} \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \right) + \hat{\mathcal{L}}_{(x_k^{(i)}, \eta_k^{(i)})}^{(2)} \chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_j}}{\hat{\beta}_j} \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} (\sqrt{\gamma_i} \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \cdot \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)} \cdot \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \right) - (\sqrt{\gamma_i} \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \cdot \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_j \gamma_i}}{\hat{\beta}_j} \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)T} :: \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}}^T g^n - (\sqrt{\gamma_i} \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \cdot \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t)),\end{aligned}$$

where, for two square matrices A and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the notation $A :: B$ denotes the inner product on square matrices, i.e. $A :: B := \text{tr}(AB^T) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} b_{ij}$. Hence,

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_1^n = \sum_{i=1}^J \sum_{k=1}^{n_i} \sqrt{\gamma_i} \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{l=1}^{n_j} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_j}}{\hat{\beta}_j} \left(\boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \boldsymbol{\eta}_l^{(j)T} :: \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \nabla_{x_l^{(j)}}^T g^n \right) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_k^{(i)} \nabla_{x_k^{(i)}} \chi^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \right].$$

We then have that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{n}|d}} \left(\hat{\mathcal{L}}^{(2)} f_1^n(\zeta^n, t) \right) \rho^\infty(\boldsymbol{\eta}^n) d\boldsymbol{\eta}^n = \sum_{j=1}^J D_j \Delta_{\mathbf{x}^{n_j}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t),$$

by exploiting that the dropped terms of the integrand are odd functions. The $O(1)$ solvability condition, (4.15), then becomes

$$\begin{aligned}0 &= \sum_{j=1}^J D_j \Delta_{\mathbf{x}^{n_j}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) - \frac{\partial g^n}{\partial t} - \left(\sum_{\zeta_{\mathbf{a}}^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{a}}^n) + \sum_{\zeta_{\mathbf{b}}^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{b}}^n) \right) g^n \\ &\quad + \mathcal{R}_+^\dagger[g^{n^+}](\mathbf{x}^n, t) + \mathcal{R}_-^\dagger[g^{n^-}](\mathbf{x}^n, t),\end{aligned}$$

representing the dynamics for the over-damped limit.

In summary, we find that the leading-order spatial densities

$$(4.17) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\mathbf{n}|d}} p^{(n)}(\xi^n, t) d\mathbf{v}^n \sim g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t), \quad (\beta \rightarrow \infty)$$

satisfy the standard over-damped volume reactivity PBSRD model (see [13, 14])

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g^n}{\partial t} &= \sum_{j=1}^J D_j \Delta_{\mathbf{x}^{n_j}} g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \\ &\quad - \left(\sum_{\zeta_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^n) + \sum_{\zeta_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^n) \right) g^n(\mathbf{x}^n, t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\zeta_b^n \in \Xi_-(\xi^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\alpha|}} m_+(\mathbf{x}_b^n | \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) K_+(\mathbf{x}_a^{n+}) g^{n+}((\mathbf{x}^n \setminus \mathbf{x}_b^n) \cup \mathbf{x}_a^{n+}, t) d\mathbf{x}_a^{n+} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\zeta_a^n \in \Xi_+(\xi^n)} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^{|\beta|}} m_-(\mathbf{x}_a^n | \mathbf{x}_b^{n-}) K_-(\mathbf{x}_b^{n-}) g^{n-}((\mathbf{x}^n \setminus \mathbf{x}_a^n) \cup \mathbf{x}_b^{n-}, t) d\mathbf{x}_b^{n-}. \end{aligned}$$

5. Examples. We now illustrate how the forward and backward reaction kernels for the examples of section 2 were obtained by enforcing consistency with detailed balance, present the overdamped limits for these examples, and demonstrate the results are consistent with the general case studied in the previous section.

Example 5.1 ($A + B \rightleftharpoons C$). Recall Example 2.1, in which particles move via the Langevin Dynamics (2.1) and can undergo the reversible reaction $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$. In this context, $\mathbf{P}(t) = \{p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t), p_3(\xi_3, t)\}$, where $p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t)$ denotes the probability density the particles are unbound at time t , with the A particle having state ξ_1 and the B particle state ξ_2 . $p_3(\xi_3, t)$ represents the probability the particles are in the bound state at t , with the C particle having state ξ_3 . $\mathbf{P}(t)$ satisfies

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial p_{12}}{\partial t} &= (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2)p_{12} - K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2)p_{12} + \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} K_-^\beta(\xi_3)m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3)p_3(\xi_3, t) d\xi_3, \\ \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial t} &= \mathcal{L}_3 p_3 - K_-^\beta(\xi_3)p_3 + \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2)m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2)p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) d\xi_1 d\xi_2, \end{aligned}$$

where, \mathcal{L}_i for $i = 1, 2$ are hypoelliptic transport operators defined analogously to (3.2). The Kolmogorov forward equation (5.1) is simply a special case of (3.1).

Similar to the general case, we expect that the principle of detailed balance of pointwise reaction fluxes,

$$(5.2) \quad K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2)m_+^\beta(\xi_3|\xi_1, \xi_2)\bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = K_-^\beta(\xi_3)m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3)\bar{p}_3(\xi_3),$$

should hold for the equilibrium solutions $\bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ and $\bar{p}_3(\xi_3)$. Substituting into the steady-state equation for (5.1), this implies

$$\bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \frac{\pi_{12}}{|\Omega|^2} \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_d(v_i; (D_i \beta_i) \mathbf{I}_d), \quad \bar{p}_3(\xi_3) = \frac{\pi_3}{|\Omega|} \mathcal{G}_d(v_3; (D_3 \beta_3) \mathbf{I}_d),$$

where, π_{12} and π_3 denote the equilibrium probabilities to be in the unbound vs. bound states. We assume these probabilities should be the same as in a standard well-mixed equilibrium model for the reaction, so that $\frac{\pi_{12}}{\pi_3} = K_d |\Omega|$, where K_d denotes the dissociation constant of the reaction [28, 29].

By substituting the corresponding rate functions K_\pm and forward placement densities m_\pm^β of Tables 1–3 into the detailed balance relation (5.2), we find the backward

placement density must be given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2 | \xi_3) &= m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3) m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3) \\
 &= \frac{1}{|B_\varepsilon|} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \varepsilon]}(|x_1 - x_2|) \delta(x_3 - (\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2)) \\
 &\quad \times \delta\left(v_3 - \frac{(m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)}{m_3}\right) \mathcal{G}_d^{-1}(v_3; (D_3 \beta_3) \mathbf{I}_d) \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_d(v_i; (D_i \beta_i) \mathbf{I}_d).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.3}$$

Here we have assumed that $\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+ |B_\varepsilon|$ (consistent with the detailed balance conditions for the overdamped case, see [29]). Note that $m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3)$ is also the normalized spatial placement density of the corresponding over-damped model [29].

Assuming conservation of mass, i.e. $m_1 + m_2 = m_3$, and using the identities in (2.10), we see that $m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3)$ is normalized. However, as written it is not clear what physical placement model it represents. Again applying the identities in (2.10), and using that the δ -function determines the value of v_3 , we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3) &= \left(\frac{D_3 \beta_3}{2\pi D_1 \beta_1 D_2 \beta_2}\right)^{d/2} \delta\left(v_3 - \frac{(m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)}{m_3}\right) e^{|v_3|^2 / 2D_3 \beta_3} \prod_{i=1}^2 e^{-|v_i|^2 / 2D_i \beta_i} \\
 &= \left(\frac{1}{2\pi(D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2)}\right)^{d/2} \delta\left(v_3 - \frac{(m_1 v_1 + m_2 v_2)}{m_3}\right) e^{-|v_1 - v_2|^2 / (2(D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2))}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.4}$$

(5.4) can then be interpreted as enforcing that total momentum is conserved in the unbinding reaction, and that the separation velocity of the products satisfies a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution (i.e. that $v_1 - v_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d)$). This is consistent with the form we gave in Example 2.1.

Finally, we now sketch the direct overdamped limit of (5.1), and show it is consistent with the general result of the last section. Consider the factorization

$$p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) := \rho_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) \bar{u}_{12}, \quad p_3(\xi_3, t) := \rho_3(\xi_3, t) \bar{u}_3,$$

where,

$$\bar{u}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_d(v_i; (D_i \beta_i) \mathbf{I}_d), \quad \bar{u}_3(\xi_3) = \mathcal{G}_d(v_3; (D_3 \beta_3) \mathbf{I}_d).$$

We first substitute the above factorization into the Kolmogorov equation (5.1), which gives the forward equations that ρ_{12} and ρ_3 satisfy similarly to (4.2). Then, we rewrite the transport operator \mathcal{L} and the velocity placement kernels $m_+^\beta(v_3 | v_1, v_2)$ and $m_-^\beta(v_1, v_2 | v_3)$ under the new coordinates $v_i = \sqrt{\beta_i D_i} \eta_i = \sqrt{\beta} \gamma_i \eta_i$. By defining $\zeta_i = (x_i, \eta_i)$, $f_{12}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) := \rho_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t)$, and $f_3(\zeta_3, t) := \rho_3(\xi_3, t)$, we get the forward equation for f_{12} and f_3 as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial f_{12}}{\partial t} &= \sum_{i=1}^2 \left(\beta \hat{L}_i^{(1)} + \sqrt{\beta} \hat{L}_i^{(2)} \right) f_{12} - K_+(x_1, x_2) f_{12} + \mathcal{R}_-[f_3](\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) \\
 \frac{\partial f_3}{\partial t} &= \left(\beta \hat{L}_3^{(1)} + \sqrt{\beta} \hat{L}_3^{(2)} \right) f_3 - K_-(x_3) f_3 + \mathcal{R}_+[f_{12}](\zeta_3, t).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.5}$$

where, $\hat{L}_i^{(1)}$ and $\hat{L}_i^{(2)}$ are the non-dimensionalized transport operators

$$\hat{L}_i^{(1)} = \hat{\beta}_i (\Delta_{\eta_i} - \eta_i \cdot \nabla_{\eta_i}), \quad \hat{L}_i^{(2)} = -(\sqrt{\gamma_i}) \eta_i \cdot \nabla_{x_i},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}_+[f_{12}](\zeta_3, t) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2}} \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} K_+(x_1, x_2) m_+(x_3|x_1, x_2) f_{12}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) \\ &\quad \times \delta\left(\eta_3 - \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_1}}\eta_1 + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_2}}\eta_2\right)\right) e^{-|\sqrt{\gamma_1}\eta_1 - \sqrt{\gamma_2}\eta_2|^2/2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} d\zeta_1 d\zeta_2, \\ \mathcal{R}_-[f_3](\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) &= \int_{\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d} K_-(x_3) m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3) f_3(\zeta_3, t) \delta\left(\eta_3 - \left(\sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_1}}\eta_1 + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_3}{\gamma_2}}\eta_2\right)\right) d\zeta_3.\end{aligned}$$

We now develop the asymptotic expansion of f_{12} and f_3 as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned}f_{12}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) &\sim f_{12}^{(0)}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} f_{12}^{(1)}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) + \frac{1}{\beta} f_{12}^{(2)}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, t) + \dots, \\ f_3(\zeta_3, t) &\sim f_3^{(0)}(\zeta_3, t) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta}} f_3^{(1)}(\zeta_3, t) + \frac{1}{\beta} f_3^{(2)}(\zeta_3, t) + \dots\end{aligned}$$

Similar to what we did in [subsection 4.2](#), we substitute the expansions of f_{12} and f_3 into the forward equations (5.5) respectively, and balance the terms based on the different orders of the friction constant β as we did in (4.9)-(4.11). From this point on the analysis is similar to [subsection 4.2](#), yielding the standard two-particle Volume-Reactivity PBSRD model for $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$ (see [14, 29]). That is, as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) dv_1 dv_2 \sim g_{12}(x_1, x_2, t) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} p_3(\xi_3, t) dv_3 \sim g_3(x_3, t),$$

where g_{12} and g_3 satisfy the two-particle VR PBSRD model

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial g_{12}}{\partial t} &= (D_1 \Delta_{x_1} + D_2 \Delta_{x_2}) g_{12} - K_+(x_1, x_2) g_{12} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} K_-(x_3) m_-(x_1, x_2|x_3) g_3(x_3, t) dx_3, \\ \frac{\partial g_3}{\partial t} &= D_3 \Delta_{x_3} g_3 - K_-(x_3) g_3 + \int_{\Omega^2} K_+(x_1, x_2) m_+(x_3|x_1, x_2) g_{12}(x_1, x_2, t) dx_1 dx_2.\end{aligned}$$

Example 5.2 ($A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$). We next consider the two-particle system undergoing the Langevin Dynamics (2.1) with reversible reaction $A + B \rightleftharpoons C + D$. In this context, $\mathbf{P}(t) = \{p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t), p_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4, t)\}$, and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}(5.6) \quad \frac{\partial p_{12}}{\partial t} &= (\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2) p_{12} - K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2) p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) \\ &\quad + \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3, \xi_4) K_-^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4) p_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4, t) d\xi_3 d\xi_4, \\ \frac{\partial p_{34}}{\partial t} &= (\mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4) p_{34} - K_-^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4) p_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4, t) \\ &\quad + \int_{(\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d)^2} m_+^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4|\xi_1, \xi_2) K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2) p_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2, t) d\xi_1 d\xi_2,\end{aligned}$$

where each \mathcal{L}_i is a hypoelliptic transport operator defined analogously to (3.3) from the general case. The Kolmogorov forward equation (5.6) is a special case of (3.1).

Similar to the general case, we assume the principle of detailed balance of point-wise reaction fluxes,

$$(5.7) \quad m_+^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4|\xi_1, \xi_2) K_+^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2) \bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2) = m_-^\beta(\xi_1, \xi_2|\xi_3, \xi_4) K_-^\beta(\xi_3, \xi_4) \bar{p}_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4),$$

holds for the equilibrium solutions $\bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ and $\bar{p}_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4)$. Substituting (5.7) into (5.6) gives that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{p}_{12}(\xi_1, \xi_2) &= \frac{\pi_{12}}{|\Omega|^2} \bar{p}_{12}(v_1, v_2), & \text{where} & \quad \bar{p}_{12}(v_1, v_2) := \prod_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{G}_d(v_i; (D_i \beta_i) \mathbf{I}_d), \\ \bar{p}_{34}(\xi_3, \xi_4) &= \frac{\pi_{34}}{|\Omega|^2} \bar{p}_{34}(v_3, v_4), & \text{where} & \quad \bar{p}_{34}(v_3, v_4) := \prod_{i=3}^4 \mathcal{G}_d(v_i; (D_i \beta_i) \mathbf{I}_d).\end{aligned}$$

Here, π_{12} and π_{34} denote the equilibrium probabilities to be in the unbound vs. bound states. As in the last example, we assume they should be consistent with the corresponding well-mixed chemical master equation equilibrium model for the reaction, so that $\frac{\pi_{12}}{\pi_{34}} = K_d$, where K_d denotes the dissociation constant of the reaction.

Let $p_{ij} := m_i v_i + m_j v_j$, the total mass be $\bar{m} := m_1 + m_2 = m_3 + m_4$, and assume that $\lambda_- := K_d \lambda_+$ (again consistent with the detailed balance conditions for the overdamped case). By substituting the corresponding rate functions K_{\pm} and forward placement densities m_+^{β} of Tables 1–3 into the detailed balance relation (5.7), we find the backward placement density must be given by $m_-^{\beta}(\xi_1, \xi_2 | \xi_3, \xi_4) = m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_4) m_-^{\beta}(v_1, v_2 | v_3, v_4)$, where $m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_4)$ is given by Table 2 and

$$(5.8) \quad m_-^{\beta}(v_1, v_2 | v_3, v_4) = \left[\frac{\bar{p}(v_1, v_2)}{\bar{p}(v_3, v_4)} \bar{m}^d \delta(p_{34} - p_{12}) \mathcal{G}_d(v_3 - v_4; (D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4) \mathbf{I}_d) \right].$$

We now confirm this reduces to the formula in Table 3, and is properly normalized. Showing that the forward velocity placement density is also normalized follows by a similar calculation. In the context of (5.8), using the Einstein relations, (2.16), and conservation of mass, we have that

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned}\frac{\mathcal{G}_d(v_3 - v_4; (D_3 \beta_3 + D_4 \beta_4) \mathbf{I}_d)}{\bar{p}(v_3, v_4)} &= \frac{1}{\bar{m}^d \mathcal{G}_d(p_{34}; (k_B T \bar{m}) \mathbf{I}_d)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\bar{m}^d \mathcal{G}_d(p_{12}; (k_B T \bar{m}) \mathbf{I}_d)} = \frac{\mathcal{G}_d(v_1 - v_2; (D_1 \beta_1 + D_2 \beta_2) \mathbf{I}_d)}{\bar{p}(v_1, v_2)},\end{aligned}$$

where in the second line we also used that the δ -function sets $p_{12} = p_{34}$. Substituting into (5.8) gives the formula in Table 3. When a $C + D \rightarrow A + B$ reaction occurs, the formula corresponds to sampling the two product particle velocities such that the total product momentum equals the total substrate momentum, and the products' relative velocity is sampled from a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution.

To confirm the normalization note that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \bar{p}_{12}(v_1, v_2) \delta(p_{34} - p_{12}) dv_1 dv_2 &= \mathcal{G}_d(p_{34}; (D_1 \beta_1 m_1^2 + D_2 \beta_2 m_2^2) \mathbf{I}_d) \\ &= \mathcal{G}_d(p_{34}; (D_3 \beta_3 m_3^2 + D_4 \beta_4 m_4^2) \mathbf{I}_d) = \mathcal{G}_d(p_{34}; (k_B T \bar{m}) \mathbf{I}_d),\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the identities (2.15) and (2.16). Combining with the first identity in (5.9), we see that m_-^{β} is normalized in (v_1, v_2) .

From this point on, the analysis is similar to Example 5.1. We find that in the over-damped limit $\beta \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} p_{ij}(\xi_i, \xi_j, t) dv_i dv_j \sim g_{ij}(x_i, x_j, t), \quad (i, j) \in \{(1, 2), (3, 4)\},$$




FIG. 1. (left) Convergence of reactive Langevin Dynamics (RLD) to over-damped reactive Brownian Dynamics (RBD) as the friction constant β (in units of s^{-1}) increases for the two-particle $A + B \leftrightarrow C$ reaction. The figure also illustrates convergence as $t \rightarrow \infty$ of both models to the steady-state of the corresponding well-mixed chemical master equation model ("Theory"). (right) Maximum difference between RLD and RBD estimates for $P_b(t)$ as β is increased.

TABLE 4
Parameters for Simulations

Parameter	Value	Unit	Description
L	200	nm	domain length
$(T, \Delta t)$	(0.3, 1.0e-6)	(s,s)	(final time, time step size)
(λ_+, λ_-)	(1.0e4, 17.3)	(s^{-1}, s^{-1})	(association rate, dissociation rate)
ε	10	nm	reaction radius
α	0.5	ratio	forward/backward placement ratio
$D_i, i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$	1.0e6	nm	diffusion coefficient
$\hat{\beta}_1, \hat{\beta}_2$	1.0	-	friction constant factor for A and B

where $g_{ij}(x_i, x_j, t)$ satisfy the Doi VR PBSRD model

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{\partial g_{12}}{\partial t} &= (D_1 \Delta_{x_1} + D_2 \Delta_{x_2}) g_{12} - K_+(x_1, x_2) g_{12} \\
 &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} K_-(x_3, x_4) m_-(x_1, x_2 | x_3, x_4) g_{34}(x_3, x_4, t) dx_3 dx_4, \\
 \frac{\partial g_{34}}{\partial t} &= (D_3 \Delta_{x_3} + D_4 \Delta_{x_4}) g_{34} - K_-(x_3, x_4) g_{34} \\
 &\quad + \int_{\Omega^2} K_+(x_1, x_2) m_+(x_3, x_4 | x_1, x_2) g_{12}(x_1, x_2, t) dx_1 dx_2.
 \end{aligned}$$

6. Numerical Simulation. To illustrate the asymptotic behavior as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ of the reactive Langevin Dynamics model derived in the previous sections, we numerically studied a RLD model for the reversible reaction $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$ in the special case of a system with just one C particle at $t = 0$. We successively increased the friction constant β to demonstrate that the empirical overdamped limit of the RLD model is consistent with the corresponding VR PBSRD model.

We considered dynamics within a cubic domain, $\Omega = [0, L]^3$. In each simulation, one C particle was initially placed using a uniform spatial density over Ω , with initial

Algorithm 6.1 Numerical method for simulating RLD model of $A + B \rightleftharpoons C$.

```

1: for  $n = 1, \dots, N$  do
2:   Initialize  $X_0^{(C,n)} \sim \mathcal{U}(\Omega)$  and  $V_0^{(C,n)} \sim \mathcal{U}([-1.0e7, 1.0e7]^3)$ 
3:   state = 0 (system contains single particle C)
4:   for  $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor T/\Delta t \rfloor$  do
5:     if state = 0 then
6:       generate  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_3)$ 
7:       Solve  $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} = V_{i\Delta t}^{(C,n)} - \beta V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} \Delta t + \beta \sqrt{2D\Delta t} Z$  for  $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)}$ 
8:       Set  $X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} = X_{i\Delta t}^{(C,n)} + V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} \Delta t$ 
9:       if  $U[0, 1] \leq \lambda_- \Delta t$  then
10:        generate  $\eta_i \sim U(B(0, \varepsilon))$ 
11:        place  $X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)}$  and  $X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$  by solving the following linear system
12:           $\alpha X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)} + (1 - \alpha) X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)} = X_{i\Delta t}^{(C,n)}$ 
13:           $X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)} - X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)} = \eta_i$ 
14:        generate  $\zeta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, (D_1 \hat{\beta}_1 \beta + D_2 \hat{\beta}_2 \beta) \mathbf{I}_3)$ 
15:        place  $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)}$  and  $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$  by solving the following linear system
16:           $\frac{m_1}{m_3} V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)} + \frac{m_2}{m_3} V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)} = V_{i\Delta t}^{(C,n)}$ 
17:           $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)} - V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)} = \zeta_i$ 
18:        state = 1
19:      end if
20:    else
21:      generate  $Z_1, Z_2 \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_3)$ 
22:      update  $V_{i\Delta t}^{(A,n)}$  and  $V_{i\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$  by similar Euler steps in Line 7 using  $Z_1, Z_2$ 
23:      update  $X_{i\Delta t}^{(A,n)}$  and  $X_{i\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$  by similar Euler steps in Line 8
24:      if  $\text{periodic\_distance}(X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(A,n)} - X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(B,n)}) \leq \varepsilon$  and  $U[0, 1] \leq \lambda_+ \Delta t$  then
25:         $X_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} = \alpha X_{i\Delta t}^{(A,n)} + (1 - \alpha) X_{i\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$ 
26:         $V_{(i+1)\Delta t}^{(C,n)} = \frac{m_1}{m_3} X_{i\Delta t}^{(A,n)} + \frac{m_2}{m_3} X_{i\Delta t}^{(B,n)}$ 
27:        state = 0
28:      end if
29:    end if
30:    save the state at  $i$ -th step in the  $n$ -th path
31:  end for
32: end for

```

velocity sampled from a uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}([-1.0e7, 1.0e7]^3)$ nm/s. This was chosen to avoid particles starting at equilibrium (3.11). Spatial boundaries were treated as periodic. Our Langevin-dynamics based algorithm is presented in [Algorithm 6.1](#), and uses a fixed-timestep implicit Euler method to solve the SDEs for particle transport. The parameters we used in simulations are given in [Table 4](#). Our reactive Brownian Dynamics method for the overdamped case was the same we used in [\[29\]](#).

To investigate the asymptotic behavior as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$, we varied $\beta \in \{10^i \text{ (s}^{-1})\}_{i=2}^6$. For each β , we performed $N = 50,000$ simulations and calculated the fraction of simulations in which the system contained one C particle at time t . This provided an empirical estimate for $P_b(t)$, the probability the system was in the bound state at t .

In Figure 1 (left), we show $P_b(t)$ as β is varied, along with the over-damped limit from direct simulation of the corresponding VR PBSRD model. As β increases, we see that solutions to the RLD model converge to the overdamped solution, which is consistent with our asymptotic analysis of the preceding sections. In addition, we show that all solutions converge as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to the equilibrium value for the analogous well-mixed chemical master equation model, $\bar{P}_b = 1/(1 + K_d |\Omega|)$ ("Theory" curve), see [29]. In this specific instance, $\bar{P}_b = 0.2323$. Figure 1 (right) displays the maximum difference across all timesteps of $P_b(t)$ from each RLD model to the overdamped limit for varying β -values, which further illustrates convergence as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$.

7. Conclusions. In this work, assuming the Einstein relation, assuming conservation of momentum and mass in reactions, and enforcing consistency with pointwise detailed balance of reactive fluxes at equilibrium, we formulated reactive interaction kernels for particle-based reactive Langevin dynamics (RLD) models of reversible reactions. For general reversible reactions, we then showed via asymptotic expansions that in the overdamped limit the derived kernels result in the RLD model converging to the classical volume reactivity particle-based stochastic reaction diffusion (PBSRD) model. In this way, our work provides a step towards, and illustrates constraints in, developing microscopic reactive Langevin-Dynamics models that remain fully consistent with widely-used overdamped reaction-diffusion models.

There are a number of interesting followup questions that could be explored. It would be of mathematical interest to rigorously prove the overdamped limit, which is well-established in the absence of reactions. The presence of reactions is expected to complicate the mathematical analysis in potentially interesting ways. It is also clear from our analysis that more general forms of the reaction kernels K_+ and K_- can be assumed (for example friction-dependent) as long as their leading order behavior as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ matches the behavior (i.e. β scaling) assumed in this work. In this way one could potentially relax the assumptions of conservation of mass or momentum that we made, and/or consider kernels that more closely model a specific microscopic reaction process (which may not be separable in x and v). We have also assumed a relatively simple mass/friction model, which could be made substantially more realistic for specific biological applications. In addition, we expect that a similar analysis carries over for irreversible reactions, e.g., $A + B \rightarrow C$ and $A + B \rightarrow C + D$, and for more general networks of zero, first, and second order reactions. Lastly, we note that it is an open problem to fully characterize the long time behavior and its interaction with the overdamped limit in such reactive systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. ARIEL AND A. AYALI, *Locust collective motion and its modeling*, PLOS computational Biology, 11 (2015), p. e1004522.
- [2] M. N. ARTYOMOV, M. LIS, S. DEVADAS, M. M. DAVIS, AND A. K. CHAKRABORTY, *CD4 and CD8 binding to MHC molecules primarily acts to enhance Lck delivery.*, PNAS, 107 (2010), pp. 16916–16921.
- [3] M. A. BURSCHKA AND U. M. TITULAER, *The kinetic boundary layer for the fokker-planck equation with absorbing boundary*, Journal of Statistical Physics, 25 (1981), pp. 569–582.
- [4] S. J. CHAPMAN, R. ERBAN, AND S. A. ISAACSON, *Reactive boundary conditions as limits of interaction potentials for Brownian and Langevin Dynamics*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 76 (2016), pp. 368–390.
- [5] D. DEL VECCHIO, Y. QIAN, R. M. MURRAY, AND E. D. SONTAG, *Future systems and control research in synthetic biology*, Annual Reviews in Control, 45 (2018), pp. 5–17.
- [6] M. DOI, *Second quantization representation for classical many-particle system*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., 9 (1976), pp. 1465–1477.

- [7] M. DOI, *Stochastic theory of diffusion-controlled reaction*, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., 9 (1976), pp. 1479–1495.
- [8] K. ELAMVAZHUTHI AND S. BERMAN, *Mean-field models in swarm robotics: A survey*, Bioinspiration & Biomimetics, 15 (2019), p. 015001.
- [9] R. ERBAN AND S. J. CHAPMAN, *Stochastic modelling of reaction-diffusion processes: algorithms for bimolecular reactions*, Phys. Biol., 6 (2009), p. 046001.
- [10] K. P. HADELER, T. HILLEN, AND F. LUTSCHER, *The langevin or kramers approach to biological modeling*, Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 14 (2004), pp. 1561–1583.
- [11] P. HÄNGGI, P. TALKNER, AND M. BORKOVEC, *Reaction-rate theory: fifty years after kramers*, Reviews of modern physics, 62 (1990), p. 251.
- [12] A. HUHN, D. NISSLEY, D. B. WILSON, M. A. KUTUZOV, R. DONAT, T. K. TAN, Y. ZHANG, M. I. BARTON, C. LIU, W. DEJNIRATTISAI, P. SUPASA, J. MONGKOLSAPAYA, A. TOWNSEND, W. JAMES, G. SCREATON, P. A. VAN DER MERWE, C. M. DEANE, S. A. ISAACSON, AND O. DUSHEK, *The molecular reach of antibodies crucially underpins their viral neutralisation capacity*, Nature Communications, 16 (2025), p. 338, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-54916-5>.
- [13] S. A. ISAACSON, J. MA, AND K. SPILIOPOULOS, *Mean field limits of particle-based stochastic reaction-diffusion models*, SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 54 (2022), pp. 453–511.
- [14] S. A. ISAACSON AND Y. ZHANG, *An unstructured mesh convergent reaction-diffusion master equation for reversible reactions*, Journal of Computational Physics, 374 (2018), pp. 954–983, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2018.07.036>.
- [15] G. R. KNELLER AND U. TITULAER, *Boundary layer effects on the rate of diffusion-controlled reactions*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications, 129 (1985), pp. 514–534.
- [16] J. LIPKOVÁ, K. C. ZYGALAKIS, S. J. CHAPMAN, AND R. ERBAN, *Analysis of brownian dynamics simulations of reversible bimolecular reactions*, SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics, 71 (2011), pp. 714–730.
- [17] S. MARBACH AND M. HOLMES-CERFON, *Mass changes the diffusion coefficient of particles with ligand-receptor contacts in the overdamped limit.*, Phys Rev Lett, 129 (2022), p. 048003.
- [18] S. NADKARNI, T. M. BARTOL, C. F. STEVENS, T. J. SEJNOWSKI, AND H. LEVINE, *Short-term plasticity constrains spatial organization of a hippocampal presynaptic terminal*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109 (2012), pp. 14657–14662.
- [19] J. NAYLOR, H. FELLERMANN, Y. DING, W. K. MOHAMMED, N. S. JAKUBOVICS, J. MUKHERJEE, C. A. BIGGS, P. C. WRIGHT, AND N. KRASNOGOR, *Simbiotics: a multiscale integrative platform for 3d modeling of bacterial populations*, ACS Synthetic Biology, 6 (2017), pp. 1194–1210.
- [20] E. PARDOUX AND Y. VERETENNIKOV, *On the Poisson Equation and Diffusion Approximation. I*, The Annals of Probability, 29 (2001), pp. 1061 – 1085.
- [21] G. PAVLIOTIS AND A. STUART, *Periodic homogenization for inertial particles*, Physica D: Non-linear Phenomena, 204 (2005), p. 161–187.
- [22] D. SHAW AND ET AL., *Millisecond-scale molecular dynamics simulations on Anton*, Proceedings of the Conference on High Performance Computing Networking, Storage and Analysis, (2009), p. 39.
- [23] A. SIOKIS, P. A. ROBERT, P. DEMETRIOU, M. L. DUSTIN, AND M. MEYER-HERMANN, *F-actin-driven cd28-cd80 localization in the immune synapse*, Cell reports, 24 (2018), pp. 1151–1162.
- [24] P. E. SMOUSE, S. FOCARDI, P. R. MOORCROFT, J. G. KIE, J. D. FORESTER, AND J. M. MORALES, *Stochastic modelling of animal movement*, Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 365 (2010), pp. 2201–2211.
- [25] M. STURROCK, A. HELLANDER, A. MATZAVINOS, AND M. A. CHAPLAIN, *Spatial stochastic modelling of the hes1 gene regulatory network: intrinsic noise can explain heterogeneity in embryonic stem cell differentiation*, Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 10 (2013), p. 20120988.
- [26] K. TAKAHASHI, S. TANASE-NICOLA, AND P. R. TEN WOLDE, *Spatio-temporal correlations can drastically change the response of a MAPK pathway*, PNAS, 107 (2010), pp. 2473–2478.
- [27] E. TERAMOTO AND N. SHIGESADA, *Theory of bimolecular reaction processes in liquids*, Prog. Theor. Phys., 37 (1967), pp. 29–51.
- [28] N. G. VAN KAMPEN, *The equilibrium distribution of a chemical mixture*, Physics Letters A, 59 (1976), pp. 333–334.
- [29] Y. ZHANG AND S. A. ISAACSON, *Detailed balance for particle models of reversible reactions in bounded domains*, J. Chem. Phys., 156 (2022), p. 204105.