

# Implementation of Support Vector Machines using Reaction Networks

Amey Choudhary<sup>1</sup>, Jiaxin Jin<sup>2</sup>, and Abhishek Deshpande<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup>Center for Computational Natural Sciences and Bioinformatics, International Institute of Information Technology Hyderabad

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Louisiana

March 26, 2025

## Abstract

Can machine learning algorithms be implemented using chemical reaction networks? We demonstrate that this is possible in the case of support vector machines (SVMs). SVMs are powerful tools for data classification, leveraging VC theory to handle high-dimensional data and small datasets effectively. In this work, we propose a reaction network scheme for implementing SVMs, utilizing the steady-state behavior of reaction network dynamics to model key computational aspects of SVMs. This approach introduces a novel biochemical framework for implementing machine learning algorithms in non-traditional computational environments.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Chemical Reaction Networks</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Support Vector Machines</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Hard-Margin SVM Formulation . . . . .	7
3.2	Iterative Training with Error-Driven Update . . . . .	8
3.3	Decision Rule . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Operation modules</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1	Dual rail encoding . . . . .	9
4.2	Addition module . . . . .	9

4.3	Multiplication module . . . . .	10
4.4	Comparison and Approximate majority . . . . .	10
4.5	Loading module . . . . .	12
4.6	Subtraction Module . . . . .	12
4.7	Oscillation module with doping . . . . .	12
<b>5</b>	<b>Encoding the feedforward module of SVM</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Learning and Gradient Descent</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Experimental Setup</b>	<b>19</b>
7.1	Dataset and Encoding . . . . .	20
7.2	Training Parameters . . . . .	21
7.3	Computational Framework . . . . .	21
<b>8</b>	<b>Results and Analysis</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>23</b>

## 1 Introduction

Living cells respond to external stimuli through mechanisms such as gene regulatory networks. Systems biology hopes to construct complex circuits such as oscillators/switches from simple building blocks. Recently, these designs have enabled the development of complicated biological circuits for real-world applications. Our work aims to enable computation in living environments, where modern computers are currently unable to operate.

Reaction networks offer a robust framework for biomolecular interactions and can be realized through DNA strand displacement reactions, providing a physical basis in cellular environments. This makes them a powerful “programming language” for molecular computation, owing to DNA’s sequence specificity and high-density information storage. However, programming reaction networks for more sophisticated tasks like training and testing remains a challenge.

The idea of using reaction networks for performing computation dates back to the 1940s. McCulloch and Pitt were the first to link neural networks to cellular automata [18]. In the 1960s, Jacob, Sugita, and Rössler used chemistry for implementing logical circuits [15, 24, 27]. Later, in 1994, Adleman solved a seven-node Hamiltonian problem using DNA strands [1]. Subsequently, Winfree and Qian [7, 23] have developed DNA strand displacement schemes to create more complex circuits. Recently, reaction

networks have been used to implement various machine learning algorithms. In particular, these include the work of Stojanovic et al. [19] who construct reaction networks to automate decision tree implementations and Gopalkrishnan et al. [12, 30, 31] who have designed reaction network schemes that calculate maximum likelihood estimates and simulate Boltzmann machines [20, 21, 22, 25]. More recently, reaction networks have been shown to implement neural network dynamics [3, 8, 16].

In this paper, our focus is on Support Vector Machines (SVMs). Introduced by Vapnik and Chervonenkis in the 1960s, SVMs are supervised classification algorithms. The essential idea of SVM is to construct a hyperplane that maximally separates data points from different classes, creating the largest possible margin. For data that can be separated linearly, SVM works perfectly well, but for nonlinear cases, one needs to use the *kernel functions* for mapping data onto spaces that are high-dimensional.

In this work, we design a reaction network scheme to implement a Hard-Margin SVM, leveraging biochemical processes for machine learning tasks. Our reaction network-based model can load input data points, perform inference, back-propagate loss, and update weights via gradient descent. To ensure these operations proceed in a controlled and sequential manner, we utilize oscillating molecular species to achieve time-scale separation. We validate our approach by simulating the reaction network on synthetic data in Python, demonstrating effective convergence with weight updates comparable to those of standard SVM library implementations. This work introduces a novel biochemical framework for executing complex machine learning algorithms beyond traditional computational systems, expanding the potential applications of reaction networks in computational and synthetic biology.

**Structure of the paper:** The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce reaction networks and recall their properties. Section 3 introduces support vector machines and describes their functioning as an optimization problem. In Section 4, we introduce the concept of dual-rail encoding to handle negative weights and biases. Further, we describe basic modules like addition, subtraction, multiplication, comparison and approximate majority that will be used as building blocks in the reaction network that simulates the SVM. Sections 5 and 6 describe the reaction network that simulates the feedforward part and the learning part of SVM, respectively. In Section 7, we introduce an experimental setup to train an SVM using a reaction network scheme. Our goal is to predict the weights and biases of the SVM obtained using reaction networks and compare them with the traditional machine learning implementation. In Section 8, we tabulate the values of weights and biases obtained using reaction networks and those obtained using the traditional SVM implementations. To validate these results, we also compare their trajectories as a function of time (epochs in our case) and find that they are in close agreement. Section 9 summarizes our contributions and outlines directions for future work.

## 2 Chemical Reaction Networks

**Definition 1** ([11]). A Chemical Reaction Network (reaction network) is a triple  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  consisting of a finite set of *species*  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ , a set of *complexes*  $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, \dots, C_r\}$ , and a set of *reactions*  $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_r\}$ . Each reaction describes an interaction between species given by:

$$R_j : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ij} X_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{ij} X_i \quad \text{with } j = 1, \dots, r,$$

where the left-hand side (*reactant complex*) and the right-hand side (*product complex*) are linear combinations of species. For each reaction  $R_j$ , the nonnegative integer coefficients  $\alpha_{ij}$  and  $\beta_{ij}$  represent the *stoichiometric coefficients* of species  $X_i$  in the reactant and product complexes, respectively.

**Example 2.** Consider the reaction network  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  shown in Figure 1. It consists of three species:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3\},$$

three complexes:

$$\mathcal{C} = \{X_1 + X_2, 2X_2, X_3\},$$

and four reactions:

$$\mathcal{R} = \{X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow X_3, \quad 2X_2 \rightarrow X_1 + X_2, \quad 2X_2 \rightarrow X_3, \quad X_3 \rightarrow 2X_1 + 3X_2\}.$$




Figure 1: A reaction network  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  with three species, three complexes, and four reactions.


One of the most widely used models in reaction network studies is based on *mass-action kinetics* [2, 13, 32, 14, 33, 10]. In this framework, the reaction rate is determined by the product of the reactant concentrations, each raised to its corresponding stoichiometric coefficient. The detailed definition is provided below.

**Definition 3** ([11]). Given a reaction network  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$ , each reaction  $R_j$  is assigned a positive constant  $k_j$  (*reaction rate constant*) for  $1 \leq j \leq r$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$  the *reaction rate vector*. The *associated mass-action system* generated by  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{k})$  is given by:

$$\frac{dx_i(t)}{dt} = \sum_{j=1}^r k_j \prod_{l=1}^n x_l^{\alpha_{lj}} (\beta_{ij} - \alpha_{ij}) \quad \text{with } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where  $\mathbf{x}(t) = (x_1(t), \dots, x_n(t))$  represents the concentrations of species  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  at time  $t$ .

For example, recall the reaction network from Figure 1 (see Example 2). Given the reaction rate vector  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_4)$ , the reaction rates are assigned as follows:



Under mass-action kinetics, the associated dynamical system is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} &= k_1 x_1 x_2 \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + k_2 x_2^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + k_3 x_2^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -2 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + k_4 x_3 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 x_1 x_2 + k_2 x_2^2 + k_4 x_3 \\ -k_1 x_1 x_2 + (k_2 - k_3) x_2^2 + k_4 x_3 \\ k_3 x_2^2 - k_4 x_3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Reaction networks offer a robust framework for implementing molecular-level computations since the mass-action systems generated by them have polynomial right-hand sides. When coupled with DNA strand displacement techniques, reaction networks can be physically realized, bridging the gap from abstract models to practical applications.

**Example 4** ([26]). Consider the mass-action system  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R}, \mathbf{k})$  shown in Figure 2. It consists of four species,  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$ , where  $X_1$  and  $X_3$  represent strands.

The reversible reactions  $X_1 + X_2 \rightleftharpoons X_3 + X_4$  describe a strand displacement process. In the forward direction ( $X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow X_3 + X_4$ ), strand  $X_1$  displaces strand  $X_3$  from complex  $X_2$  to form complex  $X_4$ . Conversely, in the reverse direction ( $X_3 + X_4 \rightarrow X_1 + X_2$ ), strand  $X_3$  displaces strand  $X_1$  from complex  $X_4$  to reform complex  $X_2$ . The associated mass-action system is

$$\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = k_1 x_1 x_2 \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} + k_2 x_3 x_4 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -k_1 x_1 x_2 + k_2 x_3 x_4 \\ -k_1 x_1 x_2 + k_2 x_3 x_4 \\ k_1 x_1 x_2 - k_2 x_3 x_4 \\ k_1 x_1 x_2 - k_2 x_3 x_4 \end{pmatrix}.$$




Figure 2: A single-reaction model of strand displacement.

In the following, we introduce two key concepts in reaction networks: catalytic and non-catalytic species, which will be frequently used in Section 4.

**Definition 5** ([11]). Let  $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  be a reaction network. Suppose all reactions  $R_1, \dots, R_r \in \mathcal{R}$ , where each reaction is of the form

$$R_j : \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{ij} X_i \rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{ij} X_i.$$

- (a) A species  $X_i \in \mathcal{S}$  is said to be *catalytic* if the number of species  $X_i$  in the reactant and product complexes remains the same for every reaction. Specifically,  $X_i$  is a catalytic species if and only if  $\alpha_{ij} = \beta_{ij}$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .
- (b) A species  $X_i \in \mathcal{S}$  is said to be a *non-catalytic* species if it is not catalytic, that is, there exists a reaction  $R_j$  such that  $\alpha_{ij} \neq \beta_{ij}$ .

**Remark 6.** In a reaction network, every species is either a catalytic species or a non-catalytic species. Under the mass-action system, catalytic species are those whose concentrations remain unchanged across the entire network, and therefore  $\frac{dx_i}{dt} \equiv 0$ ; whereas for non-catalytic species, there exists at least one reaction that alters their concentration.

**Example 7.** Consider the following reaction network:



In this example, the reaction network consists of three species,  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$ . Among them,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are non-catalytic, while  $X_3$  is a catalytic species.

### 3 Support Vector Machines

Support Vector Machines (SVMs) are supervised machine learning algorithms. SVMs have attracted widespread attention in machine learning, data mining and pattern recognition tasks. In particular, they have been found to be particularly useful in binary classification problems.




Figure 3: Hard Margin SVM Decision Boundary

SVM works on the principle of generating a surface that separates data into classes by maximizing the distance between itself and the data points. In particular, SVM assigns the data points labels by finding the *optimal hyperplane*. This hyperplane corresponds to one that is at the maximum distance from the closest point of any class. Given a new data point, it can be classified and given labels according to which side of the hyperplane it will be in feature space.

If the data cannot be separated by such a hyperplane, then the SVM finds the hyperplane as in the hard margin case with the caveat that a penalty is added each time a point crosses the margin. These SVMs are referred to as soft margin SVMs.

### 3.1 Hard-Margin SVM Formulation

Given a set of data points (which are feature vectors), that belong to either of the two classes, one needs to decide to which of the two classes does a new data point belong to? More formally, given a dataset  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$ , where  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$  are the feature vectors and  $y_i \in \{1, -1\}$  are the binary class labels, the goal is to find a weight vector  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  such that it maximizes the distance of its nearest point for each class and bias  $b \in \mathbb{R}$  such that:

$$y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1 \quad \text{for all } i. \quad (1)$$

The optimization problem for a hard-margin SVM can be defined as:

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}, b} \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2, \quad (2)$$

subject to the constraint that all training points satisfy:

$$y_i(\mathbf{w} \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1. \quad (3)$$

### 3.2 Iterative Training with Error-Driven Update

In practice, we can use an iterative training algorithm that updates  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $b$  whenever a data point is misclassified. This approach is similar to a gradient descent method on hinge loss. Given a learning rate  $\eta > 0$ , we update the parameters as follows:

1. **Initialize**  $\mathbf{w} = 1$  and  $b = 0$ .
2. **For each data point**  $(x_i, y_i)$ : - Compute the decision function:  $f(x_i) = \mathbf{w} \cdot x_i + b$ . The hinge loss for a single training example  $(x_i, y_i)$  is defined as:

$$\text{Loss}(w, b) = \max(0, 1 - y_i * f(x_i))$$

To update the weights based on the hinge loss, we compute the gradients:

$$\frac{\partial \text{Loss}}{\partial w} = \begin{cases} -y_i x_i & \text{if } y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) < 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\frac{\partial \text{Loss}}{\partial b} = \begin{cases} -y_i & \text{if } y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) < 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The weight update rules for gradient descent with learning rate  $\eta$  are as follows:

1. **If there is a misclassification or margin violation** ( $y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) < 1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} w &\leftarrow w - \eta(\lambda w - y_i x_i) \\ b &\leftarrow b + \eta y_i \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

2. **If there is no misclassification** ( $y_i(w \cdot x_i + b) \geq 1$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} w &\leftarrow w - \eta \lambda w \\ b &\leftarrow b \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here  $\lambda$  is the regularization parameter.

3. **Repeat** this process for multiple epochs until convergence or a set number of iterations is reached.

This update rule moves  $\mathbf{w}$  and  $b$  in the direction that reduces the error for misclassified points, adjusting the hyperplane iteratively. The learning rate  $\eta$  controls the step size for each update, impacting the convergence rate.

### 3.3 Decision Rule

After training, the classification decision for a new data point  $x$  is given by:

$$f(x) = \mathbf{w} \cdot x + b. \tag{6}$$

The predicted class is then:

$$\hat{y} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } f(x) \geq 0, \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This iterative approach, while not the standard quadratic programming formulation of SVM, provides a computationally efficient method for training hard-margin SVMs and is particularly useful in online or large-scale learning scenarios.

## 4 Operation modules

In this section, we flesh out the reaction network scheme for the individual sub-modules that will be used for implementing the feedforward and backpropagation step. Towards this, we note that in dealing with weights and biases, we may encounter negative values, and need a mechanism to handle this. The next subsection on *dual rail encoding* addresses this part.

### 4.1 Dual rail encoding

In physical setting, concentration of species is always non-negative. As data points and weights can be negative, we use the Dual Rail Encoding [28].

For any variable  $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ , we take two species  $\zeta^+$  and  $\zeta^-$  with non-negative concentrations  $\zeta^+(t) \geq 0$  and  $\zeta^-(t) \geq 0$ . For all  $t \geq 0$ , the difference between  $\zeta^+(t) - \zeta^-(t)$  represents the real value  $\zeta$ .

Here, we list some basic modules that will be used for in the implementation of the more feedforward and backpropagation modules. Some of these have also been described in [29]. In this description, we will denote by  $[X(t)]$ , the concentration corresponding to the species  $X$  at time  $t$ .

### 4.2 Addition module

In order to add two numbers, we consider the following network:



The concentrations of species  $A$  and  $B$  are added and the result is stored in the steady state concentration of  $C$ . The original input species  $A$  and  $B$  are catalysts and their concentrations are preserved. Let  $[A] = [A(t)] = [A(0)]$  and  $[B] = [B(t)] = [B(0)]$ . Then the dynamics of network 7 is given by

$$\frac{d[C(t)]}{dt} = [A] + [B] - [C(t)] \quad (8)$$

The steady-state concentration of  $[C(t)]$  (denoted by  $[C^{ss}]$ ) is given by  $[C^{ss}] = [A] + [B]$ .

### 4.3 Multiplication module

In order to multiply, we consider the following network:



Here, the concentrations of species  $A$  and  $B$  are multiplied and the result is stored in the steady-state concentration of  $C$ . Since  $A$  and  $B$  are catalysts, their concentrations are preserved. Let  $[A] = [A(t)] = [A(0)]$  and  $[B] = [B(t)] = [B(0)]$ . Then the dynamics corresponding to network 9 is given by

$$\frac{d[C(t)]}{dt} = [A] \cdot [B] - [C(t)] \quad (10)$$

The steady-state concentration of  $[C(t)]$  (denoted by  $[C^{ss}]$ ) is given by  $[C^{ss}] = [A] \cdot [B]$ .

### 4.4 Comparison and Approximate majority

Our module is designed to compare the concentrations of species and set the corresponding flags. This functionality is achieved using a *comparison module* (CMP) and an *approximate majority module* (AM), triggered in consecutive clock cycles.

#### Comparison Module (CMP)

In the comparison (CMP) module, the inputs  $X$  and  $Y$  are assigned to flag species  $X_{gtY}$  and  $X_{ltY}$  in a normalized fashion. The network for implementing this is given by



In this network, the species  $X$  and  $Y$  are catalysts. We let  $[X] = [X(0)]$  and  $[Y] = [Y(0)]$ . To normalize the values within the range  $[0, 1]$ , the initial concentrations

of  $X_{gtY}$  and  $X_{ltY}$  are set such that  $[X_{gtY}(0)] + [X_{ltY}(0)] = 1$ . For example, if  $[X(0)] = 60$  and  $[Y(0)] = 40$ , the flag species  $X_{gtY}$  and  $X_{ltY}$  will converge to 0.6 and 0.4, respectively.

The dynamics corresponding to network 11 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d[X_{gtY}(t)]}{dt} &= -[X_{gtY}(t)] \cdot [Y] + [X_{ltY}(t)] \cdot [X] \\ \frac{d[X_{ltY}(t)]}{dt} &= [X_{gtY}(t)] \cdot [Y] - [X_{ltY}(t)] \cdot [X]\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

At steady-state, we get


$$\frac{[X_{gtY}^{ss}]}{[X_{ltY}^{ss}]} = \frac{[X]}{[Y]}\tag{13}$$

Note that  $[X_{ltY}^{ss}] + [X_{gtY}^{ss}] = 1$ . This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}[X_{gtY}^{ss}] &= \frac{[X]}{[X] + [Y]} \\ [X_{ltY}^{ss}] &= \frac{[Y]}{[X] + [Y]}\end{aligned}\tag{14}$$

### Approximate Majority module (AMP)

In the approximate Majority Module (AM) module [6], molecules of species possessing lower population are converted into molecules of species possessing higher population through the following network:



The dynamical system corresponding to the module 15 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d[X_{gtY}(t)]}{dt} &= -[X_{gtY}(t)] \cdot [X_{ltY}(t)] + [B(t)] \cdot [X_{gtY}(t)] \\ \frac{d[X_{ltY}(t)]}{dt} &= -[X_{gtY}(t)] \cdot [X_{ltY}(t)] + [B(t)] \cdot [X_{ltY}(t)] \\ \frac{d[B(t)]}{dt} &= -[B(t)] \cdot [X_{ltY}(t)] - [B(t)] \cdot [X_{gtY}(t)] + 2[X_{gtY}(t)] \cdot [X_{ltY}(t)]\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Assuming the normalization step in the comparison module (CMP) has already been executed, the species  $(X_{gtY}, X_{ltY}, B)$  will converge to the state  $(1, 0, 0)$  if  $X_{gtY}(0) > X_{ltY}(0)$ , and to  $(0, 1, 0)$  if  $X_{gtY}(0) < X_{ltY}(0)$ . [For a proof of this fact, please refer [29].]

As it will turn out, in Section 6  $X_{gtY}$  will serve as a catalyst in reactions that occur when  $X > Y$ , while  $X_{ltY}$  plays the same role for the opposite condition.

#### 4.5 Loading module

The loading module copies the concentration of  $A$  into  $B$  using the following network:



In this network, the species  $A$  is a catalyst. Let  $[A] = [A(0)]$ . Then the dynamical system corresponding to 17 is given by

$$\frac{d[B]}{dt} = [A] - [B] \tag{18}$$

At steady state, we get  $[B^{ss}] = [A]$ .

#### 4.6 Subtraction Module

The subtraction module computes  $C := \max(0, A - B)$ . The reaction network corresponding to this is given by:




The species  $A$  and  $B$  are catalysts. Let  $[A] = [A(0)]$  and  $[B] = [B(0)]$ . Then the dynamics corresponding to network 19 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d[C(t)]}{dt} &= [A] - [C(t)][H(t)] - [C(t)] \\ \frac{d[H(t)]}{dt} &= [B] - [C(t)][H(t)] \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

This implies that at steady-state  $[C^{ss}] = [A] - [B]$ . If  $[A] > [B]$ , then  $C = [A] - [B]$ . If  $[A] \leq [B]$ , then  $[C] = 0$ .

#### 4.7 Oscillation module with doping


Oscillating molecules [17, 5, 9] are used for sequential execution of reactions in a network. In particular, the concentrations of these molecules oscillate such that when the concentration of a certain species is positive, the concentrations of the remaining species are zero. For example, consider the following network



The network contains  $n$  oscillating species, denoted by  $O_i$ . If a reaction contains  $O_i$  and another reaction contains  $O_j$ , such that  $i < j$ , then the reaction containing the oscillation molecule  $O_i$  will be executed before the reaction containing the oscillation molecule  $O_j$ .

However, these oscillations eventually die out when one of the species becomes extinct, meaning the oscillations are not perpetual. To make them perpetual, Ballarini et.al [5]. introduce the notion of a *doping reaction* for each species. A doping reaction is defined as one that generates a molecule of a species  $X \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  by consuming a molecule of a doping substance and another species.

In practical terms, the chemical equations representing the  $n$ -way oscillator with doping are as follows:



The presence of doping species ensures that the oscillator is perpetual.

## 5 Encoding the feedforward module of SVM

Given an  $n$ -dimensional input vector  $X$ , and its associated label  $Y$ , we can use our network to determine whether it has been classified correctly or not (i.e. the associated label  $Y$  is correct or not). We can do this by computing


$$Y \times (W \cdot X + b) \tag{21}$$

and comparing it with 1.

We do this in a sequence of five steps:

### Step 1:

We first compute the dot product of  $W$  and  $X$ . We do so by multiplying  $W$  and  $X$  pair-wise and storing the the product in  $WX$  (for every  $i$ , the product of  $W_i$  and  $X_i$  is stored in  $WX_i$ ). The network below computes  $WX_i = W_i \times X_i$ .



The species  $W_i, X_i, O_i$  are catalysts in this network. Let  $[W_i] = [W_i(0)], [X_i] = [X_i(0)]$  and  $[O_i] = [O_i(0)]$ .


The dynamical system corresponding to Equation 22 is given by

$$\frac{d[WX_i]}{dt} = [W_i][X_i][O_1] - [WX_i][O_1] \tag{23}$$

At steady state, we get  $[WX_i^{ss}] = [W_i][X_i]$  as required.

**Step 2:**

We then sum all  $WX_i$  and add the bias  $b$  and store the this sum in a new species, called  $P$ . The network below computes the following quantity:  $P = (\sum_{i=1}^N WX_i) + b$



The dynamical system corresponding to the network 24 is given by

$$\frac{d[P]}{dt} = \sum_i [W_i][X_i][O_1] + [b][O_1] - [P][O_1] \tag{25}$$

At steady state, we get  $[P^{ss}] = \sum_i [W_i][X_i] + [b]$ .

**Step 3:**

We first multiply  $P$  with  $Y$  and store the result in  $Q$ .


$$Q = Y \times P \tag{26}$$

All reactions containing  $O_1$  would be executed parallelly and before other reactions. At steady state, we would have computed

$$Y \times (W \cdot X + b) \quad (27)$$

and stored the value in  $Q$ .

Now, we compare the value in  $Q$  with 1. If the associated label is correct, then concentration of  $Q$  will be greater than 1 and a flag will be set, in the form of concentration of some species converging to 1. We divide this comparison process into two steps, Step 4 (which compares) and Step 5 (which sets the flag). As these steps need to happen sequentially, we use oscillating species. Oscillation molecule  $O_2$  is used in Step 4, whereas  $O_3$  is used in Step 5. This ensures reactions of Step 4 finish before Step 5 reactions begin.



The dynamical system corresponding to network 28 is


$$\frac{d[Q]}{dt} = [P][Y][O_1] - [Q][O_1] \quad (29)$$

At steady state, we get  $[Q^{ss}] = [P] \cdot [Y]$ .

**Step 4:**

In Step 4, we introduce the following new species:  $K$ ,  $K_{ltQ}$  and  $K_{gtQ}$ . We will compare the concentration of  $Q$  with the concentration of  $K$  (which is set to 1).  $K_{ltQ}$  and  $K_{gtQ}$  are flag species such that the sum of their initial concentrations is 1.

The network that accomplishes this is given by



The dynamical system corresponding to network 30 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{[K_{ltQ}]}{dt} &= [Q][K_{gtQ}][O_2] - [K_{ltQ}][K][O_2] \\ \frac{[K_{gtQ}]}{dt} &= -[Q][K_{gtQ}][O_2] + [K_{ltQ}][K][O_2] \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Consequently, steady-state concentrations of  $K_{ltQ}$  and  $K_{gtQ}$  will be set as follows:

$$[K_{ltQ}^{ss}] = \frac{[Q]}{[Q] + [K]} \quad (32)$$


$$[K_{gtQ}^{ss}] = \frac{[K]}{[Q] + [K]} \quad (33)$$

where  $[K] = [K(0)]$  and  $[Q] = [Q(0)]$ .

**Step 5:**

By end of Step 4, we have compared  $Q$  and  $K$ , and we have set the values of  $K_{ltQ}$  and  $K_{gtQ}$  as shown above.

In Step 5, approximate majority algorithm (see Section 4.4) is used to detect which flag species is in majority. In particular, we try to set the flags, such that if  $Q > K$ , then  $K_{ltQ}$  converges to 1 and  $K_{gtQ}$  converges to 0. If  $K > Q$ , then vice versa happens. The network corresponding to this is given by



The dynamical system corresponding to network 34 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d[K_{ltQ}]}{dt} &= -[K_{gtQ}][K_{ltQ}][O_3] + [B][K_{ltQ}][O_3] \\
\frac{d[Q]}{dt} &= -[K_{gtQ}][K_{ltQ}][O_3] + [B][K_{gtQ}][O_3] \\
\frac{d[B]}{dt} &= [K_{gtQ}][K_{ltQ}][O_3] - [B][K_{gtQ}][O_3] + [K_{ltQ}][K_{gtQ}][O_3] - [B][K_{gtQ}][O_3]
\end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The analysis of the steady states follows from the discussion in subsection 4.4.

After Step 5, if  $K_{ltQ}$  converges to 1 and  $K_{gtQ}$  converges to 0, that means our associated label was correct. If the vice versa happens, that implies that associated label was wrong.

## 6 Learning and Gradient Descent

In this section, we flesh out the reaction network scheme for the learning (backpropagation) part of the SVM through gradient descent. In particular, this will implement Equations 4 and 5. We describe it in the following four steps:


**Step 1:**

In this step, we calculate the quantity  $\eta \cdot \lambda \cdot [W_i]$  from Equation 4 and 5. In particular, each weight  $W_i$  is multiplied by the learning parameter  $\eta$  and the regularization

Description of Feedforward Part	Mathematical Equation	Chemical Reactions Implementing That Part
Compute element-wise product of W and X	$WX_i = W_i \times X_i$	$W_i + X_i + O_1 \rightarrow W_i + X_i + WX_i + O_1$ $WX_i + O_1 \rightarrow O_1$
Sum all $WX_i$ and add $b$	$P = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N WX_i \right) + b$	$WX_i + O_1 \rightarrow WX_i + P + O_1$ $b + O_1 \rightarrow b + O_1 + P$ $P + O_1 \rightarrow O_1$
Multiply P with Y	$Q = Y \times P$	$P + Y + O_1 \rightarrow P + Y + Q + O_1$ $Q + O_1 \rightarrow O_1$
Compare Q with 1	$K_{ltQ} = \frac{Q_{\text{initial}}}{Q_{\text{initial}} + K_{\text{initial}}}$ $K_{gtQ} = \frac{K_{\text{initial}}}{Q_{\text{initial}} + K_{\text{initial}}}$	$Q + K_{gtQ} + O_2 \rightarrow K_{ltQ} + Q + O_2$ $K_{ltQ} + K + O_2 \rightarrow K_{gtQ} + K + O_2$
Set flag based on comparison	If $Q > K$ , then $K_{ltQ} \rightarrow 1$ and $K_{gtQ} \rightarrow 0$ Else, $K_{ltQ} \rightarrow 0$ and $K_{gtQ} \rightarrow 1$	$K_{gtQ} + K_{ltQ} + O_3 \rightarrow K_{ltQ} + B + O_3$ $B + K_{ltQ} + O_3 \rightarrow K_{ltQ} + K_{ltQ} + O_3$ $K_{ltQ} + K_{gtQ} + O_3 \rightarrow K_{gtQ} + B + O_3$ $B + K_{gtQ} + O_3 \rightarrow K_{gtQ} + K_{gtQ} + O_3$

Table 1: Summary of Feedforward Computation

parameter  $\lambda$ . This update is stored in  $WA_i$  and is applied to the weight regardless of whether the outcome is correct or incorrect




The dynamical system corresponding to this network is

$$\frac{d[WA_i]}{dt} = \eta\lambda[W_i][O_4] - [WA_i][O_4] \tag{37}$$

At steady state, we get  $[WA_i^{ss}] = \eta \cdot \lambda \cdot [W_i(0)]$ .

### Step 2:

Here, we handle conditional weight updates. In particular, we calculate the quantity  $\eta \cdot [K_{gtQ}] \cdot [X_i] \cdot [Y]$  and  $\eta \cdot [K_{gtQ}] \cdot [Y]$ . If the outcome is incorrect, we use  $K_{gtQ}$  as a catalyst with unit concentration, storing the former product in  $XY_i$  and latter in  $BY$ . If the outcome is correct,  $K_{gtQ}$  is zero, preventing any weight update.



The dynamical system corresponding to this network is


$$\frac{d[XY_i]}{dt} = \eta[K_{gtQ}][X_i][Y][O_4] - [XY_i][O_4] \tag{39}$$

& for bias

$$\frac{d[BY]}{dt} = \eta[K_{gtQ}][Y][O_4] - [BY][O_4] \tag{40}$$

At steady state, we get  $[XY_i^{ss}] = \eta \cdot [K_{gtQ}] \cdot [X_i] \cdot [Y]$  and  $[BY^{ss}] = \eta \cdot [K_{gtQ}] \cdot [Y]$ .

**Step 3:** Note that in both equations 4 and 5, the term  $\eta \cdot \lambda \cdot [W_i]$  is always subtracted from the weights irrespective of misclassifications. We will implement this update in the current step. In particular, we subtract the always-updated value ( $WA_i$ ) from the original weight ( $W_i$ ) and store the result in  $WD_i$ .



The dynamical system corresponding to this network is


$$\frac{d[WD_i]}{dt} = [W_i][O_5] - [WD_i][O_5] - [WD_i][H][O_5] \tag{42}$$

&

$$\frac{d[H]}{dt} = [WA_i][O_5] - [WD_i][H][O_5] \tag{43}$$

At steady state, we get  $[H^{ss}] = [WA_i]/[WD_i]$  and  $[WD_i^{ss}] = [W_i] - [WA_i]$ .

We also store the sum of the old bias  $b$  and the update to the bias  $BY$  in a new variable  $BT$ .




The dynamical system corresponding to this network is

$$\frac{d[BT]}{dt} = [b][O_5] + [BY][O_5] - [BT][O_5] \tag{45}$$

At steady state, we get  $[BT^{ss}] = [b] + [BY]$ .

**Step 4:**

Finally, we apply the conditional weight update ( $XY_j$ ) to  $WD_i$ , loading it into  $W_i$ , thus completing the final weight update.



The dynamical system corresponding to this network is

$$\frac{dW_i}{dt} = [WD_i][O_6] + [XY_i][O_6] - [W_i][O_6] \tag{47}$$

and for bias

$$\frac{db}{dt} = [BT][O_6] - [b][O_6] \tag{48}$$

At steady state, we get  $[W_i^{ss}] = [WD_i] + [X][Y]$  and  $[b^{ss}] = [BT]$ .

As a consequence, we have implemented Equations 4 and 5 and the backpropagation module is complete.

## 7 Experimental Setup

In this experiment, we aim to train a Support Vector Machine (SVM) using a computational reaction network (CRN)-based approach. Our goal is to predict the weights and bias of the SVM and compare them with the traditional machine learning implementation.

Description of Training Step	Mathematical Equation	Chemical Reactions Implementing That Part
Compute always-updated weight adjustments	$WA_i = W_i \times \eta \times \lambda$	$O_4 + \eta + \lambda + W_i \rightarrow O_4 + \eta + \lambda + W_i + WA_i$ $WA_i + O_4 \rightarrow O_4$
Compute conditional weight adjustments (only if prediction is incorrect)	$XY_i = \eta \times X_i \times Y \times K_{gtQ}$ $BY = \eta \cdot K_{gtQ} \cdot Y$	$O_4 + \eta + Y + X_i + K_{gtQ} \rightarrow O_4 + \eta + Y + X_i + XY_i + K_{gtQ}$ $XY_i + O_4 \rightarrow O_4$ $O_4 + \eta + Y + K_{gtQ} \rightarrow O_4 + \eta + Y + BY + K_{gtQ}$ $BY + O_4 \rightarrow O_4$
Subtract always-updated value from original weight and load sum of bias and its update to BT	$WD_i = W_i - WA_i$ $BT = BY + b$	$W_i + O_5 \rightarrow O_5 + W_i + WD_i$ $WA_i + O_5 \rightarrow O_5 + WA_i + H$ $WD_i + O_5 \rightarrow O_5$ $WD_i + H + O_5 \rightarrow O_5$ $b + O_5 \rightarrow O_5 + b + BT$ $BY + O_5 \rightarrow O_5 + BY + BT$ $BT + O_5 \rightarrow O_5$
Apply conditional weight update to complete final weight update	$W_i = WD_i + XY_i$ $b = BT$	$WD_i + O_6 \rightarrow WD_i + O_6 + W_i$ $XY_i + O_6 \rightarrow XY_i + O_6 + W_i$ $W_i + O_6 \rightarrow O_6$ $BT + O_6 \rightarrow BT + O_6 + b$ $b + O_6 \rightarrow O_6$

Table 2: Summary of SVM Training and Weight Update

## 7.1 Dataset and Encoding

We generate a synthetic dataset where each sample consists of:

- **Input** ( $X$ ): A two-dimensional vector.
- **Output** ( $Y$ ): A binary label, either +1 or -1, indicating class membership.

The dataset consists of ten data points distributed across the two classes. To represent numerical values in our computational framework, we use a dual rail encoding scheme. This encoding transforms each number into two separate values:

- A positive component ( $x_p$ ) that holds the original value if positive, or zero otherwise.
- A negative component ( $x_n$ ) that holds the approximate value of the number if it is negative, or zero otherwise.

The same encoding is applied to the output labels ( $Y$ ) and model parameters.

## 7.2 Training Parameters

We train our CRN-based SVM using the following hyperparameters:

- **Regularization parameter ( $\lambda$ ):** 0.0001
- **Number of epochs:** 500
- **Learning rate ( $\eta$ ):** 0.002

## 7.3 Computational Framework

The CRN-based SVM is implemented using a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) that simulate biochemical reactions corresponding to arithmetic operations required for SVM optimization. The core operations include:

- Addition and subtraction
- Multiplication
- Division
- Comparison and thresholding

These operations are implemented as ODEs solved numerically using the `odeint` function from SciPy. The iterative updates for weight parameters ( $w_1$ ,  $w_2$ ) and bias ( $b$ ) are performed based on the hinge loss function, which is commonly used in SVM optimization.

# 8 Results and Analysis

We compare the actual and predicted values of the learned SVM parameters. The table below presents a comparison of the true and computed values for weights and bias, along with their respective errors.

We observe that the average error in predicting the weights is approximately **1.6%**, indicating that our CRN-based approach closely approximates the traditional SVM training process.

To further validate our results, we visualize the evolution of the learned net weights and bias over the training process.

Figure 4 presents a consolidated visualization of the evolution of weight parameters, bias, and the comparison between the predicted and actual SVM hyperplanes. The plots illustrate how the model’s predicted values align with the actual values over the course of 500 training epochs.

Parameter	Actual Value	Net Predicted Value	Error
$w_1$	0.2352	0.2356	0.0015
$w_2$	-0.2925	-0.3032	0.0364
$b$	-0.0783	-0.0792	0.0115
<b>Average Error</b>			<b>0.0165</b>

Table 3: Comparison of Actual and Predicted SVM Weights




Figure 4: Representation of Weight Evolution

In the top-left and top-right subplots, Weight 1 and Weight 2 exhibit an initial sharp decline, followed by a stabilization phase after approximately 300 epochs. This trend reflects the gradient-based optimization process, where rapid updates occur in the early stages, and convergence is reached as the learning progresses. The predicted values (red dashed lines) closely track the actual values (solid blue lines), indicating strong predictive accuracy.

The bottom-left subplot depicts the evolution of the bias term, which follows a

similar pattern of rapid early changes before stabilizing. While slight deviations between the predicted and actual bias exist, the overall trend suggests effective approximation of the learning dynamics.

The bottom-right subplot provides a direct comparison of the actual and predicted hyperplanes. The actual hyperplane, obtained from SVM (blue dashed line), is contrasted against the predicted hyperplane (black solid line). A slight shift between the two indicates small differences in the learned weights, highlighting potential refinements in the predictive approach. However, the overall similarity suggests that the model effectively captures the underlying decision boundary.

This combined visualization confirms that the learning process leads to stable weight updates while also revealing subtle differences in hyperplane estimation. The close alignment of actual and predicted values validates the predictive model’s reliability, with room for fine-tuning to improve precision.

## 9 Discussion

We have shown how to implement hard margin support vector machines using reaction networks. Our method involves implementing the feedforward and backpropagation module of the support vector machine. Towards this, we have used various sub-modules to accomplish this. In particular, these include the addition module, the subtraction module, the multiplication module, the comparison module and the approximate majority module. To handle sequential execution of reactions, we use time-scale separation, which is handled by the oscillation module coupled with doping. To handle the possibility of negative weights and biases, we make use of the dual rail encoding.

Our work intersects with several other works that have used reaction networks to implement machine learning algorithms. In particular, these include the use of reaction networks to model neural networks [3], the use of reaction networks to implement boltzmann machines [20, 21] and also to compute maximum likelihood estimates [12].

Our works raises several avenues for future work and investigation.

**Question:** Can you compute the complexity of this implementation (in terms of number of molecules, number of reactions and rate of convergence for various steps as described in [4])?

Another possibility is:

**Question:** Does our setup satisfy the following optimal criteria of computation as laid out in [3]? In particular, assume that our reaction network can be represented as a dynamical system of the form  $\dot{x}(t) = f(y, x(t))$  with  $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

1. Is our computation exponentially reliable? In other words, does there exists a  $\zeta : \mathbb{R}_{>0}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  such that

$$|x(t) - \xi(y)| \leq |x(0) - \xi(y)|e^{-\zeta(y)t} \quad ,$$

where  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = \xi(y)$ .

2. Do the solutions of our systems converge to a compact set containing the equilibrium in finite time, In other words, does there exists compact set  $K \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and a  $T : \mathbb{R}_{> 0}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  such that  $x(t) \in K$  for any  $t \geq T(y)$  and  $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ ?

Another possibility is to see how to extend our framework to *soft margin support vector machines*? Can we modify our framework to incorporate the *kernel trick* to classify nonlinear data?

## References

- [1] L. Adleman, *Molecular computation of solutions to combinatorial problems*, Science (1994), 1021–1024.
- [2] L. Adleman, M. Gopalkrishnan, M. Huang, P. Moisset, and D. Reishus, *On the mathematics of the law of mass action*, A Systems Theoretic Approach to Systems and Synthetic Biology I: Models and System Characterizations, Springer, 2014, pp. 3–46.
- [3] D. Anderson, B. Joshi, and A. Deshpande, *On reaction network implementations of neural networks*, J. R. Soc. Interface **18** (2021), no. 177, 20210031.
- [4] D. F. Anderson and B. Joshi, *Chemical mass-action systems as analog computers: Implementing arithmetic computations at specified speed*, Theor. Comput. Sci. **1025** (2025), 114983.
- [5] Paolo Ballarini, Radu Mardare, and Ivan Mura, *Analysing biochemical oscillation through probabilistic model checking*, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science **229** (2009), no. 1, 3–19, Proceedings of the Second Workshop From Biology to Concurrency and Back (FBTC 2008).
- [6] L. Cardelli and A. Csikász-Nagy, *The cell cycle switch computes approximate majority*, Scientific reports **2** (2012), no. 1, 656.
- [7] K. Cherry and L. Qian, *Scaling up molecular pattern recognition with DNA-based winner-take-all neural networks*, Nature **559** (2018), no. 7714, 370–376.
- [8] Y. Fan, X. Zhang, C. Gao, and D. Dochain, *Automatic implementation of neural networks through reaction networks—part i: Circuit design and convergence analysis*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18313 (2023).
- [9] Yuzhen Fan, Xiaoyu Zhang, and Chuanhou Gao, *Towards programming adaptive linear neural networks through chemical reaction networks*, IFAC-PapersOnLine **55** (2022), no. 18, 7–13, 4th IFAC Workshop on Thermodynamics Foundations of Mathematical Systems Theory TFMST 2022.

- [10] M. Feinberg, *Lectures on chemical reaction networks*, Notes of lectures given at the Mathematics Research Center, University of Wisconsin (1979), 49.
- [11] Martin Feinberg, *Foundations of chemical reaction network theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 202, Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [12] M. Gopalkrishnan, *A scheme for molecular computation of maximum likelihood estimators for log-linear models*, International Conference on DNA-Based Computers, Springer, 2016, pp. 3–18.
- [13] C. Guldberg and P. Waage, *Studies Concerning Affinity*, CM Forhandlinger: Videnskabs-Selskabet I Christiana **35** (1864), no. 1864, 1864.
- [14] J. Gunawardena, *Chemical reaction network theory for in-silico biologists*, Notes available for download at <http://vcp.med.harvard.edu/papers/crnt.pdf> (2003).
- [15] François Jacob and Jacques Monod, *Genetic regulatory mechanisms in the synthesis of proteins*, J. Mol. Biol. **3** (1961), no. 3, 318–356.
- [16] S. Kang and J. Kim, *Noise-robust chemical reaction networks training artificial neural networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11919 (2024).
- [17] M. Lachmann and G. Sella, *The computationally complete ant colony: Global coordination in a system with no hierarchy*, European Conference on Artificial Life, Springer, 1995, pp. 784–800.
- [18] W. McCulloch and W. Pitts, *A logical calculus of the ideas immanent in nervous activity*, Bull. Math. Biophys. **5** (1943), 115–133.
- [19] R. Pei, E. Matamoros, M. Liu, D. Stefanovic, and M. Stojanovic, *Training a molecular automaton to play a game*, Nat. Nanotechnol. **5** (2010), no. 11, 773.
- [20] W. Poole, A. Ortiz-Munoz, A. Behera, N. Jones, T.E. Ouldridge, E. Winfree, and M. Gopalkrishnan, *Chemical boltzmann machines*, International Conference on DNA-Based Computers, Springer, 2017, pp. 210–231.
- [21] W. Poole, T. Ouldridge, and M. Gopalkrishnan, *Autonomous learning of generative models with chemical reaction network ensembles*, J. R. Soc. Interface **22** (2025), no. 222, 20240373.
- [22] W. Poole, T. Ouldridge, M. Gopalkrishnan, and E. Winfree, *Detailed balanced chemical reaction networks as generalized boltzmann machines*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.06313 (2022).
- [23] L. Qian, E. Winfree, and J. Bruck, *Neural network computation with dna strand displacement cascades*, Nature **475** (2011), no. 7356, 368–372.
- [24] O.E. Rössler, *Chemical automata in homogeneous and reaction-diffusion kinetics*, Physics and mathematics of the nervous system, Springer, 1974, pp. 399–418.

- [25] A. Singh, C. Wiuf, A. Behera, and M. Gopalkrishnan, *A reaction network scheme which implements inference and learning for hidden markov models*, International Conference on DNA Computing and Molecular Programming, Springer, 2019, pp. 54–79.
- [26] David Soloveichik, Georg Seelig, and Erik Winfree, *Dna as a universal substrate for chemical kinetics*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **107** (2010), no. 12, 5393–5398.
- [27] M. Sugita and N. Fukuda, *Functional analysis of chemical systems in vivo using a logical circuit equivalent: III. Analysis using a digital circuit combined with an analogue computer*, Journal of theoretical biology **5** (1963), no. 3, 412–425.
- [28] M. Vasic, C. Chalk, S. Khurshid, and D. Soloveichik, *Deep molecular programming: a natural implementation of binary-weight relu neural networks*, International Conference on Machine Learning, PMLR, 2020, pp. 9701–9711.
- [29] M. Vasić, D. Soloveichik, and S. Khurshid, *Crn++: Molecular programming language*, Nat. Comput. **19** (2020), no. 2, 391–407.
- [30] V. Virinchi, A. Behera, and M. Gopalkrishnan, *A stochastic molecular scheme for an artificial cell to infer its environment from partial observations*, International Conference on DNA-Based Computers, Springer, 2017, pp. 82–97.
- [31] ———, *A reaction network scheme which implements the EM algorithm*, International Conference on DNA Computing and Molecular Programming, Springer, 2018, pp. 189–207.
- [32] E. Voit, H. Martens, and S. Omholt, *150 years of the mass action law*, PLOS Comput. Biol. **11** (2015), no. 1, e1004012.
- [33] P. Yu and G. Craciun, *Mathematical Analysis of Chemical Reaction Systems*, Isr. J. Chem. **58** (2018), no. 6-7, 733–741.