How to Upscale The Kinetics of Complex Microsystems
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The rate constants of chemical reactions are typically inferred from slopes and intersection points of observed concentration curves. In small systems that operate far below the thermodynamic limit, these concentration profiles become stochastic and such an inference is less straightforward. By using elements of queueing theory, we introduce a procedure for inferring (time dependent) kinetic parameters from microscopic observations that are given by molecular simulations of many simultaneously reacting species. We demonstrate that with this procedure it is possible to assimilate the results of molecular simulations in such a way that the latter become descriptive on the macroscopic scale. As an example, we upscale the kinetics of a molecular dynamics system that forms a complex molecular network. Incidentally, we report that the kinetic parameters of this system feature a peculiar time and temperature dependences, whereas the probability of a network strand to close a cycle follows a universal distribution.
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How can one deduce chemical rate constants from observations? On the macroscopic scale, where concentrations of chemical compounds are deterministic quantities, this question was answered by Arrhenius who famously connected the reaction rate constants to slopes and intersection points of the concentration related curves\(^1\). Microscopic systems, as for instance, living cells\(^2\)\(^3\), micropores\(^4\), or those used for in silico computer experiments\(^5\)\(^6\), typically have a small reaction volume, and therefore, the reaction rates feature stochastic fluctuations that are not accounted for in the Arrhenius theory. The stochastic means that the reaction rates are lacking a predictable order and due to the thermal noise and chaotic collision dynamics can only be described with probabilities. A few more assumptions that provide the foundations for the Arrhenius theory of reaction rates may lead to artefacts even in the macroscopic systems: a well-mixed environment, Boltzmann’s stosszahlansatz, absence of memory, and non-cooperation of particles. If such artefacts occur\(^10\)\(^11\)\(^12\), the reaction rate constants are said to be time-dependent. For example, irreversible polymerisation leads to progressively growing molecules and therefore each reaction firing changes the conditions of the system and consequently the rates of the reactions occurring therein\(^8\)\(^13\)\(^14\). Molecular networks pose an especially severe case: their physical properties evolve considerably in the course of the assembly process and the latter can undergo various types of phase transitions\(^7\)\(^9\). As an illustration of how drastic such changes can be, Fig.\(^1\) depicts the formation of a densifying molecular network that transits from a liquid-like to solid-like state. It is not surprising that such evolution of physical properties has a strong and complex impact on the reaction rates. Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations\(^6\) are parameter free and do not require reaction rate constants as input. On the contrary, they produce streams of large series of data that implicitly contain information about these rates. Provided the reaction rates are extracted from an MD system they can then be used as input for macroscopic kinetic models\(^1\), which constitutes the multi-scale paradigm. While the foundation of reaction rates is frequently discussed in the literature\(^15\)\(^16\), this letter takes a phenomenological lens and devises the methodology for inferring reaction rate parameters from noisy microscopic observations as given by, for example, molecular dynamics simulations.

Consider a system that consists of \(M\) chemical species reacting via \(n\) reactions. Each species may be represented by multiple particles, which is indicated by particle count numbers \(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_M\), so that we have \(N = \sum_{i=1}^{M} x_i\) particles in total. The reactive interactions that occur between this species can be modelled by using three levels of mathematical description\(^1\): the equation of motion, stochastic process, and rate equation.

The rate equations\(^1\) are ordinary differential equations (ODEs) that instead of species counts \(x_i\), govern the evolution of species concentrations,

\[
c_i = \frac{x_i}{V_{nA}}
\]

under the assumption that volume \(V \to \infty\) and \(x_i\) scale accordingly to keep the pressure constant. As an example, consider a system that consists of three chemical species \(A, B\) and \(C\), having the particle counts \(\#A = x_1, \#B = x_2\), and \(\#C = x_3\), and reacting via the following mechanism:

\[
A + B \xleftrightarrow{\kappa_1}{\kappa_2} C.
\]

We can describe this system by the following set of rate equations for time-dependent concentrations:

\[
c_1' = k_1 c_1 c_2 - k_2 c_1 c_3,
\]

\[
c_2' = -k_2 c_1 c_2 + k_2 c_3,
\]

\[
c_3' = -k_2 c_1 c_2 + k_2 c_3.
\]

This ODEs can be easily extended to a general form. Let \(\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_M)^T\) be the vector of concentrations. The reaction rate equation for \(M\) species and \(n\) reactions is then given by:

\[
c'_i(t) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} k_j S_{ij} \mathbf{c}^j(t), \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, M.
\]
Here, the vector power \( c^\nu = c_1^{\nu_1} c_2^{\nu_2} \ldots c_M^{\nu_M} \) is evaluated in the point-wise manner; \( k_j \) are the reaction rate constants, \( \nu_j \) define the orders of the reactions, and \( S \) is an \( M \times n \) matrix having the stoichiometric vectors as its rows. For example, one recovers Eq. (6) by setting:

\[
S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu_1 = (1,1,0), \quad \nu_2 = (0,0,1).
\]

One can see that the elements of \( \nu_1 \) sum up to 1, which indicates that \( j = 1 \) is a first order reaction, whereas the elements of \( \nu_2 \) sum up to 2, indicating that the reaction order of \( j = 2 \) is two. The reactions of first and second orders derive their rates in different ways, yet, as was suggested by Gillespie, who devised the stochastic simulation algorithm (SSA)\cite{SSA1977}, these rates can be related to the stochastic processes that govern the reaction firings. Consider a system that consists of a single molecule undergoing a first order reaction. The probability that time \( t \) passes until this molecule reacts, is given by an exponential random variable with parameter \( \lambda \):

\[
P[t \in [\tau, \tau + d\tau]] = \lambda e^{-\lambda \tau}.
\]

In short, we will refer to this fact as \( t \sim \text{Exp}[\lambda_1] \), also known as the “exponential clock”\cite{SSA1977}. If instead, we have \( x_1 = \#A \) independent molecules of the same species, the time until the first reaction firing within this species is given by:

\[
t \sim \inf\{\text{Exp}[\lambda], \ldots, \text{Exp}[\lambda]\} \sim \text{Exp}[x_1 \lambda]. \quad (5)
\]

Here, we made use of the standard result about the minimum of multiple exponential random variables\cite{SSA1977}. Since \( t \) is an exponential random variable, its expected value is given by \( \mathbb{E}[t] = (\lambda x_1)^{-1} \), which gives the characteristic time between reaction firings. Thus, the reaction rate \( r \) (the amount of substance per volume per time) is given by

\[
r = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[t]} \frac{1}{V n_A} = \frac{\lambda x_1}{V n_A} = \lambda c(t) = kc(t), \quad (6)
\]

where the last equality derives from Eq. (1), and \( n_A \) is Avogadro’s number. Equation (6) settles the relationship between the stochastic rate \( \lambda \) and the rate constant \( k \) for first order reactions:

\[
k = \lambda. \quad (7)
\]

The rates of second order reactions are dependent on a coincidence of two events: 1. the two reactants collide in the correct configuration, 2. together they undergo a first order reaction. We thus have a two-stage process:

\[
A + B \rightleftharpoons AB \rightarrow C, \quad (8)
\]

where AB is an intermediate that represents the species that collided but have not reacted. According to Arrhenius theory, the first stage settles on an equilibrium: the number of AB is a constant fraction of the total number of couple combinations:

\[
\#AB = Ax_1x_2.
\]

Since AB \( \rightarrow \) C is a first-order mechanism, it features the stochastic rate \( \lambda' \) as given by Eq. (6). Consequently, one writes the time until the first reaction firing as

\[
t \sim \text{Exp}[\lambda'Ax_1x_2] = \text{Exp}[\lambda x_1x_2], \quad \lambda = \lambda' A \quad (9)
\]

which, after applying similar transformations to Eq. (6), gives the known approximation for the second-order reaction rate:

\[
r = \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[t]} \frac{1}{V n_A} = \frac{\lambda x_1x_2}{V n_A} = \lambda V n_A c_1(t)c_2(t) = kc_1(t)c_2(t).
\]

For second order reactions we therefore have:

\[
k = \lambda V n_A. \quad (10)
\]

Note that if a second order reaction takes place between members of the same species, then the number of couples \( \#AA = \frac{1}{2} x_1(x_1 - 1) \) and therefore, \( k \approx \frac{1}{2} \lambda V n_A \). More generally, if the \( j \)th reaction (of
arbitrary waiting time now) is isolated, the waiting time that passes before the reaction firing is $t \sim \text{Exp}[\lambda]$ and, by analogy to Eq. (5), the time until the earliest event in the case of multiple competing reactions is given by: 
$t \sim \inf_j \text{Exp}[\lambda_j] \sim \text{Exp}[\sum_j \lambda_j]$. Moreover, the probability that this is the $j$th reaction is given by: 
$P[j] = \frac{\lambda_j}{\sum_l \lambda_l}$. We will now derive the probability that within interval $\tau$ we have exactly $z$ firings of reaction 1, $z_2$ firings of reaction 2, etc., which amounts to the total configuration vector $z = (z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n)^\top$. In fact, the following considerations are inspired by the $\tau$-leaping method. Suppose that the species count vector has large values, $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_M) \gg 0$, and in a small time increment $\tau$ these values undergo a small relative change. Then the elements of the configuration vector $z$ are Poisson random variables: 
$z_j \sim \text{Poisson}[\lambda_j x_j \tau]$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$. When combined with reaction stoichiometry $S$ the realisations of $z$ give update vectors for $x$ at a given time increment $\tau$, and so, one can recover the evolution trajectory of species count vectors $x_I$ by writing:
$$x_{I+1} = x_I + S^\top z_I,$$
$$z_I \sim (\text{Poisson}[\lambda_1 x_1 \tau] \ldots, \text{Poisson}[\lambda_n x_n \tau])^\top,$$
where $\tau = t_I - t_{I-1}$, $I = 1, \ldots, L$ are the time intervals, and the stochastic rates $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n$ are the only parameters. Equation (11) can be regarded as an $M$-dimensional random walk on species count numbers, or alternatively a stochastic process. This process, although is a very practical model as it is relatively fast to simulate, relies upon the system being well-mixed, memoryless, and non-cooperative among other assumptions. An alternative that does not suffer from these issues is solving the $N$-body problem for a system composed of all copies of chemical species.

Molecular dynamics allows us to follow the time evolution of complex systems by solving the equation of motion. When provided with a reactive scheme, MD also yields the evolution of the different species in the system, their particle counts, and the counts of all reaction events. We denote the realisations of the latter by adding a tilde to the symbols: $\tilde{x}_I$ and $\tilde{z}_I$. We therefore have both, an empirical realisation of $x_I$ and $z_I$ as given by MD, and the theoretical model for the underlying stochastic process $x_I$ and $z_I$ as parametrised by stochastic rates $\lambda$. In what follows we propose several maximum likelihood estimators (MLEs) that infer the stochastic rates $\lambda_j$ by treating the molecular dynamics trajectories as input data. See Supplemental Material at [22] for the mathematical derivations of these MLEs.

First, we assume that the stochastic rates $\lambda_j$ do not depend on time. In this case, the maximisation of the log-likelihood gives the following estimate (see SI [22]):
$$\lambda_j = \langle \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle / \langle \tilde{x}_{j,I} \rangle \tau, \quad \text{var}(\lambda_j) = \frac{\lambda_j^2}{L \langle \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle},$$
where $\langle x_I \rangle := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{I=1}^L x_I$ denotes the time-average and $\text{var}(\lambda_j)$ refers to the asymptotic variance of this estimator. The variance tells us how the size of the data affects the certainty of the estimator. A small variance implies that the system is large enough to derive consistent estimates, however, the variance does not tell us how well the model explains observed data. The latter quality is given by the residual.

Note that the process of Eq. (11) does not require the stochastic rates to be the same on all time steps. We thus exploit this observation to devise an estimator that yields stochastic rates in the form of a time series:
$$\lambda_{j,t} = \frac{\langle \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle_s}{\langle \tilde{x}_{j,I} \rangle_s} \lambda_{j,t}^0, \quad \text{var}(\lambda_{j,t}) = \frac{\lambda_{j,t}^2}{2s + 1} \langle \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle_s,$$
where $\langle x_I \rangle_s := \frac{1}{2s+1} \sum_{l=-s}^{l+s} x_I$ represents the moving average. Finally, we assume that the reaction rate parameters that appear in the random walk model (11) have an exponential dependence on time:
$$\lambda_{j,t} = e^{-p_j(t)},$$
where $p_j(t) = \alpha_j + \lambda_j x_I + \alpha_{j,2} x_2 + \cdots + \alpha_{j,S} x_S$, is a polynomial of order $S$. The estimators for the polynomial coefficients are given by the solution of the following system of non-linear equations:
$$\langle e^{-p_j(t)} \rangle \tilde{x}_{j,I} \tau - \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle = 0, \quad s = 0, \ldots, S,$$
whereas the variance of the rate logarithm is given by:
$$\text{var}(\ln \lambda_{j,t}) = \frac{1}{L} b^\top H^{-1} b,$$
where
$$H_{k,s} = \langle e^{-p_j(t)} \rangle \langle t_{k,I} \rangle \tilde{x}_{j,I} \tau - \tilde{z}_{j,I} \rangle.$$
and $b = (1, t, t^2, \ldots, t^S)^\top$. It is also important to mention that one can replace time $t$ in MLE (14) with any monotonous function of time that tracks the progress of the chemical system, for instance, the conversion of an important species is a practical choice here. The estimator equations (12)-(16) are additionally supplied with ready-to-use source code in [33].

A natural question now arises: which polynomial order is the best when applying MLE (14) to a specific set of data? High order polynomials yield small residuals, yet, the more coefficients there are in the ansatz, the larger is the uncertainty. Here we thus propose a procedure to rationally determine the estimator’s order by simultaneously minimising two qualities: the variance, and the residual (see SI [22]).

We will now demonstrate the inference procedure on a tangible example of photo-polymerising hexane-diol diacrylate (HDDA) network [33]. The detailed chemistry of this system, as well as the description of the MD methodology, are given in our previous work [29]. In what follows we refer to the following MD system as the microsystem: 2000 HDDA molecules confined in a 7.5210^{-25} m^3 simulation box with periodic boundary conditions and integrated in time up
FIG. 2: Reaction rate pre-factors $A(t)$ in the microsystem as inferred from the MD data at $T = 300, 400, 500$, and $600$K by different maximum-likelihood estimators: constant estimator Eq. (12), $4^{th}$ order exp-polynomial estimator Eq. (13), and time series estimator Eq. (14). The margins indicate $2\sigma$ confidence. All panels have the same legend.

to $10^{-8}$s in the NVT ensemble. Only at time $t = 0$ the system is initiated with $5\%$ radicals (i.e. dark polymerisation)[13]. Moreover, the activation energy of the reaction has been reduced to speed up the simulations. The true kinetic parameters can be recovered by appropriate unbiasin (see Ref. [9] for the discussion). Despite being so small this system has the maximal size given the constrains of realistic computational resources: the integration of one trajectory requires approximately one week of time on a 32 core supercomputer. This microsystem is confronted with the macrosystem that reflects the desired real world target: $4.7\text{mol}$ of monomer units (which is of the order $10^{24}$ particles), polymerised under continuous initialisation that maintains a steady concentration of radicals at $10^{-4}\text{mol}$ (e.g. photo polymerisation). We investigate the rates of the two most important species: vinyl groups (V) and a radicals (R) that react via two reaction channels, respectively propagation and termination:

$$V + R \rightarrow R, \quad R + R \rightarrow \emptyset.$$  

(17)

The molecular network is formed as a byproduct of these processes, and as it is being formed the network interferes with the diffusion of species. Moreover, the network also undergoes a topological phase transition during the polymerisation, and subsequently, the glass transition, which in turn affects the reaction rates in a complex manner. The mechanism (17) is characterised by

$$S = \begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 0 \\
0 & -2 
\end{pmatrix}, \quad \nu_1 = (1, 1), \quad \nu_2 = (0, 2),$$

which in combination with molecular dynamics data $\tilde{x}_1$ and $\tilde{x}_2$, provides enough information to apply our rate estimators. Since the activation energy $E_a$ has been reduced in the microsystem, we use the following decomposition of the rate:

$$k(t) = A(t)e^{-E_a/RT},$$  

(18)

and perform the inference solely for pre-exponential factor $A(t)$. To recover $k(t)$, Eq. (18) should be supplied with $E_a = 31.02 \text{kJ mol}^{-1}$ for propagation and $E_a = 8.673 \text{kJ mol}^{-1}$ for termination reactions (activation energies taken from the RMGpy database[24]). From the variance analysis (see SI[22]) we conclude that the optimal estimation is provided by the polynomial of $4^{th}$ order for propagation and the $3^{rd}$ order for termination reactions. Figure 2 presents the inferred values of $A(t)$ for various temperatures. Initially, $A(0)$ does not depend on the temperature, however, at $t > 0$ the inferred rates do not obey the standard Arrhenius theory: they decay with time, and this effect becomes less pronounced when temperature is increased. From topological point of view, the network consist of multiple connected components (sometimes called clusters) that grow in size and eventually amount to one giant molecule that occupies the whole system. Both species R and V reside in the network, and therefore, every propagation firing either joins two connected components or closes a cycle. The probability that a polymer chain closes a cycle of size $n$ is typically derived from the return probability of a hypothesised random walk. The exact definition of this random walk is a topic of debates, see for example Refs. [23, 26]. We observe in Fig. 3 that the probability that a network strand closes a cycle can be asymptotically related to Flory’s expression for the self-avoiding random walk,

$$p \sim n^{-3/2}e^{-\frac{3}{2}n^{-1/2}},$$

where the chain stiffness parameter was found to be $\alpha = 1.2$ by fitting. Flory formulated his random walk approximation for stiff linear polymers[8, 27] and it is remarkable that the theory seem to hold for networks as well. In the latter case, the shortest path replaces the notion of a linear strand.

By following the polymer physics convention[8, 13, 23] we also perform the rate inference with respect to the conversion of an important species (V), $\chi(t) = 1 - \frac{c_1(t)}{c_1(0)}$ instead of time (see Fig. 4). While
FIG. 4: Inferred conversion-dependent rate parameters as obtained by 4th order exp-polynomial estimator Eq. (14) (the margins indicate $2\sigma$ confidence) and time series estimator Eq. (13). All panels have the same legend.

FIG. 5: (colour online) Demonstration of the upscaling procedure. Left panel: The counts of species V and R in the microsystem as obtained from MD data for dark polymerisation at $T = 300K$. The MD data is compared to stochastic process and ODE models, both of which are supplied with inferred exp-polynomial rates and integrated on 1000× longer time interval. Right panel: concentration profiles of species V as a function of time in the upscaled macrosystem, the ODEs are supplied with inferred conversion-dependent reaction rates and steady initiation. The margins indicate $2\sigma$ confidence.

To summarise, in this letter we solve the inverse problem to the famous Gillespie’s stochastic simulation algorithm[10]: we take counts of molecular species and recover the reaction rate parameters that drive the kinetics. As such, our results introduce the stochastic alternative to one of the most common tools in chemistry: the Arrhenius plot. From the point of view of molecular dynamics, reaction rates are emergent phenomena of many reactive particles, and this inference method allows one to extract the kinetic parameters from simulations as well. By using the fact that these parameters are scale-invariant, we demonstrate how to assimilate the results of reactive molecular simulations so that they become descriptive on the macroscopic scale. Such an upscaling opens up the opportunity for modelling the kinetics of macroscopic world with molecular simulations. In fact, molecular simulations of many reaction-driven macroscopic phenomena are already on the way, see for example the studies on crystallisation[6][28], self-assembly[29], aggregation[30], separation[31], and polymerisation[9][11][32], and a possibility to learn from molecular simulations may recover new macroscopic trends and improve existing kinetic models for these phenomena. In our example, we apply the method to diacylate polymerisation and reveal an intricate phenomenological dependance of the kinetic parameters on temperature and time in this system. These dependencies are likely to be induced by the complex evolution of the underlying network topology, and cannot be explained by existing theoretical frameworks. Nevertheless, the probability of a network strand to close a cycle of a given length is invariant in time and temperature and seems to follow a universal distribution.

I.K. acknowledges the support from the research programme VENI with Project No 639.071.511, and A.T-K. acknowledges support from PREDAGIO Project. Both projects are financed by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

* Electronic address: i.kryven@uva.nl

[10] Ahmad K. Omar and Zhen-Gang Wang. Shear-induced heterogeneity in associating polymer gels:


[22] Supplemental material url.


[33] https://github.com/ikryven/RateInference

[34] RMGpy kinetic database: https://rmg.mit.edu/

Supplemental Material for: How to Upscale The Kinetics of Complex Microsystems

In this supplement, we give the necessary derivations related to the problem of inferring the intensity parameters $\lambda_j(t)$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$ of the following non-homogenous stochastic process:

\[ x_{l+1} = x_l + Sz_l, \]

\[ z_l \sim (\text{Pois} [\lambda_j(t) x_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l], \ldots, \text{Pois} [\lambda_n(t) x_l^{\nu_n} \tau_l])^T, \]

from a known realisation of empirical data $\tilde{x}_l, \tilde{z}_l$ on a series of time points $t_1, t_2, \ldots, L$.

Maximum likelihood estimator for constant reaction rates

We consider the general setting in which the time intervals $\tau_l = t_l - t_{l-1}$, $l = 1, \ldots, L$ need not to be equispaced. Let $\lambda_j(t) = \lambda_j = \text{const}$, then the parameters of the Poisson random variables from Eq. (19) are given by

\[ \lambda = \lambda_j x_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l, \quad l = 1, \ldots, L. \]

Therefore the probability to observe configuration $\tilde{x}_l, \tilde{z}_l$ on time intervals $\tau_l$ is given by:

\[ \prod_{l=1}^{L} \prod_{j=1}^{n} e^{-\lambda_j} \frac{\lambda_j^{y_j}}{y_j!} \frac{\lambda_j^{z_j}}{z_j!} \]
and taking a logarithm of this product gives the log-likelihood of the entire ensemble of data,

\[ f(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \left( -\lambda + y \ln \lambda - \ln y! \right) \bigg|_{\lambda = \lambda_j, z_{l,t}} \]

which has the following derivatives:

\[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_j} = - \sum_{l=1}^{L} \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l + \frac{1}{\lambda_j} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \bar{z}_{j,l} = - L(\bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l) + \frac{1}{\lambda_j} L(\bar{z}_{j,l}) \]

where \( \langle x_l \rangle := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} x_l \). By equating this derivatives to zero, one obtains expressions for \( \lambda_j \):

\[ \lambda_j = \langle \bar{z}_{j,l} \rangle / \langle \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l \rangle, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n, \]

In order to give an estimate for the variance of these parameter, \( \text{var}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \), we make use of the asymptotic normality property of this MLE and write:

\[ \text{var}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) = - (\text{Hess}(f(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n)))^{-1}, \]

where \( \text{Hess}(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) := \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \lambda_i \partial \lambda_j} \) is the Hessian matrix. Evaluating this variance estimate for Eq. (20) results in a diagonal covariance matrix, so that:

\[ \text{var}(\lambda_j) = \frac{\lambda_j^2}{L(\bar{z}_{j,l})}. \]

**Maximum likelihood estimator for moving-average reaction rates (time-series estimator)**

For this estimator we require time intervals \( \tau_l \) to be equispaced. Consider a modification of the previous case in which for every \( l = 1, \ldots, L \) the parameter \( \lambda(t_l) \) is calculated from a local snippet of the data \( \bar{x}_{l}, \bar{z}_{l} \), where \( l' = l - s, \ldots, l + s \). Here, \( s = 1, 2, \ldots \) plays role of a regularity parameter. Consequently, we obtain the following log-likelihood function for \( \lambda_{j,l} \):

\[ f(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{n,l}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l'=l-s}^{l+s} \left( -\lambda + y \ln \lambda - \ln y! \right) \bigg|_{\lambda = \lambda_{j,l}, z_{l',t}} \]

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l'=l-s}^{l+s} (\lambda_{j,l} \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l + \bar{z}_{j,l} \ln(\lambda_{j,l}) + \bar{z}_{j,l} \ln(\bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l) - \ln(\bar{z}_{j,l})) \]

having derivatives:

\[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_{j,l}} = - \sum_{l'=l-s}^{l+s} \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l + \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,l}} \sum_{l'=l-s}^{l+s} \bar{z}_{j,l} = (2s + 1) \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,l}} \langle \bar{z}_{j,l} \rangle - \langle \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l \rangle, \]

where \( \langle x_l \rangle_s := \sum_{l'=l-s}^{l+s} x_l \) is the moving average. By equating this derivatives to zero, one obtains expressions for \( \lambda_{j,l} \):

\[ \lambda_{j,l} = \langle \bar{z}_{j,l} \rangle_s / \langle \bar{z}_{l,t} \tau_l \rangle_s. \]

By following an analogous derivation to the one of Eq. (23), one obtains the estimate for variance:

\[ \text{var}(\lambda_{j,l}) = \frac{\lambda_{j,l}^2}{(2s + 1) \langle \bar{z}_{j,l} \rangle_s}. \]
Maximum Likelihood estimator for exponentially decaying reaction rates

Consider the following ansatz for the parameters of process (19):

$$\lambda_j(t) = \lambda_{j,0}e^{-\alpha_j t}. \quad (26)$$

By plugging $y = \tilde{z}_{j,l}$ and $\lambda = \lambda_{j,0}e^{-\alpha_j t}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l$ into the log-likelihood function, we obtain:

$$f(\alpha_{1,0}, \ldots, \alpha_n, 0, \alpha_{1,1}, \ldots, \alpha_n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{L} (-\lambda + y \ln \lambda - \ln y!) =$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{L} (-\lambda_{j,0}e^{-\alpha_j t}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l + \tilde{z}_{j,l} \ln \lambda_{j,0} - \tilde{z}_{j,l} \alpha_j t_l - \ln \tilde{z}_{j,l}!). \quad (27)$$

By equating to zero the partial derivatives with respect to $\lambda_{j,0}$, we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_{j,0}} = -\sum_{l=1}^{L} e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l + \frac{1}{\lambda_{j,0}} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \tilde{z}_{j,l} = 0,$$

and consequently:

$$\lambda_{j,0} = \frac{\langle \tilde{z}_{j,l} \rangle}{\langle e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l \rangle}. \quad (28)$$

In a similar fashion, we compute the derivatives with respect to $\alpha_j$ and equate them to zero:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_j} = \lambda_{j,0} \sum_{l=1}^{L} t_l e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l - \sum_{l=1}^{L} \tilde{z}_{j,l} t_l = \lambda_{j,0} L(t_l e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l) - L(\tilde{z}_{j,l} t_l) = 0. \quad (29)$$

Plugging Eq. (28) in to the latter equality gives:

$$\frac{\langle \tilde{z}_{j,l} \rangle}{\langle e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l \rangle} (t_l e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l) - \langle \tilde{z}_{j,l} t_l \rangle = 0.$$

and since $\langle e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l \rangle > 0$ one can multiply by this quantity on both sides to obtain:

$$\langle (t_l - \langle \tilde{z}_{j,l} t_l \rangle) \tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l \omega_j \rangle = 0, \quad \omega_j \in [0, 1], \quad \alpha_j = -\ln \omega_j. \quad (30)$$

If each of these transcendental equations have a unique real root $\omega_j \in [0, 1]$, then the MLE (26) has a minimum at $\alpha_j$. Equation (29) can be solved numerically by, for example, the bisection method. As a special case, when $t_l = hl$, $l = 1, 2, \ldots, L$ are equispaced, Eqs. (29) become polynomial equations. For each $j$: $\alpha_j = -\frac{1}{h} \ln y$ where

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} a_l y^l = 1 \quad (30)$$

and $a_l = (l(\tilde{z}_{j,l}) - \langle \tilde{z}_{j,l} t_l \rangle) \tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j}$. The roots of this polynomial equation can be solved numerically by it to the eigenvalue problem of the corresponding companion matrix.

Analogously to Eq. (22), the variances of $\lambda_{j,0}$ and $\alpha_j$ can be computed form the Hessian matrices of the corresponding log-likelihood functions. These matrices are not diagonal, however, at $t = 0$ we have $\lambda_{j,0} e^{-\alpha_j t} = \lambda_{j,0}$ and therefore:

$$\text{var}(\lambda_j) = \text{var}(\lambda_{j,0}) = \frac{\lambda_{j,0}^2}{L(\tilde{z}_{j,l})},$$

In similar fashion, when $t \gg 1$, $\lambda_{j,0} e^{-\alpha_j t} = e^{\frac{1}{h} \ln \lambda_{j,0} - \alpha_j t} \approx e^{-\alpha_j t}$ and

$$\text{var}(\alpha_j) = \frac{1}{L \lambda_{j,0} (t_l e^{-\alpha_j t_l}\tilde{x}_l^{\nu_j} \tau_l)}. \quad (31)$$
Maximum Likelihood estimator for exp-polynomial reaction rates

In this estimator we assume the ansatz:

\[ \lambda_j(t) = e^{-p_j(t)}, \]

where

\[ p_j(t) = \alpha_{j,0} + \alpha_{j,1} t + \alpha_{j,2} t^2 + \cdots + \alpha_{j,s} t^S. \]

By plugging \( y = \tilde{z}_{j,t} \) and \( \lambda = \lambda_j(t) \tilde{x}_{i}^{\nu_i} \tau_l = e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_{i}^{\nu_i} \tau_l \) into the log-likelihood function, we obtain

\[
f(\alpha_{1,0}, \ldots, \alpha_{n,s}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{L} (-\lambda + y \ln \lambda - \ln y!) = L(-e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i} \tau_l - \tilde{z}_{j,t} p_j(t_l) + \tilde{z}_{j,t} \ln(\tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i}) + \tilde{z}_{j,t} \ln(\tau_l + \ln(\tilde{z}_{j,t}))).
\]

Which has derivatives \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha_{j,s}} = L(e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i} \tau_l - \tilde{z}_{j,t} t_l) \). We obtain \( nS \) equations that define \( \alpha_{j,s} \) by equating these derivatives to zero:

\[
\langle (e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i} \tau_l - \tilde{z}_{j,t}) t_l^s \rangle = 0.
\]

As in the preceding case, the variance analysis is performed by computing the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood function:

\[
\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \alpha_{j,s_1} \partial \alpha_{j,s_2}} = \begin{cases} -L(e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i} \tau_l t_{l_1}^{s_1} t_{l_2}^{s_2}) & \text{if } j_1 = j_2, \\ 0 & \text{if } j_1 \neq j_2, \end{cases}
\]

so that \( \text{var}(\alpha_{j,1}, \alpha_{j,2}, \ldots, \alpha_{j,s}) = \frac{1}{L} \hat{H}^{-1} \) where

\[
H_{k,s} = (e^{-p_j(t)} \tilde{x}_i^{\nu_i} \tau_l t_{l_1}^{k} t_{l_2}^{s}).
\]

Moreover, this covariance matrix translates into the total variance of the rate parameter logarithm in the following way:

\[
\text{var}(\ln \lambda_j(t)) = \text{var} \left( \sum_{s=0}^{S} \alpha_{j,s} t^s \right) = \frac{1}{L} b^\top \hat{H}^{-1} b,
\]

where \( b = (1, t, t^2, \ldots, t^S)^\top \).

Inference of the Kinetic Rates for HDDA Polymerisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T [K]</th>
<th>Propagation, ( k_1 ) [\text{mm}^2 \text{mm}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}]</th>
<th>Termination, ( k_2 ) [\text{mm}^2 \text{mm}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.55 ± 0.2802</td>
<td>1.28210^6 ± 4.48810^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>792.3 ± 15.04</td>
<td>7.86510^6 ± 2.38710^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>17733.0 ± 268.7</td>
<td>2.11310^7 ± 5.49210^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>97422.0 ± 1385.0</td>
<td>2.49410^7 ± 5.96410^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>4.27610^7 ± 5301.0</td>
<td>3.10610^7 ± 6.89810^6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>1.68210^6 ± 23599.0</td>
<td>8.0310^7 ± 1.8910^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>3.64410^6 ± 43900.0</td>
<td>6.25810^7 ± 1.33610^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>1.03110^7 ± 1.39110^5</td>
<td>1.23710^8 ± 2.87110^7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.64110^7 ± 1.94410^5</td>
<td>1.51510^8 ± 3.57710^7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: Inferred reaction rate parameters for HDDA polymerisation as given by the constant MLE

The simplest way to infer the rate parameters from the MD data is to apply the constant MLE, Eq. (21). The rate parameters inferred in this way from the HDDA microsystem, as shown in Table I, feature tight confidence intervals. Can we however claim then that the constant MLE is a good choice? Let us consider the most general MLE \( \lambda_j(\chi) \) as given by Eq. (31) by using conversion \( \chi(t) = 1 - \frac{c(t)}{c(0)} \) as the time variable. Note that setting the polynomial order \( S = 0 \) reduces this MLE to the previous case. In Fig. 6, we explore how different orders
FIG. 6: Conversion-dependent rate pre-factors as estimated with MLEs of various order (the red line and the 2σ confidence confidence margins). The apparent time-series pre-factor is given for a reference (the black line). The optimal balance between small residual and high certainty corresponds to order 4.

\[ S = 0, \ldots, 6 \]

influence the inferred profiles of the rate pre-factor \( A(\chi) \) and the corresponding to them confidence intervals. To quantify the quality of the exp-polynomial estimator we calculate the residual:

\[ r = \int_0^{1} |\ln \lambda_j(\chi) - \ln \lambda_j(t)|d\chi, \]

where \( \lambda_j^*(t) \) is given by time-series estimator \( \lambda_j(t) \). Generally speaking, the higher order of the polynomial the smaller are the values of \( r \). Yet, this is not the case for the variance of \( r \), which has a tendency to increase with the polynomial order (the trend that can be also seen in Fig. 6). Employing the fact that,

\[ \text{var}(r) = \int_0^{1} \text{var}(\ln \lambda_j(\chi))d\chi^2, \]

we find the upper bound of the confidence interval to be \( c = r + 2\sqrt{\text{var}(r)} \). The optimal polynomial order is then defined as the order that yields the smallest value of \( c \). The left panel in Figure 7 shows that the residual indeed tends to decrease with increasing polynomial order, whereas the right panel shows that there is an optimal saddle point, \( S = 4 \), at which the confidence interval is the smallest in the most of the MD trajectories. One can also see from Fig. 7 (left) that the accuracy increases around 5-10 fold when we use the 4th order estimator as opposed to constant one (i.e. the 0th order). Similar analysis for the termination reaction reveals the optimal order \( S = 3 \), see Fig. 8. We therefore report the inferred rate coefficients using the 4th polynomial for the propagation:

\[ k_1(\chi, T) = A_1(t)e^{-\frac{E_{a,1}}{RT}} = Ce^{-(\alpha_1,1\chi^4 + \alpha_1,2\chi^3 + \alpha_1,3\chi^2 + \alpha_1,4\chi + 1,0)}e^{-\frac{E_{a,1}}{RT}}, \tag{33} \]

and the 3rd order polynomial for the termination reaction:

\[ k_2(\chi, T) = A_2(t)e^{-\frac{E_{a,2}}{RT}} = Ce^{-(\alpha_2,1\chi^3 + \alpha_2,2\chi^2 + \alpha_2,3\chi + 1,0)}e^{-\frac{E_{a,2}}{RT}}, \tag{34} \]

where the activation energy is \( E_{a,1} = 3.102 \cdot 10^4 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \) for propagation and \( E_{a,2} = 8.673 \cdot 10^3 \text{ J mol}^{-1} \) for termination reactions, the scaling constant \( C = VN_a = 452.93 \frac{1}{\text{mol}} \), and the polynomial coefficients are given in Table II. Note that the units of the exp-polynomial in Eq. (33) are \( \text{s}^{-1} \), so that the units of \( k_1(\chi, T) \) and \( k_2(\chi, T) \) are \( \frac{1}{\text{mol s}} \).

Unlike in the case of the constant estimator, where we can report the confidence intervals in a concise
manner, in the cases of higher polynomial order, the total uncertainty of the MLE is given by covariances matrices that are not diagonal and depend on the temperature, see Tables III and IV Since $\Sigma_T = H^{-1}$, the covariance matrices can readily be plugged into (32) for uncertainty quantification. Note in consistence with Eqs. (34) and (54), the covariance matrices are computed using $\chi(t)$ as the time variable.

![FIG. 7: The effect of the polynomial order $S$ of the MLE for the propagation reaction. (Left:) The estimator residual $r$ as a function of $S$. (Right:) The upper bound $c$ of the residual confidence interval as a function of $S$. The upper bound is averaged over 4 simulation runs. The colour scheme is identical on both panels and indicates the simulation temperature.](image)

![FIG. 8: The effect of the polynomial order $S$ of the MLE for the termination reaction. (Left:) The estimator residual $r$ as a function of $S$. (Right:) The upper bound $c$ of the residual confidence interval as a function of $S$. The bound is averaged over 4 simulation runs. The colour scheme is identical on both panels and indicates the simulation temperature.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ [K]</th>
<th>$\alpha_{1,4}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{1,3}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{1,2}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{1,1}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{1,0}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{2,3}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{2,2}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{2,1}$</th>
<th>$\alpha_{2,0}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>78.806</td>
<td>-67.177</td>
<td>16.329</td>
<td>2.931</td>
<td>-16.479</td>
<td>163.830</td>
<td>-156.050</td>
<td>43.836</td>
<td>-16.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>38.288</td>
<td>-38.096</td>
<td>12.209</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>-17.787</td>
<td>89.115</td>
<td>-98.233</td>
<td>36.041</td>
<td>-17.526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>31.335</td>
<td>-36.106</td>
<td>12.000</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>-17.584</td>
<td>84.355</td>
<td>-103.340</td>
<td>37.832</td>
<td>-17.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>13.135</td>
<td>-11.238</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>-17.098</td>
<td>47.405</td>
<td>-66.980</td>
<td>28.765</td>
<td>-16.719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: The coefficients of the optimal order exp-polynomial MLEs
TABLE III: Covariance matrices as given by Eq. (12) for the 4th order estimator (propagation reaction at various temperatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $\Sigma_{200}$   | $450^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1.10^{-3} & -2.210^{-3} & 0.011 & -0.022 & 0.014 \\
-2.210^{-3} & 0.36 & -2.3 & 4.8 & -3.3 \\
0.011 & -2.3 & 15.0 & -32.0 & 22.0 \\
-0.022 & 4.8 & -32.0 & 70.0 & -49.0 \\
0.014 & -3.3 & 22.0 & -49.0 & 35.0 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| $\Sigma_{250}$   | $550^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
3.310^{-3} & -7.010^{-3} & 3.710^{-3} & -7.310^{-3} & 4.710^{-3} \\
-7.010^{-3} & 0.062 & -0.42 & 3.0 & -6.8 & 4.8 \\
3.710^{-3} & -0.42 & 0.9 & -6.8 & 16.0 & -12.0 \\
-7.310^{-3} & 0.033 & -0.17 & 0.29 & -0.16 & 0.95 \\
4.710^{-3} & -0.61 & 4.8 & -12.0 & 8.5 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{300}$   | $650^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
4.110^{-3} & -8.410^{-3} & 4.110^{-3} & -7.410^{-3} & 4.510^{-3} \\
-8.410^{-3} & 0.087 & -0.55 & 1.1 & -0.75 \\
4.110^{-3} & -0.55 & 3.7 & -8.0 & 5.6 \\
-7.410^{-3} & 1.1 & -8.0 & 18.0 & -13.0 \\
4.510^{-3} & -0.75 & 5.6 & -13.0 & 9.4 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\] |
| $\Sigma_{350}$   | $750^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
6.710^{-5} & -1.010^{-3} & 4.410^{-3} & -7.010^{-3} & 3.810^{-3} \\
-1.010^{-3} & 0.303 & -0.17 & 0.29 & -0.16 & 0.95 \\
4.410^{-3} & -0.17 & 0.92 & -1.7 & 0.95 \\
-7.010^{-3} & 0.29 & -1.7 & 3.1 & -1.8 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{400}$   | $850^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
2.010^{-5} & -4.010^{-4} & 1.810^{-3} & -2.810^{-3} & 1.510^{-3} \\
-4.010^{-4} & 0.038 & -0.2 & 0.33 & -0.18 \\
1.810^{-3} & -0.2 & 1.1 & -1.9 & 1.1 \\
-2.810^{-3} & 0.33 & -1.9 & 3.5 & -2.0 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{450}$   | $950^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1.10^{-4} & -1.710^{-3} & 7.510^{-3} & -0.013 & 7.010^{-3} \\
-1.710^{-3} & 0.038 & -0.19 & 0.34 & -0.18 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{500}$   | $1050^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
2.810^{-5} & -5.110^{-4} & 2.010^{-3} & -2.910^{-3} & 1.410^{-3} \\
-5.110^{-4} & 0.028 & -0.13 & 0.64 & -1.0 & 0.53 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{550}$   | $1150^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
7.710^{-5} & -1.110^{-3} & 4.410^{-3} & -6.410^{-3} & 3.110^{-3} \\
-1.110^{-3} & 0.033 & -0.15 & 0.23 & -0.12 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{600}$   | $1250^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
4.310^{-5} & -6.710^{-4} & 2.610^{-3} & -3.610^{-3} & 1.710^{-3} \\
-6.710^{-4} & 0.022 & -0.099 & 0.15 & -0.073 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{650}$   | $1350^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
2.610^{-3} & -0.099 & 0.47 & -0.74 & 0.37 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{700}$   | $1450^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
-3.610^{-3} & 0.15 & -0.74 & 1.2 & -0.62 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{750}$   | $1550^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
1.710^{-3} & -0.073 & 0.37 & -0.62 & 0.33 |
\] |

TABLE IV: Covariance matrices as given by Eq. (12) for the 3rd order estimator (termination reaction at various temperatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Covariance Matrix</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $\Sigma_{200}$   | $450^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
7.710^{-3} & -9.210^{-4} & 2.710^{-3} & -2.310^{-3} \\
-9.210^{-4} & 0.04 & -0.15 & 0.15 \\
2.710^{-3} & -0.15 & 0.61 & -0.61 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{250}$   | $550^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
3.710^{-3} & -4.910^{-3} & 1.410^{-3} & -1.210^{-3} \\
-4.910^{-3} & 0.016 & -0.055 & 0.049 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{300}$   | $650^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
4.410^{-5} & -5.710^{-4} & 1.610^{-3} & -1.310^{-3} \\
-5.710^{-4} & 0.022 & -0.077 & 0.07 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{350}$   | $750^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
4.910^{-5} & -4.710^{-4} & 1.210^{-3} & -8.210^{-4} |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{400}$   | $850^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
2.110^{-5} & -2.510^{-4} & 6.410^{-4} & -4.710^{-4} \\
-2.510^{-4} & 8.610^{-3} & -0.027 & 0.021 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{450}$   | $950^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
6.810^{-5} & -6.610^{-4} & 1.710^{-3} & -1.210^{-3} \\
-6.610^{-4} & 9.10^{-3} & -0.028 & 0.022 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{500}$   | $1050^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
2.810^{-5} & -2.810^{-4} & 6.410^{-4} & -4.010^{-4} \\
-2.810^{-4} & 6.710^{-3} & -0.018 & 0.012 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{550}$   | $1150^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
5.510^{-5} & -5.110^{-4} & 1.210^{-3} & -7.410^{-4} \\
-5.110^{-4} & 0.01 & -0.027 & 0.019 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{600}$   | $1250^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
3.710^{-5} & -3.310^{-4} & 7.010^{-4} & -4.310^{-4} \\
-3.310^{-4} & 5.710^{-3} & -0.014 & 9.310^{-3} |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{650}$   | $1350^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
7.010^{-4} & -0.014 & 0.038 & -0.026 |
\] |
| $\Sigma_{700}$   | $1450^\circ$ | \[
\begin{bmatrix}
-4.310^{-4} & 9.310^{-3} & -0.026 & 0.018 |
\] |