Stochastic Yield Catastrophes and Robustness in Self-Assembly
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A guiding principle in self-assembly is that, for high production yield, nucleation of structures must be significantly slower than their growth. However, details of the mechanism that impedes nucleation are broadly considered irrelevant. Here, we analyze self-assembly into finite-sized target structures employing mathematical modeling. We investigate two key scenarios to delay nucleation: (i) by introducing a slow activation step for the assembling constituents and, (ii) by decreasing the dimerization rate. These scenarios have widely different characteristics. While the dimerization scenario exhibits robust behavior, the activation scenario is highly sensitive to demographic fluctuations. These demographic fluctuations ultimately disfavor growth compared to nucleation and can suppress yield completely. The occurrence of this stochastic yield catastrophe does not depend on model details but is generic as soon as number fluctuations between constituents are taken into account. On a broader perspective, our results reveal that stochasticity is an important limiting factor for self-assembly and that the specific implementation of the nucleation process plays a significant role in determining the yield.

Efficient and accurate assembly of macromolecular structures is vital for living organisms. Not only must resource use be carefully controlled, but malfunctioning aggregates can also pose a substantial threat to the organism itself. Furthermore, artificial self-assembly processes have important applications in a variety of research areas like nanotechnology, biology, and medicine. In these areas, we find a broad range of assembly schemes. While viral capsids are generally assembled from identical substructures, DNA-brick-based assembly is used to artificially construct almost any desired configuration starting from large numbers of different constituents.
Notwithstanding these differences, a generic self-assembly process always includes three key steps: First, subunits must be made available, e.g. by gene expression, or rendered competent for binding, e.g. by nucleotide exchange\textsuperscript{13,14} (‘activation’). Second, the formation of a structure must be initiated by a nucleation event (‘nucleation’). Due to cooperative or allosteric effects in binding, there might be a significant nucleation barrier\textsuperscript{15–19}. Third, following nucleation, structures grow via aggregation of substructures (‘growth’). To avoid kinetic traps that may occur due to irreversibility or very slow disassembly of substructures\textsuperscript{20,21}, structure nucleation must be significantly slower than growth\textsuperscript{6,9,10,22–24}. In this manuscript we investigate, for a given target structure, whether the nature of the specific mechanism employed in order to slow down nucleation influences the yield of assembled product. To address this question, we examine a generic model that incorporates the key elements of self-assembly outlined above.

1 Model definition.

We consider a set of \( S \) different species of constituents denoted by \( 1, \ldots, S \) which assemble into rings of size \( L \). The cases \( S = 1 \) and \( 1 < S \leq L \) (\( S = L \)) are denoted as homogeneous and partially (fully) heterogeneous, respectively. The homogeneous model builds on previous work on virus capsid and linear protein filament assembly\textsuperscript{15,20,25–27}. The heterogeneous model in turn links to previous model systems used to study, for example, DNA-brick-based assembly of heterogeneous structures\textsuperscript{28–30}. We emphasize that, even though strikingly similar experimental realizations of our model exist\textsuperscript{11,12,31}, it is not intended to describe any particular system. The ring structure represents a general linear assembly process involving building blocks with equivalent
Figure 1: Schematic description of the model. (a) Rings of size $L$ are assembled from $S$ different particle species. $N$ monomers of each species are initially in an inactive state and are activated at the same per-capita rate $\alpha$. Once active, species with periodically consecutive index can bind to each other. Structures grow by attachment of single monomers. Below a critical nucleation size ($L_{\text{nuc}}$), structures of size $l$ grow and decay into monomers at size-dependent rates $\mu_l$ and $\delta_l$, respectively. Above the critical size, polymers are stable and grow at size-independent rate $\nu$ until the ring is complete (the absorbing state). (b) Illustration of depletion traps. If nucleation is slow compared to growth, initiated structures are likely to be completed. Otherwise, many stable nuclei will form that cannot be completed before resources run out.
binding properties and resulting in a target of finite size. In order to test the robustness of our findings, we furthermore perform stochastic simulations of systems with non-linear assembly paths and no translational symmetry (see Figs. 5 and 6).

The assembly process starts with \(N\) inactive monomers of each species. We use \(C = N/V\) to denote the initial concentration of each monomer species, where \(V\) is the reaction volume. Monomers are activated independently at the same per capita rate \(\alpha\), and, once active, are available for binding. Binding takes place between constituents of species with periodically consecutive indices, for example 1 and 2 or \(S\) and 1 (Fig. 1). To avoid ambiguity, we restrict ring sizes to integer multiples of the number of species \(S\). Polymers, i.e., incomplete ring structures, grow via consecutive attachment of monomers. For simplicity, polymer-polymer binding is disregarded at first, as it is typically assumed to be of minor importance \(^6\)\(^,\)\(^15\)\(^,\)\(^28\)\(^,\)\(^32\). To probe the robustness of the model, later we consider an extended model including polymer-polymer binding for which the results are qualitatively the same (see Fig. 5 and the discussion). Furthermore, it has been observed that nucleation phenomena play a critical role for self-assembly processes \(^9\)\(^,\)\(^10\)\(^,\)\(^15\)\(^,\)\(^22\). So it is in general necessary to take into account a critical nucleation size, which marks the transition between slow particle nucleation and the faster subsequent structure growth \(^18\)\(^,\)\(^25\)\(^,\)\(^28\)\(^,\)\(^33\). We denote this critical nucleation size by \(L_{\text{nuc}}\), which in terms of classical nucleation theory corresponds to the structure size at which the free energy barrier has its maximum. For \(l < L_{\text{nuc}}\) attachment of monomers to existing structures and decay of structures into monomers take place at size-dependent reaction rates \(\mu_l\) and \(\delta_l\), respectively (Fig. 1). Here, we focus on identical rates \(\mu_l = \mu\) and \(\delta_l = \delta\). A discussion of the general case is given in the Supplemental Material \(^34\). Above the nucleation size,
polymers grow by attachment of monomers with reaction rate $\nu \geq \mu$ per binding site. As we consider successfully nucleated structures to be stable on the observational time scales, monomer detachment from structures above the critical nucleation size is neglected\textsuperscript{15,28}. Complete rings neither grow nor decay (absorbing state).

We investigate two scenarios for the control of nucleation speed, first separately and then in combination. For the ‘activation scenario’ we set $\mu = \nu$ (all binding rates are equal) and control the assembly process by varying the activation rate $\alpha$. For the ‘dimerization scenario’ all particles are inherently active ($\alpha \rightarrow \infty$) and we control the assembly process by varying the dimerization rate $\mu$ (we focus on $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$). We quantify the quality of the assembly process in terms of the assembly yield, defined as the number of successfully assembled ring structures relative to the maximal possible number $NS/L$. Yield is measured when all resources have been used up and the system has reached its final state. We simulated our system both stochastically via Gillespie’s algorithm\textsuperscript{35} and deterministically as a set of ordinary differential equations corresponding to chemical rate equations (see Supplemental Material\textsuperscript{34}).

2 Results

**Deterministic behavior in the macroscopic limit.** First, we consider the macroscopic limit, $N \gg 1$, and investigate how assembly yield depends on the activation rate $\alpha$ (activation scenario) and the dimerization rate $\mu$ (dimerization scenario) for $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. Here, the deterministic description coincides with the stochastic simulations (Fig. 2(a) and (b)). For both high activation and high
Figure 2: Deterministic behavior in the macroscopic limit $N \gg 1$. (a, b) Yield for different particle numbers $N$ (symbols) and ring sizes $L$ (colors) for $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. Decreasing either (a) the activation rate (‘activation scenario’: $\mu = \nu$) or (b) the dimerization rate (‘dimerization scenario’: $\alpha \to \infty$) achieves perfect yield. The stochastic simulation results (symbols) agree exactly with the integration of the chemical rate equations (lines). The threshold values (Eq. 1) are indicated by the vertical dashed lines. Plotting yield against the dimensionless quantity $\alpha/(\nu C)$ causes the curves for different $C$ to collapse into a single master curve (inset in a). For both scenarios there is no dependency on the number of species $S$ in the deterministic limit. (c, d) Illustration showing how depletion traps are avoided by either slow activation (c) or slow dimerization (d). If the activation or the dimerization rate is small (large) compared to the growth rate, assembly paths leading to complete rings are favored (disfavored). (e) Deterministically, the size distribution of polymers behaves like a wave, and is shown for large and small activation rate for $L = 60$, $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$, $N = 10000$ and $\mu = \nu = 1$. The distributions are plotted for early, intermediate and final simulation times. The respective percentage of inactive monomers and complete rings is indicated by the symbols in the scale bar on the left or right.
dimerization rates, yield is very poor. Upon decreasing either the activation rate (Fig. 2(a)) or the dimerization rate (Fig. 2(b)), however, we find a threshold value, $\alpha_{th}$ or $\mu_{th}$, below which a rapid transition to the perfect yield of 1 is observed both in the deterministic and stochastic simulation. By exploiting the symmetries of the system with respect to relabeling of species, one can show that, in the deterministic limit, the behavior is independent of the number of species $S$ (for fixed $L$ and $N$, see Supplemental Material 34). Consequently, all systems behave equivalently to the homogeneous system and yield becomes independent of $S$ in this limit. Note, however, that equivalent systems with differing $S$ have different total numbers of particles $SN$ and hence assemble different total numbers of rings.

Decreasing the activation rate reduces the concentration of active monomers in the system. Hence growth of the polymers is favored over nucleation, because growth depends linearly on the concentration of active monomers while nucleation shows a quadratic dependence. Likewise, lower dimerization rates slow down nucleation relative to growth. Both mechanisms therefore restrict the number of nucleation events, and ensure that initiated structures can be completed before resources become depleted (see Fig. 2(c) and (d)).

Mathematically, the deterministic time evolution of the polymer size distribution $c(l, t)$ is described by an advection-diffusion equation 36, 37 with advection and diffusion coefficients depending on the instantaneous concentration of active monomers (see Supplemental Material 43). Solving this equation results in the wavefront of the size distribution advancing from small to large polymer sizes (Fig. 2(e)). Yield production sets in as soon as the distance travelled by this wave-
front reaches the maximal ring size $L$. Exploiting this condition, we find that in the deterministic system for $L_{\text{mic}} = 2$, a non-zero yield is obtained if either the activation rate or the dimerization rate remains below a corresponding threshold value, i.e. if $\alpha < \alpha_{\text{th}}$ or $\mu < \mu_{\text{th}}$, where

$$
\alpha_{\text{th}} = P_{\alpha} \frac{\nu}{\mu} \frac{\nu C}{(L - \sqrt{L})^3} \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\text{th}} = P_{\mu} \frac{\nu}{(L - \sqrt{L})^2}
$$

(see Supplemental Material [34]) with proportionality constants $P_{\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(2/3)}{\Gamma(7/6)}^{3/3} \approx 5.77$ and $P_{\mu} = \frac{\pi^2}{2} \approx 4.93$. These relations generalize previous results [33] to finite activation rates, and highlight important differences between the two scenarios (where $\alpha \to \infty$ and $\mu = \nu$, respectively): While $\alpha_{\text{th}}$ decreases cubically with the ring size $L$, $\mu_{\text{th}}$ does so only quadratically. Furthermore, the threshold activation rate $\alpha_{\text{th}}$ increases with the initial monomer concentration $C$ (Fig. 2(a)). Consequently, for fixed activation rate, the yield can be optimized by increasing $C$. In contrast, the threshold dimerization rate is independent of $C$ and the yield curves coincide for $N \gg 1$. Finally, if $\alpha$ is finite and $\mu < \nu$, the interplay between the two slow-nucleation scenarios may lead to enhanced yield. This is reflected by the factor $\nu/\mu$ in $\alpha_{\text{th}}$, and we will come back to this point later when we discuss the stochastic effects.

In summary, for large particle numbers ($N \gg 1$), perfect yield can be achieved in two different ways, independently of the heterogeneity of the system - by decreasing either the activation rate (activation scenario) or the dimerization rate (dimerization scenario) below its respective threshold value.

**Stochastic effects in the case of reduced resources.** Next, we consider the limit where the particle number becomes relevant for the physics of the system. In the activation scenario, we find a
Figure 3: Stochastic effects in the case of reduced resources. (a, b) Yield of the fully heterogeneous system ($S = L$) for reduced number of particles (symbols) for $L = 60$ and $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. In the activation scenario, at low activation rates the yield saturates at an imperfect value $y_{\text{max}}$, which decreases with the number of particles (a). This finding disagrees with the deterministic prediction of perfect yield for $\alpha \to 0$. In contrast, the dimerization scenario robustly exhibits the maximal yield of 1 for small $N$ (b). (c) Dependence of maximal yield in the activation scenario on the number of species $S$ for $L = 60$. Symbols indicate different values of the critical nucleation size $L_{\text{nuc}}$. The total number of particles is held constant at $SN = 60000$. The impact of stochastic effects strongly depends on the number of species. The homogeneous system is not subject to stochastic effects at all. Higher reversibility for larger $L_{\text{nuc}}$ also mitigates stochastic effects. (d) Polymer size distribution for the activation scenario (symbols) in comparison with its deterministic prediction (lines) for $S = L = 100$, $N = 1000$ and $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. Due to the enhanced number of nucleation events, the stochastic wave encompasses far more structures and moves more slowly. As a result, it does not quite reach the absorbing boundary.
markedly different phenomenology if resources are sparse. Figure 3(a) shows the dependence of the yield on the activation rate for different, low particle numbers in the completely heterogeneous case ($S = L$). Whereas the deterministic theory predicts perfect yield for small activation rates, in the stochastic simulation yield saturates at an imperfect value $y_{\text{max}} < 1$. Reducing the particle number $N$ decreases this saturation value $y_{\text{max}}$ until no finished structures can be produced, an effect we term ‘stochastic yield catastrophe’. Moreover, $y_{\text{max}}$ increases with decreasing number of species $S$ (Fig. 3(c)). For the fully homogeneous case, $S = 1$, a perfect yield of 1 is always achieved for $\alpha \to 0$. Finally, increasing the nucleation size $L_{\text{nuc}}$, and with it the reversibility of binding, also increases $y_{\text{max}}$. This indicates that both heterogeneity of the target structure and irreversibility of binding make the system more susceptible to stochastic effects. The stochastic yield catastrophe is mainly attributable to fluctuations in the number of active monomers. In the deterministic (mean-field) equation the different particle species evolve in balanced stoichiometric concentrations. However, if activation is much slower than binding, the number of active monomers present at any given time is small, and the mean-field assumption of equal concentrations is violated due to fluctuations ($S > 1$). Activated monomers then might not fit any of the existing larger structures and would instead initiate new structures. Due to the effective enhancement of nucleation rate the resulting polymer size distribution has a higher amplitude than that predicted deterministically (Fig. 3(d)) and the system is prone to depletion traps. A similar broadening of the size distribution has been reported in the context of stochastic coagulation-fragmentation of identical particles\textsuperscript{38}.

In the dimerization scenario, in contrast, there is no stochastic activation step. All particles
are available for binding from the outset. Consequently, stochastic effects do not play an essential role in the dimerization scenario and perfect yield can be reached robustly for all system sizes, regardless of the number of species $S$ (Fig. 3(b)).

**Non-monotonic yield curves for a combination of slow dimerization and activation.** So far, the two implementations of the ‘slow nucleation principle’ have been investigated separately. Surprisingly, we observe counter-intuitive behavior in a mixed scenario in which both dimerization and activation occur slowly (i.e., $\mu < \nu, \alpha < \infty$). Figure 4 shows that, depending on the ratio $\mu/\nu$, the yield can become a non-monotonic function of $\alpha$. In the regime where $\alpha$ is large, nucleation is dimerization-limited; therefore activation is irrelevant and the system behaves as in the dimerization scenario for $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$. Upon decreasing $\alpha$ we then encounter a second regime, where activation and dimerization jointly limit nucleation. The yield increases due to synergism between slow dimerization and activation (see $\mu/\nu$ dependence of $\alpha_{\text{th}}$, Eq. 1), whilst the average number of active monomers is still high and fluctuations are negligible. Finally, a stochastic yield catastrophe occurs if $\alpha$ is further reduced and activation becomes the limiting step. This decline is caused by an increase in nucleation events due to relative fluctuations in the availability of the different species (“fluctuations between species”). This contrasts the deterministic description where nucleation is always slower for smaller activation rate. Depending on the ratio $\mu/\nu$, the ring size $L$ and the particle number $N$, maximal yield is obtained either in the dimerization-limited (red curves, Fig. 4), activation-limited (blue curve, Fig. 4(b)) or intermediate regime (green and orange curves).
Figure 4: Yield for a combination of slow dimerization and activation. (a, b) Dependence of the yield of the fully heterogeneous system on the activation rate $\alpha$ for $N = 100$ and different values of the dimerization rate (colors/symbols) for $L = 60$ (a) and $L = 40$ (b). For large activation rates yield behaves deterministically (lines). In contrast, for small activation rates stochastic effects (blue shading) lead to a decrease in yield. Depending on the parameters, the yield maximum is attained in either the deterministic, stochastic or intermediate regime. (c) Table summarizing the qualitative behavior of the yield (poor/intermediate/perfect) for a combination of dimerization and activation rates for both the deterministic and the stochastic limit. The columns correspond to low and high values of the dimerization rate, as indicated by the marker in the corresponding deterministic yield curve at the top of the column. Similarly, the rows correspond to low, intermediate and high activation rates. Arrows and colors indicate where and for which curve this behavior can be observed in (a) and (b). Deviations between the deterministic and stochastic limits are most prominent for low activation rates.
Figure 5: Extended model including polymer-polymer binding. (a) In the extended model, structures not only grow by monomer attachment but also by binding with another polymer (colored arrow). As before, binding happens between periodically consecutive species with rate $\nu$ per binding site. The reaction rate for two polymers is identical to the one for monomer-polymer binding, $\nu$. Furthermore, only polymers with combined length $\leq L$ can bind. All other processes and rules are the same as in the original model described in Fig. 1. (b) Dependence of the yield of the extended model on the activation rate $\alpha$ for $S = L = 100$, $\mu = \nu = 1$, $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$ and different values of the number of particles per species, $N$. The qualitative behavior is the same as for the original model, in particular yield saturates (in the stochastic limit) at an imperfect value for slow activation rates. Note that polymer-polymer binding results in an increase of the minimal yield for small particle numbers.
Robustness of the results to model modifications. In our model, the reason for the stochastic yield catastrophe is that due to fluctuations between species - the effective nucleation rate is strongly enhanced. As a result, there is an excess of structures that ultimately cannot be completed. This is due to the fact that larger structures can not combine. Thus, a natural question to ask is whether relaxing the constraint that polymers cannot bind other polymers will resolve the stochastic yield catastrophe. To answer this question, we performed stochastic simulations for an extended model showing that the stochastic yield catastrophe indeed persists. In this extended model, polymer-polymer binding is taken into account in addition to growth via monomer attachment (Fig. 5). In detail, we assume that two structures of arbitrary size (and with combined length \( \leq L \)) bind at rate \( \nu \) if they fit together, i.e. if the left (right) end of the first structure is periodically continued by the right (left) end of the second one. Realistically, the rate of binding between two structures is expected to decrease with the motility and thus the sizes of the structures. In order to assess the effect of polymer-polymer binding, we focus on the worst case where the rate for binding is independent of the size of both structures. If a stochastic yield catastrophe occurs for this choice of parameters, we expect it to be even more pronounced in all the “intermediate cases”.

Fig. 5 shows the dependence of the yield on the activation rate in the polymer-polymer model. As before, yield increases below a critical activation rate and then saturates at an imperfect value for small activation rates. Decreasing the number of particles per species, decreases this saturation value. Compared to the original model, the stochastic yield catastrophe is mitigated but still significant: For structures of size \( S = L = 100 \), yield saturates at around 0.87 for \( N = 100 \) particles per species and at around 0.33 for \( N = 10 \) particles per species. We thus conclude that polymer-
polymer binding indeed alleviates the stochastic yield catastrophe but does not resolve it. Since binding only happens between consecutive species, structures with overlapping parts intrinsically can not bind together and depletion traps occur. Taken together, also in the extended model, fluctuations in the availability of the different species lead to an excess of intermediate-sized structures that get kinetically trapped due to structural mismatches. Note that in the extreme case of \( N = 1 \), incomplete polymers can always combine into 1 final ring structure so that in this case yield is always 1. Analogously, for high activation rates yield is improved for \( N = 10 \) compared to \( N \geq 50 \) (Fig. 5b).

Kinetic trapping due to structural mismatches can occur in every (partially) irreversible heterogeneous assembly process with finite-sized target structure and limited resources. From our results, we thus expect a stochastic yield catastrophe to be common to such systems. In order to test this hypothesis, we simulated a variant of our model where we assemble finite sized squares via monomer attachment from a pool of initially inactive particles. Figure 6 depicts the dependence of the yield on the activation rate for a square of size \( S = 100 \). Also in this case, we find that the yield saturates at an imperfect value for small activation rates. This observation supports the general validity of our findings and indicates that stochastic yield catastrophes are a general phenomenon of heterogeneous self-assembling systems that occur if particle number fluctuations are non-negligible.
Figure 6: Assembly of squares of size $\sqrt{L} \times \sqrt{L}$ from $L$ different particle species. (a) As in the ring models, there are $N$ monomers of each species in the system. All particles are initially in an inactive state and are activated at the same per-capita rate $\alpha$. Once active, species with neighboring position within the square (left/right, up/down) can bind to each other. Structures grow by attachment of single monomers until the square is complete (absorbing state). Depending on the number $b$ of contacts between the monomer and the structure, the corresponding rate is $b\nu$. For simplicity, all polymers are stable ($L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$) and we do not consider polymer-polymer binding. (b) Dependence of the yield of the square model on the activation rate $\alpha$ for $S = L = 100$, $\mu = \nu = 1$ and different values of the number of particles per species, $N$. The qualitative behavior is the same as for the previous models: Whereas the yield is poor for large activation rates, it strongly increases below a threshold value and saturates (in the stochastic limit) at an imperfect value $< 1$ for small activation rates. The saturation value decreases with decreasing number of particles in the system.
3 Conclusions

Our results show that different ways to slow down nucleation are indeed not equivalent, and that the explicit implementation is crucial for assembly efficiency. Susceptibility to stochastic effects is highly dependent on the specific scenario. Whereas systems for which dimerization limits nucleation are robust against stochastic effects, stochastic yield catastrophes can occur in heterogeneous systems when resource supply limits nucleation. The occurrence of stochastic yield catastrophes is not captured by the deterministic rate equations, for which the qualitative behavior of both scenarios is the same. Therefore, a stochastic description of the self-assembly process, which includes fluctuations in the availability of the different species, is required. The interplay between stochastic and deterministic dynamics can lead to a plethora of interesting behaviors. For example, the combination of slow activation and slow nucleation may result in a non-monotonic dependence of the yield on the activation rate. While deterministically, yield is always improved by decreasing the activation rate, stochastic fluctuations between species strongly suppress the yield for small activation rate by effectively enhancing the nucleation speed. This observation clearly demonstrates that a *deterministically* slow nucleation speed is not sufficient in order to obtain good yield in heterogeneous self-assembly. For example, a slow activation step does not necessarily result in few nucleation events although deterministically this behavior is expected. Thus, our results indicate that the slow nucleation principle has to be interpreted in terms of the stochastic framework and have important implications for yield optimization.

We showed that demographic noise can cause stochastic yield catastrophes in heterogeneous
self-assembly. However, other types of noise, such as spatiotemporal fluctuations induced by diffusion, are also expected to trigger stochastic yield catastrophes. Hence, our results have broad implications for complex biological and artificial systems, which typically exhibit various sources of noise. We characterize conditions under which stochastic yield catastrophes occur, and demonstrate how they can be mitigated. These insights could usefully inform the design of experiments to circumvent yield catastrophes: In particular, while slow provision of constituents is a feasible strategy for experiments, it is highly susceptible to stochastic effects. On the other hand, irrespective of its robustness to stochastic effects, the experimental realization of the dimerization scenario relies on cooperative or allosteric effects in binding, and may therefore require more sophisticated design of the constituents. Our theoretical analysis shows that stochasticity can be alleviated either by decreasing heterogeneity (presumably lowering realizable complexity) or by increasing reversibility (potentially requiring fine-tuning of binding affinities). Alternative approaches include the promotion of specific assembly paths and the control of fluctuations.

Moreover, these ideas are relevant for the understanding of intracellular self-assembly. In cells, provision of building blocks is typically a gradual process, as synthesis is either inherently slow or an explicit activation step, such as phosphorylation, is required. In addition, the constituents of the complex structures assembled in cells are usually present in small numbers and subject to diffusion. Hence, stochastic yield catastrophes would be expected to have devastating consequences for self-assembly, unless the relevant cellular processes use elaborate control mechanisms to circumvent stochastic effects. Further exploration of these control mechanisms should enhance the understanding of self-assembly processes in cells and help improve synthesis of complex nanos-
structures.

4 Methods

Here we show the derivation of Eq. 1 in the main text, giving the threshold values for the rate constants below which finite yield is obtained. The details can be found in the SI.

Master equation and chemical rate equations We start with the general Master equation and derive the chemical rate equations (deterministic/mean-field equations) for the heterogeneous self-assembly process. We renounce to show the full Master equation here but instead state the system that describes the evolution of the first moments. To this end, we denote the random variable that describes the number of polymers of size $\ell$ and species $s$ in the system at time $t$ by $n^s_\ell(t)$ with $2 \leq \ell < L$ and $1 \leq s \leq S$. The species of a polymer is defined by the species of the respective monomer at its left end. Furthermore, $n^s_0$ and $n^s_1$ denote the number of inactive and active monomers of species $s$, respectively, and $n_L$ the number of complete rings. We signify the reaction rate for binding of a monomer to a polymer of size $\ell$ by $\nu_\ell$. $\alpha$ denotes the activation rate and $\delta_\ell$ the decay rate of a polymer of size $\ell$. By $\langle \ldots \rangle$ we indicate (ensemble) averages. The system
governing the evolution of the first moments (the averages) of the \( \{ n^s_\ell \} \) is then given by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dt} \langle n^s_0 \rangle &= -\alpha \langle n^s_0 \rangle, \\
\frac{d}{dt} \langle n^s_1 \rangle &= \alpha \langle n^s_0 \rangle - \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-1} \nu_{\ell} \left( \langle n^s_\ell n^s_{\ell+1} \rangle + \langle n^s_{\ell+1} n^s_{\ell-1} \rangle \right) + \sum_{k=s+1-\ell}^{L_{\text{nuc}}-1} \sum_{k=s+1-\ell}^{L_{\text{nuc}}-1} \delta_{\ell} \langle n^k_{\ell} \rangle, \\
\frac{d}{dt} \langle n^s_2 \rangle &= \nu_1 \langle n^s_1 n^s_{1+1} \rangle - \nu_2 \langle n^s_2 n^s_{2+1} \rangle - \nu_2 \langle n^s_2 n^s_{1-1} \rangle - \delta_2 \langle n^s_3 \rangle 1_{\{2 < L_{\text{nuc}}\}}, \\
\frac{d}{dt} \langle n^s_\ell \rangle &= \nu_{\ell-1} \langle n^s_{\ell-1} n^s_{1} \rangle + \nu_{\ell-1} \langle n^s_{\ell-1} n^s_{1} \rangle - \nu_\ell \langle n^s_{\ell} n^s_{1+1} \rangle - \nu_\ell \langle n^s_{\ell} n^s_{1-1} \rangle - \delta \langle n^s_\ell \rangle 1_{\{\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}\}}, \\
\frac{d}{dt} \langle n^s_L \rangle &= \nu_{L-1} \langle n^s_{L-1} n^s_{1+1} \rangle + \nu_{L-1} \langle n^s_{L-1} n^s_{1} \rangle.
\end{align*}
\]

The first equation describes loss of inactive particles due to activation at rate \( \alpha \). Eq. (2b) gives the temporal change of the number of active monomers that is governed by the following processes: activation of inactive monomers at rate \( \alpha \), binding of active monomers to the left or to the right end of an existing structure of size \( \ell \) at rate \( \nu_\ell \), and decay of below-critical polymers of size \( \ell \) into monomers at rate \( \delta_\ell \) (disassembly).

Equations (2c) and (2d) describe the dynamics of dimers and larger polymers of size \( 3 \leq \ell < L \), respectively. The terms account for reactions of polymers with active monomers (polymerization) as well as decay in the case of below-critical polymers (disassembly). The indicator function \( 1_{\{x < L_{\text{nuc}}\}} \) equals 1 if the condition \( x < L_{\text{nuc}} \) is satisfied and 0 otherwise. Note that a polymer of size \( \ell \geq 3 \) can grow by attaching a monomer to its left or to its right end whereas the formation of a dimer of a specific species is only possible via one reaction pathway (dimerization reaction).

Finally, polymers of length \( L \) – the complete ring structures – form an absorbing state and, therefore, include only the respective gain terms (cf. Eq (2e)).
We simulated the Master equation underlying Eq. (2) stochastically using Gillespie’s algorithm. For the following deterministic analysis, we neglect correlations between particle numbers \( \{n_i^s\} \), which is valid assumption for large particle numbers. Then the two-point correlator can be approximated as the product of the corresponding mean values (mean-field approximation)

\[
\langle n_i^s n_j^k \rangle = \langle n_i^s \rangle \langle n_j^k \rangle \forall s, k
\]  

(3)

Furthermore, for the expectation values it must hold

\[
\langle n_i^s \rangle = \langle n_1^s \rangle \forall s
\]  

(4)

because all species have equivalent properties (there is no distinct species) and hence the system is invariant under relabelling of the upper index. By

\[
c_\ell := \frac{\langle n_\ell^s \rangle}{V},
\]  

(5)

we denote the concentration of any monomer or polymer species of size \( \ell \), where \( V \) is the reaction volume. Due to the symmetry formulated in Eq. (4), the heterogeneous assembly process decouples into a set of \( S \) identical and independent homogeneous assembly processes in the deterministic limit. The corresponding homogeneous system then is described by the following set of equations

\[
\]
that is obtained by applying (3), (4) and (5) to (2)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d}{dt} c_0 &= -\alpha c_0, \\
\frac{d}{dt} c_1 &= \alpha c_0 - 2c_1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-1} \nu_\ell c_\ell + \sum_{\ell=2}^{L_{\text{nuc}}-1} \ell \delta_\ell c_\ell, \\
\frac{d}{dt} c_2 &= \nu_1 c_1^2 - 2\nu_2 c_1 c_2 - \delta_2 c_2 \{2 < L_{\text{nuc}}\}, \\
\frac{d}{dt} c_\ell &= 2\nu_{\ell-1} c_1 c_{\ell-1} - 2\nu_\ell c_1 c_\ell - \delta_\ell c_\ell \{\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}\}, \quad \text{for } 3 \leq \ell < L, \\
\frac{d}{dt} c_L &= 2\nu_{L-1} c_1 c_{L-1}.
\end{align*}
\]

The rate constants \(\nu_\ell\) in Eq. (6) and (2) differ by a factor of \(V\). For convenience, we use however the same symbol in both cases. The rate constants \(\nu_\ell\) in Eq. (6) can be interpreted in the usual units \([\text{liter mol sec}]\). Due to the symmetry, the yield, which is given by the quotient of the number of completely assembled rings and the maximum number of complete rings, becomes independent of the number of species \(S\)

\[
\text{yield}(t) = \frac{Sc_L(t)}{SNL^{-1}} = \frac{c_L(t) L}{N}. \quad (7)
\]

Hence, it is enough to study the dynamics of the homogeneous system, Eq. (6), to identify the condition under which non zero yield is obtained.

**Effective description by an advection-diffusion equation** The dynamical properties of the evolution of the polymer-size distribution become evident if the set of ODEs (6) is rewritten as a partial differential equation. This approach was previously described in the context of virus capsid assembly\(^{6,33}\).

For simplicity, we restrict ourselves to the case \(L_{\text{nuc}} = 2\) and let \(\nu_1 = \mu\) and \(\nu_{\ell \geq 2} = \nu\). Then, for the
polymers with $\ell > 2$ we have

$$\partial_t c_\ell = 2\nu A \left[ c_{\ell-1} - c_\ell \right]. \quad (8)$$

As a next step, we approximate the index $\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, L\}$ indicating the length of the polymer as a continuous variable $x \in [2, L]$ and define $c(x = \ell) := c_\ell$. The concentration of active monomers is denoted by $A$. Formally expanding the right-hand side of Eq. (8) in a Taylor series up to second order

$$c(\ell - 1) = c(\ell) - \partial_x c(\ell) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 c(\ell), \quad (9)$$

one arrives at the advection-diffusion equation with both advection and diffusion coefficients depending on the concentration of active monomers $A(t)$

$$\partial_t c(x) = -2\nu A \partial_x c(x) + \nu A \partial_x^2 c(x). \quad (10)$$

Equation (10) can be written in the form of a continuity equation $\partial_t c(x) = -\partial_x J(x)$ with flux $J = 2\nu A c - \nu A \partial_x c$. The flux at the left boundary $x = 2$ equals the influx of polymers due to dimerization of free monomers $J(2, t) = \mu A^2$. This enforces a Robin boundary condition at $x = 2$

$$2\nu A c(2, t) - \nu A \partial_x c(2, t) = \mu A^2. \quad (11)$$

At $x = L$ we set an absorbing boundary $c(L, t) = 0$ so that completed structures are removed from the system. The time evolution of the concentration of active monomers is given by

$$\partial_t A = \alpha C e^{-\alpha t} - 2\mu A^2 - 2\nu A \int_2^L c(x, t) \, dx. \quad (12)$$

The terms on the right-hand side account for activation of inactive particles, dimerization, and binding of active particles to polymers (polymerization).
Qualitatively, Eq. (10) describes a profile that emerges at $x = 2$ from the boundary condition Eq. (11) moves to the right with time-dependent velocity $2\nu A(t)$ due to the advection term, and broadens with a time-dependent diffusion coefficient $\nu A(t)$. In the SI we show how the full solution of Eqs. (10) and (11) can be found assuming knowledge of $A(t)$. Here, we focus only on the derivation of the threshold activation rate and threshold dimerization rate that mark the onset of non-zero yield.

Yield production starts as soon as the density wave reaches the absorbing boundary at $x = L$. Therefore, finite yield is obtained if the sum of the advectively travelled distance $d_{\text{adv}}$ and the diffusively travelled distance $d_{\text{diff}}$ exceeds the system size $L - 2$

$$d_{\text{adv}} + d_{\text{diff}} \geq L - 2. \quad (13)$$

According to Eq. (10), $d_{\text{adv}} = 2\nu \int_0^\infty A(t)dt$ and $d_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{2\nu \int_0^\infty A(t)dt}$, giving as condition for the onset of finite yield

$$2\nu \int_0^\infty A(t)dt = \frac{1}{4} \left( \sqrt{1 + 4(L-2)} - 1 \right)^2 \approx L - \sqrt{L}, \quad (14)$$

where the last approximation is valid for large $L$.

In order to obtain $\int_0^\infty A(t)dt$ we derive an effective two-component system that governs the evolution of $A(t)$. To this end, we denote the total number of polymers in Eq. (12) by $B(t) := \int_2^\infty c(x,t)\,dx$ (as long as yield is zero the upper boundary is irrelevant and we can consider $L = \infty$). Eq. (12) then reads

$$\frac{d}{dt}A = \alpha C e^{-\alpha t} - 2\mu A^2 - 2\nu A B, \quad (15)$$
and the dynamics of $B$ is determined from the boundary condition, Eq. (11)

$$\frac{d}{dt}B = \int_0^\infty \partial_t c(x,t) \, dx = \int_0^\infty -\partial_x J(x,t) \, dx = -J(\infty, t) + J(2, t) = \mu A(t)^2.$$ \hspace{1cm} (16)

Measuring $A$ and $B$ in units of the initial monomer concentration $C$ and time in units of $(\nu C)^{-1}$ the equations are rewritten in dimensionless units as

$$\frac{d}{dt}A = \omega e^{-\omega t} - 2\eta A^2 - 2A B,$$ \hspace{1cm} (17a)

$$\frac{d}{dt}B = \eta A^2,$$ \hspace{1cm} (17b)

where $\omega = \frac{\alpha}{\nu C}$ and $\eta = \frac{\mu}{\nu}$. Eq. (17) describes a closed two-component system for the concentration of active monomers $A$ and the total concentration of polymers $B$. It describes the dynamics exactly as long as yield is zero. In order to evaluate the condition (14) we need to determine the integral over $A(t)$ as a function of $\omega$ and $\eta$

$$\int_0^\infty A_{\omega,\eta}(t) \, dt := g(\omega, \eta).$$ \hspace{1cm} (18)

To that end, we proceed by looking at both scenarios separately. The numerical analysis, confirming our analytic results, is given in the SI.

**Dimerization scenario** The activation rate in the dimerization scenario is $\alpha \to \infty$, and instead of the term $\omega e^{-\omega t}$ in $dA/dt$, we set the initial condition $A(0) = 1$ (and $B(0) = 0$). Furthermore, $\eta = \mu/\nu \ll 1$ and we can neglect the term proportional to $\eta$ in $dA/dt$. As a result,

$$\frac{dA}{dB} = -\frac{2B}{\eta A}.$$
Solving this equation for $A$ as a function of $B$ using the initial condition $A(B = 0) = 1$, the totally travelled distance of the wave is determined to be

$$2g(\omega, \eta) = 2\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (19)$$

where for the evaluation of the integral we used the substitution $\eta A^2 dt = dB$.

**Activation scenario** In the activation scenario, yield sets in only if the activation rate and thus the effective nucleation rate is slow. As a result, in addition to $\omega \ll 1$, we can again neglect the term proportional to $\eta$ in $dA/dt$. This time, however, we have to keep the term $\omega e^{-\omega t}$. As a next step, we assume that $dA/dt$ is much smaller than the remaining terms on the right-hand side, $\omega e^{-\omega t}$ and $-2AB$. This assumption might seem crude at first sight but is justified *a posteriori* by the solution of the equation (see SI). Hence, we get the algebraic equation $A(t) = \omega e^{-\omega t}/(2B(t))$. Using it to solve $dB/dt = \eta A^2$ for $B$, and then to determine $A$, the totally travelled distance of the wave is deduced as

$$2g(\omega, \eta) = 2\frac{3^{2/3} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(2/3)}{6\Gamma(7/6)} (\omega \eta)^{-1/3}. \quad (20)$$

Taken together, we therefore obtain two conditions out of which one must be fulfilled in order to obtain finite yield

$$2a(\eta \omega)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \geq L - \sqrt{L} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha < \alpha_{th} := P_\alpha \frac{\nu C}{\mu (L - \sqrt{L})^3} \quad (21)$$

or

$$2b\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \geq L - \sqrt{L} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mu < \mu_{th} := P_\mu \frac{\nu}{(L - \sqrt{L})^2}, \quad (22)$$

where $a$ and $b$ are numerical factors, and $P_\alpha = 8a^3 \approx 5.77$ and $P_\mu = 4b^2 \approx 4.93$. This verifies Eq. (1) in the main text.
**Acknowledgements**  We thank Nigel Goldenfeld for a stimulating discussion, and Raphaela Geßele and Laeschkir Hassan for helpful feedback on the manuscript. This research was supported by the German Excellence Initiative via the program ‘NanoSystems Initiative Munich’ (NIM). F.M.G. and I.R.G. are supported by a DFG fellowship through the Graduate School of Quantitative Biosciences Munich (QBM). We also gratefully acknowledge financial support by the DFG Research Training Group GRK2062 (Molecular Principles of Synthetic Biology). Finally, E.F. thanks the Aspen Center for Physics, which is supported by National Science Foundation grant PHY-1607611, for their hospitality and inspiring discussions with colleagues.


28. Murugan, A., Zou, J. & Brenner, M. P. Undesired usage and the robust self-assembly of  

29. Hedges, L. O., Mannige, R. V. & Whitelam, S. Growth of equilibrium structures built from a  


32. Haxton, T. K. & Whitelam, S. Do hierarchical structures assemble best via hierarchical path-  

33. Morozov, A. Y., Bruinsma, R. F. & Rudnick, J. Assembly of viruses and the pseudo-law of  

34. See Supplementary Information below.

   (2007).

36. Endres, D. & Zlotnick, A. Model-based analysis of assembly kinetics for virus capsids or  


Supplementary Information

S1 Chemical reaction equations and the equivalence of models with different numbers of species

In this section we derive the chemical rate equations (deterministic equations) for the self-assembly process as described in the main text. Furthermore, we show that for general $S$ in the deterministic limit the model is equivalent to a set of $S$ independent assembly processes with only one species.

**Homogeneous structures** First, we consider the homogeneous model ($S = 1$). By $c_\ell(t)$ we denote the concentration of complexes of length $\ell$ ($\ell \geq 2$) at time $t$, $c_1(t)$ is the concentration of active monomers and $c_0(t)$ the concentration of inactive monomers at time $t$. In the following we will usually skip the time argument for better readability. We denote the reaction rate for binding of a monomer to a polymer of size $\ell$ by $\nu_\ell$. The model from the main text is recovered by setting $\nu_\ell := \mu_\ell$ if $\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}$, and $\nu_\ell := \nu$ otherwise. The ensuing set of ordinary differential equations then reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dc_0}{dt} &= -\alpha c_0 , \\
\frac{dc_1}{dt} &= \alpha c_0 - 2c_1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-1} \nu_\ell c_\ell + \sum_{\ell=2}^{L_{\text{nuc}}-1} l \delta_\ell c_\ell , \\
\frac{dc_2}{dt} &= \nu_1 c_1^2 - 2\nu_2 c_1 c_2 - \delta_2 c_2 \mathbf{1}_{\{2 < L_{\text{nuc}}\}} , \\
\frac{dc_\ell}{dt} &= 2\nu_{\ell-1} c_{\ell-1} c_1 c_\ell - 2\nu_\ell c_1 c_\ell - \delta_\ell c_\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}\}} , \quad \text{for } 3 \leq \ell < L , \\
\frac{dc_L}{dt} &= 2\nu_{L-1} c_1 c_{L-1} .
\end{align*}
\]
The indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{\{x < L_{\text{nuc}}\}}$ equals 1 if the condition $x < L_{\text{nuc}}$ is satisfied and 0 otherwise. The first equation describes loss of inactive particles due to activation at rate $\alpha$. The equation is uncoupled from the remainder of the equations and is solved by $c_0(t) = Ce^{-\alpha t}$, with $C$ denoting the initial concentration of inactive monomers. The temporal change of the active monomers is governed by the following processes (Eq. (S1p)): activation of inactive monomers at rate $\alpha$, binding of active monomers to existing structures at rate $\nu_\ell$ (polymerization), and decay of below-critical polymers into monomers at rate $\delta_\ell$ (disassembly). All binding rates appear with a factor of 2 because a monomer can attach to a polymer on its left or on its right end.

Note that there is a subtlety with the dimerization term “$2 \nu_1 c_1^2$”: the dimerization term as well bears a factor of 2 because two identical monomers $A$ and $B$ can form a dimer in two possible ways, either as $AB$ or $BA$. Additionally, there is a stoichiometric factor of 2 for this reaction. However, one factor of 2 is cancelled again because, assuming there are $n$ monomers, the number of ordered pairs of monomers that describe possible reaction partners is $\frac{1}{2}n(n - 1) \approx n^2/2$ (if $n$ is large) rather than $n^2$ (the number of reaction partners when two different species react). This leaves us with a single factor of 2 like for all the other binding reactions.

Equations (S1c) and (S1d) describe the dynamics of dimers and larger polymers of size $3 \leq \ell < L$, respectively. The terms account for reactions of polymers with active monomers (polymerization) as well as decay in the case of below-critical polymers (disassembly). The dimerization term in the equation for $\partial_t c_2$ lacks the factor of 2 because the stoichiometric factor is missing as compared with the dimerization term in the line above. Finally, polymers of length $L$ – the
complete ring structures – form an absorbing state and therefore only include a reactive gain term (Eq. (S1e)).

**Heterogeneous structures** Next we consider systems with more than one particle species \((S > 1)\). The heterogeneous system can be described by dynamical equations equivalent to the homogeneous system. We show this starting from a full description that distinguishes both monomers and polymers into a set of different species \(1, \ldots, S\). In order to formulate the dynamic equations and to see the equivalence to a one-species model, we distinguish both monomers and polymers into a set of different species \(1, \ldots, S\). The species of a polymer is defined by the species of the respective monomer at its left end. As polymers assemble in consecutive order of species, a polymer is uniquely determined by its length and species (i.e. species of leftmost monomer). In that sense, \(c^s_\ell\) with \(0 \leq \ell < L\) and \(1 \leq s \leq S\) denotes the concentration of a polymer of length \(\ell\) and species \(s\) (\(c^s_0\) and \(c^s_1\) again denote inactive and active monomers of species \(s\), respectively). For example, \(c^5_4\) denotes the concentration of polymers \([5678]\) if \(S \geq 8\), or of polymers \([5612]\) if \(S = 6\). Upper indices are always assumed to be taken modulo \(S\) whenever they lie outside the range \([1, S]\).

Therefore, the dynamics of the concentrations \(c^s_\ell\) with \(3 \leq \ell < L\) is given by

\[
\frac{d}{dt} c^s_\ell = \nu_{\ell-1} c^s_{\ell-1} c^{\ell+s-1}_1 + \nu_{\ell-1} c^{s+1}_{\ell-1} c^s_1 - \nu_{\ell} c^s_\ell c^{s+\ell}_1 - \nu_{\ell} c^s_\ell c^{s-1}_1 - \delta c^s_\ell 1_{\{\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}\}}. \tag{S2}
\]

The terms on the right-hand side account for the influx due to binding of the respective polymers of length \(\ell - 1\) with a monomer either on the right or on the left (first and second term), and for the outflux due to reactions of a polymer of length \(\ell\) and species \(s\) (third and fourth term), as well as for decay into monomers for \(\ell < L_{\text{nuc}}\) (last term). For the dynamics of the dimers, however, there
is only one gain term arising from dimerization:

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_s^2 = \nu_1 c_s^1 c_1^1 + \nu_2 c_s^2 c_2^{s+2} - \nu_2 c_s^2 - \delta_2 c_s^1 \mathbf{1}_{\{2<L_{\text{nuc}}\}}. \quad (S3)$$

Equivalently, for the active monomers we find:

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_s^1 = \alpha C e^{-\alpha t} - c_s^1 \sum_{\ell=1}^{L-1} \nu_\ell \left( c_s^{\ell+1} + c_s^{\ell-1} \right) + \sum_{\ell=2}^{L_{\text{nuc}}-1} \sum_{k=s}^{s+1} \delta_\ell c_s^k. \quad (S4)$$

Now we exploit the symmetry of the system with respect to the species index, that is, the upper index in \{c_s^\ell\}: Since all species in the system are equivalent, the dynamic equations are invariant under relabelling of the upper indices. Consequently, it must hold that:

$$c_s^\ell(t) = c_k^\ell(t), \quad \text{for any } s, k \leq S \text{ at any time } t. \quad (S5)$$

In other words, the upper index is irrelevant and can also be discarded. The variable \(c_\ell\) then denotes the concentration of any one polymer species of length \(\ell\). Taking advantage of this symmetry for the equations of the heterogeneous system, (Eq. (S2), Eq. (S3) and Eq. (S4)), and collecting equal terms leads to a set of equations fully identical to those for the homogeneous system (Eq. (S1)).

We show the equivalence to the homogeneous model exemplarily for the dynamics of the polymers with size \(\ell \geq 3\) in Eq. (S2). Applying \(c_s^\ell(t) = c_\ell(t)\) to Eq. (S2) yields for the dynamics of the concentration of an arbitrary polymer species of size \(\ell\):

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_\ell = \nu_{\ell-1} c_{\ell-1} c_1 + \nu_{\ell-1} c_{\ell-1} c_1 - \nu_\ell c_\ell c_1 - \nu_\ell c_\ell c_1 - \delta c_\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell<L_{\text{nuc}}\}}.$$

$$= 2\nu_{\ell-1} c_{\ell-1} c_1 - 2\nu_\ell c_\ell c_1 - \delta c_\ell \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell<L_{\text{nuc}}\}},$$

which is identical to the respective dynamic equation (S1d) for the homogeneous model. The other equations for the heterogeneous system reduce to those for the homogeneous system in an analogous manner.
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Summarizing, we have shown that the (deterministic) heterogeneous assembly process decouples into a set of $S$ identical and independent homogeneous processes. In particular, yield, which is given by the quotient of the number of completely assembled rings and the maximal possible number of complete rings, becomes independent of $S$:

$$\text{yield}(t) = \frac{Sc_L(t)}{SNL^{-1}} = \frac{c_L(t)N}{N}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S6)

### S2 Effective description of the evolution of the polymer size distribution as an advection-diffusion equation

The dynamical properties of the evolution of the polymer size distribution become evident if the set of ODEs (S1) is rewritten as a partial differential equation. This approach was previously described in the context of virus capsid assembly$^{6,33}$ but we will restate the essential steps here for the convenience of the reader. To this end we interpret the length index of the polymer $\ell \in \{2, 3, \ldots, L\}$ as a continuous variable that we rename $x \in [2, L]$. With such a continuous description in view we write $c(x = \ell) := c_\ell$ to denote the concentration of polymers of size $\ell$.

Since the active monomers play a special role, we denote their concentration in the following by $A$. For simplicity we restrict our discussion to the case $L_{nuc} = 2$ and let $\nu_1 = \mu$ and $\nu_{\ell \geq 2} = \nu$. Generalizations to $L_{nuc} > 2$ can be done in a similar way. Then, for the polymers with $\ell \geq 3$ we have:

$$\partial_t c(\ell) = 2\nu A \left[ c(\ell - 1) - c(\ell) \right].$$ \hspace{1cm} (S7)
Formally, expanding the right-hand side in a Taylor series up to second order

\[ c(\ell - 1) = c(\ell) - \partial_x c(\ell) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_x^2 c(\ell) , \]  

we arrive at an advection-diffusion equation with both advection and diffusion coefficients depending on the concentration of active monomers \( A(t) \),

\[ \partial_t c(x) = -2\nu A \partial_x c(x) + \nu A \partial_x^2 c(x) . \]  

(S9)

Equation (S9) can be written in the form of a continuity equation \( \partial_t c(x) = -\partial_x J(x) \) with flux \( J = 2\nu A c - \nu A \partial_x c \). The flux at the left boundary, \( x = 2 \), equals the influx of polymers due to dimerization of free monomers, \( J(2, t) = \mu A^2 \). This enforces a Robin boundary condition at \( x = 2 \),

\[ 2\nu A c(2, t) - \nu A \partial_x c(2, t) = \mu A^2 . \]  

(S10)

At \( x = L \), we have an absorbing boundary \( c(L, t) = 0 \) so that completed structures are removed from the system. Furthermore, the time evolution of the concentration of active particles is given by

\[ \partial_t A = \alpha C e^{-\alpha t} - 2\mu A^2 - 2\nu A \int_2^L c(x, t) \, dx . \]  

(S11)

The terms on the right-hand side account for activation of inactive particles, dimerization, and binding of active particles to polymers (polymerization).

Qualitatively, Eq. (S9) describes a profile that emerges at \( x = 2 \) from the boundary condition, Eq. (S10), moves to the right with time dependent velocity \( 2\nu A(t) \) due to the advection term, and broadens with a time-dependent diffusion coefficient \( \nu A(t) \). The concentration of active particles
A determines both the influx of dimers at $x = 2$, as well as the speed and diffusion of the wave profile.

Next, we derive an expression that solves Eq. (S9), assuming that we know $A(t)$. We start by solving Eq. (S9) at the left boundary $c(2, t)$, and then translate the resulting expression to obtain a solution for $c(x, t)$. To obtain $c(2, t)$ in dependence of $a(t)$ we can solve \[ \frac{d}{dt} c(2, t) = \mu A^2 - \nu A c(2, t) \] (see Eq. (S1c)) by 'variation of the constants' as

\[
c(2, t) = \int_0^t \mu A(\tilde{t})^2 \exp \left[ - \int_\tilde{t}^t \nu A(t') dt' \right] d\tilde{t} . \tag{S12}
\]

With help of this expression we find $c(x, t)$: Given $c(2, t)$, the advective part of Eq. (S9),

\[
\partial_t \tilde{c}(x) = -2\nu A \partial_x \tilde{c}(x) . \tag{S13}
\]

is solved by

\[
c_{\text{advec}}(x, t) = c(2, \tau(x, t)) . \tag{S14}
\]

Here, $\tau(x, t)$ denotes the time that a particle at position $x$ and time $t$ was at $x = 2$. In other words, a particle at time $t$ and position $x$ has entered the system at $x = 2$ at time $\tau(x, t)$. This ansatz solves the PDE (Eq. (S13)) if and only if $\tau(x, t)$ satisfies

\[
\tau(x, t) = \tilde{A}^{-1} \left( \tilde{A}(t) - \frac{x - 2}{2\nu} \right) . \tag{S15}
\]

with $\tilde{A}$ being an arbitrary integral of $A$ such that $\partial_t \tilde{A}(t) = A(t)$ and $\tilde{A}^{-1}$ denoting its inverse. More easily, we find this form of $\tau$ by requiring that the integral over the velocity from time $\tau$ to $t$ equals the travelled distance $x - 2$:

\[
\int_{\tau}^t 2\nu A(t') dt' = x - 2 . \tag{S16}
\]
To include the diffusive contribution in Eq. (S13), we use the diffusion kernel,

\[
k(x, y, t) = \left(4\pi \int_{\tau(y,t)}^{t} D(t) \right)^{-1/2} \exp \left(\frac{-x^2}{4 \int_{\tau(y,t)}^{t} D(t)} \right),
\]

(S17)

with the time dependent diffusion constant \(D(t) = \nu \mu(t)\). The kernel \(k(x, y, t)\) accounts for the mass that has been diffusively transported from \(y\) a distance of \(x\). Because the mass has entered the system at \(x = 2\) at time \(\tau(y, t)\), it diffused for the time \(t - \tau(y, t)\). The complete expression for \(c(x, t)\) is then obtained as the convolution of \(c_{\text{advec}}(x, t)\) (Eq. (S14)), that is obtained from Eq. (S12) and Eq. (S15), and the diffusion kernel \(k(x, y, t)\) (Eq. (S17)):

\[
c(x, t) = \int c_{\text{advec}}(s, t) k(x - s, s, t) ds = \int c(2, \tau(s, t)) k(x - s, s, t) ds.
\]

(S18)

Interpreting the terms in the equations and the general form of the solution, we are able to understand the qualitative behavior of the system. If both the activation and the dimerization rate are large, the system produces zero yield: both advection and diffusion are driven by the concentration of active monomers \(A\). If activation is fast, the concentration of active monomers \(A\) will become large initially since activation is faster than the reaction dynamics. Consequently, provided \(\mu \sim \nu\), dimerization dominates over binding because it depends quadratically on \(A\), see Eq. (S11). The reservoir of free particles then depletes quickly and cannot sustain the motion of the wave for long enough to reach the absorbing boundary, resulting in a very low yield. Only if either the activation rate is low enough or if \(\mu \ll \nu\), the motion of the wave can be sustained until it reaches the absorbing boundary.
S3  Threshold values for the activation and dimerization rate

Based on the analysis from the previous section, we will now determine the threshold activation rate and threshold dimerization rate which mark the onset of non-zero yield. Yield production starts as soon as the density wave reaches the absorbing boundary at $x = L$. Therefore, finite yield is obtained if and only if the sum of the advectively travelled distance $d_{\text{adv}}$ and the diffusively travelled distance $d_{\text{diff}}$ exceeds the system size $L - 2$:

$$d_{\text{adv}} + d_{\text{diff}} \geq L - 2. \quad (S19)$$

The condition for the onset of non-zero yield is obtained by assuming equality in this relation. The advectively travelled distance is obtained from Eq. (S16) by setting the borders of the integral over the velocity to $\tau = 0$ and $t = \infty$:

$$d_{\text{adv}} = \int_{0}^{\infty} 2\nu A(t') dt'. \quad (S20)$$

The diffusively travelled distance is approximately given by the standard deviation of the Gaussian diffusion kernel, Eq. (S17), again with $\tau = 0$ and $t = \infty$,

$$d_{\text{diff}} = \sqrt{2 \nu \int_{0}^{\infty} A(t) dt}. \quad (S21)$$

Taken together, we obtain a condition for the onset of finite yield:

$$2\nu \int_{0}^{\infty} A(t) dt + \sqrt{2 \nu \int_{0}^{\infty} A(t) dt} = L - 2. \quad (S22)$$
Substituting \( y = \sqrt{2\nu \int A} \) and requiring that \( y \) is positive, we can solve the quadratic equation and find that Eq. (S22) is equivalent to

\[
2\nu \int_0^\infty A(t) dt = y^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left( \sqrt{1 + 4(L - 2)} - 1 \right)^2 \approx L - \sqrt{L}, \tag{S23}
\]

where the last approximation is valid for large \( L \).

We determine the threshold values for the activation rate \( \alpha \) and the dimerization rate \( \mu \) by finding solutions of the dynamical equation for the active particles \( A(t) \), Eq. (S11), such that the condition, Eq. (S23), is fulfilled. Thus, we start by deriving the dependence of \( \int_0^\infty A(t) dt \) on \( \alpha \) and \( \mu \).

The concentration \( c(x, t) \) appears in Eq. (S11) only in terms of an integral \( \int_2^L c(x, t) dx \), counting the total number of polymers in the system. As long as yield is zero there is no outflux of polymers at the absorbing boundary \( x = L \) and the total number of polymers in the system only increases due to the influx at the left boundary \( x = 2 \). As long as yield is zero we can therefore equivalently consider the limit \( L \to \infty \). We denote the total number of polymers in Eq. (S11) by \( B(t) := \int_2^\infty c(x, t) dx \) for which the dynamics is determined from the boundary condition, Eq. (S10):

\[
\frac{d}{dt} B = \int_2^\infty \partial_t c(x, t) dx = \int_2^\infty -\partial_x J(x, t) dx = -J(\infty, t) + J(2, t) = \mu A(t)^2. \tag{S24}
\]

Hence, as long as yield is zero, the total number of polymers increases with the rate of the dimerization events. The system then simplifies to a set of two coupled ordinary differential equations
for $A$ and $B$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}A = \alpha Ce^{-\alpha t} - 2\mu A^2 - 2\nu B A, \quad (S25a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}B = \mu A^2. \quad (S25b)$$

The dynamics of $A$ and $B$ is equivalent to a two-state activator-inhibitor system, where $A$ dimerizes into $B$ at rate $\mu$, and $B$ degrades (inhibits) $A$ at rate $2\nu$. Note that Eq. (S25a) describes the exact dynamics of the active monomers $A$ and total number of polymers $B$ in the deterministic system as long as yield is zero. The system has therefore been greatly reduced from originally $SN$ coupled ODEs to now only 2 coupled ODEs.

For the further analysis it is useful to non-dimensionalize Eq. (S25a) by measuring $A$ and $B$ in units of the initial concentration of inactive monomers $C$ and time in units of $(\nu C)^{-1}$:

$$\frac{d}{dt}A = \omega e^{-\omega t} - 2\eta A^2 - 2A B, \quad (S26a)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}B = \eta A^2, \quad (S26b)$$

with the remaining dimensionless parameters $\omega = \frac{\alpha}{\nu C}$ and $\eta = \frac{\mu}{\nu}$. We are interested in the integral over $A(t)$ as a function of $\omega$ and $\eta$,

$$\int_0^\infty A_{\omega,\eta}(t) dt := g(\omega, \eta), \quad (S27)$$

which relates to the totally travelled distance of the wave. Note that, in case of zero yield, $2g(\omega, \eta)$ is the total advectively travelled distance of the wave (cf. Eq. (S20)) and the square of the diffusively travelled distance (cf. Eq. (S21)).
Analysis of the dimerization scenario The dimerization scenario is characterized by fast activation $\alpha \gg C\nu$ and slow dimerization $\mu \ll \nu$. For the dimensionless parameters these assumptions translate to $\eta \ll 1$ and $\eta \ll \omega$. Because for small $\eta \ll 1$ nucleation is much slower than growth we neglect the dimerization term in Eq. (S26a) against the growth term. Furthermore, because $\eta \ll \omega$ activation happens on a fast time scale compared with nucleation and we may therefore integrate out the fast time scale assuming that all particles are activated instantaneously at the beginning.

The system Eq. (S26) then reduces to

\begin{align}
\frac{d}{dt} A &= -2AB, \\
\frac{d}{dt} B &= \eta A^2,
\end{align}

(S28a)\hspace{1cm}(S28b)

with the initial condition $A(0) = 1$ and $B(0) = 0$. We divide the first equation by the second one (formally applying the chain rule and the inverse function theorem) to obtain a single equation for the dynamics of $A(B)$:

\[
\frac{dA}{dB} = -\frac{2B}{\eta A},
\]

(S29)

where $A(B=0) = 1$. This first order ODE can be solved by separation of variables and subsequent integration, yielding

\[
A(B) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{\eta} B^2}.
\]

(S30)

Because the number of active monomers $A(t)$ must vanish for $t \to \infty$, the final value of $B$ is

\[
B_\infty := B(t=\infty) = \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{2}}.
\]

(S31)

Thereby, we calculate the function $g(\eta)$ via variable substitution $dt = \frac{dB}{\eta A^2}$:

\[
g(\eta) = \int_0^\infty A(t) dt = \int_0^{B_\infty} A(B) \frac{dB}{\eta A(B)^2} = \frac{1}{\eta} \int_0^{B_\infty} \frac{dB}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2}{\eta} B^2}} = \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}} \eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

(S32)
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So, the dependence of the travelled distance of the wave on $\eta$ obeys a power law with exponent $-\frac{1}{2}$, confirming the previous result\textsuperscript{33}. For the coefficient we find $\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 1.1107$.

Additionally, we can determine the time dependent solutions $A(t)$ and $B(t)$. Using the solution for $A(B)$ from Eq. \textsuperscript{(30)} in Eq. \textsuperscript{(28b)} we obtain $B(t)$ as

$$B(t) = \sqrt{\frac{\eta}{2}} \tanh \left( \sqrt{2\eta t} \right).$$ \textsuperscript{(S33)}

We use this expression for $B(t)$ in Eq. \textsuperscript{(28a)} to obtain $A(t)$. The resulting ODEs can again be solved by separation of variables as

$$A(t) = \frac{1}{\cosh \left( \sqrt{2\eta t} \right)}. \textsuperscript{(S34)}$$

Analysis of the activation scenario In the activation scenario, $\alpha \ll C\nu$, such that $\omega \ll 1$ and $\omega \ll \eta$. As we know already that decreasing $\omega$ will slow down nucleation relative to growth we can again neglect the dimerization term in Eq. \textsuperscript{(26a)}. In contrast to the dimerization scenario, however, we have to keep the activation term. Transforming time via $\tau := 1 - e^{-\omega t}$ such that $\tau \in [0,1]$ and writing $a(\tau) = a(1 - e^{-\omega t}) := A(t)$ and $b(\tau) = b(1 - e^{-\omega t}) := B(t)$ the system in Eq. \textsuperscript{(26)} becomes:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} a = 1 - \frac{2}{\omega(1 - \tau)} ab,$$ \textsuperscript{(S35a)}

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} b = \frac{\eta}{\omega(1 - \tau)} a^2,$$ \textsuperscript{(S35b)}

with the initial condition $a(0) = b(0) = 0$. The function $g(\omega, \eta)$ transforms as

$$g(\omega, \eta) = \int_{0}^{\infty} A(t) dt = \int_{0}^{1} \frac{a(\tau)}{1 - \tau} d\tau.$$ \textsuperscript{(S36)}
In the following we derive the asymptotic solution for $a(\tau)$ in the limit of small $\omega$ in order to evaluate the integral in Eq. (S36). In the limit $\tau \to 1$ ($\Leftrightarrow t \to \infty$) both $a(\tau)$ and $\frac{d}{d\tau} a(\tau)$ will become small whereas $b(\tau)$ increases monotonically. The reaction term in Eq. (S35a) is furthermore weighted by a factor $\frac{1}{\omega}$ which will become large if $\omega \ll 1$. We therefore postulate that for sufficiently large $\tau$ the derivative $\frac{d}{d\tau} a(\tau)$ is much smaller than the two terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (S35a) and hence negligible. This assumption has to be justified a posteriori with the obtained solution. Neglecting the derivative term $\frac{d}{d\tau} a$ in (S35a) reduces the equation to an algebraic equation and we find

$$a = \frac{\omega(1 - \tau)}{2b}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S37)

Using this result in Eq. (S35b) we can solve for $b$ by separation of variables and subsequent integration:

$$b(\tau) = (\omega \eta)^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot \left(\frac{3}{4} \tau - \frac{3}{8} \tau^2\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S38)

From Eq. (S37) we immediately obtain $a(\tau)$:

$$a(\tau) = \frac{\omega^{\frac{2}{3}}}{\eta^{\frac{1}{3}}} \cdot \frac{1 - \tau}{(6\tau - 3\tau^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}} := \frac{\omega^{\frac{2}{3}}}{\eta^{\frac{1}{3}}} h(\tau),$$  \hspace{1cm} (S39)

where by $h(\tau)$ we denote the part of the solution that depends only on $\tau$. Hence, we find that $a$ and hence also $\frac{d}{d\tau} a$ scale like $\sim \omega^{\frac{2}{3}}$, and will thus become small if $\omega \ll 1$ and $\tau$ is large enough. Therefore the solution is consistent\footnote{Consistency of the solution with the approximation is a sufficient criterion for the validity of the approximation: We can solve the system for $A$ and $B$ in Eq. (S35) iteratively by defining}

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} a_{i-1} = 1 - \frac{2}{\omega(1 - \tau)} a_i b_i,$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} b_i = \frac{\eta}{\omega(1 - \tau)} a_i^2.$$
derivative term in the limit of small \( \omega \) and sufficiently large \( \tau \).

Assuming that for \( i \to \infty \), \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) converge to the correct solutions \( a(\tau) \) and \( b(\tau) \) when starting with \( a_0 = 0 \), we obtain \( a_1 \) and \( b_1 \) as given by Eq. (S39) and Eq. (S38) and can iteratively refine the approximation.

The next iteration step then reads: \( \frac{d}{d\tau} a_1 = 1 - \frac{2}{\omega(1-\tau)} a_2 b_2 \). As \( a_1 \sim \omega^{4/3} \) we know that the left-hand side will be small and \( a_1 \) and \( b_1 \) solve the system if the left-hand side equals 0. Writing \( a_2 = a_1 + \tilde{a}_2 \) and \( b_2 = b_1 + \tilde{b}_2 \) this gives:

\[
\frac{d}{d\tau} a_1 = 1 - \frac{2}{\omega(1-\tau)} (a_1 + \tilde{a}_2)(b_1 + \tilde{b}_2) \approx \frac{2}{\omega(1-\tau)} (a_1 \tilde{b}_2 + b_1 \tilde{a}_2). \tag{S40}
\]

From dimensional analysis it follows that the correction terms \( \tilde{a}_2 \) and \( \tilde{b}_2 \) must scale like \( \tilde{a}_2 \sim \omega^{4/3} \) and \( \tilde{b}_2 \sim \omega \) and are hence much smaller than the first order approximations \( a_1 \) and \( b_1 \). Higher order corrections will give even smaller contributions showing that if \( \frac{d}{d\tau} a_1 \ll 1 \), \( a_1 \) is indeed a very good approximation.
In the limit $\tau \to 0$, however, the expression for $a(\tau)$ in Eq. (S39) diverges and consistency is violated. Hence, the obtained solution is valid only for sufficiently large $\tau$.

We fix some small $\epsilon > 0$ such that the approximation can be assumed to be sufficiently good if $\frac{d}{dt}a < \epsilon$. Furthermore, we define $\tau_\epsilon$ such that $\frac{d}{d\tau}a < \epsilon$ for all $\tau > \tau_\epsilon$. Using Eq. (S39) we can write this as $\frac{d}{d\tau}h < \epsilon \eta^{\frac{3}{2}}/\omega^{\frac{3}{2}}$ for all $\tau > \tau_\epsilon$, where the left-hand side, $\frac{d}{d\tau}h$, depends only on $\tau$. Hence, by decreasing $\omega$ we can make $\tau_\epsilon$ arbitrarily small: $\lim_{\omega \to 0} \tau_\epsilon = 0$. In order to calculate $g(\omega, \eta)$ the integral in Eq. (S36) can be separated in a domain where the approximation $a(\tau)$ is accurate and a domain where the correct solution $\tilde{a}(\tau)$ deviates strongly from $a(\tau)$:

$$g(\omega, \eta) = \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{\tilde{a}(\tau)}{1-\tau} d\tau + \frac{1}{\omega} \int_{\tau_\epsilon}^{\infty} \frac{a(\tau)}{1-\tau} d\tau. \quad (S41)$$

We see from Eq. (S35a) that $\frac{d}{d\tau} \tilde{a} = 1$ describes an upper bound to $\tilde{a}$ showing that $\tilde{a}(\tau) \leq \tau$. Therefore we can bound the contribution of the first integral as $\int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{\tilde{a}(\tau)}{1-\tau} d\tau \leq \int_0^{\tau_\epsilon} \frac{\tau}{1-\tau} d\tau = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\tau^2}{1-\tau}.

Because this upper bound for the integral goes to 0 if $\omega$ and hence $\tau_\epsilon$ become small the first integral will become negligible against the second one. Asymptotically, we therefore only need to consider the second integral with the solution for $a(\tau)$ as given by Eq. (S39):

$$g(\omega, \eta) = (\omega \eta)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_0^{\frac{1}{3}} (6t - 3t^2)^{-\frac{1}{3}} dt = (\omega \eta)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \int_0^{\frac{3}{6}} \frac{dz}{6z^{\frac{3}{2}} \sqrt{1-z^{\frac{3}{2}}}} =$$

$$= \frac{3\frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\frac{2}{3})}{6 \Gamma(\frac{2}{6})} (\omega \eta)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \approx 0.8969 \cdot (\omega \eta)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (S42)$$

where we used the substitution $t = 1 - \sqrt{1-z/3}$ and $\Gamma(x)$ is the (Euler) Gamma function. So, in the limit of small $\omega$, $g$ scales with $\omega$ and $\eta$ with identical exponent $-\frac{1}{3}$. This contrasts the dimerization scenario where $g$ as well as $A$ and $B$ depend only on $\eta$ and are independent of $\omega$ (cf. Eq. (S32), (S33) and (S34)).
**Numerical analysis and the threshold values for the rate constants** In order to confirm the results of the last two paragraphs and to see how \( g(\omega, \eta) \) behaves in the intermediate regime where \( \omega \) and \( \eta \) are of the same order of magnitude we also investigate the function \( g(\omega, \eta) \) numerically.

For that purpose we numerically integrate the ODE-system for \( A(t) \) and \( B(t) \) in Eq. (S26) for different values of \( \omega \) and \( \eta \) with a semi-implicit method. Subsequently, we integrate the solution \( A(t) \) using an adaptive recursive Simpson’s rule. Plotting \( g \) in dependence of \( \omega \) for fixed \( \eta \) on a double-logarithmic scale reveals a rather simple bipartite form of \( g \), see Fig. S1a:

\[
\begin{align*}
g(\omega, \eta) &= \begin{cases} 
g_1(\eta)\omega^{-\frac{1}{3}} & \omega \ll 1 \\
g_2(\eta) & \omega \gg 1.
\end{cases} 
\end{align*}
\] (S43)

The transition between these two regimes is rather sharp so that \( g \) is best described in a piecewise fashion

\[
g(\omega, \eta) = \max (g_1(\eta)\omega^{-\frac{1}{3}}, g_2(\eta)).
\] (S44)

Next, we plot the coefficients \( g_1(\eta) \) and \( g_2(\eta) \) against \( \eta \). Here we find that \( g_1(\eta) = a\eta^{-\frac{1}{3}} \) with \( a = \text{const} \approx 0.90 \) and \( g_2(\eta) \) is again bipartite with a sharp kink in between (Fig. S1b):

\[
g_2(\eta) = \min (b\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}, b'\eta^{-0.85}),
\] (S45)

where \( b \approx 1.11 \) and \( b' \approx 1.37 \). The transition between both regimes is at \( \eta \approx 1.82 \). The second regime is not relevant for self-assembly since it refers to both large \( \omega \) and large \( \eta \), hence the travelled distance \( 2g \) is too small to give finite yield in this regime. Therefore, we discard the second regime and obtain as final result

\[
g(\omega, \eta) = \max (a(\eta\omega)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, b\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}),
\] (S46)
with $a \approx 0.90$ and $b \approx 1.11$. This confirms perfectly the exponents as well as the coefficients found in the last two paragraphs. It is, however, surprising that there is such a sharp transition between both regimes, which allows to define $g(\omega, \eta)$ in a piecewise fashion. This behavior must be the result of a series of lower order terms in $g(\omega, \eta)$ which are unimportant in the limits $\omega \ll \eta$ and $\eta \ll \omega$ but cause the sharp transition when $\omega$ and $\eta$ are of the same order of magnitude.

Finally, we return to our original task of finding the threshold values of the activation and dimerization rate for the onset of yield. Using our result for $g(\omega, \eta)$ in Eq. (S23) we find as necessary and sufficient condition to obtain finite yield in the deterministic system:

$$2 \max (a(\eta \omega)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, b\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \geq L - \sqrt{L}. \quad (S47)$$

Alternatively, we can state this result as two separate conditions out of which at least one must be fulfilled to obtain finite yield:

$$2a(\eta \omega)^{-\frac{1}{3}} \geq L - \sqrt{L} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha < \alpha_{\text{th}} := P_{\alpha} \frac{\nu}{\mu (L - \sqrt{L})^3} \quad (S48)$$

or

$$2b\eta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \geq L - \sqrt{L} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mu < \mu_{\text{th}} := P_{\mu} \frac{\nu}{(L - \sqrt{L})^2} \quad (S49)$$

where $P_{\alpha} = 8a^3 \approx 5.77$ and $P_{\mu} = 4b^2 \approx 4.93$. This verifies Eq. (1) in the main text.
In the main text we focused our discussion on irreversible binding $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. In this section we investigate the effect of different implementations of the sub-nucleation reactions.

In general, perfect yield is trivially achieved if the complete ring is the only stable structure. However, yield can be maximal already for smaller nucleation sizes $L_{\text{nuc}}$ depending on the explicit decay rate $\delta$. In the deterministic limit without the dimerization and activation mechanisms ($\mu = \nu$, $\alpha \to \infty$) a rapid transition from zero yield to perfect yield occurs in dependence of the critical nucleation size (see Fig. S2). The threshold value in this case is approximately half the ring size and is weakly affected by the decay rate $\delta$. In order to obtain finite yield for small nucleation sizes, an extremely high decay rate would be necessary. Hence, maximizing the yield solely by increasing the nucleation size is not very feasible.

In our model, the subcritical reaction rates $\mu_i$ may take different values. Here, we want to restrict our discussion to two scenarios. First, all rates have an identical value $\mu_i = \mu$ and second, the rates increase linearly up to the super-nucleation reaction rate: $\mu_i = \mu + (\nu - \mu) \frac{i-1}{L_{\text{nuc}}-1}$.

In the deterministic limit, both implementations show the same qualitative behavior as the dimerization mechanism with $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$ in the main text (see Fig. S3). The only relevant aspect for the final yield is the extend to which nucleation is slowed down in total. In the constant scenario all reaction steps contribute equally. As a results there is a strong dependence on the number of such reaction steps, i.e. on the critical nucleation size. If however, the reaction rates increase linearly
with the size of the polymers the dimerization rate dominates. Only in the case $\mu \ll \nu$ finite yield is observed at all. In this limit the dimerization rate is much smaller than the subsequent growth rates. The explicit form of the different $\mu_i$ is not of major importance for the yield. The total slowdown of nucleation is the central feature. Structure decay does not play any role for intermediate nucleation sizes.

The last question we want to address is how the combination of activation and dimerization mechanism and the corresponding non-monotonic behavior is affected by the nucleation size. Again, we compare constant sub-nucleation growth with a linearly increasing growth rate (see Fig. S4). In the deterministic regime both implementations behave qualitatively similar as the dimerization mechanism discussed in the main text. However, in both cases the stochastic yield catastrophe is less pronounced. For the constant growth rates a saturation of the maximal yield is observed for sufficiently low $\mu$. If the profile is linear this effect is weaker as compared to the constant case and a dependency on the explicit value of $\mu$ is still observed. The saturation value is not reached for these reactions rates.

Taking all our results for the sub-nucleation behavior together we draw the following conclusions: First, structure decay by itself it not very efficient in order to maximize yield. Second, the explicit choice of the sub-nucleation rates is of minor importance for the qualitative behavior. The system behaves similarly to the case $L_{\text{nuc}} = 2$. Third, larger nucleation sizes mitigate the stochastic yield catastrophe in general.
Figure S1: Fit of $g(\omega, \eta)$ on log-log scale. The function $g(\omega, \eta) = \int_0^\infty A_{\omega, \eta}(t) \, dt$ describes (half) the travelled distance of the profile of the polymer size distribution in dependence of $\omega = \frac{\nu}{\rho}$ and $\eta = \frac{\mu}{\rho}$. Marker points show solutions for $g(\omega, \eta)$ as obtained numerically from integration of Eq. (17). Red lines are linear fits on log-log scale. In a) we plot $g(\omega, \eta)$ for fixed $\eta$ (here exemplarily for $\eta = 0.01$) over 25 orders of magnitude in $\omega$ and find a markedly bipartite behavior: For small $\omega$ the dependence on $\omega$ is perfectly matched by a power law with exponent $-\frac{1}{3}$ and $\eta$-dependent coefficient $g_1(\eta)$, whereas for large $\omega$ it is a constant $g_2(\eta)$. b) Plotting $g_2(\eta) = g(\omega = \infty, \eta)$ in dependence of $\eta$ reveals again strictly bipartite behavior. Here, however, only the branch for small $\eta$ is realistically relevant. With the coefficient $g_1(\eta)$ that can be determined in a similar way this leads to the final form of $g(\omega, \eta)$ as given by Eq. (S46).
Figure S2: Yield maximization due to increased nucleation size. Without activation and dimerization mechanism \((\alpha \to \infty, \mu = \nu)\) the yield can still be optimized by increasing the critical nucleation size \(L_{\text{nucl}}\). However, a significant improvement is only achieved for critical sizes larger than half the ring size. Above, a rapid transition to perfect yield takes place. Below no effect is observed at all. Increasing \(\delta\) shifts the onset of yield to slightly smaller critical nucleation sizes. Other parameters: \(L = 60, N = 10000\).
Figure S3: Yield for the dimerization mechanism ($\alpha \to \infty$) with different nucleation sizes (colors). 

**a** If all sub-nucleation growth rates are identical ($\mu_i = \mu$) increasing the nucleation size increases the threshold value $\mu_{th}$. The slow down of nucleation due to the individual sub-nucleation steps in total determines the yield. 

**b** If the sub-nucleation growth rates increase linear ($\mu_i = \mu + (\nu - \mu) \frac{i-1}{L_{\text{nuc}}-1}$) no dependence on the nucleation size is observed. The dimerization rate $\mu_1 = \mu$ (which is the most limiting step) dominates entirely. Other parameters: $L = 60$, $N = 10000$, $\delta = 1$. 
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Figure S4: Combined mechanisms for different nucleation sizes (symbols) and dimerization rates (color). 

a If the sub-nucleation growth rates are identical ($\mu_i = \mu$) The stochastic yield catastrophe is weakened but still has a drastic impact. The qualitative behavior remains unchanged. 
b For a linearly increasing sub-nucleation growth rate ($\mu_i = \mu + (\nu - \mu)\frac{1}{n_{\text{nuc}}-1}$) in the deterministic regime no changes are observed at all. The effect of the stochastic yield catastrophe is less pronounced. This improvement is mainly caused by structure decay which mitigates stochastic fluctuations. However, a slight dependency of the saturation value on the rate $\mu$ is observed. Other parameters: $L = 60$, $S = L$, $N = 100$, $\delta = 0.1$. 