

THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT OF CHEMICAL MASTER EQUATION VIA NONLINEAR SEMIGROUP

YUAN GAO

Department of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

JIAN-GUO LIU

Department of Mathematics and Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, NC

ABSTRACT. Chemical reactions can be modeled by a random time-changed Poisson process on countable states. The macroscopic behaviors such as the large fluctuations can be studied via the WKB reformulation. The WKB reformulation for the backward equation is Varadhan’s discrete nonlinear semigroup and is also a monotone scheme which approximates the limiting first order Hamiltonian-Jacobi equations(HJE). The discrete Hamiltonian is a m -accretive operator, which generates a nonlinear semigroup on countable grids and justifies the wellposedness of CME and the backward equation with ‘no reaction’ boundary conditions. The convergence from the monotone schemes to the viscosity solution of HJE is proved via constructing barriers to overcome the polynomial growth coefficient in Hamiltonian. This means the convergence of Varadhan’s discrete nonlinear semigroup to the continuous Lax-Oleinik semigroup, and leads to the large deviation principle for the chemical reaction process at any single time. Here the required exponential tightness at any time is proved for either compact supported initial distribution or with the help of an exponentially tight reversible invariant measure to CME. Consequently, the macroscopic mean-field limit reaction rate equation is recovered. The convergence from a reversible invariant measure to an upper semicontinuous viscosity solution to the stationary HJE is also proved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Chemical or biochemical reactions, such as producing useful materials in industry and maintaining metabolic processes with enzyme for living cells, are one of the most important events in the world. At a microscopic scale, those reactions can be understood from a probabilistic viewpoint.

A convenient way to stochastically describe chemical reactions is via random time-changed Poisson processes $X(t)$ (1.1), c.f. [AK15]. This continuous time Markov process on countable states counts the number of molecular species $X_i(t), i = 1, \dots, N$ for chemical reactions happening in a large container characterized by a size $\frac{1}{h} \gg 1$. After counting the net change of the molecular

E-mail addresses: gao662@purdue.edu, jliu@math.duke.edu.

Date: June 1, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 80A30, 35F21, 70H33, 49N99.

Key words and phrases. Viscosity solution to HJE, Crandall-Liggett’s nonlinear semigroup, large deviation, Lax-Oleinik semigroup, monotone schemes, Varadhan’s lemma.

numbers $\vec{\nu}_j$ for a j -th reaction, the rescaled process $X^h(t) = hX(t)$ is

$$(1.1) \quad X^h(t) = X^h(0) + \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}_j h \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{X^h(t^-) + \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0\}} Y_j^+ \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(X^h(s)) ds \right) \right. \\ \left. - \mathbb{1}_{\{X^h(t^-) - \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0\}} Y_j^- \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(X^h(s)) ds \right) \right),$$

where $Y_j^\pm(t)$ are i.i.d. unit rate Poisson processes and $\mathbb{1}$ is the characteristic function indicating that there is no reaction if the next state $X^h(t^-) \pm \vec{\nu}_j h$ is negative. This ‘no reaction’ constraint will also be reflected in the chemical master equation (1.2) below. The intensity $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm(\vec{x})$ of this Poisson process is given by the law of mass action (LMA) (2.3) indicating the encounter of species in one reaction. The master equation (2.8) for the rescaled process $X^h(t)$ is a linear ordinary differential equation (ODE) system on countable discrete grids with a ‘no reaction’ boundary condition to maintain a nonnegative counting states and the conservation of total mass. The key observation is that the master equation (2.8) has a monotonicity property, which is also known as a monotone scheme approximation for hyperbolic differential equations. The generator and the associated backward equation (2.22) of process X^h can be regarded as a dual equation for the chemical master equation (CME). The backward equation (2.22) is also a linear ODE system on the same countable discrete grids adapting the ‘no reaction’ boundary condition and monotonicity.

The macroscopic behaviors of the chemical reactions with the above stochastic modeling are deterministic ‘statistical properties’ that can be studied by taking the large volume limit (a.k.a. thermodynamic limit $h \rightarrow 0$). At the first level, the law of large numbers characterizes the mean-field limit nonlinear ODE, which is known as the reaction rate equation (RRE) with polynomial nonlinearity due to LMA

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}_j \left(\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \right), \quad \Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x}_i) = k_j^\pm \prod_{\ell=1}^N (x_\ell)^{\nu_{j\ell}^\pm}.$$

At a more detailed level, the large deviation principle estimates the fluctuations away from the mean-field limit RRE (1.2). To capture the small probabilities in the large deviation regime, WKB reformulation $p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = e^{-\frac{\psi_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{h}}$ of the master equation gives a discrete Hamiltonian and an exponentially nonlinear ODE system on the same countable discrete grids; see eq.(2.17). This nonlinear ODE system inherit the monotonicity and the ‘no reaction’ boundary condition from CME, so we call (2.17) as CME in the Hamilton-Jacobi equation (HJE) form, or the monotone scheme for HJE (2.18). The backward equation can proceed with the same WKB reformulation and inherit the ‘no reaction’ boundary condition as the restriction $\vec{x}_i \pm \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0$. The resulting exponentially nonlinear ODE system

$$(1.3) \quad \partial_t u_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = H_h(u_h(\vec{x}_i), \vec{x}_i) \\ := \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right) + \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right)$$

is also a nonlinear semigroup (2.29) on discrete countable grids. A zero extension to negative grids, which is consistent with the ‘no reaction’ boundary condition, is taken on $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm$; see (2.4) and Lemma 2.2. Thus after proper extension, the domain for (1.3) and the corresponding HJE (1.5) become the whole space. We observe (1.3) is a monotone scheme because H_h is decreasing w.r.t. $u_h(\vec{x}_i)$ while increasing w.r.t. $u_h(\vec{x}_i \pm \vec{\nu}_j h)$. The probability representation for this nonlinear semigroup is

given by

$$(1.4) \quad (S_t u_0)(\vec{x}_i) = h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}_i} \left(e^{\frac{u_0(X_t^h)}{h}} \right),$$

dated back to VARADHAN [Var66]. The justification of the existence of the nonlinear semigroup on discrete countable grids relies on the resolvent approximation $u_h - \Delta t H_h(u_h) = f_h$ (i.e., backward Euler scheme (3.5)) and CRANDALL-LIGGETT's nonlinear semigroup theory [CL71]; see Theorem 3.4.

To prove the large deviation principle at a single time, the rigorous justification for the WKB expansion of the backward equation can be obtained by proving the convergence from the discrete nonlinear semigroup to (1.3) to the viscosity solution of the limiting HJE

$$(1.5) \quad \partial_t u(\vec{x}, t) - H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = 0, \quad H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) \left(e^{\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}} - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \left(e^{-\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}} - 1 \right) \right).$$

The concept of viscosity solution was initiated by CRANDALL, LIONS in [CL83, CL84] using two methods: vanishing viscosity method and monotone scheme approximation. Since the WKB reformulations for the forward/backward equation are exactly monotone schemes, we can directly prove the convergence from the exponentially nonlinear ODE system, i.e., monotone scheme (1.3), to the viscosity solution to HJE (1.5) using the upper/lower semicontinuous envelopes of discrete solution to the resolvent problem and CRANDALL-LIGGETT's nonlinear semigroup theory; see Theorem 4.7. However, since the coefficients $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$ in Hamiltonian H has polynomial growth due to LMA of chemical reaction, abstract theorems established by SOUGANIDIS [Sou85] and BARLES, PERTHAME [BP87] can not directly apply. Hence we choose the ambient space as $C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, i.e., the far field limit is constant value (4.14). The key observation is that chemical reactions satisfy the conservation of mass, i.e., there exists a positive mass vector such that $\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{m} = 0$, $j = 1, \dots, M$. Thanks to this, any mass function $f(\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x})$ is a stationary solution to HJEs (1.3) and (1.5) and hence can be used to construct barriers to overcome the polynomial growth of $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$. Thus we first prove the viscosity solution $u(\vec{x}, t) \in C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and then extend to $C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by using the non-expansive property of the resolvent problem; see Corollary 4.6. On the other hand, the construction of stationary solution to HJE is usually difficult, but under the assumption of existence of a positive reversible invariant measure π_h satisfying (3.44), we can construct an upper semicontinuous (USC) viscosity solution in the Barron-Jensen's sense [BJ90]; see Proposition 4.1. However, since the stationary HJE does not have uniqueness, whether our construction gives the unique weak KAM solution is still unknown.

Since the limiting HJE (1.5) is a first order HJE, the viscosity solution has a time reversed Lax-Oleinik semigroup representation, i.e.,

$$(1.6) \quad u(\vec{x}, t) = \sup_{\vec{y}} (u_0(\vec{y}) - I(\vec{y}; \vec{x}, t)), \quad I(\vec{y}; \vec{x}, t) := \inf_{\gamma(0)=\vec{x}, \gamma(t)=\vec{y}} \int_0^t L(\dot{\gamma}(s), \gamma(s)) ds,$$

where $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ is the convex conjugate of Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$. This connects the viscosity solution to the HJE with the pathwise deterministic optimal control problem with terminal profit $u_0(y)$ and running cost $L(\dot{\gamma}(s), \gamma(s))$; c.f., [Eva08]. On the other hand, if the large deviation principle holds at a single time, VARADHAN's lemma [Var66] implies the nonlinear semigroup solution $S_t u_0$, i.e. solution to (1.3), converges to HJE solution $u(\vec{x}, t)$ to (1.5), which is represented via the Lax-Oleinik semigroup (1.6) with I being the good rate function of the large deviation principle. The inverse VARADHAN's lemma was proved by Bryc [Bry90] as long as the exponential tightness of the process can be verified. Our convergence result (see Theorem 4.7) from the discrete nonlinear semigroup solution of (1.3) to the viscosity solution of HJE (1.5) provides the convergence part of the large

deviation principle at a single time. To verify the exponential tightness of X^h at any time t , we impose one of the following two assumptions: one is the existence of a positive reversible invariant measure π_h (see (3.44)) which is exponentially tight; another one is that there is a compact support for the initial density ρ_h^0 ; see Theorem 6.2. We point out the assumption of the reversibility of π_h includes both the chemical reaction detailed balance case (i.e., the product Poisson distribution π_h satisfying the usual detailed balance condition (3.40); see Remark 3.9) and some non-equilibrium enzyme reactions [GL21], where the energy landscape is proved to be the USC viscosity solution to stationary HJE in the Barron-Jensen's sense (see Proposition 4.1). The resulting energy landscape is nonconvex with multiple steady states indicating three key features of non-equilibrium reactions: multiple steady states, non-zero flux and positive entropy production rate at the non-equilibrium steady states (NESS), advocated by PRIGOGINE [Pri67]. As a consequence of the large deviation principle at a single time, the mean-field limit RRE (1.2) is recovered using the concentration of measures with a detailed mean-field limit rate (see Corollary 6.3).


While a comprehensive review of the vast literature of chemical reactions and large deviation principle is beyond the scope of this work, let us review here some closely related works. Using the viscosity solution to HJE as the limit of the nonlinear semigroup of Markov processes is developed by FENG AND KURZT in [FK06] as a general framework to study the large deviation principle; see also some recent developments in [Kra16, Kra20]. To study the large deviation principle, the idea of using the nonlinear semigroup and variational principle of Markov processes tracked back to [Var66, Fle83] while the idea of using the viscosity solution to HJE tracked back to [IE85, FS86, BP87]. Another general approach using HJE to study the large deviation in physical literature is the macroscopic fluctuation theory developed by BERTINI, et.al [BDSG⁺02, BDSG⁺15]; see further mathematical analysis and variational structure in [Ren18, PRS21]. For chemical reactions, the sample paths large deviation principle was first proved in [ADE18]; see recent development to handle the boundary issue with a uniform vanishing rate at boundary [AAPR21]. A dynamic large deviation principle for the pair of concentrations and fluxes of chemical reaction jump processes was proved in [PR19a]. The connection between the generalized gradient flow and the good rate function in the large deviation principle was rigorously established by MIELKE, RENGER, PELETIER [MRP14]. Mean-field limit of the chemical reaction stochastic model was proved by Kurtz in [Kur70, Kur71]. Recently, MAAS, MIELKE [MM20] provide another proof via the evolutionary Γ -convergence approach under the detailed balance assumption.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we revisit some terminologies of stochastic/deterministic chemical reaction equations and introduce the WKB reformulations for CME and the backward equation. In Section 3, we study the monotonicity, construct barriers to control the polynomial growth at far fields and the solvability of the associated monotone schemes (i.e., WKB reformulations). Then we prove the wellposedness of the backward equation in Section 3.2, and recovers the wellposedness of CME for reversible process in Section 3.3. In Section 4, we prove the convergence from the monotone schemes to the viscosity solution of HJE; see the construction of USC viscosity solution for stationary HJE in Section 4.1 and for dynamic HJE in Section 4.2 respectively. The short time classical solution to HJE and error estimates are discussed in Section 5. In Section 6, the above convergence results, together with the exponential tightness, are used to prove the large deviation principle at a single time, which also recovers the mean-field limit RRE for chemical reactions.

2. PRELIMINARIES: STOCHASTIC AND DETERMINISTIC MODELS FOR CHEMICAL REACTIONS, AND WKB REFORMULATIONS FOR FORWARD/BACKWARD EQUATIONS

In this section, we first introduce some backgrounds for stochastic chemical reaction modeled by the random time changed Poisson process (see Section 2.1), derive the CME (2.8) associated with ‘no reaction’ boundary condition (see Section 2.2) and revisit the macroscopic RRE (1.2) (see Section 2.3). Then in Sections 2.4 and 2.5, we use WKB reformulation to recast CME and the backward equation as nonlinear ODE systems, i.e., nonlinear discrete semigroup on countable grids.

2.1. Random time changed Poisson process and the law of mass action for chemical reactions. Chemical reaction with $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ species X_i and $j = 1, \dots, M$ reactions can be kinematically described as



where nonnegative integers $\nu_{j\ell}^{\pm} \geq 0$ are stoichiometric coefficients and $k_j^{\pm} \geq 0$ are reaction rates for a j -th forward/backward reactions. The column vector $\vec{v}_j := \vec{v}_j^- - \vec{v}_j^+ := (\nu_{j\ell}^- - \nu_{j\ell}^+)_{\ell=1:N} \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ is called the reaction vector for a j -th reaction counting the net change in molecular numbers for species X_{ℓ} . Let \mathbb{N} be the natural number including 0. In this paper, all vectors $\vec{X} = (X_i)_{i=1:N} \in \mathbb{N}^N$ and $(\varphi_j)_{j=1:M}, (k_j)_{j=1:M} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ are column vectors. Denote $\vec{m} = (m_{\ell})_{\ell=1:N}$ and m_{ℓ} represents the molecular weight for the ℓ -th species. Then the conservation of mass for j -th reaction in (2.1) implies

$$(2.2) \quad \vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{m} = 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, M.$$

Sometimes in an open system, if the materials exchange with the environment, denoted as \emptyset , then this exchange reaction $X_{\ell} \rightleftharpoons \emptyset$ does not conserve mass.

Let the space of natural numbers \mathbb{N} be the state space of the counting process $X_{\ell}(t)$, which counts the number of each species $\ell = 1, \dots, N$ in those biochemical reactions. Then with the reaction container size $1/h \gg 1$, $X_{\ell}^h(t) = hX_{\ell}(t)$ satisfies the random time-changed Poisson representation for chemical reactions (1.1)(c.f. [AK15])

$$\begin{aligned} X^h(t) = X^h(0) &+ \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{v}_j h \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{X^h(t^-) + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0\}} Y_j^+ \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(X^h(s)) ds \right) \right. \\ &\left. - \mathbb{1}_{\{X^h(t^-) - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0\}} Y_j^- \left(\frac{1}{h} \int_0^t \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(X^h(s)) ds \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here for the j -th reaction channel, $Y_j^{\pm}(t)$ are i.i.d. unit rate Poisson processes and its intensity function is given by the mesoscopic law of mass action (LMA)

$$(2.3) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_j^{\pm}(X^h) = k_j^{\pm} \prod_{\ell=1}^N \frac{\left(\frac{X_{\ell}^h}{h}\right)! h^{\nu_{j\ell}^{\pm}}}{\left(\frac{X_{\ell}^h}{h} - \nu_{j\ell}^{\pm}\right)!}.$$

Here we use $\tilde{\Phi}_j^{\pm}$ to distinguish the mesoscopic LMA and the limit macroscopic LMA Φ_j^{\pm} in (2.12). For the purpose of effectively handle the boundary condition when some species becomes zero, we extend process $X^h(t)$ to include negative counting number for species such that those negative numbers remains unchanged. Clearly, if $X_{\ell}^h(0) < 0$ for some ℓ , then $X^h(t) \equiv X^h(0)$. To realize this, we also set the LMA

$$(2.4) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_j^{\pm}(X^h) = 0 \text{ if for some } \ell, X_{\ell}^h < 0.$$

In summary, the original process is

$$(2.5) \quad X^h \in \Omega_h^+ := \{\vec{x}_i = \vec{i}h; \vec{i} \in \mathbb{N}^N\},$$

while after including the above extended notions, the process

$$(2.6) \quad X^h \in \Omega_h = \{\vec{x}_i = \vec{i}h; \vec{i} \in \mathbb{Z}^N\}$$

can still be described by (1.1). In other words,

$$(2.7) \quad \text{if } X^h(0) \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+, \text{ then } X^h(t) \equiv X^h(0).$$

2.2. Chemical master equation and ‘no reaction’ boundary condition. For a chemical reaction modeled by (1.1), denote the counting probability of $X^h(t)$ as $p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}_{\vec{x}_i}(X^h(t)))$, where $\mathbb{1}_{\vec{x}_i}$ is the indicator function. Then $p_h(\vec{x}_i, t)$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$ satisfies the chemical master equation (CME), c.f. [AK15]

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \left(\tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \left(\tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \right), \quad \text{for } \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+; \\ \frac{d}{dt} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= 0, \quad \text{for } \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+. \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to take $p_h(\vec{x}_i, 0) = 0$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$, which remains to be 0 all the time for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$. In the Q -matrix form, we denote $\frac{d}{dt} p_h = Q_h^* p_h$, where Q_h^* is the transpose of the generator Q_h of process $X^h(t)$. We compute the generator in Lemma 2.2 later. Here the constraint $\vec{x}_i \pm \vec{v}_j h \leq 0$ is understood as componentwisely and we will call it the ‘no reaction’ boundary condition for CME. The meaning of this ‘no reaction’ boundary condition is that if the number of some species is negative in the container, then there is no chemical reaction. Below, we will show in Lemma 2.1, under this boundary constraint, the total probability is conserved. In Lemma 2.2, we will also derive the generator Q_h and the backward equation associated with the boundary constraint. In the literature, a commonly used simple Dirichlet boundary condition is $p_h(\vec{x}_i) = 0$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$, (or equivalently $\tilde{\Phi}^\pm(\vec{x}_i) = 0$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$), c.f. [AK15, GY14, PR19b, MM20]. Instead, ‘no reaction’ boundary condition is directly derived from (1.1) and requires that any reaction jumps such that one of the specie number becomes negative can not happen. This is in the same spirit of the Feller–Wentzell type dynamic boundary conditions, which was proposed by FELLER AND WENTZELL to impose proper boundary conditions preserving total probability [Fel52, Fel54, Ven59]. The same boundary condition was used in [AHLW19], where a constraint Langevin approximation was established to incorporate the boundary condition.

An immediate lemma below shows the conservation of total probability.

Lemma 2.1. *For CME (2.8), we have the conservation of total probability*

$$(2.9) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = 0.$$

Proof. From (2.8), we have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t). \end{aligned}$$

Then changing variable $\vec{y}_i = \vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h$, the second line above becomes

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{y}_i \geq 0} \sum_{\vec{y}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0} \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{y}_i) p_h(\vec{y}_i, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{y}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h) p_h(\vec{y}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h, t).$$

And thus $\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = 0$. \square

The rigorous justification of non-explosion $\sum_{\vec{x}_i} p_h(\vec{x}_i) \leq 1$ for CME was proved in [MM20] under the detailed balance assumption (3.40). We refer to [GY14] for the existence and regularity of solutions to CME.

2.3. Mean-field limit is the macroscopic reaction rate equation. The mesoscopic jumping process X^h in (1.1) can be regarded as a large size interacting particle system. In the large size limit (thermodynamic limit), this interacting particle system can be approximately described by a mean field equation, i.e., a macroscopic nonlinear chemical reaction-rate equation. If the law of large numbers in the mean field limit holds, i.e., $p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \rightarrow \delta_{\vec{x}(t)}$ for some $\vec{x}(t)$, then the limit $\vec{x}(t)$ describes the dynamics of the concentration of N species in the continuous state space $\mathbb{R}_+^N := \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N; x_\ell \geq 0\}$ and is given by the following reaction rate equation (RRE) (1.2), a.k.a. chemical kinetic rate equation. The macroscopic fluxes Φ_j^\pm satisfy the macroscopic LMA

$$(2.12) \quad \Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x}) = k_j^\pm \prod_{\ell=1}^N (x_\ell)^{\nu_{j\ell}^\pm}.$$

For analysis simplicity, we also extend this LMA as

$$(2.13) \quad \Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x}) = 0 \quad \text{if } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

This is a macroscopic approximation for the mesoscopic LMA (2.3) since $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow \Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$ as $\vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}$. This RRE with LMA were first proposed by GULDBERG, WAAGE in 1864. The detailed balance condition for RRE (1.2) is defined by WEGSCHEIDER 1901, LEWIS 1925: there exists $\vec{x}^s > 0$ (componentwise) such that

$$(2.14) \quad \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}^s) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}^s) = 0, \quad \forall j.$$

Kurtz [Kur70, Kur71] proved the law of large numbers for the large size process $X^h(t)$; c.f., [AK15, Theorem 4.1], i.e., if $X^h(0) \rightarrow \vec{x}(0)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0, t > 0$,

$$(2.15) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{P}\left\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |X^h(s) - \vec{x}(s)| \geq \varepsilon \right\} = 0.$$

Thus we will also call the large size limiting ODE (1.2) as the macroscopic RRE. This gives a passage from the mesoscopic LMA (2.3) to the macroscopic one (2.12). We also refer to recent results in [MM20] which proves the evolutionary Γ -convergence from CME to the Liouville equation and thus starting from a deterministic state \vec{x}_0 , [MM20, Theorem 4.7] recovers Kurtz's results on the mean field limit of CME.

2.4. WKB reformulation for CME and discrete HJE. Besides the macroscopic trajectory $\bar{x}(t)$ given by the law of large numbers, WKB expansion for $p_h(\bar{x}_i, t)$ in CME (2.8) is another standard method [KMK73, Gan87, DMRH94, SW95, GQ17], which builds up a more informative bridge between the mesoscopic dynamics and the macroscopic behaviors. To characterize the exponential asymptotic behavior, take a change of variable

$$(2.16) \quad p_h(\bar{x}_i, t) = e^{-\frac{\psi_h(\bar{x}_i, t)}{h}}, \quad p_h(\bar{x}_i, 0) = p_0(\bar{x}_i).$$

CME can be recast as the following nonlinear ODE system, for $\bar{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$,

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \partial_t \psi_h(\bar{x}_i) + \sum_{j=1, \bar{x}_i - \bar{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\bar{x}_i - \bar{\nu}_j h) e^{(\psi_h(\bar{x}_i) - \psi_h(\bar{x}_i - \bar{\nu}_j h))/h} - \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\bar{x}_i) \\ + \sum_{j=1, \bar{x}_i + \bar{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\bar{x}_i + \bar{\nu}_j h) e^{(\psi_h(\bar{x}_i) - \psi_h(\bar{x}_i + \bar{\nu}_j h))/h} - \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\bar{x}_i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

while for $\bar{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$, $\partial_t \psi_h(\bar{x}_i) = 0$. We point out that in general a constant is not a solution to (2.17). On the other hand, if ψ_h is a solution then $\psi_h + c$ is also a solution to (2.17). Formally, as $h \rightarrow 0$, Taylor's expansion of ψ_h w.r.t h leads to the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation (HJE) for the rescaled master equation (2.8) for $\psi(\bar{x}, t)$

$$(2.18) \quad \partial_t \psi(\bar{x}, t) = - \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\Phi_j^+(\bar{x}) \left(e^{\bar{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla \psi(\bar{x}, t)} - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}) \left(e^{-\bar{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla \psi(\bar{x}, t)} - 1 \right) \right).$$

Define Hamiltonian $H(\bar{p}, \bar{x})$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}_+^N$ as

$$(2.19) \quad H(\bar{p}, \bar{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\Phi_j^+(\bar{x}) e^{\bar{\nu}_j \cdot \bar{p}} - \Phi_j^+(\bar{x}) + \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}) e^{-\bar{\nu}_j \cdot \bar{p}} - \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}) \right).$$

Recall in (2.13), $\Phi_j^\pm(\bar{x}) = 0$ for $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^N$. We naturally extend $H(\bar{p}, \bar{x})$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$. Then the HJE for $\psi(\bar{x}, t)$ can be recast as

$$(2.20) \quad \partial_t \psi + H(\nabla \psi, \bar{x}) = 0, \quad \bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

The WKB analysis above defines a Hamiltonian $H(\bar{p}, \bar{x})$, which contains almost all the information for the macroscopic dynamics [DMRH94, GL21]. For this reason, we also call (2.17) as the CME in the HJE form. We remark this kind of WKB expansion was first used by KUBO et.al. [KMK73] for master equations for general Markov processes and later was applied to CME in [Gan87]. In [DMRH94], formally derived HJE (2.20) with the associated Hamiltonian H in (2.19).

2.5. WKB reformulation for the backward equation is Varadhan's nonlinear semigroup.

The fluctuation on path space, i.e., the large deviation principle, can be computed through WKB expansion for the backward equation. Recall the rescaled process $X^h(t)$ in (1.1), which is also denoted as X_t^h for simplicity. For any $f \in C_b(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, denote

$$(2.21) \quad w_h(\bar{x}_i, t) = \mathbb{E}^{\bar{x}_i}(f(X_t^h)),$$

then $w_h(\bar{x}_i, t)$ satisfies the backward equation

$$(2.22) \quad \partial_t w_h = Q_h w_h, \quad w_h(\bar{x}_i, 0) = f(\bar{x}_i).$$

Notice the 'no reaction' boundary condition we derived in CME (2.8). Below we give a lemma to explicitly derive the associated boundary condition in the generator Q_h as the duality of Q_h^* .

Lemma 2.2. *The backward equation with explicit generator Q_h can be expressed as the duality of the forward equation*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \partial_t w_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) (w_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h) - w_h(\vec{x}_i)) \\
 (2.23) \quad &+ \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) (w_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h) - w_h(\vec{x}_i)), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+; \\
 \partial_t w_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= 0, \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Multiplying (2.8) by w_h and summation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.24) \quad \langle w_h, Q_h^* p \rangle &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h, t) w_h(\vec{x}_i) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) w_h(\vec{x}_i) \\
 &+ \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{x}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h) p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h, t) w_h(\vec{x}_i) - \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) w_h(\vec{x}_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here from (2.8), we used

$$(2.25) \quad \langle w_h, Q_h^* p \rangle = \langle w_h, Q_h^* p \rangle_{\Omega_h^+}.$$

Changing variable $\vec{y}_i = \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h$ in the above $\tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h)$ term while changing variable $\vec{y}_i = \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h$ in the above $\tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.26) \quad \langle Q_h w_h, p \rangle_{\Omega_h^+} &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{y}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{y}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{y}_i) p_h(\vec{y}_i, t) [w_h(\vec{y}_i + \vec{v}_j h) - w_h(\vec{y}_i)] \\
 &+ \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{y}_i \geq 0} \sum_{j=1, \vec{y}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{y}_i) p_h(\vec{y}_i, t) [w_h(\vec{y}_i - \vec{v}_j h) - w_h(\vec{y}_i)].
 \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we set

$$(2.27) \quad Q_h w_h = 0, \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+.$$

Regarding p as arbitrary test functions, this gives the backward equation (2.22). \square

Denote $u_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h \log w_h(\vec{x}_i, t)$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$. We obtain a nonlinear ODE system for the backward equation in HJE form

$$(2.28) \quad \partial_t u_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h e^{-\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{h}} Q_h e^{\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{h}} =: H_h(u_h), \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i, 0) = h \log f(\vec{x}_i).$$

The above WKB reformulation for the backward equation is equivalent to

$$(2.29) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h \log w_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}_i} (f(X_t^h)) = h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}_i} \left(e^{\frac{u_0(X_t^h)}{h}} \right) =: (S_t u_0)(\vec{x}_i),$$

which is the so-called nonlinear semigroup [Var66, FK06] for process $X^h(t)$. Notice here the process X^h and the nonlinear semigroup are all extended to $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$.

We first write H_h explicitly. For $\vec{x}_i \geq 0$,

$$(2.30) \quad H_h(u) = \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right) + \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{u_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\nu}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right).$$

From the extended $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm(\vec{x}_i)$ in (2.4), (2.30) also naturally extended to $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$. We see $\partial_t u_h = H_h(u_h)$ is a nonlinear ODE system on the countable grids. We point out a constant is always a solution to (2.28). Meanwhile, if u_h is a solution then $u_h + c$ is also a solution to (2.28). We will use these two important invariance facts to prove the existence and contraction principle later; see Lemma 3.2 and Proposition 3.3.

Take a formal limit in (2.28) with the discrete Hamiltonian H_h in (2.30), we obtain HJE in terms of $u(\vec{x}, t)$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, i.e., (1.5)

$$\partial_t u(\vec{x}, t) = \sum_{j=1}^M \left(\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) \left(e^{\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla u(\vec{x}, t)} - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \left(e^{-\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla u(\vec{x}, t)} - 1 \right) \right) = H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}).$$

We remark that the duality between the forward and backward equation, after WKB limit, leads to the same HJEs with only a sign difference in time derivative. The boundary condition for (2.28) is incorporated into the constraint $\vec{x}_i \pm \vec{\nu}_j h \geq 0$ in the equation. Imposing physically meaningful boundary condition of the limit HJE (1.5) at $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$ is complicated. However, in our construction of the viscosity solution to HJE, as a limit of (2.28), can automatically inherit the boundary condition of (2.28) and meanwhile the HJE (1.5) is defined on whole space \mathbb{R}^N by using extension; see Section 4.2. This is in the same spirit of the Feller–Wentzell type dynamic boundary conditions, which was proposed by FELLER AND WENTZELL to impose proper boundary conditions preserving total mass [Fel52, Fel54, Ven59].

From now on, for both discrete monotone scheme (1.3) and HJE (2.18), the domain means extended domain Ω_h and \mathbb{R}^N respectively.

3. WELLPOSEDNESS OF CME AND BACKWARD EQUATION VIA NONLINEAR SEMIGROUP

In this section, we study the wellposedness of CME (2.8) and the backward equation (2.22) via the nonlinear semigroup method. First, the WKB reformulation for both CME (2.8) and the backward equation (2.22) leads to two discrete HJEs respectively. The main difference between them is the sign of the time derivative. Next, we observe that both CME and the backward equation can be regarded as monotone schemes for linear hyperbolic equations. These monotone schemes, after WKB reformulation, is still monotone schemes for the corresponding HJEs. The essential features of these monotone schemes is the monotonicity and the nonexpansive estimates, which naturally generates a nonlinear semigroup thanks to Crandall-Liggett’s nonlinear semigroup theory. Using this observation, this section obtains a unique discrete solution to the corresponding HJEs.

In Section 3.1, we study the monotone and nonexpansive properties of monotone scheme with backward Euler time discretization and then prove the existence and the uniqueness of the backward Euler scheme (3.5) by the Perron method. We point out we can not directly use explicit scheme in [CL84] because LMA (2.12) leads to a polynomial growing in the coefficients $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$. Thus we will prove the existence and uniqueness of this backward Euler scheme (3.5). In Section 3.2, taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ and using the nonexpansive nonlinear semigroup constructed by Crandall-Liggett [CL71], we prove the global existence of the solution to the backward equation (2.22). In order to recover the existence and exponential tightness of CME from the results of the backward equation, Section 3.3 assume the existence of a positive reversible invariant measure π_h satisfying (3.44) and then

prove the existence, comparison principle and exponential tightness of CME; see Corollary 3.8. This reversibility assumption includes not only the usual chemical reaction detailed balance (3.40) but also some non-equilibrium enzyme reactions [GL21], where the energy landscape (i.e., the limiting solution to stationary HJE in Proposition 4.1) is nonconvex with multiple steady states indicating three key features of non-equilibrium reactions: multiple steady states, non-zero flux and positive entropy production rate at the non-equilibrium steady states (NESS).

3.1. A monotone scheme for HJE inherit from CME. Recall the backward equation (2.22) and the WKB reformulation (2.28). Recall the countable discrete domain as

$$(3.1) \quad \Omega_h := \{\vec{x}_i = i\vec{h}; i \in \mathbb{Z}^N\}.$$

(1.3) is exactly a monotone scheme for the corresponding HJE (1.5). We remark that the solution to (1.3) shifted by a constant is still a solution. After proofing the wellposedness, we also call the solution to (1.3) as Varadhan's nonlinear semigroup.

3.1.1. Nonexpansive property for backward Euler monotone scheme. We now rewrite monotone scheme (1.3) following BARLES-SOUGANIDIS framework [BS91]. Denote the monotone scheme operator

$$(3.2) \quad H_h : D(H_h) \subset \ell^\infty(\Omega_h) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Omega_h); \quad (u(\vec{x}_i))_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} \mapsto (H_h(\vec{x}_i, u(\vec{x}_i), u(\cdot)))_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h}$$

where $D(H_h)$ is the domain of H_h , $D(H_h) := \{(u(\vec{x}_i)) \in \ell^\infty(\Omega_h); (H_h(\vec{x}_i, u(\vec{x}_i), u)) \in \ell^\infty(\Omega_h)\}$

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), \varphi) := & \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right) \\ & + \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i) \left(e^{\frac{\varphi(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h) - u_h(\vec{x}_i)}{h}} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

This notation of discrete Hamiltonian follows [BS91].

It is straightforward to verify H_h satisfies the monotone scheme condition, i.e.,

$$(3.4) \quad \text{if } \varphi_1 \leq \varphi_2 \quad \text{then } H_h(\vec{x}, u_h(\vec{x}), \varphi_1) \leq H_h(\vec{x}, u_h(\vec{x}), \varphi_2).$$

Denote the time step as Δt . Then the backward Euler time discretization gives

$$(3.5) \quad \frac{u_h^n - u_h^{n-1}}{\Delta t} - H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h^n(\vec{x}_i), u_h^n) = 0.$$

Here the second variable in H is the value $u_h^n(\vec{x}_i)$ at \vec{x}_i , and the third variable u_h replaces φ in (3.2) indicating the dependence of the values u_h at the surrounding jumping points $u_h(\vec{x}_i \pm \vec{v}_j h)$. This notation clearly shows that H_h is decreasing w.r.t. the second variable while increasing w.r.t. the third variable. Then $u_h^n = (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-1} u_h^{n-1} := J_{\Delta t, h} u_h^{n-1}$ can be solved as the solution u_h to the discrete resolvent problem with $f_h = u_h^{n-1}$

$$(3.6) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \Delta t H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) = f_h(\vec{x}_i).$$

We first prove the nonexpansive property for the discrete solutions, which implies the uniqueness of the solution to (3.5).

Lemma 3.1. *Let u_h and v_h be two solutions satisfying $u_h = J_{\Delta t, h} f_h$ and $v_h = J_{\Delta t, h} g_h$. Then we have*

(i) *Monotonicity: if $f_h \leq g_h$, then $u_h \leq v_h$;*

(ii) *Nonexpansive:*

$$(3.7) \quad \|u_h - v_h\|_\infty \leq \|f_h - g_h\|_\infty.$$

Proof. First, denote \vec{x}_i^* as a maximum point such that $\max(u_h - v_h) = (u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^*)$. Here, without loss of generality, we assume the maximum is attained, otherwise, the proof is still true by passing to a limit. Then

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} (u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^*) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i^*) e^{\xi_i} [(u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^* + \vec{v}_j h) - (u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^*)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{j=1, \vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_j h \geq 0}^M \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i^*) e^{\xi_i'} [(u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^* - \vec{v}_j h) - (u_h - v_h)(\vec{x}_i^*)] + (f_h - g_h)(\vec{x}_i^*) \\ &\leq (f_h - g_h)(\vec{x}_i^*), \end{aligned}$$

where ξ_i, ξ_i' are some constants in the mean value theorem. This immediately gives

$$(3.9) \quad \max(u_h - v_h) \leq \max(f_h - g_h).$$

Then if $f_h \leq g_h$, we have $u_h \leq v_h$, which concludes (i). Notice also the identity

$$(3.10) \quad \|u_h - v_h\|_\infty = \max\{\max(u_h - v_h), \max(v_h - u_h)\} \leq \max\{\max(f_h - g_h), \max(g_h - f_h)\} = \|f_h - g_h\|_\infty,$$

which concludes (ii). \square

The property (ii) shows the resolvent $J_{\Delta t, h} = (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-1}$ is nonexpansive. Thus we also obtain $-H_h$ is an accretive operator on $\ell^\infty(\Omega_h)$.

3.1.2. Existence and uniqueness of the backward Euler scheme via the Perron method. We next prove the following lemma to ensure the existence and uniqueness of a solution u_h^n to (3.5), i.e., solving the resolvent problem (3.6). The proof of this lemma follows the classical Perron method and the observation that a constant is always a solution to (1.3).

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\lambda > 0$. Assume there exist constants $K_M := \sup_i f(\vec{x}_i)$, $K_m := \inf_i f(\vec{x}_i)$. Then there exists a unique solution u_h to*

$$(3.11) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \lambda H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) = f(\vec{x}_i), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h.$$

We also have $K_m \leq u_h \leq K_M$.

Proof. Step 1. We define a discrete subsolution u_h to (3.11) as

$$(3.12) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \lambda H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) \leq f(\vec{x}_i), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h.$$

Since H_h satisfies the monotone scheme condition (3.4), we can directly verify the above discrete subsolution definition is consistent with the viscosity subsolution; see definition in Appendix A.3. Supersolution is defined by reversing the inequality.

Based on this definition, we can directly verify K_M is a super solution while K_m is a subsolution. Denote

$$(3.13) \quad \mathcal{F} := \{v; \quad v \text{ is a subsolution to (3.11), } v \leq K_M\}.$$

Since $K_m \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F} \neq \emptyset$. Step 2. Define

$$(3.14) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i) := \sup\{v_h(\vec{x}_i); v \in \mathcal{F}\}.$$

We will prove $u_h(\vec{x}_i)$ is a subsolution. It is obvious that $u_h \geq K_m$. Since Ω_h is countable, by the diagonal argument, there exists a subsequence $v_k \in \mathcal{F}$ such that for any \vec{x}_i , $v_k(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow u_h(\vec{x}_i)$ as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. Then from the continuity of H_h , for each $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$, taking $k \rightarrow +\infty$, we have

$$(3.15) \quad u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \lambda H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) \leq f(\vec{x}_i).$$

Step 3. We now prove u_h is also a supersolution. If not, there exists a point x^* such that

$$(3.16) \quad u_h(x^*) - \lambda H_h(x^*, u_h(x^*), u_h) < f(x^*).$$

First, if $u_h(x^*) = K_M$, then from the definition of u_h , x^* is a maximal point for u_h . Then $H_h(x^*, u_h(x^*), u_h) \leq 0$, which contradicts with $f \leq K_M$.

Therefore, we know $u_h(x^*) < K_M$. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $u_h(x^*) + \varepsilon < K_M$. Define

$$(3.17) \quad v_h(\vec{x}_i) := \begin{cases} u_h(x^*) + \varepsilon, & \vec{x}_i = x^*; \\ u_h(\vec{x}_i) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $\vec{x}_i = x^*$, from (3.16), by the continuity of H , taking ε small enough, then we have

$$(3.18) \quad u_h(x^*) + \varepsilon - \lambda H_h(x^*, u_h(x^*) + \varepsilon, u_h) < f(x^*).$$

For $\vec{x}_i \neq x^*$, since $u_h \leq v_h$, from (3.15) and monotone condition (3.4), we have

$$(3.19) \quad v_h(\vec{x}_i) - \lambda H_h(\vec{x}_i, v_h(\vec{x}_i), v_h) \leq u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \lambda H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) \leq f(\vec{x}_i).$$

Therefore $v_h \in \mathcal{F}$ is a subsolution which is strictly larger than u_h . This is a contradiction. In summary, u_h constructed in (3.14) is a solution. Uniqueness is directly from the construction in (3.14). \square

3.1.3. *Construct barriers to control the polynomial growth of intensity $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm(\vec{x}_i)$.* Below, under a slight assumption of the conservation of total mass, we provide more contraction estimates on the solution to (3.11).

Assume there exists a componentwisely positive mass vector \vec{m} such that (2.2) holds. Under the mass balance assumption (2.2), for $m_1 = \min_{i=1}^N m_i$, we have

$$(3.20) \quad m_1 \|\vec{x}\| \leq m_1 \|\vec{x}\|_1 \leq \vec{m} \cdot \vec{x} \leq \|\vec{m}\| \|\vec{x}\|, \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N,$$

where $\|\vec{x}\| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \cdots + x_N^2}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $f \in \ell^\infty$ be RHS in the resolvent problem (3.11). Assume there exists positive \vec{m} satisfying (2.2). Define*

$$(3.21) \quad f_m(r) := \inf_{|\vec{x}_i| \geq r, \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+} f(\vec{x}_i), \quad f_M(r) := \sup_{|\vec{x}_i| \geq r, \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+} f(\vec{x}_i).$$

Define

$$(3.22) \quad u_m(\vec{x}_i) := \begin{cases} f_m\left(\frac{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}_i}{\|\vec{m}\|}\right), & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+, \\ f(\vec{x}_i), & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+, \end{cases} \quad u_M(\vec{x}_i) := \begin{cases} f_M\left(\frac{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}_i}{m_1}\right), & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+, \\ f(\vec{x}_i), & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+, \end{cases}$$

Then

(i) we have the estimate

$$(3.23) \quad u_m(\vec{x}_i) \leq f(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_M(\vec{x}_i), \quad \forall \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h;$$

(ii) $u_m(\vec{x}_i)$ and $u_M(\vec{x}_i)$ are two stationary solutions to HJE

$$(3.24) \quad H(\vec{x}_i, u_m(\vec{x}_i), u_m) = 0, \quad H(\vec{x}_i, u_M(\vec{x}_i), u_M) = 0;$$

(iii) we have the barrier estimates for the solution u_h to (3.11)

$$(3.25) \quad u_m(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_h(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_M(\vec{x}_i);$$

(iv) if f satisfies $f \equiv \text{const}$ for $|\vec{x}_i| > R$ and $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$, then $u_h(\vec{x}_i)$ satisfies $u_h \equiv \text{const}$ for $|\vec{x}_i| > \frac{\|\vec{m}\|R}{m_1}$ and $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$.

Proof. First, $f_M(r)$ is decreasing in r while $f_m(r)$ is increasing in r . Thus, together with (3.20), we know for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$

$$(3.26) \quad f(\vec{x}_i) \leq f_M(|\vec{x}_i|) \leq f_M\left(\frac{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}_i}{m_1}\right),$$

$$(3.27) \quad f(\vec{x}_i) \geq f_m(|\vec{x}_i|) \geq f_m\left(\frac{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}_i}{\|\vec{m}\|}\right).$$

Second, \vec{m} satisfies (2.2) implies

$$(3.28) \quad u_m(\vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h) = f_m\left(\frac{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{m} h}{\|\vec{m}\|}\right) = u_m(\vec{x}_i), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+ \text{ and } \vec{x}_i + \vec{v}_j h \in \Omega_h^+.$$

Thus from the definition of H_h in (3.3), we conclude (ii).

Third, from the monotonicity (i) in Lemma 3.1 and (3.24), we know the comparison $u_m(\vec{x}_i) \leq f(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_M(\vec{x}_i)$ in (3.23) implies $u_m(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_h(\vec{x}_i) \leq u_M(\vec{x}_i)$. Thus we have conclusion (iii) and thus (iv). \square

3.2. Existence and uniqueness of semigroup solution to the backward equation. Combining the existence results and barrier estimates in Section 3.1, we obtain the existence and uniqueness of the solution to backward Euler scheme (3.5). This, together with the nonexpansive property of the resolvent $J_{\Delta t, h} = (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-1}$ in Lemma 3.1 implies that $-H_h$ is a maximal accretive operator. Precisely, define the space

$$(3.29) \quad \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h) := \{(u_h(\vec{x}_i)) \in \ell^\infty(\Omega_h); u_h(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow \text{const for } \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+ \text{ and as } |\vec{x}_i| \rightarrow +\infty\}$$

and a subspace

$$(3.30) \quad \ell_{c*}^\infty(\Omega_h) := \{(u_h(\vec{x}_i)) \in \ell^\infty(\Omega_h); u_h(\vec{x}_i) = \text{const for } \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+ \text{ and } |\vec{x}_i| > R \text{ for some } R > 0\}.$$

Define

$$(3.31) \quad H_h : D(H_h) \subset \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h) \rightarrow \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h); \quad (u(\vec{x}_i))_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} \mapsto (H_h(\vec{x}_i, u(\vec{x}_i), u(\cdot)))_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h}$$

The abstract domain of H_h is not straightforward to be characterized due to the polynomial growth of $\tilde{\Phi}_j^\pm(\vec{x}_i)$ in H_h . However, for $u_h \in \ell_{c*}^\infty$, the polynomial growth at far field does not turn on because $u_h = \text{const}$ for large $|\vec{x}_i|$. Hence $\ell_{c*}^\infty \subset D(H_h)$. Since $\overline{\ell_{c*}^\infty(\Omega_h)} = \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$, hence H_h is densely defined. Thus we conclude the following theorem

Theorem 3.4. *Let H_h be the discrete Hamiltonian operator defined in (3.31). Assume there exists positive \vec{m} satisfying (2.2). Let $u^0 \in \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$, then there exists a unique global solution $u_h(t, \vec{x}_i) \in C([0, +\infty); \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h))$ to (1.3) and $u_h(t, \vec{x}_i)$ satisfies*

(i) contraction

$$(3.32) \quad \inf_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} u^0(\vec{x}_i) \leq \inf_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} u_h(t, \vec{x}_i) \leq \sup_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} u_h(t, \vec{x}_i) \leq \sup_{\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h} u^0(\vec{x}_i);$$

(ii) for all $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$, $u_h(\cdot, \vec{x}_i) \in C^1(0, +\infty)$;

(iii) Moreover, if $u^0 \in \ell_{c*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$ then $u_h(\cdot, \vec{x}_i) \in C^1[0, +\infty)$ for all $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$.

Proof. Assume $u^0 \in \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h) = \overline{D(H_h)}$. Then fix Δt , from the existence and uniqueness of the resolvent problem in Lemma 3.2 and the barrier estimate in Proposition 3.3, we know for any $f \in \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$, there exists a unique solution $u_h \in \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$ to the resolvent problem

$$u_h(\vec{x}_i) - \Delta t H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(\vec{x}_i), u_h) = f(\vec{x}_i).$$

Hence we know $H_h(u_h) \in \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$ and thus $u_h \in D(H_h)$. This gives the maximality of $-H_h$. Besides, the accretivity of $-H_h$ is given by the non-expansive property of the resolvent in Lemma 3.1.

Thus $-H_h$ is a maximal accretive operator on Banach space $\ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$, then by CRANDALL AND LIGGETT [CL71], there exists a unique global contraction C^0 -semigroup solution $u_h(t, \vec{x}_i) \in C([0, +\infty); \ell_{0*}^\infty(\Omega_h))$ to (1.3)

$$(3.33) \quad u_h(t, \cdot) := \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-[\frac{t}{\Delta t}]} u^0 =: S_{h,t} u^0.$$

Here $[\frac{t}{\Delta t}]$ is the integer part of $\frac{t}{\Delta t}$. The contraction (3.32) follows from the nonexpansive property of $J_{\Delta t, h}$ in Lemma 3.1.

For any $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$, from

$$(3.34) \quad u_{h,\varepsilon}(t, \vec{x}_i) - u_{h,\varepsilon}(0, \vec{x}_i) = \int_0^t H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_{h,\varepsilon}(s, \vec{x}_i), u_{h,\varepsilon}(s)) ds,$$

taking limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$(3.35) \quad u_h(t, \vec{x}_i) - u(0, \vec{x}_i) = \int_0^t H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h(s, \vec{x}_i), u_h(s)) ds.$$

Therefore we conclude $u_h(\cdot, \vec{x}_i) \in C^1(0, +\infty)$ is the solution to (1.3). For $u^0 \in \ell_{c*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$, $u^0 \in D(H_h)$, thus the C^1 regularity includes $t = 0$. □

Remark 3.5. We remark that since the solution to (1.3) translated by a constant is still a solution, the nonexpansive property for time-continuous monotone scheme is equivalent to the monotonicity of the solution due to Crandall-Tartar's lemma [CT80]. Precisely, given an initial data u_h^0 , denote the numerical solution computed from the monotone scheme (1.3) as

$$(3.36) \quad u_h(t, \cdot) = S_t u_h^0.$$

Then we know S_t is invariant under a translation by constant, i.e., for any constant c and any function $u_h \in \ell^\infty(\Omega_h)$

$$(3.37) \quad S_t(u_h + c) = S_t u_h + c.$$

Moreover, this semigroup satisfies the following properties

- (i) Monotonicity: if $u_h \geq v_h$ then $S_t u_h \geq S_t v_h$;
- (ii) ℓ^∞ nonexpansive:

$$(3.38) \quad \|S_t u_h - S_t v_h\|_\infty \leq \|u_h - v_h\|_\infty.$$

Indeed, first, from the definition of S_t , if u_h is a solution to (1.3), then $u_h + c$ is also a solution. Thus (3.37) is satisfied. Second, similar to (3.8), we have (ii). Then by Crandall-Tartar's lemma [CT80], under (3.37), (i) is equivalent to (ii).

3.3. Existence, comparison principle and exponential tightness of CME for reversible case. In this section, under the assumption of a positive reversible invariant measure π_h satisfying 3.44, we focus on recovering the existence and exponential tightness of CME from the backward equation.

3.3.1. Chemical reaction detailed balance condition and CME reversible condition. Assume RRE satisfies the detailed balance condition (2.14) with a positive steady state \vec{x}^s ; see Appendix A.1 for on the unique characterization of \vec{x}^s . WHITTLE [Whi86, Ch7, Thm 3.1 and eq. (1) in Sec 7.4] use the product of Poisson distributions with intensity \vec{x}^s/h

$$(3.39) \quad \pi_h(\vec{x}_i) = \prod_{k=1}^N \frac{(x_k^s/h)^{x_k/h}}{(x_k/h)!} e^{-x_k^s/h} \text{ for } \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$$

to construct a detailed balanced invariant measure $\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)$ satisfying for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$, $\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h \in \Omega_h^+$,

$$(3.40) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h) \pi_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\nu}_j h) = \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}_i) \pi_h(\vec{x}_i), \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, M.$$

This is the commonly used detailed balance condition in biochemistry for the process X^h , c.f. [Whi86, Ch7, Thm 3.1 and eq. (1) in Sec 7.4], [ACK10, Theorem 4.5], [QG21, (7.30)].

As in (2.16), change variable to ψ_h^{ss} such that $e^{-\psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i)/h} = \pi_h(\vec{x}_i)$ in the CME. Then one can directly verify $\psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i)$ is a stationary solution to the discrete stationary HJE (2.17). In this case, for any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, let $\vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$, by the Stirling's formula, we have the following convergence of WKB approximation for π

$$(3.41) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i) &= -h \log \pi_h(\vec{x}_i) = - \sum_{i=k}^N (x_k \log x_k^s - x_k \log x_k + x_k - x_k^s) + hO\left(\sum_k \log \frac{x_k}{h}\right) \\ &\rightarrow \text{KL}(\vec{x} || \vec{x}^s) = \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}). \end{aligned}$$

From (3.39), we know $\pi_h \rightarrow \delta_{\vec{x}^s}$ and thus the detailed balance condition (3.40), after taking integration and letting $h \rightarrow 0$, leads to the detailed balance condition (2.14) for RRE. Then (2.14), and (2.12) yields the identity $\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^s} = \log \left(\frac{\Phi_j^-(\vec{x})}{\Phi_j^+(\vec{x})} \right)$, so one can directly verify $\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \text{KL}(\vec{x} || \vec{x}^s) = \sum_i \left(x_i \ln \frac{x_i}{x_i^s} - x_i + x_i^s \right)$ is a stationary solution satisfying $H(\log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^s}, \vec{x}) = 0$. An immediate conclusion in the detailed balance case (3.40) is that $\psi^{ss}(\vec{x})$ is convex and unbounded.

Second, observe the Q_h -matrix for the stochastic process and then one can see that the jumping process indeed does not distinct different reaction channel j . Instead, the jumping process with Q_h only distinct the same reaction vector $\vec{\xi}$ and then the summation in j shall be rearranged in terms of all j such that $\vec{\nu}_j = \pm \vec{\xi}$. Hence we define the grouped fluxes as

$$(3.42) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}) := \sum_{j: \vec{\nu}_j = \vec{\xi}} \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}) + \sum_{j: \vec{\nu}_j = -\vec{\xi}} \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}), \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}) := \sum_{j: \vec{\nu}_j = \vec{\xi}} \tilde{\Phi}_j^-(\vec{x}) + \sum_{j: \vec{\nu}_j = -\vec{\xi}} \tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{x}).$$

Then CME (2.8) recast as

$$(3.43) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h \geq 0} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h) p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i + h \vec{\xi} \geq 0} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h) p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h, t) - \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i) p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \right) \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+. \end{aligned}$$

Again, $\frac{d}{dt} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = 0$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$. Therefore, for any \vec{x}_i and $\vec{\xi}$, the detailed balance for the 'effective stochastic process' means the total forward probability steady flux from \vec{x}_i to $\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h$ equals the total backward one, i.e., for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$, $\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h \in \Omega_h^+$,

$$(3.44) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h) \pi_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h) = \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i) \pi_h(\vec{x}_i), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}.$$

We call this as a reversible condition (detailed balance condition) for CME; a.k.a Markov chain detailed balance, c.f. [Jos15].

Under the reversible condition for CME (3.44), due to the flux grouping degeneracy brought by the same reaction vector, we do not have an explicit invariant distribution anymore. Indeed, in some non-equilibrium enzyme reactions satisfying reversible condition (3.44), the macroscopic energy landscape ψ^{ss} becomes nonconvex with multiple minimums. These multiple stable states are called non-equilibrium steady states (NESS) which was pioneered by Prigogine [Pri67]. Multiple steady states, nonzero steady state fluxes and positive entropy production rates at non-equilibrium steady states (NESS) are three distinguished features for non-equilibrium reactions. Below, we give

a rigorous proof for the existence and uniqueness of such a limiting energy landscape ψ^{ss} under the reversible condition for CME (3.44).

3.3.2. Existence and comparison principle for reversible CME. In this section, under the condition that CME satisfies reversible condition (3.44), we prove the existence and comparison principle for the solution to CME (2.8).

Lemma 3.6. *Assume there exists a positive invariant measure $\pi_h > 0$ in Ω_h^+ to CME (2.8) and π_h satisfies the CME reversible condition (3.44). Then we know that*

$$(3.45) \quad Q_h^* p_h = \begin{cases} \pi_h Q_h \left(\frac{p_h}{\pi_h} \right), & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+; \\ 0, & \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Using (3.44), RHS of CME (2.8) reads that for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$,

$$(3.46) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi_h} Q_h^* p_h &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h \geq 0} \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h) \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} - \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i) \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i + h \vec{\xi} \geq 0} \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h) \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} - \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i) \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h \geq 0} \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i) \left(\frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi} h)} - \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\vec{\xi}, \vec{x}_i + h \vec{\xi} \geq 0} \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i) \left(\frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi} h)} - \frac{p_h(\vec{x}_i, t)}{\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)} \right) = Q_h \left(\frac{p_h}{\pi_h} \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 3.7. Given any $0 < \ell < \infty$, if there exists a R_ℓ and h_0 such that,

$$(3.47) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \sum_{|\vec{x}_i| \geq R_\ell, \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+} p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) \leq e^{-\frac{\ell}{h}}, \quad \forall h \leq h_0,$$

then we call the sequence of process $(X^h(t))$ is exponentially tight for each $t \in [0, T]$.

Here we only consider $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$ because from (2.8), it is natural to take $p_h(\vec{x}_i, 0) = 0$ for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$, which remains to be 0 all the time for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$. Notice that

$$(3.48) \quad \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{P}(|X^h(t)| \geq R_\ell) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X^h(t)| \geq R_\ell \right).$$

Hence the exponential tightness of $(X^h(t))$ for each $t \in [0, T]$ defined above is weaker than the usual definition of the exponential compact containment condition for X^h , i.e., for any $\ell < \infty$, there exist R_ℓ and h_0 such that,

$$(3.49) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X^h(t)| \geq R_\ell \right) \leq e^{-\frac{\ell}{h}}, \quad \forall h \leq h_0;$$

c.f. [FK06, Theorem 4.4].

Then using Theorem 3.4, we obtain the existence and comparison principle for $u_h = h \log w_h$ and thus the solution w_h to backward equation (2.22). We remark that one can also directly prove the existence and comparison principle for (2.22) using linear semigroup theory developed by LUMER–PHILLIPS in 1961. So under the detailed balance assumption of the invariant measure π_h , we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.8. *Assume there exists a positive reversible invariant measure $\pi_h > 0$ in Ω_h^+ to CME (2.8) such that (3.44) holds. We have*

- (i) *there exists a unique global solution $p_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = \pi_h(\vec{x}_i)u_h(\vec{x}_i, t)$ in Ω_h^+ , where u_h is the solution to (1.3) with initial data $\frac{p_h^0}{\pi_h}$ in Ω_h^+ ;*
- (ii) *if the initial density satisfies $c_1\pi_h \leq p_h^0 \leq c_2\pi_h$ in Ω_h^+ , then*

$$(3.50) \quad c_1\pi_h \leq p_h \leq c_2\pi_h \quad \text{in } \Omega_h^+;$$

- (iii) *if π_h is exponentially tight, then p_h is also exponentially tight for any t .*

Remark 3.9. For chemical reaction detailed balance case (3.40), we know $\psi_h = -h \log \pi_h \rightarrow \text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s)$. Since $\text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s)$ is super linear, so we know for $|\vec{x}_i| \geq R \gg 1$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$

$$(3.51) \quad \psi_h \geq \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s) \geq c|\vec{x}|.$$

Thus

$$(3.52) \quad \sum_{|\vec{x}_i| \geq R} e^{-\frac{\psi_h}{h}} \leq \int_{|\vec{x}| \geq R} e^{-\frac{c|\vec{x}|}{h}} \leq e^{-\frac{cR}{2h}}.$$

For any $\ell < \infty$, taking $R = \frac{2\ell}{c}$, we obtain π_h has exponential tightness and hence by Corollary 3.8, the chemical process satisfies the exponential tightness for any t .

4. THERMODYNAMIC LIMIT OF CME AND BACKWARD EQUATION IN THE HJE FORMS

The comparison principle and nonexpansive properties for the monotone schemes naturally bring up the concept of viscosity solutions to the corresponding continuous HJE as $h \rightarrow 0$; see Appendix A.3 for the definition of viscosity solutions. Indeed, the monotone scheme approximation and the vanishing viscosity method are two ways to construct a viscosity solution to HJE proposed in CRANDALL-LIONS in [CL83, CL84].

In this section, we first study the existence of a USC viscosity solution to the stationary HJE in the Barron-Jensen's sense; see Proposition 4.1. This relies on the assumption of existence of a positive reversible invariant measure π_h to CME. We point out our reversible assumption (3.44) is more general than the commonly used chemical reaction detailed balance condition (3.40); see explanations in Section 3.3.1. So our invariant measure includes some non-equilibrium enzyme reactions and the stationary HJE solution can be nonconvex, which indicates the nonconvex energy landscape for non-equilibrium reactions [GL21].

Second, we focus on the viscosity solution to the dynamic HJE (1.5). Fix Δt in the backward Euler scheme (3.5) and take limit $h \rightarrow 0$. Following Barles-Perthame's procedure, the upper semicontinuous (USC) envelope of the discrete HJE solution gives a USC subsolution to HJE, which automatically inherits the 'no reaction' boundary condition from (3.5). The proof still relies on the monotonicity and nonexpansive property of the monotone schemes. Thanks to the conservation of mass, we use some mass functions $f(\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x})$ to construct barriers to control the polynomial growth of coefficients in Hamiltonian. Then by comparison principle, we obtain the viscosity solution to the continuous resolvent problem. Next, taking $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, thanks to Crandall-Liggett's construction of a nonlinear contraction semigroup solution [CL71], we finally obtain a unique viscosity solution to the HJE as a large size limit of the backward equation; see Theorem 4.7.

4.1. Stationary HJE and convergence from the mesoscopic reversible invariant measure. The stationary solution to HJE $H(\nabla\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = 0$ can be used to compute the energy landscape guiding the chemical reaction and the associated energy barrier of transition paths [GL21]. However, ψ^{ss} is usually hard to compute and is non-unique. In this section, we assume there exists an invariant measure for the mesoscopic CME (2.8) satisfying the reversible condition (3.44) and then use it to obtain a convergence to the stationary solution to the HJE.

Under the assumption of existence of a positive reversible invariant measure, we now prove this invariant measure converges to a Barron-Jensen's USC viscosity solution.

As in (2.16), change variable in the CME to $\psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i)$ such that

$$\pi_h(\vec{x}_i) = e^{-\psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i)/h}.$$

Then the reversible condition for CME (3.44) becomes that for $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$, $\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi}_j h \in \Omega_h^+$,

$$(4.1) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi}_j h) e^{\frac{\psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i) - \psi_h^{ss}(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi}_j h)}{h}} = \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}.$$

We have the solvability since π is assumed to exist and satisfies reversible condition for CME (3.44).

Let $\psi_h(\vec{x}_i)$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$ be the solution to (4.1). Take some continuous function $\psi(\vec{x})$ in open domain $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Define the extension of ψ_h in $\Omega_h \setminus \Omega_h^+$ as

$$(4.2) \quad \psi_h(\vec{x}_i) = \psi(\vec{x}_i), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+.$$

Denote its upper semicontinuous (USC) envelope as

$$(4.3) \quad \bar{\psi}(\vec{x}) := \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} \psi_h(\vec{x}_i).$$

Similarly, we use the lower semicontinuous (LSC) envelope to construct a supersolution

$$(4.4) \quad \underline{\psi}(\vec{x}) := \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} \psi_h(\vec{x}_i).$$

Next proposition states that after taking large size limit $h \rightarrow 0$ from a reversible invariant measure, we can obtain an USC viscosity solution to the stationary HJE in the sense of BARRON-JENSEN [BJ90]. **The zero extension of Φ_j^\pm is assumed to be local Lipschitz continuous....**

Proposition 4.1. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. Let $\psi_h(\vec{x}_i)$ be a solution to (4.1) with a continuous extension (4.2). Then as $h \rightarrow 0$, the upper semicontinuous envelope $\bar{\psi}(\vec{x})$ is a USC viscosity solution to the stationary HJE in the Barron-Jensen's sense, i.e., for any smooth test function φ , if $\bar{\psi} - \varphi$ has local maximum at \vec{x}_0 then*

$$(4.5) \quad H(\nabla\varphi(\vec{x}_0), \vec{x}_0) = 0.$$

Proof. Step 1. For any smooth test function φ , let x^* be a strict local maximal of $\bar{\psi} - \varphi$. Denote $c_0 := \max_j |\vec{v}_j|$. Then for some r , there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad \bar{\psi}(x_0) - \varphi(x_0) \geq \bar{\psi}(x) - \varphi(x) + c|x - x_0|^2, \quad x \in B(x_0, r).$$

Then taking c large enough, as proved by BARLES, SOUGANIDIS in [BS91, Theorem 2.1], there exists a sequence $\{x_*^h\}$ with x_*^h being the maximum point of $\psi_h - \varphi$ in $B(x_*^h, c_0 h)$ and satisfies

$$(4.7) \quad x_*^h \rightarrow x_0, \quad \psi_h(x_*^h) \rightarrow \bar{\psi}(x_0).$$

Step 2. Since ψ_h is the discrete solution to (4.1),

$$(4.8) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi}_j h) e^{\frac{\psi_h(\vec{x}_i) - \psi_h(\vec{x}_i + \vec{\xi}_j h)}{h}} = \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}.$$

Since for $x \in B(x_*^h, c_0 h)$, we have

$$(4.9) \quad \psi_h(x_*^h) - \varphi(x_*^h) \geq \psi_h(x) - \varphi(x),$$

thus $\psi_h(x_*^h) - \psi_h(x) \geq \varphi(x_*^h) - \varphi(x)$. Thus replacing ψ_h by φ in (4.8) yields

$$(4.10) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(x_*^h + \vec{\xi}_j h) e^{\frac{\varphi(x_*^h) - \varphi(x_*^h + \vec{\xi}_j h)}{h}} \leq \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(x_*^h), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}.$$

On the other hand, ψ_h also satisfies

$$(4.11) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi}_j h) e^{\frac{\psi_h(\vec{x}_i) - \psi_h(\vec{x}_i - \vec{\xi}_j h)}{h}} = \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(\vec{x}_i), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}$$

due to (4.1). Hence same as (4.9), using $\psi_h(x_*^h) - \psi_h(x) \geq \varphi(x_*^h) - \varphi(x)$, replacing ψ_h by φ in (4.11) yields

$$(4.12) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(x_*^h - \vec{\xi}_j h) e^{\frac{\varphi(x_*^h) - \varphi(x_*^h - \vec{\xi}_j h)}{h}} \leq \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(x_*^h), \quad \forall \vec{\xi}.$$

Then talking limit $h \rightarrow 0$ in (4.10) and (4.12) implies

$$(4.13) \quad \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^-(x_0) e^{-\nabla \varphi(x_0)} = \tilde{\Phi}_\xi^+(x_0).$$

□

Remark 4.2. This notion of USC viscosity solution was first proposed by BARRON AND JENSEN [BJ90]. They proved the uniqueness of solution in this new notion for evolutionary problem. However, the uniqueness of solution in this new notion for stationary problem was left as an open problem. On the other hand, if this USC viscosity solution can be proved to be continuous, then by [BJ90, Theorem 2.3], this USC viscosity solution is indeed the viscosity solution in the sense of CRANDALL, LIONS viscosity solution [CL83].

Remark 4.3. In the chemical reaction detailed balance case (3.40), we have a closed formula for the unique invariant measure π_h given by the product Poisson distribution (3.39). But for the corresponding macroscopic stationary HJE $H(\nabla \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = 0$, we still do not have the uniqueness of viscosity solution since a constant is always a solution. This means a selection principle such as weak KAM solution need to be used to identify a unique solution. We believe this selection principle shall be consistent with the physically meaningful stationary solution, which is constructed by the limit of the invariant measure π_h for the CME as shown in Proposition 4.1. We leave this deep question for the future study.

4.2. Convergence of backward equation to viscosity solution of HJE. Define Banach space

$$(4.14) \quad C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^N); u(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \text{const for } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \text{ and as } |\vec{x}| \rightarrow +\infty\}$$

In this section, we will follow the framework in CRANDALL, LIONS [CL83] and FENG, KURTZ [FK06] to first prove the Hamiltonian, regarded as an operator on the Banach space $C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, is a m -accretive operator and then obtain the dynamic solution of HJE as a nonlinear semigroup of contraction that generated by H .

To overcome the polynomial growth of the coefficients in Hamiltonian H , we further define a subspace of $C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as

$$(4.15) \quad C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N) := \{u \in C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N); u \equiv \text{const for } \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \text{ and } |\vec{x}| \geq R \text{ for some } R\}.$$

Recall the Hamiltonian $H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x})$ in (2.19). We define the operator

$$(4.16) \quad H : D(H) \subset C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{s.t. } u(\vec{x}) \mapsto H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}).$$

The maximality of H such that $\text{Ran}(I - \Delta t H) = C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ requires we find a classical solution to HJE, which is in general difficult. This is because (i) the solution to HJE does not have enough regularity; (ii) due to the polynomial growth of the coefficients in the Hamiltonian, we can not find solution in commonly used spaces, such as $C_b(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Instead, we will use the notion of viscosity solution to extend the domain of H so that the maximality of H in the sense of viscosity solution is easy to be obtained as the limit of the backward Euler approximation when $h \rightarrow 0$. We refer to Appendix A.3 for the definition of viscosity solutions. Besides, we also need to construct a C_{0^*} solution as a limit of a C_{c^*} viscosity solution obtained above.

Precisely, at the first step, following [CL83] and [FK06], we define the viscosity extension of H as

$$(4.17) \quad \hat{H}_1 : D(\hat{H}_1) \subset C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$$

satisfying

- (i) $u \in D(\hat{H}_1) \subset C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if there exists the $f \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that the resolvent problem

$$u(\vec{x}) - \Delta t H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = f(\vec{x})$$

has a unique viscosity solution $u \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

- (ii) for $u \in D(\hat{H}_1)$, $\hat{H}_1(u) := \frac{u-f}{\Delta t}$ for such a $f(\vec{x})$ in (i).

In other words, the domain $D(\hat{H}_1)$ is defined as the range of the resolvent operator

$$(4.18) \quad J_{\Delta t} := (I - \Delta t \hat{H}_1)^{-1}.$$

Since the resolvent problem holds in the classical sense implies the resolvent problem has a viscosity solution, so we can regard \hat{H}_1 as an extension of H . We will prove later in Proposition 4.5 the existence and comparison principle for the resolvent problem in $C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ above. We remark that the domain $D(\hat{H}_1)$ characterized in (i) does not depend on the value of $\Delta t < \infty$. Indeed, if $u \in D(\hat{H}_1)$ such that $u_1 - H(\nabla u_1(x), x) = f_1$ has a viscosity solution $u_1 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for some $f_1 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then $u_2 - \Delta t H(\nabla u_2(x), x) = f_2$ also has a viscosity solution with $f_2 = \Delta t f_1 + (1 - \Delta t)u_1 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Next step, we extend $C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ to a Banach space $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Notice $C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. For any $f \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists a Cauchy sequence $f_k \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|f_k - f\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. Then from the comparison principle of the resolvent problem in $C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ [BD⁺97, Page 293, Theorem 5.1.3], we know the corresponding viscosity solutions $u_k \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the resolvent problem with f_k is also a Cauchy sequence in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Take u as the limit of u_k in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. This limit is independent of the choice of the Cauchy sequence. Thus we further define viscosity extension of H as

$$(4.19) \quad \hat{H} : D(\hat{H}) \subset C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$$

satisfying

- (i) $u \in D(\hat{H}) \subset C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ if and only if there exists $f \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that the resolvent problem

$$u(\vec{x}) - \Delta t H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = f(\vec{x})$$

has a unique viscosity solution $u \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

- (ii) for $u \in D(\hat{H})$, $\hat{H}(u) := \frac{u-f}{\Delta t}$ for such a $f(\vec{x})$ in (i).

Below, we show that the abstract domain $D(\hat{H})$ above indeed includes a large subspace.

Lemma 4.4. *We have the following inclusions*

$$(4.20) \quad C_{c^*}^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset D(H) \subset D(\hat{H}_1) \subset D(\hat{H});$$

$$(4.21) \quad C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \overline{D(\hat{H})}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty} = \overline{D(\hat{H}_1)}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty} = \overline{D(\hat{H})}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty}.$$

Proof. First, based on the definition of $D(\hat{H})$, it is obvious that $D(H) \subset D(\hat{H})$, because for u such that $H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) \in C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ holds in the classical sense implies that there exists $f \in C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $(I - \Delta t H)u = f$ holds in the viscosity solution sense. $D(\hat{H}_1) \subset D(\hat{H})$ is also obvious because if there exists $f \in C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ then we have viscosity solution $u \in C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Second, for $u \in C_{c*}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\nabla u = 0$ outside a ball B_r . Thus $H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x})$ is bounded for $\vec{x} \in B_r$ while $H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) = 0$ outside B_r . Hence $H(\nabla u(\vec{x}), \vec{x}) \in C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $u \in D(H)$. So we conclude (4.20).

Third, since $C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and C_{0*} is closed space, so $C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N) = \overline{C_{c*}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty} \subset \overline{D(\hat{H})}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty} \subset C_{0*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. \square

In the next subsection, we construct a viscosity solution to the resolvent problem

$$(4.22) \quad u = J_{\Delta t} f \quad \text{with } J_{\Delta t} = (I - \Delta t \hat{H})^{-1}.$$

This solvability in the viscosity solution sense gives the maximality of \hat{H} .

Then the nonexpansive property of $J_{\Delta t}$ can be shown after taking limit from the nonexpansive property of the discrete resolvent $J_{\Delta t, h}$ proved in Lemma 3.1.

4.2.1. *Barles-Perthame's procedure of convergence to viscosity solution as $h \rightarrow 0$.* In this section, we first fix Δt and take $h \rightarrow 0$ to construct a viscosity solution to the backward Euler problem

$$(4.23) \quad (I - \Delta t \hat{H})u^n(\vec{x}) = u^{n-1}(\vec{x}), \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

For easy presentation, this reduces to solve the following resolvent equation

$$(4.24) \quad (I - \Delta t \hat{H})u(\vec{x}) = f(\vec{x}), \quad \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

The following proposition follows Barles-Perthame's procedure [BP87] to use the upper semicontinuous (USC) envelope of the numerical approximation to construct a subsolution to (4.23). Let $u_h(\vec{x}_i)$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$ be the solution to (3.11), and define

$$(4.25) \quad \bar{u}(\vec{x}) := \limsup_{h \rightarrow 0^+, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h(\vec{x}_i).$$

Similarly, we use the lower semicontinuous (LSC) envelope to construct a supersolution

$$(4.26) \quad \underline{u}(\vec{x}) := \liminf_{h \rightarrow 0^+, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h(\vec{x}_i).$$

We denote the set of upper semicontinuous functions on \mathbb{R}^N as $\text{USC}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $u_h(\vec{x}_i)$ be a solution to (3.11) with $f \in \ell_{c*}^\infty$. Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. Assume there exists a positive \bar{m} satisfying (2.2). Then as $h \rightarrow 0$, the upper semicontinuous envelope $\bar{u}(\vec{x})$ is a subsolution to (4.23). The lower semicontinuous envelope $\underline{u}(\vec{x})$ is a supersolution to (4.23). Furthermore, from the comparison principle,*

$$(4.27) \quad u(\vec{x}) = \bar{u} = \underline{u} = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h(\vec{x}_i) \in C_{c*}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Proof. Step 1. From the barrier estimates in Proposition 3.3, we know $u_h(\vec{x}_i) \equiv c_0$ for $|\vec{x}_i| > R$ for some $R > 0$ and for some constant c_0 . Thus

$$(4.28) \quad \bar{u}(\vec{x}) = \underline{u}(\vec{x}) = c_0 \quad \text{for } |\vec{x}_i| > R.$$

Step 2. For any test function φ , let x_0 be a strict local maximal of $\bar{u} - \varphi$. Denote $c_0 := \max_j |\vec{v}_j|$. Then for some r , there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$(4.29) \quad \bar{u}(x_0) - \varphi(x_0) \geq \bar{u}(x) - \varphi(x) + c|x - x_0|^2, \quad x \in B(x_0, r).$$

Then taking c large enough, as proved by BARLES, SOUGANIDIS in [BS91, Theorem 2.1], there exists a sequence $\{u_h\}$ with x_*^h being the maximum point of $u_h - \varphi$ in $B(x_*^h, c_0h)$ and satisfies

$$(4.30) \quad x_*^h \rightarrow x_0, \quad u_h(x_*^h) \rightarrow \bar{u}(x_0).$$

Step 3. Since u_h is the discrete solution to (3.11),

$$(4.31) \quad u_h(x_*^h) - \lambda H_h(x_*^h, u_h(x_*^h), u_h) = f(x_*^h).$$

Since for $x \in B(x_*^h, c_0h)$, we have

$$(4.32) \quad u_h(x_*^h) - \varphi(x_*^h) \geq u_h(x) - \varphi(x),$$

so $u_h(x) - u_h(x_*^h) \leq \varphi(x) - \varphi(x_*^h)$. Thus replacing u_h by φ in (4.31), we have

$$(4.33) \quad H_h(x_*^h, u_h(x_*^h), u_h) \leq H_h(x_*^h, \varphi(x_*^h), \varphi).$$

Thus taking limit $h \rightarrow 0$,

$$(4.34) \quad \bar{u}(x_0) - \lambda H(x_0, \nabla \varphi(x_0)) \leq f(x_0).$$

Step 4, similarly, we can prove the LSC envelope \underline{u} is a supersolution. Then by the comparison principle of (4.23) in a ball B_R [BD⁺97, Page 293, Theorem 5.1.3], we have $\bar{u} \leq \underline{u}$ and thus

$$(4.35) \quad u(\vec{x}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0, \vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h(\vec{x}_i)$$

is the unique viscosity solution to (4.23). □

Corollary 4.6. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous.*

- (i) *Let $f \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then the limit solution $u(\vec{x}) \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ obtained in Proposition 4.5 is unique viscosity solution to (4.23).*
- (ii) *Let u_1 and u_2 be viscosity solutions to (4.23) in (i) corresponding to f_1 and f_2 . Then $\|u_1 - u_2\|_\infty \leq \|f_1 - f_2\|_\infty$.*
- (iii) *Let $f \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then there exists a unique viscosity solution to (4.23) $u \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ which satisfies non-expansive property. In other words, $\text{Ran}(I + \Delta t \hat{H}) = C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$.*

Proof. First, (i) is directly from Proposition 4.5.

Second, taking limit $h \rightarrow 0$ preserves the nonexpansive property of $J_{\Delta t}$. Indeed, assume u_1 and u_2 are two solutions to the resolvent problem (4.23) with $f_1(\vec{x})$, $f_2(\vec{x})$ respectively. Then denote $f_1^h(\vec{x}_i) := f_1(\vec{x}_i)$, $f_2^h(\vec{x}_i) := f_2(\vec{x}_i)$, the associated discrete solutions $u_1^h(\vec{x}_i)$ and $u_2^h(\vec{x}_i)$, by Lemma 3.1, satisfies

$$(4.36) \quad \|u_1^h(\cdot) - u_2^h(\cdot)\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \|f_1^h(\cdot) - f_2^h(\cdot)\|_{\ell^\infty}.$$

Then taking limit $h \rightarrow 0$ implies

$$(4.37) \quad \|u_1 - u_2\|_{L^\infty} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|u_1^h - u_2^h\|_{\ell^\infty} \leq \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \|f_1^h - f_2^h\|_{\ell^\infty} = \|f_1 - f_2\|_{L^\infty}.$$

This implies the monotonicity as in Lemma 3.1.

Third, notice $C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is dense in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. For any $f \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists a Cauchy sequence $f_k \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\|f_k - f\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. Then from the last step, we know the corresponding viscosity solutions $u_k \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the resolvent problem with f_k is also a Cauchy sequence in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Take $u = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} u_k$ as the limit of u_k in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. The non-expansive property is still maintained as in the last step. □

4.2.2. $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ converges to the semigroup solution. Now we follow the framework in [CL83, FK06] to obtain a strongly continuous nonlinear semigroup solution $u(\vec{x}, t)$ to HJE. It is indeed a viscosity solution to the original dynamic HJE [CL83, FK06]. Given any $t > 0$, denote $[\frac{t}{\Delta t}]$ as the integer part of $\frac{t}{\Delta t}$. We next prove the convergence from the discrete solution of backward Euler scheme (3.5) to the viscosity solution of HJE (1.5).

Theorem 4.7. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. Given any $t > 0$ and $\Delta t > 0$, let $u_h^n(\vec{x}_i)$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h$, $n = 1, \dots, [\frac{t}{\Delta t}]$ be a solution to (3.5) with initial data $u_h^0(\vec{x}_i) \in \ell_{c^*}^\infty(\Omega_h)$. Assume for any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $u^0(\vec{x}) = \lim_{\vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h^0(\vec{x}_i)$ and $u^0 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Let $\hat{H} : D(\hat{H}) \subset C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \rightarrow C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be the viscosity extension of H defined in (4.17). Then as $h \rightarrow 0$, $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$, we know*

$$(4.38) \quad u(\vec{x}, t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \left((I - \Delta t \hat{H})^{-[t/\Delta t]} u^0 \right) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \left(\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-[t/\Delta t]} u_h^0 \right) \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

is a viscosity solution to HJE (1.5).

Proof. First, take $u^0 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, fix Δt and denote the solution to resolvent problem (4.24) as $u_h^1(\vec{x}_i)$ satisfying

$$(4.39) \quad (I - \Delta t H_h) u_h^1(\vec{x}_i) = u_h^0(\vec{x}_i) \in \ell_{c^*}^\infty(\Omega_h).$$

Then by Proposition 4.5, since $u^0(\vec{x}) = \lim_{\vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}} u_h^0(\vec{x}_i) \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we know as $h \rightarrow 0$, $u^1 \in C_{c^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a viscosity solution to the continuous resolvent problem

$$(4.40) \quad (I - \Delta t H) u^1(\vec{x}_i) = u^0(\vec{x}_i).$$

In the resolvent form, we have

$$(4.41) \quad u^1 = (I - \Delta t \hat{H})^{-1} u^0 = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} (I - \Delta t H_h)^{-1} u_h^0 \in C_{c^*}.$$

Repeating $[\frac{t}{\Delta t}] =: n$ times, we conclude that for any \vec{x} and $\vec{x}_i \rightarrow \vec{x}$ as $h \rightarrow 0$,

$$(4.42) \quad u^n(\vec{x}) = \left((I - \Delta t \hat{H})^{-[t/\Delta t]} u^0 \right) (\vec{x}) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \left((I - \Delta t H_h)^{-[t/\Delta t]} u_h^0 \right) (\vec{x}_i) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} u_h^n(\vec{x}_i) \in C_{c^*}.$$

Second, the non-expansive property and the maximality of $-\hat{H}$ in $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ are proved in Corollary 4.6. Thus we conclude $-\hat{H}$ is m-accretive operator on $C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. From inclusion (4.21) in Lemma 4.4, we know $u^0 \in C_{0^*}(\mathbb{R}^N) \subset \overline{D(\hat{H})}^{\|\cdot\|_\infty}$, then by Crandall-Liggett's nonlinear semigroup theory [CL71], \hat{H} generates a strongly continuous nonexpansive semigroup

$$(4.43) \quad u(\vec{x}, t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} (I - \Delta t \hat{H})^{-[t/\Delta t]} u^0 =: S(t) u^0,$$

which is the solution to HJE (1.5). \square

5. SHORT TIME CLASSICAL SOLUTION AND ERROR ESTIMATE

In this section, we give error estimates between the discrete solution of monotone scheme (1.3) (i.e., discrete nonlinear semigroup) and the classical solution of HJE for a short time.

Notice the chemical flux has a polynomial growth at the far field so usual method for error estimate do not work. However, we observe that for special initial data $u^0 \in C_{c^*}^1$, the dynamic classical solution u still belongs to $C_{c^*}^1$ for a short time. This can be seen from the characteristic method for a short time classical solution. Starting from any initial data $(\vec{x}(0), \vec{p}(0))$, construct the bi-characteristics $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ for HJE

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\vec{x}} &= \nabla_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), & \vec{x}(0) &= \vec{x}_0, \\ \dot{\vec{p}} &= -\nabla_x H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), & \vec{p}(0) &= \nabla \psi_0(\vec{x}_0) \end{aligned}$$

upto some $T > 0$ such that the characteristics exist uniquely. Then along characteristics, with $\vec{p}(t) = \nabla_x u(\vec{x}(t), t)$, we know $z(t) = u(\vec{x}(t), t)$ satisfies

$$(5.2) \quad \dot{z} = \nabla_x u(\vec{x}(t), t) \cdot \dot{\vec{x}} + \partial_t u(\vec{x}(t), t) = \vec{p} \cdot \nabla_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) + H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad z(0) = u_0(\vec{x}_0).$$

Hence after solving (5.1), we can solve for $z(t) = u(\vec{x}(t), t)$. Since $u^0 \in C_{c^*}^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we know for $|\vec{x}_0| \gg 1$, $\vec{p}_0 = 0$. Then as long as bi-characteristic is unique up to T , $\vec{p} \equiv 0$ due to $\nabla_x H(\vec{0}, \vec{x}) = 0$. This, together with (5.2) and $H(\vec{0}, \vec{x}) = 0$, implies $\dot{z} = 0$ up to T . Thus we conclude

$$(5.3) \quad u(\vec{x}, t) = \text{const} \quad \text{for } |\vec{x}| \gg 1.$$

Recall Δt is the time step and the size of a container for chemical reactions is $\frac{1}{h}$. Next, based on the above observation, we give the error estimate for initial data $u^0 \in C_{c^*}^1$.

Proposition 5.1. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. Let $T > 0$ be the maximal time such that bi-characteristic $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ for HJE exists uniquely. Given any initial data u_h^0 for the backward equation (1.3), assume there exists u^0 such that $\|u_h^0 - u^0\|_\infty \leq Ch$. Then we have*

(i) *the error estimate between backward Euler scheme solution $u_h^n(\vec{x}_i)$ to (3.5) and the classical solution $u(\vec{x}, t^n)$ to HJE (1.5)*

$$(5.4) \quad \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t^n)\|_\infty \leq C(T+1)(\Delta t + h).$$

(ii) *the error estimate between monotone scheme solution $u_h(\vec{x}_i, t)$ to (1.3) and the classical solution $u(\vec{x}, t)$ to HJE (1.5)*

$$(5.5) \quad \|u_h(\cdot, t) - u(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \leq Ch, \quad \forall 0 < t \leq T;$$

Proof. Let T be the maximal time such that bi-characteristic $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ for HJE exists uniquely and thus from the uniqueness of solution to HJE, the viscosity solution obtained in Theorem 4.7 is the unique classical solution. Then from analysis for (5.3), u is constant outside B_R .

(i) We perform the truncation error estimate for $u(\vec{x}, t) \in C^2$. By Taylor expansion, plugging $u(\vec{x}, t^n)$ to the resolvent problem, we have

$$(5.6) \quad u(\vec{x}, t^n) - \Delta t H(\vec{x}, \nabla u(\vec{x}, t^n)) = u(\vec{x}, t^{n-1}) + O(\Delta t^2).$$

Then we further plug $u(\vec{x}_i, t^n)$ into the discrete resolvent problem. Since $H = 0$ for $\vec{x} \in B_R^c$, the polynomial growth outside B_R does not affect the truncation error and thus

$$(5.7) \quad u(\vec{x}_i, t^n) - \Delta t H_h(\vec{x}_i, \nabla u(\vec{x}_i, t^n)) = u(\vec{x}_i, t^{n-1}) + O(\Delta t^2 + h\Delta t).$$

(ii) We perform error estimate using the nonexpansive property for discrete resolvent in Lemma 3.1. Recall the numerical solution obtained in backward Euler scheme

$$(5.8) \quad u_h^n(\vec{x}_i) - \Delta t H_h(\vec{x}_i, u_h^n(\vec{x}_i), u_h^n) = u_h^{n-1}(\vec{x}_i).$$

Then by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \|u_h^n - u(\cdot, t^n)\|_\infty &\leq \|u_h^{n-1} - u(\cdot, t^{n-1})\|_\infty + C\Delta t(\Delta t + h) \\ &\leq \dots \leq \|u_h^0 - u(\cdot, 0)\|_\infty + Cn\Delta t(\Delta t + h) \leq C(T+1)(\Delta t + h). \end{aligned}$$

Notice this is linear growth in time. Changing the above resolvent problem to the original CME in the HJE form (1.3), we have the first order convergence

$$(5.10) \quad \|u_h(\cdot, t) - u(\cdot, t)\|_\infty \leq Ch, \quad \forall 0 < t \leq T.$$

□

Under the observation of the finite time propagation of support (5.3), the error estimates for monotone schemes to classical solutions of HJE are standard; see abstract theorem in [Sou85]. We remark that if the solution to HJE (1.5) lose the regularity and becomes only locally Lipschitz, then the convergence rate in terms of h can be at most $h^{\frac{1}{2}}$; c.f. [CL84, Waa08, Sou85].

6. APPLICATION TO LARGE DEVIATION PRINCIPLE FOR CHEMICAL REACTIONS AT SINGLE TIME

In previous sections, we proved the convergence from the solution to monotone scheme (1.3), i.e., Varadhan's nonlinear semigroup (1.4), to the global viscosity solution to HJE (1.5). In this section, we discuss some straightforward applications of this convergence result, particularly the large deviation principle and the law of large numbers at a single time.

First, we will discuss the exponential tightness of the large size process X^h at single times. Then, using the time reversed Lax–Oleinik semigroup representation for first order HJE, the convergence result in Theorem 4.7 implies the convergence from Varadhan's discrete nonlinear semigroup to the continuous Lax–Oleinik semigroup. Therefore, together with the exponential tightness, we obtain the large deviation principle at a single time point in Theorem 6.2. As long as one can prove the exponential tightness in Skorokhod space $D([0, T]; \Omega_h)$, by using [FK06, Theorem 4.28], the large deviation principle for finite many time points will lead to the sample path large deviation principle for the chemical reaction process X^h . We leave the exponential tightness in Skorokhod space $D([0, T]; \Omega_h)$ to future study. The exponential tightness for $(X^h(\cdot))$ in path space was proved in [ADE18, Lemma 2.1] under the assumption that there exists a growth estimate for a Lyapunov function. For finite states continuous time Markov chain, the exponential tightness for $(X^h(\cdot))$ in path space was proved by [MRP14].

Second, the large deviation principle also implies the mean-field limit of the CME (2.8) is the RRE (1.2), but with a more detailed rate of the concentration of measures. The mean-field limit of the CME for chemical reactions was first proved by Kurtz [Kur70, Kur71]. Recent results in [MM20] proves the evolutionary Γ -convergence from CME to the Liouville equation corresponding to RRE.

6.1. Large deviation principle for chemical reaction at single times. From the theory of Hamilton-Jacobi equation (or the deterministic optimal control formulation), it is well-known that the viscosity solution to first order HJE can be expressed as the Lax-Oleinik semigroup, c.f. [Tra21, Theorem 2.22], [Eva08].

Lemma 6.1 (Lax-Oleinik semigroup). *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. The viscosity solution $u(\vec{x}, t)$ to HJE (1.5) can be represented as the time reversed Lax–Oleinik semigroup, i.e., (1.6)*

$$(6.1) \quad u(\vec{x}, t) = \sup_{\vec{y}} (u_0(\vec{y}) - I(\vec{y}; \vec{x}, t)), \quad I(\vec{y}; \vec{x}, t) := \inf_{\gamma(0)=\vec{x}, \gamma(t)=\vec{y}} \int_0^t L(\dot{\gamma}(s), \gamma(s)) ds$$

where $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ is the convex conjugate of $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$.

Theorem 6.2. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. We also assume one of the following two cases:*

- (i) *there exists a reversible invariant measure $\pi_h(\vec{x}_i)$, $\vec{x}_i \in \Omega_h^+$ in (3.44) satisfying exponential tightness and $p_h^0 \leq c\pi_h$ for some constant c ;*
- (ii) *the initial distribution p_h^0 has a compact support and there exists a componentwisely positive mass vector \vec{m} satisfying (2.2).*

Then the chemical reaction process $X^h(t)$ at each time t satisfies the exponential tightness and the large deviation principle with a good rate function $I(y; x, t)$.

Proof. First, the exponential tightness of the process X^h is essential for large deviation analysis. Under the assumption (i), using Corollary 3.8, we obtain the exponential tightness at any time $t \geq 0$.

Second, under the assumption (ii), then (3.20) holds. Using the mass balance vector (2.2), multiplying SDE (1.1) by \vec{m} , we have

$$(6.2) \quad X^h(t) \cdot \vec{m} = X^h(0) \cdot \vec{m}.$$

For $X^h(0) \in \Omega_h^+$, we know $X^h(t) \in \Omega_h^+$ and obtain

$$(6.3) \quad m_1 \|X^h(t)\| \leq \|m\| \|X^h(0)\|, \quad \forall t \geq 0$$

and thus the associated distribution \mathbb{P} of X^h has a compact support for any time t . Therefore, under one of the assumptions, we obtain the exponential tightness of $X^h(t)$ at each time t .

Third, from Varadhan's lemma [Var66] on the necessary condition of the large deviation principle and Bryc's theorem [Bry90] on the sufficient condition, we know X^h satisfies the large deviation principle with a good rate function $I(y)$, if and only if for any bounded continuous function $u_0(\vec{x})$,

$$(6.4) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}} \left(e^{\frac{u_0(X^h(t))}{h}} \right) = u(\vec{x}, t) = \sup_y (u_0(y) - I(y; x, t)).$$

Then we show (6.4) holds. From the WKB reformulation for the backward equation (2.29)

$$u_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h \log w_h(\vec{x}_i, t) = h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}_i} \left(e^{\frac{u_0(X_t^h)}{h}} \right),$$

we show below the pointwise convergence for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$(6.5) \quad \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}} \left(e^{\frac{u_0(X_t^h)}{h}} \right) = u(\vec{x}, t).$$

For any $t \in [0, T]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, from Theorem 4.7, we know there exists Δt_0 such that for any $\Delta t \leq \Delta t_0$, $n = [t/\Delta t]$, the estimate between the solution $u(\vec{x}, t)$ to HJE and the solution $u^n(\vec{x})$ to the backward Euler approximation (4.23) satisfies $\|u(\cdot, t) - u^n(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$. For this $u^n(\vec{x})$, at any fixed $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, from (4.42), there exists h_0 such that for any $h \leq h_0$, the solution $u_h^n(\vec{x}_i)$ to the discrete (3.5) converges to $u^n(\vec{x})$ pointwisely. That is to say, exists h_0 , such that for $h \leq h_0$, $|u^n(\vec{x}) - u_h^n(\vec{x}_i)| \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$. From the convergence of backward Euler scheme (3.5) to the ODE system (1.2) in (3.33), we obtain another $\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon$ and hence (6.5) holds.

Meanwhile, $u(x, t)$ has the time reversed Lax–Oleinik semigroup representation 1.6. Hence we conclude (6.4). \square

As a consequence of the above large deviation principle, we state below the law of large numbers gives the mean-field limit ODE (1.2).

Corollary 6.3. *Assume $\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x})$, $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, after zero extension, is local Lipschitz continuous. Let $\vec{x}^*(t)$ be the solution to RRE (1.2). Then $\vec{x}^*(t)$ is the mean-field limit path in the sense that the weak law of large numbers for process $X^h(t)$ holds at any time t .*

The proof for mean-field limit of $X^h(t)$ was proved by Kurtz [Kur71]. Here we use the large deviation principle at single time t to illustrate that large deviation principle implies the law of large numbers after the concentration of measure and gives the exponential rate of that concentration. This can be seen via verification method. First, we know $\vec{x}^*(t)$ is the solution to RRE (1.2) if and only if the action cost is zero $I(y; x_0, t) = 0$; see Appendix A.2. Second, we choose any bounded continuous function u_0 in (6.4) such that at time t , $u_0(\vec{x}^*(t)) = \operatorname{argmax}_x u_0(x)$. Then (6.4) becomes $\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} h \log \mathbb{E}(e^{u_0(X^h(t))/h}) = u_0(\vec{x}^*(t))$. This is to say $X^h(t)$ concentrate at $\vec{x}^*(t)$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Jin Feng for valuable discussions. The authors would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences at Cambridge, for support and hospitality during the program “Frontiers in kinetic theory: connecting microscopic to macroscopic scales - KineCon 2022” where work on this paper was partially undertaken. Yuan Gao was supported by NSF under Award DMS-2204288. Jian-Guo Liu was supported by NSF under award DMS-2106988.

REFERENCES

- [AAPR21] Andrea Agazzi, Luisa Andreis, Robert I. A. Patterson, and D. R. Michiel Renger. Large deviations for markov jump processes with uniformly diminishing rates. *arXiv:2102.13040 [math, q-bio]*, Feb 2021. arXiv: 2102.13040.
- [ACK10] David F. Anderson, Gheorghe Craciun, and Thomas G. Kurtz. Product-form stationary distributions for deficiency zero chemical reaction networks. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 72(8):1947–1970, Nov 2010.
- [ADE18] Andrea Agazzi, Amir Dembo, and Jean-Pierre Eckmann. Large deviations theory for markov jump models of chemical reaction networks. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 28(3):1821–1855, 2018.
- [AHLW19] David F Anderson, Desmond J Higham, Saul C Leite, and Ruth J Williams. On constrained langevin equations and (bio) chemical reaction networks. *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 17(1):1–30, 2019.
- [AK15] David F. Anderson and Thomas G. Kurtz. *Stochastic Analysis of Biochemical Systems*. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [BD⁺97] Martino Bardi, Italo Capuzzo Dolcetta, et al. *Optimal control and viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations*, volume 12. Springer, 1997.
- [BDSG⁺02] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim. Macroscopic fluctuation theory for stationary non-equilibrium states. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 107(3):635–675, 2002.
- [BDSG⁺15] Lorenzo Bertini, Alberto De Sole, Davide Gabrielli, Giovanni Jona-Lasinio, and Claudio Landim. Macroscopic fluctuation theory. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 87(2):593–636, Jun 2015.
- [BJ90] E. N. Barron and R. Jensen. Semicontinuous viscosity solutions for hamilton-jacobi equations with convex hamiltonians. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 15(12):293–309, Jan 1990.
- [BP87] G. Barles and B. Perthame. Discontinuous solutions of deterministic optimal stopping time problems. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 21(4):557–579, 1987.
- [Bry90] Wlodzimierz Bryc. *Large Deviations by the Asymptotic Value Method*, page 447–472. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1990.
- [BS91] Guy Barles and Panagiotis E Souganidis. Convergence of approximation schemes for fully nonlinear second order equations. *Asymptotic analysis*, 4(3):271–283, 1991.
- [CL71] Michael G Crandall and Thomas M Liggett. Generation of semi-groups of nonlinear transformations on general banach spaces. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 93(2):265–298, 1971.
- [CL83] Michael G Crandall and Pierre-Louis Lions. Viscosity solutions of hamilton-jacobi equations. *Transactions of the American mathematical society*, 277(1):1–42, 1983.
- [CL84] Michael G Crandall and P-L Lions. Two approximations of solutions of hamilton-jacobi equations. *Mathematics of computation*, 43(167):1–19, 1984.
- [CT80] Michael G. Crandall and Luc Tartar. Some relations between nonexpansive and order preserving mappings. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 78(3):385–390, 1980.
- [DMRH94] M. I. Dykman, Eugenia Mori, John Ross, and P. M. Hunt. Large fluctuations and optimal paths in chemical kinetics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 100(8):5735–5750, Apr 1994.
- [Eva08] Lawrence C Evans. Weak kam theory and partial differential equations. In *Calculus of variations and nonlinear partial differential equations*, pages 123–154. Springer, 2008.
- [Fel52] William Feller. The parabolic differential equations and the associated semi-groups of transformations. *Annals of Mathematics*, page 468–519, 1952.
- [Fel54] William Feller. Diffusion processes in one dimension. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 77(1):1–31, 1954.
- [FK06] Jin Feng and Thomas G Kurtz. *Large deviations for stochastic processes*. Number 131. American Mathematical Soc., 2006.

- [Fle83] Wendell H Fleming. Optimal control of markov processes. Technical report, BROWN UNIV PROVIDENCE RI LEFSCHETZ CENTER FOR DYNAMICAL SYSTEMS, 1983.
- [FS86] Wendell H Fleming and Panagiotis E Souganidis. Pde-viscosity solution approach to some problems of large deviations. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa-Classe di Scienze*, 13(2):171–192, 1986.
- [Gan87] Hu Gang. Stationary solution of master equations in the large-system-size limit. *Physical Review A*, 36(12):5782–5790, Dec 1987.
- [GL21] Yuan Gao and Jian-Guo Liu. Revisit of macroscopic dynamics for non-equilibrium chemical reactions from a hamiltonian viewpoint. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.05396*, 2021.
- [GQ17] Hao Ge and Hong Qian. Mathematical formalism of nonequilibrium thermodynamics for nonlinear chemical reaction systems with general rate law. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 166(1):190–209, 2017.
- [GY14] Ludwig Gauckler and Harry Yserentant. Regularity and approximability of the solutions to the chemical master equation. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis - Modélisation Mathématique et Analyse Numérique*, 48(6):1757–1775, 2014.
- [HJ72] F. Horn and R. Jackson. General mass action kinetics. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 47:81–116, 1972.
- [IE85] H. Ishii and L.C. Evans. A pde approach to some asymptotic problems concerning random differential equations with small noise intensities. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, 2(1):1–20, Feb 1985.
- [Jos15] Badal Joshi. A detailed balanced reaction network is sufficient but not necessary for its markov chain to be detailed balanced. *Discrete & Continuous Dynamical Systems - B*, 20(4):1077–1105, 2015.
- [KMK73] Ryogo Kubo, Kazuhiro Matsuo, and Kazuo Kitahara. Fluctuation and relaxation of macrovariables. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 9(1):51–96, Sep 1973.
- [Kra16] Richard Kraaij. Large deviations for markov jump processes with mean-field interaction via the comparison principle for an associated hamilton-jacobi equation. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 164(2):321–345, Jul 2016. arXiv:1502.05185 [cond-mat].
- [Kra20] Richard C. Kraaij. The exponential resolvent of a markov process and large deviations for markov processes via hamilton-jacobi equations. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 25(none), Jan 2020. arXiv:1910.03946 [math].
- [Kur70] Thomas G Kurtz. Solutions of ordinary differential equations as limits of pure jump markov processes. *Journal of applied Probability*, 7(1):49–58, 1970.
- [Kur71] T. G. Kurtz. Limit theorems for sequences of jump markov processes approximating ordinary differential processes. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 8(2):344–356, 1971.
- [MM20] Jan Maas and Alexander Mielke. Modeling of chemical reaction systems with detailed balance using gradient structures. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 181(6):2257–2303, 2020.
- [MRP14] Alexander Mielke, D. R. Michiel Renger, and Mark A. Peletier. On the relation between gradient flows and the large-deviation principle, with applications to markov chains and diffusion. *Potential Analysis*, 41(4):1293–1327, Nov 2014.
- [MS97] Donald Allan McQuarrie and John Douglas Simon. *Physical chemistry: a molecular approach*, volume 1. University science books Sausalito, CA, 1997.
- [PR19a] Robert I. A. Patterson and D. R. Michiel Renger. Large deviations of jump process fluxes. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry*, 22(3):21, Sep 2019.
- [PR19b] Robert IA Patterson and DR Renger. Large deviations of jump process fluxes. *Mathematical Physics, Analysis and Geometry*, 22(3):1–32, 2019.
- [Pri67] Ilya Prigogine. Introduction to thermodynamics of irreversible processes. *New York: Interscience*, 1967.
- [PRS21] Robert I. A. Patterson, D. R. Michiel Renger, and Upanshu Sharma. Variational structures beyond gradient flows: a macroscopic fluctuation-theory perspective. *arXiv:2103.14384 [math-ph]*, Mar 2021. arXiv: 2103.14384.
- [QG21] Hong Qian and Hao Ge. *Stochastic Chemical Reaction Systems in Biology*. Lecture Notes on Mathematical Modelling in the Life Sciences. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [Ren18] D. R. M. Renger. Flux large deviations of independent and reacting particle systems, with implications for macroscopic fluctuation theory. 172:1291–1326, Sep 2018.
- [Sou85] Panagiotis E Souganidis. Approximation schemes for viscosity solutions of hamilton-jacobi equations. *Journal of differential equations*, 59(1):1–43, 1985.
- [SW95] Adam Shwartz and Alan Weiss. *Large deviations for performance analysis: queues, communication and computing*, volume 5. CRC Press, 1995.

- [Tra21] Hung Vinh Tran. *Hamilton-Jacobi equations: theory and applications*, volume 213. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [Var66] S. R. S. Varadhan. Asymptotic probabilities and differential equations. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 19(3):261–286, Aug 1966.
- [Ven59] Alexander D Venttsel'. On boundary conditions for multidimensional diffusion processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 4(2):164–177, 1959.
- [Waa08] Knut Waagan. Convergence rate of monotone numerical schemes for hamilton–jacobi equations with weak boundary conditions. *SIAM journal on numerical analysis*, 46(5):2371–2392, 2008.
- [Whi86] Peter Whittle. *Systems in Stochastic Equilibrium*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., USA, 1986.

APPENDIX A. TERMINOLOGIES FOR MACROSCOPIC RRE, PROPERTIES OF HAMILTONIAN AND LAGRANGIAN, AND CONCEPTS OF VISCOSITY SOLUTIONS

In this appendix, we review some known terminologies for the large size limiting RRE (1.2) and collect some preliminary results for the characterization of steady states in a detailed balanced RRE system. The properties of Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ and the convex conjugate $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ of $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ are also listed. We omit the proofs and refer to [GL21, Section 2]. We also give the definition of viscosity (sub/super)solutions.

A.1. The macroscopic RRE and equilibrium. The $M \times N$ matrix $\nu := (\nu_{ji}) = (\nu_{ji}^- - \nu_{ji}^+)$, $j = 1, \dots, M$, $i = 1, \dots, N$ is called the Wegscheider matrix and ν^T is referred as the stoichiometric matrix [MS97]. Then mass balance (2.2) reads $\nu \vec{m} = \vec{0}$ and the Wegscheider matrix ν has a nonzero kernel, i.e., $\dim(\text{Ker}(\nu)) \geq 1$. We have a direct decomposition for the species space

$$(A.1) \quad \mathbb{R}^N = \text{Ran}(\nu^T) \oplus \text{Ker}(\nu),$$

where $\text{Ran}(\nu^T)$ is the span of the column vectors $\{\vec{\nu}_j\}$ of ν^T . Denote the stoichiometric space $G := \text{Ran}(\nu^T)$. Given an initial state $\vec{X}_0 \in \vec{q} + G$, $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, the dynamics of both mesoscopic (1.1) and macroscopic (1.2) states stay in the same space $G_q := \vec{q} + G$, called a stoichiometric compatibility class.

A.1.1. Detailed balance and characterization of steady states for the macroscopic RRE. Denote a steady state to RRE (1.2) as \vec{x}^s , which satisfies

$$(A.2) \quad \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}_j \left(\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}^s) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}^s) \right) = 0.$$

Under the assumption of detailed balance (2.14) and (2.12), we have

$$(A.3) \quad \log k_j^+ - \log k_j^- = \vec{\nu}_j \cdot \log \vec{x}^s$$

Then $\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \log(\vec{x}_1^s - \vec{x}_2^s) = 0$ and all the steady states of RRE (1.2) can be characterized as follows. For any $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, there exists a unique steady states \vec{x}_*^s in the space $\{\vec{x} \in \vec{q} + G; \vec{x} > 0\}$. This uniqueness of steady states in one stoichiometric compatibility class is a well-known result; c.f., [HJ72, Theorem 6A], [AK15, Theorem 3.5].

A.2. Properties of Hamiltonian H and the convex conjugate. Recall the mass conservation law of chemical reactions (2.2) and direct decomposition (A.1). We further observe, for H , we have $H(\vec{0}, \vec{x}) \equiv 0$ and hence $\nabla_x H(\vec{0}, \vec{x}) \equiv 0$. We summarize useful lemmas on the properties of H and L .

Lemma A.1. *Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ in (2.19) is degenerate in the sense that*

$$(A.4) \quad H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\vec{p}_1, \vec{x}),$$

where $\vec{p}_1 \in \text{Ran}(\nu^T)$ is the direct decomposition of \vec{p} such that

$$(A.5) \quad \vec{p} = \vec{p}_1 + \vec{p}_2, \quad \vec{p}_1 \in \text{Ran}(\nu^T), \quad \vec{p}_2 \in \text{Ker}(\nu).$$

Lemma A.2. $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ defined in (2.19) is strictly convex for $\vec{p} \in G$.

Since H defined in (2.19) is convex w.r.t \vec{p} , we compute the convex conjugate of H via the Legendre transform. For any $\vec{s} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, define

$$(A.6) \quad L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) := \sup_{\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N} (\langle \vec{p}, \vec{s} \rangle - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})) = \langle \vec{p}^*, \vec{s} \rangle - H(\vec{p}^*, \vec{x})$$

where $\vec{p}^*(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ solves

$$(A.7) \quad \vec{s} = \nabla_p H(\vec{p}^*, \vec{x}) = \sum_j \bar{v}_j \left(\Phi_j^+ e^{\bar{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}^*} - \Phi_j^- e^{-\bar{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}^*} \right).$$

Here notation $\nabla_p H$ is a vector $(\partial_{p_i} H)_{i=1:N}$. Thus

$$(A.8) \quad L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{p}^*(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}^*(\vec{s}, \vec{x}), \vec{x}).$$

Define the action functional as

$$(A.9) \quad I(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\dot{\vec{x}}(t), \vec{x}(t)) dt.$$

Then we have the following lemma.

Lemma A.3. For L function defined in (A.6), we know

(i) $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) \geq 0$ and

$$(A.10) \quad L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \begin{cases} \max_{\vec{p} \in G} \{ \vec{s} \cdot \vec{p} - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \}, & \vec{s} \in G \\ +\infty, & \vec{s} \notin G; \end{cases}$$

moreover, L is strictly convex in G ;

(ii) For the action functional $I(\vec{x}(\cdot))$ in (A.9) the least action $\vec{x}(t)$ satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$(A.11) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\vec{x}}}(\dot{\vec{x}}(t), \vec{x}(t)) \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \vec{x}}(\dot{\vec{x}}(t), \vec{x}(t)),$$

which is equivalent to the Hamiltonian dynamics with H defined in (2.19)

$$(A.12) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \nabla_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \vec{p} = -\nabla_x H(\vec{p}, \vec{x});$$

(iii) $\vec{x}(t)$ is the solution to RRE (1.2) if and only if $I(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = 0$.

A.3. Concepts of viscosity solution. Here for the convenience of readers, we adapt the notion of viscosity solutions used in [BP87].

Definition A.4. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set. We say $u \in \text{USC}(\mathbb{R}^N)(\Omega)$ (resp. $\text{LSC}(\mathbb{R}^N)(\Omega)$) is a viscosity subsolution (resp. supersolution) to (4.23), if for any $x \in \Omega$ and any test function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $u - \varphi$ has a local maximum (resp. minimum) at x , it holds

$$(A.13) \quad u(x) - H(\nabla \varphi(x), x) \leq 0. \quad (\text{resp. } \geq 0)$$

We say u is a viscosity solution if it is both a viscosity subsolution and supersolution.