

Interval Analysis of Worst-case Stationary Moments for Stochastic Chemical Reactions with Uncertain Parameters

Yuta Sakurai, Yutaka Hori

Abstract

The dynamics of cellular chemical reactions are variable due to stochastic noise from intrinsic and extrinsic sources. The intrinsic noise is the intracellular fluctuations of molecular copy numbers caused by the probabilistic encounter of molecules and is modeled by the chemical master equation. The extrinsic noise, on the other hand, represents the intercellular variation of the kinetic parameters due to the variation of global factors affecting gene expression. The objective of this paper is to propose a theoretical framework to analyze the combined effect of the intrinsic and the extrinsic noise modeled by the chemical master equation with uncertain parameters. More specifically, we formulate a semidefinite program to compute the intervals of the stationary solution of uncertain moment equations whose parameters are given only partially in the form of the statistics of their distributions. The semidefinite program is derived without approximating the governing equation in contrast with many existing approaches. Thus, we can obtain guaranteed intervals of the worst possible values of the moments for all parameter distributions satisfying the given statistics, which are prohibitively hard to estimate from sample-path simulations since sampling from all possible uncertain distributions is difficult. We demonstrate the proposed optimization approach using two examples of stochastic chemical reactions and show that the solution of the optimization problem gives practically useful upper and lower bounds of the statistics of the stationary copy number distributions.

Keywords: analysis of systems with uncertainties, Markov process, Uncertain dynamical systems, Biomolecular systems, Mathematical optimization

1 Introduction

The stochastic response of biomolecular reactions in cells is often explained by two types of noise called intrinsic and extrinsic noise (Elowitz et al. 2002, Taniguchi et al. 2010). The intrinsic noise is the intracellular fluctuations of molecular copy numbers caused by the probabilistic encounter of molecular species such as mRNA and proteins in a single cell. The extrinsic noise, on the other hand, arises from the intercellular variation of the global factors affecting gene expression, and some of these are modeled by the variation of the rate parameters of the reactions.

The dynamics of the intrinsic noise is modeled by a continuous-time discrete state Markov process on a possibly infinite integer lattice associated with the copy numbers of molecular species, whose governing equation is called the chemical master equation (CME) (McQuarrie 1967, Gillespie 1992). However, the exact solution of the CME is hard to obtain since the number of the states,

Y. Sakurai and Y. Hori are with Department of Applied Physics and Physico-Informatics, Keio University 3-14-1 Hiyoshi, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, Kanagawa 223-8522, Japan.
Corresponding author Y. Hori. Tel. +81-45-566-1548.

which equals to the order of the equation, becomes extremely large or even infinite in applications of practical interest. Thus, analyses of stochastic chemical reactions are carried out based either by sample-path generation using the stochastic simulation algorithm (Gillespie 1976) or by approximate models.

Examples of the approximate models include the chemical Langevin equation (Gillespie 2000), the linear noise approximation (van Kampen 2007), and the truncated moment equations (Singh & Hespanha 2011, Lakatos et al. 2015, Schnoerr et al. 2015), which allow for computing approximate sample paths or dynamic moments of the molecular copy numbers of interest. Efforts were also made to theoretically guarantee the accuracy of analysis by bounding the error of the approximation. For instance, Munsky & Khammash (2006), Gupta et al. (2017) proposed the finite state projection, which enables analytic quantification of the error bound of the copy number distributions. Ahmadi et al. (2016) developed a method for bounding the solution of the Langevin equation. More recently, Ghusinga et al. (2017), Sakurai & Hori (2017, 2018, 2019), Dowdy & Barton (2018*a,b*), Kuntz et al. (2019) independently proposed an optimization based approach for bounding the solution of truncated moment equations based on the SDP relaxation of the generalized moment problem (Lasserre 2009), of which the idea was extended to the analysis of a wider class of systems (Lamperski & Dhople 2017, Lamperski et al. 2019, Ghusinga et al. 2020).

Despite these advancements, one limitation of these general frameworks is that they focus only on the analysis of intrinsic noise while experimental observations suggest that the stochastic cellular response is the result of the combined effects of intrinsic and extrinsic noise (Taniguchi et al. 2010). Thus, an important next step is to generalize these frameworks to enable simultaneous analysis for intrinsic and extrinsic noise.

Toward this goal, this paper considers a computational method to obtain theoretically guaranteed bounds of the stationary moments of the copy number distributions subject to extrinsic noise modeled by the uncertainty of reaction rates. Since exact identification of the uncertainty is hard in practice, we here assume that only part of the statistics of the parameter distribution such as the mean is available. This implies that the stationary moments of the copy number distribution can be obtained only as the *worst-case* interval for all possible parameter distributions satisfying the *a priori* statistics (Fig. 1). We show that the problem of the worst-case interval analysis reduces to a similar form of the semidefinite program that was designed for the deterministic parameter case (Ghusinga et al. 2017, Sakurai & Hori 2017, 2018, Dowdy & Barton 2018*a*, Kuntz et al. 2019) by reorganizing the CME and adding various types of constraints to the optimization problem. In particular, we show that the proposed optimization program is capable of computing the stationary moments of highly uncertain moment equations that are hard to analyze with the widely-used stochastic simulation algorithm (Gillespie 1976).

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2.2, we formulate the problem and introduce the proposed approach along with the associated optimization problem in the previous studies. In Section 3, we derive the specific form of the optimization program. Section 4 is devoted to demonstration of the proposed approach using two illustrative examples. Finally, we summarize the results in Section 5.

Notations: \mathbb{N}_0 is the set of natural numbers including zero, $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, \mathbb{Z} is the set of integers, and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is the set of positive real numbers, $\mathbb{R}_{>0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x > 0\}$. A superscript is used to represent the dimension of the vector space, *e.g.*, \mathbb{N}_0^n . A probability distribution defined on the sample space X and its support is denoted by \mathbb{P}_X and $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_X)$, respectively. A scalar \mathbf{X}^α is defined for vectors $\mathbf{X} = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]^\top$ and $\alpha = [\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n]^\top$ as $\mathbf{X}^\alpha := \prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{\alpha_i} = X_1^{\alpha_1} X_2^{\alpha_2} \dots X_n^{\alpha_n}$.




Figure 1: The concept of the worst-case interval of stationary moments for uncertain parameter distributions

2 Model of Stochastic Chemical Reactions with Uncertain Parameters

In this section, we first introduce a chemical master equation, a mathematical model of stochastic chemical reactions, and define the problem of moment analysis with uncertain reaction parameters. The stationary moment equation is then derived to use for the development of our optimization problem.

2.1 Chemical master equation and problem formulation

Consider a chemical reaction system that consists of n species of molecules, $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n$, and r reactions. We denote the copy number of the molecular species \mathcal{M}_j by X_j and define $\mathbf{X} := [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]^\top \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. The stoichiometry of the i -th reaction is defined by $\mathbf{s}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, meaning that the molecular copy numbers change from \mathbf{X} to $\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{s}_i$ by reaction i . The reactions occur in a stochastic manner due to the low copy nature of the molecular species, and thus, the dynamics of the copy number \mathbf{X} is considered as a stochastic process. More specifically, the probability of the occurrence of reaction i in an infinitesimal time dt is given by $w_i(\mathbf{X}, K_i)dt$, where $w_i(\mathbf{X}, K_i)$ is the propensity function with a constant $K_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We assume that all reactions are elementary, meaning that the propensity function is a zero-th, first, or second order polynomial in X_i .

Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{X}_0}$ denote the conditional probability distribution of \mathbf{X} given the time-invariant rate constants $\mathbf{K} := [K_1, K_2, \dots, K_r]^\top \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ and the initial value of the copy number $\mathbf{X}_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. We define the probability at time t by

$$P(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}_0; t) := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{X}_0}(\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{K} = \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0).$$

The evolution of the distribution is then governed by the chemical master equation (CME) (Gillespie 1992)

$$\frac{d}{dt}P(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}_0; t) = \sum_{i=1}^r \{w_i(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}_i, k_i)P(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{s}_i|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}_0; t) - w_i(\mathbf{x}, k_i)P(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}_0; t)\}. \quad (1)$$

The CME is also known as Kolmogorov’s forward equation for a discrete state Markov chain, where the state of the chain is the copy number of molecular species.

The CME (1) characterizes the dynamics of the intrinsic variability caused by the stochastic reaction events within a cell. On the other hand, the cell population is also subject to extrinsic noise resulting from the variation of global factors. Hence, we here consider the extrinsic noise that can be modeled by the variation of the time-invariant kinetic parameters across the cell population that is characterized by the distribution \mathbb{P}_K .

In what follows, we consider analyzing the stationary moments of the copy number distribution \mathbb{P}_X when the parameter distribution \mathbb{P}_K is partially given in the form of its moments. Specifically, our goal is to propose a mathematical optimization program for computing the bounds of the stationary moments and their associated statistical values such as the mean and the variance of the distribution based on the *a priori* information of the parameter distribution \mathbb{P}_K . More formally, the problem is stated as follows.

Problem. Consider the chemical master equation (1). Suppose a set of parameter distributions \mathcal{P} is given. Compute the upper and the lower bounds of the stationary moments of \mathbb{P}_X for all parameter distributions $\mathbb{P}_K \in \mathcal{P}$ and all initial distributions \mathbb{P}_{X_0} .

It is reasonable, in practice, to assume that the actual distribution of the parameters \mathbb{P}_K is unknown but only some statistics such as the mean and the covariance are known. Thus, we here consider the case where the set \mathcal{P} is characterized by some of the moments of parameter distributions. The stationary distribution of the copy numbers \mathbb{P}_X might not be unique for the set of the parameter distributions \mathcal{P} . In other words, we can obtain only an interval of statistics of the copy number distribution. The upper and the lower bound of the statistics then gives the worst-case statistics of the stochastic chemical system (1) when the underlying parameter distribution $\mathbb{P}_K \in \mathcal{P}$ is uncertain (Fig. 1).

In what follows, we impose the following assumptions to enable moment based analysis of the stationary distribution of the molecular copy numbers.

Assumption 1. For any parameter distributions \mathbb{P}_K in the given set \mathcal{P} , and any initial copy number distributions \mathbb{P}_{X_0} , (i) the stationary solution of the CME (1) exists, and (ii) its associated Markov chain is non-explosive. Moreover, (iii) all moments of the stationary distributions \mathbb{P}_X are finite.

Remark 1. The conditions (i) and (ii) guarantee the existence of the stationary distributions (Theorem 30 in Kuntz et al. (2019)). The condition (iii) is necessary to rule out the case of heavy-tailed copy number distributions as observed in Ham et al. (2020), in which case moment based characterization of the stationary distribution is not possible.

2.2 Stationary moment equation with uncertain parameters and its solutions

To analyze the uncertain stationary moments of the copy number distribution, we first introduce the moment equation of the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}_{X,K}$. To this goal, we reorganize the CME (1) by marginalizing the parameter \mathbf{K} and the initial copy number \mathbf{X}_0 , and incorporating the parameters

into the state by $\hat{\mathbf{X}} := [\mathbf{X}^\top, \mathbf{K}^\top]^\top$. Specifically, eq. (1) becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}; t) = \sum_{i=1}^r \{\hat{w}_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_i)\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{s}}_i; t) - \hat{w}_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}; t)\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}; t) := \mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$ with $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}} := \mathbb{P}_X \mathbb{P}_K$ at time t , $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i := [\mathbf{s}_i^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top]^\top$, and $\hat{w}_i(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) := w_i(\mathbf{x}, k_i)$. The initial distribution is defined by $\hat{P}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}; 0) = \mathbb{P}_K(\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{k})\mathbb{P}_{X_0}(\mathbf{X}_0 = \mathbf{x}_0)$. It should be noted that \mathbb{P}_K and \mathbb{P}_X are Lebesgue and Dirac measure, respectively.

Eq. (2) can be viewed as a chemical master equation for the new state $\hat{\mathbf{X}}$. In particular, the rate constants are no longer variable. Thus, the dynamics of the moments of the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$ can be modeled by the moment equation using the standard approach (see Sakurai & Hori (2018) for example). This allows us to recast the analysis problem of the uncertain stationary moments into an optimization problem that was previously studied for computing the moment bounds of stochastic reactions without parameter uncertainty (Ghusinga et al. 2017, Sakurai & Hori 2017, 2018, Dowdy & Barton 2018a, Kuntz et al. 2019).

Specifically, let the p -th order moment of the distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(= \mathbb{P}_{X,K})$ be defined by

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma] := \int_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}} \hat{\mathbf{x}}^\gamma \, d\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \quad (3)$$

where $\|\gamma\|_1 = p$ and $\hat{\mathcal{X}} := \text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}})$ (see Notations in Section 1 for the definition of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma$). The moment equation then becomes a set of linear ordinary differential equations of the moments of $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$, and its stationary solution gives the stationary moment. The stationary moment equation is specifically given by

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{\gamma} a_{i,\gamma}^\zeta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma] \quad (4)$$

for each $\zeta := [\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_{n+r}] \in \mathbb{N}_0^{n+r}$, where the constant $a_{i,\gamma}^\zeta$ is the coefficient of $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\gamma$ in the polynomial $\{(\hat{\mathbf{X}} + \hat{\mathbf{s}}_i)^\zeta - \hat{\mathbf{X}}^\zeta\}\hat{w}_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$). This implies that, given the stoichiometry $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_i$ and the propensity $\hat{w}_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$, the stationary moments can be found as the solution of the linear equation (4). In general, however, the equation is highly underdetermined, *i.e.*, there is no subset of equations that can close the system of equations, and simply solving the linear equation (4) does not give practical moment bounds.

Hence, the following necessary condition that the solutions must satisfy were used in the previous works (Ghusinga et al. 2017, Sakurai & Hori 2017, 2018, Dowdy & Barton 2018a, Kuntz et al. 2019).

Proposition 1. *Consider the CME (1) and its associated stationary moment equation (4). Suppose Assumption 1 holds. Then, the stationary moments of $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}$ satisfy the linear equation (4) and*

$$H_0 := \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_0 \mathbf{g}_0^\top] \succeq O, \quad (5)$$

$$H_i := \mathbb{E}[z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top] \succeq O \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell), \quad (6)$$

where \mathbf{g}_i is a vector of the monomial basis of polynomials $\mathbb{R}[\hat{\mathbf{X}}]$ of an arbitrary degree, and $z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ are given polynomial functions satisfying $\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathcal{X}}}) \subseteq \{\hat{\mathbf{X}} \mid z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) \geq 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell)\}$.

The function $z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ is, for example, $z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}}) = X_i$ since the molecular copy number is non-negative. Since the entries of the matrices H_i ($i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \ell$) are the moments of the joint distribution $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}}$, which also appear in eq. (4), eqs. (5), and (6) constitute semidefinite constraints that eq. (4) must satisfy. Thus, we can formulate a semidefinite program that explores the maximum or the minimum value of a target variable (moment) subject to the constraints (4)–(6) by replacing the moments with independent variables. This approach was previously studied to compute the bounds of the moments when the parameter K_i of the propensity function $w_i(\mathbf{X}, K_i)$ is given and deterministic (Ghusinga et al. 2017, Sakurai & Hori 2017, 2018, Dowdy & Barton 2018a, Kuntz et al. 2019). In the next section, we follow this idea to formulate an optimization problem that seeks guaranteed upper and lower bounds of the stationary moments when the parameters are given by an uncertain distribution \mathbb{P}_K .

3 Mathematical Optimization for Bounding Stationary Moments of Uncertain Chemical Reactions

Let \mathcal{P} denote the set of uncertain parameter distributions \mathbb{P}_K satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose that the moments of \mathbb{P}_K are specified by linear inequalities $h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$), and that the support of \mathbb{P}_K is a subset of a basic (closed) semialgebraic set, *i.e.*,

$$\mathcal{P} := \{\mathbb{P}_K \mid h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq 0 \ (i = 1, 2, \dots, m), \text{ supp}(\mathbb{P}_K) \subseteq \{\mathbf{K} \mid c_i(\mathbf{K}) \geq 0\}_{i=1}^{\ell_1}\} \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}, \quad (7)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is a vector of the moments of \mathbb{P}_K , *i.e.*,

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} := [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}^{\beta_1}], \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}^{\beta_2}], \dots]^\top, \quad (8)$$

and $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ is the set of all distributions satisfying Assumption 1. Similarly, we define a basic (closed) semialgebraic set $\{\mathbf{X} \mid d_i(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0 \ (i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell_2)\}$ satisfying

$$\text{supp}(\mathbb{P}_X) \subseteq \{\mathbf{X} \mid d_i(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0\}_{i=1}^{\ell_2} (=:\mathcal{X}). \quad (9)$$

To derive the specific form of the optimization program, we further define the truncated stationary moment equation by collecting a subset of eq. (4) for low order moments. Specifically,

$$\mathbf{0} = A\boldsymbol{\mu} + B\boldsymbol{\nu} + C\boldsymbol{\xi}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu} &:= [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1}], \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_2}], \dots]^\top, \\ \boldsymbol{\nu} &:= [\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1} \mathbf{K}^{\beta_1}], \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}^{\alpha_1} \mathbf{K}^{\beta_2}], \dots]^\top \quad (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \neq \mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_i \neq \mathbf{0}), \end{aligned}$$

and the matrices A, B , and C are defined with the coefficients in eq. (4). It should be noted that $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}$, and $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ are finite dimensional vectors.

Then, the following proposition gives the specific form of the optimization problem for computing the upper and the lower bounds of a target moment of the copy number distribution \mathbb{P}_X .

Proposition 2. *Consider the stochastic reaction system governed by the CME (1). Suppose Assumption 1 holds, and the functions $c_i(\mathbf{K}), h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi})$, and $d_i(\mathbf{X})$ defined in eqs. (7) and (9) are given. Let φ_{\min}^* (resp., φ_{\max}^*) denote the minimum (resp., maximum) value of the stationary moment $\mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ among all possible parameter distributions $\mathbb{P}_K \in \mathcal{P}$, *i.e.*, $\varphi_{\min}^* := \min_{\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ (resp., $\varphi_{\max}^* := \max_{\mathcal{P}} \mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$), where \mathbf{f} is a given constant vector for defining the moments of interest.*

Then, the solution of the following minimization (resp., maximization) problem gives the lower (resp., upper) bound of φ_{\min}^* .

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}} \mathbf{f}^\top \bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad \text{subject to} \\ & A\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} + B\bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} + C\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \mathbf{0}, \\ & h_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}) \geq 0 \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, m), \\ & \bar{H}_i := \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}_0 \mathbf{g}_0^\top]) \succeq O & (i = 0) \\ \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{E}[c_i(\mathbf{K}) \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top]) \succeq O & (i = 1, \dots, \ell_1) \\ \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{E}[d_{i-\ell_1}(\mathbf{X}) \mathbf{g}_i \mathbf{g}_i^\top]) \succeq O & (i = \ell_1 + 1, \dots, \ell_1 + \ell_2), \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\nu}} := \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$, and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}} := \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\xi})$, and $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is a bijective operator that maps each moment in the entries to an independent variable.

The complete proof of the proposition is shown in Appendix A. This proposition extends the previously proposed optimization programs for deterministic parameters (Ghusinga et al. 2017, Sakurai & Hori 2017, 2018, Dowdy & Barton 2018a, Kuntz et al. 2019) and enables the analysis of moment equations with uncertain parameter distributions. The optimization problem explores the bounds of uncentered moments $\mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ over the set specified by the constraints that form a necessary condition for $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ to be the moments of $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}}$. In particular, it belongs to a class of semidefinite program (SDP), and more specifically, it is known as an SDP relaxation of the generalized moment problem (Lasserre 2009). Thus, existing optimization solvers are available to systematically find the intervals of the moments.

Remark 2. When a conservation law holds for some molecular species, the redundant state variables in the CME can be systematically removed by using the bases of the left null space of the stoichiometry matrix $[\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2, \dots, \mathbf{s}_r]$ as shown in Dowdy & Barton (2018a). This allows for reducing the number of variables in the resulting optimization problem and accelerating the computation time.

When the moments of the parameter distribution, $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, are known *a priori*, they can be substituted in $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ to reduce the variables. The solution of the optimization program then provides a theoretically guaranteed certificate that the moment of a copy number distribution is within the computed bounds even when the parameter distribution is given only as a set \mathcal{P} , which answers the Problem posed in Section 2.1.

In the simplest case where the entire parameter distribution \mathbb{P}_K is given without uncertainty, we can simply substitute its moments $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{K}^\beta]$ to $\bar{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ to solve the optimization problem. The moments of the parameter distribution, $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, can be systematically determined if the parameters K_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, r$) are independently distributed, and the marginal distributions of \mathbb{P}_K are given by well-known parametric distributions such as Poisson or gamma distributions as shown in Section 4.1.

In a more complex case, where the underlying parameter distribution is not parametric nor completely known, the parameter distribution can be constrained only by the moments of the parameter distribution as $h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq 0$. The inequality constraints are useful in more practical situations where only the low order moments such as the mean and the variance are given or estimated from data while the shape of the entire distribution is unknown, which is illustrated in Section 4.2.

Table 1: Specification of dimerization process (11)


index i	Reaction rate w_i	Stoichiometry s_i
1	$w_1 = K_1 D$	$s_1 = 1$
2	$w_2 = K_2 X$	$s_2 = -1$
3	$w_3 = K_3 X(X - 1)$	$s_3 = -2$

4 Application examples

In this section, we demonstrate the proposed optimization approach by using two examples of stochastic chemical reactions and show that the solution of the optimization problem gives practically useful upper and lower bounds of the statistics of the stationary copy number distribution \mathbb{P}_X .

4.1 Analysis for partially known parameter distributions

We consider the dimerization process of a molecular species A, which consists of three reactions:



where the copy number of the molecular species A is denoted by X , and the stoichiometry and the propensity functions are defined in Table 1. These reactions correspond to gene expression, degradation, and protein dimerization, for instance. We assume that the distributions of K_1 and K_2 are by gamma distributions, where the shape factor η_i and the scale factor θ_i for K_i are $(\eta_1, \theta_1) = (2, 0.4)$ and $(\eta_2, \theta_2) = (4, 0.1)$, respectively. K_3 and D are assumed to be constants, and $K_3 = 0.02$ and $D = 5$. The parameters K_1 and K_2 are possibly correlated and the correlation is bounded by $|\text{corr}(K_1, K_2)| \leq r$, where $\text{corr}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the correlation between the two variables. This constraint is expressed as $h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\mathbb{E}[K_1 K_2]) &= -\mathbb{E}[K_1 K_2] + \tilde{\mu}_1 \tilde{\mu}_2 + r \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\sigma}_2, \\ h_2(\mathbb{E}[K_1 K_2]) &= \mathbb{E}[K_1 K_2] - \tilde{\mu}_1 \tilde{\mu}_2 + r \tilde{\sigma}_1 \tilde{\sigma}_2, \end{aligned}$$

and $\tilde{\mu}_i$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ are the mean and the standard deviation of the gamma distribution \mathbb{P}_{K_i} , respectively, which can be computed by

$$\mathbb{E}[K_i^{\beta_i}] = \theta_i^{\beta_i} \prod_{j=1}^{\beta_i} (\eta_i + j - 1). \quad (12)$$

It should be noted that the existence of parameter correlation is often the case in biomolecular reactions such as gene expression since the reaction machinery depends on common global resources of a cell.

In what follows, we analyze the stationary mean copy number of the monomer A. To this goal,

the moment equation (10) is computed based on the CME (1). For instance,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{0} = & \begin{bmatrix} 2K_3 & -2K_3 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[X] \\ \mathbb{E}[X^2] \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[K_1] \\ \mathbb{E}[K_1^2] \\ \mathbb{E}[K_1 K_2] \end{bmatrix} \\ & + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2K_3 & -2K_3 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2K_3 & -2K_3 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{E}[XK_1] \\ \mathbb{E}[X^2 K_1] \\ \mathbb{E}[XK_2] \\ \mathbb{E}[X^2 K_2] \\ \mathbb{E}[XK_1 K_2] \\ \mathbb{E}[XK_2^2] \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which is obtained from eq. (4) with $\hat{\mathbf{X}}^\zeta = X^{\zeta_1} K_1^{\zeta_2} K_2^{\zeta_3}$. For later convenience, we define $\rho := \max \zeta_1$ and $\sigma := \max(\zeta_2 + \zeta_3)$, which are the parameters that determine the order of moments included in the truncated moment equation. These parameters are used to control the tradeoff between accuracy and computation time. For example, $\rho = \sigma = 1$ for eq. (13). Substituting eq. (12) into the corresponding entries in eq. (13), we obtain the equality constraint of the optimization problem.

We further narrow the solution space of eq. (13) by using $\bar{H}_0, \bar{H}_1, \bar{H}_2$, and \bar{H}_3 . For $\rho = \sigma = 1$, we use

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_0 &= [1, X, K_1, XK_1, K_2, XK_2]^\top \\ \mathbf{g}_1 = \mathbf{g}_2 &= [1, X]^\top, \quad \mathbf{g}_3 = [1, K_1, K_2]^\top, \end{aligned}$$

and $c_1(\mathbf{K}) = K_1, c_2(\mathbf{K}) = K_2, d_1(X) = X$, which allows for including all moments in eq. (13) into the matrices.

Finally, based on Proposition 2, we compute the upper and the lower bounds of the possible values of the mean copy number $\mathbb{E}[X]$ for different values of r . The results are illustrated in Fig. 2(A), where $\rho = 5$ is used. We observe from Fig. 2(A) that, for each r , the gap between the upper and the lower bounds monotonically decreases with increasing σ . This is because the constraints for the optimization program with smaller σ become a subset of those for the larger ones. This feature allows us to automate the choice of σ by iteratively solving the optimization problem by increasing σ until the solution converges to a certain value. Another important observation is that the gap increases monotonically with r . This gap shows the uncertainty of the mean copy number that originates from the uncertainty of the joint distribution \mathbb{P}_K due to the possible correlation of the parameters. In other words, Fig. 2(A) shows the worst-case value of the uncertain moment for each r . In fact, the gap becomes zero (with two significant digits) for $\sigma = 9$ when the parameters are independent, for which case the \mathbb{P}_K is uniquely determined as the product of the two gamma distributions.

This result can be verified by generating sample paths for each r and plotting the intervals of the mean copy number as shown in Fig. 2. More specifically, the sample paths are generated by the following procedure:

1. Generate 100000 random numbers $K_{1,i}$ and $K_{2,i}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 100000$) from the gamma distributions \mathbb{P}_{K_1} and \mathbb{P}_{K_2} , respectively.
2. Sort each parameter in ascending order and make pairs of parameters (K_{1,i_1}, K_{2,i_2}) .
3. Randomly choose two pairs of parameters, say (K_{1,i_1}, K_{2,i_2}) and (K_{1,j_1}, K_{2,j_2}) , and swap K_2 so that (K_{1,i_1}, K_{2,j_2}) and (K_{1,j_1}, K_{2,i_2}) .




Figure 2: Bounds of maximum and minimum values of mean copy number $\mathbb{E}[X]$ for the reaction system (11). (A) gamma distribution is assumed for \mathbb{P}_{K_1} and \mathbb{P}_{K_2} . (B) Only the first and the second order moments are assumed for \mathbb{P}_{K_1} and \mathbb{P}_{K_2} .

4. Repeat (2) and (3) unless $\text{corr}(K_1, K_2) \leq r$
5. Run the stochastic simulation algorithm (SSA) (Gillespie 1976) for each parameter pair, and record the mean copy number at time $t = 1440$.

In short, positively correlated parameter pairs are generated by step (2), and then the correlation is reduced in step (3). To make negatively correlated pairs,

- (6) Run (1)-(5) again, but K_2 is sorted in descending order in step (2) and $\text{corr}(K_1, K_2) \geq -r$ in step (4).
- (7) Plot the range of the mean copy numbers obtained in steps (5) and (6).

It should be noted that obtaining asymptotic bounds using the stochastic simulation algorithm (Gillespie 1976) is prohibitively hard since there are many possible joint distributions satisfying the constraint of the correlation $|\text{corr}(K_1, K_2)| \leq r$, and the sample space of the parameter com-

binations becomes significantly large. This is more prominent in the next example.

4.2 Analysis for fully unknown parameter distributions

Next, we consider a more practical scenario where the marginal distributions of the parameters K_1 and K_2 are not completely known, but only their first and second order moments are. We assume $K_3 = 0.02$ and $D = 5$, and the correlation between the two parameters is assumed to be $\text{corr}(K_1, K_2) \leq r$, which is the same as the previous example. Thus, the only difference from the previous example is that the parameter distribution \mathbb{P}_K has larger uncertainty in that the marginal distribution is not unique.

We formulate the same optimization problem as the previous example in Section 4.1 except that the third and the higher order moments for K_1 and K_2 , *i.e.*, $\mathbb{E}[K_1^r]$ and $\mathbb{E}[K_2^r]$ with $r \geq 3$, are set as variables. The upper and the lower bounds of the mean copy number computed by the optimization program are plotted in Fig. 2(B). The results of the SSA shown in gray are repeated from Fig. 2(A). As expected, the gap between the upper and the lower bounds becomes larger than those in Fig. 2(A) since the parameter distribution \mathbb{P}_K has larger uncertainty than the previous example. It should be noted that the marginal distributions of the parameters are no longer limited to the gamma distributions. Since parameterization of such uncertain parameter distributions is not available, it is prohibitively difficult to obtain a reasonable estimation of the bounds by using the sampling based approach such as the SSA (Gillespie 1976). The proposed approach, on the other hand, gives mathematically guaranteed bounds, and thus, it is useful for rational engineering and analysis of stochastic chemical reaction systems.

Remark 3. All optimization problems were solved with SeDuMi 1.3.2 (Sturm 1999) on MATLAB 2021a. To avoid numerical instability of the solver, the variables were normalized by constants as shown in Appendix B.

5 Conclusion

We have proposed a computational framework to analyze the worst-case stationary moments of the molecular copy number distributions in stochastic chemical reactions with parametric uncertainty. Specifically, a mathematical optimization method has been developed to compute the intervals of the possible moment values of uncertain moment equations whose parameters are given only partially using the statistics of the parameter distributions. A distinctive feature of the proposed method is that it has been derived without approximating the governing equation of the stochastic chemical reactions, *i.e.*, the CME, unlike many other approaches reviewed in Section 1. In other words, the moments of interest are guaranteed to be within the bounds for all possible parameter distributions satisfying the given statistics. This feature is useful for model-based rational engineering of biomolecular circuits, where the robustness of synthetic reactions is important.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16H07175, JP18H01464, and 21H01355.

References

Ahmadi, M., Harris, A. W. K. & Papachristodoulou, A. (2016), An optimization-based method for bounding state functionals of nonlinear stochastic systems, *in* 'Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control', pp. 5342–5347.

- Dowdy, G. R. & Barton, P. I. (2018a), ‘Bounds on stochastic chemical kinetic systems at steady state’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **148**(8), 084106.
- Dowdy, G. R. & Barton, P. I. (2018b), ‘Dynamic bounds on stochastic chemical kinetic systems using semidefinite programming’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **149**(7), 074103.
- Elowitz, M. B., Levine, A. J., Siggia, E. D. & Swain, P. S. (2002), ‘Stochastic gene expression in a single cell’, *Science* **297**(5584), 1183–1186.
- Ghusinga, K. R., Lamperski, A. & Singh, A. (2020), ‘Moment analysis of stochastic hybrid systems using semidefinite programming’, *Automatica* **112**, 108634.
- Ghusinga, K. R., Vargas-Garcia, C. A., Lamperski, A. & Singh, A. (2017), ‘Exact lower and upper bounds on stationary moments in stochastic biochemical systems’, *Physical Biology* **14**(4), 04LT01.
- Gillespie, D. T. (1976), ‘A general method for numerically simulating the stochastic time evolution of coupled chemical reactions’, *Journal of Computational Physics* **22**(4), 403–434.
- Gillespie, D. T. (1992), ‘A rigorous derivation of the chemical master equation’, *Physica A* **188**(1–3), 404–425.
- Gillespie, D. T. (2000), ‘The chemical Langevin equation’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **113**(1), 297.
- Gupta, A., Mikelson, J. & Khammash, M. (2017), ‘A finite state projection algorithm for the stationary solution of the chemical master equation’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **147**(15), 154101.
- Ham, L., Brackston, R. D. & Stumpf, M. P. (2020), ‘Extrinsic synthetic oscillatory network of transcriptional regulators’, *Physical Review Letters* **124**, 108101.
- Kuntz, J., Thomas, P., Stan, G.-B. & Barahona, M. (2019), ‘Bounding the stationary distributions of the chemical master equation via mathematical programming’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **151**(3), 034109.
- Lakatos, E., Ale, A., Kirk, P. D. W. & Stumpf, M. P. H. (2015), ‘Multivariate moment closure techniques for stochastic kinetic models’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **143**(9), 094107.
- Lamperski, A. & Dhople, S. (2017), A semidefinite programming method for moment approximation in stochastic differential algebraic systems, in ‘Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control’, pp. 2455–2460.
- Lamperski, A., Ghusinga, K. R. & Singh, A. (2019), ‘Analysis and control of stochastic systems using semidefinite programming over moments’, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **64**(4), 1726–1731.
- Lasserre, J. B. (2009), *Moments, positive polynomials and their applications*, Imperial College Press.
- McQuarrie, D. A. (1967), ‘Stochastic approach to chemical kinetics’, *Journal of Applied Probability* **4**(3), 413–478.
- Munsky, B. & Khammash, M. (2006), ‘The finite state projection algorithm for the solution of the chemical master equation’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **124**(4), 044104.

- Sakurai, Y. & Hori, Y. (2017), A convex approach to steady state moment analysis for stochastic chemical reactions, *in* ‘Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Decision and Control’, pp. 1206–1211.
- Sakurai, Y. & Hori, Y. (2018), ‘Optimization-based synthesis of stochastic biocircuits with statistical specifications’, *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **15**(138), 20170709.
- Sakurai, Y. & Hori, Y. (2019), ‘Bounding transient moments of stochastic chemical reactions’, *IEEE Control Systems Letters* **3**(2), 290–295.
- Schnoerr, D., Sanguinetti, G. & Grima, R. (2015), ‘Comparison of different moment-closure approximations for stochastic chemical kinetics’, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **143**(18), 185101.
- Singh, A. & Hespanha, J. P. (2011), ‘Approximate moment dynamics for chemically reacting systems’, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **56**(2), 414–418.
- Sturm, J. F. (1999), ‘Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones’, *Optimization Methods and Software* **11–12**, 625–653.
- Taniguchi, Y., Choi, P. J., Li, G.-W., Chen, H., Babu, M., Hearn, J., Emili, A. & Xie, X. S. (2010), ‘Quantifying e. coli proteome and transcriptome with single-molecule sensitivity in single cells’, *Science* **329**(5991), 533–538.
- van Kampen, N. G. (2007), *Stochastic processes in physics and chemistry*, 3rd edition edn, North Holland.

A Proof of Proposition 2

Let \mathcal{S}_0 denote the set of stationary moments of $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}}$ for all $\mathbb{P}_K \in \mathcal{P}$. Then, it follows from Proposition 1 that the stationary moments $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \in \mathcal{S}_0$ satisfy the truncated moment equation (10) and $H_i \succeq O$ (\star_1). The function $z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ in eq. (6) specifies the superset of the support of $\mathbb{P}_{\hat{X}}$ by definition. Thus, eq. (7) and eq. (9) imply that $z_i(\hat{\mathbf{X}})$ can be chosen as $c_i(\mathbf{K})$ and $d_i(\mathbf{X})$ (\star_2). Moreover, $h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \geq 0$ holds from the definition of \mathcal{P} in eq. (7) (\star_3).

Finally, (\star_1), (\star_2), and (\star_3) imply that the feasible set of the optimization problem \mathcal{S}_1 satisfy $\mathcal{S}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{S}_0$. Thus

$$\min_{\mathcal{S}_1} \mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} \leq \min_{\mathcal{S}_0} \mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} (= \varphi_{\min}^*),$$

which completes the proof.

B Scaling of the variables for the optimization

Scaling constants were introduced to avoid numerical instability caused by rounding error. Let

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{scaled}}[X^\alpha K_1^{\beta_1} K_2^{\beta_2}] := \frac{1}{C(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)} \mathbb{E}[X^\alpha K_1^{\beta_1} K_2^{\beta_2}]$$

denote a scaled moment, where $C(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2) := C_X^\alpha C_{K_1}^{\beta_1} C_{K_2}^{\beta_2}$ with C_X and C_{K_i} being given constants associated with the copy number X and the parameters K_i ($i = 1, 2$).

When solving the optimization problem, we reformulated equivalent constraints by dividing the stationary moment equation (4) with $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = [\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2]^\top$ by $C(\alpha, \beta_1, \beta_2)$. The variables in $h_i(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ and H_i were also replaced with the scaled moments with appropriate scaling. The constants were $C_X = 5, C_{K_1} = 3$ and $C_{K_2} = 0.7$ for Fig. 2.