The random time-changed Poisson representation for the concentration of each species in chemical reactions is a powerful tool to study macroscopic properties for chemical reactions. The nonlinear semigroup for the corresponding large volume stochastic process, i.e., the classical WKB expansion, defines a Hamiltonian $H$, a Hamiltonian dynamics and a Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Through this Hamiltonian $H$, we revisit and bridge some important macroscopic properties: (i) The detailed/complex balance and the associated symmetric property give rise gradient flow structures; (ii) The rate function $L$, as the conjugate of $H$, measures the deviation of any path from the thermodynamic limit Kurtz equation written in its generalized gradient flow form; (iii) The solution to the thermodynamic limit Kurtz equation, is a least action curve with zero action cost, while its time reversed solution is also a least action curve with a nonzero affinity; (iv) We give an infinite time optimal control interpretation for the most probable path connecting two typical states of a chemical reaction and prove nonexistence of transitions between two steady states in a detailed balanced reaction system.
Consider chemical reaction with \( i = 1, \ldots, N \) species and \( j = 1, \ldots, M \) reactions

\[
\text{(1.1) \quad \text{reaction} \ j : \sum_i \nu _{ji}^+ X_i \xrightarrow{k_j^+}{k_j^-} \sum_i \nu _{ji}^- X_i,}
\]

where nonnegative integers \( \nu _{ji}^+ \geq 0 \) are stoichiometric coefficients and \( k_j^+ \geq 0 \) are reaction rates for the \( j \)-th forward/backward reactions. Denote \( M \times N \) matrix \( \nu := \{\nu _{ji}\}, j = 1, \ldots, M, i = 1, \ldots, N \) as the Wegscheider matrix and \( \nu ^T \) is referred as the stoichiometric matrix \([\text{MS07}]\). In this paper, all vectors \( \vec{X} = \{X_i\}_{i=1:N} \in \mathbb{R}^N \) and \( \{\varphi _j\}_{j=1:M}, \{k_j\}_{j=1:M} \in \mathbb{R}^M \) are column vectors.

Let the space of natural numbers \( \mathbb{N} \) be the state space of the random process \( X_i(t) \) and let \( X_i(t) \in \mathbb{N} \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, N \). Kurtz proposed the random time-changed Poisson representation for chemical reactions \((1.1)\), c.f. \([\text{AK15}]\), for \( i = 1, \ldots, N \),

\[
X_i(t) = X_i(0) + \sum_{j=1}^M \nu _{ji}^+ Y_j^+(\vec{t}^+_{ji}) - \nu _{ji}^- Y_j^-(\vec{t}^-_{ji}),
\]

\[
\text{(1.2) \quad \vec{t}^\pm_{ji} := \int_0^t \varphi _j^\pm(X(s)) \, ds, \quad \nu _{ji} = (\nu _{ji}^+ - \nu _{ji}^-), \quad \varphi _j^\pm(X) = k_j^\pm V \prod_{\ell=1}^N (X_{\ell} / V)^{\nu _{ji}^{\pm}_{\ell}},}
\]

where for the \( j \)-th reaction channel, \( Y_j^\pm(t) \) are i.i.d. unit rate Poisson processes and \( \varphi _j^\pm \) are usually called the intensity functions.

Let \( V \gg 1 \) be the volume. Rescale the process \((1.2)\) as \( C_i^V := X_i / V \) and denote \( \vec{x}_V := \vec{n} / V, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{N}^N \), which are both in a countable discrete state space. Suppose the forward and backward fluxes at the large volume scale satisfies the law of mass action \((\text{LMA})\)

\[
\Phi _j^\pm(\vec{x}_V) := \frac{\varphi _j(\vec{n})}{V} = k_j^\pm \prod_{\ell=1}^N (x_{\ell} / V)^{\nu _{ji}^{\pm}_{\ell}}.
\]

Then the large volume process \( C_i^V \) satisfies

\[
\text{(1.3) \quad C_i^V(t) = C_i^V(0) + \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}^j V \left( Y_j^+(V \int_0^t \Phi _j^+(C^V(s)) \, ds) - Y_j^-(V \int_0^t \Phi _j^-(C^V(s)) \, ds) \right),}
\]

where \( \vec{\nu}^j = \{\nu _{ji}\}_{i=1:N}, \) column vector in \( \mathbb{R}^N \), is called the reaction vector for the \( j \)-th reaction.

For a chemical reaction modeled by \((1.2)\), denote the law of \( C_i^V(t) \) as \( p(\vec{x}_V, t) = \mathbb{E}(\delta_{\vec{x}_V,C_i^V(t)}) \), where \( \delta \) is the Kronecker delta function. Then \( p(\vec{x}_V, t) \) satisfies the chemical master equation \((\text{CME})\)

\[
\text{(1.5) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}p(\vec{x}_V, t) = (Q_i^V)p(\vec{x}_V, t)}
\]

\[
:= V \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}^j (\Phi _j^+(\vec{x}_V) - \vec{\nu}^j V) p(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}^j V / V, t) - \left( \Phi _j^+(\vec{x}_V) + \Phi _j^-(\vec{x}_V) \right) p(\vec{x}_V, t) + \Phi _j^-(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}^j / V) p(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}^j V / V, t).
\]

Here \( Q_i^V \) is the transport of the generator \( Q_i^V \) of process \( C_i^V(t) \); see Appendix \[A.1\] for a derivation.

In the large volume limit (thermodynamic limit), the mesoscopic jumping process gives a macroscopic nonlinear chemical reaction-rate equation, which describes the dynamics of the concentration of \( N \) species in the continuous state space \( \mathbb{R}^N_+ := \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N; x_i \geq 0\} \). This limiting equation is given by

\[
\text{(1.6) \quad} \frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{\nu}^j \left( \Phi _j^+(\vec{x}) - \Phi _j^-(\vec{x}) \right),
\]
Kurtz proved the law of large number for the large volume process $C^V(t)$; c.f. [AK15, Theorem 4.1]. Suppose $\Phi_j^\pm$ is local Lipschitz. If $C^V(0) \rightarrow \bar{x}(0)$ as $V \rightarrow +\infty$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0, t > 0$,\n\begin{align}
\lim_{V \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}\{ \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} |C^V(s) - \bar{x}(s)| \geq \varepsilon \} = 0.
\end{align}
Thus we will also call the large volume limiting ODE (1.6) as the Kurtz ODE.

The corresponding nonlinear semigroup (1.13) (also known as WKB) for the master equation is another standard method [SW95, PK06, GQ17], which builds up a more informative bridge between the mesoscopic dynamics and the macroscopic behaviors. To characterize the exponential asymptotic behavior, we assume there exists a continuous function $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ such that\n\begin{align}
p(\vec{x}_v, t) = e^{-V\psi(\vec{x}_v, t)}, \quad p(\vec{x}_v, 0) = p_0(\vec{x}_v).
\end{align}
We know $\psi$ satisfies\n\begin{align}
\partial_t \psi(\vec{x}_v, t) = -\frac{1}{V} e^{V\psi(\vec{x}_v, t)} Q^V e^{-V\psi(\vec{x}_v, t)} = -\frac{1}{V} H^V(\psi), \quad \psi(\vec{x}_v, 0) = -\frac{1}{V} \log p_0(\vec{x}_v).
\end{align}
By Taylor’s expansion, we obtain the following Hamilton-Jacobi equation (HJE) for the rescaled master equation (1.5) for $\psi$\n\begin{align}
\partial_t \psi(\vec{x}, t) = -\sum_{j=1}^M \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) \left( e^{\nu_j^+} \nabla \psi(\vec{x}, t) - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \left( e^{-\nu_j^-} \nabla \psi(\vec{x}, t) - 1 \right) \right).
\end{align}
Define Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$ as\n\begin{align}
H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) e^{\nu_j^+} \vec{p} - \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) e^{-\nu_j^-} \vec{p} - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \right).
\end{align}
Then the HJE for $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ can be recast as\n\begin{align}
\partial_t \psi + H(\nabla \psi, \vec{x}) = 0.
\end{align}

Equivalently, from the backward equation, one can define the so-called nonlinear semigroup [PK06] for process $C^V(t)$\n\begin{align}
uu(\vec{x}_v, t) = \frac{1}{V} \log \mathbb{E}^{\vec{x}_v} \left( e^{Vuu(C^V_t)} \right) =: (S_t u_0)(\vec{x}_v)
\end{align}
and as $V \rightarrow +\infty$, with the same Hamiltonian $H$, $u(\vec{x}, t)$ satisfies\n\begin{align}
\partial_t u - H(\nabla u, \vec{x}) = 0.
\end{align}

The WKB expansion above defines a Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$, which contains almost all the information for the macroscopic dynamics; see details in Section 3.

First, the Hamiltonian defines the degeneracy of the chemical reaction. Notice from the mass conservation law of chemical reactions, there always exists a positive vector $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ such that\n\begin{align}
\nu \vec{m} = 0,
\end{align}
where $\vec{m}$ represents the molecular weight for the $j$-th species. Therefore the Wegscheider matrix $\nu$ always has a nonzero kernel, i.e., $\dim(\operatorname{Ker}(\nu)) \geq 1$. Thus using the direct decomposition\n\begin{align}
\mathbb{R}^N = \operatorname{Ran}(\nu^T) \oplus \operatorname{Ker}(\nu),
\end{align}
one will see $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ vanishes for $\vec{p} \in \operatorname{Ker}(\nu)$ while $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ is strictly convex for $\vec{p} \in G := \operatorname{Ran}(\nu^T)$. This allows us to define the convex conjugate of $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$, the Lagrangian $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ for $\vec{s} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, which is also strictly convex for $\vec{s} \in G$ while $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = +\infty$ for $\vec{s} \notin G$. 
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Second, Hamiltonian $H$ defines a Hamiltonian dynamics, which is a least action curve minimizing action functional $A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\vec{x}, \dot{\vec{x}}) \, dt$. The solution to ODE (1.6) is indeed a least action curve with action cost $A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = 0$. In other words, it is a curve following the Hamiltonian dynamics with zero momentum $\vec{p} = 0$; see Lemma 4.1. Moreover, in terms of the solution $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ to HJE (1.12), its minimizer gives the ODE trajectory
\begin{equation}
\vec{x}(t) = \arg\min_{\vec{x}} \psi(\vec{x}, t), \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T],
\end{equation}
while its steady solution $\psi^{ss}(\vec{x})$ gives a Lyapunov function of ODE (1.6); see (3.27).

Third, the detailed balance property is contented in the symmetry of the Hamiltonian $H$. Denote a steady state to ODE (1.6) as $\vec{x}_s$, which satisfies
\begin{equation}
\sum_{j=1}^M v_j^+ (\Phi^+_j(\vec{x}^s) - \Phi^-_j(\vec{x}^s)) = 0.
\end{equation}
The detailed balance condition is defined as: (i) there exists a $\vec{x}^s > 0$ (componentwisely); and (ii) $\vec{x}^s$ satisfies
\begin{equation}
\Phi^+_j(\vec{x}^s) - \Phi^-_j(\vec{x}^s) = 0, \quad \forall j.
\end{equation}
We call (1.6) is detailed balanced if there exists such a detailed balanced state $\vec{x}^s$. This immediately gives the necessary condition that both $k^+ j > 0$, i.e., the reaction is reversible. With this, then all the positive steady solutions to (1.6) are detailed balanced and are characterized by $\vec{x}^s e^\vec{q} > 0$ for some $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$. This is also true for a weaker condition called the complex balance condition; see (2.6) and Lemma 2.2. More importantly, $\vec{x}^s$ constructs a steady solution to HJE (1.12), known as the relative entropy,
\begin{equation}
\text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s) = \sum_i \left( x_i \ln \frac{x_i}{x^s_i} - x_i + x^s_i \right).
\end{equation}
Notice detailed balance condition (1.19) implies the identity
\begin{equation}
\vec{v}_j \cdot \nabla \text{KL} = \vec{v}_j \cdot \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^s} = \log \left( \prod_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{x_i}{x^s_i} \right)^{\nu_{ji}} \right) = \log \left( \frac{\Phi^-_j(\vec{x})}{\Phi^+_j(\vec{x})} \right).
\end{equation}
Therefore, we obtain the even-symmetry w.r.t. $\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^s}$ for Hamiltonian $H$, i.e.,
\begin{equation}
H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^s} - \vec{p}, \vec{x}).
\end{equation}
The symmetry in the Hamiltonian (1.21) was first discovered in [MRP14] for continuous time Markov processes with a positive detailed balanced equilibrium. This gives rise to a De Giorgi ($\psi, \psi^*$)-type generalized gradient flow w.r.t. the free energy $\text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s)$, which is also the zero level-set of the rate function $L$ in the large deviation principle; see [MRP14] for the general theory and see Section 4.2 for an application to Kurtz ODE (1.6).

Fourth, the symmetry of Hamiltonian $H$ yields a time reversed curve which also satisfies the same Hamiltonian dynamics. Indeed, the time reversed curve (4.22) is also a least action with a nonzero action cost
\begin{equation}
A(\vec{x}^R(\cdot)) - A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \text{KL}(\vec{x}^R_T||\vec{x}^R) - \text{KL}(\vec{x}^R_0||\vec{x}^R).
\end{equation}
This action cost is independent of the choice of $\vec{x}^R$ and is described by the free energy difference at two ending points, so we call it affinity; see Proposition 4.3. Moreover, this time reversed curve
is exactly an optimally controlled curve (the most probable path) from steady state $\vec{x}^A$ to steady state $\vec{x}^B$ for the following optimal control problem with a free terminal time

$$\inf_{T, \vec{p}} \int_0^T \left( \vec{p} \cdot \partial_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \right) \, dt,$$

s.t. $\vec{x} = \partial_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$, $t \in (0, T)$, $\vec{x}_0 = \vec{x}^A$, $\vec{x}_T = \vec{x}^B$.

Here and afterwards, we use notation $\partial_p H$ as the vector \{\(\partial_p H^i\)\}_{i=1:N}.

If both $\vec{x}^A$ and $\vec{x}^B$ are not steady state, a normalization constant needs to be added in the cost function; see (4.67).

**Fifth, under the detailed balance condition, the most probable path connecting two positive steady states to ODE (1.6) does NOT exist.** By the Freidlin-Wentzell theory, the most probable path connecting two steady states $\vec{x}^A$ and $\vec{x}^B$ continuously is constructed by some piecewise connected least action curves which is solved from the optimal control problem (1.24). However, under the detailed balance condition, along the least action curve

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left( \log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A \right) \cdot \vec{x}(t) = (\log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A) \cdot \partial_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = 0$$

due to $\log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$. Thus

$$\left( \log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A \right) \cdot (\vec{x}^B - \vec{x}^A) = 0$$

implies a contradiction $\vec{x}^B = \vec{x}^A$; see Proposition 4.9. This is also a consequence of the well-known uniqueness result of positive steady states in Lemma 2.2 because the Hamiltonian dynamics stays in one stoichiometric compatibility class, i.e., $q + G$ for a fixed $q \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, just as that for Kurz ODE (1.6). In other words, we can not use a quasipotential $\text{KL}(\vec{x} || \vec{x}^s)$ to compute the most probable path connecting $\vec{x}^B$ and $\vec{x}^A$; see constructions of a double well-type quasipotential in Lemma 4.7. As an alternative approach for finding a transition path, at a fixed volume $V$, the transition path theory (TPT) compute a ‘finite-noise version most probable path’ through a committor function; see [EVE06] for the original theory and see [MSVE09, GLLL20] for algorithms for jumping process.

In summary, the main goal in this paper is to comprehensively explore Hamiltonian $H$ and use it to explain relations between the macroscopic Kurz ODE for trajectory $\vec{x}(t)$, the HJE for the phase variable $\psi$, the rate function $L$ in the large deviation principle and the corresponding action functional in the optimal control problem for transition paths. In many biochemical reactions, such as heterogeneous catalytic oxidation and some enzyme reactions, the detailed/complex balance conditions do not hold. Nevertheless, these restrictive conditions provide the symmetry of $H$, which enables us to explore the gradient flow formulation connected with the large deviation rate function, and the associated least action explicit path formula for the optimal control problem.

The WKB expansion and the Hamiltonian viewpoint are classical and powerful tools to understand many physical problems, particularly for the large deviation principle in the large volume stochastic process representation for chemical reactions, c.f. [SW95, LS99, FK06, GQ17]. In the large deviation principle, the transition path (the most probable path) connecting two typical states in a chemical reaction is a fundamental problem; see [FS06, PAV12] for a general theory for the most probable path and the stochastic optimal control theory, and see recent result in [ADE18] for the large deviation principle in chemical reactions. Among those chemical reactions, detailed/complex balanced systems, although restricted, have many special properties; c.f., the characterization of all macroscopic steady states in [HJ72, AK15]. Moreover, the detailed balanced macroscopic system possesses some gradient flow structures [Ons31, MM20] and particularly the De Giorgi generalized gradient flow structure that closely connected with the rate function in the large deviation principle; see [MRP14] for the general theory. Particularly, [ML17, MM20] the recovered the macroscopic
ODE for chemical reactions via the evolutionary $\Gamma$-convergence techniques in [SS04, Mie16] in the gradient flow regime.

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the limiting Kurtz ODE with some preliminary properties. In Section 3 we study properties of Hamiltonian $H$ and the associated HJE. In Section 4 we prove connections between the least action solution, the time reversed least action, the most probable path and the generalized gradient flow formulation for chemical reactions.

2. Law of large number and properties for large volume limiting ODE

In this section, we introduce some preliminary lemmas for the large volume limiting ODE (1.6) including existence, uniqueness, characterization of steady states in a detailed/complex balanced system, and a gradient flow formulation w.r.t. the relative entropy.

2.1. Kurtz’s limiting model. Recall the forward and backward fluxes $\Phi^\pm_j$ satisfying LMA (1.3) and Kurtz ODE (1.6). Using the $N \times M$ stoichiometric matrix $\nu^T$ and the reaction rate vector (2.1)

$$\vec{r}(\vec{x}) = \{r_j(\vec{x})\} = \{\Phi^+_j(\vec{x}) - \Phi^-_j(\vec{x})\} = \vec{R}(\vec{x})$$

we represent ODE (1.6) in the matrix form

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \nu^T \vec{r} =: \vec{R}(\vec{x}),$$

where $\vec{R}(\vec{x})$ is called the production rate. Denote the range of matrix $\nu^T$ as Ran($\nu^T$), i.e., the span of the column vectors $\{\vec{v}_j\}$ of $\nu^T$. Then we know the production rate

$$\dot{\vec{x}}(t) \in \text{Ran}(\nu^T) \subset \mathbb{R}^N.$$ 

Motivated by this, we define the subspace $G = \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N; \vec{x} \in \text{Ran}(\nu^T)\}$ which is known as the stoichiometric space. Recall (1.15), i.e., $\nu \vec{m} = 0$, which implies the conservation of total mass, i.e.,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (\vec{m} \cdot \vec{x}) = \vec{m} \cdot \nu^T \vec{r} = 0.$$ 

Therefore the Wegscheider matrix $\nu$ always has a nonzero kernel, i.e., $\text{dim}(\text{Ker}(\nu)) \geq 1$.

We have the following lemma on the solution to (1.6).

**Lemma 2.1.** Assume $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ is the Wegscheider matrix satisfying (1.15). Consider Kurtz ODE (1.6) with flux $\Phi^\pm_j$ satisfying (1.3). We have

(i) The region $R^+_N = \{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N; x_i \geq 0\}$ is an invariant region;

(ii) For any initial data $\vec{x}_0 \geq 0$, there exists a unique global-in-time bounded solution to (1.6) satisfying

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x}(t) \cdot \vec{m} = 0.$$ 

The statement (i) can be directly verified by proving $\frac{d}{dt} x_i \geq 0$ at any $x_i = 0$ using case by case arguments. The statement (ii) is a consequence of (1.15) and the standard ODE theory.

2.1.1. Detailed balance and complex balance for Kurtz ODE. Recall the macroscopic Kurtz ODE (1.6) and the detailed balance condition (1.19) is equivalent to

$$\log k^+_j - \log k^-_j = \vec{v}_j \cdot \log \vec{x}$$

due to LMA (1.3).

Denote the complex space as the collection of distinct reaction vectors $\mathcal{C} := \{\vec{v}_j\} = 1:M$. Then the complex balance condition means for each complex $\eta \in \mathcal{C}$, all the reactant contribution in the
flux equals the product contributions in flux. Precisely, a strictly positive (componentwisely) state $\vec{x}^s > 0$ is called complex balanced [HJ72] if

$$
\sum_{j,'\nu_j' = \eta} \left( \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) + \sum_{j,'\nu_j' = \eta} \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) = 0.
$$

One can directly verify state $\vec{x}^s > 0$ satisfying (2.6) is a steady state to Kurtz ODE (1.6). Indeed, at $\vec{x}_c^s$, recast RHS of (1.6) as flux difference

$$
\sum_{j} \nu_j' \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) = \sum_{j} \nu_j' \left( \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) + \sum_{j} \nu_j' \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right).
$$

The first term in the summation represents that for the reactant (aka substrate) complex $\nu_j'$ in the $j$th-forward reaction, the net flux is $\Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s)$. Similarly, the second term in the summation represents that the reactant complex $\nu_j'$ in the $j$th-backward reaction, the net flux is $\Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s)$. Then we rearrange the summation in $j$ according to the reactant complex $\eta \in C$,

$$
\sum_{j} \nu_j \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) = \sum_{\eta \in C} \eta \left( \sum_{j: '\nu_j' = \eta} \left( \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) + \sum_{j: '\nu_j' = \eta} \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}_c^s) \right) \right) = 0,
$$

where we used the complex balance condition (2.6).

2.2. Energy dissipation and a gradient flow formulation. Assume ODE (1.6) is detailed balanced with some steady state $\vec{x}^s > 0$. We use the relative entropy $KL(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^s)$ in (1.20) as a non-negative Lyapunov function. Notice the LMA formula for $\Phi$ and (1.19) yield (1.21). Then along the ODE trajectory, we have dissipation relation

$$
\frac{d}{dt} KL(\vec{x}(t)||\vec{x}^s) = \sum_i \dot{x}_i \log \frac{x_i}{\vec{x}_i^s} = - \sum_j \left( \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}) \right) \log \left( \frac{\Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x})}{\Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x})} \right) =: -D(\vec{x}) \leq 0.
$$

Now we investigate all the steady states of ODE (1.6), i.e.,

$$
S_e := \{ \vec{x}^e \in \mathbb{R}^N; \bar{R}(\vec{x}^e) = \sum_j \nu_j' \left( \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}^e) - \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}^e) \right) = 0 \}.
$$

If $\vec{x}^e > 0$, then we have

$$
0 = \log \frac{\vec{x}^e}{\vec{x}^s} \cdot \bar{R}(\vec{x}^e) = - \sum_j \left( \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}^e) - \Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}^e) \right) \log \left( \frac{\Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}^e)}{\Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}^e)} \right),
$$

which implies $\Phi^{+}_j(\vec{x}^e) = \Phi^{-}_j(\vec{x}^e)$. Using the identity (1.21), we know

$$
\log \frac{\vec{x}^e}{\vec{x}^s} \in \text{Ker}(\nu).
$$

Recall the stoichiometric space $G$. Given $q \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, $q + G$ is called one stoichiometric compatibility class. Then it is easy to verify that if $\vec{x}^e$ and $\vec{x}^s$ are in the same stoichiometric compatibility class, then $\vec{x}^e = \vec{x}^s$. Indeed, from $\log \frac{\vec{x}^e}{\vec{x}^s} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$ and $\vec{x}^e - \vec{x}^s \in G$, we know

$$
\log \frac{\vec{x}^e}{\vec{x}^s} \cdot (\vec{x}^e - \vec{x}^s) = 0,
$$
which implies \( \bar{x}^n = \bar{x}^n \). A slight modification is needed if changing the detailed balance condition to the complex balance condition. We conclude the following lemma, which is a well-known result on the uniqueness of steady state; c.f., [HJ72, Theorem 6A], [AK15, Theorem 3.5].

Lemma 2.2. Assume there exists a strictly positive steady state \( \bar{x}^s \) satisfying complex balance \((2.6)\). Then for any \( q \in \text{Ker}(\nu) \), there exists a unique steady states \( \bar{x}^s \) in the space \( \{ \bar{x} \in q + G; \bar{x} > 0 \} \). Moreover, \( \bar{x}^s \) satisfies complex balance condition \((2.6)\), and is characterized by

\[
(\bar{x}^s)_i = (\bar{x}^s)_i e^{\mu_i} > 0.
\]

As a consequence, if \( \bar{x}^s \) satisfies detailed balance \((1.19)\), thus it also satisfies \((2.6)\). So \((2.14)\) still holds and this unique steady state \( \bar{x}^s \) in the space \( \{ \bar{x} \in q + G; \bar{x} > 0 \} \) is detailed balanced.

2.2.1. Strong form of gradient flow for chemical reaction. One can use the logarithmic mean \( A(x, y) := \frac{x - y}{\log x - \log y} \) [MM20] to obtain a strong gradient flow formulation of Kurzt ODE \((1.6)\).

Let \( \bar{x}^s \) be a steady solution to \((1.6)\) satisfying detailed balance condition \((1.19)\). Then \((1.6)\) can be recast as

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \bar{x} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \partial_j \Phi_j(\bar{x}) - \frac{\Phi^+_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} - \frac{\Phi^-_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} \left( \log \frac{\Phi^+_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} - \log \frac{\Phi^-_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} \right)
\]

\[
= -\sum_{j=1}^{M} \partial_j \Phi_j(\bar{x}) \Lambda \left( \frac{\Phi^+_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})}, \frac{\Phi^-_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} \right) \delta_{ij} \cdot \log \frac{\bar{x}}{\bar{x}^s} - \sum_{\ell} (\hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j)_{i\ell} \frac{\partial KL}{\partial x_{\ell}},
\]

where we used \((2.18)\). Notice

\[
A_{ij} = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \Phi_j(\bar{x}) \Lambda \left( \frac{\Phi^+_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})}, \frac{\Phi^-_j(\bar{x})}{\Phi_j(\bar{x})} \right) (\hat{v}_j \otimes \hat{v}_j)_{i\ell}
\]

is symmetric positive semidefinite. Indeed \( A \) is positive definite in \( G \) while \( A \) vanished in \( \text{Ker}(\nu) \). One has a quadratic dissipation term \( \psi^*(\delta_{KL}) = (\delta_{KL}, A \delta_{KL}) \) and a strong gradient flow in matrix form is

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \bar{x} = -A \delta_{KL}.
\]

This strong gradient flow is known, c.f., [MM20, Theorem 2.2]. We remark this strong form of gradient flow implies a De Giorgi \((\psi, \psi^*)\)-type gradient flow [MRP14, GL20] \((\delta_{KL}, \psi^* - \psi^* - \delta_{KL} = 0 \) by using the convex conjugate \( \psi \) of \( \psi^* \) at the same time. However, to make the connection between the De Giorgi \((\psi, \psi^*)\)-type gradient flow and the rate function \( L \) in the large deviation principle, we adapt the method in [MRP14] to introduce a non-quadratic but convex dissipation \( \psi^* \) which is naturally defined by the Hamiltonian \( H \) in the WKB expansion; see Section 4.2.

Remark 1. We remark the gradient flow formulation \((2.17)\) was introduced in Onsager’s original paper [Onds31] for the linearized case. Assume the chemical potential \( \mu_i \) satisfies the thermodynamic relation \( \log x_i = \frac{\mu_i - \mu_i^G}{kT} \), where \( \mu_i^G \) is the Gibbs free energy. From LMA \((1.3)\), we have

\[
\log \Phi^+_j(\bar{x}) = \sum_i \nu^+_ji (\log x_i - \log x^s_i) = \sum_i \nu^+_ji \frac{\mu_i - \mu_i^eq}{kT}.
\]
Using \( e^x \approx 1 + x \), we have
\[
\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) = \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}^0)e^{\sum \nu_ji\mu_{ji} - \mu_{ji}^q} \approx \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}^0)
\]
\(1 + \sum \nu_ji\frac{\mu_{ji} - \mu_{ji}^q}{kT}\).

Under the strong detailed balance condition \([1.19]\), we know
\[
\Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \approx \Phi_j(\vec{x}^0) \sum (\nu^+ - \nu^-)j_i \frac{\mu_{ji} - \mu_{ji}^q}{kT}.
\]

For the free energy \( KL(\vec{x}) \), we have \( \frac{\partial KL}{\partial x_i} = \log \frac{x_i}{x_i^0} = \frac{\mu_{ji} - \mu_{ji}^q}{kT} \). Then plugging \([2.20]\) into ODE \([1.6]\), we obtain
\[
\frac{d}{dt}x_i = -\sum_j \Phi_j(\vec{x}^0)\nu_{ji} \sum_\ell j_{ji} \mu_{ji}^\ell - \mu_{ji}^\ell = -\sum_\ell \left( \sum_j \Phi_j(\vec{x}^0)\nu_{ji}\nu_{j\ell} \right) \frac{\partial KL}{\partial x_\ell}.
\]

Here the nonnegative symmetric matrix \( A_{ij} := \sum_j \Phi_j(\vec{x}^0)\nu_{ji}\nu_{j\ell} \) is called the Onsager matrix.

### 3. Nonlinear semigroup, Hamilton-Jacobi equation and properties

In this section, we use the WKB analysis of the master equation for \( p(\vec{x}_V, t) \) to study the exponential asymptotic behavior. We will investigate some good properties of the resulting HJE and the associated Hamiltonian \( H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \) defined in \([1.11]\). Recall the large volume process \( C^V(t) \) in \([1.4]\), which is also denoted as \( C_t \) for simplicity. For fixed \( V \), recall the generator \( Q_V \) defined in \([1.5]\).

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\vec{x}_V} f(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t) = \sum_{\vec{x}_V} (Q_V f)(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t).
\]

Denote
\[
w(\vec{x}_V, t) = E\vec{x}_V (f(C_t)),
\]
then \( w(\vec{x}_V, t) \) satisfies the backward equation
\[
\partial_tw = Q_V w, \quad w(\vec{x}_V, 0) = f(\vec{x}_V).
\]

Assume there exists a smooth enough function \( u(\vec{x}, t) \) such that at \( \vec{x} = \vec{x}_V \),
\[
w(\vec{x}_V, t) = e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V, t)}.
\]

We obtain
\[
\partial_tu(\vec{x}_V, t) = \frac{1}{V} e^{-Vu(\vec{x}_V, t)}Q_V e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V, t)} =: \frac{1}{V} H_V(Vu), \quad u(\vec{x}_V, 0) = \frac{1}{V} \log f(\vec{x}_V).
\]

In summary,
\[
u(\vec{x}_V, t) = \frac{1}{V} \log w(\vec{x}_V, t) = \frac{1}{V} \log E\vec{x}_V (f(C_t)) = \frac{1}{V} \log E\vec{x}_V (e^{Vu_0(C_t)}) =: (S_t u_0)(\vec{x}_V)
\]
is the so-called nonlinear semigroup \([FK06]\) for process \( C_t \).

For any \( \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \), let \( \vec{\nu}_V = \frac{\vec{\nu}}{V} \rightarrow \vec{x} \) as \( V \rightarrow +\infty \). Then the Taylor expansion w.r.t \( \vec{\nu}_V \) shows that
\[
Q_V e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V, t)} = V \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V) \left( e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V+\vec{\nu}_V)} - e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V)} \right) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V) \left( e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V-\vec{\nu}_V)} - e^{Vu(\vec{x}_V)} \right) \right)
\]
\[
\approx V \sum_{j=1}^M \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) \left( e^{\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla u(\vec{x}, t)} - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \left( e^{-\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla u(\vec{x}, t)} - 1 \right) \right) e^{Vu(\vec{x}, t)}.
\]
Then we obtain HJE for $u$

$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(x, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( \Phi_j^+(x) \left( e^{\nu_j \cdot \nabla u(x, t)} - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^-(x) \left( e^{-\nu_j \cdot \nabla u(x, t)} - 1 \right) \right)$.

Similarly, starting from the forward equation (1.5), one can obtain the HJE (1.12) for $\psi(x, t)$.

**Remark 2.** From the definition of the backward solution $w$ and the forward solution $p$, we have

$$w(x, t) = \langle w_0(y), p(y, t; x) \rangle_y, \quad p(y, t) = \langle p_0(x), p(y, t; x) \rangle_x.$$ 

Thus using the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation, we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} \langle p(x, s) w(x, t - s) \rangle_x = 0.$$

Similarly, given $T > 0$, the time reversal $\tilde{u}(x, s) = u(x, T - s)$ starting from $\tilde{u}(x, 0) = \psi(x, 0)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{u}(x, s) = u(x, T - s) = \psi(x, s).$$

### 3.1. Properties of Hamiltonian $H$

Recall the matrix form of the macroscopic Kurzt ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \nu^T \vec{r} =: \tilde{R}(\vec{x}),$$

where $\nu \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ is a constant matrix. Recall the mass conservation law of chemical reactions (1.15) and the direct decomposition (1.16), which always satisfies

$$\dim (\text{Ran}(\nu^T)) < N.$$

It motivates that for the WKB expansion and the corresponding relations with the rate function $L$ in the large deviation principle, we will see $L$ make sense in a ‘more accurate’ subspace $G$.

**Lemma 3.1.** Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ in (1.11) is degenerate in the sense that

$$H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\vec{p}_1, \vec{x}),$$

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

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

**Proof.** From the direct decomposition (1.16), we have (3.14). Thus $\vec{0} = \vec{\nu}_j \cdot \vec{p}_2$, which implies (3.13). \qed

**Lemma 3.2.** $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ defined in (1.11) is strictly convex for $\vec{p} \in G$.

**Proof.** We compute the Hessian of $H$ in $G \times \mathbb{R}^N$. For any $\vec{\alpha} \in G$,

$$\frac{d^2}{d\varepsilon^2} \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} H(\vec{p} + \varepsilon \vec{\alpha}, \vec{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} (\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \vec{\alpha})^2 \left( \Phi_j^+(x) e^{\nu_j \cdot \vec{p}} + \Phi_j^-(x) e^{-\nu_j \cdot \vec{p}} \right) \geq 0$$

and zero holds if and only if $\nu \vec{\alpha} = \vec{\nu}_j \cdot \vec{\alpha} = 0$. Since $\vec{\alpha} \in G = \text{Ran}(\nu^T)$, there exists a vector $\vec{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^M$ such that $\vec{\alpha} = \nu^T \vec{\beta}$. Thus ‘zero’ holds if and only if

$$0 = \vec{\beta}^T \nu \vec{\alpha} = \vec{\beta}^T \nu \nu^T \vec{\beta},$$

which implies $\alpha = \vec{0} \in G$. \qed
3.2. Kurz’s limiting ODE as the minimizer of HJE solution $\psi$. We further observe the following special properties for $H$

\begin{equation}
H(0, \vec{x}) \equiv 0, \quad \partial_x H(0, \vec{x}) \equiv 0.
\end{equation}

Here we use $\partial_x H$ as a vector $\{\partial_x H\}_{i=1,N}$. Then we have the following Proposition.

**Proposition 3.3.** Let $\psi_0(\vec{x})$ be the initial data to HJE (1.12). Assume $\psi_0(\vec{x})$ is a strictly convex function with a linear growth at the far field, i.e.,

\begin{equation}
c_1|\vec{x}| \leq \psi_0(\vec{x}) \leq c_2|\vec{x}|, \quad \text{as } |\vec{x}| \to +\infty.
\end{equation}

Then there exists a unique local-in-time strictly convex solution $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$, $t \in [0, T]$ to (1.12) and the solution $\vec{x}(t)$ to Kurz limit ODE (1.6) is the minimizer of $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$, i.e.,

\begin{equation}
\vec{x}(t) = \text{argmin}_x \psi(\vec{x}, t), \quad \text{for all } t \in [0, T].
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Using the definition of the Hamiltonian in (1.11), we solve the following HJE by the characteristic method

\begin{equation}
\partial_t \psi + H(\nabla \psi, \vec{x}) = 0, \quad \psi(\vec{x}, 0) = \psi_0(\vec{x}).
\end{equation}

Then constructing the characteristics $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$

\begin{equation}
\dot{\vec{x}} = \partial_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad \vec{x}(0) = \vec{x}_0, \\
\dot{\vec{p}} = -\partial_x H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad \vec{p}(0) = \nabla_x \psi_0(\vec{x}_0).
\end{equation}

From the assumptions on $\psi_0$, we know there exists $T$ such that the characteristics $\vec{x}_1(t), \vec{x}_2(t)$ starting from any initial data $(\vec{x}_1(0), \vec{p}_1(0)), (\vec{x}_2(0), \vec{p}_2(0))$ do not intersect. Thus upto $t \in [0, T]$, $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ can be uniquely solved from (3.20). For any $t \in [0, T]$, we also know $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ is convex. Then along characteristics, with $\vec{p}(t) = \partial_x \psi(\vec{x}(t), t)$, we know $z(t) = \psi(\vec{x}(t), t)$ satisfies

\begin{equation}
\dot{z} = \vec{p} \cdot \partial_p H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad z(0) = \psi_0(\vec{x}_0).
\end{equation}

Then we know along the characteristic

\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} H(\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)) = \dot{\vec{x}} \partial_x H + \dot{\vec{p}} \partial_p H = 0,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \psi(\vec{x}(t), t) = \dot{z} - \vec{p}(t) \partial_t \psi(\vec{x}(t), t) = -H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = -H(\vec{p}_0, \vec{x}_0).
\end{equation}

Therefore, particularly, taking $\vec{x}_0$ as the minimizer of $\psi_0$ such that $\nabla_x \psi_0(\vec{x}_0) = 0$ and thus $\vec{p}(0) = 0$. Then from (3.16), we have

\begin{equation}
p(t) \equiv 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \psi(\vec{x}(t), t) \equiv 0
\end{equation}

and the characteristic

\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x} = \partial_p H(0, \vec{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^M \vec{v}_j \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \right)
\end{equation}

gives exactly the Kurzt limit ODE (1.6). Moreover, we know $\nabla \psi(\vec{x}(t), t) = p(t) \equiv 0$, which means Kurzt limit ODE (1.6) can be recovered from the minimizer of $\psi(\vec{x}, t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ as

\begin{equation}
\vec{x}(t) = \text{argmin}_x \psi(\vec{x}, t).
\end{equation}
3.3. **Lyapunov function.** Denote the steady solution of (1.10) as $\psi^{ss}$, which satisfies

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{M} \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) e^{\nu_j} \nabla \psi(\vec{x},t) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) e^{-\nu_j} \nabla \psi(\vec{x},t) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \right) = 0.
$$

(3.26)

It is shown in [GQ17] that $\psi^{ss}$ is a Lyapunov function of ODE (1.6) satisfying

$$
\frac{d}{dt} \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \vec{\dot{x}} \cdot \nabla \psi^{ss} = \sum_j \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}) \right) \nu_j \cdot \nabla \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \leq 0,
$$

(3.27)

where we used $x \leq e^x - 1$ for any $x$. Under the detailed balance condition, from (1.22), one can directly verify $\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}^0)$ is a steady solution to HJE. In general, under the complex balance condition, one can also show

$$
0 = H(0,\vec{x}) = H(\log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^0},\vec{x});
$$

(3.28)

see [GQ17] and Appendix A.3. However, in the complex balance case, (1.22) does not hold for general $\vec{p}$.

3.3.1. **$\psi^{ss}$ constructed from ODE steady state.** For the rescaled master equation (1.5), assume $\pi(\vec{x}_V)$ is the steady state, which satisfies

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{M} \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V - \frac{\nu_j}{V}) \pi(\vec{x}_V - \frac{\nu_j}{V}) - \left( \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V) \right) \pi(\vec{x}_V) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V + \frac{\nu_j}{V}) \pi(\vec{x}_V + \frac{\nu_j}{V}) = 0.
$$

(3.29)

The detailed balance condition is defined as

$$
\Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V + \frac{\nu_j}{V}) \pi(\vec{x}_V) = \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V) \pi(\vec{x}_V).
$$

(3.30)

Besides LMA (3.3), another common choice on the reaction rate is [AK15]

$$
\tilde{\Phi}_j^+(\vec{X}) = k_j^+ V \prod_{\ell=1}^{N} \frac{X_{\ell}!}{V_{\ell}! (X_{\ell} - \nu_{\ell}^+)!}.
$$

(3.31)

However, the corresponding macroscopic Kurtz limiting ODE are same. The advantage of this rate is that if there exists $\vec{x}^0$ satisfying complex balance condition (2.6), then one can construct a distribution $\pi_V$ [AK15] Theorem 3.7] satisfying detailed balance (3.30) and

$$
\log \pi_V(\vec{n}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} n_i \left( \log(V x_i^0) - \log(n_i!) - V x_i^0 \right)
$$

(3.32)

for the chemical master equation (1.5) with $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\phi}/V$ for a fixed volume $V$. We have the following lemma on the Lyapunov function $\psi^{ss}$ constructed from the WKB for $\pi_V$.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $\vec{x}^0$ be a steady state to Kurtz ODE (1.6) satisfying the detailed balance condition (1.19). Given volume $V$, let $\pi_V$ satisfying (3.32) be the invariant measure of the chemical master equation (1.5) with rate $\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\phi}/V$ in (3.31). For any $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let $\vec{x}_V = \frac{\vec{n}}{V} \to \vec{x}$ as $V \to +\infty$, then the limit in WKB approximation for $\pi_V$ exists

$$
\lim_{V \to +\infty} \frac{-\log \pi_V(\vec{x}_V)}{V} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( x_i \log x_i - x_i \log x_i^0 + x_i^0 - x_i \right) =: \psi^{ss}(\vec{x})
$$

(3.33)
and this limit is a steady solution to (3.26). Moreover, \( \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \geq 0 \) is strictly convex function with unique minimum point \( \vec{x}^s \).

**Proof.** First, changing to variable \( \vec{x}_V = \frac{\vec{n}}{V} \) and using the Stirling’s formula, we have

\[
\log \pi_V(\vec{x}_V) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{i}^{N} \left( n_i \log(Vx_i^s) - n_i \log(n_i) + n_i - Vx_i^s + O(\log n_i) \right)
\]

(3.34)

\[
= \sum_{i}^{N} \left( x_i \log x_i^s - x_i \log x_i + x_i - x_i^s \right) + \frac{O(\sum_i^n \log n_i)}{V}.
\]

Then for any fixed \( \vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \), \( \vec{x}_V = \frac{\vec{n}}{V} \rightarrow \vec{x} \) implies \( O(\sum_i^n \log n_i) \rightarrow 0 \) as \( V \rightarrow +\infty \).

Second, we verify \( \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \) is a steady solution to (3.26). Under the detailed balance (1.19), we have (1.21), i.e.,

\[
\vec{\nu}_j \cdot \nabla \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = - \log \left( \frac{\Phi^{+}(\vec{x})}{\Phi^{-}(\vec{x})} \right)
\]

and thus (3.26) holds. \( \square \)

4. LARGE DEVIATION, LEAST ACTION AND OPTIMAL CONTROL

In this section, we use the convex conjugate \( L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) \) of \( H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \) to bridge the solution to the Kurtz ODE, the least action curve with zero or nonzero action cost and the time reversed curve for a general Hamiltonian dynamics; see Section 4.1. Then using the symmetry of \( H \), we give a generalized gradient flow, which is the zero level set of \( L \); see Section 4.2. In Section 4.3, we prove the time reversed curve is exactly the most probable path with an infinite time horizon optimal control interpretation. However, two steady states in a detailed balanced system can not be connected via least action curves; see Proposition 4.9.

Let us first introduce the convex conjugate function \( L \) and the associated action functional. Since \( H \) in (1.11) is convex w.r.t \( \vec{p} \), we compute the convex conjugate of \( H \) via the Legendre transform. For any \( s \in \mathbb{R}^N \), define

\[
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) := \sup_{\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \langle \vec{p}, \vec{s} \rangle - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \right) = \langle \vec{p}^s, \vec{s} \rangle - H(\vec{p}^s, \vec{x})
\]

(4.1)

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

\[
s = \partial_p H(\vec{p}^s, \vec{x}) = \sum_j \vec{\nu}_j \left( \Phi^{+}_j e^{\vec{p}^s_j \vec{x}} - \Phi^{-}_j e^{-\vec{p}^s_j \vec{x}} \right);
\]

(4.2)

see Figure 1 for illustration. Thus

\[
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{p}^s(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{x}, \vec{p}^s(\vec{s}, \vec{x})).
\]

(4.3)

Define the action functional as

\[
A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\dot{\vec{x}}(t), \vec{x}(t)) \, dt.
\]

(4.4)

Then we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** For \( L \) function defined in (4.1), we know

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

\[
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \begin{cases} 
\max_{\vec{p} \in \mathcal{G}} \{ \vec{s} \cdot \vec{p} - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \}, & \vec{s} \in \mathcal{G} \\
+\infty, & \vec{s} \notin \mathcal{G};
\end{cases}
\]

(4.5)

moreover, \( L \) is strictly convex in \( \mathcal{G} \);
Proof. (i) First, from (3.16),

\[
\frac{d}{dt} L(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{x}(t)) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{x}(t)),
\]

which is equivalent to the Hamiltonian dynamics with \( H \) defined in (1.11).

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{x} = \partial_p H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{p} = -\partial_x H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x});
\]

(iii) \( \tilde{x}(t) \) is the solution to Kurtz ODE (1.6) if and only if \( A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) = 0 \).

(ii) For the action functional \( A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) \) in (4.4), the least action \( \tilde{x}(t) \) satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{x}(t)) \right) = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{x}(t), \tilde{x}(t)),
\]

On the other hand, for \( \tilde{s} \notin G \),

\[
L(\tilde{s}, \tilde{x}) = \sup_{\tilde{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \langle \tilde{p}, \tilde{s} \rangle - H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) \right) = \sup_{\tilde{p} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)} \left( \langle \tilde{p_1}, \tilde{s} \rangle + \langle \tilde{p_2}, \tilde{s} \rangle - H(\tilde{p_1}, \tilde{x}) \right) = +\infty.
\]

From the definition of \( H \), we know \( H \) has a lower bound and is exponentially coercive. Indeed,

\[
\lim_{|\tilde{p}| \to +\infty} H(\tilde{p}, \tilde{x}) \geq \lim_{|\tilde{p}| \to +\infty} \sum_j \left( \min(\Phi^+_{j}, \Phi^-_{j}) e^{\langle \tilde{p}, \tilde{x} \rangle} - \Phi^+_{j}(\tilde{x}) - \Phi^-_{j}(\tilde{x}) \right) = +\infty.
\]

Therefore, the sup in (4.9) can be achieved and we conclude (4.5).

(iii) First, let \( \tilde{x}(t) \) be the least action such that

\[
\tilde{x}(\cdot) = \arg \min_{x(0)=\tilde{x}_0, x(T)=b} A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)).
\]

Then \( \tilde{x}(t) \) satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation (4.6). From (4.2), (4.3), we know given \( \tilde{s}, \tilde{x} \)

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \tilde{x}}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{x}) = -\partial_x H(\tilde{p}^*(\tilde{s}, \tilde{x}), \tilde{x}).
\]

Thus for \( \tilde{p} = \partial L/\partial \tilde{x}^* \), the Hamiltonian dynamics (4.7) holds.

(iii) First, let \( \tilde{x}(t) \) is the solution to Kurtz ODE (1.6) with initial data \( \tilde{x}_0 \) and set \( \tilde{p}(0) = 0 \). Then

\[
\tilde{p} \equiv 0, \quad \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{x} = \partial_p H(0, \tilde{x}).
\]

This corresponds to a least action \( \tilde{x}(t) \) such that \( A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) = 0 \).

Second, assume \( \tilde{x} \) is a least action such that \( A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) = 0 \), then \( L(\dot{\tilde{x}}(t), \tilde{x}(t)) \equiv 0 \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \) and the Hamiltonian dynamics (4.7) holds. It sufficient to prove the following two cases.
Case (I), if there exists \( t^* \) such that \( \tilde{p}(t^*) = \bar{q} \) for some \( \bar{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu) \), then \( \tilde{p}(t) \equiv \bar{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu) \) because 
\[
\tilde{p} = -\partial_x H(\bar{q}, \bar{x}) = 0.
\]
Thus 
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \bar{x} = \partial_p H(\bar{q}, \bar{x}) = \partial_p H(0, \bar{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \tilde{\nu}_j \left( \Phi_j^+(\bar{x}) - \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}) \right)
\]
implies \( \bar{x}(t) \) is the solution to Kurtz ODE \((1.6)\).

Case (II), if \( \tilde{p}(t) \not\in \text{Ker}(\nu) \) for all \( t \in [0, T] \), then we know \( \nu_j \cdot \tilde{p} \neq 0 \). Then from \((4.2)\) and Lemma \[3.2\], we have 
\[
\dot{x}(t) = \bar{s} = \partial_p H(\bar{p}(t), \bar{x}(t)) \neq \partial_p H(0, \bar{x}(t)).
\]
However, from the strict convexity of \( L \), \( L(\bar{s}, \bar{x}) > 0 \) for \( \bar{s} \neq \partial_p H(0, \bar{x}(t)) \), which contradicts with \( A(\bar{x}(\cdot)) = 0 \).

Thus we conclude (iii). \( \Box \)

The function \( L \) defined in \((4.1)\) is actually the good rate function for the large derivation principle in the path space \( D([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^+_N) \), i.e., the space of càdlàg functions, for the large volume process \( C^V(t) \) defined in \((1.4)\) with generator \( Q_v \) defined in \((3.1)\). This large deviation principle was derived by [SW95, GQ17] via the WKB approximation. Under some mild assumptions ensuring the existence of solution \( C^V(t), [ADE18] \) rigorously proved the large derivation principle for \( C^V(t) \), which is stated below.

**Theorem 4.2 (Theorem 1.6, [ADE18]).** Let \( C^V \) be the large volume process defined in \((1.4)\) with generator \( Q_v \) defined in \((3.1)\). Assume \( C^V(0) = \bar{x}_0^V \) satisfying \( \bar{x}_0^V \to \bar{x}_0 \) in \( \mathbb{R}^N \). Then the sample path \( C^V(t), t \in [0, T] \) satisfies the large deviation principle in \( D([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^+_N) \) with the good rate function

\[
I_{\bar{x}_0, T}(\bar{x}(\cdot)) := \begin{cases} 
\int_0^T L(\bar{x}(t), \bar{x}(t)) \, dt & \text{if } \bar{x}(0) = \bar{x}_0, \ \bar{x}(\cdot) \in AC([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^N), \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

That is, for any set \( \Gamma \subset D([0, T]; \mathbb{R}^+_N) \) with its interior \( \Gamma^0 \) and closure \( \bar{\Gamma} \), we have

\[
\lim_{V \to +\infty} \sup \frac{1}{V} \log \mathbb{P}_{\bar{x}_0^V} \{C^V(t) \in \bar{\Gamma} \} \leq -\inf_{\bar{x} \in \Gamma} I_{\bar{x}_0, T}(\bar{x}(\cdot)),
\]

\[
\lim_{V \to +\infty} \inf \frac{1}{V} \log \mathbb{P}_{\bar{x}_0^V} \{C^V(t) \in \Gamma^0 \} \geq -\inf_{\bar{x} \in \Gamma^0} I_{\bar{x}_0, T}(\bar{x}(\cdot)),
\]

**4.1. Time reversed least action solution.** In order to study the transition path between two states \( \bar{x}^A \) and \( \bar{x}^B \), we now characterize the time reversed solution to Kurtz ODE \((1.6)\) and also in general the time reversed solution to the Hamiltonian dynamics \((4.7)\).

Assume ODE \((1.6)\) is detailed balanced. Let \( \bar{x}(t), \bar{p}(t) \) be the solution to Hamiltonian dynamics \((4.7)\) with \( \bar{x}(0) = \bar{x}^B \) and \( \bar{x}(T) = \bar{x}^A \) for some finite time \( T \). Then by Proposition \[4.1\] we know \( \bar{x}(t) \) is a least action solution for action functional \( A(\bar{x}(\cdot)) \) in \((4.4)\) starting from \( \bar{x}^A \) ending at \( \bar{x}^B \). We define the time reversed curve for \( \bar{x}(t), \bar{p}(t) \) by

\[
\bar{x}^R(t) = \bar{x}(T-t), \quad \bar{p}^R(t) = \bar{p}(T-t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.
\]

Then we know \( \bar{x}^R \) satisfies

\[
\dot{\bar{x}}^R = \sum_{j=1}^{M} -\tilde{\nu}_j \left( \Phi_j^+(\bar{x}^R) e^{\tilde{\nu}_j \bar{p}^R} - \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}^R) e^{-\tilde{\nu}_j \bar{p}^R} \right), \quad \bar{x}_0^R = \bar{x}(T) = \bar{x}^A, \ \bar{x}_T^R = \bar{x}(0) = \bar{x}^B.
\]
In the following proposition, we state this time reversed solution $\tilde{x}^R$ with a modified reversed momentum $\tilde{p}^{MR}(t)$ is indeed a least action solution from $\tilde{x}^R_0 = \tilde{x}^A$ to $\tilde{x}^R_T = \tilde{x}^B$ but with an entropy-quantified action $A(\tilde{x}^R(\cdot))$.

**Proposition 4.3.** Assume ODE (1.6) is detailed balanced. Let the time reversed solution $\tilde{x}^R(t), \tilde{p}^R(t)$ be defined in (4.20) and (4.21). Denote the modified reversed momentum $\tilde{p}^{MR}(t)$ as

$$\tilde{p}^{MR}(t) = -\tilde{p}^R(t) + \log \frac{\tilde{x}^R(t)}{\tilde{x}^A}.$$  

Then

(i) $\tilde{x}^R(t), \tilde{p}^{MR}(t)$ satisfies the Hamiltonian dynamics with Hamiltonian defined in (1.11)

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{x}^R = \partial_p H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \tilde{p}^{MR} = -\partial_x H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R),$$  

which implies $\tilde{x}^R$ is a least action solution for action functional $A(\tilde{x}^R(\cdot))$ in (4.4) starting from $\tilde{x}^R_0 = \tilde{x}^A$ and ending at $\tilde{x}^R_T = \tilde{x}^B$;

(ii) The corresponding action cost for least action $A(\tilde{x}^R(t))$ is given by

$$A(\tilde{x}^R(\cdot)) = A(\tilde{x}(\cdot)) + \psi^{ss}(\tilde{x}^R_T) - \psi^{ss}(\tilde{x}^R_0),$$

where $\psi^{ss}(\tilde{x}) := \sum_{j}^N (x_i \log x_i - x_i \log \tilde{x}^A_j + \tilde{x}^A_j - x) \log \tilde{x}^A_j$ is the Lyapunov function. This action cost is independent with the choice of the steady state $\tilde{x}^A$.

**Proof.** First, we give the following auxiliary identities. Since $\tilde{x}^A$ satisfies detailed balance (1.19), we have

$$\tilde{\nu}_j \cdot \log \frac{\tilde{x}^R}{\tilde{x}^A} = \log \left( \prod_{i=1}^N \left( \frac{\tilde{x}^R_i}{\tilde{x}^A_i} \right)^{\nu_j_i} \right) = \log \left( \frac{\Phi^+_j(\tilde{x}^R)}{\Phi^+_j(\tilde{x}^R)} \right).$$

Recall the definition of $H$ in (1.11). Then by elementary calculations, we have following identities

$$H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R) \equiv H(\tilde{p}^R, \tilde{x}^R);$$

$$\partial_p H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R) \equiv -\partial_p H(\tilde{p}^R, \tilde{x}^R);$$

$$\partial_x H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R) \equiv \partial_x H(\tilde{p}^R, \tilde{x}^R) + \frac{\partial_p H(\tilde{p}^R, \tilde{x}^R)}{\tilde{x}^R}.$$  

Second, by the definition, the time reversed solution $\tilde{x}^R(t)$ starts from $\tilde{x}^R_0 = \tilde{x}^A$, ends at $\tilde{x}^R_T = \tilde{x}^B$ and satisfies

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{x}^R = \sum_{j=1}^M -\tilde{\nu}_j \left( \Phi^+_j(\tilde{x}^R) e^{\tilde{\nu}_j \tilde{p}^R} - \Phi^-_j(\tilde{x}^R) e^{-\tilde{\nu}_j \tilde{p}^R} \right) = \partial_p H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R),$$

where we used (4.27). On the other hand, by the definition of $\tilde{p}^{MR}$ in (4.22), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{p}^{MR} = -\frac{d}{dt} \tilde{p}^R + \frac{\dot{\tilde{x}}^R}{\tilde{x}^R} \equiv -\partial_x H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R) - \frac{\partial_p H(\tilde{p}^R, \tilde{x}^R)}{\tilde{x}^R} = -\partial_x H(\tilde{p}^{MR}, \tilde{x}^R),$$

where we used (4.27) and (4.28). Thus from statement (2) in Proposition 4.1 we conclude $\tilde{x}^R(t), \tilde{p}^R(t)$ is a least action solution for action functional $A(\tilde{x}^R(\cdot))$ in (4.4).
Third, from \([4.26]\), one can directly compute the action cost along \(\bar{x}^R\)
\[
A(\bar{x}^R(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\bar{x}^R(t), \dot{\bar{x}}^R(t))\, dt = \int_0^T \left( \bar{p}^{MR}(t) \cdot \partial_p H(\bar{p}^{MR}(t), \bar{x}^R(t)) - H(\bar{p}^{MR}(t), \bar{x}^R(t)) \right)\, dt \\
= \int_0^T \left( \bar{p}^R(t) \cdot \partial_p H(\bar{x}^R, \bar{x}^R) + \log \frac{\bar{x}^R(t)}{\bar{x}^A} \cdot \frac{d}{dt} \bar{x}^R(t) - H(\bar{p}^R(t), \bar{x}^R(t)) \right)\, dt \\
= A(\bar{x}(\cdot)) + \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \left( \bar{x}^R(t) \log \frac{\bar{x}^R(t)}{\bar{x}^A} + \bar{x}^A - \bar{x}^R(t) \right)\, dt,
\]
where we used \([4.22], [4.26]\) and \([4.27]\) in the second last equality. Then for Lyapunov function
\[
\psi^{ss}(\bar{x}) = \sum_i^N (x_i \log x_i - x_i \log x_i^s + x_i^s - x_i),
\]
the minimum action can be calculated as
\[
A(\bar{x}^R(\cdot)) = A(\bar{x}(\cdot)) + \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt} \psi^{ss}(\bar{x}^R(t))\, dt = A(\bar{x}(\cdot)) + \psi^{ss}(\bar{x}^R_T) - \psi^{ss}(\bar{x}^R_0).
\]

As a special case, let \(\bar{x}(t)\) be the solution to Kurtz ODE \([1.6]\) with \(\bar{x}(0) = \bar{x}^b\) and \(\bar{x}(T) = \bar{x}^A\) for some finite time \(T\). Then by Proposition \(4.1\), we know \(\bar{x}(t)\) is a least action solution for action functional \(A(\bar{x}^R(\cdot))\) in \([4.4]\) starting from \(\bar{x}^A\) ending at \(\bar{x}^b\) with action cost zero. We define the
time reversed solution to Kurtz ODE \([1.6]\)
\[
\bar{x}^R(t) = \bar{x}(T - t), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T.
\]
Then we know \(\bar{x}^R\) satisfies
\[
\dot{\bar{x}}^R = \sum_{j=1}^M \dot{J}_j \left( \Phi_j^-(\bar{x}^R) - \Phi_j^+(\bar{x}^R) \right), \quad \bar{x}^R_0 = \bar{x}(T) = \bar{x}^A, \quad \bar{x}^R_T = \bar{x}(0) = \bar{x}^b.
\]
The following Corollary is a special case for Proposition \(4.3\).

**Corollary 4.4.** Assume ODE \([1.6]\) is detailed balanced. For the time reversed Kurtz solution \(\bar{x}^R(t)\)
defined in \([4.20]\) and \([4.21]\), we know

(i) it satisfies the Hamilton dynamics with Hamiltonian defined in \([1.11]\)
\[
\frac{d}{dt} \bar{x}^R = \partial_p H(\bar{p}^{MR}, \bar{x}^R), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \bar{p}^{MR} = -\partial_x H(\bar{p}^{MR}, \bar{x}^R)
\]
with the closed formula for momentum \(\bar{p}^{MR}(t) = \log \bar{x}^b(t) - \log \bar{x}^s\). This implies \(\bar{x}^R(t)\) is a least action solution for action functional \(A(\bar{x}^R(\cdot))\) in \([4.4]\) starting from \(\bar{x}^R_0\) and ending at \(\bar{x}^R_T\);
(ii) the corresponding action cost is given by
\[
A(\bar{x}^R(\cdot)) = \psi^{ss}(\bar{x}^R_T) - \psi^{ss}(\bar{x}^R_0).
\]

where \(\psi^{ss}(\bar{x}) = \sum_i^N (x_i \log x_i - x_i \log x_i^s + x_i^s - x_i)\) is the Lyapunov function.

The time reversed Kurtz solution \(\bar{x}^R\) with the reversed momentum \(\bar{p}^{MR}\) is illustrated in Figure \([1]\) (right). As time evolves, the Kurtz solution and the reversed one stay at the same level set of the Hamiltonian \(H \equiv 0\).

We remark the results on the time reversed solutions in Proposition \(4.3\) still hold if \(H\) is a general Hamiltonian satisfying
\[
H(\bar{p}, \bar{x}) = H(-\bar{p} + \bar{q}(\bar{x}), \bar{x}), \quad \forall \bar{x}, \bar{p}
\]
for some function \(\bar{q}(\bar{x})\). A Hamiltonian which is quadratic in terms of the momentum \(\bar{p}\) and the Hamiltonian \(H\) defined in \([1.11]\) are both special cases of \([4.37]\). So we state the general result below without a proof.
Corollary 4.5. Given a Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ satisfying \[4.37\] for some function $\tilde{q}(\vec{x})$, suppose $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ is its convex conjugate. Let $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ be a least action solution for the action functional $A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\vec{x}, \vec{x}) \, dt$ starting from $\vec{x}(0)$ and ending at $\vec{x}(T)$. Then for the time reversed solution $\vec{x}^R(t), \vec{p}^R(t)$ defined in \[4.20\], we know

(i) the modified time reversed solution $\vec{x}^R(t)$ and $\vec{p}^R(t) = -\vec{p}^R(t) + \tilde{q}(\vec{x}^R(t))$ is still a least action solution starting from $\vec{x}^R_0 = \vec{x}(T)$ and ending at $\vec{x}^R_T = \vec{x}(0)$ and satisfy the Hamiltonian dynamics

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \vec{x}^R = \partial_p H(\vec{p}^R, \vec{x}^R), \quad \frac{d}{dt} \vec{p}^R = -\partial_x H(\vec{p}^R, \vec{x}^R);
\]

(ii) If in addition $\tilde{q}(\vec{x}) = \nabla V(\vec{x})$ for some potential $V$, the corresponding action cost for least action $\vec{x}^R(t)$ is given by

\[
A(\vec{x}^R(\cdot)) = A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) + V(\vec{x}^R_T) - V(\vec{x}^R_0).
\]

The statement (ii) for the reversed action cost can be understood as a path affinity describing in which direction the chemical reaction (or a general nonlinear dynamics) proceed. Precisely, this affinity is given by $A(\vec{x}^R(\cdot)) - A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = V(\vec{x}^R_T) - V(\vec{x}^R_0)$. In the case of $A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = 0$, i.e. Corollary 4.4, the reversed action cost $A(\vec{x}^R(\cdot)) = V(\vec{x}^R_T) - V(\vec{x}^R_0)$ is known as the quasipotential in the Freidlin-Wentzell theory \[FW12\].

4.2. Generalized gradient flow for chemical reaction. For chemical reactions, recall the Hamiltonian $H$ defined in \[1.11\] and its convex conjugate $L$ defined in \[4.1\]. We adapt the characterization in \[MRP14\] to give a relation between the rate function $L$ and the generalized gradient flow.

Based on Hamiltonian $H$, introduce a new convex dissipation $\psi^*$ on $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$

\[
\psi^*(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\vec{p} + \vec{p}_m, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}_m, \vec{x}),
\]

where $\vec{p}_m = \vec{p}_m(\vec{x})$ is the minimum point of $H$ for fixed $\vec{x}$; see Figure 1 for their relations. Then we have

\[
\psi^*(0, \vec{x}) = 0, \quad \partial_p \psi^*(0, \vec{x}) = 0.
\]

We compute the convex conjugate of $\psi^*$ as

\[
\psi(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \sup_{\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \langle \vec{s}, \vec{p} \rangle - \psi^*(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) \right)
\]

\[
= -\langle \vec{s}, \vec{p}_m \rangle + H(\vec{p}_m, \vec{x}) + \sup_{\vec{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N} \left( \langle \vec{s}, \vec{p} + \vec{p}_m \rangle - H(\vec{p} + \vec{p}_m, \vec{x}) \right)
\]

\[
= -\langle \vec{s}, \vec{p}_m \rangle - \psi^*(-\vec{p}_m, \vec{x}) + L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}),
\]

where we used the definition of $L$ in \[4.1\]. Therefore, we have the following identity representing the relation between the rate function $L$ and the convex pair $(\psi, \psi^*)$

\[
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \psi(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) + \psi^*(-\vec{p}_m, \vec{x}) + \langle \vec{s}, \vec{p}_m \rangle.
\]

Note from Lemma 4.1(iii), the level-set $L = 0$ defines the solution to ODE \[1.6\], which possesses a strong gradient flow formulation \[2.17\] under the detailed balance condition. Here if for some free energy $F$, $\vec{p}_m = \frac{\delta F}{\delta \vec{x}}$ has a gradient form, then the level-set $L = 0$ in \[4.43\] also defines a De Giorgi $(\psi, \psi^*)$-type gradient flow \[MRP14\], \[GL20\]

\[
\left( \frac{\delta F}{\delta \vec{x}}, \vec{x} \right) + \psi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}) + \psi^*(-\frac{\delta F}{\delta \vec{x}}, \vec{x}) = 0.
\]
Figure 1. Illustration for the relation between $L$, $H$ and the dissipation functionals $(\psi, \psi^*)$ in gradient flow formulation. Blue lines and green lines are profiles at state $\vec{x}(t_1)$ and $\vec{x}(t_2)$ respectively. The symmetry of $H$ profile, particularly the time reversed momentum $\vec{p}^R$, is shown at $t_1$ and $t_2$.

Now we prove under the detailed balance condition, the minimum point $\vec{p}_m$ has gradient form.

\begin{equation}
\partial_p H = \sum_j \vec{v}_j \left( \Phi_j^+ (\vec{x}) e^{\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}} - \Phi_j^- (\vec{x}) e^{-\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}} \right) = 0
\end{equation}

yields that $\vec{p}_m$ solves

\begin{equation}
\Phi_j^+ (\vec{x}) e^{\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}_m} = \Phi_j^- (\vec{x}) e^{-\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}_m},
\end{equation}

which implies

\begin{equation}
\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}_m = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\Phi_j^- (\vec{x})}{\Phi_j^+ (\vec{x})}.
\end{equation}

Under the detailed balance assumption, we have (1.21) and thus $\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p}_m = \frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_j \cdot \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}_s}$. Therefore, we conclude the minimum point in $G$ is

\begin{equation}
\vec{p}_m = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}_s}.
\end{equation}

Thus we choose free energy $F = \frac{1}{2} \text{KL}(\vec{x}||\vec{x}_s)$, so $\vec{p}_m = \frac{\delta F}{\delta \vec{x}}$ and we obtain (4.44).

Furthermore, from (4.26), we also know the detailed balance condition implies the even-symmetry for Hamiltonian $H$, i.e.,

\begin{equation}
H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}_s} - \vec{p}, \vec{x}),
\end{equation}

and the symmetric axis $\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}_s}$ is shown in Figure 1. Then by the definition of $\psi$ and $\psi^*$, we know they are both even function w.r.t. the first variable. Besides, from the even-symmetry of $H$, we have

\begin{equation}
\vec{s} = \partial_p H(\vec{p}, x) = -\partial_p H \left( 2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial \vec{x}} - \vec{p}, \vec{x} \right).
\end{equation}

The plugging this into the definition of $L$, we have

\begin{equation}
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = \vec{s} \cdot \vec{p} - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}), \quad L(-\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = -\vec{s} \cdot \left( 2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial \vec{x}} - \vec{p} \right) - H \left( 2 \frac{\partial F}{\partial \vec{x}} - \vec{p}, \vec{x} \right).
\end{equation}
Then using the symmetry of $H$, we have
\begin{equation}
L(\vec{s}, \vec{x}) - L(-\vec{s}, \vec{x}) = 2\vec{s} \cdot \frac{\partial F}{\partial \vec{x}}.
\end{equation}

In terms of this type of symmetry for the rate function, we remark the fluctuation theorem for the continuous time Markov chain without detailed balance condition was proved in [LS99]. It says the large deviation rate function $\hat{L}(\vec{s})$ defined from the sample entropy production rates has a symmetry of the Gallavotti-Cohen type $\hat{L}(\vec{s}) - \hat{L}(-\vec{s}) = -\vec{s}$.

We remark that the choice of $\psi^*$, i.e.,
\begin{equation}
\psi^*(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = H(\vec{p} + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^0}, \vec{x}) - H(\frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^0}, \vec{x}) = \sum_j \sqrt{\Phi_j^+ (\vec{x}) \Phi_j^- (\vec{x})} \left( e^{\vec{v}_j \vec{p}} + e^{-\vec{v}_j \vec{p}} - 2 \right),
\end{equation}
was also constructed from another general way via a convex function $\varphi$ in [MM20 Section 2.5]. Indeed, taking $\varphi(z) = e^z + e^{-z} - 2$ with $\varphi(z) \geq \varphi(0) = 0$, we have
\begin{equation}
\psi^*(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = \sum_j \frac{\Phi_j^+ (\vec{x}) - \Phi_j^- (\vec{x})}{\varphi' \left( -\frac{1}{2} \vec{v}_j \cdot \log \frac{\vec{x}}{\vec{x}^0} \right) \varphi (\vec{v}_j \cdot \vec{p})}.
\end{equation}

For the case $\varphi(z) = \frac{1}{2} z^2$, it gives rise to the strong form of gradient flow formulation (2.17).

### 4.3. Infinite time horizon optimal control problem.

In biochemical reactions, the rare events such as conformational transition usually require us to find an optimal path (most probable path) in an infinite time horizon with an optimal terminal time.

#### 4.3.1. Construction of saddle point.

In practice, stable states $A$ and $B$ are easy to observed but along the transition from $A$ to $B$, the transition state or saddle point $C$ is hard to determine. The question is, if one observes a transition (the most probable path) from $A$ to $B$, can we construct a possible saddle point $C$ and a most probable path in the sense of the large deviation principle such that this path starts from $A$, passing through $C$ and ending at $B$. This problem is in general challenging for non-detailed balanced system. Below, we illustrate the idea of the construction for a detailed balanced system and later in Remark 3 we will comment on how to find the transition path for the large volume process with a fixed volume.

For two stable states to ODE (1.6), denoted as $\vec{x}^A$ and $\vec{x}^B$, assume they satisfy detailed balance condition (1.19). Then by Lemma 2.2, any logarithmic linear combination $\log \vec{x}^* = \alpha \log \vec{x}^A + (1 - \alpha) \log \vec{x}^B$ gives a steady state $\vec{x}^*$ to (1.6). Indeed, from Lemma 2.2 there exists $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu^T)$ such that $\vec{x}^0 = \vec{x}^A e^{\vec{q}}$, then
\begin{equation}
\vec{x}^* = (\vec{x}^A)^\alpha (\vec{x}^B)^{1-\alpha} = \vec{x}^A e^{(1-\alpha)\vec{q}}
\end{equation}
is a steady state satisfying the detailed balance condition due to Lemma 2.2.

Recall Lemma 3.4 We can construct two Lyapunov functions $\psi^{ss}$ from $\vec{x}^A$ and $\vec{x}^B$ such that $\psi^{ss}_A = KL(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^A)$ and $\psi^{ss}_B = KL(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^B)$ satisfy
\begin{equation}
\pi^{\alpha}_V \approx e^{-V KL(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^A)}, \quad \pi^{\beta}_V \approx e^{-V KL(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^B)}.
\end{equation}

Since $\frac{\pi^A + \pi^B}{2}$ is also a steady solution, we use it to construct a double-well type Lyapunov function
\begin{equation}
\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \lim_{V \to +\infty} \frac{-\log \left( \frac{\pi^A + \pi^B}{2} \right)}{V}.
\end{equation}

We have the following lemma to characterize the constructed Lyapunov function $\psi^{ss}(\vec{x})$. 
Lemma 4.6. Let \( \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \) be the Lyapunov function defined in (4.56), then we have
\[
\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \min (\text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A), \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^B)).
\]

Proof. From Lemma 3.4, we know
\[
\lim_{V \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{V} \log \left( \frac{\pi^\Lambda + \pi^B}{2} \right) = \lim_{V \to +\infty} -\frac{1}{V} \log \left( e^{-V \text{KL}(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^A)} + e^{-V \text{KL}(\vec{x}|\vec{x}^B)} + e^{O(\log(V))} \right).
\]
Then by Laplace’s method \( \max(a,b) = \lim_{V \to +\infty} \frac{1}{V} \log \left( e^{Va} + e^{Vb} \right) \), we have
\[
\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \min (\text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A), \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^B)).
\]
Particularly, for \( \vec{x} \in \Gamma \), \( \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A) | \Gamma \). □

Thus it is natural to define a bisection plane w.r.t the relative entropy
\[
\Gamma := \{ \vec{x}; \ \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A) = \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^B) \} = \{ \vec{x}; \ \vec{x} \cdot (\log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A) = \vec{\epsilon} \cdot (\vec{x}^B - \vec{x}^A) = : \gamma \},
\]
where \( \vec{\epsilon} = (1, \cdots, 1)^T \). Denote the normal vector of \( \Gamma \) as \( \vec{q} = \log \frac{\vec{x}^B}{\vec{x}^A} \), then (4.57) is equivalent to
\[
\psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) = \begin{cases} 
\text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A), & \text{if } \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} \leq \gamma, \\
\text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^B), & \text{if } \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} > \gamma.
\end{cases}
\]
Now we construct a saddle point in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. Let \( \vec{x}^A, \vec{x}^B \) be steady states to ODE (1.6) with the detailed balance property (1.19). Let \( \Gamma \) be the bisection plane with its normal vector \( \vec{q} \) defined in (4.60). Choose \( \vec{x}^C \in \Gamma \) as the minimum point such that
\[
\frac{d}{d\varepsilon} \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0} \text{KL}(\vec{x}^C + \varepsilon \vec{x} | \vec{x}^A) = 0 \quad \text{for any } \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} = 0.
\]
Then \( \vec{x}^C \) is a steady state to ODE (1.6) with detailed balance property and \( \vec{x}^C \) is also a saddle point of \( \psi^{ss} \) defined in (4.57).

Proof. First, from (4.62), we know
\[
(\log \vec{x}^C - \log \vec{x}^A) \cdot \vec{x} = 0 \quad \text{for any } \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} = 0.
\]
Thus there exists \( \alpha > 0 \) such that
\[
\log \vec{x}^C - \log \vec{x}^A = \alpha \vec{q}.
\]
Meanwhile, \( \vec{x}^C \in \Gamma \) requires \( \vec{x}^C \cdot \vec{q} = \gamma \), so \( \vec{x}^C \) can be uniquely solved.

Second, since \( \vec{x}^A, \vec{x}^B \) are steady states with the detailed balance property, from Lemma 2.2 \( \vec{q} = \log \frac{\vec{x}^B}{\vec{x}^A} \in \text{Ker}(\nu^T) \). Thus we know \( \vec{x}^C \) is also a steady state to ODE (1.6) with the detailed balance property.

Third, since \( \text{KL}(\vec{x} | \vec{x}^A) \) is convex, so \( \vec{x}^C \) is the minimum point of \( \psi^{ss} \) on \( \Gamma \). To prove \( \vec{x}^C \) is a saddle point, it is sufficient to compute two one-side directional derivatives along \( \vec{q} \). For \( \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} \leq \gamma \),
\[
\partial_{\vec{q}} \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \bigg|_{\vec{x}^-} = \log \frac{\vec{x}^C}{\vec{x}^A} \cdot \vec{q} = \alpha |\vec{q}|^2 > 0,
\]
while for \( \vec{x} \cdot \vec{q} > \gamma \),
\[
\partial_{\vec{q}} \psi^{ss}(\vec{x}) \bigg|_{\vec{x}^+} = \log \frac{\vec{x}^C}{\vec{x}^B} \cdot \vec{q} = -\alpha |\vec{q}|^2 < 0.
\]
□
4.3.2. Most probable path given by least action. Assume $\vec{x}_A$ and $\vec{x}_B$ are two states. Assume there exists a most probable path connecting $\vec{x}_A$ and $\vec{x}_B$ which is realized by a piecewise least action $\vec{x}(s)$ in the following sense:

(i) $\vec{x}(s)$ is a continuous curve such that $\vec{x}(0) = \vec{x}_A$, $\vec{x}(S) = \vec{x}_B$ with arclength parameterization $s$, $0 \leq s \leq S$;
(ii) assume there exists a finite partition $0 = s_0 < s_1 < s_2 < \cdots < s_k = S$ such that for $\ell = 1, \cdots, k$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a least action connecting $\vec{x}(s_{\ell-1} + \varepsilon)$ with $\vec{x}(s_{\ell} - \varepsilon)$.

For the most probable path described by a least action problem with $L$ defined in (4.1), we first reformulate it as the following control problem in an infinite time horizon with an optimal terminal time

$$\min_{\vec{p}, \vec{x}} \int_0^T (\vec{p} \cdot \partial_\vec{p} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) + c_0) \, dt,$$

subject to $\vec{x} = \partial_\vec{x} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$, $t \in (0, T)$, $\vec{x}_0 = \vec{x}_A$, $\vec{x}_T = \vec{x}_B$.

where $c_0$ is a normalization constant to be chosen later. Define the augmented Lagrangian function as

$$\mathcal{L}(\vec{x}, \dot{\vec{x}}, \vec{p}, \lambda) := \vec{p} \cdot \partial_\vec{p} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) + c_0 + \lambda \cdot (\vec{x} - \partial_\vec{x} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}))$$

where $\lambda$ is the Lagrange multiplier. Then the augmented Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H}(\vec{x}, \vec{p}, \lambda) := \mathcal{L} - \dot{\vec{x}} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\vec{x}}} = \vec{p} \cdot \partial_\vec{p} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) - H(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) + c_0 - \lambda \cdot \partial_\vec{x} H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$$

Then the minimization of $\int_0^T \mathcal{L} \, dt$ w.r.t perturbations $\vec{x}, \vec{p}, \lambda, \dot{T}$ gives the Euler-Lagrange equations

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \vec{x}} - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \dot{\vec{x}}} \right) = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \vec{p}} = 0, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = 0, \quad \mathcal{H}(\vec{p}, \vec{x})|_{t=T^*} = 0$$

with $\vec{x}_0 = A$, $\vec{x}_{T^*} = B$. We simplify (4.70) as

$$-\partial_x H + \partial_x ((\vec{p} - \lambda) \cdot \partial_\vec{p} H) - \dot{\lambda} = 0,$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\vec{p}, \vec{x}) = 0.$$
Specially, in the detailed balance case, combining the above derivations with Proposition 4.5, we conclude that the time reversed solution can also be derived from the Pontryagin maximum principle as an optimal control problem in an infinite time horizon. More precisely, we have

**Proposition 4.8.** Given a Hamiltonian $H(\vec{p}, \vec{x})$ satisfying (4.37) for some function $\vec{q}(\vec{x})$, suppose $L(\vec{s}, \vec{x})$ is its convex conjugate. Let $\vec{x}(t), \vec{p}(t)$ be a least action solution for the action functional

$$A(\vec{x}(\cdot)) = \int_0^T L(\dot{\vec{x}}, \vec{x}) \, dt$$

starting from $\vec{x}(0) = \vec{x}^B$ and ending at $\vec{x}(T) = \vec{x}^A$. Taking $c_0 = H(\vec{x}(0), \vec{p}(0))$ in (4.67). Then the optimal control $\vec{p}^*(t)$ and the associated optimal curve $\vec{x}^*(t)$, which solve the optimal control problem (4.67), are indeed the time reversed solution $\vec{x}^R(t), \vec{p}^{MR}(t)$ in Corollary 4.5.

For the classical over-damped Langevin dynamics with a double well potential, it is well-known by the Freidlin-Wentzell theory [FW12] that the most probable path connecting stable states $\vec{x}^A, \vec{x}^B$ passing through a saddle point $\vec{x}^C$ and ending at $\vec{x}^B$ is given by two pieces least action curve. However, as proved below, it is not true for a chemical reaction described by Kurtz ODE (1.6) with $\vec{x}^A$ satisfying detailed balance condition.

**Proposition 4.9.** Assume $\vec{x}^A$ and $\vec{x}^B$ are two positive steady states to Kurtz ODE (1.6) with detailed balance property (1.19). Then there does not exist a most probable path that is given by piecewise least action defined above.

**Proof.** From Lemma 2.2 there exists $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$ such that

$$\log \vec{x}^B = \log \vec{x}^A + \vec{q}. \tag{4.75}$$

If there exists a continuous piecewise least action curve $\vec{x}(t)$, then

$$\vec{x}^B - \vec{x}^A = \int_0^S \frac{d}{ds} \vec{x}(s) \, ds = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\ell=k} \int_{s_\ell}^{s_{\ell+1}} \partial_p H(\vec{p}(s), \vec{x}(s)) \, ds \in \text{Ran}(\nu^T). \tag{4.76}$$

Since $\vec{q} \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, we know

$$\log \vec{x}^B - \log \vec{x}^A \cdot (\vec{x}^B - \vec{x}^A) = \vec{q} \cdot (\vec{x}^B - \vec{x}^A) = 0. \tag{4.77}$$

This, together with (4.75), contradicts with $\vec{x}^A \neq \vec{x}^B$. \qed

The detailed/complex balance condition is indeed a very restrictive condition. For general chemical reaction, the Freidlin-Wentzell theory [FW12] for finding the most probable path is still powerful.

**Remark 3.** Beside the deterministic optimal control problem described above, one can also directly investigate the stochastic optimal control problem from the original large volume process $C^V$ with a fixed volume $V$. The corresponding generator for this Markov jumping process on the countable state space is $Q_V$ defined in (3.1). The transition path theory theory (TPT) was first proposed by E and Vanden-Eijnden in [EVE06], particularly in [MSVE09] for Markov jumping process, to obtain transition paths and transition rates at a finite noise level by calculating the committor function, i.e., the stationary solution to the backward equation with two boundary conditions at two stable states $A$ and $B$. In [GLL20], an optimally controlled random walk is constructed based on the committor function, which realized the Monte Carlo simulations for the transition path almost surely. Those methods can be adapted in the chemical reactions at fixed volume $V$ with generator $Q_V$: see a simple stochastic model of a genetic toggle switch in [ROR+05] and the numerical results in [MSVE09, Section 4.3].
4.3.3. Some approximations for the least action problem. Let $A$ and $B$ be two states close to two stable states respectively for ODE (1.6). Proposition 4.1 shows that given two endpoints $\bar{x}_0 = A$ and $\bar{x}_T = B$, the least action solution satisfying (4.12) is characterized by the Hamiltonian dynamics (4.7). Thus in a fixed time horizon, the least action problem with given two endpoints $\bar{x}_0$ and $\bar{x}_T$ can be approximated in the following ways.

In practice, we can solve (4.7) with two-point boundary values $\bar{x}_0$ and $\bar{x}_T$ by various numerical methods such as Newton iteration. Let $\bar{x}_i, i = 0, \cdots, N$ and $\bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}, i = 0, \cdots, N - 1$ be the grid points along least action curve with grid length $h = \frac{T}{N}$. Take $\bar{x}_0 = A$ and $\bar{x}_N = B$, then we use the following centered difference approximation to solve $2N - 1$ unknowns

$$\frac{\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_{i-1}}{h} = (\partial_p H) \left( \bar{p}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, \frac{\bar{x}_{i-1} + \bar{x}_i}{2} \right), \quad i = 1, \cdots, N;$$

$$\frac{\bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} - \bar{p}_{i-\frac{1}{2}}}{h} = (-\partial_x H) \left( \frac{\bar{p}_{i-\frac{1}{2}} + \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2}}}{2}, \bar{x}_i \right), \quad i = 1, \cdots, N - 1. \tag{4.78}$$

To ensure the solvability of the above $2N - 1$ nonlinear equations, we assume two end points $\bar{x}_0, \bar{x}_T \in q + G$ for a fixed $q \in \text{Ker}(\nu)$, i.e., they are in the same stoichiometric compatibility class. In the Newton iteration, we always find solution in $\bar{x}_i \in q + G$ and $\bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2}} \in G$ to ensure the stability.

In general, the running cost $L$ does not have the classical quadratic form for the kinetic energy as in Nelson’s theory. However, near the minimizer of $A(\cdot)$, i.e., the curve solves Kurtz ODE (1.6), we have the following quadratic approximation for the running cost.

Denote $s^* := \partial_p H(\bar{p}, \bar{x})|_{\bar{p}=0} = \sum_{j=1}^M \bar{p}_j \left( \Phi^+_j(\bar{x}) - \Phi^-_j(\bar{x}) \right)$. Then we have

$$H(\bar{p}, \bar{x}) = s^* \cdot \bar{p} + \frac{1}{2} \bar{p}^T \nabla_p^2 H(0, \bar{x}) \bar{p} + o(|\bar{p}|^2) \tag{4.79}$$

and for $s \in G$,

$$L(s, \bar{x}) = \max_{\bar{p} \in G} (s - s^*) \cdot \bar{p} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{p}^T \nabla_p^2 H(0, \bar{x}) \bar{p} + o(|\bar{p}|^2). \tag{4.80}$$

Then approximately we have $s - s^* = \nabla_p^2 H(0, \bar{x}) \bar{p}$ and

$$L(s, \bar{x}) \approx \frac{1}{2} (s - s^*)^T \nabla_p^2 L(s^*, \bar{x})(s - s^*) = \frac{1}{2} \bar{p}^T \nabla_p^2 H(0, \bar{x}) \bar{p}. \tag{4.81}$$

In this quadratic approximation, the above $2N - 1$ nonlinear equations (4.78) become linear system and thus can be solved efficiently.

5. Discussion

In this paper, we revisit the macroscopic dynamics for chemical reactions from a Hamiltonian viewpoint. The concentration of chemical species are modeled by a degenerate Kurtz ODE system, which is the thermodynamic limiting equation from the law of large number for the random time-changed Poisson representation of chemical reactions. Using a Hamiltonian defined from the WKB expansion: (i) We bridge the detailed/complex balance property with the symmetric property of the Hamiltonian, and thus (generalized) gradient flow structures of the Kurtz ODE. (ii) We characterize both the forward curve and the time reversal of the Kurtz ODE as least action curves, where the affinity of the chemical reaction is given by the difference between forward and reversed action cost. (iii) We interpret the most probable path connecting two states as an optimal control problem in an infinite time horizon. In a detailed balanced system, we proved the nonexistence of transitions between two positive steady states, however, the optimal control interpretation and the construction of saddle point are insightful for more complicated reaction systems.
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APPENDIX A. MASTER EQUATION AND GRADIENT FLOW FORMULATION

A.1. Master equation derivation. We will only compute the generator for the portion of the forward reactions with the forward Poisson process $Y_j = Y_j^+$ in [1,2], because the backward portion is exactly same. Consider

\begin{equation}
X_i(t) = X_i(0) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \nu_{ji} Y_j \left( \int_0^t \varphi_j(X(s)) \, ds \right).
\end{equation}

For any test function $f \in C_b$, since $R_j(t) := Y_j \left( \int_0^t \varphi_j(\bar{X}(s)) \, ds \right)$ is a counting process representing the $j$-th reaction, so

\begin{equation}
f(\bar{X}(t)) = f(\bar{X}(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \left( f(\bar{X}(s_-) + \bar{\nu}_j) - f(\bar{X}(s_-)) \right) \, dR_j(s).
\end{equation}

From [AK15, Thm 1.10], $M_j(t) := Y_j \left( \int_0^t \varphi_j(\bar{X}(s)) \, ds \right) - \int_0^t \varphi_j(\bar{X}(s)) \, ds$ is a Martingale. Thus (A.2) becomes

\begin{equation}
f(\bar{X}(t)) = f(\bar{X}(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \varphi_j(\bar{X}(s)) \left( f(\bar{X}(s_-) + \bar{\nu}_j) - f(\bar{X}(s_-)) \right) \, ds
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
+ \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \left( f(\bar{X}(s_-) + \bar{\nu}_j) - f(\bar{X}(s_-)) \right) \, dM_j(s).
\end{equation}

Now we derive the master equation for $\bar{X}(t) \in \mathbb{N}^N$. Denote the (time marginal) law of $\bar{X}(t)$ as

\begin{equation}
p(\bar{n},t) = \mathbb{E} \left( \delta_{\bar{n},\bar{X}(t)} \right).
\end{equation}

For any $f : \mathbb{Z}^N \to \mathbb{R}$, $f(\bar{X}) = \sum_{\bar{n}} f(\bar{n}) \delta_{\bar{n},\bar{X}}$, and

\begin{equation}
\mathbb{E}(f(\bar{X})) = \sum_{\bar{n}} f(\bar{n}) \mathbb{E}(\delta_{\bar{n},\bar{X}}) = \sum_{\bar{n}} f(\bar{n}) p(\bar{n},t).
\end{equation}

Taking expectation for (A.3), we have the Dynkin’s formula

\begin{equation}
\mathbb{E} f(\bar{X}(t)) = \mathbb{E} f(\bar{X}(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} \left( \varphi_j(\bar{X}(s)) \left( f(\bar{X}(s) + \bar{\nu}_j) - f(\bar{X}(s)) \right) \right) \, ds.
\end{equation}

Taking derivative yields

\begin{equation}
\frac{d}{dt} \sum_{\bar{n}} f(\bar{n}) p(\bar{n},t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\bar{n}} \varphi_j(\bar{n}) \left( f(\bar{n} + \bar{\nu}_j) - f(\bar{n}) \right) p(\bar{n},t)
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
= \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\bar{n}} \varphi_j(\bar{n} - \bar{\nu}_j) f(\bar{n}) p(\bar{n} - \bar{\nu}_j, t) - \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\bar{n}} \varphi_j(\bar{n}) f(\bar{n}) p(\bar{n}, t).
\end{equation}
Then the master equation for $p(\vec{n}, t)$ is

$$
\frac{d}{dt}p(\vec{n}, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \varphi_j(\vec{n} - \vec{\nu}_j)p(\vec{n} - \vec{\nu}_j, t) - \sum_{j=1}^{M} \varphi_j(\vec{n})p(\vec{n}, t).
$$

Therefore, for the chemical reaction described by (1.2), the master equation is

$$
\text{(A.8)} \quad \frac{d}{dt}p(\vec{n}, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \varphi_j^+(\vec{n} - \vec{\nu}_j)p(\vec{n} - \vec{\nu}_j, t) - \left( \varphi_j^+(\vec{n}) + \varphi_j^-(\vec{n}) \right)p(\vec{n}, t) + \varphi_j^-(\vec{n} + \vec{\nu}_j)p(\vec{n} + \vec{\nu}_j, t).
$$

Similarly, one can derive the master equation for the large volume jumping process $C^V(t)$.

We only compute the generator for the portion of the forward reactions. Notice

$$
\Phi = \frac{V}{V} \Phi_j(C^V(s)) \, ds
$$

is a counting process and $M_j(t) = \frac{1}{V} \int_0^t \Phi_j(C^V(s)) \, ds$. Similar to (A.3), we obtain for any $f \in C_b$,

$$
\text{(A.9)} \quad d\frac{d}{dt}f(C^V(t)) = f(C^V(0)) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \left( f(C^V(s_-) + \vec{\nu}_j) - f(C^V(s_-)) \right) \, dR_j(s) + \sum_{j=1}^{M} \int_0^t \left( f(C^V(s_-) + \vec{\nu}_j) - f(C^V(s_-)) \right) \, dM_j(s).
$$

Then using $\mathbb{E}f(C^V(t)) = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\vec{x}_V} f(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t)$, we obtain the generator $Q_V$ for the large volume process $C^V(t)$ for fixed $V$

$$
\text{(A.10)} \quad \sum_{\vec{x}_V} f(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t) = V \sum_{j=1}^{M} \sum_{\vec{x}_V} \left[ \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V) \left( f(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j) - f(\vec{x}_V) \right) p(\vec{x}_V, t) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V) \left( f(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j) - f(\vec{x}_V) \right) p(\vec{x}_V, t) \right] =: \sum_{\vec{x}_V} (Q_V f)(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t).
$$

A.2. **Gradient flow formulation for the master equation.** Now we derive the strong form of gradient flow structure for master equation (1.5).

Under the detailed balance condition (3.30) for the master equation, we recast the master equation as

$$
\text{(A.12)} \quad \frac{1}{V} \frac{d}{dt}p(\vec{x}_V, t) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j)p(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j, t) - \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t) + \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)p(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j, t) - \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V)p(\vec{x}_V, t)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j} \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V)\pi(\vec{x}_V) \left( \frac{p(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j)} - \frac{p(\vec{x}_V, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V)} \right) + \sum_{j} \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V)\pi(\vec{x}_V) \left( \frac{p(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)} - \frac{p(\vec{x}_V, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V)} \right)
$$

$$
= \sum_{j} \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_V)\pi(\vec{x}_V) \Lambda \left( \frac{p(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V - \vec{\nu}_j)} - \frac{p(\vec{x}_V, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V)} \right) + \sum_{j} \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V)\pi(\vec{x}_V) \Lambda \left( \frac{p(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)} - \frac{p(\vec{x}_V, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V)} \right)
$$

$$
+ \sum_{j} \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_V)\pi(\vec{x}_V) \Lambda \left( \frac{\log p(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V + \vec{\nu}_j)} - \log \frac{p(\vec{x}_V, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_V)} \right),
$$
where $\Lambda(a, b) = \frac{a-b}{\log a - \log b}$. Denote

(A.13)\[
A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) := -\Phi_j^\pm(\vec{x}_\nu) \pi(\vec{x}_\nu) \Lambda \left( \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j)}, \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu)} \right) \leq 0, \quad A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu) := -\sum_{j, \pm} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) \geq 0.
\]

Introduce the free energy

(A.14)\[
\text{KL}(p||\pi) := \sum_{\vec{x}_\nu} p(\vec{x}_\nu) \log \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu)}, \quad \frac{\delta \text{KL}(p||\pi)}{\delta p} = \log \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu)} + 1.
\]

Then we have the equivalent form

(A.15)\[
\frac{1}{V} \frac{d}{dt} p(\vec{x}_\nu, t) = -\sum_{j, \pm} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) \log \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j)} - A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu) \log \frac{p(\vec{x}_\nu, t)}{\pi(\vec{x}_\nu)} =: -A \frac{\delta \text{KL}(p||\pi)}{\delta p}.
\]

Thanks to detailed balance (3.30), it is easy to verify

(A.16)\[
A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) = A(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j, \vec{x}_\nu).
\]

Moreover, we can verify $\mathcal{A}$ is positive semidefinite. Indeed, for any $\alpha(\vec{x}_\nu)$, we have

(A.17)\[
\sum_{\vec{x}_\nu, j, \pm} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu) \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu \pm \vec{\nu}_j) + \sum_{\vec{x}_\nu} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu) \alpha^2(\vec{x}_\nu)
\]

\[= \sum_{\vec{x}_\nu, j} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu + \vec{\nu}_j) \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu) (\alpha(\vec{x}_\nu + \vec{\nu}_j) - \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu)) + \sum_{\vec{x}_\nu, j} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu - \vec{\nu}_j) \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu) (\alpha(\vec{x}_\nu - \vec{\nu}_j) - \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu))
\]

\[= -\sum_{\vec{x}_\nu, j} A(\vec{x}_\nu, \vec{x}_\nu + \vec{\nu}_j) (\alpha(\vec{x}_\nu + \vec{\nu}_j) - \alpha(\vec{x}_\nu))^2 \geq 0,
\]

where we used (A.16). We remark this gradient flow formulation was first introduced in [Maa11, CHLZ12, MRP14] independently, which study a gradient flow of with respect to a discrete Wasserstein distance.

**Remark 4.** The gradient flow structure lost when the detailed balance property fails. However, we still have the KL-divergence energy dissipation law based on the $Q$-matrix structure. Indeed, we can recast (1.5) as $\frac{dp^T}{dt} = p^T Q$ with

(A.18)\[
Q(\vec{x}_\nu - \frac{\vec{\nu}_j}{V}, \vec{x}_\nu) = V \Phi_j^+(\vec{x}_\nu - \frac{\vec{\nu}_j}{V}), \quad Q(\vec{x}_\nu + \frac{\vec{\nu}_j}{V}, \vec{x}_\nu) = V \Phi_j^-(\vec{x}_\nu + \frac{\vec{\nu}_j}{V}),
\]

and then we have have

\[\frac{d}{dt} \sum_i p_i \log \frac{p_i}{\pi_i} = \sum_{i,j} p_j Q_{ji} \log \frac{p_i}{\pi_i} = \sum_{i,j} p_j Q_{ji} \log \left( \frac{p_i}{\pi_i} \frac{\pi_j}{p_j} \right) = \sum_{j \neq i} p_j Q_{ji} \left( \frac{p_i}{\pi_i} \frac{\pi_j}{p_j} - 1 \right) = \sum_{i,j} p_j Q_{ji} \left( \frac{p_i}{\pi_i} \frac{\pi_j}{p_j} - 1 \right) = 0.
\]

**A.3. Partial symmetry of $H$ under complex balance condition.** In general the symmetry of $H$ in (1.22) is broken, however, if the complex balance (2.6) holds, we still have (3.28).

Using the LMA (1.3), similar to (1.21), one obtains the following identity

(A.19)\[
\frac{\Phi_j^+(\vec{x})}{\Phi_j^-(\vec{x})} = \frac{\Phi_j^+(\vec{x})}{\Phi_j^-(\vec{x})} e^{\nu_j \log \frac{\vec{\nu}_j}{V}}.
\]
Then at $\tilde{p} = \log \frac{x}{x^s}$, we have

$$H \left( \log \frac{x}{x^s}, \tilde{x} \right) = \sum_j \left( \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}) \left( \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s) - 1 \right) + \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}) \left( \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s) - 1 \right) \right)$$

$$= \sum_j \left( \frac{\Phi_j^- (\tilde{x})}{\Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s)} \left( \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s) - \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s) \right) + \frac{\Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x})}{\Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s)} \left( \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s) - \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s) \right) \right)$$

Then similar to (2.8), rearranging according to the reactant complex $\eta \in \mathcal{C}$ and using complex balance (2.6), we have

$$H \left( \log \frac{x}{x^s}, \tilde{x} \right) = \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{C}} \left( \sum_j \left( \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s) - \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s) \right) + \sum_{j : \tilde{x}_j^+ = \eta} \left( \Phi_j^- (\tilde{x}^s) - \Phi_j^+ (\tilde{x}^s) \right) \right) = 0.$$ 
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