

STOCHASTIC MODELS OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION IN CHEMICAL REACTION NETWORKS

VINCENT FROMION, PHILIPPE ROBERT, AND JANA ZAHERDDINE

ABSTRACT. This paper analyses of a stochastic model of a chemical reaction network with three types of chemical species \mathcal{R} , \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{U} that interact to transform a flow of external resources, the chemical species \mathcal{Q} , to produce a product, the chemical species \mathcal{P}_r . A regulation mechanism involving the sequestration of the chemical species \mathcal{R} when the flow of resources is too low is investigated. The original motivation of the study is of analyzing the qualitative properties of a key regulation mechanism of gene expression in biological cells, the *stringent response*.

A scaling analysis of a Markov process in \mathbb{N}^5 representing the state of the chemical reaction network is achieved. It is shown that, depending on the parameters of the model, there are, quite surprisingly, three possible asymptotic regimes. To each of them corresponds a stochastic averaging principle with a fast process expressed in terms of a network of $M/M/\infty$ queues. One of these regimes, the optimal sequestration regime, does not seem to have been identified up to now. Under this regime, the input flow of resources is low but the state of the network is still acceptable in terms of unused macro-molecules, showing the remarkable efficiency of this regulation mechanism. The technical proofs of the main convergence results rely on a combination of coupling arguments, technical estimates of the solutions of SDEs, of sample paths of fast processes in particular, and the stability properties of some dynamical systems in \mathbb{R}^2 .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Stochastic Model	8
3. A Model without Regulation	16
4. A Model with Regulation	29
4.1. Stability Regime	29
4.2. Under-Loaded Regime: Optimal Sequestration	30
4.3. Under-Loaded Regime: Saturation	33
References	35

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes a scaling analysis of a stochastic model of a chemical reaction network which can be described as follows. See Section 1.2 for a detailed description.

There are two chemical species R -particles and M -particles which can form via pairing mechanisms a complex \mathcal{RM}_I which becomes after some steps a functional complex \mathcal{RM}_L .

Date: December 1, 2025.

Key words and phrases. Markov Processes; Scaling; Functional Law of Large Numbers; Stochastic Averaging Principle; Gene Expression.

There is an incoming flow of chemical species, Q -particles, resources, which can be paired to a chemical species, U -particles, defined as suppliers. Such a pair can be processed by a \mathcal{RM}_L -type complex in order to obtain the final product, a P -particle. At this point, the corresponding R -, M -, and U -particles are once again free in the environment.

Overall, the flow of Q -particles is used to create P -particles via a set of chemical reactions driven by random events. The regulation mechanism considered in this paper involves the sequestration of R -particles. This control is designed to happen when the flow of Q -particles is too low, to avoid having too many unused complexes of the type \mathcal{RM}_L .

The initial motivation of our study is of investigating the qualitative properties of an important regulation mechanism of gene expression in biological cells, the *stringent response*. See Bouveret and Battesti [4] and Traxler et al. [31]. This type of chemical network can be used to describe several important processes of molecular biology as we will see. We first give a quick reminder of the gene expression context.

1.1. Gene Expression. In bacterial cells, protein production is a central process. The production of macro-molecules, such as polymerases, ribosomes, and RNAs, as well as molecules like amino acids and energy sources, consumes most of cell resources. This enables the production of a diverse set of proteins with various functional properties.

It can be represented as a two-step mechanism:

The *transcription step*. Macro-molecules *polymerases* bind to genes of DNA to produce different types of RNAs: mRNAs, rRNAs, tRNAs, sRNAs, ...

The *translation step*. A couple of macro-molecules (R, M) , where R is a *ribosome* and M is an mRNA, may bind to form a complex RM_I . After this *initiation phase*, the complex is transformed into a complex RM_L for the *elongation phase*: A chain of amino-acids corresponding to the protein associated to this mRNA is sequentially built. Loosely speaking, an amino-acid Q , a biological brick of proteins, is paired to an uncharged/free *transfer RNA* (tRNA), U , to form a complex UQ , a charged tRNA. If the complex RM_L is waiting for this type of amino-acid, the complex UQ can be bound/processed by RM_L so that Q is added to the current chain of amino-acids being built. This procedure goes on until the desired protein is completed and can be detached from the complex RM_L and the complex itself breaks into R and M macro-molecules.

Regulation Mechanisms. The growth of a bacterial population in a given medium leads to an active consumption of resources necessary to produce new cells. When the concentrations of different resources in the medium are high enough for some time, the bacterium uses them efficiently, via its complex regulatory system, to reach a steady growth regime with a fixed growth rate.

When resources are scarce, a bacterium has to adapt, to either exploit differently the available resources, or to do without some of them, as for example when some amino-acids are missing. For many classes of bacteria resources maximizing the growth rate are used in priority. In the context of this adaptation, when resources are decaying, a bacterial cell has to decrease its growth rate and even to ultimately stop its growth. For a global deterministic model of allocation in bacterial cells, see Goelzer et al. [12] and Goelzer et al. [13].




FIGURE 1. Transitions of Chemical Species

In Fromion et al. [11] we have analyzed a stochastic model of the regulation of the transcription phase. A macro-molecule, a 6S-RNA can sequester a subset of polymerases and therefore reduce the production of RNAs and consequently of proteins.

In this paper, we are studying the regulation of the translation phase. There are analogies with the regulation of transcription. There is also a sequestration mechanism (for ribosomes). But it is done via a more sophisticated system. We give a quick sketch of its basic principle. When a flow of amino-acids is too low, there will be many complexes of the type RM_L waiting for this missing amino-acid. If this situation lasts, it may end-up that a “wrong” amino-acid is used instead, leading to an error for the composition of the protein and therefore, in some cases, a non-functional protein.

For this reason, the cell has to produce a maximal number of proteins to sustain its growth rate, but at the same time the number of complexes RM_L waiting for an amino-acid should not be too large.

When there is a starvation of some types of amino-acids, a significant fraction of the corresponding tRNAs are uncharged, i.e. not paired with an amino-acid. Recall that they “bring” amino-acids to complexes of the type RM_L in the elongation phase of proteins. The core of the regulation mechanism, *the stringent response*, is that the complex RM_L can use them as a sensor of the lack of amino-acids in the cell. It can detect these uncharged tRNAs and initiate a pathway leading to the production of a specific metabolite, (p)ppGpp, that will inhibit/block ribosomes and, therefore, the creation of complexes of the type RM_L . The number of uncharged tRNAs is therefore the key quantity in this regulation mechanism. See Bai et al. [1], Traxler et al. [31] and Zhu and Dai [36] for example.

This is, of course, a simplification of the current consensus on the stringent response but, from a modeling perspective, this seems to be a reasonable representation. More biological details and further references are provided in Chapter 4 of Zaherddine [35]. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the stringent response in the general economy of bacterial cells. Many types of bacterial cells have such a regulation, with variations, but with the same basic principles. It is a key component of the properties of adaptation of these cells to various environments. Recall that these organisms exist for almost four billions years.

This chemical reaction context with chemical species, suppliers and resources with interactions via pairing mechanisms is quite common in molecular biology. The transcription step can be described similarly, R -particles are polymerases, M -particles are genes and U -particles are nucleotids such as ATP or GTP and similarly for the duplication of DNA. See Watson et al. [34].

1.2. A Chemical Reaction Network. We now give a more detailed presentation of the kinetics of this system in terms of a chemical reaction network. See Feinberg [8] for the general definitions and results on chemical reaction networks. See Section 2 for a detailed Markovian description.

There are 10 chemical species,

$$\mathcal{S} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_S, \mathcal{R}M_I, \mathcal{R}M_L, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U}Q, \mathcal{Q}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{P}, \emptyset\}.$$

and the set of reaction rates is

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{K} \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \{\kappa_{RS}, \kappa_{SR}, \kappa_{LR}, \kappa_{Q\emptyset}, \kappa_{\emptyset Q}, \kappa_{RI}, \kappa_{IL}, \kappa_{QU}\}.$$

All these constants are assumed to be positive. The set of chemical reactions is given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{RI}} \mathcal{R}M_I \xrightarrow{\kappa_{IL}} \mathcal{R}M_L, \quad \emptyset \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa_{Q\emptyset}]{\kappa_{\emptyset Q}} \mathcal{Q}, \quad \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{Q} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{QU}} \mathcal{U}Q, \\ \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{U} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{RS}} \mathcal{R}_S + \mathcal{U}, \quad \mathcal{R}_S \xrightarrow{\kappa_{SR}} \mathcal{R}, \quad \mathcal{R}M_L + \mathcal{U}Q \xrightarrow{\kappa_{LR}} \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{P}. \end{array} \right.$$

We detail each of these reactions.

(a) PAIRINGS OF R -PARTICLES AND M -PARTICLES.

In the case of the regulation of the translation step, an R -particle is a ribosome and an M -particle an mRNA.

$$(2) \quad \mathcal{R} + \mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\kappa_{RI}} \mathcal{R}M_I \xrightarrow{\kappa_{IL}} \mathcal{R}M_L$$

The R -particles can be

- *Free*, the species \mathcal{R} ;
- *Paired* with a M -particle in two species, $\mathcal{R}M_I$ or $\mathcal{R}M_L$.

The species $\mathcal{R}M_I$ describes the complex after the pairing of a couple of M and R -particles during the *initiation phase*. After several steps, a complex of the species $\mathcal{R}M_L$ is obtained. The complex has the functional properties to start the production of a P -particle via a pairing with a complex of species $\mathcal{U}Q$. See item (e).

- *Sequestered*, species \mathcal{R}_S . See item (d).

(b) RESOURCES: Q -PARTICLES.


For the regulation of the translation step, a Q -particle is an amino-acid. The reactions are

$$(3) \quad \emptyset \xrightleftharpoons[\kappa_{Q\emptyset}]{\kappa_{\emptyset Q}} \mathcal{Q}.$$

They describe the creation of these particles and their possible degradation. A Q -particle can be also used/consumed to produce a P -particle. See item (e). If the production rate $\kappa_{\emptyset Q}$ is large, the biological environment is favorable. The interesting situation is when it is not the case, this is where the regulation mechanism is playing its role.

(c) SUPPLIERS: U -PARTICLES.


A U -particle is a tRNA in the regulation of the translation step. Such a particle can be paired with a Q -particle, as follows,




A U -particle can thus be free, i.e. the species \mathcal{U} , or paired, the species \mathcal{UQ} .

(d) SEQUESTRATION OF R -PARTICLES.

The regulation mechanism is represented by the following reactions,



The number of free U -particles is the key characteristic. Because of the kinetics based on the law of mass action, see Section 2, if the number of free U -particles is large, the R -particles will be often sequestered, i.e. in a state where they cannot contribute to the production of P -particles. A sequestered Q -particle becomes free after some time.

(e) ELONGATION PHASE: PRODUCTION OF P -PARTICLES.

Roughly speaking, a complex of species \mathcal{UQ} “carries” a Q -particle to a complex $\mathcal{R}M_L$ to produce of P -particle (protein).

In the context of the regulation of the translation step, Relation (4) indicates that a protein is created with one amino-acid. This is a caricature of the real system of course since the average length of a protein is around 300 amino-acids for *E. coli*. Nevertheless, from a modeling perspective, it does make sense. We believe that the main qualitative results of this paper, the existence of three regimes, still hold when one considers J different types Q_1, \dots, Q_K of amino-acids and the distribution of the sequence of amino-acids of a protein is i.i.d. distribution with a random length. The dimension of the state space is much larger in this detailed model: $1+4J$ for a *minimal* model instead of 5 for the model of this paper, which already requires a careful analysis.

1.3. The Three Regimes. We give a quick and informal picture of the results we show in this paper. Precise statements of the main theorems are in Section 2.

In the analysis of the regulation of transcription, see Fromion et al. [11], we have shown the result that there are two regimes depending on the initiation rates of rRNAs, overloaded/under-loaded. For the regulation of the translation step, the situation is, quite surprisingly, more intricate since we will show that there are in fact three asymptotic regimes.

Initially, the total number of R -particles (free, paired, sequestered) is fixed and equal to N , this is the scaling parameter of our analysis. The input rate of Q -particles is assumed to be the order of N . There are other (natural) scaling assumptions which are detailed in Section 2.

The state of the system at time $t > 0$ is given by a vector of \mathbb{N}^5 ,

$$X_N(t) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} (S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t)),$$

for the respective numbers of copies of the species \mathcal{R}_S , \mathcal{R} , $\mathcal{R}M_L$, \mathcal{Q} , \mathcal{U} .

- (a) **STABLE NETWORK.** If the input rate of Q -particles is above some threshold κ_0 . The variables $(S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$ are $O(1)$.

- (b) UNDER-LOADED NETWORK. When the input rate of Q -particles is below κ_0 , there is a condition \mathcal{C} , see Relation (10) of Section 2, depending on the parameters of the system such that,
- i) if \mathcal{C} holds, then the variables $(L_N(t), R_N(t), Q_N(t))$ are $O(1)$ and the process $(S_N(t)/N, U_N(t)/N)$ converges in distribution to a non-trivial limit.
 - ii) if \mathcal{C} does not hold then the variables $(R_N(t), Q_N(t))$ are $O(1)$ and the process $(L_N(t)/N, S_N(t)/N)$ converge in distribution to a non-trivial limit.

In case a), when Q -particles are created they can be paired with U -particles of the network, the complexes of the species \mathcal{RM}_L produce P -particles, and disappear, rapidly. When there are not sufficiently many U -particles, $(U_N(t))$ is $O(1)$ in this regime, the Q -particles are degraded at some fixed rate.

The case b)-i) is more interesting. This is the unexpected regime in fact but it is also a validation of the efficiency of this regulation mechanism. In this situation, the input rate of Q -particles is not sufficient, nevertheless the regulation mechanism, via the sequestration, manages to keep the process $(L_N(t))$ of R -particles in elongation of the order of $O(1)$. It turns out that in this case the regulation mechanism is sequestering just the right number of R -particles so that most of resources are used to produce P -particles. It is defined as the *optimal sequestration* regime. See Theorem 14.

In the case of the regulation of the translation step, this means that if the flow of amino-acids is low, there will be few ribosomes in elongation, thereby reducing the probability of non-functional proteins. Given the adaptation capabilities of bacterial cells, it is very likely that Condition \mathcal{C} holds in practice. It should be noted that Condition \mathcal{C} has some intuitive explanation but this is not entirely clear to us since it involves the numerous parameters of our model. See Theorem 4.

In the case b)-ii), the situation is not favorable from this point of view since the number of R -particles in elongation of the order of N and therefore prone to the production of “wrong” proteins.

In a somewhat different context, mathematical models of the regulation of gene expression has been analyzed in a deterministic context essentially. This is the literature of regulatory gene networks. See Santillán [30], Mestl et al. [24] and Hecker et al. [16]. See also the general references Mackey et al. [23] and Chapter 6 of Bressloff [5], and the references therein.

1.4. Stochastic Averaging Principles. An asymptotic regime is determined in fact by the subset of coordinates of $(X_N(t))$ which are $O(1)$, the other coordinates being of the order of N . See Definition 2 of Section 2.4. Each asymptotic regime corresponds to a stochastic averaging principle. The coordinates of $(X_N(t))$ which are $O(1)$ are associated to a class of fast processes and the others are the slow components.

Early works on the proof of averaging principles are due to Has'minskii. See [14, 15]. Chapter 7 of Freidlin and Wentzell [9] considers these questions in terms of the convergence of Cesaro averages of the fast component. Papanicolaou et al. [25] has introduced a stochastic calculus approach to these problems, mainly for diffusion processes. Kurtz [20] has developed this approach to jump processes.

Averaging principles have already been used in various situations to study chemical reaction networks (CRNs), Ball et al. [2], Kang and Kurtz [18], Kim et al. [19],

Laurence and Robert [21, 22], ... It should be noted that for most of these examples of CRNs, the fast process is generally of dimension 1, a birth and death process. The tightness of the associated occupation measure is generally proved with standard arguments. Its invariant distribution, which is crucial to express the asymptotic behavior of the slow component has an explicit expression.

In our case, the state space is of dimension five and the state space of the fast process is in general of dimension three. The proofs of the convergence in distribution of the sequence of occupation measures and of the slow process require a careful analysis. A significant difficulty of this context is of showing the crucial property that if the coordinates of the initial state has the “correct” orders of magnitude in the scaling parameter, then this property also holds on any finite time interval. This is not only a formal complication as it will be seen: Under the conditions of Theorem 14, this property is not true, one has to restrict the set of initial states in the convergence result for this reason.

In a classical stochastic averaging setting such as in Kurtz [20], Ball et al. [2], Kang and Kurtz [18], the tightness/convergence properties of fast processes are expressed in terms of their occupation measures which is sufficient in general to derive a limiting equation for the slow processes. Here, we need a control on the orders of magnitudes of the *sample paths* of fast processes and not only their occupation measure. Several technical results, Propositions 6, 7, 8 are used for this purpose. We believe that this type of approach may be also a useful tool to prove convergence results for CRNs when more than two timescales are involved.

The proofs of the main convergence results are achieved by using these technical results on fast processes and via a sequence of steps involving

- (a) introduce a stopping time to stop the slow processes and the occupation measure so that the components of $(X_N(t))$ remain in the “correct” region of the state space. The main difficulty is of showing that this stopping time is not vanishing to 0 as N gets large.
- (b) A coupling argument with an auxiliary process is used to prove tightness properties. It is a somewhat decoupled version of the initial process.
- (c) For each of the asymptotic regimes, the fast process is expressed in terms of a network of several $M/M/\infty$ queues. See Section 2.7. The invariant distribution of these networks has in fact an explicit expression. For one of them it is not expressed by a product form formula. See Proposition 9.
- (d) In Section 4 a stability analysis of an asymptotically deterministic system to extend the convergence in distribution on an arbitrary time-interval. This is a crucial ingredient in the proofs of Theorems 15 and 17. In the context of optimal sequestration, Theorem 15, there is a constraint on the initial state precisely for this reason. It is due to the fact that even if the system starts in the “correct” state space (for the orders of magnitudes of the coordinates), it may leave it before returning to it later.

The proof of Theorem 10 details each of these steps.

1.5. Organization of the Paper. Section 2 introduces the processes investigated and the associated definitions and notations. The main first order results are stated in this section. To stress the impact of the regulation, Section 3 investigates the CRN without a sequestration state for the R -particles. There are two asymptotic regimes in this case. Section 4 investigates the general system with regulation.

In this case there is an additional asymptotic regime, the optimal sequestration regime. Theorems 15 and 17 of this section are the main convergence results of the paper. In addition, in each case, as a consequence of these results, we establish a convergence result for the total number of P -particles produced.

2. STOCHASTIC MODEL

2.1. Notations and Definitions. If H is a locally compact space $\mathcal{C}(H)$, resp. $\mathcal{C}_c(H)$, denotes the set real-valued continuous functions on H , resp. continuous functions with compact support on H . The set of Radon measures on H is denoted by $\mathcal{M}(H)$, it is endowed with the topology of weak convergence. Finally $\mathcal{P}(H)$ is the space of probability distributions on H . See Rudin [29].

A càdlàg process $(X(t))$ is a stochastic process whose sample paths are almost surely continuous on the right with left limit $X(s-)$ at every point $s > 0$.

Definition 1. If $(Z(t))$ is a càdlàg process on H , the occupation measure associated to $(Z(t))$ is the random measure Λ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times H$ defined by

$$\langle \Lambda, f \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} f(t, Z(t)) dt,$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times H)$

See Dawson [6] for a general presentation of random measures.

2.2. Scaling Conditions. For $A \in \{R, M, U\}$, the total number of A -particles, paired or free is constant, it will be assumed that the corresponding constants R_N^0 , M_N^0 and U_N^0 , are such that, $R_N^0 = N$ and are asymptotically proportional to N ,

$$(5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{M_N^0}{N}, \frac{U_N^0}{N} \right) = (C_M, C_U),$$

with $C_M > 1$ and $C_U > 0$. The condition $C_M > 1$ reflects the fact that there are much more M -particles than R -particles. This condition has in fact a biological motivation. See Chapter 4 of Zaherddine [35].

It will be also assumed that the input rate of resources, the Q -particles, is also of the order of N .


2.3. A Markovian Representation. The state space of our system is

$$\mathcal{S}_N = \{x = (s, r, l, q, u) \in \mathbb{N}^5 : s + r + l \leq N, u \leq U_N^0\}.$$

If $x = (s, r, l, q, u)$ is an element of \mathcal{S}_N ,

- (a) s, r, l are respectively the number of R -particles sequestered, free or in elongation (species \mathcal{RM}_L),
 - $N - r - s - l$ is the number of R -particles in initiation (species \mathcal{RM}_I).
 - $N - r - s$ is the number of R -particles paired with an M -particle (species \mathcal{RM}_I or \mathcal{RM}_L),
 - $M_N^0 - (N - r - s)$ is the number of free (i.e. not paired) M -particles.
- (b) q is the number of free Q -particles;
- (c) u is the number of free U -particles, $U_N^0 - u$ is the number of paired Q -particles.

The kinetics of our system is Markovian, driven by the *law of mass action*, see Waage and Guldberg [33] and Voit et al. [32]. For the reactions



with the chemical species $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}$, in state (x_A, x_B, x_C) , the number of copies of species \mathcal{C} grows at rate κx_A in the first reaction and $\kappa x_A x_B$ in the second one.

This gives that the Q -matrix \mathcal{Q}_N of the associated Markov process of our model

$$(X_N(t)) = (X_{N,i}(t), i \in \{s, r, \ell, q, u\}) = (S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t))$$

is defined by, for $x = (s, r, \ell, q, u)$,

$$(6) \quad x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} \text{Jump} & \text{Rate} \\ e_Q, & \kappa_{0Q} N, \\ -e_Q, & \kappa_{Q0} q, \\ -e_U - e_Q, & \kappa_{QU} uq. \end{cases} \quad x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R - e_L + e_U, & \kappa_{LR}(U_N^0 - u)l, \\ e_S - e_R, & \kappa_{RS} ru, \\ e_R - e_S, & \kappa_{SR} s, \\ -e_R, & \kappa_{RI}(M_N^0 - (N - r - s))r, \\ e_L, & \kappa_{IL}(N - r - s - l), \end{cases}$$

where e_R, e_L, e_U, e_S and e_Q are the unit vectors of \mathbb{N}^5 .

2.4. Occupation Measures and Orders of Magnitude. For the sake of readability, we make a slight abuse of notations for the set of indices in the following, we will use the notation $\{s, r, \ell, q, u\}$ instead of $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ and similarly for any subset.

If I is a subset of $\{s, r, \ell, q, u\}$, the random measure $\Lambda_{N,I}$ is the occupation measure associated to the process $(X_{N,i}(t), i \in I)$, i.e. the random measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^{|I|}$ defined by,

$$\langle \Lambda_{N,I}, f \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} f(t, (X_{N,i}(t), i \in I)) dt,$$

for $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^{|I|})$. In some situations, the fifth coordinate $(X_{N,u}(t)) = (U_N(t))$ may be replaced by $(U_N^0 - U_N(t))$ in the definition of $\Lambda_{N,I}$.

The scaled process on the index set I is defined by

$$(\bar{X}_{N,I}(t)) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left(\frac{X_{N,i}(t)}{N}, i \in I \right).$$

We will study the asymptotic behavior of this model for a convenient I when N goes to infinity. The scaling results obtained give the order of magnitude in N of the chemical species, proportional to N or $O(1)$ essentially. Mathematically, this is expressed rigorously by the following definition.

The three regimes in this paper are identified by the subset of the variables which are $O(1)$, they are “fast variables”, the other are “slow” variables, of the order of N . The convergence is expressed as follows.

Definition 2. For $I \subset \{s, r, \ell, q, u\}$, the coordinates of the process $(X_N(t))$ whose index is in I are said to be $O(1)$ and the others of the order of N if

- The initial condition is such that, for any $N \geq 1$, $X_{N,I}(0) = (X_{N,i}(0), i \in I)$ is a fixed element of $\mathbb{N}^{|I|}$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{X_{N,i}(0)}{N}, i \notin I \right) = (x_i, i \notin I) \in (0, +\infty)^{5-|I|}.$$

- The sequence of variables $((\bar{X}_{N,I^c}(t)), \Lambda_{N,I})$, with $I^c = \{s, r, \ell, q, u\} \setminus I$, is converging in distribution to $((x(t)), \Lambda_\infty)$, where $(x(t))$ is a non-trivial continuous process and Λ_∞ is a random measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^{|I|}$, such that, almost surely, $\Lambda_\infty(dx, \mathbb{N}^{|I|})$ is the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}_+ .

2.5. Stochastic Differential Equations. The Markov process $(X_N(t))$ is represented as a càdlàg process on \mathbb{N}^5 , the unique solution of a stochastic differential equation (SDE).

The probability space is such that, for any element κ of the set of reaction rates \mathcal{K} , see Relation (1), there is a Poisson process \mathcal{P}_κ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with intensity measure $\kappa ds \otimes dt$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . The Poisson processes \mathcal{P}_κ , $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$ are assumed to be independent. See Chapter 1 of Robert [27].

The associated filtration is (\mathcal{F}_t) , where, for $t \geq 0$, \mathcal{F}_t is the completed σ -field generated by set of random variables

$$(7) \quad \{\mathcal{P}_r(A \times [0, s]), r \in \mathcal{K}, s \leq t, A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+)\}.$$

Throughout the paper, the notions of adapted, optional processes, of martingale and stopping time are implicitly with respect to this filtration. See Rogers and Williams [28] for general definitions and results of stochastic calculus.

For $a \geq 0$ and $\kappa \in \mathcal{K}$, we will use the differential notation,

$$\mathcal{P}_\kappa((0, a), dt) = \int_{s=0}^a \mathcal{P}_\kappa(ds, dt).$$

Finally, throughout the paper, for $a > 0$, $\text{Pois}[a]$ denotes the Poisson distribution on \mathbb{N} with parameter a .

Let $(X_N(t)) = (S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t))$ be the unique solution of the following system of SDEs

$$\begin{aligned} dS_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RS}} \left((0, R_N(t-)U_N(t-)), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left((0, S_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ dR_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-))), dt \right) + \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left((0, S_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RS}} \left((0, R_N(t-)U_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left((0, (M_N^0 - (N - R_N(t-) - S_N(t-)))R_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ dL_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left((0, N - R_N(t-) - S_N(t-) - L_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-))), dt \right), \\ dQ_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QQ}} \left((0, N), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, Q_N(t-)U_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{Q0}} \left((0, Q_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ dU_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-))), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, Q_N(t-)U_N(t-)), dt \right), \end{aligned}$$

with initial point $(s, r, l, q, u) \in \mathcal{S}_N$.

Production Process. Since the P -particles are created via Reaction (4), with these notations, the number $P_N(t)$ of P -particles produced up to time $t \geq 0$, is therefore given by

$$(8) \quad P_N(t) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \int_{(0,t]} \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(s-)(U_N^0 - U_N(s-)) \right), ds \right).$$

The existence and uniqueness of the solution $(X_N(t))$ of this system of SDEs is standard by constructing by induction the sequence of the instants of jump and the state at these instants. Such a solution has the same distribution as the Markov process with Q -matrix \mathcal{Q}_N and initial point (s, r, l, q, u) . It is easily checked by showing that it is the solution of the martingale problem associated to \mathcal{Q}_N . See Section IV.20 of Rogers and Williams [28] for example.

To simplify the mathematical model, it is tempting to merge the initiation and elongation phases, into one phase. It would reduce the dimension of the state space to 4 instead of 5. As a model of the regulation of gene expression, this is of course not accurate from a biological point of view. Mathematically, it can be shown that the associated Markov process of this reduced system does not exhibit the qualitative properties described in Section 1.3: When the network is under-loaded, the number of complexes RM_L , the process $(L_N(t))$, is always of the order of N so that Regime (b) i) does not exist. This would imply that for a biological cell under stress a significant fraction of proteins would exhibit errors, which is unlikely biologically.

The Use of Poisson Processes on \mathbb{R}_+^2 in the SDEs. If $(\lambda(t))$ is a càdlàg adapted process, a Poisson point process with intensity $(\lambda(t))$ can be represented in two ways:

- (a) Following Kurtz, see Ethier and Kurtz [7], if \mathcal{N} is a Poisson point process with rate 1 on \mathbb{R}_+ , the counting measure of such a point process can be expressed as

$$(\mathcal{A}(t)) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left(\mathcal{N} \left(0, \int_0^t \lambda(s) ds \right) \right).$$

- (b) In our paper we take the representation

$$(\mathcal{B}(t)) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left(\int_0^t \mathcal{P}((0, \lambda(s-))), ds \right),$$

where \mathcal{P} is a Poisson process on \mathbb{R}_+^2 with intensity measure $ds \otimes dt$.

It is not difficult to see that $(\mathcal{A}(t))$ and $(\mathcal{B}(t))$ have the same distribution.

It should be noted that the filtration (\mathcal{F}_t) we have defined is dependent of the process $(\lambda(t))$. A natural filtration for $(\mathcal{A}(t))$ would, a priori, depend on $(\lambda(t))$. When coupling constructions are considered, there may be different such processes $(\lambda(t))$, with a common driving Poisson process. The definition of the filtration, which is crucial for martingale, stopping time properties, is not impossible in this case, but may be quite cumbersome to define properly.

2.6. The Different Asymptotic Regimes. To stress the impact of the regulation mechanism, we have also analyzed in Section 3 the model without the regulation, i.e. when R -particles cannot be sequestered. The regulation mechanism is analyzed in Section 4.

2.6.1. System without Regulation.

The state space in this case is

$$\mathcal{S}_N = \{x=(r, \ell, q, u) \in \mathbb{N}^4 : r+\ell \leq N, u \leq U_N^0\},$$

and the Markov process has four coordinates

$$(X_N(t)) = (R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t)).$$

A heuristic picture. In view of the discussion of the introduction, a desired state is that the processes of R -particles in elongation ($L_N(t)$) and the process of the number of free U -particles ($U_N(t)$) should be $O(1)$. Since $C_M > 1$, the transition from \mathcal{R} to \mathcal{RM}_I is quick, so the same property holds for $(R_N(t))$. Consequently, the coordinates $(R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$ should be $O(1)$. This implies that all, but a finite number, of the N R -particles are in the species \mathcal{RM}_I . Similarly, the arriving Q -particles are quickly paired with a U -particle. The arrival rate of Q -particles is κ_{Q} and their consumption rate, via the production of P -particles is of the order of $\kappa_{\text{IL}} N$. Hence if $\kappa_{\text{Q}} > \kappa_{\text{IL}}$, there will be an excess of Q -particles, so that the process $(L_N(t))$ of the number of proteins in elongation is $O(1)$ with high probability on finite time intervals, which is desirable to avoid the production of non-functional proteins in the case of gene expression.

Our main results are summarized in the following theorem. A more precise version of these results are given by Propositions 10 and 12 of Section 3.

Theorem 3. *Under the scaling conditions (5),*

- (a) *if $\kappa_{\text{Q}} > \kappa_{\text{IL}}$, and the initial state is $x_N(0) = (r, \ell, q_N, u) \in \mathcal{S}_N$ and*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{q_N}{N} = q_\infty > 0,$$

The coordinates $(R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$ are $O(1)$ and the convergence in distribution

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{Q_N(t)}{N} \right) = (q(t)),$$

holds, where $(q(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$\dot{q}(t) = \kappa_{\text{Q}} - \kappa_{\text{IL}} + \kappa_{\text{Q}} q(t),$$

starting at q_∞ .

- (b) *If $\kappa_{\text{Q}} < \kappa_{\text{IL}}$ and $x_N(0) = (r, \ell_N, q, U_N^0 - u)$, with $r, q, u \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\ell_N}{N} = \ell_0 \in (0, 1),$$

The coordinates $(R_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N^0 - U_N(t))$ are $O(1)$ and the convergence in distribution

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right) = (\ell(t)),$$

where $(\ell(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$(9) \quad \dot{\ell}(t) = \kappa_{\text{IL}} - \kappa_{\text{Q}} - \kappa_{\text{IL}} \ell(t),$$

starting at ℓ_0 .

Note that the equilibrium point of the ODE (9) is $\eta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - \kappa_{0Q}/\kappa_{IL} > 0$, the fraction of R -particles in elongation is greater than $(\ell_0 \wedge \eta)/2$ with high probability on any finite time interval. Hence when $\kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL}$, the system has a large number R -particles in elongation. In the context of gene expression, this implies that non-functional proteins will be produced on a regular basis.

2.6.2. System with Regulation. Our main results on the regulation are summarized in the following theorem. A more detailed version of these results, with the explicit expressions of the corresponding limiting occupation measures, is given by Propositions 17 and 15 of Section 4.

Theorem 4. *Under the scaling conditions (5),*

- (a) *If $\kappa_{0Q} > \kappa_{IL}$, the assertions of (a) of Theorem 3 hold and the coordinates $(S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$ are $O(1)$.*
- (b) *If $\kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL}$ and*

$$(10) \quad \frac{\kappa_{SR}}{\kappa_{RS}} \frac{\kappa_{RI}}{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) < C_U$$

and if $x_N(0) = (s_N, r, \ell, q, u_N)$, with $r, q, \ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} (s_N/N, u_N/N) = (s_0, u_0) \in V_0.$$

where V_0 is an open subset of $(0, 1) \times (0, C_U)$, then $(R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t))$ is $O(1)$ and, for the convergence in distribution, the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} (S_N(t)/N, U_N(t)/N) = (s(t), u(t)),$$

holds, where $(s(t), u(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u}(t) &= \kappa_{IL}(1-s(t)) - \kappa_{0Q} \\ \dot{s}(t) &= \kappa_{RS}u(t) \frac{\kappa_{IL}(1-s(t)) + \kappa_{SR}s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - (1-s(t))) + \kappa_{RS}u(t)} - \kappa_{SR}s(t), \end{aligned}$$

starting at (s_0, u_0) .

- (c) *If $\kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL}$ and*

$$(11) \quad \frac{\kappa_{SR}}{\kappa_{RS}} \frac{\kappa_{RI}}{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) > C_U$$

hold, and if $x_N(0) = (s_N, r, \ell_N, q, U_N^0 - u)$, with $r, q, u \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{s_N}{N}, \frac{\ell_N}{N} \right) = (s_0, \ell_0) \text{ with } \ell_0, s_0 > 0 \text{ and } s_0 + \ell_0 < 1.$$

then the coordinates $(R_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N^0 - U_N(t))$ are $O(1)$ and, for the convergence in distribution, the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{S_N(t)}{N}, \frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right) = (s(t), \ell(t)),$$

holds, where $(s(t), \ell(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\ell}(t) &= \kappa_{IL}(1-\ell(t)-s(t)) - \kappa_{0Q}, \\ \dot{s}(t) &= \kappa_{RS}C_U \frac{\kappa_{0Q} + \kappa_{SR}s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - 1 + s(t) + \ell(t)) + \kappa_{RS}C_U} - \kappa_{SR}s(t) \end{aligned}$$

starting at (s_0, ℓ_0) .

In case (b), despite that there are not sufficiently many Q -particles, the number of R -particles in elongation remains finite in contrast with (b) of Theorem 3 when there is no regulation. The R -particles are in some way put aside by the sequestration, thereby showing the efficiency of this scheme. There are limitations to the sequestration mechanism nevertheless, since this property of stability does not hold anymore when Condition (10) is not valid.

2.7. The $M/M/\infty$ process. We introduce a classical birth and death process, the $M/N/\infty$ queue, technical results for this process play an important role in the proof of our convergence results. See Chapter 6 of Robert [27].

Definition 5. *The $M/M/\infty$ queue with input rate $\lambda \geq 0$ and service rate $\mu > 0$ is a Markov process on \mathbb{N} with transition rates, for $x \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$x \longrightarrow \begin{cases} x+1 & \lambda, \\ x-1 & \mu x. \end{cases}$$

Its invariant distribution is $\text{Pois}[\rho]$, a Poisson distribution with parameter $\rho = \lambda/\mu$.




FIGURE 2. $M/M/\infty$ queue

The following technical proposition on the $M/M/\infty$ queue will be used repeatedly in the following.

Proposition 6.

- (a) *Let $(L(t))$ be the process of an $M/M/\infty$ queue with input rate $\lambda > 0$ and service rate $\mu > 0$ with $L(0) = \ell \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any $\delta > 0$, $T > 0$,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \leq T} \frac{L(N^\delta t)}{N} \geq 1 \right) = 0.$$

- (b) *Let $(L_N(t))$ be the process of an $M/M/\infty$ queue with input rate $\lambda N > 0$ and service rate $\mu > 0$ with initial condition $L_N(0)$ such that,*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{L_N(0)}{N} = \ell_0,$$

then, for any $\delta > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{L_N(N^\delta t)}{N} - \rho \right| > |\ell_0 - \rho| + \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$

with $\rho = \lambda/\mu$ and, for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{\eta \leq t \leq T} \left| \frac{L_N(N^\delta t)}{N} - \rho \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$

In the context of the second case of this proposition, it is well known that, for the convergence in distribution

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right) = (\rho + (\ell_0 - \rho)e^{-\mu t}).$$

See Theorem 6.13 of [27] for example. The case b) gives a further characterization. By speeding up the timescale by a factor N^δ , then the process L_N is arbitrarily close to the fixed point ρ outside time 0, and do not escape from any of its neighborhoods on any finite time interval.

Proof. Define $u_N \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \lceil N^\delta \rceil$ and

$$H_N = \inf\{t > 0 : L(t) \geq u_N\}.$$

Proposition 6.10 of Robert [27] shows that $(H_N/(u_N-1)!)$ is converging in distribution to an exponential random variable. As a consequence, the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(H_N \leq N^\delta T) = 0,$$

holds. The case a) of the proposition is proved.

For the case b), a coupling is used. Assume $\rho \leq \ell_0 < \rho + \varepsilon$, define $v_N^1 = \lceil N(\rho + 2\varepsilon) \rceil$, and

$$H_N^1 = \inf\{t > 0 : L_N(t) \geq v_N^1\}.$$

We introduce $(Z_N(t))$, the Markov process with jump matrix

$$x \longrightarrow \begin{cases} x+1 & \lambda N, \\ x-1 & \mu N(\rho + \varepsilon) \mathbb{1}_{\{x > N(\rho + \varepsilon)\}}. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to construct a coupling of $(Z_N(t))$ and $(L_N(t))$, such that $L_N(t) \leq Z_N(t)$ holds for all $t \leq H_N^1$.

The $(Z_N(t))$ is a random walk with a reflection at $v_N^0 = \lfloor N(\rho + \varepsilon) \rfloor$. This process can be expressed as $v_N^0 + A(Nt)$, where $(A(t))$ is a birth and death process on \mathbb{N} with birth rate λ and death rate $\lambda + \mu\varepsilon$. This is the process of the $M/M/1$ queue, see Chapter 5 of [27].

The coupling gives that $T_N \leq NH_N^1$, with

$$T_N = \inf\{t \geq 0 : A(t) \geq N\varepsilon\}.$$

Proposition (5.11) of Robert [27] shows that there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that the sequence $(\alpha^n T_N)$ converges in distribution to an exponential distribution. This implies that (T_N/N^p) converges in distribution to $+\infty$ for any $p > 0$, hence

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(H_N^1 \leq N^\delta T) = 0.$$

The case $\rho \geq \ell_0 > \rho - \varepsilon$ is handled in a similar way. The first relation of b) is therefore established.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, the convergence of $(L_N(t)/N)$ to $(\rho + (\ell_0 - \rho)e^{-\mu t})$, shows that if

$$H_N^2 \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \frac{L_N(t)}{N} \in \left(\rho - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \rho + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right) \right\},$$

then there exists $K > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(H_N^2 \geq K)$ is arbitrarily small uniformly in N . In particular H_N^2 is less than ηN^δ with high probability. Our last assertion is proved by using the strong Markov property of $(L_N(t))$ for the stopping time H_N^2 and the first relation of b). \square

3. A MODEL WITHOUT REGULATION

In this section we investigate the production of P -particles when there is no possibility of sequestering R -particles. There are two regimes described roughly as follows.

- (a) When N is large, if the input rate of resources, Q -particles, is above some threshold then all R -particles but a finite number are paired in the initiation phase, the chemical species \mathcal{RM}_I . In particular there is a finite number of paired R -particles waiting for a Q particle, the chemical species \mathcal{RM}_L .
- (b) Otherwise, if the input rate is strictly less than this threshold the number of paired R -particles waiting for a Q particle is of the order of N .




FIGURE 3. Network without Regulation

Without the sequestration mechanism, the state space is

$$\mathcal{S}_N = \{x = (r, \ell, q, u) \in \mathbb{N}^4 : r + \ell \leq N, u \leq U_N^0\},$$

and the Markov process is $(X_N(t)) = (R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t))$, with Q -matrix, for $x = (r, \ell, q, u) \in \mathcal{S}_N$,

$$x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R - e_L + e_u, & \kappa_{LR}(U_N^0 - u)\ell, \\ -e_R, & \kappa_{RI}(M_N^0 - (N-r))r, \\ e_L, & \kappa_{IL}(N - e - r), \end{cases} \text{ and } x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_Q, & \kappa_{Q0}N, \\ -e_Q, & \kappa_{Q0}q, \\ -e_U - e_Q, & \kappa_{QU}uq. \end{cases}$$

In this case the corresponding SDEs, see Section 2.5, are given by

$$(12) \quad \begin{cases} dR_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left(\left(0, (M_N^0 - (N - R_N(t-))) R_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dL_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left(\left(0, N - R_N(t-) - L_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-)) \right), dt \right), \\ dQ_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QI}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-) U_N(t-) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QO}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dU_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)(U_N^0 - U_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-) U_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

The following proposition is a technical result on fast processes in a simple setting. It will be used in the proof of the main result of this section. Its proof uses essentially standard arguments. It is nevertheless detailed since they will be used repeatedly without justification in subsequent proofs of this paper.

Proposition 7. *For $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$, let $(A_N(t), B_N(t))$ be the solution of the SDE,*

$$\begin{cases} dA_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left((0, N), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \alpha N A_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ dB_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \beta N A_N(t-)), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \eta N B_N(t-)), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

with initial condition (a, b) .

If μ_N is the occupation measure of $(A_N(t), B_N(t))$ on \mathbb{N}^2 , then the sequence (μ_N) is converging in distribution to $dt \otimes \pi$ with

$$\pi \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\alpha \kappa_{LR}} \right] \otimes \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\beta \kappa_{IL}}{\alpha \kappa_{QU}} \right],$$

and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \langle \mu_N, f \otimes h \rangle = \langle \mu_\infty, f \otimes h \rangle,$$

for any function $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $h \in L_1(\pi)$, in particular for any h such that

$$|h(a, b)| \leq C_1 + C_2(a + b), \forall (a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2,$$

for some constants C_1 and C_2 .

For any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, $p \geq 1$, $T > 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(13) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{t \leq T} \frac{(A_N + B_N)(N^p t)}{N^\delta} \geq \varepsilon \right) = 0.$$

Finally, the relation

$$(14) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{1}{N} \int_0^t A_N(u) du, \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t B_N(u) du \right) = \left(\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\kappa_{LR} \beta} t, \frac{\kappa_{IL} \beta}{\kappa_{QU} \alpha} t \right)$$

holds for the convergence in distribution of processes.

Recall that, Section 2.5, for $a > 0$, $\text{Pois}[a]$ is the Poisson distribution on \mathbb{N} with parameter a . In Relation (14), the convergence in distribution of the marginals is a direct consequence of the convergence of (μ_N) .

Proof. Let $(Y(t))=(A(t), B(t))$ be the Markov process on \mathbb{N}^2 with Q -matrix given by

$$x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_1, & \kappa_{IL}, \\ e_2 - e_1, & \kappa_{LR}\alpha x_1, \\ e_2, & \kappa_{LR}(\beta - \alpha)x_1, \\ -e_2, & \kappa_{QU}\eta x_2, \end{cases}$$

and initial point (a, b) . It is clear that $(A_N(t), B_N(t)) \stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} (Y(Nt))$. Note that the first coordinate $(A(t))$ is an $M/M/\infty$ process, its invariant measure is a Poisson distribution with parameter $\kappa_{IL}/(\alpha\kappa_{LR})$. The process $(Y(t))$ itself is a positive recurrent Markov process. Indeed, it is easily checked that the function F on \mathbb{N}^2 defined by $F(r, l) = a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2$ is a Lyapounov function satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 8.14 of Robert [27] provided that the positive constants a_1 and a_2 are chosen so that $\beta a_2 < \alpha a_1$ holds. We denote by π its invariant distribution.

By representing $(Y(t))$ as the solution of an SDE, one gets that if $Y(0) \stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} (0, 0)$ and $K > 0$, then one gets the relation

$$\eta\kappa_{QU}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t (B(s) \wedge K) ds\right) \leq \beta\kappa_{LR}\mathbb{E}\left(\int_0^t A(s) ds\right),$$

and by dividing this relation by t and by letting t go to infinity, the mean ergodic theorem for positive recurrent Markov processes gives the relation

$$\eta\kappa_{QU} \int_{\mathbb{N}^2} (b \wedge K) \pi(da, db) \leq \beta\kappa_{LR} \int_{\mathbb{N}^2} a \pi(da, db) = \frac{\beta\kappa_{IL}}{\alpha},$$

for all $K > 0$. By letting K go to infinity, one gets that the first moments of π are finite.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $K_0 > 0$ such that $\pi([0, K_0]^2) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, so that, for $T > 0$,

$$\langle \mu_N, [0, T] \times [0, K_0]^2 \rangle = \int_0^T \mathbb{1}_{\{Y(Ns) \in [0, K_0]^2\}} ds = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^{NT} \mathbb{1}_{\{Y(s) \in [0, K_0]^2\}} ds,$$

and therefore, again by the mean ergodic theorem,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{E}(\langle \mu_N, [0, T] \times [0, K_0]^2 \rangle) = T\pi([0, K_0]^2).$$

From Lemma 1.3 of Kurtz [20], we obtain that (μ_N) is tight for the convergence in distribution. If $h: \mathbb{N}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is in $L_1(\pi)$ then,

$$\langle \mu_N, \mathbb{1}_{[0, T]} \otimes h \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \int_0^{NT} h(Y(s)) ds \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow +\infty} T \int h(y) \pi(dy),$$

almost surely, by the pointwise ergodic theorem. We get that (μ_N) is converging in distribution to $dt \otimes \pi$ and that the convergence holds for all functions $f \otimes h$ such that, $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $h \in L_1(\pi)$.

Fix $\delta_0 < \delta$, from Lemma (6), for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and $T > 0$, we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_N) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, for N sufficiently large, with

$$\mathcal{E}_N \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left\{ \sup_{t \leq T} \frac{A_N(t)}{N^{\delta_0}} \leq 1 \right\},$$

if $(F_N(t))$ is the solution of the SDE

$$dF_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \beta N^{\delta_0}), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \eta F_N(t-)), dt \right),$$

with $F_N(0)=B_N(0)$. It is easily checked that the relation $B_N(t)\leq F_N(Nt)$, for all $t\leq T$ on the event \mathcal{E}_N . From Proposition 6, there exists $K_0>0$ such that

$$\lim_{N\rightarrow+\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\leq T} \frac{B_N(N^p t)}{N^{\delta_0}} \geq K\right) = 0.$$

For the last assertion of the proposition, since the possible limit is determined by the ergodic theorem, it is enough to prove the convergence of each of the coordinates of the sequence of processes and therefore the tightness of this sequence. From the SDE for $(A_N(t))$, we have

$$\frac{A_N(t)}{N} = \frac{a}{N} + M_N^A(t) + \kappa_{IL}t - \beta\kappa_{LR} \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t A_N(u) du,$$

where $(M_N^A(t))$ is a martingale. With Doob's Inequality, it is easily seen $(M_N(t))$ is converging in distribution to (0). We have shown, Relation (13), that $(A_N(t)/N)$ is converging to (0) and, hence, the convergence of the first coordinate of Relation (14). Using again the SDE, one gets

$$\beta \frac{A_N(t)}{N} + \alpha \frac{A_N(t)}{N} = \beta a + \alpha b + M_N^B(t) + \alpha\kappa_{IL}t - \kappa_{QU} \int_0^t B_N(u) du,$$

the desired convergence follows in the same way. The proposition is proved. \square

To prove that the process $(Y(t))$ is a positive recurrent Markov process, we have used a Lyapounov criterion. In fact it is easily verified that

$$\pi = \text{Pois}\left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\alpha\kappa_{LR}}\right] \otimes \text{Pois}\left[\frac{\beta\kappa_{IL}}{\alpha\kappa_{QU}}\right]$$

is its invariant distribution. We could have used this explicit representation to simplify our proof. It is unfortunately not always available for all the cases studied in the following. The above method with Lyapounov function and ergodic theorems applies in these cases.

We now prove another technical result on the perturbation of a scaled $M/M/\infty$ queue.

Proposition 8. *Let $(V_N(t))$ and $(W_N(t))$ be non-negative optional processes with values in $[0, N]$, resp. in $[0, U_N]$, we denote by $(A_N(t))$ the solution of*

$$(15) \quad dA_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}}\left(\left(0, N - V_N(t-)\right), dt\right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}}\left(\left(0, A_N(t-)(U_N^0 - W_N(t-))\right), dt\right),$$

with the initial condition $A_N(0)=a\in\mathbb{N}$

If there exists $\delta\in(0, 1)$ such that, for any $T>0$,

$$\lim_{N\rightarrow+\infty} \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{t\leq T} \frac{V_N(t)}{N^\delta} \geq 1, \sup_{t\leq T} \frac{W_N(t)}{N^\delta} \geq 1\right) = 0,$$

then the sequence of occupation measures of $(A_N(t))$ converges in distribution to the measure $dt\otimes\text{Pois}[\kappa_{IL}/(\kappa_{LR}C_U)]$.

Proof. In the same way as in the proof of Proposition 7, with Lemma 1.3 of Kurtz [20] we can prove that the sequence (μ_N) of occupation measures of $(A_N(t))$ is tight.

Lemma 1.4 of this reference shows that any limiting point μ_∞ can be represented as, for $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N})$,

$$\langle \mu_\infty, g \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}} g(s, a) \pi_s(da) ds,$$

almost surely, where (π_s) is an optional process with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, and the convergence to μ_∞ holds for function g of the type $f \otimes h$, for $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $h: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $(h(x)/x, x \geq 1)$ is bounded.

If $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ has finite support then, almost surely, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$(16) \quad f(A_N(t)) = f(a) + M_N^f(t) + \kappa_{IL} \int_0^t \nabla_1(f)(A_N(s))(N - V_N(s)) ds \\ + \kappa_{LR} \int_0^t \nabla_{-1}(f)(A_N(s)) A_N(s) (U_N^0 - W_N(s)) ds,$$

where $(M_N^f(t))$ is a martingale. Using the assumption on $(V_N(t))$ and $(W_N(t))$, as in the proof of Proposition 7, we obtain that the sequences of processes

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} M_N^f(t) \right) \text{ and } \left(\frac{1}{N} \int_0^t (V_N(s) + A_N(s) W_N(s)) ds \right)$$

are converging in distribution to (0). By dividing Relation (16) by N and by taking a convenient subsequence we obtain that the relation

$$\left(\int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{N}} (\kappa_{IL} \nabla_1(f)(a) + \kappa_{LR} C_U a \nabla_{-1}(f)(a)) \pi_s(da) ds \right) = (0),$$

holds almost surely. Since the operator Ω defined by

$$\Omega(f)(a) = \kappa_{IL} \nabla_1(f)(a) + \kappa_{LR} C_U a \nabla_{-1}(f)(a)$$

is the infinitesimal generator of the $M/M/\infty$ queue with input rate κ_{IL} and service rate $\kappa_{LR} C_U$, by following the standard method of Kurtz [20] we get that, for $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N})$, the relation

$$\langle \mu_\infty, g \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}} g(s, a) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\kappa_{LR} C_U} \right] (da) ds$$

holds almost surely. The proposition is proved. \square

The Markov process of Proposition 7 is related to a fast process of one of the models considered in this paper. As usual the invariant distribution of the fast processes plays an important role in the dynamical behavior of the slow variables. We have seen that it has a product form which is a desirable property. The three-dimensional fast process of the stability result of this section, Theorem 10 does not have this property. Nevertheless its invariant distribution has an explicit representation. This is the result of the following lemma.

Proposition 9. *For $\lambda > 0$, $\mu_i > 0$, $i = R, L, U$, the invariant distribution of the Markov process on \mathbb{N}^3 with Q -matrix given by*

$$x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R + e_U - e_L, & \mu_L x_L, \\ -e_R, & \mu_R x_R, \\ -e_U, & \mu_U x_U, \\ e_L, & \lambda, \end{cases}$$

is the distribution of the random vector $(X + Y_1, Z, X + Y_2)$, where X, Y_1, Y_2, Z , are independent Poisson random variables with respective parameters

$$\frac{\lambda}{\mu_R + \mu_U}, \quad \frac{\lambda \mu_U}{\mu_R(\mu_R + \mu_U)}, \quad \frac{\lambda \mu_R}{\mu_U(\mu_R + \mu_U)}, \quad \frac{\lambda}{\mu_L}.$$

Proof. This Markov process can also be represented as follows: there Poisson arrivals of particles at node 2 with rate λ , each particle leaves the node after an exponentially distributed amount of time with rate μ_2 and, at this instant, creates a particle at node 1 and a particle at node 3. The distribution of the lifetimes of particles at node 1 and 3 are exponential with respective parameters μ_1 and μ_3 .

We use the method of Fromion et al. [10], see also Robert [26]. The trick is of using a Poisson marked point process on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}^3$,

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}(dt, dx) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \delta_{(t_n, L_1^N, L_2^N, L_3^N)},$$

where (t_n) is the sequence of the points of a Poisson process on \mathbb{R}_+ with rate λ and for $i=1, 2, 3$, (L_i^N) is an i.i.d. sequence with an exponential distribution with parameter μ_i . All theses sequences are independent. The intensity of the Poisson process is the positive measure

$$m_{\mathcal{N}}(du, dx) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \lambda du \otimes \mu_1 e^{-\mu_1 x_1} dx_1 \otimes \mu_2 e^{-\mu_2 x_2} dx_2 \otimes \mu_3 e^{-\mu_3 x_3} dx_3$$

on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^3$, F is a non-negative Borelian function on this state space,

$$(17) \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(- \int F(u, x) \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \right) \right) = \left(\exp \left(- \int \left(1 - e^{-F(u, x)} m_{\mathcal{N}}(du, dx) \right) \right) \right)$$

If the system starts empty at time 0, for $t \geq 0$ then it is easy to see that the state $A(t)$ of the Markov process at time t as the same distribution as $(A_1(t), A_2(t), A_3(t))$ with

$$\begin{aligned} A_2(t) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathbb{1}_{\{t_n \leq t < t_n + L_2^n\}} = \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq t < u + x_2\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \\ &\stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} \int_{[-t, 0] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0 < u + x_2\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{[-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq 0 < u + x_2\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \\ &\stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} \int_{[0, +\infty] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u \leq x_2\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx), \end{aligned}$$

the two relations in distribution of this relation are a consequence of the invariance of the distribution of \mathcal{N} by the two transformations of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}^2$, $(s, x) \mapsto (s - t, x)$ and $(s, x) \mapsto (-s, x)$. See Chapter 1 of Robert [27].

Similarly for $i=1, 3$

$$\begin{aligned} A_i(t) &= \int_{[0, t] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u + x_2 \leq t < u + x_2 + x_i\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \\ &\stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} \int_{[-t, 0] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u + x_2 \leq 0 < u + x_2 + x_i\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{[-\infty, 0] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{u + x_2 \leq 0 < u + x_2 + x_i\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \\ &\stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} \int_{[0, +\infty] \times \mathbb{N}^3} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_2 \leq u < x_2 + x_i\}} \mathcal{N}(du, dx). \end{aligned}$$

We have therefore that $(A(t))$ converges in distribution to $(A_1(\infty), A_2(\infty), A_3(\infty))$, with, for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $j \in \{2, 3\}$,

$$A_i(\infty) = \int f_i(u, x) \mathcal{N}(du, dx), \text{ with } f_2(u, x) = \mathbb{1}_{\{0 \leq u < x_2\}}, f_j(u, x) = \mathbb{1}_{\{x_2 \leq u < x_2 + x_j\}}.$$

Since, for $j \in \{2, 3\}$, $f_2 f_j \equiv 0$, the independence properties of Poisson properties imply that $A_2(\infty)$ is independent of $(A_1(\infty), A_3(\infty))$. Since $(A_2(t))$ has the same distribution as an $M/M/\infty$ process with input rate λ and service rate μ_2 , its invariant distribution, the law of $A_2(\infty)$, is Poisson with parameter λ/μ_2 .

The Laplace transform of $(A_1(\infty), A_3(\infty))$ at (ξ_1, ξ_3) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(e^{-\xi_1 A_1(\infty) - \xi_3 A_3(\infty)} \right) \\ = \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(- \int_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3} (\xi_1 f_1(u, x) + \xi_3 f_3(u, x)) \mathcal{N}(du, dx) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We can now use Relation (17) to get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(e^{-\xi_1 A_1(\infty) - \xi_3 A_3(\infty)} \right) = \exp \left((1 - e^{-\xi_1 - \xi_3}) \frac{\lambda}{\mu_1 + \mu_3} \right. \\ \left. + (1 - e^{-\xi_1}) \frac{\lambda \mu_3}{\mu_1(\mu_1 + \mu_3)} + (1 - e^{-\xi_3}) \frac{\lambda \mu_1}{\mu_3(\mu_1 + \mu_3)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proposition is proved. \square

We can now establish our main stability result when there is no regulation.

Theorem 10 (Stability). *Under the scaling assumptions (5), if $\kappa_{0Q} > \kappa_{IL}$, and the initial state is $x_N(0) = (r, \ell, q_N, u) \in \mathcal{S}_N$, such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{q_N}{N} = q_0 > 0,$$

and $\Lambda_N \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}^3)$ is the occupation measure of $(R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$, then, for the convergence in distribution,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\left(\frac{Q_N(t)}{N} \right), \Lambda_N \right) = ((q(t)), \Lambda_\infty),$$

where $(q(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$\dot{q}(t) = \kappa_{0Q} - \kappa_{IL} - \kappa_{Q0} q(t),$$

starting at q_0 , and Λ_∞ is the measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3$ defined by, for $F \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$,

$$\begin{aligned} (18) \quad \langle \Lambda_\infty, F \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}^4} F(t, a+v, b, a+w) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{C_\kappa} \right] (da) \\ \times \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\kappa_{LR} C_U} \right] (db) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL} \kappa_{Q0} q(t)}{\kappa_{RI} (C_M - 1) C_\kappa} \right] (dv) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL} \kappa_{RI} (C_M - 1)}{\kappa_{Q0} q(t) C_\kappa} \right] (dw) dt, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_\kappa = \kappa_{RI} (C_M - 1) + \kappa_{Q0}$.

A glance at the SDEs (12) shows that, provided that the process stays in the subset of points similar to the initial point, the three process $(R_N(t), (L_N(t), (L_N(t)$ are “fast processes” in the sense that their transition rates are of the order of N , and therefore with large fluctuations. The kinetics of $(Q_N(t)/N)$ are $O(1)$, it will be referred to as a “slow variable”. The main challenge of the proof of the convergence

of the theorem, is of controlling the fluctuations of the fast processes so that the process stays indeed in the subset of points similar to the initial point.

Proof. We first give a sketch of the strategy of the proof. We first introduce a stopping time τ_N before that either the fast process $(U_N(t)/N)$ is “too large” or the slow process $(Q_N(t)/N)$ is “too small”. On the time interval $[0, \tau_N]$ an auxiliary process $(\tilde{X}_N(t))=(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t), \tilde{U}_N(t))$ is constructed with the following property: it has three fast processes $(\tilde{R}_N(t))$, $(\tilde{L}_N(t))$, $(\tilde{U}_N(t))$ are respectively greater than our fast processes $(R_N(t))$, $(L_N(t))$, $(U_N(t))$ and the slow variable $(\tilde{Q}_N(t)/N)$ is smaller than $(Q_N(t)/N)$. A convergence result is established for $(\tilde{X}_N(t))$ that will show that there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\tau_N \geq t_0$ with high probability and also a more precise control of the fast processes: the sequence of processes $(R_N(t)/\sqrt{N})$, $(L_N(t)/\sqrt{N})$, $(U_N(t)/\sqrt{N})$ are bounded in distribution on $[0, t_0]$. From there, with the help of Propositions 7 and 8 and with tightness arguments for occupation measures and $(Q_N(t)/N)$, one obtains the desired convergence result on $[0, t_0]$. With the condition $\kappa_{0Q} > \kappa_{IL}$, the procedure can be repeated on the time interval $[t_0, 2t_0]$, and therefore on the whole half-line.

We fix $T > 0$, the time interval for the convergence in distribution is $[0, T]$.

STEP 1: COUPLING.

Let $\eta \in (0, (q_0 \wedge 1)/4)$ and define

$$\tau_N \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \inf\{t > 0 : Q_N(t) \leq \eta N \text{ or } U_N(t) \geq \eta N\}.$$

Let $(\tilde{X}_N(t))=(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t), \tilde{U}_N(t))$ be the solution of the SDE,

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{R}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \bar{c}_u N \tilde{L}_N(t-)), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left((0, (\underline{c}_M - 1) N \tilde{R}_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{L}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left((0, N), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, (\underline{c}_u - \eta) N \tilde{L}_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{Q}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{0Q}} \left((0, N), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-) \tilde{U}_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{Q0}} \left((0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{U}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \bar{c}_u N \tilde{L}_N(t-)), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \eta N \tilde{U}_N(t-)), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

with $\tilde{X}_N(0)=(r, \ell, q_N, u)$, where $\underline{c}_u = C_U/2$, $\underline{c}_m = C_M/2$ and $\bar{c}_u = 2C_U$

Using these SDEs and Relations (12) and with a simple, but careful, induction on the sequence of instants of jumps of the process $(X_N(t), \tilde{X}_N(t))$, one can show that, if N is sufficiently large, the relations

$$(19) \quad R_N(t) \leq \tilde{R}_N(t), \quad L_N(t) \leq \tilde{L}_N(t), \quad U_N(t) \leq \tilde{U}_N(t), \quad Q_N(t) \geq \tilde{Q}_N(t),$$

hold for all $t \leq \tau_N$.

STEP 2: ANALYSIS OF $(\tilde{X}_N(t))$

With the same method used in the proof of Proposition 7, we obtain that the sequence of occupation measures $\tilde{\mu}_N$ of $(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{U}_N(t))$ is converging in distribution to $\tilde{\mu}_\infty = dt \otimes \tilde{\pi}$, where $\tilde{\pi}$ is the invariant distribution of the Markov process on \mathbb{N}^3 whose Q -matrix is given by, for $x=(r, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{N}^3$,

$$x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R + e_U - e_L, & \kappa_{LR}(\bar{c}_u - \eta), \\ e_R + e_U, & \kappa_{LR}\eta, \end{cases} \begin{cases} -e_R, & \kappa_{RI}(\underline{c}_m - 1)r, \\ -e_U, & \kappa_{QU}u, \\ e_L, & \kappa_{IL}. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore the first moments of $\tilde{\pi}$ are finite and the convergence of $\langle \tilde{\mu}_N, f \otimes h \rangle$ to $\langle \tilde{\mu}_\infty, f \otimes h \rangle$ holds for all $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $h \in L_1(\pi)$.

The SDE for $(\tilde{Q}_N(t))$ gives the relation

$$(20) \quad \tilde{Q}_N(t) = q_N + \tilde{M}_N(t) + \kappa_{IL} Nt - \kappa_{QU} \int_0^t \tilde{Q}_N(s) \tilde{U}_N(s) ds - \kappa_{Q0} \int_0^t \tilde{Q}_N(s) ds,$$

where $(\tilde{M}_N(t))$ is a martingale whose previsible increasing process is given by

$$\left(\langle \tilde{M}_N \rangle(t) \right) = \left(\kappa_{IL} Nt + \kappa_{QU} \int_0^t \tilde{Q}_N(s) \tilde{U}_N(s) ds + \kappa_{Q0} \int_0^t \tilde{Q}_N(s) ds \right).$$

From the SDE for the process $(\tilde{Q}_N(t))$, one has the relation, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\tilde{Q}_N(t) \leq q_N + \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{Q0}} \left((0, N), [0, t] \right).$$

We get that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists K_0 such that, for N sufficiently large, the relation $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_N^1) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ holds where \mathcal{F}_N^1 is the event

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{F}_N^1 \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left\{ \sup_{s \leq T} \frac{\tilde{Q}_N(s)}{N} \leq K_0 \right\}.$$

Let

$$H_N = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \tilde{U}_N(t) \geq \sqrt{N} \text{ or } \tilde{Q}_N(t) \geq K_0 N \right\},$$

then, by Doob's Inequality the process $(M_N(t \wedge H_N)/N)$ is converging in distribution to (0). Proposition 7 show that the sequence $\mathbb{P}(H_N \leq T)$ is converging to 0, and therefore $(M_N(t))$ is converging in distribution to (0) on the time interval $[0, T]$.

For $s \leq t \leq T$ and $\delta > 0$, Relation (20) gives that, on the event \mathcal{F}_N^1 , the relation

$$(22) \quad \sup_{\substack{s \leq t \leq T \\ |s-t| \leq \delta}} \left| \frac{\tilde{Q}_N(t)}{N} - \frac{\tilde{Q}_N(s)}{N} \right| \leq 2 \sup_{s \leq T} |\tilde{M}_N(s)| + \kappa_{IL} Nt + \kappa_{QU} K_0 \sup_{\substack{s \leq t \leq T \\ |s-t| \leq \delta}} \frac{1}{N} \int_s^t \tilde{U}_N(u) du + \kappa_{Q0} K_0 \delta$$

holds. Relation (14) of Proposition 7 gives that the sequence of processes

$$\left(\frac{1}{N} \int_0^t \tilde{U}_N(u) du \right)$$

is converging in distribution and is therefore tight. Using the criterion of the modulus of continuity, see Theorem 7.3 of Billingsley [3], Relation (22) gives that the sequence of processes $(\tilde{Q}_N(t)/N)$ is tight and, due to the convergence of $(\tilde{\mu}_N)$, if $(\tilde{q}(t))$ is a limiting point of $(\tilde{Q}_N(t)/N)$ then it satisfies the relation

$$\tilde{q}(t) = q_0 + \kappa_{IL} t - \left(\kappa_{QU} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} u \tilde{\pi}(d\ell, dq, du) - \kappa_{Q0} \right) \int_0^t \tilde{q}(s) ds,$$

which implies the convergence in distribution of $(\tilde{Q}_N(t)/N)$. We conclude from the convergence of $(\tilde{\mu}_N, (\tilde{Q}_N(t)/N))$ and Proposition 7 that there exists some $0 < t_0 \leq T$ and $\eta_0 > 0$ such that if $q_0 > \eta_0$ and

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{F}_N^2 \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left\{ \sup_{s \leq t_0} \frac{\tilde{Q}_N(s)}{N} \geq \eta_0, \sup_{s \leq t_0} \frac{\tilde{R}_N(s) + \tilde{L}_N(s) + \tilde{U}_N(s)}{\sqrt{N}} \leq 1 \right\},$$

then the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_N^2) = 1$$

holds. In particular, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_N \leq t_0) = 0,$$

the coupling relation (19) holds on the time interval $[0, t_0]$ with high probability. From now on it is assumed that $q_0 > \eta_0$.

STEP 3: CONVERGENCE

In the same way as in Step 2, with Relation (23), we get that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists K_0 such that, for N sufficiently large, the relation $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_N) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ holds with

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{E}_N \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \left\{ \frac{Q_N(t)}{N} \in [\eta_0, K_0], \forall t \in [0, t_0] \right\}.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 7, on the event \mathcal{E}_N , there exists a coupling such that $(U_N(t))$ is upper bounded by a process $(Z_1(Nt))$, where $(Z_1(t))$ is an $M/M/\infty$ process on the time interval $[0, t_0]$.

We have seen that the coupling relation (19) on the time interval t_0 holds with high probability. Since the sequence of occupation measures of $(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{U}_N(t))$ is converging in distribution, the sequence of occupation measures (Λ_N) of the processes $(R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$, restricted to $[0, t_0] \times \mathbb{N}^3$ is therefore tight. From Relation (23) and Proposition 8, any limiting point Λ_∞ of this sequence can be represented as, for $g \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$,

$$(25) \quad \langle \Lambda_\infty, g \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} g(s, a) \pi_s(da) ds,$$

almost surely, where (π_s) is an optional process with values in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^3)$. Furthermore the convergence to Λ_∞ , along some subsequence, holds for a function g of the type $f \otimes h$, for $f \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+)$ and $h: \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, such that $(|h(a)|/(a_1 + a_2 + a_3), a = (a_i) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \setminus \{0\})$ is bounded.

With Relation (12), we have, for $t \geq 0$,

$$(26) \quad \overline{Q}_N(t) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \frac{Q_N(t)}{N} = \frac{q_N}{N} + M_N^0(t) + \kappa_{\alpha Q} t - \kappa_{QU} \int_0^t \overline{Q}_N(u) U_N(u) du - \kappa_{\alpha Q} \int_0^t \overline{Q}_N(u) du,$$

where $(\overline{M}_N(t))$ is a martingale.

By using the fact that the event $\mathcal{F}_N^2 \cap \mathcal{E}_N$ has a probability arbitrarily close to 1 when N gets large, in the same way as in Step 2, we can show that the martingale $(\overline{M}_N(t))$ is vanishing and, with the criterion of the modulus of continuity, that the sequence of processes $(\overline{Q}_N(t))$ is tight on the time interval $[0, t_0]$, and if $(q(t))$ is a limiting point, it is continuous on $[0, t_0]$ and lower bounded by $\eta_0 > 0$. By taking a convenient subsequence (N_k) it can be assumed that $(\Lambda_{N_k}, (\overline{Q}_{N_k}(t)))$ is converging in distribution to $(\Lambda_\infty, (q(t)))$ on the time interval $[0, t_0]$.

As in the proof of Proposition 7, by using the SDEs (12) and by writing an equation for $h(R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$, for some function h on \mathbb{N}^3 with finite support, we obtain that the measure Λ_∞ can be almost surely be represented by Relation (25)

where, for $s \in [0, t_0]$, $\pi_s \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}^3)$ is the invariant distribution of the Markov process on \mathbb{N}^3 whose Q -matrix is given by, for $x = (r, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{N}^3$,

$$x \rightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_L, & \kappa_{iL}, \\ e_R + e_U - e_L, & \kappa_{LR} C_U \ell, \end{cases} \quad x \rightarrow x + \begin{cases} -e_R, & \kappa_{Ri}(C_M - 1)r, \\ -e_U, & \kappa_{QU} q(s)u. \end{cases}$$

This 3-dimensional process can be seen as a network of three $M/M/\infty$ queues, for the nodes L , R and U , with the following specific dynamic: When a job leaves node L , it generates two simultaneous arrivals at node R and U respectively. See Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. Stable Case: $M/M/\infty$ network for fast processes

By Proposition 9, for $f \in \mathcal{C}([0, t_0])$, almost surely the relation

$$\int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} f(s) u \pi_s(dr, d\ell, du) = \int_0^{t_0} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} f(s) \frac{\kappa_{iL}}{\kappa_{QU} q(s)} ds$$

holds. Recall that $q(s) \geq \eta_0$ for all $s \leq t_0$. See Relation (24).

By taking the limit in Relation (26) along the subsequence (N_k) , one obtains that the relation

$$q(t) = q_0 + (\kappa_{oQ} - \kappa_{iL})qt - \kappa_{oQ} \int_0^t q(s) ds$$

holds almost surely for $t \leq t_0$, and therefore the convergence in distribution of $(\Lambda_N(t), \bar{Q}_N(t))$ to $(\Lambda_\infty, q(t))$ on the time interval $[0, t_0]$. The fixed point of the above ODE is $q_\infty = 1 - \kappa_{iL}/\kappa_{oQ}$. The condition $\kappa_{iL} < \kappa_{oQ}$ gives that if $q_0 \in (\eta_0, q_\infty)$ then $q(t_0) > \eta_0$, and if $\eta_0 \geq q_\infty$ then $q(t_0) \geq q_\infty$. From this instant, we can obtain the convergence result on the time interval $[t_0, 2t_0]$ and, by induction, on $[0, T]$. The proposition is proved. \square

The following corollary is quite intuitive, it just states that in this stable setting the production rate of P -particles is maximal. Consequently, a fraction $\kappa_{oQ} - \kappa_{iL}$ of Q -particles is degraded by Reaction (3).

Corollary 11 (Production of P -particles). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 10, then for the convergence in distribution*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} \right) = (\kappa_{iL} t)$$

where $(P_N(t))$ is the process defined by Relation (8)

Proof. By using Doob's Inequality, it is not difficult to prove that

$$\left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} - \kappa_{LR} \int_0^t L_N(s) \left(\frac{U_N^0}{N} - \frac{U_N(s)}{N} \right) ds \right)$$

is a martingale converging in distribution to (0).

The convergence of the occupation measure (Λ_N) of Theorem 10 and the fact that $(U_N(t)/N)$ converges in distribution to (0) give the relation

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t L_N(s) \left(\frac{U_N^0}{N} - \frac{U_N(s)}{N} \right) ds \right) \\ = \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{N}} b_{CU} \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}}{\kappa_{LR} C_U} \right] (db) ds \right) = (\kappa_{IL} t) \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 12 (Under-Loaded System). *Under the scaling assumptions (5), if $\kappa_{QQ} < \kappa_{IL}$ and $x_N(0) = (r, \ell_N, q, U_N^0 - u)$, with $r, q, u \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\ell_N}{N} = \ell_0 \in (0, 1),$$

and $\Lambda_N \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}^3)$ is the occupation measure of $(R_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N^0 - U_N(t))$, then, for the convergence in distribution,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\left(\frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right), \Lambda_N \right) = ((\ell(t)), \Lambda_\infty),$$

where $(\ell(t))$ is the solution of the ODE, $\dot{\ell}(t) = \kappa_{IL}(1 - \ell(t)) - \kappa_{QQ}$, starting at ℓ_0 , and μ_∞ is the measure defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Lambda_\infty, F \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} F(t, r, q, v) \times \\ \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{QQ}}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - 1)} \right] (dr) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{QQ}}{\kappa_{QU} C_U} \right] (dq) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{QQ}}{\kappa_{LR} \ell(t)} \right] (dv) dt, \end{aligned}$$

for any function $F \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$.

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as the proof of Theorem 10. We just give a description of the coupling used, of the stopping time and finally of the associated fast processes.

First we define $(V_N(t)) = (U_N^0 - V_N(t))$ and the stopping time to consider in this case is

$$\tau_N = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : V_N(t) \geq \eta N, \frac{L_N(t)}{N} \leq \eta \right\}.$$

An auxiliary process $(\tilde{X}_N(t)) = (\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t), \tilde{V}_N(t))$ is introduced as the solution of the SDE

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{R}_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, N\tilde{V}_N(t-)), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left((0, (M_N^0 - N)\tilde{R}_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{L}_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left((0, N - \tilde{R}_N(t-) - \tilde{L}_N(t-)), dt \right) \\ \quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \tilde{L}_N(t-) \tilde{V}_N(t-)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{Q}_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QQ}} \left((0, N), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-)(U_N^0 - \eta N)), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{V}_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left((0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-) U_N^0), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left((0, \eta N \tilde{V}_N(t-)), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

with the initial condition $(R_N(0), L_N(0), Q_N(0), V_N(0))$.

Using these SDEs and Relations (12) and with an induction on the sequence of instants of jumps of the process $(X_N(t), \tilde{X}_N(t))$, one can show that the relations

$$(27) \quad R_N(t) \leq \tilde{R}_N(t), \quad L_N(t) \geq \tilde{L}_N(t), \quad Q_N(t) \leq \tilde{Q}_N(t), \quad V_N(t) \leq \tilde{V}_N(t),$$

hold for all $t \leq \tau_N$.

The tightness of the process $(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t), \tilde{V}_N(t))$ is a straightforward consequence of Proposition 7. The tightness of $(\tilde{L}_N(t)/N)$ follows from standard stochastic calculus along the same lines of the proof of Proposition 8.

Coming back to our process, the corresponding SDEs are

$$\begin{cases} dR_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ \quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left(\left(0, (M_N^0 - (N - R_N(t-)))R_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dQ_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QO}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) \\ \quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-)(U_N^0 - V_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QO}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dV_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-)(U_N^0 - V_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) \\ \quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

and the SDE for $(L_N(t))$ is

$$dL_N(t) = \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left(\left(0, N - R_N(t-) - L_N(t-) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right).$$

For $x=(r, q, v) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, the Q -matrix associated to the fast process at time t ,

$$x \rightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R - e_V, & \kappa_{LR} r \ell(t), \\ -e_R, & \kappa_{RI} (C_M - 1)r, \end{cases} \quad x \rightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_Q, & \kappa_{QO}, \\ e_V - e_Q, & \kappa_{QU} C_U q. \end{cases}$$

The associated $M/M/\infty$ network is simple in this case. It consists of three queues in series. The invariant distribution is the product of the three Poisson distributions of the statement of the theorem. See Figure 5 below.




FIGURE 5. Under-loaded Case: $M/M/\infty$ network for fast processes

Again, the convergence result is obtained on a time interval $[0, t_0]$, as before the condition $\kappa_{QO} < \kappa_{IL}$ gives that the solution of the ODE $(\ell(t))$ is converging to its positive fixed point, the same procedure can be used starting at time t_0 on the time interval $[t_0, 2t_0]$, and by induction on the half line. The theorem is proved. \square

The result for the production of P -particles is given by the following corollary.

Corollary 13. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 12, then for the convergence in distribution*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} \right) = (\kappa_{QO} t)$$

where $(P_N(t))$ is the process defined by Relation (8)

Proof. We proceed in the same way as in the proof of Corollary 11, by noting that the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} \right) &= \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t \bar{L}_N(s) (U_N^0 - U_N(s)) \, ds \right) \\ &= \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{N}} \ell(s) v \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{LR} \ell(s)} \right] (dv) \, ds \right) = (\kappa_{0Q} t) \end{aligned}$$

hold. \square

4. A MODEL WITH REGULATION

We return to the model of Section 2, the process

$$(X_N(t)) = (S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N(t))$$

is defined by the SDEs of Section 2.5.

4.1. Stable Network.

In this case the flow of resources, Q -particles, is sufficiently important. As it can be expected, the regulation mechanism does not have a significant impact. The following result is essentially identical to Theorem 10. The proof is skipped for this reason.

Intuitively, starting from a convenient subset of initial states, a free R -particle is paired to an M -particle at a rate at least $M_M - N \sim (C_M - 1)N$, the sequestration rate being κ_{RS} , sequestration is unlikely, given that there is a finite number R -particles. The process $(S_N(t))$ is not in fact a fast process, in the limit for the occupation measure, it is a Dirac measure at 0.

Theorem 14 (Stability). *Under the scaling assumptions (5), if $\kappa_{0Q} > \kappa_{IL}$, and the initial state is $x_N(0) = (s, r, \ell, q_N, u) \in \mathcal{S}_N$, such that*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{q_N}{N} = q_0 > 0,$$

then, for the convergence in distribution,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{Q_N(t)}{N} \right) = (q(t)),$$

where $(q(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$\dot{q}(t) = \kappa_{0Q} - \kappa_{IL} - \kappa_{Q0} q(t),$$

starting at q_0 and the occupation measure of $(S_N(t), R_N(t), L_N(t), U_N(t))$ is converging in distribution to μ_∞ defined by, for $F \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^4)$,

$$\langle \mu_\infty, F \rangle = \langle \Lambda_\infty, \tilde{F} \rangle,$$

where $\tilde{F}(t, (x)) = F(t, (0, x))$, for $t \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{N}^3$, and Λ_∞ is the measure on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3$ defined by Relation (18).

For the production of P -particles, it is easily seen that Corollary 11 also holds. The sequestered R -particles do not play any role in this case.

4.2. Under-Loaded Network: Optimal Sequestration. In this section the efficiency of the regulation mechanism is shown in the following theorem. When the input rate of Q -particles is too low, $\kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL}$, if an additional condition is satisfied, Relation (29), the process $(L_N(t))$ is still $O(1)$. Only the processes $(S_N(t))$ and $(U_N(t))$ are of the order of N . This is in contrast with Theorem 12 under the same condition when there is no regulation.

This case stands out also for another reason. For this regime even if the coordinates of the initial state are all of the correct asymptotic orders of magnitude, it may happen that the Markov process may leave this part of the state space after some finite time, one of the $O(1)$ coordinates become of the order of N . Heuristically, this happens for example when there are too many sequestered R -particles initially. The remaining R -particles cannot cope with the (small) incoming flow of Q -particles, so the process $(Q_N(t))$ will be of the order of N on a time interval before returning to the correct order of magnitude $O(1)$.

In the five asymptotic results of this paper, this is the only case when this phenomenon happens. The introduction of the neighborhood V_0 for the initial state is a way of preserving the orders of magnitudes on the whole time axis. This is related to the stability properties of a dynamical system in \mathbb{R}^2 .

Theorem 15. *Let*

$$(28) \quad \begin{cases} s_\infty &= 1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}}, \\ u_\infty &= \frac{\kappa_{SR}}{\kappa_{RS}} \frac{\kappa_{RI}}{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right), \end{cases}$$

and assume that the initial state of $(X_N(t))$ is $x_N(0) = (s_N, r, \ell, q, u_N) \in \mathbb{N}^5$, with

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{s_N}{N}, \frac{u_N}{N} \right) = (s_0, u_0),$$

and Λ_N is the occupation measures of $(R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t))$.

Under the scaling assumptions (5) and the conditions

$$(29) \quad \kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL} \text{ and } \frac{\kappa_{SR}}{\kappa_{RS}} \frac{\kappa_{RI}}{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) < C_U,$$

there exists a neighborhood of V_0 of (s_∞, u_∞) in $(0, 1) \times (0, C_U)$ such that if $(s_0, u_0) \in V_0$, then the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\left(\frac{S_N(t)}{N}, \frac{U_N(t)}{N} \right), \Lambda_N \right) = ((s(t), u(t)), \Lambda_\infty),$$

holds for the convergence in distribution, where $(s(t), u(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$(30) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{s}(t) &= \kappa_{RS} u(t) \frac{\kappa_{IL}(1-s(t)) + \kappa_{SR}s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - (1-s(t))) + \kappa_{RS}u(t)} - \kappa_{SR}s(t), \\ \dot{u}(t) &= \kappa_{IL}(1-s(t)) - \kappa_{0Q}, \end{cases}$$

starting at (s_0, u_0) , and $\Lambda_\infty \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$ is the measure defined by

$$(31) \quad \langle \Lambda_\infty, F \rangle = \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} F(t, r, l, q) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}(1-s(t)) + \kappa_{SR}s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - (1-s(t))) + \kappa_{RS}u(t)} \right] (dr) \\ \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}(1-s(t))}{\kappa_{LR}(C_U - u(t))} \right] (d\ell) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{QU}u(t)} \right] (dq) dt,$$

for any function $F \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$.

The point (s_∞, u_∞) is a locally stable point of the dynamical system $(s(t), u(t))$.

Proof. For the beginning of the proof, we proceed as in the proof of Theorem 12 and by following the same method used to prove Theorem 10: First define a convenient stopping time, then introduce an auxiliary process $(\tilde{X}_N(t))$ and a coupling with the process $(X_N(t))$. Tightness/convergence properties for $(\tilde{X}_N(t))$ are then used to prove tightness and convergence results for $(X_N(t))$.

We define

$$\tau_N = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \min \left(\frac{S_N(t)}{N}, \frac{U_N(t)}{N}, \frac{U_N^0 - U_N(t)}{N} \right) \leq \eta \right\}$$

and $(\tilde{S}_N(t), \tilde{U}_N(t), \tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t))$ the solution of the SDE

$$(32) \quad \begin{cases} d\tilde{S}_N(t) &= -\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{S}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{U}_N(t) &= -\mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-) \tilde{U}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{R}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, U_N^0 \tilde{L}_N(t-) \right), dt \right) + \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left(\left(0, (M_N^0 - N) \tilde{R}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{L}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, \eta N \tilde{L}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{Q}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{OQ}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, \eta N \tilde{Q}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

with initial point $(s_N, u_N, r, l, q) \in \mathcal{S}_N$.

$$S_N(t) \geq \tilde{S}_N(t), \quad U_N(t) \geq \tilde{U}_N(t),$$

$$R_N(t) \leq \tilde{R}_N(t), \quad L_N(t) \leq \tilde{L}_N(t), \quad Q_N(t) \leq \tilde{Q}_N(t),$$

hold for all $t \leq \tau_N$.

From there, by proceeding as before, it is not difficult to prove the convergence in distribution of the occupation measure of the sequence of occupation measures of $(\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t))$ and of the scaled processes $(\tilde{S}_N(t)/N, \tilde{L}_N(t)/N)$. This convergence gives the existence of t_0 such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \mathbb{P}(\tau_N \geq t_0) = 1,$$

and, consequently, the tightness property of $(\Lambda_N, (\bar{X}_N(t)))$ on the time interval $[0, t_0]$.

For $x = (r, \ell, q) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, the Q -matrix associated to the fast process $(R_N(t), L_N(t), Q_N(t))$ at time t is

$$x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_R - e_L, & \kappa_{LR}(C_U - u(t))\ell, \\ e_R, & \kappa_{SR}s(t), \\ -e_R, & (\kappa_{RS}u(t) + \kappa_{RI}(C_M - 1 + s(t)))r, \end{cases} \quad x \longrightarrow x + \begin{cases} e_L, & \kappa_{IL}(1 - s(t)), \\ e_Q, & \kappa_{OQ}, \\ -e_Q, & \kappa_{QU}u(t)q. \end{cases}$$

The associated $M/M/\infty$ network is depicted in Figure 6 below. It is easily checked that the product of the three Poisson distribution in the right-hand side of Relation (31) is indeed the invariant distribution of this Markov process. In the same way as in the proof Theorem 12 by using tightness and continuity arguments, *on the time interval* $[0, t_0]$ we obtain the desired convergence of $(\Lambda_N, (S_N(t)/N, U_N(t)/N))$.

We now investigate the dynamical system defined by the ODE (30). It is clear that $w_\infty = (s_\infty, u_\infty)$ is its unique fixed point, and it is in the domain $(0, 1) \times (0, C_U)$ by Condition (29). The Jacobian matrix of $(s(t), u(t))$ at w_∞ is

$$\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{D_0} \kappa_{SR} \kappa_{IL} ((C_M - 1) \kappa_{IL}^2 - \kappa_{0Q}^2 + \kappa_{IL}^2) & \frac{1}{D_0} \kappa_{RS} \kappa_{0Q}^2 \kappa_{IL}^2 \\ -\kappa_{IL} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $D_0 = \kappa_{0Q} \kappa_{IL} - \kappa_{0Q} \kappa_{SR} + \kappa_{IL} \kappa_{SR}$, and its characteristic polynomial is P_3 with

$$\begin{aligned} P_3(x) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} & \kappa_{RI} (\kappa_{0Q} \kappa_{IL} + \kappa_{SR} (\kappa_{IL} - \kappa_{0Q})) ((C_M - 1) \kappa_{IL} + \kappa_{IL} - \kappa_{0Q}) x^2 \\ & + ((C_M - 1) \kappa_{IL}^3 \kappa_{RI} \kappa_{SR} + \kappa_{IL} \kappa_{RI} \kappa_{SR} (\kappa_{IL}^2 - \kappa_{0Q}^2)) x + \kappa_{IL}^3 \kappa_{RS} \kappa_{0Q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

The condition $\kappa_{IL} > \kappa_{0Q}$ implies that all coefficients of P_3 are positive. If the zeroes of P_3 are real, then they are negative. Otherwise, their real part is negative. This implies that w_∞ is an asymptotically stable point of $(s(t), u(t))$ and, therefore, that there exists a neighborhood V_0 of w_∞ such that if $(u(0), s(0)) \in V_0$ then $(u(t), s(t)) \in V_0$ for all $t \geq 0$. See Hirsch and Smale [17]. From there, we can start from $(u(t_0), s(t_0)) \in V_0$ and by checking carefully the dependence of t_0 with respect to $(u(0), s(0))$, repeat the same operation on the time interval $[t_0, 2t_0]$ and concludes the proof of our theorem by induction. \square




FIGURE 6. Under-loaded Regime — Optimal Sequestration.
The $M/M/\infty$ network for fast processes

Corollary 16 (Production of P -particles). *Under the assumptions of Theorem 15, then for the convergence in distribution*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} \right) = \left(\kappa_{IL} \int_0^t (1-s(w)) dw \right)$$

where $(P_N(t))$, resp $(s(w))$, is the process defined by Relation (8), resp. Relation (30).

Note that if the initial state (s_0, u_0) is the equilibrium point of the ODE (30), then the limit of $(P_N(t)/N)$ is $(\kappa_{0Q} t)$ as it can be expected.

Proof. We proceed in the same way as in the proof of Corollary 11, by noting that as a consequence of Theorem 15, the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t L_N(w) \left(\frac{U_N^0}{N} - \frac{U_N(w)}{N} \right) dw \right) \\ = \left(\kappa_{LR} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{N}} \ell(C_U - u(w)) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{IL}(1-s(w))}{\kappa_{LR}(C_U - u(w))} \right] (d\ell) dw \right) \\ = \left(\kappa_{IL} \int_0^t (1-s(w)) dw \right) \end{aligned}$$

hold. \square

4.3. Under-Loaded Network: Saturation. When $\kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL}$ but the second condition of Relation (29) is not true, then the regulation mechanism cannot avoid the undesirable property that the process $(L_N(t))$ is of the order of N . We are in the qualitative situation of Theorem 12 without regulation.

Theorem 17. *Under the scaling assumptions (5) and the conditions*

$$(33) \quad \kappa_{0Q} < \kappa_{IL} \text{ and } \frac{\kappa_{SR}}{\kappa_{RS}} \frac{\kappa_{RI}}{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} \right) > C_U,$$

assume that the initial state is $x_N(0) = (s_N, r, \ell_N, q, U_N^0 - u)$, with $r, q, u \in \mathbb{N}$ and

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{s_N}{N}, \frac{\ell_N}{N} \right) = (s_0, \ell_0) \text{ with } \ell_0, s_0 > 0 \text{ and } s_0 + \ell_0 < 1,$$

and $\Lambda_N \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{N}^3)$ denotes the occupation measure of $(R_N(t), Q_N(t), U_N^0 - U_N(t))$.

For the convergence in distribution, the relation

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\left(\frac{S_N(t)}{N}, \frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right), \Lambda_N \right) = ((s(t), \ell(t)), \Lambda_\infty),$$

holds, where $(s(t), \ell(t))$ is the solution of the ODE,

$$(34) \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\ell}(t) &= \kappa_{IL}(1-\ell(t)-s(t)) - \kappa_{0Q}, \\ \dot{s}(t) &= \kappa_{RS} C_U \frac{\kappa_{0Q} + \kappa_{SR} s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - 1 + s(t)) + \kappa_{RS} C_U} - \kappa_{SR} s(t) \end{cases}$$

starting at (s_0, ℓ_0) , and $\Lambda_\infty \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$ is the measure defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Lambda_\infty, F \rangle &= \int_0^{+\infty} \int_{\mathbb{N}^3} F(t, r, q, v) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{0Q} + \kappa_{SR} s(t)}{\kappa_{RI}(C_M - 1 + s(t)) + \kappa_{RS} C_U} \right] (dr) \\ &\quad \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{0Q} C_U} \right] (dq) \text{Pois} \left[\frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{LR} \ell(t)} \right] (dv) dt, \end{aligned}$$

for any function $F \in \mathcal{C}_c(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^3)$.

The equilibrium point (s_∞, ℓ_∞) of $(s(t), \ell(t))$,

$$(35) \quad \begin{cases} s_\infty &= \frac{1}{2} \left(-(C_M - 1) + \sqrt{(C_M - 1)^2 + 4C_U \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{RI}} \frac{\kappa_{RS}}{\kappa_{SR}}} \right) \\ \ell_\infty &= 1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}} - s_\infty, \end{cases}$$

is asymptotically stable.

Proof. We denote $(V_N(t)) = (U_N^0 - U_N(t))$. The corresponding SDEs are

$$\begin{cases} dR_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right) + \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, S_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RS}} \left(\left(0, R_N(t-)U_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left(\left(0, (M_N^0 - (N - R_N(t-) - S_N(t-)))R_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dQ_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-)(U_N^0 - V_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{Q0}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dV_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, Q_N(t-)(U_N^0 - V_N(t-)) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

and the SDEs for $(S_N(t), L_N(t))$ are

$$\begin{cases} dS_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RS}} \left(\left(0, R_N(t-)U_N(t-) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, S_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ dL_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left(\left(0, N - R_N(t-) - S_N(t-) - L_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, L_N(t-)V_N(t-) \right), dt \right). \end{cases}$$

We define

$$\tau_N = \inf \left\{ t > 0 : \min \left(\frac{S_N(t)}{N}, \frac{L_N(t)}{N} \right) \leq \eta \text{ or } \max \left(\frac{R_N(t)}{N}, \frac{U_N(t)}{N}, \frac{V_N(t)}{N} \right) \geq \eta \right\}$$

The auxiliary process $(\tilde{X}_N(t)) = (\tilde{R}_N(t), \tilde{L}_N(t), \tilde{Q}_N(t), \tilde{V}_N(t))$ is the solution of the SDE

$$\begin{cases} d\tilde{S}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RS}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{R}_N(t-)\tilde{U}_N(t-) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{S}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{R}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, N\tilde{V}_N(t-) \right), dt \right) + \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{SR}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{RI}} \left(\left(0, (M_N^0 - N)\tilde{R}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{L}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{IL}} \left(\left(0, (1-\eta)N - \tilde{L}_N(t-) \right), dt \right) \\ &\quad - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{L}_N(t-)\tilde{V}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{Q}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{0Q}} \left(\left(0, N \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-)(U_N^0 - \eta N) \right), dt \right), \\ d\tilde{V}_N(t) &= \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{QU}} \left(\left(0, \tilde{Q}_N(t-)(U_N^0 - \eta N) \right), dt \right) - \mathcal{P}_{\kappa_{LR}} \left(\left(0, \eta N\tilde{V}_N(t-) \right), dt \right), \end{cases}$$

with the initial condition $(S_N(0), R_N(0), L_N(0), Q_N(0), V_N(0))$.

$$\dot{s}(t) = - \frac{P_1(s)}{((C_M - 1)\kappa_{RI} + C_U\kappa_{RS} + \kappa_{RI}s)},$$

with

$$P_1(s) \stackrel{\text{def.}}{=} \kappa_{RI}\kappa_{SR}s^2 + (C_M - 1)\kappa_{RI}\kappa_{SR}s - C_U\kappa_{0Q}\kappa_{RS},$$

P_1 has two roots,

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(-(C_M - 1) \pm \sqrt{(C_M - 1)^2 + 4C_U \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{RI}} \frac{\kappa_{RS}}{\kappa_{SR}}} \right),$$

only one, s_∞ is positive, the other is negative. It is easily checked that the second condition of Relation (33) implies that $s_\infty \in (0, 1)$. The equilibrium point ℓ_∞ of

$(\ell(t))$ is positive if and only if $s_\infty < 1 - \kappa_{0Q}/\kappa_{IL}$. This is equivalent to the relation $P_1(1 - \kappa_{0Q}/\kappa_{IL}) > 0$ and, with trite calculations, this is the condition

$$\left(C_M - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{IL}}\right) - C_U \frac{\kappa_{0Q}}{\kappa_{RI}} \frac{\kappa_{RS}}{\kappa_{SR}} > 0,$$

which is exactly the second condition of Relation (33).

If $s_0 \in (0, s_\infty)$, resp. if $s_0 \in (s_\infty, 1)$, one gets that $(s(t))$ is non-decreasing, resp. $(s(t))$ is non-increasing. □




FIGURE 7. Under-loaded Regime — Saturation.
The $M/M/\infty$ network for fast processes

Corollary 18. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 17, then for the convergence in distribution*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\frac{P_N(t)}{N} \right) = (\kappa_{0Q} t),$$

where $(P_N(t))$ is the process defined by Relation (8)

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Corollary 13. □

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Bai, H. Yan, X. Chen, Q. Lyu, N. Jiang, J. Li, and L. Luo. “The Role of RelA and SpoT on ppGpp Production, Stress Response, Growth Regulation, and Pathogenicity in *Xanthomonas campestris*”. In: *Microbiology Spectrum* 9.3 (2021), e02057–21. eprint: <https://journals.asm.org/doi/pdf/10.1128/spectrum.02057-21>.
- [2] K. Ball, T. G. Kurtz, L. Popovic, and G. Rempala. “Asymptotic analysis of multiscale approximations to reaction networks”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 16.4 (2006), pp. 1925–1961.
- [3] P. Billingsley. *Convergence of probability measures*. Second. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics: Probability and Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1999, pp. x+277.
- [4] E. Bouveret and A. Battesti. “The Stringent Response”. In: *Bacterial Stress Responses*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2010. Chap. 14, pp. 229–250. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1128/9781555816841.ch14>.
- [5] P. C. Bressloff. *Stochastic processes in cell biology*. Interdisciplinary applied mathematics. Springer, 2014.
- [6] D. A. Dawson. “Measure-valued Markov processes”. In: *École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXI—1991*. Vol. 1541. Lecture Notes in Math. Berlin: Springer, Nov. 1993, pp. 1–260.

- [7] S. N. Ethier and T. G. Kurtz. *Markov processes: Characterization and Convergence*. New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1986, pp. x+534.
- [8] M. Feinberg. *Foundations of chemical reaction network theory*. Vol. 202. Applied Mathematical Sciences. Springer, Cham, 2019, pp. xxix+454.
- [9] M. I. Freidlin and A. D. Wentzell. *Random perturbations of dynamical systems*. Second. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1998, pp. xii+430.
- [10] V. Fromion, E. Leoncini, and P. Robert. “Stochastic Gene Expression in Cells: A Point Process Approach”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 73.1 (Jan. 2013), pp. 195–211.
- [11] V. Fromion, P. Robert, and J. Zaherddine. “Stochastic Models of Regulation of Transcription in Biological Cells”. In: *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 87.5 (2023), p. 65.
- [12] A. Goelzer, V. Fromion, and G. Scorletti. “Cell design in bacteria as a convex optimization problem”. In: *Automatica* 47.6 (2011), pp. 1210–1218.
- [13] A. Goelzer et al. “Quantitative prediction of genome-wide resource allocation in bacteria”. In: *Metabolic Engineering* 32 (2015), pp. 232–243.
- [14] R. Z. Has’minskii. “On the principle of averaging the Itô’s stochastic differential equations”. In: *Kybernetika (Prague)* 4 (1968), pp. 260–279.
- [15] R. Z. Has’minskii. “Principle of Averaging for Parabolic and Elliptic Differential Equations and for Markov Processes with Small Diffusion”. In: *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 8.1 (1963), pp. 1–21.
- [16] M. Hecker, S. Lambeck, S. Toepfer, E. van Someren, and R. Guthke. “Gene regulatory network inference: Data integration in dynamic models—A review”. In: *Biosystems* 96.1 (2009), pp. 86–103.
- [17] M. W. Hirsch and S. Smale. *Differential equations, dynamical systems, and linear algebra*. Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1974, pp. xi+358.
- [18] H.-W. Kang and T. Kurtz. “Separation of time-scales and model reduction for stochastic reaction networks”. In: *The Annals of Applied Probability* 23.2 (2013), pp. 529–583.
- [19] J. K. Kim, G. A. Rempala, and H.-W. Kang. “Reduction for Stochastic Biochemical Reaction Networks with Multiscale Conservations”. In: *Multiscale Modeling & Simulation* 15.4 (2017), pp. 1376–1403.
- [20] T. G. Kurtz. “Averaging for martingale problems and stochastic approximation”. In: *Applied Stochastic Analysis*. Ed. by I. Karatzas and D. Ocone. Vol. 177. Springer-Verlag, 1992, pp. 186–209.
- [21] L. Laurence and P. Robert. “A Scaling Approach to Stochastic Chemical Reaction Networks”. Sept. 2024.
- [22] L. Laurence and P. Robert. “Stochastic chemical reaction networks with discontinuous limits and AIMD processes”. In: *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 186 (2025), Paper No. 104643, 32.
- [23] M. C. Mackey, M. Santillán, M. Tyran-Kamińska, and E. S. Zeron. *Simple mathematical models of gene regulatory dynamics*. Lecture Notes on Mathematical Modelling in the Life Sciences. Springer, Cham, 2016, pp. xiv+124.
- [24] T. Mestl, E. Plahte, and S. W. Omholt. “A mathematical framework for describing and analysing gene regulatory networks”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 176.2 (1995), pp. 291–300.

- [25] G. Papanicolaou, D. W. Stroock, and S. R. S. Varadhan. “Martingale approach to some limit theorems”. In: *Proc. 1976. Duke Conf. On Turbulence*. III. Duke Univ. Math, 1977.
- [26] P. Robert. “Mathematical models of gene expression”. In: *Probability Surveys* 16 (2019), pp. 277–332.
- [27] P. Robert. *Stochastic Networks and Queues*. Vol. 52. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability Series. New-York: Springer, June 2003, pp. xix+398.
- [28] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams. *Diffusions, Markov Processes and Martingales: Volume 2, Itô Calculus*. Cambridge University Press, Sept. 2000.
- [29] W. Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. Third. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1987, pp. xiv+416.
- [30] M. Santillán. “On the Use of the Hill Functions in Mathematical Models of Gene Regulatory Networks”. In: *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena* 3.2 (2008), pp. 85–97.
- [31] M. F. Traxler, S. M. Summers, H.-T. Nguyen, V. M. Zacharia, G. A. Hightower, J. T. Smith, and T. Conway. “The global, ppGpp-mediated stringent response to amino acid starvation in *Escherichia coli*”. In: *Molecular microbiology* 68.5 (2008), pp. 1128–1148.
- [32] E. O. Voit, H. A. Martens, and S. W. Omholt. “150 years of the mass action law”. In: *PLoS Comput Biol* 11.1 (2015), e1004012.
- [33] P. Waage and C. Guldberg. “Studier over Affiniteten”. In: *Videnskabs-selskabet I Christiania* (1864), pp. 35–45.
- [34] J. D. Watson, T. A. Baker, S. P. Bell, A. Gann, M. Levine, R. Losick, and I. CSHLP. *Molecular biology of the gene*. 6th. San Francisco; Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.: Pearson/Benjamin Cummings; Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Dec. 2007.
- [35] J. Zaherddine. “Stochastic models of protein production in bacterial cells: analysis of regulation mechanisms for transcription and translation phases”. PhD thesis. Sorbonne Université, Dec. 2023.
- [36] M. Zhu and X. Dai. “Growth suppression by altered (p) ppGpp levels results from non-optimal resource allocation in *Escherichia coli*”. In: *Nucleic acids research* 47.9 (2019), pp. 4684–4693.

Email address: Vincent.Fromion@inrae.fr

(V. Fromion, J. Zaherddine) INRAE, MAIAGE, UNIVERSITÉ PARIS-SACLAY, DOMAINE DE VILVERT, 78350 JOUY-EN-JOSAS, FRANCE

Email address: Philippe.Robert@inria.fr

URL: <http://www-rocq.inria.fr/who/Philippe.Robert>

Email address: Jana.Zaherddine@inria.fr

(Ph. Robert, J. Zaherddine) INRIA PARIS, 48, RUE BARRAULT, CS 61534, 75647 PARIS CEDEX, FRANCE