

# Designing Machine Learning Tools to Characterize Multistationarity of Fully Open Reaction Networks

Shenghao Yao<sup>\*†</sup>, AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh<sup>\*‡§</sup> and Matthew England<sup>\*¶</sup>

July 3, 2024

## Abstract

We present the first use of machine learning tools to predict multistationarity of reaction networks.

Chemical Reaction Networks (CRNs) are the mathematical formulation of how the quantities associated to a set of species (molecules, proteins, cells, or animals) vary as time passes with respect to their interactions with each other. Their mathematics does not describe just chemical reactions but many other areas of the life sciences such as ecology, epidemiology, and population dynamics. We say a CRN is at a steady state when the concentration (or number) of species do not vary anymore. Some CRNs do not attain a steady state while some others may have more than one possible steady state. The CRNs in the later group are called multistationary. Multistationarity is an important property, e.g. switch-like behaviour in cells needs multistationarity to occur. Existing algorithms to detect whether a CRN is multistationary or not are either extremely expensive or restricted in the type of CRNs they can be used on, motivating a new machine learning approach.

We address the problem of representing variable-length CRN data to machine learning models by developing a new graph representation of CRNs for use with graph learning algorithms. We contribute a large dataset of labelled fully open CRNs whose production necessitated the development of new CRN theory. Then we present experimental results on the training and testing of a graph attention network model on this dataset, showing excellent levels of performance. We finish by testing the model predictions on validation data produced independently, demonstrating generalisability of the model to different types of CRN.

**Keywords:** Chemical Reaction Network, Multistationarity, Machine Learning, Graph Attention Network

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 From the life sciences to CRNs

Many phenomena in the life sciences involve a group of species, such as chemical molecules, proteins or cells, depending on the context; and some interactions among them. Each interaction causes some of these species to be destroyed / consumed and some others to be created / produced. Thus the quantities of these species, which can be a concentration

---

<sup>\*</sup>Research Centre for Computational Sciences and Mathematical Modelling, Coventry University, Coventry, United Kingdom.

<sup>†</sup>yaos10@uni.coventry.ac.uk

<sup>‡</sup>amirhossein.sadeghimanesh@coventry.ac.uk

<sup>§</sup>Corresponding author.

<sup>¶</sup>matthew.england@coventry.ac.uk, <https://www.matthewengland.coventry.domains/>.

(a real number) or a count (an integer), are changing over time. This means that the quantity of each species is a variable (function) of time. Then the changes over time because of the interactions give us derivatives. Writing the equations describing how these variables change, gives us equations for these derivatives, called ordinary differential equations (ODEs), and the set of these equations defines an ODE system.

To predict behaviour of the original experiments in chemistry or biology, one can study their corresponding ODE system mathematically. For example, consider identifying an equilibrium of the experiment. Equilibria, also known as the steady states of the ODE system, are reached after waiting for sufficient time for the concentrations of the species to not vary any more. The values of concentrations at the steady states may be obtained as solutions to the algebraic equations found by substituting the derivatives in the ODE system for zeros.

Some systems do not reach any steady states, such as chaotic or oscillatory models: for example, the classic non-equilibrium oscillating Belousov-Zhabotinsky reaction in chemistry [28], the non-equilibrium thermodynamic system described by the Boltzmann model [13], and the Lotka-Volterra equations that describe the dynamic interaction between predator and prey in biology [1]. Some systems always have a unique steady state: for instance, the weakly reversible complex balanced reaction networks have one steady state in a closed system [27]. Finally, some models can have more than one steady state: such models are called *multistationary*. Multistationarity allows for the possibility of more than one choice. It is a fundamental property behind mechanisms such as switch-like behaviour in cell-division or apoptosis decisions, and the role of memory in cells and bacteria [25, 33, 47].

The field of study devoted to developing the mathematics which describes the changes in the concentrations of a group of species with respect to the interactions among them is called *Chemical Reaction Network (CRN) Theory* [19]. We note that despite the explicit mention of the word chemical in the title of this field, the concept and the results are equally applicable to many other domains, including but not restricted to biology, epidemiology, ecology, population dynamics, and pharmacokinetics. In this paper we maintain a common language with the interactions among the species in any such system called the *reactions*, and the system is called a *reaction network*. The network is *fully open* if it has inflow and outflow reactions for all species.

## 1.2 Detecting multistationary

The most well-known set of algorithms to check if a reaction network is multistationary are called *deficiency algorithms*. This class of tools were initially developed in the group of Feinberg [15–18]. Such algorithms work on a specific type of reaction networks called regular networks (see Definition 3.4).

An alternative set of algorithms, which in theory work for any arbitrary reaction network, use algebraic tools [8, 9] to find the exact semi-algebraic description of the set of parameter values for which the system has multiple steady states and thus the network is multistationary [6, 35, 43, 44].

Unfortunately, these algebraic algorithms have worst case computational complexity doubly exponential in the number of species and parameters of the network [7, 37, 38]. Thus when these number more than just a few, the computation does not terminate on a computer in reasonable time; or more commonly the intermediate algebraic expression swell exhausts the memory resources [43].

Hence, there is a need for a tool which is cheaper than the algebraic approach, but not having the restrictions to certain input of deficiency algorithms.

### 1.3 ML for multistationarity in CRNs

The problem of interest is to decide whether a given network is multistationary or not. This is a binary classification problem. We can think of the networks as the input data that we want to label with “*multistationary*” or “*not multistationary*” tags. A common approach for classification problems is to use Machine Learning (ML) techniques.

ML tools have presented substantial competitiveness over traditional methods in many research areas in recent years. An advantage of using ML is that we pay the computational time cost once at the start, during the training process. Then once we have a trained model, we can get predictions of the label for new input data from it almost instantaneously, for as many inputs as we need.

The use of ML in CRN up to now has been limited to predicting species, complexes and reactions involved in a reaction network rather than predicting behaviour of the network. For example learning the potential energy surfaces and reaction pathways. For a comprehensive review on the current applications of ML in CRN see [52].

We describe in this paper the first ML models which accept a reaction network itself as input data. The methodology developed will not only let us to deal with the multistationarity classification problem in fully open CRN systems with the power of ML, but also open the path for others to use ML tools for other questions in CRN theory.

### 1.4 Structure of the paper

We continue in Section 2 with a formal definition of CRNs and then detail current approaches to detect multistationarity of a CRN in Section 3. We introduce ML with a simple application of a support vector machine and a random forest in Section 4. We observe that since we have variable length input we need more advanced ML tools to have a meaningful impact. Thus in Section 5 we present a new graph representation for CRNs, generate a large labelled dataset (making use of the methods in Section 4 and some new theory), and present results for a graph learning algorithm (a graph attention network) to predict multistationarity. We finish with ideas for future work in Section 6.

### 1.5 Notation

The cardinality of a set,  $A$ , is denoted by  $|A|$ . We assume that  $0^0 = 1$ , and so there is no ambiguity for the notation  $x^0$  where  $x$  is a real-valued variable. For any real number  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ , the sign of  $r$  is denoted by  $\text{sgn}(r)$  and defined to be 1,  $-1$  or 0 if  $r$  is positive, negative or zero respectively.

## 2 Chemical reaction network theory

### 2.1 Chemical reaction networks

A *chemical reaction network*, or a *network* for short, is denoted by  $\mathcal{N}$  and consists of three finite sets: the set of species,  $\mathcal{S}$ , the set of complexes,  $\mathcal{C}$ , and the set of reactions,  $\mathcal{R}$ . The elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  are denoted by uppercase letters, i.e.  $A, B, \dots$  or  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  and an element of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a linear combination of species with non-negative integer coefficients. For example if  $\mathcal{S} = \{A, B, C\}$ , then  $A + 2C$  is a complex (with the coefficient of  $B$  in this particular complex set to zero). The coefficient beside each species in a complex is called a *stoichiometric coefficient*. An element of  $\mathcal{R}$  is an ordered pair of complexes. If  $y$  and  $y'$  are two complexes, then the reaction defined by the ordered pair  $(y, y')$  is denoted  $y \longrightarrow y'$ . The complex on the left side of the reaction arrow is called the *reactant* and the complex

on the right side is called the *product*. A reversible reaction is denoted as  $y \rightleftharpoons y'$  which is simply a shorthand for two irreversible reactions  $y \longrightarrow y'$  and  $y' \longrightarrow y$ .

The *zero complex* is the complex in which the stoichiometric coefficients of all species are zero. A *flow reaction* has the zero complex as either the reactant (an *inflow reaction*) or the product (an *outflow reaction*). An inflow reaction denotes the injection of species to the network and an outflow denotes the degradation of species or their extraction from the network.


**Definition 2.1.** We say that a reaction network  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  is *fully open* if

$$\forall X \in \mathcal{S} : 0 \longrightarrow X, X \longrightarrow 0 \in \mathcal{R}.$$

The reactions  $0 \longrightarrow X$  and  $X \longrightarrow 0$  are called the *inflow* and the *outflow* of the species  $X$ .

A directed graph can naturally be associated to a network by considering the complexes as its nodes and the reactions as its directed edges. We refer to this digraph as the *CR-graph* of the network.

**Example 2.2** ([14]). Consider a simple model for chemotherapy of tumours. Let  $A$  stand for tumour cells and  $B$  for a drug. In a simple scenario a tumour cell divides and becomes two new tumour cells, giving reaction  $A \longrightarrow 2A$ . Suppose the drug and a tumour cell react and the tumour cell dies. This can be expressed as a reaction with one molecule of the drug and one cell in the reactant, but only the molecule of the drug remaining in the product, i.e.  $A + B \longrightarrow B$ . Finally, we assume the drug leaves the body so we have an outflow for  $B$ ,  $B \longrightarrow 0$ . The three sets associated with this network are  $\mathcal{S} = \{A, B\}$ ,  $\mathcal{C} = \{0, A, 2A, B, A + B\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \{A \longrightarrow 2A, A + B \longrightarrow B, B \longrightarrow 0\}$ . All this information can be represented via the following CR-graph with two components.



With no flow reactions for  $A$  and no inflow for  $B$ , this is not a fully open network (Definition 2.1).

## 2.2 ODEs associated to CRNs

The amount of each species changes over time and thus we associate a variable (technically a mathematical function with respect to time) to each species, denoted with lowercase letters. For example the amount of species  $X$  at time  $t$  should be denoted by  $x(t)$ . However, we drop the emphasis on  $t$  and simply write  $x$  to simplify the notation. Similarly, instead of  $\frac{dx(t)}{dt}$  for the derivative of  $x$  with respect to  $t$ , we use  $\dot{x}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and consider a complex  $y = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i X_i$ . We use the notation  $y$  to represent both the complex and the vector of the stoichiometric coefficients  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  interchangeably. Each time a reaction  $y \longrightarrow y'$  occurs, the amount of  $X_i$  changes by  $y'_i - y_i$  units. If the rate of occurrence of the reaction  $y \longrightarrow y'$  is denoted by  $\rho_{y \rightarrow y'}$ , then the total change in  $x_i$  can be formulated as

$$\dot{x}_i = \sum_{y \rightarrow y' \in \mathcal{R}} (y'_i - y_i) \rho_{y \rightarrow y'}. \quad (1)$$


The rate of occurrence of a reaction depends on the choice of the kinetics (our assumption about how often reactions happen). The most common kinetics, which we use

in this paper, is *mass action kinetics* which states that the rate of occurrence of a reaction is proportional to the product of the concentration of the species on the reactant side of the reaction. The constant of the proportionality is called the *reaction rate constant* and is denoted by  $k_{y \rightarrow y'}$ . Therefore  $\rho_{y \rightarrow y'} = k_{y \rightarrow y'} \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{y_i}$ . We simply use  $x^y$  to denote  $\prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{y_i}$ . Then Equation (1) becomes  $\dot{x}_i = \sum_{y \rightarrow y' \in \mathcal{R}} (y'_i - y_i) k_{y \rightarrow y'} x^y$ . Using a vector notation and putting the equations for all  $n$  species together, we get the following system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$\dot{x} = \sum_{y \rightarrow y' \in \mathcal{R}} (y' - y) k_{y \rightarrow y'} x^y. \quad (2)$$

To include the reaction rate constants in the CR-graph, they will be written as a label for the corresponding directed edges.

**Example 2.3.** Recall the network in Example 2.2. Rename the species as  $X_1 = A$  and  $X_2 = B$ . Then order the reactions in the order they were above: thus instead of using  $k_{A \rightarrow 2A}$  we use  $k_1$ . The labelled CR-graph becomes the following.



The ODE system associated to this network is

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_1 = k_1 x_1 - k_2 x_1 x_2 \\ \dot{x}_2 = -k_3 x_2 \end{cases}. \quad (3)$$

Note that the reaction rate constants, the  $k_i$ s, are parameters for the ODE system and can only attain positive real values. On the other hand, the  $x_i$ s are variables and can have non-negative real values.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a network with  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ . For a fixed value of the reaction rate constants, we say  $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  is a *steady state* if after substituting  $x = x^*$  in Equation (2) we get  $\dot{x} = 0$ . The polynomials on the right hand side of Equation (2) are called the *steady state polynomials*, and by *steady state equations* we refer to the equations  $f(x) = 0$  where  $f(x)$  are the steady state polynomials.

**Example 2.5.** Recall the simple chemotherapy network in Examples 2.2 and 2.3. Fix the reaction rate constants to the following values coming from [14, Table 1]:

$$k = (0.206, 0.117, 0.0709). \quad (4)$$

We used the `dsolve` command of `Maple` to numerically solve the ODE system obtained after substituting these values into (3) with the initial conditions  $x_1(0) = 1$  and  $x_2(0) = 5$ . The plot of the trajectories of the ODE solution is shown in Figure 1. This shows the system is not reaching a steady state as the value of  $x_1$  is not stabilizing at a fixed value no matter how long we wait.

Solving the system of equations obtained by letting  $\dot{x} = 0$  in (3) for any fixed choice of parameter values, we get only one solution  $x = (0, 0)$ . However this steady state can be achieved only in the case where  $x_1(0) = 0$ . The steady state  $(0, 0)$  is an unstable steady state because any generic solution, no matter how close it gets to it, eventually moves away from it ( $x_1$  starts diverging to infinity). Although stability of steady states is important, we do not focus on stability in the rest of this paper.




Figure 1: Plot of the trajectories for the ODE system in (3) after substituting the parameter values in (4) with the initial conditions  $x_1(0) = 1$  and  $x_2(0) = 5$ .


### 2.3 Multistationarity

Consider a fully open network with two (stable) steady states. One can consider one of the steady states as the “state on” and the other one as “state off”, and to switch the state one needs to inject or extract some amount from a species so that the trajectory exits the basin of attraction of one steady state and enters into the basin of attraction of the other. Therefore the capacity of having more than one steady state is crucial in designing biological or chemical circuits [23, 48].

**Definition 2.6.** A fully open network with  $n$  species and  $r$  reactions is called *multistationary* if there exists a choice of reaction rate constants,  $k^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ , for which the system of steady state equations after substituting  $k = k^*$  has more than one solution in  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

Note that we restricted above to non-negative real steady states, as these are the ones with biological / chemical meaning. The definition of multistationarity for the general case of CRNs can be found in [46, Definition 1.1]. When the network is fully open the two definitions are equivalent.

**Example 2.7.** Consider the following network.



Fix the reaction rate constants to the following values (which are given by software introduced in Section 3.3):

$$\begin{aligned}
 k_1 &= 2.4956, \quad k_2 = 1, \quad k_3 = 11.1073, \quad k_4 = 1, \\
 k_5 &= 1, \quad k_6 = 1, \quad k_7 = 3.5202, \quad k_8 = 4.4904.
 \end{aligned}$$

Using the `dsolve` command of `Maple` we plotted the solutions of the ODE system associated to this network for two different initial conditions as shown in Figure 2. The network has more than one steady state for this choice of parameter values which proves the multistationarity of the network.





Figure 2: Plot of two trajectories for the ODE system of the network in Example 2.7 after substituting for the parameter values given there, under two different initial conditions. (a)  $x(0) = (1, 1, 1)$  and (b)  $x(0) = (1.5, 1, 1)$ . Even though the reaction rate constants have the same values in both cases, the first solution converges to the steady state  $(0.1, 7.4, 3.4)$  while the second solution converges to a different steady state,  $(2.3, 1, 1.2)$ . Therefore this network is multistationary.

### 3 Approaches to detect multistationarity

#### 3.1 Examples

We start with simple examples where the computations by hand are feasible.

**Example 3.1.** Consider the following fully open network with only one species.



The ODE system associated to this network has only one equation:

$$\dot{x} = k_1 - k_2x + k_3x^2.$$

To find whether this network is multistationary or not we should see if there exists any choice of  $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$  such that the steady state equation has more than one non-negative real solution. This equation is a univariate degree two polynomial equation and thus its solutions over the complex numbers can be obtained via an explicit formula as follows:

$$\begin{cases} x^{(1)} &= \frac{k_2 + \sqrt{k_2^2 - 4k_1k_3}}{2k_3} \\ x^{(2)} &= \frac{k_2 - \sqrt{k_2^2 - 4k_1k_3}}{2k_3} \end{cases}.$$

Simply by letting  $k = (6, 5, 1)$  one gets two non-negative real solutions  $x^{(1)} = 3$  and  $x^{(2)} = 2$ . Therefore this network is multistationary.

Now let us change the stoichiometric coefficient of  $X$  in only one complex. Consider the following fully open network.



The ODE system associated to this network is

$$\dot{x} = k_1 - k_2x - k_3x^2.$$

This time the two complex solutions of the steady state equation are

$$\begin{cases} x^{(1)} &= \frac{k_2 + \sqrt{k_2^2 + 4k_1k_3}}{2k_3} \\ x^{(2)} &= \frac{k_2 - \sqrt{k_2^2 + 4k_1k_3}}{2k_3} \end{cases}.$$

Since  $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$  we have the strict inequality  $\sqrt{k_2^2 + 4k_1k_3} > k_2$ . This implies that  $k_2 - \sqrt{k_2^2 + 4k_1k_3} < 0$  and therefore for any choice of the reaction rate constants,  $x^{(2)}$  is always negative. So the network in this case has at most one steady state for all choices of parameters and therefore it is *not* multistationary.

Even though in Example 3.1 the computation was straightforward, this is not always the case. There do not exist such explicit formulae for polynomial equations in several variables and arbitrary degrees: to study these we usually require advanced techniques. Further, the approach needs to be algorithmic so that one can make a program to make the decision automatically. We continue this section by surveying four different approaches that are common in CRN theory for detecting multistationarity. We will also use these tools to generate a dataset for ML training in the subsequent sections.

### 3.2 Algebraic tools

An algebraic approach that in theory works for any given network consists of three steps. In the first step it receives the steady state polynomials of the network with the parameters treated as unknowns (not fixed to any specific values). It then uses elimination theory, for example the calculation of a Gröbner Basis (GB, originally introduced by Buchberger [8] with [10] a good introductory text), and returns a polynomial only involving the parameter unknowns. This polynomial is called the *discriminant*. The set of vanishing points of the discriminant polynomial is a hypersurface in the parameter space.

The second step uses *cylindrical algebraic decomposition* (CAD, originally introduced by Collins [9] with [30] a good introductory text) to decompose the parameter regions into a union of connected sets, each of which resides completely inside one connected component of the complement of the discriminant hypersurface. We usually perform an open CAD which produces only full-dimensional open sets, accepting that the boundaries of the sets may contain unexpected behaviour.

The CAD ensures that the number of (non-negative) real solutions of the parametric polynomial system of equations is invariant in each of these connected components. Thus it is enough to check the number of solutions of the system for a single sample point of each set. The third and final step is to repeatedly solve the system after substituting the values of the parameters to the sample points and count the number of solutions at each. The union of the regions where system has more than one non-negative real solution



is called the *multistationarity region*. The network is multistationary if and only if the multistationarity region is nonempty.

To read more about this approach and all its technical details see [34, 39]; or for a simple explanation of how to use this algorithm in the context of multistationarity see [43, 45]. Additional papers that have developed this approach further include [6, 35, 44]. This algorithm is also implemented in the `Maple` package `RootFinding[Parametric]` [24]. In this paper we refer to this as the *algebraic approach*.

**Example 3.2.** Recall the two simple fully open networks of Example 3.1. Using the `Maple` package `RootFinding[Parametric]` we apply the algebraic approach to find the multistationarity region of the two networks. For Network (5) the discriminant is

$$k_1 k_2 k_3 (k_2^2 - 4k_1 k_3).$$

The open CAD decomposition of the parameter region creates two regions with the sample points  $k^{(1)} = (\frac{73786976294838206307}{590295810358705651712}, 1, 1)$  and  $k^{(2)} = (1, 1, 1)$ . The steady state equation has two non-negative real solutions for  $k = k^{(1)}$ , but no non-negative solutions for  $k = k^{(2)}$ . Thus the multistationarity region is the region containing  $k^{(1)}$  which is non-empty and the network is multistationary. The discriminant surface and the two sample points are shown in Figure 3.

In the case of Network (6), the discriminant is

$$k_1 k_2 k_3 (k_2^2 + 4k_1 k_3).$$

The discriminant surface becomes the boundaries of the non-negative orthant, because  $k_2^2 + 4k_1 k_3$  does not vanish on  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$ . Thus the complement of the discriminant surface in the parameter space is a single region with  $(1, 1, 1)$  as a possible sample point. The steady state equation has only one non-negative solution at this point. This proves that the network is not multistationary.




Figure 3: The discriminant surface and the sample points computed in the algebraic approach in order to check multistationarity of Network (5) of Example 3.1.

### 3.3 Deficiency algorithms


The best known software in the CRN theory community is `CRNToolbox` [20]. This software uses deficiency theorems and algorithms to decide multistationarity of CRNs. To briefly review the deficiency results, we need a few simple definitions.

We recall from graph theory that a simple graph, i.e. one whose edges do not have direction, is connected if for every two nodes one can find a path of edges from one node to the other node. A directed graph (digraph) is called *connected* if it is a connected graph without considering the direction of its edges. It is called *weakly connected* if for every two nodes  $u$  and  $v$ , there is a directed path from one of the two nodes to the other one. It is called *strongly connected* if for every two nodes  $u$  and  $v$ , there are directed paths both from  $u$  to  $v$  and from  $v$  to  $u$ . A connected, weakly connected or strongly connected *component* of a digraph is a subgraph of the digraph which is connected, weakly connected or strongly connected respectively.

A maximal connected component of the CR-graph of a network is called a *linkage class*. A strongly connected component of a linkage class where there is no reaction from any of its complexes to a complex outside of it, is called a *terminal strong linkage*. A network is called *weakly reversible* if every linkage class is a terminal strong linkage.

**Example 3.3.** The network in Example 2.2 has two linkage classes, and each of them has one terminal strong linkage consisting of a single complex with no reaction, that is  $2A$  and  $0$ .

The CR-graph of the network in Example 2.7 can be redrawn as the following.



It has 3 linkage classes. Each of them has one terminal strong linkage. The linkage class of flow reactions is itself a terminal strong linkage and the two others are isolated complexes  $2A$  and  $C$ .

**Definition 3.4.** Let  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  be a network. It is called *regular* if the following three conditions hold.

1. The set of vectors  $\{y' - y \mid y \longrightarrow y' \in \mathcal{R}\}$  is linearly dependent over  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ .
2. Each linkage class has only one terminal strong linkage class.
3. If we remove the reactions between two complexes in a terminal strong linkage, it becomes disconnected.

Note that for terminal strong linkages that contain an isolated complex, the third condition is vacuously true.

**Example 3.5.** The network in Example 2.2 is not a regular network because of the first condition. The set of vectors associated to the reactions are  $\{(1, 0), (-1, 0), (0, -1)\}$  which are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ . Note that over  $\mathbb{R}$  we could put 0 as the coefficient of the third vector, but over  $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$  the coefficient can not be 0.

The networks in Examples 2.7 and Example 3.1 are regular.

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a network. The *stoichiometric matrix*,  $N$ , is the matrix whose columns are the vectors  $y' - y$  for the reactions  $y \longrightarrow y'$  of  $\mathcal{N}$ . The rank of  $N$  is called the *stoichiometric dimension* of  $\mathcal{N}$  and is denoted by  $s$ . If  $\mathcal{N}$  has  $c$  complexes and  $\ell$  linkage classes, then the *deficiency* of  $\mathcal{N}$ , denoted by  $\delta$ , is defined to be  $\delta = c - \ell - s$ .

Clearly the stoichiometric dimension of fully open networks is equal to the number of their species. Now everything is ready to state the deficiency theorems and algorithms. The results from this point until the end of Section 3.3 are taken from [16–18], to which one should refer for their proofs and further details. Here we just restate them for the case of fully open networks.

**Theorem 3.7.** (Deficiency zero theorem [31, Theorem 2.10]). *A weakly reversible fully open network of deficiency zero is not multistationary.*

**Theorem 3.8.** (Deficiency one theorem [31, Theorem 2.11]). *A fully open network that satisfies the following three conditions is not multistationary:*

1. *each linkage class has only one terminal strong linkage;*
2. *the deficiency of each linkage is at most one; and*
3. *the sum of deficiencies of linkages is equal to the deficiency of the network.*

**Theorem 3.9.** (Deficiency one algorithm [31, Section 3]). *The deficiency one algorithm can determine multistationarity of a regular fully open network of deficiency one whose linkage classes have deficiency zero.*

The CR-graph of the network in Example 2.7 has been given to `CRNToolbox`: the software detected that it satisfies the conditions of Theorem 3.9; thus after applying the algorithm on the network it announces that the network is multistationary and returns the reaction rate constants values used in Example 2.7 and the two steady states as the evidence of multistationarity.

We omit in this manuscript discussion on the higher deficiency algorithm, noting only that it is a generalization of the deficiency one algorithm for networks with deficiency higher than one. Interested readers are referred to [15, 29].

### 3.4 Inheritance of multistationarity via network extension operators


Another approach that attracted attention of CRN theory researchers is to find under which conditions one can conclude properties of a CRN based on a smaller part of the network. Since the computations for the smaller networks take less time, this can save a lot of computational effort. Some of these works involve removing reactions or removing species, or both, or partitioning these sets to smaller sets. For such works see [2–4, 21, 46].

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $\mathcal{N} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{R})$  be a network,  $S \subset \mathcal{S}$  and  $R \subset \mathcal{R}$ . Then perform the following steps in the order given.


1. Remove from  $\mathcal{R}$  any reactions not in  $R$ .
2. Remove from  $\mathcal{S}$  any species not in  $S$ .
3. Change the stoichiometric coefficients of the species that do not belong to  $S$  in all complexes to 0 and update  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  accordingly. These are sets, so we do not keep duplicates.
4. Remove any reaction  $y \longrightarrow y$  from  $\mathcal{R}$ .
5. Remove any complex that is not involved in any reaction from  $\mathcal{C}$ .
6. Remove any species that is not involved in any complex from  $\mathcal{S}$ .

The updated sets  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{R}$  define a new network that we denote by  $\mathcal{N}|_{S,R}$  and call the *embedded subnetwork* of  $\mathcal{N}$  induced by  $S$  and  $R$ , (alternatively it can be called the embedded subnetwork of  $\mathcal{N}$  after removal of  $\mathcal{S} - S$  and  $\mathcal{R} - R$  from  $\mathcal{N}$ ). The network  $\mathcal{N}$  is called an *extension* of  $\mathcal{N}|_{S,R}$ .


**Example 3.11.** Consider the network  $\mathcal{N}_1$  with the CR-graph as follows. It has 7 species, 9 complexes and 8 reactions.




We want to generate an embedded subnetwork,  $\mathcal{N}_2$ , from  $\mathcal{N}_1$  by removing two species  $X_3$  and  $X_4$  and two reactions: the 4th and the 7th. Applying the first step the CR-graph becomes the following.




Applying Steps 2 and 3 then gives us the following CR-graph.




Applying Step 4 updates the CR-graph as follows.



Finally after Steps 5 and 6 we have  $\mathcal{N}_2$  below.




Note that even though the species  $X_6$  was not requested to be removed, as the result of removing the fourth reaction in the original network, this species automatically is removed. The new network has 4 species, 6 complexes and 5 reactions. Also note that the zero complex and the complex  $X_1$  (containing only  $X_1$  with stoichiometric coefficient one) did not exist in the original network, but by removal of species 3 and 4 they are generated. The CR-graph of  $\mathcal{N}_2$  has only one linkage class while  $\mathcal{N}_1$  had two.



**Theorem 3.12.** ([32, Corollary 4.6]). *Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a fully open network and  $\mathcal{N}'$  a fully open embedded subnetwork of  $\mathcal{N}$ . If  $\mathcal{N}'$  is multistationary, then  $\mathcal{N}$  is multistationary as well.*

This theorem tells us that by adding reactions or species to a fully open multistationary network we again obtain a multistationary network. However, we can not conclude anything about multistationarity of a subnetwork of a multistationary network. Similarly we can conclude that removing reactions and species from a fully open non-multistationary network, gives us a non-multistationary network, but we can not conclude anything about multistationarity of an extension of a fully open non-multistationary network.

**Example 3.13.** Since Network (5) is multistationary, the following network is also multistationary by Theorem 3.12.



### 3.5 Positive feedback loops

The last approach that we will discuss is a method to preclude multistationarity. This needs a different graph representation of a CRN called the *directed species-reaction graph* (DSR-graph).

**Definition 3.14.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a network with  $n$  species,  $X_i$ , and  $r$  reactions with the occurrence rates  $\rho_i$ . Note that each  $\rho_i$  can be a function of concentrations of the species, as in the mass action kinetics. The *influx matrix*,  $Z = [z_{i,j}]_{n \times r}$  is defined as a symbolic matrix with entries as

$$z_{i,j} = \text{sgn}\left(\frac{d\rho_j}{dx_i}\right)\gamma_{i,j}. \quad (7)$$

In the case of mass action kinetics (which is what we restrict ourselves to in this manuscript) the influx matrix has a simple form stated in the following lemma whose proof is straightforward.

**Lemma 3.15.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a network with  $n$  species,  $X_i$ , and  $r$  reactions, which is equipped with mass action kinetics. Equation (7) simplifies to  $z_{i,j} = \gamma_{i,j}$  if  $X_i$  is at the reactant side of the  $j$ th reaction, otherwise  $z_{i,j} = 0$ .

**Definition 3.16.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a network with  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ ,  $\mathcal{R} = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r\}$ , the stoichiometric matrix  $N = [a_{i,j}]_{n \times r}$ , and the influx matrix  $Z = [z_{i,j}]_{n \times r}$ . The *DSR-graph* is a labelled digraph with  $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{R}$  as its set of nodes. For every non-zero entry of  $N$ , there is an edge from  $\tau_j$  to  $X_i$  with  $a_{i,j}$  as its label, and for every non-zero entry of  $Z$ , there is an edge from  $X_i$  to  $\tau_j$  labelled  $z_{i,j}$ .

Additionally the *signed DSR-graph* is the same as the DSR-graph with the difference that the  $\gamma_{i,j}$ s are removed from the labels coming from the influx matrix, and only the signs behind them remain. Similarly the labels coming from the stoichiometric matrix are replaced with their signs, that is  $\text{sgn}(a_{i,j})$ . In this representation of the signed DSR-graphs we write  $+$  and  $-$  instead of 1 and  $-1$  on the edges.

**Example 3.17.** Recall Network (6) from Example 3.1. The DSR-graph and signed DSR-graph are shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: (a) DSR-graph and (b) signed DSR-graph for Network (6) of Example 3.1.

Recall that a *cycle* in a graph is a closed path that does not cross itself at any vertices.

**Definition 3.18.** Consider the signed DSR-graph of a network. The label or sign of a cycle is the product of labels from its edges. A cycle with positive label is called a *positive feedback loop*. Similarly a *negative feedback loop* is a cycle with a negative label. The length of a feedback loop is the number of species vertices used in this cycle. A feedback loop is called *even* or *odd* if its length is an even or odd integer respectively. Two feedback loops are called *disjoint* if they have no common nodes.

**Definition 3.19.** A *nucleus* is a set of disjoint feedback loops. Let  $D = \{L_1, \dots, L_m\}$  be a nucleus and assume  $m'$  is the number of even feedback loops in  $D$ . The label or sign of  $D$  is defined as

$$\text{sgn}(D) = (-1)^{m'} \prod_{i=1}^m \text{sgn}(L_i).$$

**Theorem 3.20.** ([22]). *Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be network with stoichiometric dimension  $s$ . If the sign of every nucleus of length  $s$  is equal to  $(-1)^s$ , then  $\mathcal{N}$  is not multistationary.*

The following lemma is implicitly proved in [22].

**Lemma 3.21.** ([22]). *If all feedback loops in a nucleus  $D$  are negative, and the length of  $D$  is  $m$ , then  $\text{sgn}(D) = (-1)^m$ .*

Theorem 3.20 and Lemma 3.21 together give the following corollary.

**Corollary 3.22.** ([22]). *If a network does not contain any positive feedback loop, then it is not multistationary.*

Note that there are only two feedback loops in Example 3.17, both negative. Therefore by Corollary 3.22 Network (6) is not multistationary. Note that this theorem is inconclusive when its condition is not satisfied. For example it does not make any conclusion about the multistationarity of Network (5). It has stoichiometric dimension 1 and two feedback loops, one negative of length one and one positive of length one. The positive feedback loop alone makes a nucleus of length 1 with no even feedback loops so its sign is

$$(-1)^0(+1)^1 = 1,$$

while  $(-1)^s = (-1)^1 = -1$ .

We now go a bit further than [22] and prove the following new proposition which is simplified version of Theorem 3.20 for fully open networks equipped with mass action kinetics.

**Proposition 3.23.** *Theorem 3.20 is inconclusive for a fully open network equipped with mass action kinetics if and only if there exists a positive feedback loop.*

Before presenting the proof of Proposition 3.23, we include a straightforward corollary of the result.

**Corollary 3.24.** *If a fully open network equipped with mass action kinetics contains a reaction with a species on both sides of it, but with higher stoichiometric coefficient on the product side, then Theorem 3.20 is inconclusive.*

*Proof.* Let the species in the corollary be  $X$  with the stoichiometric coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  in the reactant and the product sides respectively. By the corollary's assumption  $1 \leq a < b$ . Therefore the sign of the corresponding entry of the influx matrix and the stoichiometric matrix are both positive and  $X \xrightleftharpoons[+]{+} \mathbf{r}_1$  is a positive feedback loop. By Proposition 3.23, Theorem 3.20 does not decide multistationarity status of the network.  $\square$

In particular if a fully open network contains a reversible reaction with a species appearing on both sides with different stoichiometric coefficients, one of the two sides gives us a positive feedback loop.


*Proof of Proposition 3.23.* Since the network is fully open the stoichiometric dimension is the number of species,  $n$ . For every species the outflow reaction gives a negative feedback loop of length one.

If there exist no positive feedback loop then by Lemma 3.21, the condition of Theorem 3.20 holds. So assume there exists a positive feedback loop. Denote the length of this positive feedback loop with  $m$ . If we pick up this positive feedback loop with  $m-n$  negative feedback loops of length one for outflow reactions of the species not involved in the previous positive feedback loop, then the sum of the lengths is  $n$  and the selected feedback loops all are disjoint. Therefore we have a nucleus whose sign is  $((-1)^1)^{n-m}((-1)^0(+1)^m) = (-1)^{n-m}$  if  $m$  is odd, and is  $((-1)^1)^{n-m}((-1)^1(+1)^m) = (-1)^{n-m+1}$  if  $m$  is even. If  $m$  is odd,  $n-m$  is odd or even if  $n$  is even or odd respectively. That means  $(-1)^{n-m}$  is always of opposite sign to  $(-1)^n$ . If  $m$  is even, then  $m-1$  is odd and with a same reasoning as in the previous sentence, the sign of  $(-1)^{n-m+1} = (-1)^{n-(m-1)}$  is always of opposite sign to  $(-1)^n$ . Thus the condition of Theorem 3.20 does not hold.  $\square$

### 3.6 Limitation of current approaches

To show the limitations of the current methods we study the following example which is small compared to realistic biological examples that might contain hundreds or even thousands of species and reactions.

**Example 3.25.** Consider a fully open network with 6 species and 6 non-flow reactions as follows.



Giving this network to `CRNToolbox` as an input, the initial report suggests to run the higher deficiency algorithm. Note that the CR-graph contains the flow reactions as well, this graph has three linkage classes and the deficiency of the network is 4. After requesting the higher deficiency algorithm from `CRNToolbox`, which took more than a minute to finish the computation, the report states “*taken with mass action kinetics, the network might have the capacity for multiple steady states*”. I.e. The higher deficiency algorithm failed to determine the multistationarity of this network.


The report continues with a suggestion to run other algorithms implemented in `CRNToolbox`: “*to determine whether the network might admit two distinct stoichiometrically compatible positive equilibria, you should also consult the mass action injectivity or concordance report if you haven’t already done so. (To test for rate constants that give a degenerate steady state, consult the Zero Eigenvalue Report)*”. The mass action injectivity report is produced instantly but failed to make a decision on multistationarity. The report says “*taken with mass action kinetics, the network is not injective*”.

We then turn to the other suggestions in the higher deficiency report. When asking `CRNToolbox` for the zero eigenvalue report, the CPU use of the computer increases considerably and even after 10 minutes waiting the software does not give any output. The last suggestion of `CRNToolbox`, the concordance report, states that there is a kinetics such that the network can be multistationary, however the given kinetics is not mass-action. In summary, `CRNToolbox` and specially deficiency results (higher deficiency algorithm in this case) failed to determine multistationarity of Network (8).

We attempt to use the algebraic approach via Maple package, `RootFinding:-Parametric`. The amount of memory used quickly passes 25 GB within 7 minutes with the computation still unfinished.

Regarding the inheritance method: none of the atoms of multistationarity (of fully open networks with one reversible or irreversible non-flow reaction, or fully open networks with two reversible and irreversible non-flow reactions where the sum of the stoichiometric coefficients of each complex is at most two, introduced in [31, 32]) are embedded sub-networks of Network (8). Hence this method also fails to detect multistationarity of this network.

Finally the last approach, the use of positive feedback loops for excluding multistationarity also fails. Note that by considering the reversible reaction  $X_2 + X_3 \rightleftharpoons X_1 + X_4$  and naming the forward reaction as  $\tau_1$  and the backward reaction as  $\tau_2$ , we get the following positive feedback loop.



Thus by Proposition 3.23, Theorem 3.20 is inconclusive for Network (8).

This example motivates us to look for an alternative approach.


## 4 Initial attempts to use ML

An observation, true for any general network, is that when we fix the CR-graph of a network and only let the stoichiometric coefficients vary, then multistationarity of the network is dependent on these stoichiometric coefficients. Therefore a natural question is whether we can train a Machine Learning (ML) model that finds a relation among the coefficients of the network that separates multistationary and non-multistationary networks.

### 4.1 The smallest fully open networks

Let us start by experimenting with the smallest fully open networks, namely fully open networks with only one irreversible or reversible non-flow reaction. Joshi has completely classified multistationarity of these networks in [31] using deficiency results (Section 3.3).

**Theorem 4.1.** ([31, Theorem 4.1]). *Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a fully open network with  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and only one non-flow reaction as follows.*



*The network  $\mathcal{N}$  is multistationary if and only if*

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ a_i < b_i}}^n a_i > 1.$$

*If the non-flow reaction is reversible then the above condition becomes*

$$\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ a_i < b_i}}^n a_i > 1 \text{ or } \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ b_i < a_i}}^n b_i > 1.$$



To make it even simpler consider fully open networks with one irreversible non-flow reaction and only one species. So the only varying features of the networks are the stoichiometric coefficients of this species on the two sides of the non-flow reaction,  $aX \longrightarrow bX$ .

The inputs space can be represented as a two-dimensional space,  $\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid a \neq b\}$ . By Theorem 4.1 the set of multistationary networks will correspond to the set of points in the input space that are between the two lines  $a = \frac{3}{2}$  and  $b = a$ , as shown in Figure 5. This visualisation suggests the use of the ML technique of Support Vector Machines (SVMs) [11] to fit a dividing hypersurface between the classes.




Figure 5: The fully open networks with only one species  $X$  and one non-flow irreversible reaction  $aX \longrightarrow bX$  can be simply represented as a vector  $(a, b)$ . The points  $(a, b)$  with  $a = b$  are not representing any network since we do not allow a reaction with both complexes the same, these points are shown as empty circles. The points coloured in red are associated to the multistationary networks and the blue points associate with non-multistationary networks. The multistationary networks satisfy  $a > \frac{3}{2}$  and  $b > a$ .

## 4.2 Experiments with support vector machines

We first create a simple dataset of all  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$  such that  $a, b \leq 20$  and assigned each data point one of two labels: one for multistationary networks and one for any other points including points that do not correspond to a network at all. Then we used the `svm` command from the `sklearn` package for Python [41] to train an SVM with a linear kernel. The result is visualised in Figure 6(a). We also used the same command for an SVM with a polynomial of degree 7 for the kernel (see Figure 6(b)).

We then looked at the case of fully open networks with one species and one non-flow reaction, but this time reversible. The networks can still be represented with the points  $(a, b)$ : the multistationary networks will be all points other than those on the three lines  $a = 1$ ,  $b = 1$  or  $a = b$ . Using `sklearn`, an SVM with a polynomial of degree 3 for the kernel is trained with 400 of the points  $(a, b)$  with  $a, b \leq 20$ , as visualised in Figure 6(c).

To go one dimension higher we considered fully open networks with two species and one irreversible non-flow reaction and we fixed the value of one of the four stoichiometric coefficients,  $X_1 + aX_2 \longrightarrow bX_1 + cX_2$ . These networks can be represented by points in three dimensions,

$$\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{N}^3 \mid (1, a) \neq (b, c)\}.$$

The multistationary networks are those that have  $2 < a < c$  or  $a = 1$ ,  $b > 1$  and  $c > a$ . The result of using `sklearn` for training an SVM with linear kernel with the dataset of 125 points  $(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{N}^3$ ,  $a, b, c \leq 5$  is visualised in Figure 6(d).




Figure 6: Visualization of the results of training SVMs for binary classification of multistationarity of some small networks. In all figures the red colored circles indicate parameter values corresponding to multistationary networks and the cyan coloured circles those which do not (they indicate either the presence of a network that is non-multistationary, or that there is no network at all). The background shading in (a)–(c) indicates the multistationarity predictions made by trained SVMs in these regions. That is, the red shaded region is where the trained function of the SVM is nonnegative and thus the points in this region are predicted to correspond to multistationary networks.

(a) Linear SVM for fully open networks with one species and one irreversible non-flow reaction.

(b) SVM with degree 7 polynomial kernel for fully open networks with one species and one irreversible non-flow reaction.

(c) SVM with degree 3 polynomial kernel for fully open networks with one species and one reversible non-flow reaction.

(d) Linear SVM for fully open networks with two species and one irreversible non-flow reaction with the stoichiometric coefficient of the first species in the reactant fixed to 1. In this case only the boundary plane is drawn: the points below this plane are predicted to be non-multistationary and the ones above predicted to be multistationary.

### 4.3 Limitations of simple ML approaches

SVM is not the only ML method that can be used. For example, we also used the `sklearn RandomForestClassifier` to train a random forest (RF) [53, Chapter 5] for the fully open networks with one species and one irreversible non-flow reaction. An RF is an ensemble of decision trees (cascading binary decisions based on the input) such as the one visualised in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Visualisation of one of the decision trees from the `RandomForestClassifier` from `sklearn` that was trained to create an RF for predicting multistationarity of fully open networks with only one species and one irreversible non-flow reaction. The input vectors are  $(a, b)$  where  $a$  and  $b$  are the stoichiometric coefficients of the species in the reactant and the product sides of the non-flow reaction.

Models such as SVM and RF require fixed length input vectors, whereas the number of stoichiometric coefficients of networks vary based on the number of reactions and species. So although we can get nice results for small sub-cases this way, it does not generalise to study more general CRNs. In the next section we develop new methods to handle variable length input data for CRNs.

## 5 ML for CRNs via a new graph representation


We opt for a graph representation of our chemical reaction networks since this seems best placed to capture the detail of the interactions involved. There are a variety of ML approaches that accept graphs as input, usually called graph learning algorithms. Probably the best known is the *graph neural network* (GNN) which consists of an iterative process to propagate node states until equilibrium, followed by a neural network is trained to produce an output for each node. An overview of the family of GNN methods may be found in [36].

However, before applying any such tool we need to first decide precisely how to present a CRN as a graph input. For this purpose we introduce a new graph representation for a fully open network.

## 5.1 New graph representation of CRNs

Since by assumption the species flow reactions are included in all CRNs we study here, they do not play a role in determining multistationarity. Thus we will only encode the rest of the reactions.

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a fully open network with  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and assume there are  $r$  reactions other than the species flows where the  $i$ th such reaction, denoted by  $\tau_i$ , is written as



We construct a new weighted labelled digraph representation with the vertices set  $V$  and edges set  $E$  following the steps below.

1. For any reaction  $\tau_i$  construct a vertex  $v_{\tau_i} \in V$  to represent this reaction.
2. For every species in the reactant side of  $\tau_i$ , say  $X_j$ , construct a vertex  $v_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i}$ . That means if  $a_j^{(i)} \neq 0$  then  $v_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i} \in V$ . Construct also a directed edge  $e_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i} = (v_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i}, v_{\tau_i}) \in E$ .
3. Similarly for every species in the product side of  $\tau_i$ , say  $X_j$ , we associate a vertex  $v_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j}$ . That means if  $b_j^{(i)} \neq 0$  then  $v_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j} \in V$ . Construct also directed edge  $e_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j} = (v_{\tau_i}, v_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j}) \in E$ .
4. Connect all vertices of the form  $v_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i}$  or  $v_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j}$  via reversible edges with the label  $X_j$ .
5. Assign every vertex of the form  $v_{\tau_i}$  the weight 0.
6. Assign all vertices of the form  $v_{X_j \rightarrow \tau_i}$  the weight  $a_j^{(i)}$ , and all vertices of the form  $v_{\tau_i \rightarrow X_j}$  the weight  $b_j^{(i)}$ .

Since a species with 0 as its stoichiometric coefficient in a complex does not contribute to a vertex in this graph, the only vertices with 0 as their weight are the reaction vertices. All other vertices contain one of the nonzero stoichiometric coefficients that appear in the CR-graph of the network. The labelled reversible reactions make it clear which of the stoichiometric coefficients in this new graph are coming from the same species and makes it possible to recreate the complexes.

Note that a permutation on the species names or a renaming of them does not change the multistationarity of the network. The irreversible unlabelled edges show which side of the reaction the species is appeared with the given stoichiometric coefficient. Therefore the CR-graph can uniquely, up to a renaming of the species, be rewritten from this new graph. We call this new graph representation of a fully open network the *species-reaction graph with emphasis on stoichiometric coefficients* abbreviated as the *SRSC-graph*.

**Example 5.2.** Let  $\mathcal{N}_1$  be a fully open network with two species  $A$  and  $B$  and one non-flow reversible reaction,



Let  $\mathcal{N}_2$  be a fully open network with three species  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  and three non-flow irreversible reactions:






Figure 8: The SRSC-graph representation of (a) Network (9) and (b) Network (10).

The SRSC-graph of these two networks are presented in Figure 8.

The reasoning behind Definition 5.1 is that the graph learning algorithm needs to pass data from one node to another node using the directed edges. The decisive data in our problem are the stoichiometric coefficients, and therefore we let these move in the direction of reactants to products, and also freely among different instances of a species in different complexes. Note that without the later permission, the graph may end up with low connectivity, leading the graph learning algorithm to perform poorly. We also put 0 as the weight on the reaction vertices since they are not encoding stoichiometric coefficients and they are only playing the role of a bridge between reactants and products and thus they should not have a numerical contribution.

## 5.2 Dataset creation

Our new graph representation allows us to apply graph learning algorithms and thus frees us from the restriction on the number of non-flow reactions and species that we had in Section 4. However, graph learning networks need large datasets for training and testing. In addition to that, our goal is not to only study one non-flow reaction as in Section 4 since Theorem 4.1 has already provided an exact and easy answer to that case. We want to have a tool to predict multistationarity of a general fully open network and so we need to create a dataset that has representation from a reasonably diverse set of shapes of fully open networks. To create this labelled dataset we used not only Theorem 4.1, but also the rest of tools reviewed in Section 3.

We included all atoms of multistationarity, smallest embedded subnetworks that are multistationary, of bimolecular<sup>1</sup> two non-flow reactions that are classified in [32, Figure 3]. There are 35 of these. Then we created some extended networks from these atoms which are again multistationary due to Theorem 3.12.

CRNToolbox was also used to generate some examples and label them. Unfortunately generation of networks in CRNToolbox can not be automatized and the user needs to enter every example manually. The software does not have an API interface to allow for calls

<sup>1</sup>meaning the sum of stoichiometric coefficients in every complex is at most two.

from code. We also observed that for networks with large complexes or many reactions the software does not work well.

As seen in Section 3.6 the algebraic approach also takes too much time and memory and thus was deemed not practical for dataset generation.

Using Theorem 3.12 we were able to create many multistationary networks from any other multistationary case that we could find. However, creating non-multistationary examples is harder and the dataset up to this step is very unbalanced. That is why we get help from positive feedback loop approach and Theorem 3.20.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a CRN with  $\mathcal{S} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and  $\mathcal{R} = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r\}$  where  $\tau_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j^{(i)} X_j \longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n b_j^{(i)} X_j$ . Define a new set of reactions  $\mathcal{R}' = \{\tau'_1, \dots, \tau'_r\}$  with  $\tau'_i = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j^{(i)} X_j \longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n d_j^{(i)} X_j$  satisfying the following two conditions.*

- *For every  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $a_j^{(i)} = 0$  if and only if  $c_j^{(i)} = 0$ , similarly  $b_j^{(i)} = 0$  if and only if  $d_j^{(i)} = 0$ .*
- *For every  $i$  and  $j$ , if  $a_j^{(i)} \prec b_j^{(i)}$  where  $\prec$  is one of the three relations  $<, =, >$ , then  $c_j^{(i)} \prec d_j^{(i)}$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{N}'$  be the CRN defined by  $\mathcal{R}'$  as its set of reactions. Considering mass action kinetics, if  $\mathcal{N}$  does not have a positive feedback loop, then  $\mathcal{N}'$  also does not have any positive feedback loop.*

*Proof.* Name the signed DSR-graphs of  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}'$  as  $G$  and  $G'$  respectively. If the change in the stoichiometric coefficients does not make two reactions duplicate, then  $G' = G$  and the proposition trivially holds. If two reactions become redundant, say  $\tau_i = \tau_j$ , for  $i \neq j$ , then  $G'$  is the subgraph of  $G$  obtained by removal of the vertex  $v_{\tau_j}$ . Thus the set of positive feedback loops of  $\mathcal{N}'$  is a subset of positive feedback loops of  $\mathcal{N}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

This proposition is interesting in its own right because, while so far network extension operations could only keep multistationarity, here a new operation keeping non-multistationarity is obtained. If  $\mathcal{N}$  is a fully open CRN equipped with mass action kinetics without a positive feedback loop, and thus non-multistationary, then using Proposition 5.3 one can change the stoichiometric coefficients and obtain a new non-multistationary fully open network. Note that this new operation keeps the set of species the same, but changes the sets of complexes and reactions. Furthermore, while each atom of multistationarity only provides finitely many choices of non-multistationary networks, a network without positive feedback loop provides us infinitely many choices of non-multistationary networks.

To create a sufficient number of non-multistationary networks to make our dataset balanced we first identified 45 fully open networks with no positive feedback loops as listed in Appendix A. Then, by changing the stoichiometric coefficients of these networks following Proposition 5.3, we generated new non-multistationary examples to add to the dataset.

The final dataset consists of around 104,000 CRNs, split evenly from our two classes of multistationary and non-multistationary. These are created using three tools: 5621 multistationary and 6898 non-multistationary networks are generated using Theorem 4.1, 46499 multistationary networks are created by Theorem 3.12 using the atoms of multistationary given at [32, Figure 3], and finally 45410 non-multistationary networks are created using Proposition 5.3 and the 45 base networks with no positive feedback loops at Appendix A.

For validation purpose, we created a separate 32 additional networks manually, keeping the reactions and species between 2 – 6 each. None of these networks belong to the dataset above; further, we can prove that none of the non-multistationary ones could possibly be written based on the 45 networks in Appendix A. These networks could all be labelled using `CRNToolbox` and they are listed in Appendix B. Since these represent fundamentally different networks to those in the training set they will be used for validation – to evaluate the level of generalisability of the ML model.

### 5.3 ML experiment methodology

Most GNNs do not usually consider directions of the graph edges, they treat every edge similarly, which does not fit our purposes. We choose to work with *graph attention networks* (GATs<sup>2</sup>)

GATs were presented in [50]. Crucially for us, they allow for directed edges. The main distinction of GATs over GNNs is the use of a self-attention mechanism (inspired by transformers [49]). In ML, an attention mechanism is a technique that allows models to focus on specific parts of the input data when producing outputs, allowing for variable sized inputs, with a self-attention mechanism the use of these to compute a representation of single sequence. The architecture of GATs allows training to efficiently specify weights to different nodes in a neighbourhood without knowing the graph structure upfront. Thus GATs usually perform better than GNNs in cases where the graph contains nodes or edges of varying importance to a prediction. We hypothesise that this will be the case for our problem: the architecture may allow for learning to focus on parts of the network that promote or block multistationarity. The disadvantage of GATs compared to GNNs is a higher computational cost, however, this extra costs is not significant for the size of experiments presented here.

We use the GAT implementation in DGL [51] running on Pytorch [40].

### 5.4 Results

Figure 9 shows the training loss (the aggregated difference between a model’s predicted output and the actual target values) and accuracy of classifications of the GAT model as it progressed through the training process. In both cases we observe a fairly swift and smooth convergence.

The GAT model achieves 96% accuracy on both training and testing data (separate subsets of the original dataset). We can conclude that the new graph representation allows for successful machine learning without the limitations of our earlier experiments in Section 4.

We note that the model’s output layer is a single point indicate the binary classification. However, prior to this, the model can project the input CRN to three dimensions (before projecting further to that final decision). The advantage of this is that the 3-dimensional data can be used to give a visualisation of its classification. An example of this is within Figure 10, showing that under this projection the labelled instances are very well separated.

A key question of any ML experiment is whether the model can generalise away from the training data. Although we tested and saw good predictive performance on data not used in training, that data was part of the main dataset and thus will have many similarities to the training data. There is hence the risk of data leakage and overfitting.

---

<sup>2</sup>The acronym GAT is chosen to distinguish this from generative adversarial networks: another tool in the ML family which is usually referred to with the acronym GAN.




Figure 9: The training loss and accuracy of the GAT model throughout the training process.




Figure 10: Visualization of the class separation provided by the GAT model on the training data

To explore this risk we use the separate validation set of 32 examples described at the end of Section 5.2 and itemised in Appendix B. These examples were produced completely independently of the main dataset. Table 1 shows the confusion matrix for the performance of the GAT on this data: the instances in the shaded cells are correctly predicted and the others incorrect. The overall accuracy is 72%, and this is observed both in predictions of multistationarity and non-multistationarity. While there is still much room for improvement, the model is demonstrating generalisation away from the training data.

Table 1: Confusion Matrix

Actual	Predicted	
	Multi	Non-Multi
Multi	8	3
Non-Multi	6	15



## 6 Conclusions and future work

We have demonstrated the feasibility of ML to predict multistationarity of CRNs. This can offer a powerful alternative to the existing methods to uncover this property. This new approach pays a high computational cost once (during ML training) but is then cheap to make predictions thereafter. Of course, as a probabilistic method these predictions come with no guarantees and so researchers may choose to pay the high cost to verify the result: such a cost could be chosen selectively though, e.g. just for the model selected to study in detail.

We suggest that graph learning is the natural ML methodology for answering such questions about CRNs and have developed a graph representation of CRNs suitable for the purpose. This approach removes the limitation of having fixed length input and arguably better models the underlying networks. We note that the representation and methodology of Section 5 could be applied for other classifications in CRN with relative ease.

Future work could of course experiment with other representations and learning algorithms. However, we suspect that future improvements to generalisability will have to come from a more diverse dataset. We have contributed the first large scale labelled dataset in this field (available online at the URL at the end). However, this does not yet sufficiently represents the space of CRNs.

We finish by speculating on another avenue of future work. Namely that the ML models trained for such tasks might inform new mathematical results. The use of ML for mathematical discovery has been investigated for example in [12, 26]. A route to this may come from applying the burgeoning literature on Explainable / Interpretable AI methods [5]. For example, recently an XAI analysis of ML predictions to optimise a computer algebra algorithm led to the creation of new simple heuristics that are not data-dependent and can be easily interpreted and implemented by humans [42]. We propose that such analysis might lead mathematicians to new CRN results on multistationarity.

## Data Access Statement

The code and data described in this paper is openly available from this URL: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12587197>

## Acknowledgements

The first author acknowledges funding from Coventry University for a summer research internship. The second and third authors acknowledge the support of UKRI EPSRC Grant EP/T015748/1, “*Pushing Back the Doubly-Exponential Wall of Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition* (the DEWCAD Project).

## References

- [1] Andris Abakus. *Review of The Mathematical Theory of the Dynamics of Biological Populations II*. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A (General), 145(4):512–512, 1982, DOI: 10.2307/2982110.
- [2] Murad Banaji. *Inheritance of oscillation in chemical reaction networks*. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 325:191–209, 2018, DOI: 10.1016/j.amc.2017.12.012.

- [3] Murad Banaji, Balázs Boros, and Josef Hofbauer. *The inheritance of local bifurcations in mass action networks*. 2023, arXiv: 2312.12897.
- [4] Murad Banaji and Casian Pantea. *The Inheritance of Nondegenerate Multistationarity in Chemical Reaction Networks*. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 78(2):1105–1130, 2018, DOI: 10.1137/16M1103506.
- [5] Alejandro Barredo Arrieta, Natalia Díaz-Rodríguez, Javier Del Ser, Adrien Bennetot, Siham Tabik, Alberto Barbado, Salvador Garcia, Sergio Gil-Lopez, Daniel Molina, Richard Benjamins, Raja Chatila, and Francisco Herrera. *Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI*. *Information Fusion*, 58:82–115, 2020, DOI: 10.1016/j.inffus.2019.12.012.
- [6] Russell Bradford, James H. Davenport, Matthew England, Hassan Errami, Vladimir Gerdt, Dima Grigoriev, Charles Hoyt, Marek Košta, Ovidiu Radulescu, Thomas Sturm, and Andreas Weber. *Identifying the parametric occurrence of multiple steady states for some biological networks*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 98:84–119, 2020, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2019.07.008.
- [7] Russell Bradford, James H. Davenport, Matthew England, Scott McCallum, and David Wilson. *Truth Table Invariant Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 76:1–35, 2016, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2015.11.002.
- [8] Bruno Buchberger. *Bruno Buchberger’s PhD thesis (1965): An algorithm for finding the basis elements of the residue class ring of a zero dimensional polynomial ideal*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 41(3-4):475–511, 2006, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2005.09.007.
- [9] George E. Collins. *Quantifier Elimination for Real Closed Fields by Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*. In *Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*, *Texts & Monographs in Symbolic Computation*, pages 85–121. Springer-Verlag, 1998, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-7091-9459-1\_4.
- [10] David A. Cox, John Little and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*. Springer Cham, 2015, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-16721-3.
- [11] Nello Cristianini and John Shawe-Taylor. *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-based Learning Methods*. Cambridge University Press, 2000, DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511801389.
- [12] Alex Davies, Petar Veličković, Lars Buesing, Sam Blackwell, Daniel Zheng, Nenad Tomašev, Richard Tanburn, Peter Battaglia, Charles Blundell, András Juhász, Marc Lackenby, Geordie Williamson, Demis Hassabis, and Pushmeet Kohli. *Advancing mathematics by guiding human intuition with AI*. *Nature*, 600:70–74, 2021, DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-04086-x.
- [13] R. J. DiPerna and P. L. Lions. *On the Cauchy Problem for Boltzmann Equations: Global Existence and Weak Stability*. *Annals of Mathematics*, 130(2):321–366, 1989, DOI: 10.2307/1971423.
- [14] Dániel András Drexler, Tamás Ferenci, András Füredi, Gergely Szakács, and Levente Kovács. *Tumor dynamics modeling based on formalreaction kinetics*. *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica*, 16(10):31–44, 2019, DOI: 10.12700/APH.16.10.2019.10.3.
- [15] Phillipp Raymond Ellison. *The advanced deficiency algorithm and its applications to mechanism discrimination*. PhD thesis, The University of Rochester, 1998.
- [16] Martin Feinberg. *Complex Balancing in General Kinetic Systems*. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 49(3):187–194, 1972, DOI: 10.1007/BF00255665.
- [17] Martin Feinberg. *Chemical Reaction Network Structure and the Stability of Complex Isothermal Reactors —I. The Deficiency Zero and Deficiency One Theorems*. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 42(10):2229–2268, 1987, DOI: 10.1016/0009-2509(87)80099-4.

- [18] Martin Feinberg. *Multiple steady states for chemical reaction networks of deficiency one*. Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 132(4):371–406, 1995, DOI: 10.1007/BF00375615.
- [19] Martin Feinberg. *Foundations of Chemical Reaction Network Theory*. Springer Cham, 2019, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-03858-8.
- [20] Martin Feinberg, Phillipp Ellison, Haixia Ji, and Daniel Knight. *The Chemical Reaction Network Toolbox, Windows Version*, 2018.
- [21] Elisenda Feliu and Carsten Wiuf. *Simplifying biochemical models with intermediate species*. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 10(87):20130484, 2013, DOI: 10.1098/rsif.2013.0484.
- [22] Elisenda Feliu and Carsten Wiuf. *Finding the positive feedback loops underlying multi-stationarity*. BMC Systems Biology, 9(1):Article number 22, 2015, DOI: 10.1186/s12918-015-0164-0.
- [23] Timothy S. Gardner, Charles R. Cantor, and James J. Collins. *Construction of a genetic toggle switch in Escherichia coli*. Nature, 403(6767):339–342, 2000, DOI: 10.1038/35002131.
- [24] Jürgen Gerhard, David J. Jeffery, and Guillaume Moroz. *A package for solving parametric polynomial systems*. ACM Communications in Computer Algebra, 43(3/4):61–72, 2010, DOI: 10.1145/1823931.1823933.
- [25] Raúl Guantes and Juan F. Poyatos. *Multistable Decision Switches for Flexible Control of Epigenetic Differentiation*. PLOS Computational Biology, 4(11):1–13, 2008, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1000235.
- [26] Yang-Hui He. *Machine-learning mathematical structures*. International Journal of Data Science in the Mathematical Sciences, 1(1):1–25, 2022, DOI: 10.1142/S2810939222500010.
- [27] F. Horn and R. Jackson. *General Mass Action Kinetics*. Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, 47(2):81–116, 1972, DOI: 10.1007/BF00251225.
- [28] J. L. Hudson and J. C. Mankin. *Chaos in the Belousov–Zhabotinskii Reaction*. The Journal of Chemical Physics, 74(11):6171–6177, 1981, DOI: 10.1063/1.441007.
- [29] Haixia Ji. *Uniqueness of Equilibria for Complex Chemical Reaction Networks*. PhD thesis, Ohio State University, Department of Mathematics, 2011, [http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc\\_num=osu1307122057](http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1307122057).
- [30] Mats Jirstrand. *Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition – an Introduction*. Linköping University, 1995, <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:315832/FULLTEXT02>.
- [31] Badal Joshi. *Complete Characterization by Multistationarity of Fully Open Networks with One Non-Flow Reaction*. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 219(12):6931–6945, 2013, DOI: 10.1016/j.amc.2013.01.027.
- [32] Badal Joshi and Anne Shiu. *Atoms of multistationarity in chemical reaction networks*. Journal of Mathematical Chemistry, 51(1):153–178, 2013, DOI: 10.1007/s10910-012-0072-0.
- [33] Varun B. Kothamachu, Elisenda Feliu, Luca Cardelli, and Orkun S. Soyer. *Unlimited multistability and Boolean logic in microbial signalling*. Journal of The Royal Society Interface, 12(108):20150234, 2015, DOI: 10.1098/rsif.2015.0234.
- [34] Daniel Lazard and Fabrice Rouillier. *Solving parametric polynomial systems*. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 42(6):636–667, 2007, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2007.01.007.
- [35] Daniel Lichtblau. *Symbolic analysis of multiple steady states in a MAPK chemical reaction network*. Journal of Symbolic Computation, 105:118–144, 2021, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2020.06.004.

- [36] Zhiyuan Liu and Jie Zhou. *Introduction to Graph Neural Networks*. Springer Cham, 2020, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-01587-8.
- [37] Ernst W Mayr and Albert R Meyer. *The Complexity of the Word Problems for Commutative Semigroups and Polynomial Ideals*. *Advances in Mathematics*, 46(3):305–329, 1982, DOI: 10.1016/0001-8708(82)90048-2.
- [38] Ernst W. Mayr and Stephan Ritscher. *Dimension-Dependent Bounds for Gröbner Bases of Polynomial Ideals*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 49:78–94, 2013, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2011.12.018.
- [39] Guillaume Moroz. *Sur la décomposition réelle et algébrique des systèmes dépendant de paramètres*. PhD thesis, Université Pierre et Marie Curie - Paris VI, 2008, [https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00812436/file/these\\_moroz.pdf](https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00812436/file/these_moroz.pdf).
- [40] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Yang, Zach DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. *PyTorch: an imperative style, high-performance deep learning library*. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, page Article number 721. Curran Associates Inc., 2019, DOI: 10.5555/3454287.3455008.
- [41] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, Jake Vanderplas, Alexandre Passos, David Cournapeau, Matthieu Brucher, Matthieu Perrot, and Édouard Duchesnay. *Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python*. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(85):2825–2830, 2011, <http://www.jmlr.org/papers/v12/pedregosa11a.html>.
- [42] Lynn Pickering, Tereso Del Rio Almajano, Matthew England, and Kelly Cohen. *Explainable AI Insights for Symbolic Computation: A case study on selecting the variable ordering for cylindrical algebraic decomposition*. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 123:102276, 2024, DOI: 10.1016/j.jsc.2023.102276.
- [43] Gergely Röst and AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh. *Exotic bifurcations in three connected populations with Allee-effect*. *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 31(13):Article number 2150202, 2021, DOI: 10.1142/S0218127421502023.
- [44] Gergely Röst and AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh. *Unidirectional Migration of Populations with Allee Effect*. *Letters in Biomathematics*, 10(1):43–52, 2023, DOI: 10.30707/LiB10.1.1682014077.816387.
- [45] AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh and Mttthew England. *Resultant Tools for Parametric Polynomial Systems with Application to Population Models*. 2022, arXiv: 2201.13189.
- [46] AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh and Elisenda Feliu. *The Multistationarity Structure of Networks with Intermediates and a Binomial Core Network*. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 81(7):2428–2462, 2019, DOI: 10.1007/s11538-019-00612-1.
- [47] S. Murat Sen, E. Zerrin Bagci, and Mehmet C. Camurdan. *Bistability Analysis of an Apoptosis Model in the Presence of Nitric Oxide*. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 73(8):1952–1968, 2011, DOI: 10.1007/s11538-010-9613-5.
- [48] R. Thomas and M. Kaufman. *Multistationarity, the basis of cell differentiation and memory. I. Structural conditions of multistationarity and other nontrivial behavior*. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 11(1):170–179, 2001, DOI: 10.1063/1.1350439.
- [49] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. *Attention is all you need*. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’17*, page 6000–6010, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2017. Curran Associates Inc, <https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2017>.

- [50] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. *Graph Attention Networks*. In International Conference on Learning Representations, pages 1–12, 2018, <https://openreview.net/forum?id=rJXMpikCZ>.
- [51] Minjie Wang, Da Zheng, Zihao Ye, Quan Gan, Mufei Li, Xiang Song, Jinjing Zhou, Chao Ma, Lingfan Yu, Yu Gai, Tianjun Xiao, Tong He, George Karypis, Jinyang Li, and Zheng Zhang. *Deep Graph Library: A Graph-Centric, Highly-Performant Package for Graph Neural Networks*. 2019, arXiv: <https://arxiv.org/1909.01315>.
- [52] Mingjian Wen, Evan Walter Clark Spotte-Smith, Samuel M. Blau, Matthew J. McDermott, Aditi S. Krishnapriyan, and Kristin A. Persson. *Chemical reaction networks and opportunities for machine learning*. Nature Computational Science, 3(1):12–24, 2023, DOI: 10.1038/s43588-022-00369-z.
- [53] Cha Zhang and Yunqian Ma. *Ensemble Machine Learning*. Springer New York, 2012, DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-9326-7.

## A Fully open networks with no positive feedback loop

In this Appendix we list 45 fully open networks with no positive feedback loops, thus by Theorem 3.20 they are not multistationary. These networks are used as bases to generate more non-multistationary networks following Proposition 5.3 for the training dataset of GAT in Section 5.

We give the full DSR-graph for just one of the networks, Network (20), below in Figure 11. Since the species flows reactions can not be used to create positive feedback loops, we omit the vertices and edges corresponding to these reactions in the rest of this section. We also switch to the signed DSR-graph and instead of putting labels + and -, we colour the negative edges with blue and keep positive edges as black.




























Figure 11: The full DSR-graph of Network (20).

For the other networks the reactions  $X_i \xrightleftharpoons[k_{2i+r-1}]{k_{2i+r}} 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$  where  $n$  is the number of species and  $r$  is the number of non-species-flow reactions are also omitted to save space, but the reader should remember that all these networks are fully open and thus these reactions are actually present.















(25)





(28)





(26)

















(29)





(27)





(30)









(38)





(39)





(40)





(41)





(42)




(43)




(44)




(45)




(46)




(50)




(47)




(51)








(48)



(52)



(49)



## B Validating examples

This appendix contains the 32 validating CRN examples used in Section 5. The first 21 networks are nonmultistationary and the remaining 11 are multistationary. Similar to Appendix A, the species flows reactions are omitted.

