



# State sequences of interactive processes of reaction systems



Luca Manzoni, Antonio E. Porreca  
{luca.manzoni, porreca}@disco.unimib.it

Note: all reaction systems  
in this talk are without context

$$f : 2^S \rightarrow 2^S$$



power set  
function


$$f(\emptyset) = f(S) = \emptyset$$



boundary  
power set  
function

# Theorem


$f = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some  $\mathcal{A}$



$f$  is a boundary power set function

# Proof idea

$$f(X) = Y$$



$$(X, S - X, Y)$$

$(\{x\}, I, P)$


reactant-minimal  
(only 1 reactant)

$(R, \{y\}, P)$

inhibitor-minimal  
(only 1 inhibitor)

$(\{x\}, \{y\}, P)$

resource-minimal  
(only 1 reactant  
and 1 inhibitor)



union-subadditive

$$f(X \cup Y) \subseteq f(X) \cup f(Y)$$

$$f(X \cap Y) \subseteq f(X) \cup f(Y)$$

intersection-subadditive

# Examples

$(\{a, b\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, b\})$



Not union-subadditive

$$\text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a\} \cup \{b\}) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a, b\}) = \{a, b\}$$

~~$\neq$~~

$$\text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a\}) \cup \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{b\}) = \emptyset$$



# Examples

$(\{a, b\}, \{c, d\}, \{a, b\})$



Not intersection-subadditive

$$\text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a, b, c\} \cap \{a, b, d\}) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a, b\}) = \{a, b\}$$

~~$\neq$~~

$$\text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a, b, c\}) \cup \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}(\{a, b, d\}) = \emptyset$$

# Theorem

$f$  is union-subadditive



$f = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some reactant-minimal  $\mathcal{A}$

$f$  is intersection-subadditive



$f = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some inhibitor-minimal  $\mathcal{A}$


# Theorem

$f$  is union- and intersection-subadditive




$f = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some resource-minimal  $\mathcal{A}$


# Dynamics




$\text{res}_A^t(T)$




# Dynamics




# Dynamics




Fixed points



# Implementing binary counters




# Incrementing binary counters







# Reactions for incrementing binary counters




Long paths  $\rightarrow$  binary counters



Long cycles  $\rightarrow$  binary counters



# Turing machines (with bounded tape)




*q a*  $\rightarrow$  *q b*  $\triangleright$

*q b*  $\rightarrow$  *r a*  $\triangleright$


*r a*  $\rightarrow$  *q a*  $\triangleleft$

*r b*  $\rightarrow$  *r a*  $\triangleright$


# Turing machines (with bounded tape)



# Encoding as reaction system



# Encoding as reaction system



$(\{q_1, a_1\}, \{\spadesuit\}, \{q_2, b_1\})$

$(\{q_2, a_2\}, \{\spadesuit\}, \{q_3, b_2\})$

$\vdots$

$(\{q_6, a_6\}, \{\spadesuit\}, \{q_7, b_6\})$

# Encoding as reaction system




⋮





# Preserving the tape



$(\{a_1\}, \{q_1, r_1\}, \{a_1\})$

$(\{b_1\}, \{q_1, r_1\}, \{b_1\})$

$(\{a_2\}, \{q_2, r_2\}, \{a_2\})$

$(\{b_2\}, \{q_2, r_2\}, \{b_2\})$


$\vdots$

$\vdots$


$(\{a_7\}, \{q_7, r_7\}, \{a_7\})$

$(\{b_7\}, \{q_7, r_7\}, \{b_7\})$


# Computation step



$$\text{res}_A \begin{array}{l} \{a_1, b_2, b_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, b_7, q_3\} \\ \{a_1, b_2, a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6, b_7, r_4\} \end{array}$$




Dynamics of the same complexity



Does minimality make a difference?

$f$  is union- and intersection-subadditive



$f = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}$  for some resource-minimal  $\mathcal{A}$

# Theorem


For each reaction system  $\mathcal{A}$  there exists a resource-minimal  $\mathcal{B}$  such that

$$\text{res}_{\mathcal{B}}^{2t}(U) = \text{res}_{\mathcal{A}}^t(U)$$

# Proof idea

$$a = (\{x, y\}, \{z\}, \{w\})$$

$$b = (\{v\}, \{z, w\}, \{z\})$$



Proof idea: given  $a = (R_a, I_a, P_a)$

Reactant missing?

$(\{x\}, \{y\}, \{\bar{a}\})$  for  $y \in R_a, x \in S - \{y\}$

Any inhibitor?

$(\{x\}, \{\heartsuit\}, \{\bar{a}\})$  for  $x \in I_a$

If not disabled, produce  $P_a$

$(\{\heartsuit\}, \{\bar{a}\}, P_a)$

Make  $\heartsuit$  every other step

$(\{x\}, \{\heartsuit\}, \{\heartsuit\})$  for  $x \in S$

Proof idea: given  $a = (R_a, I_a, P_a)$

Reactant missing?

$(\{x\}, \{y\}, \{\bar{a}\})$  for  $y \in R_a, x \in S - \{y\}$

Any inhibitor?

$(\{x\}, \{\heartsuit\}, \{\bar{a}\})$  for  $x \in I_a$

If not disabled, produce  $P_a$

$(\{\heartsuit\}, \{\bar{a}\}, P_a)$

Make  $\heartsuit$  every other step


$(\{x\}, \{\heartsuit\}, \{\heartsuit\})$  for  $x \in S$




Minimal!




# Dynamics




$\text{res}_A^t(T)$







# Dynamics



$\text{res}_{\mathcal{B}}^t(T)$









# Long sequences in resource-minimal reaction systems

There exists a resource-minimal reaction system with  $|S| = n$  having a terminating state sequence of length  $\Theta(3^{n/4})$




# Long sequences in almost-minimal reaction systems

There exists a reaction system with at most 3 resources per reaction and  $|S| = n$  having a terminating state sequence of length  $\Theta(3^{n/3})$



# Long cycles in almost-minimal reaction systems

There exists a reaction system with at most 3 resources per reaction and  $|S| = n$  having a cycle of length  $\Theta(3^{n/3})$





Does minimality make a difference here?



Type	Longest sequence known
Generic	$\Theta(2^n) \rightarrow \text{optimal}$
Almost-minimal	$\Theta(3^{n/3}) \approx \Theta(1.44^n)$
Resource-minimal	$\Theta(3^{n/4}) \approx \Theta(1.32^n)$





# Context as nondeterminism



# Context as nondeterminism



# Context as nondeterminism



Thanks for your attention!  
Grazie per la vostra attenzione!

Any questions?