

HHS Public Access

Author manuscript *J Comput Phys.* Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 May 15.

Published in final edited form as:

J Comput Phys. 2015 May 15; 289: 1–17. doi:10.1016/j.jcp.2015.01.030.

Convergence of methods for coupling of microscopic and mesoscopic reaction-diffusion simulations

Mark B. Flegga^a, Stefan Hellander^b, and Radek Erban^c

^aSchool of Mathematical Sciences, Monash University, Wellington road, Clayton, Melbourne, Australia; mark.flegg@monash.edu

^bDepartment of Computer Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-5070 Santa Barbara, USA; stefanh@engineering.ucsb.edu

^cMathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, United Kingdom; erban@maths.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper, three multiscale methods for coupling of mesoscopic (compartment-based) and microscopic (molecular-based) stochastic reaction-diffusion simulations are investigated. Two of the three methods that will be discussed in detail have been previously reported in the literature; the two-regime method (TRM) and the compartment-placement method (CPM). The third method that is introduced and analysed in this paper is called the ghost cell method (GCM), since it works by constructing a "ghost cell" in which molecules can disappear and jump into the compartment-based simulation. Presented is a comparison of sources of error. The convergent properties of this error are studied as the time step t (for updating the molecular-based part of the model) approaches zero. It is found that the error behaviour depends on another fundamental computational parameter h, the compartment size in the mesoscopic part of the model. Two important limiting cases, which appear in applications, are considered:

- (i) $t \to 0$ and *h* is fixed;
- (ii) $t \to 0$ and $h \to 0$ such that t/h is fixed.

The error for previously developed approaches (the TRM and CPM) converges to zero only in the limiting case (ii), but not in case (i). It is shown that the error of the GCM converges in the limiting case (i). Thus the GCM is superior to previous coupling techniques if the mesoscopic description is much coarser than the microscopic part of the model.

Keywords

Multiscale simulation; reaction-diffusion; particle-based model

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1. Introduction

Multiscale stochastic reaction-diffusion methods which use models with different levels of detail in different parts of the computational domain are applicable to a number of biological systems, including modelling of intracellular calcium dynamics [14], MAPK pathway [22] and actin dynamics [11]. In these applications, a detailed modelling approach (which requires simulation of trajectories and reactive collisions of individual biomolecules) is only needed in a small part of the computational domain. The main idea of multiscale methods is then simple to formulate [12]: we use a detailed modelling approach in the small subdomain of interest and a coarser model in the rest of the computational domain. In this paper, detailed molecular-based (microscopic) models will be given in terms of Brownian dynamics [3, 30]. The remainder of the computational domain will be divided into compartments and a mesoscopic (compartment-based) model will be used, i.e. we will simulate the time evolution of the numbers of molecules in the corresponding compartments [6, 21].

There have been a number of approaches developed for coupling different reaction diffusion models. They include coupling of mesoscopic (compartment-based) models with coarser (mean-field) PDE-based descriptions [15, 2, 31, 25], coupling of microscopic (molecular-based) models with mean-field PDEs [17, 20, 16], coupling of microscopic and mesoscopic models [12, 13, 22, 23, 28] or even coupling microscopic models with more detailed molecular dynamics simulations [7]. Conceptually similar ideas have been pursued in related fields [4, 32]. In [32] they consider the flow of a liquid past a large molecule by coupling molecular dynamics simulations closest to the molecule with a Lattice-Boltzmann simulation in other parts of the domain. An accurate coupling is accomplished by introducing a bufffer region overlapping the two domains, through which the flux of mass and momentum is preserved.

A successful multiscale algorithm requires an accurate implementation of inter-regime transfer of molecules. In this paper, we will study convergence properties of two algorithms for coupling microscopic and mesoscopic descriptions which were previously published in the literature: the two-regime method (TRM) [12, 13] and the compartment-placement method (CPM) [22]. One of the conclusions of our analysis is that these algorithms do not converge in the limit of small time steps and a fixed compartment size. Thus, we also propose another approach, the ghost cell method (GCM) which is suitable for this parameter regime. We then present a more detailed exploration of the GCM and its accuracy using a number of test problems.

We will consider a reaction-diffusion model in the computational domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ for N = 1, 2 and 3. We will divide Ω into two parts, open sets Ω_M and Ω_C , which satisfy

 $\overline{\Omega_{_M}}\cup\overline{\Omega_{_C}}{=}\overline{\Omega}\qquad \text{and}\qquad \Omega_{_M}\cap\Omega_{_C}{=}\varnothing \quad (1)$

where an overbar denotes the closure of the corresponding set. The microscopic simulation technique is used in Ω_M . Each molecule, *j*, in Ω_M is considered to be a point particle at some

motion, i.e.

$$X_{j}(t+\Delta t) = X_{j}(t) + \sqrt{2D_{j}\Delta t}\zeta, \quad (2)$$

where D_j is the diffusion constant of the *j*-th molecule, *t* is a small prescribed time step and ζ is a vector containing zero mean, unit variance normally distributed random numbers. Notably, all of these methods can be redesigned trivially for other microscopic algorithms (such as the GFRD [30] or eGFRD [29]).

In this paper, we will study the convergence of multiscale methods in the limit $t \to 0$. Since the time-discretized Brownian motion (2) is only used in Ω_M , we have to specify what will be done in the remainder of the domain, Ω_C , where the mesoscopic model is used. In this paper, we distinguish the following two cases:

(i) the mesoscopic model is kept fixed in the limit $t \rightarrow 0$;

(ii) the mesoscopic model is refined as t approaches zero.

The resolution of the mesoscopic model (compartment size) will be denoted by h. Of particular interest is the error that is caused as a direct result of the coupling and thus we will use the parameter h as a measure of the compartment size at/on the interface between the two modelling subdomains. In the case of regular cubic compartments of volume h^3 , the parameter h is simply the length of an edge of each cube. We will also consider unstructured meshes where the compartment size hwill be suitably generalized. Using h, the cases (i)–(ii) can be formulated as follows:

- (i) $t \to 0$ and *h* is fixed;
- (ii) $t \to 0$ and $h \to 0$ such that t/h is fixed.

Both limits (i) and (ii) are important in applications. We will see that the error at the interface $\Omega_{\rm M}$ h $\Omega_{\rm C}$ of previously developed methods [12, 13, 22] converges to zero in the limit (ii). This limit requires the refinement of the mesoscopic model. However, the standard mesoscopic model converges in the limit $h \rightarrow 0$ only if the molecules are subject to zeroorder or first-order chemical reactions [10]. It fails to converge when bimolecular reactions are present [9]. This makes the limit (i) attractive in applications. In Section 4, we introduce the GCM which converges in the limit (i).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the TRM for coupling of structured mesoscopic meshes with microscopic simulations. The methodology for simulation of stochastic reaction-diffusion processes on irregular meshes and the implementation of the CPM is presented in Section 3. The GCM is introduced in Section 4. Using numerical examples in Section 5, we compare the computational error associated with the TRM with that of the GCM for structured meshes and the CPM with the GCM for unstructured meshes. In Section 6, we shall explore the GCM further with a test problem involving reactions and another of morphogen gradient formation on a circular domain. We will then discuss the sources of errors, ways in which they may be reduced and other implementation issues that arise with the presented coupling methods.

2. The two-regime method (TRM)

The two-regime method (TRM) [12, 13] couples microscopic and mesoscopic subdomains by carefully redefining the jump rate over the interface from the mesoscopic compartments and purposeful and deliberate placement of these molecules into the microscopic domain. To date, the TRM has been used with mesoscopic subdomains with regular meshes [14, 11]. It has also been extended to the case where the decomposition of domain Ω into Ω_M and Ω_C is adaptively updated during the simulation, which is useful for studying travelling fronts [28] The advantage of using this technique (as is the case with all of the coupling techniques in this manuscript) is that accuracy can be gained in 'regions of interest' Ω_M without the need to run computationally expensive microscopic simulations over the entire domain Ω . In this section we will briefly cover the two different simulation paradigms and then discuss how these paradigms are combined using the TRM.

2.1. Microscopic simulation

The defining characteristic of 'microscopic' simulation techniques for diffusion is that each molecule in the system is simulated individually on a continuous domain. In particular, these techniques follow the trajectory of each Brownian molecule to a resolution dependent on the time steps that are used. For illustrative purposes we consider here a time-driven microscopic algorithm (event-driven algorithms can be analysed as a time-driven algorithm with an infinitely small time step), that is, an algorithm with a defined constant time step. Furthermore, we will not be considering volume exclusion effects in this manuscript. Each molecule, *j*, is therefore considered to be a point particle at some location in space, $\mathbf{X}_j(t)$, at time *t*. The Brownian diffusion of these molecules is modelled by (2). Reactions may take place between these diffusing molecules at a particular time step if the reactants are within a given reaction radius of each other [26, 24].

Molecule interactions with boundaries depend on the type of boundary: boundaries can be reflective, adsorbing or reactive (partially adsorbing) [8]. For D t much smaller than the local radius of curvature of the boundary, the boundary can be considered locally flat on the scale of relative motion of the molecules in one time step. In the case of absorbing boundaries, molecules are removed from the system when they are updated to a position outside of the boundary. Since we simulate Brownian motion using a finite time step, we have to take into account that a molecule can interact with the boundary during the time step [t, t+t] even if its computed position at time t+t is inside the simulation domain. The probability, P_m that this molecule-boundary interaction occured within the time interval (t, t+t] is dependent on the diffusion constant and the initial and final normal distances from the boundary the molecule is found (x_i and x_i respectively)

$$P_m\left(\Delta x_i, \Delta x_f, D, \Delta t\right) = \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta x_i \Delta x_f}{D\Delta t}\right) \quad (3)$$

This probability will also be important when it comes to coupling of microscopic simulations with mesoscopic simulations via an interface in the two-regime method [12, 13].

2.2. Mesoscopic simulation

Mesoscopic approaches to reaction-diffusion processes are simulated on a lattice. For the purposes of the TRM we will describe how this is done for a regular cubic lattice. The distance between each node is h. In a mesoscopic model, molecules can be thought to exist only at lattice nodes rather than existing in continuous space. The state of the simulation at any moment of time is defined by a set of numbers describing the copy numbers $N_{i,j}$ of molecules of the *i*-th type at the *j*-th lattice point. Considering the diffusion of (non-reacting) molecules, the expected state of the system $E(N_{i,j})$ is described by the equation:

$$\frac{dE(N_{i,j})}{dt} = D_i \sum_{k} (q_{k,j} E(N_{i,k}) - q_{j,k} E(N_{i,j})), \quad (4)$$

where $q_{k,j}$ is the propensity per molecule to go from the *k*-th compartment to the *j*-th compartment. It is possible to show that for a regular lattice with spacing *h*,

$$q_{k,j} = \begin{cases} D_i/h^2, & \text{if } k \text{ and } j \text{ are adjacent lattice points,} \\ 0, & \text{if } k \text{ and } j \text{ are not adjacent lattice points,} \end{cases}$$
(5)

results in the recovery of the discretized form of the diffusion partial differential equation and can therefore be used to approximate a diffusion process on the lattice correct to order h^2 accuracy. The simulation of a mesoscopic reaction-diffusion process usually makes use of event-driven algorithms, such as the Gillespie algorithm [19] or the Gibson-Bruck algorithm [18]. We shall conceptualize the mesoscopic simulation by considering that when a molecule is at a particular lattice point, rather than existing at the node, it is somewhere at random inside the compartment belonging to the node defined by the lattice dual mesh [6]. That is, for a regular cubic lattice with node spacing *h*, each molecule which is at a particular lattice point is thought to exist inside the cubic compartment of side length *h* for which the lattice point is at the center. It is important to note that the state of the molecule has no specific location but rather is thought to exist in a probabilistic sense uniformly over its compartment.

2.3. Interfacing microscopic and mesoscopic simulations

Interfacing microscopic and mesoscopic simulations of reaction-diffusion processes using the TRM has previously been derived for mesoscopic regimes that use regular cubic lattices [12, 13]. The TRM is proposed by partitioning the domain Ω into subdomains (1) separated by the interface $I = \Omega_M \cap \Omega_C$. In what follows, we consider that this partitioning is fixed during the simulation, but the TRM can also be generalized to situations where $I \equiv I(t)$ changes during the simulation [28]. In both subdomains Ω_M and Ω_C , molecules behave as they would normally according to the rules of that particular regime. We describe the TRM with an event-driven mesoscopic simulation in Ω_C and a time-driven microscopic simulation with constant time step t in Ω_M . Reactions do not cause any issue within the domain because they occur locally. We focus, therefore, on the correct manner in which molecules may migrate over the interface I. It is assumed that the TRM is simulated such that $\sqrt{D\Delta th} \ll 1$. A diagram of the numerical TRM scheme using a regular cubic lattice can be seen in two dimensions in Figure 1. A detailed TRM algorithm may be found in the

reference [12]. A defining feature of the TRM that characterizes it apart from the other methods discussed in this paper is the notion that molecules are free to migrate over the interface within a small boundary layer near the interface that naturally appears from the molecular-based simulation. That is, molecules jumping from Ω_C to Ω_M replace molecules that are absorbed in the opposite direction. Therefore the propensity for molecules to jump out of a compartment into the molecular-based domain Ω_M depends on both the lattice spacing *h* as well as the molecular-based time step *t*. When implementing the TRM, in order that a molecular migration over the interface is smooth with optimally small error, the propensity per molecule to cross the interface *I* from each adjacent compartment needs to be

treated individually as a special case (We denote the special case of jump propensity $q_{k,\Omega_M}^{\text{TRM}}$ over the interface *I* in the TRM with the shorthand Γ).

For a regular cubic mesoscopic lattice,

$$q_{k,\Omega_M}^{\text{TRM}} = \Gamma\left(h,\Delta t\right) = 2\sqrt{\frac{D}{\pi\Delta th^2}},\quad (6)$$

where *D* is the diffusion constant of the migrating molecule. The TRM considers that microscopic molecules in Ω_M cease to be microscopic molecules, in principle, when they migrate over the interface. Molecules are therefore absorbed by the interface *I* from Ω_M and placed in the closest compartment in Ω_C . Equation (3) is used to absorb all molecules which interacted with the interface. If this is not used then molecules effectively migrate into Ω_C and back out again without changing from a microscopic molecule to a mesoscopic one. This is crucial for coupling of the two regimes as outlined in the derivation in the reference [12]. Furthermore, molecules must be precisely placed in Ω_M when migrating from Ω_C . In particular, the perpendicular distance *x* the molecule is placed from the interface into Ω_M is found by sampling from the distribution f(x)

$$f(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4D\Delta t}}$$
 erfc $\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{4D\Delta t}}\right)$, (7)

where $\operatorname{erfc}(x) = 2/\pi \int_x^\infty \exp(-t^2) dt$ is the complementary error function. In higher dimensions, the initial position of molecules migrating into Ω_M can be chosen to be uniformly distributed tangentially to the interface in the region of the originating compartment [13]. Then the error associated with the TRM is O(h). We shall investigate the error associated with the TRM in 1D in a later section of this manuscript and compare it with the GCM method introduced in Section 4.

3. Compartment-placement method (CPM)

In this section, we will discuss how mesoscopic simulation is implemented on an irregular lattice [6]. We will then present a brief description of the CPM [22].

3.1. Mesoscopic simulation on unstructured meshes

Mesoscopic simulations on Cartesian meshes are convenient in the sense that they are memory lenient. However, complex geometries and surfaces with high curvature are easier to resolve accurately with an unstructured mesh. Living cells can have different shapes and eukaryotes have a complicated internal structure with two-dimensional membranes and a one-dimensional cytoskeleton [1]. The geometrical flexibility of unstructured meshes is therefore an advantage when considering simulations of realistic biological problems.

Consider a domain Ω . The domain is covered by a primal mesh, such that the boundary Ω is covered with non-overlapping triangles and the domain Ω is covered with non-overlapping tetrahedra (resp. triangles in 2D). A dual mesh is constructed from the primal mesh, see Figure 2, from the bisectors of the tetrahedra (resp. triangles) that use the nodes as vertices. The diffusion of molecules is now modelled as discrete jumps between the nodes of the dual mesh. The rate $q_{i,j}$ at which a molecule jumps from compartment V_i to V_j is given by the diffusion constant of the molecule and the finite element discretization of the Laplacian on the primal mesh. For details on how the unstructured meshes and the diffusion matrix are generated the reader is referred to [6].

3.2. Interfacing microscopic and mesoscopic simulations

The algorithm for the CPM is presented in a similar way to the TRM. The algorithm progresses asynchronously by updates in the mesoscopic simulation and microscopic simulation separately [22]. The jump rates from compartments that are on the interface I between regimes are calculated from the underlying mesh over the entire domain. That is, the jump rates are calculated by computing the mesoscopic jump rates between interfacial compartments and "compartments" that are adjacent to the interface in the microscopic domain Ω_M (see Figure 2).

Molecules that start in a compartment in Ω_C and, at the end of the time step, have ended up in Ω_M are initialized uniformly inside the "compartment" which they jump into, and is the process from which the CPM has been named. Molecules in Ω_M migrate back to Ω_C via microscopic domain diffusion (2). When a molecule appears inside one of the mesoscopic compartments from Brownian motion, it is encorporated into that compartment by increasing the copy number inside this compartment.

The CPM has been determined using heuristics. Molecules that are in compartments obey mesoscopic rules for diffusive migration. This includes molecules that are on interfacial compartments. They jump to compartments in Ω_M as though they were still in Ω_C . When this occurs, initialization of the molecules must take place. The molecules are initiated uniformly over the compartment in which they are placed. Molecules are not placed at the node at the center of this compartment because this would unphysically concentrate molecules at this point and reactions would occur between possible reactants upon migration over the interface. Conversely, molecules that are in Ω_M obey microscopic rules for diffusive migration (Brownian trajectory). When this Brownian trajectory leads to a compartment, it can no longer be described using the microscopic description and is added to the compartment in which it lands. As we shall see, this heuristic approach can lead to

inaccuracies. The inaccuracies can be minimized if $h^2 \sim D t$ (that is, if the size of the compartment is approximately the size of a microscopic molecular jump).

4. The ghost cell method (GCM)

Here we will consider a new method for interfacing mesoscopic and microscopic simulations. This method uses different assumptions to the TRM and CPM and is therefore implemented differently. We call this method the ghost cell method (GCM) since microscopic molecules in Ω_M feel the presence of a pseudo-compartment allowing for instantaneous jumping from Ω_M to Ω_C in the same way that molecules within compartments jump instantaneously. The steps of the GCM are given in Table 1.

The key assumption that is used in the TRM and CPM is that molecules in Ω_M migrate via diffusion (2) over the interface *I* whereby they become parts of the corresponding compartment. In the GCM, this assumption is relaxed. Instead, molecules migrate over the interface using the compartment-based approach in both directions. Microscopic molecules in Ω_M near the interface feel the presence of a layer of "ghost" cells (compartments). In the step [G.2] in Table 1, we calculate the numbers of molecules in these "ghost" cells. They are used in the step [G.4] to create a fully compartment-based simulation of transition across the interface *I*.

To justify the GCM, let us consider a hypothetical simulation of diffusion in a domain Ω for which a mesoscopic method was implemented. Then consider the same domain where a microscopic simulation is implemented. Let the molecules of the microscopic simulation be "binned" according to compartments of the mesoscopic simulation. The expected number of molecules binned into each compartment should match that of the mesoscopic simulation to within the precision of the mesoscopic method. This is because both simulations are accurate representations of the same phenomena, diffusion. This is the philosophy behind the GCM. Molecules which are binned into ghost compartments near the interface may jump into compartments in Ω_C via the rates prescribed by the mesoscopic algorithm. If both regimes are correct individually then the flux over the interface I is the same as though a mesoscopic algorithm was used over the whole domain. To ensure that microscopic molecules do not migrate to Ω_C via diffusion (2), they are reflected at the interface I in the step [G.5]. Figure 3 demonstrates the principle differences between a TRM/CPM and a GCM description of the interface. In Appendix A we provide a mathematical analysis of the GCM in one dimension to demonstrate that the expected concentration and fiux of molecules over the interface are matched. The theoretical error associated with the GCM t which is on the same order as that of the TRM. Unlike the TRM, this error, as scales as we will see in the later part of this manuscript, is reduced to zero by reducing *t*/*h*.

The ghost cell method is implemented using the algorithm in Table 1. This algorithm is given for an event-driven mesoscopic simulation and a time-driven microscopic simulation, however it can also be extended to event-driven microscopic simulations.

5. Numerical tests: Method convergence

In the following two sections, we present various numerical tests. Here we present a simple tests comparing the accuracy of the GCM against the TRM and CPM respectively. In the following Section 6 we focus on the GCM and, in particular, numerical tests considering its applicability to reaction-diffusion processes.

5.1. One dimensional simulations: TRM versus GCM

We use a simple diffusion test problem to compare the diffusive flow over the interface with an exact solution which can be analytically obtained. We use the domain $\Omega = (0, 1)$ and subdomains $\Omega_C = (0, 0.5)$, $\Omega_M = (0.5, 1)$, which are separated by the interface $I = \{0.5\}$. We initially position $N_0 = 5 \times 10^5$ molecules according to the distribution g(x) = 2x, $x \in \Omega$. We construct regular spaced compartments of width $h_0 = 0.1$ within Ω_C and "bin" the molecules generated in Ω_C into these compartments. We allow these molecules to diffuse throughout the domain Ω with a diffusion constant D = 1 using the TRM or GCM until time t = 1. At the boundary x = 0 molecules are absorbed and placed at x = 1. At the boundary x = 1 molecules are reffected. In this way, $N_0g(x)$ is the steady state distribution of this system and $0.25N_0$ is the steady state number of molecules in the compartment-based subdomain Ω_C . We define a measure of the error E to this test problem for each simulation schemewhere $N_j(1)$ is the copy number of molecules in the *j*-th compartment evaluated at t = 1 and the sum is taken over all compartments in the compartment-based subdomain Ω_C .

$$E = \frac{\sum_{j} N_{j} \left(1\right) - 0.25 N_{0}}{N_{0}}, \quad (8)$$

In order to see the effect of the compartment spacing near the interface h on the error E for both the TRM and GCM we start with the set of regular compartments

$$(0, h_0), (h_0, 2h_0), \ldots, (0.5 - h_0, 0.5),$$

which have nodes (compartment centers) at $h_0/2$, $3h_0/2$, ..., $0.5 - h_0/2$. Then we use the following lattice refinement technique designed specifically so that the position of the interface does not change (see Figure 4):

[R.1] Delete the two nodes closest to the interface.

[R.2] Introduce into the space between the new node closest to the interface and the interface (a distance of x) three nodes placed consecutively a distance of 2 x/7 from the node to its left.

[R.3] Recompute the compartments by finding the bisectors of each node.

The specific distances in the step [R.2] are chosen such that the interface does not change location and the last two compartments have the same size. This is also the size that is given to the ghost cell in the GCM. The refinement algorithm [R.1]–[R.3] is repeated *m* times such that the size of the final compartment in Ω_C (and ghost cell), h_m , is

$$h_m = h_0 \left(\frac{5}{7}\right)^m$$
 (9)

A diagram representing one iteration of the refinement technique [R.1]–[R.3] is shown in Figure 4. The error is computed for various final compartment sizes $h_m(m = 0,..., 10)$ and various time steps t_k (k = 0, 1,..., 10) where

$$\Delta t_k = 2^k \Delta t_0$$
, (10)

and $\Delta t_0 = 5 \times 10^{-6}$.

Figures 5 and 6 show how the absolute error || E || given by (8) depends on both parameters h_m (compartment size on the interface) and t for the TRM and GCM algorithms respectively. The error due to the interface in the TRM includes a shift of $h_{m'}$ 2 in the expected distribution of molecules at the interface into Ω_C [12]. This is because of the "initialization" of molecules from Ω_M into Ω_C . Unlike the initialization of molecules from Ω_C into Ω_M , molecules that are transported in the reverse direction cannot be placed carefully according to a continuous distribution but must necessarily be placed in the nearest compartment. This initialization has an expected position of $h_{m'}$ 2 away from the boundary causing a shift of $h_{m'}$ 2 in the distribution of molecules. However, if molecules could be initialized into Ω_C with a continuous distribution, for symmetry reasons one would expect this to be done with a distribution of f(x) given by (7). The average distance, therefore, that a

molecule would ideally be placed into Ω_C is $\int_0^\infty xf(x) dx = \sqrt{\pi D\Delta t/2}$. Therefore, the error that is due to unphysical shifting of molecules is proportional to the expected shift of molecules as they are transferred from Ω_M to Ω_C . That is $E \propto h_m - \sqrt{\pi D\Delta t}$.

In Figure 5 a dotted red line showing $h_m = \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ approximately follows the path of the minimum absolute error. The discrepancy between the actual minimum absolute error and the dotted red line in Figure 5 can be attributed to higher order error that is inherent in the mesoscopic approximation to the diffusion equation. To show that $E \propto h_m - \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ Figure 7 is a plot of error $h_m - \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ The plot is generated by using various values of h_m (see legend) and then plotting a number of points while changing t. Whilst it is clear that the graph is approximately linear, the higher order mesoscopic error is clearly seen in the form of a vertical displacement of this curve about the origin. The effect that the higher order mesoscopic error has on the interface is dificult to quantify because it will depend on the particular molecular system. Therefore, the best choice of parameters that can be chosen for the TRM is $h_m \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$.

In Figure 6, we see that the error of the GCM depends on t and specifically on its relative size compared to h (the analysis of the GCM is provided in Appendix A). Rapidly increasing error (quickly saturating the color bar in Figure 6) is observed when $h_m \sqrt{\pi D\Delta t}$. The higher order mesoscopic error artefact can also be seen in Figure 6 since this artefact is independent of the coupling mechanism (see the larger absolute error for large values of h). The GCM is

therefore most accurate for very small values of t. Whilst in practice making t small may significantly increase the computing time, small t is often required for accurate microscopic simulation (for example, capturing reactions with high resolution) and in such cases the GCM is more appropriate than the TRM.

5.2. Three dimensional simulations: CPM versus GCM

In this section we will demonstrate how, when using an unstructured mesh, the error associated with the GCM coupling converges as $t \rightarrow 0$ whereas error associated with the CPM is minimized when $h \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ where *h* is the average size of boundary compartments. Both the error associated with the CPM and GCM are due to imbalances in the fiux of molecules over the interface. We implement the CPM and GCM in three spatial dimensions using a tetrahedral primal mesh as described in Section 3. The implementation builds on the freely available software URDME [5]. The choice of a cubic domain here does not fully utilise the capabilities of the unstructured mesh, however, it does provide simple analytical results as a standard for measuring accuracy. It is important to note that the interface *I* that is generated from using an unstructured mesh automatically is not straight/trivial and therefore motivates this test. The irregularity of the interface can be clearly seen in Figure 8.

We consider a cube with side length L = 1. The cube is first discretized with an unstructured mesh and then divided into a mesoscopic region $\Omega_{\rm C}$, and a microscopic region $\Omega_{\rm M}$, where $\Omega_{\rm M}$ is the set of all compartments with a vertex (x, y, z) such that x < 0.5 and $\Omega_{\rm C} = \Omega \Omega_{\rm M}$. Here Ω is the set of all compartments. The partitioning is illustrated in Figure 8 for two different mesh sizes. We start each simulation with $N_0=2 \times 10^4$ molecules whose initial positions are sampled from a uniform distribution. The diffusion constant of the molecules is D = 1, and we simulate the system for time t=0.1. Since we start with a uniform distribution and the molecules only diffuse and do not react, we expect the distribution to be uniform at the final time. As the interface is parallel with the y - z-plane, we expect that the distributions of molecules in the y- and z-directions are uniform, but that we get a small error in the distribution of molecules in the x-direction. We now divide the x-axis into 10 bins of equal length, and then count the number of molecules in each bin at the final time. Mesoscopic molecules are binned by first sampling a continuous position from a uniform distribution on the compartment. We expect $N_0/10$ molecules in each bin, and can therefore define the error of the method by

$$E = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{10} |N_i - N_0/10|}{N_0} \quad (11)$$

In Figure 9 we have computed ||E|| for different mesh sizes and time steps. As expected, the error decreases as we refine the mesh and decrease the time step.

In the CPM method, mesoscopic (resp. microscopic) molecules stay mesoscopic (resp. microscopic) during a time step. This implies that the time step should be chosen suffciently small such that a molecule does not diffuse across several compartments. On the other hand, if the time step is too small the distribution of molecules in space will be biased towards the microscopic region. This can be seen by considering a microscopic molecule diffusing into the mesoscopic regime. If the time step is small, it is likely that it will be close to the

microscopic regime at the end of the time step, but if it ends up on the mesoscopic side it will nevertheless be considered uniformly distributed in the compartment at the end of the time step. Thus, the time step should not be chosen too small relative to the size of the compartments, or the error due to the spatial splitting will become large.

Since the GCM converges with decreasing time step, but performs worse for larger time steps, one could suspect that there is a regime where the CPM in [22] performs better than the GCM. At some point, however, the error of the GCM will become small and outperform the CPM in [22]. The errors of the different methods are compared in Figure 10 for a mesh with 49101 compartments. Indeed, we see that the CPM method performs better for time steps down to almost $t = 10^{-4}$, at which point the error of the GCM method becomes smaller. Importantly, the GCM error as we have measured it does not converge in the strict sense for small t. This is because there are natural errors associated with broken symmetry in the accuracy of the transport methods on both sides of the interface. That is, molecular-based transport is more accurate than compartment-based transport (accurate only to order h^2). This breaking of symmetry adds an error that perfect coupling cannot overcome and is not easily filtered from the measurement of error associated with coupling since it depends on the molecular system which is generalised as far as the algorithm rules are concerned. This error was also seen in Section 5.1.

6. Numerical tests: The ghost cell method

6.1. Test problem 1: Bimolecular reactions

Here we demonstrate that any errors that may be introduced by the GCM do not significantly effect the rates of diffusion-limited bimolecular reaction.

Consider the following domain represented in Figure 11. Let Ω_M be the cube $(-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \cdot (-1, 1$

After a time *t*, given an initial separation *d*, it is possible to exactly solve for the probability of reaction between two isolated molecule reactants. This is done by solving the diffusion equation describing the probability to find molecule *B* with an absorbing boundary at $r = \rho_{AB}$. Integrating over the probability distribution from $r = \rho_{AB}$ to $r = \infty$ gives the probability that the particle has not reacted. From here we find that for $d = \rho_{AB}$

$$P\left(\text{reacted}|d,t\right) = \frac{\rho AB}{d} \text{erfc}\left[\frac{d-\rho_{AB}}{\sqrt{4D_{AB}}t}\right], \quad (12)$$

and P (reacted | d, t) = 1 for $d < \rho_{AB}$ as reaction is instant.

Using 5×10^4 simulations of molecule *B*, implementing the GCM on the infinite domain $\Omega = \Omega_M \cup \Omega_C$, up until the non-dimensionalized time t = 1, we predict the probability of reaction. This is done simply by finding the proportion of simulations resulting in a reaction. This test was performed for various separations $d \in [0, 0.7]$. In order to show that the boundary does not effect this reaction probability, the orientation of the separation was considered in two directions (1) along the *y*-axis and (2) along the diagonal, towards the corner of Ω_M , where the azimuthal (ϕ) and polar (θ) angles both equal to $\pi/2$. These directions are shown in blue and red respectively in Figure 11.

In Figure 12, it is shown that as $t \rightarrow 0$ the GCM rapidly predicts the correct reaction rate in comparison to the exact result given in equation (12). Changes in orientation from those towards boundary surfaces (blue circles) to boundary corners (red crosses) do not influence the rate of probability (or the conditional probability for molecules to move freely throughout the whole domain). Discrepancies between the GCM data and the analytical result (12) is shown to differ by a factor that does not depend on relative distance from the boundary but rather only depends on t. This phenomena is an artefact of the molecular-based algorithm alone. It is the probability that a molecule will come close to the reaction radius and not react due to the finite time step. It was calculated that for the three time steps tested, $t = 5 \times 10^{-2}$, $t = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $t = 5 \times 10^{-4}$, reaction was 61.7%, 88.0% and 95.3% effcient and was independent of d.

6.2. Test problem 2: Morphogen gradient

Morphogen gradients are formed from a localized source of diffusing molecules which are undergoing decay. Far away from the source concentrations can be very low and noise becomes important to model accurately. In this test problem, we model a 2D circular domain void of degradable chemical. The chemical flows at a constant rate from the boundary into the domain where it is in low concentrations at the center. These circumstances are typical of biological problems such as wound healing (where the center of the wound is devoid of oxygen and nutrient).

We model a normalized circular domain 0 r 1. Let $c(\mathbf{x}, t)$ be the concentration of morphogen throughout the domain at time *t*. This concentration, in the continuum limit, is governed by the partial differential equation

$$\frac{\partial c}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2 c(x,t) - \mu c, \quad (13)$$

where μ is the decay rate and D is the diffusion constant. We use the initial condition $c(\mathbf{x}, 0) = 0$ and the boundary condition $D\hat{n} \cdot \nabla c (xt) = \lambda$, where \hat{n} is the outward facing normal vector and λ is the number of molecules entering the domain over the boundary per unit time per unit length. We choose $\lambda = 5 \times 10^4$ to reduce noise for comparison with deterministic simulations. We also choose D = 0.1 and $\mu = 1$. The circular domain is discretized using tlabs PDE toolbox inbuilt Delaunay triangulation algorithm. Compartments are drawn according to the dual mesh. Compartments whose nodes lie within 0 r 0.4 are removed, except for a layer of ghost cells. This region is to be modelled using a molecular-based approach and coupled with the ghost-cell method.

In Figure 13, we qualitatively compare a typical GCM-derived simulated molecule distribution against that expected deterministically by solving equation (13) on the triangulated lattice using the Finite Element Method (FEM). A full video showing the evolution of both the GCM and deterministic FEM is provided in the Supporting Material.

For a more detailed comparison of the GCM simulation against the FEM expected distribution, in Figure 14, we plot both the number of molecules in the compartment region Ω_C and in the molecular region Ω_M against those expected by the deterministic model. We observe very strong agreement between the GCM simulation and the solution of the equivalent partial differential equation (13).

7. Summary

In this paper we have compared two existing mesoscopic-microscopic coupling techniques for stochastic simulations of reaction-diffusion processes with a method called the ghost cell method (GCM). Here we will summarize the specific sources of error of the TRM, CPM and GCM, when they converge, how they may be optimized for accuracy and notes on their computational effciency.

7.1. Summary of the two-regime method

The TRM couples molecules by considering that mesoscopic compartments contain molecules that are evenly distributed in a probabilistic sense. As these molecules diffuse over the interface they are placed according to the distribution f(x) given by (7). Molecules migrating in reverse from the microscopic regime to the mesoscopic regime must be absorbed by the interfacial compartments and be indistinguishable from other molecules in these compartments by virtue of this paradigm. As such, instead of migrating an average distance over the interface proportional to $\sqrt{\Delta t}$ it becomes evenly distributed over the compartment with an expected location of h/2 over the interface. The molecules are therefore effectively shifted $\left(h - \sqrt{\pi D\Delta t}\right)/2$ into the compartment regime. This shift in the molecules therefore creates a discontinuity of in the distribution to find molecules on the interface and therefore an error due to the presence of the coupling proportional to $h - \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$. The nature of this error is that, if the expected net flux of molecules over the interface is 0, then no error due to the presence of the interface will be experienced. This is important to note, since, this is not the case for both the CPM and GCM methods. Furthermore, since the error is proportional to $h - \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ it clearly converges in the limiting case (ii) described in the introduction but not in the limiting case (i).

Whilst the TRM can give controllably accurate results, it can be computationally more costly to implement. This is because perfect absorption of molecules is required on the boundary and this means that each molecule in the molecular-based domain needs to be checked for interaction with the boundary in a given time step using (3).

7.2. Summary of the compartment-placement method

The CPM is a coupling mechanism that, whilst heuristically derived, can produce accurate results under some circumstances and do so with minimum computational cost. Molecules

are placed within a pseudo-compartment in the molecular-based domain via diffusion from the compartment-based domain. In reverse molecules are placed in compartments from the molecular-based domain via diffusion of these molecules in the continuous domain over the interface. The antisymmetry that is seen in the methods of migration, mesoscopic to microscopic and microscopic to mesoscopic, result in a boundary layer in the expected distribution of molecules at the interface. This boundary layer is caused by the fact that molecules diffusing from the molecular region to the compartmental region are considered uniformly distributed on the compartment at the end of the time step. If t is small compared to h, this will be a poor approximation. It should thus be noted that the error of the CPM does not converge in the limiting case (i) described in the introduction, however the error appears to converge according to limiting case (ii).

The CPM is computationally effcient. Its only ineffciency is that, unlike the TRM, it requires the knowledge of a pseudo-compartment in the microscopic domain. The TRM is therefore more appropriate than the CPM for coupling completely independent simulation algorithms, since the CPM requires its own custom algorithm to be implemented fully.

7.3. Summary of the ghost cell method

The GCM couples molecules according to a discrete domain on each side of the interface. Molecules that are in the microscopic domain are binned according to a ghost compartment/ cell and jump into the mesoscopic domain using jump rates derived using the mesoscopic approach. In such a way, symmetry is conserved in the method of migration from mesoscopic to microscopic and from microscopic to mesoscopic, unlike the CPM. It is important that the molecules are binned correctly for this coupling to work accurately. The error, therefore, can be attributed to molecules that are in the ghost cell when they should not be, or not in the ghost cell when they should be. Therefore, if the compartment size h at the interface (and of the ghost cell) is much larger than the resolution of the particle tracking in the microscopic domain, the correct number of molecules will be in the ghost cell. The error therefore converges in the limit of small t so long as h is sufficiently coarse. Furthermore, it is possible to show that, unlike the TRM, this source of error is not due to a displacement of molecules but an unbalanced flux of molecules (see Appendix A) and will therefore appear even if the expected net flux over the interface is 0. The GCM, however, is convergent in the limiting case (i) but not (ii) from the introduction giving the GCM a unique advantage over both the CPM and TRM.

The GCM is computationally effcient for small t since the jump rates from the microscopic domain to the mesoscopic domain are determined by the ghost cell size and not the time step (like the TRM for example).

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the *European Community*'s Seventh Framework Programme (*FP7/2007-2013*)/ ERC grant agreement No. 239870. This

publication was based on work supported in part by Award No KUK-C1-013-04, made by King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST). Stefan Hellander has been supported by the National Institute of Health under Award no. 1R01EB014877-01, the Swedish Research Council, and by the NSF Award DMS-1001012. Radek Erban would also like to thank Brasenose College, University of Oxford, for a Nicholas Kurti Junior Fellowship; the Royal Society for a University Research Fellowship; and the Leverhulme Trust for a Philip Leverhulme Prize.

Appendix A: Mathematical justification for the ghost cell method

Here we present an analysis of the GCM in one-dimension. We show that error of the GCM that is produced on the interface between mesoscopic and microscopic subdomains converges in the case (i). Specifically, we see convergence of the interface-derived error as $\Lambda = \sqrt{D\Delta t}/h \rightarrow 0$. This property of convergence is unique to the GCM when compared with other reported coupling mechanisms. In showing that the interface-derived error vanishes in the small time step limit, we will show that rapid variation within the boundary layer of the interface vanishes as $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$, leaving behind a linear approximation of the true distribution of molecules. Since the error at the interface will be of order h^2 it is accurate to the same order as the mesoscopic algorithm itself.

Without loss of generality, consider an interface at x = 0 on an infinite one-dimensional domain. To the left of this interface (x < 0) a compartment-based model is used with fixed compartment size *h*. To the right of the interface (x > 0) a molecular-based algorithm is used and is updated at fixed time increments of t, i.e. $\Omega_C = (-\infty, 0)$ and $\Omega_M = (0, \infty)$. We denote the compartments in Ω_C by $C_k = (-kh, -kh + h)$, where k = 1, 2, ... Then the interface compartment is $C_1 = (-h, 0)$. The ghost cell will be denoted by $C_M = (0, h)$.

Molecules in Ω_C are described only by their compartment. Their compartment changes with an exponentially distributed random time with a rate that is given by D/h^2 . This rate is conditional on initial and final states being compartments. The rate given by D/h^2 is chosen in such a way that the expected number of molecules in each compartment matches that of a discretized diffusion equation (see (4) and (5)). These rates, however, breakdown in the case of the TRM because the initial and final states of jump across the interface are not compartments but rather the final state is a molecule in Ω_M . The jump across the boundary for the TRM is given by (6). Molecules in Ω_M have one thing in common with those in compartments. A domain that is modeled microscopically and then binned into compartments shows the same expected behaviour as a domain modeled with compartments to leading and first order accuracy in h in the limit as $t \to 0$. Therefore, in an attempt to interface the two regimes together it may be appropriate to bin molecules in Ω_M into a ghost cell/compartment C_M near the interface. The molecules that are in C_M will then have the same properties as a compartment from the perspective of the interface compartment C_1 . To this end, any molecule in C_M may spontaneously change state from the molecular domain to C_1 . We expect that since the interface compartment-bound molecules see a compartment state for molecules in C_M , the change of state from C_1 to a random position within C_M will occur with a normal inter-compartmental rate. In the following analysis we show that this is the case.

We shall test the hypothesis by matching the master equations for C_1 and the probability distribution in Ω_M in such a way that no rapid variation in probability to find molecules,

 $\overline{p}(x,t)$, is apparent at the interface. We shall assume that the rate for molecules to jump into Ω_M from C_1 is Γ^+ and are placed in an initial position from the interface given by the probability distribution f(x). Molecules in Ω_M spontaneously jump into C_1 with a rate $\Gamma^-g(x)$. Functions f(x) and g(x) are normalized such that they have a unit integral over Ω_M . We shall show that

$$\Gamma^{+} = \Gamma^{-} = \frac{D}{h^{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = f(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{h}, & \text{for } x \in C_{M}; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$
(A.1)

We will find it convenient for the sake of notation to introduce the parameters

$$\alpha^{\pm} = \frac{h^2 \Gamma^{\pm}}{D}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda = \frac{\sqrt{D\Delta t}}{h}.$$

To show (A.1) we focus on the purely diffusive problem, since bulk reactions have no effect on boundary conditions. In order to limit the flux of molecules jumping into C_1 , all molecules in Ω_M that hit the interface by Brownian motion are reflected back to Ω_M .

We denote the probability of finding a molecule in compartment

 $C_k, k=1, 2, ...,$ by $p_k(t)h$ (so that $p_k(t)$ approximates the probability density function at the node within this compartment). If we denote by p(x, t) the probability density function of the discrete molecular-based algorithm, then the transmission/reffection rules give us the following master equation

$$p_{1}(t+\Delta t) = \left(1 - \left(1+\alpha^{+}\right)\Lambda^{2}\right)p_{1}(t) + \Lambda^{2}p_{2}(t) + \alpha^{-}\Lambda^{2}\int_{0}^{\infty}g(x)p(x,t)\,dx, \quad (A.2)$$

$$p(x,t+\Delta t) = \int_0^\infty \frac{p(y,t)}{\sqrt{4\pi D\Delta t}} \left[\exp\left(\frac{-(x-y)^2}{4D\Delta t}\right) + \exp\left(\frac{-(x+y)^2}{4D\Delta t}\right) \right] dy + \frac{\alpha^+ D\Delta t p_1(t) f(x)}{h} - \frac{\alpha^- D\Delta t p_1(t) f(x)}{h}$$
(A.3)

In the vicinity of x = 0 there is a boundary layer of width O(h) so long as f(x) and g(x) vanish for $x \gg h$ [8]. We rescale (A.2) and (A.3) using the (dimensionaless) boundary layer coordinate $\xi = x/h$. We also denote $(\xi) = hg(h\xi)$. The rescaling of f and g by h are done to keep the integrals of these functions equal to 1. Thus, in the boundary layer coordinates, (A. 2) and (A.3) become

$$p_{1}(t+\Delta t) = (1 - (1+\alpha^{+})\Lambda^{2}) p_{1}(t) + \Lambda^{2} p_{2}(t) + \alpha^{-}\Lambda^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} g_{\text{inner}}(\xi) p_{\text{inner}}(\xi, t) d\xi, \quad (A.4)$$

$$p_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi, t + \Delta t\right) = \Lambda^{-1} \int_{0}^{\infty} p_{\text{inner}}\left(\eta, t\right) \left[K\left(\Lambda^{-1}\left(\Lambda - \xi\right)\right) + K\left(\Lambda\left(\eta + \xi\right)\right) \right] d\eta + \alpha^{+} \Lambda^{2} p_{1}\left(t\right) f_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi\right) - \alpha^{-} \Lambda^{2} p_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi, t\right) g_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi\right),$$
(A.5)

where $K(x) = (4\pi)^{-1/2} \exp(-x^2/4)$. The parameter Λ gives us the relative size of D_t t to h^2 and we wish to show that as $\Lambda \to 0$ the distribution of molecules across the boundary is smooth and the error that remains is of the order of h^2 , which is the same size of the error associated with the mesoscopic discretization in Ω_C . In order to join these models smoothly we require in Ω_C that

$$p_{1}(t) = p(-h/2, t) = (0, t) - \frac{h}{2}\bar{p}_{x}(0, t) + O(h^{2}) + O(\Lambda), \quad (A.6)$$

$$p_{2}(t) = p(-3h/2, t) = p(0, t) - \frac{3h}{2}\bar{p}_{x}(0, t) + O(h^{2}) + O(\Lambda), \quad (A.7)$$

$$p_1(t+\Delta t) = p_1(t) + O(\Delta t)$$
, (A.8)

while, for the molecular-based side, we want variation from the linear approximation in the boundary layer to be limited to $O(\Lambda)$ up to order h^2 accuracy, so that

$$p_{\text{inner}}(\xi, t) = p(0, t) + h\xi p_x(0, t) + O(h^2) + O(\Lambda), \quad (A.9)$$

$$p_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi, t + \Delta t\right) = p_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi, t\right) + O\left(\Delta t\right). \quad (A.10)$$

The prescription of a consistent probability density p(0, t) and derivative $p_x(0, t)$ for both sides of the interface, along with linear approximations suffciently close to the interface equates to continuity and differentiability over the interface which is the matching condition that we are attempting to achieve.

Substituting (A.6)–(A.10) into (A.4) and (A.5) and equating terms of the same order in *h* and leading order in Λ gives the following conditions that must be placed on g(x), f(x), a^+ and a^- :

(i) $O(h^0 \Lambda^0)$ terms from equation (A.4) give condition:

$$\alpha^{+} = \alpha^{-} \int_{0}^{\infty} g_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi\right), d\xi. \quad (A.11)$$

Condition (A.11) states how the relative rates for molecules to transition to and from Ω_M and Ω_C must be dependent on the relative sizes of C_1 and C_M .

(ii) $O(h^1 \Lambda^0)$ terms from equation (A.4) give condition:

$$2 = \alpha^{+} + \alpha^{-} \int_{0}^{\infty} \xi g_{\text{inner}} \left(\xi\right) \, d\xi. \quad (A.12)$$

Condition (A.12) states how the rates for molecules to transition to and from Ω_M and Ω_C depend on the average distance molecules are placed from the interface when placed within C_M . This is the same condition given in Ω_C for jumps between the compartments.

(iii) $O(h^0 \Lambda^0)$ terms from equation (A.5) give condition:

$$\alpha^{+} f_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi\right) = \alpha^{-} g_{\text{inner}}\left(\xi\right).$$
 (A.13)

Condition (A.13) states that molecules must be placed into Ω_M with the same probability weighting that they are taken out and placed back into Ω_C .

(iv) $O(h^1 \Lambda^0)$ terms from equation (A.5) are automatically satisfied.

The GCM that is presented in this manuscript uses parameters (A.1) which satisfy the three conditions (A.11)–(A.13) listed above. Such a scheme, therefore, has an error that is no greater than the error of the mesoscopic scheme in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$, in other words, in the limit $t \rightarrow 0$ whilst *h* remains constant.

References

- Alberts, B.; Johnson, A.; Lewis, J.; Raff, M.; Roberts, K.; Walter, P. Molecular Biology of the Cell. Garland Science; New York: 2007.
- [2]. Alexander F, Garcia A, Tartakovsky D. Algorithm refinement for stochastic partial differential equations: I. linear diffusion. Journal of Computational Physics. 2002; 182(1):47–66.
- [3]. Andrews S, Bray D. Stochastic simulation of chemical reactions with spatial resolution and single molecule detail. Physical Biology. 2004; 1:137–151. [PubMed: 16204833]
- [4]. Delgado-Buscalioni R, Kremer K, Praprotnik M. Concurrent tripe-scale simulation of molecular liquids. Journal of Chemical Physics. 2008; 128(11):114110. [PubMed: 18361557]
- [5]. Drawert B, Engblom S, Hellander A. URDME: A modular framework for stochastic simulation of reaction-transport processes in complex geometries. BMC Syst. Biol. 2012; 6:76. [PubMed: 22727185]
- [6]. Engblom S, Ferm L, Hellander A, Lötstedt P. Simulation of stochastic reaction-diffusion processes on unstructured meshes. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing. 2009; 31:1774–1797.
- [7]. Erban R. From molecular dynamics to Brownian dynamics. Proceedings of the Royal Society A. 2014; 470:20140036.
- [8]. Erban R, Chapman SJ. Reactive boundary conditions for stochastic simulations of reactiondiffusion processes. Physical Biology. 2007; 4(1):16–28. [PubMed: 17406082]
- [9]. Erban R, Chapman SJ. Stochastic modelling of reaction-diffusion processes: algorithms for bimolecular reactions. Physical Biology. 2009; 6(4):046001. [PubMed: 19700812]
- [10]. Erban, R.; Chapman, SJ.; Maini, P. A practical guide to stochastic simulations of reactiondiffusion processes. 2007. http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.1908, http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.1908,
- [11]. Erban R, Flegg M, Papoian G. Multiscale stochastic reaction-diffusion modelling: application to actin dynamics in filopodia. Bulletin of Mathematical Biology. 2013
- [12]. Flegg M, Chapman J, Erban R. The two-regime method for optimizing stochastic reactiondiffusion simulations. Journal of the Royal Society Interface. 2012; 9(70):859–868.
- [13]. Flegg M, Chapman J, Zheng L, Erban R. Analysis of the two-regime method on square meshes. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing. 2014; 36(3):B561–B588.
- [14]. Flegg M, Rüdiger S, Erban R. Diffusive spatio-temporal noise in a first-passage time model for intracellular calcium release. Journal of Chemical Physics. 2013
- [15]. Flekkøy E, Feder J, Wagner G. Coupling particles and fields in a diffusive hybrid model. Physical Review E. 2001; 64:066302.

- [16]. Franz, B.; Flegg, M.; Chapman, J.; Erban, R. Multiscale reaction-diffusion algorithms: PDEassisted Brownian dynamics. 2013. http://arxiv.org/abs/1206.5860http://arxiv.org/abs/ 1206.5860SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics
- [17]. 2004; 120(10):4573–4580.
- [18]. Gibson M, Bruck J. Efficient exact stochastic simulation of chemical systems with many species and many channels. Journal of Physical Chemistry. 2000; 104:>1876–1889.
- [19]. Gillespie D. Exact stochastic simulation of coupled chemical reactions. Journal of Physical Chemistry. 1977; 81(25):2340–2361.
- [20]. Gorba C, Geyer T, Helms V. Brownian dynamics simulations of simplified cytochrome c molecules in the presence of a charged surface. Journal of Chemical Physics. 2004; 121(1):457– 464. [PubMed: 15260567]
- [21]. Hattne J, Fange D, Elf J. Stochastic reaction-diffusion simulation with MesoRD. Bioinformatics. 2005; 21(12):2923–2924. [PubMed: 15817692]
- [22]. Hellander A, Hellander S, Lötstedt P. Coupled mesoscopic and microscopic simulation of stochastic reaction-diffusion processes in mixed dimensions. Multiscale Modeling and Simulation. 2012; 10(2):585–611.
- [23]. Klann M, Ganguly A, Koeppl H. Hybrid spatial Gillespie and particle tracking simulation. Bioinformatics. 2012; 28(18):i549–i555. [PubMed: 22962480]
- [24]. Lipkova J, Zygalakis K, Chapman J, Erban R. Analysis of Brownian dynamics simulations of reversible bimolecular reactions. SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics. 2011; 71(3):714–730.
- [25]. Moro E. Hybrid method for simulating front propagation in reaction-diffusion systems. Physical Review E. 2004; 69:060101.
- [26]. Rice, SA. Diffusion Limited Reactions. 1. Elsevier; Amsterdam: 1985.
- [27]. Robinson M, Andrews S, Erban R. Multiscale simulations in Smoldyn. submitted to Bioinformatics. 2014
- [28]. Robinson M, Flegg M, Erban R. Adaptive two-regime method: application to front propagation. Journal of Chemical Physics. 2014; 140(12):124109. [PubMed: 24697426]
- [29]. Takahashi K, T nase-Nicola S, ten Wolde PR. Spatio-temporal correlations can drastically change the response of a MAPK pathway. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2010; 107(6):2473–2478.
- [30]. van Zon J, ten Wolde P. Green's-function reaction dynamics: a particle-based approach for simulating biochemical networks in time and space. Journal of Chemical Physics. 2005; 123:234910. [PubMed: 16392952]
- [31]. Wagner G, Flekkøy E. Hybrid computations with flux exchange. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical & Engineering Sciences. 2004; 362:1655–1665.
- [32]. Walther JH, Praprotnik M, Kotsalis EM, Koumoutsakos P. Multiscale simulation of water flow past a C₅₄₀ fullerene. Journal of Computational Physics. 2012; 231(7):2677–2681.







Figure 2.

Schematic of CPM computational domain. (a) The primal mesh is indicated with red dashed lines. The nodes are connected to form triangles. The bisectors are then drawn in to create the dual mesh (blue dotted lines). Compartments are drawn from the dual mesh with one node at the center of each compartment. One example compartment is shown in blue. (b) *The domain is split into mesoscopic* Ω_C and microscopic Ω_M domains. Jumps between compartments and from the compartments into Ω_M are calculated using a finite element discretization of the Laplacian. The copy numbers of molecules in each compartment in Ω_C are stored whilst in Ω_M each molecule has its own position in continuous space.



Figure 3.

A diagram illustrating the fundamental differences between (a) *the TRM/CPM paradigm and* (b) *the GCM paradigm*.







Figure 5.

Surface plot of the absolute error ||E|| *defined by* (8) as a function of compartment size at the interface h_m and time step t for the one dimensional test problem using the TRM.



Figure 6.

Surface plot of the absolute error ||E|| defined by (8) as a function of compartment size at the interface h_m and time step t for the one dimensional test problem using the GCM.



Figure 7.

Scatter plot of the error *E* versus $h_m - \sqrt{\pi D \Delta t}$ for the TRM. The different color points represent different value of the commpartment size at the interface h (see lengend) and in each instance t varied from 5×10^{-6} to 5×10^{-3} .



Figure 8.

The cube $[0, 1]^3$ is partitioned into a mesoscopic region (grey) and a microscopic region (white). (a) *a coarse mesh*; (b) *a fine mesh*.

Author Manuscript



Figure 9.

The error ||E|| of the GCM method for different mesh sizes and time steps. The error decreases with decreasing time step, as expected.



Figure 10.

Comparison of the error ||E|| produced by the GCM and CPM for interfacing microscopic and mesoscopic simulations as a function of the time step in the microscopic simulation domain t. The length scale h is defined to be the cubic root of the average volume of a compartment.



Figure 11.

Diagram of Ω_M domain used in Test problem 1. Ω_M is the cube $(-1, 1) \times (-1, 1) \times (-1, 1)$ surrounded by compartments of size h = 0.1. Molecule A is at the centre with a reaction radius (indicated by a red sphere) of $\rho_{AB} = 0.1$. Molecule B (indicated by black spot) is initially placed a distance d from the origin. Two sample orientations for this separation are chosen (1) along the y-axis (shown in blue) and (2) along the orientation $\phi = \theta = \pi/2$ (shown in red).



Figure 12.

Probability of reaction at t = 1 for Test problem 1 versus initial separation, d. Gold standard Greens Function Reaction Dynamics (GFRD) reaction probability is given by a solid blue curve (see equation (12)). Scatter points are probabilities derived from GCM simulation. Blue circles correspond to orientation (1) *and red crosses correspond to orientation* (2). *See Figure* 11 for details. Simulations were completed using three different time steps $t = 5 \times 10^{-2}$, $t = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ and $t = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ showing progressive improvement against the GFRD probability. Blue dashed lines do not represent lines of best fit but rather, in each case, a constant factor decrease from the GFRD curve. Note that the y-axis has a log scale.



Figure 13.

Distribution of molecules at t = 1 for Test problem 2. The GCM simulation is on the left and the deterministic FEM solution is on the right. The colormap represents compartment particle concentration calculated by dividing copy number in each compartment by the area. The solid white line for the GCM simulation corresponds to the boundary between regimes, the white dashed line represents the boundary of the ghost cells. Individual molecules in the molecular-based regime are represented by red dots. Also note that $\lambda = 5000$ for plotting purposes.



Figure 14.

Copy numbers in the compartment-based regime (black) and the molecular-based regime (red) for both the GCM simulation (solid lines) and the expected FEM solution (dotted lines). Notice that the dotted lines are indistinguishable from the solid lines.

Table 1

The ghost cell method algorithm.

[G.1]	Initialize lattice over whole domain Ω and construct dual mesh (compartments). Generate interface <i>I</i> on the edges of compartments to separate Ω_M from Ω_C . Choose <i>t</i> and set time $t = 0$. Determine q_{kj} using the finite element method between all compartments [6].
[G.2]	Initialize the state of the system by placing molecules in compartments in Ω_C and placing molecules in continuous space in Ω_M . Count and store numbers of molecules in ghost cells, those compartments in Ω_M which are adjacent to the interface <i>I</i> .
[G.3]	Determine the time τ for the next event (reaction or diffusive) in Ω_C or diffusive jumps to and from ghost cells and Ω_C .
[G.4]	If $t + \tau < t + t \lfloor t/t \rfloor$ then change the state of the system to reflect the next event corresponding to τ and update time $t := t + \tau$. If this event is a diffusive jump from ghost cell to Ω_C choose a molecule at random within the relavant ghost cell to migrate. If this event is a diffusive jump from Ω_C to a ghost cell then initialize this molecule with uniform probability over the ghost cell.
[G.5]	If $t + \tau$ $t + t \lfloor t/t \rfloor$ then update the positions of all molecules in Ω_M using (2). Check for reactions in Ω_M [13]. All molecules incident on the interface <i>I</i> are reflected. Update time $t := t + t \lfloor t/t \rfloor$

[G.6] Repeat steps [G.3]–[G.5] until the desired end of the simulation.