

Summer 2017

Feedforward Chemical Neural Network: An In Silico Chemical System That Learns XOR

Drew Blount

Wild Me

Peter Banda

University of Luxembourg, tremor11@gmail.com

Christof Teuscher

Portland State University, teuscher@pdx.edu

Darko Stefanovic

University of New Mexico

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ece_fac

 Part of the [Electrical and Computer Engineering Commons](#)

Citation Details

Blount, D., Banda, P., Teuscher, C., & Stefanovic, D. (2017). Feedforward Chemical Neural Network: An In Silico Chemical System That Learns XOR. *Artificial Life*. Volume 23, Issue 3, p. 295-317.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electrical and Computer Engineering Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Feedforward Chemical Neural Network: An In Silico Chemical System That Learns XOR

Drew Blount^{*,**}

Wild Me

Peter Banda[†]

University of Luxembourg

Christof Teuscher[‡]

Portland State University

Darko Stefanovic[§]

University of New Mexico

Abstract Inspired by natural biochemicals that perform complex information processing within living cells, we design and simulate a chemically implemented feedforward neural network, which learns by a novel chemical-reaction-based analogue of backpropagation. Our network is implemented in a simulated chemical system, where individual neurons are separated from each other by semipermeable cell-like membranes. Our compartmentalized, modular design allows a variety of network topologies to be constructed from the same building blocks. This brings us towards general-purpose, adaptive learning in chemico: wet machine learning in an embodied dynamical system.

Keywords

Chemical reaction network, cellular compartment learning, feedforward, error backpropagation, linearly inseparable function

I Introduction

Just as neural networks were inspired by models of the brain and a desire to emulate and understand its computational power, chemical computation looks to the cell and other biological systems, hoping to comprehend and harness the information-processing dynamics that drive life [13, 15, 31]. In this view, each living cell is a powerful chemical computer, capable of dynamic resource allocation, repair, reproduction, and sometimes even motility. We wish to understand chemical computation, with the ultimate goal of building synthetic chemical networks capable of adaptation and learning.

Furthermore, a programmable wet computer could have myriad medical applications, particularly in smart drug delivery [17, 37, 59]: We imagine a tiny chemical computer injected into a patient, perhaps in its own cellular membrane, that dynamically reasons about the chemical composition of the patient's blood and releases drugs as appropriate. This is a particularly potent option, considering that such chemical computers would likely be implemented using biocompatible synthetic DNA strands [55].

There have been many projects on developing chemical computers in simulated environments over the past two decades [9, 15, 16, 29, 58]. Several models of chemical neural networks have been explored [11, 24, 25, 32], but so far these networks have been static in their behavior, incapable of learning.

* Contact author.

** Wild Me, 1726 North Terry Street, Portland, OR 97217. E-mail: me@drew.computer

† Luxembourg Centre for Systems Biomedicine, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg. E-mail: peter.banda@uni.lu

‡ Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Portland State University, Portland, OR 97201. E-mail: teuscher@pdx.edu

§ Department of Computer Science and Center for Biomedical Engineering, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131.

In our previous work we proposed several binary and analogue chemical perceptrons [4, 6, 7]. These were the first simulated chemical systems capable of fully autonomous learning. We used *chemical reaction networks* (CRNs), which are unstructured macroscopic chemistries, where interactions between symbolic species follow realistic reaction-kinetic laws. In these CRNs, single perceptrons were able to learn two-input linearly separable functions, and we also tackled time series learning and prediction by introducing chemical delay lines, which store the past inputs (concentrations) and feed them to underlying perceptrons [3, 46].

Having developed a family of individual chemical perceptrons, we wish to design a method for connecting these in a more computationally powerful network. The network should be modular, such that networks with different topologies are constructed from different combinations of the same parts. As neural networks have been shown to be powerful machine learners, we hope that a network of single chemical perceptrons could be a step towards the first general-use reprogrammable chemical computer.

We achieve this goal with the *feedforward chemical neural network* (FCNN), a network of cell-like compartments, each containing a chemical neuron as a module. Communication between nodes in the network is achieved by permeation through the walls of these compartments, facilitating the network's feedforward and backpropagation mechanisms.

Like standard single-layer perceptrons, each of our individual chemical perceptrons can learn the linearly separable binary two-input logic functions, such as AND and OR, but they are incapable of learning the linearly inseparable functions XOR and XNOR [45]. Here, we demonstrate that the FCNN learns each of these functions. To our knowledge, it is the first chemical system able to learn a linearly inseparable function.

The FCNN has the simplest feedforward neural network topology: one hidden layer with two hidden neurons, the same as the first classical neural network to learn XOR via backpropagation [53]. For more complex learning problems, we show how the FCNN's modular design can be applied to topologies with more, or larger, hidden layers. Using an FCNN is as simple as injecting a few species into its outermost chemical container and measuring the concentration of an output species. By modulating the concentrations of injected species, different inputs can be provided, the network can be trained to new tasks, and its learning rate can be annealed.

Built on a realistic model of chemical dynamics, the FCNN is a step towards reusable, reprogrammable chemical computers and a possible union of biochemistry and computer science. The project is also driven by a desire to better understand, through emulation and analogy, the information processing that occurs naturally in living systems. In this sense, the FCNN is an exploration of how relatively simple chemical reaction networks can embody computation, self-modification, and learning.

1.1 Related Work

Several projects have already implemented static, non-adapting neural networks in simulated chemical systems, especially using DNA-based models [10, 11, 25, 26, 32, 44, 51]. Hjelmfelt et al. [26] and Otakamo et al. [47], for example, both use schemes where connection weights are encoded in the concentrations of catalysts, which in turn speed up or slow down the relative consumption of the input chemical in parallel reactions. Most previous work encodes binary values by considering whether chemicals are present in the system above a certain threshold. We have taken the same approach here.

While Hjelmfelt et al. [26] and others have made important progress in implementing various components of the familiar feedforward neural network, such as a chemical activation function with sigmoidal properties, all of the above-mentioned projects focus only on the forward propagation of information, and not the backward propagation of the error. In each case, learning either is not considered, or is performed by an external, non-chemical system that computes the weights for a formal neural network before converting them to molecular concentrations to serve as parameters for the chemical implementation [32, 51]. For a system to be truly useful, the real challenge is to

implement chemical adaptation, where a reinforcement signal triggers reactions that then modify the system's own behavior.

Several groups have designed chemical systems based on learning models other than neural networks, such as decision trees [48] and least-squares regression (LSR) [34]. McGregor et al. [42] demonstrated how *in silico* evolution can be used to develop artificial chemistries capable of learning some particular fixed function. Lakin et al.'s scheme for rudimentary learning in an enzymatic chemistry [34] is equivalent to non-negative least-squares regression and achieves learning within a chemical system (and similarly for our more recent learning scheme based on buffered DNA strand displacement chemistry [35, 36]). Our FCNN differs from these architectures in two important ways. First, it enjoys the conceptual advantages of the neural network model itself, which is perhaps the most widely used and well-researched machine learning paradigm, and therefore represents a good model to use as the backbone of a general-purpose adaptable computer. Second, the FCNN is built from modular and composable components, so that it or something similar could be the scalable basis of future networks that are much larger and capable of more complex computation, whereas previous chemical computers have generally been limited-purpose and not scalable.

Chiang et al. [12] proposed a construction method for chemical reaction networks to represent reconfigurable logic functions. As opposed to our work, the reconfiguration is performed manually by changing the concentrations of certain control species. Wu et al. [60] surveyed a wide range of DNA-based logic gates and their applications in biotechnology and biomedicine. Fernando et al. [21] proposed a system based on gene regulatory networks embedded in *Escherichia coli* and demonstrated that even single-celled organisms could carry out associative learning.

2 Chemical Formalism

2.1 The Chemical Reaction Network

Our simulated chemical system consists of chemical species and reactions between them, along with rate coefficients governing the speed of those reactions. In this model, also known as a *chemical reaction network* (CRN) [18, 26], there is no notion of space, as each species is considered only in terms of its concentration in a uniformly mixed chemical bath where pressure, volume, and temperature are constant. The chemical species are completely abstract, without any defined molecular structure or atomic components. Their behavior is fully described by the reaction network, whose dynamics are deterministic, given the species' concentrations and the reaction coefficients.

Our CRN uses both catalytic and non-catalytic reactions, and has no notion of reaction reversibility, that is, reactions go one way. Non-catalytic reactions follow the mass action law, which states that the rate of a chemical reaction is the product of the concentrations of the reactants and a positive reaction rate k . For the elementary reaction $S_1 + S_2 \rightarrow P$, where substrates S_1 and S_2 combine to form product P without any intermediate reactions, the reaction rate $d[P]/dt$ is

$$\frac{d[P]}{dt} = -\frac{d[S_1]}{dt} = -\frac{d[S_2]}{dt} = k[S_1][S_2]. \quad (1)$$

Square brackets around a species symbol denote the concentration of that species in the system.

In catalytic reactions, the catalyst, a chemical species, drives the reaction without being consumed by it. If substrate S turns into product P in the presence of catalyst E , denoted $S \xrightarrow{E} P$, then so-called Michaelis-Menten kinetics [14, 43] approximates the reaction rate,

$$\frac{d[P]}{dt} = \frac{k_{\text{cat}}[E][S]}{K_m + [S]}, \quad (2)$$

where $k_{\text{cat}}, K_m \in \mathbb{R}^+$ are rate constants.

We allow annihilation reactions, which remove chemicals from the system. These reactions work like any other, but produce the null product λ , which does not signify disappearance of matter, but simply an inert species that does not further interact with other species in the system.

These different types of chemical reactions then give rise to a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) over the concentrations of species within our system. This system of ODEs mathematically defines our chemical reaction network.

2.2 Cell-like Compartments

Since Aristotle, Pasteur, and more recently Maturana and Varela [41], cellular compartmentalization has been considered a central characteristic of living systems; this is a major motivation behind the modern study of “protocells” [52]. The analogy of the cell as a self-contained, self-sustaining regulatory machine is a familiar one, and the most basic requirement for such a machine is compartmentalization—separation from the outside world. Hence, much effort has gone into determining the salient characteristics of a cell and simulating cells in the field of artificial life [20, 28, 54, 56]. For these reasons, cells have been a common component of several significant accomplishments in chemical computing [8, 15, 57].

In our artificial chemistry, we introduce cell-like compartments, used as containers for each of the individual chemical neurons composing the FCNN. Interaction between neurons is facilitated by permeation across the walls of these compartments. We defined the permeation dynamics of these compartment walls with reactionlike rules that we call *channels*.

Channels can be either reactive or inert. In the first case, a species is allowed to enter the compartment wall, but a different species emerges on the other side. Chemically, we imagine a molecule that reacts with a cell wall as it passes through it. In the other case, a species passing through an inert channel is not changed; it simply travels from one side of the membrane to the other. A given compartment wall can have any number of channels of either type.

In modeling membrane permeation, it is common to consider the pressure inside the cell, or, in a similar vein, the numbers of particular molecules within it [30, 54]. In the latter case, a chemical species S permeates into a cell more slowly if there is already a high concentration of S in the cell. Furthermore, if a cell’s total volume is constrained, species can permeate into it only up to a certain point, when the cell becomes “full.” More detailed models also consider solute permeability, viscosity, hydraulic conductivity [33], pH, and temperature.

We make several simplifying assumptions regarding the dynamics of our cell-like compartments. First, each compartment’s internal pressure is assumed constant, meaning that the total volume of species entering or exiting through permeation is much smaller than the total volume of the container; in other words, there is a large amount of some inert solvent inside each compartment. Second, we assume that permeation rules are inherently one-way; if a species passes from side A of a container wall to side B , it does so aware only of the state on side A . This means that permeation is not osmotic, or equilibrium-seeking, but conceptually more akin to so-called active transport across cell walls. Third, since we consider chemical species only in terms of their concentrations, other physical parameters such as temperature and viscosity are beyond the scope of our model. Having thus simplified the chemical picture, channel permeation rates follow mass-action kinetics: The rate of permeation is exactly proportional to the concentration of the source species in the source container and a permeability constant k .

We introduce a notation for channels. Consider two example channels through the wall of container \mathbf{C} ,



In the parentheses, the first species is always inside \mathbf{C} , and the second outside. The arrow denotes the direction of permeation. Here $\mathbf{C} : (S_2 \leftarrow S_1)$ is a reactive channel in which S_1 passes into \mathbf{C} ,

turning into S_2 in the process, while $\mathbf{C} : (S'_1 \rightarrow S'_2)$ is a reactive channel in which S'_1 passes out of \mathbf{C} , turning into S'_2 .

It should be noted that the computational use of cells and their membranes is the central object of study in the field of *P systems*, or membrane systems, which are abstracted chemical systems where different reactions occur in different cells, with communication between cells via membrane permeation [49, 50]. The work presented here is somewhat similar to P systems, so it is important to understand key differences between the two models. Our approach to chemistry is less abstracted than that taken in P systems: The chemical objects of P systems are strings that “react” through rewriting rules akin to Chomsky’s context-free grammars [49]. P systems successfully demonstrated the theoretical computational power of chemically inspired systems of a certain type, but omissions such as reaction-kinetic models generally make P systems unwieldy for the design of viable chemical computers.

Our goal is to use the systems of ODEs that describe our CRNs to construct autonomously learning neural networks. Each phase of the operation of a multilayered perceptron, such as “calculate linear sum,” and “update weights,” is only qualitatively emulated by our ODEs—we do not aim to reproduce the mathematics of neural networks in a one-to-one fashion in chemistry. Thus, our chemical perceptrons are mathematically distinct from perceptrons [22]. Moreover, chemical reactions representing each operation run continuously and in parallel, rather than discretely and in sequence. Because our network is a large, nonlinear system of ODEs, there are generally no analytic solutions for, say, what concentration of Y will be present in our system a set time after it is started with given initial conditions. We therefore use numerical ODE solvers as the backbone of our analysis (see Section 6).

Previous results on the theoretical power of perceptrons and neural networks (e.g., Hornik’s proof that feedforward perceptrons are universal approximators [27]) start with the mathematical definitions of the models, and thus rely upon assumptions (as basic as $y = \sum w_i x_i$) that are not valid in our chemical perceptrons. Furthermore, our scalable network construction is restricted to treelike topologies, a restriction that is generally not made in the study of classical perceptrons. Thus, this work demonstrates the robustness of the general conceptual framework behind neural networks, and that the mathematical particulars of a neural network’s implementation are perhaps less important than the general, functional relationships between its parts.

In the spirit that drove the early history of neural networks, we consider in this article the same problem that is the focus of Rumelhart’s classic exposition of backpropagation [53]: solving XOR with a one-hidden-layer, two-hidden-unit feedforward perceptron. In Section 6 we will use this early result from classical multilayer perceptrons as a benchmark against our FCNN.

3 Chemical Neurons

The chemical neuron we chose as the building block for FCNNs is the *analogue asymmetric signal perceptron* (AASP) [4]. Two new variants of the AASP are used, one for hidden neurons and one for the output neuron. As a reference throughout this section and the rest of the article, Table 1 lists all chemical species in the FCNN. Tables listing all reactions, reaction rate constants, and permeation channels are provided in the Online Supplementary Material (http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/suppl/10.1162/ARTL_a_00233).

3.1 Our Chemical Neuron: The AASP

Our previous work [4] introduced the AASP and described its mechanism and motivation in depth. Because both our hidden and output neurons (described in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) are modified versions of the AASP, here we describe those features of the AASP that are relevant to the FCNN. We present the two-input AASP, but the model can be easily extended by treating additional inputs analogously to the first two.

Table I. Chemical Species in the FCNN.

Function	Species
Inputs	X_1, X_2
Output	Y
Weights	W_0, W_1, W_2
Input (clock) signal	S_{in}
Learning signal	S_L
Production records	$X_1Y, X_2Y, S_{in}Y$
Weight adjusters	W^{\oplus}, W^{\ominus}
Indiv. weight decreaseers	$W_0^{\ominus}, W_1^{\ominus}, W_2^{\ominus}$
Inert input transmit*	X'_1, X'_2, S'_{in}
Binary threshold*	T
Penalty*	P
Error signal*	E^{\oplus}, E^{\ominus}
Backprop. signals*	$P_1^{\oplus}, P_1^{\ominus}, P_2^{\oplus}, P_2^{\ominus}$
Feedforward signal#	S_F
Feedforward output#	F

Notes. *: Output neuron only; #: hidden neuron only.

3.1.1 Input

Each component of the input vector is represented by a species X_i . Although the AASP accepts continuous input values, it also operates very well as a binary-input perceptron. In this case, we inject only those X_i whose value is 1, at a preset input concentration, and do not inject the X_i whose value is 0.

Under this input encoding, the zero input ($X_i = 0$ for all i) corresponds to no chemical injection, which poses problems for a system that should react to such an input because the zero input is indistinguishable from no input at all. We therefore include a special clock signal S_{in} with every input, alerting the perceptron to the input event. Though S_{in} is necessary only to recognize the zero input, it is included with all inputs for the sake of consistency. We will see later that S_{in} is also useful in the weight integration.

3.1.2 Input-Weight Integration

Here we encounter a common problem in mapping mathematical structures to chemical systems, the representation of negative numbers. As chemical species cannot exist in negative concentrations, an arbitrary real number, such as a perceptron's input weight, cannot be represented by a straightforward mapping to a concentration of a single species.

In our earliest models of chemical perceptrons, we solved this problem by associating each weight with two species, one to encode positive weight values and one for negative [6]. To reduce the size and complexity of the chemical system, we have since used a scheme that requires only one species per weight. For this we must sacrifice the straightforward linear relationship between the weight of a formal perceptron and concentrations of weight species in a chemical system—hence the name *asymmetric* signal perceptron. Our ASP is not only simpler than its predecessors, but also learns more accurately [7].

Like a formal perceptron's weights, our chemical perceptrons' weights determine the persistent state of the system and, when adjusted, modulate the mapping from input to output. With reactions between the weight species W_i , input species X_i , and output species Y , we wish to qualitatively reproduce the simple linear sum

$$y = w_0 + w_1x_1 + w_2x_2 \quad (4)$$

in such a way that it reproduces the functionality of negative weights.

What we require of each W_i is simply that, in the presence of X_i , the output Y be either increased or decreased depending on the concentration of W_i . This is achieved by a race between two reactions that consume X_i . In the first, W_i catalyzes X_i 's transformation into Y . In the second, X_i and Y annihilate:



The first reaction, which produces Y as a function of X_i and W_i , also produces a record-keeping species X_iY . This species is later used in the weight-update stage of learning, as will be described in Section 3.1.3. X_iY is merely another abstract species in our artificial chemistry, and should not be interpreted as a molecular complex containing both X_i and Y . The clock species S_{in} is already present in every injection, so it is used as the constant multiplicative coefficient of the bias W_0 . In terms of Equation 5, $S_{in} = X_0$.

Based on the reaction rate laws as described by Equations 1 and 2, we see that $[Y]$'s rate of change $d[Y]/dt$ during the input-weight integration is the sum of two terms for each input:

$$\frac{d[Y]}{dt} = \sum_i \left(\frac{k_{c,i}[X_i][W_i]}{K_{m,i} + [X_i]} - k_{a,i}[X_i][Y] \right), \quad (6)$$

where each k is a reaction rate constant. The terms inside the sum are the rates of the reactions in Equation 5; their signs are opposite because one reaction produces Y and the other consumes it. Because the first reaction's rate is proportional to $[W_i]$, a large $[W_i]$ will result in the first reaction producing Y faster than the second reaction consumes it. In this case, the net effect of the two reactions is to increase $[Y]$. When $[W_i]$ is small, the second reaction dominates and $[Y]$ decreases. Thus, the concentration of the weight species W_i determines if the presence of X_i serves to increase or decrease the final output.

Note that upon input injection, each (W_i, X_i) pair is simultaneously producing and annihilating the same Y . A consequence of this is another difference between chemical and formal perceptrons: Weight strengths are relative, as each copy of the second reaction above will proceed at a rate proportional to $[Y]$, which is constantly changing in a manner dependent on every input weight. This sharing of Y by the various inputs, as well as the two reactions above, is diagrammed in Figure 1.

Although we cannot determine the nonlinear dynamics of $[Y]$ without running an ODE solver, the nature of the chemical reaction network enforces a lower bound of zero and an upper bound




Figure 1. Reactions in the input-weight integration of a two-input AASP. Dotted arrows denote a catalyst, for example, signifying $X_i \xrightarrow{W_i} Y + X_iY$. Each weight catalyzes a reaction turning its associated input into Y , while that input and Y simultaneously annihilate each other at a different rate. Reproduced from our article on the AASP [4].

equal to the sum of the input concentrations, $\sum_i [X_i]$. The upper bound is asymptotically reached as weights go to infinity.

3.1.3 Learning

Chemical implementations of the input-weight integration are not new [25, 32], but our previous work was the first to implement autonomous learning [6]. In an AASP, learning starts with the injection of a *desired output* species \hat{Y} , and ultimately updates each weight in the appropriate direction by a magnitude relative to that input dimension's influence on the most recent output Y combined with an analogue of an error. This scheme is described below, and illustrated in its entirety in Figure 2.

The first step of the learning process is reading the output of the AASP. After input injection, the integration reactions are allowed to run for a preset period of time, chosen so that the injected input species are fully consumed. In our simulations, this lasted 50 time steps. At the end of this period, the concentration of Y in the AASP is read as its output. The next step in the AASP's learning process is determining the correctness of this output. This is accomplished by injecting the desired output species \hat{Y} at the desired Y concentration. Upon this injection, Y and \hat{Y} quickly annihilate each other in equal proportions via the reaction



This reaction consumes all of whichever species has the lower initial concentration, and the remaining species' concentration will be equal to the difference in initial concentrations, that is, it will be an analogue of the error. We then use whichever species remains to create weight-changing species with the appropriate sign, in a slower reaction than the above, to ensure something akin to execution order:



where the learning-signal species S_L , also injected with \hat{Y} , ensures that Y is transformed into W^{\ominus} only after \hat{Y} 's injection. This process, by which the output is compared with the desired output to produce weight-adjustment species, is illustrated in Figure 2a. Similar processes are used to calculate error and weight-adjustment signals in both the hidden and output neurons in the FCNN.

Once weight-adjustment signals are produced, all neuron types behave identically, adjusting their i th weight in proportion to both the adjustment signal and the i th input dimension's influence on




Figure 2. The three components of the weight-update mechanism of an AASP. (a) Y is compared with \hat{Y} , and the appropriately signed error species is produced. (b) The positive error species (the result of $[Y] < [\hat{Y}]$) is transformed directly into each weight species. (c) The negative error species is transformed into annihilator species, which decrease each weight. In both (b) and (c), the record-keeping species X_iY catalyze the reactions, ensuring that the i th weight is adjusted somewhat proportionally to the impact that the i th input had on Y . Nodes represent species, solid lines are reactions, dashed lines are catalysts, and λ stands for no or inert species.

the most recent production of Y . This qualitatively reproduces the so-called *delta rule* of classic perceptron learning [22].

In Section 3.1.2, we introduced the species X_iY , which is produced as a record of the influence of X_i and W_i on the production of Y . Via catalysis, we use this species to emulate the delta rule: The weight-adjustment species W^\oplus and W^\ominus adjust the concentration of weight W_i through productive and annihilatory reactions, respectively, each catalyzed by X_iY . Thus, weight adjustment is achieved by the reactions



The main difference between this method and the classical delta rule is that, because X_iY 's production is influenced positively by W_i , and X_iY also catalyzes W_i 's adjustment, larger W_i will be adjusted relatively more than smaller ones. Thus, larger weights are adjusted more than smaller ones. We reproduce the effect that the i th weight is adjusted proportionally to both the difference between desired and actual output, and the most recent i th input signal.

Note that it takes an intermediate species and two reactions for W^\ominus to annihilate W_i . This is simply because the hypothetical reaction $W^\ominus + W_i \xrightarrow{X_iY} \lambda$, with two reactants and a catalyst, would require the collision of three molecules in the same instant. As such three-molecule interactions are unlikely, we do not use them in our designs.

3.2 Two Breeds of AASP

To accommodate communication between neurons in FCNNs, we had to modify the original AASP design. This resulted in two related breeds: one for hidden neurons, which has a modulated output schedule and accepts backpropagated error signals; and another for the output neuron, modified to initialize the cascading backpropagation reactions. We discuss the means by which these neurons are connected to each other to achieve feeding forward and backpropagation in Sections 4.2 and 4.3, but here we first discuss the details that distinguish our output and hidden neurons from each other and the AASP.

3.2.1 The Hidden Chemical Neuron

The *hidden chemical neuron* (HCN) is the modular component from which FCNNs of various topologies are constructed. It has two differences from the AASP as presented in Section 3.1, one each to facilitate feeding forward and backpropagation.

The AASP produces output Y constantly, as the input dimensions are gradually integrated through the series of reactions in Section 3.1.2. It is designed to receive input signals instantaneously, however, so in a network context we cannot simply feed forward a hidden neuron's output as it is produced. In practice, we have found that AASPs perform poorly with their input injected gradually over time.

Thus, we introduce a *feedforward species* S_F , which arrives in an HCN's chemical system when its output Y is meant to feed forward. The details of this will be discussed along with the rest of the network in Section 4.2, but for now it is enough to know that the following reaction occurs in each HCN:



where F is the species that is later fed forward. Thus, the next neuron receives an input signal that is more sudden than the relatively gradual output of the HCN, and this action is induced by S_F .

In learning, an HCN has less work to do than an AASP. An AASP reasons about its output and a desired output to produce the weight-update species W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} , but hidden neurons receive error signals through backpropagation, not through a direct comparison of the outputs. Thus, the W^{\oplus} - and W^{\ominus} -producing reactions of an AASP, illustrated in Figure 2a, are omitted from the HCN.

3.2.2 The Output Chemical Neuron

The *output chemical neuron* (OCN) has a different learning mechanism from the AASP. As the current FCNN is designed to learn binary functions, such as XOR, inserting a desired-output species to instigate learning, as Figure 2a shows, is somewhat ineffective. For example, if the binary threshold is 0.5, the error will be minuscule if the actual output is, say, 0.499. This was not a serious problem in the single AASP, but the OCN's error signal must not only update its own weights, but propagate backwards as well. The reactions involving backpropagation will be discussed in Section 4.3; here, we explain the method by which weight-changing signals are produced within the OCN.

The OCN's learning phase begins with the external evaluation of its output. A penalty species P is injected only if the OCN's output is incorrect, that is, on the wrong side of the binary threshold that is used to interpret chemical concentrations as binary values. Along with P , the AASP's learning signal S_L is injected. Further, a threshold species T is injected in concentration equivalent to the binary threshold. T communicates the binary threshold to the OCN, and behaves somewhat analogously to the desired-output species \hat{Y} in the AASP (Section 3.1.3).

The goal of the OCN's error-evaluating reactions, diagrammed in Figure 3, is to amplify small continuous-valued errors to emulate distinct binary-valued errors. This is done in two stages. First, Y and T annihilate in a fast reaction. Whichever is left over encodes whether Y was above or below the threshold, and whether the weights should be increased or decreased. Thus, S_L catalyzes relatively slow reactions from Y and T to signed error species E^{\ominus} and E^{\oplus} , respectively.




Figure 3. The weight-update mechanism for a two-input AASP. The process is started by the injection of the penalty signal P . The annihilatory comparison of the output Y and the threshold T determines whether the weights will be increased or decreased. Nodes represent species, solid lines are reactions, dashed lines are catalysts, and λ stands for no or inert species.

Whichever E species is more prevalent tells whether the weights should be increased or decreased, but their absolute magnitudes might be very small. We then amplify these signals autocatalytically while consuming the penalty species P :



Note that E^{\oplus} (E^{\ominus}) is both catalyst and product, and W^{\oplus} (W^{\ominus}) is also produced. The above equations are illustrated in the bottom half of Figure 3.

The autocatalytic reactions ensure that the total amount of weight change is not limited by the initial difference between $[Y]$ and $[T]$, which is encoded in the $[E]$ s. The total amount of weight change is bounded, however, by the injected concentration of P , as it is the only reactant creating W^{\oplus} or W^{\ominus} . Thus, we can achieve annealing by decreasing the concentration of successive injections of P . To summarize the error-evaluating reactions: The initial difference between $[Y]$ and $[T]$ determines the sign of the weight adjustment, and $[P]$ determines the magnitude.

4 Networking

This section discusses the methods by which AASPs are connected to make a FCNN. We first describe the network's topology, both as a neural network and as a series of chemical containers; and then its mechanisms of feeding forward signals and error backpropagation.

4.1 Constructing the Network Topology

With neurons in nested compartments and links across compartment walls, our networks are topologically trees, each wall being a branch and the outermost compartment being the root (Figure 4).




Figure 4. FCNNs have treelike topologies.




Figure 5. An alternative scheme places all hidden neurons as sibling subcompartments of the output neuron, illustrated for an all-to-all network topology.

The outermost compartment (1 in the figure) corresponds to the output layer in a feedforward multi-layer perceptron, and for a given set of nested compartments, the deepest compartments (4–7 in the figure) correspond to the input layer. We cannot construct arbitrary feedforward networks, because in our treelike networks each node can feed forward to only one node in the next layer.

This nested architecture enables the FCNN's modularity. Each neuron is guaranteed to share a permeable wall with any neuron to which it is connected in the network, so messages that must pass from one neuron to another do not need to be “addressed”—they passively permeate from parent to child or vice versa. This makes the architecture scalable. The signal species between different pairs of neurons can be chemically identical because the signaling occurs in distinct compartments. For this reason, the number of species in the FCNN is sublinear in the size of the network.

If we wished to make arbitrary feedforward topologies, that would be possible provided we included distinct signal species for every linkage in the neural network. This could be achieved by placing all hidden neurons, regardless of their level in the network, as sibling subcompartments within the larger output neuron (Figure 5). Feedforward and backpropagation signals would travel between hidden neurons via this shared compartment. As long as there are unique signal species for each link in the network, this design allows arbitrary feedforward network topologies.




Figure 6. A simplified diagram of the feedforward action of a two-input, one-hidden-layer, two-hidden-neuron FCNN. The inert X'_i species are injected into the outer layer and permeate into the input layer, turning into the reactive X_i input species in the process. Each inner compartment produces Y , which then permeates into the outer compartment as it is transformed into the appropriate X_i . This feedforward process is modulated by unshown species S_i and F_i ; see Section 3.2.1.

In the simulation results presented in this article, we used a simple two-hidden-neuron, one-hidden-layer topology to solve XOR (Figure 6). This topology is consistent with either of the above paradigms. As we are more interested in the modularity afforded by a treelike topology, we implement backpropagation and feeding forward in ways generalizable to treelike designs.


4.2 The Forward Pass

4.2.1 Injection

Each of an FCNN's input neurons is contained in a subcompartment of the output neuron. In the interest of keeping the system's input-output protocol as straightforward as possible, all injections are made directly into the outermost compartment, rather than precisely into any of its subcompartments. Yet the input species must be consumed only by reactions in the input-layer nodes, and because the output compartment contains an AASP, any input species X_i are automatically consumed whenever they are present within it. Therefore, an inert species X'_i is injected instead that permeates into the input compartments. These compartments have channels that convert each inert X'_i to the reactive input species X_i , which are then immediately treated by the hidden neurons as input (Figure 6):




Similarly, each hidden neuron needs to receive a feedforward species S_F (described in Section 3.2.1), which must be injected from outside the system so that every neuron in a given layer receives this signal simultaneously. In an FCNN with n hidden layers, we require a set of feedforward species $S_F^1, S_F^2, \dots, S_F^n$, which transform into the basic signal species S_F when permeating into compartments of the appropriate layer:



Once S_F permeates into a given hidden neuron, that neuron's output Y is transformed into the feedforward species F . If this HCN is the i th neuron in the j th hidden layer, say it is in container ${}^j\mathbf{C}$. Then F permeates outward into \mathbf{C} , turning into the corresponding input species X_i in the process:



Simultaneously, the OCN receives its signal species S_{in} by recycling the HCN's S_F :



Thus, S_F plays two roles: It alerts the hidden neurons to feed forward their output, and then by the above permeation alerts the neurons in the next layer to begin processing input. With these reactions, the output Y of each hidden chemical neuron feeds forward. This process is illustrated in Figure 7, which shows (in silico) experimental concentration-versus-time data for the species in the feedforward process, in each neuron in a simple one-hidden-layer FCNN.

4.3 Backpropagation

Backpropagation is the algorithm that first learned XOR and popularized the modern feedforward neural network [53]. Again, our chemical system does not exactly reproduce the classic formulae




Figure 7. Concentration-versus-time plot in the example FCNN with two HCNs (a, b) and one OCN (c), illustrating the HCNs' outputs feeding forward and becoming the OCN's input. At time zero the inputs X_1' , X_2' , and S_{in} are injected to the OCN (not shown in (c)). They then permeate into each HCN, transforming into the input species. Note the initial spikes in concentrations of X_1 , X_2 , and S_{in} in (a) and (b). After the injection of an S_F signal at time 40, each HCN's output permeates out to the OCN, transforming into the appropriate input species and S_{in} . Axis units are arbitrary.

defining this process, and we focus instead on chemically reproducing the important conceptual relationships between parts.

To review, classical backpropagation proceeds in three steps:

1. The output perceptron's error $e = \hat{y} - y$ is calculated, where \hat{y} and y are the desired and actual outputs.
2. Moving backwards, each perceptron's error is calculated as the sum of the errors that it has affected, weighted by the connecting weights. In our topologically restricted multilayer perceptrons, each node only feeds forward to one other, so this reduces to $e_i = e_j w_{ji}$, where w_{ji} is the weight from perceptron i to j , and e_j is already known.
3. Each weight is updated proportionally to this error, the weight's own magnitude, and the most recent output of the source perceptron: $\Delta w_{ji} \propto e_j w_{ji} y_i$, where y_i is the last output of perceptron i .

The first step above is emulated by the OCN's internal reactions, described in Section 3.2.2. These reactions produce weight-update species that encode the sign and magnitude of the network's overall error.

The OCN generates input-specific error signals to be backpropagated to the previous layer in the network. These reactions are also implemented in any HCN with deeper layers of HCNs inside it, that is, all neurons where a signal should be backpropagated. In such neurons, the weight-adjustment species W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} , in addition to changing weights, produce input-specific backpropagation signals. This production is catalyzed by the weight species W_i ,



so the i th backpropagation signal P_i^{\oplus} or P_i^{\ominus} is produced in an amount positively correlated with the i th weight and the overall adjustment species W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} .





Figure 8. A diagram of the backpropagation action of a one-hidden-layer, two-hidden-neuron FCNN. The weight-adjusting species in the outer OCN (right of figure) produce signed, input-specific penalty species P_i . The penalty species then permeate into the hidden neurons' compartments, becoming those neurons' weight-changing species in the process.

The signed, dimension-specific penalty species P_i^{\oplus} or P_i^{\ominus} then propagates backwards through the network via permeation channels. Since the purpose of these signals is to adjust weights, they are simply transformed to the species W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} as they permeate into the appropriate subcontainers:



Thus, in the one-hidden-layer case, the concentration of the weight-changing species W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} in the i th inner compartment is related to (a) W^{\oplus} and W^{\ominus} in the outer compartment, and (b) the weight W_i connecting the two compartments. This relationship is diagrammed in Figure 8.

5 Methodology

5.1 Rate and Permeation Constants

We have so far specified the reactants, products, and catalysts in each reaction, but every reaction also has at least one dimensionless rate coefficient, which describes its speed (k in Equations 1 and 2). Here we discuss how those rate coefficients have been set in our simulations. Tables listing all reaction rates can be found in the Online Supplementary Material.

As each AASP (Section 3.1) contains around twenty distinct rate constants, the rate parameter space is prohibitively large and complex to explore via exhaustive search. In our previous work [4] we searched for these constants with a standard genetic algorithm. As both the hidden and output chemical neurons share most of their reactions with the AASP, those reactions are set to the rates found by the method described in [4].

Unlike with the AASP, we found success in setting the rate constants introduced in this article by hand. Our intuition in doing so was based on the intended function of each reaction, and which reactions should occur faster or slower than others. To illustrate the intuitive setting, consider the case when two species annihilate in order to determine which had the larger initial concentration, and then the remaining species is transformed into another to perform a task dependent on the initial comparison. This is the case when Y and T are compared in the OCN's error-calculating mechanism (Figure 3): Whichever species remains after annihilation is meant to turn into an appropriately signed error species. In such cases, the comparison reaction should be faster than the follow-up reactions, dependent on that comparison. Otherwise, the second reaction would execute before the comparison had been meaningfully made. These manually set rate constants, as well as those set by the genetic algorithm, are listed in the Online Supplementary Material.

5.2 Simulation Details

The FCNN is a large system of ODEs. As such systems are generally unsolvable analytically, we use numerical Runge-Kutta-type ODE solvers to observe the FCNN's behavior. We used a fixed-time-step solver with a step size of 0.1, chosen for speed as well as stability. All simulations were run on the COEL web-based chemical modeling and simulation framework [2, 5].

In the interest of modularity and flexibility, COEL's ODE solvers do not consider the FCNN as a whole. Rather, the contents of each compartment are simulated semi-independently, each by a separate ODE solver. Several solvers then communicate with each other as needed. This allows us to use different solvers for different compartments, or even to have compartments solved by entirely different types of simulations. When using adaptive time-step-size ODE solvers, the compartments are synchronized by imposing the slowest compartment's time-step size on the other compartments, and so all of the chemical concentrations in the FCNN are updated in unison.

6 Results

As our goal is to learn linearly inseparable functions in a chemical neural network, we built the first FCNN in the classic one-hidden-layer, two-hidden-neuron network topology first shown to learn XOR [53]. We will refer to this topology, with rate constants set as described in Section 5.1, simply as the FCNN in this section.

The FCNN successfully learns each of the 16 binary two-input logic functions. In a single learning run, it was trained to a given logic function with 2,000 random inputs and corresponding penalty injections (described in Section 4). We generated inputs randomly from $\{0, 1\}^2$ and later injected a threshold species T with concentration 0.6 and a penalty P as appropriate, 2,000 times consecutively. The concentration of the penalty species, which is analogous to a learning rate, was annealed by a factor of 0.0008 at each injection (see the Online Supplementary Material for further details).

The FCNN's accuracy at each of the 2,000 consecutive iterations was averaged over 10,000 training runs to produce accuracy-versus-time data for each logic function shown in Figure 9. Figure 10 shows an example of the FCNN converging to a solution of XOR.

The most important results are the FCNN's performance on XOR and XNOR, which, because of their linear inseparability, cannot be learned by a single perceptron [45]. On the 2,000th iteration, the FCNN's accuracy on XOR and XNOR is 100.00% and 98.05%, respectively. Averaged over all 16 functions, the FCNN is 99.88% accurate by the 2,000th learning iteration.

As can be seen in Figure 10, the FCNN converges to learn inseparable functions in a relatively short period of time. The 14 separable functions are almost perfectly learned by the 600th learning iteration, but it takes until around iteration 1,200 to learn XOR. XNOR is not perfectly learned even by iteration 2,000. We see this as confirmation that linear inseparability is a challenging feature to learn. Nonetheless, the FCNN learns about as quickly as the original multilayer perceptrons that solved XOR: Rumelhart's classic multilayer perceptron took roughly 1,000 learning iterations [53].

The difference in performance between XOR and XNOR can be explained by the FCNN's asymmetric treatment of the input values 0 and 1. As can be seen in Figure 10, the functions !X1 and !X2




Figure 9. Average accuracy of the FCNN on each of the 16 binary two-input logic functions. An FCNN with one hidden layer and two hidden neurons was run 10,000 times on each of the 16 functions. Each run started with random initial weights and was trained for 2,000 learning iterations. The data points represent the proportion of correct answers the system produced on a given learning iteration. Six of the functions are labeled; the remaining ten overlap in the top left of the graph. Note that the FCNN learns equally well any two functions that are equivalent after switching the names of X1 and X2.




Figure 10. An example of weights and output concentration converging in the OCN as an FCNN learns XOR over 300 learning iterations. Note that when the weights reach a fixed point around the 250th iteration, the output $[Y]$ oscillates around 0.6, which in this case is the binary threshold. In this simulation, inputs were cycled in the fixed order $((0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1))$ for the purpose of illustration—once the function is learned, $[Y]$ oscillates as the system produces the correct (thresholded) output stream 0, 1, 1, 0 (zoomed in the smaller plot).

are learned almost identically well by the FCNN. This is because the FCNN architecture is symmetric on input; each input dimension behaves according to the same logic. Its architecture is not symmetric on negation, however, because 1 and 0 values are treated fundamentally differently. Consider the fact that the output species Y is ultimately produced by the two input species X_1 and X_2 , as well as the signal species S_{in} (Sections 3.1.1 and 4.2). For this reason, it is easier for the FCNN to learn to output 0 when it is given the input $(0, 0)$ (i.e., when only S_{in} is present at injection) than to learn to output 1.

Unlike its building block, the AASP (Section 3.1), the FCNN in this context behaves as a binary perceptron. Thus, we compare its performance on the binary logic functions not with the AASP, but with our previous binary single chemical perceptrons: the SASP (standard ASP), an automatically thresholded version, the TASP (thresholded ASP) [7], the WLP, and the WRP [6]. The two more recent models, the SASP and the TASP, represent the state of the art in binary chemical perceptrons; although the TASP is more accurate, the SASP is more similar to the FCNN because of its lack of automatic output thresholding. As shown in Table 2, the FCNN is significantly more capable than any of them.

Thus, the FCNN is the first simulated chemical system to autonomously learn linearly inseparable functions. As shown by Minsky and Papert [45], single perceptrons cannot learn such functions, because, as binary classifiers, they can only divide the input space along a hyperplane. In common

Table 2. Accuracy of FCNN versus single chemical perceptrons.

	FCNN	WLP	WRP	SASP	TASP
XOR	100.00	57.61	61.88	50.53	59.00
XNOR	98.05	57.79	61.12	51.02	57.86
16-function average	99.88	94.71	95.18	93.40	94.80




Figure 11. Response surface of an FCNN that learned XOR. Input $[X]$ values of 1.0 correspond to TRUE, and 0.0 to FALSE, so the accuracy of the FCNN is defined only by its response at the corners of the plots. The plot on the left shows the FCNN's output value at each $([X_1], [X_2])$, while the plot on the right shows the same data thresholded by 0.6—the output values above the threshold correspond to TRUE (red region), and those below indicate FALSE (blue regions). Jagged lines in the right figure are an artefact of our sampling technique.

with a multilayer perceptron, the FCNN does not have this constraint. To illustrate this, we mapped the response surface of an FCNN after it had successfully learned to compute XOR, as shown in Figure 11.

7 Conclusion

We have presented a hierarchical, compartmentalized artificial chemical system that is capable of autonomous learning. The *feedforward chemical neural network* (FCNN) is, to our knowledge, the first simulated chemical system to learn a linearly inseparable function. It does so by a chemical analogue of backpropagation. This is demonstrated in the classic example of the XOR binary function, which the FCNN learns perfectly in under 1,500 learning iterations, 100% of the time.

Each chemical neuron in the FCNN is a modified version of the AASP from our previous work. Neurons are distinguished from each other by their compartmentalization in nested cell-like containers. This nesting constrains FCNNs to treelike topologies, but allows modular design. Inter-neuron communication, facilitating feeding forward and backpropagation, is mediated by selective permeation of signal species through the compartment walls.

Each hidden neuron is chemically identical in the species and reactions that occur within them. Thus, the FCNN brings us closer to a world where we might build a whole class of general-purpose chemical computers from the same scalable, composable components.

Because they follow textbook reaction rate laws, the chemical reaction networks we have designed (i.e., each individual chemical neuron) are directly translatable to wet chemistries thanks to advances in DNA strand-displacement circuits [55]. Translating our cell-like containers, along with their reactive channels, into a wet implementation would be more challenging, as the problem of constructing chemical membranes has no straightforward solution. We are hopeful that current work in synthesizing bilayer lipid membranes will develop such a solution.

One technical complication in the FCNN design worth addressing is the manual injection of the feedforward signal species S_F . Ideally, a chemical neural network could operate completely independently once receiving input and a desired output signal. We are hopeful of developing mechanisms by which S_F could be generated periodically within the FCNN, perhaps using chemical oscillators such as the Lotka-Volterra predator-prey system [38, 39].

Another direction for further research is optimizing the modules of the FCNN. In our previous work, we have developed a small family of single chemical perceptrons—we have already mentioned the (standard) asymmetric signal perceptron [7], the thresholded asymmetric signal perceptron [7], and the analogue ASP [3]. We have explored network architectures with many of these as building blocks, shown in our Online Supplementary Materials. Though we have presented the best-performing architecture we have tested, it is possible that there are yet better components for the FCNN than our current hidden and output neurons.

In our previous work we have developed chemical perceptrons that incorporate delay lines to learn patterns in time series [3, 46]. Integrating these into an FCNN would add a temporal dimension to the network's pattern-recognition capabilities, which would enable us to tackle standard neural network and reservoir computing benchmark time series such as NARMA [1], Mackey-Glass [19, 40], and the Hénon map [23].

Another logical extension of this work is to explore the FCNN model on larger networks, with either more hidden layers, more neurons per layer, or both. Larger FCNNs are expected to tackle more complex problems, and it is an open question how many layers and neurons per layer are necessary for the FCNN to solve certain tasks, as its behavior and performance will likely differ somewhat from classically implemented neural networks.

It bears repeating that the FCNN is not a chemical transcription of a neural network, but an analogy. As discussed with our results in Section 6, the FCNN we used here to solve XOR converged about as quickly as Rumelhart, Hinton, and Williams's first XOR-solving network [53]. It would be interesting to explore if the FCNN generally converges faster or slower than classical neural nets. Our analogue of input-weight integration, mathematically written in the language of ODEs, is highly nonlinear.

The importance of this research is the hope of a reprogrammable chemical computer. Like the formal multilayered perceptron, the FCNN has two modes: simply processing output when given an input, and learning via backpropagation of errors. A wet implementation of the FCNN, once trained to learn a task, could perform that task reliably as long as desired. The chemical computer could then, at any time, be retrained to perform any other task of which it is capable.

As parallelization becomes ever more prominent in computing, it is difficult not to be tempted by the possibility of molecule-scale chemical computers. Such tiny machines could conceivably be combined in molar amounts—on the scale of 10^{23} —to perform naturally distributed, parallel computing.

Furthermore, the liquid nature of chemical computers and the possibility of constructing them from bio-compatible DNA strands [55] open profound possibilities for patient-embedded biochemical computers. A fleet of cell-size machines could monitor chemical concentrations in the bloodstream, modulating the release of some drug accordingly. With time-series integration, biochemical computers could keep a record of changes in a biological system and act as diagnostic aids and tools in preventative medicine.

There has already been significant research into medical uses of computational chemical networks. One recent result [61] presented a chemical logic circuit that tests for the presence of particular microRNA molecules and the absence of others, effectively identifying a HeLa cancer cell. The authors designed a bespoke chemical logic circuit for this purpose, but this is exactly the type of computation an FCNN excels at learning. A standardized model of a programmable chemical

computer would trivialize the design of such medical machines, whose potential has only begun to be explored.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grants 1318833, 1518833, and 1518861.

References

1. Atiya, A. F., & Parlos, A. G. (2000). New results on recurrent network training: Unifying the algorithms and accelerating convergence. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 11(3), 697–709.
2. Banda, P., Blount, D., & Teuscher, C. (2014). COEL: A web-based chemistry simulation framework. In S. Stepney & P. Andrews (Eds.), *CoSMoS 2014: Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Complex Systems Modelling and Simulation* (pp. 35–60). Frome, UK: Luniver Press.
3. Banda, P., & Teuscher, C. (2014). An analog chemical circuit with parallel-accessible delay line for learning temporal tasks. In H. Sayama, J. Rieffel, S. Risi, R. Doursat, & H. Lipson (Eds.), *ALIFE 14: The Fourteenth Conference on the Synthesis and Simulation of Living Systems* (pp. 482–489). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
4. Banda, P., & Teuscher, C. (2014). Learning two-input linear and nonlinear analog functions with a simple chemical system. In O. H. Ibarra, L. Kari, & S. Kopecki (Eds.), *Unconventional Computing and Natural Computing Conference* (pp. 14–26). Basel, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
5. Banda, P., & Teuscher, C. (2016). COEL: A cloud-based reaction network simulator. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 3(13), 13.
6. Banda, P., Teuscher, C., & Lakin, M. R. (2013). Online learning in a chemical perceptron. *Artificial Life*, 19(2), 195–219.
7. Banda, P., Teuscher, C., & Stefanovic, D. (2014). Training an asymmetric signal perceptron through reinforcement in an artificial chemistry. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 11(93), 20131100.
8. Basu, S., Gerchman, Y., Collins, C. H., Arnold, F. H., & Weiss, R. (2005). A synthetic multicellular system for programmed pattern formation. *Nature*, 434(7037), 1130–1134.
9. Berry, G., & Boudol, G. (1992). The chemical abstract machine. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 96(1), 217–248.
10. Bray, D. (1995). Protein molecules as computational elements in living cells. *Nature*, 376(6538), 307–312.
11. Buchler, N. E., Gerland, U., & Hwa, T. (2003). On schemes of combinatorial transcription logic. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100(9), 5136–5141.
12. Chiang, H.-J. K., Jiang, J.-H. R., & Fagesy, F. (2014). Building reconfigurable circuitry in a biochemical world. In *Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference (BioCAS)* (pp. 560–563). New York: IEEE.
13. Condon, A., Harel, D., Kok, J. N., Salomaa, A., & Winfree, E. (Eds.) (2009). *Algorithmic Bioprocesses*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
14. Copeland, R. A. (2002). *Enzymes: A practical introduction to structure, mechanism, and data analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
15. Dittrich, P. (2005). Chemical computing. In J.-P. Banatre, P. Fradet, J.-L. Giavitto, & O. Michel (Eds.), *Unconventional programming paradigms* (pp. 19–32). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.
16. Dittrich, P., Ziegler, J., & Banzhaf, W. (2001). Artificial chemistries: A review. *Artificial Life*, 7(3), 225–275.
17. Douglas, S. M., Bachelet, I., & Church, G. M. (2012). A logic-gated nanorobot for targeted transport of molecular payloads. *Science*, 335(6070), 831–834.
18. Érdi, P., & Tóth, J. (1989). *Mathematical models of chemical reactions: Theory and applications of deterministic and stochastic models*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
19. Farmer, J. D., & Sidorowich, J. J. (1987). Predicting chaotic time series. *Physical Review Letters*, 59, 845–848.
20. Fellermann, H., Rasmussen, S., Ziock, H.-J., & Solé, R. V. (2007). Life cycle of a minimal protocell—a dissipative particle dynamics study. *Artificial Life*, 13(4), 319–345.

21. Fernando, C. T., Liekens, A. M. L., Bingle, L. E. H., Beck, C., Lenser, T., Stekel, D. J., & Rowe, J. E. (2009). Molecular circuits for associative learning in single-celled organisms. *Journal of the Royal Society, Interface / the Royal Society*, 6(34), 463–469.
22. Haykin, S. (2009). *Neural networks and learning machines* (3rd ed.). New York: Prentice Hall.
23. Hénon, M. (1976). A two-dimensional mapping with a strange attractor. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 50(1), 69–77.
24. Hjelmfelt, A., & Ross, J. (1992). Chemical implementation and thermodynamics of collective neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 89(1), 388–391.
25. Hjelmfelt, A., Weinberger, E. D., & Ross, J. (1991). Chemical implementation of neural networks and Turing machines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 88(24), 10983–10987.
26. Horn, F., & Jackson, R. (1972). General mass action kinetics. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 47(2), 81–116.
27. Hornik, K., Stinchcombe, M., & White, H. (1989). Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural Networks*, 2(5), 359–366.
28. Hutton, T. J. (2007). Evolvable self-reproducing cells in a two-dimensional artificial chemistry. *Artificial Life*, 13(1), 11–30.
29. Jiang, H., Riedel, M. D., & Parhi, K. K. (2012). Digital signal processing with molecular reactions. *IEEE Design & Test of Computers*, 29(3), 21–31.
30. Kargol, M., & Kargol, A. (2003). Mechanistic formalism for membrane transport generated by osmotic and mechanical pressure. *General Physiology and Biophysics*, 22(1), 5168.
31. Katz, E. (Ed.) (2012). *Biomolecular information processing: From logic systems to smart sensors and actuators*. Weinheim, Germany: Wiley-VCH.
32. Kim, J., Hopfield, J. J., & Winfree, E. (2004). Neural network computation by in vitro transcriptional circuits. In L. K. Saul, Y. Weiss, & L. Bottou (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 17 (pp. 681–688). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
33. Kleinhans, F. (1998). Membrane permeability modeling: Kedem-Katchalsky vs a two-parameter formalism. *Cryobiology*, 37(4), 271–289.
34. Lakin, M. R., Minnich, A., Lane, T., & Stefanovic, D. (2014). Design of a biochemical circuit motif for learning linear functions. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 11(101), 20140902.
35. Lakin, M. R., & Stefanovic, D. (2015). Supervised learning in an adaptive DNA strand displacement circuit. In A. Phillips & P. Yin (Eds.), *DNA computing and molecular programming* (pp. 154–167). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer International Publishing.
36. Lakin, M. R., & Stefanovic, D. (2016). Supervised learning in adaptive DNA strand displacement networks. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, 5(8), 885–897.
37. LaVan, D. A., McGuire, T., & Langer, R. (2003). Small-scale systems for in vivo drug delivery. *Nature Biotechnology*, 21(10), 1184–1191.
38. Lotka, A. (1920). Undamped oscillations derived from the law of mass action. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 42(8), 1595–1599.
39. Lotka, A. J. (1956). *Elements of mathematical biology: Formerly published under the title "Elements of physical biology" (1924)*. New York: Dover.
40. Mackey, M. C., & Glass, L. (1977). Oscillation and chaos in physiological control systems. *Science*, 197(4300), 287–289.
41. Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1980). *Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the living*. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.
42. McGregor, S., Vasas, V., Husbands, P., & Fernando, C. (2012). Evolution of associative learning in chemical networks. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 8(11), 1–19.
43. Michaelis, L., & Menten, M. L. (1913). Die Kinetik der Invertinwirkung. *Biochemische Zeitschrift*, 49, 333–369.
44. Mills, A. P., Yurke, B., & Platzman, P. M. (1999). Article for analog vector algebra computation. *Biosystems*, 52(1–3), 175–180.

45. Minsky, M., & Papert, S. (1972). *Perceptrons: An introduction to computational geometry*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
46. Moles, J., Banda, P., & Teuscher, C. (2015). Delay line as a chemical reaction network. *Parallel Processing Letters*, 25(1), 1540002.
47. Okamoto, M., Sakai, T., & Hayashi, K. (1987). Switching mechanism of a cyclic enzyme system: Role as a chemical diode. *Biosystems*, 21(1), 1–11.
48. Pei, R., Matamoros, E., Liu, M., Stefanovic, D., & Stojanovic, M. N. (2010). Training a molecular automaton to play a game. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 5(11), 773–777.
49. Păun, G. (2000). Computing with membranes. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 61(1), 108–143.
50. Păun, G., & Rozenberg, G. (2002). A guide to membrane computing. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 287(1), 73–100.
51. Qian, L., Winfree, E., & Bruck, J. (2011). Neural network computation with DNA strand displacement cascades. *Nature*, 475(7356), 368–372.
52. Rasmussen, S. (2009). *Proteocells: Bridging nonliving and living matter*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
53. Rumelhart, D. E., Hinton, G. E., & Williams, R. J. (1986). Learning representations by backpropagating errors. *Nature*, 323(6088), 533–536.
54. Shirt-Ediss, B. (2011). Dynamical systems analysis of a protocell lipid compartment. In G. Kampis, I. Karsai, & E. Szathmáry (Eds.), *Advances in artificial life. Darwin meets von Neumann, 10th European Conference on Artificial Life ECAL 2009, Part I* (pp. 230–239). Heidelberg: Springer.
55. Soloveichik, D., Seelig, G., & Winfree, E. (2010). DNA as a universal substrate for chemical kinetics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(12), 5393–5398.
56. Suzuki, K., & Ikegami, T. (2009). Shapes and self-movement in protocell systems. *Artificial Life*, 15(1), 59–70.
57. Tamsir, A., Tabor, J. J., & Voigt, C. A. (2010). Robust multicellular computing using genetically encoded NOR gates and chemical ‘wires’. *Nature*, 469(7329), 212–215.
58. Tominaga, K., Watanabe, T., Kobayashi, K., Nakamura, M., Kishi, K., & Kazuno, M. (2007). Modeling molecular computing systems by an artificial chemistry—its expressive power and application. *Artificial Life*, 13(3), 223–247.
59. Win, M. N., & Smolke, C. D. (2008). Higher-order cellular information processing with synthetic RNA devices. *Science*, 322(5900), 456–460.
60. Wu, C., Wan, S., Hou, W., Zhang, L., Xu, J., Cui, C., Wang, Y., Hu, J., & Tan, W. (2015). A survey of advancements in nucleic acid-based logic gates and computing for applications in biotechnology and biomedicine. *Chemical Communications*, 51, 3723–3734.
61. Xie, Z., Wroblewska, L., Prochazka, L., Weiss, R., & Benenson, Y. (2011). Multi-input RNAi-based logic circuit for identification of specific cancer cells. *Science*, 333(6047), 1307–1311.