

ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE SET OF BIFURCATION POINTS OF PERIODIC SOLUTIONS FOR MULTIPARAMETER HAMILTONIAN SYSTEMS

WIKTOR RADZKI

ABSTRACT. This paper deals with periodic solutions of the Hamilton equation $\dot{x}(t) = J\nabla_x H(x(t), \lambda)$, where $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is a parameter. Theorems on global bifurcation of solutions with periods $\frac{2\pi}{j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, from a stationary point $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ are proved. $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)$ can be singular. However, it is assumed that the local topological degree of $\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ at x_0 is nonzero. For systems satisfying $\nabla_x H(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ it is shown that (global) bifurcation points of solutions with periods $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ can be identified with zeros of appropriate continuous functions $F_j: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. If, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda) = \text{diag}(A(\lambda), B(\lambda))$, where $A(\lambda)$ and $B(\lambda)$ are $(n \times n)$ -matrices, then F_j can be defined by $F_j(\lambda) = \det[A(\lambda)B(\lambda) - j^2 I]$. Symmetry breaking results concerning bifurcation of solutions with different minimal periods are obtained. A geometric description of the set of bifurcation points is given. Examples of constructive application of the theorems proved to analytical and numerical investigation and visualization of the set of all bifurcation points in given domain are provided.

This paper is based on a part of the author's thesis [W. Radzki, *Branching points of periodic solutions of autonomous Hamiltonian systems* (Polish), PhD thesis, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Toruń, 2005].

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to describe the set of bifurcation points of solutions of the Hamilton equation with the condition of 2π -periodicity of solutions

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = J\nabla_x H(x(t), \lambda) \\ x(0) = x(2\pi), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is a parameter. In particular, this work is intended to investigate the subsets of the set of bifurcation points consisting of global bifurcation points of solutions with periods $\frac{2\pi}{j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and to prove theorems concerning symmetry breaking points, defined as bifurcation points of solutions with different minimal periods.

In the case of the systems with linear dependence on one parameter problem (1.1) can be written as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = \lambda J\nabla H(x(t)) \\ x(0) = x(2\pi), \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

Date: September 28, 2008.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 34C23, 34C25. Secondary: 70H05, 70H12.

Key words and phrases. Hamiltonian system; Periodic solution; Global bifurcation; Symmetry breaking; Topological degree for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient mappings.

Partially supported by Ministry of Science and Education, Poland, under grant 1 P03A 009 27, and grant 471-M of Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland.

where $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Every solution (x, λ) of (1.2) with $\lambda > 0$ can be translated to $2\pi\lambda$ -periodic solution of the equation

$$\dot{x}(t) = J\nabla H(x(t)). \quad (1.3)$$

Consequently, for every connected branch of nontrivial solutions of (1.2) bifurcating (in a suitable space) from $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \times (0, +\infty)$ one can find the corresponding connected branch of nonstationary periodic trajectories of (1.3) emanating from x_0 with periods tending to $2\pi\lambda_0$ at x_0 . Particularly interesting systems are those for which the Hessian matrix of H at x_0 has the block-diagonal form: $\nabla^2 H(x_0) = \text{diag}(A, B)$, where A and B are real symmetric $(n \times n)$ -matrices. This condition is satisfied in the generic case of Hamiltonian function being the sum of kinetic energy dependent on generalized momenta and potential energy dependent on generalized coordinates, for example if

$$H(x) = H(y, z) = \frac{1}{2}\langle M^{-1}y, y \rangle + V(z), \quad (1.4)$$

where $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $V \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R})$ and M is a nonsingular real symmetric $(n \times n)$ -matrix. Equation (1.3) with H given by (1.4) is equivalent to the Newton equation

$$M\ddot{z}(t) = -\nabla V(z(t)). \quad (1.5)$$

If x_0 is a stationary point of (1.3), $J\nabla^2 H(x_0)$ is nonsingular, and it has nonresonant purely imaginary eigenvalues then the Lyapunov centre theorem [22] ensures the existence of a one-parameter family of nonstationary periodic solutions of (1.3) emanating from x_0 . The Lyapunov centre theorem can be derived from the Hopf bifurcation theorem [17]. Berger [5] (see also [6, 25]), Weinstein [37], Moser [26], and Fadell and Rabinowitz [14] proved the existence of a sequence of periodic solutions of (1.3) convergent to a nondegenerate stationary point x_0 in the case of possibly resonant purely imaginary eigenvalues of $J\nabla^2 H(x_0)$. (The theorem of Berger concerns second order equations, including (1.5) for $M = I$.) Global bifurcation theorems in nondegenerate case have been proved by Gęba and Marzantowicz [16] by using topological degree for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant mappings.

Zhu [38] and Szulkin [36] used Morse theoretic methods and they proved the existence of a sequence of periodic solutions of (1.3) emanating from a stationary point which can be degenerate. Dancer and Rybicki [9] obtained a global bifurcation theorem of Rabinowitz type (see [27]) for (1.2) in the case of possibly degenerate stationary point by using the topological degree theory for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient maps. The results from [9] were applied by the author [29] and the author with Rybicki [30] to the description of connected branches of bifurcation of (1.2) and emanation of (1.3) in possibly degenerate case under assumptions written in terms of eigenvalues of $\nabla^2 H(x_0)$ and the local topological degree of ∇H in a neighbourhood of x_0 . The examples of applications of the results from [29, 30] were given by Maciejewski, the author, and Rybicki [24].

The structure of the set of bifurcation points of periodic solutions of the first order ordinary differential equations with many parameters was studied by Izydorek and Rybicki [20], and Rybicki [32]. They applied the Krasnosiel'skii bifurcation theorem (see [21]) and the results of real algebraic geometry obtained by Szafraniec [34, 35]. However, Izydorek and Rybicki assumed that the Fréchet derivative of the right-hand side of the equation they considered was zero. In such a case there is no bifurcation of nonstationary solutions of Hamiltonian system with fixed period (see Remark 3.6).

In the present paper, which presents the results of a part of the author's PhD thesis [31] (with Corollaries 3.7, 6.11, 6.12, Examples 7.6, 7.7, and figures added afterwards), the stationary point (x_0, λ_0) can be degenerate, i.e. $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)$ can be singular. However, it is assumed that the local Brouwer degree of $\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0)$ in a neighbourhood of x_0 is well defined and nonzero. (Although theorems without this assumptions and corresponding examples

are also given.) The set of bifurcation points of (1.1) is investigated in the case of many parameters. To this aim a generalized version of the global bifurcation theorem of Dancer and Rybicki [9] in the case of Hamiltonian systems with one parameter is first proved and then it is applied to the Hamiltonian systems with many parameters. Also, some results from [29, 30] concerning unbounded branches of periodic solutions are generalized. The proofs exploit the topological degree for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient mappings (see [33]). Bifurcation points of solutions of (1.1) with period $\frac{2\pi}{j}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, (proved to be global bifurcation points) are identified with zeros of suitable continuous functions $F_j: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, under assumptions written in terms of that functions. In the case of systems satisfying, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, the condition $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda) = \text{diag}(A(\lambda), B(\lambda))$, where $A(\lambda)$ and $B(\lambda)$ are some $(n \times n)$ -matrices, the functions F_j are given by $F_j(\lambda) = \det[A(\lambda)B(\lambda) - j^2 I]$. Symmetry breaking results are obtained. A geometric description of the set of bifurcation points is obtained by using results of real algebraic geometry [34, 35]. Examples of application of theorems proved in this paper to analytical and numerical investigation and visualization of the set of all bifurcation points in given domain are provided. They demonstrate constructive character of the results obtained in this paper by using topological degree.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section notation and terminology are set up and basic results used in this paper are summarized to make the exposition self-contained.

2.1. Algebraic notation. Let $\mathbb{M}(n, \mathbb{R})$ be the set of all real $(n \times n)$ -matrices and let $\mathbb{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbb{S}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbb{O}(n, \mathbb{R})$ be the subsets of $\mathbb{M}(n, \mathbb{R})$ consisting of nonsingular, symmetric, and orthogonal matrices, respectively. For given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the identity $(n \times n)$ -matrix is denoted by $I \equiv I_n$, whereas

$$J \equiv J_n := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For any square matrices A_1, \dots, A_m the symbol $\text{diag}(A_1, \dots, A_m)$ stands for the block-diagonal matrix built from A_1, \dots, A_m .

If $A \in \mathbb{M}(n, \mathbb{R})$ then $\sigma(A)$ denotes the spectrum of A , whereas $\sigma_+(A)$ and $\sigma_-(A)$ are the sets of real positive and real negative eigenvalues of A , respectively. If $\alpha \in \sigma(A)$ then $\mu(\alpha) \equiv \mu_A(\alpha)$ denotes the algebraic multiplicity of α . The negative and the positive Morse index of $A \in \mathbb{S}(n, \mathbb{R})$ are defined as

$$m^-(A) := \sum_{\alpha \in \sigma_-(A)} \mu(\alpha), \quad m^+(A) := \sum_{\alpha \in \sigma_+(A)} \mu(\alpha),$$

respectively.

Let a representation of a group G on a linear space V be given. For every subgroup H of G and every subset Ω of V it is assumed

$$\Omega^H := \{v \in \Omega \mid \forall h \in H \, hv = v\} = \{v \in \Omega \mid H \subset G_v\},$$

$$\Omega_H := \{v \in \Omega \mid H = G_v\},$$

where G_v is the isotropy group of v . Consider another representation of G on a linear space W and let $f: V \rightarrow W$ be a G -equivariant map. As well known, $G_v \subset G_{f(v)}$ for every $v \in V$. If H is a subgroup of G then f^H denotes the restriction of f to the pair (V^H, W^H) .

For $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ set

$$\mathbb{K}_j = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}_j & \text{if } j \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2) & \text{if } j = 0. \end{cases}$$

For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\rho_j: \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2) \rightarrow \mathbb{O}(2, \mathbb{R})$ be the homomorphism defined by

$$\rho_j \left(\begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ \sin \phi & \cos \phi \end{bmatrix} \right) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos j\phi & -\sin j\phi \\ \sin j\phi & \cos j\phi \end{bmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi.$$

For $m, j \in \mathbb{N}$ the representation $\mathbb{R}[m, j]$ of $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ is defined as the direct sum of m copies of the representation (\mathbb{R}^2, ρ_j) , whereas $\mathbb{R}[m, 0]$ denotes the identity representation of $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ on \mathbb{R}^m .

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $K \in \mathbb{S}(2n, \mathbb{R})$, and every $T: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ set

$$Q_j(K) = \frac{1}{1+j^2} \begin{bmatrix} -K & jJ^t \\ jJ & -K \end{bmatrix}, \quad Q_0(K) = -K, \quad (2.1)$$

$$\Lambda_j(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \det Q_j(T(\lambda)) = 0\}, \quad (2.2)$$

$$\Lambda_0(T) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k \mid \det Q_0(T(\lambda)) = 0\},$$

$$\Lambda(T) = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_j(T). \quad (2.3)$$

For $k = 1$ let

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j^+(T) &= \Lambda_j(T) \cap (0, +\infty), \\ \Lambda^+(T) &= \Lambda(T) \cap (0, +\infty). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Remark 2.1. For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the eigenvalues of $Q_j(K)$ have even multiplicity. Indeed, if $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^{2n} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ is an eigenvector of $Q_j(K)$ then $(v_1 - v_2, v_1 + v_2)$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the same eigenvalue.

2.2. Degree for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient maps. Proofs of global bifurcation theorems in this paper exploit the topological degree for $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient mappings, which is a special case of the degree described in [33]. For earlier results concerning equivariant degree see [8, 18, 11, 19, 15] and references therein.

Consider an orthogonal representation of the group $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ on a real inner product space V with $\dim V < \infty$. Let Ω be an $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -invariant bounded open subset of V and let $\nabla f: V \rightarrow V$ be a continuous $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient mapping such that $\nabla f(x) \neq 0$ for every $x \in \partial\Omega$. Then

$$\text{DEG}(\nabla f, \Omega) = \{\text{DEG}_j(\nabla f, \Omega)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$$

denotes the $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -degree of ∇f in Ω [33]. It is an element of the Euler ring of the group $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$, i.e. the ring

$$U(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)) = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \mathbb{K}_j$$

with addition $+$ and multiplication \star defined for every $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty, \{b_j\}_{j=0}^\infty \in U(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2))$ by $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty + \{b_j\}_{j=0}^\infty = \{a_j + b_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$ and $\{a_j\}_{j=0}^\infty \star \{b_j\}_{j=0}^\infty = \{c_j\}_{j=0}^\infty$, where $c_0 = a_0 b_0$, $c_j = a_0 b_j + a_j b_0$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice that $\Theta = (0, 0, \dots)$ is the neutral element of addition in this ring. The degree DEG has properties analogous to the Brouwer degree (see [33]). However, if $\text{DEG}_j(\nabla f, \Omega) \neq 0$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ then $(\nabla f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \Omega^{\mathbb{K}_j} \neq \emptyset$ (not only $(\nabla f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \Omega \neq \emptyset$).

If $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is an isolated zero of a continuous mapping $g: \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ then the topological index $i(g, y_0)$ of y_0 with respect to g is defined as the Brouwer degree $\text{deg}(g, B(y_0, r), 0)$ of g in a ball $B(y_0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ centred at y_0 with radius $r > 0$ such that $g^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \text{cl}(B(y_0, r)) = \{y_0\}$.

Analogously, if x_0 is an isolated element of $(\nabla f)^{-1}(\{0\})$ then its index

$$I(\nabla f, x_0) = \{I_j(\nabla f, x_0)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \in U(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2))$$

with respect to ∇f is defined by the formula

$$I(\nabla f, x_0) = \text{DEG}(\nabla f, B(x_0, r)),$$

where $B(x_0, r) \subset V$ is a ball such that $(\nabla f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \text{cl}(B(x_0, r)) = \{x_0\}$.

Lemma 2.2 ([9]). *Let $V = \mathbb{R}[m, 0] \oplus \mathbb{R}[m_1, j_1] \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathbb{R}[m_r, j_r]$, where $m, m_i, j_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < j_1 < \cdots < j_r$. Assume that $f \in C^2(V, \mathbb{R})$ is an $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant map and x_0 is an isolated element of $(\nabla f)^{-1}(\{0\})$ such that $\nabla^2 f(x_0) = \text{diag}(A_0, A_1, \dots, A_r)$ for some matrix A_0 of dimension m and for nonsingular matrices A_i of dimensions $2m_i$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then*

$$I_0(\nabla f, x_0) = i\left(\nabla f^{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)}, x_0\right)$$

and for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ one has

$$I_j(\nabla f, x_0) = \begin{cases} i\left(\nabla f^{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)}, x_0\right) \cdot \frac{m^-(A_i)}{2} & \text{if } j = j_i \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Assume that $\nabla_x f: V \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V$ is a continuous $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient (with respect to V) mapping such that $\nabla_x f(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ for some fixed $x_0 \in V$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda \neq \lambda_0$, from a neighbourhood of λ_0 there exists a neighbourhood $W \subset V \times \mathbb{R}$ of (x_0, λ) such that $(\nabla_x f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap W \subset \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}$. Then for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ one can define the *bifurcation index*

$$\text{IND}(x_0, \lambda_0) = \{\text{IND}_j(x_0, \lambda_0)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \in U(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2))$$

of (x_0, λ_0) with respect to $\nabla_x f$ by

$$\text{IND}(x_0, \lambda_0) = I(\nabla_x f(\cdot, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon), x_0) - I(\nabla_x f(\cdot, \lambda_0 - \varepsilon), x_0). \quad (2.5)$$

This bifurcation index will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

2.3. Functional setting. For given Hilbert spaces Y, E, Z the symbols $C^{1,0}(Y \times E, Z)$ and $C^{2,0}(Y \times E, Z)$ denote the sets of continuous functions from $Y \times E$ to Z having, respectively, first partial Fréchet derivative and two first partial Fréchet derivatives with respect to Y continuous on $Y \times E$.

Solutions (x, λ) of (1.1) are regarded as elements of the space $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$. (The description of the Sobolev space $H_{2\pi}^1 \equiv W^{1,2}([0, 2\pi], \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ can be found in [25].) The inner product in $H_{2\pi}^1$ is defined for every $x, y \in H_{2\pi}^1$ by the formula

$$\langle x, y \rangle_{H_{2\pi}^1} = \langle x, y \rangle_{L_{2\pi}^2} + \langle \dot{x}, \dot{y} \rangle_{L_{2\pi}^2} = \int_0^{2\pi} \langle x(t), y(t) \rangle dt + \int_0^{2\pi} \langle \dot{x}(t), \dot{y}(t) \rangle dt,$$

where \dot{x} stands for the weak derivative of x and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product in \mathbb{R}^{2n} . Since every $x \in H_{2\pi}^1$ has a continuous representative (denoted by the same symbol) satisfying the condition $x(0) = x(2\pi)$, it can be regarded as a continuous 2π -periodic function on \mathbb{R} .

For fixed $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ a function $x \in H_{2\pi}^1$ is called a *weak solution of (1.1)* if the equation $\dot{x}(t) = J\nabla_x H(x(t), \lambda)$ (where \dot{x} denotes the weak derivative of x) is satisfied for almost all $t \in [0, 2\pi]$. However, since it is assumed that $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, every such solution is in fact a classical solution of class C^2 on $[0, 2\pi]$ and it has a unique extension to the classical solution on \mathbb{R} , which is a 2π -periodic function of class C^2 .

Let Y, Z be Hilbert spaces. Consider a map $F: Y \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow Z$ and a fixed set $\Delta \subset Y$ such that $F(x, \lambda) = 0$ for all $x \in \Delta, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$. The set $\Delta \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is referred to as the set of *trivial solutions* of the equation

$$F(x, \lambda) = 0. \quad (2.6)$$

The complement of $\Delta \times \mathbb{R}^k$ in the set of all solutions of (2.6) in $Y \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is called the set of *nontrivial solutions*.

Definition 2.3. Let $X \subset Y \times \mathbb{R}^k$ be a subset of the set of nontrivial solutions of (2.6). A solution $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is called a *bifurcation point of solutions from X* if it is a cluster point of X . It is called a *branching point of solutions from X* if there exists a connected set $C \subset X$ such that $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \text{cl}(C)$ (the closure in $Y \times \mathbb{R}^k$). If the connected component of $\text{cl}(X)$ containing the bifurcation point (x_0, λ_0) is unbounded or it contains another bifurcation point of solutions from X then (x_0, λ_0) is said to be a *global bifurcation point of solutions from X* .

Assuming $Y = H_{2\pi}^1, Z = L_{2\pi}^2$, and defining $F: H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow L_{2\pi}^2$ by

$$F(x, \lambda)(t) = \dot{x}(t) - J\nabla_x H(x(t), \lambda)$$

one can write (1.1) in form (2.6), therefore Definition 2.3 can be applied. If (x, λ) is a *stationary solution* of (1.1), i.e. x is constant, then x is regarded as an element of \mathbb{R}^{2n} . For fixed $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ such that

$$\nabla_x H(x_0, \lambda) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k \quad (2.7)$$

one can assume $\Delta = \{x_0\}$. In such a case the set $\{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ of trivial solutions of (1.1) is denoted by $\mathcal{T}(x_0)$ and the symbol $\mathcal{NT}(x_0)$ stands for the set of nontrivial solutions of (1.1). Notice that $\mathcal{NT}(x_0)$ can contain stationary solutions.

Define the action of $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ on $H_{2\pi}^1$ as follows. For every $x \in H_{2\pi}^1$ and

$$g = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \phi & -\sin \phi \\ \sin \phi & \cos \phi \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{SO}(2), \quad 0 \leq \phi < 2\pi, \quad (2.8)$$

set

$$(gx)(t) = x(t + \phi).$$

The space $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is regarded as the direct sum of the orthogonal representation of $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ on $H_{2\pi}^1$ defined above and the identity representation of $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ on \mathbb{R}^k . One has $\mathbb{SO}(2)_{(x, \lambda)} = \mathbb{SO}(2)_x$ for every $(x, \lambda) \in H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$.

The subspaces of $H_{2\pi}^1$ defined as

$$E_0 := \{x \in H_{2\pi}^1 \mid x(t) \equiv a, a \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\},$$

$$E_j := \{x \in H_{2\pi}^1 \mid x(t) \equiv a \cos jt + b \sin jt, a, b \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

are $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ -equivariant. One has $E_0 \approx \mathbb{R}[2n, 0]$ and $E_j \approx \mathbb{R}[2n, j]$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Obviously, $(H_{2\pi}^1)^{\mathbb{SO}(2)} = (H_{2\pi}^1)_{\mathbb{SO}(2)} = E_0$ and if $j \in \mathbb{N}, v \in E_j \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathbb{SO}(2)_v = \mathbb{Z}_j$. Furthermore,

$$(H_{2\pi}^1)^{\mathbb{Z}_j} = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} E_{lj} \approx \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathbb{R}[2n, lj].$$

Let (e_1, \dots, e_{2n}) be the standard basis in \mathbb{R}^{2n} . For fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ set $\varphi_0(t) \equiv 1, \varphi_j(t) \equiv \cos jt, \psi_j(t) \equiv \sin jt$, and

$$\hat{e}_i = \begin{cases} e_i \varphi_j & ; 1 \leq i \leq 2n, \\ e_{i-2n} \psi_j & ; 2n+1 \leq i \leq 4n. \end{cases}$$

Then $(e_1\varphi_0, \dots, e_{2n}\varphi_0)$ and $(\hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_{4n})$ are called the *standard bases in E_0 and E_j* , respectively. The standard basis in $E_{j_1} \oplus \dots \oplus E_{j_s}$, where $j_1, \dots, j_s \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $s \in \mathbb{N}$, is built from the standard bases in E_{j_1}, \dots, E_{j_s} .

Remark 2.4. There exists $c > 0$ such that for every $x \in H_{2\pi}^1$ (identified with its continuous representative) one has $\|x\|_0 \leq c\|x\|_{H_{2\pi}^1}$, where $\|x\|_0 = \sup_{t \in [0, 2\pi]} |x(t)|$ (see [25]). As it was

observed in [9], for given $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ and bounded $U \subset H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ one can find $\eta > 0$ and $H_1 \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ such that

- (1) for every $(x, \lambda) \in \text{cl}(U)$, $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ one has $(x(t), \lambda) \in B(0, \eta) \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k$,
- (2) $H_1|_{B(0, \eta)} = H|_{B(0, \eta)}$, $H_1|_{\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k \setminus B(0, 2\eta)} = 0$,
- (3) $(x, \lambda) \in \text{cl}(U)$ is a solution of (1.1) iff it is a solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) = J\nabla_x H_1(x(t), \lambda) \\ x(0) = x(2\pi). \end{cases} \quad (2.9)$$

Consequently, investigating bounded (in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$) subsets of solutions of (1.1) one can replace H by a modified Hamiltonian H_1 having compact support, therefore no growth conditions are needed.

Theorem 2.5 given below has been extracted from the proof of Theorem 3.3 in [9]. It is a version of the Amann-Zehnder global reduction [3, 4]. Every point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is identified with the constant function from $E_0 \subset H_{2\pi}^1$. The gradients $\nabla_x a(\cdot, \lambda)$, $\nabla_x H_1(\cdot, \lambda)$ and the Hessian matrices $\nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda)$, $\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda)$ are computed with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_{2\pi}^1}$ and the standard inner product in \mathbb{R}^{2n} , respectively. Use is made of the standard bases in E_f and \mathbb{R}^{2n} .

Theorem 2.5. *If $H_1 \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ has compact support then there exist $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and an $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant mapping $a \in C^{2,0}(E_f \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, where*

$$E_f := \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r_0} E_j \approx \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r_0} \mathbb{R}[2n, j],$$

such that for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1) $a(x_0, \lambda) = -2\pi H_1(x_0, \lambda)$.
- (2) $\nabla_x a(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ iff $\nabla_x H_1(x_0, \lambda) = 0$. Moreover, $\nabla_x a^{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)} = \nabla_x a|_{(E_0 \times \mathbb{R}^k, E_0)} = -\nabla_x H_1$.
- (3) If $\nabla_x a(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ then

$$\nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda) = \text{diag}(Q_0(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda)), \dots, Q_{r_0}(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda))).$$
- (4) For every $j > r_0$ one has $m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda))) = m^+(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda))) = 2n$ (in particular, $\det Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \lambda)) \neq 0$).

Furthermore, there exists an $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant homeomorphism $h: (\nabla_x a)^{-1}(\{0\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(H_1)$, where $\mathcal{R}(H_1) \subset H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is the set of solutions of (2.9).

Conclusion (4) in the above theorem holds true for every $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, since it is assumed that H_1 has compact support. The fact that h is a homeomorphism follows from its construction. Notice that the authors of [3, 4] regard the space $H_{2\pi}^1$ as a subspace of $L_{2\pi}^2 \equiv L^2([0, 2\pi], \mathbb{R}^{2n})$ and they use the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{L_{2\pi}^2}$ which generates weaker topology in $H_{2\pi}^1$ than the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{H_{2\pi}^1}$. It affects also the form of matrices Q_j and changes their eigenvalues used in the reduction. The matrices used in [9] are in fact those from [3, 4] (without the factor $\frac{1}{1+j^2}$). However, the change of the inner product is possible in view of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that $H_1 \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ has compact support, $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ is the set of solutions of (2.9), and $d_{L_{2\pi}^2}$, $d_{H_{2\pi}^1}$ are the metrics in $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ induced by the product norms from $L_{2\pi}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ and $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$, respectively. Then the identity mapping from $(\mathcal{R}(H_1), d_{L_{2\pi}^2})$ to $(\mathcal{R}(H_1), d_{H_{2\pi}^1})$ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the identity mapping from the space $(\mathcal{R}(H_1), d_{L_{2\pi}^2})$ to the space $(\mathcal{R}(H_1), d_{H_{2\pi}^1})$ is continuous. Suppose that a sequence $\{(x_m, \lambda_m)\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{R}(H_1)$ is convergent to some $(x, \lambda) \in \mathcal{R}(H_1)$ with respect to the metric $d_{L_{2\pi}^2}$. It will be shown to be also convergent with respect to the metric $d_{H_{2\pi}^1}$. Since

$$\|x_m - x\|_{H_{2\pi}^1}^2 = \|x_m - x\|_{L_{2\pi}^2}^2 + \|\dot{x}_m - \dot{x}\|_{L_{2\pi}^2}^2,$$

it remains to prove that $\|\dot{x}_m - \dot{x}\|_{L_{2\pi}^2} \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. The mapping $J\nabla_x H_1$ is continuous and has compact support, hence there exist $a, b > 0$ such that for all $(y, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ the growth condition

$$|J\nabla_x H_1(y, \alpha)| \leq a + b|y| \equiv a + b|y|^{\frac{2}{3}}$$

is satisfied. Consequently, by a Krasnosiel'skii theorem, the mapping

$$L_{2\pi}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^k \ni (z, \alpha) \mapsto J\nabla_x H_1(z(\cdot), \alpha) \in L_{2\pi}^2$$

is continuous, hence

$$\|\dot{x}_m - \dot{x}\|_{L_{2\pi}^2} = \|J\nabla_x H_1(x_m(\cdot), \lambda_m) - J\nabla_x H_1(x(\cdot), \lambda)\|_{L_{2\pi}^2} \rightarrow 0$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 2.7. *If $H_1 \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ has compact support then the set $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ of solutions of (2.9) is closed in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ and every bounded subset of $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ is relatively compact.*

Proof. The set $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ is closed in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ as the set of critical points of the action functional of class $C^{2,0}$ defined on $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ (see [9]). If the action functional is defined on $H_{2\pi}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ (see [28, 1]) then it is still of class $C^{2,0}$, the set of its critical points is still equal to $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$, and its gradient is a compact perturbation of a selfadjoint Fredholm operator. (In the case of the space $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ the Hessian operator of the action functional is compact not Fredholm.) Thus $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ is closed in $H_{2\pi}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ and bounded subsets of $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ are relatively compact in $H_{2\pi}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \mathbb{R}^k$. However, those subsets of $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ that are bounded in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ are also bounded in $H_{2\pi}^{\frac{1}{2}} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ and both topologies restricted to $\mathcal{R}(H_1)$ coincide, in view of Lemma 2.6. \square

3. NECESSARY CONDITIONS FOR BIFURCATION AND SYMMETRY BREAKING

Remark 3.1. Let $x \in H_{2\pi}^1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

- (1) $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_x = \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ iff x is a constant function,
- (2) $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_x \supset \mathbb{Z}_j$ iff $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is a period (not necessarily minimal) of x ,
- (3) $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_x = \mathbb{Z}_j$ iff $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is the minimal period of x .

Equivalence (1) is straightforward.

To see (2) first observe that $g \in \mathbb{Z}_j$ iff g is of form (2.8) with $\phi = \frac{2\pi}{j}k$ for some $k \in \{0, \dots, j-1\}$. For such a g one has

$$(gx)(t) = x\left(t + \frac{2\pi}{j}k\right). \quad (3.1)$$

If $\mathbb{SO}(2)_x \supset \mathbb{Z}_j$ then (3.1) implies

$$x\left(t + \frac{2\pi}{j}k\right) = x(t). \quad (3.2)$$

In particular, putting $k = 1$ one finds that $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is a period of x . Conversely, if $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is a period of x , then (3.2) is satisfied for every $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, hence (3.1) implies $\mathbb{SO}(2)_x \supset \mathbb{Z}_j$.

Now, turn to assertion (3). If $\mathbb{SO}(2)_x = \mathbb{Z}_j$ then $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is a period of x , in view of (2). If there was a smaller period of x then it would be equal to $\frac{2\pi}{m}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m > j$, since x is 2π -periodic. Then (2) would imply $\mathbb{Z}_m \subset \mathbb{SO}(2)_x = \mathbb{Z}_j$, a contradiction. Conversely, if $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is the minimal period of x then $\mathbb{SO}(2)_x \supset \mathbb{Z}_j$, according to (2). Moreover, for every $g \in \mathbb{SO}(2)_x$ of form (2.8) ϕ is a period of x . Thus ϕ has to be an integer multiple of $\frac{2\pi}{j}$, hence $g \in \mathbb{Z}_j$. Consequently, $\mathbb{SO}(2)_x \subset \mathbb{Z}_j$.

Definition 3.2. Let $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. A solution (x, λ) of (1.1) is called a j -solution if $\mathbb{SO}(2)_{(x, \lambda)} \equiv \mathbb{SO}(2)_x \supset \mathbb{K}_j$.

If $j \in \mathbb{N}$ then (x, λ) is a j -solution of (1.1) iff $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ is a period (not necessarily minimal) of x , whereas 0-solutions are the stationary ones.

In the reminder of this section x_0 satisfying (2.7) is fixed and $\mathcal{T}(x_0) = \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is regarded as the set of trivial solutions of (1.1).

Definition 3.3. A point $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{T}(x_0)$ is called a *symmetry breaking point* for (1.1) if every neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ contains at least two nontrivial solutions of (1.1) with different isotropy groups (or, equivalently, different minimal periods – see Remark 3.1).

Proofs of theorems on symmetry breaking in this paper exploit the following lemma, based on a remark from [7].

Lemma 3.4. *If $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ then for every $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ there exists a neighbourhood $U \subset H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$ of $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{T}(x_0)$ such that the isotropy group $\mathbb{SO}(2)_{(x, \lambda)} = \mathbb{SO}(2)_x$ of every nontrivial solution $(x, \lambda) \in U \cap \mathcal{NT}(x_0)$ of (1.1) belongs to the set $G(\lambda_0)$ of isotropy groups of nonzero elements of the finite dimensional space $E(\lambda_0) = \bigoplus_{j \in X(\lambda_0)} E_j$, where*

$$X(\lambda_0) = \{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid \det Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) = 0\}.$$

Proof. By Remark 2.4 and Theorem 2.5 it suffices to consider isotropy groups of solutions (z, λ) of the equation

$$\nabla_x a(z, \lambda) = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

such that $z \in E_f \setminus \{x_0\}$ (such solutions are regarded as nontrivial solutions of (3.3)). Since $\nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is symmetric, one can use the decomposition

$$E_f = (\text{im } \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)) \oplus (\ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0))$$

and write (3.3) as the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi \nabla_x a(u, (v, \lambda)) &= 0 \\ (Id - \Pi) \nabla_x a(u, (v, \lambda)) &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where Π is a projection of E_f onto $\text{im } \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$, $u = \Pi(z)$, $v = (Id - \Pi)(z)$. Write also $x_0 = (u_0, v_0)$, where $u_0 = \Pi(x_0)$, $v_0 = (Id - \Pi)(x_0)$. Applying the $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ -equivariant version of the implicit function theorem to (3.4) one obtains the existence of an open neighbourhood W of $u_0 \in \text{im } \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$, an open neighbourhood V of $(v_0, \lambda_0) \in \ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0) \times \mathbb{R}^k$, and an $\mathbb{SO}(2)$ -equivariant mapping $\gamma: V \rightarrow W$ of class $C^{1,0}$ such that if $(u, (v, \lambda)) \in W \times V$

a solution of (3.3) then $u = \gamma(v, \lambda)$. (In particular, $\gamma(v_0, \lambda) = u_0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $(v_0, \lambda) \in V$, since $\nabla_x a(u_0, (v_0, \lambda)) = 0$.) Thus all nontrivial solutions of (3.3) in $U := W \times V$ are of the form $(\gamma(v, \lambda), (v, \lambda))$, where $v \in \ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$, $v \neq v_0$. Their isotropy groups are equal to

$$\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{(\gamma(v, \lambda), (v, \lambda))} = \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{\gamma(v, \lambda)} \cap \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{(v, \lambda)}.$$

Furthermore, $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{(v, \lambda)} \subset \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{\gamma(v, \lambda)}$, since the mapping γ is $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant, hence

$$\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{(\gamma(v, \lambda), (v, \lambda))} = \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_{(v, \lambda)} = \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)_v,$$

where $v \in \ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$, $v \neq v_0$. Thus if $v_0 = 0$ then the isotropy groups of nontrivial solutions of (3.3) in a neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) belong to the set of isotropy groups of nonzero elements of $\ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0)$. The same condition is obtained for $v_0 \neq 0$ by choosing the set V in such a way that $(0, \lambda) \notin V$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Finally, observe that, by Theorem 2.5, $\ker \nabla_x^2 a(x_0, \lambda_0) \subset E(\lambda_0)$, and that $\dim E(\lambda_0) < 4nr_0 + 2n < \infty$, since $E(\lambda_0) \subset E_f$. \square

The set $G(\lambda_0)$ from Lemma 3.4 consists of groups \mathbb{K}_j , $j \in X(\lambda_0)$, and all their intersections. Every such intersection is also equal to \mathbb{K}_l for some $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Namely, $\mathbb{Z}_j \cap \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2) = \mathbb{Z}_j$ and $\mathbb{Z}_j \cap \mathbb{Z}_m = \mathbb{Z}_l$, where l is the greatest common divisor of j and m . Thus

$$G(\lambda_0) \subset \{\mathbb{K}_j \mid j \in \{0, \dots, \max(X(\lambda_0))\}\}.$$

In particular, the set $G(\lambda_0)$ is finite, since $X(\lambda_0)$ is finite.

As a consequence of Lemma 3.4 and the definition of j -solution one obtains the following version of necessary conditions for bifurcation formulated in [9].

Corollary 3.5. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$. If $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \mathcal{T}(x_0)$ is a bifurcation point of nontrivial solutions of (1.1) then $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)) \cup \Lambda(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$. Namely,*

(1) *if (x_0, λ_0) is a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions then*

$$\lambda_0 \in \Lambda_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot));$$

(2) *if (x_0, λ_0) is a bifurcation point of nonstationary j -solutions for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ then*

$$\lambda_0 \in \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)).$$

Proof. If $\lambda_0 \notin \Lambda_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$ then there are no nontrivial stationary solutions in a neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) , according to Lemma 3.4. To prove (2) assume that U , $G(\lambda_0)$, and $X(\lambda_0)$ are such as in Lemma 3.4. The isotropy group of every nonstationary j -solution from the set U contains \mathbb{Z}_j , therefore it is equal to \mathbb{Z}_{sj} for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$, which depends on the solution. The group \mathbb{Z}_{sj} belongs to $G(\lambda_0) \setminus \{\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)\}$, according to Lemma 3.4. Thus $\mathbb{Z}_{sj} \subset \mathbb{Z}_r$ for some $r \in X(\lambda_0) \setminus \{0\}$, which implies that $r = msj$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Setting $l = ms$ one has $\det Q_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) = \det Q_r(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) = 0$, hence $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$. \square

Remark 3.6. If (x_0, λ_0) is completely degenerate, i.e. $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0) = 0$, then for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $\det Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) \neq 0$. In such a case (x_0, λ_0) is not a bifurcation point of nonstationary solutions of (1.1), in view of Corollary 3.5.

As a consequence it is now proved that if a completely degenerate stationary point of a Hamiltonian system without parameter is an emanation point of periodic orbits then the minimal periods of that orbits tend to infinity as the orbits converge to the stationary point.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$. If $x_0 \in (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ is completely degenerate, i.e. $\nabla^2 H(x_0) = 0$, then for every $C > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every nonstationary periodic orbit of (1.3) contained in the ball in \mathbb{R}^{2n} centred at x_0 with radius δ has the minimal period greater than C .*

Proof. Let $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of nonstationary periodic solutions of (1.3) such that $\|x_n - x_0\|_0 < \frac{1}{n}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\|\cdot\|_0$ denotes the supremum norm. Let T_n be the minimal period of x_n for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Set $\bar{x}_n(t) := x_n((T_n/2\pi)t)$ and $\lambda_n := T_n/2\pi$. Then (\bar{x}_n, λ_n) is a solution of (1.2). Suppose, on the contrary, that the sequence $\{T_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a bounded subsequence. Then passing to a subsequence once again one can assume that $\lambda_n \rightarrow \lambda_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Now, let

$$M_n = \sup_{|\xi - x_0| \leq \frac{1}{n}} |J\nabla H(\xi)|^2.$$

Notice that $M_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since $\nabla H(x_0) = 0$. As in estimate (5.1) in [29] one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\bar{x}_n - x_0\|_{H_{2\pi}^1}^2 &= \int_0^{2\pi} \left[|\bar{x}_n(t) - x_0|^2 + |\dot{\bar{x}}_n(t)|^2 \right] dt \\ &\leq 2\pi \|\bar{x}_n - x_0\|_0^2 + \lambda_n^2 \int_0^{2\pi} |J\nabla H(\bar{x}_n(t))|^2 dt \\ &\leq 2\pi \|\bar{x}_n - x_0\|_0^2 + \lambda_n^2 2\pi M_n < 2\pi \frac{1}{n^2} + \lambda_n^2 2\pi M_n, \end{aligned}$$

since $\|\bar{x}_n - x_0\|_0 = \|x_n - x_0\|_0 < \frac{1}{n}$. Thus $(\bar{x}_n, \lambda_n) \rightarrow (x_0, \lambda_0)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$, a contradiction (see Remark 3.6). \square

Remark 3.8. Lemma 3.4 can exclude symmetry breaking in the situation when Corollary 3.5 does not exclude it. For example, assume that $\det Q_6(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) = 0$ and $\det Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)) \neq 0$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \neq 6$, which holds for diagonal matrix $\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0)$ with the n th and the $2n$ th element of the diagonal equal to 6 and the rest of elements equal to 0 (see Remark 5.7 and condition (5.3)). Then $E(\lambda_0) = E_0 \cup E_6$ and the only possible isotropy group of nonstationary solutions of (1.1) in a neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) is \mathbb{Z}_6 , which corresponds to the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{6}$. This excludes symmetry breaking if (x_0, λ_0) is not a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions. However, Corollary 3.5 does not exclude bifurcation of solutions of (1.1) with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ from (x_0, λ_0) , since $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda_6 = \Lambda_{2,3} \subset \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_{l,3}$.

4. DANCER-RYBICKI BIFURCATION THEOREM FOR j -SOLUTIONS.

In this section global bifurcation theorems for j -solutions of (1.1) are proved in the case of systems with one parameter ($k = 1$), i.e. it is assumed that $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$.

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ satisfy (2.7) for $k = 1$ and fix $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$ and every $\lambda \in [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon] \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$ there exists a neighbourhood $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}$ of (x_0, λ) such that $(\nabla_x H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap W \subset \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}$. Set

$$\eta_0(x_0, \lambda_0) = i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon), x_0) - i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0 - \varepsilon), x_0).$$

If $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is not a cluster point of the set $\Lambda_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ then one can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\Lambda_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)) \cap [\lambda_0 - \varepsilon, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon] = \{\lambda_0\}$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) &= i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon), x_0) \cdot \frac{\mathfrak{m}^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0 + \varepsilon)))}{2} \\ &\quad - i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0 - \varepsilon), x_0) \cdot \frac{\mathfrak{m}^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda_0 - \varepsilon)))}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The sequence

$$\eta(x_0, \lambda_0) = \{\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0)\}_{j=0}^\infty$$

is called a *bifurcation index* of (x_0, λ_0) . Usually only selected coordinates of this index are needed. Notice that infinitely many of them may be nonzero. However, according to Theorem 2.5 and Remark 2.4 there exists $r_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) = \eta_0(x_0, \lambda_0) \cdot n$ for $j > r_0$. In the proof of Theorem 4.3 some coordinates of $\eta(x_0, \lambda_0)$ will be identified with coordinates of the index $\text{IND}(x_0, \lambda_0)$ defined by (2.5) for an appropriate mapping $\nabla_x f$.

Consider first the case of system (1.2) with linear dependence on parameter, which can be written in form (1.1) for H replaced by $\hat{H} \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$\hat{H}(x, \lambda) = \lambda H(x).$$

To define η in this case it suffices to assume that x_0 is an isolated element of $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$. (For every $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a < b$, the set $\Lambda(\nabla_x^2 \hat{H}(x_0, \cdot)) \cap [a, b]$ is finite.) Then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_0(x_0, \lambda_0) &= 0, \\ \eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) &= i(\nabla H, x_0) \cdot \left(\frac{\text{m}^-(Q_j((\lambda_0 + \varepsilon)\nabla^2 H(x_0)))}{2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\text{m}^-(Q_j((\lambda_0 - \varepsilon)\nabla^2 H(x_0)))}{2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, as in [9]. Notice that $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) = 0$ for every $j > r_0$, hence $\eta(x_0, \lambda_0) \in U(\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2))$.

As it was proved in [9], for every $K > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that every solution $(x, \lambda) \in H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ of (1.2) satisfying the conditions $|\lambda| \leq \delta$ and $\|x\|_0 \leq K$ is stationary. (In particular, $(x_0, 0)$ is not a bifurcation point of nonstationary solutions of (1.2).) Thus it suffices to consider the solutions of (1.2) for $\lambda > 0$.

The set $\mathcal{T} = (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \times (0, +\infty)$ is regarded as the set of trivial solutions of (1.2) and nontrivial solutions are the nonstationary ones. If (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nonstationary solutions of (1.2) then $C(x_0, \lambda_0)$ denotes the connected component of the closure of the set of nonstationary solutions of (1.2) containing (x_0, λ_0) .

The following Rabinowitz-type global bifurcation theorem for Hamiltonian systems has been proved by Dancer and Rybicki [9].

Theorem 4.1. *Let $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$ and let $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ be finite. Fix $x_0 \in (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ and $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda^+(\nabla_x^2 \hat{H}(x_0, \cdot))$. If $\eta(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq \Theta$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nonstationary solutions of (1.2). Moreover, if the set $C(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is bounded in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times (0, +\infty)$ then $C(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap \mathcal{T} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \eta(y_i) = \Theta.$$

In this section generalized versions of Theorem 4.1 concerning j -solutions (for systems with nonlinear dependence on parameter) are proved. To this aim, the method presented in [9] is applied to the restriction of the mapping $\nabla_x a$ from Theorem 2.5 to the subspace of fixed points of the action of the group \mathbb{K}_j for given $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Consider an orthogonal representation of the group $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ on a real inner product space V with $\dim V < \infty$ and let $\nabla_x f: V \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow V$ be a continuous $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant gradient mapping. Let $\Delta \times \mathbb{R} \subset (\nabla_x f)^{-1}(\{0\})$ be the set of trivial solutions of the equation

$$\nabla_x f(x, \lambda) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

for some finite set $\Delta \subset V$. If $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}$ is a branching point of nontrivial solutions of (4.1) then $\Sigma(x_0, \lambda_0)$ denotes the connected component of the closure of the set of nontrivial solutions of (4.1) containing (x_0, λ_0) .

The following theorem is a slightly modified version of Theorem 2.2 formulated in [9]. It will be used in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.2. *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $V \times \mathbb{R}$. Assume that $(\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \Omega$ contains at most finite number of bifurcation points of nontrivial solutions of (4.1) and $\partial\Omega$ contains no bifurcation points. If $\text{IND}(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq \Theta$ for some $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in (\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \Omega$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nontrivial solutions of (4.1). Moreover, if $\Sigma(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$ then $\Sigma(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap (\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \Omega = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \text{IND}(z_i) = \Theta.$$

The proof of the above theorem proceeds analogously to that of Theorem 29.1 in [10]. (It is based on Whyburn lemma and standard properties of topological degree.) The Brouwer degree ($\dim V < \infty$) is replaced by the degree DEG in this case. To guarantee that sets over which the degree DEG is computed are $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant it suffices to observe that if $D \subset V \times \mathbb{R}$ then the set $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)D := \{gv \mid g \in \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2), v \in D\}$ is $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant and $(\nabla_x f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D = (\nabla_x f)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)D$, since the mapping $\nabla_x f$ is $\mathbb{S}\mathbb{O}(2)$ -equivariant.

Assume that $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and let $\Delta \times \mathbb{R} \subset (\nabla_x H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ be the set of trivial solutions of (1.1) for some finite set $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. (Notice that some nontrivial solutions can be stationary.) Set

$$P_j(\Delta) = \bigcup_{x_0 \in \Delta} \left(\{x_0\} \times \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)) \right)$$

for $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For a fixed bounded open set $U \subset H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ use will be made of the following condition.

(N) For every $(x, \lambda) \in (\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \text{cl}(U) \setminus P_j(\Delta)$ there exists its neighbourhood $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $(\nabla_x H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap W \subset \Delta \times \mathbb{R}$.

If $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in P_j(\Delta)$ is a branching point of nontrivial j -solutions of (1.1) for some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then $K_j(x_0, \lambda_0)$ denotes the connected component of the closure of the set of nontrivial (possibly stationary) j -solutions containing (x_0, λ_0) .

Theorem 4.3. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Fix $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and let U be a bounded open subset of $H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$. Assume that the set $P_j(\Delta) \cap U$ is finite, $P_j(\Delta) \cap \partial U = \emptyset$, and condition (N) is satisfied. If $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq 0$ for some $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in P_j(\Delta) \cap U$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nontrivial (possibly stationary) j -solutions of (1.1). Moreover, if $K_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap \partial U = \emptyset$ then $K_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap (\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap U = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \Delta \times \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_{lj}(z_i) = 0 \quad \text{for every } l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}.$$

Proof. H can be replaced by H_1 from Remark 2.4. One has $(\Delta \times \mathbb{R}) \cap \text{cl}(U) \subset B(0, \eta)$ and the functions H and H_1 are equal on $B(0, \eta)$. The solutions of (1.1) in $\text{cl}(U)$ are those of (2.9). In view of Theorem 2.5, (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nontrivial j -solutions of (2.9) iff it is a branching point of nontrivial j -solutions of the equation $\nabla_x a(x, \lambda) = 0$ in the space $E_f \times \mathbb{R}$, which means that (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nontrivial solutions of (4.1) in the space $V \times \mathbb{R}$, where $V = (E_f)^{\mathbb{K}_j} = E_f \cap \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\infty} E_{lj}$ and $\nabla_x f = (\nabla_x a)|_{(V \times \mathbb{R}, V)}$.

(E_f can be regarded as a subspace of $H_{2\pi}^1$.) Notice that the only solutions of (4.1) in $V \times \mathbb{R}$ are then j -solutions. The set of trivial solutions and bifurcation points of j -solutions remain

the same as in the case of (2.9). Use will be made of Theorem 4.2. According to Lemma 2.2, for every $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ one has

$$\text{IND}_k(x_0, \lambda_0) = \begin{cases} \eta_k(x_0, \lambda_0) & \text{if } k = lj \leq r_0 \text{ for some } l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{IND}(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is the bifurcation index (2.5). Notice also that if $j > r_0$ then

$$\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) = \eta_0(x_0, \lambda_0) \cdot n = \text{IND}_0(x_0, \lambda_0) \cdot n.$$

(In this case, in view of Theorem 4.2, (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nontrivial stationary solutions, which are j -solutions for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$). Furthermore, in view of the assumptions and Corollary 3.5, U contains at most finite number of bifurcation points of nontrivial j -solutions of (2.9) and if $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in U$ is a branching point of nontrivial j -solutions of (2.9) such that $K_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap \partial U = \emptyset$ then $K_j(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is compact (see Lemma 2.7), so also is $\Sigma(x_0, \lambda_0) := h^{-1}(K_j(x_0, \lambda_0))$, where h is the homeomorphism from Theorem 2.5. Thus one can find $\Omega \subset V \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 and the condition $\Sigma(x_0, \lambda_0) \subset \Omega$. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 4.3 one obtains the next two theorems that will be used in subsequent sections. In the first one it is assumed that (x_0, λ_0) is not a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions, whereas in the second one such bifurcation is allowed but it is assumed that λ_0 is not a cluster point of $\Lambda_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$, which means that all the points from $\mathcal{T}(x_0) \setminus \{(x_0, \lambda_0)\}$ in a neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) are nondegenerate (although (x_0, λ_0) can be degenerate). In both cases $\mathcal{T}(x_0) = \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ is regarded as the set of trivial solutions, i.e. $\Delta = \{x_0\}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\nabla_x H(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that λ_0 is an isolated element of the set $\bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and (x_0, λ_0) is not a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions of (1.1). If $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq 0$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.1) and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions.*

Theorem 4.5. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\nabla_x H(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume that λ_0 is an isolated element of $\Lambda_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)) \cup \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_{lj}(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq 0$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial (possibly stationary) j -solutions of (1.1).*

Recall that in the case of system (1.2) with linear dependence on parameter the set $\mathcal{T} = (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \times (0, +\infty)$ is regarded as the set of trivial solutions. If (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.2) then $C_j(x_0, \lambda_0)$ denotes the connected component of the closure of the set of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.2) containing (x_0, λ_0) . Theorem 4.3 implies the following generalized version of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.6. *Let $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$ and let $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ be finite. Fix $x_0 \in (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ and $\lambda_0 \in \Lambda^+(\nabla_x^2 \hat{H}(x_0, \cdot))$. If $\eta_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \neq 0$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.2). Moreover, if the set $C_j(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is bounded in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times (0, +\infty)$ then $C_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \cap \mathcal{T} = \{z_1, \dots, z_m\}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \mathcal{T}$ such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \eta_j(z_i) = 0 \quad \text{for every } l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

The conclusion of Theorem 4.6 does not seem to follow from Theorem 4.1, since the formula for the sum of bifurcation indices over the branch $C(x_0, \lambda_0)$ does not imply the formula for the sum of indices over the branch $C_j(x_0, \lambda_0) \subset C(x_0, \lambda_0)$.

The results from [29, 30] provide sufficient conditions for global bifurcation of (2π -periodic) solutions of (1.2) and describe unbounded branches of solutions bifurcating from given points. Theorem 4.6 allows to replace that branches by appropriate branches of j -solutions. For example, taking into account Corollary 3.5 and Theorem 4.6 one can generalize Lemma 3.3, Theorem 4.6, and Corollary 5.3 from [30] as follows.

Corollary 4.7. *Assume that $H \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n}, \mathbb{R})$ and that $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ is finite. Let $x_0 \in (\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ be such that $i(\nabla H, x_0) \neq 0$ and $\nabla^2 H(x_0) = \text{diag}(A, B)$, $A, B \in \mathbb{S}(n, \mathbb{R})$, where A or B is strictly positive or strictly negative definite. Then for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ the set of bifurcation points $(x_0, \lambda) \in \{x_0\} \times (0, +\infty)$ of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.2) is equal to the set of global bifurcation points of nonstationary j -solutions and equal to*

$$\left\{ \left(x_0, \frac{l_j}{\sqrt{\nu}} \right) \mid \nu \in \sigma_+(AB), l \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Furthermore, if $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{x_0\}$, $\lambda_0 = \frac{j_0}{\sqrt{\nu_0}}$, $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu_0 \in \sigma_+(AB)$ then the set $C_{j_0}(x_0, \lambda_0)$ is unbounded in $H_{2\pi}^1 \times (0, +\infty)$.

In the above corollary the set $C(x_0, \lambda_0)$ from Corollary 5.3 in [30] has been replaced by $C_{j_0}(x_0, \lambda_0)$. Similarly, in the case when $(\nabla H)^{-1}(\{0\})$ is not a singleton but it is finite, the unbounded branches $C(\xi, \frac{j}{\sqrt{\omega}})$ of 2π -periodic solutions in Corollaries 5.5-5.7 from [30] can be replaced by the unbounded branches $C_j(\xi, \frac{j}{\sqrt{\omega}})$ of j -solutions.

5. GLOBAL BIFURCATION POINTS IN MULTIPARAMETER SYSTEMS

In this section global bifurcation and symmetry breaking theorems for system (1.1) are proved in the case of arbitrary number k of parameters. To this aim use is made of the bifurcation theorems for the system with one parameter obtained in the previous section.

Definition 5.1. Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. A function $F_j \in C(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ is called a j th detecting function for system (1.1) provided that the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1) For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $F_j(\lambda) = 0$ iff $\det Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda)) = 0$.
- (2) For every straight line $L \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and every $\lambda_0 \in L$ being an isolated zero of F_j on L , if F_j changes its sign on L at λ_0 then the function $\mathbb{R}^k \ni \lambda \mapsto m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda)))$ changes its value on L at λ_0 .

$F_0 := \det Q_0(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot))$ is called the 0th detecting function for (1.1). $\{F_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$ is said to be a detecting sequence for (1.1) if F_j is a j th detecting function for (1.1) for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Remark 5.2. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Since H is of class $C^{2,0}$ and for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ each eigenvalue $\nu(\lambda)$ of the symmetric matrix $Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda))$ has even multiplicity $\mu(\nu(\lambda))$ (see Remark 2.1), there exist $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{2n} \in C(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\sigma(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda))) = \{\nu_1(\lambda), \dots, \nu_{2n}(\lambda)\}$ and for every $i \in \{1, \dots, 2n\}$ the eigenvalue $\nu_i(\lambda)$ occurs $\frac{1}{2}\mu(\nu_i(\lambda))$ times in the $2n$ -tuple $(\nu_1(\lambda), \dots, \nu_{2n}(\lambda))$. Then the function F_j defined by $F_j(\lambda) = \nu_1(\lambda) \cdot \dots \cdot \nu_{2n}(\lambda)$ is a j th detecting function for (1.1). Notice that the mapping $\mathbb{R}^k \ni \lambda \mapsto \det Q_j(\nabla_x^2(x_0, \lambda))$ is nonnegative for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, therefore it cannot be used to detect the change of the Morse index of $Q_j(\nabla_x^2(x_0, \lambda))$.

Now, explicit formulae for detecting functions (exploited in examples in Section 7) will be given in the case when

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k : \nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} A(\lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & B(\lambda) \end{bmatrix}, \quad A(\lambda), B(\lambda) \in \mathbb{S}(n, \mathbb{R}). \quad (5.1)$$

If $C, D \in \mathbb{S}(n, \mathbb{R})$ and $K \in \mathbb{S}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ is of the form

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} C & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$$

then for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ define $G_j(K) \in \mathbb{S}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ and $X \in \mathbb{O}(4n, \mathbb{R})$ as follows.

$$G_j(K) = \begin{bmatrix} -C & jI \\ jI & -D \end{bmatrix} = -K + j \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -I \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where $I \equiv I_n$.

Lemma 5.3 ([30]). *For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ one has*

(1)

$$X^t Q_j(K) X = \frac{1}{1+j^2} \begin{bmatrix} G_j(K) & 0 \\ 0 & G_j(K) \end{bmatrix},$$

(2) $\det G_j(K) = \det[CD - j^2 I]$.

Using Lemma 5.3 one obtains the following.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ and fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$. Assume that condition (5.1) is satisfied. Define the functions $F_j : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, by the formula*

$$F_j(\lambda) = \det G_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda)) = \det[A(\lambda)B(\lambda) - j^2 I]. \quad (5.2)$$

Then $\{F_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}}$ is a detecting sequence for (1.1).

Notice that the functions F_j given by (5.2) multiplied by $\frac{1}{1+j^2}$ are equal to the functions F_j from Remark 5.2.

Clearly, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the function F_j given by (5.2) satisfies the condition

$$F_j(\lambda) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad j^2 \in \sigma_+(A(\lambda)B(\lambda)) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad 1 \in \sigma_+\left(\frac{1}{j^2}A(\lambda)B(\lambda)\right). \quad (5.3)$$

Lemma 5.5. *Let $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$, and let $\{F_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \subset C(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ be a detecting sequence for (1.1). Then for every bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ the set*

$$\{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid \exists \lambda \in U : F_j(\lambda) = 0\}$$

is finite. Moreover, every $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ has an open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in U$ and every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $F_j(\lambda_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$ one has $Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda)) = \frac{j}{j^2+1} \left(P + \frac{1}{j} Z(\lambda) \right)$, where

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & J^t \\ J & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z(\lambda) = \begin{bmatrix} -\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda) & 0 \\ 0 & -\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \lambda) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $\sigma(P) = \{-1, 1\}$, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $T \in S(4n, \mathbb{R})$ with the operator norm $\|T\| < \varepsilon$ one has $\sigma(P+T) \cap (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \emptyset$, hence $\det(P+T) \neq 0$. On the other hand,

$H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, therefore for any bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ the number $\sup_{\lambda \in U} \|Z(\lambda)\|$ is finite. Thus for fixed U there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\frac{1}{j} \|Z(\lambda)\| < \varepsilon$ for every $\lambda \in U$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}, j > m$. Consequently, $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in U, j \in \mathbb{N}, j > m$. Now, choose U to be a neighbourhood of λ_0 . Since the set $\{0, \dots, m\}$ is finite and F_0, \dots, F_m are continuous, one can change U in such a way that also $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in U$ and every $j \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ such that $F_j(\lambda_0) \neq 0$. \square

Let $[a]$ denote the integer part of $a \in \mathbb{R}$. One can use the following lemma to find all the functions F_j vanishing in a neighbourhood of given $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ in the case of systems satisfying condition (5.1).

Lemma 5.6. *Let the assumptions of Lemma 5.4 be satisfied. Fix $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and set*

$$N(\lambda_0) = \left[\max \left\{ \sqrt{\nu} \mid \nu \in \sigma_+(A(\lambda_0)B(\lambda_0)) \right\} \right].$$

Then there exists an open neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ of λ_0 such that $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $j > N(\lambda_0), \lambda \in U$.

Proof. If $j > N(\lambda_0)$ then $j^2 > \max \sigma_+(A(\lambda_0)B(\lambda_0))$, hence $F_j(\lambda_0) \neq 0$, in view of (5.3). Application of Lemma 5.5 completes the proof. \square

The following assumptions are used in the reminder of this paper.

- (H1) $H \in C^{2,0}(\mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$,
- (H2) $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ and $\nabla_x H(x_0, \lambda) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$,
- (H3) $\{F_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}} \subset C(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$ is a detecting sequence for (1.1).

The set $\mathcal{T}(x_0) = \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ is regarded as the set of trivial solutions of (1.1). In some theorems it is assumed additionally that for given $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ the following conditions are satisfied.

- (E1(x_0, λ)) There exists a neighbourhood $W \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R}^k$ of (x_0, λ) such that

$$(\nabla_x H)^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap W \subset \{x_0\} \times \mathbb{R}^k$$

(i.e. (x_0, λ) is not a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions of (1.1)),

- (E2(x_0, λ)) $i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda), x_0) \neq 0$.

Remark 5.7. If conditions (H1)-(H3) are satisfied then Lemma 3.4 and Corollary 3.5 can be formulated in terms of the functions F_j , since for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \cdot)) &= F_j^{-1}(\{0\}), \\ X(\lambda_0) &= \{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid F_j(\lambda_0) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is fixed.

Continuous curve in \mathbb{R}^k means any subset of \mathbb{R}^k homeomorphic to \mathbb{R} . A submanifold of \mathbb{R}^k is called a manifold and the tangent space to such a manifold is regarded as a linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^k .

Theorem 5.8. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1(x_0, λ_0)), and (E2(x_0, λ_0)) be satisfied. Assume that $M \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a continuous curve and $\lambda_0 \in M$ is an isolated element of the set*

$$\bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} F_{lj}^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap M$$

for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If the restriction of F_j to M changes its sign at λ_0 then (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.1) and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions.

Proof. Let $\varphi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ be a parametrization of M such that $\varphi(0) = \lambda_0$ and let $H_1: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Hamiltonian defined by $H_1(x, s) = H(x, \varphi(s))$. It suffices to prove the conclusion for H_1 and $(x_0, 0) \in H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ instead of H and $(x_0, \lambda_0) \in H_{2\pi}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^k$. By assumptions (E1(x_0, λ_0)), (E2(x_0, λ_0)) one has $i(\nabla_x H_1(\cdot, \varepsilon), x_0) = i(\nabla_x H_1(\cdot, -\varepsilon), x_0) = i(\nabla_x H_1(\cdot, 0), x_0) = i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0), x_0) \neq 0$, therefore

$$\eta_j(x_0, 0) = i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda_0), x_0) \cdot \left(\frac{m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \varepsilon)))}{2} - \frac{m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, -\varepsilon)))}{2} \right).$$

Since F_j is a j th detecting function and its restriction to M changes its sign at λ_0 , one has

$$\begin{aligned} m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \varepsilon))) &= m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \varphi(\varepsilon)))) \\ &\neq m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H(x_0, \varphi(-\varepsilon)))) \\ &= m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, -\varepsilon))). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\eta_j(x_0, 0) \neq 0$, which implies that $(x_0, 0)$ is a branching point of nonstationary j -solutions and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions, according to Theorem 4.4. \square

Theorem 5.9. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Assume that $M \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is a continuous curve and $\lambda_0 \in M$ is an isolated element of the set*

$$\left(F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cup \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} F_l^{-1}(\{0\}) \right) \cap M$$

for some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If the restriction of F_j to M changes its sign at λ_0 then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial (possibly stationary) j -solutions of (1.1).

Proof. Choose the parametrization φ and the modified Hamiltonian H_1 as in the proof of Theorem 5.8. By the assumption there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $F_0(\varphi(s)) \neq 0$ for $s \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon] \setminus \{0\}$. If the restriction of F_0 to M changes its sign at λ_0 then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_0(x_0, 0) &= \operatorname{sgn} \det \nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \varepsilon) - \operatorname{sgn} \det \nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, -\varepsilon) \\ &= \operatorname{sgn} F_0(\varphi(\varepsilon)) - \operatorname{sgn} F_0(\varphi(-\varepsilon)) \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence $(x_0, 0)$ is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions, which are j -solutions for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus one can assume that the restriction of F_0 to M does not change its sign at λ_0 (in particular, $j \neq 0$). Then one has

$$\operatorname{sgn} \det \nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \varepsilon) = \operatorname{sgn} \det \nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, -\varepsilon) = \operatorname{sgn} F(\varphi(\varepsilon)) \neq 0,$$

and

$$\eta_j(x_0, 0) = \operatorname{sgn} F(\varphi(\varepsilon)) \cdot \frac{m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, \varepsilon))) - m^-(Q_j(\nabla_x^2 H_1(x_0, -\varepsilon)))}{2}.$$

Thus $\eta_j(x_0, 0) \neq 0$, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 5.8. \square

Remark 5.10. Let $k \geq 2$, $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $F \in C^r(\mathbb{R}^k, \mathbb{R})$, $F(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\nabla F(\lambda_0) \neq 0$. Then there exists a neighbourhood $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ of λ_0 , such that $\Gamma = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional manifold of class C^r . Note that if L is a one dimensional linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^k such that $L \not\subset T_{\lambda_0} \Gamma$ then the restriction of F to the straight line $L_{\lambda_0} = \lambda_0 + L$ has an isolated zero at λ_0 and changes its sign at λ_0 .

Set

$$\begin{aligned} X_j(\lambda_0) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid F_{l_j}(\lambda_0) = 0\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \\ X_j^+(\lambda_0) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \mid F_{l_j}(\lambda_0) = 0\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of Remark 5.10, the next two theorems follow from Theorems 5.8 and 5.9 for $M = L_{\lambda_0} = \lambda_0 + L$, where $L \not\subset T_{\lambda_0}(F_{l_j}^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U)$ for all $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$ and $l \in X_j(\lambda_0)$, respectively.

Theorem 5.11. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1(x_0, λ_0)), and (E2(x_0, λ_0))) be satisfied. Assume that $F_j(\lambda_0) = 0$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If for all $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$ the functions F_{l_j} are of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 and $\nabla F_{l_j}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a branching point of nonstationary j -solutions of (1.1) and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions.*

Theorem 5.12. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Assume that $F_j(\lambda_0) = 0$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If for all $l \in X_j(\lambda_0)$ the functions F_{l_j} are of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 and $\nabla F_{l_j}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial (possibly stationary) j -solutions of (1.1).*

In view of Lemma 3.4 and Remark 5.7 one obtains the following two pairs of corollaries to Theorems 5.11 and 5.12, concerning symmetry breaking. First consider the case of only one type of solutions in a neighbourhood of (x_0, λ_0) .

Corollary 5.13. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1(x_0, λ_0)), and (E2(x_0, λ_0))) be satisfied. Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If F_j is of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 , $F_j(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\nabla F_j(\lambda_0) \neq 0$, and $F_l(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \neq j$, then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions of (1.1). Moreover, it is a branching point of nonstationary solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j}$, but it is not a symmetry breaking point.*

Corollary 5.14. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Fix $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. If F_j is of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 , $F_j(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\nabla F_j(\lambda_0) \neq 0$, and $F_l(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $l \neq j$, then (x_0, λ_0) is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions of (1.1). Moreover, it is a branching point of nonstationary solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ if $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and nontrivial stationary solutions if $j = 0$, but it is not a symmetry breaking point.*

The assumption of the next two corollaries, in which symmetry breaking occurs, imply that j_1 and j_2 are relatively prime.

Corollary 5.15. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1(x_0, λ_0)), and (E2(x_0, λ_0))) be satisfied. Fix $j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that for $i = 1, 2$ the functions F_{j_i} are of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 , $F_{j_i}(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\nabla F_{j_i}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$, and $F_{l_{j_i}}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $l \geq 2$. Then (x_0, λ_0) is a symmetry breaking point. Namely, it is a branching point of nonstationary solutions of (1.1) with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j_1}$ and solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j_2}$. Moreover, it is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j_1 -solutions and j_2 -solutions.*

Corollary 5.16. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied. Fix $j_1, j_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that for $i = 1, 2$ the functions F_{j_i} are of class C^1 in a neighbourhood of λ_0 , $F_{j_i}(\lambda_0) = 0$, $\nabla F_{j_i}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$, and $F_{l_{j_i}}(\lambda_0) \neq 0$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $l \neq 1$. Then (x_0, λ_0) is a symmetry breaking point. Namely, it is a branching point of nonstationary solutions of (1.1) with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j_1}$ and solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j_2}$. Moreover, it is a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j_1 -solutions and j_2 -solutions.*

6. THE STRUCTURE OF THE SET OF BIFURCATION POINTS

In this section the results from Section 5 and [34, 35] are applied to the description of the structure of the set of bifurcation points of solutions of (1.1).

Let $\text{Bif}(x_0)$ and $\text{GlBif}(x_0)$ be the sets of those $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for which (x_0, λ) is, respectively, a bifurcation point and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial solutions of (1.1). Similarly, for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ let $\text{Bif}_j(x_0)$ and $\text{GlBif}_j(x_0)$ denote the sets of those $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k$ for which (x_0, λ) is, respectively, a bifurcation point and a global bifurcation point of nontrivial j -solutions of (1.1). Finally, for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ let the subsets $\text{Bif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \subset \text{Bif}_j(x_0)$, $\text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \subset \text{GlBif}_j(x_0)$ consist of those λ for which (x_0, λ) is, respectively, a bifurcation point and a branching point of nonstationary solutions of (1.1) with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j}$ if $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and nontrivial stationary solutions if $j = 0$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X(\lambda) &:= \{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid F_j(\lambda) = 0\}, \\ X^+(\lambda) &:= \{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid F_j(\lambda) = 0\} = X(\lambda) \setminus \{0\}, \\ X_j(\lambda) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid F_{lj}(\lambda) = 0\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}, \\ X_j^+(\lambda) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \mid F_{lj}(\lambda) = 0\} = X_j(\lambda) \setminus \{0\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Set also $\text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) := F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap \nabla F^{-1}(\{0\})$.

As it is shown in the subsequent part of this paper, Theorems 6.1-6.4 bellow provide a constructive description of the set of bifurcation points of solutions of (1.1) which can be used both to obtain qualitative results by applying theorems of real algebraic geometry as well as in numerical computations for finding all bifurcation points in given domain. Notice that the existence of the neighbourhood U of λ_0 is ensured by Lemma 5.5.

Theorem 6.1. *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be fulfilled and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open neighbourhood of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that the conditions $(E1(x_0, \lambda))$, $(E2(x_0, \lambda))$, and $F_m(\lambda) \neq 0$ are satisfied for every $\lambda \in U$ and $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus X^+(\lambda_0)$. If $X^+(\lambda_0) = \emptyset$ then $\text{Bif}(x_0) \cap U = \emptyset$. If $X^+(\lambda_0) \neq \emptyset$ and F_j , $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$, are of class C^1 in U then the following conclusions hold for $F = \prod_{j \in X^+(\lambda_0)} F_j$.*

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Bif}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) &= \text{GlBif}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) \\ &= F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) = \bigcup_{j \in X^+(\lambda_0)} F_j^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F). \end{aligned}$$

(2) For every $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) &= \text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) \\ &= F_j^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F). \end{aligned}$$

The sets $\text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$, $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$, are pairwise disjoint.

(3) If F_j , $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$, are analytic in U and $\bar{\lambda}$ is an isolated element of $\text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$ such that $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{cl}(F_{j_0}^{-1}(\{0\}) \setminus \text{P}_{\text{sing}}(F))$ for some $j_0 \in X^+(\lambda_0)$ then $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{Bif}_{j_0}^{\text{min}} \cap \text{GlBif}_{j_0}(x_0)$.

Proof. If $X^+(\lambda_0) = \emptyset$ then $\text{Bif}(x_0) \cap U = \emptyset$, in view of Corollary 3.5 and Remark 5.7. Assume that $X^+(\lambda_0) \neq \emptyset$. Conclusion (1) follows from assertion (2), Corollary 3.5, and Remark 5.7. To prove assertion (2) observe that

$$\nabla F(\lambda) = \sum_{j \in X^+(\lambda_0)} \nabla F_j(\lambda) \prod_{i \in X^+(\lambda_0) \setminus \{j\}} F_i(\lambda).$$

Fix $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$ and $\lambda \in U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$ such that $F_j(\lambda) = 0$. Then $\nabla F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ and $F_i(\lambda) \neq 0$ for all $i \in X^+(\lambda_0) \setminus \{j\}$. (In particular, the sets $F_j^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$, $j \in X^+(\lambda_0)$, are pairwise disjoint.) Thus Corollary 5.13 with λ_0 replaced by λ implies that $(x_0, \lambda) \in \text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0)$ and (x_0, λ) is not a symmetry breaking point.

Now turn to assertion (3). Notice that conclusion (2) implies that $(x_0, \bar{\lambda})$ is a bifurcation point of solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2\pi}{j_0}$ as a cluster point of such bifurcation points. It remains to show that $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{GlBif}_{j_0}(x_0)$. (One cannot use Corollary 5.13, since $\nabla F(\bar{\lambda}) = 0$.) In view of the curve selection lemma for semianalytic sets there exists a continuous curve M such that $\bar{\lambda}$ is an isolated element of $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap M$ and the restriction of F_{j_0} to M changes its sign at $\bar{\lambda}$. Consequently, according to Theorem 5.8, $(x_0, \bar{\lambda})$ is a global bifurcation point of j_0 -solutions. \square

Applying Corollary 5.14 and Theorem 5.9 instead of Corollary 5.13 and Theorem 5.8 one obtains the following theorem in which bifurcation of nontrivial stationary solutions is allowed.

Theorem 6.2. *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be fulfilled and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open neighbourhood of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $F_m(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $\lambda \in U$ and $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \setminus X(\lambda_0)$. If $X(\lambda_0) = \emptyset$ then $\text{Bif}(x_0) \cap U = \emptyset$. If $X(\lambda_0) \neq \emptyset$ and F_j , $j \in X(\lambda_0)$, are of class C^1 in U then conclusions (1)-(3) of Theorem 6.1 hold true for $F = \prod_{j \in X(\lambda_0)} F_j$ and $X^+(\lambda_0)$ replaced by $X(\lambda_0)$.*

If the functions F in Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 do not satisfy the assumptions of that theorems, one can restrict the discussion to the set of bifurcation points of j -solutions for some fixed j , which leads to the following two theorems.

Theorem 6.3. *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be fulfilled and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open neighbourhood of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that the conditions (E1(x_0, λ)), (E2(x_0, λ)), and $F_{mj}(\lambda) \neq 0$ are satisfied for some fixed $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $\lambda \in U$, $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus X_j^+(\lambda_0)$. If $X_j^+(\lambda_0) = \emptyset$ then $\text{Bif}_j(x_0) \cap U = \emptyset$. If $X_j^+(\lambda_0) \neq \emptyset$ and F_{lj} , $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$, are of class C^1 in U then the following conclusions hold for $F = \prod_{l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)} F_{lj}$.*

$$(1) \text{Bif}_j(x_0) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) = \text{GlBif}_j(x_0) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) \\ = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) = \bigcup_{l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)} F_{lj}^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F).$$

(2) For every $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$ one has

$$\text{Bif}_{lj}^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) = \text{GlBif}_{lj}^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F) \\ = F_{lj}^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F).$$

The sets $\text{GlBif}_{lj}^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap U \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$, $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$, are pairwise disjoint.

(3) If F_{lj} , $l \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$, are analytic in U and $\bar{\lambda}$ is an isolated element of $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)$ such that $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{cl}\left(F_{l_0j}^{-1}(\{0\}) \setminus \mathbb{P}_{\text{sing}}(F)\right)$ for some fixed $l_0 \in X_j^+(\lambda_0)$ then $\bar{\lambda} \in \text{Bif}_{l_0j}^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap \text{GlBif}_{l_0j}(x_0)$.

Theorem 6.4. *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) be fulfilled and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be an open neighbourhood of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that $F_{mj}(\lambda) \neq 0$ for some fixed $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and all $\lambda \in U$, $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \setminus X_j(\lambda_0)$. If $X_j(\lambda_0) = \emptyset$ then $\text{Bif}_j(x_0) \cap U = \emptyset$. If $X_j(\lambda_0) \neq \emptyset$ and F_{lj} ,*

$l \in X_j(\lambda_0)$, are of class C^1 in U then conclusions (1)-(3) of Theorem 6.3 hold true for $F = \prod_{l \in X_j(\lambda_0)} F_{lj}$ and $X_j^+(\lambda_0)$ replaced by $X_j(\lambda_0)$.

Remark 6.5. In view of Lemma 5.5, Theorems 6.1-6.4 remain valid for a bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and the sets $X^+(\lambda_0)$, $X(\lambda_0)$, $X_j^+(\lambda_0)$, $X_j(\lambda_0)$ replaced by the sets

$$\begin{aligned} X^+(U) &:= \{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists \lambda \in U : F_j(\lambda) = 0\}, \\ X(U) &:= \{j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid \exists \lambda \in U : F_j(\lambda) = 0\}, \\ X_j^+(U) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists \lambda \in U : F_{lj}(\lambda) = 0\}, \\ X_j(U) &:= \{l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \mid \exists \lambda \in U : F_{lj}(\lambda) = 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, which makes that theorems independent from λ_0 .

Now the results from [34, 35] can be applied. In what follows the symbols D_r^k , and S_r^{k-1} denote, respectively, the closed disk and the sphere in \mathbb{R}^k centred at the origin with radius $r > 0$.

Definition 6.6. A mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called *admissible* if it is analytic and $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is an isolated singular point of $F^{-1}(\{0\})$, i.e. it is an isolated element of the set $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap (\nabla F)^{-1}(\{0\})$.

Consider first the case of two parameters ($k = 2$).

Definition 6.7. Let $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be admissible. An analytic mapping $g: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a *test function* for F if $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is an isolated element of the set $g^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap F^{-1}(\{0\})$.

Set $h(g, F) := (\text{Jac}(g, F), F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ (see [34]), where $\text{Jac}(g, F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is the Jacobian of the mapping $(g, F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$.

Applying Theorem A.1, Corollary A.2 (see Appendix A), and Lemma 5.5 one obtains the following two corollaries to Theorems 6.1 and 6.2. Determining the numbers $b_+(g, F)$ and $b_-(g, F)$ in these corollaries allows to localize the curves forming the set of bifurcation points (see for example Corollary A.3). Note that assumptions (E1($x_0, 0$)) and (E2($x_0, 0$)) in Corollary 6.8 (and in Corollary 6.11) imply that conditions (E1(x_0, λ)) and (E2(x_0, λ)) are satisfied for every λ from a neighbourhood of the origin.

Corollary 6.8. Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1($x_0, 0$)), and (E2($x_0, 0$)) be satisfied for $k = 2$, and let $X^+(0) \neq \emptyset$. Set $F = \prod_{j \in X^+(0)} F_j$ and assume that $F, F_j, j \in X^+(0)$, are admissible

and g_+ is a nonnegative test function for F . Then for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ the following conclusions hold.

- (1) Each of the sets $\text{GlBif}(x_0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $\text{GlBif}_j^{\min}(x_0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $j \in X^+(0)$, is a union of even (possibly zero) number of disjoint analytic curves, each of which meets the origin and crosses S_r^1 transversally in one point. The number of those curves, equal to $b(F)$ and $b(F_j)$, respectively, is determined by formula (A.2) in Corollary A.2. If the number of the curves is nonzero then $0 \in \text{GlBif}(x_0)$.
- (2) If g is an arbitrary test function for F then the number of those curves forming $\text{GlBif}(x_0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\text{GlBif}_j^{\min}(x_0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $j \in X^+(0)$, on which g is positive (negative), equal to $b_+(g, F)$ ($b_-(g, F)$) and $b_+(g, F_j)$ ($b_-(g, F_j)$), respectively, is determined by formula (A.1) in Theorem A.1.
- (3) If $b(F) \neq b(F_j) \neq 0$ for some $j \in X^+(0)$, then $(x_0, 0)$ is a symmetry breaking point.

Corollary 6.9. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied for $k = 2$ and let $X(0) \neq \emptyset$. Set $F = \prod_{j \in X(0)} F_j$ and assume that $F, F_j, j \in X(0)$, are admissible and g_+ is a nonnegative test function for F . Then for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ conclusions (1)-(3) of Corollary 6.8 hold true for $X^+(0)$ replaced by $X(0)$.*

Remark 6.10. One obtains two analogous corollaries to Theorems 6.3 and 6.4 in the case of $k = 2$.

Now consider the case of arbitrary number k of parameters.

Assume that an admissible function $F: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Morse function on small spheres, i.e. there exists $r > 0$ such that $F|_{S_r^{k-1}}$ is a Morse function for every $0 < s \leq r$. Let Σ_r be the set of critical points of $F|_{S_r^{k-1}}$. For $\lambda \in \Sigma_r$ denote by $\text{ind}(F, \lambda)$ the Morse index of $F|_{S_r^{k-1}}$ at λ . Set

$$\begin{aligned} n_+(F) &:= \#\{\lambda \in \Sigma_r \mid F(\lambda) < 0 \wedge \text{ind}(F, \lambda) \text{ is even}\}, \\ n_-(F) &:= \#\{\lambda \in \Sigma_r \mid F(\lambda) < 0 \wedge \text{ind}(F, \lambda) \text{ is odd}\}, \\ p_+(F) &:= \#\{\lambda \in \Sigma_r \mid F(\lambda) > 0 \wedge \text{ind}(F, \lambda) \text{ is even}\}, \\ p_-(F) &:= \#\{\lambda \in \Sigma_r \mid F(\lambda) > 0 \wedge \text{ind}(F, \lambda) \text{ is odd}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Szafraniec [35] proved theorems which can be used to verify whether F is Morse on small spheres and gave formulae for $n_{\pm}(F), p_{\pm}(F)$ written in terms of local topological degree of mappings defined explicitly by using F .

Notice that if $n_{\mu}(F) \cdot p_{\nu}(F) \neq 0$ for some $\mu, \nu \in \{+, -\}$ then F has zeros on S_r^{k-1} for every sufficiently small $r > 0$. In particular, $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^k \neq \emptyset$. Thus one obtains the following two corollaries to Theorems 6.1 and 6.2 (see also Lemma 5.5).

Corollary 6.11. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3), (E1($x_0, 0$)), and (E2($x_0, 0$)) be satisfied, and let $X^+(0) \neq \emptyset$. Set $F = \prod_{j \in X^+(0)} F_j$ and assume that $F, F_j, j \in X^+(0)$, are admissible and Morse on small spheres. Then for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ the following conclusions hold.*

- (1) *If $n_{\mu}(F) \cdot p_{\nu}(F) \neq 0$ for some $\mu, \nu \in \{+, -\}$ then the set $\text{GlBif}(x_0) \cap D_r^k$ is a topological cone with vertex at the origin and base $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S_r^k$. Moreover, $\text{GlBif}(x_0) \cap D_r^k \setminus \{0\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional manifold with boundary $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S_r^k$.*
- (2) *Similarly, if $n_{\mu}(F_j) \cdot p_{\nu}(F_j) \neq 0$ for some $j \in X^+(0)$ and $\mu, \nu \in \{+, -\}$ then the set $\text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap D_r^k \cup \{0\}$ is a topological cone with vertex at the origin and base $F_j^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S_r^k$. Moreover, $\text{GlBif}_j^{\text{min}}(x_0) \cap D_r^k \setminus \{0\}$ is a $(k-1)$ -dimensional manifold with boundary $F_j^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap S_r^k$.*
- (3) *If $n_{\mu_1}(F_{j_1}) \cdot p_{\nu_1}(F_{j_1}) \cdot n_{\mu_2}(F_{j_2}) \cdot p_{\nu_2}(F_{j_2}) \neq 0$ for some $j_1, j_2 \in X^+(0)$ and some $\mu_1, \nu_1, \mu_2, \nu_2 \in \{+, -\}$ then $(x_0, 0)$ is a symmetry breaking point.*

Corollary 6.12. *Let conditions (H1)-(H3) be satisfied and let $X(0) \neq \emptyset$. Set $F = \prod_{j \in X(0)} F_j$ and assume that $F, F_j, j \in X(0)$, are admissible and Morse on small spheres. Then for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ conclusions (1)-(3) of Corollary 6.11 hold true for $X^+(0)$ replaced by $X(0)$.*

One obtains two analogous corollaries to Theorems 6.3 and 6.4.

The above corollaries allow to use the formulae for $n_{\pm}(F)$, $p_{\pm}(F)$ given in [35] to detect symmetry breaking points. The results from [35] can be also used to investigate the number of the cones from the above corollaries.

7. EXAMPLES

In this section the results from Section 6 are applied to examples of system (1.1) with two and three parameters. Symbolic computations of topological indices have been performed by using Łęcki's program based on an algorithm described in [12, 23]. Other symbolic computations (solving polynomial equations, estimates, etc.) have been carried out by using Maple. The graphs of curves and surfaces forming the sets of zeros of detecting functions (which are proved to be bifurcation points of given systems) in prescribed area have been obtained by using Endrass' program *surf* [13].

Recall that D_r^k denotes the closed disc in \mathbb{R}^k centred at the origin with radius $r > 0$.

Remark 7.1. Let $F: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an analytic function for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $r > 0$ and let $0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ be the unique singular point of F in D_r^k . Assume that for every $\lambda \in F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^k \setminus \{0\}$ the tangent space to $F^{-1}(\{0\})$ at λ is not equal to the tangent space at λ to the sphere centred at the origin. Then every connected component of $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^k$ contains the origin.

Remark 7.2. Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ be a bounded open neighbourhood of $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and let $F: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. In the aim of proving that λ_0 is the only zero of F in $\text{cl}(U)$ it suffices to prove that λ_0 is the only solution in \mathbb{R}^k of the equation

$$F(\lambda)^2 = h(\lambda),$$

where $h: \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function such that $h(\lambda_0) = 0$, $h(\lambda) = 0$ for every $\lambda \in \partial U$, $h(\lambda) > 0$ for every $\lambda \in \text{Int}(U) \setminus \{\lambda_0\}$, and $h(\lambda) < 0$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \text{cl}(U)$. If $\text{cl}(U)$ is a closed disc centred at λ_0 with radius $r > 0$ then one can exploit the function h of the form

$$h(\lambda) = -|\lambda - \lambda_0|^{2p} (|\lambda - \lambda_0|^{2q} - r^{2q}),$$

where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 7.3. In the next two examples, the functions $g_i: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are defined by

$$g_1(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2, \quad g_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_1, \quad g_3(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_2, \quad g_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2$$

(see [20]). If $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an admissible mapping which has no zeros on the coordinate axes in a neighbourhood of the origin (e.g. if $F(\cdot, 0)$ and $F(0, \cdot)$ are polynomials of nonzero degree) then g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are test functions for F , since the roots of g_i lie on the coordinate axes. For such an F the symbol $b_i(F)$ denotes the number of components of $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ (for sufficiently small $r > 0$) contained in the i th quarter of the plane \mathbb{R}^2 for $i = 1, \dots, 4$.

In all examples use is made of the functions F_j defined by (5.2).

Example 7.4. Let $H: \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Hamilton function given by

$$H(x, \lambda) \equiv H(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) + Q(x_1, \dots, x_6),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = & \frac{1}{2}(9 + \frac{1}{10}\lambda_1^6)x_1^2 + \frac{5}{2}x_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}x_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}(5 - \frac{1}{20}\lambda_1^5)x_6^2 \\ & + 2\lambda_2^6x_1x_3 + 8\lambda_2^6x_4x_6 + x_2^4 + x_5^4, \end{aligned}$$

$Q \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^6, \mathbb{R})$ has a local minimum at the origin, and $\nabla^2 Q(0) = 0$, for example

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x_1, \dots, x_6) = & x_1^6 + x_2^6 + x_3^6 + x_4^6 + x_5^6 + x_6^6 + (x_1^9 + x_3^7)x_2 \\ & + x_1x_2^7 + x_2^7x_3 + x_2x_6^9 + x_4^7x_5 + (x_2^9 + x_5^7)x_6. \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H3) for $k = 2$ and $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$.

First the set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$ will be described for sufficiently small $r > 0$ and then it will be shown that the conclusions hold for every $r \leq 0.3$.

One has

$$\begin{aligned} A(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \begin{bmatrix} 9 + \frac{1}{10}\lambda_1^6 & 0 & 2\lambda_2^6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\lambda_2^6 & 0 & 5 \end{bmatrix}, \\ B(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 8\lambda_2^6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 8\lambda_2^6 & 0 & 5 - \frac{1}{20}\lambda_1^5 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Those of the functions F_j , $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, defined by (5.2), which vanish at $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are F_0 , F_3 , and F_5 , hence $X^+(0) = \{3, 5\}$ (see also Lemmas 5.5, 5.6). One has

$$\begin{aligned} F_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &\equiv 0, \\ F_3(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= 288\lambda_1^6\lambda_2^{12} - \frac{72}{5}\lambda_1^6 + \frac{9}{40}\lambda_1^{11} - 2304\lambda_2^{24} + 28692\lambda_2^{12} - \frac{9}{5}\lambda_1^5\lambda_2^{12}, \\ F_5(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= 800\lambda_1^6\lambda_2^{12} + \frac{5}{8}\lambda_1^{11} + 92500\lambda_2^{12} - 100\lambda_1^5 - 6400\lambda_2^{24} - 5\lambda_1^5\lambda_2^{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Use will be made of Theorems 6.1, 6.3, and Corollary 6.8 (see also Remark 6.10). Theorems 6.2, 6.4, and Corollary 6.9 cannot be applied, since $F_0 = 0$, which means that all the points (x_0, λ) , $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^2$, are degenerate.

Observe that conditions (E1(0, λ)) and (E2(0, λ)) are satisfied for every $\lambda \in U := (-0.31, 0.31)^2$. (At the moment only assumptions (E1(0, 0)) and (E2(0, 0)) are needed, as in Corollary 6.8.) Indeed. An appropriate estimate for the function P shows that for every $\lambda \in (-0.31, 0.31)^2$ and every $v \in \mathbb{R}^6 \setminus \{0\}$ the function $[0, +\infty) \ni c \mapsto P(cv, \lambda)$ is strictly increasing (in particular, $P(\cdot, \lambda)$ has a strict local minimum at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$). On the other hand, Q has a minimum at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$ and it does not depend on λ . Thus there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\nabla_x H(x, \lambda) \neq 0$ for every $0 < |x| < \varepsilon$, $\lambda \in (-0.31, 0.31)^2$. Consequently, for every $\lambda \in (-0.31, 0.31)^2$ condition (E1(0, λ)) is fulfilled and the function $H(\cdot, \lambda)$ has a strict local minimum at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$, hence $i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, \lambda), 0) = 1 \neq 0$ (see [2]).

Symbolic computations show that $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is an isolated singular point of the functions F_3 , F_5 , and $F = F_3 \cdot F_5$. Thus they are admissible and, according to Remark 7.3, g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are test functions for them. Furthermore,

$$i(h(g_1, F_3), 0) = 2, \quad i(h(g_1, F_5), 0) = 1, \quad i(h(g_1, F), 0) = 3, \quad (7.2)$$

which has been checked by using Lęcki's program. It follows from Theorems 6.1, 6.3 and Corollary 6.8 (for $g_+ = g_1$) that for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ the following equalities hold.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bif}(0) \cap D_r^2 &= \text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^2 = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \\ &= (\text{GlBif}_3^{\min}(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_5^{\min}(0)) \cap D_r^2, \\ \text{GlBif}_3^{\min} \cap D_r^2 &= F_3^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2, \\ \text{GlBif}_5^{\min} \cap D_r^2 &= F_5^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$




FIGURE 1. The set of those $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, for which $(0, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ is a global bifurcation point of the system from Example 7.4. The legend on the right describes the minimal periods of solutions bifurcating from the points of given curve.

The fact that $0 \in \text{GlBif}_3^{\min} \cap D_r^2$ and $0 \in \text{GlBif}_5^{\min} \cap D_r^2$ follows from Lemma 3.4 and Remark 5.7. (The only minimal periods of nontrivial solutions in a neighbourhood of the origin are $\frac{2\pi}{3}$ and $\frac{2\pi}{5}$.)

In view of Corollary 6.8, the set $\text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ consists of $b(F) = 6$ curves. The numbers of the curves forming the sets $\text{GlBif}_3^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ and $\text{GlBif}_5^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ are equal to $b(F_3) = 4$ and $b(F_5) = 5$, respectively.

To localize the curves in the quarters of the plane Corollary A.3 will be used. Application of Łecki's program yields

$$\begin{aligned} i(h(g_2, F_3), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_2, F_5), 0) &= 1, \\ i(h(g_3, F_3), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_3, F_5), 0) &= 0, \\ i(h(g_4, F_3), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_4, F_5), 0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

Taking into account (7.2), (7.4), and Corollary A.3 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(F_3) &= 1, & b_2(F_3) &= 1, & b_3(F_3) &= 1, & b_4(F_3) &= 1, \\ b_1(F_5) &= 1, & b_2(F_5) &= 0, & b_3(F_5) &= 0, & b_4(F_5) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

The following results of additional symbolic computations and estimates ensure that the above conclusions concerning bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$ hold for every $r \leq 0.3$. One has $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{3, 5\}$, $\lambda \in U := (-0.31, 0.31)^2$. The origin is the only singular point of F_3 , F_5 , and $F = F_3 \cdot F_5$ in U . The sets of zeros of F_3 , F_5 restricted to $D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$, are disjoint and they have no common points with the coordinate axes. Furthermore, the functions F_3 , F_5 , and F satisfy the assumptions of Remark 7.1 for $k = 2$ and $r = 0.3$. Thus for $r = 0.3$ every connected component of $F_3^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$, $F_5^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$, and $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$ contains the origin.

Theorems 6.1 and 6.3 have been also applied to find bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, numerically as zeros of the functions F_j , according to formulae (7.3), which has been performed by using the program *surf* and presented on Figure 1. The earlier conclusions

ensure that the number of curves on Figure 1, their localization, and their relative position do not change when passing to a smaller scale.

One can summarize the above results as follows. The set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, is equal to the set of global bifurcation points in this domain and consists of six curves, for which the origin is the only common point. Apart from the origin four curves (one curve in each quarter) consist of branching points of solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2}{3}\pi$ (and only such solutions), whereas two curves (one curve in the first quarter and one curve in the fourth quarter) consist of branching points of solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2}{5}\pi$ (and only such solutions). The origin is a branching point of solutions with the minimal periods $\frac{2}{3}\pi$ and solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2}{5}\pi$ (and only such solutions). In particular, the origin is a symmetry breaking point.

Example 7.5. Consider the Hamiltonian $H: \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by the formula

$$H(x, \lambda) \equiv H(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) = P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) + Q(x_1, \dots, x_6),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \frac{1}{2}(4 + 3\lambda_1^{10} + \lambda_1^7\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2\lambda_2^7 + \lambda_1^5\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^4\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^3\lambda_2^4 - \lambda_2^9)x_1^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{3}{2}x_2^2 + x_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}x_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}(3 + 3\lambda_1^7)x_5^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1^2x_6^2 + (3\lambda_1^3 + 22\lambda_2^4)x_5x_6, \end{aligned}$$

$$Q(x_1, \dots, x_6) = x_1^3x_2 + (x_1 + x_4)x_3^2 + x_4^2x_5 + (x_6 - x_5)^3. \quad (7.5)$$

H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H3) for $k = 2$ and $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$.

Notice that in this case $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$ is an isolated critical point of $H(\cdot, 0)$, it is degenerate, and $i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, 0), 0) = 0$.

First the set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$ will be described for sufficiently small $r > 0$ and then it will be shown that the conclusions hold for every $r \leq 0.3$.

One has

$$A(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 4 + 3\lambda_1^{10} + \lambda_1^7\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2\lambda_2^7 + \lambda_1^5\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^4\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^3\lambda_2^4 - \lambda_2^9 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 + 3\lambda_1^7 & 3\lambda_1^3 + 22\lambda_2^4 \\ 0 & 3\lambda_1^3 + 22\lambda_2^4 & \lambda_1^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Use will be made of Theorems 6.2, 6.4, and Corollary 6.9 (see also Remark 6.10). Theorems 6.1, 6.3, and Corollary 6.8 are not suitable in this case. (It will be shown that the origin is a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions.)

Those of the functions F_j , $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, defined by (5.2), which vanish at $(0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are F_0 , F_2 , and F_3 , hence $X(0) = \{0, 2, 3\}$ (see also Lemmas 5.5, 5.6). One has

$$F_0 = f_0 \cdot a_0, \quad F_2 = f_2 \cdot a_2, \quad F_3 = f_3 \cdot a_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
f_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= 18\lambda_1^9 + 18\lambda_1^2 - 54\lambda_1^6 - 792\lambda_1^3\lambda_2^4 - 2904\lambda_2^8, \\
f_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= 3\lambda_1^{10} + \lambda_1^7\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2\lambda_2^7 + \lambda_1^5\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^4\lambda_2^5 - \lambda_1^3\lambda_2^4 - \lambda_2^9, \\
f_3(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= 18\lambda_1^9 - 81\lambda_1^7 - 54\lambda_1^6 - 792\lambda_1^3\lambda_2^4 - 2904\lambda_2^8, \\
a_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= f_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) + 4, \\
a_2(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= f_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) - 8\lambda_1^2 - 36\lambda_1^7 - 20, \\
a_3(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= a_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) - 9.
\end{aligned}$$

The functions a_0 , a_2 , a_3 have no zeros in $U := (-0.31, 0.31)^2$. Thus F_0 , F_2 , F_3 can be replaced by f_0 , f_2 , f_3 in computations.

It has been checked by symbolic computations that $(0, 0)$ is an isolated singular point of the functions F_0 , F_2 , F_3 , and $F = F_0 \cdot F_2 \cdot F_3$. Thus they are admissible and, according to Remark 7.3, g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are test functions for them. Application of Łecki's program gives

$$\begin{aligned}
i(h(g_1, F_0), 0) &= 2, & i(h(g_1, F_2), 0) &= 3, \\
i(h(g_1, F_3), 0) &= 2, & i(h(g_1, F), 0) &= 7.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

In view of Theorems 6.2, 6.4 and Corollary 6.9 (for $g_+ = g_1$), for every sufficiently small $r > 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Bif}(0) \cap D_r^2 &= \text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^2 = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \\
&= (\text{GlBif}_0(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_2(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_3(0)) \cap D_r^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{GlBif}_0^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 &\equiv \text{GlBif}_0(0) \cap D_r^2 = F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2, \\
\text{GlBif}_2(0) \cap D_r^2 &= (F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cup F_2^{-1}(\{0\})) \cap D_r^2, \\
\text{GlBif}_3(0) \cap D_r^2 &= (F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cup F_3^{-1}(\{0\})) \cap D_r^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{GlBif}_2^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\} &= F_2^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}, \\
\text{GlBif}_3^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\} &= F_3^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

According to Corollary 6.9, the set $\text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ consists of $b(F) = 14$ curves. The numbers of curves forming the sets $\text{GlBif}_0^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $\text{GlBif}_2^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $\text{GlBif}_3^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ are equal to $b(F_0) = 4$, $b(F_2) = 6$, $b(F_3) = 4$, respectively.

In the aim of applying Corollary A.3 to localize the curves in the quarters of the plane it has been checked by using Łecki's program that

$$\begin{aligned}
i(h(g_2, F_0), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_2, F_2), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_2, F_3), 0) &= -2, \\
i(h(g_3, F_0), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_3, F_2), 0) &= 1, & i(h(g_3, F_3), 0) &= 0, \\
i(h(g_4, F_0), 0) &= 0, & i(h(g_4, F_2), 0) &= -2, & i(h(g_4, F_3), 0) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{7.10}$$

Taking into account (7.6), (7.10), and Corollary A.3 one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
b_1(F_0) &= 1, & b_2(F_0) &= 1, & b_3(F_0) &= 1, & b_4(F_0) &= 1, \\
b_1(F_2) &= 1, & b_2(F_2) &= 3, & b_3(F_2) &= 0, & b_4(F_2) &= 2, \\
b_1(F_3) &= 0, & b_2(F_3) &= 2, & b_3(F_3) &= 2, & b_4(F_3) &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The following results of additional symbolic computations and estimates ensure that the above conclusions concerning bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$ hold for every $r \leq 0.3$. One has $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 2, 3\}$, $\lambda \in U := (-0.31, 0.31)^3$. The origin is the only singular




FIGURE 2. The set of those $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, for which $(0, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^2$ is a global bifurcation point of the system from Example 7.5. The legend on the right describes the minimal periods of solutions bifurcating from the points of given curve.

point of F_0, F_2, F_3 , and $F = F_0 \cdot F_2 \cdot F_3$ in U . The sets of zeros of F_0, F_2, F_3 restricted to $D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$, are pairwise disjoint and they have no common points with the coordinate axes. Moreover, the functions F_0, F_2, F_3 , and F satisfy the assumptions of Remark 7.1 for $k = 2$ and $r = 0.3$. Thus for $r = 0.3$ every connected component of $F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$, $F_2^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$, $F_3^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$, and $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2$ contains the origin.

Theorems 6.2 and 6.4 have been also applied to find bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, numerically as zeros of the functions F_j , according to formulae (7.7)-(7.9), which has been performed by using the program *surf* and presented on Figure 2. The earlier conclusions ensure that the number of curves on Figure 2, their localization, and their relative position do not change when passing to a smaller scale.

The above results can be summarized as follows. The set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^2$, $r = 0.3$, is equal to the set of global bifurcation points in this domain and consists of fourteen curves, for which the origin is the only common point. Apart from the origin four curves (one curve in each quarter) consist of branching points of nontrivial stationary solutions (and only such solutions), six curves (one curve in the first quarter, three curves in the second quarter, and two curves in the fourth quarter) consist of branching points of solutions with the minimal period π (and only such solutions), and four curves (two curves in the second quarter and two curves in the third quarter) consist of branching points of solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2}{3}\pi$ (and only such solutions). The origin is a symmetry breaking point, since it is a bifurcation point of stationary solutions, solutions with the minimal periods π , and solutions with the minimal period $\frac{2}{3}\pi$ (as a cluster point of branching points of such solutions). The origin is also a global bifurcation point of stationary solutions, 2-solutions, and 3-solutions. However, it has not been proved that it is a branching point of solutions with the minimal periods π and $\frac{2}{3}\pi$.

Example 7.6. Let the Hamiltonian $H: \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be of the form

$$H(x, \lambda) \equiv H(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) + Q(x_1, \dots, x_6),$$




FIGURE 3. The set of those $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in D_r^3$, $r = 0.3$, for which $(0, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ is a global bifurcation point of the system from Example 7.6. The legend on the right describes the minimal periods of solutions bifurcating from the points of given surface.

where

$$P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \frac{1}{2}(7 - \lambda_1^4)x_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}(1 - \lambda_1^{13})x_3^2 + \frac{7}{2}x_4^2 + 8x_6^2 - \lambda_3^4x_1x_3 + \lambda_2^3x_4x_6 + x_2^4 + x_5^4$$

and $Q \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^6, \mathbb{R})$ is the same as in Example 7.4, i.e. it has a local minimum at the origin and $\nabla^2 Q(0) = 0$, see (7.1) for instance.

H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H3) for $k = 3$ and $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$.

The set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^3$ will be investigated for $r = 0.3$.

One has

$$A(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 7 - \lambda_1^4 & 0 & -\lambda_3^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\lambda_3^4 & 0 & 1 - \lambda_1^{13} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$B(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 0 & \lambda_2^3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda_2^3 & 0 & 16 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Those of the functions F_j , $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, defined by (5.2), which vanish at $(0, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are F_0 , F_4 , and F_7 , hence $X^+ = \{4, 7\}$. One has

$$F_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \equiv 0,$$

$$F_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = -1792\lambda_1^{17} - 512\lambda_3^4\lambda_2^3 + 8448\lambda_1^{13} - 16\lambda_3^8\lambda_2^6 + 1792\lambda_3^8 + 16\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^{17} - 112\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^{13} - 16\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^4 + 112\lambda_2^6,$$

$$F_7(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = -11319\lambda_1^4 - 5488\lambda_1^{17} - 49\lambda_3^8\lambda_2^6 - 4802\lambda_3^4\lambda_2^3 + 5488\lambda_3^8 + 49\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^{17} - 343\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^{13} - 49\lambda_2^6\lambda_1^4 + 343\lambda_2^6.$$

Use will be made of Theorems 6.1, 6.3 (see also Remark 7.8). Theorems 6.2, 6.4 cannot be applied, since $F_0 = 0$, which means that all the points (x_0, λ) , $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^2$, are degenerate.

Analogously as in Example 7.4 it has been checked that conditions (E1(0, λ)), (E2(0, λ)) are satisfied for every $\lambda \in U := (-0.31, 0.31)^3$. Other symbolic computations and estimates show what follows. One has $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{4, 7\}$, $\lambda \in U$. The origin is the only singular point of F_4 , F_7 , and $F = F_4 \cdot F_7$ in U . In particular, the sets of zeros of F_4 , F_7 restricted to $D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$, are disjoint. Furthermore, the functions F_4 , F_7 , and F satisfy the assumptions of Remark 7.1 for $k = 3$ and $r = 0.3$. Thus for $r = 0.3$ every connected component of $F_4^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3$, $F_7^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3$, and $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3$ contains the origin. It has also been checked that F_4 and F_7 do have zeros in $D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$.

By Theorems 6.1, 6.3 the following equalities hold for every $r \leq 0.3$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bif}(0) \cap D_r^3 &= \text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^3 = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3 \\ &= (\text{GlBif}_4^{\text{min}}(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_7^{\text{min}}(0)) \cap D_r^3, \\ \text{GlBif}_4^{\text{min}} \cap D_r^3 &= F_4^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3, \\ \text{GlBif}_7^{\text{min}} \cap D_r^3 &= F_7^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3. \end{aligned} \tag{7.11}$$

The fact that $0 \in \text{GlBif}_4^{\text{min}} \cap D_r^3$ and $0 \in \text{GlBif}_7^{\text{min}} \cap D_r^3$ follows from Lemma 3.4 and Remark 5.7. (The only minimal periods of nontrivial solutions in a neighbourhood of the origin are $\frac{2\pi}{4}$ and $\frac{2\pi}{7}$.)

The results of numerical application of Theorems 6.1 and 6.3, consisting in finding global bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^3$, $r = 0.3$, as zeros of the functions F_j , according to formulae (7.11), have been obtained by using the program *surf* and presented on Figure 3. The earlier conclusions ensure that the number of the cones on Figure 3 does not change when passing to a smaller scale.

Example 7.7. Let $H: \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Hamiltonian defined by

$$H(x, \lambda) \equiv H(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) + Q(x_1, \dots, x_6),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &P(x_1, \dots, x_6, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(16 - 85\lambda_1^9 + 11\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^2 - 6\lambda_1^3\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_2^3\lambda_3^2 + 6\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^4 + 17\lambda_2^4 + \lambda_3^6)x_1^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{5}{2}x_2^2 + x_3^2 + \frac{1}{2}x_4^2 + \frac{1}{2}(5 + \lambda_1^{13} + 8\lambda_2^8)x_5^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}(2\lambda_1^2 + 4\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 + \lambda_2^4)x_6^2 + (\lambda_2^3 - \lambda_3^2)x_5x_6, \end{aligned}$$

and Q is defined by the formula (7.5) from Example 7.5.

H satisfies conditions (H1)-(H3) for $k = 3$ and $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$.

Notice that in this case $x_0 = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^6$ is an isolated critical point of $H(\cdot, 0)$, it is degenerate, and $i(\nabla_x H(\cdot, 0), 0) = 0$.

The set of bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^3$ will be investigated for $r = 0.3$.

Setting

$$h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) := 16 - 85\lambda_1^9 + 11\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^2 - 6\lambda_1^3\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_2^3\lambda_3^2 + 6\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^4 + 17\lambda_2^4 + \lambda_3^6$$

one has

$$A(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \begin{bmatrix} h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix},$$




FIGURE 4. The set of those $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in D_r^3$, $r = 0.3$, for which $(0, (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3)) \in \mathbb{R}^6 \times \mathbb{R}^3$ is a global bifurcation point of the system from Example 7.7. The legend on the right describes the minimal periods of solutions bifurcating from the points of given surface.

$$B(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 5 + \lambda_1^{13} + 8\lambda_2^8 & \lambda_2^3 - \lambda_3^2 \\ 0 & \lambda_2^3 - \lambda_3^2 & 2\lambda_1^2 + 4\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 + \lambda_2^4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Use will be made of Theorems 6.2, 6.4 (see also Remark 7.8). Theorems 6.1, 6.3 are not suitable in this case. (The origin is a bifurcation point of nontrivial stationary solutions.)

Those of the functions F_j , $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, defined by (5.2), which vanish at $(0, 0, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ are F_0 , F_4 , and F_5 , hence $X(0) = \{0, 4, 5\}$. One has

$$F_0 = f_0 \cdot a_0, \quad F_2 = f_2 \cdot a_2, \quad F_3 = f_3 \cdot a_3,$$

where

$$f_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = 20\lambda_1^{15} + 40\lambda_1^{13}\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 + 10\lambda_1^{13}\lambda_2^4 + 100\lambda_1^2 + 200\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 + 50\lambda_4^4 \\ + 160\lambda_2^8\lambda_1^2 + 320\lambda_2^{10}\lambda_3^3 + 80\lambda_2^{12} - 10\lambda_2^6 + 20\lambda_2^3\lambda_3^2 - 10\lambda_4^3,$$

$$f_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = -85\lambda_1^9 + 11\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^2 - 6\lambda_1^3\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_2^3\lambda_3^2 + 6\lambda_1^5\lambda_3^4 + 17\lambda_2^4 + \lambda_3^6,$$

$$f_5(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = 20\lambda_1^{15} + 40\lambda_1^{13}\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 + 10\lambda_1^{13}\lambda_2^4 - 125\lambda_1^{13} + 160\lambda_2^8\lambda_1^2 \\ + 320\lambda_2^{10}\lambda_3^3 + 80\lambda_2^{12} - 1000\lambda_2^8 - 10\lambda_2^6 + 20\lambda_2^3\lambda_3^2 - 10\lambda_4^3,$$

$$a_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = f_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) + 16,$$

$$a_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = f_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) - 64\lambda_1^2 - 80\lambda_1^{13} - 128\lambda_3^3\lambda_2^2 \\ - 32\lambda_2^4 - 640\lambda_2^8 - 144,$$

$$a_5(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) = f_4(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) - 9.$$

The functions a_0 , a_4 , a_5 have no zeros in $U := (-0.31, 0.31)^3$. Thus F_0 , F_4 , F_5 can be replaced by f_0 , f_4 , f_5 in computations.

Symbolic computations and estimates show what follows. One has $F_j(\lambda) \neq 0$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 4, 5\}$, $\lambda \in U := (-0.31, 0.31)^3$. The origin is the only singular point of F_0 , F_4 ,

F_5 , and $F = F_0 \cdot F_4 \cdot F_5$ in U . In particular, the sets of zeros of F_0, F_4, F_5 restricted to $D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$, are pairwise disjoint. Moreover, the functions F_0, F_4, F_5 , and F satisfy the assumptions of Remark 7.1 for $k = 3$ and $r = 0.3$. Thus for $r = 0.3$ every connected component of $F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3, F_4^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3, F_5^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3$, and $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3$ contains the origin. It has also been checked that F_0, F_4 , and F_5 do have zeros in $D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}$, $r = 0.3$.

By Theorems 6.2, 6.4 the following equalities hold for every $r \leq 0.3$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Bif}(0) \cap D_r^3 &= \text{GlBif}(0) \cap D_r^3 = F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3 \\ &= (\text{GlBif}_0(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_4(0) \cup \text{GlBif}_5(0)) \cap D_r^3, \end{aligned} \quad (7.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GlBif}_0^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^3 &\equiv \text{GlBif}_0(0) \cap D_r^3 = F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3, \\ \text{GlBif}_4(0) \cap D_r^3 &= (F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cup F_4^{-1}(\{0\})) \cap D_r^3, \\ \text{GlBif}_5(0) \cap D_r^3 &= (F_0^{-1}(\{0\}) \cup F_5^{-1}(\{0\})) \cap D_r^3, \end{aligned} \quad (7.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GlBif}_4^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^3 \setminus \{0\} &= F_4^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}, \\ \text{GlBif}_5^{\min}(0) \cap D_r^3 \setminus \{0\} &= F_5^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^3 \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.14)$$

The results of numerical application of Theorems 6.2 and 6.4, consisting in finding global bifurcation points in $\{0\} \times D_r^3$, $r = 0.3$, as zeros of the functions F_j , according to formulae (7.12)-(7.14), have been obtained by using the program *surf* and presented on Figure 4. The earlier conclusions ensure that the number of the cones on Figure 4 does not change when passing to a smaller scale.

Remark 7.8. Corollaries 6.11, 6.12, and results from [35, 23] can be used in Examples 7.6 and 7.7 to verify the number of the cones forming the set of bifurcation points and to confirm that the origin is a symmetry breaking point.

Examples analogous to Examples 7.4, 7.5 can be constructed for any number of degrees of freedom, whereas examples similar to Examples 7.6, 7.7 can be given for any number of parameters and any number of degrees of freedom.

APPENDIX A. DESCRIPTION OF SEMIANALYTIC SETS

In this appendix the relevant results from [34], in the case they have been used in Sections 6, 7, are summarized for the convenience of the reader.

In what follows use is made of Definition 6.6 of admissible function and Definition 6.7 of test function.

As well known, if $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an admissible mapping then for sufficiently small $r > 0$ the set $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ is either empty or it is a union of finitely many disjoint analytic curves, each of which meets the origin and crosses S_r^1 transversally in one point.

If $g: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a test function for an admissible mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then for sufficiently small $r > 0$ the function g has a constant sign on every connected component of the set $F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}$ (i.e. on each of the analytic curves forming this set).

The following notation is used.

$$\begin{aligned} b(F) &= \text{the number of components of the set } F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\}, \\ b_+(g, F) &= \text{the number of components of } F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\} \text{ on which } g \text{ is positive,} \\ b_-(g, F) &= \text{the number of components of } F^{-1}(\{0\}) \cap D_r^2 \setminus \{0\} \text{ on which } g \text{ is negative.} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $b_+(g, F) + b_-(g, F) = b(F)$.

Let $\text{Jac}(g, F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the Jacobian of the mapping $(g, F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, and let the mapping $h(g, F): \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be defined by

$$h(g, F) = (\text{Jac}(g, F), F).$$

In the following theorem $i(h(g, F), 0)$ denotes the topological index of $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with respect to $h(g, F)$ (see Section 2.2).

Theorem A.1 ([34]). *If $g: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a test function for an admissible mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is isolated in $h(g, F)^{-1}(\{0\})$ and*

$$b_+(g, F) - b_-(g, F) = 2 \cdot i(h(g, F), 0). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Corollary A.2 ([34]). *If $g_+: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative test function for an admissible mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ then $0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is isolated in $h(g_+, F)^{-1}(\{0\})$ and*

$$b(F) = b_+(g_+, F) = 2 \cdot i(h(g_+, F), 0). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Let $b_i(F)$, g_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$, be such as in Remark 7.3.

Corollary A.3 ([20]). *If an admissible mapping $F: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has no zeros on the coordinate axes in a neighbourhood of the origin then*

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(F) + b_2(F) + b_3(F) + b_4(F) &= 2 \cdot i(h(g_1, F), 0), \\ b_1(F) - b_2(F) - b_3(F) + b_4(F) &= 2 \cdot i(h(g_2, F), 0), \\ b_1(F) + b_2(F) - b_3(F) - b_4(F) &= 2 \cdot i(h(g_3, F), 0), \\ b_1(F) - b_2(F) + b_3(F) - b_4(F) &= 2 \cdot i(h(g_4, F), 0). \end{aligned}$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper is based on a part of the author's PhD thesis [31]. The author wishes to express his gratitude to his thesis advisor, Professor Sławomir Rybicki, for his remarks.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Abbondandolo, *Morse theory for Hamiltonian systems*, Chapman & Hall/CRC Research Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 425, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton (FL)-London-New York-Washington, D.C., 2001.
- [2] H. Amann, *A note on degree theory for gradient mappings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **85** (4) (1982), 591-595.
- [3] H. Amann, E. Zehnder, *Nontrivial solutions for a class of nonresonance problems and applications to nonlinear differential equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci., Sér. 4 **7** (4) (1980), 539-603.
- [4] H. Amann, E. Zehnder, *Periodic solutions of asymptotically linear Hamiltonian systems*, Manuscripta Math. **32** (1980), 149-189.
- [5] M. S. Berger, *Bifurcation theory and the type numbers of Marston Morse*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **69** (7) (1972), 1737-1738.
- [6] M. S. Berger, *Nonlinearity and Functional Analysis. Lectures on Nonlinear Problems in Mathematical Analysis*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Academic Press, New York-San Francisco-London, 1977.
- [7] E. N. Dancer, *On non-radially symmetric bifurcation*, J. London Math. Soc., Ser. 2 **20** (1979), 287-292.
- [8] E. N. Dancer, *A new degree for S^1 -invariant gradient mappings and applications*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **2** (5) (1985), 329-370.
- [9] E. N. Dancer, S. Rybicki, *A note on periodic solutions of autonomous Hamiltonian systems emanating from degenerate stationary solutions*, Differential and Integral Equations **12** (2) (1999), 147-160.
- [10] K. Deimling, *Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, 1985.
- [11] G. Dylawerski, K. Gęba, J. Jodel, W. Marzantowicz, *An S^1 -equivariant degree and the Fuller index*, Ann. Polon. Math. **52** (1991), 243-280.
- [12] D. Eisenbud, H. I. Levine *An algebraic formula for the degree of a C^∞ map germ*, with an appendix *Sur une inégalité à la Minkowski pour les multiplicités* by B. Teissier, Ann. of Math. **106** (1) (1977), 19-44.
- [13] S. Endrass *et al.*, *surf 1.0.4*, a computer program for visualization of real algebraic geometry, Johannes Gutenberg Universität, Mainz, Germany, 2000-2003, <http://surf.sourceforge.net>.
- [14] E.R. Fadell, P.H. Rabinowitz, *Generalized cohomological index theories for Lie group actions with an application to bifurcation questions for Hamiltonian systems*, Invent. Math. **45** (2) (1978), 139-174.

- [15] K. Gęba, W. Krawcewicz, J. Wu, *An equivariant degree with applications to symmetric bifurcation problems. Part 1: Construction of the degree*, Proc. London Math. Soc., Ser. 3 **69** (2) (1994), 377–398.
- [16] K. Gęba, W. Marzantowicz, *Global bifurcation of periodic solutions*, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. **1** (1) (1993), 67–93.
- [17] E. Hopf, *Abzweigung einer periodischen Lösung von einer stationären Lösung eines Differentialsystems*, Ber. Verh. Sächs. Akad. Wiss. Leipzig, Math.-Naturw. Kl., **95** (1) (1943), 3–22.
- [18] J. Ize, I. Massabò, A. Vignoli, *Degree theory for equivariant maps. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **315** (2) (1989), 433–510.
- [19] J. Ize, I. Massabò, A. Vignoli, *Degree theory for equivariant maps, the general S^1 -action*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **100** (481) (1992).
- [20] M. Izydorek, S. Rybicki, *On the structure of the set of bifurcation points for ordinary differential equations*, J. Differential Equations **107** (2) (1994), 418–427.
- [21] M.A. Krasnosel'skii, *Topological Methods in the Theory of Nonlinear Integral Equations* (Russian), Gosudarst. v. Izdat. Tehn.-Teor. Lit., Moscow, 1956. [English translation: Pergamon Press, Oxford-London-New York-Paris, 1964.]
- [22] A. M. Lyapunov, *Problème général de la stabilité du mouvement*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Sci. Math. Sci. Phys., Sér. 2 **9** (1907), 203–474. [English translation: Internat. J. Control **55** (3) (1992), 521–790.]
- [23] A. Łęcki, Z. Szafraniec, *Applications of the Eisenbud & Levine's theorem to real algebraic geometry*, in *Computational Algebraic Geometry*, Progr. in Math. 109, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, 1993, 177–184.
- [24] A. Maciejewski, W. Radzki, S. Rybicki, *Periodic trajectories near degenerate equilibria in the Hénon-Heiles and Yang-Mills Hamiltonian systems*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations **17** (3) (2005), 475–488.
- [25] J. Mawhin, M. Willem, *Critical point theory and Hamiltonian systems*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, Vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1989.
- [26] J. Moser, *Periodic orbits near an equilibrium and a theorem by Alan Weinstein*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **29** (6) (1976), 727–747.
- [27] P.H. Rabinowitz, *Some global results for nonlinear eigenvalue problems*, J. Functional Analysis **7** (1971), 487–513.
- [28] P.H. Rabinowitz, *Minimax Methods in Critical Point Theory with Applications to Differential Equations*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, Vol. 65, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, 1986.
- [29] W. Radzki, *Degenerate branching points of autonomous Hamiltonian systems*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **55** (1–2) (2003), 153–166.
- [30] W. Radzki, S. Rybicki, *Degenerate bifurcation points of periodic solutions of autonomous Hamiltonian systems*, J. Differential Equations **202** (2) (2004), 284–305.
- [31] W. Radzki, *Branching points of periodic solutions of autonomous Hamiltonian systems* (Polish), PhD thesis, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Toruń, 2005.
- [32] S. Rybicki, *Applications of Morse theory to bifurcation theory*, Differential and Integral Equations **6** (5) (1993), 1125–1135.
- [33] S. Rybicki, *A degree for S^1 -equivariant orthogonal maps and its applications to bifurcation theory*, Nonlinear Anal. TMA **23** (1) (1994), 83–102.
- [34] Z. Szafraniec, *On the number of branches of an 1-dimensional semianalytic set*, Kodai Math. J. **11** (1) (1988), 78–85.
- [35] Z. Szafraniec, *On the number of singular points of a real projective hypersurface*, Math. Ann. **291** (1991), 487–496.
- [36] A. Szulkin, *Bifurcation for strongly indefinite functionals and a Liapunov type theorem for Hamiltonian systems*, Differential and Integral Equations **7** (1) (1994), 217–234.
- [37] A. Weinstein, *Normal modes for nonlinear Hamiltonian systems*, Invent. Math. **20** (1973) 47–57.
- [38] D. Zhu, *The Fadell-Rabinowitz reduction method and bifurcation of periodic solutions to a system of symmetric Hamiltonian equations* (Chinese), Chinese Ann. Math., Ser. A **14** (3) (1993), 371–380.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, UL. CHOPINA 12/18, 87-100 TORUŃ, POLAND

E-mail address: wiktorradzki@yahoo.com