

MULTISTATIONARITY IN THE SPACE OF TOTAL CONCENTRATIONS FOR SYSTEMS THAT ADMIT A MONOMIAL PARAMETRIZATION

CARSTEN CONRADI, ALEXANDRU IOSIF, AND THOMAS KAHLE

ABSTRACT. We apply tools from real algebraic geometry to the problem of multistationarity of chemical reaction networks. A particular focus is on the case of reaction networks whose steady states admit a monomial parametrization. For such systems we show that in the space of total concentrations multistationarity is scale invariant: if there is multistationarity for some value of the total concentrations, then there is multistationarity on the entire ray containing this value (possibly for different rate constants) – and vice versa. Moreover, for these networks it is possible to decide about multistationarity independent of the rate constants by formulating semi-algebraic conditions that involve only concentration variables. These conditions can easily be extended to include total concentrations. Hence quantifier elimination may give new insights into multistationarity regions in the space of total concentrations. To demonstrate this, we show that for the distributive phosphorylation of a protein at two binding sites multistationarity is only possible if the total concentration of the substrate is larger than either the total concentration of the kinase or the total concentration of the phosphatase. This result is enabled by the chamber decomposition of the space of total concentrations from polyhedral geometry. Together with the corresponding sufficiency result of Bihan et al. this yields a characterization of multistationarity up to lower dimensional regions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of many biochemical processes can be described by systems of ordinary differential equations (ODEs). Already the steady states of such ODEs contain important information, for example, about the long term behavior of a process. In particular, in modeling signal transduction and cell cycle control, one is often interested in the existence of multiple steady states, multistationarity for short [10, 11].

As measurement data is often noisy and realistic models tend to be large, parameter values often come with large uncertainties or are not known at all. Hence, given an ODE system, one asks whether or not there exist parameter values such that the system admits multistationarity. This is a mathematically challenging problem, even in the simplest case when all kinetics are of mass-action form and the ODEs have polynomial right hand sides.

Date: August 14, 2019.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 13P15, 37N25; Secondary: 92C42, 13P25, 13P10.

Key words and phrases. Polynomial systems in biology, chemical reaction networks, steady states, multistationarity.

In this case one has to identify those parameter values for which a parametrized family of polynomials admits at least two positive real solutions.

A variety of necessary conditions for multistationarity in mass-action networks are known in the literature, for example graph-based conditions (e.g. [1, 2, 51] and the references therein), conditions based on the determinant of the Jacobian (e.g. [32, 57] and the references therein) or conditions based on network concordance (e.g. [52, 53]).

Conditions that are both necessary and sufficient can usually only be found if the network satisfies additional conditions, for example encoded in the network deficiency [26–28, 30, 31], in the stoichiometric matrix [11], the steady state ideal [43] and [44, Section 3.1] or the Brouwer degree of the polynomial map defining the steady state ideal [10, 23]. The last two references are similar in spirit to the results presented here: while we require a monomial parametrization of the positive steady states, their results require a rational parametrization. Moreover, our results are derived independent of the Brouwer degree.

Some of the aforementioned results allow to determine rate constants where multistationarity occurs. It is, however, currently not possible to directly infer total concentrations (a different but equally important set of parameters) based on these results. The notable exception is [5], where results similar to the ones obtained in Section 4 are presented: if the total concentrations satisfy a linear inequality, then there exist rate constants such that multistationarity is possible. The linear inequalities, however, are not arbitrarily imposed by the authors of [5] but arise from the system itself. It is therefore currently not possible to decide whether or not multistationarity is possible for arbitrary polynomial inequalities in the total concentrations.

As the total concentrations are experimentally more accessible than the rate constants, conditions directly incorporating total concentrations are desirable. Here we initiate the study of such conditions with a focus on systems whose positive steady states admit a monomial parametrization (Definition 3.1). These systems are closely related to systems with toric steady states described in [43], that is, to systems whose steady state ideal is binomial (i.e. the ideal is generated by polynomials with at most two terms). One way to establish this property is to find a Gröbner basis that is binomial. The results in [49] allow for the efficient computation of such Gröbner bases for the enzymatic systems frequently used in modeling intracellular signaling and control. Multistationarity conditions are described in [50]. The systems discussed in [49, 50] belong to the larger class of MESSI systems [46]. However, while the former systems always admit a monomial parametrization this need not be the case for the latter.

For systems that admit a monomial parametrization we show that in the space of total concentrations multistationarity is scale invariant: from Theorems 3.18 and 3.19 it follows that if there is multistationarity for some vector c of the total concentrations (and for some vector of rate constants k), then, for any $\alpha > 0$ there is multistationarity for αc , albeit for a different k . And vice versa: if for some c there is no k such that multistationarity is possible, then there is no k such that multistationarity is possible for αc , $\alpha > 0$.

In Theorem 3.15 and Corollary 3.16 we formulate semi-algebraic conditions for multistationarity that use only variables representing concentrations. Such conditions can be extended to incorporate constraints on the total concentrations. Hence, for such systems it is possible to decide about multistationarity without knowing the rate constants.

There are many biologically meaningful networks that admit a monomial parametrization, see for example the networks discussed in [16]. We apply our results to one of those, the well-known sequential distributive phosphorylation of a protein at two binding sites [12] (see [37] for proteins with an arbitrary number of phosphorylation sites). These networks are arguably among the best studied systems when it comes to multistationarity: in [42] multistationarity has been shown numerically, in [15] via sign patterns. This analysis also allows to study the effect of parameter variations on multistationarity [12]. In [13] conditions on a subset of the rate constants called catalytic constants have been derived: if the catalytic constants satisfy this condition, then multistationarity is possible for some values of the total concentrations. Here we describe a similar result for the total concentrations: applying Corollary 3.16 we show in Theorem 4.12 and Corollary 4.13 that multistationarity is possible only if the total concentration of the substrate is at least as large as either the total concentration of the kinase or the total concentration of the phosphatase. A result of [5] shows the converse up to lower dimensional regions: multistationarity occurs if the substrate concentration is strictly larger than the total concentration of kinase or the total concentration of phosphatase. Corollary 4.13 summarizes the situation. The description is complete up to lower dimensional boundary cases. In particular, multistationarity occurs in the Michaelis–Menten regime, where the total concentration of the substrate exceeds those of both enzymes by orders of magnitude.

To arrive at this condition we make use of the chamber decomposition of the cone of total concentrations: in Theorem 4.3 we show that, independent of the number of phosphorylation sites, this cone consists of five full-dimensional sub-cones called chambers. These chambers are determined by subsets of linearly independent columns of a matrix defining the conservation relations. In Theorem 4.7 we show that for two sites, multistationarity is only possible in four of these chambers.

The paper is organized as follows: we close this section with an introduction of some basic mathematical notation used throughout this paper. In Section 2 we introduce the ODEs that arise from chemical reaction networks with mass-action kinetics and formally define multistationarity. We also comment on the relationship between steady states and rate constants. In Section 3 we formally define systems that admit a monomial parametrization and discuss the consequences concerning steady states and multistationarity. In Section 4 we apply the results of Section 3 to a reaction network describing the distributive phosphorylation of a protein at two binding sites. And in Section 5 we comment on conditions for the existence of monomial parametrizations. The paper closes with a brief discussion of the main findings in Section 6.

1.1. Notation. For any $m \times n$ matrix A , we write $\text{im}(A) = \{Ax | x \in \mathbb{R}^n\}$ for the right image and $\text{rowspan}(A) = \{yA | y \in \mathbb{R}^m\}$ for the rowspan (left image). If A and B are

two matrices of the same dimensions, then $A \star B$ denotes their Hadamard product, that is $(A \star B)_{ij} = A_{ij}B_{ij}$. If x is a vector of length m and A is an $m \times n$ matrix, then we write x^A for the n -vector with entries

$$(x^A)_j = \prod_{i=1}^m x_i^{A_{ij}}, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Slightly deviating from the matrix-vector product notation, this operation is possible independent of whether x is a row or column vector and should always return the same type of vector. We also apply scalar functions to vectors which always means coordinate-wise application. Using this, for example, one can check that

$$\ln x^A = (\ln x)A \quad \text{if } x \text{ is a row vector,}$$

and

$$\ln x^A = A^T(\ln x) \quad \text{if } x \text{ is a column vector.}$$

A vector which has 1 in every entry is denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. If $I \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is an ideal of n -variate polynomials with coefficients in a field k , then the variety $\mathbb{V}(I) \subseteq k^n$ is the set of all points where all elements of I simultaneously vanish. See [18, Chapter 4] for basics on computational algebraic geometry.


2. CHEMICAL REACTION NETWORKS

A *chemical reaction network* is a finite directed graph whose vertices are labeled by *chemical complexes* and whose edges are labeled by positive parameters called the *rate constants* (cf. (\mathcal{N}_1) of Example 2.1). The digraph is denoted by $\mathcal{N} = ([m], E)$, with vertex set $[m]$ and edge set E . Each chemical complex $i \in [m]$ has the form $\sum_{j=1}^n (y_i)_j X_j$ for some $y_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, where X_1, \dots, X_n are *chemical species*. The vectors y_i are the *complex-species incidence vectors* and they are gathered as the columns of the *complex-species incidence matrix* $Y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Throughout this article the integers n , m , and r denote the number of species, complexes, and reactions, respectively. Each finite directed graph has an incidence matrix \mathcal{I} with $\mathcal{I}_{jl} = -\mathcal{I}_{il} = 1$ whenever the l^{th} edge points from the i^{th} vertex to the j^{th} vertex and 0 otherwise. A complex which is the source of a reaction is an *educt complex* and a complex which is the sink of a reaction is a *product complex*. Each complex can be an educt and product for several reactions. For each reaction network one has a matrix \mathcal{Y} whose columns are the complex-species incidence vectors corresponding to the educt complexes for each reaction:

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{Y} = (\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_r), \text{ where } \tilde{y}_i = y_k \text{ when reaction } i \text{ has educt complex } k.$$

We exemplify the above notation in Example 2.1 below. The system serves as a running example in Sections 2 and 3 to illustrate our definitions and results.

Example 2.1. The following reaction network is the *1-site phosphorylation network*:



The chemical species are $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5,$ and X_6 and the chemical complexes are $X_1 + X_2, X_3, X_1 + X_4, X_4 + X_5, X_6,$ and $X_2 + X_5$. The species X_1 is a catalyst for the phosphorylation of X_2 which goes through an intermediate state X_3 before becoming the phosphorylated X_4 . Similarly X_5 catalyzes the dephosphorylation. The network has 6 reactions, each one labeled by a rate constant k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4, k_5 or k_6 . The matrix \mathcal{Y} of this network is

$$\mathcal{Y} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.1. Dynamical systems defined by mass-action networks. Every chemical reaction network defines a dynamical system of the form

$$(2.2) \quad \dot{x} = S\nu(k, x),$$

where $S = Y\mathcal{I}$ is the *stoichiometric matrix* and $\nu(k, x)$ is the *vector of reaction rates*. It depends on the vector of concentrations x and the vector of rate constants k .

In this paper we are concerned with *mass-action networks* for which the kinetics is of *mass-action form*, i.e. the rate of each reaction is proportional to the product of the concentrations of its educt complex. Thus, for mass-action networks,

$$\nu(k, x) = k \star \phi(x),$$

where $\phi(x) = (x^{\tilde{y}_1}, \dots, x^{\tilde{y}_r})^T = (x^{\mathcal{Y}})$, and $k = (k_1, \dots, k_r)^T$ is a vector of parameters.

Example 2.2. The stoichiometric matrix and the monomial vector $\phi(x)$ of \mathcal{N}_1 are

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_3 \\ x_4x_5 \\ x_6 \\ x_6 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The reaction rates are then

$$\nu_1 = k_1x_1x_2, \nu_2 = k_2x_3, \nu_3 = k_3x_3, \nu_4 = k_4x_4x_5, \nu_5 = k_5x_6, \text{ and } \nu_6 = k_6x_6.$$

Consequently, the dynamics of \mathcal{N}_1 is given by the following system of ODEs:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_1 &= -k_1x_1x_2 + (k_2 + k_3)x_3, & \dot{x}_4 &= k_3x_3 - k_4x_4x_5 + k_5x_6, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -k_1x_1x_2 + k_2x_3 + k_6x_6, & \dot{x}_5 &= -k_4x_4x_5 + (k_5 + k_6)x_6, \\ \dot{x}_3 &= k_1x_1x_2 - (k_2 + k_3)x_3, & \dot{x}_6 &= k_4x_4x_5 - (k_5 + k_6)x_6. \end{aligned}$$

2.2. Conservation relations and total concentrations. For many reaction networks there are linear dependencies among $\dot{x}_1, \dots, \dot{x}_n$: they are relations of the form $z\dot{x} = 0$, where z is an element of the left kernel of S . If $z\dot{x} = 0$ for $z^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ then, by integrating with respect to time, zx is constant along trajectories. These constants zx are the *total concentrations* or *conserved moieties*. As, by (2.2), every $z^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $zS = 0$ yields $z\dot{x} = 0$, the left kernel of the stoichiometric matrix is called the *conservation space* $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$. A matrix Z whose rows are a basis of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ is a *conservation matrix*. In general, every conservation matrix defines total concentrations via

$$(2.3) \quad c = Zx.$$

As in our setting the elements of x represent chemical species, we are usually only interested in those elements c of (2.3) associated to $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. We use the following notation to refer to these

$$(2.4) \quad \text{im}_+(Z) = \{c \in \mathbb{R}^{n-s} \mid \exists x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \text{ such that } c = Zx\}.$$

Let $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ with corresponding $c = Zx(0)$. If $x(0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ is the initial condition of the trajectory $\{x(t) \mid t > 0\}$, then, under mass-action kinetics, the above discussion implies that $x(t)$ is constrained to the following polyhedron associated with c :

$$(2.5) \quad \mathcal{P}_c = \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid Zx = c\}.$$

The set \mathcal{P}_c is known as the *invariant polyhedron* with respect to $x(0)$ [19], or the *stoichiometric compatibility class* of $x(0)$ [30, 31].

Remark 2.3. For a given $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n-s}$ one has $\mathcal{P}_c \neq \emptyset$ if and only $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$.

Example 2.4. The conservation space $\mathcal{L}_{\text{cons}}$ of \mathcal{N}_1 is spanned by the rows of the matrix

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1. \end{bmatrix}$$

Consequently, \mathcal{N}_1 has three linearly independent conservation relations and three total concentrations c_1 , c_2 and c_3 :

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 + x_3 &= c_1, \\ x_5 + x_6 &= c_2, \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_6 &= c_3. \end{aligned}$$

The values c_1 , c_2 and c_3 can be interpreted as total amount of kinase, phosphatase and substrate, respectively. Further examples can be found in [14, 54].

2.3. **Steady states.** If k and x are such that

$$(2.6) \quad S\nu(k, x) = 0,$$

then x is a *steady state*. In the mass-action networks setting, as $\nu(k, x)$ is a vector of monomials, equations (2.6) are algebraic; hence tools from algebraic geometry are useful in the study of steady states. As x is a vector of concentrations of chemical species, only nonnegative x are chemically meaningful. Consequently, when talking about steady states, we mean nonnegative real solutions of equations (2.6). A steady state is *positive* if all its coordinates are positive real numbers. It is a *boundary steady state* if all coordinates are nonnegative but it is not positive. The *steady state ideal* I is the polynomial ideal generated by the entries of $S\nu(x, k)$. This ideal can be considered in different polynomial rings. The parameters k can be part of the indeterminates, i.e. $I \subset \mathbb{R}[x, k]$, or appear as the variables in rational functions that serve as coefficients. In the second case $I \subset \mathbb{R}(k)[x]$. In both cases the *steady state variety* is the zero locus of the steady state ideal.

Example 2.5. The equations $\dot{x}_i = 0$ define the steady state ideal of \mathcal{N}_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \langle -k_1x_1x_2 + (k_2 + k_3)x_3, -k_1x_1x_2 + k_2x_3 + k_6x_6, k_1x_1x_2 - (k_2 + k_3)x_3, \\ &\quad k_3x_3 - k_4x_4x_5 + k_5x_6, -k_4x_4x_5 + (k_5 + k_6)x_6, k_4x_4x_5 - (k_5 + k_6)x_6 \rangle \\ &= \langle k_1x_1x_2 - (k_2 + k_3)x_3, k_3x_3 - k_6x_6, k_4x_4x_5 - (k_5 + k_6)x_6 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality results from elementary simplification and omitting redundant generators. While such simplifications are useful to understand the geometry of steady states, the resulting polynomials need not have a biochemical interpretation anymore.

When modeling chemical reaction systems, one is often interested in questions of the form ‘Does there exist a k , such that ...?’. The following definition aims to capture such questions by including both x and k as coordinates. Following [22], we use the word *variety*, although strictly speaking it is the positive real part of a variety.

Definition 2.6. The *positive steady state variety* of a reaction network \mathcal{N} with mass-action kinetics is

$$V^+ = \{(k, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \mid S\nu(k, x) = 0\}.$$

Remark 2.7. It would be very interesting to systematically understand the ideal $\mathbb{I}(V^+)$ of polynomials that vanish on V^+ . This ideal is typically much larger than the steady state ideal. First, the steady state ideal need not contain all functions that vanish on its real variety (i.e. it need not be a real-radical ideal). Real-radicals can be computed [4, 45]. The second and more severe problem is that there is no simple method to determine $\mathbb{I}(V^+)$, the ideal of all polynomials that vanish on the strictly positive part. If the steady state equations are binomial equations in the x variables (that is if the steady state ideal is binomial in $\mathbb{R}(k)[x]$), then a remedy of sorts is offered at the end of Section 5.

Often it is possible to obtain a parametrization of V^+ as shown in Example 2.8 below. Such parametrizations simplify the study of multistationarity (which we formally define after Example 2.8) and are the topic of Section 3.

Example 2.8. According to Example 2.5, the steady state ideal of \mathcal{N}_1 is generated by 3 polynomials. Since we are only interested in positive x_i , the equations that describe V^+ can be rearranged as

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{x_3}{x_6} = \frac{k_6}{k_3}, \quad \frac{x_1x_2}{x_3} = \frac{k_2 + k_3}{k_1}, \quad \frac{x_4x_5}{x_6} = \frac{k_5 + k_6}{k_4}.$$

These equations can be solved as

$$(2.8) \quad x_3 = \frac{k_1}{k_2 + k_3} x_1x_2, \quad x_4 = \frac{k_1k_3(k_5 + k_6)}{(k_2 + k_3)k_4k_6} \frac{x_1x_2}{x_5}, \quad x_6 = \frac{k_1k_3}{(k_2 + k_3)k_6} x_1x_2.$$

This shows that the positive steady state variety of \mathcal{N}_1 can be parametrized by x_1, x_2 , and x_5 together with k_1, \dots, k_6 . This parametrization uses only products (and divisions) of the x_i , but no sums. This *monomial parametrization* is crucial for the developments of Section 3.

The following is the central property studied in this paper.

Definition 2.9. A network \mathcal{N} admits *multistationarity* if there are $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $(k, a) \in V^+$, $(k, b) \in V^+$, and $a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c$ for $c = Za = Zb$.

Multistationarity requires the existence of a vector of rate constants k and an affine subspace $x_0 + \text{im}(S)$ that intersects the variety $\{x \mid S\nu(k, x) = 0\}$ in at least two distinct positive points. Often it is useful to have a dual view of this variety: globally, as a variety in $\mathbb{R}^r \times \mathbb{R}^n$, or as a family of varieties in \mathbb{R}^n , parametrized over k . The theory of multistationarity is mathematically interesting because the existential quantifier “ $\exists k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ ” can often be eliminated and equivalently expressed without quantifiers. Theorems 3.15 and 3.18 are instances of this phenomenon.

2.4. Steady states and rate constants. We revisit the equation (2.6) and observe that $S\nu(k, x) = 0$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq x}^n$, if and only if $\nu(k, x) \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ (as $\nu(k, x)$ is nonnegative for $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq x}^n$). As discussed in – among many other references – [11], $\ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ is a pointed polyhedral cone. As such it is generated by finitely many generators that are unique up to scalar multiplication. Let E_1, \dots, E_d denote the generators and let $E = [E_1, \dots, E_d]$ be the *cone generator matrix*. In particular, every generator E_i is nonnegative and every element of the cone can be represented by a nonnegative linear combination of the generators [48]:

$$\nu(k, x) \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r \Leftrightarrow \nu(k, x) = E\lambda, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d.$$

And $(k, x) \in V^+$, if and only if $\nu(k, x)$ is in the (relative) interior of $\ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$, that is if and only if $\nu(k, x) \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$. As suggested in [11], the cone $\ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^r$ can be parametrized with the help of the following set that we call *coefficient cone*:

$$(2.9) \quad \Lambda(E) = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d \mid E\lambda > 0\}.$$

See [11, Remark 4] for more on $\Lambda(E)$. For future use we observe:

Remark 2.10. $\Lambda(E) = \emptyset$ if and only if E contains a zero row.

Example 2.11. The network \mathcal{N}_1 has the following cone generator matrix and coefficient cone:

$$E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \Lambda(E) = \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3.$$

The first connected component of network \mathcal{N}_1 , can be considered as a reaction network in its own right with $x = (x_1, \dots, x_4)$ the concentrations of X_1, \dots, X_4 . This network has the following stoichiometric matrix, cone generator matrix and vector of reaction rates:

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, E = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \nu(k, x) = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 x_2 x_2 \\ k_2 x_3 \\ k_3 x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

In this case the coefficient cone $\Lambda(E)$ is the empty set (there is no nonnegative real number λ such that $E\lambda > 0$). Moreover, (k, x) is a steady state, if and only if $\nu(k, x) = E\lambda$. From the structure of E it follows that $x_3 = 0$ for every steady state. Hence there are no positive steady states and $V^+ = \emptyset$ in this case.

The following lemma formalizes the observation of the above example.

Lemma 2.12. $V^+ \neq \emptyset$ if and only if E does not have a zero row.

Proof. Suppose $V^+ \neq \emptyset$, i.e. there exist $(k, x) \in V^+$, i.e. $\nu(k, x) = k \star \phi(x) \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$, i.e. $k \star \phi(x) = E\lambda$, for some $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$, and thus $\Lambda(E) \neq \emptyset$. Then, by Remark 2.10, E does not have a zero row. Vice versa, suppose E does not have a zero row. Then $\Lambda(E) \neq \emptyset$, again by Remark 2.10. Pick any $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and define $k = \phi(x^{-1}) \star E\lambda$. Then $k \star \phi(x) = E\lambda$ and $(k, x) \in V^+$, i.e. $V^+ \neq \emptyset$. \square

The cone generator matrix and the coefficient cone contain important information about V^+ :

Theorem 2.13. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$. If E does not have any zero row, then

$$(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow \exists \lambda \in \Lambda(E) \text{ such that } k = \phi(x^{-1}) \star E\lambda.$$

Proof. By Definition 2.6, $(k, x) \in V^+$ if and only if $S(k \star \phi(x)) = 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$. \Rightarrow) Every element of $\ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ is of the form $E\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$. Then, if $S(k \star \phi(x)) = 0$, there is a $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ such that $k \star \phi(x) = E\lambda$. Hence $k = \phi(x^{-1}) \star E\lambda$. \Leftarrow) If $k = \phi(x^{-1}) \star E\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$, then $k \star \phi(x) = E\lambda$. As $\forall \lambda \in \Lambda(E)$, $E\lambda \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$, $S(k \star \phi(x)) = 0$. Hence $(k, x) \in V^+$. \square

Corollary 2.14. If E does not have any zero row then, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, there is a $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ such that $(k, x) \in V^+$.

Proof. Suppose E does not have a zero row. Then $V^+ \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 2.12. Pick any $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ and define $k = \phi(x^{-1}) \star E\lambda$. Then $k \star \phi(x) = E\lambda$ which is equivalent to $\nu(k, x) \in \ker(S) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$. Hence $(k, x) \in V^+$. \square

Remark 2.15. Theorem 2.13 shows in particular that under the (very mild) assumption that E does not have any zero row, for every positive x , one can find positive k such that $(k, x) \in V^+$. If E does have zero rows, then there are no positive steady states and V^+ is empty. Hence from here on we only consider reaction networks \mathcal{N} where the cone generator matrix E does not have any zero row.

3. MONOMIAL PARAMETRIZATIONS OF POSITIVE STEADY STATES

In this section we consider a mass-action network \mathcal{N} on n species and r reactions, with at least one conservation relation. In Section 4 we use the results of this section to deduce conditions for multistationarity in the space of total concentrations for a network describing the distributive phosphorylation of a protein.

Let S and Z denote the stoichiometric and a conservation matrix of \mathcal{N} respectively. We study the consequences of the existence of monomial parametrizations for the positive steady state variety of \mathcal{N} . Following [44], the positive steady state variety admits a monomial parametrization if suitable Laurent monomials in the concentrations can be expressed in terms of the reaction rates (cf. [44, Section 3.2]). Such systems can be diagonalized using monomial transformations. The following definition captures what was observed in Example 2.8.

Definition 3.1. The positive steady state variety V^+ admits a monomial parametrization if there is a matrix $M \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times d}$ of rank $p < n$ and a rational function γ in the variables k_1, \dots, k_r with values in \mathbb{R}^d such that, for all $(k, x) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$,

$$(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow \gamma(k) \text{ is defined and } x^M = \gamma(k).$$

In Definition 3.1, the matrix M is understood as part of saying *admits a monomial parametrization*. In the following, if V^+ admits a monomial parametrization and a matrix M appears, then it is the matrix in that definition.

The existence of a monomial parametrization implies that all positive steady states can be recovered from monomial transformations of one positive steady state. In algebraic geometry, a variety which equals the closure of an algebraic torus acting on the variety is known as a toric variety. Affine toric varieties are cut out by binomial equations such as those in Definition 3.1.

Equation (2.7) of Example 2.8 shows that the network \mathcal{N}_1 admits a monomial parametrization according to Definition 3.1. By introducing two matrices M^+ and M^- with nonnegative entries, of appropriate dimension, such that

$$(3.1) \quad M = M^+ - M^-,$$

and extracting numerators and denominators of the rational function $\gamma(k)$ as follows

$$(3.2) \quad \gamma^\pm(k) = (\gamma_i^\pm(k))_i, \text{ where } \gamma_i(k) = \frac{\gamma_i^-(k)}{\gamma_i^+(k)},$$

we can write the system of Definition 3.1 as a binomial system:

$$(3.3) \quad \gamma^+(k) \star x^{M^+} - \gamma^-(k) \star x^{M^-} = 0.$$

Remark 3.2. In (3.2) the coefficients $\gamma^\pm(k)$ usually have many terms, hence (3.2) is binomial only in x . As a consequence of [25, Theorem 2.1], the ideal $\langle x^M - \gamma(k) \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}(k)[x^\pm]$ is a complete intersection. This means that there exists a generating set of $\langle x^M - \gamma(k) \rangle$ in which M has full rank. In the following we assume that M is of full rank.

Remark 3.3. Our Definition 3.1 is equivalent to asking that the ideal $\mathbb{I}(V^+)$, considered in the ring $\mathbb{R}(k)[x]$, is generated by the binomials (3.3). As there may well be several generating sets of binomials, neither the coefficients $\gamma^\pm(k)$ nor the matrices M^\pm need be unique. In [50] a similar situation is considered: the ideal defined by the polynomials $S\nu(k, x) = 0$ is generated by binomials in the ring $\mathbb{R}(k)[x]$. Our definition is slightly more general, as it might happen that even though $S\nu(k, x) = 0$ is not generated by binomials, the ideal $\mathbb{I}(V^+)$ is.

Given the binomials (3.3), we can now define the positive values of k where the vector $\gamma(k)$ of Definition 3.1 is defined: the system (3.3) can only be satisfied by positive k and x if the coefficients $\gamma^\pm(k)$ are nonzero and of the same sign, that is if k is contained in the semi-algebraic set

$$(3.4) \quad \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+ := \{k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r \mid \gamma_i^+(k) \cdot \gamma_i^-(k) > 0, i = 1, \dots, p\}.$$

In particular, if $k \notin \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$, then there does not exist a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $(k, x) \in V^+$.

The next few lemmata make the monomial parametrization explicit in our setting.

Lemma 3.4. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization and, for $q < n$, $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{q \times n}$ is any matrix of maximal rank q such that $AM = 0$, then:*

- (i) $(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow (k, x \star \xi^A) \in V^+, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^q,$
- (ii) $(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow (k, x \star (e^\kappa)^A) \in V^+, \forall \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^q.$

Proof. As V^+ admits a monomial parametrization, the left hand side of (i) is equivalent to $x^M = \gamma(k)$ and the right hand side is equivalent to $(x \star \xi^A)^M = \gamma(k)$. As $AM = 0$, these are equivalent: $(x \star \xi^A)^M = x^M$. Item (ii) follows from (i) by replacing ξ with e^κ . \square

By Lemma 3.4, given a pair $(k, x) \in V^+$, one obtains all \tilde{x} with $(k, \tilde{x}) \in V^+$ from x with the help of the left kernel of M . In the following lemma we show that by choosing a special basis of the left kernel of M , one can make the connection between x and k in the solution of $S\nu(k, x) = 0$ explicit.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization. Then there are*

- *a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$ of rank $n - p$ such that $AM = 0$,*

- a function $\psi : \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, and
- an exponent $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$,

such that ψ^η is a rational function and

$$(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+ \text{ and } \exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p} \text{ such that } x = \psi(k) \star \xi^A.$$

Proof. As in Remark 3.2, consider the ideal $\langle x^M - \gamma(k) \rangle \subset \mathbb{R}(k)[x^\pm]$. By [25, Theorem 2.1], this ideal is a complete intersection and we can find a generating set in which M has full rank and format $n \times p$ for a suitable γ . In the following we assume that M is ordered such that the first p rows are linearly independent. (Note that this can always be achieved by a suitable reordering of the variables x .) Then there is an invertible matrix $U \in \mathbb{Q}^{p \times p}$ such that

$$MU = \begin{bmatrix} I_p \\ -W \end{bmatrix},$$

where W is of format $(n-p) \times p$. Let

$$A = [W | I_{n-p}] \text{ and } \psi(k) = \gamma(k)^{[U | 0_{p \times n-p}]}$$

We now argue that A and $\psi(k)$ have the properties stated above: first, $AM = 0$ since $AMU = 0$ and U is invertible. Second, only if $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$, there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $(k, x) \in V^+$. Hence we only need to consider $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$. As $\gamma_i^\pm(k) \neq 0$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ by (3.4) and, as powers of the entries $\psi_i(k)$ are products of γ_i^\pm , the function $\psi(k)$ is well defined on \mathcal{K}_γ^+ . And third, as $\gamma(k)$ is rational, the coordinate-wise power $\psi^\eta(k)$ is rational when η is the least common multiple of the denominators in U .

Next we turn to the equivalence: according to Definition 3.1,

$$(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow x^M = \gamma(k) \text{ and } k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+.$$

In the following calculations we take logarithms on both sides of the equation above. This is well defined, if we require $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ which implies $\gamma(k) > 0$. Taking logarithms we get

$$M^T(\ln x) = \ln \gamma(k) \Leftrightarrow U^T M^T(\ln x) = U^T(\ln \gamma(k)).$$

Decompose x into $x' = (x_1, \dots, x_p)^T$ and $\xi = (x_{p+1}, \dots, x_n)^T$. As $U^T M = [I_p | -W^T]$ the above equivalence is

$$(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow \ln x' - W^T(\ln \xi) = U^T(\ln \gamma(k)) \Leftrightarrow x' = \gamma(k)^U \star \xi^W.$$

Using $x = (x', \xi)$ and the above matrix A together with the vector $\psi(k)$ we obtain the final equivalence $(k, x) \in V^+ \Leftrightarrow x = \psi(k) \star \xi^A$. \square

- Remark 3.6.**
- (i) For fixed $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$, the matrix A in Lemma 3.5 captures all information about the parametrization. We call A the *exponent matrix* of the parametrization.
 - (ii) Choosing $\xi_i = 1$ for all i , one obtains $(k, \psi(k)) \in V^+$, i.e. the vector $\psi(k)$ is a (positive) solution of the equation $S\nu(k, x) = 0$ for a given vector k .

- (iii) In the proof of Lemma 3.5, the coordinates ξ are elements of x , i.e. the ξ_i correspond to variables of the system and thus have a biological meaning. Moreover, usually there are several orderings of variables one can choose from when constructing the matrix A in the proof of Lemma 3.5. One strategy would be to choose an ordering that yields ξ_i that correspond to measurable species.

The following example is an illustration of Lemma 3.5 and the steps taken in its proof.

Example 3.7. Going back to Example 2.8, equations (2.7) can be expressed as

$$x^M = \gamma(k),$$

where

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}^T \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(k) = \left(\frac{k_6}{k_3}, \frac{k_2 + k_3}{k_1}, \frac{k_5 + k_6}{k_4} \right)^T.$$

As numerators and denominators of $\gamma(k)$ are sums of positive monomials, one has $\mathcal{K}_\gamma^+ = \mathbb{R}_{>0}^6$, that is, the monomial parametrization is valid for all positive k . For example, for the matrix

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{one obtains} \quad MU = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which in the ordering $(x_3, x_6, x_4, x_1, x_2, x_5)^T$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_3 \\ -W \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad W = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$A = [W|I_3] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $\psi(k)$ we obtain

$$\psi(k) = \gamma(k)^{[U|0_{3 \times 3}]} = \left(\frac{k_1}{k_2 + k_3}, \frac{k_3}{k_6} \frac{k_1}{k_2 + k_3}, \frac{k_3}{k_6} \frac{k_1}{k_2 + k_3} \frac{k_5 + k_6}{k_4}, 1, 1, 1 \right)^T.$$

In this case $\psi(k)$ is already a rational function, as the the matrix U contains only integer entries and the least common multiple of the denominators in U therefore is $\eta = 1$. If U was not an integer matrix but contained rational entries, then $\psi(k)$ would not be a rational function as it would contain entries with rational exponents. In this case only $\psi(k)^\eta$ would

be rational as taking entries of ψ with rational exponents to the power η yields integer exponents. Then, with $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)^T$,

$$\begin{aligned} (x_3, x_6, x_4, x_1, x_2, x_5)^T &= \psi(k) \star \xi^A \\ &= \left(\frac{k_1}{k_2 + k_3} \xi_1 \xi_2, \frac{k_1 k_3}{(k_2 + k_3) k_6} \xi_1 \xi_2, \frac{k_1 k_3 (k_5 + k_6)}{(k_2 + k_3) k_4 k_6} \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2}{\xi_3}, \xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3 \right)^T. \end{aligned}$$

As explained above, if V^+ admits a monomial parametrization and if $(k, x) \in V^+$, then there are infinitely many \tilde{x} with $(k, \tilde{x}) \in V^+$. The following result describes the connection between an arbitrary pair a and b of these.

Lemma 3.8. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ are such that $(k, a) \in V^+$ and $(k, b) \in V^+$, then*

- (i) $\exists \xi \neq \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that $b = a \star \xi^A$,
- (ii) $\exists 0 \neq \mu \in \text{rowspace}(A)$ such that $b = a \star e^\mu$.

Proof. (i) It follows from Lemma 3.5 that there are $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that $a = \psi(k) \star \xi_1^A$ and $b = \psi(k) \star \xi_2^A$. Then, $\psi(k) = a \star \xi_1^{-A}$ and $b = a \star \xi_1^{-A} \star \xi_2^A = a \star \xi^A$ with $\xi = \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_1}$. Item (ii) follows from (i) by replacing ξ^A with $(e^{\ln(\xi)})^A$. \square

This final corollary summarizes the development so far.

Corollary 3.9. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$, then for every positive $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ there exists a vector $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ such that the following equivalent conditions hold:*

- (i) $(k, x) \in V^+$,
- (ii) $x^M = \gamma(k)$,
- (iii) $\exists \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that $x = \psi(k) \star \xi^A$.

Proof. This is Lemma 3.5 together with Theorem 2.13 and Corollary 2.14. \square

3.1. Multistationarity. This section collects results concerning multistationarity under the assumption that V^+ admits a monomial parametrization. Some conditions involve sign patterns similar to [11] and [44]. For a scalar u we use $\text{sign}(u)$ to denote its sign, for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we use $\text{sign}(v) = (\text{sign}(v_1), \dots, \text{sign}(v_n))$ to denote its sign pattern. Theorem 3.14 appeared in a different formulation in [44]. In this subsection we frequently refer to Z , the conservation matrix of a reaction network and the set $\text{im}_+(Z)$. Our first result exploits a monomial parametrization of V^+ to formulate conditions for multistationarity that are independent of the rate constants.

Lemma 3.10. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathcal{N} admits multistationarity,
- (ii) $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p} \setminus \{\mathbf{1}\}$, such that $Z(x - x \star \xi^A) = 0$,

(iii) $\exists x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n-p} \setminus \{0\}$, such that $Z(x - x \star (e^\kappa)^A) = 0$.

Proof. Items (ii) and (iii) are equivalent as for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ there is a $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}^{n-p}$ such that $\xi = e^\kappa$. Now assume (ii) holds for some x and ξ . We prove that (i) holds. By Lemma 3.5, there exists a $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ such that $(k, x) \in V^+$ and by Lemma 3.4 $(k, x \star \xi^A) \in V^+$ as well. Since $Zx = Z(\xi^A \star x) = c$ by assumption one has $x, \xi^A \star x \in \mathcal{P}_c$, that is, \mathcal{N} admits multistationarity. When (i) holds, we have $x \neq x'$ and k such that $Z(x - x') = 0$, and $(k, x) \in V^+$ and $(k, x') \in V^+$. Now Lemma 3.8 implies $x' = x \star \xi^A$ and thus (ii). \square

As discussed in [43] and [44] for systems with toric steady states multistationarity can be established by analysis of sign patterns. Theorems 3.11 – 3.14 below translate this to our setting. Theorems 3.11 and 3.12 show that the existence of a pair of nontrivial vectors $\mu \in \text{rowspan}(A)$ and $z \in \text{im}(S)$ with $\text{sign}(\mu) = \text{sign}(z)$ is both necessary and sufficient for multistationarity. Theorem 3.11 is constructive in the sense that given such a pair μ, z one can construct rate constants k and a corresponding pair of steady states a and b .

Theorem 3.11. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$ and there are $\mu \in \text{rowspan}(A)$ and $z \in \text{im}(S)$ such that $\text{sign}(\mu) = \text{sign}(z)$, then \mathcal{N} admits multistationarity. Specifically, for arbitrary $\bar{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $i \in [n]$, let $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ denote the vector with entries*

$$(3.5a) \quad a_i = \begin{cases} \frac{z_i}{e^{\mu_i} - 1} & \text{if } z_i \neq 0, \\ \bar{a}_i & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

and let

$$(3.5b) \quad b = a \star e^\mu.$$

Then, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$, setting

$$(3.5c) \quad k = \phi(a^{-1}) \star E\lambda,$$

\mathcal{N} admits multistationarity as

$$(k, a) \in V^+, (k, b) \in V^+, \text{ and } (b - a) \in \text{im}(S).$$

Proof. The vector b is positive whenever a is positive, and the vector a is positive, whenever $\text{sign}(\mu) = \text{sign}(z)$. By definition, $(b - a) = z \in \text{im}(S)$. Then Theorem 2.13 shows $(k, a) \in V^+$ and Lemmata 3.4 and 3.5 also show $(k, b) \in V^+$. \square

Theorem 3.12. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$ and let $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, $a \neq b$, be such that $(k, a) \in V^+$, $(k, b) \in V^+$, and $(b - a) \in \text{im}(S)$. Let $z = b - a$ and $\mu = \ln b - \ln a$. Then*

- (i) $z \in \text{im}(S)$, $\mu \in \text{rowspan}(A)$, $\text{sign}(z) = \text{sign}(\mu)$,
- (ii) k, a , and b together with z and μ satisfy (3.5a) – (3.5c).

Proof. For item (i), $z \in \text{im}(S)$ by assumption. As V^+ admits a monomial parametrization, by Lemma 3.5, there are κ_1 and $\kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-p}$ such that $a = \psi(k) \star (e^{\kappa_1})^A$ and $b = \psi(k) \star (e^{\kappa_2})^A$. Hence $\mu = (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1)A$ and, consequently, $\mu \in \text{rowspan}(A)$. By construction $b = e^\mu \star a$, and thus $z = (e^\mu - \mathbf{1}) \star a$. As a is positive, $\text{sign}(e^\mu - \mathbf{1}) = \text{sign}(z)$ must hold. As $\text{sign}(e^\mu - \mathbf{1}) = \text{sign}(\mu)$, $\text{sign}(\mu) = \text{sign}(z)$. For item (ii), (3.5b) holds by construction and (3.5a) follows from the equation $z = (e^\mu - \mathbf{1}) \star a$. Now, $(k, a) \in V^+$ implies that $k \star \phi(a) = E\lambda$ for some $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ by Theorem 2.13; hence (3.5c) also holds. \square

The following Theorem 3.14 rests on the set of all sign patterns associated to a linear subspace: let $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ be a linear subspace, then $\text{sign}(\mathcal{U})$ is the set of all sign patterns of all its elements:

$$(3.6) \quad \text{sign}(\mathcal{U}) = \{\delta \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^n \mid \exists u \in \mathcal{U} \text{ with } \text{sign}(u) = \delta\}$$

Example 3.13. Let $\mathcal{U} = \text{im} \left(\begin{bmatrix} -5 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} \right)$ and observe that for every vector $u \in \mathcal{U}$ one has either

$$\text{sign}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \text{sign}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \text{sign}(u) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consequently

$$\text{sign}(\mathcal{U}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

Theorem 3.14 below is similar to [44, Proposition 3.9 and Corollary 3.11]. All of them employ analysis of the aforementioned sign patterns to decide the existence of two positive real solutions a and b to the parametrized family of polynomials (2.6) such that both are elements of the affine space $\{x \mid Zx = Za = Zb\}$. For a detailed discussion on how to verify sign conditions, see [44, Section 4].

Theorem 3.14. *If V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix A , then there are $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $(k, a) \in V^+$, $(k, b) \in V^+$, and $Z(b - a) = 0$ if and only if*

$$(3.7) \quad \text{sign}(\text{rowspan}(A)) \cap \text{sign}(\text{im}(S)) \neq \{0\}.$$

Proof. This is the combination of Theorems 3.11 and 3.12. \square

3.2. Multistationarity in the space of total concentrations. In this section we study multistationarity in the space of total concentrations under the assumption that V^+ admits a monomial parametrization. The first result translates some of the results of the previous section into the space of total concentrations.

Theorem 3.15. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$. Let c be an element of $\text{im}_+(Z)$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\exists k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $(k, a), (k, b) \in V^+$, and $c = Za = Zb$, that is $a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c$,

- (ii) $\exists k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ such that $Z(\psi(k) \star \xi^A) = c$ has at least two solutions $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$,
 (iii) $\exists a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \neq \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$, such that $Z(a \star \xi^A - a) = 0$ and $c = Za = Zb$.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Let $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ as in (i). By Lemma 3.5, there are $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that $a = \psi(k) \star \xi_1^A$ and $b = \psi(k) \star \xi_2^A$ and $a \neq b$ implies $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$. Since $c = Za = Zb$ the equation $Z(\psi(k) \star \xi^A) = c$ has at least the two positive solutions ξ_1 and ξ_2 .

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Let $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ as in (ii). For $a = \psi(k) \star \xi_1^A$ and $b = \psi(k) \star \xi_2^A = a \star \left(\frac{\xi_2}{\xi_1}\right)^A$ one has $Za = Zb = c$ by assumption. Hence $Z(a \star \xi^A - a) = 0$ has the positive solution $a = \psi(k) \star \xi_1^A$ and $\xi = \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_1}$. Further $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$ implies $\xi \neq \mathbf{1}$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \neq \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ be as in (iii). Choose $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ and let $k = \phi(a^{-1}) \star E\lambda$. By Theorem 2.13 $(k, a) \in V^+$. Let $b = a \star \xi^A$. By Lemma 3.4 also $(k, b) \in V^+$. As $Za = Zb = c$, we have $a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c$. \square

Theorem 3.15 item (iii) is independent of the rate constants. That is, given any $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$ one can decide about multistationarity within the corresponding \mathcal{P}_c , even if all or some of the rate constants are unknown. In fact, as the following two corollaries show, arbitrary semi-algebraic constraints in the total concentrations c can be added to the description of the multistationarity locus and a variant of Theorem 3.15 still holds. Already the case of linear inequalities is interesting (see Section 4).

Corollary 3.16. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$. Let $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathbb{R}[c]$, $\square \in \{>, \geq\}^l$, and $\mathcal{F}(g(c) \square 0)$ be any logical combination of the inequalities $g(c) \square 0$. Then there are $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$ such that*

$$Z(\psi(k) \star \xi^A) = c, \mathcal{F}(g(c) \square 0)$$

has at least two positive solutions $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2$, if and only if the system

$$(3.8) \quad Z(a \star \xi^A - a) = 0, \mathcal{F}(g(Za) \square 0)$$

has a solution $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{(n-p)}$ with $\xi \neq \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. This is Theorem 3.15 (ii) and (iii) together with $c = Za$. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 3.14, multistationarity is possible if and only if the sign condition (3.7) holds. Frequently one first asks whether multistationarity is possible at all (by checking condition (3.7)) before asking whether it is possible under some conditions on the total concentrations. Hence, one often computes the intersection (3.7) before employing Corollary 3.16. In this case one can add the information contained in the sign patterns satisfying (3.7) to the system (3.8) of Corollary 3.16. To this end, let Δ be the set of sign patterns satisfying condition (3.7) and recall that, by Theorem 3.12 (a), there are $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ with $a \neq b$ and $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ with $(k, a) \in V^+$, $(k, b) \in V^+$, and $c = Za = Zb$, i.e. $a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c$. Then, $\text{sign}(b - a) \in \Delta$ by Theorem 3.14. Further recall that, under the standing assumption

that V^+ admits a monomial parametrization, we have $b = a \star \xi^A$ by Lemma 3.8. Let $\delta \in \Delta$, then

$$(3.9) \quad \text{sign}(b - a) = \delta \Leftrightarrow \text{sign}(\ln b - \ln a) = \delta \Leftrightarrow \text{sign}(\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) = \delta.$$

Now we can ask whether multistationarity is possible for a given sign pattern δ and some semi-algebraic constraint on the total concentrations:

Corollary 3.17. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$, and that E does not contain a zero row. Let Δ be the set of sign patterns from (3.7) with $\Delta \neq \emptyset$. Pick $\delta \in \Delta$ and let $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathbb{R}[c]$, $\square \in \{>, \geq\}^l$, and $\mathcal{F}(g(c) \square 0)$ be any logical combination of the inequalities $g(c) \square 0$. Then there are $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$, $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ with $a \neq b$ such that*

$$(k, a) \in V^+, (k, b) \in V^+, \quad \text{sign}(b - a) = \delta \text{ and } \mathcal{F}(g(c) \square 0)$$

if and only if there are $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that

$$Z((\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star a) = 0, \quad \text{sign}(\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) = \delta, \quad \mathcal{F}(g(Za) \square 0).$$

Proof. This is Corollary 3.16 with $b - a = (\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star a$ and (3.9). \square

The next theorem shows that if there is multistationarity for some value of the total concentrations c , then there is also multistationarity for any rescaled αc ($\alpha > 0$), albeit k needs to be adjusted in a nonlinear way.

Theorem 3.18. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$. Let $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exist $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ such that $(k, a) \in V^+$, $(k, b) \in V^+$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c$.*
- (ii) *For every $\alpha > 0$ there exists $a(\alpha) \neq b(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $k(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ such that $(k(\alpha), a(\alpha)) \in V^+$, $(k(\alpha), b(\alpha)) \in V^+$ and $a(\alpha), b(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_{\alpha c}$.*

Proof. Let $a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ as in (i). By Theorem 3.15, item (i) \Rightarrow (iii) there exists $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $\xi \neq 1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-p}$ such that $Z(a \star \xi^A) = Za = c$. Pick $\alpha > 0$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda(E)$ and define

$$a(\alpha) = \alpha a, b(\alpha) = a(\alpha) \star \xi^A \text{ and } k(\alpha) = \Phi(a(\alpha)^{-1}) \star E\lambda.$$

Then $(k(\alpha), a(\alpha)) \in V^+$ by construction of $k(\alpha)$. By Lemma 3.4 this implies $(k(\alpha), b(\alpha)) \in V^+$ as well. By construction $Za(\alpha) = Zb(\alpha) = \alpha c$, that is $a(\alpha), b(\alpha) \in \mathcal{P}_{\alpha c}$.

Vice versa, assume $a(\alpha) \neq b(\alpha) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$ are as in (ii). Then $\alpha = 1$ yields the desired result. \square

Theorem 3.18 states that a network \mathcal{N} for which V^+ admits a monomial parametrization (and E does not contain a zero row) admits multistationarity for some value $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$, if and only if it admits multistationarity for all αc with $\alpha > 0$.

The next result can be used to preclude multistationarity on entire rays in the space of total concentrations.

Corollary 3.19. *Assume V^+ admits a monomial parametrization with exponent matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{(n-p) \times n}$ and let $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$. If the system*

$$(3.10) \quad Z(a \star \xi^A) = c$$

does not have a solution $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, $\xi \neq 1 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{(n-p)}$, then there do not exist $k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that the system

$$(3.11) \quad Z(\psi(k) \star \xi^A) = \alpha c$$

has at least two solutions $\xi_1 \neq \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^p$.

Proof. This is Theorem 3.18 together with 3.15. \square

Remark 3.20. The scaling invariance in the previous results can be reformulated in terms of cones. For this let $s = \dim(\text{im}(S))$ and denote by $\mathbb{S}^{n-s-1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-s}$ the unit sphere. Define the set of all total concentrations $c \in \text{im}_+(Z)$ for which the network admits multistationarity (for some value of the rate constants k):

$$\mathcal{C} = \{c \in \text{im}_+(Z) \mid \exists k \in \mathcal{K}_\gamma^+ \text{ and } a \neq b \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \text{ s.t. } (k, a), (k, b) \in V^+, \text{ and } a, b \in \mathcal{P}_c\}.$$

By the Tarski–Seidenberg Theorem [17, Theorem 2.3], \mathcal{C} is a semi-algebraic set. We have shown that (except the missing origin) it is a cone: if $c \in \mathcal{C}$, then by Theorem 3.18 $\alpha c \in \mathcal{C}$, $\forall \alpha > 0$, i.e.


$$\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{C} \cap \mathbb{S}^{n-s-1}) \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}.$$

Remark 3.21. As a consequence of Theorem 3.18, for systems that admit a monomial parametrization, if there exist rate constants such that multistationarity occurs for some value c of the total concentrations, then there exist rate constants, such that it occurs for arbitrarily small values αc , $\alpha \ll 1$. That is, multistationarity persists for arbitrarily small total concentrations, as long as the ratios $\frac{c_i}{c_j}$ remain constant.

4. MULTISTATIONARITY CONDITIONS ON THE TOTAL CONCENTRATIONS FOR SEQUENTIAL AND DISTRIBUTIVE PHOSPHORYLATION


In this section we apply the results of Section 3 to networks describing the sequential and distributive phosphorylation of a protein. Our results complement recent results of [5]. Their Theorem 4.1 states that, for any $n \geq 2$, if the total concentration of substrates is greater than the sum of the concentrations of phosphatase and intermediate products with phosphatase, then there is a choice of rate constants for which multistationarity is attained. Our results are also on the total concentrations and motivate the inequalities using the chamber decomposition as a natural, intrinsic subdivision of the cone of values of the total concentrations.

4.1. Sequential distributive phosphorylation of a protein. Phosphorylation processes are frequently encountered in the modeling of biochemical processes; see, for example, [16] and the references therein. The following network models the phosphorylation of a protein A at n binding sites in a sequential and distributive way:



The first two connected components of network \mathcal{N}_n form network (\mathcal{N}_1) from Example 2.1 (after the change of variables $X_1 = K$, $X_2 = A$, $X_3 = AK$, $X_4 = A_p$, $X_5 = P$, $X_6 = A_p P$). In this sense \mathcal{N}_n extends \mathcal{N}_1 to n phosphorylation steps. Due to their biochemical importance such networks have been extensively studied in mathematical biology. For example, it is known that \mathcal{N}_n is multistationary if and only if $n \geq 2$ [37]. For $n = 2$ there are known sufficient conditions on the rate constants for the presence or absence of multistationarity and it is known that the number of positive steady states is 1, 2, or 3 [13]. For $n > 2$ there are bounds on the maximum number of positive steady states that can be attained [33, 56].

The aim of this section is to describe the multistationarity locus in the space of total concentrations. The strongest results are available for the $n = 2$ case which we consider first:



If all reactions of (\mathcal{N}_2) are of mass-action form, we obtain the following set of ODE. Here x_1 denotes the concentration of A , x_2 of K , x_3 of AK , x_4 of A_p , x_5 of $A_p K$, x_6 of A_{pp} , x_7 of P , x_8 of $A_{pp} P$ and x_9 of $A_p P$.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dot{x}_1 &= f_1(x_1, \dots, x_9) = -k_1 x_1 x_2 + k_2 x_3 + k_{12} x_9 \\
 \dot{x}_2 &= f_2(x_1, \dots, x_9) = -k_1 x_1 x_2 + (k_2 + k_3) x_3 - k_4 x_2 x_4 + (k_5 + k_6) x_5 \\
 \dot{x}_3 &= f_3(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_1 x_1 x_2 - (k_2 + k_3) x_3 \\
 \dot{x}_4 &= f_4(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_3 x_3 - k_4 x_2 x_4 + k_5 x_5 + k_9 x_8 - k_{10} x_4 x_7 + k_{11} x_9 \\
 \dot{x}_5 &= f_5(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_4 x_2 x_4 - (k_5 + k_6) x_5 \\
 \dot{x}_6 &= f_6(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_6 x_5 - k_7 x_6 x_7 + k_8 x_8
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}_7 &= f_7(x_1, \dots, x_9) = -k_7x_6x_7 + (k_8 + k_9)x_8 - k_{10}x_4x_7 + (k_{11} + k_{12})x_9 \\ \dot{x}_8 &= f_8(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_7x_6x_7 - (k_8 + k_9)x_8 \\ \dot{x}_9 &= f_9(x_1, \dots, x_9) = k_{10}x_4x_7 - (k_{11} + k_{12})x_9.\end{aligned}$$

There are three independent linear relations among the polynomials f_1, \dots, f_9 and thus three linearly independent conserved quantities under the dynamics of the network:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned}x_2 + x_3 + x_5 &= c_1, \\ x_7 + x_8 + x_9 &= c_2, \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_8 + x_9 &= c_3.\end{aligned}$$

In (4.1) above, c_1 represents the total amount of kinase K , c_2 the total amount of phosphatase P and c_3 the total amount of protein A , the substrate. Relations (4.1) are the rays of the *cone of conservation relations*. According to (4.1), we can choose the conservation matrix as

$$(4.2) \quad Z = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

In [43] it has been shown that the positive steady state variety V^+ of (\mathcal{N}_2) admits a monomial parametrization of the form

$$x = \psi(k) \star \xi^A \text{ with } k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12} \text{ and } \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3 \text{ free,}$$

where


$$\psi(k) = \left(\frac{(k_2 + k_3)k_4k_6(k_{11} + k_{12})k_{12}}{k_1k_3(k_5 + k_6)k_9k_{10}}, \frac{(k_5 + k_6)k_9k_{10}}{k_4k_6(k_{11} + k_{12})}, \frac{k_{12}}{k_3}, \frac{k_{11} + k_{12}}{k_{10}}, \frac{k_9}{k_6}, \frac{k_8 + k_9}{k_7}, 1, 1, 1 \right)^T$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

4.2. A numerical study of multistationarity in the space of total concentrations.

We did a numerical study of multistationarity in the space of total concentrations which is depicted in Fig. 1a. For this computation the rate constants have been numerically fixed to the values in [13, Fig. 3]. The computation was done using Paramotopy [7] which builds on Bertini [3] and allows one to efficiently analyze the solutions of a polynomial systems with unknown coefficients (a parametric polynomial system). We computed the isolated solutions for each point in the grid $[0, 1000]^3 \cap (10\mathbb{Z})^3$ and plotted those which yield multistationarity. An alternative approach is through the *discriminant* which in this case can be found with Maple [41]. A discriminant of a parametric semi-algebraic system is a polynomial which vanishes in those points of the parameter space where the solution behavior can change. For an extensive discussion of discriminants with a special emphasis on computation we refer to [40]. Discriminants for multistationarity have also appeared



(a) Numerical computation with Paramotopy. We consider a grid of 10^6 points in the space of total concentrations and represent every point which leads to multistationarity. The boundary of the corresponding multistationarity region is represented in red and the interior in black. This cone shaped region is semi-algebraic and its boundary is part of the discriminant in Fig. 1b.

(b) The discriminant has seven \mathbb{Q} -irreducible components which can be found with **Maple**. Three of them are coordinate hyperplanes and two others are sums of squares. We show only those two components which intersect the interior of the positive orthant. The boundary of the numerical approximation of the multistationarity region from Fig. 1a is a subset of this discriminant surface.

FIGURE 1. Representation of regions of multistationarity in the space of total concentrations for \mathcal{N}_2 . For both figures all rate constants have been fixed to the values given in [13, Fig. 3].

in [36, Section 4]. Two relevant irreducible components of the discriminant of the parametric system are visualized in Fig. 1b. The algebraic boundary of the region from Fig. 1a is a subvariety of the discriminant from Fig. 1b. Specifically, the cone shaped region in Fig. 1a is also visible in the top center of Fig. 1b. Both figures indicate that, for the values of the rate constants chosen in [13, Fig. 3], multistationarity does not occur for all values of the total concentrations. In the next section we employ the results of Section 3.2 to elucidate conditions on the total concentrations for the presence or absence of multistationarity.

4.3. The chamber decomposition of $\text{im}_+(Z)$ for \mathcal{N}_2 and \mathcal{N}_n . Using the sets $\text{im}_+(Z)$ and \mathcal{P}_c from (2.4) and (2.5), we now introduce the chamber decomposition of $\text{im}_+(Z)$ induced by the columns of the conservation matrix Z . We assume that Z is of full row rank $n - s$ and call a subset of $n - s$ linear independent columns a basis of $\text{im}_+(Z)$. Each basis B defines a *basic cone* $\text{cone}(B)$ consisting of nonnegative linear combinations of the columns in B .

Definition 4.1. The *chamber complex* of a matrix Z is the common refinement of the basic cones of all its bases. More precisely, c_1 and c_2 are in the same chamber of the chamber

complex if and only if

$$c_1 \in \text{cone}(B) \Leftrightarrow c_2 \in \text{cone}(B) \quad \text{for all bases } B \text{ of } Z.$$

Remark 4.2. The chamber complex is important in linear programming as it classifies the different combinatorial types that the polyhedron \mathcal{P}_c can take for any c : within one chamber, all polyhedra \mathcal{P}_c are combinatorially equal, that is, their face lattices are the same. See [21, Section 2.1] for an interpretation of the vertices of \mathcal{P}_c in this context. Chamber complexes can be computed with polyhedral geometry software such as POLYMAKE [34] or TOPCOM [47]. Chambers are also related to siphons of chemical reactions [55]. A chamber complex of a slightly different type appears in [20] where every basic cone encodes a possible reaction network among a given finite set of experimentally indistinguishable networks. We believe that the chamber complex is an interesting structure to study for different chemical reaction networks.

The polyhedron \mathcal{P}_c is defined by the matrix Z from (4.2). The cone generated by the columns of Z is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$. There are eight basic cones generated by the following sets of columns of Z :

$$\{1, 2, 7\}, \{1, 2, 8\}, \{1, 3, 7\}, \{1, 3, 8\}, \{2, 3, 7\}, \{2, 3, 8\}, \{2, 7, 8\}, \{3, 7, 8\}.$$

Any of the basic cones is the intersection of three linear half-spaces of \mathbb{R}^3 and each of these half-spaces is spanned by exactly two of the three columns (see [58, Section 1.1] for more details on polyhedra). For example, the cone generated by the columns of $\{1, 2, 7\}$ of Z is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$ and equals the intersection of the half-spaces $c_1 \geq 0$, $c_2 \geq 0$, and $c_3 \geq 0$. There are six distinct planes occurring among the defining hyperplanes of all cones: $c_1 = 0$, $c_2 = 0$, $c_3 = 0$, $c_1 = c_3$, $c_2 = c_3$, and $c_1 + c_2 = c_3$. These planes divide $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$ into five full-dimensional cones. The interiors of these cones are the full-dimensional chambers of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$. See Fig. 2 for a two-dimensional representation of this chamber decomposition. There are also smaller dimensional chambers: the interiors of the faces of the full-dimensional chambers.

For $n \geq 2$ the chamber complex does not change:

Theorem 4.3. *The cone of conservation relations of \mathcal{N}_n is $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^3$ and it has five full-dimensional chambers:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(1) : & \begin{cases} c_3 > 0 \\ c_2 > c_3 \\ c_1 > c_3, \end{cases} & \Omega(2) : & \begin{cases} c_1 > 0 \\ c_2 > c_3 \\ c_1 < c_3, \end{cases} & \Omega(3) : & \begin{cases} c_2 > 0 \\ c_2 < c_3 \\ c_1 > c_3, \end{cases} \\ \Omega(4) : & \begin{cases} c_1 < c_3 \\ c_2 < c_3 \\ c_1 + c_2 > c_3, \end{cases} & \Omega(5) : & \begin{cases} c_1 > 0 \\ c_2 > 0 \\ c_1 + c_2 < c_3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As described in [37, Section 3], the conservation matrix of \mathcal{N}_n , for the ordering of the concentrations defined in [37, Table 1], has the form $Z^{(n)} = (Z_0 | Z_1 | \dots | Z_1) \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times (3n+3)}$,




FIGURE 2. The intersection of the full-dimensional chambers associated to \mathcal{N}_n with the plane $c_1 + c_2 + c_3 = 1$. Labeled vertices correspond to different columns in $Z^{(n)}$.

where Z_1 is repeated n times and

$$Z_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

As $Z^{(n)}$ has the same set of columns for every $n \geq 1$, it follows that all chamber decomposition of all \mathcal{N}_n are equal. \square

Remark 4.4. Although the ordering of variables defined in [37, Table 1] is different from the one we use with \mathcal{N}_2 , a reordering of the variables corresponds to a reordering of the columns of $Z^{(n)}$ and thus, it leaves the chamber decomposition invariant.

Remark 4.5. Although \mathcal{N}_n has the same chamber complex for each n , the constants c express nonnegative linear combinations of the concentrations specific to each network.

4.4. Multistationarity conditions in the space of total concentrations. Now we turn to $n = 2$ and \mathcal{N}_2 and employ Corollary 3.17 to decide whether multistationarity is possible for total concentrations in the chambers $\Omega(i)$. The linear inequality conditions $c \in \Omega(i)$ become the conditions $\mathcal{F}(\bullet)$ in Corollary 3.17. We also integrate the information in the sign patterns in the intersection (3.7). These have been computed in [12] and are

encoded as rows of the following matrix Δ (or their negatives):

$$(4.4) \quad \Delta = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The rows δ_i of Δ define the conditions $\text{sign}(\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) = \delta_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 7$ of Corollary 3.17. Using the matrix A from (4.3), this condition reads

$$(4.5) \quad \text{sign} \left(\frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_2 \xi_3} - 1, \frac{\xi_2 \xi_3}{\xi_1} - 1, \xi_1 - 1, \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} - 1, \xi_2 - 1, \frac{\xi_2}{\xi_3} - 1, \xi_3 - 1, \xi_2 - 1, \xi_1 - 1 \right) = \delta_i.$$

To check multistationarity for c in all of the chambers $\Omega(i)$ we use `Mathematica` [38]. For each chamber and each row δ_i we set up the conditions of Corollary 3.17 and use the command `Reduce` to decide the existence of solutions. In the following example we show how to set up the `Mathematica` code to check multistationarity.

Example 4.6. We check multistationarity via Corollary 3.17 for $\Omega(1)$ and $\delta = (1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 1, -1, 1)$ (the negative of the first row of Δ from (4.4)). First we formulate the three conditions $Z((\xi^A - 1) \star a) = 0$, $\text{sign}(\xi^A - 1) = \delta$ and $\mathcal{F}(g(Za)) \square 0$ of the corollary:

- $\text{sign}(\xi^A - 1) = \delta$: after adding the constraints $\xi_1 > 0$, $\xi_2 > 0$, $\xi_3 > 0$ and removing redundant inequalities, (4.5) reduces to

$$(4.6) \quad 1 < \xi_1 < \xi_2 \xi_3 < \xi_1^2 \text{ and } 0 < \xi_2 < 1.$$

- $\mathcal{F}(g(Za) \square 0)$: we want to encode $c \in \Omega(1)$. By Theorem 4.3 this is equivalent to $c_3 > 0$, $c_1 > c_3$ and $c_2 > c_3$. By (4.1), $c_1 = a_2 + a_3 + a_5$, $c_2 = a_7 + a_8 + a_9$ and $c_3 = a_1 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 + a_8 + a_9$. The condition $a_i > 0$ then implies $c_3 > 0$ and we only need to account for the remaining inequalities:

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 - a_2 + a_4 + a_6 + a_8 + a_9 &< 0 \text{ (for } c_1 > c_3) \text{ and} \\ a_1 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - a_7 &< 0 \text{ (for } c_2 > c_3). \end{aligned}$$

- In the condition $Z((\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star a) = 0$ we use the matrix

$$(4.8) \quad Z' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

obtained from (4.2) by elementary row operations (compared to Z from (4.2), we found that computation times are significantly shorter when Z' is used, cf. Remark 4.9). To

obtain polynomial conditions (ξ^A is rational) we write this condition as $Z'(\xi^A \star a) = Z'a$ and clear denominators:

(4.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_2 \xi_3 a_2 + \xi_1^2 a_3 + \xi_1 \xi_2 a_5 &= \xi_1 (a_2 + a_3 + a_5) \\ \xi_1^2 a_1 + \xi_1 \xi_2 \xi_3 a_3 + \xi_1 \xi_2 a_4 + \xi_2^2 \xi_3 a_5 + \xi_2^2 a_6 - \xi_2 \xi_3^2 a_7 &= \xi_2 \xi_3 (a_1 + a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + a_6 - a_7) \\ \xi_1^3 a_1 - \xi_2^2 \xi_3^2 a_2 + \xi_1^2 \xi_2 a_4 + \xi_1 \xi_2^2 a_6 + \xi_1 \xi_2^2 \xi_3 a_8 + \xi_1^2 \xi_2 \xi_3 a_9 &= \xi_1 \xi_2 \xi_3 (a_1 - a_2 + a_4 + a_6 + a_8 + a_9) \end{aligned}$$

The following `Mathematica` code can be used to decide the existence of ξ_i and a_i satisfying the conditions (4.6), (4.7) and (4.9) together with the condition $a_i > 0$ (`x1`, `x2`, `x3` are shorthand for the variables ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3):

```
Reduce[Exists[{a1,a2,a3,a4,a5,a6,a7,a8,a9},
a1>0 && a2>0 && a3>0 && a4>0 && a5>0 && a6>0 && a7>0 && a8>0 && a9>0 &&
x2*x3*a2 + x1^2*a3 + x1*x2*a5 == x1*(a2+a3+a5) &&
x1^2*a1 + x1*x2*x3*a3 + x1*x2*a4 + x2^2*x3*a5
+ x2^2*a6 - x2*x3^2*a7 == x2*x3*(a1+a3+a4+a5+a6-a7) &&
x1^3*a1 - x2^2*x3^2*a2 + x1^2*x2*a4 + x1*x2^2*a6
+ x1*x2^2*x3*a8 + x1^2*x2*x3*a9 == x1*x2*x3*(a1-a2+a4+a6+a8+a9) &&
a1+a3+a4+a5+a6-a7<0 &&
a1-a2+a4+a6+a8+a9<0 &&
x2*x3<x1^2 && x1<x2*x3 &&
1<x1 && 1>x2 && x2>0 ]]
```

The computation takes a few hours, but then the result is ‘False’, that is, there do not exist a_1, \dots, a_9 satisfying the constraints, no matter what the values of ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 are. Consequently, in the chamber $\Omega(1)$ there is no multistationarity coming from the first row of Δ . Theorem 4.7 below shows that there is no multistationarity in $\Omega(1)$ at all.

Theorem 4.7 spells out for which chambers and which sign patterns there is multistationarity. For a pair $(\Omega(i), \delta_j)$, we write + if there is multistationarity in $\Omega(i)$ for all values of ξ compatible with (4.5). We write ++ if there is multistationarity in $\Omega(i)$ with extra conditions for ξ stronger than (4.5). We write – if there is no multistationarity. If the computation does not finish in reasonable time, we leave the cell empty.

	δ_1	δ_2	δ_3	δ_4	δ_5	δ_6	δ_7
$\Omega(1)$	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
$\Omega(2)$	–	–	+	+	++	+	++
$\Omega(3)$	++	+	++	–	–	+	+
$\Omega(4)$	++	+		+	++		
$\Omega(5)$	++	+	+	+	+	+	+

TABLE 1. The chamber-signs incidence table of (\mathcal{N}_2) . In particular, multistationarity is not possible in $\Omega(1)$.

Theorem 4.7. *Up to the three empty cells, the chambers-signs incidence table of (\mathcal{N}_2) is Table 1. For the ++ entries the following additional constraints are derived:*

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Omega(2), \delta_7) &: 0 < \xi_3 < \xi_1 < 1 \wedge \xi_2 > \frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_3^2}, \\
(\Omega(2), \delta_5) &: \xi_3 > 1 \wedge 0 < \xi_1 < 1 \wedge \xi_2 > \xi_3^2, \\
(\Omega(4), \delta_5) &: \xi_3 > 1 \wedge 0 < \xi_1 < 1 \wedge \xi_2 > \xi_3^2, \\
(\Omega(3), \delta_3) &: \xi_3^2 < \xi_1 < \xi_3 < 1 \wedge \xi_2 > 1, \\
(\Omega(3), \delta_1) &: \xi_3 > 1 \wedge \\
&\quad \left(\left(1 < \xi_1 < \xi_3^{2/3} \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < \frac{\xi_1^{3/2}}{\xi_3} \right) \vee \left(\xi_3^{2/3} < \xi_1 < \xi_3 \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < 1 \right) \right), \\
(\Omega(4), \delta_1) &: \xi_3 > 1 \wedge \\
&\quad \left(\left(1 < \xi_1 < \xi_3^{2/3} \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < \frac{\xi_1^{3/2}}{\xi_3} \right) \vee \left(\xi_3^{2/3} < \xi_1 < \xi_3 \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < 1 \right) \right), \\
(\Omega(5), \delta_1) &: \xi_3 > 1 \wedge \\
&\quad \left(\left(1 < \xi_1 < \xi_3^{1/2} \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < \frac{\xi_1^2}{\xi_3} \right) \vee \left(\xi_3^{1/2} < \xi_1 < \xi_3 \wedge \frac{\xi_1}{\xi_3} < \xi_2 < 1 \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Computational Proof. The quantifier elimination problems were set up similarly to Example 4.6 and solved using `Mathematica`. \square

Remark 4.8. To obtain Table 1, some of the computations were made indirectly. For example, we checked that for δ_1 multistationarity doesn't take place in $\Omega(1)$ but we couldn't check directly that it doesn't take place in $\Omega(2)$, as the computations did not finish within one to five days. We therefore checked that it does not take place in $\Omega(1) \cup \Omega(2) \cup \Omega(1, 2)$, where $\Omega(1, 2)$ denotes the boundary between $\Omega(1)$ and $\Omega(2)$. This computation was feasible. It is an interesting computational challenge to classify all boundaries between chambers.

Remark 4.9. The quantifier elimination problems arising from the analysis of multistationarity have additional structure that should be exploited. In particular, the run times of our computations seem to be sensitive to the formulation of the input. We experimented with different equivalent semi-algebraic systems in `Mathematica`. One knob to turn is the system $Z((\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star a) = 0$ in Corollary 3.17. Different bases for the row space of Z lead to different run times. Consider the pair $(\Omega(4), \delta_4)$ and let R_1, R_2 , and R_3 be the rows of Z from eq. (4.2). Let $Z_1 = [(R_1 + R_2 + R_3)^T | (R_2 + R_3)^T | R_3^T]^T$, $Z_2 = [R_1^T | R_2^T | (R_3 - R_1 - R_2)^T]^T$, and $Z_3 = [R_1^T | (R_3 - R_2)^T | (R_3 - R_1)^T]$. Using in Corollary 3.17 the matrix Z from (4.2), the computation takes about seven seconds while with either of Z_1, Z_2 , and Z_3 the computation did not finish within 24 hours. It is tempting to think that the computations with the matrix Z are faster because it is in row echelon form; however this is not the case: for the pair $(\Omega(1), \delta_1)$ the computation with Z did not finish in several days while the computation with Z_3 finished within a few hours.

Remark 4.10. Since in Corollary 3.17 we are only interested in the positive solutions of the system $Z((\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star x) = 0$, clearing denominators does not add any new solutions. Let $\varsigma(Z, \xi^A, \delta, x)$ denote the system obtained from $Z((\xi^A - \mathbf{1}) \star x) = 0$ and δ , by clearing

denominators. If Z' and A' are matrices obtained by performing elementary row operations on Z and A respectively, then $\varsigma(Z, \xi^A, \delta, x)$ and $\varsigma(Z', \xi^{A'}, \delta, x)$ have the same set of positive solutions (they are *equivalent systems*), yet they are not linearly equivalent systems.

Remark 4.11. Throughout we found `Mathematica` to have the fastest implementation of quantifier elimination. It would be nice to implement heuristics for pre-simplification, e.g. along the lines of [9], in open source systems such as `qepcadB` [8] or `REDLOG` [24]. The performance of quantifier elimination on systems from biology has been explored in [6].

The first row of Table 1 shows that multistationarity is only possible if $c \notin \Omega(1)$:

Corollary 4.12. *For (\mathcal{N}_2) , if $c \in \Omega(1)$, then there is no $k \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12}$ such that the equations*

$$Sv(k, x) = 0, \quad Zx = c$$

have at least two positive solutions.

Together with results of Bihan, Dickenstein, and Giaroli we almost obtain a characterization of multistationarity for 2-site phosphorylation in the total concentration coordinates. The regions of multistationarity are polyhedral and the only unresolved cases are when $c_2 = c_3$, $c_1 = c_3$, or both.

Corollary 4.13. *In the 2-site phosphorylation network, multistationarity is impossible if $c_3 < c_2$ and $c_3 < c_1$, and possible if $c_3 > c_2$ or $c_3 > c_1$. If S_{tot} is the total concentration of substrate, F_{tot} that of phosphatase, and E_{tot} that of kinase, then multistationarity is impossible if $S_{tot} < E_{tot}$ and $S_{tot} < F_{tot}$ and possible if $S_{tot} > E_{tot}$ or $S_{tot} > F_{tot}$.*

Proof. Theorem 4.1 in [5] says (in our notation) that if $c_3 > c_2$, then there is a choice of rate constants k for which there is multistationarity. There is an inherent symmetry of the system, exchanging x_2, x_3, x_5 with, respectively, x_7, x_8, x_9 . Under this symmetry, the mathematical properties are unchanged, but c_1 and c_2 change roles. Therefore there is multistationarity also if just $c_3 > c_1$. Theorem 4.7 shows that if both $c_1 < c_3$ and $c_2 < c_3$ then multistationarity is impossible. \square

To characterize multistationarity for (\mathcal{N}_2) , the following boundary cases remain

- $c_3 = c_2$ and $c_1 < c_3$,
- $c_3 < c_2$ and $c_1 = c_3$,
- $c_3 = c_2$ and $c_1 = c_3$.


We attempted this classification using computations as in Example 4.6. For several combinations of signs and items above, we could rule out multistationarity, but no conclusions were possible. One region we could not rule out was sign δ_7 combined with $c_1 = c_2 = c_3$. For this instance we employed the numerical solver `scip` [35]. It could not find a solution to the corresponding inequality system and the run on the computation indicates that multistationarity is impossible in this region too. From these computational experiences we conjecture that multistationarity is impossible in the boundary regions.

5. ON THE EXISTENCE OF MONOMIAL PARAMETRIZATIONS FOR V^+

Definition 3.1 uses the strictly positive steady states. This differs from the definition of *toric steady states*, which uses the steady state ideal and thus poses restrictions on all complex solutions of the steady state equations. Example 5.1 demonstrates the, maybe unsurprising, fact that the positive real part can have a monomial parametrization while the whole steady state variety does not. We discuss these phenomena in the context of decompositions of binomial ideals [25, 39].

It follows from [25, Corollary 1.2] that a binomial Gröbner basis of the steady state ideal is sufficient for toric steady states and thus a monomial parametrization of the positive steady states (by Proposition 5.2). A binomial steady state ideal, however, is not necessary for this. The steady state ideal may possess primary components that are irrelevant to the positive real part. We first illustrate this fact with an example.

Example 5.1. Let \mathcal{T} be the following triangular network [43, Example 2.3]:




Let x_i denote the concentration of X_i . The steady state ideal of network \mathcal{T} is $I_1 = \langle x_1^2 - x_2^2 \rangle = \langle x_1 - x_2 \rangle \cap \langle x_1 + x_2 \rangle$. The Zariski closure of the positive steady state variety $\overline{V^+} = \mathbb{V}(x_1 - x_2)$ has exactly one irreducible component defined by one binomial and is thus a toric variety. It has a monomial parametrization $x_1 = x_2 = s$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Restricting this monomial parametrization to the interior of the positive orthant yields a parametrization for V_1^+ (see Fig. 3a). Let

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} I_2 &= I_1 \cap \langle x_1 + x_2 + 1 \rangle = \langle x_1 - x_2 \rangle \cap \langle x_1 + x_2 \rangle \cap \langle x_1 + x_2 + 1 \rangle \\ &= \langle -x_1^3 - x_1^2 x_2 + x_1 x_2^2 + x_2^3 - x_1^2 + x_2^2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, I_2 is not binomial; I_2 is the intersection of two prime binomial ideals and a prime trinomial ideal. Geometrically, the intersection of ideals corresponds to taking the union of the corresponding varieties as in Fig. 3b. Only the component $\mathbb{V}(x_1 - x_2)$ of $\mathbb{V}(I_2)$ intersects the interior of the positive orthant. Still, I_2 can be the steady state ideal of some mass-action network. According to [29, Section 4.7.1.1], a mass-action network is described by a system of ODEs of the form $\dot{x} = f$, where $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]^n$, if and only if every negative term in f_i is divisible by the variable x_i . This condition is fulfilled by the following system of ODEs:

$$\dot{x}_1 = -\dot{x}_2 = -x_1^3 - x_1^2 x_2 + x_1 x_2^2 + x_2^3 - x_1^2 + x_2^2.$$




(a) The variety $\mathbb{V}(x_1^2 - x_2^2) = \mathbb{V}(x_1 - x_2) \cup \mathbb{V}(x_1 + x_2)$ of \mathcal{T} from Example 5.1. \mathcal{S} has toric steady states as its steady state ideal is binomial and $\overline{V_1^+}$ is nonempty and irreducible (see [43, Definition 2.2]). V_1^+ is parametrized by $s \mapsto (s, s)$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

(b) The variety $\mathbb{V}((x_1^2 - x_2^2)(x_1 + x_2 + 1)) = \mathbb{V}(x_1 - x_2) \cup \mathbb{V}(x_1 + x_2) \cup \mathbb{V}(x_1 + x_2 + 1)$ of \mathcal{S} from Example 5.1. \mathcal{S} does not have toric steady states according to [43, Definition 2.2] because I_2 is not binomial. Still, $\mathbb{V}(I_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ is toric and parametrized by $s \mapsto (s, s)$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

FIGURE 3. The positive steady state varieties of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are equal. \mathcal{T} has a binomial steady state ideal while \mathcal{S} does not. In both cases the equations that describe only the positive steady states are binomial.

One network whose steady state ideal is equal to I_2 is \mathcal{S} :



Summarizing, the steady state variety $\mathbb{V}(I_2)$ has three irreducible components, but only $\mathbb{V}(x_1 - x_2)$ intersects the interior of the positive orthant. Since $V_1^+ = V_2^+$, the positive steady state varieties of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} share the parametrization $x_1 = x_2 = s$, for $s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

The following proposition uses [25, Section 2] to show why the name *toric steady states* is justified. We include it, as it seems to have never appeared explicitly in the literature. Proposition 5.2 below shows that if the steady state ideal is binomial, then the positive real part of its variety always admits a monomial parametrization, even if the corresponding variety does not.

Proposition 5.2. *If $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}[x]$ is a binomial ideal, then at most one of the irreducible components of its variety intersects $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $I = I : (x_1 \dots x_n)^\infty$ and $I = I\mathbb{R}[x^\pm] \cap \mathbb{R}[x]$ as all other components are contained in coordinate hyperplanes. By [25, Corollary 2.5],

$$I = I_+(\rho) = \langle x^{m_+} - \rho(m)x^{m_-} : m \in L_\rho \rangle$$

for a unique lattice $L \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ and partial character $\rho : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$. By [25, Corollary 2.2], $I_+(\rho)$, seen as an ideal of $\mathbb{C}[x]$, is radical and it has a decomposition into prime ideals as

$$I_+(\rho) = \bigcap_{j=1}^g I_+(\rho_j),$$

where $\{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_g\}$ is the set of extensions of ρ to the saturation $\text{Sat}(L)$ of L and g is the order of the group $\text{Sat}(L)/L$. A variety $\mathbb{V}(I_+(\rho_k))$ has positive points if and only if ρ_k takes only positive real values. Fixing b_1, \dots, b_r to be a basis of $\text{Sat}(L_\rho)$, any basis c_1, \dots, c_r of L can be expressed in terms of the b_i as $c_i = \sum_j a_{ij} b_j$ where $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times r}$ has determinant g . Let ρ_k be any of the extensions of ρ ; since $\rho = \rho_k|_L$, we have

$$(5.2) \quad \rho(c_i) = \rho_k \left(\sum_j a_{ij} b_j \right) = \prod_j \rho_k(b_j)^{a_{ij}}.$$

These equations in the unknowns $\rho_k(b_j)$ determine the extensions of ρ and thus the irreducible components of $\mathbb{V}(I)$. If $\rho_k(b_j)$ is not positive and real for some k and $j \in [r]$, then $\mathbb{V}(I_+(\rho_k)) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n = \emptyset$. We only need to consider components for which $\rho_k(b_j) > 0$ for all $j \in [r]$. In this case we can take logarithms on both sides of (5.2):

$$(5.3) \quad \log(\rho(c_i)) = \sum_j a_{ij} \log(\rho_k(b_j)).$$

The result is a linear equation for $\log(\rho_k(b_j))$ whose solutions yield characters ρ_k such that $\mathbb{V}(I_+(\rho_k))$ has positive points. The matrix A can be inverted over \mathbb{Q} . Write $\log \rho_k(b) = (\log \rho_k(b_1), \dots, \log \rho_k(b_r))$ and similarly $\log \rho(c) = (\log \rho(c_1), \dots, \log \rho(c_r))$. Then (5.3) has the unique solution $\log \rho_k(b) = A^{-1} \log \rho(c)$. Consequently, there is a unique saturation $\rho^* : \text{Sat}(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^*$ of ρ such that $\rho^*(b_i) > 0$. \square

With Example 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 in mind, one would like to analyze the primary decomposition of any steady state ideal that one encounters. If the original steady state ideal was not binomial, then maybe the primary decomposition reveals that at least all components whose varieties intersect the positive orthant are binomial. In this case one has a monomial parametrization for each such component. Deciding if a non-binomial variety contains positive real points is very hard, though. Only in the binomial case it is easy using the analysis of characters as in the proof of Proposition 5.2.

Remark 5.3. If the steady state equations in variables (k, x) are binomials in x , then Proposition 5.2 holds locally. In particular, for any specialization of the k to positive real numbers, one has a binomial ideal, as specialization of the k could only reduce the number of terms. For a careful analysis of the consequences of specialization on two different generating

sets of the same steady state ideal see [50, Section 2]. It remains an interesting problem to systematically analyze primary decompositions of steady state ideals in $\mathbb{R}(k)[x]$.

6. DISCUSSION

The results in this paper show that multistationarity of mass-action systems is a semi-algebraic condition. Polynomial inequalities are used to describe where in parameter space multistationarity can occur. On the 2-site phosphorylation network the result is particularly satisfying as Corollary 4.13 complements the results of Bihan et al. and shows—in biologically meaningful terms—exactly where multistationarity is possible. The chamber decomposition is an interesting structure because it is inherent to the biological system. It would be interesting to apply our methods to other systems where the chamber decomposition is explicitly known, e.g. the Wnt pathway from [36]. For us, this shows that it is worthwhile for biologists to interact with real algebraic geometry. Mass-action systems whose steady state varieties admit a monomial parametrization appear as a natural hunting ground. Here the techniques of this paper can be applied and combined with ever more powerful exact computational methods from logic. As an immediate goal, it would be very interesting to prove or disprove Corollary 4.13 for 3-site or n -site phosphorylation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, 284057449. Alexandru Iosif and Thomas Kahle are also partially supported by the DFG-RTG “MathCore”, 314838170. We thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments. One reviewer helped to improve the paper by providing a simpler proof of Lemma 3.10, clarifying the statements of Theorems 3.15 and 3.18, and pointing us to [5, Theorem 4.1] which yields Corollary 4.13.

REFERENCES

1. Murad Banaji and Gheorghe Craciun, *Graph-theoretic approaches to injectivity and multiple equilibria in systems of interacting elements*, Communications in Mathematical Sciences **7** (2009), no. 4, 867–900.
2. ———, *Graph-theoretic criteria for injectivity and unique equilibria in general chemical reaction systems*, Advances in Applied Mathematics **44** (2010), no. 2, 168 – 184.
3. Daniel J. Bates, Jonathan D. Hauenstein, Andrew J. Sommese, and Charles W. Wampler, *Bertini: Software for Numerical Algebraic Geometry*, Available at bertini.nd.edu with permanent doi: [dx.doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5](https://doi.org/10.7274/R0H41PB5).
4. Eberhard Becker and Rolf Neuhaus, *Computation of real radicals of polynomial ideals*, Computational algebraic geometry, Springer, 1993, pp. 1–20.
5. Frédéric Bihan, Alicia Dickenstein, and Magalí Giaroli, *Lower bounds for positive roots and regions of multistationarity in chemical reaction networks*, preprint, arXiv:1807.05157 (2018).
6. Russell Bradford, James Davenport, Matthew England, Hassan Errami, Vladimir P. Gerdt, Dima Grigoriev, Charles Hoyt, Marek Kosta, Ovidiu Radulescu, Thomas Sturm, and Andreas Weber, *A case study on the parametric occurrence of multiple steady states*, Proceedings of the 42nd International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC ’17), ACM, July 2017, pp. 45–52.
7. Danielle Brake and Matt Niemberg, *Paramotopy*, available at <http://paramotopy.com>, 2016.

8. Christopher W. Brown, *QEPCAD B: a program for computing with semi-algebraic sets using CADs*, ACM SIGSAM Bulletin **37** (2003), no. 4, 97–108.
9. Christopher W. Brown and Adam Strzeboński, *Black-box/white-box simplification and applications to quantifier elimination*, Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ACM, 2010, pp. 69–76.
10. Carsten Conradi, Elisenda Feliu, Maya Mincheva, and Carsten Wiuf, *Identifying parameter regions for multistationarity*, PLOS Computational Biology **13** (2017), no. 10, 1–25.
11. Carsten Conradi and Dietrich Flockerzi, *Multistationarity in mass action networks with applications to ERK activation*, Journal of mathematical biology **65** (2012), no. 1, 107–156.
12. Carsten Conradi, Dietrich Flockerzi, and Jörg Raisch, *Multistationarity in the activation of a MAPK: parametrizing the relevant region in parameter space*, Mathematical biosciences **211** (2008), no. 1, 105–131.
13. Carsten Conradi and Maya Mincheva, *Catalytic constants enable the emergence of bistability in dual phosphorylation*, Journal of The Royal Society Interface **11** (2014), no. 95, 20140158.
14. Carsten Conradi and Casian Pantea, *Chapter 9 - multistationarity in biochemical networks: Results, analysis, and examples*, Algebraic and Combinatorial Computational Biology (Raina Robeva and Matthew Macauley, eds.), Academic Press, 2019, pp. 279 – 317.
15. Carsten Conradi, Julio Saez-Rodriguez, Ernst-Dieter Gilles, and Jörg Raisch, *Using Chemical Reaction Network Theory to discard a kinetic mechanism hypothesis*, Systems Biology, IEE Proceedings (now IET Systems Biology) **152** (2005), no. 4, 243–248.
16. Carsten Conradi and Anne Shiu, *Dynamics of posttranslational modification systems: Recent progress and future directions*, Biophysical Journal **114** (2018), no. 3, 507 – 515.
17. Michel Coste, *An introduction to semialgebraic geometry*, RAAG network school **145** (2002), 30.
18. David A. Cox, John B. Little, and Donal O’Shea, *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*, second ed., UTM, Springer, New York, 1996.
19. Gheorghe Craciun, Alicia Dickenstein, Anne Shiu, and Bernd Sturmfels, *Toric dynamical systems*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **44** (2009), no. 11, 1551 – 1565, Ordner: Gattermann.
20. Gheorghe Craciun, Casian Pantea, and Grzegorz A. Rempala, *Algebraic methods for inferring biochemical networks: a maximum likelihood approach*, Computational biology and chemistry **33** (2009), no. 5, 361–367.
21. Jesús A. De Loera, Edward D. Kim, Shmuel Onn, and Francisco Santos, *Graphs of transportation polytopes*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **116** (2009), no. 8, 1306–1325.
22. Alicia Dickenstein, *Biochemical reaction networks: An invitation for algebraic geometers*, Mathematical Congress of the Americas, vol. 656, American Mathematical Soc., 2016, pp. 65–83.
23. Alicia Dickenstein, Mercedes Perez Millan, Anne Shiu, and Xiaoxian Tang, *Multistationarity in structured reaction networks*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05574 (2018).
24. Andreas Dolzmann and Thomas Sturm, *REDLOG: Computer algebra meets computer logic*, SIGSAM Bull. **31** (1997), no. 2, 2–9.
25. David Eisenbud and Bernd Sturmfels, *Binomial ideals*, Duke Mathematical Journal **84** (1996), no. 1, 1–45.
26. Phillip Ellison and Martin Feinberg, *How catalytic mechanisms reveal themselves in multiple steady-state data: I. Basic principles*, Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical **154** (2000), no. 1–2, 155–167.
27. Phillip Ellison, Martin Feinberg, Ming-Huei Yueb, and Howard Saltsburg, *How catalytic mechanisms reveal themselves in multiple steady-state data: II. An ethylene hydrogenation example*, Journal of Molecular Catalysis A: Chemical **154** (2000), no. 1–2, 169–184.
28. Phillip Raymond Ellison, *The Advanced Deficiency Algorithm and its applications to mechanism discrimination*, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Rochester, 1998.

29. Péter Érdi and János Tóth, *Mathematical models of chemical reactions: theory and applications of deterministic and stochastic models*, Manchester University Press, 1989.
30. Martin Feinberg, *The existence and uniqueness of steady states for a class of chemical reaction networks*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **132** (1995), no. 4, 311–370.
31. ———, *Multiple steady states for chemical reaction networks of Deficiency One*, Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis **132** (1995), no. 4, 371–406.
32. Elisenda Feliu and Carsten Wiuf, *Preclusion of switch behavior in networks with mass-action kinetics*, Applied Mathematics and Computation **219** (2012), no. 4, 1449 – 1467.
33. Dietrich Flockerzi, Katharina Holstein, and Carsten Conradi, *N-site phosphorylation systems with 2n-1 steady states*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology (2014), 1–25.
34. Ewgenij Gawrilow and Michael Joswig, *polymake: a framework for analyzing convex polytopes*, Polytopes—combinatorics and computation, vol. 29, Birkhäuser, 2000, pp. 43–47.
35. Ambros Gleixner, Michael Bastubbe, Leon Eifler, Tristan Gally, Gerald Gamrath, Robert Lion Gottwald, Gregor Hendel, Christopher Hojny, Thorsten Koch, Marco E. Lübbecke, Stephen J. Maher, Matthias Miltenberger, Benjamin Müller, Marc E. Pfetsch, Christian Puchert, Daniel Rehfeldt, Franziska Schlösser, Christoph Schubert, Felipe Serrano, Yuji Shinano, Jan Merlin Viernickel, Matthias Walter, Fabian Wegscheider, Jonas T. Witt, and Jakob Witzig, *The SCIP Optimization Suite 6.0*, Technical report, Optimization Online, July 2018.
36. Elizabeth Gross, Heather A. Harrington, Zvi Rosen, and Bernd Sturmfels, *Algebraic systems biology: A case study for the wnt pathway*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology **78** (2016), no. 1, 21–51.
37. Katharina Holstein, Dietrich Flockerzi, and Carsten Conradi, *Multistationarity in sequential distributed multisite phosphorylation networks*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology **75** (2013), no. 11, 2028–2058.
38. Wolfram Research, Inc., *Mathematica, Version 11.2*, Champaign, IL, 2017.
39. Thomas Kahle and Ezra Miller, *Decompositions of commutative monoid congruences and binomial ideals*, Algebra & Number Theory **8** (2014), no. 6, 1297–1364.
40. Daniel Lazard and Fabrice Rouillier, *Solving parametric polynomial systems*, Journal of Symbolic Computation **42** (2007), no. 6, 636 – 667.
41. Maplesoft, a division of Waterloo Maple Inc., Waterloo, Ontario, *Maple 2017*.
42. Nick I. Markevich, Jan B. Hoek, and Boris N. Kholodenko, *Signaling switches and bistability arising from multisite phosphorylation in protein kinase cascades*, The Journal of Cell Biology **164** (2004), no. 3, 353–359.
43. Mercedes Pérez Millán, Alicia Dickenstein, Anne Shiu, and Carsten Conradi, *Chemical reaction systems with toric steady states*, Bulletin of Mathematical Biology **74** (2012), no. 5, 1027–1065.
44. Stefan Müller, Elisenda Feliu, Georg Regensburger, Carsten Conradi, Anne Shiu, and Alicia Dickenstein, *Sign conditions for injectivity of generalized polynomial maps with applications to chemical reaction networks and real algebraic geometry*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics **16** (2016), no. 1, 69–97.
45. Rolf Neuhaus, *Computation of real radicals of polynomial ideals—II*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **124** (1998), no. 1-3, 261–280.
46. Mercedes Pérez Millán and Alicia Dickenstein, *The structure of MESSI biological systems*, SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems **17** (2018), no. 2, 1650–1682.
47. Jörg Rambau, *TOPCOM: Triangulations of point configurations and oriented matroids*, Mathematical Software—ICMS 2002 (Arjeh M. Cohen, Xiao-Shan Gao, and Nobuki Takayama, eds.), World Scientific, 2002, pp. 330–340.
48. Ralph Tyrell Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*, Princeton University Press, 1970.
49. AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh and Elisenda Feliu, *Groebner bases of reaction networks with intermediate species*, preprint, arXiv:1804.01381 (2018).

50. ———, *The multistationarity structure of networks with intermediates and a binomial core network*, preprint, arXiv:1808.07548 (2018).
51. Paul M. Schlosser and Martin Feinberg, *A theory of multiple steady states in isothermal homogeneous CFSTRs with many reactions*, *Chemical Engineering Science* **49** (1994), no. 11, 1749 – 1767.
52. Guy Shinar and Martin Feinberg, *Concordant chemical reaction networks*, *Mathematical Biosciences* **240** (2012), no. 2, 92 – 113.
53. ———, *Concordant chemical reaction networks and the species-reaction graph*, *Mathematical Biosciences* **241** (2013), no. 1, 1 – 23.
54. Anne Shiu, *Algebraic methods for biochemical reaction network theory*, Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 2010.
55. Anne Shiu and Bernd Sturmfels, *Siphons in chemical reaction networks*, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **72** (2010), no. 6, 1448–1463, Ordner: Gatermann.
56. Liming Wang and Eduardo Sontag, *On the number of steady states in a multiple futile cycle*, *Journal of Mathematical Biology* **57** (2008), 29–52.
57. Carsten Wiuf and Elisenda Feliu, *Power-law kinetics and determinant criteria for the preclusion of multistationarity in networks of interacting species*, *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems* **12** (2013), no. 4, 1685–1721.
58. Günter M. Ziegler, *Lectures on polytopes*, GTM, vol. 152, Springer Verlag, 2012.

HOCHSCHULE FÜR TECHNIK UND WIRTSCHAFT, BERLIN, GERMANY

E-mail address: carsten.conradi@htw-berlin.de

JOINT RESEARCH CENTER FOR COMPUTATIONAL BIOMEDICINE, AACHEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: iosif@aices.rwth-aachen.de

OTTO-VON-GUERICKE UNIVERSITÄT, MAGDEBURG, GERMANY

E-mail address: thomas.kahle@ovgu.de