

THE KINETIC SPACE OF MULTISTATIONARITY IN DUAL PHOSPHORYLATION

ELISENDA FELIU^{1,4}, NIDHI KAIHNSA², TIMO DE WOLFF³, OĞUZHAN YÜRÜK³

ABSTRACT. Multistationarity in molecular systems underlies switch-like responses in cellular decision making. Determining whether and when a system displays multistationarity is in general a difficult problem. In this work we completely determine the set of kinetic parameters that enable multistationarity in a ubiquitous motif involved in cell signaling, namely a dual phosphorylation cycle. In addition we show that the regions of multistationarity and monostationarity are both path connected.

We model the dynamics of the concentrations of the proteins over time by means of a parametrized polynomial ordinary differential equation (ODE) system arising from the mass-action assumption. Since this system has three linear first integrals defined by the total amounts of the substrate and the two enzymes, we study for what parameter values the ODE system has at least two positive steady states after suitably choosing the total amounts. We employ a suite of techniques from (real) algebraic geometry, which in particular concern the study of the signs of a multivariate polynomial over the positive orthant and sums of nonnegative circuit polynomials.

1. Introduction

Multistationarity, that is the existence of multiple steady states in a system, has been linked to cellular decision making and switch-like responses to graded input [27, 30, 42]. In the context of chemical reaction networks, there exist numerous methods to decide whether multistationarity arises for some choice of parameter values [7, 11, 12, 15–17, 33, 41]. However, determining for *which* parameter values this is the case, is a very difficult problem with complicated answers. Some recent progress in understanding the parameter region of multistationarity has eased the problem by focusing on subsets of parameters, and providing regions that guarantee or exclude that the other parameters can be chosen in such a way that multistationarity arises [1, 5].

Here, we completely characterize the region of multistationarity in terms of kinetic parameters for a simple model of phosphorylation and dephosphorylation, which is a building block of the MAPK cascade involved ubiquitously in cell signaling [23, 24, 34]. Phosphorylation processes are central in the modulation of cell communication, activities and responses, as, for example, phosphorylation affects about 30% of all proteins in human body [3].

¹Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 5, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark. efeliu@math.ku.dk

²Division of Applied Mathematics, Brown University, 182 George Street, Providence, RI, 02912. nidhi_kaihnsa@brown.edu

³Institute of Analysis and Algebra, TU Braunschweig, Universitätsplatz 2, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany. t.de-wolff@tu-braunschweig.de, oguyueru@tu-braunschweig.de


⁴*Corresponding author:* efeliu@math.ku.dk

Date: April 15, 2020.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 92Bxx, 14Pxx, 37N25, 52B20, 90C26.

Key words and phrases. Two-site phosphorylation, Multistationarity, Chemical reaction networks, Real algebraic geometry, Cylindrical algebraic decomposition Circuit polynomials.

The reaction network we consider consists of a substrate S that has two phosphorylation sites. Phosphorylation occurs distributively in an ordered manner, such that one of the sites is always phosphorylated first. We denote the three phosphoforms of S with 0, 1, 2 phosphorylated sites by S_0, S_1, S_2 respectively, and assume that a kinase E and a phosphatase F mediate the phosphorylation and dephosphorylation of S respectively. This gives rise to the following mechanism [8, 40]:



Under the assumption of mass-action kinetics, the evolution of the concentration of the species of the network over time is modeled by a system of autonomous ODEs in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^9$, see equation (2). The system consists of polynomial equations, whose coefficients are scalar multiples of one of 12 positive parameters $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}$. Furthermore, the dynamics are constrained to linear invariant subspaces of dimension six, characterized by the total amounts of kinase, phosphatase and substrate, which then enter the study as parameters.

In addition to the biological relevance of this system, this network has become the *model model* (like the model organisms in biology), where new techniques, strategies, and approaches are tested. We expect that the strategies employed to answer mathematical questions about this model can be used to approach similar systems arising in molecular biology. This system is large enough for hands-on approaches to fail, but small enough to challenge the development of new mathematics. Furthermore, dynamical properties of the ODE system of this network might be lifted to more complex networks related to it. For example, (1) is an example of an n -site phosphorylation cycle [21, 37, 40], a post-translational modification network [10, 19, 36], a MESSI system [32], and a network with toric steady states [33], to name a few.

Currently, it is known that the number of positive steady states within a linear invariant subspace is either one or three, if all positive steady states are nondegenerate [28, 40]. It has also been shown that there are choices of parameters for which there are two asymptotically stable steady states and one unstable steady state [22], see also [38]. It is currently unknown whether it admits Hopf bifurcations or periodic solutions [4].

Some recent progress has shed some light on how these qualitative properties depend on the choice of parameters. In [8] the authors give two rational functions $a(\kappa)$ and $b(\kappa)$ on the parameters $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}$ (see (5) below), with the following properties: The system has one positive steady state in each invariant linear subspace if $a(\kappa) \geq 0$ and $b(\kappa) \geq 0$, and has at least two in some invariant linear subspace if $a(\kappa) < 0$, see Subsection 2.3. Furthermore, in [1, 18] conditions for the existence of three positive steady states involving the parameters $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}$ and some of the total amounts are given, see also [6].

The difficulties in understanding the number of steady states arise from the high number of parameters and variables combined with the difficulties in studying polynomials over the positive real numbers. This is what left the scenario $a(\kappa) \geq 0$ and $b(\kappa) < 0$ open in [8]. In this work, we focus on this open case. We give necessary conditions and sufficient conditions for multistationarity to arise in this case, and give an explicit parametrization of the boundary between the region of monostationarity and multistationarity. Specifically, our approach to the study of the regions of mono- and multistationarity gives rise to the following contributions:

- **Sufficient conditions for monostationarity.** We provide two such conditions of the form $H(\kappa) \geq 0$. First, we obtain a polynomial inequality in κ using the theory of discriminants, see Theorem 3.1 in Subsection 3.1. This inequality completely characterizes the region of

multistationarity when $a(\kappa) = 0$. Second, we provide an inequality where H is a generalized polynomial with rational exponents. This is obtained by decomposing a relevant polynomial into a sum of nonnegative circuit polynomials (SONC), see Theorem 3.5 in Subsection 3.2. Although these inequalities are not necessary for monostationarity, the latter inequality gives preliminary information on the shape of the multistationarity region (Corollary 3.9), which is critical to its characterization in Section 4.

- **Existence of multistationarity when $a(\kappa) \geq 0$ and $b(\kappa) < 0$.** Proposition 4.1 in Subsection 4.1 shows that in this case, multistationarity occurs for suitable κ .
- **Parametric description of the regions of mono- and multistationarity.** In Theorem 4.4 in Subsection 4.2 we provide a full parametric description of the two regions, by giving an explicit parametric representation of the boundary between the two regions.
- **Connectivity.** In Theorem 5.2 in Section 5 we conclude that the region of multistationarity in the parameters $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}$ is an open and connected set, and the region of monostationarity is closed in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12}$ and connected as well.

We will repeatedly employ the Descartes' rule of signs, and the study of the Newton polytope associated with several polynomials, the relevant properties of which are reviewed in Subsection 2.2. Furthermore, some proofs rely on the use of symbolic algorithms from real algebraic geometry as implemented in `Maple` 2019. These include the selection of a point in each connected component of a semi-algebraic set, and the verification that a semi-algebraic set is empty. These computations are presented in the accompanying supplementary file *SupplInfo.mw*. Computations have also been performed in `Mathematica`, to reassess the validity of the proofs.

We hope that the techniques used here, targeting the study of the signs of a parametric multivariate polynomial on the positive orthant, can be employed for other systems. For instance, the allosteric kinase model given in [20] presents difficulties analogous to those encountered here. Furthermore, the study of signs plays a key role when analyzing the stability of steady states or the presence of Hopf bifurcations via the Routh-Hurwitz criterion (see for example [9, 38]).

2. Preliminaries

We start by introducing the notation, the ODE system and the mathematical techniques used in later sections, namely the Newton polytope and circuit polynomials. We elaborate on the problem we are interested in, and on the previous work.

2.1. The ODE system and a polynomial. We introduce the ODE system describing the dynamics of the reaction network (1), its linear first integrals, and a polynomial whose signs determine whether multiple positive steady states exist in some linear invariant subspace.

We consider the reaction network (1) and denote the concentrations of the species by $x_1 = [E]$, $x_2 = [F]$, $x_3 = [S_0]$, $x_4 = [S_1]$, $x_5 = [S_2]$, $x_6 = [ES_0]$, $x_7 = [FS_1]$, $x_8 = [ES_1]$, $x_9 = [FS_2]$. Under mass-action kinetics, the ODE system modelling the concentrations of the nine species in the network (1) over time t is

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dx_1}{dt} &= -\kappa_1 x_1 x_3 - \kappa_7 x_1 x_4 + \kappa_2 x_6 + \kappa_3 x_6 + \kappa_8 x_8 + \kappa_9 x_8 & \frac{dx_6}{dt} &= \kappa_1 x_1 x_3 - \kappa_2 x_6 - \kappa_3 x_6 \\
 \frac{dx_2}{dt} &= -\kappa_4 x_2 x_4 - \kappa_{10} x_2 x_5 + \kappa_5 x_7 + \kappa_6 x_7 + \kappa_{11} x_9 + \kappa_{12} x_9 & \frac{dx_7}{dt} &= \kappa_4 x_2 x_4 - \kappa_5 x_7 - \kappa_6 x_7 \\
 \frac{dx_3}{dt} &= -\kappa_1 x_1 x_3 + \kappa_2 x_6 + \kappa_6 x_7 & \frac{dx_8}{dt} &= \kappa_7 x_1 x_4 - \kappa_8 x_8 - \kappa_9 x_8 \\
 \frac{dx_4}{dt} &= -\kappa_4 x_2 x_4 - \kappa_7 x_1 x_4 + \kappa_3 x_6 + \kappa_5 x_7 + \kappa_8 x_8 + \kappa_{12} x_9 & \frac{dx_9}{dt} &= \kappa_{10} x_2 x_5 - \kappa_{11} x_9 - \kappa_{12} x_9 \\
 \frac{dx_5}{dt} &= -\kappa_{10} x_2 x_5 + \kappa_9 x_8 + \kappa_{11} x_9, & &
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2}$$

where $x_i = x_i(t)$, [8]. This is a polynomial ODE system with coefficients $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12} > 0$. These coefficients are treated as parameters, and referred to as *reaction rate constants*. The positive and nonnegative orthants of \mathbb{R}^9 are forward invariant by the trajectories of this system (as it is the case for all mass-action systems [39]). Furthermore, the system admits exactly three independent linear first integrals, $x_1 + x_6 + x_8$, $x_2 + x_7 + x_9$ and $x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 + x_8 + x_9$. Note that these are independent of κ_i . It follows that the dynamics take place in linear invariant subspaces of dimension six, defined by the equations

$$(3) \quad x_1 + x_6 + x_8 = E_{\text{tot}}, \quad x_2 + x_7 + x_9 = F_{\text{tot}}, \quad x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 + x_8 + x_9 = S_{\text{tot}},$$

subject to $x_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, 9$. Here $E_{\text{tot}}, F_{\text{tot}}, S_{\text{tot}}$ stand for the total amounts of kinase E , phosphatase F and substrate S . In the chemistry literature, the equations in (3) are referred to as conservation laws and they define the so-called stoichiometric compatibility classes.

The steady states of the network are the solutions to the system of polynomial equations given by setting the right-hand side of (2) to zero. Three of these equations are redundant, and for example the ones for x_1, x_2, x_3 can be removed. The remaining six equations together with the equations in (3) form the *steady state system*, which has variables x_1, \dots, x_9 and parameters $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}, E_{\text{tot}}, F_{\text{tot}}, S_{\text{tot}}$, all of which are assumed to be positive. The nonnegative solutions of the steady state equations determine the nonnegative steady states within the corresponding linear invariant subspace. This system has at least one positive solution for any choice of parameters, but it can have up to three. This gives rise to the following definition.

Definition 2.1. A vector of reaction rate constants $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12}$ enables multistationarity if there exist $E_{\text{tot}}, F_{\text{tot}}, S_{\text{tot}}$ such that the steady state system has at least two positive solutions, that is, with all coordinates positive. In this case we say that the network is multistationary in the linear invariant subspace with total amounts $E_{\text{tot}}, F_{\text{tot}}, S_{\text{tot}}$. The vector κ is said to *preclude* multistationarity, if it does not enable it.

In [8], see also [5], sufficient conditions on the reaction rate constants for enabling or precluding multistationarity were given. These are reviewed in Subsection 2.3, after introducing a key polynomial and some background on signs of polynomials. Consider the Michaelis-Menten constants of each phosphorylation/dephosphorylation event:

$$K_1 = \frac{\kappa_2 + \kappa_3}{\kappa_1}, \quad K_2 = \frac{\kappa_5 + \kappa_6}{\kappa_4}, \quad K_3 = \frac{\kappa_8 + \kappa_9}{\kappa_7}, \quad K_4 = \frac{\kappa_{11} + \kappa_{12}}{\kappa_{10}}.$$

The map $\pi: \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ sending $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12})$ to $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ is continuous and surjective. Consider the following polynomial in x_1, x_2, x_3 with coefficients depending on η :

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} p_\eta(x) = & K_2 \kappa_3 (\kappa_3 \kappa_{12} - \kappa_6 \kappa_9) \left(K_2 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^4 x_3^2 + K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} (x_1^3 x_2^2 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2^3 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2) \right. \\ & \left. + K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 x_2 x_3^2 \right) + K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} ((K_2 + K_3) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} - (K_1 + K_4) \kappa_6 \kappa_9) x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3 \\ & + K_1 \kappa_6 \left(K_2^2 K_4 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_9^2 x_1^4 x_3 + 2 K_2 K_3 K_4 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 x_2 x_3 + K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} (\kappa_9 + \kappa_{12}) x_1^2 x_2^3 \right. \\ & \left. + K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} x_1^2 x_2^2 + K_1 K_3^2 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 (\kappa_3 + \kappa_6) x_1 x_2^4 + 2 K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 x_1 x_2^3 x_3 \right. \\ & \left. + K_1 K_2 K_3^2 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 x_1 x_2^3 + K_1 K_3^2 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12}^2 x_2^4 x_3 + K_1^2 K_3^2 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12}^2 x_2^4 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.2 ([5, 8]). *With p_η as in (4), it holds:*

(Mono) *If $p_\eta(x)$ is positive for all $x_1, x_2, x_3 > 0$, then any $\kappa \in \pi^{-1}(\eta)$ does not enable multistationarity, and there is exactly one positive steady state in each invariant linear subspace.*

(Mult) If $p_\eta(x)$ is negative for some $x_1, x_2, x_3 > 0$, then any $\kappa \in \pi^{-1}(\eta)$ enables multistationarity in the invariant linear subspace containing the point

$$\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \left(x_1, x_2, x_3, \frac{K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 x_3}{K_1 \kappa_6 x_2}, \frac{K_2 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^2 x_3}{K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} x_2^2}, \frac{x_1 x_3}{K_1}, \frac{\kappa_3 x_1 x_3}{K_1 \kappa_6}, \frac{K_2 \kappa_3 x_1^2 x_3}{K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 x_2}, \frac{K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^2 x_3}{K_1 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} x_2} \right).$$

Explicitly, the polynomial p_η equals $\det(J_F(\varphi(x_1, x_2, x_3)))$, where $F: \mathbb{R}^9 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^9$ is the function with first three components being the left-hand side of the equations in (3), and last 6 components being the right-hand side of $\frac{dx_4}{dt}, \dots, \frac{dx_9}{dt}$ in (2), and J_F denotes the corresponding Jacobian. The Brouwer degree of p_η at zero is 1, and this is used to derive conditions (Mono) and (Mult) above (see [5]). Proposition 2.2 is a specific instance of a general theorem to identify multistationarity for networks satisfying three conditions, namely dissipativity, absence of boundary steady states, and existence of an algebraic parametrization of the steady states [5]. Therefore, the approaches we use in this paper will likely be applicable to other relevant networks.

In view of Proposition 2.2, in order to determine what reaction rate constants κ enable multistationarity, we need to study what signs p_η attains over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, as a function of η . To this end, we study the relation between the coefficients of p_η and the signs the polynomial attains using the Newton polytope of p_η and a SONC decomposition, reviewed in the next subsection.

2.2. The Newton Polytope, circuit polynomials, and signs. Key results on the relation between the coefficients of a polynomial and the signs the polynomial attains, build on a geometric object, namely the Newton polytope. Consider a polynomial $p(x) = p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ in $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. The *exponent set* of p is the set of points α in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ such that $c_{\alpha} \neq 0$. The *Newton polytope* $N(p) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ associated with p is the convex hull of the exponent set. Given a face F of $N(p)$, we define the restriction of p to the monomials supported on F as

$$p_F(x) := \sum_{\alpha \in F} c_{\alpha} x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

The first main property of the Newton polytope is that any nonzero sign attained by $p_F(x)$ also is attained by $p(x)$. The following proposition is folklore in real algebraic geometry; Remark 2.4 sketches the proof by explicitly constructing the relevant points.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Given a nonempty face F of $N(p)$, consider the restriction p_F of p to the monomials supported on F . For any $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $p_F(x) \neq 0$, there exists $y \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that*

$$\text{sign}(p(y)) = \text{sign}(p_F(x)).$$

In particular, if the coefficient of one of the monomials supported on a vertex of $N(p)$ is negative, then there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ such that $p(x) < 0$.

Remark 2.4. In the context of Proposition 2.3, we find explicit values of y where the sign of $p(y)$ agrees with the sign of $p_F(x)$ as follows. For $p(x) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, consider a d -dimensional face F of $N(p)$ and assume $N(p)$ has dimension n . The *outer normal cone* \mathcal{N}_F at the face F is the cone generated by the outer normal vectors of the supporting hyperplanes of all the facets of $N(p)$ containing F . Then for any vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ in the interior of \mathcal{N}_F (relative to the affine subspace of dimension $n - d$ containing it), the scalar product $v \cdot x$ for $x \in N(p)$ is maximized when x belongs to the face F , where the value is a constant c [43]. Hence, given $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, we have

$$p(x_1 t^{v_1}, \dots, x_n t^{v_n}) = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha} t^{v_1 \alpha_1 + \cdots + v_n \alpha_n} = p_F(x) t^c + \text{lower order terms in } t.$$




FIGURE 1. (Left) The quadrilateral corresponds to $N(p)$ for p in Example 2.5, the shaded region is the outer normal cone at the vertex, and dashed vector is the chosen u . (Right) The triangle is the Newton polytope of the Motzkin polynomial in Example 2.9.

Hence, the sign of $p(x_1 t^{v_1}, \dots, x_n t^{v_n})$ agrees with the sign of $p_F(x)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ large enough.

Example 2.5. Consider the polynomial $p(x, y) = y - 4xy^3 + x^2y^4 + 8x^3y^4$. The Newton polytope $N(p)$ is a quadrilateral in the plane, see left panel in Figure 1. As $(1, 3)$ is a vertex, $p(x, y)$ attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ by Proposition 2.3. To find a point where p is negative, consider the outer normal cone at $(1, 3)$, which is generated by the outer normal vectors $v_1 := (-2, 1)$ and $v_2 := (-1, 1)$. The vector $u = v_1 + v_2 = (-3, 2)$ belongs to its interior. Evaluation of p at (t^{-3}, t^2) is $-4t^3 + 2t^2 + 8t^{-1}$, which is negative for t larger than ≈ 1.34 .

In what follows, a point α in the exponent set of a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is said to be positive (negative) if the coefficient of the monomial x^α is positive (negative). A useful consequence of Proposition 2.3 is the following result.

Corollary 2.6. *Let $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Assume $N(p)$ has dimension n and that all negative points of the exponent set of p belong to some proper face of $N(p)$ (of dimension smaller than n). Then the following equivalence of statements holds:*

$$p(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \quad \text{if and only if} \quad p(x) > 0 \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n.$$

Proof. The reverse implication is clear. To prove the forward implication, decompose $p(x)$ as

$$p(x) = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \text{ in the boundary of } N(p) \\ c_\alpha \neq 0}} c_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n} + \sum_{\substack{\alpha \text{ in the interior of } N(p) \\ c_\alpha \neq 0}} c_\alpha x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

By assumption, the second summand has only positive coefficients and hence is positive over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$. If $p(x) = 0$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$, then necessarily the first summand is negative at this point x , and it follows that the restriction of p to some proper face attains negative values. By Proposition 2.3, the same holds for p , contradicting that $p(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$. \square

We review next **circuit polynomials**, an important tool to derive conditions that guarantee a polynomial is nonnegative, that is, it does not attain negative values. Ilman and de Wolff introduced circuit polynomials in [25], extending earlier work by Reznick [35].

Definition 2.7. A polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a *circuit polynomial* if it is of the form

$$p(x) := c_\beta x^\beta + \sum_{j=0}^r c_{\alpha(j)} x^{\alpha(j)}$$

with $r \leq n$, coefficients $c_{\alpha(j)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, $c_\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, and exponents $\alpha(j), \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $N(p)$ is a simplex with vertices $\alpha(0), \dots, \alpha(r)$ containing β in its interior.

Every circuit polynomial p has an associated *circuit number*, Θ_p , defined as

$$\Theta_p := \prod_{j=0}^r \left(\frac{c_{\alpha(j)}}{\lambda_j} \right)^{\lambda_j}$$

where $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the unique barycentric coordinates of β with respect to $\alpha(0), \dots, \alpha(r)$. That is, $\beta = \sum_{j=0}^r \lambda_j \alpha(j)$ with $0 < \lambda_j \leq 1$ for $j = 0, \dots, r$.

In contrast to the original definition of circuit polynomials given in [25], we also allow $\alpha(j)$ to contain noneven entries in Definition 2.7. The two definitions coincide when x is restricted to the positive orthant, since one can consider $q(x_1, \dots, x_n) = p(x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)$; for further details see e.g., the discussion in [25, Section 3.1]. With these considerations, the theorem that follows is a straightforward consequence of [25, Theorem 3.8]. It gives a way to check the nonnegativity of a circuit polynomial p over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ using the circuit number Θ_p .

Theorem 2.8 ([25], Theorem 3.8). *A circuit polynomial p given as in Definition 2.7 is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ if and only if*

$$-c_\beta \leq \Theta_p.$$

We conclude this subsection with an example to illustrate Theorem 2.8.

Example 2.9. Consider the polynomial $p(x, y) = 1 + x^2y^4 + x^4y^2 - cx^2y^2$. Its Newton polytope is the triangle with the exponents $\{\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \alpha(2)\} = \{(0, 0), (2, 4), (4, 2)\}$ as vertices, all of which have positive coefficients, see right panel of Figure 1. The exponent $\beta = (2, 2)$ is in the interior of $N(p)$, and its barycentric coordinates with respect to $\alpha(0), \alpha(1), \alpha(2)$ are $\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}$. We compute the circuit number:

$$\Theta_p = (3)^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot (3)^{\frac{1}{3}} \cdot (3)^{\frac{1}{3}} = 3.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.8, p is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ if and only if $c \leq 3$.

For $c = 3$ in Example 2.9, $p(x, y)$ is known as the Motzkin polynomial, which is a prominent example of nonnegative circuit polynomials. It is the first published example of a nonnegative polynomial that cannot be represented as a sum of squares of polynomials [29]. For further details on nonnegative circuit polynomials see [25], and e.g., [14, 26]. See also [31], where conditions for the positivity of multivariate polynomials were derived.

Remark 2.10. In what follows we will repeatedly encounter homogeneous polynomials. Recall that a polynomial $p \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is homogeneous if the total degree of all monomials is the same, say d . In this case, $p(\lambda x) = \lambda^d p(x)$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence, the set of signs p attains over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ agrees with the set of signs the polynomial $p(\lambda x)$ attains over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$ for any choice of $\lambda > 0$. In particular, we can set one of the variables to 1, and study the signs of the resulting polynomial in the remaining $n - 1$ variables.

2.3. Back to our system. We have now the ingredients to re-derive the conditions on the reaction rate constants that enable or preclude multistationarity given in [8] and to formulate the strategy to study the open cases. Recall the map π from Subsection 2.1 and that we write $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$. Let

$$(5) \quad a(\eta) = \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} - \kappa_6 \kappa_9, \quad b(\eta) = (K_2 + K_3) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} - (K_1 + K_4) \kappa_6 \kappa_9.$$

The coefficients of the polynomial p_η given in (4) in the variables $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ are polynomials in the eight parameters $K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$. Five of these coefficients are positive multiples of $a(\eta)$, one is a positive multiple of $b(\eta)$, and the rest of the coefficients are positive.




FIGURE 2. (Left and Middle) Newton polytope of the polynomial p_η in (4) for $a(\eta) \neq 0$. The gray circles correspond to the monomials whose coefficient is a multiple of $a(\eta)$, and the black point to the monomial with coefficient a multiple of $b(\eta)$. (Right) Newton polytope of p_η when $a(\eta) = 0$. The black point has coefficient a multiple of $b(\eta)$.

Of relevance is the monomial whose coefficient is multiple of $b(\eta)$, namely $x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3$, with exponent vector

$$m := (2, 2, 1).$$

The Newton polytope of p_η depends on whether $a(\eta)$ vanishes or not. If $a(\eta) \neq 0$, then $N(p_\eta)$ is depicted in the left and middle panels of Figure 2 and has 10 vertices:

$$\text{Vert}(N(p_\eta)) = \{(4, 0, 2), (2, 2, 2), (4, 0, 1), (3, 2, 1), (2, 3, 1), (0, 4, 1), (2, 3, 0), (2, 2, 0), (1, 4, 0), (0, 4, 0)\}.$$

The point $m = (2, 2, 1)$ is in the relative interior of the hexagonal face of $N(p_\eta)$ depicted in the middle panel of Figure 2. The monomials with coefficient multiple of $a(\eta)$ are supported on the boundary of $N(p_\eta)$.

For $a(\eta) = 0$, the corresponding Newton polytope is shown on the right panel of Figure 2. Now m is an interior point of an edge of $N(p_\eta)$. All other monomials have positive coefficient. The vertices of this Newton polytope are $(4, 0, 1), (2, 3, 0), (2, 2, 0), (1, 4, 0), (0, 4, 1), (0, 4, 0)$.

Let H be the face of $N(p_\eta)$ containing m : H is a hexagonal 2-dimensional face of $N(p_\eta)$ if $a(\eta) \neq 0$, and a 1-dimensional face if $a(\eta) = 0$. Let $p_{\eta,H}$ be the polynomial supported on the face H .

Proposition 2.11. *Let p_η be as in (4) and $a(\eta), b(\eta)$ as in (5).*

- (i) $p_\eta(x)$ is either positive for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$ or attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$. Hence, κ enables multistationarity if and only if p_η attains negative values in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, where $\eta = \pi(\kappa)$.
- (ii) Assume $a(\eta) \geq 0$. Then κ enables multistationarity if and only if $p_{\pi(\kappa),H}$ attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$.
- (iii) If $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) \geq 0$, then any $\kappa \in \pi^{-1}(\eta)$ precludes multistationarity and there is one positive steady state in each invariant linear subspace defined by the equations (3).
- (iv) If $a(\eta) < 0$, then any $\kappa \in \pi^{-1}(\eta)$ enables multistationarity.

Proof. (i) Follows from Corollary 2.6 as coefficients of monomials supported on the interior of $N(p_\eta)$ are positive; (ii) Follows from (i) and Proposition 2.3, as only $m \in H$ can be a negative point; (iii) As p_η has only positive coefficients, the statement follows from (Mono) in Proposition 2.2; (iv) In this case four of the vertices are negative. From Proposition 2.3 we conclude that (Mult) in Proposition 2.2 holds. \square

Statements (iii) and (iv) in Proposition 2.11 cover the two known cases from [8]. As m is not a vertex, $b(\eta) < 0$ does not immediately guarantee that multistationarity is enabled.

In view of Proposition 2.11(i), whether κ enables multistationarity or not only depends on $\pi(\kappa)$. Hence, we say that $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ enables multistationarity if this is the case for any $\kappa \in \pi^{-1}(\eta)$, or equivalently, if $p_\eta(x)$ attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$.

Corollary 2.12. *The set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ of parameter points η that enable multistationarity is open with the Euclidian topology in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.11(i), $\eta \in X$ if and only if $p_\eta(x^*) < 0$ for some $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$. As p_η is continuous in the coefficients, there exists an open ball centered at η for which $p_{\eta'}(x^*) < 0$ for any η' in the ball. Hence X is open. \square

Example 2.13. Consider $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (343, 1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, for which $a(\eta) > 0$ and $p_{\eta,H}(7, 1, 49) = -24706290 < 0$. By Proposition 2.11(ii), η enables multistationarity. As $\kappa = (1, 341, 2, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1)$ belongs to $\pi^{-1}(\eta)$, it enables multistationarity.

In order to find a linear invariant subspace with multiple steady states, we use Remark 2.4 to find a point where $p_\eta(x) < 0$. To this end, we note that $(-1, -1, 0)$ is an outer normal vector to H and consider

$$p_\eta(7t^{-1}, t^{-1}, 49) = -\frac{24706290}{t^4} + \frac{38706521}{t^5}.$$

This expression is negative provided $t > \frac{47}{30}$. With $t = 2$, p_η takes the value $-\frac{10706059}{32} < 0$. Hence, the steady state defined by $(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (\frac{7}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 49)$ satisfies (Mult) in Proposition 2.2. This steady state is $x^* = \varphi(\frac{7}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 49) = (\frac{7}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 49, 2, 14, \frac{1}{2}, 1, 7, 7)$ and belongs to the linear invariant subspace defined by $E_{\text{tot}} = 11$, $F_{\text{tot}} = \frac{17}{2}$, $S_{\text{tot}} = \frac{161}{2}$. We solve the equations for the positive steady states in this linear invariant subspace, and obtain x^* together with two other positive steady states, given approximately by:

$$(4.11, 0.91, 57.73, 1.51, 6.78, 0.7, 1.38, 6.2, 6.2), \quad (3.43, 0.46, 47.21, 2.07, 15.6, 0.47, 0.94, 7.1, 7.1).$$

There are two other solutions with negative components. We will see later in Example 4.2, how the initial parameter value and point $(7, 1, 49)$ were chosen.

In what follows we study the open scenario $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$ by focusing on $p_{\eta,H}$, c.f. Proposition 2.11(ii). We start by considering two strategies to certify that $p_{\eta,H}(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, which imply that multistationarity is precluded. Afterwards, we show that the polynomial $p_{\eta,H}(x)$ attains negative values for some η , and finally, we provide an explicit parametrization of the boundary between the region in the parameter space where multistationarity is enabled and the region where it is precluded. In particular, given any vector of parameters, this gives a means to certify whether multistationarity is enabled.

Remark 2.14. The ODE system in (2) is invariant under the map

$$\begin{aligned} (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{12}) &\mapsto (\kappa_{10}, \kappa_{11}, \kappa_{12}, \kappa_7, \kappa_8, \kappa_9, \kappa_4, \kappa_5, \kappa_6, \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \\ (x_1, \dots, x_9) &\mapsto (x_2, x_1, x_5, x_4, x_3, x_9, x_8, x_7, x_6). \end{aligned}$$

The reason is that the reaction network (1) remains invariant after interchanging E with F , S_0 with S_2 , the intermediate complexes accordingly, and relabeling the reactions as the map above indicates. Under this map, we have

$$(K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) \xrightarrow{\sigma} (K_4, K_3, K_2, K_1, \kappa_{12}, \kappa_9, \kappa_6, \kappa_3).$$

It follows that η enables multistationarity if and only if $\sigma(\eta)$ does. In particular, any relation on the parameters that guarantees or precludes multistationarity, gives rise to a new relation after applying σ to all parameters. In many cases though, the relations are already invariant by σ .

Remark 2.15. Observe that $a(\eta)$ only depends on $\kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$. By letting

$$K = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4), \quad \bar{\kappa} = (\kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}),$$

it will be convenient sometimes to write $a(\bar{\kappa})$ instead of $a(\eta)$.

3. The Case $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$: Monostationarity

We assume in this section that $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$ and recall the face H of $N(p_\eta)$ defined in Subsection 2.3. By Proposition 2.11(ii), η enables multistationarity if and only if $p_{\eta,H}$ attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$. The face H belongs to the hyperplane $x_1 + x_2 = 4$, and hence $p_{\eta,H}$ is homogeneous of degree 4 in x_1, x_2 . Therefore, by Remark 2.10, it suffices to study the signs of $p_{\eta,H}$ after setting $x_2 = 1$. By abuse of notation, we denote the restricted polynomial by $p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3)$. When $a(\eta) \neq 0$, we have

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3) = & K_2 \kappa_3 a(\eta) \left(K_2 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^4 x_3^2 + K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 x_3^2 + K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} x_1^2 x_3^2 \right) \\ & + K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} b(\eta) x_1^2 x_3 + K_1 \kappa_6 \left(K_2 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 (K_2 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^4 x_3 + 2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 x_3 \right. \\ & \left. + K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} x_1^2) + K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 (K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 + 2 K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 x_3 + K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 x_1 + K_3 \kappa_6 x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

When $a(\eta) = 0$, the polynomial of interest is:

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3) = & K_1 \kappa_6 \left(K_2 K_3 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_{12}^2 ((K_2 + K_3) - (K_1 + K_4)) x_1^2 x_3 \right. \\ & \left. + K_2 K_4 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_9 (K_2 \kappa_9 x_1^4 x_3 + 2 K_3 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 x_3) + K_1 K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 (2 K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 x_3 + K_3 \kappa_6 x_3) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We derive two sufficient conditions for the nonnegativity of $p_{\eta,H}$: first, we consider the discriminant of a suitable polynomial (Subsection 3.1), and then, circuit numbers (Subsection 3.2). The first strategy completely characterizes when $p_{\eta,H}$ is nonnegative when $a(\eta) = 0$.

3.1. Necessary polynomial condition for multistationarity via cylindrical algebraic decomposition. The study of the discriminant of $p_{\eta,H}$ leads to the following theorem, whose proof relies on symbolic algorithms from real algebraic geometry based on [2]. All computations are presented in the supplementary file *SupplInfo.mw*.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ such that $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$.*

(i) *Consider the following polynomial:*

$$\begin{aligned} f(\eta) := & K_2^2 K_3^2 b(\eta)^4 - K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} (K_1 K_2^2 + K_3^2 K_4) b(\eta)^3 + K_1 K_2^2 K_3^2 K_4 (\kappa_3^2 \kappa_{12}^2 - 20 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} - 8 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_9^2) b(\eta)^2 \\ & + 18 K_1 K_2 K_3 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} (\kappa_3 \kappa_{12} + 2 \kappa_6 \kappa_9) (K_1 K_2^2 + K_3^2 K_4) b(\eta) \\ & - K_1 K_4 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \left(27 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12}^2 (K_1^2 K_2^4 + K_3^4 K_4^2) + 16 K_1 K_2^2 K_3^2 K_4 (\kappa_3^3 \kappa_{12}^3 - \kappa_6^3 \kappa_9^3) \right. \\ & \left. + 6 K_1 K_2^2 K_3^2 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} (\kappa_3 \kappa_{12} + 8 \kappa_6 \kappa_9) \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $f(\eta) \leq 0$, then $p_{\eta,H}$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$, and η does not enable multistationarity.

(ii) *Assume additionally that $a(\eta) = 0$ and consider*

$$g(K) := K_2 K_3 (K_1 + K_4 - K_2 - K_3)^3 - 27 K_1 K_4 (K_2 + K_3) (K_1 K_2 - K_2 K_3 + K_3 K_4).$$

Then $p_{\eta,H}(x)$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ (and hence multistationarity is precluded) if and only if $g(K) \leq 0$. Furthermore, $a(\eta) = 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$ imply $K_1 K_2 - K_2 K_3 + K_3 K_4 > 0$.

Proof. We observe that the coefficient of x_3 in $p_{\eta,H}$ in (6) and (7) is exactly $\kappa_6 K_1 q_\eta(x_1)$ with

$$q_\eta(x_1) := K_2^2 K_4 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_9^2 x_1^4 + 2K_2 K_3 K_4 \kappa_3^2 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12} x_1^3 \\ + K_2 K_3 b(\eta) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1^2 + 2K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}^2 x_1 + K_1 K_3^2 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12}^2.$$

When $a(\eta) = 0$, $p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3)$ is exactly $\kappa_6 K_1 q_\eta(x_1) x_3$ and it follows that q_η is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if and only if $p_{\eta,H}$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$. When $a(\eta) > 0$, $p_{\eta,H}$ in (6) is a quadratic polynomial in x_3 with positive leading and constant terms. Therefore, if q_η is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, then $p_{\eta,H}$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$.

Consequently, the theorem is proven if we show that: (1) Assuming $a(\eta) \geq 0, b(\eta) < 0$, q_η is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if and only if $f(\eta) \leq 0$, and (2) that this condition is equivalent to $g(K) \leq 0$ when additionally $a(\eta) = 0$.

We prove (1). The polynomial q_η has degree 4 in x_1 , and only the coefficient of x_1^2 is negative (under the assumption $b(\eta) < 0$). By Descartes' rule of signs, q_η has either two or zero positive roots and either two or zero negative roots (counted with multiplicity). Therefore, q_η attains negative values in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if and only if q_η has two distinct positive roots.

Let Δ_{x_1} be the discriminant of q_η ; it is a polynomial in η and vanishes whenever q_η has a multiple root. We restrict the parameter space to the points where $b(\eta) < 0$ and $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and define:

$$\Omega := \{\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8 : b(\eta) < 0, a(\eta) \geq 0 \text{ and } \Delta_{x_1}(\eta) \neq 0\}.$$

In each connected component of Ω , the number of *real roots* of q_η is constant, and these are all simple roots. Since complex roots occur in pairs, the discriminant partitions $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ into regions with four, two, or zero real roots. Now note that if q_η has four real roots, then necessarily two are positive and two are negative. Furthermore, in any connected component of Ω where q_η has two real roots, these are either both positive or both negative for all $\eta \in \Omega$. This follows by continuity of the roots as a function of η in each connected component of Ω , together with the fact that q_η cannot have a positive and a negative root with multiplicity 1. We conclude that in every connected component of Ω , the number of *positive real roots* of q_η is also constant, and our goal is to determine the components where this number is 2.

We compute Δ_{x_1} and find that its zero set in Ω agrees with the zero set of one factor, f in the statement. Hence the sign of $f(\eta)$ in each connected component of Ω is constant. So the strategy to prove (1) is to show that q_η has two positive real roots if and only if $f(\eta) > 0$, by checking that this is the case for at least one point in each connected component of Ω .

To select such points, we will use the command `SamplePoints` of the package `RegularChains` in `Maple`, which builds upon the algorithms developed in [2]. To reduce the computational cost to effectively find the points, we make some simplifications. We note first that $b(\eta), a(\eta)$ and $f(\eta)$ can be seen as polynomials in K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 and the products $\kappa_3 \kappa_{12}$ and $\kappa_6 \kappa_9$, such that f is homogeneous of degree 8 in K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 and homogeneous of degree 4 in $\kappa_3 \kappa_{12}$ and $\kappa_6 \kappa_9$; $a(\eta)$ and $b(\eta)$ are both homogeneous of degree 1 in $\kappa_3 \kappa_{12}$ and $\kappa_6 \kappa_9$; and $b(\eta)$ is homogeneous of degree 1 in K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4 . Hence, given $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ and any $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 > 0$, the point

$$\eta' = \left(\lambda_1 K_1, \lambda_1 K_2, \lambda_1 K_3, \lambda_1 K_4, \frac{\lambda_2 \lambda_3}{\lambda_4} \kappa_3, \lambda_2 \kappa_6, \lambda_3 \kappa_9, \lambda_4 \kappa_{12} \right)$$

satisfies $f(\eta') = \lambda_1^8 \lambda_2^4 \lambda_3^4 f(\eta)$, $a(\eta') = \lambda_2 \lambda_3 a(\eta)$ and $b(\eta') = \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 b(\eta)$. In particular, the signs of these three polynomials evaluated at η and η' agree, and η belongs to Ω , if and only if η' does, in which case both belong to the same connected component. As a consequence, it is enough to consider points of the form $(K_1, K_2, 1, K_4, \kappa_3, 1, 1, 1) \in \Omega$. The condition $a(\eta) \geq 0$ becomes

$\kappa_3 \geq 1$, and hence it is advantageous to reparametrize these points as $(K_1, K_2, 1, K_4, a+1, 1, 1, 1)$ with $a \geq 0$.

We have reduced the problem to selecting one point in each connected component of

$$\Omega' := \{\eta = (K_1, K_2, 1, K_4, a+1, 1, 1, 1) : K_1 > 0, K_2 > 0, K_4 > 0, a \geq 0, b(\eta) < 0, f(\eta) \neq 0\}.$$

To this end, we consider $f(\eta)$ for $\eta \in \Omega'$ as a polynomial $f'_v(a)$ of degree 4 in a and coefficients in $\mathbb{R}[K_1, K_2, K_4]$, where $v = (K_1, K_2, K_4)$. We compute the discriminant Δ_a of f'_v with respect to a , which is a polynomial in K_1, K_2, K_4 . The roots of the polynomial f with variable a deform continuously in each connected component $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$ in the complement of $\Delta_a = 0$. Specifically, for a given point v in C , suppose f_v has r real roots $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$ for $r \leq 4$ such that $a_i \leq a_{i+1}$ for all i . For another point v' in C , $f_{v'}$ also has r roots $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_r\}$ such that $a'_i \leq a'_{i+1}$ for all i . In C there exists a continuous path from v to v' such that a_i deforms continuously to a'_i . Therefore, there exists a continuous path in Ω' that takes a point from $v \times (a_i, a_{i+1})$ to $v' \times (a'_i, a'_{i+1})$.

Hence, in order to select at least one parameter point for each connected component of Ω' , we consider first (at least) one choice of $K_1, K_2, K_4 > 0$ in each connected component C of the complement of $\Delta_a = 0$ with the command `SamplePoints`. We obtain a total of 22 points. For each of them, we find the nonnegative roots of f as a polynomial in a , and then extend K_1, K_2, K_4 to several parameter points in Ω' by selecting one value of a in each of the intervals the nonnegative roots define. This results in a list of points containing at least one point per connected component of Ω' , and hence of Ω . Finally, for every such point η , we find the number of positive roots of q_η (symbolically using the command `RealRootCounting`) and determine the sign of $f(\eta)$. We conclude that q_η has two distinct positive real roots if and only if $f(\eta) > 0$. It follows that q_η is nonnegative in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ if and only if $f(\eta) \leq 0$, and in this case $p_{\eta,H}$ is nonnegative as well. This completes the proof of (1).

To prove (2), assume $a(\eta) = 0$. It follows that $\kappa_3\kappa_{12} = \kappa_6\kappa_9$ and the condition $b(\eta) < 0$ becomes $K_2 + K_3 < K_1 + K_4$. In this case,

$$f(\eta) = \kappa_6^4 \kappa_9^4 (K_2 + K_3)(K_1 K_2 - K_2 K_3 + K_3 K_4) g(K).$$

Observe that under the assumption $b(\eta) < 0$, we have

$$K_1 K_2 + K_3 K_4 > (K_1 + K_4) \cdot \min\{K_2, K_3\} > (K_2 + K_3) \cdot \min\{K_2, K_3\} > K_2 K_3.$$

Hence $f(\eta) > 0$ for $\eta \in \Omega$ such that $a(\eta) = 0$ if and only if $g(K) > 0$. This concludes the proof. \square




FIGURE 3. (Left) 2-dimensional section of the zero set of the polynomial g in Theorem 3.1. (Right) Cartoon picture of the partition of the positive orthant into the regions of mono- and multistationarity.

Example 3.2 (Case $a(\eta) = 0$). According to Theorem 3.1(ii), if $a(\eta) = 0$, then multistationarity is characterized by the inequality $g > 0$, which can be written as:

$$K_2 K_3 ((K_1 + K_4) - (K_2 + K_3))^3 > 27 K_1 K_4 (K_2 + K_3) (K_1 K_2 + K_3 K_4 - K_2 K_3).$$

The expressions at each side of the inequality are positive when $b(\eta) < 0$. We have $g(K_2 + K_3, K_2, K_3, 0) = g(0, K_2, K_3, K_2 + K_3) = 0$, meaning that $g = 0$ intersects the two axes K_1 and K_4 at the given points.

For example, let $K_2 = K_3 = 1$. Then the zero set of the polynomial $g(K_1, 1, 1, K_4)$ in the (K_1, K_4) -plane is shown in Figure 3. The point $(K_2, K_3) = (1, 1)$ gives a 2-dimensional slice of the zero set of the polynomial g and its complement. By checking whether g is positive or negative on points in the connected components of the complement of g , we find the cartoon depiction of the regions of multistationarity and monostationarity illustrated in the right panel of Figure 3.

Remark 3.3. After setting $K_3 = 1$ as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, g becomes a polynomial in K_1, K_2 and K_4 . The degree of g in K_1 and K_4 is 3. The discriminant of g with variables K_1 and K_4 is a polynomial in K_2 , which does not vanish for any $K_2 > 0$. Therefore, for any $K_2 > 0$, the zero set of g in the (K_1, K_4) -plane is as depicted in the left panel of Figure 3.

Example 3.4. For any η of the form $\eta = (K_1, 1, 1, K_4, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, we have $a(\eta) > 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} f(\eta) = & 3K_1^4 - 284K_1^3K_4 - 590K_1^2K_4^2 - 284K_1K_4^3 + 3K_4^4 - 40K_1^3 + 808K_1^2K_4 + 808K_1K_4^2 \\ & - 40K_4^3 + 192K_1^2 - 320K_1K_4 + 192K_4^2 - 384K_1 - 384K_4 + 256. \end{aligned}$$

The solution set of $f = 0$ in the (K_1, K_4) -plane is depicted in Figure 4, together with the monostationarity region given in Theorem 3.1.

3.2. Necessary condition for multistationarity via circuit numbers. We now derive a necessary condition for multistationarity utilizing circuit polynomials. This new inequality, given in Theorem 3.5, allows for an easier inspection of the points verifying it, compared to Theorem 3.1 (c.f. Corollary 3.9).

As the case $a(\eta) = 0$ is completely understood by Theorem 3.1, we focus mainly on the case $a(\eta) > 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$. Consider the Newton polytope H of $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3)$ in (6) for $a(\eta) \neq 0$.




FIGURE 4. $(K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, such that $a(\bar{\kappa}) > 0$. (Left) The solid-red curve is the solution set of $f = 0$ in the (K_1, K_4) -plane, and the blue-dashed curve shows $b(\eta) = 0$. In the gray region multistationarity is not enabled. The dark gray region is the one given in Theorem 3.1, where $f < 0$ and $b < 0$. The light gray region shows $b \geq 0$ in the positive orthant. (Right) Zoom of the left panel for small K_4 .




FIGURE 5. (Left) An illustration of H , where α_j, b_j, i_j are as in (8). Right panel: The circuits of the SONC decomposition, consisting of two 2-dimensional circuits with vertices $\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5$ and $\alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_6$ respectively, and two 1-dimensional circuits, with vertices b_1, b_2 and i_1, i_2 respectively.

This polytope is the convex hull of the set A_H of exponent points, which we label as follows (see left panel of Figure 5):

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &:= (4, 2), & \alpha_2 &:= (2, 2), & \alpha_3 &:= (0, 1), & \alpha_4 &:= (4, 1), & \alpha_5 &:= (2, 0), & \alpha_6 &:= (0, 0), \\ m &:= (2, 1), & b_1 &:= (3, 2), & b_2 &:= (1, 0), & i_1 &:= (3, 1), & i_2 &:= (1, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Note that A_H is very well structured: m is the barycenter of the two triangles given by the vertices $\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5$ and $\alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_6$; b_1 and b_2 are the midpoints of the two edges of H given by α_1, α_2 and α_5, α_6 respectively; i_1 and i_2 are in the interior of H ; and finally m is the midpoint of both b_1, b_2 and i_1, i_2 . We exploit this structure to decompose $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3)$ into the sum of 4 circuit polynomials with associated simplices with vertices $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5\}$, $\{\alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_6\}$, $\{b_1, b_2\}$ and $\{i_1, i_2\}$. Afterwards we invoke Theorem 2.8 to derive conditions on the coefficients of $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3)$ that guarantee the nonnegativity of this polynomial over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$. This leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume $a(\eta) \geq 0$ and $b(\eta) < 0$. If*

$$(9) \quad -b(\eta) \leq 3(K_1 K_4 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_9^2 a(\eta))^{\frac{1}{3}} \left(K_1^{\frac{1}{3}} + K_4^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) + 4(K_1 K_4 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12})^{\frac{1}{2}} + 2(K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} a(\eta))^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

then $p_{\eta, H}$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$, and hence η does not enable multistationarity.

Proof. Assume $a(\eta) > 0$. We write $p_{\eta, H}(x)$ as the sum of four circuit polynomials. Let $p_{\eta, 1}$ be a circuit polynomial which has the exponent m as inner term and 2-dimensional simplex $\alpha_1, \alpha_3, \alpha_5$ as follows,

$$p_{\eta, 1}(x_1, x_3) = c_{\eta, \alpha_1} x^{\alpha_1} + c_{\eta, \alpha_2} x^{\alpha_2} + c_{\eta, \alpha_3} x^{\alpha_3} + \bar{c}_{\eta, 1} x^m$$

where c_{η, α_i} is exactly the coefficient of x^{α_i} in $p_{\eta, H}(x)$, and $\bar{c}_{\eta, 1}$ is in \mathbb{R} . Similarly, define the circuit polynomials $p_{\eta, 2}, p_{\eta, 3}, p_{\eta, 4}$ with exponent m as inner term with 2-dimensional simplex $\alpha_2, \alpha_4, \alpha_6$, and 1-dimensional simplices b_1, b_2 and i_1, i_2 respectively. Let $\bar{c}_{\eta, i}$ be the coefficient of x^m in the respective polynomial $p_{\eta, i}$. The Newton polytopes of these circuit polynomials are illustrated in the right panel of Figure 5.

The circuit number corresponding to each of the circuit polynomials are:

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_{p_{\eta, 1}} &= 3(c_{\eta, \alpha_1} c_{\eta, \alpha_3} c_{\eta, \alpha_5})^{\frac{1}{3}}, & \Theta_{p_{\eta, 2}} &= 3(c_{\eta, \alpha_2} c_{\eta, \alpha_4} c_{\eta, \alpha_6})^{\frac{1}{3}} \\ \Theta_{p_{\eta, 3}} &= 2(c_{\eta, b_1} c_{\eta, b_2})^{\frac{1}{2}} & \Theta_{p_{\eta, 4}} &= 2(c_{\eta, i_1} c_{\eta, i_2})^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now assume that the following inequality is satisfied for $c_{\eta, m}$, the coefficient of x^m in $p_{\eta, H}$:

$$(10) \quad -c_{\eta, m} \leq \Theta_{p_{\eta, 1}} + \Theta_{p_{\eta, 2}} + \Theta_{p_{\eta, 3}} + \Theta_{p_{\eta, 4}}.$$

Then one can find $\bar{c}_{\eta,1}, \bar{c}_{\eta,2}, \bar{c}_{\eta,3}, \bar{c}_{\eta,4} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sum \bar{c}_{\eta,i} = c_{\eta,m}$ and for all i , $-\bar{c}_{\eta,i} \leq \Theta_{p_{\eta,i}}$. Theorem 2.8 implies that each $p_{\eta,i}$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$. As $p_{\eta,H} = p_{\eta,1} + p_{\eta,2} + p_{\eta,3} + p_{\eta,4}$, $p_{\eta,H}$ also is nonnegative. In terms of the entries of η , (10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} -K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} b(\eta) &\leq 3K_1 K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} (K_1 K_4^2 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_9^2 a(\eta))^{1/3} + 3(K_1^5 K_2^3 K_3^3 K_4 \kappa_3^3 \kappa_6^5 \kappa_9^2 \kappa_{12}^3 a(\eta))^{1/3} \\ &\quad + 4(K_1^3 K_2^2 K_3^2 K_4 \kappa_3^3 \kappa_6^3 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12}^3)^{1/2} + 2(K_1^2 K_2^3 K_3^3 \kappa_3^3 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12}^3 a(\eta))^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

which after factoring out terms and simplifying gives the inequality in the statement.

When $a(\eta) = 0$, inequality (9) reduces to $K_1 + K_4 - K_2 - K_3 \leq 4\sqrt{K_1 K_4}$. We verify using the function `IsEmpty` in `Maple 2019` that whenever this holds, then g in Theorem 3.1 is negative, implying that $p_{\eta,H}(x)$ is nonnegative over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$. \square

Remark 3.6. The SONC decomposition of p_η into $p_{\eta,1}, p_{\eta,2}, p_{\eta,3}, p_{\eta,4}$ in the proof of Theorem 3.5 is not unique. Other sufficient conditions may be derived using other covers of H , see e.g., [13, page 20]. Two main reasons underlie the choice of this particular cover. First, it uses the least possible number of circuits while using every positive point only once. Hence we use all the possible positive weight and avoid introducing new parameters for non-disjoint circuits. Second, as m is the barycenter of each chosen circuit, the derived circuit numbers have simple expressions.

Example 3.7. To illustrate the use of inequality (9) to certify monostationarity, consider $\eta = (2, 0.5, 0.5, 2, 2, 1, 1, 1)$. Then, (9) holds since the right hand side is ≈ 24.72 , while the left hand side is 2. By Theorem 3.5, η does not enable multistationarity. Indeed, $p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, as it also can be seen by rewriting the polynomial as:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3) &= x_2^4 x_3 + 4x_1^4 x_3 + \frac{1}{2}x_1^3 x_2 x_3^2 + 8x_1^3 x_2 x_3 + x_1^2 x_2^2 x_3^2 \\ &\quad + 4x_1^2 x_2^2 + 4x_1 x_2^3 x_3 + x_1 x_2^3 + x_1^4 x_3^2 + x_2^4 + (x_1^2 x_3 - x_2^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.8. We fix the parameters $(K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$ as in Example 3.4. Figure 6 shows a comparison of the two necessary conditions for multistationarity from Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 3.1. For this choice of parameters, inequality (9) becomes

$$(11) \quad 0 \leq 3(K_1 K_4^2)^{\frac{1}{3}} + 4\sqrt{2}(K_1 K_4)^{\frac{1}{2}} + 3(K_1^2 K_4)^{\frac{1}{3}} - K_1 - K_4 + 2\sqrt{2} + 4.$$

Figure 6 hints at that the sufficient condition for monostationarity of Theorem 3.5 includes a cone pointed at zero. To investigate this further, consider the line $sK_1 = K_4$ for $s \in (0, +\infty)$. Then the right hand side of (11) becomes

$$(12) \quad (3s^{\frac{2}{3}} + 4\sqrt{2}s^{\frac{1}{2}} + 3s^{\frac{1}{3}} - s - 1)K_1 + (2\sqrt{2} + 4).$$

The positive semiline belongs to the monostationarity region if (12) is positive for all $K_1 > 0$. As (12) is linear in K_1 with positive constant term, it is positive for all $K_1 > 0$ if and only if the leading coefficient is positive. This holds if and only if s lies in the interval $\approx (1/197.995, 197.995)$.

The conclusions in the example above extend to any choice of fixed parameters $K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$. In particular, in the (K_1, K_4) plane, the region of monostationarity includes a cone pointed at zero that includes the line $K_1 = K_4$. This is the content of the next corollary. This result will be critical to obtain a parametric description of the regions of mono- and multistationarity in Section 4.

Corollary 3.9. *Assume $\eta' := (K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ fixed such that $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$ and consider the line $K_4 = sK_1$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ with coordinates K_1, K_4 . There exist $0 < s_1(\eta') < \frac{14 - \sqrt{192}}{2}$ and $\frac{14 + \sqrt{192}}{2} < s_2(\eta')$ such that:*




FIGURE 6. For $(K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, the region between blue dashed lines is the region where we can certify monostationarity using Theorem 3.1. The region given between full lines is the region where we can certify monostationarity using Theorem 3.5. The two panels focus on either K_1 large or K_1 small.

- (i) For any $s \in [s_1(\eta'), s_2(\eta')]$, the points in the line $K_4 = sK_1$ satisfy inequality (9).
- (ii) If $s \notin [s_1(\eta'), s_2(\eta')]$, then there exists K_1' such that (9) holds if and only if $K_1 \leq K_1'$.
- (iii) If $\kappa_3\kappa_{12}$ increases, while $K_2, K_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9$ remain fixed, then $s_1(\eta')$ decreases to zero and $s_2(\eta')$ increases to $+\infty$.

In particular, if $K_1 = K_4$ and $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$, multistationarity is not enabled.

Proof. As η' is fixed, inequality (9) is a relation on K_1 and K_4 . We rewrite it as:

$$0 \leq -(K_1 + K_4)\kappa_6\kappa_9 + 3(K_1K_4\kappa_6^2\kappa_9^2a(\eta))^{1/3} \left(K_4^{1/3} + K_1^{1/3} \right) + 4(K_1K_4\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2} \\ + 2(K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\eta))^{1/2} + (K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_{12}.$$

When $K_4 = sK_1$, this inequality becomes

$$(13) \quad 0 \leq \left(-(1+s)\kappa_6\kappa_9 + 3(s\kappa_6^2\kappa_9^2a(\eta))^{1/3}(s^{1/3} + 1) + 4(s\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2} \right) K_1 \\ + 2(K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\eta))^{1/2} + (K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_{12}.$$

First, note that since by assumption $\kappa_3\kappa_{12} \geq \kappa_6\kappa_9$, we have:

$$(1+s)\kappa_6\kappa_9 = (1+s)(\kappa_6^2\kappa_9^2)^{1/2} \leq (1+s)(\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2}.$$

Hence, if $(1+s)(\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2} \leq 4(s\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2}$, then (13) holds for all $K_1 > 0$. This inequality simplifies to $1+s \leq 4\sqrt{s}$, which holds if and only if $s \in \left(\frac{14-\sqrt{192}}{2}, \frac{14+\sqrt{192}}{2} \right)$.

Now, inequality (13) holds for all $K_1 > 0$ if and only if the coefficient of K_1 is nonnegative. We set $r^6 = s$, and the coefficient of K_1 becomes

$$h(r) := -(1+r^6)\kappa_6\kappa_9 + 3r^2(\kappa_6^2\kappa_9^2a(\eta))^{1/3}(1+r^2) + 4r^3(\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa_{12})^{1/2}.$$

This is a degree 6 polynomial in r with negative leading and independent term and the other coefficients are nonnegative, with at least one positive. Since the right hand side of (13) evaluated at $s = 1$ is strictly positive, $h(1) > 0$ and h has exactly two distinct positive roots r_1 and r_2 . These give rise to two values $s_1(\eta') = r_1^6, s_2(\eta') = r_2^6$, satisfying $s_1(\eta') < \frac{14-\sqrt{192}}{2}$ and $\frac{14+\sqrt{192}}{2} < s_2(\eta')$ for any η' , and such that (13) holds for any $s \in [s_1(\eta'), s_2(\eta')]$. This proves (i).

If $s \notin [s_1(\eta'), s_2(\eta')]$, then $h(\sqrt[6]{s})$ is negative, and hence inequality (13) only holds for $K_1 \leq K_1'$ for $K_1' > 0$ making the right-hand side of (13) zero. This concludes the proof of (ii).

Finally, (iii) follows from the fact that $a(\bar{\kappa})$ increases with the product $\kappa_3\kappa_{12}$, and hence the positive terms of $h(r)$ also increase. \square

4. Regions of Multistationarity

In the previous section we gave two inequalities in the kinetic parameters that guarantee monostationarity for all choices of total amounts. Furthermore, when $K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$ are fixed, Corollary 3.9 (see also Figure 6) certifies monostationarity for a cone pointed at zero and containing the line $K_1 = K_4$, and leaves two regions, along the K_1 - and K_4 -axes, undecided. Now, we will show that if K_4 also is fixed, then multistationarity is enabled for K_1 large enough, and, symmetrically, if K_1 is fixed, then K_4 large enough yields multistationarity. We start by proving this fact using the Newton polytope of $p_{\eta,H}(x)$, but now viewed as a polynomial in K_1, x_1, x_3 . Afterwards, we give an explicit parametric description of the regions of mono- and multistationarity.

4.1. Multistationarity can be enabled when $b(\eta) < 0$. Consider

$$\eta' = (K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}),$$

and recall that we write $a(\bar{\kappa}) = \kappa_3\kappa_{12} - \kappa_6\kappa_9$. Let $q_{\eta'}(K_1, x_1, x_3)$ be the polynomial $p_{\eta,H}(x_1, x_3)$ viewed as a polynomial in K_1, x_1, x_3 . Under the hypothesis $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$ (which is independent of K_1), the coefficient of $K_1^2 x_1^2 x_3$ is negative and equals $-K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_9 \kappa_{12}$. The Newton polytope of $q_{\eta'}(K_1, x_1, x_3)$ depends on whether $a(\eta) = 0$ or $a(\eta) > 0$, but in both cases the point $(2, 2, 1)$ is a vertex.

Proposition 4.1. *Consider $\eta' = (K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ and let \mathcal{N}^o be the interior of the outer normal cone of $\mathbf{N}(q_{\eta'})$ at $(2, 2, 1)$. If K_1 belongs to the set*

$$\bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{N}^o} \left\{ y \mid y > z_0^{w_1}, \text{ with } z_0 \text{ the largest root of } q_{\eta'}(z^{w_1}, z^{w_2}, z^{w_3}) \right\},$$

then $p_{\eta,H}$ attains negative values over $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ and η enables multistationarity. Moreover, this set is nonempty.

Analogously, by symmetry, given $K_1, K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$, after applying σ from Remark 2.14 to $q_{\eta'}(K_1, x_1, x_3)$, we obtain a set of values of K_4 that enable multistationarity.

Proof. As $(2, 2, 1)$ is a vertex of $\mathbf{N}(q_{\eta'})$, there exist $K_1, x_1, x_3 > 0$ such that $q_{\eta'}(K_1, x_1, x_3) < 0$ by Proposition 2.3. By Remark 2.4, for $w \in \mathcal{N}^o$, we consider the univariate function $u_{\eta',w}(z) = q_{\eta'}(z^{w_1}, z^{w_2}, z^{w_3})$, which is a generalized polynomial with real exponents and negative leading term. Then $u_{\eta',w}(z) < 0$ for all $z > z_0$, where z_0 is the largest root of $u_{\eta',w}$. With $\eta = (z^{w_1}, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$, we have $p_{\eta,H}(z^{w_2}, z^{w_3}) = u_{\eta',w}(z) < 0$. Hence, for any $K_1 = z^{w_1}$ with $z > z_0$, $p_{\eta,H}$ attains negative values. All that remains is to show that w_1 is positive, to rewrite this condition as $K_1 > z_0^{w_1}$ as in the statement.

The outer normal cone \mathcal{N}^o of $\mathbf{N}(q_{\eta'})$ at $(2, 2, 1)$ is generated by the vectors

$$(14) \quad \begin{array}{llll} v_1 := (2, 1, 0), & v_2 := (1, 0, 1), & v_3 := (2, 1, 2), & \text{if } a(\eta) > 0, \\ v_1 := (2, 1, 0), & v_2 := (1, 0, 1), & v_3 := (0, 0, 1), & \text{if } a(\eta) = 0. \end{array}$$

As any vector \mathcal{N}^o is of the form $w = \lambda_1 v_1 + \lambda_2 v_2 + \lambda_3 v_3$ with $\lambda_i > 0$, we have $w_1 > 0$. This concludes the proof.

Computations can be found in the supplementary file *SupplInfo.mw*. \square




FIGURE 7. With $(K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, the figure shows a dotted blue line separating the regions of monostationary (above the line, blue) and of multistationarity (below the line, orange), found from Theorem 4.4. Above the solid blue line in the monostationarity region, the condition in Theorem 3.5 is satisfied. Below the solid red line in the multistationarity region, multistationarity is enabled by means of Proposition 4.1 with $w = (3, 1, 2) \in \mathcal{N}^o$; similarly, the green dashed lines correspond to $w = (\frac{1}{2}, 2, 1)$ and $w = (\frac{1}{3}, 3, 2)$.

Example 4.2. Proposition 4.1 was invoked to select a parameter point η enabling multistationarity in Example 2.13. Let $\eta' = (K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$, such that $a(\bar{\kappa}) > 0$. Consider the vector $(3, 1, 2) = \frac{1}{2}v_1 + v_2 + \frac{1}{2}v_3 \in \mathcal{N}^o$ (c.f. (14)). Then

$$q_{\eta'}(z^3, z, z^2) = -z^7(-2z^3 + 11z^2 + 15z + 12),$$

whose largest root is ≈ 6.75 . Hence, by considering $K_1 = 7^3 = 343$, multistationarity is enabled. Furthermore, this also gives that $(x_1, x_3) = (7^{w_2}, 7^{w_3}) = (7, 49)$, satisfies $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) < 0$.

Figure 7 shows part of the region of Proposition 4.1 defined by the polynomial $q_{\eta'}(z^3, z, z^2)$ (solid red line), together with the regions defined by other choices of w (dashed lines in green). Obtaining an explicit description of the region in Proposition 4.1, in terms of algebraic inequalities in the parameters has not been possible. However, in what follows we provide an explicit parametric description of the region of multistationarity (giving rise to the dotted blue line).

4.2. Parametrization of the region of multistationarity. Let $\eta' = (K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ for any η . Assume $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$. We provide now two functions ψ, ϕ in (s, η') and (s, K_1, η') respectively, and a function $\xi(\eta')$ such that $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ enables multistationarity if and only if

$$(15) \quad K_1 = \psi(s, \eta'), \quad K_4 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta'), \quad \text{for } s \in (0, \xi(\eta')), \quad \text{or}$$

$$(16) \quad K_4 = \psi(s, \sigma(\eta')), \quad K_1 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \sigma(\eta')), \sigma(\eta')), \quad \text{for } s \in (0, \xi(\sigma(\eta'))).$$

Note that if $K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$ are fixed, then Proposition 4.1 and Corollary 3.9, together with the fact that $b(\eta) > 0$ for K_1, K_4 small, indicate that there are two branches of multistationarity along the two axes: one with K_1 large and K_4 small, and one with K_4 large and K_1 small. These are the two branches giving rise to the two conditions (15) and (16). By the symmetry of the system, we describe the K_4 -branch (15), and the other branch results from applying σ . We specify the nature of these branches further in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $\eta = (K_1^*, K_2, K_3, K_4^*, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ enables multistationarity and $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$. Then either for all $K_4 \geq K_4^*$ and $K_1 \leq K_1^*$ (if $K_1^* < K_4^*$) or for all $K_4 \leq K_4^*$ and $K_1 \geq K_1^*$ (if $K_1^* > K_4^*$), the parameter point $\eta' = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ also enables multistationarity.*

Proof. As η enables multistationarity, there exist $x_1, x_3 > 0$ such that $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) < 0$. We fix these values of x_1, x_3 , and let $\eta'' = (K_1^*, K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ obtained from η in the statement. The crucial observation is that $p_{\eta'', H}$, with η'', x_1, x_3 fixed, is simply a linear polynomial $q(K_4) = c_1 K_4 + c_0$ in K_4 , which satisfies $q(K_4^*) < 0$. By Corollary 3.9, $q(K_1^*) \geq 0$ (as $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) \geq 0$ if $K_4 = K_1$), and hence $c_1 \neq 0$. If $c_1 < 0$, then $q(K_4) < 0$ for any $K_4 \geq K_4^*$, and this implies $K_4^* > K_1^*$ must hold. Similarly, if $c_1 > 0$, then necessarily $c_0 < 0$, and hence $q(K_4) < 0$ for any $K_4 \leq K_4^*$, implying $K_4^* < K_1^*$. As $q(K_4) < 0$ implies η' enables multistationarity, the inequalities in the statement regarding K_4 hold. The inequalities for K_1 follow by symmetry. \square

Based on Lemma 4.3, we define the K_4 -branch of multistationarity to consist of the set of parameters $\eta = (K_1^*, K_2, K_3, K_4^*, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ enabling multistationarity and such that $K_4^* > K_1^*$. Any point in this branch satisfies that $(K_1^*, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ also enables multistationarity for all $K_4 \geq K_4^*$. For fixed parameters $K_1^*, K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}$, we wish to determine the *infimum* value K_4^* that satisfies this property, that is, the value K_4^* such that for any $K_4 > K_4^*$ multistationarity is enabled.

In the next theorem we identify this value parametrically: we give functions $\psi(s, \eta')$ and $\phi(s, K_1, \eta')$, for s in an interval of the form $(0, \xi(\eta'))$, such that for any $K_4 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta')$, the point $(\psi(s, \eta'), K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ enables multistationarity, but for $K_4 \leq \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta')$, multistationarity is not enabled. For fixed η' , the pair $(\psi(s, \eta'), \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta'))$ describes a curve in the (K_1, K_4) -plane separating the region of monostationarity and multistationarity along the K_4 -branch. The K_1 -branch of multistationarity is defined analogously.

Specifically, we define the following functions in s, K_1 and $\eta' = (K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^6$:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(s, \eta') &= -\left(K_2(K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_9\kappa_{12}s + K_3\kappa_{12}(2K_2a(\bar{\kappa}) + (K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_{12}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\bar{\kappa})}(2K_2\kappa_9s + K_2\kappa_{12} + 3K_3\kappa_{12})\right)K_2\kappa_3^2s^3, \\ \beta_1(s, \eta') &= \kappa_6\left(-K_2^2\kappa_3^2\kappa_9^2s^4 + K_2\kappa_3^2\kappa_9\kappa_{12}(3K_2 - K_3)s^3 + 2K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}(4\kappa_3\kappa_{12} - \kappa_9\kappa_6)s^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - K_3\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_{12}^2(K_2 - 3K_3)s - K_3^2\kappa_6^2\kappa_{12}^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2\sqrt{K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\bar{\kappa})}s(K_2\kappa_3\kappa_9s^2 + 2(K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_{12}s + K_3\kappa_6\kappa_{12})\right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_4(s, K_1, \eta') &= K_3\kappa_{12}\left(-2\sqrt{K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\bar{\kappa})}(K_2\kappa_3s + K_1\kappa_6)s + \right. \\ &\quad \left. K_2\kappa_3(K_1\kappa_6\kappa_9 - (K_2 + K_3)\kappa_3\kappa_{12})s^2 - 2K_1K_2\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_{12}s - K_1K_3\kappa_6^2\kappa_{12}\right), \\ \beta_4(s, \eta') &= K_2\kappa_3\kappa_9s^2\left(2\sqrt{K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}a(\bar{\kappa})}s + (K_2\kappa_3\kappa_9s^2 + 2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_{12}s - K_3\kappa_6\kappa_{12})\right). \end{aligned}$$

We let now

$$(17) \quad \psi(s, \eta') = \frac{\alpha_1(s, \eta')}{\beta_1(s, \eta')}, \quad \phi(s, K_1, \eta') = \frac{\alpha_4(s, K_1, \eta')}{\beta_4(s, \eta')},$$

and let $\xi(\eta')$ be the first positive root of the polynomial $\beta_1(s, \eta')$ with variable s and η' fixed.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ such that $\kappa_3\kappa_{12} - \kappa_6\kappa_{12} \geq 0$, and denote $\eta' = (K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$. Recall the map σ from Remark 2.14. Multistationarity is enabled if and only if K_1, K_4 are as in one of the following cases:*

$$K_1 = \psi(s, \eta'), \quad \text{and} \quad K_4 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta'), \quad \text{with} \quad s \in (0, \xi(\eta')).$$

or

$$K_4 = \psi(s, \sigma(\eta')), \quad \text{and} \quad K_1 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \sigma(\eta')), \sigma(\eta')), \quad \text{with} \quad s \in (0, \xi(\sigma(\eta'))).$$

The first case describes the K_4 -branch, and $s = x_1$, while the second case describes the K_1 -branch, and $s = x_2$. Furthermore, for any η' , ψ increases for s in the considered interval and the image is $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

Proof. We consider η' fixed and study the K_4 -branch. The proof relies on several symbolic computations that can be found in the accompanying supplementary file *SupplInfo.mw*. Recall from the proof of Lemma 4.3 that $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3)$ is linear in K_4 . If written as $c_1 K_4 + c_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= K_2 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^2 \left(K_2 \kappa_3 a(\bar{\kappa}) x_1^2 x_3^2 + K_1 \kappa_6 (K_2 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^2 + 2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1 - K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}) x_3 + K_1^2 K_3 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12} \right) \\ c_0 &= K_3 \kappa_{12} \left(K_2 \kappa_3 a(\bar{\kappa}) (K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 + K_1 \kappa_6) x_1^2 x_3^2 - K_1 \kappa_6 (K_2 \kappa_3 (K_1 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 - (K_2 + K_3) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12}) x_1^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - K_1 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12} (2K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 + K_3 \kappa_6)) x_3 + K_1^2 K_3 \kappa_6^2 \kappa_{12} (K_2 \kappa_3 x_1 + K_1 \kappa_6) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In order to understand the K_4 -branch, we consider the case $c_1 < 0$ (see the proof of Lemma 4.3). For fixed x_1, x_3, K_1 , this implies that the coefficient of x_3 in c_1 is negative, which in turn implies that x_1 is smaller than the positive root of $K_2 \kappa_3 \kappa_9 x_1^2 + 2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} x_1 - K_3 \kappa_6 \kappa_{12}$, namely, smaller than

$$x_{1, \text{bound}} := \frac{-K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} + \sqrt{K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} (K_2 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 + K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12})}}{K_2 \kappa_3 \kappa_9}.$$

Under the assumption $x_1 < x_{1, \text{bound}}$, and $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$, using the function `IsEmpty` in Maple 2019, we find that $c_0 > 0$. Hence for η in the K_4 -branch, if $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) < 0$, then necessarily $c_1 < 0$ and $c_0 > 0$. Furthermore, in this case $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) = 0$ holds if and only if $K_4 = \frac{-c_0}{c_1} > 0$, and $p_{\eta, H}(x_1, x_3) < 0$ holds if $K_4 > \frac{-c_0}{c_1}$. It follows that the boundary of the K_4 -branch is determined by minimizing $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ with respect to $x_1, x_3 > 0$ subject to $c_1 < 0$. For $a(\bar{\kappa}) > 0$, we find the minimum value of $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$, and for $a(\bar{\kappa}) = 0$, we find its infimum value.

For a fixed $x_1 > 0$, we consider first $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ as a function of x_3 in the region where $c_1 < 0$. When $a(\bar{\kappa}) > 0$, the derivative has a unique positive zero at

$$x_{3, \text{min}} := \frac{K_1 \kappa_6 \sqrt{K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} a(\bar{\kappa})}}{K_2 \kappa_3 a(\bar{\kappa}) x_1},$$

which defines a minimum. We evaluate $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ at $x_{3, \text{min}}$, which now becomes the function $\phi(x_1, K_1, \eta')$ in (17). When $a(\bar{\kappa}) = 0$, $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ is strictly decreasing, and hence the infimum value it attains is the limit as x_3 goes to $+\infty$, which is $\phi(x_1, K_1, \eta')$ again. It makes sense then to set $x_{3, \text{min}} = +\infty$ in this case. Hence $\phi(x_1, K_1, \eta')$ gives, for fixed η', K_1 , and x_1 such that $c_1 < 0$, the minimal/infimum value of $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ seen as a function of x_3 .

We notice that the denominator of $\phi(x_1, K_1, \eta')$ (which is a multiple of $c_1(x_1, x_{3, \text{min}})$ when $a(\bar{\kappa}) > 0$), is a polynomial in x_1 of the form x_1^2 times a quadratic polynomial. The latter has positive leading term and negative independent term. Hence it has a unique positive root γ (which we can compute), and this denominator is negative if and only if $x_1 \in (0, \gamma)$. When $a(\bar{\kappa}) = 0$, we have $\gamma = x_{1, \text{bound}}$.




FIGURE 8. Cartoon depiction of the function $\psi(s, \eta')$ for a fixed η' , with $\xi(\eta')$, $\bar{\xi}(\eta')$, γ and $K_{1,\text{bound}}$ as given in the proof of Theorem 4.4.

In particular ϕ is continuous and differentiable in $(0, \gamma)$. The function ϕ is a rational function in x_1 of the following form:

$$\phi(x_1, K_1, \eta') = \frac{a_1 x_1^2 - a_2 x_1 - a_3}{x_1^2 (b_1 x_1^2 + b_2 x_1 - b_3)},$$

where a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3 depend on η', K_1 and are positive under the current hypotheses, and a_1 , which also depends on K_1, η' is

$$a_1 := -K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} \left(-K_1 \kappa_6 \kappa_9 + (K_2 + K_3) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} + 2\sqrt{K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} a(\bar{\kappa})} \right).$$

In order to minimize ϕ in $(0, \gamma)$, we find the derivative of ϕ with respect to x_1 :

$$\phi'(x_1, K_1, \eta') = \frac{-2a_1 b_1 x_1^4 + (3a_2 b_1 - a_1 b_2) x_1^3 + (2a_2 b_2 + 4a_3 b_1) x_1^2 + (3a_3 b_2 - a_2 b_3) x_1 - 2a_3 b_3}{x_1^3 (b_1 x_1^2 + b_2 x_1 - b_3)^2}.$$

The extreme values of ϕ' are determined by the zeroes of its numerator. This numerator is a polynomial $u(x_1)$ in x_1 with negative independent term and positive degree 2 term. If $a_1 \leq 0$, then the leading and degree 3 coefficients of $u(x_1)$ are nonnegative. By Descartes' rule of signs, it follows that $\phi' = 0$ has exactly one positive root, which, in case it belongs to $(0, \gamma)$, gives rise to a minimum of ϕ , as the independent term of the numerator of ϕ' is negative.

If $a_1 > 0$, then the leading term of $u(x_1)$ is negative, and by the Descartes' rule of signs, $\phi' = 0$ at most two positive roots, in which case the first positive root will be a minimum of ϕ if it belongs to $(0, \gamma)$ as above. Note that $a_1 > 0$ if and only if

$$K_1 > K_{1,\text{bound}}, \quad \text{where } K_{1,\text{bound}} := \frac{(K_2 + K_3) \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} + 2\sqrt{K_2 K_3 \kappa_3 \kappa_{12} a(\bar{\kappa})}}{\kappa_6 \kappa_9}.$$

The next step is thus to confirm that the only positive root in the case $a_1 \leq 0$ is smaller than γ , and that there is such a (simple) positive root in the case $a_1 > 0$. To this end, we observe that the numerator of ϕ' is linear in K_1 . By solving the numerator for K_1 , we obtain that any extreme value satisfies

$$K_1 = \psi(x_1, \eta'),$$

with ψ as in (17). The denominator $\beta_1(x_1, \eta')$ has degree 4 in x_1 , negative leading and independent terms, and the coefficient of x_1^2 is positive. By Descartes' rule of signs, $\beta_1(x_1, \eta')$ has at most two positive roots. Using the function `IsEmpty` in `Maple 2019`, we find that $\beta_1(\gamma, \eta') > 0$. This implies that $\beta_1(x_1, \eta')$ has exactly one simple positive root $\xi(\eta')$ in the interval $(0, \gamma)$ and

one simple positive root $\bar{\xi}(\eta')$ in $(\gamma, +\infty)$. The numerator $\alpha_1(x_1, \eta')$ of ψ has degree 4 in x_1 , is negative for $x_1 > 0$, and vanishes at $x_1 = 0$. Hence, $\psi(x_1, \eta')$ is positive in the intervals $(0, \xi(\eta'))$ and $(\bar{\xi}(\eta'), +\infty)$. It tends to infinity when x_1 tends to $\xi(\eta')$ from the left and also to $\bar{\xi}(\eta')$ from the right. Furthermore, ψ vanishes at $x_1 = 0$ and tends to $K_{1,\text{bound}}$ when x_1 tends to infinity. In particular, the image of ψ over the interval $(0, \xi(\eta'))$ is $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and the image over the interval $(\bar{\xi}(\eta'), +\infty)$ is $(K_{1,\text{bound}}, +\infty)$. See Figure 8. The image of $(\xi(\eta'), \bar{\xi}(\eta'))$ by ψ belongs to $\mathbb{R}_{<0}$.

The anti-images of a given K_1 by ψ are the zeroes of $\phi' = 0$. By comparing the image of ψ to the discussion on the sign of a_1 and the positive roots of ϕ' above, we conclude that ψ is strictly increasing in $(0, \xi(\eta'))$, and each x_1 in this interval such that $K_1 = \psi(x_1, \eta')$ is a simple root of $\phi' = 0$. In particular, ϕ attains its minimum at the anti-image of K_1 by ψ in the interval $(0, \gamma)$.

To summarize, we have shown that given $K_1 > 0$, and $\bar{x}_1 \in (0, \xi(\eta'))$ such that $K_1 = \psi(\bar{x}_1, \eta')$, K_4 gives rise to a parameter point enabling multistationarity in the K_4 -branch if and only if K_4 is larger than $\frac{-c_0}{c_1}$ evaluated at $x_{3,\text{min}}$ and \bar{x}_1 , where we already know that $c_1 < 0$ as $\xi(\eta') < \gamma$. This gives that η enables multistationarity in the K_4 -branch if and only if there exists $x_1 \in (0, \xi(\eta'))$ such that $K_1 = \psi(x_1, \eta')$ and $K_4 > \phi(x_1, \psi(x_1, \eta'), \eta')$. This concludes the proof of (i); (ii) follows by symmetry using Remark 2.14. \square

Figure 7 shows the K_1 -branch of the multistationarity region given in Theorem 4.4 when $(K_2, K_3, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) = (1, 1, 2, 1, 1, 1)$.

Using implicitization via for example Gröbner bases, one could theoretically determine an implicit equation for the curve $(\psi(s, \eta'), \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta'))$ in the (K_1, K_4) -plane for a fixed η' . Such a computation has not been possible for arbitrary η' due to the computational cost. For η' fixed, as in Figure 7, we obtain a polynomial in K_1, K_4 whose zero set includes the dotted blue curve in Figure 7 given by the parametrization, as well as additional components.

Remark 4.5. Theorem 4.4 provide a means to verify whether a given η enables multistationarity: First, decide whether Theorem 3.5 is informative. If not, and $K_4 > K_1$, then determine $s \in (0, \xi(\eta'))$ such that $K_1 = \psi(s, \eta')$ for $s \in (0, \xi(\eta'))$, and decide whether $K_4 > \phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta')$. If $K_1 > K_4$, use the expressions for the K_1 -branch.

For example, let $\eta = (3, 1, 1, 700, 2, 1, 1, 1)$. Inequality (9) in Theorem 3.5 does not hold. As $K_4 > K_1$, we consider the K_4 -branch. We solve $3 = \psi(s, \eta')$ for $s \in (0, \xi(\eta'))$ and obtain $s \approx 0.174$, which gives $\phi(s, \psi(s, \eta'), \eta') \approx 818.17$. As $700 < 818.17$, the given parameter point does not enable multistationarity. It follows as well that the parameter point $(3, 1, 1, 900, 2, 1, 1, 1)$ enables multistationarity.

5. Connectivity

In this section we show that the open set $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ of parameter points that enable multistationarity is connected. As any $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ either enables or precludes multistationarity, the set $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8 \setminus X$ consists of the parameter points that preclude multistationarity.

We consider X as a topological subspace of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ with the Euclidean topology. We start by highlighting in the next lemma a path connected subset of X . Let $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$ consist of the parameter points η such that $a(\eta) < 0$.

Lemma 5.1. *The following subsets of \mathbb{R}^4 are path connected:*

$$A_{<0} = \{\bar{\kappa} = (\kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 \mid a(\bar{\kappa}) < 0\}, \quad A_{\geq 0} = \{\bar{\kappa} = (\kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 \mid a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0\}.$$

Additionally, Y is path connected.




FIGURE 9. Newton Polytope of $\bar{p}_{\eta',H}$ as a polynomial in x_1, x_3, κ_{12} . In black we show two negative vertices.

Proof. Consider the continuous map $h: \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ sending $(\kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ to $(\kappa_3\kappa_{12}, \kappa_6\kappa_9)$. The fibers of this map are path connected. As $A_{<0}$ and $A_{\geq 0}$ are respectively the preimages by h of the path connected subsets $\{x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2 \mid x_1 < x_2\}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2 \mid x_1 \geq x_2\}$ of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$, they are also path connected. Y is also path connected as it is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 \times A_{<0}$. \square

By Proposition 2.11, multistationarity is enabled whenever $a(\eta) < 0$. Therefore, $Y_{<0}$ is a subset of X . To show that X is path connected it is enough to show that there exists a path from any point in X to a point in $Y_{<0}$.

Theorem 5.2. X and $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8 \setminus X$ are path connected.

Proof. We start by showing that X is path connected. Let $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa'_{12}) \in X$ such that $a(\eta) \geq 0$. By Lemma 5.1, it is enough to show that there exists a path in X that connects η to a point $\eta^* \in Y_{<0}$. As $\eta \in X$ and $a(\eta) \geq 0$, we can choose $z_1, z_3 > 0$ such that $p_{\eta,H}(z_1, z_3) < 0$ (c.f. Proposition 2.11). We let $\eta' = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9)$ and let $\bar{p}_{\eta',H}(x_1, x_3, \kappa_{12})$ denote $p_{\eta,H}$ seen as a polynomial in x_1, x_3, κ_{12} . The vertices of the Newton polytope of $\bar{p}_{\eta',H}$ are (c.f. Figure 9): $\{(0, 1, 2), (2, 2, 1), (2, 2, 2), (1, 0, 2), (2, 0, 1), (0, 0, 2), (3, 2, 2), (4, 2, 1), (4, 1, 0), (4, 2, 0)\}$. The coefficients of the vertices $(2, 2, 1)$ and $(4, 2, 0)$ are negative. These two vertices lie on the one dimensional face F given by the intersection of the supporting hyperplanes $x_3 - 2 = 0$ and $-x_1 - 2\kappa_{12} + 4 = 0$. Therefore, the outer normal cone at F is generated by the vectors $v_1 := (0, 1, 0)$ and $v_2 := (-1, 0, -2)$. Following Remark 2.4, we consider $w := v_1 + v_2 = (-1, 1, -2)$ and evaluate $\bar{p}_{\eta',H}$ at $(z_1 s^{-1}, z_3 s, \kappa'_{12} s^{-2})$. The denominator is positive and the numerator is

$$\begin{aligned} q(s) := & -K_2\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9z_1^2z_3^2(K_2K_4\kappa_3\kappa_9z_1^2 + K_1K_3\kappa_6\kappa'_{12})s^3 + \kappa_6z_3(K_2^2\kappa_3^2\kappa_9(K_1K_4\kappa_9z_1^4 - K_3\kappa'_{12}z_1^3z_3) \\ & - K_1K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa_6\kappa_9\kappa'_{12}(K_1 + K_4)z_1^2 + K_1^2K_3^2\kappa_6^2\kappa'_{12}^2)s^2 + (K_2K_4\kappa_3\kappa_9\kappa'_{12}z_1^2(K_2\kappa_3^2z_1^2z_3^2 \\ & + 2K_1K_3\kappa_3\kappa_6z_1z_3 + K_1^2K_3\kappa_6^2) + K_1K_3\kappa_6\kappa'_{12}(K_2\kappa_3^2z_1^2z_3^2 + 2K_1K_2\kappa_3\kappa_6z_1z_3 + K_1^2K_3\kappa_6^2))s \\ & + K_2K_3\kappa_3\kappa'_{12}z_1(K_2\kappa_3^2z_1^2z_3^2 + K_1\kappa_3\kappa_6(K_2 + K_3)z_1z_3 + K_1^2K_3\kappa_6^2). \end{aligned}$$

The polynomial q has degree 3 in s , its leading coefficient is negative and the coefficients of degree 0 and 1 are positive. By Descartes' rule of signs, q has exactly one positive root. For $s = 1$, $q(1) = \bar{p}_{\eta,H}(z_1, z_3, \kappa'_{12})$ is negative, from where it follows that $q(s) < 0$ for all $s \geq 1$. Hence, $\eta(s) = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa'_{12}s^{-2}) \in X$ for all $s \geq 1$. As s increases, $\kappa'_{12}s^{-2}$ decreases

and hence $a(\eta(s))$ decreases. For $s > \sqrt{\frac{\kappa_3 \kappa_{12}}{\kappa_6 \kappa_9}}$, we have $a(\eta(s)) < 0$ and hence $a(\eta) \in Y_{<0}$. This provides the desired path, which proves the first part of the statement.

To study $Z := \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8 \setminus X$, note that the set of points η with $K_1 = K_4$ and $a(\bar{\kappa}) \geq 0$ is path connected by Lemma 5.1, and is further a subset of Z by Corollary 3.9. By Lemma 4.3, in Z there are paths joining any $\eta = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_4, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$ in Z to $\eta' = (K_1, K_2, K_3, K_1, \kappa_3, \kappa_6, \kappa_9, \kappa_{12})$. Hence $Z := \mathbb{R}_{>0}^8 \setminus X$ is path connected. This concludes the proof of the theorem. \square

Remark 5.3. According to Theorem 5.2, the region X of parameters η that enable multistationarity is connected in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^8$. For this system, the preimage of X by π , that is, the set of parameters $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12}$ that enable multistationarity, is also path connected in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{12}$. To see this, it is enough to study the map $(\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \mapsto (\frac{\kappa_2 + \kappa_3}{\kappa_1}, \kappa_3)$. The fiber of this map of each point in the image is one dimensional and connected. The map π comprises four disjoint copies of such a map, and hence the fiber by π of a point in the image is four dimensional and connected. Therefore, the preimage of X by π is path-connected.

Acknowledgements. EF and NK acknowledge funding from the Independent Research Fund of Denmark. The project was started while NK was at MPI, MIS Leipzig and further developed while NK was at the University of Copenhagen. TdW and OY acknowledge the funding from the DFG grant WO 2206/1-1. Bernd Sturmfels is gratefully acknowledged for useful discussions and for bringing the authors together. Alicia Dickenstein and Carsten Wiuf are thanked for comments on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Bihan, A. Dickenstein, and Giaroli M. Lower bounds for positive roots and regions of multistationarity in chemical reaction networks. *J. Algebra*, 542:367–411, 2020.
- [2] C. Chen, J. H. Davenport, M. Moreno Maza, B. Xia, and R. Xiao. Computing with semi-algebraic sets represented by triangular decomposition. In *Proceedings of the 2011 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (ISSAC 2011)*, pages 75–82. ACM Press, 2011.
- [3] P. Cohen. The structure and regulation of protein phosphatases. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.*, 58:453–508, Jan 1989.
- [4] C. Conradi, E. Feliu, and M. Mincheva. On the existence of hopf bifurcations in the sequential and distributive double phosphorylation cycle. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 1(17):494–513, 2020.
- [5] C. Conradi, E. Feliu, M. Mincheva, and C. Wiuf. Identifying parameter regions for multistationarity. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 13(10):e1005751, 2017.
- [6] C. Conradi and D. Flockerzi. Multistationarity in mass action networks with applications to ERK activation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 65(1):107–156, 2012.
- [7] C. Conradi, D. Flockerzi, J. Raisch, and J. Stelling. Subnetwork analysis reveals dynamic features of complex (bio)chemical networks. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 104(49):19175–80, 2007.
- [8] C. Conradi and M. Mincheva. Catalytic constants enable the emergence of bistability in dual phosphorylation. *J. R. S. Interface*, 11(95), 2014.
- [9] C. Conradi, M. Mincheva, and A. Shiu. Emergence of oscillations in a mixed-mechanism phosphorylation system. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 81(6):1829–1852, 2019.
- [10] C. Conradi and A. Shiu. Dynamics of post-translational modification systems: recent progress and future directions. *Biophys. J.*, 114(3):507–515, 2018.
- [11] G. Craciun, J. W. Helton, and R. J. Williams. Homotopy methods for counting reaction network equilibria. *Mathematical biosciences*, 216(2):140–149, 2008.

- [12] P. Donnell, M. Banaji, A. Marginean, and C. Pantea. Control: an open source framework for the analysis of chemical reaction networks. *Bioinformatics*, 30(11), 2014.
- [13] M. Dressler, S. Iliman, and T. de Wolff. An approach to constrained polynomial optimization via nonnegative circuit polynomials and geometric programming. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 91, 2016.
- [14] M. Dressler, S. Iliman, and T. de Wolff. A Positivstellensatz for Sums of Nonnegative Circuit Polynomials. *SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom.*, 1(1):536–555, 2017.
- [15] P. Ellison, M. Feinberg, H. Ji, and D. Knight. Chemical reaction network toolbox, version 2.2. Available online at <http://www.crnt.osu.edu/CRNTWin>, 2012.
- [16] M. Feinberg. The existence and uniqueness of steady states for a class of chemical reaction networks. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 132(4):311–370, 1995.
- [17] E. Feliu. Injectivity, multiple zeros, and multistationarity in reaction networks. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A*, doi:10.1098/rspa.2014.0530, 2014.
- [18] E. Feliu and C. Wiuf. Enzyme-sharing as a cause of multi-stationarity in signalling systems. *J. R. S. Interface*, 9(71):1224–32, 2012.
- [19] E. Feliu and C. Wiuf. Variable elimination in post-translational modification reaction networks with mass-action kinetics. *J. Math. Biol.*, 66(1):281–310, 2013.
- [20] S. Feng, M. Sáez, C. Wiuf, E. Feliu, and O.S. Soyer. Core signalling motif displaying multistability through multi-state enzymes. *J R S Interface*, 13(123), 2016.
- [21] D. Flockerzi, K. Holstein, and C. Conradi. N-site Phosphorylation Systems with 2N-1 Steady States. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 76(8):1892–1916, 2014.
- [22] J. Hell and A. D. Rendall. A proof of bistability for the dual futile cycle. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 24:175–189, 2015.
- [23] J. Hell and A. D. Rendall. Dynamical features of the map kinase cascade. In Cham Springer, editor, *Modeling Cellular Systems*, volume 11. 2017.
- [24] C. Y. Huang and J. E. Ferrell. Ultrasensitivity in the mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 93:10078–10083, 1996.
- [25] S. Iliman and T. de Wolff. Amoebas, nonnegative polynomials and sums of squares supported on circuits. *Res. Math. Sci.*, 3(9), 2016.
- [26] A. Kurpisz and T. de Wolff. New dependencies of hierarchies in polynomial optimization. In J.H. Davenport, D. Wang, M. Kauers, and R.J. Bradford, editors, *Proceedings of the 2019 on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, ISSAC 2019, Beijing, China, July 15-18, 2019.*, pages 251–258. ACM, 2019.
- [27] M. Laurent and N. Kellershohn. Multistability: a major means of differentiation and evolution in biological systems. *Trends Biochem. Sciences*, 24(11):418–422, 1999.
- [28] N. I. Markevich, J. B. Hoek, and B. N. Kholodenko. Signaling switches and bistability arising from multisite phosphorylation in protein kinase cascades. *J. Cell Biol.*, 164:353–359, 2004.
- [29] T.S. Motzkin. The arithmetic-geometric inequality. In *Inequalities: Proceedings, Volume 1*, chapter 10, pages 203–224. Academic Press, 1967.
- [30] E. M. Ozbudak, M. Thattai, H. N. Lim, B. I. Shraiman, and A. Van Oudenaarden. Multistability in the lactose utilization network of escherichia coli. *Nature*, 427(6976):737–740, 2004.
- [31] C. Pantea, H. Koeppl, and G. Craciun. Global injectivity and multiple equilibria in uni- and bi-molecular reaction networks. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 17(6):2153–2170, 2012.

- [32] M. Pérez Millán and A. Dickenstein. The structure of MESSI biological systems. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 17:1650–1682, 2018.
- [33] M. Pérez Millán, A. Dickenstein, A. Shiu, and C. Conradi. Chemical reaction systems with toric steady states. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 74:1027–1065, 2012.
- [34] L. Qiao, R. B. Nachbar, I. G. Kevrekidis, and S. Y. Shvartsman. Bistability and oscillations in the Huang-Ferrell model of MAPK signaling. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 3(9):1819–1826, 2007.
- [35] B. Reznick. Forms derived from the arithmetic-geometric inequality. *Math. Ann.*, 283(3):431–464, 1989.
- [36] M. Thomson and J. Gunawardena. The rational parameterization theorem for multisite post-translational modification systems. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 261:626–636, 2009.
- [37] M. Thomson and J. Gunawardena. Unlimited multistability in multisite phosphorylation systems. *Nature*, 460:274–277, 2009.
- [38] A. Torres and E. Feliu. Detecting parameter regions for bistability in reaction networks. *arXiv*, 1909.13608, 2019.
- [39] A. I. Vol’pert. Differential equations on graphs. *Math. USSR-Sb*, 17:571582, 1972.
- [40] L. Wang and E. D. Sontag. On the number of steady states in a multiple futile cycle. *J. Math. Biol.*, 57(1):29–52, 2008.
- [41] C. Wiuf and E. Feliu. Power-law kinetics and determinant criteria for the preclusion of multistationarity in networks of interacting species. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12:1685–1721, 2013.
- [42] W. Xiong and J. E. Ferrell Jr. A positive-feedback-based bistable ‘memory module’ that governs a cell fate decision. *Nature*, 426(6965):460–465, 2003.
- [43] G. M. Ziegler. *Lectures on polytopes*. Graduate texts in mathematics, 152. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.