

Symbolic-numeric algorithm for parameter estimation in discrete-time models with exp

Yosef Berman^a, Joshua Forrest^e, Matthew Grote^a, Alexey Ovchinnikov^{a,b,c}, Sonia Rueda^d

^aPh.D. Program in Mathematics, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, USA

^bPh.D. Program in Computer Science, CUNY Graduate Center, New York, USA

^cDepartment of Mathematics, CUNY Queens College, Queens, USA

^dDepartamento de Matemática Aplicada, E.T.S. Arquitectura, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Spain

^eSchool of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Abstract

Determining unknown parameter values in dynamic models is crucial for accurate analysis of the dynamics across the different scientific disciplines. Discrete-time dynamic models are widely used to model biological processes, but it is often difficult to determine these parameters. In this paper, we propose a robust symbolic-numeric approach for parameter estimation in discrete-time models that involve non-algebraic functions such as exp. We illustrate the performance (precision) of our approach by applying our approach to the flour beetle (LPA) model, an archetypal discrete-time model in biology. Unlike optimization-based methods, our algorithm guarantees to find all solutions of the parameter values given time-series data for the measured variables.

Keywords: parameter estimation, discrete-time models, symbolic-numeric computing, flour beetle model

2020 MSC: 92B05, 68W30, 14Q20, 39A60, 13P15

1. Introduction

Consider a discrete-time model

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{n+1} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mu, \mathbf{u}_n) \\ \mathbf{y}_{n+1} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mu, \mathbf{u}_n) \\ \mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}^* \end{cases}$$

wherein the state variables \mathbf{x} (a vector) and output variables \mathbf{y} are expressed respectively as \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} , vector-valued functions that depend both on the previous state(s), input variables \mathbf{u}_n (representing external interference e.g. noise) and scalar parameters μ, \mathbf{x}^* , the latter being the initial condition of the system. Discrete-time systems are widely used to model biological processes. Such systems typically involve unknown parameters. One is often interested in the values of

Email addresses: yberman1@gradcenter.cuny.edu (Yosef Berman), jeforrest@student.unimelb.edu.au (Joshua Forrest), mgrote@gradcenter.cuny.edu (Matthew Grote), aovchinnikov@qc.cuny.edu (Alexey Ovchinnikov), sonialuisa.rueda@upm.es (Sonia Rueda)

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

January 30, 2024

these parameters due to their biological significance. They may represent key mechanisms such as organism birth rates or survival rates[1].

Parameter estimation is the problem of determining unknown parameters of a model from measured data. In this paper, we propose an algorithm to solve this problem in the case of exact data (data without noise or measurement errors). The standard way to find the model parameters is to fit the data with minimal error using an optimization solver over many iterations. This approach may fail for several reasons: e.g., the optimization solver gets stuck at a local minimum, or the solver does find a global minimum but fails to find all global minima (in case multiple parameter values fit the data exactly). This issue can plague biological modelers [2].

There is a partial algorithm [3] to check if multiple parameter values fit the data for discrete-time systems. This approach mimics algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations (ODEs) based on differential elimination. However, it does not apply to a large collection of biological models that involve non-algebraic functions (such as the exponential function, integrals, etc.). Such non-algebraic functions exist in biological models ranging from cellular processes to ecological models [4, 5, 6], and in some cases are mixed with other modeling paradigms such as ODEs and agent-based models (ABMs) [7, 4].

Parameter estimation has been a key component in studying flour beetle dynamics [8, 9, 10]. The flour beetle system also provides a commonly-used test case for a wide range of stage- and age-structured difference equations used in ecology [11, 12, 13]. It is a highly convenient model organism for mathematical modeling—population dynamics for flour beetle systems are contained and free of confounding variables, allowing complex dynamics such as chaos that are often predicted in ecological models to actually be observed in data [12, 8, 10]. We use a simplified flour beetle model¹ [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19] to demonstrate our methods. The life cycle of the flour beetle consists of distinct states L, P, A , for the larval, pupate, and adult stages respectively. For this reason, we refer to this system as the ‘LPA model’. Explicitly, this is a discrete-time model wherein by L_k we mean the total larval population at k -th observation, and so on:

$$B : \begin{cases} L_{t+1} = b \cdot A_t \cdot \exp(-c_{EL} \cdot L_t - c_{EA} \cdot A_t) \\ P_{t+1} = L_t \cdot (1 - \mu_L) \\ A_{t+1} = P_t \cdot \exp(-c_{PA} \cdot A_t) + A_t \cdot (1 - \mu_A) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The parameter b represents the larva birthrate from the surviving eggs, which is proportional to the number of adults. The parameters μ_L, μ_A represent the mortality rate of larvae and adults, respectively. The parameters c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA} are the rates of cannibalism of eggs by larvae and by adults, and of pupae by adults, respectively. All parameters are nonnegative. We will refer to this system of equations as B throughout the paper.

The task of this paper is to propose a general algorithm for parameter estimation of a large class of difference equation models. In a system in which \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} are analytic, our algorithm approximates the non-polynomial functions by sufficiently close polynomials and then recovers the parameters by symbolic-numeric solving of the resulting polynomial system. There are multiple subtleties in this approach:

1. The degree of polynomial approximation needs to correspond to the user-specified precision of parameter estimation,

¹This is simplified in that it does not include input variables. This excludes, for instance, observation noise, and also assumes an absence of environmental factors such as predators or food scarcity

2. The approximating square polynomial systems are not always consistent,
3. The resulting consistent square non-linear polynomial systems often have multiple solutions.

In the present paper, we address the last two subtleties, leaving a detailed discussion of precision for future research. We address the second subtlety by approximating polynomial systems with a full-rank Jacobian and prove the correctness of this criterion for the LPA model. We address the multiple-solution issue by requiring that the user specifies intervals for the parameter values, and use these intervals to filter the multiple-solution set. (The intervals are also used to assist the Taylor approximation of \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} , see Section 4 for details.) The algorithm is repeatedly demonstrated on the LPA model. We successfully establish a sufficiently small approximation error through numerical experiments.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review formal concepts in difference equations and parameter estimation, including demonstrative simple models. In Section 3, we describe our algorithms for approximating difference equation systems with analytic functions by polynomial systems, illustrating this with the LPA model as a running example. Later in the same section, we describe two methods for recovering parameters from polynomial difference equation systems, again demonstrating with LPA. Finally, in Section 4, we present a randomized numerical experiment on LPA showing that varying aspects of our algorithms (namely the polynomial degree and parameter domain size) returns estimated parameter values that are very close to the true parameter values.

2. Background

2.1. Systems we consider

Consider a discrete-time (difference) system of the form

$$\Sigma : \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{n+1} &= \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u}_n), \\ \mathbf{y}_n &= \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_n, \boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{u}_n), \\ \mathbf{x}_0 &= \mathbf{x}^*, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where

- \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} are vectors of functions (combinations of polynomial, rational, exponential and other transcendental functions);
- $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_n$ is a vector of state variables that describe the state of the model;
- $\boldsymbol{\theta} := (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{x}^*)$ are unknown scalar parameters;
- $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_n$ is a vector of input sequence representing “external forces”, assumed to be known;
- $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}_n$ is a vector of output variables: this is what we actually observe.

For every set $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \mathbf{x}^*)$ of parameter values and every vector of specific input sequence $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$ such that the right-hand sides of Σ are well-defined, there is a unique sequence \mathbf{y} , denoted $Y(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$.

2.2. Parameter identifiability: problem statement

We continue with a statement of the identifiability problem, which is a prerequisite for performing parameter estimation.

Definition 1. The parameters θ in a system Σ are said to be *globally identifiable* if, for generic $\hat{\theta}$ and generic \hat{u} ,

$$Y(\hat{\theta}, \hat{u}) = Y(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{u}) \implies \hat{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}. \quad (3)$$

Remark 1. In other words, roughly speaking, the parameters θ are globally identifiable if one can almost always uniquely recover the values of the parameters from observations.

Remark 2. There is a weaker notion of *local identifiability*: the parameters are locally identifiable if one can almost always recover the values of the parameters from observations up to a finite number of options.

2.3. Parameter estimation: problem statement

The input for the parameter estimation problem consists of:

- Discrete-time system Σ ,
- Data y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m for Σ for some positive integer m corresponding to parameter values $\hat{\theta}$, which are unknown,
- Complex balls (real intervals) R_1, \dots, R_s , where s is the length of the tuple θ , such that $\hat{\theta}_i \in R_1 \times \dots \times R_s$, and
- a real number ε .

The output consists of a finite set of tuples of complex (real) numbers $\tilde{\theta}$ such that there exists $\hat{\theta} \in \tilde{\theta}$ such that, if θ_i is locally identifiable, then $|\hat{\theta}_i - \tilde{\theta}_i| < \varepsilon$.

2.4. Parameter estimation: toy examples using elimination

We will show a few toy examples illustrating how one can carry out parameter estimation in simple cases by hand using elimination.

Example 1. Consider a toy model, given by

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = x_n + \mu_1, \\ y_n = x_n, \\ x_0 = \mu_2. \end{cases}$$

Both parameters μ_1 and μ_2 can be found from the observed y_n using $\mu_1 = y_1 - y_0$ and $\mu_2 = y_0$.

Example 2. Consider another toy model, given by

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = x_n + \mu_1 + \mu_2, \\ y_n = x_n, \\ x_0 = \mu_3. \end{cases}$$

Neither μ_1 nor μ_2 can be separately found from the observed y_n .

One can approach the parameter estimation problem for discrete-time models mimicking the existing approach to ODE models by performing an elimination of the unknowns. For instance, let us try to calculate the parameter values in this toy model:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = \mu_1 x_n + \mu_2, \\ y_n = x_n, \\ x_0 = \mu_3. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We will do an elimination of variables to check if we can have an equation relating only y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots and μ_1 and another equation relating only y_n, y_{n+1}, \dots and μ_2 . For this, consider the first equation in (4) and its prolongation:

$$\begin{cases} x_{n+1} = \mu_1 x_n + \mu_2 \\ x_{n+2} = \mu_1 x_{n+1} + \mu_2 \end{cases}$$

Substituting $x_n = y_n, x_{n+1} = y_{n+1}, x_{n+2} = y_{n+2}$ and performing (Gaussian in this case because the system is linear) elimination of variables, we arrive at the solution

$$\mu_1 = \frac{y_{n+1} - y_{n+2}}{y_n - y_{n+1}}, \quad \mu_2 = \frac{y_n y_{n+2} - y_{n+1}^2}{y_n - y_{n+1}}, \quad (5)$$

and so we can uniquely determine the values of μ_1 and μ_2 from the data $\{y_0, y_1, y_2\}$. However, this approach is not immediately applicable to

- larger models because of the computational cost to carry out the elimination of unknowns,
- models that involve transcendental functions, e.g. exp, such as model (1),

and so we arrive at the following challenge: design an efficient algorithm for parameter estimation of discrete-time models that involve non-algebraic functions.

3. Our approach

3.1. General description

Given a difference equation system where all terms are analytic, we replace non-polynomial functions with polynomial approximations with, for example, a Taylor series. We determine relevant domains where a power series expansion can be carried out, then compute enough terms from the Taylor polynomial to be sufficiently accurate. We then generate a sufficient number of prolongations of the polynomial system to have enough equations to solve for the parameters. We take care of the resulting inconsistency and multiple solution subtleties using full-rank Jacobian condition and solution filtering by user-specified intervals, respectively (see Section 3.3 for more details).

Each step is demonstrated in the LPA model based on [1]. The experimental data in [1] is used to confirm our approach, and further testing was done with “simulated experimentation,” generated data within the context of [1]. Given the model (as in (1)) and data (as in [1] or simulated from [1]), we convert B to a new model B' by approximating $\exp(-c_{EL}L_t - c_{EA}A_t)$ and $\exp(-c_{PA}A_t)$ by Taylor polynomials.

3.2. Replacement of transcendental function by dynamic approximation

Our first step is to replace each occurrence of a transcendental analytic function with Taylor polynomials. Each analytic transcendental function in some difference equation system Σ we denote by G_j . These are not the equations themselves, for example in the LPA model the equation

$$A_{t+1} = P_t \exp(-c_{PA}A_t) + A_t(1 - \mu_A),$$

we would call G_2 just the term $\exp(-c_{PA}A_t)$. Critically we observe that the argument of any G_2 is realized as a function of some of the parameters. Say $G_2 = \exp(-c_{PA})$, then its argument denoted \tilde{G}_2 is $-c_{PA}A_t$ and depends on parameter c_{PA} , viewing A_t as a known numerical value.

Of course, the argument \tilde{G}_j in general can be a function of multiple parameters. Again from LPA, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= \exp(-c_{ELL}(t) - c_{EAA}(t)) \\ \tilde{G}_1 &= -c_{ELL}(t) - c_{EAA}(t). \end{aligned}$$

We make the substitution $\tilde{G}_j \rightarrow \tau_j \in \mathbb{C}$ to convert the problem to an expansion of the transcendental function of just one variable. In this direction, our first task is determining where to expand these power series.

3.2.1. Algorithm for Expansion ranges

Algorithm 1 Expansion ranges

1: Input:

- 1 Difference equation system Σ with algebraic or analytic transcendental functions.
- 2 For each parameter μ_i appearing as an argument of a transcendental function, user-specified acceptable domains for each μ_i , denoted R_{μ_i} .
- 3 Observed data $\bar{y}(t_0), \bar{y}(t_1), \dots, \bar{y}(t_r)$

2: Output: Domains R_{G_j} over which each transcendental function G_j in Σ is expanded.

3: **procedure** EXPANSION RANGE By substitution of maximums and minimums (modulus) of R_{μ_i} into arguments of G_j , as relevant, determine radii of discs R_{L_j} .

4: Call the argument of G_j as $\tilde{G}_j =: \tau_j$.

5: **for** $j = 1 \rightarrow r$, t fixed **do**

$$6: \quad R_{G_{j,t}} := \left\{ \min_{R_{\mu_i^*}, i=1, \dots, s} |\tilde{G}_j| \leq |\tau_j| \leq \max_{R_{\mu_i^*}, i=1, \dots, s} |\tilde{G}_j| \right\}$$

7: **end for**

8: **end procedure**

To emphasize, the time-measured data and acceptable parameter intervals are necessary to compute $\min_{R_{\mu_i^*}} |\tilde{G}_j|, \max_{R_{\mu_i^*}} |\tilde{G}_j|$. More clearly, the argument \tilde{G}_j varies in both the parameters (unknown) and time (known). This is made especially clear in Section 3.2.2, where this algorithm is applied to the LPA model.

To compute a Taylor polynomial, we need three pieces of data: the domain for expansion, a point to center the expansion, and the number of terms (or polynomial degree). Algorithm 1

has given the domain. In the general setting, we will allow the user to explicitly provide the center and degree - leaving the automatic choice of these based on the user-specified parameter estimation error of ε (see Section 2.3) for future research.

Algorithm 2 Dynamic Taylor

Input:

- 1 Data input for Algorithm 1, e.g. system Σ .
- 2 Output of Algorithm 1.
- 3 Set number of terms, i.e., the highest degree of Taylor polynomial, N .
- 4 Expansion point $\alpha_j \in R_{G_j}$ for each j .
- 5 Time measured data $\bar{y}(t_0), \dots, \bar{y}(t_s)$.

Output: System of polynomial equations Σ' with parameters approximately equal to those of Σ .

procedure Σ TO POWER SERIES Σ^* Suppose there are K transcendental functions in Σ .

for $j = 1 \rightarrow K$ **do**

$\tau_j := \tilde{G}_j$

$G_j \rightarrow T_{G_j} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} G_j^{(k)}(\alpha_j)(\tau_j - \alpha_j)^k$, where differentiation is with respect to τ_j .

For every equation $e_i = G_{i_1} + \dots + G_{i_r} + A_i$ in Σ , $e_i^* = T_{G_{i_1}} + \dots + T_{G_{i_r}} + A_i$ is in Σ^* , where A_i is algebraic.

end for

end procedure

procedure Σ^* TO ALGEBRAIC Σ'

for $j = 1 \rightarrow K$ **do**

$\hat{T}_{G_j} := \sum_{k=0}^N G_j^{(k)}(\alpha_j)(\tau - \alpha_j)^k$

$\tau_j \mapsto \tilde{G}_j$

For every equation $e_i^* = T_{G_{i_1}} + \dots + T_{G_{i_r}} + A_i$ in Σ^* , $e_i' = \hat{T}_{G_{i_1}}(\tilde{G}_{i_1}) + \dots + \hat{T}_{G_{i_r}}(\tilde{G}_{i_r}) + A_i$ is in Σ' , where A_i is algebraic.

end for

Substitute $\bar{y}(t_0), \dots, \bar{y}(t_s)$ throughout Σ' as they appear, if known.

end procedure

Note for clarity that the algorithm considers every transcendental term in the system separately. For example, the LPA system is written as three equations, but in practice is an indefinite number of equations all depending on t . Hence it includes both the equations

$$L_1 = bA_0 \exp(-c_{EL}L_0 - c_{EA}A_0), \quad L_2 = bA_1 \exp(-c_{EL}L_1 - c_{EA}A_1)$$

and considers

$$G_1 = \exp(-c_{EL}L_0 - c_{EA}A_0), \quad G_3 = \exp(-c_{EL}L_1 - c_{EA}A_1).$$

3.2.2. Worked example

We demonstrate our method using the LPA model. Note that all numerical values in this section have been rounded to significant figures for readability, and exact values for this example are available on GitHub as a Maple worksheet, <https://github.com/jedforrest/larva-pupa-adult/blob/main/LPA%20example%20in%20maple.mpl>.

t	L_t	P_t	A_t
0	107	73	214
1	33	86	240
2	67	27	267

Table 1: Population data for Section 3.2.2

Suppose that we have observed the population data in Table 1. To apply Algorithm 2 we first need Algorithm 1. The LPA system B is assumed. Note in this model that all parameters are positive real numbers, hence the domains R_{μ_i} become intervals. Suppose the user has determined acceptable ranges:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{EL} &\in [0.01, 0.014] = R_{c_{EL}} \\ c_{EA} &\in [0.0097, 0.0134] = R_{c_{EA}} \\ c_{PA} &\in [0.0032, 0.0062] = R_{c_{PA}} \end{aligned}$$

We determine expansion ranges for the exp term in L_t by finding its endpoints with the formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \min R_{L_t} &= -\max R_{c_{EL}} L_t - \max R_{c_{EA}} A_t \\ \max R_{L_t} &= -\min R_{c_{EL}} L_t - \min R_{c_{EA}} A_t \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly where we need maximums, minimums and time-measured data. For instance

$$\begin{aligned} \max R_{L_1} &= -0.010 \cdot 107 - 0.01 \cdot 214 \\ \min R_{L_1} &= -0.014 \cdot 107 - 0.013 \cdot 214, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$R_{L_1} = [-3.67, -2.67].$$

Similarly R_{A_t} is found via the formulas:

$$\begin{aligned} \min R_{A_t} &= -\max R_{c_{PA}} A_t \\ \max R_{A_t} &= -\min R_{c_{PA}} A_t. \end{aligned}$$

No other user input is required for Algorithm 1 because no other parameters appear in transcendental functions. Hence they are not necessary for Algorithm 2, however, they may be of use in the future Algorithm 3.

The results of Algorithm 1 are recorded in Table 2, as well as the midpoints α_t, β_t respectively. These are our expansion points (β is used instead of repeating α for readability), and the use of midpoints is justified briefly in the next sections.

t	R_{L_t}	α_t	R_{A_t}	β_t
1	$[-3.67, -2.67]$	-3.17	$[-1.48, -0.77]$	-1.13
2	$[-4.50, -3.28]$	-3.89	$[-1.65, -0.86]$	-1.25

Table 2: Expansion ranges and midpoints

We move on to apply Algorithm 2. For readability, we choose $N = 2$ as the degree of the expansion. Note the accuracy rises with increasing degree, as we find in Section 4. For illustration, every step is carried out for $t = 1$ below. Note $\tau_1 = -c_{EL}L(t) - c_{EAA}(t)$, $\tau_2 = -c_{PA}A(t)$.

$$T_{L_1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (\tau_1 - (-3.17))^k = 0.18 + 0.042\tau_1 + 0.02(\tau_1 + 3.17)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau_1^3)$$

$$T_{A_1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (\tau_2 - (-1.13))^k = 0.69 + 0.32\tau_2 + 0.16(\tau_2 + 1.13)^2 + \mathcal{O}(\tau_2^3)$$

By choice of $N = 2$, this yields

$$\hat{T}_{L_1} = 0.18 + 0.04\tau_1 + 0.02(\tau_1 + 3.17)^2,$$

$$\hat{T}_{A_1} = 0.69 + 0.32\tau_2 + 0.16(\tau_2 + 1.13)^2$$

Repeating this process for $t = 2$ yields the data of Table 3 Finally, we reverse the substitutions

t	\hat{T}_{L_t}	\hat{T}_{A_t}
1	$0.18 + 0.04\tau_1 + 0.02(\tau_1 + 3.17)^2$	$0.69 + 0.32\tau_2 + 0.16(\tau_2 + 1.13)^2$
2	$0.10 + 0.02\tau_1 + 0.01(\tau_1 + 3.89)^2$	$0.64 + 0.29\tau_2 + 0.14(\tau_2 + 1.25)^2$

Table 3: Taylor polynomials in τ_1, τ_2

$$\tau_1 \mapsto -(c_{EL}L_t + c_{EAA}A_t), \quad \tau_2 \mapsto -c_{PA}A_t$$

to create our full, multivariate polynomial system (6), denoted B' . Note that L_t, A_t are not variable so substitutions of the observed data are necessary. In this sense, τ_1, τ_2 both vary on each time step.

For example, the first three equations of system B' are just the initial conditions $L_0 = 107, P_0 = 73, A_0 = 214$. To find L_1 we note

$$\tau_1 \mapsto -(c_{EL}L_0 + c_{EAA}A_0) = -107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA},$$

$$L_1 = 33$$

and hence in B' :

$$33 = 214b(0.18 + 0.04(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA}) + 0.02(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA} + 3.17)^2)$$

Similarly $\tau_2 \mapsto -c_{PA}A_0 = -214c_{PA}, A_0 = 214, P_0 = 73$ and $A_1 = 239$ yields:

$$239 = 73(0.69 + 0.32(-214c_{PA}) + 0.16(-214c_{PA} + 1.13)^2) + 214 \cdot (1 - \mu_A)$$

No expansion occurs in P_t as it has no transcendental functions. However, data substitutions are

carried out. Continuing this process completes Algorithm 2. The result is below:

$$B' : \begin{cases} L_0 = 107 \\ P_0 = 73 \\ A_0 = 214 \\ L_1 = 33 = 214b(0.18 + 0.042(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA}) \\ \quad + 0.02(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA} + 3.17)^2) \\ P_1 = 86 = 107(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_1 = 239 = 73(0.69 + 0.32(-214c_{PA}) \\ \quad + 0.16(-214c_{PA} + 1.13)^2) + 214 \cdot (1 - \mu_A) \\ L_2 = 67 = 240b(0.1 - 0.67c_{EL} - 4.89c_{EA} + 0.01(-33c_{EL} - 240c_{EA} + 3.89)^2) \\ P_2 = 27 = 33(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_2 = 267 = 55.29 - 5884.55c_{PA} + 12.26(-240c_{PA} + 1.25)^2 + 240(1 - \mu_A) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

This comprises 9 equations. However, the first three provide no new information and can be disregarded when solving the system for parameters. Note that the equations for P_1, P_2 cause the system to be inconsistent, as the former solves $\mu_L = 22/107$ while the latter yields $\mu_L = 7/33$, which are not equal. This issue is addressed in Algorithm 3, and this example continues in Section 3.3.2.

3.2.3. Error of polynomial approximation

In Algorithm 2, the user specifies the number of terms for the Taylor polynomial. However, as mentioned this number may also be determined by use of the Taylor remainder. We demonstrate this for LPA. Note that the exp in the equations of both L_t and A_t receives a negative number as input, hence we analyze the function $e^{-\tau}$. Suppose that $e^{-\tau}$ is expanded over interval $[\alpha, \beta]$ at point $a \in [\alpha, \beta]$ with given error $\epsilon > 0$. Then for any $x \in [\alpha, \beta]$ there is a value ξ between x, a such that:

$$\left| (-1)^{n+1} e^{-\xi} \frac{(x-a)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} \right| < \epsilon$$

which simplifies to:

$$\frac{e^{-\xi} |x-a|^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} < \epsilon$$

This value ξ maximizes the value of $e^{-\tau}$. Since $e^{-\tau}$ is a monotonically decreasing function it is evident that $\xi = \min\{x, a\}$. Furthermore $e^{-\alpha} > e^{-\tau}$ for any $\tau \in (\alpha, \beta]$ so that we can instead solve:

$$\frac{e^{-\alpha} |x-a|^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} < \epsilon$$

We need to handle the maximum possible error, so we next consider the maximum value of $|x-a|^{n+1}$. View $|x-a|$ as the length of the interval between x, a . Hence as x ranges over $[\alpha, \beta]$, the maximal value of $|x-a|$ is either $|\alpha-a|$ or $|\beta-a|$. Combining these, our inequality in the Taylor remainder has only n as a variable:

$$\frac{e^{-\alpha} \max\{|\alpha-a|, |\beta-a|\}^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} < \epsilon \quad (7)$$

Thus, if the user instead provides an acceptable level of error ε , the appropriate number of terms (or degree of Taylor polynomial) can be determined. This is not currently implemented in our algorithm as our numerical experiments involved observing the effects of the Taylor degree (See Section 4); however, it is straightforward to include this calculation in the future.

Example 3. Suppose that we want to expand the term $\exp(-c_{PA}A_2)$ in the equation for A_3 in some system. If the user has provided that $c_{PA} \in [0.01, 0.027]$ (in other words, $R_{c_{PA}} = [0.01, 0.027]$) and $A_2 = 10$, then Algorithm 1 finds that $\tau = c_{PA}A_2$ lies in the interval $R_{A_3} = [0.1, 0.27]$. As in Algorithm 2 we shall use the midpoint of this interval, $a = 0.185$, as the point of expansion. If the user specifies the acceptable error of $\varepsilon = 0.01$, (7) yields:

$$\frac{e^{-0.1}(0.185)^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} < 0.01,$$

which translates into $n > 1.16547$, and so $n = 2$ guarantees that the Taylor series has an error less than 0.01 in this system.

3.2.4. Choice of midpoint for expansion

In Algorithm 2, the Taylor series are all expanded at the midpoints of R_{L_i}, R_{A_i} , though other expansion points are possible. Our rationale for choosing the midpoints follows from minimizing:

$$\min_{a \in [\alpha, \beta]} \frac{e^{-\alpha} \max\{|\alpha - a|, |\beta - a|\}^{n+1}}{(n+1)!}$$

where all notation follows from the previous section. In this problem, only a may vary. Since $\alpha \leq a \leq \beta$, it is straightforward to see that $\max\{|\alpha - a|, |\beta - a|\}$ is minimized when $a = \frac{\alpha + \beta}{2}$, that is, when a is halfway between either end of the interval.

3.3. Prolongation to obtain a consistent square polynomial system

3.3.1. Theoretical guarantee for consistency: explicit condition for the LPA model beyond full-rank Jacobian

We saw in Section 3.2.2 that the prolongation process can create inconsistent square polynomial systems. In this section, we demonstrate a technique of prolongation of a difference equation system to guarantee a solution. For a system Σ with a vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ of state variables and a vector $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell)$ of unknown scalar parameters, the matrix $S(\Sigma) = (s_{i,j})$ has entries defined as follows:

$$s_{i,j} := \begin{cases} \alpha_{i,j} & \text{if } \theta_j \text{ appears in } f_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us assume that $m < \ell$ and study the prolongation to obtain a square system of ℓ equations in ℓ unknowns. The number of prolongations needed to make the system square is $\ell - m$. Let us call $\sigma\Sigma$ the prolonged system.

Example 4. 1. $\ell = 2$

$$S(\Sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\sigma\Sigma = \{x, \sigma x\}$$

2. $\ell = 3$

$$S(\Sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} & \alpha_{1,3} \\ \alpha_{2,1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\sigma\Sigma = \{x_1, \sigma x_1, x_2\}$. Observe that $\sigma\Sigma = \{x_1, x_2, \sigma x_2\}$ would make the system inconsistent, if x_2 and σx_2 are two different univariate expressions.

3. $\ell = 4$

$$S(\Sigma) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} & \alpha_{1,3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_{2,3} & \alpha_{2,4} \end{pmatrix}$$

The number of prolongations needed is 2 that can be achieved as $\sigma\Sigma = \{x_1, \sigma x_1, \sigma^2 x_1, x_2\}$ or $\sigma\Sigma = \{x_1, \sigma x_1, x_2, \sigma x_2\}$. Observe that the choice left $\sigma\Sigma = \{x_1, x_2, \sigma x_2, \sigma^2 x_2\}$ is more likely to make the system inconsistent.

We will now demonstrate this with the LPA model. Given the new model B' output of Algorithm 2, where

$$\exp(-c_{EL}L_t - c_{EA}A_t) \quad \text{and} \quad \exp(-c_{PA}A_t)$$

have been approximated by the polynomials

$$\hat{T}_{L_t} := \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{1}{k!} (-(c_{EL}L_t + c_{EA}A_t) - \beta_t)^k \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{T}_{A_t} := \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{1}{k!} (-c_{PA}A_t - \gamma_t)^k \quad (8)$$

respectively, we study now how to prolong the equations in

$$B_0 := \begin{cases} F_{1,0} := -L_1 + b \cdot A_0 \cdot \hat{T}_{L_0}, \\ F_{2,0} := -P_1 + (1 - \mu_L) \cdot L_0, \\ F_{3,0} := -A_1 + P_0 \cdot \hat{T}_{A_0} + (1 - \mu_A) \cdot A_0, \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

to obtain a consistent square polynomial system. Recall that the elements of B_0 are polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[a, b, d, c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA}]$. For this, let us codify in a matrix $S(B_0)$ the indeterminates that appear in every equation.

$$\begin{array}{l} F_{1,0} \\ F_{2,0} \\ F_{3,0} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l} b \\ c_{EL} \\ c_{EA} \\ \mu_L \\ c_{PA} \\ \mu_A \end{array} \quad \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,1} & \alpha_{1,2} & \alpha_{1,3} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_{2,4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_{2,5} & \alpha_{2,6} \end{pmatrix}$$

Observe that B_0 is a system of 3 equations in 6 unknowns with the peculiarity that the sets of unknowns in each equation are disjoint. Recall the inconsistency that we arrived at the end of Section 3.2.2, if we included equation $F_{2,1}$ because it contradicted with $F_{2,0}$. So, we have to approach this differently. If we call σ the automorphism that takes x_n to x_{n+1} , the prolonged system

$$\sigma B_0 := \{F_{1,0}, F_{1,1} := \sigma F_{1,0}, F_{1,2} := \sigma^2 F_{1,0}, F_{2,0}, F_{3,0}, F_{3,1} := \sigma F_{3,0}\}$$

has now 6 equations in 6 unknowns. The elements of σB_0 are polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[b, \mu_L, \mu_A, c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA}]$ with the special property that a polynomial F in B_0 and its prolongation σF have the same support. We can guarantee in the first place that the system of equations

$$S_{LPA} = \{F_{1,0} = 0, F_{1,1} = 0, F_{1,2} = 0, F_{2,0} = 0, F_{3,0} = 0, F_{3,1} = 0\} \quad (10)$$

is consistent, which means that \mathcal{S}_{LPA} has a common solution in \mathbb{C}^6 . Complex solutions are not relevant to the LPA model, so the complex solution set has to be analyzed afterwards to filter appropriate real solutions.

Theorem 3.1. Given system B with nonzero initial conditions L_0, P_0, A_0 , then the system \mathcal{S}_{LPA} , provided by the prolonged set σB_0 , is a consistent system of equations if and only if the following conditions hold:

1. $F := A_0 F_{3,1} - A_1 F_{3,0}$ is a non constant polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[c_{PA}]$.
2. $G_1 := -L_1 Q_1 + L_2 Q_0$ and $G_2 := -L_1 Q_2 + L_3 Q_0$, with $Q_t := A_t \hat{T}_{L_t}$, are non-constant polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[c_{EL}, c_{EA}]$ defining curves with nonempty intersection.

Proof. Let N be the degree of the polynomial approximations obtained in Algorithm 2. Since the sets of unknowns in $F_{1,0}$, $F_{2,0}$ and $F_{3,0}$ are disjoint, the prolongation subsets of each one of them give three subsystems with disjoint sets of unknowns. Proving that each one is consistent independently implies that the system defined by σB_0 is consistent. More precisely:

1. $F_{2,0} = -P_1 + b \cdot L_0$, under the assumption $L_0 \neq 0$ then b is determined.
2. $F_{3,0}$ and $F_{3,1}$ are both polynomials with the same support

$$F_{3,t} = -A_{t+1} + A_t(1 - \mu_A) + \sum_{k=0}^N \frac{P_t}{k!} (-A_t c_{PA} - \gamma_t)^k, \quad t = 0, 1. \quad (11)$$

$F = A_0 F_{3,1} - A_1 F_{3,0}$ is a polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[c_{PA}]$. By the Weak Nullstellensatz, see [20], the system $\{F_{3,0} = 0, F_{3,1} = 0\}$ has a solution in \mathbb{C}^2 if and only if the ideal $I = (F_{3,0}, F_{3,1})$ generated by in $\mathbb{C}[\mu_A, c_{PA}]$ does not contain 1. If $F \in \mathbb{C}$ then $1 \in I$, otherwise observe that $\{F_{3,0}, F\}$ is a Gröbner basis of I w.r.t. the lexicographic monomial ordering with $\mu_A > c_{PA}$. Since 1 does not belong to the ideal generated by the leading terms $LT(F_{3,0}) = \mu_A$ and $LT(F) = c_{PA}^J$, with $0 \leq J \leq N$, we can guarantee that 1 does not belong to the ideal I .

3. $F_{1,0}$, $F_{1,1}$ and $F_{1,2}$ are also polynomials with the same support

$$F_{1,t} = -L_{t+1} + b \left(\sum_{k=0}^N \frac{A_t}{k!} (-L_t c_{EL} - A_t c_{EA} - \beta_t)^k \right) = -L_{t+1} + b Q_t, \quad t = 0, 1, 2.$$

Let us define

$$\begin{cases} G_1 := Q_1 F_{1,0} - Q_0 F_{1,1} = -L_1 Q_1 + L_2 Q_0, \\ G_2 := Q_2 F_{1,0} - Q_0 F_{1,2} = -L_1 Q_2 + L_3 Q_0. \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Since $G_1, G_2 \in \mathbb{C}[c_{EL}, c_{EA}]$, a common solution $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ of $G_1(c_{EL}, c_{EA}) = 0$ and $G_2(c_{EL}, c_{EA}) = 0$ is an intersection point of the curves they define, in other words the algebraic variety $V(G_1, G_2)$ is not empty.

If G_1 or G_2 belong to \mathbb{C} , or their resultant with respect to c_{EL} (or c_{EA}) belongs to \mathbb{C} , then 1 belongs to the ideal $J = (F_{1,0}, F_{1,1}, F_{1,2})$ of $\mathbb{C}[b, c_{EL}, c_{EA}]$. If $V(G_1, G_2) \subseteq V(Q_0)$ then Q_0 belongs to the ideal (G_1, G_2) of $\mathbb{C}[c_{EL}, c_{EA}]$, implying that $-L_1 = F_{1,0} - b Q_0 \in J$. Otherwise, if $V(G_1, G_2) \not\subseteq V(Q_0)$, then $V(F_{1,0}, G_1, G_2) = V(F_{1,0}, F_{1,1}, F_{1,2}) \neq \emptyset$. \square

Remark 3. Ultimately, the conditions stated in Theorem 3.1 are equivalent to demanding the Jacobian matrix of the resulting polynomial system is symbolically of full rank. However, in this specific case, we can exhibit more details and present equations $F(c_{PA}) = 0$ and $G_1(c_{EL}, c_{EA}) = 0$,

$G_2(c_{EL}, c_{EA}) = 0$ that would allow to compute complex solution sets for the parameters c_{PA} and the pairs (c_{EL}, c_{EA}) , respectively. The discussion on how to filter real solutions continues in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Square system method

```

1: Input:
    • Algebraic system of difference equations named  $\Sigma'$ 
    • Time measured data allowing prolongation of the system.
    • For  $\bar{\mu} = \mu_1, \dots, \mu_n$  the finite set of parameters, the data  $R_{\mu_i}$  of permissible intervals for each parameter value.

2: Output: Parameter values of  $\Sigma'$ .
3: procedure DETECT SOLVABILITY
4:   Define  $\Sigma_{prolong}$  as an indefinite time prolongation of  $\Sigma'$ .
5:   Redefine  $\Sigma' := []$ , an ‘empty system’ of no equations.
6:   Denote  $e_1, \dots$  the equations of  $\Sigma_{prolong}$ .
7:   Define  $J(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial e_i \\ \partial \mu_j \end{bmatrix}$  where  $e_i \in \Sigma', i = 1, \dots, r$ , or 0 if  $\Sigma'$  is empty.
8:    $i := 1$ 
9:   for  $rank(J(t)) := s < n$  i.e. is not of full rank, do
10:    procedure MOVE EQUATION
11:       $\Sigma' := \Sigma' \cup \{e_i\}$ 
12:       $\Sigma_{prolong} := \Sigma_{prolong} \setminus \{e_i\}$ 
13:      Compute  $rank(J(t))$  (note  $\Sigma'$  has updated)
14:      if  $rank(J(t)) < s + 1$  then  $\Sigma' := \Sigma' \setminus \{e_i\}$ 
15:      end if
16:       $i = i + 1$ 
17:      if  $rank(J(t)) < n$  then repeat procedure Move Equation.
18:      end if
19:    end procedure
20:  end for
21:  procedure BLACKBOX SOLVER AND FILTER Note Detect Solvability runs until  $J(t)$ 
    has full rank and outputs a polynomial system  $\Sigma'$  that has solutions. Run any
    algebraic solver.
22:  Filter solutions by intersecting solution set with  $R_{\mu_i}$ .
23:  end procedure
24: end procedure

```

Remark 4. The procedure ‘Move Equation’ extracts equations from the prolongation and adds them to Σ' , without replacement. It checks if this increases the rank of the Jacobian. If it does not, it deletes the equation from Σ' as well, removing it entirely from consideration. The process repeats until the Jacobian reaches full rank in the number of parameters n .

Remark 5. Our algorithm uses the full-rank Jacobian condition as a heuristic to detect solvability. It must be noted that full rank Jacobian is not a sufficient condition to have solutions in the

general setting. For instance the system $\{xy = 1, x = 0\}$ has no solutions but has full rank Jacobian. However, in Remark 3, we see that, for instance, for the LPA system, the corresponding polynomial system does have solutions if and only if the Jacobian of is of full rank. It would be interesting to expand classes of difference models for which such a criterion still holds, probably extending the proof of Theorem 3.1.

3.3.2. Continued example: getting consistency and filtering multiple solutions

We continue from our earlier example, Section 3.2.2. Removing the uninteresting first few equations, we have:

$$B' : \begin{cases} L_1 = 33 = 214b(0.18 + 0.04(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA}) \\ \quad + 0.02(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA} + 3.17)^2) \\ P_1 = 86 = 107(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_1 = 239 = 73(0.69 + 0.32(-214c_{PA}) \\ \quad + 0.16(-214c_{PA} + 1.13)^2) + 214 \cdot (1 - \mu_A) \\ L_2 = 67 = 240b(0.1 - 0.67c_{EL} - 4.89c_{EA} + 0.01(-33c_{EL} - 240c_{EA} + 3.89)^2) \\ P_2 = 27 = 33(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_2 = 267 = 55.29 - 5884.55c_{PA} + 12.26(-240c_{PA} + 1.25)^2 + 240(1 - \mu_A) \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

This forms 6 equations in 6 unknowns. Incidentally, it is immediately obvious that the 2nd and 5th equations force the system to be inconsistent. A system will rarely have such an obvious inconsistency however, and we demonstrate that the method of the Jacobian yields the same answer. By computing the Jacobian and converting it to Reduced Row-Echelon Form (RREF) we find:

$$J \stackrel{RREF}{=} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where the * are (non-equal) large, nonzero algebraic expressions in the parameters. As our interest is in the rank, we omit the expressions for readability. It is clear that the Jacobian has rank 5 and so an equation must be replaced. Note the Jacobian is written in an ordered basis of the parameters, specifically $\mu_L, b, \mu_A, c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA}$.

In practice, the choice of which equation to replace can be made by determining which row (equivalently, equation) is a linear combination of the others. This is a computationally ideal choice, although randomizing row replacement and checking solvability will also work. Here, before row reducing, one finds row 2 is 33/107 times row 5, so either may be deleted. We choose to delete the 5th equation. We will need to prolong the system using time-measured data. Suppose this is available (i.e., the scientist has continued the experiment) and is recorded in Table 4, with Algorithm 1 using Table 3.2.2 and $t = 1, 2$ data as in Section 3.2.2. Applying Algorithm 2 up to degree 2 as before yields the new equations:

$$\begin{cases} L_3 = 36 = 267b(0.13 - 1.85c_{EL} - 7.38c_{EA} + 0.014(-67c_{EL} - 267c_{EA} + 3.59)^2) \\ P_3 = 54 = 67(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_3 = 273 = 17.09 - 1998.17c_{PA} + 3.74(-267c_{PA} + 1.28)^2 + 267(1 - \mu_A) \end{cases}$$

t	L_t	P_t	A_t
3	36	54	273
t	R_{L_t}	-	R_{A_t}
3	$[-4.16, -3.02]$	-	$[-1.69, -0.87]$
	$\alpha = -3.59$	-	$\beta = -1.28$

Table 4: Prolongation data and results from Algorithm 1

Next, we decide which of these new equations to replace the former equation 5. In practice, we implement by selecting ‘down the line’ with the first available equation, checking, and proceeding until solutions are found. Of course, there are smarter options here, one notes for instance $21 = 26(1 - \mu_L)$ is a bad choice as this creates the same problem as the original; but in highly complicated systems we cannot expect such obviousness.

If we do replace the equation from P_2 with the computed L_3 , we turn to a solver to find:

$$B' : \begin{cases} L_1 = 33 = 214b(0.18 + 0.04(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA}) \\ \quad + 0.02(-107c_{EL} - 214c_{EA} + 3.17)^2) \\ P_1 = 85 = 107(1 - \mu_L) \\ A_1 = 239 = 73(0.69 + 0.32(-214c_{PA}) \\ \quad + 0.16(-214c_{PA} + 1.13)^2) + 214 \cdot (1 - \mu_A) \\ L_2 = 67 = 240b(0.1 - 0.67c_{EL} - 4.89c_{EA} + 0.01(-33c_{EL} - 240c_{EA} + 3.89)^2) \\ L_3 = 36 = 267b(0.13 - 1.85c_{EL} - 7.38c_{EA} + 0.01(-67c_{EL} - 267c_{EA} + 3.59)^2) \\ A_2 = 267 = 55.29 - 5884.55c_{PA} + 12.26(-240c_{PA} + 1.25)^2 + 240(1 - \mu_A) \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

Using MAPLE, we received the multiple solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_L = 0.196, b = 6.823, \mu_A = 0.002, c_{EL} = 0.014, c_{EA} = 0.011, c_{PA} = 0.005 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 0.048, \mu_A = 0.002, c_{EL} = -0.434, c_{EA} = 0.179, c_{PA} = 0.005 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 10.225 + 1.969i, \mu_A = 0.002, c_{EL} = 0.011 + 0.005i, c_{EA} = 0.014 + 0.0001i, c_{PA} = 0.005 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 10.225 - 1.969i, \mu_A = 0.002, c_{EL} = 0.011 - 0.005i, c_{EA} = 0.014 - 0.0001i, c_{PA} = 0.005 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 6.823, \mu_A = 0.047, c_{EL} = 0.014, c_{EA} = 0.011, c_{PA} = 0.007 \\ \mu_L = 0.197, b = 0.048, \mu_A = 0.047, c_{EL} = -0.434, c_{EA} = 0.179, c_{PA} = 0.007 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 10.225 + 1.969i, \mu_A = 0.047, c_{EL} = 0.011 + 0.005i, c_{EA} = 0.0136 + 0.0001i, c_{PA} = 0.007 \\ \mu_L = 0.196, b = 10.225 - 1.969i, \mu_A = 0.047, c_{EL} = 0.011 - 0.005i, c_{EA} = 0.0136 - 0.0001i, c_{PA} = 0.007 \end{aligned}$$

To discriminate which answer to use, we intersect with the acceptable intervals for the parameters c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA} given in Section 3.2.2. (Note then, as mentioned, complex and negative real solutions never matter). Here this returns the correct answer as the first provided solution. Hence our algorithm estimates:

$$\mu_L = 0.196, b = 6.823, \mu_A = 0.002, c_{EL} = 0.014, c_{EA} = 0.011, c_{PA} = 0.005.$$

This experiment was run as a simulation so we know the actual parameters were:

$$\mu_L = 0.206, b = 6.598, \mu_A = 0.007629, c_{EL} = 0.01209, c_{EA} = 0.01155, c_{PA} = 0.0047.$$

In Section 4 we run this experiment repeatedly to measure statistical data on Algorithm 3’s success. Full details are provided there, but to summarize, it works well.

4. Performance analysis

In this section, we demonstrate the quality of our method by applying it to the LPA model. The code is available at <https://github.com/jedforrest/larva-pupa-adult/>. The results of this experiment are in Tables 5 and 6.

4.1. Experiment setup

To test the algorithm, we begin by choosing explicit baseline values for each of the 6 parameters $\{b, c_{EL}, c_{EA}, c_{PA}, \mu_L, \mu_A\}$. For each run of the experiment, a set of ‘ground truth’ parameters $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ are randomly sampled around the baseline values. In particular, starting from the experimentally determined values given in [1] we generated small intervals I_1, \dots, I_6 centered around each of the values in [1], then uniformly sampled parameters from the intervals.² These sampled parameters are used to generate N sets of synthetic time measured data for the larva L_t , pupa P_t , and adult A_t populations over 3 prolongations. Synthetic data is generated using an exact exp function.

For a selected degree n , our systems of polynomials are generated with Taylor polynomial degree n according to the earlier defined Algorithm 2. These equations take the synthetic data and solve for the parameters using HomotopyContinuation.jl [21]. The prolongations for each variable are handled separately so that we have 3 sets of polynomials (one for each of L, P, A). If there are more equations than parameters to fit, a subset of equations is chosen equal to the number of parameters as in Algorithm 3.

The solver finds real solutions for all parameters. If the solver returns multiple real solutions, then they are filtered using the defined intervals I so that our solutions exist in the correct domain. If no real solution is found for a particular parameter within the interval, the algorithm returns 0 for that parameter (indicating an unsuccessful search).

We used the following experiment settings:

- Interval ranges: $I \in \{\pm 5\%, \pm 10\%, \pm 20\%, \pm 25\%, \pm 50\%\}$
- Taylor degrees: $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$
- Number of data sets generated: $N = 100$

In total there were $|I| \cdot |n| \cdot |N| = 5000$ simulations.

The mean and median of relative errors δ were calculated across all N simulated data sets, grouped by interval range I and Taylor degree n . The relative error for each parameter j is defined as

$$\delta_j = \left| \frac{x_j - \hat{x}_j}{\hat{x}_j} \right|$$

where x_j is the predicted parameter value for parameter j and \hat{x}_j is the actual (true) parameter value.


²Use of [1] is for scientific relevance to LPA, however this knowledge of existing estimates is not necessary when choosing a baseline.

4.2. Presentation of the performance

In Tables 5 and 6, each labelled column presents the error in scientific notation rounded to three significant digits. Adjacent to the right, the same values are given as a percentage rounded to the nearest decimal percent to emphasize the general success of the method.

Figures 4.2 pictorially summarize part of the data in Tables 5 and 6. These figures show the mean relative errors presented in a flipped logarithmic scale (taller columns represent better performance). Data is clustered by interval length marked on the columns as %, and each successive column (of the same label) represents an increase in the degree n of the applied Taylor polynomial, from $n = 1$ to 10.

This visually captures the general trend that increasing n increases accuracy, and that while wider intervals generally lower the accuracy, this can be combated by further increasing n . It is not computationally prohibitive to achieve accuracy within 5 decimal places in all parameters. Note that because of the simplicity of $P_{t+1} = (1 - \mu_L)L_t$ (a linear polynomial with no exp), the parameter μ_L is immediately recovered.



Figures 4.2 - Mean relative error clustered by parameter interval and increasing n . Errors are in reverse logarithmic scale, hence, **taller** columns represent **better** performance.

The algorithm is progressively better with increasing degree of Taylor polynomial n , so much so that in the worst scenarios investigated, $n \geq 4$ is sufficient to significantly minimize error. The

method generally gets worse with longer intervals but this is easily overcome by increasing the degree of the Taylor polynomial.

We conclude that the method of replacing exp in the LPA model with algebraic equations to estimate parameters is highly successful. We further suggest that this method will continue to be highly successful in replacing exp in more general difference equation settings.

n	Interval	Mean b		Med b		Mean c_{FA}		Med c_{FA}		Mean c_{FL}		Med c_{FL}	
1	$\pm 5\%$	7.16E-02	7.2%	1.51E-03	0.2%	7.15E-02	7.1%	1.39E-03	0.1%	7.11E-02	7.1%	9.71E-04	0.1%
2	$\pm 5\%$	9.16E-05	0.0%	4.59E-05	0.0%	8.26E-05	0.0%	4.75E-05	0.0%	5.83E-05	0.0%	2.93E-05	0.0%
3	$\pm 5\%$	3.67E-06	0.0%	1.36E-06	0.0%	3.10E-06	0.0%	1.17E-06	0.0%	1.87E-06	0.0%	5.79E-07	0.0%
4	$\pm 5\%$	1.19E-07	0.0%	2.31E-08	0.0%	1.00E-07	0.0%	2.09E-08	0.0%	5.16E-08	0.0%	9.96E-09	0.0%
5	$\pm 5\%$	3.38E-09	0.0%	3.76E-10	0.0%	2.86E-09	0.0%	3.31E-10	0.0%	1.23E-09	0.0%	1.30E-10	0.0%
6	$\pm 5\%$	8.62E-11	0.0%	5.56E-12	0.0%	7.33E-11	0.0%	4.36E-12	0.0%	2.64E-11	0.0%	1.71E-12	0.0%
7	$\pm 5\%$	2.48E-12	0.0%	8.59E-13	0.0%	2.13E-12	0.0%	7.74E-13	0.0%	9.55E-13	0.0%	4.96E-13	0.0%
8	$\pm 5\%$	8.66E-13	0.0%	7.33E-13	0.0%	7.55E-13	0.0%	6.57E-13	0.0%	4.07E-13	0.0%	4.04E-13	0.0%
9	$\pm 5\%$	9.32E-13	0.0%	7.75E-13	0.0%	7.87E-13	0.0%	6.35E-13	0.0%	1.06E-13	0.0%	1.07E-13	0.0%
10	$\pm 5\%$	1.18E-12	0.0%	1.03E-12	0.0%	1.00E-12	0.0%	8.61E-13	0.0%	3.16E-13	0.0%	3.16E-13	0.0%
1	$\pm 10\%$	1.06E-01	10.6%	6.35E-03	0.6%	1.06E-01	10.6%	5.70E-03	0.6%	1.04E-01	10.4%	4.23E-03	0.4%
2	$\pm 10\%$	5.08E-02	5.1%	4.95E-04	0.0%	5.07E-02	5.1%	4.55E-04	0.0%	5.05E-02	5.0%	2.84E-04	0.0%
3	$\pm 10\%$	8.09E-05	0.0%	2.53E-05	0.0%	6.67E-05	0.0%	2.46E-05	0.0%	3.97E-05	0.0%	7.69E-06	0.0%
4	$\pm 10\%$	5.84E-06	0.0%	1.15E-06	0.0%	4.77E-06	0.0%	1.04E-06	0.0%	2.42E-06	0.0%	2.75E-07	0.0%
5	$\pm 10\%$	3.63E-07	0.0%	4.14E-08	0.0%	2.95E-07	0.0%	3.50E-08	0.0%	1.26E-07	0.0%	7.63E-09	0.0%
6	$\pm 10\%$	2.01E-08	0.0%	1.16E-09	0.0%	1.63E-08	0.0%	1.10E-09	0.0%	5.88E-09	0.0%	1.93E-10	0.0%
7	$\pm 10\%$	1.00E-09	0.0%	3.20E-11	0.0%	8.13E-10	0.0%	3.07E-11	0.0%	2.47E-10	0.0%	4.96E-12	0.0%
8	$\pm 10\%$	4.62E-11	0.0%	1.66E-12	0.0%	3.73E-11	0.0%	1.40E-12	0.0%	9.75E-12	0.0%	4.76E-13	0.0%
9	$\pm 10\%$	2.67E-12	0.0%	1.00E-12	0.0%	2.18E-12	0.0%	8.30E-13	0.0%	3.72E-13	0.0%	1.13E-13	0.0%
10	$\pm 10\%$	1.58E-12	0.0%	1.09E-12	0.0%	1.35E-12	0.0%	9.27E-13	0.0%	3.24E-13	0.0%	3.22E-13	0.0%
1	$\pm 20\%$	2.67E-01	26.7%	2.60E-02	2.6%	2.66E-01	26.6%	2.28E-02	2.3%	2.61E-01	26.1%	1.75E-02	1.7%
2	$\pm 20\%$	2.35E-01	23.5%	5.48E-03	0.5%	2.34E-01	23.4%	4.88E-03	0.5%	2.32E-01	23.2%	2.47E-03	0.2%
3	$\pm 20\%$	3.14E-02	3.1%	4.30E-04	0.0%	3.12E-02	3.1%	3.68E-04	0.0%	3.06E-02	3.1%	1.20E-04	0.0%
4	$\pm 20\%$	2.42E-04	0.0%	3.90E-05	0.0%	1.99E-04	0.0%	3.18E-05	0.0%	7.49E-05	0.0%	7.86E-06	0.0%
5	$\pm 20\%$	2.83E-05	0.0%	3.06E-06	0.0%	2.32E-05	0.0%	2.85E-06	0.0%	7.70E-06	0.0%	4.75E-07	0.0%
6	$\pm 20\%$	3.06E-06	0.0%	2.43E-07	0.0%	2.49E-06	0.0%	2.20E-07	0.0%	7.31E-07	0.0%	2.34E-08	0.0%
7	$\pm 20\%$	2.95E-07	0.0%	1.31E-08	0.0%	2.38E-07	0.0%	1.23E-08	0.0%	6.23E-08	0.0%	1.02E-09	0.0%
8	$\pm 20\%$	2.58E-08	0.0%	6.75E-10	0.0%	2.07E-08	0.0%	5.45E-10	0.0%	4.85E-09	0.0%	4.89E-11	0.0%
9	$\pm 20\%$	2.07E-09	0.0%	2.72E-11	0.0%	1.65E-09	0.0%	2.20E-11	0.0%	3.48E-10	0.0%	1.70E-12	0.0%
10	$\pm 20\%$	1.54E-10	0.0%	3.00E-12	0.0%	1.22E-10	0.0%	2.50E-12	0.0%	2.31E-11	0.0%	3.96E-13	0.0%
1	$\pm 25\%$	3.39E-01	33.9%	3.99E-02	4.0%	3.37E-01	33.7%	3.71E-02	3.7%	3.34E-01	33.4%	3.11E-02	3.1%
2	$\pm 25\%$	2.35E-01	23.5%	6.20E-03	0.6%	2.35E-01	23.5%	5.84E-03	0.6%	2.34E-01	23.4%	4.09E-03	0.4%
3	$\pm 25\%$	1.25E-02	1.2%	6.99E-04	0.1%	1.21E-02	1.2%	6.28E-04	0.1%	1.13E-02	1.1%	2.69E-04	0.0%
4	$\pm 25\%$	2.05E-02	2.0%	6.54E-05	0.0%	2.04E-02	2.0%	6.64E-05	0.0%	2.02E-02	2.0%	2.06E-05	0.0%
5	$\pm 25\%$	6.99E-05	0.0%	4.89E-06	0.0%	5.75E-05	0.0%	5.50E-06	0.0%	2.86E-05	0.0%	1.24E-06	0.0%
6	$\pm 25\%$	9.00E-06	0.0%	4.32E-07	0.0%	7.56E-06	0.0%	3.94E-07	0.0%	3.39E-06	0.0%	6.42E-08	0.0%
7	$\pm 25\%$	1.05E-06	0.0%	2.46E-08	0.0%	9.14E-07	0.0%	2.23E-08	0.0%	3.60E-07	0.0%	2.89E-09	0.0%
8	$\pm 25\%$	1.15E-07	0.0%	1.21E-09	0.0%	1.02E-07	0.0%	1.12E-09	0.0%	3.49E-08	0.0%	1.52E-10	0.0%
9	$\pm 25\%$	1.15E-08	0.0%	5.32E-11	0.0%	1.05E-08	0.0%	5.05E-11	0.0%	3.12E-09	0.0%	8.26E-12	0.0%
10	$\pm 25\%$	1.08E-09	0.0%	6.76E-12	0.0%	1.01E-09	0.0%	6.07E-12	0.0%	2.57E-10	0.0%	4.96E-13	0.0%
1	$\pm 50\%$	3.51E-01	35.1%	1.13E-01	11.3%	3.42E-01	34.2%	1.07E-01	10.7%	3.41E-01	34.1%	1.04E-01	10.4%
2	$\pm 50\%$	5.27E-01	52.7%	8.21E-01	82.1%	5.23E-01	52.3%	7.08E-01	70.8%	5.31E-01	53.1%	7.84E-01	78.4%
3	$\pm 50\%$	7.28E-02	7.3%	9.29E-03	0.9%	6.68E-02	6.7%	8.41E-03	0.8%	6.58E-02	6.6%	5.36E-03	0.5%
4	$\pm 50\%$	2.06E-01	20.6%	1.71E-03	0.2%	2.05E-01	20.5%	1.83E-03	0.2%	2.05E-01	20.5%	1.12E-03	0.1%
5	$\pm 50\%$	4.50E-03	0.5%	2.88E-04	0.0%	3.44E-03	0.3%	3.14E-04	0.0%	2.48E-03	0.2%	1.20E-04	0.0%
6	$\pm 50\%$	3.14E-02	3.1%	3.83E-05	0.0%	3.10E-02	3.1%	4.28E-05	0.0%	3.06E-02	3.1%	1.43E-05	0.0%
7	$\pm 50\%$	3.53E-04	0.0%	5.81E-06	0.0%	2.67E-04	0.0%	4.52E-06	0.0%	1.60E-04	0.0%	1.50E-06	0.0%
8	$\pm 50\%$	7.69E-05	0.0%	6.41E-07	0.0%	5.89E-05	0.0%	5.14E-07	0.0%	3.11E-05	0.0%	1.40E-07	0.0%
9	$\pm 50\%$	1.41E-05	0.0%	6.35E-08	0.0%	1.12E-05	0.0%	5.41E-08	0.0%	5.24E-06	0.0%	1.28E-08	0.0%
10	$\pm 50\%$	2.43E-06	0.0%	5.63E-09	0.0%	2.00E-06	0.0%	4.58E-09	0.0%	8.16E-07	0.0%	1.04E-09	0.0%

Table 5: Numerical results. The first column n is the degree of the Taylor polynomial calculated. In column 2, $\pm x\%$ relatively scales fixed parameter values to create intervals where test parameters are randomly selected, e.g. $\pm 5\% \equiv [0.95x \quad 1.05x]$. The remaining columns are the raw and percentage values of relative error between the actual parameters and those found by the algorithm. Note that since the algorithm sometimes returns 0 (no solution found), the relative error appears as ‘100%’.

4.3. Choice of polynomial system solver

In our implementation, we chose HomotopyContinuation.jl [21]. Other solvers, for instance, msolve [22], can be used as well. We chose the former because it performed faster, which is preferable when performing a large volume of experiments.

n	Interval	Mean μ_I		Med μ_I		Mean c_{PA}		Med c_{PA}		Mean μ_A		Med μ_A	
1	$\pm 5\%$	5.23E-16	0.0%	5.27E-16	0.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%
2	$\pm 5\%$	5.26E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%
3	$\pm 5\%$	5.27E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	7.23E-02	7.2%	2.47E-03	0.2%	7.49E-02	7.5%	5.46E-03	0.5%
4	$\pm 5\%$	5.26E-16	0.0%	5.27E-16	0.0%	1.02E-02	1.0%	2.41E-04	0.0%	1.14E-02	1.1%	1.38E-03	0.1%
5	$\pm 5\%$	5.27E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	1.64E-05	0.0%	1.61E-05	0.0%	3.77E-05	0.0%	3.76E-05	0.0%
6	$\pm 5\%$	5.24E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	1.18E-06	0.0%	1.14E-06	0.0%	6.78E-06	0.0%	6.76E-06	0.0%
7	$\pm 5\%$	5.25E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	5.98E-08	0.0%	5.75E-08	0.0%	1.45E-07	0.0%	1.40E-07	0.0%
8	$\pm 5\%$	5.27E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	3.36E-09	0.0%	3.20E-09	0.0%	1.94E-08	0.0%	1.93E-08	0.0%
9	$\pm 5\%$	5.26E-16	0.0%	5.24E-16	0.0%	1.37E-10	0.0%	1.29E-10	0.0%	3.48E-10	0.0%	3.20E-10	0.0%
10	$\pm 5\%$	5.29E-16	0.0%	5.27E-16	0.0%	6.32E-12	0.0%	5.89E-12	0.0%	3.63E-11	0.0%	3.59E-11	0.0%
1	$\pm 10\%$	4.68E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	9.92E-01	99.2%	1.00E+00	100.0%	9.91E-01	99.1%	1.00E+00	100.0%
2	$\pm 10\%$	4.69E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	6.59E-01	65.9%	1.00E+00	100.0%	7.00E-01	70.0%	1.00E+00	100.0%
3	$\pm 10\%$	4.69E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	6.24E-02	6.2%	2.54E-03	0.3%	6.50E-02	6.5%	5.56E-03	0.6%
4	$\pm 10\%$	4.67E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	1.03E-02	1.0%	2.48E-04	0.0%	1.14E-02	1.1%	1.42E-03	0.1%
5	$\pm 10\%$	4.69E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	1.78E-05	0.0%	1.67E-05	0.0%	4.49E-05	0.0%	3.90E-05	0.0%
6	$\pm 10\%$	4.67E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	1.30E-06	0.0%	1.19E-06	0.0%	7.23E-06	0.0%	7.09E-06	0.0%
7	$\pm 10\%$	4.69E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	6.83E-08	0.0%	6.05E-08	0.0%	2.01E-07	0.0%	1.67E-07	0.0%
8	$\pm 10\%$	4.67E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	3.92E-09	0.0%	3.37E-09	0.0%	2.15E-08	0.0%	2.06E-08	0.0%
9	$\pm 10\%$	4.67E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	1.67E-10	0.0%	1.37E-10	0.0%	5.51E-10	0.0%	4.74E-10	0.0%
10	$\pm 10\%$	4.69E-16	0.0%	4.08E-16	0.0%	7.87E-12	0.0%	6.29E-12	0.0%	4.26E-11	0.0%	3.98E-11	0.0%
1	$\pm 20\%$	4.94E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	8.52E-01	85.2%	1.00E+00	100.0%	8.38E-01	83.8%	1.00E+00	100.0%
2	$\pm 20\%$	4.94E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	3.09E-01	30.9%	3.21E-02	3.2%	3.95E-01	39.5%	1.64E-01	16.4%
3	$\pm 20\%$	4.94E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	4.28E-02	4.3%	2.77E-03	0.3%	4.72E-02	4.7%	6.17E-03	0.6%
4	$\pm 20\%$	4.96E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	3.01E-04	0.0%	2.45E-04	0.0%	1.61E-03	0.2%	1.50E-03	0.1%
5	$\pm 20\%$	4.96E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	2.23E-05	0.0%	1.65E-05	0.0%	7.81E-05	0.0%	5.75E-05	0.0%
6	$\pm 20\%$	4.97E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	1.73E-06	0.0%	1.17E-06	0.0%	9.08E-06	0.0%	8.04E-06	0.0%
7	$\pm 20\%$	4.96E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	1.00E-07	0.0%	5.95E-08	0.0%	3.98E-07	0.0%	2.84E-07	0.0%
8	$\pm 20\%$	4.96E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	6.15E-09	0.0%	3.30E-09	0.0%	3.11E-08	0.0%	2.59E-08	0.0%
9	$\pm 20\%$	4.94E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	2.97E-10	0.0%	1.34E-10	0.0%	1.24E-09	0.0%	8.58E-10	0.0%
10	$\pm 20\%$	4.96E-16	0.0%	4.81E-16	0.0%	1.50E-11	0.0%	6.09E-12	0.0%	7.21E-11	0.0%	5.49E-11	0.0%
1	$\pm 25\%$	5.10E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	7.64E-01	76.4%	1.00E+00	100.0%	7.47E-01	74.7%	1.00E+00	100.0%
2	$\pm 25\%$	5.12E-16	0.0%	4.71E-16	0.0%	4.08E-01	40.8%	4.33E-02	4.3%	4.81E-01	48.1%	1.76E-01	17.6%
3	$\pm 25\%$	5.11E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	4.33E-02	4.3%	2.71E-03	0.3%	4.80E-02	4.8%	7.64E-03	0.8%
4	$\pm 25\%$	5.14E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	1.04E-02	1.0%	2.58E-04	0.0%	1.17E-02	1.2%	1.55E-03	0.2%
5	$\pm 25\%$	5.14E-16	0.0%	4.71E-16	0.0%	2.85E-05	0.0%	1.76E-05	0.0%	9.17E-05	0.0%	7.35E-05	0.0%
6	$\pm 25\%$	5.14E-16	0.0%	4.71E-16	0.0%	2.27E-06	0.0%	1.26E-06	0.0%	1.00E-05	0.0%	8.94E-06	0.0%
7	$\pm 25\%$	5.12E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	1.41E-07	0.0%	6.49E-08	0.0%	4.93E-07	0.0%	3.92E-07	0.0%
8	$\pm 25\%$	5.11E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	8.87E-09	0.0%	3.61E-09	0.0%	3.67E-08	0.0%	3.09E-08	0.0%
9	$\pm 25\%$	5.10E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	4.62E-10	0.0%	1.50E-10	0.0%	1.63E-09	0.0%	1.22E-09	0.0%
10	$\pm 25\%$	5.08E-16	0.0%	4.62E-16	0.0%	2.38E-11	0.0%	6.80E-12	0.0%	9.20E-11	0.0%	6.92E-11	0.0%
1	$\pm 50\%$	5.99E-16	0.0%	5.68E-16	0.0%	6.54E-01	65.4%	1.00E+00	100.0%	7.28E-01	72.8%	1.00E+00	100.0%
2	$\pm 50\%$	5.96E-16	0.0%	5.62E-16	0.0%	3.18E-01	31.8%	5.59E-02	5.6%	4.30E-01	43.0%	2.28E-01	22.8%
3	$\pm 50\%$	5.96E-16	0.0%	5.62E-16	0.0%	2.57E-02	2.6%	2.36E-03	0.2%	3.96E-02	4.0%	1.91E-02	1.9%
4	$\pm 50\%$	5.96E-16	0.0%	5.62E-16	0.0%	7.65E-04	0.1%	2.00E-04	0.0%	3.08E-03	0.3%	2.70E-03	0.3%
5	$\pm 50\%$	6.02E-16	0.0%	5.68E-16	0.0%	8.00E-05	0.0%	1.30E-05	0.0%	2.84E-04	0.0%	2.31E-04	0.0%
6	$\pm 50\%$	5.99E-16	0.0%	5.68E-16	0.0%	7.69E-06	0.0%	9.11E-07	0.0%	2.76E-05	0.0%	2.10E-05	0.0%
7	$\pm 50\%$	6.00E-16	0.0%	5.63E-16	0.0%	6.42E-07	0.0%	6.99E-08	0.0%	2.10E-06	0.0%	1.38E-06	0.0%
8	$\pm 50\%$	5.99E-16	0.0%	5.63E-16	0.0%	4.92E-08	0.0%	4.39E-09	0.0%	1.55E-07	0.0%	9.08E-08	0.0%
9	$\pm 50\%$	6.02E-16	0.0%	5.68E-16	0.0%	1.00E-02	1.0%	2.32E-10	0.0%	1.00E-02	1.0%	4.85E-09	0.0%
10	$\pm 50\%$	5.98E-16	0.0%	5.62E-16	0.0%	1.00E-02	1.0%	1.06E-11	0.0%	1.00E-02	1.0%	2.55E-10	0.0%

Table 6: Numerical results. The first column n is the degree of the Taylor polynomial calculated. In column 2, $\pm x\%$ relatively scales fixed parameter values to create intervals where test parameters are randomly selected, e.g. $\pm 5\% \equiv [0.95x \quad 1.05x]$. The remaining columns are the raw and percentage values of relative error between the actual parameters and those found by the algorithm. Note that since the algorithm sometimes returns 0 (no solution found), the relative error appears as ‘100%’.

4.4. Computing time efficiency

We did not explicitly include computation time as an experimental measure. However, all of these experiments combined (5000 in total) took approximately 45 minutes of sequential computing time, approximately 0.5 seconds per experiment. So, for systems of the size of the LPA model, computing time does not seem to be a limiting factor. It would be interesting to study in the future the scalability of the presented approach as the number of state variables increases.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by: the NSF grants CCF-2212460, DMS-1760448, and DMS-1853650; CUNY grant PSC-CUNY #66551-00 54; the Melbourne Research Scholarship, and; grant PID2021-124473NB-I00 from the Spanish MICINN. We are grateful to the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences for the computing resources.

References

- [1] R. Costantino, R. Desharnais, J. Cushing, B. Dennis, [Chaotic dynamics in an insect population](#), *Science* 275 (5298) (1997) 389–391.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.275.5298.389>
- [2] N. Meshkat, C. E.-z. Kuo, J. DiStefano, III, [On finding and using identifiable parameter combinations in nonlinear dynamic systems biology models and COMBOS: A novel web implementation](#), *PLOS ONE* 9 (2014) 1–14.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110261>
- [3] C. Lyzell, T. Glad, M. Enqvist, L. Ljung, [Difference algebra and system identification](#), *Automatica* 47 (9) (2011) 1896 – 1904.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2011.06.013>
- [4] P. S. Kim, P. P. Lee, [Modeling protective anti-tumor immunity via preventative cancer vaccines using a hybrid agent-based and delay differential equation approach](#), *PLoS Computational Biology* 8 (10) (2012) e1002742.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002742>
- [5] N. G. Marculis, R. Lui, [Modelling the biological invasion of *Carcinus maenas* \(the European green crab\)](#), *Journal of Biological Dynamics* 10 (1) (2016) 140–163.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513758.2015.1115563>
- [6] M. Adimy, A. Chekroun, T.-M. Touaoula, [Age-structured and delay differential-difference model of hematopoietic stem cell dynamics](#), *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems-Series B* 20 (9) (2015) 27.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2015.20.2765>
- [7] M. Oremland, R. Laubenbacher, [Optimal harvesting for a predator-prey agent-based model using difference equations](#), *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 77 (3) (2015) 434–459.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11538-014-0060-6>
- [8] R. F. Costantino, R. A. Desharnais, J. M. Cushing, B. Dennis, S. M. Henson, A. A. King, [Nonlinear stochastic population dynamics: the flour beetle *tribolium* as an effective tool of discovery](#), *Advances in Ecological Research* 37 (2005) 101–141.
URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2504\(04\)37004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2504(04)37004-2)
- [9] E. Medeiros, I. Caldas, M. Baptista, [Parameter uncertainties on the predictability of periodicity and chaos](#) (2014).
URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6902>
- [10] S. Robertson, [Modeling populations of flour beetles](#), *Statistics Case Studies* (2009) 121.
- [11] E. Benincà, B. Ballantine, S. P. Ellner, J. Huisman, [Species fluctuations sustained by a cyclic succession at the edge of chaos](#), *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (20) (2015) 6389–6394.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1421968112>
- [12] F. Brauer, C. Castillo-Chavez, C. Castillo-Chavez, [Mathematical models in population biology and epidemiology](#), Vol. 40 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*, Springer, 2012.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-3516-1>
- [13] L. L. Sullivan, B. Li, T. E. Miller, M. G. Neubert, A. K. Shaw, [Density dependence in demography and dispersal generates fluctuating invasion speeds](#), *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114 (19) (2017) 5053–5058.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618744114>
- [14] Y. Kuang, J. Cushing, [Global stability in a nonlinear difference-delay equation model of flour beetle population growth](#), *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* 2 (1) (1996) 31–37.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10236199608808040>
- [15] J. M. Cushing, S. Leverage, N. Chitnis, S. M. Henson, [Some discrete competition models and the competitive exclusion principle](#), *Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* 10 (13-15) (2004) 1139–1151.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10236190410001652739>
- [16] J. M. Cushing, [Cycle chains and the LPA model](#), *The Journal of Difference Equations and Applications* 9 (7) (2003) 655–670.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1023619021000042216>
- [17] S. N. Elaydi, R. J. Sacker, [Population models with Allee effect: a new model](#), *Journal of Biological Dynamics* 4 (4) (2010) 397–408.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513750903377434>
- [18] J. M. Cushing, R. F. Costantino, B. Dennis, R. Desharnais, S. M. Henson, *Chaos in ecology: experimental nonlinear dynamics*, Vol. 1, Elsevier, 2002.
- [19] S. L. Robertson, J. Cushing, [Spatial segregation in stage-structured populations with an application to *Tribolium*](#), *Journal of Biological Dynamics* 5 (5) (2011) 398–409.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513758.2010.503283>
- [20] D. Cox, J. Little, D. O’Shea, [Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms](#), 4th Edition, Springer, 2015.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16721-3>

- [21] P. Breiding, S. Timme, HomotopyContinuation.jl: A Package for Homotopy Continuation in Julia, in: International Congress on Mathematical Software, Springer, 2018, pp. 458–465.
- [22] J. Berthomieu, C. Eder, M. Safey El Din, [msolve: A Library for Solving Polynomial Systems](#), in: ISSAC'21: Proceedings of the 2021 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, 2021, pp. 51–58.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3452143.3465545>