

Analysis of a class of Kolmogorov systems

G. Moza, C. Lazureanu*, F. Munteanu, C. Sterbeti, A. Florea†

Abstract

A two-dimensional Kolmogorov system with two parameters and having a degenerate condition is studied in this work. We obtain local analytical properties of the system when the parameters vary in a sufficiently small neighborhood of the origin. The behavior of the system is described by bifurcation diagrams. Applications of Kolmogorov systems can be found particularly in modeling population dynamics in biology and ecology.

1 Introduction

In [16] we have studied a class of two-dimensional Kolmogorov systems [9] of the form

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\xi_1}{dt} &= \xi_1 (\mu_1 - \theta(\mu) \xi_1 + \gamma(\mu) \xi_2 - M(\mu) \xi_1 \xi_2 + N(\mu) \xi_1^2) \\ \frac{d\xi_2}{dt} &= \xi_2 (\mu_2 - \delta(\mu) \xi_1 + \xi_2 + S(\mu) \xi_1^2 + P(\mu) \xi_2^2) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

in a non-degenerate context given by $\theta(0) \delta(0) \neq 0$ and $\gamma(0) < 0$. The coefficients $\theta(\mu)$, $\gamma(\mu)$, $\delta(\mu)$, $M(\mu)$, $N(\mu)$, $S(\mu)$ and $P(\mu)$, are smooth functions of class C^k , $k \geq 1$, and the parameter $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is chosen such that $|\mu| = \sqrt{\mu_1^2 + \mu_2^2}$ is sufficiently small, $0 \leq |\mu| \ll 1$; for brevity we denote $(0, 0)$ by 0.

We are concerned in this work with local properties of the system (1) in a degenerate framework given by

$$\theta(0) \delta(0) = 0 \text{ and } \gamma(0) < 0. \quad (2)$$

This new condition changes significantly the behavior of the system. Since many applications of Kolmogorov systems use positive variables [1], [7], [10], the phase space of (1) which we consider in this work is the first quadrant $\xi_1 \geq 0$ and $\xi_2 \geq 0$. Thus, the equilibrium points will be studied only when their coordinates are positive or zero. A similar study can be performed for the other quadrants.

Applications of Kolmogorov systems can be found mainly in biology [1], [2], [15] and ecology [8], [12], [18], modeling population dynamics. A particular class of Kolmogorov systems is the class of Lotka–Volterra systems [3], [4], [6], [11], [14], [17], which are widely used for modeling the behavior of interacting biological different species of predator-prey type. For example, an autonomous Lotka–Volterra type competitive system for N –species to control the gut microbiota by antibiotics has been presented recently in [5]. Many environmental, engineering, economics and mechanical models can be reduced to some kind of Kolmogorov systems [19].

*Department of Mathematics, Politehnica University of Timisoara, Romania; gheorghe.tigan@upt.ro

†Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Craiova, Romania

2 Analysis of the system when $\theta(0) = 0$ and $\delta(0) \neq 0$

Assume $\theta(0) = 0$, $\delta(0) \neq 0$ and $N(0) \neq 0$, where $\gamma(0) < 0$. Then $\theta(\mu) = \frac{\partial\theta(0)}{\partial\mu_1}\mu_1 + \frac{\partial\theta(0)}{\partial\mu_2}\mu_2 + O(|\mu|^2)$ and assume $\frac{\partial\theta(0)}{\partial\mu_2} \stackrel{\text{not}}{=} \theta_2 \neq 0$. Throughout this work,

$$O(|\mu|^k) = \sum_{i+j \geq k} c_{ij} \mu_1^i \mu_2^j$$

denotes a Taylor series starting with terms of order at least $k \geq 1$.

Remark 2.1. To save symbols, we denote further by $\gamma(0) = \gamma$, $\delta(0) = \delta$, $N(0) = N$, $M(0) = M$, $P(0) = P$ and $S(0) = S$.

Different to the case $\theta(0)\delta(0) \neq 0$, now it may exist two equilibrium points $E_{11}(\xi_{11}(\mu), 0)$ and $E_{12}(\xi_{12}(\mu), 0)$ lying on the ξ_1 -axis, where

$$\xi_{11}(\mu) = \frac{1}{2N(\mu)} \left(\theta(\mu) + \sqrt{\Delta(\mu)} \right) \text{ and } \xi_{12}(\mu) = \frac{1}{2N(\mu)} \left(\theta(\mu) - \sqrt{\Delta(\mu)} \right), \quad (3)$$

provided that $\Delta(\mu) = \theta^2(\mu) - 4N(\mu)\mu_1 \geq 0$. In its lowest terms, we can write

$$\Delta(\mu) = \theta_2^2 \mu_2^2 (1 + O(\mu_2)) - 4N\mu_1 (1 + O(|\mu|)). \quad (4)$$

Since $N = N(0) \neq 0$, the bifurcation curve $\Delta(\mu) = 0$ exists and is unique in the parametric plane $\mu_1 O \mu_2$ for all μ with $0 \leq |\mu| \ll 1$. This result is obtained from the Implicit Function Theorem (IFT) since $\Delta(0, 0) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial\Delta}{\partial\mu_1}(0, 0) = -4N \neq 0$. Moreover, it follows from (4) and IFT that the curve $\Delta(\mu) = 0$ has the expression $4N\mu_1 = \theta_2^2 \mu_2^2 (1 + O(\mu_2))$ for all $|\mu|$ sufficiently small.

Denoting by Δ the bifurcation curve $\Delta(\mu) = 0$, it follows that Δ in its lowest terms becomes

$$\Delta = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid -4N\mu_1 + \theta_2^2 \mu_2^2 = 0\}. \quad (5)$$

Remark 2.2. For the description of qualitative properties of solutions of the system (1), $\Delta(\mu)$ from (4) can be approximated by $\Delta = -4N\mu_1 + \theta_2^2 \mu_2^2$, respectively, $\xi_{11}(\mu)$ and $\xi_{12}(\mu)$ by

$$\xi_{11} = \frac{1}{2N} \left(\theta_2 \mu_2 + \sqrt{\Delta} \right) \text{ and } \xi_{12} = \frac{1}{2N} \left(\theta_2 \mu_2 - \sqrt{\Delta} \right). \quad (6)$$

Denote further by $\Delta_+ = \Delta \cap \{\mu_2 > 0\}$ and $\Delta_- = \Delta \cap \{\mu_2 < 0\}$ the two branches of the curve Δ lying in the upper, respectively, lower half-plane.

The two equilibria $E_{11}(\xi_{11}, 0)$ and $E_{12}(\xi_{12}, 0)$ exist whenever $\Delta \geq 0$. However, since the phase space for our system (1) is only the first quadrant, the points E_{11} and E_{12} present interest and will be studied only when $\xi_{11} \geq 0$ and $\xi_{12} \geq 0$.

Definition 2.3. We say an equilibrium point $E(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ is proper if $\xi_1 \geq 0$ and $\xi_2 \geq 0$, respectively, virtual if $\Delta \geq 0$ but $\xi_1 < 0$ or $\xi_2 < 0$.

The first result is related to the type of bifurcation by which E_{11} and E_{12} come into existence or vanish.

Proposition 2.4. If $\theta_2 \delta \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $2N - \delta\theta_2 \neq 0$, then Δ_+ and Δ_- are saddle-node bifurcation curves.

Proof. Consider first the branch Δ_+ . Write the system (1) in the form $\frac{d\xi}{dt} = f(\xi, \mu)$, with $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$, $f = (f_1, f_2)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$. The proof will follow from Sotomayor's theorem, as it is described in [13]. It is clear that $f(\xi_0, \mu_0) = (0, 0)$, where $\xi_0 = (\xi_{11}, 0)$ and $\mu_0 = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \Delta_+$. Assume that $\mu_2 > 0$ is fixed while μ_1 varies, thus, μ_1 is considered the bifurcation parameter.

The Jacobian matrices $A = Df(\xi_0, \mu_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{\gamma\theta_2}{2N}\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)) \\ 0 & \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{2N}\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)) \end{pmatrix}$ and A^T have both an eigenvalue $\lambda = 0$, with the corresponding eigenvectors v for A and w for A^T , where $v = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $w = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\delta\theta_2 - 2N}{\gamma\theta_2}(1 + O(\mu_2)) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$. Denote by $f_{\mu_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \mu_1} \\ \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial \mu_1} \end{pmatrix}$ and $D^2f(\xi, \mu)(v, v) = \begin{pmatrix} d^2f_1(\xi, \mu)(v, v) \\ d^2f_2(\xi, \mu)(v, v) \end{pmatrix}$, where $d^2f_{1,2}(\xi, \mu)(v, v)$ are the differentials of second order of the functions $f_{1,2}$. Then

$$w^T f_{\mu_1}(\xi_0, \mu_0) = -\mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{2N\gamma} (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0$$

and

$$w^T [D^2f(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v, v)] = -\mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{\gamma} (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0,$$

which confirm the proof; if $w = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$ then $w^T = (a \ b)$ denotes the transpose vector of w . For Δ_- the proof is similar. ■

Remark 2.5. *The first notable differences with the non-degenerate case [16] is the existence of two different equilibria E_{11} and E_{12} lying on the same ξ_1 -axis, and the existence of the saddle-node bifurcation curves Δ_+ and Δ_- . In the non-degenerate framework, a single equilibrium E_1 exists on the ξ_1 -axis and no saddle-node bifurcation curves.*

Remark 2.6. *$O(0, 0)$ and $E_2(0, -\mu_2 + O(\mu_2^2))$ are also equilibrium points of the system (1). Their eigenvalues are μ_1 and μ_2 for O , respectively, $\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2$ and $-\mu_2$ for $E_2(0, -\mu_2)$.*

The system (1) has one more equilibrium point $E_3(\xi_1, \xi_2)$, where

$$\xi_1 = -\frac{1}{\gamma\delta}\mu_1(1 + O(|\mu|)) + \frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2(1 + O(|\mu|)) \text{ and } \xi_2 = -\frac{1}{\gamma}\mu_1(1 + O(|\mu|)) + \sigma_1\mu_2^2(1 + O(|\mu|)),$$

with $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma\delta^2}(\delta\theta_2 - N)$. In its lowest terms, E_3 reads

$$E_3 \left(-\frac{1}{\gamma\delta}(\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2), -\frac{1}{\gamma}(\mu_1 - \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2) \right).$$

The existence and uniqueness of E_3 for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small is ensured by the Implicit Function Theorem applied to the system

$$\mu_1 - \theta(\mu)\xi_1 + \gamma(\mu)\xi_2 - M(\mu)\xi_1\xi_2 + N(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0 \text{ and } \mu_2 - \delta(\mu)\xi_1 + \xi_2 + S(\mu)\xi_1^2 + P(\mu)\xi_2^2 = 0. \quad (7)$$

The bifurcation curves of E_3 for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small are

$$T_2 = \left\{ (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma}\mu_1 + O(\mu_1^2), \mu_1 > 0 \right\} \quad (8)$$

and

$$T_3 = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_1 = \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2 + O(\mu_2^3), \delta\mu_2 > 0\}. \quad (9)$$

On T_2 , E_3 coincides to $E_2(0, -\mu_2)$ which must have $\mu_2 < 0$, while on T_3 to E_{11} or E_{12} . We call E_3 *trivial* in these cases, otherwise nontrivial. For $|\mu|$ sufficiently small, E_3 is nontrivial in the region

$$R = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid (\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2)\delta > 0, \mu_1 - \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2 > 0\}. \quad (10)$$

The characteristic polynomial at $E_3(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ is $P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - 2p\lambda + L$, where

$$p = \frac{1}{2}(\xi_2 - \theta(\mu)\xi_1 + 2N(\mu)\xi_1^2 - M(\mu)\xi_1\xi_2 + 2P(\mu)\xi_2^2) \quad (11)$$

and

$$L = \xi_1\xi_2(\gamma(\mu)\delta(\mu) - \theta(\mu) + O(|\xi|)). \quad (12)$$

For obtaining (11) and (12) we used (7). The next result describes the behavior of E_3 .

Theorem 2.7. *Assume $\theta_2\delta \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in R$. If $\delta > 0$, then E_3 is a saddle. If $\delta < 0$ and $\sigma_1 \neq 0$, then*

a) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, then $p > 0$ and E_3 is a repeller;*

b) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, then E_3 is an attractor (node or focus) if $p < 0$ and a repeller if $p > 0$. A Hopf bifurcation occurs at E_3 along the curve $p = 0$.*

Proof. Denoting by $\lambda_{1,2} = p \pm \sqrt{q}$ the eigenvalues of E_3 , (12) yields

$$\lambda_1\lambda_2 = \xi_1\xi_2(\gamma\delta + O(|\mu|)) < 0 \quad (13)$$

if $\delta > 0$, thus, E_3 is a saddle; $\xi_{1,2} > 0$ on R and $\gamma < 0$.

Assume $\delta < 0$. This yields $\lambda_1\lambda_2 > 0$ by (12). Then, p in its lowest terms become

$$p = -\frac{1}{2\gamma}\mu_1 + k_3\mu_2^2$$

where $k_3 = -\frac{1}{2\gamma\delta^2}(N - \delta\theta_2 - \gamma(2N - \delta\theta_2))$.

1) Assume further $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma\delta^2}(\delta\theta_2 - N) < 0$, which yields $N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$ and $T_3 \subset \{\mu_1 > 0, \mu_2 < 0\}$. R is included in the fourth quadrant $\{\mu_1 > 0, \mu_2 < 0\}$ from $\mu_1 > \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2 > 0$ and $\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2 < 0$. Then $p = 0$ occurs along the curve

$$H = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_1 = 2\gamma k_3\mu_2^2 + O(\mu_2^3), \mu_2 < 0\}. \quad (14)$$

a) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$ then $\gamma\sigma_1 > 2\gamma k_3$ and $N > \delta\theta_2 - N > 0$; $\gamma\sigma_1 - 2\gamma k_3 = -\gamma\frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{\delta^2}$. In this case, $p > 0$ whenever E_3 exists, which yields that E_3 is a repeller.

b) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$ then $\gamma\sigma_1 < 2\gamma k_3$ and $H \subset R$. Then, $p < 0$ on the left of H and E_3 is an attractor, respectively, $p > 0$ on the right of H when E_3 is a repeller.

The eigenvalues of E_3 on H are of the form $\pm i\omega_0$ where $\omega_0 = \sqrt{L|_H} = \frac{\mu_2}{\delta}\sqrt{-\gamma\mu_2(2N - \delta\theta_2)} > 0$. Since $\frac{\partial p}{\partial \mu_1}|_H = -\frac{1}{2\gamma} \neq 0$, a Hopf bifurcation occurs on H . It is nondegenerate if the first Lyapunov coefficient $l_1(0) \neq 0$, otherwise, it is degenerate.

2) Assume $\sigma_1 > 0$, which yields $N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$ and $T_3 \subset \{\mu_1 < 0, \mu_2 < 0\}$; $\delta < 0$. In addition, $R \subset \{\mu_2 < 0\}$.

a) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$ which yields $\gamma\sigma_1 - 2\gamma k_3 = -\gamma \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{\delta^2} > 0$, we get $H \not\subset R$; $k_3 > 0$. It follows that $p > 0$ whenever E_3 exists, that is, E_3 is a repeller.

b) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$ then $\gamma\sigma_1 < 2\gamma k_3$, which yields $H \subset R$; in this case $N < \delta\theta_2 - N < 0$. Similar to 1b), $p < 0$ on the left of H and E_3 is an attractor, respectively, $p > 0$ on the right of H when E_3 is a repeller, either for $k_3 > 0$ or $k_3 < 0$. The eigenvalues of E_3 on H are of the form $\pm i\omega_0$, thus, a Hopf bifurcation occurs on H . ■

Corollary 2.8. *Assume $\theta_2\delta \neq 0$, $N > 0$ and $\delta < 0$. If $\sigma_1 < 0$ then $\theta_2 < 0$. If $\sigma_1 > 0$ then $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$ and E_3 is a repeller.*

Proposition 2.9. *Assume $\theta_2\delta \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_3$. Then, in their lowest terms,*

a) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, E_3 coincides to $E_{11}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$. Moreover, $E_{12}(-\mu_2 \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N\delta}, 0)$ is a saddle if $\mu_2 N > 0$, respectively, an attractor if $\mu_2 N < 0$, whenever E_{12} exists.*

b) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, E_3 coincides to $E_{12}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}} < 0$. In addition, $E_{11}(-\mu_2 \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N\delta}, 0)$ is a saddle if $\mu_2 N > 0$, respectively, a repeller if $\mu_2 N < 0$, whenever E_{11} exists.*

Proof. Having the equilibrium point $E_3(\xi_1, \xi_2)$, T_3 is defined by $\xi_2 = 0$. Other equilibria satisfying $\xi_2 = 0$ are given by $\mu_1 - \theta(\mu)\xi_1 + N(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0$, thus, they are E_{11} or E_{12} .

The eigenvalues of an equilibrium point $(\xi_1, 0)$ are $3N(\mu)\xi_1^2 - 2\theta(\mu)\xi_1 + \mu_1$ and $S(\mu)\xi_1^2 - \delta(\mu)\xi_1 + \mu_2$. Thus, in their lowest terms, the eigenvalues of $E_{11}(\xi_{11}, 0)$ are

$$\lambda_1^{E_{11}} = \xi_{11}\sqrt{\Delta} > 0 \text{ and } \lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \frac{1}{N}(N\mu_2 - S\mu_1 - N\delta\xi_{11} + S\theta_2\mu_2\xi_{11}), \quad (15)$$

while of $E_{12}(\xi_{12}, 0)$ they read

$$\lambda_1^{E_{12}} = -\xi_{12}\sqrt{\Delta} < 0 \text{ and } \lambda_2^{E_{12}} = \frac{1}{N}(N\mu_2 - S\mu_1 - N\delta\xi_{12} + S\theta_2\mu_2\xi_{12}). \quad (16)$$

Let $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_3$, that is, $\mu_1 = \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2$ and $\delta\mu_2 > 0$, which yield $\Delta = \mu_2^2 \frac{(2N - \delta\theta_2)^2}{\delta^2}$.

a) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, then $E_{11}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, $E_{12}(-\mu_2 \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N\delta}, 0)$ and $E_3(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, thus, $E_{11} = E_3$. Notice that $E_3 \neq E_{12}$, otherwise, $2N - \delta\theta_2 = 0$. Therefore, $\lambda_1^{E_3}\lambda_2^{E_3} = \lambda_1^{E_{11}}\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ by (12) since $\xi_2 = 0$ on T_3 , where $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} = \xi_{11}\sqrt{\Delta} \neq 0$, which yield $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$, provided that E_{11} is well-defined, that is, $\xi_{11} > 0$.

Moreover, $\lambda_1^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} = -\xi_{12}\sqrt{\Delta} < 0$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} (1 + O(\mu_2)) > 0$ if $\mu_2 N > 0$, thus, E_{12} is a saddle, respectively, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} < 0$ if $\mu_2 N < 0$, thus, E_{12} is an attractor, whenever $\xi_{12} > 0$.

b) If $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, then $E_{11}(-\mu_2 \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N\delta}, 0)$, $E_{12}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$ and $E_3(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, thus, $E_3 = E_{12}$, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ by (12) and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}} < 0$. In addition, $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} (1 + O(\mu_2))$, whenever $\xi_{11} > 0$, thus, E_{11} is a saddle if $\mu_2 N > 0$, respectively, a repeller if $\mu_2 N < 0$. ■

In the next theorem we characterize the bifurcation curve T_3 . Different to the bifurcation curve Δ , crossing T_3 in a non-degenerate manner imposes a new condition, namely $\delta_1 \neq 0$.

Theorem 2.10. *Assume $\theta_2\delta\delta_1 \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $2N - \delta\theta_2 \neq 0$, where $\delta_1 = \frac{\partial\delta}{\partial\mu_1}(0)$. Then T_3 is a transcritical bifurcation curve.*

Proof. Assume $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$. By Proposition 2.9, E_3 coincides to $E_{11}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$ and have the eigenvalues $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$.

Let μ_1 be the bifurcation parameter while $\mu_2 \neq 0$ is assumed fixed. For $\mu_2\delta > 0$, denote by $\xi_0 = (\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$ and $\mu_0 = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_3$. Assume $\delta > 0$. The proof for $\delta < 0$ is analogous.

Use further similar notations as in Proposition 2.4. Then $f(\xi_0, \mu_0) = (0, 0)$, respectively, $A = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\delta^2}\mu_2^2(2N - \delta\theta_2) & \frac{\gamma}{\delta}\mu_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where $v_1 = \frac{\gamma\delta}{\mu_2(\delta\theta_2 - 2N)}$. In finding A , we imposed the conditions corresponding to E_{11} , that is, $\xi_2 = 0$, and to E_3 , which read $\mu_1 - \theta(\mu)\xi_1 + N(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0$ and $\mu_2 - \delta(\mu)\xi_1 + S(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0$; A and v_1 are written in their lowest terms. Notice that v_1 is well-defined and $v_1 \neq 0$ because $(2N - \delta\theta_2)\mu_2 \neq 0$ and $0 < \mu_2 \ll 1$.

Denote by

$$C_1 = w^T f_{\mu_1}(\xi_0, \mu_0), \quad C_2 = w^T [Df_{\mu_1}(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v)] \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 = w^T [D^2 f(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v, v)], \quad (17)$$

where $Df_{\mu_1}(\xi_0, \mu_0)$ is the Jacobian matrix in variables ξ_1 and ξ_2 of $f_{\mu_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \mu_1} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial \mu_1} \end{pmatrix}^T$ calculated at (ξ_0, μ_0) .

In order to determine f_{μ_1} from the system (1), we need to write

$$\delta(\mu) = \delta(0) + \delta_1\mu_1(1 + O(\mu_1)) + \delta_2\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)),$$

and similarly the other parameter-functions $\theta(\mu)$, $\gamma(\mu)$, $M(\mu)$ and so on; $\delta_1 = \frac{\partial\delta}{\partial\mu_1}(0)$ and $\delta_2 = \frac{\partial\delta}{\partial\mu_2}(0)$. However, only $\delta(\mu)$ will be needed in this case.

Then, f_{μ_1} in its lowest terms in μ_1 and μ_2 has the form

$$f_{\mu_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1(1 - \theta_1\xi_1 + \gamma_1\xi_2 - M_1\xi_1\xi_2 + N_1\xi_1^2) \\ \xi_2(-\delta_1\xi_1 + S_1\xi_1^2 + P_1\xi_2^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

where $\theta_1 = \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\mu_1}(0)$, $\gamma_1 = \frac{\partial\gamma}{\partial\mu_1}(0)$, $M_1 = \frac{\partial M}{\partial\mu_1}(0)$ and so on. By (17), these lead to

$$C_1 = 0, \quad C_2 = -\frac{\delta_1}{\delta}\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad C_3 = \frac{2\gamma\delta^2}{(2N - \delta\theta_2)\mu_2}(1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0,$$

because $0 < \mu_2 \ll 1$ and $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$. The proof is similar for $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$. Thus, a non-degenerate transcritical bifurcation occurs on T_3 . ■

Denote by

$$X_+ = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 > 0, \mu_2 = 0\}, \quad X_- = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 < 0, \mu_2 = 0\},$$

respectively,

$$Y_+ = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_2 > 0, \mu_1 = 0\}, \quad Y_- = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_2 < 0, \mu_1 = 0\},$$

the semi-major and semi-minor axes of coordinates. The next result describes the bifurcations which occur on the remaining curves. Different to T_3 , they do not need the constraint $\delta_1 \neq 0$.

Theorem 2.11. *Assume $\theta_2\delta \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $2N - \delta\theta_2 \neq 0$. Then T_2 , Y_+ , Y_- , X_+ and X_- are transcritical bifurcation curves.*

Proof. When $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_2$, $E_2(0, -\mu_2 + O(\mu_2^2))$ coincides to E_3 , thus, $\xi_0 = (0, -\mu_2 + O(\mu_2^2))$ and $\mu_0 = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_2$ with $\mu_2 \neq 0$. We find $v = (\frac{1}{\delta}(1 + O(\mu_2)) \quad 1)^T$ and $w = (1 \quad 0)^T$. Using μ_1 as the bifurcation parameter, (18) and (17) yield

$$C_1 = 0, C_2 = \frac{1}{\delta} (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0 \text{ and } C_3 = \frac{2\gamma}{\delta} (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0,$$

thus, the bifurcation on T_2 is transcritical.

Let $(0, \mu_2) \in Y_+ \cup Y_-$. Then O coincides to E_{12} if $\theta_2\mu_2 > 0$, respectively, E_{11} if $\theta_2\mu_2 < 0$. Also, $\xi_0 = (0, 0)$, $\mu_0 = (0, \mu_2)$ with $\mu_2 \neq 0$, and $v = w = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$; the bifurcation parameter is μ_1 . These yield $C_1 = 0$, $C_2 = 1$ and $C_3 = -2\theta_2\mu_2 \neq 0$.

Let $(\mu_1, 0) \in X_+ \cup X_-$ and consider μ_2 as the bifurcation parameter. Then O coincides to E_2 and $\xi_0 = (0, 0)$, $\mu_0 = (\mu_1, 0)$ with $\mu_1 \neq 0$, and $v = w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^T$. These lead to $w^T f_{\mu_2}(\xi_0, \mu_0) = 0$, $w^T [Df_{\mu_2}(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v)] = 1$ and $w^T [D^2f(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v, v)] = 2$. ■

The next result is important because it states that the signs of the eigenvalues of E_{11} and E_{12} depend on the conditions of existence of E_3 .

Proposition 2.12. *Assume $\theta_2\delta \neq 0$, $N \neq 0$ and $\delta\mu_2 > 0$. If $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, the curve $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ is unique and coincides to T_3 for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small. Similarly, if $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ coincides to T_3 .*

Proof. By (15) - (16) we have

$$\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \lambda_2^{E_{12}} = \frac{\delta^2}{N} [\mu_1 (1 + O(|\mu|)) - \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2 (1 + O(|\mu|))], \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma\delta^2} (\delta\theta_2 - N)$. From the Implicit Function Theorem applied to the right-hand side term of (19), there exists a unique curve T'_3 such that $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T'_3 , for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small and $\delta\mu_2 > 0$, given by

$$T'_3 = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_1 = \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2 + k_1\mu_2^3 + O(\mu_2^4), \delta\mu_2 > 0\}, \quad (20)$$

where $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ or $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T'_3 . But $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} \Big|_{T'_3} = \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} \mu_2 (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0$ for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small, thus, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \Big|_{T'_3} = 0$. On the other hand, from Proposition 2.9 we know also $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \Big|_{T_3} = 0$. But T'_3 is unique from the Implicit Function Theorem, thus $T_3 = T'_3$ for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small. ■

Assume further $N > 0$ and $\theta_1 = \frac{\partial\theta}{\partial\mu_1}(0) \neq 0$. The case $N < 0$ can be treated similarly. Define the following regions

$$R_{00} = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \Delta < 0\} \cup \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \Delta > 0, \mu_1 > 0, \theta_2\mu_2 < 0\},$$

$$R_{10} = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 < 0\} \text{ and } R_{20} = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \Delta > 0, \mu_1 > 0, \theta_2\mu_2 > 0\}. \quad (21)$$

Since $\xi_{11}\xi_{12} = \mu_1/N$, it follows that on R_{10} a single proper equilibrium exists, E_{11} , while E_{12} is virtual. On R_{20} , both equilibria E_{11} and E_{12} exist. Indeed, in their lowest terms, we have

$$\xi_{11} + \xi_{12} = \frac{1}{N}\theta(\mu) = \frac{1}{N}(\theta_1\mu_1 + \theta_2\mu_2).$$

If $\theta_1 > 0$, it is clear that $\xi_{11} > 0$ and $\xi_{12} > 0$ on R_{20} . Assume $\theta_1 < 0$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in R_{20}$. Then $\mu_1\theta_1 > \frac{\theta_2^2}{4N}\mu_2^2\theta_1$ from $\Delta > 0$, which leads to $\theta_1\mu_1 + \theta_2\mu_2 > \theta_2\mu_2(1 + \frac{\theta_2\theta_1}{4N}\mu_2) > 0$ for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small. Thus, $\xi_{11} > 0$ and $\xi_{12} > 0$ on R_{20} .

One can show similarly that on R_{00} , E_{11} and E_{12} do not exist because either ξ_{11} and ξ_{12} are not real numbers ($\Delta < 0$) or $\xi_{11} < 0$ and $\xi_{12} < 0$ (E_{11} and E_{12} are virtual points) because $\theta_1\mu_1 + \theta_2\mu_2 < \theta_2\mu_2(1 + \frac{\theta_2\theta_1}{4N}\mu_2) < 0$.

Whenever $\sigma_1 < 0$, denote by $R_{20}^- = R_{20} \cap \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 < \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2\}$ and $R_{20}^+ = R_{20} \cap \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mid \mu_1 > \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2\}$, the regions from R_{20} to the left, respectively, the right of T_3 . Notice that

$$R_{20} = R_{20}^- \cup T_3 \cup R_{20}^+.$$

Theorem 2.13. *Assume $N > 0$ and $\sigma_1 < 0$. If $\delta > 0$, then*

- a) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, then E_{11} is a saddle on $R_{10} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{20}^-$ and a repeller on R_{20}^+ , while E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20} ;*
- b) *if $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, then E_{11} is a saddle on $R_{10} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{20}$, while E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20}^- and an attractor on R_{20}^+ .*

Proof. With the help of (19), we are able to determine the dynamics of E_{11} and E_{12} when $|\mu|$ is sufficiently small.

From $N > 0$, $\sigma_1 < 0$ and $\delta > 0$ we get $N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, $\theta_2 > 0$ and $\frac{\theta_2^2}{4N} - \gamma\sigma_1 = \frac{(2N - \delta\theta_2)^2}{4N\delta^2} > 0$; assume $2N - \delta\theta_2 \neq 0$. R_{20} and Δ_+ lie on $\{\mu_1 > 0, \mu_2 > 0\}$.

We describe in the following the behavior of the points E_{11} and E_{12} . When (μ_1, μ_2) crosses Δ_+ , the points E_{11} and E_{12} are born in the region $\Delta > 0$ through a saddle-node bifurcation on the curve Δ_+ .

On Δ_+ , there is a single equilibrium of the form $(\xi_1, 0)$, namely $E_{11}(\frac{\theta_2}{2N}\mu_2, 0)$ which has the eigenvalues 0 and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{2N} (1 + O(\mu_2))$; E_{11} coincides to E_{12} on Δ_+ while $E_3(\frac{\mu_2}{\delta}, -\mu_2^2 \frac{(2N - \delta\theta_2)^2}{4\gamma\delta^2 N})$ may exist as a different point.

As soon as the point (μ_1, μ_2) leaves the curve Δ_+ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in R_{20}$, E_{11} and E_{12} exist as two different points. In order to study the behavior of E_{11} and E_{12} when $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in R_{20}$, we will use (19). $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T_3 yields $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ or $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T_3 ; they cannot be at the same time 0 on T_3 because $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} - \lambda_2^{E_{12}} = -\frac{1}{N}(N\delta - S\theta_2\mu_2)(\xi_{11} - \xi_{12}) \neq 0$ if $\Delta > 0$ and $|\mu|$ sufficiently small.

a) Assume $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_3$, i.e. $\mu_1 = \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2$ and $\delta\mu_2 > 0$. Then $\xi_{12} = -\mu_2 \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N\delta} > 0$ and

$$\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} (1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0 \quad (22)$$

on T_3 ; $\mu_2 > 0$ on T_3 since $\delta\mu_2 > 0$ by (9). Therefore, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ on T_3 and, thus, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ changes its sign when (μ_1, μ_2) crosses T_3 , while $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} \neq 0$ on T_3 and, thus, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}$ keeps constant sign on $\mu_2 > 0$ sufficiently small, namely $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ by (22).

By (19), $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on the right of T_3 , i.e. on R_{20}^+ . Thus, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ on R_{20}^+ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} < 0$ on the left of T_3 , i.e. on R_{20}^- . Using $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}} < 0$ whenever E_{11} and E_{12} exist, it follows that E_{11} is a repeller on R_{20}^+ and a saddle on R_{20}^- , while E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20} .

On T_3 , $E_{11}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$ having the eigenvalues $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}|_{T_3} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{11}}|_{T_3} > 0$, coincides to E_3 . E_{12} is a saddle on T_3 , because $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} (1 + O(\mu_2)) > 0$ for $\mu_2 > 0$ sufficiently small and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} < 0$.

On Y_+ , $E_{11}(\frac{\theta_2}{N}\mu_2, 0)$ continues to survive as a saddle point while E_{12} collides to O ; $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \frac{N-\delta\theta_2}{N}\mu_2(1+O(\mu_2)) < 0$ on Y_+ . On Y_- , E_{11} collides to O and vanishes on $\mu_1 > 0$ and $\mu_2 > 0$.

On $\mu_1 < 0$, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ keeps constant (negative) sign, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} < 0$, because $T_3 \not\subseteq \{\mu_1 < 0\}$. This is in agreement with

$$\lambda_2^{E_{11}}(\mu_1, 0) = \frac{\sqrt{-N\mu_1}}{N} \left(\frac{S}{N} \sqrt{-N\mu_1} - \delta \right) < 0 \quad (23)$$

for $\mu_1 < 0$ sufficiently small; $\delta > 0$ and $\xi_{11}(\mu_1, 0) = \frac{1}{2N} \sqrt{-4N\mu_1} > 0$ on $\mu_1 < 0$. It implies that E_{11} survives in R_{10} as a saddle point while E_{12} vanishes in R_{10} .

On Δ_+ , the eigenvalues of the coinciding points $E_{11}(\frac{\theta_2}{2N}\mu_2, 0)$ and E_{12} are in this case 0 and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N-\delta\theta_2}{2N} (1+O(\mu_2)) > 0$.

b) Assume $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$. Then $\xi_{11} = -\mu_2 \frac{N-\delta\theta_2}{N\delta} > 0$ and

$$\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N} (1 + O(\mu_2)) < 0 \quad (24)$$

on T_3 . Therefore, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T_3 and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}$ changes its sign when (μ_1, μ_2) crosses T_3 , while $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ keeps constant (negative) sign on $R_{10} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{20}$. Thus, E_{11} is a saddle on $R_{10} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{20}$, including on $T_3 \subset R_{20}$.

From $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20}^+ , we have $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} < 0$ on R_{20}^+ and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20}^- . Therefore, E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20}^+ and a saddle on R_{20}^- because $\lambda_1^{E_{12}} < 0$. On $Y_+ \cup Y_-$ the results are similar to a).

On T_3 , E_3 coincides to $E_{12}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$, which has $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} = 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}}|_{T_3} < 0$. On Δ_+ , the eigenvalues of E_{11} are 0 and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N-\delta\theta_2}{2N} (1+O(\mu_2)) < 0$. ■

Theorem 2.14. Assume $N > 0$ and $\sigma_1 < 0$. If $\delta < 0$, then

a) if $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, E_{11} is a repeller on $R_{10} \cup Y_- \cup R_{20}^-$ and a saddle on R_{20}^+ , while E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20} .

b) if $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, E_{11} is a repeller on $R_{10} \cup Y_- \cup R_{20}$, while E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20}^- and a saddle on R_{20}^+ .

Proof. The hypothesis leads to $N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, $\theta_2 < 0$ and $\frac{\theta_2^2}{4N} > \gamma\sigma_1$, where $2N - \delta\theta_2 \neq 0$. Different to the first case, now T_3 and R_{20} lie in the fourth quadrant, $\{\mu_1 > 0, \mu_2 < 0\}$, and the used branch of Δ is Δ_- .

a) Let $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$. Then $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} \neq 0$ on T_3 by (22) and, thus, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ on T_3 by (19). Therefore, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} < 0$ on R_{20} while $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ changes its sign when crossing T_3 . More exactly, from $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20}^+ by (19), we have $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} < 0$ on R_{20}^+ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ on R_{20}^- . Thus, E_{11} is a repeller on R_{20}^- and a saddle on R_{20}^+ , respectively, E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20} .

On Y_+ , E_{11} collides to O while E_{12} exists only virtually because $\xi_{12} < 0$. However, as soon as $\mu_1 < 0$, E_{11} bifurcates from O .

On R_{10} , E_{11} is a repeller; $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ on R_{10} follows from (23) and $T_3 \not\subseteq \{\mu_1 < 0\}$.

On Y_- , $E_{11}(\frac{\theta_2}{N}\mu_2, 0)$ remains a repeller since $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} = \xi_{11}\sqrt{\Delta} > 0$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \frac{N-\delta\theta_2}{N}\mu_2(1+O(\mu_2)) > 0$, while E_{12} collides to O .

On Δ_- , the eigenvalues of the coinciding points E_{11} and E_{12} are 0 and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N-\delta\theta_2}{2N} (1+O(\mu_2)) < 0$.

b) Let $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$. Then $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \neq 0$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T_3 by (24). From $\xi_{11} = -\mu_2 \frac{N-\delta\theta_2}{N\delta} > 0$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N-\delta\theta_2}{N} (1+O(\mu_2)) > 0$ on T_3 , it follows that $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ whenever E_{11} exists. Thus, E_{11} is a repeller on $R_{10} \cup Y_- \cup R_{20}$. On Y_+ , E_{11} collides to O .




Figure 1: Bifurcation diagrams corresponding to $N > 0, \sigma_1 < 0$ and (G1) $\delta > 0, 2N - \delta\theta_1 > 0$, (G2) $\delta > 0, 2N - \delta\theta_1 < 0$, (G3) $\delta < 0, 2N - \delta\theta_1 > 0$, (G4) $\delta < 0, 2N - \delta\theta_1 < 0, 2\gamma k_3 < \frac{\theta_1^2}{4N}$, and (G5) $\delta < 0, 2N - \delta\theta_1 < 0, 2\gamma k_3 > \frac{\theta_1^2}{4N}$, respectively, (G6) corresponding to $N > 0, \sigma_1 > 0, \delta > 0$ and $\theta_1 > 0$.

Further, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} \lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20}^+ yields $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20}^+ and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} < 0$ on R_{20}^- . Thus, E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20}^+ and an attractor on R_{20}^- .

On Δ_- , the eigenvalue $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ becomes positive, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = \mu_2 \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{2N} (1 + O(\mu_2)) > 0$, while the other remains 0. ■

Remark 2.15. When $N > 0, \sigma_1 < 0, \delta < 0$ and $2N - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, the curve H can lie on the both sides of the curve Δ_- . More exactly, H lies on the left of Δ_- if $2N - 4N\gamma - \delta\theta_2 < 0$, respectively, the right of Δ_- if $2N - 4N\gamma - \delta\theta_2 > 0$, because $2\gamma k_3 - \frac{\theta_2^2}{4N} = \frac{\delta\theta_2 - 2N}{4N\delta^2} (2N - 4N\gamma - \delta\theta_2)$, Fig. 1.

Theorem 2.16. Assume $N > 0$ and $\sigma_1 > 0$. Consider the sets

$$R_{10}^+ = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_1 > \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2, \mu_1 N < 0, \delta\mu_2 > 0\} \text{ and } R_{10}^- = R_{10} \setminus (R_{10}^+ \cup T_3).$$

1) Let $\delta > 0$. If $\theta_2 > 0$, then E_{11} is a repeller on $R_{20} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{10}^+$, a saddle on R_{10}^- , and unstable on T_3 , while E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20} . If $\theta_2 < 0$, then E_{11} is a saddle on $R_{20} \cup Y_- \cup R_{10}^-$, a repeller on R_{10}^+ , and unstable on T_3 , while E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20} .




Figure 2: Bifurcation diagrams corresponding to $N > 0, \sigma_1 > 0$ and (G7) $\delta > 0, \theta_1 < 0$, (G8) $\delta < 0, \theta_1 > 0$, and (G9) $\delta < 0, \theta_1 < 0$.

2) Let $\delta < 0$. If $\theta_2 > 0$, then E_{11} is a repeller on $R_{20} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{10}^-$, a saddle on R_{10}^+ , and unstable on T_3 , while E_{12} is a saddle on R_{20} . If $\theta_2 < 0$, then E_{11} is a saddle on $R_{20} \cup Y_- \cup R_{10}^+$, a repeller on R_{10}^- , and unstable on T_3 , while E_{12} is an attractor on R_{20} .

Proof. By hypothesis we have $N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$. Using the notations from Proposition 2.9, we evaluate $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}$ on T_3 . Notice that E_3 coincides to $E_{11}(\frac{1}{\delta}\mu_2, 0)$ on T_3 , because $2N - \delta\theta_2 > 0$. Furthermore, if $\theta_2\mu_2 > 0$, we have $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}(0, \mu_2) = \frac{N - \delta\theta_2}{N}\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0$.

First, if $\delta\mu_2 > 0$, then $\lambda_2^{E_{12}}\Big|_{T_3} = \frac{2N - \delta\theta_2}{N}\mu_2(1 + O(\mu_2)) \neq 0$. Taking into account that $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}\lambda_2^{E_{12}} = 0$ on T_3 , i.e. $\mu_1 = \gamma\sigma_1\mu_2^2$, we deduce $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ on T_3 .

1) Let $\delta > 0$ and $\theta_2 > 0$. If $\mu_2 > 0$, then $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}(0, \mu_2) > 0$. Because $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} = 0$ only on T_3 , using the above results we obtain that $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ on $R_{20} \cup Y_+ \cup R_{10}^+$ and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} < 0$ on R_{10}^- , from $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}(\mu_1, 0) < 0$ by (23).

Moreover, $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20} because $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}\lambda_2^{E_{12}} > 0$ on R_{20} . On the other hand, we know from Proposition 2.9 that $\lambda_1^{E_{11}} > 0$ and $\lambda_1^{E_{12}} < 0$. Therefore, the first conclusion follows.

Now, let $\theta_2 < 0$. Therefore, on R_{20} (21), $\mu_2 < 0$. Hence $\lambda_2^{E_{11}}(0, \mu_2) < 0$. As above, $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} < 0$ on $R_{20} \cup Y_- \cup R_{10}^-$, and $\lambda_2^{E_{11}} > 0$ on R_{10}^+ , and also $\lambda_2^{E_{12}} < 0$ on R_{20} . Consequently, the second conclusion of assertion 1) is proved.

2) The second part of the theorem follows similarly. ■

Remark 2.17. In Fig. 5 we exemplify the behavior of the system (1) when (μ_1, μ_2) crosses T_2 , corresponding to the conditions of G1. Notice that, the phase portraits from quadrant I ($\xi_1 \geq 0, \xi_2 \geq 0$) when $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_2$ and (μ_1, μ_2) lies in the region "1", i.e. in the region where E_3 is virtual, coincide. This occurs because T_2 is a transcritical bifurcation curve and the phase portraits are restricted to quadrant I. Similar scenarios take place when (μ_1, μ_2) crosses the other transcritical bifurcation curves, $X_+ \cup X_-$, T_3 and $Y_+ \cup Y_-$, Figs. 6-8. Restricted to quadrant I, the phase portraits on the bifurcation curves coincide to the phase portraits corresponding to the regions where one of the colliding points became virtual after collision.

The bifurcation diagrams corresponding to the cases $\sigma_1 < 0$ and $\sigma_1 > 0$ are depicted in Figure 1 and Figure 2 respectively.




Figure 3: The phase portraits corresponding to the diagrams G1-G9




Figure 4: The phase portraits for $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \Delta$




Figure 5: The phase portraits on the left and right of T_2 in G_1




Figure 6: The phase portraits on the left and right of X_+ in G_1

All possible types of the four equilibrium points arising in the diagrams are summarized in Table 1 and Table 2.




Figure 7: The phase portraits on the left and right of T_3 in G1




Figure 8: The phase portraits on the left and right of Y_+ in G1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
O	s	s	r	r	r	s	a	r	r	s	a
E_{11}	—	—	—	r	s	s	s	s	—	r	r
E_{12}	—	—	—	s	s	—	—	a	—	—	—
E_2	s	r	—	—	—	—	s	—	—	—	s
E_3	—	s	s	s	—	—	—	s	—	—	—

Table 1: The behavior of equilibrium points on different regions from the bifurcation diagrams G1-G9.

Remark 2.18. We notice that, all bifurcation diagrams G1-G9 of this case do not exist in the non-degenerate framework. They are new and emerging mainly due to the existence of the saddle-node bifurcation curves Δ_+ and Δ_- .

3 Analysis of the system when $\theta(0) \neq 0$ and $\delta(0) = 0$

Assume $\delta(0) = 0$ and $\theta = \theta(0) \neq 0$; we still have $\gamma = \gamma(0) < 0$. Write in this case $\delta(\mu) = \frac{\partial\delta(0)}{\partial\mu_1}\mu_1 + \frac{\partial\delta(0)}{\partial\mu_2}\mu_2 + O(|\mu|^2)$ and assume $\frac{\partial\delta(0)}{\partial\mu_1} \stackrel{\text{not}}{=} \delta_1 \neq 0$. The equilibrium points are $O(0,0)$, $E_1(\frac{1}{\theta}\mu_1 + O(\mu_1^2), 0)$ and $E_2(0, -\mu_2 + O(\mu_2^2))$, respectively,

$$E_3\left(\frac{1}{\theta}(\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2), -\mu_2 + \sigma_2\mu_1^2\right) \quad (25)$$

	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
O	s	s	s	s	s	s	s	s	s	r	a
E_{11}	r	s	$-$	$-$	r	r	$-$	r	s	r	s
E_{12}	a	a	$-$	$-$	s	s	$-$	$-$	a	s	$-$
E_2	s	s	s	r	s	s	s	$-$	s	$-$	s
E_3	$-$	r	r	$-$	a	r	a	s	$-$	$-$	r

Table 2: Continuation of Table 1.

in its lowest terms, where $\sigma_2 = \frac{1}{\theta^2} (\theta\delta_1 - S)$. E_3 is well-defined and nontrivial for $|\mu|$ sufficiently small, in the region

$$Q = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2), (\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2)\theta > 0, -\mu_2 + \sigma_2\mu_1^2 > 0\}. \quad (26)$$

E_3 bifurcates from O through two bifurcation curves, namely T_2 given by (8), $\mu_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma}\mu_1 + O(\mu_1^2)$, $\mu_1 > 0$, and

$$T_4 = \{(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \mu_2 = \sigma_2\mu_1^2 + O(\mu_1^3), \theta\mu_1 > 0\}. \quad (27)$$

On T_2 , E_3 coincides to $E_2(0, -\mu_2)$ while on T_4 to $E_1(\frac{1}{\theta}\mu_1, 0)$.

Remark 3.1. The eigenvalues of $E_1(\frac{1}{\theta}\mu_1, 0)$ are $-\mu_1$ and $\mu_2 - \sigma_2\mu_1^2$, respectively of $E_2(0, -\mu_2)$ they are $-\mu_2$ and $\mu_1 - \gamma\mu_2$.

Theorem 3.2. Assume $\theta\delta_1 \neq 0$. Then T_4 is a transcritical bifurcation curve.

Proof. When $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_4$, E_3 coincides to $E_1(\frac{1}{\theta}\mu_1, 0)$ and have the eigenvalues 0 and $-\mu_1$. Let μ_2 be the bifurcation parameter while $\mu_1 \neq 0$ is assumed fixed. For $\mu_1\theta > 0$, denote by $\xi_0 = (\frac{1}{\theta}\mu_1, 0)$ and $\mu_0 = (\mu_1, \mu_2) \in T_4$. Write the system (1) in the form

$$\dot{\xi} = f(\xi, \mu), \quad (28)$$

where $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)$, $f = (f_1, f_2)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$. On T_4 , the coordinates of $E_3(\xi_1, \xi_2)$ satisfy $\xi_2 = 0$, $\mu_2 - \delta(\mu)\xi_1 + S(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0$ and $\mu_1 - \theta(\mu)\xi_1 + N(\mu)\xi_1^2 = 0$.

Then A and A^T have both $\lambda = 0$ as an eigenvalue with the corresponding eigenvectors: $v = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\gamma}{\theta} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for A and $w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$ for A^T ; $A = Df(\xi_0, \mu_0)$ is the Jacobian of (28) written in its lowest terms.

In order to write properly $f_{\mu_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \mu_2} & \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial \mu_2} \end{pmatrix}^T$, we need $\theta_2 = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \mu_2}(0)$, $\delta_2 = \frac{\partial \delta}{\partial \mu_2}(0)$, $M_2 = \frac{\partial M}{\partial \mu_2}(0)$ and so on. Then $\frac{\partial f_1}{\partial \mu_2} = \xi_1(-\theta_2\xi_1 + \gamma_2\xi_2 - M_2\xi_1\xi_2 + N_2\xi_1^2)$ and $\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial \mu_2} = \xi_2(S_2\xi_1^2 - \delta_2\xi_1 + P_2\xi_2^2 + 1)$, in their lowest terms in μ_1 and μ_2 .

These yield $w^T f_{\mu_2}(\xi_0, \mu_0) = 0$, $w^T [Df_{\mu_2}(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v)] = 1 + O(\mu_1) \neq 0$ and $w^T [D^2 f(\xi_0, \mu_0)(v, v)] = 2 + O(\mu_1) \neq 0$, for $|\mu_1|$ small. Thus, T_4 is a transcritical bifurcation curve. ■

Remark 3.3. T_2 , Y_+ , Y_- , X_+ and X_- are transcritical bifurcation curves. The proof is similar to Theorem 3.2.

Theorem 3.4. Assume $\theta\delta_1 \neq 0$ and $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \in Q$. Then, E_3 is a saddle when $\theta > 0$, respectively, a repeller when $\theta < 0$. A Hopf bifurcation cannot occur at E_3 .




Figure 9: Bifurcation diagrams corresponding to $\theta(0) \neq 0$ and $\delta(0) = 0$.

Proof. The characteristic polynomial at E_3 is $P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - 2p\lambda + L$, where p and L are given by (11) and (12); $L = -\xi_1\xi_2(\theta + O(|\mu|))$. The eigenvalues $\lambda_{1,2} = p \pm \sqrt{q}$ at E_3 satisfy $\text{sign}(\lambda_1\lambda_2) = -\text{sign}(\theta)$. Thus, E_3 is a saddle if $\theta > 0$.

If $\theta < 0$, then $p = 0$ is a curve given by

$$H_1 = \left\{ (\mu_1, \mu_2), \mu_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma - 1}\mu_1 + O(\mu_1^2) \right\}. \quad (29)$$

In its lowest terms, p reads $p = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma - 1)\mu_2 - \frac{1}{2}\mu_1$ and is given by $p = -\frac{1}{2}\theta\xi_1 + \frac{1}{2}\xi_2 > 0$, whenever E_3 exists. It follows that $H_1 \not\subseteq Q$ and $p > 0$ on Q , thus, E_3 is a repeller and a Hopf bifurcation cannot occur at E_3 . Notice that $\gamma \neq 1$ because $\gamma < 0$. ■

Remark 3.5. The bifurcation diagrams F1-F4 corresponding to this degeneracy present similarities with four diagrams from the non-degenerate case, namely with the diagrams VII-X reported in [16]. However, two bifurcation curves from these diagrams are different in the two cases, namely T_4 from the




Figure 10: The phase portraits corresponding to the diagrams $F_1 - F_4$.

degenerate case is a parabola-like curve, while T_1 is a line in the non-degenerate framework. Moreover, the equilibrium points have different expressions in the two cases.

4 Conclusions

We approached in this work two degenerate cases, namely $\theta(0) = 0$ and $\delta(0) \neq 0$, respectively, $\theta(0) \neq 0$ and $\delta(0) = 0$. Another degenerate case, $\theta(0) = 0$ and $\delta(0) = 0$, is more involved due to the fact that the Implicit Function Theorem cannot be applied anymore for finding the equilibrium E_3 . The behavior of the system in this case is an open problem.

5 Acknowledgments

This research was supported by Horizon2020-2017-RISE-777911 project. We thank to Prof. Jaume Llibre for his useful suggestions related to Kolmogorov systems. We are also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments which improved the paper.

References

- [1] D. Adak, N. Bairagi and R. Hakl, Chaos in delay-induced Leslie-Gower prey-predator-parasite model and its control through prey harvesting, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 51, 2020, Article 102998.
- [2] J. Belmonte-Beitia, Existence of travelling wave solutions for a Fisher–Kolmogorov system with biomedical applications, *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation*, 36, 2016, 14-20.
- [3] F. Brauer and C. Castillo-Chavez, *Mathematical Models in Population Biology and Epidemiology*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2000.
- [4] D. Cooke, R. W. Hiorns et al., *The Mathematical Theory of the Dynamics of Biological Populations*, Academic Press, 1981.
- [5] Y. Dong, Y. Takeuchi and S. Nakaoka, A mathematical model of multiple delayed feedback control system of the gut microbiota-Antibiotics injection controlled by measured metagenomic data, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 43, 2018, 1-17.
- [6] H. I. Freedman, *Deterministic Mathematical Models in Population Biology*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1980.
- [7] D. Greenhalgh, Q. Khan, F. Al-Kharousi, Eco-epidemiological model with fatal disease in the prey, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 53, 2020, Article 103072.
- [8] M. Kot, *Elements of Mathematical Ecology*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [9] J. Llibre and T. Salhi, On the dynamics of a class of Kolmogorov systems, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 225, 2013, 242–245.
- [10] J. Llibre and D. Xiao, Dynamics, integrability and topology for some classes of Kolmogorov Hamiltonian systems in R^4 , *J. Differential Equations*, 262, 2017, 2231–2253.

- [11] C. Lobry and T. Sari, Migrations in the Rosenzweig-MacArthur model and the atto-fox problem, *Arima Journal*, 20, 2015, 95–125.
- [12] R. M. May, *Stability and Complexity in Model Ecosystems*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1974.
- [13] L. Perko, *Differential Equations and Dynamical Systems*, Third Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [14] C. Lois-Prados, R. Precup, Positive periodic solutions for Lotka–Volterra systems with a general attack rate, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 52, 2020, Article 103024.
- [15] M. Rafikov, J.M. Balthazar and H. F. von Bremen, Mathematical modeling and control of population systems: Applications in biological pest control, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 200(2), 2008, 557-573.
- [16] G. Tigan, C. Lazureanu, F. Munteanu, C. Sterbeti, A. Florea, Bifurcation diagrams in a class of Kolmogorov systems, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications* 56 (2020), 103154, 1–14.
- [17] K. Yamasaki, T. Yajima, Lotka–Volterra system and KCC theory: Differential geometric structure of competitions and predations, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 14(4), 2013, 1845-1853.
- [18] Y. Yang, C. Wu and Z. Li, Forced waves and their asymptotics in a Lotka–Volterra cooperative model under climate change, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 353, 2019, 254-264.
- [19] Y. Yuan, H. Chen, C. Du and Y. Yuan, The limit cycles of a general Kolmogorov system, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 392, 2012, 225–237.
- [20] F. Xu and W. Gan, On a Lotka–Volterra type competition model from river ecology, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 47, 2019, 373-384.