

# Jacobi Stability Analysis for Systems of ODEs Using Symbolic Computation

Bo Huang<sup>a</sup>, Dongming Wang<sup>b,c</sup> and Jing Yang<sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*LMIB – School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*  
*bohuang0407@buaa.edu.cn*

<sup>b</sup>*LMIB – Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China*

<sup>c</sup>*Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 75794 Paris Cedex 16, France*  
*Dongming.Wang@buaa.edu.cn*

<sup>d</sup>*SMS – HCIC – School of Mathematics and Physics, Guangxi Minzu University, Nanning 530006, China*  
*yangjing0930@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** The classical theory of Kosambi–Cartan–Chern (KCC) developed in differential geometry provides a powerful method for analyzing the behaviors of dynamical systems. In the KCC theory, the properties of a dynamical system are described in terms of five geometrical invariants, of which the second corresponds to the so-called Jacobi stability of the system. Different from that of the Lyapunov stability that has been studied extensively in the literature, the analysis of the Jacobi stability has been investigated more recently using geometrical concepts and tools. It turns out that the existing work on the Jacobi stability analysis remains theoretical and the problem of algorithmic and symbolic treatment of Jacobi stability analysis has yet to be addressed. In this paper, we initiate our study on the problem for a class of ODE systems of arbitrary dimension and propose two algorithmic schemes using symbolic computation to check whether a nonlinear dynamical system may exhibit Jacobi stability. The first scheme, based on the construction of the complex root structure of a characteristic polynomial and on the method of quantifier elimination, is capable of detecting the existence of the Jacobi stability of the given dynamical system. The second algorithmic scheme exploits the method of semi-algebraic system solving and allows one to determine conditions on the parameters for a given dynamical system to have a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points. Several examples are presented to demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithmic schemes.

**Math Subject Classification (2020).** 34C07; 68W30.

**Keywords.** Algorithmic approach; dynamical systems; Jacobi stability; KCC theory; quantifier elimination; semi-algebraic system; symbolic computation

## 1 Introduction

Differential equations are widely used in science and engineering for modeling real-world phenomena of various kinds. The problem of analyzing the qualitative behaviors of systems of differential equations is essential and has to be studied theoretically and/or practically whenever the dynamical properties of the solution of the systems in question need be well understood. In this paper, we are concerned with dynamical systems of first-order ordinary differential equations

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad \mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$  are variables,  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$  are real parameters, and  $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  are rational functions in  $\mathbb{R}(\mathbf{x})$ . Our study is focused on describing the local stability of equilibria and the global stability of late-time deviations of solution trajectories. The global stability of the solutions of the dynamical systems can be described by using the well-known stability theory

of Lyapunov, where the fundamental quantities are the so-called Lyapunov exponents, used to measure the exponential deviations from the given trajectory. On the other hand, the local stability of solutions of dynamical systems is much less understood. Even though the method of Lyapunov has been well studied, it remains interesting to extend the theory and methodology for stability analysis of dynamical systems from different points of view and to compare the results with those of the corresponding analysis of Lyapunov exponents. One of the approaches that offer important new insights for stability analysis of dynamical systems is what may be called the geometro-dynamical approach, which has been developed since Kosambi [30], Cartan [10] and Chern [13]. The differential-geometric theory of Kosambi–Cartan–Chern (KCC) is established from the variational equations for the deviation of the whole trajectory to nearby ones, based on the existence of a one-to-one correspondence between a second-order dynamical system and the geodesic equations in an associated Finsler space (see [4] for more details). The qualitative analysis of dynamical systems in practice usually involves heavy symbolic computation. In the last three decades, remarkable progress has been made on the research and development of symbolic and algebraic algorithms and software tools, bringing the classical qualitative theory of differential equations to computational approaches for symbolic analysis of the qualitative behaviors of diverse dynamical systems (see [2, 5, 7, 11, 20, 25, 26, 29, 35, 40, 45, 47, 48], the survey article [27], and references therein).

In this paper, we study the Jacobi stability of dynamical systems of the form (1.1) and show how to effectively *compute a partition of the parametric space of  $\mu$  such that inside every open cell of the partition, the system can have a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points*. The main techniques we use are based on the KCC theory and advanced methods of polynomial and semi-algebraic system solving with exact symbolic computation. The idea of using the KCC theory to study the Jacobi stability of nonlinear dynamical systems is not new and a considerable amount of work has already been done on the subject (see [4, 17, 19, 21, 22, 41, 42] and references therein). However, the exploration of algorithmic and symbolic-computational approaches for systematical analysis of the Jacobi stability of dynamical systems is a new direction of research in which we are involved.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 some basic concepts and results of the KCC theory are reviewed. Section 3 presents the main results stated as Proposition 1 and Theorem 2: the former leads to a decision procedure for the existence of Jacobi stable fixed points by quantifier elimination, and the latter allows one to derive necessary and sufficient conditions for systems of the form (1.1) to have given numbers of Jacobi stable fixed points. Two algorithmic schemes for Jacobi stability analysis are presented in Section 4. The effectiveness of our computational approach is demonstrated in Section 5 with several examples including the famous Brusselator model, the Cdc2-Cyclin B/Wee1 system and the Lorenz–Stenflo system. The paper concludes in Section 6 with some discussions on future research.

## 2 KCC Theory and Jacobi Stability of Dynamical Systems

In this section, we briefly review the KCC theory and recall the basic concepts and notations that will be used later on. Some geometric objects and useful theoretical results are presented. For more details about the KCC theory, the reader may consult the expository article [4] and other recent work in [17, 22, 41, 42].

Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a real, smooth  $n$ -dimensional manifold and let  $\mathcal{TM}$  be its tangent bundle. On an open connected subset  $\Omega$  of the Euclidean  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional space  $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}$  we introduce a  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional coordinates system  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t)$ , where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)$  and  $t$  is the usual time coordinate. The coordinates  $\mathbf{y}$  are defined as

$$\mathbf{y} = \left( \frac{dx_1}{dt}, \frac{dx_2}{dt}, \dots, \frac{dx_n}{dt} \right).$$

A basic assumption in the KCC theory is that the time coordinate  $t$  is an absolute invariant.

Therefore the only admissible coordinate transformations are

$$\tilde{t} = t, \quad \tilde{x}_i = \tilde{x}_i(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n), \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}. \quad (2.1)$$

In many situations of scientific interest the equations of motion of a dynamical system can be derived from a Lagrangian function  $L : \mathcal{TM} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  via the Euler–Lagrange equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial L}{\partial y_i} - \frac{\partial L}{\partial x_i} = F_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $F_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , is the external force. For a regular Lagrangian  $L$ , the Euler–Lagrange equations introduced in (2.2) are equivalent to a system of second-order ordinary differential equations

$$\frac{d^2 x_i}{dt^2} + 2G^i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t) = 0, \quad i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}, \quad (2.3)$$

where each function  $G^i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, t)$  is  $C^\infty$  in a neighborhood of some initial conditions  $(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}_0, t_0)$  in  $\Omega$ .

The basic idea of the KCC theory is that if an arbitrary system of second-order differential equations of the form (2.3) is given, with no a priori Lagrangian function known, we can still study the behavior of its trajectories by using differential geometric methods. This study can be performed by using the close analogy with the trajectories of the standard Euler–Lagrange system.

For the non-singular coordinate transformations introduced through (2.1), we define the KCC-covariant differential of a vector field  $\xi_i(\mathbf{x})$  on the open subset  $\Omega$  as

$$\frac{D\xi_i}{dt} = \frac{d\xi_i}{dt} + N_j^i \xi_j,$$

where  $N_j^i = \partial G^i / \partial y_j$  are the coefficients of the nonlinear connection. For  $\xi_i = y_i$ , we obtain

$$\frac{Dy_i}{dt} = N_j^i y_j - 2G^i = -\epsilon_i.$$

The contravariant vector field  $\epsilon_i$  on  $\Omega$  is called the first KCC invariant.

We vary now the trajectories  $x_i(t)$  of the system (2.3) into nearby ones according to

$$\tilde{x}_i(t) = x_i(t) + \eta \xi_i(t), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $|\eta|$  is a small parameter, and  $\xi_i(t)$  are the components of a contravariant vector field defined along the path  $x_i(t)$ . Substituting (2.4) into (2.3) and taking the limit  $\eta \rightarrow 0$  we obtain the deviation equations in the form

$$\frac{d^2 \xi_i}{dt^2} + 2N_j^i \frac{d\xi_j}{dt} + 2 \frac{\partial G^i}{\partial x_j} \xi_j = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

Equation (2.5) can be reformulated in the covariant form with the use of the KCC-covariant differential as

$$\frac{D^2 \xi_i}{dt^2} = P_j^i \xi_j, \quad (2.6)$$

where we have denoted

$$P_j^i = -2 \frac{\partial G^i}{\partial x_j} - 2G^\ell G_{j\ell}^i + y_\ell \frac{\partial N_j^i}{\partial x_\ell} + N_\ell^i N_j^\ell + \frac{\partial N_j^i}{\partial t}, \quad (2.7)$$

and we have introduced the Berwald connection  $G_{j\ell}^i$ , defined as

$$G_{j\ell}^i \equiv \frac{\partial N_j^i}{\partial y_\ell}. \quad (2.8)$$

$P_j^i$  is called the second KCC-invariant or the deviation curvature tensor, while equation (2.6) is called the Jacobi equation. The third, fourth and fifth KCC-invariants are called respectively the torsion tensor, the Riemann–Christoffel curvature tensor, and the Douglas tensor are defined as

$$P_{jk}^i = \frac{1}{3} \left( \frac{\partial P_j^i}{\partial y_k} - \frac{\partial P_k^i}{\partial y_j} \right), \quad P_{ikl}^i = \frac{\partial P_{jk}^i}{\partial y_l}, \quad D_{jkl}^i = \frac{\partial G_{jk}^i}{\partial y_l}.$$

These tensors always exist in a Berwald space. In the KCC theory they describe the geometrical properties and interpretation of a system of second-order differential equations (see [17, 41, 42] and references therein).

For many physical, chemical or biological applications one is interested in the behaviors of the trajectories of the dynamical system (2.3) in a vicinity of a point  $x_i(t_0)$ . For simplicity in the following we take  $t_0 = 0$ . We consider the trajectories  $x_i = x_i(t)$  of (2.3) as curves in the Euclidean space  $(\mathbb{R}^n, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle)$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  represents the canonical inner product of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and suppose that the deviation vector  $\xi$  satisfies  $\xi(0) = O \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,  $\dot{\xi}(0) = W \neq O$ ; here,  $O$  is the null vector.

For any two vectors  $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  we define an adapted inner product  $\langle\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\rangle$  to the deviation tensor  $\xi$  by  $\langle\langle X, Y \rangle\rangle := 1/\langle W, W \rangle \cdot \langle X, Y \rangle$ . We also have  $\|W\|^2 := \langle\langle W, W \rangle\rangle = 1$ . Thus, the focusing tendency of the trajectories around  $t_0 = 0$  can be described as follows:

- bunching together if  $\|\xi(t)\| < t^2$ , namely, if and only if the real part of the eigenvalues of  $P_j^i(0)$  are strictly negative.
- disperses if  $\|\xi(t)\| > t^2$ , namely, if and only if the real part of the eigenvalues of  $P_j^i(0)$  are strictly positive.

Based on the above considerations we introduce the rigorous definition of the concept of Jacobi stability for a dynamical system as follows.

**Definition 1.** *If the system (2.3) of differential equations satisfies the initial conditions  $\|x_i(t_0) - \tilde{x}_i(t_0)\| = 0$ ,  $\|\dot{x}_i(t_0) - \dot{\tilde{x}}_i(t_0)\| \neq 0$ , with respect to the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  induced by a positive-definite inner product, then the trajectories of (2.3) are Jacobi stable if and only if the real part of the eigenvalues of the deviation curvature tensor  $P_j^i$  are strictly negative everywhere. Otherwise, the trajectories are Jacobi unstable.*

More detailed discussions of the KCC theory, including applications, can be found in [4, 17, 21, 22].

### 3 Theoretical Results on the Jacobi Stability

In this section, we present our main results on the Jacobi stability of system (1.1). The following lemma gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a fixed point of system (1.1) to be Jacobi stable. Its proof can be found in Appendix A.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$  be an isolated fixed point of system (1.1). Denoted by  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  the Jacobian matrix of system (1.1) evaluated at the fixed point  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ . Then  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is Jacobi stable if and only if all the eigenvalues of the matrix  $J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  have negative real parts.*

The following result is an immediate consequence of [22, Theorem 2], which shows that only even-dimensional first-order dynamical systems can exhibit Jacobi stability.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $n = 2j + 1$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the fixed point  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  of system (1.1) is always Jacobi unstable. If  $n = 2j$ , then  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is Jacobi stable if and only if system (1.1) satisfies the following two conditions:*

- all eigenvalues of the characteristic polynomial of Jacobian matrix  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  are complex conjugate, i.e.,  $\lambda_j := \alpha_j + i\beta_j$ ,  $\bar{\lambda}_j := \alpha_j - i\beta_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n/2$ ;*
- for any  $j = 1, \dots, n/2$ , we have  $\alpha_j^2 - \beta_j^2 < 0$ .*

*Proof.* The result follows directly from [22, Theorem 2]. Here we only present the proof for the case  $n = 2j + 1$  odd, more detailed arguments can be found in [22, Section 4.2]. In fact, for *odd-dimensional* first-order dynamical systems of the form (1.1). The resulting characteristic polynomial of the Jacobian matrix  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  has at least one real root. It follows from [22, Lemma 2] that the matrix  $J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  has at least one real positive root. That is, the fixed point  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is Jacobi unstable.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *In practice, the results established in Theorem 1 are not suitable for application to real-world differential models. The main reason is that the root structure analysis of the characteristic polynomial of  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  is very difficult, especially for parametric dynamical systems with higher dimensions. In this paper, we provide a systematic approach for analyzing the existence of Jacobi stability of dynamical systems by using the method of quantifier elimination automatically (see Proposition 1). We also remark that for special systems of ODEs of the form (1.1), one may reduce an odd-dimensional first-order dynamical system to certain set of second-order differential equations; in such case an odd-dimensional first-order dynamical system could exhibit Jacobi stability without knowing the information on the matrix  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ , see [18, 19, 21, 28, 31] and references therein.*

Our main question, relevant to the algorithmic aspects of Jacobi stability, then arises: *under what conditions does a dynamical system of the form (1.1) have a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points?* In the following we provide two algorithmic schemes to answer the question by means of symbolic and algebraic computation.

The first scheme addresses the existence of Jacobi stable fixed points, i.e., the problem of determining the conditions on the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  for a system of the form (1.1) to have at least one Jacobi stable fixed point. The next result is based on Theorem 1, which provides an algorithmic approach for testing Jacobi stability by quantifier elimination (QE).

**Proposition 1.** *The problem of detecting the existence of Jacobi stable fixed points of a  $2m$ -dimensional dynamical system (1.1) can be formulated into the following QE problem*

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists b_1 \cdots \exists b_m \exists c_1 \cdots \exists c_m \exists \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\ & \left[ \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{2m} f_{i,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0 \right) \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{2m} f_{i,2}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \neq 0 \right) \right. \\ & \quad \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{j=1}^m a_j(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) - a_j(b_1, \dots, b_m; c_1, \dots, c_m) = 0 \right) \\ & \quad \left. \wedge \left( \bigwedge_{j=1}^m 2c_j - b_j^2 > 0 \right) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where  $f_{i,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $f_{i,2}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  are respectively the numerator and denominator of the function  $f_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  in (1.1).

*Proof.* As indicated by Theorem 1, we assume that  $n = 2m$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}$ . The characteristic polynomials  $p(\lambda)$  of the matrix  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  can be written as

$$p(\lambda) = \lambda^{2m} + a_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})\lambda^{2m-1} + \cdots + a_{2m}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}). \tag{3.2}$$

Then all eigenvalues of  $p$  are complex conjugates if and only if there exist  $b_j, c_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$  such that

$$p(\lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^m (\lambda^2 + b_j\lambda + c_j), \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$b_j^2 - 4c_j < 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Taking the expansion of (3.3) and comparing its coefficients in terms of  $\lambda$  with those in (3.2), we may get a series of constraints on  $b_j, c_j$  which can be simply written as

$$a_i(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = a_i(b_1, \dots, b_m; c_1, \dots, c_m), \quad i = 1, \dots, 2m.$$

We further assume that  $\alpha_j \pm \beta_j i$  are the conjugate roots of  $\lambda^2 + b_j \lambda + c_j = 0$ . More explicitly, we have  $\alpha_j = -b_j/2$  and  $\beta_j = \sqrt{4c_j - b_j^2}/2$ . The substitution of the two relations into  $\alpha_j^2 < \beta_j^2$  immediately yields

$$2c_j - b_j^2 > 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Obviously, the condition (3.4) is implied by the condition (3.5) and thus we can omit it. Collecting all the constraints on  $b_j$ 's and  $c_j$ 's and using Theorem 1, we formulate the desired QE problem (3.1).  $\square$

**Remark 2.** *By Tarski theory, the QE problem of the first-order theory is solvable over the real field [46]. In other words, for any formula constructed from polynomial equations and inequalities over the real field by logical connectives (i.e.,  $\wedge$  (and),  $\vee$  (or),  $\neg$ ) and quantifiers (i.e.,  $\forall, \exists$ ), one can find a quantifier-free equivalence to the given formula. The first practical algorithm for QE is based on Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition (CAD), which is proposed by Collins in 1975 [14]. Following up his work, numerous improvements have been made since then (e.g., to cite a few [3, 9, 12, 23, 24, 36]) and several software tools are implemented, such as QEPCAD B [8] (an improvement of QEPCAD [15]), functions Resolve and Reduce in Mathematica (as described in [44]), package REDLOG in REDUCE (implemented on the basis of the methods of CAD [14, 15] and virtual term substitution [49, 50]), and the Maple package RegularChains (developed by Moreno Maza and his coworkers).*

Our second algorithmic scheme is devoted to providing necessary and sufficient conditions on  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  for systems of the form (1.1) to have given numbers of Jacobi stable fixed points. According to Lemma 1, we need to determine whether all the eigenvalues of  $J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  have negative real parts. This can be done by using the stability criterion of Routh–Hurwitz [32, 37]. Let

$$\bar{p}(\lambda) = \lambda^n + \bar{a}_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})\lambda^{n-1} + \dots + \bar{a}_n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad (3.6)$$

be the characteristic polynomial of the matrix  $J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ . The Routh–Hurwitz criterion reduces the problem of determining the negative signs of the real parts of the eigenvalues of  $J^2$  to the problem of determining the signs of certain coefficients  $a_i$  of  $\bar{p}(\lambda)$  and the signs of certain determinants  $\Delta_j$  of matrices with  $a_i$  or 0 as entries.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for  $\bar{p}(\lambda)$  to have all solutions such that  $\text{Re}(\lambda) < 0$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_n > 0, \quad \Delta_1 = \bar{a}_1 > 0, \quad \Delta_2 = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_3 \\ 1 & \bar{a}_2 \end{vmatrix} > 0, \\ \Delta_3 = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_3 & \bar{a}_5 \\ 1 & \bar{a}_2 & \bar{a}_4 \\ 0 & \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_3 \end{vmatrix} > 0, \dots, \\ \Delta_j = \begin{vmatrix} \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_3 & \dots & \dots \\ 1 & \bar{a}_2 & \bar{a}_4 & \dots \\ 0 & \bar{a}_1 & \bar{a}_3 & \dots \\ 0 & 1 & \bar{a}_2 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \bar{a}_j \end{vmatrix} > 0, \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . Here  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_n$  are known as the *Hurwitz determinants* of  $\bar{p}(\lambda)$ .

The following result gives necessary and sufficient conditions for a given system of the form (1.1) to have a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points.

**Theorem 2.** For a general  $n$ -dimensional dynamical system of the form (1.1), the system has exactly  $k$  Jacobi stable fixed points if and only if the following semi-algebraic system

$$\begin{cases} f_{1,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = f_{2,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \cdots = f_{n,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0, \\ f_{i,2}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \bar{a}_n(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) > 0, \quad \Delta_j(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) > 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

has exactly  $k$  distinct real solutions with respect to the variable  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$  are parameters appearing in (1.1).

*Proof.* The result follows directly from Lemma 1 and Routh–Hurwitz criterion.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** In our approach, we do not explicitly compute the fixed points, nor the corresponding eigenvalues of  $\bar{p}(\lambda)$ . By Theorem 2, the problem of Jacobi stability analysis is reduced to that of solving a semi-algebraic system (namely (3.8)). Theorem 2 provides a straightforward computational method to verify whether a given differential system has a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points. Its main task is to find conditions on the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  for system (3.8) to have exactly  $k$  distinct real solutions. In the next section, we will give a systematic approach for solving semi-algebraic systems and analyzing Jacobi stability of dynamical systems by using symbolic computation methods automatically.

## 4 Algorithmic Analysis of the Jacobi Stability

Based on the theoretical results established in Section 3, we present our algorithmic tests **Jacobi Test I** and **Jacobi Test II**. Given an input dynamical system of the form (1.1), these algorithmic tests verify its Jacobi stability by using QE formula (3.1) and solving semi-algebraic system (3.8), respectively. In so doing, the first test is applicable only to verify the existence of Jacobi stable fixed points. The second test admits one to determine conditions on the parameters such that the given system has a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points.

### 4.1 Jacobi Test I

The process of using the first algorithmic test for analyzing the existence of Jacobi stability of a given dynamical system can be divided into three parts.

**Part 1:** Compute the Jacobian matrix  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  of a given dynamical system of the form (1.1) and write the characteristic polynomial  $p(\lambda)$  of  $J$ .

**Part 2:** Formulate a QE problem using (3.1).

**Part 3:** Solve the problem by QE tools.

It is well known that real QE can be carried out algorithmically due to the ground-breaking work of Tarski [46], Collins [14], and others. See [3, 9, 12, 23, 24, 36] for further information. In principle, the above problem in **Part 3** can be carried out automatically by using QE algorithms. However, the symbolic computation involved is so huge that automatic synthesis is practically impossible with currently available QE software.

We remark that the problem of detecting the existence of Jacobi stability of a given dynamical system, i.e., the quantifier elimination problem (see (3.1)) may be formulated as the problem of determining the conditions on the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  for the following semi-algebraic system

$$\begin{cases} f_{1,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = f_{2,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = \cdots = f_{2m,1}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = 0, \\ f_{i,2}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \neq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2m, \\ a_j(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) - a_j(b_1, \dots, b_m; c_1, \dots, c_m) = 0, \\ 2c_j - b_j^2 > 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

to have at least one real solution. The general approach for solving such semi-algebraic systems is explained in detail in [38, 48] and it is based on the methods of real solution classification [52] and discriminant varieties [33].

In view of the above remark, in the algorithmic analysis of Jacobi stability, our attention will be focused on the algorithmic steps for solving semi-algebraic systems (see details in Section 4.2).



## 4.2 Jacobi Test II

Our purpose is to derive conditions on the parameters for systems of the form (1.1) to have given numbers of Jacobi stability fixed points. In what follows we present a general algorithmic approach for automatically analyzing Theorem 2 by using methods from symbolic computation. This approach is based on the one for studying Lyapunov stability of biological systems proposed by Wang, Xia and Niu [38, 48]. The main steps of our computational approach are described as follows.

**STEP 1.** Formulate the semi-algebraic system (3.8) from a dynamical system of the form (1.1). Denote by  $\mathcal{S}$  the semi-algebraic system for solving,  $\Psi$  the set of inequalities of  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{F}$  the set of polynomials in  $\Psi$ , and  $\mathcal{P}$  the set of polynomials in the equations of  $\mathcal{S}$ .

**STEP 2.** Triangularize the set  $\mathcal{P}$  of polynomials to obtain one or several (regular) triangular sets  $\mathcal{T}_k$  by using the method of triangular decomposition or Gröbner bases.

**STEP 3.** For each triangular set  $\mathcal{T}_k$ , use the polynomial set  $\mathcal{F}$  to compute an algebraic variety  $V$  in  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  by means of real solution classification (using, e.g., Yang–Xia’s method [51, 52] or Lazard–Rouillier’s method [33]), which decomposes the parameter space  $\mathbb{R}^p$  into finitely many cells such that in each cell the number of real zeros of  $\mathcal{T}_k$  and the signs of polynomials in  $\mathcal{F}$  at these real zeros remain invariant. The algebraic variety is defined by polynomials in  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ . Then take a rational sample point from each cell by using the method of PCAD or critical points [16], and isolate the real zeros of  $\mathcal{T}_k$  by rational intervals at this sample point. In this way, the number of real zeros of  $\mathcal{T}_k$  and the signs of polynomials in  $\mathcal{F}$  at these real zeros in each cell are determined.

**STEP 4.** Determine the signs of (the factors of) the defining polynomials of  $V$  at each sample point. Formulate the conditions on  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  according to the signs of these defining polynomials at the sample points in those cells in which the system  $S$  has exactly the number of real solutions we want.

**STEP 5.** Output the conditions on the parameter  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  such that the dynamical system has a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points.

**Remark 4.** *There are several software packages which can be used to realize the algorithmic steps in our approach. For example, the method of discriminant varieties of Lazard and Rouillier [33] (implemented as a Maple package DV by Moroz and Rouillier), and the Maple package DISCOVERER (see also recent improvements in the Maple package RegularChains[SemiAlgebraicSetTools]), developed by Xia, implements the methods of Yang and Xia [52] for real solution classification. In Section 5, we will present several examples to demonstrate the applicability and the computational efficiency of our general algorithmic approach.*

## 5 Examples and Experiments

In this section, we explain how to apply the algorithmic tests to study Jacobi stability of dynamical systems and illustrate some of the computational steps by a famous Brusselator model. In addition, using our computational approach, we also analyze Jacobi stability of the Cdc2-Cyclin B/Wee1 system and the Lorenz–Stenflo system. The experimental results show the applicability and efficiency of our algorithmic approach. All the experiments were made in Maple 17 on a Windows 10 laptop with 4 CPUs 2.9GHz and 8192M RAM.



## 5.1 Illustrative Example: The Brusselator

The Brusselator is a simple biological system proposed by Prigogine and Lefever in 1968 [39]. The chemical reactions are:



where the  $k_i$ 's are rate constants, and the reactant concentrations of  $A$  and  $B$  are kept constant. Then, the law of mass action leads to the following dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{dx}{dt} &= 1 - (b + 1)x + ax^2y, \\
 \frac{dy}{dt} &= bx - ax^2y,
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  correspond to the concentrations of  $X$  and  $Y$ , respectively, and  $a$ , and  $b$  are positive constants.

Here we use algorithmic tests to study the Jacobi stability of the Brusselator model. The experimental results show as well the applicability and efficiency of our algorithmic approach. The fixed point of (5.2) satisfies the following algebraic system:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \{f_1 = 1 - (b + 1)x + ax^2y = 0, \\
 f_2 = bx - ax^2y = 0, \ a > 0, \ b > 0\}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Simple computations show that the Jacobian evaluated at the fixed point  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (x, y)$  is given by

$$J(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = \begin{pmatrix} 2axy - b - 1 & ax^2 \\ -2axy + b & -ax^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.4}$$

and hence the characteristic polynomials of  $J(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$  and  $J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(\lambda) &= \lambda^2 + a_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\lambda + a_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}), \\
 \bar{p}(\lambda) &= \lambda^2 + \bar{a}_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}})\lambda + \bar{a}_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}),
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= ax^2 - 2axy + b + 1, \\
 \bar{a}_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= -a^2x^4 + 4a^2x^3y - 4a^2x^2y^2 - 2abx^2 \\
 &\quad + 4abxy + 4axy - b^2 - 2b - 1, \\
 a_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) &= ax^2, \quad \bar{a}_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = a^2x^4.
 \end{aligned}$$

**Jacobi Test I:** Using Proposition 1, we obtain the following QE problem

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\exists b_1 \exists c_1 \exists \bar{\mathbf{x}} \\
 &\left[ \begin{aligned}
 &f_1 = 1 - (b + 1)x + ax^2y = 0, \\
 &f_2 = bx - ax^2y = 0, \\
 &a_1(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - b_1 = ax^2 - 2axy + b + 1 - b_1 = 0, \\
 &a_2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - c_1 = ax^2 - c_1 = 0, \\
 &a > 0, \ b > 0, \ 2c_1 - b_1^2 > 0 \end{aligned} \right].
 \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Using the Maple package RegularChains[SemiAlgebraicSetTools] to the above system, we obtain an equivalent quantifier-free formula  $R_0 = (a - b)^2 - 2b + 1 < 0$ . Thus we have the following result on the Jacobi stability of the Brusselator model.

**Theorem 3.** *The Brusselator model (5.2) has at least one Jacobi stable fixed point if  $R_0 = (a - b)^2 - 2b + 1 < 0$ .*

**Jacobi Test II:** Using Theorem 2, we obtain the following semi-algebraic system, which can be used for analyzing whether the Brusselator model (5.2) has a prescribed number of Jacobi stable fixed points:

$$\mathcal{S} : \begin{cases} f_1 = 1 - (b + 1)x + ax^2y = 0, \\ f_2 = bx - ax^2y = 0, \\ \bar{a}_1(\bar{x}) > 0, \quad \bar{a}_2(\bar{x}) > 0, \quad a > 0, \quad b > 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

Solving the semi-algebraic system  $\mathcal{S}$  by means of symbolic computation presented in Section 4.2, we see that system  $\mathcal{S}$  has exactly one real solution if and only if  $R_0 = (a - b)^2 - 2b + 1 < 0$ ; system  $\mathcal{S}$  has no real solution if and only if  $R_0 > 0$ .

From the above analysis, we have the following result on the Jacobi stability of the Brusselator model.

**Theorem 4.** *The Brusselator model (5.2) has exactly one or no Jacobi stable fixed point if and only if  $R_0 = (a - b)^2 - 2b + 1 < 0$  or  $R_0 > 0$ .*

Theorem 4 is consistent with the result in [4, Section 3.3]. In Figure 1, we provide partitions of the parameter set  $\{(a, b) \mid a, b > 0\}$  of (5.2) for distinct numbers of Jacobi stable fixed points.




Figure 1: In the dark-gray and light-gray regions, system (5.2) has one and zero Jacobi stable fixed point, respectively. The blue curve is defined by  $R_0 = 0$ .

## 5.2 Other Models and Remarks

### 5.2.1 The Cdc2-Cyclin B/Wee1 System

The aim of this subsection is to study the Jacobi stability of the Cdc2-cyclin B/Wee1 system. We refer to [1] for the setting details of this example. Under certain assumptions, the system of differential equations that model the two-component, mutually inhibitory feed-back loop is reduced to the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= \alpha_1(1 - x) - \frac{\beta_1 x(vy)^{\gamma_1}}{k_1 + (vy)^{\gamma_1}}, \\ \frac{dy}{dt} &= \alpha_2(1 - y) - \frac{\beta_2 yx^{\gamma_2}}{k_2 + x^{\gamma_2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2$  are rate constants,  $k_1, k_2$  are Michaelis constants,  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  are Hill coefficients, and  $v$  is a coefficient that reflects the strength of the influence of Wee1 on Cdc2-cyclin B. For

easy reference and comparison, we take some of the parameter values for the biological constants suggested in [1]:

$$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1, \beta_1 = 200, \beta_2 = 10, k_1 = 30, v = 24.$$

Then system (5.8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= 1 - x - 200 \frac{x(24y)^{\gamma_1}}{30 + (24y)^{\gamma_1}}, \\ \frac{dy}{dt} &= 1 - y - 10 \frac{yx^{\gamma_2}}{k_2 + x^{\gamma_2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

Here we summarize our computational results for  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \{1, 2\}$ , report some of our experiments with comparisons for the proposed two algorithmic tests of Jacobi stability analysis, and provide timing statistics in table form to show the performance of the two schemes.

**Theorem 5.** *The following statements hold for the Cdc2-cyclin B/Wee1 system (5.9).*

**Case 1:**  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$ . *System (5.9) has no Jacobi stable fixed point.*

**Case 2:**  $\gamma_1 = 1, \gamma_2 = 2$ . *System (5.9) has at least one Jacobi stable fixed point if  $R_1 < 0$  by **Jacobi Test I**; and has exactly one Jacobi stable fixed point if and only if  $R_1 < 0$  by **Jacobi Test II**.*

**Case 3:**  $\gamma_1 = 2, \gamma_2 = 1$ . *Application of **Jacobi Test I** shows that system (5.9) has at least one Jacobi stable fixed point if one of the following two conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_1 &= [R_2 < 0, R_3 < 0, R_4 \leq 0, R_5 \leq 0], \\ \mathcal{C}_2 &= [0 < R_2, R_3 < 0, R_4 \leq 0, R_5 \leq 0, R_6 \leq 0] \end{aligned}$$

*holds. Application of **Jacobi Test II** shows that system (5.9) has exactly one or two Jacobi stable fixed points if and only if  $R_7 < 0$  or the condition*

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = [R_8 < 0, 0 < R_9, 0 \leq R_{10}]$$

*holds.*

**Case 4:**  $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 2$ . *The **Jacobi Test I** cannot detect the existence of Jacobi stable fixed point in a reasonably short time! Application of **Jacobi Test II** shows that system (5.9) has exactly one or two Jacobi stable fixed points if and only if  $R_{11} < 0$  or the condition*

$$\mathcal{C}_4 = [0 \leq R_{12}, 0 < R_{13}, R_{14} \leq 0, R_{15} \leq 0, R_{16} \leq 0]$$

*holds.*

Theorem 5 can be proved by using calculations and arguments similar to those for the proof of Theorem 4. The detailed proof is omitted here. The explicit expressions of  $R_i$  are put in Appendix B. The results in Table 1 show the difference of computational times using the two algorithmic tests. The times marked in blue and red denote the entire computations of **Jacobi Test II** for system (5.9) to have exactly one and two Jacobi stable fixed points, respectively.

**Remark 5.** *From Table 1, one can see that the **Jacobi Test I** can be applied to stability analysis only for dynamical systems involving a few (say, less than 4) parameters and variables. The **Jacobi Test II** is expected to have a better performance for systems of higher dimension.*

### 5.2.2 The Lorenz–Stenflo System

In order to save space, the details of our results on the Jacobi stability of the Lorenz–Stenflo system are placed in Appendix C.

Table 1: Computational times (in seconds) of the **Jacobi Test I/II** for system (5.9).

Cases	Jacobi Test I	Jacobi Test II
1	0.009	0.020
2	0.329	0.141
3	37.203	0.156/1.547
4	–	0.203/51.156

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper and for the first time, the problem of the Jacobi stability analysis is tackled algorithmically for an important class of systems of ODEs of arbitrary dimension. We reduce the problems of detecting the existence and analyzing the numbers of Jacobi stable fixed points of dynamical systems to algebraic problems, and propose two algorithmic schemes to verify Jacobi stability of dynamical systems by using methods of symbolic computation. The results of experiments performed demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed algorithmic tests.

Our work also indicates that algebraic methods for Jacobi stability analysis are feasible only for systems of small or moderate size. For large systems, one may try model reduction methods (see, e.g., [6]) to reduce them to small ones. It would be interesting to employ our algorithmic schemes for analyzing the Jacobi stability of dynamical systems from different domains of science and engineering. The involved symbolic computation may easily become too heavy and intractable as the number and degree of equations and the number of system parameters increase. How to simplify and optimize the steps of symbolic computation in current algorithmic analysis of the Jacobi stability is a nontrivial question that remains for further investigation.

As noted in Remark 1, one may reduce a dynamical system of the form (1.1) to a set of second-order differential equations as (2.3) and study the Jacobi stability of the reduced system without information about the matrix  $J(\bar{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  (see [18, 19, 21, 28, 31] and references therein). How to combine differential elimination theory and other techniques to automate the model reduction process for Jacobi stability analysis and how to develop practical software tools to detect the Jacobi stability of dynamical systems are some of the standing questions for our research.

## Acknowledgments

Huang’s work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 12101032 and NSFC 12131004), Yang’s work is partially supported by NSFC 12326353.

## References

- [1] David Angeli, James E. Ferrell, and Eduardo D. Sontag. Detection of multistability, bifurcations, and hysteresis in a large class of biological positive-feedback systems. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 101:1822–1827, 2004.
- [2] Valery Antonov, Diana Dolićanin, Valery G. Romanovski, and János Tóth. Invariant planes and periodic oscillations in the may–leonard asymmetric model. *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*, 76:455–474, 2016.
- [3] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie F. Roy. A new algorithm to find a point in every cell defined by a family of polynomials. In *Quantifier Elimination and Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition*. Springer-Verlag, 1998.

- [4] Christian G. Boehmer, Tiberiu Harko, and Sorin V. Sabau. Jacobi stability analysis of dynamical systems – applications in gravitation and cosmology. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 16:1145–1196, 2012.
- [5] François Boulier, Mao A. Han, François Lemaire, and Valery G. Romanovski. Qualitative investigation of a gene model using computer algebra algorithms. *Program. Comput. Soft.*, 41:105–111, 2015.
- [6] François Boulier, Marc Lefranc, François Lemaire, and Pierre-Emmanuel Morant. Model reduction of chemical reaction systems using elimination. *Math. Comput. Sci.*, 5:289–301, 2011.
- [7] Russell Bradford, James H. Davenport, Matthew England, Hassan Errami, Vladimir Gerdt, Dima Grigoriev, Charles Hoyt, Marek Košta, Ovidiu Radulescu, Thomas Sturm, and Andreas Weber. Identifying the parametric occurrence of multiple steady states for some biological networks. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 98:84–119, 2020.
- [8] Christopher W. Brown. QEPCAD B: a program for computing with semi-algebraic sets using CADs. *ACM SIGSAM Bulletin*, 37(4):97–108, 2003.
- [9] Christopher W. Brown and Christian Gross. Efficient preprocessing methods for quantifier elimination. In *Proceedings of the 2006 International Workshop on Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing*, pages 89–100, 2006.
- [10] Élie Cartan. Observations sur le mémoire précédent. *Math. Z.*, 37:619–622, 1933.
- [11] Chang B. Chen, Robert M. Corless, Marc M. Maza, Pei Yu, and Yi M. Zhang. An application of regular chain theory to the study of limit cycles. *Int. J. Bifur. Chaos*, 23:1350154–1–21, 2013.
- [12] Chang B. Chen and Marc M. Maza. Quantifier elimination by cylindrical algebraic decomposition based on regular chains. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 75:74–93, 2016.
- [13] Shiing-Shen Chern. Sur la geometrie d’un systeme d’equations differentielles du second ordre. *Bull. Sci. Math.*, 63:206–212, 1939.
- [14] George E. Collins. Quantifier elimination for the elementary theory of real closed fields by cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In *Lecture Notes In Computer Science*, pages 134–183. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1975. Vol. 33.
- [15] George E. Collins and Hoon Hong. Partial cylindrical algebraic decomposition for quantifier elimination. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 12:299–328, 1991.
- [16] Mohab Safey El Din. Testing sign conditions on a multivariate polynomial and applications. *Math. Comput. Sci.*, 1:177–207, 2007.
- [17] Peter L. Antonelli (ed.). *Handbook of Finsler Geometry*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 2003.
- [18] Manish K. Gupta and Chiranjeev K. Yadav. Jacobi stability analysis of rikitake system. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.*, 13:1650098–1–20, 2016.
- [19] Manish K. Gupta and Chiranjeev K. Yadav. Jacobi stability analysis of rössler system. *Int. J. Bifur. Chaos*, 27:1750056–1–13, 2017.
- [20] Mao A. Han and Valery G. Romanovski. Estimating the number of limit cycles in polynomials systems. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 368:491–497, 2010.
- [21] Tiberiu Harko, Chor Y. Ho, Chun S. Leung, and Stan Yip. Jacobi stability analysis of the lorenz system. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.*, 12:1550081–1–23, 2015.

- [22] Tiberiu Harko, Praiboon Pantaragphong, and Sorin V. Sabau. Kosambi–cartan–chern (kcc) theory for higher-order dynamical systems. *Int. J. Geom. Methods Mod. Phys.*, 13:1650014–1–24, 2016.
- [23] Hoon Hong. An improvement of the projection operator in cylindrical algebraic decomposition. In *Proceedings of the 1990 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 261–264, 1990.
- [24] Hoon Hong and Mohab S. Din. Variant quantifier elimination. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 47:883–901, 2012.
- [25] Hoon Hong, Richard Liska, and Stanly Steinberg. Testing stability by quantifier elimination. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 24:161–187, 1997.
- [26] Hoon Hong, Xiao X. Tang, and Bi C. Xia. Special algorithm for stability analysis of multi-stable biological regulatory systems. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 70:112–135, 2015.
- [27] Bo Huang, Wei Niu, and Dong M. Wang. Symbolic computation for the qualitative theory of differential equations. *Acta Math. Sci.*, 42B:2478–2504, 2022.
- [28] Qiu J. Huang, Ai M. Liu, and Yong J. Liu. Jacobi stability analysis of the chen system. *Int. J. Bifur. Chaos*, 29:1950139–1–15, 2019.
- [29] M’hammed E. Kahoui and Andreas Weber. Deciding hopf bifurcations by quantifier elimination in a software-component architecture. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 30:161–179, 2000.
- [30] Damodar D. Kosambi. Parallelism and path-space. *Math. Z.*, 37:608–818, 1933.
- [31] Matthew J. Lake and Tiberiu Harko. Dynamical behavior and jacobi stability analysis of wound strings. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 76:311–1–26, 2016.
- [32] Peter Lancaster and Miron Tismenetsky. *The Theory of Matrices: With Applications*. Academic Press, London, 1985.
- [33] Daniel Lazard and Fabrice Rouillier. Solving parametric polynomial systems. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 42:636–667, 2007.
- [34] Edward N. Lorenz. Deterministic nonperiodic flow. *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 20:130–141, 1963.
- [35] Adam Mahdi, Claudio Pessoa, and Jonathan D. Hauenstein. A hybrid symbolic-numerical approach to the center-focus problem. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 82:57–73, 2017.
- [36] Scott McCallum. On projection in cad-based quantifier elimination with equational constraint. In *Proceedings of the 1999 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 145–149, 1999.
- [37] Richard K. Miller and Anthony N. Michel. *Ordinary Differential Equations*. Academic Press, New York London, 1982.
- [38] Wei Niu and Dong M. Wang. Algebraic approaches to stability analysis of biological systems. *Math. Comput. Sci.*, 1:507–539, 2008.
- [39] Ilya Prigogine and René Lefever. Symmetry breaking instabilities in dissipative systems. ii. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 48:1695–1700, 1968.
- [40] Valery G. Romanovski and Douglas S. Shafer. *The Center and Cyclicity Problems: A Computational Algebra Approach*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2009.
- [41] Sorin V. Sabau. Some remarks on jacobi stability. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 63:143–153, 2005.

- [42] Sorin V. Sabau. Systems biology and deviation curvature tensor. *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, 6:563–587, 2005.
- [43] Lennart Stenflo. Generalized lorenz equations for acoustic-gravity waves in the atmosphere. *Phys. Scr.*, 53:83–84, 1996.
- [44] Adam Strzeboński. Computation with semialgebraic sets represented by cylindrical algebraic formulas. In *Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 61–68, 2010.
- [45] Thomas Sturm, Andreas Weber, Essam O. Abdel-Rahman, and M’hammed E. Kahoui. Investigating algebraic and logical algorithms to solve hopf bifurcation problems in algebraic biology. *Math. Comput. Sci.*, 2:493–515, 2009.
- [46] Alfred Tarski. *A Decision Method for Elementary Algebra and Geometry*. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, second edition, 1951.
- [47] Dong M. Wang. Mechanical manipulation for a class of differential systems. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 12:233–254, 1991.
- [48] Dong M. Wang and Bi C. Xia. Stability analysis of biological systems with real solution classification. In *Proceedings of the 2005 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 354–361, 2005.
- [49] Volker Weispfenning. Quantifier elimination for real algebra—the cubic case. In *Proceedings of the 1994 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 258–263, 1994.
- [50] Volker Weispfenning. Quantifier elimination for real algebra—the quadratic case and beyond. *Appl. Algebra Eng. Commun. Comput.*, 8:85–101, 1997.
- [51] Lu Yang, Xiao R. Hou, and Bi C. Xia. A complete algorithm for automated discovering of a class of inequality-type theorems. *Sci. China (Ser. F)*, 44:33–49, 2001.
- [52] Lu Yang and Bi C. Xia. Real solution classifications of parametric semi-algebraic systems. pages 281–289, Herstellung und Verlag, Norderstedt, 2005. In: *Algorithmic Algebra and Logic – Proceedings of the A3L 2005* (A. Dolzmann, A. Seidl, and T. Sturm, eds.).



## A Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof.* The proof can be done by using the ideas from [22, Section 4]. It should be noted that our fixed point here has arbitrariness and is not limited to the origin.

By taking the derivative of system (1.1) with respect to the time parameter  $t$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2x_1}{dt^2} &= f_{11}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_1 + f_{12}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_2 + \cdots + f_{1n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_n, \\ \frac{d^2x_2}{dt^2} &= f_{21}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_1 + f_{22}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_2 + \cdots + f_{2n}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_n, \\ &\vdots \\ \frac{d^2x_n}{dt^2} &= f_{n1}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_1 + f_{n2}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_2 + \cdots + f_{nn}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_n,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$f_{ij} = \frac{\partial f_i(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\partial x_j}, \quad y_i = \frac{dx_i}{dt}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The system can be written as

$$\frac{d^2x_i}{dt^2} - \sum_{k=1}^n f_{ik}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_k = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

By comparing equations (A.2) and (2.3) we find

$$G^i = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n f_{ik}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_k = -\frac{1}{2} J(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \mathbf{y}^T, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where  $J(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  is the Jacobian matrix of system (1.1) evaluated at the point  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ .

A direct computation shows that the coefficients of the nonlinear connection  $N_j^i$  in (2.4) are the following:

$$N_j^i = \frac{\partial G^i}{\partial y_j} = -\frac{1}{2} f_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

and hence

$$G_{j\ell}^i = \frac{\partial N_j^i}{\partial y_\ell} = 0.$$

Then, for the components of the deviation curvature tensor ( $P_j^i$ ), given by (2.7), we have

$$P_j^i = -2 \frac{\partial G^i}{\partial x_j} + y_\ell \frac{\partial N_j^i}{\partial x_\ell} + N_\ell^i N_j^\ell. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Then, with the use of (A.3) and (A.4) we obtain

$$P_j^i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell=1}^n f_{ij\ell}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})y_\ell + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^n f_{i\ell}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})f_{\ell j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu}), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$f_{ij\ell} = \frac{\partial f_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})}{\partial x_\ell}, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, n.$$

Evaluating  $P_j^i$  at the fixed point  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$  we obtain

$$P = (P_j^i)|_{\mathbf{x}=\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\ell=1}^n f_{i\ell}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})f_{\ell j}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\mu})|_{\mathbf{x}=\bar{\mathbf{x}}} = \frac{1}{4} J^2(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \boldsymbol{\mu}). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

According to Definition 1, we complete the proof of Lemma 1.  $\square$

## B List of Expressions

The expressions of  $R_i$  in Theorem 5 are listed below:

$$R_1 = 70125304508199817427241 k_2^4 + 2829746914856987864074 k_2^3 + 3361232488971186326 k_2^2 - 32526719864490606 k_2 + 98410095984901,$$

$$R_2 = 34129852019334120275001 k_2^6 + 18955466201762993305416 k_2^5 + 2079190417275568260115 k_2^4 + 11545127440608096320 k_2^3 - 3094243064633242585 k_2^2 - 15298201362610744 k_2 + 1392902183498461,$$

$$R_3 = 2547433055974362750136440827901 k_2^{10} + 2549462537607706690564021423110 k_2^9 - 11268940034759448427530866055 k_2^8 + 1771067395411006049507787720 k_2^7 + 28244030137459182635195610 k_2^6 - 460293255845386666548348 k_2^5 + 9100321029103822970810 k_2^4 + 297199449630260016520 k_2^3 + 3645502337110575145 k_2^2 + 33660749290927910 k_2 + 169273934903501,$$

$$R_4 = 530232127206073089345217425321878979119696099835597928551671071 k_2^{22} + 3097568644611971444018698881173599447265615683575058548497331842 k_2^{21} + 7631912584419224736955284085076914218830918666122263171845545206 k_2^{20} + 10243812154818022698633706855579005484350933865146851778358261390 k_2^{19} + 8031685712664902128506558699613174184490713998578705437363239640 k_2^{18} + 3608244453515524749277956778611111417229843502952863578657903764 k_2^{17} + 794764359535314512081976864785139140055413494553824640783948368 k_2^{16} + 20894102919957803979386118708497568327087562923158615870530244 k_2^{15} - 20077675696091265474887792731401874508822528862130335446054430 k_2^{14} - 2067712427622846475879664020713131922381294277091986666630480 k_2^{13} - 65182044845510285735335621012309574274177334661692302436484 k_2^{12} + 339635340361378887076606248053764520769182382620977531152 k_2^{11} + 61405280215488767442278117538451501738536091865851055396 k_2^{10} + 1006294203795016137037000243498516131331383390064323220 k_2^9 - 5868935702170245109981453893271152154490719243964880 k_2^8 - 249498164636329157855776482316565392957953809477476 k_2^7 - 441175185347076290754389665091550246937940606057 k_2^6 + 20236868784347726647226088401625126982040617134 k_2^5 + 34188215606113191165438934804508226389357790 k_2^4 - 827990633410769468615972272531952966688510 k_2^3 + 765121082185867033046840058962291876076 k_2^2 + 9150532230210533587885936821516051192 k_2 - 19157158958607356689340105603878224,$$

$$R_5 = 171111729271577451816916278294023637020390895326107388729132780846012918718939 k_2^{27} + 694058399451306261725309490847033737870051270843334752981725680436287342684503 k_2^{26} + 1178406123343676406775701066834141331856286513708627226487776933169942187601614 k_2^{25} + 1086184492602659587435877292825091909193535934090024046781151680622987684675950 k_2^{24}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 587600286465267683565422314814858949846965420943287191504340073072926730345075 k_2^{23} \\
& + 187696389921620346825367529671357600840225909847866759826485985846683732081095 k_2^{22} \\
& + 33823176214705151036374071791646083386183863063515016771850659515433885581640 k_2^{21} \\
& + 3168705954369816312044412433038541646244389993413871636586762301879685990920 k_2^{20} \\
& + 157719645153763614429585162767144417550947668046726238941183420945850858550 k_2^{19} \\
& + 3769263391289015682652935646237578780964143127713243504313067099864625550 k_2^{18} \\
& + 7781326543536335811696740024439763284918812524206846106330927985634740 k_2^{17} \\
& - 1598865380914933222287901070755314927309638217057705929494690264998220 k_2^{16} \\
& - 23611093059604333942073745159899456397702641168899437844647628990210 k_2^{15} \\
& + 288400340225816957967706406166422339125773748570149231817259494950 k_2^{14} \\
& + 8865162354955973036833080016831068975429805232497336344341656200 k_2^{13} \\
& + 8794551486034664260013873978797003612014468390045028510532040 k_2^{12} \\
& - 1185022490305343092089409689922446690952051454865289257511345 k_2^{11} \\
& - 5256101291995032544599277175058425930712185071813464946885 k_2^{10} \\
& + 70122573819275858453538672368351623032523271094492805550 k_2^9 \\
& + 376338742984691754801480051134092494791792064666753550 k_2^8 \\
& - 1316760022331698962634453099334594874797705155466705 k_2^7 \\
& - 5505495750662436547862196117124969486088681961485 k_2^6 \\
& + 12555177418738885902467941529691860825870238720 k_2^5 \\
& + 176520205866143202283905174900805862536243200 k_2^4 \\
& - 452038623179439358955980730065952248012800 k_2^3 \\
& - 7697216805222090220411113153159403585536 k_2^2 \\
& + 40208114346381897524553294486239920128 k_2 \\
& - 55345609604109527952398613254209536, \\
R_6 = & 81642460060267214759804220641838072236440477070626195418905470941083810292 \\
& 968891926695412098418661614396677 k_2^{38} + 8554635236181774812542851023404692010353 \\
& 26559787375208717798398612512610786885957329777463166218670134955276 k_2^{37} \\
& + 3983641059892053868666048940241816372115146946526079749133366450143983 \\
& 685297060685693336628187138977843033906 k_2^{36} + 10800832180677194445434 \\
& 724051260565272028480117454678208524352048697677786324047502700362425 \\
& 134606637901537722 k_2^{35} + 1861184424818983364552609410428706085020953133599176487624 \\
& 1082756250300325354610515100540322258263356151997505 k_2^{34} \\
& + 20433219326868882410780315108683964803514605147560796603099 \\
& 666960191437685382973750542489268548722637925121484 k_2^{33} \\
& + 123524551562823807446935732021017843529952711743119791073497 \\
& 91543296837005788395904967344802498607798633008012 k_2^{32} \\
& - 356101639163494904584678366530439864197827361569527075087357 \\
& 243781376483717571284745517388141968801812783988 k_2^{31}
\end{aligned}$$

– 855543478581650557041675445854581230608181181114250639100152  
 7367734013486422526195433784627330007312637521441  $k_2^{30}$   
 – 899222656124848590440998290217688465615415933561620143035182  
 6589832463923763737244565570616466046466833094970  $k_2^{29}$   
 – 5362253387151727844716297094276345745694747840673658995214942  
 893996067262880667596698680266828343090862736438  $k_2^{28}$   
 – 2084650284124464232269542587051075098782422361393046736570330  
 946837060600316911112345284280063910005147443474  $k_2^{27}$   
 – 5331186684717390027527068690154122600161764949994032388574100  
 35854388192435988534341897013194737657112671079  $k_2^{26}$   
 – 8453694258057299776118305307451377084831268341676793629271372  
 2116878332568965543856244123775004196411212808  $k_2^{25}$   
 – 6832224634463696713909292711018776602397712379428983203235633  
 498268994424148297257149070938223468138371800  $k_2^{24}$   
 – 1938698684014866374138286765755589817275141011508321565502230  
 6295942470918376178704099463133702974373880  $k_2^{23}$   
 + 3886404714525680478436476571495300346854580041596559106229896  
 1597227201888316054385408091911381863843985  $k_2^{22}$   
 + 2533430342443214931359132995183224473626578615631268777381320  
 014363643942113962722417855508768218263010  $k_2^{21}$   
 + 2484480242851330232419560223316541759307083508048277092384835  
 0211452828654708528020847014839342105970  $k_2^{20}$   
 – 3370307994157824138333596609165421189387369016903926676615333  
 127742776429068021038429191536970118650  $k_2^{19}$   
 – 1210646592339666898297814541413731201419562890540753143608669  
 28452459009344751647623530714108466405  $k_2^{18}$   
 + 6557212592303017019650067531434746769647057465109753392750866  
 81671233076399250667462463825361260  $k_2^{17}$   
 + 1033195891630950864197923771406472172773858002506365960972264  
 35022173723223610566637649700158860  $k_2^{16}$   
 + 1152618011724133911131881076353189139469520873389337311237604  
 192111173479008723495933626296620  $k_2^{15}$   
 – 3296723261054974680220771950938953745369576124275012552208643  
 8769811313475606078899676568675  $k_2^{14}$   
 – 7372432584851908452930560658218590879869355542842571780616650  
 35527027726071680214565012358  $k_2^{13}$  + 29427693514925808523437035512  
 81367259799855177020979617678647821431517603375098235588246  $k_2^{12}$   
 + 1652780329250025351870433200157445055533587654470086460801313  
 55093078973901132224565826  $k_2^{11}$  + 18320840656707481535820667046029  
 1251465034441890044122232924617989283481554825270987  $k_2^{10}$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - 1892889107498379215759699674801737136844658974642339207583950 \\
& 3842752551576918808720 k_2^9 - 2944866600091607446117968503796855809 \\
& 3063224064235059464395246348212593734580416 k_2^8 + 1320191920665524 \\
& 107087294583146812989293475967326750339296236044198729718390912 k_2^7 \\
& - 3068662117758780868064943909747958466085273140693944425723674 \\
& 92524770613138 k_2^6 - 507716429982515482349455037867512887213746622 \\
& 11413983115410601506547565166 k_2^5 + 140218391155856183217676031924 \\
& 298597312950491398447790358188744468264380 k_2^4 + 56431135009290372 \\
& 6722954096659542967326729422312749562519733968190672 k_2^3 - 32453573 \\
& 45340865168544329892341383787825462690287868803341183598144 k_2^2 \\
& + 4672541551069989116041573841580968722813107076376215392621660576 k_2 \\
& - 1145363252306785173851064975145467934264549208846368468611648, \\
R_7 = & 34129852019334120275001 k_2^6 + 18955466201762993305416 k_2^5 \\
& + 2079190417275568260115 k_2^4 + 11545127440608096320 k_2^3 \\
& - 3094243064633242585 k_2^2 - 15298201362610744 k_2 + 1392902183498461, \\
R_8 = & 74878248801 k_2^4 + 75073646804 k_2^3 - 325811394 k_2^2 - 35967996 k_2 + 491401, \\
R_9 = & 34129852019334120275001 k_2^6 + 18955466201762993305416 k_2^5 \\
& + 2079190417275568260115 k_2^4 + 11545127440608096320 k_2^3 \\
& - 3094243064633242585 k_2^2 - 15298201362610744 k_2 + 1392902183498461, \\
R_{10} = & 514959115623141851336003033444651672162268192381 k_2^{13} \\
& + 117109671411481100316406909482175799959340582595 k_2^{12} \\
& - 18340125718418870324370612366298647132416682954 k_2^{11} \\
& + 366527529613459370771331193768602701751101450 k_2^{10} \\
& - 379955788713767745549920982715959250364501965 k_2^9 \\
& + 21889673872367143957751295631807636649008877 k_2^8 \\
& + 341871929691167075836381668283836930880020 k_2^7 \\
& - 51724631573689868994658484974779627274708 k_2^6 \\
& + 1173833924252340563250903096402567527075 k_2^5 \\
& + 5250100448198199403687806473352176285 k_2^4 \\
& - 648976539257362445568036079320186954 k_2^3 \\
& + 11661228914135151280020506988360650 k_2^2 \\
& - 92712858325208352861180603850579 k_2 \\
& + 289072187996578736260607421875. \\
R_{11} = & 1078794467013971763259359619128104601 k_2^6 + 4190789390543288 \\
& 52718339349023527216 k_2^5 + 33396015289931023560113178292575115 k_2^4 \\
& + 51109179326295655736130695620320 k_2^3 + 2612847963967947253253 \\
& 6013415 k_2^2 + 5418875034949417696457856 k_2 + 533709272401908912261, \\
R_{12} = & 47192996838389807416746580659 k_2^4 - 20966587660735653205580364 k_2^3 \\
& - 658192566458176776046 k_2^2 + 563983250276411636 k_2 - 400954223341,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{13} &= 1078794467013971763259359619128104601 k_2^6 + 41907893905432 \\
&\quad 8852718339349023527216 k_2^5 + 33396015289931023560113178292575115 k_2^4 \\
&\quad + 51109179326295655736130695620320 k_2^3 + 261284796396794725325360 \\
&\quad 13415 k_2^2 + 5418875034949417696457856 k_2 + 533709272401908912261, \\
R_{14} &= 648918481217371346882003704556042428115795163 k_2^7 - 120695 \\
&\quad 20134716704004714952557737875934559559 k_2^6 + 4418216183863088669 \\
&\quad 646708188024293824411 k_2^5 - 225642379665655687012727484781439055 k_2^4 \\
&\quad - 94217435382044199079650160444215 k_2^3 + 123328823049113171017254 \\
&\quad 37603 k_2^2 - 202932195376509203593919 k_2 + 2141281744336142451, \\
R_{15} &= 14056083607991138241973991322676251462172878957848237991 \\
&\quad 3553898385129889746029544845326003185723 k_2^{16} + 2487625815782812 \\
&\quad 35354806794696673165631650960435230785210418714255826514104406 \\
&\quad 22889919214839006 k_2^{15} - 155897796352570630306233247711593095023 \\
&\quad 6049804018682712620839206639305264934164189345916714152 k_2^{14} + \\
&\quad 33048677661362277534579674865020142536299750624126833610998614 \\
&\quad 687308501888978076461728818466 k_2^{13} - 3048362047040274113781939 \\
&\quad 99924518110797455949109123936691399056447996404599640181367954 \\
&\quad 976 k_2^{12} + 1066718616203081609059336541064799313529528292309053 \\
&\quad 117793766851288330417409309962131390 k_2^{11} - 32299540207717384207897 \\
&\quad 6177113703107750469071212584166178363676248683954792172388064 k_2^{10} \\
&\quad - 4571663446818831633613643989738970986766239848463453468645 \\
&\quad 90653471179878132193934 k_2^9 + 927944105023302105425959038081905 \\
&\quad 53340860402362044666722444639156785683061142 k_2^8 + 301760908371 \\
&\quad 49661510853942896789833165111854613937461288783334854353093578 k_2^7 \\
&\quad - 1211204553937845261047331963454850242156244631992369887070 \\
&\quad 486269112584 k_2^6 - 157293712612208298921791399071661576835299 \\
&\quad 6009193827408523506011306 k_2^5 - 10549702522586887516038904142 \\
&\quad 925745391047495992912539169946232 k_2^4 + 274332540684284987959 \\
&\quad 35202777461547303123585416897513398426 k_2^3 + 1460770671064342 \\
&\quad 8657527700471030908560741272471074704 k_2^2 - 1510216620258154 \\
&\quad 60184527833765062030321382907626 k_2 + 68022059837701619029533623932680489962439, \\
R_{16} &= 46443086472084477153537655823845850437972818518257003503456 \\
&\quad 394063472690608258502194893271995676780497161204331247203 k_2^{19} \\
&\quad - 52158170657966182914162844526727943938490389931550890626039 \\
&\quad 6478645497829435537399388053538565860982068438876535183 k_2^{18} \\
&\quad + 3201257950756916754465804315535444189774519741953603309022 \\
&\quad 201006215501288979507505209223781587857597403874816759 k_2^{17} \\
&\quad - 1927995411081746058973956781918474223027984128328479003815 \\
&\quad 127959362776009883822706578699596916599521844783923 k_2^{16} \\
&\quad - 2268356906763940471268547817632435582187593709272285523121
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& 16167860486647589829033930636118167091647211276 k_2^{15} \\
& + 53584393800503414261090476532734443550844345600599565076920 \\
& 6857989232214394382033462855395684493550124 k_2^{14} \\
& - 19443976348590594703350908603230305113809875060581048140581 \\
& 6912862013245444213168220275974741047724 k_2^{13} \\
& + 28992180967930349314441595446461339819791158773334326427838 \\
& 411845390402370921204656323963954252 k_2^{12} - 28394928847 \\
& 94291756669617736291488403000782829994786262524426867742351 \\
& 17861143059182535614 k_2^{11} - 5773592163286104238291604956032 \\
& 91354259491139120371012380026364185450663400998521016538 k_2^{10} \\
& + 9947593079915175208553037303126970657054478671877805850024376 \\
& 7986765129498109929514 k_2^9 - 8535714135086335438265639803987 \\
& 202183206550314600701159128643417292433587490274 k_2^8 + 418329857 \\
& 38467958747560692134980030626881692592356322830329320 \\
& 5262311495252 k_2^7 - 1261829187607242551912965107896606397635 \\
& 3591963391247363619554648675284 k_2^6 + 1908800964866068184886 \\
& 43179802191139907804565129923180626416053652 k_2^5 - 176042942 \\
& 0526840061516849181898454180692596708492743946208532 k_2^4 \\
& + 3261775682688532894456623956405746916790234221598965267 k_2^3 \\
& - 4220059061286457391465143087604107072714470954991 k_2^2 \\
& - 82934020944978298855798955351132208803593 k_2 \\
& + 301375413724781100070065356301069789.
\end{aligned}$$

## C The Lorenz–Stenflo System

In 1996, Stenflo [43] derived a system to describe the evolution of finite amplitude acoustic gravity waves in a rotating atmosphere. This system is rather simple and reduces to the well-known Lorenz system [34] when the parameter associated with the flow rotation is set to zero. The Lorenz–Stenflo (L–S) system is described by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{x} &= a(y - x) + dw, \\
\dot{y} &= cx - y - xz, \\
\dot{z} &= -bz + xy, \\
\dot{w} &= -x - aw,
\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

where  $a, b, c, d$  are real parameters;  $a, c, d$  are the Prandtl, the Rayleigh, and the rotation numbers respectively, and  $b$  is a geometric parameter.

Here we provide some explicit conditions for system (C.1) to have Jacobi stable fixed points by using the **Jacobi Test II**. The main result is stated as follows.

**Theorem 6.** *The L–S system (C.1) has two Jacobi stable fixed points if one of the following three conditions*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_1 &= [c = 26, d = 3/2] \wedge [b < 0, a < 0, 0 < T_1, 0 < T_2], \\
\mathcal{C}_2 &= [c = 26, d = 3/2] \wedge [0 < b, a < 0, 0 < T_1, T_2 < 0], \\
\mathcal{C}_3 &= [b = 7/10, d = 3/2] \wedge [a < 0, 0 < T_3, 0 < T_4]
\end{aligned}$$

*holds.*



Theorem 6 can be proved by using similar calculations and arguments to the proof of Theorem 4. The detailed proof is omitted here. The explicit expressions of  $T_i$  are the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 = & 64a^{15} + 128a^{13}b^2 + 64a^{11}b^4 + 192a^{14} - 8000a^{13}b - 1344a^{12}b^2 - 8000a^{11}b^3 \\
& - 1536a^{10}b^4 + 608a^{13} - 16000a^{12}b + 178848a^{11}b^2 + 73600a^{10}b^3 + 21824a^9b^4 \\
& + 1088a^{12} - 12320a^{11}b + 198176a^{10}b^2 - 1097920a^9b^3 - 6720a^8b^4 + 1760a^{11} \\
& - 59840a^{10}b + 21296a^9b^2 + 201984a^8b^3 + 32448a^7b^4 + 2352a^{10} + 768a^9b \\
& + 585312a^8b^2 + 69504a^7b^3 - 9504a^6b^4 + 1776a^9 - 53952a^8b - 394512a^7b^2 \\
& + 110016a^6b^3 - 432a^5b^4 + 2736a^8 - 39600a^7b + 399888a^6b^2 + 15984a^5b^3 \\
& - 3888a^4b^4 - 684a^7 + 25056a^6b - 34992a^5b^2 - 39744a^4b^3 - 324a^3b^4 + 2916a^6 \\
& - 86724a^5b - 41796a^4b^2 - 972a^3b^3 + 648a^2b^4 - 3618a^5 + 36504a^4b + 3402a^3b^2 \\
& + 1944a^2b^3 + 3564a^4 - 35154a^3b - 486a^2b^2 - 4212a^3 - 2268a^2b \\
& + 1215ab^2 + 2673a^2 + 2430ab - 1944a + 729,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 = & 1024a^{25}b + 2048a^{23}b^3 + 1024a^{21}b^5 - 102400a^{25} - 46080a^{24}b - 332800a^{23}b^2 \\
& - 119808a^{22}b^3 - 230400a^{21}b^4 - 73728a^{20}b^5 - 409600a^{24} + 10800640a^{23}b + 7833600a^{22}b^2 \\
& + 18090496a^{21}b^3 + 9676800a^{20}b^4 + 3507200a^{19}b^5 - 1734656a^{23} + 37417984a^{22}b \\
& - 424120832a^{21}b^2 - 312825344a^{20}b^3 - 386302976a^{19}b^4 - 95136768a^{18}b^5 \\
& - 4225024a^{22} + 100739072a^{21}b - 1135625216a^{20}b^2 + 7420781312a^{19}b^3 \\
& + 4588603392a^{18}b^4 + 1110275584a^{17}b^5 - 9981952a^{21} + 224365824a^{20}b \\
& - 1114916352a^{19}b^2 + 10749888512a^{18}b^3 - 55741947392a^{17}b^4 - 421719552a^{16}b^5 \\
& - 17460224a^{20} + 308750848a^{19}b - 4281228288a^{18}b^2 - 2329730048a^{17}b^3 \\
& + 12866933760a^{16}b^4 + 2085397248a^{15}b^5 - 27503616a^{19} + 573111552a^{18}b \\
& - 1304512512a^{17}b^2 + 34330615296a^{16}b^3 - 18127017216a^{15}b^4 - 631109376a^{14}b^5 \\
& - 37567488a^{18} + 307343232a^{17}b - 4333292544a^{16}b^2 - 26064317184a^{15}b^3 \\
& + 8521984512a^{14}b^4 + 829949184a^{13}b^5 - 37366272a^{17} + 899697024a^{16}b \\
& - 2002513536a^{15}b^2 + 27555901056a^{14}b^3 - 7730560512a^{13}b^4 - 343115136a^{12}b^5 \\
& - 46872576a^{16} - 213326784a^{15}b - 489215232a^{14}b^2 - 9876429504a^{13}b^3 \\
& - 95095296a^{12}b^4 + 154484928a^{11}b^5 - 12517632a^{15} + 963038592a^{14}b - 944495424a^{13}b^2 \\
& + 2960556480a^{12}b^3 + 6986295360a^{11}b^4 - 45748800a^{10}b^5 - 42667776a^{14} \\
& - 531171648a^{13}b - 793224576a^{12}b^2 + 314807904a^{11}b^3 + 301242240a^{10}b^4 \\
& - 190022112a^9b^5 + 41326848a^{13} + 426272544a^{12}b + 1781828928a^{11}b^2 \\
& + 137505600a^{10}b^3 - 559563552a^9b^4 + 2807136a^8b^5 - 50917248a^{12} \\
& + 21117024a^{11}b - 1688884992a^{10}b^2 + 2420528832a^9b^3 - 815033664a^8b^4 \\
& + 5252688a^7b^5 + 86220288a^{11} - 414950688a^{10}b + 760757184a^9b^2 \\
& - 1845485856a^8b^3 - 195352560a^7b^4 + 21216816a^6b^5 - 74929536a^{10} \\
& + 479471076a^9b - 53887680a^8b^2 - 353537784a^7b^3 + 228217824a^6b^4 \\
& + 4137804a^5b^5 + 94700016a^9 - 537666660a^8b - 252085284a^7b^2 \\
& + 315240012a^6b^3 + 31589028a^5b^4 - 4181544a^4b^5 - 78708672a^8 \\
& + 193912542a^7b - 195062904a^6b^2 + 20483442a^5b^3 - 21327624a^4b^4 \\
& - 314928a^3b^5 + 64857672a^7 - 120451212a^6b + 150889878a^5b^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - 8752374 a^4 b^3 - 1154736 a^3 b^4 + 209952 a^2 b^5 - 47046744 a^6 - 32866236 a^5 b \\
& + 44203644 a^4 b^2 - 5045409 a^3 b^3 + 629856 a^2 b^4 + 23304672 a^5 + 16697745 a^4 b \\
& - 21454470 a^3 b^2 - 551124 a^2 b^3 - 11311164 a^4 + 9789012 a^3 b - 1915812 a^2 b^2 \\
& + 393660 a b^3 + 2283228 a^3 - 2696571 a^2 b + 787320 a b^2 + 866052 a^2 \\
& - 866052 a b - 236196 a + 236196 b. \\
T_3 = & 160000 a^{15} + 480000 a^{14} - 560000 a^{13} c + 2236800 a^{13} - 1198400 a^{12} c \\
& + 352800 a^{11} c^2 + 4232000 a^{12} - 1954400 a^{11} c + 501760 a^{10} c^2 - 54880 a^9 c^3 \\
& + 7428816 a^{11} - 5674256 a^{10} c + 172088 a^9 c^2 + 14456512 a^{10} - 2222640 a^9 c \\
& + 1505280 a^8 c^2 + 9533088 a^9 - 9355752 a^8 c - 623868 a^7 c^2 + 24279072 a^8 \\
& - 2295720 a^7 c + 1128960 a^6 c^2 + 6212880 a^7 - 5944428 a^6 c - 132300 a^5 c^2 \\
& + 21012912 a^6 - 4093740 a^5 c + 5641812 a^5 - 949914 a^4 c + 9875412 a^4 \\
& - 2835000 a^3 c + 4799979 a^3 + 4174092 a^2 + 880875 a + 1822500, \\
T_4 = & 102400000 a^{25} c - 120320000 a^{25} + 445440000 a^{24} c - 304640000 a^{23} c^2 \\
& - 535040000 a^{24} + 2584832000 a^{23} c - 1232896000 a^{22} c^2 + 338688000 a^{21} c^3 \\
& - 2854553600 a^{23} + 7597952000 a^{22} c - 4368268800 a^{21} c^2 + 1096345600 a^{20} c^3 \\
& - 162444800 a^{19} c^4 - 8232422400 a^{22} + 21222730240 a^{21} c - 10897295360 a^{20} c^2 \\
& + 1866045440 a^{19} c^3 - 328401920 a^{18} c^4 + 30732800 a^{17} c^5 - 23273663232 a^{21} \\
& + 45899996416 a^{20} c - 19264251776 a^{19} c^2 + 5598612992 a^{18} c^3 - 106028160 a^{17} c^4 \\
& - 49983813632 a^{20} + 83374773504 a^{19} c - 41432491520 a^{18} c^2 + 3739328768 a^{17} c^3 \\
& - 1082672640 a^{16} c^4 + 18439680 a^{15} c^5 - 96326281728 a^{19} + 149143164544 a^{18} c \\
& - 37381367744 a^{17} c^2 + 12369205632 a^{16} c^3 + 255323712 a^{15} c^4 - 167647532032 a^{18} \\
& + 173787017856 a^{17} c - 91354190592 a^{16} c^2 + 1789062912 a^{15} c^3 - 1157748480 a^{14} c^4 \\
& + 13829760 a^{13} c^5 - 227425725312 a^{17} + 312896469312 a^{16} c - 28797599040 a^{15} c^2 \\
& + 17772822144 a^{14} c^3 + 137606112 a^{13} c^4 - 362506999296 a^{16} + 180192326976 a^{15} c \\
& - 132395042304 a^{14} c^2 - 4868809344 a^{13} c^3 - 598631040 a^{12} c^4 - 304400165184 a^{15} \\
& + 467753832864 a^{14} c + 7232649984 a^{13} c^2 + 18692868096 a^{12} c^3 + 118688976 a^{11} c^4 \\
& - 561297799296 a^{14} + 42548531040 a^{13} c - 129109365504 a^{12} c^2 - 7775853120 a^{11} c^3 \\
& - 284497920 a^{10} c^4 - 182374282944 a^{13} + 504294917040 a^{12} c + 21884278248 a^{11} c^2 \\
& + 11333685888 a^{10} c^3 + 33339600 a^9 c^4 - 663683825664 a^{12} - 79178271120 a^{11} c \\
& - 75280562784 a^{10} c^2 - 2945887056 a^9 c^3 + 58961684592 a^{11} + 358509021624 a^{10} c \\
& + 1343542788 a^9 c^2 + 2332152648 a^8 c^3 - 595091251008 a^{10} - 46680515784 a^9 c \\
& - 16888045104 a^8 c^2 + 514382400 a^7 c^3 + 170623493928 a^9 + 136412319996 a^8 c \\
& - 11093173560 a^7 c^2 - 377823441168 a^8 + 23152074804 a^7 c + 1877169168 a^6 c^2 \\
& + 111499520652 a^7 + 15649706898 a^6 c - 4208444100 a^5 c^2 - 164481701004 a^6 \\
& + 21640434984 a^5 c - 459270000 a^4 c^2 + 43753552839 a^5 + 1566740556 a^4 c \\
& - 60554338344 a^4 + 2447253000 a^3 c + 22319203239 a^3 + 2755620000 a^2 c \\
& - 22575718656 a^2 + 8040505500 a - 4133430000.
\end{aligned}$$