

BISTABILITY OF SEQUESTRATION NETWORKS

XIAOXIAN TANG* AND JIE WANG†



Abstract. We solve a conjecture on multiple nondegenerate steady states, and prove bistability for sequestration networks. More specifically, we prove that for any odd number of species, and for any production factor, the fully open extension of a sequestration network admits three nondegenerate positive steady states, two of which are locally asymptotically stable. In addition, we provide a non-empty open set in the parameter space where a sequestration network admits bistability.

Key words. multistationarity, bistability, chemical reaction networks, mass-action kinetics, sequestration networks

AMS subject classifications. 92C40, 92C45

1. Introduction. Bistability is an important problem to determine for given dynamical systems arising under mass-action kinetics from biochemical reaction networks [4, 6, 10]. Biologically, bistability is crucial for understanding basic phenomena such as decision-making process in cellular signaling [2, 13, 30]. Mathematically, identifying parameter values/regions for which a system exhibits two (or more) stable steady states is a challenging problem in computational real algebraic geometry [19]. A necessary condition for bistability is multistationarity (the system has at least two distinct steady states). In practice, one way to experimentally observe bistability is finding multistationarity. In many lucky cases, a witness for multistationarity gives at least three distinct steady states, two of which are stable (see [6, 21]). Criteria for multistationarity have been widely studied, and many structured networks are well-understood (such as “smallest” networks with a few species or reactions [17], (linearly) binomial networks [9, 23, 24], conservative networks without boundary steady states [5] and MESSI networks [22]). However, given a general network, it is not always true that multistationarity guarantees bistability.

Here we use algebraic methods to study both multistationarity and bistability for a family of important networks arising from biology: the fully open extensions of sequestration networks (see [16], and variations in [3, 25]), i.e., sequestration networks with all inflow and outflow reactions:



We are the first to prove the following results.

- (I) For any production factor $m \geq 2$, and for any odd order $n \geq 3$, the fully open extension of sequestration network admits three nondegenerate steady states (Theorem 4.3).

*Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, College Station, 77840 TX (xiaoxian@math.tamu.edu, <https://sites.google.com/site/rootclassification/>).

†School of Mathematical Sciences, Peking University (wangjie@math.pku.edu.cn, <http://www.math.pku.edu.cn/teachers/wangjie/>).

- (II) For any production factor $m \geq 2$, and for any odd order $n \geq 3$, the fully open extension of sequestration network admits bistability (Theorem 4.6).
- (III) For any production factor $m \geq 2$, and for any odd order $n \geq 3$, we provide an open region in the parameter space where the fully open extension of sequestration network admits bistability (Theorem 4.7).


The fully open extensions of sequestration networks were first introduced in [16], which were motivated by biochemical networks studied in [3, 25]. Our main result (I) solves Conjecture 6.10 proposed in [16] (see [12, Conjecture 2.10]). There are many well-known criteria for multistationarity by applying positive parametrization (e.g., [18, 28]) and examining the sign change of determinant of the Jacobian matrix (e.g., [1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 19, 26, 29]). Under some assumptions, one of these results [5, Theorem 1] (or [9, Theorem 3.12]), proved by the Brouwer degree theory, guarantees an odd number of steady states when a network exhibits multistationarity. But in general there was no proof showing at least three of these steady states are nondegenerate. Here, we use a strong algebraic technique to construct three nondegenerate steady states for sequestration networks $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ (see Lemma 5.3, Lemma 5.6, and Theorem 4.3).

A standard algebraic tool for studying stability is the Routh-Hurwitz criterion (see [15]), or alternatively the Liénard-Chipart criterion (see [8]). Using these criteria, one examines the positivity of some gigantic determinants, which is computationally challenging (e.g., [21]). Here, we discover a nice structure of the Jacobian matrices of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ at two of those three nondegenerate steady states we constructed; specifically, they are similar to diagonally dominant matrices. So, we are able to use the Gershgorin circle theorem to conclude stability (see Lemma 5.11, Lemma 5.12, and Theorem 4.6). We remark that the Gershgorin circle theorem can be used to study stability for more general reaction networks (see Theorem 3.5). Also, we derive an open region in the parameter space for bistability, which is described by a set of positive solutions of finitely many polynomial inequalities in terms of rate constants (see Theorem 4.7). We provide a procedure for computing a witness based on these inequalities and the proofs of Theorem 4.6.

Finally, our work is related to the following open questions: If a network admits multiple positive steady states, does this guarantee that the network admits multiple nondegenerate positive steady states? (See Nondegeneracy Conjecture [17, 27].) If a network admits multiple nondegenerate positive steady states, under which condition does the network admit multiple stable positive steady states?

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce mass-action kinetics systems arising from reaction networks. In Section 3, we introduce an algebraic criterion for stability (Theorem 3.5), which is deduced by the classical Gershgorin circle theorem (Theorem 3.2). In Section 4, we recall a family of sequestration networks defined in [16], and present our main results (I–III) (Theorems 4.3, 4.6 and 4.7). In Section 5, we prove the main results in details. We end with a summary in Section 6.

2. Reaction networks. In this section, we briefly recall the standard notions and definitions on reaction networks, see [5, 9] for more details. A *reaction network* G (or *network* for short) consists of a set of s species $\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_s\}$ and a set of m reactions:



where all α_{ij} and β_{ij} are non-negative integers. We call the $s \times m$ matrix with (i, j) -entry equal to $\beta_{ij} - \alpha_{ij}$ the *stoichiometric matrix* of G , denoted by N . We call the image of N the *stoichiometric subspace*, denoted by S .

We denote by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s the concentrations of the species X_1, X_2, \dots, X_s , respectively. Under the assumption of *mass-action kinetics*, we describe how these concentrations change in time by following system of ODEs:

$$(2.1) \quad \dot{x} = f(x) := N \cdot \begin{pmatrix} r_1 x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} \dots x_s^{\alpha_{s1}} \\ r_2 x_1^{\alpha_{12}} x_2^{\alpha_{22}} \dots x_s^{\alpha_{s2}} \\ \vdots \\ r_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m}} x_2^{\alpha_{2m}} \dots x_s^{\alpha_{sm}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where x denotes the vector (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s) , and each $r_j \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is called a *reaction rate constant*. By considering the rate constants as a vector $r = (r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m)$, we have polynomials $f_i \in \mathbb{Q}[r, x]$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$.

A *positive steady state* (or, simply *steady state*)¹ of (2.1) is a concentration-vector $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$ at which $f(x)$ on the right-hand side of the ODEs (2.1) vanishes, i.e., $f(x^*) = 0$. We say a steady state x^* is *nondegenerate* if the image of $\text{Jac}(f)(x^*)|_S$ is equal to the stoichiometric subspace S , where $\text{Jac}(f)(x^*)$ denotes the Jacobian matrix of f , with respect to x , at x^* . Notice that when the stoichiometric matrix N is full rank, a steady state x^* is nondegenerate if $\text{Jac}(f)(x^*)$ is full rank. A steady state x^* is said to be *Liapunov stable* if for any $\epsilon > 0$ and for any $t_0 > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|x(t_0) - x^*\| < \delta$ implies $\|x(t) - x^*\| < \epsilon$ for any $t \geq t_0$. A steady state x^* is said to be *locally asymptotically stable* if it is Liapunov stable, and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|x(t_0) - x^*\| < \delta$ implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = x^*$. It is well-known that a steady state x^* is locally asymptotically stable if all eigenvalues of $\text{Jac}(f)(x^*)$ have negative real parts.

3. A criterion for stability.

DEFINITION 3.1. Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a matrix. For every $i = 1, \dots, n$, define the i -th row Gershgorin disc of A in the complex plane as the set

$$R_i := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|\}.$$

Similarly, define the i -th column Gershgorin disc of A in the complex plane as the set

$$C_i := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ji}|\}.$$

THEOREM 3.2. [14, Gershgorin circle theorem] The eigenvalues of a matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ lie in the union of row Gershgorin discs $\cup_i^n R_i$, and also lie in the union of column Gershgorin discs $\cup_i^n C_i$.

DEFINITION 3.3. Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a matrix. If for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, $|a_{ii}| \geq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$ (or, $|a_{ii}| \geq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ji}|$), then A is row diagonally dominant (or, column diagonally dominant).

¹Usually, a steady state is defined as a non-negative vector $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s$. In our setting, we do not consider boundary steady states (i.e., steady states with zero coordinates). So all steady states in our context are positive.

For a diagonally dominant matrix, we have a simple sufficient condition for its stability by virtue of the Gershgorin circle theorem.

LEMMA 3.4. *Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a (row or column) diagonally dominant matrix. If $a_{ii} < 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, then every nonzero eigenvalue of A has a negative real part.*

Proof. Let λ be a nonzero eigenvalue of A . Denote respectively the real and imaginary parts of λ by $Re(\lambda)$ and $Im(\lambda)$. Then $Re(\lambda) \neq 0$, or $Im(\lambda) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, assume A is row diagonally dominant. Note for any i , $a_{ii} < 0$. So if $Re(\lambda) \geq 0$, then for any i , we have

$$|\lambda - a_{ii}| = \sqrt{(Re(\lambda) - a_{ii})^2 + Im(\lambda)^2} > a_{ii} \geq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|,$$

which is a contradiction to Theorem 3.2. Hence, we must have $Re(\lambda) < 0$. \square

THEOREM 3.5. *If a matrix is similar to a (row or column) diagonally dominant matrix with negative diagonal entries, then all the nonzero eigenvalues have negative real parts.*

Proof. The conclusion directly follows from Lemma 3.4 and the fact that similar matrices have the same eigenvalues. \square

4. Sequestration networks and main results.

4.1. **Preliminary.** In this section, we recall sequestration networks $K_{m,n}$ [16, Definition 6.3] and their fully open extensions $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ [16, Definition 2.3].

DEFINITION 4.1. *For any integer $m \geq 1$, and for any integer $n \geq 2$, the sequestration network $K_{m,n}$ of order n with production factor m is defined to be the network (1.1). If we add into (1.1) all inflow reactions and outflow reactions (1.2), then we obtain the fully open extension of $K_{m,n}$, denoted by $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$.*

According to (2.1), the mass-action ODEs $\dot{x} = f(x)$ of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ are given by:

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{cases} f_1 = -r_1 x_1 x_2 - r_n x_1 - r_{n+1} x_1 + r_{2n+1}, \\ f_i = -r_{i-1} x_{i-1} x_i - r_i x_i x_{i+1} - r_{n+i} x_i + r_{2n+i}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ f_n = -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} x_n + m r_n x_1 - r_{2n} x_n + r_{3n}. \end{cases}$$

The Jacobian matrix of f with respect to x_1, \dots, x_n below is simply denoted by J :

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 - r_n - r_{n+1} & -r_1 x_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -r_1 x_2 & -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -r_2 x_3 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n - r_{2n-1} & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ m r_n & 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} - r_{2n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

DEFINITION 4.2. *The network $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is multistationary (respectively, bistable) if, for some choice of positive rate-constant vector $r \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{3n}$, there exist two or more positive steady states (respectively, locally asymptotically stable positive steady states) of (5.1).*

It is known that for any integers $m \geq 1$, and for any integers $n \geq 2$, $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is multistationary if and only if $m > 1$ and n is odd [16, Theorem 6.4]. There is a conjecture that **for any integers $m \geq 2$, and for odd integers $n \geq 3$, $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ admits multiple nondegenerate steady states** [16, Conjecture 6.10]. Notice that the stoichiometric matrix N of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is full rank (e.g., see [12, Formula (4)]), so the conjecture says for some rate-constant vector $r^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{3n}$, there exist at least two positive steady states $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$ such that $\det J|_{r=r^*, x=x^{(i)}} \neq 0, i = 1, 2$. For any integers $m \geq 2$, and for $n = 3$, the conjecture was resolved in [12, Theorem 4.5]. For $m = 2, 3, 4, 5$, and for $n = 5, 7, 9, 11$, the conjecture was proved in [12, Theorem 5.1].

4.2. Main results. Our main results are a proof of [16, Conjecture 6.10] (see Theorem 4.3) and a bistability result for sequestration networks (see Theorem 4.6). Also, we provide an open region in the parameter space where $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ admits bistability (see Theorem 4.7). The proofs of these results are given later in Section 5. A procedure for computing a witness for bistability is presented (see **Procedure Witness**). A concrete example of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ with two locally asymptotically stable steady states is given (see Example 4.9), which is not covered by [12, Theorem 4.5] or [12, Theorem 5.1]

THEOREM 4.3. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, if for any odd integer $n > 3$, the rate-constant vector $(r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ belongs to the open set determined by the following polynomial inequalities (4.3)–(4.8)*

$$(4.3) \quad (r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} \neq (m-1)r_1r_n,$$

$$(4.4) \quad r_{n-1} > mr_n,$$

$$(4.5) \quad (m-1)r_1 > r_{n+2},$$

$$(4.6) \quad (m-1)r_1(r_{i-1} + (-1)^i mr_n) > (-1)^i m(r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2}, \quad i = 3, \dots, n,$$

$$(4.7) \quad r_1 + r_{n+2} > r_{n-2},$$

$$(4.8) \quad r_i > r_{n-2}, \quad i = 3, 5, \dots, n-4,$$

or, if for $n = 3$, the rate-constant vector $(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4$ belongs to the open set determined by the polynomial inequalities (4.3)–(4.6), then there exist rate constants $r_{n+1}, r_{n+3}, \dots, r_{3n} > 0$ such that $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ has three nondegenerate steady states. Moreover, the above open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ is non-empty.

Remark 4.4. As mentioned before, for $n = 3$, the original conjecture ([16, Conjecture 6.10]) was already proved in [12, Theorem 4.5]. However, we still provide a self-contained proof in Section 5 because we need the construction of three nondegenerate steady states shown in our proof to demonstrate the bistability result (see Theorem 4.6).

Remark 4.5. If we replace the condition (4.3) listed in Theorem 4.3 with the inequality (4.9) below, then we can conclude that there are two stable steady states among the three nondegenerate steady states stated in Theorem 4.3, where one of the two stable steady states is $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ (see Theorem 4.6).

THEOREM 4.6 (Bistability). *For any integer $m \geq 2$, if for any odd integer $n > 3$, the rate-constant vector $(r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ belongs to the open set determined by the polynomial inequalities (4.4)–(4.8) and the following inequality*

$$(4.9) \quad (r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} > (m-1)r_1r_n,$$

or, if for $n = 3$, the rate-constant vector $(r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4$ belongs to the open set determined by the polynomial inequalities (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.9), then there exist rate

constants $r_{n+1}, r_{n+3}, \dots, r_{3n} > 0$ such that $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ has two locally asymptotically stable steady states, and one of these two steady states is $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$. Moreover, the above open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ is non-empty.

In Theorem 4.6, it is obvious that the set of positive solutions of the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9) for $n > 3$ (or, the inequalities (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.9) for $n = 3$) is an open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$. In order to make it more obvious to see the open set is non-empty, we provide Theorem 4.7, which explicitly describe the positive solutions of the inequalities stated in Theorem 4.6.

THEOREM 4.7. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for $n = 3$, the open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ determined by the inequalities by (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.9) in Theorem 4.6 is equivalent to the following set:*

$$(4.10) \quad (r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 : \begin{cases} r_5 < (m-1)r_1, \\ r_2 > mr_3. \end{cases}$$

For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n > 3$, the open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ determined by the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9) in Theorem 4.6 is equivalent to the following set:

$$(4.11) \quad (r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1} : \begin{cases} r_{n+2} < (m-1)r_1, \\ r_n < \frac{r_1 r_{n+2}}{(m-1)r_1 - r_{n+2}}, \\ r_{n-1} > mr_n, \\ \frac{m((r_1+r_n)r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n)}{(m-1)r_1} < r_{n-2} < r_1 + r_{n+2}, \\ r_i > r_{n-2}, \quad \text{for } i = 3, 5, \dots, n-4. \end{cases}$$

Remark 4.8. By the inequalities in (4.10) and (4.11), one can easily choose a rate-constant vector such that the conditions of Theorem 4.6 are satisfied. In fact, for any integer $m \geq 2$, if $n = 3$, then for any fixed $r_1, r_3 > 0$, there always exist $r_5, r_2 > 0$ such that the two inequalities in (4.10) are satisfied. If $n > 3$, notice that the inequalities in (4.11) have a “triangular” shape. More specifically, first, for any fixed $r_1 > 0$, one can always choose $r_{n+2} > 0$ such that the first inequality is satisfied. Second, for the chosen $r_1, r_{n+2} > 0$ in the first step, one can find $r_n > 0$ such that the second inequality is satisfied. Third, for the chosen $r_n > 0$ in the second step, one can find $r_{n-1} > 0$ such that the third inequality is satisfied. Similarly, we can find r_{n-2} and r_i for $i = 3, 5, \dots, n-4$ by the last two inequalities (notice that in the fourth inequality, there exists $r_{n-2} > 0$ between the two numbers $\frac{m((r_1+r_n)r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n)}{(m-1)r_1}$ and $r_1 + r_{n+2}$ because $\frac{m((r_1+r_n)r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n)}{(m-1)r_1} < r_1 + r_{n+2}$ is implied by the first inequality $r_{n+2} < (m-1)r_1$). Notice that r_2, r_4, \dots, r_{n-3} do not appear in the inequalities (4.11). We can choose any positive values for them. For instance, we give the following choices.

For $n = 3$, we can choose $r_1 = 2, r_2 = m+1, r_3 = 1$, and $r_5 = m-1$ such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.9) in Theorem 4.6 are satisfied.

For any odd integer $n > 3$, we can choose $r_1 = 2, r_2 = r_4 = \dots = r_{n-3} = 1, r_3 = r_5 = \dots = r_{n-4} = m+1, r_{n-2} = m, r_{n-1} = m+1, r_n = 1$, and $r_{n+2} = m-1$ such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9) in Theorem 4.6 are satisfied.

Based on Theorem 4.7 and the proofs of Theorems 4.3 and 4.6 (in Section 5), we provide a procedure (**Procedure Witness**) for computing a witness for bistability. Notice that Step 1 in the procedure below can be carried out according to Remark 4.8. We give a more concrete example later for $m = 6$ and $n = 5$; see Example 4.9.

Procedure Witness. Input. $m \geq 2$, and odd $n \geq 3$; Output. $r_1, \dots, r_{3n} > 0$ such that $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is bistable.

Step 1. For $n = 3$, find values for $r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5 > 0$ by (4.10) such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.9) are satisfied. For $n > 3$, find values for $r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} > 0$ by (4.11) such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9) are satisfied.

Step 2. Let $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon > 0$.

Step 3. Compute values for r_{2n+1}, \dots, r_{3n} by the equalities:

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{cases} r_{2n+1} &= r_1 + r_n + r_{n+1}, \\ r_{2n+i} &= r_{i-1} + r_i + r_{n+i}, \quad \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ r_{3n} &= r_{n-1} - mr_n + r_{2n}. \end{cases}$$

Step 4. Compute steady states of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ and check their stability (for instance, by **Mathematica**). If $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is bistable, then output r_1, \dots, r_{3n} . Otherwise, go back to Step 2, make ϵ smaller and repeat Steps 2–4 until $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is bistable.

EXAMPLE 4.9. We give a concrete example of $\tilde{K}_{6,5}$ with two locally asymptotically stable steady states. Let $r_1 = 2$, $r_2 = r_5 = 1$, $r_3 = 6$, $r_4 = 7$, $r_7 = 5$, $r_6 = r_8 = r_9 = r_{10} = 0.006$, $r_{11} = 3.006$, $r_{12} = 8$, $r_{13} = 7.006$, $r_{14} = 13.006$, and $r_{15} = 1.006$. Here, the values of rate constants r_1, \dots, r_5 and r_7 are chosen by the method described in Remark 4.8, which satisfy the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9). By the proof of Theorem 4.6 (see Section 5.2), the values for r_6, r_8, r_9 and r_{10} are chosen to be the same small number 0.006. After we choose these values for r_1, \dots, r_{10} , the values of r_{11}, \dots, r_{15} are computed by the equalities (4.12). The specialized system f in (4.1) is given by

$$\begin{cases} f_1 &= -2x_1x_2 - 1.006x_1 + 3.006, \\ f_2 &= -2x_1x_2 - x_2x_3 - 5x_2 + 8, \\ f_3 &= -x_2x_3 - 6x_3x_4 - 0.006x_3 + 7.006, \\ f_4 &= -6x_3x_4 - 7x_4x_5 - 0.006x_4 + 13.006, \\ f_5 &= -7x_4x_5 + 6x_1 - 0.006x_n + 1.006. \end{cases}$$

It can be verified by **Maple** [20] that the above system $f = 0$ has three positive solutions:

$$\hat{x}^{(1)} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1), \quad \hat{x}^{(2)} \approx (1.69795, 0.382186, 12.5363, 0.028445, 54.5727)$$

and $\hat{x}^{(3)} \approx (1.92826, 0.276459, 20.0808, 0.0110718, 150.601)$, where $\hat{x}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ are locally asymptotically stable. Indeed, the Jacobian matrix at $\hat{x}^{(1)}$ has five negative eigenvalues, which are approximately

$$-19.7034, -9.28405, -6.17915, -2.78462, -0.07275,$$

and the Jacobian matrix at $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ has five negative eigenvalues, which are approximately

$$-1174.78, -29.2068, -1.49192, -0.151575, -0.00198971.$$

Remark 4.10. In Theorem 4.6, if we replace the inequality (4.9) with its opposite

$$(4.13) \quad (r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} < (m-1)r_1r_n,$$

one can still prove (in a similar way with the proof of Theorem 4.6) that $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ admits two locally asymptotically stable steady states, and one of the two stable steady states

is close to $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n)$ given in (5.3) (Section 5). For instance, for any integer $m \geq 2$, when $n = 3$, we can choose $r_1 = 3, r_2 = 3m, r_3 = 2, r_5 = m - 1$ such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.6) and (4.13) are satisfied, and when $n > 3$ is odd, we can choose $r_1 = 3, r_2 = r_4 = \dots = r_{n-3} = m, r_3 = r_5 = \dots = r_{n-4} = m + 1, r_{n-2} = m, r_{n-1} = 3m, r_n = 2, r_{n+2} = m - 1$ such that the inequalities (4.4)–(4.8) and (4.13) are satisfied. We give another example to illustrate this case; see Example 4.11.

EXAMPLE 4.11. *Again, we consider the network $\tilde{K}_{6,5}$. Let $r_1 = 3, r_2 = r_3 = 6, r_4 = 18, r_5 = 2, r_7 = 5, r_6 = r_8 = r_9 = r_{10} = 0.06, r_{11} = 5.06, r_{12} = 14, r_{13} = 12.06, r_{14} = 24.06, \text{ and } r_{15} = 6.06$. This time, these rate constants satisfy the inequalities (4.4)–(4.8) and (4.13). It can be verified by **Maple** that there are three positive steady states:*

$$\hat{x}^{(1)} = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1), \quad \hat{x}^{(2)} \approx (0.932124, 1.12282, 0.778704, 1.44839, 0.659961)$$

and $\hat{x}^{(3)} \approx (1.68739, 0.312906, 5.77995, 0.0248477, 51.8643)$, where $\hat{x}^{(2)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ are locally asymptotically stable. Indeed, the Jacobian matrix at $\hat{x}^{(2)}$ has five negative eigenvalues, which are approximately

$$-40.2232, -20.8642, -7.79735, -7.20777, -0.0343658,$$

and the Jacobian matrix at $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ has five negative eigenvalues, which are approximately

$$-968.734, -46.3232, -2.9517, -0.5785, -0.0443525.$$

Remark 4.12. Numerical experiments show that if the conditions of Theorem 4.3 are not satisfied, then it is possible for $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ to admit either one or three nondegenerate steady states. We have never seen more than three nondegenerate steady states. We always observe bistability whenever three nondegenerate steady states are found. So, we propose Conjecture 4.13 below.

CONJECTURE 4.13. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any integer $n \geq 3$, the maximum number of nondegenerate steady states of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is three, and the network $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ is multistationary if and only if it is bistable.*

5. Proofs of main results. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 4.3, Theorem 4.6 and Theorem 4.7. Our first step is to apply the specializations of parameters (4.12)² to the network. Substituting (4.12) into the system f (4.1), the system can be rewritten as

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{cases} f_1 = -r_1 x_1 x_2 - r_n x_1 - r_{n+1} x_1 + r_1 + r_n + r_{n+1}, \\ f_i = -r_{i-1} x_{i-1} x_i - r_i x_i x_{i+1} - r_{n+i} x_i + r_{i-1} + r_i + r_{n+i}, \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq n-1, \\ f_n = -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} x_n + m r_n x_1 - r_{2n} x_n + r_{n-1} - m r_n + r_{2n}. \end{cases}$$

Note that by the equalities (4.12), $x^{(1)} := (1, \dots, 1)$ is always a positive solution to the system (5.1). Note also that this substitution does not change the Jacobian matrix of f with respect to x since r_{2n+1}, \dots, r_{3n} are constant terms in (4.1).

Under the equalities (4.12), we only need to find rate constants $r_1, \dots, r_{2n} > 0$ such that the system $f = 0$ in (5.1) has three distinct simple positive solutions. Then by (4.12), we can find positive values for rate constants r_{2n+1}, \dots, r_{3n} . Remark that

²These specializations are inspired by the proof of [12, Theorem 4.5].

in order to ensure $r_{3n} > 0$, we need to require $r_{n-1} + r_{2n} - mr_n > 0$. Here, we require a stronger condition

$$r_{n-1} > mr_n \quad (\text{i.e., the inequality (4.4) in Theorem 4.3}).$$

In fact, if we have $r_{n-1} > mr_n$, then for any $r_{2n} > 0$, we can make it sure $r_{3n} > 0$. We make this stronger requirement on r_{n-1} and r_n because we need more flexibility on r_{2n} later when we prove Theorem 4.3.

5.1. Nondegenerate multistationarity. In this subsection, we prove Theorem 4.3. We give an outline of the proof below.

First, we consider a simpler network. For $i \neq 2$, we remove the inflow reactions $X_i \rightarrow 0$ from $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ and obtain a subnetwork. Notice that for the subnetwork, we have $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = 0$ in f (5.1) on the right-hand side of mass-action ODEs. We show in Lemma 5.3 that for this special choice of rate constants, the system $f = 0$ has two nondegenerate positive solutions under conditions (4.3) and (4.5)–(4.6). In order to prove Lemma 5.3, we need two results from linear algebra; see Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

Second, for $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = 0$, besides two solutions $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$ shown in Lemma 5.3, the system $f = 0$ (5.1) has a ‘‘special’’ solution $x^{(3)}$ with its last coordinate $x_n = +\infty$. We make this third solution ‘‘visible’’ by applying a variable substitution to the system f (see (5.5)–(5.6)). Equivalently, we show the resulting system g in (5.6) has a nondegenerate positive solution (under the condition (4.5) for $n = 3$, or the conditions (4.6)–(4.8) for $n > 3$), which gives the third solution $x^{(3)}$ to the original system $f = 0$; see Lemma 5.4 for $n = 3$ and Lemma 5.6 for $n > 3$.

Finally, we set $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon$. By the previous steps and the implicit function theorem, we show that $f = 0$ has three nondegenerate positive solutions if ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number; see Lemma 5.8 and the proof of Theorem 4.3.

LEMMA 5.1. *For any $n \geq 3$, the determinant of the tridiagonal matrix*

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 + b_1 & a_2 & & & & & & \\ b_1 & a_2 + b_2 & a_3 & & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & b_{n-2} & a_{n-1} + b_{n-1} & a_n & & \\ & & & & b_{n-1} & a_n & & \end{bmatrix}$$

is equal to $a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$.

Proof. We transform the matrix into an upper triangular matrix by applying the Gaussian elimination starting from the last row to the first row:

$$\begin{bmatrix} a_1 + b_1 & a_2 & & & & & & \\ b_1 & a_2 + b_2 & a_3 & & & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & & \\ & & & b_{n-2} & a_{n-1} + b_{n-1} & a_n & & \\ & & & & b_{n-1} & a_n & & \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a_1 + b_1 & a_2 & & & & \\ b_1 & a_2 + b_2 & a_3 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \\ & & & b_{n-2} & a_{n-1} & 0 \\ & & & & b_{n-1} & a_n \end{bmatrix} \\ &\rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & 0 & & & & \\ b_1 & a_2 & 0 & & & \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & b_{n-2} & a_{n-1} & 0 & \\ & & & b_{n-1} & a_n & \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the determinant is $a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$. \square

LEMMA 5.2. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n \geq 3$, if*

$$(5.2) \quad r_{n+1} = 0 \text{ and } r_{n+i} = 0, \text{ for } 3 \leq i \leq n,$$

then the determinant of J in (4.2) is

$$r_2 \cdots r_{n-1} x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} ((m-1)r_1 r_n x_1 - (r_n + r_1 x_2) r_{n+2}).$$

Proof. We expand $\det J|_{r_{n+1}=0 \text{ and } r_{n+i}=0, 3 \leq i \leq n}$ with respect to the first row and obtain $\det J = -(r_1 x_2 + r_n) \det J_1 + r_1 x_1 \det J_2$, where

$$J_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ & -r_2 x_3 & \ddots & \vdots \\ & 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$J_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 & -r_2 x_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -r_2 x_2 - r_3 x_4 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & -r_3 x_4 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ m r_n & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, $\det J_1 = r_2 x_2 \cdots r_{n-1} x_{n-1} (r_1 x_1 + r_{n+2})$. Again, we expand $\det J_2$ with respect to the first column: $\det J_2 = -r_1 x_2 \det J_3 - m r_n \det J_4$, where

$$J_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -r_2 x_2 - r_3 x_4 & -r_3 x_3 & \cdots & 0 \\ -r_3 x_4 & -r_3 x_3 - r_4 x_5 & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$J_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -r_2x_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -r_2x_2 - r_3x_4 & -r_3x_3 & \ddots & \vdots \\ -r_3x_4 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2}x_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-2}x_{n-2} - r_{n-1}x_n & -r_{n-1}x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, $\det J_3 = -r_2x_2 \cdots r_{n-1}x_{n-1}$. Clearly, $\det J_4 = -r_2x_2 \cdots r_{n-1}x_{n-1}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \det J &= -(r_1x_2 + r_n)r_2x_2 \cdots r_{n-1}x_{n-1}(r_1x_1 + r_{n+2}) \\ &\quad + r_1x_1(r_1x_2 + mr_n)r_2x_2 \cdots r_{n-1}x_{n-1} \\ &= r_2 \cdots r_{n-1}x_2 \cdots x_{n-1}((m-1)r_1r_nx_1 - (r_n + r_1x_2)r_{n+2}). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 5.3. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n \geq 3$, if the rate constants $r_{n+1}, r_{n+3}, \dots, r_{2n}$ satisfy the condition (5.2), and if the positive rate constants r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} satisfy the inequalities (4.3) and (4.5)–(4.6), then the system f in (5.1) has two distinct positive solutions*

$$(5.3) \quad x^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad x^{(2)} = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n),$$

where

$$\delta_1 := \frac{(r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2}}{(m-1)r_1r_n}, \quad \delta_2 := \frac{((m-1)r_1 - r_{n+2})r_n}{r_1r_{n+2}},$$

and

$$\delta_i := \frac{(m-1)r_1(r_{i-1} + (-1)^i mr_n) + (-1)^{i-1}m(r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2}}{(m-1)r_1r_{i-1}\delta_{i-1}}, \quad i = 3, \dots, n,$$

and the Jacobian matrix J in (4.2) has full rank at both solutions.

Proof. First, it is straightforward to check that if the rate constants satisfy condition (4.12), then $x^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ is a positive solution to $f(x) = 0$ for f in (5.1).

Below, we show how to obtain the other solution $x^{(2)}$ to $f(x) = 0$. Note that under the condition (5.2), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} f_j = (m-1)r_nx_1 + r_{n+2}x_2 - (m-1)r_n - r_{n+2}.$$

We solve for x_2 from $\sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^{j-1} f_j = 0$, substitute the expression into $f_1 = 0$, and obtain a quadratic equation in terms of only x_1 :

$$(m-1)r_1r_nx_1^2 - ((m-1)r_1r_n + (r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2})x_1 + (r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} = 0,$$

which indeed has two solutions: $x_1^{(1)} = 1$ and $x_1^{(2)} = \delta_1$. We substitute $x_1^{(2)} = \delta_1$ into $f_1 = 0$ and solve that $x_2^{(2)} = \delta_2$. Note that for $3 \leq i \leq n$, under the condition (5.2), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} f_j = (-1)^{i-1}r_{i-1}x_{i-1}x_i + (-1)^i r_{i-1} - r_n(x_1 - 1) + r_{n+2}(x_2 - 1).$$

So, we can substitute $x_1^{(2)} = \delta_1$ and $x_2^{(2)} = \delta_2$ into $\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^{j-1} f_j = 0$ and solve $x_i^{(2)} = \delta_i$ for $i = 3, \dots, n$. Hence $x^{(2)} = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n)$ is also a solution to $f(x) = 0$ under the condition (5.2). If the rate constants satisfy conditions (4.5)–(4.6), then $x^{(2)}$ is clearly positive. Obviously, under the condition (4.3), we have $1 \neq \delta_1$, and hence $x^{(1)} \neq x^{(2)}$.

Below, we show that if the inequality (4.3) is satisfied, then at both solutions $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$, the Jacobian matrix J has nonzero determinants. In fact, by Lemma 5.2,

$$\det J = r_2 \cdots r_{n-1} x_2 \cdots x_{n-1} ((m-1)r_1 r_n x_1 - (r_n + r_1 x_2) r_{n+2}).$$

Therefore,

$$\det J|_{x=x^{(1)}} = r_2 \cdots r_{n-1} ((m-1)r_1 r_n - (r_1 + r_n) r_{n+2})$$

and

$$\det J|_{x=x^{(2)}} = r_2 \cdots r_{n-1} \delta_2 \cdots \delta_{n-1} ((r_1 + r_n) r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n),$$

which are nonzero if (4.3) holds. \square

As mentioned before, for the special choice of rate-constant values in the condition (5.2), besides two solutions $x^{(1)}$ and $x^{(2)}$ shown in Lemma 5.3, the polynomial system $f = 0$ in (5.1) has a “special” solution with its last coordinate $x_n = +\infty$. In order to make this third solution “visible”, we need to apply a variable substitution to the system f .

First, define a map $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ as follows:

$$(5.4) \quad \varphi(y_1, \dots, y_n) = \left(y_1, \dots, y_{n-2}, \frac{r_{2n} y_{n-1}}{y_n}, \frac{y_n}{r_{2n}} \right).$$

We substitute $x = \varphi(y)$ into f in (5.1) and view y_1, \dots, y_n as new variables. We define the resulting rational functions as

$$(5.5) \quad p(y_1, \dots, y_n; r_1, \dots, r_{2n}) := f|_{x=\varphi(y)} \in \mathbb{Q}(r_1, \dots, r_{2n}, y_1, \dots, y_n).$$

Then, substitute (5.2) into p , and define the resulting polynomials as

$$(5.6) \quad g(y_1, \dots, y_n; r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2}) := p|_{r_{n+1}=0, r_{n+i}=0 (3 \leq i \leq n)}.$$

Denote by J_p and J_g respectively the Jacobian matrix of p and g with respect to variables y_1, \dots, y_n .

When $n = 3$, the system g in (5.6) is given by the polynomials:

$$(5.7) \quad \begin{cases} g_1 = r_1 + r_3 - r_3 y_1, \\ g_2 = r_1 + r_2 + r_5 - r_2 y_2, \\ g_3 = r_2 - m r_3 - r_2 y_2 + m r_3 y_1 - y_3. \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 5.4. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, if the positive rate constants r_1 and r_5 satisfy,*

$$(5.8) \quad (m-1)r_1 - r_5 > 0,$$

then for any positive rate constant r_2 and r_3 , the system $g = 0$ in (5.7) has a positive solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ such that $\det J_g|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$.

Proof. Solve the system $g = 0$ from (5.7) for the variables y_1, y_2, y_3 over $\mathbb{Q}(r)$, and obtain a solution in terms of r :

$$\xi_1 := \frac{r_1 + r_3}{r_3}, \quad \xi_2 := \frac{r_1 + r_2 + r_5}{r_2}, \quad \xi_3 := (m-1)r_1 - r_5.$$

Clearly, if $(m-1)r_1 - r_5 > 0$, then for any positive r_2 and r_3 , the above solution is positive. It is straightforward to compute that $\det J_g|_{y=\xi} = -r_2 r_3 \neq 0$. \square

Remark 5.5. Remark that the inequality (5.8) is a specific case of the inequality (4.5) for $n = 3$.

Now, we focus on the case when $n \geq 5$. Explicitly, the form of p in (5.5) for $n \geq 5$ is given below:

$$\begin{cases} p_1 = -r_1 y_1 y_2 - r_n y_1 - r_{n+1} y_1 + r_1 + r_n, \\ p_2 = -r_1 x_1 x_2 - r_2 x_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} x_2 + r_1 + r_2 + r_{n+2}, \\ p_i = -r_{i-1} y_{i-1} y_i - r_i y_i y_{i+1} - r_{n+i} y_i + r_{i-1} + r_i + r_{n+i}, & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n-3, \\ p_{n-2} = -r_{n-3} y_{n-3} y_{n-2} - r_{n-2} y_{n-2} \frac{r_{2n} y_{n-1}}{y_n} - r_{2n-2} y_{n-2} + r_{n-3} + r_{n-2} + r_{2n-2}, \\ p_{n-1} = -r_{n-2} y_{n-2} \frac{r_{2n} y_{n-1}}{y_n} - r_{n-1} y_{n-1} - r_{2n-1} y_{n-1} + r_{n-2} + r_{n-1} + r_{2n-1}, \\ p_n = -r_{n-1} y_{n-1} + m r_n x_1 - y_n + r_{n-1} + r_{2n} - m r_n. \end{cases}$$

Explicitly, the form of g in (5.6) for $n \geq 5$ is given below:

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{cases} g_1 = r_1 + r_n - r_n y_1 - r_1 y_1 y_2, \\ g_2 = r_1 + r_2 + r_{n+2} - r_1 y_1 y_2 - r_2 y_2 y_3 - r_{n+2} y_2, \\ g_i = r_{i-1} + r_i - r_{i-1} y_{i-1} y_i - r_i y_i y_{i+1}, & \text{for } 3 \leq i \leq n-3, \\ g_{n-2} = r_{n-3} + r_{n-2} - r_{n-3} y_{n-3} y_{n-2}, \\ g_{n-1} = r_{n-2} + r_{n-1} - r_{n-1} y_{n-1}, \\ g_n = r_{n-1} - m r_n + m r_n x_1 - r_{n-1} y_{n-1} - y_n. \end{cases}$$

LEMMA 5.6. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n > 3$, if the positive rate constants r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} satisfy the inequalities (4.7)–(4.8) and*

$$(5.10) \quad (m-1)r_1 r_{n-2} + m(m-1)r_1 r_n > m(r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2},$$

then the system $g = 0$ in (5.9) has a positive solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ such that $\det J_g|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$.

Proof. The goal is to find a positive solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ to the equations

$$g_1(y; r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2}) = \dots = g_n(y; r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2}) = 0$$

for positive parameter values r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} . First, we solve for y_{n-1} from $g_{n-1} = 0$ over $\mathbb{Q}(r)$, and we get

$$(5.11) \quad y_{n-1} = \frac{r_{n-1} + r_{n-2}}{r_{n-1}}.$$

Second, we substitute (5.11) into g_n , and then we solve for y_n from $g_n = 0$ over $\mathbb{Q}(r, y_1)$:

$$(5.12) \quad y_n = m r_n (y_1 - 1) - r_{n-2}.$$

Now, we show how to solve for y_2, \dots, y_{n-2} from (5.9) over $\mathbb{Q}(r, y_1)$. For this purpose, for every $i = 2, \dots, n-2$, let $h_i = \sum_{k=i}^{n-2} (-1)^k g_k$. Notice that n is odd. So, explicitly, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_2 &= r_1 + r_{n+2} - r_1 y_1 y_2 - r_{n+2} y_2 - r_{n-2}, & \text{and} \\ h_i &= (-1)^i (r_{i-1} - r_{i-1} y_{i-1} y_i) - r_{n-2} & \text{for } i = 3, \dots, n-2. \end{aligned}$$

We solve for y_i from $h_i = 0$, and we have

$$(5.13) \quad \begin{aligned} y_2 &= \frac{r_1 - r_{n-2} + r_{n+2}}{r_1 y_1 + r_{n+2}}, \quad \text{and} \\ y_i &= \frac{r_{i-1} - (-1)^i r_{n-2}}{r_{i-1} y_{i-1}} \quad \text{for } i = 3, \dots, n-2. \end{aligned}$$

We substitute (5.13) into g_1 , and we obtain a quadratic polynomial in y_1 :

$$h_1 := r_1 r_n y_1^2 + (r_1 r_{n+2} + r_n r_{n+2} - r_1 r_{n-2} - r_1 r_n) y_1 - (r_1 + r_n) r_{n+2}.$$

It is straightforward to check by the discriminant and Vieta's formulas that for any positive parameters $r_1, r_{n-2}, r_n, r_{n+2}$, the quadratic equation $h_1(y_1) = 0$ has two real roots, and only one of these two roots is positive. Let ξ_1 be this positive root. Substituting ξ_1 back to (5.11), (5.12), and (5.13), we obtain a solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}, \xi_n)$ of $g = 0$ in (5.9), where

$$\xi_2 = \frac{r_1 + r_{n+2} - r_{n-2}}{r_1 \xi_1 + r_{n+2}}, \quad \xi_i = \frac{r_{i-1} - (-1)^i r_{n-2}}{r_{i-1} \xi_{i-1}}, \quad i = 3, \dots, n-2$$

and

$$\xi_{n-1} = \frac{r_{n-2} + r_{n-1}}{r_{n-1}}, \quad \xi_n = m r_n (\xi_1 - 1) - r_{n-2}.$$

We show the positivity of this solution. Clearly, if (4.7) holds, then $\xi_2 > 0$. Also, if (4.8) holds, then for every $i = 3, \dots, n-2$, $\xi_i > 0$ holds. Note that $\xi_n > 0$ if $\xi_1 > \frac{r_{n-2}}{m r_n} + 1$. Note also ξ_1 is the only positive root of $h_1(y_1) = 0$. So, if $h_1(\frac{r_{n-2}}{m r_n} + 1) < 0$, then $\xi_1 > \frac{r_{n-2}}{m r_n} + 1$. Note

$$h_1\left(\frac{r_{n-2}}{m r_n} + 1\right) = -\frac{r_{n-2}}{m^2 r_n} \left((m-1) r_1 r_{n-2} + m \left((m-1) r_1 r_n - (r_1 + r_n) r_{n+2} \right) \right).$$

So for positive m, r_{n-2} and r_n , $h_1(\frac{r_{n-2}}{m r_n} + 1) < 0$ is equivalent to (5.10). Thus, if (4.7)–(4.8) and (5.10) are satisfied, then ξ is positive.

Finally, we show $\det J_g|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$. In fact, the Jacobian matrix of g_1, \dots, g_n with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n is

$$J_g = \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 y_2 - r_n & -r_1 y_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -r_1 y_2 & -r_1 y_1 - r_2 y_3 - r_{n+2} & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -r_2 y_3 & \ddots & -r_{n-3} y_{n-3} & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-3} y_{n-3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \ddots & 0 & -r_{n-1} & 0 \\ m r_n & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -r_{n-1} & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Expanding $\det J_g$ with respect to the first row and taking advantage of Lemma 5.1, we have

$$\det J_g = -r_2 \cdots r_{n-3} r_{n-1} y_2 \cdots y_{n-3} (r_n r_{n+2} + r_1 r_n y_1 + r_1 r_{n+2} y_2)$$

which is obviously nonzero at any positive solution $y = \xi$. \square

Remark 5.7. Remark that the inequality (5.10) is a specific case of the inequality (4.6) for $i = n - 1$.

LEMMA 5.8. *If for a choice of the rate constants r_1, \dots, r_{2n} , the system $p = 0$ has a solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ such that $\xi_n \neq 0$ and $\det J_p|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$, and if the rate constant $r_{2n} \neq 0$, then for the same choice of rate constants, $\hat{x} := (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-2}, \frac{r_{2n}\xi_{n-1}}{\xi_n}, \frac{\xi_n}{r_{2n}})$ is a solution to f such that $\det J|_{x=\hat{x}} \neq 0$.*

Proof. By the definition of the map φ (5.4), and by the definition of the system p (5.5), \hat{x} is a solution to f . Note also, the Jacobian matrix of φ with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n is

$$J_\varphi := \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{n-2} & & \\ & \frac{y_n}{r_{2n}} & \frac{r_{2n}y_{n-1}}{y_n} \\ & & r_{2n} \end{bmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{I}_{n-2} denotes the identity matrix of size $(n-2) \times (n-2)$. So, if $\xi_n \neq 0$ and $r_{2n} \neq 0$, $J_\varphi|_{y=\xi}$ is invertible. By (5.5), we have $J_p = J \cdot J_\varphi$. So we conclude that $\det J|_{x=\hat{x}} \neq 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Let $r_{n+1} = \epsilon$, and for $i = 3, \dots, n$, let $r_{n+i} = \epsilon$. For $n = 3$, choose values for the rate constants r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5 such that the conditions (4.3)–(4.6) are satisfied. For instance, we can choose

$$(5.14) \quad r_1 = 2, \quad r_2 = m + 1, \quad r_3 = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad r_5 = m - 1.$$

For any odd integer $n > 3$, choose values for the rate constants r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} such that the conditions (4.3)–(4.8) are satisfied. For instance, we can choose

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} r_1 = 2, \quad r_2 = r_4 = \dots = r_{n-3} = r_n = 1, \\ r_3 = r_5 = \dots = r_{n-4} = r_{n-1} = m + 1, \quad r_{n-2} = m, \quad r_{n+2} = m - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Here, by the values in (5.14) (or, the values in (5.15)), we see the open set determined by the inequalities (4.3)–(4.6) for $n = 3$ (or, the inequalities (4.3)–(4.8) for $n > 3$) is non-empty. For $i = 2n + 1, \dots, 3n$, set r_i as (4.12).

By Lemma 5.3, if $\epsilon = 0$, then $f = 0$ in (5.1) has two distinct positive solutions $x^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $x^{(2)}$ in (5.3). So, by the implicit function theorem, if ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, then $f = 0$ has two distinct positive solutions $\hat{x}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(2)}$ with $\det J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(i)}} \neq 0$, ($i = 1, 2$), where $\hat{x}^{(1)} = x^{(1)}$ (since $x^{(1)}$ is always a solution to $f = 0$ in (5.1)), and $\hat{x}^{(2)}$ is sufficiently close to $x^{(2)}$. That means $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ has at least two distinct nondegenerate steady states.

By Lemmas 5.4–5.6, for the rate constants (5.14) when $n = 3$, or respectively for the rate constants (5.15) when $n > 3$, the system $g = 0$ in (5.6) has a positive solution $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ such that $\det J_g|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$. By the definition of g in (5.6), when $\epsilon = 0$, ξ is also a positive solution of the system $p = 0$ in (5.5) such that $\det J_p|_{y=\xi} \neq 0$ for the same choice of r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} . Therefore, by the implicit function theorem, if ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, then $p = 0$ has a positive solution, say $\hat{\xi} = (\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_n)$, which is close to ξ , such that $\det J_p|_{y=\hat{\xi}} \neq 0$. Let $\hat{x}^{(3)} = (\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{n-2}, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_n}{\epsilon})$. By Lemma 5.8, $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ is a positive solution to the system $f = 0$ such that $\det J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(3)}} \neq 0$. So $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ is the third nondegenerate steady state of $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$.

5.2. Bistability. Here, we prove that two of those three steady states stated in Theorem 4.3 are stable if we replace the condition (4.3) in Theorem 4.3 with the condition (4.9) (see Theorem 4.6). The main idea is to show the Jacobian matrices at two steady states are similar to column diagonally dominant matrices (see Lemmas 5.9-5.12). Then, we can conclude bistability by Theorem 3.5.

LEMMA 5.9. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n \geq 3$, if the rate constants $r_{n+1}, r_{n+3}, \dots, r_{2n}$ satisfy the condition (5.2), and if the rate constants r_1, r_n, r_{n+2} satisfy the inequality (4.9), then for $x^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, the matrix $J|_{x=x^{(1)}}$ is similar to a column diagonally dominant matrix.*

Proof. Since the condition (5.2) holds, for any r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} , the Jacobian matrix J is as follows:

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 - r_n & -r_1 x_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -r_1 x_2 & -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -r_2 x_3 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ m r_n & 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let $\alpha = 1 + \frac{r_{n+2}}{r_1 x_1}$, and let D be the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\alpha, 1, \dots, 1)$. Note that the matrix $\tilde{J} := DJD^{-1}$ is equal to

$$\tilde{J} = \begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 - r_n & -r_1 x_1 \alpha & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{r_1 x_2}{\alpha} & -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -r_2 x_3 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ \frac{m r_n}{\alpha} & 0 & \cdots & -r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote by a_{ij} the (i, j) -entry in \tilde{J} . Clearly, for $i > 2$, we have $|a_{ii}| = \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$. For $i = 2$, by $\alpha = 1 + \frac{r_{n+2}}{r_1 x_1}$, we have

$$|a_{22}| = r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_3 + r_{n+2} = \alpha r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_3 = \sum_{j \neq 2} |a_{2j}|.$$

Note that the inequality $|a_{11}| > \sum_{j \neq 1} |a_{1j}|$ is equivalent to

$$(5.16) \quad \frac{(r_1 x_2 + r_n) r_{n+2}}{x_1} > (m-1) r_1 r_n.$$

For $x = x^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, the inequality (5.16) is exactly the inequality (4.9). \square

Remark 5.10. Similarly to Lemma 5.9, one can prove if the rate constants satisfy the inequality (4.13), then for $x^{(2)} = (\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n)$ (5.3) stated in Lemma 5.3, $J|_{x=x^{(2)}}$ is similar to a column diagonally dominant matrix.

LEMMA 5.11. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for $n = 3$, if $r_4 = r_6 = \epsilon$, and if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for any positive rate constants r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5 , and for any positive numbers $\hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2, \hat{\xi}_3$, the matrix $J|_{x=(\hat{\xi}_1, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_2}{\hat{\xi}_3}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_3}{\epsilon})}$ is similar to a column diagonally dominant matrix.*

Proof. Let $D = \text{diag}(d_1, 1, d_3)$, where d_1 and d_3 satisfy the equalities:

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{cases} d_1 r_1 x_1 + d_3 r_2 x_3 = r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_3 + r_5 \\ \frac{1}{d_3} r_2 x_2 = r_2 x_2 + r_6 \end{cases}.$$

We solve for d_1 and d_3 from (5.17) over $\mathbb{Q}(r, x)$:

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{cases} d_1 = \frac{r_1 r_2 x_1 x_2 + r_1 r_6 x_1 + r_2 r_5 x_2 + r_2 r_6 x_3 + r_5 r_6}{r_1 x_1 (r_2 x_2 + r_6)}, \\ d_3 = \frac{r_2 x_2}{r_2 x_2 + r_6}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that the matrix $\tilde{J} := DJD^{-1}$ is equal to

$$\begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 - r_3 - r_4 & -d_1 r_1 x_1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{d_1} r_1 x_2 & -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_5 & -\frac{1}{d_3} r_2 x_2 \\ \frac{d_3}{d_1} m r_3 & -d_3 r_2 x_3 & -r_2 x_2 - r_6 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote by a_{ij} the (i, j) -entry in \tilde{J} . By (5.17), for $i = 2, 3$, we have $|a_{ii}| = \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$. By Definition 3.3, in order to make \tilde{J} to be column diagonally dominant, we only need to ensure $|a_{11}| \leq \sum_{j \neq 1} |a_{1j}|$. That means, it is sufficient to show that for $x = (\hat{\xi}_1, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_2}{\hat{\xi}_3}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_3}{\epsilon})$, and for $r_4 = r_6 = \epsilon$, the inequality below is true if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small:

$$(5.19) \quad \frac{d_3}{d_1} m r_3 + \frac{1}{d_1} r_1 x_2 \leq r_1 x_2 + r_3 + r_4.$$

In fact, we substitute (5.18) into the inequality (5.19) and obtain

$$(5.20) \quad r_1 x_1 x_2 (m r_2 r_3 + r_1 (r_2 x_2 + r_6)) \leq (r_2 r_6 x_3 + (r_1 x_1 + r_5) (r_2 x_2 + r_6)) (r_1 x_2 + r_3 + r_4).$$

When $x = (\hat{\xi}_1, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_2}{\hat{\xi}_3}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_3}{\epsilon})$ and $r_4 = r_6 = \epsilon$, the inequality (5.20) is

$$(5.21) \quad r_1 \hat{\xi}_1 \frac{\hat{\xi}_2 \epsilon}{\hat{\xi}_3} (m r_2 r_3 + r_1 r_2 \frac{\hat{\xi}_2 \epsilon}{\hat{\xi}_3} + \epsilon) \leq (r_2 \hat{\xi}_3 + (r_1 \hat{\xi}_1 + r_5) (r_2 \frac{\hat{\xi}_2 \epsilon}{\hat{\xi}_3} + \epsilon)) (r_3 + r_1 \frac{\hat{\xi}_2 \epsilon}{\hat{\xi}_3} + \epsilon).$$

Note that both sides of (5.21) are quadratic functions in ϵ . Note also, at $\epsilon = 0$, the function on the left-hand side evaluates to 0, while the one on the right-hand side is positive. So for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, the inequality (5.21) holds. \square

LEMMA 5.12. *For any integer $m \geq 2$, and for any odd integer $n > 3$, if $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon$, and if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, then for any positive rate constants r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} , and for any positive numbers $\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_n$, the matrix*

$$J|_{x=(\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{n-2}, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_n}{\epsilon})}$$

is similar to a column diagonally dominant matrix.

Proof. Let $D = \text{diag}(d_1, 1, \dots, 1, d_{n-1}, d_n)$, where d_1, d_{n-1} , and d_n satisfy the equalities:

$$(5.22) \quad \begin{cases} d_1 r_1 x_1 = r_1 x_1 + r_{n+2} \\ \frac{1}{d_{n-1}} r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + \frac{d_n}{d_{n-1}} r_{n-1} x_n = r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + r_{n-1} x_n + r_{2n-1} \\ \frac{d_{n-1}}{d_n} r_{n-1} x_{n-1} = r_{n-1} x_{n-1} + r_{2n} \end{cases}.$$

We solve for d_1, d_{n-1} , and d_n from (5.22) over $\mathbb{Q}(r, x)$:

$$(5.23) \quad \begin{cases} d_1 = \frac{r_1 x_1 + r_{n+2}}{r_1 x_1}, \\ d_{n-1} = \frac{r_{n-1} r_{n-2} x_{n-1} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-2} x_{n-2}}{r_{n-1} r_{n-2} x_{n-1} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-1} x_n + r_{2n-1} r_{n-1} x_{n-1} + r_{2n} r_{2n-1}}, \\ d_n = \frac{r_{n-1} r_{n-2} x_{n-1} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-1} x_n + r_{2n} r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + r_{2n-1} r_{n-1} x_{n-1} + r_{2n} r_{2n-1}}{r_{n-1} r_{n-2} x_{n-1} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + r_{2n} r_{n-1} x_n + r_{2n-1} r_{n-1} x_{n-1} + r_{2n} r_{2n-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Notice that $\tilde{J} := DJD^{-1}$ is equal to

$$\begin{bmatrix} -r_1 x_2 - r_n - r_{n+1} & -d_1 r_1 x_1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{d_1} r_1 x_2 & -r_1 x_1 - r_2 x_3 - r_{n+2} & \cdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & -r_2 x_3 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & -\frac{1}{d_{n-1}} r_{n-2} x_{n-2} & 0 \\ 0 & \vdots & \ddots & -r_{n-2} x_{n-2} - r_{n-1} x_n - r_{2n-1} & -\frac{d_{n-1}}{d_n} r_{n-1} x_{n-1} \\ -\frac{d_n}{d_1} m r_n & 0 & \cdots & -\frac{d_n}{d_{n-1}} r_{n-1} x_n & -r_{n-1} x_{n-1} - r_{2n} \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote by a_{ij} the (i, j) -entry in \tilde{J} . Clearly, for any $2 < i < n-2$, $|a_{ii}| = \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$. By (5.22), for $i = 2, n-1, n$, we have $|a_{ii}| = \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$. By Definition 3.3, in order to make \tilde{J} to be column diagonally dominant, we only need to make sure $|a_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$ for $i = 1$ and $i = n-2$. That means that it is sufficient to show that for $x = (\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{n-2}, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_n}{\epsilon})$, and for $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon$, we have the inequalities below if $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small:

$$(5.24) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d_1} r_1 x_2 + \frac{d_n}{d_1} m r_n \leq r_1 x_2 + r_n + r_{n+1} \\ r_{n-3} x_{n-3} + d_{n-1} r_{n-2} x_{n-1} \leq r_{n-3} x_{n-3} + r_{n-2} x_{n-1} + r_{2n-2} \end{cases}.$$

By (5.23), $d_{n-1} < 1$. So, the second inequality in (5.24) holds for any positive r and x . We substitute (5.23) into the first inequality in (5.24). Then we have

$$(5.25) \quad \begin{aligned} m r_1 r_{n-1} r_{n-2} r_n x_1 x_{n-2} x_{n-1} &\leq (r_1 r_n x_1 + r_1 r_{n+1} x_1 + r_1 r_{n+2} x_2 + r_n r_{n+2} \\ &\quad + r_{n+1} r_{n+2})(r_{n-2} r_{n-1} x_{n-2} x_{n-1} + r_{n-1} r_{2n-1} x_{n-1} \\ &\quad + r_{2n}(r_{n-2} x_{n-2} + r_{n-1} x_n + r_{2n-1})). \end{aligned}$$

For $x = (\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{n-2}, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_n}{\epsilon})$, and for $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon$, the inequality (5.25) is

$$(5.26) \quad \begin{aligned} (m r_1 r_{n-1} r_{n-2} r_n \hat{\xi}_1 \hat{\xi}_{n-2} \frac{\hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}) \epsilon &\leq (r_1 r_n \hat{\xi}_1 + r_1 r_{n+2} \hat{\xi}_2 + r_n r_{n+2} + (r_1 \hat{\xi}_1 + r_{n+2}) \epsilon) \\ &\quad (r_{n-1} \hat{\xi}_n + (r_{n-1} \frac{\hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n} + 1)(r_{n-2} \hat{\xi}_{n-2} \epsilon + \epsilon^2)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that when $\epsilon = 0$, the left-hand side of (5.26) is zero, and the right-hand side is positive. So, the inequality (5.26) clearly holds for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.6. Let $r_{n+1} = r_{n+3} = \dots = r_{2n} = \epsilon$. For $n = 3$, choose the rate constants r_1, r_2, r_3, r_5 as in (5.14). For $n > 3$, choose the rate constants r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+2} as in (5.15). By the proof of Theorem 4.3, for these rate constants, $\tilde{K}_{m,n}$ has three nondegenerate positive steady states $\hat{x}^{(i)}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) if ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, where $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ has the form $(\hat{\xi}_1, \dots, \hat{\xi}_{n-2}, \frac{\epsilon \hat{\xi}_{n-1}}{\hat{\xi}_n}, \frac{\hat{\xi}_n}{\epsilon})$, and $\hat{x}^{(1)} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$. By Lemmas 5.11–5.12 and Theorem 3.5, all non-zero eigenvalues of $J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(3)}}$ have negative real parts. Note our choice of rate constants also satisfies the inequality (4.9). So, by Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 5.9, when $\epsilon = 0$, all non-zero eigenvalues of $J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(1)}}$ have negative real parts. Note that the eigenvalues of a matrix vary continuously under continuous perturbations of entries. So, if ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, all non-zero eigenvalues of $J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(1)}}$ also have negative real parts. By the proof of Theorem 4.3, $\det J|_{x=\hat{x}^{(i)}} \neq 0$, for $i = 1, 3$. So both $\hat{x}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{x}^{(3)}$ are locally asymptotically stable.

5.3. Non-empty open region for bistability. Proof of Theorem 4.7. The case for $n = 3$ is obvious. For any odd integer $n > 3$, by the inequality (4.9), the inequality (4.6) holds if and only if

$$(5.27) \quad (m-1)r_1 r_{i-1} > m((r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n), \quad i = 4, \dots, n-1.$$

And by the inequalities (4.8), the inequality (5.27) holds if and only if

$$(m-1)r_1 r_{n-2} > m((r_1 + r_n)r_{n+2} - (m-1)r_1 r_n).$$

Then, it is easy to see that the open set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n+1}$ determined by the inequalities (4.4)–(4.9) is equivalent to the set given in (4.11).

6. Summary. In this paper, we prove that the fully open extension of a sequestration network admits three nondegenerate positive steady states, two of which are locally asymptotically stable. The method we use to prove stability here is based on the Gershgorin circle theorem, which can be applied to more general chemical reaction networks. Moreover, we give an open region in the parameter space as well as explicit choices of rate constants to ensure bistability. In the future, it would be interesting to invest the configuration of the positive steady states and study how the stability of them changes as the rate constants vary. Also, it is challenging to prove the maximum number of (stable) positive steady states for the fully open extension of a sequestration network (Conjecture 4.13).

Acknowledgments. We would like to acknowledge Anne Shiu for her generous support and valuable advice. We also thank Badal Joshi for his comments on the first draft of our work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Murad Banaji and Casian Pantea. Some results on injectivity and multistationarity in chemical reaction networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(2):807–869, 2016.
- [2] Christoph Bagowski and James Ferrell Jr. Bistability in the JNK cascade. *Curr. Biol.*, 11(15):1176–82, 2001.
- [3] Gheorghe Craciun, and Martin Feinberg. Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: I. the injectivity property. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 65 (2005) 1526–1546.

- [4] Gheorghe Craciun, Yangzhong Tang, and Martin Feinberg. Understanding bistability in complex enzyme-driven reaction networks. *PNAS*, 103 (23): 8697–8702, 2006.
- [5] Carsten Conradi, Elisenda Feliu, Maya Mincheva, and Carsten Wiuf. Identifying parameter regions for multistationarity. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 13(10):e1005751, 2017.
- [6] Carsten Conradi and Anne Shiu. Dynamics of post-translational modification systems: recent progress and future challenges. *Biophys. J.*, 114(3):507–515, 2018.
- [7] Gheorghe Craciun and Martin Feinberg. Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: Semiopen mass action systems. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 70(6):1859–1877, 2010.
- [8] Biswa Nath Datta. An elementary proof of the stability criterion of Liénard and Chipart. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 22: 89–96, 1978.
- [9] Alicia Dickenstein, Mercedes Perez Millan, Anne Shiu and Xiaoxian Tang. Multistationarity in Structured Reaction Networks. *Bull. Math. Biol.* 81 (5): 1527–1581, 2019.
- [10] Mirela Domijan, and Markus Kirkilionis, Bistability and oscillations in chemical reaction networks. *J. Math. Biol.* 59 (4): 467–501, 2009.
- [11] Elisenda Feliu. Injectivity, multiple zeros and multistationarity in reaction networks. *Proc. R. Soc. A*, 471(2173), 2014.
- [12] Bryan Félix, Anne Shiu, and Zev Woodstock. Analyzing multistationarity in chemical reaction networks using the determinant optimization method. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 287–288:60–73, 2016.
- [13] James Ferrell Jr., Eric Machleder. The biochemical basis of an all-or-none cell fate switch in *Xenopus* oocytes. *Science*, 280(5365): 895–898, 1998
- [14] Semyon Aranovich Gerschgorin. Über die Abgrenzung der Eigenwerte einer Matrix. *Izv. Akad. Nauk. USSR Otd. Fiz.-Mat. Nauk (in German)*, 6: 749–754, 1931
- [15] Hoon Hong, Xiaoxian Tang, and Bican Xia, Special algorithm for stability analysis of multistable biological regulatory systems. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 70: 112–135, 2015.
- [16] Badal Joshi and Anne Shiu. A survey of methods for deciding whether a reaction network is multistationary. *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom., special issue on “Chemical dynamics”*, 10(5):47–67, 2015.
- [17] Badal Joshi and Anne Shiu. Which small reaction networks are multistationary? *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 16(2):802–833, 2017.
- [18] Matthew Johnston, Stefan Müller, and Casian Pantea. A deficiency-based approach to parametrizing positive equilibria of biochemical reaction systems. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 81(4):1143–1172, 2019.
- [19] Stefan Müller, Elisenda Feliu, Georg Regensburger, Carsten Conradi, Anne Shiu, and Alicia Dickenstein. Sign conditions for injectivity of generalized polynomial maps with applications to chemical reaction networks and real algebraic geometry. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 16(1):69–97, 2016.
- [20] Maple 17 (2013) Maplesoft, a division of Waterloo Maple Inc., Waterloo, Ontario.
- [21] Nida Obatake, Anne Shiu, Xiaoxian Tang, and Angelica Torres, Oscillations and bistability in a model of ERK regulation. *Preprint*, [arXiv:1903.02617](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.02617).
- [22] Mercedes Pérez Millán and Alicia Dickenstein. The structure of MESSI biological systems. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 17(2):1650–1682, 2018.
- [23] Mercedes Pérez Millán, Alicia Dickenstein, Anne Shiu, and Carsten Conradi. Chemical reaction systems with toric steady states. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 74(5):1027–1065, 2012.
- [24] AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh and Elisenda Feliu. The multistationarity structure of networks with intermediates and a binomial core network. *Preprint*, [arXiv:1808.07548](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.07548).
- [25] Paul Michael Schlosser and Martin Feinberg, A theory of multiple steady states in isothermal homogeneous CFSTRs with many reactions, *Chem. Eng. Sci.* 49 (11) (1994) 1749–1767.
- [26] Guy Shinar and Martin Feinberg. Concordant chemical reaction networks. *Math. Biosci.*, 240(2):92–113, 2012.
- [27] Anne Shiu and Timo de Wolff. Nondegenerate multistationarity in small reaction networks. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B*, 24(6): 2683–2700, 2019.
- [28] Matthew Thomson and Jeremy Gunawardena. The rational parameterisation theorem for multisite post-translational modification systems. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 261(4):626–636, 2009.
- [29] Carsten Wiuf and Elisenda Feliu. Power-law kinetics and determinant criteria for the preclusion of multistationarity in networks of interacting species. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12:1685–1721, 2013.
- [30] Wen Xiong, James Ferrell Jr. A positive-feedback-based bistable ‘memory module’ that governs a cell fate decision. *Nature*, 426: 460–465, 2003.