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## Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine whether it is possible for concentration oscillations to occur in the case of the isothermal reaction $A(g)+B(g) \longrightarrow A \cdot m$ which is taking place on a catalytic foil. By assuming a Langmuir-Hinshelwood kinetic mechanism in which the energy of activation for the final step depends linearly on the coverage by adsorbed $\mathrm{D}(\mathrm{g})$, we were able to derive the differential equations for the net rates of adsorption of $A(g)$ and $B(g)$. The necessary and sufficient conditions for stability were derived for the special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$. In addition, uniqueness criteria were derived for various ranges of the kinetic parameters. Numerical integration of the dynamic equations proved the possible existence of sustained oscillations in the case of a unique, unstable steady state, with a period between ll-17 seconds. However, we have not been able to find any examples of limit cycles for a case in which multiple steady states exist. Application of bifurcation theory did not lead to the finding of limit cycles in the case of multiple steady states.
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## CHAPTER I

## Introduction

During the past few years a number of publications have reported phenomena involving catalytic pellets, wires and foils, which cannot be explained by the already existing dynamic models of lumped and distributed parameter systems.

The puzzling behavior observed during these experiments was temperature and composition oscillations in isothermal and nonisothermal heterogeneous catalytic systems. For example, Wicke and coworkers [1] observed concentration and temperature oscillations with amplitudes up to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and periods from minutes up to hours during the oxidation of hydrogen on a 8 mm spherical, $0.4 \% \mathrm{Pt}$ on silica-alumina catalytic pellet. The causes for these low frequency oscillations and their mechanism is unknown and the existing dynamic models are incapable of predicting this phenomenon. Wicke attempted to explain the periodicity by assuming that "it originates from particular reaction mechanisms
which produce long time periodic changes in the nature of the active catalyst surface" [l]. Another possibility might be the effect of temperature on the adsorption and desorption rates of the reacting species [6].

For the isothermal case, Wicke and coworkers [I]
investigated the co oxidation over a $3 \times 3 \mathrm{~mm}$ cylindrical,
$0.3 \% \mathrm{Pt}$ on $\gamma-\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ catalytic pellet. The reaction rate goes through a maximum with increasing concentration of the reactants (self-poisoning), because the strong chemisorption of $C O$ inhibits the reaction rate at higher Co partial pressures. When this is the case, the reacting system may become unstable even under isothermal operating conditions. In fact, temperature and concentration oscillations do appear when the feed's temperature is below $250^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A mechanism explaining this phenomenon has to be presented.

Hugo and Jakuìith [3] have reported similar concentration oscillations during the isothermal oxidation of CO on a platinum gauze. They attributed the observed phenomenon
to the existence of two types of adsorbed co molecules. Dauchot and Cakenberghe [4] experimented with the catalytic oxidation of CO -under isothermal conditionson a thin platinum film evaporated on silica. Again, concentration oscillations were observed. They interpreted this phenomenon by postulating that the reaction mechanism shifts from an Eley-Rideal to a Langmuir-Hinshelwood type. When oxygen has been mostly adsorbed, the hot catalytic surface begins to cool down and $C O$ is progressively adsorbed -with or without the contribution of an

Eley-Rideal reaction. After an induction period the reaction starts and proceeds rapidly. The $C O$ is eliminated by a Langmuir-Hinshelwood reaction, the hot resulting surface is again instantly covered with oxygen, and the cycle is repeated. They suggest that the interaction between the local surface temperature and concentration causes this oscillatory behavior.

McCarthy [19] has shown in his study of CO oxidation
over supported $P t$ that the mechanism for this reaction is complex, with a two-step rate control $\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right.$ adsorption and gaseous $C O$ reacting with adsorbed $O_{2}$ ). The observed rate-CO concentration behavior is, in fact, a competitive conspiracy of two distinct rate processes: (1) Chemisorption of $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ upon a surface partially covered with $C O$, and (2) an Eley-Rideal-type reaction of gaseous CO with adsorbed $O_{2}$. In the region in which both rates are of comparable magnitude, isothermal limit cycling is observed. This suggests that the $C O$ oxidation over supported $P t$ is not a unique reaction between surface adsorbed species, which would give rise to

$$
\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{k} *\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right) *\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right) *(1+\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{CO}))^{-2}
$$

because this equation is based on a model of a one-step
rate control and, consequently, could not give rise to
limit cycling.

Recently, Slinko and coworkers [5] have observed
concentration oscillations during the isothermal oxidation
of hydrogen on a nickel foil. They claim that these
oscillations can be explained by a surface kinetics
mechanism where the rate limiting step is the reaction between adsorbed hydrogen and adsorbed oxygen. In other words, they assume a Langmuir-Hinshelwood-type mechanism in which tine rate constant for the limiting step depends on the surface coverage by oxygen. Their paper, however, does not contain any kinetic parameter values, or numerical simulations which demonstrate that the proposed kinetic mechanism agrees with experimental results.

The main purpose of our research work has been to test the claim of Slinko and coworkers [5] by investigating the stability characteristics of the same surface kinetics mechanism. The question is asked whether there exist parameter values for which the ordinary differential equations representing the rates of adsorption of the gaseous reactants on the catalytic surface exhibit oscillatory behavior. In other words, we are attempting to determine kinetic parameters for which oscillatory solutions exist. The kinetic scheme chosen for this study and the basic
assumptions are expounded in the next chapter along with the mathematical equations representing the physical model. One cannot avoid noticing the similarity between our differential equations and those of Poore and coworkers [9,10], who investigated the stability characteristics of a continuously stirred tank reactor (CSTR). The methodology shown in the work of Poore and coworkers $[9,10]$ is similar to the one followed in our study, although our differential equations are considerably more complicated. As result of this complexity, some of the mathematical techniques used by Poore to predict the direction of bifurcation of the periodic orbits as one of the parameters is varied cannot be employed here.

The fact that existing dynamic models do not predict the experimental phenomena mentioned in the above publications is an indication that certain important chemical processes have not been taken into account. What has been heretofore neglected is the inclusion
of the adsorption capacity of the various reacting species on the catalytic surface. Elnashaie and Cresswell [7,8] have demonstrated that neglecting the dynamics of the adsorption-reaction-desorption process may produce a very oversimplified picture of the behavior and stability of catalytic pellets. One is inclined to believe that what is needed is the use of more sophisticated dynamic models than those used up until now. Such models would not only represent more accurately the actual physical situation, but would also be more helpful for design and industrial purposes. It is hoped that the present study is a small step in this direction.

## CHAPTER II

Here, we discuss the following topics: First, the heterogeneous catalytic mechanism postulated for the general chemical reaction

$$
\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{~g})+\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{~g}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{AB}
$$

Second, the basic assumptions accompanying the kinetic mechanism chosen-for this reaction. Third, the derivation of the differential equations for the rates of chemisorption of reactants $A(g)$ and $F(g)$ on the catalytic surface; and, fourth, the form of the steady state equations.

IIa] Postulated kinetic mechanism

Suppose that the chenical reaction

$$
A(g)+B(g) \longrightarrow A B
$$

takes place on a catalytic surface. The mechanism assumed for this reaction consists of the following kinetic

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(g)+[S] \longrightarrow(A-S) \\
& B(g)+[S] \longrightarrow(B-S)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
(A-S)+(B-S) \longrightarrow A B+2[S]
$$

where [S] denotes an active surface site, while (A-S) and $(B-S)$ denote the adsorbed reactants $A(g)$ and $B(g)$, respectively. The mechanism for which both reactants have to be adsorbed on the surface for the final product to be formed is known as a Langmuir-Hinshelwood mechanism. Instead of a Langmuir-Hinshelwood we could have assumed an Eley-Rideal mechanism. In the latter, only one reactant has to be chemisorbed on the catalytic surface while the other has to strike the adsorbate from the gas phase in order to form a bond between them. For the reaction chosen in our study, an Eley-Rideal mechanism consists of the following kinetic steps:

$$
\begin{gathered}
A(g)+[S] \longrightarrow(A-S) \\
(A-S)+B(g) \longrightarrow A B+[S]
\end{gathered}
$$

In the present work, however, the mechanism postulated for the reaction was a Langmuir-Hinshelwood rather than an Eley-Rideal-type, because the mathematical analysis is less
complicated. Hopefully, in some later time an analysis will be attempted assuming an Lley -Rideal mechanism, or a hybrid of an Eley-Rideal and Langmuir-Hinshelwood. In either case, analytical results should be compared with experimental to decide whether the kinetic model is realistic.

IIb] __Basic_assumptions_--
a) Let $\{S$ 上 denote the number of active surface sites which are not occupied at time $t$. Then, the total number of active sites on the catalytic surface, $L$, is given by

$$
L=\{S\}+\{A-S\}+\{B-S\}
$$

where $\{A-S\}$ and $\{B-S\}$ denote the number of active sites occupied at time $t$ by adsorbed $A(g)$ and $B(g)$, respectively. Then

$$
\{S\}=L-\{A-S\}-\{B-S\}
$$

and after dividing both sides by $L$

$$
\zeta=1-x-y
$$

where
which are not occupied at time $t$.
x: represents the coverage of the catalytic surface with
adsorbed $A(g)$ at time $t$.
$y:$ represents the coverage of the catalytic surface with adsorbed $B(g)$ at time $t$.
b) For the kinetic mechanism

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A(g)+[S] \longrightarrow(A-S) \\
& B(g)+[S] \longrightarrow(B-S) \\
& (A-S)+(B-S) \longrightarrow A B+2[S]
\end{aligned}
$$

we assume that the number of sites on the adsorbent is constant, and each site can adsorb one species only. All
sites are identical but the activation energy for adsorption increases linearly with coverage due to induced
heterogeneity: i.e., (i) there are lateral (repulsive)
interactions between adsorbed molecules which are uniformly distributed over the available sites, or (ii) the adsorbate molecules by perturbation of the adsorbent surface, change the properties of the remaining free sites such that the activation energy increases with coverage. In our
study we postulate that the adsorbed $B(g),(B-S)$, changes the properties of the catalytic surface and the greatest influence is in the third step. In that case, the energy of this step depends on the coverage by adsorbed $B(g)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}_{3}=\mathrm{E}_{3}^{0}+\mu \mathrm{RTY} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mu$ is the coefficient of heterogeneity of the catalytic surface. The above relation for the energy of activation of the adsorption process is identical to the one shown in the work of slinko and coworkers [5]; its derivation and more extensive discussions can be found in the works of Brunauer et. al. [21], Aharoni and Tompkins [22], as well as Weber and Loucka [15].
The rate constant for the surface reaction is given
by

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{3}=k_{30} e^{-E_{3} / R T} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of (1), we can rewrite (2) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{3}=\left(k_{30} e^{-E_{3}^{0} / R T}\right) e^{-\mu y} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

c) We assume that the reaction

$$
A(g)+B(g) \longrightarrow A B
$$

occurs under isothermal conditions. If this is the case, we can rewrite equ. (3) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
k_{3}=k e^{-\mu y} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
k=k_{30} e^{-E_{3}^{0} / R T} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, assuming a first order rate dependence with
respect to $(A-S)$ and $(B-S)$, the rate for the surface reaction is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=k_{3} x y L^{2} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of (4), we can rewrite (6) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
r=k e^{-\mu y} x y L^{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

IIC]


The net rates of adsorption of $A(g)$ and $B(g)$ on the catalytic surface are given by the following nonlinear, coupled, ordinary differential equations:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d x}{d t}=k_{1}[A](1-x-y)-K_{-1} x-k_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y} x y \equiv f_{1}(x, y) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

# $\frac{d y}{d t}=K_{2}[B](1-x-y)-K_{-2} y-k_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y} x y \equiv f_{2}(x, y)$ 

where [ $A$ ] and [ $B$ ] denote concentrations of $A(g)$ and $B(g)$, respectively, and

$$
k_{3}^{0}=k L
$$

note that the above differential equations, although
considerably more complicated, are similar to the
equations appearing in the work of Poore and coworkers [9,10].

In our study we want to investigate whether for some
values of the six kinetic paraneters $\left(k_{1}[A], k_{2}[B], k_{-1}\right.$, $\left.k_{-2}, k_{3}^{0}, \mu\right)$ sustained oscillations can exist.

IId] _-_Steady_state_eguations_-_---

At steady state, equations (8) and (9) become:

$$
\begin{equation*}
0=K_{1}[A]\left(1-x_{s}-y_{s}\right)-K_{-1} X_{s}-K_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y_{s}} x_{s} y_{s} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{S}}$ and $\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{s}}$ denote the steady state values of x and $y$, respectively.
combining (10) and (11) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{s}=\beta_{1} x_{s}+\beta_{2} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assuming that $\beta_{I} \neq 0$, which implies $k_{-1}+k_{1}[A] \neq k_{2}[B]$,
(12) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{5}=\frac{1}{\beta_{1}}\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

substituting (13) in (10) and further assuming that

$$
e^{\substack{y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right) \neq 0, \text { we obtain } \\-k y_{5} \\ \stackrel{\beta_{1}}{k_{1}}[A]\left(1-\beta_{2}\right)+\beta_{2}\left[k_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right] \\ k_{3}^{0} y_{5}\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right)} \frac{\left[k_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}{k_{3}^{o}\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right)}}
$$

## CIMPIER III

Here we linearize equations (8) and (9) about the steady state and use the first method of Liapunov to determine the local stability of the critical points. Next, we derive expressions for the determinant and trace of $A$ in the special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$. Our purpose is to demonstrate that when $\beta_{2}=0$ it is easier to classify the critical points of the linearized system (27) by determining the sign of detA and trA, than when $\beta_{2} \neq 0$.

IIIa] _Linerization of the dynamic equations.

The net rates of adsorption of reactants $A(g)$ and $B(g)$ on the catalytic surface are given by the ordinary

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { differential equations: } \\
& \frac{d x}{d t}=K_{1}[A](1-x-y)-K_{-1} x-K_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y}  \tag{8}\\
& \frac{d y}{d t}=K_{2}[B](1-x-y)-K_{-2} y-K_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y} x y \equiv f_{2}(x, y) \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

Our purpose is to investigate whether for some values of the six kinetic parameters sustained oscillations can exist. In other words, we want to find kinetic parameters for which equations (8) and (9) give rise to limit cycles.

The first method of Liapunov consists of examining the properties of equations (8) and (9) linearized about the steady state. Linearization of (8) and (9) yields

$$
\frac{d Y}{d t}=\underline{A} \underline{Y}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underline{Y}=\left[\begin{array}{l}
x-x_{5} \\
y-y_{5}
\end{array}\right], \underline{A}=\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial y} \\
\frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial x} & \frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial y}
\end{array}\right]_{x=x_{5}} \\
& y=y_{5} \\
& \text { where }
\end{aligned}
$$

The local stability character of the steady states is determined by the sign of the real part of the eigenvalues of $A$. These eigenvalues, $\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2}$, are the roots of the characteristic equation

$$
\lambda^{2}-(\operatorname{tr} A) \lambda+(\operatorname{det} A)=0
$$

where the determinant of $\underset{\sim}{2}$

$$
\operatorname{det} A=\left[\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial y}-\frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial x} \frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial y}\right]_{\substack{x \\ y=x_{s} \\=y_{s}}}
$$

and the trace of $\underline{A}$

$$
\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=\left[\frac{\partial f_{1}}{\partial x}+\frac{\partial f_{2}}{\partial y}\right]_{\substack{x=x_{s} \\ y=y_{s}}}
$$

Algebraic substitution yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left[\alpha_{2} y_{s}+\alpha_{3} x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\right]  \tag{15}\\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+k_{3}^{0} e^{-k y_{s}}\left[x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)-y_{s}\right] \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha_{1} \equiv\left\{K_{-1} K_{2}[B]+K_{-2} K_{1}[A]+K_{-1} K_{-2}\right\} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \alpha_{2} \equiv K_{3}^{0}\left\{K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]+K_{-2}\right\}  \tag{18}\\
& \alpha_{3} \equiv K_{3}^{0}\left\{K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]-K_{-1}\right\}  \tag{19}\\
& \beta \equiv\left\{K_{1}[A]+K_{-1}+K_{2}[B]+K_{-2}\right\} \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

We can eliminate $x_{s}$ from (15) and (16) by using the relation(13),

$$
x_{5}=\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right) / \beta_{1}
$$

to obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left\{\alpha_{2} y_{s}+\alpha_{3}\left(\frac{y_{s}-\beta_{2}}{\beta_{1}}\right)\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\right\}  \tag{21}\\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+k_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left\{\left(\mu_{s}-1\right)\left(\frac{y_{s}-\beta_{2}}{\beta_{1}}\right)-y_{s}\right\} \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

We can eliminate the exponential term in (21) and (22) by using (14) :

$$
e^{-\mu y_{s}}=\frac{\beta_{1} K_{1}[A]\left(1-\beta_{2}\right)+\beta_{2}\left[K_{1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}{K_{3}^{\circ} y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}-\frac{\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}{K_{3}^{0}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+\frac{\alpha_{2}\left(\mathcal{H}-\Theta y_{s}\right)}{k_{3}^{\circ}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}+\frac{\alpha_{3}\left(\mu y_{5}-1\right)\left(\mathcal{F} E-\Theta y_{2}\right)}{k_{3}^{\circ} \beta_{1} y_{s}} \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta-\frac{\left(\mathcal{H E}_{t}-\Theta y_{s}\right)}{\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}+\frac{\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\left(\mathcal{J}_{t}-\Theta y_{s}\right)}{\beta_{1} y_{s}} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

wiere

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{H E} \equiv K_{1}[A]\left(\beta_{1}+B_{2}\right)+K_{-1} \beta_{2}=\frac{K_{-1} K_{2}[B]}{K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]}  \tag{25}\\
& \Theta \equiv\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]=\frac{K_{-1} K_{-2}+K_{-1} K_{2}[B]+K_{-2} K_{1}[A]}{K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]} \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

IIIb] _Classification_of the critical_points_of_the
_linearized system.
We found that the linearized equations are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \underline{Y} / d t=\underline{A} \underline{Y} \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the determinant and trace of A are given by (23) and (24), respectively. We now state the following theorem[9]:

Theorem_3.1. Let $D=(\operatorname{tr} A)^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} A)$. Then, the critical points of the linearized system (27) are classified as follows:

1. If $\operatorname{det} A<0$, then the critical point is a saddle point. 2. Let detA> 0. Then
(i) The steady state is an unstable focus if trA $>0$ and $D<0$, and an unstable node if trA $>0$ and $D>0$.
(ii) The steady state is a stable focus if tra $<0$ and $D<0$, and a stable node if trA $<0$ and $D>0$.
(iii) The steady state is a center if trAㅡ́n $=0$. (iv) The steady state is a stable or unstable node if $\mathrm{D}=0$. 3. Let $\operatorname{det} \underset{-}{A}=0$. The critical point is degenerate in the sense that the phase plane consists entirely of critical points or entirely of parallel straight lines and critical points.

The type of critical point for the nonlinear equations
(8) and (9) is the same as that for the linear problem in cases 1 and 2 above except in the case of the center. The critical point is either a center or a spiral for the nonlinear problem.

Remark_1: For some combination of the six kinetic
parameters ( $\left.k_{1}[A], k_{2}[B], k_{-1}, k_{-2}, k_{3}^{0}, \mu\right)$ each of the cases in (1)-(3) actually occurs for the nonlinear system.

Remark _2: The critical points are roots of equation (14) in the interval $(0,1)$.

IIIC] The special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$

Suppose that $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$. Then (12a) become

$$
\begin{align*}
& \beta_{1}=k_{-1} / k_{-2}  \tag{28}\\
& \beta_{2}=0 \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

Equations (17)-(20) become

$$
\begin{align*}
& \alpha_{1} \equiv\left\{K_{1}[A]\left(K_{-1}+K_{-2}\right)+K_{-1} K_{-2}\right\}  \tag{30}\\
& \alpha_{2} \equiv K_{3}^{0} K_{-2}  \tag{31}\\
& \alpha_{3} \equiv-K_{3}^{0} K_{-1}  \tag{32}\\
& \beta \equiv\left\{2 K_{1}[A]+K_{-1}+K_{-2}\right\} \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

Equations (25)-(26) become

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
\left.K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)\right]
\end{array}\right.
$$

Since $\beta_{2}=0$, (23) and (24) become

$$
\begin{align*}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+\frac{\left(\notin-\Theta y_{5}\right)\left[\alpha_{2} \beta_{1}+\alpha_{3}\left(\mu y_{5}-1\right)\right]}{k_{3}^{0} \beta_{1} y_{5}}  \tag{36}\\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+\frac{\left(\mathscr{H}-\Theta y_{5}\right)\left[\left(\mu y_{5}-1\right)-\beta_{1}\right]}{\beta_{1} y_{5}} \tag{37}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\beta_{1}>0, \alpha_{3}<0$, and $0<y_{S}<1$, it follows that $\operatorname{sgn}(\operatorname{det} \underline{A})=\operatorname{sgn}\left(\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\right)$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A})=\operatorname{sgn}\left(G\left(y_{S}\right)\right)$
where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Phi\left(y_{s}\right) \equiv\left[-k_{3}^{\circ} \beta_{1} y_{s} / \alpha_{3}\right](\operatorname{det} \underline{A})  \tag{38}\\
& G\left(y_{s}\right) \equiv\left(\beta_{1} y_{s}\right)(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}) \tag{39}
\end{align*}
$$

Substituting (28)-(35) in (36)-(37) and then in (38)-(39), we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{s}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+v  \tag{40}\\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)=-\gamma y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} y_{s}-\gamma^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \gamma \equiv \mu\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)\right]  \tag{42}\\
& \varepsilon \equiv\left[K_{1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)+\mu K_{1}[A] \frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right]  \tag{43}\\
& \mathcal{J} \equiv\left[2 K_{1}[A] \frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right]  \tag{44}\\
& \varepsilon^{\prime} \equiv\left[\dot{\mu} K_{1}[A] \frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\left(\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)^{2}\right)\right]  \tag{45}\\
& \mathcal{S}^{\prime} \equiv \frac{K_{1}[A] K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right) \tag{46}
\end{align*}
$$

Note that when $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B], \beta_{2}=0$, equation (14) becomes
$K_{3}^{0} y_{s}^{2} e^{-K y_{s}}+\left\{\underline{K}_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)\right\} y_{s}-K_{1}[A]\left(\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)=0$
and the critical points are roots of (47), where $0<y_{s}<1$.
Remark _3: Undoubtedly, theorem 3.1 also applies in the special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$, where instead of examining the sign of $\operatorname{det} \underline{A}$ and trig we are interested in the sign of the polynomials $\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)$ and $G\left(y_{S}\right)$ which are given by (40)-(41).

III] _Roots_of_the_polynomials_(40)=(41)._----

Consider the equations

$$
\begin{align*}
& \phi(\xi)=\gamma \xi^{2}-\varepsilon \xi+\vartheta^{\prime}=0  \tag{48}\\
& G(\omega)=-\gamma \omega^{2}+\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega-\vartheta^{\prime}=0 \tag{49}
\end{align*}
$$

Let $\Delta_{\phi}$ and $\Delta_{6}$ denote the discriminants of the equations (48) and (49), respectively. Then

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta_{\phi}=\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma O  \tag{50}\\
& \Delta_{G}=\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \tag{51}
\end{align*}
$$

Suppose now that

$$
\Phi\left(p_{1}\right)=\Phi\left(p_{2}\right)=0
$$

and

$$
\sigma\left(\psi_{1}\right)=\sigma\left(\psi_{2}\right)=0
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p_{1}=\frac{\varepsilon+\sqrt{\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma}}{2 \gamma}, p_{2}=\frac{\varepsilon-\sqrt{\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta}}{2 \gamma} \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{1}=\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}+\sqrt{\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}}}{2 \gamma}, \psi_{2}=\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}-\sqrt{\varepsilon^{\prime}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}}}{2 \gamma} \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 4: When $\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v=0$, then $p_{1}=p_{2}=p=\frac{\varepsilon}{2 \gamma}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { When } \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}=0 \quad \text {, then } \psi_{1}=\psi_{2}=\psi=\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{54}
\end{equation*}
$$

Remark 5: $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ are also roots of the equ. det프 $=0$. $\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ are also roots of the equ. $\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=0$.

## CHAPTER IV

Here we describe a procedure which helps in classifying the critical points of the linearized system (27) for the special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$. We emphasize the importance of the nature and relative positions of $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$, and derive necessary and sufficient conditions for all possible arrangements for the root positions for the polynomials $\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)$ and $G\left(y_{S}\right)$.

IVa] The nature of the roots of $\operatorname{det} \underline{A}=0$ and tr a $=0$.

In the previous chapter we derived expressions for fetA and frA for the special case $k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]$. We also obtained the polynomials

$$
\begin{align*}
& \phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{5}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+v^{\prime}  \tag{40}\\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)=--y y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon \varepsilon_{s} y_{s}-\gamma^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

which have the same sign as detA and tree, respectively. These polynomials are very helpful in classifying the critical points of the linearized system (27) for various values of the kinetic parameters, by using theorem 3.l.

The roots $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ of

$$
\phi(\xi)=\gamma \xi^{2}-\varepsilon \xi+\mathcal{B}=0
$$

are given by (52), while the roots $\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ of

$$
G(\omega)=-\gamma \xi^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} \xi-\gamma^{\prime}=0
$$

are given by (53). Note that $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ are roots of get and $\Psi_{1}$,
$\Psi_{2}$ are roots of tran.
The following cases can be distinguished with respect to the nature of the roots $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ :
(A) The roots of $\Phi(\xi)=0$ and $G(\omega)=0$ are all real and unequal; that is, $\rho_{1}>\rho_{2}$ and $\Psi_{1}>\Psi_{2}$ and the two equations have no common roots.
(B) $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ are real. However, the roots of either $\Phi(\xi)=0$ or $G(\omega)=0$ are equal; that is, $\rho_{1}=\rho_{2}=\rho$ and $\Psi_{1}>\Psi_{2}$, or $\Psi_{1}=\Psi_{2}=\Psi$ and $\rho_{1}>\rho_{2}$. There is also the trivial case $\rho_{1}=\rho_{2}=\Psi_{1}=\Psi_{2}$.
(C) The roots of either $\Phi(\xi)=0$, or $G(\omega)=0$, or of both of them are complex. Here, we can distinguish the following subcases:
(i) $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ are complex and $\Psi_{1}>\Psi_{2}$.
(ii) $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}$ are complex and $\Psi_{1}=\Psi_{2}=\Psi$.
(iii) $\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ are complex and $\rho_{1}>\rho_{2}$.
(iv) $\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ are complex and $\rho_{1}=\rho_{2}=\rho$.
(v) $\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}$ are complex.

IV

```
Relative positions of \(\rho_{1}\) \(1 \rho\) , \({ }^{4}{ }^{\prime}\)
``` \(2^{\circ}\)

According to theorem 3.1, we need to know the sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) in order to classify the critical points of the linearized system (27). The sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) depends, in turn, on the position of \(y_{s} \in(0,1)\) with respect to the roots of \(\Phi(\xi)=0\) and \(G(\omega)=0\).

However, before examining the position of \(y_{s} \in(0,1)\) with respect to \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\), it should be emphasized that for the cases (A)-(C) a large number of possible arrangements for the root positions exists, and that it is relatively easy to derive the necessary and sufficient conditions for each of them.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for all possible arrangements for the root positions for cases (A)-(C) are presented next. The detailed derivation of these conditions is shown in the Appendix.
al]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1 \\
\gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
2 \gamma>\varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
ad]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\rho_{2}<\Psi 2<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi 1 \\
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\theta\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \vartheta^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon<\inf \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, 2 \gamma\right) \\
(\varepsilon-\theta)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
a3]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\rho_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\psi_{1} \\
& \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \mathcal{V}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
& \gamma<\inf \left[\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right),\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
\]
a4] \(\quad 0<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\mathscr{O}^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>\sup (\varepsilon, 2 \gamma) \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
a5] \(\quad 1 .<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\theta\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \gamma-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
bll \(\quad 0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+V)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
b2] \(0<\psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left.\gamma\left(v^{\prime}-v^{2}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right\rangle-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\inf (\varepsilon, 2 \gamma) \\
\left.\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<(\varepsilon-\nabla)\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
b3] \(\quad 0 .<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)^{2} & <\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime} & <\varepsilon \\
\gamma & <\inf \left\{\left(\varepsilon-\vartheta^{\prime}\right),\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
b4] \(\quad 0<\Psi_{2}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon>\sup \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, 2 \gamma\right) \\
(\varepsilon-\nabla)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
b5] \(\quad 1 .<\psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\delta\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta-\varepsilon \delta^{\prime}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\theta^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
c1] \(0 .<\rho_{2}<\psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\delta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \cdot \theta-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right) \\
\gamma>\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},(\varepsilon-V)\right\}
\end{gathered}
\]
c2] \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\delta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \theta-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<(\varepsilon-D)
\end{gathered}
\]
c3] \(0<\rho_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime} V^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\theta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \theta-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-V\right) \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]

C4] \(\quad 0<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\nabla^{2}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{2}-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\nabla\right) \\
&\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla\right)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon-v^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\text { c5] } \begin{aligned}
& 1<p_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<p_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V{ }^{\prime}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{2}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right) \\
&(\varepsilon-V)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
d1] \(O<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \gamma>\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
d2]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{\gamma}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\forall\right) \\
& \sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\left(\varepsilon-D^{\prime}\right)\right\}<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-D^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
d3]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\Psi_{2}<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\Psi_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(\sigma^{\prime}-V^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v^{2}-\varepsilon \theta^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right) \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]
d4]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\psi_{2}<1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \nabla^{\prime}-\varepsilon \vartheta^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
&(\varepsilon-\theta)<\gamma<\inf \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
d5] \(1<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\mathcal{V}^{\prime}-\mathcal{V}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \mathcal{V}^{2}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\mathcal{V}^{\prime}-D\right) \\
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
el] \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
\(\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{\nabla}>0\)
\(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma J^{\prime}>0\)
\(\gamma\left(\sigma^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \sigma-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right)\)
\(\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\mathscr{O}^{\prime}-\hat{O}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)\)
\[
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\]
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0
\]
e2]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{0}>0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{\prime}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{-}-\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\mathscr{D}^{\prime}-D\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
\left.\varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]
e3] \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\theta^{\prime}\right),(\varepsilon-\theta)\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { e4] } 0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \geqslant>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\dot{J}^{\prime}-\mathscr{D}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{2}-\varepsilon \dot{J}^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\phi^{\prime}-\phi\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\delta)<0 \\
& \text { e5] } 1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \dot{v}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma 0^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\sigma\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+v^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \text { f1] } 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1 \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma{ }^{\circ}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\sigma^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+D)>0 . \\
& \text { f2] } \quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<1<p_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{v}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \cdot \sigma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \left.\gamma\left(O^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right\rangle-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-\nabla\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+\delta^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
f3]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p_{2}<p_{1} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma^{\circ}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-\phi\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},(\varepsilon-\nabla),\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
£4]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma ण^{\prime}>0 \\
\left.\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma\right\rangle^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\delta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\delta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]
f5] \(\quad 1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<\rho_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma O^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma O^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-D^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} O-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \quad\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+D^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
_CASE B
al] \(0<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
a2] \(\quad 0<p<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma D^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma D^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
a3] \(\quad 0<p<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
a4] \(1<\rho<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
\]
bl]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p<1 \\
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
b2]
\[
\begin{aligned}
0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
b3]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p \\
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
\]
b4]
\[
\begin{gathered}
1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p \\
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
c1]
\[
\begin{aligned}
0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1} & <1 \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} & <\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
\gamma & >\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\sigma^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
c2]
\[
\begin{aligned}
0<\Psi_{2}<p<1 & <\Psi_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma \forall \\
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} & <\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
\frac{\varepsilon}{2} & <\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
c3] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<1<p<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \gamma<\inf \left\{\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\sigma^{\prime}\right), \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma 0 \\
2 \gamma V^{\prime} & <\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
c4] \(1<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma ण \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
d1]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}<1 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma j^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \gamma>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma \\
&(\gamma-\varepsilon+\sigma)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
d2] \(0<\psi<p_{2}<1<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \forall>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\hat{v})<0
\end{aligned}
\]
d3]
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<\psi<1<p_{2}<p_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \forall>0 \\
2 \gamma \forall>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},(\varepsilon-\nabla)\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{gathered}
\]
d4] \(1<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma 0>0 \\
& 2 \gamma\rangle>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
\]
ell \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gg 0 \\
& 2 \gamma \hat{v}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
e2] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \sup \left\{(\varepsilon-\gamma), \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}^{\prime}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
e3] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1,1 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \left.\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma\right\rangle>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+D)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
e4]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \text { D }>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \forall>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+D)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
f1] \(0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \gamma>\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
£2]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 0<p_{2}<\psi<1<p_{1} \\
&-\quad \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \theta^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
f3]
\[
\begin{aligned}
0<p_{2}<1<\psi & <p_{1} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & =4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma V^{\prime} & <\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
\gamma & <\inf \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},(\varepsilon-D)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
f4] \(1<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma 0^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma \forall<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& (\varepsilon-V)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
gl] \(\quad 0<p<\psi<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \theta^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
g2] \(\quad 0<p<1<\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma O^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \sigma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon<2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
\]
g3] \(\quad 1<\rho<\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& 2 y<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
\text { h1] } \quad 0<\psi<p & <1 \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & =4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime} & <\varepsilon<2 \gamma \\
& \\
\text { h2] } \quad 0<\psi<1 & <p \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & =4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime} & <2 \gamma<\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
\]
h3] \(1<\psi<p\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \vartheta \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{aligned}
\]
il]
\[
\begin{aligned}
0<p=\psi & <1 \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & =4 \gamma \varepsilon^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon & =\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
i2] \(1<p=\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon=\varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

CASE C
al] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma \sigma \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}>4 \gamma \sigma^{\prime} \\
& \gamma>\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2},\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
an] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma 0
\]
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\theta^{\prime}\right)<0
\]
as] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma 0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}>4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{gathered}
\]
bl] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi<1\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma \sigma \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \sigma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
b2] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(1<\psi\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma \vartheta \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
cl] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\)
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}
\]
\[
\varepsilon^{2}>4 \gamma v
\]
\[
\gamma>\sup \left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},(\varepsilon-\theta)\right\}
\]
c2] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma\right\rangle^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\text { c3] } \psi_{1}, \psi_{2} \text { are complex, and } 1<p_{2}<p_{1} .
\]
di] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2} \underset{\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma 0^{\prime}}{\text { are complex }} \quad 0<p<1\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \gamma \\
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]
d2] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(1<p\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & <4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{2} & =4 \gamma{ }^{\circ} \\
\varepsilon & <2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
e] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma v^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma V^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{CIIAPTER V}

Here we classify the critical points of the linearized system (27) for the special case \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\), for all possible arrangements of the root positions of the polynomials \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\), by using theorem 3.1.

Va] _-_Introduction

According to theorem 3.1, we need to know the sign of detAㅗ and trA in order to classify the critical points of the linearized system (27). For the special case \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\), we were able to derive the polynomials \(\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) which have the same sign as detㄹ, and tri, respectively. Now, the sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) depends on the position of \(y_{S} \in(0,1)\) with respect to \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}, \Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\), as well as on the nature of these roots. In the previous chapter, we distinguished cases (A)-(C) according to the nature of the roots \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\), \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2} ;\) for these cases we obtained a large nuraber of possible arrangements of the root positions, and derived the necessary and sufficient conditions for each arrangement. Next, we show that for each possible arrangement of the root positions a number of suivcases can be distinguished depending on the magnitude of \(y_{S} \in(0,1)\), and that in each subcase the sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) can be determined and the critical points classified. Recall that \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) are given by
\[
\begin{align*}
& \phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{s}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+\gamma^{\prime}  \tag{40}\\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)=-\gamma y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} y_{s}-\nabla^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\gamma>0\). For the special case \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\), the critical points are roots of the equation
\(K_{3}^{0} y_{s}^{2} e^{-\mu y_{s}}+\left\{K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)\right\} y_{s}-K_{1}[A]\left(\frac{K_{-1}}{K_{-2}}\right)=0\)
where \(y_{s} \in(0,1)\).
\(\mathrm{Vb}]\) _Classification_of_the_critical_points_for_the_special_case \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\).

For cases (A)-(C), we classify all possible arrangements for the root positions, taking into account the magnitude of \(y_{s} \in(0,1)\). This allows us to determine the sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\), so that we can classify the critical points by using theorem 3.1. The results of this classification are presented in tabular form for each group listed; for the "type of steady state" we use the notation:

1: Stable focus (or stable node).
2: Unstable focus (or unstable node).
3: Saddle point.

\section*{CASE A}

Table 5.1
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of
\[
\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)
\] & Sign of
\[
G\left(y_{s}\right)
\] & Type of Steady State \\
\hline all & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline al2 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline a13 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline al4 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline al5 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a21 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline a22 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline a23 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline a24 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a31 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline a32 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline a33 & \[
0<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<l<\rho_{1}<\Psi 1
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a41 & \[
0<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}
\] & - & - & 3 \\
\hline a42 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a5 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.2
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{s}}\right)\) & Sign of \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Type of Steady State \\
\hline b11 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<y_{S}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b12 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline b13 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline b14 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b15 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b21 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{S}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline b22 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline b23 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b24 & \[
0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b31 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline b32 & \[
0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}
\] & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b33 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b41 & \[
0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}
\] & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b42 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b5 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi \Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.3
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sign of } \\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
\] & Type of Steady State \\
\hline c11 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c12 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{S}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c13 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline c14 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c15 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c21 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{S}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c22 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline c23 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c24 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c31 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
\hline c32 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c33 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c41 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline c42 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c5 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.4
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
\hline & Arrangement & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sign of \\
\(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sign of \\
\(\mathrm{G}\left(\mathrm{y}_{s}\right)\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Type of Steady \\
State
\end{tabular} \\
\hline d11 & \(-0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
d12 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
d13 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & - & + & 3 \\
d14 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
d15 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
d21 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
d22 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
d23 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
d24 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
d31 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & - & + & 3 \\
d32 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
d33 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
d41 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<l<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 1 \\
d42 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 2 \\
d5 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1
\end{tabular}

Table 5.5
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Sign of \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Type of Steady State \\
\hline ell & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline el2 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline el3 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e14 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e15 & \(0<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e21 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}{ }^{<}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline e22 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e23 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<1<{ }^{\Psi}{ }^{\Psi}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e24 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi{ }_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e31 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e32 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e33 & \(0<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi{ }_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e41 & \[
0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}
\] & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e42 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e5 & \(0<y_{s}<l<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi 1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.6
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Sign of \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Type of Steady State \\
\hline f11 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f 12 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<\rho_{1}<i\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f13 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f14 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline f15 & \(0<y_{S}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f21 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f22 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{\dot{s}}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline £23 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline f24 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f31 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{S}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f32 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline f33 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f41 & \[
0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}
\] & + & + & 2 \\
\hline £42 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f5 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{CASE B}

Table 5.7
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sign of } \\
& \Phi\left(y_{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
\] & Sign of
\[
G\left(y_{s}\right)
\] & Type of Steady State \\
\hline all & \(0<0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a12 & \(0<\rho<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline al3 & \(0<\rho<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline al4 & \(0<y_{S}<\rho<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a21 & \(0<\rho<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline a22 & \(0<\rho<y_{S}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & +. & - & 1 \\
\hline a23 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a31 & \[
0<\rho<y_{S}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a32 & \[
0<y_{S}<0<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline a4 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\rho<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline bll & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b12 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<p<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b13 & \[
0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<\rho<1
\] & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b14 & \(0<y_{S}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b21 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1<\rho\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b22 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b23 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1<\rho\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b31 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s} \leqslant 1<\Psi_{1}<\rho\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline b32 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\Psi_{1}<\rho\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline b4 & \[
0<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.8
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Sign of \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) & Type of Steady State \\
\hline cll & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho<\Psi_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c12 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho<y_{s}<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline c13 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline c14 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<\rho<\Psi_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c21 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline c22 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<\rho<1<\Psi_{-1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline c23 & \(0<y_{S}<\Psi_{2}<\rho<1<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c31 & \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho<\Psi_{1}\) & + & + & 2 \\
\hline c32 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi_{2}<1<\rho<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline c4 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\Psi_{2}<\rho<\Psi_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d11 & \(0<\Psi<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d12 & \(0<\Psi<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline d13 & \(0<\Psi<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d14 & \[
0<y_{s}<\Psi<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d21 & \(0<\Psi<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline d22 & \(0<\Psi<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d23 & \(0<y_{s}<\Psi<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d31 & \(0<\Psi<y_{s}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d32 & \(0<y_{s}<\psi<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline d4 & \(0<y_{s}<1<\psi<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.9
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Arrangement & Sign of \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sign of } \\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)
\end{aligned}
\] & Type of Steady State \\
\hline ell & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline el2 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<\Psi<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline el3 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<\psi<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline el4 & \[
0<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi<1
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e21 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1<\psi\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e22 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e23 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<1<\Psi\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e31 & \[
0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi
\] & - & - & 3 \\
\hline e32 \({ }^{\text {. }}\) & \[
0<y_{S}<\rho_{2}<1<\rho_{1}<\Psi
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline e4 & \[
0<y_{s}<1<\rho_{2}<\rho_{1}<\Psi
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f11 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi<\rho_{1}<y_{s}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f12 & \(0<\rho_{2}<\Psi<y_{s}<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f13 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi<\rho_{1}<1\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f14 & \(0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\psi<\rho_{1}<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f21 & \[
0<\rho_{2}<\Psi<y_{s}<1<\rho_{1}
\] & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f22 & \(0<\rho_{2}<y_{s}<\Psi<1<\rho_{1}\) & - & - & 3 \\
\hline £23 & \[
0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<\Psi<1<\rho_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f31 & \[
0<\rho_{2}<y_{S}<1<\Psi<\rho_{1}
\] & - & - & 3 \\
\hline f32 & \[
0<y_{s}<\rho_{2}<1<\Psi<\rho_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline f4 & \[
0<y_{S}<1<\rho_{2}<\Psi<\rho_{1}
\] & + & - & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 5.10
\begin{tabular}{llccc}
\hline & Arrangement & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sign of \\
\(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sign of \\
\(G\left(y_{s}\right)\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Type of Steady \\
State
\end{tabular} \\
\hline g1 & \(0<\rho<\Psi<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
g2 & \(0<\rho<1<\Psi\) & + & - & 1 \\
g3 & \(1<\rho<\Psi\) & + & - & 1 \\
h1 & \(0<\Psi<\rho<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
h2 & \(0<\Psi<1<\rho\) & + & - & 1 \\
h3 & \(1<\Psi<\rho\) & + & - & 1 \\
i1 & \(0<\rho=\Psi<1\) & + & - & 1 \\
i2 & \(1<\rho=\Psi\) & + & - & 1
\end{tabular}

\section*{CASE C}

Table 5.11
\(\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\hline & \text { Arrangement } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Sign of } \\ \Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Sign of } \\ \text { G (y }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { Type of Steady } \\ \text { State }\end{array}\right]\)

From these tables we see that the steady state will be an unstable focus (or an unstable node) only in the following cases:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline TABLE & CASE & ARRASGEMEST \\
\hline \(5.1-\) & A & a12, a21 \\
\hline 5.2 & A & b14, b23, b32, b41 \\
\hline 5.4 & A & d12, d14, d21, d23, d32, d41 \\
\hline 5.5 & A & el2, e21 \\
\hline 5.6. & A & f14, f23, f32, f41 \\
\hline 5.7 & B & al2, a21, b13, b22, b31 \\
\hline 5.8 & B & cl2, cl3, c21, c22, c31 \\
\hline 5.11 & C & al2, a21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

If the steady state is unique, then sustained oscillations will be observed for each of the above arrangements. Necessary and sufficient conditions for uniqueness can be derived.

In the case of multiple steady states, the fact that a critical point is an unstable focus (or an unstable node) does not necessarily mean that limit cycles exist. The only way to investigate this problem is by integrating numerically the dynamic equations.

CIIAPTLR VI
__Uniqueness_Criteria_-

Here, we derive the conditions under which a unique steady state solution exists for a lumped system described by the nonlinear algebraic equation

Multiplication of both sides of the above equation by
\[
K_{3}^{0} /\left[K_{1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]
\]
yields,
\[
\begin{equation*}
\frac{k_{3}^{\circ} y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right) e^{-\mu y_{s}}}{\left[k_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}=\left\{\beta_{2}+\frac{\beta_{1} k_{1}[A]\left(1-\beta_{2}\right)}{\left[k_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}\right\}-y_{s} \tag{56}
\end{equation*}
\]

Let
\[
\begin{equation*}
\delta \equiv\left\{\beta_{2}+\frac{\beta_{1} K_{1}[A]\left(1-\beta_{2}\right)}{\left.\left.\left[K_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\right]+1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}\right\} \tag{57}
\end{equation*}
\]

But according to (12a),

Substituting in (57), it yields
\[
\begin{equation*}
\delta \equiv \frac{K_{1} K_{2}[B]}{K_{1} K_{2}[B]+K_{1} K_{2}+K_{2} K_{1}[A]} \tag{58}
\end{equation*}
\]
where \(0<\delta<1\).

Using (57), we can write (56) as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \frac{k_{3}^{\circ} y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right) e^{-\mu y_{s}}}{\left[k_{1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}=\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)  \tag{59}\\
& \frac{\left\{y_{s}\left(y_{-}-\beta_{2}-e^{-\mu y_{s}} /\left[k_{1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]\right\}\right.}{\left(\delta y_{s}\right)}=\frac{1}{k_{3}^{\circ}}
\end{align*}
\]

Let
\[
f\left(y_{s}\right) \equiv \frac{y_{5}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right) e^{-k y_{s}}}{\left[\underline{k}_{-1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}
\]
and
\[
\begin{equation*}
\tau \equiv k_{3}^{0} \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
\]

Then, we can write (60) as
\[
\begin{equation*}
F\left(y_{s}\right)=\frac{f\left(y_{s}\right)}{\left(s^{2}-y_{s}\right)}=\frac{1}{\tau} \tag{63}
\end{equation*}
\]

From (63) we have that
\[
\begin{equation*}
\left(\delta^{2}-y_{s}\right)=\tau f\left(y_{s}\right) \tag{64}
\end{equation*}
\]
where \(0<y_{S} \neq \delta<1\).
At this point, we would like to examine the sign of \(f\left(y_{S}\right)\) which is defined by (61). We have the following possibilities:

Suppose that
\[
k_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]>0
\]

Then,
\[
\left\{\underline{K}_{-2}-K_{1}[A]+K_{2}[B]\right\}>0
\]

Using (12a), we have
\(\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right] \equiv \frac{K_{1}\left(K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]\right)+K_{-2} K_{1}[A]}{\left\{K_{-2}-K_{1}[A]+K_{2}[B]\right\}}>0\)
and
\[
0<\beta_{2}<1
\]
where
\[
\beta_{2}=\left\{K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]\right\} /\left\{K_{-2}-K_{1}[A]+K_{2}[B]\right\}
\]

Since \(0<y_{S}<1\), we cannot draw in this case any conclusions about the sign of \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)\). By looking at equ. (60), however, we see that since the right-hand side of this equation is positive, we must have either that
(i) \(\beta_{2}<y_{5}<\delta^{2}\)
or
(ii) \(\delta<y_{S}<\beta_{2}\)

When \(\beta_{2}<y_{S}<\delta\), we have that \(f\left(y_{S}\right)>0\).
when \(\delta<y_{S}<\beta_{2}\), we have that \(f\left(y_{s}\right)<0\).
_-CAB E-_II_

Suppose that
\[
\begin{equation*}
K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]<0 \tag{65}
\end{equation*}
\]

Then either \(K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]<0\), or we have that \(K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]>0\).
(i) If in addition to (65) we have that \(K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]<0\)
then
\[
\left[\underline{k}_{1}+k_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]<0
\]
and
\[
\beta_{2}>1
\]

As result, \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)<0\), and, consequently, \(f\left(y_{S}\right)>0\).
(ii) If in addition to (65) we have that
\[
K_{-2}+K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]>0
\]
then
\[
\left[\underline{K}_{-1}+\underline{K}_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]>0
\]
and
\[
\beta_{2}<0
\]

As result, \(\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right)>0\), and, consequently, \(f\left(y_{5}\right)>0\).
_CASE_III_

Suppose that
\[
K_{2}[B]-K_{1}[A]=0
\]
then
\[
\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]>0
\]
and
\[
\beta_{2}=0
\]

As result, \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)>0\), and, consequently, \(f\left(y_{s}\right)>0\).
conclusion: \(f\left(y_{5}\right)>0\) for \(0<y_{S} \neq \delta<1\), except in case I (ii).

Since \(F\left(y_{S}\right) \rightarrow \infty\) as \(y_{S} \rightarrow \delta\), we can distinguish the
following possibilities in connection with cases II and III only:
1) \(y_{s} \in\left(0, \delta^{2}\right)\)
2) \(y_{s} \in(\delta, 1)\)

In case (1), \(\left(\delta-y_{5}\right)>0\)., and the lumped system is described by equ.(64):
\[
\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)=\tau f\left(y_{s}\right)
\]

In case (2), \(\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)<0\), and the lumped system is described by
\[
\left(y_{s}-\delta\right)=-\tau f\left(y_{s}\right)
\]

This equation, however, cannot be satisfied, because the left-hand side is positive, while the right-hand side is negative. As result, there are no steady state solutions for \(y_{S} \in(\Omega, 1)\) in cases II and III.

Now, we will develop uniqueness criteria for cases I-III.
_CASE_I_
(i) Here we have that \(\beta_{2}<y_{5}<\delta^{2}\). If the function
\[
F\left(y_{s}\right)=f\left(y_{s}\right) /\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)
\]
is monotonic, a unique solution exists. Hence, a necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness for all \(\mathcal{T}\) is that
\[
\frac{d}{d y_{s}}\left(\frac{f\left(y_{s}\right)}{\delta-y_{s}}\right)>0
\]

Differentiating and multiplying by \(\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)^{2}\), we have
\[
\left(\delta-y_{s}\right) f^{\prime}\left(y_{s}\right)+f\left(y_{s}\right)>0
\]
and
\[
\left(\delta-y_{s}\right) f^{\prime}\left(y_{s}\right)>-f\left(y_{s}\right)
\]
dividing both sides by \(f\left(y_{s}\right)>0\), it yields
\[
\frac{\left(\delta-y_{s}\right) f^{\prime}\left(y_{s}\right)}{f\left(y_{s}\right)}>-1
\]
\[
\frac{d \ln f\left(y_{s}\right)}{d y_{s}}=\frac{1}{f\left(y_{s}\right)} \frac{d f\left(y_{s}\right)}{d y_{s}}=\frac{f^{\prime}\left(y_{s}\right)^{J}}{f\left(y_{s}\right)}
\]
we can rewrite it as
\[
\left(\delta-y_{s}\right) \frac{d \ln f\left(y_{s}\right)}{d y_{s}}>-1
\]

Taking the logarithm of both sides of
\[
f\left(y_{s}\right)=\frac{y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right) e^{-\mu y_{s}}}{\left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]}
\]
we have that
\[
\ln f\left(y_{s}\right)=\ln \left[y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)\right]-\mu y_{s}-\ln \left[K_{-1}+K_{1}[A]\left(1+\beta_{1}\right)\right]
\]
and differentiating,
\[
\frac{d \ln \left[f\left(y_{S}\right)\right]}{d y_{S}}=\frac{\left(2 y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}{y_{S}\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}-\mu
\]

Thus; the necessary and sufficient condition for all \(\tau\) is
\[
\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)\left[\frac{\left(2 y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}{y_{s}\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}-\mu\right]>-1
\]
or
\[
\frac{\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)\left(2 y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)}{y_{S}\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}>-1+\mu\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)
\]

Multiplying both sides of this inequality by \(y_{S}\), it yields
\[
\frac{\left(\delta-y_{S}\right)\left(2 y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}{\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}>-y_{S}+\mu y_{s}\left(\delta-y_{S}\right)
\]

Consequently,
\[
-2 y_{S}+\left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)+\frac{\beta_{2}\left(\delta_{-} \beta_{2}\right)}{\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}>-y_{S}+\mu y_{S}\left(\delta-y_{S}\right)
\]
or
\[
\begin{equation*}
\mu y_{s}^{2}-(1+\mu \delta) y_{s}+2 \delta>\frac{\beta_{2}\left(y_{s}-\delta\right)}{\left(y_{s}-\beta_{2}\right)} \tag{78}
\end{equation*}
\]
since \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)>0\), we can multiply both sides of (78) by this term to get
\[
-\beta_{2} \delta+\delta\left(2+\mu \beta_{2}\right) y_{S}-\left[1+\mu\left(\beta_{2}+\delta\right)\right] y_{S}^{2}+\mu y_{S}^{3}>0
\]

Now, making the substitution
\[
0<\sigma \equiv \frac{\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)}{\left(\delta-\beta_{2}\right)}<1
\]
we can rewrite the above inequality as
\[
A(\sigma) \equiv b_{0}+b_{1} \sigma+b_{2} \sigma^{2}+b_{3} \sigma^{3}>0
\]
where
\[
\begin{aligned}
& b_{0} \equiv \beta_{2} \\
& b_{1} \equiv\left(\delta-\beta_{2}\right)\left(2-\mu \beta_{2}\right) \\
& b_{2} \equiv\left(\delta-\beta_{2}\right)\left[\mu\left(2 \beta_{2}-\delta\right)-1\right] \\
& b_{3} \equiv \mu\left(\delta-\beta_{2}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
sufficient conditions for \(A(\sigma)>0\), whenever \(0<\sigma<1\),
are according to [17]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& b_{0} \equiv \beta_{2}>0 \\
& b_{1}+3 b_{0}>0 \\
& b_{1}+b_{2}>0 \\
& b_{2}+3 b_{3}>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Substituting, we have that the sufficient conditions for uniqueness for all \(\mathcal{T}\) are in this case:
\[
\frac{1}{\left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)}<\mu<\frac{1}{\left(\delta-\beta_{2}\right)}
\]
(ii) Here we have that \(\delta<y_{S}<\beta_{2}\), and \(f\left(y_{S}\right)<0\). Again, if the function
\[
F\left(y_{s}\right)=f\left(y_{s}\right) /\left(\delta-y_{s}\right)
\]
is monotonic, a unique solution exists. Hence, a necessary and sufficient condition for uniqueness for all \(\mathcal{T}\) is
\[
\frac{d}{d y_{s}}\left(\frac{f\left(y_{s}\right)}{\delta-y_{s}}\right)<0
\]

Following the same procedure as in case \(I(i)\), we arrive at equ. (78). Multiplying both sides of (78) by \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)<0\), we get
\[
-\beta_{2} \delta+\delta\left(2+\mu \beta_{2}\right) y_{S}-\left[1+\mu\left(\beta_{2}+\delta\right)\right] y_{s}^{2}+\mu y_{s}^{3}<0
\]

Making the substitution
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ne substitution } \\
& 0<w \equiv \frac{\left(y_{-}-\delta\right)}{\left(\beta_{2}-\delta\right)}<1
\end{aligned}
\]
and multiplying both sides by minus one we arrive at
\[
B(w) \equiv b_{0}^{*}+b_{1}^{*} w+b_{2}^{*} w^{2}+b_{3}^{*} w^{3}>0
\]
where
\[
\begin{aligned}
& b_{0}^{*} \equiv \delta \\
& b_{1}^{*} \equiv \mu \delta\left(\beta_{2}-\delta\right) \\
& b_{2}^{*} \equiv\left(\beta_{2}-\delta\right)\left[-\mu\left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)+1\right] \\
& b_{3}^{*} \equiv-\mu\left(\beta_{2}-\delta\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
\]

Sufficient conditions for uniqueness for all \(\tau\) are in this case [17]:
\[
0<\mu<\frac{1}{\left(2 \beta_{2}-\delta\right)}
\]

Remark: In case I, it is impossible to have
\[
\beta_{2}=\delta^{2}
\]
_CASE_II_-
(i). Here we have that \(\beta_{2}>1\), and \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)<0\). Multiplying both sides of (78) by \(-\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right)\) it yields
\[
Z\left(y_{S}\right) \equiv a_{0}^{\prime}+a_{1}^{\prime} y_{S}+a_{2}^{\prime} y_{S}^{2}+a_{3}^{\prime} y_{S}^{3}>0
\]
where \(y_{s} \in(0, \delta)\), and
\[
\begin{aligned}
& a_{0}^{\prime} \equiv \beta_{2} \delta \\
& a_{1}^{\prime} \equiv-\delta\left(2+\mu \beta_{2}\right) \\
& a_{2}^{\prime} \equiv\left[1+\mu\left(\beta_{2}+\delta\right)\right] \\
& a_{3}^{\prime} \equiv-\mu
\end{aligned}
\]

The above inequality can be rewritten as
\[
Z\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right) \equiv a_{0}^{*}+a_{1}^{*} \sigma^{\prime}+a_{2}^{*} \sigma^{2}+a_{3}^{*} \sigma^{3}>0
\]
where
\[
0<\sigma^{\prime} \equiv \frac{y_{s}}{\delta^{2}}<1
\]
and
\[
\begin{aligned}
& a_{0}^{*} \equiv \beta_{2} \delta^{\prime} \\
& a_{1}^{*} \equiv-\delta^{2}\left(2+\mu \beta_{2}\right) \\
& a_{2}^{*} \equiv \delta^{2}\left[1+\mu\left(\beta_{2}+\delta\right)\right] \\
& a_{3}^{*} \equiv-\mu \delta^{3}
\end{aligned}
\]
sufficient conditions for \(Z\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right)>0\), whenever \(\sigma^{\prime} \in(0,1)\), are according to [17]:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \quad a_{0}^{*}>0 \\
& \nu a_{\nu}^{*}+(n-v+1) \alpha_{\nu-1}^{*}>0, \quad(\nu=1, \ldots, n) \\
& \text { where } n \text { is the degree of } Z\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right) .
\end{aligned}
\]

The first condition is automatically satisfied; the second condition can be written in its full form as
\[
\begin{aligned}
& a_{1}^{*}+3 a_{0}^{*}>0 \\
& a_{1}^{*}+a_{2}^{*}>0 \\
& a_{2}^{*}+3 a_{3}^{*}>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Substituting, we can write these conditions as
\[
\frac{1}{\delta}<\mu<\left(\frac{3}{\delta}-\frac{2}{\beta_{2}}\right)
\]
\[
\mu\left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)<1
\]

In a better form, we can write that the sufficient conditions for uniqueness for all \(\tau\) in this case are:
\[
\frac{1}{\delta}<\mu<\left(\frac{3}{\delta}-\frac{2}{\beta_{2}}\right), \quad\left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)<\frac{1}{\mu}
\]
(ii) Here we have that \(\beta_{2}<0\) and \(\left(y_{5}-\beta_{2}\right)>0\).

Multiplying both sides of (78) by \(\left(y_{S}-\beta_{2}\right)\) it yields
\[
\Omega\left(\sigma^{\prime}\right) \equiv a_{0}+a_{1} \sigma^{\prime}+a_{2} \sigma^{\prime 2}+a_{3} \sigma^{\prime 3}>0
\]
where
\[
0<\sigma^{\prime} \equiv \frac{y_{S}}{\delta^{2}}<1
\]
and
\[
\begin{aligned}
& a_{0} \equiv-\beta_{2} \delta \\
& a_{1} \equiv \delta^{2}\left(2+\mu \beta_{2}\right) \\
& a_{2} \equiv-\delta^{2}\left[1+\mu\left(\beta_{2}+\delta\right)\right] \\
& a_{3} \equiv \mu \delta^{3}
\end{aligned}
\]

Similarly, we can derive sufficient conditions for uniqueness for all \(\tau\) [17]:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{3}{\delta}-\frac{2}{\beta_{2}}\right)<\mu<\frac{1}{\delta^{2}} \\
& \left(2 \delta-\beta_{2}\right)>\frac{1}{\mu}
\end{aligned}
\]
_CASE _III_
riere we have that \(\beta_{2} \equiv 0\). Then equ. (78) becomes
\[
\begin{equation*}
\mu y_{S}^{2}-(1+\mu \delta) y_{S}+2 \delta>0 \tag{108}
\end{equation*}
\]

Recall also that \(y_{S} \in(0, \delta)\).
Let
\[
A\left(y_{S}\right) \equiv \mu y_{S}^{2}-(1+\mu \delta) y_{S}+2 \delta
\]
and \(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\) be the roots of \(A\left(y_{s}\right)=0\).
Then,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma_{1}=\frac{(1+\mu \delta)-\sqrt{(1-\mu \delta)^{2}-4 \mu \delta}}{2 \mu} \\
& \sigma_{2}=\frac{(1+\mu \delta)+\sqrt{(1-\mu \delta)^{2}-4 \mu \delta}}{2 \mu}
\end{aligned}
\]

In connection with the sign of the discriminant
\[
\Delta=(1-\mu \delta)^{2}-4 \mu \delta
\]
we can distinguish the following subcases:
a) \((1-\mu \delta)^{2}<4 \mu \delta\)

Then \(A\left(y_{S}\right)>0\) for any real value of \(y_{S}\). Thus, the condition \((1-\mu \delta)^{2}<4 \mu \delta \quad\) is a sufficient condition for (108) to hold.
b) \((1-\mu \delta)^{2}=4 \mu \delta\)

Then \(\sigma_{1}=\sigma_{2}=\frac{(1+\mu \delta)}{2 \mu}\), and \(A\left(y_{s}\right)>0\) if in addition
we have that \(\mu<\frac{1}{\delta^{2}}\).
c) \((1-\mu \delta)^{2}>4 \mu \delta^{2}\)

Then \(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}\) are real and unequal; in fact, we can prove that they are positive.

Now, we can distinguish the following subcases:
(1) Suppose that \(\mu<\frac{1}{\delta}\); then, we have that \(A\left(y_{s}\right)>0\).
(2) Suppose that \(\mu>1 / \delta^{2}\). Then, \(\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2} \in(0, \delta)\).

\section*{CHAPTER VII}

Here we present sets of paraneter values for which the dynamic equations, when numerically integrated, give rise to limit cycles. These values are such that a unique steady state solution exists for equ. (14), when \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\). VIIa] _Kinetic_parameter_values

In this study, our purpose is to prove the existence of oscillatory solutions for some values of the kinetic parameters. In other words, we need to find parameter values for which the dynamic equations give rise to limit cycles. For simplicity, we restrict our search by choosing values such that \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\), and for which (109) -the
sufficient condition for uniqueness for all \(\tau\) - is satisfied.

For a unique steadystate solution for which \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\), the dynamic equations give rise to limit cycles, if the kinetic parameter values are such that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}>0 \\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}>0
\end{aligned}
\]

For illustration, we present the following two examples:
\(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]=2.00\)
\(k_{-1}=1 / 6\)
\(k_{-2}=0.2640065\)
\(k_{3}^{0}=237.1082966\)
\(\mu=14.00\)
where \(k_{1}[A], k_{2}[B], k_{-1}, k_{-2}\) and \(k_{3}^{0}\) have units \((\sec )^{-1}\).

Then, using (42)-(46) we obtain
\(\gamma=48.00966577\)
\(\varepsilon=21.10559431\)
\(\partial=2.525190352\)
\(\varepsilon^{\prime}=20.47340573\)
\(\partial^{\prime}=2.059668465\)
Since
\[
\Delta_{\phi}=\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \partial=-39.48806784<0
\]
we conclude that \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex.
Using (53), we obtain
\(\Psi_{1}=0.2638416181\)
\(\Psi_{1}=0.1626017947\)
Thus, \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1\). This is the arrangement (Cal) as shown on page 38.

Using (47), we find that the steady state equation is
\((237.1082966) y_{s}^{2} e^{-14 y_{s}}+3.429261841 y_{s}-1.262595176=0\)
Since \(\beta_{2}=0\) and \(\beta_{1} \equiv k_{-1} / k_{-2}=0.631297588\), (12)
yields
\[
\begin{equation*}
x_{s}=y_{s} / 0.631297588 \tag{111}
\end{equation*}
\]

The solution of (110) in \((0,1)\) is:
\(y_{S}=0.20\), and using (111) we have \(x_{S}=0.3168078\).
A sufficient condition for uniqueness
for all \(\tau\) for equation (110) is
\[
\begin{equation*}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2}<4 \delta \mu \tag{109}
\end{equation*}
\]

Using (58), we obtain
\[
\delta=0.3681827853
\]

Thus,
\[
\begin{aligned}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2} & =17.26036044 \\
4 \mu \delta & =20.61823598
\end{aligned}
\]

Therefore, (109) is satisfied for the values assumed in this example.

According to table 5.11, when \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<1\) we have that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi\left(y_{S}\right)>0 \\
& G\left(y_{S}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
and the steady state is either an unstable focus or an an unstable node.

Using (30)-(33), we obtain
\[
\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{1} & =0.9053474166 \\
\alpha_{2} & =62.59813151 \\
\alpha_{3} & =-39.51804943 \\
\beta & =4.430673167
\end{aligned}
\]

According to (15)-(16), we have
\(\operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left[\alpha_{2} y_{s}+\alpha_{3} x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\right]\)
\(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+K_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left[x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)-y_{s}\right]\)
Substituting, we find that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det} \underset{A}{A}=0.2962920094>0 \\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=0.9078607617>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Since
\[
D=(\operatorname{tr} A)^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} A)=-0.3609568729<0 \text {, then }
\]
according to theorem 3.1 the point \((0.3168078,0.20)\) is an unstable focus.

The characteristic equation for the linearized system is
\[
\lambda^{2}-(\operatorname{tr} \underset{A}{ }) \lambda+(\operatorname{det} A)=0
\]

Tine eigenvalues are

For this example,
\[
\lambda_{1,2}=\frac{(t r A)}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(t r \underline{A})^{2}-t(\operatorname{det} \underline{A})}}{2}
\]
\(\lambda_{1}=0.4539303809+i(0.3003984325)\)
\(\lambda_{2}=0.4539303809-i(0.3003984325)\) _ _ EXAMPLE_2_

This example is related to the previous one. Suppose that
\(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]=2: 00\)
\(k_{-1}=1 / 6\)
\(k_{-2}=0.2640065\)
\(k_{3}^{0}=339.3304816\)
\(\mu=15.83025413\)
where \(k_{1}[A], k_{2}[B], k_{-1}, k_{-2}\) and \(k_{3}^{0}\) have units \((s e c)^{-1}\).

Using (42)-(46), we obtain
\(\gamma=54.28608642\)
\(\varepsilon=23.41646432\)
\(\partial=2.525190352\)
\(\varepsilon^{\prime}=22.78427579\)
\(\partial^{\prime}=2.059668465\)
Since
\(\Lambda \phi=\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma=-5.2526 * 10^{-6}<0\), we conclude that \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex.

Using (53), we obtain
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Psi_{1}=0.2879407886 \\
& \Psi_{2}=0.1317666778
\end{aligned}
\]

Thus, \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\Psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<l\). This is the arrangement Cal as shown on page 38.

Using (47), we find that the steady state equation is \((339.3304816) y_{s}^{2} e^{-15.83025413 y_{s}}+3.429261841 y_{s}-1.26259=0\) (112) We also have that
\[
\begin{equation*}
x_{s}=y_{s} / 0.631297588 \tag{113}
\end{equation*}
\]

A sufficient condition for uniqueness for
all \(\tau\) for equation (112) is
\[
\begin{equation*}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2}<4 \mu \delta \tag{109}
\end{equation*}
\]

Using (58), we obtain
\[
\delta=0.3681827853
\]

Thus,
\[
\begin{gathered}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2}=23.31370783 \\
4 \mu \delta=23.313708823
\end{gathered}
\]

Therefore, (109) is satisfied for the values assumed in this example.

The solution of (112) in the interval \((0,1)\) is
\[
y_{s}=0.25
\]
and using (113)
\[
x_{s}=0.39600975
\]

Since \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\Psi_{2}<y_{S}<\Psi_{1}<l\), we have the arrangement (Ca12). According to table 5.11, for this arrangement
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi\left(y_{S}\right)>0 \\
& G\left(y_{S}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
and the steady state solution is either an unstable focus or an unstable node.

Using (30)-(33) we obtain
\(\alpha_{1}=0.9053474166\)
\(\alpha_{2}=89.58545279\)
\(\alpha_{3}=-56.55508027\)
\(\beta=4.430673167\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { According to (15)-(16), we have } \\
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left[\alpha_{2} y_{s}+\alpha_{3} x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\right] \\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+K_{3}^{0} e^{-\mu y_{s}}\left[x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)-y_{5}\right]
\end{aligned}
\]

Substituting, we find that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=0.0675377564>0 \\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=1.542981473>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Since
\[
D=(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A})^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} \underline{A})=2.110640802>0, \text { then }
\]
according to theorem 3.1, the point \((0.39600975,0.25)\) is an unstable node.

The eigenvalues are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{1}=1.497892967 \\
& \lambda_{2}=0.0450885062
\end{aligned}
\]

VIIb] _Numerical_integration_of the_dynamic_equations.--

In examples 1 and 2, parameter values were presented for which a unique, unstable steady state solution exists for equation (47). In other words, these values are such that
\[
(1-\mu \delta)^{2}<4 \mu \delta
\]
and
\[
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det} \underset{A}{A} & >0 \\
\operatorname{tr} \underset{-}{A} & >0
\end{aligned}
\]

Here, the dynamic equations
\(\frac{d x}{d t}=K_{1}[A](1-x-y)-K_{1} x-K_{3}^{\circ} e^{-\mu y} x y\)
\(\frac{d y}{d t}=K_{2}[B](1-x-y)-K_{-2} y-K_{3}^{\circ} e^{-\mu y} x y\)
give rise to limit cycles.
Dividing (9) by (8), we obtain
\[
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{K_{2}[B](1-x-y)-K_{-2} y-K_{3}^{0} x y e^{-\mu y}}{K_{1}[A](1-x-y)-K_{-1} x-K_{3}^{0} x y e^{-\mu y}} \tag{114}
\end{equation*}
\]
(114) is a nonlinear, ordinary differential equation which
can be solved numerically. As initial values for \(x \in(0,1)\) and \(y \in(0,1)\), we can choose values along the sides of a square with corners the points \((0,0),(0,1),(1,1)\) and \((1,0)\).

The numerical integration technique used in this study was a fourth order Runge-Iiutta; we employed subroutine Rix2, which-can be found on page 332 of [18]. The programs were run on the UivIVAC 1108 computer at the University of Houston.

For the parameter values cited in the two examples, equation (ll4) was numerically integrated with different \(x\) and \(y\). initial values for each run. The integration was performed witi a stepsize \(10^{-3}\), and the resulting trajectories were plotted in order to examine the phase plane jehavior of equations (8)-(9).

In both examples, limit cycling was observed as shown in figures 7.1 and 7.2. By perturbing the unique, unstable steady state, we were able to eliminate the possibility of an unstable limit cycle surrounded by a stable one. The figures show that trajectories originating from the inside give rise to a stable limit cycle.

Figure 7.1 represents example 1 , while figure 7.2 corresponds to example 2. The time dependence of \(x\) and \(y\) for each of these examples can be determined by integrating numerically the dynamic equations (8)-(9). The numerical integration was performed by using subroutine RKGS [18], and the results are shown in figures 7.1 a and 7.2a corresponding to examples 1 and 2 , respectively. From figure
7.la we read that the period of oscillations is approximately 11 seconds, while from figure 7.2 a we see that it is about 17 seconds.

\section*{IMPORTANT REMARK}

It is essential to emphasize at this point that our region of interest is not the above mentioned square, but actually the orthogonal triangle which has as sides the positive \(X\) and \(Y\) axes and the line \(x+y=1\). Thus, our search is reduced by a factor of two, because if a limit cycle exists it should definately be restricted in this region.

At this point, it is pertinent to state the following important theorem:

BEEDIXSON'S_SECOND_THEOREM: Consider a two-dimensional system whose state variables are bounded, and which has a unique, unstable steady state. Then all system trajectories are either a stable limit cycle, or else approach a stable limit cycle asymptotically.

A statement of this theorem can be found in: N. Minorsky, "Nonlinear Oscillations", Ch. 3, Van Nostrand, Princeton,iv.J., 1962.



Fig. 7.la. Dimensionless concentrations of adsorbed reactants versus time, oxample \(1, \mu=14.0\)


Fig. 7.2. Phase plane trajectories, example 2, \(\mu=15.83025413\)


Fig 7.2a. Dimensionless concentrations of adsorbed reactants versus time, exarọle \(2, \mu=15.83025413\)

\section*{CHAPTER VIII}

Here we investigate whether sustained oscillations occur when equ. (47) has multiple steady state solutions. The investigation is carried out by using bifurcation theory.

\section*{Multiple_steady states and applications_of bifurcation_theory.}

In the previous chapter, we presented examples demonstrating that the dynamic equations can give rise to limit cycles in the case of a unique, unstable steady state solution.

Since we are interested in the phase plane behavior of equs.(8)-(9), we need to investigate whether limit cycles can occur when multiple steady state solutions exist. We will commence our investigation by presenting the following numerical example.

Suppose that
\(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]=1.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(k_{-1}=2.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(k_{-2}=4.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(k_{3}^{0}=1604.719045 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(\mu=50.00\)
Then using (42)-(46) we obtain
\(\gamma=175.00\)
\(\varepsilon=28.50\)
\(\partial=1.00\)
\(\varepsilon^{\prime}=26.25\)
\(a^{\prime}=0.75\)
Using (52)-(53) we obtain
\(\rho_{1}=0.1116994573\)
\(\rho_{2}=0.0511576855\)
\(\Psi_{1}=0.1115962527\)
\(\Psi_{2}=0.0384037472\)
Thus,
\[
0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1
\]

This is the arrangement (Abl) as shown on page 26.
Using. (47), we find that the steady state equation is
\((1604.719045) y_{s}^{2} e^{-50 y_{s}}+3.5 y_{s}-0.5=0\)
(115) does not satisfy the
condition for uniqueness :
\[
\begin{equation*}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2} \leq 4 \mu \delta \tag{109}
\end{equation*}
\]

Using (58), we obtain
\[
\delta=1 / 7
\]

Thus,
\[
\begin{array}{r}
(1-\mu \delta)^{2}=37.73469 \\
4 \mu \delta=28.571428
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, (109) is not satisfied for the parameter values assumed in this example, and, consequently, equ.(115) has multiple steady states.
\[
\begin{gather*}
\text { since } \beta_{2}=0 \text { and } \beta_{1} \equiv k_{-1} / k_{-2}=0.5, \text { (12) yields } \\
x_{s}=2 y_{s} \tag{116}
\end{gather*}
\]

Equ. (115) has the following solutions in ( 0,1 ) :
\(y_{s 1}=0.045\); using (116), \(x_{s l}=0.090\)
\(y_{s 2}=0.132\), and \(x_{s 2}=0.264\)
\(y_{s 3}=0.058\), and \(x_{s 3}=0.116\)
Using (30)-(33), we obtain
\(\alpha_{1}=14.00\)
\(\alpha_{2}=6418.87618\)
\(\alpha_{3}=-3209.43809\)
\(\beta=8.00\)
According to (15)-(16), we have
\(\operatorname{det} \underline{A}=\alpha_{1}+\exp \left(-\mu y_{s}\right) *\left[\alpha_{2} y_{s}+\alpha_{3} x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)\right]\)
\(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-\beta+k_{3}^{0} \exp \left(-\mu y_{s}\right) *\left[x_{s}\left(\mu y_{s}-1\right)-y_{s}\right]\)
Since \(0<\Psi_{2}<Y_{s l}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<1\), we have the arrangement (Abl). According to table 5.2, for this arrangement we have that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi\left(y_{s l}\right)>0 \\
& G\left(y_{s l}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
and the steady state is either an unstable focus or an unstable node.

Substituting, we find that for \(y_{s l}=0.045\) and \(x_{s l}=0.09\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det} \underline{A} & =6.388873565>0 \\
\operatorname{tr} \underline{A} & =3.416689651>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Since
\[
D=(\operatorname{tr} A)^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} A)=-13.88172607<0, \text { then }
\]
according to theorem 3.1 the point \((0.090,0.045)\) is an unstable focus.

Since \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<\Psi_{1}<\rho_{1}<Y_{s 2}<1\), we have the arrangenent (Abll). Accarding to table 5.2, for this arrangement
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi\left(y_{S 2}\right)>0 \\
& G\left(y_{S 2}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
and the steady state is either a stable focus or a stable node.

Substituting, we find that for \(y_{s 2}=0.132\) and \(x_{s 2}=0.264\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{det} \underline{A}=8.697908959>0 \\
& \operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=-5.060797358<0
\end{aligned}
\]

Since
\[
D=(\operatorname{tr} \underset{A}{A})^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} \underset{A}{A})=-9.179965917<0 \text {, then }
\]
according to theorem 3.1 the point ( \(0.264,0.132\) ) is a stable focus.

Since \(0<\Psi_{2}<\rho_{2}<Y_{s 3}<\Psi_{I}<\rho_{1}<1\), we have the arrangement (Abl3). According to table 5.2, for this arrangement
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi\left(y_{S 3}\right)<0 \\
& G\left(y_{S 3}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
and the steady state is a saddle point.
Substituting, we find that for \(y_{s 3}=0.058\) and \(x_{s 3}=0.116\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{det} \underline{A} & =-4.436373749<0 \\
\operatorname{tr} \underline{A} & =6.339401805>0
\end{aligned}
\]

Therefore, the point \((0.116,0.058)\) is a saddle point according to theorem 3.1.

Conclusion_: For the paraneter values cited in this example, equ. (47) inas multiple steady state solutions in the interval ( 0,1 ); these solutions are:
\(y_{s I}=0.045, x_{s I}=0.090:\) Unstable focus.
\(y_{s 2}=0.132, x_{s}=0.264\) : Stable focus.
\(y_{s 3}=0.058, x_{s 3}=0.116:\) Saddle point.

Numerical integration of (114) for the above mentioned parameter values with a stepsize \(10^{-3}\) does not give rise to limit cycles. By using values along the boundaries of the feasible domain as initial values for x and y , we see that all trajectories go to the stable focus; the same is true when we perturb the unstable focus, as shown in figure 8.1. We cannot conclude, however, that limit cycles do not arise for other kinetic parameter values for which (47) has multiple steady state solutions in (0,1).

Thus, we would like to examine whether it is possible to have sustained oscillations in the case of multiple steady state solutions for equ.(47). We will try to solve this problem by using bifurcation theory: We will examine whether limit cycles bifurcate (originate) from critical points, which are centers for the linearized problem associated with the dynamic equations. Poore and coworkers have published in their work \([9,10]\) a large number of examples where bifurcation theory is applied.

X-DIMENSIONLESS CONCENTRPTIION OF ADSORBED \(A(g)\).

Fig. 8.1. Flase plane trajectories,


Bifurcation theory is concerned with the variation of a single parameter. In the following example we will vary \(k_{3}^{0}\) and let the other five kinetic parameters have the same values as in the previous example; that is, let
\(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]=1.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(k_{-1}=-2.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(k_{-2}=4.00 \quad(\mathrm{sec})^{-1}\)
\(\mu=50.00\)
Using equ. (47), we find that in this case the steady state equation is
\[
\begin{equation*}
x_{3}^{0} y_{s}^{2} e^{-50 y_{s}}+3.5 y_{s}-0.5=0 \tag{117}
\end{equation*}
\]

Then,
\[
\begin{equation*}
k_{3}^{0}=\frac{\left(0.5-3.5 y_{s}\right) e^{50 y_{s}}}{y_{s}^{2}} \tag{118}
\end{equation*}
\]

Since \(k_{3}^{0}>0, y_{s}\) is restricted in the interval (0,0.1428571429). We can draw a graph of \(y_{s}\) versus \(k_{3}^{0}\), as shown in figure 8.2 .

The characteristic equation for the linearized system is
\[
\lambda^{2}-(\operatorname{tr} \underset{A}{A}) \lambda+(\operatorname{det} A)=0
\]

The eigenvalues are
\[
\lambda_{1,2}=\frac{(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A})}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(\operatorname{tr} \underline{A})^{2}-4(\operatorname{det} \underline{A})}}{2}
\]

Bifurcation of periodic solutions can occur only from the center or possibly at those points at which one of the eigenvalues of \(\underline{A}\) is equal to zero [9]. According to theorem

3.1, the critical point ( \(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{S}}, Y_{\mathrm{S}}\) ) will be a center for the linearized problem if the eigenvalues of A are purely imaginary:
\[
\operatorname{tr} \underline{A}=0 \quad \text { and } \operatorname{det} \underline{A} \underset{-}{ }>0
\]

For the parameter values cited in this section, the cente \(\bar{r}\) is
\[
y_{s}=\Psi_{2}=0.0384037472, x_{s}=0.0768074944
\]

Using (118), we find that at the center \(\mathrm{k}_{3}^{0}=1691.103454\). Thus, we are able to locate the center for the linearized problem on the \(y_{s}\) versus \(k_{3}^{0}\) graph(fig. 8.2). By increasing the value of \(k_{3}^{0}\) above its value at the center, and integrating numerically the ordinary differential equation
\[
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d y}{d x}=\frac{K_{2}[B](1-x-y)-K_{-2} y-K_{3}^{0} x y e^{-\mu y}}{K_{1}[A](1-x-y)-K_{-1} x-K_{3}^{0} x y e^{-\mu y}} \tag{114}
\end{equation*}
\]
we find that there are no limit cycles in the phase plane; the same is true when we integrate (114) for values of \(k_{3}^{0}\) which are smaller than its value at the center. The numerical integrations were carried-out with a stepsize \(10^{-3}\). Therefore, we can draw the conclusion that this particular set of kinetic parameters does not give rise to limit cycles. It is possible, however, that there are other parameters for which sustained oscillations may exist in the case of multiple steady state solutions.

\section*{CHAPTER IX}

\section*{_Conclusions}

In this study, we have attempted to investigate the stability characteristics of a surface kinetics mechanism representing a general chemical reaction. Our main objective was to examine the validity of statements made by slinko and coworkers [5] concerning the observance of concentration oscillations during the isothermal oxidation of hydrogen on a nickel foil.

Because we wanted to keep the mathematical analysis as simple as possible, rather than working on a specific chenjcal reaction we prefered to analyze the general reaction \(A(g)+B(g) \longrightarrow A B\). We assumed that the heterogeneous catalytic mechanism for this reacticr is a Langruir-Einshelwood type, and the adsorbed \(.9(g)\) changes the properties of the catalytic surface such that the energy of activation for the surface reaction depends linearly on the coverage by adsorbed \(B(g)\).

We derived the differential equations for the net rates of adsorption of \(A(g)\) and \(B(g)\), and linearized them about the steady state in order to investigate the local stability characteristics of the critical points, by using the first method of Liapunov. Expressions were derived for the determinant and trace of the linearized matrix \(A\), and for
simplicity we decided to assume in our stability analysis that \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\).

The nature of the critical points depends on the sign of detA and tra. We have been able to derive, however, the polynomials \(\Phi\left(y_{s}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) having the sane sign as detA and tra. The signs of \(\Phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) and \(G\left(y_{S}\right)\) depend on the size of the critical point with respect to the relative positions of the roots of the equations \(\Phi(\xi)=0, G(\omega)=0\), in the interval ( 0,1 ). We have also been able to derive the necessary and sufficient conditions for all possible arrangements of the root positions for the equations \(\Phi(\xi)=0, G(\omega)=0\), in ( 0,1 ).

Uniqueness criteria were developed for the steady state solutions both for the general case and when \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\). Using these uniqueness criteria and the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangenent of the root positions for the equations \(\Phi(\xi)=0, G(\omega)=0\) in the interval \((0,1)\), we were able to find parameter values for which the dynamic equations give rise to limit cycles. These limit cycles were found for the case of a unique, unstable steady state solution.

We used principles of bifurcation theory to investigate the existence of sustained oscillations for the case of multiple steady states. By varying one of the kinetic parameters and numerically integrating the dynamic equations, we checked whether periodic orbits bifurcate (originate) from
critical points which are centers for the linearized problem. Our efforts have led us to conclude that limit cycles do not exist for the kinetic parameter values chosen in that particular example. It is possible, however, that there are other values for which sustained oscillations could be observed in the case of multiple steady state solutions; this is, of course, only an assumption and will have to be proved.

Slinko and coworkers [5] do not give in their paper any kinetic parameter values, or show numerical simulations to demonstraie that their proposed kinetic mechanism gives rise to limit cycles such that is in agreement with experimental results. Our study has shown that there are parameter values for which sustained oscillations arise in the case of a unigue, unstable steacy state. Our kinetic mechanism, although simpler than Slinko's, does have similar features and is based on the same assumptions.

In our study, the stability analysis was performed for the special case \(k_{1}[A]=k_{2}[B]\). It would be rather interesting, however, to investigate the general case \(k_{1}[A] \neq k_{2}[B]\), in order to get a picture of the phase plane behavior of the dynamic equations.

It is possible that the chemical reaction proceeds by an Eley-Rideal rather than a Langmuir-Hinshelwood kinetic mechanism. Then it would be interesting to assume that the reaction has features belonging to both possible
kinetic mechenisms. An even more difficult problem to consider is one where we take into account diffusional limitations and mass tranfer resistance such as. in the case of a catalytic pellet.

APPENDIX
_Section_1_
Consider the polynomials
\[
\begin{align*}
& \phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{5}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+\sigma  \tag{40}\\
& G\left(y_{S}\right)=-\gamma y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} y_{5}-\gamma^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
\]
then, we can state the following theorems [20] :
Theorem_A1_: Suppose that the polynomial \(\varphi\left(y_{s}\right)\) has real and unequal roots \(\left.\rho_{1}\right\rangle \rho_{2}\). Then, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(m<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are:
\[
\Delta_{\phi}^{\text {are: }}>0, \gamma \phi(m)>0, m<\frac{p_{1}+p_{2}}{2}
\]
where \(m\) is a real number.

Theorem _A2_: Suppose that the polynomial \(G\left(Y_{S}\right)\) has real and unequal roots \(\psi_{1}>\psi_{2}\). Then, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(m<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are:
\[
\begin{gathered}
\Delta_{G}>0,-\gamma G(m)>0, m<\frac{\Psi_{1}+\psi_{2}}{2}, ~
\end{gathered}
\]
where m is a real number.
Theorem_A3_: Suppose that the polynomial \(\phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) has real and unequal roots, \(p_{1}>\rho_{2}\). Then, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\rho_{2}<P_{1}<M\) are:
where \(M\) is a real number.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \langle M \\
& \left.\Delta_{\phi}>0, \gamma P(M)>0, M\right\rangle \frac{p_{1}+p_{2}}{2},
\end{aligned}
\]

Theorem A4_: Suppose that the polynomial \(G\left(Y_{S}\right)\) has real and unequal roots \(\psi_{1}>\psi_{2}\). Then, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<M\) are:
\[
\Delta_{G}>0,-\gamma G(M)>0, M>\frac{\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}}{2}
\]
where \(M\) is a real number.
Theorem A5: Suppose that \(\rho_{2}\left\langle\eta<\rho_{1}\right.\), where \(\rho_{1}>\rho_{2}\) are roots of the polynomial \(\varphi\left(y_{s}\right)\); then, we have that \(\gamma \Phi(\eta)<0\). The reverse is also true: If \(\eta\) is a real number and \(\gamma \varphi(\eta)<0\), then the roots of \(\phi\left(y_{S}\right)\) are real and unequal and \(\eta\) lies between the roots.

Theorem _A6_: Suppose that \(\psi_{2}<\eta<\psi_{1}\), where \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are roots of the polynomial \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\); then, we have that \(-\gamma(V) \leqslant 0\). The reverse is also true: If \(\eta\) is a real number and \(-\gamma G(\eta)<0\), then the roots of \(G\left(y_{s}\right)\) are real and unequal and \(\eta\) lies between the roots.
_Sectio n_2

Suppose that we have the polynomials
\[
\begin{align*}
& \phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{s}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+V  \tag{40}\\
& G\left(y_{s}\right)=-\gamma y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} y_{s}-\gamma^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are the roots of \(\Phi(\xi)=0\), and \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are the roots of \(G(\omega)=0\). Then, the following relations exist :
\[
\begin{align*}
& \rho_{1}+\rho_{2}=\varepsilon / \gamma  \tag{A1}\\
& \rho_{1} \rho_{2}=\lambda / \gamma  \tag{A2}\\
& \psi_{1}+\psi_{2}=\varepsilon^{\prime} / \gamma  \tag{A3}\\
& \psi_{1} \psi_{2}=\delta^{\prime} / \gamma \\
& \rho_{1}^{2}+\rho_{2}^{2}=\left(\varepsilon^{2}-2 \gamma \nabla\right) / \gamma^{2}  \tag{A5}\\
& \psi_{1}^{2}+\psi_{2}^{2}=\left(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}\right) / \gamma^{2}  \tag{A6}\\
& \gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}=\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}+2 \gamma\left(\nu^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A7}\\
& -\gamma\left\{E\left(p_{1}\right)+\mathbb{E}\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}=\varepsilon^{2}-\varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}-2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A8}\\
& \left.R_{\sigma \phi}=\gamma^{2} \phi\left(\psi_{1}\right) \phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)=\gamma^{2} E\left(p_{1}\right) G\left(p_{2}^{\prime}\right)=\gamma^{2}\left(\rho^{\prime}-\hat{j}\right)\right)^{2}-\gamma\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A9}\\
& \gamma \phi(0)=\gamma \nu  \tag{A10}\\
& \gamma \phi(1)=\gamma(\gamma-\varepsilon+\hat{V})  \tag{All}\\
& -\gamma \sigma(0)=\gamma \nabla^{\prime}  \tag{A12}\\
& -\gamma G(1)=\gamma\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{Al3}\\
& -\gamma G(\varepsilon / 2 \gamma)=\gamma \gamma^{\prime}+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A14}\\
& \gamma^{\phi}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\right)=\gamma \nabla+\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\left(\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}-\varepsilon\right) \tag{A15}
\end{align*}
\]
_-_Section_3_-
\[
\begin{align*}
& \phi\left(y_{s}\right)=\gamma y_{s}^{2}-\varepsilon y_{s}+q^{\prime}  \tag{40}\\
& \sigma\left(y_{s}\right)=-\gamma y_{s}^{2}+\varepsilon^{\prime} y_{s}-\gamma^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
\]
which have no common roots. Let \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) be the roots of \(\phi(\xi)=0\), and \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) be the roots of \(G(\omega)=0\). Then, we state the following theorem [20] :

Theorem_A﹎ : suppose that \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are real and unequal, \(P_{1}>P_{2}\); similarly, that \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are real and unequal, \(\psi_{1}>\psi_{2}\). Then,. we can distinguish the following subcases :
a] \(\quad p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
\[
\begin{align*}
& R_{G \phi}<0  \tag{A16}\\
& P_{1}+P_{2}<\psi_{1}+\psi_{2} \tag{A17}
\end{align*}
\]
b] \(\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
c] \(\quad p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gather*}
R_{G \phi}<0  \tag{Al}\\
\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}<p_{1}+p_{2} \tag{A19}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
\[
\begin{equation*}
\Delta_{G}>0 \tag{A20}
\end{equation*}
\]
\[
\begin{gather*}
R_{\sigma \phi}>0  \tag{A21}\\
\gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}<0 \tag{A22}
\end{gather*}
\]
d] \(\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{\phi}>0  \tag{A23}\\
R_{G \varnothing}>0  \tag{AR}\\
-\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}<0 \tag{A25}
\end{gather*}
\]
e] \(p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{\phi}>0  \tag{A26}\\
\Delta_{G}>0  \tag{A27}\\
R_{6 \phi}>0  \tag{A28}\\
\gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}>0  \tag{A29}\\
-\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}>0  \tag{A30}\\
p_{1}+p_{2}\left\langle\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right. \tag{A31}
\end{gather*}
\]
f. \(\quad \psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\)

The necessary and sufficient conditions for this arrangement are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{\phi}>0  \tag{AB}\\
\Delta_{G}>0  \tag{A33}\\
R_{G \phi}>0  \tag{AB}\\
\gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}>0  \tag{A35}\\
-\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}>0  \tag{AB}\\
\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\left\langle p_{1}+p_{2}\right. \tag{A37}
\end{gather*}
\]

We can now use theorems (Al)-(A7) to derive the necessary and sufficient conditions for all possible arrangements for the root positions shown in chapter IVb.
_CASE A
al] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}<1\)
For the arrangement
\[
p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}
\]
we have from theorem A7a that the necessary and sufficient conditions are (Al6)-(Al7). Using relations (A9), (Al), and (A3), we can write (Al6)-(A17) in the form
\[
\begin{equation*}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{-}-\varepsilon \vartheta^{\prime}\right) \tag{A38}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for zero to be smaller than \(p_{1}, p_{2}\), are according to theorem Al :
\[
\Delta_{\phi}>0, \gamma \phi(0)>0,0<\frac{p_{1}+p_{2}}{2}
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta & >0  \tag{A40}\\
\gamma \vartheta & >0  \tag{A41}\\
\varepsilon / 2 \gamma & >0 \tag{A42}
\end{align*}
\]
since \(\gamma, \mathcal{V}\), and \(\mathcal{E}\) are all positive by definition, it is obvious that (A41) and (A42) are automatically satisfied. Condition (A40) is actually repetitive, because (A38) guarantees that the roots \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are real and unequal; therefore, we do not have to require that (A40)-(A42) be satisfied.

According to theorem A4, the necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\) are
\[
\Delta_{G}>0,-\gamma G(1)>0,1>\frac{\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}}{2}
\]

Using (All), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0  \tag{A43}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A44}\\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{A45}
\end{gather*}
\]

However, since (A38) guarantees that \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are real and unequal and we have the arrangement \(p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\), it
is obvious that \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\) will also be real and unequal; therefore, we do not need to include (A43).

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement
\[
0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}<1
\]
are :
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}  \tag{A39}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{AH}\\
2 \gamma>\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A45}
\end{gather*}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{2}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
2 \gamma>\varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]
ad] \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement
\[
0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}
\]
are as before
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(v^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A39}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\psi_{1}\) and \(\psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (AlB), we can write this condition as
\[
\gamma\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\delta^{\prime}\right)<0
\]
and since \(\gamma>0\),
\[
\begin{equation*}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<0 \tag{A46}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\beta_{1}, \rho_{2}\), are according to theorem A3
\[
\Delta \phi>0, \gamma \phi(1)>0,1>\frac{p_{1}+p_{2}}{2}
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V>0  \tag{A47}\\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\forall)>0  \tag{A48}\\
& 1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \tag{A49}
\end{align*}
\]

Since (A47) is repetitive, we end-up with the conditions
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}  \tag{A39}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0  \tag{A46}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A48}\\
2 \gamma>\varepsilon \tag{A49}
\end{gather*}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\sigma^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon<\inf \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, 2 \gamma\right) \\
(\varepsilon-\sigma)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
a3] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorems \(A 6, A 5, \quad-\gamma G(1)<0\)
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (A13), (All), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \gamma\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)<0  \tag{A50}\\
& \gamma(\gamma-\varepsilon+\partial)<0 \tag{ASl}
\end{align*}
\]

Since \(\gamma>0\), we can rewrite these as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \left(y-\varepsilon^{\prime}+q^{\prime}<0\right.  \tag{A52}\\
& \left(y-\varepsilon+i^{\prime}\right)<0 \tag{A53}
\end{align*}
\]

For the arrangement
\[
0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}
\]
we have again that the necessary and sufficient conditions are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{AB}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A39}
\end{gather*}
\]

In summary, we have that the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}  \tag{A39}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0  \tag{A52}\\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \tag{A53}
\end{gather*}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
\gamma<\inf \left\{\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right),\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{gathered}
\]
a4] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<1<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\), are according to theorem A2
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (A3), we write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A54}\\
1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{A55}
\end{gather*}
\]

Since \(\gamma>0\), we can rewrite (A54) as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A56}\\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A55}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All), this condition can be written as
\[
\begin{equation*}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)<0 \tag{A57}
\end{equation*}
\]

As before, the necessary and sufficient conditions are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\eta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \eta^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A39}
\end{gather*}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<p_{2}<1<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\delta^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>\sup (\varepsilon, 2 \gamma) \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<(\varepsilon-\delta)
\end{gathered}
\]
as] \(\quad 1<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A l\),
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{equation*}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nabla^{2}\right)>0 \tag{A58}
\end{equation*}
\]
\[
\begin{equation*}
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \tag{A59}
\end{equation*}
\]

As before, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\rho_{2}<\psi_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A39}
\end{gather*}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(1<\rho_{2}<\psi_{2}<\rho_{1}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
bi] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}<1\)
For the arrangement \(\quad \psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) we have from theorem AFb that the necessary and sufficient conditions are
\[
R_{G \phi}<0, \psi_{1}+\psi_{2}<p_{1}+p_{2}
\]

Using (A9), (Al), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A38}\\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for zero to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2
\[
-\gamma G(0)>0 \quad, \quad 0<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma>0
\end{aligned}
\]
since \(\gamma, \delta^{\prime}, \varepsilon^{\prime}\) are all positive by definition, it is obvious that both these conditions are automatically satisfied.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(l\) to be greater than \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem A3
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\delta)>0  \tag{A60}\\
& \quad 1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \tag{A61}
\end{align*}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}<1\) are
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
2 \gamma>\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{2}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+V)>0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]
b2] \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5
\[
\gamma \varphi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
\begin{equation*}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)<0 \tag{A62}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A4,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0 \quad, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A63}\\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{A64}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are as before,
\[
\begin{equation*}
\gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} D-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right) \tag{A38}
\end{equation*}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} D-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 2 \gamma>\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { ct form, } \\
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\inf (\varepsilon, 2 \gamma) \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<(\varepsilon-\nabla)
\end{gathered}
\]
b3] \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(l\) to be between \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) and \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorems \(A 5\) and A6,
\(\gamma \phi(1)<0\)
\(-\gamma G(1)<0\)
Using (All), (AlB), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+V)<0  \tag{A65}\\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \tag{A66}
\end{align*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are as before,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\nabla\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+O)<0 \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\nabla^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \nu^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nu^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\gamma<\inf \left\{(\varepsilon-\vartheta),\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{gathered}
\]
b4] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<1<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (AlB), we can write this condition as
\[
\begin{equation*}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)<0 \tag{A67}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 1\),
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)>0,1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\eta)>0  \tag{A68}\\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \tag{A69}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\) are as before,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\hat{V}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon_{\ddot{V}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<1<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { are } \\
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} O-\varepsilon \sigma^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\dot{\eta})>0 \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
r m,\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon>\sup \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}, 2 \gamma\right) \\
\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)
\end{gathered}
\]
b5] \(\quad 1<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less \(\operatorname{than} \Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0,1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (AlB), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)>0  \tag{A70}\\
& 1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{A71}
\end{align*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\) are as before,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-D^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\eta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \eta-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\dot{V}\right)^{2}<\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \hat{\gamma}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
cl] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{1}\) are according to theorem ATc given by
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta_{G}>0 \\
& R_{G \phi}>0 \\
& \gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}<0
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A9), (A7), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0  \tag{A72}\\
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \tag{A73}
\end{gather*}
\]
\[
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \tag{A74}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for zero to be less than \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A l\),
\[
\Delta_{\phi}>0, \quad \gamma \phi(0)>0, \quad 0<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
\left(\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V\right) & >0  \tag{A75}\\
\gamma V & >0  \tag{A76}\\
\varepsilon / 2 \gamma & >0 \tag{A77}
\end{align*}
\]

Conditions (A76), (A77) are automatically satisfied.
Condition (A75) is repetitive, because
\[
R_{6 \phi}=\gamma^{2} \phi\left(\Psi_{1}\right) \phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)>0
\]
and
\[
\gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}<0
\]
imply that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma \phi\left(\Psi_{1}\right)<0 \\
& \gamma \phi\left(\Psi_{2}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
which according to theorem A5 means that \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are real and unequal. Therefore, we do not really need to require that \(\left(\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v\right)>0\).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A3,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta) & >0  \tag{A78}\\
1 & >\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \tag{A79}
\end{align*}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}<1 \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right) \\
& \gamma>\sup \{\varepsilon / 2,(\varepsilon-\phi)\}
\end{aligned}
\]
c2] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are as before
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All), we can write this condition as
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nabla)<0
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater \(\operatorname{than} \Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 4\),
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (AlB), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\delta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<\rho_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon-v^{\prime}\right) \\
& \text { cz] } \quad 0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are as before
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime 2}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \delta^{\prime}\right\rangle 0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\nabla\right)
\end{gathered}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) and \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\) are according to theorems A5 and A6 given by
\[
\begin{gathered}
\gamma \Phi(1)<0 \\
-\gamma G(1)<0
\end{gathered}
\]

Using (All), (All), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{aligned}
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\theta)<0 \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\eta^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for
\[
\begin{gathered}
0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad \text { are } \\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
\left.\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}\right\rangle-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-\vartheta\right) \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\theta^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]
c4] \(0<p_{2}<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)

The necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are as before
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \gamma\left(\eta^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All), we can write this condition as
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\dot{v})<0
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\nu^{\prime}-\eta\right) \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
\gamma\left(v^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<\gamma \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\gamma\right) \\
\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon-v^{\prime}\right) \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]
c5] \(\quad 1<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1}\) are as before,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\sigma^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem Al,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<p_{2}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\sigma\right) \\
&\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\varepsilon / 2
\end{aligned}
\]
di] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are according to theorem And given by (A23)-(A25). Using (A9), (A8), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V>0  \tag{A80}\\
\gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A81}\\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right) \tag{AB}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for zero to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2,
\[
\Delta_{G}>0,-\gamma G(0)>0, \quad 0<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (Al2), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0  \tag{A.83}\\
& \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0  \tag{A84}\\
& \varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma>0 \tag{A85}
\end{align*}
\]

Since \(\gamma, \mathcal{U}^{\prime}\) and \(\varepsilon^{\prime}\) are positive by definition, (A84)-(A85) are automatically satisfied. Condition (A83) is repetitious, because
\[
\begin{aligned}
& R_{G \phi}=\gamma^{2} G\left(p_{1}\right) G\left(p_{2}\right)>0 \\
& -\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}<0
\end{aligned}
\]
imply that
\[
\begin{aligned}
& -\gamma G\left(p_{1}\right)<0 \\
& -\gamma G\left(p_{2}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
which according to theorem A6 means that \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are real and unequal. Therefore, we do not need to require that
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \quad, \text { because conditions (A81)-(A82) }
\]
guarantee this.
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A4,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (AlB), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\sigma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}<1 \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \forall>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-v^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\nu^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \gamma>\operatorname{Sup}\left\{\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2,\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
d2] \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (AlB),
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem A3
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+v)>0 \\
& 1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are (A80)-(A82).

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nu^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right) \\
& \operatorname{Sup}\left\{\frac{\varepsilon}{2},(\varepsilon-V)\right\}<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-D^{\prime}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
da] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are (A80)-(A82).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\sigma)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta>0 \\
& \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-v\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v-\varepsilon v^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-V\right) \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{0}\right)<0 \\
& \text { da] } \quad 0<\psi_{2}<1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are (A80)-(A82).

The necessary and sufficient condotions for 1 to lie between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\rho_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 1\),
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\eta)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-V^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\dot{v}^{\prime}-\nabla\right) \\
& \quad\left(\varepsilon-v^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\inf \left\{\varepsilon / 2,\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\text { d5] } \quad 1<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1}\) are (A80)-(A82).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less \(\operatorname{than} \psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 2\),
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 0<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\dot{v}^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
0<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<\psi_{2}<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \dot{V}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-D^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v^{2}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}
\end{aligned}
\]
el] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficientconditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are according to theorem ATe,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \Delta_{\phi}>0, \Delta_{G}>0, R_{G \phi}>0 \\
& \gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}>0 \\
& -\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}>0 \\
& p_{1}+p_{2}\left\langle\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right.
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A9), (A7), (A8), (A1), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0  \tag{A86}\\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0  \tag{A87}\\
\gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A88}\\
\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\nabla\right)  \tag{A89}\\
\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(D^{\prime}-\nabla\right)  \tag{A90}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A91}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 4\),
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1 \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\nabla\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \sigma^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\nabla\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \text { en] } \quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A86)-(A91).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (AlB),
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\hat{v}^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\nu^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\nu^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
e3] \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A86)-(A91).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]
' The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A3,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nu)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\rho_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \operatorname{Sup}\left\{\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right),\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right), \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2} \\
& \text { en] } \quad 0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A86)-(A91).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(\rho_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\tilde{v})<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \forall>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\nu^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\forall)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
es] \(1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A86)-(A91).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem Al,
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{array}{r}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+v^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{array}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\nabla^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} \vartheta^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
fl] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are according to theorem ATs,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\Delta \phi>0, \Delta_{G}>0, R_{G \phi}>0 \\
\gamma\left\{\phi\left(\psi_{1}\right)+\phi\left(\psi_{2}\right)\right\}>0 \\
-\gamma\left\{G\left(p_{1}\right)+G\left(p_{2}\right)\right\}>0 \\
\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}<p_{1}+p_{2}
\end{gathered}
\]

Using (A9), (A7), (A8), (A1), (A3), we can write these conäitions as
\[
\begin{align*}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0  \tag{A99}\\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0  \tag{A93}\\
& \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\vartheta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v^{\prime}-\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime}\right)  \tag{A94}\\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)>2 \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\nabla\right)  \tag{A95}\\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-\nabla\right)  \tag{A96}\\
& \varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A97}
\end{align*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater tina \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem A3,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (A1),
\[
\begin{array}{r}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\eta)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{array}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}<1 \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\gamma^{\prime}-\gamma\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \eta^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& 2 \gamma>\varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+V)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
f2] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<1<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<p_{1}\) are (A92)-(A97).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+v)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<1<p_{1} \quad\) are, \(\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \dot{\gamma}>0\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\mathscr{D}^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon \nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+D^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
f3] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
are (A92)-(A97).
The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem \(n l\),
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)>0,1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\circ}\right)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A4,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+D^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<\rho_{2}<p_{1} \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-V\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \sup \left\{\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right),\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right), \frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2} .
\end{aligned}
\]
f4] \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are (A92)-(A97).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (A13),
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \theta^{\prime}>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \theta^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(\vartheta^{\prime}-\theta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} V^{\prime}-\varepsilon D^{\prime}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(\theta^{\prime}-\theta\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
f5] \(\quad 1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho_{2}<p_{1}\) are (A92)-(A97).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 2\),
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right) & >0 \\
1 & <\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma\left(V^{\prime}-\theta\right)^{2}>\left(\varepsilon-\varepsilon^{\prime}\right)\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} v^{\prime}-\varepsilon V^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left.\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right)<2 \gamma\left(v^{\prime}-V\right)\right)<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{__CA SErB}
al] \(0<\rho<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient condition for \(\phi(\xi)=0\) to have a double root, \(\rho=\varepsilon / 2 \gamma\), is
\[
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \sigma \tag{Ag}
\end{equation*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are according to theorem A 2 ,
\(\Delta_{G}>0,-\gamma G(\varepsilon / 2 \gamma)>0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2 \gamma}<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2\)
Using (Ais), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{\prime^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0}  \tag{A99}\\
2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)  \tag{Al00}\\
\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{A101}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to thoerem A4,
\[
-\gamma C(1)>0, \quad 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for
the arrangement \(\quad 0<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1 \quad\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \forall \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& \left.2 \gamma \delta^{\prime}\right\rangle \varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left\langle\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma\right. \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\mathcal{O}^{\prime}\right)>0
\end{aligned}
\]
a2] \(\quad 0<p<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A98)-(A101).

The necessary and sufficient condition for 1 to lie between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) is according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (Ā13),
\[
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\) are
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma^{\prime} \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left\langle\varepsilon^{\prime}\right. \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+J^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
a3] \(\quad 0<p<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A98)-(A101).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and greater than \(\rho\) are according to
theorem A2,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0,1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2, \varepsilon<2 \gamma
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\partial^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \\
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement
\[
0<p<1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}
\] are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \forall \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
\(\sup \left\{\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right), \frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\)
a4] \(1<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are (A98)-(A101).

The necessary and sufficient condition for 1 to be less than \(\rho\) is
\[
\varepsilon>2 \gamma
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 1<p<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma 0
\]
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \theta^{\prime}>0
\]
\[
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)
\]
\[
2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime}
\]
bl] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p\),
where \(\rho\) is a double root of the equation \(\phi(\xi)=0\), are according to theorem A4,
\[
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma^{S},-\gamma G(\varepsilon / 2 \gamma)>0, \frac{\varepsilon}{2 \gamma}>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2, \Delta_{G}>0
\]

Using (All), (A3), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma{ }^{\circ}  \tag{All}\\
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0  \tag{Al03}\\
2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)  \tag{Al04}\\
\varepsilon>\varepsilon^{\prime} \tag{Al05}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient condition for 1 to be greater than \(\rho\) is,
\[
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions Er the arrangement \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho<1 \quad\) are
\[
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V
\]
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma^{\prime} v^{\prime}>0
\]
\[
2 \gamma 0^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)
\]
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\]
b2] \(\quad 0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p\) are (Al02)-(A105).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and less than \(\rho\), are according to theorem A4,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { theorem an, } \\
& -\gamma G(1)>0,1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2, \varepsilon>2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \\
\varepsilon>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\Psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1<p \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma ण \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma J^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \partial^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\sup \left\{\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}\right), \varepsilon^{\prime^{\prime} / 2}\right\}<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\]
b3] \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<\rho\) are (AIO2)-(A105).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
-\gamma G(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
\prime\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}<p \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \theta^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \sigma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \sigma^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
b4] \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p\) are (Al02)-(A105).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\), are according to theorem A2,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (A3),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<p \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma O \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma 0^{\prime}>\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\theta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \text { ci] } \quad 0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}<1
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}\), where \(\rho\) is a double root of \(\phi(\xi)=0\), are according to theorem A 6 ,
\[
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \checkmark,-\gamma G(\varepsilon / 2 \gamma)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
\begin{array}{r}
\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \tag{Al07}
\end{array}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A4,
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta_{G} & >0  \tag{Al08}\\
-\gamma G(1) & >0  \tag{A109}\\
1 & >\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma \tag{All}
\end{align*}
\]

Condition (Al08) is repetitious, because according to theorem \(A 6\), the condition \(-\gamma \zeta(\varepsilon / 2 \gamma)<0\) guarantees that \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are real and unequal. Thus, we can disregard (Al08).

Using (A13), we can write (Al09)-(All0) as
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\partial^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}<1 \quad\) are,
\(\varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma v\)
\(2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)\)
\(\gamma>\sup \left\{\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2,\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-v^{\prime}\right)\right\}\)
cf]
\[
0<\psi_{2}<p<1<\psi_{1}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{2}\) are (A106)-(A107).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and greater than \(\rho\) are according to theorem A6,
\(-\gamma G(1)<0\)
\[
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\]

Using (A13),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In-summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<p<1<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma D^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma D^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \frac{\varepsilon}{2}<\gamma<\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\nabla^{\prime}\right) \\
& \text { c3] } \quad 0<\psi_{2}<1<p<\psi_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}\) are (Al06)-(A107).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and less than \(\rho\) are according to theorem \(A \sigma\),
\[
\begin{gathered}
-\gamma G(1)<0 \\
\varepsilon>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

Using (A13),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\varepsilon>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, tine necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi_{2}<1<p<\psi_{1}\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma \vartheta \\
& 2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \gamma<\inf \left\{\varepsilon / 2,\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
c4] \(\quad 1<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{2}<\rho<\psi_{1}\) are (A106)-(A107).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are according to theorem A2,
\[
-\gamma G(1)>0,1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\gamma^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(1<\psi_{2}<p<\psi_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}=4 \gamma V \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}<\varepsilon\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right) \\
& \left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-V^{\prime}\right)<\gamma<\varepsilon / 2
\end{aligned}
\]
di] \(0<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}\), where \(\psi\) is a double root of \(G(\omega)=0\), are according to theorem Al ,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\circ}>0 \\
& \gamma \phi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\right)>0 \\
& \quad \varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (Alb), (Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{equation*}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma v^{\prime} \tag{Alll}
\end{equation*}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta>0  \tag{All}\\
& 2 \gamma \nabla> \varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right)  \tag{All}\\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \tag{All}
\end{align*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\), are according to theorem \(A 3\),
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0,1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{aligned}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nabla) & >0 \\
1 & >\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \theta^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \forall>0 \\
& 2 \gamma 0>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon<2 \gamma \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+\theta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \text { di] } \quad 0<\psi<\rho_{2}<1<P_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi<p_{2}<P_{1}\) are (Alll)-(All4).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\gamma)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for
the arrangement \(0<\psi<p_{2}<1<p_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \forall>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \forall>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
& \text { di] } \quad 0<\psi<1<p_{2}<p_{1}
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are (AIIl)-(All4).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) and greater than \(\Psi\) are according to theorem All,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2, \quad \varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\]

Using (AIl), (AI),
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\gamma)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\psi<1<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are, \(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}\)
\(\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gg 0\)
\(2 \gamma v>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right)\)
\(\sup \left\{\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2,(\varepsilon-V)\right\}<\gamma<\varepsilon / 2\)
d4] \(\quad 1<\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi<p_{2}<p_{1}\) are (Alll)-(All4).

The necessary and sufficient condition for 1 to be less than \(\psi\) is,
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 1<\psi<\rho_{2}<p_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \partial^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& 2 \gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime}<\varepsilon \\
& \text { el] } \quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi<1
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi\) are according to theorem A3,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \geqslant>0 \\
& \gamma \phi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\right)>0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma>\left(\rho_{1}+\rho_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (Alb), (Al),
\[
\begin{gather*}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime}  \tag{All}\\
\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}>0  \tag{Alle}\\
2 \gamma \nabla^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right)  \tag{Alli}\\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \tag{Alle}
\end{gather*}
\]

The necessary and sufficient condition for 1 to be greater than \(\psi\) is
\[
\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi<1 \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma \\
& \text { en] } \quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi
\end{aligned}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi\) are (Al l5)-(A118).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) and less than \(\Psi\) are according to theorem \(A 3\),
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0,1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2, \quad \varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+v^{\circ}\right)>0 \\
1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for that arrangement \(\quad 0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1<\psi \quad\) are,
\(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \eta^{\prime}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma v^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& 2 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \sup \left\{\left(\varepsilon-v^{\prime}\right), \varepsilon / 2\right\}<\gamma<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2
\end{aligned}
\]
e3] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi\) are (All5)-(All8).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to lie between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\]

Using (All),
\[
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)<0
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma J>0 \\
& 2 \gamma V>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{-2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime}>\varepsilon \\
& (\gamma-\varepsilon+D)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
e4] \(\quad 1<p_{2}<p_{1}<\psi\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{2}<\rho_{1}<\psi\) are (All5)-(All8).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(\rho_{1}, P_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 1\),
\[
\gamma \Phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}<\psi\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma j^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
\begin{gathered}
2 \gamma \forall>\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{\prime^{2}}\right) \\
2 \gamma<\varepsilon<\varepsilon^{\prime} \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+V)>0
\end{gathered}
\]
fl] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\), where \(\Psi\) is a double root of \(G(\omega)=0\), are according to theorem A5,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& \gamma \Phi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A15),
\[
\begin{array}{r}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \nabla^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma ण<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \tag{Al20}
\end{array}
\]

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be greater than \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A 3\),
\[
\begin{gather*}
\Delta_{\phi}>0  \tag{All}\\
\gamma \phi(1)>0  \tag{Al22}\\
1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2 \tag{A123}
\end{gather*}
\]

Condition (A12l) is repetitious, because according to theorem A5, the condition \(\gamma \Phi\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\right)<0 \quad\) guarantees that \(\rho_{1}, P_{2}\) are real and unequal. Therefore, we can disregard (All), and using (All), (Al), we can write (A122)-(Al23) as
\[
\begin{gathered}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\dot{V})>0 \\
1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}<1 \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma \nabla<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nabla)>0 \\
\varepsilon<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2} & =4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
2 \gamma \forall & <\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
\gamma & >\sup \left\{\varepsilon / 2,\left(\varepsilon-V^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
f21 \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi<1<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\) are (All9)-(A120).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) and greater than \(\Psi\), are according to theorem A5,
\[
\gamma \phi(1)<0, \quad \varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\]

Using (All),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+v^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}<2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(\quad 0<p_{2}<\psi<1<p_{1} \quad\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma^{\prime}<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}<\gamma<(\varepsilon-\nabla)
\end{aligned}
\]
f3] \(\quad 0<p_{2}<1<\psi<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(0<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\) are (Al19)-(A120).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be between \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) and less than \(\Psi\), are according to theorem AS,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)<0 \\
\varepsilon^{\prime}>2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement \(0<\rho_{2}<1<\psi<p_{1}\) are,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma v^{\prime} \\
& 2 \gamma \nu^{\circ}<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right) \\
& \gamma<\operatorname{in} f\left\{\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2,(\varepsilon-\nabla)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
f4] \(\quad 1<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}\) are (Al19)-(Al20).

The necessary and sufficient conditions for 1 to be less than \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are according to theorem \(A l_{\text {, }}\)
\[
\gamma \phi(1)>0, \quad 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{array}{r}
(\gamma-\varepsilon+V)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{array}
\]

In summary, the necessary and sufficient conditions for the arrangement
\[
1<p_{2}<\psi<p_{1}
\]
are,
\(\varepsilon^{\prime 2}=4 \gamma \theta^{\prime}\)
\(2 \gamma \vartheta<\varepsilon^{\prime}\left(\varepsilon-\frac{\varepsilon^{\prime}}{2}\right)\)
\((\varepsilon-\sigma)<\gamma<\varepsilon / 2\)
gl] \(\quad 0<p<\psi<1\)
ge]
\[
0<p<1<\psi
\]
ga]
\(1<p<\psi\)
hl] \(\quad 0<\psi<p<1\)
h2] \(\quad 0<\psi<1<p\)
n3] \(\quad 1<\psi<p\)
il] \(\quad 0<p=\psi<1\)
id] \(\quad 1<\rho=\psi\)

The necessary and sufficient conditions for tine above arrangements are shown in chapter IVb. The derivation of these conditions is trivial, and will not be discussed.
_OAS EnC_
al] \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}<1\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) to be complex and for \(0<\psi_{2}<\Psi_{1}<1 \quad\) are according to theorem A4,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma \gamma \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}>0 \\
& -\gamma G(1)>0 \\
& 1>\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma v \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+\theta^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& \quad 1>\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma\right\rangle \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
& \gamma>\sup \left\{\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2,\left(\varepsilon^{\prime}-\vartheta^{\prime}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
\]
a2] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) to be complex and for \(0<\psi_{2}<1<\psi_{1}\) are according to theorem A6,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma v<0 \\
& -\gamma G(1)<0
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A13),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}<4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime} \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+V^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{aligned}
\]
a3] \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are complex and \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\).
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) to be complex and for \(1<\psi_{2}<\psi_{1}\) are according to theorem A2,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \left.\varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \vartheta\right\rangle<0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \vartheta^{\prime}>0 \\
& -\gamma G(1)>0 \\
& 1<\left(\psi_{1}+\psi_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (A13), (A3),
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma V^{\prime}<0 \\
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma v^{\prime}>0 \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon^{\prime}+v^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 1<\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
bl] \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are complex and \(0<\psi<1\)
b2] \(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}\) are complex and \(1<\psi\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for these arrangements are shown in chapter IVb. Their derivation is trivial and will not be discussed.
cl] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\).
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\Psi_{1}, \Psi_{2}\) to be complex and for \(0<p_{2}<p_{1}<1\) are according to theorem A3,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}<0 \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \phi>0 \\
& \gamma \phi(1)>0 \\
& \quad 1>\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (All),(Al), we can write these conditions as
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma O^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}>4 \gamma \forall \\
& \left(\gamma-\varepsilon+V^{\prime}\right)>0 \\
& 1>\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{aligned}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma \theta^{\prime} \\
& \varepsilon^{2}>4 \gamma \theta \\
& \gamma>\sup \{\varepsilon / 2,(\varepsilon-\sigma)\}
\end{aligned}
\]
c2] \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}\)
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) to be complex and for \(0<p_{2}<1<p_{1}\) are according to theorem A5,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}<0 \\
\gamma \phi(1)<0
\end{gathered}
\]

Using (All),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma v^{\prime} \\
\left(\gamma-\varepsilon+\vartheta^{\prime}\right)<0
\end{gathered}
\]
c3] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(1<p_{2}<p_{1}\).
The necessary and sufficient conditions for \(\Psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) to be complex and for \(1<p_{2}<\rho_{1}\) are according to theorem A1,
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \varepsilon^{\prime 2}-4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime}<0 \\
& \varepsilon^{2}-4 \gamma \delta>0 \\
& \gamma \phi(1)>0 \\
& 1<\left(p_{1}+p_{2}\right) / 2
\end{aligned}
\]

Using (All), (Al),
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma V^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{2}>4 \gamma V \\
(\gamma-\varepsilon+\nabla)>0 \\
1<\varepsilon / 2 \gamma
\end{gathered}
\]

Or in a more compact form,
\[
\begin{gathered}
\varepsilon^{\prime 2}<4 \gamma \gamma^{\prime} \\
\varepsilon^{2}>4 \gamma v^{\prime} \\
(\varepsilon-\dot{\prime})<\gamma<\frac{\varepsilon}{2}
\end{gathered}
\]
di] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(0<p<1\)
d2] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) are complex and \(1<p\)
e] \(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) and \(p_{1}, p_{2}\) are complex.
The necessary and sufficient conditions for the above arrangements are shown in chapter IVb. Their derivation is trivial and will not be discussed.
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\section*{Nomenclature}

\section*{English_characters}

A : Reactant
[A] : Concentration of \(A\)
A : Linearized matrix defined in IIIa.
\((A-S)\) : Adsorbed reactant \(A\).
\{A-S \} : Number of active sites occupied by adsorbed A.
B : Reactant
[B] : Concentration of \(B\).
(B-S) : Adsorbed reactant \(B\).
' \{B-S \} : Number of active sites occupied by adsorbed B.
\(\mathrm{E}_{3}\) : Activation energy of adsorption. Defined in IIb.
\(\mathrm{f} \quad:\) Function defined in VI.
\(\mathrm{f}_{1} \quad: \quad\) Function defined in IIc.
\(\mathrm{f}_{2}: \quad\) : \(\quad\) ! \(\quad 1 \quad 1!\)

F : Function defined in VI.
G : Polynomial defined in IIIc.
k : Kinetic constant defined in IIb.
\(k_{1} \quad\) : Kinetic constant for adsorption of \(A(g)\).

\(k_{-1}\) : Kinetic constant for desorption of (A-S).

\(k_{3} \quad:\) Rate constant defined in IIb.
\(\mathrm{k}_{30}\) : Kinetic constant comprising \(\mathrm{k}_{3}\).
\(\mathrm{k}_{3}^{0}\)
\(k_{2}^{\prime}\)
: \(=\mathrm{kL}\)

L : Total number of active surface sites.
m. : Real number(see APPENDIX).

M : ' \(\quad 11\)
r : Reaction rate defined in IIb.
R : Universal gas constant
\(R_{G \Phi}\) : Constant defined in the APPENDIX, page 91.
[S] : Active surface site.
'\{i\}: Number of active sites which are not occupied at time \(t\).
T : Temperature
t : Time
x : Coverage of catalytic surface with adsorbed A(g).
Y
: Vector defined in IIIa
Z : Polynomial defined in VI.

\section*{_...Greek_characters}

\[
V^{\prime}, \vartheta^{\prime}, \Theta: \text { constants defined in IIIc }
\]
\[
\lambda_{1}, \lambda_{2} \quad: \text { Eigenvalues of linearized matrix } \mathbb{A}
\]
\(\mu\) : Coefficient of heterogeneity of catalytic surface.
\(\xi:\) Unknown in equation \(\phi(\xi)=0\)
\(\rho_{1}, \rho_{2}:\) Roots of equ. \(\phi(\xi)=0\), defined in LId.
\(\rho\) : Double root of \(\phi(\xi)=0,=\varepsilon / 2 \gamma\). \(\boldsymbol{\tau}:=\mathrm{k}_{3}^{0}\)
\(\phi\) : Polynomial defined in TIc
\(\psi_{1}, \psi_{2}\) : Roots of equ. \(\sigma(\omega)=0\), defined in AId. \(\psi\) : Double root of equ. \(G(\omega)=0,=\varepsilon^{\prime} / 2 \gamma\).
\(\omega\) : Unknown in equ. \(G(\omega)=0\).
\(\Omega\) : polynomial defined in VI.

> _Symbols_in_Script_
ff : constant defined in TIa.```

