

## A nonlinear version of the equivalent bifurcation lemma

This article has been downloaded from IOPscience. Please scroll down to see the full text article.

1990 J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. 23 L1339

(<http://iopscience.iop.org/0305-4470/23/24/009>)

View [the table of contents for this issue](#), or go to the [journal homepage](#) for more

Download details:

IP Address: 129.252.86.83

The article was downloaded on 01/06/2010 at 09:54

Please note that [terms and conditions apply](#).

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

# A nonlinear version of the equivalent bifurcation lemma

G Cicogna

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Pisa, Piazza Torricelli 2, I-56100 Pisa, Italy

Received 1 November 1990

**Abstract.** We provide an extension of the equivariant bifurcation lemma to the case of nonlinear Lie point symmetries. In this extension, the role of the fixed subspaces under the symmetry subgroups is played by some well specified flow-invariant manifolds. Some typical examples are also considered.

The 'equivariant bifurcation lemma' (see [1-5] and references therein) has become a useful tool in bifurcation problems, and more in general in nonlinear time-evolution problems [6] in the presence of linear symmetries: essentially, it allows one to select some linear subspace, characterized by the property of being the fixed subspace of a symmetry subgroup, and to restrict the original problem to this subspace (in many cases, one or two dimensional).

In this letter, we attempt to extend this result to the case of *nonlinear* Lie point symmetries, i.e. geometrical symmetries (not necessarily linear), as originally introduced by Lie and recently reconsidered by Ovsjannikov, Olver and many others (e.g. [4, 7-9]). We shall show that this extension is actually possible, and very interesting; the main difficulty being that in this case the analogue of the fixed subspace may be given by a more or less singular manifold.

We will consider  $n$ -dimensional autonomous bifurcation problems, in the standard form

$$\dot{u} = F(\lambda, u) \quad 2cmu = u(t) \in R^n \quad \lambda \in R \quad (1)$$

where  $F : \Lambda \times \Omega \rightarrow R^n$  is a smooth vector field defined in some neighbourhood  $\Lambda \times \Omega$  of the origin in  $R \times R^n$ . As usual in bifurcation theory, we assume there is the trivial stationary solution  $u_0 \equiv 0$ , i.e.

$$F(\lambda, 0) = 0 \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \quad (2)$$

and we look for non-trivial stationary or periodic solutions of (1) bifurcating from  $u_0 \equiv 0$ , as the control parameter  $\lambda$  crosses some critical value  $\lambda = \lambda_0$ . We can assume  $\lambda_0 = 0$ .

Let us state the relevant result concerning Lie point symmetries (cf [7, 10]) given by problem (1) in the form most suitable for the applications below. We use the notation (sum over repeated indices,  $i, j = 1, \dots, n$ )

$$\partial_t = \partial/\partial t \quad \partial_i = \partial/\partial u_i \quad F\partial_u = F_i\partial_i.$$

*Proposition 1.* The symmetries admitted by problem (1) are generated by Lie operators  $\eta$  of the following types (or by linear combinations of them):

- (i)  $\eta = \Phi(\lambda, t, u) (\partial_t + F\partial_u)$  where  $\Phi$  is an arbitrary function;
- (ii)  $\eta = \theta_i \partial_i$ , where  $\theta_i = \theta_i(\lambda, u)$  satisfy the ‘determining equations’

$$\theta_j \partial_j F_i = F_j \partial_j \theta_i \tag{3}$$

- (iii)  $\eta = \partial_i$ ;
- (iv) if  $\eta$  is any symmetry generator, and  $h = h(\lambda, t, u)$  is any integral of motion (depending on time or not) of (1), then also

$$\eta' = \Psi(h) \eta$$

where  $\Psi$  is arbitrary, generates a symmetry for (1).

*Remarks.* 1. One could also consider other symmetry generators containing the operator  $\partial/\partial\lambda$ , i.e. involving changes of the parameter. These are introduced and analysed in [10, 11], but are not relevant to the present discussion.

2. Given any solution  $\bar{u} = \bar{u}(t, \lambda, u_0)$ , with fixed  $\lambda$  and initial datum  $u_0$ , each symmetry of type (i) produces ‘motions’  $(t, \bar{u}) \rightarrow (t + \epsilon, \bar{u} + \epsilon F)$  along  $\bar{u}$ , leaving invariant (globally, in general, not pointwise) the orbit of  $\bar{u}$ . They essentially correspond to a ‘reparametrization’ of time, and are not interesting to our purposes.

3. Putting

$$\hat{F} \equiv F\partial_u$$

condition (3) for the time-independent Lie point symmetries of type (ii) can be written in the form of a Lie commutator

$$[\hat{F}, \eta] = 0. \tag{4}$$

These symmetries generalize the concept of the ‘equivariance’ property under linear group representations (cf [10]).

4. Condition (3) (or (4)) is certainly satisfied choosing

$$\eta = \hat{F} \quad \text{i.e. } \theta_i \equiv F_i. \tag{5}$$

But along any solution  $\bar{u}$ , one has

$$\hat{F} \equiv \partial_t \tag{6}$$

the symmetry  $\hat{F}$  then generates the time translations  $\bar{u} \rightarrow \bar{u}(t + \epsilon)$ .

We can finally give the main result of this letter (for an analysis of the algebraic features and some general results based on Lie point symmetries in nonlinear time-evolution problems, see also [10–12]).

Given any Lie point symmetry generator  $\eta = \theta_i(\lambda, u)\partial_i$ , and any fixed  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , let  $U_\eta = U_\eta(\lambda)$  be the manifold defined by

$$U_\eta(\lambda) = \{u \mid \theta_i(\lambda, u) = 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}. \tag{7}$$

We then have the following.

*Lemma 1.* If  $\eta_1$  is a time-independent Lie point symmetry generator commuting with  $\eta$ , i.e.  $[\eta_1, \eta] = 0$ , then

$$\eta_1 : U_\eta \rightarrow TU_\eta$$

$TU_\eta$  being the tangent bundle of  $U_\eta$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in U_\eta$  and  $G_x = \{g \in G \mid gx = x\}$ , where  $G$  is the symmetry group of (1), i.e. the connected Lie group generated by the Lie point symmetries of (1). If  $y = g_1x$ , then  $g_1g_xg_1^{-1} \in G_y$ , for each  $g_x \in G_x$ ; in particular if  $g_1$  is a group element generated by  $\eta_1$ , and  $g_x$  by  $\eta$ , we have  $\theta(\lambda, y) = 0$ .

*Lemma 2.* The manifold  $U_\eta(\lambda)$  is invariant, for each fixed  $\lambda$ , under the flow of (1).

*Proof.* It is sufficient to apply lemma 1 and remarks 3 and 4.

*Remark 5.* As a consequence of (iv) in the above proposition, if  $h$  is a time-independent integral of motion, and if  $\eta' = \Psi(h)\eta$ , condition (7) can be met through the condition  $\Psi(h) = 0$ , i.e.  $h = \text{constant}$ . In this case, the result that the manifold  $U_{\eta'}$  is flow invariant is, in fact, obvious. However, some examples below will show some non-trivial aspects of this situation.

Clearly, the above lemmas allow the reduction of the original problem, if the initial datum is in  $U_\eta$ , to a problem lying in the lower-dimensional manifold  $U_\eta$ . Now, under reasonable hypotheses on these manifolds, and on the restricted problem, many of the typical results of bifurcation theory can be easily recovered. For instance, we can say:

Let  $U = U_\eta(\lambda)$ , a manifold satisfying (7), be one dimensional (for each fixed  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ), and assume that  $u_0 \equiv 0 \in U$  for any  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Assume there is a smooth parametrization of  $U_\eta(\lambda)$  for each  $\lambda$  such that  $U_\eta(\lambda)$  is diffeomorphic to  $R$ :

$$u_i = u_i(\lambda, s) \quad s \in R \quad u_i(\lambda, 0) = 0$$

then the restriction of the right-hand side of (1) to  $U$  becomes

$$F(\lambda, u(\lambda, s)) \equiv \mathcal{F}(\lambda, s) = 0 \tag{8}$$

and the original problem becomes just a standard one-dimensional bifurcation problem, with, in particular,  $\mathcal{F}(\lambda, 0) = 0$ .

Similarly, if  $U = U_\eta(\lambda)$  is two dimensional, for each  $\lambda$ , if  $0 \in U$ , and  $U$  is diffeomorphic to  $R^2$ , then usual hypotheses (e.g. the standard Hopf hypothesis [3, 5, 13]) can ensure the existence of a periodic bifurcation on  $U$ . Different possibilities, for both the one- and two-dimensional cases, are considered in [12]. The assumptions about the regularity of the manifolds  $U$  can be substituted by different assumptions, concerning e.g. stability properties [14–16] or by arguments *à la* Poincaré–Bendixson [14, 17]. For instance, if one assumes that for  $\lambda = \lambda_0 = 0$  the solution  $u_0 \equiv 0$  on the manifold is asymptotically stable, whereas for  $\lambda > 0$  it becomes completely unstable, then a stable bifurcation appears for  $\lambda > 0$ ; if  $U$  is two dimensional, the bifurcation sets are limit cycles, corresponding to either a periodic solution or a set of stationary points.

We propose now a list of examples, that—even if very simple—may give an idea of some of the different situations covered by the above discussion.

*Example 1.* This is taken from standard *linear* theory, and is given here to clarify how the results of the linear group representation theory can be rephrased in terms of the above language. Let the group  $G = \text{SO}(3)$  operate on the five-dimensional space of real symmetric traceless  $3 \times 3$  matrices  $M$  according to the linear representation

$$M \rightarrow M' = gMg^{-1} \quad g \in \text{SO}(3). \quad (9)$$

Putting  $M = u_i e_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 5$ , where

$$e_1 = 2^{-1/2} \text{diag}(1, -1, 0) \quad e_2 = \text{diag}(1, 1, -2)$$

and  $e_3, e_4, e_5$  span the subspace of the off-diagonal matrices, it is easy to see that the Lie generator  $\eta_3$  of the rotations around the third axis has in this space the following differential form

$$\eta_3 = u_3 \partial_1 - u_1 \partial_3 + u_5 \partial_4 - u_4 \partial_5.$$

Then, condition (7) gives that the space  $U_\eta \equiv \{\alpha e_2, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is invariant under the flow of any problem equivariant under the group action (9); this is precisely the result obtained from linear theory:  $U_\eta$  is in fact the fixed subspace under the isotropy subgroup generated by  $\eta_3$ .

*Example 2.* Let now  $u \equiv (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= f(\lambda, x) \\ \dot{y} &= 2\lambda x f(\lambda, x) - g(\lambda, x)(y - \lambda x^2) \end{aligned}$$

where  $f, g$  are arbitrary functions. The problem admits the symmetry generated by

$$\eta = (y - \lambda x^2) \partial_y \quad (10)$$

and for each fixed  $\lambda$  there is the flow-invariant manifold  $U = \{(x, y) \mid y = \lambda x^2\}$ . If e.g.  $f = \lambda x - x^2$ , there is a stationary bifurcation given by

$$x = s \quad y = s^3 \quad \lambda = s \quad (s \in \mathbb{R}).$$

*Example 3.* This and the following examples may illustrate the role played by integrals of motion in this context. With  $u \equiv (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , and  $r^2 = x^2 + y^2$ , consider

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \lambda x - xr^2 - \epsilon y \\ \dot{y} &= \lambda y - yr^2 + \epsilon x. \end{aligned}$$

Both for  $\epsilon = 0$  and  $\epsilon \neq 0$ , this problem possesses the obvious rotation symmetry

$$\eta = x \partial_y - y \partial_x. \quad (11)$$

Applying condition (7) to this operator, we obtain only the origin  $(0, 0)$ . According to remark 5, we look now for (time-independent) integrals of motion. If  $\epsilon = 0$ , we obtain  $y/x = \text{constant}$ , and, in fact, in each straight line from the origin there is stationary bifurcation. If  $\epsilon \neq 0$ , we have instead

$$\frac{\lambda - r^2}{r^2} \exp\left(\frac{2\lambda}{\epsilon} \tan^{-1} \frac{y}{x}\right) = \text{constant}$$

which defines (for each fixed  $\lambda \neq 0$ ) a very singular one-dimensional manifold. Notice in particular the singularity for  $x, y \rightarrow 0$ , and, actually, no stationary bifurcation exists along these manifolds (clearly, there is instead a Hopf bifurcation, and the existence of limit cycles shows that this singular behaviour cannot be avoided, according to well known arguments [14, ch 11, section 5]). It can also be noted that the two cases  $\epsilon = 0$  and  $\epsilon \neq 0$  actually possess different symmetry groups ( $\text{O}(2)$  and  $\text{SO}(2)$  respectively), which cannot be distinguished at the algebraic level (equation (11)), but are distinguished by the different form of the respective flow-invariant manifolds.

*Example 4.* Let  $u \equiv (x, y, z) \in R^3$ , and consider problems of the following form

$$\dot{x} = xf(\lambda, z) - yg(\lambda, z)$$

$$\dot{y} = yf(\lambda, z) + xg(\lambda, z)$$

$$\dot{z} = zf(\lambda, z).$$

Symmetries for these problems are clearly generated by

$$\eta_1 = x\partial_y - y\partial_x \quad \eta_2 = x\partial_x + y\partial_y. \quad (12)$$

Condition (7) applied to either  $\eta_1$  or  $\eta_2$  gives for  $U_\eta$  just the  $z$  axis, thus obtaining a standard one-dimensional problem. Time-independent integrals of motion of the above problem assume constant values along the cones

$$x^2 + y^2 = \text{constant} \times z^2 \quad (13)$$

and respectively the surfaces

$$\tan^{-1}(y/x) + \chi(\lambda, z) = \text{constant} \quad (14)$$

where  $\chi$  is a function depending on  $f, g$ . Despite the singularities, there may be bifurcation (depending on the functions  $f, g$ ). For example, if for  $z = z_0$ , there is  $\lambda = \lambda(z_0)$  such that  $f(\lambda(z_0), z_0) = 0$ , with  $\lambda(z_0) \rightarrow 0$  when  $z_0 \rightarrow 0$ , then each cone (13) contains a bifurcating solution at the level  $z = z_0$ . If  $g(\lambda(z_0), z_0) \neq 0$ , this is a periodic solution (with period  $2\pi/g(\lambda(z_0), z_0)$ ); if  $g(\lambda(z_0), z_0) = 0$ , this is a set of stationary solutions. The other manifold (14) does not contain, in general, periodic bifurcating solutions.

It is a pleasure to thank my friend Giuseppe Gaeta for many discussions and useful comments.

## References

- [1] Cicogna G 1981 *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **31** 600; 1984 *Boll. Un. Mat. Ital.* **3-A** 131; 1986 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **19** L368
- [2] Vanderbauwhede A 1982 *Local Bifurcation and Symmetry* (Boston: Pitman)
- [3] Golubitsky M and Stewart I 1985 *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **89** 107
- [4] Sattinger D H and Weaver O 1986 *Lie Groups and Algebras* (Berlin: Springer)
- [5] Golubitsky M, Stewart I and Schaeffer D G 1988 *Singularities and Groups in Bifurcation Theory* vol 2 (Berlin: Springer)
- [6] Cicogna G and Gaeta G 1989 *Nonlinear Anal.* **13** 475
- [7] Ovsjannikov L V 1962 *Group Properties of Differential Equations* (Novosibirsk) (Engl. transl. 1967 by G Bluman); 1982 *Group Analysis of Differential Equations* (New York: Academic)
- [8] Olver P J 1986 *Applications of Lie Groups to Differential Equations* (Berlin: Springer)
- [9] Bluman G W and Kumei S 1989 *Symmetries and Differential Equations* (Berlin: Springer)
- [10] Cicogna G and Gaeta G 1990 Lie point symmetries in bifurcation problems *Preprint*; see also 1990 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23** L799
- [11] Gaeta G 1989 Bifurcation theory and nonlinear symmetries *Nonlinear Anal.* to be published
- [12] Gaeta G 1990 Lie point symmetries and periodic solutions for autonomous ODE *Preprint*
- [13] Marsden J E and McCracken M 1976 *The Hopf Bifurcation and its Applications* (Berlin: Springer)
- [14] Hirsch M and Smale S 1974 *Differential Equations, Dynamical Systems and Linear Algebra* (New York: Academic)
- [15] Negrini P and Salvadori L 1979 *Nonlinear Anal.* **3** 87
- [16] Bernfeld S R, Negrini P and Salvadori L 1982 *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* **130** 1070
- [17] Yan-Qian Y *et al* 1986 *Theory of Limit Cycles* (Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society)