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#### Abstract

In this paper we explicitly compute the transformation that maps the generic second-order differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, y, y^{\prime}\right)$ to the Painlevé first equation $y^{\prime \prime}=6 y^{2}+x$ (resp. the Painlevé second equation $y^{\prime \prime}=2 y^{3}+y x+\alpha$ ). This change of coordinates, which is a function of $f$ and its partial derivatives, does not exist for every $f$; it is necessary that the function $f$ satisfies certain conditions that define the equivalence class of the considered Painleve equation. In this work we will not consider these conditions and the existence issue is solved on line as follows: if the input equation is known then it suffices to specialize the change of coordinates on this equation and test by simple substitution if the equivalence holds. The other innovation of this work lies in the exploitation of discrete symmetries for solving the equivalence problem.


PACS number: 02.30.Jr

## 1. Introduction

By fiber-preserving transformations we mean analytical transformations of the form

$$
\mathbb{C}^{2} \ni(x, y) \rightarrow(\bar{x}(x), \bar{y}(x, y)) \in \mathbb{C}^{2}
$$

with the condition $\bar{x}_{x} \bar{y}_{y} \neq 0$ expressing their local invertibility. These transformations form a Lie pseudo-group with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{x}_{y}=0, \quad \bar{x}_{x} \bar{y}_{y} \neq 0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

as a defining system.

* The research was supported in part by the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports within the project LC06002.

As indicated in the abstract, our aim is to explicitly compute the transformation of this form that maps the second-order equation

$$
\mathcal{E}_{f}: y^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, y, y^{\prime}\right)
$$

where $y^{\prime}=\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d} x} y(x)$, to the first Painlevé equation (resp. to the second Painlevé equation). This change of coordinates, which is clearly a function of $f$ and its partial derivatives, does not exist for every $f$; it is necessary that the function $f$ satisfies certain conditions that define the equivalence class of the considered Painlevé equation. Comparing to [KLS85] and [HD02], the existence issue is solved here on line as follows: if the input equation is known then it suffices to specialize the change of coordinates on this equation and test by simple substitution if the equivalence holds.

The calculations of transformation candidates are based on the following result [DP07]. Given a Lie pseudo-group of transformations $\Phi$ and denote by $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}$ the symmetry pseudogroup of the equation $\mathcal{E}_{f}$ w.r.t. $\Phi$ i.e., $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}=\Phi \cap \operatorname{Diff}^{\text {loc }}\left(\mathcal{E}_{f}\right)$. In [DP07], we proved the following.
(i) The number of constants appearing in the change of coordinates is exactly the dimension of $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}$. Also, we have $\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}\right)=\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}\right)$.
(ii) In the particular case when $\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}\right)=0$, the transformation $\varphi$ is algebraic in $f$ and its partial derivatives and it is obtained without solving differential equations. The degree of this transformation $\varphi$ is exactly equal to the finite value $\operatorname{card}\left(\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{E}_{f}, \Phi}\right)$.
The last case is exactly what happens when $\mathcal{E}_{\bar{f}}$ is one of the Painlevé equations and $\Phi$ is the pseudo-group of fiber-preserving transformations or more generally point transformations. Indeed, the classical Lie analysis shows that the point symmetry pseudo-group of each one of the Painlevé equations is zero dimensional. Moreover, according to the fact that the unique transformations that preserve the singularity structure are homographic transformations, one can show by straightforward computations that the point symmetry pseudo-group of Painlevé one is

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{x}=x \frac{\bar{y}^{2}}{y^{2}}  \tag{1.2}\\
\bar{y}^{5}=y^{5}
\end{array}\right.
$$

and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{x}=x \frac{\bar{y}^{2}}{y^{2}}  \tag{1.3}\\
\bar{y}^{3}=\frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha} y^{3} \\
\bar{\alpha}^{2}=\alpha^{2}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for Painlevé two when $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{x}=x \frac{\bar{y}^{2}}{y^{2}}  \tag{1.4}\\
\bar{y}^{6}=y^{6}
\end{array}\right.
$$

when $\alpha=0$.
Fiber-preserving transformations are suitable when dealing with Painlevé equations. In particular, such transformations preserve the integrability in the sense of Poincaré [CM08]. However, since Painlevé equations lie in the class of equations of the form

$$
y^{\prime \prime}=A(x, y)+B(x, y) y^{\prime}+C(x, y) y^{\prime 2}+D(x, y) y^{\prime 3}
$$

which is invariant under point transformations ${ }^{1}$, we consider in the last section of this paper the equivalence under these more general transformations.

## 2. Building the invariants

Let $\left(x, y, p=y^{\prime}\right)$ be a system of local coordinates of $\mathbf{J}^{1}=\mathrm{J}^{1}(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$, the space of first-order jets of functions $\mathbb{C} \ni x \rightarrow y(x) \in \mathbb{C}$ [Olv93]. Two scalar second-order ordinary equations

$$
\mathcal{E}_{f}: y^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, y, y^{\prime}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \mathcal{E}_{\bar{f}}: \bar{y}^{\prime \prime}=\bar{f}\left(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{y}^{\prime}\right)
$$

are said to be equivalent under a point transformation $\varphi$ if its first prolongation (to $\mathrm{J}^{1}$ ) maps the contact forms

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\omega^{1}=\mathrm{d} y-p \mathrm{~d} x \\
\omega^{2}=\mathrm{d} p-f(x, y, p) \mathrm{d} x
\end{array}\right.
$$

to the contact forms

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{\omega}^{1}=\mathrm{d} \bar{y}-\bar{p} \overline{\mathrm{~d}} x \\
\bar{\omega}^{2}=\mathrm{d} \bar{p}-\bar{f}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{p}) \mathrm{d} \bar{x}
\end{array}\right.
$$

up to an invertible $2 \times 2$-matrix of the form

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
a_{1} & 0 \\
a_{2} & a_{3}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The $a_{i}$ are functions from $\mathrm{J}^{1}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. To encode equivalence under fiber-preserving transformations (i.e., taking into account the Lie equations (1.1)) we must have

$$
\varphi^{*} \mathrm{~d} \bar{x}=a_{4} \mathrm{~d} x
$$

for a certain function $a_{4}: \mathrm{J}^{1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Summarizing, two second-order differential equations $\mathcal{E}_{f}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\bar{f}}$ are equivalent under a fiber-preserving transformation $\varphi$ if and only if

$$
\varphi^{*}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{d} \bar{y}-\bar{p} \mathrm{~d} \bar{x} \\
\mathrm{~d} \bar{p}-\bar{f}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{p}) \mathrm{d} \bar{x} \\
\mathrm{~d} \bar{x}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
a_{1} & 0 & 0 \\
a_{2} & a_{3} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & a_{4}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{d} y-p \mathrm{~d} x \\
\mathrm{~d} p-f(x, y, p) \mathrm{d} x \\
\mathrm{~d} x
\end{array}\right)
$$

For this problem, Cartan's equivalence method [Olv95] gives three fundamental invariants

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
I_{3}=-\frac{f_{p p p} a_{4}}{2 a_{1}{ }^{2}} \\
I_{2}=\frac{f_{y p}-D_{x} f_{p p}}{2 a_{1} a_{4}}, \\
I_{1}=\frac{\left(2 f_{y y}-D_{x} f_{y p}-f_{p p} f_{y}+f_{y p} f_{p}\right) a_{1}+\left(-f_{y p}+D_{x} f_{p p}\right) a_{4} a_{2}}{2 a_{1}{ }^{2} a_{4}{ }^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

and six invariant derivations defined on certain manifold $\tilde{M}$, fibered over $\mathrm{J}^{1}$, with local coordinates de $\left(x, y, p, a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{4}\right)$. Here, $D_{x}=\partial_{x}+p \partial_{y}+f \partial_{p}$ is the Cartan vector field.

When specializing on the Painlevé equations, the two fundamental invariants $I_{2}$ and $I_{3}$ vanish. On this splitting branch, the application of the Jaccobi identity to the final structure
${ }^{1}$ Indeed, as remarked by Cartan [Car24], the above equation can always be regarded as the geodesics equation of a projective structure on a surface with local coordinates $x$ and $y$ and thus invariant under point transformations.
equations shows that among the six invariant derivations only two can produce new invariants. These two derivations are

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
X_{1}=\frac{1}{a_{1}} \partial_{y}-\frac{a_{2} a_{4}}{a_{1}^{2}} \partial_{p}-\frac{1}{2} f_{p p} \partial_{a_{1}}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{f_{p y}}{a_{4}} \partial_{a_{2}}, \\
X_{3}=\frac{1}{a_{4}} \partial_{x}+\frac{p}{a_{4}} \partial_{y}+\frac{f}{a_{4}} \partial_{p}+a_{2} \partial_{a_{1}}-\frac{f_{y} a_{1}}{a_{4}^{2}} \partial_{a_{2}}+\frac{2 a_{2} a_{4}+f_{p} a_{1}}{a_{1}} \partial_{a_{4}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Notation 1. In the following, $I_{1 ; j \cdots k}$ denotes the differential invariant $X_{k} \cdots X_{j}\left(I_{1}\right)$. For instance, the invariant $I_{1 ; 33}$ is obtained by differentiating twice the fundamental invariant $I_{1}$ with respect to invariant derivation $X_{3}$.

## 3. The first Painlevé equation $y^{\prime \prime}=6 y^{2}+x$

Since the associated fiber-preserving symmetry Lie pseudo-group is zero dimensional, this justifies the following lemma:

Lemma 1. The specialization of the invariants

$$
I_{1}, I_{1 ; 3}, I_{1 ; 33}, \frac{I_{1 ; 333}}{I_{1 ; 33}}, \frac{I_{1 ; 3333}}{I_{1 ; 33}}-\frac{43}{120} I_{1 ; 33}, \frac{I_{1 ; 33333}}{I_{1 ; 33}}-\frac{5}{4} I_{1 ; 33}
$$

on the first Painlevé equation gives six invariants functionally independent defined on $\tilde{M}$.
The problem with the above invariants is that they do depend on extra parameters $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and $a_{4}$. Fortunately, in our zero-dimensional case, we can normalize (i.e., eliminate) these parameters by setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{1}=-12, \quad I_{1 ; 3}=0, \quad \frac{I_{1 ; 333}}{I_{1 ; 33}}=1 \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now substituting the values of the parameters in the remaining invariants gives us, due again to our zero-dimensional case, three functionally independent invariants that do not depend on the extra parameters. Writing the equality of the invariants and simplifying the obtained system, by computing a characteristic set [Kol73, BLOP95], give an algebraic transformation of degree 5:

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=129600 \frac{\left(5 I_{1 ; 33}{ }^{2}+4 I_{1 ; 33333}\right)}{I_{1 ; 33}{ }^{3}} \bar{y}^{4}  \tag{3.2}\\
\bar{x}=-6 \frac{\left(120 I_{1 ; 3333}+43 I_{1 ; 33}{ }^{2}\right)}{I_{1 ; 33}^{2}} \bar{y}^{2} \\
\bar{y}^{5}=-\frac{1}{23328000} \frac{I_{1 ; 33}{ }^{5}}{\left(5 I_{1 ; 33}^{2}+4 I_{1 ; 33333}\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

In these formulae the invariants are normalized using (3.1), that is, they do not depend on the extra parameters. According to (ii) of the introduction and (1.2), we have the following theorem.

Theorem 1. A second-order differential equation $\mathcal{E}_{f}$ is equivalent to the first Painlevé equation by a fiber-preserving transformation if and only if this transformation is given by (3.2) and the normalization (3.1).

Let us explain how theorem 1 can be used in practice. Consider the following equations

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}=c \frac{y^{\prime 2}}{y}+\frac{1}{y}\left(y^{4}+x\right), \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
y^{\prime \prime}=c \frac{y^{\prime 2}}{y}+y\left(y^{4}+x\right) \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The question is to determine the values of the parameter $c$ for which the above equations can be mapped to the first Painlevé equation (and compute the equivalence transformation when the equivalence holds).

First of all, the fact that the derived invariants $I_{1 ; 1}$ vanish on the first Painlevé equation restricts the possible values of $c$ to $\{-1,3\}$ for the first equation and to $\{-3,5\}$ for the second equation.

The second step is to specialize (3.2) on the given equation to obtain transformation candidates. In step 3, we have to check whether the pullback of the first Painlevé equation w.r.t. these candidates is exactly the considered equation.

In the case of equation (3.3), the specialization yields

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=36 \frac{\bar{y}^{4} p}{y^{7}}  \tag{3.5}\\
\bar{x}=6 \frac{\bar{y}^{2} x}{y^{4}} \\
\bar{y}^{5}=\frac{1}{108} y^{10}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for $c=-1$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=-864 \frac{\bar{y}^{4} y^{5}\left(625 x^{5}-2079\right)\left(-25 y x^{3}+250 p x^{4}+21 y^{3}\right)}{\left(50 x^{3}+3 y^{2}\right)^{4}}  \tag{3.6}\\
\bar{x}=6 \frac{\left(2500 x^{5}-891\right) y^{4} \bar{y}^{2}}{\left(50 x^{3}+3 y^{2}\right)^{2}} \\
\bar{y}^{5}=-\frac{1}{31104} \frac{\left(50 x^{3}+3 y^{2}\right)^{5}}{y^{10}\left(625 x^{5}-2079\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

for $c=3$. The third step shows that the equivalence holds only for $c=-1$ and the equivalence transformation is (3.5). We can also deduce, according to (ii) in the introduction, that the cardinal of the fiber-preserving (point) symmetry group of equation (3.3) with $c=-1$ is equal to 10 .

The same calculations show that equation (3.4) can not be mapped to the first Painlevé equation. In particular, we have a division by zero error in step 2 for $c=5$. Warning: this error does not mean that the method failed. In fact it is part of the method and implies that no equivalence transformation exists.

Time estimates are given in the tables where $P_{1}$ refers to the first Painlevé equation.

## 4. The second Painlevé equation $y^{\prime \prime}=2 y^{3}+x y+\alpha$

Again, due to the zero dimensionality, there exist seven invariants defined on the manifold of local coordinates $\left(x, y, p, a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{4}, \alpha\right)$ such that when specialized, on Painlevé two, they give exactly seven functionally independent functions. For instance, one can take the invariants $I_{1}, I_{1 ; 3}, I_{1 ; 31}, I_{1 ; 33}, I_{1 ; 331}, I_{1 ; 3331}$ and $I_{1 ; 33311}$. We normalize $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and $a_{4}$ by setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{1}=-12, \quad I_{1 ; 3}=-12, \quad I_{1 ; 31}=0 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 1. Time estimates (in seconds) for $y^{\prime \prime}=c \frac{y^{\prime 2}}{y}+\frac{1}{y}\left(y^{4}+x\right)$.

|  | Computation of transformation candidates | Checking equivalence with $P_{1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $c=-1$ | 0.15 | (yes) 0.04 |
| $c=3$ | 2.13 | (no) 0.13 |

Table 2. Time estimates (in seconds) for $y^{\prime \prime}=c \frac{y^{\prime 2}}{y}+y\left(y^{4}+x\right)$.

|  | Computation of transformation candidates | Checking equivalence with $P_{1}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $c=-3$ | 0.35 | (no) 0.03 |
| $c=5$ | Division by zero error | (no) 0.00 |

and as in the previous section, we obtain

$$
\left\{\begin{align*}
\bar{p}= & \frac{1}{6}\left(\frac{I_{1 ; 33311}\left(I_{1 ; 3331}+4032\right)}{I_{1 ; 33311} I_{1 ; 33}-3096576-4032 I_{1 ; 331}}\right) \bar{y}^{2} \bar{\alpha},  \tag{4.2}\\
\bar{x}= & -\left(16+\frac{1}{72} I_{1 ; 331}\right) \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{3}= & 48384 \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{I_{1 ; 33311} I_{1 ; 33}-3096576-4032 I_{1 ; 331}}, \\
\bar{\alpha}^{2}= & -\frac{1}{112 I_{1 ; 33311}\left(16257024+8064 I_{1 ; 3331}+I_{1 ; 3331}{ }^{2}\right)}\left(I_{1 ; 33311}{ }^{2} I_{1 ; 33}{ }^{2}\right. \\
& -8064 I_{1 ; 3311} I_{1 ; 33} I_{1 ; 331}-6193152 I_{1 ; 33311} I_{1 ; 33} \\
& \left.+9588782923776+24970788864 I_{1 ; 331}+16257024 I_{1 ; 331}{ }^{2}\right) .
\end{align*}\right.
$$

when $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=\frac{1}{290304} I_{1 ; 33311}\left(4032+I_{1 ; 3331}\right) \bar{y}^{5},  \tag{4.3}\\
\bar{x}=-\frac{1}{72}\left(1152+I_{1 ; 331}\right) \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{6}=-20901888 \frac{1}{I_{1 ; 33311}\left(4032+I_{1 ; 3331}\right)^{2}},
\end{array}\right.
$$

when $\alpha=0$. The comparison with the symmetry pseudo-groups (1.3) and (1.4) proves the following theorem.

Theorem 2. A second-order differential equation can be mapped to the second Painlevé equation $y^{\prime \prime}=2 y^{3}+y x+\alpha$ by a fiber-preserving transformation if and only if this transformation is given by (4.2) if $\alpha \neq 0$ and by (4.3) otherwise with the normalization (4.1) in both cases.

Let us remark that (4.3) can be obtained from (4.2) (as well as (1.4) from (1.3)) by eliminating the $\bar{\alpha}$ and taking into account the functional dependence between the invariants resulting from $\bar{\alpha}=0$. Nevertheless, it is safer to separate the two cases $(\alpha \neq 0$ and $\alpha=0)$.

## 5. Equivalence under point transformation

The equivalence problem under the more general point transformations naturally arises since Painlevé equations belong to the class of equations of the form

$$
y^{\prime \prime}=A(x, y)+B(x, y) y^{\prime}+C(x, y) y^{\prime 2}+D(x, y) y^{\prime 3}
$$

which is invariant under point transformations. In this case our starting Pfaffian system is

$$
\varphi^{*}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{d} \bar{y}-\bar{p} \mathrm{~d} \bar{x} \\
\mathrm{~d} \bar{p}-\bar{f}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{p}) \mathrm{d} \bar{x} \\
\mathrm{~d} \bar{x}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
a_{1} & 0 & 0 \\
a_{2} & a_{3} & 0 \\
a_{4} & 0 & a_{5}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathrm{d} y-p \mathrm{~d} x \\
\mathrm{~d} p-f(x, y, p) \mathrm{d} x \\
\mathrm{~d} x
\end{array}\right)
$$

for which we normalize $a_{3}$ and prolong to obtain involution and four fundamental invariants defined on an eight-dimensional manifold. For the above class, only two invariants are not identically zero:

$$
\begin{gathered}
K_{1}=\left(6 f_{y y}-4 D_{x} f_{y p}+D_{x}^{2} f_{p p}-3 f_{y} f_{p p}+4 f_{y p} f_{p}-D_{x} f_{p p} f_{p}\right) /\left(a_{1} a_{5}^{2}\right) \\
K_{2}=\left(2 f_{y} f_{p p p} a_{5}+4 f_{y p} f_{p} a_{4}-D_{x} f_{p p} f_{p} a_{4}-3 f_{y} f_{p p} a_{4}-a_{5} f_{p p} f_{y p}+a_{5} f_{p p} D_{x} f_{p p}\right. \\
\quad+6 a_{4} f_{y y}+a_{4} D_{x} D_{x} f_{p p}-a_{5} D_{x} f_{p p p} f_{p}-a_{5} f_{p p p} D_{x} f_{p}-4 a_{4} D_{x} f_{y p} \\
\\
\left.\quad-2 f_{y y p} a_{5}+2 a_{5} D_{x} f_{y p p}-a_{5} D_{x} D_{x} f_{p p p}\right) /\left(a_{5}^{2} a_{1}^{2}\right) .
\end{gathered}
$$

As in the fiber-preserving case, only two invariant derivations $X_{1}$ and $X_{3}$ (one page long) are needed.

Theorem 3. A second-order ordinary differential equation $y^{\prime \prime}=f\left(x, y, y^{\prime}\right)$ is equivalent
(i) to the first Painlevé equation $y^{\prime \prime}=6 y^{2}+x$ under a point transformation if and only if this transformation is given by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=\frac{5}{1056} \frac{\left(2^{15} 3^{5} 11^{3} K_{1 ; 33333}+K_{\left.1 ; 33313^{3}\right)}^{2}\right.}{K_{1 ; 33313}{ }^{2}} \bar{y}^{4}  \tag{5.1}\\
\bar{x}=-6 \frac{\left(2^{9} 3^{3} 511^{2} K_{1 ; 3333}+43 K_{\left.1 ; 33313^{2}\right)}\right.}{K_{1 ; 33313^{2}}{ }_{y}} \bar{y}^{2} \\
\bar{y}^{5}=-\frac{88}{375} \frac{K_{1 ; 33313}{ }^{5}}{\left(2^{15} 3^{5} 11^{3} K_{1 ; 33333}+K_{1 ; 33313}\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

with the normalization
$K_{1}=-12, \quad K_{2}=0, \quad K_{1 ; 1}=0, \quad K_{1 ; 3}=0, \quad K_{1 ; 33} / K_{1 ; 333}=720$.
(ii) to the second Painlevé equation $y^{\prime \prime}=2 y^{3}+x y+\alpha$ under a point transformation if and only if this transformation is given by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=-\frac{1}{18} \frac{K_{2 ; 3}\left(15 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-216000+4032 K_{2 ; 3}-450 K_{1 ; 331}-50 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 333}\right)}{25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-115200+1728 K_{2 ; 3}-150 K_{1 ; 331}} \bar{y}^{2} \bar{\alpha},  \tag{5.2}\\
\bar{x}=\frac{1}{3600}\left(25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}+336 K_{2 ; 3}-57600-50 K_{1 ; 331}\right) \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{3}=-1800 \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-115200+1728 K_{2 ; 3}-150 K_{1 ; 331}}, \\
\bar{\alpha}^{2}=-108 \frac{\left(25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-115200+1728 K_{2 ; 3}-150 K_{1 ; 331}\right)^{2}}{K_{2 ; 3}\left(15 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-216000+4032 K_{2 ; 3}-450 K_{1 ; 331}-50 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 333}\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

when $\alpha \neq 0$ and

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\bar{p}=-\frac{1}{16200} K_{2 ; 3}\left(576 K_{2 ; 3}+25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 333}+30 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-64800\right) \bar{y}^{5}  \tag{5.3}\\
\bar{x}=\frac{1}{1080}\left(5 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-5760-72 K_{2 ; 3}\right) \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{6}=-\frac{87480000}{K_{2 ; 3}\left(576 K_{2 ; 3}+25 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 333}+30 K_{2 ; 3} K_{1 ; 33}-64800\right)^{2}}
\end{array}\right.
$$

when $\alpha=0$, with the normalization

$$
K_{1}=-12, \quad K_{2}=0, \quad K_{1 ; 1}=0, \quad K_{1 ; 3}=0, \quad K_{2 ; 3} / K_{1 ; 31}=-5 / 24 .
$$

Example. Let us terminate with considering the equivalence of the two equations (3.3) and (3.4) with the second Painlevé equation under point transformations. Here, computations are done with arbitrary $c$.

Equation (3.3). The specialization of (5.2) on this equation yields (after 0.512 s ) a transformation candidate depending on $c$ and which is too long to include in this paper. The variable $\bar{x}$ does not depend on $p$ in only two cases $c \in\{-1,3\}$ and these two values return a division by zero error when computing the other components. The same thing happens with the specialization of (5.3) on (3.3). Thus, equation (3.3) can not be equivalent to the second Painlevé equation under point transformations.
Equation (3.4). The specialization of (5.2) on this equation gives the following transformation (in 1.11 s ):

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\bar{p}= & \frac{1}{36} \frac{(c+3)(c-2)^{2} p}{(1+c)(c-5) y^{12}} \times\left(9 y^{3} c+66 y^{6} p+\cdots+27 y^{3}\right) \bar{\alpha} \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{x}= & \frac{2}{3} \frac{\left(-27 y^{6}+3 y^{2} x c-2 c^{2} p^{2}-24 y^{6} c+3 y^{6} c^{2}+5 c p^{2}-18 y^{2} x+6 p^{2}-c^{3} p^{2}+3 y^{2} x c^{2}\right)}{(c-5) y^{6}} \\
& \times \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{3}= & \frac{1}{16} \frac{(c-5)}{1+c} \bar{\alpha}, \\
\bar{\alpha}^{2}= & 1728 \frac{(5-c)(1+c)^{2}}{(c+3)(c-2)^{2}} y^{18} \times\left(-9 y^{3} c-66 y^{6} p+54 y^{2} p x+18 y^{6} c^{2} p-48 y^{6} p c\right. \\
& \left.+18 y^{2} x c^{2} p+2 c^{3} p^{3}-2 p^{3} c^{2}+72 y^{2} p x c-34 p^{3} c-30 p^{3}-27 y^{3}\right)^{-2} .
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

For the particular values of $c$ for which $\bar{x}$ does not depend on $p$ we obtain division by zero errors when computing the other components and then equation (3.4) can not be mapped to Painlevé two with $\alpha \neq 0$. However, the specialization of (5.3) on (3.4) gives

$$
\left\{\begin{aligned}
\bar{p}= & -\frac{4}{9} \frac{(c-2)^{2} p(c+3)\left(18 x y^{2} p c^{2}-90 p y^{6}+\cdots+18 y^{6} p c^{2}\right)}{(c-5)^{2} y^{12}} \bar{y}^{5}, \\
\bar{x}= & \frac{2}{3} \frac{\left(-23 y^{6}+3 y^{2} x c-2 c^{2} p^{2}-20 y^{6} c+3 y^{6} c^{2}+5 c p^{2}-18 y^{2} x+6 p^{2}-c^{3} p^{2}+3 y^{2} x c^{2}\right)}{(c-5) y^{6}} \\
& \times \bar{y}^{2}, \\
\bar{y}^{6}= & -\frac{27}{4} \frac{(c-5)^{3}}{(c+3)(c-2)^{2}} y^{18} \times\left(18 x y^{2} p c^{2}-90 p y^{6}-9 y^{3} c+54 p x y^{2}-27 y^{3}+72 p c x y^{2}\right. \\
& \left.-34 p^{3} c-72 p c y^{6}+2 c^{3} p^{3}-30 p^{3}-2 p^{3} c^{2}+18 y^{6} p c^{2}\right)^{-2}
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

which is point transformation only when $c=-1$. In this case, the resulting transformation is

$$
\bar{p}=4 \frac{\bar{y}^{5} p}{y^{9}}, \quad \bar{x}=2 \frac{\bar{y}^{2} x}{y^{4}}, \quad \bar{y}^{6}=1 / 4 y^{12}
$$

and this maps equation (3.4) to Painlevé two $y^{\prime \prime}=2 y^{3}+x y$ (with $\alpha=0$ ).
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