The oscillatory behavior of chemical systems near the onset of a Hopf bifurcation instability is of considerable importance since the discovery by Belousov of homogeneous oscillations in a cerium catalyzed oxidation of citric acid by bromate,\textsuperscript{1} the following work of Zhabotinsky,\textsuperscript{2} early observations of chemical waves,\textsuperscript{3} and oscillations in a broad range of chemical systems.\textsuperscript{4} Here the dynamics can be described efficiently by virtue of a center manifold theorem in a low-dimensional space by using so-called normal forms. In this paper, we show how the inclusion of higher-order terms from the normal form description leads to a significant improvement of the description of the chemical oscillatory kinetics near the Hopf bifurcation point. This approach gives a much more accurate description of the geometry of the limit cycle and, in addition, provides an accurate starting point suitable for further investigation of the dynamical properties of the limit cycle by numerical continuation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Oscillatory chemical reactions often exhibit a broad range of time scales. This is due to the fact that the rate constants governing the time scale of each elementary reaction may differ by several orders of magnitude. For this reason, analysis and simulation of chemical kinetics needs special care since the underlying ordinary differential equations (ODE’s) typically are highly stiff and, therefore, numerically ill-conditioned. Examples of this dynamical behavior include the Belousov–Zhabotinsky reaction,\textsuperscript{5} the horseradish peroxidase-oxidase reaction,\textsuperscript{6,7} oscillatory behavior found in the metabolic decomposition of glucose,\textsuperscript{8} and intracellular calcium oscillations.\textsuperscript{9} In this paper, we focus attention on chemical systems where the oscillations originate from an instability of the Hopf bifurcation type and discuss the numerical problems encountered when locating and analyzing properties of oscillatory behavior close to the Hopf bifurcation point.

Assume that two complex eigenvalues associated with the linearization of the flow around a stationary solution become purely imaginary when certain model parameters are varied. Then the dynamical system undergoes a Hopf bifurcation\textsuperscript{10–13} causing a small-amplitude limit cycle to branch off at the Hopf bifurcation point. The limit cycle close to the bifurcation point lies in a two-dimensional unfolding of the center manifold tangent to a linear subspace spanned by the real and imaginary parts of the complex eigenvector associated with the bifurcating complex eigenvalue.\textsuperscript{14}

As a consequence of the center manifold theorem,\textsuperscript{14–16} the behavior of the original system can be represented by a much simpler two-dimensional ordinary differential equation called a normal form which, sufficiently close to the bifurcation point, describes the oscillations on a quantitative level. From this point of view, the normal form becomes a universal dynamical system whose characteristics are valid for any dynamical system which undergoes a Hopf bifurcation.

In a vast majority of systems, the presence of the Hopf bifurcation is a necessary prerequisite for the onset of more complex dynamical phenomena in the system. Indeed, dynamic events such as quasi-periodic oscillations, sequences of period doublings, and chaos can very often be traced back as originating from a Hopf bifurcation. Limit cycles, however, may arise in other ways as well, for example, via a saddle node or a homoclinic bifurcation.

In model studies of such phenomena, one typically applies continuation techniques to observe how dynamical characteristics of limit sets vary as a function of some relevant parameter (for further details regarding the theory and
conjugate, pure imaginary eigenvalues $\lambda = i\omega_0$ and $\bar{\lambda} = -i\omega_0$ (all other eigenvalues are assumed to have nonzero real parts). In the following, we shall for simplicity assume that this situation occurs for $x_1 = 0$ and $\mu = 0$ (this situation can always be achieved by a simple linear translation of the stationary point and the parameter value). We denote the right and left eigenvectors of $J$ corresponding to $\lambda$ by $u$ and $u^*$, and those of $\bar{\lambda}$ by $\bar{u}$ and $\bar{u}^*$, and choose these eigenvectors normalized according to

$$
\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{u}^* = 1, \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{\bar{u}}^* = 0, \quad \mathbf{\bar{u}} \cdot \mathbf{u}^* = 0, \quad \mathbf{\bar{u}} \cdot \mathbf{\bar{u}}^* = 1.
$$

As a consequence of the center manifold theorem,\textsuperscript{14,15} the branching which takes place at a Hopf bifurcation point, is restricted to a two-dimensional center manifold $W^c$ tangent to the linear center subspace $E^c$ spanned by the real and imaginary parts of the right eigenvector $u$. To describe the branching we may, therefore, restrict ourselves to studying the dynamics of the system (1) on the center manifold. This can be achieved in the following way:

For points $x \in W^c$, we may construct a transformation $x = z + \mathbf{h}(z, \mu)$, which maps points $(z, \mu)$ from $E^c \times \mathbb{R}$ to points $z + \mathbf{h}(z, \mu)$ on the center manifold. If we write the vector $z$ as $z = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{\bar{u}}^* \mathbf{u}$, we obtain a complex differential equation for the motion in $E^c \times \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$
\dot{z} = i\omega_0 z + \mathbf{u}^* \mathbf{g}(z, \mu).
$$

The functions $\mathbf{F}(z + \mathbf{h}(z, \mu), \mu), \mathbf{h}(z, \mu), \text{ and } \mathbf{g}(z, \mu)$ are now Taylor expanded as

$$
\mathbf{h}(z, \mu) = \sum_{pqr} h_{pqr} z^p \bar{z}^q \mu^r, \quad \mathbf{g}(z, \mu) = \sum_{pqr} g_{pq} z^p \bar{z}^q \mu^r,
$$

$$
\mathbf{F}(z + \mathbf{h}(z, \mu), \mu) = J \cdot z + \sum_{pqr} f_{pqr} z^p \bar{z}^q \mu^r.
$$

The coefficients $g_{pqr} \text{ and } h_{pqr}$ can then be obtained by order by the following iterative procedure. At any order $(p,q,r)$, any nonvanishing component $u^* \cdot g_{pqr}$ in the amplitude equation is given explicitly by

$$
\mathbf{u}^* \cdot \mathbf{g}_{pqr} = u^* \cdot f_{pqr},
$$

which only appears if the resonance condition,

$$
p - q = 1,
$$

is satisfied for the terms indicated at order $(p,q,r)$. The amplitude equation includes all resonant terms and no others. To obtain the coefficient $h_{pqr}$, one has to solve the system of linear equations

$$
(J - (p - q) \lambda I) \cdot h_{pqr} = -Q \cdot \Phi_{pqr},
$$

determining the nonresonant components of $h_{pqr}$. Here $Q$ is the projection onto the nonresonant part of $E^c$ defined by $Q \cdot \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{u}^* \cdot \mathbf{x}) \mathbf{u}$. The auxiliary condition,

$$
\mathbf{u}^* \cdot h_{pqr} = 0,
$$

ensures that all resonant components of $h_{pqr}$ vanish. Equation (7) together with Eq. (8) determines $h_{pqr}$ completely.

To cubic order, the amplitude transformation for the Hopf bifurcation is
Inserting this solution into the corresponding transformation \( h(z, \mu) \) given by Eq. (9) yields the following expansion which corresponds to a (periodic) limit cycle solution for the differential equation (1) on the center manifold associated with the Hopf bifurcation

\[
x = x_0 + h_{001}\mu + x_1(t) + x_2(t) + x_3(t),
\]

where

\[
x_1(t) = R_\epsilon (ue^{i\theta} + \text{c.c.}),
\]

\[
x_2(t) = R_\epsilon^2 (u\bar{h}_{200}e^{2i\theta} + \text{c.c.} + h_{110}),
\]

\[
x_3(t) = R_\epsilon^3 (u\bar{h}_{300}e^{3i\theta} + h_{210}e^{i\theta} + \text{c.c.}) + R_\epsilon (h_{001}e^{i\theta} + \text{c.c.})\mu,
\]

where c.c. denotes the complex conjugate of the preceding terms within a given bracket.

The stability of the limit cycle is determined by the real part \( g^* \) of the nonlinear coefficient \( g \) in Eq. (10). If \( g^* < 0 \) the limit cycle is stable (within the center manifold) and it is unstable for \( g^* > 0 \). In each of the two cases, the Hopf bifurcation is referred to as being either supercritical or subcritical respectively. For a given distance \( \mu \) from the bifurcation point, the period \( T \) of the limit cycle can be determined from Eq. (12) as

\[
T(\mu) = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_0 + (\omega_1 - g^*g^*/g)^\mu}.
\]
The third-order expansion (13) of the limit cycle illustrates the well-known fact that the limit cycle which bifurcates from the Hopf bifurcation is analytic in the square root of the distance \( |\mu| \) from the bifurcation point. The term \( h_{001} \) is not directly related to the geometry of the limit cycle itself but corresponds to the first-order derivative of the stationary point \( x_s \) with respect to \( \mu \). This term therefore provides a first-order description of the translation of the stationary point as the distance from the bifurcation point \( \mu \) is varied. The time dependent term \( x_1(t) \) corresponds to the linear description of the limit cycle which is obtained by projecting Eq. (13) onto the center subspace \( E^c \). By means of perturbation theory, one can show that the part of \( x_2(t) \) which involves \( h_{001} \) can be identified as describing the rotation of the eigenvector \( u \) per unit change of \( \mu \). Similarly, we may identify the coefficient \( \lambda_1 \) in the normal form Eq. (10) as the derivative of the bifurcating eigenvalue with respect to \( \mu \).

By inspection of Table I, we also observe that explicit calculations of the coefficient vectors \( h_{001} \), \( h_{200} \), and \( h_{110} \) are needed in order to determine the complex resonant coefficients \( \lambda_1 \) and \( g \) in Eq. (10). For this reason, the terms \( x_1(t) \) and \( x_2(t) \) in the expansion (13) of the limit cycle are immediately available once the resonant coefficients in the normal form have been determined. However, to find the coefficient vectors \( h_{300} \), \( h_{210} \), and \( h_{110} \) that determine the third-order term \( x_3(t) \), observe that an additional set of linear equations must be solved.

One crude approach for estimating the limit cycle emanating from a Hopf bifurcation is to use only a simplification of the term \( x_1(t) \) in order to estimate a point \( x \) on the limit cycle with corresponding period \( T \), namely

\[
x = \varepsilon (u + \bar{u}),
\]

\[
T = \frac{2 \pi}{\omega_0},
\]

for some real (small) value of \( \varepsilon \). This expansion is then applied for fixed \( \mu = \varepsilon \), which will hold sufficiently close to the bifurcation point since the derivative \( dR_s/d\mu \) is infinite at \( \mu = 0 \). However, for systems where the limit cycle is unstable due to either a subcritical Hopf bifurcation or a stationary point associated with some very unstable nonbifurcating eigendirections, the estimate provided by Eq. (18) will rarely suffice as initial input for a continuation algorithm. This in particular applies to methods using a shooting method in solving the associated boundary value problem. Here either one or (if multiple shooting is required) several precise estimates of points on the limit cycle are needed as initial input data for the continuation problem. In Sec. IV, we shall address this problem by discussing several examples which illustrate the importance and advantages obtained when the full expansion (13) is used instead of the traditional approach represented by Eq. (18). Also, the Hopf bifurcation frequently turns out to be subcritical, and the bifurcating unstable cycle typically merges with a stable cycle in a fold bifurcation at a nearby parameter value. A normal form capturing this feature requires the inclusion of terms of quintic order in the expansion. Even though this extension is straightforward, we do not discuss it here, but rather use continuation to determine the location of the fold bifurcation.

First however, we describe shortly the numerical algorithm used in the results presented here for locating Hopf bifurcation solutions \( (x, \mu) \) to Eq. (1).

### III. LOCATION OF HOPF BIFURCATION POINTS AND CALCULATION OF NORMAL FORM COEFFICIENTS

Several approaches for location of Hopf bifurcation points exist as described in the reviews given in Refs. 12, 16, 17, and 21. In the work presented in this paper, we have chosen a slightly modified variant of the algorithm described in Ref. 22. Here the equations that define the Hopf bifurcation point are

\[
F(x_\varepsilon, \mu) = 0,
\]

\[
J \cdot v_1 + \omega_0 v_2 = 0,
\]

\[
J \cdot v_2 - \omega_0 v_1 = 0,
\]

\[
v_1^2 \cdot v_1 + v_2^2 \cdot v_2 = 1,
\]

\[
v_1^2 \cdot v_1 = 0,
\]

where Eq. (19) constitutes a system of \( 3n + 2 \) nonlinear equations in \( 3n + 2 \) unknowns: the stationary point \( x_\varepsilon \), the bifurcation parameter \( \mu \), the imaginary part \( \omega_0 \) of the bifurcating eigenvalue, and the real and imaginary parts \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) of the complex eigenvector \( u \) associated with the bifurcating eigenvalue. The solution of this system is readily obtained by applying a standard Newton iteration scheme to Eq. (19).

Even though the set of defining equations has a large dimension compared to other approaches which typically involve numerical evaluation of determinants, we find it numerically more stable than low-dimensional schemes since determinant evaluations easily become numerically very ill-behaved. Furthermore, in situations where the purpose of solving Eq. (19) is to provide an initial estimate of the limit cycle solution of Eq. (1), one typically analyzes only a few Hopf bifurcation points. Even for larger system sizes (we have made tests for \( n = 256 \)) such computations proceed smoothly on modern workstations or high-end PCs.

Notice that setting up a Newton algorithm for the system (19) requires the evaluation of second-order derivatives of Eq. (1) with respect to \( x \) and \( \mu \)—the so-called Hessian. This can either be supplied in symbolic form or be obtained by numerical differentiation. In the implementation presented in this paper, we have used a symmetric five-point differentiation formula Ref. 23 (p. 914) to evaluate the Hessian using analytic expressions for the elements of the Jacobian. The structure of the Jacobian matrix associated with Eq. (19) and explicit expressions for all its elements are shown in Fig. 1 and Table II, respectively. The matrix is relatively sparse and the linear equations arising from Newton iteration of Eq. (19) can be solved efficiently using a block decomposition described in Ref. 24.

Once the Newton iteration has converged, the formulas in Table I must be evaluated in order to find the terms in the expansion (13) as well as other properties of the limit cycle. Solutions of the linear equations that determine the vectors...
that the calculation of $g$ requires evaluation of the nonlinear coefficients $l$ and $m$ onto the center subspace. Notice that the calculation of $g$ in general requires evaluation of the third-order derivatives of Eq. (1). In the examples considered here, these were calculated numerically from the Jacobian of Eq. (1) using a symmetric four point formula Ref. 23 (p. 884).

The vectors $h_{200}$, $h_{110}$, and $h_{001}$ should now be found. Since the linear equation which determines these vectors is readily obtained. However, the linear systems that define $h_{210}$ and $h_{101}$ involve the singular matrix $J - ia_0 I$. First the singular part of the vector $\Phi_{210}$ and $\Phi_{101}$ are removed according to Eq. (7). The resulting system is then solved using a singular value decomposition where the solution is subject to the additional condition (8).

Next assume that we would like to know the parameter dependence of the limit cycle throughout a broad region by means of a numerical continuation procedure. The formulas in Table I provides us readily with an initial estimate for such a calculation. To choose a proper operating point for the initial estimate of the limit cycle, a finite parameter distance from the bifurcation point must be chosen. This value is finally used in Eq. (13) to generate either one or, if a multiple shooting or a discretization is desired, a set of initial points on the limit cycle. An estimate for the initial period of the limit cycle is given by Eq. (17).

### IV. Examples

In this section, we examine four different models in order to discuss and illustrate the use of Eq. (13) to approximate the geometry of limit cycles emerging from a Hopf bifurcation. The examples are arranged according to the size of their phase space. While the dynamics of the first and the fourth models are amenable to numerical integration by standard Runge–Kutta solvers, the other two models are highly stiff and a relevant numerical solver has to be used (e.g., LSODE). In order to compare the expansion in Eq. (13) with the exact limit cycle solutions, we have introduced the following root-mean-square square measure:

$$|x| = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \sum_{j=1}^n x_j(t)^2 dt}.$$  (20)

The relative error $|x|_{rel}$, for a given expansion $x(t)_{rel}$ of Eq. (13) of order $i=1,...,3$, is then calculated as $|x|_{rel} = |x - x_{rel}|/|x|$ where $x(t)$ is the exact limit cycle solution determined by numerical continuation.

### A. Papain oscillator

The first model example is the papain oscillator—a biochemical model involving the enzyme papain. This system describes the enzyme catalyzed hydrolysis of a substrate (N-$\alpha$-benzoyl-L-arginin ethylester) in a compartment connected to a reservoir in a compartment connected to a reservoir. The model can be cast in terms of two independent variables $s$ (dimensionless substrate concentration) and $h$ (dimensionless concentration of hydrogen ions) whose temporal dynamics are described by the following differential equations:

$$\dot{s} = q_s (s_0 - s) - r_{HS},$$
$$\dot{h} = \frac{h^2}{1 + h^2} \left( q_H (h_0 - h) - \frac{1}{h_0} - \frac{1}{h} \right) + r_{HS},$$

where the reaction kinetics term is

$$r_{HS} = Da \left( \frac{s}{f_1 + f_2} \right) s + f_3,$$

$$f_1 = (1 + 10^{-2.79} h + 10^{-1.49} h^{-1}),$$

$$f_2 = (1 + 10^{-1.86} h + 10^{-0.59} h^{-1}),$$

$$f_3 = (1 + 10^{-1.86} h + 10^{-0.59} h^{-1}).$$

### Table II. Expressions for the elements of the Jacobian matrix shown in Fig. 1 needed to solve the defining system (19) for locating a Hopf bifurcation point by Newton iteration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Element expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{x}}_{ij}$</td>
<td>$(n \times n)$</td>
<td>$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mu}$</td>
<td>$(n \times 1)$</td>
<td>$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial h}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{v}_1}$</td>
<td>$(n \times n)$</td>
<td>$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \mu} v_{1k}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{v}_2}$</td>
<td>$(n \times n)$</td>
<td>$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \mu} v_{2k}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{v}_1}$</td>
<td>$(n \times 1)$</td>
<td>$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \mu} v_{1k}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \mathbf{v}_2}$</td>
<td>$(n \times 1)$</td>
<td>$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial \mu} v_{2k}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 1. Structure of the Jacobian matrix needed to solve the defining system (19) for locating a Hopf bifurcation point by Newton iteration. Gray colored areas contain zero elements only. Explicit expressions needed to evaluate each nonzero matrix element are shown in Table II.
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The papain oscillator Eq. (21) exhibits a curve of Hopf bifurcations in the $h_0-Da$ parameter space shown in the bifurcation diagram in Fig. 2(a). Both super- and subcritical bifurcations occur as shown in the figure with solid and dashed lines respectively. Both endpoints of the bifurcation curve terminate at codimension-two Bogdanov–Takens bifurcation points$^{29}$ where the Hopf bifurcation curve coalesces with a fold (or saddle-node) bifurcation curve (indicated with white circles). A blow-up of the region corresponding to supercritical bifurcations is shown in Fig. 2(b).

To investigate the effect of the nonlinear terms of the expansion (13), we have chosen the sample point $(h_0, \ln Da) = (2.410914 \times 10^{-3}, 15.43957)$ within the supercritical region as indicated on Fig. 2 with a solid circle, see also Table III. To study the limit cycle bifurcating from this point, we need to operate at a finite distance from the bifurcating point which is done by fixing $Da$ and choosing $h_0 = 2.410778 \times 10^{-3}$. The comparison of the numerically accurate limit cycle solution obtained by the shooting method$^{17}$ and the estimates provided by Eq. (13) are shown as both time plots and phase portraits in Fig. 3. The first-order expansion of Eq. (13) shows large deviations from the exact solution, whereas the second- and third-order expansions agree increasingly better with the accurate solution. This is in correspondence with the relative deviations from the exact limit cycle solution given by Eq. (20), where we find 0.2254%, 0.0234%, and 0.0171% for the first-, second-, and third-order expansions respectively.

Numerical values for all the coefficient vectors used in the expansion Eq. (13) are shown in Table IV.

### B. Inorganic pH oscillator

The next model by Luo and Epstein$^{30}$ has been used as a general system to describe pH oscillations in inorganic chemical reaction systems. This four variable model describes a flow-through stirred chemical system with inflow of

![FIG. 3. Comparisons of the actual periodic solution (solid line) to the papain model (21) and its approximation by the first-, second-, and third-order expansions of the limit cycle formula (13) (long-dashed, short-dashed, and dotted lines, respectively).](image-url)
TABLE IV. Numerical values for all characteristic vectors describing the Hopf bifurcation in the papain model (21) indicated on Fig. 2 with a solid circle. The coefficient vectors \( \mathbf{h}_{ijk} \) have been calculated using the formulas of Table I. Observe that these are dependent on the chosen normalization of the complex right eigenvector \( \mathbf{u} \). All shown numbers are needed to evaluate the terms in Eq. (13) describing the expansion of the limit cycle associated with the Hopf bifurcation point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stationary point ( \mathbf{x}_i )</th>
<th>Vector field ( \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_i) )</th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( 4.760 \times 10^7 )</td>
<td>( 8.729 \times 10^{-19} )</td>
<td>( \text{Re} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 4.576 \times 10^7 )</td>
<td>( -1.644 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
<td>( 8.881 \times 10^{-15} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in the bifurcation diagram in Fig. 4(a), the inorganic pH oscillator Eq. (23) exhibits oscillatory behavior emerging from Hopf bifurcation for a wide range of the parameters \( k_0 \) and \( X_0 \). Observe also that almost the entire curve in parameter space corresponds to subcritical Hopf bifurcations, except for a narrow region located at low flow

![Image](https://example.com/bifurcation_diagram.png)

**FIG. 4.** Loci of Hopf bifurcations for the inorganic pH oscillator in the parameter plane \( (k_0, X_0) \). At two parameter points, the Hopf bifurcation changes stability from super- to subcritical (solid and dashed curves, respectively). The curve shown in (b) illustrates how the imaginary part \( \omega_{ib} \) of the bifurcating eigenvalue varies along the bifurcation curve in (a).

TABLE V. Rate constants and external constraints used for numerical simulations of the inorganic pH oscillator model in Eq. (23). All values are taken from Ref. 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( k_1 / M^{-1} s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 5.0 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_{-1} / s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 3.0 \times 10^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_2 / M^{-1} s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 3.077 \times 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_3 / M^{-1} s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 10^6 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_4 / s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 11.0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k_5 / M^{-1} s^{-1} )</td>
<td>( 2.5 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( A/M )</td>
<td>( 6.5 \times 10^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B/M )</td>
<td>( 2.0 \times 10^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( H_0/M )</td>
<td>( 2.0 \times 10^{-2} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE VI. Characteristic coefficients for the normal form (10) associated with the Hopf bifurcation point in the inorganic pH oscillator (23) indicated on Fig. 4 with a solid circle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Re</th>
<th>Im</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_0$</td>
<td>$4.111 \times 10^3$</td>
<td>$4.111 \times 10^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_0$</td>
<td>$6.540 \times 10^{-1}$</td>
<td>$-2.052 \times 10^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_0$</td>
<td>$7.993 \times 10^1$</td>
<td>$-5.407 \times 10^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>$-9.611 \times 10^0$</td>
<td>$2.052 \times 10^0$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rates where the bifurcations are supercritical. Both endpoints on the bifurcation curve terminate at Bogdanov–Takens points indicated with white circles on Fig. 4. This feature is shown in Fig. 4(b) where the variation of the imaginary part $\omega_0$ of the bifurcating eigenvalue along the bifurcation curve is shown as a function of the flow rate $k_0$; clearly, $\omega_0$ vanishes at the two endpoints as required at a Bogdanov–Takens point.

To investigate the application of the higher-order expansions of Eq. (13) as the distance from the Hopf bifurcation point is varied, we have selected the sample point $(k_0, X_0) = (41.1112, 0.654069)$ marked on the bifurcation curve in Fig. 4 with a solid circle. The characteristics of the corresponding normal form are presented in Table VI.

Next, we keep $X_0$ fixed, and choose four increasing values of $k_0$ whose numerical values are shown in Table VII. Phase portraits showing the numerically accurate limit cycle solution and the first- and the third-order estimates of Eq. (13) projected onto the $(H, X)$-plane are shown in Fig. 5. For each of the four parameter values, the corresponding amplitudes of the oscillations for the two components $H$ and $X$ are shown in Table VII. Close to the bifurcation point (5a), both the first- and third-order estimate are numerically identical to the exact solution. However, as the distance is increased (5b) and (5c), deviations from the exact solution, become increasingly pronounced for the first-order estimate, whereas the third-order estimate still agrees well. Notice in Table VII that the size of the limit cycle increases by two orders of magnitude from cases (a)–(d). For a sufficiently large parameter value (5d) the third-order solution also fails to capture the dynamics and geometry of the exact solution.

C. Peroxidase-oxidase oscillator

The purpose of the following example is to show the performance of the bifurcation formulas in Table I in a larger system whose dynamics are extremely stiff due to vastly different time scales involved. In addition, we illustrate the evolution of the periodic branches as they extend far from their emergence at the Hopf bifurcation. The system is a model for aerobic oxidation of nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NADH) catalyzed by the enzyme horseradish peroxidase. Apart from periodic oscillations emerging via a Hopf bifurcation, the model exhibits a complex sequence of bifurcations leading to chaos. The model was proposed by Aguda and Larter to account for earlier experimental observations of chaos. The system is open to oxygen from air and is governed by ten evolution equations

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{A} &= -k_1 WA + k_7 CN, \\
\dot{B} &= k_2 XN + k_3 NY - k_4 BZ - k_5 BF + k_7 CN - 2k_8 B^2 - k_{12} BW, \\
\dot{C} &= -k_5 CW + k_8 BF - k_7 CN, \\
F &= -k_6 BF - k_13 FV + k_4 ([O_2]_{eq} - F), \\
\dot{N} &= -k_2 XN - k_3 NY - k_5 CW - k_{13} BW, \\
W &= -k_1 AW + k_3 NY - k_5 CW - k_{13} BW, \\
X &= k_1 AW - k_2 XN + k_4 BZ, \\
\dot{Y} &= k_2 XN - k_3 NY, \\
\dot{Z} &= -k_4 BZ + k_5 CW + k_{13} FV, \\
\dot{V} &= k_{12} BW - k_{13} FV,
\end{align*}
\]

where the variables are assigned to concentrations of respective species as follows: $A = [H_2O_2]$, $B = [NAD\cdot\cdot]$, $C = [O_2^-]$, $W = [H_2O_2]$, $X = [NADH]$, $Y = [NADH]_{eq}$, $Z = [O_2^-]$, $V = [O_2]$.
TABLE VII. Four parameter values of inflow concentrations of hydrogen $H_2$ for the inorganic pH oscillator associated with the Hopf bifurcation point indicated on Fig. 4 with a solid circle. At each parameter value, the numerically accurate limit cycle solution and the first and third estimates provided by the expansion (13) have been calculated as shown in Fig. 5. The table also exhibits the amplitude of oscillations for both the $H$ and $X$ component at each corresponding parameter point.

| Figure | $k_0 - k_0^{\text{Hopf}}$ | Amplitude of $H$ | Amplitude of $X$ | $|x_1|_{\text{tot}}/\%$ | $|x_1|_{\text{tot}}/\%$ |
|--------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 5(a)   | 0.013 89                    | $1.3652 \times 10^{-5}$ | $3.4583 \times 10^{-6}$ | 0.0230                  | 0.0230                  |
| 5(b)   | 0.013 96                    | $2.1557 \times 10^{-5}$ | $5.5226 \times 10^{-6}$ | 3.6064                  | 3.6286                  |
| 5(c)   | 0.014 04                    | $3.3952 \times 10^{-5}$ | $8.8395 \times 10^{-6}$ | 7.7942                  | 1.3956                  |
| 5(d)   | 0.014 13                    | $4.6754 \times 10^{-5}$ | $1.2472 \times 10^{-5}$ | 13.2738                 | 3.87005                 |

$F=\left[O_2\right], N=\left[NADH\right], W=\left[\text{Per}^{3+}\right], X=\left[\text{col}\right], Y=\left[\text{colII}\right], Z=\left[\text{colIII}\right],$ and $V=\left[\text{Per}^{2+}\right].$ The various oxidation states of the enzyme are bound by the constraint $E_{\text{tot}}=V+W+X+Y+Z,$ which permits a reduction of the number of equations by one (we choose $V$ to be calculated from the constraint and leave out the corresponding differential equation). The rate coefficients are fixed at $k_1,...,k_4=k_5,...,k_8=k_9=1 \mu M^{-1}s^{-1}, k_5=60 \mu M^{-1}s^{-1}.$ Two external parameters, the mass transfer coefficient, $k_7=0.1 \text{s}^{-1},$ and the inflow of NADH, $\text{NADH}_m=0.1 \mu \text{Ms}^{-1},$ are also fixed. The remaining two parameters, the concentration of oxygen when equilibrated with the gas, $[O_2]_{eq}$ and the total concentration of the enzyme, $E_{\text{tot}},$ are free.

The curve of the Hopf bifurcations in this parameter plane is shown in Fig. 6(a). It encloses a bounded region where oscillations are expected. Observe that the curve consists of both super- and subcritical parts as indicated by solid and dashed lines respectively.

The branches that emanate from the two bifurcation points selected by setting the parameter $[O_2]_{eq}=1.3 \mu M$ are undergoing various bifurcations when further away from the Hopf bifurcation as shown in Fig. 6(b). The characteristics of the normal form are shown in Table VIII. The bifurcation formulas were used to find an estimate of a periodic orbit close to its emergence and this estimate was subsequently used to track the entire branch of periodic orbits by continuation. The figure shows that both Hopf points are joined by a single three times folded branch. The solutions become unstable due to repeated fold and period-doubling bifurcations, the latter being consistent with the observations of chaos discussed in Ref. 6.

D. Reaction-diffusion systems

As a final example, we wish to consider how the calculations of the characteristics of a Hopf bifurcation considered in the previous examples can be extended to reaction-diffusion systems described by a partial differential equation (PDE) of the form

![FIG. 6. (a) Loci of Hopf bifurcations for the peroxidase-oxidase oscillator in the parameter plane ($[O_2]_{eq}, E_{\text{tot}}$). Super- and subcritical regions are shown with solid and dashed curves, respectively. The curve shown in the solution diagram (b) illustrates a continuation of the limit cycles that branch off from the two Hopf bifurcation points marked in (a) with solid circles. Initial estimates of the limit cycle for a 20-point multiple shooting continuation were evaluated by using the full third expansion of Eq. (13). During the course of continuation the limit cycle exhibits a series of period-doubling and limit point bifurcations indicated on the continuation curve with white and gray circles, respectively.](image-url)

TABLE VIII. Characteristic coefficients for the normal form (10) associated with the two Hopf bifurcation point in the peroxidase-oxidase model indicated on Fig. 6 with a solid circle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$E_{\text{tot}}$</th>
<th>$[O_2]_{eq}$</th>
<th>1.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_0$</td>
<td>1.052 593 $\times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1$</td>
<td>$-2.777 684 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>$-2.151 067 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_x$</td>
<td>7.366 951 $\times 10^{-6}$</td>
<td>1.848 198 $\times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{tot}}$</td>
<td>2.514 597</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[O_2]_{eq}$</td>
<td>4.775 365 $\times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_0$</td>
<td>8.274 127 $\times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$-1.228 465 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_1$</td>
<td>$-8.655 570 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
<td>1.786 902 $\times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[ \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial t} = \mathbf{J} \cdot \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mu) + \mathbf{D} \cdot \nabla^2 \mathbf{x}. \]  

Here \( \mathbf{x}(r,t) \) is a vector of \( n \) chemical components \( x_i(r,t) \) defined on a functional space \( H \) dependent on both time \( t \) and a one-dimensional spatial variable \( r \). The spatial dependence corresponds to the inclusion of diffusion driven transport of matter described by the diagonal diffusion matrix \( \mathbf{D} \) whose individual components \( D_i \) are diffusion coefficients of the respective chemical species.

The extension and application of the center manifold theorem and bifurcation analysis in terms of normal form calculations for infinite dimensional systems of the type Eq. (25) is today well-established in the literature and we refer to Refs. 12, 15, 16 and 32 for a detailed treatment of this subject.

In this context, we wish to consider the Brusselator model\(^{33}\) with an additional diffusion term, namely

\[ \begin{align*}
\dot{x}_1 &= a - (b + 1)x_1 + x_1^2 x_2 + d \nabla^2 x_1, \\
\dot{x}_2 &= b x_1 - x_1^2 x_2 + d \nabla^2 x_2,
\end{align*} \]

where we shall use the diffusion coefficient \( d \) as the bifurcation parameter. The spatial variable \( r \) is defined on the domain \( r \in [0; \pi] \) whereas each variable \( x_i \) is subject to no-flux (or von Neumann) boundary conditions

\[ \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial t} |_{r=0} = \frac{\partial x_i}{\partial t} |_{r=\pi} = 0, \quad \text{for } i = 1,2. \]

The Brusselator (26) has a nontrivially spatially homogeneous solution \( (x_1^*, x_2^*) = (a, b/a) \) and we wish to consider the stability of this state here.

The linear part of Eq. (26) at the homogeneous state \( (x_1^*, x_2^*) \) defines an operator

\[ \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{J} + \mathbf{D} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} \]

with eigenfunctions \( \mathbf{Y}_k(r) \)

\[ \mathbf{Y}_k(r) = \cos(kr) \mathbf{v}_k, \]

where the wave number \( k \) is defined for \( k = 0,1, \ldots \). The vector \( \mathbf{v}_k \) is the eigenvector associated with the eigenvalue problem

\[ (\mathbf{J} - k^2 \mathbf{D}) \cdot \mathbf{v}_k = \lambda_k \mathbf{v}_k. \]

If we define an inner product \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) on the functional space \( H \) as

\[ \langle \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_0^\pi \mathbf{w}_i \mathbf{v}_i \, dr, \]

the adjoint operator \( \mathbf{M}^* \) of Eq. (28) becomes

\[ \mathbf{M}^* = \mathbf{J}^T + \mathbf{D} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \delta^2}, \]

with corresponding (adjoint) eigenfunctions

\[ \mathbf{Y}_k^*(r) = \cos(kr) \mathbf{v}_k^*, \quad \text{for } k = 1,2,\ldots \]

As in Eq. (2), we normalize the eigenfunctions according to

\[ \langle \mathbf{Y}_k^*, \mathbf{Y}_l \rangle = \delta_{kl}, \]

which implies that the right and left eigenvectors \( \mathbf{v}_k \) and \( \mathbf{v}_k^* \) satisfy

\[ \mathbf{v}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k^* = \frac{2}{\pi} \delta_{kl}. \]

At the parameter value \( d = 2 \), the homogeneous steady state undergoes a Hopf bifurcation for the wave number \( k = 1 \), implying that a spatially nonhomogeneous periodic solution branches off from the homogeneous reference state \( (a,b/a) \). The corresponding right and left eigenfunctions are

\[ \mathbf{Y}(r) = \cos(r) \mathbf{v}^*, \quad \mathbf{Y}_1^*(r) = \cos(r) \mathbf{v}^*, \]

where

\[ \mathbf{v} = (1,-2+i)^T, \quad \mathbf{v}^* = \frac{1}{\pi} (1-2i,-i). \]

By application of the inner product defined in Eq. (31), we may use the left eigenvector \( \mathbf{Y}_1^* \) to decompose any smooth function in \( H \) into its center subspace component and associated complement.

For the example presented here, we only wish to discuss the calculation of the coefficients \( \lambda_1 \) and \( g \) of Eq. (10) and need therefore only to determine the coefficient vectors \( \mathbf{h}_{200}, \mathbf{h}_{110}, \) and \( \mathbf{h}_{001} \). The notational modifications of the formulas in Table I needed to determine these quantities [and thereby the normal form equation (10) associated with the Hopf bifurcation] are almost trivial. For example, for the second-order component \( \mathbf{h}_{200}(r) \), we find

\[ (\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{D} \cdot \nabla^2 - 2i \omega_0 \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbf{h}_{200} = -\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{F}_{xx}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}), \]

whereas the equation that determines the third-order coefficient \( g \) becomes

\[ g = \langle \mathbf{v}^*, \mathbf{F}_{xx}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}_{110}) + \mathbf{F}_{xx}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{h}_{200}) + \frac{i}{2} \mathbf{F}_{xxx}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}) \rangle. \]

Equation (38) is a linear boundary value problem which must be solved subject to the no-flux condition \( \partial \mathbf{h}_{200} / \partial r = 0 \). Insertion of \( \mathbf{M} \) and the eigenfunction \( \mathbf{Y}_1(r) \) into Eq. (38) gives

\[ (\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{D} \cdot \nabla^2 - 2i \omega_0 \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbf{h}_{200} = -(1+2i, -1-2i)^T \cos^2 r. \]

Expanding the right-hand side as

\[ (\mathbf{J} + \mathbf{D} \cdot \nabla^2 - 2i \omega_0 \mathbf{I}) \cdot \mathbf{h}_{200} = \frac{1}{2} (1+2i, -1-2i)^T (1+ \cos 2r), \]

and solving Eq. (41) for each separate harmonic (1 and \( \cos 2r \)) gives

\[ \mathbf{h}_{200}(r) = (1+2i)\left[ \frac{1}{15} (2+i, \frac{15}{2}\pi)^T + \frac{1}{15} (4-i, -\frac{25}{4}+4i)^T \cos 2r \right]. \]

The derivations and solutions of the linear equations that determine the remaining quantities from Table I (the transformation coefficients \( \mathbf{h}_{110}, \mathbf{h}_{210}, \mathbf{h}_{300} \), as well as the unfolding coefficient \( \lambda_1 \) ) follow precisely the same procedure sketched for \( \mathbf{h}_{200} \) above and we shall therefore omit these details here. Using the same procedure as demonstrated for \( \mathbf{h}_{200} \), we find for the additional coefficient functions.
TABLE IX. Numerically calculated values of the nonlinear coefficient $g$ of the normal form Eq. (10) for the Brusselator PDE (26) using second- and fourth-order finite difference schemes for discretization of the Laplacian. For an increasing number of grid points, each row displays the numerically obtained values as well as the relative error with respect to the exact solution shown in Eq. (44).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid points</th>
<th>2. order</th>
<th>4. order</th>
<th>Relative error/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>$g$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.432 284 5 $- i \cdot 3.090 980 7$</td>
<td>3.435 875 1 $- i \cdot 3.091 076 3$</td>
<td>0.080 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.435 121 9 $- i \cdot 3.091 061 1$</td>
<td>3.435 974 5 $- i \cdot 3.091 078 3$</td>
<td>0.019 1.2 $\times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.435 772 9 $- i \cdot 3.091 074 2$</td>
<td>3.435 980 0 $- i \cdot 3.091 078 4$</td>
<td>0.005 7.4 $\times 10^{-6}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>3.435 929 3 $- i \cdot 3.091 077 4$</td>
<td>3.435 980 3 $- i \cdot 3.091 078 4$</td>
<td>0.001 4.6 $\times 10^{-7}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ h_{10}(r) = \frac{1}{15} (4 \cos 2r, -25 - 9 \cos 2r) \text{T}, \]
\[ h_{001}(r) = 0. \]  
Using the definition of the inner product (31), the third-order coefficient $g$ is calculated from Eq. (39) as
\[ g = \frac{35 047}{10 200} + \frac{31 529}{10 200} \]  
whereas a similar calculation for $\lambda_1$ gives
\[ \lambda_1 = -\frac{3}{4} + i \frac{3}{2}. \]

V. DISCUSSION

The numerical analysis of Hopf bifurcation points should meet at least two criteria: First, the method should provide a sufficiently precise initial estimate for a one-parameter continuation of the periodic orbit which emerges at the Hopf bifurcation point. Second, the method should provide information regarding the stability of the limit cycle close to the bifurcation point by determining whether the Hopf bifurcation is super- or subcritical.

In this paper, we have shown how these two criteria can be met efficiently by a straightforward application of the normal form theorem. We provide explicit expressions for deriving the nonlinear contributions from the normal form transformation for the expansion of the limit cycle emerging at a Hopf bifurcation. All the examples considered here clearly illustrate that the addition of the nonlinear terms to the limit cycle expansion provides a significant improvement and accuracy in the numerical estimate of the limit cycle. This can be crucial for the convergence. We stress that the calculation of the additional nonlinear terms requires very little extra numerical work since these terms are required for the determination of the resonant coefficients in the corresponding normal form (10) for the Hopf bifurcation. In fact, only the third-order terms in the expansion requires additional numerical work. We believe these results will prove useful for future developments of robust numerical codes for bifurcation analysis of Hopf bifurcations superseding currently used ones.

In addition, we have also shown that inclusion of higher-order terms in the normal form approximation provides a significant improvement in the representation of the exact limit cycle. This, for example, is clearly illustrated in Fig. 5, where both the translation and the nonlinear bending of the limit cycle is captured well by the higher-order expansion. This holds even at parameter distances quite far from the actual Hopf bifurcation point and makes it much easier for the numerical procedure of finding the limit cycle to converge. In addition, we believe that this may have experimental importance when the geometry of the limit cycle is reconstructed from experimental data using either quenching techniques\(^ {36} \) or control theory.\(^ {37} \)

The ideas presented here for the Hopf bifurcation have been implemented numerically into a software tool BRANCH\(^ {38} \) which supports bifurcation analysis of dynamical systems described by autonomous ordinary differential equations and discrete iterated maps. For such systems, all “simple” codimension-one bifurcations are handled: Saddle-node, transcritical, pitchfork, and Hopf–Neimark-Sacker bifurcations of stationary, periodic, and fixed point solutions, as well as period doubling bifurcations of periodic orbits. In addition, a range of codimension-two bifurcations commonly encountered in ODE’s with special symmetry.
properties are also supported. For the analysis of periodic solutions of Eq. (1), full support for multiple shooting or discretization is provided. Estimates of initial points on the branches are calculated and output is generated in a form suitable as input data for the continuation software CONT [Ref. 18 (Appendix B)]. Both software packages are free and can be obtained by contacting the authors.

Finally, we emphasize that the results presented in this paper have general relevance within the field of dynamical systems and nonlinear dynamics; Even though the examples and the discussion are focused on nonlinear chemical kinetics, the Hopf bifurcation formulas in Table I can be applied to any dynamical system represented by a set of autonomous ordinary differential equations of the form (1).
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