

# On the Roots of Characteristic Equations of Delay Differential Systems

Jia-Yuan Dai

## Abstract

We prove that characteristic equations of certain types of delay differential systems, under some mild conditions on their coefficients, can possess infinitely many complex roots.

## A. Preliminary

Our motivation comes from the linear (single, complex, constant) time-delay complex differential system:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + Bx(t - \tau), \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{C}^n \quad (1)$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are  $n$ -by- $n$  matrices over  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  is a complex time-delay. The stability of the zero solution is determined to the real parts of roots of the characteristic equation:

$$f(\lambda) := \det(\lambda \text{id} - A - e^{-\tau\lambda} B) = 0, \quad (2)$$

after the exponential ansatz  $x(t) = e^{\lambda t} x_0$  is applied. We are interested in the question whether there exist infinitely many complex roots of  $f$ .

Our main observations are the following:

- (i)  $f$  is an entire function;
- (ii) for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , the growth rate of  $f$  is bounded by  $e^{|\lambda|^{1+\epsilon}}$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|\lambda|$  sufficiently large.

We note that (ii) follows directly by using triangle inequality.

**Definition.** Let  $f$  be an entire function, the **order** of  $f$ , denoted by  $\text{ord}(f)$ , is the infimum of  $\alpha > 0$  such that there exists  $R > 0$  such that  $|f(\lambda)| \leq e^{|\lambda|^\alpha}$  holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $|\lambda| \geq R$ .

Hence the observation (ii) indicates that  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$ . Now finiteness of  $\text{ord}(f)$  reminds us a dichotomy.

**Lemma 1** (Theorem 16.13 in [BaNe10]). *Let  $f$  be an entire function and of finite order, then*

- (i) either  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses infinitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,

(ii) or there exist complex polynomial  $g(\lambda)$  and  $h(\lambda)$  such that  $h(0) = 0$  and

$$f(\lambda) = g(\lambda)e^{h(\lambda)}$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Furthermore, in the case (ii), we have  $\deg(h) = \text{ord}(f)$ .

Thus, our strategy is to give an indirect proof: according to Lemma 1, if  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses at most finitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ , then  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$  implies

$$f(\lambda) = g(\lambda)e^{c\lambda}$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  where  $g(\lambda)$  is a complex polynomial and  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ . Then the main task is to seek conditions on the coefficients  $A$  and  $B$  to reach a contradiction.

## B. Single Complex Constant Delay

In the following Proposition we apply our strategy carefully.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose  $\text{tr}(B) \neq 0$ , then for each  $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ , the equation*

$$f(\lambda) := \det(\lambda \text{id} - A - e^{-\tau\lambda}B) = 0 \quad (3)$$

*possesses infinitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ .*

**Proof.** Setting  $\lambda \mapsto \tau\lambda$ , without loss of generality we consider  $\tau = 1$ . The equation (3) can be expressed as

$$f(\lambda) := \lambda^n + a_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda} + \dots + a_n(\lambda)e^{-n\lambda}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$a_1(\lambda) = -(\text{tr}(B))\lambda^{n-1} + \text{lower order terms}$$

is a nonzero polynomial since we assume  $\text{tr}(B) \neq 0$ . Obviously all other  $a_j(\lambda)$  for  $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$  are (maybe identically zero) complex polynomials. Since  $a_1(\lambda)$  is nonzero, there exist  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$  such that  $a_k(\lambda)$  is the *last* (with respect to the order as real numbers in the exponential exponents) nonzero polynomial, i.e.

$$f(\lambda) = \lambda^n + a_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda} + \dots + a_k(\lambda)e^{-k\lambda}. \quad (5)$$

Obviously  $f$  is an entire function. We easily see that  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$ , because for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , using triangle inequality, the estimates

$$|f(\lambda)| \leq (k+1) \max_{j=1, \dots, k} \{1, |a_j(\lambda)|\} e^{k|\lambda|} \leq e^{|\lambda|^{1+\epsilon}} \quad (6)$$

hold as  $|\lambda|$  is sufficiently large.

**Contradiction Part:** Suppose the contrary that  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses at most finitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Since  $f$  is entire and  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$ , by Lemma 1,

$$f(\lambda) = g(\lambda)e^{c\lambda}$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  where  $g(\lambda)$  is a complex polynomial and  $c \in \mathbb{C}$ . We claim that

$$\text{Re}(c) = -k, \quad \text{Im}(c) = 0. \quad (7)$$

Let  $z_l \lambda^l$  ( $0 \leq l \leq n$ ) be the leading term of  $a_k(\lambda)$ . Multiplying (5) by  $e^{k\lambda}/\lambda^l$  yields

$$\frac{g(\lambda)}{\lambda^l} e^{i\text{Im}(c)\lambda} e^{(\text{Re}(c)+k)\lambda} = \frac{\lambda^n e^{k\lambda} + a_1(\lambda)e^{(k-1)\lambda} + \dots a_{k-1}(\lambda)e^\lambda}{\lambda^l} + z_l + \frac{\tilde{a}_k(\lambda)}{\lambda^l} \quad (8)$$

where  $\deg(\tilde{a}_k) < l$ . Taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ , since  $g$ , all  $a_j$ , and  $\tilde{a}_k$  are polynomials, the right-hand side of (8) converges to  $z_l$ , while the left-hand side of (8) diverges to infinity (resp. to zero) if  $\text{Re}(c) + k < 0$  (resp.  $\text{Re}(c) + k > 0$ ). Thus  $\text{Re}(c) + k = 0$ . We now have

$$\frac{g(\lambda)}{\lambda^l} e^{i\text{Im}(c)\text{Re}(c)} e^{-\text{Im}(c)\text{Im}(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda^n e^{k\lambda} + a_1(\lambda)e^{(k-1)\lambda} + \dots a_{k-1}(\lambda)e^\lambda}{\lambda^l} + z_l + \frac{\tilde{a}_k(\lambda)}{\lambda^l}. \quad (9)$$

Again we play the same trick by taking  $\text{Re}(\lambda) \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $\text{Im}(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$  (or  $-\infty$ , it does not matter), we see  $\text{Im}(c) = 0$ . As a result, (5) becomes

$$g(\lambda)e^{-k\lambda} = \lambda^n + a_1(\lambda)e^{-\lambda} + \dots + a_k(\lambda)e^{-k\lambda}.$$

At last taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  we have

$$0 = \lim_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \rightarrow \infty} \lambda^n,$$

which is a contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

### C. Multiple Real Constant Delays

We consider the linear (multiple, real, constant) time-delay complex differential systems:

$$\dot{x}(t) = Ax(t) + \sum_{j=1}^k B_j x(t - \tau_j), \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{C}^n \quad (10)$$

for integer  $j \geq 2$  and  $-\infty < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots < \tau_k < \infty$ . The characteristic equation is given by

$$\det(\lambda \text{id} - A - \sum_{j=1}^k B_j e^{-\tau_j \lambda}) = 0, \quad (11)$$

which is a special case of the general *quasi-polynomials*

$$f(\lambda) := \sum_{(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in \mathbb{N}^{k+1} \cup \{0\}} a_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \lambda^{\alpha_0} e^{-(\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j \tau_j) \lambda} \quad (12)$$

where only finitely many  $a_{\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} \in \mathbb{C}$  are nonzero. Denote  $\boldsymbol{\tau} := (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_k)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ . We call  $f$  is **admissible** if there exist  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^2$  such that

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} \neq \boldsymbol{\alpha}^2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}$$

and there exist  $\alpha_0^1, \alpha_0^2 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  such that

$$a_{\alpha_0^1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^1} \neq 0, \quad a_{\alpha_0^2, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^2} \neq 0.$$

In other words,  $f(\lambda)$  possesses two different exponential exponents.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $f$  be defined in (12), then  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses infinitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$  if and only if  $f$  is admissible.*

**Proof.** Assume  $f$  is not admissible, then  $f(\lambda) = 0$  is equivalent to a polynomial equation, which possesses at most finitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

Conversely, assume  $f$  is admissible. Obviously  $f$  is an entire function and  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$ . Since all  $\tau_j$  are real, the terms of  $f(\lambda)$  can be sorted by the order as real numbers in the exponential exponents. Hence if  $f$  is admissible, then

$$f(\lambda) = a_h(\lambda)e^{-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^h \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau})\lambda} + \dots + a_l(\lambda)e^{-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^l \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau})\lambda} \quad (13)$$

holds where  $a_h(\lambda)$  and  $a_l(\lambda)$  are nonzero complex polynomials and  $-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^h \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}) > -(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^l \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau})$  are two different real numbers. Therefore,  $f(\lambda) = 0$  is equivalent to the equation

$$\tilde{f}(\lambda) = a_h(\lambda) + \dots + a_l(\lambda)e^{-(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^l \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^h \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau})\lambda} = 0.$$

**Contradiction Part:** Suppose the contrary that  $\tilde{f}(\lambda) = 0$  possesses at most finitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ , then

$$\tilde{f}(\lambda) = g(\lambda)e^{c\lambda} \quad (14)$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Now we notice that the claim in the Contradiction Part of the previous Proposition:

$$\text{Re}(c) = -(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^l \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} - \boldsymbol{\alpha}^h \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}), \quad \text{Im}(c) = 0,$$

holds if we assume all  $\tau_j$  are real. Therefore, taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  in (14), we have

$$0 = \lim_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \lambda \rightarrow \infty} a_h(\lambda),$$

a contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

**Remark.** *The assumption  $\text{tr}(B) \neq 0$  is just a sufficient condition of Proposition 1, but it is the unique sufficient condition that is irrelevant to  $A$ .*

**Remark.** *It is interesting to seek sufficient conditions for  $f$  in (11) being admissible. For instance Pontryagin's condition that  $f$  is without the principal term, see [Po55]. Another sufficient condition is that  $\tau_j$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , i.e.*

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau} = 0, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{Z}^k \quad \text{implies} \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}.$$

and one of  $B_j$  is of trace zero.

## D. Single Real Distributed Delay

We consider a linear (single, real, distributed) time-delay complex differential equation:

$$\dot{x}(t) = ax(t) + \int_0^\tau M(\theta)x(t-\theta)d\theta, \quad x(t) \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (15)$$

where  $a \in \mathbb{C}$ ,  $\tau > 0$ , and  $M \in C^0([0, \tau], \mathbb{C})$ . The characteristic equation of (15) is given by

$$f(\lambda) := \lambda - a - \int_0^\tau M(\theta)e^{-\lambda\theta}d\theta = 0$$

**Proposition 3.**  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses infinitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$  if and only if  $M$  is not identically zero.

**Proof.** Assume  $M$  is identically zero, then  $f(\lambda) = 0$  possesses the unique root  $\lambda = a$ .

Conversely, assume  $M$  is not identically zero. Suppose the contrary that  $f$  possesses at most finitely many roots in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Obviously  $f$  is an entire function and  $\text{ord}(f) \leq 1$ , then by Lemma 1,

$$f(\lambda) = g(\lambda)e^{c\lambda}$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . Define  $\delta := \tau\|M\|_{C^0} > 0$ , then using triangle inequality,

$$|\lambda - a| - \delta e^{\tau \text{Re}(\lambda)} \leq |f(\lambda)| = |g(\lambda)|e^{\text{Re}(c)\text{Re}(\lambda) - \text{Im}(c)\text{Im}(\lambda)} \leq |\lambda - a| + \delta e^{\tau \text{Re}(\lambda)}. \quad (16)$$

Taking  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda \rightarrow -\infty$ , we see  $|f(\lambda)|$  cannot grow exponentially, hence  $\text{Re}(c) = 0$ . Similarly, taking  $\text{Re}(\lambda) \rightarrow -\infty$  and  $\text{Im}(\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$  (or  $-\infty$ , it does not matter), we have  $\text{Im}(c) = 0$ . Now that  $c = 0$ , the growth constraint (16) of  $|g(\lambda)|$  also implies that  $g(\lambda)$  is linear. Therefore there exist  $p, q \in \mathbb{C}$  such that

$$\int_0^\tau M(\theta)e^{-\lambda\theta}d\theta = p\lambda + q \quad (17)$$

holds for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ . To reach a contradiction, we differentiate (17) twice to obtain

$$\int_0^\tau \theta^2 M(\theta)e^{-\lambda\theta}d\theta = 0.$$

Since  $M$  is continuous, by using Fourier series, we have  $\theta^2 M(\theta) = 0$  for all  $\theta \in [0, \tau]$ . Thus  $M$  is identically zero, a contradiction. The proof is complete.  $\square$

## References

- [BaNe10] J. Bak and D. J. Newman. *Complex Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York, 2010.
- [Po55] L. S. Pontryagin. On the zeros of some elementary transcendental functions, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* (2) **1** (1955), p. 95-110.