ON THE TORUS BIFURCATION IN AVERAGING THEORY

MURILO R. CÂNDIDO AND DOUGLAS D. NOVAES

Abstract. In this paper, we take advantage of the averaging theory to study a Torus Bifurcation in two-parameter family of differential equations characterized by a Neimark-Sacker Bifurcation in the first return map. We provide generic conditions on the averaged functions ensuring the existence of a codimension-one bifurcation curve on the parameter space characterized by the birth of an invariant torus branching from a periodic solution.

1. Introduction and statements of the main result

In the present study, we consider the following two-parameter family of differential equations

\[
\dot{x} = \varepsilon F_1(t, x; \mu) + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{F}(t, x; \varepsilon, \mu).
\]

Here, \( F_1 \) and \( \tilde{F} \) are \( C^1 \) functions, \( T \)-periodic in the variable \( t \), \( x = (x, y) \in \Omega \) with \( \Omega \) an open bounded subset of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \), \( t \in \mathbb{R} \), \( \varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0] \) for some \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) small, and \( \mu \in \mathbb{R} \).

Detecting invariant sets of differential equations is a problem of major interest in the qualitative theory of ordinary differential equations. In particular, there are several works deriving sufficient conditions for the existence of isolated periodic solutions for systems of kind (1). In this direction, the averaging theory (see [12] and [13, Chapter 11]) is one of the most widely used tools. In short, this theory provides a sequence of functions \( g_i \), each one called \( i \)-th order averaged function, \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, k \), which “control” the bifurcation of isolated periodic solutions of (1). For a definition of the averaged functions see the Appendix. In addition, it is also reported in the literature results relating the Hopf bifurcation in the averaged system

\[
\dot{x} = \varepsilon g_1(x; \mu),
\]

with the existence of invariant tori in system (1). This fact is briefly commented in [12, Appendix C.5]. Similar results can be found in [3, Section 4.C] and [11, Chapter 2]. The above function \( g_1(x; \mu) \) denotes the first order averaged function of (1), that is,

\[
g_1(x; \mu) = (g_1^1(x; \mu), g_1^2(x; \mu)) = \int_0^T F_1(t, x; \mu) dt.
\]

It is worthwhile to mention that the averaging theory says that the coordinate change \( x = \tilde{x} + \varepsilon u(\tilde{x}, t) \), with \( u(\tilde{x}, t) = \int_0^t (F_1(s, \tilde{x}; \mu) - g_1(\tilde{x}; \mu)) ds \), and the
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time rescale \( t = T \tilde{t} \) carries the solutions of system (1) to the solutions of the full averaged system

\[
\frac{d\tilde{x}}{dt} = \varepsilon \mathbf{g}_1(\tilde{x}; \mu) + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{g}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}; \varepsilon, \mu).
\]  

(3)

Here, \( \tilde{g} \) is 1–periodic in \( \tilde{t} \) (see [13, Section 2.9]).

The aim of this paper is to provide generic conditions on the averaged functions \( \mathbf{g}_i \) which guarantees the existence of a codimension-one bifurcation curve \( \mu(\varepsilon) \) on the parameter space \((\mu, \varepsilon)\) characterized by the birth of an invariant torus of \( \mathbb{R}^4 \) branching from a periodic solution. Roughly speaking, our assumptions will ensure the existence of a Neimark-Sacker Bifurcation (see [8, 10, 11]) on the Poincaré map of (1), that is, the birth of an invariant closed curve enclosing a fixed point (see Figure 1). This Torus Bifurcation is also known as Secondary Hopf Bifurcation.

In what follows, as a first main result, we establish the relation between a Hopf Bifurcation in the averaged system (2) with a Torus Bifurcation in the differential equation (1).

**Theorem A.** Suppose that there exists a continuous curve \( \mu \mapsto x_\mu \in \Omega \), defined on an interval \( J \), such that \( \mathbf{g}_1(x_\mu; \mu) = 0 \) and \( D_{x_\mu} \mathbf{g}_1(x_\mu; \mu) \) is in its real Jordan normal form for every \( \mu \in J \subset \mathbb{R} \). Hence, the following statements hold:

(i) Let \( \lambda(\mu) = \alpha(\mu) \pm i \beta(\mu) \) be the eigenvalues of \( D_{x_\mu} \mathbf{g}_1(x_\mu; \mu) \). Assume that, for some \( \mu_0 \in J \), \( \alpha(\mu_0) = 0 \), \( \beta(\mu_0) = \omega_0 \), \( (\omega_0 > 0) \), and

\[
\left. \frac{d\alpha(\mu)}{d\mu} \right|_{\mu = \mu_0} = d \neq 0.
\]

Then, for every \( \mu \) in a small neighborhood \( J_0 \subset J \) of \( \mu_0 \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, system (1) admits a unique periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) satisfying \( \varphi(0; \mu, \varepsilon) \to x_\mu \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0 \).

(ii) Let \( \mathbf{g}_1(x; \mu) = (\mathbf{g}_1(x; \mu), \mathbf{g}_1^2(x; \mu)) \), with \( x = (x, y) \). Assume, aditionally, that

\[
\ell_{1,1} = \frac{1}{8} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x^3} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1^2(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x^2 \partial y} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1^2(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1^2(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x^2} \right)
\]

\[
+ \frac{1}{8\omega_0} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x \partial y} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1^2(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial y^2} - \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{g}_1^2(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)}{\partial x^2} \right) \right)
\]

\[
\neq 0.
\]

Then, there exists a \( C^1 \) curve \( \mu(\varepsilon) \subset J_0 \), defined for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small and satisfying \( \mu(\varepsilon) = \mu_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \), such that a unique invariant torus bifurcates from the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) whenever \( \ell_{1,1}(\mu - \mu(\varepsilon)) < 0 \). Moreover, if \( \ell_{1,1} > 0 \) (resp. \( \ell_{1,1} < 0 \)) the torus is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) is stable (resp. unstable).
Remark 1. In short, Theorem 1 says that a Hopf bifurcation on the averaged system (2) implies in a bifurcation of a periodic solution surrounded by an invariant torus of (1). Indeed, the conditions of Theorem 1 basically ensure that \((x_{mu_0}, \mu_0)\) is a Hopf point of the averaged system (2). Moreover, the first Lyapunov coefficient of averaged system (2) at \((x_{mu_0}, \mu_0)\) is given by \(\varepsilon_{l_1}\) (see [2, 4]).

Remark 2. The \(C^1\) differentiability of the functions \(F_1\) and \(\tilde{F}\) was the very first assumption on the differential system (1). It is worthwhile to mention that this hypothesis is not strictly necessary in order to apply Theorem 1. In fact, we shall see that it is sufficient to have the differentiability of the “time \(T\) map” of system (1). This implies that Theorem 1 can be applied to a wider class of differential equations, in particular for the class of piecewise smooth differential equation introduced in [5].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the Neimark-Sacker bifurcation, which plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 1 performed in Section 3. Afterward, in Section 4 we state Theorem B, which generalizes Theorem 1 establishing weaker conditions on the higher order averaged functions \(g_i\) still ensuring the existence of an invariant torus of (1) bifurcating from a periodic solution. Finally, in Section 5, the obtained results are applied to study the existence of an invariant torus for a family of 3D vector fields. An Appendix is provided with the formulae of the averaged functions.

2. Neimark-Sacker Bifurcation

The proof of our main result is mainly based on the classical Neimark-Sacker Bifurcation, which is a version of Hopf Bifurcation for maps. In what follows we shall briefly discuss this bifurcation.

Consider the map

\[
\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}; \sigma), \quad \mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2)^T \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^1.
\]  

(4)

with a \(C^1\) function \(\mathbf{F}\), which has at \(\sigma = 0\) the fixed point \(\mathbf{x}_0 = 0\) with the simple eigenvalues \(\lambda_{1,2} = e^{\pm i\theta_0}, 0 < \theta_0 < \pi\). By the Implicit Function Theorem we know that there exists a fixed point \(\mathbf{x}_\sigma\) of (4) for all \(|\sigma|\) sufficiently small. Without loss of generality we take \(\mathbf{x}_\sigma = 0\), thus we can write the Taylor approximation of system (4) at \(\mathbf{x} = 0\) as

\[
\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}; 0) = A\mathbf{x} + \frac{1}{2} \beta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{6} C(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) + \mathcal{O}(||\mathbf{x}||^4),
\]  

(5)

The Jacobian matrix \(A_\sigma = \partial_x \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}_\sigma, \sigma)\) has two multipliers

\[\lambda_{1,2}(\sigma) = r(\sigma)e^{\pm i\varphi(\sigma)},\]

where \(r(0) = 1, \varphi(0) = \theta_0\). In the following we consider the inner product \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}\) such that \(\langle u, v \rangle = \bar{u}^T \cdot v\) for all \(u, v \in \mathbb{C}^2\).

Theorem 1 ([1, Theorem 4.6]). Consider the two-dimensional one-parameter map defined in (4). Assume that, for each \(|\sigma|\) sufficiently small, \(\mathbf{x}_0 = 0\) is a fixed point of (5) with complex multipliers \(r(\sigma)e^{\pm i\varphi(\sigma)}\), satisfying
for each

\[ \sum \quad \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon \quad \begin{array}{c}
\varepsilon^2 G(x; \varepsilon, \mu) = 0
\end{array}
\]

Then, there is a neighborhood of \( x_0 \) in which a unique closed invariant curve bifurcates from \( x_0 \) whenever \( \ell_1 \sigma < 0 \). Moreover, if \( \ell_1 > 0 \) (resp. \( \ell_1 < 0 \)), then the closed invariant curve is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the fixed point is stable (resp. unstable).

3. PROOF OF THEOREM \( A \)

This section is completely devoted to the proof of Theorem \( A \). The proof of statement \( (i) \) will follow from Lemma \( 1 \) and the proof of statement \( (ii) \) will follow from Proposition \( 3 \).

The Poincaré Map of system \( (1) \), defined at the section \( \Sigma = \{ t = T \} \), writes

\[ x \mapsto P(x; \mu, \varepsilon) = x + \varepsilon g_1(x; \mu) + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{G}(x; \varepsilon, \mu). \tag{7} \]

The next result provides a branch of fixed points \( (\mu, \varepsilon) \) for the Poincaré Map.

**Lemma 1.** Assume the hypotheses of Theorem \( A \). Then, there exist a neighborhood \( J_0 \subset J \) of \( \mu_0 \) and \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that, for each \( \mu \in J_0 \) and \( \varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \), there exists a unique \( C^1 \) function \( \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \), defined on \( J_0 \times (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \), satisfying \( \xi(\mu, 0) = x_\mu \) and \( P(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon); \mu, \varepsilon) = \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \).

**Proof.** Define

\[ f(x, \mu, \varepsilon) := \frac{P(x; \mu, \varepsilon) - x}{\varepsilon} = g_1(x; \mu) + \varepsilon \tilde{G}(x; \varepsilon, \mu). \]

Notice that \( f(x_{\mu_0}, \mu_0, 0) = (0, 0) \) and

\[ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, \mu, 0) = \mathcal{D}_x g_1(x, \mu). \]

From the hypothesis of statement \( (i) \) of Theorem \( A \), \( \alpha(\mu_0) = 0 \) and \( \beta(\mu_0) = \omega_0 \neq 0 \). Therefore, there exists a neighborhood \( J_0 \subset J \) of \( \mu_0 \) such that

\[ \left| \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(x, \mu, 0) \right| \neq 0, \]

for each \( \mu \in J_0 \). Hence, from the Implicit Function Theorem and from the compactness of \( J_0 \), there exists \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) and a unique function \( \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \), defined on \( J_0 \times (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \), such that \( \xi(\mu, 0) = x_\mu \) and \( f(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 0 \) for every \( \varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0) \). \( \square \)
As a direct consequence of Lemma 1 we conclude, for every $\mu \in \mathcal{J}_0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the existence of a periodic solution $\varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon)$ of (1) satisfying $\varphi(0; \mu, \varepsilon) = \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \rightarrow x_\mu$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Hence, we get statement (i) of Theorem A proved.

The next result provides a curve $\mu(\varepsilon)$ of critical values of the parameter $\mu$ regarding the fixed point $\xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$ of the map (7).

**Lemma 2.** Let $\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon)$ and $\overline{\lambda}(\mu, \varepsilon)$ be the eigenvalues of $D_x P(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon); \mu, \varepsilon)$ and assume the hypotheses of Theorem A. Then, there exists $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and a unique smooth function $\mu : (0, \varepsilon_1) \rightarrow \mathcal{J}_0$, with $\mu(\varepsilon) = \mu_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$, satisfying: (a) $|\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)| = 1$, (b) $(\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon))^k \neq 1$, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and (c) $\frac{d}{d\mu}|\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon)|_{\mu=\mu(\varepsilon)} \neq 0$.

**Proof.** The Jacobian matrix of the first return map $P(x; \mu, \varepsilon)$ at its fixed point $\xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$ is given by

$$D_x P(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon); \mu, \varepsilon) = Id + \varepsilon \partial_x g_1(x_\mu; \mu) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2),$$

which has the following eigenvalues

$$\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon (\alpha(\mu) + i\beta(\mu)) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \text{ and}$$

$$\overline{\lambda}(\mu, \varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon (\alpha(\mu) - i\beta(\mu)) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2).$$

Notice that

$$|\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon)|^2 = 1 + 2\varepsilon \alpha(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$$
$$= 1 + \varepsilon \ell(\mu, \varepsilon),$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where $\ell(\mu, \varepsilon) = 2\alpha(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. From hypothesis (ii), we have

$$\ell(\mu_0, 0) = 0 \text{ and } \frac{\partial \ell}{\partial \mu}(\mu_0, 0) = 2d \neq 0.$$  

Thus, by the Implicit Function Theorem, there exist $\varepsilon_1$ and $\delta_1$, satisfying $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ and $0 < \delta_1 < \delta_0$, and a function $\eta : (-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) \rightarrow (\mu_0 - \delta_1, \mu_0 + \delta_1)$ such that $\eta(0) = \mu_0$ and $\ell(\eta(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 0$, for every $\varepsilon \in (-\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1)$.

So, take $\mu = \eta|_{(0, \varepsilon_1)}$. Accordingly, $\mu(\varepsilon) \in (\mu_0 - \delta_0, \mu_0 + \delta_0)$ and $\ell(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 0$, for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$, which implies that $|\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)| = 1$. So, we got statement (a) proved. Moreover, since

$$\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) = 1 + \varepsilon (\alpha(\mu(\varepsilon)) + i\beta(\mu(\varepsilon))) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$$
$$= 1 + \varepsilon (i\omega_0) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2),$$

and $\omega_0 > 0$, the parameter $\varepsilon_1$ can be taken smaller in order that

$$\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) \notin \left\{ \pm 1, \pm i, -\frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right\},$$

for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. Consequently, $(\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon))^k \neq 1$ for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, proving then statement (b). Finally, computing the derivative of (8) at $\mu = \mu_0$ we obtain, implicitly,
The proof of the proposition will follow by showing that, for each $\varepsilon_1$, the map (9) satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Accordingly, we identify $\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon) = \alpha'(-\varepsilon) + O(\varepsilon^2)$.

The proof of the proposition will follow by showing that, for each $\varepsilon_1$, the map (9) satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Accordingly, we identify $\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon) = \alpha'(0) + O(\varepsilon^2)$.

This concludes the proof of statement (c). \hfill \Box

Finally, statement (ii) of Theorem 1 is a direct consequence of the next proposition.

**Proposition 1.** Consider the $C^1$ function $\mu(\varepsilon)$ given by Lemma 2. Then, for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, there is a neighborhood of $\xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ in which a unique closed invariant curve of $P(\mu, \varepsilon)$ bifurcates from $\xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ whenever $\ell_{1,1}(\mu - \mu(\varepsilon)) < 0$. Moreover, if $\ell_{1,1} > 0$ (resp. $\ell_{1,1} < 0$), then the closed invariant curve is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the fixed point is stable (resp. unstable).

**Proof.** Let $\xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$ be the fixed point of the Poincaré map (7) given by Lemma 1 and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ be the curve of critical values of the parameter $\mu$ given by Lemma 2. Doing the change of coordinates $x = y + \xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$ and taking $\mu = \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon)$ we define the map

$$y \to H_\varepsilon(y; \sigma) := P(y + \xi(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon); \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) - \xi(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$$

$$= y + \varepsilon g_1(y + \xi(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon)) + \varepsilon^2 \tilde{G}(y + \xi(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \varepsilon; \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon)).$$

(9)

The proof of the proposition will follow by showing that, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the map (9) satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Accordingly, we identify $e^{\beta \theta_0} = e^{\beta \theta_1} = \lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ and $F(x; \sigma) = H_\varepsilon(y; \sigma)$.

Clearly, $y = 0$ is a fixed point of the map (9). So, write

$$H_\varepsilon(y; 0) = A \cdot y + \frac{1}{2} B_\varepsilon(y, y) + \frac{1}{6} C_\varepsilon(y, y, y) + O(||y||^4),$$

where $A_\varepsilon$, $B_\varepsilon(u, v) = (B^1_\varepsilon(u, v), B^2_\varepsilon(u, v))$, and $C_\varepsilon(u, v, w) = (C^1_\varepsilon(u, v, w), C^2_\varepsilon(u, v, w))$ are defined, for $i = 1, 2$, as

$$A_\varepsilon = \text{Id} + \varepsilon D_x g_1(\xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon); \mu(\varepsilon)) + O(\varepsilon^2),$$

$$B^i_\varepsilon(u, v) = \varepsilon \left( \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \frac{\partial^2 g_1^i(\xi(\mu(\varepsilon)))}{\partial \xi_j \partial \xi_k} \bigg|_{\xi = \xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)} |_{u_j v_k} + O(\varepsilon^2) \right),$$

$$C^i_\varepsilon(u, v, w) = \varepsilon \left( \sum_{j,k,l=1}^2 \frac{\partial^3 g_1^i(\xi(\mu(\varepsilon)))}{\partial \xi_j \partial \xi_k \partial \xi_l} \bigg|_{\xi = \xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)} |_{u_j v_k w_l} + O(\varepsilon^2) \right).$$

Here, $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $w = (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Firstly, from Lemma 2 the eigenvalue $\lambda(\sigma, \varepsilon) = \lambda(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ of $D_y H_\varepsilon(0; \sigma) = D_x P(\xi(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon); \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ satisfies all the conditions of Theorem 1 for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$. It only remains to verify hypothesis C.3.
Accordingly, let $p_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $q_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}^2$ be, respectively, the eigenvectors of the matrices $D_y H_\varepsilon(0; 0)^T$ and $D_y H_\varepsilon(0; 0)$ regarding the eigenvalue $\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ and $\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$. Notice that $p_\varepsilon = p + O(\varepsilon)$ and $q_\varepsilon = q + O(\varepsilon)$, where $p \in \mathbb{C}^2$ and $q \in \mathbb{C}^2$ are, respectively, the eigenvectors of $D_x g_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)^T$ and $D_x g_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)$ regarding the eigenvalue $-i\omega_0$ and $i\omega_0$. Indeed, an eigenvector $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^2$ of $D_y H_\varepsilon(0; 0) = D_x P(\xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon); \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ with respect to $\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)$ satisfies the relation $V(\eta, \varepsilon) = 0$ where
\[
V(\eta, \varepsilon) = [D_x P(\xi(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon); \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon) - \text{Id}.\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)] \eta.
\] (10)
From Lemmas 1 and 2, the Taylor series of $V(\eta, \varepsilon)$ around $\varepsilon = 0$ writes
\[
V(\eta, \varepsilon) = \varepsilon [\partial_x g_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0) - \text{Id} i\omega_0 + O(\varepsilon)] \eta.
\]
Thus, taking $\eta = y_0 + O(\varepsilon)$ and matching the coefficients of $\varepsilon$ of equation $V(\eta, \varepsilon) = 0$ we get that $y_0$ is an eigenvector of $\partial_x g_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)$ with respect to the eigenvalue $i\omega_0$. Thus, taking $y_0 = q$, we get $q_\varepsilon = q + O(\varepsilon)$. We can proceed in an analogous way with $p_\varepsilon$.

In the remainder of this proof, we shall compute $\ell_1$ as defined in (6). Defining the bilinear function $B_0(u, v) = (B_0^1(u, v), B_0^2(u, v))$ as
\[
B_0^i(u, v) = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \left. \frac{\partial^2 g_1^j(\xi; \mu_0) - q_j q_k \xi_l}{\partial \xi_j \partial \xi_k} \right|_{\xi = x_{\mu_0}} u_j v_k,
\]
for $i = 1, 2$, we get that $B_\varepsilon = \varepsilon B_0 + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and
\[
g_{20} = \langle p_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon(q_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon) \rangle = \langle p, B_\varepsilon(q, q) \rangle + O(\varepsilon^2) = \varepsilon \langle p, B_0(q, q) \rangle + O(\varepsilon^2).
\]
Analogously, we get $g_{11} = \varepsilon \langle p, B_0(q, q) \rangle + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and $g_{02} = \varepsilon \langle p, B_0(q, q) \rangle + O(\varepsilon^2)$. Now, defining the multilinear function $C_0(q, q, \bar{q}) = (C_0^1(q, q, \bar{q}), C_0^2(q, q, \bar{q}))$ as
\[
C_0^i(q, q, \bar{q}) = \sum_{j,k,l=1}^2 \left. \frac{\partial^2 g_1^j(\xi; \mu_0) - q_j q_k \xi_l}{\partial \xi_j \partial \xi_k \partial \xi_l} \right|_{\xi = x_{\mu_0}} q_j q_k \bar{q}_l,
\]
for $i = 1, 2$, we get that $C_\varepsilon = \varepsilon C_0 + O(\varepsilon^2)$ and
\[
g_{21} = \langle p_\varepsilon, C_\varepsilon(q_\varepsilon, q_\varepsilon, \bar{q}_\varepsilon) \rangle = \varepsilon \langle p, C_0(q, q, \bar{q}) \rangle + O(\varepsilon^2).
\]
Finally, from hypothesis, $D_x g_1(x_{\mu_0}; \mu_0)$ is in its normal Jordan form, thus we can take $p = q = (1, -i)/\sqrt{2}$. Using the obtained expressions of $g_{20}$, $g_{11}$, $g_{02}$, and $e^{i\theta_\varepsilon}$ we compute
\[
\ell_1 = \varepsilon \ell_{1,1} + O(\varepsilon^2).
\]
Consequently, $\ell_{1,1} \neq 0$ implies $\ell_1 \neq 0$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. Furthermore, $\text{sgn}(\ell_1) = \text{sgn}(\ell_{1,1})$. This proof follows by applying Theorem 1 for the map $\phi$ and going back through the change of coordinates.
4. Higher order approach

In this section we consider the following differential equation,

$$\dot{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^i F_i(t, x) + \varepsilon^{k+1} \overline{F}(t, x, \varepsilon),$$

(11)

where $F_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, and $\overline{F}$ are sufficiently smooth functions, $T$-periodic in the variable $t$, $x \in \Omega$ with $\Omega$ an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\varepsilon \in [0, \varepsilon_0]$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small. In what follows, we show how to use the higher order averaged method for obtaining stronger versions of Theorem 4.

Consider the averaged functions $g$, $l \leq i \leq k$, as defined in Appendix. Let $l, 1 \leq l < k$, be the subindex of the first non-vanishing averaging function. From Lemma 3 of the Appendix, the Poincaré Map of system (11), defined at the section $\Sigma = \{ t = T \}$, writes

$$x \mapsto P(x; \mu, \varepsilon) = x + \varepsilon^l G(x, \mu, \varepsilon) + \varepsilon^{l+1} \overline{G}(x; \varepsilon, \mu),$$

(12)

where $G(x, (\mu, \varepsilon)) = g_i(x; \mu) + \varepsilon^l g_{i+1}(x; \mu) + \cdots + \varepsilon^{k-l} g_k(x; \mu) + \varepsilon^{k+1-l} \overline{G}(x; \varepsilon, \mu)$.

In what follows we shall see that the same ideas of the previous section can be applied in order to obtain a higher order version of Theorem A. As a first hypothesis we have:

(A) Suppose that there exists a continuous curve $\mu \mapsto x_\mu \in \Omega$, defined on an interval $J$, such that $g_i(x_\mu; \mu) = 0$ for every $\mu \in J$. Let $\lambda(\mu) = \alpha(\mu) \pm i \beta(\mu)$ be the eigenvalues of $D_x g_i(x_\mu; \mu)$. Assume that, for some $\mu_0 \in J$, $\alpha(\mu_0) = 0$, $\beta(\mu_0) = \omega_0$ ($\omega_0 > 0$), and

$$\frac{d\alpha(\mu)}{d\mu} \bigg|_{\mu=\mu_0} = d \neq 0.$$

From hypothesis (A), the proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2 can be followed straightly in order to get:

(a) a neighborhood $B \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of $(\mu_0, 0)$ and a function $\xi : B \to \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\xi(\mu, 0) = x_\mu$ and $P(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon); \mu, \varepsilon) = \xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$, for every $(\mu, \varepsilon) \in B$, and

(b) $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and a unique smooth function $\mu : (0, \varepsilon_1) \to \mathbb{R}$, satisfying $\mu(0) = \mu_0$, such that the eigenvalues $\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon)$ and $\overline{\lambda}(\mu, \varepsilon)$ of $D_x P(\xi(\mu, \varepsilon); \mu, \varepsilon)$ satisfy: (a) $|\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon)| = 1$, (b) $(\lambda(\mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon))^k \neq 1$, for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and

(c) $\left. \frac{d}{d\mu} |\lambda(\mu, \varepsilon)| \right|_{\mu=\mu(\varepsilon)} \neq 0$.

Moreover, for every $\mu$ in a small neighborhood $J_0 \subset J$ of $\mu_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$ sufficiently small, we get from (a) the existence of an isolated periodic solution $\varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon)$ of system (11) satisfying $\varphi(0; \mu, \varepsilon) = \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \to x_\mu$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. We emphasize that the functions $\xi(\mu, \varepsilon)$ and $\mu(\varepsilon)$ can be both explicitly expanded in series around $\varepsilon = 0$ up to $\varepsilon^k$. Due to the complexity of the coefficients of these expansions, we shall omit them here.
Now, applying the change of variables \( \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\xi}(\mu, \varepsilon) \) and taking \( \mu = \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon) \), the Poincaré map (12) writes

\[
\mathbf{y} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, \sigma) := \mathbf{y} + \varepsilon^l \mathbf{G}(\mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\xi}(\sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon), \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon), \varepsilon). \tag{13}
\]

Notice that, for \( |\sigma| \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, the above items (a) and (b) imply that \( \mathbf{y}_0 = 0 \) is a fixed point of the map (13) with complex multipliers \( r_\varepsilon(\sigma)e^{\pm i\varphi_\varepsilon(\sigma)} \) satisfying \( r_\varepsilon(0) = 1, \varphi_\varepsilon(0) = \theta_\varepsilon, \) \( r_\varepsilon'(0) \neq 0, \) and \( e^{i k \theta_\varepsilon} \neq 1, \) for \( k = 1, 2, 3, 4. \) Consequently, conditions C.1 and C.2 of Theorem 1 are fulfilled.

Denote

\[
e^{i \theta_\varepsilon} = \alpha_\varepsilon(0) + i \beta_\varepsilon(0) = 1 + \sum_{j=l}^k \varepsilon^j (\alpha_j + i \beta_j) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}), \tag{14}
\]

with \( \alpha_1 = 0 \) and \( \beta_1 = \omega_0. \)

From Theorem 1, in order to conclude the existence of an invariant torus for differential system (11), it is sufficient to show that \( \ell_1 \neq 0 \) (see hypothesis C.3 of Theorem 1). So, we first compute the Taylor expansion of map (13) at \( \mathbf{y}_0 = 0 \) for \( \sigma = 0, \)

\[
\mathbf{H}_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, 0) = A_\varepsilon \mathbf{y} + \frac{1}{2} B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{6} C_\varepsilon(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{y}) + \mathcal{O}(|\mathbf{y}|^4),
\]

where \( \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \) and \( \mathbf{w} \) are vectors in \( \mathbb{R}^2, \) \( A_\varepsilon = \text{Id} + \varepsilon^l A_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}), \) \( B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = \varepsilon^l B_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}), \) \( C_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \varepsilon^l C_{\varepsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}), \) and

\[
A_\varepsilon = A_l + \varepsilon^1 A_{l+1} + \varepsilon^2 A_{l+2} + \cdots + \varepsilon^{k-l} A_k, \\
B_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) = B_l(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \varepsilon^1 B_{l+1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \varepsilon^2 B_{l+2}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) + \cdots + \varepsilon^{k-l} B_k(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}), \\
C_\varepsilon(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = C_l(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) + \varepsilon^1 C_{l+1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) + \varepsilon^2 C_{l+2}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) + \cdots + \varepsilon^{k-l} C_k(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}).
\]

It is worthwhile to mention that the functions \( A_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon, \) and \( C_\varepsilon \) can be explicitly computed.

In general, the truncate Jacobian matrix \( \text{Id} + \varepsilon^l A_{\varepsilon} + \cdots + \varepsilon^k A_k \) can be normalized after successive changes of coordinates in (13). Finding these changes of coordinates always involves solving homological equations. The interest reader is addressed to [7, Chapter 3]. So, without loss of generality, we assume that

(B) for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small, the matrix of \( \text{Id} + \varepsilon^l A_{\varepsilon} \) is in its real Jordan normal form, that is,

\[
\text{Id} + \varepsilon^l A_{\varepsilon} = \begin{pmatrix}
\bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon & -\bar{\beta}_\varepsilon \\
\bar{\beta}_\varepsilon & \bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where, from (14),

\[
\bar{\alpha}_\varepsilon = 1 + \sum_{j=l}^k \varepsilon^j \alpha_j, \ 	ext{and} \ ar{\beta}_\varepsilon = \sum_{j=l}^k \varepsilon^j \beta_j.
\]

Then, Theorem 1 is generalized as follows.
Theorem B. Assume that conditions (A) and (B) are satisfied for the differential system \((11)\) and for the map \((13)\), respectively. Let \(p = q = (1, -i)/\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{C}^2\), and define

\[
\ell_1^{(1)} = \text{Re} \left( e^{-i\theta_2} \left( \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle - \frac{(1 - 2e^{i\theta_2})e^{-2i\theta_2}}{2(1 - e^{i\theta_2})} \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q)} \rangle \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, \bar{q})} \rangle \right) \right)
\]

\[
- \frac{|\langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle|^2}{2} - \frac{|\langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle|^2}{4}.
\]

Consider the Taylor series of \(\ell_1^{(1)}\) around \(\varepsilon = 0\), which can be explicitly computed as

\[
\ell_1^{(1)} = \varepsilon \ell_{1,1} + \varepsilon^{l+1} \ell_{1,l+1} + \varepsilon^{l+2} \ell_{1,l+2} + \cdots + \varepsilon^k \ell_{1,k} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}).
\]

Suppose that \(\ell_{1,j} \neq 0\), for some \(l \leq j \leq k\), and let \(j^*\), \(l \leq j^* \leq k\), be the first subindex such that \(\ell_{1,j^*} \neq 0\). Then, a unique invariant torus bifurcates from the periodic orbit \(\varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon)\) whenever \(\ell_{1,j^*}(\mu - \mu(\varepsilon)) < 0\). Moreover, if \(\ell_{1,j^*} > 0\) (resp. \(\ell_{1,j^*} < 0\)) the torus is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the periodic orbit \(\varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon)\) is stable (resp. unstable). Here, the periodic orbit \(\varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon)\) is given by (A) and the curve \(\mu(\varepsilon)\) is given by (B).

Proof. Firstly, recall that

\[
\ell_1 = \text{Re} \left( \frac{e^{-i\theta_2} g_{21}}{2} \right) - \text{Re} \left( \frac{(1 - 2e^{i\theta_2})e^{-2i\theta_2}}{2(1 - e^{i\theta_2})} g_{20} g_{11} \right) - \frac{1}{2} |g_{11}|^2 - \frac{1}{4} |g_{02}|^2
\]

\[(15)\]

with \(g_{20} = \langle p, B_\varepsilon(q_e, q_e) \rangle\), \(g_{11} = \langle p, B_\varepsilon(q_e, \bar{q}_e) \rangle\), \(g_{02} = \langle p, B_\varepsilon(\bar{q}_e, q_e) \rangle\), \(g_{21} = \langle p, C_\varepsilon(q_e, q_e, q_e) \rangle\), and \(p, q_e \in \mathbb{C}^2\) are the eigenvalues satisfying \(A_e q_e = e^{i\theta_2} q_e\) and \(A_\varepsilon p_e = e^{-i\theta_2} p_e\). Here, \(\langle u, v \rangle = \bar{u} \cdot v \in \mathbb{C}\).

Let \(p = q = (1, -i)/\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{C}^2\). From hypothesis (B), \(p\), and \(q\) are, respectively, eigenvectors of \(A_e^\dagger\) and \(A_e\) regarding the eigenvalues \(\alpha_e - i\beta_e\) and \(\bar{\alpha}_e + i\bar{\beta}_e\). Moreover, equation \((10)\) can be used to show that \(p_e = p + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k-l+1})\) and \(q_e = q + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k-l+1})\). Accordingly,

\[
g_{20} = \langle p_e, B_\varepsilon(q_e, q_e) \rangle = \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q)} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}),
\]

\[
g_{11} = \langle p_e, B_\varepsilon(q_e, q(e)) \rangle = \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}),
\]

\[
g_{02} = \langle p_e, B_\varepsilon(q(e), q(e)) \rangle = \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}),
\]

\[
g_{21} = \langle p_e, C_\varepsilon(q(e), q(e), q(e)) \rangle = \langle p, e^{i\ell_2(q, q, \bar{q})} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}).
\]

Thus, we compute

\[
\ell_1 = \ell_1^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}),
\]

\[(16)\]

where

\[
\ell_1^{(1)} = \varepsilon \ell_{1,1} + \varepsilon^{l+1} \ell_{1,l+1} + \varepsilon^{l+2} \ell_{1,l+2} + \cdots + \varepsilon^k \ell_{1,k} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{k+1}).
\]

From expression \((16)\) it is clear why we can consider the coefficients of \(\varepsilon^i\) in the expansion of \(\ell_1^{(1)}\) only for \(l \leq i \leq k\). Now, let \(j^*\), \(l \leq j^* \leq k\), be the first subindex such that \(\ell_{1,j^*} \neq 0\). So, for \(\varepsilon > 0\) sufficiently small, \(\text{sign}(\ell_1) = \text{sign}(\ell_{1,j^*})\). Hence, applying Theorem \([\text{??}]\) we conclude this proof. \(\square\)
In what follows we provide the formula for \( \ell_{1,i} \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). Accordingly, denote
\[
L_m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m} p_{i_1} \langle p, C_{l+i_2}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle - \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 + i_6 = m} s_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} q_{i_4} \langle p, B_{l+i_5}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \langle p, B_{l+i_6}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle,
\]
\[
\bar{L}_m = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m} p_{i_1} \langle p, C_{l+i_2}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle - \sum_{i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 + i_5 + i_6 = m} s_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} q_{i_4} \langle p, B_{l+i_5}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \langle p, B_{l+i_6}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle
\]
\[
- \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m-l} \langle p, B_{l+i_1}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \langle B_{l+i_2}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i_1 + i_2 = m-l} \langle p, B_{l+i_1}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \langle B_{l+i_2}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle,
\]
where
\[
s_0 = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad p_0 = 1, \quad q_0 = -\frac{1}{\lambda_1},
\]
and, for \( 1 \leq i \leq k-l \),
\[
s_i = -\alpha_i - i\beta_i,
\]
\[
p_i = \frac{1}{i!} \sum_{s=1}^{i} (-1)^s \frac{s!}{e(s+1)\theta_x} B_{i,s}(x, y) \left( \frac{d e^{i\theta_x}}{d \varepsilon}, \frac{d^2 e^{i\theta_x}}{d \varepsilon^2}, \cdots, \frac{d^{(i-s+1)} e^{i\theta_x}}{d \varepsilon^{(i-s+1)}} \right) \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0},
\]
\[
q_i = \frac{1}{i!} \sum_{s=1}^{i} (-1)^s \frac{s!}{e^{s+1}(1)\theta_x} B_{i,s}(x, y) \left( \frac{d t(\varepsilon)}{d \varepsilon}, \frac{d^2 t(\varepsilon)}{d \varepsilon^2}, \cdots, \frac{d^{(i-s+1)} t(\varepsilon)}{d \varepsilon^{(i-s+1)}} \right) \bigg|_{\varepsilon=0},
\]
with
\[
t(\varepsilon) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-l} \varepsilon^j (\alpha_{l+j} + i\beta_{l+j}).
\]
Here, \( B_{i,s} \) denote the partial Bell polynomial as defined in the Appendix.

**Proposition 2.** Consider the coefficients \( \ell_{1,j} \), \( 1 \leq j \leq k \), given in Theorem \( \ref{prop:torus-bifurcation} \). The following statements hold.

(i) If \( k - 2l < 0 \), then \( \ell_{1,l+m} = Re(L_m) \), for \( 0 \leq m \leq k - l \),

(ii) If \( k - 2l \geq 0 \), then

\[
\ell_{1,l+m} = \begin{cases} 
Re(L_m) & \text{if } 0 \leq m < l, \\
Re(\bar{L}_m) & \text{if } l \leq m \leq k - l.
\end{cases}
\]

In particular,
\[
\ell_{1,l} = \frac{1}{8} \left( \frac{\partial^3 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x^3} + \frac{\partial^3 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x \partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^3 g^2(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x^2 \partial y} + \frac{\partial^3 g^2(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial y^3} \right)
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{8\omega_0} \left( \frac{\partial^2 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x \partial y} \left( \frac{\partial^2 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x \partial y^2} - \frac{\partial^2 g^2(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x \partial y} \right) - \frac{\partial^2 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial y^2} \left( \frac{\partial^2 g^2(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 g^2(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial x \partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2 g^1(x_{\mu}; \mu)}{\partial y^2} \right) \right),
\]
Proof. In fact, substituting the expressions for $g_{20}$, $g_{11}$, $g_{02}$, and $g_{21}$ in (15), we have

$$\ell_1 = \epsilon^l \text{Re} \left( \frac{e^{-i\theta_s}}{2} \langle p, C_{\epsilon}(q, q, \bar{q}) \rangle - \frac{\epsilon^l (1 - 2e^{i\theta_s}) e^{-2i\theta_s}}{2(1 - e^{-i\theta_s})} \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, q) \rangle \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \right)$$

$$- \frac{\epsilon^l}{2} \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \langle B_{\epsilon}(q, q), p \rangle - \frac{\epsilon^l}{4} \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, q) \rangle \langle B_{\epsilon}(q, q), p \rangle + O(\epsilon^{k+1}).$$

(17)

Since

$$e^{-i\theta_s} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} \epsilon^i p_i + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}),$$

we have

$$\frac{1 - 2e^{i\theta_s}}{2} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} \epsilon^i s_i + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\epsilon^l}{1 - e^{-i\theta_s}} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} \epsilon^i q_i + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}),$$

we have

$$\frac{(1 - 2e^{i\theta_s})\epsilon^l e^{-2i\theta_s}}{1 - e^{-i\theta_s}} = \frac{1 - 2e^{i\theta_s}}{2} \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, q) \rangle \langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle =$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{k-l} \epsilon^m \left( \sum_{i_1+i_2+i_3+i_4+l_5+l_6=m} s_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} q_{i_4} \langle p, B_{l+i_5}(q, q) \rangle \langle p, B_{l+i_6}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle \right) + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}).$$

On the other hand,

$$\langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, q) \rangle \langle B_{\epsilon}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{k-l} \frac{\epsilon^m}{2} \sum_{i_1+i_2=m} \langle p, B_{l+i_1}(q, q) \rangle \langle B_{l+i_1}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}),$$

$$\langle p, B_{\epsilon}(q, q) \rangle \langle B_{\epsilon}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle = \sum_{m=0}^{k-l} \frac{\epsilon^m}{4} \sum_{i_1+i_2=m} \langle p, B_{l+i_1}(q, q) \rangle \langle B_{l+i_1}(q, \bar{q}), p \rangle + O(\epsilon^{k-\ell+1}).$$

So, the expressions for $\ell_{1,t+i}$ are obtained using these expansions in (17) and collecting the coefficients of order $m$ in $\epsilon$.

Finally, we compute

$$\ell_{1,l} = \text{Re}(L_0) = \text{Re} \left( \frac{\langle p, C_{l}(q, q, \bar{q}) \rangle}{2} + i \frac{\langle p, B_{l}(q, q) \rangle \langle p, B_{l}(q, \bar{q}) \rangle}{2\omega_0} \right).$$

$\square$
Remark 3. It is worthwhile to mention that Theorem B and Proposition 2 say that a Hopf bifurcation on the differential system

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{g}_t(\mathbf{x}; \mu)$$

implies in a bifurcation of a periodic solution surrounded by an invariant torus of (1). Indeed, the conditions (A) and (B) ensure that $(\mathbf{x}_{\mu_0}, \mu_0)$ is a Hopf point of the averaged system (19). Moreover, the first Lyapunov coefficient of system (19) at $(\mathbf{x}_{\mu_0}, \mu_0)$ is given by $\epsilon \ell_{1,t}$.

5. IN Variant TURAUS IN A 3D VECTOR FIELD

In this section, as an example of application of the developed theory, we show how to use Theorems A and B for detecting an invariant torus for the following family of 3D vector fields,

$$x' = -y + \epsilon P_1(x, y, z; \mu) + \epsilon^2 P_2(x, y, z; \mu),$$
$$y' = x + \epsilon^2 Q(x, y, z; \mu),$$
$$z' = \epsilon R_1(x, y, z; \mu) + \epsilon^2 R_2(x, y, z; \mu),$$

where

$$P_1(x, y, z; \mu) = 10x(3\mu + \ell_1^2(9 + 4x^2 + 3z^2)) - 30x\rho(x, y)(z + \mu + \ell_1^2(1 + 4x^2 + z^2)),$$
$$P_2(x, y, z; \mu) = 10\ell_1^2x(9 + 4x^2 + 3z^2) - 30\ell_1^2x\rho(x, y)(1 + 4x^2 + z^2),$$
$$Q(x, y, z; \mu) = -30\pi y(15(\mu^2 - 1) + 20\ell_1^2(\mu(4y^2 + 3z^2 + 9) + 3z)) + 3(\ell_1^2)^2(24y^4 + 40y^2(z^2 + 5) + 15(z^4 + 6z^2 + 5)) + 150\pi y\rho(x, y)(3\mu^2 + 6\mu(2\ell_1^2(4y^2 + z^2 + 1) + z) + \ell_1^2(3\ell_1(24y^4 + 8y^2(3z^2 + 5) + 3(z^2 + 1)^2) + 8y^2z + 6z^3 + 6z) - 3),$$
$$R_1(x, y, z; \mu) = 10(3\mu + \ell_1^2(9 + 4x^2 + 3z^2)) - 30\rho(x, y)(z + \mu + \ell_1^2(1 + 4x^2 + z^2)),$$
$$R_2(x, y, z; \mu) = 10\ell_1^2x(9 + 4x^2 + 3z^2) - 30\ell_1^2x\rho(x, y)(1 + 4x^2 + z^2).$$
\[ R_1(x, y, x; \mu) = 30x^2(1 - 2\ell_1^2)\rho(x, y) + 15(\ell_1^4(2x^2z + z^3 + z) + \mu z - 1), \]
\[ R_2(x, y, z; \mu) = -225\pi(\ell_1^4)^2z(8y^4 + 12y^2(z^2 + 3) + 3(z^2 + 1)^2) \]
\[ -450\pi\ell_1^4(y^2(4\mu z - 6) + (z^2 + 1)(2\mu z - 1)) + 15\ell_1^4(2x^2z + z^3 + z) \]
\[ -225\pi((\mu^2 - 1)z - 2\mu) + 60\rho(x, y)\left(5\pi y^2(\ell_1^4((6\ell_1^4z - 1)(4y^2 + 3z^2) \right. \]
\[ +18\ell_1^4z + 12\mu z - 9) - 3\mu) - \ell_1^2x^2z), \]

and
\[ \rho(x, r) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}. \]

**Proposition 3.** For \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( |\mu| \) sufficiently small the vector field (20) admits a unique limit cycle \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) = (x(t; \mu, \varepsilon), y(t; \mu, \varepsilon), z(t; \mu, \varepsilon)) \) such that \( x(t; \mu, 0)^2 + y(t; \mu, 0)^2 = 1 \) and \( z(t; \mu, 0) = 0 \) for every \( t \in \mathbb{R} \). Moreover, assume that \((\ell_{1,1})^2 + (\ell_{1,2})^2 \neq 0 \). Then, there exists a smooth curve \( \mu(\varepsilon) \), defined for \( \varepsilon > 0 \) sufficiently small and satisfying \( \mu(\varepsilon) = -\varepsilon\pi/2 + O(\varepsilon^2) \), such that

(i) if \( \ell_{1,1} \neq 0 \), then a unique invariant torus bifurcates from the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) whenever \( \ell_{1,1}(\mu - \mu(\varepsilon)) < 0 \). In additional, if \( \ell_{1,1} > 0 \) (resp. \( \ell_{1,1} < 0 \)) the torus is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) is stable (resp. unstable) (see Figure 1);

(ii) if \( \ell_{1,1} = 0 \) and \( \ell_{1,2} \neq 0 \), a unique invariant torus bifurcates from the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) whenever \( \ell_{1,2}(\mu - \mu(\varepsilon)) < 0 \). In additional, if \( \ell_{1,2} > 0 \) (resp. \( \ell_{1,2} < 0 \)) the torus is unstable (resp. stable), whereas the periodic orbit \( \varphi(t; \mu, \varepsilon) \) is stable (resp. unstable) (see Figure 2).

**Proof.** Applying cylindrical coordinates \((x, y, z) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z)\) and taking \( \theta \) as the new independent variable we get the system

\[ \frac{\partial r}{\partial \theta} = \varepsilon \cos \theta \tilde{P}_1(\theta, r, z) + \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{1}{r} \cos \theta \sin \theta \tilde{P}_1(\theta, r, z)^2 + \cos \theta \tilde{P}_2(\theta, r, z) + \sin \theta \tilde{Q}(\theta, r, z) \right), \]
\[ \frac{\partial z}{\partial \theta} = \varepsilon \tilde{R}_1(\theta, r, z) + \varepsilon^2 \left( \frac{1}{r} \sin \theta \tilde{P}_1(\theta, r, z) \tilde{R}_1(\theta, r, z) + \tilde{R}_2(\theta, r, z) \right), \]

where \( \tilde{P}_1(\theta, r, z) = P_i(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z) \) and \( \tilde{R}_i(\theta, r, z) = R_i(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z) \), for \( i = 1, 2 \), and \( \tilde{Q}(\theta, r, z) = Q(r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta, z) \). Computing the first and second averaging functions of (21) we get

\[ g_1(r, z) = 30\pi \left( (r - 1)\mu - z + \ell_1^4((r - 1)(r - 1)^2 + z^2) \right), \quad r - 1 + \mu z \]
\[ + \ell_1^4z((r - 1)^2 + z^2), \]
\[ g_2(r, z) = 30\pi \ell_1^2 \left( (r - 1)((r - 1)^2 + z^2), \quad z((r - 1)^2 + z^2) \right). \]

It is easy to see that \( g_1 \) satisfies hypothesis (A) for \( x_\mu = (1, 0) \) and \( \mu_0 = 0 \).

Following the method described in the previous section we take \( y = x + \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) \) and \( \mu = \sigma + \mu(\varepsilon) \). It is easy to see that \( \xi(\mu, \varepsilon) = (1, 0) + O(\varepsilon^2) \) and \( \mu(\varepsilon) = \)
Thus, the transformed Poincaré map (13) for system (21) writes
\[ H_\varepsilon(y, 0) = A_\varepsilon y + \frac{1}{2} B_\varepsilon(y, y) + \frac{1}{6} C_\varepsilon(y, y, y) + O(|y|^4), \]
with
\[ A_\varepsilon = \text{Id} + \varepsilon A_1 + \varepsilon^2 A_2 + O(\varepsilon^3), \]
\[ B_\varepsilon(u, v) = \varepsilon^1 B_1(u, v) + \varepsilon^2 B_2(u, v) + O(\varepsilon^3), \]
and
\[ C_\varepsilon(u, v, w) = \varepsilon^1 C_1(u, v, w) + \varepsilon^2 C_2(u, v, w) + O(\varepsilon^3), \]
where
\[ A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_1(u, v) = B_2(u, v) = (0, 0), \]
and
\[ C_i(u, v, w) = 2 \ell_i^1 \left( 3 u_1 v_1 w_1 + u_2 v_2 w_1 + u_2 v_1 w_2 + u_1 v_2 w_2, \right. \]
\[ \left. u_2 v_1 w_1 + u_1 v_2 w_1 + u_1 v_1 w_2 + 3 u_2 v_2 w_2 \right), \]
for \( i = 1, 2. \)

Figure 1. Invariant torus of (20) predicted by Proposition 3 (i) assuming \( \ell_1^1 = -1, \ell_1^2 = 0, \mu = 0, \) and \( \varepsilon = 10^{-3}. \) Figure (a) shows the trajectory of (20) starting at \( (0.98, 0.21, 0) \), for \( t \in [50000, 51250]. \) Figure (b) depict the Poincaré section \( y = 0, x > 0 \) of (20) showing the stable invariant torus as a stable invariant closed curve.
Figure 2. Invariant torus of (20) predicted by Proposition 3 (ii) assuming $\ell_1 = 0$, $\ell_2 = -80$, $\mu = 0$, and $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}/3$. Figure (a) shows the trajectory of (20) starting at $(0.385, 0.386)$, for $t \in [57540, 59000]$. Figure (b) depicts the Poincaré section $y = 0$, $x > 0$ of (20) showing the stable invariant torus as a stable invariant closed curve.

Appendix: Higher order averaged functions

The averaging theory is one of the most classical analytical methods to study isolated periodic solutions of differential equations in the presence of a small parameter. Usually, this theory deals with differential systems in the following standard form

$$\dot{x}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^i F_i(t, x) + \varepsilon^{k+1} \overline{F}(t, x, \varepsilon), \quad (22)$$

where $F_i$ and $\overline{F}$ are sufficiently smooth functions, $T$-periodic in the variable $t$, $x \in \Omega$ with $\Omega$ an open bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\varepsilon \in [-\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_0]$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small. In [6, 9] it has been established that the $i$-th order averaged function of (22) is given by

$$g_i(z) = \frac{y_i(T, z)}{i!},$$

where $y_i : \mathbb{R} \times D \to \mathbb{R}^n$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, are defined recurrently by the following integral equation

$$y_1(t, z) = \int_0^t F_1(s, z) \, ds,$$

$$y_{i}(t, z) = \int_0^t \left( i! F_i(s, z) + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} \sum_{m=1}^{l} \frac{i!}{l!} \partial^m F_{i-l}(s, z) \mathbb{B}_{l,m}(y_1(s, z), \ldots, y_{l-1}(s, z)) \right) \, ds.$$

Here, $\partial^l F(t, z)$ denotes the Frechet’s derivative with respect to the variable $x$. It is a $L$-multilinear map applied to a “product” of $L$ vectors of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{L} y_j \in \mathbb{R}^{nL}$,
where \( y_j = (y_{j1}, \ldots, y_{jn}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \). Formally,
\[
\frac{\partial^L F(t, x)}{\partial x_{i_1} \cdots \partial x_{i_L}} y_{i_1} \cdots y_{i_L}.
\]

Also, for \( p \) and \( q \) positive integers, \( B_{p,q} \) denotes the partial Bell polynomials:
\[
B_{p, q}(x_1, \ldots, x_{p - q + 1}) = \sum_{\tilde{S}_{p,q}} \frac{p!}{b_1! b_2! \cdots b_{p - q + 1}!} \prod_{j=1}^{p - q + 1} x_j^{b_j},
\]
where now \( \tilde{S}_{p,q} \) is the set of all \((p-q+1)\)-tuple of nonnegative integers \((b_1, b_2, \cdots, b_{p-q+1})\) satisfying \( b_1 + 2b_2 + \cdots + (p-q+1)b_{p-q+1} = p \), and \( b_1 + b_2 + \cdots + b_{p-q+1} = q \).

The next results were proved in [6]. Nonsmooth versions of these results can be found in [5].

**Lemma 3 ([6]).** Let \( \varphi(\cdot, z, \varepsilon) : [0, T] \to \mathbb{R}^n \) be the solution of (11) with \( \varphi(0, z, \varepsilon) = z \). Then, for \( |\varepsilon| \) sufficiently small,
\[
\varphi(t, z, \varepsilon) = z + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \varepsilon^i y_i(t, z) + O(\varepsilon^{k+1}).
\]

**Theorem 2 ([6]).** Assume that, for some \( l \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \), \( g_i = 0 \) for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, l - 1 \), and \( g_l \neq 0 \). Then, for each \( a^* \in D \) such that \( g_l(a^*) = 0 \) and \( \det(df_l(a^*)) \neq 0 \), there exists, for \( |\varepsilon| > 0 \) sufficiently small, a \( T \)-periodic solution \( \varphi(\cdot, \varepsilon) \) of (22) such that \( \varphi(0, \varepsilon) \to a^* \) when \( \varepsilon \to 0 \).
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