

MULTISTATIONARITY OF REACTION NETWORKS WITH ONE-DIMENSIONAL STOICHIOMETRIC SUBSPACES*

KEXIN LIN[†], XIAOXIAN TANG[‡], AND ZHISHUO ZHANG[§]

Abstract. We study the multistationarity for the reaction networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces, and we focus on the networks admitting finitely many positive steady states. We prove that if a network admits multistationarity, then network has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$. The inverse is also true if there exist two reactions in the network such that the subnetwork consisting of the two reactions admits at least one and finitely many positive steady states. We also prove that if a network admits at least three positive steady states, then it contains at least three bi-arrow diagrams. More than that, we completely characterize the bi-reaction networks that admit at least three positive steady states.

Key words. reaction networks, mass-action kinetics, multistationarity, multistability

AMS subject classifications. 92C40, 92C45

1. Introduction. This work is motivated by the multistability problem of dynamical systems arising from biochemical reaction networks (under mass-action kinetics): for which rate constants, a network has at least two stable positive steady states in the same stoichiometric compatibility class? Multistability is a frontier topic in mathematical biology since it widely exists in the decision-making process and switch-like behavior in cellular signaling (e.g., [1, 27, 8, 17, 10]). Multistability problem is known to be a special real quantifier elimination problem so it is challenging to solve it by the computational tools in real algebraic geometry (e.g., [12, 4]). Given a network, one way to find multistability is to look for a witness for (nondegenerate) multistationarity, i.e., a choice of parameters (rate constants and total constants) such that the network has at least two positive (nondegenerate) steady states. In practice, if the number of positive nondegenerate steady states is large enough, one can usually obtain at least two stable ones (e.g., [18, 25, 11]). Deciding multistationarity or computing the witnesses for multistationarity is not easy neither but there exists a collection of nice methods (e.g., [21, 6, 16, 13]). For instance, one typical approach is to check if the determinant of a certain Jacobian matrix changes sign [7, 2, 26, 5]. Especially, for the networks with binomial steady-state equations, deciding multistationarity can be unexpectedly simple [9, 20].

Since multistability or nondegenerate multistationarity can be lifted from small subnetworks to the corresponding large networks [14, 3], criteria of (nondegenerate) multistationarity for small networks with only one species or up to two reactions (possibly reversible) are studied in [15, 22]. At the end of [15], the authors wonder if their results can be extended to more general networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces (note here, for a network with two reactions, if it admits multistationarity, then it has a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace [15]). More specifically, they proposed the following question:

QUESTION 1.1. [15, Question 6.1] *Consider a network G with a one-dimensional*

*Submitted to the editors DATE.

Funding: XT was funded by the NSFC12001029.

[†]School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing, China (19377317@buaa.edu.cn).

[‡]School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing, China (xiaoxian@buaa.edu.cn, <https://sites.google.com/site/rootclassification/>).

[§]School of Mathematical Sciences, Beihang University, Beijing, China (793008192@buaa.edu.cn).

stoichiometric subspace. For G to be multistationary, is it necessary for G to have an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$? Is it sufficient?

It is remarkable that for the networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces, multistationarity is equivalent to nondegenerate multistationarity if the maximum number of positive steady states is finite (see Theorem 2.1). It is also worth mentioning that if a network with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace admits multistability, then it admits at least three positive steady states (e.g., [24, Theorem 3.4]). So, it is also important to extend the results in [15] to the networks admitting at least three positive steady states.

In this paper, we study the multistationarity problem for the networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces, and we focus on the networks admitting finitely many positive steady states. We answer Question 1.1 and extend the problem by the following results.


- (1) If a network admits multistationarity, then the network has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ (Theorem 4.3). The inverse is also true if we additionally assume that a subnetwork consisting of two reactions from the original network admits at least one and finitely many positive steady states (Theorem 4.7).
- (2) If a network admits at least three positive steady states, then it contains at least three bi-arrow diagrams (Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4).
- (3) We completely characterize the stoichiometric coefficients of the bi-reaction networks that admit at least three positive steady states (Theorem 6.1).

We provide Example 4.6 for illustrating that the inverse of Theorem 4.3 might not be true in general. We also remark that for the networks admitting infinitely many positive steady states, it is not necessary for a multistationary network to contain the pair of arrow diagrams $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ (see Example 4.5). Note that Theorem 4.3 implies that if a network admits at least two positive steady states, then it contains at least two bi-arrow diagrams (see Corollary 5.2). So, Theorem 5.3 can be viewed as a generalization of Theorem 4.3 (to see this, one can also compare Theorem 4.3 and Corollary 5.4). We remark that admitting three bi-arrow diagrams is also a necessary condition for multistability (Corollary 5.5). Theorem 6.1 shows that the inverse of Theorem 5.3 is not true in general. The proof of Theorem 6.1 is constructive, which provide one way for getting witnesses for three positive steady states. Theorem 6.1 also shows that it is possible for us to enumerate the bi-reaction networks admitting at least three positive steady states. From these networks, as a future direction, one might characterize the bi-reaction networks admitting multistability.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the basic definitions and notions for the mass-action kinetics systems arising from reaction networks. In Section 3, we prepare the steady-state system augmented with the conservation laws for the networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces. We also make some assumptions for the rest of the discussion. In Section 4, we prove a necessary (Theorem 4.3) and a sufficient condition (Theorem 4.7) for a network with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace to admit multistationarity. In Section 5, we prove a necessary condition (Theorem 5.3) for a network with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace to admit at least three positive steady states. In Section 6, we completely characterize the bi-reaction networks that admit at least three positive steady states (Theorem 6.1). Finally, we end this paper with some future directions inspired by the main results, see Section 7.

2. Background.

2.1. Chemical reaction networks. In this paper, we follow the standard notions on reaction networks used in [24], see [5, 15] for more details. A *reaction network* G (or *network* for short) consists of a set of m reactions:



where X_1, \dots, X_s denote s *species*, the *stoichiometric coefficients* α_{ij} and β_{ij} are non-negative integers, each $\kappa_j \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a *rate constant* corresponding to the j -th reaction, and we assume that

$$(2.2) \quad \text{for every } j \in \{1, \dots, m\}, (\alpha_{1j}, \dots, \alpha_{sj}) \neq (\beta_{1j}, \dots, \beta_{sj}).$$

The *stoichiometric matrix* of G , denoted by \mathcal{N} , is the $s \times m$ matrix with (i, j) -entry equal to $\beta_{ij} - \alpha_{ij}$. The *stoichiometric subspace*, denoted by S , is the real vector space spanned by the column vectors of \mathcal{N} .

The concentrations of the species X_1, X_2, \dots, X_s are denoted by x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s , respectively. Note that x_i can be considered as a function in the time variable. Under the assumption of mass-action kinetics, we describe how these concentrations change in time by following system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs):

$$(2.3) \quad \dot{x} = (f_1(\kappa; x), \dots, f_s(\kappa; x))^T := \mathcal{N} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_1 x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} \cdots x_s^{\alpha_{s1}} \\ \kappa_2 x_1^{\alpha_{12}} x_2^{\alpha_{22}} \cdots x_s^{\alpha_{s2}} \\ \vdots \\ \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m}} x_2^{\alpha_{2m}} \cdots x_s^{\alpha_{sm}} \end{pmatrix},$$

where x denotes the vector (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s) , and κ denotes the vector $(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_m)$. Note that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $f_i(\kappa; x)$ is a polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[\kappa, x]$.

A *conservation-law matrix* of G , denoted by W , is any row-reduced $d \times s$ matrix (here, $d := s - \text{rank}(\mathcal{N})$), whose rows form a basis of S^\perp . Note that $\text{rank}(W) = d$. Especially, if the stoichiometric subspace of G is one-dimensional, then $\text{rank}(\mathcal{N}) = 1$ and $\text{rank}(W) = s - 1$. Note that the system (2.3) satisfies $W\dot{x} = 0$, and any trajectory $x(t)$ beginning at a nonnegative vector $x(0) = x^0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s$ remains, for all positive time, in the following *stoichiometric compatibility class* with respect to the *total-constant vector* $c := Wx^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{P}_c := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s \mid Wx = c\}.$$

2.2. Multistationarity and multistability. For a given rate-constant vector $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$, a *steady state* of (2.3) is a concentration vector $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^s$ such that $f_1(\kappa, x^*) = \cdots = f_s(\kappa, x^*) = 0$, where f_1, \dots, f_s are on the right-hand side of the ODEs (2.3). If all coordinates of a steady state x^* are strictly positive (i.e., $x^* \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$), then we call x^* a *positive steady state*. We say a steady state x^* is *nondegenerate* if $\text{im}(\text{Jac}_f(x^*)|_S) = S$, where $\text{Jac}_f(x^*)$ denotes the Jacobian matrix of f , with respect to x , at x^* . A steady state x^* is *exponentially stable* (or simply *stable*) if it is nondegenerate, and all non-zero eigenvalues of $\text{Jac}_f(x^*)$ have negative real parts. Note that if a steady state is exponentially stable, then it is locally asymptotically stable [19].

Suppose $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We say a network *admits* N (*nondegenerate*) *positive steady states* if there exist a rate-constant vector $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ and a total-constant vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that it has N (nondegenerate) positive steady states in the stoichiometric

compatibility class \mathcal{P}_c . Similarly, we say a network *admits N stable positive steady states* if there exist a rate-constant vector $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ and a total-constant vector $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that it has N stable positive steady states in \mathcal{P}_c .

The *maximum number of positive steady states* of a network G is

$$\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) := \max\{N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\} \mid G \text{ admits } N \text{ positive steady states}\}.$$

Similarly, we define

$$\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G) := \max\{N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\} \mid G \text{ admits } N \text{ nondegenerate positive steady states}\}$$

and

$$\text{cap}_{\text{stab}}(G) := \max\{N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\} \mid G \text{ admits } N \text{ stable positive steady states}\}.$$

We say a network admits *multistationarity* if $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 2$. We say a network admits *nondegenerate multistationarity* if $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G) \geq 2$. We say a network admits *multistability* if $\text{cap}_{\text{stab}}(G) \geq 2$.

THEOREM 2.1. [24, Theorem 6.1] *Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$, then $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G) = \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G)$.*

3. Steady states of networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces.

ASSUMPTION 3.1. *For any network G with reactions defined in (2.1), by (2.2), we know $(\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{s1}) \neq (\beta_{11}, \dots, \beta_{s1})$. Without loss of generality, we would assume $\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} \neq 0$ throughout this paper.*

If the stoichiometric subspace of a network G (2.1) is one-dimensional, then under Assumption 3.1, for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, there exists $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{1j} - \alpha_{1j} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{sj} - \alpha_{sj} \end{pmatrix} = \lambda_j \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{s1} - \alpha_{s1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note here, we have $\lambda_1 = 1$, and by (2.2), we have $\lambda_j \neq 0$ for all $j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$.

By substituting (3.1) into f_1, \dots, f_s in (2.3), we have

$$(3.2) \quad f_i = (\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1}) \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s x_k^{\alpha_{kj}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, s.$$

We define the steady-state system augmented with the conservation laws:

$$(3.3) \quad h_1 := f_1 = (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s x_k^{\alpha_{kj}}$$

$$(3.4) \quad h_i := (\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1})x_1 - (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11})x_i - c_{i-1}, \quad i = 2, \dots, s.$$

Clearly, if for a rate-constant κ^* , x^* is a steady state in \mathcal{P}_{c^*} , then x^* is a common solution to the equations $h_1(\kappa^*, c^*, x^*) = \dots = h_s(\kappa^*, c^*, x^*) = 0$.

4. Multistationarity. The main results of this section are Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.7, which are proved in Sections 4.1–4.2. We first recall the definitions for embedded subnetworks and arrow diagrams, which are needed in the statement of the theorems. Then, we will answer Question 1.1 by Theorem 4.3, Example 4.5, Example 4.6, and Theorem 4.7.


DEFINITION 4.1. [15, Definition 2.11] *Given a network G , the embedded subnetwork of G is a network constructed by removing certain reactions and reactants of G .*

DEFINITION 4.2. [15, Definition 3.3] Let G be a reaction network that contains only one species X_1 . Thus, each reaction of G has the form $aX_1 \rightarrow \beta X_1$, where $a, \beta \geq 0$ and $a \neq \beta$. Let ℓ be the number of (distinct) reactant complexes, and let $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_\ell$ be their stoichiometric coefficients. The **arrow diagram** of G , denoted by $\rho = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_\ell)$, is the element of $\{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow\}^\ell$ defined by:

$$(4.1) \quad \rho_i = \begin{cases} \rightarrow & \text{if for all reactions } a_i X_1 \rightarrow \beta X_1 \text{ in } G, \text{ it is the case that } \beta > a_i \\ \leftarrow & \text{if for all reactions } a_i X_1 \rightarrow \beta X_1 \text{ in } G, \text{ it is the case that } \beta < a_i \\ \leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

THEOREM 4.3. Given a network G (2.1) with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, suppose $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$. If the network G admits multistationarity, then G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$.

EXAMPLE 4.4. Consider the following network:




Let $\kappa_1 = 1$, $\kappa_2 = 9$, $\kappa_3 = 1$, and $c_1 = 0.5$. By solving the equations $h_1(x) = h_2(x) = 0$ (see (3.3)–(3.4)), we see that the network has two positive steady states:

$$x^{(1)} = (0.30806, 0.80806), \quad x^{(2)} = (6.8111, 7.3111).$$

So, the network admits multistationarity.


It is straightforward to check that G has the embedded one-species networks



with arrow diagrams $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ respectively. So, this example verifies Theorem 4.3.

We remark that Theorem 4.3 (or Corollary 4.8) might not be true if G admits infinitely many degenerate positive steady states, see the following example.


EXAMPLE 4.5. Consider the following network:




The arrow diagram of G is $(\leftarrow \bullet \rightarrow)$, so by [15, Theorem 3.6 2(a)], G admits infinitely many degenerate positive steady states. Therefore, G admits multistationarity but does not have any embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ or $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$.

We also remark that the inverse of Theorem 4.3 does not hold (see Example 4.6) unless we put some additional condition (e.g., see Theorem 4.7).

EXAMPLE 4.6. Consider the following network:



It is straightforward to check that G has the embedded one-species networks



with arrow diagrams $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ respectively.

For this network, we have $h_1(x) = x_1x_2(-\kappa_1x_1 + \kappa_2x_2 - \kappa_3)$, and $h_2(x) = -x_2 + x_1 - c_1$. So, the system $h_1(x) = h_2(x) = 0$ has at most one positive solution for any positive κ and for any real c_1 . Hence, G admits no multistationarity.

THEOREM 4.7. *Given a network G (2.1) with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if*

- (1) a subnetwork consisting of two reactions in G admits at least one and finitely many positive steady states, and
- (2) G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$,

then the network G admits multistationarity.

The following corollary directly follows from Theorem 4.3, Theorem 4.7 and [15, Lemma 4.1], which is consistent with [15, Theorem 5.1].

COROLLARY 4.8. *Given a network G (2.1) with two reactions, assume $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$. The network G admits multistationarity if and only if*

- (1) there exists $\lambda < 0$ such that $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} = \lambda(\beta_{k2} - \alpha_{k2})$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, and
- (2) G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$.

4.1. Proof of Theorem 4.3.


ASSUMPTION 4.9. *For the scalars λ_j defined in (3.1), we assume that $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\lambda_i < 0$ for all $i \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, where $t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Note that $\lambda_1 > 0$. So, $t \geq 1$. Also, note that if $t = m$, then we have $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$.*

LEMMA 4.10. *Given a network G (2.1) with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, we have the following statements.*

- (a) G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ if and only if there exist $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $(\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) < 0$.
- (b) G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ if and only if there exist $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $(\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) > 0$.

Proof. We only prove the part (a). The part (b) can be similarly proved.


\Rightarrow : If G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$, then we can assume this embedded one-species network is



where $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\lambda_j > 0$, i.e., $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. By Definition 4.2, we know that $\text{sign}(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) = -\text{sign}(\beta_{k\ell} - \alpha_{k\ell})$. Thus, by (3.1), $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. More than that, by Definition 4.2, if $\alpha_{kj} > \alpha_{k\ell}$, then $\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj} < 0$, and if $\alpha_{kj} < \alpha_{k\ell}$, then $\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj} > 0$. Above all, we have $(\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) < 0$.

\Leftarrow : Suppose there exist $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $(\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) < 0$. Consider the following embedded one-species

network:



If $\alpha_{kj} > \alpha_{k\ell}$, then by the hypothesis $(\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) < 0$, we have $\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj} < 0$. Note that $\lambda_j \lambda_\ell < 0$. Hence, by (3.1), we have $\beta_{k\ell} - \alpha_{k\ell} < 0$. So the arrow diagram of the network is $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$. Similarly, if $\alpha_{kj} < \alpha_{k\ell}$, then we can show that the arrow diagram of the above network is also $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$. \square

LEMMA 4.11. *Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) > 0$, then there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\lambda_j < 0$, where λ_j is the scalar defined in (3.1).*

Proof. If $\lambda_1 > 0, \dots, \lambda_m > 0$, then by (3.3), $h_1(x) = 0$ has no positive solutions for x , which is a contradiction to $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) > 0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.3.

Proof. Suppose that for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$, G has two distinct positive steady states $x^{(1)}, x^{(2)}$ in a stoichiometric compatibility class \mathcal{P}_c . Without loss of generality, we assume the first coordinate of $x^{(1)}$ is larger than that of $x^{(2)}$, i.e., $x_1^{(1)} > x_1^{(2)}$. Note that for the polynomial h_1 in (3.3), we have $h_1(x^{(1)}) = h_1(x^{(2)}) = 0$, i.e.,

$$(4.2) \quad h_1(x^{(i)}) = (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s (x_k^{(i)})^{\alpha_{kj}} \right) = 0, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

For $j = 1, \dots, m$, we define

$$A_j^{(i)} := \begin{cases} \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s (x_k^{(i)})^{\alpha_{kj}}, & \text{if } j \in \{1, \dots, t\} \text{ (i.e., } \lambda_j > 0), \\ -\lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s (x_k^{(i)})^{\alpha_{kj}}, & \text{if } j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\} \text{ (i.e., } \lambda_j < 0). \end{cases}$$

By (4.2), we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(1)} = \sum_{j=t+1}^m A_j^{(1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(2)} = \sum_{j=t+1}^m A_j^{(2)}.$$

Note that $A_j^{(i)} \neq 0$ (since $x^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$, $\kappa_j > 0$ and $\lambda_j \neq 0$). Recall Assumption 4.9 that we have $t \geq 1$, and so $\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(i)} \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. Note also, by Lemma 4.11, if $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) > 0$, then $\{t+1, \dots, m\} \neq \emptyset$, and so $\sum_{j=t+1}^m A_j^{(i)} \neq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$. So, we have

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(2)}} = \frac{\sum_{j=t+1}^m A_j^{(1)}}{\sum_{j=t+1}^m A_j^{(2)}}.$$

Below, we prove by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we assume that G does not have any embedded one-species network with the arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$.

Then, by Lemma 4.10 (b), for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, we have

$$(4.4) \quad (\alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell})(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) \leq 0.$$

Note that $\lambda_j > 0$. So, by (3.1), we know that $\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}$ have the same sign with $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}$. Therefore, for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have the following results.

- (a) If $\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj} = 0$, then $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} = 0$. So, by $h_k(x^{(1)}) = h_k(x^{(2)}) = 0$ (here, recall that h_k is defined in (3.4)), we have

$$\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} = \frac{\frac{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} x_1^{(1)} - \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}}}{\frac{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} x_1^{(2)} - \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}}} = 1,$$

and hence, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$,

$$(4.5) \quad \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}}.$$

- (b) If $(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) > 0$, then $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} > 0$, and by (4.4), we have $\alpha_{kj} \leq \alpha_{k\ell}$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. Recall $x_1^{(1)} > x_1^{(2)} > 0$. So, we have

$$(4.6) \quad \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(1)} - c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(2)} - c_{k-1}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} \leq \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(1)} - c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(2)} - c_{k-1}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}} = \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}}.$$

- (c) If $(\beta_{kj} - \alpha_{kj}) < 0$, then $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} < 0$, and by (4.4), we have $\alpha_{kj} \geq \alpha_{k\ell}$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. So, we still have

$$(4.7) \quad \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(1)} - c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(2)} - c_{k-1}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} \leq \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(1)} - c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})x_1^{(2)} - c_{k-1}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}} = \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}}.$$

So, by (a), (b) and (c), for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, we have

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{A_j^{(1)}}{A_j^{(2)}} = \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} \leq \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{x_k^{(1)}}{x_k^{(2)}} \right)^{\alpha_{k\ell}} = \frac{A_\ell^{(1)}}{A_\ell^{(2)}},$$

and hence,

$$(4.9) \quad \frac{\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(1)}}{\sum_{j=1}^t A_j^{(2)}} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq t} \frac{A_j^{(1)}}{A_j^{(2)}} \leq \min_{t+1 \leq \ell \leq m} \frac{A_\ell^{(1)}}{A_\ell^{(2)}} \leq \frac{\sum_{\ell=t+1}^m A_\ell^{(1)}}{\sum_{\ell=t+1}^m A_\ell^{(2)}}.$$

So by (4.3), all the non-strict inequalities in (4.9) should be equalities. Hence, the non-strict inequality in (4.8) is an equality, and the non-strict inequalities in (4.6) and (4.7) are also equalities. By (b) and (c), for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} \neq 0$, we have $\alpha_{kj} = \alpha_{k\ell}$ for any $j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and for any $\ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, and hence we have α_{kj} 's are all the same for every $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then, the equality (4.2) can be rewritten as

$$(4.10) \quad (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k \text{ s.t. } \beta_{k1} = \alpha_{k1}} \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} \right) \prod_{k \text{ s.t. } \beta_{k1} \neq \alpha_{k1}} \left(x_k^{(i)} \right)^{\alpha_{k1}} = 0.$$

Since $(\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \neq 0$ and $x^{(i)}$ is a positive steady state, we must have

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k \text{ s.t. } \beta_{k1} = \alpha_{k1}} \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = 0.$$

Thus, $h_1(x)$ is equal to

$$(4.11) \quad (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k \text{ s.t. } \beta_{k1} = \alpha_{k1}} \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}} \right) \prod_{k \text{ s.t. } \beta_{k1} \neq \alpha_{k1}} x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \equiv 0.$$

Therefore, the network G has infinitely many positive steady states in \mathcal{P}_c , which is a contradiction to the hypothesis that $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$. \square

4.2. Proof of Theorem 4.7.

DEFINITION 4.12. [15, Definition 2.1] A **subnetwork** of a network G is a network that consists of some reactions from the network G .

LEMMA 4.13. [15, Lemma 2.12] Let G^* be a subnetwork of a network G which has the same stoichiometric subspace as G . Then $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G^*) \leq \text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G)$.

LEMMA 4.14. Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if there exist $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that

- (1) the subnetwork consisting of the i -th and the j -th reactions of G admits finitely many positive steady states, and
- (2) there exist $k_1, k_2 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ($k_1 \neq k_2$) such that

$$(\alpha_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 j})(\beta_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 i}) \cdot (\alpha_{k_2 i} - \alpha_{k_2 j})(\beta_{k_2 i} - \alpha_{k_2 i}) < 0,$$

then G admits multistationarity.

Proof. Consider the bi-reaction subnetwork G_1 consisting of the i -th and the j -th reactions of G . By the hypothesis (2), the network G_1 satisfies the sufficient condition of [15, Theorem 5.1], and thus, G_1 admits multistationarity, i.e., $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_1) \geq 2$. By the hypothesis (1), we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_1) < +\infty$, and hence, we deduce from Theorem 2.1 that $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_1) = \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_1) \geq 2$. Since Lemma 4.13 shows that $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_1) \leq \text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G)$, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq \text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G) \geq 2$. \square

LEMMA 4.15. [15, Theorem 5.2] Let G be a network (2.1) with two reactions. Then G is nondegenerately multistationary if and only if

- (1) there exists $\lambda < 0$ such that $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} = \lambda(\beta_{k2} - \alpha_{k2})$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$,
- (2) in the set $\{(\alpha_{k1} - \alpha_{k2})(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})\}_{k=1}^s$ there are at least one positive and at least one negative number, and
- (3) if in the set $\{(\alpha_{k1} - \alpha_{k2})(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})\}_{k=1}^s$ there are exactly one positive and one negative number, say $(\alpha_{i1} - \alpha_{i2})(\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1}) > 0$ and $(\alpha_{j1} - \alpha_{j2})(\beta_{j1} - \alpha_{j1}) < 0$, then $\alpha_{i1} - \alpha_{i2} \neq -(\alpha_{j1} - \alpha_{j2})$ (here, $i, j \in \{1, \dots, s\}$).

Proof of Theorem 4.7.

Proof. By the hypothesis (1), there exist two indices $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that for the subnetwork consisting of i -th and j -th reactions, say G^* , we have $0 < \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G^*) < +\infty$. Note here, if $i, j \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ or $i, j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, then by a similar argument with the proof of Lemma 4.11, we will have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G^*) = 0$. So, since $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G^*) > 0$, we can assume that $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. Also notice that if $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) = 0$ for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, then by (3.3)–(3.4), we will see that $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G^*) = +\infty$. So, since $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G^*) < +\infty$, there exists $k_1 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $(\alpha_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 j})(\beta_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 i}) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume

$$(4.12) \quad (\alpha_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 j})(\beta_{k_1 i} - \alpha_{k_1 i}) < 0.$$

Below, we discuss two cases.

(Case 1). If there exists $k_2 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that

$$(\alpha_{k_2 i} - \alpha_{k_2 j})(\beta_{k_2 i} - \alpha_{k_2 i}) > 0,$$

then by Lemma 4.14, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 2$ and we are done.

(Case 2). Suppose for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \leq 0$. By (4.12) and Lemma 4.10 (a), G has an embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$. By the hypothesis (2), G has another embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$. So, by Lemma 4.10 (b), there exist $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, $j_2 \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ and $k_3 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that

$$(4.13) \quad (\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2})(\beta_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 i_2}) > 0.$$

Consider the subnetwork consisting of the i_2 -th and the j_2 -th reactions, say G_2^* . If $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_2^*) \geq 2$, then by Lemma 4.13, we have

$$\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq \text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_2^*) \geq 2,$$

and we are done. So, in the rest of the proof, we assume that $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_2^*) < 2$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2} > 0$. Pick any two positive numbers y_1 and z_1 such that $y_1 > z_1 > 0$. For $k = 2, \dots, s$, we define

$$(4.14) \quad y_k := \frac{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} y_1 + \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} \quad \text{and} \quad z_k := \frac{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} z_1 + \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}},$$

where c_1, \dots, c_{s-1} are chosen to be real numbers satisfying the following two conditions.

(C1) For every $k \in \{2, \dots, s\}$, $y_k > 0$ and $z_k > 0$.

(C2) For any k such that $(\beta_{k i_2} - \alpha_{k i_2})(\beta_{k j_2} - \alpha_{k j_2}) > 0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}} > \frac{c_{k_3-1}}{\beta_{k_31} - \alpha_{k_31}} > 0, & \text{if } \beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} > 0 \\ \frac{c_{k_3-1}}{\beta_{k_31} - \alpha_{k_31}} < \frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}} < -y_1, & \text{if } \beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} < 0 \end{cases}$$

It is straightforward to check that (C2) is consistent with (C1). Now we define the following two continuous functions in κ :

(4.15)

$$\varphi(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_t) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i \prod_{k=1}^s y_k^{\alpha_{ki}}}{\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{ki}}}, \quad \psi(\kappa_{t+1}, \dots, \kappa_m) := \frac{\sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s y_k^{\alpha_{kj}}}{\sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{kj}}}.$$

Claim 1. If for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \leq 0$, then there exists $\kappa^{(1)} = (\kappa_1^{(1)}, \dots, \kappa_m^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ such that

$$(4.16) \quad \varphi(\kappa_1^{(1)}, \dots, \kappa_t^{(1)}) < \psi(\kappa_{t+1}^{(1)}, \dots, \kappa_m^{(1)}).$$

Claim 2. If $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_2^*) < 2$, then there exists $\kappa^{(2)} = (\kappa_1^{(2)}, \dots, \kappa_m^{(2)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ such that

$$(4.17) \quad \varphi(\kappa_1^{(2)}, \dots, \kappa_t^{(2)}) > \psi(\kappa_{t+1}^{(2)}, \dots, \kappa_m^{(2)})$$

(we will prove the claims later).

If both Claim 1 and Claim 2 are true, then by (4.16) and (4.17), there exists $\kappa^* = (\kappa_1^*, \dots, \kappa_m^*) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ such that

$$(4.18) \quad \varphi(\kappa_1^*, \dots, \kappa_t^*) = \psi(\kappa_{t+1}^*, \dots, \kappa_m^*).$$

Now, we define two positive numbers

$$B := \sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i^* \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{ki}}, \quad C := - \sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j^* \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{kj}}.$$

For $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, let $\kappa_i^{**} := \kappa_i^*/B > 0$, $\kappa_j^{**} := \kappa_j^*/C > 0$. Then, it is straightforward to check that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{ki}} = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{kj}} = -1.$$

So, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{ki}} + \sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s z_k^{\alpha_{kj}} = 0.$$

Also, by (4.15) and (4.18), we can check that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \lambda_i \kappa_i^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s y_k^{\alpha_{ki}} + \sum_{j=t+1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j^{**} \prod_{k=1}^s y_k^{\alpha_{kj}} = 0.$$

Therefore, for the rate-constant vector $\kappa^{**} = (\kappa_1^{**}, \dots, \kappa_m^{**})$, G has at least two positive steady states $y = (y_1, \dots, y_s)$ and $z = (z_1, \dots, z_s)$ in \mathcal{P}_{c^*} , and we are done.

Proof of Claim 1. Recall by Assumption 4.9 that $\lambda_i > 0$ since $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. So, by (3.1), $\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}$ and $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}$ have the same sign. So, for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, if we have $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \leq 0$, then $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}) \leq 0$. Therefore,

$$(4.19) \quad \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k}\right)^{\alpha_{ki}} = \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})y_1 + c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})z_1 + c_{k-1}}\right)^{\alpha_{ki}} \leq \left(\frac{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})y_1 + c_{k-1}}{(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})z_1 + c_{k-1}}\right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k}\right)^{\alpha_{kj}}.$$

Note that by (4.12), for $k = k_1$, the above inequality is strict. Hence, for the rate constants $\kappa_i = 1$, $\kappa_j = 1$, and $\kappa_\ell = 0$ ($\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i, j\}$),

$$(4.20) \quad \varphi(\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_t) = \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k}\right)^{\alpha_{ki}} < \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k}\right)^{\alpha_{kj}} = \psi(\kappa_{t+1}, \dots, \kappa_m).$$

So, there exists $\kappa^{(1)} = (\kappa_1^{(1)}, \dots, \kappa_m^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^m$ such that (4.16) holds (here, for instance, we can choose $\kappa_i^{(1)} = 1$, $\kappa_j^{(1)} = 1$, and $\kappa_\ell^{(1)} = \epsilon$ for $\ell \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i, j\}$, where ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number).

Proof of Claim 2. Recall that G_2^* is a bi-reaction network consisting of the i_2 -th and j_2 -th reactions in G , where $i_2 \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j_2 \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. By (3.1), we know that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $(\beta_{ki_2} - \alpha_{ki_2}) = \frac{\lambda_{i_2}}{\lambda_{j_2}}(\beta_{kj_2} - \alpha_{kj_2})$, and by Assumption 4.9, $\frac{\lambda_{i_2}}{\lambda_{j_2}} < 0$. So, the condition (1) stated in Lemma 4.15 always holds for G_2^* . If $\text{cap}_{\text{nondeg}}(G_2^*) < 2$, then by Lemma 4.15, for the network G_2^* , either the condition (2) or the condition (3) in Lemma 4.15 does not hold.

Recall that for some $k_3 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have (4.13): $(\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2})(\beta_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 i_2}) > 0$. So, if the condition (2) in Lemma 4.15 does not hold for G_2^* , then for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we have $(\alpha_{k i_2} - \alpha_{k j_2})(\beta_{k i_2} - \alpha_{k i_2}) \geq 0$, and by a similar argument with the proof of the claim 1, we can prove the claim 2.

Suppose the condition (3) in Lemma 4.15 does not hold for G_2^* . We can assume that there exists $k_4 \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $(\alpha_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 j_2})(\beta_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 i_2}) < 0$ and

$$(4.21) \quad \text{for any } k \in \{1, \dots, s\} \setminus \{k_3, k_4\}, (\alpha_{k i_2} - \alpha_{k j_2})(\beta_{k i_2} - \alpha_{k i_2}) = 0.$$

Since the condition (3) in Lemma 4.15 does not hold, we have

$$(4.22) \quad \alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2} = -(\alpha_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 j_2}).$$

By the proof of the claim 1, we only need to show that

$$(4.23) \quad \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k} \right)^{\alpha_{k i_2}} > \prod_{k=1}^s \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k} \right)^{\alpha_{k j_2}}.$$

By (4.21), for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\} \setminus \{k_3, k_4\}$, we have $\left(\frac{y_k}{z_k} \right)^{\alpha_{k i_2}} = \left(\frac{y_k}{z_k} \right)^{\alpha_{k j_2}}$. So, the inequality (4.23) becomes

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{y_{k_3}}{z_{k_3}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_3 i_2}} \left(\frac{y_{k_4}}{z_{k_4}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_4 i_2}} > \left(\frac{y_{k_3}}{z_{k_3}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_3 j_2}} \left(\frac{y_{k_4}}{z_{k_4}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_4 j_2}} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \left(\frac{y_{k_3}}{z_{k_3}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2}} \left(\frac{y_{k_4}}{z_{k_4}} \right)^{\alpha_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 j_2}} > 1 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2} > 0$. By (4.22), in order to prove (4.24), we only need to show

$$(4.25) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{y_{k_3}}{z_{k_3}} \right) \left(\frac{y_{k_4}}{z_{k_4}} \right)^{-1} > 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{(\beta_{k_3 1} - \alpha_{k_3 1})(\beta_{k_4 1} - \alpha_{k_4 1})}{(\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11})^2} \left(\frac{c_{k_4-1}}{\beta_{k_4 1} - \alpha_{k_4 1}} - \frac{c_{k_3-1}}{\beta_{k_3 1} - \alpha_{k_3 1}} \right) (y_1 - z_1) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

(here, the last equivalence follows from (4.14)). Recall that

$$(\alpha_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 j_2})(\beta_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 i_2}) > 0, \text{ and } (\alpha_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 j_2})(\beta_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 i_2}) < 0.$$

So, we have

$$(4.26) \quad \beta_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 i_2} > 0, \text{ and } \beta_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 i_2} > 0.$$

Note also, by Assumption 4.9, we have $\lambda_{i_2} > 0$. So, by (3.1), we have

$$(4.27) \quad \beta_{k_3 1} - \alpha_{k_3 1} = \lambda_{i_2}^{-1}(\beta_{k_3 i_2} - \alpha_{k_3 i_2}) > 0, \text{ and } \beta_{k_4 1} - \alpha_{k_4 1} = \lambda_{i_2}^{-1}(\beta_{k_4 i_2} - \alpha_{k_4 i_2}) > 0.$$

Since $y_1 > z_1$, we deduce from (4.27) that

$$(4.25) \Leftrightarrow \frac{c_{k_4-1}}{\beta_{k_4 1} - \alpha_{k_4 1}} > \frac{c_{k_3-1}}{\beta_{k_3 1} - \alpha_{k_3 1}}.$$

Thus, by (4.26) and (C2), we are done with the proof. \square

5. A necessary condition for admitting three positive steady states. In this section, we will extend Theorem 4.3 to the networks admitting at least three positive steady states. We first introduce a new concept “bi-arrow diagram”. Then, we point out that Theorem 4.3 shows that multistationarity implies two bi-arrow diagrams (Corollary 5.2). The main result of this section is Theorem 5.3: admitting three positive steady states implies three bi-arrow diagrams. Recall that multistability implies three positive steady states. So, another remarkable corollary here is that multistability implies three bi-arrow diagrams.

First, we recall that for any network (2.1) with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, we have non-zero scalars λ_i defined in (3.1). By Assumption 4.9, t is the index in $\{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\lambda_i > 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $\lambda_i < 0$ for all $i \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$.

DEFINITION 5.1. (1) For a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if there exist $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, and $j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \neq 0$, then we say G has a **bi-arrow diagram**.

(2) $Ad(G) := |\{(k, i, j) \in \{1, \dots, s\} \times \{1, \dots, t\} \times \{t+1, \dots, m\} \mid (\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \neq 0\}|$, i.e., $Ad(G)$ denotes the number of bi-arrow diagrams the network G has.

COROLLARY 5.2. Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if $2 \leq cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then $Ad(G) \geq 2$.

Proof. The conclusion directly follows from Theorem 4.3, Lemma 4.10 and Definition 5.1 (2). \square

THEOREM 5.3. Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if $3 \leq cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then $Ad(G) \geq 3$.

COROLLARY 5.4. Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if $3 \leq cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then one of the following two statements holds.

- (1) G has two embedded one-species networks with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and one with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$.
- (2) G has two embedded one-species networks with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$ and one with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, if $2 \leq cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then G has an embedded one-species networks with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ and another with arrow diagram $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$. By Lemma 4.10, there exist (i_1, j_1, k_1) and (i_2, j_2, k_2) such that

$$(\alpha_{k_1 i_1} - \alpha_{k_1 j_1})(\beta_{k_1 i_1} - \alpha_{k_1 i_1}) > 0, \text{ and } (\alpha_{k_2 i_2} - \alpha_{k_2 j_2})(\beta_{k_2 i_2} - \alpha_{k_2 i_2}) < 0.$$

By Theorem 5.3, if $3 \leq cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then $Ad(G) \geq 3$. So, by Definition 5.1, there exists (i_3, j_3, k_3) , which is different from (i_1, j_1, k_1) or (i_2, j_2, k_2) such that


$$(\alpha_{k_3 i_3} - \alpha_{k_3 j_3})(\beta_{k_3 i_3} - \alpha_{k_3 i_3}) \neq 0.$$

By Lemma 4.10, the triple (i_3, j_3, k_3) corresponds to a third embedded one-species network with arrow diagram $(\leftarrow, \rightarrow)$ or $(\rightarrow, \leftarrow)$. \square

COROLLARY 5.5. Given a network G with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, if G admits multistability, then $Ad(G) \geq 3$, and one of the statements (1)–(2) in Corollary 5.4 holds.

Proof. Since we have $cap_{stab}(G) \leq \frac{cap_{pos}(G)+1}{2}$ (see [24, Theorem 3.4]), the result follows from Theorem 5.3 and Corollary 5.4.

EXAMPLE 5.6. This example illustrates how to count $Ad(G)$. Consider the following network:



For this network, we have $s = 3$, $m = 2$ and $t = 1$, and thus $\{1, \dots, t\} = \{1\}$, $\{t + 1, \dots, m\} = \{2\}$. It is straightforward to verify that $(\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{12})(\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) = -1 \neq 0$, $(\alpha_{21} - \alpha_{22})(\beta_{21} - \alpha_{21}) = 2 \neq 0$, and $(\alpha_{31} - \alpha_{32})(\beta_{31} - \alpha_{31}) = -1 \neq 0$. Hence, the network has 3 bi-arrow diagrams, i.e., $Ad(G) = 3$.

On the other hand, by [23, Theorem 2.4], we know $cap_{pos}(G) \geq 3$. So this example also verifies Theorem 5.3.


5.1. Proof of Theorem 5.3. Throughout this section, we assume any network G mentioned in the lemmas has a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace. Given a network G (2.1), we first define the following notions.

DEFINITION 5.7. (1) $E := \{k \in \{1, \dots, s\} \mid \alpha_{k1}, \dots, \alpha_{km} \text{ are not all the same}\}$.


(2) $H := \{k \in \{1, \dots, s\} \mid \beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} \neq 0\}$.

(3) For $F \subset \{1, \dots, s\}$, G_F denotes the embedded subnetwork of G obtained by removing all the species except $\{X_k \mid k \in F\}$. Especially, we abbreviate $G_{\{k\}}$ as G_k .

EXAMPLE 5.8. This example illustrates Definition 5.7. Consider the following network



For this network, $s = 5$ and $m = 2$. By Definition 5.7, $E = \{1, 2, 3, 5\}$ and $H = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. More than that, G_H is obtained by removing X_5 :



PROPOSITION 5.9. We have the following statements.

(1) $Ad(G) = \sum_{k=1}^s Ad(G_k)$.

(2) For any $k \in H$, $Ad(G_k) = |\{(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, t\} \times \{t+1, \dots, m\} \mid \alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj} \neq 0\}|$.

(3) If $cap_{pos}(G) > 0$, then for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $Ad(G_k) \geq 1$ if and only if $k \in E \cap H$.

(4) If $cap_{pos}(G) > 0$, then $Ad(G) \geq |E \cap H|$.

(5) For any $k \in H$, if the set $\{\alpha_{k1}, \dots, \alpha_{km}\}$ contains at least 3 distinct values, then $Ad(G_k) \geq 2$.

Proof. (1) This conclusion directly follows from Definition 5.1 (1)(2).

(2) For any $k \in H$, by Definition 5.7 (2), $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} \neq 0$. Note that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have $\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki} \neq 0$ since $\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki} = \lambda_i(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})$ and $\lambda_i \neq 0$ (recall (3.1)). So, the conclusion follows from Definition 5.1 (2).

(3) “ \Rightarrow ” If $Ad(G_k) \geq 1$, then by Definition 5.1 (2), there exist $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{t + 1, \dots, m\}$ such that $(\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj})(\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki}) \neq 0$, i.e., $\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{kj} \neq 0$ and $\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki} \neq 0$. Note that by (3.1), we have $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} \neq 0$ since $\beta_{ki} - \alpha_{ki} = \lambda_i(\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1})$ and $\lambda_i \neq 0$. So, by Definition 5.7 (1)(2), we have $k \in E \cap H$.

“ \Leftarrow ” If $k \in E \cap H$, then $k \in E$, and so by Definition 5.7 (1), $\alpha_{k1}, \dots, \alpha_{km}$ are not all the same. By Lemma 4.11, if $cap_{pos}(G) > 0$, then $\{t + 1, \dots, m\} \neq \emptyset$. If there exists $j \in \{t + 1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\alpha_{k1} \neq \alpha_{kj}$, then by (2), $Ad(G_k) \geq 1$. If $\alpha_{k1} = \alpha_{kj}$ for any $j \in \{t + 1, \dots, m\}$, then there exists $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ such that $\alpha_{k1} \neq \alpha_{kj}$ since $\alpha_{k1}, \dots, \alpha_{km}$ are not all the same. So, we have $\alpha_{km} \neq \alpha_{kj}$, and thus by (2), $Ad(G_k) \geq 1$.

(4) By (1) and (3), we have

$$Ad(G) = \sum_{k=1}^s Ad(G_k) \geq \sum_{k \in E \cap H} Ad(G_k) \geq \sum_{k \in E \cap H} 1 = |E \cap H|.$$

(5) Let $\alpha_{ki}, \alpha_{kj}, \alpha_{k\ell}$ be three different values. If $i, j, \ell \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, then at least two of the values $\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{k\ell}, \alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell}, \alpha_{k\ell} - \alpha_{km}$ are non-zero. Since $k \in H$, by (2), we have $Ad(G_k) \geq 2$. Similarly, if $i, j, \ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$, then at least two of $\alpha_{ki} - \alpha_{k\ell}, \alpha_{kj} - \alpha_{k\ell}, \alpha_{k\ell} - \alpha_{km}$ are non-zero, and thus, $Ad(G_k) \geq 2$. Without loss of generality, assume $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j, \ell \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\alpha_{ki}, \alpha_{kj}, \alpha_{k\ell}$ are distinct, then by (2), we have $Ad(G_k) \geq 2$. \square

LEMMA 5.10. *If $0 < cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, $cap_{pos}(G) = cap_{pos}(G_{E \cap H})$.*

Proof. (1) For any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $k \notin E$, we have $\alpha_{k1} = \dots = \alpha_{km}$. The steady-state system defined in (3.3) and (3.4) can be written as

$$(5.1) \quad h_1(x) = (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{i \neq k} x_i^{\alpha_{ij}} \right)$$

$$(5.2) \quad h_i(x) = (\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1}) x_1 - (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) x_i - c_{i-1}, \quad 2 \leq i \leq s.$$

Consider the network obtained by removing the species X_k from network G , say \tilde{G} . The steady-state system for \tilde{G} is

$$(5.3) \quad \tilde{h}_1(x) = (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{i \neq k} x_i^{\alpha_{ij}} \right)$$

$$(5.4) \quad \tilde{h}_i(x) = (\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1}) x_1 - (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) x_i - c_{i-1}, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, s\} \setminus \{k\}$$

(here, we assume $k \neq 1$, and if $k = 1$, by $0 < cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$ and by [24, Lemma 5.11], one can similarly prove the conclusion by reordering the species). Comparing the two steady-state systems (5.1)–(5.2) and (5.3)–(5.4), we have

$$cap_{pos}(G) = cap_{pos}(\tilde{G}).$$

(2) For any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $k \notin H$, we have $\beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1} = 0$. Recall that by Assumption 3.1, we have $\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} \neq 0$. So, here we have $k \neq 1$. Hence, the steady-state system defined in (3.3) and (3.4) becomes

$$h_1(x) = (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \tilde{\kappa}_j \prod_{i \neq k} x_i^{\alpha_{ij}} \right), \quad \text{where } \tilde{\kappa}_j := \kappa_j \left(\frac{c_{k-1}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} \right)^{\alpha_{kj}}.$$

$$h_i(x) = (\beta_{i1} - \alpha_{i1}) x_1 - (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) x_i - c_{i-1}, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, s\} \setminus \{k\}.$$

Consider the network obtained by removing the species X_k from network G , say \tilde{G} . Then, the above steady-state system is exactly the same with the steady-state system of \tilde{G} if the rate constants of \tilde{G} are denoted by $\tilde{\kappa}_1, \dots, \tilde{\kappa}_m$. Therefore, $cap_{pos}(G) = cap_{pos}(\tilde{G})$.

By (1) and (2), since $G_{E \cap H}$ is obtained by removing all the species indexed by $k \notin E \cap H$, we have $cap_{pos}(G) = cap_{pos}(G_{E \cap H})$. \square

LEMMA 5.11. *If $0 < cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$, then $E \cap H \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. By the proof of Lemma 5.10, we have $cap_{pos}(G) = cap_{pos}(G_H)$. Assume $E \cap H = \emptyset$. Then for any $k \in H$, we have $k \notin E$, i.e., $\alpha_{k1} = \dots = \alpha_{km}$. By (3.3), the first equation in the steady-state system for the network G_H is

$$h_1(x) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_j \kappa_j \right) \left(\prod_{k \in H} x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \right) = 0.$$

Clearly, either G_H has no positive steady states, or G_H has infinitely many positive steady states, which is a contradiction to $0 < \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_H) = \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$. \square

DEFINITION 5.12. [15, Definition 3.4] For a positive integer T , a **T -alternating network** is a one-species network with exactly $T+1$ reactions and with arrow diagram $\rho \in \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow\}^{T+1}$ such that $\rho_i = \rightarrow$ if and only if $\rho_{i+1} = \leftarrow$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$.

LEMMA 5.13. If $3 \leq \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$ and $|E \cap H| = 1$, then $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$.

Proof. Let $E \cap H = \{k\}$, then by Lemma 5.10, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) = \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_k)$, and thus $3 \leq \text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_k) < \infty$. By [15, Theorem 3.6 2(b)], G_k has a 3-alternating subnetwork, and so, by Definition 5.12, Definition 4.2 and Definition 5.1 (1)(2), $\text{Ad}(G_k) \geq 3$. Finally, by Proposition 5.9 (1), we have $\text{Ad}(G) \geq \text{Ad}(G_k) \geq 3$. \square

LEMMA 5.14. Suppose that $|\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} | \lambda_j > 0\}| = 1$ and $|E \cap H| = 2$. Without loss of generality, let $E \cap H = \{1, 2\}$. If both $\{\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{1m}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{2m}\}$ contain only 2 distinct values, then $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$ or $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \leq 2$.

Proof. Recall Assumption 4.9. The hypothesis $|\{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} | \lambda_j > 0\}| = 1$ means that $t = 1$. If $t = 1$, then $\{1, \dots, t\} = \{1\}$ and $\{t+1, \dots, m\} = \{2, \dots, m\}$. If there exist $i, j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ ($i \neq j$), such that $\alpha_{11} \neq \alpha_{1i}$ and $\alpha_{11} \neq \alpha_{1j}$, then by Proposition 5.9 (2) (note here $1 \in E \cap H \subset H$), $\text{Ad}(G_1) \geq 2$. By Proposition 5.9 (3), $\text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 1$. So it follows from Proposition 5.9 (1) that $\text{Ad}(G) \geq \text{Ad}(G_1) + \text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 3$. Similarly, if there exists $i, j \in \{2, \dots, m\}$, $i \neq j$, such that $\alpha_{21} \neq \alpha_{2i}$ and $\alpha_{21} \neq \alpha_{2j}$, then we also have $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. Below, we will consider the case that there exists only one index $j_1 \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ such that $\alpha_{11} \neq \alpha_{1j_1}$ and there also exists only one index $j_2 \in \{2, \dots, m\}$ such that $\alpha_{21} \neq \alpha_{2j_2}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $j_1 = m$. So, we have $\alpha_{11} = \dots = \alpha_{1m-1} \neq \alpha_{1m}$. In the rest of the proof, we discuss the following two cases.

Case 1: If we have $j_2 = m$, then $\alpha_{11} = \dots = \alpha_{1m-1} \neq \alpha_{1m}$ and $\alpha_{21} = \dots = \alpha_{2m-1} \neq \alpha_{2m}$.

In this case, for the polynomial h_1 (3.3) defined in the steady-state system, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x) &= (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\prod_{k=3}^s x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \lambda_j \kappa_j x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m}} x_2^{\alpha_{2m}} \right) \\ &= (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\prod_{k=3}^s x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \right) x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \lambda_j \kappa_j + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m} - \alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{2m} - \alpha_{21}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

So the positive solutions to the steady-state system (3.3)–(3.4) are all the positive solutions to the following two equations:

$$(5.5) \quad x_2 = \mathcal{C} x_1^{\frac{\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{1m}}{\alpha_{2m} - \alpha_{21}}}, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{C} = \left(- \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \lambda_j \kappa_j / \lambda_m \kappa_m \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{2m} - \alpha_{21}}}$$

$$(5.6) \quad x_2 = \frac{\beta_{21} - \alpha_{21}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} x_1 - \frac{c_1}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}}.$$

Note that a power function and a linear function have at most two intersection points of their graphs in the first quadrant. So, the above two equations have at most two common positive solutions. Therefore, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \leq 2$.

Case 2: If we have $j_2 \in \{2, \dots, m-1\}$, then without loss of generality, we assume $j_2 = 2$. So, we have $\alpha_{11} = \dots = \alpha_{1m-1} \neq \alpha_{1m}$ and $\alpha_{21} = \alpha_{23} = \dots = \alpha_{2m} \neq \alpha_{22}$.

In this case, for the polynomial h_1 (3.3) defined in the steady-state system, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x) &= (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\prod_{k=3}^s x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \right) (\bar{C} x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} + \lambda_2 \kappa_2 x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{22}} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}}) \\ &= (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \left(\prod_{k=3}^s x_k^{\alpha_{k1}} \right) x_1^{\alpha_{11}} x_2^{\alpha_{21}} (\bar{C} + \lambda_2 \kappa_2 x_2^{\alpha_{22} - \alpha_{21}} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m} - \alpha_{11}}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{C} = \lambda_1 \kappa_1 + \sum_{j=3}^{m-1} \lambda_j \kappa_j$. So the positive solutions to the steady-state system (3.3)–(3.4) are all the positive solutions to the following two equations:

$$(5.7) \quad x_2 = \left(-\frac{\bar{C} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m} - \alpha_{11}}}{\lambda_2 \kappa_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{22} - \alpha_{21}}},$$

$$(5.8) \quad x_2 = \frac{\beta_{21} - \alpha_{21}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} x_1 - \frac{c_1}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}}.$$

Let

$$F(x_1) = \left(-\frac{\bar{C} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m} - \alpha_{11}}}{\lambda_2 \kappa_2} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_{22} - \alpha_{21}}} - \frac{\beta_{21} - \alpha_{21}}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}} x_1 + \frac{c_1}{\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}}.$$

It is straightforward to check that $F''(x_1)$ does not change sign when $x_1 > 0$ and $-\frac{\bar{C} + \lambda_m \kappa_m x_1^{\alpha_{1m} - \alpha_{11}}}{\lambda_2 \kappa_2} > 0$. However, if the equations (5.7)–(5.8) have at least three common positive solutions such that $x_1 > 0$ and $x_2 > 0$, then $F''(x_1) = 0$ has at least one solution. So, the equations (5.7)–(5.8) have at most two common positive solutions. Above all, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \leq 2$. \square


Proof of Theorem 5.3.

Proof. Since $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3 > 0$, by Lemma 5.11, we have $E \cap H \neq \emptyset$. By Proposition 5.9 (4), if $|E \cap H| \geq 3$, then $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. By Lemma 5.13, if $|E \cap H| = 1$, then $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. Below, we suppose that $|E \cap H| = 2$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $E \cap H = \{1, 2\}$. By Proposition 5.9 (3), for $k = 1$, we have $\text{Ad}(G_k) \geq 1$. By Definition 5.1, there exist $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $j \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$ such that $\alpha_{1i} \neq \alpha_{1j}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $i = 1$ and $j = m$, i.e., $\alpha_{11} \neq \alpha_{1m}$.

First, we prove that if $2 \leq t \leq m-2$, then $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. In fact, if $2 \leq t \leq m-2$, then $2 \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ and $m-1 \in \{t+1, \dots, m\}$. If $\alpha_{11} \neq \alpha_{1,m-1}$ or $\alpha_{12} \neq \alpha_{1m}$, then by Proposition 5.9 (2), $\text{Ad}(G_1) \geq 2$. If $\alpha_{12} = \alpha_{1m}$ and $\alpha_{1,m-1} = \alpha_{11}$, then $\alpha_{12} \neq \alpha_{1,m-1}$, and thus, by Proposition 5.9 (2), $\text{Ad}(G_1) \geq 2$. Note that by Proposition 5.9 (3), we have $\text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 1$ since $2 \in E \cap H$. So by Proposition 5.9 (1), $\text{Ad}(G) \geq \text{Ad}(G_1) + \text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 2 + 1 = 3$.

Second, we prove that if $t = 1$ or $t = m-1$, we have $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. We only prove the conclusion when $t = 1$, and one can similarly prove the conclusion if $t = m-1$. By Proposition 5.9 (5), if $\{\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{1m}\}$ or $\{\alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{2m}\}$ contains at least 3 distinct values, then $\text{Ad}(G_1) \geq 2$ or $\text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 2$. Recall again that by Proposition 5.9 (3), we have $\text{Ad}(G_1) \geq 1$ and $\text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 1$ since $E \cap H = \{1, 2\}$. So by Proposition 5.9 (1), $\text{Ad}(G) \geq \text{Ad}(G_1) + \text{Ad}(G_2) \geq 3$. If both $\{\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{1m}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{21}, \dots, \alpha_{2m}\}$ contain only 2 distinct values, then by Lemma 5.14 and by the hypothesis that $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3$, we have $\text{Ad}(G) \geq 3$. \square

6. Bi-reaction networks admitting three positive steady states. In this section, we focus on the bi-reaction network G :



For $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we define the following notions

$$(6.2) \quad \alpha_k := \alpha_{k1} - \alpha_{k2}, \quad \gamma_k := \beta_{k1} - \alpha_{k1}.$$

Without loss of generality, we make the following assumption, which gives a partition of the set $\{1, \dots, s\}$:

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{for } j \in S_1 := \{1, \dots, i_1 - 1\}, \alpha_j > 0, \gamma_j > 0, \\ &\text{for } j \in S_2 := \{i_1, \dots, i_2 - 1\}, \alpha_j < 0, \gamma_j < 0, \\ &\text{for } j \in S_3 := \{i_2, \dots, i_3 - 1\}, \alpha_j > 0, \gamma_j < 0, \\ &\text{for } j \in S_4 := \{i_3, \dots, i_4 - 1\}, \alpha_j < 0, \gamma_j > 0, \text{ and} \\ &\text{for } j \in S_5 := \{i_4, \dots, s\}, \alpha_j = 0 \text{ or } \gamma_j = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, we define $\text{sign}_\alpha(k) := \text{sign}(\alpha_i)$ and $\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(k) := \text{sign}(\alpha_i\gamma_i)$, where i can be any index in S_k . By the definition of S_k , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sign}_\alpha(1) > 0, \text{sign}_\alpha(2) < 0, \text{sign}_\alpha(3) > 0, \text{sign}_\alpha(4) < 0, \\ \text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(1) > 0, \text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(2) > 0, \text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(3) < 0, \text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(4) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, for any three indices $j, k, \ell \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, there exists a unique pair of indices, say (k, ℓ) , such that $\text{sign}_\alpha(k) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(\ell) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(j)$, and $\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(\ell) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(k) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(j)$.

THEOREM 6.1. *Given a bi-reaction network G (6.1) with a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace, suppose $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$.*


- (a) *If only one of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 is non-empty, then $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < 3$.*
- (b) *If there are exactly two of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, then $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3$ if and only if*
 - (1) *both the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ and $\{\alpha_k\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs,*
 - (2) $\sum_{i \in S_k} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_\ell} \{|\alpha_i|\}$ *and* $\sum_{i \in S_\ell} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_k} \{|\alpha_i|\}$, *where S_k and S_ℓ are the two non-empty sets.*
- (c) *If there are exactly three of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, say S_j, S_k , and S_ℓ , then $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3$ if and only if $\sum_{i \in S_\ell} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_k} \{|\alpha_i|\}$, where k and ℓ are assumed to be the two indices such that $\text{sign}_\alpha(k) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(\ell) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(j)$, and $\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(\ell) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(k) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(j)$.*
- (d) *If all the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, then $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3$ if and only if at least one of the following four conditions holds*

$$(6.4) \quad \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}, \quad \sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\},$$

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{i \in S_3} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_2} \{|\alpha_i|\}, \quad \sum_{i \in S_2} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_3} \{|\alpha_i|\}.$$

EXAMPLE 6.2. *These examples illustrate how Theorem 6.1 works.*

(a) Consider the following network:




It is straightforward to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 1, \gamma_1 = 1, \gamma_2 = 1. \\ S_1 = \{1, 2\}, S_2 = \emptyset, S_3 = \emptyset, S_4 = \emptyset, S_5 = \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

So by Theorem 6.1 (a), we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_a) < 3$.

(b) Consider the following network:




It is straightforward to check the following results:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 = 2, \alpha_2 = 1, \alpha_3 = -2 \text{ (change signs)}. \\ \gamma_1 = 1, \gamma_2 = 1, \gamma_3 = 1. \\ \alpha_1\gamma_1 = 2, \alpha_2\gamma_2 = 1, \alpha_3\gamma_3 = -2 \text{ (change signs)}. \\ S_1 = \{1, 2\}, S_2 = \emptyset, S_3 = \emptyset, S_4 = \{3\}, S_5 = \emptyset. \\ \{k, \ell\} = \{1, 4\}. \\ \sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| = |\alpha_1| + |\alpha_2| = 3 > 2 = |\alpha_3| = \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\}. \\ \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| = |\alpha_3| = 2 > 1 = |\alpha_2| = \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}. \end{aligned}$$

So by Theorem 6.1 (b), we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_b) \geq 3$. One can also check that for $c_1 = 19999/2$, $c_2 = 9999$, $\kappa_1 = 26879/4294967296$, and $\kappa_2 = 1/2$, the network has 3 positive steady states:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(1)} &= (9999.50, 0.00020, 0.50), \\ x^{(2)} &= (11716.81, 1717.31, 1717.81), \\ x^{(3)} &= (68177.66, 58178.16, 58178.66). \end{aligned}$$

(c) Consider the following network:




It is straightforward to check the following results:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = -1, \alpha_3 = -2. \\ \gamma_1 = 1, \gamma_2 = -1, \gamma_3 = 1. \\ \alpha_1\gamma_1 = 1, \alpha_2\gamma_2 = 1, \alpha_3\gamma_3 = -2. \\ S_1 = \{1\}, S_2 = \{2\}, S_3 = \emptyset, S_4 = \{3\}, S_5 = \emptyset. \\ \text{sign}_\alpha(1) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(2) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(4), \\ \text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(4) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(1) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(2). \\ k = 1, \ell = 4, \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\} = |\alpha_1| = 1 < 2 = |\alpha_3| = \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i|. \end{aligned}$$

So by Theorem 6.1 (c), we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_c) \geq 3$. One can also check that for $c_1 = -10001$, $c_2 = -1$, $\kappa_1 = 102624395269/16384$, and $\kappa_2 = 1/2$, the network has 3 positive steady states:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(1)} &= (0.00080, 10001.00, 1.00), \\ x^{(2)} &= (1465.72, 8535.28, 1466.72), \\ x^{(3)} &= (8533.28, 1467.72, 8534.28). \end{aligned}$$

(d) Consider the following network:



It is straightforward to check that:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= 2, \alpha_2 = -1, \alpha_3 = 1, \alpha_4 = -1. \\ \gamma_1 &= 1, \gamma_2 = -1, \gamma_3 = -1, \gamma_4 = 1. \\ S_1 &= \{1\}, S_2 = \{2\}, S_3 = \{3\}, S_4 = \{4\}, S_5 = \emptyset. \\ \sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| &= |\alpha_1| = 2 > 1 = |\alpha_4| = \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\}. \end{aligned}$$

So by Theorem 6.1 (d), we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G_d) \geq 3$. One can also check that for $c_1 = -10003$, $c_2 = -10002$, $c_3 = 1$, $\kappa_1 = 262251/4194304$, and $\kappa_2 = 1/2$, the network has 3 positive steady states:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(1)} &= (1.17, 10001.83, 10000.83, 0.17), \\ x^{(2)} &= (6.83, 9996.17, 9995.17, 5.83), \\ x^{(3)} &= (10002.00, 1.00, 0.00080, 10001.00). \end{aligned}$$

In the above networks, we find the witnesses for admitting 3 positive steady states by the proofs of Theorem 6.1. See the subsection.

6.1. Proof of Theorem 6.1. Throughout this section, we assume that any network G mentioned in the lemmas has the form (6.1), and it has a one-dimensional stoichiometric subspace.

We introduce a new variable z , and a new parameter d_1 such that

$$(6.6) \quad x_1 = \gamma_1 z + d_1.$$

Then, the conservation laws (see h_i defined in (3.4)) can be written as

$$(6.7) \quad x_i = \gamma_i z + d_i, \quad \text{where } d_i := \frac{\gamma_i}{\gamma_1} d_1 - \frac{c_{i-1}}{\gamma_1}, \quad i \in \{2, \dots, s\}.$$

Also, we recall (3.1) that $\lambda_1 = 1$, and λ_2 is a non-zero real number.

LEMMA 6.3. A network G admits at least N ($N \geq 0$) positive steady states if and only if there exist rate constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and real numbers d_1, \dots, d_s such that the equation

$$(6.8) \quad \sum_{k=1}^s \alpha_k \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) = K, \quad \text{where } K := \ln(-\lambda_2 \kappa_2 / \lambda_1 \kappa_1)$$

has at least N different solutions for z in the open interval

(6.9) $I := (a, M)$, where

$$(6.10) \quad a := \begin{cases} \max_{\{k|\gamma_k > 0\}} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}, & \text{if } \{k|\gamma_k > 0\} \neq \emptyset \\ -\infty, & \text{if } \{k|\gamma_k > 0\} = \emptyset \end{cases}, M := \begin{cases} \min_{\{k|\gamma_k < 0\}} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}, & \text{if } \{k|\gamma_k < 0\} \neq \emptyset \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \{k|\gamma_k < 0\} = \emptyset \end{cases}.$$

Proof. By the steady-state system (3.3)–(3.4) and by (6.6)–(6.7), the network G admits at least 3 positive steady states if and only if there exists a rate-constant $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ and real numbers d_1, \dots, d_s such that the equation

$$(6.11) \quad (\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11}) \sum_{j=1}^2 \lambda_j \kappa_j \prod_{k=1}^s (\gamma_k z + d_k)^{\alpha_{kj}} = 0.$$

has at least 3 different solutions for z such that for any $k = 1, \dots, s$, $\gamma_k z + d_k > 0$. Notice that $\gamma_k z + d_k > 0$ for any k if and only if z belongs to the open interval I defined in (6.9). Since $\beta_{11} - \alpha_{11} \neq 0$, the equation (6.11) is equivalent to

$$\lambda_1 \kappa_1 \prod_{k=1}^s (\gamma_k z + d_k)^{\alpha_{k1}} + \lambda_2 \kappa_2 \prod_{k=1}^s (\gamma_k z + d_k)^{\alpha_{k2}} = 0.$$

For any $z \in I$, the above equation is equivalent to

$$\prod_{k=1}^s (\gamma_k z + d_k)^{\alpha_k} = -\frac{\lambda_2 \kappa_2}{\lambda_1 \kappa_1}.$$

Here, recall that $\alpha_k = \alpha_{k1} - \alpha_{k2}$, see (6.2). Take logarithm on both sides, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^s \alpha_k \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) = \ln\left(-\frac{\lambda_2 \kappa_2}{\lambda_1 \kappa_1}\right).$$

So, we have the conclusion. \square

LEMMA 6.4. *We have the following statements.*

- (a) *If the network G admits at least 2 positive steady states, then the numbers in the sequence $\{\alpha_k \gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs.*
- (b) *If the network G admits at least 3 positive steady states, then the numbers in the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs.*

Proof. Define

$$(6.12) \quad g(z) := \sum_{k=1}^s \alpha_k \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k).$$

(a) By Lemma 6.3, if the network G admits at least 2 positive steady states, then there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(z) = K$ has at least 2 different solutions in the interval I defined in (6.9). It follows from Rolle's Theorem that $g'(z) = 0$ has at least 1 solution in I . Note that

$$g'(z) = \sum_{k=1}^s \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k}{\gamma_k z + d_k} = \sum_{k=1}^{i_4-1} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k}{\gamma_k z + d_k},$$

where the last equality follows from (6.3) that for any $k \in \{i_4, \dots, s\}$, $\alpha_k \gamma_k = 0$. Note also, if $z \in I$, then for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, $\gamma_k z + d_k > 0$. So, if $g'(z) = 0$ has a solution in I , then the numbers in the sequence $\{\alpha_k \gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs.

(b) By Lemma 6.3, if the network G admits at least 3 positive steady states, then there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(z) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in the interval I defined in (6.9). So, $g''(z) = 0$ has at least 1 solution in I . Note that

$$g''(z) = - \sum_{k=1}^{i_4-1} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k^2}{(\gamma_k z + d_k)^2}.$$

So, if $g''(z)$ has a solution in I , then the numbers in the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs. \square

LEMMA 6.5. *Given a univariate C^2 -function $g(z)$ defined on an open interval $(a, M) \subset \mathbb{R}$, suppose $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = \infty$. If there exists $z^* \in (a, M)$ such that $g'(z^*) = 0$ and*

$$g''(z^*) \lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) < 0,$$

then there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(z) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in (a, M) .

Proof. Since $g''(z^*) \lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) < 0$, we have $g''(z^*) \neq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $g''(z^*) < 0$. And thus, $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = +\infty$. Since $g''(z)$ is continuous, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $g''(z) < 0$ in $(z^* - \delta, z^* + \delta) \subset (a, M)$. So, $g'(z)$ strictly decreases in $(z^* - \delta, z^* + \delta)$. Note that $g'(z^*) = 0$. So, $g'(z) > 0$ in $(z^* - \delta, z^*)$, and $g'(z) < 0$ in $(z^*, z^* + \delta)$. Hence, $g(z)$ strictly increases in $(z^* - \delta, z^*)$ and strictly decreases in $(z^*, z^* + \delta)$. Let $\epsilon = \min\{g(z^*) - g(z^* - \delta), g(z^*) - g(z^* + \delta)\}$ and let $K = g(z^*) - \epsilon/2$, then $g(z) = K$ has 2 solutions in $(z^* - \delta, z^* + \delta)$. Since $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = +\infty$ and $g(z^* + \delta) < K$, $g(z) = K$ has at least 1 solution in $(z^* + \delta, M)$. Overall, $g(z) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in (a, M) . \square

For simplicity, for any $k \in \{1, \dots, s\}$, we define

$$(6.13) \quad b_k(z) := \left| \frac{\gamma_k}{\gamma_k z + d_k} \right|.$$

By (6.3), for $g(z)$ defined in (6.12), for any z in the interval I defined in (6.9), we have

$$(6.14) \quad g'(z) = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| b_k - \sum_{k \in S_3} |\alpha_k| b_k - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k,$$

$$(6.15) \quad g''(z) = - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 - \sum_{k \in S_3} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k^2.$$

LEMMA 6.6. *Suppose that $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12), and let I be the interval defined in (6.9). If there exists $z^* \in I$ such that $g'(z^*) = 0$, then for $z = z^*$, we have the following inequalities:*

$$(6.16) \quad -\frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} + \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} \leq \frac{g''(z)}{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k\right)^2} \leq -\frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k|} + \frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}}.$$

More than that, if the first equality holds, then S_1 is singleton, and if the second equality holds, then S_4 is singleton.

Proof. Notice that by (6.9) and (6.13), for any $z \in I$, $b_k(z)$ is well-defined and $b_k(z) > 0$. So, by Cauchy's inequality, we have

$$(6.17) \quad \left(\sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 \right) \left(\sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k| \right) \geq \left(\sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2, \quad i = 1, 4.$$

On the other hand,

$$(6.18) \quad \min_{k \in S_i} \{|\alpha_k|\} \sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 \leq \sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k|^2 b_k^2 \leq \left(\sum_{k \in S_i} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2, \quad i = 1, 4.$$

Note that the last equality holds if and only if S_i is singleton. If $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, then by (6.15), (6.17) and (6.18), we have

$$g''(z) = - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k^2$$

and

$$- \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} + \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} \leq - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 \leq - \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k|} + \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}}.$$

Since $g'(z^*) = 0$, for $z = z^*$, we have $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k = \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k$. So, for $z = z^*$, we have the inequality (6.16). \square

LEMMA 6.7. *Suppose $cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$. If $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$, then $\sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| \neq \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i|$.*

Proof. Suppose $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| = \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$. It is straightforward to check that if we

choose d_1, \dots, d_{i_4} such that $\frac{d_1}{\gamma_1} = \dots = \frac{d_{i_4}}{\gamma_{i_4}}$, then $g(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{i_4} |\alpha_k| \ln(d_k)$. Hence, we can find a real number K such that $g(z) = K$ for any z in the interval I defined in (6.9) (note here, $I = (-\frac{d_1}{\gamma_1}, +\infty)$). So, by Lemma 6.3, we have $cap_{pos}(G) = +\infty$, which is a contradiction to the hypothesis that $cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$. \square

LEMMA 6.8. *Suppose $cap_{pos}(G) < +\infty$. Suppose that $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. If the network G admits at least 3 positive steady states, then $\sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| >$*

$\min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}$ and $\sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\}$.

Proof. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12). By Lemma 6.3, there exists $K \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(x) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in the interval I defined in (6.9). By Rolle's Theorem, $g'(z) = 0$ has at least 2 different solutions in I , i.e., there exist $z_1, z_2 \in I$ ($z_1 \neq z_2$) such that $g'(z_1) = g'(z_2) = 0$ and $g''(z_1)g''(z_2) \leq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $g''(z_1) \geq 0$ and $g''(z_2) \leq 0$. Recall $b_k(z)$ defined in (6.13). Hence, by Lemma 6.6, we have

$$(6.19) \quad - \frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} + \frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} \leq \frac{g''(z_2)}{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k(z_2) \right)^2} \leq 0, \text{ and}$$

$$(6.20) \quad 0 \leq \frac{g''(z_1)}{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k(z_1)\right)^2} \leq -\frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k|} + \frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}}.$$

So, we have $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| \geq \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$ and $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| \geq \min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}$.

If $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| = \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, then the equalities in (6.19) hold. By Lemma 6.6, we have S_1 is singleton, and hence, we have $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| = \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\} = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k|$. This is a contradiction to Lemma 6.7. So, we have $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$. Similarly, we can show that $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}$. \square

LEMMA 6.9. *Suppose that $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$.*

(1) *If $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| < \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$ and $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states.*

(2) *If $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| < \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k|$ and $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states.*

Proof. We only need to prove (1), and the statement (2) holds by symmetry. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12), and let $I = (a, M)$ be the interval defined in (6.9). By Lemma 6.3, we only need to prove that we can choose d_1, \dots, d_s such that for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = K$ has at least three different solutions in I . If $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$, then by (6.3) and (6.10), we have $a = \max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}$ and $M = +\infty$. By (6.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &= \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) \\ &\sim \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| \right) \ln(z) \quad (z \rightarrow +\infty). \end{aligned}$$

So, if $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| < \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$, then we have $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow +\infty} g(z) = -\infty$.

Below, we will prove that there exist d_1, \dots, d_s such that $0 \in (a, M)$, $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) > 0$. For any $i \in S_1$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{X}, \quad \text{where } X \text{ is a real number.}$$

For any $i \in S_4 \setminus \{\ell\}$, where ℓ can be any index chosen from $\operatorname{argmin}_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{\epsilon}, \quad \text{where } \epsilon \text{ is a real number.}$$

Finally, for the index ℓ we choose in the previous step, let

$$d_\ell = \frac{|\gamma_\ell|}{Y}, \quad \text{where } Y \text{ is a real number.}$$

Note here, for any $(\epsilon, X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, we have $0 \in (a, M) = (\max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}, +\infty)$. Note

also,

$$g'(0) = \sum_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k}{\gamma_k z + d_k} \Big|_{z=0} = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| X - |\alpha_\ell| Y - \sum_{k \in S_4 \setminus \{l\}} |\alpha_k| \epsilon,$$

$$g''(0) = \sum_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k^2}{(\gamma_k z + d_k)^2} \Big|_{z=0} = - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| X^2 + |\alpha_\ell| Y^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4 \setminus \{l\}} |\alpha_k| \epsilon^2.$$

If $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_4} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, i.e., $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| > |\alpha_\ell|$, then for $\epsilon = 0$, for any positive number X , and for $Y = X \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| / |\alpha_\ell|$, we have $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) > 0$. So, when ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, there exists $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ such that $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) > 0$. So, we know by Lemma 6.5 that we can choose d_1, \dots, d_s such that for some real number K , $g(z) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in the interval $I = (a, M)$. \square

LEMMA 6.10. *Suppose $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) < +\infty$. If there are exactly two of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states if and only if*

- (1) both the sequence $\{\alpha_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ and $\{\alpha_k \gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{i_4-1}$ change signs,
- (2) $\sum_{i \in S_k} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_\ell} \{|\alpha_i|\}$ and $\sum_{i \in S_\ell} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_k} \{|\alpha_i|\}$, where S_k and S_ℓ are the two non-empty sets.

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ” The statement (1) directly follows from Lemma 6.4. If there are exactly two of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, by the conclusion (1), there are only two possibilities: S_1 and S_4 are non-empty, or S_2 and S_3 are non-empty. Without loss of generality, we assume $S_2 = S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. Thus, the statement (2) follows from Lemma 6.8.

“ \Leftarrow ” Again, by the statement (1), we can assume that S_1 and S_4 are non-empty. By Lemma 6.7, we have $\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| \neq \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$. If

$$\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| < \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|, \text{ or } \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| > \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|,$$

then the conclusion follows from Lemma 6.9. \square

LEMMA 6.11. *Suppose that $S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12), and let I be the interval defined in (6.9). If there exists $z^* \in I$ such that $g'(z^*) = 0$, then for $z = z^*$, we have the following inequality:*

$$(6.21) \quad g''(z) > \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} - \frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} \right).$$

Proof. Since $g'(z) = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| b_k - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k$, for $z = z^*$, $g'(z^*) = 0$ implies that

$$(6.22) \quad \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k(z^*) = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k(z^*) + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| b_k(z^*) > \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k(z^*).$$

If $S_3 = \emptyset$, then by (6.17), (6.18) and (6.22), for $z = z^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g''(z) &= - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 \\
&> - \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k^2 \\
&\geq - \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} + \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} \\
&> - \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} + \frac{\left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k \right)^2}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, we have the equality (6.21). \square

LEMMA 6.12. *Suppose that $S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. If the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states, then $\sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}$.*

Proof. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12). Let I be the interval defined in (6.9). Similar to the proof of Lemma 6.8, if G admits at least 3 different positive steady states, then there exist d_1, \dots, d_s such that for two different points $z_1, z_2 \in I$, we have $g'(z_1) = g'(z_2) = 0$ and $g''(z_1)g''(z_2) \leq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $g''(z_1) \leq 0$. By Lemma 6.11, we have

$$(6.23) \quad \left(\sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| b_k(z_1) \right)^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|} - \frac{1}{\min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}} \right) < g''(z_1) \leq 0.$$

Therefore, we have $\min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\} < \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i|$. \square

LEMMA 6.13. *Suppose that $S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$. If $\sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}$, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 6.8, we only need to prove that we can choose d_1, \dots, d_s such that for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = K$ has at least three different solutions in I . If $S_3 = \emptyset$, $S_1 \neq \emptyset$, $S_2 \neq \emptyset$, and $S_4 \neq \emptyset$, then by (6.3) and (6.10), we have $a = \max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}$ and $M = \min_{k \in S_2} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}$, and by (6.12), we have

$$g(z) = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) - \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k)$$

So, we have $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = +\infty$.

Below, we will prove that there exist d_1, \dots, d_s such that $0 \in (a, M)$, $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. For any $i \in (S_1 \cup S_2) \setminus \{\ell\}$, where ℓ can be any index chosen from $\operatorname{argmin}_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{\epsilon}, \quad \text{where } \epsilon \text{ is a real number.}$$

For the index ℓ we choose in the previous step, let

$$d_\ell = \frac{|\gamma_\ell|}{X}, \quad \text{where } X \text{ is a real number.}$$

For any $i \in S_4$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{Y}, \quad \text{where } Y \text{ is a real number.}$$

Note here, for any $(\epsilon, X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$, we have

$$0 \in (a, M) = \left(\max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \left\{ -\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k} \right\}, \min_{k \in S_2} \left\{ -\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k} \right\} \right).$$

Note also,

$$\begin{aligned} g'(0) &= \sum_{k \in S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_4} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k}{\gamma_k z + d_k} \Big|_{z=0} = |\alpha_\ell| X - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| Y + \sum_{k \in S_1 \cup S_2 \setminus \{\ell\}} |\alpha_k| \epsilon, \\ g''(0) &= \sum_{k \in S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_4} \frac{\alpha_k \gamma_k^2}{(\gamma_k z + d_k)^2} \Big|_{z=0} = -|\alpha_\ell| X^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| Y^2 - \left(\sum_{k \in S_1 \setminus \{\ell\}} |\alpha_k| - \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| \right) \epsilon^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, i.e., $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > |\alpha_\ell|$, then for $\epsilon = 0$, for any positive number X , and for $Y = X|\alpha_\ell| / \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$, we have $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. So, when ϵ is a sufficiently small positive number, there exists $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ such that $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. So, we know by Lemma 6.5 that we can choose d_1, \dots, d_s such that for some real number K , $g(x) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in the interval $I = (a, M)$. \square

LEMMA 6.14. *Suppose exactly three of the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, say S_j, S_k , and S_ℓ . Then, the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states if and only if $\sum_{i \in S_\ell} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_k} \{|\alpha_i|\}$, where k and ℓ are assumed to be the two indices such that $\text{sign}_\alpha(k) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(\ell) = -\text{sign}_\alpha(j)$, and $\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(\ell) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(k) = -\text{sign}_{\alpha\gamma}(j)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $S_3 = \emptyset, S_1 \neq \emptyset, S_2 \neq \emptyset, S_4 \neq \emptyset$. From $\text{sign}(\alpha_k) = -\text{sign}(\alpha_\ell) = -\text{sign}(\alpha_j)$, and $\text{sign}(\alpha_\ell \gamma_\ell) = -\text{sign}(\alpha_k \gamma_k) = -\text{sign}(\alpha_j \gamma_j)$, we get $k = 1$ and $\ell = 4$. So the conclusion follows from Lemma 6.12 and Lemma 6.13. \square

LEMMA 6.15. *If all the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are singleton, i.e., $S_k = \{k\}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and if $|\alpha_1| = |\alpha_4|$ and $|\alpha_2| = |\alpha_3|$, then the network G admits at most 2 different positive steady states.*

Proof. Let $g(z)$ be the function defined in (6.12). Let I be the interval defined in (6.9). If $S_k = \{k\}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and if $|\alpha_1| = |\alpha_4|$ and $|\alpha_2| = |\alpha_3|$, then we have

$$(6.24) \quad g'(z) = |\alpha_1| b_1 + |\alpha_2| b_2 - |\alpha_2| b_3 - |\alpha_1| b_4.$$

Here, recall (6.13) that $b_i := \left| \frac{\gamma_i}{\gamma_i z + d_i} \right|$.

Case 1. For any $(d_2, d_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\frac{d_2}{\gamma_2} = \frac{d_3}{\gamma_3}$, we have

$$g'(z) = |\alpha_1| b_1 - |\alpha_1| b_4.$$

Clearly, $g'(z) = 0$ has at most one solution in I , and hence, for any $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = K$ has at most two solutions in I . By Lemma 6.3, the $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \leq 2$.

Case 2. For any $(d_2, d_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\frac{d_2}{\gamma_2} \neq \frac{d_3}{\gamma_3}$, without loss of generality, we assume $\frac{d_2}{\gamma_2} < \frac{d_3}{\gamma_3}$. Then, for any $z \in I$, we have $b_2 < b_3$. Note that

$$(6.25) \quad \begin{aligned} g''(z) &= -|\alpha_1|b_1^2 + |\alpha_2|b_2^2 - |\alpha_2|b_3^2 + |\alpha_1|b_4^2 \\ &= -|\alpha_1|(b_1 + b_4)(b_1 - b_4) + |\alpha_2|(b_2 + b_3)(b_2 - b_3). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $z^* \in I$ and $g'(z^*) = 0$. By (6.24), we have

$$(6.26) \quad -|\alpha_1|(b_1(z^*) - b_4(z^*)) = |\alpha_2|(b_2(z^*) - b_3(z^*)).$$

Substitute (6.26) into (6.25), and we have

$$g''(z^*) = |\alpha_2|(b_1(z^*) + b_2(z^*) + b_3(z^*) + b_4(z^*))(b_2(z^*) - b_3(z^*)) < 0.$$

That means $g''(z)$ does not change sign on the set $\{z^* \in I | g'(z^*) = 0\}$. So, $g'(z) = 0$ has at most one solution in I , and hence, for any $K \in \mathbb{R}$, $g(z) = K$ has at most two solutions in I . By Lemma 6.3, the $cap_{pos}(G) \leq 2$. \square

LEMMA 6.16. *If all the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, and if $\min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\} < \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i|$, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 6.12. If $S_k \neq \emptyset$ for every $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then by (6.3) and (6.10), we have $a = \max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}$ and $M = \min_{k \in S_2 \cup S_3} \{-\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k}\}$, and by (6.12), we have

$$(6.27) \quad g(z) = \sum_{k \in S_1} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) - \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) + \sum_{k \in S_3} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k) - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| \ln(\gamma_k z + d_k)$$

Below, we will prove that there exist d_1, \dots, d_s such that $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = +\infty$, $0 \in (a, M)$, $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. For any $i \in (S_1 \cup S_2) \setminus \{\ell\}$, where ℓ can be any index chosen from $\operatorname{argmin}_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{\epsilon_1}, \quad \text{where } \epsilon_1 \text{ is a real number.}$$

For the index ℓ we choose in the previous step, let

$$d_\ell = \frac{|\gamma_\ell|}{X}, \quad \text{where } X \text{ is a real number.}$$

For any $i \in S_3$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{\epsilon_2}, \quad \text{where } \epsilon_2 \text{ is a real number.}$$

For any $i \in S_4$, let

$$d_i = \frac{|\gamma_i|}{Y}, \quad \text{where } Y \text{ is a real number.}$$

Note here, for any $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4$ such that $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2$, we have

$$0 \in (a, M) = \left(\max_{k \in S_1 \cup S_4} \left\{ -\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k} \right\}, \min_{k \in S_2} \left\{ -\frac{d_k}{\gamma_k} \right\} \right).$$

So, by (6.27), we have $\lim_{z \rightarrow M} g(z) = +\infty$. Note also,

$$g'(0) = |\alpha_\ell|X - \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|Y + \left(\sum_{k \in S_1 \setminus \{\ell\}} |\alpha_k| + \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| \right) \epsilon_1 - \sum_{k \in S_3} |\alpha_k| \epsilon_2,$$

$$g''(0) = -|\alpha_\ell|X^2 + \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|Y^2 - \left(\sum_{k \in S_1 \setminus \{\ell\}} |\alpha_k| - \sum_{k \in S_2} |\alpha_k| \right) \epsilon_1^2 - \sum_{k \in S_3} |\alpha_k| \epsilon_2^2.$$

If $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > \min_{k \in S_1} \{|\alpha_k|\}$, i.e., $\sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k| > |\alpha_\ell|$, then for $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0$, for any positive number X , and for $Y = X|\alpha_\ell| / \sum_{k \in S_4} |\alpha_k|$, we have $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. So, when

ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are sufficiently small such that $\epsilon_1 > \epsilon_2$, there exists $(X, Y) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^2$ such that $g'(0) = 0$ and $g''(0) < 0$. So, we know by Lemma 6.5 that we can choose d_1, \dots, d_s such that for some real number K , $g(z) = K$ has at least 3 different solutions in the interval $I = (a, M)$. By Lemma 6.3, we have $\text{cap}_{\text{pos}}(G) \geq 3$. \square

LEMMA 6.17. *If all the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are non-empty, then the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states if and only if at least one of the four conditions (6.4)–(6.5) holds.*

Proof. “ \Rightarrow ” We assume that none of the four conditions in (6.4)–(6.5) holds, i.e., we have the following four conditions

$$(6.28) \quad \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i|, \quad \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i|,$$

$$(6.29) \quad \min_{i \in S_2} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_3} |\alpha_i|, \quad \min_{i \in S_3} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_2} |\alpha_i|$$

hold simultaneously. By (6.28)–(6.29), we have

$$\min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| \geq \min_{i \in S_4} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_1} |\alpha_i| \geq \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}, \text{ and}$$

$$\min_{i \in S_2} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_3} |\alpha_i| \geq \min_{i \in S_3} \{|\alpha_i|\} \geq \sum_{i \in S_2} |\alpha_i| \geq \min_{i \in S_2} \{|\alpha_i|\}.$$

So, we conclude that all the four sets S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 are singleton, and if we assume that $S_k = \{k\}$ for every $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, then we have $|\alpha_1| = |\alpha_4|$ and $|\alpha_2| = |\alpha_3|$. By Lemma 6.15, the network G admits at most 2 different positive steady states.

“ \Leftarrow ” Suppose at least one of the four conditions in (6.4)–(6.5) holds. Without loss of generality, we assume that the first condition in (6.4) holds, i.e., we have $\sum_{i \in S_4} |\alpha_i| > \min_{i \in S_1} \{|\alpha_i|\}$. By Lemma 6.16, the network G admits at least 3 different positive steady states. \square

Proof of Theorem 6.1.

Proof. The conclusion (a) follows from Lemma 6.4 (b). The statements (b), (c), and (d) are proved in Lemma 6.10, Lemma 6.14 and Lemma 6.17. \square

7. Discussion. For the networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces that admit finitely many positive steady states, we remark again that admitting at least three positive steady states is a necessary condition for multistability. So, characterizing networks admitting more positive steady states is as important as characterizing multistationarity. However, by comparing Theorem 6.1 and Lemma 4.15, one can see that the conditions for admitting three (nondegenerate) positive steady

states are more complicated than those for admitting two (nondegenerate) positive steady states (note here, by Theorem 2.1, we see that Theorem 6.1 also characterize nondegenerate multistationarity). So, even for bi-reaction networks, directly characterizing multistability or characterizing at least four positive steady states should be a challenging task. Also, from Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 5.3, we want to ask if it is true that $cap_{pos}(G) \geq N$ implies $Ad(G) \geq N$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Christoph Bagowski, and James Ferrell Jr. Bistability in the JNK cascade. *Curr. Biol.*, 11(15):1176–82, 2001.
- [2] Murad Banaji, and Casian Pantea. Some results on injectivity and multistationarity in chemical reaction networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 15(2):807–869, 2016.
- [3] Murad Banaji, and Casian Pantea. The inheritance of nondegenerate multistationarity in chemical reaction networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 78:1105–1130, 2018.
- [4] Russell Bradford, James H. Davenport, Matthew England, Hassan Errami, Vladimir Gerdt, Dima Grigoriev, Charles Hoyt, Marek Kořta, Ovidiu Radulescu, Thomas Sturm, and Andreas Weber. A case study on the parametric occurrence of multiple steady states. *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, 45-52, 2017.
- [5] Carsten Conradi, Elisenda Feliu, Maya Mincheva, and Carsten Wiuf. Identifying parameter regions for multistationarity. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 13(10):e1005751, 2017.
- [6] Carsten Conradi, and Dietrich Flockerzi. Switching in mass action networks based on linear inequalities. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 11(1):110-134, 2012.
- [7] Gheorghe Craciun, and Martin Feinberg. Multiple equilibria in complex chemical reaction networks: I. the injectivity property. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 65:1526–1546, 2005.
- [8] Gheorghe Craciun, Yangzhong Tang, and Martin Feinberg. Understanding bistability in complex enzyme-driven reaction networks. *PNAS*, 103(23):8697–8702, 2006.
- [9] Alicia Dickenstein, Mercedes Perez Millan, Anne Shiu, and Xiaoxian Tang. Multistationarity in structured reaction networks. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 81(5):1527–1581, 2019.
- [10] Suvankar Halder, Sumana Ghosh, Joydev Chattopadhyay, and Samrat Chatterjee. Bistability in cell signalling and its significance in identifying potential drug targets. *Bioinformatics.*, 2021.
- [11] Clarmyra Hayes, Elisenda Feliu, and Orkun S. Soyer. Multi-site enzymes as a mechanism for bistability in reaction networks. *BioRxiv.*, 2021.05.06.442945.
- [12] Hoon Hong, Xiaoxian Tang, and Bican Xia. Special algorithm for stability analysis of multistable biological regulatory systems. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 70:112–135, 2015.
- [13] Badal Joshi. Complete characterization by multistationarity of fully open networks with one non-flow reaction. *Appl. Math. Comput.*, 219:6931–6945, 2013.
- [14] Badal Joshi and Anne Shiu. Atoms of multistationarity in chemical reaction networks, *J. Math. Chem.*, 51(1):153–178, 2013.
- [15] Badal Joshi, and Anne Shiu. Which small reaction networks are multistationary? *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 16(2):802–833, 2017.
- [16] Stefan Müller, Elisenda Feliu, Georg Regensburger, Carsten Conradi, Anne Shiu, and Alicia Dickenstein. Sign conditions for injectivity of generalized polynomial maps with applications to chemical reaction networks and real algebraic geometry. *Found. Comput. Math.*, 16(1):69–97, 2016.
- [17] Shintaro Nagata, and Macoto Kikuchi. Emergence of cooperative bistability and robustness of gene regulatory networks. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 16(6):e1007969, 2020.
- [18] Nida Obatake, Anne Shiu, Xiaoxian Tang, and Angelica Torres. Oscillations and bistability in a model of ERK regulation. *J. Math. Biol.*, 79:1515–1549, 2019.
- [19] Lawrence Perko. Differential equations and dynamical systems, *Volume 7 of Texts in Applied Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition*, 2001.
- [20] AmirHosein Sadeghimanesh, and Elisenda Feliu. The multistationarity structure of networks with intermediates and a binomial core network, *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 81:2428–2462, 2019.
- [21] Guy Shinar, and Martin Feinberg. Concordant chemical reaction networks. *Math. Biosci.*, 240(2):92–113, 2012.
- [22] Anne Shiu, and Timo de Wolff. Nondegenerate multistationarity in small reaction networks. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B*, 24(6):2683–2700, 2019.
- [23] Xiaoxian Tang, and Hao Xu. Multistability of small reaction networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn.*

- Syst.*, 20:608-635, 2021.
- [24] Xiaoxian Tang, and Zhishuo Zhang. Multistability of reaction networks with one-dimensional stoichiometric subspaces. arXiv:2012.15437.
 - [25] Angélica Torres, and Elisenda Feliu. Detecting parameter regions for bistability in reaction networks. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 20(1):1–37, 2021.
 - [26] Carsten Wiuf, and Elisenda Feliu. Power-law kinetics and determinant criteria for the preclusion of multistationarity in networks of interacting species. *SIAM J. Appl. Dyn. Syst.*, 12:1685–1721, 2013.
 - [27] Wen Xiong, and James Ferrell Jr. A positive-feedback-based bistable ‘memory module’ that governs a cell fate decision. *Nature*, 426:460–465, 2003.