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Abstract

Exploring some results of Wang et al. (Adv. Differ. Equ. 2016:33, 2016) from another point of view, we first investigate the stability and direction for a class of Schrödingerian difference equations with Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation. Next we obtain the stable conditions for these equations, and prove that Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcations shall occur when the delay passes through the critical value.

Keywords: local stability; Schrödingerian difference equations; delay

1 Introduction

A biological system is a nonlinear system, so it is still a public problem upon how to control the biological system balance. The predecessors have done a lot of research. Especially the research on the predator-prey system’s dynamic behaviors has received much attention from the scholars. There is also a large number of research works on the stability of a predator-prey system with time delays. The time delays have a very complex impact on the dynamic behaviors of the nonlinear dynamic system (see [2, 3]). May and Odter (see [4]) introduced a general example of such a generalized model, that was to say, they investigated a three-species model, and the results show that the positive equilibrium is always locally stable when the system has two same time Schrödingerian delays.

Hassard and Kazarinoff (see [5]) proposed a three-species food chain model with chaotic dynamical behavior in 1991, and then the dynamic properties of the model were studied. Berryman and Millstein (see [6]) studied the control of chaos of a three-species Hastings-Powell food chain model. The stability of biological feasible equilibrium points of the modified food web model was also investigated. By introducing the disease in prey population, Shilnikov et al. (see [3]) modified the Schrödingerian Hastings-Powell model, and the stability of biological feasible equilibria was also obtained.

In this paper, we provide a Schrödingerian difference equation to describe the dynamic of Schrödingerian Hastings-Powell food chain model. In the three-species food chain model, x represents the prey, y and z represent two predators. Based on the Holling type II functional response, we know that the middle predator y feeds on the prey x and the top
predator $z$ preys upon $y$. We write three-species food chain model as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dX}{dT} &= R_0X \left(1 - \frac{X}{K_0}\right) - C_1 \frac{A_1 XY}{B_1 + X}, \\
\frac{dY}{dT} &= -D_1 Y + \frac{A_1 XY}{B_1 + X} - \frac{A_2 YZ}{B_2 + Y}, \\
\frac{dZ}{dT} &= -D_2 Z + C_2 \frac{A_2 YZ}{B_2 + Y},
\end{align*}
\]

(1)

where $X, Y, Z$ are the prey, predator and top-predator, respectively; $B_1, B_2$ represent the half-saturation constants; $R_0, A_1$ represent the intrinsic growth rate and the carrying capacity of the environment of the fish, respectively; $C_1, C_2$ are the conversion factors of prey-to-predator; and $D_1, D_2$ represent the death rates of $Y$ and $Z$, respectively. In this paper, two different Schrödingerian delays in (1) are incorporated into Schrödinger Tritrophic Hastings-Powell (STHP) model which will be given in the following.

We next introduce the following dimensionless version of delayed STHP model:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dx}{dt} &= x(1-x) - \frac{a_1x}{1 + b_1x}y(t - \tau_1), \\
\frac{dy}{dt} &= -d_1y + \frac{a_1x}{1 + b_1x}y - \frac{a_2x}{1 + b_2x}z(t - \tau_2), \\
\frac{dz}{dt} &= -d_2z + \frac{a_2x}{1 + b_2x},
\end{align*}
\]

(2)

where $x, y$ and $z$ represent dimensionless population variables; $t$ represents dimensionless time variable and all of the parameters $a_i, b_i, d_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) are positive; $\tau_1$ and $\tau_2$ represent the period of prey transitioning to predator and that of predator transitioning to top predator, respectively.

2 Bifurcation analysis

In this section we first study the Schrödingerian Hastings-Powell food chain system with delay, which undergoes the Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation when $\tau = \tau_0^0$. Next we confirm the Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation's stability, direction and the periodic solutions of delay differential equations.

Now we consider system (2) by the transformation

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{u}_1(t) &= x(t) - x^*, \\
\dot{u}_2(t) &= y(t) - y^*, \\
\dot{u}_3(t) &= z(t) - z^*,
\end{align*}
\]

(3)

where $t = \tau_1 + \tau_2$.

We get the following Schrödingerian differential equation (SDE) system (see [7]) in $C = C([-1, 1], R^3)$:

\[
\dot{u}(t) = L_\mu(u_t) + f(\mu, u_t),
\]

(4)
where \( u(t) = (u_1(t), u_2(t), u_3(t))^T \in \mathbb{R}^3 \), \( L_\mu : C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( f : R \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3 \) are given by

\[
L_\mu(x_t) = (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 \\ B_1 & B_2 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & C_3 \end{bmatrix} + (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(0) \\ \phi_2(0) \\ \phi_3(0) \end{bmatrix} + (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_1(0) \\ \phi_2(-1) \\ \phi_3(0) \end{bmatrix}
\]

and

\[
f(\mu, \varphi) = (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} f_{11} \\ f_{12} \\ f_{13} \end{bmatrix} \varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3) \in C,
\]

respectively.

By (3), (4) and the Schrödingerian Riesz representation theorem (see [3]), there exists a function \( \eta(\theta, \mu) \) of bounded variation such that

\[
L_\mu(\varphi) = \int_{-\tau}^{0} d\eta(\theta, \mu) \varphi(\theta)
\]

for any \( \theta \in C \), where \( \theta \in [-\tau, 0] \).

It follows from (5) that

\[
\eta(0, \mu) = (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & 0 & 0 \\ B_1 & B_2 & 0 \\ 0 & C_2 & C_3 \end{bmatrix} \delta(\theta) + (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \delta(\theta + 1) + (\tau_k + \mu) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & B_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \delta(\theta + 1),
\]

where \( \delta(\theta) \) is the Dirac delta function.

For any \( \theta \in C([-1, 1], \mathbb{R}^3) \), we define the operator \( A(\mu) \) as follows (see [1]):

\[
A(\mu)\varphi(\theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{d\varphi}{d\theta}, & \theta \in [-1, 1), \\ \int_{-\tau}^{0} \eta(\theta, \mu) d\varphi(\theta), & \theta = 0 \end{cases}
\]

and

\[
R(\mu)\varphi(\theta) = \begin{cases} 0, & \theta \in [-1, 1), \\ f(\mu, \theta), & \theta = 0 \end{cases}
\]

It is easy to see that system (2) is equivalent to

\[
\dot{u}(t) = A(\mu)u_t + R(\mu)u_t,
\]

where \( \theta \in [-1, 1] \) and \( \mu_t(\theta) = \mu(t + \theta) \) is a real function.
For any $\psi \in C([-1, 1], (R^2)^*)$, we define operator $A^*$ of $A$ by

$$A^*(\mu)\psi(s) = \begin{cases} -\frac{d\phi(s)}{ds}, & s \in (0, 1], \\ \int_{-\tau}^{0} d\eta^T(t, 0)\psi(-t), & s = 0 \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

and

$$(\psi(s), \varphi(\theta)) = \psi^T(0)\varphi(0) - \int_{-\tau}^{0} \int_{\xi = 0}^{\theta} \psi^T(\xi - \theta) d\eta(\theta)\varphi(\xi) d\xi, \quad (10)$$

where $\eta(\theta) = \eta(\theta, 0)$.

It is easy to see that $A^*(0)$ and $A(0)$ are adjoint operators. From (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10), we obtain that $\pm i\omega \tau_k$ are the eigenvalues of $A(0)$. So they are the eigenvalues of $A^*(0)$.

Let $q(\theta)$ be an eigenvector of $A(0)$ corresponding to $i\omega \tau_k$ and $q^*(\theta)$ be an eigenvector of $A^*(0)$ corresponding to $-i\omega \tau_k$. Then we know that

$$A(0)q(\theta) = i\omega \tau_k q(\theta)$$

and

$$A^*(0)q^*(\theta) = -i\omega \tau_k q^*(\theta).$$

Suppose that $q(\theta) = (1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta}$ is an eigenvector of $A(0)$ corresponding to $i\omega \tau_k$. It follows from the definitions of $A(0)$, $A^*(0)$ and $\eta(0, \mu)$ that

$$q(\theta) = (1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta} = q(0) e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta}.$$ 

By the definition of $A^*$ (see [8], p.109), we know that

$$q^*(\theta) = D(1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta} = q^*(0) e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta}.$$

In order to satisfy $(q^*(s), q(\theta)) = 1$, we need to evaluate $D$. By the definition of bilinear inner product, we know that

$$\langle q^*(\theta), q(\theta) \rangle = \bar{D}(1, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)(1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T$$

$$- \int_{-\tau}^{0} \int_{\xi = 0}^{\theta} \bar{D}(1, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2) e^{i\omega \tau_k (\xi - \theta)} \eta(\theta)(1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T e^{i\omega \tau_k \xi} d\xi$$

$$= \bar{D} \left\{ 1 + \rho_1 \gamma_1 + \rho_2 \gamma_2 - \int_{-\tau}^{0} (1, \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2) e^{i\omega \tau_k \theta} \eta(\theta)(1, \rho_1, \rho_2)^T \right\}$$

$$= \bar{D} [1 + \rho_1 \gamma_1 + \rho_2 \gamma_2 + \tau_k e^{i\omega \tau_k} (A_2 + B_3 \rho_2 \gamma_2)].$$

Then we choose $\bar{D}$ as follows:

$$\bar{D} = [1 + \rho_1 \gamma_1 + \rho_2 \gamma_2 + \tau_k e^{i\omega \tau_k} (A_2 + B_3 \rho_2 \gamma_2)]^{-1}.$$ 

It is easy to see that $(q^*(s), q(\theta)) = 1$ and $(q^*(s), \bar{q}(\theta)) = 0.$
In the remainder of this section, we also use the same notations to compute the coordinates, which describe the center manifold $C_0$ at $\mu = 0$.

Define

$$z(t) = \{q^*, u_t\}, \quad W(t, \theta) = u_t(\theta) - zq - \bar{z}q = u_t(\theta) - 2\text{Re}\{z(t)q(\theta)\}, \quad (11)$$

where $u_t$ and $W$ are real functions.

By the definition of center manifold $C_0$, we know that

$$W(t, \theta) = W(z(t), \bar{z}(t), \theta) = W_{20}(\theta)\frac{\dot{z}^2}{2} + W_{11}(\theta)z\bar{z} + W_{02}(\theta)\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + \cdots \quad (12)$$

from (11), where $z$ and $\bar{z}$ are local coordinates for the center manifold $C_0$ in the directions of $q$ and $\bar{q}^*$. If $u_t$ is real, then we know that $W$ is also real. We only consider real solutions.

Since $\mu = 0$, we know that

$$z = i\omega(0) + \{q^*(\theta), f(0, W(z, \bar{z}, \theta) + 2\text{Re}zq(\theta))\}$$

$$= i\omega + q^*/0(z, \bar{z}) = i\omega + g(z, \bar{z}), \quad (\text{def})$$

from (11) for the solution $u_t \in C_0$, where

$$g(z, \bar{z}) = q^*/0(z, \bar{z}) = g_{20}\frac{\dot{z}^2}{2} + g_{11}z\bar{z} + g_{02}\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + \cdots. \quad (13)$$

By using (4), we know that $x_{12}(\theta) = W(z, \bar{z}, \theta) + 2\text{Re}[z(t)q(\theta)]$, where

$$x_t = \begin{bmatrix} x_{1t}(\theta) \\ x_{2t}(\theta) \\ x_{3t}(\theta) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} W^{(1)}(z, \bar{z}, \theta) \\ W^{(2)}(z, \bar{z}, \theta) \end{bmatrix} + z\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \end{bmatrix} e^{i\omega t} + \bar{z}\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \bar{\rho}_1 \\ \bar{\rho}_2 \end{bmatrix} e^{-i\omega t},$$

$$x_{1t}(\theta) = ze^{i\omega t} + \bar{z}e^{-i\omega t} + W_{10}^{(1)}(\theta)\frac{\dot{z}^2}{2}$$

$$W_{11}^{(1)}(\theta)z\bar{z} + W_{02}^{(1)}(\theta)\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + O(|z, \bar{z}|^3),$$

$$x_{2t}(\theta) = z\rho_1 e^{i\omega t} + \bar{z}\bar{\rho}_1 e^{-i\omega t} + W_{20}^{(2)}(\theta)\frac{\dot{z}^2}{2}$$

$$+ W_{11}^{(2)}(\theta)z\bar{z} + W_{02}^{(2)}(\theta)\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + O(|z, \bar{z}|^3),$$

$$x_{3t}(\theta) = z\rho_2 e^{i\omega t} + \bar{z}\bar{\rho}_2 e^{-i\omega t} + W_{20}^{(2)}(\theta)\frac{\dot{z}^2}{2}$$

$$+ W_{11}^{(2)}(\theta)z\bar{z} + W_{02}^{(2)}(\theta)\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + O(|z, \bar{z}|^3). \quad (14)$$

It follows from (12), (13) and (14) that

$$g(z, \bar{z}) = q^*/0(z, \bar{z}) = \tilde{D}r_{10}(1\bar{\gamma}\hat{\gamma}_t) \begin{bmatrix} f_{11} \\ f_{12} \\ f_{13} \end{bmatrix}.$$
By comparing the coefficients with (9), we get \( g_20, g_11, g_02 \) and \( g_21 \). And we need to compute \( W_{20}(\theta) \) and \( W_{11} \). By (7) and (13), we know that

\[
\dot{W} = i\dot{z}q - \dot{z}q
\]

\[
= \begin{cases} 
AW - 2\Re(\overline{q}(\theta)f_0q(\theta)), & \theta \in [-1, 1], \\
AW - 2\Re(\overline{q}(\theta)f_0q(\theta)) + f_0(z, \bar{z}), & \theta = 0 
\end{cases}
\]

\[= AW + H(z, \bar{z}, \theta), \tag{15}\]

where

\[
H(z, \bar{z}, \theta) = H_{20}(\theta)\frac{z^2}{2} + H_{11}(\theta)z\bar{z} + H_{02}(\theta)\frac{\bar{z}^2}{2} + \cdots. \tag{16}
\]

On the other hand, by taking the derivative with respect to \( t \) in (4), we know that

\[
\dot{W} = W_z\dot{z} + W_{\bar{z}}\dot{\bar{z}} \tag{17}
\]

from (13), (14), (15) and (16), which together with (4) and (5) gives that

\[
(A - 2i\omega \tau)W_{20}(\theta) = -H_{20}(\theta),
\]

\[
AW_{11}(\theta) = -H_{11}(\theta),
\]

\[
(A + 2i\omega \tau_0)W_{02}(\theta) = -H_{02}(\theta).
\]

By using (9) for \( \theta \in [-1, 1] \), we know that

\[
H(z, \bar{z}, \theta) = -\Re(\overline{q}(\theta)f_0(z, \bar{z})q(\theta))
\]

\[= (z, \bar{z})q(\theta) - \overline{g}(z, \bar{z})\overline{q}(\theta). \]

Comparing the coefficients with (4), we obtain that

\[
H_{20}(\theta) = -g_{20}q(\theta) - \overline{g}_{02}\overline{q}(\theta) \tag{18}
\]

and

\[
H_{11}(\theta) = -g_{11}q(\theta) - \overline{g}_{11}\overline{q}(\theta). \tag{19}
\]

From (5), (7) and the definition of \( A \), we know that

\[
W_{20}(\theta) = \frac{ig_{20}}{\tau_{10}\omega}q(0)e^{i\omega\tau_0\theta} + \frac{ig_{02}}{3i\omega}\overline{q}(0)e^{-i\omega\tau_0\theta} + E_1e^{\theta}. \tag{20}
\]

Similarly, we know that

\[
W_{11}(\theta) = \frac{ig_{11}}{\tau_{10}\omega}q(0)e^{i\omega\tau_0\theta} + \frac{ig_{11}}{3i\omega}\overline{q}(0)e^{-i\omega\tau_0\theta} + E_2. \tag{21}
\]
from (18) and (19), where $E_1 = (E_1^{(1)}, E_1^{(2)}) \in R^2$ and $E_2 = (E_2^{(1)}, E_2^{(2)}) \in R$ are constant vectors.

If we solve these for $E_1$ and $E_2$, we compute $W_{20}(\theta)$ and $W_{11}(\theta)$ from (8), (9), (10) and confirm the following values to investigate the qualities of the bifurcation periodic solution in the center manifold at the critical value $\tau_k$ (see [9]).

To this end, we express each $g'_{ij}$ in terms of parameters and delay. Then we obtain the following values:

\[
\begin{align*}
C_1(0) &= \frac{i}{\omega \tau} (g_{20} g_{11} - 2|g_{11}|^2 - \frac{|g_{20}|^2}{2}) + \frac{\xi_1}{\tau}, \\
\mu_2 &= \frac{\text{Re}(C_1(0))}{\text{Re}(\lambda'(\tau))}, \\
\beta_2 &= 2 \text{Re}(C_1(0)), \\
T_2 &= -\frac{\text{Im}(C_1(0)) + \mu_2 \text{Im}(\lambda'(\tau))}{\omega}.
\end{align*}
\]

(22)

From the above analysis, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem** If $\tau = \tau_k$, then the stability and the direction of periodic solutions of the Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation of system (22) are determined by the parameters $\mu_2$, $\beta_2$ and $T_2$.

(i) The direction of the Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation is determined by the sign of $\mu_2$: if $\mu_2 > 0$ (resp. $\mu_2 < 0$), then the Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation is supercritical (resp. subcritical), and the bifurcation periodic solution exists for $\tau > \tau_0$ (resp. $\tau < \tau_0$).

(ii) The stability of the Schrödingerian bifurcation periodic solution is determined by the sign of $\beta_2$: if $\beta_2 > 0$ (resp. $\beta_2 < 0$), then the Schrödingerian bifurcation periodic solution is stable (resp. unstable).

(iii) The sign of $T_2$ determines the period of the Schrödingerian bifurcation periodic solution: if $T_2 > 0$ (resp. $T_2 < 0$), then the period increases (resp. decreases).

3 Conclusions

In this paper, we provide a differential model to describe the dynamic behavior of the Hasting-Powell food chain system. And two different Schrödinger delays are incorporated into the model. The stabilities of equilibrium point and Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation are studied. We also get the system's stable conditions, and there are four cases in this paper, which are discussed to illustrate the existence of Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation. Based on the center manifold theorem and the normal form theorem, we control the direction and the stability of Schrödingerian Hopf bifurcation. Finally, we give numerical examples to verify theorems and results.
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