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A nutrient-phytoplankton model with multiple delays is studied analytically and numerically. The aim of this paper is to study how the delay factors influence dynamics of interaction between nutrient and phytoplankton. The analytical analysis indicates that the positive equilibrium is always globally asymptotically stable when the delay does not exist. On the contrary, the positive equilibrium loses its stability via Hopf instability induced by delay and then the corresponding periodic solutions emerge. Especially, the stability switches for positive equilibrium occur as the delay is increased. Furthermore, the numerical simulations show that periodic-2 and periodic-3 solutions can appear due to the existence of delays. Numerical results are consistent with the analytical results. Our results demonstrate that the delay has a great impact on the nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics.

1. Introduction

Some phytoplankton, for example, Cyanobacteria, can form dense and sometimes toxic blooms in freshwater and marine environments, which threaten ecological balance, drinking water, fisheries, and even human health [1]. However, the mechanism, by which phytoplankton blooms occur, is currently not very clear, which contribute to the difficulty to prevent or mitigate the proliferation of phytoplankton blooms. These have stimulated lots of researches aiming to understand the growth mechanisms of phytoplankton.

In recent years, dynamics in phytoplankton growth have drawn increasing attention from experimental ecologists, as well as mathematical ecologists. Some results from experiments and field observations imply that many factors affecting the dynamics of phytoplankton growth are bound to exist, such as nutrient [2], light [3], temperature [4], iron supply [5], zooplankton [6]. Especially, due to the effects of limiting factors including temperature, light, and day length, it has been indicated by Rhee and Gotham [7] that the population dynamics of phytoplankton in aquatic environments can change with season, latitude, and depth. Among factors affecting phytoplankton growth, nutrient has been an essential element [8–10], mainly including nitrogen and phosphate. Results reported by Ryther [11] indicated that phytoplankton indeed consumes lots of nitrogen and phosphate in their growth process, but reducing the nitrogen content in aquatic cannot slow the eutrophication. Using data from 17 lakes, Smith [8] analysed the influence of ratio of total nitrogen to phosphorus on the growth of blue-green algae (Cyanophyta) and showed that controlling the ratio can help us improve the quality of aquatic environment very well. Obviously, the production process of phytoplankton is more complex.

However, due to the complexity and nonlinearity of aquatic ecosystem, there are some difficulties in understanding nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics only depending on experiment or field observation, which makes it necessary
to use models to provide quantitative insights into dynamic mechanisms of phytoplankton growth. For different aquatic environments, we can use various modifications of the classical prey-predator models by introducing functional responses to model nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics [12–14]. For example, Huppert et al. [15] describe the dynamics of nutrient-driven phytoplankton blooms by a simple model and identify, using the model analysis, an important threshold effect that a bloom will only be triggered when nutrients exceed a certain defined level. Additionally, most nutrient-phytoplankton models reveal that phytoplankton population and nutrient population can coexist at equilibrium globally under some conditions [16, 17]. However, Sherratt and Smith [18] have reported that a constant population density may not exist in reality because of the existence of some factors, such as noise and physical factors. Actually, experiments and field observations show that the changes of phytoplankton population density usually possess oscillatory behaviour [19, 20].

For the single cell phytoplankton species, in most studies of nutrient-phytoplankton models, it is usually assumed that the processes, such as conversion process of nutrient, in the dynamics of phytoplankton growth are instantaneous [14–17, 19–23]. It may be doubtful whether there exists delay in the growth of phytoplankton over the large area or not. Yet, J. Caperon [24] studied time lag in population growth response of Isochrysis galbana, a phytoplankton species, to a variable nitrate environment by both experiments and model, and demonstrated the existence of delay in the growth of Isochrysis galbana. Hence, the delay may indeed exist in the phytoplankton growth, which means that it is necessary to consider delay in nutrient-phytoplankton models. An approach that has been attempted by researchers to model the dynamics of phytoplankton is the role of delay since delay appears as an important component in biosystems and ecosystems [25–30].

Actually, growing evidence shows that there exists time lag in some conversion processes from one state to another in some systems, and delay is an important factor because it can affect the dynamics of these systems. Volterra [31] considered time delay in a prey-predator model first and found oscillatory behaviour for the spatial distribution. For a long time, it has been recognized that delays can give rise to destabilizing effect of the dynamics of systems, where periodic solutions, as well as chaos, may emerge [32–35]. Models incorporating delays in diverse biological and ecological models are extensively studied [36–42]. Especially, the characteristic equation with respect to the linearized system of delay differential equations plays a key role in dynamic analysis, by which we can obtain some information on the stability of equilibrium. In addition, using the normal form theory, one can carry out the bifurcation analysis, such as the direction and stability of periodic solutions arising through Hopf bifurcation [43, 44].

The main purpose of this paper is to consider the effects of multiple delays on the nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics. In [15], Huppert et al. presented a simple model to investigate effect of nutrient on phytoplankton blooms, and much better results are obtained. Here, this model is extended into a “two preys-one predator” type to describe nitrogen-phosphorus-phytoplankton dynamics, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{dN}{dt} &= I_1 - q_1N - \alpha_1NA \\
\frac{dP}{dt} &= I_2 - q_2P - \alpha_2 PA \\
\frac{dA}{dt} &= \beta_1\alpha_1(N - \tau_1)A + \beta_2\alpha_2 P(t - \tau_2)A - mA
\end{align*}
\]

where \(N\), \(P\), and \(A\) represent nitrogen, phosphorus, and phytoplankton population density at time \(t\), respectively; \(I_1\) is the nitrogen nutrients input flowing into the system and \(I_2\) is the phosphorus nutrients input flowing into the system; \(q_1\) is the loss rate of the nitrogen nutrients, and \(q_2\) is the loss rate of the phosphorus nutrients; \(\alpha_1\) is nitrogen nutrient uptake rate of phytoplankton, and \(\alpha_2\) is phosphorus nutrient uptake rate of phytoplankton; \(\beta_1\) and \(\beta_2\) denote the efficiency of nutrient utilization; \(\tau_1\) and \(\tau_2\) are time delay parameters; \(m\) is the mortality rate of phytoplankton. Although the function, which describes nutrient uptake dynamics, is not a Michaelis-Menten function, but Lotka-Volterra type, Huppert et al. [15] have indicated that the Lotka-Volterra term is a good first approximation to the Michaelis-Menten type. From biological viewpoint, all parameters are nonnegative. \(N(t), P(t),\) and \(A(t) \geq 0\) are continuous on \(-\tau \leq t < 0\), where \(\tau = \max(\tau_1, \tau_2)\) and \(N(0), P(0),\) and \(A(0) > 0\).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we analyze the existence and stability of positive equilibrium in model (1) without delays. In Section 3, we discuss stability of positive equilibrium and Hopf bifurcation under five different cases for delay effect. Subsequently, the direction of bifurcation and the stability of periodic solutions arising through Hopf bifurcation are given in Section 4. In order to analyze further how delay effects influence nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics, a series of numerical simulations are carried out in Section 5. Finally, the paper ends with Section 6.

2. Existence and Stability of Positive Equilibrium in Model (1) without Delays

In this section, it is presented first that the first octant is positive invariant in model (1) without delays and the following lemma holds.

**Lemma 1.** All the solutions of model (1) with initial conditions that initiate in \(R_+^3\) are positive invariant in the absence of delays.

**Proof.** From the first equation of model (1), we have

\[
\frac{dN}{dt} = I_1 - q_1N - \alpha_1NA \geq -(q_1 + \alpha_1A)N.
\]  

Hence, \(N(t) \geq N(0)\exp[-\int_0^t (q_1 + \alpha_1A)ds] > 0\) under \(N(0) > 0\).

Likewise, from the second equation of model (1), we have

\[
P(t) \geq P(0)\exp[-\int_0^t (q_2 + \alpha_2A)ds] > 0\) under \(P(0) > 0\).
In the absence of delays in model (1), from the third equation of model (1), if \( A(0) > 0 \), it can be obtained that

\[
A(t) = A(0) \exp \left[ \int_0^t (\beta_1 \alpha_1 N + \beta_2 \alpha_2 P - m) \, ds \right] > 0 \quad (3)
\]

Obviously, all the solutions of model (1) without delays are positive invariant if the initial conditions initiate in \( R^3_+ \).

Then, we complete the proof. \( \square \)

For model (1), it is obvious that the extinction equilibrium, \( (I_1/q_1, I_2/q_2, 0) \), exists. Moreover, in order to discuss the existence of positive equilibrium, the following function is defined:

\[
f(x) = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 m^2 + \left[ (mq_1 - \alpha_1 \beta_1 I_1) \alpha_2 + (mq_2 - \alpha_2 \beta_2 I_2) \alpha_1 \right] x + (mq_1 q_2 - \beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1 q_2 - \beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2 q_1),
\]

and then we can obtain

\[
N^* = \frac{I_1}{q_1 + \alpha_1 A^*}, \quad P^* = \frac{I_2}{q_2 + \alpha_2 A^*}, \quad (5)
\]

where \( A^* \) is the positive root of (4).

For the function \( f(x) \), we have \( f(0) = 0 \) when the condition, \( m > (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \), holds, and then there is no positive equilibrium in model (1). Obviously, \( f(0) < 0 \) holds if \( m < (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \), and then there exists a unique positive root with respect to \( f(x) = 0 \), which means that there exists a unique positive equilibrium in model (1) under this condition. However, when \( m > (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \), it can be verified directly that \( f(0) > 0 \) and \( (mq_1 - \alpha_1 \beta_1 I_1) \alpha_2 + (mq_2 - \alpha_2 \beta_2 I_2) \alpha_1 > 0 \), which implies that there is no positive equilibrium in model (1). Thus, summarizing these results, the following theorem can be obtained.

**Theorem 2.** If \( 0 < m < (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \) holds, then there exists a unique positive equilibrium in model (1); otherwise, there is no positive equilibrium in model (1) if \( m \geq (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \) holds.

Letting the unique positive equilibrium be \( E_0 = (N^*, P^*, A^*) \), then the following theorem holds for model (1) without delays.

**Theorem 3.** If the unique positive equilibrium exists in model (1) without delays, then it is globally asymptotically stable.

Proof. We construct a Lyapunov function, as follows:

\[
V = \beta_1 \int_0^{N^*} \frac{s - N^*}{s} \, ds + \beta_2 \int_0^{P^*} \frac{s - P^*}{s} \, ds + \int_0^{A^*} \frac{s - A^*}{s} \, ds
\]

In the model (1) without delays,

\[
\frac{dV}{dt} = \beta_1 \frac{N - N^*}{N} \frac{dN}{dt} + \beta_2 \frac{P - P^*}{P} \frac{dP}{dt} + \frac{A - A^*}{A} \frac{dA}{dt}
\]

\[
= \beta_1 \frac{N - N^*}{N} (I_1 - q_1 N - \alpha_1 NA) + \beta_2 \frac{P - P^*}{P} (I_2 - q_2 P - \alpha_2 PA) + \frac{A - A^*}{A} (\beta_1 \alpha_1 NA + \beta_2 \alpha_2 PA - mA)
\]

\[
= \beta_1 \frac{N - N^*}{N} \left( (q_1 N + \alpha_1 NA) + \beta_2 \frac{P - P^*}{P} \left( q_2 P^* + \alpha_2 P^* A^* \right) \right)
\]

\[
- \beta_1 \frac{N - N^*}{N} \left( q_1 N + \alpha_1 NA \right) + \beta_2 \frac{P - P^*}{P} \left( q_2 P^* + \alpha_2 P^* A^* \right) - (\beta_1 \alpha_1 N^* + \beta_2 \alpha_2 P^*) A = -\beta_1 (q_1 + \alpha_1 A^*) \cdot \frac{(N - N^*)^2}{N} - \beta_2 (q_2 + \alpha_2 A^*) \left( \frac{P - P^*}{P} \right)^2
\]

Obviously, \( dV/dt \leq 0 \) holds under existence of positive equilibrium and \( dV/dt = 0 \) holds if and only if \( N = N^* \) and \( P = P^* \). The largest invariant subset of the set of the point where \( dV/dt = 0 \) is \( E_0 = (N^*, P^*, A^*) \). Therefore, according to LaSalle’s theorem, \( E_0 = (N^*, P^*, A^*) \) is globally asymptotically stable.

Then, we complete the proof. \( \square \)

Letting the extinction equilibrium be \( E_0 = (N_0, P_0, 0) = (I_1/q_1, I_2/q_2, 0) \), then we can obtain the following theorem in model (1) in the absence of delay.

**Theorem 4.** In the absence of delays, let \( m^* = (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \), so that

(i) if \( m > m^* \), then the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) is locally asymptotically stable;

(ii) if \( m < m^* \), then the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) is unstable;

(iii) if \( m = m^* \), then the model (1) undergoes transcritical bifurcation at the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \).

Proof. For simplicity, let

\[
f_w(X, m) = \begin{pmatrix}
I_1 - q_1 N - \alpha_1 NA \\
I_2 - q_2 P - \alpha_2 PA \\
\beta_1 \alpha_1 NA + \beta_2 \alpha_2 PA - mA
\end{pmatrix}
\]

and \( X = [N, P, A]^T \).

The Jacobian matrix at \( E_0 \) is

\[
J(E_0) = \begin{pmatrix}
-q_1 & -\alpha_1 I_1 & q_1 \\
0 & -q_2 & -\alpha_2 I_2 \\
0 & 0 & -(m - m^*)
\end{pmatrix}
\]

The eigenvalues are \(-q_1, -q_2, -(m - m^*)\).
Obviously, if \( m > m^* \), then the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) is locally asymptotically stable.

If \( m < m^* \), then the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) is unstable. When \( m = m^* \), the Jacobian matrix at \( E_0 \) is

\[
J(\bar{E}_0) = \begin{pmatrix}
-q_1 & 0 & -\frac{\alpha_1 I_1}{q_1} \\
0 & -q_2 & -\frac{\alpha_2 I_2}{q_2} \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (10)

Then \( J(\bar{E}_0) \) has a geometrically simple zero eigenvalue with right eigenvector \( \Phi = (\alpha_1 I_1, \alpha_2 I_2, -q_1^2 q_2^2)^T \) and left eigenvector \( \Psi = (0, 0, 1) \).

Now

\[
D_m f_w = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ -A \end{pmatrix}
\] (11)

and

\[
\begin{aligned}
(\Psi (D_X D_m f_w) \Phi)_{E_0} &= q_1^2 q_2^2 \neq 0, \\
(\Psi ((D_X f_w)(\Phi, \Phi)))_{E_0} &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^3 e_i \Phi e_i^T D_X (D_X f_w) e_i \right)_{E_0} \\
&= -2q_1^2 q_2^2 \left( \beta_1 I_1 \alpha_1 I_2 + \beta_2 I_2 \alpha_2 I_1 \right) \neq 0
\end{aligned}
\]

(12)

According to [45], the model (1) undergoes transcritical bifurcation at the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) in the absence of delays.

Then, we complete the proof.

Actually, when \( m > m^* \) holds, the positive equilibrium does not exist, and the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 \) is globally asymptotically stable. Then, the following theorem holds.

**Theorem 5.** If \( m > (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \), then the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 = (N_0, P_0, A_0) = (I_1/q_1, I_2/q_2, 0) \) is globally asymptotically stable.

**Proof.** We construct a Lyapunov function, as follows:

\[
V = \beta_1 \int_0^N \frac{s - N_0}{s} ds + \beta_2 \int_{P_0}^{P} \frac{s - P_0}{s} ds + A
\] (13)

In the model (1) without delays,

\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{dV}{dt} &= \beta_1 \frac{N - N_0 d N}{dt} + \beta_2 \frac{P - P_0 d P}{dt} + \frac{dA}{dt} \\
&= \beta_1 \frac{N - N_0}{N} (I_1 - q_1 N - \alpha_1 A)
\end{aligned}
\]

Obviously, \( dV/dt < 0 \) holds if \( m > (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \). Therefore, the extinction equilibrium \( E_0 = (N_0, P_0, 0) = (I_1/q_1, I_2/q_2, 0) \) is globally asymptotically stable when \( m > (\beta_1 \alpha_1 I_1/q_1) + (\beta_2 \alpha_2 I_2/q_2) \).

Then, we complete the proof.

### 3. Local Stability Analysis and the Hopf Bifurcation

In this section, we first state the following positive invariant theorem.

**Lemma 6.** All the solutions of model (1) with initial conditions that initiate in \( [R_+^n] \) are positive invariant.

**Proof.** We consider \( (N, P, A) \) a noncontinuable solution of model (1); see [46], defined on \([-\tau, B]\), where \( B \in (0, +\infty) \). Then we can use the method from [47] to prove that, for all \( t \in [0, B) \), \( N(t) > 0 \), \( P(t) > 0 \), and \( A(t) > 0 \). Suppose that is not true. Then, there exists \( 0 < T < B \) such that, for all \( t \in [0, T) \), \( N(t) > 0 \), \( P(t) > 0 \), and \( A(t) > 0 \) and either \( N(T) = 0 \), \( P(T) = 0 \), or \( A(T) = 0 \). According to Lemma 1, for all \( t \in [0, T) \), we have

\[
\begin{aligned}
N(t) &> N(0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^t (q_1 + \alpha_1 A) ds \right], \\
P(t) &> P(0) \exp \left[ - \int_0^t (q_2 + \alpha_2 A) ds \right], \\
A(t) &= A(0) \cdot \exp \left[ \int_0^t (\beta_1 \alpha_1 N (s - \tau_1) + \beta_2 \alpha_2 P (s - \tau_2) - m) ds \right].
\end{aligned}
\] (15) (16)
As \((N, P, A)\) is defined and continuous on \([-τ, T]\), there is a \(M \geq 0\) such that, for all \(t \in [-τ, T]\),
\[
N(t) > N(0) \exp \left[ -\int_0^t \left( q_1 + \alpha_1 A \right) ds \right] \\
\geq N(0) \exp (-TM),
\]
\[
P(t) > P(0) \exp \left[ -\int_0^t \left( q_2 + \alpha_2 A \right) ds \right] \\
\geq P(0) \exp (-TM)
\]
and
\[
A(t) = A(0) \exp \left[ \int_0^t \left( \beta_3 \alpha_1 N(s-τ_1) + \beta_2 \alpha_2 P(s-τ_2) - m \right) ds \right]
\]
\[
\geq A(0) \exp (-TM).
\]
Taking the limit, as \(t \to T\), we can get
\[
N(T) \geq N(0) \exp (-TM) > 0,
\]
\[
P(T) \geq P(0) \exp (-TM) > 0
\]
and
\[
A(T) \geq A(0) \exp (-TM) > 0,
\]
which contradicts the fact that either \(N(T) = 0\), \(P(T) = 0\), or \(A(T) = 0\). Thus, for all \(t \in [0, B]\), \(N(t) > 0\), \(P(t) > 0\), and \(A(t) > 0\).

Therefore, all the solutions of model (1) are positive invariant if the initial conditions initiate in \([R^*_1]\).

Then, we complete the proof. \(\square\)

Next, we will discuss the stability of the unique positive equilibrium and existence of Hopf bifurcation in model (1) for five different cases: \(τ_1 > 0\), \(τ_2 = 0\); \(τ_1 = 0\), \(τ_2 > 0\); \(τ_1 = τ_2 = τ\); \(τ_1 \in (0, τ_{10})\), \(τ_2 > 0\); \(τ_1 > 0\), \(τ_2 \in (τ_{20}, \infty)\).

According to Theorem 2, let \(u_1 = N(t) - N^*, u_2 = P(t) - P^*, u_3 = A(t) - A^*\); the linearized form of model (1) can be obtained as follows:
\[
\dot{u}_1 = a_{11} u_1 + a_{13} u_3
\]
\[
\dot{u}_2 = a_{22} u_2 + a_{23} u_3
\]
\[
\dot{u}_3 = a_{31} u_1 + a_{32} u_2
\]
where
\[
a_{11} = -q_1 - \alpha_1 A^*;
\]
\[
a_{13} = -\alpha_1 N^*;
\]
\[
a_{22} = -q_2 - \alpha_2 A^*;
\]
\[
a_{23} = -\alpha_2 P^*;
\]
\[
a_{31} = \beta_1 \alpha_1 A^*;
\]
\[
a_{32} = \beta_2 \alpha_2 A^*.
\]
Then, we obtain the associated characteristic equation of model (21) as follows:
\[
\lambda^3 + B\lambda^2 + C\lambda + D\lambda e^{-\lambda_1} + E e^{-\lambda_1} + F e^{-\lambda_2} + Ge^{-\lambda_2} = 0,
\]
where
\[
B = -(a_{11} + a_{22});
\]
\[
C = a_{11} a_{22};
\]
\[
D = -a_{13} a_{31};
\]
\[
E = a_{13} a_{31} a_{23};
\]
\[
F = -a_{23} a_{31} a_{23};
\]
\[
G = a_{11} a_{22} a_{31} a_{23}.
\]

Case I. \(τ_1 > 0\), \(τ_2 = 0\).
Due to \(τ_1 > 0\), \(τ_2 = 0\), (23) becomes
\[
\lambda^3 + B\lambda^2 + (C + F)\lambda + (D\lambda + E) e^{-\lambda_1} + G = 0.
\]
Assuming \(\lambda = iω_1(ω_1 > 0)\) is the pure imaginary root of (25), then the following can be obtained:
\[
-ω_1^3 + (C + F)ω_1 = E \sin(ω_1 τ_1) - Dω_1 \cos(ω_1 τ_1),
\]
\[
-Bω_1^2 + G = -E \cos(ω_1 τ_1) - Dω_1 \sin(ω_1 τ_1).
\]
Then
\[
ω_1^6 + \left( B^2 - 2(C + F) \right) ω_1^4
\]
\[
+ \left( (C + F)^2 - 2BG - D^2 \right) ω_1^2 + (C + F)^2 ω_1^2 - E^2 = 0.
\]

Now, we define a function as follows:
\[
f_1(ν_1) = ν_1^k + \left( B^2 - 2(C + F) \right) ν_1
\]
\[
+ \left( (C + F)^2 - 2BG - D^2 \right) ν_1 + G^2 - E^2.
\]

(i) If \((H_{21})G^2 - E^2 < 0\) holds, then, (28) has at least one positive root. Without loss of generality, we denote \(ν_{11}, ν_{12},\) and \(ν_{13}\) as the roots of (28); hence \(ω_{1k} = \sqrt{ν_{1k}}, \ k = 1, 2, 3,\) if \(ν_{1k} > 0\).

(ii) If \((H_{22})G^2 - E^2 > 0\) holds, let \(M_1 = B^2 - 2(C + F)\) and \(M_2 = (C + F)^2 - 2BG - D^2\). When \(Δ = M_1^2 - 3M_2 \leq 0\), then (28) has no positive roots. However, when \(Δ > 0\), \(f_1(ν_1) = 0\) has two real roots, denoted as
\[
ν_1^* = \frac{-M_1 + \sqrt{Δ}}{3},
\]
\[
ν_1^* = \frac{-M_1 - \sqrt{Δ}}{3}.
\]
Obviously, \( \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f_1(x) = +\infty \). If \((H_{22})\) and \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 > 0 \) holds, then \((28)\) has two positive real roots if and only if \( x_1^* > 0 \) and \( f_1(x_1^*) < 0 \). In addition, we denote two positive roots of \((28)\) as \( x_1 \) and \( x_2 \); then, \((27)\) has two positive roots, namely, \( \omega_{1a} = \sqrt{x_1} \) and \( \omega_{1b} = \sqrt{x_2} \). Furthermore, we can have the following results.

**Proposition 7.**

(i) If \((H_{21})\) holds, then \((28)\) has at least one positive root.

(ii) If \((H_{22})\) and \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 \leq 0 \) holds, then, \((28)\) has no positive root.

(iii) If \((H_{22})\) and \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 > 0 \) holds, then, \((28)\) has two positive roots if and only if \( x_1^* > 0 \), and \( f_1(x_1^*) < 0 \).

Then, according to \((26)\), the critical delay can be obtained as follows:

\[
\tau_{1p}^j = \frac{1}{\omega_{1p}} \left( \arccos \frac{\Delta w_{1p}^4 + (BE - (CD + DF)) w_{1p}^2 - EG}{D w_{1p}^2 + E^2} \right) + 2j\pi, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \quad p = 1, 2, 3, a, b
\]

**Case 2.** \( \tau_1 = 0, \tau_2 > 0 \).

Since \( \tau_1 = 0, \tau_2 > 0 \), \((23)\) becomes

\[
\lambda^3 + 3\lambda^2 \beta^2 + (C + D) \lambda + (F\lambda + G) e^{-\lambda \tau_2} + E = 0.
\]

Similar to Case 1, let \( \lambda = i\omega_2(\omega_2 > 0) \) be the pure imaginary root of \((34)\); then we obtain

\[
-\omega_2^3 + (C + D) \omega_2 = G \sin(\omega_2 \tau_2) - F\omega_2 \cos(\omega_2 \tau_2),
\]

\[
-\frac{\omega_2^6}{2} + E \cos(\omega_2 \tau_2) - F \omega_2 \sin(\omega_2 \tau_2).
\]

That is,

\[
\omega_2^6 + \left( (B^2 - 2(C + D)) \omega_2^4 \right) + \left( ((C + D)^2 - 2BE - F^2) \omega_2^2 + E^2 - G^2 \right) = 0.
\]

Letting \( v_2 = \omega_2^2 \), we define the following function:

\[
f_2(v_2) = v_2^2 + \left( (B^2 - 2(C + D)) \right) v_2^2 + \left( ((C + D)^2 - 2BE - F^2) \right) v_2 + E^2 - G^2.
\]

(i) If \((H_{31})\): \( E^2 - G^2 < 0 \) holds, then \((37)\) has at least one positive root. Without loss of generality, we denote \( v_{21}, v_{22}, v_{23} \) as the roots of \((37)\); then \( \omega_{2k} = \sqrt{v_{2k}}, \) \( k = 1, 2, 3, \) if \( v_{2k} > 0 \).

(ii) If \((H_{32})\): \( E^2 - G^2 > 0 \) holds, let \( M_1 = B^2 - 2(C + D) \) and \( M_2 = (C + D)^2 - 2BE - F^2 \). When \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 \leq 0 \), then \((37)\) has no positive roots. However, when \( \Delta > 0 \), \( f_2(v_2) = 0 \) has two real roots, denoted as

\[
x_1^{**} = -\frac{M_1 + \sqrt{\Delta}}{3},
\]

\[
x_2^{**} = -\frac{M_1 - \sqrt{\Delta}}{3}.
\]

Obviously, \( \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} f_2(x) = +\infty \). If \((H_{32})\) and \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 > 0 \) holds, then \((37)\) has two positive real roots if and only if \( x_1^{**} > 0 \) and \( f_2(x_2^{**}) < 0 \). In addition, we denote two positive roots of \((37)\) as \( x_1^{*} \) and \( x_2^{*} \); then \((36)\) has two positive roots, namely, \( \omega_{2a} = \sqrt{x_1^{*}} \) and \( \omega_{2b} = \sqrt{x_2^{*}} \). Furthermore, we can obtain the following results.

**Proposition 8.** For model (1) with \( \tau_1 > 0, \tau_2 = 0 \).

(i) If \((H_{31})\) and \((H_{32})\) both hold, then the positive equilibrium \( E_\ast \) is locally asymptotically stable for \( \tau_1 \in (0, \tau_{10}) \) and Hopf bifurcation occurs at \( \tau_1 = \tau_{10} \).

(ii) If \((H_{32})\) and \( \Delta = M_1^2 - 3M_2 \leq 0 \) holds, then, \((36)\) has no positive root.
(iii) If $(H_{32})$ and $Δ = M_1^2 - 3M_2 > 0$ holds, then (36) has two positive roots if and only if $x_1^{*+} > 0$ and $f_2(x_1^{*+}) < 0$.

Then the critical delay can be derived by (35):

$$
t^j_{1p} = \frac{1}{ω_{2p}} \left( \arccos \frac{D_0ω_p^4 + (B(E+CD+DF)ω_p^2 - EG)}{D^2ω_p^2 + E^2} + 2jπ \right), \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \quad p = 1, 2, 3, a, b \tag{39}$$

Let $τ_{20} = \min_{p=1,2,3\ldots} τ_{1p}^0$. Differentiating left side of (34) with respect to $τ_2$, we obtain

$$
\left( \frac{dλ}{dτ_2} \right)^{-1} = \frac{3λ^2 + 2Bλ + (C + D + Fe^{-τ_2})}{λ(FA + G) e^{-τ_2}} - \frac{τ_2}{λ} \tag{40}
$$

Hence, we obtain the following:

$$
Re \left( \frac{dλ}{dτ_2} \right)^{-1}_{λ=ω_{2τ}} = \frac{ω_{20}^2}{Δ} f_2^\prime (ω_{20}^2), \tag{41}
$$

where

$$Δ = \left( -Fω_{20}^2 cos (ω_{20}τ_2) + Gω_{20} sin (ω_{20}τ_2) \right)^2 \tag{42}$$

and

$$\left( dReλ/dτ_2 \right)^{-1}_{λ=ω_{2τ}} \neq 0 \hspace{1cm} \text{(ii) in Proposition 9 holds, then the positive equilibrium $E_*$ is locally asymptotically stable for all $τ_2 ≥ 0$}.$$

(iii) If (iii) in Proposition 9 holds, then there exists a non-negative integer $n$, such that the positive equilibrium $E_*$ is locally asymptotically stable whenever $τ_2 ∈ [0, τ_{20}^0) ∪ (τ_{21}^0, τ_{21}^0) ∪ \cdots (∩_n^0, τ_{2n}^0) ∪ (τ_{2n+1}^0, +∞)$ and is unstable whenever $τ_2 ∈ [τ_{20}^0, τ_{21}^0) ∪ (τ_{21}^0, τ_{22}^0) ∪ \cdots ∩_n^0, τ_{2n}^0) ∪ (τ_{2n+1}^0, +∞)$. Then, model (1) undergoes Hopf bifurcation around $E_*$ for every $τ_2 = τ_{20}^0$ and $τ_{2n}^0$, $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$.

Case 3. $τ_1 = τ_2 = τ$.

When $τ_1 = τ_2 = τ$, (23) becomes

$$λ^3 + Bλ^2 + CL + (D + F)λe^{-τ} + (E + G)e^{-τ} = 0. \tag{43}$$

Letting $λ = iω_3(ω_3 > 0)$ be the pure imaginary root of (43), then

$$-ω_3^6 + Cω_3 = (E + G) sin (ω_3τ) \tag{44}$$

$$-ω_3^6 + (B^2 - 2C)ω_3^2 + [C^2 - (D + F)^2]ω_3^2 - (E + G)^2 = 0. \tag{45}$$

Let $ν_3 = ω_3^2$ and define the following function:

$$f_3(ν_3) = ν_3^3 + (B^2 - 2C)ν_3^2 + [C^2 - (D + F)^2]ν_3^2 - (E + G)^2, \tag{46}$$

From (46), we can clearly see that $f_2(0) = -(E + G)^2 < 0$; hence (46) has at least one positive root. Without loss of generality, we denote $ν_{31}, ν_{32}$, and $ν_{33}$ as the roots of (46); then we have $ω_{3} = \sqrt[3]{ν_{3k}}, k = 1, 2, 3$, if $ν_{3k} > 0$ holds. Hence, the critical delay can be derived by (44):

$$τ_{3k}^j = \frac{1}{ω_{3k}} \left( \arccos \frac{(D + F) ω_{3}^4 + B(E + G)ω_{3}^2 - C(D + F)ω_{3}^2}{(D + F)^2 ω_{3}^2 + (E + G)^2} + 2πj \right), \quad (j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \quad k = 1, 2, 3) \tag{47}$$

where

$$Δ = \left( -(D + F) ω_{3}^2 cos (ω_{30}τ) \right.$$
If \((H_{41})\): \(f_1'\left(\omega_{\omega_0}^*\right) \neq 0\) holds, then \(\text{Re}(d\lambda/d\tau_2)^{-1}|_{\lambda=\omega_{\omega_0}^*} \neq 0\) is obtained; hence, we have the following result.

**Theorem 11.** For model (1), when \(\tau_1 = \tau_2 = \tau\), if \((H_{41})\) holds, then the positive equilibrium \(E_2\) is locally asymptotically stable for \(\tau \in (0, \tau_{30})\) and Hopf bifurcation occurs at \(\tau = \tau_{30}\).

**Case 4.** \(\tau_1 \in (0, \tau_{30}), \tau_2 > 0\).

Under this case, \(\tau_1\) is considered as a parameter. The same as Case 1, let \(\lambda = i\omega_{\omega_0}^*\) be the root of (23); then we have the following:

\[
R_{51} \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) - R_{52} \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) = R_{53},
\]

\[
R_{51} \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) + R_{52} \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) = R_{54},
\]

where

\[
R_{51} = F \omega_{\omega_0}^*;
\]

\[
R_{53} = \omega_{\omega_0}^{3} - C \omega_{\omega_0}^* - D \omega_{\omega_0}^* \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) + \varepsilon \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1);
\]

\[
R_{52} = G;
\]

\[
R_{54} = B \omega_{\omega_0}^{2} - D \omega_{\omega_0}^* \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) - E \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1).
\]

According to (51), the following holds:

\[
F_1 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) + F_2 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) + F_3 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) = 0,
\]

where

\[
F_1 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) = \omega_{\omega_0}^6 + (B^2 - 2C) \omega_{\omega_0}^4 + (C^2 + D^2 - F^2) \omega_{\omega_0}^2 + (E^2 - G^2),
\]

\[
F_2 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) = 2 (E - BD) \omega_{\omega_0}^3 - 2CE \omega_{\omega_0}^2,
\]

\[
F_3 (\omega_{\omega_0}^*) = -2D \omega_{\omega_0}^4 + 2 (CD - BE) \omega_{\omega_0}^2.
\]

Assuming \((H_{52})\); (53) has finite positive root and denoting as \(\omega_{2k}^*\), \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, l_1\), then the critical value can be represented as follows:

\[
\omega_{2k}^* = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\omega_{2k}^*}} \left(\arccos \left(\frac{R_{51} \cdot R_{53} + R_{52} \cdot R_{54}}{R_{51}^2 + R_{52}^2}\right) + 2\pi j\right),
\]

\[(j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots; k = 1, 2, \ldots, l_1).
\]

Let \(\omega_{2k}^{* (0)} = \min \omega_{2k}^*\). Differentiating left side of (23) with respect to \(\tau_2\), the following is obtained:

\[
\left(\frac{d\lambda}{d\tau_2}\right)^{-1} = \frac{3\lambda^2 + 2B\lambda + C + (D - D\lambda \tau_1 - \tau_1 E) e^{-\lambda_\tau_1} + Fe^{-\lambda_\tau_2}}{\lambda (F\lambda + G) e^{-\lambda_\tau_2}} - \frac{\tau_2}{\lambda},
\]

and then, we have

\[
\text{Re} \left(\frac{d\lambda}{d\tau_2}\right)^{-1} = \frac{F_{51} F_{53} + F_{54} F_{52}}{F_{51}^2 + F_{52}^2},
\]

where

\[
F_{51} = -F \omega_{20}^{* 2} \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) + G \omega_{\omega_0}^* \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2),
\]

\[
F_{52} = G \omega_{\omega_0}^* \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2) + F \omega_{20}^{* 2} \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2),
\]

\[
F_{53} = -3 \omega_{20}^{* 2} + C + D \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) - \tau_1 E \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1),
\]

\[
- \tau_1 D \omega_{20}^* \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) + F \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2),
\]

\[
F_{54} = 2 \omega_{20}^{* 2} - D \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) + \tau_1 E \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1),
\]

\[
- \tau_1 D \omega_{20}^* \cos (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_1) - F \sin (\omega_{\omega_0}^* \tau_2).
\]

Supposing \((H_{52})\): \(F_{51} F_{53} + F_{54} F_{52} \neq 0\), then we have the following.

**Theorem 12.** For model (1), when \(\tau_1 \in (0, \tau_{30})\) and \(\tau_2 > 0\), if both \(H_{51}\) and \(H_{52}\) hold, then the positive equilibrium \(E_2\) is locally asymptotically stable for \(\tau_2 \in (0, \tau_{20})\) and Hopf bifurcation occurs at \(\tau_2 = \tau_{20}\).

**Case 5.** \(\tau_1 > 0, \tau_2 \in (0, \tau_{20})\).

Since \(\tau_1 > 0, \tau_2 \in (0, \tau_{20})\), we consider \(\tau_1\) as a parameter. The same as Case 4, letting \(\lambda = i\omega_{\omega_1}^*\) be the root of (23), we obtain:

\[
R_{61} \cos (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_1) - R_{62} \sin (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_1) = R_{63},
\]

\[
R_{61} \sin (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_1) + R_{62} \cos (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_1) = R_{64},
\]

where

\[
R_{61} = D \omega_{\omega_1}^*;
\]

\[
R_{63} = \omega_{\omega_1}^{3} - C \omega_{\omega_1}^* - F \omega_{\omega_1}^* \cos (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2) + G \sin (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2);
\]

\[
R_{62} = E;
\]

\[
R_{64} = B \omega_{\omega_1}^{2} - F \omega_{\omega_1}^* \sin (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2) - G \cos (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2).
\]

According to (59), the following holds:

\[
G_1 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) + G_2 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) \sin (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2) + G_3 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) \cos (\omega_{\omega_1}^* \tau_2)
\]

\[
= 0,
\]

where

\[
G_1 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) = \omega_{\omega_1}^{6} + (B^2 - 2C) \omega_{\omega_1}^4 + (C^2 + D^2 - F^2) \omega_{\omega_1}^2 + (E^2 - G^2),
\]

\[
G_2 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) = 2 (G - BF) \omega_{\omega_1}^{3} - 2CE \omega_{\omega_1},
\]

\[
G_3 (\omega_{\omega_1}^*) = -2F \omega_{\omega_1}^{4} + 2 (CF - BG) \omega_{\omega_1}^2.
\]
Supposing \((H_{61})\): (61) has finite positive root \(\omega^*_{2k}, (k = 1, 2, \ldots, l_2)\), then we obtain

\[
\tau^*_{ik} = \frac{1}{\omega^*_{ik}} \left( \arccos \left( \frac{R_{61} \cdot R_{63} + R_{62} \cdot R_{64}}{R_{61}^2 + R_{62}^2} \right) + 2\pi j \right),
\]

(j = 0, 1, 2; \(k = 1, 2, \ldots, l_2\)).

Assuming \(\tau^*_{10} = \min \tau^*_{ik} (0), (k = 1, 2, \ldots, l_2)\) and differentiating left side of (23) with respect to \(\tau_1\), therefore, the following is obtained:

\[
\left( \frac{d\lambda}{d\tau_1} \right)^{-1} = \frac{3\lambda^2 + 2B\lambda + C + (F - F\lambda r_2 - r_2 G) e^{\lambda r_2} + D e^{-\lambda r_2}}{\lambda (F\lambda + G) e^{-\lambda r_2}} - \frac{\tau_1}{\lambda},
\]

Hence, we have

\[
\text{Re} \left( \frac{d\lambda}{d\tau_1} \right)_{\lambda = \omega^*_{13}} = \frac{F_{61} F_{63} + F_{64} F_{62}}{F_{61} + F_{62}}.
\]

where

\[
F_{61} = -D\omega^*_{10}^2 \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}) + E \omega^*_{10} \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}),
\]

\[
F_{62} = E \omega^*_{10} \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}) + D \omega^*_{10}^2 \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}),
\]

\[
F_{63} = -3\omega^*_{10}^2 + C + D \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}) - r_2 G \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2)
- r_2 F\omega^*_{10} \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2) + F \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2),
\]

\[
F_{64} = 2B\omega^*_{10} - D \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau^*_{10}) + r_2 G \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2)
- r_2 F\omega^*_{10} \cos (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2) - F \sin (\omega^*_{10} \tau_2),
\]

Supposing \((H_{62})\): \(F_{61} F_{63} + F_{64} F_{62} \neq 0\) holds, then we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 13.** For model (1), when \(\tau_1 > 0\) and \(\tau_2 \in (0, \tau_{20})\), if both \(H_{61}\) and \(H_{62}\) hold, then the positive equilibrium \(E_\ast\) is locally asymptotically stable for \(\tau_1 \in (0, \tau_{10})\) and Hopf bifurcation occurs at \(\tau_1 = \tau_{10}\).

4. Properties of Periodic Solution

In this section, we will discuss the direction of Hopf bifurcation and the stability of the bifurcating periodic solutions under Case 4 by using normal form method and center manifold theorem [43], and methods of other four cases are similar to Case 4. Assuming \(\tau_1 \in (0, \tau_{10}), \tau_{20} > \tau_1\), and Hopf bifurcation occurs at \((N^*, P^*, A^*)\) in model (1) when \(\tau = \tau_{20}\).

Let \(\tau_2 = \tau^*_{20} + \mu, t = \tau \tau_2, x(\tau_2) = \tilde{x}(s), y(\tau_2) = \tilde{y}(s),\) and \(z = (\tau_2) = \tilde{z}(s),\) and we also denote \(\tilde{x}(s), \tilde{y}(s),\) and \(\tilde{z}(s)\)

as \(x(s), y(s),\) and \(z(s).\) Then, model (1) could be rewritten as follows in \(C = C([-1, 0), R^3)\):

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

where \(u(t) = (x(t), y(t), z(t))^T \in R^3,\) \(L_\mu (\phi) : C \rightarrow R^3\) and \(f(\mu, u(t))\) are given as follows:

\[
L_\mu (\phi) = (r^*_{20} + \mu) \left( A\phi(0) + B\phi \left( -\frac{\tau_1}{\tau^*_{20}} \right) + C\phi(-1) \right),
\]

\[
f(\mu, \phi) = (r^*_{20} + \mu) \left( f_1, f_2, f_3 \right)^T,
\]

where

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix}
    a_{11} & 0 & a_{13} \\
    0 & a_{22} & a_{23} \\
    0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
B = \begin{pmatrix}
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    a_{31} & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
C = \begin{pmatrix}
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & a_{32} & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
f_1 = -\alpha_1 \phi_1 (0) \phi_1 (0),
\]

\[
f_2 = -\alpha_2 \phi_2 (0) \phi_3 (0),
\]

\[
f_3 = \beta_1 \alpha_1 \phi_1 \left( -\frac{\tau_1}{\tau^*_{20}} \right) \phi_3 (0) + \beta_2 \alpha_2 \phi_2 (-1) \phi_3 (0).
\]

According to the Riesz representation theorem, we know that there exists a function \(\eta(\theta, \mu)\) of bounded variation for \(\theta \in [-1, 0]\) such that \(L_\mu \phi = \int_{-1}^{0} d\eta(\theta, \mu)\phi(\theta)\), for all \(\phi \in C([-1, 0), R^3)\). Choosing

\[
\eta(\theta, \mu) = \begin{cases}
    (r^*_{20} + \mu) (A + B + C), & \theta = 0 \\
    (r^*_{20} + \mu) (B + C), & \theta \in \left[-\frac{\tau_1}{\tau^*_{20}}, 0\right) \\
    (r^*_{20} + \mu) C, & \theta \in \left(-1, -\frac{\tau_1}{\tau^*_{20}}\right) \\
    0, & \theta = -1
\end{cases}
\]
For $\phi \in C^1([-1, 0], R^2)$, we define
\[
A(\mu) \phi = \begin{cases} 
\frac{d\phi}{d\theta}, & \theta \in [-1, 0) \\
0, & \theta = 0 
\end{cases},
\]
and
\[
R(\mu) \phi = \begin{cases} 
0, & \theta \in [-1, 0) \\
f(\mu, \phi), & \theta = 0 
\end{cases}.
\] (71)

Then, model (1) can be rewritten as
\[
\dot{u}(t) = A(\mu) u_t + R(\mu) u_t. \quad (72)
\]

For $\psi \in C^1([0,1], (R^3)^*)$, the adjoint operator $A^*$ of $A$ is defined as follows:
\[
A^* \psi(s) = \begin{cases} 
-\frac{d\psi(s)}{ds}, & s \in (0, 1], \\
-1, & d\eta^T(t, 0) \psi(-t), \ s = 0.
\end{cases}
\] (73)

Associated with a bilinear inner product
\[
\langle \psi(s), \phi(\theta) \rangle = \overline{\psi(0)} \phi(0) - \int_0^\theta \overline{\psi(\xi - \theta)} \phi(\xi) d\xi, \quad (74)
\]
where $\eta(\theta) = \eta(\theta, 0)$ and we know that $\pm i \omega_0^* r_{20}$ are the eigenvalues of $A(0)$ and $A^*(0)$.

Choose $q(\theta) = (1, q_2, q_3)^T e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20} \theta}$ to be the eigenvector of $A(0)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $i \omega_0^* r_{20}$ and $q^*(s) = D(1, q_2^*, q_3^*) e^{k_0^* r_{20} s}$ to be the eigenvector of $A^*(0)$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $-i \omega_0^* r_{20}$. By computation, we obtain
\[
q_2 = \frac{a_{23} (\omega_0^* - a_{11})}{a_{13} (\omega_0^* - a_{22})};
q_3 = \frac{i \omega_0^* - a_{11}}{a_{13}};
q_2^* = \frac{a_{32} e^{i \omega_0^* r_2} (a_{11} + i \omega_0^*)}{a_{31} e^{i \omega_0^* r_{12}} (a_{22} + i \omega_0^*)};
q_3^* = \frac{- (a_{11} + i \omega_0^*)}{a_{31} e^{i \omega_0^* r_{12}}}. \quad (75)
\]

Besides, from (74) we have
\[
D = \frac{1}{1 + q_2 q_2^* + q_3 q_3^*} = \frac{1}{1 + q_2 q_2^* + q_3 q_3^* + q_3 a_{31} r_{12} e^{-i \omega_0^* r_2} + q_2 q_3 a_{32} r_{20} e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20}}}.
\] (76)

such that $\langle q^*(s), q(\theta) \rangle = 1$ and $\langle q^*(s), \overline{q}(\theta) \rangle = 0$.

Then, according to [44], we obtain the following relevant parameter, which helps to determine the direction and stability of Hopf bifurcation:
\[
g_{20} = 2 D_{r_{20}}^* \left(- \alpha_1 q_3 - \alpha_2 q_2 q_3 + \beta_1 \alpha_1 q_3 q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* r_1} + \beta_2 \alpha_2 q_2 q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* r_{20}} \right),
\]
\[
g_{11} = D_{r_{12}}^* \left[- \alpha_1 (q_3 + q_3^*) - \alpha_2 q_3 q_3^* + q_3^* \right]
+ \beta_1 \alpha_1 q_3 \left(q_3^* e^{-i \omega_0^* r_{12}} + q_3 q_3^* e^{i \omega_0^* r_{12}} \right),
\]
\[
g_{02} = 2 D_{r_{20}}^* \left(- \alpha_1 q_3 - \alpha_2 q_2 q_3 + \beta_1 \alpha_1 q_3 q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* r_1} + \beta_2 \alpha_2 q_2 q_3 e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20}} \right),
\]
\[
g_{21} = 2 D_{r_{20}}^* \left[- \alpha_1 W_{11}^{(0)}(0) + \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) \right]
+ \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) q_3 W_{11}^{(1)}(0) + \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) q_3 W_{11}^{(2)}(0)
+ \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) e^{i \omega_0^* r_1} + W_{11}^{(1)}(0) e^{-i \omega_0^* r_1}
+ \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) \left(q_{11} W_{11}^{(1)}(-1) + \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(-1) \right)
+ \frac{1}{2} W_{20}^{(3)}(0) e^{i \omega_0^* r_1} + W_{11}^{(1)}(0) e^{-i \omega_0^* r_1}
\] (77)
\[
W_{20}(\theta) = \frac{i g_{20} q(0)}{\omega_2 r_{20}^2} + \frac{q_{31}}{3 \omega_2 r_{20}^2} = \frac{i g_{20} q(0) e^{-i \omega_0^* r_{20}}}{\omega_2 r_{20}^2} + \frac{q_{31}}{3 \omega_2 r_{20}^2} e^{-i \omega_0^* r_{20}}
+ E_1 e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20}},
\]
\[
W_{11}(\theta) = \frac{-i g_{11} q(0)}{\omega_2 r_{20}^2} + \frac{q_{31}}{3 \omega_2 r_{20}^2} = \frac{-i g_{11} q(0) e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20}}}{\omega_2 r_{20}^2} + \frac{q_{31}}{3 \omega_2 r_{20}^2} e^{i \omega_0^* r_{20}}
+ E_2,
\] (78)

where $E_1$ and $E_2$ can be determined by the following, respectively:
\[
E_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 i \omega_2^* - a_{11} & 0 & - a_{13} \\ 0 & 2 i \omega_2^* - a_{22} & - a_{23} \\ - a_{11} e^{-2 i \omega_2^* r_{20}} & - a_{22} e^{-2 i \omega_2^* r_{20}} & 2 i \omega_2^* \end{pmatrix}.
\]
\[
E_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 i \omega_2^* - a_{11} & 0 & - a_{13} \\ 0 & 2 i \omega_2^* - a_{22} & - a_{23} \\ - a_{11} e^{-2 i \omega_2^* r_{20}} & - a_{22} e^{-2 i \omega_2^* r_{20}} & 2 i \omega_2^* \end{pmatrix}.
\]


\[ a_{11} \\ a_{12} \\ a_{13} \) · \( E_2 = - \begin{pmatrix} K_{12} \\ K_{22} \\ K_{32} \end{pmatrix}, \]

(79)

where

\[ K_{11} = -\alpha_1 q_3; \]
\[ K_{21} = -\alpha_2 q_2 q_3; \]
\[ K_{31} = \beta_1 \alpha_1 q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* \tau_1}; \]
\[ K_{12} = -\alpha_1 \left( q_3 + \frac{q_3}{\tau} \right); \]
\[ K_{22} = -\alpha_2 \left( q_2 q_3 + \frac{q_2}{\tau} \right); \]
\[ K_{32} = \beta_1 \alpha_1 \left( q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* \tau_1} + \frac{q_3}{\tau} e^{-i \omega_0^* \tau_1} \right) + \beta_2 \alpha_2 \left( \frac{q_2 q_3 e^{-i \omega_0^* \tau_2}}{\tau} + \frac{q_2}{\tau} e^{-i \omega_0^* \tau_2} \right). \]

Then, we can compute the following values:

\[ c_1(0) = \frac{i}{2} \left( -2g_1^1 - \frac{|b_2|^2}{3} + \frac{g_21}{2} \right), \]
\[ \mu = \frac{-\text{Re}(c_1(0))}{\text{Re}(\lambda'(\tau_2^*))}, \]
\[ \beta = 2 \text{Re}(c_1(0)) \],
\[ T = -\frac{\text{Im}(c_1(0)) + \mu \text{Im}(\lambda'(\tau_2^*))}{\omega_0^* \tau_2^*}. \]

This determines the properties of bifurcating periodic solutions and the Hopf bifurcation at \( \tau = \tau_2^* \). That is,

(i) \( \mu \) determines the direction of the Hopf bifurcation. Specifically, when \( \mu > 0 \) (negative), the Hopf bifurcation is supercritical (subcritical).

(ii) \( \beta \) determines the stability of the bifurcating periodic solutions; when \( \beta < 0 \) (positive), the bifurcating periodic solution is stable (unstable).

(iii) \( T \) determines the period of the bifurcating periodic solutions; when \( T > 0 \) (negative), the period of bifurcating periodic solution increases (decrease).

5. Numerical Simulations

Due to the complexity of model (1), we perform some numerical simulations in this section to investigate further how the delay influences dynamics in model (1). The following parameter values are used \( I_1 = I_2 = 0.5, q_1 = q_2 = 0.001, \quad \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0.08, \beta_1 = 0.3, \) and \( m = 0.8 \). Other parameters are chosen as control parameters.

According to the standard linear analysis, when \( \tau_2 \) is equal to zero, the analysis reveals that the \( \beta_2 - \tau_2 \) parameter plane is divided into four parts (see Figure 1(a)). In Figure 1(a), before \( \beta_2 \) reaching black dashed line, there exists \( \tau_{10} \) in model (1) such that the unique positive equilibrium loses its stability when the condition, \( \tau_1 > \tau_{10} \), holds. When the locus of \( \beta_2 \) is between black dashed line and green dashed line, the stability switches for positive equilibrium do not exist although (28) has two positive roots, which means that there exists \( \tau_{10} \) in model (1) such that the unique positive equilibrium loses its stability when the condition, \( \tau_1 > \tau_{10} \), holds. However, the stability switches for positive equilibrium emerge when \( \beta_2 \) is beyond green dashed line but it does not reach blue zone. When the locus of \( \beta_2 \) is in blue zone, the unique positive equilibrium is always stable, which suggests that \( \tau_1 \) cannot influence the stability of the positive equilibrium. When \( \tau_1 \) equals zero, the similar results for \( \beta_2 - \tau_2 \) parameter plane are shown in Figure 1(b), but the sequence is reversed. Additionally, according to results in Section 4, we calculate the values of \( \mu, \beta, \) and \( T \) at \( \tau_1 = \tau_{10} \) with \( \beta_2 \in (0, 0.3) \), and the corresponding results are shown in Figure 1(c), where we can find that the Hopf bifurcation is supercritical and the bifurcating periodic solutions are stable; especially, the period of the bifurcating periodic solutions increases as \( \beta_2 \) increases. For other cases of \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \), the same procedures with respect to calculations of \( \mu, \beta, \) and \( T \) can be performed like Figure 1(c).

As examples corresponding to stability of the positive equilibrium with \( \beta_2 = 0.2 \), taken \( \tau_1 = 1 \) and \( \tau_2 = 3 \) in Figure 1(a), respectively, the corresponding numerical solutions are shown in Figure 2. Obviously, the positive equilibrium is stable when \( \tau_1 = 1 \) is below \( \tau_{10} \) (see Figure 2(a)). In contrast, due to \( \beta_2 = 0.2 \), a periodic solution exists (see Figure 2(b)). Furthermore, set \( \beta_2 = 0.7 \), then we have \( \tau_{10} = 4.9050 < \tau_{10} = 19.0615 < \tau_{10} = 38.6683 \). Taken \( \tau_1 = 4, \tau_1 = 18 \) and \( \tau_2 = 21 \) in Figure 1(a), respectively, the corresponding numerical solutions are shown in Figure 3. Obviously, the positive equilibrium is stable when \( \tau_1 = 4 \) and \( \tau_2 = 21 \) (see Figures 3(a) and 3(c)), but the positive equilibrium is unstable when \( \tau_1 = 18 \) (see Figure 3(b)), which means that the positive equilibrium can gain its stability again for \( \tau_1 > \tau_{10} \). In Figure 3, the same initial values are applied, and other parameter values except for \( \tau_2 \) are also identical. Clearly, the delay is the principal factor giving rise to the difference among (a), (b), and (c).

Numerical solutions in Figure 3 suggest that the stability switches induced by delay may exist. Hence, the bifurcation diagram in \( \tau_1 - \tau_2 \) parameter plane is given (see Figure 4(a)). For case \( \tau_2 = 0 \), there exists a \( \tau_1^* \), such that the positive equilibrium with respect to \( \tau_1^* \) is stable. For case \( \tau_1 = 0 \), there exists a \( \tau_2^* \) such that the positive equilibrium with respect to \( \tau_2^* \) is stable. Additionally, when \( \tau_2 = (0, \tau_2^*) \), Figure 4(a) shows that \( \tau_{10} \) exists such that the positive equilibrium with respect to \( \tau_1^* \) is stable. Likewise, when \( \tau_1 = (0, \tau_1^*) \), Figure 4(a) also display that \( \tau_{10} \) exists such that the positive equilibrium with respect to \( \tau_2^* \) is stable.
Figure 1: (a) Bifurcation diagram with $\tau_2 = 0$ corresponding to $\tau_1$ V.S. $\beta_2$, where solid, dashed, dash-dot, and dotted curves represent the critical values of $\tau_1$ in (30) for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, respectively, and the green dashed line denotes $\beta_2 = 0.417238$. (b) Bifurcation diagram with $\tau_1 = 0$ corresponding to $\tau_2$ V.S. $\beta_2$, where solid, dashed, dash-dot, and dotted curves represent the critical values of $\tau_2$ in (39) for $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, respectively, and the green dashed line denotes $\beta_2 = 0.21$. (c) Examples for $\mu$, $\beta$, and $T$ at $\tau_1 = \tau_10$ with respect to $\beta_2$, where $\tau_2 = 0$.

Figure 2: Numerical solutions of model (1) with $\tau_2 = 0$ and $\beta_2 = 0.2$, (a) $\tau_1 = 1$; (b) $\tau_1 = 3$.

Figure 3: Numerical solutions of model (1) with $\tau_2 = 0$ and $\beta_2 = 0.7$, (a) $\tau_1 = 4$; (b) $\tau_1 = 18$ (c) $\tau_1 = 21$. 
(0, \tau_{20}) is stable. Significantly, Figure 4(a) demonstrates that the stability switches for positive equilibrium with respect to \tau_1 emerge when \tau_2 below \tau_2^* is fixed.

Figure 4(b) depicts the dependence of stability of positive equilibrium on delay \tau_2 in the fully nonlinear regime for \tau_1 in sequence [0, 2, 10, 30] and \tau_1 = \tau_2, which is consistent with results in Figure 4(a). However, when \tau_2 is fixed, Figure 4(c) shows that the stability switches emerge with \tau_1 increases. Especially, periodic-2 solutions exist for some values of \tau_2 (see magenta zone in Figure 4(c)). As an example of periodic-2 solution existence, taking \tau_1 = 41, a phase and a time-series are given in the inner of Figure 4(c). Moreover, Figure 4(d) shows that there exist periodic-3 solutions in model (1). According to results in Section 2, the positive equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable in the model (1) without delay if it exists. Obviously, the results shown in Figure 4 are induced by delay.

In Figure 4(a), we can find that the number of intervals corresponding to stability of positive equilibrium for small values of \tau_2 equals 3. However, when \tau_2 is beyond dashed line (\tau_2^*), the number of intervals is 2. So the number of intervals for stability switches may be different for diverse \tau_2. Accordingly, we calculate the number of intervals with respect to parameter \beta_2, as shown in Figure 5(a). Figure 5(b) shows that there exist 3 stable intervals when \beta_2 = 0.7 and \tau_2 = 2, which is an example of Figure 5(a). Evidently, parameter \beta_2 can remarkably influence the number of intervals for stability of positive equilibrium.

**Figure 4:** (a) Bifurcation diagram with \beta_2 = 0.7 for \tau_1 V.S. \tau_2, where the symbol “S” denotes stable and the symbol “US” denotes unstable; (b) bifurcation diagram with \beta_2 = 0.7 for the effect of \tau_1 on nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics, where dashed line denotes unstable; solid line denotes stable; the green solid square is Hopf bifurcation point, dot-dashed line corresponding to \tau_1^* in (a), blue line represents equilibrium, and red line represents amplitude of periodic solutions. (c) Bifurcation diagram with \beta_2 = 0.7 and \tau_2 = 1, where the yellow solid square is Hopf bifurcation point, the blue solid circle is bifurcation point for periodic-2 solution, the magenta zone indicates the existence of periodic-2 solutions, and the cyan solid diamond denotes the value of \tau_1 for a phase and a time-series in the inner of (c). (d) A periodic-3 solution for phytoplankton population, where \beta_2 = 0.7, \tau_1 = 100, and \tau_2 = 2.
6. Conclusions

In this paper we proposed a nitrogen-phosphorus-phytoplankton model with multiple delays. The analysis focused on the effect of delay on nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics. In the absence of delay, theoretical analysis indicated that the unique positive equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable in model (1) if it exists. Deng et al. [48] also studied a nitrogen-phosphorus-phytoplankton model without delay, where Holling II function was employed to describe the nutrient uptake dynamics of phytoplankton. Although the function modelling the nutrient uptake dynamics of phytoplankton is different, they get the same results. These results mean that the nutrient-phytoplankton ecosystem will approach the stable equilibrium. However, it has been reported [18] that a constant population density may not exist because of the existence of some factors including noise, interval factors, and physical factors. And ecological studies [49, 50] also criticized this idea of “the balance of nature.” Actually, the existence of nutrient-plankton oscillations has been detected by laboratory experiments and field observation [19, 20]. Additionally, Benincà et al. [49] present the first experimental demonstration of chaos in a long-term experiment with a complex food web, where the food web was consisted of bacteria, several phytoplankton species, herbivorous and predatory zooplankton species, and detritivores. And they also find that the community moved back and forth between stabilizing and chaotic dynamics during the cyclic succession, and their findings provide a field demonstration of nonequilibrium coexistence of competing species through a cyclic succession at the edge of chaos [50]. These reports support that the nonequilibrium dynamics, such as oscillations and chaos, can exist in reality.

In the present paper, we find that the unique positive equilibrium may lose its stability via Hopf bifurcation when delay appears, and then a periodic solution emerges, which means that nutrient-phytoplankton oscillation occurs. Obviously, the factor giving rise to nutrient-phytoplankton oscillation is delay in our studies. And the period and the stability of the bifurcating periodic solutions with respect to delay are discussed by using center manifold argument and normal form theory. In fact, instability induced by delay in nutrient-plankton model has been studied widely, and many studies indicate that the equilibrium is always unstable when delay is beyond a critical value [25, 29, 51, 52]. Yet, it should be emphasized in the present paper that the stability switches induced by delay can occur under some conditions.

Moreover, numerical simulations showed how the delay influences nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics. Numerical results for model (1) in the fully nonlinear regime are consistent with the linear analysis. In numerical simulations, we found that delay indeed gives rise to the emergence of stability switches for the positive equilibrium. Yet, the numerical results show that the parameter intervals for stability switches may depend on other parameters as well, e.g., $\beta_2$. Additionally, numerical results also indicated that periodic-2 solutions and periodic-3 solutions can emerge under some conditions for delay, which means that complex dynamics induced by delay exist in model (1). From biological viewpoint, the existence of periodic solutions implies that the fluctuations exist in density of phytoplankton population; that is, nutrient-phytoplankton oscillation emerges. Especially, by Li and York’s theory, periodic-3 solution implies chaos, which means that chaotic density fluctuations can display a variety of different periodicities and the long-term prediction of phytoplankton density can be fundamentally impossible. The chaotic density fluctuations do not contribute to the control of phytoplankton bloom. Consequently, the importance of the present paper is not the precision with which it predicts specific events for
phytoplankton blooms but its contribution to the studies on how the delay influences nutrient-phytoplankton dynamics.
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