



Research article

A reaction-diffusion predator-prey model with pursuit, evasion, and nonlocal sensing

Paulo Amorim^{1,*}, Bruno Telch¹ and Luis M. Villada²

¹ Instituto de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Av. Athos da Silveira Ramos 149, Centro de Tecnologia - Bloco C, Cidade Universitária - Ilha do Fundão, Caixa Postal 68530, 21941-909 Rio de Janeiro, RJ - Brasil

² GIMNAP-Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad del Bío-Bío, Casilla 5-C, Concepción, Chile and CI2MA, Universidad de Concepción, Casilla 160-C, Concepción, Chile

* **Correspondence:** Email: paulo@im.ufrj.br.

Abstract: In this paper, we propose and analyze a reaction-diffusion model for predator-prey interaction, featuring both prey and predator taxis mediated by nonlocal sensing. Both predator and prey densities are governed by parabolic equations. The prey and predator detect each other indirectly by means of odor or visibility fields, modeled by elliptic equations. We provide uniform estimates in Lebesgue spaces which lead to boundedness and the global well-posedness for the system. Numerical experiments are presented and discussed, allowing us to showcase the dynamical properties of the solutions.

Keywords: mathematical biology; predator-prey; mechanistic models; reaction-diffusion equations; numerical simulations; ecology; chemotaxis; animal movement

1. Introduction

The mathematical modeling of predator-prey interactions has a long and rich history. The basic dynamics are given by the system of Lotka–Volterra (here in nondimensional form)

$$\begin{cases} u' = \alpha uw - u \\ w' = \beta w(1 - w - u), \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $u(t) \geq 0$ represents the predator and $w(t) \geq 0$ the prey at time $t \geq 0$. According to system (1.1), the predator population decreases exponentially in the absence of prey, while the prey follows a logistic growth law. Interactions between predators and prey are modeled by a mass-action law benefitting the

predator and depleting the prey. The system's main feature is the global asymptotic stability of its only nontrivial steady state $(u, w) = (\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha})$, which, for $\alpha > 1$, expresses a balance between predation, prey reproduction, and predators' natural death rate.

When spatial movement is expected to influence the dynamics, it is natural to consider predator and prey densities $u(t, x)$ and $w(t, x)$ depending on a spatial variable x in some physical domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, one can introduce spatial diffusion and advection to model foraging movement, the spreading of the population in a territory, and/or movement in a preferred direction.

In particular, besides spatial diffusion, a reasonable assumption is that the prey tries to evade the predator, while the predator tries to chase the prey. This can be modeled by introducing advection terms into the equations. Thus, the predators advect towards regions of higher prey density, while prey advects away from regions of higher predator density. Variants of this idea have been considered, for instance, in [1–14].

Recently, indirect prey- and predator-taxis have been introduced as a mechanism allowing pursuit and evasion [3, 4, 10, 15]. This supposes that the advection velocities are mediated by some indirect signal, which may be an odor, a chemical, a field of visual detection, or seen as a potential. In this spirit, following [3, 4, 10, 15], we consider the predator-prey system with pursuit, evasion and non-local sensing (already written in a non-dimensional form)

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \nabla \cdot (u \nabla p) = \alpha uw - u \\ \partial_t w - D_w \Delta w - \nabla \cdot (w \nabla q) = \beta w(1 - w - u) \\ - D_p \Delta p = \delta_w w - \delta_p p \\ - D_q \Delta q = \delta_u u - \delta_q q, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

for $t > 0$, x in a bounded, open $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, supplemented with boundary conditions

$$\nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n} = \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{n} = \nabla p \cdot \mathbf{n} = \nabla q \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0 \quad \text{in } \partial\Omega \quad (1.3)$$

and initial data $u_0(x), w_0(x)$. Here, $u(t, x)$ is the predator density, $w(t, x)$ is the prey density, $p(t, x)$ is the odor produced by the prey, $q(t, x)$ is the odor produced by the predator, and $\alpha, \beta, D_w, D_p, D_q, \delta_p, \delta_q$ are non-negative non-dimensional constants — see the Appendix for the physical meaning of the constants and details on the non-dimensionalisation procedure. System (1.2) states that the predator is attracted to the odor p of the prey w , which solves a (steady-state) diffusion equation with source proportional to w , while the prey is repelled by the odor q produced by the predator.

Notice that the equations for the odors of the prey and predator are elliptic, rather than parabolic. This is justified in cases where the diffusion of the odor happens in a much faster time scale than the movement of individuals, which is reasonable on a variety of ecological settings.

Note also that we refer to p and q as “odors” but these quantities do not necessarily model chemical odors. They may be more generally interpreted as potentials representing the chance of an animal being detected at a distance by, e.g., visual means.

We remark on the Neumann boundary conditions (1.3). They model the fact that in the time evolution of system (1.2) there is no flow of individuals across the border of the physical domain. Depending on the particular application, this may be a natural assumption, modeling for instance an enclosed area. However, different boundary conditions could be envisaged (e.g., Dirichlet or mixed-type) reflecting distinct natural settings. Here we limit ourselves to the analysis with (1.3).

Still, in the numerical experiments presented below, we show an example with Dirichlet boundary conditions.

1.1. Main contributions and outline of the paper

In light of the recent mathematical results in [4, 15], our main contributions are the introduction of the predator-prey Lotka-Volterra dynamics and the numerical simulations. As we will see, the interaction terms on the right-hand side make the analysis more involved, in particular with respect to the derivation of L^∞ estimates. Indeed, while it is shown in the above-mentioned works that the system with no population or interaction dynamics does not originate finite time blow-up of the solutions, the predator equation dynamics introduces a quadratic term uw so it is not obvious that the boundedness property remains valid. We shall see that the attractive-repulsive nature of the advection terms continues to ensure boundedness of the solutions. Moreover, the property of instantaneous boundedness of the solution even for unbounded initial data, observed already in [4], remains valid in this setting.

An outline of the paper follows. In Section 2, we present our main well-posedness result. Next, in Section 3 we derive our main *a priori* estimates in L^γ spaces, for $\gamma \in [1, \infty]$. This will allow us, in Section 4, to construct strong and then weak solutions to the system (1.2), completing the proof of our well-posedness result. Finally, in Section 5 we detail an implicit-explicit two-step finite volume method for the approximation of system (1.2) and present some numerical experiments.

2. Main Results

The main results of this paper are concerned with the well-posedness and Lebesgue integrability of weak solutions of the system (1.2). We follow a strategy similar to [4, 16], making use of fine *a priori* estimates in Lebesgue spaces, and a De Giorgi level-set method [17] to obtain boundedness of the solutions. Still, the character of the present system introduces several changes in the analysis with respect to the results in [4, 16].

The system (1.2) is, mathematically, of chemotaxis type [18, 19]. As is well known, such systems may exhibit blow-up of solutions in finite time, see for example the review [20]. Therefore, it is not obvious at first glance whether solutions might also possess blow-up behavior. As we shall see in the following analysis, the indirect nature of the sensing, as well as the attraction-repulsion behavior, prevent the densities from becoming infinite in finite time.

We say that the quadruple (u, w, p, q) is a weak solution of the system (1.2) if it satisfies:

1. $(u, w) \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$ and $(\partial_t u, \partial_t w) \in L^2(0, T, [H^1(\Omega)]^*)$, and
2. For any test function $\xi \in C^\infty([0, \infty) \times \Omega)$ compactly supported in $[0, T) \times \bar{\Omega}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^T \int_\Omega (-u \partial_t \xi + (\nabla u - u \nabla p) \cdot \nabla \xi)(t, x) \, dx \, dt \\ & \quad = \int_\Omega u_0(x) \xi(0, x) \, dx + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (uw - u) \xi(t, x) \, dx \, dt, \\ & \int_0^T \int_\Omega (-w \partial_t \xi + (\nabla w + w \nabla q) \cdot \nabla \xi)(t, x) \, dx \, dt \end{aligned}$$

$$= \int_{\Omega} w_0(x) \xi(0, x) dx + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} w(1 - w - u) \xi(t, x) dx dt,$$

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla q \cdot \nabla \xi dx = \int_{\Omega} (u - q) \xi(t, x) dx$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla p \cdot \nabla \xi dx = \int_{\Omega} (w - p) \xi(t, x) dx.$$

Note that while the biologically relevant regime is when $\alpha > 1$, the value of $\alpha > 0$ does not change the results, so we present most of our analysis with α , as well as all the remaining constants in system (1.2), set to 1.

We will suppose throughout the paper that the initial data (u_0, w_0) is non-negative and has finite mass

$$\int_{\Omega} u_0 + w_0 dx = \mathcal{M} < \infty.$$

and that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain of class C^2 . The main results regarding the system (1.2) are collected here:

Theorem 2.1. *Let the initial data u_0, w_0 be in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$ for some $\alpha > 2$. Then, the system (1.2) has a unique non-negative weak solution. The following estimates are satisfied by the solutions for any $0 \leq t \leq T < \infty$,*

(i) *For any $\gamma \in [1, \alpha]$, it holds*

$$\|u(t)\|_\alpha + \|w(t)\|_\alpha \leq C(\alpha, \mathcal{M}, \|u_0\|_\alpha, \|w_0\|_\alpha).$$

In particular, if $u_0, w_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\mathcal{M}, \|u_0\|_\infty, \|w_0\|_\infty).$$

(ii) *L^γ -integrability: for any $\gamma \in (\alpha, \infty]$, it holds*

$$\|u(t)\|_\gamma + \|w(t)\|_\gamma \leq C(\gamma, \mathcal{M}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1/2\gamma}} \right).$$

In particular, we have the L^∞ -integrability property

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right).$$

for some C independent of $t > 0$.

3. Analysis of the system (1.2)

In this section we provide *a priori* estimates which will be used in the well-posedness results. To establish the existence of a weak solution, we must first prove that strong, or classical, solutions exist. We say that (u, w, p, q) is a classical solution of the system (1.2) if it satisfies:

1. $(u, w, p, q) \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega))$ and each of the terms in the system (1.2) are well defined functions in $L^2((0, T) \times \Omega)$,
2. The equations on (1.2) are satisfied almost everywhere, and
3. The initial data $(u, w)|_{t=0} = (u_0, w_0)$ and boundary conditions (1.3) are satisfied almost everywhere.

An essential feature of solutions of (1.2) is the following mass estimate:

Proposition 3.1 (Mass estimate). *Let (u, w, p, q) be sufficiently smooth non-negative solutions of the system (1.2) with the boundary conditions (1.3). Then there exists a constant \mathcal{M} depending on $\|u_0\|_1$, $\|w_0\|_1$, α , β and $|\Omega|$, but not on t , such that for all $t > 0$,*

$$\int_{\Omega} w(t) + u(t) dx \leq \mathcal{M}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. Integrating the first and second equations of (1.2) and using the Neumann boundary conditions (1.3), we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} u dx \leq \beta \int_{\Omega} w dx - \beta \int_{\Omega} w^2 dx - \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \int_{\Omega} u dx.$$

From $\beta(w - w^2) \leq \frac{(\beta+1)^2}{4\beta} - w$ we get, with $\zeta(t) := \int_{\Omega} w + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} u dx$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \zeta(t) + \zeta(t) \leq C|\Omega| \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{d}{dt} (e^t \zeta(t)) \leq e^t C|\Omega| \quad \Rightarrow \quad \zeta(t) \leq e^{-t} \zeta(0) + (1 - e^{-t}) C|\Omega|.$$

The conclusion of the proposition readily follows. □

3.1. A priori estimates in L^γ

In this section we prove that data $(u_0, w_0) \in L^1(\Omega)$ generate instantaneous L^γ -integrability, with $\gamma > 1$, for classical non-negative solutions of (1.2).

Proposition 3.2 (A priori estimates in L^γ). *Let (u, w, p, q) be sufficiently smooth nonnegative solutions of the system (1.2) with boundary condition (1.3) and integrable initial data, and let $t > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, for any $\gamma \in (1, \infty)$, $\epsilon > 0$, we have the estimate*

$$\|u(t)\|_\gamma + \|w(t)\|_\gamma \leq C(\gamma, \mathcal{M}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/\gamma') + \epsilon}} \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Moreover, if $u_0, w_0 \in L^\gamma(\Omega)$, then actually

$$\|u(t)\|_\gamma + \|w(t)\|_\gamma \leq C(\gamma, \mathcal{M}, \|u_0\|_\gamma, \|w_0\|_\gamma), \quad (3.3)$$

for some $C > 0$ depending on \mathcal{M} and L^γ -norms of the data, but independent of t .

Proof. We will frequently use the Gagliardo–Nirenberg–Sobolev (GNS) inequality in two dimensions (see e.g. [21]), holding for any $\alpha \geq 1$,

$$\int_{\Omega} \xi^{\alpha+1} dx \leq C(\Omega, \alpha) \|\xi\|_1 \|\xi^{\alpha/2}\|_{H^1}^2 \leq C(\Omega, \alpha) \int_{\Omega} \xi dx \left(\int_{\Omega} \xi^{\alpha} dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(\xi^{\alpha/2})|^2 dx \right), \quad (3.4)$$

as well as the interpolation inequality

$$\|u\|_{\gamma} \leq \|u\|_1^{1-\theta} \|u\|_{\gamma+1}^{\theta}, \quad \theta = \frac{\gamma^2-1}{\gamma^2} \in (0, 1). \quad (3.5)$$

We start by multiplying the second equation of (1.2) by $w^{\gamma-1}$ and integrating, to find (discarding a nonpositive term)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} \nabla q \cdot \nabla(w^{\gamma}) dx + (\gamma-1) \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma-2} |\nabla w|^2 dx \\ \leq \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx - \int_{\Omega} u w^{\gamma} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Now multiply the fourth equation of (1.2) by w^{γ} and integrate by parts to get

$$- \int_{\Omega} \nabla q \cdot \nabla(w^{\gamma}) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} q w^{\gamma} dx. \quad (3.6)$$

Also using

$$\int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma-2} |\nabla w|^2 dx = 4 \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{\gamma/2}|^2 dx,$$

we find, discarding nonpositive terms,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + 4 \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{\gamma/2}|^2 dx \leq \gamma \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + (\gamma-1) \int_{\Omega} q w^{\gamma} dx \quad (3.7)$$

Let us consider the terms on the right-hand side of the previous inequality. Take a small $\epsilon > 0$ to be specified later. We use the following consequence of Young's inequality, $q w^{\gamma} \leq \epsilon w^{\gamma+1} + \epsilon^{-\gamma} q^{\gamma+1}$, and also the inequality

$$\int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx \leq C \|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\frac{\gamma^2-1}{\gamma}} \leq C + \epsilon \|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\gamma+1},$$

which is obtained from Young's inequality, the mass estimate (3.1), and the interpolation inequality (3.5). Therefore, for some constant C depending on γ , \mathcal{M} , and ϵ ,

$$\gamma \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + (\gamma-1) \int_{\Omega} q w^{\gamma} dx \leq C + C\epsilon \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx.$$

This way, we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + 4 \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w^{\gamma/2}|^2 dx \leq C + C\epsilon \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx$$

and from the GNS inequality (3.4) and ϵ sufficiently small,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx \leq C + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx.$$

Again, from $\int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx \leq C + \epsilon \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx \leq C + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx. \quad (3.8)$$

for some C depending on γ , \mathcal{M} , the GNS constant, and the parameters of the system.

To deal with the last term on the right-hand side of (3.8), multiply the fourth equation of (1.2) by $q^{\gamma-1}$ to get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla q^{\gamma/2}|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} u q^{\gamma-1} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma} dx.$$

From the GNS inequality (3.4) we deduce that

$$\int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx + C \epsilon \int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx + C.$$

Choosing ϵ small, we find

$$\int_{\Omega} q^{\gamma+1} dx \leq C \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx + C. \quad (3.9)$$

In view of (3.9), the estimate (3.8) becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} dx + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} dx \leq C + C \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx. \quad (3.10)$$

Note that the gain from w being the prey population, and thus having a repulsive behavior, is reflected in the lower power u^{γ} .

In contrast, performing very similar computations using the first and third equations of the system (1.2), so that instead of (3.6) only

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla p \cdot \nabla(u^{\gamma}) dx \leq \int_{\Omega} w u^{\gamma} dx.$$

is valid, we find that for $\alpha \geq 2$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha} dx + C \int_{\Omega} u^{\alpha+1} dx \leq C + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\alpha+1} dx. \quad (3.11)$$

Adding (3.10) and (3.11) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma} + u^{\alpha} dx + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\gamma+1} + u^{\alpha+1} dx \leq C|\Omega| + C \int_{\Omega} w^{\alpha+1} + \int_{\Omega} u^{\gamma} dx.$$

It is clear that to conveniently bound the terms on the right-hand side using the left-hand side, we should take $\alpha < \gamma < \alpha + 1$.

Now, we make use of the interpolation inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{\gamma} &\leq \|u\|_1^{1-\theta_1} \|u\|_{\alpha+1}^{\theta_1}, & \theta_1 &= \frac{(\gamma-1)(\alpha+1)}{\gamma\alpha} \in (0, 1), \\ \|w\|_{\alpha+1} &\leq \|w\|_1^{1-\theta_2} \|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\theta_2}, & \theta_2 &= \frac{\alpha(\gamma+1)}{\gamma(\alpha+1)} \in (0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the mass estimate (3.1), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|w\|_\gamma^\gamma + \|u\|_\alpha^\alpha) + C(\|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\gamma+1} + \|u\|_{\alpha+1}^{\alpha+1}) \leq C + C(\|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\theta_2(\alpha+1)} + \|u\|_{\alpha+1}^{\theta_1\gamma}),$$

for C depending on γ, α , and \mathcal{M} . Now, $\theta_2(\alpha + 1) < \gamma + 1$ and $\theta_1\gamma < \alpha + 1$, so using Young's inequality with a sufficiently small ϵ allows the terms on the right-hand side to be absorbed into the left-hand side. This gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|w\|_\gamma^\gamma + \|u\|_\alpha^\alpha) + C(\|w\|_{\gamma+1}^{\gamma+1} + \|u\|_{\alpha+1}^{\alpha+1}) \leq C$$

for C depending on γ, α , and \mathcal{M} . Next, use the inequality (3.5) to find

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\|w\|_\gamma^\gamma + \|u\|_\alpha^\alpha) + C((\|w\|_\gamma^\gamma)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} + (\|u\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}) \leq C$$

and so, from $(\|u\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \leq (\|u\|_\alpha^\alpha)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}}$ and convexity of the power function, we find, setting

$$\eta(t) := \|w\|_\gamma^\gamma + \|u\|_\alpha^\alpha,$$

that

$$\eta'(t) + C\eta(t)^{\frac{\gamma}{\gamma-1}} \leq C.$$

Now use the ODE comparison result from [16, Corollary A.2] to conclude

$$\eta(t) \leq C(1 + t^{1-\gamma}).$$

In view of the definition of η , one finds

$$\|w\|_\gamma \leq C(1 + t^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}}) = C\left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1/\gamma'}}\right)$$

and, taking $\gamma = \alpha + \epsilon$,

$$\|u\|_\alpha \leq C(1 + t^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\alpha}}) = C\left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/\alpha')+\epsilon}}\right),$$

for C depending on γ, α , and \mathcal{M} . This proves the estimate (3.2). The uniform estimate (3.3) follows from the afore-mentioned ODE comparison results in [16]. This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.2. \square

3.2. L^∞ estimates

In this section we prove two boundedness results adopting De Giorgi's energy method (see [17] and [4, 16, 22–24] for related applications of the method). Throughout this section, we will use the notation γ^+ to denote an arbitrary fixed number in $(\gamma, +\infty)$.

First, we consider initial data u_0 and w_0 only in $L^1(\Omega)$, and obtain an estimate of the type

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\mathcal{M})\left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1^+}}\right), \quad (3.12)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on \mathcal{M} , but not on $T > 0$. Then, we will suppose that the initial data u_0 and w_0 are in $L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then we can upgrade the estimates above to

$$\max\{\|u(t)\|_\infty, \|w(t)\|_\infty\} \leq C(\mathcal{M}, \|u_0\|_\infty, \|w_0\|_\infty), \quad t \geq 0,$$

where C now depends also on the L^∞ norms of initial data.

To further clarify the notation, let us spell out that, for instance, the estimate (3.12) precisely means that for any $\epsilon > 0$, it holds

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\mathcal{M}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1+\epsilon}}\right),$$

with a constant C that may, however, depend on ϵ .

3.2.1. Initial data in L^1

The main result in this section is the following:

Proposition 3.3. *Let (u, w, p, q) be a sufficiently smooth non-negative solution of the system (1.2) with boundary conditions (1.3) and integrable, nonnegative initial data, and let $T > 0$ be arbitrary. Then, for all $t \in (0, T]$, we have the estimate*

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\mathcal{M}) \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1+}}\right),$$

where the constant C is independent of $T > 0$.

Let us begin by recording here the following L^∞ estimates, which are a consequence of elliptic regularity for the last two equations of the system (1.2) and Proposition 3.2.

$$\|\nabla p(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\Omega) \|p(t)\|_{W^{2,2^+}} \leq C(\Omega) \|u(t)\|_{2^+} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/2)^+}}\right), \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$\|\nabla q(t)\|_\infty \leq C(\Omega) \|q(t)\|_{W^{2,2^+}} \leq C(\Omega) \|w(t)\|_{2^+} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/2)^+}}\right). \quad (3.14)$$

The first step in the proof of Proposition 3.3 is a boundedness result valid on each interval (t_*, T) with $t_* > 0$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let (u, w, p, q) be as in Proposition 3.3, and let $t_* > 0$. Then, there exist constants $M, N > 0$ depending on t_*, T , and $u(t_*), w(t_*)$ such that $0 \leq u(t, x) \leq M$ and $0 \leq w(t, x) \leq N$ almost everywhere on $(t_*, T) \times \Omega$.*

Proof. Although the structure of the proof is the similar to corresponding results in [4, 16], we show the details since the rather involved calculations depend heavily on the structure of the system. Consider (u, p) a non-negative, sufficiently smooth solution to the general problem

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \nabla \cdot (u \nabla p) &= f \\ -\Delta p &= w - p \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

in $[0, T] \times \Omega$ with the boundary conditions

$$\nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = \nabla p \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad (3.16)$$

where \mathbf{n} is the outward unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$, f and w are known, and w satisfies

$$\|w(t)\|_\gamma \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/\gamma)^+}} \right), \quad \gamma > 1.$$

Similarly, take a non-negative solution (w, q) to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t w - \Delta w - \nabla \cdot (w \nabla q) &= g \\ -\Delta q &= w - q \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

$[0, T] \times \Omega$ with boundary conditions

$$\nabla w \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = \nabla q \cdot \mathbf{n}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \quad (3.18)$$

g and u given and u satisfying

$$\|u(t)\|_\gamma \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/\gamma)^+}} \right), \quad \gamma > 1.$$

We denote $V_\lambda = \{(t, x) \in \Omega \times [0, T], u(t, x) > \lambda\}$ and define

$$u_\lambda = (u - \lambda) \mathbf{1}_{V_\lambda}.$$

Multiplying the first equation of (3.15) by u_λ , integrating in space and using (3.16), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega u_\lambda^2 dx + 2 \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx \leq -2 \int_\Omega u \nabla p \cdot \nabla u_\lambda dx + 2 \int_\Omega f_+ u_\lambda dx.$$

For the first term on the right-hand side note that using Young's inequality, we find

$$-2 \int_\Omega u \nabla p \cdot \nabla u_\lambda dx \leq \int_\Omega |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_\lambda} dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega u_\lambda^2 dx + \int_\Omega |\nabla u_\lambda|^2 dx \leq \int_\Omega |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_\lambda} dx + 2 \int_\Omega f_+ u_\lambda dx. \quad (3.19)$$

Let $M > 0$ be a constant to be defined later, let $t_* > 0$, and set

$$\lambda_k = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \right) M, \quad t_k = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{k+1}} \right) t_*$$

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Define the energy functional

$$U_k := \sup_{t \in [t_k, T]} \int_\Omega u_k^2 dx + \int_{t_k}^T \int_\Omega |\nabla u_k|^2 dx dt, \quad (3.20)$$

where we use the notation $u_k = u_{\lambda_k}$. Similarly, we define for w the energy functional

$$W_k := \sup_{t \in [t_k, T]} \int_{\Omega} w_k^2(t) \, dx + \int_{t_k}^T |\nabla w_k|^2 \, dx \, dt \quad (3.21)$$

with the same definitions of λ_k (with N instead M) and t_k , for some $N > 0$ to be chosen later.

With $\lambda = \lambda_k$ on (3.19), integrating over $[s, t]$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u_k^2(t) \, dx + \int_s^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^2 \, dx \, ds &\leq \int_{\Omega} u_k^2(s) \, dx + \int_s^t \int_{\Omega} |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_k} \, dx \, dt \\ &\quad + 2 \int_s^t \int_{\Omega} f_+ u_k \, dx \, ds. \end{aligned}$$

We use this relation with $t_{k-1} \leq s \leq t_k \leq t \leq T$ to check that

$$\frac{U_k}{2} \leq \int_{\Omega} u_k^2(s) \, dx + \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_k} \, dx \, dt + 2 \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} f_+ u_k \, dx \, dt.$$

Integrating with respect to s over $[t_{k-1}, t_k]$, bearing in mind that $t_k - t_{k-1} = t_*/2^k$ and only the first term on the right-hand side of this inequality depends on s , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_k &\leq \frac{2^{k+1}}{t_*} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} u_k^2(s) \, dx \, ds + 2 \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_k} \, dx \, dt + 4 \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} f_+ u_k \, dx \, dt \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are going to introduce a series of estimates for I_1 , I_2 and I_3 . For this, we will use the Gagliardo-Nirenberg interpolation inequality in \mathbb{R}^n (see e.g. [25]) and a key estimate for $\mathbf{1}_{V_k}$. Note that we are temporarily performing the analysis in n dimensions. We have

$$\|u\|_p^p \leq C \|u\|_{H^1}^{\alpha p} \|u\|_2^{(1-\alpha)p} \quad \text{with} \quad 1 = \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}\right) \alpha p + \frac{1-\alpha}{2} p. \quad (3.22)$$

which holds for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Choosing the parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ such that $\alpha p = 2$, it follows that $p = 2 \frac{n+2}{n}$ and

$$\|u\|_p^p \leq C \|u\|_{H^1}^2 \|u\|_2^{p-2}. \quad (3.23)$$

Observe also that $u_k > 0$ implies $u > \lambda_k$, therefore $u - \lambda_{k-1} > \lambda_k - \lambda_{k-1} = \frac{M}{2^k}$. We also have $u - \lambda_k < u - \lambda_{k-1}$, thus, which a simple computation,

$$\mathbf{1}_{V_k} \leq \left(\frac{2^k}{M} u_{k-1}\right)^a. \quad (3.24)$$

holds for all $a \geq 0$.

- Estimate for I_1

First, note that for $a \geq 0$ we have

$$I_1 = \frac{2^{k+1}}{t_*} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} u_k^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_k} dx ds \leq \frac{2^{k+1}}{t_*} \frac{2^{ka}}{M^a} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} u_{k-1}^{2+a} dx ds.$$

We choose a in (3.24) such that $2 + a = p = 2\frac{n+2}{n}$, so $a = \frac{4}{n}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\leq 2 \frac{2^{\frac{4+n}{n}k}}{M^{\frac{4}{n}} t_*} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} u_{k-1}^{2\frac{n+2}{n}} dx ds \\ &\leq 2C(\Omega, n) \frac{2^{\frac{4+n}{n}k}}{M^{\frac{4}{n}} t_*} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T (\|u_{k-1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_{k-1}\|_2^2) \|u_{k-1}\|_2^{2\frac{n+2}{n}-2} ds \\ &\leq 2C(\Omega, n) \frac{2^{\frac{4+n}{n}k}}{M^{\frac{4}{n}} t_*} U_{k-1}^{\frac{n+2}{n}-1} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T (\|u_{k-1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_{k-1}\|_2^2) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\int_{t_{k-1}}^T (\|u_{k-1}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla u_{k-1}\|_2^2) ds \leq (T+1)U_{k-1}$, which leads to

$$I_1 \leq C(1+T) \frac{2^{\frac{4+n}{n}k}}{M^{\frac{4}{n}} t_*} U_{k-1}^{\frac{n+2}{n}}. \quad (3.25)$$

- Estimate for I_2

We have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= 2 \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \int_{\Omega} |u \nabla p|^2 \mathbf{1}_{V_k} dx dt \\ &\leq \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{V_k} dx \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now, choosing $a = p$ in (3.24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \left[\int_{\Omega} \mathbf{1}_{V_k} dx \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} dt &\leq \frac{2^{\frac{pk}{q}}}{M^{\frac{p}{q}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \left[\int_{\Omega} u_{k-1}^p dx \right]^{\frac{1}{q}} dt \\ &\stackrel{(3.23)}{\leq} C \frac{2^{\frac{pk}{q}}}{M^{\frac{p}{q}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \|u_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^{\frac{p}{q}\alpha} \|u_{k-1}\|_2^{(1-\alpha)\frac{p}{q}} dt, \end{aligned}$$

where we need $q > 1$. Thus,

$$I_2 \leq C \frac{2^{\frac{pk}{q}}}{M^{\frac{p}{q}}} \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \|u_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^{\frac{p}{q}\alpha} \|u_{k-1}\|_2^{(1-\alpha)\frac{p}{q}} dt,$$

where we used (3.23) with the relation (3.22). We choose $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ satisfying $\frac{\alpha p}{q} = 2$ to find

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{p}{2q} - \frac{2}{n} \quad \Rightarrow \quad p = 2 \left(\frac{n+2q}{n} \right).$$

Observe that $\alpha = \frac{2q}{p}$ implies $\alpha = \frac{qn}{n+2q}$, then

$$0 < \alpha < 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \leq 2 \leq \frac{p}{q} \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 < 2q < 2\left(\frac{n+2q}{n}\right),$$

where q is such that $1 < q < \frac{n}{n-2}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\leq C \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \right) \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \|u_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^2 \|u_{k-1}\|_2^{\frac{2}{\alpha}-2} dt \\ &\leq C \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \right) (1+T) U_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

where in this last step we proceeded as in the estimate for I_1 . Therefore

$$I_2 \leq C(1+T) \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \right) U_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \quad (3.26)$$

- Estimates for I_3

Proceeding as we did for the estimate of I_2 , using that $u_k \leq u \mathbf{1}_{V_k}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &\stackrel{a=p}{\leq} 4 \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|f_+ u\|_{q'} \right) \frac{2^{\frac{kp}{q}}}{M^{\frac{p}{q}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \|u_{k-1}\|_{\frac{p}{q}}^{\frac{p}{q}} ds \\ &\leq C \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|f_+ u\|_{q'} \right) \frac{2^{\frac{kp}{q}}}{M^{\frac{p}{q}}} \int_{t_{k-1}}^T \|u_{k-1}\|_{H^1}^{\frac{p\alpha}{q}} \|u_{k-1}\|_2^{(1-\alpha)\frac{p}{q}} ds \\ &\leq C \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|f_+ u\|_{q'} \right) \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} (1+T) U_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}, \end{aligned}$$

where α , p and q are the same of the estimate for I_2 . Since $\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|f_+ u\|_{q'} \leq \sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \{\|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'}\}$, we find

$$I_3 \leq C(1+T) \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'} \right) \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} U_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}. \quad (3.27)$$

Combining (3.25), (3.26) e (3.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U_k &\leq C(1+T) \times \\ &\times \left[\frac{2^{\frac{4+n}{n}k}}{M^{\frac{4}{n}t_*}} U_{k-1}^{\frac{n+2}{n}} + \frac{2^{\frac{2k}{\alpha}}}{M^{\frac{2}{\alpha}}} \left(\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 + \sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \{\|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'}\} \right) U_{k-1}^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.28)$$

Now we are going to restrict our reasoning to the case $n = 2$, where we have $\alpha = \frac{q}{q+1}$ and the advantage that we can take $1 < q < \infty$, since $1 < q < \frac{n}{n-2} = \infty$. Using Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\|u \nabla p\|_{2q'}^2 \leq \|\nabla p\|_{\infty}^2 \|u\|_{2q'}^2 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}} \right).$$

Likewise,

$$\|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'} \leq C \|f_+\|_{2q'} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\left(\frac{q+1}{2q}\right)^+}}\right) \quad (3.29)$$

and particularizing to $f_+ = uw$,

$$\|f_+\|_{2q'} = \left(\int_{\Omega} [uw]^{2q'} dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2q'}} \leq \|u\|_{4q'} \|w\|_{4q'} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\left(\frac{3q+1}{2q}\right)^+}}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \left\{ \|\nabla p\|_{\infty}^2 \|u\|_{2q'}^2 + \|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'} \right\} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \quad (3.30)$$

Now, substituting these results in (3.28), we obtain

$$U_k \leq C(1+T) \left[\frac{2^{3k}}{M^2 t_*^2} U_{k-1}^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \frac{2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}k}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} U_{k-1}^{\frac{q+1}{q}} \right]. \quad (3.31)$$

We are going to prove that there exists a constant $a \in (0, 1)$ depending only on q such that $U_k \leq a^k U_0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. First, set $V_k = a^k U_0$. Then applying the recurrence relation defined by the right-hand side of (3.31) to V_k gives

$$\begin{aligned} & C(1+T) \left[\frac{2^{3k}}{M^2 t_*^2} V_{k-1}^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \frac{2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}k}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} V_{k-1}^{\frac{q+1}{q}} \right] \\ &= C(1+T) \left[\frac{(2^3 a)^k}{M^2 t_*^2 a^2} U_0 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \frac{(2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{1}{q}})^k}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{q+1}{q}}} U_0^{\frac{1}{q}} \right] V_k. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Now we choose a such that $\max\{2^3 a, 2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{1}{q}}\} < 1$. So, the last line of (3.32) is bounded by

$$(3.32) \leq C(1+T) \left[\frac{U_0}{M^2 t_*^2 a^2} + \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \frac{U_0^{\frac{1}{q}}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{q+1}{q}}} \right] V_k.$$

Now, choosing M so that

$$\max \left\{ \frac{C U_0}{a^2 M^2 t_*^2}, \frac{C U_0^{\frac{1}{q}}}{a^{\frac{q+1}{q}} M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}}\right) \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2C(1+T)},$$

we find that

$$(3.32) \leq V_k.$$

In other words, V_k is a supersolution of the recurrence relation defined by (3.31). By a comparison principle, we have $U_k \leq a^k U_0 \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow +\infty} 0$. Thus, we obtain

$$\int_{t_*/2}^T \int_{\Omega} u^2(t, x) \mathbf{1}_{\{u(t,x) \geq M(1-1/2^k)\}} dx dt \leq U_k \xrightarrow{k \rightarrow +\infty} 0.$$

Fatou's lemma implies

$$\frac{1}{T - t_*/2} \int_{t_*/2}^T \int_{\Omega} u^2(t, x) \mathbf{1}_{\{u(t,x) \geq M\}} dx dt = 0,$$

which in turn implies $0 \leq u(t, x) \leq M$ almost everywhere on $(t_*/2, T) \times \Omega$. For $t_*/2 < 1$ we can determine M explicitly via

$$M = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2C(1+T)U_0}{a^2 t_*}}, \sqrt{\frac{(2C(1+T))^{\frac{q}{q+1}} U_0^{\frac{1}{q+1}}}{a}} \frac{2}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{2(q+1)}\right)^+}} \right\}.$$

Taking $q \searrow 1$, we have

$$M = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2C(1+T)U_0}{a^2 t_*}}, \sqrt{\frac{(2C(1+T))^{\frac{1}{2}} U_0^{\frac{1}{2}}}{a}} \frac{2}{t_*^{(3/4)^+}} \right\}, \quad (3.33)$$

A very similar computation using (3.17), (3.21), particularizing to $g_+ = w$ gives

$$W_k \leq C(1+T) \left[\frac{2^{3k}}{N^2 t_*} W_{k-1}^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{\left(\frac{2q+1}{q}\right)^+}} \right) \frac{2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}k}}{N^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} W_{k-1}^{\frac{q+1}{q}} \right].$$

Then, we obtain $N > 0$ as before so that $0 \leq w(t, x) \leq N$ almost everywhere on $(t_*/2, T) \times \Omega$ and when $0 < t_*/2 < 1$, N can be estimated by

$$N = \max \left\{ \sqrt{\frac{2C(1+T)W_0}{a^2 t_*}}, \sqrt{\frac{(2C(1+T))^{\frac{1}{2}} W_0^{\frac{q}{2}}}{a}} \frac{2}{t_*^{(3/4)^+}} \right\}. \quad (3.34)$$

Renaming $t_*/2$ as t_* concludes the proof of Lemma 3.4. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.3. In Lemma 3.4 we found $M, N > 0$ such that $0 \leq u(t, x) \leq M$ and $0 \leq w(t, x) \leq N$ almost everywhere on $(t_*, T) \times \Omega$. From (3.33) and (3.34) we see that M and N depend directly on U_0 and W_0 , respectively. First, we are going to obtain appropriate estimates for these terms, from which the L^∞ -bound for w and u in the time interval $(t_*, 1)$ follows. After this, we will extend the estimate for general large intervals. Proceeding as we did in (3.19) for the particular case $f_+ = uw$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 dx &\leq 2 \int_{\Omega} u \nabla u \nabla p dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} f_+ u dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} \nabla u^2 \nabla p dx + 2 \int_{\Omega} u^2 w dx \\ &\leq 3 \int_{\Omega} u^2 w dx, \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

where, in the last step, we used

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u^2 \nabla p dx \leq \int_{\Omega} u^2 w dx - \int_{\Omega} p u^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} u^2 w dx,$$

which follows from the first equation of (3.15). Observe that

$$\int_{\Omega} u^2 w \, dx \leq \|u\|_3^3 + \|w\|_3^3 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^2}\right).$$

Substituting this in (3.35), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u|^2 \, dx \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^2}\right). \quad (3.36)$$

Integrating over $[s, t]$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u^2(t) \, dx + \int_s^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u(t')|^2 \, dx \, dt' &\leq \int_{\Omega} u^2(s) \, dx + C \int_s^t \left(1 + \frac{1}{t'^{2+}}\right) \, dt' \\ &\leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{s^{1+}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that from this inequality we conclude

$$U_0 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{1+}}\right).$$

Now, via (3.33), using the estimates made previously, we get for $t \geq t_*$

$$\|u(t)\|_{\infty} \leq M \leq \frac{C}{t_*^{1+}} \quad (3.37)$$

where we remember that $0 < t_* < 1$. For W_0 , a similar computation with (3.17) and particularizing $g = w$ leads to

$$W_0 \leq C(T + 1) \left(1 + \frac{1}{t_*^{1+}}\right).$$

Now, via (3.34), we conclude for $t \geq t_*$

$$\|w(t)\|_{\infty} \leq N \leq \frac{C}{t_*^{1+}}, \quad (3.38)$$

where we recall that $0 < t_* < 1$.

These estimates are valid whenever $0 < t_* \leq t \leq T = 1$, but the same reasoning can be applied for any $T > 0$ and it would provide a bound depending on T . In order to justify that the same L^{∞} -estimate can be made uniform with respect to T , we proceed by extending this estimate in a similar way as was done in [16]: let $t_1 \in (t_*, T - t_*)$ and note that the shifted functions $w_{t_1}(t, x) = w(t + t_1, x)$ and $u_{t_1}(t, x) = u(t + t_1, x)$ are still solutions of the same problem with initial data $w_{t_1}(0, x) = w(t_1, x)$ and $u_{t_1}(0, x) = u(t_1, x)$, and the appropriate right-hand side. Since the constant C doesn't change due to the Proposition 3.1, we pick $t_1 \in (0, T)$ and repeat the same arguments to w_{t_1} and u_{t_1} , which leads the same L^{∞} -bounds (3.37) and (3.38) for w and u on the interval $[t_*, T]$. It means that (3.37) and (3.38) happen for $[t_* + t_1, T + t_1]$, that is, we extend (3.37) and (3.38) over $[t_*, T + t_1]$. We can repeat this procedure, completing the proof of Proposition 3.3. \square

3.2.2. Initial data in L^α , $\alpha > 2$

We suppose now we have initial data u_0 and w_0 in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$, for some $\alpha > 2$. We will slightly modify the previous analysis in order to obtain better versions of the estimates in Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, as well as a uniform estimate in L^∞ in the case of bounded initial data.

Proposition 3.5. *Let u_0 and w_0 be initial data in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$, for some $\alpha \in (2, \infty]$. The estimates (3.2) of Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 can be upgraded by adding to the constant C the dependence of L^α -norms on the initial data: for any $\gamma > \alpha$, we have*

$$\|u(t)\|_\gamma + \|w(t)\|_\gamma \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{1/2\gamma'}} \right). \quad (3.39)$$

and, in particular,

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty + \|w(t)\|_\infty \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right). \quad (3.40)$$

If $u_0, w_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, then we have the uniform estimate

$$\max\{\|u(t)\|_\infty, \|w(t)\|_\infty\} \leq C(\mathcal{M}, \|u_0\|_\infty, \|w_0\|_\infty), \quad t \geq 0,$$

where the constant $C > 0$ is independent of $T > 0$.

Proof. First of all, by Proposition 3.2, there exist a constant $A > 0$ such that

$$A := \left\{ \sup_{s \geq 0} \|u(s)\|_\alpha, \sup_{s \geq 0} \|w(s)\|_\alpha \right\} < \infty.$$

We change the definition $t_k = (1 - 1/2^k)t_*$, and observe now that $t_0 = 0$. Note first that (3.30) becomes

$$\sup_{t \geq \frac{t_*}{2}} \left\{ \|\nabla p\|_\infty^2 \|u\|_{2q'}^2 + \|f_+\|_{2q'} \|u\|_{2q'} \right\} \leq C, \quad (3.41)$$

since $\|\nabla p(t)\|_\infty \leq \|u(t)\|_\alpha \leq A < \infty$. In this way, (3.31) becomes

$$U_k \leq C \left[\frac{2^{3k}}{M^2 t_*} U_{k-1}^2 + \frac{2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}k}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} U_{k-1}^{\frac{q+1}{q}} \right], \quad (3.42)$$

with a constant C depending on \mathcal{M} , A and T , but independent of t_* and k . We are going to proceed as we did after (3.31), but now with (3.42), relying on the fact that here we have

$$U_0 \leq C(1 + T) \leq \tilde{C},$$

where the constant \tilde{C} depends on \mathcal{M} , A and T . Let us now see that there exist $a \in (0, 1)$, $M > 0$, so that $U_k \leq a^k U_0$, for all k . So, taking the right-hand side of (3.42) applied to $V_k := a^k U_0$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & C \left[\frac{2^{3k}}{M^2 t_*} V_{k-1}^2 + \frac{2^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}k}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} V_{k-1}^{\frac{q+1}{q}} \right] \\ & \leq C \left[\frac{(2^3 a)^k}{M^2 t_* a^2} U_0 + \frac{(2^2 a)^{\frac{q+1}{q}k}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} U_0^{\frac{1}{q}} \right] V_k. \end{aligned} \quad (3.43)$$

Then, taking a so that $2^3 a < 1$,

$$(3.43) \leq C \left[\frac{U_0}{M^2 t_* a^2} + \frac{U_0^{\frac{1}{q}}}{M^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}} a^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} \right] a^k U_0.$$

Choosing $M > 0$ so that

$$0 < \max \left\{ \frac{CU_0}{t_* a^2}, \left(\frac{CU_0^{\frac{1}{q}}}{a^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} \right)^{\frac{q}{q+1}} \right\} \leq \frac{M^2}{2},$$

we get that V_k is a supersolution of the recurrence defined by (3.42), and so $U_k \leq a^k U_0 \xrightarrow[k \rightarrow +\infty]{} 0$. Observe also that for $t < 1$

$$\max \left\{ \left(\frac{CU_0}{t_* a^2} \right)^{1/2}, \left(\frac{CU_0^{\frac{1}{q}}}{a^{\frac{2(q+1)}{q}}} \right)^{\frac{q}{2(q+1)}} \right\} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t_*}} \right) =: M.$$

Thus, we have $0 \leq u(t, x) \leq M$, whence it follows that

$$0 \leq u(t, x) \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right). \quad (3.44)$$

We get the same estimate for w proceeding exactly in the same way for W_k , which leads to

$$0 \leq w(t, x) \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}} \right). \quad (3.45)$$

This proves (3.40). Estimate (3.39) follows by Lebesgue interpolation between estimates (3.44) and (3.45) and mass conservation. From this point, the deduction of the uniform estimate of Proposition 3.5 using (3.44) and (3.45) is very similar to [16, Prop.3.2], so we refer the reader to that work for details. \square

4. Construction of classical and weak solutions

The *a priori* estimates of the previous sections will now allow us to prove the global well-posedness of the system (1.2). The first step is to prove existence and uniqueness of classical solutions with smooth initial data. For this, we will use the Banach fixed-point theorem. A stability result for such solutions will be obtained and the existence of a weak solution follows as a consequence.

4.1. Construction of classical solutions

Let $w_0 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ and define the set

$$\Upsilon = \{ \xi \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)), \quad 0 \leq \xi(t, x) \leq 2\|w_0\|_\infty \},$$

equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|_\Upsilon = \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^2}.$$

Note that Υ with the metric induced by $\|\cdot\|_\Upsilon$ is a complete metric space. In this section we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 4.1. *Let u_0 and $w_0 \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ be non-negative initial data. Then, for all $T > 0$ the system (1.2) supplemented with the boundary condition (1.3) admits a unique non-negative classical solution. This solution satisfies the estimates obtained in Propositions 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5.*

The main step to prove this theorem is the use of the following lemma, whose proof is standard and can be found in [16, Thm. 3.1].:

Lemma 4.2. *Let ψ be a smooth solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \psi - \Delta \psi + \nabla \cdot (B\psi) + b\psi &= 0 \\ \nabla \psi \cdot \mathbf{n} &= B \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, \\ \psi(0) &= \psi_0 \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

with $b, B, \nabla \cdot B \in L^\infty$. Then,

$$0 \leq \psi(t, x) \leq \|w_0\|_\infty e^{(\|b\|_\infty + \|\nabla \cdot B\|_\infty)t}. \quad (4.2)$$

Now let $\phi \in \Upsilon$ and let $p = p[\phi]$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} p - \Delta p &= \phi \\ \nabla p \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0. \end{cases}$$

Linear theory guarantees that there exists a unique solution $p \in H^1(\Omega)$, and, since $\phi(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and Ω is smooth, we have $p(t) \in H^2(\Omega)$ with $\|p(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C\|\phi(t)\|_{L^2}$ almost everywhere in time. Therefore we have $p(t), \nabla p(t)$ and $\Delta p(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Now we associate $u = u[\phi]$ the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u + \nabla \cdot (u\nabla p) + (1 - \phi)u &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega, \\ u(0) &= u_0. \end{cases}$$

By linear theory, u is unique and such that $u \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$. Linear theory still guarantees that there exists some constant $C > 0$ depending on T and Ω such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\Omega))} \leq C\|u_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$. Now, we associate $q = q[\phi]$ the solution of

$$\begin{cases} q - \Delta q &= u[\phi] \\ \nabla q \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0. \end{cases}$$

The same arguments lead to the existence of a unique solution $q \in H^1(\Omega)$, which satisfies $q(t) \in H^2(\Omega)$ with $\|q(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C\|u(t)\|_{L^2}$, then $q(t), \nabla q(t), \Delta q(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Finally, we associate $w = w[\phi]$ the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w - \Delta w - \nabla \cdot (w\nabla q) + \beta w(u + \phi - 1) &= 0 \text{ in } \Omega, \\ \nabla w \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 \text{ in } \partial\Omega, \\ w(0) &= w_0, \end{cases}$$

where $w[\phi]$ is the only weak solution and such that $w \in L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \cap C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$.

Lemma 4.3. *For $T > 0$ small enough, $w[\phi] \in \Upsilon$.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.2 for $w[\phi]$,

$$0 \leq w(t, x) \leq \|w_0\|_\infty e^{(\|u+\phi-1\|_\infty + \|\Delta q\|_\infty)t}.$$

Note that all terms in the exponential can be bounded by $C\|\phi\|_\infty$, with $C > 0$ depending on the data of the problem. Thus, for $T > 0$ small enough we have $0 \leq w(t, x) \leq 2\|w_0\|_\infty$, which means $w[\phi] \in \Upsilon$. \square

Lemma 4.4. $\Phi : \phi \in \Upsilon \mapsto w[\phi] \in \Upsilon$ is a contraction on $[0, T]$ for some $T > 0$.

Proof. Let $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Upsilon$ and define $\bar{w} = w_1 - w_2$, where w_1 and w_2 are the respective associated solutions, and so forth. It's easy to check that

$$\partial_t \bar{w} - \Delta \bar{w} - \nabla \cdot (w_2 \nabla \bar{p}) - \nabla \cdot (\bar{w} \nabla p_2) = \bar{w} - w_1 \bar{\phi} - \bar{w} \phi_2 - w_1 \bar{u} - \bar{w} u_2.$$

Multiplying by \bar{w} and integrating in space, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \bar{w}^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{w} \cdot w_2 \nabla \bar{p} dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \bar{w} \cdot \bar{w} \nabla p_2 dx \\ \leq C \left(\|\bar{w}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{u}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{\phi}(t)\|_2^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

where we used the estimates for w_i , u_i and ϕ_i guaranteed by Lemma 4.2 and by the definition of Υ , respectively. Substituting

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} w_2 \nabla \bar{w} \nabla \bar{p} dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \bar{w}\|_2^2 + C \|\bar{\phi}(t)\|_2^2$$

and

$$\left| \int_{\Omega} \bar{w} \nabla \bar{w} \nabla p_2 dx \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \bar{w}\|_2^2 + C \|\bar{w}(t)\|_2^2$$

in (4.3), we find

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \bar{w}^2 dx \leq C \left(\|\bar{w}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{u}(t)\|_2^2 + \|\bar{\phi}(t)\|_2^2 \right).$$

By Gronwall's lemma, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \bar{w}^2 dx &\leq e^{Kt} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(s)|^2 + |\bar{\phi}(s)|^2 dx ds \\ &\leq e^{Kt} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(s)|^2 dx ds + \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_{\Omega} |\bar{\phi}(s)|^2 dx \right] t e^{Kt}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

for some constant $K > 0$ which may change from line to line. Likewise, for $\bar{u} = u_1 - u_2$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(t)|^2 dx \leq C e^{Kt} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\bar{\phi}(s)|^2 dx ds. \quad (4.5)$$

Note that

$$e^{Kt} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\bar{u}(s)|^2 dx ds \leq C e^{Kt} \frac{t^2}{2} \left[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_{\Omega} |\bar{\phi}(s)|^2 dx \right]. \quad (4.6)$$

Combining (4.5) and (4.6) with (4.4), we conclude that

$$\int_{\Omega} |\bar{w}(t)|^2 dx \leq M e^{Kt} \left(\frac{t^2}{2} + t \right) \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \int_{\Omega} |\bar{\phi}(s)|^2 dx,$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Thus, for $T > 0$ small enough, Φ is a contraction. \square

This is enough to prove Theorem 4.1. We take $\tilde{T} > 0$ being the smallest guaranteed by Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4. By the fixed point theorem, the result follows for small time. Extension to $[0, T]$ is done in a standard way.

Let $\alpha > 2$. We say that the system of equations (1.2) is *stable* on $L^\infty(0, T; L^\alpha(\Omega))$ when, given two pairs of initial data $u_{0,i}, w_{0,i} \in L^\alpha(\Omega)$, the respective classical solutions u_i and w_i admit $C > 0$ depending only on \mathcal{M} and on L^α -norms of the data such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|u_1(t) - u_2(t)\|_2 + \|w_1(t) - w_2(t)\|_2 \\ & \leq C (\|u_{1,0}(t) - u_{2,0}(t)\|_2 + \|w_{1,0}(t) - w_{2,0}(t)\|_2) e^{C(\mathcal{M})t}, \quad t \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Proposition 4.5. *Let $\alpha > 2$. The system (1.2) is stable (in the sense of (4.7)) on $L^\infty(0, T; L^\alpha(\Omega))$.*

Proof. Let $\bar{u} = u_1 - u_2$ and similarly for the other differences. The system for the differences reads

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \bar{u} - \Delta \bar{u} + \nabla \cdot (\bar{u} \nabla p_1) + \nabla \cdot (u_2 \nabla \bar{p}) &= u_1 \bar{w} + \bar{u} w_2 - \bar{u} \\ \partial_t \bar{w} - \Delta \bar{w} - \nabla \cdot (\bar{w} \nabla q_1) - \nabla \cdot (w_2 \nabla \bar{q}) &= \bar{w} - u_1 \bar{w} - \bar{u} w_2 - (w_1 + w_2) \bar{w} \\ -\Delta \bar{p} &= \bar{w} - \bar{p} \\ -\Delta \bar{q} &= \bar{u} - \bar{q}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Multiplying (4.8) by \bar{u} and integrating in space, we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_2^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} \bar{u} \nabla p_1 \nabla \bar{u} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u_2 \nabla \bar{p} \nabla \bar{u} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u_1 \bar{w} \bar{u} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 w_2 \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 \, dx. \quad (4.9)$$

It is easy to check using (3.40) that

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{u} \nabla p_1 \nabla \bar{u} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} u_1 \bar{w} \bar{u} \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 w_2 \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_2^2 + C \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}}\right) (\|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{w}\|_2^2).$$

Hölder inequality guarantees that

$$\int_{\Omega} u_2 \nabla \bar{p} \nabla \bar{u} \, dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2} \|u_2(t) \nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_2^2$$

Observe that using

$$\|u_2(t) \nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_2^2 \leq \|\nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_{2q}^2 \|u_2(t)\|_{2q'}^2$$

for $q \in (1, \infty)$, with $\|\nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_{2q}^2 \leq C \|\bar{p}(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \|\bar{w}(t)\|_2^2$ and $\|u_2(t)\|_{2q'}^2 \leq \|u_2(t)\|_{\infty}^{1+\frac{1}{q}} \|u_2(t)\|_1^{\frac{1}{q}}$ and (3.40), we find

$$\|u_2(t) \nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_2^2 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{q+1}{2q}}}\right) \|\bar{w}(t)\|_2^2.$$

Then,

$$\|u_2(t) \nabla \bar{p}(t)\|_2^2 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{q+1}{2q}}}\right) \|\bar{p}(t)\|_{H^2}^2 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{\frac{q+1}{2q}}}\right) \|w(t)\|_2^2.$$

Choosing q big enough, we have from (4.9) and the previous estimates that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\bar{u}\|_2^2 \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/2)+\epsilon}}\right) (\|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{w}\|_2^2),$$

for some small ϵ . A similar result is obtained for \bar{w} using the same arguments, where we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \{ \|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{w}\|_2^2 \} \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/2)+\epsilon}} \right) (\|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{w}\|_2^2).$$

Defining $Z(t) = \|\bar{u}\|_2^2 + \|\bar{w}\|_2^2$, we have

$$Z'(t) \leq C \left(1 + \frac{1}{t^{(1/2)+\epsilon}} \right) Z(t).$$

Integration of this differential equation leads to the result. \square

4.2. Global well-posedness of weak solutions

Now we are ready to state and prove a well-posedness result for weak solutions:

Theorem 4.6. Fix an arbitrary $T > 0$ and assume non-negative initial data $u_0, w_0 \in L^\alpha(\Omega)$, for some $\alpha > 2$. Then, there exists a unique non-negative weak solution for the system (1.2). This solution satisfies the estimates of Proposition 3.2 and 3.3–3.5.

Proof. Take a sequence of non-negative initial data $u_{0,k}, w_{0,k} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ with $u_{0,k} \rightarrow u_0$ and $w_{0,k} \rightarrow w_0$ both strongly in $L^\alpha(\Omega)$. Theorem 4.1 guarantees sequences u_k, w_k, p_k and q_k in $C([0, T], L^2(\Omega))$ strong solutions of the system (1.2) for each pair of data $u_{0,k}, w_{0,k} \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_k - \Delta u_k + \nabla \cdot (u_k \nabla p_k) & = u_k w_k - u_k \\ \partial_t w_k - \Delta w_k - \nabla \cdot (w_k \nabla q_k) & = w_k(1 - w_k - u_k) \\ -\Delta p_k & = w_k - p_k \\ -\Delta q_k & = u_k - q_k \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

$k \in \mathbb{N}$. The following convergence properties hold:

- i) $u_k \rightarrow u$ and $w_k \rightarrow w$ strongly in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$.
- ii) $p_k \rightarrow p$ and $q_k \rightarrow q$ strongly in $L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$.
- iii) $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ and $w_k \rightharpoonup w$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$.
- iv) $\partial_t u_k \rightarrow \partial_t u$ and $\partial_t w_k \rightarrow \partial_t w$ weakly in $L^2(0, T; [H^1(\Omega)]^*)$.
- v) $u_k \nabla p_k \rightarrow u \nabla p$ and $w_k \nabla q_k \rightarrow w \nabla q$ strongly in $L^1((0, T) \times \Omega)$.

In fact, estimate (3.3) guarantees that u_k and w_k are uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0, T; L^\alpha(\Omega))$ with respect to $k \geq 1$. Therefore, Proposition 4.5 applied to the Cauchy differences $u_k - u_l, w_k - w_l, k, l \in \mathbb{N}$ guarantees that u_k and w_k are Cauchy sequences in $L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, giving i). Now, let $\bar{p} = p_k - p_l$ with $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, and denote $\bar{w} = w_k - w_l$. Multiplying by \bar{p} the difference of the third equations of (1.2) and integrating in space, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{p}^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{p}|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \bar{w}^2 dx$$

Similarly, with the fourth equation we compute

$$\int_{\Omega} \bar{q}^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \bar{q}|^2 dx \leq \int_{\Omega} \bar{u}^2 dx.$$

Thus, using Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\|\bar{p}(t)\|_{H^1} + \|\bar{q}(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C (\|u_{0,k}(t) - u_{0,l}(t)\|_2 + \|w_{0,k}(t) - w_{0,l}(t)\|_2) e^{C(M)T}. \quad (4.11)$$

This means that p^k and q^k are Cauchy sequences in $L^\infty(0, T; H^1(\Omega))$, so we get **ii**). Next, multiply the first and second lines of (1.2) by u_k and w_k , respectively, and integrate in space. Using (3.13), (3.14), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} u_k^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx &\leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx + C \int_{\Omega} u_k^2 dx, \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} w_k^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla w_k|^2 dx &\leq C \int_{\Omega} w_k^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating in time gives that $\nabla u_k, \nabla w_k$ are in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ uniformly in k . From this we find **iii**).

It is classical to check that $\partial_t u_k(t) = \nabla \cdot (\nabla u_k - u_k \nabla p_k) + u_k w_k - u_k \in (H^1)^*$ and $\partial_t w_k(t) = \nabla \cdot (\nabla w_k + w_k \nabla q_k) + w_k - w_k^2 - u_k w_k \in (H^1)^*$. For instance, if $\varphi \in L^2(0, T; H^1)$, then we find (to take just the term involving ∇u_k , and using that ∇u_k is in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ uniformly in k)

$$\left| \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_k \cdot \nabla \varphi dx dt \right| \leq \left(\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_k|^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^T \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \varphi|^2 dx dt \right)^{1/2} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))}.$$

Treating the other terms similarly, we get that $\partial_t u_k$ and $\partial_t w_k$ are bounded in $L^2(0, T; [H^1(\Omega)]^*)$, so **iv**) holds. The last convergence follows from the previous ones.

Thus, we can pass to the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.10) to find that (u, w, p, q) is a weak solution of (1.2). The condition $(u(0), w(0)) = (u_0, w_0)$ is satisfied by continuity at $t = 0$ which follows from the estimate on the time derivatives. Finally, using the approximating by classical solutions we can check that the stability result from Proposition 4.5 and estimate (4.11) hold for weak solutions. This can be used to prove uniqueness: using the notations in Proposition 4.5, if (u_i, w_i, p_i, q_i) , $i = 1, 2$ are two weak solutions associated to the same initial data, then (4.7) proves that $(u_1, w_1) = (u_2, w_2)$ a.e. on $[0, T] \times \Omega$. In turn, the estimate (4.11) (which, since it is a direct consequence of Proposition 4.5, also holds for weak solutions) gives uniqueness of p and q . \square

5. Numerical experiments

In order to show some of the relevant features of the system, we provide in this section the details of a numerical simulation of (1.2). Our goal is to present an implicit-explicit finite volume scheme and showcase some numerical results exhibiting the system's main features, namely, evasive behavior of the prey, and chasing by the predator.

We consider the system (1.2) in a rectangular domain $\Omega = [0, L_x] \times [0, L_y]$, where we introduce a cartesian mesh consisting of the cells $I_{i,j} := [x_{i-\frac{1}{2}}, x_{i+\frac{1}{2}}] \times [y_{j-\frac{1}{2}}, y_{j+\frac{1}{2}}]$, which for the sake of simplicity, are assumed square with uniform size, so $|I_{i,j}| := h^2$ for all i and j . Consider a step size $\Delta t > 0$ to

discretize the time interval $(0, T)$. Let $N > 0$ the smallest integer such that $N\Delta t \leq T$ and set $t^n := n\Delta t$ for $n \in \{0, N\}$. The cell average of a quantity v at time t is defined by

$$\bar{v}_{i,j}(t) := \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{I_{i,j}} v(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

and define $\bar{v}_{i,j}^n := \bar{v}_{i,j}(t^n)$. Note that in this section we use $\mathbf{x} = (x, y)$ to denote the spatial variable. Let $f_k(u, w)$, $k = 1, 2$, be the reactive terms in the right-hand side of the first two equations in (1.2). Then, the terms

$$\frac{1}{h^2} \int_{I_{i,j}} f_k(u(t, \mathbf{x}), w(t, \mathbf{x})) dx, \quad k = 1, 2$$

are approximated by $f_{k,i,j} := f_k(\bar{u}_{i,j}, \bar{w}_{i,j})$, $k = 1, 2$. The Laplacian on a Cartesian grid is discretized via

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{i,j} u &:= \frac{1}{h} (F_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} - F_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}) + \frac{1}{h} (F_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} - F_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}), \\ F_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} &:= \frac{1}{h} (\bar{u}_{i+1,j} - \bar{u}_{i,j}), \quad F_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} := \frac{1}{h} (\bar{u}_{i,j+1} - \bar{u}_{i,j}). \end{aligned}$$

The numerical fluxes in the x - and y - directions are respectively

$$\mathcal{F}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^1(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_{i,j} \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} & \text{if } \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} > 0 \\ \bar{u}_{i+1,j} \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} & \text{if } \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} < 0, \end{cases} \quad \bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j} = \frac{\bar{p}_{i+1,j} - \bar{p}_{i,j}}{h}, \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^1(\mathbf{p}) = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_{i,j} \bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} > 0 \\ \bar{u}_{i,j+1} \bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} & \text{if } \bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} < 0, \end{cases} \quad \bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{\bar{p}_{i,j+1} - \bar{p}_{i,j}}{h}, \quad (5.2)$$

and in a similar way for $\mathcal{F}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^2(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^2(\mathbf{q})$. Finally we incorporate a first-order Euler time integration for the u and w components. The diffusive terms are treated in an implicit form and an explicit form is used for the convective and reactive terms. The initial data are approximated by their cell averages,

$$\bar{u}_{i,j}^0 := \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{I_{i,j}} u_0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad \bar{w}_{i,j}^0 := \frac{1}{h^2} \int_{I_{i,j}} w_0(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

To advance the numerical solution from t^n to $t^{n+1} = t^n + \Delta t$, we use the following finite volume scheme: given $\mathbf{u}^n = (\bar{u}_{i,j}^n)$ and $\mathbf{w}^n = (\bar{w}_{i,j}^n)$ for all cells $I_{i,j}$ at time $t = t^n$, the unknown values \mathbf{u}^{n+1} and \mathbf{w}^{n+1} are determined by the following two steps implicit-explicit scheme:

Step 1 solve for $\mathbf{p} = (\bar{p}_{i,j})$ and $\mathbf{q} = (\bar{q}_{i,j})$

$$-D_p \Delta_h \mathbf{p} + \delta_p \mathcal{I} \mathbf{p} = \delta_w \mathcal{I} \mathbf{w}^n \quad (5.3a)$$

$$-D_q \Delta_h \mathbf{q} + \delta_q \mathcal{I} \mathbf{q} = \delta_u \mathcal{I} \mathbf{u}^n. \quad (5.3b)$$

Step 2 solve for $\mathbf{u}^{n+1} = (\bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1})$ and $\mathbf{w}^{n+1} = (\bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1})$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1} - \Delta t \Delta_{i,j} u^{n+1} &= \bar{u}_{i,j}^n + \Delta t f_{1,i,j}^n \\ &+ \Delta t \left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^1(\mathbf{p}) - \mathcal{F}_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}^1(\mathbf{p})}{h} + \frac{\mathcal{F}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^1(\mathbf{p}) - \mathcal{F}_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}^1(\mathbf{p})}{h} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1} - \Delta t D_w \Delta_{i,j} w^{n+1} &= \bar{w}_{i,j}^n + \Delta t f_{2,i,j}^n \\ &+ \Delta t \left(\frac{\mathcal{F}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}^2(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{F}_{i-\frac{1}{2},j}^2(\mathbf{q})}{h} + \frac{\mathcal{F}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^2(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{F}_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}^2(\mathbf{q})}{h} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4b)$$

where we have used the notation $\Delta_h = (\Delta_{i,j})$ to indicate the matrix of the discrete Laplacian operator, and \mathcal{I} is the identity matrix.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose that $f_1(u, w) = u(\alpha w - 1)$ and $f_2(u, w) = \beta w(1 - u - w)$. Then the solutions $\bar{p}_{i,j}$, $\bar{q}_{i,j}$ and $\bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1}$, $\bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ of the finite volume scheme (5.3a)–(5.3b) and (5.4a)–(5.4b) respectively, are nonnegatives for all i, j provided $\bar{u}_{i,j}^n$, $\bar{w}_{i,j}^n$ are nonnegative for all i, j , and the following CFL-like condition is satisfied:

$$\frac{\Delta t}{h} \leq \min \left\{ \frac{1}{2a}, \frac{1}{2b}, \frac{1}{K} \right\}, \quad (5.5)$$

where

$$a = \max_{i,j} \{ |\bar{p}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}|, |\bar{q}_{i+\frac{1}{2},j}| \}, \quad b = \max_{i,j} \{ |\bar{p}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}|, |\bar{q}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}| \},$$

$$K = \|f_{1,u}\|_\infty + \|f_{1,w}\|_\infty + \|f_{2,u}\|_\infty + \|f_{2,w}\|_\infty.$$

Proof. In (5.3a)–(5.3b), we have a linear system of algebraic equations for $\bar{p}_{i,j}$ and $\bar{q}_{i,j}$ which need to be solve in each time step t^n . However, observe that the matrix of these linear systems are diagonally dominant, which guarantee the existence of solution and the positivity of $p_{i,j}$ and $q_{i,j}$. Each system of equations (5.4a)–(5.4b) can be seen as a linear system for $\bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ and $\bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ respectively, where the right side is positive according with the CFL condition (5.5) (see [26–28]) which guarantees the positivity of $\bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ and $\bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1}$. \square

Each system of linear algebraic equations for $\bar{p}_{i,j}$, $\bar{q}_{i,j}$ and $\bar{u}_{i,j}^{n+1}$, $\bar{w}_{i,j}^{n+1}$ can be solved by using an accurate and efficient linear algebraic solver.

5.1. Test 1: chasing and evasion

In this numerical test, shown in Figure 1, we suppress the terms on the right-hand side of (1.2), to ignore the population dynamics and emphasize the effect of the pursuit and evasion. We can see that the predator starts to chase the prey even though at first any direct contact with it would be very small (due to diffusion only). The prey takes evasive action immediately. Note that by choosing large δ_u, δ_w in this example, we see from Tables 1 and 2 that this may be interpreted as saying that the chemical sensitivity of the predator and prey are large compared to their diffusion rates. Therefore, we expect that the movement observed in Figure 1 is due to the attraction and repulsion terms and not so much to the diffusion. The numerical parameters are a 400 by 400 spatial cell grid, and a time step of 0.01.




Figure 1. Numerical solution of system (1.2) with only pursuit and evasion. Left column is the predator and right column is the prey. Shown times are, from top to bottom, $t = 0, 1, 4, 8$. Parameters in this simulation: $f_1(u, w) = f_2(u, w) = 0$, $\delta_w = \delta_u = 100$, $\delta_p = \delta_q = 0.1$, $D_w = 1$, $D_p, D_q = 10$.




Figure 2. Numerical solution of system (1.2) with predator-prey dynamics, pursuit, and evasion. Left column is the predator and right column is the prey. Shown times are, from top to bottom, $t = 0, 1, 5, 10$. Parameters in this simulation: $\alpha = 10, \beta = 2, \delta_w = 100, \delta_u = 50, \delta_p = \delta_q = 1, D_w = 1, D_p = 3, D_q = 2$.




Figure 3. Numerical solution of system (1.2) with only pursuit and evasion and Dirichlet boundary conditions. Left column is the predator and right column is the prey. Shown times are, from top to bottom, $t = 0, 1, 4, 8$. Parameters in this simulation are the same as in Test 1.

5.2. Test 2: full dynamics

In this test, shown in Figure 2, we set some generic parameters in the system (1.2) in order to observe the full behavior. We can see now the predator-prey interaction taking place, as the densities of the two species fluctuate more widely in relation to the previous example, due to the predator's population growth from predation. After some time, the solution seems to exhibit wave-like interaction patterns with decreasing amplitudes, stabilizing around the values predicted by the equilibrium point $(\frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha}, \frac{1}{\alpha}) = (0.9, 0.1)$. Although here we show the solution only until $t = 10$, computation up to larger times, not shown here, confirm this behavior. The numerical parameters are a 400 by 400 spatial cell grid, and a time step of 0.01.

5.3. Test 3: Dirichlet boundary conditions

This test, which we show in Figure 3, implements a variant of the proposed method for system (1.2) with Dirichlet boundary conditions instead of the conditions (1.3). The parameters are the same as in Test 1. We can see that although the general dynamics remains similar, the boundary behavior affects the solution, in particular making the maximum density smaller. This is natural, since a Dirichlet condition corresponds, physically, to an absorption, or death, at the boundary.

One can also see, especially on the prey column, the formation of steep gradients along the border (boundary layers). This, again, is natural, since with the parameters of the simulation, the evasion dynamics of the prey should be dominant. Since evasion corresponds in (1.2) to an advection term, the formation of boundary layers when considering Dirichlet conditions is to be expected.

6. Conclusions and outlook

In this work, we have studied analytically and numerically a system of parabolic-elliptic PDEs modeling predator-prey dynamics including prey- and predator-taxis, indirect detection by means of a "potential" or odor, diffusion, and Lotka–Volterra dynamics. We have seen that the system is well posed and established boundedness properties of the solution in Lebesgue spaces. Although these purely mathematical properties may not be of immediate biological relevancy, the reasonings and results establish that the model does not lead to non-biological phenomena such as blow-up in finite time – this being by no means a given property of systems of parabolic equations.

The Lotka–Volterra dynamics with logistic term featured in the right-hand side of our system was chosen since it is the simplest model not leading to unrealistic population explosions. Therefore, possible extensions of our work include the question of whether the results still hold for more realistic population dynamics, namely Holling-type, or after the inclusion of Allee effects, prey handling time, etc.

One other obvious extension to the system (1.2) would be to consider a fully parabolic system where the odor diffusion time scale is of the same order than the population diffusion time scale. In that case, the analysis is more involved. We plan to address this question in future work.

Acknowledgements

P.A. was partially supported by Faperj "Jovem Cientista do Nosso Estado" grant no. 202.867/2015, *Capes* by PRONEX, and CNPq grant no. 442960/2014-0. B.T. acknowledges the

support from *Capes* via a doctoral grant from the Institute of Mathematics of UFRJ. L.M.V. was supported by CONICYT/PIA/Concurso Apoyo a Centros Científicos y Tecnológicos de Excelencia con Financiamiento Basal AFB170001. The authors would also like to thank the anonymous referee for their insightful comments.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. B. Aïnseba, M. Bendahmane and A. Noussair, A reaction-diffusion system modeling predator-prey with prey-taxis, *Nonlinear Anal- Real.*, **9** (2008), 2086–2105.
2. A. Chakraborty, M. Singh, D. Lucy, et.al., Predator-prey model with prey-taxis and diffusion, *Math. Comput. Model.*, **46** (2007), 482–498.
3. T. Goudon, B. Nkonga, M. Rascle, et. al., Self-organized populations interacting under pursuit-evasion dynamics, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, **304–305** (2015), 1–22.
4. T. Goudon and L. Urrutia, Analysis of kinetic and macroscopic models of pursuit-evasion dynamics, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, **14** (2016), 2253–2286.
5. X. He and S. Zheng, Global boundedness of solutions in a reaction-diffusion system of predator-prey model with prey-taxis, *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **49** (2015), 73–77.
6. H. Jin and Z. Wang, Global stability of prey-taxis systems, *J. Differ. Equations*, **262** (2017), 1257–1290.
7. J. M. Lee, T. Hillen and M. A. Lewis, Continuous traveling waves for prey-taxis. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, **70** (2008), 654.
8. J. M. Lee, T. Hillen and M. A. Lewis, Pattern formation in prey-taxis systems, *J. Biol. Dyn.*, **3** (2009), 551–573.
9. Y. Tao, Global existence of classical solutions to a predator-prey model with nonlinear prey-taxis *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, **11** (2010), 2056–2064.
10. Y. Tyutyunov, L. Titova and R. Arditi, A Minimal Model of Pursuit-Evasion in a Predator-Prey System. *Math. Model. Nat. Pheno.*, **2** (2007), 122–134.
11. Ke Wang, Qi Wang and Feng Yu, Stationary and time-periodic patterns of two-predator and one-prey systems with prey-taxis, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. S.*, **37** (2016), 505–543.
12. X. Wang, W. Wang and G. Zhang, Global bifurcation of solutions for a predator-prey model with prey-taxis, *Math. Method. Appl. Sci.*, **38** (2015), 431–443.
13. S. Wu, J. Shi and B. Wu, Global existence of solutions and uniform persistence of a diffusive predator-prey model with prey-taxis, *J. Differ. Equations*, **260**, (2016).
14. T. Xiang, Global dynamics for a diffusive predator-prey model with prey-taxis and classical Lotka–Volterra kinetics, *Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl.*, **39** (2018), 278–299.

15. Y. Tao and M. Winkler. Boundedness vs. blow-up in a two-species chemotaxis system with two chemicals. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. S.*, **20** (2015), 3165–3183.
16. R. Alonso, P. Amorim and T. Goudon, Analysis of a chemotaxis system modeling ant foraging, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, **26** (2016), 1785–1824.
17. E. De Giorgi, Sulla differenziabilità e l'analiticità delle estremali degli integrali multipli regolari, *Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat.*, **3** (1957), 25–43.
18. E. Keller and L. Segel, Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability, *J. Theor. Biol.*, **26** (1970), 399–415.
19. E. Keller and L. Segel, Model for Chemotaxis, *J. theor. Biol.*, **30** (1971), 225–234.
20. T. Hillen and K. J. Painter, A user's guide to PDE models for chemotaxis, *J. Math. Biol.*, **58** (2009), 183–217.
21. B. Perthame, *Transport Equations in Biology*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel - Boston - Berlin.
22. L. Caffarelli and A. Vasseur, Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geostrophic equation, *Ann. Math.*, **171** (2010), 1903–1930.
23. L. Caffarelli and A. Vasseur, The De Giorgi method for nonlocal fluid dynamics, in *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, Advanced Courses in Mathematics–CRM Barcelona* (Birkhäuser, 2012), 1–38.
24. B. Perthame and A. Vasseur, Regularization in Keller–Segel type systems and the De Giorgi method, *Commun. Math. Sci.*, **10** (2012), 463–476.
25. H. Brézis, *Analyse Fonctionnelle, Théorie et Applications* (Masson, 1987).
26. A. Chertock and A. Kurganov, A second-order positivity preserving central-upwind scheme for chemotaxis and haptotaxis models, *Numer. Math.*, **111** (208), 169–205.
27. H. Holden, K. H. Karlsen and N. H. Risebro, On uniqueness and existence of entropy solutions of weakly coupled systems of nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations, *Electron. J. Differential Equations*, **46** (2003), 1–31.
28. R. Bürger, R. Ruiz-Baier and K. Schneider, Adaptive multiresolution methods for the simulation of waves in excitable media, *J. Sci. Comput.*, **43** (2010), 261–290.

Appendix

The dimensional version of system (1.2) reads as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \alpha_u \Delta u + \nabla \cdot (u \beta_u \nabla p) = \bar{\alpha} w u - \bar{\beta} u \\ \partial_t w - \alpha_w \Delta w - \nabla \cdot (w \beta_w \nabla q) = \gamma w (1 - w/K_w) - \delta w u \\ -\alpha_p \Delta p = \bar{\delta}_w w - \bar{\delta}_p p \\ -\alpha_q \Delta q = \bar{\delta}_u u - \bar{\delta}_q q, \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

supplemented with appropriate no-flux boundary conditions similar to (1.3).

In Table 1 we present the physical meaning of the parameters appearing in (6.1), and in Table 2 we show the dimensionless parameters appearing in system (1.2), obtained after a standard non-dimensionalization procedure applied to the system (6.1).

Table 1. Physical parameters in system (6.1). Here, ℓ denotes length, t denotes time, bio denotes some measure of predator or prey quantity or mass, and $odor$ denotes some measure of “odor”.

Parameter	Units	Physical meaning
α_u, α_w	ℓ^2/t	Diffusion rate of predators and prey
α_p, α_q	ℓ^2/t	Diffusion rate of prey and predator odor
$\bar{\alpha}$	$(bio\ t)^{-1}$	Predator growth rate from predation
$\bar{\beta}$	t^{-1}	Predator death rate
γ	t^{-1}	Prey growth rate
K_w	$\frac{bio}{\ell^2}$	Prey carrying capacity
δ	$(bio\ t)^{-1}$	Prey death rate from predation
β_u, β_w	$\frac{\ell^4}{t \cdot odor}$	Predator (resp. prey) odor sensitivity
$\bar{\delta}_w, \bar{\delta}_u$	$\frac{odor}{t \cdot bio}$	Prey (resp. predator) odor production rate
$\bar{\delta}_p, \bar{\delta}_q$	t^{-1}	Prey (resp. predator) odor degradation rate

Table 2. Dimensionless parameters in system (1.2). Here, ℓ denotes length, t denotes time, bio denotes some measure of predator or prey quantity or mass, and $odor$ denotes some measure of “odor”.

Dimensionless parameter	Physical meaning
$D_w = \alpha_w/\alpha_u$	Prey diffusion rate relative to predator diffusion rate
$\alpha = \bar{\alpha}K_w/\bar{\beta}$	Predator efficiency relative to death rate
$\beta = \gamma/\bar{\beta}$	Prey growth rate relative to predator death rate
$D_p = \alpha_p/\alpha_u$	Prey odor diffusion rate relative to predator diffusion rate
$D_q = \alpha_q/\alpha_u$	Predator odor diffusion rate relative to predator diffusion rate
$\delta_w = \beta_u K_w \bar{\delta}_w / (\alpha_u \bar{\beta})$	Normalized prey odor production rate
$\delta_u = \beta_w \gamma \bar{\delta}_u / (\alpha_u \bar{\beta} \delta)$	Normalized prey odor production rate
$\delta_p = \bar{\delta}_p / \bar{\beta}$	Prey odor degradation rate relative to predator death rate
$\delta_q = \bar{\delta}_q / \bar{\beta}$	Predator odor degradation rate relative to predator death rate



AIMS Press

©2019 the Author(s), licensee AIMS Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)