



Conditions for Existence or Nonexistence of Positive Solutions to Elliptic General Model

Joon Hyuk Kang^{1*} and William Tritch¹

¹Department of Mathematics, Andrews University, USA.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/BJMCS/2015/17076

Editor(s):

(1) Morteza Seddighin, Indiana University East Richmond, USA.

Reviewers:

(1) Matej Mencinger, Faculty of Civil Engineering, University of Maribor, Slovenia.

(2) Ette Harrison Etuk, Department of Mathematics Computer Science, Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria.

Complete Peer review History:

<http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?iid=1035&id=6&aid=9101>

Original Research Article

Received: 25 February 2015

Accepted: 31 March 2015

Published: 04 May 2015

Abstract

Two species of animals are competing or cooperating in the same environment. Under what conditions do they coexist peacefully? Or under what conditions does either one of the two species become extinct, that is, is either one of the two species excluded by the other? We investigate this phenomenon from a mathematical point of view.

In this paper we concentrate on coexistence solutions of the competition or cooperation model

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + g(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v + h(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

This system is the general model for the steady state of a competitive or cooperative interacting system depending on growth conditions for g and h . The techniques used in this paper are super-sub solutions and some detailed properties of the solution of logistic equations (See [1]).

Keywords: Competition and cooperation system; coexistence state.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35A05, 35A07

*Corresponding author: kang@andrews.edu

1 Introduction

A lot of research has been focused on reaction-diffusion equations modeling various systems in mathematical biology, especially the elliptic steady states of competitive and cooperative interacting processes with various boundary conditions. In earlier literature, investigations into mathematical biology models were concerned with studying those with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions. Later on, the more important Dirichlet problems, which allow flux across the boundary, became the subject of study.

Suppose two species of animals, rabbits and squirrels for instance, are competing or cooperating in a bounded domain Ω . Let $u(x, t)$ and $v(x, t)$ be densities of the two habitats in the place x of Ω at time t . Then we have the dynamic competition model

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + au(x, t) - bu^2(x, t) - cu(x, t)v(x, t) \\ v_t(x, t) = \Delta v(x, t) + dv(x, t) - fv^2(x, t) - eu(x, t)v(x, t) \\ u(x, t) = v(x, t) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, \infty),$$

or cooperation model

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x, t) = \Delta u(x, t) + au(x, t) - bu^2(x, t) + cu(x, t)v(x, t) \\ v_t(x, t) = \Delta v(x, t) + dv(x, t) - fv^2(x, t) + eu(x, t)v(x, t) \\ u(x, t) = v(x, t) = 0 \text{ for } x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega \times [0, \infty),$$

Here we are interested in the time independent, positive solutions, i.e. the positive solutions $u(x), v(x)$ of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + u(x)(a - bu(x) - cv(x)) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + v(x)(d - fv(x) - eu(x)) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

or

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + u(x)(a - bu(x) + cv(x)) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + v(x)(d - fv(x) + eu(x)) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{1.2}$$

which are called the coexistence state or the steady state. The coexistence state is the positive density solution depending only on the spatial variable x , not on the time variable t , and so its existence means that the two species of animals can live peacefully and forever.

A lot of work about the existence and uniqueness of the coexistence state of the above steady state models has already been done during the last decades (See [2], [3], [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]).

In [5], Cosner and Lazer established a sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of positive solution to the competing system.

Their result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *In order that there exist positive smooth functions u and v in Ω satisfying (1.1) with $a = d$, it is necessary and sufficient that one of the following three sets of conditions hold, where λ_1 is as described in the Lemma 2.2.*

- (1) $a > \lambda_1, b > e, c < f$
- (2) $a > \lambda_1, b = e, c = f$
- (3) $a > \lambda_1, b < e, c > f$

Biologically, the Theorem 1.1 implies that they can coexist peacefully if their reproduction rates are large enough and their self-limitation and competition rates balance each other.

In [9], Korman and Leung established a sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of positive solution to the cooperation system. Their result is the following:

Theorem 1.2. For existence of a positive solution to (1.2) with $b = f = 1$, it is necessary and sufficient that $ce < 1$.

Biologically, the Theorem 1.2 indicates that their strong cooperation may decrease reproduction capacities and increase self-limitation abilities that cause their extinction.

However, in reality, the rates of change of population densities may vary in a more complicated and irregular manner than can be described by the simple competition or cooperation models. In this paper we study rather general types of the system.(See more work in generalized system in [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16].) We are concerned with the existence of positive coexistence when the relative growth rates are nonlinear, more precisely, the existence and uniqueness of a positive steady state of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + g(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v + h(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where g and h are C^1 functions, Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^n and u, v are densities of the two competitive or cooperative species.

The functions g and h describe how species 1 (u) and 2 (v) interact among themselves and with each other.

The followings are questions raised in the general model with nonlinear growth rates.

Problem 1 : Under what conditions do the species coexist?

Problem 2 : When does either one of the species become extinct?

In Section 3, some sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of positive solution in the competition system are obtained that generalizes the Theorem 1.1, and we can also see some nonexistence result. In Section 4. we establish sufficient and necessary conditions for the existence of positive solution in the cooperating system that generalizes the Theorem 1.2.

2 Preliminaries

Before entering into our primary arguments and results, we must first present a few preliminary items that we later employ throughout the proofs detailed in this paper. The following definition and lemmas are established and accepted throughout the literature on our topic.

Definition 2.1. (Super and sub solutions)

Consider

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + f(x, u) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{2.1}$$

where $f \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbf{R})$ and Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbf{R}^n .

(A) A function $\bar{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \bar{u} + f(x, \bar{u}) \leq 0 \\ \bar{u}|_{\partial\Omega} \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

is called a super solution to (2.1).

(B) A function $\underline{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \underline{u} + f(x, \underline{u}) \geq 0 \\ \underline{u}|_{\partial\Omega} \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

is called a sub solution to (2.1).

Lemma 2.1. Let $f(x, \xi) \in C^\alpha(\bar{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R})$ and let $\bar{u}, \underline{u} \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ be, respectively, super and sub solutions to (2.1) which satisfy $\underline{u}(x) \leq \bar{u}(x), x \in \bar{\Omega}$. Then (2.1) has a solution $u \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ with $\underline{u}(x) \leq u(x) \leq \bar{u}(x), x \in \bar{\Omega}$.

In our proof, we also employ accepted conclusions concerning the solutions of the following logistic equations.

Lemma 2.2. (Established in [15])

Consider

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + uf(u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, u > 0, \end{cases}$$

where f is a decreasing C^1 function such that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that $f(u) \leq 0$ for $u \geq c_0$ and Ω is a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n .

If $f(0) > \lambda_1$, then the above equation has a unique positive solution, where λ_1 is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta$ with homogeneous boundary conditions whose corresponding eigenfunction is denoted by ϕ_1 . We denote this unique positive solution as θ_f .

The most important property of this positive solution is that θ_f is increasing as f is increasing.

We specifically note that for $a > \lambda_1$, the unique positive solution of

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + u(a - u) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, u > 0, \end{cases}$$

is denoted by $\omega_a \equiv \theta_{a-x}$. Hence, θ_{a-x} is increasing as $a > 0$ is increasing.

Consider the system

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + f(x, u) &= 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $u = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$ and $f = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ is quasimonotone increasing, i.e. $f_i(x, u)$ is increasing in u_j for all $j \neq i$.

Lemma 2.3. ([9]) Let w_λ be a family of subsolutions ($\alpha \leq \lambda \leq \beta$) to (2.2), increasing in λ such that

$$\Delta w_\lambda + f(x, w_\lambda) \geq 0 \text{ in } \Omega, w_\lambda = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

Assume also $u \geq w_\alpha, w_\lambda$ does not satisfy (2.2) for any λ , and $\frac{\partial w_\lambda}{\partial n}$ changes continuously in λ on $\partial\Omega$. Then $u \geq \sup w_\lambda$.

3 Competing Species

Consider the system for two competing species of animals

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + g(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + h(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{3.1}$$

where $g, h \in C^2$.

The following theorem provides a sufficient condition for the existence of a positive smooth solution to (3.1).

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose*

(A) $g_{uu} < 0, g_{uv} < 0, h_{uv} < 0, h_{vv} < 0,$

(B) $g(0, v) = h(u, 0) = 0$

(C) *there is $C_0 > 0$ such that $g(u, v) < 0, h(u, v) < 0$ for $u, v > c_0.$*

If $g_u(0, 0) = h_v(0, 0)$ and one of the following three sets of conditions holds.

- (1) $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1, \quad \inf(g_{uu}) < \inf(h_{uv}), \quad \inf(g_{uv}) > \inf(h_{vv})$
- (2) $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1, \quad \inf(g_{uu}) = \inf(h_{uv}), \quad \inf(g_{uv}) = \inf(h_{vv})$
- (3) $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1, \quad \inf(g_{uu}) > \inf(h_{uv}), \quad \inf(g_{uv}) < \inf(h_{vv})$

Then (3.1) has a positive smooth solution.

Proof. By the Theorem 1.1, if one of the above three sets of conditions holds, then there is a positive smooth solution (u, v) to

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) - (-\inf(g_{uu}))u - (-\inf(g_{uv}))v] &= 0 \\ \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) - (-\inf(h_{uv}))u - (-\inf(h_{vv}))v] &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

But, by the Mean Value Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta u + g(u, v) \\ &= \Delta u + g(u, v) - g(0, v) \\ &= \Delta u + u g_u(\tilde{u}, v) \\ &= \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) + g_u(\tilde{u}, v) - g_u(0, 0)] \\ &= \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) + g_u(\tilde{u}, v) - g_u(0, v) + g_u(0, v) - g_u(0, 0)] \\ &= \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) + g_{uu}(\tilde{u}, v)\tilde{u} + g_{uv}(0, \tilde{v})v] \\ &\geq \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) + g_{uu}(\tilde{u}, v)u + g_{uv}(0, \tilde{v})v] \\ &\geq \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) + \inf(g_{uu})u + \inf(g_{uv})v] \\ &= \Delta u + u[g_u(0, 0) - (-\inf(g_{uu}))u - (-\inf(g_{uv}))v] \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 \leq \tilde{u} \leq u, 0 \leq \tilde{v} \leq v,$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta v + h(u, v) \\ &= \Delta v + h(u, v) - h(u, 0) \\ &= \Delta v + v h_v(u, \tilde{v}) \\ &= \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) + h_v(u, \tilde{v}) - h_v(0, 0)] \\ &= \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) + h_v(u, \tilde{v}) - h_v(u, 0) + h_v(u, 0) - h_v(0, 0)] \\ &= \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) + h_{vv}(u, \tilde{v})\tilde{v} + h_{uv}(\tilde{u}, 0)u] \\ &\geq \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) + h_{vv}(u, \tilde{v})v + h_{uv}(\tilde{u}, 0)u] \\ &\geq \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) + \inf(h_{vv})v + \inf(h_{uv})u] \\ &= \Delta v + v[h_v(0, 0) - (-\inf(h_{uv}))u - (-\inf(h_{vv}))v] \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 \leq \hat{v} \leq \tilde{v} \leq v.$ Hence, (u, v) is a subsolution to (3.1).

But by the conditions of $g, h,$ any large positive constant M satisfying

$u < M, v < M$ in Ω is a supersolution to (3.1).

Therefore, by the Lemma 2.1, (3.1) has a positive smooth solution. □

The next theorem establishes a necessary condition for the existence of a positive smooth solution to (3.1).

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose*

(A) $g_{uu} < 0, g_{uv} < 0, h_{uv} < 0, h_{vv} < 0,$

(B) $g(0, v) = h(u, 0) = 0$

(C) For any $d > 0$, there is $c(d) > 0$ such that $g_u(u, d) < 0, h_v(d, v) < 0$ for $u, v > c(d)$.

If $g_u(0, 0) = h_v(0, 0)$ and (3.1) has a positive smooth solution, then $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1$ and one of the following six sets of conditions holds.

- (1) $g_{uu} \equiv h_{uv}$ are constants, $\inf(h_{vv}) \leq \sup(g_{uv}), \sup(h_{vv}) \geq \inf(g_{uv})$
- (2) $\inf(h_{uv}) = \sup(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{uv}) > \inf(g_{uu}), \inf(h_{vv}) \leq \sup(g_{uv})$
- (3) $\inf(h_{uv}) > \sup(g_{uu}), \inf(h_{vv}) < \sup(g_{uv})$
- (4) $\inf(h_{uv}) < \sup(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{uv}) = \inf(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{vv}) \geq \inf(g_{uv})$
- (5) $\inf(h_{uv}) < \sup(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{uv}) < \inf(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{vv}) > \inf(g_{uv})$
- (6) $\inf(h_{uv}) < \sup(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{uv}) > \inf(g_{uu})$

Proof. Suppose (u, v) is a positive smooth solution to (3.1).

By the Mean Value Theorem, there are $\tilde{u}, \bar{u}, \tilde{v}$ with $0 \leq \bar{u} \leq \tilde{u} \leq u, 0 \leq \bar{v} \leq v$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v) - g(0, v) &= g_u(\tilde{u}, v)u, \\ g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) - g_u(0, 0) &= g_{uu}(\bar{u}, 0)\tilde{u}, \\ g_u(\tilde{u}, v) - g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) &= g_{uv}(\tilde{u}, \bar{v})v. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by the Green's Identity,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} u\phi_1[\lambda_1 - g_u(0, 0) - g_{uu}(\bar{u}, 0)\tilde{u} - g_{uv}(\tilde{u}, \bar{v})v]dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} u\phi_1[\lambda_1 - g_u(0, 0) + g_u(0, 0) - g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) + g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) - g_u(\tilde{u}, v)]dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} u\phi_1[\lambda_1 - g_u(\tilde{u}, v)]dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} -\phi_1 u g_u(\tilde{u}, v) + u\lambda_1 \phi_1 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_1 [g(0, v) - g(u, v)] + u\lambda_1 \phi_1 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_1 [-g(u, v)] + u\lambda_1 \phi_1 dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \phi_1 \Delta u - u\Delta \phi_1 dx \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

But, since $-g_{uu}(\bar{u}, 0)\tilde{u} - g_{uv}(\tilde{u}, \bar{v})v > 0$ in $\Omega, g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1$.

By the Mean Value Theorem again, there are u_1, v_1 with $0 \leq u_1 \leq u, 0 \leq v_1 \leq v$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v) - g(0, v) &= g_u(u_1, v)u, \\ h(u, v) - h(u, 0) &= h_v(u, v_1)v. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta u + u g_u(u, v) \\ & \leq \Delta u + u g_u(u_1, v) \\ & = \Delta u + g(u, v) - g(0, v) \\ & = \Delta u + g(u, v) \\ & = 0, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta v + v h_v(u, v) \\ & \leq \Delta v + v h_v(u, v_1) \\ & = \Delta v + h(u, v) - h(u, 0) \\ & = \Delta v + h(u, v) \\ & = 0, \end{aligned}$$

so, (u, v) is a supersolution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + u g_u(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + v h_v(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

Since $g_u(0, 0) = h_v(0, 0) > \lambda_1$, by the continuity of g_u and h_v , there is $d > 0$ such that $g_u(0, d) > \lambda_1$ and $h_v(d, 0) > \lambda_1$, and so, for sufficiently small $m > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta[m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}] + m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}g_u(m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}) \\ = & m[\Delta\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)} + \theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}g_u(m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)})] \\ \geq & m[\Delta\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)} + \theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}g_u(\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, d)] \\ = & 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta[m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}] + m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}h_v(m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}) \\ = & m[\Delta\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)} + \theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}h_v(m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)})] \\ \geq & m[\Delta\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)} + \theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)}h_v(d, \theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)})] \\ = & 0 \end{aligned}$$

So, $(m\theta_{g_u(\cdot, d)}, m\theta_{h_v(d, \cdot)})$ is a subsolution to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + ug_u(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + vh_v(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

Therefore, by the Lemma 2.1, there is a positive smooth solution, again denoted by (u, v) to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + ug_u(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + vh_v(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

By the Mean Value Theorem again, there are u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 with $0 \leq u_1, u_2 \leq u, 0 \leq v_1, v_2 \leq v$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} g_u(u, v) - g_u(0, v) &= g_{uu}(u_1, v)u \\ h_v(u, v) - h_v(0, v) &= h_{vv}(u_2, v)v \\ g_u(0, v) - g_u(0, 0) &= g_{uv}(0, v_1)v \\ h_v(0, v) - h_v(0, 0) &= h_{vv}(0, v_2)v \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the Green's Identity again,

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} uv[h_{uv}(u_2, v) - g_{uu}(u_1, v)]u + [h_{vv}(0, v_2) - g_{uv}(0, v_1)]v dx \\ = & \int_{\Omega} uv[h_{uv}(u_2, v)u + h_{vv}(0, v_2)v - g_{uu}(u_1, v)u - g_{uv}(0, v_1)v] dx \\ = & \int_{\Omega} uv[h_v(u, v) - h_v(0, v) + h_v(0, v) - h_v(0, 0) + g_u(0, v) - g_u(u, v) - g_u(0, v) \\ & + g_u(0, 0)] dx \\ = & \int_{\Omega} uv[h_v(u, v) - g_u(u, v)] dx \\ = & \int_{\Omega} v\Delta u - u\Delta v dx \\ = & 0, \end{aligned}$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} uv([\inf(h_{uv}) - \sup(g_{uu})]u + [\inf(h_{vv}) - \sup(g_{uv})]v) dx &\leq 0, \\ \int_{\Omega} uv([\sup(h_{uv}) - \inf(g_{uu})]u + [\sup(h_{vv}) - \inf(g_{uv})]v) dx &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which derives

$$\begin{aligned} (A) \quad & \inf(h_{uv}) = \sup(g_{uu}), \inf(h_{vv}) \leq \sup(g_{uv}), \\ (B) \quad & \inf(h_{uv}) > \sup(g_{uu}), \inf(h_{vv}) < \sup(g_{uv}), \\ (C) \quad & \inf(h_{uv}) < \sup(g_{uu}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (A') \quad & \sup(h_{uv}) = \inf(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{vv}) \geq \inf(g_{uv}), \\ (B') \quad & \sup(h_{uv}) < \inf(g_{uu}), \sup(h_{vv}) > \inf(g_{uv}), \\ (C') \quad & \sup(h_{uv}) > \inf(g_{uu}). \end{aligned}$$

Combining (A), (B), (C) and (A'), (B'), (C') together, we establish the result of the Theorem. \square

We easily recognize that combining the Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 generalizes the result of Theorem 1.1 with linear growth rates.

We also prove a nonexistence result. In biological terms, this result confirms that sufficiently large reproduction capacity of the species 1 with fixed reproduction rate of the species 2 results in their extinction.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose*

(A) $g_{uu} < 0, g_{uv} < 0, h_{uv} < 0, h_{vv} < 0,$

(B) $g(0, v) = h(u, 0) = 0$

(C) *For any $d > 0,$ there is $c(d) > 0$ such that $g_u(u, d) < 0, h_v(d, v) < 0$ for $u, v > c(d).$*

If $g_u(0, 0) > \frac{\nu}{\mu} h_v(0, 0), -1 \leq g_{uu} < 0,$ and $h_{vv} \leq -1,$ where $\mu = \min[-\sup(h_{uv}), 1]$ and $\nu = \max[-\inf(g_{uv}), 1],$ then there is no positive solution to (3.1).

Proof. Suppose there is a positive solution (u, v) to (3.1).

As we have proved in the previous theorem, there is a positive solution, again denoted by $(u, v),$ to

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + ug_u(u, v) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + vh_v(u, v) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0. \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega,$$

So, by the Mean Value Theorem, the Green's Identity and the inequality conditions,

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \int_{\Omega} (g_u(0, 0) - h_v(0, 0) + [-\sup(h_{uv}) - 1]u + [1 + \inf(g_{uv})]v)uvdx \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} (g_u(0, 0) - h_v(0, 0) + [\inf(g_{uu}) - \sup(h_{vv})]u + [\inf(g_{uv}) - \sup(h_{vv})]v)uvdx \\ & \leq \int_{\Omega} [g_u(0, 0) - h_v(0, 0) + g_u(u, 0) - g_u(0, 0) - h_v(u, v) + h_v(0, v) \\ & \quad + g_u(u, v) - g_u(u, 0) - h_v(0, v) + h_v(0, 0)]uvdx \tag{3.2} \\ & = \int_{\Omega} [g_u(u, v) - h_v(u, v)]uvdx \\ & = \int_{\Omega} (-v\Delta u + u\Delta v)dx \\ & = 0. \end{aligned}$$

But, if $g_u(0, 0) > \frac{\nu}{\mu} h_v(0, 0),$ then since $g_u(0, 0) \geq u$ and $h_v(0, 0) \geq v,$

$$g_u(0, 0) - h_v(0, 0) + [-\sup(h_{uv}) - 1]u + [1 + \inf(g_{uv})]v \geq \mu g_u(0, 0) - \nu h_v(0, 0) > 0,$$

which contradicts to (3.2). □

4 Cooperating Species

Consider the system for two cooperating species of animals

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u(x) + g(u(x), v(x)) = 0 \\ \Delta v(x) + h(u(x), v(x)) = 0 \\ u|_{\partial\Omega} = v|_{\partial\Omega} = 0, \end{cases} \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{4.1}$$

where $g, h \in C^2$ are such that $g_{uu} < 0, g_{uv} > 0, h_{uv} > 0, h_{vv} < 0,$ and $g(0, v) = h(u, 0) = 0.$

The following Theorem proves a necessary condition for the existence of a positive solution to (4.1).

Theorem 4.1. *If $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1, h_v(0, 0) > \lambda_1, \inf(h_{vv}) \geq -1,$ and $\inf(h_{uv}) > 0,$ then the existence of a positive solution to (4.1) implies*

$$\inf(g_{uv}) \inf(h_{uv}) + \inf(g_{uu}) < 0.$$

Proof. Suppose $\inf(g_{uv}) \inf(h_{uv}) + \inf(g_{uu}) \geq 0$. Consider a family $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) = (\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1)$ with any $\lambda > 0$.

Then by the assumption and Mean Value Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta u_\lambda + g(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) \\ &= -\lambda\lambda_1\phi_1 + g(\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) \\ &= -\lambda\lambda_1\phi_1 + g(\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) - g(0, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) \\ &= -\lambda\lambda_1\phi_1 + \lambda\phi_1 g_u(\tilde{u}, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) \\ &= \lambda\phi_1(-\lambda_1 + g_u(\tilde{u}, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) - g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) + g_u(\tilde{u}, 0) - g_u(0, 0) + g_u(0, 0)) \\ &\geq \lambda\phi_1(g_u(0, 0) - \lambda_1 + \inf(g_{uv}) \inf(h_{uv})\lambda\phi_1 + \inf(g_{uu})\tilde{u}) \\ &\geq \lambda\phi_1(g_u(0, 0) - \lambda_1 + \inf(g_{uv}) \inf(h_{uv})\lambda\phi_1 + \inf(g_{uu})\lambda\phi_1) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 \leq \tilde{u} \leq \lambda\phi_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta v_\lambda + h(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) \\ &= -\lambda \inf(h_{uv})\lambda_1\phi_1 + h(\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) \\ &= -\lambda \inf(h_{uv})\lambda_1\phi_1 + h(\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1) - h(\lambda\phi_1, 0) \\ &= -\lambda \inf(h_{uv})\lambda_1\phi_1 + \lambda \inf(h_{uv}\phi_1 h_v(\lambda\phi_1, \tilde{v})) \\ &= \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + h_v(\lambda\phi_1, \tilde{v}) - h_v(\lambda\phi_1, 0) + h_v(\lambda\phi_1, 0) - h_v(0, 0) + h_v(0, 0)] \\ &= \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1[h_v(0, 0) - \lambda_1 + \inf(h_{vv})\tilde{v} + \inf(h_{uv})\lambda\phi_1] \\ &\geq \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1[h_v(0, 0) - \lambda_1 + \inf(h_{vv}) \inf(h_{uv})\lambda\phi_1 + \inf(h_{uv})\lambda\phi_1] \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some $0 \leq \tilde{v} \leq \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1$.

Therefore, $(u_\lambda, v_\lambda) = (\lambda\phi_1, \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1)$ with any $\lambda > 0$ is a family of subsolutions to (4.1).

Furthermore, if (u, v) is a positive solution to (4.1), then $u > \lambda_0\phi_1$ and $v > \lambda_0 \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1$ for sufficiently small $\lambda_0 > 0$, and so by the lemma 2.3, we conclude that $u \geq \lambda\phi_1$ and $v \geq \lambda \inf(h_{uv})\phi_1$ for any $\lambda \geq \lambda_0$.

Hence, there is no positive solution to (4.1). □

We now establish a sufficient condition for the existence of a positive solution to (4.1).

Theorem 4.2. *If $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1, h_v(0, 0) > \lambda_1$ and the system of equations*

$$\begin{aligned} g(u, v) &= 0 \\ h(u, v) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

has a solution (A, B) with $A > 0, B > 0$, then (4.1) has a positive solution.

Proof. Let $\underline{u} = \alpha\phi_1, \underline{v} = \beta\phi_1$, where $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

Then since $g_u(0, 0) > \lambda_1$ and $h_v(0, 0) > \lambda_1$, by the Mean Value Theorem, for small enough $\alpha, \beta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta \underline{u} + g(\underline{u}, \underline{v}) \\ &= \Delta \underline{u} + g(\underline{u}, \underline{v}) - g(0, \underline{v}) \\ &= -\alpha\lambda_1\phi_1 + \alpha\phi_1 g_u(\tilde{u}, \beta\phi_1) \\ &= \alpha\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + g_u(\tilde{u}, \beta\phi_1)] \\ &= \alpha\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + g_u(0, 0) + g_u(\tilde{u}, \beta\phi_1) - g_u(0, \beta\phi_1) + g_u(0, \beta\phi_1) - g_u(0, 0)] \\ &\geq \alpha\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + g_u(0, 0) + \inf(g_{uu})\tilde{u} + \inf(g_{uv})\beta\phi_1] \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

for some \tilde{u} with $0 \leq \tilde{u} \leq u$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \Delta v + h(\underline{u}, v) \\
 = & \Delta v + h(\underline{u}, v) - h(\underline{u}, 0) \\
 = & -\beta\lambda_1\phi_1 + \beta\phi_1 h_v(\alpha\phi_1, \tilde{v}) \\
 = & \beta\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + h_v(\alpha\phi_1, \tilde{v})] \\
 = & \beta\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + h_v(0, 0) + h_v(\alpha\phi_1, \tilde{v}) - h_v(0, \tilde{v}) + h_v(0, \tilde{v}) - h_v(0, 0)] \\
 \geq & \beta\phi_1[-\lambda_1 + h_v(0, 0) + \inf(h_{uv})\alpha\phi_1 + \inf(h_{vv})\tilde{v}] \\
 \geq & 0,
 \end{aligned}$$

for some \tilde{v} with $0 \leq \tilde{v} \leq v$,

and so, $(\underline{u}, \underline{v}) = (\alpha\phi_1, \beta\phi_1)$ is a subsolution to (4.1) for sufficiently small $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

But, by the condition for g and h , there is a supersolution (M, N) with $M > 0, N > 0$ to (4.1).

We conclude by the Lemma 2.1 that there is a positive solution (u, v) to (4.1) with $\alpha\phi_1 \leq u \leq M, \beta\phi_1 \leq v \leq N$. \square

We easily recognize that combining the Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 generalizes the result of Theorem 1.2 with linear growth rates.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, our investigation of the effects of nonlinear growth rates on the competition and cooperation models resulted in the development and proof of Theorems 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1 and 4.2, as detailed above. The results together assert that right choice of functions $g(u, v)$ and $h(u, v)$ will maintain the existence of the positive steady state. Indeed, our results specifically outline conditions sufficient and necessary to maintain the positive, steady state solution when rates of reproduction, self-limitation, competition and cooperation are nonlinear.

Applying this mathematical results to real world situations, our results establish that two species residing in the same environment can vary their interactions, within certain limitations, and continue to survive together indefinitely at densities. The conditions necessary for coexistence, as described in the Theorems, simply require that competing members' rates of reproduction, self-limitation and competition are well-balanced, and cooperating members of each species interact strongly with themselves and weakly with members of the other species.

While our research in this paper therefore represents a progression in the field, the results obtained have an important limitation. Our model describes the interactions of only two species who reside in the same environment, so the parallel conditions required for the coexistence of more than two species need to be investigated in future research (For example, see [10] that has results of perturbation of the model with arbitrary N species of animals, and is the development of [14] that has the results with two species of animals). Mathematically, analysis of competition and cooperation models for N populations would expand the community's understanding of the behavior of functions and extend established theory in the field. Biologically, the investigation of models for N species would increase knowledge on the nature of interactions between any number of species within the same environment. Thus, the results achieved through our research will enable both fields to continue the development of theory on interaction of populations.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

References

- [1] Dunninger D. Lecture note for applied analysis in Michigan State University.
- [2] Ali SW, Cosner C. On the uniqueness of the positive steady state for Lotka-Volterra Models with diffusion. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Application*. 1992;168:329-341.
- [3] Cantrell RS, Cosner C. On the steady-state problem for the Volterra-Lotka competition model with diffusion. *Houston Journal of Mathematics*. 1987;13:337-352.
- [4] Cantrell RS, Cosner C. On the uniqueness and stability of positive solutions in the Volterra-Lotka competition model with diffusion. *Houston J. Math*. 1989;15:341-361.
- [5] Cosner C, Lazer AC. Stable coexistence states in the Volterra-Lotka competition model with diffusion. *Siam J. Appl. Math*. 1984;44:1112-1132.
- [6] Gomez JL, Pardo R. Existence and uniqueness for some competition models with diffusion. *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I Math*. 1991;313:933-938.
- [7] Gui C, Lou Y. Uniqueness and nonuniqueness of coexistence states in the Lotka-Volterra competition model. *Comm Pure and Appl. Math., XVL2*. 1994;12:1571-1594.
- [8] Korman P, Leung A. A general monotone scheme for elliptic systems with applications to ecological models. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*. 1986;102A:315-325.
- [9] Korman P, Leung A. On the existence and uniqueness of positive steady states in the Volterra-Lotka ecological models with diffusion. *Applicable Analysis*. 1987;26:145-160.
- [10] Kang J. Perturbation of a nonlinear elliptic biological interacting model with multiple species. *Communications in Mathematics and Applications*. 2011;2(2-3):61-76.
- [11] Kang J, Oh Y. A sufficient condition for the uniqueness of positive steady state to a reaction diffusion system. *Journal of Korean Mathematical Society*. 2002;39:377-385.
- [12] Kang J, Oh Y. Uniqueness of coexistence state of general competition model for several competing species. *Kyungpook Mathematical Journal*. 2002;42(2):391-398.
- [13] Kang J, Oh Y, Lee J. The existence, nonexistence and uniqueness of global positive coexistence of a nonlinear elliptic biological interacting model. *Kangweon-Kyungki Math. Jour*. 2004;12(1):77-90.
- [14] Lizarraga K, Kang J, Lee J. Perturbation of a nonlinear elliptic biological interacting model. *Dynamics of PDE*. 2006;3(4):281-293.
- [15] Li L, Logan R. Positive solutions to general elliptic competition models. *Differential and Integral Equations*. 1991;4:817-834.
- [16] Leung A. Equilibria and stabilities for competing-species, reaction-diffusion equations with Dirichlet boundary data. *J. Math. Anal. Appl*. 1980;73:204-218.

©2015 Kang and Tritch; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here (Please copy paste the total link in your browser address bar)

www.sciencedomain.org/review-history.php?id=1035&id=6&aid=9101