

April 14, 2019.

Preprint version: Comments and suggestions welcome.

A MEETING POINT OF ENTROPY AND BIFURCATIONS IN CROSS-DIFFUSION HERDING

ANSGAR JÜNGEL, CHRISTIAN KUEHN, AND LARA TRUSSARDI

ABSTRACT. A cross-diffusion system modeling the information herding of individuals is analyzed in a bounded domain with no-flux boundary conditions. The variables are the species' density and an influence function which modifies the information state of the individuals. The cross-diffusion term may stabilize or destabilize the system. Furthermore, it allows for a formal gradient-flow or entropy structure. Exploiting this structure, the global-in-time existence of weak solutions and the exponential decay to the constant steady state is proved in certain parameter regimes. This entropy approach does not extend to all parameters. We investigate local bifurcations from homogeneous steady states analytically to determine whether this defines the validity boundary. This analysis shows that generically there is a gap in the parameter regime between the entropy approach validity and the first local bifurcation. Next, we use numerical continuation methods to track the bifurcating non-homogeneous steady states globally. In summary, we find that the main boundaries in the parameter regime are given by the first local bifurcation point, the degeneracy of the diffusion matrix and a certain entropy decay validity condition. In a suitable limit, these three boundaries collapse onto one parameter value and provide a meeting point for the entropy method and the bifurcation-theoretic approach. We suggest that our paradigm of comparing bifurcation-generated obstructions to the global parameter validity of entropy-structure methods could also be of high relevance for many other models beyond the one studied here.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the following cross-diffusion system:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & \partial_t u_1 = \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 - g(u_1)\nabla u_2), \\ (2) \quad & \partial_t u_2 = \operatorname{div}(\delta\nabla u_1 + \kappa\nabla u_2) + f(u_1) - \alpha u_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $u_1 = u_1(t, x)$, $u_2 = u_2(t, x)$ for $(t, x) \in [0, T) \times \Omega$, $T > 0$ is the final time, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 1$) is a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary, ∇ denotes the gradient,

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35K57, 35K20, 35B40, 35Q91.

Key words and phrases. Information herding, entropy method, global existence of solutions, large-time behavior of solutions, relative entropy, Crandall-Rabinowitz, numerical continuation, bifurcation.

AJ and LT acknowledge partial support from the European Union in the FP7-PEOPLE-2012-ITN Program under Grant Agreement Number 304617, the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), grants P22108, P24304, W1245, and the Austrian-French Program of the Austrian Exchange Service (ÖAD). CK acknowledges partial support by an APART fellowship of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (ÖAW) and by a Marie-Curie International Reintegration Grant by the EU/REA (IRG 271086).

$\operatorname{div} = \nabla \cdot$ is the divergence and $\partial_t = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$ denotes the partial derivative with respect to time. The equations are supplemented by no-flux boundary conditions and suitable initial conditions

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} (\nabla u_1 - g(u_1)\nabla u_2) \cdot \nu &= 0 \\ (\delta \nabla u_1 + \kappa \nabla u_2) \cdot \nu &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0, \quad u_1(0, x) = u_1^0, \quad u_2(0, x) = u_2^0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where ν denotes the outer unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$. The function $u_1(x, t) \in [0, 1]$ represents the density of individuals with information variable $x \in \Omega$ at time $t \geq 0$, and $u_2(x, t)$ is an influence function which modifies the information state of the individuals and possibly may lead to a herding (or aggregation) behavior of individuals. The influence function acts through the term $g(u_1)\nabla u_2$ in (1). The non-negative bounded function $g(u_1)$ is assumed to vanish only at $u_1 = 0$ and $u_1 = 1$, which provides the bound $0 \leq u_1 \leq 1$ if $0 \leq u_1(0, x) \leq 1$. The influence function is modified by the non-negative source term $f(u_1)$, relaxes with time with rate $\alpha > 0$, and diffuses with coefficient $\kappa > 0$.

If $\delta = 0$, equations (1)-(2) are employed in [BMP11] to model the evolution of large human crowds driven by the dynamic field u_2 , where x describes a spatial variable and the functions

$$(4) \quad g(s) = s(1 - s), \quad f(s) = s(1 - s), \quad s \in [0, 1],$$

have been chosen. In fact, the nonlinearity in (4) is just the classical logistic growth term [Mur02], which also appears in the one-dimensional Fisher-Kolmogorov-Petrovskii-Piscounov (FKPP) monostable reaction-diffusion equation [Fis37, KPP91]. This nonlinearity is one of the paradigmatic examples in mathematical biology. Although our results here apply to a lot more general nonlinearities, the choice (4) is helpful to keep in mind as a basic example.

For general nonlinearities, the system (1)-(2) is one possible model to describe the dynamics of information herding in a macroscopic setting. There exist other, more realistic, approaches to model herding behavior, for instance using kinetic equations [DL14] or agent-based models [LS08], but the focus in this paper is to understand the influence of the parameter δ on the solution behavior from a mathematical viewpoint. Equations (1)-(2) with $\delta = 0$ can be also interpreted as a nonlinear variant of the chemotaxis Patlak-Keller-Segel model [KS70], where the function u_2 corresponds to the concentration of the chemoattractant [HP02]. The nonlinear mobility $g(u_1) = u_1(1 - u_1)$ models finite-size exclusion and prevents blow-up phenomena [HW05, Wrz04], which are known in the original Keller-Segel model.

The above system with $\delta > 0$ and $g(u_1) = u_1$ was analyzed in [HJ11] in the Keller-Segel context. The additional cross diffusion with $\delta > 0$ in (2) was motivated by the fact that it prevents the blow up of the solutions in two space dimensions, even for large initial densities and for arbitrarily small values of $\delta > 0$. The motivation to introduce this term in our model is different since the nonlinear mobility $g(u_1)$ allows us to conclude that $u_1 \in [0, 1]$, thus preventing blow up without taking into account the cross-diffusion term $\delta \Delta u_1$. Our aim is to investigate the behavior of the solutions to (1)-(2) for *all* values for δ , thus allowing for *destabilizing* cross-diffusion parameters $\delta < 0$.

One starting point to investigate the dynamics is to consider the functional structure of the equation. In this context entropy methods are a powerful tool [Jün15]. The entropy structure can frequently be used to establish the existence of (weak) solutions. Furthermore, it is helpful for a quantitative analysis of the large-time behavior of solutions for certain reaction-diffusion systems; see, e.g., [DF07]. The method quantifies the decay of a certain functional with respect to a steady state. An advantage is that the approach can work globally, even for initial conditions far away from steady states. Moreover, the entropy structure may be formulated in the variational framework of gradient flows which allows one to analyze the geodesic convexity of their solutions [LM13, ZM15]. However, this global view indicates already that we may not expect that the approach is valid for all parameters in general nonlinear systems. Indeed, in some situations, entropy methods only work for a certain range of parameters occurring in the system. The question is what happens for parameter values outside the admissible parameter range.




FIGURE 1. Sketch of the different conjectures and scenarios, how entropy methods and bifurcation of steady-state branches may interact, where the main parameter δ is on the horizontal axis and a measure of the norm of solutions is on the vertical axis. Homogeneous steady state branches are the black horizontal lines. Local bifurcation points are marked as magenta dots and parts of emanating bifurcation curves as red curves. (a) Scenario 1: Local supercritical (pitchfork) bifurcation point at δ_b . The entropy validity regime boundary δ^* and the local bifurcation point value simply coincide. (b) Scenario 2: The effect arises due to global bifurcation curves. For example, at a local (transcritical) bifurcation a solution branch may emanate and extend globally up to the validity boundary of the entropy method at δ^* . (c) Scenario 3: The bifurcation regime and the entropy regime do not match exactly but are separated by a degeneracy in the structure of the equation at δ_d as well as a condition at δ_e coming from the entropy method. In particular, the entropy method validity regime is $\delta > \delta_e$ and the first local bifurcation occurs at δ_b . The parameter value δ^* is a suitable (singular) limit. This is the situation of the present paper.

One natural conjecture is that upon variation of a single parameter, there exists a critical parameter value associated to a local bifurcation point beyond which the entropy approach cannot extend; see Figure 1(a). In particular, the homogeneous steady state upon which the entropy is built, could lose stability and new solution branches may appear in parameter space. Another possibility is that global bifurcation branches in parameter space are an obstruction as shown in Figure 1(b).

In the context of (1)-(2), the distinguished parameter we are interested in is δ . Here we shall state our main results on an informal level. Carrying out the existence of weak solutions and the global decay to homogeneous steady states $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$ via an entropy approach, we find the following results:

- (M1) The global entropy decay to equilibrium does not extend to arbitrary negative δ . Suppose we fix all other parameters, then there exists a critical δ_e (to be defined below) such that global decay occurs only for $\delta > \delta_e$ ($\delta \neq 0$).
- (M2) If we consider the limit $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$ then we can extend the entropy method up to $\delta^* := -\kappa/\gamma < 0$, where $\gamma := \max_{v \in [0,1]} g(v)$, i.e., global exponential decay to a steady state occurs for all $\delta > \delta^*$ ($\delta \neq 0$) if α is large enough.

The proof of these results provides a number of technical challenges, which are discussed in more detail in Section 2.1 and Section 3. However, the entropy method definitely does not extend to any negative δ . Based upon these results, it is natural to check the conjectures shown in Figure 1(a)-(b). If these cases would occur, it is clear that a global decay to steady state is impossible as bifurcating non-homogeneous steady state solutions exist in addition to homogeneous steady states. We use standard analytical local bifurcation theory based upon a modification of Crandall-Rabinowitz theory and the Lyapunov-Schmidt method [Kie04], to prove the following:

- (M3) The bifurcation approach for homogeneous steady states can be carried out as long as $\delta \neq \delta_d := -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$. Local bifurcations of simple eigenvalues occur for certain negative values of $\delta = \delta_b$.
- (M4) If we fix all other parameters, $\delta^* > \delta_b$ for the largest bifurcation point δ_b .

Although these results are completely consistent with the entropy method, they do not yield the possibility shown in Figure 1(a) for generic fixed parameter values. To study the case in Figure 1(b), one has to track the bifurcation curves globally. In general, this is not possible analytically for arbitrary nonlinear systems. Therefore, we consider numerical continuation of the non-homogeneous steady-state solution branches (for $d = 1$). The continuation is carried out using AUTO [DCD⁺07]. Our numerical results show the following:

- (M5) The non-homogeneous steady-state bifurcation branches starting at the local bifurcation points extend in parameter space but they do not reach δ^* .
- (M6) A two-parameter continuation in (δ, α) of the local bifurcation points shows that these points are asymptotic to the value $\delta_d := -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$.

Combining all the results we conclude that we have the situation in Figure 1(c) for generic fixed parameter values, i.e., the validity regimes are $\delta < \delta_d$ for the bifurcation theory approach with a first bifurcation at $\delta_b < \delta_d$, and $\delta > \delta_e$ for the global entropy

decay. Furthermore, there exists a special value $\delta^* \in (\delta_d, \delta_e)$. We proceed to explain the role of this special value as a singular limit below.

First, we remark that the condition $\kappa \neq -\delta g(u_1)$ does not only occur in the numerical continuation analysis but also in the context of the entropy method as well as the analytical bifurcation calculation. It is precisely the condition for the vanishing of the determinant of the diffusion matrix that prevents pushing the entropy method further and it is also a condition where the analytical bifurcation theory does not work because the linearized problem does not yield a Fredholm operator. We have already stated in (M6) that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_b = \delta_d,$$

i.e., the bifurcation points accumulate at the degeneracy. In addition, note carefully that

$$\lim_{u_1^* \rightarrow u_1^{**}} \delta_d = \delta^*, \quad \text{where } g(u_1^{**}) = \gamma,$$

so for the homogeneous steady state associated to the maximum of the nonlinearity g and the limit $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$, the bifurcation validity regime limits onto the critical value δ^* . Even better, we show below that we also have the limit

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_e = \delta^*.$$

In this sense, the global decay provided by the entropy method is sharp. In summary, we see that for fixed α and an arbitrary homogeneous steady state, the situation is as in Figure 1(c) for the cross-diffusion herding model. In a suitable limit for the parameter α and the choice of homogeneous steady state considered for the analysis, the situation in Figure 1(c) collapses onto the critical parameter line δ^* .

Therefore, the main contribution of this work is to study the interplay between three different techniques available for reaction-diffusion systems with cross-diffusion: entropy methods, analytical local bifurcation and numerical global bifurcation theory. Furthermore, for each technique, we have to use, improve, and apply the previously available methods to the herding model problem (1)-(3). Our results lead to clear insight on the subdivision of parameter space into regimes, where each method is particularly well-suited to describe the system dynamics. Furthermore, we also compute via continuation several solutions that are of interest for applications to herding behavior.

There seem to be very few works [Gab12] studying the parameter space interplay between global entropy-structure methods in comparison to local analytical and global numerical bifurcation approaches. Our work seems to be, to the best of our knowledge, the first analysis combining and comparing all three methods, and also the first to consider the entropy-bifurcation interaction problem for cross-diffusion systems. In fact, our analysis suggests a general paradigm to improve our understanding of global methods for nonlinear spatio-temporal systems, i.e., one major goal is to determine the parameter space *validity boundaries* between *different methods*.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state our main results and provide an overview of the strategy for the proofs respectively the numerical methods employed.

In particular, the entropy method results are considered in Section 2.1, the analytical local bifurcation in Section 2.2, and the numerical global bifurcation results in Section 2.3. The following sections contain the full details for the main results. The proofs using the entropy method are contained in Section 3, where the weak solution construction is carried out in Section 3.1 and the global decay is proved in Section 3.2. Section 4 proves the existence of a local bifurcation point to non-trivial solutions upon decreasing δ . The details for the global numerical continuation results are reported in Section 5. We conclude in Section 6 with an outlook, where we discuss several open questions.

Notation: When operating with vectors we view them as column vectors and use $(\cdot)^\top$ to denote the transpose. We use the standard notation for L^p -spaces, $W^{k,p}$ for the Sobolev space with (weak) derivatives up to and including order k in L^p as well as the shorthand notation $W^{k,2} = H^k$; see [Eva02] for details. Furthermore, $'$ denotes the associated dual space, when applied to a function space.

2. MAIN RESULTS

We describe the main results of this paper, obtained by either the entropy method or local analytical and global numerical bifurcation analysis.

2.1. Entropy Method. First, we show the global existence of weak solutions and their large-time decay to equilibrium. The main challenge of (1)-(2) is that the diffusion matrix of the system is neither symmetric nor positive definite, such that even the local existence is nontrivial. The key idea of our analysis, similar as in [HJ11], is to define a suitable entropy functional. For this, we introduce the entropy density

$$h(u) = h_0(u_1) + \frac{u_2^2}{2\delta_0}, \quad u = (u_1, u_2)^\top \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R},$$

where h_0 is defined as the second anti-derivative of $1/g$,

$$(5) \quad h_0(s) := \int_m^s \int_m^\sigma \frac{1}{g(t)} dt d\sigma, \quad s \in (0, 1),$$

where $0 < m < 1$ is a fixed number, and

$$\delta_0 := \delta \quad \text{if } \delta > 0, \quad \delta_0 := \kappa/\gamma \quad \text{if } -\kappa/\gamma < \delta < 0.$$

It turns out that the so-called entropy variables $w = (w_1, w_2)^\top$ with $w_1 = h_0'(u_1)$ and $w_2 = u_2/\delta_0$ make the diffusion matrix positive semi-definite for all $\delta > \delta^* := -\kappa/\gamma$, $\delta \neq 0$. We remark that for $\delta = 0$ the entropy method does not work and we do not cover this case. In the entropy variables, we can formulate (1)-(2) equivalently as

$$\partial_t u = \operatorname{div}(B(w)\nabla w) + F(u),$$

where $u = u(w)$, $F(u) = (0, f(u_1) - \alpha u_2)^\top$ and

$$(6) \quad B(w) = \begin{pmatrix} g(u_1) & -\delta_0 g(u_1) \\ \delta g(u_1) & \delta_0 \kappa \end{pmatrix}.$$

The invertibility of the mapping $w \mapsto u(w)$ is guaranteed by Hypothesis (H3) below. We show in Lemma 4 below that $B(w)$ is positive semi-definite if $\delta > \delta^*$, $\delta \neq 0$. The global existence is based on the fact that the entropy

$$(7) \quad H(u(t)) = \int_{\Omega} \left(h_0(u_1(t)) + \frac{u_2(t)^2}{2\delta_0} \right) dx$$

is bounded on $[0, T]$ for any $T > 0$; note that we write $u = u(t)$ here to emphasize the time dependence of the entropy. A formal computation, which is made rigorous in Section 3.1, shows that

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dH}{dt} = & - \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla u_1|^2}{g(u_1)} + \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta_0} - 1 \right) \nabla u_1 \cdot \nabla u_2 + \frac{\kappa}{\delta_0} |\nabla u_2|^2 \right) dx \\ & + \frac{1}{\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1) - \alpha u_2) u_2 \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

The terms in the first bracket define a positive definite quadratic form if and only if $\delta > \delta^*$. The second integral is bounded since $f(u_1)$ is bounded. This shows that for some $\varepsilon_1(\delta) > 0$,

$$(9) \quad \frac{dH}{dt} \leq -\varepsilon_1(\delta) \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla u_1|^2}{g(u_1)} + \frac{|\nabla u_2|^2}{\delta_0^2} \right) dx + c,$$

where the constant $c > 0$ depends on Ω , f , and α . These gradient bounds are essential for the existence analysis.

Before we state the existence theorem, we make our assumptions precise:

(H1) $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\partial\Omega \in C^2$, $\alpha > 0$, $\kappa > 0$, $h(u^0) \in L^1(\Omega)$ with $u_1^0 \in (0, 1)$ a.e.

(H2) $f \in C^0([0, 1])$ is nonnegative.

(H3) $g \in C^2([0, 1])$ is positive on $(0, 1)$, $g(0) = g(1) = 0$, $g(u) \leq \gamma$ for $u \in [0, 1]$, where $\gamma > 0$, and $\int_0^m ds/g(s) = \int_m^1 ds/g(s) = +\infty$ for some $0 < m < 1$.

The condition $g(u) \leq \gamma$ in $[0, 1]$ in (H3) implies that $(u_1^0 - m)^2/(2\gamma) \leq h_0(u_1^0)$ and hence, $h(u^0) \in L^1(\Omega)$ in (H1) yields $u_1^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $u_2^0 \in L^2(\Omega)$. Hypothesis (H3) ensures that the function h_0 defined in (5) is well defined and of class C^4 (needed in Lemma 5). Its derivative h_0' is strictly increasing on $(0, 1)$ with range \mathbb{R} , thus being invertible with inverse $(h_0')^{-1} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$. For instance, the function $g(s) = s(1-s)$, $s \in [0, 1]$, satisfies (H3) and $h_0(s) = s \log s + (1-s) \log(1-s)$, where \log denotes the natural logarithm. A more general class of functions fulfilling (H3) is $g(s) = s^a(1-s)^b$ with $a, b \geq 1$.

Theorem 1 (Global existence). *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) hold and let $\delta > -\kappa/\gamma$. Then there exists a weak solution to (1)-(3) satisfying $0 \leq u_1 \leq 1$ in Ω , $t > 0$ and*

$$u_1, u_2 \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; H^1(\Omega)), \quad \partial_t u_1, \partial_t u_2 \in L_{\text{loc}}^2(0, \infty; H^1(\Omega)').$$

The initial datum is satisfied in the sense of $H^1(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)'$.

We provide a brief overview of the proof. First, we discretize the equations in time using the implicit Euler scheme, which keeps the entropy structure. Since we are working in the entropy-variable formulation, we need to regularize the equations in order to be able to apply the Lax-Milgram lemma for the linearized problem. The existence of solutions to

the nonlinear problem then follows from the Leray-Schauder theorem, where the uniform estimate is a consequence of the entropy inequality (9). This estimate also provides bounds uniform in the approximation parameters. A discrete Aubin lemma in the version of [DJ12] provides compactness, which allows us to perform the limit of vanishing approximation parameters.

Although the proof is similar to the existence proofs in [HJ11, Jün15], the results of these papers are not directly applicable since our situation is more general than in [HJ11, Jün15]. The main novelties of our existence analysis are the new entropy (7) and the treatment of destabilizing cross diffusion ($\delta < 0$).

For the analysis of the large-time asymptotics, we introduce the constant steady state $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$, where

$$u_1^* = \bar{u}_1^0, \quad u_2^* = \frac{f(u_1^*)}{\alpha}, \quad \text{with } \bar{u}_j^0 := \frac{1}{m(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} u_j^0(x) \, dx, \quad j \in \{1, 2\},$$

and $m(\Omega)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of Ω . Furthermore, we define the relative entropy

$$H(u|u^*) = \int_{\Omega} h(u|u^*) \, dx$$

with the entropy density

$$(10) \quad h(u|u^*) = h_0(u_1|u_1^*) + \frac{1}{2\delta_0}(u_2 - u_2^*)^2, \quad \text{where } h_0(u_1|u_1^*) = h_0(u_1) - h_0(u_1^*).$$

Note that u_1 conserves mass, i.e. $\bar{u}_1(t) := m(\Omega)^{-1} \int_{\Omega} u_1(t) \, dx$ is constant in time and $\bar{u}_1(t) = u_1^*$ for all $t > 0$. Thus, by Jensen's inequality, $h_0(u_1|u_1^*) \geq 0$.

Theorem 2 (Exponential decay). *Let assumptions (H1)-(H3) hold, let Ω be convex, let f be Lipschitz continuous with constant $c_L > 0$, and let*

$$(11) \quad \delta_0 \varepsilon_1(\delta) > \frac{\gamma}{\alpha} c_L^2 c_S,$$

where $\varepsilon_1(\delta) > 0$ and $c_S > 0$ are defined in Lemmas 4 and 5, respectively. Then, for $t > 0$,

$$(12) \quad H(u(t)|u^*) \leq e^{-\mu(\delta)t} H(u^0|u^*), \quad \text{where } \mu(\delta) = \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} - \frac{\gamma c_L^2}{\alpha \delta_0}, \alpha \right\} > 0.$$

Moreover, it holds for $t > 0$,

$$(13) \quad \|u_1(t) - u_1^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|u_2(t) - u_2^*\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq 2\sqrt{\max\{\gamma, \delta\} H(u^0|u^*)} e^{-\mu(\delta)t/2}.$$

Recall that $\delta_0 = \kappa/\gamma$ if $\delta < 0$ and $\delta_0 = \delta$ if $\delta > 0$. The values for $\delta_0 \varepsilon_1(\delta)$ are illustrated in Figure 2. It turns out that (11) is fulfilled if either the additional diffusion $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently large or if γ/α is sufficiently small. The latter condition means that the influence of the drift term $g(u_1)\nabla u_2$ is “small” or that the relaxation $-\alpha u_2$ is “strong”. The theorem states that in all these cases, the diffusion is sufficiently strong to lead to exponential decay to equilibrium. For all parameters fixed, except δ , we conclude from the

condition (11) that there exists a δ_e such that exponential decay holds for $\delta > \delta_e$ ($\delta \neq 0$) and we see that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow +\infty} \delta_e = \delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma.$$

as a singular limit already discussed above. We remark that the exclusion of the decay for $\delta = 0$ seems to be purely technical and we conjecture that exponential decay also holds for $\delta = 0$.




FIGURE 2. Illustration of $\delta_0 \varepsilon_1(\delta)$ for $\kappa = 1$ and $\delta = \frac{1}{4}$ (black curves). The corresponding singular limit $\delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma = -4$ is also marked (grey dashed vertical line).

Theorem 2 is proved by differentiating the relative entropy $H(u|u^*)$ with respect to time, similar as in (8). We wish to estimate the gradient terms from below by a multiple of $H(u|u^*)$. The convex Sobolev inequality from Lemma 5 shows that the L^2 -norm of $g(u_1)^{1/2} \nabla u_1$ is estimated from below by $\int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1|u_1^*) dx$, up to a factor. The L^2 -norm of ∇u_2 is estimated from below by a multiple of $\int_{\Omega} (u_2 - \bar{u}_2)^2 dx$, using the Poincaré inequality. However, the variable u_2 generally does not conserve mass and in particular, $\bar{u}_2 \neq u_2^*$. We exploit instead the relaxation term in (2) to achieve the estimate

$$H(u(t)|u^*) + \mu(\delta) \int_0^t H(u(s)|u^*) ds \leq 0$$

Then Gronwall's lemma gives the result. The difficulty is the estimate of the source term $f(u_1)$. This problem is overcome by controlling the expression involving $f(u_1)$ by taking into account the contribution coming from the convex Sobolev inequality. However, we need that δ is sufficiently large, i.e., cross diffusion has to dominate reaction.

The above arguments hold on a formal level only. A second difficulty is to make these arguments rigorous since we need the test function $h'_0(u_1) - h'_0(u_1^*)$, which is undefined if $u_1 = 0$ or $u_1 = 1$ (since $h'_0(0) = -\infty$ and $h'_0(1) = +\infty$ by Hypothesis (H3)). The idea is to perform a transformation of variables in terms of so-called entropy variables which

ensure that $0 < u_1 < 1$ in a time-discrete setting. Passing from the semi-discrete to the continuous case, the variable u_1 may satisfy $0 \leq u_1 \leq 1$ in the limit.

2.2. Analytical Bifurcation Analysis. As outlined in the introduction, the first natural conjecture for the failure of the entropy method for $\delta \leq \delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma$ is to study bifurcations of the homogeneous steady states $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$, which solve

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 - g(u_1)\nabla u_2), \\ 0 &= \operatorname{div}(\delta\nabla u_1 + \kappa\nabla u_2) + f(u_1) - \alpha u_2, \end{aligned}$$

with the no-flux boundary conditions (3). To study the bifurcations of u^* under variation of δ we use the right-hand side of (14) to define a bifurcation function and apply the theory of Crandall-Rabinowitz [CR71, Kie04]. The problem is that u^* is not an *isolated* bifurcation branch as a function of δ since fixing any initial mass yields a different one-dimensional family of homogeneous steady states with

$$(15) \quad u_1^* = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{m}(\Omega)} \int_{\Omega} u_1(x) \, dx \geq 0.$$

Hence, the standard approach has to be modified and we follow arguments that can be found in [CKWW12, SW09, WX13]. It is helpful to introduce some notations first. For $p > d$, let

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{X} := W^{2,p}(\Omega), \quad \mathcal{Y} := L^p(\Omega), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y}_0 := \left\{ u_1 \in L^p(\Omega) : \int_{\Omega} u_1(x) \, dx = 0 \right\}.$$

Due to the Sobolev embedding theorem we know that $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ is continuously embedded in $C^{(1+\theta)}(\bar{\Omega})$ for some $\theta \in (0, 1)$. Furthermore, consider the trace space $W^{2-1/p,p}(\partial\Omega)$ with norm

$$\|w\|_{2-1/p,p} := \inf_{\bar{w}|_{\partial\Omega}=w} \|\bar{w}\|_{2,p}.$$

The associated two-component 'boundary' Banach space we need for our problem is

$$(\partial\mathcal{X})^2 := W^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\Omega) \times W^{1-1/p,p}(\partial\Omega)$$

with norm $\|(u_1, u_2)\| := \|u_1\|_{1-1/p,p} + \|u_2\|_{1-1/p,p}$. Now one defines the mapping $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ by

$$(17) \quad \mathcal{F}(u_1, u_2, \delta) := \begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{div}(\nabla u_1 - g(u_1)\nabla u_2) \\ \delta\Delta u_1 + \kappa\Delta u_2 - \alpha u_2 + f(u_1) \\ \int_{\Omega} u_1(x) \, dx - \mathfrak{m}(\Omega)u_1^* \\ (\nabla u_1 - g(u_1)\nabla u_2) \cdot \nu \\ (\delta\nabla u_1 + \kappa\nabla u_2) \cdot \nu \end{pmatrix}.$$

The first two terms are the usual bifurcation function one would naturally define, the third term is used to isolate the bifurcation branch for the mapping \mathcal{F} , i.e., to avoid the problem with mass conservation, while the last two terms take into account the boundary conditions. We know that there exists a family of solutions

$$\mathcal{F}(u_1^*, u_2^*, \delta) = 0$$

for each $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. The goal is to find the largest parameter value δ_b such that at $\delta = \delta_b$ a non-trivial (or non-homogeneous) branch of steady states is generated at a bifurcation/branch point; see also Figure 1. We are going to check that \mathcal{F} is C^1 -smooth and the Fréchet derivative $D_u \mathcal{F}$ with respect to u at a point $\tilde{u} = (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ is given by

$$(18) \quad \mathcal{A}_\delta(\tilde{u}) \begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{pmatrix} := D_u \mathcal{F}(\tilde{u}, \delta) \begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta U_1 - \operatorname{div}[g'(\tilde{u}_1)(\nabla \tilde{u}_2)U_1 + g(\tilde{u}_1)\nabla U_2] \\ \delta \Delta U_1 + \kappa \Delta U_2 - \alpha U_2 + f'(\tilde{u}_1)U_1 \\ \int_\Omega U_1(x) \, dx \\ (\nabla U_1 - g(\tilde{u}_1)\nabla U_2 - g'(\tilde{u}_1)(\nabla \tilde{u}_2)U_1) \cdot \nu \\ (\delta \nabla U_1 + \kappa \nabla U_2) \cdot \nu \end{pmatrix}$$

where $(U_1, U_2)^\top \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{A}_\delta : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$. We already know from Theorem 2 that for all $\delta > \delta_e$ ($\delta \neq 0$), the homogeneous steady state u^* is globally stable. Clearly this implies local stability as well and this fact can also be checked by studying the spectrum of $\mathcal{A}_\delta(u^*)$. From the structure of the cross-diffusion equations (1)-(2) one does expect destabilization of the homogeneous state upon decreasing δ .

Theorem 3. *Let $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$ be a homogeneous steady state and consider the generic parameter case $-\kappa \neq \delta g(u_1^*)$. Then the following hold:*

- (R1) $D_u \mathcal{F}(\tilde{u}, \delta) : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ is a Fredholm operator with index zero;
- (R2) there exists $\delta = \delta_b$ such that $\dim(\mathcal{N}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b)]) = 1$, where $\mathcal{N}[\cdot]$ denotes the nullspace;
- (R3) there exists a real eigenvalue $\lambda = \lambda(\delta)$ of $\mathcal{A}_\delta(u^*)$, which satisfies $\lambda(\delta_b) = 0$. Furthermore, λ crosses the imaginary axis at δ_b with non-zero speed, i.e., $\mathcal{A}_{\delta_b} e_b \notin \mathcal{R}[\mathcal{A}_{\delta_b}]$, where $\mathcal{R}[\cdot]$ denotes the range and $\operatorname{span}[e_b] = \mathcal{N}[\mathcal{A}_{\delta_b}]$.

The results from (R1)-(R3) then generically (i.e., for $-\kappa \neq \delta_b g(u_1^*)$ or alternatively $\delta \neq \delta_d = -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$) yield, upon applying a standard result by Crandall-Rabinowitz [CR71, CR73, Kie04], the existence of a branch of non-trivial solutions

$$(u_1[s], u_2[s], \delta[s]) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}, \quad (u_1[0], u_2[0], \delta[0]) = (u_1^*, u_2^*, \delta_b),$$

where $s \in [-s_0, s_0]$ parametrizes the steady-state branch locally for some small $s_0 > 0$, and $(u_1[s], u_2[s], \delta[s]) \neq (u_1^*, u_2^*, \delta_b)$ for $s \in [-s_0, 0) \cup (0, s_0]$. Slightly more precise information about the branch can be obtained using the eigenfunction e_b and we refer to Section 4 for the details. The main conclusion of the relatively standard bifurcation theorem is that we know that the entropy method cannot show the decay to steady state for all parameter regions. However, to track the non-trivial solution branches in parameter space, it is usually not possible to compute the global shape of all bifurcation branches analytically. In this case, numerical bifurcation analysis is extremely helpful.

2.3. Numerical Bifurcation Analysis. The results from Section 2.1-2.2 do not provide a full exploration of the dynamical structure of the solutions for the parameter regime $\delta < \delta^*$. To understand this regime better we study the bifurcations of (14) numerically for

$$(19) \quad f(s) = s(1-s), \quad g(s) = s(1-s), \quad s \in \Omega = [0, l] \subset \mathbb{R}.$$

for some interval length $l > 0$. Note that this yields a boundary-value problem (BVP) involving two second-order ordinary differential equations (ODEs)

$$(20) \quad 0 = \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{du_1}{dx} - g(u_1) \frac{du_2}{dx} \right),$$

$$(21) \quad 0 = \delta \frac{d^2 u_1}{dx^2} + \kappa \frac{d^2 u_2}{dx^2} - \alpha u_2 + f(u_1).$$

with boundary conditions

$$(22) \quad 0 = \frac{du_1}{dx}(0) - g(u_1(0)) \frac{du_2}{dx}(0), \quad 0 = \delta \frac{du_1}{dx}(0) + \kappa \frac{du_2}{dx}(0),$$

$$(23) \quad 0 = \frac{du_1}{dx}(1) - g(u_1(1)) \frac{du_2}{dx}(1), \quad 0 = \delta \frac{du_1}{dx}(1) + \kappa \frac{du_2}{dx}(1).$$

An excellent available tool to study the problem (20)-(23) is the software `AUTO` [DCD⁺07] for numerical continuation of BVPs; for other possible options and extensions we refer to the discussion in Section 6. `AUTO` is precisely designed to deal with BVPs for ODEs of the form

$$(24) \quad \frac{dz}{dx} = F(z; p), \quad x \in [0, 1], \quad G(w(0), w(1)) = 0$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$, $G : \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^P$ are parameters and $z = z(x) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the unknown vector. It is easy to re-write (20)-(23) as a system in the form (24) of four first-order ODEs, i.e., we get $N = 4$, consider the scaling $\tilde{x} = x/l$ to normalize the interval length to one, then drop the tilde for x again, and let

$$p_1 := \delta, \quad p_2 := \kappa, \quad p_3 := \alpha, \quad p_4 := l,$$

so $P = 4$ with primary bifurcation parameter δ . For more background on `AUTO` and on numerical continuation we refer to [KOGV07, Kel77, Gov87]. In the setup (24) one can numerically continue the family of homogeneous solutions

$$(u^*, \delta) = (u_1^*, u_2^*, \delta)$$

as a function of δ , i.e., to compute $u^* = u^*(\cdot; \delta)$ for δ in some specified parameter interval. Although this calculation yields bifurcation points for some δ values, it is not straightforward to use the formulation (20)-(21) to switch onto the non-homogeneous solution branches generated at the bifurcation point. The problem is due to the mass conservation since

$$\bar{u}_1 = m(\Omega)^{-1} \int_{\Omega} u_1 \, dx = u_1^*, \quad u_2^* = \frac{f(u_1^*)}{\alpha}$$

is a solution for every positive initial mass \bar{u}_1^0 . In particular, the branch of solutions is not isolated and there exist parametric two-dimensional families of solutions. There are multiple ways to deal with this problem; see also Section 6. One possibility is to resolve the degeneracy of the problem via a small parameter $0 < \rho \ll 1$ and consider

$$(25) \quad 0 = \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{du_1}{dx} - g(u_1) \frac{du_2}{dx} \right) - \rho(u_1 - \bar{u}_1),$$

$$(26) \quad 0 = \delta \frac{d^2 u_1}{dx^2} + \kappa \frac{d^2 u_2}{dx^2} - \alpha u_2 + f(u_1).$$

for a fixed positive parameter $\bar{u}_1 > 0$. In particular, upon setting

$$z_1 := u_1, \quad z_2 := u_2, \quad z_3 := \frac{du_1}{dx}, \quad z_4 := \frac{du_2}{dx},$$

as well as

$$p_5 := \bar{u}_1, \quad p_6 := \rho, \quad P = 6,$$

we end up with a problem of the form (24) by transforming the two second-order ODEs to four first-order ODEs and re-labelling parameters. The vector field for the ODE-BVP we study numerically is then given by

$$(27) \quad F(z; p) = \begin{pmatrix} p_4 z_3 \mathcal{D}_g \\ p_4 z_4 \mathcal{D}_g \\ p_4 [-g(z_1)f(z_1) + p_3 g(z_1)z_2 + p_2 g'(z_1)z_3 z_4 + p_2 p_6 (z_1 - p_5)] \\ p_4 [-f(z_1) + p_3 z_2 - p_1 g'(z_1)z_3 z_4 - p_1 (z_1 - p_5)p_6] \end{pmatrix}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_g := p_2 + p_1 g(z_1)$ and the detailed choices for the free parameters are discussed in Section 5. As mentioned above, the primary bifurcation parameter we are going to be interested in is $\delta = p_1$. The main results of the numerical bifurcation analysis, which are presented in full detail in Section 5, are the following:

- (B1) As predicted by the analytical results, we find the existence of local bifurcation points on the branch of homogeneous steady states in the parameter region with $\delta < \delta^*$. At each bifurcation point on the homogeneous branch, a simple eigenvalue crosses the imaginary axis.
- (B2) The non-trivial (i.e. non-homogeneous) solution branches consist of solutions of multiple 'bumps'; branches originating at smaller values of δ contain more bumps. On each non-homogeneous branch, the bumps acquire sharp interfaces as δ is decreased, which is important for practical applications in information herding.
- (B3) At the local bifurcation points, we observe the emergence of two symmetric branches of solutions for the case when the nonlinearities are identical FKPP quadratic nonlinearities of the form $s \mapsto s(1 - s)$.
- (B4) We carry out a two-parameter continuation of the bifurcation points in (δ, α) -parameter space, which shows the special role of the degeneracy $\kappa = -\delta g(u_1^*)$ as the two-parameter curves are asymptotic to $\delta = -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$.
- (B5) We also construct non-homogeneous solutions for $\rho = 0$ by a homotopy continuation step first continuing onto the non-trivial branches in δ and then decreasing ρ to zero in a second continuation step.

3. ENTROPY METHOD – PROOFS

3.1. Proof of Theorem 1. First, we prove that the new diffusion matrix $B(w)$, defined in (6), is positive semi-definite if δ is not too negative.

Lemma 4. *Assume (H3) and $\delta > -\kappa/\gamma$, $\delta \neq 0$. Then the matrix $B(w)$ is positive semidefinite, and there exists $\varepsilon_1(\delta) > 0$ such that for all $z = (z_1, z_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $w \in \mathbb{R}^2$:*

$$z^\top B(w)z \geq \varepsilon_1(\delta)(g(u_1)z_1^2 + z_2^2).$$

It holds $\varepsilon_1(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \searrow 0$ and $\delta \searrow -\kappa/\gamma$ (see Figure 3).




FIGURE 3. Illustration of $\varepsilon_1(\delta)$ for $\kappa = 1$ and $\delta_0 = \frac{1}{4}$ (black curves). The corresponding singular limit $\delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma = -4$ is also marked (grey dashed vertical line).

For later use, we note that the lemma implies that

$$(28) \quad \nabla w : B(w)\nabla w \geq \varepsilon_1(\delta) \left(\frac{|\nabla u_1|^2}{g(u_1)} + \frac{|\nabla u_2|^2}{\delta_0^2} \right),$$

where $w = (w_1, w_2) = (h'_0(u_1), u_2/\delta_0)$ are the entropy variables introduced in the introduction and $A : B = \sum_{i,j} A_{ij}B_{ij}$ for two matrices $A = (A_{ij})$, $B = (B_{ij})$.

Proof. Let $z = (z_1, z_2)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then

$$z^\top B(w)z = g(u_1)z_1^2 - (\delta_0 - \delta)g(u_1)z_1z_2 + \delta_0\kappa z_2^2.$$

If $\delta > 0$, then $\delta_0 = \delta$ and the mixed term vanishes, showing the claim for $\varepsilon_1(\delta) = \min\{1, \delta\kappa\}$. If $-\kappa/\gamma < \delta < 0$, we have $\delta_0 = \kappa/\gamma$. We make the (non-optimal) choice

$$\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\delta) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{4} \left(1 - \frac{\gamma\delta}{\kappa} \right)^2 \right) > 0.$$

Then $\varepsilon_0 < 1 - (1 - \gamma\delta/\kappa)^2/4$, which is equivalent to $(\kappa - \gamma\delta)^2 < 4(1 - \varepsilon_0)\kappa^2$. Thus, using $g(u_1) \leq \gamma$ (see assumption (H3)),

$$z^\top B(w)z = g(u_1)z_1^2 - \left(\frac{\kappa}{\gamma} - \delta \right) g(u_1)z_1z_2 + \frac{\kappa^2}{\gamma} z_2^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \varepsilon_0 g(u_1) z_1^2 + (1 - \varepsilon_0) g(u_1) \left(z_1 - \frac{(\kappa - \gamma\delta) z_2}{2\gamma(1 - \varepsilon_0)} \right)^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\kappa^2 - \frac{(\kappa - \gamma\delta)^2}{4\gamma(1 - \varepsilon_0)} g(u_1) \right) z_2^2 \\
&\geq \varepsilon_0 g(u_1) z_1^2 + \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\kappa^2 - \frac{(\kappa - \gamma\delta)^2}{4(1 - \varepsilon_0)} \right) z_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the choice of ε_0 , the bracket on the right-hand side is positive, and the claim follows after choosing $\varepsilon_1(\delta) = \min\{\varepsilon_0(\delta), [\kappa^2 - (\kappa - \gamma\delta)^2/(4(1 - \varepsilon_0(\delta)))]/\gamma\} > 0$ for $-\kappa/\gamma < \delta < 0$. \square

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on the solution of a time-discrete and regularized problem.

Step 1: Solution of an approximate problem. Let $T > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau = T/N$, $\varepsilon > 0$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n > d/2$. Then $H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Let $w^{k-1} \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be given. If $k = 1$, we define $w^0 = h'(u^0)$. We wish to find $w^k \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(29) \quad &\frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u(w^k) - u(w^{k-1})) \cdot \phi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi : B(w^k) \nabla w^k \, dx \\
&\quad + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} D^\beta w^k \cdot D^\beta \phi + w^k \cdot \phi \right) dx = \int_{\Omega} F(u(w^k)) \cdot \phi \, dx
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, where $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ is a multi-index, D^β is the corresponding partial derivative, $u(w) = (h')^{-1}(w)$ for $w \in \mathbb{R}$, and we recall that $F(u) = (0, f(u_1) - \alpha u_2)^\top$. By definition of h_0 , we find that $u_1(w) \in (0, 1)$, thus avoiding any degeneracy at $u_1 = 0$ or $u_1 = 1$.

The existence of a solution to (29) will be shown by a fixed-point argument. In order to define the fixed-point operator, let $y \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ and $\eta \in [0, 1]$ be given. We solve the linear problem

$$(30) \quad a(w, \phi) = G(\phi) \quad \text{for all } \phi \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a(w, \phi) &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi : B(y) \nabla w \, dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} D^\beta w \cdot D^\beta \phi + w \cdot \phi \right) dx, \\
G(\phi) &= -\frac{\eta}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u(y) - u(w^{k-1})) \cdot \phi \, dx + \eta \int_{\Omega} F(u(y)) \cdot \phi \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

The forms a and G are bounded on $H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, in view of the positive semi-definiteness of $B(y)$ and the generalized Poincaré inequality (see Chap. II.1.4 in [Tem97]), the bilinear form a is coercive:

$$a(w, w) \geq \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w|^2 + |w|^2 \right) dx \geq \varepsilon c \|w\|_{H^n(\Omega)}^2 \quad \text{for } w \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2).$$

By the Lax-Milgram lemma, there exists a unique solution $w \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ to (30). This defines the fixed-point operator $S : L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \times [0, 1] \rightarrow L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, $S(y, \eta) = w$.

By construction, $S(y, 0) = 0$ for all $y \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$, and standard arguments show that S is continuous and compact, observing that the embedding $H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2) \hookrightarrow L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ is compact. It remains to prove a uniform bound for all fixed points of $S(\cdot, \eta)$. Let $w \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be such a fixed point. Then w solves (30) with y replaced by w . With the test function $\phi = w$, we find that

$$(31) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{\eta}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u(w) - u(w^{k-1})) \cdot w \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \nabla w : B(w) \nabla w \, dx \\ & + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w|^2 + |w|^2 \right) dx = \eta \int_{\Omega} F(u(w)) \cdot w \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since $h_0'' = 1/g > 0$ on $(0, 1)$, h_0 is convex. Consequently, $h_0(x) - h_0(y) \leq h_0'(x)(x - y)$ for all $x, y \in [0, 1]$. Choosing $x = u(w)$ and $y = u(w^{k-1})$ and using $h_0'(u(w)) = w$, this gives

$$\frac{\eta}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u(w) - u(w^{k-1})) \cdot w \, dx \geq \frac{\eta}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (h(u(w)) - h(u(w^{k-1}))) \, dx.$$

Since $u_1 = u_1(w) \in (0, 1)$ and f is continuous, there exists $f_M = \max_{s \in [0, 1]} f(s)$ and thus,

$$\int_{\Omega} F(u(w)) \cdot w \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} (f_M - \alpha u_2) u_2 \, dx \leq c_f,$$

where $c_f > 0$ only depends on f_M and α . Hence, (31) can be estimated as follows:

$$(32) \quad \begin{aligned} & \eta \int_{\Omega} h(u(w)) \, dx + \tau \int_{\Omega} \nabla w : B(w) \nabla w \, dx + \varepsilon \tau \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w|^2 + |w|^2 \right) dx \\ & \leq \eta \tau c_f + \eta \int_{\Omega} h(u(w^{k-1})) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

This yields an H^n bound for w uniform in η (but not uniform in τ or ε). The Leray-Schauder fixed-point theorem shows the existence of a solution $w \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ to (30) with y replaced by w and with $\eta = 1$, which is a solution to (29).

Step 2: Uniform bounds. Let w^k be a solution to (29). Set $w^{(\tau)}(x, t) = w^k(x)$ and $u^{(\tau)}(x, t) = u(w^k(x))$ for $x \in \Omega$ and $t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau]$, $k = 1, \dots, N$. At time $t = 0$, we set $w^{(\tau)}(\cdot, 0) = h_0'(u^0)$ and $u^{(\tau)}(0) = u^0$. We introduce the shift operator $(\sigma_\tau u^{(\tau)})(t) = u(w^{k-1})$ for $t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau]$, $k = 1, \dots, N$. Then $u^{(\tau)}$ solves

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\tau} \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} (u^{(\tau)} - \sigma_\tau u^{(\tau)}) \cdot \phi \, dx \, dt + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \nabla \phi : B(w^{(\tau)}) \nabla w^{(\tau)} \, dx \, dt \\ & + \varepsilon \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} D^\beta w^{(\tau)} \cdot D^\beta \phi + w^{(\tau)} \cdot \phi \right) dx \, dt = \int_0^T \int_{\Omega} F(u^{(\tau)}) \cdot \phi \, dx \, dt \end{aligned}$$

for piecewise constant functions $\phi : (0, T) \rightarrow H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$. By density, the weak formulation also holds for all $L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2))$.

We have shown in Step 1 that the solution $w = w^k$ satisfies the entropy estimate (32). By (28), we obtain the gradient estimate

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla w^k : B(w^k) \nabla w^k \, dx \geq \varepsilon_1(\delta) \min\{\gamma^{-1}, \delta_0^{-2}\} \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_1^k|^2 + |\nabla u_2^k|^2) \, dx,$$

since $g(u_1^k) \leq \gamma$. Thus, we obtain from (32) the following entropy inequality:

$$(34) \quad \int_{\Omega} h(u^k) \, dx + c_0 \tau \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_1^k|^2 + |\nabla u_2^k|^2) \, dx \\ + \varepsilon \tau \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w^k|^2 + |w^k|^2 \right) \, dx \leq c_f \tau + \int_{\Omega} h(u^{k-1}) \, dx,$$

where $c_0 = \varepsilon_1(\delta) \min\{\gamma^{-1}, \delta_0^{-2}\}$. Adding these inequalities leads to

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u^k) \, dx + c_0 \tau \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla u_1^j|^2 + |\nabla u_2^j|^2) \, dx \\ + \varepsilon \tau \sum_{j=1}^k \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w^j|^2 + |w^j|^2 \right) \, dx \leq c_f k \tau + \int_{\Omega} h(u^0) \, dx.$$

Since

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u^k) \, dx = \int_{\Omega} \left(h_0(u_1^k) + \frac{(u_2^k)^2}{2\delta_0} \right) \, dx \geq \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (u_2^k)^2 \, dx,$$

the above estimate shows the following uniform bounds:

$$(35) \quad \|u_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^\infty(\Omega))} + \|u_2^{(\tau)}\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} \leq c,$$

$$(36) \quad \|u_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))} + \|u_2^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))} \leq c,$$

$$(37) \quad \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|w^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega))} \leq c,$$

where $c > 0$ denotes here and in the following a constant which is independent of ε or τ (but possibly depending on T).

In order to derive a uniform estimate for the discrete time derivative, let $\phi \in L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega))$. Then, setting $Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$,

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \left| \int_{\tau}^T \int_{\Omega} (u_1^{(\tau)} - \sigma_\tau u_1^{(\tau)}) \phi \, dx \, dt \right| \leq (\|\nabla u_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \|g(u_1^{(\tau)})\|_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \|\nabla u_2^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)}) \\ \times \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \varepsilon \|w_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega))} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega))} \\ \leq c \sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^n(\Omega))} + c \|\phi\|_{L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega))},$$

(38)

$$\frac{1}{\tau} \left| \int_{\tau}^T \int_{\Omega} (u_2^{(\tau)} - \sigma_\tau u_2^{(\tau)}) \phi \, dx \, dt \right| \leq (\delta \|\nabla u_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \kappa \|\nabla u_2^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)}) \|\nabla \phi\|_{L^2(Q_T)}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \varepsilon \|w_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0,T;H^n(\Omega))} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0,T;H^n(\Omega))} + (\|f(u_1^{(\tau)})\|_{L^2(Q_T)} + \alpha \|u_2^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(Q_T)}) \|\phi\|_{L^2(Q_T)} \\
& \leq c\sqrt{\varepsilon} \|\phi\|_{L^2(0,T;H^n(\Omega))} + c\|\phi\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))},
\end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$(39) \quad \tau^{-1} \|u^{(\tau)} - \sigma_\tau u^{(\tau)}\|_{L^2(0,T;(H^n(\Omega))')} \leq c.$$

Step 3: The limit $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$. The uniform estimates (36) and (39) allow us to apply the discrete Aubin lemma in the version of [DJ12], showing that, up to a subsequence which is not relabeled, as $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(40) \quad & u^{(\tau)} \rightarrow u \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \text{ and a.e. in } Q_T, \\
& u^{(\tau)} \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)), \\
& \tau^{-1}(u^{(\tau)} - \sigma_\tau u^{(\tau)}) \rightharpoonup \partial_t u \quad \text{weakly in } L^2(0,T;(H^n(\Omega))'), \\
& \varepsilon w^{(\tau)} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(0,T;H^n(\Omega)).
\end{aligned}$$

Because of the L^∞ bound (35) for $(u_1^{(\tau)})$, we have

$$g(u_1^{(\tau)}) \rightharpoonup^* g(u_1), \quad f(u_1^{(\tau)}) \rightharpoonup^* f(u_1) \quad \text{weakly}^* \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T;L^\infty(\Omega))$$

(and even strongly in $L^p(Q_T)$ for any $p < \infty$). Thus, we can pass to the limit $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$ in (33) to obtain a solution to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_1, \phi \rangle dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\nabla u_1 - g(u_1) \nabla u_2) \phi dx dt = 0, \\
& \int_0^T \langle \partial_t u_2, \phi \rangle dt + \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\delta \nabla u_1 + \kappa \nabla u_2) \phi dx dt = \int_0^T \int_\Omega (f(u_1) - \alpha u_2) \phi dx dt
\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi \in L^2(0,T;H^n(\Omega))$. In fact, performing the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then $\tau \rightarrow 0$, we see from (38) that $\partial_t u \in L^2(0,T;(H^1(\Omega))')$ and hence, the weak formulation also holds for all $\phi \in L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. It contains the no-flux boundary conditions (3). Moreover, the initial conditions are satisfied in the sense of $(H^1(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^2))'$; see Step 3 of the proof of Theorem 2 in [Jün15]. This finishes the proof.

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2. We recall first the following convex Sobolev inequality which is used to estimate the gradient terms in the entropy inequality.

Lemma 5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ ($d \geq 1$) be a convex domain and let $\phi \in C^4$ be a convex function such that $1/\phi''$ is concave. Then there exists $c_S > 0$ such that for all integrable functions u with integrable $\phi(u)$ and $\phi''(u)|\nabla u|^2$,*

$$\frac{1}{m(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \phi(u) dx - \phi\left(\frac{1}{m(\Omega)} \int_\Omega u dx\right) \leq \frac{c_S}{m(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \phi''(u) |\nabla u|^2 dx,$$

where $m(\Omega)$ denotes the measure of Ω .

Proof. The lemma is a consequence of Prop. 7.6.1 in [BGL14] after choosing the probability measure $d\mu = dx/m(\Omega)$ on Ω and the differential operator $L = \Delta - x \cdot \nabla$, which satisfies the curvature condition $CD(1, \infty)$ since $\Gamma_2(u) = \frac{1}{2}(|\nabla^2 u|^2 + |\nabla u|^2) \geq \frac{1}{2}|\nabla u|^2 = \Gamma(u)$. Another proof can be found in [AMTU01, Section 3.4]. \square

Step 1: Uniform bound for the L^1 norm of u_1^k . The L^1 norm of u_1^k is not conserved but we are able to control its L^1 norm. For this, let $w^k \in H^n(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^2)$ be a solution to (29) and set $u_1^k = u_1(w^k)$. We introduce the notation $\bar{v} = m(\Omega)^{-1} \int_{\Omega} v(x) dx$ for any integrable function v . This implies that $u_1^* = \bar{u}_1^0$. Employing the test function $\phi = (1, 0)$ in (29), we find that $\bar{u}_1^k = \bar{u}_1^{k-1} - \varepsilon\tau \bar{w}_1^k$. Solving the recursion gives

$$\bar{u}_1^k = \bar{u}_1^0 - \varepsilon\tau \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{w}_1^j = u_1^* - \varepsilon\tau \sum_{j=1}^k \bar{w}_1^j,$$

and by (37), we conclude that

$$|\bar{u}_1^{(\tau)}(t) - u_1^*| \leq \varepsilon \|w_1^{(\tau)}\|_{L^1(0,t;L^1(\Omega))} \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon} \mathcal{C},$$

where $\bar{u}_1^{(\tau)}(t) = \bar{u}_1^k$ for $t \in ((k-1)\tau, k\tau]$. Consequently, as $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$, the convergence (40) shows that $\bar{u}_1(t) = u_1^*$ for $t > 0$.

Step 2: Estimate of the relative entropy. We employ the test function

$$\phi = (h'_0(u_1^k) - h'_0(u_1^*), (u_2^k - u_2^*)/\delta_0) = (w_1^k - h'_0(u_1^*), w_2^k - u_2^*/\delta_0)$$

in (29) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} \left((u_1^k - u_1^{k-1})(h'_0(u_1^k) - h'_0(u_1^*)) + \frac{1}{\delta_0} (u_2^k - u_2^{k-1})(u_2^k - u_2^*) \right) dx \\ (41) \quad &+ \int_{\Omega} \nabla w^k : B(w^k) \nabla w^k dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{|\beta|=n} |D^\beta w^k|^2 + w_1^k (w_1^k - h'_0(u_1^*)) \right. \\ &\left. + w_2^k (w_2^k - u_2^*/\delta_0) \right) dx - \frac{1}{\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1^k) - \alpha u_2^k) (u_2^k - u_2^*) dx \\ &=: I_1 + \dots + I_4. \end{aligned}$$

For the first integral, we employ the convexity of h_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} (u_1^k - u_1^{k-1})(h'_0(u_1^k) - h'_0(u_1^*)) &\geq (h_0(u_1^k) - h_0(u_1^{k-1})) - h'_0(u_1^*)(u_1^k - u_1^{k-1}), \\ (u_2^k - u_2^{k-1})(u_2^k - u_2^*) &\geq \frac{1}{2} ((u_2^k - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2^{k-1} - u_2^*)^2), \end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &\geq \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^k) - h_0(u_1^{k-1})) dx - \frac{h'_0(u_1^*)}{\tau} \int_{\Omega} (u_1^k - u_1^{k-1}) dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\delta_0\tau} \int_{\Omega} ((u_2^k - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2^{k-1} - u_2^*)^2) dx. \end{aligned}$$

By (28), it follows that

$$I_2 \geq \varepsilon_1(\delta) \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{|\nabla u_1^k|^2}{g(u_1^k)} + \frac{|\nabla u_2^k|^2}{\delta_0^2} \right) dx = \varepsilon_1(\delta) \int_{\Omega} \left(h_0''(u_1^k) |\nabla u_1^k|^2 + \frac{|\nabla u_2^k|^2}{\delta_0^2} \right) dx.$$

Lemma 5 then shows that

$$I_2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^k) - h_0(\bar{u}_1^k)) dx + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{\delta_0^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2^k|^2 dx.$$

The third integral in (41) is estimated by using Young's inequality:

$$I_3 \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} ((w_1^k)^2 + (w_2^k)^2 - h_0'(u_1^*)^2 - \delta_0^{-2}(u_2^*)^2) dx \geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_{\Omega} (h_0'(u_1^*)^2 + \delta_0^{-2}(u_2^*)^2) dx.$$

Summarizing these estimates, we infer from (41) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^k) - h_0(u_1^{k-1})) dx - h_0'(u_1^*) \int_{\Omega} (u_1^k - u_1^{k-1}) dx \\ & + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} ((u_2^k - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2^{k-1} - u_2^*)^2) dx \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)\tau}{c_S} \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^k) - h_0(\bar{u}_1^k)) dx + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)\tau}{\delta_0^2} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2^k|^2 dx \\ & \leq \frac{\varepsilon\tau}{2} \int_{\Omega} (h_0'(\bar{u}_1^k)^2 + \delta_0^{-2}(u_2^*)^2) dx + \frac{\tau}{\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1^k) - \alpha u_2^k)(u_2^k - u_2^*) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Adding these equations over k and using the notation as in the proof of Theorem 1 for $u_i^{(\tau)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^{(\tau)}(t)) - h_0(u_1^0)) dx - h_0'(u_1^*) \int_{\Omega} (u_1^{(\tau)}(t) - u_1^0) dx \\ (42) \quad & + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} ((u_2^{(\tau)}(t) - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2^0 - u_2^*)^2) dx \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1^{(\tau)}) - h_0(\bar{u}_1^{(\tau)})) dx ds + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{\delta_0^2} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2^{(\tau)}|^2 dx ds \\ & \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (h_0'(\bar{u}_1^{(\tau)})^2 + \delta_0^{-2}(u_2^*)^2) dx ds + \frac{1}{\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1^{(\tau)}) - \alpha u_2^{(\tau)})(u_2^{(\tau)} - u_2^*) dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3: The limit $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$. Because of the L^∞ bound for $(u_1^{(\tau)})$, it follows that, for a subsequence, $u_1^{(\tau)} \rightharpoonup^* u_1$ weakly* in $L^\infty(0, T; L^1(\Omega))$ and thus, as $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$,

$$\int_{\Omega} (u_1^{(\tau)}(t) - u_1^0) dx = \int_{\Omega} (u_1^{(\tau)}(t) - u_1^*) dx \rightarrow \int_{\Omega} (u_1(t) - u_1^*) dx = 0,$$

since $\bar{u}_1(t) = u_1^*$ for $t > 0$, by Step 1. The weak convergence of $(\nabla u_2^{(\tau)})$ to ∇u_2 in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ implies that

$$\liminf_{\tau \rightarrow 0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2^{(\tau)}|^2 dx ds \leq \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx ds.$$

Furthermore, by the strong convergence $u_1^{(\tau)} \rightarrow u_1$ in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, up to a subsequence, $u_1^{(\tau)} \rightarrow u_1$ a.e. in $Q_T = \Omega \times (0, T)$ and $h_0(u_1^{(\tau)}) \rightarrow h_0(u_1)$ a.e. in Q_T . Then the L^∞ bound of $(u_1^{(\tau)})$ implies that $h_0(u_1^{(\tau)}) \rightarrow h_0(u_1)$ strongly in $L^p(0, T; L^p(\Omega))$ for any $p < \infty$. Furthermore, we know that $u_2^{(\tau)} \rightarrow u_2$ strongly in $L^2(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$, see (40). Therefore, the limit $(\varepsilon, \tau) \rightarrow 0$ in (42) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1(t)) - h_0(u_1^0)) dx + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} ((u_2(t) - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2^0 - u_2^*)^2) dx \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1) - h_0(u_1^*)) dx ds + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{\delta_0^2} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_2|^2 dx ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1) - \alpha u_2)(u_2 - u_2^*) dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we estimate the right-hand side. Because of $f(u_1^*) = \alpha u_2^*$ and the Lipschitz continuity of f with Lipschitz constant $c_L > 0$, we infer that (recall (10) for the definition of $h_0(u_1|u_1^*)$)

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1(t)|u_1^*) dx - h_0(u_1(0)|u_1^*)) dx + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} ((u_2(t) - u_2^*)^2 - (u_2(0) - u_2^*)^2) dx \\ & + \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1(s)|u_1^*) dx ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1) - f(u_1^*))(u_2 - u_2^*) dx ds - \frac{\alpha}{\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_2 - u_2^*)^2 dx ds \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\delta_0\alpha} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (f(u_1) - f(u_1^*))^2 dx ds - \frac{\alpha}{2\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_2 - u_2^*)^2 dx ds \\ & \leq \frac{c_L^2}{2\alpha\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_1 - u_1^*)^2 dx ds - \frac{\alpha}{2\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_2 - u_2^*)^2 dx ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{u}_1 = u_1^*$, a Taylor expansion and the assumption $1/h_0''(u_1) = g(u_1) \leq \gamma$ give

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1|u_1^*) dx ds = \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (h_0(u_1) - h_0(u_1^*)) dx ds \\ (43) \quad & = \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} \left(h_0'(u_1^*)(u_1 - u_1^*) + \frac{1}{2} h_0''(\xi)(u_1 - u_1^*)^2 \right) dx ds \\ & \geq \frac{1}{2\gamma} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_1 - u_1^*)^2 dx ds, \end{aligned}$$

where ξ is a number between u_1 and u_1^* . We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1(t)|u_1^*) \, dx + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (u_2(t) - u_2^*)^2 \, dx + \left(\frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} - \frac{\gamma c_L^2}{\alpha \delta_0} \right) \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1(s)|u_1^*) \, dx \, ds \\ & + \frac{\alpha}{2\delta_0} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} (u_2 - u_2^*)^2 \, dx \, ds \leq \int_{\Omega} h_0(u_1(0)|u_1^*) \, dx + \frac{1}{2\delta_0} \int_{\Omega} (u_2(0) - u_2^*)^2 \, dx, \end{aligned}$$

and recalling the notation $h(u|U) = h_0(u_1|u_1^*) + (u_2 - u_2^*)^2/(2\delta_0)$,

$$\int_{\Omega} h(u(t)|U) \, dx + \min \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_1(\delta)}{c_S} - \frac{\gamma c_L^2}{\alpha \delta_0}, \alpha \right\} \int_0^t \int_{\Omega} h(u|U) \, dx \, ds \leq \int_{\Omega} h(u(0)|U) \, dx.$$

Then Gronwall's lemma implies that

$$H(u(t)|U) = \int_{\Omega} h(u(t)|U) \, dx \leq e^{-\mu(\delta)t} H(u(0)|U), \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\mu(\delta)$ is defined in (12). Finally, taking into account (43), we estimate

$$h(u|U) \geq \frac{1}{2\gamma}(u_1 - u_1^*)^2 + \frac{1}{2\delta}(u_2 - u_2^*)^2,$$

which shows (13) and finishes the proof.

4. ANALYTICAL BIFURCATION ANALYSIS – PROOFS

In this section, we are going to prove Theorem 3. The proofs follow closely ideas presented for similar systems in [CKWW12, SW09, WX13], which are fundamentally based upon an application of results of Crandall and Rabinowitz [CR71, CR73]; see also [Kie04] for a detailed exposition of the those results. In fact, the application of branching of simple eigenvalues is – by now – quite standard and the proofs are included here for completeness.

Recall that we defined the spaces \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{Y} , \mathcal{Y}_0 , $(\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ in (16) and the mapping

$$\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$$

in (17). A first step is to investigate the Fredholm and differentiability properties of \mathcal{F} .

Lemma 6. *The mapping \mathcal{F} satisfies the following properties:*

- (L1) $\mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta) = 0$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (L2) $\mathcal{F}(u_1, u_2, \delta) = 0$ implies that (u_1, u_2) solves (14).
- (L3) \mathcal{F} is C^1 -smooth with Fréchet derivative $D_u\mathcal{F}$ given by (18).
- (L4) If $\tilde{u}(x) \equiv (\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)$ is a homogeneous state and $\delta g(\tilde{u}_1) \neq -\kappa$ then $D_u\mathcal{F}(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \delta)$ is a Fredholm operator with index zero.

Proof. For (L1) recall that $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$ was the notation for a homogeneous steady state. Regarding (L2), observe that the first two components of \mathcal{F} are just the steady state equations (14). Statement (L3) follows from a direct calculation. The problem is to show (L4). We follow the argument given in [CKWW12, WX13] and consider

$$(44) \quad D_u\mathcal{F}(\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \delta)(U_1, U_2) = \mathcal{B}_1(U_1, U_2) + \mathcal{B}_2(U_1, U_2) + \mathcal{B}_3(U_1, U_2),$$

where $\mathcal{B}_1 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ is defined by

$$(45) \quad \mathcal{B}_1(U_1, U_2) = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta U_1 - \operatorname{div}[g'(\tilde{u}_1)(\nabla\tilde{u}_2)U_1 + g(\tilde{u}_1)\nabla U_2] \\ \delta\Delta U_1 + \kappa\Delta U_2 - \alpha U_2 + f'(\tilde{u}_1)U_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the mapping $\mathcal{B}_2 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ is given by

$$(46) \quad \mathcal{B}_2(U_1, U_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \int_{\Omega} U_1(x) \, dx \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and the mapping $\mathcal{B}_3 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \times (\partial\mathcal{X})^2$ is defined by

$$(47) \quad \mathcal{B}_3(U_1, U_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ (\nabla U_1 - g(\tilde{u}_1)\nabla U_2 - g'(\tilde{u}_1)(\nabla\tilde{u}_2)U_1) \cdot \nu \\ (\delta\nabla U_1 + \kappa\nabla U_2) \cdot \nu \end{pmatrix}.$$

We observe easily that $\mathcal{B}_2 : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_0 \times \mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R}$ is linear and compact. We need an ellipticity condition. According to the Definition 2.1 in [SW09] we have ellipticity for \mathcal{B}_1 (in the sense of Petrovskii) if

$$(48) \quad \det \begin{pmatrix} \xi_1^2 & -g(\tilde{u}_1)\xi_1\xi_2 \\ \delta\xi_1\xi_2 & \kappa\xi_2^2 \end{pmatrix} \neq 0,$$

for all $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \{0\}$. Computing the determinant this condition just yields

$$(49) \quad 0 \neq \xi_1^2\xi_2^2(\kappa + \delta g(\tilde{u}_1)) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad -\kappa \neq \delta g(\tilde{u}_1).$$

Moreover by Remark 2.5 of case 3 in [SW09], one can show that the pair $(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_3)$ satisfies Agmon's condition using the same determinant as above. By applying Theorem 3.3 in [SW09] we infer that $\mathcal{B}_1 + \mathcal{B}_3$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero for $\delta g(\tilde{u}_1) \neq -\kappa$. Therefore, $D_u\mathcal{F}$ is a Fredholm operator of index zero as \mathcal{B}_2 is a compact perturbation. Hence, the result (R1) in Theorem 3 follows. \square

We remark that the previous result can be slightly improved. Indeed, for $\delta \geq 0$ the property (L4) always holds. Even for the case $0 > \delta > -\kappa/\gamma = \delta^*$ we find that

$$\kappa + \delta g(\tilde{u}_1) \geq \kappa + \delta\gamma > 0,$$

so (L4) holds again. In particular, we notice that for our problem the entropy method fails precisely in the regime where the operator is not Fredholm in the entire parameter space, i.e., for $\delta \leq \delta^*$. Locally, this is not a problem as $\{\delta g(\tilde{u}_1) = -\kappa\}$ is an algebraic subvariety of codimension two in $(\delta, \tilde{u}_1, \kappa)$ -parameter space when the given homogeneous state \tilde{u} is

viewed as fixed; for generic parameter values the operator is Fredholm and we restrict the analytical bifurcation analysis to this generic case.

For applying Theorem 4.3 of [SW09] we need some additional properties on \mathcal{F} . In particular, in order that a bifurcation occurs at the homogeneous steady state $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*)$ we need that the implicit function theorem fails.

Lemma 7. *There exists δ_b such that for $\delta_b g(u_1^*) \neq -\kappa$, the operator \mathcal{F} satisfies the following properties:*

(L5) *the null space $\mathcal{N}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b)]$ is one dimensional, i.e., $\text{span}[e_b] = \mathcal{N}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b)]$;*

(L6) *the non-degenerate crossing condition holds, i.e.,*

$$(50) \quad D_{\delta_u} \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b) e_b \notin \mathcal{R}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b)].$$

Proof. We start by proving (L5). By (45), the null space of $D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta)$ consists of solutions for

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta U_1 - g(u_1^*) \Delta U_2 &= 0, \\ \delta \Delta U_1 + \kappa \Delta U_2 - \alpha U_2 + f'(u_1^*) U_1 &= 0, \\ \int_{\Omega} U_1(x) \, dx &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

with no-flux conditions on $\partial\Omega$ given by $\mathcal{B}_3(U_1, U_2) = 0$ from (47). For any pair $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$, we can expand u_1 and u_2 as a series of mutually orthogonal eigenfunctions of the following system

$$(52) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \mu u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

multiplied by constants vectors. Suppose that $\mu > 0$ is a simple eigenvalue of (52) and e_μ is an eigenfunction corresponding to μ normalized by $\int_{\Omega} (e_\mu)^2 \, dx = 1$. Then we define

$$\bar{U}_1 := \int_{\Omega} u_1(x) e_\mu(x) \, dx, \quad \bar{U}_2 := \int_{\Omega} u_2(x) e_\mu(x) \, dx.$$

We obtain

$$(53) \quad \int_{\Omega} e_\mu \Delta u_1 \, dx = -\mu \int_{\Omega} u_1 e_\mu \, dx = -\mu \bar{U}_1, \quad \int_{\Omega} e_\mu \Delta u_2 \, dx = -\mu \int_{\Omega} u_2 e_\mu \, dx = -\mu \bar{U}_2.$$

Now, by multiplying the first two equations of (51) by e_μ and integrating over Ω , using the boundary condition and (53), we arrive at the following algebraic system for \bar{U}_1 and \bar{U}_2 :

$$(54) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{U}_1 - g(u_1^*) \bar{U}_2 &= 0, \\ (\kappa \mu + \alpha) \bar{U}_2 - (f'(u_1^*) - \delta \mu) \bar{U}_1 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $\delta > f'(u_1^*)/\mu$ then the system (54) has only the zero solution. In this case, we would have $\mathcal{N}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta)] = 0$ for all δ . In order to have existence of a non-constant solution we

necessarily require $\delta \leq f'(u_1^*)/\mu$. In this case the system (54) has a non-zero solution if and only if

$$(55) \quad \delta = \delta_b := \frac{f'(u_1^*)}{\mu} - \frac{\kappa\mu + \alpha}{g(u_1^*)\mu}.$$

Taking $\delta = \delta_b$, we can rewrite the first two equations of (51) as the system:

$$(56) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \Delta U_1 \\ \Delta U_2 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\kappa + \delta_b g(u_1^*)} \begin{pmatrix} -g(u_1^*)f'(u_1^*) & g(u_1^*)\alpha \\ -f'(u_1^*) & \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{pmatrix} =: A \begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Using (55) and computing the determinant and the trace of the matrix A we find that its eigenvalues are $\lambda_1 = 0$ and $\lambda_2 = -\mu$, where $\mu > 0$ is a single eigenvalue of the problem (52). Let T be the matrix whose columns are the eigenvectors corresponding to λ_1 and λ_2 respectively:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & g(u_1^*) \\ f'(u_1^*) & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have

$$T^{-1}AT = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, by considering the transformation

$$(57) \quad \begin{pmatrix} p \\ q \end{pmatrix} = T^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} U_1 \\ U_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

it follows that the first two equations of (51) can be uncoupled and we find that

$$(58) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta p &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta q &= \mu q && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \alpha \int_{\Omega} p(x) \, dx + g(u_1^*) \int_{\Omega} q(x) \, dx &= 0, \\ \nabla p \cdot \nu &= \nabla q \cdot \nu = 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where the genericity condition $-\kappa \neq \delta_b g(u_1^*)$ is used to obtain zero Neumann boundary conditions. Recall that μ is a simple eigenvalue of (52) with eigenfunction e_μ . Observe that $\int_{\Omega} e_\mu(x) \, dx = 0$, which implies that $p = 0$ and $q = C e_\mu$ for some constant C are the solutions of (58). Therefore, it follows that

$$(59) \quad (U_1, U_2) = C(g(u_1^*), 1)e_\mu.$$

This shows that $\mathcal{N}[D_u \mathcal{F}(u^*, \delta_b)] = \text{span}[(g(u_1^*), 1)e_\mu] =: \text{span}[e_b]$. In particular, the nullspace is one-dimensional and the result (L5) follows.

To prove (L6), we argue by contradiction and suppose that (50) is not satisfied. Hence, by computing $D_{\delta u}(u^*, \delta_b)$, it follows there exists (p, q) such that

$$(60) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta p - g(u_1^*)\Delta q &= \mu g(u_1^*)e_\mu && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \kappa\Delta q + \delta_b\Delta p - \alpha q + f'(u_1^*)p &= 0 && \text{in } \Omega, \\ \int_{\Omega} p(x) \, dx &= 0, \\ \nabla p \cdot \nu = \nabla q \cdot \nu &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{aligned}$$

As in the first part of the proof, it is helpful to consider a suitable projection and we define P and Q as

$$P := \int_{\Omega} p(x)e_b(x) \, dx, \quad Q := \int_{\Omega} q(x)e_b(x) \, dx.$$

Multiplying the first two equations (60) by e_b and integrating over Ω and using boundary conditions one obtains an algebraic system for P and Q given by

$$(61) \quad \begin{cases} P - g(u_1^*)Q &= -g(u_1^*), \\ (f'(u_1^*) - \delta_b\mu)P - (\kappa\mu + \alpha)Q &= 0. \end{cases}$$

By the definition of δ_b , the determinant of the matrix of coefficients on the left-hand side of the system (61) is zero. This implies that the inhomogeneous linear system has no solution. Hence the system (60) has no solutions and the result (50) in (L6) follows. \square

Note that (L5)-(L6) are just the results (R2)-(R3) claimed in Theorem 3. By applying Theorem 4.3 in [SW09] we obtain the existence of a non-trivial branch

$$(62) \quad (u_1[s], u_2[s], \delta[s]) = (u_1^* + sg(u_1^*)e + s\phi_1(s), u_2^* + se + s\phi_2(s), \delta(s)).$$

Therefore, the local dynamics of the problem already shows that the entropy method cannot provide exponential decay to a distinguished steady state for all parameter values.

5. NUMERICAL BIFURCATION ANALYSIS – CONTINUATION RESULTS

In Section 2.1 we proved the existence of a weak solution for $\delta > \delta^* = -\kappa/\delta$ as well as global convergence to a steady state for $\delta > \delta_e$ ($\delta \neq 0$); in addition, δ_e converges to $\delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma$ as $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$. In Section 2.2 we showed the existence of non-trivial solutions for $\delta = \delta_b$ where δ_b is defined in (55). The numerical continuation results presented in this section aim to augment and extend these results. To simplify the comparison to numerical results, we start to focus on the case

$$\kappa = 1, \quad g(s) = s(1-s), \quad f(s) = s(1-s),$$

which yields the condition $\delta > \delta^* = -4$ for the validity of the entropy method. Hence, we will be particularly interested in the regime $\delta \leq -4$.

Figure 4 shows a continuation calculation for fixed parameters

$$(\kappa, \alpha, l, \bar{u}_1, \rho) = (p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5) = (1, 0.2, 12, 0.594, 0.05)$$




FIGURE 4. Continuation calculation for the system (24) with parameter values $(\kappa, \alpha, l, \bar{u}_1, \rho) = (p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5) = (1, 0.2, 12, 0.594, 0.05)$ and primary bifurcation parameter δ . (a) Bifurcation diagram in $(\delta, \|z\|_{L^2})$ -space showing the parameter on the horizontal axis and the solution norm on the vertical axis. The detected bifurcation points are marked as circles (magenta). The first branch point (open circle) is not a true bifurcation point but results from the degeneracy $\delta = -\kappa/g(u_1^*) =: \delta_d$. At the other four branch points (magenta, filled circles) non-homogeneous solution branches (red, green, blue, cyan) bifurcate via single eigenvalue crossing. The asymptotically stable branches are shown as thick curves. The region where the entropy method starts to fail, i.e. $\delta \leq \delta^* = -\kappa/\gamma = -4$ is marked by a vertical gray dashed line. (b) Solutions are plotted for $(x, u_1 = u_1(x))$ at certain points on the non-homogeneous branches; the solutions are marked in (a) using crosses.

using δ as the primary bifurcation parameter. The steady state we start from is given by

$$(u_1^*, u_2^*) = (\bar{u}_1, f(\bar{u}_1)/\alpha).$$

We begin the continuation at $\delta = -3$ and do not detect any bifurcations when δ is increased, i.e. for $\delta > -3$. This result is expected since we have already proven in Theorem 2 that a fixed homogeneous steady state is globally asymptotically stable in the range $\delta > \delta_e$. The small perturbation term $-\rho(u_1 - \bar{u}_1)$ we added numerically to treat the mass conservation degeneracy does not seem to change the result, at least for the case $\rho = 0.05$ we focus on here.




FIGURE 5. Continuation calculation for the system (24) as in Figure 4 with a focus on the first bifurcation point (filled circle, magenta). One can show that by using two different branch directions (parameter δ negative and positive in *AUTO*) that actually two different non-homogeneous solution branches (red) bifurcate via single eigenvalue crossing but the two branches contain solutions with identical L^2 -norm for the same parameter value. This is a result of a symmetry in the problem as discussed in the main text. (b) Three different solutions plotted in $(x, u_1 = u_1(x))$ -space at the parameter value $\delta = -7$. The three solutions are marked in (a) using crosses.

The more interesting results in the bifurcation calculation in Figure 4 occur when we decrease the primary bifurcation parameter δ . In this case, several branch points are detected. In Figure 4, we have shown the first five branch points detected obtained upon decreasing δ . The first point at $\delta \approx 4.146$ turns out to be not a bifurcation point. From a practical perspective, it is not possible to use the branch switching algorithm in *AUTO* to detect a non-homogeneous branch. The reason for this degeneracy is clear if we recall the degeneracy condition $\kappa = -\delta g(u_1^*)$. Indeed, we simply compute

$$\kappa/g(u_1^*) \approx -1/(0.594(1 - 0.594)) = -4.1466.$$

Therefore, the first detected branch point results from the degeneracy of the determinant that we previously encountered, e.g., in the analytical bifurcation calculation in Section 4. The remaining four detected branch points in Figure 4 are true bifurcation points. This numerical result is in accordance with the analytical results on the existence of bifurcations in Theorem 3. In fact, one can carry out the same calculation as in Section 4. The condition in (55) is now given for the modified problem with $\rho > 0$ by

$$\delta_b = \frac{f'(u_1^*)}{\mu} - \frac{(\kappa\mu + \alpha)(\mu + \rho)}{g(u_1^*)\mu^2},$$

which reduces to (55) in the case $\rho = 0$. At each bifurcation point, a simple eigenvalue crosses the imaginary axis. One can use a branch switching algorithm implemented in

AUTO to compute the non-homogeneous families of solutions bifurcating at each of the four points as shown in Figure 4(a). In Figure 4(b), we show a representative solution $u_1 = u_1(x)$ on each of the four solution families. The solutions are non-homogeneous steady states and have interface-like behavior in the spatial variable. Each family has a characteristic number of these interfaces, i.e., the family with representative in Figure 4(b1) contains fronts with one interface, the family with representative in Figure 4(b2) is a bump with two interfaces, and so on. There are families with even more interfaces than the four interfaces in Figure 4(b4), which can be found upon decreasing δ even further; we are not interested in these highly oscillatory solutions here.




FIGURE 6. Continuation calculation for the system (24) starting with the same basic parameter values as in Figure 4. Then we stop the continuation at the solution points marked with stars (red, green, blue) in Figure 4(a) and change from δ as a primary continuation parameter to ρ as a primary parameter with the goal to decrease the parameter to $\rho = 0$. (a1)-(a3) Bifurcation diagrams in $(\rho, \|z\|_{L^2})$ -space. The starting point for the continuation is at the right boundary where $\rho = 0.05$ and then ρ is decreased. (b1)-(b3) Solutions obtained on the bifurcation branches above at the point $\rho = 0$ (points are marked with squares in (a1)-(a3)).

Another observation regarding the continuation run in Figure 4 is reported in more detail in Figure 5 with a focus on the first bifurcation point. It is shown that there are actually two different branches bifurcating at the same point with families of non-homogeneous solutions that are symmetric. In particular, one non-trivial solution branch can be transformed into

the other by considering $u \mapsto 1 - u$; as an illustration we refer to two representative numerical solutions on the two branches originating at the first bifurcation point as shown in Figure 5(b).




FIGURE 7. Continuation calculation for the system (24) with parameter values $(\kappa, \alpha, l, \bar{u}_1, \rho) = (p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5) = (1, 0.2, 12, 0.5, 0.05)$ and primary bifurcation parameter δ followed by a second continuation run to reach $\rho = 0$. (a) Solution on the first branch of non-homogeneous steady states at $\rho = 0$ and $\delta = -63.879$. (b) Solution on the second branch of non-homogeneous steady states at $\rho = 0$ and $\delta = -66.866$.

The next question to be addressed is if we can find non-homogeneous steady states also for the original problem with $\rho = 0$. This can be achieved by using a homotopy-continuation idea. First, we continue the problem in δ and compute the non-homogeneous solution branches. Then we pick a steady state on the non-homogeneous branch and switch to continuation in ρ while keeping δ fixed. The results of this strategy are shown in Figure 6. For the first three solutions shown in Figure 4(b), this strategy works and we indeed find non-homogeneous steady states for $\rho = 0$ as shown in Figure 6(b).

For information herding models, solutions which are of particular importance are those with sharp interfaces between the endstates, i.e., the solution is near zero and near one in certain regions with sharp interfaces in between. The easiest way to obtain these solutions is to continue the bifurcation branches to very large negative values of δ , which essentially yields a singular perturbation problem [Ni98], so classical boundary-layer-type solutions well-known from multiple time scale ODEs [Kue15] occur as shown in Figure 7. These solutions represent a herding effect in the sense of sharply split opinions. More precisely, they indicate for which values of the information variable x we observe a herding behavior, i.e. a concentration of individuals ($u \approx 1$) at certain values of x . Figure 7(a) shows herding in the interval $[0.4, 1]$ (approximately), while only a few number of individuals ($u \approx 0.1$) adopt the information value around $x = 0$.

The last step we are interested in concerns the location of the bifurcation points. To investigate their location, one has to select a second parameter to carry out a two-parameter




FIGURE 8. Continuation calculation for the system (24) starting with the same basic parameter values as in Figure 4. Here a two-parameter continuation of the four non-degenerate branch points computed in Figure 4 is shown, i.e., a two-parameter continuation in (δ, α) -parameter space was started at each of the branch points. The magenta curves, from bottom to top branch, correspond to the branch points located initially at $\delta_b \approx -5.08, -7.68, -11.52, -16.31$ for $\alpha = 0.2$. The thick dashed vertical line (brown) indicates $\delta_d = -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$ and we observe that the two-parameter branches limit onto this vertical line as δ is increased.

continuation of branch points in AUTO. The most interesting result was obtained by selecting α . The results of this two-parameter continuation are shown in Figure 8 for all four bifurcation points originally obtained in Figure 4. One observes that upon decreasing δ that all branch points collapse asymptotically to the vertical line $\delta = \delta_d := -\kappa/g(u_1^*)$. This indicates that the value δ_d is the crucial validity boundary for the dynamical systems analysis. Indeed, neither the analytical bifurcation calculation in Section 4 nor the numerical approach in this section work at this special value of δ . In addition, we easily see that

$$\lim_{u_1^* \rightarrow u_1^{**}} \delta_d = \delta^*, \quad \text{where } g(u_1^{**}) = \gamma,$$

so the validity boundary of the bifurcation approach is really located at δ^* in the limit as $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$. This observation finally completes our decomposition in parameter space and identifies the value δ^* as a *meeting point of entropy and bifurcation*.

In summary, the main result of the numerical bifurcation analysis confirms that the obstruction to global stability for $\delta \leq \delta^*$ is due to local bifurcations from homogeneous steady states. Furthermore, we have illuminated that a common problem in the entropy method, the analytical bifurcation calculation, as well as the numerical setup are the degenerate points of the diffusion matrix. Furthermore, for generic fixed parameter values and a fixed steady state, the different techniques are limited in their validity range as shown in Figure 1(c). For the limit as $\alpha \rightarrow +\infty$ and the steady state yielding a maximum

of the nonlinearity g , the different techniques have a (singular) meeting point at $\delta = \delta^*$ in parameter space.

6. OUTLOOK

So far, relatively little attention has been devoted to the study of the parameter space interfaces of different mathematical methods. In this contribution, we have analyzed as an example a cross-diffusion herding model to understand where, and how, the global nonlinear analysis approach via entropy variables is connected to bifurcation analysis techniques from dynamical systems. We have shown that both approaches encounter similar problems regarding the degeneracy of the diffusion matrix and we were able to cover different parameter regimes by combining the results of the two methods.

This paper is only a first starting point. Here we shall just mention a few ideas for future work. The first step is to expand the approach to other examples. In particular, many reaction-diffusion systems as well as other classes of PDEs have natural entropies, which can be used to study global existence and convergence properties. In the nonlinear case, one frequently can also employ approaches from dynamical systems to understand the dynamics of the PDE. Using a similar approach as we presented here could be illuminating for other examples. For example, it is natural to conjecture that there are examples in applications, which exhibit the following behavior:

- (C1) There exists one fixed parameter region in which the entropy method yields global decay. Upon variation of a single parameter, the validity boundary of the entropy method coincides precisely with a local supercritical bifurcation point; see Figure 1(a).
- (C2) There exists one fixed parameter region in which the entropy method yields global decay. Upon variation of a single parameter, the validity boundary of the entropy method does not coincide with a local bifurcation point. Instead, the obstruction is a global bifurcation branch in parameter space with a fold point precisely at the validity boundary; see Figure 1(b).

In this work, we apparently found a more complicated case as shown in Figure 1(c). However, it seems plausible that the cases (C1)-(C2) should occur even in classical problems without cross-diffusion, i.e. reaction-diffusion equations with a diagonal positive-definite diffusion matrix. Determining whether this is true for several classical examples from applications is an interesting open problem.

Regarding the entropy method [CJM⁺01, DF06], it would be interesting to investigate in more detail parametric scenarios for its validity regime. For example, the question arises whether it is possible to find criteria for the validity range that are computable for entire classes of PDEs. The entropy approach relies on upper bounds. Although the bounds we present here turn out to be sharp in the sense of global decay dynamics in a suitable singular limit, this may not always be easy to achieve. It would be relevant to estimate a priori which regime in parameter space one fails to cover, if certain non-optimal upper

bounds are used. As above, carrying this out for several examples could already be very illuminating.

Regarding the analytical and numerical bifurcation analysis, there are multiple strategies to deal with the problem of mass conservation, or more generally with higher-dimensional solution manifolds. For example, one may try to compute the entire solution family of steady states parametrized by the mass numerically [Hen02, DS13], which yields a numerical continuation problem for higher-dimensional manifolds and not only curves. Furthermore, we have focused on the numerical problem in the one-dimensional setup and computing the two- and three-space dimension cases could be interesting [Kue14, UWR14]. Regarding analytical generalizations, a possible direction is to view δ^* as a singular limit and phrase the problem as a perturbation problem [Ni98, Fif73, AK15].

REFERENCES

- [AK15] F. Achleitner and C. Kuehn. On bounded positive stationary solutions for a nonlocal Fisher-KPP equation. *Nonl. Anal. A: Theor. Meth. & Appl.*, 112:15–29, 2015.
- [AMTU01] A. Arnold, P. Markowich, G. Toscani, and A. Unterreiter. On convex Sobolev inequalities and the rate of convergence to equilibrium for Fokker-Planck type equations. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 26(1-2):43–100, 2001.
- [BGL14] D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and Geometry of Markov Diffusion Operators*. Springer, 2014.
- [BMP11] M. Burger, P. Markowich, and J.-F. Pietschmann. Continuous limit of a crowd motion and herding model: analysis and numerical simulations. *Kinet. Relat. Mod.*, 4:1025–1047, 2011.
- [CJM⁺01] J.A. Carrillo, A. Jüngel, P.A. Markowich, G. Toscani, and A. Unterreiter. Entropy dissipation methods for degenerate parabolic problems and generalized Sobolev inequalities. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 133(1):1–82, 2001.
- [CKWW12] A. Chertock, A. Kurganov, X. Wang, and Y. Wu. On a chemotaxis model with saturated chemotactic flux. *Kinet. Relat. Mod.*, 5:51–95, 2012.
- [CR71] M.G. Crandall and P.H. Rabinowitz. Bifurcation from simple eigenvalues. *J. Functional Analysis*, 8(2):321–340, 1971.
- [CR73] M.G. Crandall and P.H. Rabinowitz. Bifurcation, perturbation of simple eigenvalues and linearized stability. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 52:161–180, 1973.
- [DCD⁺07] E.J. Doedel, A. Champneys, F. Dercole, T. Fairgrieve, Y. Kuznetsov, B. Oldeman, R. Paffenroth, B. Sandstede, X. Wang, and C. Zhang. Auto 2007p: Continuation and bifurcation software for ordinary differential equations (with homcont). <http://cmvl.cs.concordia.ca/auto>, 2007.
- [DF06] L. Desvillettes and K. Fellner. Exponential decay toward equilibrium via entropy methods for reaction-diffusion equations. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 319(1):157–176, 2006.
- [DF07] L. Desvillettes and K. Fellner. Entropy methods for reaction-diffusion systems. *Discrete Cont. Dyn. Sys. (suppl.)*, pages 304–312, 2007.
- [DJ12] M. Dreher and A. Jüngel. Compact families of piecewise constant functions in $L^p(0, T; B)$. *Nonlin. Anal.*, 75:3072–3077, 2012.
- [DL14] M. Delitala and T. Lorenzo. A mathematical model for value estimation with public information and herding. *Kinet. Relat. Mod.*, 7:29–44, 2014.
- [DS13] H. Dankowicz and F. Schilder. *Recipes for Continuation*. SIAM, 2013.
- [Eva02] L.C. Evans. *Partial Differential Equations*. AMS, 2002.
- [Fif73] P.C. Fife. Semilinear elliptic boundary value problems with small parameters. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, 52(3):205–232, 1973.

- [Fis37] R.A. Fisher. The wave of advance of advantageous genes. *Ann. Eugenics*, 7:353–369, 1937.
- [Gab12] P. Gabriel. Long-time asymptotics for nonlinear growth-fragmentation equations. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 10:787–820, 2012.
- [Gov87] W.F. Govaerts. *Numerical Methods for Bifurcations of Dynamical Equilibria*. SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1987.
- [Hen02] M.E. Henderson. Multiple parameter continuation: Computing implicitly defined k-manifolds. *Int. J. Bif. Chaos*, 12(3):451–476, 2002.
- [HJ11] S. Hittmeir and A. Jüngel. Cross diffusion preventing blow up in the two-dimensional Keller-Segel model. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 43:997–1022, 2011.
- [HP02] T. Hillen and K. Painter. Volume filling and quorum sensing in models for chemosensitive movement. *Canad. Appl. Math. Quart.*, 10:501–543, 2002.
- [HW05] D. Horstmann and M. Winkler. Boundedness vs. blow-up in a chemotaxis system. *J. Differential Equat.*, 215:52–107, 2005.
- [Jün15] A. Jüngel. The boundedness-by-entropy method for cross-diffusion systems. *To appear in Nonlinearity*, pages 1–38, 2015.
- [Kel77] H. Keller. Numerical solution of bifurcation and nonlinear eigenvalue problems. In P. Rabinowitz, editor, *Applications of Bifurcation Theory*, pages 359–384. Academic Press, 1977.
- [Kie04] H. Kielhoefer. *Bifurcation Theory: An Introduction with Applications to PDEs*. Springer, 2004.
- [KOGV07] B. Krauskopf, H.M. Osinga, and J. Galán-Vique, editors. *Numerical Continuation Methods for Dynamical Systems: Path following and boundary value problems*. Springer, 2007.
- [KPP91] A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrovskii, and N. Piscounov. A study of the diffusion equation with increase in the amount of substance, and its application to a biological problem. In V.M. Tikhomirov, editor, *Selected Works of A. N. Kolmogorov I*, pages 248–270. Kluwer, 1991. Translated by V. M. Volosov from Bull. Moscow Univ., Math. Mech. 1, 1–25, 1937.
- [KS70] E. Keller and S. Segel. Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 26:399–415, 1970.
- [Kue14] C. Kuehn. Efficient gluing of numerical continuation and a multiple solution method for elliptic PDEs. *arXiv:1406.6900*, pages 1–34, 2014.
- [Kue15] C. Kuehn. *Multiple Time Scale Dynamics*. Springer, 2015.
- [LM13] M. Liero and A. Mielke. Gradient structures and geodesic convexity for reaction-diffusion systems. *Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. A*, 371:20120346, 2013.
- [LS08] H. Lambda and T. Seaman. Market statistics of a psychology-based heterogeneous agent model. *Intern. J. Theor. Appl. Finance*, 11:717–737, 2008.
- [Mur02] J.D. Murray. *Mathematical Biology I: An Introduction*. Springer, 3rd edition, 2002.
- [Ni98] W.-M. Ni. Diffusion, cross-diffusion and their spike-layer steady states. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 45(1):9–18, 1998.
- [SW09] J. Shi and X. Wang. On the global bifurcation for quasilinear elliptic systems on bounded domains. *J. Differential Equat.*, 246:2788–2812, 2009.
- [Tem97] R. Temam. *Infinite-Dimensional Dynamical Systems in Mechanics and Physics*. Springer, 1997.
- [UWR14] H. Uecker, D. Wetzel, and J.D.M. Rademacher. pde2path - A Matlab package for continuation and bifurcation in 2D elliptic systems. *Num. Math.: Th. Meth. Appl.*, 7:58–106, 2014.
- [Wrz04] D. Wrzosek. Global attractor for a chemotaxis model with prevention of overcrowding. *Nonlin. Anal.*, 59:1293–1310, 2004.
- [WX13] X. Wang and Q. Xu. Spiky and transition layer steady states of chemotaxis systems via global bifurcation and Helly’s compactness theorem. *J. Math. Biol.*, 66(6):1241–1266, 2013.
- [ZM15] J. Zinsl and D. Matthes. Transport distances and geodesic convexity for systems of degenerate diffusion equations. *arXiv:1409.6520*, pages 1–32, 2015.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Main Results	6
2.1. Entropy Method	6
2.2. Analytical Bifurcation Analysis	10
2.3. Numerical Bifurcation Analysis	11
3. Entropy Method – Proofs	13
3.1. Proof of Theorem 1	13
3.2. Proof of Theorem 2	18
4. Analytical Bifurcation Analysis – Proofs	22
5. Numerical Bifurcation Analysis – Continuation Results	26
6. Outlook	32
References	33

INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8–10, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: juengel@tuwien.ac.at

INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8–10, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: ck274@cornell.edu

INSTITUTE FOR ANALYSIS AND SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING, VIENNA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY,
WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8–10, 1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA
E-mail address: lara.trussardi@tuwien.ac.at