

The diffusive Beddington-DeAngelis predator-prey model with nonlinear prey-taxis and free boundary¹

Jianping Wang, Mingxin Wang²

Department of Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, PR China

Abstract. The diffusive Beddington-DeAngelis predator-prey model with nonlinear prey-taxis and free boundary is considered. We investigate the existence and uniqueness, regularity and uniform estimates, and long time behavior of the global solution. Some sufficient conditions for both spreading and vanishing are established.

Keywords: Diffusive predator-prey model; Prey-taxis; Free boundary; Spreading and vanishing; Long time behavior.

AMS subject classifications (2010): 35K51, 35R35, 92B05, 35B40.

1 Introduction

The dynamical relationship between the predator and prey has been investigated widely in recent years due to its universal existence and importance in mathematical biology and ecology. Let Ω be a bounded domain in \mathbb{R}^n ($n \geq 1$). After rescaling, the diffusive predator-prey model with Beddington-DeAngelis functional response takes the form [2, 4]:

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} = -au + \frac{buv}{c+u+mv}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t - dv_{xx} = v(q-v) - \frac{ruv}{c+u+mv}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \end{cases}$$

where where u and v represent predator and prey densities, respectively. Constants a, b, c, m, q, r, d are positive, a is the mortality rate of the predator which does not depend on the prey density, the function $\frac{rv}{c+u+mv}$ is the Beddington-DeAngelis functional response, b/r is the conversion rate from prey to predator.

In the above model, the predator and prey species are usually assumed to move randomly in their habitat. It has been recognized that in the spatial predator-prey interaction, in addition to the random diffusion of predator and prey, the spatiotemporal variations of the predator velocity are affected by the prey gradient [1, 11, 13]. The diffusive predator-prey model with Beddington-DeAngelis functional response and prey-taxis reads as follows

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} + (u\chi(u)v_x)_x = -au + \frac{buv}{c+u+mv}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ v_t - dv_{xx} = v(q-v) - \frac{ruv}{c+u+mv}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

In this model, the predator is attracted by the prey and χ denotes their prey-tactic sensitivity and satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \chi(u) \in C^1([0, \infty)), \quad \chi(u) = 0 \text{ for } u \geq u_m, \text{ and } \chi'(u) \text{ is Lipschitz continuous, i.e.,} \\ |\chi'(u_1) - \chi'(u_2)| \leq L|u_1 - u_2| \text{ for any } u_1, u_2 \in [0, \infty), \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

¹This work was supported by NSFC Grants 11371113 and 11771110

²Corresponding author. *E-mail:* mxwang@hit.edu.cn

where u_m and L are two positive constants.

The assumption that $\chi(u) \equiv 0$ for $u \geq u_m$ has a clear biological interpretation [1]: the predator stops to accumulate at a given point after its density attains a certain threshold value u_m and the prey-tactic cross diffusion $\chi(u)$ vanishes identically when $u \geq u_m$. The assumption that $\chi'(u)$ is Lipschitz continuous is a regularity requirement for our qualitative analysis. Let $\eta(u) = u\chi(u)$, then it is easily seen that

- $\eta(u)$ and $\eta'(u)$ are bounded, and $\eta'(u)$ is Lipschitz continuous.

In many realistic modeling situations, both the predator and prey have a tendency to emigrate from the boundary to obtain their new habitat and to improve the living environment ([16, 18, 20, 25, 27, 28]). Hence it is more reasonable to consider the domain with a free boundary. As a general rule, to avoid being hunted, the prey will have a stronger tendency than the predator. So, we may consider that the free boundary is caused only by the prey. For simplicity, we assume that the species only spreads to the right (the left boundary is fixed) in a one-dimensional environment. According to the deductions of the free boundary conditions in [3] and [25], a free boundary problem related to (1.1) can be written as

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} u_t - u_{xx} + (u\chi(u)v_x)_x = \frac{buv}{c+u+mv} - au := f(u, v), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ v_t - dv_{xx} = v(q-v) - \frac{ruv}{c+u+mv} := g(u, v), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ u_x = v_x = 0, & t \geq 0, \quad x = 0, \\ u = v = 0, & t \geq 0, \quad x = h(t), \\ h'(t) = -\mu v_x(t, h(t)), & t \geq 0, \\ h(0) = h_0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad v(0, x) = v_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0, \end{array} \right. \quad (1.3)$$

where h_0, μ are given positive constants. In the problem (1.3) it is assumed that the free boundary is caused only by the prey.

It is interesting to investigate the dynamics of the problem (1.3) because of the influence of chemotactic cross-diffusion. We will show that (1.3) has a unique solution and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) \leq \infty$. Moreover, if $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) < \infty$, then the predator and prey fails to establish and vanishes eventually. Some sufficient conditions for spreading and vanishing are given.

Throughout this paper we also assume that $0 < \alpha < 1$ and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0]), \quad u'_0(0) = 0, \quad u_0(x) \geq, \neq 0 \text{ in } [0, h_0), \quad u_0(x) = 0 \text{ in } [h_0, \infty), \\ v_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0]), \quad v'_0(0) = 0, \quad v_0(x) \geq, \neq 0 \text{ in } [0, h_0), \quad v_0(x) = 0 \text{ in } [h_0, \infty). \end{array} \right. \quad (1.4)$$

This article is divided into five sections. Section 2 proves the global existence and uniqueness of solutions. Section 3 establishes an important estimate for the solution. Section 4 is devoted to understanding the behavior of the solution. Section 5 provides some sufficient conditions for spreading and vanishing.

Before ending this section we should mention that the free boundary problems of the diffusive competition models have been studied widely by many authors. Please refer to [5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 21, 22, 24, 26, 29, 30].

2 Existence and uniqueness

For $T > 0$ we set $D_T = [0, T] \times [0, h(t)]$ and $\Delta_T := [0, T] \times [0, 1]$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $\chi(u)$ and (u_0, v_0) satisfy the conditions (1.2) and (1.4), respectively.*

(i) *Then there is a $T > 0$ such that the problem (1.3) admits a unique solution*

$$(u, v, h) \in [C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_T)]^2 \times C^{1+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T]), \quad (2.1)$$

and $h'(t) > 0$ in $(0, T]$ and

$$\|u, v\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_T)} + \|h\|_{C^{1+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T])} \leq C, \quad (2.2)$$

where positive constants T and C depend on $\|u_0(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$, $\|v_0(x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$, h_0 and $h^* := -\mu v'_0(h_0)$.

(ii) *Let $0 < \tau < \infty$ and $(u, v, h) \in [C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\tau)]^2 \times C^{1+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, \tau])$ be the unique solution of (1.3). Then there exist positive constant M_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, independent of τ , such that*

$$0 < u \leq M_1, \quad 0 < v \leq M_2 \quad \text{in } (0, \tau] \times [0, h(t)], \quad (2.3)$$

$$0 < h'(t) \leq M_3 \quad \text{in } (0, \tau]. \quad (2.4)$$

Proof. The claims concerning local-in-time existence of the classical solution to the problem (1.3) are well established by a fixed point theorem. The proof is quite standard, we refer readers to [19, 25].

First of all, in order to straighten the free boundary, we define

$$y = x/h(t), \quad w(t, y) = u(t, h(t)y), \quad z(t, y) = v(t, h(t)y).$$

Then it follows from (1.3) that $w(t, y), z(t, y), h(t)$ satisfy

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} w_t - \zeta(t)w_{yy} - \xi(t)yw_y + \zeta(t)\eta'(w)z_yw_y \\ \quad = -\zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy} + f(w, z), & t > 0, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ z_t - d\zeta(t)z_{yy} - \xi(t)yz_y = g(w, z), & t > 0, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ w_y(t, 0) = w(t, 1) = z_y(t, 0) = z(t, 1) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ w(0, y) = u_0(h_0y) := w_0(y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\ z(0, y) = v_0(h_0y) := z_0(y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\ h'(t) = -\mu\frac{1}{h(t)}z_y(t, 1), \quad t \geq 0; \quad h(0) = h_0, & \end{array} \right. \quad (2.5)$$

where $\zeta(t) = h^{-2}(t)$ and $\xi(t) = h'(t)/h(t)$.

Step 1: The existence. We prove the existence result by a fixed point theorem. Let $h^* := -\mu v'_0(h_0)$. For $0 < T \leq \min\{1, \frac{h_0}{2(1+h^*)}\}$, we define

$$\Omega_{1T} := \{w \in C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T) : w(0, y) = w_0(y), \quad w \geq 0, \quad \|w - w_0\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq 1\},$$

$$\Omega_{2T} := \{z \in C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T) : z(0, y) = z_0(y), \quad z \geq 0, \quad \|z - z_0\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq 1\},$$

$$\Omega_{3T} := \{h \in C^{1+\alpha/2}([0, T]) : h(0) = 0, \quad h'(0) = h^*, \quad \|h' - h^*\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0, T])} \leq 1\}.$$

Clearly, $\Omega_T := \Omega_{1T} \times \Omega_{2T} \times \Omega_{3T}$ is a bounded and closed convex set of $[C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)]^2 \times C^{1+\alpha/2}([0, T])$.

For any $h \in \Omega_{3T}$, we have

$$|h(t) - h_0| \leq T\|h'\|_\infty \leq T(1 + h^*) < \frac{h_0}{2},$$

which yields that

$$\frac{h_0}{2} \leq h(t) \leq \frac{3h_0}{2}, \quad \forall t \in [0, T].$$

Therefore the transformation $(t, x) \rightarrow (t, y)$ introduced at the beginning of the proof is well defined. Denote

$$\Lambda = \{\|u_0, v_0\|_{C^\alpha([0, h_0])}, h_0, h^*\}.$$

For the given $(w, z, h) \in \Omega_T$. Direct computations entails that there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ depends on Λ such that

$$\|\zeta(t)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|\xi(t)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|g(w, z)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_1.$$

Recall that $z_0(y) := v_0(h_0 y) \in C^{2+\alpha}([0, 1])$. The parabolic Schauder theory asserts that the problem

$$\begin{cases} \hat{z}_t - d\zeta(t)\hat{z}_{yy} - \xi(t)y\hat{z}_y = g(w(t, y), z(t, y)), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ \hat{z}_y(t, 0) = \hat{z}(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \hat{z}(0, y) = z_0(y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution $\hat{z} \in C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)$ and

$$\|\hat{z}\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_2 \tag{2.6}$$

for some $C_2 > 0$ which is a constant dependent on Λ and $\|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$. Moreover, by the maximum principle we infer that $\hat{z} > 0$ in $(0, T] \times [0, 1)$. Hence, $\hat{z}_y(t, 1) < 0$ for $t \in (0, T]$ by the Hopf boundary lemma. Thus the problem

$$\hat{h}'(t) = -\mu \frac{1}{h(t)} \hat{z}_y(t, 1), \quad 0 < t \leq T; \quad \hat{h}(0) = h_0$$

has a unique solution $\hat{h}(t)$. Obviously, $\hat{h}'(0) = h^*$, $\hat{h}'(t) > 0$ in $(0, T]$ and

$$\hat{h}' \in C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T]) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{h}'\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T])} \leq C_3, \tag{2.7}$$

where $C_3 > 0$ is dependent on Λ and $\|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$.

Now let us consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \hat{w}_t - \zeta(t)\hat{w}_{yy} + [\zeta(t)\eta'(w)\hat{z}_y - \xi(t)y]\hat{w}_y + \zeta(t)\chi(w)\hat{z}_{yy}\hat{w} \\ \quad = f(w(t, y), z(t, y)), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ \hat{w}_y(t, 0) = \hat{w}(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \hat{w}(0, y) = w_0(y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.8}$$

In view of (2.6) and assumption (1.2), it holds that

$$\|\zeta(t)\eta'(w)\hat{z}_y - \xi(t)y\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|\zeta(t)\chi(w)\hat{z}_{yy}\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|f(w, z)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_4$$

for some positive constant C_4 which depends on Λ , $\|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$, $\|u_0\|_{C^\alpha([0, h_0])}$ and L , where L is given by (1.2). Recalling $\hat{w}_0(y) := u_0(h_0 y) \in C^{2+\alpha}([0, 1])$ and using parabolic Schauder theory, the problem (2.8) admits a unique solution $\hat{w} \in C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)$ and

$$\|\hat{w}\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_5, \tag{2.9}$$

where C_5 is a positive constant depending on $\|u_0, v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}$, h_0, h^* and L . Furthermore, it follows from the maximum principle that $\hat{w} > 0$ in $(0, T] \times [0, 1)$.

Based on the above analysis, we can define

$$F : \Omega_T \rightarrow [C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)]^2 \times C^{1+\alpha/2}([0, T])$$

by

$$F(w, v, h) = (\hat{w}, \hat{z}, \hat{h}).$$

Evidently, $(w, v, h) \in \Omega_T$ is a fixed point of F if and only if it solves (2.5). From (2.6), (2.7) and (2.9), we see that F is compact and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{w} - w_0\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} &\leq C_6 \max\{T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\} \|\hat{w}\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_6 C_5 \max\{T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\}, \\ \|\hat{z} - z_0\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} &\leq C_6 \max\{T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\} \|\hat{z}\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_6 C_2 \max\{T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}, T^{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}\}, \\ \|\hat{h}' - h^*\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0, T])} &\leq C_7 T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\hat{h}'\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T])} \leq C_7 C_3 T^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_6, C_7 > 0$ is independent of time T . Hence F maps Ω_T into itself if T is small enough. Consequently F has at least one fixed point $(w, z, h) \in \Omega_T$, and then (2.5) admits at least one solution (w, z, h) defined in $[0, T]$. Moreover, $w, z > 0$ in $(0, T] \times [0, 1)$. Noticing that $z(t, 1) = 0$, it deduces by the Hopf boundary lemma that $z_y(t, 1) < 0$, which implies $h'(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, T]$.

Step 2: The uniqueness. Let $(w_i, z_i, h_i), i = 1, 2$ be two local solutions of (2.5), which are defined for $t \in [0, T]$ with $0 < T \ll 1$. By the maximum principle and Hopf boundary lemma, we have

$$w_i, z_i > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T], \quad x \in [0, 1),$$

and

$$h'_i(t) = -\mu z_{i,y}(t, 1) > 0 \quad \text{for } t \in (0, T].$$

Thereby, we may assume that

$$h_0 \leq h_i(t) \leq h_0 + 1 \quad \text{in } [0, T], \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Denote $\zeta_i(t) = h_i^{-2}(t), \xi_i(t) = h'_i(t)/h_i(t)$. Set

$$w = w_1 - w_2, \quad z = z_1 - z_2, \quad h = h_1 - h_2.$$

It then follows from (2.5) that z solves the problem

$$\begin{cases} z_t - d\zeta_1(t)z_{yy} - \xi_1(t)yz_y - A_1(t, y)z = A(t, y), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ z_y(t, 0) = z(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ z(0, y) = 0, & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$A(t, y) = dz_{2,yy}[\zeta_1(t) - \zeta_2(t)] + z_{2,y}[\xi_1(t)y - \xi_2(t)y] + z_2(A_1(t, y) - A_2(t, y))$$

and

$$A_i(t, y) = q - z_i - \frac{rw_i}{c + w_i + mz_i}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

It is easy to see that $\zeta_1, \xi_1, A_1 \in L^\infty(\Delta_T)$. Applying the parabolic L^p theory and Sobolev embedding theorem we derive that

$$\|z\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|z\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Delta_T)} \leq C_8 \|A\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} \leq C_9 (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}), \quad (2.10)$$

where C_8, C_9 are independent of T . Notice that $z(0, y) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} &= \|z - z_0\|_{C(\Delta_T)} + [z - z_0]_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} \\ &\leq T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|z\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} + T^{\frac{1}{2}} \|z\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} \\ &\leq (T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} + T^{\frac{1}{2}}) \|z\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \\ &\leq 2C_9 T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

Similarly, w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t - \zeta_1(t)w_{yy} + B_1(t, y)w_y - D_1(t, y)w = E(t, y), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ w_y(t, 0) = w(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ w(0, y) = 0, & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$E(t, y) = w_{2,yy}[\zeta_1(t) - \zeta_2(t)] - w_{2,y}[B_1(t, y) - B_2(t, y)] + w_2[D_1(t, y) - D_2(t, y)],$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_i(t, y) &= \zeta_i(t)\eta'(w_i)z_{i,y} - \xi_i(t)y, \\ D_i(t, y) &= -\zeta_i(t)\chi(w_i)z_{i,yy} - a + \frac{bz_i}{c + w_i + mz_i}, \end{aligned}$$

$i = 1, 2$. Evidently, $\zeta_1, B_1, D_1 \in L^\infty(\Delta_T)$. Notice (2.10). Employing the parabolic L^p theory and embedding theorem we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} &\leq C_{10} \|E\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} \\ &\leq C_{10} (\|w_{2,yy}(\zeta_1 - \zeta_2)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} + \|w_{2,y}(B_1 - B_2)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} + \|w_2(D_1 - D_2)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}) \\ &\leq C_{11} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} + \|z\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Delta_T)}) \\ &\leq C_{12} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}), \end{aligned}$$

where the constants C_{10}, C_{11}, C_{12} are independent of T . Notice that $w(0, y) = 0$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|w\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} &= \|w - w_0\|_{C([0,T])} + [w - w_0]_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}([0,T])} \\ &\leq \|w\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} + \|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 0}(\Delta_T)} T^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} (T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} + T^{\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &\leq 2C_{12} T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Take the difference of the equations for h_1, h_2 results in

$$h'(t) = \mu \left(\frac{1}{h_2} z_{2,y}(t, 1) - \frac{1}{h_1} z_{1,y}(t, 1) \right), \quad 0 \leq t \leq T; \quad h(0) = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|h'(t)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0,T])} &= \mu \|h_2^{-1} z_{2,y}(t,1) - h_1^{-1} z_{1,y}(t,1)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0,T])} \\ &\leq \mu \|h_1^{-1} z_y\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},0}(\Delta_T)} + \mu \|z_{2,y}(h_1^{-1} - h_2^{-1})\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},0}(\Delta_T)} \\ &\leq C_{13} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}), \end{aligned}$$

where C_{13} is independent of T . Thanks to $h(0) = h'(0) = 0$, we have

$$\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} \leq 2T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \|h'(t)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0,T])} \leq 2C_{13} T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}).$$

Combined this with (2.11) and (2.12) allows us to derive

$$\begin{aligned} \|w, z\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},0}(\Delta_T)} + \|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} &\leq C_{14} T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)}) \\ &\leq C_{15} T^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} (\|h\|_{C^1([0,T])} + \|w, z\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2},0}(\Delta_T)}), \end{aligned}$$

where C_{14}, C_{15} are independent of T . Thus, when $0 < T \ll 1$, we have $w = z = 0$ and $h = 0$, i.e., $w_1 = w_2, z_1 = z_2$ and $h_1 = h_2$.

Recalling the transformation at the beginning of the proof, we thus conclude that, for $T > 0$ small enough, the problem (1.3) admits a unique classical solution (u, v, h) , i.e., (2.1) holds. Moreover, from the proof we also see that $u, v > 0$ in $(0, T] \times [0, h(t))$, $h'(t) > 0$ in $(0, T]$ and (2.2) holds.

Step 3: The bounds. Let $0 < \tau < \infty$ and $(u, v, h) \in [C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\tau)]^2 \times C^{1+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, \tau])$ be the unique solution of (1.3). It follows from the maximum principle that $u, v > 0$ in $(0, \tau] \times [0, h(t))$ and $h'(t) > 0$ in $(0, \tau]$. By (1.3) and the nonnegativity of u and v , we can see that v satisfies

$$\begin{cases} v_t - dv_{xx} = g(u, v) \leq v(q - v), & 0 < t \leq \tau, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, h(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq \tau, \\ v(0, x) = v_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0. \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$v \leq \max\{q, \|v_0\|_{C([0, h_0])}\} := M_2 \quad \text{on } [0, \tau] \times [0, h(t)]. \quad (2.13)$$

Next, we prove that there exists $M_3 > 0$ such that $h'(t) \leq M_3$ for $t \in (0, \tau]$. Let K be a positive constant and

$$Q_K := \{0 < t < \tau, \quad h(t) - 1/K < x < h(t)\}.$$

Clearly, Q_K is well defined if we set $K \geq 1/h_0$. Introducing an auxiliary function

$$w(t, x) = M_2 [2K(h(t) - x) - K^2(h(t) - x)^2].$$

The number K will be chosen to ensure that $w \geq v$ in Q_K . By straightforward calculation, we obtain

$$w_t = 2M_2 K h'(t) [1 - K(h(t) - x)] \geq 0, \quad w_{xx} = -2M_2 K^2.$$

It follows from (2.13) that $g(u, v) \leq qM_2$. Hence,

$$w_t - dw_{xx} \geq 2dM_2 K^2 \geq qM_2 \geq g(u, v) \quad \text{in } Q_K$$

provided $K \geq \sqrt{\frac{q}{2d}}$. It is easy to see that

$$w(t, h(t) - 1/K) = M_2 \geq v(t, h(t) - 1/K), \quad w(t, h(t)) = 0 = v(t, h(t)).$$

Note that

$$v_0(x) = \int_x^{h_0} v'_0(y) dy \leq (h_0 - x) \|v'_0\|_{C([0, h_0])}, \quad \forall x \in [h_0 - 1/K, h_0]$$

and

$$w(0, x) = M_2[2K(h_0 - x) - K^2(h_0 - x)^2] \geq M_2K(h_0 - x), \quad \forall x \in [h_0 - 1/K, h_0].$$

Therefore, if $M_2K \geq \|v'_0\|_{C([0, h_0])}$, then

$$v_0(x) \leq (h_0 - x) \|v'_0\|_{C([0, h_0])} \leq w(0, x), \quad \forall x \in [h_0 - 1/K, h_0].$$

Let

$$K = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{h_0}, \sqrt{\frac{q}{2d}}, \frac{\|v'_0\|_{C([0, h_0])}}{M_2} \right\}.$$

Applying the maximum principle to $w - v$ over Q_K yields that $v(t, x) \leq w(t, x)$ for $(t, x) \in Q_K$. It follows that $v_x(t, h(t)) \geq w_x(t, h(t)) = -2M_2K$. Hence,

$$h'(t) = -\mu v_x(t, h(t)) \leq 2\mu M_2K := M_3 \quad \text{on } [0, \tau].$$

Finally, we show that

$$u \leq \max \left\{ u_m, \|u_0\|_\infty, \frac{(b - am)M_2}{a} - c \right\} := M_1 \quad \text{on } [0, \tau] \times [0, h(t)].$$

Assume on the contrary that there is $(t_0, x_0) \in (0, T] \times [0, h(t))$ fulfilling $u(t_0, x_0) = \max_{[0, T] \times [0, h(t)]} u > M_1$. By (1.3), u satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} + u_x \chi(u) v_x + u \chi'(u) u_x v_x + u \chi(u) v_{xx} \\ \quad = u \frac{(b - am)v - ac - au}{c + u + mv}, & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), \quad v(0, x) = v_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0. \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

We first assert that $x_0 \notin (0, h(t))$. Assume on the contrary that $x_0 \in (0, h(t))$. Then $u_t \geq 0, u_x = 0, u_{xx} \leq 0$ at (t_0, x_0) and $\chi(u(t_0, x_0)) = \chi'(u(t_0, x_0)) = 0$ because of $u(t_0, x_0) > M_1 \geq u_m$. Thus

$$u_t - u_{xx} + u_x \chi(u) v_x + u \chi'(u) u_x v_x + u \chi(u) v_{xx} \geq 0 \quad \text{at } (t_0, x_0).$$

And so $(b - am)v - ac - au \geq 0$ at (t_0, x_0) . This yields

$$aM_1 < au(t_0, x_0) \leq (b - am)v(t_0, x_0) - ac,$$

which is a contradiction and hence $x_0 \notin (0, h(t))$. Therefore, $x_0 = 0$. However, by Hopf boundary lemma we see that $u_x(t, 0) < 0$, which is impossible. The proof is complete. \square

The next theorem guarantees that the solution of (1.3) exist globally.

Theorem 2.2. *Assume that $\chi(u)$, and (u_0, v_0) satisfy the conditions (1.2) and (1.4), respectively. Then the solution (u, v, h) of problem (1.3) exists and is unique for all $t > 0$. Moreover, the unique global solution (u, v, h) of (1.3) satisfies*

$$(u, v, h) \in C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty) \times C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty) \times C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}([0, \infty)),$$

where $D_\infty := [0, \infty) \times [0, h(t)]$.

Proof. Let T_0 be the maximal existence time. On the contrary we assume that $T_0 < \infty$. The same as the proof of Theorem 2.1, we set

$$y = x/h(t), \quad w(t, y) = u(t, h(t)y), \quad z(t, y) = v(t, h(t)y).$$

Then, for any $0 < T < T_0$, (w, z, h) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t - \zeta(t)w_{yy} - \xi(t)yw_y + \zeta(t)\eta'(w)z_yw_y \\ \quad = -\zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy} + f(w, z), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ w_y(t, 0) = w(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ w(0, y) = u_0(h_0y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} z_t - d\zeta(t)z_{yy} - \xi(t)yz_y = g(w, z), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ z_y(t, 0) = z(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ z(0, y) = v_0(h_0y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$h'(t) = -\mu \frac{1}{h(t)} z_y(t, 1), \quad 0 < t \leq T; \quad h(0) = h_0. \quad (2.17)$$

According to Theorem 2.1 (ii),

$$0 < \zeta(t) \leq \frac{1}{h_0^2}, \quad 0 \leq \xi(t) \leq \frac{M_3}{h_0}, \quad \|g(w, z)\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_T)} \leq C,$$

where C is independent of T . Apply the parabolic L^p theory to (2.16) yields that

$$\|z\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T)(\|g(w, z)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} + \|v_0\|_{L^p((0, h_0))}) \leq C(T), \quad (2.18)$$

Notice that the respective constant on the most right-hand side of (2.18) depends on T only through an upper bound for T . Therefore, we have

$$\|z\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0).$$

Then the embedding theorem gives $\|z_y\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0)$. Therefore

$$\|\zeta(t)\eta'(w)z_y\|_{L^\infty(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0), \quad \|- \zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy} + f(w, z)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0).$$

Now we can apply the parabolic L^p theory to (2.15) to derive

$$\|w\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T)(\|- \zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy} + f(w, z)\|_{L^p(\Delta_T)} + \|u_0\|_{W_p^2((0, h_0))}) \leq C(T_0).$$

For any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we take p large enough such that $1 - 3/p > \alpha$. Then $\|w, z\|_{C^{(1+\alpha)/2, 1+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0)$ by the embedding theorem. Hence, $\|g(w, z)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0)$. Moreover, from (2.17), we have $\|h'\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0, T])} \leq C(T_0)$, which implies $\|\zeta, \xi\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0, T])} \leq C(T_0)$. Using the parabolic Schauder theory for (2.16) we find

$$\|z\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T)(\|g(w, z)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}) \leq C(T_0).$$

It follows that

$$\|f(w, z) - \zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy}\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(T_0).$$

Now, we can apply the parabolic Schauder theory to (2.15) to get

$$\|w\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}(\Delta_T)} \leq C(t)(\|f(w, z) - \zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy}\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}(\Delta_T)} + \|u_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}) \leq C(T_0).$$

Recalling the transformation, we conclude that

$$\|u, v\|_{C^{1+\alpha/2, 2+\alpha}([0, T] \times [0, h(t)])} \leq C(T_0) \quad \text{for } 0 < T < T_0, \quad (2.19)$$

and hence

$$h(t) > h_0, \quad \|h\|_{C^{1+\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}([0, T])} \leq C(T_0) \quad \text{for } 0 < T < T_0. \quad (2.20)$$

Take $t_0 \in (0, T_0)$ as a new initial time. Based on the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can choose a positive constant τ , which depends only on the upper bound of $\|(u, v)(t_0, x)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h(t_0)])}$, $h(t_0)$ and $h'(t_0)$, and thus depends only on T_0 by (2.19) and (2.20), such that the solution (u, v, h) can be extended to $[0, t_0 + \tau] \times [0, h(t)]$. If we set $t_0 < T_0$ such that $t_0 + \tau > T_0$, then a contradiction is obtained. \square

3 Regularity and estimates

Theorem 2.1 asserts that $h(t)$ is monotonic increasing. Thereby, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) = h_\infty$ where $h_\infty \in (0, \infty]$. This section provides an estimate for (u, v, h) which plays an essential role in the sequel.

Theorem 3.1. *Let (u, v, h) be the unique global solution of (1.3) and $D_\infty := [0, \infty) \times [0, h(t)]$. Then there is a positive constant C such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty)} \leq C, \quad \|v\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty)} \leq C. \quad (3.1)$$

The second estimate in (3.1) implies

$$\|h'\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq C. \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. The idea of this proof comes from [17, Theorem 2.1], [19, Theorem 2.1] and [23, Theorem 2.2]. In the following arguments we always take $p > 3/(1 - \alpha)$.

By Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, the unique global solution (u, v, h) of (1.3) satisfies

$$(u, v, h) \in C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty) \times C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}(D_\infty) \times C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\mathbb{R}_+). \quad (3.3)$$

The same as the proof of Theorem 2.2 we define

$$y = x/h(t), \quad w(t, y) = u(t, h(t)y), \quad z(t, y) = v(t, h(t)y).$$

Then (w, z, h) satisfies (2.15), (2.16) and (2.17) for all $T > 0$. Denote $Q_1 := [0, 3] \times [0, 1]$. Using Theorem 2.1 we infer that

$$0 < \zeta(t) \leq \frac{1}{h_0^2}, \quad 0 \leq \xi(t) \leq \frac{M_3}{h_0}, \quad \|g(w, z)\|_{L^\infty([0,3] \times [0,1])} \leq C.$$

Applying the parabolic L^p theory to (2.16) firstly and using the embedding theorem secondly, we have

$$\|z\|_{W_p^{1,2}(Q_1)} + \|z\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(Q_1)} \leq C. \quad (3.4)$$

This yields

$$\|\zeta(t)\eta'(w)z_y\|_{L^\infty(Q_1)} + \|\zeta(t)\eta(w)z_{yy} + f(w, z)\|_{L^p(Q_1)} \leq C.$$

Again, we apply the parabolic L^p estimate to (2.15) and embedding theorem to get

$$\|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(Q_1)} \leq C. \quad (3.5)$$

Case 1: $h_\infty < \infty$. For the integral $i \geq 0$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} z^i(t, y) &= z(t + i, y), & w^i(t, y) &= w(t + i, y), \\ h^i(t) &= h(t + i), & \zeta^i(t) &= \zeta(t + i), & \xi^i(t) &= \xi(t + i). \end{aligned}$$

Then $w^i(t, y)$ and $z^i(t, y)$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t^i - \zeta^i(t)w_{yy}^i - \xi^i(t)yw_y^i + \zeta^i(t)\eta'(w^i)z_y^i w_y^i \\ \quad = -\zeta^i(t)\eta(w^i)z_{yy}^i + f^i, & 0 < t \leq 4, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ w_y^i(t, 0) = w^i(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 4, \\ w^i(0, y) = u(i, h(i)y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} z_t^i - d\zeta^i(t)z_{yy}^i - \xi^i(t)yz_y^i = g^i, & 0 < t \leq 4, \quad 0 < y < 1, \\ z_y^i(t, 0) = z^i(t, 1) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 4, \\ z^i(0, y) = v(i, h(i)y), & 0 \leq y \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

where $f^i = f(w^i, z^i)$, $g^i = g(w^i, z^i)$. In view of (2.3)-(2.4) we deduce that functions $w^i, z^i, \zeta^i, \xi^i, f^i$ and g^i are uniformly bounded and the modulus of continuity

$$\rho^i := \max_{0 \leq t, s \leq 4, |t-s| \leq \delta} |\zeta^i(t) - \zeta^i(s)| \leq \frac{2M_3}{h_0^3} \delta \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } \delta \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly on i . Similarly to the arguments of [19, Theorem 2.1] we can obtain

$$\|z^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}([1,4] \times [0,1])} + \|z^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([1,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(D_\infty)} \leq C.$$

The last estimate implies

$$\|h'\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+)} \leq C. \quad (3.9)$$

By (3.8), we have

$$\|\zeta^i \eta'(w^i) z_y^i\|_{L^\infty([1,4] \times [0,1])} + \|\zeta^i \eta(w^i) z_{yy}^i\|_{L^p([1,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq 0.$$

Hence we can apply the interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorems 7.30 and 7.35]) to (3.6) to deduce that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|w^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}([2,4] \times [\frac{1}{2}, 1])} \leq C$ and $\|w^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}([2,4] \times [0, \frac{1}{2}])} \leq C$ for integer $i \geq 0$. Thus we have

$$\|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(B_i)} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq 0,$$

where $B_i = [i+2, i+4] \times [0, 1]$. Since these rectangles B_i overlap and C is independent of i , it follows that $\|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([2, \infty) \times [0, 1])} \leq C$. This in conjunction with (3.5) yields

$$\|w\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([0, \infty) \times [0, 1])} \leq C. \quad (3.10)$$

Thanks to (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10), we see that functions ζ^i, ξ^i and g^i are Hölder continuous uniformly in i , i.e., there exists a positive constant C independent of i such that

$$\|\zeta^i, \xi^i\|_{C^{\alpha/2}([0,4])} \leq C, \quad \|g^i\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C.$$

Using the global Schauder estimate for $i = 0$ and the interior Schauder estimate for $i \geq 1$ ([12]), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|z\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} &\leq C(\|g\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} + \|v_0\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h_0])}) \leq C, \\ \|z^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([1,4] \times [0,1])} &\leq C(\|g^i\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} + \|z^i\|_\infty) \\ &\leq C(\|g^i\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} + M_2) \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

which entails that

$$\|z\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0, \infty) \times [0, 1])} \leq C.$$

The estimates (3.11) and (3.8) show that $\zeta^i \eta'(w^i) z_y^i$, $\zeta^i \eta(w^i) z_{yy}^i$ and f^i are Hölder continuous on $[1, 4] \times [0, 1]$ and uniformly with respect to $i \geq 1$, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\zeta^i \eta'(w^i) z_y^i, \zeta^i \eta(w^i) z_{yy}^i, f^i\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([1,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq 1.$$

Similar to the above, we can apply the Schauder estimate to w and w^i and obtain

$$\|w\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C, \quad \|w^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([2,4] \times [0,1])} \leq C \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\|w\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0, \infty) \times [0, 1])} \leq C.$$

Take advantage of (3.9) and the relations:

$$u_t = w_t - \frac{h'}{h} y w_y, \quad u_{xx} = \frac{1}{h^2} w_{yy}, \quad v_t = z_t - \frac{h'}{h} y z_y, \quad v_{xx} = \frac{1}{h^2} z_{yy}, \quad (3.12)$$

it is easily to derive the estimates (3.1).

Case 2: $h_\infty = \infty$. For any fixed $i_1, i_2 < \infty$, an argument similar to the one used in *Case 1* shows that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0, i_1] \times [0, h(t)])} \leq C(i_1), \quad (3.13)$$

$$\|v\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([0, i_2] \times [0, h(t)])} \leq C(i_2). \quad (3.14)$$

For the integer $i \geq 0$, let

$$u^i(t, x) = u(t + i, x), \quad v^i(t, x) = v(t + i, x), \quad h^i(t) = h(t + i).$$

Then u^i, v^i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_t^i - u_{xx}^i + \eta'(u^i)v_x^i u_x^i = -\eta(u^i)v_{xx}^i + f(u^i, v^i), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < x < h^i(t), \\ u_x^i(t, 0) = u^i(t, h^i(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ u^i(0, x) = u(i, x), & 0 \leq x \leq h(i), \end{cases} \quad (3.15)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} v_t^i - dv_{xx}^i = g(u^i, v^i), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < x < h^i(t), \\ v_x^i(t, 0) = v^i(t, h^i(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ v^i(0, x) = v(i, x), & 0 \leq x \leq h(i). \end{cases} \quad (3.16)$$

From Theorem 2.1, u^i, v^i, h^i are bounded uniformly on i , and

$$h^i(t) \leq h(i) + M_3 t \leq h(i) + 7M_3$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq 7$. Set $\sigma = 7M_3$ and $\sigma_n = \sigma + n$ from now on. Then, it is easy to see that $h(i) \geq h^i(t) - \sigma$ for all $0 \leq t \leq 7$. As $h_\infty = \infty$, there is an $i' \geq 0$ fulfilling $h(i') > \sigma + 9$.

With (3.13) and (3.14) at hand, we only need to study u^i, v^i with $i \geq i'$. Clearly, $h(i) > \sigma + 9$ for all $i \geq i'$. Let us choose $p \gg 1$. For any integer $0 \leq l \leq h(i) - 9$, we can apply the interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorems 7.30 and 7.35]) to the problem (3.16) and deduce that

$$\|v^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}((1,7) \times (l, l+8))} + \|v^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([1,7] \times [l, l+8])} \leq C, \quad \forall 0 \leq l \leq h(i) - 9, \quad (3.17)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of l and i . The same as the proof of [23, Theorem 2.2] we can get

$$\|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+1, \infty] \times [0, h(t) - \sigma_2])} \leq C.$$

Set $Q'_l = (1, 7) \times (l, l+8)$ and $Q''_l = (2, 6) \times (l+1, l+7)$. The estimate (3.17) implies

$$\|v_x^i\|_{L^\infty(Q')} \leq C, \quad \|v_{xx}^i\|_{L^p(Q')} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i'.$$

When $l = 0$, an application of interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorems 7.35]) yields that

$$\|u^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}((2,6) \times (0,7))} + \|u^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([2,6] \times [0,7])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i'. \quad (3.18)$$

When $l \geq 1$, since $Q''_l \subset \subset Q'_l$, we are able to apply the interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorem 7.22]) to the problem (3.15) to obtain

$$\|u^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}((2,6) \times (l+1, l+7))} + \|u^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([2,6] \times [l+1, l+7])} \leq C \quad (3.19)$$

for some $C > 0$ independent of i and l . Use the arguments in the proof of [23, Theorem 2.2], it can be deduced that

$$\|u\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+2, \infty] \times [0, h(t)-\sigma_3])} \leq C.$$

Thanks to (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we see that functions $g(u^i, v^i)$ are Hölder continuous uniformly in i , i.e., there exists a positive constant C independent of i such that

$$\|g(u^i, v^i)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([2,6] \times [0,7])} \leq C,$$

and

$$\|g(u^i, v^i)\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([2,6] \times [l+1, l+7])} \leq C, \quad l \geq 1.$$

Using the interior Schauder estimate for $i \geq i'$ ([12]), we obtain

$$\|v^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([3,6] \times [0,6])} \leq C(\|g(u^i, v^i)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([2,6] \times [0,7])} + M_2) \leq C, \quad (3.20)$$

$$\|v^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([3,6] \times [l+2, l+6])} \leq C(\|g(u^i, v^i)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([2,6] \times [l+1, l+7])} + M_2) \leq C, \quad l \geq 1, \quad (3.21)$$

which entails that

$$\|v\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty] \times [0, h(t)-\sigma_4])} \leq C. \quad (3.22)$$

The estimates (3.19), (3.20) and (3.21) show that $\eta'(u^i)v_x^i$, $-\eta(u^i)v_{xx}^i + f(u^i, v^i)$ are Hölder continuous on $[3, 6] \times [0, 6] \cup [3, 6] \times [l+2, l+6]$ and uniformly with respect to $i \geq i', l \geq 1$, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\|\eta'(u^i)v_x^i, f(u^i, v^i) - \eta(u^i)v_{xx}^i\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([3,6] \times [0,6])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i',$$

and

$$\|\eta'(u^i)v_x^i, f(u^i, v^i) - \eta(u^i)v_{xx}^i\|_{C^{\alpha/2, \alpha}([3,6] \times [l+2, l+6])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i', l \geq 1.$$

Similar to the above, we can apply the interior Schauder estimate to u^i and obtain

$$\|u^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([4,6] \times [0,5])} \leq C, \quad \|u^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([4,6] \times [l+3, l+5])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i', l \geq 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\|u\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+4, \infty] \times [0, h(t)-\sigma_5])} \leq C. \quad (3.23)$$

Next, we shall show

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+4, \infty] \times [h(t)-\sigma_5, h(t)])} &\leq C, \\ \|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty] \times [h(t)-\sigma_4, h(t)])} &\leq C. \end{aligned}$$

Using the transformation

$$y = h(t) - x, \quad \phi(t, y) = u(t, h(t) - y), \quad \psi(t, y) = v(t, h(t) - y)$$

we deduce that ϕ, ψ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \phi_t - \phi_{yy} + h'(t)\phi_y + \eta'(\phi)\phi_y\psi_y = -\eta(\phi)\psi_{yy} + f(\phi, \psi), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < y < h(t), \\ \phi(t, 0) = \phi_y(t, h(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ \phi(0, y) = u_0(h_0 - y), & 0 \leq y \leq h_0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t - d\psi_{yy} + h'(t)\psi_y = g(\phi, \psi), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < y < h(t), \\ \psi(t, 0) = \psi_y(t, h(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ \psi(0, y) = v_0(h_0 - y), & 0 \leq y \leq h_0. \end{cases}$$

For the integer $i \geq i'$, we let

$$\phi^i(t, y) = \phi(t + i, y), \quad \psi^i(t, y) = \psi(t + i, y), \quad h^i(t) = h(t + i).$$

Then ϕ^i, ψ^i satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \phi_t^i - \phi_{yy}^i + [(h^i(t))' + \eta'(\phi^i)\psi_y^i]\phi_y^i \\ \quad = -\eta(\phi^i)\psi_{yy}^i + f(\phi^i, \psi^i), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < y < h^i(t), \\ \phi^i(t, 0) = \phi_y^i(t, h^i(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ \phi^i(0, y) = \phi(i, y) = u(i, h(i) - y), & 0 \leq y \leq h(i), \end{cases} \quad (3.24)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t^i - d\psi_{yy}^i + (h^i(t))'\psi_y^i = g(\phi^i, \psi^i), & 0 < t \leq 7, \quad 0 < y < h^i(t), \\ \psi^i(t, 0) = \psi_y^i(t, h^i(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq 7, \\ \psi^i(0, y) = \psi(i, y) = v(i, h(i) - y), & 0 \leq y \leq h(i). \end{cases} \quad (3.25)$$

In view of Theorem 2.1, we know that $\phi^i, \psi^i, (h^i(t))', f(\phi^i, \psi^i), g(\phi^i, \psi^i)$ are bounded uniformly on i . Set $\Gamma_i = [i + 1, i + 7] \times [0, \sigma_8]$. Recall

$$h(i) - \sigma_8 \geq h(i') - \sigma_8 > 1, \quad \forall i \geq i', \quad 0 \leq t \leq 7.$$

Applying the interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorems 7.30]) to (3.25) firstly and the embedding theorem secondly, we have

$$\|\psi^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Gamma_0)} + \|\psi^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Gamma_0)} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i'. \quad (3.26)$$

Accordingly,

$$\|\psi\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Gamma_i)} \leq C.$$

Since these rectangles Γ_i overlap and C is independent of i , it follows that

$$\|\psi\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+1, \infty] \times [0, \sigma_8])} \leq C. \quad (3.27)$$

Set $\Sigma_i = [i + 2, i + 6] \times [0, \sigma_7]$. In view of (3.26) and $\sigma_8 = \sigma_7 + 1$, we can apply interior L^p estimate ([14, Theorems 7.30]) to (3.24) firstly and embedding theorem secondly to get

$$\|\phi^i\|_{W_p^{1,2}(\Sigma_0)} + \|\phi^i\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}(\Sigma_0)} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i'. \quad (3.28)$$

It follows that

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+2, \infty] \times [0, \sigma_7])} \leq C.$$

From (3.26) and (3.28) we have

$$\|(h^i(t))'\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}([2,6])} + \|g(\phi^i, \psi^i)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([2,6] \times [0, \sigma_7])} \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i'.$$

This allows us to apply the interior Schauder estimate to (3.25) for $i \geq i'$ ([12]) to obtain

$$\|\psi^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([3,6] \times [0, \sigma_6])} \leq C(\|g(\phi^i, \psi^i)\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([2,6] \times [0, \sigma_7])} + M_2) \leq C, \quad \forall i \geq i', \quad (3.29)$$

which implies that

$$\|\psi\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty) \times [0, \sigma_6])} \leq C. \quad (3.30)$$

The estimates (3.28) and (3.29) show that functions $(h^i(t))' + \eta'(\phi^i)\psi_y^i$ and $f(\phi^i, \psi^i) - \eta(\phi^i)\psi_{yy}^i$ are Hölder continuous on $[3, 6] \times [0, \sigma_6]$ and uniformly with respect to $i \geq i'$, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 0$ independent of i such that

$$\|(h^i(t))' + \eta'(\phi^i)\psi_y^i\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([3,6] \times [0, \sigma_6])} + \|f(\phi^i, \psi^i) - \eta(\phi^i)\psi_{yy}^i\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([3,6] \times [0, \sigma_6])} \leq C.$$

Hence by the interior Schauder estimate ([12]) we get that, for all $i \geq i'$,

$$\|\phi^i\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([4,6] \times [0, \sigma_5])} \leq C \left(\|f(\phi^i, \psi^i) - \eta(\phi^i)\psi_{yy}^i\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}, \alpha}([3,6] \times [0, \sigma_6])} + M_1 \right) \leq C,$$

which yields

$$\|\phi\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+4, \infty) \times [0, \sigma_5])} \leq C. \quad (3.31)$$

Notice that $0 \leq y \leq \sigma_i$ is equivalent to $h(t) - \sigma_i \leq x \leq h(t)$, $i = 5, 6$. By means of $0 < h'(t) \leq M_3$ and $v_x(t, x) = -\psi_y(t, y)$ ($u_x(t, x) = -\phi_y(t, y)$), It follows from (3.30) and (3.31) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+4, \infty) \times [h(t) - \sigma_5, h(t)])} &\leq C, \\ \|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty) \times [h(t) - \sigma_6, h(t)])} &\leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (3.32)$$

Recalling that $\sigma_6 = \sigma_4 + 2$, we have

$$\|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty) \times [h(t) - \sigma_4, h(t)])} \leq C. \quad (3.33)$$

A combination of (3.23) and (3.32) implies

$$\|u\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+4, \infty) \times [0, h(t)])} \leq C, \quad (3.34)$$

and a combination of (3.22) and (3.33) yields

$$\|v\|_{C^{1+\frac{\alpha}{2}, 2+\alpha}([i'+3, \infty) \times [0, h(t)])} \leq C. \quad (3.35)$$

Finally, using (3.13) with $i_1 = i' + 4$ and (3.34) we get the first estimate in (3.1). Employing (3.14) with $i_2 = i' + 3$ and (3.35) we get the second estimate in (3.1). \square

4 Long time behavior of (u, v, h)

4.1 Long time behavior of (u, v) in the case of $h_\infty < \infty$

Theorem 4.1. *Let (u, v, h) be the unique global solution of the problem (1.3). If $h_\infty < \infty$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h'(t) = 0$.*

Proof. In view of (2.4), (3.2) and assumption $h_\infty < \infty$, it is easy to derive that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h'(t) = 0$. \square

Next, we give a lemma which enables us to obtain the vanishing phenomenon.

Lemma 4.1. ([23, Lemma 4.1]) *Let d, C, μ and s_0 be positive constants, $w \in W_p^{1,2}((0, T) \times (0, s(t)))$ for some $p > 1$ and any $T > 0$, and $w_x \in C([0, \infty) \times [0, s(t)])$, $s \in C^1([0, \infty))$. If (w, s) satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} w_t - dv_{xx} \geq -Cw, & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < s(t), \\ w \geq 0, & t > 0, \quad x = 0, \\ w = 0, \quad s'(t) \geq -\mu w_x, & t > 0, \quad x = s(t), \\ w(0, x) = w_0(x) \geq, \neq 0, & x \in (0, m_0), \\ s(0) = s_0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s(t) = s_\infty < \infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} s'(t) = 0, \\ \|w(t, \cdot)\|_{C^1[0, s(t)]} \leq M, \quad \forall t > 1 \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $M > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max_{0 \leq x \leq s(t)} w(t, x) = 0.$$

By using of Lemma 4.1 we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Let (u, v, h) be the unique global solution of (1.3). If $h_\infty < \infty$, then,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C^2([0, h(t)])} = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. According to Theorem 2.1, we find that

$$g(u, v) \geq -v \left(v + \frac{ru}{c + u + mv} \right) \geq -v(M_2 + rM_1/c).$$

Recall (2.1), the second estimate in (3.1) and Theorem 4.1. An application of Lemma 4.1 yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0.$$

The second estimate in (3.1) implies

$$\max_{t \geq 1} \|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, h(t)])} \leq C.$$

And so $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|z(t, \cdot)\|_{C([0, 1])} = 0$ and

$$\max_{t \geq 1} \|z(t, \cdot)\|_{C^{2+\alpha}([0, 1])} \leq C,$$

where $z(t, y) = v(t, h(t)y)$. Since $C^{2+\alpha}([0, 1]) \hookrightarrow C^2([0, 1])$, there exists $t_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that $z(t_k, y) \rightarrow z^*(y)$ in $C^2([0, 1])$. The uniqueness of the limit shows that $z^*(y) \equiv 0$. And then $z(t, y) \rightarrow 0$ in $C^2([0, 1])$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. This combined with (3.12) allows us to deduce (4.1). \square

Remark 4.1. *Theorem 4.2 asserts that if the prey can not spread into the whole space, then it will die out.*

With the help of Theorem 4.2, we show that the predator will die out in the case of $h_\infty < \infty$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let (u, v, h) be the unique global solution of (1.3). If $h_\infty < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0.$$

Proof. In the system (1.3) we have

$$\begin{cases} u_t - u_{xx} + \eta'(u)v_x u_x = -v_{xx}\chi(u)u + \frac{buv}{c+u+mv} - au, & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, h(t)) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

In view of (1.2), there exists $E > 0$ such that

$$|\chi(u)| < E \quad \text{for all } u \in [0, \infty).$$

In view of (4.1), for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ fulfilling $(E+1)\varepsilon = a/2$, one can find $T_1 > 0$ such that

$$|v_{xx}(t, x)| \leq \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geq T_1, \quad x \in [0, h(t)].$$

Moreover, again by (4.1), one can find $T_2 > 0$ such that

$$0 < \frac{bv}{c+u+mv} \leq \varepsilon \quad \forall t \geq T_2.$$

Set $T := \max\{T_1, T_2\}$. It is well known that

$$\bar{u}(t) = M_1 e^{(E\varepsilon + \varepsilon - a)(t-T)} \quad \text{for } t \geq T$$

is a solution of the following equation

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t = (\varepsilon E - a + \varepsilon)\bar{u}, & t > T, \\ \bar{u}(T) = M_1. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\bar{u}(t)$ is an upper solution to the problem (4.2). Hence by the comparison principle (Lemma A.1) we have

$$0 < u(t, x) \leq \bar{u}(t) \quad \forall t \geq T, \quad x \in [0, h(t)].$$

Due to $E\varepsilon + \varepsilon - a = -a/2 < 0$, we get $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}(t) = 0$, which yields

$$0 \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} u(t, x) \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}(t) = 0$$

uniformly for x in $[0, h(t)]$. This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.2. *In the application of the comparison principle (Lemma A.1), we used the assumption that $\chi(u) \in C^2([0, \infty))$, which is a necessary assumption for our result.*

4.2 Long time behavior of (v, h) in the case of $h_\infty = \infty$

Theorem 4.4. *If $h_\infty = \infty$, then $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \leq q$ uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$, and there exists $k_1 > 0$ such that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq k_1$.*

Proof. We observe that (v, h) is an lower solution of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \bar{v}_t - d\bar{v}_{xx} = \bar{v}(q - \bar{v}), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < \bar{h}(t), \\ \bar{v}_x(t, 0) = \bar{v}(t, \bar{h}(t)) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ \bar{h}'(t) = -\mu\bar{v}_x(t, \bar{h}(t)), & t \geq 0, \\ \bar{v}(0, x) = v_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq \bar{h}(0), \\ \bar{h}(0) = h_0. \end{cases}$$

By the comparison principle, $h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t)$, $v(t, x) \leq \bar{v}(t, x)$, and so $\bar{h}_\infty \geq h_\infty = \infty$. Using [6, Theorems 3.4 and 4.2], $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{v}(t, x) = q$ uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\bar{h}(t)}{t} = k_1$ for $k_1 > 0$. Hence, our conclusion follows from the comparison principle (Lemma A.2). \square

5 Conditions for spreading and vanishing

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $h_\infty < \infty$. Let (u, v, h) be the unique global solution of (1.3). Then,*

$$h_\infty \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/q}.$$

Proof. As $h_\infty < \infty$, it follows from Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \|u, v\|_{C([0, h(t)])} = 0$. For any small $\varepsilon \in (0, q)$, there exists $\tau_1 \gg 1$ such that

$$\frac{ru}{c+u} \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_1, \quad x \in [0, h_\infty],$$

We assume that $h_\infty > \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/(q-\varepsilon)}$. Then, there exists $\tau_2 \gg 1$ such that

$$h(t) > \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/(q-\varepsilon)}, \quad \forall t \geq \tau_2.$$

Set $\tau = \max\{\tau_1, \tau_2\}$. Similar to the proof of [6, Lemma 3.1], we can construct a function \underline{v} which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \underline{v}_t - d\underline{v}_{xx} \leq \underline{v}(q - \varepsilon - \underline{v}), & t \geq \tau, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ \underline{v}_x(t, 0) = \underline{v}(t, h(t)) = 0, & t \geq \tau, \\ \underline{v}(\tau, x) \leq v(\tau, x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0. \end{cases}$$

On the one hand, we observe that $-\varepsilon \leq -\frac{ru}{c+u+mv}$ for $t \geq \tau$. According to the comparison principle, we obtain

$$\underline{v}(t, x) \leq v(t, x) \quad \text{for } t \geq \tau, \quad 0 \leq x \leq h(t),$$

which yields that

$$v_x(t, h(t)) \leq \underline{v}_x(t, h(t)).$$

On the other hand, from the proof of [6, Lemma 3.1], we have $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \underline{v}_x(t, h(t)) < 0$. Hence, we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} v_x(t, h(t)) < 0.$$

Recall that $v_x(t, h(t)) = -\frac{1}{\mu}h'(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we get a contradiction and then, for any small $\varepsilon \in (0, q)$,

$$h_\infty \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/(q - \varepsilon)}.$$

The desired result then follows by letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark 5.1. Due to $h'(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$, it is straightforward to show that $h_0 \geq \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/q}$ implies $h_\infty = \infty$.

The following lemma provides a sufficient condition for vanishing.

Lemma 5.1. Suppose that $h_0 < \frac{\pi}{2} \sqrt{d/q}$. Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that $h_\infty < \infty$ provided that $\mu \leq \mu_0$.

Proof. From (1.3), v satisfies

$$\begin{cases} v_t - dv_{xx} = v \left(q - v - \frac{ru}{c + u + mv} \right), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < h(t), \\ v_x(t, 0) = v(t, h(t)) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ v(0, x) = v_0(x), & 0 \leq x \leq h_0 \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Let us construct a suitable upper solution to problem (5.1). Let δ, α, M be positive constants to be chosen later. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(t) &= h_0 \left(1 + \delta - \frac{\delta}{2} e^{-\alpha t} \right), \quad t \geq 0; \quad \psi(y) = \cos \frac{\pi y}{2}, \quad 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\ \bar{v}(t, x) &= M e^{-\alpha t} \psi \left(\frac{x}{\beta(t)} \right), \quad t \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq x \leq \beta(t). \end{aligned}$$

A straightforward calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{v}_t - d\bar{v}_{xx} - \bar{v}(q - v) \\ &= M e^{-\alpha t} \left(-\alpha \psi - \frac{x\beta'(t)}{\beta^2(t)} \psi' - \frac{d}{\beta^2(t)} \psi'' - \psi (q - M e^{-\alpha t} \psi) \right) \\ &\geq M e^{-\alpha t} \psi \left(-\alpha + \frac{\pi^2}{4} \frac{d}{(1 + \delta)^2 h_0^2} - q + M e^{-\alpha t} \psi \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t > 0$ and $0 < x < \beta(t)$. Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$\beta'(t) = \alpha h_0 \frac{\delta}{2} e^{-\alpha t}, \quad -\mu \bar{v}_x(t, \beta(t)) = \mu M e^{-\alpha t} \frac{\pi}{2\beta(t)}.$$

Observe that $q < \frac{d\pi^2}{4h_0^2}$, we can find $\delta > 0$ fulfilling

$$\frac{d\pi^2}{4(1 + \delta)^2 h_0^2} - q = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\pi^2}{4h_0^2} - q \right) > 0.$$

We now choose M large enough such that

$$v_0(x) \leq M \cos \left(\frac{\pi x}{2h_0(1 + \delta/2)} \right) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq h_0,$$

and take

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\pi^2}{4h_0^2} - q \right), \quad \mu_0 = \frac{\delta\alpha h_0^2}{M}.$$

Then for any $0 < \mu \leq \mu_0$, it holds that

$$\begin{cases} \bar{v}_t - d\bar{v}_{xx} \geq \bar{v}(r - \frac{r}{K}\bar{v}), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < \beta(t), \\ \bar{v}_x(t, 0) = \bar{v}(t, \beta(t)) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ \beta'(t) > -\mu\bar{v}_x(t, \beta(t)), & t \geq 0, \\ \beta(0) = (1 + \frac{\delta}{2})h_0 > h_0. \end{cases}$$

Applying the comparison principle (Lemma A.2) to get that $h(t) \leq \beta(t)$ and $v(t, x) \leq \bar{v}(t, x)$ for $0 \leq x \leq h(t)$ and $t > 0$. Thereupon, we conclude that

$$h_\infty \leq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \beta(t) = h_0(1 + \delta) < \infty.$$

We thus finish the proof. □

Lemma 5.2. *Suppose that $h_0 < \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{d/q}$. If $q > \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1}$ and*

$$\mu \geq \mu^0 := d \max \left\{ 1, \|v_0\|_\infty \left(q - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1} \right) \right\} \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{d/q} - h_0 \right) \left(\int_0^{h_0} v_0(x) dx \right)^{-1},$$

then $h_\infty = \infty$. Furthermore, we have that

$$q - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \leq q$$

uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$, and there exists $0 < k_2 \leq k_1$ such that

$$k_2 \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq k_1,$$

where k_1 is given by Theorem 4.4.

Proof. It is easy to see that (v, h) is an upper solution of

$$\begin{cases} \underline{v}_t - d\underline{v}_{xx} = \underline{v} \left(q - \underline{v} - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1} \right), & t > 0, \quad 0 < x < \underline{h}(t), \\ \underline{v}_x(t, 0) = \underline{v}(t, \underline{h}(t)) = 0, & t \geq 0, \\ \underline{h}'(t) = \mu\underline{v}_x(t, \underline{h}(t)), & t \geq 0, \\ \underline{v}(0, x) = v_0(x), \quad \underline{h}(0) = h_0, & 0 \leq x \leq h_0 \end{cases}$$

Then we have $h(t) \geq \underline{h}(t)$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $v(t, x) \geq \underline{v}(t, x)$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $x \in [0, \underline{h}(t)]$. In view of $q - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1} > 0$, it follows from [6, Lemma 3.7] that $\underline{h}_\infty = \infty$. Hence we have $h_\infty = \infty$ by the comparison principle (Lemma A.2).

Using $\underline{h}_\infty = \infty$ and [6, Theorem 4.2], we know that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \underline{v}(t, x) = q - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1}$ uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$ and there exists $k_2 > 0$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\underline{h}(t)}{t} = k_2$. It follows from comparison principle (Lemma A.2) that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \underline{v}(t, x) = q - \frac{rM_1}{c+M_1}$$

uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$, and

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} = k_2.$$

Notice that $q > q - \frac{rM_1}{c + M_1}$. According to [6], we find that $k_2 \leq k_1$. This fact combined with Theorem 4.4 yields that

$$k_2 \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} \leq k_1,$$

and

$$q - \frac{rM_1}{c + M_1} \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \leq q$$

uniformly for x in any bounded set of $[0, \infty)$. \square

Theorem 5.2. *Suppose that $q > \frac{rM_1}{c + M_1}$. If $h_0 < \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{d/q}$, then there exists $\mu^* \geq \mu_* > 0$ depending on u_0, v_0 and h_0 such that $h_\infty \leq \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{d/q}$ if $\mu \leq \mu_*$ or $\mu = \mu^*$, and $h_\infty = \infty$ if $\mu > \mu^*$*

Proof. (Cf. [25, Theorem 5.2]). Writing $\Lambda := \frac{\pi}{2}\sqrt{d/q}$ and (u_μ, v_μ, h_μ) in place of (u, v, h) to clarify the dependence of solution of (1.3) on μ . Define

$$\Sigma := \{\mu > 0 : h_{\mu, \infty} \leq \Lambda\}.$$

It follows from Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 5.1 that $(0, \mu_0] \subset \Sigma$. According to Lemma 5.2, $\Sigma \cap [\mu^0, \infty) = \emptyset$. Hence, $\mu^* := \sup \Sigma \in [\mu_0, \mu^0]$. We have by this definition and Theorem 5.1 that $h_{\mu, \infty} = \infty$ if $\mu > \mu^*$.

Next, we claim that $\mu^* \in \Sigma$. If not, then we would have $h_{\mu^*, \infty} = \infty$. Therefore, there is $T > 0$ fulfilling $h_{\mu^*}(T) > \Lambda$. Thanks to the continuous dependence of (u_μ, v_μ, h_μ) on μ , there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $h_{\mu, \infty} > \Lambda$ for $\mu \in [\mu^* - \varepsilon, \mu^* + \varepsilon]$. This entails that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h_\mu(t) \geq h_\mu(T) > \Lambda \quad \text{for all } \mu \in [\mu^* - \varepsilon, \mu^* + \varepsilon].$$

Consequently, we have $[\mu^* - \varepsilon, \mu^* + \varepsilon] \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ and then $\sup \Sigma \leq \mu^* - \varepsilon$. This is contrary to the definition of μ^* . We have thus shown that $\mu^* \in \Sigma$.

Define

$$\mathcal{S} = \{\nu : \nu \geq \mu_0 \text{ such that } h_{\mu, \infty} \leq \Lambda \text{ for all } \mu \leq \nu\},$$

where μ_0 is given by Lemma 5.1. Clearly, $\mu_* = \sup \mathcal{S} \leq \mu^*$. Similar to the above, it can be proved that $\mu_* \in \mathcal{S}$. This completes the proof. \square

Appendix

Let $0 < T \leq \infty$ and $L_T := (0, T) \times (0, l)$. Consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - F_1 u_{xx} + F_2 \gamma(u) u_x + F_3 u_x = F_4 \theta(u) + F_5 u & \text{in } L_T, \\ u_x(t, 0) = u(t, l) = 0 & \text{in } [0, T), \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x) & \text{in } [0, l], \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma, \theta \in C^1(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_+)$, $F_i(t, x) \in C(L_T)$ are bounded in L_T , $i = 1, \dots, 5$. Moreover, there is $\lambda > 0$ such that $F_1 \geq \lambda$ for $(t, x) \in L_T$.

Lemma A.1. *Suppose that*

$$\bar{u}, \underline{u} \in C^{1,2}((0, T) \times [0, l]) \cap C([0, T] \times [0, l]),$$

and $\bar{u}, \underline{u} \geq 0$ in $[0, T] \times [0, l]$. If

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t - F_1 \bar{u}_{xx} + F_2 \gamma(\bar{u}) \bar{u}_x + F_3 \bar{u}_x + F_4 \theta(\bar{u}) + F_5 \bar{u} \\ \geq \underline{u}_t - F_1 \underline{u}_{xx} + F_2 \gamma(\underline{u}) \underline{u}_x + F_3 \underline{u}_x + F_4 \theta(\underline{u}) + F_5 \underline{u} & \text{in } L_T, \\ \bar{u}_x(t, 0) \leq \underline{u}_x(t, 0), \quad \bar{u}(t, l) \geq \underline{u}(t, l) & \text{in } [0, T], \\ \bar{u}(0, x) \geq \underline{u}(0, x) & \text{in } [0, l], \end{cases}$$

then $\bar{u} \geq \underline{u}$ in $[0, T] \times [0, l]$.

Proof. Let $w = \bar{u} - \underline{u}$, then we have

$$\begin{cases} w_t - F_1 w_{xx} + F_2 \gamma(\underline{u}) w_x + F_2 \bar{u}_x [\gamma(\bar{u}) - \gamma(\underline{u})] \\ \quad + F_3 w_x + F_4 [\theta(\bar{u}) - \theta(\underline{u})] + F_5 w \geq 0 & \text{in } L_T, \\ w_x(t, 0) \leq 0, \quad w(t, l) \geq 0 & \text{in } [0, T], \\ w(0, x) \geq 0 & \text{in } [0, l]. \end{cases}$$

Writing

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(\bar{u}) - \gamma(\underline{u}) &= (\bar{u} - \underline{u}) \int_0^1 \gamma'(\underline{u} + s(\bar{u} - \underline{u})) ds, \\ \theta(\bar{u}) - \theta(\underline{u}) &= (\bar{u} - \underline{u}) \int_0^1 \theta'(\underline{u} + s(\bar{u} - \underline{u})) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $a_2(t, x) = F_2(t, x) \gamma(\underline{u}) + F_3(t, x)$ and

$$a_3(t, x) = F_5(t, x) + F_2(t, x) \bar{u}_x \int_0^1 \gamma'(\underline{u} + s(\bar{u} - \underline{u})) ds + F_4(t, x) \int_0^1 \theta'(\underline{u} + s(\bar{u} - \underline{u})) ds.$$

Then a_3 is bounded in $[\varepsilon, T - \varepsilon] \times [0, l]$ for each fixed $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$, and w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t - F_1(t, x) w_{xx} + a_2(t, x) w_x + a_3(t, x) w \geq 0 & \text{in } L_T, \\ w_x(t, 0) \leq 0, \quad w(t, l) \geq 0 & \text{in } [0, T], \\ w(0, x) \geq 0 & \text{in } [0, l]. \end{cases}$$

The standard maximum principle yields $w \geq 0$, and so $\bar{u} \geq \underline{u}$. \square

Lemma A.2. *Suppose that $T > 0$, $\bar{h} \in C^1([0, T])$ and $\bar{h} > 0$ in $[0, T]$, $\bar{v} \in C(\bar{D}_T) \cap C^{1,2}(D_T)$ with $D_T := \{0 < t \leq T, 0 < x < \bar{h}(t)\}$, ψ is C^1 and satisfies $\psi(0) = 0$, (\bar{v}, \bar{h}) satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \bar{v}_t - \bar{v}_{xx} \geq \psi(\bar{v}), & 0 < t \leq T, \quad 0 < x < \bar{h}(t), \\ \bar{v}_x(t, 0) = 0, \quad \bar{v}(t, \bar{h}(t)) = 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \bar{h}'(t) \geq -\mu \bar{v}_x(t, \bar{h}(t)), & 0 \leq t \leq T. \end{cases}$$

If $\bar{h}(0) \geq h_0$, $\bar{v}(0, x) \geq 0$ in $[0, \bar{h}(0)]$, and $\bar{v}(0, x) \geq v_0(x)$ in $[0, h_0]$. Then $h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t)$ in $(0, T]$, and $v(t, x) \leq \bar{v}(t, x)$ for $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in [0, h(t)]$.

The proof of Lemma A.2 is identical to that of [6, Lemma 3.5].

References

- [1] B.E. Ainseba, M. Bendahmane and A. Noussair, *A reaction-diffusion system modeling predator-prey with prey-taxis*, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA*, 9 (2008), 2086-2105.
- [2] J.R. Beddington, *Mutual interference between parasites or predators and its effect on searching efficiency*, *J. Animal Ecol.*, 44(1975), 331-340.
- [3] G. Bunting, Y. Du and K. Krakowski, *Spreading speed revisited: Analysis of a free boundary model*, *Netw. Heterog. Media.*, 7(2012), 583-603.
- [4] D.L. DeAngelis, R.A. Goldstein and R.V. O'Neill, *A model for trophic interaction*, *Ecology*, 56(1975), 881-892.
- [5] Q.L. Chen, F.Q. Li and F. Wang, *The diffusive competition problem with a free boundary in heterogeneous time-periodic environment*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 433(2)(2016), 1594-1613.
- [6] Y.H. Du and Z.G. Lin, *Spreading-vanishing dichotomy in the diffusive logistic model with a free boundary*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 42(2010), 377-405.
- [7] Y.H. Du and Z.G. Lin, *The diffusive competition model with a free boundary: Invasion of a superior or inferior competition*, *Discrete Cont. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 19(2014), 3105-3132.
- [8] Y.H. Du, M.X. Wang and M.L. Zhou, *Semi-wave and spreading speed for the diffusive competition model with a free boundary*, *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 107(3)(2017), 253-287.
- [9] J.S. Guo and C.H. Wu, *On a free boundary problem for a two-species weak competition system*, *J. Dyn. Diff. Equa.*, 24(2012), 873-895.
- [10] J.S. Guo and C.H. Wu, *Dynamics for a two-species competition-diffusion model with two free boundaries*, *Nonlinearity*, 28(2015), 1-27.
- [11] P. Kareiva and G.T. Odell, *Swarms of predators exhibit "preytaxis" if individual predators use area-restricted search*, *Amer. Nat.* 130(1987), 233-270.
- [12] O.A. Ladyzenskaja, V.A. Solonnikov and N. N. Ural'ceva, *Linear and quasi-Linear equations of parabolic type*, Academic Press, New York, London, 1968.
- [13] J.M. Lee, T. Hillen and M.A. Lewis, *Pattern formation in prey-taxis systems*, *J. Biol. Dyn.* 3(6)(2009), 551-573.
- [14] G.M. Lieberman, *Second Order Parabolic Differential Equations*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996.
- [15] J. Wang and L. Zhang, *Invasion by an inferior or superior competitor: A diffusive competition model with a free boundary in a heterogeneous environment*, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 423(1)(2015), 377-398.
- [16] M.X. Wang, *On some free boundary problems of the prey-predator model*, *J. Differential Equations*, 256(10)(2014), 3365-3394.
- [17] M.X. Wang, *The diffusive logistic equation with a free boundary and sign-changing coefficient*, *J. Differential Equations*, 258(2015), 1252-1266.
- [18] M. X. Wang, *Spreading and vanishing in the diffusive prey-predator model with a free boundary*, *Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simulat.*, 23(2015), 311-327.

- [19] M.X. Wang, *A diffusive logistic equation with a free boundary and sign-changing coefficient in time-periodic environment*, J. Funct. Anal., 270(2)(2016), 483-508.
- [20] M.X. Wang and Y. Zhang, *Two kinds of free boundary problems for the diffusive prey-predator model*, Nonlinear Anal.: Real World Appl., 24(2015), 73-82.
- [21] M.X. Wang and Y. Zhang, *The time-periodic diffusive competition models with a free boundary and sign-changing growth rates*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys., 67(5)(2016), Art.132.
- [22] M.X. Wang and Y. Zhang, *Note on a two-species competition-diffusion model with two free boundaries*, Nonlinear Anal: TMA, 159(2017), 458-467.
- [23] M.X. Wang and Y. Zhang, *Dynamics for a diffusive prey-predator model with different free boundaries*. [arXiv:1511.06479v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.06479v3) [math.AP].
- [24] M.X. Wang and J.F. Zhao, *Free boundary problems for a Lotka-Volterra competition system*, J. Dyn. Diff. Equat., 26(3)(2014), 655-672.
- [25] M.X. Wang and J.F. Zhao, *A free boundary problem for a predator-prey model with double free boundaries*, J. Dyn. Diff. Equat., 29(3)(2017), 957-979.
- [26] C.H. Wu, *The minimal habitat size for spreading in a weak competition system with two free boundaries*, J. Differential Equations, 259(3)(2015), 873-897.
- [27] J.F. Zhao and M.X. Wang, *A free boundary problem of a predator-prey model with higher dimension and heterogeneous environment*, Nonlinear Anal.: Real World Appl., 16(2014), 250-263.
- [28] M. Zhao, W.T. Li and J.F. Cao, *A prey-predator model with a free boundary and sign-changing coefficient in time-periodic environment*, Discrete Cont. Dyn. Syst. B, 22(9)(2017), 3295-3316.
- [29] Y.G. Zhao and M.X. Wang, *Free boundary problems for the diffusive competition system in higher dimension with sign-changing coefficients*, IMA J. Appl. Math., 81(2016), 225-280.
- [30] L. Zhou, S. Zhang and Z. H. Liu, *An evolutionary free-boundary problem of a reaction-diffusion-advection system*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A, 147(3)(2017), 615-648.