

Deterministic and Stochastic Research of Cubic Population Model with Harvesting

Özgür Gültekin,^{1,2,*} Çağatay Eskin,^{3,†} and Esra Yazıcıoğlu^{1,‡}

¹*Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Department of Statistics, Istanbul 34427, Turkey*

²*Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Department of Mathematics, Istanbul 34427, Turkey*

³*Middle East Technical University, Department of Physics, Ankara 06800, Turkey*

A detailed examination of the effect of harvesting on a population has been carried out by extending the standard cubic deterministic model by considering a population under Allee effect with a quadratic function representing harvesting. Weak and strong Allee effect transitions, carrying capacity, and Allee threshold change according to harvesting is first discussed in the deterministic model. A Fokker Planck equation has been obtained starting from a Langevin formulation, subject to Gaussian white noise with zero mean. This allowed to calculate the stationary probability distribution of population size, and thus discuss the effects of harvesting for a population under Allee effect, subject to Gaussian white noise.

I. INTRODUCTION

Population dynamics have a wide range of applications beyond the limits of ecology and biology [1–4]. For example, theoretical and practical tools for population dynamics in different fields such as astrophysics and plasma physics are utilized [5, 6]. An important phenomenon in terms of the consequences of intraspecific cooperation in a population is the Allee effect. Allee effect was first described by Warder Clyde Allee in the 1930's [7, 8]. Despite its long history, it is still a current research topic in the fields of evolutionary biology and genetics [9–12]. Allee effect is a positive correlation between population density and mean individual fitness [13–15]. If population always goes to extinction for average population size values below a threshold value, this is strong Allee effect. In the absence of such a critical average population size, if the Allee effect is observed although the per capita growth rate of population remains always positive, this is defined as weak Allee effect [13].

Although there are studies considering the harvesting effect in deterministic population models for a single species [16, 17], the harvesting effect has not been studied sufficiently in stochastic models. When population models are expanded to include the harvesting effect, the systems described by the model may also vary [2]. For example, the effects of stress, that affect on individuals in population, on the average population size in the case of danger in the population

can be modeled by extending the population model with a function representing the stress effects. [18–20]. Therefore, we think that researching extended population models with harvesting function will provide motivation for population dynamics and various studies that go beyond the limits of population dynamics.

A simple population containing the Allee effect can be represented by a cubic model. Although deterministic models have pedagogical significance, they do not produce sufficiently realistic results. Although there are various approaches to describe the model including stochastic properties with noise, two approaches are basically in the foreground [21, 22]. Master equation can be solved by using transition rates representing the transition of a population from n individuals to $n + r$ individuals [23–25]. Although there is no general solution of the master equation, a mean field equation can be obtained [26]. Another way to obtain a stochastic model representing the population under internal and external fluctuations is to write a Fokker-Planck equation [23, 27]. A Langevin equation is written using the statistical properties of Gaussian white noise and the Fokker-Planck equation is obtained from the correlation relations. In fact, the choice of the type of noise is important. There are studies that use colored noise to represent stochastic fluctuations [28, 29]. In this study, we use Gaussian white noise with zero mean to discuss the harvesting effect through an expanded stochastic model with harvesting function. First, we expand the cubic deterministic model with the harvesting function and carry a detailed study on the harvesting for both weak and strong Allee effect cases. Thus, we obtain the Stationary Probability Distribution (SPD) by making a stochastic description of a population con-

* Corresponding author: gultekino@yahoo.com

† cagatay.eskin@metu.edu.tr

‡ yaziciogluesra@gmail.com

taining the harvesting effect with the Fokker-Planck equation. We discuss the effects of multiplicative noise strength, additive noise strength and the degree of correlation between additive and multiplicative noise on SPD for the population model we have expanded with the harvesting function under weak and strong Allee effect.

II. CUBIC DETERMINISTIC MODEL UNDER ALLEE EFFECT IN THE PRESENCE OF HARVESTING

When the number of births per unit population is proportional to the square of the population size, and the Allee effect taken into consideration, a standard model is obtained where the time change of the population size is a cubic function of the population size [30]:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = rx \left(1 - \frac{x}{K}\right) (x - m) \quad (2.1)$$

Here, x represents the average population size at time t , r is the intrinsic growth rate, K is the carrying capacity, and m is the threshold value for population size below which population goes to extinction. For the model to be biologically meaningful, parameters other than m must be positive. In the population model, $m > 0$ should be used to describe the strong Allee effect, and $m < 0$ to describe the weak Allee effect. In addition, $m < K$ because of the biological definitions of parameters. This model is deterministic in terms of mathematically and precisely describing the future state of the population when the initial conditions are known. By subtracting an $H(x)$ function, representing harvesting, from the right side of the equation (2.1) we expand the model as follows:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = -\frac{r}{K}x^3 + r \left(1 + \frac{m}{K}\right)x^2 - rmx - H(x) \quad (2.2)$$

When $H(x) = 0$, it is clear that equation (2.2) takes the standard form in (2.1). In Fig. 1, change of average population size over time for different initial population values is shown as carrying capacity $K = 30$, Allee threshold $m = 10$ and intrinsic growth rate $r = 0.1$ taken for a population under strong Allee effect. Average population size always reaches the carrying capacity for different initial values of average population size above Allee threshold. In addition to

this, for initial values below Allee threshold, average population size always reaches to zero. Thus, the deterministic model predicts that the average population size for each value above the Allee threshold will go to the carrying capacity, which is an equilibrium point, and will also go to another equilibrium point, zero, for each value below the Allee threshold. In Fig. 2, population under weak Allee effect shown. In this case, average population size, regardless of the initial value, except that it is 0, always goes to the carrying capacity, which is an equilibrium point. Fig. 3 shows the relationship between the average population size and the derivative of average population size with respect to time. When $dx/dt = 0$ taken, average population size values, which are the solution of equation (2.2) defined as equilibrium points. For strong Allee effect case, $x = 0$ is stable, $x = m$ is unstable, and $x = K$ are stable equilibrium points.




Figure 1: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$.

In this case, it is clearly seen in Fig. 3 that when $0 < x < m$, dx/dt becomes negative and average population size goes to zero but when $m < x < K$, dx/dt becomes positive so that average population size goes to carrying capacity. For the weak Allee effect case, there are only two non-negative roots, $x = 0$ and $x = K$.

We continue by examining the situation where the harvesting function is represented by a constant $H(x) = H$ and $H > 0$. An interesting result here is that in the presence of a harvesting term independent of the average population size, weak Allee effect can no longer be mentioned. The presence of the harvesting function as a constant in the model does displace




Figure 2: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = -10$.




Figure 4: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = -10$ and $H(x) = 3.75$.




Figure 3: Time derivative of average population size dx/dt as a function of x when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$ and $m = 10$, $m = -10$ for strong and weak Allee effects.




Figure 5: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$ and $H(x) = 3.75$.

not only the roots but also causes the formation of a root above zero for the weak Allee effect case, that is, an Allee threshold that did not exist before. This case is clearly seen in Fig. 4.

There is now such a critical average population size value just above zero, where the average population size is going to zero at each initial average population size value below this value and goes to carrying capacity for each initial value above this threshold. So, the model now foresees an Allee threshold. As the harvesting term grows, the value of the Allee threshold increases and the carrying capacity of the population decreases. The steady decline of the average

size of population means an external environmental condition that suppresses the carrying capacity of the population. As can be seen from Fig. 5, in the presence of harvesting term, the model that was showing Allee effect before the addition of harvesting term, has $x(t) = 15$ as Allee threshold even though $m = 10$. In other words, in the model (2.2), where harvesting term is 0, m stands as the Allee threshold. However, expanding the model to include a fixed harvesting term causes displacement of the equilibrium points. Thus, m no longer represents the Allee threshold of the model. Also, K , which was the carrying capacity of the population before the addition of harvesting




Figure 6: Time derivative of average population size dx/dt as a function of x when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $H(x) = 3.75$, and $m = 10$, $m = -10$ for strong and weak Allee effects.

term, is no longer carrying capacity. In the presence of a constant harvesting term carrying capacity of the population has dropped below K . Fig. 6 shows the change of roots in the presence of constant harvesting term clearly. From now on even if the $x = 0$ is not a root when $dx/dt = 0$ taken, it is biologically meaningful. Because, near $x = 0$, $dx/dt < 0$, so that the average population size value must reduce. However, $x = 0$ acts as a biologically stable equilibrium since the average population size cannot be less than zero biologically. Therefore, mathematically, in Figures 4 and 5, the fact that the average population size is less than zero does not have a biological significance and is biologically interpreted as the reset of the average population size. Fig. 7 shows the change of the carrying capacity of the population and Allee threshold according to the harvesting.

We discussed the change of equilibrium points for the weak and strong Allee effect cases with the expansion of the population model. To determine equilibrium points, we can find positive roots by taking $dx/dt = 0$ again in equation (2.2). Thus, after expanding the model to include a fixed harvesting term, we obtained the following solutions for the new Allee threshold m' and the new carrying capacity K' as:

$$m' = A \sin\left(\frac{1}{3} \arcsin E\right) + \frac{K+m}{3} \quad (2.3)$$

$$K' = A \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{6} + \frac{1}{3} \arcsin E\right) + \frac{K+m}{3} \quad (2.4)$$




Figure 7: Change of Allee threshold, m' , and carrying capacity, K' with respect to H , when $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$.

Where E and A given as:

$$E = \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{2} \left[-\frac{2}{27}(K+m)^3 + \frac{1}{3}mK(K+m) + \frac{KH}{r} \right] \times \left[\frac{(K+m)^2}{3} - mK \right]^{-3/2} \quad (2.5a)$$

$$A = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \left[\frac{(K+m)^2}{3} - mK \right]^{1/2} \quad (2.5b)$$

We continue by assuming harvesting function to be in the form of $H(x) = H_1x^2 + H_2x$. When $dx/dt = 0$ taken and $r^2(1 + m/K - H_1/r)^2 > 4r(rm + H_2)/K$, equation (2.2) arranged as follows and m' , K' are the roots.

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = (rm + H_2)x \left(1 - \frac{x}{K'}\right) \left(\frac{x}{m'} - 1\right) \quad (2.6)$$

Here K' and m' given as:

$$K' = \frac{K}{2r} \left[r \left(1 + \frac{m}{K} - \frac{H_1}{r} \right) + \sqrt{r^2 \left(1 + \frac{m}{K} - \frac{H_1}{r} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{r}{K} (rm + H_2)} \right] \quad (2.7)$$

$$m' = \frac{K}{2r} \left[r \left(1 + \frac{m}{K} - \frac{H_1}{r} \right) - \sqrt{r^2 \left(1 + \frac{m}{K} - \frac{H_1}{r} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{r}{K} (rm + H_2)} \right] \quad (2.8)$$




Figure 8: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$ and $H(x) = 0.25x$.

When $H_1 = 0$, harvesting term is a linear function of average population size. In this case, new Allee threshold and carrying capacity can be calculated by (2.7) and (2.8). Furthermore, an advantage of writing (2.2) in the form of (2.6) is that the model represents either the weak and strong Allee effect according to the sign of $rm + H_2$ expression. If $rm + H_2 > 0$, model represents strong Allee effect, and if $rm + H_2 < 0$ represents weak Allee effect. When $H_1 = 0$ and, $H_2 = 0.25$ Fig. 8 stands for strong Allee effect, Fig. 9 for weak Allee effect, and Fig. 10 for relationship between the first derivative of average population size with respect to time and average population size. In Fig. 9, it is seen that the harvesting term has the effect of decreasing the carrying capacity of the population under weak Allee effect. In addition to this, in Figure 8 it is seen that the harvesting term has an effect of decreasing the carrying capacity and increasing the Allee threshold in the population under strong Allee effect. An important difference between the case where the harvesting term is a linear function of the average size of the population and the case where the harvesting term is taken as a constant independent of the average size

of the population is that the weak Allee effect does not immediately convert to a strong Allee effect in the first case. This is clear when Fig. 10 is examined. In Fig. 11, change of carrying capacity of the population and Allee threshold with respect to amount of harvesting shown. Figures 12 and 13 show the variation of the Allee threshold and the carrying capacity of the population depending on the coefficients H_1 and H_2 for population model under strong Allee effect where $H_1 > 0$ and $H_2 > 0$.




Figure 9: Average population size $x(t)$ as a function of t for different initial x values when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = -10$ and $H(x) = 0.25x$.




Figure 10: Time derivative of average population size dx/dt as a function of x when, $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $H(x) = 0.25x$, and $m = -10$ for strong and weak Allee effect cases respectively.




Figure 11: Change of Allee threshold, m' and carrying capacity, K' with respect to H_2 , when $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$.

III. STATIONARY PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION SUBJECT TO WHITE NOISE AND HARVESTING

In order to describe the cubic population model containing the Allee effect, which we discussed in the previous section, by stochastic approach, we write a Langevin equation as follows:

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = -\frac{r}{K}x^3 + r\left(1 + \frac{m}{K}\right)x^2 - (rm + H)x + x\zeta(t) + \psi(t) \quad (3.1)$$




Figure 12: Change of Allee threshold, m' , with respect to H_1 and H_2 , when $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$.




Figure 13: Change of carrying capacity, K' with respect to H_1 and H_2 , when $K = 30$, $r = 0.1$, $m = 10$.

Statistical properties of $\zeta(t)$ and $\psi(t)$, which represent Gaussian white noise with zero mean, defined as:

$$\langle \zeta(t) \rangle = \langle \psi(t) \rangle = 0 \quad (3.2a)$$

$$\langle \zeta(t)\zeta(t') \rangle = 2D\delta(t-t') \quad (3.2b)$$

$$\langle \psi(t)\psi(t') \rangle = 2\alpha\delta(t-t') \quad (3.2c)$$

$$\langle \zeta(t)\psi(t') \rangle = 2\lambda\sqrt{D\alpha}\delta(t-t') \quad (3.2d)$$

Here, parameters D and α are the strength of the noises $\zeta(t)$ and $\psi(t)$ and the parameter λ is the degree of correlation between $\zeta(t)$ and $\psi(t)$. By using (3.1) and (3.2) and by following the general procedure given in [31], we arrive at a Fokker Planck equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} P(x, t) = & -\frac{\partial}{\partial x} [A(x)P(x, t)] \\ & + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} [B(x)P(x, t)] \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A(x) = & -\frac{r}{K}x^3 + r\left(1 + \frac{m}{K}\right)x^2 - (r + H)x \\ & + Dx + \lambda\sqrt{D\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4a)$$

$$B(x) = Dx^2 + 2\lambda\sqrt{D\alpha}x + \alpha \quad (3.4b)$$

Stationary solution of Fokker Planck equation obtained by a simple conversion as follows:

$$P_{st} = \frac{N}{B(x)} \exp \left[\int^x \frac{A(x')}{B(x')} dx' \right] \quad (3.5)$$

Here, N is normalization constant. Using equations (3.4) in (3.5), we find stationary probability distribution function P_{st} for $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ as follows:

$$P_{st} = \frac{Ne^\eta}{\sqrt{Dx^2 + 2\lambda\sqrt{D\alpha}x + \alpha}} \quad (3.6)$$

Where,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta = & \frac{1}{2KD^3} \left[\varphi \ln \alpha + 2 \arctan \left(\frac{\lambda\sqrt{\alpha D}}{\sqrt{\alpha D} - \lambda^2\alpha D} \right) \gamma + 2Drx \left(D(K + m) + 2\lambda\sqrt{\alpha D} \right) \varphi \right. \\ & \left. - D^2rx^2\varphi - \varphi \ln \left(\alpha + Dx^2 + 2\lambda x\sqrt{\alpha D} \right) - 2 \arctan \left(\frac{Dx + \lambda\sqrt{\alpha D}}{\sqrt{\alpha D} - \lambda^2\alpha D} \right) \gamma \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\varphi = \left[D(-\alpha r + DK(H + mr)) + 2D\lambda(K + m)r\sqrt{\alpha D} + 4\lambda^2r\alpha D \right] \quad (3.8)$$

$$\gamma = \frac{\left(\alpha D^2(K + m)r - D\lambda(-3\alpha r + DK(H + mr))\sqrt{\alpha D} - 2D\lambda^2(K + m)r\alpha D - 4\lambda^3r(\alpha D)^{3/2} \right)}{\sqrt{\alpha D} - \lambda^2\alpha D} \quad (3.9)$$

Thus, for a population model under Allee effect, in the presence of Gaussian white noise and in the presence of harvesting, the stationary probability distribution function of the average size of population was obtained from the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation.

First, we discuss the effects of additive and multiplicative noise for the case there is no harvesting. In Fig. 14, change of stationary probability distribution function (SPD) for different values of strength of multiplicative noise D given for population under strong Allee effect, where other parameters are $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0.5$. For small values of the strength of multiplicative noise, when population size is near the carrying capacity, SPD has a one peak. In other words, for the very small values of D , the population is likely to be around the carrying capacity. With the increase of D , probability of population to taking values farther away from the carrying capacity gets bigger by the spread of SPD around carrying capacity. In further growing values of D , the

probability of the population to be near carrying capacity decreases and the probability to be at low population size values increases. Therefore, we say that the high strength of multiplicative noise under strong Allee effect will increase the chance of population to extinct.

In Fig. 15 change of SPD for different values of the strength of multiplicative noise for population under weak Allee effect given. For that case, $m = -10$ and other parameters are same as the previous case. For very small values of multiplicative noise, we also see a peak in carrying capacity but for that case probability of population to be at carrying capacity is higher compared to the strong Allee effect case. Increasing the strength of multiplicative noise causes the SPD to become more widespread around carrying capacity. For large values of the strength of multiplicative noise, population does not extinct and SPD gets wider in shape.

In Fig. 16, where $r = 0.001$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $D = 0.001$ and $\alpha = 0.5$, change of SPD for different




Figure 14: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of D when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0.5$




Figure 16: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of λ when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $\alpha = 0.5$ and $D = 0.001$.




Figure 15: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of D when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = -10$, $\alpha = 0.5$ and $\lambda = 0.5$.




Figure 17: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of λ when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = -10$, $\alpha = 0.5$ and $D = 0.001$.

values of the degree of correlation between noises given. In the presence correlation between noises, it is seen in Fig. 16 that the probability of the population size to be around the carrying capacity decreases and as the degree of correlation increases the probability of the population to be around 0 increases. In Fig. 17, $m = -10$, but other parameters are the same as in the previous case. It shows that the presence of correlation between noises in the case of a weak Allee effect reduces the likelihood of being around the carrying capacity of the population and increases the likelihood of being around 0, similar to the case of a strong Allee effect. From this, we say that increasing degree of correlation between noises increases tendency of population

to extinct.

In Fig. 18, the increase of the strength of additive noise under strong Allee effect, with $r = 0.001$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $D = 0.001$ and $\lambda = 0.5$, reduces the likelihood that the population size will be around 0 and carrying capacity, causes SPD to have more flattened shape. In addition to that, the reduction in the likelihood of being around the carrying capacity of the population is smaller compared to the reduction in the probability of being at 0. In this case, we can say that the increase in the strength of additive noise has a positive effect on the survival of the population in case of strong Allee effect. In Fig. 19, $m = -10$ and other parameters are taken same as the previous case. In the




Figure 18: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of α when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $D = 0.001$.




Figure 20: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of H when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $D = 0.001$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.




Figure 19: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of α when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = -10$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $D = 0.001$.




Figure 21: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of H when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $D = 0.005$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.

case of weak Allee effect, the increase in additive noise strength decreases the probability of the population size to be around the carrying capacity and increases the probability of being around 0. We say that in the case of the weak Allee effect, the increase in the intensity of additive noise increases the tendency of the population to extinct.

In Fig. 20, for parameters $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = 10$, $D = 0.001$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$, and in Fig. 21 for same parameters except that $D = 0.005$, change of stationary probability distribution function (SPD) for different values of H given for population under strong Allee effect. In the deterministic model

we examined in Part II, it was discussed that the harvesting term has an effect that decreases the carrying capacity and increases the Allee threshold in the population under strong Allee effect. Figures 20 and 21 clearly show the change in carrying capacity. The growing values of H cause a decrease in carrying capacity and a flattening of the SPD. Thus, for a population under a strong Allee effect, the effect of H is that it decreases the probability of the population size to be around the carrying capacity and increases the probability of being close to zero. At the same time, we see that the strength of multiplicative noise, D , being greater causes the change in H to have a stronger

effect.

Figures 22 and 23 show the effect of H in a population under weak Allee effect for $m = -10$, with the same parameters as the case of strong Allee effect except m . In the case of small H , SPD shows bimodal structure and in the case of bigger H , the shape of SPD turns to unimodal. The second peak occurs at population values close to zero. Bimodal structure of SPD shows that population will extinct under a threshold value.




Figure 22: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of H when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = -10$, $D = 0.001$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.




Figure 23: P_{st} as a function of x for different values of H when $r = 0.01$, $K = 30$, $m = -10$, $D = 0.005$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.

IV. CONCLUSION

We discussed the effect of harvesting on a population model under Allee effect. We made a detailed examination of the effect of harvesting by writing a cubic deterministic model under weak or strong Allee effect according to the size of the parameters. When the harvesting is represented by a constant in the form $H(x) = H$, a population under weak Allee effect immediately starts to show strong Allee effect. As the harvesting term increases, the value of the Allee threshold increases, while the carrying capacity of the population decreases. In the deterministic model we made a similar analysis for the case where harvesting is represented by a function in the form of $H(x) = H_1x^2 + H_2x$. We discussed weak and strong Allee effect transitions, carrying capacity and Allee threshold change according to the change of harvesting function.

We developed a stochastic description of the cubic model. We obtained the Fokker Planck equation from a Langevin equation subject to Gaussian white noise with zero mean. Thus, we calculated the stationary probability distribution of population size in the presence of harvesting and Gaussian white noise for a population under Allee effect. According to different values of multiplicative noise strength, D , additive noise strength, α , and degree of correlation between noises, λ , we discussed the effect of harvesting on population model. We conclude that for a population under strong Allee effect, H reduces the likelihood of population size to be around the carrying capacity and increases the likelihood of being close to zero. We have found that growth of the strength of multiplicative noise, D , causes the change H to have a stronger effect.

-
- [1] J. D. Murray, *Mathematical biology.*, Interdisciplinary applied mathematics: v. 17 (Springer, 2003).
- [2] M. Kot, *Elements of mathematical ecology.* (Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- [3] I. A. Hanski and M. E. Gilpin, *Metapopulation Biology Ecology, Genetics and Evolution* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1997) p. 512.
- [4] E. S. Allman and J. A. Rhodes, *Mathematical Models in Biology : An Introduction.* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- [5] P. H. Diamond, *Relaxation Dynamics In Laboratory And Astrophysical Plasmas.*, Biennial Reviews of the Theory of Magnetized Plasmas No. v. 1 (World Scientific, 2010).
- [6] P. Morel, Ö. D. Gürçan, and V. Berionni, *Plasma Physics and Controlled Fusion* **56** (2014), 10.1088/0741-3335/56/1/015002.
- [7] W. Allee, *Animal aggregations; a study in general sociology.* (Univ. of Chicago Press, 1931).
- [8] W. C. Allee, *The social life of animals* (W.W. Norton & Company, inc., New York, 1938) pp. 1–314.
- [9] L. Qin, F. Zhang, W. Wang, and W. Song, *PLoS ONE* **12**, 20 (2017).
- [10] G. Q. Sun, *Nonlinear Dynamics* **85**, 1 (2016).
- [11] S. J. Schreiber, *Theoretical Population Biology* **64**, 201 (2003).
- [12] P.-O. Cheptou, *Evolution* **58**, 2613 (2004).
- [13] F. Courchamp, L. Berec, and J. Gascoigne, *Allee Effects in Ecology and Conservation.* (Oxford University Press, (1)Department of Ecologie, Systématique and Evolution, Univ Paris Sud, 2008).
- [14] F. Courchamp, T. Clutton-Brock, and B. Grenfell, *TRENDS IN ECOLOGY & EVOLUTION* **14**, 405 (n.d.).
- [15] S. P. A., S. W. J., and F. R. P., *Oikos* **87**, 185 (1999).
- [16] F. Brauer, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **56**, 18 (1976).
- [17] P. Liu, J. Shi, and Y. Wang, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **369**, 730 (2010).
- [18] C. J. Saitanis and E. Agathokleous, *Science of the Total Environment* **682**, 623 (2019).
- [19] K. H. Elliott, G. S. Betini, and D. R. Norris, *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **284**, 2 (2017).
- [20] S. K. Sasmal, *Applied Mathematical Modelling* **64**, 1 (2018).
- [21] X. Yu and X. Y. Li, *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* **81**, 4840 (2018), arXiv:1710.05639.
- [22] M. Assaf and B. Meerson, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **50** (2017), 10.1088/1751-8121/aa669a, arXiv:1612.01470.
- [23] C. W. Gardiner, *Handbook of stochastic methods for physics, chemistry, and the natural sciences.*, Springer series in synergetics: 13 (Springer-Verlag, 1985).
- [24] M. Assaf and B. Meerson, *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **81**, 1 (2010), arXiv:0907.0070.
- [25] Ç. Eskin and Ö. Gültekin, *AIP Conference Proceedings* **2178**, 030067 (2019), <https://aip.scitation.org/doi/pdf/10.1063/1.5135465>.
- [26] V. Méndez, M. Assaf, A. Masó-Puigdellosas, D. Campos, and W. Horsthemke, *Physical Review E* **99**, 1 (2019).
- [27] K. Jacobs, *Stochastic processes for physicists : understanding noisy systems.* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [28] Y. C. Yang and D. X. Li, *Communications in Theoretical Physics* **71**, 107 (2019).
- [29] E. Y. Levine and B. Meerson, *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **87**, 1 (2013), arXiv:1210.6436.
- [30] V. Volterra, “Population growth, equilibria, and extinction under specified breeding conditions: a development and extension of the theory of the logistic curve,” in *The Golden Age of Theoretical Ecology: 1923–1940* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1978) pp. 18–27.
- [31] W. Da-Jin, C. Li, and K. Sheng-Zhi, *Physical Review E* **50**, 2496 (1994).