

OPTIMAL HARVESTING FOR A LOGISTIC MODEL WITH GRAZING

MOHAN MALLICK, ARDRA A, AND SARATH SASI

ABSTRACT. We consider semi-linear elliptic equations of the following form:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda[u - \frac{u^2}{K} - c\frac{u^2}{1+u^2} - h(x)u] =: \lambda f_h(u), & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where, $h \in U = \{h \in L^2(\Omega) : 0 \leq h(x) \leq H\}$. We prove the existence and uniqueness of the positive solution for large λ . Further, we establish the existence of an optimal control $h \in U$ that maximizes the functional $J(h) = \int_{\Omega} h(x)u_h(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2h(x))h(x) dx$ over U , where u_h is the unique positive solution of the above problem associated with h , $B_1 > 0$ is the cost per unit effort when the level of effort is low and $B_2 > 0$ represents the rate at which the cost rises as more labor is employed. Finally, we provide a unique optimality system.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 49J20, 49K20, 92D25, 92D40; Secondary 35J05, 35P05.

Keywords: Optimal control, Spatial ecology, Elliptic equations, Existence and uniqueness, Grazing and harvesting

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a bounded domain with C^2 boundary. We study an optimal control problem for a nonlinear elliptic equation of the form

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda[u - \frac{u^2}{K} - c\frac{u^2}{1+u^2} - h(x)u] =: \lambda f_h(u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $\frac{1}{\lambda}$ is the diffusion coefficient, K , c and q are positive constants. Here u is the population density and $u - \frac{u^2}{K}$ represents logistics growth and the control h represents the harvesting effort. This model describes the grazing of a fixed number of grazers on a logistically growing species (see [10]-[11]). The rate of grazing is given by $\frac{cu^2}{1+u^2}$ and the grazing population is assumed to be a constant. The model has also been used to describe the effect of natural predators on fish populations. In such cases the term $\frac{cu^2}{1+u^2}$ corresponds to natural predation. For more details see [10], [7], [12] and [13]. Robin boundary condition, where the flux at the boundary is proportional to the fish stock density, describes a scenario more favorable to the fish stock especially compared to the Dirichlet boundary condition in which the region surrounding our spatial domain is assumed to be lethal.

The optimal harvesting problem for a population described by logistic growth was studied by Cañada et al. in [3]. They studied (1.1) with Dirichlet boundary condition taking $c = 0$ and derived an optimality system that maximizes the payoff functional

$$J(h) = \int_{\Omega} h(x)u_h(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} (h(x))^2 dx,$$

where u_h is the positive solution of (1.1). The same logistic growth model was studied by Ding and Lenhart in [4], where they discuss the existence and characterization of a h which maximizes the functional

$$(1.2) \quad J(h) = \int_{\Omega} h(x)u_h(x) dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2h(x))h(x) dx,$$

where $B_1 > 0$ is the cost per unit effort when the level of effort is low and $B_2 > 0$ represents the rate at which the cost rises as more labor is employed. In this article we study the optimal control problem for the ‘logistic growth with grazing’ model (1.1) with the objective of maximizing the payoff functional (1.2). The set of admissible controls is defined by

$$U = \{h(x) \in L^2(\Omega) : 0 \leq h(x) \leq H\},$$

where $0 < H < 1$ is a constant. We pose the optimal control problem in the setting where (1.1) has a unique positive solution.

The existence of an optimality system can be proved using the standard arguments given in [3] and [4]. However, derivation of the optimality system and uniqueness becomes very challenging because of the model’s nonlinear grazing term and the Robin boundary condition. Certain monotonicity arguments in [3], which were also used in [4], become unfeasible because of the grazing term. The Robin boundary condition and the new solution space introduce new challenges in obtaining certain estimates.

First, we state a result that gives the existence and uniqueness of positive solutions of (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *For $c < 2(1 - H)$, there exists a $K^* > 0$ such that for $K > K^*$ (1.1) has a unique positive solution for large λ .*

Considering the optimal control problem in the above setting we have the following existence result for the optimal control.

Theorem 1.2. *Let c, K^* be as in Theorem 1.1. Then for $K > K^*$ there exists $h^* \in U$ that maximizes $J(h)$.*

In the next theorem, we give a characterization for any optimal h .

Theorem 1.3. *Let $c < 2(1 - H)$ and both K, λ be large. Also, let $h \in U$ be any optimal control and u_h be the corresponding maximal solution. Then $h(x)$ is characterized by,*

$$(1.3) \quad h(x) = \min \left\{ H, \max \left\{ 0, \frac{u_h - pu_h - B_1}{2B_2} \right\} \right\},$$

where p in $H^2(\Omega)$ is a solution to the adjoint problem

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta p - \lambda \left(p - \frac{2u_h p}{K} - 2c \frac{u_h}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} p - h(x)p \right) = h(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} + qp = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

In the case $B_2 > 0$, the state equation (1.1) and the adjoint equation (1.4) together with (1.3) is called optimality system (OS), which is given by

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_h = \lambda \left[u_h - \frac{u_h^2}{K} - \frac{cu_h^2}{1 + u_h^2} - h(x)u_h \right], & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial \eta} + qu_h = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ -\Delta p - \lambda \left[p - \frac{2u_h p}{K} - \frac{2cu_h p}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} - hp \right] = h, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial p}{\partial \eta} + qp = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Next, we state a uniqueness result which gives a characterization of the unique optimal control in terms of the unique solutions of (OS).

Theorem 1.4. *Let $N \in \{2, 3\}$. The solution h, p, u_h of the optimality system (OS), with $u_h > 0$ in Ω , is unique for a large value of B_2 .*

In the next section, we will prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 3 we will prove the existence of an optimal control. The optimality system will be derived in Section 4 and finally in Section 5 we will prove the uniqueness of the optimality system i.e., Theorem 1.4.

2. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF POSITIVE SOLUTIONS

Consider the following autonomous problem:

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f(u), & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

The existence of positive solutions of (2.1) has been proved under various assumptions on f (see [9] for a discussion). We are interested in a class of nonlinearities satisfying the following hypothesis:

(A): $f \in C^2([0, \infty))$ is such that $f(0) = 0$, $f'(0) > 0$, and there exists $r_0 > 0$ with $f(s) > 0$ on $(0, r_0)$ and $f(s) < 0$ for $s > r_0$. It is known that for such f , the boundary value problem, (2.1) admits a positive solution for $\lambda > \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{f'(0)}$, where $\lambda_1(\Omega)$ is the principal eigenvalue of the following eigenvalue problem:

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda u, & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

See Theorem 1.1 in Mohan et al [9] for a proof for the same. In the same paper by Mohan et al., they have proved the following uniqueness result:

Proposition 2.1. *Let f satisfy (A), then the following results hold:*

- (i) *For all sufficiently large λ , the boundary value problem (2.1) has a unique positive solution u such that $\|u\|_\infty \leq r_0$ (see Theorem 1.3 of [9]).*
- (ii) *Moreover, given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\lambda_\delta > 0$ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$ the positive solution of (2.1) satisfies the following:*

$$r_0 - \frac{\delta}{2} < u(x) \leq r_0 \text{ for } x \in \bar{\Omega}$$

(see Lemma 3.1 of [9]).

The following result will follow from the above discussion.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $0 \leq \alpha \leq H$, $c < 2(1 - \alpha)$, and $f_\alpha(s) = s - \frac{s^2}{K} - c\frac{s^2}{1+s^2} - \alpha s$. Then there exists $K_\alpha^* > 0$ and $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ such that for $K > K_\alpha^*$ and $\lambda > \lambda_\alpha$, the boundary value problem*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda f_\alpha(u), & x \in \Omega \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega \end{cases}$$

has a unique positive solution u_α .

Proof. By Proposition 2.1, it is enough if we show that f_α satisfies (A). Using arguments similar to the ones made in the proof of Proposition 3.2 of [8], it is easy to show that for $c < 2(1 - \alpha)$ there exists a K_α^* such that for $K > K_\alpha^*$ there is a unique $r_0 > 0$ such that $f_\alpha(r_0) = 0$. \square

Remark 2.3. Note that $f_H(\frac{K(1-\alpha)}{2}) > 0$ and $f_\alpha(K) < 0$ and hence $r_0 \in (\frac{K(1-\alpha)}{2}, K)$.

Let $c < 2(1 - H)$. Corresponding to $\alpha = 0$, $\alpha = H$, there exist $\lambda \geq \max\{\lambda_0, \lambda_H\}$ and $K^* \geq \max\{K_0^*, K_H^*\}$ such that (2.1) has unique solutions u_0 and u_H respectively. The next proposition gives an estimate for u_0 and u_H .

Proposition 2.4. *Let $K > K^*$ and $c < 2(1 - H)$. Given $\delta > 0$ there exists $\lambda_\delta > \max\{\lambda_0, \lambda_H\}$ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$, $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} < u_H < u_0 < K$ in $\bar{\Omega}$.*

Proof. Clearly $\|u_0\|_\infty < K$ as $f_0(K) < 0$ for $K > 0$. Since $f_H(s) < f_0(s)$ for all $s > 0$, we have $u_H < u_0$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} < r_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. Then by Proposition 2.1 there exists a λ_δ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$, $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} < u_H < u_0 < K$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. \square

Now we will prove the existence and uniqueness of positive solutions of the non-autonomous equation (1.1). We will use the method of sub-supersolutions to prove our existence result. By a subsolution (Supersolution) of (1.1), we mean a function $\psi \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C(\bar{\Omega})$ with

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \psi \nabla \phi \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q\psi\phi \, ds \leq (\geq) \int_\Omega \lambda[\psi - \frac{\psi^2}{K} - c\frac{\psi^2}{1+\psi^2} - h(x)\psi]\phi \, dx \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

for every $\phi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\phi \geq 0$ in Ω . Then the following lemma holds (see [2])

Lemma 2.5. *Let ψ and ϕ be a subsolution and supersolution of 1.1 respectively. Then 1.1 has a solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $\psi \leq u \leq \phi$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1:

Existence: In the proof of Proposition 2.2, we have seen that there exists a $K^* > 0$ such that for $K > K^*$ the function $f_H(s) = s - \frac{s^2}{K} - c\frac{s^2}{1+s^2} - Hs$ satisfies the hypothesis (A). Hence for $\lambda > \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{f'_H(0)} = \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{1-H}$, the boundary value problem (2.3) has a positive solution u_H . It is easy to check that u_H is a subsolution for (1.1) and $\Psi \equiv K$ is a supersolution for (1.1). Hence by Lemma 2.5, (1.1) has a positive solution for $\lambda > \frac{\lambda_1(\Omega)}{1-H}$.

Uniqueness: We will show that (1.1) has a unique positive solution for large λ . Let u_h be any positive solution of (1.1), then u_h is a super solution to (2.3). By Proposition 2.2, we have u_H is the unique solution of (2.3) for large values of the parameter λ . Thus $u_H \leq u_h$ for large λ . A similar argument can be used to prove that $u_h \leq u_0$ for $\lambda \gg 1$. Hence for $\lambda \gg 1$, any positive solutions u_h of (1.1) satisfies

$$u_H \leq u_h \leq u_0.$$

Choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} < r_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, where r_0 is such that $f_H(r_0) = 0$. Then by Proposition 2.4, there exists a λ_δ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$,

$$(2.4) \quad \frac{K(1-H)}{2} \leq u_H \leq u_h \leq u_0 < K \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Let u_m be the maximal positive solution of (1.1) and u_h be any positive solution of (1.1) different from u_m , then

$$(2.5) \quad u_m \Delta u_h - u_h \Delta u_m = \lambda [u_h f_h(u_m) - u_m f_h(u_h)] = \lambda u_h u_m \left[\frac{f_h(u_m)}{u_m} - \frac{f_h(u_h)}{u_h} \right].$$

Integrating (2.5) over Ω we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} [u_m \Delta u_h - u_h \Delta u_m] \, dx &= \lambda \int_{\Omega} u_h u_m \left[\frac{f_h(u_m)}{u_m} - \frac{f_h(u_h)}{u_h} \right] \, dx \\ &\leq \lambda K^2 \int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{f_h(u_m)}{u_m} - \frac{f_h(u_h)}{u_h} \right] \, dx < 0. \end{aligned}$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} [u_m \Delta u_h - u_h \Delta u_m] \, dx &= \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla u_m \, dx - \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_h \cdot \nabla u_m \, dx - \int_{\partial\Omega} u_h \frac{\partial u_m}{\partial \eta} \, ds + \int_{\partial\Omega} u_m \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial \eta} \, ds \\ &= q \int_{\partial\Omega} u_h u_m \, ds - q \int_{\partial\Omega} u_h u_m \, ds = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. Hence for $\lambda \gg 1$, (1.1) has a unique positive solution. \square

3. EXISTENCE OF AN OPTIMAL CONTROL

In this section, we prove the existence of an optimal control for our objective functional.

Proof of Theorem 1.2.

We have

$$J(h) = \int_{\Omega} h(x)u(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2 h)h \, dx \leq \|u\|_{\infty} H |\Omega|.$$

Let $\{h_n\} \subset U$ be any maximizing sequence for J . Consequently $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(h_n) = \sup_{h \in U} J(h)$. Since u_{h_n} is a solution of (1.1) with $h = h_n$ we have

$$(3.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} \nabla u_{h_n} \cdot \nabla v \, dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{h_n} v \, ds = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(u_{h_n} - \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{K} - c \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{1+u_{h_n}^2} - h_n u_{h_n} \right) v \, dx.$$

Taking $v = u_{h_n}$ in (3.1) and since $q > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{h_n}|^2 dx &\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla u_{h_n}|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} u_{h_n}^2 ds = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(u_{h_n} - \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{K} - c \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{1 + u_{h_n}^2} - h_n u_{h_n} \right) u_{h_n} dx \\ &\leq \lambda \int_{\Omega} u_{h_n}^2 dx \leq \lambda K^2 |\Omega|, \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\|u_{h_n}\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$. Thus there exists $u^* \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that a subsequence, which we denote by u_{h_n} itself, converges weakly to u^* in $H^1(\Omega)$. Further $u_{h_n} \rightarrow u^*$ strongly in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $H^1(\Omega) \subset\subset L^2(\Omega)$. This subsequence can be chosen such that the convergence is almost uniform. Since $\{h_n\} \subset U$ is uniformly bounded in $L^2(\Omega)$, h_n converges weakly to some $h^* \in U$. Also, a simple integration by parts argument gives us $u_{h_n} \rightharpoonup u^*$ in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$.

Now we will prove that $u^* = u_{h^*}$. It is enough if we can show that

$$\int_{\Omega} \nabla u^* \cdot \nabla v dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q u^* v ds = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(u^* - \frac{(u^*)^2}{K} - c \frac{(u^*)^2}{1 + (u^*)^2} - h^* u^* \right) v dx, \quad v \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Since $u_{h_n} \rightarrow u^*$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, we get

$$\int_{\Omega} [\nabla u_{h_n} \cdot \nabla v - \nabla u^* \cdot \nabla v] dx = \int_{\Omega} (\nabla u_{h_n} - \nabla u^*) \cdot \nabla v dx \rightarrow 0.$$

Also as $u_{h_n} \rightarrow u^*$ in $L^2(\partial\Omega)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\partial\Omega} [q u_{h_n} v - q u^* v] ds &\leq \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |(u_{h_n} - u^*)|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\partial\Omega} |q v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now we will show that

$$\int_{\Omega} \left| \left(u_{h_n} - \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{K} - c \frac{u_{h_n}^2}{1 + u_{h_n}^2} - h_n u_{h_n} \right) v - \left(u^* - \frac{(u^*)^2}{K} - c \frac{(u^*)^2}{1 + (u^*)^2} - h^* u^* \right) v \right| dx \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We do this by grouping together similar terms and showing that each converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As $u_{h_n} \rightarrow u^*$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} |(u_{h_n} - u^*) v| dx &\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} |(u_{h_n} - u^*)|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} |v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dx \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

We can use this to further show that $\int_{\Omega} |(u_{h_n}^2 - u^{*2}) v| dx \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \left| \left(\frac{u_{h_n}^2}{1 + u_{h_n}^2} - \frac{u^{*2}}{1 + u^{*2}} \right) v \right| dx &= \int_{\Omega} \left| \frac{(u_{h_n}^2 - u^{*2})}{(1 + u_{h_n}^2)(1 + u^{*2})} v \right| dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} |(u_{h_n}^2 - u^{*2}) v| dx \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Omega} (h_n u_{h_n} - h^* u^*) v dx \right| &\leq \left| \int_{\Omega} h_n (u_{h_n} - u^*) v dx \right| + \left| \int_{\Omega} (h_n - h^*) u^* v dx \right| \\ &\leq \int_{\Omega} H |(u_{h_n} - u^*) v| dx + \left| \int_{\Omega} (h_n - h^*) u^* v dx \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$

Now we will prove that h^* maximizes the functional $J(h)$ by showing that $\sup_{h \in U} J(h) \leq J(h^*)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{h \in U} J(h) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} J(h_n) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} h_n(x) u_{h_n}(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2 h_n) h_n \, dx \right) \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} h^* u_{h^*} \, dx - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2 h_n) h_n \, dx \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} h^* u_{h^*} \, dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1 + B_2 h^*) h^* \, dx \\
&= J(h^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have shown that there exists a control h^* which maximizes $J(h)$. \square

4. THE OPTIMALITY SYSTEM

In this section, we deduce the optimality system for the functional J . We present some preliminary results which will be used in the sequel.

Consider the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.1) \quad & -\Delta u(x) + V(x)u(x) = \sigma u(x) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\
& \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu(x) = 0 \quad \text{on } \Omega,
\end{aligned}$$

where $V(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. The principal eigenvalue $\sigma_1(V)$ is characterized by

$$\sigma_1(V) = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds}{\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^2 \, dx}.$$

It is known that $\sigma_1(V)$ is simple and the associated eigenfunctions $\phi_V \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ (see Proposition 2.4 in [5]). Let ϕ_V be the normalized eigenfunction with $\|\phi_V\|_\infty = 1$. The principle eigenvalue $\sigma_1(V)$ has the following properties:

- 1 $\sigma_1(V)$ is increasing with respect to V , that is, if $V_1 < V_2$, then $\sigma_1(V_1) < \sigma_1(V_2)$.
- 2 $\sigma_1(V)$ is continuous with respect to $V \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.
- 3 If $\sigma_1(V) > 0$, we can find a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$(4.2) \quad M|\phi|_{H^1(\Omega)^2} \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Establishing 1 and 2 is a straightforward exercise. Here we present a proof of property 3, part of which follows along the lines of the discussion in [3], where a similar result is proved for the Dirichlet boundary case.

Let $0 < C < \frac{\sigma_1(V)}{\sigma_1(V) + \|V\|_\infty}$ that is $C\|V\|_\infty \leq (1 - C)\sigma_1(V)$, then by the definition of $\sigma_1(V)$, we have for all $\phi \in H^1(\Omega)$

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - C) \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla \phi|^2 + V \phi^2) \, dx + (1 - C)q \int_{\partial \Omega} \phi^2 \, ds &\geq (1 - C)\sigma_1(V) \int_{\Omega} \phi^2 \, dx \\
&\geq C\|V\|_\infty \int_{\Omega} \phi^2 \, dx \\
&\geq -C \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

As $q > 0$, we have

$$(1 - C) \int_{\Omega} (|\nabla \phi|^2 + V \phi^2) \, dx + q \int_{\partial \Omega} \phi^2 \, ds \geq -C \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx.$$

Rearranging the above equation we have

$$(4.3) \quad C \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial \Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds, \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Omega).$$

From the variational characterization of $\sigma_1(V)$, it follows that

$$(4.4) \quad \sigma_1(V) \int_{\Omega} \phi^2 \, dx \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds, \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Set $M := \frac{1}{2} \inf\{C, \sigma_1(V)\}$. Adding (4.3) and (4.4), we get

$$M|\phi|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds, \quad \forall \phi \in H^1(\Omega).$$

Next, we state a useful existence and uniqueness result.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume that $V \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, and $\sigma_1(V) > 0$. Then for each $f \in L^2(\Omega)$ the linear problem*

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} -\Delta u(x) + V(x)u(x) &= f(x) & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial \eta} + qu(x) &= 0 & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{aligned}$$

has a unique solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$.

Proof. Consider the bilinear form $B : H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$B[u, v] = \int_{\Omega} \nabla u \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V(x)uv \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} quv \, ds.$$

Then using Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |B[u, v]| &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|V\|_{\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + q \|u\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\partial\Omega)} \\ &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|V\|_{\infty} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + qK \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \quad (\text{using trace inequality}) \\ &\leq (1 + \|V\|_{\infty} + qK) \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \|v\|_{H^1(\Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by property 3 for $\sigma_1(V)$ above, we know, for all $u \in H^1(\Omega)$,

$$M \|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \leq B[u, u].$$

Let us define a bounded linear function $\phi : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by $\phi(v) = \int_{\Omega} f v \, dx$. Then by the Lax Milgram theorem there exists a unique $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $B[u, v] = \phi(v)$ for all $v \in H^1(\Omega)$. \square

In [3] and [4], the authors use the monotonicity of $\sigma_1(V)$ to obtain certain existence results while deriving the optimality system. The introduction of the grazing terms in the nonlinearity makes it impossible to employ a similar argument in our case. The next lemma will help us to arrive at the optimality system.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $c < 2(1 - H)$, $K \gg 1$, and u_g, u_h be solutions of (1.1) corresponding to $h, g \in U$ respectively. Then there exists $\lambda_\delta > 0$ such that for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$, the principal eigenvalue $\sigma_1\left(\lambda\left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_h + u_g}{K} + c \frac{u_h + u_g}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_g^2)}\right)\right)$ of (4.1) is positive.*

Proof. Since u_h is a solution of (1.1), we have

$$-\Delta u_h + \lambda \left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_h}{K} + c \frac{u_h}{1 + u_h^2} \right) u_h = 0.$$

This implies that $\sigma_1\left(\lambda\left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_h}{K} + c \frac{u_h}{1 + u_h^2}\right)\right) = 0$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= \lambda \left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_h}{K} + c \frac{u_h}{1 + u_h^2} \right), \\ V_2 &= \lambda \left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_h + u_g}{K} + c \frac{u_h + u_g}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_g^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 - V_1 &= \lambda \left(\frac{u_g}{K} + c \frac{u_h + u_g - u_h(1 + u_g^2)}{(1 + u_g^2)(1 + u_h^2)} \right) \\ &= \lambda u_g \left(\frac{1}{K} + c \frac{(1 - u_h u_g)}{(1 + u_g^2)(1 + u_h^2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To estimate $V_2 - V_1$ we define $g: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as,

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{x} + \frac{c(1-x^2)}{(1+x^2)^2}.$$

Let x_0 be the smallest positive number such that $g(x) > 0$, for $x > x_0$. Choose $K > \bar{K} = \max\{x_0, \frac{8}{(1-H)}\}$ and $\alpha_0 = \frac{K(1-H)}{2}g(K)$. Let $\delta > 0$ be such that $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} < r_0 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. Then by (2.4), for $\lambda > \lambda_\delta$ we have the following estimate for $V_2 - V_1$ in Ω ,

$$\begin{aligned} V_2 - V_1 &= \lambda u_g \left(\frac{1}{K} + c \frac{(1 - u_g u_h)}{(1 + u_g^2)(1 + u_h^2)} \right) \\ &> \lambda \frac{K(1-H)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{K} + \frac{c(1-K^2)}{(1+K^2)^2} \right) \\ &= \lambda \frac{K(1-H)}{2} g(K) = \lambda \alpha_0. \end{aligned}$$

To show that $\sigma_1(V_2) > 0$, we will first show that $\sigma_1(V_2) > \sigma_1(V_1)$. Now, $\sigma_1(V_2)$ has the following characterization

$$\sigma_1(V_2) = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V_2 \phi^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q \phi^2 \, ds}{\int_{\Omega} |\phi|^2 \, dx},$$

Let ϕ_{V_2} be the corresponding eigenfunction with $\|\phi_{V_2}\|_{L^2} = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(V_2) &= \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \phi_{V_2}|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} (V_2 - V_1) \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} V_1 \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} q \phi_{V_2}^2 \, ds \\ &\geq \sigma_1(V_1) + \int_{\Omega} (V_2 - V_1) \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$(4.6) \quad \sigma_1(V_2) - \sigma_1(V_1) \geq \int_{\Omega} (V_2 - V_1) \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx = \int_{\Omega} (V_2 - V_1) \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx \geq \lambda \alpha_0 \int_{\Omega} \phi_{V_2}^2 \, dx > 0.$$

Hence $\sigma_1(V_2) > 0$ as $\sigma_1(V_1) = 0$. □

In order to characterize the optimal control we examine the differentiability of the mapping $h \rightarrow u_h$, whose derivative is called the sensitivity. We say that the mapping $h \mapsto u_h$ is differentiable at h if there exists $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$\frac{u_{h+\gamma\epsilon} - u_h}{\epsilon} \rightharpoonup \psi \text{ weakly in } H^1(\Omega) \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $h + \epsilon\gamma \in U$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $c < 2(1-H)$ and $K > K^*$, then for $\lambda \geq \lambda_\delta$ there exists a $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \rightharpoonup \psi$ weakly in $H^1(\Omega)$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ for any $\gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Further ψ is the unique solution of the linear problem*

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta \psi = \lambda \left(\psi - \frac{2u_h}{K} \psi - 2c \frac{u_h}{(1+u_h^2)^2} \psi - h\psi - \gamma u_h \right) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \eta} + q\psi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We have

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} = \lambda \left(u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2}{K} - c \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2}{1+u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2} - (h+\epsilon\gamma)u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \right), \\ \frac{\partial u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}}{\partial \eta} + q u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} = 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta u_h = \lambda \left(u_h - \frac{u_h^2}{K} - c \frac{u_h^2}{1+u_h^2} - h u_h \right), \\ \frac{\partial u_h}{\partial \eta} + q u_h = 0. \end{cases}$$

Subtracting (4.9) from (4.8) and dividing by ϵ , we have

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} = \lambda \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} - \frac{1}{K} \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2 - u_h^2}{\epsilon} - c \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{(1+u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2)(1+u_h^2)} \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right. \\ \quad \left. - h(x) \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} - \gamma u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \right), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \eta} \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right) + q \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying both sides by $\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon}$ and integrating over Ω , we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon}|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right)^2 ds \\ & \int_{\Omega} \lambda \left(-1 + \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{K} + c \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{(1+u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2)(1+u_h^2)} + h(x) \right) \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right)^2 dx \\ & = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \gamma u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} dx. \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 4.2 we have $\sigma_1 \left(\lambda \left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{K} + c \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{(1+u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2)(1+u_h^2)} \right) \right) > 0$. Hence by (4.2) there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} M \left\| \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 & \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon}|^2 dx + \int_{\Omega} \lambda \left(-1 + h + \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{K} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + c \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} + u_h}{(1+u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}^2)(1+u_h^2)} \right) \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right)^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right)^2 ds \\ & = \lambda \int_{\Omega} \gamma u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} dx \\ & \leq \lambda \|u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}\|_{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} \gamma^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} \left[\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right]^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq \lambda \|u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}\|_{\infty} \left(\int_{\Omega} \gamma^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left\| \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \\ & \leq C_1 \left\| \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 = \lambda \|u_{h+\epsilon\gamma}\|_{\infty} \|\gamma\|_{\infty} \|\Omega\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Dividing both sides by $\left\| \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2$ we have $\left\| \frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \right\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is uniformly bounded by $\frac{C_1}{M}$. Thus there exist $\psi \in H^1(\Omega)$ such that $\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} \rightharpoonup \psi$ in $H^1(\Omega)$. We also have $u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \rightarrow u_h$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Using (4.10) we get ψ satisfies (4.7). From Lemma 4.2 we have $\sigma_1 \left(\lambda \left(-1 + h(x) + \frac{2u_h}{K} + \frac{2cu_h}{(1+u_h^2)^2} \right) \right) > 0$. Hence by Lemma 4.1, the linear problem (4.7) has a unique solution. \square

Next, we will prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3 : By Theorem 2.4.2.7 from [6], the adjoint problem (1.4) has a unique solution $p \in H^2(\Omega)$. Now we will derive the characterization of optimal control $h(x)$ in terms of the solution to the adjoint problem. This part of the proof follows along the lines of [4]. Suppose $h(x)$ is an optimal control and $\gamma \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ is such that $h + \epsilon\gamma \in U$ for small $\epsilon > 0$. Then the derivative of $J(h)$ with respect

to h in the direction of γ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{J(h + \epsilon\gamma) - J(h)}{\epsilon} \\
&= \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} - u_h}{\epsilon} h + \gamma u_{h+\epsilon\gamma} \right) dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1\gamma + B_2(2h\gamma + \epsilon\gamma^2)) dx \right] \\
&= \int_{\Omega} [\psi h + \gamma u_h] dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1\gamma + 2h\gamma B_2) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left[\psi \left(-\Delta p - \lambda \left(p - \frac{2u_h p}{K} - \frac{2cu_h p}{(1+u_h^2)^2} - h(x)p \right) \right) + \gamma u_h \right] dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1\gamma + 2B_2h\gamma) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where p is the solution to the adjoint problem (1.4). By using (4.7) we further have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\geq \int_{\Omega} \left[\nabla p \cdot \nabla \psi - \lambda \left(\psi - \frac{2u_h \psi}{K} - 2cu_h \frac{\psi}{(1+u_h^2)^2} - h(x)\psi \right) p + \gamma u_h \right] dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} \text{qp}\psi ds - \int_{\Omega} (B_1\gamma + 2B_2h\gamma) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \left[-\lambda \gamma u_h p + \gamma u_h \right] dx - \int_{\Omega} (B_1\gamma + 2h\gamma B_2) dx \\
&= \int_{\Omega} \gamma (-\lambda u_h p + u_h - B_1 - 2B_2h) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $D = \{x \in \Omega : 0 < h(x) < H\}$. Choosing variations γ with support on D , the above inequality will be satisfied if and only if $-\lambda u_h p + u_h - B_1 - 2B_2h = 0$ on D . Thus the characterization for optimal control can be given in compact form as follows,

$$(4.11) \quad h = \min \left\{ H, \max \left\{ 0, \frac{u_h - \lambda p u_h - B_1}{2B_2} \right\} \right\}.$$

□

Remark 4.4. If $B_1 = B_2 = 0$ in $J(h)$, then the optimal control is given by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } p > 1 \\ H, & \text{if } p < 1 \\ \frac{\lambda}{2}, & \text{if } p = 1. \end{cases}$$

Please see Theorem 4.3 in [4] for details.

5. UNIQUENESS OF OPTIMALITY SYSTEM

In this section, we prove that the optimality system has a unique solution. The proof is a modification of the arguments in Ding et al. [4]. In order to prove the uniqueness, we need a bound for the adjoint p in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ which depends only on B_2 .

Lemma 5.1. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, where $N = 2, 3$ and $B_2 \neq 0$. Suppose u_h, p, h is a solution of (1.5) with $u_h > 0$ in Ω , Then the adjoint p satisfies

$$(5.1) \quad \|p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M'}{B_2},$$

where M' does not depend on B_2 .

Proof. Taking $u_g = u_h$ in Lemma 4.2, we have $\sigma_1(\lambda[-1 + \frac{2u_h}{K} + \frac{2cu_h}{(1+u_h^2)^2} + h]) > 0$.

For $N \in \{2, 3\}$, from [1, Section 4.27], we have $H^2(\Omega) \subset\subset C(\overline{\Omega})$. So there exists $M_0(\Omega, N)$ such that

$$(5.2) \quad \|p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq M_0 \|p\|_{H^2(\Omega)}.$$

We can use Theorem 3.1.2.3 from [6] in (1.4) since Ω is C^2 (see Remark 3.1.2.4 from [6]) to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|p\|_{H^2(\Omega)} &\leq M_1(\lambda, \Omega) \|-\Delta p + \lambda p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
(5.3) \quad &= M_1 \left\| 2\lambda p - \frac{2\lambda u_h p}{K} - \frac{2\lambda cu_h p}{(1+u_h^2)^2} - \lambda h p + h \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq M_2 \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + M_1 \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq M \|p\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \\
&\leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla p|^2 \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \lambda \left(-1 + \frac{2u_h}{K} + \frac{2cu_h}{(1+u_h^2)^2} + h \right) p^2 \, dx + \int_{\partial\Omega} qp^2 \, ds \\
&= \int_{\Omega} hp \, dx \\
&\leq \left(\int_{\Omega} h^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} p^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq H|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Omega} p^2 \, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$(5.4) \quad \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{H|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{M}.$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.5) \quad \|h\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &= \left\| \frac{u_h - \lambda pu_h - B_1}{2B_2} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{2B_2} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\lambda K}{2B_2} \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \frac{B_1}{2B_2} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \frac{K}{2B_2} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\lambda KH}{2B_2 M} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{B_1}{2B_2} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ (using (5.4))} \\
&= \frac{M_3}{B_2}, \text{ where } M_3 := \frac{|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2} \left(K + \frac{\lambda KH}{M} + B_1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

As in the calculations for (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned}
M \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 &\leq \int_{\Omega} hp \, dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \int_{\Omega} h^2 \, dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} p^2 \, dx \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4\varepsilon} \left(\frac{M_3}{B_2} \right)^2 + \varepsilon \int_{\Omega} p^2 \, dx
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $\varepsilon = \frac{M}{2}$,

$$(5.6) \quad \|p\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_4}{B_2}, \text{ where } M_4 := \frac{M_3}{M}.$$

Using (5.6) and (5.5) in (5.3),

$$(5.7) \quad \|p\|_{H^2(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M_2 M_4 + M_1 M_3}{B_2}.$$

Substituting (5.3) in (5.2), we get

$$\|p\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{M'}{B_2}, \text{ where } M' := M_0(M_2 M_4 + M_1 M_3).$$

□

Next we prove Theorem 1.4 for the uniqueness of the optimality system.

Proof of Theorem 1.4: Suppose u_h, p, h and $u_{\bar{h}}, \bar{p}, \bar{h}$ are two solutions of (1.5). From the characterization of h and \bar{h} given in (4.11) we have

$$|h - \bar{h}| = \left| \frac{u_h - \lambda pu_h - B_1}{2B_2} - \frac{u_{\bar{h}} - \lambda \bar{p} u_{\bar{h}} - B_1}{2B_2} \right|.$$

Rewriting $\lambda p u_h - \lambda \bar{p} u_{\bar{h}} = \lambda p(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) + \lambda(p - \bar{p})u_{\bar{h}}$ we have

$$(5.8) \quad |h - \bar{h}| \leq \frac{1}{2B_2} (|(1 - \lambda p)(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})| + \lambda u_{\bar{h}} |p - \bar{p}|).$$

Choosing test functions $u_h - u_{\bar{h}}$ in the state equation (1.1) and using $h u_h - \bar{h} u_{\bar{h}} = h(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) + (h - \bar{h})u_{\bar{h}}$, gives

$$(5.9) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 ds + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(-1 + \frac{1}{K}(u_h + u_{\bar{h}}) + c \frac{u_h + u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)} + h \right) (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} \lambda u_{\bar{h}} (h - \bar{h})(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) dx.$$

Similarly choosing test function $p - \bar{p}$ in the adjoint equation we have

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(p - \bar{p})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (p - \bar{p})^2 ds \\ + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left[-(p - \bar{p}) + \frac{2}{K}(u_h p - u_{\bar{h}} \bar{p}) + 2c \left(\frac{u_h p}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} - \frac{u_{\bar{h}} \bar{p}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} \right) + h p - \bar{h} \bar{p} \right] (p - \bar{p}) dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} (h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx.$$

Using $u_h p - u_{\bar{h}} \bar{p} = (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})p + u_{\bar{h}}(p - \bar{p})$, $h p - \bar{h} \bar{p} = (h - \bar{h})p + \bar{h}(p - \bar{p})$ and adding $\frac{u_{\bar{h}} \bar{p}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2}$ both side of the above equation we have

$$(5.10) \quad \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(p - \bar{p})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (p - \bar{p})^2 ds + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(-1 + \frac{2}{K}u_{\bar{h}} + 2c \frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} + \bar{h} \right) (p - \bar{p})^2 dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} (h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx - \frac{2\lambda}{K} \int_{\Omega} p(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})(p - \bar{p}) dx \\ - \lambda \int_{\Omega} p(h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx + 2c\lambda \int_{\Omega} p \left(\frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} - \frac{u_h}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} \right) (p - \bar{p}) dx$$

Add (5.9) and (5.10), to get,

$$\int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 ds + \int_{\Omega} \lambda \left(-1 + \frac{1}{K}(u_h + u_{\bar{h}}) + c \frac{u_h + u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)} + h \right) (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 dx \\ + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(p - \bar{p})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (p - \bar{p})^2 ds + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(-1 + \frac{2}{K}u_{\bar{h}} + 2c \frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} + \bar{h} \right) (p - \bar{p})^2 dx \\ = \int_{\Omega} \lambda u_{\bar{h}} (h - \bar{h})(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) dx \\ + \int_{\Omega} (h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx - \frac{2\lambda}{K} \int_{\Omega} p(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})(p - \bar{p}) dx \\ - \lambda \int_{\Omega} p(h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx + 2c\lambda \int_{\Omega} p \left(\frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} - \frac{u_h}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} \right) (p - \bar{p}) dx.$$

Because $u_h, u_{\bar{h}} > 0$, and $u_h, u_{\bar{h}}$ satisfy the state equation (1.5), by Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\sigma_1 \left(\lambda \left(-1 + \frac{1}{K}(u_h + u_{\bar{h}}) + c \frac{u_h + u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)} + h \right) \right) > 0.$$

From this we also get

$$\sigma_1 \left(\lambda \left(-1 + \frac{2}{K}u_{\bar{h}} + 2c \frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} + \bar{h} \right) \right) > 0.$$

Hence by (4.2) there exists $M > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& M \left(\|u_h - u_{\bar{h}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|p - \bar{p}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 ds + \int_{\Omega} \lambda \left(-1 + \frac{1}{K}(u_h + u_{\bar{h}}) + c \frac{u_h + u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_h^2)(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)} + h \right) (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 dx \\
& + \int_{\Omega} |\nabla(p - \bar{p})|^2 dx + q \int_{\partial\Omega} (p - \bar{p})^2 ds + \lambda \int_{\Omega} \left(-1 + \frac{2}{K}u_{\bar{h}} + 2c \frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} + \bar{h} \right) (p - \bar{p}) dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega} \lambda u_{\bar{h}}(h - \bar{h})(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) dx + \int_{\Omega} (h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx - \frac{2\lambda}{K} \int_{\Omega} p(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})(p - \bar{p}) dx \\
& - \lambda \int_{\Omega} p(h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx + 2c\lambda \int_{\Omega} p \left(\frac{u_{\bar{h}}}{(1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} - \frac{u_h}{(1 + u_h^2)^2} \right) (p - \bar{p}) dx \\
& = \int_{\Omega} \lambda u_{\bar{h}}(h - \bar{h})(u_h - u_{\bar{h}}) dx + \int_{\Omega} (h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx - \frac{2\lambda}{K} \int_{\Omega} p(u_h - u_{\bar{h}})(p - \bar{p}) dx \\
& - \lambda \int_{\Omega} p(h - \bar{h})(p - \bar{p}) dx + 2c\lambda \int_{\Omega} p \left(\frac{-1 + 2u_h u_{\bar{h}} + u_{\bar{h}}^3 u_h + u_h^2 u_{\bar{h}}^2 + u_h u_{\bar{h}}^3}{(1 + u_h^2)^2 (1 + u_{\bar{h}}^2)^2} \right) (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})(p - \bar{p}) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.1), (5.8), and $\frac{K(1-H)}{2} \leq u_h, u_{\bar{h}} \leq K$ in the above inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& M \left(\|u_h - u_{\bar{h}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|p - \bar{p}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \frac{\lambda K \|1 - \lambda p\|_{L^\infty}}{2B_2} \int_{\Omega} (u_h - u_{\bar{h}})^2 dx + \frac{(\lambda K)^2}{2B_2} \int_{\Omega} |u_h - u_{\bar{h}}| |p - \bar{p}| dx + \frac{2\lambda M'}{KB_2} \int_{\Omega} |u_h - u_{\bar{h}}| (p - \bar{p}) dx \\
& + \frac{1 + \lambda \|p\|_{L^\infty}}{2B_2} \left\{ \|1 - \lambda p\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\Omega} |u_h - u_{\bar{h}}| |p - \bar{p}| dx + \int_{\Omega} (p - \bar{p})^2 dx \right\} + \frac{2c\lambda M' M_5(K, H)}{B_2} \int_{\Omega} |u_h - u_{\bar{h}}| |p - \bar{p}| dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Cauchy's inequality and (5.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& M \left(\|u_h - u_{\bar{h}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|p - \bar{p}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right) \\
& \leq \frac{M_6}{B_2} \left(\|u_h - u_{\bar{h}}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 + \|p - \bar{p}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This leads to a contradiction if we choose B_2 sufficiently large. Thus we conclude that the optimal control is unique for large B_2 .

REFERENCES

- [1] R. A. Adams and J. J. F. Fournier. *Sobolev spaces*, volume 140 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics (Amsterdam)*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam, second edition, 2003.
- [2] H. Amann. Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces. *SIAM Rev.*, 18(4):620–709, 1976.
- [3] A. Cañada, J. L. Gámez, and J. A. Montero. Study of an optimal control problem for diffusive nonlinear elliptic equations of logistic type. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 36(4):1171–1189 (electronic), 1998.
- [4] W. Ding and S. Lenhart. Optimal harvesting of a spatially explicit fishery model. *Nat. Resour. Model.*, 22(2):173–211, 2009.
- [5] G. Fragnelli, D. Mugnai, and N. S. Papageorgiou. The Brezis-Oswald result for quasilinear Robin problems. *Adv. Nonlinear Stud.*, 16(3):603–622, 2016.
- [6] P. Grisvard. *Elliptic problems in nonsmooth domains*. Pitman Publishing Inc, 1985.
- [7] J. Jiang and J. Shi. Bistability dynamics in some structured ecological models. In *Spatial Ecology*, pages 33–62. Chapman & Hall CRC Mathematical and Computational Biology, 2009.
- [8] E. Lee, S. Sasi, and R. Shivaji. S-shaped bifurcation curves in ecosystems. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 381(2):732 – 741, 2011.
- [9] M. Mallick, S. Sasi, R. Shivaji, and S. Sundar. Bifurcation, uniqueness and multiplicity results for classes of reaction diffusion equations arising in ecology with nonlinear boundary conditions. *Communications on Pure & Applied Analysis*, 0:–, 2021.
- [10] R. M. May. Thresholds and breakpoints in ecosystems with a multiplicity of stable states. *Nature*, 269:471–477, 1977.
- [11] I. Noy-Meir. Stability of grazing systems an application of predator-prey graphs. *J. Ecol.*, 63:459–482, 1975.
- [12] J. Steele and E. Henderson. Modelling long term fluctuations in fish stocks. *Science*, 224:985–987, 1984.

- [13] E. Van Nes and M. Scheffer. Implications of spatial heterogeneity for catastrophic regime shifts in ecosystems. *Ecology*, 86(7):1797–1807, 2005.

(Mohan Mallick) VNIT NAGPUR, INDIA-440010

Email address: mohan.math09@gmail.com, mohanmallick@mth.vnit.ac.in

(Ardra A) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IIT PALAKKAD, KERALA-678557, INDIA

Email address: ardra.math@gmail.com, 211814001@smail.iitpkd.ac.in

(Sarath Sasi) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IIT PALAKKAD, KERALA-678557, INDIA

Email address: sarath@iitpkd.ac.in