

BIFURCATION STRUCTURE OF STEADY-STATES FOR A COOPERATIVE MODEL WITH POPULATION FLUX BY ATTRACTIVE TRANSITION

MASAHIRO ADACHI[†] AND KOUSUKE KUTO[‡]

ABSTRACT. This paper studies the steady-states to a diffusive Lotka-Volterra cooperative model with population flux by attractive transition. The first result gives many bifurcation points on the branch of the positive constant solution under the weak cooperative condition. The second result shows each steady-state approaches a solution of the scalar field equation as the coefficients of the flux tend to infinity. Indeed, the numerical simulation using pde2path exhibits the global bifurcation branch of the cooperative model with large population flux is near that of the scalar field equation.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we are concerned with the following diffusive Lotka-Volterra cooperative model with density-dependent nonlinear diffusion terms:

$$\begin{cases} u_t = d_1 \Delta u + \alpha \nabla \cdot \left[v^2 \nabla \left(\frac{u}{v} \right) \right] + u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ v_t = d_2 \Delta v + \beta \nabla \cdot \left[u^2 \nabla \left(\frac{v}{u} \right) \right] + v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v), & (x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \partial_\nu u = \partial_\nu v = 0, & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0, T), \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \geq 0, \quad v(x, 0) = v_0(x) \geq 0, & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\Omega (\subset \mathbb{R}^N)$ is a bounded domain with a smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$; unknown functions $u(x, t)$ and $v(x, t)$ are the population densities at location $x \in \Omega$ and time $t > 0$ of two species in a symbiotic relationship with each other. We assume the homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions that each species has the zero derivative in the direction of the outward unit normal vector ν on the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of the habitat Ω . The coefficients a_i , b_i and c_i ($i = 1, 2$) in the reaction terms are all positive constants. The growth rate of the species corresponding to u is $a_1 > 0$ assuming natural increase, while that of the species corresponding to v is $-a_2 < 0$ assuming natural decrease. The positive coefficients c_1 and b_2 indicates the magnitude of symbiotic interactions between different species. The positive constants d_1 and d_2 stand for random diffusion rates of each individual of the species. The strongly coupled diffusion terms $\nabla \cdot [v^2 \nabla(u/v)]$ and $\nabla \cdot [u^2 \nabla(v/u)]$ describe a situation in which each species migrates with higher probability to areas with higher densities of different species. In terms of the diffusion process

Date: June 28, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35B35, 35B36, 35B32, 35J20, 92D25.

Key words and phrases. nonlinear diffusion, population model, bifurcation, the scalar field equation, perturbation.

This research was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K03379.

[†] Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Graduate School of Fundamental Science and Engineering, Waseda University, 3-4-1 Ohkubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan.

[‡] Department of Applied Mathematics, Waseda University, 3-4-1 Ohkubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan.

E-mail: kuto@waseda.jp.

in ecology, the strongly coupled diffusion term microscopically models a situation where the transition probability of each individual of each species depends on the density of the other species at the point of arrival (Okubo and Levin [12, Section 5.4]). Although the strongly coupled diffusion term is placed in [12] as a prototype of bio-diffusion, along with the cross-diffusion term $\Delta(uv)$ and the chemotaxis term $\nabla \cdot (u\nabla v)$, there have not been many studies from the perspective of reaction-diffusion systems. Concerning a prey-predator model with the strongly coupled diffusion term as in (1.1), Oeda and the second author [11, 8] studied the set of stationary solutions. Furthermore, for the prey-predator model, Heihoff and Yokota [7] established the global existence and boundedness of time-depending solutions and derived the convergence of solutions to the positive constant solution.

Throughout this paper, we assume the weak cooperative condition

$$\frac{c_1}{c_2} < \frac{b_1}{b_2} < \frac{a_1}{a_2}. \quad (1.2)$$

Under the condition (1.2), it is easy to check that (1.1) without the initial conditions admits the positive constant solution

$$(u^*, v^*) = \left(\frac{a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1}, \frac{a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1} \right),$$

and moreover, (u^*, v^*) is globally asymptotically stable in the kinetic system of the corresponding ordinary differential equation with $d_i = \alpha = \beta = 0$ (e.g., Goh [6]). Furthermore, also in the linear diffusion case where $d_i > 0$ and $\alpha = \beta = 0$, the well-known result by Weinberger [16] on the invariant region of a class of reaction-diffusion system ensures that (u^*, v^*) is globally asymptotically stable in the sense that all positive solutions of (1.1) converge to (u^*, v^*) uniformly in $\bar{\Omega}$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Therefore, it is natural to ask whether the strongly coupled diffusion term $\nabla \cdot [v^2 \nabla(u/v)]$ or $\nabla \cdot [u^2 \nabla(v/u)]$ can produce nonconstant steady-states and the nontrivial spatio-temporal dynamics instead of the global stability of (u^*, v^*) . With those objectives in mind this paper focuses on the effect of the strongly coupled diffusion term on the set of stationary solutions. Then we study the stationary problem which consists of the nonlinear elliptic equations

$$d_1 \Delta u + \alpha \nabla \cdot \left[v^2 \nabla \left(\frac{u}{v} \right) \right] + u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.3a)$$

$$d_2 \Delta v + \beta \nabla \cdot \left[u^2 \nabla \left(\frac{v}{u} \right) \right] + v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad (1.3b)$$

subject to the homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions

$$\partial_\nu u = \partial_\nu v = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (1.3c)$$

and the nonnegative conditions

$$u \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (1.3d)$$

In what follows, we call (u, v) a positive solution if (u, v) satisfies (1.3a)-(1.3c) and $u > 0$ and $v > 0$ in Ω . Hence a positive solution corresponds to a coexistence steady-state of the two species.

In order to find nonconstant solutions of (1.3), we resort to the bifurcation theory established by Crandall and Rabinowitz [3] regarding d_2 as the bifurcation parameter. The first result (Theorem 2.1) asserts that if $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j$ as in Fig.1 for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, then there appears a bifurcation point $d_*^{(j)}$ in the sense that a local branch of nonconstant solutions bifurcate from (u^*, v^*) at $d_2 = d_*^{(j)}$. Next the asymptotic behavior of nonconstant solutions of (1.3) as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$

and/or $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ will be discussed. The second result (Theorem 2.2) asserts that if $\alpha = \alpha_n \rightarrow \infty$ and/or $\beta = \beta_n \rightarrow \infty$ with $\alpha_n/\beta_n \rightarrow \gamma \in [0, \infty]$, then any sequence of positive nonconstant solutions (u_n, v_n) converges to (τ^*v, v) with some positive function v and $\tau^* = u^*/v^*$ passing to a subsequence if necessary. Furthermore, it will be shown that the limit function v can be classified depending on $\gamma := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_n/\beta_n$: If $\gamma \in [0, A\tau^*)$ with $A := a_1/a_2$, then the limit v is equal to the constant v^* , that is, any sequence $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ converges to (u^*, v^*) , whereas if $\gamma \in (A\tau^*, \infty]$, then $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ approaches a positive solution of the scalar field equation. Consequently, it can be said from this result that nonconstant solutions of (1.3) can be approximated by some solution of the scalar field equation when the strongly coupled diffusion terms are very strong.

In this paper, the eigenvalue problem of the Laplace equation:

$$-\Delta u = \lambda u \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_\nu u = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

will play an important role. We denote the all eigenvalues by

$$0 = \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_j \leq \dots$$

counting multiplicity and denote by Φ_j any $L^2(\Omega)$ normalized eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_j . Furthermore, the usual norm of $L^p(\Omega)$ will be denoted by

$$\|u\|_p := \left(\int_{\Omega} |u(x)|^p \right)^{1/p} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq p < \infty$$

and $\|u\|_{\infty} = \sup_{x \in \Omega} |u(x)|$. As typical functional spaces for the bifurcation analysis concerning (1.3), we define

$$X_p := W_{\nu}^{2,p}(\Omega) = \{ u \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) : \partial_{\nu} u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega \}$$

and

$$\mathbf{X}_p := X_p \times X_p, \quad \mathbf{Y}_p := L^p(\Omega) \times L^p(\Omega)$$

for any $p > N$.

2. MAIN RESULTS

The first result asserts that bifurcation points appear on the branch

$$\Gamma_0 := \{ (d_2, u^*, v^*) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbf{X}_p \}, \quad \text{where } \mathbb{R}_+ := (0, \infty),$$

of the positive constant solution (u^*, v^*) by the effect of the strongly coupled diffusion terms.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume (1.2). Let λ_j with $j \geq 1$ be any simple eigenvalue. Suppose that*


$$(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j := \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 : a_2 v^* \lambda_j \alpha - (a_1 + d_1 \lambda_j) u^* \lambda_j \beta - (c_2 d_1 \lambda_j + a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) v^* > 0 \}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} := [0, \infty)$. Then, a simple curve of nonconstant positive solutions of (1.3) bifurcates from the branch Γ_0 of the positive constant solution at

$$d_2 = d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta) := \frac{a_2 v^* \lambda_j \alpha - (a_1 + d_1 \lambda_j) u^* \lambda_j \beta - (c_2 d_1 \lambda_j + a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) v^*}{\{ (d_1 + \alpha v^*) \lambda_j + b_1 u^* \} \lambda_j}. \quad (2.2)$$

To be precise, there exist a neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_j \subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{X}_p$ of $(d_*^{(j)}, u^*, v^*)$ and a small positive number δ_j such that all solutions of (1.3) (treating d_2 as a positive parameter) contained in \mathcal{U}_j consist of the union of $\Gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{U}_j$ and a simple curve

$$\Gamma_j : \begin{bmatrix} d_2 \\ u \\ v \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta) \\ u^* \\ v^* \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} q(s) \\ s(\Phi_j + \tilde{u}(s)) \\ s(\kappa_j \Phi_j + \tilde{v}(s)) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } s \in (-\delta_j, \delta_j),$$

FIGURE 1. \mathcal{R}_j and $\gamma = A\tau^*$ on the $\alpha\beta$ plane

where $\kappa_j = (b_1 u^* + (d_1 + \alpha v^*)\lambda_j)/(c_1 + \lambda_j \alpha)u^*$ and $(q(s), \tilde{u}(s), \tilde{v}(s)) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbf{X}_p$ are smooth functions satisfying $(q(0), \tilde{u}(0), \tilde{v}(0)) = (0, 0, 0)$ and $\int_{\Omega} \Phi_j \tilde{u}(s) = \int_{\Omega} \Phi_j \tilde{v}(s) = 0$ for $s \in (-\delta_j, \delta_j)$.

See Figure 1 for a depiction of the region \mathcal{R}_j on the $\alpha\beta$ plane.

The next result asserts that the limit of positive solutions of (1.3) as $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$ and/or $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ with $\alpha/\beta \rightarrow \gamma \in [0, \infty]$ can be characterized by either (u^*, v^*) or a positive solution to the scalar field equation depending on γ .

Theorem 2.2. *Assume (1.2) and $N \leq 3$. Let $\{(\alpha_n, \beta_n)\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ be any nonnegative sequence satisfying $\alpha_n/\beta_n \rightarrow \gamma \in [0, \infty]$ and at least one of $\{\alpha_n\}$ and $\{\beta_n\}$ tends to ∞ . Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ be any sequence of positive nonconstant solutions of (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_n, \beta_n)$. Then there exists a positive function $v \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n, v_n) = (\tau^*, 1)v \quad \text{in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{with } \tau^* = \frac{u^*}{v^*},$$

passing to a subsequence if necessary. Furthermore, the following properties hold true:

- (i) If $\gamma \in [0, A\tau^*)$ with $A = a_1/a_2$, then $v = v^*$, more precisely in this case, it follows that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n, v_n) = (u^*, v^*)$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ with the full sequence.
- (ii) If $\gamma \in (A\tau^*, \infty]$, then v satisfies

$$\begin{cases} d\Delta v + \xi^* v(v - v^*) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$(d, \xi^*) := \begin{cases} (\tau^* d_1 + \gamma d_2, (\gamma a_2 - \tau^* a_1)/v^*) & \text{if } \gamma < \infty, \\ (d_2, a_2/v^*) & \text{if } \gamma = \infty. \end{cases}$$

The limit equation (2.3) can be classified into the scalar field equation, and the rich structure of nonconstant solutions with small $d_2 > 0$ has been actively studied in the field of nonlinear elliptic equations (e.g., [10, Chapter 3]). Therefore, the assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.2 naturally enables us to expect that (1.1) has also a rich structure of nonconstant stationary patterns when α is large enough such as $\alpha/\beta > A\tau^*$ and $d_2 > 0$ is very small. See Figure 1 for the regions (i) and (ii) occur on the $\alpha\beta$ plane.

3. A PRIORI ESTIMATES

In this section, some a priori estimates of solutions of (1.3) will be shown. We begin with the L^2 estimate independently of d_i ($i = 1, 2$), α and β .

Lemma 3.1. *Assume (1.2). Let (u, v) be any solution of (1.3). Then it holds that*

$$\|u\|_2 \leq \frac{a_1 c_2}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1} |\Omega|^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_2 \leq \frac{a_1 b_2}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1} |\Omega|^{1/2}.$$

Proof. It is noted that (1.3a) is equivalent to

$$\nabla \cdot [(d_1 + \alpha v) \nabla u - \alpha u \nabla v] + u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) = 0 \quad (3.1)$$

in which the linear and nonlinear diffusion terms are expressed as the divergence form. Integrating (3.1) over Ω and using the divergence theorem, one can get

$$\int_{\Omega} u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) = \int_{\partial\Omega} [(d_1 + \alpha v) \nabla u - \alpha u \nabla v] \cdot \nu \, d\sigma = 0$$

by the Neumann boundary conditions on u and v . It follows that $b_1 \|u\|_2^2 = a_1 \|u\|_1 + c_1 \int_{\Omega} uv$. Applying the Schwarz inequality to both terms in the right-hand side, we obtain

$$b_1 \|u\|_2 \leq a_1 |\Omega|^{1/2} + c_1 \|v\|_2. \quad (3.2)$$

Hence the same procedure for (1.3b) gives

$$c_2 \|v\|_2 \leq b_2 \|u\|_2. \quad (3.3)$$

By (3.2) and (3.3), one can get the desired estimates on $\|u\|_2$ and $\|v\|_2$. The proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete. \square

Furthermore, in the case where the spatial dimension N satisfies $N \leq 3$, we find the uniform $W^{2,p}$ bound which is independent of α and β as follows:

Theorem 3.2. *Assume (1.2) and $N \leq 3$. Then for any $p \in (1, \infty)$, there exists a positive number $C_p = C_p(a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$, which is independent of α and β , such that any solution (u, v) of (1.3) satisfies*

$$\|u\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_p \quad \text{and} \quad \|v\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C_p.$$

In the proof of Theorem 3.2, the following Harnack inequality will play an important role.

Lemma 3.3 ([9]). *Let w be a nonnegative solution of*

$$\Delta w + V(x)w = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_{\nu} w = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

Then for any $p > \max\{N/2, 1\}$, there exists $C_{\sharp} = C_{\sharp}(\|V\|_p) > 0$ such that

$$\max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} w(x) \leq C_{\sharp} \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} w(x).$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Since $\nabla \cdot (v \nabla u - u \nabla v) = v \Delta u - u \Delta v$, then (3.1) (or (1.3a)) is reduced to

$$(d_1 + \alpha v) \Delta u - \alpha u \Delta v + u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (3.4)$$

Similarly one can form (1.3b) derive

$$(d_2 + \beta u) \Delta v - \beta v \Delta u + v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \quad (3.5)$$

Substituting Δv in (3.5) for Δv in (3.4), and substituting Δu in (3.4) for Δu in (3.5), we obtain the following semilinear system which is equivalent to (1.3):

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + V_1(u, v; \alpha, \beta)u = 0, & u \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \Delta v + V_2(u, v; \alpha, \beta)v = 0, & v \geq 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_{\nu} u = \partial_{\nu} v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$V_1(u, v; \alpha, \beta) := \frac{(d_2 + \beta u)(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) + \alpha v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v)}{d_1 d_2 + d_1 \beta u + d_2 \alpha v} \quad (3.7)$$

and

$$V_2(u, v; \alpha, \beta) := \frac{(d_1 + \alpha v)(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v) + \beta u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v)}{d_1 d_2 + d_1 \beta u + d_2 \alpha v}. \quad (3.8)$$

Our strategy of the proof is first to find the uniform bound of $\|V_i(u, v; \alpha, \beta)\|_2$ independently of (α, β) with the aid of Lemma 3.1 and next to apply Lemma 3.3 to (3.6). It follows from (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} |V_1(u, v; \alpha, \beta)| &\leq \left| \frac{(d_2 + \beta u)(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v)}{d_1 d_2 + d_1 \beta u + d_2 \alpha v} \right| + \left| \frac{\alpha v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v)}{d_1 d_2 + d_1 \beta u + d_2 \alpha v} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v|}{d_1} + \frac{|-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v|}{d_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Similarly, we know from (3.8) that

$$|V_2(u, v; \alpha, \beta)| \leq \frac{|-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v|}{d_2} + \frac{|a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v|}{d_1}. \quad (3.10)$$

Hence (3.9) and (3.10) with Lemma 3.1 ensure a positive constant $\bar{C} = \bar{C}(a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$ independent of (α, β) such that $\|V_i(u, v; \alpha, \beta)\|_2 \leq \bar{C}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, if $N \leq 3$, then the application of Lemma 3.3 for (3.6) with $p = 2$ ensures some $C_{\sharp} = C_{\sharp}(a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i)$ such that

$$\max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u(x) \leq C_{\sharp} \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u(x), \quad \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} v(x) \leq C_{\sharp} \min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} v(x).$$

Since $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u(x) \leq a_1 c_2 / (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)$ and $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} v(x) \leq a_1 b_2 / (b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1)$ by Lemma 3.1, then we obtain the uniform L^∞ bound, which is independent of α and β , as follows:

$$\max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u(x) \leq M \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} v(x) \leq M \quad \text{where} \quad M := C_{\sharp} \frac{a_1 \max\{b_2, c_2\}}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1}. \quad (3.11)$$

By virtue of (3.6), the standard application of the elliptic regularity theory using (3.9)-(3.11) ensures the desired bound C_p in the assertion. The proof of Theorem 3.2 is complete. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let M be the positive constant obtained in (3.11). If (1.3) admits at least one positive nonconstant solution, then*

$$d_1 < \frac{(\alpha + \beta)M}{2} + \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(a_1 + \frac{(3c_1 + b_2)M}{2} \right)$$

or

$$d_2 < \frac{M}{2} \left(\alpha + \beta + \frac{c_1 + 3b_2}{\lambda_1} \right),$$

Proof. Suppose that (u, v) is a positive nonconstant solution of (1.3). We set $\bar{u} := |\Omega|^{-1} \int_{\Omega} u$ and $\bar{v} := |\Omega|^{-1} \int_{\Omega} v$. Taking the inner product of (3.1) with $u - \bar{u}$, we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} (d_1 + \alpha v) |\nabla u|^2 - \alpha \int_{\Omega} u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v = \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) u (a_1 - b_1 u - c_1 v). \quad (3.12)$$

Here we observe that

$$a_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) u = a_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})(u - \bar{u} + \bar{u}) = a_1 \|u - \bar{u}\|_2^2 \quad (3.13)$$

and

$$-b_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u}) u^2 = -b_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})(u^2 - \bar{u}^2 + \bar{u}^2) = -b_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 (u + \bar{u}) \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})uv &= c_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})(u - \bar{u} + \bar{u})v \\
&= c_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 v + c_1 \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})v \\
&= c_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 v + c_1 \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})(v - \bar{v}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Substituting (3.13)-(3.15) into (3.12), one can see that

$$d_1 \|\nabla u\|^2 - \alpha \int_{\Omega} u \nabla u \cdot \nabla v < a_1 \|u - \bar{u}\|_2^2 + c_1 \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})^2 v + c_1 \bar{u} \int_{\Omega} (u - \bar{u})(v - \bar{v}).$$

Therefore, together with (3.11), the Schwarz and the Young inequalities yield

$$\left(d_1 - \frac{\alpha M}{2}\right) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 - \frac{\alpha M}{2} \|\nabla v\|_2^2 < \left(a_1 + \frac{3c_1 M}{2}\right) \|u - \bar{u}\|_2^2 + \frac{c_1 M}{2} \|v - \bar{v}\|_2^2. \tag{3.16}$$

Obviously, the same procedure for (1.3b) yields

$$\left(d_2 - \frac{\beta M}{2}\right) \|\nabla v\|_2^2 - \frac{\beta M}{2} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 < \frac{b_2 M}{2} \|u - \bar{u}\|_2^2 + \frac{3b_2 M}{2} \|v - \bar{v}\|_2^2. \tag{3.17}$$

Adding (3.16) and (3.17), one can see

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(d_1 - \frac{(\alpha + \beta)M}{2}\right) \|\nabla u\|_2^2 + \left(d_2 - \frac{(\alpha + \beta)M}{2}\right) \|\nabla v\|_2^2 \\
&< \left(a_1 + \frac{(3c_1 + b_2)M}{2}\right) \|u - \bar{u}\|_2^2 + \frac{(c_1 + 3b_2)M}{2} \|v - \bar{v}\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with the Poincaré-Wirtinger equality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{d_1 - \frac{(\alpha + \beta)M}{2} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \left(a_1 + \frac{(3c_1 + b_2)M}{2}\right)\right\} \|\nabla u\|_2^2 \\
&+ \left\{d_2 - \frac{(\alpha + \beta)M}{2} - \frac{(c_1 + 3b_2)M}{2\lambda_1}\right\} \|\nabla v\|_2^2 < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we obtain the assertion of Theorem 3.4. \square

4. BIFURCATION FROM THE CONSTANT STATE

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof relies on the bifurcation theorem from simple eigenvalues established by Crandall and Rabinowitz [3, Theorem 1.7] and its improvement by Shi and Wang [13, Theorem 4.3] for the application to a class of quasilinear systems. We begin with the linearized stability of (u^*, v^*) when $d_2 > 0$ is sufficiently large.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume (1.2). Then for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, there exists $\widehat{d}_*(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$ such that if $d_2 > \widehat{d}_*(\alpha, \beta)$, then (u^*, v^*) is linearly stable.*

Proof. In view of the left-hand sides of (3.4) and (3.5), for any $(d_2, u, v) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbf{X}_p$ with $p > N$, we define $F(d_2, u, v) \in \mathbf{Y}_p$ by

$$F(d_2, u, v) := \begin{bmatrix} d_1 + \alpha v & -\alpha u \\ -\beta v & d_2 + \beta u \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta u \\ \Delta v \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} u(a_1 - b_1 u + c_1 v) \\ v(-a_2 + b_2 u - c_2 v) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.1}$$

In order to find bifurcation points on Γ_0 , we consider the linearized eigenvalue problem around the positive constant solution (u^*, v^*) to (1.3) as follows:

$$L(d_2) \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \psi \end{bmatrix} + \mu \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $L(d_2) = D_{(u,v)}F(d_2, u^*, v^*)$. By straightforward calculation, one can see that the eigenvalue problem (4.2) is reduced to the following system of linear elliptic equations:

$$\begin{bmatrix} d_1 + \alpha v^* & -\alpha u^* \\ -\beta v^* & d_2 + \beta u^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Delta \phi \\ \Delta \psi \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \mu - b_1 u^* & c_1 u^* \\ b_2 v^* & \mu - c_2 v^* \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.3)$$

We seek for solution (ϕ, ψ) of (4.3) in the following form of the Fourier expansion:

$$(\phi, \psi) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (h_j, k_j) \Phi_j.$$

By the fact that $\{\Phi_j\}$ is a complete orthogonal system in $L^2(\Omega)$, we substitute the above expression into (4.3) to get

$$(\mu I - A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta)) \begin{bmatrix} h_j \\ k_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.4)$$

where

$$A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) := \begin{bmatrix} b_1 u^* + (d_1 + \alpha v^*) \lambda_j & -(c_1 + \lambda_j \alpha) u^* \\ -(b_2 + \lambda_j \beta) v^* & c_2 v^* + (d_2 + \beta u^*) \lambda_j \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is noted that μ is an eigenvalue of (4.2) if and only if (4.4) admits a nontrivial solution (h_j, k_j) with some $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, that is,

$$\det(\mu I - A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta)) = \mu^2 - \operatorname{tr} A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \mu + \det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

We denote roots of the algebraic equation $\det(\mu I - A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta)) = 0$ by $\mu_j^\pm(d_2; \alpha, \beta)$ with

$$\operatorname{Re} \mu_j^-(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \leq \operatorname{Re} \mu_j^+(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{Im} \mu_j^-(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \leq \operatorname{Im} \mu_j^+(d_2; \alpha, \beta).$$

Since

$$\operatorname{tr} A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) = b_1 u^* + c_2 v^* + \lambda_j (d_1 + d_2 + \alpha v^* + \beta u^*) > 0,$$

then

$$\begin{cases} \mu_j^-(d_2; \alpha, \beta) < 0 < \mu_j^+(d_2; \alpha, \beta) & \text{if } \det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) < 0, \\ 0 = \mu_j^-(d_2; \alpha, \beta) < \mu_j^+(d_2; \alpha, \beta) & \text{if } \det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) = 0, \\ 0 < \operatorname{Re} \mu_j^-(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \leq \operatorname{Re} \mu_j^+(d_2; \alpha, \beta) & \text{if } \det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) > 0. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

By straightforward calculation, one can verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \\ &= \{(d_1 + \alpha v^*) \lambda_j + b_1 u^*\} \lambda_j d_2 - a_2 v^* \lambda_j \alpha + (a_1 + d_1 \lambda_j) u^* \lambda_j \beta + (c_2 d_1 \lambda_j + a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) v^*, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore,

$$\det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) \begin{cases} < 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j \text{ and } 0 < d_2 < d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta), \\ = 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j \text{ and } d_2 = d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta), \\ > 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j \text{ and } d_2 > d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta), \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) > 0 \quad \text{for any } d_2 > 0 \text{ if } (\alpha, \beta) \notin \mathcal{R}_j, \quad (4.8)$$

where \mathcal{R}_j and $d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)$ are defined by (2.1) and (2.2), respectively. In addition, it is noted that $\det A_0(d_2; \alpha, \beta) > 0$ for any $d_2 > 0$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ under (1.2).

For any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$, we define $J(\alpha, \beta)$ by the set of $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j$, that is,

$$J(\alpha, \beta) := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{R}_j\}.$$

In view of \mathcal{R}_j , one can verify that $\#J(\alpha, \beta) < \infty$ for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. We set

$$\widehat{d}_*(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} \max\{d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta) : j \in J(\alpha, \beta)\} & \text{if } J(\alpha, \beta) \neq \emptyset, \\ 0 & \text{if } J(\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

We obtain from (4.6)-(4.8) that if $d_2 > \widehat{d}_*(\alpha, \beta)$, then $\operatorname{Re} \mu_j(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Consequently, it follows that (u^*, v^*) is linearly stable if $d > \widehat{d}_*(\alpha, \beta)$. The proof of Lemma 4.1 is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1. In view of (4.2) and (4.5), one can see that $\operatorname{Ker} L(d_2)$ is nontrivial if and only if $\det A_j(d_2; \alpha, \beta) = 0$. Therefore, it follows from (4.7) that $\operatorname{Ker} L(d_2)$ is nontrivial if and only if $d_2 = d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)$, and moreover,

$$\operatorname{Ker} L(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)) = \operatorname{Span} \{ (1, \kappa_j) \Phi_j \},$$

where $\kappa_j = (b_1 u^* + (d_1 + \alpha v^*) \lambda_j) / (c_1 + \lambda_j \alpha) u^*$. Here it is easily verified that

$$\operatorname{Ker} L^*(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)) = \operatorname{Span} \{ (1, \kappa_j^*) \Phi_j \},$$

where $L^*(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta))$ is the adjoint operator of $L(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta))$ and $\kappa_j^* = (b_1 u^* + (d_1 + \alpha v^*) \lambda_j) / (b_2 + \lambda_j \beta) v^*$. By the Fredholm alternative theorem, one can see that

$$\operatorname{Ran} L(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)) = \operatorname{Span} \{ (1, \kappa_j^*) \Phi_j \}^\perp,$$

that is, $L(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta))$ is a Fredholm operator with index zero. For the application of [13, Theorem 4.3], we have to check the transversality condition that

$$D_{(u,v), d_2} F(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta), u^*, v^*) \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \kappa_j \end{bmatrix} \Phi_j \notin \operatorname{Ran} L(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta)) (= \operatorname{Span} \{ (1, \kappa_j^*) \Phi_j \}^\perp). \quad (4.10)$$

Here it is easily verified that

$$D_{(u,v), d_2} F(d_*^{(j)}(\alpha, \beta), u^*, v^*) \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \kappa_j \end{bmatrix} \Phi_j = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -\kappa_j \lambda_j \end{bmatrix} \Phi_j.$$

Obviously, the right-hand side is not orthogonal to $\operatorname{Span} \{ (1, \kappa_j^*) \Phi_j \}$, and thereby, (4.10) follows. Therefore, we can use the bifurcation theorem [13, Theorem 4.3] to obtain all assertions in Theorem 2.1. \square

5. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR OF SOLUTIONS AS $\alpha, \beta \rightarrow \infty$

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Assume (1.2) and $N \leq 3$. Let $\{(u_n, v_n)\}$ be any sequence of positive nonconstant solutions of (1.3) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ satisfying $\gamma_n := \alpha_n / \beta_n \rightarrow \gamma \in [0, \infty]$ and at least one of $\{\alpha_n\}$ and $\{\beta_n\}$ tends to ∞ . By Theorem 3.2 and the Sobolev embedding theorem, we find nonnegative functions $(u_\infty, v_\infty) \in \mathbf{X}_p$ with $p > N$ such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (u_n, v_n) = (u_\infty, v_\infty) \quad \text{weakly in } \mathbf{X}_p \quad \text{and} \quad \text{strongly in } C^1(\overline{\Omega}) \times C^1(\overline{\Omega}), \quad (5.1)$$

passing to a subsequence if necessary.

As the first step of the proof, we show that $u_\infty > 0$ and $v_\infty > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. We set $(\tilde{u}_n(x), \tilde{v}_n(x)) := (u_n(x)/\|u_n\|_\infty, v_n(x)/\|v_n\|_\infty)$. Multiplying the first equation of (3.6) by $1/\|u_n\|_\infty$, we see that

$$\Delta \tilde{u}_n + V_1(u_n, v_n; \alpha_n, \beta_n) \tilde{u}_n = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_\nu \tilde{u}_n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By virtue of (3.9) and $\|\tilde{u}_n\|_\infty = 1$, the elliptic regularity theory and the strong maximum principle (e.g., [5]) give a positive function $\tilde{u}_\infty \in X_p$ with $p > N$ and $\|\tilde{u}_\infty\|_\infty = 1$ such that $\tilde{u}_n \rightarrow \tilde{u}_\infty$ weakly in X_p and strongly in $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Obviously, the same procedure for the second equation of (3.6) implies that $\tilde{v}_n \rightarrow \tilde{v}_\infty$ weakly in X_p and strongly in $C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ with some positive function $\tilde{v}_\infty \in X_p$ with $p > N$ and $\|\tilde{v}_\infty\|_\infty = 1$. Next, multiplying (1.3b) by $1/\|v_n\|_\infty$ and integrating the resulting expression over Ω , one can see

$$\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v}_n(-a_2 + b_2 u_n - c_2 v_n) = 0 \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N} \quad (5.2)$$

by (1.3c). Suppose for contradiction that $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} u_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, subject to a subsequence. Thanks to (3.9), we can set $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the weak form of

$$\Delta u_n + V_1(u_n, v_n; \alpha_n, \beta_n) u_n = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_\nu u_n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (5.3)$$

and apply the combination of the elliptic regularity with the strong maximum principle to reach $u_\infty = 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. Setting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.2), we know that

$$\int_{\Omega} \tilde{v}_\infty(-a_2 - c_2 v_\infty) = 0.$$

Hence this contradicts the fact that $\tilde{v}_\infty > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. Consequently, we obtain $u_\infty > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ by contradiction. We next suppose for contradiction that $\min_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} v_n(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, passing to a subsequence. Owing to the uniform estimate (3.10), the same limiting procedure in the weak form of

$$\Delta v_n + V_2(u_n, v_n; \alpha_n, \beta_n) v_n = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_\nu v_n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega \quad (5.4)$$

leads to $v_\infty = 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$. In view of (3.7), setting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.3) again, we know that $u_\infty > 0$ satisfies

$$-d_1 \Delta u_\infty = u_\infty(a_1 - b_1 u_\infty) \quad \text{in } \Omega, \quad \partial_\nu u_\infty = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega$$

in the weak sense. By the uniqueness of positive solutions to the above Neumann problem, one can deduce $u_\infty = a_1/b_1$. Then, setting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.2), one can see

$$\left(-a_2 + \frac{a_1 b_2}{b_1}\right) \int_{\Omega} \tilde{v}_\infty = 0.$$

From $\tilde{v}_\infty > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$, it follows that $a_1/a_2 = b_1/b_2$. However this contradicts (1.2). Therefore, we obtain $v_\infty > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}$ by contradiction.

As the next step of the proof, we show that $u_\infty(x) = \tau^* v_\infty(x)$ for all $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ with $\tau^* = u^*/v^*$. Taking the inner product of (1.3a) with u_n/v_n , we get

$$d_1 \left(\int_{\Omega} \frac{|\nabla u_n|^2}{v_n} - \int_{\Omega} \left(\frac{u_n}{v_n} \right)^2 \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla v_n \right) + \alpha_n \int_{\Omega} v_n^2 \left| \nabla \left(\frac{u_n}{v_n} \right) \right|^2 = \int_{\Omega} \frac{u_n^2}{v_n} (a_1 - b_1 u_n + c_1 v_n) \quad (5.5)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By virtue of (5.1) with $u_\infty > 0$ and $v_\infty > 0$ in Ω , we multiply (5.5) by $1/\alpha_n$ and set $n \rightarrow \infty$ to get

$$\int_{\Omega} v_\infty^2 \left| \nabla \left(\frac{u_\infty}{v_\infty} \right) \right|^2 = 0.$$

Since $u_\infty > 0$ and $v_\infty > 0$ in Ω , then $u_\infty/v_\infty = \tau^*$ in Ω with some positive constant τ^* . In order to get $\tau^* = u^*/v^*$, we set $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the integration of (1.3a) and (1.3b) to see

$$\begin{cases} a_1 \|v_\infty\|_1 + (-b_1\tau^* + c_1) \|v_\infty\|_2^2 = 0, \\ -a_2 \|v_\infty\|_1 + (b_2\tau^* - c_2) \|v_\infty\|_2^2 = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows from the algebraic equations that $\tau^* = u^*/v^*$.

As the final step of the proof, we show the desired assertions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 2.2. By virtue of $u_\infty = \tau^*v_\infty$ in (5.1), we set $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.3) and (5.4) using (3.7) and (3.8), respectively, to reach the same equation of v_∞ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} d\Delta v_\infty + \xi^*v_\infty(v_\infty - v^*) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu v_\infty = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

where

$$(d, \xi^*) := \begin{cases} (\tau^*d_1 + \gamma d_2, (\gamma a_2 - \tau^*a_1)/v^*) & \text{if } \gamma < \infty, \\ (d_2, a_2/v^*) & \text{if } \gamma = \infty. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known that if $\xi^* < 0$, then (5.6) is corresponding to the diffusive logistic equation and $v_\infty = v^*$, whereas if $\xi^* > 0$, then (5.6) is corresponding to the scalar field equation and admits positive nonconstant solutions when $d > 0$ is small. The proof of Theorem 2.2 is complete. \square

6. NUMERICAL BIFURCATION BRANCHES

In this section, some numerical bifurcation branches of steady-state solutions to the one-dimensional version of (1.3) will be shown. Our numerical simulations employ the continuation software pde2path [2, 4, 14, 15] based on an FEM discretization of the stationary problem. For (1.3), our setting of parameters in the numerical simulation is as follows:

$$\Omega = (-0.5, 0.5), \quad (d_1, a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2) = (0.004, 1, 1, 4, 5, 2, 3). \quad (6.1)$$

and some pairs of (α, β) so that $\gamma = \alpha/\beta = 2$. In line with the theoretical analysis, d_2 will play an role of the bifurcation parameter.

It should be noted here that in the one-dimensional case where Ω is an interval, the global bifurcation structure of all positive nonconstant solutions of the limiting system (2.3) is well known. To illustrate the structure, we classify the positive nonconstant solutions by node, and introduce

$$\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(j)} = \{ (d_2, v) : v \text{ satisfies (2.3) and } v' \text{ has exactly } j - 1 \text{ zeros in } \Omega \}.$$

Then it is well-known that $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(j)}$ forms a pitchfork bifurcation curve bifurcating from the positive constant solution $v = v^*$ at

$$d_2 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left(\frac{\xi^*v^*}{(j\pi)^2} - \tau^*d_1 \right) (= d_{*,\infty}^{(j)}),$$

and moreover, the upper and lower branches of $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(j)}$ can be parameterized by $d_2 \in (0, d_{*,\infty}^{(j)})$. Here, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we call the subset of $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(j)}$ for which v' is monotone increasing (resp. decreasing) in a neighborhood of the left end of Ω , the upper (resp. lower) branch. In (f) of Figure 2, right (blue), center (red) and left (green) curves numerically exhibit upper branches of $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(2)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_\infty^{(3)}$ in case (6.1) and $\gamma = 2$.

In Figure 2, (a) to (e) numerically present the bifurcation branches of nonconstant solutions of (1.3). In each of (a)-(e), right (blue), center (red) and left (green) bifurcation curves correspond




FIGURE 2. Bifurcation branches of solutions to (1.3) and (2.3).

to global extensions of upper branches of Γ_1 , Γ_2 and Γ_3 (obtained in Theorem 2.1), respectively. The coefficients in the reaction terms and the linear diffusion coefficient d_1 are fixed to satisfy (6.1), while gradually increasing both α and β by keeping their ratio $\gamma = \alpha/\beta$ equals to 2 from (a) to (e). At this point, it can be observed that the bifurcation branches approach the bifurcation branches of the limiting system (2.3) presented in (f). The transition of the bifurcation branches from (a) to (e) supports numerically the content of (ii) of Theorem 2.2.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Amann, *Dynamic theory of quasilinear parabolic systems, III. Global existence*, Math Z. 202 (1989), 219–250.
- [2] M. Breden, C. Kuehn, C. Soresina, *On the influence of cross-diffusion in pattern formation*, J. Comput. Dyn., 8 (2021), 213–240.
- [3] M. G. Crandall, P. H. Rabinowitz, *Bifurcation from simple eigenvalues*, J. Funct. Anal., 8 (1971), 321–340.
- [4] T. Dohnal, J. D. M. Rademacher, H. Uecker, D. Wetzel, *pde2path 2.0: Multi-parameter continuation and periodic domains*, in Proceedings of the 8th European Nonlinear Dynamics Conference, ENOC, 2014 (2014).
- [5] D. Gilbarg, N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, 1998.
- [6] B. S. Goh, *Stability in models of mutualism*, Am. Nat. 113 (1979), 261–275.
- [7] T. Heihoff, T. Yokota, *Global existence and stabilization in a diffusive predator-prey model with population flux by attractive transition*, Nonlinear Anal. RWA, 69 (2023), Article 103757.
- [8] K. Kuto, K. Oeda, *Bifurcation structure of coexistence states for a prey-predator model with large population flux by attractive transition*, Proc. R. Soc. Edinb. Sect. A, Math., 152 (2022), 965–988.
- [9] Y. Lou, W.-M. Ni, *Diffusion vs cross-diffusion: an elliptic approach*, J. Differ. Equ., 154 (1999), 157–190.
- [10] W.-M. Ni, *The Mathematics of Diffusion*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics 82, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2011.
- [11] K. Oeda, K. Kuto, *Positive steady states for a prey-predator model with population flux by attractive transition*, Nonlinear Anal. RWA, 44 (2018), 589–615.
- [12] A. Okubo, L. A. Levin, *Diffusion and Ecological Problems: Modern Perspective*, Second edition. Interdisciplinary Applied Mathematics, 14, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
- [13] J. Shi and X. Wang, *On global bifurcation for quasilinear elliptic systems on bounded domains*, J. Differ. Equ., 246 (2009), 2788–2812.
- [14] H. Uecker, *Hopf bifurcation and time periodic orbits with pde2path - algorithms and applications*, Commun. Comput. Phys., 25 (2019), 812–852.
- [15] U. Uecker, D. Watzel, J. M. Rademacher, *pde2path - A Matlab package for continuation and bifurcation in 2D elliptic systems*, Numer. Math. Theory Methods Appl., 7 (2014), 58–106.
- [16] H. F. Weinberger, *Invariant sets for weakly coupled parabolic and elliptic systems*, Rend. Mat., 8 (1975), 295–310.