

# Chaos induced coherence in two independent food chains

Adriana Auyuanet\* and Arturo C. Martí†

*Instituto de Física, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, Iguá 4225, 11400 Montevideo, Uruguay*

Raúl Montagne‡

*Laboratório de Física Teórica e Computacional, Departamento de Física,  
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, 50670-901 Recife, PE, Brazil§*

(Dated: February 9, 2020)

Coherence evolution of two food web models can be obtained under stirring by chaotic advection. Each model sustains a three-level trophic system composed of interacting predators, consumers and vegetation. These populations are in competition for a common limiting resource in open flows with chaotic advection dynamics. Here we show that two species (the top-predators) of different colonies chaotically advected by a jet-like flow can synchronize their evolution even without migration interaction. The phase differences (calculated through the Hilbert transform) of the variables calculated yield the signature of a pair of correlated variables. The coherence evolution of the two variables is shown to be a robust phenomenon that can be adjusted through the flow parameters.

PACS numbers: 05.45.-a, 05.65.+b

When dealing with transport processes in complex fluids flows, the concept of turbulence, comes to mind. In two dimensional flows, a situation where chaotic trajectories are generated, can be obtained by a simple and regular velocity field. This situation is called chaotic advection or Lagrangian turbulence. In most cases turbulence, chaotic advection and disorder have been considered as synonymous concepts. Less known is the paradoxical “ordering” effect of the chaotic advection. Here we show that a chaotic advection in hydrodynamical flow can induce a coherence evolution in two chaotic systems. This simple and robust mechanism is examined using a realistic ecological systems in a open aquatic environment.

In most natural habitats, numerous competing species are able to coexist, while generally only few resources (niches) limit these communities. This fact contradicts the classical theoretical and empirical studies predicting competitive exclusion of all but the most perfectly adapted species for each limiting factor. Recent developments in the field of chaotic advection in hydrodynamical/environmental flows encourage us to revisit the population dynamics of competing species in open aquatic systems. Modelling population dynamic in ecological systems imply a variety of levels of description are available, since many physical and biological processes are involved. A basic model should contain equations considering the interaction between the components of the system under study and the interactions between the system itself and the external world. A typical model that takes into account this features is a trophic web food chain, among them we choose a trophic web food chain with a complex behavior. The complex behavior, that is a local disorder, is a requirement believed to be necessary for observing non trivial collective behavior [1].

Simple models for three-species food chains exhibit a broad range of non-equilibrium dynamics, from charac-

teristic natural cycles to more complex chaotic oscillations [2]. Two chaotically oscillating food web models coupled diffusively may also synchronize [3, 4]. Synchronization phenomenon in coupled chaotic systems have been extensively studied [5, 6]. Those systems can display different degrees of synchronization, namely complete synchronization, phase synchronization, lag synchronization, and generalized synchronization [7]. Synchronization by periodic external action, in the presence of noise [6], noise induced [8] has also attracted considerable interest. In this work we couple two chaotic systems by an external action: the chaotic advection of the flow they are immersed in.

We use a simple model of two three-species food chains dynamic immersed in a meandering jet flow. The flow used is an unsteady laminar flow known as chaotic advection. One important consequence of chaotic advection is the exponential separation of nearby fluid elements. The spatial dependence of the two colonies of food chains embedded in the time-dependent incompressible flow is described by the advection-reaction equations in a Lagrangian representation of the form:

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{dt} = \mathbf{v}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}, t) \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{du_i}{dt} = F_i(u_{1,2}, v_{1,2}, w_{1,2}, \mathbf{r} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}(t)) \quad (2)$$

where the second set of equations describes the populations dynamics inside a fluid parcel that is being advected by the flow described by the first equation (1) [9]. The flow is assumed to be imposed externally, so that the population dynamics has no influence on the velocity field. Neglecting diffusion, the interaction between the flow and the population evolution can only appear as a consequence of the spatial dependence of the

$F_i(u_{1,2}, v_{1,2}, w_{1,2}, \mathbf{r})$  functions.  $F_i$  varies from point to point, being evaluated at the position of the fluid element at time  $t$ , that is, at  $\mathbf{r}(t)$ .

The population dynamic represented by the function  $F_i(u_{1,2}, v_{1,2}, w_{1,2}, \mathbf{r})$  will be explicitly modeled by two trophic chain food. In each portion of well mixed fluid the time evolution of the model describes two standard three level "vertical" food chains, where the resource (i.e. nutrients)  $u_{1,2}$  are consumed by  $v_{1,2}$  (i.e. phytoplankton), which in turn are preyed on by top predators  $w_{1,2}$  (i.e. zooplankton). The coupled differential equations for the biomass of the different species are:

$$\frac{du_1}{dt} = a(u_1 - u_0(\mathbf{r})) - \alpha_1 f_1(u_1, v_1), \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{dv_1}{dt} = -b_1 v_1 + \alpha_1 f_1(u_1, v_1) - \alpha_2 f_2(v_1, w_1), \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{dw_1}{dt} = -c(w_1 - w^*) + \alpha_2 f_2(v_1, w_1), \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{du_2}{dt} = a(u_2 - u_0(\mathbf{r})) - \alpha_1 f_1(u_2, v_2), \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{dv_2}{dt} = -b_2 v_2 + \alpha_1 f_1(u_2, v_2) - \alpha_2 f_2(v_2, w_2), \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{dw_2}{dt} = -c(w_2 - w^*) + \alpha_2 f_2(v_2, w_2). \quad (8)$$

The coefficients  $a$ ,  $b_{1,2}$ ,  $c$ , represent the respective net growth rates of each individual species in the absence of interactions among them ( $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ ). This model has a fixed point in the absence of species interactions, namely  $(u_{1,2}^*, v_{1,2}^*, w_{1,2}^*)$  (stable or unstable). We choose a stable fixed point  $u_{1,2}^* = 0, v_{1,2}^* = 0, w_{1,2}^* > 0$ . The two colonies can be distinguished by a frequency mismatch of  $\Delta f \approx b_2 - b_1$ . This model is still undefined until one specifies the kind of interaction among species. The functions  $f_i$  describes interactions among the species with strengths  $\alpha_i$ . We use a Lotka–Volterra term ( $f_1(u, v) = \frac{uv}{1+k_1u}$ ) for describing the competition among species  $u$  and  $v$ . The interaction among species  $v$  and  $w$  is given by the standard interactions of Holling type II ( $f_2(u, v) = uv$ ). Equations (3),(6) describes the relaxation of the resources ( $u_{1,2}$ ), at a rate  $a$ , towards an inhomogeneous shape  $u_0(\mathbf{r})$ . This will be the only explicitly inhomogeneous term, describing a spatially dependent resource (nutrient in a plankton model) input which could arise naturally from a variety of processes such as localized upwelling, river run-off, translated as a source or a sink in the flow model.

The 2-dimensional flow which the two colony of species are immersed in consists of a jet flowing eastward with meanders, of amplitude  $B(t)$  and wavenumber  $k$  in the North-South direction which are themselves advected by the jet at a phase velocity  $c$  [10, 11]. The cartesian components of the flow  $\mathbf{v} = (-\partial\psi/\partial y, \partial\psi/\partial x)$  are expressed, in nondimensional units, in terms of the stream function

$\psi$

$$\psi(x, y) = 1 - \tanh \frac{y - B(t) \cos k(x - ct)}{(1 + k^2 B(t)^2 \sin^2 k(x - ct))^{1/2}}. \quad (9)$$

The amplitude  $B(t)$  is time periodic  $B(t) = B_0 + \epsilon \cos(\omega t + \theta)$ .

This flow representing an open flow, advects most of the fluid particles (nutrients in our model) from the left to the right. The source (or sink) of resources (nutrients)  $u_0(\mathbf{r})$  is localized at the origin of coordinates, according to  $u_0(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1 + A \sin(\frac{2\pi x}{L}) \sin(\frac{2\pi y}{L}) & \text{if } x, y \in (0, L), \\ 0 & \text{elsewhere,} \end{cases}$

where the amplitude  $A$  is constant.

The evolution of the colonies is integrated numerically in the flow according to the method proposed by Ottino [12] and later used by others [9, 13]. The two-dimensional physical space accessible to fluid particles is subdivided into regions characterized by different Lagrangian behaviors. The model we use, without the spatial dependence, was shown [4] to have synchronized behavior among the top predators species of the two colonies when migration, of rate  $D$ , is allowed. Actually in the absence of migration  $D = 0$ , Blasius et al. [3, 4] showed that the two colonies would normally be unsynchronized. This unsynchronized behavior can be observed in most of the time evolution of the top predators, as can be seen in figure 1. In this figure we show the temporal evolution of the  $w_{1,2}$  for a fixed parcel in the Lagrangian point of view.

We observe in Fig. 1 that initially the two web chain are not synchronized. Then, the parcels enter into the region where the nutrients are spatially inhomogeneous, the two colonies surprisingly start to evolve synchronous. In the left–superior corner a zoom of the first time interval is shown. For this period of time the fluid parcel goes through a region where the nutrients are homogeneous. It can be seen an unsynchronized evolution as was expected for these parameter values [4]. In the right-superior corner a zoom of the synchronous evolution can be observed. This correspond to the period of time when the spatial dependence, that is, the non-homogeneous sources or sinks advects the resources (nutrients). It is obvious from this figure that the evolution of the two subsystems have changed of attractor, adjusting their rhythm due to the interaction of the flow.

The coherence evolution of the top predators of the two colonies  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  can be explicitly shown plotting  $w_2$  vs  $w_1$ . This is done in figure 2. In the top panel (Fig. 2 a)  $w_2$  vs.  $w_1$  is plotted during the time where the source is not forcing the system. The clouds of points clearly shows the uncorrelated behavior of the two variables. In Fig. 2 b), on the contrary,  $w_2$  and  $w_1$  display a coherent evolution.

It is well known that two chaotic systems could display different synchronized regimes [4, 6, 7]. Thus, we inves-




FIG. 1: Chaotic time series of top predators,  $w_{1,2}$  in the web model. The top images correspond to zooms of the main image. The image on the left shows the unsynchronized evolution when the parcel goes through a region where the nutrients are homogeneous. On the contrary, when the parcel enters into a region where the nutrients are inhomogeneous (right) the top predators evolve synchronized. Parameters for the web food model area  $a = 1$ ,  $b_1 = 1.1$ ,  $b_2 = 1.055$ ,  $c = 10$ ,  $k_1 = 0.5$ ,  $\alpha_1 = 0.2$ ,  $\alpha_2 = 1.0$ ,  $w^* = 0.006$ ,  $u_{1,2}(0) = 5.0$ ,  $v_{1,2}(0) = 5.0$ ,  $w_{1,2}(0) = 0.0$ . For the flow  $B_0 = 1.2$ ,  $\epsilon = 0.3$ ,  $\omega = 0.4$ ,  $c = 0.12$ ,  $A = 0.2$ .

tigate which regime of synchronization the two colonies are engaged in, and also the influence of the degree of mixing power of the flow.

A closer look at the synchronized evolution reveals that is not a completed synchronization. In fact,  $\overline{w_1 - w_2} \approx b_1 - b_2$  (where  $\overline{\quad}$  means a temporal average of ...). The next step was to study whether the two colonies are displaying a phase synchronization.

To describe the phase synchronization, we need to introduce corresponding quantities. In order to compute the phase we use the approach based on the Hilbert Transform [6]  $w_i = |w_i(t)|e^{i\phi_i(t)}$ . Figure 3 plots the relative phase difference  $\Delta\omega(t) = \phi_1(t) - \phi_2(t)$  as a function of time. When the two colonies are synchronized,  $\Delta\omega(t)$  is, on average, constant in time and the two populations lock to the same frequency. The two colonies are unsynchronized when the average phase difference  $\Delta\omega(t)$  grows with time. Figure 3 clearly shows those typical behaviors. As the parcel reaches the region where the source (or sink) of nutrients is located, ( $u_0(\mathbf{r}) \neq 0$ ), the phase difference between the two patches drops to a constant and it grows everywhere else.

We also add a migration term between species  $v_{1,2}$  and  $w_{1,2}$  as described by Blasius et al. [3] with no notorious change in the behavior of the top predators. As soon as the advection takes effects the coherence behavior appears no matter the previous behavior was. The coherence induced by the chaotic advection is a robust phe-




FIG. 2: Projections of the phase portrait on  $(w_1, w_2)$  plane. Panel (a) and (b) correspond to the cases where the nutrients are homogeneous and inhomogeneous respectively. Notice the perfect synchronization. Parameters for the web food model and the flow are the same as for Fig.1.

nomenon. Different situations may arise though, changing the parameters of the colonies dynamic and the flow parameters.

In most of the synchronization problems there is a coupling coefficient which turns on the synchronization once it overcomes a critical value. Here the synchronization is achieved once the Lagrangian parcel passes over the inhomogeneous advected flow. In this aspect it resembles the synchronization of complex dynamic by external noisy forcing. In this problem it can be shown that the synchronization depends on the mixing power of the chaotic advection.

Next we discuss the relation between the flow and the coherence evolution of the two colonies. It has been shown [10, 11] that the mixing capacity of this type of flow can be modified by three parameters, namely  $B_0, \epsilon, \omega$ . In this work we use the values used by Cencini et al. [11] and later used by others[9]. This choice was motivated mainly by observations in oceans jets. These are the critical values for obtaining "large scale chaos". It is under this situation that exchange of particle between north-south part is more favorable (more mixing). The parameter  $\epsilon = 0.3$  was chosen by Cencini et al. to be greater than the critical value in order to have big power of mixing. Then,  $\epsilon$  was varied obtaining different collective behavior of the two colonies. The phase synchronization is lost for values of  $\epsilon \geq 0.8$ . It is also observed that the top-predators  $w_{1,2}$  stop the adiabatically following of the forcing. Indeed for the values where the flow behaves constant (and  $u_0(\mathbf{r}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ ) the variables  $w_{1,2}$




FIG. 3: Plot of phase difference  $\Delta\omega(t) = \phi_1(t) - \phi_2(t)$  as a function of time. The regions of phase difference growth associated with synchronized evolution correspond to no chaotic advection and regions of phase differences constant, associated with synchronized evolution correspond to chaotic advection turned on. Parameters for the web food model and the flow are the same as for Fig. 1.

are pull back to their original attractor.




FIG. 4: The two top predators time-series  $w_{1,2}$  as a function of time are shown and the flow forcing  $u_0(\mathbf{r})$  for different flow parameters values. It is shown only the parcel where the flow is on. The first two figures (from top to bottom) shows the typical following of the forcing ( $\omega = 0.4, A = 0.2$ ). The other two figures (third and fourth) shows the independent behavior of the variables  $w_{1,2}$  of the dynamical system related to the forcing ( $\omega = 0.5, A = 0.5$ ). Parameters for the web food model are the same as for Fig.1.

In summary we have addressed the evolution of two food web model immersed in a flow. The chaotic advection, a mixing mechanism present in the real ocean was shown to induced a coherence evolution of two species of different colonies. In particular we have considered two food web models of a three species food chain each advected by a jet-like flow. The population model considered here represents quite general population dynamic, and we expect the main issues found here, namely the possibility of finding coherence evolution of two species,

to be present in real observation biological transport situations. There still remain open questions in this issue such as, mapping in the phase parameter space all the possible collective behavior of the two colonies, the transition between the different attractors. Simpler dynamical model (although less ecologically plausible) may help to examine the influence of different flows. Finally, we stress that the coherence evolution of two species as a result of a mixing property of the flow they are immersed in is a powerful process. It has the potential to shape the distribution and abundance of aquatic species in a current flow with important implications to ecological dynamics in fluid flows.

We acknowledge financial support from the Programa de Desarrollo de Ciencias Básicas (PEDECIBA, Uruguay). R.M. acknowledge useful discussions with O. Piro and H. Chaté.

\* Electronic address: auyuanet@fisica.edu.uy

† Electronic address: marti@fisica.edu.uy

‡ Electronic address: montagne@lftc.ufpe.br

§ On leave: Instituto de Física, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, Iguá 4225, 11400 Montevideo, Uruguay

- [1] L. G. Brunnet, H. Chaté, and P. Manneville, *Physica D* **78**, 141 (1994); L. G. Brunnet and H. Chaté, *Physica A* **257**, 347 (1998); H. Chaté, *Int. J. of Modern Phys. B* **12**, 299 (1998).
- [2] W. M. Schaffer, *Ecology* **66**, 93 (1985); A. Hastings and T. Powell, *Ecology* **72**, 896 (1991);
- [3] B. Blasius, A. Huppert, and L. Stone, *Nature* **399**, 354 (1999).
- [4] B. Blasius and L. Stone, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos* **10**, 2361 (2000).
- [5] M. G. Rosenblum, A. S. Pikovsky, and J. Kurths, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 1804 (1996); M. G. Rosenblum, A. S. Pikovsky, and J. Kurths, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 4193 (1997).
- [6] M. G. Rosenblum, A. S. Pikovsky, and J. Kurths, *Synchronization: A universal concept in nonlinear sciences*, vol. 12 of *Cambridge Nonlinear Sciences Series* (Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2001).
- [7] S. Boccaletti, J. Bragard, F. Arecchi, and H. Mancini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 536 (1999).
- [8] R. Toral, C. Mirasso, E. Hernández-García, and O. Piro, *Chaos* **11**, 665 (2001).
- [9] C. López, Z. Neufeld, E. Hernández-García, and P. H. Haynes, *Phys. and Chem. of the Earth B* **26**, 313 (2001).
- [10] A. S. Bower, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **21**, 173 (1991).
- [11] M. Cencini, G. Lacorata, A. Vulpiani, and E. Zambianchi, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* **29**, 2578 (1999).
- [12] J. M. Ottino, *The Kinematics of Mixing: Stretching, Chaos, and Transport* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989).
- [13] A. Martí and F. Sagués, *Physica A* **295**, 77(2001).