Existence and uniqueness of solution of the differential equation describing the TASEP-LK coupled transport process
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Abstract

We study the existence and uniqueness of solution of an evolutionary partial differential equation originating from the continuum limit of a coupled process of totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP) and Langmuir kinetics (LK). In the fields of physics and biology, the TASEP-LK coupled process has been extensively studied by Monte Carlo simulations, numerical computations, and detailed experiments. However, no rigorous mathematical analysis so far has been given for the corresponding differential equations, especially the existence and uniqueness of their solutions. In this paper, the existence of the $W^{1,2}(0,1)$ weak steady-state solution is proved by the method of upper and lower solution, and the uniqueness by a generalized maximum principle. Also, the weak steady-state solution has $C^\infty$ regularity, thereby being a classical solution. We further prove the global existence and uniqueness of the time-dependent solution in $C([0,1] \times [0,\infty)) \cap C^{2,1,1}([0,1] \times (0,\infty))$, which, for any continuous initial value, converges to the steady-state solution uniformly in space (global attractivity). Our results support the numerical calculations and Monte Carlo simulations, and provide theoretical foundations for the TASEP-LK coupled process, especially the most important phase diagram of particle density along the travel track under different model parameters, which is difficult because the boundary layers (at one or both boundaries) and domain wall (separating high and low particle densities) may appear as the length of the travel track tends to infinity. The methods used in this paper may be instructive for studies of the more general cases of the TASEP-LK process, such as the one with multiple travel tracks and/or multiple particle species.

Part I. Introduction

Active transport along filamentous track driven by molecular motors is one of basic mechanisms of intracellular transport, and the case of single isolated motor has been studied extensively [1,2]. In order to describe traffic-like collective movements of many motors simultaneously on the same filamentous track, Aghababaie et al propose a model based on an abstract formulation of Brownian ratchet [3]. Subsequent works however, are generally based on the asymmetric simple exclusion process (ASEP) [4].

In ASEP, two motors cannot occupy the same lattice site (simple exclusion), and motors prefer to move in one direction (asymmetric). ASEP is further specialized to totally asymmetric simple exclusion process (TASEP) as motors only move in one direction (totally asymmetric). Steady-state solutions of TASEP have been obtained by various methods [5,6,7].

Most models of molecular motor traffic in practice [8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17] incorporate Langmuir kinetics (LK) that motors can attach and detach filamentous track (Fig. 1). Such a TASEP-LK coupled process is deeply discussed in [18,19,20,21]. A rich steady state phase diagram, with
FIGURE 1. A diagram to illustrate the TASEP-LK coupled process with \( N + 2 \) sites. Particles move from left to right along a one-dimensional lattice and exclude with each other. The leftmost site 0 and the rightmost one \( N + 1 \) have fixed particle densities \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) respectively. Particles at site \( i \) will hop forward to site \( i + 1 \) if site \( i + 1 \) is vacant. The Langmuir kinetics (LK) means that particles can attach and detach the main body of the lattice with rates \( \omega_A \) and \( \omega_D \) respectively.

The experimental observations of the motor protein Kip3 (in the kinesin-8 family) \([22]\) are reproduced by the simulation of Parmeggiani-Franosh-Frey model \([18]\). In \([23]\), the authors introduce a generalized ASEP-LK coupled process, which captures most of the biochemistry of KIF1A motor, and successfully predicts the position of the domain wall in their experiment.

Until now, steady-state solution of TASEP-LK coupled process has not been obtained explicitly. The recursion method for pure TASEP \([6,7]\) is too technical to generalize to TASEP-LK coupled process. On the contrary, the matrix product ansatz for pure TASEP \([5]\) is tidy, but the network structure of TASEP-LK coupled process prevents a direct implementation of it \([19]\).
By mean field approximation [24], the TASEP-LK coupled process is transformed to a semi-linear initial value parabolic problem with Dirichlet boundary condition [19].

\[
\begin{cases}
\phi_t^\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \phi_{xx}^\epsilon + (2\phi^\epsilon - 1)\phi_x^\epsilon + \Omega_A(1 - \phi^\epsilon) - \Omega_D\phi^\epsilon, & 0 < x < 1, t > 0, \\
\phi^\epsilon(0, t) = \alpha, & \phi^\epsilon(1, t) = 1 - \beta, \\
\phi^\epsilon(x, 0) = \sigma(x), & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

The corresponding time-independent semi-linear elliptic problem with Dirichlet boundary condition is

\[
\begin{cases}
L\rho^\epsilon := \frac{\epsilon}{2} \rho_{xx}^\epsilon + (2\rho^\epsilon - 1)\rho_x^\epsilon + \Omega_A(1 - \rho^\epsilon) - \Omega_D\rho^\epsilon = 0, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\rho^\epsilon(0) = \alpha, & \rho^\epsilon(1) = 1 - \beta.
\end{cases}
\]

In [19], Eq. (0.2) has been solved numerically and exhibits the same phase diagram as the TASEP-LK coupled process. In this paper, we prove rigorously the results in [19] and some further claims. Concretely, Eq. (0.2) has a unique $C^\infty[0, 1]$ solution. The phase diagram of the solution of Eq. (0.2) coincides with the numerical one in [18, 19]. Eq. (0.1) has a unique $C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty)) \cap C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$ solution for continuous initial value. The unique solution of Eq. (0.1) for continuous initial value tends to the solution of Eq. (0.2) uniformly (global attractivity).

Inspired by the idea used to study a diffusive logistic equation originating from population models in disrupted environments [25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30], we analyze Eq. (0.2) by the method of upper and lower solution [31]. The uniqueness of steady-state solution is obtained by the comparison principle for divergence form operator [32, 33]. The nonlinear part of Eq. (0.1) has divergence form, so Proposition 7.3.6 in [34] promises the global existence and uniqueness of its solution. The global attractivity is proved by Theorem 3.1 in [35] since Eq. (0.1) is a monotone dynamical system with a unique steady state.

This paper is organized as follows. In Part II, we introduce the TASEP-LK coupled process briefly and derive its continuum limit Eq. (0.1). By the monotone semiflow theory, we prove the global existence and uniqueness of the $C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty)) \cap C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$ solution of Eq. (0.1) in Part III and the global attractivity of Eq. (0.1) in $C[0, 1]$ in Part IV. In Part V, we prove the uniqueness of the $L^\infty(0, 1)$ solution of Eq. (0.2) by the theory of quasi-linear elliptic equation [33], and show that the $L^\infty(0, 1)$ solution has $C^\infty[0, 1]$ regularity. In Parts VI, VII, VIII, we use the method of upper and lower solution to prove the existence of a weak steady-state solution in $W^{1,2}(0, 1)$ with the same phase diagram specified numerically in [19]. Finally, conclusions and remarks are presented in Part IX.

**Part II. TASEP-LK coupled process**

Fig. 1 gives diagram of the TASEP-LK coupled process. In TASEP, particles of the same species hop unidirectionally along a one-dimensional lattice with constant rate (usually normalized to be unit) and spatial exclusion (particle at site $i$ can hop to site $i + 1$ only if site $i + 1$ is empty). In LK, particles attach and detach the main body of the lattice (sites $i \in [1, N]$) with rates $\omega_A$ and $\omega_D$ respectively [19, 21]. Let $\phi_i(t)$ for $i \in [0, N + 1]$ be the probability that site $i$ is occupied at time $t$. At boundaries, $\phi_0(t) \equiv \alpha$ and $\phi_{N+1}(t) \equiv \beta := 1 - \beta$. By mean field approximation [24], $\phi_i(t)$ satisfies [19, 21]

\[
\begin{cases}
\partial_t \phi_i = \phi_{i-1}(1 - \phi_i) - \phi_i(1 - \phi_{i+1}) + \omega_A(1 - \phi_i) - \omega_D\phi_i, & 1 \leq i \leq N, \\
\phi_0 = \alpha, & \phi_{N+1} = \beta.
\end{cases}
\]

Let $x := i/(N + 1)$, $\phi^\epsilon(x, t) := \phi_i(t)$, and $\epsilon := 1/(N + 1)$. We assume that $\Omega_A := \omega_A/\epsilon$ and $\Omega_D := \omega_D/\epsilon$ are nonzero constants ($\omega_A$ and $\omega_D$ are of order $\epsilon^2$ with $\gamma = 1$) because for $\gamma \neq 1$, the TASEP-LK coupled process reduces to either pure TASEP or LK process [17, 36].

Substitute $\phi^\epsilon(x \pm \epsilon, t) = \phi^\epsilon(x, t) \pm \epsilon \phi_x^\epsilon(x, t) + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^2 \phi_{xx}^\epsilon(x, t) + O(\epsilon^3)$ into Eq. (0.3).

\[
\begin{cases}
\phi_t^\epsilon = \epsilon \left[ \frac{\epsilon}{2} \phi_{xx}^\epsilon + (2\phi^\epsilon - 1)\phi_x^\epsilon + \Omega_A(1 - \phi^\epsilon) - \Omega_D\phi^\epsilon \right] + O(\epsilon^3), & 1/N + \frac{1}{N + 1} \leq x \leq N/N + 1, \\
\phi^\epsilon(0, t) = \alpha, & \phi^\epsilon(1, t) = \beta.
\end{cases}
\]
For $\varepsilon \ll 1$ ($N \gg 1$), neglect $O(\varepsilon^3)$ in Eq. (0.4), and add initial condition $\phi^\varepsilon(x, 0) = \sigma(x)$, we have Eq. (0.1).

A particle entering the lattice from the left end is always accompanied by a hole leaving the lattice from the left end, and a particle leaving the lattice from the right end is always accompanied by a hole entering the lattice from the right end; a particle hopping right along the lattice is always accompanied by a hole hopping left along the lattice; a particle attaching the lattice is always accompanied by a hole detaching the lattice, and a particle detaching the lattice is always accompanied by a hole attaching the lattice. This is called particle-hole symmetry. Mathematically, define $\phi^\varepsilon(x, t) := 1 - \phi^\varepsilon(x, t)$ as the hole density, where $x := 1 - t$. By Eq. (0.1), $\phi^\varepsilon$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
\phi_t + 2\frac{\sigma}{2} \phi_{xx} + (2\phi^\varepsilon - 1)\phi_x + \Omega_D(1 - \phi^\varepsilon - \Omega_A\phi^\varepsilon) = 0, & 0 < x < 1, t > 0, \\
\phi(0, t) = \beta, \quad \phi(1, t) = 1 - \alpha, & t > 0, \\
\phi(x, 0) = 1 - \alpha(x), & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
$$

(0.5)

Eq. (0.5) has the same form as Eq. (0.1), but with $\Omega_A, \Omega_D, \alpha, \beta$ replaced by $\Omega_D, \Omega_A, \beta, \alpha$. Particle-hole symmetry allows one to assume $\Omega_A \geq \Omega_D$ without loss of generality, since otherwise, one may study $\phi^\varepsilon$ instead of $\phi^\varepsilon$. Particularly, if $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega$, one may assume $\alpha \geq \beta$.

### PART III. GLOBAL EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF THE $C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty)) \cap C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$ SOLUTION OF EQUATION (0.1)

It is proved in Parts [V][X][XI] and [XII] that Eq. (0.2) has a unique $C^\infty[0, 1]$ solution $\rho^\varepsilon(x)$. Let $g := \phi^\varepsilon - \rho^\varepsilon$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}
g_t = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} g_{xx} + \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - 1)g_x + \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D)g, & t > 0, 0 < x < 1, \\
g(0, t) = 0, \quad g(1, t) = 0, & t > 0, \\
g(x, 0) = g_0, & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
$$

(0.6)

where $K := \Omega_A/\Omega_D$ and $g_0(x) := \sigma(x) - \rho^\varepsilon(x)$. Define

$$
A g := \frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} g_{xx} + \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - 1)g_x + \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D)g, \quad \varphi(g) := \varepsilon g^2.
$$

(0.7)

Then

$$
\begin{cases}
g_t = Ag + [\varphi(g)]_x, & t > 0, 0 < x < 1, \\
g(0, t) = 0, \quad g(1, t) = 0, & t > 0, \\
g(x, 0) = g_0, & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
$$

(0.8)

**Theorem 0.1.** \(\forall g_0 \in C_0[0, 1], \text{ Eq. (0.8) has a unique solution } g(x, t; g_0) \in C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty)) \cap C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty)). \text{ t}^{1/2}\ g_x \text{ is bounded near } t = 0. \text{ The mapping } \Phi_0(t, g_0) := g(\cdot; t; g_0) : [0, +\infty) \times C_0[0, 1] \mapsto C_0[0, 1] \text{ is continuous (} \Phi_0(t, g_0) \text{ is semiflow in } C_0[0, 1]). \text{ Fixing } \tau > 0, \text{ the mapping } \Phi_0(\tau, g_0) : C_0[0, 1] \mapsto C_0[0, 1] \cap C^1[0, 1] \text{ is continuous.}

**Proof.** Eq. (0.8) is a second order equation with nonlinearities in divergence form. $A$ is a time-independent elliptic second order differential operator with continuous coefficients, and the function \(\varphi(g) = \varepsilon g^2 : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}\) is twice continuously differentiable. By Proposition 7.3.6 in [34], Eq. (0.8) has a unique solution $g \in C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty))$, s.t. $g_x, g_t, Ag \in C([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$. Since

$$
\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2} g_{xx} = Ag - \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - 1)g_x - \varepsilon(2\rho^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D)g \in C([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty)),
$$

(0.9)

$g_x, g_t, Ag \in C([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty)) \Leftrightarrow g \in C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$ in Eq. (0.8).
Boundness of $t^{1/2}g_2$, near $t = 0$ and continuity of $\Phi_0(t, g_0) : [0, +\infty) \times C_0[0, 1] \to C_0[0, 1]$ also come from Proposition 7.3.6 in [34]. Continuity of $\Phi_0(\tau, g_0) : C_0[0, 1] \to C_0[0, 1] \cap C^1[0, 1]$ for fixed $\tau > 0$ comes from estimate (7.1.18) of Theorem 7.1.5 in [34].

COROLLARY 0.2. \( \forall \sigma \in X = \{ f \in C[0,1] \mid f(0) = \alpha, f(1) = 1 - \beta \} \), Eq. (0.1) has a unique solution $\phi^f(x; t; \sigma) \in C([0,1] \times [0, +\infty)) \cap C^2([0,1] \times (0, +\infty))$. $t^{1/2}\phi^f_x$ is bounded near $t = 0$. The mapping $\Phi(t, \sigma) := \rho^\sigma(\cdot; t; \sigma) : [0, +\infty) \times X \to X$ is continuous ($\Phi(t, \sigma)$ is semiflow in $X$). Fixing $\tau > 0$, the mapping $\Phi(\tau, \sigma) : X \to X \cap C^1[0, 1]$ is continuous.

PART IV. GLOBAL ATTRACTIVITY OF EQ. (0.1) IN $C[0,1]$

THEOREM 0.3. \( \forall \sigma \in X \), the semiflow $\Phi(t, \sigma) : (0, +\infty) \times X \to X$ satisfies $\lim_{t \to \infty} \Phi(t, \sigma) = \rho^\sigma$ uniformly in $[0, 1]$.

To prove Theorem 0.3, we first prove some lemmas.

DEFINITION 1. Define the orbit of $\sigma \in X$ as $O(\sigma) := \{ \Phi(t, \sigma) \mid t \geq 0 \}$, and that of $B \subset X$ as $O(B) := \bigcup_{\sigma \in B} O(\sigma)$.

LEMMA 0.4. Let $B \subset X$. If $\exists M_u, M_l \in \mathbb{R}$, s.t. $\forall \sigma \in B$, $M_l \leq \sigma \leq M_u$ in $[0, 1]$ ($B$ is bounded in $X$), then $\forall \sigma' \in O(B)$, $\min(M_l, 0) \leq \sigma' \leq \max(M_u, 1)$ in $[0, 1]$ ($O(B)$ is bounded in $X$).

**Proof.** Define $\phi_u := \phi^\sigma - \max(M_u, 1)$, which satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
(\phi_u)_t &\leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (\phi_u)_{xx} + \epsilon(2\phi_u + 2\max(M_u, 1) - 1)\phi_u - \epsilon(K + 1)\Omega_D\phi_u, & t > 0, 0 < x < 1, \\
\phi_u(0, t) &\leq 0, & \phi_u(1, t) \leq 0, \\
\phi_u(x, 0) &\leq 0. & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{align*}
\]

(0.10)

Prove by contradiction. Fixing $T > 0$, suppose that $\phi_u(x_0, t_0) > 0$ for $(x_0, t_0) \in [0,1] \times (0, T]$. Since $\phi_u(x_0, t_0) \leq 0$ on the parabolic boundary $\{0\} \times [0, T] \cup \{1\} \times [0, T] \cup \{0\} \times \{0\}$, $(x_0, t_0) \in (0,1) \times (0, T]$. Therefore, $(\phi_u)_{xx}(x_0, t_0) \leq 0, (\phi_u)_x(x_0, t_0) = 0$. By Eq. (0.10),

\[
0 \leq (\phi_u)_x(x_0, t_0) \leq \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} (\phi_u)_{xx}(x_0, t_0) + \epsilon(2\phi_u(x_0, t_0) + 2\max(M_u, 1) - 1)\phi_u(x_0, t_0) - \epsilon(K + 1)\Omega_D\phi_u(x_0, t_0) < 0,
\]

(0.11)

conflicts. So $\phi_u \leq 0$ ($\phi^\sigma \leq \max(M_u, 1)$) in $[0, 1] \times [0, T]$. Similarly, $\phi_l := \phi^\sigma - \min(M_l, 0) \geq 0$ ($\phi^\sigma \geq \min(M_l, 0)$) in $[0, 1] \times [0, T]$. Since $\sigma \in B$ and $T > 0$ are arbitrary, the proof is completed.

LEMMA 0.5. Fixing $t_0 > 0$, the mapping $\sigma \mapsto \Phi(t_0, \sigma) : X \to X$ is compact.

**Proof.** Fix $0 < \tau < \tau^* < t_0$ and $p > 2$. Decompose $\sigma \mapsto \Phi(t_0, \sigma) : X \to X$ as follows:

(i) $\sigma \mapsto \Phi(\tau, \sigma) : X \to X$.
(ii) $\Phi(\tau, \sigma) \mapsto \Phi(\tau, \sigma) - \rho^\sigma : X \to C_0[0, 1]$.
(iii) $\rho^\sigma(\cdot; t; \sigma) : C_0[0, 1] \to W^{2,1}_p((0, 1) \times (\tau^*, t_0))$.
(iv) $\phi^\sigma(x, t; \sigma) - \rho^\sigma(\cdot; \sigma) : W^{2,1}_p((0, 1) \times (\tau^*, t_0)) \to W^{2,1}_p((0, 1) \times (\tau^*, t_0))$.
(v) $\phi^\sigma(x, t; \sigma) \mapsto \phi^\sigma(x, t; \sigma) : W^{2,1}_p((0, 1) \times (\tau^*, t_0)) \to W^{1,p}_1((0, 1) \times (\tau^*, t_0))$. 


(vi) $\phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma) \mapsto \phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma) : W^{1,p}((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0)) \to C([0, 1] \times [\tau, t_0])$.

(vii) $\phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma) \mapsto \Phi(t_0, \sigma) : C([0, 1] \times [\tau, t_0]) \to X$.

(i) is bounded by Lemma 0.3. (ii) is a translation transformation in $C[0, 1]$, thereby bounded. $g = \phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma) - \rho^\varepsilon$ with $t \in [\tau, t_0]$ is $C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times (\tau, t_0))$, thereby $W_p^{2,1}((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$ solution of the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_1 &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} g_{xx} + \epsilon^2g + 2(\rho^\varepsilon - 1)g_x + \epsilon[2\rho_x^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D]g, \\
g(0, t) &= 0, \\
g(x, \tau) &= \Phi(t_0, \sigma)(x) - \rho^\varepsilon(x),
\end{aligned}
$$

(0.12)

$\epsilon[2g + (2\rho^\varepsilon - 1)]$ and $\epsilon[2\rho_x^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D]$ are bounded in $[0, 1] \times [\tau, t_0]$ because $g \in C^{2,1}([0, 1] \times [\tau, t_0])$ and $\rho^\varepsilon \in C^{\infty}[0, 1]$. The coefficient of the highest order term is constant in Eq. (0.12). By Theorem 7.15 in [37], $\|g_x\|^p_{L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))} + \|g_t\|^p_{L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))} \leq C\|g\|^p_{L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))}$. By Lemma 0.4 if $\Phi(t_0, \sigma)$ is bounded in $X$, then $\phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma)$, thereby $g = \phi^\varepsilon - \rho^\varepsilon$ is bounded in $C([0, 1] \times [\tau, t_0])$, thereby $L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$. Thus, $g_{xx}$ and $g_t$ are bounded in $L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$.

The constant $C$ may vary below. Prove the boundness of $g_x$ in $L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$ by Sobolev interpolation theorem (Theorem 5.2 in [38]). Because $g$ is only once differentiable according to $t$, one cannot apply the interpolation theorem in two-dimensional domain $(0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0)$ directly. Fortunately, since $g(x, t) \in W^{2,p}(0, 1)$ for fixed $t \in [\tau, t_0)$, we have $\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} \leq C\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} + \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)}$. By convexity,

$$
\left(\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} + \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)}\right)^{p-1} \leq 2^{p-1}\left(\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} + \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)}\right).
$$

Thus, $\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} \leq C\left(\|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} + \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)}\right)$. Thereby,

$$
g_x(x, t) \leq C\int_{t_0}^{t_0} \|g_x(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} dt
$$

$$
\leq C\left(\int_{t_0}^{t_0} \|g_{xx}(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} dt + \int_{t_0}^{t_0} \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1)} dt\right)
$$

$$
= C\left(\|g_{xx}(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0)} + \|g_t(x, t)\|^p_{L^p(0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0)}\right)
$$

(0.14)

is bounded in $L^p((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$. Consequently, $g = \phi^\varepsilon - \rho^\varepsilon$ is bounded in $W_p^{2,1}((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$.

And (iii) is bounded. (iv) is a translation transformation in $W_p^{2,1}((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$, thereby bounded. Since $W_p^{2,1}((0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0)) \subset W^{1,p}(0, 1) \times (\tau, t_0))$, the imbedding (v) is bounded. Since $p > 2$, by Sobolev compact imbedding theorem (Theorem 6.3 in [38]), (vi) is compact. The restriction mapping (vii) is obviously continuous. In conclusion, $\sigma \to \Phi(t_0, \sigma) : X \to X$ is compact.

**Lemma 0.6.** If $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in X$ satisfy $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2$ in $[0, 1]$, then $\forall T > 0$, $\Phi(T, \sigma_1) \geq \Phi(T, \sigma_2)$ in $[0, 1]$ (monotonicity).

**Proof.** By Corollary 0.4 for fixed $T > 0$, $\exists M > 0$ s.t. $|t^{1/2}\phi_x^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma_1)| < M$ in $[0, 1] \times (0, T]$. Define $\phi := \phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma_1) - \phi^\varepsilon(x, t; \sigma_2)$, which satisfies

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_1 &= \frac{\varepsilon}{2} g_{xx} + \epsilon^2g + 2(\phi^\varepsilon - 1)g_x + \epsilon[2\phi_x^\varepsilon - (K + 1)\Omega_D]g, \\
g(0, t) &= 0, \\
g(x, 0) = \sigma_1(x) - \sigma_2(x) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

(0.15)

Prove by contradiction. Suppose that $\min_{(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]} g(x, t) < 0$. Then $\exp(-4cMt^{1/2})g(x_0, t_0) < 0$, where $(x_0, t_0) := \arg\min_{(x, t) \in [0, 1] \times [0, T]} g(x, t)$. Because $g \geq 0$ on the parabolic
boundary \{0\} \times [0, T] \cup \{1\} \times [0, T] \cup [0, 1] \times \{0\}

we have \((x_0, t_0) \in (0, 1) \times (0, T)\). Thus,

\[
0 \geq \left[\exp(-4M t^{1/2})g\right]_t(x_0, t_0)
\]

\[
= -2e M t_0^{-1/2} \exp(-4e M t_0^{-1/2})g(x_0, t_0) + \exp(-4e M t_0^{-1/2})g_t(x_0, t_0)
\]

\[
= \exp(-4e M t_0^{-1/2}) \left\{ \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} g_{xx}(x_0, t_0) + \epsilon [2g(x_0, t_0) + (2\rho_2(x_0, t_0) - 1)]g_x(x_0, t_0)
\right. \\
+ \epsilon \left[2t_0^{-1/2}[t_0^{1/2} (\rho_2 x)(x_0, t_0) - M] - (K + 1)\Omega_D\right] g(x_0, t_0) \right\} > 0
\]

(0.16)

since \(g(x_0, t_0) < 0, t_0^{1/2} (\rho_2 x)(x_0, t_0) - M < 0, g_x(x_0, t_0) = 0, \) and \(g_{xx}(x_0, t_0) \geq 0\), conflicts. So \(g \geq 0\) \((\phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_1) \geq \phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2))\) in \([0, 1] \times [0, T]\). Since \(T > 0\) is arbitrary, the proof is completed. \(\square\)

**Lemma 0.7.** If \(\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in X\) satisfy \(\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_2\) in \([0, 1]\), and \(\sigma_1(x) > \sigma_2(x)\) for some \(x \in [0, 1]\), then there exist \(t_0 > 0\) and open sets \(U, V \subset X\) with \(\sigma_1 \in U\) and \(\sigma_2 \in V\), s.t. \(\forall \sigma_u \in U\) and \(\sigma_v \in V, \Phi(t_0, \sigma_u) \geq \Phi(t_0, \sigma_v)\) in \([0, 1]\) (strong order preserving (SOP)).

**Proof.** Since \(\sigma_1(x) > \sigma_2(x)\), by continuity, \(\exists \tau > 0\) s.t. \(\phi^\epsilon(x, \tau; \sigma_1) > \phi^\epsilon(x, \tau; \sigma_2)\). By Lemma 0.6 \(\phi^\epsilon(x, \tau; \sigma_1) > \phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2)\) for \(x \in [0, 1]\). Define \(g\) as in Lemma 0.6 \(\forall T > \tau, \exists \lambda > 0\) s.t. \(\lambda \geq \epsilon [2(\phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2) - (K + 1)\Omega_D)]\) in \([0, 1] \times [\tau, T]\) (boundness). Define \(h := \exp(-\lambda t)g\). Then

\[
\begin{cases}
  h_t = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} h_{xx} + \epsilon [2g + (2\phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2) - 1)] h_x \\
  + \epsilon [2\phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2) - (K + 1)\Omega_D] - \lambda h, & t > \tau, \ 0 < x < 1, \\
  h(0, t) = 0, h(1, t) = 0, & t > \tau, \\
  h(x, \tau) = \exp(-\lambda \tau)g(x, \tau), & 0 \leq x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(0.17)

Since \(h > 0\) in \([0, 1] \times [\tau, T]\), \(\epsilon [2g + (2\phi^\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2) - 1)]\) and \(\epsilon [2\phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(x, t; \sigma_2) - (K + 1)\Omega_D] - \lambda \leq 0\), by strong maximum principle (Theorem 2.9 in \([37]\)), \(h(x, t) > 0\) in \((0, 1) \times (\tau, T]\) because otherwise, \(h = 0\) for some \((x_h, t_h) \in (0, 1) \times (\tau, T]\), thereby \(h = 0\) in \([0, 1] \times [\tau, t_h]\). Therefore, \(g(x_0, \tau) = \exp(\lambda \tau)h(x_0, \tau) = 0\), conflicts. So \(h = 0\) in \((0, 1) \times (\tau, T]\) and \(h > 0\) in \((0, 1) \times (\tau, T]\). By Lemma 0.6, \(h(x, t) > 0 > h(x, 1, t)\) for \(t \in (\tau, T]\). Thereby, \(g(x, t) > 0\) in \((0, 1) \times (\tau, T]\), and \(g_t(x, 0) > 0 > g_t(x, 1)\) for \(t \in (\tau, T]\). Since \(T > \tau > 0\) are arbitrary, \(g(x, t) > 0\) in \((0, 1) \times (0, +\infty)\), and \(g_t(x, 0) > 0 > g_t(x, 1)\) for \(t \in (0, +\infty)\). For fixed \(t_0 > 0\), \(\phi^\epsilon(x, t_0; \sigma_1) > \phi^\epsilon(x, t_0; \sigma_2)\) in \((0, 1), \phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(x, 0; \sigma_1) > \phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(x, 0; \sigma_2), \) and \(\phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(1, 0; \sigma_1) < \phi^\epsilon_\epsilon(1, 0; \sigma_2)\). Thus, there exist neighbourhoods \(U, V \subset X \cap \mathbb{C}^1[0, 1]\) of \(\phi^\epsilon(x, t_0; \sigma_1) \) and \(\phi^\epsilon(x, t_0; \sigma_2)\) s.t. \(\forall \phi_u \in U\) and \(\phi_v \in V\), \(\phi_u \leq \phi_v\) in \([0, 1]\). By Corollary 0.2 \(\sigma \rightarrow \Phi(t_0, \sigma) : X \rightarrow Z\) is continuous. In conclusion, there exist neighbourhoods \(U, V \subset X\) of \(\sigma_1\) and \(\sigma_2\) s.t. \(\Phi(t_0, U) \subset U\) and \(\Phi(t_0, V) \subset V\). \(\square\)

Finally, we prove Theorem 0.3.

**Proof.** By Lemma 0.4 semiflow \(\Phi(t, \sigma)\) has bounded orbits for bounded initial set. By Lemma 0.5 \(\Phi(t_0, \sigma)\) is compact for fixed \(t_0 > 0\). \(\Phi(t, \sigma)\) is SOP by Lemma 0.7. Since \(\Phi(t, \sigma)\) has unique equilibrium \(\rho^\epsilon\), the result is straightforward by Theorem 3.1 in \([35]\). \(\square\)

**PART V. Uniqueness and \(C^\infty[0, 1]\) Regularity of the \(L^\infty(0, 1)\) Solution of Eq. 0.2**

**Lemma 0.8.** The \(C^1[0, 1]\) solution of Eq. 0.2, if exists, is unique.

The proof follows Theorem 10.7 in \([33]\), which is a generalization of the classical linear maximum principle to the quasi-linear case.
Proof. Let $K := \Omega_A/\Omega_D$. $\mathcal{B}(\rho^1, \rho^2) := \epsilon \rho^2 / 2 + (\rho^2)^2 - \rho^1$, and $C(\rho^1) := -(K + 1)\Omega_D \rho^1 + K \Omega_D$. Then Eq. (0.2) becomes $[\mathcal{B}(\rho^1, \rho^2)]_x + C(\rho^1) = 0$. Suppose both $\rho^1$ and $\rho^2$ are $C^1[0, 1]$ solutions of Eq. (0.2). Define $g := \rho^{1,1} - \rho^{0,0}$ and $\rho^{1,1} := t \rho^{1,1} + (1 - t) \rho^{0,0}$. Then $\forall \phi \in W_0^{1,2}(0, 1)$,

$$
0 = \int_0^1 \left\{ [\mathcal{B}(\rho^{1,1}, \rho^{0,0}) - \mathcal{B}(\rho^{0,0}, \rho^{0,0})] \phi_x - [C(\rho^{1,1}) - C(\rho^{0,0})] \phi \right\} dx.
$$

(0.18)

Note that

$$
\mathcal{B}(\rho^{1,1}, \rho^{0,0}) - \mathcal{B}(\rho^{0,0}, \rho^{0,0}) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{B}(\rho^{1,1}, \rho^{0,0}) dt = \int_0^1 (2 \rho^{1,1} - 1)g + \epsilon \frac{g}{2g_x} dx = b(x)g + \epsilon \frac{g}{2g_x},
$$

(0.19)

where $b := \int_0^1 (2 \rho^{1,1} - 1) dt$. Since $\rho^{0,0}, \rho^{1,1} \in C^1[0, 1], |b| \leq \Lambda$ for some $\Lambda > 0$. Also,

$$
C(\rho^{1,1}) - C(\rho^{0,0}) = -\int_0^1 (K + 1)\Omega_D g dt = -(K + 1)\Omega_D g.
$$

(0.20)

$\forall \delta > 0$, substitute $\phi := \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} \in W_0^{1,2}(0, 1)$ and Eqs. (0.19) (0.20) into Eq. (0.18):

$$
0 = \int_0^1 \left\{ \left( b \log g^+ + \epsilon \frac{g^+}{2g_x} \right) \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} - \frac{g^+ g^+}{g^+ + (g^+ + \delta)^2} \right\} dx
$$

$$
= \int_0^1 \left\{ b \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x \delta + (K + 1)\Omega_D \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} \right\} dx,
$$

(0.21)

where

$$
g^+(x) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
g(x), \quad g(x) \geq 0, \\
0, \quad g(x) < 0.
\end{array} \right.
$$

(0.22)

Since $(K + 1)\Omega_D \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} \geq 0, b \leq \Lambda, \frac{g^+}{g^+ + \delta} \leq 1,$

$$
\frac{\epsilon}{2} \int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x^2 dx \leq \Lambda \int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x dx.
$$

(0.23)

By Hölder’s inequality,

$$
\left[ \int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x dx \right]^{1/2} \leq \left( \int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x^2 dx \right)^{1/2}.
$$

(0.24)

Thus,

$$
\int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x^2 dx \leq \left( \frac{2\Lambda}{\epsilon} \right)^2.
$$

(0.25)

By Poincaré’s inequality,

$$
\int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x^2 dx \leq \left( \frac{2\Lambda}{\epsilon} \right)^2.
$$

(0.26)

$g^+ = 0 (\rho^{1,1} - \rho^{0,0} = g \leq 0)$ because otherwise, $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \int_0^1 \left[ \log \left( 1 + \frac{g^+}{\delta} \right) \right]_x^2 dx = +\infty$ since $g^+$ is continuous in $[0, 1]$. By symmetry, $\rho^{0,0} - \rho^{1,1} \leq 0$. In conclusion, $\rho^{0,0} = \rho^{1,1}$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 0.9.** Any $W^{1,2}(0, 1)$ weak solution $\rho^1$ of Eq. (0.2) has $C^\infty [0, 1]$ regularity.

**Proof.** By mathematical induction, assume $\rho^1$ is a $W^{n,2}(0, 1)$ solution of Eq. (0.2). Since $\frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial x} = -(2 \rho^1 - 1) \rho^1 - \Omega_A (1 - \rho^1) + \Omega_D \rho^1$ and $\rho^1 \rho^1 \in W^{n-1,2}(0, 1)$ (Theorem 7.4 in [33]), $\frac{\partial \rho^1}{\partial x} \in W^{n,2}(0, 1)$. \hfill \Box
\[ W^{n-1,2}(0,1), \text{ thereby } \rho^x \in W^{n+1,2}(0,1). \] Inductively, \( \rho^x \in W^{k,2}(0,1) \) \( \forall k > 0 \) if \( \rho^x \in W^{1,2}(0,1), \) thereby \( \rho^x \in C^\infty[0,1] \) (Section 7.7 in [33]).

**Corollary 0.10.** The \( W^{1,2}(0,1) \) solution of Eq. (0.2), if exists, is unique.

**Proof.** Let \( \rho^{x,0}, \rho^{x,1} \in W^{1,2}(0,1) \) be solutions of Eq. (0.2). By Lemma 0.9, \( \rho^{x,0} \in C^\infty[0,1] \subset C^1[0,1]. \) By Lemma 0.8, \( \rho^{x,0} = \rho^{x,1}. \)

**Theorem 0.11.** Any \( L^\infty(0,1) \) solution \( \rho^x \) of Eq. (0.2) has \( C^\infty[0,1] \) regularity.

**Proof.** The existence of \( W^{1,2}(0,1) \) solution of Eq. (0.2) is proved in Parts XI and XII. By Corollary 0.10 let \( \rho^{x,0} \) be the unique \( W^{1,2}(0,1) \) solution of Eq. (0.2), which is \( C^\infty[0,1] \) by Lemma 0.9. Let \( g := \rho^x - \rho^{x,0} \in L^\infty(0,1), \) which satisfies

\[
\begin{align*}
0 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x} g_{xx} + [g^2 + g(2\rho^{x,0} - 1)]_x - (K + 1)\Omega_D g, \quad 0 < x < 1, \\
g(0) &= 0, \quad g(1) = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

Then

\[
g^2 + g(2\rho^{x,0} - 1) \in L^\infty(0,1) \subset L^2(0,1), \text{ so } [g^2 + g(2\rho^{x,0} - 1)]_x \in W^{-1,2}(0,1). \text{ Then }
\]

\[
\frac{\epsilon}{2} g_{xx} = -[g^2 + g(2\rho^{x,0} - 1)]_x + (K + 1)\Omega_D g \in W^{-1,2}(0,1).
\]

Therefore, \( g \in W^{1,2}_0(0,1). \) Thus, \( \rho^x = \rho^{x,0} + g \in W^{1,2}(0,1). \) By Lemma 0.9, \( \rho^x \in C^\infty[0,1]. \)

**Theorem 0.12.** The \( L^\infty(0,1) \) solution of Eq. (0.2), if exists, is unique.

**Proof.** Let \( \rho^{x,0}, \rho^{x,1} \in L^\infty(0,1) \) be solutions of Eq. (0.2). By Theorem 0.11, \( \rho^{x,0}, \rho^{x,1} \in C^\infty[0,1] \subset C^1[0,1]. \) By Lemma 0.8, \( \rho^{x,0} = \rho^{x,1}. \)

**Part VI. Neighbourhood and Limit**

**Definition 2.** Let \( \rho^x \) and \( \hat{\rho} \) be functions in \( [a, b] \). We say \( \rho^x \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [a, b] \) iff \( \forall x \in [a, b], \)

\[
\inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y) - \Delta < \rho^x(x) < \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y) + \Delta.
\]

We say \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^x = \hat{\rho} \) in \( [a, b] \) iff \( \forall \Delta > 0, \exists \epsilon_0 > 0, \) s.t. \( \forall \epsilon \in (0, \epsilon_0), \rho^x \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [a, b]. \)

**Lemma 0.13.** If \( \exists \rho^x_1, \rho^x_2 \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) s.t. \( \rho^x_1 \leq \rho^x \leq \rho^x_2 \) in \( [a, b], \) then \( \rho^x \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [a, b]. \)

**Proof.** \( \forall x \in [a, b], \)

\[
\inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y) - \Delta < \rho^x_1(x) \leq \rho^x(x) \leq \rho^x_2(x) < \Delta + \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y).
\]

**Lemma 0.14.** If \( \rho_1 \in O(\rho_2, \Delta_1) \) and \( \rho_2 \in O(\rho_3, \Delta_2) \) in \( [a, b], \) then \( \rho_1 \in O(\rho_3, \Delta_1 + \Delta_2) \) in \( [a, b]. \)
Proof. \( \forall x \in [a, b], \)
\[
\rho_1(x) < \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_1} \rho_2(y) + \Delta_1 \\
\leq \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_1} \left[ \sup_{z \in [a, b]: |z - y| \leq \Delta_2} \rho_3(z) + \Delta_2 \right] + \Delta_1 \\
= \sup_{z \in [a, b]: |z - x| \leq \Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \rho_3(z) + \Delta_1 + \Delta_2. \tag{31.31}
\]
Similarly, \( \rho_1(x) > \inf_{z \in [a, b]: |z - x| \leq \Delta_1 + \Delta_2} \rho_3(z) - \Delta_1 - \Delta_2. \)

\[\square\]

Lemma 0.15. Let \( a = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_m = b. \) If \( \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \in [a, b]. \) If \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon = \hat{\rho} \) in \( [x_{i-1}, x_i] \forall 1 \leq i \leq m, \) then \( \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [a, b]. \)

Proof. \( \forall x \in [a, b], \exists 1 \leq i \leq m \) s.t. \( x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]. \) Since \( \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [x_{i-1}, x_i], \)
\[
-\Delta + \inf_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y) \leq -\Delta + \inf_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho^\epsilon(y) < \rho^\epsilon(x) \\
< \Delta + \sup_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \hat{\rho}(y) \leq \Delta + \sup_{y \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho^\epsilon(y). \tag{32.32}
\]
Since \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon = \hat{\rho} \) in \( [x_{i-1}, x_i], \) \( \exists \epsilon_i > 0, \) s.t. \( \forall \epsilon < \epsilon_i, \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [x_{i-1}, x_i]. \) Let \( \epsilon_0 := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m} \epsilon_i. \) Then \( \forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0, \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) \( \forall 1 \leq i \leq m. \) Therefore, \( \rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) in \( [a, b]. \)

\[\square\]

Definition 3. If \( \forall x \in [a, b], \) either
\[
\inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_2} \rho_2(y) - \Delta_2 \geq \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_1} \rho_1(y) + \Delta_1 \tag{33.33}
\]
or
\[
\sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_2} \rho_2(y) + \Delta_2 \leq \inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_1} \rho_1(y) - \Delta_1, \tag{34.34}
\]
then we say \( O(\rho_1, \Delta_1) \cap O(\rho_2, \Delta_2) = \emptyset \) in \( [a, b]. \) Particularly, we say \( O(\rho_1, \Delta_1) \cap \rho_2 = \emptyset \) in \( [a, b] \) if \( \Delta_2 = 0. \)

Lemma 0.16. If \( O(\rho_1, \Delta) \cap \rho_2 = \emptyset \) in \( [a, b], \) then \( O(\rho_1, \Delta / 2) \cap O(\rho_2, \Delta / 2) = \emptyset \) in \( [a, b]. \)

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume \( \rho_1 > \rho_2 \) in \( [a, b]. \) Prove by contradiction. Suppose \( O(\rho_1, \Delta / 2) \cap O(\rho_2, \Delta / 2) \neq \emptyset \) in \( [a, b]. \) Then \( \exists x_0 \in [a, b] \) s.t.
\[
\sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x_0| \leq \Delta / 2} \rho_2(y) + \Delta / 2 > \inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x_0| \leq \Delta / 2} \rho_1(y) - \Delta / 2. \tag{35.35}
\]
So \( \exists \epsilon > 0 \) and \( x \in [x_0 - \Delta / 2, x_0 + \Delta / 2] \cap [a, b] \) s.t.
\[
\rho_2(x) > \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x_0| \leq \Delta / 2} \rho_2(y) - \epsilon \\
> \inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta / 2} \rho_1(y) - \Delta \geq \inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x_0| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) - \Delta, \tag{36.36}
\]
conflicts \( O(\rho_1, \Delta) \cap \rho_2 = \emptyset. \)

\[\square\]

Lemma 0.17. If \( \rho_1 \) is continuous, and \( \Delta_s := \inf_{x \in [a, b]} |\rho_1(x) - \rho_2(x)| > 0, \) then \( \exists \Delta_s > 0, \) s.t. \( \forall \Delta < \Delta_s, O(\rho_1, \Delta) \cap \rho_2 = \emptyset \) in \( [a, b]. \)
Proof. Define $\mathbb{G}(\Delta) := \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in [a, b]: |x_1 - x_2| \leq \Delta} |\rho_1(x_1) - \rho_1(x_2)|$. Since $\rho_1$ is uniformly continuous in $[a, b]$, $\exists \Delta_m > 0$, s.t. $\mathbb{G}(\Delta) < \Delta_u/2 \ \forall \Delta < \Delta_m$. Then $\forall \Delta < \Delta_u := \min(\Delta_m, \Delta_u/2)$ and $x \in [a, b]$,

$$\inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) - \Delta \geq \rho_1(x) - \mathbb{G}(\Delta) - \Delta > \rho_1(x) - \Delta_u \geq \rho_2(x). \quad (0.37)$$

\[ \square \]

Lemma 0.18. If $\rho_1$ is continuous except at $a = x_{1,0} < x_{1,1} < x_{1,2} < \cdots < x_{1,m} = b$, $\rho_2$ is continuous except at $a = x_{2,0} < x_{2,1} < x_{2,2} < \cdots < x_{2,n} = b$, $\Delta_u := \inf_{x \in [a, b]} [\rho_1(x) - \rho_2(x)] > 0$, and $\Delta_c := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} |x_{1,i} - x_{2,j}| > 0$, then $\exists \Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\rho_1, \Delta_p) \cap O(\rho_1, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$ in $[a, b]$.

Proof. Let $a = c_0 < c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_k = b$ s.t. $\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} |c_i - c_{i-1}| < \Delta_c/2$. Define $d_{i-1} := \max(a, c_{i-1} - \Delta_c/4)$ and $e_i := \min(b, c_i + \Delta_c/4)$. Then $\forall 1 \leq i \leq k$, either $\rho_1$ or $\rho_2$ is (uniformly) continuous in $[d_{i-1}, e_i]$, say $\rho_1$. By Lemma 0.17 $\exists \Delta_{i,s} > 0$, s.t. $\forall \Delta < \Delta_{i,s}$, $O(\rho_1, \Delta) \cap \rho_2 = \emptyset$ in $[d_{i-1}, e_i]$. By Lemma 0.16 $O(\rho_1, \Delta/2) \cap O(\rho_2, \Delta/2) = \emptyset$ in $[d_{i-1}, e_i]$. Assume without loss of generality that $\rho_1 > \rho_2$ in $[d_{i-1}, e_i]$. Then $\forall \Delta_p < \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left[ \frac{\Delta_c}{2}, \frac{x_{2,i} - x_{1,i}}{x_{1,i} - x_{2,i}} \right]$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $x \in [c_{i-1}, c_i]$, we have

$$\inf_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_p} \rho_1(y) - \Delta_p = \inf_{y \in [d_{i-1}, e_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_p} \rho_1(y) - \Delta_p \geq \sup_{y \in [d_{i-1}, e_i]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_p} \rho_2(y) + \Delta_p = \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta_p} \rho_2(y) + \Delta_p. \quad (0.38)$$

Therefore, $O(\rho_1, \Delta_p) \cap O(\rho_2, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$ in $[a, b]$.

\[ \square \]

Lemma 0.19. If $\rho_1$ is continuous except at $a = x_{1,0} < x_{1,1} < x_{1,2} < \cdots < x_{1,m} = b$, $\rho_2$ is continuous except at $a = x_{2,0} < x_{2,1} < x_{2,2} < \cdots < x_{2,n} = b$, all discontinuous points are of the first type, $\Delta_c := \min_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n} |x_{1,i} - x_{2,j}| > 0$, and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_1' = \rho_1$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_2' = \rho_2$ in $[a, b]$, then $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (\rho_1' + \rho_2') = \rho_1 + \rho_2$ in $[a, b]$.

Proof. Define

$$\mathbb{G}_{1,i}(\Delta) := \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in (x_{1,i-1,1,1}, x_{1,i}) \setminus x_1 - x_2 \leq \Delta} |\rho_1(x_1) - \rho_1(x_2)|, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

$$\mathbb{G}_{2,j}(\Delta) := \sup_{x_1, x_2 \in (x_{1,j-1,1,1}, x_{1,j}) \setminus x_1 - x_2 \leq \Delta} |\rho_2(x_1) - \rho_2(x_2)|, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n,$$

$$\mathbb{G}_{\max}(\Delta) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbb{G}_{1,i}(\Delta), \quad \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{G}_{2,j}(\Delta). \quad (0.39)$$

Because $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_1' = \rho_1$, $\forall 0 < \Delta < \Delta_c/2$, $\exists \epsilon_1 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_1$ and $x \in [a, b]$,

$$\rho_1'(x) < \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) + \Delta. \quad (0.40)$$

Similarly, $\exists \epsilon_2 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_2$ and $x \in [a, b]$,

$$\rho_2'(x) < \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho_2(y) + \Delta. \quad (0.41)$$

Then $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0 := \min(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ and $x \in [a, b]$,

$$\rho_1'(x) + \rho_2'(x) < \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) + \sup_{y \in [a, b]: |y - x| \leq \Delta} \rho_2(y) + 2\Delta. \quad (0.42)$$
\( \forall x \in [a, b] \), either \( \rho_1 \) or \( \rho_2 \) is uniformly continuous in \([\max(a, x - \Delta), \min(b, x + \Delta)]\), say \( \rho_1 \). Then

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_1^\ast(x) + \rho_2^\ast(x) &< \sup_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) + \sup_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \Delta} \rho_2(y) + 2\Delta \\
&\leq \inf_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \Delta} \rho_1(y) + \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + \sup_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \Delta} \rho_2(y) + 2\Delta \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \Delta} [\rho_1(y) + \rho_2(y)] + \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta \\
&\leq \sup_{y \in [a, b]:|y-x| \leq \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta} [\rho_1(y) + \rho_2(y)] + \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta.
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly,

\[
\begin{align*}
\rho_1^\ast(x) + \rho_2^\ast(x) &> \inf_{y : |y-x| \leq \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta, y \in [a, b]} [\rho_1(y) + \rho_2(y)] - \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) - 2\Delta.
\end{align*}
\]

So \( \rho_1^\ast + \rho_2^\ast \in O(\rho_1 + \rho_2, \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta) \) in \([a, b]\). Since discontinuous points are of the first type, \( \rho_1 \) and \( \rho_2 \) are piecewise uniformly continuous. Therefore, \( \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \mathcal{G}_\text{max}(2\Delta) + 2\Delta = 0 \). Thus, \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (\rho_1^\ast + \rho_2^\ast) = \rho_1 + \rho_2 \) in \([a, b]\).

**Part VII. Phases of Eq. (0.2) as \( \epsilon \to 0 \) for \( \Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega \)**

By simulations and numerical computations, previous studies \([19, 20, 21]\) find that \( \hat{\rho} := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon \) changes essentially with \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) (boundary-induced phase transition). See \([39, 40]\) for experimental observations. In this part, we summary the phases of \( \hat{\rho} \) for \( \Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega \). Now Eq. (0.2) becomes

\[
L \rho^\epsilon = \frac{\epsilon}{2} \rho^\epsilon_{xx} + (2\rho^\epsilon - 1)(\rho^\epsilon - \Omega) = 0.
\]

By particle-hole symmetry (Part II), assume \( \alpha \geq \beta \). \( \hat{\rho} \) has 6 phases depending on \( \alpha, \beta, \Omega \). We fix \( \Omega = 0.25 \) in this part so that all 6 phases of \( \hat{\rho} \) can be obtained by only varying \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \).

1. \( \overline{\rho}_b > 0.5 \)

Let \( \epsilon = 0 \) in Eq. (0.45). Then \((2\hat{\rho} - 1)(\hat{\rho}_b - \Omega) = 0\). \( \rho_b := \overline{\rho} - \Omega + \Omega x \) with \( \overline{\rho} := 1 - \beta \) is a solution from the right boundary, which generally does not satisfy the left boundary condition, i.e. \( 1 - y_b = \overline{\rho}_b := \rho_b(0) = \overline{\rho} - \Omega \neq \alpha \). Choose \( \beta < 0.25 \) s.t. \( \overline{\rho}_b > 0.5 \). \( \hat{\rho} \) has three phases depending on \( \alpha \).

If \( \beta < \alpha < y_b = \Omega + \beta \), then (Fig. 2a)

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^\alpha, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^\beta, & x_d < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \rho^a := \Omega x + \alpha \) solves \((2\hat{\rho} - 1)(\hat{\rho}_x - \Omega) = 0 \) from the left boundary, and \( x_d := (\Omega + \beta - \alpha)/(2\Omega) \) satisfies \( \rho^\alpha(x_d) + \rho^\beta(x_d) = 1 \).

If \( y_b < \alpha < \overline{\rho}_b \), then (Fig. 2b)

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^\beta, & 0 < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]

If \( \overline{\rho}_b < \alpha \), then (Fig. 2c)

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^\beta, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

2. \( \overline{\rho}_b < 0.5 < \overline{\beta} \)

Choose \( \beta \) s.t. \( \overline{\rho}_b < 0.5 < \overline{\beta} \). \( \hat{\rho} \) has three phases depending on \( \alpha \).
Figure 2. (a) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.25, \beta = 0.125$. (b) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.375, \beta = 0.125$. (c) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.8125, \beta = 0.125$. (d) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.375, \beta = 0.333$. (e) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.4583, \beta = 0.333$. (f) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.75, \beta = 0.333$. (g) $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega = 0.25, \alpha = 0.75, \beta = 0.6667$. (h-l) Phase diagrams of $\hat{\rho}$ with $\Omega = 0.25, \Omega = 0.5, \Omega = 0.75$, and $\Omega \geq 1$. Cases with $\alpha < \beta$ are obtained by particle-hole symmetry. (m-r) $\hat{\rho}_u$ (the upper dotted line), $\hat{\rho}_l$ (the lower dotted line), $\hat{\rho}$ (the real line). $\Omega = 5/8, \alpha = 1/32, \delta_u = 0.1, \Omega_u = \Omega_l = \Omega - 0.04$ in (m). $\Omega = 1, \alpha = 1/8, \delta_u = 3/32, C_u = C_l = 40, \Omega_u = \Omega_l = \Omega - 0.08$ in (n). $\Omega = 1, \alpha = 3/4, \beta = 1/8, \delta_u = 3/32, C_u = 40, \Omega_u = \Omega - 0.08$ in (o). $\hat{\rho}_l = \hat{\rho}, \Omega = 1/4, \alpha = 7/16, \beta = 1/8$ in (p). $\hat{\rho}_u = \hat{\rho}, \Omega = 1/4, \alpha = 3/4, \beta = 1/8, \delta_l = 1/16$ in (q). $\Omega = 1/4, \alpha = 3/4, \beta = 3/4, \delta_u = \delta_l = 1/16$ in (r).
If $\beta < \alpha < y_b$, then $\hat{\rho}$ satisfies Eq. (1.1) (Fig. 2(d)).
If $y_b < \alpha < 0.5$, then (Fig. 2(e))
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases}
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x < x_p, \\
0.5, & x_p \leq x \leq x_q, \\
\rho^b, & x_q < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]  
(2.1)
where $x_p := (0.5 - \alpha)/\Omega$ and $x_q := 1 - (0.5 - \beta)/\Omega$ satisfy $\rho^a(x_p) = 0.5$ and $\rho^b(x_q) = 0.5$.
If $0.5 < \alpha$, then (Fig. 2(f))
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases}
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
0.5, & 0 < x < x_q, \\
\rho^b, & x_q < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]  
(2.2)

3. $0.5 < \beta \leq \alpha$
Choose $\beta$ s.t. $0.5 < \beta \leq \alpha$. Then (Fig. 2(g))
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases}
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
0.5, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1.
\end{cases}
\]  
(3.1)

4. Summary of phases for $\Omega_A = \Omega_D$

We summary the phases of $\hat{\rho}$ for $\Omega_A = \Omega_D$ in Table 1. Integrating Table 1, we have Table 2. The complete phase diagram of $\hat{\rho}$ is given in Fig. 2(h) by choosing $\Omega = 0.25$. Some phases may disappear for other $\Omega$ values. In Figs. 2(i-l), we show four typical incomplete phase diagrams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary choices</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &gt; \beta$</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; y_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{y}_b &gt; 0.5$</td>
<td>$y_b &lt; \alpha &lt; y_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_b &lt; \alpha$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha &lt; \bar{y}_b$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$y_b &lt; \alpha &lt; 0.5$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5 &lt; \alpha$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5 &lt; \beta$</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Phases of $\hat{\rho}$ for $\Omega_A = \Omega_D$.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Boundary choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; \beta$, $\beta + \Omega &gt; \alpha$, $\alpha + \beta + \Omega &lt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; \beta$, $\alpha &lt; 0.5$, $\alpha + \beta + \Omega &gt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.5$, $0.5 - \Omega &lt; \beta &lt; 0.5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; \beta + \Omega$, $\alpha + \beta + \Omega &lt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\beta &lt; 0.5 - \Omega$, $\alpha + \beta + \Omega &gt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$\alpha &gt; 0.5$, $\beta &gt; 0.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Phases of $\hat{\rho}$ for $\Omega_A = \Omega_D$.**
PART VIII. PHASES OF Eq. (0.2) AS $\epsilon \to 0$ FOR $\Omega_A/\Omega_D > 1$

By particle-hole symmetry (Part II), assume $K := \Omega_A/\Omega_D > 1$. $\dot{\rho}$ has 11 phases depending on $\alpha, \beta, \Omega_D, K$. We choose $\Omega_D = 0.1$ and $K = 2$ in this part so that the 11 phases of $\dot{\rho}$ can be obtained by only varying $\alpha$ and $\beta$.

5. $\beta > \tau_K$

Let $\epsilon = 0$ in Eq. (0.2).

$$\left(2\dot{\rho} - 1\right)\dot{\rho}_x + \Omega_A(1 - \dot{\rho}) - \Omega_D\dot{\rho} = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Redefine $\rho^a$ and $\rho^b$ as the solutions of Eq. (5.1) from the left and right boundaries respectively. Let $1 - y_b = \eta_b := \rho^b(0)$ and $\tau_K := K/(K + 1)$. Eq. (5.1) is equivalent to

$$\dot{\rho}_x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\dot{\rho} - \tau_K)}{2(\dot{\rho} - 0.5)}, \quad (5.2)$$

which is singular for $\dot{\rho} = 0.5$.

If $\rho^a(0) = \alpha < 0.5$, then $\rho^a_0 > 0$ by Eq. (5.2), and $\rho^a$ increases to 0.5; if $\rho^a(0) = \alpha \in (0.5, \tau_K)$, then $\rho^a_0 < 0$ by Eq. (5.2), and $\rho^a$ decreases to 0.5. In both cases, assume $\rho^a(x_p) = 0.5$, and if $x_p > 1$, define $y_a := \rho^a(1)$. If $\rho^a(0) = \alpha > \tau_K$, then $\rho^a_0 > 0$ by Eq. (5.2), and $\rho^a > \tau_K > 0.5$.

If $\rho^b(1) = \beta < 0.5$, then $\rho^b_0 > 0$ by Eq. (5.2), and $\rho^b < 0$; if $\rho^b(1) = \beta > \tau_K$, then $\rho^b_0 > 0$ by Eq. (5.2), and $\rho^b$ tends to $\tau_K$ from above as $x$ decreasing. Choose $\beta$ s.t. $\beta > \tau_K$. $\dot{\rho}$ has 4 phases depending on $\alpha$.

If $\alpha < y_b$ and $y_a < \beta$, then (Fig. 3(a))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

If $\alpha < y_b$, and either $x_p > 1$ and $\beta < y_a$ or $x_p < 1$, then (Figs. 3(b,c))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^b, & x_d < x \leq 1, 
\end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

where $x_d \in (0, 1)$ satisfies $\rho^a(x_d) + \rho^b(x_d) = 1$. $x_d$ is unique because $\rho^a$ and $\rho^b$ are increasing in $[0, 1], \rho^a(0) + \rho^b(0) = \alpha + \eta_b < 1$, and: if $x_p > 1$ and $\beta < y_a$, then $\rho^a(1) + \rho^b(1) = y_a + \beta > 1$; if $x_p < 1$, then $\rho^a(x_p) + \rho^b(x_p) > 0.5 + \tau_K > 1$.

If $y_b < \alpha < \eta_b$, then (Fig. 3(d))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\beta, & 0 < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (5.5)$$

If $\eta_b < \alpha$, then (Fig. 3(e))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\beta, & 0 < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

6. $0.5 < \beta < \tau_K$

Choose $\beta$ s.t. $0.5 < \beta < \tau_K$, $\dot{\rho}$ has 4 phases depending on $\alpha$.

If $\alpha < y_b$ and $y_a < \beta$, then (Fig. 3(f))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$
\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{(a) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.0242, \beta = 0.2740$. (b) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.1124, \beta = 0.2740$. (c) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.1764, \beta = 0.2740$. (d) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.4022, \beta = 0.2740$. (e) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.8478, \beta = 0.2740$. (f) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.0718, \beta = 0.4167$. (g) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.1570, \beta = 0.4167$. (h) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.2503, \beta = 0.4167$. (i) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.4285, \beta = 0.4167$. (j) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.8215, \beta = 0.4167$. (k) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.0288, \beta = 0.7140$. (l) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.1124, \beta = 0.7140$. (m) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.2651, \beta = 0.7140$. (n) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.4316, \beta = 0.7140$. (o) $\Omega_D = 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.8184, \beta = 0.7140$.}
\end{figure}
If $\alpha < y_b$ and either $x_p > 1$ and $\beta < y_a$ or $x_p < 1$, then (Figs. 3g,h)

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^b, & x_d < x \leq 1,
\end{cases} \quad (6.2)$$

where $x_d \in (0, 1)$ satisfies $\rho^a(x_d) + \rho^b(x_d) = 1$. $x_d$ exists because $\rho^a(0) + \rho^b(0) = \alpha + \overline{y}_b < 1$ and:

if $x_p > 1$ and $\beta < y_a$, then $\rho^a(1) + \rho^b(1) = \alpha + \frac{\beta}{\beta} > 1$; if $x_p < 1$, then $\rho^a(x_p) + \rho^b(x_p) > 0.5 + 0.5 = 1$. Let $x_d^{\inf} := \inf\{x \in (0, 1)|\rho^a(x) + \rho^b(x) = 1\}$. If $\rho^a + \rho^b \geq 1$, then

$$\frac{\partial_x (\rho^a + \rho^b)}{2} = \frac{(K + 1) \Omega_D(\rho^a - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a - 0.5)} + \frac{(K + 1) \Omega_D(\rho^b - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^b - 0.5)}$$

So $\rho^a(x) + \rho^b(x) > 1$ for $x \in (x_d^{\inf}, 1)$, and $x_d$ is unique.

If $y_b < \alpha < \overline{y}_b$, then (Fig. 3i))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b, & 0 < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

If $\overline{y}_b < \alpha$, then (Fig. 3i))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b, & 0 < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (6.5)$$

7. $\overline{\beta} < 0.5$

Choose $\beta$ s.t. $\overline{\beta} < 0.5$. Let $\rho^M$ be the solution of Eq. (6.1) with $\rho^M(1) = 0.5$ and $\rho^M(0) > 0.5$. Define $1 - y_M := \overline{y}_M := \rho^M(0)$. $\hat{\rho}$ has 5 phases depending on $\alpha$.

If $\alpha < y_M$ and $y_a < \beta$, then (Fig. 3k))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\rho^b, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (7.1)$$

If $\alpha < y_M$, $x_p > 1$, and $\overline{\beta} < y_a$, then (Fig. 3l))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} \quad (7.2)$$

If $\alpha < y_M$ and $x_p < 1$, then (Fig. 3m))

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^M, & x_d < x \leq 1, 
\end{cases} \quad (7.3)$$

where $x_d \in (0, x_p)$ satisfies $\rho^a(x_d) + \rho^M(x_d) = 1$. $x_d$ exists because $\rho^a(0) + \rho^M(0) = \alpha + \overline{y}_b < 1$ and $\rho^a(x_p) + \rho^M(x_p) > 0.5 + 0.5 = 1$. Let $x_d^{\inf} := \inf\{x \in (0, 1)|\rho^a(x) + \rho^M(x) = 1\}$. If $\rho^a + \rho^M \geq 1$, then

$$\frac{\partial_x (\rho^a + \rho^M)}{2} = \frac{(K + 1) \Omega_D(\rho^a - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a - 0.5)} + \frac{(K + 1) \Omega_D(\rho^M - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^M - 0.5)}$$

So $\rho^a(x) + \rho^M(x) > 1$ for $x \in (x_d^{\inf}, x_p)$, and $x_d$ is unique.
If $y_M < \alpha < y_M$, then (Fig. 3(n))
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho_M, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1.
\end{cases}
\]  
(7.5)

If $\overline{y}_M < \alpha$, then (Fig. 3(o))
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho_M, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1.
\end{cases}
\]  
(7.6)

8. Summary of phases for $\Omega_A/\Omega_D > 1$

We summarize the phases of $\hat{\rho}$ in Table 3. Integrating Table 3, we have Table 4. The complete phase diagram of $\hat{\rho}$ is given in Fig. 4(a) by choosing $\Omega_A/\Omega_D = K = 2$, $\Omega_D = 0.1$. The phase diagram may change with $\Omega_A$ and $\Omega_D$. We show other two typical phase diagrams in Figs. 4(b,c).

**Part IX. Basic ideas in proving the existence of the $W^{1,2}(0,1)$ solution of Eq. (0.2) with specified phases**

9. The method of upper and lower solution

Eq. (0.2) has the quasi-linear form.
\[
-\left[ D(x, \rho^\epsilon, \rho_x^\epsilon) \right]_x + p(x, \rho^\epsilon, \rho_x^\epsilon) = 0, \quad x \in (0,1),
\]
\[
\rho^\epsilon(0) = \alpha, \quad \rho^\epsilon(1) = \overline{\beta},
\]  
(9.1)

where $D(x, t, \xi) := \frac{\xi}{2} \xi$ and $p(x, t, \xi) := -(2t - 1)\xi - \Omega_A(1 - t) + \Omega_D t$. Let $q = 2$, $q' = q/(q - 1)$, $k_0 = 0$, $c_0 = c_1 = \epsilon/2$, and $k_1 = 0$. Then (1) $D : R \times R \times R \to R$ satisfies the Caratheodory conditions, i.e. $D(x, t, \xi)$ is measurable in $x \in (0,1)$ for fixed $t, \xi \in R$, and continuous with $t$ and $\xi$ for a.e. fixed $x \in (0,1)$; (2) $k_0 \in L^{q'}(0,1)$, and for a.e. $x \in (0,1)$ and $\forall t, \xi \in R$, $|D(x, t, \xi)| \leq k_0(x) + c_0(|t|^{q-1} + |\xi|^{q-1})$; (3) for a.e. $x \in (0,1)$ and $\forall t, \xi, \xi' \in R$ with $\xi \neq \xi'$, $|D(x, t, \xi) - D(x, t, \xi')|(|\xi - \xi'|^{q-2})$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary choices</th>
<th>Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_K &lt; \overline{\beta}$</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; y_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &gt; 1, \beta &lt; y_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &lt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$y_b &lt; \alpha$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5 &lt; \overline{\beta} &lt; \tau_K$</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; y_b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &gt; 1, \beta &lt; y_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &lt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$y_b &lt; \alpha$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\overline{\beta} &lt; 0.5$</td>
<td>$\alpha &lt; y_M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &gt; 1, \beta &lt; y_a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x_p &lt; 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$y_M &lt; \alpha &lt; \overline{y}_M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\overline{y}_M &lt; \alpha$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Phases of $\hat{\rho}$ for $\Omega_A/\Omega_D > 1$. 
Solution $w'$ of Eq. (10.7), with $A = 0.25, w'(0.5) = 0.5, w'(0) = 1, w'(1) = 0$, and $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$. (e-o) $\hat{\rho}_1$ (the upper dotted line), $\hat{\rho}_l$ (the lower dotted line), $\hat{\rho}$ (the real line).

\begin{align*}
\Omega_D &= 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.03, \beta = 0.4502, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.0249, \Omega_D^{u} = \Omega_D + 0.01, \delta_{u,1} = 0.0498 \text{ in (e)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.06, \beta = 0.8074, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.0422, \Omega_D^{l} = \Omega_D + 0.01, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0396 \text{ in (f)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.1, K = 2, \alpha = 0.4200, \beta = 0.1000, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.0457, \Omega_D^{u} = \Omega_D - 0.01, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0407 \text{ in (g)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.2, K = 2, \alpha = 0.9323, \beta = 0.1500, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.0451, \Omega_D^{l} = \Omega_D - 0.01.
\delta_{u,1} &= 0.0305 \text{ in (h)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.02, K = 20, \alpha = 0.4074, \beta = 0.2000, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.0926.
\Omega_D^{u} &= \Omega_D - 0.005, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0488 \text{ in (i)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.013, K = 20, \alpha = 0.9762, \beta = 0.3000.
\delta_{u,1} &= \delta_l = 0.0653, \Omega_D^{l} = \Omega_D - 0.001 \text{ in (j)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.02, K = 20, \alpha = 0.3457, \beta = 0.5800.
\delta_{u,1} &= 0.1029, \Omega_D^{u} = \Omega_D - 0.007, \delta_{l,1} = \delta_{l,2} = 0.0376 \text{ in (k)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.01, K = 20, \alpha = 0.9762, \beta = 0.7500, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.2574, \Omega_D^{l} = \Omega_D - 0.005, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0615 \text{ in (l)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.3, K = 1.5, x_d = 0.5, y_d = 0.3000, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.1500, \Omega_D^{u,a} = \Omega_D + 0.03, \Omega_D^{u,b} = \Omega_D - 0.05, \Omega_D^{l,a} = \Omega_D - 0.02, \delta_{u,1} = 0.0481, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0562 \text{ in (m)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.11, K = 3.5, x_d = 0.5, y_d = 0.2822.
\delta_u &= \delta_l = 0.1500, \Omega_D^{u,a} = \Omega_D + 0.006, \Omega_D^{l,a} = \Omega_D - 0.004, \Omega_D^{l,b} = \Omega_D - 0.02, \delta_{u,1} = 0.0310, \delta_{l,1} = 0.0398 \text{ in (n)}.
\Omega_D &= 0.11, K = 3.5, x_d = 0.5, \delta_u = \delta_l = 0.1500, \Omega_D^{u,a} = \Omega_D + 0.006, \Omega_D^{l,a} = \Omega_D - 0.003, \Omega_D^{l,b} = \Omega_D - 0.05, \delta_{u,1} = 0.0304, \delta_{l,2} = 0.0212 \text{ in (o)}.
\end{align*}
\( \xi' > 0 \); (4) \( k_1 \in L^q (0, 1) \), and for a.e. \( x \in (0, 1) \) and \( \forall t, \xi \in \mathbb{R} \), \( D(x, t, \xi) \xi \geq c_1 |\xi|^q - k_1(x) \). For short, we say \( D \) satisfies **Condition D**.

**Lemma 9.1.** \( w \) is a weak upper (lower) solution of Eq. (0.2) if (1) \( w \in C[0, 1], w(0) \geq (\leq) \alpha \), \( w(1) \geq (\leq) 1 - \beta \); (2) \( \exists \beta = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_k = 1 \), s.t. \( \forall i = [0, k - 1], w \in C^2[x_i, x_{i+1}] \) and \( \frac{\bar{\tau}}{\bar{\xi}} w'' + (2w - 1)w + \Omega_A(1 - w) - \Omega_Dw \leq (\geq) 0 \) in \([x_i, x_{i+1}]\); (3) \( \forall i = [1, k - 1], w(x_i^-) \geq (\leq) w(x_{i+}^+) \).

**Proof.** Use integration by parts (see Definition 4.7 in [31] and Lemma 5.2 in [25]). \( \blacksquare \)

**Theorem 9.2.** If \( \rho_l^\epsilon \) and \( \rho_u^\epsilon \) are weak lower and upper solutions of Eq. (0.2) respectively, and \( \exists m, M \in \mathbb{R} \) s.t. \( m \leq \rho_l^\epsilon \leq \rho_u^\epsilon \leq M \) in \((0, 1)\), then Eq. (0.2) has a weak solution \( \rho^\epsilon \in w^{1, 2}(0, 1) \) s.t. \( \rho_l^\epsilon \leq \rho^\epsilon \leq \rho_u^\epsilon \) a.e. in \((0, 1)\).

**Proof.** \( \forall x \in (0, 1), \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \) and \( t \in [\rho_l^\epsilon(x), \rho_u^\epsilon(x)] \subset [m, M] \),

\[
|p(x, t, \xi)| = |-(2t - 1)\xi - \Omega_A(1 - t) + \Omega_Dt| \\
\leq \max(|2M - 1|, |2m - 1|)\xi + (\Omega_A + \Omega_D) \max(|M|, |m|) + \Omega_A. 
\]

(9.2)

Since the quasi-linear part \( D \) of Eq. (0.2) [see Eq. (9.1)] satisfies **Condition D**, the proof is straightforward by Theorem 4.9 in [31]. \( \blacksquare \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Boundary choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ( y_a &lt; \beta &lt; \bar{y}_a )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ( \bar{y} &lt; y_a, x_p &gt; 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ( \bar{\tau}_K &lt; \bar{y}, y_b &lt; \alpha &lt; \bar{y}_b )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ( \bar{\tau}_K &lt; \bar{y}, \bar{y}_b &lt; \alpha )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ( 0.5 &lt; \bar{\tau} &lt; \bar{\tau}_K, y_b &lt; \alpha &lt; \bar{y}_b )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ( 0.5 &lt; \bar{\tau} &lt; \bar{\tau}_K, \bar{y}_b &lt; \alpha )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ( \bar{\tau} &lt; 0.5, y_M &lt; \alpha &lt; \bar{y}_M )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ( \bar{\tau} &lt; 0.5, \bar{y}_M &lt; \alpha )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ( \bar{\tau}_K &lt; \bar{\tau}, \alpha &lt; y_b, \beta &lt; y_a ) if ( x_p &gt; 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ( 0.5 &lt; \bar{\tau} &lt; \bar{\tau}_K, \alpha &lt; y_b, \beta &lt; y_a ) if ( x_p &gt; 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ( \bar{\tau} &lt; 0.5, \alpha &lt; y_M, x_p &lt; 1 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Phases of \( \rho \) for \( \Omega_A/\Omega_D > 1 \).**
10. A key ordinary differential equation (ODE) related to Eq. (10.2)

**Lemma 10.1.** For $\overline{A} := 1 - A \geq 1/2$, the limit $\hat{w} := \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon$ (in the sense of Definition 2) of the solution $w^\epsilon$ of

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2} w_x^\epsilon = -(w^\epsilon - A)(w^\epsilon - \overline{A}), \quad w^\epsilon(x_0) = w_0$$

(10.1)

satisfies (Fig. 3(d))

$$\hat{w} = \begin{cases} w_0, & x = x_0, \quad \text{if } w_0 \geq \overline{A}; \\
\overline{A}, & x > x_0, \quad \text{if } w_0 = A; \\
w_0, & x = x_0, \quad \text{if } w_0 \leq A; \\
\overline{A}, & x > x_0, \quad \text{if } A < w_0 < A. 
\end{cases}$$

(10.2)

**Proof.** Let $\hat{w}(x) := w^\epsilon(y)$ with $y := \epsilon(x - x_0) + x_0$. Then

$$\hat{w}_x(x) = \epsilon w_x^\epsilon(\epsilon) = \epsilon^2 \left[-(w^\epsilon(y) - A)(w^\epsilon(y) - \overline{A})\right] = -2(\hat{w}(x) - A)(\hat{w}(x) - \overline{A}).$$

(10.3)

$\hat{w}(x)$ is independent of $\epsilon$, and $w^\epsilon$ is its contraction in $x$ direction centred at $x_0$. $w^\epsilon(x_0) = \hat{w}(x_0) = w_0$. Obviously, $\lim_{x \to +\infty} \hat{w}(x) \downarrow \overline{A}$ if $w_0 \geq \overline{A}$; $\lim_{x \to -\infty} \hat{w}(x) \uparrow A$ if $w_0 \leq A$; $\lim_{x \to +\infty} \hat{w}(x) \uparrow A$ if $A < w_0 < \overline{A}$. Consequently, $\forall \Delta > 0$, if $w_0 \geq \overline{A}$, then $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon(x) = \overline{A}$ uniformly in $[x_0 + \Delta, +\infty]$ because $\overline{A} \leq w^\epsilon(x) = \hat{w}(x_0 + (x - x_0)/\epsilon) \leq \hat{w}(x_0 + \Delta/\epsilon) \to \overline{A}$; if $w_0 \leq A$, then $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon(x) = A$ uniformly in $(-\infty, x_0 - \Delta]$ because $\overline{A} \leq w^\epsilon(x) = \hat{w}(x_0 + (x - x_0)/\epsilon) \geq \hat{w}(x_0 - \Delta/\epsilon) \to A$; if $A < w_0 < \overline{A}$, then $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon(x) = \overline{A}$ uniformly in $[x_0 + \Delta, +\infty]$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon(x) = A$ uniformly in $(-\infty, x_0 - \Delta]$ because $\overline{A} \leq w^\epsilon(x) = \hat{w}(x_0 + (x - x_0)/\epsilon) \geq \hat{w}(x_0 - \Delta/\epsilon) \to A$. In conclusion, $\forall \Delta > 0$, $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$; if $w_0 \geq \overline{A}$, then $\forall x \in [x_0 + \Delta, +\infty)$,

$$\inf_{y \geq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta < \hat{w}(x) = \overline{A} \leq w^\epsilon(x) < \overline{A} + \Delta = \hat{w}(x) + \Delta \leq \sup_{y \geq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta,$$

and $\forall x \in [x_0, x_0 + \Delta),$

$$\inf_{y \geq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta < \hat{w}(x + \Delta) = \overline{A} \leq w^\epsilon(x) \leq w_0 = \hat{w}(x_0) \leq \sup_{y \geq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta;$$

if $w_0 \leq A$, then $\forall x \in (-\infty, x_0 - \Delta],$

$$\inf_{y \leq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta \leq \hat{w}(x) - \Delta = A - \Delta < w^\epsilon(x) \leq A = \hat{w}(x) \leq \sup_{y \leq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta,$$

and $\forall x \in (x_0 - \Delta, x_0],$

$$\inf_{y \leq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta < \hat{w}(x_0) = w_0 \leq w^\epsilon(x) \leq A = \hat{w}(x - \Delta) < \sup_{y \leq x_0; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta;$$

if $A < w_0 < \overline{A}$, then $\forall x \in [x_0 + \Delta, +\infty),$

$$\inf_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta \leq \hat{w}(x) - \Delta = \overline{A} - \Delta < w^\epsilon(x) < \overline{A} = \hat{w}(x) < \sup_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta,$$

$\forall x \in (-\infty, x_0 - \Delta],$

$$\inf_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta < \hat{w}(x) = A < w^\epsilon(x) < A + \Delta = \hat{w}(x) + \Delta \leq \sup_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta,$$

and $\forall x \in (x_0 - \Delta, x_0 + \Delta),$

$$\inf_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) - \Delta < \hat{w}(x - \Delta) = A < w^\epsilon(x) < \overline{A} = \hat{w}(x) < \sup_{y; y - x \leq \Delta} \hat{w}(y) + \Delta.$$

PROPER TIES TASEP-LK COUPLED TRANSPORT PROCESS
Differentiating Eq. (10.1), one reaches the continuum limit of pure TASEP $0 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + (2w^\rho - 1)w^\rho_x$, which generates a domain wall from down to up \([41, 65, 7]\), and is used to construct the upper and lower solutions of Eq. (0.2) with similar domain walls \([19, 20, 21]\).

11. Basic ideas in proving the phases of Eq. (0.2)

**Lemma 11.1.** If $\forall \Delta > 0$, $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $\exists \rho_u^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$ as an upper solution of Eq. (0.2) and $\rho_l^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$ as a lower solution, s.t. $\rho_l^\epsilon \leq \rho_u^\epsilon$ in $[0, 1]$, then Eq. (0.2) has a solution $\rho^\epsilon$ s.t. $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 9.2, Eq. (0.2) has a solution $\rho^\epsilon$ s.t. $\rho_l^\epsilon \leq \rho \leq \rho_u^\epsilon$. Since $\hat{\rho}_u, \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, by Lemma 11.1 $\rho^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$.

**Lemma 11.2.** If $\forall \Delta > 0$, $\exists \epsilon_0 > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, $\exists \rho_u^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, $\Delta > 0$, $\rho_u^\epsilon$, $\rho_l^\epsilon$, and $\epsilon_u, \epsilon_l > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_r) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_r) = \emptyset$, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_u^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_u$, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_l$, $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_u$, $\rho_u$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2), and $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon_l$, $\rho_l$ is a lower solution, then Eq. (0.2) has a solution $\rho^\epsilon$ s.t. $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}$.

**Proof.** Because $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_u^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_u$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_l$, $\exists \epsilon > 0$, s.t. $\forall \epsilon < \epsilon$, $\rho_u^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}_u, \min(\Delta, \Delta_r))$ and $\rho_l^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}_l, \min(\Delta, \Delta_r))$. Since $\hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$ and $\hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, by Lemma 11.4 $\rho_u^\epsilon, \rho_l^\epsilon \in O(\hat{\rho}, 2\Delta)$. Since $O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta_r) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_r) = \emptyset$, $\rho_l^\epsilon \leq \rho_u^\epsilon$ in $[0, 1]$. Let $\epsilon_0 := \min(\epsilon_r, \epsilon_u, \epsilon_l)$. By Lemma 11.1 one has the result.

By Lemma 11.2, one may prove that Eq. (0.2) has a solution $\rho^\epsilon$ s.t. $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho = \hat{\rho}$ (in the sense of Definition 2) by the following process: (1) $\forall \Delta > 0$, construct $\hat{\rho}_u, \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$; (2) prove that $\hat{\rho}_u$ and $\hat{\rho}_l$ satisfy Lemma 0.18 thereby $\exists \Delta > 0$ s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_r) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_r) = \emptyset$; (3) construct $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_u^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_u$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}_l$ by Lemmas 0.19 and 10.1; (4) prove that $\rho_u^\epsilon$ and $\rho_l^\epsilon$ satisfy Lemma 9.1 thereby being the upper and lower solutions of Eq. (0.2) for $\epsilon$ small enough.

**Part X. Existence of the $W^{1,2}(0,1)$ solution of Eq. (0.2) with specified phase for $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega$**

We prove $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho = \hat{\rho}$ for phases of $\Omega_A = \Omega_D = \Omega$ in Table 2 by investigating the conditions of Lemma 11.2.

12. Phase 1: $\alpha > \beta$, $\beta + \Omega > \alpha$, $\alpha + \beta + \Omega < 1$

In this case (Fig. 2(m)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \alpha + \Omega x, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\ \beta - \Omega + \Omega x, & x_d < x \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

(12.1)

where $x_d = (\Omega + \beta - \alpha)/(2\Omega)$. For $\delta_u > 0$, define $x_u^w := x_d - \delta_u$ and $x_u^w := x_d - \delta_u/2$. Let $w^\rho_u$ solve $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} w^\rho_u = -(w^\rho_u - y_d)(w^\rho_u - \overline{\rho}_d)$ with $w^\rho_u(x_d^w) = 0.5$, where $1 - \overline{\rho}_d = y_d := (\Omega + \beta + \alpha)/2$. 

By Lemma [10.1]

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} y_d, & 0 \leq x < x_d^u, \\ 0.5, & x = x_d^u, \\ \overline{y}_d, & x_d^u < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$ (12.2)

Define (Fig. 2m) $\hat{\rho}_u := \hat{w}_u + v_u$ with

$$v_u := \begin{cases} \Omega_l(x - x^l_t), & x \leq x^l_t, \\ \Omega_u(x - x^u_t), & x > x^u_t. \end{cases}$$ (12.3)

Symmetrically, for $\delta_l > 0$, define $x^d_l := x_d + \delta_l$ and $x^l_l := x_d + \delta_l/2$. Let $w^\epsilon_t$ solve $\frac{d}{dt}(w^\epsilon_t)_x = -(w^\epsilon_t - y_d)(w^\epsilon_t - \overline{y}_d)$ with $w^\epsilon_t(x^d_l) = 0.5$. By Lemma [10.1]

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_t = \hat{w}_l := \begin{cases} y_d, & 0 \leq x < x^d_l, \\ 0.5, & x = x^d_l, \\ \overline{y}_d, & x^d_l < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$ (12.4)

Define (Fig. 2m) $\hat{\rho}_l := \hat{w}_l + v_l$ with

$$v_l := \begin{cases} \Omega_l(x - x^l_l), & x \leq x^l_l, \\ \Omega(x - x^l_l), & x > x^l_l. \end{cases}$$ (12.5)

$\forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \Omega - \Omega_u > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$ and $\hat{\rho}_u > \hat{\rho}$. Similarly, choose $\delta_l, \Omega - \Omega_l > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$ and $\hat{\rho}_l < \hat{\rho}$. By Lemma [0.18] $\exists \Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$.

Define $\rho^\epsilon_u := w^\epsilon_u + v_u$ and $\rho^\epsilon_l := w^\epsilon_l + v_l$. By Lemma [0.19] $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (w^\epsilon_u + v_u) = \hat{w}_u + v_u = \hat{\rho}_u$. Similarly, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_l = \hat{\rho}_l$.

Differentiate $\frac{d}{dx}(w^\epsilon_u)_x = -(w^\epsilon_u - y_d)(w^\epsilon_u - \overline{y}_d)$. Then $\frac{d}{dt}(w^\epsilon_u)_x + (2w^\epsilon_u - 1)(w^\epsilon_u)_x = 0$. Thus,

$$L\rho^\epsilon_u = \begin{cases} 2v_u(w^\epsilon_u)_x, & x \leq x^u_t, \\ 2v_u(w^\epsilon_u)_x + (2\rho^\epsilon_u - 1)(\Omega_u - \Omega), & x > x^u_t. \end{cases}$$ (12.6)

For $x \leq x^u_t$, $L\rho^\epsilon_u \leq 0$ because $(w^\epsilon_u)_x > 0$ and $v_u \leq 0$. For $x > x^u_t$, because $\rho^\epsilon_u$ is increasing and $\Omega_u < \Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (2\rho^\epsilon_u - 1)(\Omega_u - \Omega) \leq \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} [2\rho^\epsilon_u(x^u_t) - 1](\Omega_u - \Omega)$$
$$= \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} [2w^\epsilon_u(x^u_t) - 1](\Omega_u - \Omega) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} [2\overline{y}_u - 1](\Omega_u - \Omega) < 0.$$ (12.7)

Since $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (w^\epsilon_u)_x = 0$ uniformly in $[x^u_t, 1]$ and $v_u$ is bounded, for $\epsilon$ small enough, $L\rho^\epsilon_u < 0$ in $[x^u_t, 1]$. $\rho_u$ is continuous because $w_u$ and $v_u$ are continuous. At the cusp $x^u_t$, $(\rho^\epsilon_u)_x (x^u_t) = (w^\epsilon_u)_x(x^u_t) + \Omega > (w^\epsilon_u)_x(x^u_t) + \Omega_u = (\rho^\epsilon_u)_x(x^u_t)$. At the boundaries, $\rho^\epsilon_u(0) = w^\epsilon_u(0) - y_d + \hat{\rho}_u(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u(1) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_u(1) - \overline{y}_d + \hat{\rho}_u(1) = \hat{\rho}_u(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \overline{\rho}$. By Lemma [9.1] $\rho^\epsilon_u$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2) for $\epsilon$ small enough. Similarly, $\rho^\epsilon_l$ is a lower solution.

13. **Phase 2**: $\alpha > \beta, \alpha < 0.5, \alpha + \beta + \Omega > 1$

In this case (Fig. 2n),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \alpha + \Omega x, & 0 \leq x \leq x_p, \\ \beta - \Omega + \Omega x, & x_p < x < x_q, \\ \overline{\beta} - \Omega + \Omega x, & x_q < x \leq 1, \end{cases}$$ (13.1)

where $x_p = (0.5 - \alpha)/\Omega$ and $x_q = 1 - (0.5 - \beta)/\Omega$. For $\delta_u > 0, C_u > 0$, and $\Omega_u > 0$, define $y_u := 0.5 + \delta_u$, $z_u := 0.5 + \delta_u/2$, $q_u(x) := z_u + C_u(x - x_q), x^u_1 := -\sqrt{\delta_u/(2C_u)} + x_q$ as the smaller
root of \( q_u(x) = y_u, \ x_u^0 := \Omega_u/(2C_u) + x_q \) as the root of \( (q_u)_x(x) = \Omega_u, \) and (Fig.2(n))

\[
\hat{\rho}_u := \begin{cases} 
y_u + \Omega(x - x_p), & 0 \leq x \leq x_p, 
y_u, & x_p < x \leq x_1^u, 
q_u(x_u^u) + \Omega_u(x - x_u^u), & x_1^u < x \leq x_2^u, 
\end{cases} \tag{13.2}
\]

Symmetrically, for \( \delta_l > 0, C_l > 0, \) and \( \Omega_l > 0 \), define \( y_l := 0.5 - \delta_l, z_l := 0.5 - \delta_l/2, q_l(x) := z_l - C_l(x - x_p)^2, x_1^l := \sqrt{\delta_l/(2C_l)} + x_p \) as the larger root of \( q_l(x) = y_l, x_2^l := -\Omega_l/(2C_l) + x_p \) as the root of \( (q_l)_x(x) = \Omega_l, \) and (Fig.2(n))

\[
\hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} 
q_l(x_2^l) + \Omega_l(x - x_2^l), & 0 \leq x \leq x_2^l, 
n_l, & x_2^l < x \leq x_1^l, 
y_l + \Omega(x - x_q), & x_q < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \tag{13.3}
\]

\( \forall \Delta > 0, \) choose \( \delta_u, 1/C_u, \Omega - \Omega_u > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) and \( \hat{\rho}_u > \hat{\rho} \). Similarly, choose \( \delta_l, 1/C_l, \Omega - \Omega_l > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) and \( \hat{\rho}_l < \hat{\rho} \). By Lemma \ref{lem:18} \( \exists \Delta_p > 0, \) s.t. \( O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset. \)

Define \( \rho^r_u := \hat{\rho}_u \) and \( \rho^r_l := \hat{\rho}_l. \)

\[
L\rho^r_u = \begin{cases} 
0, & 0 \leq x < x_p, 
-2\delta_u - \Omega_u \leq 0, & x_p < x \leq x_1^u, 
(2\rho^r_u - 1)(\Omega - \Omega_u), & x_1^u < x \leq x_2^u, 
\end{cases} \tag{13.4}
\]

For \( x_1^u < x \leq x_2^u, \) \( L\rho^r_u < 0 \) for \( \epsilon \) small enough because \( q_u \geq z_u = 0.5 + \delta_u/2 > 0.5 \) and \( (q_u)_x \leq \Omega_u < \Omega. \) For \( x_2^u < x \leq 1, \) \( L\rho^r_u < 0 \) because \( \rho^r_u \geq q_u(x_2^u) > 0.5 \) and \( \Omega_u < \Omega. \) \( \rho^r_u \) is continuous.

At the cusps \( x_1^u, (\rho^r_u)_x(x_1^u) = 0 > (q_u)_x(x_1^u) = (\rho^r_u)_x(x_1^u). \) At the boundaries, \( \rho^r_u(0) = \hat{\rho}_u(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho^r_u(1) = \hat{\rho}_u(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta. \) By Lemma \ref{lem:9}, \( \rho^r_u \) is an upper solution of Eq. (13.2).

Similarly, \( \rho^r_l \) is a lower solution.

14. Phase 3: \( \alpha > 0.5, 0.5 - \Omega < \beta < 0.5 \)

In this case (Fig.2(o)),

\[
\hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, 
0.5 - \Omega + \Omega x, & 0 < x < x_q, 
\beta - \Omega + \Omega x, & x_q < x \leq 1, 
\end{cases} \tag{14.1}
\]

where \( x_q = 1 - (0.5 - \beta)/\Omega. \) For \( \delta_u > 0, C_u > 0, \) and \( \Omega_u > 0 \), define \( 1 - \gamma_u = y_u := 0.5 + \delta_u, \)

\[
z_u := 0.5 + \delta_u/2, \quad q_u(x) := z_u + C_u(x - x_q)^2, \quad x_1^u := -\sqrt{\delta_u/(2C_u)} + x_q \quad \text{as the smaller root of} \quad q_u(x) = y_u, \quad x_u^2 := \Omega_u/(2C_u) + x_q \quad \text{as the root of} \quad (q_u)_x(x) = \Omega_u, \quad \text{and} \quad (Fig.2(o))
\]

\[
\hat{\rho}_u := \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, 
y_u, & 0 < x < x_1^u, 
q_u(x_u^u) + \Omega_u(x - x_u^u), & x_1^u < x \leq x_2^u, 
\end{cases} \tag{14.2}
\]

For \( \delta_l > 0, \) define \( y_l := 0.5 - \delta_l \) and (Fig.2(o))

\[
\hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} 
y_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x_q, 
y_l + \Omega(x - x_q), & x_q < x \leq 1. 
\end{cases} \tag{14.3}
\]

\( \forall \Delta > 0, \) choose \( \delta_u, 1/C_u, \Omega - \Omega_u > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \delta_u < \alpha - 0.5, \) \( \hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) and \( \hat{\rho}_u \geq \hat{\rho} \).

Also, choose \( \delta_l < 0.5, \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \) and \( \hat{\rho}_l < \hat{\rho} \). By Lemma \ref{lem:18} \( \exists \Delta_p > 0, \) s.t. \( O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset. \)
Let \( w^\varepsilon_u \) solve \( \varepsilon (w^\varepsilon_u)_x = -(w^\varepsilon_u - y_u)(w^\varepsilon_u - \overline{y}_u) \) with \( w^\varepsilon_u(0) = \alpha \). \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w^\varepsilon_u = y_u \) uniformly in \( [\chi, 1] \) \( \forall \chi \in (0, 1) \). Thus, for \( \varepsilon \) small enough, \( q_u(x) = w^\varepsilon_u(x) \) has two roots. Let \( x^u_1, x^u_2 \) be the smaller one. Define

\[
\rho^\varepsilon_u := \begin{cases} 
  w^\varepsilon_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x^u_1, \\
  q_u, & x^u_1 < x \leq x^u_2, \\
  q_u(x^u_2) + \Omega_u(x - x^u_2), & x^u_2 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(14.4)

Thus, for \( x \in [x^u_1, 1] \), \( \rho^\varepsilon_u = \hat{\rho}_u \). For \( x \in [0, x^u_1] \), \( \hat{\rho}_u \leq \rho^\varepsilon_u \leq w^\varepsilon_u \). By Lemma 0.13 \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^\varepsilon_u = \hat{\rho}_u \) in \( [0, x^u_1] \). By Lemma 0.15 \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^\varepsilon_u = \hat{\rho}_u \) in \( [0, 1] \). Define \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 := \hat{\rho}_1 \). For \( x^u_1 < x \leq x^u_2 \), \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 < 0 \) for \( \varepsilon \) small enough because \( q_u \geq s_u = 0.5 + \delta_u/2 > 0.5 \) and \( (q_u)x \leq \Omega_u < \Omega \) in \( [0, x^u_1] \). For \( x^u_2 < x \leq 1 \), \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 < 0 \) because \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 \geq q_u(x^u_2) > 0.5 \) in \( [x^u_1, 1] \) and \( \Omega_u < \Omega \). \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 \) is continuous in \( [0, 1] \). At the cusp \( x^u_1, x^u_2 \), \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\rho^\varepsilon_1)_x[(x^u_1)^+ - (x^u_2)^-] = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (w^\varepsilon_u)_x(x^u_1)^+ = 0 > (q_u)_x(x^u_1) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (q_u)_x(x^u_1)^+ = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\rho^\varepsilon_u)_x[(x^u_1)^+] \). At the boundaries, \( \rho^\varepsilon_1(0) = w^\varepsilon_u(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho^\varepsilon_1(1) = \hat{\rho}_u(1) = \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta \). By Lemma 9.1 \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 \) is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

(14.5)

\[
L \rho^\varepsilon_1 := \begin{cases} 
  -\Omega(2w^\varepsilon_1 - 1) < -\Omega(2y_1 - 1) = -2\Omega \delta_u < 0, & 0 \leq x \leq x^\varepsilon_u, \\
  (2\rho^\varepsilon_1 - 1)(\Omega_u - \Omega), & x^\varepsilon_u < x \leq x^u_2, \\
  (2\rho^\varepsilon_1 - 1)(\Omega_u - \Omega), & x^u_2 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(14.6)

\[
\rho^\varepsilon_1 = \hat{\rho}_1 \text{ is continuous. At the cusp } x_q, \ (\rho^\varepsilon_1)_x(x_q^-) = 0 < \Omega = (\rho^\varepsilon_1)_x(x_q^+). \text{ At the boundaries, } \rho^\varepsilon_1(0) = \hat{\rho}_1(0) < \hat{\rho}_1(0) = \alpha \text{ and } \rho^\varepsilon_1(1) = \hat{\rho}_1(1) < \hat{\rho}_1(1) = \beta. By Lemma 9.1 \rho^\varepsilon_1 \text{ is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).}
\]

15. Phase 4: \( \alpha > \beta + \Omega, \alpha + \beta + \Omega < 1 \)

In this case (Fig. 2(p)),

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
  \alpha, & x = 0, \\
  \beta - \Omega - \Omega x, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(15.1)

For \( \delta_u > 0 \), define \( \overline{\rho}_u := \beta + \delta_u \) and (Fig. 2(p)) \( \hat{\rho}_u := \overline{\rho}_u - \Omega + \Omega x > \hat{\rho} \). Also, define (Fig. 2(p)) \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 := \hat{\rho}_1 \). \( \forall \Delta > 0 \), choose \( \delta_u > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 \in \Omega(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \). By Lemma 0.18 \( \exists \Delta > 0 \) s.t. \( \Omega(\rho_u^\varepsilon, \Delta_p) \cap \Omega(\hat{\rho}_1, \Delta_p) = \emptyset \).

Define \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 := \hat{\rho}_1 \). Let \( w^\varepsilon_1 \) solve \( \varepsilon (w^\varepsilon_1)_x = -(w^\varepsilon_1 - \overline{y}_b)(w^\varepsilon_1 - y_b) \) with \( w^\varepsilon_1(0) = \alpha \), where \( y_b = 1 - \overline{y}_b = \beta + \Omega \). Define \( \rho^\varepsilon_1 := w^\varepsilon_1 + \Omega x \). By Lemma 10.1

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w^\varepsilon_1 = \hat{w}_1 := \begin{cases} 
  \alpha, & x = 0, \\
  \overline{y}_b, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(15.2)

By Lemma 0.19 \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^\varepsilon_1 = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (w^\varepsilon_1 + \Omega x) = \hat{w}_1 + \Omega x = \hat{\rho}_1 \).

\[
L \rho^\varepsilon_1 = 0. \rho^\varepsilon_1 \in C^1[0, 1]. \text{ At the boundaries, } \rho^\varepsilon_1(0) = \hat{\rho}_1(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha \text{ and } \rho^\varepsilon_1(1) = \hat{\rho}_1(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta. By Lemma 9.1 \rho^\varepsilon_1 \text{ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).}
\]

\[
L \rho^\varepsilon_1 = 2\Omega x(w^\varepsilon_1)_x \geq 0. \rho^\varepsilon_1 \in C^1[0, 1]. \text{ At the boundaries, } \rho^\varepsilon_1(0) = w^\varepsilon_1(0) = \alpha \text{ and } \rho^\varepsilon_1(1) = w^\varepsilon_1(1) + \Omega \leq \hat{w}_1(1) + \Omega = \hat{\rho}_1(1) = \rho^\varepsilon_1(1) = \beta. By Lemma 9.1 \rho^\varepsilon_1 \text{ is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).}
\]

16. Phase 5: \( \beta < 0.5 - \Omega, \alpha + \beta + \Omega > 1 \)

In this case (Fig. 2(q)),

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
  \alpha, & x = 0, \\
  \beta - \Omega - \Omega x, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(16.1)
Define \((\text{Fig. 2} q)\) \(\bar{\rho} u := \bar{\rho} = \hat{\rho} = \beta + \Omega x < 0\) and \((\text{Fig. 2} q)\) \(\bar{\rho} := \bar{\rho} - \Omega + \Omega x < \rho\). Let \(\Delta > 0\), choose \(\delta_1 > 0\) small enough s.t. \(\hat{\rho} = O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)\). By Lemma 0.18 \(\exists \Delta \rho > 0\) s.t. \(O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \cap O(\hat{\rho} \Delta) = \emptyset\). Let \(w^\epsilon_u\) solve \(\frac{\xi}{(w^\epsilon_u)_x} = -(w^\epsilon_u - \bar{y}_b)(w^\epsilon_u - y_b)\) with \(w^\epsilon_u(0) = \alpha\), where \(y_b = 1 - \bar{y}_b := \beta + \Omega\). Define \(\rho^\epsilon_u := w^\epsilon_u + \Omega x\). By Lemma 10.1

\[
\lim_{x \to 0} w^\epsilon_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} \alpha, & x = 0, \\ \bar{y}_b, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{16.2}
\]

By Lemma 0.19 \(\lim_{x \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u = \lim_{x \to 0} (w^\epsilon_u + \Omega x) = \hat{w}_u + \Omega x = \hat{\rho} u\). Define \(\hat{\rho} := \hat{\rho} u\). \(L \rho^\epsilon_u = 2\Omega x (w^\epsilon_u)_x \leq 0\). \(\rho^\epsilon_u \in C^1[0, 1]\). At the boundaries, \(\rho^\epsilon_u(0) = w^\epsilon_u(0) = \alpha\) and \(\rho^\epsilon_u(1) = w^\epsilon_u(1) + \Omega \geq \hat{w}_u(1) + \Omega = \rho u(1) = \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta\). By Lemma 9.1 \(\rho^\epsilon_u\) is an upper solution of Eq. 0.2. \(L \rho^\epsilon_u = 0\). \(\rho^\epsilon_u \in C^1[0, 1]\). At the boundaries, \(\rho^\epsilon_u(0) = \hat{\rho}(0) < \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha\) and \(\rho^\epsilon_u(1) = \hat{\rho}(1) < \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta\). By Lemma 9.1 \(\rho^\epsilon_u\) is a lower solution of Eq. 0.2.

17. Phase 6: \(\alpha > 0.5, \beta > 0.5\)

In this case (Fig. 2 r),

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & x = 0, \\ 0.5, & 0 < x < 1, \\ \beta, & x = 1. \end{cases} \tag{17.1}
\]

For \(\delta_u > 0\), define \(y_u := 0.5 + \delta_u\) and (Fig. 2 r)

\[
\hat{\rho} < \hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} \alpha, & x = 0, \\ y_u, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{17.2}
\]

Symmetrically, for \(\delta_t > 0\), define \(y_t := 0.5 - \delta_t\) and (Fig. 2 r)

\[
\hat{\rho} > \hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} y_t, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \beta, & x = 1. \end{cases} \tag{17.3}
\]

Choose \(\delta_1 > 0\) small enough s.t. \(\delta_1 < \alpha - 0.5\) and \(\hat{\rho} u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)\). Similarly, choose \(\delta_t > 0\) small enough s.t. \(\delta_t < \beta - 0.5\) and \(\hat{\rho} t \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)\). By Lemma 0.18 \(\exists \Delta \rho > 0\) s.t. \(O(\hat{\rho} u, \Delta) \cap O(\hat{\rho} t, \Delta) = \emptyset\).

Let \(w^\epsilon_u\) solve \(\frac{\xi}{(w^\epsilon_u)_x} = -(w^\epsilon_u - \bar{y}_t)(w^\epsilon_u - y_t)\) with \(w^\epsilon_u(0) = \alpha\), where \(\bar{y}_t = 1 - y_t := 0.5 - \delta_u\).

Define \(\rho^\epsilon_u := w^\epsilon_u\). By Lemma 10.1 \(\lim_{x \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u = \hat{\rho} u\). Similarly, let \(w^\epsilon_t\) solve \(\frac{\xi}{(w^\epsilon_t)_x} = -(w^\epsilon_t - \bar{y}_t)(w^\epsilon_t - y_t)\) with \(w^\epsilon_t(1) = \beta\), where \(\bar{y}_t = 1 - y_t := 0.5 + \delta_t\). Define \(\rho^\epsilon_t := w^\epsilon_t\). By Lemma 10.1 \(\lim_{x \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_t = \hat{\rho} t\).

\(L \rho^\epsilon_u = -\Omega (2w^\epsilon_u - 1) < -2\Omega \delta_u < 0\). \(\rho^\epsilon_u \in C^1[0, 1]\). At the boundaries, \(\rho^\epsilon_u(0) = w^\epsilon_u(0) \geq \hat{\rho}(0) \geq \rho^\epsilon(0) = \alpha\) and \(\rho^\epsilon_u(1) = w^\epsilon_u(1) \geq \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta\). By Lemma 9.1 \(\rho^\epsilon_u\) is an upper solution of Eq. 0.2. Similarly, \(\rho^\epsilon_t\) is a lower solution.

PART XI. EXISTENCE OF THE \(W^{1,2}(0, 1)\) SOLUTION OF Eq. 0.2 WITH SPECIFIED PHASE FOR \(\Omega_A / \Omega_D = K > 1\)

We prove \(\lim_{x \to 0} \rho^\epsilon = \hat{\rho}\) for phases of \(\Omega_A / \Omega_D = K > 1\) in Table 4 by investigating the conditions of Lemma 11.2.
18. Phase 1: $\gamma < \beta < \overline{\gamma}$

In this case (Fig. 4(e)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \rho^u, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \beta, & x = 1, \end{cases}$$

(18.1)

where $\rho^u$ solves $\rho^u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u - \overline{\gamma})}{2\rho^u - 0.58}$ with $\rho^u(0) = \alpha$. For $\delta_u, \delta_{u,1} > 0$, define $\alpha_u := \alpha + \delta_u, \beta_u := \beta - \delta_{u,1}$, and $\beta_u := 1 - \beta_u$. Let $\rho^u$ solve $\rho^u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u - \overline{\gamma})}{2\rho^u - 0.58}$ with $\rho^u(0) = \alpha_u$, where $\Omega_D > \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. 4(e))

$$\hat{\rho} < \rho_u := \begin{cases} \rho^u, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \beta_u, & x = 1. \end{cases}$$

(18.2)

For $\delta > 0$, define $\alpha_1 := \alpha - \delta$. Let $\rho^u$ solve $\rho^u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u - \overline{\gamma})}{2\rho^u - 0.58}$ with $\rho^u(0) = \alpha_1$. Define (Fig. 4(e)) $\hat{\rho} := \rho^u \wedge \rho, \forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \delta_{u,1} > 0$ small enough s.t. $y_u^u < \beta < \overline{\gamma}_u$ and $\rho_u \in \Omega(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$. Let $w_u$ solve $w_u(x) = -w_u + A$ with $w_u(1) = \beta_u + \delta_u, 2$. Define $\rho^u := \rho^u + w_u - A$. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} A, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \beta_u + \delta_u, & x = 1. \end{cases}$$

(18.3)

By Lemma 10.1

$$L\rho^u_e = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\rho^u_{xx} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D}{2\rho^u - 1}(w^u - A) + 2(\rho^u - A)(w^u_x) + (\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho^u + w_u - A - \overline{\gamma}).$$

(18.4)

Both $\rho^u$ and $w_u$ are increasing. So $\rho^u - \rho^u(1) = 0 \leq \rho^u - A = -\delta_u, 2$ and

$$w_u(x) = -\frac{2}{\epsilon}(w_u - A)(w_u - A) \geq 2\frac{\sigma}{\epsilon}(A - \overline{\gamma}) \geq 2\frac{\sigma}{\epsilon}(\overline{\gamma} - \overline{\gamma}).$$

(18.5)

If $w^u > 0.5$, then $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} w^u = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 2(\overline{\gamma} - \overline{\gamma}) = 0.5 - A = \infty$. Since other terms are bounded, $L\rho^u > 0$. If $w_u < 0.5$, then $\rho_u^u + w_u - A = \rho^u + w_u - \overline{\gamma}_u + \delta_u, 2)$ and $\rho_u^u - A - \delta_u, 2$. So $(\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho^u + w_u - A - \overline{\gamma}) \leq (\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(0.5 - \delta_u, 2).$ Therefore, for $\epsilon$ small enough, $\rho_u^u \leq 0 < \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D}{2\rho^u - 1}(w_u - A) + 2(\rho^u - A)(w_u_x) + (\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho^u + w_u - A - \overline{\gamma}) < 0$. By Lemma 10.2, $\rho_u^u$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).
19. Phase 2: $\bar{\beta} < y_a, x_p > 1$

In this case (Fig. 4(f)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^0, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1,
\end{cases}$$

(19.1)

where $\rho^0$ solves $\rho^0_x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho^0 - \tau_K)}{2(\rho^0 - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^0(0) = \alpha$. For $\delta_u > 0$, define $\alpha_u := \alpha + \delta_u$. Let $\rho^u$ solve $(\rho^u)^x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho^u - \tau_K)}{2(\rho^u - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^u(0) = \alpha_u$, where $\Omega^u_D > \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. 4(f)) $\hat{\rho}_u := \rho^u > \hat{\rho}$.

For $\delta_i > 0$ and $\delta_{l,1} > 0$, define $\alpha_i := \alpha - \delta_l, \beta_i := \beta + \beta_{l,1}$, and $\beta_{l,1} := 1 - \beta_i$. Let $\rho_i^l$ solve $(\rho_i^l)^x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho_i^l - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_i^l - 0.5)}$ with $\rho_i^l(0) = \alpha_i$. Define (Fig. 4(f))

$$\hat{\rho} > \hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} 
\rho_i^l, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta_i, & x = 1.
\end{cases}$$

(19.2)

$\forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \Omega^u_D - \Omega_D > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$. Also, choose $\delta_l, \delta_{l,1} > 0$ small enough s.t. $y_l > \bar{\beta}, \delta_{l,1} < y_a - y_l$, and $\hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, where $y_0 := \rho_i^l(1)$. By Lemma 9.1, there exists $\Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$.

Define $\rho_i^u := \hat{\rho}_u$. Define $1 - \Omega = A := y_i^l + \delta_{l,1} < y_a$. Let $w_i^l$ solve $w_i^l_x = -(w_i^l - A)(w_i^l - \Omega)$ with $w_i^l(1) = \bar{\beta}$. Define $\rho_i^l := \rho_i^l + w_i^l - A$. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w_i^l = \hat{w}_l := \begin{cases} 
A, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1.
\end{cases}$$

(19.3)

By Lemma 0.19, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_i^l = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(\rho_i^l + w_i^l - A) = \rho_i^l + \hat{w}_l - A = \hat{\rho}_l$.

$L\rho_i^u = \frac{(\rho_i^u)^x + \Omega_k - \Omega_D}{(K + 1)(\rho_i^u - \tau_K)}$, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} L\rho_i^u < 0$ because $(\rho_i^u)^x$ is bounded, $\Omega_D > \Omega_D$, and $\rho_i^u - \tau_K < 0$. $\rho_i^u = \rho_i^u \in C^1[0, 1]$. At the boundaries, $\rho_i^u(0) = \hat{\rho}_u(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha$ and $\rho_i^u(1) = \hat{\rho}_u(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \bar{\beta}$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho_i^u$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

$L\rho_i^l = \frac{(\rho_i^l)^x - (1)(\Omega_k - \rho_i^l)}{2(\rho_i^l - 0.5)}$. Because $\rho_i^l$ is increasing, $\rho_i^l - A \leq \rho_i^l(1) - A = y_i^l - A = -\delta_{l,1} < 0$. Because $w_i^l < A < \Omega$, $w_i^l_x = -\frac{2}{\epsilon}(w_i^l - A)(w_i^l - \Omega) < \frac{2}{\epsilon}(\Omega - A)(w_i^l - A) < 0$. Thus, for $\epsilon$ small enough,

$$-(\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D}{2\rho_i^l}) (w_i^l - A) + 2(\rho_i^l - A)(w_i^l)_x$$

$$> -(\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D}{2\rho_i^l}) (w_i^l - A) - \frac{4\delta_{l,1}}{\epsilon}(\Omega - A)(w_i^l - A)$$

$$= -(\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D}{2\rho_i^l}) - \frac{4\delta_{l,1}}{\epsilon}(\Omega - A) (w_i^l - A) > 0,$$

(19.4)

thereby $L\rho_i^l > 0$ since $(\rho_i^l)^x > 0, \rho_i^l \in C^1[0, 1]$. At the boundaries, $\rho_i^l(0) = \alpha_i + w_i^l(0) - A < \alpha$ and $\rho_i^l(1) = y_i^l + \beta - (y_i^l + \delta_{l,1}) = \beta - \delta_{l,1} < \bar{\beta}$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho_i^l$ is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

20. Phase 3: $\tau_K < \bar{\beta}, y_b < \alpha < \bar{y}_b$

In this case (Fig. 4(g)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b, & 0 < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}$$

(20.1)

where $\rho^b$ solves $\rho^b_x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho^b - \tau_K)}{2(\rho^b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b(1) = \bar{\beta}$. For $\delta_u > 0$, define $\bar{\beta}_u := \bar{\beta} + \delta_u$. Let $\rho^u$ solve $(\rho^u)^x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho^u - \tau_K)}{2(\rho^u - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^u(1) = \bar{\beta}_u$, where $\Omega^u_D > \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. 4(g)) $\hat{\rho}_u := \rho^u > \hat{\rho}$. For $\delta_i > 0$ and $\delta_{l,1} > 0$, define $\bar{\beta}_{l,1} := \bar{\beta} - \delta_l$ and $\alpha_i := \alpha - \delta_{l,1}$. Let $\rho_i^l$ solve $(\rho_i^l)^x = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho_i^l - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_i^l - 0.5)}$
with $\rho^b(1) = \overline{\beta}$. Define (Fig. 4(g))

$$\hat{\rho} > \hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} \alpha_l, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b_l, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (20.2)$$

$\forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \Omega_D - \Omega_D^u > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_u \in \overline{O}(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$. Also, choose $\delta_1, \delta_{1,1} > 0$ small enough s.t. $y_b^u < \alpha_l < y_b^u$ and $\hat{\rho}_l \in \overline{O}(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, where $y_b^u = 1 - y_b^u := 1 - \rho^b_l(0)$. By Lemma 0.18 $\exists \Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\rho_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$.

Define $\rho^b_u := \hat{\rho}_u$. Define $1 - \overline{A} = A := y_b^u + \delta_{1,2}$, where $0 < \delta_{1,2} < (\alpha_l - y_b^u)/2$. Then $A = y_b^u + \delta_{1,2}$, where $y_b^u < \alpha_l - \delta_{1,2} < y_b^u - \delta_{1,2} = \overline{A}$. Let $w^\epsilon_l$ solve $\frac{\epsilon}{2}(w^\epsilon_l)_x = -(w^\epsilon_l - \overline{A})(w^\epsilon_l - \overline{A})$ with $w^\epsilon_l(0) = \alpha_l - \delta_{1,2}$. Define $\rho^\epsilon_l := \rho^b_l + w^\epsilon_l - \overline{A}$. By Lemma 0.11

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_l = \hat{w}_l := \begin{cases} \alpha_l - \delta_{1,2}, & x = 0, \\
\overline{A}, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (20.3)$$

By Lemma 0.19 $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_l = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(\rho^b_l + w^\epsilon_l - \overline{A}) = \rho^b_l + \hat{w}_l - \overline{A} = \hat{\rho}_l$.

$L_{\rho^b_u} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\rho^b_u)_x + (\Omega_D - \Omega_D^u)(K + 1)(\rho^b_u - \overline{\beta})$. lim$_{\epsilon \to 0} L_{\rho^\epsilon_u} < 0$ because $(\rho^b_u)_x$ is bounded, $\Omega_D < \Omega_D$, and $\rho^b_u - \overline{\beta}_K > 0$. $\rho^b_u = \rho^b_u \in C^1[0,1]$. At the boundaries, $\rho^b_u(0) = \rho^b_u(0) > \rho(0) = \alpha$ and $\rho^b_u(1) = \rho^b_u(1) > \rho(1) = \overline{\beta}$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho^\epsilon_u$ is an upper solution of Eq. 0.2.

$L_{\rho^\epsilon_u} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\rho^\epsilon_u)_x + (K - 1)(\rho^\epsilon_u - \overline{\beta}_K)$. By Lemma 9.1 $\rho^\epsilon_u$ is a lower solution of Eq. 0.2.

21. Phase 4: $\overline{\tau}_K < \overline{\beta}, \overline{y}_b < \alpha$

In this case (Fig. 4(h)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \alpha_l, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b_l, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (21.1)$$

where $\rho^b_l$ solves $\rho^b_x = \frac{(K + 1)(\rho^b(1) - \overline{\beta})}{2(\rho^b - 0.5)} \quad (21.2)$

For $\delta_{1,1} > 0$, define $\overline{\beta}_l := \overline{\beta} - \delta_{1,1}$. Let $\rho^b_u$ solve $\rho^b_u = \frac{(K - 1)(\rho^b_u - \overline{\beta})}{2(\rho^b_u - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b_u(1) = \overline{\beta}_l$, where $\Omega_{D^u} < \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. 4(h))

$$\hat{\rho} < \rho_u := \begin{cases} \alpha_u, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b_u, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (21.3)$$

For $\delta_{1,1} > 0$, define $\overline{\beta}_l := \overline{\beta} - \delta_{1,1}$. Let $\rho^b_l$ solve $\rho^b_l = \frac{(K - 1)(\rho^b_l - \overline{\beta}_l)}{2(\rho^b_l - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b_l(1) = \overline{\beta}_l$. Define (Fig. 4(h)) $\hat{\rho}_l := \rho^b_l < \hat{\rho}$. $\forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \Omega_D - \Omega_D^u, \delta_{u,1} > 0$ small enough s.t. $\overline{y}_b^u - \delta_{u,1} > 0.5$ and $\hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$. Also, choose $\delta_{1,1} > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$. By Lemma 0.18 $\exists \Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$.

Define $1 - \overline{A} = A := y_b^u + \delta_{u,1} < 0.5$. Let $w^\epsilon_u$ solve $\frac{\epsilon}{2}(w^\epsilon_u)_x = -(w^\epsilon_u - \overline{A})(w^\epsilon_u - \overline{A})$ with $w^\epsilon_u(0) = \alpha$. Define $\rho^\epsilon_u := \rho^b_u + w^\epsilon_u - \overline{A}$. By Lemma 0.11

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} \alpha_l, & x = 0, \\
\overline{A}, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (21.3)$$

By Lemma 0.19 $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(\rho^b_u + w^\epsilon_u - \overline{A}) = \rho^b_u + \hat{w}_u - \overline{A} = \hat{\rho}_u$. Define $\rho^\epsilon_l := \hat{\rho}_l$.

$$L_{\rho^\epsilon_u} = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\rho^b_u)_x - \frac{(K - 1)(\rho^\epsilon_u - \overline{A})}{2(\rho^\epsilon_u - 0.5)} + 2(\rho^b_u - \overline{A})(w^\epsilon_u)_x + (\Omega_D - \Omega_D^u)(K + 1)(\rho^b_u + w^\epsilon_u - \overline{A} - \overline{\beta}_K). \quad (21.4)$$
Because \( \rho_b^0 \) is increasing, \( \rho_u^0 - \overline{A} \geq \rho_u^0(0) - \overline{A} = \delta_{u,1} > 0 \). \( \lim_{x \to 0} L\rho_u^c < 0 \) since \( (\Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b)(K + 1)(\rho_u^0 + w_u^c - \overline{A} - \tau_K) < (\Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b)(K + 1)(\overline{y}_b^c - \tau_K) < 0 \), \( \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^b}{2\rho_u^0 - 1}(w_u^c - \overline{A}) < 0 \), \( (w_u^c)_x < 0 \), and \((\rho_u^0)_x \) is bounded. \( \rho_u^0 \in C^1[0,1] \). At the boundaries, \( \rho_u^0(0) = \overline{y}_b^c + \alpha - (\overline{y}_b^c - \delta_{u,1}) = \alpha + \delta_{u,1} > 0 \) and \( \rho_u^0(1) = \beta_u + w_u^c(1) - \overline{A} > \beta \). By Lemma 9.1, \( \rho_u^0 \) is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

\[ L\rho_u^0 = \frac{1}{x}(\rho_u^0)_x > 0. \rho_u^0 = \rho_u^0 \in C^1[0,1]. \] At the boundaries, \( \rho_u^0(0) = \hat{\rho}_l(0) < \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho_u^0(1) = \hat{\rho}_l(1) < \hat{\rho}(1) = \overline{\beta} \). By Lemma 9.1, \( \rho_u^0 \) is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

### 22. Phase 5: \( 0.5 < \overline{\beta} < \overline{\tau}_K, y_b < \alpha < \overline{y}_b \)

In this case (Fig. 4(i)),

\[ \hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} \alpha, & x = 0, \\ \rho_b^0, & 0 < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \]

(22.1) where \( \rho_b \) solves \( \rho_b^0 = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^b(\rho_b^0 - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_b^0 - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho_b^0(1) = \overline{\beta} \). For \( \delta_u > 0 \), define \( \overline{\beta}_u := \overline{\beta} + \delta_u \). Let \( \rho_u^0 \) solve \((\rho_u^0)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^b(\rho_b^0 - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_u^0 - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho_u^0(1) = \overline{\beta}_u \). Define (Fig. 4(i)) \( \hat{\rho}_u := \rho_u^0 > \hat{\rho} \). For \( \delta_1 > 0 \) and \( \delta_{t,1} > 0 \), define \( \overline{\beta}_l := \overline{\beta} - \delta_l \) and \( \alpha_l := \alpha - \delta_{t,1} \). Let \( \rho_b \) solve \((\rho_b)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^b(\rho_b - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_b - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho_b(1) = \overline{\beta}_l \), where \( \Omega_D^b < \Omega_D^b \). Define (Fig. 4(ii))

\[ \hat{\rho} > \hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} \alpha_l, & x = 0, \\ \rho_b^0, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \]

(22.2)

\( \forall \Delta > 0 \), choose \( \delta_u > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{\rho}_u \in \hat{\rho}(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \). Also, choose \( \delta_1, \Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b, \delta_{t,1} > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{y}_b^c \leq \alpha < \overline{y}_b^c \) and \( \hat{\rho}_u \in \hat{\rho}(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \), where \( 1 - \hat{y}_b^c = \overline{y}_b^c := \rho_l^0(0) \). By Lemma 0.18 \( \exists \Delta \), s.t. \( \hat{\rho}(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta \rho) \cap \hat{\rho}(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta \rho) = \emptyset \).

Define \( \rho_l^c := \hat{\rho}_u \). Define \( 1 - \overline{\beta} = A := \overline{y}_b^c + \delta_{t,2} \), where \( 0 < \delta_{t,2} < (\alpha_l - \hat{y}_b^c)/2 \). Then \( A = \overline{y}_b^c + \delta_{t,2} < \alpha_l - \delta_{t,2} < \overline{y}_b^c - \delta_{t,2} = \overline{A} \). Let \( w_l^c \) solve \( \frac{1}{2}(w_l^c)_x = (\hat{w}_l^c - A)(w_l^c - \overline{A}) \) with \( w_l^c(0) = \alpha_l - \delta_{t,2} \). Define \( \hat{\rho}_l := \rho_l^c + w_l^c - \overline{A} \). By Lemma 10.1,

\[ \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w_l^c = \overline{w}_l := \begin{cases} \alpha_l - \delta_{t,2}, & x = 0, \\ \overline{A}, & 0 < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \]

(22.3)

By Lemma 0.19 \( \lim_{x \to 0} \rho_l^c = \lim_{x \to 0}(\rho_l^0 + w_l^c - \overline{A}) = \rho_b^0 + \overline{w}_l - \overline{A} = \overline{\beta} \).

\( L\rho_l^c = \frac{1}{x}(\rho_l^c)_x < 0. \rho_l^c = \rho_l^c \in C^1[0,1] \). At the boundaries, \( \rho_l^c(0) > \hat{\rho}_l(0) = \rho_b^0(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho_l^c(1) = \hat{\rho}_l(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \overline{\beta} \). By Lemma 9.1, \( \rho_l^c \) is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

\[ L\rho_l^c = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\rho_l^c)_x - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^b(\rho_l^c - \overline{A})}{2\rho_l^c - 1} + 2(\rho_b^0 - \overline{A}) (w_l^c)_x + (\Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b)(K + 1)(\rho_l^c + w_l^c - \overline{A} - \overline{\tau}_K). \]

(22.4)

Since \( \rho_l^c(0) - \overline{A} = \overline{y}_b^c - \overline{A} > \delta_{t,2} > 0, \exists \delta_{t,3} > 0, \text{s.t. } \rho_l^c - \overline{\beta} \text{ is decreasing and } w_l^c - \overline{A} < 0 \),

\[ (\Omega_D^b - \overline{\tau}_K)(K + 1)(\rho_l^c + w_l^c - \overline{A} - \overline{\tau}_K) > (\Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b)(K + 1)[\rho_l^c(0) - \overline{\tau}_K] = (\Omega_D^b - \Omega_D^b)(K + 1)(\overline{y}_b^c - \overline{\tau}_K) > 0. \]

(22.5)

Then \( \lim_{x \to 0} L\rho_l^c > 0 \) since \( \frac{-(K-1)\Omega_D^b(\overline{y}_b^c - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2\rho_l^c - 1} > 0, (w_l^c)_x > 0, \) and \( (\rho_l^c)_x \) is bounded. \( \rho_l^c \in C^1[0,1] \). At the boundaries, \( \rho_l^c(0) = \overline{y}_b^c + \alpha_l - \delta_{t,2} - (\overline{y}_b^c - \delta_{t,2}) = \alpha_l < \alpha \) and \( \rho_l^c(1) = \overline{\beta}_l + w_l^c(1) - \overline{A} < \overline{\beta} \). By Lemma 9.1, \( \rho_l^c \) is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).
23. Phase 6: $0.5 < \beta < \overline{\beta}_K, \overline{y}_b < \alpha$

In this case (Fig. [4](j)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^b, & 0 < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}$$

(23.1)

where $\rho^b$ solves $\rho^b_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^b b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^b b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b(1) = \overline{\beta}$. For $\delta_u > 0$, define $\overline{\beta}_u := \overline{\beta} + \delta_u$. Let $\rho_u$ solve $(\rho_u)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho_u b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho_u b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho_u(1) = \overline{\beta}_u$. Define (Fig. [4](j))

$$\hat{\rho} \leq \hat{\rho}_u := \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho_u, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}$$

(23.2)

For $\delta_l > 0$, define $\overline{\beta}_l := \overline{\beta} - \delta_l$. Let $\rho^l$ solve $(\rho^l)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^l b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^l b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^l(1) = \overline{\beta}_l$, where $\Omega_D < \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. [4](j)) $\hat{\rho}_l := \hat{\rho}^l < \hat{\rho}, \forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u > 0$ small enough s.t. $\overline{y}_b < \alpha$ and $\hat{\rho}_u \in \partial(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$, where $\overline{y}_b := \rho^b(0)$. Also, choose $\delta_l, \Omega_D - \Omega_D > 0$ small enough s.t. $\hat{\rho}_l \in \partial(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)$.

By Lemma 0.18, $\exists \Delta > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta) = \emptyset$.

Define $1 - A = \alpha := \beta$. Let $\omega^u_l$ solve $\omega^u_l(x) = \omega^u_l(0) = \overline{A} - \alpha - y_b > \overline{A}$. Define $\rho^u := \rho^b + \omega^u - \overline{A}$. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \omega^u_l = \omega^u := \begin{cases} 
\overline{A} + \alpha - y_b, & x = 0, \\
\overline{A}, & 0 < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}$$

(23.3)

By Lemma 0.19, $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^u_l = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\rho^u_l + \omega^u_l - \overline{A}) = \rho^u + \omega^u - \overline{A} = \rho^u$. Define $\rho_l := \hat{\rho}_l$.

$$L \rho^u_l = \frac{\omega^u_l(x) - (K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^u b - 0.5)}(\overline{A} - \rho^u(0) - \overline{A}) + 2(\rho^u - \overline{A})(\omega^u(0))_x.$$ Because $\rho^u$ is decreasing, $\rho^u - \overline{A} \geq \rho^u(1) - \overline{A} = \rho_u - \overline{A} = \delta_u > 0$. Then $L \rho^u_l < 0$ since $\frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^u b - 0.5)}(w^u(0))_x < 0$, $\omega^u_l < 0$, and $(\rho^u_l)_x < 0, \rho^u_l \in C^1[0,1]$. At the boundaries, $\rho^u(0) = y_b^u + \overline{A} - \alpha - y_b - \overline{A} = \alpha$ and $\rho^u(1) = \overline{\beta}_u + y_b^u(1) - \overline{A} > \overline{A}$. By Lemma 2.1, $\rho^u_l$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

$$L \rho^u_l = \begin{cases} 
\omega^u_l(x) + (\Omega_D - \overline{\Omega}_D)(K + 1)(\rho^u_l - \overline{r}_K), & (\rho^u_l)_x < 0, \\
(\Omega_D - \overline{\Omega}_D)(K + 1)(\rho^u_l - \overline{r}_K), & (\rho^u_l)_x = 0.
\end{cases}$$

(23.4)

Then $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} L \rho^u_l > 0$ since $(\rho^u_l)_x$ is bounded, $\rho^u_l \in C^1[0,1]$. At the boundaries, $\rho^u(0) = \rho^u_l(0) = \alpha$ and $\rho^u_l(1) = \rho^u_l(1) < \rho^u(1) = \beta$. By Lemma 2.1, $\rho^u_l$ is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

24. Phase 4: $\overline{\beta} < 0.5, y_M < \alpha < \overline{y}_M$

In this case (Fig. [4](k)),

$$\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\alpha, & x = 0, \\
\rho^M, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1
\end{cases}$$

(24.1)

where $\rho^M$ solves $\rho^M_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^M b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^M b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^M(1) = 0.5$ and $\rho^M(0) = \overline{y}_M > 0.5$. For $\delta_u > 0$, define $\overline{\beta}_u := 0.5 + \delta_u$. Let $\rho^u$ solve $(\rho^u)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^u b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^u b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^u(1) = \overline{\beta}_u$. Define (Fig. [4](k))

$$\hat{\rho}_u := \rho^b > \hat{\rho}. \text{ Let } \rho^M \text{ solve } (\rho^M)_x = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^M b - \overline{r}_K)}{2(\rho^M b - 0.5)} \text{ with } \rho^M(1) = 0.5 \text{ and } 1 - y_M^M = \overline{y}_M := \rho^M(0) > 0.5, \text{ where } \Omega_D < \Omega_D. \text{ For } \delta_{1.1} > 0 \text{ and } \delta_{1.2} > 0, \text{ define } \overline{\beta}_l := \overline{\beta} - \delta_{1.1} \text{ and } \alpha_l := \alpha - \delta_{1.2}. \text{ Define (Fig. [4](k))}

$$\hat{\rho} > \hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} 
\alpha_l, & x = 0, \\
\rho^M_l - \delta_{1.1}, & 0 < x < 1, \\
\beta_l, & x = 1
\end{cases}$$

(24.2)
\( \forall \Delta > 0, \) choose \( \delta_\alpha > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \). Also, choose \( \Omega_D - \Omega_D^0, \delta_1, \delta_2 > 0 \) s.t. \( y^1_l + \hat{\delta}_{1,1} < \alpha_l < \overline{y}_M - \hat{\delta}_{1,1} \) and \( \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta) \). By Lemma 0.18, \( \exists \Delta_p > 0, \) s.t. \( O(\rho_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\rho_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset \).

Define \( \rho^{u}_l := \hat{\rho}_u. \) Define \( 1 - A := A := y^1_l + \hat{\delta}_{1,1} + \hat{\delta}_{1,3}, \) where \( \hat{\delta}_{1,3} < (\alpha_l - y^1_l - \hat{\delta}_{1,1})/2. \) Then \( \hat{\Delta} = y^1_l + \hat{\delta}_{1,1} + \hat{\delta}_{1,3} < \alpha_l - \delta_{1,3} - y^1_l - \overline{y}_M = \hat{\Delta}. \) Let \( w^\epsilon_l \) solve \( \frac{x}{\xi}(w^\epsilon_l)_{x} = -(w^\epsilon_l - \hat{\Delta})(w^\epsilon_l - \overline{\Delta}) \) with \( w^\epsilon_l(0) = \alpha_l - \delta_{1,3}. \) Let \( w^\epsilon_{l,1} \) solve \( \frac{\xi}{x}(w^\epsilon_{l,1})_{x} = -\epsilon[|w^\epsilon_{l,1} - (0.5 - \hat{\delta}_{1,1})[|w^\epsilon_{l,1} - (0.5 + \hat{\delta}_{1,1}) |] \] with \( w^\epsilon_{l,1}(1) = \overline{\Delta}, \) where \( 0 < \epsilon < 1. \) Let \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} \) solve \( (\rho^M_{l, \epsilon}, \rho^M_{\epsilon}, \epsilon) = (K + 1)\Omega_D(\rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta}) \) with \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) = \rho^M(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}). \) Define \( \rho^\epsilon_l := \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} + w^\epsilon_l - 5 + w^\epsilon_{l,1} - 0.5. \) By Lemma 0.1.1

\[
\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w^\epsilon_l = \hat{w}_l := \begin{cases} \alpha_l - \delta_{1,3}, & x = 0, \\ \overline{\Delta}, & 0 < x < 1, \\ \hat{\Delta}, & x = 1. 
\end{cases}
\]

(24.3)

Because \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} = \rho^M_{l} \), by Lemma 0.19 \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_l = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(\rho^M_{l, \epsilon} + w^\epsilon_l - 5 + w^\epsilon_{l,1} - 0.5) = \rho^M_{l} + \hat{w}_l - 5 + \hat{w}_{l,1} - 0.5 = \hat{\rho}. \)

Solving \( \rho^M \),

\[
\frac{2}{(K + 1)\Omega_D} \rho^M + \frac{K - 1}{(K + 1)^2\Omega_D} \log [(K + 1)\Omega_D \rho^M - K\Omega_D] = x + C^M,
\]

(24.4)

where \( C^M \) is constant. Define \( \mu := \rho^M(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) - 0.5. \) Then by \( \rho^M(1) = 0.5 \), Eq. (24.4) becomes (leading order) \( 2\mu^2/[(K + 1)\Omega_D] \sim \epsilon^{1/2}. \) Similarly, solving \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}, \)

\[
\frac{2}{(K + 1)\Omega_D} \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} + \frac{K - 1}{(K + 1)^2\Omega_D} \log [(K + 1)\Omega_D \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - K\Omega_D] = x + C^M_{l, \epsilon},
\]

(24.5)

where \( C^M_{l, \epsilon} \) is constant. Define \( \theta := \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) - 0.5. \) By \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) = 0.5 + \mu, \) Eq. (24.5) becomes (leading order) \( \theta^2 = (K + 1)(\Omega_D - \Omega_D^0) \epsilon^{1/2}/2. \)

Let \( \rho^\epsilon_u = \xi(\rho^b_u)_{x} < 0 \). \( \rho^\epsilon_u = \rho^b_u \) is \( \tilde{C}^1[0, 1] \). At the boundaries, \( \rho^\epsilon_u(0) = \hat{\rho}_u(0) > \hat{\rho}(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho^\epsilon_u(1) = \hat{\rho}_u(1) > \hat{\rho}(1) = \beta. \) By Lemma 0.1, \( \rho^\epsilon_u \) is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

\[
L\rho^\epsilon_u = \xi(\rho^b_u)_{x} < 0 \text{ s.t.} \rho^\epsilon_u(\delta_{1,4}) = \rho^\epsilon_u(\delta_{1,4}) + \xi(\rho^b_u)_{x} < 0, \text{ for } \epsilon \text{ small enough.}
\]

\[
\rho^\epsilon_u(\delta_{1,4}) + \xi(\rho^b_u)_{x} < 0 \text{ uniformly in } [\delta_{1,4}, 1], \text{ thereby } \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^\epsilon_u(\delta_{1,4}) = 0 \text{ uniformly in } [0, \delta_{1,4}]. \]

Since \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} < \overline{\Delta}, \) \( w^\epsilon_l < \overline{\Delta}, \) and \( w^\epsilon_{l,1} < 0.5 - \hat{\delta}_{1,1}. \)

\[
(\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(w^\epsilon_l + w^\epsilon_{l,1} + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 - \overline{\Delta}) > -(\Omega_D - \Omega_D)(K + 1)\delta_{1,1} > 0.
\]

(24.7)

Because \( \hat{w}^\epsilon_{l,1}(0) + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 = \delta_{1,1} + \overline{\mathbf{y}}_0 - \overline{\Delta} = \delta_{1,3} > 0, \) by continuity, \( \exists \delta_{1,4} > 0 \) s.t. \( \hat{w}^\epsilon_{l,1}(\delta_{1,4}) + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}(\delta_{1,4}) - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 > 0. \) Thus, \( w^\epsilon_{l,1}(\delta_{1,4}) + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon}(\delta_{1,4}) - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 > 0 \) for \( \epsilon \) small enough. \( w^\epsilon_{l,1} \) and \( \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} \) are decreasing, so \( w^\epsilon_{l,1} + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 < 0 \) in \( [0, \delta_{1,4}]. \) Since \( \xi w^\epsilon_{l,1} > 0, \) we have \( 2(w^\epsilon_{l,1} + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5)(w^\epsilon_{l,1} - 0.5) x > 0 \) in \( [0, \delta_{1,4}]. \) Also, \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \xi w^\epsilon_{l,1} = 0 \) uniformly in \( [\delta_{1,4}, 1], \) thereby \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} 2(w^\epsilon_{l,1} + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5)(w^\epsilon_{l,1}) = 0 \) uniformly since \( w^\epsilon_{l,1} + \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - \overline{\Delta} - 0.5 \) is bounded. Define \( E^\epsilon := \rho^M_{l, \epsilon} - 0.5 - \theta > 0. \) Because \( \theta^2 \sim (K + 1)(\Omega_D - \Omega_D^0) \epsilon^{1/2}/2, \) for \( \epsilon \) small enough,
\[
\frac{ε(Ω_D^l)^2(K-1)(K+1)(0.5−τ_K)}{16θ^3} + \frac{(K-1)Ω_D^l}{2θ} \delta_{l,1} > 0.
\]
Thus,
\[
\frac{ε}{2} \partial_x^2 ρ_{l,1}^{M,ε} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^l}{2ρ_{l,1}^{M,ε} - 1} = \frac{ε(Ω_D^l)^2(K-1)(K+1)(ρ_{l,1}^{M,ε} - τ_K)}{16(θ + E^ε)^3} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^l}{2(θ + E^ε)^3} (w_i^l + w_i,1_1 - \overline{A} - 0.5)
\]
\[
> \frac{ε(Ω_D^l)^2(K-1)(K+1)(0.5 - τ_K)}{16(θ + E^ε)^3} + \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^l}{2(θ + E^ε)^3} (K, l, 1, 1) \frac{θ^3}{(θ + E^ε)^3} + \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^l}{2θ} \delta_{l,1} \left(1 - \frac{θ^2}{(θ + E^ε)^2}\right) > 0.
\]
\[\text{(24.8)}\]

Because \(\hat{w}_l(1) + ρ_{l,1}^{M}(1) - \overline{A} = 0\), by continuity, \(∃\delta_{l,5} > 0\) s.t. \(\hat{w}_l(1 - \delta_{l,5}) + ρ_{l,1}^{M}(1 - \delta_{l,5}) - \overline{A} < 0\) \(\delta_{l,3} > 0\). \(w_i^l,1_1 > 0\). This is a contradiction, so \(\hat{w}_l(1) + ρ_{l,1}^{M} - \overline{A} - 0.5 + (1 - e)(w_i^l,1_1 - 0.5) < 0\) in \([1 - \delta_{l,5}, 1]\].

Since \((w_i^l,1)_x < 0, 2[w_i^l + ρ_i^{M,ε} - \overline{A} - 0.5 + (1 - e)(w_i^l,1_1 - 0.5)](w_i^l,1)_x > 0\) in \([1 - \delta_{l,5}, 1]\). Also, \(\lim_{ε→0}(w_i^l,1)_x = 0\) uniformly in \([0, 1 - \delta_{l,5}]\), thereby \(\lim_{ε→0}2[w_i^l + ρ_i^{M,ε} - \overline{A} - 0.5 + (1 - e)(w_i^l,1_1 - 0.5)](w_i^l,1)_x = 0\) uniformly since \(w_i^l + ρ_i^{M,ε} - \overline{A} - 0.5 + (1 - e)(w_i^l,1_1 - 0.5)\) is bounded. In summary, for \(ε\) small enough, \(Lρ_{i}^{ε} > 0, ρ_{i}^{ε} ∈ C^1[0, 1]\). At the boundaries,

\[
\lim_{ε→0} ρ_{i}^{ε}(0) = \lim_{ε→0} [w_i^l(0) + w_i,1_1(0) + ρ_i^{M,ε}(0) - \overline{A} - 0.5]
\]
\[
= \lim_{ε→0} [α_i - δ_{l,3} + w_i,1_1(0) - 0.5] + ρ_i^{M,ε}(0) - (\overline{A}_M - δ_{l,1} - δ_{l,3})
\]
\[
< \lim_{ε→0} [α_i + ρ_i^{M,ε}(0) - \overline{A}_M] = α_i < α,
\]
\[
\lim_{ε→0} ρ_{i}^{ε}(1) = \lim_{ε→0} [w_i^l(1) + w_i,1_1(1) + ρ_i^{M,ε}(1) - \overline{A} - 0.5]
\]
\[
= \lim_{ε→0} [w_i^l(1) + \overline{A} + δ_{l,1} + θ] < \lim_{ε→0} (\overline{A} + θ) = \overline{B} < \overline{β}.
\]
\[\text{(24.9)}\]

By Lemma 4.1, \(ρ_{i}^{ε}\) is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

25. Phase 8: \(\overline{β} < 0.5, \overline{γ}_M < α\)

In this case (Fig. 311),

\[
\hat{ρ} = \begin{cases} α, & x = 0, \\ ρ_{M}, & 0 < x < 1, \\ \overline{β}, & x = 1, \end{cases}
\]
\[\text{(25.1)}\]

where \(ρ_{M}\) solves \(ρ_{M} = \frac{(K+1)Ω_D^l(ρ_{M} - τ_K)}{2(ρ_{M} - 0.5)}\) with \(ρ_{M}(1) = 0.5\) and \(ρ_{M}(0) = \overline{γ}_M > 0.5\). For \(δ_{u} > 0\), define \(\overline{β}_u := 0.5 + δ_{u}\). Let \(ρ_{u}^{b}\) solve \(ρ_{u}^{b}(x) = \frac{(K+1)Ω_D^l(ρ_{u}^{b} - τ_K)}{2(ρ_{u}^{b} - 0.5)}\) with \(ρ_{u}^{b}(1) = \overline{β}_u\). Define (Fig. 311)

\[
\hat{ρ} ≤ \hat{ρ}_u := \begin{cases} α, & x = 0, \\ ρ_{u}^{b}, & 0 < x ≤ 1. \end{cases}
\]
\[\text{(25.2)}\]
Let \( \rho^M_t \) solve \( (\rho^M_t)^x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^M_t(\rho^M_t - \tau_K)}{2(\rho^M_t - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^M_t(1) = 0.5 \) and \( 1 - y^M = \underline{y}_M := \rho^M_t(0) > 0.5 \), where \( \Omega^D_t < \Omega_D \). For \( \delta_{l,1} > 0 \), define \( \beta_l := \frac{\rho^M_t - \delta_{l,1}}{\beta_l}, \quad 0 \leq x < 1, \quad x = 1. \) (25.3)

\( \forall \Delta > 0 \), choose \( \delta_u > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \beta_l < \alpha \) and \( \delta_u \in O(\rho, \Delta) \), where \( \underline{y}_b := \rho^b_t(0) \). Also, choose \( \Omega_D - \Omega^D_t, \delta_{l,1} > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( \beta_l \in O(\rho, \Delta) \). By Lemma 0.18 \( \exists \rho > 0 \) s.t. \( O(\rho, \Delta_p) \cap O(\beta_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset \).

Let \( w^e_u \) solve \( \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} (w^e_u)_x = -(w^e_u - 0.5)^2 \) with \( w^e_u(0) = 0.5 + \alpha - \underline{y}_b^e > 0.5 \). Define \( \rho^e_u := \rho^b_u + w^e_u - 0.5 \). By Lemma 10.1

\[ \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w^e_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} 0.5 + \alpha - \underline{y}_b^e, & x = 0, \\ 0.5, & 0 < x < 1. \end{cases} \] (25.4)

By Lemma 0.19 \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^e_u = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^b_u + w^e_u - 0.5 = \rho^b_u + \hat{w}_u - 0.5 = \rho_u. \) Let \( w^e_u \) solve \( \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} (w^e_u)_x = -e[w^e_u - (0.5 - \delta_{l,1})][w^e_u - (0.5 + \delta_{l,1})] \) with \( w^e_u(1) = \beta_l, \) where \( 0 < e < 1. \) Let \( \rho^M,e \) solve \( (\rho^M,e)^x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^M,e(\rho^M,e - \tau_K)}{2\rho^M,e - 1} \) with \( \rho^M,e(1) - e^{1/2} = \rho^M(1) - e^{1/2} \). Define \( \rho^e_u := \rho^M,e + w^e_u - 0.5 \). By Lemma 10.1

\[ \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} w^e_u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} 0.5 - \delta_{l,1}, & 0 \leq x < 1, \\ \beta_l, & x = 1. \end{cases} \] (25.5)

By Lemma 0.19 \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^M,e = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\rho^M,e + w^e_u - 0.5) = \rho^M,e + \hat{w}_u - 0.5 = \rho_u. \) Let \( \rho^e_u \) solve \( \frac{\varepsilon}{\rho} (\rho^e_u)_x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^e_u(\rho^e_u - \tau_K)}{2\rho^e_u - 1}(w^e_u - 0.5) + 2[w^e_u - (0.5 - \delta_{l,1})](w^e_u - (0.5 + \delta_{l,1})) \) with \( \rho^e_u(1) = \beta_l, \) where \( 0 < e < 1. \) Let \( \rho^M,e \) solve \( (\rho^M,e)^x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^M,e(\rho^M,e - \tau_K)}{2\rho^M,e - 1} \) with \( \rho^M,e(1) = 0 \), \( \rho^M,e(0) = 0.5 + \alpha - \underline{y}_b^e < 0.5 + \alpha \) \( \rho^M,e(1) = \beta_l + w^e_u(1) - 0.5 > \beta_l \). By Lemma 9.1 \( \rho_u \) is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

\[ L \rho^e_u = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\rho^M,e)_x - \frac{(K-1)\Omega^D}{2\rho^M,e - 1}(w^e_u - 0.5) + 2[w^M,e - 0.5 + (1-e)(w^e_u - 0.5)](w^e_u)_x + (\Omega^D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(w^e_u + \rho^M,e - 0.5 - \tau_K). \] (25.6)

Since \( \rho^M,e < \tau_K \) and \( w^e_u < 0.5 - \delta_{l,1}, \)

\[ (\Omega^D - \Omega_D)(K+1)(w^e_u + \rho^M,e - 0.5 - \tau_K) > -(\Omega^D - \Omega_D)(K+1)\delta_{l,1} > 0. \] (25.7)

Define \( E^e := \rho^M,e - 0.5 - \theta \geq 0. \) Because \( \theta^2 \sim (K-1)(\Omega^D - \Omega^D)e^{1/2}/2, \) for \( \varepsilon \) small enough, \( \varepsilon(\Omega^D)^2(K-1)(\Omega^D)e^{1/2}/2, \) for \( \varepsilon \) small enough, \( \varepsilon(\Omega^D)^2(K-1)(\Omega^D)(0.5 - \tau_K) + (K-1)\Omega^D \delta_{l,1} > 0. \) Thus, \( \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\rho^M,e)_x = \frac{(K-1)\Omega^D}{2\rho^M,e - 1}(w^e_u - 0.5) \)

\[ = \frac{\varepsilon(\Omega^D)^2(K-1)(\Omega^D)(0.5 - \tau_K)}{16(\theta + E^e)^3} + \frac{(K-1)\Omega^D}{2\theta + E^e} \]

\[ > \frac{\varepsilon(\Omega^D)^2(K-1)(\Omega^D)(0.5 - \tau_K)}{16(\theta + E^e)^3} + \frac{(K-1)\Omega^D}{2\theta + E^e} \]

\[ \delta_{l,1} \left( \frac{\theta^2}{(\theta + E^e)^2} \right) > 0. \] (25.8)

Because \( \rho^M_t(1) - 0.5 = 0, \) by continuity, \( \exists \delta_{l,2} > 0, \) s.t. \( \rho^M_t(1 - \delta_{l,2} - 0.5 < 0 < (1 - e)\delta_{l,1}/2, \) \( w^e_u - 0.5 < -\delta_{l,1}, \) \( \rho^M_t(1 - \delta_{l,2} - 0.5 + (1-e)(w^M_t(1 - \delta_{l,2}) - 0.5 < (e - \delta_{l,1})/2 < 0. \) Thus, for
In this case (Fig. 4(m)),

\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases}
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^b, & x_d < x \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\rho^a\) solves \(\rho^a(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{(a)}(\rho^a - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^a(0) = \alpha\), and \(\rho^b\) solves \(\rho^b(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{(b)}(\rho^b - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^b(1) = \beta\). Define \(1 - \overline{\gamma}_d = y_d := \rho^a(x_d) = 1 - \rho^b(x_d)\). For \(\delta_1 > 0\) and \(\delta_{u,1} > 0\), define \(x_d^l := x_d - \delta_l, y_d^{l,a} := \rho^a(x_d^l) + \delta_{l,1},\) and \(1 - y_d^{l,b} = \overline{\gamma}_d^l := \rho^b(x_d^l) + \delta_{l,1}\). Let \(\rho^a_u\) solve \(\rho^a_u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{a,l}(\rho^a_u - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^a_u(x_d^l) = \overline{\gamma}_d^l\), and \(\rho^a_b\) solve \(\rho^b_u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{b,l}(\rho^b_u - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^b_u(x_d^l) = \overline{\gamma}_d^l\), where \(\Omega_D^{a,b} < \overline{\Omega}_D < \Omega_D^{a,a}\). Define (Fig. 4(m))

\[
\hat{\rho}_u := \begin{cases}
\rho^a_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\
\rho^b_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

For \(\delta_l > 0\) and \(\delta_{l,1} > 0\), define \(x_d^l := x_d - \delta_l, y_d^{l,a} := \rho^a(x_d^l) - \delta_{l,1},\) and \(1 - y_d^{l,b} = \overline{\gamma}_d^l := \rho^b(x_d^l) - \delta_{l,1}\). Let \(\rho^l_u\) solve \(\rho^l_u(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{l,a}(\rho^l_u - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^l_u(x_d^l) = y_d^{l,a}\), where \(\Omega_D^{l,a} < \overline{\Omega}_D < \Omega_D^{l,b}\), and \(\rho^l_b\) solve \(\rho^l_b(x) = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^{l,b}(\rho^b - \overline{\tau}_K)}{2(\rho^a-\rho^b)}\) with \(\rho^l_b(x_d^l) = \overline{\gamma}_d^l\). Define (Fig. 4(m))

\[
\hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases}
\rho^l_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\
\rho^l_b, & x_d^l < x \leq 1.
\end{cases}
\]

\(\forall \Delta > 0\), choose \(\delta_{u,1} > 0, \Omega_D^{a,b} - \Omega_D, \Omega_D - \Omega_D^{b} > 0\) small enough s.t. \(y_d^{l,a} + \overline{\gamma}_d^l < 1\), \(\hat{\rho}_u > \hat{\rho}\), and \(\hat{\rho}_l > \hat{\rho}\). Also, choose \(\delta_1, \delta_{u,1}, \Omega_D - \Omega_D^{a,b} > 0\) small enough s.t. \(\rho^a(x_d^l) + \rho^b(x_d^l) < 2\overline{\tau}_K\) and \(\overline{\gamma}_d^l > 1, \hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta), \) and \(\hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta)\). Choose \(\delta_{u,1} > 0, \Omega_D^{a,b} - \Omega_D, \Omega_D - \Omega_D^{b} > 0\) small enough s.t. \(y_d^{l,a} + \overline{\gamma}_d^l < 1\), \(\hat{\rho}_u > \hat{\rho}\), and \(\hat{\rho}_l > \hat{\rho}\). By Lemma [1.18], \(\exists \Delta_p > 0\), s.t. \(O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset\).

Define \(1 - A_u = A_u := \frac{y_d^{u,a} - y_d^{u,b}}{2} < y_d^{u,b}, \) so \(\delta_{u,2} := A_u - y_d^{u,b} = y_d^{u,a} - A_u = \overline{\gamma}_d^{u,b} > 0\). Let \(w^{u}_x\) solve \(\frac{1}{2}(w^{u}_x)^2 = -(w^{u}_x - A_u)(w_u(x_u) - A_u)\) with \(w^{u}_u(x_u) = 0.5\). Define \(\rho^{u,b}_u := \rho^{u,b}_u(x) = \{\rho^{u,b}_u, 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \rho^{u,b}_u, x_d^u < x \leq 1\}\). Define \(\rho^{u,b}_u := \{\rho^{u,b}_u, 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \rho^{u,b}_u, x_d^u < x \leq 1\}\). Define \(\rho^{u,b}_u := \{\rho^{u,b}_u, 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \rho^{u,b}_u, x_d^u < x \leq 1\}\). Define \(\rho^{u,b}_u := \{\rho^{u,b}_u, 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \rho^{u,b}_u, x_d^u < x \leq 1\}\).
Define $\rho^b_t := \rho^b + u^\varepsilon_t$ with

$$\rho^b_t := \begin{cases} \rho^b - A^t, & 0 \leq x \leq x^i_d, \\ \rho^b - \bar{A}, & x^i_d < x \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

(26.7)

continuous. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} u^\varepsilon_t = \bar{u}_t := \begin{cases} A^t, & 0 \leq x \leq x^i_d, \\ \bar{A}, & x^i_d < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(26.8)

By Lemma 0.19 $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^b_t = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} (\rho^b + u^\varepsilon_t) = \rho^b + \bar{u}_t = \bar{\rho}_t$.

$$L\rho^u_\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\rho^u_\varepsilon)^{xx} + (\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u - \gamma_K), & x \leq x^i_d, \\ \frac{\varepsilon}{2} (\rho^u_\varepsilon)^{xx} - (\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u - \gamma_K), & x > x^i_d. \end{cases}$$

(26.9)

For $x \leq x^i_d$, $\rho^u_\varepsilon - A_u \leq \delta_{u,2}$ and $w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon \leq 0$. So

$$(\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u - \gamma_K) \leq (\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u - \gamma_K) < 0,$$

$$2(\rho^u_\varepsilon - A_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon) \leq \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon}(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) \leq \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - \bar{A}_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) < 0.$$  

(26.10)

Since $-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1}$ is bounded, for $\varepsilon$ small enough,

$$-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) + 2(\rho^u_\varepsilon - A_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon) \leq -\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) + \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - \bar{A}_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) = \left[-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} + \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - \bar{A}_u)\right] (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) < 0.$$  

(26.11)

Then $L\rho^u_\varepsilon < 0$ for $\varepsilon$ small enough since $(\rho^u_\varepsilon)^{xx}$ is bounded. For $x > x^i_d$, $(\rho^u_\varepsilon)^{xx}$ and $-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1}$ are bounded. Because $\rho^u_\varepsilon(x^i_d) - \bar{A}_u = -\delta_{u,2} < 0$, $x^i_d$, $\bar{A}_u = -\delta_{u,2}$, $x > x^i_d$. Define $\gamma := (\rho^u_\varepsilon(x^i_d) - \gamma_K)/2 > 0$. If $\bar{A}_u - w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon \geq \gamma$, then $\rho^u_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u < -\delta_{u,2}/2$ implies $\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} 2(\rho^u_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon) < \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} -\frac{2\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - A_u) = -\infty$. Since other terms are bounded, $L\rho^u_\varepsilon < 0$ for $\varepsilon$ small enough. Otherwise, if $\bar{A}_u - w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon < \gamma$, then

$$(\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u) \leq (\Omega^u_D - \Omega^u_J)(\rho^u_\varepsilon + (2\gamma + w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - \bar{A}_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) < 0.$$  

(26.12)

Thus, for $\varepsilon$ small enough,

$$-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) + 2(\rho^u_\varepsilon - A_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon) \leq -\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) + \frac{2\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - A_u)(w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) \leq \left[-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega^u_D}{2\rho^u_\varepsilon - 1} + \frac{2\delta_{u,2}}{\varepsilon} (0.5 - A_u)\right] (w^\varepsilon_\varepsilon - A_u) < 0.$$  

(26.13)
thereby $L\rho_u^\epsilon < 0$. Also, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(w_u^\epsilon - \overline{A}_u) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(w_u^\epsilon)_x = 0$ uniformly in $(x_u^\alpha + \delta_{u,3}, 1]$. Thus, for $\epsilon$ small enough,

$$
(\Omega_D^{u,b} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(\rho_u^\epsilon - \tau_K + w_u^\epsilon - \overline{A}_u) \leq (\Omega_D^{u,b} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(2\gamma + w_u^\epsilon - \overline{A}_u)
$$

$$
< (\Omega_D^{u,b} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)\gamma < 0,
$$

(26.14)

thereby $L\rho_u^\epsilon < 0$. $\rho_u^\epsilon$ is continuous. At the cusp $x_u^\alpha$, $(\rho_u^\epsilon)_x[(x_u^\alpha)^-] = (\rho_u^\epsilon)_x(x_u^\alpha) + (w_u^\epsilon)_x(x_u^\alpha) > (\rho_u^\epsilon)_x(x_u^\alpha)$ since

$$(\rho_u^\epsilon)_x(x_u^\alpha) = \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}(\rho_u^\epsilon(x_u^\alpha) - \tau_K)}{2(\rho_u^\epsilon(x_u^\alpha) - 0.5)} > \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2} > \frac{(K + 1)\Omega_D^{u,b}}{2}.
$$

(26.15)

At the boundaries, $\rho_u^\epsilon(0) = \rho_u^\epsilon(0) + w_u^\epsilon(0) - A_0 > \rho_u^\epsilon(0) = \rho_u^\epsilon(0) > \rho(0) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}\rho_u^\epsilon(1) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}[\rho_u^\epsilon(1) + w_u^\epsilon(1) - \overline{A}_u] = \rho_u(1) - \rho(1) = \overline{\beta}$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho_u^\epsilon$ is an upper solution of Eq. (0.2).

$$
L\rho_u^\epsilon = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\frac{1}{2}\rho_u^\epsilon x_x - \frac{(K - 1)\rho_u^\epsilon}{2\rho_u^\epsilon - 1}(w_u^\epsilon - A_1) & x \leq x_d', \\
+2(\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 + (1 - \epsilon)(w_u^\epsilon - 0.5))(w_u^\epsilon)_x & x = x_d', \\
+2(\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(\rho_u^\epsilon + w_u^\epsilon - A_1 - \tau_K) & x > x_d',
\end{array} \right.
$$

(26.16)

Because

$$
2\tau_K > \rho^a(x_d') + \rho^b(x_d') = y_d^\alpha + y_d^\beta + 2\delta_{d,1} = A_1 + \overline{A}_1 + 2\delta_{d,2} + 2\delta_{d,1},
$$

(26.17)

and for $x \leq x_d'$, $w_u^\epsilon \leq 0.5$ and $\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 \leq \delta_{d,2}$, we have

$$
(\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(\rho_u^\epsilon + w_u^\epsilon - A_1 - \tau_K) > (\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(\delta_{d,2} + 0.5 - \tau_K) > 0.
$$

(26.18)

Because $\rho_u^\epsilon(x_d') - A_1 = \delta_{d,2} > 0$, $\exists \delta_{d,3} > 0$, s.t. $\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 > \delta_{d,2}/2 > 0$ in $[x_d' - \delta_{d,3}, x_d']$. Since $(1 - \epsilon)(0.5 - A_1) < \delta_{d,2}/4$, we have $\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 + (1 - \epsilon)(w_u^\epsilon - 0.5) > \rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 + (1 - \epsilon)(A_1 - 0.5) > \delta_{d,2}/4 > 0$ in $[x_d' - \delta_{d,3}, x_d']$, thereby $2(\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1 + (1 - \epsilon)(w_u^\epsilon - 0.5))(w_u^\epsilon)_x > 0$ since $(w_u^\epsilon)_x > 0$. Also, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(w_u^\epsilon)_x = 0$ uniformly in $[0, x_d' - \delta_{d,3}]$. Because $2\rho_u^\epsilon x_x > 0$ and $-\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho_u^\epsilon - 1}(w_u^\epsilon - A_1) > 0$, for $\epsilon$ small enough, $L\rho_u^\epsilon > 0$ in $[0, x_d']$. For $x > x_d'$, $L\rho_u^\epsilon > 0$ since $(\rho_u^\epsilon)_x > 0$, $-(\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho_u^\epsilon - 1}(w_u^\epsilon - A_1)) > 0$, and $2(\rho_u^\epsilon - A_1)(w_u^\epsilon)_x > 0$. $\rho_u^\epsilon$ is continuous. At the cusp $x_d'$, $(\rho_u^\epsilon)_x[(x_d')^-] = (\rho_u^\epsilon)_x(x_d') + (w_u^\epsilon)_x(x_d') = (\rho_u^\epsilon)_x[(x_d')^+]$ for $\epsilon$ small enough since

$$
\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}(w_u^\epsilon x_x - (w_u^\epsilon x_x x_d')_x) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{2}{\epsilon} \rho_u^\epsilon (1 - \epsilon)(0.5 - A_1)(0.5 - \tau_K) = -\infty.
$$

(26.19)

At the boundaries, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0}\rho_u^\epsilon(0) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}[\rho_u^\epsilon(0) + w_u^\epsilon(0) - A_0] = \rho_0(0) - \rho(0) = \alpha$ and $\rho_u^\epsilon(1) = \rho_u^\epsilon(1) + w_u^\epsilon(1) - \overline{A}_1 < \rho(1) < \rho(1) = \overline{\beta}$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho_u^\epsilon$ is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

27. Phase 10: $0.5 \leq \overline{\beta} < \tau_K$, $\alpha < y_b$, $\beta < y_a$ if $x_p > 1$

In this case (Fig. 34(n)),

$$
\hat{\rho} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\rho_u^\epsilon, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho_u^\epsilon, & x_d < x \leq 1,
\end{array} \right.
$$

(27.1)
where $\rho^a$ solves $\rho^a_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^a - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^a - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^a(0) = \alpha$, and $\rho^b$ solves $\rho^b_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^b - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^b - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b(1) = \beta$. Define $1 - \overline{\rho}_d = y_d := \rho^b(x_d) = 1 - \rho^b(x_d)$. For $\delta_u > 0$ and $\delta_{u,1} > 0$, define $x_d^u := x_d - \delta_u, y_d^{u,a} := \rho^a(x_d^u) + \delta_x, 1 - y_d^{u,b} = \overline{\rho}_d^{u,b} := \rho^b(x_d^u) + \delta_{u,1}$. Let $\rho^a_u$ solve $(\rho^a_u)_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^a_u - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^a_u - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^a_u(x_d^u) = y_d^{u,a}$, where $\Omega_{u,D} > \Omega_D$, and $\rho^b_u$ solve $(\rho^b_u)_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D(\rho^b_u - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^b_u - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b_u(x_d^u) = \overline{\rho}_d^{u,b}$. Define (Fig. 1n))

$$\hat{\rho}_u := \begin{cases} \rho^a_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\ \rho^b_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.2)

For $\delta_l > 0$ and $\delta_{l,1} > 0$, define $x_d^l := x_d + \delta_l, y_d^{l,a} := \rho^a(x_d^l) - \delta_{l,1}$, and $1 - y_d^{l,b} = \overline{\rho}_d^{l,b} := \rho^b(x_d^l) - \delta_{l,1}$. Let $\rho^a_l$ solve $(\rho^a_l)_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^a(\rho^a_l - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^a_l - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^a_l(x_d^l) = y_d^{l,a}$, and $\rho^b_l$ solve $(\rho^b_l)_t = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^b(\rho^b_l - \rho_K)}{2(\rho^b_l - 0.5)}$ with $\rho^b_l(x_d^l) = \overline{\rho}_d^{l,b}$, where $\Omega_{l,D}^a > \Omega_D, \Omega_{l,D}^b > \Omega_D$. Define (Fig. 1n))

$$\hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} \rho^a_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\ \rho^b_l, & x_d^l < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.3)

Note that $\rho^a(x_d^l) + \rho^b(x_d^l) > 0$. For $\forall \Delta > 0$, choose $\delta_u, \delta_{u,1}, \Omega_{u,D}^a - \Omega_D > 0$ small enough s.t. $y_d^{u,a} + \overline{\rho}_d^{u,b} < 1, \hat{\rho}_u \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta), \text{ and } \hat{\rho}_u > \hat{\rho}$. Also, choose $\delta_l, \delta_{l,1}, \Omega_{l,D}^a - \Omega_D, \Omega_{l,D}^b - \Omega_D > 0$ small enough s.t. $y_d^{l,a} + \overline{\rho}_d^{l,b} > 1, \hat{\rho}_l \in O(\hat{\rho}, \Delta), \text{ and } \hat{\rho}_l < \hat{\rho}$. By Lemma 0.18, $\exists \Delta_p > 0$, s.t. $O(\hat{\rho}_u, \Delta_p) \cap O(\hat{\rho}_l, \Delta_p) = \emptyset$.

Define $1 - \overline{\rho}_u = A_u := (y_d^{u,a} + \overline{\rho}_d^{u,b})/2, y_d^{u,a} < y_d^{u,b}$, so $\delta_{u,2} := A_u - y_d^{u,a} = y_d^{u,b} - A_u = \overline{\rho}_u - \overline{\rho}_d^{u,b} > 0$. Let $w_a^u$ solve $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(w_a^u)(x) = -(w_a^u - A_u)(w_a^u - \overline{\rho}_u) + w_a^u(x_d^u) = 0.5$. Define $\rho^a_u := \rho^a_u + w_a^u$ with

$$\rho^a_{ab} := \begin{cases} \rho^a_u - A_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\ \rho^a_u - \overline{\rho}_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.4)

continuous. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w_a^u = \hat{w}_u := \begin{cases} A_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\ \overline{\rho}_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.5)

By Lemma 0.19, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_a^e = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^a_{ab} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^a_{ab} + \hat{w}_u = \hat{\rho}_u$. Define $1 - \overline{\rho}_l = A_l := (y_d^{l,a} + \overline{\rho}_d^{l,b})/2, y_d^{l,a} < y_d^{l,b}$, so $\delta_{l,2} := A_l - y_d^{l,a} = y_d^{l,b} - A_l > 0$. Let $w_l^{a,e}$ solve $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(w_l^{a,e})(x) = -(w_l^{a,e} - A_l)(w_l^{a,e} - \overline{\rho}_l)$ with $w_l^{a,e}(x_d^l) = 0.5$, where $0 < \epsilon < 1$, and $(1 - \epsilon)(0.5 - A_l) < \delta_{l,2}/4$.

Let $w_l^{b,e}$ solve $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(w_l^{b,e})(x) = -(w_l^{b,e} - A_l)(w_l^{b,e} - \overline{\rho}_l)$ with $w_l^{b,e}(x_d^l) = 0.5$. Define

$$w_l^e := \begin{cases} w_l^{a,e}, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\ w_l^{b,e}, & x_d^l < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.6)

Define $\rho_l^e := \rho_l^{ab} + w_l^e$ with

$$\rho_l^{ab} := \begin{cases} \rho_l^b - A_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\ \rho_l^a - \overline{\rho}_l, & x_d^l < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.7)

continuous. By Lemma 10.1

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} w_l^e = \hat{w}_l := \begin{cases} A_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\ \overline{\rho}_l, & x_d^l < x \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

(27.8)

By Lemma 0.19, $\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_l^e = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho_l^{ab} + w_l^e = \rho_l^{ab} + \hat{w}_l = \hat{\rho}_l$.

$$L \rho_u^a = \begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\rho_u^a)_{xx} - \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^a}{2(\rho_u^a - 0.5)}(w_a^u - \overline{\rho}_u) + 2(\rho_u^a - A_u)(w_a^u)_{xx} \\ + (\Omega_D^a - \Omega_D)(\rho_u^a + w_a^u - \overline{\rho}_u), & x \leq x_d^u, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(\rho_u^a)_{xx} - \frac{(K+1)\Omega_D^a}{2(\rho_u^a - 0.5)}(w_a^u - \overline{\rho}_u) + 2(\rho_u^a - A_u)(w_a^u)_{xx}, & x > x_d^u. \end{cases}$$

(27.9)
For $x \leq x_d^u$,
\[
(\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^a + w_u^c - A_u - \pi_K) \leq (\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(-\delta_{a,2} + 0.5 - \pi_K) < 0,
\]
\[
2(\rho_u^a - A_u)(w_u^c) \leq \frac{4\delta_{a,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - \pi_u)(w_u^c - A_u) < 0.
\]
(27.10)  

Thus, for $\epsilon$ small enough,
\[
-\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho_u^a - 1}(w_u^c - A_u) + 2(\rho_u^a - A_u)(w_u^c) \leq 0,
\]
\[
\leq -\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho_u^a - 1}(w_u^c - A_u) + \frac{4\delta_{a,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - \pi_u)(w_u^c - A_u) \leq 0,
\]
(27.11)  

thereby $L\rho_u^a < 0$ in $[0, x_d^u]$ since $(\rho_u^a)_{xx}$ is bounded. For $x > x_d^u$, $2(\rho_u^b - \pi_u)(w_u^c) \leq \frac{4\delta_{a,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - A_u)(w_u^c - \pi_u) < 0$. Thus, for $\epsilon$ small enough,
\[
-\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D}{2\rho_u^b - 1}(w_u^c - \pi_u) + 2(\rho_u^b - \pi_u)(w_u^c) \leq 0,
\]
\[
\leq -\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D}{2\rho_u^b - 1}(w_u^c - \pi_u) + \frac{4\delta_{a,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - A_u)(w_u^c - \pi_u) \leq 0,
\]
(27.12)  

thereby $L\rho_u^b < 0$ in $[x_d^u, 1]$ since $(\rho_u^b)_{xx} < 0$. $\rho_u^b$ is continuous. At the cusp $x_d^u$, $(\rho_u^a)_{x}(x_d^u)^+ = (\rho_u^a)_{x}(x_d^u)^-$ by continuity of $\pi_u$, $(\rho_u^b)_{x}(x_d^u)^+ = (\rho_u^b)_{x}(x_d^u)^-$. At the boundaries, $\rho_u^a(0) = \rho_u^a(0) = \rho_u^b(0) = \rho_u^b(0) = \rho_u^b(0) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{x \to 0} \rho_u^a(1) = \lim_{x \to 0} \rho_u^b(1)$. By Lemma 9.1, $\rho_u$ is an upper solution of Eq. (27.12).

\[
L\rho_u^a = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{4}(\rho_u^a)_{xx} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho_u^a - 1}(\rho_u^a - A_l), \\
+2(\rho_u^a - A_l + (1-\epsilon)(w_l^c - 0.5))(w_l^c) \\
+(\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^a + w_l^c - A_l - \pi_K),  \\
\end{cases} x \leq x_d^l,
\]
(27.13)  

\[
L\rho_u^b = \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{4}(\rho_u^b)_{xx} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{b,a}}{2\rho_u^b - 1}(\rho_u^b - \pi_l), \\
+2(\rho_u^b - \pi_l + (1-\epsilon)(w_l^c - 0.5))(w_l^c) \\
+(\Omega_D^{b,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^b + w_l^c - \pi_l - \pi_K),  \\
\end{cases} x > x_d^l.
\]

For $x \leq x_d^l$, we have $(\rho_u^b)_{xx} > 0$, $-\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{b,a}}{2\rho_u^b - 1}(\rho_u^b - A_l) > 0$, and
\[
(\Omega_D^{b,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^b + w_l - A_l - \pi_K) \geq (\Omega_D^{b,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\delta_{l,2} + 0.5 - \pi_K) > 0.
\]
(27.14)  

since $2\pi_K > y_d^l + y_d^b = A_l + A_l + 2\delta_{l,2} = 1 + 2\delta_{l,2}$. Because $\rho_l^c(x_d^l) - A_t = \delta_{l,2} > 0$, $\exists t_{l,3} > 0$, $s.t. \rho_l^c(x_d^l) - A_l > \delta_{l,2}/2 > 0$ in $[x_d^l - \delta_{l,3}, x_d^l]$. $(1-\epsilon)(0.5 - A_l) < \delta_{l,2}/4$, so $\rho_l^c(x_d^l) - A_l + (1-\epsilon)(w_l^c - 0.5) > \rho_l^c(x_d^l) - A_l + (1-\epsilon)(A_l - 0.5) > \delta_{l,2}/4 > 0$ in $[x_d^l - \delta_{l,3}, x_d^l]$, thereby $2(\rho_l^c - A_l + (1-\epsilon)(w_l^c - 0.5))(w_l^c) > 0$ since $(w_l^c) > 0$. Also, $\lim_{x \to 0}(w_l^c) = 0$ uniformly in $[x_d^l - \delta_{l,3}, 1]$. In summary, $L\rho_l^c > 0$ in $[0, x_d^l]$ for $\epsilon$ small enough. For $x > x_d^l$, $(\rho_l^c)_{xx}$ is bounded, $-\frac{(K-1)\Omega_D^{b,a}}{2\rho_u^b - 1}(\rho_u^b - \pi_l) > 0$, and
\[
(\Omega_D^{b,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^b + w_l - \pi_l - \pi_K) \leq (\Omega_D^{b,a} - \Omega_D)(K+1)(\rho_u^b(x_d^l) - \pi_K) > 0.
\]
(27.15)  

Because $\rho_l^c(x_d^l) - \pi_l = \delta_{l,2} > 0$, $\exists t_{l,4} > 0$, $s.t. \rho_l^c(x_d^l) - \pi_l > \delta_{l,2}/2 > 0$ in $[x_d^l, x_d^l + \delta_{l,4}]$, thereby $2(\rho_l^c - \pi_l)(w_l^c) > 0$ since $(w_l^c) > 0$. Also, $\lim_{x \to 0}(w_l^c) = 0$ uniformly in $[x_d^l + \delta_{l,4}, 1]$. In summary, $L\rho_l^c > 0$ in $[x_d^l, 1]$ for $\epsilon$ small enough. $\rho_l^c$ is continuous. At the cusp $x_d^l$,
\[(\rho_\epsilon^M)^{(0)}(x_d^{(0)} -) = (\rho_\epsilon^M)^{(0)}(x_d^{(0)}) + (w^{0,c,\epsilon}_1(x_d^{(0)}) < (\rho_\epsilon^M)^{(0)}(x_d^{(0)}) + (w^{1,b,\epsilon}_1(x_d^{(0)}) = (\rho_\epsilon^M)^{(0)}(x_d^{(0)})) \] for \( \epsilon \) small enough since \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}[(\rho_\epsilon^{a,c})_x(x_d^{(0)}) - (w^{1,b,\epsilon}_1(x_d^{(0)})] = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0}\frac{\rho(1 - \epsilon)(0.5 - A_l)(0.5 - A_l)}{-\infty}. \]

At the boundaries, \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\rho(0)}{\rho(0) - A_l} = 0 < \rho(0) = \alpha \) and \( \rho(0) = \rho(1) = \rho(1) + w(1) - A_l < \rho(1) - A_l = \rho(1) = \beta \). By Lemma 1, \( \rho_\epsilon^M \) is a lower solution of Eq. (0.2).

28. Phase 11: \( \beta < 0.5, \alpha < y_M, x_p < 1 \)

In this case (Fig. 4(0)),
\[
\hat{\rho} = \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^M, & x_d < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1, 
\end{cases} 
\]
(28.1)

where \( \rho^a \) solves \( \rho^a = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^a(0) = \alpha \), and \( \rho^M \) solves \( \rho^M = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^M(1) = 0.5 \) and \( \rho^M(0) > 0.5 \). Define \( 1 - \gamma_d = y_d \) := \( \rho^a(x_d) = 1 - \rho^M(x_d) \). For \( \delta_u < 0 \) and \( \delta_u > 0 \), define \( x_d^j := x_d - \delta_u \), \( y_d^{j,a} := \rho^a(x_d^j) + \delta_u,1 \), and \( 1 - y_d^j = y_d^{j,b} := \rho^M(x_d^j) + \delta_u,1 \). Let \( \rho^a \) solve \( \rho^a = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^a(x_d^j) = y_d^{j,a} \), where \( \Omega_\rho^b > \Omega_\rho \), and \( \rho^M \) solve \( \rho^M = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^M(x_d^j) = y_d^{j,b} \). Define (Fig. 4(0))
\[
\hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} 
\rho^a, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d, \\
\rho^M, & x_d < x < 1, \\
\beta, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} 
\]
(28.2)

For \( \delta_l > 0 \) and \( \delta_l < 0 \), define \( x_d^l := x_d + \delta_l \) and \( \gamma_d^l := -\delta_l,1. \) Let \( \rho^M \) satisfy \( \rho^M = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^M(1) = 0.5 \) and \( \rho^M(0) > 0.5 \), where \( \Omega_\rho^b < \Omega_\rho \). Define \( 1 - y_d^l,b = y_d^l,b := 1 - \rho^M(x_d^l) \). Let \( \rho^l \) solve \( \rho^l = \frac{(K+1)\Omega_\rho(x_d - \kappa)}{2(\rho^d - 0.5)} \) with \( \rho^l(x_d^l) = y_d^l,a \), where \( \Omega_\rho^a < \Omega_\rho \). Define (Fig. 4(0))
\[
\hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} 
\rho^l, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^l, \\
\rho^M - \delta_l, & x_d^l < x < 1, \\
\beta_l, & x = 1. 
\end{cases} 
\]
(28.3)

Note that \( \rho^a(x_d^1) + \rho^M(x_d^1) > 0, \forall \Delta > 0, \) choose \( \delta_u, \delta_u,1, \Omega_\rho^u - \Omega_\rho > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( y_d^u,a + y_d^u,b < 1, \rho^u \in (\rho, \Delta) \), and \( \rho^u > \rho \). Also, choose \( \delta_l,1, \Omega_\rho^u - \Omega_\rho > 0 \) small enough s.t. \( y_d^l,a + y_d^l,b < \delta_l,1 \), \( \rho^l \in (\rho, \Delta) \), and \( \rho^l < \rho \). By Lemma 18 \( \exists \Delta_p > 0 \), s.t. \( O(\rho, \Delta_p) \cap O(\rho, \Delta_p) = \emptyset \).

Define \( 1 - A_u = A_u := (y_d^u,a + y_d^u,b)/2 \), \( y_d^u,a < y_d^u,b \), so \( \delta_d,2 := A_u - y_d^u,a = y_d^u,b = A_u = y_d^u,b > 0 \). Let \( \rho^u \) solve \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = -\rho^u - A_u(x_d^1 - A_u) \) with \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = 0.5 \). Define \( \rho^u := \rho^u + w^u \) with
\[
\rho^u := \begin{cases} 
\rho^u - A_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\
\rho^u - A_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1 
\end{cases} 
\]
(28.4)

continuous. By Lemma 11
\[
\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^u := \hat{\rho} := \begin{cases} 
A_u, & 0 \leq x \leq x_d^u, \\
A_u, & x_d^u < x \leq 1 
\end{cases} 
\]
(28.5)

By Lemma 0,19 \( \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^u = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \rho^u + w^u = \rho^u + \hat{\rho} = \rho \). Define \( 1 - A_l = A_l := (y_d^l,a + y_d^l,b + \delta_l,2)/2 \), \( y_d^l,a > y_d^l,b + \delta_l,2 \), so \( \delta_d,3 := y_d^l,a - A_l = A_l - y_d^l,b - \delta_l,2 = y_d^l,b - \delta_l,2 < A_l \). Let \( \rho^u \) solve \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = -(w^u - A_l)(w^u - A_l) \) with \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = 0.5 \), where \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \), and \( (1 - \epsilon)(0.5 - A_l) < \delta_l,3 \). Let \( \rho^u \) solve \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = -(w^u - A_l)(w^u - A_l) \) with \( \rho^u(x_d^1) = 0.5 \).
Define
\[ w^\varepsilon_l := \begin{cases} w^{\varepsilon,l}, & 0 \leq x \leq x^l_d, \\ w^{\varepsilon}_l, & x^l_d < x \leq 1. \end{cases} \] (8.6)

Let \( w^\varepsilon_{l,1} \) solve \( \frac{\delta}{2}(w^\varepsilon_{l,1})_x = -\epsilon_{l,1}[w^\varepsilon_{l,1} - (0.5 - \delta_{l,2})][w^\varepsilon_{l,1} - (0.5 + \delta_{l,2})] \) with \( w^\varepsilon_{l,1}(1) = \bar{\rho}_l \). Let \( \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l \) solve \( (\rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l)_x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^{\varepsilon}_l}{2(\rho^{\varepsilon}_l - 0.5)}(\rho^{\varepsilon}_l - \tau_K) \) with \( \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) = \rho^M(1 - \epsilon^{1/2}) \). Then \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l = \rho^M \).

Define \( \delta^{\varepsilon,3}_l := w^\varepsilon_{l,1}(x^l_d) - 0.5 + \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l(x^l_d) - \bar{A}_l \). Then \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \delta^{\varepsilon,3}_l = -\delta_{l,2} + \bar{\gamma}_d^{l,b} - \bar{A}_l = \delta_{l,3} \). Let \( \rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l \) solve \( (\rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l)_x = \frac{(K+1)\rho^{\varepsilon}_l}{2(\rho^{\varepsilon}_l - 0.5)}(\rho^{\varepsilon}_l - \tau_K) \) with \( \rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l(x^l_d) = A_l + \delta^{\varepsilon,3}_l \). \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l = \rho_l^a \) since \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \delta^{\varepsilon,3}_l = \delta_{l,3} \).

Define
\[ \begin{aligned} \rho_l^\varepsilon := & \begin{cases} \hat{w}_l + \rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l - A_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x^l_d, \\ \hat{w}_l + \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l - \bar{A}_l + \hat{w}_{l,1} - 0.5, & x^l_d < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \hat{w}_l = & \hat{\rho}_l := \begin{cases} A_l, & 0 \leq x < x^l_d, \\ \bar{A}_l, & x = x^l_d, \\ \bar{A}_l, & x^l_d < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \\ \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \hat{w}_{l,1} = & \hat{\rho}_{l,1} := \begin{cases} 0.5 - \delta_{l,2}, & x^l_d \leq x < 1, \\ \bar{A}_l, & x = 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \] (8.7)

which is continuous because \( \rho_l^\varepsilon([x^l_d^{-}]) = 0.5 + \delta^{\varepsilon,3}_l = \rho_l([x^l_d^{+}]) \). By Lemma [0.1]

Because
\[ \hat{\rho}_l = \begin{cases} \hat{w}_l + \rho^a_l - A_l, & 0 \leq x \leq x^l_d, \\ \hat{w}_l + \rho^M_l - \bar{A}_l + \hat{w}_{l,1} - 0.5, & x^l_d < x \leq 1, \end{cases} \] (8.9)

by Lemma [0.19] \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\varepsilon = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}(\hat{w}_l + \rho^{a,\varepsilon}_l - A_l) = \hat{w}_l + \rho^a_l - A_l = \hat{\rho}_l \) in \( [0, x^l_d] \), and \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\varepsilon = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0}(\hat{w}_l + \rho^{M,\varepsilon}_l - \bar{A}_l + \hat{w}_{l,1} - 0.5) = \hat{w}_l + \rho^M_l - \bar{A}_l + \hat{w}_{l,1} - 0.5 = \hat{\rho}_l \) in \( [x^l_d, 1] \). By Lemma [0.15] \( \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \rho_l^\varepsilon = \hat{\rho}_l \) in \( [0, 1] \).

For \( x \leq x^u, (\rho^u_a)_x \) is bounded, and
\[ (\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(\rho^a_u + w^u_a - A_u - \tau_K) \leq (\Omega_D^{u,a} - \Omega_D)(K + 1)(-\delta_{u,2} + 0.5 - \tau_K) < 0. \] (8.11)

Since \( 2(\rho^a_u - A_u)(w^u_a)_x \leq \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - \bar{A}_u)(w^u_a - A_u) < 0, \) for \( \epsilon \) small enough,
\[ \begin{aligned} \frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho^a_u - 1}(w^u_a - A_u) + 2(\rho^a_u - A_u)(w^u_a)_x & \leq -\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho^a_u - 1}(w^u_a - A_u) + \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - \bar{A}_u)(w^u_a - A_u) \\ & = \left[ -\frac{(K - 1)\Omega_D^{u,a}}{2\rho^a_u - 1} + \frac{4\delta_{u,2}}{\epsilon}(0.5 - \bar{A}_u) \right](w^u_a - A_u) < 0, \end{aligned} \] (8.12)
thereby $Lρ^ε_0 < 0$ in $[0, x^0_d]$. For $x > x^0_d$, $(ρ^b_u)_{xx} < 0$. Since $2(ρ^b_u - A_u)∂_x w_u ≤ \frac{4δ_u,ε}{ε}(0.5 - A_u)(w_u - A_u) < 0$, for $ε$ small enough,

\[- \frac{(K - 1)Ω_D}{2ρ^b_u - 1}(w^*_u - A_u) + 4(ρ^b_u - A_u)(w^*_u)_x \]
\[≤ - \frac{(K - 1)Ω_D}{2ρ^b_u - 1}(w^*_u - A_u) + \frac{4δ_u,ε}{ε}(0.5 - A_u)(w^*_u - A_u) \]
\[= \left[- \frac{(K - 1)Ω_D}{2ρ^b_u - 1} + \frac{4δ_u,ε}{ε}(0.5 - A_u)\right](w^*_u - A_u) < 0, \tag{28.13} \]

thereby $Lρ^ε_0 < 0$ in $[x^0_d, 1]$. $ρ^ε_0$ is continuous. At the cusp $x^0_d$, $(ρ^ε_0)_x(x^0_d^-) = (ρ^ε_0)_x(x^0_d^+) + (w^*_u)_x(x^0_d^-) > (w^*_u)_x(x^0_d^+) > (ρ^ε_0)_x(x^0_d^+) + (w^*_u)_x(x^0_d^+) = (ρ^ε_0)_x(x^0_d^+)$. At the boundaries, $ρ^ε_0(0) = ρ^ε_0(0) + w^*_u(0) - A_u > ρ^ε_0(0) = ρ^ε_0(0) > ρ(0) = α$ and $\lim_{x \to 0} ρ^ε_0(1) = \lim_{x \to 0}[ρ^ε_0(1) + w^*_u(1) - A_u] = ρ^ε_0(1) > ρ(1) = β$. By Lemma 9.1, $ρ^ε_0$ is an upper solution of Eq. (20.2).

\[
Lρ^ε_1 = \begin{cases}
\frac{1}{2}(ρ^{a,ε}_u)_x - \frac{(K - 1)Ω^a_D}{2ρ^a_u - 1}(w^*_u - A_t) + 2[ρ^{a,ε}_u - A_t + (1 - ε)(w^*_u - 0.5)](w^*_u)_x & x ≤ x^0_d, \\
+ (Ω^a_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(ρ^{a,ε}_t + w^*_t - A_t - τ_K), \quad & x > x^0_d.
\end{cases} \tag{28.14} \]

For $x ≤ x^0_d$ and $ε$ small enough, $(ρ^{a,ε}_u)_x > 0$, $- \frac{(K - 1)Ω^a_D}{2ρ^a_u - 1}(w^*_u - A_t) > 0$, and because $2τ_K > y^l_{d,α} + \frac{y^l_{d,β}}{y^l_{d,β}} = A_t + A_t + δ_{l,2} + 2δ_{l,3} = 1 + δ_{l,2} + 2δ_{l,3} > 1 + 2δ_{l,3},$

\[
(Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(ρ^{a,ε}_t + w^*_t - A_t - τ_K) ≥ (Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(δ_{l,3} + 0.5 - τ_K) > (Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(δ_{l,3} + 0.5 - τ_K)/2 > 0. \tag{28.15} \]

Because $ρ^v_0(x^0_d) - A_t = δ_{l,3} > 0$, $∃ δ_{l,4} > 0$, s.t. $ρ^v_0(x^0_d - δ_{l,4}) - A_t > δ_{l,3}/2 > 0$. Thus, for $ε$ small enough, $ρ^{a,ε}_t(x^0_d - δ_{l,4}) - A_t > δ_{l,3}/2 > 0$. Because $ρ^{a,ε}_t$ is increasing, $ρ^{a,ε}_t - A_t > δ_{l,3}/2 > 0$ in $[x^0_d - δ_{l,4}, x^0_d]$. Since $w^*_u > A_t$ and $(1 - ε)(0.5 - A_t) < δ_{l,3}/4$, for $ε$ small enough, $ρ^{a,ε}_t - A_t + (1 - ε)(0.5 - A_t) < δ_{l,3}/4$, thereby $2[ρ^{a,ε}_t - A_t + (1 - ε)(0.5 - A_t)](w^*_u)_x < 0$ since $(w^*_u)_x > 0$. Also, $\lim_{x \to 0}(w^*_u)_x = 0$ uniformly in $[0, x^0_d - δ_{l,4}]$. In summary, for $ε$ small enough, $Lρ^ε_1 > 0$ in $[0, x^0_d]$. For $x > x^0_d$ and $ε$ small enough,

\[
(Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(w^*_t + ρ^{M,ε}_t - δ_{l,2} - τ_K) \]
\[> (Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(ρ^{M,ε}_t(x^0_d) - δ_{l,2} - τ_K) \]
\[> (Ω^l_D - Ω_D)(K + 1)(ρ^{M}(x^0_d) - δ_{l,2} - τ_K)/2 > 0. \tag{28.16} \]
Define $\theta := \rho_M^*(1) - 0.5$. Then $\theta^2 \sim \frac{(K-1)(\eta_0 - \eta_1)}{2} \epsilon^{1/2}$. Define $E^\epsilon := \rho_M^*(\epsilon) - \theta - 0.5 \geq 0$. For $\epsilon$ small enough, 
$$
\frac{\epsilon}{2} (\rho_M^*(\epsilon))_{xx} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_l}{2\rho_M^*(\epsilon)} (\rho_M^*(\epsilon))_{x} - (K-1)\Omega_l \frac{(\rho_M^*(\epsilon)x \epsilon_{x} - \epsilon_{x}^2)}{2\rho_M^*(\epsilon)} (\rho_M^*(\epsilon))_{x} + (K-1)\Omega_l = 0.
$$

In summary, for $\epsilon$ small enough, $\epsilon(\Omega_l^{1,2})^{(K-1)(K+1)(0.5 - \vartheta)} + \delta_{l,2} \frac{(K-1)\Omega_l^{1,2}}{2\theta^3} > 0$, thereby

$$
\frac{\epsilon}{2} \left( \rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{xx} - \frac{(K-1)\Omega_l}{2\rho_M^*(\epsilon)} (\rho_M^*(\epsilon))_{x} - (K-1)\Omega_l \frac{(\rho_M^*(\epsilon)x \epsilon_{x} - \epsilon_{x}^2)}{2\rho_M^*(\epsilon)} (\rho_M^*(\epsilon))_{x} + (K-1)\Omega_l \right)
= \frac{\epsilon(\Omega_l^{1,2})^{(K-1)(K+1)(0.5 - \vartheta)} + \delta_{l,2} (K-1)\Omega_l^{1,2}}{16\theta^3} \left( \frac{1 - \theta^2}{(\theta + \epsilon x^{2})^2} \right) > 0.
$$

(28.17)

Because $\rho_M^*(x^{l,1}_{1,1}) - \alpha_I = \delta_{l,2} + \delta_{l,3} > 0$, $\delta_{l,5} > 0$, s.t. $\rho_M^* (x^{l,1}_{1,1} + \delta_{l,5}) - \alpha_I > \delta_{l,2} + \delta_{l,3}/2 > 0$. Since $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{xx} = \rho_M^*$ and $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{x} = 0.5 - \delta_{l,2}$ in $[0, 1)$, for $\epsilon$ small enough, $\rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{xx} + \delta_{l,5} - \alpha_I$ and $\rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{x} = 0.5 - \delta_{l,2}$ in $[0, 1)$. The solution of Eq. (0.2) is unique in $\Omega_M = \{ x^{l,1}_{1,1} : \rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{xx} + \delta_{l,5} - \alpha_I \}$ and $\rho_M^*(\epsilon)_{x} = 0.5 - \delta_{l,2}$ in $[0, 1)$. By the method of uniqueness of their solutions and the global attractivity of the steady-state solution. By the method of diagram of the steady state problem in $\Omega_M$ is important for understanding both macroscopic upper and lower solution, we finally come to the following

conclusions.

This paper is devoted to study an initial value parabolic problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions in Eq. (0.1), which originates from the continuum limit of TASEP-LK coupled process. The phase diagram of the steady state problem in Eq. (0.2) is important for understanding both macroscopic and microscopic biological processes, and has been extensively studied by Monte Carlo simulations and numerical computations. We prove many properties of Eqs. (0.1) and (0.2), including the existence and uniqueness of their solutions and the global attractivity of the steady-state solution. By the method of upper and lower solution, we finally come to the following conclusions.

1. Eq. (0.2) has a weak solution in $W^{1,2}(0, 1)$ with the same phase diagram specified by previous Monte Carlo simulations and numerical computations.

2. $L^\infty (0, 1)$ solution of Eq. (0.2) has $C^\infty [0, 1]$ regularity.

3. The solution of Eq. (0.2) is unique in $L^\infty (0, 1)$.

4. Eq. (0.1) has a unique solution in $C([0, 1] \times [0, +\infty)) \subset C^2([0, 1] \times (0, +\infty))$ for any continuous initial value, which converges to the solution of Eq. (0.2) in $C^0 [0, 1]$. 

**PART XII. CONCLUSIONS AND REMARKS**
Eqs. (0.1) studied in this paper are from the simplest case of the TASEP-LK coupled process, in which one species of particles (with the same properties, say speed, attachment and detachment rates, initiation and termination rates etc.) travel along single one-dimensional track, and during each forward step, particles have only single internal biochemical or biophysical state. In the field of biology and physics, there are actually many general cases. For examples, particles may travel along closed track, have different traveling speeds at different domains of the track, include multiple internal states, switch between different tracks, and/or come from different species. Rich biophysical properties have been obtained by Monte Carlo simulations and numerical computations for many general TASEP-LK coupled processes, but almost no mathematical analysis has been carried out to prove the properties of the corresponding differential equations, or validate the numerical results. In the future, we hope to generalize the methods in this paper to more complex cases, or present more sophisticated methods.
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