

# Longterm existence of solutions of a reaction diffusion system with non-local terms modeling an immune response

Cordula Reisch<sup>a,\*</sup>, Dirk Langemann<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*TU Braunschweig, Institute for Partial Differential Equations, Universitätsplatz 2, 38106 Braunschweig, Germany*

---

## Abstract

This paper shows the global existence and boundedness of solutions of a reaction diffusion system modeling liver infections. Non-local effects in the dynamics between the virus and the cells of the immune system lead to an integro-partial differential equation with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions. Depending on the chosen model parameters, the system shows two types of solutions which are interpreted as different infection courses. Apart from solutions decaying to zero, there are solutions with a tendency towards a stationary and spatially inhomogeneous state.

By proving the boundedness of the solution in the  $L^1(\Omega)$ - and the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norms, it is possible to show the global boundedness of the solution. The proof uses the opposite mechanisms in the reaction terms. The gained rough estimates for showing the boundedness in the  $L^1(\Omega)$ - and the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norms are compared numerically with the norms of the solutions.

*Keywords:* reaction diffusion equations, integro-partial differential equation, existence, global bounds, modeling inflammation

*2020 MSC:* 35A01, 35K57, 35Q92, 45K05, 92-10

---

## 1. Introduction

Modeling the dynamics of virus and the immune system during a liver infection caused by a hepatitis virus is challenging because the mechanisms behind persisting infections over month or years are still unknown, [20]. An opportunity for overcoming the problem of unknown mechanisms on the cell scale contains two integrative changes. First, the modeling scale is changed from the cell scale towards a mesoscopic scale on the length scale of a few centimeters. Second, the mechanisms, which are unknown in detail, are replaced by integrative mechanisms representing the commonly accepted properties of the unknown mechanisms. This change of view results in a compact model of partial differential equations.

Modeling inflammations with differential equations is a widely used approach. For example in [7, 21], atherogenesis as a particular inflammation is modeled with reaction diffusion equations. In [7], instable states are interpreted as persisting infections, whereas in [21] travelling waves are interpreted as persisting infections. Rezounenko [16] presents a reaction diffusion system for modeling the dynamics of liver infections. In [4, 5] systems of ordinary equations are used for modeling the total amount of immune system cells and virus during a hepatitis C liver infection.

In [8, 11, 12, 13] liver inflammations are modeled by using reaction diffusion equations describing the virus concentration and the T cell population during an infection. As a specific feature, the reaction diffusion equations include a space-dependent and non-local term describing the inflow of T cells in a small part of the modeled region. The amount of inflowing T cells depends on the total virus amount in

---

\*Corresponding author

*Email addresses:* [c.reisch@tu-bs.de](mailto:c.reisch@tu-bs.de) (Cordula Reisch), [d.langemann@tu-bs.de](mailto:d.langemann@tu-bs.de) (Dirk Langemann)

the regarded part of the liver. The dependency on the total virus amount is represented by an integral term over the whole domain. The non-local term models the T cell dispersal starting in the lymphs.

The description of the inflow region, called portal field, reflects some important parts of the real liver structure. Therefore, the term is desirable even if it makes the mathematical analysis of the model more difficult. One difficult task caused by the non-local and space-depending term is the proof of the longterm existence of a solution. Often used results for parabolic partial differential equations are based on Lipschitz continuous reaction functions with respect to the state variable or require monotonous reaction functions. These results are not directly applicable to the system modeling the dynamics for liver infections, see Sec. 3.

In this paper, the longterm existence and boundedness of solutions of the model proposed in [8] is proven. Therefore, the model is presented in Sec. 2. An important property of the reaction functions are the oppositely acting tendencies of the mechanisms which have some similarity to the classical Lotka-Volterra predator prey models. Particularly the non-local term is a new feature compared to the classical model and influences the dynamics of the model notably, not only by its position-dependency and the integral term.

In Sec. 3, the longterm existence of solutions is proven. First, the local existence of a weak solution is concluded from existence results for parabolic differential equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Additionally, properties of the solution like its non-negativity and the boundedness of one state variable are shown. Due to the reaction term modeling the inflow of T cells, showing a-priori boundedness of the second state variable is the main concern.

The boundedness of the second variable is shown in different steps, starting with proofs of the boundedness of the solution in  $L^1(\Omega)$  and  $L^2(\Omega)$  in Sec. 3.2. The proofs use different functionals depending on the  $L^1(\Omega)$ - or  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norms and they are handling the oppositely acting mechanisms in the reaction function. As a result, we get rough but robust estimates for the  $L^1(\Omega)$ - and  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norms of the solution.

The results are used for proving the boundedness of the solution in the  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -norm. Consequently, the global existence of a bounded solution is shown.

In Sec. 4, the quality of used estimates is visualized for different solutions types which are interpreted as different infection courses. The paper finishes with a conclusion of the results and further ideas.

## 2. Reaction diffusion infection model with non-local inflow

A model for describing the interaction between virus and T cells during a viral liver infection is presented in [8] and analyzed in [8, 11, 12, 13]. The virus population  $u = u(t, \mathbf{x})$  is named according to the prey in the classical Lotka Volterra model and interpreted as a concentration. The cells of the immune system are concluded as T cells. They can be seen as a predator for the virus and are therefore named  $v = v(t, \mathbf{x})$ . We model the interaction in a part of the liver seen as a domain  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $d = \{2, 3\}$ .

According to [8], the T cells, as the summed cells of the immune system, kill infected liver cells and thus the virus. Both, the T cells and the virus spread out in the liver, modeled by diffusion terms. The virus grow by reproduction in dependency of the local virus amount. The change of the T cell population depends on the total virus load inside the liver, which is modeled by an inflow term  $j[u]$ .

Since the T cells as immune response are produced in the lymphs outside the liver, the T cells arrive in the regarded part of the liver through portal fields, which are sub-domains  $\Theta \subset \Omega$ . Furthermore, the external production of the immune response motivates the dependence of the inflow  $j = j[u]$  on the total amount of virus in the regarded domain  $\Omega$ , i.e. the inflow  $j = j[u](\mathbf{x})$  in every point  $\mathbf{x} \in \Theta$  depends non-locally on the integral  $U(t) = \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$  of  $u$  over  $\Omega$ .

We regard, as a simplification, the boundary  $\partial\Omega$  of the domain  $\Omega$  to be impermeable. This results in zero flux or homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

Using as few mechanisms as possible, see [13], we find the predator-prey model

$$\begin{aligned}
u_{,t} &= ww(u) - \gamma uv + \alpha \Delta u && \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0, \\
v_{,t} &= j[u] - \eta(1-u)v + \beta \Delta v && \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0, \\
u(0, \mathbf{x}) &= u_0(\mathbf{x}), v(0, \mathbf{x}) = v_0(\mathbf{x}) && \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\
0 &= \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{n} = \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} && \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, t > 0
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with a growth function  $w(u)$  describing the non-linear growth of the virus in absence of other mechanisms and the non-local inflow  $j = j[u](\mathbf{x})$  of T cells. The constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  describe the strength of diffusion. The reaction diffusion system in Eq. (1) contains the predator term  $\gamma uv$  diminishing the virus in presence of the immune response  $v$ , and the decay term  $\eta(1-u)v$  describing the fade out of the immune response in absence of any virus.

The growth rate  $w$  in [8] describes a logistic growth of the virus with a strong Allee effect [1], i. e.

$$w(u) = (1-u) \frac{u - u_{\min}}{u + \kappa} \quad \text{with } 0 < u_{\min} \ll 1 \text{ and } \kappa > 0. \tag{2}$$

The minimal density for the survival of the virus is  $u_{\min}$ . Otherwise, the virus is locally attacked and it decreases without the secondary immune response from the lymphs. The parameter  $\kappa$  is a small parameter fitting the growth in Eq. (2) to a pure logistic growth for values  $u$  close to 1.

**Remark 1.** *The particular choice of the growth rate makes  $w(u_{\min}) = 0$  and  $w(1) = 0$ , and it is positive between the zeros. Furthermore  $w$  behaves asymptotically like  $1-u$  for large  $u$ , and we find that  $w$  is increasing in the interval  $[0, u_{\min}]$ . Thus, the minimal value  $w(u)$  for  $u \in [0, 1]$  is  $w(0) = -u_{\min}/\kappa$ .*

Opposite to the classical Lotka-Volterra model, the Allee effect allows a population to become extinct. Besides, the Allee effect does not influence qualitatively the system behavior for larger values  $u$ .

**Remark 2.** *Eq. (2) norms the capacity of the logistic growth to 1 because  $w(u) < 0$  for all  $u > 1$ . There is no loss of generality because the normalization of  $u$  is a pure scaling. A possible  $u$  with  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) > 1$  at some  $\mathbf{x}$  decays in finite time below 1. Due to this realistic property of the model, system (1) is suitable only for  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ .*

The non-local inflow term is

$$j[u](\mathbf{x}) = \delta \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) \int_{\Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \delta \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) U(t) \quad \text{where } U(t) = \int_{\Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \tag{3}$$

is the total amount of virus, and  $\chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x})$  is a non-negative function with  $\text{supp } \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \Theta$  and

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Theta} \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 1. \tag{4}$$

As a realistic inflow, we consider  $\chi_{\Theta}$  to be at least a bounded and piecewise continuous function.

A non-smooth example for  $\chi_{\Theta}$  is the characteristic function on the subdomain  $\Theta \subset \Omega$  providing  $1/|\Theta|$  for  $\mathbf{x} \in \Theta$  and 0 elsewhere.

Analogously, to Eq. (3), we define the integral of the non-negative  $v$  over  $\Omega$  as

$$V(t) = \|v(t, \mathbf{x})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \int_{\Omega} v(t, \cdot) d\mathbf{x}. \tag{5}$$

**Remark 3.** *Since the integral over  $\chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x})$  is 1, we see that the total inflow*

$$J = \int_{\Omega} j[u](\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Theta} \delta \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) U(t) d\mathbf{x} = \delta U(t) \tag{6}$$

*is proportional to the total amount of virus.*

The total amount  $U(t)$  of virus at the time instant  $t$  occurs in Eq. (3) and results in the non-local inflow term in the reaction diffusion system in Eq. (1). Consequently, the model equations in Eq. (1) are only meaningful if the integral in Eq. (3) exists and is finite, i.e. if  $u(t, \cdot) \in L^1(\Omega)$ . We show in Sec. 3.2, that the solutions  $u$  and  $v$  stay in  $L^1(\Omega)$  after they are once in  $L^1(\Omega)$ . So in particular, we show therewith that no blow-up in  $L^1(\Omega)$  will occur, cf. Sec. 3.2.

The reaction terms in both reaction diffusion equations in system (1) contain oppositely acting mechanisms. For the first state variable  $u$ , the growth function leads to an increase of  $u$  for all  $u > u_{\min}$ . As a contrary effect, the second reaction term describes a decrease depending on the amount of the second state variable  $v$ . The reaction terms of the second state variable  $v$  can be separated into three different mechanisms. First,  $v$  increases with the total amount of  $u$  in the domain  $\Omega$ . The increase of  $v$  is space-dependent and takes place in a subdomain  $\Theta \subset \Omega$ . The second mechanism is a decrease  $-\eta v$ , which depends linearly on  $v$ . As a third mechanism, there is a term opposite to the decrease mechanism of the first variable. Similarly to the mechanisms in a classical Lotka Volterra system, the second state variable is increasing in dependency on the first state variable.

Fig. 1 shows a state chart of the reaction mechanisms. This simplified chart does not show the space dependency of the increase of  $v$  by the term  $j[u]$ .




Figure 1: State chart for the reaction mechanisms of system (1) for  $u$  above  $u_{\min}$ . The influence of  $u$  is positive on both populations  $u$  and  $v$ . In contrast, the influence of  $v$  on both populations is negative. Additional to the dynamics of the classical predator-prey mode, there is a positive influence on  $v$  just depending on  $u$ , compare the thicker line. This might lead to an unbounded growth of  $v$ , what is part of our discussion. The feedback loop of an increasing predator population slowing down its own growth by diminishing the prey population is marked by  $(-)$ .

The non-local inflow term  $j[u]$  is a considerate expansion of the classical Lotka Volterra system because the growth of the predator depends directly and linear on the prey in Eq. (1). That enforces the feedback loop in the way, that an increasing predator population slows down its own growth by diminishing the prey population in  $u$ , compare  $(-)$  in Fig. 1.

**Remark 4** (Modeling scale). *In the context of liver infections, the area  $\Theta$  can be seen as a model for a portal field through which  $T$  cells enter a certain part of the liver  $\Omega$ . The model abstracts from the cell-scale structure of the liver and the involved cells. Nevertheless, we cover some basic structure of a liver by still regarding portal fields in the liver.*

We observe in [8] that the system (1) has solutions which can be divided into two qualitative different types. On the one hand, there are solutions tending towards zero. On the other hand, we find solutions with a tendency towards a stationary state which is spatially inhomogeneous. The used parameters and the shape and size of the domain  $\Omega$  control towards which stationary state the solution is tending. See [8, 11, 13, 14] for further details on the analytical results.

As the model was found in the context of liver infections, we interpret the two qualitative different solution types as different infection courses. Solutions with a tendency towards zero are interpreted as healing courses, see Fig. 2. The immune system is able to kill all infected cells during an active phase and therefore, the virus vanishes. Afterwards, the immune reaction fades out and the  $T$  cell amount tends towards zero as well, see Fig. 2(f).

Solutions with tendency towards stationary spatially inhomogeneous states are interpreted as persisting or chronic infections, compare Fig. 3. After an active phase with a strong immune reaction in Fig. 3(d),




Figure 2: Numerical simulation with a solution interpreted as healing infection course. Used parameter values are  $u_{\min} = 0.05$ ,  $\kappa = 0.01$ ,  $\gamma = 0.9$ ,  $\delta = 3.7$ ,  $\eta = 0.2$ ,  $\alpha = 0.6$  and  $\beta = 0.3$ . (a), (b) show initial conditions connected to a starting time right after the activation of the immune response. In (d) T cells enter the domain through an area  $\Theta$  around  $(x_1, x_2) = (1, 1)$ . The virus is killed by the T cells and decays in (c) and (e). (f) shows a decaying T cell population due to the very low virus concentration. Both population vanish after an active phase.

the T cell amount decays, but does not vanish and the virus persists in the liver. In the stationary phase, there is still virus in the whole domain  $\Omega$ , see Fig. 3(e), and T cells as well, see Fig. 3(f).

In addition to Fig. 2 and 3, where space-dependent solutions for a fixed time are displayed, Fig. 4 shows the trajectories of the total virus  $U(t)$  and T cell populations  $V(t)$  of different infection courses over the time.

Fig. 4 shows, that in both cases the total populations tend towards a stationary state. Together with the space dependent Fig. 3, Fig. 4 shows the tendency of the solution towards a spatially inhomogeneous stationary distribution for a chronic infection course.

### 3. Existence

The model in Eq. (1) reflects biological structures, see Remark 4, and uses a non-local and space-dependent term for modeling the biological structure of the application. The analysis of this model leads to an interesting new problem which cannot be handled easily by standard approaches.

Of course, there are many theorems for the existence of a solution of a reaction diffusion system or more general a parabolic partial differential equation. In this section, we mention some important results on the existence of solutions for reaction diffusion equations and explain, why they cannot be applied directly to the system (1).

There are at least two main approaches often used in proofs of existence theorems for parabolic partial differential equations. One approach is the use of fixed point theorems, like the Banach fixed point theorem, the Brouwer fixed point theorem and from this following the Schauder and the Leray-Schauder fixed point theorems, [6]. The second approach uses semigroups theory, see [2, 10].

The first approach using fixed point theorems can be found for example in [6, p. 536]. There, the existence and uniqueness of solutions is shown under the requirement, that the reaction function  $\mathbf{f}$  is Lipschitz continuous with respect to the state variables  $\mathbf{q} = (u, v)^T$ . This requirement is used for showing the contraction of the operator for the fixed point theorem. Additionally, the theorem in [6] requires Dirichlet boundary conditions.

In [18, p. 188], an existence theorem for a reaction diffusion system with Lotka Volterra reaction terms




Figure 3: Numerical simulation with a solution interpreted as chronic or persisting infection course. Used parameter values are the same as in Fig. 2 but  $\delta = 0.7$  and  $\eta = 0.9$ . Starting with the same initial conditions as in Fig. 2, the virus and the T cells persist in the whole domain. The T cell population is higher around the portal field  $\Theta$ , where the virus concentration is slightly lower, see (e) and (f) with different scales.




Figure 4: Numerical simulations according to those in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3. (a) Total virus  $U$  and T cell amount  $V$  during a chronic or healing infection course over the time. (b) Summed dynamics of a healing or chronic infection course in phase space.

is shown. The proof is based on the Schauder fixed point theorem and uses a-priori bounds for the state variables.

There are several proofs for monotonous reaction functions as well, see [19, p. 120].

Unfortunately, the reaction functions in Eq. (1) are neither globally Lipschitz continuous with respect to the state variables  $u$  and  $v$ , nor monotonous. Even if  $u$  is bounded by construction by an upper limit 1, an a-priori upper bound for  $v$  is not obvious. We show the existence of a global upper bound in Sec. 3.3.

Existence results using a semigroup approach are based on limited growth conditions, for example [10, p. 276]. Due to the non-local integro term, the nonlinear terms and the unavailable a-priori bound for  $v$ , the system in Eq. (1) does not fulfill the requirements for these existence results.

Results for reaction diffusion systems with non-local effects can be divided into results for nonlinear diffusion and nonlinear reaction terms. Laamri [9] show the global existence of solutions for systems with nonlinear diffusion,

$$u_{i,t} = \Delta\varphi_i(u_i) + f_i(u_1, \dots, u_m)$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. The results yield if the solutions are non-negative

and the total mass is controlled. Additionally, an a-priori estimate in the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm for the nonlinear reaction functions is required.

In [17], the reaction diffusion equation

$$u_{,t} = \Delta u + \int_{\Omega} u^p \, dy$$

with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions is analyzed. The global existence of non-negative solutions is shown for any  $p > 1$ .

As a third example, Anguiano [3] show the global existence of solutions of the general equation

$$u_{,t} + A(u) = F(u),$$

where  $A$  is a parabolic operator and  $F$  is bounded in the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm.

The results are mainly for single equations instead of systems, and the requirements are not fulfilled for system (1).

Therefore, we show the existence of solutions and their boundedness in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ . The section has the following structure. First, the existence of a weak solution for a small time span  $[0, T]$  is shown. We discuss some basic properties of such solutions like non-negativity of  $u$  and  $v$  and boundedness of  $u$ .

In Sec. 3.2, the boundedness of  $v$  in  $L^1(\Omega)$  is shown. Afterwards and building up on this result, the boundedness of the norm  $\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$  is proven.

Finally, in Sec. 3.3 the boundedness of the norm  $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$  is proven. With this boundedness, the global longterm existence of weak solutions of Eq. (1) is shown.

### 3.1. Properties of the weak solution

Starting with the definition of a weak solution, the existence of a weak solution of Eq. (1) for a small time span  $[0, T]$  is shown.

**Definition 5.** A weak solution of (1) on the time-interval  $[0, T]$  is a pair of functions  $(u, v)$  with  $u, v \in L^2([0, T]; H^1(\Omega))$  and  $u_{,t}, v_{,t} \in L^2([0, T]; H^{-1}(\Omega))$  for which

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u_{,t} \varphi \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\Omega} uw(u) \varphi - \gamma uv \varphi - \alpha \nabla u \cdot \nabla \varphi \, d\mathbf{x}, \\ \int_{\Omega} v_{,t} \varphi \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\Omega} j[u] \varphi - \eta(1-u)v \varphi - \beta \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi \, d\mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

is fulfilled for all  $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$  with  $\varphi = \varphi(\mathbf{x})$  and almost every time  $t \in [0, T]$ .

In [6, Theorem 9.2.2, p. 536] the existence of a unique weak solution of a reaction diffusion system

$$\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}) + D\Delta \mathbf{q} \quad \text{with } \mathbf{q} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \beta \end{pmatrix}$$

with Dirichlet boundary conditions and a Lipschitz continuous reaction function  $\mathbf{f}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{q}$  is proven. The first step of the proof shows the existence of a weak solution in case of an externally given function  $\mathbf{h}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}(t))$  replacing the reaction terms. Additionally, it is shown in this step, that the time derivative of the solution is a  $L^2(\Omega)$ -function as well. Even if the reaction diffusion system (1) has Neumann boundary conditions and the reaction function does not fulfill globally Lipschitz conditions with respect to the state variables, this step is adaptable by the following considerations.

Regarding a solution  $\mathbf{q} \in C([0, T]; L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2))$ , which is bounded in a suitable chosen time interval  $t \in [0, T]$ . Define  $\mathbf{h}(t) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{q}(t))$  as a right-hand side for the general parabolic system

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_t - D\Delta\mathbf{q} &= \mathbf{h}(t) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, 0 < t < T, \\ \nabla\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{n} &= \mathbf{0} & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, 0 < t < T, \\ \mathbf{q}(0, \mathbf{x}) &= \mathbf{q}_0(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Due to the boundedness of  $\mathbf{q}$  in the limited time interval and the smoothness of  $\mathbf{f}$ , the function  $\mathbf{h}$  is regular in the sense, that  $\mathbf{h} \in L^2([0, T]; L^2(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^2))$ .

In [6, Theorem 3, p. 378], the existence of a weak solution for systems like in Eq. (7) but with Dirichlet boundary conditions is shown. By replacing the Sobolev space  $H_0^1(\Omega)$  by  $H^1(\Omega)$  and changing some of the constants, a completely analogous proof assures the existence of a weak solution in case of homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $u_0, v_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  and  $T > 0$  such that  $u(t), v(t) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then, there exists a weak solution  $u(t, \cdot), v(t, \cdot) \in L^2((0, T), H^1(\Omega))$  with  $u_{,t}(t, \cdot), v_{,t}(t, \cdot) \in L^2((0, T), H^{-1}(\Omega))$  of system (1).*

The proof follows [6, Theorem 9.2.2, p. 536] and [6, Theorem 3, p. 378] with the mentioned adaptations of the boundary conditions.

The weak solution  $(u, v)$  of Eq. (1) fulfills some basic properties.

**Lemma 7** (Non-negativity). *If  $u_0(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $v_0(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , then  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $v(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  yield for all  $t \in (0, T)$  and all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Regard the point  $\mathbf{x}_{\min} \in \Omega$ , where one state variable has its minimal value. If at one time  $t$  the minimum  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) = u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) = 0$  touches the lower bound of the positive domain, then Eq. (1) provides that the reaction term

$$u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min})w(u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min})) - \gamma u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min})v(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) = 0$$

vanishes at the point  $\mathbf{x}_{\min}$  of the minimum. At the same time,  $\Delta u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) \geq 0$  at this point. Thus,  $u$  cannot pass zeros, and stays non-negative.

Similarly, if  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} v(t, \mathbf{x}) = v(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) = 0$ , then  $j[u](\mathbf{x}_{\min}) \geq 0$ ,  $\eta(1 - u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}))v(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) = 0$  and  $\Delta v(t, \mathbf{x}_{\min}) \geq 0$ , and  $v$  stays non-negative as long as it exists, too.  $\square$

**Lemma 8** (Boundedness of  $u$ ). *If  $u_0(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , then the (weak) solution  $u(t, \mathbf{x})$  is bounded by  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  for all  $t \in (0, T)$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ .*

*Proof.* Regard the maximum value  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) = u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\max})$ . If this maximum is equal to 1, then the growth term  $uw(u)$  vanishes at  $\mathbf{x}_{\max}$ , see Remark 1, the predator term  $-\gamma uv$  is not positive, and the diffusion term  $\alpha\Delta u$  is not positive, too, cf. proof of Lemma 7. Consequently, the maximum  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x})$  cannot grow above 1.  $\square$

According to Remark 2, the model in Eq. (1) is not suitable for values of  $u$  larger than 1. Initial conditions with  $u_0 > 1$  does not affect the boundedness of  $u$  by 1.

**Corollary 9.** *If  $u_0(\mathbf{x}) > 1$  for some  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , there exists a time  $t_1$  with  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  for all  $t > t_1$ .*

*Proof.* Again, we regard the maximum  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) = u(t, \mathbf{x}_{\max})$ . If it is larger than 1, the logistic growth  $uw(u)$  is strictly negative at the point  $\mathbf{x}_{\max}$ . Since  $u$  has its maximum at  $\mathbf{x}_{\max}$ , the diffusion term fulfills  $\alpha\Delta u \leq 0$ . At the same time,  $v$  is increasing, so that the predator term  $-\gamma uv$  is larger than 0, and the maximum  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x})$  passes the value 1 with a non-zero time derivative at a finite time instant  $t_1$ .  $\square$



The proof shows that  $u$  does not tend to 1, but rather passes 1. We formulate this observation in a next corollary saying that  $u$  becomes smaller than 1 together with a non-vanishing  $v$  on some sub-domain of  $\Omega$ .

**Corollary 10.** *All bounded and non-vanishing initial values allow to find a time instant  $t_2$  for which  $u(t_2, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  holds true for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and  $U(t_2) < (1 - \varepsilon)|\Omega|$  yields for  $\varepsilon > 0$ . At the same time,  $v$  is not vanishing at points  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  where  $u$  is smaller than 1.*

*Proof.* If the function  $u(t, \cdot)$  is not identical to  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x})$ , then Cor. 9 provides  $t_1$  with  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  for all  $t > t_1$ . Due to the position-dependency of  $u$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $U(t_1) < (1 - \varepsilon)|\Omega|$ .

For space-independent functions  $u(t_1, \mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t_1, \mathbf{x})$ , only the situation

$$u(t_1, \mathbf{x}) = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t_1, \mathbf{x}) = 1$$

is interesting. If  $u(t, \mathbf{x}) > 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , the reaction terms lead to a decay with  $u(t_2, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  due to Cor. 9. Let  $(t_1, \mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} u(t_1, \mathbf{x}) = 1$ .

Since the inflow  $j[u]$  is positive in both cases,  $v$  increases, and the predator term  $-\gamma uv$  is strictly negative in  $\Theta$  for all  $t > t_1$ . Therefore the assertions are fulfilled for every  $t_2 > t_1$  with sufficiently small  $t_2 - t_1$ .  $\square$

In the following, we assume initial conditions  $u(0, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ . As shown in Cor. 9 and 10 and according to the formulation of system (1), this is not a restriction.

**Corollary 11.** *Let  $(u, v)$  be a solution of system (1) for  $t \in (0, T)$  with initial conditions  $0 \leq u(0, \mathbf{x}) \leq 1$  and  $0 \leq v(0, \mathbf{x}) \leq v_{\max} < \infty$ . Then, the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm  $U(t) = \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$  is bounded by  $U(t) \leq |\Omega|$  for all times  $t \in [0, T)$ .*

*Proof.* Due to Lemma 8, the solution  $u(t, \mathbf{x})$  is bounded by 1. Integration of both sides of  $u \leq 1$  gives  $U(t) \leq |\Omega|$ .  $\square$

With these results, we found a (weak) solution for a time interval  $[0, T)$ , which is non-negative and at least one component of the solution, namely  $u$ , is bounded. The increase of the second component  $v$  depends on the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm  $U$  of  $u$ . Hence, until now,  $v$  could still grow over all bounds.

Consequently, we have to show that the increase of  $v$  happens simultaneously to a decrease of  $U$ , cf. Fig. 1, and that this simultaneity makes  $v$  to be bounded in the different norms.

Since we will need it in the next section for showing that blow-ups of the solution of system (1) do not occur, we prove that  $u$  is not only bounded by 1 but it is sufficiently remote from 1 after some time. The medical background suggests that a virus density close to 1 provokes an increase of the immune response. Hence, the virus density decreases. This slows down the influx of T cells again, compare the opposite directions of the mechanisms in Fig. 1. The following Lemma 12 will give a very rough estimate for this observation.

But first, we consider the solution  $v_{\text{aux}} = v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x})$  of the auxiliary stationary problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta \Delta v + \eta v &= \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The function  $\chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  is at least piecewise continuous and not vanishing in the whole domain  $\Omega$ . Consequently  $v_{\text{aux}}$  is continuous, bounded and positive. Since  $\chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x})$  is positive only in the influx region  $\Theta$ , there is some value  $v_{\text{thr}} > 0$  with  $v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq v_{\text{thr}}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Theta$ .

Therewith, we are prepared to prove the announced Lemma.

**Lemma 12.** For all  $\varrho \geq 0$ , there is a  $\theta$  with  $0 < \theta < 1$  and a time  $t_3$  with

$$\int_{\Omega} uv^{\varrho} \, d\mathbf{x} \leq \theta \int_{\Omega} v^{\varrho} \, d\mathbf{x} \quad (9)$$

for all  $t \geq t_3$ .

*Proof.* First, we show that there is at least one  $t_3$  for which Eq. (9) is fulfilled.

Assume, there would be no such  $t_3$ . Then,  $u$  must be equal 1 almost everywhere in  $\text{supp } v \subset \Omega$  for all time  $t$ . As a solution of Eq. (1),  $u$  is continuous with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$ . Consequently,  $u$  must be equal 1 in  $\Theta$  and we get the rough estimate  $U(t) \geq |\Theta|$ . Now, the evolution of  $v$  in Eq. (1) reads

$$v_{,t} = j[u] - \eta(1-u)v + \beta\Delta v \geq \delta U(t)\chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x}) - \eta v + \beta\Delta v,$$

and after a transient phase, we get

$$v(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq \delta U(t)v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \delta|\Theta|v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x})$$

and thus

$$v(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq \delta|\Theta|v_{\text{thr}} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \Theta. \quad (10)$$

Finally, the first equation in system (1) reads

$$u_{,t} = uw(u) - \gamma uv + \alpha\Delta u \leq u(w(u) - \gamma\delta U(t)v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x})) + \alpha\Delta u.$$

So, Eq. (10) implies  $u_{,t} < 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Theta$ , what contradicts the assumption  $u = 1$  in  $\Theta$ . Consequently, there is at least one time instant  $t_3$  fulfilling Eq. (9).

If we now assume that  $u$  grows again after  $t_3$  so that the estimate (9) is hurt for every  $\theta < 1$  at some  $t_4$ , that would mean  $u$  gets arbitrarily close to 1 in  $\Theta$ . This is again a contradiction to

$$w(u) - \gamma\delta U(t)v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x}) \leq w(u) - \gamma\delta|\Theta|v_{\text{aux}}(\mathbf{x}) < 0$$

at this time instant  $t_4$ . □

In the next steps, we show, that there exists an upper bound for  $v$  as well. First, we show, that  $v$  is bounded in  $L^1(\Omega)$  for  $t \in (0, T)$ . Next, we expand this property for all times  $T > 0$ . As an intermediate step, we show  $v(t, \cdot) \in L^2(\Omega)$ . Finally, by using the stationary solution of another related elliptic equation for a stationary problem, we prove that  $v$  is bounded and smooth for all times  $t$ ,  $v(t, \cdot) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ .

### 3.2. $L^p(\Omega)$ bounds

First, we determine a  $L^1(\Omega)$  bound for  $v$ . With Theorem 6 we have a (weak) solution  $(u, v)$  with  $u(t, \cdot), v(t, \cdot) \in H^1(\Omega)$  for  $t \in [0, T)$  with a time  $T$ .

In this section, we show, that  $V$  is not growing to infinity for  $t \in [0, T)$ .

Therefore, we regard the time derivative of the functional  $\Phi = \eta U + \gamma V$  which is a linear combination of the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms of  $u$  and  $v$ .

**Theorem 13.** Any pair  $(U(0), V(0))$  with  $0 \leq U(0) \leq |\Omega|$  and  $0 \leq V(0) < \infty$  allows to find a trapezoid  $\Sigma = \{(U, V) : U \in [0, |\Omega|], V \in [0, V_{\text{up}} - \frac{\eta}{\gamma}U]\}$  such that  $(U(t), V(t)) \in \Sigma$  for all  $t \in [0, T)$ , i. e. as long as the solution  $(u, v)$  of system (1) exists in  $L^1(\Omega)$ .

This theorem says that the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm of a solution  $(u, v)$  of system (1) stays in a bounded region  $\Sigma$  as long as a weak solution exists.

*Proof.* The time derivative of the functional  $\Phi = \eta U + \gamma V$  is with system (1)

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{,t} &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \eta u + \gamma v \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \eta u_{,t}(t, \mathbf{x}) + \gamma v_{,t}(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \eta u w(u) - \eta \gamma u v + \eta \alpha \Delta u + \gamma j[u] + \eta \gamma u v - \eta \gamma v + \gamma \beta \Delta v \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \eta u w(u) + \gamma j[u] - \eta \gamma v \, d\mathbf{x},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the divergence theorem and homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions from Eq. (1).

The solution  $u$  is meaningful for values between 0 and 1. Due to Cor. 9, it suffices to regard solutions  $u$  bounded by 0 and 1, see Lemma 7 and 8. Consequently, the growth function  $w(u)$  in Eq. (2) is smaller than 1 for all  $u \in [0, 1]$ . We get

$$\Phi_{,t} \leq \eta \int_{\Omega} u(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} + \gamma \int_{\Omega} j[u] \, d\mathbf{x} - \gamma \eta \int_{\Omega} v(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

The inflow term  $j[u]$  is bounded, see Remark 3, and with Eqs. (3) and (5), we can write

$$\Phi_{,t} \leq \eta U(t) + \gamma \delta U(t) - \gamma \eta V(t) = (\eta + \gamma \delta) U(t) - \gamma \eta V(t), \quad (11)$$

which is not positive for  $U \leq |\Omega|$  and  $V \geq \frac{\eta + \gamma \delta}{\gamma \eta} |\Omega|$ . The derivative is non-positive for

$$\Phi \geq \eta |\Omega| + \gamma \frac{\eta + \gamma \delta}{\gamma \eta} |\Omega| = \left( \eta + 1 + \frac{\gamma \delta}{\eta} \right) |\Omega| = \gamma V_{\text{up}}$$

and  $U \leq |\Omega|$ .

Since  $U$  stays lower than  $|\Omega|$ , compare Cor. 11,  $\Phi \geq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$  implies  $\Phi_{,t} \leq 0$ , see Eq. (11). In particular,  $\Phi$  cannot pass  $\gamma V_{\text{up}}$  when it is once lower than  $\gamma V_{\text{up}}$  with  $U \leq |\Omega|$ . Consequently, the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm  $(U, V)$  of a solution  $(u, v)$  stays in  $\Sigma$  when it starts in  $\Sigma$ .

If now  $\Phi(0) = \eta U(0) + \gamma V(0) \leq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$ , then  $\Phi(t) \leq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$  for all admissible  $t$ . If otherwise  $\Phi(0) \geq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$ , we have shown that  $\Phi$  decreases until  $\Phi(t)$  is smaller than  $\gamma V_{\text{up}}$ .

Finally,  $\Phi(t) \leq \max\{\Phi(0), \gamma V_{\text{up}}\} = \gamma V_{\text{up}}$  for all admissible  $t$  and all initial values allow to construct a suitable  $\Sigma$  where the solution stays in.  $\square$

In Fig. 5, the trapezoid  $\Sigma$  is shown in the phase space of  $(U, V)$ . The arrows show the direction of the dynamics given by the reaction term in system (1). The arrows of the dynamics point inside  $\Sigma$  or at least not to the exterior, especially at the upper bound of  $V$ .

**Remark 14.** Since  $|\Omega| > 0$ , the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm  $V(t)$  of  $v$  is bounded by

$$V_{\text{up}} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \left( \eta + 1 + \frac{\gamma \delta}{\eta} \right) |\Omega| \quad (12)$$

for all  $t \in [0, T)$ .

**Remark 15.** Let  $\Sigma$  be the trapezoid in the phase space  $(U, V)$ , which is bounded by  $U = 0$ ,  $V = 0$ ,  $U = |\Omega|$  and  $\eta U + \gamma V \leq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$ . If the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms  $U(0) = \|u_0(\cdot)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$  and  $V(0) = \|v_0(\cdot)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$  are inside  $\Sigma$ , then the linear combination  $\eta U(t) + \gamma V(t)$  with  $U(t)$  and  $V(t)$  as the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms of the weak solutions  $u(t, \mathbf{x}), v(t, \mathbf{x})$  of system (1) with  $t \in (0, T)$  is inside of  $\Sigma$  as well.

The  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms  $U(T - \varepsilon)$  and  $V(T - \varepsilon)$  are for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  inside of  $\Sigma$ .  $\Sigma$  depends only on the initial values, but it is independent of the time  $t$  and the solutions  $u$  and  $v$  themselves. Consequently, the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms  $U(T)$  and  $V(T)$  are inside of  $\Sigma$  as well. The values  $u(T, \mathbf{x})$  and  $v(T, \mathbf{x})$  can be seen as new initial data of system (1). By induction, the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms  $U(t)$  and  $V(t)$  are inside of  $\Sigma$  for every  $t > 0$  and the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm  $V(t)$  of  $v(t, \mathbf{x})$  is bounded by  $V_{\text{up}}$  in Eq. (12) for all time  $t > 0$ .




Figure 5: Trapezoid  $\Sigma$  in the phase space  $(U, V)$  of the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms of a solution  $(u, v)$  of system (1). The scaled vector field shows the dynamics of the reaction terms in Eq. (1).

The second state variable  $v$  is not only bounded in the sense of  $L^1(\Omega)$  but also in the sense of  $L^2(\Omega)$ . This can be shown by regarding the time derivative of the functional

$$\Psi(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|v(t, \mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

**Theorem 16.** *Let  $(u, v)$  be a solution of system (1). Then, the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm of  $v$  is bounded for all  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* The time derivative of the functional  $\Psi$  is

$$\Psi_{,t} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \frac{v^2}{2} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} v \cdot v_{,t} \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} v j[u] + v \cdot \eta(u-1)v + v \cdot \beta \Delta v \, d\mathbf{x}.$$

Using Green's first identity and the zero-flux boundary conditions, we get

$$\beta \int_{\Omega} v \Delta v \, d\mathbf{x} = \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} v \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds - \beta \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x} = -\beta \int_{\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \nabla v \, d\mathbf{x} \leq 0.$$

Further, Remark 3 provides an estimate for the integral of  $j[u]$ , which is

$$\Psi_{,t} \leq \int_{\Omega} v \cdot j[u] + \eta(u-1)v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \leq \delta \chi_{\max} U \int_{\Omega} v \, d\mathbf{x} + \eta \int_{\Omega} (u-1)v^2 \, d\mathbf{x}$$

with  $\chi_{\max} = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \chi_{\Theta}(\mathbf{x})$  according to Eq. (4). Now, Remark 14 assures

$$\Psi_{,t} \leq \delta \chi_{\max} |\Omega| V_{\text{up}} + \eta \int_{\Omega} (u-1)v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} = M - \eta \xi(t) \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x},$$

with the constant  $M = \delta \chi_{\max} |\Omega| V_{\text{up}}$  and the weighted mean value  $\xi(t)$  defined by

$$\int_{\Omega} (1-u)v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} = \xi(t) \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x}. \quad (13)$$

The mean value  $\xi(t)$  fulfills  $0 < 1 - \theta \leq \xi(t)$  because of Lemma 12. Finally, the functional  $\Psi$  obeys the linear differential inequality

$$\Psi_{,t} = \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{2} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} \leq M - \eta \xi(t) \int_{\Omega} v^2 \, d\mathbf{x} = M - 2\eta \xi(t) \Psi \quad (14)$$

with a positive decay rate  $2\eta\xi(t)$  which stays remote from 0. Eq. (14) is a first order differential inequality, compare [22], and  $\Psi(t)$  is bounded by the solution of the linear first order differential equation  $y' = M - 2\eta\xi(t)y$  with  $\xi(t) \geq 1 - \theta > 0$ .

Thus, the largest possible accumulation point of  $\Psi$  is  $\frac{M}{2\eta(1-\theta)}$ , and the functional  $\Psi$  is bounded by  $\frac{M}{\eta(1-\theta)}$  after a transient phase.

Later in Sec. 4, we will use the estimate

$$\Psi(t) \leq \Psi(0)e^{-2\eta \int_0^t \xi(s) ds} + \frac{M}{2\eta(1-\theta)} \leq \Psi(0)e^{-2\eta(1-\theta)t} \quad (15)$$

for showing numerically the precision of the estimates.  $\square$

Theorem 13 and 16 show, that the  $L^1(\Omega)$ - and the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norms of  $v$  are not only bounded for a time interval  $[0, T)$  but for all time  $t > 0$ . So in these norms, the solution is not blowing up.

### 3.3. $L^\infty(\Omega)$ bounds and global existence

In this section, we show the boundedness of  $v$  in the sense of  $L^\infty(\Omega)$  for all  $t > 0$ . With the boundedness of  $v(t, \mathbf{x})$ , the existence of a solution  $(u, v)^T$  with finite values is shown for all  $t > 0$ .

We will prove, that there exists a value  $v_{\max}$  with  $v(t, x) \leq v_{\max}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and all  $t \in [0, \infty)$ . For this purpose, a stationary problem is defined. Let  $v^* = v^*(\mathbf{x})$  be a solution of

$$\begin{aligned} -\beta\Delta v &= \chi_\Theta(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

System (16) fulfills the solvability condition because the forces are equalized, see Eq. (4) and

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_\Theta(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} + \beta\Delta v \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \chi_\Theta(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} - \int_{\Omega} \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \, d\mathbf{x} + \beta \int_{\partial\Omega} \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} \, ds = 1 - \frac{|\Omega|}{|\Omega|} + 0 = 0.$$

**Remark 17.** *Since the right-hand side  $\chi_\Theta(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{1}{|\Omega|}$  in Eq. (16) is a bounded piecewise continuous function and thus in  $L^2(\Omega) \subset H^{-1}(\Omega)$ , the existence of a weak solution  $v^* \in H^1(\Omega)$  is ensured, compare [15].*

**Remark 18.** *The solution  $v^*$  of Eq. (16) has a free additive constant as always in pure Neumann problems. In the following, we fix just one  $v^*$  with  $\|v^*(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0$ .*

Now, we will show that the population  $v = v(t, \mathbf{x})$  in Eq. (1) does not grow to infinity. Even having already estimates for its  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm, cf. Theorem 13, and for its  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm, cf. Theorem 16, it is not trivial to give a pointwise bound. Before we will do that in the later Theorem 23, we collect some auxiliary results about solutions of partial differential equations with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

**Lemma 19.** *Let  $v = v(t, \mathbf{x})$  be the solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} v_{,t} &= \beta\Delta v - a(t, \mathbf{x})v + f(t, \mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ v(0, \mathbf{x}) &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

*with  $a(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $|f(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq C_f$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0$ . Then  $|\Delta v|$  is bounded by a constant  $C_c \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and  $t > 0$ .*

**Remark 20.** Eq. (17) is a heat conduction equation with the additional leveling term  $-a(t, \mathbf{x})v$ , homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions, i.e. no heat flux over the boundary, and a bounded heat source  $f$ . Hence, a physical point of view implies immediately a bounded curvature of  $v$ .

The mathematical argumentation starts with the Green's function  $G = G(t, \mathbf{x}, \tau, \mathbf{y})$  of Eq. (17), which is dominated by the singularity of the standard heat equation. Due to the Neumann boundary condition, there are no additional source terms at the boundary. The Laplacian  $\Delta v(\mathbf{x})$  is the convolution of  $\Delta_{\mathbf{x}}G$  with the bounded function  $f$ . This convolution can be estimated by a sum of spatial integrals over small domains and afterwards by time integration leading to terms in the Gauss' error function. Due to its technical effort, we omit the argumentation of the physically proven assertion of Lemma 19. By the way, another possible argumentation uses a discretization of the Eq. (17), where the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the discretized differential operator  $-(\Delta + a)$  can be estimated in a similarly technical argumentation. Then the limit case of a temporal step size tending to zero provides the assertion of Lemma 19 for every spatial discretization, and since  $f$  is bounded also the limit situation of a vanishing grid size.

**Lemma 21.** Let  $z : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a sufficiently smooth function with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions. The function  $z$  fulfills  $|\Delta z(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and  $\|z\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_2$ . Then its values  $z(\mathbf{x})$  are bounded by some  $z_{\max} < \infty$  with  $|z(\mathbf{x})| \leq z_{\max}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ .

*Proof.* Such a function  $z$  solves a boundary value problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta z(\mathbf{x}) &= \varrho(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, \\ \nabla z \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with a source term with  $|\varrho(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ . We choose a Green's function  $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  with  $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \Omega$ .

With an additive constant  $C_3$ , we have

$$z(\mathbf{x}) = \int_{\Omega} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \varrho(\mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} + C_3 \quad \text{and} \quad |z(\mathbf{x}) - C_3| \leq C_1 \int_{\Omega} G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \, d\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x})$$

with the smooth and bounded potential  $\tilde{\Phi}$  for a constant source term.

There is a value  $C_{3,\max} < \infty$  so that the condition  $\|z\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_2$  is not fulfilled for any  $C_3 \geq C_{3,\max}$ . Consequently, we get

$$|z(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_{3,\max} + \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \tilde{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}) = z_{\max} < \infty.$$

□

**Lemma 22.** Let  $v = v(t, \mathbf{x})$  be the solution of

$$\begin{aligned} v_{,t} &= \beta \Delta v - a(t, \mathbf{x})v + f(t, \mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0, \\ \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{n} &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \partial\Omega, t > 0, \\ v(0, \mathbf{x}) &= v_0(\mathbf{x}) & \text{for } \mathbf{x} \in \Omega \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

with  $a(t, \mathbf{x}) \geq 0$  and  $|f(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq C_f$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t > 0$  and bounded initial conditions  $v_0(\mathbf{x})$ . Furthermore, it shall be known that  $\|v\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq C_2$  is bounded.

Then, there is a bounded  $v_{\max}$  with  $|v(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq v_{\max}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$  and all  $t > 0$ .

At every maximum point of  $v(t, \cdot)$ , we find  $v_{,t} \leq f \leq C_f$ , and the maximum  $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} v(t, \cdot)$  grows at most linearly. So the following proof excludes an infinite growth of  $f$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* System (19) is a linear differential equation and the solution  $v$  decomposes into  $v = v_{\text{hom}} + v_{\text{part}}$ . The function  $v_{\text{hom}}$  obeys the homogeneous equation with  $f \equiv 0$  and fulfills the initial conditions  $v_0$ . The function  $v_{\text{part}}$  solves the system (17) from Lemma 19.

The function  $v_{\text{hom}}$  follows the maximum principle

$$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega, t \geq 0} |v_{\text{hom}}(t, \mathbf{x})| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} |v_0(\mathbf{x})|$$

and stays bounded.

Lemma 19 says that  $v_{\text{part}}(t, \cdot)$  has a bounded Laplacian  $|\Delta v_{\text{part}}(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq C_1$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ . Lemma 21 assures that  $v_{\text{part}}$  is bounded for all times by a  $z_{\text{max}} \in \mathbb{R}$ . Together with the boundedness of  $v_{\text{hom}}$ , we find

$$|v(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} |v_0(\mathbf{x})| + z_{\text{max}}.$$

□

**Theorem 23.** *The solution  $v$  of Eq. (1) is bounded by a finite value  $v_{\text{max}}$ .*

*Proof.* We decompose  $v = v(t, \mathbf{x})$  into

$$v(t, \mathbf{x}) = \delta v^*(\mathbf{x})U(t) + \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x})$$

and the evolution equation for  $v$  in Eq. (1) transforms into

$$v_{,t} = \delta U'(t)v^*(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{v}_{,t} = j[u] - \eta(1-u)(\delta Uv^* + \tilde{v}) + \delta U\beta\Delta v^* + \beta\Delta\tilde{v}. \quad (20)$$

Due to Eq. (3) and the stationary solution  $v^*$  of Eq. (16), Eq. (20) simplifies to

$$\tilde{v}_{,t} = \beta\Delta\tilde{v} - \eta(1-u)\tilde{v} + f, \quad (21)$$

where the exogenous influence

$$f = \frac{\delta U}{|\Omega|} - \eta(1-u)\delta Uv^* - \delta U'v^* \quad (22)$$

for the standard diffusion problem in Eq. (21) is a function in  $t$  and  $\mathbf{x}$  for fixed  $u$  and thus fixed  $U$  and  $U'$  are as well as  $v^*$ . Eq. (21) is completed with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions for  $\tilde{v}$ .

That means, we regard  $u$  to be given and investigate Eq. (21) as a diffusion problem for  $\tilde{v} = \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x})$  with the exogenous influence  $f = f(t, \mathbf{x})$ . Since

$$U'(t) = \int_{\Omega} uw(u) \, d\mathbf{x} - \gamma \int_{\Omega} uv \, d\mathbf{x}$$

and  $|w(u)| \leq \nu$  with  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , cf. Remark 1, we see

$$|U'(t)| \leq \nu U(t) + \gamma V(t)$$

for all  $t$ . Together with the boundedness of  $U$  and  $V$  for all  $t$ , the exogenous influence  $f$  in Eq. (22) is bounded by some constant  $C_f \geq |f(t, \mathbf{x})|$  for all  $t > 0$  and  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ .

Now with Eq. (21), we find

$$V_{\text{up}} \geq \int_{\Omega} v(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \delta U(t) \int_{\Omega} v^*(\mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} + \int_{\Omega} \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\Omega} \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x}. \quad (23)$$

Now, Eq. (21) fulfills all conditions of Lemma 22, namely  $a(t, \mathbf{x}) = \eta(1 - u) \geq 0$  and  $|f(t, \mathbf{x})| \leq C_f$  for a heat equation with homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions.

Consequently, there exists a maximal value  $\tilde{v}_{\max} \geq \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x})$  for all  $t > 0$  and all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ , and we get

$$v(t, \mathbf{x}) \leq \delta|\Omega| \max v^*(\mathbf{x}) + \tilde{v}_{\max} = v_{\max} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

□

**Remark 24.** *The solution  $v$  of Eq. (1) is bounded by a finite value  $v_{\max}$ . Finally, the solution  $v(\cdot, \mathbf{x})$  is a  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -function.*

In this section, we have proven the boundedness of the solution of Eq. (1). While the boundedness of  $u$  was a result of the used growth function and the interpretation as a concentration, the boundedness of  $v$  was not obvious. Using the oppositely acting mechanisms in the reaction functions and the boundedness of  $u$ , we first showed the boundedness of  $v$  in the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm.

We provided a bounded estimate for the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm of  $v$  by using the mean-value theorem of integration and the boundedness of  $\|v(\cdot, \mathbf{x})\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ .

For proving the boundedness of  $v$  in  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ , we separated  $v(t, \mathbf{x}) = \delta v^*(\mathbf{x})U(t) + \tilde{v}(t, \mathbf{x})$  into different functions. One component,  $v^*$ , of the functions was the solution of a stationary problem covering the space-dependent function modeling the inflow area of the liver structure. By showing the boundedness of all components of  $v$ , we proved in Theorem 23 that  $v$  has a finite maximal value.

#### 4. Numerical evaluation of the estimates

Oftentimes, estimates used in analytical results are rather rough. In this section, we show numerical simulations of the estimates and the exact value.

First, we evaluate the estimation of the domain  $\Sigma$  as maximal  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms. In Fig. 6, the trajectories of the two solutions from Fig. 2 and 3 provide the total amount  $U$  and  $V$ . They are compared to the estimated  $\Sigma$  following Theorem 13.




Figure 6: Comparison of the trajectories of different solutions in phase space  $(U, V)$  and the trapezoid  $\Sigma$ . (a) Healing course, see Fig. 2 for the parameters. The upper value  $V_{\text{up}}$  is given by  $V_{\text{up}} = 19.833$ . (b) Chronic course, see Fig. 3 for the parameters. The upper value  $V_{\text{up}}$  is given by  $V_{\text{up}} = 4$ .

Fig. 6 shows, that the upper bound of  $\eta U + \gamma V \leq \gamma V_{\text{up}}$  is a rather rough estimate for the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms of the solutions. In the numerical simulations in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, which are as well used in Fig. 6, the



initial conditions are  $u(0, \mathbf{x}) \equiv 1$  and  $v(0, \mathbf{x}) \equiv 0$ . A solution with larger initial conditions  $V(0)$  would reach closer to the upper bound given by  $\Phi = \gamma V_{\text{up}}$ . As shown in Theorem 13, the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norms of every solution with  $(U(0), V(0)) \in \Sigma$  stay in  $\Sigma$ .

Theorem 16 gives in Eq. (15) an estimate for the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm of  $v$ . By using  $\xi(t)$  as solution of Eq. (13) and directly Eq. (14) we get the approximation

$$\Psi(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|v(t, \mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq e^{-2\eta \int_0^t \xi(s) ds} \left( M \int_0^t e^{2\eta \int_0^\tau \xi(s) ds} d\tau + \Psi(0) \right)$$

with a parameter-dependent constant  $M = \delta|\Omega|\chi_{\text{max}}V_{\text{up}}$ . According to Lemma 12,  $0 < \xi(t) \leq 1$  yields.

In the cases of the two regarded simulations in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 of Eq. (1), the initial value  $\Psi(0)$  is zero, because  $v(0, \mathbf{x}) = 0$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega$ . Therefore, we compare the  $\Psi(t) = \frac{1}{2} \|v(t, \mathbf{x})\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$  with the functional

$$E(\xi(t)) = e^{-2\eta \int_0^t \xi(s) ds} \delta|\Omega|V_{\text{up}} \int_0^t e^{2\eta \int_0^\tau \xi(s) ds} d\tau.$$




Figure 7: Comparison  $\Psi(t)$  and  $E(\xi(t))$ . (a) Healing course, see Fig. 2 for the parameters. (b) Chronic course, see Fig. 3 for the parameters. In both cases,  $E(\xi(t))$  overestimates the functional  $\Psi(t)$ .

In both cases in Fig. 7, the estimation  $E$  is rather large compared to the functional  $\Psi(t)$ . Nevertheless, the estimate is a good approximation of scale of the maximal value of  $\Psi$ .

The numerical simulations show that the used estimates are rather loose even if they were sufficient for gaining the analytical existence results.

## 5. Conclusions

With the aim to modeling the dynamics of liver infections as an interplay between virus and T cells, a reaction diffusion system was presented in [8]. A non-local term in the reaction function describes the inflow of T cells depending on the total virus amount in the domain. The model abstracts from the cell scale with many unknown mechanisms to a mesoscopic length scale. On this scale, the mathematical description contains a space-dependent term which leads to a new problem concerning the analysis of reaction diffusion equations.

The aim of this paper was to prove the existence of bounded solutions for all time. Therefore, we started with a local existence theorem and some properties of a weak solution. Then, we showed the boundedness

of the solution in the  $L^1(\Omega)$ -norm and in the  $L^2(\Omega)$ -norm. Both results are based on the interplay of the two species in the population dynamics model and the oppositely acting mechanisms of growth and decay. We defined a stationary problem for showing the boundedness of the solution in the  $L^\infty(\Omega)$ -norm.

In Sec. 4, we evaluated the sharpness of the used estimates in the proofs. The numerical simulations show that the estimates are rather loose for the regarded cases.

A further investigation could be the improving of the used estimated such that the difference between estimate and real value of the functionals becomes smaller. Another possible extension is the application of the estimates for a wider class of integro-partial differential equations.

**Funding:** This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

**Declarations of interest:** none.

## References

## References

- [1] W.C. Allee, Principles of Animal Ecology. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1949.
- [2] H. Amann, Linear and Quasilinear Parabolic Problems. Birkhäuser, Boston, 1995.
- [3] M. Anguiano, P.E. Kloeden, T. Lorenz, Asymptotic behaviour of nonlocal reaction-diffusion equations, *Nonlinear Anal.-Theor.* **73**(9) (2010) 3044-3057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.na.2010.06.073>
- [4] P. Aston, A New Model for the Dynamics of Hepatitis C Infection: Derivation, Analysis and Implications, *Viruses* **10**(4) (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3390/v10040195>
- [5] H. Dahari, A. Lo, R.M. Ribeiro, A.S. Perelson, Modeling hepatitis C virus dynamics: Liver regeneration and critical drug efficacy, *J. Theor. Biol.* **247**(2) (2007) 371-381. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2007.03.006>
- [6] L.C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, second ed., Graduate Series in Mathematics **19**, AMS, Providence, 2010.
- [7] A.I. Ibragimov, C.J. McNeal, L.R. Ritter, J.R. Walton, A mathematical model of atherogenesis as an inflammatory response, *Math. Med. Biol.* **22**(4) (2005) 305-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/imammb/dqi011>
- [8] H.J. Kerl, D. Langemann, A. Vollrath, Reaction-diffusion equations and the chronification of liver infections, *Math. Comput. Simulat.* **82** (2012) 2145-2156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matcom.2012.04.011>
- [9] E.H. Laamri, M. Pierre, Global existence for reaction-diffusion systems with nonlinear diffusion and control of mass, *Ann I H Poincare-An* **34**(3) (2017) 571-591. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2016.03.002>
- [10] A. Lunardi, Analytic Semigroups and Optimal Regularity in Parabolic Problems, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
- [11] C. Reisch, D. Langemann, Chemotactic effects in reaction-diffusion equations for inflammation, *J. Biol. Phys.* **45** (2019) 253-273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10867-019-09527-3>
- [12] C. Reisch, D. Langemann, Modeling the Chronification Tendency of Liver Infections as Evolutionary Advantage, *Bull. Math. Biol.* **81** (2019) 4743-4760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11538-019-00596-y>

- [13] C. Reisch, Reaktions-Diffusions-Gleichungen und Modellfamilien zur Analyse von Entzündungsprozessen, Dissertation, Cuvillier, Göttingen, 2020.
- [14] C. Reisch, D. Langemann, Entropy functionals for finding requirements in hierarchical reaction-diffusion models for inflammations, *Math. Method Appl. Sci.* (2020) to appear.
- [15] M. Renardy, R.C. Rogers, An Introduction to Partial Differential Equations, Springer, New York, 2004.
- [16] A. Rezounenko, Viral infection model with diffusion and state-dependent delay: stability of classical solutions, *Discrete Cont. Dyn. - B* **23**(3) (2018) 1091-1105. <https://doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2018143>
- [17] P. Rouchon, Universal bounds for global solutions of a diffusion equation with a nonlocal reaction term, *J. Differ. Equations* **193**(1) (2003) 75-94. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0396\(03\)00039-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0396(03)00039-1)
- [18] T. Roubíček, Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations with Application, Springer, Basel, 2013.
- [19] R.E. Showalter, Monotone Operators in Banach Space and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations, AMS, Mathematical Surveys and monographs **49**, Providence, 1997.
- [20] E. Thomas, T.J. Liang, Experimental models of hepatitis B and C - new insights and progress, *Nat. Rev. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* **13**(6) (2016) 362-374. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrgastro.2016.37>
- [21] V.A. Volpert, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations, Monographs in mathematics **104**, Birkhäuser, Basel, 2014.
- [22] W. Walter, Ordinary Differential Equations, Springer, New York, 1998.