Abstract. A general system of \( n \) ordinary differential equations coupled with one reaction-diffusion equation, considered in a bounded \( N \)-dimensional domain, with no-flux boundary condition is studied in a context of pattern formation. Such initial boundary value problems may have different types of stationary solutions. In our parallel work \cite{Instability of all regular stationary solutions to reaction-diffusion-ODE systems (2021)}, regular (i.e. sufficiently smooth) stationary solutions are shown to exist, however, all of them are unstable. The goal of this work is to construct discontinuous stationary solutions to general reaction-diffusion-ODE systems and to find sufficient conditions for their stability.

1. Introduction

We study properties of solutions to the following general system of \( n \) ordinary differential equations coupled with one reaction-diffusion equation

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{du}{dt} &= f(u,v), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\
v_t &= \gamma \Delta v + g(u,v), \quad x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,
\end{align*}
\]  

with an unknown vector field (denoted by the bold font) and a scalar function:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
    u_1(x,t) \\
    \vdots \\
    u_n(x,t)
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad v = v(x,t).
\]

Here, we consider arbitrary \( C^2 \)-nonlinearities

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
    f_1(u,v) \\
    \vdots \\
    f_n(u,v)
\end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad g = g(u,v).
\]

System (1.1) is considered in a bounded open domain \( \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N \) for \( N \geq 1 \) with \( C^2 \)-boundary \( \partial \Omega \). Moreover, the reaction-diffusion equation in (1.1) is supplemented...
with the Neumann boundary condition

\[ \partial_{\nu}v = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \partial \Omega, \quad t > 0, \]

where \( \partial_{\nu} = \nu \cdot \nabla \) with \( \nu \) denoting the unit outer normal vector to \( \partial \Omega \). Problem (1.1)-(1.3) together with suitable initial conditions

\[ u(x,0) = u_0(x) = \begin{pmatrix} u_{0,1}(x) \\ \vdots \\ u_{0,n}(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad v(x,0) = v_0(x), \]

has a unique local-in-time solution, which we recall below in Theorem 6.1. Our goal is to identify a class of stationary solutions that are stable. Note that a couple \((U, V) = (U(x), V(x))\) is a stationary solution of this problem if it satisfies the relation

\[ f(U(x), V(x)) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega \]

and the boundary value problem

\[ \Delta V + g(U, V) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \] \[ \partial_{\nu}V = 0, \quad x \in \partial \Omega. \]

Problem (1.5)-(1.6) may have different types of stationary solutions. Particular versions of such a system have been studied in e.g. the works \([7,9–12,15,16,19–24,29–31]\) where the following two types of stationary solutions were considered.

1. Stationary solutions of the first type are called regular. In this case, the function \( U(x) \) is obtained from \( V(x) \) by solving equation (1.5) in such a way that \( U(x) = k(V(x)) \) for some \( C^2 \)-function \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_n) \).
2. The second class of stationary solutions is called jump-discontinuous, because \( U(x) \) is obtained from \( V(x) \) using different branches of solutions to equation (1.5), which result in jump discontinuities.

In our paper \([3]\), we deal with the first class of solutions and we show that regular stationary solutions are always unstable. That class of solutions includes Turing patterns that are close-to-equilibrium regular patterns. In this work, we construct stationary solutions with jump-discontinuities to problem (1.1)-(1.4) and we find sufficient conditions for their stability. This class of stationary solutions contains far-from-equilibrium stable patterns exhibiting jump-discontinuities. We obtain our stability results for general nonlinearities in system (1.1)-(1.2) and, in this way, we generalize a series of previous works where an existence and stability of either regular or discontinuous stationary solutions have been analysed in the case of specific reaction-diffusion-ODE systems from applications.

We begin our brief description of previous results by recalling the works by Fife \([6]\) and Mimura, Tabata and Hosono \([11,24]\) on a singular perturbation method used for constructing large amplitude solutions for two-components systems

\[ \varepsilon^2 u_{xx} + f(u, v) = 0, \quad v_{xx} + g(u, v) = 0, \]

with a small parameter \( \varepsilon \). Those works contain a construction of discontinuous stationary solutions to this system with \( \varepsilon = 0 \) which were then used as a lowest order approximation of a solution to the system with sufficiently small \( \varepsilon > 0 \).
Stable discontinuous stationary solutions to a simple system of one ODE coupled with one reaction-diffusion equation with a degenerate diffusion and in one dimension, have been constructed by Weinberger [31].

The following reaction-diffusion system of three ordinary/partial differential equations modelling the diffusion-regulated growth of a cell population

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \left( \frac{av}{u+v} - d_c \right) u, \\
    v_t &= -d_b v + u^2 w - dv, \\
    w_t &= D \Delta w - d_g w - u^2 w + dv + \kappa_0,
\end{align*}
\]

in a bounded domain and supplemented with zero-flux boundary condition for the function \( w \) and with nonnegative initial data have been studied in [21, 22]. The paper [21] contains a construction of regular and jump-discontinuous stationary solutions to this problem in the one dimensional case by using the phase plane analysis. All of them are unstable due to the so called autocatalysis property which was shown in [21, 22]. Those results can be extended to a higher dimensional domain by using the approach from this work.

Another one dimensional reaction-diffusion-ODE system

\[
\begin{align*}
    u_t &= \frac{1}{\gamma} u_{xx} + \alpha v - \beta u, \\
    v_t &= u - p(v),
\end{align*}
\]

for \( x \in [0, 1] \), supplemented with homogeneous Neumann boundary condition for \( u \) was introduced in [18] in order to understand the role of bistability and hysteresis in pattern formation (see also [12] for more comments). We refer the reader to [13] for a construction of stable discontinuous stationary solutions of the one dimensional problem (1.7). Here, in Section 7 we apply the general theory from this work to extend results from [13] on the \( N \)-dimensional version of model (1.7).

Here, we also recall the recent work [10] containing mathematical results on one reaction-diffusion equation on the interval coupled with either one or two ODEs. These are a new receptor-based model exhibiting the diffusion driven-instability and hysteresis which lead to de novo formation of stable patterns with jump type discontinuities. Those results are now a direct consequence of theorems from this paper.

Theory developed in this work and in [3] can be also applied to regular and discontinuous stationary solutions of other particular reaction-diffusion-ODE system studied in the papers [2, 8–13, 15, 16, 18, 21, 26, 28–31].

This work is constructed in the following way. Main results, stated in the next section, concern the existence of discontinuous stationary solutions (Theorem 2.6), their linear stability (Theorem 2.11) and their nonlinear stability (Theorem 2.13). In Section 3, we construct discontinuous stationary solutions. Since a stability of stationary solutions is obtained via a classical linearisation procedure, in Section 4 we study stability of zero solution to general linear reaction-diffusion-ODE systems. In Section 5 we prove that the linear stability implies the nonlinear stability where this classical approach has to be suitably adapted to reaction-diffusion-ODE systems. The proofs of stability Theorems 2.11 and 2.13 are contained in Section 4. To see our results in action, we apply them to a particular version of system (1.7).
Notation. By the bold font, e.g. $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{u}$, we denote either matrices or vector valued functions in order to distinguish them from scalar quantities. For $f$ and $g$ defined in (1.2) we set

$$f_u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial u_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial u_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial u_n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad f_v = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial v} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial v} \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial g}{\partial u_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial g}{\partial u_n} \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_v = \frac{\partial g}{\partial v}.$$

For a matrix $M = (m_{i,j})$, we set $|M| = \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} m_{i,j}^2}$. The product $Y^n = Y \times \cdots \times Y$ (n-times) of a given space $Y$ is supplemented with the norm denoted by $\|y\|_{Y^n}$ (instead of $\|y\|_Y$). For $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ we denote by $\overline{\Omega}$ its topological closure. The symbol $\sigma(L)$ means the spectrum of a linear operator $(L, D(L))$ and $s(L) = \sup\{\text{Re} \lambda : \lambda \in \sigma(L)\}$ is the spectral bound of the operator $(L, D(L))$. The usual Sobolev spaces are denoted by $W^{k,p}(\Omega)$. We use the symbol $\Delta_{\nu}$ for the Laplace operator in a bounded domain $\Omega$ with the Neumann boundary condition. It is defined in the usual way via a bilinear form on $W^{1,2}(\Omega)$, and $-\Delta_{\nu}$ has the eigenvalues $\mu_k$ satisfying $0 = \mu_0 < \mu_1 \leq \cdots \leq \mu_n \to \infty$. We recall the domain of $-\Delta_{\nu}$ on $L^p(\Omega)$ with $p \in [1, \infty)$

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

which is the Sobolev space $W^{2,p}(\Omega)$ supplemented with the Neumann boundary condition. Constants in the estimates below are denoted by the same letter $C$, even if they vary from line to line. Sometimes we shall emphasize dependence of such constants on parameters used in our calculations.

2. Main results

2.1. Stationary solutions. The goal of this work is to construct a certain class of non-constant stationary solutions of problem (1.1)-(1.4) and to show their stability. Thus, we deal with a couple \( (\mathbf{U}, V) = (\mathbf{U}(x), V(x)) \) with a vector field and a scalar function

$$\mathbf{U}(x) = \begin{pmatrix} U_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ U_n(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V = V(x),$$

which is a solution to the boundary value problem

\begin{align*}
f(\mathbf{U}, V) &= 0, & x &\in \overline{\Omega}, \\
\gamma \Delta_{\nu} V + g(\mathbf{U}, V) &= 0, & x &\in \Omega,
\end{align*}

(2.1)

with arbitrary $C^2$-functions $f$ and $g$ of the form (1.2) and in a bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ with a $C^2$-boundary.

Definition 2.1. A pair $(\mathbf{U}, V) = (\mathbf{U}(x), V(x))$ is a weak solution of problem (2.1) if

- $\mathbf{U}$ is measurable,
- $V \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)$,
- $g(\mathbf{U}, V) \in (W^{1,2}(\Omega))^* \ (\text{the dual of } W^{1,2}(\Omega))$,
- the equation $f(\mathbf{U}(x), V(x)) = 0$ is satisfied for almost all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$,
\[ -\gamma \int_{\Omega} \nabla V(x) \cdot \nabla \varphi(x) \, dx + \int_{\Omega} g(U(x), V(x)) \varphi(x) \, dx = 0 \]

holds true for all test functions \( \varphi \in W^{1,2}(\Omega) \).

**Remark 2.2.** The most direct way to construct such stationary solutions is to solve first equation in (2.1) with respect to \( U \) and to substitute the result into the second equation to obtain an elliptic boundary value problem. Namely, we may assume that there exists a \( C^2 \)-function \( k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n \) such that \( U(x) = k(V(x)) \) for all \( x \in \Omega \) and

\[ f(U(x), V(x)) = f(k(V(x)), V(x)) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \Omega, \]

where \( V = V(x) \) is a solution of the elliptic Neumann problem

\[ \Delta V + h(V) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega \]

with \( h(V) = g(k(V), V) \). In our parallel work [3], such solutions are called regular and we showed that all of them are unstable.

**Remark 2.3.** Results in this work require that problem (2.1) has a constant solution, namely, a constant vector \( (U, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) such that \( f(U, V) = 0 \) and \( g(U, V) = 0 \). In the following, we use the constant coefficient matrices

\begin{align*}
A_0 &= f_u(U, V), & B_0 &= f_v(U, V), & C_0 &= g_u(U, V), & d_0 &= g_v(U, V).
\end{align*}

On the other hand, if \( (U, V) \in L^\infty(\Omega)^{n+1} \) is a non-constant solution to problem (2.1) we introduce the matrices

\begin{align*}
A &= f_u(U, V), & B &= f_v(U, V), & C &= g_u(U, V), & d &= g_v(U, V),
\end{align*}

with coefficients from \( L^\infty(\Omega) \).

### 2.2. Existence of discontinuous stationary solutions

We begin by imposing crucial assumptions in our construction of solutions to boundary value problem (2.1) which are not regular, i.e. which are not necessary \( C^2 \)-functions.

**Assumption 2.4.** The vector \( (U, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) is a constant solution of problem (2.1) with the corresponding matrices (2.2) satisfying

\[ \det A_0 \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\det A_0} \det \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & B_0 \\ C_0 & d_0 \end{pmatrix} \neq \gamma \mu_k, \]

for each eigenvalue \( \mu_k \) of \( -\Delta V \).

Notice that if \( \det A_0 \neq 0 \), by the Implicit mapping theorem, there exist an open neighbourhood \( \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) of \( V \) and a function \( k \in C^2(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{R}^n) \) such that

\[ k(V) = U \quad \text{and} \quad f(k(w), w) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad w \in \mathcal{V}. \]

In the following assumption, the equation \( f(U, V) = 0 \) is required to have two different branches of solutions with respect to \( U \) on a common domain \( \mathcal{V} \).

**Assumption 2.5.** Let \( (U, V) \) be a constant solution of problem (2.1). We assume that there exists an open set \( \mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \) and \( k_1, k_2 \in C(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{R}^n) \) such that

- \( \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{V} \),
• \( \mathbf{U} = k_1(\mathbf{V}), \) \( k_1(\mathbf{V}) \neq k_2(\mathbf{V}), \)
• \( f(k_1(w), w) = f(k_2(w), w) = 0 \) for all \( w \in \mathcal{V}. \)

Such two branches allow us to construct discontinuous solution of problem (2.1).

**Theorem 2.6 (Existence of solutions).** Assume that

• problem (2.1) with \( \gamma > 0 \) has a constant solution \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \) satisfying Assumption 2.4,
• Assumptions 2.5 holds true,
• \( \Omega \subseteq \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \) for arbitrary disjoint open sets \( \Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega \) and \( \Omega_2 \subseteq \Omega. \)

There is \( \varepsilon_0 > 0 \) such that for all \( \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0) \) there exists \( \delta > 0 \) such that if \( |\Omega_2| < \delta \) then problem (2.1) has a weak solution in the sense of Definition 2.1 with the following properties:

• \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \times W^{2,p}_p(\Omega) \) for each \( p \in [2, \infty), \)
• \( \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}(x) \) is a weak solution to problem,
  \[ \gamma \Delta_{\nu} \mathbf{V} + g(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = 0 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \]
where

\[
\mathbf{U}(x) = \begin{cases} 
k_1(\mathbf{V}(x)), & x \in \Omega_1, 
k_2(\mathbf{V}(x)), & x \in \Omega_2, \end{cases}
\]

satisfies \( f(\mathbf{U}(x), \mathbf{V}(x)) = 0 \) for almost all \( x \in \overline{\Omega}. \)

• the couple \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \) satisfies

\[
|\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{V}|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{U} - k_1(\mathbf{V})|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} + |\mathbf{U} - k_2(\mathbf{V})|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} < C\varepsilon
\]
for a constant \( C = C(f, g). \)

**Remark 2.7.** In particular, by the Sobolev embedding, we have \( \mathbf{V} \in C(\overline{\Omega}). \) On the other hand, the function \( \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}(x) \) given by formula (2.4) is discontinuous when \( k_1(w) \neq k_2(w) \) for all \( w \in \mathcal{V} \) which holds true when \( \varepsilon > 0 \) in inequalities (2.5) is sufficiently small.

### 2.3. Stability of discontinuous stationary solutions.

Let \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \in L^\infty(\Omega)^{n+1} \) be a stationary solution of problem (1.1)-(1.4). We linearise problem (1.1)-(1.4) around \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \) by introducing the new functions

\[ \varphi = \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{U} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi = \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{V}, \]

which satisfy the system

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma \Delta_{\nu} \psi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} R_1(\varphi, \psi) \\ R_2(\varphi, \psi) \end{pmatrix}
\]

with the matrices (2.3) and with the usual remainders \( R_1, R_2 \) obtained from the Taylor expansion. We also impose the initial datum

\[
\varphi(\cdot, 0) = \mathbf{u}_0 - \mathbf{U}, \quad \psi(\cdot, 0) = \mathbf{v}_0 - \mathbf{V},
\]

for some \( \mathbf{u}_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n, \) \( \mathbf{v}_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega}). \)

We begin by an analysis of a linear problem and say that \( (\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) \) is linearly exponentially stable if the zero solution to system (2.6) with the remainders \( R_1 = R_2 = 0 \)
is exponentially stable. Our stability result requires additional assumptions imposed on the constant solution \((\overline{U}, \overline{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\) used in Theorem 2.6.

**Assumption 2.8.** Matrices (2.2) satisfy

\[
s(A_0) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad s \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_0 & B_0 \\ C_0 & d_0 \end{array} \right) < 0,
\]

which means that both matrices have all eigenvalues with strictly negative real parts.

**Assumption 2.9.** For fixed \(p \in (1, \infty)\), the diffusion coefficient satisfies \(\gamma \geq \gamma_0\) where \(\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(A_0, B_0, C_0, d_0, |\Omega|, p) > 0\) is a constant provided by Lemma 4.1, below.

**Remark 2.10.** Assumptions 2.8 and 2.9 are needed to show stability of a zero solution of the following linear system with constant coefficients

\[
(2.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma \Delta \psi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & B_0 \\ C_0 & d_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Obviously, for \(s(A_0 B_0 C_0 d_0, \gamma_0) < 0\), zero is a stable solution to this system with \(\gamma = 0\). If \(s(A_0) > 0\), zero solution of system (2.8) with arbitrary \(\gamma > 0\) is unstable which results from the characterization of the spectrum of the linear operator in (2.8) obtained in [3, Thm. 4.5] and recalled below in equation (4.4). Thus, for stability results, we have to impose the assumption \(s(A_0) < 0\). Finally, \(\gamma > 0\) has to be large enough which is required in Lemma 4.1.

**Theorem 2.11 (Linear stability).** Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.6 holds true. Fix \(p \in (1, \infty)\). The stationary solution \((U, V)\) constructed in Theorem 2.6 is linearly exponentially stable in \(L^p(\Omega)^{n+1}\) if moreover

- Assumptions 2.8 and 2.9 are valid,
- \(\varepsilon > 0\) and \(|\Omega_2| > 0\) are small enough in Theorem 2.6
- the following inequality is satisfied

\[
(2.9) \quad s(f_u(k_2(V), V)) < 0.
\]

Theorem 2.11 is proved in Section 3 and it is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.2 below, containing a spectral analysis of a linear operator which appears in system (2.6).

**Remark 2.12.** The solution \((U, V) \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n \times C(\overline{\Omega})\) constructed in Theorem 2.6 can not be stable in \(L^p(\Omega)^{n+1}\) if

\[
\text{either} \quad s(f_u(k_1(V), V)) > 0 \quad \text{or} \quad s(f_u(k_2(V), V)) > 0,
\]

and if \(\varepsilon > 0\), \(|\Omega_3| > 0\) are sufficiently small. This follows immediately from the fact that eigenvalues of the matrix \(f_u(U(x), V(x))\) belong to \(\sigma(L_p)\), for almost every \(x \in \Omega\), (see formulas (4.4) and (4.8) below) and from inequalities (2.5) ensuring that \(f_u(U(x), V(x))\) stays close to \(f_u(k_1(V), V)\) on \(\Omega_1\) and close to \(f_u(k_2(V), V)\) on \(\Omega_2\).

**Theorem 2.13 (Nonlinear stability).** Let the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 hold true. Assume moreover

\[
(2.10) \quad g_v(k_1(V), V) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g_v(k_2(V), V) < 0.
\]
Then the stationary solution \((U, V)\) constructed in Theorem \ref{thm:existence} is exponentially asymptotically stable in the Lyapunov sense in \(L^\infty(\Omega)^{n+1}\) provided \(\varepsilon > 0\) in inequalities \((2.3)\) is small enough.

Remark 2.14. Theorem \ref{thm:linear_exp_stability_2} is a direct consequence of Theorem \ref{thm:linear_exp_stability} containing a proof of the so-called linearisation principle when a linear exponential stability of zero solution of system \((2.6)\) implies a nonlinear exponential stability. To adapt this well-known procedure to reaction-diffusion-ODE systems, we have to deal with certain obstacles. For example, the linearised operator may have a continuous spectrum without a spectral gap, see equation \((4.4)\) and we work in \(L^\infty(\Omega)\) where the linearised operator does not generate strongly continuous semigroup of linear operators. Here, the nonlinear stability in \(L^\infty(\Omega)\) is obtained by using the linear exponential stability in \(L^p(\Omega)\) with \(p \in (1, \infty)\) from Theorem \ref{thm:linear_exp_stability}. Remarks 2.15. Other discontinuous stationary solutions can be constructed using the same reasoning as in Theorem 2.6. For sufficiently large \(\gamma > 0\), this solution is linearly stable if \(s(f_u(U, V), V) < 0\) for each \(i \in \{1, \cdots, J\}\) and nonlinearly stable if \(g_u(U, V) < 0\) for each \(i \in \{1, \cdots, J\}\). Remarks 2.16. For \(n = 1\), \textit{i.e.} when one ODE is coupled with one reaction-diffusion equation, the stationary solution \((U, V)\) constructed in Theorem \ref{thm:existence} is linearly exponentially stable in \(L^p(\Omega)^{n+1}\) for each \(p \in (1, \infty)\) and every \(\gamma > 0\) (not necessarily large as required in Assumption \ref{assump:linear_exp_stability}) under the following conditions

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle f_u(U, V), V \rangle < 0, & \quad \langle f_v(U, V), V \rangle < 0, \\
\langle g_u(U, V), V \rangle < 0, & \quad \langle g_v(U, V), V \rangle > 0,
\end{align*}
\]

which result from Assumption \ref{assump:linear_exp_stability} and inequalities \((2.10)\) for sufficiently small \(\varepsilon > 0\) and \(|\Omega_\varepsilon| > 0\). This linear exponential stability in \(L^p(\Omega)^{n+1}\) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.3.

Remark 2.17. The \(L^\infty\)-stability from Theorem \ref{thm:linear_exp_stability_2} requires from initial perturbations to have the same discontinuities as considered stationary solutions. A different notion of stability (so-called \((\varepsilon, A)\)-stability) is used in the papers \cite{10, 12, 30, 31} on particular reaction-diffusion models. In that approach, perturbations can be continuous...
functions and neighborhoods of discontinuities of stationary solutions are excluded from the stability analysis. We do not apply that approach in this work, because it requires from the considered model to have an invariant region.

3. CONSTRUCTION OF DISCONTINUOUS STATIONARY SOLUTIONS

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is based on the following preliminary results.

**Lemma 3.1.** Fix \( p \in [2, \infty) \) and let \( \gamma > 0 \) be arbitrary. For each \( b \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( b \neq \gamma \mu_k \) for all eigenvalues \( \mu_k \) of \( -\Delta_\nu \), and for every \( f \in L^p(\Omega) \) the problem
\[
\gamma \Delta_\nu v + bv = f \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega, \tag{3.1}
\]
has a unique weak solution \( v \in W^{1,p}(\Omega) \) satisfying
\[
\|v\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq C(b, \gamma)\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{3.2}
\]
If \( \partial \Omega \) is of the class \( C^2 \), then \( v \in W^{2,p}(\Omega) \) and there exists a constant \( C = C(b, p, \gamma) > 0 \) such that
\[
\|v\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}. \tag{3.3}
\]

**Proof.** In the case of \( p = 2 \) and \( b < 0 \), this is a well known result on the existence and \( W^{2,2} \)-regularity of solution to problem (3.1), see e.g. [1, Thm. 9.26]. In fact, we can extend this result to all \( b \neq \gamma \mu_k \) because the solution to problem (3.1) is given by the explicit formula
\[
v = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma \mu_k + b} \langle f, \Phi_k \rangle_{L^2(\Omega)} \Phi_k,
\]
where \( \Phi_k \) is an eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue \( \mu_k \).

To prove this Lemma for \( p > 2 \), we rewrite the equation in the form
\[
\gamma \Delta_\nu v - v = f - (b + 1)v \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega.
\]
By using the \( L^p \)-elliptic regularity (see e.g. [17, Thm. 3.1.3]), the Sobolev embedding \( W^{2,2}_p(\Omega) \subseteq L^p(\Omega) \) for each \( p \in (1, \infty) \) if \( N < 4 \) and for \( p \in \left(2, 2N/(N - 4)\right) \) if \( N > 4 \), as well as inequality (3.2) with \( p = 2 \), we obtain
\[
\|v\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)} \leq C \left( \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|v\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right) \leq C \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \tag{3.3}
\]

In order to obtain the desired estimate for the whole range of \( p \in [2, \infty) \) it suffices to apply a bootstrap argument involving inequality (3.3) together with the Sobolev embedding \( W^{2,p}_p(\Omega) \subseteq L^q(\Omega) \) for \( q < Np/(N - 2p) \).

We obtain discontinuous stationary solutions of problem (2.1) from the following lemma which is a consequence of the Banach fixed point argument.

**Lemma 3.2.** Let \( p > N/2 \) with \( p \geq 2 \), \( \gamma > 0 \), and \( h_1, h_2 \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R}) \) (i.e. all derivatives up to order two are bounded). Assume that for some \( \tau \in \mathbb{R} \) we have
\[
h_1(\tau) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h_1'(\tau) \neq \gamma \mu_k
\]
for each eigenvalue $\mu_k$ of $-\Delta_\nu$. Consider two measurable sets $\Omega_1 \subseteq \Omega$ and $\Omega_2 \subseteq \Omega$ such that

$$\Omega \subseteq \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_1 \cap \Omega_2 = \emptyset.$$  

One can find $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if $|\Omega_2| \leq \delta$ then problem

\begin{equation}  
\gamma \Delta_\nu v + h_1(v)1_{\Omega_1} + h_2(v)1_{\Omega_2} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega,  
\end{equation}

has a weak solution $v \in W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)$ satisfying $\|v - \bar{v}\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$.

**Proof.** We denote by $v = (\gamma \Delta_\nu + h'_1(\bar{v}))^{-1}f$ the solution of problem (3.1) with $b = h'_1(\bar{v})$ which by Lemma 3.1 satisfies the estimate

\begin{equation}  
\left\| (\gamma \Delta_\nu + h'_1(\bar{v}))^{-1}f \right\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)}  
\end{equation}

for each $p \geq 2$ and all $f \in L^p(\Omega).

Repeating $v$ by $v + \bar{v}$ and $h_i(v)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ by $h_i(v + \bar{v})$ we may assume without loss of generality that $\bar{v} = 0$. We write equation (3.4) in the equivalent form

\begin{equation}  
v = (\gamma \Delta_\nu + h'_1(0))^{-1}\left( (h'_1(0)v - h_1(v))1_{\Omega_1} \right)  
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}  
+ (\gamma \Delta_\nu + h'_1(0))^{-1}\left( (h'_1(0)v - h_2(v))1_{\Omega_2} \right)  
= \mathcal{T}_1(v) + \mathcal{T}_2(v).  
\end{equation}

Our goal is to show that the right-hand side of this equation defines a contraction on the ball

$$B_{\varepsilon}(0) = \{v \in W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega) : \|v\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon \}$$

provided $|\Omega_2|$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ are sufficiently small.

First, we deal with the operator $\mathcal{T}_1$. Since $h_1 \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $h_1(0) = 0$ by the Taylor expansion we get

$$|h'_1(0)v(x) - h_1(v(x))| = |h_1(v(x)) - h_1(0) - h'_1(0)v(x)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|h''_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}|v(x)|^2.$$  

Hence, by estimate (3.5) and the Sobolev embedding $W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega) \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $p > N/2$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $v \in B_{\varepsilon}(0)$ we have

\begin{equation}  
\|\mathcal{T}_1(v)\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)} \leq C\|v\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2.  
\end{equation}

Analogously, by the Taylor expansion,

\begin{align*}
\left| h'_1(0)v(x) - h_1(v(x)) - \left( h'_1(0)w(x) - h_1(w(x)) \right) \right| \\
\leq |h_1(v(x)) - h_1(w(x))| + h'_1(w(x))(v(x) - w(x))|  \\
+ \left| (h'_1(w(x)) - h'_1(0))(v(x) - w(x)) \right|  \\
\leq \frac{1}{2}\|h''_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}|v(x) - w(x)|^2 + \|h''_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}|w(x)|v(x) - w(x)|.
\end{align*}

Hence, as in inequalities (3.7), for $v, w \in B_{\varepsilon}(0)$, we obtain

\begin{equation}  
\|\mathcal{T}_1(v) - \mathcal{T}_1(w)\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)} \leq C\varepsilon\|h''_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\|v - w\|_{W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)}.  
\end{equation}
Here, we choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ we have

$$ C\varepsilon^2 \leq \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad C\varepsilon\|h''_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < 1. $$

In the case of the operator $T_2$, we begin by the following inequality

$$ h'_1(0)v(x) - h_2(v(x)) \leq \|h'_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}|v(x)| + \|h_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}. $$

Thus, by estimate (3.9) and the embedding $W^2_p(\Omega) \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega)$ for $p > N/2$ and for each $v \in B_\varepsilon(0)$ we get

$$ \|T_2(v)\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)} \leq C(\|h'_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\|v\|_{L_p(\Omega)} + \|h_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\|\Omega\|_{L_p(\Omega)}) $$

(3.10)\]

\leq C\|\Omega\|^\frac{1}{p}(\|v\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)} + 1).

Analogously, we have

$$ \left|h'_1(0)v(x) - h_2(v(x)) - (h'_1(0)w(x) - h_2(w(x)))\right| $$

(3.11)\]

\leq (\|h'_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|h_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})})(v(x) - w(x)).

Thus, by inequality (3.11), as in estimate (3.10), for $v, w \in B_\varepsilon(0)$, we obtain

$$ \|T_2(v) - T_2(w)\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)} \leq C(\|h'_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}, \|h_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})})(v - w)\|\Omega\|_{L_p(\Omega)} $$

(3.12)\]

\leq C\|\Omega\|^\frac{1}{p}\|v - w\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)}.

Here, we choose $\delta > 0$ such that for arbitrary $\Omega_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying $|\Omega_2| < \delta$ we have

$$ C(\varepsilon + 1)|\Omega_2|^\frac{1}{p} \leq \varepsilon/2 \quad \text{and} \quad C|\Omega_2|^\frac{1}{p} < 1. $$

Estimates (3.7), (3.8), (3.9) and (3.12) together with the Banach fixed point argument complete the proof of the existence of a solution to equation (3.6) in $B_\varepsilon(0)$. \qed

**Proof of Theorem 2.6.** Let us choose $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $[\nabla - \varepsilon, \nabla + \varepsilon] \subseteq \nabla$. First, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we restrict $\mathbf{k}_i$ to $[\nabla - \varepsilon, \nabla + \varepsilon]$ and then we extend them in arbitrary way to $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i \in C^2_b(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i = \mathbf{k}_i$ on $[\nabla - \varepsilon, \nabla + \varepsilon]$. Now we define $h_i(V) = h(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V)$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ which satisfy assumptions of Lemma 3.2. Obviously $h_i \in C^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $h_1(\nabla) = 0$. Applying the identity for the determinants from equation (4.12) and using Assumption 2.5 we obtain

$$ h'_i(V) = g_u(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V)\tilde{\mathbf{k}}'_i(V) + g_v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V) $$

$$ = -g_u(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V)f_u(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V)^{-1}f_v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V) + g_v(\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V), V) $$

$$ = \frac{1}{\det(f_u(U, V), f_v(U, V))}(f_u(U, V), f_v(U, V)) \neq \gamma\mu_k. $$

Hence for each $p \in [2, \infty)$, by Lemma 3.2 we obtain a solution $V \in W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)$ to problem (3.4) which satisfy $\|V - \nabla\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)} \leq \varepsilon$ for arbitrary small $\varepsilon > 0$ provided $|\Omega_2| > 0$ is sufficiently small. However by the Sobolev embedding with $p > N/2$, we have

$$ \|V - \nabla\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\|V - \nabla\|_{W^{2,p}_p(\Omega)}. $$

Thus, if $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough we obtain $\tilde{\mathbf{k}}_i(V(x)) = \mathbf{k}_i(V(x))$ for all $x \in \Omega$. This completes the construction of solution to problem (2.1). \qed
4. Linear stability

4.1. Linearised operator. In order to apply the usual linearisation procedure, first, we study a stability of the zero solution to the following general linear reaction-diffusion-ODE system

\[\varphi_t = A\varphi + B\psi \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,\]
\[\psi_t = \gamma \Delta_x \psi + C\varphi + d\psi \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0,\]

with general matrices

\[A = A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}(x) & \cdots & a_{1n}(x) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1}(x) & \cdots & a_{nn}(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} b_1(x) \\ \vdots \\ b_n(x) \end{pmatrix},\]

\[C = C(x) = (c_1(x) \ldots c_n(x)), \quad d = d(x),\]

with arbitrary coefficients (not necessarily as those in equation (2.3)).

For a completeness of the exposition, we recall also properties of the spectrum of \(A\). The spectrum of \(A\) can be characterized as

\[\sigma(A) = \sigma(A(\cdot)) \cup \{\text{eigenvalues of } L_p\}.\]

In particular, the spectrum of the operator \(L_p\) is independent of \(p\), see [3, Thm. 4.5].

For a completeness of the exposition, we recall also properties of the spectrum \(\sigma(A(\cdot))\) of the multiplication operator \(A(\cdot)\) acting on \(L^p(\Omega)^n\) for \(p \in [1, \infty)\) induced by an arbitrary matrix \(A(x) = (a_{i,j}(x))_{i,j=1}^n\) with \(x\)-dependent and essentially bounded coefficients. The following results are either well-known or can be found in the works [3,4,14, Appendix B].

- For a square matrix \(A_0\) with constant coefficients, we have
  \[s(A_0) = \max \{\Re \lambda : \lambda \text{ is an eigenvalue of } A_0\}.\]

- The spectral radius \(r(A_0) = \sup \{\|\lambda\| : \lambda \in \sigma(A_0)\}\) satisfies
  \[r(A_0) \leq \|A_0\| = \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{i,j}^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\]

- For more general matrices \(A = A(x)\), the spectrum has the form (see e.g. [3, Lemma 4.3])
  \[\sigma(A(\cdot)) = \left\{ \lambda \in \mathbb{C} : \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \Omega^{\varepsilon}_x \subseteq \Omega \text{ open set } \exists \xi^{\varepsilon}_x \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ such that } \|A(\cdot)\xi^{\varepsilon}_x - \lambda \xi^{\varepsilon}_x\|_{L^p(\Omega^{\varepsilon}_x)} \leq \varepsilon \|\xi^{\varepsilon}_x\| \right\}.\]
• The following equality holds true
\[ s(A(\cdot)) = \text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega} (s(A(x))). \] (4.7)

• By Lemma 4.4, if there exists a closed set \( \Omega' \subseteq \Omega \) such that \(|\Omega'| = 0\) and \(m_{i,j}|_{\Omega \setminus \Omega'}\) is continuous, then
\[ \sigma(A(\cdot)) = \bigcup_{x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega'} \sigma(A(x)). \] (4.8)

• It follows immediately from formulas (4.6) and (4.8) that eigenvalues of matrix \( A(x) \) belongs to the spectrum of \( L_p \) for almost every \( x \in \overline{\Omega} \).

Finally, we recall properties of matrices which we use in this work.

• For an arbitrary matrix \( A_0 \) with constant coefficients and satisfying \( s(A_0) < 0 \), the resolvent \(|(A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}|\) is uniformly bounded for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) with Re \( \lambda \geq 0 \). Indeed, the determinant is a product of all eigenvalues, hence by (4.5)
\[ |\text{det}(A_0 - \lambda I)| \geq \left( \max(|s(A_0)|, |\lambda - |A_0||) \right)^n. \]

Therefore, denoting by \( \text{adj} \) the adjugate matrix we obtain
\[ |(A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1}| = \frac{|\text{adj}(A_0 - \lambda I)|}{|\text{det}(A_0 - \lambda I)|} \leq \frac{C(\lambda^n + 1)}{\max(|s(A_0)|, |\lambda - |A_0||)^n} \leq C. \] (4.9)

Analogously, for every matrix \( A(x) \) with essentially bounded coefficients, equation (4.7) provides the inequality \( s(A(x)) \leq s(A(\cdot)) \) for almost all \( x \in \Omega \). Thus, if \( s(A(\cdot)) < 0 \), then
\[ |(A(x) - \lambda I)^{-1}| \leq \frac{C(\lambda^n + 1)}{\max(|s(A(x))|, |\lambda - |A(x)||)^n} \leq C, \] (4.10)
for almost all \( x \in \Omega \) and all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) with Re \( \lambda \geq 0 \).

• It follows from equation (4.7), that if \( s(A(\cdot)) < 0 \) then for every \( k \in (0, -s(A(\cdot))) \) there exist constants \( C > 0 \) such that
\[ |e^{A(x)t}| \leq Ce^{-kt} \] for almost all \( x \in \Omega \).

• For matrices \( A, B, C, d \) as in (4.1)-(4.2) and arbitrary \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) we have
\[ d - \lambda - C(A - \lambda I)^{-1}B = \frac{1}{\text{det}(A - \lambda I)} \det \begin{pmatrix} A - \lambda I & B \\ C & d - \lambda \end{pmatrix}. \] (4.12)

The proof of this identity is given in [3 eq. (3.5)].

4.2. Conditions for stability. We begin by resolvent estimates in the case of constant coefficients.

Lemma 4.1. Assume that matrices \( A = A_0, B = B_0, C = C_0, d = d_0 \) in (4.1) have constant coefficients and satisfy
\[ s(A_0) < 0 \] as well as \( s \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & B_0 \\ C_0 & d_0 \end{pmatrix} < 0. \]
Let $p \in (1, \infty)$. There exists $\gamma_0 = \gamma_0(A_0, B_0, C_0, d_0, |\Omega|, p) > 0$ such that for all $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$ the problem

\begin{equation}
(A_0 - \lambda I)\varphi + B_0 \psi = f, \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega},
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\gamma \Delta_\nu \psi + C_0 \varphi + (d_0 - \lambda) \psi = g, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega,
\end{equation}

has a unique solution $(\varphi, \psi) \in L^p(\Omega)^n \times W^{1,p}(\Omega)$ for each $(f, g) \in L^p(\Omega)^{n+1}$. Moreover, there exists a number $K = K(A_0, B_0, C_0, d_0, |\Omega|, p, \gamma) > 0$ independent of $\lambda$ and $f, g$ such that

\[ \|\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq K(\|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega)}). \]

**Proof.** Integrating both equations in (4.13) over $\Omega$ we obtain

\begin{equation}
(A_0 - \lambda I) \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx + B_0 \int_\Omega \psi \, dx = \int_\Omega f \, dx,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
C_0 \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx + (d_0 - \lambda) \int_\Omega \psi \, dx = \int_\Omega g \, dx.
\end{equation}

Since $s(A_0, B_0, C_0, d_0) < 0$, applying inequality (4.9), we have

\begin{equation}
\left| \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx \right| + \left| \int_\Omega \psi \, dx \right| \leq C \left( \left| \int_\Omega f \, dx \right| + \left| \int_\Omega g \, dx \right| \right)
\end{equation}

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of $\lambda$. Subtracting equations (4.14) multiplied by $\frac{1}{|\Omega|}$ from equations (4.13) and denoting the averages

\[ \tilde{\varphi} = \varphi - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \varphi \, dx, \quad \tilde{\psi} = \psi - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \psi \, dx, \]

\[ \tilde{f} = f - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega f \, dx, \quad \tilde{g} = g - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega g \, dx, \]

we obtain

\begin{equation}
(A_0 - \lambda I)\tilde{\varphi} + B_0 \tilde{\psi} = \tilde{f}, \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega},
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\gamma \Delta_\nu \tilde{\psi} + C_0 \tilde{\varphi} + (d_0 - \lambda) \tilde{\psi} = \tilde{g}, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.
\end{equation}

Thus, by first equation in (4.16) and by inequality (4.9), we have

\begin{equation}
|\tilde{\varphi}(x)| \leq \left| (A_0 - \lambda I)^{-1} \left( \tilde{f}(x) - B_0 \psi(x) \right) \right| \leq C \left( |\tilde{f}(x)| + |\tilde{\psi}(x)| \right)
\end{equation}

for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}$. Next, applying the elliptic regularity for $\Delta_\nu$, (see eg. [17, Thm. 3.1.3]) to the second equation in (4.16) we obtain the estimate

\begin{equation}
\int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{\psi}|^p \, dx \leq C \gamma \left( \int_\Omega |\tilde{\psi}|^p \, dx + \int_\Omega |\tilde{f}|^p \, dx + \int_\Omega |\tilde{g}|^p \, dx \right).
\end{equation}

Next, applying the Poincaré inequality with a constant $C = C(|\Omega|, p)$

\[ \int_\Omega |\nabla \tilde{\psi}|^p \, dx \geq C \int_\Omega |\tilde{\psi}|^p \, dx
\]
for each \( \gamma \) large enough, we obtain
\[
\int_{\Omega} |\nabla \tilde{\psi}|^p \, dx \leq C \left( \int_{\Omega} |\tilde{f}|^p \, dx + \int_{\Omega} |\tilde{g}|^p \, dx \right).
\]
Consequently using (4.15) and (4.18) we estimate
\[
\|\psi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \leq \|\tilde{\psi}\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} + \frac{1}{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} |\psi| \, dx \leq K \left( \|f\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|g\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right).
\]
Finally, we get the required estimate for \( \varphi \) from inequalities (4.17) and (4.15).

**Theorem 4.2.** Assume that constant coefficient matrices \( A_0, B_0, C_0, d_0 \) satisfy
\[
(4.19) \quad s(A_0) < 0, \quad s \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_0 & B_0 \\ C_0 & d_0 \end{array} \right) < 0
\]
and fix \( \gamma > 0 \) so large as required in Lemma 4.1. Let \( (\mathcal{L}_p, D(\mathcal{L}_p)) \) be the operator defined in (1.3) with matrices \( A(\cdot), B(\cdot), C(\cdot), d(\cdot) \) as in (4.11)-(4.2). Assume, moreover, that
\[
(4.20) \quad s(A(\cdot)) < 0.
\]
There exist \( \rho > 0 \) such that if
\[
\|A - A_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|B - B_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|C - C_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|d - d_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \rho
\]
then \( s(\mathcal{L}_p) < 0. \)

**Proof.** By equation (4.31), it suffices to show that for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \text{Re} \lambda \geq 0 \), the zero solution is the only solution to the problem
\[
(4.21) \quad A\varphi + B\psi = \lambda\varphi, \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega},
\]
\[
\gamma \Delta \nu \psi + C\varphi + d\psi = \lambda\psi, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.
\]
Notice that for each \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \text{Re} \lambda \geq 0 \), by inequality (4.10) the function
\[
\varphi(x) = -(A(x) - \lambda I)^{-1}B(x)\psi(x)
\]
satisfies
\[
(4.22) \quad |\varphi(x)| \leq |(A(x) - \lambda I)^{-1}B\psi(x)| \leq C|\psi(x)|,
\]
for all \( x \in \Omega \). Now, we rewrite the problem (4.21) in the following form
\[
(4.23) \quad (A_0 - \lambda I)\varphi + B_0\psi = -(A - A_0)\varphi - (B - B_0)\psi, \quad \text{for } x \in \overline{\Omega},
\]
\[
\gamma \Delta \nu \psi + C_0\varphi + (d_0 - \lambda)\psi = -(C - C_0)\varphi - (d - d_0)\psi, \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega.
\]
By Lemma 4.1 there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) such that the solution of equation (4.23) satisfies
\[
\|\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega))} + \|\psi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega))} \leq C \left( \|(A - A_0)\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|(B - B_0)\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right)
\]
\[
+ C \left( \|(C - C_0)\varphi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|(d - d_0)\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \right).
\]
For \( N \geq p \), by the Hölder and Sobolev inequalities, we estimate
\[
\|B - B_0\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} + \|(d - d_0)\psi\|_{L^p(\Omega)}
\]
\[
\leq \|\psi\|_{L^{\infty}(\Omega)} \left( \|(B - B_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|(d - d_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C\|\psi\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \left( \|(B - B_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|(d - d_0)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right).
\]
and similarly, by the inequality (4.22) combined with the Sobolev inequality, we obtain
\[
\| (A - A_0)\varphi \|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \| (C - C_0)\varphi \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \\
\leq \| \varphi \|_{L^{\frac{np}{n-p}}(\Omega)} \left( \| (A - A_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| (C - C_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right) \\
\leq C \| \varphi \|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega)} \left( \| (A - A_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| (C - C_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} \right).
\]

Choosing \( \| (A - A_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| (B - B_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| (C - C_0) \|_{L^q(\Omega)} + \| d - d_0 \|_{L^q(\Omega)} \) sufficiently small, we conclude that \( \varphi = 0 \) and \( \psi = 0 \).

The proof for \( N < p \) is analogous using the Sobolev embedding \( W^{1,p}(\Omega) \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega) \).

In the particular case of one ODE coupled with one reaction-diffusion equation, we can formulate sufficient conditions for stability for every diffusion coefficient \( \gamma > 0 \).

**Proposition 4.3** (One PDE coupled with one ODE). Let \((L_p, D(L_p))\) be the operator given by formula (4.23). Assume that \( n = 1 \), thus \( A(x) = a(x), B(x) = b(x), C(x) = c(x), d(x) \) are essentially bounded functions. If
\[
s(a(\cdot)) < 0, \quad s\left( ^{(a,c)} \left( ^{(b,d)} \right) \right) < 0, \quad s(d(\cdot)) < 0
\]
then \( s(L_p) < 0 \).

**Proof.** Since \( s(a(\cdot)) < 0 \), by equation (4.4), it suffices to study only eigenvalues of the operator \( L_p \). We prove that \( (\varphi, \psi) = (0, 0) \) is the only solution of the system
\[
a\varphi + b\psi = \lambda \varphi, \quad x \in \overline{\Omega}, \\
\gamma \Delta \psi + c\varphi + d\psi = \lambda \psi, \quad x \in \Omega.
\]
for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \text{Re} \lambda \geq -\kappa \) for some
\[
\kappa \in \left( 0, \min \left( -s(a(\cdot)), -s\left( ^{(a,c)} \left( ^{(b,d)} \right) \right), -s(d(\cdot)) \right) \right).
\]
Since \( a(x) \leq s(a(\cdot)) < 0 \) almost everywhere, first equation in (4.24) implies
\[
\varphi = -\frac{b}{a - \lambda} \psi, \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega.
\]
Substituting this expression into second equation in (4.24) we obtain
\[
\gamma \Delta \psi + \left( -\frac{cb}{a - \lambda} + d - \lambda \right) \psi = 0, \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega.
\]
We introduce the function
\[
h(x, \lambda) \equiv \text{Re} \left( -\frac{c(x)b(x)}{a(x) - \lambda} + d(x) - \lambda \right)
\]
\[
= -\frac{c(x)b(x)a(x) - c(x)b(x)\text{Re} \lambda}{(a(x) - \text{Re} \lambda)^2 + \text{Im}^2 \lambda} + d(x) - \text{Re} \lambda,
\]
which, by equation (4.12), is also given by the formula
\[
h(x, \lambda) = \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{a(x) - \lambda} \det \left( \begin{array}{cc} a(x) & b(x) \\ c(x) & d(x) - \lambda \end{array} \right) \right).
\]
It is well-known that zero is the only solution of equation (4.25) if
\[
\text{ess sup}_{x \in \Omega, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, \Re \lambda \geq -\kappa} \ h(x, \lambda) < 0.
\]

In order to prove this claim, first we consider \( \lambda = \alpha \geq -\kappa \), first. It follows from assumption on \( \alpha \) that
\[
s \left( a(x) - \alpha \ b(x) \begin{array}{c} c(x) \\ d(x) - \alpha \end{array} \right) < 0
\]
implies
\[
\det \left( a(x) - \alpha \ b(x) \begin{array}{c} c(x) \\ d(x) - \alpha \end{array} \right) \geq s^2 \left( a(x) - \alpha \ b(x) \begin{array}{c} c(x) \\ d(x) - \alpha \end{array} \right) > 0
\]
for almost all \( x \in \Omega \). Thus, the inequalities \( a(x) \leq s(a(\cdot)) < -\alpha < 0 \) yields to
\[
h(x, \alpha) = \frac{\det \left( a(x) - \alpha \ b(x) \begin{array}{c} c(x) \\ d(x) - \alpha \end{array} \right)}{a(x) - \alpha} \leq -\left( \frac{s(a(\cdot) b(\cdot)) - \alpha}{|s(a)| + |\alpha|} \right)^2.
\]
Since \( s(a(\cdot) b(\cdot)) < 0 \) it is clear that there exist \( h_0 > 0 \) such that
\[
-\left( \frac{s(a(\cdot) b(\cdot)) - \alpha}{|s(a)| + |\alpha|} \right)^2 < -h_0 < 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \geq -\kappa.
\]

Finally, by formula (4.26), the function \( h(x, \alpha + i\beta) \) with fixed \( \alpha \geq -\kappa \) is even with respect to \( \beta \in \mathbb{R} \) and monotone with respect to \( \beta^2 \). Thus, for the number \( h_0 > 0 \) defined above and by formula (4.26) we have
\[
h(x, \alpha + i\beta) \leq \max(s(d(\cdot)), -h_0) < 0,
\]
for all \( \lambda = \alpha + i\beta \) with \( \alpha \geq -\kappa \) and \( \beta \in \mathbb{R} \) and almost all \( x \in \Omega \). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.4.** Proposition 4.3 can not be directly extended to systems with more than one ODE, because the function \( h(x, \alpha + i\beta) \) defined in (4.26) is no longer monotone with respect to \( \beta \in \mathbb{R}^+ \).

## 5. Nonlinear stability

Using stability results for the linear system from the previous section, we are in a position to study a stability of the zero solution to the nonlinear problem
\[
\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \gamma \Delta \varphi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi \\ \psi \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} R_1(\varphi, \psi) \\ R_2(\varphi, \psi) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \ t > 0,
\]
with arbitrary \( x \)-dependent matrices \( A, B, C \), and \( d \) of the form (4.1)–(4.2) and with the remainders
\[
R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} R_{11}(\varphi, \psi) \\ \vdots \\ R_{1n}(\varphi, \psi) \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad R_2 = R_2(\varphi, \psi),
\]
satisfying the following typical assumption.
Assumption 5.1. There exist constants $K > 0$ and $C_K = C(K) > 0$ such that for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $|\varphi| + |\psi| \leq K$ we have
\begin{equation}
|R_1(\varphi, \psi)| \leq C_K(|\varphi|^2 + |\psi|^2) \quad \text{and} \quad |R_2(\varphi, \psi)| \leq C_K(|\varphi|^2 + |\psi|^2).
\end{equation}

We supplement system (5.1) with an arbitrary initial condition
\begin{equation}
\varphi(\cdot, 0) = \varphi_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega), \quad \psi(\cdot, 0) = \psi_0 \in C(\Omega),
\end{equation}
and we assume that initial value problem (5.1)-(5.3) has a unique global-in-time mild solution
\begin{equation}
\varphi \in C([0, \infty), L^\infty(\Omega)^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi \in C([0, \infty), C(\Omega)),
\end{equation}
namely, the functions $(\varphi, \psi)$ satisfying equations (5.6) and (5.8), below. Such a unique local-in-time solution can be constructed following the reasoning from the Theorem 5.1 below and it can be extended to a global-in-time solution using a priori estimates below.

Theorem 5.2 (Stability of zero solution). Assume that
- $s(L_p) < 0$, where $L_p$ is defined by (1.3),
- $s(d(\cdot)) < 0$,
- Assumption 5.1 holds true for some $K > 0$.

Then the zero solution to system (5.1)-(5.3) is exponentially asymptotically stable in $L^\infty(\Omega)^{n+1}$. More precisely, there exist $C \geq 1$ and $k > 0$ such that if
\[
\|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \frac{K}{4C^2},
\]
then
\[
\|\varphi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C(\|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})e^{-\frac{kt}{2}},
\]
for all $t \geq 0$.

This is a result where the linear stability implies the nonlinear stability of the zero solution adapted to a reaction-diffusion-ODE system (5.1), however, under the extra assumption $s(d(\cdot)) < 0$. We precede the proof of Theorem 5.2 by a sequence of lemmas.

Lemma 5.3. Let $(\varphi, \psi)$ be a solution (5.4) to system (5.1)-(5.3) satisfying
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K \quad \text{for some} \quad T > 0.
\]

For each $p \in (1, \infty)$ and each $k_1 \in (0, -s(L_p))$ there exists $C = C(K, k_1, p) > 0$ such that
\[
\|\varphi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{-k_1t}(\|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)})
\]
\[
+C \int_0^t e^{-k_1(t-s)}\left(\|\varphi(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2\right)ds,
\]
for all $t \in [0, T]$. 

\[\tag{5.2}
\]
\[\tag{5.3}
\]
\[\tag{5.4}
\]
\[\tag{5.6}
\]
\[\tag{5.8}
\]
Proof. We begin by the integral formulation of the Cauchy problem (5.1)-(5.3)

\[ \phi(t) = e^{tL_p} \phi(0) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)L_p} \left( R_1(\phi(s), \psi(s)) + R_2(\psi(s), \psi(s)) \right) \, ds. \]

Since \( \exists (L_p) \) < 0, it is well-known (see e.g. [5, Ch. IV, Cor. 3.12]) that for each \( k_1 \in (0, -\exists (L_p)) \) there exist constant \( C = C(k_1) > 0 \) such that

\[ \| e^{tL_p} \phi(0) \| \leq Ce^{-k_1t} \| \phi(0) \| \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \]

Now, it suffices to compute the \( L^p \)-norm of equation (5.5), apply the well known inequality \( \| w \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \leq \| \Omega \|^{\frac{1}{p}} \| w \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \) and use Assumption 5.1 for the remainders. \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.4.** Let \( (\phi, \psi) \) be a solution (5.4) to system (5.1)-(5.3) satisfying

\[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \phi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K \quad \text{for some } T > 0. \]

For each \( k_2 \in (0, -s(A(\cdot))) \) there exist a number \( C = C(K, k_2) > 0 \) such that

\[ \| \phi(x, t) \| \leq Ce^{-k_2t} \| \phi_0(x) \| + C \int_0^t e^{-k_2(t-s)} \left( \| \psi(x, s) \| + \| \phi(x, s) \| \right) \, ds, \]

for all \( t \in [0, T] \) and almost all \( x \in \Omega \).

**Proof.** We write the equation for \( \phi \) in system (5.1) in the following way

\[ \phi(x, t) = e^{tA(x)} \phi_0(x) + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)A(x)} \left( B(x) \psi(x, s) + R_1(\phi(x, s), \psi(x, s)) \right) \, ds. \]

By equation (4.4), the assumption \( s(L_p) < 0 \) implies \( s(A(\cdot)) < 0 \). Therefore, by inequality (4.11) we have the exponential pointwise decay estimate

\[ e^{tA(x)} \phi_0(x) \leq C_1 e^{-k_2t} \phi_0(x) \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and almost all } x \in \Omega. \]

To complete the proof, it suffices to apply inequality (5.7) to equation (5.6) and use \( B \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n \) together with Assumption 5.1 for the remainder. \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.5.** Let \( (\phi, \psi) \) be a solution (5.4) to system (5.1)-(5.3) satisfying

\[ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \phi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K \quad \text{for some } T > 0. \]

For each \( k_3 \in (0, -s(d(\cdot))) \) and each \( p \in (N/2, \infty) \) there exist \( C = C(K, k_3, p) > 0 \) such that

\[ \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{-k_3t} \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + C \int_0^t e^{-k_3(t-s)} m_p(t-s) \left( \| \phi(s) \|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \| \phi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) \, ds, \]

for all \( t \in [0, T] \), where \( m_p(t) = \max \left( t^{-\frac{N}{2p}}, 1 \right) \).

**Proof.** We write the equation for \( \psi \) in system (5.1) in the form

\[ \psi(t) = e^{t(\Delta + d)} \psi_0 + \int_0^t e^{(t-s)(\Delta + d)} \left( C \phi + R_2(\phi, \psi) \right) \, ds. \]
Next, we recall the estimate for the Neumann heat semigroup (see e.g. [27, p. 25]) which holds true for all \( \zeta \in L^p(\Omega) \):

\[
\left\| e^{\gamma \Delta_{\nu} t} \zeta \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C m_p(t) \| \zeta \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } p \in [1, \infty].
\]

Combining this fact with the maximum principle we conclude that

\[
\left\| e^{(\gamma \Delta_{\nu} + d) t} \zeta \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C m_p(t) e^{-k_3 t} \| \zeta \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } p \in [1, \infty]
\]

for each \( k_3 \in (0, -s(d(\cdot))) \). Therefore, there exists a constant \( C > 0 \) such that

\[
\| e^{(\gamma \Delta_{\nu} + d)} (\varphi + \varphi^2 + \psi^2) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-k_3 t} m_p(t) \left( \| \varphi \|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \| \varphi \|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi \|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}^2 \right)
\]

\[
\leq C e^{-k_3 t} m_p(t) \left( \| \varphi \|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \| \varphi \|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi \|_{L^{2p}(\Omega)}^2 \right). 
\]

We complete this reasoning by calculating the \( L^\infty \)-norm of equation \((5.8)\) and using the assumption \( C \in L^\infty(\Omega^n) \) as well as the Assumption 5.1 for the remainder. \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.6.** Let \( (\varphi, \psi) \) be a solution \((5.4)\) to system \((5.1)-(5.3)\) satisfying

\[
\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \| \varphi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K \quad \text{for some } T > 0.
\]

Choose the exponents \( k_1 \in (0, -s(L_p)) \) and \( k_3 \in (0, -s(d)) \) from Lemmas 5.3 and 5.5 respectively. For each \( k_4 \in (0, \min(k_1, k_3)) \) and every \( p > N/2 \) there exist \( C = C(K, k_4, p) > 0 \) such that

\[
\int_0^t e^{-k_3 (t-s)} m_p(t-s) \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^p(\Omega)} ds \leq C \cdot e^{-k_4 t} \left( \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)
\]

\[
+ C \int_0^t e^{-k_4 (t-s)} \left( \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) ds,
\]

for all \( t \in [0, T] \), where \( m_p(t) = \max \left( t^{-\frac{N}{2p}}, 1 \right) \).

**Proof.** We apply the estimate of \( \| \varphi(t) \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \) from Lemma 5.3 to obtain

\[
\int_0^t e^{-k_3 (t-s)} m_p(t-s) \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^p(\Omega)} ds \leq I_1 + I_2,
\]

where

\[
I_1 = C \left( \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right) \int_0^t e^{-k_3 (t-s)} m_p(t-s) e^{-k_1 s} ds,
\]

\[
I_2 = C \int_0^t e^{-k_3 (t-s)} m_p(t-s) \int_0^s e^{-k_1 (s-\tau)} \left( \| \varphi(\tau) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi(\tau) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) d\tau d\tau.
\]
Since, \( m_p(t-s) \) is integrable for \( s \in [0, t] \) and \( p > \frac{N}{2} \) we estimate the integral in \( I_1 \) by
\[
e^{-k_3t} \int_0^{t-1} m_p(t-s)e^{(k_3-k_1)s} \, ds + C e^{-k_3t} \int_{t-1}^{t} m_p(t-s) e^{(k_3-k_1)s} \, ds
\]
\[
\leq C e^{-k_3t} \int_0^{t-1} m_p(t-s) \max (1, e^{(k_3-k_1)s}) \, ds + C e^{-k_3t} \int_{t-1}^{t} e^{(k_3-k_1)s} \, ds
\]
\[
\leq C \left( e^{-k_1t} + e^{-k_3t} \right) \int_0^{t-1} m_p(t-s) \, ds + C \left( e^{-k_1t} + e^{-k_3t} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C(t+1) \left( e^{-k_1t} + e^{-k_3t} \right).
\]

Therefore, for arbitrary \( k_4 \in (0, \max(k_1, k_3)) \) there exists \( C > 0 \) such that
\[
I_1 \leq C e^{-k_3t} \left( \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right).
\]

Denoting \( h(s) = \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \) the integral \( I_2 \) takes the form
\[
I_2 = \int_0^{t} e^{-k_3(t-s)} m_p(t-s) \int_0^{s} e^{-k_1(s-\tau)} h(s) \, d\tau \, ds
\]
\[
= \int_0^{t} h(\tau) e^{k_1\tau} e^{-k_3t} \int_{\tau}^{t} e^{(k_3-k_1)s} m_p(t-s) \, ds \, d\tau.
\]

Next, choosing arbitrary \( k_4 \in (0, \max(k_1, k_3)) \) and following the calculations from (5.9) we obtain the estimates
\[
e^{k_1\tau} e^{-k_3t} \int_{\tau}^{t} e^{(k_3-k_1)s} m_p(t-s) \, ds \leq e^{k_1\tau} e^{-k_3t} C(1 + t - \tau) \left( e^{(k_3-k_1)(t-\tau)} + e^{(k_3-k_1)t-\tau} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C(1 + t - \tau) \left( e^{-k_1(t-\tau)} + e^{-k_3(t-\tau)} \right)
\]
\[
\leq C e^{-k_4(t-\tau)}
\]
which imply \( I_2 \leq C \int_0^{t} h(\tau) e^{-k_4(t-\tau)} \, d\tau \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 5.7.** Let \( (\varphi, \psi) \) be a solution \((5.4)\) to system \((5.1)-(5.3)\) satisfying
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \| \varphi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K \quad \text{for some} \quad T > 0.
\]

For each \( k \in (0, \min(k_1, k_2, k_3)) \) there exist \( C = C(K, k_4) > 0 \) such that
\[
\| \varphi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-kt} \left( \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)
\]
\[
+ C \int_0^{t} e^{-k(t-\tau)} \left( \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) \, ds
\]
for all \( t \in [0, T] \).

**Proof.** Applying Lemma 5.6 with \( p > N/2 \) and with arbitrary exponent \( k_4 \in (0, \min(k_1, k_3)) \) to the linear term containing \( \| \varphi \|_{L^p(\Omega)} \) on the right-hand side of the inequality in Lemma 5.5 yields to
\[
\| \psi(t) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C e^{-k_4t} \left( \| \psi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \| \varphi_0 \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \right)
\]
\[
+ C \int_0^{t} e^{-k_4(t-\tau)} \left( \| \varphi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \| \psi(s) \|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 \right) \, ds.
\]
Next, we compute the $L^\infty$-norm of the inequality provided by Lemma 5.4 for a constant $k_5 \in (0, \min(k_2, k_4))$ and obtain
\begin{equation}
\|\varphi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{-k_5t} \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}
+ C \int_0^t e^{-k_5(t-s)} \left(\|\psi(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi(s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + \|\varphi(s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\right) ds.
\tag{5.12}
\end{equation}

Now, it suffices to estimate the linear term in inequality (5.12) using inequality (5.11). Therefore after changing the integrals we obtain
\begin{align*}
\int_0^t e^{-k_5(t-s)} \|\psi(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds & \leq Cte^{-k_5t} \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
& + C \int_0^t e^{-k_5(t-s)} \int_0^s e^{-k_5(s-\tau)} \left(\|\varphi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\omega)}^2 + \|\varphi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2\right) d\tau ds \\
& \leq Cte^{-k_5t} \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + C \int_0^t e^{-k_5(t-\tau)} \left(\|\varphi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2\right) d\tau.
\end{align*}

Thus, for arbitrary number $k \in (0, \min(k_4, k_5))$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that
\begin{align}
\int_0^t e^{-k_5(t-s)} \|\psi(s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds & \leq Cte^{-kt} \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\
& + C \int_0^t e^{-k(t-\tau)} \left(\|\varphi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2 + \|\psi(\tau)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^2\right) d\tau.
\tag{5.13}
\end{align}

By applying inequality (5.13) to inequalities (5.12) and (5.11) we complete the proof of estimate (5.10).

Next, let us recall the well-known fact from stability theory which we prove for completeness of the exposition.

**Lemma 5.8.** Let $h = h(t)$ be a nonnegative continuous function on $\mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying
\begin{equation}
h(t) \leq Ce^{-kt}h(0) + C \int_0^t e^{-k(t-s)}h(s)^2 ds \quad \text{for each } t > 0
\tag{5.14}
\end{equation}
and some constant $C \geq 1$. If $h(0) \leq k/(4C^2)$, then $h(t) \leq Ch(0)e^{-\frac{k}{2}t}$ for all $t > 0$.

**Proof.** Let $T > 0$ be such that $h(t) < k/(2C)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$. After multiplying both sides of inequality (5.14) by $e^{kt}$ we obtain
\[
h(t)e^{kt} \leq Ch(0)e^{\frac{k}{2}t} + \frac{k}{2} \int_0^t e^{k(t-s)}h(s) ds \quad \text{for each } t \in [0, T]
\]
and using the Gronwall inequality we conclude that $h(t) \leq Ch(0)e^{-\frac{k}{2}t}$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

In order to show that this inequality holds true for all $t > 0$ we show that $h(t) < k/(4C)$. Indeed, if there exist there exist $t_0 \in [0, T]$ such that $h(t_0) = k/(4C)$ then
\[
\frac{k}{4C} = h(t_0) \leq C \frac{k}{4C^2} e^{-\frac{k}{2}t_0} < \frac{k}{4C},
\]
which is a contradiction. \qed
Proof of Theorem 5.2. Let \((\varphi, \psi)\) be a solution \((5.14)\) to problem \((5.1)\) with an initial condition \((\varphi_0, \psi_0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n \times C(\overline{\Omega})\). Fix a number \(K > 0\) from Assumption 5.1 and assume that the initial condition satisfies
\[
\|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \frac{K}{4C^2}.
\]
By continuity in \((5.4)\), we may choose maximal \(T > 0\) such that
\[
\sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\varphi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \sup_{t \in [0,T]} \|\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq K.
\]
If \(T < \infty\) then \(\|\varphi(T)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi(T)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = K\). On the other hand by Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.8 we obtain
\[
\|\varphi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi(t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\left(\|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\psi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right) e^{-\frac{K}{4C}} \leq K
\]
for \(t \in [0, T]\) which is a contradiction for \(t = T\) because \(C \geq 1\). Hence the inequality \((5.15)\) holds true for all \(t > 0\).

6. Stability of discontinuous stationary solutions

6.1. Existence of local-in-time solutions. In this work, we consider mild solutions of problem \((1.1)-(1.4)\), that is, a solution to the corresponding system of integral equations
\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{u} &= \mathbf{u}_0 + \int_0^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}(s), \mathbf{v}(s)) \, ds, \\
\mathbf{v} &= e^{\gamma \Delta_v} \mathbf{v}_0 + \int_0^t e^{\gamma \Delta_v (t-s)} \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}(s), \mathbf{v}) \, ds.
\end{align*}
\]

Theorem 6.1. For every \(\mathbf{u}_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n\) and \(v_0 \in C(\overline{\Omega})\) there exists \(T > 0\) such that system \((6.1)\) has a unique solution \(\mathbf{u} \in C([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega)^n)\) and \(v \in C([0, T], C(\overline{\Omega}))\).

Proof. First, we recall that the operator \((\Delta_v, D(\Delta_v))\) with the domain
\[
D(\Delta_v) = \left\{ u \in \bigcap_{p \geq 1} W^{2,p}_{\text{loc}}(\Omega) : \ u, \Delta u \in C(\overline{\Omega}), \ \partial_v u = 0 \text{ on } \partial \Omega \right\},
\]
is a sectorial operator on the space \(C(\overline{\Omega})\), see [17] Corollary 3.1.24. Now, it is sufficient to apply the Banach fixed point theorem to system \((6.1)\) with the locally Lipschitz nonlinearities \(f\) and \(g\). In this approach the Bohner integrals on the right hand side of equation \((6.1)\) are convergent in the corresponding spaces. Indeed, for every \(\mathbf{u} \in C([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega)^n)\) and \(v \in C([0, T], C(\overline{\Omega}))\) we have \(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}, v) \in C([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega)^n)\) and consequently the integral is convergent
\[
\int_0^t \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{u}(s), \mathbf{v}(s)) \, ds \in C([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega)^n).
\]
Analogously, we have \(\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{u}, v) \in C([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))\) and hence by the well-known property of the Neumann semigroup we obtain
\[
w(s) \equiv e^{\gamma \Delta_v (t-s)} g(\mathbf{u}, v) \in C(\overline{\Omega})
\]
for each $t \in (0, T)$ and $s \in [0, t)$. Therefore

$$w \in C([0, t]; C(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty([0, t], L^\infty(\Omega))$$

and for every $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\int_0^{t-\varepsilon} e^{\gamma \Delta_\varepsilon(t-s)} g(u(s), v) \, ds \in C([0, T - \varepsilon]; C(\Omega)).$$

Since $g(u, v) \in L^\infty([0, T]; L^\infty(\Omega))$ we have

$$\int_0^{t-\varepsilon} e^{\gamma \Delta_\varepsilon(t-s)} g(u(s), v) \, ds \overset{\varepsilon \to 0}{\to} \int_0^t e^{\gamma \Delta_\varepsilon(t-s)} g(u(s), v) \, ds$$

locally uniformly on $[0, T) \times \Omega$. \hfill \Box

6.2. Proofs of stability theorems. We are in position to apply theorems from Sections 4 and 5 to obtain a stability of stationary solutions to the initial-boundary value problem for general reaction-diffusion-ODE system (1.1)–(1.4).

Proof of Theorem 2.11. Let $(U, V) \in \mathbb{R}^{N+1}$ be a constant solution to problem (2.1) with the corresponding linearisation matrices (2.2) and satisfying Assumptions 2.4, 2.5, 2.8 and 2.9 Denote by $\rho > 0$ a constant required in Theorem 1.2.

By the assumptions $s(f_u(k_1(V), V)) < 0$ and $s(f_u(k_2(V), V)) < 0$, we may choose $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} s(f_u(k_1(w), w)) < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} s(f_u(k_2(w), w)) < 0.$$ 

Similarly, by continuity we have

$$\sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} \left| f_u(k_1(w), w) \right| < \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} \left| f_u(k_2(w), w) \right| < \rho.$$ 

Next, we choose $\delta_1 > 0$ so small to have

$$\sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} \left| f_u(k_1(w), w) \right| < \rho \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{w \in B_{\varepsilon_1}(V)} \left| f_u(k_2(w), w) \right| < \rho.$$ 

Now, we consider a jump-discontinuous solution $(U, V)$ to problem (2.1) constructed in Theorem 2.6 with $\varepsilon < \min(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1)$ and $|\Omega_2| < \min(\delta, \delta_1)$. Let us check that the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 are satisfied in the case of matrices from Remark 2.3. Indeed, Assumptions 2.5, 2.9 and inequality (6.2) imply inequalities (4.19) and (4.20). Moreover, inequalities (6.3) and (6.4) provide

$$\|A - A_0\|_N \leq \|A - A_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} + \|A - A_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}$$

$$\leq |\Omega_1|^\frac{1}{p} \|f_u(k_1(V), V) - A_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} + |\Omega_2|^\frac{1}{p} \|f_u(k_2(V), V) - A_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}$$

$$\leq \rho/4.$$ 

We show analogously the following inequalities

$$\|B - B_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \rho/4, \quad \|C - B_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \rho/4 \quad \text{and} \quad \|d - d_0\|_{L^N(\Omega)} \leq \rho/4.$$ 

By Theorem 1.2 the jump-discontinuous stationary solution $(U, V)$ is exponentially asymptotically stable in $L^p(\Omega)^{N+1}$ for each $p \in (1, \infty)$. \hfill \Box
Proof of Theorem 2.13. It suffices to check assumptions of Theorem 5.2 in the case of problem (2.6)-(2.7). By Remark 2.7, a stationary solution constructed in Theorem 2.6 satisfies $\varphi, V \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Thus, problem (2.6)-(2.7) has a solution $\varphi(\cdot, t) = u_0 - U$ and $\psi(\cdot, t) = v(t) - V$ for some $T > 0$ by applying Theorem 6.1. Due to the properties of the Taylor remainders, Assumption 5.1 holds true for each $K > 0$. By Theorem 2.11, the corresponding linearisation operator $\mathcal{L}_p, D(\mathcal{L}_p)$ satisfies $s(\mathcal{L}_p) < 0$ for each $p \in (1, \infty)$. It remains to prove that $s(g_v(U(\cdot)), V(\cdot)) < 0$ provided $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. This however is an immediate consequence of condition (2.10), inequalities (2.5) and the $C^2$-regularity of nonlinear terms. By Theorem 5.2 applied to $\varphi(\cdot, t) = u_0 - U$ and $\psi(\cdot, t) = v(t) - V$, if
\[ \|u_0 - U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v_0 - V\|_{C^2(\Omega)} < K/(4C^2), \]
then
\[ \|u_0 - U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v(t) - V\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C\left(\|u_0 - U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|v_0 - V\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right)e^{-\frac{K}{4C^2}}, \]
for all $t \in [0, T]$. Since the constants here are independent of $T$ this solution and the inequality can be extended to all $t > 0$. □

7. Example

7.1. Hysteresis-driven pattern formation. Let us apply results from this work to the following prototype reaction-diffusion-ODE model
\begin{align*}
  u_t &= v - p(u), & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \ t > 0, \\
  v_t &= \gamma\Delta v + \alpha u - \beta v, & \text{for } x \in \Omega, \ t > 0,
\end{align*}
(7.1)

supplemented with the initial conditions
\begin{align*}
  u(0, x) &= u_0(x), & \quad v(0, x) &= v_0(x),
\end{align*}
(7.2)

where $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ are positive constants, $p(u)$ is a polynomial of degree three such that $p(u) \to \infty$ as $u \to \infty$, and $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ with $N \geq 1$ is an open bounded domain. This model was introduced in the paper [18] to understand the role of bistability and hysteresis in pattern formation. Notice that, to keep our notation consistent with the one in [18], we have to exchange the notation for $u$ and $v$.

Results on an existence and stability of either regular or discontinuous stationary solutions to this model in the one dimensional case (i.e. for $\Omega = [0, 1]$) have been obtained in the works [12, 13]. In particular, stationary solutions to system (7.1) in one dimension have been constructed via a phase portrait analysis. Results from this work and from [18] allow us to generalise results from the papers [12, 13] to system (7.1) in higher dimensions.

7.2. Constant solutions. An analysis of stationary solutions to system (7.1) begins by the assumption that it has a constant stationary solution, namely a vector $(\bar{U}, \bar{V}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying $\bar{V} - p(\bar{U}) = 0$ and $\alpha \bar{U} - \beta \bar{V} = 0$. On Fig. 7.1, we choose the polynomial $p$ and the parameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in such a way to have three constant solutions $(\bar{U}_1, \bar{V}_1), (\bar{U}_2, \bar{V}_2)$ and $(\bar{U}_3, \bar{V}_3)$. 

7.3. **Regular stationary solutions.** By our previous work \[3\], a stationary solution \((U, V)\) is called regular if there exist a \(C^2\)-function \(k\) such that \(U(x) = k(V(x))\). Some regular stationary solutions have been obtained in \[3\] by a bifurcation around a constant solution \((\overline{U}, \overline{V})\) satisfying

\[
\frac{1}{\det f_u(\overline{U}, \overline{V})} \det \begin{pmatrix} f_u(\overline{U}, \overline{V}) & f_v(\overline{U}, \overline{V}) \\ g_u(\overline{U}, \overline{V}) & g_v(\overline{U}, \overline{V}) \end{pmatrix} = \gamma \mu_k,
\]

where \(f(u, v) = v - p(u), g(u, v) = \alpha u - \beta v\) and \(\mu_k\) is an eigenvalue of \(-\Delta\nu\), and the diffusion coefficient \(\gamma > 0\). Notice that if the polynomial \(p(u)\) is strictly monotone function then every stationary solution to system (7.1) is regular. It follows from our work \[3\] that all regular stationary solutions to system (7.1) are unstable.

7.4. **Discontinuous stationary solutions.** Now, we fix a constant stationary solutions, say, \((U, V) = (\overline{U}_1, \overline{V}_1)\) on Fig. 7.1. Following Assumption 2.5 we consider two different branches of solutions to equation \(V - p(U) = 0\) in a neighbourhood of \(\overline{V}_1\). Namely, we choose a set \(\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathbb{R}\) and functions \(k_1, k_2 \in C^2(\mathcal{V}, \mathbb{R})\) such that \(\overline{V} \in \mathcal{V}\) and

\[
w - p(k_1(w)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w - p(k_2(w)) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad w \in \mathcal{V},
\]

see bold curves on Fig. 7.1. By Theorem 2.6 an arbitrary decomposition \(\Omega = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2\) with sufficiently small \(|\Omega_2| > 0\) and for all small \(\varepsilon > 0\) there exist a stationary solution to system (7.1) with the following properties

- \((U, V) \in L^\infty(\Omega)^n \times W^{2,p}_\nu(\Omega)\);
- \(V = V(x)\) is a weak solution to problem

\[
\gamma \Delta_\nu V + \alpha U - \beta V = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \Omega
\]
and

\[
U(x) = \begin{cases} 
  k_1(V(x)), & x \in \Omega_1, \\
  k_2(V(x)), & x \in \Omega_2,
\end{cases}
\]

satisfies \( V(x) - p(U(x)) = 0 \) for almost all \( x \in \Omega \).

- the couple \((U, V)\) satisfies

\[
\|V - V_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \|U - U_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} + \|U - k_2(V_1)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)} < C\varepsilon.
\]

An analogous analysis can be repeated by choosing the constant solution \((U_1, V_1)\) together with the branches \(k_1\) and \(k_3\), in the neighbourhood \(V \subseteq \mathbb{R}\), see Fig. 7.1.

A discontinuous stationary solution can be also obtained, if we use a constant solution \((U_2, V_2)\) with two branches either \(k_1\) and \(k_2\) or \(k_2\) and \(k_3\) with a suitable neighbourhood \(V \subseteq \mathbb{R}\) of the point \(V_2\). Here, we can also apply Remark 2.13 and consider three branches \(k_1, k_2, k_3\) to obtain discontinuous stationary solutions on three different sets \(\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3\).

On the other hand, this reasoning can not be applied around the point \((U_3, V_3)\) because there is only one branch of the equation \(U - p(V) = 0\) in every neighbourhood of the point \(V_3\).

7.5. Stability of stationary solutions. Let us discuss sufficient conditions for a stability of the discontinuous stationary solution

\((U, V) = (U(x), V(x))\)

constructed around the point \((U_1, V_1)\) with branches \(k_1\) and \(k_2\). Assumptions 2.8 and condition (2.9) reduce to the inequalities

\[-p'(U_1) < 0, \quad -p'(k_2(V_1)) < 0, \quad s \left( \frac{-p'(U_1)}{\alpha} \right) \left( \frac{1}{-\beta} \right) < 0.\]

The first two hold true because \(p\) is strictly increasing around points \(U_1\) and \(k_2(V_1)\), see Fig. 7.1. The matrix in the third inequality has eigenvalues with negative real parts if its trace is negative and the determinant is positive which is equivalent to the inequalities

\[-p'(U_1) - \beta < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad p'(U_1) > \alpha/\beta.\]

Both of them are obtained immediately from properties of \(p, \alpha, \beta\), see Fig. 7.1. Choosing \(\gamma > 0\) sufficiently large (see Assumption 2.9) as well as \(\varepsilon > 0\) and \(|\Omega_2| > 0\) sufficiently small we obtain by Theorem 2.11 that the solution \((U, V)\) is linearly exponentially stable.

Moreover, since the conditions in (2.10) reduce to the inequality

\[-\beta < 0,\]

this solution is also nonlinearly stable in \(L^\infty(\Omega)^{n+1}\) by Theorem 2.13.

On the other hand, every discontinuous stationary solution containing the branch \(k_3\) is linearly unstable. This is a consequence of the fact that \(-p'(k_3(w)) > 0\) for each \(w \in V\) and \(p'(U)\) belongs to the spectrum of the corresponding linearisation operator by equation (4.4), see Remark 2.12 for more comments.

7.6. Numerical illustrations. We conclude this work by numerical simulations of solutions to problem (7.1)-(7.2) with \(p, \alpha, \beta\) as on Fig. 7.1 and with large \(\gamma > 0\). To obtain Fig. 7.2 and Fig. 7.3 we used the explicit finite difference Euler method. In both cases, we choose an initial conditions \((u_0, v_0)\) as a small perturbations of the
constant solution \((U_2, V_2)\). We decompose the domain \(\Omega = [0, 1]^2 = \Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2\) with \(|\Omega_2| > 0\) sufficiently small and set
\[ u_0 < U_2 \text{ and } v_0 < V_2 \text{ on } \Omega_1 \text{ as well as } u_0 > U_2 \text{ and } v_0 > V_2 \text{ on } \Omega_2. \]
We choose the \(\pi\)-shape set \(\Omega_2\) on Fig. 7.2 and a random small set \(\Omega_2\) on Fig. 7.3.

The graphs of the corresponding solutions on both Figures 7.2 and 7.3 were obtained for large values of \(t > 0\) and, by stability results from this work, they are good approximations of discontinuous stationary solutions. Here we observe a graphical illustration of inequalities (2.5), namely, \(U\) stays close to \(U_1 = k_1(V_1)\) on the set \(\Omega_1\) and close to \(k_2(V_1)\) on the set \(\Omega_2\).

**Figure 7.2.** The solution \(u, v\) to problem (7.1)-(7.2) for sufficiently large \(t > 0\) and for the \(\pi\)-shape set \(\Omega_2\). Here, we choose such a particular shape to emphasize that every shape is allowed.

**Figure 7.3.** The solution \(u, v\) to problem (7.1)-(7.2) for sufficiently large \(t > 0\) and for a random initial condition.
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