Journal of the Nigerian Association of Mathematical Physics Volume 24 (July, 2013), pp 525 – 526 © J. of NAMP

Stabilizing a mathematical model of competition-colonization: context, performance deterioration and prospects

¹Ekaka-a E.N., ²Nwachukwu E. C., ³Agwu I. A., ²Musa Alex, ¹Amos E. and ¹Nafo N. M.

¹Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

²Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Nigeria. ³Department of Mathematics, Abia State Polytechnic, Aba, Nigeria.

Abstract

In this study, we will attempt to stabilize the multiple steady states of the wellknown competition-colonization model. The implications of this sophisticated analysis for delayed and full stabilizations have been made. The results which we have achieved and have not seen elsewhere are presented and discussed quantitatively.

1.0 Introduction

The well-known competition-colonization model [1] is an important educational model in mathematical ecology. The key feature of this model is that it has multiple steady-state solutions that require further stabilization [2]. The theory and the practical application examples which demonstrate the stabilization of interacting population systems have already been reported in the literature [2 - 5]. Our present stabilization analysis will be based on this theory.

2.0 Mathematical formulation

Following [1], we consider the following model equations:

$$\frac{du_1}{dt} = \lambda_1 u_1 (1 - u_1) - u_1 \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{du_2}{dt} = \lambda_2 u_2 (1 - u_1 - u_2) - u_2 - \lambda_1 u_1 u_2 \tag{2}$$

where $u_i(t)$ is the density of species *i* at time *t*. As in most ecological model, λ_1 and λ_2 are positive constants which reflect some biological insights [1]. In this scenario, λ_1 is called the birth rate of the density of species 1 whereas λ_2 is the birth rate of the density of species 2. The above system of model equations has two multiple steady-state solutions namely

$$u_{1e} = 1 - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \text{and} u_{2e} = \frac{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1^2}{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \text{ provided } \lambda_2 > \lambda_1^2 \text{ where } \lambda_1 > 1.$$

3.0 Methodology

It is clear that the competition-colonization model will have multiple steady-state solutions which will vary as values of λ_1 and λ_2 also vary. By using the standard theory of linearization in the neighborhood of an arbitrary steady-state solution and calculating the Jacobian elements, we can characterize whether each steady-state solution is either stable or unstable. For the steady-state solutions which are unstable under the changing values of λ_1 and λ_2 , we follow the procedure of [2] to develop a controller based on Euler discretization scheme which was used to stabilize the unstable steady-state solutions or further stabilize the stable steady-state solution.

4.0 **Results and Discussions**

For the purpose of clarity, we shall consider various scenarios of stabilizing the steady-state solutions of a competitioncolonization model. Our results of this analysis will be clearly presented in this section.

Result 1

If $\lambda_1 = 2$ and $\lambda_2 = 5$, such that $u_{1e} = 0.5$ and $u_{2e} = 0.1$ and using the initial conditions of 2 and 10 in the appropriate units of the interacting populations when the step length k = 0.01, we have obtained the following results

We observe from Table 1 that convergence starts to set in when the value of Tfinal is 10 up till when the value of Tfinal is30. **Result 2**

In this scenario, we consider when the values of λ_1 and λ_2 are 1.5 and 3 respectively such that $u_{1e} = 0.3333$ and $u_{2e} = 0.1667$. Using the same initial conditions and step length as used in Result 1 analysis, we have observed a dominant

Corresponding author: *Ekaka-a E.N.*, E-mail: -, Tel.: +2347066441590 and +2348037898499 (Nwachukwu) Journal of the Nigerian Association of Mathematical Physics Volume 24 (July, 2013), 525 – 526

Estimated u_{1e}	Estimated u_{2e}	Extent of stabilization	
0.5500	0.0213	Delayed stabilization	
0.5170	0.0577	Delayed stabilization	
0.5077	0.0813	Delayed stabilization	
0.5033	0.0921	Delayed stabilization	
0.5014	0.0986	Delayed stabilization	
0.5006	0.0994	Delayed stabilization	
0.5002	0.0998	Delayed stabilization	
0.5001	0.0999	Near stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
0.5000	0.1000	Full stabilization	
	Estimated u_{1e} 0.5500 0.5170 0.5077 0.5014 0.5006 0.5002 0.5001 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000 0.5000	Estimated u_{1e} Estimated u_{2e} 0.5500 0.0213 0.5170 0.0577 0.5033 0.0921 0.5014 0.0986 0.5006 0.0994 0.5006 0.0998 0.5006 0.0999 0.5001 0.0999 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000 0.5000 0.1000	

Table 1: Stabilization of steady-state solution: case 1

occurrence of performance deterioration in the output of the steady-state solution particularly indicating negative coordinates of a steady-state solution. A similar observation has been made for the scenario when $\lambda_1 = 2$ and $\lambda_2 = 6$ such that $u_{1e} = 0.5$ and $u_{2e} = 0.1667$. Therefore, our choices of steady-state solutions which are based on the chosen values of the model parameters do not guarantee effective stabilization of these steady-state solutions. Result 3

In this scenario, $\lambda_1 = 2$ and $\lambda_2 = 4.5$ such that $u_{1e} = 0.5000$ and $u_{2e} = 0.0556$. We obtain the following results: Table 2: Stabilization of steady-state solution: case 3

Table 2: Stabilization of steady-state solution: case 3			
Tfinal	Estimated u_{1e}	Estimated u_{2e}	Extent of stabilization
2	0.5474	0.0247	Delayed stabilization
4	0.5134	0.0408	Delayed stabilization
6	0.5054	0.0494	Delayed stabilization
8	0.5022	0.0530	Delayed stabilization
10	0.5009	0.0545	Delayed stabilization
12	0.5004	0.0551	Delayed stabilization
14	0.5002	0.0554	Delayed stabilization
16	0.5001	0.0555	Near stabilization
18	0.5000	0.0555	Stabilization
20	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization
22	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization
24	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization
26	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization
28	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization
30	0.5000	0.0556	Full stabilization

We also observe from Table 2 that near stabilization occurs when the value of Tfinal is 16.

5.0 Conclusion

The original formulation of a competition-colonization model lacks the application of stabilization of its steady-state solutions. In this study, we have successfully demonstrated that $u_1 \rightarrow u_{1e}$ and $u_2 \rightarrow u_{2e}$ as t or Tfinal increases. Therefore, the multiple steady-state solutions of a competition-colonization model which were not previously stabilized have been stabilized. In summary, we have been able to construct a controller which was used to stabilize the steady-state solutions of a competition-colonization model which were not previously stabilized have been stabilized. In summary, we have been able to construct a controller which was used to stabilize the steady-state solutions of a competition-colonization model. It is worth mentioning that the competition-colonization model exhibits performance deterioration as popularly called in the applied control theory literatures.

References

- [1] Claudia Neuhauser, Mathematical Challenges in Spatial Ecology, Notices of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 48, Number 11, 2000.
- [2] Yubin Yan and Enu-Obari N. Ekaka-a, Stabilizing a mathematical model of population system, Journal of the Franklin Institute 348 (2011) 2744–2758.
- [3] X. Zhou, J. Cui, Stability and Hopf bifurcation analysis of an eco-epidemiological model with delay, Journalof the Franklin Institute 347 (2010) 1654–1680.
- [4] Y. Yan, D. Coca, V. Barbu, Feedback control for Navier–Stokes equation, Nonlinear Functional Analysisand Optimization 29 (2008) 225–242.
- [5] Y. Yan, D. Coca, V. Barbu, Finite-dimensional controller design for semilinear parabolic systems, NonlinearAnalysis: Theory, Methods and Applications 70 (2009) 4451–4475.

Journal of the Nigerian Association of Mathematical Physics Volume 24 (July, 2013), 525 – 526