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1 Introduction

Population models, which are used in a variety of biological and ecological applications, have been studied extensively for many decades. It is often important that these models include both time-delay and spatial diffusion to reflect the dynamic behavior of the models, based on past history, and the trend of a species to migrate to the least densely populated areas. Delay reaction-diffusion models, which display oscillatory solutions, can describe the lagged response to past behaviour and the spatial structure of certain chemical, biological and ecological systems. Some examples include the delayed logistic diffusion equation which represents the general framework of the growth dynamics of a single species and the delayed diffusive Lotka-Volterra predator-prey systems for multiple population models [4, 9, 21].

Alfred Lotka and Vito Volterra [15] proposed a model for predator-prey systems to describe the population of sharks and fish in the Adriatic Sea during World War I. This model can also be used to describe chemical reactions and physical systems such as resonantly coupled lasers [11, 15]. Many theoretical and experimental studies have considered the stability of the Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model. For example, Faria [8] considered the system with one and two delays. They studied the effect of diffusion and obtained the stability of the positive equilibrium and the location of Hopf bifurcation points. Yan and Chu [22] analyzed the stability for a delayed Lotka-Volterra predator-prey system and found conditions for oscillatory solutions to occur. They also examined the stability of the oscillatory solutions.

Chen et al. [5] considered the diffusive Lotka-Volterra predator-prey system with two delays. By analyzing the characteristic equations, the authors investigated the stability of Hopf bifurcations and the coexistence equilibrium. They found that the positive equilibrium point of the system could be destabilized through a Hopf bifurcation as the delay increases in magnitude. Shenghu [20] studied the dynamics of the diffusive Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model with prey-stage structure. They showed the effect of large diffusion rates on the existence of the positive steady states. A large diffusion rate for the prey species can lead to the destruction of spatial patterns while a large diffusion rate for the predator species preserves spatial patterns. Galiano et al. [10] examined the Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model with
cross-diffusion terms numerically and analytically. The authors proved the existence of a global weak solution in any number of space dimensions. Also, the numerical results for the 1-D domain were shown, underlining the effects of segregation of the species. Zhang and Zhao [23] considered a delayed diffusive three species Lotka-Volterra system and analysed the Hopf bifurcations of the system. These also presented numerical solutions of stable and oscillatory solutions to illustrate the effects of both delay and diffusion.

Usually, a system of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) can be analyzed by standard techniques. However reaction-diffusion equations are also important in many physically relevant modelling scenarios and are not so easily analyzed. Marchant [16] considered semi-analytical solutions for the Gray & Scott cubic autocatalytic model in a reaction-diffusion cell. The governing partial differential equation (PDE) model was approximated by a lower-order ODE model, using the Galerkin method of averaging. The ODE model was analyzed using various techniques from combustion theory which allowed bifurcation diagrams and Hopf bifurcation parameter maps to be found. An excellent comparison between the results of the semi-analytical method and the numerical solutions of the governing PDEs was found. The Galerkin averaging method has been applied to various other problems including a class of generalized diffusive logistic delay equations [2], the reversible Selkov model with feedback delay [3] and extensions to the Gray-Scott model such as Michaelis-Menten decay [17].

Fagan et al. [7] explored the importance of habitat edge effects, or boundary conditions, on species interactions and illustrated a number of scenarios using diffusive Lotka-Volterra equations. They gave physical examples of the different types of boundary conditions and related them to mathematical definitions. Scenarios considered included edge induced changes to migration patterns and mortality, cross-boundary subsidies and new types of interactions.

In this paper, the Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model with two delays is examined in both 1-D and 2-D domains where the Galerkin method is used to develop semi-analytical solutions. In §2 governing equations are presented and the Galerkin method is used to obtain the delay differential equations (DDEs) which represent the semi-analytical model. In §3 the steady-state concentration profiles and response diagrams are presented and described in detail. In §4 a local stability analysis of the semi-analytical model is performed. The Hopf points are found and the parameter region in which Hopf bifurcations occur is identified. In §5 the periodic solution near the Hopf bifurcation is developed for the semi-analytical DDE model for the 1-D domain. Comparisons are made throughout the paper between the semi-analytical results and numerical solutions of the governing PDEs.

2 The semi-analytical model

2.1 The governing equations

The Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model with two delays is considered in 1-D and 2-D domains. The governing PDEs and boundary conditions in 2-D are

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{du}{dt} &= D_u \left( u_{xx} + u_{yy} \right) + u(\alpha - \gamma_1 u - \delta_1 v(t - \tau_1)), \\
\frac{dv}{dt} &= D_v \left( v_{xx} + v_{yy} \right) + v(\beta + \gamma_2 u(t - \tau_2) - \delta_2 v), \\
\frac{du}{dx} &= \frac{dv}{dx} = 0, \quad \text{at } x = 0, \quad \text{at } y = 0, \quad u = v = 0, \quad \text{at } x = y = 1, \\
\frac{du}{\partial y} &= \frac{dv}{\partial y} = 0, \quad \text{at } x = 0, \quad \text{at } y = 0, \quad \text{at } x = y = 1, \\
u &= u_0, \quad v = v_0, \quad \text{at } -\tau_2 < t \leq 0.
\end{align*}
\] (1)

The system (1) is in non-dimensional form with the scaled concentrations of the prey population density, \( u \), and the predator population density, \( v \). The 1-D system is the natural simplification of (1), where there are no \( y \)-variations. The boundary conditions at \( x = y = 0 \) are zero-flux Neumann boundary conditions while at \( x = y = 1 \) fixed population, Dirichlet boundary conditions are applied. Hence, it is an open system which allows the existence of steady-state solutions and sustained periodic oscillations. At \( x = y = 0 \) the zero-flux boundary conditions can either be interpreted as an impermeable boundary, which the species cannot cross or a simple symmetry condition. Fagan et al. [7] refers to this type of boundary condition as a “fence effect” and gives an example of the edges between old growth forests and clear-cuts as a boundary red-backed voles will not cross. As a fixed zero population boundary condition
is applied at \( x = y = 1 \) the region beyond can be interpreted as lethal to the species. Fagan et al. [7] gives examples of the applicability of Dirchlet boundary conditions such as Bison crossing national park boundaries (outside of which they are shot) and beetles crossing into cleared land (where they die of dessication).

The system has ten other parameters; \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) represent the growth rate of the prey species and the death rate of the prey species, respectively. The parameters \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) are the carrying capacity of the prey \( u \) and the predator \( v \) populations. \( \delta_1 \) is the decrease in the population of the prey due to the predator presence, while \( \gamma_2 \) denotes the growth in the population of predator, due to the existence of the prey. The parameters \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \) represent the hunting and predator maturation delays. The parameters \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) are the diffusion coefficients of the two species \( u \) and \( v \). Note that all parameters are positive for physically realistic population models.

Numerical solutions of (1) and (2) are found using a Crank-Nicholson finite-difference scheme with accuracy of \( O(\Delta t, \Delta x^2) \), while a fourth-order Runge-Kutta method is used to solve the DDE models.

### 2.2 The Galerkin method

The Galerkin method is used to obtain the semi-analytical model for the Lotka-Volterra predator-prey model (1) in 1-D and 2-D domains. This method assumes a spatial structure of the population density profiles, allowing the governing PDEs (1) and boundary conditions (2) to be approximated by a set of lower-order ODEs. The expansion

\[
\begin{align*}
    u(x, t) &= u_1(t) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi x \right) + u_2(t) \cos \left( \frac{3}{2} \pi x \right), \\
v(x, t) &= v_1(t) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi x \right) + v_2(t) \cos \left( \frac{3}{2} \pi x \right),
\end{align*}
\]

(3)

is used which represents a two-term method in the 1-D spatial domain. Expansion (3) satisfies the boundary conditions (2), but not the governing PDEs. The form of basis functions (3) also has the property that the concentrations at the impermeable boundary \( x = 0 \) are \( u = u_1 + u_2 \) and \( v = v_1 + v_2 \). The free parameters in (3) are found by evaluating averaged versions of the governing equations, weighted by the basis functions. This process gives the following DDEs

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{du_1}{dt} &= -\frac{\pi^2 D_1 u_1}{4} + 8\gamma_1 u_1^2 \frac{1}{3\pi} - 16\gamma_1 u_1 u_2 \frac{1}{15\pi} + \alpha u_1 - \frac{8\delta_1 u_1 v_1}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 u_1 v_2}{15\pi}, \\
\frac{dv_1}{dt} &= -\frac{\pi^2 D_2 v_1}{4} + 8\gamma_2 v_1^2 \frac{1}{3\pi} - 16\gamma_2 v_1 u_2 \frac{1}{15\pi} - \beta v_1 + \frac{8\gamma_2 v_1 u_1}{3\pi} + \frac{8\gamma_2 v_1 u_2}{15\pi}, \\
\frac{du_2}{dt} &= -\frac{9\pi^2 D_1 u_2}{4} - 8\gamma_1 u_1^2 \frac{1}{15\pi} - 144\gamma_1 u_1 u_2 \frac{1}{35\pi} + \alpha u_2 - \frac{8\delta_1 u_1 v_1}{15\pi} + \frac{8\gamma_1 u_2}{9\pi}, \\
\frac{dv_2}{dt} &= -\frac{9\pi^2 D_2 v_2}{4} + 8\gamma_2 v_2^2 \frac{9}{35\pi} - 144\gamma_2 v_2 u_2 \frac{9}{35\pi} - \beta v_2 + \frac{72\gamma_2 v_2 u_1}{35\pi} - \frac{8\delta_2 v_2}{15\pi},
\end{align*}
\]

(4)

where \( u_{id} = u_i(t - \tau_2) \) and \( v_{id} = v_i(t - \tau_1) \), \( i = 1, 2 \). The DDEs (4) are obtained by truncating the series (3) after two terms. It is found that a two-term method produces superior accuracy without excessive expression swell. The one-term solution (when \( u_2 = v_2 = 0 \)) is also calculated for comparison purposes. The accuracy of the one and two-term series solutions can be estimated using Richardson extrapolation, see Nelson et al. [19] for an example of error.
estimation for a reaction-diffusion equation governing self-heating in compost piles. For the 2-D spatial domain, the expansion

\[
\begin{align*}
    u(x, y, t) &= u_1(t) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi x \right) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi y \right) + u_2(t) \cos \left( \frac{3}{2} \pi x \right) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi y \right) \\
    v(x, y, t) &= v_1(t) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi x \right) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi y \right) + v_2(t) \cos \left( \frac{3}{2} \pi x \right) \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \pi y \right)
\end{align*}
\]

represent the two-term method which is used here. Note that two terms in each series have the same coefficient (for the \( u \) series, the coefficient \( u_2 \) appears twice). This is because the solution is symmetric along the line \( y = x \). The expansion (5) also satisfies the boundary condition (2). The following DDE model, for the 2-D spatial domain,

\[
\begin{align*}
    \frac{du_1}{dt} &= -\frac{\pi^2 D_1 u_1}{2} - \frac{64 \gamma_1 u_1^2}{9\pi^2} - \frac{256 \gamma_1 u_1 u_2}{45\pi^2} + \alpha u_1 - \frac{64 \delta_1 u_1 v_1}{9\pi^2} - \frac{128 \delta_1 u_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} \\
    &\quad - \frac{128 \delta_1 u_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{128 \gamma_1 u_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{1575\pi^2}{18176 \gamma_1 u_2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_1}{45\pi^2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{18176 \gamma_1 u_2}{45\pi^2} \\
    \frac{dv_1}{dt} &= -\frac{\pi^2 D_1 v_1}{2} - \frac{64 \gamma_2 v_1^2}{9\pi^2} - \frac{256 \gamma_2 v_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \beta v_1 + \frac{64 \gamma_2 v_1}{9\pi^2} + \frac{128 \gamma_2 v_1}{45\pi^2} \\
    &\quad + \frac{128 \gamma_2 v_1}{45\pi^2} + \frac{18176 \gamma_2 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{1575\pi^2}{18176 \gamma_1 u_2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_1}{45\pi^2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{18176 \gamma_2 v_2}{45\pi^2} \\
    \frac{du_2}{dt} &= -\frac{5 \delta_2 D_2 u_2}{2} - \frac{64 \gamma_1 u_1^2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{18176 \gamma_1 u_1 u_2}{45\pi^2} + \alpha u_2 - \frac{64 \delta_1 u_1 v_1}{45\pi^2} - \frac{4352 \gamma_1 u_2}{4725\pi^2} \\
    &\quad - \frac{1575\pi^2}{90881 \gamma_1 u_2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_1}{45\pi^2} - \frac{256 \delta_1 v_2}{45\pi^2} - \frac{18176 \gamma_2 v_2}{45\pi^2} \\
    \frac{dv_2}{dt} &= -\frac{5 \delta_2 D_2 v_2}{2} - \frac{4352 \gamma_2 v_1^2}{4725\pi^2} - \frac{18176 \gamma_2 v_1 v_2}{4725\pi^2} - \beta v_2 + \frac{90881 \gamma_2 v_2}{4725\pi^2} - \frac{4352 \gamma_2 v_2}{4725\pi^2} \\
    &\quad + \frac{90881 \gamma_2 v_2}{4725\pi^2} + \frac{18176 \gamma_2 v_2}{4725\pi^2}
\end{align*}
\]

is obtained by weighting the equations by the basis functions and averaging.

3 Steady-state solutions

The steady-state of both (4) and (6) (where the time derivative terms are all zero) represents a set of four transcendental equations \( (f_i = 0, i = 1, \ldots, 4) \), which are solved numerically using Maple. For the one term case, \( u_2 = v_2 = 0 \), so in this case two transcendental equations are obtained.

Figures 1(a) and 1(b) show steady-state population density profiles \( u \) and \( v \) versus \( x \), for the 1-D spatial domain. The parameters are \( \alpha = 0.4, \gamma_1 = 0.1, D_1 = D_2 = 0.05, \delta_1 = 0.2, \gamma_2 = 0.7, \delta_2 = 0.5, \beta = 0.4 \) and \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0 \). The one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions of (1) and (2) are shown. The prey and predator densities are both highest in the centre of the domain as movement of both species occurs across the domain boundaries, to maintain the fixed population densities of zero there. The one-term solutions have a density of \( (u, v) = (1.51, 0.876) \) at \( x = 0 \). The two-term density peaks are \( (u, v) = (1.44, 0.926) \) at \( x = 0 \), while the numerical densities are \( (u, v) = (1.45, 0.922) \). It can be seen that the two-term expression produces an excellent approximation when compared with the numerical solution of the governing PDEs (1) and (2). The errors are less than 1% for the \( u \) and \( v \) population density. For the one-term approximation, the errors are slightly larger, but no greater than about 5%. The two-term solutions are superior to the one-term profile as they model flat \( u \) and \( v \) population density profiles more accurately.
Figure 1: Steady-state prey, $u$ (a), and predator, $v$ (b), population density profiles versus $x$ for the 1-D spatial domain. The parameters are $\alpha = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.05$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one-term (black solid line), two-term (blue dashed line) semi-analytical solutions and the numerical solution of (1) and (2) (red dotted line) are shown.
Figure 2: Steady-state prey, $u$ (a), and predator, $v$ (b), population density profiles versus $x$ for the 2-D spatial domain. The parameters are $\alpha = 0.65$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.02$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one-term (black solid line), two-term (blue dashed line) semi-analytical solutions and the numerical solution of (1) and (2) (red dotted line) are shown.
Figure 3: Steady-state population densities, $u$ (a), and $v$ (b), versus $\alpha$ for the 1-D spatial domain. The population densities are shown at $x = 0$. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one-term (black solid line), two-term (blue dashed line) semi-analytical solutions and the numerical solution of (1) and (2) (red dotted line) are shown.
Figure 4: Steady-state population densities, $u$ (a), and $v$ (b), versus $\alpha$ for the 2-D spatial domain. The population densities are shown at $x = y = 0$. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.02$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one-term (black solid line), two-term (blue dashed line) semi-analytical solutions and the numerical solution of (1) and (2) (red dotted line) are shown.
Figures 2(a) and 2(b) show steady-state population profiles $u$ and $v$ versus $x$, for the 2-D spatial domain respectively. The parameters are $\alpha = 0.65$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.02$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions of (1) and (2) are shown. The figures also show the profile through the centre of the domain, at $y = 0$. Moreover, at $x = 0$ the one and two-term solutions have densities of $(u, v) = (2.74, 2.46)$ and $(u, v) = (1.92, 2.18)$ respectively, while the numerical density is $(u, v) = (2.15, 2.08)$. For the one-term model, the errors are quite large at 28% and 18% for the $u$ and $v$ population density respectively. The two-term model gives a better comparison with the numerical solution. The errors are less than 11% and 5% for the $u$ and $v$ population densities. The numerical prey population density is very flat in the center of the domain and series solutions have difficulty in modelling such profiles, hence the oscillatory two term profile. More series terms are needed to model flat profiles better.

Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show steady-state population densities $u$ and $v$ versus the bifurcation parameter $\alpha$, for the 1-D spatial domain. The population densities are shown at $x = 0$. The steady state two-term population densities increase in a near linear manner as $\alpha$ increases. The steady state two-term solutions can be approximated by $u = 2.92\alpha + 0.090$ and $v = 4.49\alpha - 1.51$. The solution $v$ becomes positive at $\alpha = 0.34$ hence physically realistic solutions only exist for $\alpha \geq 0.34$. The two-term solution is very close to the numerical solution of the PDEs. At $\alpha = 1$ the numerical solutions are $(u, v) = (2.99, 2.92)$ while the one and two-term semi-analytical solutions are $(u, v) = (3.14, 2.87)$ and $(u, v) = (2.95, 2.89)$ respectively. The errors between the numerical and two-term semi-analytical solutions less than 2% for both the $u$ and $v$ population densities. While the one-term errors are no greater than about 5%.

Figures 4(a) and 4(b) show steady-state population densities $u$ and $v$ versus $\alpha$, for the 2-D spatial domain respectively. The population densities are shown at $x = y = 0$. The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.02$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. The one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions of the governing PDEs are shown. Again there is a near linear relationship between $u$, $v$ and $\alpha$. The one-term steady-state solution can be described by $u = 3.65\alpha + 0.368$, $v = 5.11\alpha - 0.869$. Here, the solution $v$ is physically realistic solutions for $\alpha \geq 0.17$. At $\alpha = 0.6$, the errors between numerical and two-term semi-analytical solutions are about 9% and 7%, for the $u$ and $v$ population density respectively.

4 Local stability, bifurcation diagrams and oscillatory solutions

A Hopf bifurcation occurs when oscillatory solutions exist in the neighborhood of a steady state whose stability is lost because of the crossing of a pair of complex conjugate eigenvalues over the imaginary axis. The Hopf bifurcation theory is explained in standard texts on bifurcation theory and dynamical systems [6, 12]. Here the stability of the semi-analytical model is analyzed and used to explore the effects of the two delays in altering the stability of the system (1) and (2), for both 1-D and 2-D spatial domains. The Hopf degeneracy points are calculated to find a semi-analytical map in which Hopf bifurcations occur and this prediction is compared with numerical results. Also bifurcation diagrams are drawn with two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions compared. The bifurcations diagrams exhibit the steady-state amplitude solution branch and the maximum and minimum amplitudes of the oscillatory solutions. The amplitudes at $x = 0$, for the 1-D spatial domain, and at $x = y = 0$ for the 2-D spatial domain are shown.

The Hopf points are obtained by expanding in a Taylor series about the steady-state solution,

$$u_i(t) = u_{i0} + e^{\lambda t}, \quad v_i(t) = v_{i0} + e^{\lambda t}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

We substitute (7) into the DDEs (4) (1-D domain) and (6) (2-D domain) and linearize around the steady state. The eigenvalues of the Jacobian matrix characterizes the perturbation in the system and we obtain a characteristic equation for $\lambda$. We set $\lambda = i\omega$ in the characteristic
Figure 5: The regions of the $\alpha$-$\beta$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation can occur for the 1-D spatial domain. The one-term (black solid line), the two-term (blue, dashes) regions and the numerical solution (red, squares) are shown. The other parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$.

Figure 5 shows the region in the $\alpha$-$\beta$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation occur for the 1-D spatial domain. Shown are the one and two-term semi-analytical solutions plus numerical solutions. The other parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. The semi-analytical solutions are found by solving (8). The Hopf curves break the plane into two regions. To the right of the curves Hopf bifurcation points occur while to the left only stable solutions occur. Generally speaking, a higher growth rate $\alpha$ destabilizes the system while a higher death rate $\beta$ stabilizes it. The curve has a turning point at $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.410, 0.334)$ so Hopf bifurcations can only occur for $\alpha \geq 0.410$. The comparisons between the semi-analytical estimates and the numerical solutions, of the PDE model, are excellent. For example, at $\alpha = 0.6$, the numerical value at which Hopf bifurcations can occur is $\beta = 2$ while the one and two-term semi-analytical values are $\beta = 1.91$ and 1.98 respectively, which represents the errors of 5% and 2%.

Figure 6 shows the region in the $\alpha$-$\beta$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation occur for the 2-D spatial domain. Shown are the one and two-term semi-analytical solutions plus the numerical solution. The other parameters are the same as figure 5. Again the turning point here is $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.657, 0.106)$ so Hopf bifurcations only occur for $\alpha \geq 0.657$. The errors are less than 5% and 2% for the one and two-term analytical solutions.

Figure 7 shows the regions in the $\tau_1$-$\tau_2$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation occur for the 1-D spatial domain. Shown are the one and two-term semi-analytical solutions and the numerical solution. The other parameters are $\alpha = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. The semi-analytical solutions are found by solving (8). The Hopf curves break the plane into two regions. To the right of the curves Hopf bifurcation points occur while to the left only stable solutions occur. Generally speaking, a higher growth rate $\alpha$ destabilizes the system while a higher death rate $\beta$ stabilizes it. The curve has a turning point at $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.410, 0.334)$ so Hopf bifurcations can only occur for $\alpha \geq 0.410$. The comparisons between the semi-analytical estimates and the numerical solutions, of the PDE model, are excellent. For example, at $\alpha = 0.6$, the numerical value at which Hopf bifurcations can occur is $\beta = 2$ while the one and two-term semi-analytical values are $\beta = 1.91$ and 1.98 respectively, which represents the errors of 5% and 2%.
Figure 6: The regions of the $\alpha$-$\beta$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation can occur for the 2-D spatial domain. The one-term (black solid line), the two-term (blue, dashes) regions and the numerical solution (red, squares) are shown. The other parameters are $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$.

Figure 8 shows the regions in the $\tau_1$-$\tau_2$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation occur for the 2-D spatial domain. Shown are the one and two-term solutions and the numerical solution. The other parameters are the same as figure 5. The curves divide the plane into upper and lower regions. Above these curves limit cycles can occur while under the curves only stable solutions occur and there are no Hopf bifurcation points. The Hopf curve of Hopf bifurcations can be described by the linear equations $\tau_2 = -0.994\tau_1 + 3.11$ and $\tau_2 = -\tau_1 + 3.23$ for one and two-term semi-analytical solutions respectively. Given the computational difficulty in obtaining estimates for arbitrary choices of the delay parameters, the linear equation approximations represent a simple and useful method for predicting the occurrence of Hopf bifurcations for this PDE system. At $\tau_1 = 1.60$, the one and two-term semi-analytical values are $\tau_2 = 1.51$ and $\tau_2 = 1.63$ while the numerical value is $\tau_2 = 1.60$. The errors are less than 6% and 2% respectively.

Figure 9(a) shows a limit cycle solution in the $u$ versus $v$ phase plane for $x = 0$, 0.33 and 0.66, while (b) and (c) show the evolution of $u$ versus $t$, at $x = 0$ and 0.66 respectively, for the 1-D spatial domain. The parameters are $\alpha = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 2$. Shown are the one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions. The parameters lie above the Hopf curve in figure 7 so a limit cycle is possible. The figure illustrates the variations in the oscillatory solution as the
Figure 7: The regions of the $\tau_1$-$\tau_2$ plane in which Hopf bifurcation can occur for the 1-D spatial domain. The one-term (black solid line), the two-term (blue, dashes) regions and the numerical solution (red, squares) are shown. The other parameters are $\alpha = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$ and $\delta_2 = 0.5$.
Figures 11(a) and (b) shows the bifurcation diagrams of population densities $u$ and $v$, versus $\alpha$, at $x = 0$, for the 1-D spatial domain. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. Shown are the one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions. The Hopf bifurcation point occurs at $\alpha = 0.410$ for both the one and two-term semi-analytical models, while the numerical value is $\alpha = 0.413$. The stable solution branch occurs for $\alpha$ less than the Hopf point value while the periodic solutions occur for larger $\alpha$. Also, the values of $v$ are non-negative for $\alpha \geq 0.34$ so physically realistic steady-state solutions occur for $\alpha \in [0.34, 0.41]$. The maximum amplitudes of the oscillations increases as $\alpha$ increases, while the minimum amplitudes of the oscillations become very small. It can be seen that the two-term semi-analytical solution gives an excellent approximation, when compared with the numerical solution of the governing PDEs, for both the stable and oscillatory solutions of the bifurcation diagram. The error in the one-term semi-analytical is no greater than 4%, while the two-term solution is the same as the numerical solution, to graphical accuracy.

Figures 12(a) and 12(b) show the bifurcation diagrams of population densities $u$ and $v$, versus $\alpha$, at $x = y = 0$, in the 2-D spatial domain. The parameter values are the same as figure 11. The one and two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions are shown. For both one and two-term semi-analytical models the Hopf bifurcation point occurs at $\alpha = 0.679$ and $\alpha = 0.678$ respectively, while the numerical value is $\alpha = 0.677$. The errors for the 2-D domain are slightly larger than those for the 1-D case but are less than 15%.

Figure 13 shows the limit cycle curve $u$ versus $v$ at $x = 0$ for $\alpha = 1$ (inner curves), $\alpha = 1.25$ (middle curves) and $\alpha = 1.5$ (outer curves), for the 1-D domain. Shown is the two-term semi-analytical and numerical solutions. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 2$. This figure illustrates the nature of the limit cycle for larger $\alpha$, well beyond the Hopf bifurcation point. Many biological systems, such as the Nicholsons blowflies equation (see, for example, Alfifi et al. [1]) exhibit
Figure 9: (a) The limit cycle curve $u$ versus $v$, for $x = 0$ (outer curves), $x = 0.33$ (middle curves) and $x = 0.66$ (inner curves) and the evolution of $u$ versus $t$ for (b) $x = 0$ and (c) $x = 0.66$, for the 1-D domain. Shown is the one-term semi-analytical solution (black, solid line), two-term semi-analytical solution (blue, dashed lines) and the numerical solution (red, dotted lines). The parameters are $\alpha = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 2$. 
Figure 10: The evolution of $u$ versus $t$, for (a) $x = 0$, (b) $x = 0.33$ (c) $x = 0.66$, for the 1-D domain. The one-term semi-analytical solution (black, solid line), the two-term semi-analytical solution (blue, dashed lines) and the numerical solution (red, dotted lines) are shown. The parameters are $\alpha = 0.8$, $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 1$. 
Figure 11: The bifurcation diagrams of $u$ (a), and $v$ (b), at $x = 0$, versus $\alpha$ for the 1-D spatial domain. The one-term semi-analytical solution (black solid line), the two-term semi-analytical solution (blue dashed line) and the numerical solution (red dotted line) are shown. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. 
Figure 12: The bifurcation diagrams of $u$, (a), and $v$, (b), at $x = 0$, versus $\alpha$ for the 2-D spatial domain. The one-term semi-analytical solution (black solid line), the two-term semi-analytical solution (blue dashed line) and the numerical solution (red dotted line) are shown. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. 
Figure 13: The limit cycle curve $u$ versus $v$ at $x = 0$ for $\alpha = 1$ (inner curves), $\alpha = 1.25$ (middle curves) and $\alpha = 1.5$ (outer curves), for the 1-D domain. Shown is the two-term semi-analytical solution (blue, dashed lines) and the numerical solution (red, dotted lines). The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 2$.

Period doubling and chaotic solutions. This behaviour does not occur for the classical two species Lokta-Volterra ode system without delay, as a minimum of three species is required for chaotic solutions, see Kozlov and Vakulenko [13]. An extensive numerical search of the parameter space for the diffusive delayed Lokta-Volterra system in 1-D and 2-D domains, (1) and (2), only yielded limit cycle solutions, beyond the relevant Hopf point, with no chaotic behaviour found. This figure shows that the amplitude of the oscillations continues to increase as $\alpha$ increases and that the limit cycle curve takes a near rectangular shape. The amplitudes of the oscillations are, for $\alpha = 1$, $(u, v) = (7.70, 9.87)$ (two-term) and $(u, v) = (7.79, 9.77)$ (numerical), for $\alpha = 1.25$, $(u, v) = (10.8, 14.1)$ (two-term) and $(u, v) = (10.9, 14.1)$ (numerical) and for $\alpha = 1.5$, $(u, v) = (13.6, 18.1)$ (two-term) and $(u, v) = (13.7, 18.2)$ (numerical). The two-term solution is extremely accurate, even for large $\alpha$, with errors less than 1%.

5 Periodic solutions near the Hopf bifurcation point

An asymptotic analysis of the periodic solution of the semi-analytical DDEs model for the delayed Lotka-Volterra PDEs system (1) and (2) is developed for the 1-D domain. The Hopf perturbation technique, also called the Lindstedt-Poincaré method, is used to construct asymptotic limit cycle solutions of both the one- and two-term semi-analytical DDE models [6]. The power series method assumes that the oscillation amplitude $\epsilon$ is small and determines corrections to the frequency and bifurcation parameters by eliminating secular terms that appear in the expansion, at higher-order [14].
5.1 One-term solution

The one-term semi-analytical system is given by following DDEs

\[
\frac{du_1}{dt} = -\frac{\pi^2 D_1 u_1}{4} - \frac{8\gamma_1 u_1^2}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 u_1 v_{1d}}{3\pi} + \alpha u_1, \\
\frac{dv_1}{dt} = -\frac{\pi^2 D_2 v_1}{4} - \frac{8\delta_2 v_1^2}{3\pi} - \beta v_1 + \frac{8\gamma_2 v_1 u_{1d}}{3\pi}.
\]

We assume a 2π-periodic solution of (9), of the form,

\[
u_1(s) = m_1 + \epsilon m_1(s) + \epsilon^2 m_2(s) + \epsilon^3 m_3(s) + ..., \quad (10) \\
v_1(s) = n_1 + \epsilon n_1(s) + \epsilon^2 n_2(s) + \epsilon^3 n_3(s) + ..., \quad (11)
\]

where \(s = \omega t\) is the scaled time variable and the parameter \(\epsilon\) is the amplitude of the oscillation. This can be determined by a normalization condition as

\[
\epsilon = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} m(s, \epsilon) e^{-i\omega s} ds, \quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} m_1(s) e^{-i\omega s} ds = 1,
\]

where \(\epsilon\) and \(\omega\) are the values of the parameters at the Hopf bifurcation point. The corrections \(\alpha\) and \(\omega_2\) are obtained by using solvability conditions at the third order of the perturbation analysis. Substituting equations (10) and (12) into (9), we obtain governing equations at the first three orders of \(\epsilon\), which are

\[
O(\epsilon) : \quad \omega_0 m_1 = \omega_0 m_1 = \frac{16\gamma_1 m_1 m_1}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 \eta_1 m_1}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 m_1 \eta_1 d}{3\pi} - \frac{1}{4} D_1 \pi^2 m_1,
\]

\[
O(\epsilon^2) : \quad \omega_0 m_2 = \omega_0 m_2 = \frac{16\gamma_1 m_2 m_2}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 \eta_1 m_2}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 m_2 \eta_1 d}{3\pi} - \frac{1}{4} D_1 \pi^2 \eta_1 d,
\]

\[
O(\epsilon^3) : \quad \omega_0 m_3 = \frac{8\gamma_1 m_3 \omega_2 \eta_1 d}{3\pi} - \frac{16\gamma_1 m_3 m_3}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 \eta_1 m_3}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 m_3 \eta_1 d}{3\pi},
\]

At the first two orders the solution of (13) and (14) are

\[
m_1(s) = e^{i\omega} + c.c., \quad \eta_1(s) = \lambda e^{i\omega} + c.c., \quad (16) \\
m_2(s) = B_1 e^{2i\omega} + c.c., \quad \eta_2(s) = B_2 e^{2i\omega} + c.c.,
\]

where c.c. is the complex conjugate. To find the amplitudes \(A, B_1\) and \(B_2\) of the oscillations in (16) we substitute (16) into (13) and (14) and separate into real and imaginary parts, see
The leading-order limit cycle and its period is given by

\[ \alpha_c \] not a solution to the homogeneous equations. Thus, an appropriate choice of the equations have the solution (25) in the Appendix. At third-order we substitute the solutions (16) into (15) and obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\omega_3 m_3 &= \frac{16\delta_1 m_3}{3\pi} + \frac{8\delta_1 \eta_2 m_3}{3\pi} + \frac{8\delta_1 \mu_2 \eta_3}{3\pi} + \frac{1}{4}D_1 \pi^2 m_3 - \alpha_0 m_3, \\
e^{i\epsilon}(\alpha_2 + \frac{8i\delta_1 m_2 \omega_3 A e^{-i\omega_0}}{3\pi} - i\omega_2 - \frac{16\delta_1 B_1}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 B_2 e^{-2i\omega_0}}{3\pi} - \frac{8\delta_1 B_1 e^{i\omega_0}}{3\pi} + \text{c.c.}) = 0, \\
\omega_3 \eta_3 &= \frac{16\delta_2 \eta_1 \eta_3}{3\pi} - \frac{8\gamma_2 m_3 \eta_3}{3\pi} + \frac{8\gamma_2 m_2 \eta_3}{3\pi} + \frac{1}{4}D_2 \pi^2 \eta_3 + \beta \eta_3, \\
e^{i\epsilon}(\frac{8i\gamma_2 AB_1 e^{-2i\omega_0}}{3\pi} + \frac{8i\gamma_2 \eta_2 e^{-i\omega_0}}{3\pi} - i\omega_2 A - \frac{16\delta_2 B_2 A}{3\pi} - \frac{8\gamma_2 B_2 e^{i\omega_0}}{3\pi} + \text{c.c.}) = 0.
\end{align*}
\]

where only the secular \( e^{i\epsilon} \) terms are shown on the r.h.s. of (17). The homogeneous form of the equations have the solution \((m_3, \eta_3)^T = e^{\pm i\epsilon}(1, A)^T\) which can not be used to eliminate secular terms at \(O(\epsilon^3)\). However, a choice orthogonal to this, such as \((m_3, \eta_3)^T = e^{\pm i\epsilon}(1, 0)^T\) is not a solution to the homogeneous equations. Thus, an appropriate choice of \(c\) together with \(\alpha_2\) and \(\omega_2\) eliminates the secular terms at \(O(\epsilon^3)\), see (26) in the Appendix.

The solution is now complete and we explain the special case \(\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4\) in detail. The solution is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
(\alpha_0, \omega_0, m_3, \eta_3) &= (0.410, 0.161, 1.310, 0.305), \\
A &= 0.033 - 0.879i, \quad B_1 = -0.158 - 0.462i, \\
B_2 &= -1.130 - 0.279i, \quad \alpha_2 = 0.133, \quad \omega_2 = -0.371.
\end{align*}
\]

The leading-order limit cycle and its period is given by

\[
\begin{align*}
u_1(s) &= m_3 + \epsilon \cos(\omega t), \quad v_1(s) \approx \eta_3 + \epsilon \Re(A e^{i\alpha} + A e^{-i\alpha}), \\
\epsilon &\simeq \sqrt{7.5\alpha - 3.08}, \quad \omega \simeq 13.0 - 2.79\alpha,
\end{align*}
\]

where the extrema of the oscillatory solutions are \(u = m_3 \pm 2\epsilon\) and \(v = \eta_3 \pm 1.76\epsilon\). The limit cycle (19) shows the classical square root behaviour near the Hopf point \(\alpha = 0.410\). Also the frequency decreases linearly with \(\alpha\).

### 5.2 Two-term solution

The two-term semi-analytical equations are found from (4). The procedure for obtaining periodic solutions near the Hopf bifurcation point is similar to the one-term case. We assume a solution of (4) of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
u_1(s) &= m_1 + e^s m_2(s) + e^{3s} m_3(s), \\
v_1(s) &= \eta_1 + e^s \eta_2(s) + e^{3s} \eta_3(s), \\
u_2(s) &= \xi_1 + e^s \xi_2(s) + e^{3s} \xi_3(s), \\
v_2(s) &= \rho_1 + e^s \rho_2(s) + e^{3s} \rho_3(s).
\end{align*}
\]

The governing equations at the first three orders of \(\epsilon\) are obtained by substituting (20) and (12) into (4). These perturbation equations are excessively long so are not presented here. Note that there are four equations at each order of \(\epsilon\). The first order solution has the form

\[
\begin{align*}
m_1(s) &= e^{is} + \text{c.c.}, \quad \eta_1(s) = A_1 e^{i\alpha} + \text{c.c.}, \\
\xi_1(s) &= A_2 e^{i\alpha} + \text{c.c.}, \quad \rho_1(s) = A_3 e^{i\alpha} + \text{c.c.}
\end{align*}
\]

By substituting (21) into the \(O(\epsilon)\) equations, three complex equations are obtained for the complex amplitudes \(A_1, A_2, A_3\). At \(O(\epsilon^2)\), the solution has the following form

\[
\begin{align*}
m_2(s) &= B_1 e^{2is} + \text{c.c.}, \quad \eta_2(s) = B_2 e^{2is} + \text{c.c.}, \\
\xi_2(s) &= B_3 e^{2is} + \text{c.c.}, \quad \rho_2(s) = B_4 e^{2is} + \text{c.c.}
\end{align*}
\]

Again, by substituting (21) and (22) into the \(O(\epsilon^2)\) equations, four complex equations are obtained for complex amplitudes \(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\). At the third order, the equations have
Figure 14: The bifurcation diagrams of $u$, (a), and $v$, (b), versus $\alpha$. The one-term semi-analytical solution (red dotted lines) and the perturbation solution (blue dashed lines) are shown, for the 1-D domain. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. 
Figure 15: The bifurcation diagrams of $u$, (a), and $v$, (b), versus $\alpha$. The two-term semi-analytical solution (red dotted lines) and the perturbation solution (blue dashed lines) are shown, for the 1-D domain. The parameters are $\beta = 0.4$, $\gamma_1 = 0.1$, $D_1 = D_2 = 0.1$, $\delta_1 = 0.2$, $\gamma_2 = 0.7$, $\delta_2 = 0.5$ and $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4$. 
\[ e^{\pm is} \text{ terms on the r.h.s, which are secular terms. We let } (m_3, \eta_3, \xi_3, \rho_3) = c_1 e^{\pm is}(1, 1, 1, 0)^T \text{ and choose } c_1, \alpha_2 \text{ and } \omega_0 \text{ to eliminate the secular terms at } O(e^s). \]

We illustrate the special case \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4 \). The Hopf bifurcation solution is

\begin{align}
&\begin{cases}
(\alpha_0, \omega_0, m_1, \eta_1, \xi_1, \rho_1) = (0.410, 0.162, 1.310, 0.311, -0.023, 0.017), \\
A_1 = 0.047 - 0.882i, \quad A_2 = -0.014 + 0.198i, \quad A_3 = 0.015 - 0.044i,
\end{cases} \\
&\begin{align*}
B_1 &= -0.131 - 0.462i, \quad B_2 = -1.112 - 0.323i, \quad B_3 = 0.021 + 0.003i, \\
B_4 &= -0.042 - 0.048i, \quad \alpha_2 = 0.118, \quad \omega_2 = -0.366.
\end{align*}
\end{align}

The leading-order limit cycle solution is

\begin{align}
&u(s) \simeq m_{a1} + \xi_1 + \epsilon(2 \cos(\omega t) + \Re\{A_2 e^{is} + A_3 e^{-is}\}), \\
v(s) \simeq \eta_{a1} + \rho_1 + \epsilon(\Re\{A_1 e^{is} + A_1 e^{-is} + A_{a1} e^{is} + A_{a1} e^{-is}\}), \\
\epsilon \simeq \sqrt{8.48\alpha - 3.48}, \quad \omega \simeq 1.43 - 3.10\alpha,
\end{align}

where the extrema of the oscillatory solutions are \( u = 1.28 \pm 1.98\epsilon \) and \( v = 0.327 \pm 1.857\epsilon \).

Figures 14 show the bifurcation diagram for \( u \) and \( v \), for the one-term solution while figure 15 shows the two-term solution, both for the 1-D domain. Shown are semi-analytical and perturbation solutions. The parameters are \( \beta = 0.4, \gamma_1 = 0.1, D_1 = D_2 = 0.1, \delta_1 = 0.2, \gamma_2 = 0.7, \delta_2 = 0.5 \) and \( \tau_1 = \tau_2 = 4 \). The solution loses stability at the Hopf point, \( \alpha = 0.410 \) for both the one- and two-term cases. The branches of oscillatory solutions form a near right angle with the steady state solution branch. These angles deviate slightly from the theoretically expected right angle due to the plotting of a finite number of points in the figures. Both figures show a good comparison between perturbation solutions and semi-analytical results for the interval \( \alpha \in [0.410, 0.413] \). The range of validity is limited by the fast growth of oscillatory amplitude, with respect to increasing \( \alpha \), and the limited range of accuracy for the Taylor-series expansion.

6 Conclusion

Semi-analytical DDE models have been developed for the diffusive Lotka-Volterra predator-prey system with delay in the 1-D and 2-D spatial domains. The DDE models are obtained as approximations to the governing PDEs. Bifurcation diagrams and Hopf bifurcation points are obtained for both the 1-D and 2-D domains and an asymptotic limit cycle solution developed, for the 1-D spatial domain. The method used here has proved to be highly effective in generating accurate approximate solutions and is applicable to a wide range of reaction-diffusion equations, both with and without delay terms.

A Equations associated with the one-term periodic solution

The transcendental equations for the amplitudes \( A = A_r + iA_i, B_1 = B_{1r} + iB_{1i}, \) and \( B_2 = B_{2r} + iB_{2i} \) are

\begin{align}
&\begin{cases}
\alpha_0 - \frac{16}{3\pi} \gamma_1 m_{a1} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 A_r - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_{a1} A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_{a1} A_i \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{1}{4} D_1 \pi^2 = 0, \\
\omega_0 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_{a1} A_r \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_{a1} A_i \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) = 0,
\end{cases} \\
\omega_0 A_i - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_1 A_r + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_{a1} A_r + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_1 \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{1}{4} D_2 \pi^2 A_r - \beta A_r = 0, \\
\omega_0 A_r + \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_1 A_i - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_{a1} A_i + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_1 \sin(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{1}{4} D_2 \pi^2 A_i + \beta A_i = 0, \\
2 \omega_0 B_{1i} - \frac{16}{3\pi} \gamma_1 m_{a1} B_{1r} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 \eta_1 B_{1r} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_{a1} B_{2r} \cos(2\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_1
\end{align}
The transcendental equations for $c = c_0 + ic_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\omega_2$ are

\begin{align*}
\omega_0 c_1 &= \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) B_{21} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 D_1 c_r - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
- \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) + \alpha_0 c_1 + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
- \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m \omega_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m \omega_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} = 0,
\omega_0 c_1 &= \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 D_1 c_r - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\alpha_0 B_{21} - 2\omega_0 B_{21} - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 \eta_2 B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} \cos(2\omega_0) \\
- \frac{1}{4} D_1 \pi^2 B_{11} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_1) = 0,
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
2\omega_0 B_{21} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \sin(\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_2 B_{21}
+ \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} \cos(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 A_r^2 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_2 A_r^2 - \frac{1}{4} D_2 \pi^2 B_{21} = 0,
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
-2\omega_0 B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_2 B_{21}
+ \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 A_r^2 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \cos(2\omega_0 \tau_2) = 0.
\end{align*}

The transcendental equations for $c = c_0 + ic_1$, $\alpha_2$ and $\omega_2$ are

\begin{align*}
\omega_0 c_1 &= \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) B_{21} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 D_1 c_r - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
- \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) + \alpha_0 c_1 + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
- \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) \sin(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m \omega_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m \omega_2 \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) A_{22} = 0,
\omega_0 c_1 &= \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m c_1 - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 D_1 c_r - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 B_{11} A_{21} \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1)
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\alpha_0 B_{21} - 2\omega_0 B_{21} - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 \eta_2 B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} \cos(2\omega_0) \\
- \frac{1}{4} D_1 \pi^2 B_{11} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_1) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_1 m_m B_{21} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_1) = 0,
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
2\omega_0 B_{21} + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \sin(\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_2 B_{21}
+ \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} \cos(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{1}{4} \pi^2 A_r^2 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \delta_2 A_r^2 - \frac{1}{4} D_2 \pi^2 B_{21} = 0,
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
-2\omega_0 B_{21} - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 A_r \cos(\omega_0 \tau_2) + \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \sin(2\omega_0 \tau_2) - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 \eta_2 B_{21}
+ \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 m_m B_{22} - \frac{16}{3\pi} \delta_2 A_r^2 - \frac{8}{3\pi} \gamma_2 \eta_2 B_{11} \cos(2\omega_0 \tau_2) = 0.
\end{align*}
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