A TIME DEPENDENT OPTIMAL HARVESTING PROBLEM WITH MEASURE VALUED SOLUTIONS

G. M. COCLITE AND M. GARAVELLO

ABSTRACT. The paper is concerned with the optimal harvesting of a marine park, which is described by a parabolic heat equation with Neumann boundary conditions and a nonlinear source term. We consider a cost functional, which is linear with respect to the control; hence the optimal solution can belong to the class of measure-valued control strategies. For each control function, we prove existence, and stability estimates for solutions of the parabolic equation. Moreover, we prove the existence of an optimal solution. Finally, some numerical simulations conclude the paper.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider an optimal control problem associated to a model for the evolution of fishes or of a group of individuals in a multi-dimensional domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ ($N \geq 2$). Denote by $\varphi = \varphi(t,x)$ the density of fish at time t at the point $x \in \Omega$. In absence of fishing activity, we assume that the fish population evolves according to the parabolic heat equation with source term

$$\partial_t \varphi = \Delta \varphi + g(t,x,\varphi), \qquad t > 0, \; x \in \Omega,$$

with Neumann boundary conditions

$$\partial_\nu \varphi = 0, \qquad t > 0, \; x \in \partial\Omega, \tag{1.1}$$

and with the initial condition

$$\varphi(0,x) = \varphi_0(x) \qquad x \in \Omega. \tag{1.2}$$

Here $\nu = \nu(x)$ denotes the unit outer normal vector to the set Ω at the point $x \in \partial\Omega$. A typical choice for the source term is the logistic type function

$$g(t,x,\varphi) = \alpha(t,x)\big(h(t,x) - \varphi\big)\,\varphi,$$

where $h(t,x)$ denotes the maximum fish population supported by the habitat at x a time t, while α is a reproduction speed.

Denoting by $u = u(t,x)$ the intensity of harvesting conducted by a fishing company, we assume that, in the presence of this harvesting activity, the density φ evolves according to the following partial differential equation

$$\partial_t \varphi = \Delta \varphi + g(t,x,\varphi) - \varphi u, \qquad t > 0, \; x \in \Omega, \tag{1.3}$$

together with the Neumann boundary conditions (1.1) and the initial condition (1.2). The function u can be considered as a control function. Define also the cost functional

$$J(u) = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \varphi(t,x)u(t,x)dtdx - \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_\Omega c(t,x)\,u(t,x)\,dtdx\right), \tag{1.4}$$

where $\varphi = \varphi(t,x)$ is the solution of (1.3) in correspondence of the harvesting strategy $u = u(t,x)$, $c(t,x)$ is the cost for a unit of fishing effort at time t and at the location $x \in \Omega$, and Ψ is a suitable

function. The functional J is the net gain associated to the control u, being composed of two pieces representing respectively the income and the cost of the strategy. Various choices for the function c are meaningful. The simple one is c constant. Another possibility is to have a function c, which increases with respect to the distance from a point $\bar{x}$, representing the base of the fishing company. Note also that, setting $c = +\infty$ on a set $\Omega_0 \subseteq \Omega$ one can consider regions, where fishing is not permitted. As regards the control function u, it is reasonable to assume that it satisfies constraints of the form

$$(1.5) \qquad\qquad u(t,x) \ \geq \ 0, \qquad\qquad \int_0^T \int_\Omega b(t,x)\, u(t,x)\, dtdx \ \leq \ 1,$$

for some non-negative function b. The first constraint imposes that there is indeed a fishing activity and not a process of population's increment, while the second one determines the maximum amount of harvesting power within the capabilities of the company. In practice, this may depend on the number of fishermen and on the size of fishing boats available.

Our interest is both the existence of solution for problem (1.3) and the existence of optimal solutions with respect to the cost (1.4). Since the first part of the cost functional (1.4) has only linear growth w.r.t. u, there is no guarantee that the optimal strategy u will lie in the space $L^1((0,T) \times \Omega)$. Indeed, existence of optimal solutions will be proved within the larger space of functions with values in the space of the bounded Radon measures supported on the closure $\overline{\Omega}$ of the domain. An example where the optimal control is indeed a measure was constructed in [5] for the stationary case. We remark that a quadratic harvesting cost such as

$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega c(t,x)u^2(t,x)\, dtdx,$$

entirely natural from a mathematical point of view, guarantees that the optimal strategy is indeed a function. However, the linear cost provides a more realistic model. We also remark that most of the theory of partial differential equations with measure-valued right hand side is concerned with elliptic equations with Dirichlet boundary conditions. In our fishery model, the Neumann boundary conditions (1.1) yield a more appropriate model.

Problems of optimal harvesting of a marine park, governed by a semilinear elliptic equation, have been the subject of several investigations; see for example [1, 6, 13, 14, 17]. The use of measure valued strategies was first considered in the paper [4]. In [4] the authors study the well posedness of the stationary elliptic problem on a real interval and prove the existence and uniqueness of the optimal control. Moreover, they considered a differential game, in which several fishing companies want to minimize a cost functional, and proved the existence of Nash equilibria. Those results have been extended to the time-dependent case in [11]. In [5, 11] necessary conditions on the Nash equilibria of a differential game were addressed. Finally, in [3] the elliptic problem in a multi dimensional domain is considered. Control and optimization problems in measure spaces have been considered also in [7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 20].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with a parabolic problem with smooth coefficients. In particular we prove existence and uniqueness of solution for such a problem, which is the preliminary step for considering measure valued controls. We use here the classical techniques of sub and super solutions. In Section 3 we introduce a definition of weak solutions to (1.3), when the control u is a measure valued function, and we prove existence, and stability estimates. The proof is based on approximating the measure valued control by smooth functions and proving that the approximate sequence of solutions has a limit point, which is the solution of the original problem. In Section 4 we establish the existence of an optimal measure-valued control, by using compactness arguments in the space of control functions and the results of Section 3. Finally, in Section 5 we present some numerical simulations.

2. A PARABOLIC PROBLEM WITH SMOOTH COEFFICIENTS

This section is dedicated to various technical results concerning the initial-boundary value problem

$$(2.1) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi = \Delta\varphi - a(t,x)\varphi + g(t,x,\varphi) & 0 < t < T, \ x \in \Omega \\ \partial_\nu \varphi = 0 & 0 < t < T, \ x \in \partial\Omega \\ \varphi(0,x) = \varphi_0(x) & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Let us introduce the following hypotheses on Ω, g and φ_0.

(H.1) The domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is open, bounded, connected with smooth boundary, denoted by $\partial\Omega$.

(H.2) The nonlinear source term g can be written as $g(t,x,\varphi) = f(t,x,\varphi)\varphi$, where $f : [0,T]\times\overline\Omega\times\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function satisfying

$$(2.2) \qquad f(\cdot,\cdot,0) \in L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega),$$

$$(2.3) \qquad -\alpha_0 \leq \partial_\varphi f(t,x,\varphi) < 0, \qquad \text{for all } (t,x,\varphi) \in [0,T] \times \overline\Omega \times \mathbb{R},$$

$$(2.4) \qquad f(t,x,\varphi) > 0, \qquad \text{if and only if} \quad \varphi < h(t,x),$$

where $h : [0,T] \times \overline\Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth bounded function such that $h \geq h_*$ and α_0, $h_* > 0$ are constants.

(H.3) The initial datum φ_0 satisfies

$$(2.5) \qquad \varphi_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega),$$

$$(2.6) \qquad 0 < \varphi_* \leq \varphi_0(x) \qquad \text{for all } x \in \overline\Omega,$$

for some constant φ_*.

For $\varepsilon > 0$, define the sets

$$(2.7) \qquad \Omega_\varepsilon = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^N : d(x,\Omega) < \varepsilon \right\} \qquad \Omega_{-\varepsilon} = \left\{ x \in \Omega : d(x,\partial\Omega) > \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Lemma 2.1. *Assume* **(H.1)**, **(H.2)** *and* **(H.3)**. *Fix $T > 0$ and a function $a \in C^\infty\left([0,T]\times\overline\Omega\right)$ such that $a(t,x) \geq 0$ for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$. The initial boundary value problem (2.1) admits a unique classical solution φ such that*

$$(2.8) \qquad 0 \leq \varphi(t,x) \leq M := \max\{\|h\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)}, \|\varphi_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\}$$

for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \Omega$.

Proof. Clearly 0 and M are respectively a subsolution and a supersolution to (2.1). By the comparison principle, see [19, Theorem 9.7] and [15, Theorem 2.16] for the case of Dirichlet boundary conditions, we deduce that (2.8) holds for every classical solution φ.

Moreover local in time existence of solutions for (2.1) can be deduced by [19, Theorem 8.2] or by [15, Theorem 7.8]. The a-priori estimates (2.8) imply that global existence of solution. Finally, again by the comparison principle, uniqueness of solution is granted. $\square$

Lemma 2.2. *Assume* **(H.1)**, **(H.2)** *and* **(H.3)**. *Fix $T > 0$ and a function $a \in C^\infty\left([0,T]\times\overline\Omega\right)$ such that $a(t,x) \geq 0$ for every $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\Omega$. The unique classical solution φ to (2.1) satisfies, for every $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, the estimate*

$$(2.9) \qquad \|\varphi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\int_s^t \|\nabla\varphi(\tau,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \, d\tau \leq \|\varphi(s,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + C(t-s),$$

where

$$(2.10) \qquad C = M^2 \|f(\cdot,\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)} |\Omega|.$$

Proof. Using (2.1) and Lemma 2.1, we obtain that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \frac{\varphi^2}{2}dx = \int_\Omega \varphi\partial_t\varphi dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \varphi \Delta\varphi dx - \underbrace{\int_\Omega \varphi^2 a(t,x)dx}_{\leq 0} + \int_\Omega \varphi g(t,x,\varphi)dx$$

$$\leq - \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx + \underbrace{\int_\Omega \varphi^2 f(t,x,\varphi)dx}_{(\text{see } (\mathbf{H.2}))}$$

$$\leq - \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx + \underbrace{\int_\Omega \varphi^2 f(t,x,0)dx}_{(\text{see } (2.2),\ (2.3),\ (2.8))}$$

$$\leq - \int_\Omega |\nabla\varphi|^2 dx + M^2 \|f(\cdot,\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)} |\Omega|.$$

Integrating over (s,t) we obtain (2.9).   □

3. A PARABOLIC PROBLEM WITH MEASURE-VALUED COEFFICIENTS

This section is dedicated to the well-posedness of the initial-boundary value problem with the time-dependent measure-valued coefficient μ_t

$$(3.1) \qquad \begin{cases} \partial_t\varphi = \Delta\varphi - \varphi\mu_t + g(t,x,\varphi), & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu\varphi = 0, & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \varphi(0,x) = \varphi_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We introduce the following hypothesis on the coefficient μ.

(**H.4**) There exist $\Phi_0 \in L^\infty\left(0,T;L^1\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)\right)$ and $\Phi_1,\ldots,\Phi_N \in L^\infty\left(0,T;L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)\right)$ such that the following conditions hold.

(1) $\mu_t = \Phi_0(t) - \operatorname{div}\left(\Phi_1(t),\ldots,\Phi_N(t)\right)$ in the sense of distributions for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$. More precisely, for every $v \in C_c^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ and for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)d\mu_t(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)\Phi_0(t,x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi_j(t,x)D_{x_j}v(x)dx.$$

(2) $\Phi_0(t) - \operatorname{div}\left(\Phi_1(t),\ldots,\Phi_N(t)\right) \geq 0$ in the sense of distributions for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, i.e. for every $v \in C_c^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ with $v \geq 0$ and for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)\Phi_0(t,x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi_j(t,x)D_{x_j}v(x)dx \geq 0.$$

(3) There exists $\bar\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\Phi_j(t,x) = 0$ for every $t \in [0,T]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}$, $j \in \{0,\cdots,N\}$.

Remark 3.1. *Note that* (**H.4**) *implies that* $\mu_t \in \mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ *for a.e.* $t \in [0,T]$, *where* $\mathcal{M}(\Omega)$ *denotes the set of the bounded Radon measures on* Ω. *Let* $v \in C_c^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ *and consider a function* $\tilde v \in C_c^\infty\left(\Omega\right)$ *such that* $\tilde v(x) = v(x)$ *for every* $x \in \Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}$. *By* (**H.4**) *we have that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)d\mu_t(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)\Phi_0(t,x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi_j(t,x)D_{x_j}v(x)dx$$

$$= \int_{\Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}} v(x)\Phi_0(t,x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}} \Phi_j(t,x)D_{x_j}v(x)dx$$

$$= \int_{\Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}} \tilde v(x)\Phi_0(t,x)dx + \sum_{j=1}^N \int_{\Omega_{-\bar\varepsilon}} \Phi_j(t,x)D_{x_j}\tilde v(x)dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega \tilde{v}(x)d\mu_t(x).$$

In particular, for every $v \in H^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ and for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, the integral

$$\int_\Omega v(x)d\mu_t(x) = \int_\Omega \Phi_0(t,x)v(x)dx + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_\Omega \Phi_i(t,x)D_{x_i}v(x)dx$$

is well defined.

Remark 3.2. *Similarly to* [3], *one can also consider a function $\mu \in L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\Omega))$ such that $\mu_t(A) = 0$ for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$ and for every Borel subset A of Ω with zero capacity. In this case, for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$, it is possible to write μ_t in a non-unique way as a sum $\tilde{\mu}_t + \overline{\mu}_t$ with $\tilde{\mu}_t \in L^1(\Omega)$ and $\overline{\mu}_t \in H^{-1}(\Omega)$; see* [12, Proposition 2.5]. *The non uniqueness of the decomposition introduces the additional difficulty about the choice of $\tilde{\mu}_t$ and of $\overline{\mu}_t$. Moreover it is not clear whether the two functions $t \mapsto \tilde{\mu}_t$ and $t \mapsto \overline{\mu}_t$ are strongly measurable.*

In the following we shall use the following definition of solution.

Definition 3.1. *A function $\varphi : [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is a solution to* (3.1) *if*

(3.2)
$$\varphi \in L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$$

and for every test function $v \in H^1(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega)$ such that $v(T) = 0$ we have

(3.3)
$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega (\partial_t v\varphi - \nabla v \cdot \nabla \varphi)\, dxdt - \int_0^T \int_\Omega v\varphi d\mu_t(x)dt$$
$$+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega vg(t,x,\varphi)dxdt + \int_\Omega v(0,x)\varphi_0(x)dx = 0.$$

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that assumptions* (**H.1**), (**H.2**), (**H.3**) *and* (**H.4**) *hold. The initial-boundary value problem* (3.1) *admits a semigroup of solutions S, in the sense of Definition 3.1, such that, if $\varphi(t,x) = S_t(\varphi_0)(x)$, then*

(3.4)
$$0 \leq \varphi(t,x) \leq M, \qquad (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \overline{\Omega},$$

(3.5)
$$\|\varphi(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\int_0^t \|\nabla\varphi(s,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\, ds \leq \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + Ct, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T,$$

where

(3.6)
$$C = M^2\, \|f(\cdot,\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)}\, |\Omega|,$$

and M is the constant defined in (2.8). *Moreover, if $\widehat{\varphi}$ is the solution of* (3.1) *obtained in correspondence of the initial condition $\widehat{\varphi}_0$, i.e. $\widehat{\varphi} = S(\widehat{\varphi}_0)$, the following stability estimate holds*

(3.7)
$$\|\varphi(t,\cdot) - \widehat{\varphi}(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2e^{Kt}\int_0^t e^{-Ks}\|\nabla(\varphi(s,\cdot) - \widehat{\varphi}(s,\cdot))\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\, ds \leq \|\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\, e^{Kt},$$

for every $0 \leq t \leq T$, where

(3.8)
$$K = \alpha_0 M + \|f(\cdot,\cdot,0)\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)}.$$

Proof. Given $\overline{\varepsilon} > 0$ of hypothesis (**H.2**), by using convolution, there exist sequences of functions $\Phi_{0,n}$ and $\Phi_{i,n}$ ($i \in \{1,\ldots,N\}$) in $C^\infty([0,T] \times \Omega)$ such that

(1) $\Phi_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}(t,x) \geq 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \Omega$;
(2) $\Phi_{j,n}(t,x) = 0$ for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{-\frac{\overline{\varepsilon}}{2}}$;
(3) $\Phi_{0,n} \to \Phi_0$ as $n \to +\infty$ in $L^p(0,T;L^1(\Omega))$ for every $1 \leq p < +\infty$;
(4) for every $i \in \{1,\ldots,N\}$ and for every $1 \leq p < +\infty$, $\Phi_{i,n} \to \Phi_i$ in $L^p(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ as $n \to +\infty$;

(5) there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|\Phi_{0,n}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}))} + \sum_{i=1}^N \|D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar{\varepsilon}}))} \le C$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the smooth and positive function

$$a_n(t,x) = \Phi_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}(t,x)$$

and consider, by Lemma 2.1, the classical solution φ_n of the initial-boundary value problem

(3.9)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi_n = \Delta\varphi_n - a_n(t,x)\varphi_n + g(t,x,\varphi_n), & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \varphi_n = 0, & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \varphi_n(0,x) = \varphi_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we obtain that, for every $t \in [0,T]$, $x \in \Omega$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$0 \le \varphi_n(t,x) \le M$$

proving that the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 we deduce that, for every $t \in [0,T]$,

(3.10)
$$\|\varphi_n(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + 2\int_0^t \|\nabla\varphi_n(s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\, ds \le \|\varphi_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 + Ct,$$

where C is defined in (2.10); hence the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$ and in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$. Therefore there exists a function φ and a subsequence of φ_n (again denoted by φ_n) such that

(3.11) $\varphi \in L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega) \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$,

(3.12) $\varphi_n \rightharpoonup \varphi$ weakly in $L^p((0,T)\times\Omega)$, $L^p(0,T;L^2(\Omega))$, $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ for every $1 \le p < \infty$,

(3.13) $\varphi_n \overset{\star}{\rightharpoonup} \varphi$,   weakly-$*$ in $L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$.

First note that, for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the function $\partial_t\varphi_n$ belongs to $L^2(\Omega)$ and so to $H^{-N}(\Omega)$ through the canonical inclusion $T^* : L^2(\Omega) \to H^{-N}(\Omega)$.

The sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$; consequently the sequence $\{\Delta\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2(0,T;H^{-1}(\Omega))$ and the sequence $\{a_n\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega))$. Therefore, for every $s > \frac{N}{2}$, $\{a_n\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;H^{-s}(\Omega))$. Moreover we have that the sequence $\{g(\cdot,\cdot,\varphi_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega) \subseteq L^\infty((0,T);L^1(\Omega))$ and so in $L^\infty(0,T;H^{-s}(\Omega))$ for every $s > \frac{N}{2}$. Since (3.9) holds in the sense of distributions, we deduce that the sequence $\{\partial_t\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2(0,T;H^{-s}(\Omega))$ for every $s > \frac{N}{2}$.

Since the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ (and so in $L^1(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$), we deduce that the sequence $\{\partial_t\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^1(0,T;H^{-N}(\Omega))$. In light of [21, Corollary 4], we have that

(3.14) $\varphi_n \longrightarrow \varphi$ strongly in $L^2((0,T)\times\Omega)$

and then, passing to a subsequence, we get that

(3.15) $\varphi_n \longrightarrow \varphi$ a.e. in $(0,T)\times\Omega$.

Since φ_n is a classical solution to (3.9), then, for every $w \in H^1(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ such that $w(T) = 0$, it holds

(3.16)
$$\int_0^T \int_\Omega (\partial_t w\varphi_n - \nabla w \cdot \nabla\varphi_n)\, dxdt - \int_0^T \int_\Omega a_n(t,x)w\varphi_n dxdt$$
$$+ \int_0^T \int_\Omega wg(t,x,\varphi_n)dxdt + \int_\Omega w(0,x)\varphi_0(x)dx = 0.$$

By using Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem and by (3.12) and (3.15), passing to the limit as $n \to +\infty$ in (3.16), one obtains that φ satisfies (3.3); hence it provides a solution to (3.1). Estimate (3.5) follows passing to the limit as $n \to +\infty$ in (3.10).

We have now to prove the stability estimate (3.7). Consider two initial conditions φ_0 and $\widehat{\varphi}_0$ and the sequences

$$\Phi_{0,n}, \Phi_{1,n}, \ldots, \Phi_{N,n} \in C^\infty\left([0,T] \times \Omega\right) \qquad \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}, \widehat{\Phi}_{1,n}, \ldots, \widehat{\Phi}_{N,n} \in C^\infty\left([0,T] \times \Omega\right)$$

such that

(1) $\Phi_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}(t,x) \geq 0$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t,x) \geq 0$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \Omega$;

(2) $\Phi_{j,n}(t,x) = 0$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{j,n}(t,x) = 0$ for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_{-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}$;

(3) $\Phi_{0,n} \to \Phi_0$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{0,n} \to \Phi_0$ as $n \to +\infty$ in $L^p\left(0,T; L^1(\Omega)\right)$ for every $1 \leq p < +\infty$;

(4) for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and for every $1 \leq p < +\infty$, $\Phi_{i,n} \to \Phi_i$ and $\widehat{\Phi}_{i,n} \to \Phi_i$ in $L^p\left(0,T; L^2(\Omega)\right)$ as $n \to +\infty$;

(5) there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|\Phi_{0,n}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar\varepsilon}))} + \sum_{i=1}^N \|D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar\varepsilon}))} \leq C$ and $\left\|\widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}\right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar\varepsilon}))} + \sum_{i=1}^N \left\|D_{x_i}\widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}\right\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^1(\Omega_{\bar\varepsilon}))} \leq C.$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we consider the smooth and positive functions

$$a_n(t,x) = \Phi_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\Phi_{i,n}(t,x) \qquad \widehat{a}_n(t,x) = \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t,x) - \sum_{i=1}^N D_{x_i}\widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t,x)$$

and consider, by Lemma 2.1, the classical solutions φ_n and $\widehat{\varphi}_n$ respectively of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi_n = \Delta\varphi_n - a_n(t,x)\varphi_n + g(t,x,\varphi_n), & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \varphi_n = 0, & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \varphi_n(0,x) = \varphi_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

and of

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \widehat{\varphi}_n = \Delta\widehat{\varphi}_n - \widehat{a}_n(t,x)\widehat{\varphi}_n + g(t,x,\widehat{\varphi}_n), & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \widehat{\varphi}_n = 0, & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \widehat{\varphi}_n(0,x) = \widehat{\varphi}_0(x), & x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

We have that

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2}dx = \int_\Omega \partial_t(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)dx$$

$$= \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\Delta(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)dx - \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\left(a_n(t,x)\varphi_n - \widehat{a}_n(t,x)\widehat{\varphi}_n\right)dx$$

$$+ \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)(g(t,x,\varphi_n) - g(t,x,\widehat{\varphi}_n))dx$$

$$= -\int_\Omega |\nabla(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2\,dx \underbrace{- \int_\Omega a_n(t,x)\left(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\right)^2 dx}_{\leq 0}$$

$$- \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\widehat{\varphi}_n\left(a_n(t,x) - \widehat{a}_n(t,x)\right)dx + \int_\Omega \int_{\widehat{\varphi}_n}^{\varphi_n} (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\partial_\varphi g(t,x,\xi)d\xi dx$$

$$\leq -\int_\Omega |\nabla(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2\,dx - \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\widehat{\varphi}_n\left(\Phi_{0,n}(t,x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t,x)\right)dx$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^N \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)\widehat{\varphi}_n D_{x_i}\left(\Phi_{i,n}(t,x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t,x)\right)dx$$

$$+ \int_\Omega \int_{\widehat{\varphi}_n}^{\varphi_n} (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) f(t, x, \xi) d\xi dx + \int_\Omega \int_{\widehat{\varphi}_n}^{\varphi_n} (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \xi \partial_\varphi f(t, x, \xi) d\xi dx.$$

By using the Divergence Theorem on the term

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n D_{x_i} \left(\Phi_{i,n}(t, x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, x) \right) dx$$

we deduce that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2} dx \leq - \int_\Omega |\nabla (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2 \, dx + K \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2 \, dx$$
$$- \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n \left(\Phi_{0,n}(t, x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t, x) \right) dx$$
$$- \sum_{i=1}^N \int_\Omega D_{x_i} [(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n] \left(\Phi_{i,n}(t, x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, x) \right) dx,$$

where K is defined in (3.8). Denoting

$$\gamma_n(t) = - \int_\Omega (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n \left(\Phi_{0,n}(t, x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t, x) \right) dx$$
$$- \sum_{i=1}^N \int_\Omega D_{x_i} [(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n] \left(\Phi_{i,n}(t, x) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, x) \right) dx$$

and $z_n(t) = \int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2} dx$, we get that

$$\frac{d}{dt} z_n(t) \leq - \int_\Omega |\nabla (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2 \, dx + K z_n(t) + \gamma_n(t).$$

By Gronwall Lemma, we deduce that

$$z_n(t) \leq e^{kt} z_n(0) - \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \int_\Omega |\nabla (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2 \, dx ds + \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \gamma_n(s) ds;$$

hence

$$(3.17) \quad \int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)^2}{2} dx \leq e^{kt} \int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_0)^2}{2} dx - \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \int_\Omega |\nabla (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n)|^2 \, dx ds + \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \gamma_n(s) ds.$$

Now

$$|\gamma_n(t)| \leq 2M^2 \left\| \Phi_{0,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$$
$$+ \sum_{i=1}^N \| D_{x_i} [(\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \widehat{\varphi}_n] \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
$$\leq 2M^2 \left\| \Phi_{0,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$$
$$+ M \sum_{i=1}^N \| D_{x_i} (\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n) \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
$$+ 2M \sum_{i=1}^N \| D_{x_i} \widehat{\varphi}_n \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$
$$\leq 2M^2 \left\| \Phi_{0,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$$

$$+ M \|\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

$$+ 2M \|\widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(t, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(t, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\left| \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \gamma_n(s) ds \right| \leq 2M^2 \int_0^t \left\| \Phi_{0,n}(s, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n}(s, \cdot) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} ds$$

$$+ M \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_0^t \|\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(s, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(s, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds$$

$$+ 2M \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_0^t \|\widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \left\| \Phi_{i,n}(s, \cdot) - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n}(s, \cdot) \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} ds$$

$$\leq 2M^2 \left\| \Phi_{0,n} - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n} \right\|_{L^1(0,T;L^1(\Omega))}$$

$$+ M \|\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \Phi_{i,n} - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}$$

$$+ 2M \|\widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \Phi_{i,n} - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))}.$$

By the previous analysis, the terms $\|\varphi_n - \widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}$ and $\|\widehat{\varphi}_n\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}$ are uniformly bounded and so we deduce that, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\left| \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \gamma_n(s) ds \right| \leq K_1 \left[\left\| \Phi_{0,n} - \widehat{\Phi}_{0,n} \right\|_{L^1(0,T;L^1(\Omega))} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \Phi_{i,n} - \widehat{\Phi}_{i,n} \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Omega))} \right],$$

where K_1 is a suitable positive constant. Therefore, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

(3.18)
$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \left| \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \gamma_n(s) ds \right| = 0.$$

Passing to the limit in (3.17) as $n \to +\infty$, we have that, for every $t \in [0, T]$,

(3.19)
$$\int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi(t,x) - \widehat{\varphi}(t,x))^2}{2} dx + \int_0^t e^{K(t-s)} \int_\Omega |\nabla (\varphi(s,x) - \widehat{\varphi}(s,x))|^2 \, dx ds \leq e^{kt} \int_\Omega \frac{(\varphi_0 - \widehat{\varphi}_0)^2}{2} dx$$

proving (3.7). $\qquad \square$

Remark 3.3. *Note that it is possible to determine the pointwise values of the solution φ of (3.1) in the following way. Consider, as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, a sequence $a_n(t,x)$ approximating the measure μ and consider φ_n as the unique solution to the approximate problem (3.9). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 < \tau < t < T$ and for every $x \in \Omega$, define*

$$\psi_n(t, x; \tau) = \int_\Omega G(t, x; \xi, \tau) \varphi_n(\tau, \xi) d\xi,$$

where $G(t, x; \xi, \tau)$ is the Green function associated to the problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t w = \Delta w & t > 0, x \in \Omega \\ \partial_\nu w = 0 & x \in \partial\Omega; \end{cases}$$

see [15, Section 3.7]. By Ascoli's compactness theorem, by taking a subsequence, there exists a function ψ such that

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} \psi_n(t, x; \tau) = \psi(t, x; \tau)$$

for every rational $t > \tau$. By continuity, the convergence holds for every $t > \tau$. Define

$$\overline{\psi}(x, \tau) = \liminf_{\tau \to t^+} \psi(t, x, \tau).$$

We have that, for a.e. $\tau \in (0, T)$, $\overline{\psi}(\cdot, \tau) = \varphi(\tau, \cdot)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, by the estimates (3.17) and (3.18), the function $\psi(t, x, \tau)$, and consequently $\overline{\psi}$, does not depend on the choice of approximation a_n.

4. EXISTENCE OF AN OPTIMAL MEASURE-VALUED HARVESTING STRATEGY

In section we study the existence of an optimal strategy μ^* for the problem

$$(4.1) \qquad \text{maximize:} \qquad J(\mu) := \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi(t, x) d\mu_t(x) dt - \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c(t, x) d\mu_t(x) dt\right),$$

where φ is the solution, associated to the semigroup constructed in Theorem 3.1, of (3.1) and μ is a non-negative measure valued function on $\overline{\Omega}$ which satisfies the constraint

$$(4.2) \qquad \int_{\overline{\Omega}} b(t, x) d\mu_t(x) \le 1, \qquad 0 \le t \le T.$$

In addition to the hypotheses (**H.1**)-(**H.4**), made in Sections 2 and 3, we now assume on b, c, Ψ

(**H.5**) The functions $b : [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $c : [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$(4.3) \qquad b(t, x) \ge 0, \qquad c(t, x) \ge c_* > 0, \qquad \text{for all } (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \overline{\Omega},$$

for some positive constant c_*.

(**H.6**) Ψ is a non decreasing, convex, and lower semicontinuous function such that

$$(4.4) \qquad \Psi(0) = 0, \qquad \Psi'(0) = 1.$$

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume* (**H.1**), (**H.2**), (**H.3**), (**H.5**), *and* (**H.6**). *There exist*

$$\{\mu_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{N}, \qquad \{\varphi_n\} \subseteq L^\infty((0, T) \times \Omega) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)),$$

$$\mu^* \in L_w^\infty\left(0, T; \mathcal{M}_+\left(\overline{\Omega}\right)\right), \qquad \varphi \subseteq L^\infty((0, T) \times \Omega) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)),$$

such that

    (1) *μ^* and μ_n satisfy (4.2) for every n;*
    (2) *for every n, φ_n solves (3.1) in correspondence of μ_n, in the sense of Theorem 3.1;*
    (3) *φ solves (3.1) in correspondence of μ^*, in the sense of Definition 3.1;*
    (4) *the following convergences hold*

$$(4.5) \qquad \mu_n \overset{\star}{\rightharpoonup} \mu^*, \text{ weakly-* in } L_w^\infty(0, T; \mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})),$$

$$(4.6) \qquad \varphi_n \rightharpoonup \varphi \text{ weakly in } L^p((0, T) \times \Omega), L^p(0, T; L^2(\Omega)), L^2(0, T; H^1(\Omega)) \text{ for every } 1 \le p < \infty,$$

$$(4.7) \qquad \varphi_n \longrightarrow \varphi \text{ strongly in } L^1(0, T; L^2(\Omega)) \text{ and a.e. in } (0, T) \times \Omega;$$

    (5) *the following identity holds*

$$(4.8) \qquad \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{N}} J(\mu) = \lim_n J(\mu_n) = \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi(t, x) d\mu_t^*(x) dt - \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c(t, x) d\mu_t^*(x) dt\right);$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ denotes the set of coefficients μ satisfying (**H.4**).

Remark 4.1. *We note that, in general, μ^* does not belong to $\mathcal{N}$, because the decomposition stated in* (**H.4**) *does not hold. Indeed the space $L^\infty\left(0, T; L^1\left(\Omega\right)\right)$ is not closed with respect to the weak$-*$ convergence. As a consequence, we are not able to define the semigroup S, introduced in Theorem 3.1, and the functional J on μ^*. Anyway, we are able to obtain a weak solution φ to (3.1) in correspondence of μ^*, and the supremum of J on $\mathcal{N}$ is attained in μ^* and φ.*

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ be a maximizing sequence of J, and $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of the corresponding solution of (3.1), according to Theorem 3.1. Note that by φ_n we consider the pointwise defined representative selected as in Remark 3.3. Estimate (3.5) shows that the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0,T)\times\Omega)$ and $L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$.

By (**H.5**), there exists a constant $c_* > 0$ small enough so that $c(t,x) > c_*$ for all $(t,x) \in [0,T]\times\overline{\Omega}$. It is not restrictive to assume that

(4.9)
$$\bigcup_{0\leq t\leq T} \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{n,t}) \subset A_n := \{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\overline{\Omega};\ \varphi_n(t,x)\geq c_*\}.$$

Otherwise consider the strategy μ_n' defined, for every $t\in[0,T]$, by

$$\mu_{n,t}' := \chi_{A_{n,t}}\,\mu_{n,t},$$

where

$$A_{n,t} := \{x\in\overline{\Omega};\ \varphi_n(t,x)\geq c_*\}.$$

Clearly, μ_n' satisfies (4.2) and (**H.4**). Let φ_n' be the solution of the Cauchy problem (3.1) with respect to μ_n', in the sense of Theorem 3.1. Since φ_n provides a subsolution of problem (3.1) with the measure $\mu_{n,t}'$, we deduce that $\varphi_n' \geq \varphi_n$. This can be proved by considering approximating problems as in the proof of Theorem 3.1 and by applying the maximum principle.

Using the definition of μ_n' we get

$$J(\mu_n) - J(\mu_n') = \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi_n d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt - \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi_n' d\mu_{n,t}'(x)dt$$
$$- \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c\,d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt\right) + \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c\,d\mu_{n,t}'(x)dt\right)$$
$$= \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi_n d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt - \int_0^T \int_{A_{n,t}} \varphi_n' d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt$$
$$- \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c\,d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt\right) + \Psi\left(\int_0^T \int_{A_{n,t}} c\,d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt\right).$$

Moreover, by $\varphi_n' \geq \varphi_n$, by the inequality $c > c_* > 0$, and by (**H.6**) we deduce that

$$J(\mu_n) - J(\mu_n') \leq \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}\setminus A_{n,t}} \varphi_n d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt - \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}\setminus A_{n,t}} c\,d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt$$
$$\leq \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}\setminus A_{n,t}} (\varphi_n - c_*)d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt \leq 0,$$

proving that we can replace μ_n with the strategy μ_n', which satisfies the additional condition (4.9).

We claim that

(4.10)
$$\varphi_n \geq \kappa = \min\{c_*, h_*, \varphi_*\}$$

Thanks to (4.9) we already know that

(4.11)
$$\varphi_n \geq c_* \qquad \text{on} \bigcup_{0\leq t\leq T} \operatorname{supp}(\mu_{n,t})$$

Consider the set

$$Q = \{\varphi_n < c_*\}.$$

Due to (4.11), φ_n solves the problem

(4.12)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi_n = \Delta \varphi_n + g(t,x,\varphi_n), & (t,x) \in ((0,T) \times \Omega) \cap Q, \\ \partial_\nu \varphi = 0, & (t,x) \in ((0,T) \times \partial\Omega) \setminus \partial Q, \\ \varphi = c_*, & (t,x) \in \partial Q \setminus ((0,T) \times \partial\Omega), \\ \varphi = \varphi_0, & (0,x) \in (\{0\} \times \Omega) \cap Q. \end{cases}$$

Since κ is a subsolution of (4.12) we have (4.10).

Due to (4.2) and (**H.5**), the sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}))$ Therefore, there exists function $\mu \in L_w^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}))$ such that, passing to a subsequence, (4.5) holds. Since $L_w^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})) = \left(L^1(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega})) \right)'$ (see for example [2]), equation (4.5) says that for every $v \in L^1(0,T;C(\overline{\Omega}))$

$$\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v(t,x)d\mu_{n,t}(x)dt \longrightarrow \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v(t,x)d\mu_t(x)dt.$$

Moreover, if we define $\nu_n = \varphi_n \mu_n$ we have that also he sequence $\{\nu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}))$. Therefore, there exists a function $\nu \in L_w^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega}))$ such that, passing to a subsequence,

(4.13)
$$\nu_n \overset{\star}{\rightharpoonup} \nu, \qquad \text{weakly-}* \text{ in } L_w^\infty(0,T;\mathcal{M}(\overline{\Omega})).$$

Moreover, arguing in the same way of the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have that we have that the sequence $\{\varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega) \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$ and the sequence $\{\partial_t \varphi_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $L^1(0,T;H^{-N}(\Omega))$. Therefore there exists a function

$$\varphi \in L^\infty((0,T) \times \Omega) \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))$$

such that, passing to a subsequence, (4.6) and (4.7) hold.

Due to (4.10) we have

(4.14)
$$\varphi \geq \kappa.$$

Therefore, it makes sense to define the strategy

(4.15)
$$\mu^* \doteq \frac{\nu}{\varphi}$$

and we claim that μ^* provides an optimal solution to our harvesting problem.

Clearly φ is a solution to

(4.16)
$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \varphi = \Delta\varphi - \varphi\mu^* + g(t,x,\varphi), & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \Omega, \\ \partial_\nu \varphi = 0, & 0 < t < T,\ x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \varphi(0,x) = \varphi_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

in the sense of Definition 3.1.

We now establish the key inequality

(4.17)
$$\mu^* \leq \mu.$$

To prove that (4.17) holds, it suffices to show that

(4.18)
$$\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v\, d\mu_t^*(x)dt \leq \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v\, d\mu_t(x)dt, \qquad \text{for every } v \in C_c^\infty([0,T] \times \overline{\Omega}),\ v \geq 0.$$

Dividing the equation by φ_n and (4.16) by φ we get

$$\partial_t \log(\varphi_n) = \Delta \log(\varphi_n) + \frac{|\nabla \varphi_n|^2}{\varphi_n^2} - \mu_n + f(t,x,\varphi_n),$$

$$\partial_t \log(\varphi) = \Delta \log(\varphi) + \frac{|\nabla \varphi|^2}{\varphi^2} - \mu^* + f(t,x,\varphi).$$

Let $v \in C_c^\infty([0,T] \times \overline{\Omega})$, $v \geq 0$. Since

$$\lim_n \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\partial_t v \log(\varphi_n) + \Delta v \log(\varphi_n) + v f(t,x,\varphi_n)) \, dt dx$$

$$= \int_0^T \int_\Omega (\partial_t v \log(\varphi) + \Delta v \log(\varphi) + v f(t,x,\varphi)) \, dt dx,$$

$$\lim_n \int_0^T \int_\Omega v \frac{|\nabla \varphi_n|^2}{\varphi_n^2} \, dt dx \geq \int_0^T \int_\Omega v \frac{|\nabla \varphi|^2}{\varphi^2} \, dt dx,$$

we have

$$\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v d\mu_t(x) dt = \lim_n \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v d\mu_{n,t}(x) dt$$

$$= \lim_n \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\partial_t v \log(\varphi_n) + \Delta v \log(\varphi_n) + v \frac{|\nabla \varphi_n|^2}{\varphi_n^2} + v f(t,x,\varphi_n) \right) dt dx + \int_\Omega v(0,x) \varphi_0(x) dx$$

$$\geq \int_0^T \int_\Omega \left(\partial_t v \log(\varphi) + \Delta v \log(\varphi) + v \frac{|\nabla \varphi|^2}{\varphi^2} + v f(t,x,\varphi) \right) dt dx + \int_\Omega v(0,x) \varphi_0(x) dx$$

$$= \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} v d\mu_t^*(x) dt.$$

We conclude by proving that the strategy μ^* optimal. Since $\{\mu_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a maximizing sequence, using the monotonicity of Ψ and (4.17), we obtain

$$\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{N}} J(\mu) = \lim_n J(\mu_n) = \lim_n \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi_n d\mu_{n,t}(x) dt - \lim_n \Psi \left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c d\mu_{n,t}(x) dt \right)$$

$$\leq \lim_n \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} d\nu_{n,t}(x) dt - \Psi \left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c d\mu_t(x) dt \right)$$

$$= \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} d\nu_t(x) dt - \Psi \left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c d\mu_t(x) dt \right)$$

$$= \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi d\mu_t^*(x) dt - \Psi \left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c d\mu_t(x) dt \right)$$

$$\leq \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} \varphi d\mu_t^*(x) dt - \Psi \left(\int_0^T \int_{\overline{\Omega}} c d\mu_t^*(x) dt \right).$$

Finally, hypothesis (4.3) on b yields

$$\int_{\overline{\Omega}} b d\mu_t^*(x) \leq \int_{\overline{\Omega}} b d\mu_t(x) \leq \liminf_n \int_{\overline{\Omega}} b d\mu_{n,t}(x) \leq 1.$$

This completes the proof. □

5. Numerical simulations

In this section we present various numerical simulations on system (3.1) to show qualitative features of the solutions. The parabolic equation in (3.1) is solved by means of an explicit forward finite difference method of the first order, while the Neumann boundary condition was achieved by using ghost cells; see for example [18, Chapter 2.12].

In all the simulations, we consider a rectangular domain $\Omega = (0,30) \times (0,20)$, a fix time interval $(0,T)$ with $T = 10$, and a fixed time step $dt = \max\left\{(dx)^2, (dy)^2\right\}/5$, where dx and dy are the sizes of the meshes respectively for x and y. In the following the function $\chi_B(x)$ denotes the characteristic function of the set B.

FIGURE 1. Contour plots of the solution to (3.1). The pictures represent the solutions at time $t = 10$ corresponding to the strategies of Subsection 5.1.

5.1. **Marine Park.** We consider here the case of a marine park, in which the fishing activity is forbidden. The conjecture is that the optimal measure is indeed singular along the boundary of the non fishing zone. Numerical simulations seem to confirm this fact. We perform four different simulations using the following functions (see (3.1) and (4.1))

$$g(t, x, y, u) = 0.3 \cdot u\,(2 - u) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \varphi_0(x, y) \equiv 1$$

$$c(t, x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{20} & \text{if } (x, y) \in (0, a) \times (0, 20) \\ +\infty & \text{if } (x, y) \in (a, 30) \times (0, 20) \end{cases} \qquad\qquad \Psi(\xi) = \xi$$

with $a = 1$. Note that the region, where the cost is equal to $+\infty$, corresponds to the marine park. The fishing strategies, denoted by μ^1, μ^2, μ^3 and μ^4, are

$$\mu_t^1 = 0.1 * \chi_{(0,a) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy$$
$$\mu_t^2 = 0.05 * \chi_{(0,a/2) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy + 0.15 * \chi_{(a/2,a) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy$$
$$\mu_t^3 = 0.05 * \chi_{(0,3a/4) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy + 0.25 * \chi_{(3a/4,a) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy$$
$$\mu_t^4 = 0.05 * \chi_{(0,7a/8) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy + 0.45 * \chi_{(7a/8,a) \times (0,20)}(x, y) dx\, dy$$

so that $\mu_t^1(\Omega) = \mu_t^2(\Omega) = \mu_t^3(\Omega) = \mu_t^4(\Omega)$. All the measures are supported in the fishing zone $(0, a) \times (0, 20)$. Figure 1 displays the qualitatively similar behaviors of the solutions at final time $t = 10$ respectively for the different fishing strategies. The cost for μ^1 is approximately 31.71, for μ^2 is 31.82, for μ^3 is 32.49 and for μ^4 is 33.70; see Figure 2. The cost slightly increases as the fishing strategy concentrates near the boundary of the marine park.

5.2. **Different fishing locations.** We consider here three different fishing strategy. More precisely the total strength of the three strategies is the same, while the positions, where the fishing activities

FIGURE 2. Graph of the cost (4.1) with respect to time for the four different strategies implemented in Subsection 5.1.

act, are different. In all the cases, we use the following functions (see (3.1) and (4.1))

$$g(t, x, u) = 0.3 \cdot u \, (2 - u) \qquad \varphi_0(x, y) \equiv 1 \qquad c(t, x, y) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Psi(\xi) = \xi.$$

The fishing strategies, denoted by μ^1, μ^2 and μ^3, are

$$\mu_t^1 = \chi_{B_1}(x, y) dx \, dy \qquad \mu_t^2 = \chi_{B_2}(x, y) dx \, dy \qquad \mu_t^3 = \chi_{B_3}(x, y) dx \, dy,$$

where $B_1 = (10, 20) \times \left(\frac{20}{3}, \frac{40}{3}\right)$, B_2 is a disjoint union of 4 rectangles with edges of length 5 and $\frac{10}{3}$, while B_3 is a disjoint union of 16 rectangles with edges of length $\frac{5}{2}$ and $\frac{5}{3}$. The sizes of the mesh are $dx = dy = \frac{1}{50}$. Figure 3 shows the contour of the initial condition and of the solution at the final time $t = 0$ with respect to the fishing strategies μ^1, μ^2 and μ^3. The cost for μ^1 is approximately 39.73, for μ^2 is 220.64 and for μ^3 is 420.34; see Figure 4. These simulations seem to suggest that, in order to maximize (4.1) with the constraint (4.2), one possible strategy could be distributing the fishing activity in several different locations.

5.3. **Time dependent fishing activity.** We consider here a simple situation in which the fishing activity happens in a rectangular region moving with constant speed from the left to the right. More precisely we consider here the system (3.1) with the following choices:

$$\mu_t = \chi_{B_t}(x, y) dx \, dy \qquad g(t, x, y, u) = \frac{3}{10} u \, (2 - u) \qquad \varphi_0(x, y) \equiv 1,$$

where $B_t = (2t, 2t + 10) \times \left(\frac{20}{3}, \frac{40}{3}\right)$. As regards the cost functional (4.1), we consider the following functions

$$c(t, x, y) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Psi(\xi) = \xi.$$

Finally, we used $dx = dy = \frac{1}{50}$. In Figure 5 the plots of the solution to (3.1) at times $t = 0$, $t = 2$, $t = 5$ and $t = 10$ are shown. The overall cost (4.1) for such a problem is approximately 141.35; see Figure 6.

REFERENCES

[1] O. Arino and J. A. Montero. Optimal control of a nonlinear elliptic population system. *Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc.* **43** (2000), 225–241.

FIGURE 3. Contour plots of the solution to (3.1). The first picture displays the common initial condition. The other pictures represent the solutions at time $t = 10$ corresponding to the strategies of Subsection 5.2.


FIGURE 4. Graph of the cost (4.1) with respect to time for the three different strategies implemented in Subsection 5.2.

[2] J. M. Ball. A version of the fundamental theorem for young measures. *Lecture Notes in Phys.* **344**, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[3] A. Bressan, G. M. Coclite, and W. Shen. A Multi-dimensional Optimal Harvesting Problem with Measure Valued Solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51** (2013), 1186–1202.

[4] A. Bressan and W. Shen. Measure-valued solutions for a differential game related to fish harvesting. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **47** (2009), 3118–3137.

[5] A. Bressan and W. Shen. Measure valued solutions to a harvesting game with several players. *Advances in Dynamic Games* **11** (2011), 399–423.

[6] A. Cañada, J. L. Gámez, and J. A. Montero. Study of an optimal control problem for diffusive nonlinear elliptic equations of logistic type. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **36** (1998), 1171–1189.

[7] E. Casas, C. Clason, K. Kunisch. Parabolic control problems in measure spaces with sparse solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51** (2013), no. 1, 28–63.

[8] E. Casas, C. Clason, K. Kunisch. Approximation of elliptic control problems in measure spaces with sparse solutions. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **50** (2012), no. 4, 1735–1752.

FIGURE 5. Contour plots of the solution to (3.1) at times $t = 0$, $t = 2$, $t = 5$ and $t = 10$. Here we use the functions and parameters of Subsection 5.3.


FIGURE 6. Graph of the cost (4.1) with respect to time for the solution of Subsection 5.3.

[9] E. Casas, B. Vexler, E. Zuazua. Sparse initial data identification for parabolic PDE and its finite element approximations. *Math. Control Relat. Fields* **5** (2015), no. 3, 377–399.

[10] E. Casas, E. Zuazua. Spike controls for elliptic and parabolic PDEs. *Systems Control Lett.* **62** (2013), no. 4, 311–318.

[11] G.M. Coclite, M. Garavello, L.V. Spinolo. *Optimal strategies for a time-dependent harvesting problem*, submitted 2016.

[12] G. Dal Maso, F. Murat, L. Orsina, and A. Prignet. Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci.* **28** (1999), 741–808.

[13] M. Delgado, J. A. Montero, and A. Suárez. Optimal control for the degenerate elliptic logistic equation. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **45** (2002), 325–345.

[14] M. Delgado, J. A. Montero, and A. Suárez. Study of the optimal harvesting control and the optimality system for an elliptic problem. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **42** (2003), 1559–1577.

[15] A. Friedman, *Partial Differential Equations of Parabolic Type.* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.

[16] K. Kunisch, K. Pieper, B. Konstantin. Measure valued directional sparsity for parabolic optimal control problems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **52** (2014), no. 5, 3078–3108.

[17] S. M. Lenhart and J. A. Montero. Optimal control of harvesting in a parabolic system modeling two subpopulations. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.* **11** (2001), 1129–1141.

[18] R.J. LeVeque, *Finite difference methods for ordinary and partial differential equations. Steady-state and time-dependent problems.* Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2007. xvi+341 pp.

[19] G. M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations.* World Scientific Publishing Co., Inc., River Edge, NJ, 1996. xii+439 pp.

[20] K. Pieper, B. Vexler. A priori error analysis for discretization of sparse elliptic optimal control problems in measure space. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **51** (2013), no. 4, 2788–2808.

[21] J. Simon. Compact sets in the space $L_p(0, T; B)$. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)* **146** (1987), 65–96.

(Giuseppe Maria Coclite)

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Bari, Via E. Orabona 4,I–70125 Bari, Italy.

E-mail address: giuseppemaria.coclite@uniba.it

URL: http://www.dm.uniba.it/Members/coclitegm/

(Mauro Garavello)

Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università di Milano Bicocca, Via R. Cozzi 53, I–20125 Milano, Italy.

E-mail address: mauro.garavello@unimib.it

URL: http://www.matapp.unimib.it/~garavello