

Attractivity of Saturated Equilibria for Lotka-Volterra Systems with Infinite Delays and Feedback Controls

YOSHIAKI MUROYA¹

Department of Mathematics, Waseda University
3-4-1 Ohkubo, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169-8555, Japan

TERESA FARIA²

Departamento de Matemática and CMAF-CIO,
Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa
Campo Grande, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal

Abstract

In this paper, we apply a Lyapunov functional approach to Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delays and feedback controls and establish that the feedback controls have no influence on the attractivity properties of a saturated equilibrium. This improves previous results by the authors and others, where, while feedback controls were used mostly to change the position of a unique saturated equilibrium, additional conditions involving the controls had to be assumed in order to preserve its global attractivity. The situation of partial extinction is further analysed, for which the original system is reduced to a lower dimensional one which maintains its global dynamics features.

Keywords: Lotka-Volterra system, feedback control, infinite delay, saturated equilibrium, global attractor, extinction.

2013 Mathematics Subject Classification: 34K25, 34K35, 34K20, 92D25.

1 Introduction

Recently, there has been a significant number of publications on the study of Lotka-Volterra population models with delays and feedback controls, see [6, 13, 19, 22, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 37, 38] and references cited therein. In particular, Li *et al.* [22] established results on the influence of the feedback controls on extinction and global attractivity of a two-species autonomous competitive Lotka-Volterra system with infinite delays by applying Lyapunov functional techniques. Motivated by this work and others [8, 26], Faria and Muroya [11] considered the following multiple species Lotka-Volterra models with infinite delays and feedback controls:

$$\begin{cases} x'_i(t) = x_i(t) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right. \\ \quad \left. - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds \right), \\ u'_i(t) = -e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (1.1)$$

¹Professor Yoshiaki Muroya passed away in October 2015, while the research for this paper was being conducted. The second author wishes to dedicate this paper to his memory.

²Corresponding author. E-mail: teresa.faria@fc.ul.pt.

where μ_i, c_i, d_i, e_i are positive constants, $b_i, a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$, and the kernels $K_{ij}, G_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are L^1 functions, normalized so that

$$\int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) ds = 1, \int_0^\infty G_i(s) ds = 1, \text{ for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1.2)$$

In (1.1), $x_i(t)$ denotes the density of an i th-species or class population, $u_i(t)$ is a feedback control variable, b_i is the intrinsic growth rate, μ_i is a self-limitation coefficient in the instantaneous negative feedback term, a_{ij} are the intra- (if $i = j$) and inter-specific (if $i \neq j$) cooperative/competition coefficients, for $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Actually, the particular case of Lotka-Volterra systems (1.1) without controls, or with controls only for some of the variables – i.e., the situation with $c_i \geq 0$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ – can be included in most of the results presented here. For simplicity, we also assume the following technical condition: for any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\int_0^\infty sK_{ij}(s) ds < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^\infty sG_i(s) ds < \infty. \quad (1.3)$$

As will be shown in the proofs, when using Lyapunov functional techniques, condition (1.3) allows the treatment of the infinite delay terms in a way analogous to the one usually employed to deal with the finite delay case. For a more general setting which does not require (1.3), see Faria and Muroya [11].

Since some previous works by Kuang and Smith [20, 21], the literature on Lotka-Volterra with infinite delays has been quite vast, and it is impossible to mention here all the significant works. For some results on stability, extinction and permanence for autonomous and non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra models with infinite delay (and no controls), see e.g. [4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 18, 23, 24, 25, 33, 34, 35]. To treat the permanence of non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra systems, methods inspired in the setting proposed by Ahmad and Lazer (see e.g. [1, 2]) and initiated in the classical work of Vance of Coddington [36], have proven to be very fruitful. Here, non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra systems are not treated *per se*, but as a secondary outcome of the method developed, see Remark 3.2.

An admissible initial condition for (1.1) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(\theta) &= \varphi_i(\theta), u_i(\theta) = \psi_i(\theta), \quad \theta \in (-\infty, 0], \\ \varphi_i(0) &> 0, \psi_i(0) > 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (1.4)$$

where φ_i, ψ_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, are non-negative, bounded and continuous functions on $(-\infty, 0]$. For the initial value problems (1.1)-(1.4), from the general theory for delay differential equations (DDEs) it follows that solutions are positive and defined for all $t > 0$. Without loss of generality, although not relevant here, we may suppose that, for all i , the linear operators defined by $L_{ii}^K(\varphi) := \int_0^\infty K_{ii}(s)\varphi(-s) ds$ and $L_i^G(\varphi) := \int_0^\infty G_i(s)\varphi(-s) ds$, for $\varphi : (-\infty, 0] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ continuous and bounded, are non-atomic at zero, i.e., $K_{ii}(0) = K_{ii}(0^+)$ and $G_i(0) = G_i(0^+)$ [15].

For system (1.1), we define the matrices

$$\begin{aligned} M_0 &= [\delta_{ij}\mu_i + a_{ij}]_{n \times n}, \\ M &= [\delta_{ij}\lambda_i + a_{ij}]_{n \times n}, \quad \text{where } \lambda_i = \mu_i + (c_i d_i)/e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

which are called the **community matrix** and the **controlled community matrix**, respectively. Here and throughout the paper, the standard notation $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ if $i \neq j$ is used.

In this paper, the authors pursue their work in [11], where, among other results, general sufficient conditions for the existence and global attractivity of a saturated equilibrium for model (1.1) were established. The definition of a *saturated equilibrium* can be found in [17] and will be recalled in Section 2. Of course, if a saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1) with exactly p positive components $x_i^* > 0$, corresponding to the i th-populations $x_i(t)$, is a global attractor of all positive solutions, this means that those p species $x_i(t)$ stabilize with time at a constant value x_i^* , whereas the other $n - p$ populations are driven to extinction.

While the literature usually treats the case of competitive systems only – which amounts to having $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$ in (1.1) –, here, as in [11], we shall not impose any restrictions on the signs of the intra- and inter-specific coefficients a_{ij} , nor on the Malthusian rates b_i . In [11], we assumed a

form of diagonal dominance of the instantaneous negative intra-specific terms over the infinite delay effect, in both the population variables and controls. To be more precise, the main result in [11] states that if the $n \times n$ matrix $\hat{M} := [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}| - \delta_{ij}\frac{c_i e_i}{d_i}]$ is a nonsingular M -matrix (see [5] and Section 2 for a definition), then there exists a saturated equilibrium of (1.1) which is globally attractive. When the saturated equilibrium is positive, in fading memory spaces this condition also implies its asymptotic stability, see [11, Theorem 3.8]. When the saturated equilibrium is on the boundary of \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} , sharper criteria for the extinction of part of the populations were also given in [11].

With the present research, better criteria for the global attractivity of a saturated equilibrium E^* than the ones in [11] are achieved. The present techniques are quite different from the ones in [11], where the main results were obtained by a monotone flow approach and depended on the feedback controls. In contrast, here we construct original Lyapunov functionals to deduce our main criteria of global attractivity. Namely, we derive that the saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1) is globally attractive if the matrix $\hat{M}_0 := [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}|]_{n \times n}$ is a nonsingular M -matrix (although a better result is obtained if some components of E^* are zero). This imposition does not depend on the control coefficients and is much less restrictive than having \hat{M} a non-singular M -matrix. Therefore, we conclude that, whereas feedback controls can effectively be useful to change the position of a unique saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1) – as it was well-illustrated in [11] –, they have no influence on the attractivity properties of E^* . Moreover, weaker sufficient conditions for partial extinction will be given: we shall show that the global attractivity can be reduced to the one for a reduced system, i.e., a system of smaller dimension, in the spirit in Muroya [26, Theorem 1.2] and Shi *et al.* [31, Theorem 3.1].

Integro-differential equations with infinite delay have been considered in population dynamics since the times of Volterra, in order to account for the entire past of the species. Dealing with DDEs with infinite delays requires a careful choice of an *admissible* (in the sense of Hale and Kato, see [14, 16]) Banach phase space. The additional property of being a *fading memory space* is important, in order to recover some classical results, such as the principle of linearized stability and precompactness of bounded periodic orbits. A rigorous theoretical framework to deal with Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delays was provided in e.g. [8, 10, 11]. In order to avoid repetitions, here we shall not present a suitable phase-space for (1.1), nor an abstract formulation of the initial value problem (IVP) (1.1)-(1.4): in summary, we say that for the IVP (1.1)-(1.4) existence, uniqueness and continuation of solution for $t \geq 0$ is well-established, and address the reader to the literature.

The contents of this paper are organized as follows. Section 2 is a section of preliminaries, where we recall the definition of a saturated equilibrium, give basic conditions for such an equilibrium to be positive or on the boundary of \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} , and summarize some results from [11]. In Section 3, the main result on global attractivity of the saturated equilibrium of (1.1) is proven. In Section 4, sharper sufficient conditions for partial extinction are further analysed. To illustrate the theoretical results, the paper finishes with some simple examples.

2 Preliminaries and basic results on saturated equilibria

Throughout the paper, for the controlled Lotka-Volterra system (1.1) the following general hypothesis is assumed:

- (H0) μ_i, d_i, e_i are positive constants, $c_i \geq 0, b_i, a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$, the kernels $K_{ij}, G_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are in $L^1[0, \infty)$ and satisfy (1.2) and (1.3).

For most cases, we are interested in the situation with effective controls, i.e., with $c_i > 0$ for all i , but the situation without part or all of the control variables $u_i(t)$ is allowed. In the absence of controls, the Lotka-Volterra system reads as

$$x'_i(t) = x_i(t) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.1)$$

Clearly, the introduction of controls might change the dynamics of (2.1). In [11], the controls were mainly used to change the position of a globally attractive equilibrium, and further requirements on the controls were imposed in order to preserve its attractivity. Here, we shall show that in fact the

controls do not have any effect on the attractivity of the saturated equilibrium, therefore additional restrictions are not needed.

A point $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_n^*, u_n^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ is an equilibrium of (1.1) if and only if

$$x_i^* = 0 \text{ or } (Mx^*)_i = b_i, \quad \text{and} \quad u_i^* = \frac{d_i}{e_i} x_i^*, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

In view of the biological interpretation of the model, only non-negative solutions are meaningful, thus only solutions with initial conditions (1.4) will be considered. The following definition of a *saturated equilibrium* can be found in e.g. [17, 11].

Definition 2.1. *Let $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_n^*, u_n^*)$ be an equilibrium of (1.1). We say that E^* is a saturated equilibrium if E^* is non-negative and $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ satisfies*

$$(Mx^*)_i \geq b_i \quad \text{whenever} \quad x_i^* = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.2)$$

A saturated equilibrium $E^* \geq 0$ of (1.1) is said to be globally attractive if it attracts all solutions of the problems (1.1)-(1.4), i.e., $X(t) \rightarrow E^*$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for all positive solutions $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1).

For (2.1) and (1.1), define the *community matrix* M_0 and the *controlled community matrix* M , respectively, as in (1.5). Consider also the $n \times n$ matrices

$$M_0^- = [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - a_{ij}^-], \quad \hat{M}_0 = [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}|], \quad (2.3)$$

where $a_{ij}^- = 0$ if $a_{ij} \geq 0$, $a_{ij}^- = -a_{ij}$ if $a_{ij} < 0$.

As for ordinary differential equation (ODE) models, the algebraic properties of M_0 and M determine many features of the asymptotic behaviour of solutions to (2.1) and (1.1). (cf. e.g. [3, 9, 17]). The existence of a saturated equilibrium depends on the properties of the controlled community matrix M . Further properties of some special matrices will be used for the analysis of the attractive properties of equilibria. The concepts of P-matrix and M-matrix [5, 17], given below, are crucial for results and arguments used in this paper.

Definition 2.2. *Let $B = [b_{ij}]$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. We say that B is a **P-matrix** if all its principal minors are positive. For B with $b_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$, B is said to be an **M-matrix** (respectively a **non-singular M-matrix**) if all its principal minors are non-negative (respectively positive).*

For B a square matrix with non-positive off-diagonal entries, it is well-known that B is an M-matrix if and only if all its eigenvalues have non-negative real parts. The following properties of non-singular M-matrices, as well as additional ones, can be found in [5]. A further property will be given in Section 3.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $B = [b_{ij}]$ be an $n \times n$ matrix with $b_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$. The following assertions are equivalent: (i) B is a non-singular M-matrix; (ii) B is an M-matrix and $\det B \neq 0$; (iii) all eigenvalues of B have positive real parts; (iv) there exists a positive vector v such that $Bv > 0$.*

We recall some results established previously by the authors in [11], where it was assumed that μ_i, d_i, e_i are positive constants, $c_i \geq 0, b_i, a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$, and $K_{ij}, G_i : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ satisfy (1.2). One should once more emphasize that, contrary to what is often assumed in the literature, here the coefficients b_i, a_{ij} have no prescribed signs.

Theorem 2.1. [11] *Consider the controlled system (1.1), and define the matrices M, M_0 and M_0^- as in (1.5) and (2.3).*

(i) *If M_0^- is a non-singular M-matrix, then all solutions of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4) are defined on $[0, \infty)$ and (1.1) is dissipative; i.e., there exists a uniform upper bound $K > 0$ such that all solutions of (1.1)-(1.4) satisfy $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) \leq K, \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_i(t) \leq K$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

(ii) *If M is a P-matrix, there is a unique saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1).*

Several interesting conclusions can be drawn from the above theorem: for instance, a competitive system (1.1), i.e., when $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, is dissipative if $\mu_i - a_{ii}^- > 0$ for all i .

Theorem 2.2. [11] (i) Suppose that M is a P-matrix. The trivial solution $(0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ is the saturated equilibrium of (1.1) if and only if $b_i \leq 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore, if the $n \times n$ matrix $M_0^- = [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - a_{ij}^-]_{n \times n}$ is an M-matrix, then the trivial solution of (1.1) is globally attractive.

(ii) If $c_i > 0$ for all i and the $n \times n$ matrix

$$\hat{M} = \left[\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}| - \delta_{ij} \frac{c_i d_i}{e_i} \right] \quad (2.4)$$

is an M-matrix, then there exists a saturated equilibrium E^* , which is a global attractor of all positive solutions of (1.1). If in addition E^* is positive and \hat{M} is non-singular, then E^* is globally asymptotically stable.

The main goal of this paper is to improve the criterion for the global attractivity of the saturated equilibrium given above in Theorem 2.2(ii).

We start by establishing more precise conditions on each equilibrium to be saturated. Consider the $n \times n$ matrix $A = [a_{ij}]$ and denote

$$\hat{a}_{ii} = \lambda_i + a_{ii}, \quad (2.5)$$

where the coefficients $\lambda_i = \mu_i + (c_i d_i)/e_i$ are as in (1.5). For each $p = 1, \dots, n$, set

$$R_0^p = \begin{vmatrix} \hat{a}_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1p} \\ a_{21} & \hat{a}_{22} & \cdots & a_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{p1} & a_{p2} & \cdots & \hat{a}_{pp} \end{vmatrix}, \quad (2.6)$$

and, for $i = 1, \dots, p$,

$$R_i^p = \begin{vmatrix} \hat{a}_{11} & \cdots & a_{1,i-1} & b_1 & a_{1,i+1} & \cdots & a_{1p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{i-1,1} & \cdots & \hat{a}_{i-1,i-1} & b_{i-1} & a_{i-1,i+1} & \cdots & a_{i-1,p} \\ a_{i,1} & \cdots & a_{i,i-1} & b_i & a_{i,i+1} & \cdots & a_{i,p} \\ a_{i+1,1} & \cdots & a_{i+1,i-1} & b_{i+1} & \hat{a}_{i+1,i+1} & \cdots & a_{i+1,p} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{p1} & \cdots & a_{p,i-1} & b_p & a_{p,i+1} & \cdots & \hat{a}_{pp} \end{vmatrix}. \quad (2.7)$$

Observe that $R_0^p > 0$, $p = 1, \dots, n$, if M is a P-matrix. If $1 \leq p < n$, for any fixed $q \in \{p+1, \dots, n\}$, we also define

$$R_q^{p+1,q} = \begin{vmatrix} \hat{a}_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1p} & b_1 \\ a_{21} & \hat{a}_{22} & \cdots & a_{2p} & b_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ a_{p1} & a_{p2} & \cdots & \hat{a}_{pp} & b_p \\ a_{q1} & a_{q2} & \cdots & a_{qp} & b_q \end{vmatrix}, \quad (2.8)$$

and remark that

$$R_q^{p+1,q} = b_q R_0^p - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{qj} R_j^p, \quad q = p+1, \dots, n. \quad (2.9)$$

First, we investigate the existence of a positive equilibrium of (1.1). A positive equilibrium $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, x_2^*, u_2^*, \dots, x_n^*, u_n^*)$ of system (1.1) must satisfy

$$b_i - \lambda_i x_i^* - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j^* = 0, \quad -e_i u_i^* + d_i x_i^* = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.10)$$

By Cramer's formulas, E^* is a positive equilibrium of system (1.1) if and only if $R_i^n > 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, or $R_i^n < 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$. In this case,

$$x_i^* = \frac{R_i^n}{R_0^n} > 0, \quad u_i^* = \frac{d_i}{e_i} x_i^* > 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (2.11)$$

If M is a P-matrix, the saturated equilibrium of (1.1) is positive if and only if $R_i^n > 0$ for all i .

The case of a nontrivial saturated equilibrium on the boundary of the positive cone $R_+^n = [0, \infty)^n$ is now analysed. Although there may be 2^n possible nonnegative equilibria of (1.1), for simplicity, we reorder the variables and restrict our attention only to equilibria of the form

$$E^{*,p} = (x_1^{*,p}, u_1^{*,p}, \dots, x_p^{*,p}, u_p^{*,p}, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0), \quad (2.12)$$

$x_l^{*,p} > 0, u_l^{*,p} = \frac{d_l}{e_l} x_l^{*,p}$ for $l = 1, \dots, p, p \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. The case $p = 0$ (of the trivial equilibrium) has already been addressed in [11], see Theorem 2.2(i).

With this notation, if $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and $E^{*,p}$ is the saturated equilibrium of (1.1), together with the original system, we shall also consider the following *reduced and rearranged* p -species Lotka-Volterra system with feedback controls and infinite delay:

$$\begin{cases} x_i'(t) = x_i(t) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right. \\ \quad \left. - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds \right), \\ u_i'(t) = -e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, p. \end{cases} \quad (2.13)$$

It is apparent that, for each $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $E^{*,p} = (x_1^{*,p}, u_1^{*,p}, \dots, x_p^{*,p}, u_p^{*,p}, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ with $x_i^{*,p} > 0, 1 \leq i \leq p$, is an equilibrium of (1.1) if and only if $\tilde{E}^{*,p} := (x_1^{*,p}, u_1^{*,p}, \dots, x_p^{*,p}, u_p^{*,p})$ is a positive equilibrium of its reduced and rearranged system (2.13). The relations between an equilibrium $E^{*,p}$ of (1.1) and the positive equilibrium $\tilde{E}^{*,p}$ of its reduced and rearranged system will be deeper exploited in Section 4.

A basic result on a saturated equilibrium is as follows.

Lemma 2.2. *Let M be a P-matrix and $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$. Then, there exists a unique positive equilibrium $\tilde{E}^{*,p} := (x_1^{*,p}, u_1^{*,p}, \dots, x_p^{*,p}, u_p^{*,p})$ of the reduced and rearranged system (2.13) if and only if $R_i^p > 0, i = 0, 1, \dots, p$. In this case,*

$$x_i^{*,p} = \frac{R_i^p}{R_0^p} > 0, \quad u_i^{*,p} = \frac{d_i}{e_i} x_i^{*,p} > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p. \quad (2.14)$$

Moreover, $E^{*,p} = (x_1^{*,p}, u_1^{*,p}, \dots, x_p^{*,p}, u_p^{*,p}, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ is the saturated equilibrium of (1.1) if and only if

$$\begin{cases} R_i^p > 0, & \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, p, \\ R_q^{p+1,q} \leq 0, & \text{for any } q = p+1, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (2.15)$$

In this case,

$$b_q \leq \sum_{j=1}^p a_{qj} x_j^{*,p}, \quad q = p+1, \dots, n. \quad (2.16)$$

Proof. The first part is apparent. The first inequalities in (2.15) imply (2.14). By (2.9) and the last inequalities in (2.15), it is clear that (2.2) is satisfied. \square

Example 2.1. For (1.1) with $n = 2$, assume that M is a P-matrix, that is,

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_i + a_{ii} > 0, & i = 1, 2, \\ \det M := (\lambda_1 + a_{11})(\lambda_2 + a_{22}) - a_{12}a_{21} > 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.17)$$

From Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.2, we have:

- (i) $E^{*,0} = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ is the unique saturated equilibrium of system (1.1) if and only if $b_i \leq 0$, $i = 1, 2$.
- (ii) $E^{*,1} = (x_1^{*,1}, u_1^{*,1}, 0, 0)$, where

$$x_1^{*,1} = \frac{b_1}{\lambda_1 + a_{11}} > 0, \quad u_1^{*,1} = \frac{d_1 b_1}{e_1(\lambda_1 + a_{11})} \quad (2.18)$$

is the unique saturated equilibrium of system (1.1) if and only if

$$b_1 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_1 a_{21} \geq b_2(\lambda_1 + a_{11}). \quad (2.19)$$

- (iii) there exists a unique positive equilibrium $E^{*,2} = (x_1^{*,2}, u_1^{*,2}, x_2^{*,2}, u_2^{*,2})$ of system (1.1), where

$$\begin{cases} x_1^{*,2} = \frac{b_1(\lambda_2 + a_{22}) - b_2 a_{12}}{\det M}, & x_2^{*,2} = \frac{b_2(\lambda_1 + a_{11}) - b_1 a_{21}}{\det M}, \\ u_1^{*,2} = \frac{d_1 x_1^{*,2}}{e_1}, & u_2^{*,2} = \frac{d_2 x_2^{*,2}}{e_2}, \end{cases} \quad (2.20)$$

if and only if

$$b_1(\lambda_2 + a_{22}) > b_2 a_{12} \quad \text{and} \quad b_2(\lambda_1 + a_{11}) > b_1 a_{21}. \quad (2.21)$$

Example 2.2. Consider system (1.1) with $n = 2$, $b_1 = b_2 = -2$, $a_{12} = a_{21} = -4$, $a_{ii} = 0$, $\mu_i = c_i = d_i = e_i = 1$ for $i = 1, 2$, so that $M_0 = M_0^- = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -4 \\ -4 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $M = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -4 \\ -4 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$. In this situation, M_0 is not a non-singular M-matrix, neither M is a P-matrix, and both $(0,0,0,0)$ and $(1,1,1,1)$ are saturated equilibria. This simple example shows that the above setting should be used with caution.

3 Main results

For the sake of completeness, we include here a result about matrices which was not found in the literature.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $B = [b_{ij}]$ be an $n \times n$ matrix with $b_{ij} \leq 0$ for all $i \neq j$. The two conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) B is a non-singular M-matrix;
- (ii) there exist positive vectors $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$, $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\eta_i b_{ij} q_j + \eta_j b_{ji} q_i) > 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. If B is a non-singular M-matrix, so is its transpose B^T . Thus, there are positive vectors $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$, $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ such that $Bq > 0$ and $B^T \eta > 0$. It follows that

$$\eta_i \left(\sum_j b_{ij} q_j \right) > 0, \quad q_i \left(\sum_j b_{ji} \eta_j \right) > 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

which implies (3.1).

Conversely, suppose that (3.1) holds for some positive vectors $\eta, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $-b_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, there exists $c > 0$ such that $-B = A_0 - cI$, where A_0 is a non-negative matrix. If $A_0 = 0$, then $B = cI$ and (i) is satisfied. Otherwise, by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem [5, 17], the spectral radius of A_0 , $\rho := \sup\{|\mu| : \mu \in \sigma(A_0)\}$, is an eigenvalue of A_0 with a corresponding non-negative eigenvector u . Clearly $\sigma(-B) = \sigma(A_0) - c$, hence $\lambda = \rho - c$ is the spectral bound $s(-B)$ of $-B$, and $-Bu = \lambda u$. It suffices to prove that $\lambda < 0$. In fact, since $\sigma(-B) = -\sigma(B)$, if $\lambda < 0$ it follows that all eigenvalues of B have positive real parts, which shows that B is a non-singular M-matrix.

For the sake of contradiction, suppose that $\lambda \geq 0$, and consider the ODE system

$$x'_i = -x_i[r_i + (Bx)_i], \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.2)$$

where r is the vector defined by $r = \lambda u \geq 0$. We now prove that condition (3.1) implies that $x = 0$ is a global attractor of all non-negative solutions of (3.2).

By the scaling $\bar{x}_i = x_i/q_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$), and dropping the bars for simplicity, we may assume that (ii) holds with $q_i = \dots = q_n = 1$; i.e, for some $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) > 0$, it holds

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\eta_i b_{ij} + \eta_j b_{ji}) > 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.3)$$

Consider the function $V(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i x_i(t)$. Along non-negative solutions $x(t) \neq 0$ of (3.2), $V(t) \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t) &= - \sum_i \eta_i x_i(t) \left(r_i + \sum_j b_{ij} x_j(t) \right) \leq - \sum_i \eta_i x_i(t) \left(\sum_j b_{ij} x_j(t) \right) \\ &\leq - \sum_i \eta_i \left(b_{ii} x_i^2(t) + \sum_{j \neq i} b_{ij} \frac{1}{2} (x_i^2(t) + x_j^2(t)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

because $b_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V}(t) &\leq - \sum_i \left[\eta_i \left(b_{ii} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} b_{ij} \right) x_i^2(t) + \eta_i \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} b_{ij} x_j^2(t) \right] \\ &= - \sum_i \left[\eta_i b_{ii} x_i^2(t) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \neq i} (\eta_i b_{ij} + \eta_j b_{ji}) x_i^2(t) \right] \\ &= - \frac{1}{2} \sum_i \sum_j (\eta_i b_{ij} + \eta_j b_{ji}) x_i^2(t) < 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $x = 0$ is a global attractor of all non-negative solutions of (3.2). But this contradicts the fact that $x = u$ is a (non-zero) non-negative equilibrium of (3.2). \square

Remark 3.1. As in the above proof, whenever it is convenient, one may effect the changes of variables $\bar{x}_i(t) = \frac{x_i(t)}{q_i}$ and $\bar{u}_i(t) = \frac{u_i(t)}{q_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, which transform system (1.1) into

$$\begin{cases} \bar{x}'_i(t) = \bar{x}_i(t) \left(b_i - \bar{\mu}_i \bar{x}_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) \bar{x}_j(t-s) ds \right. \\ \qquad \qquad \qquad \left. - \bar{c}_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) \bar{u}_i(t-s) ds \right), \\ \bar{u}'_i(t) = -e_i \bar{u}_i(t) + d_i \bar{x}_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where the new coefficients are given by $\bar{\mu}_i = \mu_i q_i$, $\bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} q_j$, and $\bar{c}_i = c_i q_i$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.

We are now ready to prove our main results. The Lyapunov functional used below is inspired by the ones introduced in [13, 22, 29].

Theorem 3.1. Consider (1.1), assume (H0) and let $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ be a saturated equilibrium of (1.1), for some $p \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, where $E^* = 0$ if $p = 0$. If the matrix

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,p} := [\delta_{ij} \mu_i - |\bar{a}_{ij}|], \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$\bar{a}_{ij} := a_{ij}^- = \max\{0, -a_{ij}\} \text{ for } i, j = p+1, \dots, n, \text{ and } \bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} \text{ otherwise,} \quad (3.6)$$

is a non-singular M-matrix, then E^* is globally attractive.

Proof. With $p = 0$, we have the case $E^* = 0$, addressed in Theorem 2.2(i). Note that in this situation $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,p} = M_0^-$. So let $E^* \neq 0$ be a saturated equilibrium.

After reordering the variables, we may suppose that this equilibrium E^* has the form $E^* = E^{*,k} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_k^*, u_k^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ given by (2.12), with $x_i^* > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, for some

$k \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. If $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,p}$ is a nonsingular M-matrix and $1 \leq k < p$, then $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,k}$ is a nonsingular M-matrix as well, so we may suppose that $p = k$; otherwise, we replace p by k in the computations below. We now prove that this $E^* = E^{*,p}$ is globally attractive.

From Lemma 3.1, take positive vectors $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_n)$ and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ for which

$$\eta_i \mu_i q_i > \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta_i |\tilde{a}_{ij}| q_j + \eta_j |\tilde{a}_{ji}| q_i \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (3.7)$$

for \tilde{a}_{ij} given by (3.6). Effecting a scaling of the variables as in Remark 3.1, and dropping the bars from the new variables and coefficients in (3.4) for simplicity, we assume (3.7) with $q_1 = q_2 = \dots = q_n = 1$, i.e.,

$$\eta_i \mu_i > \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta_i |\tilde{a}_{ij}| + \eta_j |\tilde{a}_{ji}| \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3.8)$$

For $x > 0$ and $x^* \geq 0$, define the functions $g(x) = x - 1 - \ln x$ and $G(x, x^*) = \begin{cases} x^* g(\frac{x}{x^*}), & \text{if } x^* > 0, \\ x, & \text{if } x^* = 0. \end{cases}$

Thus $G(x, x_i^*) = x_i^* g(\frac{x}{x_i^*})$ if $i = 1, \dots, p$ and $G(x, x_i^*) = x$ if $i = p + 1, \dots, n$. Define

$$U_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left(G(x_i(t), x_i^*) + \frac{c_i}{d_i} \frac{(u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2}{2} \right), \quad (3.9)$$

Along positive solutions $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), x_2(t), u_2(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of system (1.1), we have

$$\dot{U}_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left\{ \frac{d}{dt} G(x_i(t), x_i^*) + \frac{c_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*) u_i'(t) \right\} \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} G(x_i(t), x_i^*) = \begin{cases} (x_i(t) - x_i^*) \frac{x_i'(t)}{x_i(t)}, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, p \\ x_i'(t), & \text{if } i = p + 1, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

For the case $x_i^* > 0$ (i.e., for $i = 1, \dots, p$), since $b_i = \mu_i x_i^* + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j^* + c_i u_i^*$ and $e_i u_i^* = d_i x_i^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_i'(t) &= x_i(t) \left(-\mu_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*) - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) (x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) (u_i(t-s) - u_i^*) ds - \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right), \\ u_i'(t) &= -e_i (u_i(t) - u_i^*) + d_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

For the case $x_i^* = 0$ (i.e., for $i = p + 1, \dots, n$), from (2.2) we have $b_i \leq \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} x_j^*$, and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} x_i'(t) &\leq x_i(t) \left(-\mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) (x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds - \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Summing up (3.10), (3.11), (3.12), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{U}_1(t) \leq & \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left\{ (x_i(t) - x_i^*) \left(-\mu_i(x_i(t) - x_i^*) - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds \right. \right. \\
& - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s)(u_i(t-s) - u_i^*) ds - \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j(t-s) ds \Big) \\
& + \frac{c_i}{d_i}(u_i(t) - u_i^*) \left(-e_i(u_i(t) - u_i^*) + d_i(x_i(t) - x_i^*) \right) \Big\} \\
& + \sum_{i=p+1}^n \eta_i \left\{ x_i(t) \left(-\mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j(t-s) ds \right. \right. \\
& - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s)u_i(t-s) ds - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds \Big) \\
& + \frac{c_i}{d_i}u_i(t) \left(-e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t) \right) \Big\},
\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{U}_1(t) \leq & \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left(-\mu_i(x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 - \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i}(u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right. \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)(x_i(t) - x_i^*)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds \\
& - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s)(x_i(t) - x_i^*)(u_i(t-s) - u_i(t)) ds \Big) \\
& - \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)(x_i(t) - x_i^*)x_j(t-s) ds \\
& + \sum_{i=p+1}^n \eta_i \left(-\mu_i x_i^2(t) - \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i}u_i^2(t) - \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_i(t)x_j(t-s) ds \right. \\
& - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s)x_i(t)(u_i(t-s) - u_i(t)) ds \Big) \\
& - \sum_{i=p+1}^n \eta_i \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_i(t)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

We now use $-a_{ij} \leq |a_{ij}| = |\tilde{a}_{ij}|$ for either $i \leq p$ or $j \leq p$, and $-a_{ij} \leq a_{ij}^- = |\tilde{a}_{ij}|$ for $i, j > p$, and, for $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, the estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
|(x_i(t) - x_i^*)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*)| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left((x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + (x_j(t-s) - x_j^*)^2 \right), \\
|(x_i(t) - x_i^*)(u_i(t-s) - u_i(t))| & \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\varepsilon (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} (u_i(t-s) - u_i(t))^2 \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where ε is a positive constant. We therefore derive

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{U}_1(t) \leq & \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left\{ \left(-\mu_i(x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 - \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i}(u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right) \right. \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{|\tilde{a}_{ij}|}{2} \left((x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)(x_j(t-s) - x_j^*)^2 ds \right) \\
& \left. + \frac{c_i}{2} \left(\varepsilon (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty G_i(s)(u_i(t-s) - u_i(t))^2 ds \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

By our assumption (3.8), we may choose $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small such that

$$\eta_i(\mu_i - |\tilde{a}_{ii}|) > \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta_i |\tilde{a}_{ij}| + \eta_j |\tilde{a}_{ji}| \right) + \frac{c_i \varepsilon}{2}, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \tag{3.15}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned}
U_2(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{|\tilde{a}_{ij}|}{2} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) \int_{t-s}^t (x_j(u) - x_j^*)^2 du ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{c_i}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty G_i(s) \int_{t-s}^t (u_i(u) - u_i(t))^2 du ds \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Note that, since $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,p}$ is a non-singular M-matrix and $M_0^- \geq \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0,p}$, we know that M_0^- is also a non-singular M-matrix. From Theorem 2.1, it follows that all solutions are bounded. Boundedness of solutions together with condition (1.3) imply that $U_2(t)$ is well defined.

Clearly $U_2(t) \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$. Calculating the derivative of U_2 along solutions, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{U}_2(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{|\tilde{a}_{ij}|}{2} \left((x_j(t) - x_j^*)^2 - \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) (x_j(t-s) - x_j^*)^2 ds \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{c_i}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty G_i(s) (u_i(t-s) - u_i(t))^2 ds \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Define $U(t) = U_1(t) + U_2(t)$. It follows from (3.14), (3.15) and (3.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{U}(t) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \left\{ \left(-(\mu_i - |\tilde{a}_{ii}|)(x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 - \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{|\tilde{a}_{ij}|}{2} \left((x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + (x_j(t) - x_j^*)^2 \right) + \frac{c_i}{2} \varepsilon (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 \right\} \\
&= - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\eta_i (\mu_i - |\tilde{a}_{ii}|) - \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{1}{2} (\eta_i |\tilde{a}_{ij}| + \eta_j |\tilde{a}_{ji}|) - \frac{c_i \varepsilon}{2} \right) (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 \\
&\quad - \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \leq 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

where the inequality is strict if $x(t) \neq x^*$. Since all coordinates $x_i(t)$ are bounded and have bounded derivatives, $(x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2$ are uniformly continuous on $[0, \infty)$. From (3.18) and (3.15), we may write

$$\dot{U}(t) \leq - \sum_{i=1}^n [A_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + B_i (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2],$$

where $A_i, B_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, n$. Integrating the above inequality on $[0, t]$ for $t > 0$, for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we obtain

$$A_i \int_0^t (x_i(s) - x_i^*)^2 ds \leq U(0), \quad B_i \int_0^t (u_i(s) - u_i^*)^2 ds \leq U(0),$$

hence $(x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2, (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2$ are integrable on $[0, \infty)$. By Barbalat's Lemma (see e.g. [12, p. 4]), it follows that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 = 0.$$

The proof is complete. \square

Sufficient conditions for the existence of a positive equilibrium and its global attractivity are as follows:

Theorem 3.2. *Assume (H0), suppose that the matrix $\hat{M}_0 = [\delta_{ij} \mu_i - |a_{ij}|]$ is a non-singular M-matrix and that $R_i^n > 0, i = 1, \dots, n$, where R_i^n are given by (2.7). Then, there exists a unique positive equilibrium $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_n^*, u_n^*)$ of (1.1), which is globally attractive.*

Proof. Recall the matrices M_0, M and \hat{M}_0 defined in (1.5) and (2.3). It is enough to prove that in this situation M is a P-matrix. In fact, if M is a P-matrix, Theorem 2.1 implies that there exists a unique saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1), in which case, as $\hat{M}_{0,n} = M_0$, the result is a consequence of Theorem 3.1.

Note that $\check{M} := [\lambda_i \delta_{ij} - |a_{ij}|] = [(\mu_i + c_i \frac{d_i}{e_i}) \delta_{ij} - |a_{ij}|] \geq \hat{M}_0$. If \hat{M}_0 is a non-singular M-matrix, then \check{M} is a non-singular M-matrix as well, thus there exists a positive vector v such that $\check{M}v > 0$. In particular, it follows that $-M$ is LV-stable, hence M is a P-matrix. See [17, pp. 201-202] and [11] for definitions and details. \square

Remark 3.2. It is opportune to mention that the above proof of Theorem 3.1 is applicable to non-negative solutions of differential inequalities

$$\begin{cases} x'_i(t) \leq x_i(t) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right. \\ \quad \left. - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds \right), \\ u'_i(t) \leq -e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (3.19)$$

for coefficients and kernels satisfying (H0), and E^* still a saturated equilibrium of (1.1). This observation also permits us to apply the above result to *non-autonomous* Lotka-Volterra models with infinite delays and feedback controls of the form

$$\begin{cases} x'_i(t) = x_i(t) \left(\beta_i(t) - m_i(t) x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij}(t) \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds \right. \\ \quad \left. - k_i(t) \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds \right), \\ u'_i(t) = -\epsilon_i(t) u_i(t) + \delta_i(t) x_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (3.20)$$

where the non-negative kernels $K_{ij}(t), G_i(t)$ satisfy (1.2), (1.3), $\beta_i(t), m_i(t), \alpha_{ij}(t), k_i(t), \epsilon_i(t), \delta_i(t)$ are continuous and bounded in $[0, \infty)$, with $m_i(t), \epsilon_i(t)$ bounded below by positive constants and $k_i(t), \delta_i(t) \geq 0$. In fact, non-negative solutions of the non-autonomous system (3.20) satisfy (3.19), with

$$b_i = \sup_{t \geq 0} \beta_i(t), \quad d_i = \sup_{t \geq 0} \delta_i(t), \\ \mu_i = \inf_{t \geq 0} m_i(t), \quad a_{ij} = \inf_{t \geq 0} \alpha_{ij}(t), \quad c_i = \inf_{t \geq 0} k_i(t), \quad e_i = \inf_{t \geq 0} \epsilon_i(t), \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Remark 3.3. As already noticed by the authors in [11], in fading memory spaces (see [16] for a definition) the saturated equilibrium E^* of (1.1) is asymptotically stable if it is globally attractive and positive, however E^* is not necessarily asymptotically stable if it lies on the boundary of the positive cone (although its linearization is stable).

Theorem 3.1 states the global attractivity of the unique saturated equilibrium of (1.1), if $\hat{M}_{0,p}$ defined by (3.5) is a non-singular M-matrix (or equivalently, if (3.7) holds, for some positive vectors η, q). This sufficient condition *does not depend on the feedback controls*, and strongly improves results in the literature [11, 13, 22, 31]. E.g., applying Theorem 3.1 to a planar Lotka-Volterra system, we obtain the following corollary (compare with [22, Theorems 1.1 and 1.2] and [11, Proposition 5.3]):

Corollary 3.1. *For (1.1) with $n = 2$, assume (2.17) and as before set $a_{ii}^- = \max\{0, -a_{ii}\}, i = 1, 2$. With the notation in Example 2.1,*

$$i) \text{ if } E^{*,1} = (x_1^{*,1}, u_1^{*,1}, 0, 0) \text{ is the unique saturated equilibrium and } \hat{M}_{0,1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 - |a_{11}| & -|a_{12}| \\ -|a_{21}| & \mu_2 - a_{22}^- \end{bmatrix}$$

is a non-singular M-matrix, i.e.,

$$\mu_1 - |a_{11}| > 0, \quad \mu_2 - a_{22}^- > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu_1 - |a_{11}|)(\mu_2 - a_{22}^-) > |a_{12} a_{21}|, \quad (3.21)$$

then $E^{,1}$ is globally attractive;*

ii) if there exists a positive equilibrium $E^{,2}$ and the 2×2 matrix $\hat{M}_0 = [\delta_{ij} \mu_i - |a_{ij}|]$ is a nonsingular M-matrix, that is,*

$$\mu_i - |a_{ii}| > 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad (\mu_1 - |a_{11}|)(\mu_2 - |a_{22}|) > |a_{12} a_{21}|, \quad (3.22)$$

then $E^{,2}$ is globally attractive.*

4 Sharper results on partial extinction

If the saturated equilibrium is on the boundary of the non-negative cone \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} , Theorem 3.1 establishes sufficient conditions for some of the populations $x_j(t)$ to be driven to extinction. For other results on partial extinction of Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delay (and with or without controls), see e.g. [8, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 31]. In this section, we study criteria to have this partial extinction associated with the sufficient conditions in Theorem 3.2 for the global attractivity, not of the saturated equilibrium of the original system (1.1) but instead of the positive equilibrium of the reduced and rearranged system (2.13). In other words, and with the notation in Section 2, we address the question: when does the global attractivity of the positive equilibrium $\tilde{E}^{*,p}$ of the reduced and rearranged system (2.13) imply the global attractivity of the equilibrium $E^{*,p}$ of (1.1)?

Theorem 4.1. *For system (1.1) under (H0), assume that for some $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ the following holds:*

- (i) $E^{*,p} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ is a saturated equilibrium of (1.1);
- (ii) for any positive solution $(x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1),

$$x_q(t) \in L^2[0, \infty) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_q(t) = 0, \quad \text{for } q = p+1, \dots, n;$$

- (iii) for the “reduced and rearranged system” (2.13), the matrix $\hat{M}_0^{(p)} := [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}|]$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, p$) is a non-singular M -matrix.

Then this saturated equilibrium $E^{*,p}$ is a global attractor for (1.1).

First, we give some auxiliary results.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $K_{ij}(s)$ satisfy (1.2), (1.3) and $x_j(t)$ be a component of a solution of (1.1)-(1.4).*

- (i) If $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_j(t) = 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^\alpha(t-s) ds = 0$.
- (ii) If $x_j \in L^2[0, \infty)$, then the function $\int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^2(t-s) ds$, $t \geq 0$, is in $L^1[0, \infty)$.

Proof. Let $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ be a solution of (1.1)-(1.4).

(i) Let $M > 0$ be such that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |x_j^\alpha(t)| \leq M$ and fix any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $T_0, T_1 > 0$ such that $\int_{T_0}^\infty K_{ij}(s) ds < \varepsilon/(2M)$ and $0 \leq x_j^\alpha(t) < \varepsilon/2$ for $t \geq T_1$. Thus, for $t \geq T_0 + T_1$ one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^\alpha(t-s) ds &= \int_0^{T_0} K_{ij}(s)x_j^\alpha(t-s) ds + \int_{T_0}^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^\alpha(t-s) ds \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_0^{T_0} K_{ij}(s) ds + M \int_{T_0}^\infty K_{ij}(s) ds < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Fix $b > 0$, and write

$$\int_0^b dt \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^2(t-s) ds = \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) \left(\int_{-s}^{b-s} x_j^2(y) dy \right) ds.$$

Let $M > 0$ be such that $\sup_{t \leq 0} x_j^2(t) \leq M$ and consider any $s \geq 0$. If $b-s \leq 0$, then $\int_{-s}^{b-s} x_j^2(y) dy \leq \int_{-s}^0 x_j^2(y) dy \leq Ms$. If $b-s > 0$, then

$$\int_{-s}^{b-s} x_j^2(y) dy = \int_{-s}^0 x_j^2(y) dy + \int_0^{b-s} x_j^2(y) dy \leq sM + \|x_j\|_{L^2[0, \infty)}^2.$$

Hence, using (1.3), for any $b > 0$ we have

$$\int_0^b dt \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^2(t-s) ds \leq M \int_0^\infty sK_{ij}(s) ds + \|x_j\|_{L^2[0, \infty)}^2 < \infty,$$

which proves that the function $t \mapsto \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j^2(t-s) ds$ is integrable on $[0, \infty)$. \square

Lemma 4.2. Consider a solution $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), x_2(t), u_2(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4). Then,

$$0 \leq \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) \leq \frac{e_i}{d_i} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_i(t) \leq \frac{e_i}{d_i} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_i(t) \leq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Integration of $u_i'(t) = -e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t)$ gives $u_i(t) = u_i(0)e^{-e_i t} + d_i e^{-e_i t} \int_0^t e^{e_i s} x_i(s) ds$ for $t \geq 0$, which leads to the above estimates. \square

Lemma 4.3. Under the hypotheses (ii) and (iii) of Theorem 4.1 (except the requirement that $x_q(t) \in L^2[0, \infty)$ for $q = p+1, \dots, n$), all solutions of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4) are bounded.

Proof. It was already observed that solutions $X(t)$ of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4) are defined and positive for $t \geq 0$. Fix a solution $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), x_2(t), u_2(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$.

Write the uncontrolled community matrix M_0 as

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{0,11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & M_{0,22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $M_{0,11} := [\delta_{ij}\mu_i + a_{ij}]$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, p$) is the $p \times p$ uncontrolled community matrix for the reduced system (2.13) and $M_{0,22}$ is an $(n-p) \times (n-p)$ matrix. By hypothesis (iii), $\hat{M}_{0,11} := \hat{M}_0^{(p)} = [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}]_{p \times p}$ is a non-singular M-matrix, hence there is a positive vector $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\hat{M}_{0,11}\eta > 0$. After a scaling, take $\eta = (1, \dots, 1)$. Hence, one can choose $\delta > 0$ small enough so that

$$\mu_i - \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}| - \delta > 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, p.$$

Define

$$h_i(t) := \sum_{j=p+1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j(t-s) ds, \quad t \geq 0.$$

By assumption (ii) and Lemma 4.1, choose $T_0 > 0$ large such that $x_j(t) \leq \delta$ for $t \geq T_0, j = p+1, \dots, n$ and $|h_i(t)| \leq \delta$ for $t \geq T_0, i = 1, \dots, p$.

Consider \mathbb{R}^p endowed with the maximum norm $|\cdot|$. We claim that $\sup_{t \geq 0} |(x_1(t), \dots, x_p(t))| < \infty$.

Otherwise, for any $K > \max\{1 + \frac{b_1}{\delta}, \dots, 1 + \frac{b_p}{\delta}, \sup_{t \leq T_0} |(x_1(t), \dots, x_p(t))|\}$, there is $T = T(K) > T_0$ such that

$$|(x_1(T), \dots, x_p(T))| \geq K \quad \text{and} \quad |(x_1(t), \dots, x_p(t))| \leq |(x_1(T), \dots, x_p(T))| \quad \text{for } t \leq T.$$

Choose $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $x_i(T) = |(x_1(T), \dots, x_p(T))|$. By the definition of T , $x_i'(T) \geq 0$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} x_i'(T) &\leq x_i(T) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(T) + \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}| \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s)x_j(T-s) ds + |h_i(T)| \right) \\ &\leq x_i(T) \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(T) + \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}| x_i(T) + \delta \right) \\ &= x_i(T) \left[b_i - x_i(T) \left(\mu_i - \sum_{j=1}^p |a_{ij}| \right) + \delta \right] < x_i(T) [b_i - (x_i(T) - 1)\delta] < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

which is not possible. This implies that $(x_1(t), \dots, x_p(t))$ is bounded for $t \geq 0$, and from Lemma 4.2 $X(t)$ is bounded on $[0, \infty)$ as well. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Since the $p \times p$ matrix $\hat{M}_0^{(p)} = [\delta_{ij}\mu_i - |a_{ij}|]$ is a non-singular M-matrix, there are $(q_1, \dots, q_p) > 0, \eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_p) > 0$ such that (3.7) is satisfied with $n = p$ and $\tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}$. As already observed in Remark 3.1, the scaling of the variables $x_i(t) \mapsto q_i^{-1} x_i(t), u_i(t) \mapsto q_i^{-1} u_i(t)$

allows us to consider (2.13) with μ_i, a_{ij}, c_i replaced by $\mu_i q_i, a_{ij} q_j, c_i q_i$, respectively, for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. In this way, we may take $q_1 = \dots = q_p = 1$ in (3.7), and assume without loss of generality that (3.8) holds with $n = p$ and $\tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}$; i.e., there exists a positive vector $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_p)$ such that $\eta_i \mu_i > \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{2} (\eta_i |a_{ij}| + \eta_j |a_{ji}|)$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Hence, there is $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ sufficiently small such that for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$

$$\gamma_i = \gamma_i(\varepsilon) := \eta_i \mu_i - \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{2} (\eta_i |a_{ij}| + \eta_j |a_{ji}|) - \frac{\varepsilon \eta_i}{2} \left(c_i + \sum_{j=p+1}^n |a_{ij}| \right) > 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, p. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that, from hypothesis (ii) and Lemma 4.1(i) with $\alpha = 2$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty K_{iq}(s) x_q^2(t-s) ds = 0$$

for any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $q \in \{p+1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, it follows that

$$h(t) = h_\varepsilon(t) := \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=p+1}^n \eta_i \frac{|a_{ij}|}{2} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j^2(t-s) ds \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (4.4)$$

Take $E^* = E^{*,p}$ as in the statement of the theorem. Now, define (compare with (3.9))

$$U_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left(G(x_i(t), x_i^*) + \frac{c_i}{d_i} \frac{(u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2}{2} \right). \quad (4.5)$$

We now proceed as in the proof of Theorem 3.1, so some computations are omitted. Along positive solutions $(x_1(t), u_1(t), x_2(t), u_2(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of system (1.1), for any fixed $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{U}_1(t) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left\{ -\mu_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 - \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right. \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{|a_{ij}|}{2} \left((x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) (x_j(t-s) - x_j^*)^2 ds \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=p+1}^n \frac{|a_{ij}|}{2} \left(\varepsilon (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j^2(t-s) ds \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{c_i}{2} \left(\varepsilon (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty G_i(s) (u_i(t-s) - u_i(t))^2 ds \right) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Now, set $U(t) = U_1(t) + U_2(t), t \geq 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U_2(t) &= \sum_{i=1}^p \eta_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{|a_{ij}|}{2} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) \int_{t-s}^t (x_j(u) - x_j^*)^2 du ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{c_i}{2\varepsilon} \int_0^\infty G_i(s) \int_{t-s}^t (u_i(u) - u_i(t))^2 du ds \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

Calculating the derivative of $U_2(t)$ along solutions as in (3.17) and adding up (4.6), from (4.3) and (4.4) we obtain

$$\dot{U}(t) \leq - \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\gamma_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \eta_i \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right) + h(t) \quad (4.8)$$

where $\gamma_i > 0$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$) and $h(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

Next, Lemma 4.3 allows us to conclude that $x_i(t), u_i(t)$ and $x_i'(t), u_i'(t)$ are bounded on $[0, \infty)$, therefore $x_i(t), u_i(t)$ are uniformly continuous on $[0, \infty)$. This and the assumptions imposed on the kernels K_{ij}, G_i imply that $\dot{U}(t)$ and $h(t)$ are also uniformly continuous on $[0, \infty)$. Write

$$f(t) = \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\gamma_i (x_i(t) - x_i^*)^2 + \eta_i \frac{c_i e_i}{d_i} (u_i(t) - u_i^*)^2 \right).$$

We further define $V(t) = U(t) - H(t)$, $t \geq 0$, where $H(t) = \int_0^t h(s) ds$. From Lemma 4.1, $H(t)$ is bounded. Clearly, $\dot{V}(t) = \dot{U}(t) - h(t) \leq -f(t) \leq 0$ on $[0, \infty)$, thus $V(t) \searrow c$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for some $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $\dot{V}(t)$ is uniformly continuous for $t \geq 0$, from Barbalat's lemma [12, p. 5], we conclude that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \dot{V}(t) = 0$, which implies that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = 0$. Thus, $x_i(t) \rightarrow x_i^*$, $u_i(t) \rightarrow u_i^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$, which ends the proof. \square

Remark 4.1. In Theorem 4.1, it is possible that $x_i^* = 0$ for some of the components $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ of the saturated equilibrium $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$. In this case, after reordering the variables, E^* takes the form $E^* = E^{*,k} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_k^*, u_k^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ as in (2.12), with $x_i^{*,k} > 0$ for some $k < p$, and, as in Theorem 3.1, in the definition of $\hat{M}_0^{(p)}$ one may replace $|a_{ij}|$ by a_{ij}^- for $i, j = k+1, \dots, p$.

Let $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$ (for some $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$) be the saturated equilibrium of (1.1). In this situation, it is important to establish sufficient conditions for hypothesis (ii) in the statement of Theorem 4.1 to be satisfied.

With some additional conditions to (2.15) in Lemma 2.2, and based on the construction of a new Lyapunov functional (inspired however by the approach in Hu *et al.* [19], Montes de Oca e Pérez [23] and Shi *et al.* [31]), we obtain a generalization of the result on partial extinction.

Theorem 4.2. Assume (H0) and that all solutions of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4) are bounded. For some $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ and some fixed $q \in \{p+1, \dots, n\}$, suppose that there exists a nonnegative vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) \geq 0$, such that

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i b_i - b_q > 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i (\delta_{ij} \lambda_i + a_{ij}) - a_{qj} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, p \\ \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i a_{ij} - (\delta_{qj} \lambda_q + a_{qj}) \leq 0, \quad j = p+1, \dots, n \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

If $\alpha = 0$, in addition suppose that $\mu_q - a_{qq}^- > 0$. Then, any positive solution $(x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1) satisfies $x_q = O(e^{-\eta t})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and some $\eta > 0$; in particular, $x_q \in L^2[0, \infty)$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_q(t) = 0$.

Proof. Fix $q > p$, and assume that for some non-negative constants $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$ conditions (4.9) are satisfied. If $\alpha_1 = \dots = \alpha_p = 0$ and $\mu_q - a_{qq}^- > 0$, from (4.9) we have $b_q < 0$ and all the entries $\delta_{qj} \lambda_q + a_{qj}$ of the q -line of M are nonnegative, therefore

$$x'_q(t) \leq x_q(t) \left(b_q - \mu_q x_q(t) + a_{qq}^- \int_0^\infty K_{qq}(s) x_q(t-s) ds \right),$$

and the result follows by Remark 3.2 applied with $n = 1$.

With at least some $\alpha_i > 0$, consider the following Lyapunov functional:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{p,q}(t) &= x_1^{-\alpha_1}(t) x_2^{-\alpha_2}(t) \dots x_p^{-\alpha_p}(t) x_q(t) \times \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \left(\frac{c_i}{e_i} u_i(t) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) \int_{t-s}^t x_j(\theta) d\theta ds + c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) \int_{t-s}^t u_i(\theta) d\theta ds \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left(\frac{c_q}{e_q} u_q(t) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{qj} \int_0^\infty K_{qj}(s) \int_{t-s}^t x_j(\theta) d\theta ds \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + c_q \int_0^\infty G_q(s) \int_{t-s}^t u_q(\theta) d\theta ds \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

For any positive solution $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1), calculating the derivative of $V_{p,q}(t)$ with respect to $t > 0$ along $X(t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_{p,q}(t) &= V_{p,q}(t) \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) x_j(t-s) ds - c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) u_i(t-s) ds \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(b_q - \mu_q x_q(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{qj} \int_0^\infty K_{qj}(s) x_j(t-s) ds - c_q \int_0^\infty G_q(s) u_q(t-s) ds \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \left[\frac{c_i}{e_i} (-e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \int_0^\infty K_{ij}(s) [x_j(t) - x_j(t-s)] ds \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + c_i \int_0^\infty G_i(s) [u_i(t) - u_i(t-s)] ds \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \left(\frac{c_q}{e_q} (-e_q u_q(t) + d_q x_q(t)) + \sum_{j=1}^n a_{qj} \int_0^\infty K_{qj}(s) [x_j(t) - x_j(t-s)] ds \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + c_q \int_0^\infty G_q(s) \{u_q(t) - u_q(t-s)\} ds \right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{V}_{p,q}(t) &= V_{p,q}(t) \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \left(b_i - \mu_i x_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j(t) - \frac{c_i d_i}{e_i} x_i(t) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(b_q - \mu_q x_q(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{qj} x_j(t) - \frac{c_q d_q}{e_q} x_q(t) \right) \right\} \\
&= V_{p,q}(t) \left\{ - \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i \left(b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{ij} \lambda_i + a_{ij}) x_j(t) \right) + \left(b_q - \sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{qj} \lambda_q + a_{qj}) x_j(t) \right) \right\} \\
&= V_{p,q}(t) \left\{ - \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i b_i - b_q \right) + \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i (\delta_{ij} \lambda_i + a_{ij}) - a_{qj} \right) x_j(t) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{j=p+1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i a_{ij} - (\delta_{qj} \lambda_q + a_{qj}) \right) x_j(t) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Define

$$\eta := \sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i b_i - b_q > 0.$$

By (4.9) and (4.11), we obtain $\dot{V}_{p,q}(t) \leq -\eta V_{p,q}(t)$, thus

$$V_{p,q}(t) \leq V_{p,q}(0) e^{-\eta t}. \tag{4.12}$$

On the other hand, since the positive kernels $K_{ij}(t), G_j(t)$ satisfy (1.3) and all coordinates $x_j(t), u_j(t), 1 \leq j \leq n$, of the solution $X(t)$ are bounded from above by some positive constant C , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{p,q}(t) &\geq C^{-(\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_p)} x_q(t) \\
&\quad \times \exp \left\{ -C \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \alpha_i |a_{ij}| \int_0^\infty s K_{ij}(s) ds + |a_{qj}| \int_0^\infty s K_{qj}(s) ds \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \frac{c_q}{e_q} + c_q \int_0^\infty s G_q(s) ds \right] \right\} \geq C_1 x_q(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. From the upper and lower estimates (4.12), (4.13), we obtain $x_q(t) \leq C_1^{-1} V_{p,q}(0) e^{-\eta t}$. \square

Remark 4.2. Suppose that M is a P-matrix and that there exists $p \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ such that the unique saturated equilibrium has the form $E^{*,p} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, x_2^*, u_2^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$, with $x_i^* \geq 0$ and $b_i = \sum_{j=1}^p (\lambda_i \delta_{ij} + a_{ij}) x_j^*$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$, and $b_q < \sum_{j=1}^p a_{pj} x_j^*$ for $q = p+1, \dots, n$. Define $x^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_p^*, 0, \dots, 0)$. In this writing, for each $i = 1, \dots, p$, we now let $x_i^* = 0$ if $(Mx^*)_i = b_i$, but in (2.2) we demand $(Mx^*)_q > b_q$ for $q = p+1, \dots, n$. Proceeding as in Section 2, instead of (2.15), in this situation we have

$$\begin{cases} R_i^p \geq 0, & \text{for any } i = 1, \dots, p \\ R_q^{p+1,q} < 0, & \text{for any } q = p+1, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

and the strict inequality in (2.16) implies now that for each $q = p+1, \dots, n$ the first conditions in (4.9) are satisfied with $\alpha_i^q = |a_{qi}| x_i^*$, $i = 1, \dots, p$.

From Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, rather than Theorem 3.1, an alternative outcome for global attractivity with partial extinction is as follows:

Theorem 4.3. Assume (H0) and that M is a P-matrix. Suppose that the saturated equilibrium is neither positive nor trivial, so it has the form $E^{*,p} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, x_2^*, u_2^*, \dots, x_p^*, u_p^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0) \neq 0$ for some $p \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$, with $x_i^* \geq 0$ and $b_i = \sum_{j=1}^p a_{ij} x_j^*$, $i = 1, \dots, p$. In addition, assume that:

- (i) the $n \times n$ matrix M_0^- and the $p \times p$ matrix $M_0^{(p)} = [\delta_{ij} \mu_i - |a_{ij}|]$ are non-singular M-matrices;
- (ii) there exist nonzero vectors $\alpha^{(q)} = (\alpha_1^{(q)}, \dots, \alpha_p^{(q)}) \geq 0$ such that conditions (4.9) are satisfied for $q = p+1, \dots, n$.

Then $E^{*,p}$ is a global attractor of all positive solutions of (1.1). In other words, with $x_i^* = R_i^p / R_0^p$ ($1 \leq i \leq p$), any positive solution $(x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_i(t) = x_i^* & \text{for } j = 1, \dots, p, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_q(t) = 0 & \text{for } q = p+1, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

Another consequence of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 is given below.

Theorem 4.4. Assume (H0), that M is a P-matrix and M_0^- a non-singular M-matrix. Suppose also that

$$a_{q1} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad R_q^{2,q} := (\lambda_1 + a_{11}) b_q - a_{q1} b_1 < 0 \quad \text{for } q = 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.14)$$

Then $E^{*,1} = (x_1^*, u_1^*, 0, 0, \dots, 0, 0)$, with $x_1^* = b_1 / (\lambda_1 + a_{11})$, $u_1^* = \frac{d_1}{e_1} x_1^*$, is the saturated equilibrium of (1.1). Moreover, $x_q \in L^2[0, \infty)$ and $x_q(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for all $q = 2, \dots, n$ and all positive solutions $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of (1.1).

If in addition $b_1 > 0$ and $\mu_1 > |a_{11}|$, then $E^{*,1}$ is a global attractor of all positive solutions.

Proof. Since M_0^- is a non-singular M-matrix, all solutions of the initial value problems (1.1)-(1.4) are bounded. From Lemma 2.2, conditions (4.14) imply that $E^{*,1}$ as above is the saturated equilibrium.

In a first step, take $p = n-1$ and $q = n$ in Theorem 4.2. With $\alpha^{(n)} = (\alpha_{n1}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $\alpha_{n1} \geq 0$, conditions (4.9) are equivalent to

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{n1} b_1 > b_n \\ \alpha_{n1} (\lambda_1 + a_{11}) \leq a_{n1} \\ \alpha_{n1} a_{1n} \leq \lambda_n + a_{nn}. \end{cases}$$

Choose $\alpha_{n1} = \frac{a_{n1}}{\lambda_1 + a_{11}} \geq 0$. From (4.14), the first two conditions are satisfied. On the other hand,

$$\alpha_{n1} a_{1n} - (\lambda_n + a_{nn}) = \frac{a_{n1} a_{1n} - (\lambda_1 + a_{11})(\lambda_n + a_{nn})}{\lambda_1 + a_{11}} = -\frac{1}{\lambda_1 + a_{11}} \begin{vmatrix} \lambda_1 + a_{11} & a_{1n} \\ a_{n1} & \lambda_n + a_{nn} \end{vmatrix} < 0$$

because M is a P-matrix. We now use a Lyapunov functional $V_{n-1,n}(t)$ as in (4.10), see the proof of Theorem 4.2. For solutions $X(t) = (x_1(t), u_1(t), \dots, x_n(t), u_n(t))$ of the IVPs (1.1)-(1.4), we deduce that $\dot{V}_{n-1,n}(t) \leq -\eta_n V_{n-1,n}(t)$, for some $\eta_n > 0$, from which it follows that $x_n(t) = O(e^{-\eta_n t})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

In a next step, we show that system (1.1) can be reduced to (2.13) with $p = n - 1$. Take $p = n - 2$ and $q = n - 1$ in Theorem 4.2, and choose $\alpha^{(n-1)} = (\alpha_{n-1,1}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-2}$ with $\alpha_{n-1,1} = \frac{a_{n-1,1}}{\lambda_1 + a_{11}} \geq 0$. As before, we obtain

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{n-1,1} b_1 > b_{n-1} \\ \alpha_{n-1,1} (\lambda_1 + a_{11}) = a_{n-1,1} \\ \alpha_{n-1,1} a_{1,n-1} < \lambda_{n-1} + a_{n-1,n-1}. \end{cases}$$

Proceeding as in the the proof of Theorem 4.2, for $V_{n-1,n-2}(t)$ defined by (4.10) and calculating the derivative along solutions $X(t)$ of (1.1)-(1.4), from (4.11) we now obtain an estimate of the form

$$\dot{V}_{n-1,n-2}(t) \leq (-\eta + h_n(t))V_{n-1,n-2}(t),$$

where $\eta = \alpha_{n-1,1} b_1 - b_{n-1} > 0$ and $h_n(t) = (\alpha_{n-1,1} - a_{n-1,n})x_n(t) = O(e^{-\eta n t})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Arguing as in (4.12), (4.13), we therefore conclude that $x_{n-1}(t) = O(e^{-\eta_{n-1} t})$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\eta_{n-1} > 0$.

Recursively, in this way system (1.1) is reduced to

$$\begin{cases} x_1'(t) = x_1(t) \left(b_1 - \mu_1 x_1(t) - a_{11} \int_0^\infty K_{11}(s) x_1(t-s) ds - c_1 \int_0^\infty G_1(s) u_1(t-s) ds \right) \\ u_1'(t) = -e_1 u_1(t) + d_1 x_1(t) \end{cases} \quad (4.15)$$

By virtue of Theorem 4.1, the equilibrium $E^{*,1}$ is a global attractor for (1.1) if $\mu_1 > |a_{11}|$. \square

For $n = 2$, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 4.1. *Consider (1.1) with $n = 2$, and suppose that M is a P-matrix, that is, conditions (2.17) are satisfied. If*

$$\mu_i - a_{ii}^- > 0 \quad (i = 1, 2), \quad a_{21} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a_{21} b_1 > (\lambda_1 + a_{11}) b_2, \quad (4.16)$$

then any solution of (1.1) with initial conditions (1.4) satisfies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x_2(t) = 0$. Then, (1.1) is reduced to (4.15), whose equilibrium $(x_1^{,1}, u_1^{*,1})$ given by (2.18) is positive and globally stable if*

$$b_1 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_1 > |a_{11}|. \quad (4.17)$$

In this case, $(x_1^{,1}, u_1^{*,1}, 0, 0)$ is a global attractor for (1.1).*

Proof. Assume (4.16). With the notation in Example 2.1, $E^{*,1} := (x_1^{*,1}, u_1^{*,1}, 0, 0)$ is the saturated equilibrium. With (4.16), $\det M_0^- = (\mu_i - a_{ii}^-)(\mu_2 - a_{22}^-) > 0$, thus in particular M_0^- is a non-singular M-matrix, hence all positive solutions of (1.1) are bounded. With the additional hypotheses (4.17), Theorem 4.4 yields that $E^{*,1}$ attracts all positive solutions of (1.1). \square

Remark 4.3. Let $n = 2$, and M be a P-matrix. If $a_{21} \geq 0$ and $(Mx^*)_2 > b_2$, i.e., with the strict inequality $a_{21} b_1 > (\lambda_1 + a_{11}) b_2$, Corollary 4.1 provides a better result than Corollary 3.1. It also improves the result of Li *et al.* [22], where the sufficient conditions for attractivity depend on the controls.

Remark 4.4. Similarly to what was done in Theorem 4.4 for $p = 1$, following a recursive scheme, one could provide sufficient conditions to have all the last $2(n - p)$ components $x_q(t), u_q(t)$ of solutions, with $p = 2, 3, \dots, n - 1$, satisfying $x_q(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

5 Examples

For simplicity, we present some examples with $n = 2$. Simpler versions of Examples 5.1 and 5.3 were given in [11], but here they are revisited in light of the better criteria in this paper.

Example 5.1. Consider a planar version of (2.1) with e.g. discrete delays $\tau_{ij} \geq 0$:

$$\begin{cases} x_1'(t) = x_1(t) \left(b_1 - \mu_1 x_1(t) - a_{11} x_1(t - \tau_{11}) - a_{12} x_2(t - \tau_{12}) \right) \\ x_2'(t) = x_2(t) \left(b_2 - \mu_2 x_2(t) - a_{21} x_1(t - \tau_{21}) - a_{22} x_2(t - \tau_{22}) \right) \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

Choosing $b_1 = 1, b_2 = -\frac{5}{4}, \mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1, a_{11} = a_{22} = \frac{1}{2}, a_{12} = \frac{1}{8}, a_{21} = -2$, we obtain a predator-prey system, with community matrix $M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 3/2 & 1/8 \\ -2 & 3/2 \end{bmatrix}$. For this system, $(x_1^*, x_2^*) = (\frac{53}{80}, \frac{1}{20})$ is

the positive equilibrium. Moreover, since $\det M_0 > 0$ and $\hat{M}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & -1/8 \\ -2 & 1/2 \end{bmatrix}$ is an M-matrix, from [8] it follows that (x_1^*, x_2^*) is globally attractive. We now introduce controls, with the purpose of driving the predators to extinction.

For nonnegative coefficients c_i and positive d_i, e_i , consider the corresponding system obtained by adding delayed terms with controls $-c_i x_i(t) u_i(t - \sigma_i)$ ($\sigma_i \geq 0$) to each equation i in (5.1), as well as the equations for the control variables $u_i'(t) = -e_i u_i(t) + d_i x_i(t)$, $i = 1, 2$, as in (1.1). Note that $b_2(\mu_1 + a_{11} + c_1 \frac{d_1}{e_1}) \leq a_{21} b_1$ if and only if $c_1 \frac{d_1}{e_1} \geq \frac{1}{10}$ (and any $c_2 \geq 0$), in which case $E^{*,1} := (x_1^*, u_1^*, x_2^*, u_2^*) = (\frac{1}{\frac{3}{2} + c_1 \frac{d_1}{e_1}}, \frac{d_1 e_1}{\frac{3}{2} e_1 + c_1 d_1}, 0, 0)$ is the saturated equilibrium; moreover, from Corollary 3.1, $E^{*,1}$ is a global attractor of all positive solutions without any further restrictions. For this particular situation, the global attractivity of $E^{*,1}$ was derived in [11] under the more restrictive condition $\frac{1}{10} \leq c_1 \frac{d_1}{e_1} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Of course, similarly to the above situation, finite distributed or infinite delays may have been considered.

Example 5.2. Consider a planar competitive system without controls given by (5.1), with $b_1 = 2, \mu_1 = 3 - a, b_2 = \mu_2 = 1, a_{11} = a, a_{12} = 4, a_{21} = a_{22} = 2$ ($a < 3$). Hence, $M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$ is the community matrix and $x^* = (2/3, 0)$ is the saturated equilibrium. Since $a_{21} b_1 > (\mu_1 + a_{11}) b_2$, Corollary 4.1 implies that all positive solutions $x(t) = (x_1(t), x_2(t))$ satisfy $x_2(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. One easily verifies that the characteristic equation for the linearized equation about x^* is given by

$$h(\lambda) = 0, \quad \text{for } h(\lambda) = \left(\lambda + \frac{1}{3} \right) \left(\lambda + \frac{2}{3}(3 - a) + \frac{2}{3} a e^{-\lambda \tau_{11}} \right).$$

Therefore, if $a \leq 3/2$, x^* is locally asymptotically stable (see e.g. [15]); moreover, if $0 < a < 3/2$, we have $\mu_1 > |a_{11}|$ and Corollary 4.1 yields now that x^* is globally attractive.

We now introduce a control variable $u_1(t)$, so that a system of the form (1.1) with $n = 2$ and $c_1, d_1, e_1 > 0, c_2 = 0$ is obtained, with the purpose of keeping the $x_2(t)$ population extinct with time, but trying to stabilize the $x_1(t)$ population at a level lower than $x_1^* = 2/3$. If $c_1 d_1 < e_1$, then conditions (4.16) still hold, thus the saturated equilibrium is $E^{*,1} := (x_1^*, u_1^*, 0, 0)$ with $x_1^* = 2/(3 + c_1 \frac{d_1}{e_1})$ and $x_2(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for any positive solution $(x_1(t), u_1(t), x_2(t), u_2(t))$ of the controlled system. If we still suppose that $0 < a < 3/2$, then $E^{*,1}$ is a global attractor.

Example 5.3. Consider the uncontrolled system (2.1) with $n = 2$ and take e.g. $b_1 = 1, b_2 = \frac{1}{3}, \mu_1 = \mu_2 = 1, a_{11} = a_{21} = \frac{1}{2}$, arbitrary coefficients $a_{12}, a_{22} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $K_{ij}(s) = \gamma e^{-\gamma s}$ for some $\gamma > 0$. With the above notations, we have

$$M_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 3/2 & a_{12} \\ 1/2 & 1 + a_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \hat{M}_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1/2 & -|a_{12}| \\ -1/2 & 1 - |a_{22}| \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_0^- = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -a_{12}^- \\ 0 & 1 - a_{22}^- \end{bmatrix}.$$

One easily sees that $(X_1, 0) = (\frac{2}{3}, 0)$ is a saturated equilibrium. If $a_{22} > -1$, conditions (4.16) and (4.17) are satisfied with $\lambda_1 = 0$. Applying Corollary 4.1 to this system without controls, we deduce that $(\frac{2}{3}, 0)$ is a global attractor of all its positive solutions.

We now introduce the controls, in order to recover the $x_2(t)$ population, which otherwise would be lead to extinction. For positive coefficients c_i, d_i, e_i , denote $\alpha_i := c_i \frac{d_i}{e_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, consider the corresponding system with controls as in (1.1), and the controlled matrix M given by $M =$

$\begin{bmatrix} 3/2 + \alpha_1 & a_{12} \\ 1/2 & 1 + \alpha_2 + a_{22} \end{bmatrix}$. For any values of α_1, α_2 such that $\det M > 0$, the controlled system now has a positive equilibrium $E^* = (x_1^*, u_1^*, x_2^*, u_2^*)$, with

$$x_1^* = (\det M)^{-1} [1 + \alpha_1 + a_{22} - \frac{1}{3}a_{12}] \quad \text{and} \quad x_2^* = (\det M)^{-1} \frac{\alpha_1}{3}.$$

If $1 - |a_{22}| > |a_{12}|$, then \hat{M}_0 is a non-singular M-matrix, and Theorem 3.2 yields that E^* is a global attractor of all positive solutions. For instance, for the case of $a_{22} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $|a_{12}| < \frac{1}{2}$, E^* is always globally attractive for the system with controls. This example generalizes and improves the situation considered in [11, Example 5.1], where the coefficients a_{12}, a_{22} were chosen to be $a_{22} = \frac{1}{2}$ and $a_{12} = \frac{1}{8}$, and the global attractivity of E^* was derived only if $\alpha_i \leq 1/4, i = 1, 2$.

Acknowledgements

Research supported by Scientific Research (c), No. 15K05010 of Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (Yoshiaki Muroya) and by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal) under project UID/MAT/04561/2013 (Teresa Faria). We thank the referees for their careful reading and valuable comments, which have led to improvements in the writing of some proofs.

References

- [1] S. Ahmad, A.C. Lazer, Necessary and sufficient average growth in a Lotka-Volterra system, *Nonlinear Anal.* 34 (1998), 191–228.
- [2] S. Ahmad, A.C. Lazer, Average growth and extinction in a competitive Lotka-Volterra system, *Nonlinear Anal.* 62 (2005), 545–557.
- [3] I. Al-Darabsah, X. Tang and Y. Yuan, A prey-predator model with migrations and delays, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 21 (2016), 737–761.
- [4] H. Bereketoglu and I. Györi, Global asymptotic stability in a nonautonomous Lotka-Volterra type systems with infinite delay, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 210 (1997), 279–291.
- [5] A. Berman and R. Plemmons, *Nonnegative Matrices in the Mathematical Sciences*, Academic Press, New York, 1979.
- [6] F. Chen, Z. Li and Y. Huang, Note on the permanence of a competitive system with infinite delay and feedback controls, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 8 (2007), 680–687.
- [7] F. Chen, X. Xie and H. Wang, Global stability in a competition model of plankton allelopathy with infinite delay, *J. Syst. Sci. Complex.* 28 (2015), 1070–1079.
- [8] T. Faria, Stability and extinction for Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delay, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 22 (2010), 299–324.
- [9] T. Faria, Global dynamics for Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delay and patch structure, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 245 (2014), 575–590.
- [10] T. Faria, Persistence and permanence for a class of functional differential equations with infinite delay, *J. Dynam. Differential Equations* 28 (2016), 1163–1186.
- [11] T. Faria and Y. Muroya, Global attractivity and extinction for Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delay and feedback controls, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* 145 (2015), 301–330.
- [12] K. Gopalsamy, *Stability and oscillations in delay differential equations of population dynamics*, Kluwer Academic Publ., Dordrecht, 1992.
- [13] K. Gopalsamy and P. Weng, Global attractivity in a competition system with feedback controls, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 45 (2003), 665–676.
- [14] J.K. Hale and J. Kato, Phase space for retarded equations with infinite delay, *Funkcial. Ekvac.* 21 (1978), 11–41.

- [15] J. K. Hale, S. M. Verduyn Lunel, *Introduction to Functional Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1993.
- [16] Y. Hino, S. Murakami and T. Naito. *Functional Differential Equations with Infinite Delay*, Springer-Verlag, New-York, 1993.
- [17] J. Hofbauer and K. Sigmund, *The Theory of Evolution and Dynamical Systems*, London Mathematical Society, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [18] Z. Hou, Permanence and extinction in competitive Lotka-Volterra systems with delays, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 12 (2011), 2130–2141.
- [19] H. Hu, Z. Teng and S. Gao, Extinction in nonautonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive system with pure-delays and feedback controls, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 10 (2009), 2508–2520.
- [20] Y. Kuang, Global stability in delay differential systems without dominating instantaneous negative feedbacks. *J. Differential Equations* 119 (1995), 503–532.
- [21] Y. Kuang and H.L. Smith, Global stability for infinite delay Lotka-Volterra type systems, *J. Differential Equations* 103 (1993), 221–246.
- [22] Z. Li, M. Han and F. Chen, Influence of feedback controls on an autonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive system with infinite delays, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 14 (2013), 402–413.
- [23] F. Montes de Oca and L. Pérez, Extinction in nonautonomous competitive Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delay, *Nonlinear Anal.* 75 (2012), 758–768.
- [24] F. Montes de Oca and L. Pérez, Balancing survival and extinction in nonautonomous competitive Lotka-Volterra systems with infinite delays, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 20 (2015), 2663–2690.
- [25] F. Montes de Oca and M. Vivas. Extinction in a two dimensional Lotka-Volterra system with infinite delay, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 7 (2006), 1042–1047.
- [26] Y. Muroya, Partial survival and extinction of species in nonautonomous Lotka-Volterra systems with delays, *Dynam. Systems Appl.* 12 (2003), 295–306.
- [27] Y. Muroya, Global stability of a delayed nonlinear Lotka-Volterra system with feedback controls and patch structure, *Appl. Math. Comput.* 239 (2014), 60–73.
- [28] Y. Muroya, A Lotka-Volterra system with patch structure (related to a multi-group SI epidemic model), *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S* 8 (2015), 999–1008.
- [29] Y. Muroya, T. Kuniya and J. Wang, Stability analysis of a delayed multi-group SIS epidemic model with nonlinear incidence rates and patch structure, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 425 (2015), 415–439.
- [30] L. Nie, J. Peng and Z. Teng, Permanence and stability in multi-species non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive systems with delays and feedback controls, *Math. Comput. Modelling* 49 (2009), 295–306.
- [31] C. Shi, Z. Li and F. Chen, Extinction in a nonautonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive system with infinite delay and feedback controls, *Nonlinear Anal. RWA* 13 (2012), 2214–2226.
- [32] T. Su and X. Yang, Finite-time synchronization of competitive neural networks with mixed delays, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* 21 (2016), 3655–3667.
- [33] X.H. Tang, X. Zou Global attractivity of non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra competition system without instantaneous negative feedback, *J. Differential Equations* 192 (2003), 502–535.
- [34] Z. Teng and L. Chen, Global stability of periodic Lotka-Volterra systems with delays, *Nonlinear Anal.* 45 (2001), 1081–1095.
- [35] Z. Teng and M. Rehim, Persistence in nonautonomous predator-prey systems with infinite delay *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* 197 (2006), 302–321.
- [36] R.R. Vance and E.A. Coddington, A nonautonomous model of population growth, *J. Math. Biol.* 27 (1989), 491–506.

- [37] K. Wang, Z. Teng and H. Jiang, On the permanence for n -species non-autonomous Lotka-Volterra competitive system with infinite delay and feedback controls, *Int. J. Biomath.* 1 (2008), 29–43.
- [38] Z. Zhang, Existence and global attractivity of a positive periodic solution for a generalized delayed population model with stocking and feedback control, *Math. Comput. Modelling* 48 (2008), 749–760.