

Persistence and time periodic positive solutions of doubly
nonlocal Fisher-KPP equations in time periodic and space
heterogeneous media

Jianping Gao

College of Mathematics and Econometrics
Hunan University
Changsha, Hunan 410082
People's Republic of China

and

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University, AL 36849

Shangjiang Guo

College of Mathematics and Econometrics
Hunan University
Changsha, Hunan 410082
People's Republic of China

and

Wenxian Shen

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Auburn University, AL 36849

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate the asymptotic dynamics of Fisher-KPP equations with nonlocal dispersal operator and nonlocal reaction term in time periodic and space heterogeneous media. We first show the global existence and boundedness of nonnegative solutions, and then obtain some sufficient conditions ensuring the uniform persistence. In particular, we study the existence, uniqueness and global stability of positive time periodic solutions under several different conditions.

Key words. Fisher-KPP equation, nonlocal diffusion, nonlocal reaction, uniform persistence, positive time periodic solution, time-space dependence.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35K57, 47G20, 47J35, 58D25, 92D25.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following three nonlocal dispersal equations with nonlocal intra-specific competition in time periodic and space heterogeneous media,

$$u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t) + u(x,t)f_1(x,t,u,G_1 * u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (\mathbf{P}_1)$$

$$u_t = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t) + u(x,t)f_2(x,t,u,G_2 * u), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (\mathbf{P}_2)$$

$$u_t = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)(u(y,t) - u(x,t))dy + u(x,t)f_3(x,t,u,G_3 * u), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (\mathbf{P}_3)$$

where $N \geq 1$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain,

$$G_1 * u = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y-x)u(y,t)dy,$$

$$G_2 * u = G_3 * u = \int_{\Omega} G(y-x)u(y,t)dy,$$

and

$$f_1(x,t,u,G * u) = a_1(x,t) - b_1(x,t)u(x,t) - c_1(x,t)G_1 * u(x,t),$$

$$f_2(x,t,u,G * u) = a_2(x,t) - b_2(x,t)u(x,t) - c_2(x,t)G_2 * u(x,t),$$

$$f_3(x,t,u,G * u) = a_3(x,t) - b_3(x,t)u(x,t) - c_3(x,t)G_3 * u(x,t).$$

Throughout this paper, we always assume

(\mathbf{A}_0) $J(\cdot)$ and $G(\cdot)$ are C^1 nonnegative convolution kernels supported on the balls B_{r_0} and B_{r_1} , respectively, where $0 < r_1, r_0 < \infty$ and B_r is a ball centered at 0 with radius r , and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(z)dz = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(z)dz = 1.$$

The functions $a_i(x,t)$, $b_i(x,t)$ and $c_i(x,t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are nonnegative, continuous in (x,t) , periodic in t with period T , and $a_1(x + p_j e_j, t) = a_1(x,t)$, $b_1(x + p_j e_j, t) = b_1(x,t)$ and $c_1(x + p_j e_j, t) = c_1(x,t)$ for $p_j > 0$, $e_j = (e_{1j}, e_{2j}, \dots, e_{Nj})$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, N$) and for $k, j = 1, 2, \dots, N$, $e_{kj} = 1$ if $k = j$ and 0 if $k \neq j$.

For convenience, let

$$\mathcal{L}_1[u] = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_2[u] = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_3[u] = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)(u(y,t) - u(x,t))dy.$$

Systems (\mathbf{P}_1), (\mathbf{P}_2) and (\mathbf{P}_3) can be used to model the evolution of the population of a species with nonlocal internal dispersal and nonlocal intra-specific competition. In such case, $u(x,t)$ represents the population density of the species at space location x and time t ; $\mathcal{L}_i[u]$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) characterizes the long range interaction or movement of the species and dispersal

kernel J describes the probability that the species jump from one position to another; $a_i(x, t)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) denotes the intrinsic growth rate function; the term $-b_i(x, t)u$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) describes the competition of the individuals of the species for the resources in the environment that only depends on the value of $u(x, t)$ at point x ; the term $-c_i(x, t)G_i * u$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) accounts for competition of the individuals of the species for the resources in the environment that not only depends on the value of $u(x, t)$ at point x , but also on the value of u in a neighborhood of x . For any fixed $t \geq 0$, if we confine the solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) to the space X_1 of space periodic functions (see Section 2), then we call (\mathbf{P}_1) is of periodic boundary condition $u(x + p_j \mathbf{e}_j, t) = u(x, t)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. (\mathbf{P}_2) is of Dirichlet type boundary condition $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} J(y-x)u(y)dy = 0$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, which describes a hostile environment outside Ω and any individual that jumps outside dies instantaneously. (\mathbf{P}_3) is of Neumann type boundary condition $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} J(y-x)(u(y)-u(x))dy = 0$ for $x \in \bar{\Omega}$, which means that the individuals may not enter or leave the domain Ω .

Observe that (\mathbf{P}_i) can be put in the following general form,

$$u_t = A_i(u) + u f_i(x, t, u, K_i(u)), \quad x \in \Omega_i, \quad (1.1)$$

complemented with proper boundary conditions, where

$$\Omega_i = \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^N, & \text{for } i = 1, \\ \bar{\Omega} & \text{for } i = 2, 3, \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

and A_i, K_i are linear operators with respect to u . In fact, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, if $A_i(u) = \mathcal{L}_i[u]$ and $K_i(u) = G_i * u$, then (1.1) becomes (\mathbf{P}_i) .

Equation (1.1) with various special A_i and K_i induces many important equations in literature. For example, for $i = 1, 2, 3$, if $A_i(u) = \Delta u$ and $K_i(u) = u$, then (1.1) gives rise to the following reaction-diffusion equations,

$$u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_1(x, t, u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.3)$$

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_2(x, t, u), & x \in \Omega, \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_3(x, t, u), & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega; \end{cases} \quad (1.5)$$

if $A_i(u) = \Delta u$ and $K_i(u) = G_i * u$, then (1.1) induces the following nonlocal reaction-diffusion equations,

$$u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_1(x, t, u, G_1 * u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.6)$$

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_2(x, t, u, G_2 * u), & x \in \Omega, \\ u(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (1.7)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta u + u(x, t)f_3(x, t, u, G_3 * u), & x \in \Omega, \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial n}(x, t) = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega; \end{cases} \quad (1.8)$$

if $A_i(u) = \mathcal{L}_i[u]$ and $K_i(u) = u$, then (1.1) becomes the following nonlocal dispersal equations,

$$u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t) + u(x,t)f_1(x,t,u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad (1.9)$$

$$u_t = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t) + u(x,t)f_2(x,t,u), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}, \quad (1.10)$$

and

$$u_t = \int_{\Omega} J(y-x)(u(y,t) - u(x,t))dy + u(x,t)f_3(x,t,u), \quad x \in \bar{\Omega}. \quad (1.11)$$

Equations (1.3)-(1.5) are widely used to study the population dynamics of single species with local diffusion and local intra-specific competition. Equations (1.6)-(1.8) are called nonlocal reaction-diffusion equations which are used to model the dynamics of single species with local diffusion and nonlocal intra-specific competition. The reader is referred to [22] for the introduction of nonlocal reaction term in population biology. Equations (1.9)-(1.11) can be used to investigate the population dynamics of single species with only nonlocal dispersal operator. For the background of nonlocal dispersal operator, the reader is referred to [2, 28] and the references therein.

Among the central dynamical issues for (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) (resp. (1.3)-(1.5), (1.6)-(1.8), (1.9)-(1.11)) are global existence of solutions with given nonnegative initial functions; uniform persistence of the population; existence, uniqueness and stability of positive time periodic solutions; spreading speeds and traveling wave solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) (resp. (1.3), (1.6), (1.9)). There exist many works on these central dynamical issues. In the following, we recall some relevant works.

First, models (1.3)-(1.5) have been extensively investigated. Model (1.3) in time homogeneous case has been studied in the two pioneering works of Fisher [21] and Kolmogorov et al. [29], in which a well-known propagation phenomenon was obtained. The reader is referred to [7, 8] for the study of persistence and pulsating traveling fronts for (1.3) with general local dispersal operator and general local reaction term in space periodic media. Nadin in [32, 33, 34] investigated (1.3) with general local dispersal operator and general local reaction term in space-time periodic media, including the existence, uniqueness and stability of periodic solutions and properties of traveling wave solutions. The reader is referred to the book [27] and references therein for the study of the existence and stability properties of time periodic solution and asymptotic behavior of the solution of initial value problem associated with (1.4)-(1.5) in more general case of local dispersal operator and local reaction term. From the papers mentioned in the above, it is known that the properties of positive periodic solutions of (1.3)-(1.5) in the general case are determined by the sign of the principal eigenvalue of the corresponding linearized equation at the null state.

Second, models (1.6)-(1.8) have been studied mainly in the time independent case. Most existing works are on (1.6) with $b(x,t) \equiv 0$. Hamel and Ryzhik [26] studied some properties of solutions of (1.6) with $b(x,t) \equiv 0$ and $N = 1$, including existence of non-constant space periodic steady state, spreading speed and global boundedness for the solution of the Cauchy problem. The study of (1.6) with $b(x,t) \equiv 0$ and $N > 1$ has been given in [5], in which the steady states and traveling wave solutions connecting these states have been investigated. For more works on (1.6) with $b(x,t) \equiv 0$, the reader is referred to [1, 24, 23], and for more works on nonlocal reaction-diffusion model on the whole space, the reader is referred to [3, 4, 10, 15, 16]. For the study of (1.7)-(1.8) in time independence case, we refer the reader to [9, 11, 14, 44], in which the

authors applied the bifurcation theory and monotonicity methods to study the existence and stability of steady states.

Third, models (1.9)-(1.11) have been recently studied with quite general reaction term. In the case that $f_1(x, t, u) = f_1(x, u)$ is spatially periodic, the existence, uniqueness and stability of positive stationary solutions of (1.9) have been studied in [12, 41, 42]. Berestycki, Coville, and Vo [6] employed the principal eigenvalue theory and obtained a persistence criteria for (1.9) with the reaction term that is time independent, but depends on x . For the study of traveling waves and spreading properties of (1.9) in time independent case, the reader is referred to [13, 42, 43]. For the time periodic case, Rawal and Shen [36] studied the principal eigenvalue theory of operators $\mathcal{L}_i[u]$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and furthermore, applied the principal eigenvalue theory and the tool of part metric to obtain the existence, uniqueness and global stability of positive time periodic solutions for (1.9)-(1.11). In particular, Rawal and Shen [36] showed that the properties of positive time periodic solutions are determined by the sign of the principal spectrum point of the corresponding linearized equation of (1.9)-(1.11) at the null state. We refer the reader to [37] for the study of spreading properties and traveling waves of (1.9) in time and space periodic case and to [39] for the study of properties of transition waves and positive entire solutions of (1.9) in general time and space dependence. For the study of other aspects of nonlocal dispersal models, the reader is referred to [40, 45] and the references therein.

There exist some recent works on (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_2) when $a_i(x, t)$, $b_i(x, t)$, and $c_i(x, t)$ are constant functions, but there is no work on (\mathbf{P}_3) even in the homogenous case. For (\mathbf{P}_1) with both local and nonlocal interaction in time and space independent case, we refer the reader to [20] for the study of the existence and properties of traveling wave solutions, to [19] for the study of the front propagation, to [30] for the study of the pattern formation in one dimensional space. For the study of (\mathbf{P}_1) with only nonlocal interaction, the reader is referred to [17, 18] and the references therein. The dynamics of (\mathbf{P}_2) recently has been investigated in [31].

However, there is little study on the central dynamical issues for (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) with $a_i(x, t)$, $b_i(x, t)$ and $c_i(x, t)$ being non-constant functions. The difficulties for the study of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) lie in many aspects. One of them is the lack of compactness and regularities of the solutions of nonlocal dispersal evolution equations (which do not arise in the study of (1.3)-(1.5) and (1.6)-(1.8)); another is the lack of standard comparison principle (which do not arise in the study of (1.3)-(1.5) and (1.9)-1.11). Moreover, the space and time dependence of the coefficients gives rise to some additional difficulties.

The objective of the current paper is to study the dynamical behaviors of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) , including persistence and the properties of positive time periodic solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) . Mainly, under proper conditions on J , G , and a_i, b_i, c_i , we will prove

- global existence and boundedness of solutions to (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) with nonnegative initial functions (see Theorem 2.1);
- uniform persistence of systems (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) (see Theorem 2.2);
- existence, uniqueness and global stability of positive time periodic solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) (see Theorem 2.3).

We will study the spreading speeds and traveling wave solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) in our future works.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some standing notations, assumptions, and definitions, and state our main results. We devote Section 3-5 to the proofs of the main results.

2 Notations, assumptions, definitions and main results

In this section, we introduce some standing notations, assumptions and definitions, and state the main results of the paper.

2.1 Notations

In this subsection, we introduce some standing notations.

Let

$$D_i = \begin{cases} [0, p_1] \times [0, p_2] \times \cdots \times [0, p_N], & \text{for } i = 1, \\ \bar{\Omega}, & \text{for } i = 2, 3. \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} a_{iM} &= \max_{D_i \times [0, T]} a_i(x, t), & b_{iM} &= \max_{D_i \times [0, T]} b_i(x, t), & c_{iM} &= \max_{D_i \times [0, T]} c_i(x, t), \\ a_{iL} &= \min_{D_i \times [0, T]} a_i(x, t), & b_{iL} &= \min_{D_i \times [0, T]} b_i(x, t), & c_{iL} &= \min_{D_i \times [0, T]} c_i(x, t), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} g_{i,m} = \inf_{x \in \Omega_i} \int_{\Omega_i} G(y-x) dy, & g_{i,M} = \sup_{x \in \Omega_i} \int_{\Omega_i} G(y-x) dy, \\ j_{i,m} = \inf_{x \in \Omega_i} \int_{\Omega_i} J(y-x) dy. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

We denote $|\cdot|$ the norm in \mathbb{R} and $\|\cdot\|$ the norm in \mathbb{R}^N , and define the following spaces:

$$\hat{X}_1 = \{u \in C(\mathbb{R}^N, \mathbb{R}) : u \text{ is uniformly continuous and bounded}\}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{\hat{X}_1} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} |u(x)|$;

$$X_1 = \{u \in \hat{X}_1 : u(\cdot + p_i \mathbf{e}_i) = u(\cdot)\}$$

with norm $\|u\|_{X_1} = \sup_{x \in D_1} |u(x)|$;

$$\hat{X}_i = X_i = C(\bar{\Omega}, \mathbb{R}), \quad i = 2, 3$$

with norm $\|u\|_{\hat{X}_i} = \|u\|_{X_i} = \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}} |u(x)|$; and

$$X_i^+(\hat{X}_i^+) = \{u \in X_i(\hat{X}_i) : u \geq 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

$$X_i^{++} = \{u \in X_i^+ : u(x) > 0 \forall x \in \Omega_i\}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

For given $i = 1, 2, 3$, the solution $u_i(x, t)$ of (\mathbf{P}_i) with initial value $u_i(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \in \hat{X}_i$, if it exists, is denoted by $u_i(x, t; u_0)$.

2.2 Definitions

In this subsection, we introduce the definition of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) and the definition of uniform persistence of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) .

Definition 2.1. For given $i = 1, 2, 3$, a pair of positive bounded continuous functions $\overline{U}_i(x, t)$ and $\underline{U}_i(x, t)$ on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ are called a pair of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) if $\frac{\partial \overline{U}_i}{\partial t}$ and $\frac{\partial \underline{U}_i}{\partial t}$ exist and are continuous on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$, and

$$\begin{cases} \overline{U}_{it} - \mathcal{L}_i[\overline{U}_i] \geq \overline{U}_i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\overline{U}_i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \underline{U}_i] \\ \underline{U}_{it} - \mathcal{L}_i[\underline{U}_i] \leq \underline{U}_i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\underline{U}_i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \overline{U}_i] \end{cases}$$

for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$.

Definition 2.2. For given $i = 1, 2, 3$, we call system (\mathbf{P}_i) is uniformly persistent if for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$, $u_i(x, t; u_0)$ exists for all $t \geq 0$, and if there exists $\eta_i > 0$, such that for any u_0 satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+ \text{ with } \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0, & \text{for } i = 1, \\ u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+ \setminus \{0\}, & \text{for } i = 2, 3, \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

there exists $T_i(u_0) > 0$ such that

$$\eta_i \leq u_i(x, t; u_0) \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_i, t \geq T_i(u_0).$$

2.3 Assumptions

In this subsection, we introduce some standing assumptions and make some remarks on the assumptions.

We first give the following standing assumption.

(A₁) For $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < a_{iL} \leq a_{iM} < \infty, \\ 0 < b_{iL} \leq b_{iM} < \infty, \\ 0 \leq c_{iL} \leq c_{iM} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 2$,

$$j_{i,m} - 1 + a_{iL} > 0.$$

Remark 2.1. Assumption **(A₁)** gives sufficient conditions for the instability of the trivial solution $u \equiv 0$ and for the existence, uniqueness, and stability of strictly positive time periodic solutions of the equation

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_i[u] + u[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)u], \quad x \in \Omega_i \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (2.3)$$

In fact, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. Assume (\mathbf{A}_0) and (\mathbf{A}_1) and let $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given. Then (2.3) has exactly two time periodic solutions, $u = 0$ and $u = u_i^*(x, t)$ with $\inf_{x \in \Omega_i, t \in \mathbb{R}} u_i^*(x, t) > 0$. Moreover, $u = 0$ is linearly unstable and the positive time periodic solution $u_i^*(x, t)$ is globally asymptotically stable in the sense that

$$\|\hat{u}_i(\cdot, t; u_0) - u_i^*(\cdot, t)\|_{\hat{X}_i} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty$$

for any initial value u_0 satisfying (2.2), where $\hat{u}_i(x, t; u_0)$ is a solution of (2.3) with initial value u_0 .

Proof. Using the standard comparison principle for (2.3) and [40, Proposition 3.3], the proof of the lemma follows from the arguments in [36, Theorem E]. \square

Let (\mathbf{A}_2) be the following standing assumption.

(\mathbf{A}_2) $a_i(t, x) - c_i(x, t)G_i * u_i^*(x, t) > 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ for $i = 1, 3$, and $\int_{\Omega_i} J(y - x)dy - 1 + a_i(t, x) - c_i(x, t)G_i * u_i^*(x, t) > 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ for $i = 2$.

Remark 2.2. (1) As it is pointed out in Remark 2.1, assumption (\mathbf{A}_1) gives sufficient conditions for the instability of the trivial solution $u \equiv 0$ of (2.3) and hence gives sufficient conditions for the instability of the trivial solution $u_i \equiv 0$ of (\mathbf{P}_i) . In the case where the nonlocal reaction in (\mathbf{P}_i) is absent, that is, $c_i(x, t) \equiv 0$, by Lemma 2.1, persistence occurs in (\mathbf{P}_i) and (\mathbf{P}_i) has a unique globally asymptotically stable strictly positive periodic solution. In general, we will show that Assumption (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_2) implies the persistence in (\mathbf{P}_i) (see Theorem 2.2).

(2) If $a_{iL} - \frac{c_{iM}a_{iM}}{b_{iL}} > 0$ (resp. $j_{i,m} - 1 + a_{iL} - \frac{c_{iM}a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}g_{i,M} > 0$, $a_{iL} - \frac{c_{iM}a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}g_{i,M} > 0$), then (\mathbf{A}_2) holds for $i = 1$ (resp. $i = 2, i = 3$).

(3) For given $i = 1, 2$, or 3 , assume (\mathbf{A}_0) - (\mathbf{A}_2) . It can be proved that there exist two continuous positive periodic functions $\underline{U}^i(x, t) \leq \bar{U}^i(x, t)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} \bar{U}_t^i = \mathcal{L}_i[\bar{U}^i] + \bar{U}^i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\bar{U}^i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \underline{U}^i], & x \in \Omega_i, t \in \mathbb{R} \\ \underline{U}_t^i = \mathcal{L}_i[\underline{U}^i] + \underline{U}^i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\underline{U}^i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \bar{U}^i], & x \in \Omega_i, t \in \mathbb{R} \end{cases} \quad (2.4)$$

(see Theorem 2.2). If $c_i(t, x) \equiv 0$, it is clear that $\bar{U}^i(x, t) = \underline{U}^i(x, t) = u_i^*(x, t)$ for all $x \in \Omega_i, t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $i = 1, 2, 3$.

(4) Let

$$\hat{u}_1^* = \frac{a_{iM}b_{1M} - a_{1L}c_{1L}}{b_{1L}b_{1M} - c_{1L}c_{1M}}, \quad \hat{u}_{*1} = \frac{a_{1L}b_{1L} - a_{1M}c_{1M}}{b_{1L}b_{1M} - c_{1L}c_{1M}}, \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\hat{u}_3^* = \frac{a_{3M}b_{3M} - a_{3L}c_{3L}g_{3,m}}{b_{3L}b_{3M} - c_{3L}c_{3M}g_{3,m}g_{3,M}}, \quad \hat{u}_{*3} = \frac{a_{3L}b_{3L} - a_{3M}c_{3M}g_{3,m}}{b_{3L}b_{3M} - c_{3L}c_{3M}g_{3,m}g_{3,M}}. \quad (2.6)$$

If

$$\begin{cases} a_{iL}b_{iL} - a_{iM}c_{iM} > 0 \text{ for } i = 1 \\ a_{iL}b_{iL} - a_{iM}c_{iM}g_{i,M} > 0 \text{ for } i = 3, \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

then

$$0 < \hat{u}_{*i} \leq \underline{U}^i(t, x) \leq \bar{U}^i(t, x) \leq \hat{u}_i^* \leq \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \Omega_i, i = 1, 3.$$

Let (\mathbf{A}_3) , (\mathbf{A}_4) and (\mathbf{A}_5) be the following standing assumptions,

(\mathbf{A}_3) $r_0 > r_1$ and $J_m > c_{iM} \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}} G_M$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$J_m = \inf_{x \in B_{r_1}} J(x), \quad G_M = \sup_{x \in B_{r_1}} G(x). \quad (2.8)$$

(\mathbf{A}_4) (\mathbf{A}_2) holds and for $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$h_1^i(t, x) + h_2^i(t, x) < 0, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_1^i(x, t) &= a_i(x, t) - 2b_i(x, t)\underline{U}^i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \underline{U}^i, \\ h_2^i(x, t) &= c_i(x, t)\overline{U}^i, \end{aligned}$$

and \overline{U}^i and \underline{U}^i are as in Remark 2.2 (3).

(\mathbf{A}_5) $a_1(x, t) \equiv a(t)$, $b_1(x, t) \equiv b(t)$, $c_1(x, t) \equiv c(t)$, and $b_{1L} > c_{1M}$.

Remark 2.3. (1) In the case where the nonlocal reaction term is absent in (\mathbf{P}_i) , that is, $c_i(x, t) \equiv 0$, the occurrence of persistence in (\mathbf{P}_i) implies the existence, uniqueness, and stability of strictly positive periodic solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) . In general, we will prove that (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_3) or (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_4) implies the existence, uniqueness, and stability of strictly positive periodic solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) (see Theorem 2.3 (1)(2)), and that (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_5) implies the existence, uniqueness, and stability of strictly positive periodic solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) (see Theorem 2.3 (3)).

(2) Let \hat{u}_i^* and \hat{u}_{*i} be as in Remark 2.2(4). If (\mathbf{A}_2) and (2.7) hold, and

$$a_{iM} - 2b_{iL}\hat{u}_{*i} - c_{iL}g_m\hat{u}_{*i} + c_{iM}\hat{u}_i^* < 0, \quad (2.10)$$

then (\mathbf{A}_4) holds for $i = 1, 3$.

2.4 Main results

In this subsection, we state the main results of this paper.

First, the following theorem includes our main results on the global existence and boundedness of nonnegative solutions for (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) .

Theorem 2.1 (Global existence and boundedness). *Assume (\mathbf{A}_0) , and let $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given.*

(1) (\mathbf{P}_i) with initial value $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$ has a global solution $u_i(x, t; u_0) \in \hat{X}_i^+$, and if $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$ and $u_0 \not\equiv 0$, then $u_i(x, t; u_0) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega_i$ and $t > 0$. In addition, if (\mathbf{A}_1) holds, then for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$ and any $M_i > \max\{\|u_0\|_{\hat{X}_i}, \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}\}$, $\|u_i(\cdot, t; u_0)\|_{\hat{X}_i} \leq M_i$, $t \in [0, \infty)$.

(2) Suppose that \overline{U}_i and \underline{U}_i are a pair of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) and $\overline{U}_i(\cdot, t), \underline{U}_i(\cdot, t) \in \hat{X}_i^+$ for any $t \geq 0$. Then for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$ satisfying $\underline{U}_i(x, 0) \leq u_0(x) \leq \overline{U}_i(x, 0)$ for $x \in \Omega_i$, (\mathbf{P}_i) admits a solution $u_i(x, t; u_0)$ on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ which satisfies

$$\underline{U}_i(x, t) \leq u_i(x, t; u_0) \leq \overline{U}_i(x, t), \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty).$$

Next, we state our main results on the uniform persistence of solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) , $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Theorem 2.2 (Uniform Persistence). *For each fixed $i = 1, 2$ or 3 , assume that (\mathbf{A}_0) - (\mathbf{A}_2) hold. Then persistence occurs in (\mathbf{P}_i) . More precisely, there exist two continuous positive periodic functions $\underline{U}^i(x, t) \leq \overline{U}^i(x, t)$ such that (2.4) holds, and for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough and any initial value u_0 satisfying (2.2), there exists t_{ϵ, u_0}^i such that*

$$0 < \underline{U}^i(x, t) - \epsilon \leq u_i(x, t; u_0) \leq \overline{U}^i(x, t) + \epsilon \quad (2.11)$$

for all $x \in \Omega_i$ and $t > t_{\epsilon, u_0}^i$. Moreover, $\underline{U}^i(x, 0) \leq u_0 \leq \overline{U}^i(x, 0)$ for $x \in \Omega_i$ implies

$$\underline{U}^i(x, t) \leq u_i(x, t; u_0) \leq \overline{U}^i(x, t), \quad \forall x \in \Omega_i, t > 0. \quad (2.12)$$

In the following, we state our main results on the existence, uniqueness and stability of positive time periodic solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) .

Theorem 2.3 (Positive time periodic solution). *Let $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given.*

- (1) *Assume that (\mathbf{A}_0) - (\mathbf{A}_1) and (\mathbf{A}_3) hold. Then (\mathbf{P}_i) has exactly one time periodic solution $u_P^i(\cdot, t) \in \hat{X}_i^{++}$. Moreover, $u_P^i(\cdot, t)$ is globally asymptotically stable in the sense that*

$$\|u_i(\cdot, t; u_0) - u_P^i(\cdot, t)\|_{\hat{X}_i} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$ satisfying (2.2)

- (2) *In addition to conditions (\mathbf{A}_0) - (\mathbf{A}_1) and (\mathbf{A}_4) , assume that kernel functions $J(\cdot)$ and $G(\cdot)$ are symmetric with respect to 0. Then (\mathbf{P}_i) has exactly one time periodic solution $U_i^*(\cdot, t) \in X_i^{++}$. Moreover, $U_i^*(\cdot, x)$ is globally asymptotically stable in the sense that*

$$\|u_i(\cdot, t; u_0) - U_i^*(\cdot, t)\|_{X_i} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $u_0 \in X_i^+ \setminus \{0\}$.

- (3) *Assume that (\mathbf{A}_0) - (\mathbf{A}_1) and (\mathbf{A}_5) hold. Then (\mathbf{P}_1) has exactly one spatially homogeneous positive time periodic solution $\phi_1^*(t)$. Moreover, $\phi_1^*(t)$ is globally asymptotically stable in the sense that for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1$ with $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$,*

$$\|u_1(\cdot, t; u_0) - \phi_1^*(t)\|_{\hat{X}_1} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.13)$$

Remark 2.4. (1) *By Theorem 2.3, assumptions (\mathbf{A}_0) and (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_3) or (\mathbf{A}_4) imply that the persistence occurs in (\mathbf{P}_1) , and assumptions (\mathbf{A}_0) and (\mathbf{A}_1) together with (\mathbf{A}_5) imply that the persistence occurs in (\mathbf{P}_1) .*

- (2) *If $c_i(t, x) \equiv 0$, then (2.9) becomes*

$$a_i(t, x) - 2b_i(t, x)u_i^*(t, x) < 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \Omega_i.$$

In view of Theorem 2.2 and Remark 2.2 (3), however, we see that (2.9) is not needed for Theorem 2.3 (2) to hold in the case that $c_i(t, x) \equiv 0$.

Before ending this section, we present several properties about the solutions of (1.9)-(1.11) and a lemma which will be used in the proof of the main results. Let $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given, for $u, v \in X_i$, we define

$$u \leq v (u \geq v) \text{ if } v - u \in X_i^+ (u - v \in X_i^+),$$

and for $u, v \in \hat{X}_i$, we define

$$u \leq v (u \geq v) \text{ if } v - u \in \hat{X}_i^+ (u - v \in \hat{X}_i^+).$$

Recall that $\hat{u}_1(x, t; u_0)$ (resp. $\hat{u}_2(x, t; u_0)$, $\hat{u}_3(x, t; u_0)$) is the solution of (1.9) (resp. (1.10), (1.11)) with $\hat{u}_1(\cdot, 0; u_0) = u_0(\cdot) \in \hat{X}_1$ (resp. $\hat{u}_2(\cdot, 0; u_0) = u_0(\cdot) \in \hat{X}_2$, $\hat{u}_3(\cdot, 0; u_0) = u_0(\cdot) \in \hat{X}_3$).

Definition 2.3. A continuous function $u(x, t)$ on $\Omega_1 \times [0, \tau)$ is called a super-solution (sub-solution) of (1.9) if for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $u(x, t)$ is differentiable on $[0, \tau)$ and satisfies that for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in [0, \tau)$,

$$u_t \geq (\leq) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y, t)dy - u(x, t) + u(x, t)f_1(x, t, u).$$

Similarly, we can define the super-solution and sub-solution of (1.10)-(1.11).

Proposition 2.1 (Comparison principle [36, 42]). *Let $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given.*

- (1) *If $u^1(x, t)$ and $u^2(x, t)$ are bounded sub- and super- solution of (1.9) (resp. (1.10), (1.11)) on $[0, \tau)$, respectively, and satisfy that $u^1(\cdot, 0) \leq u^2(\cdot, 0)$, then $u^1(\cdot, t) \leq u^2(\cdot, t)$ for $t \in [0, \tau)$.*
- (2) *For every $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i^+$, $\hat{u}_i(x, t; u_0)$ exists for all $t \geq 0$.*
- (3) *If $u^1, u^2 \in \hat{X}_i^+$, $u^1 \leq u^2$ and $u^1 \not\equiv u^2$, then $\hat{u}_i(x, t; u^1) < \hat{u}_i(x, t; u^2)$ for $x \in \Omega_i$ and $t > 0$.*

Lemma 2.2. *For $i = 1, 2, 3$ be given. Assume that a continuous function Φ with*

$$\inf_{x \in \Omega_i, t \geq 0} \Phi(x, t) > -\infty \text{ and } \Phi(x, 0) \geq 0 \text{ for } x \in \Omega_i$$

satisfies

$$\Phi_t \geq \int_{\Omega_i} J(y-x)\Phi(y, t)dy + h_1(x, t)\Phi(x, t) + h_2(x, t)G_i * \Phi(x, t), \quad (2.14)$$

where both h_1 and h_2 are continuous functions, $h_1(x, t) > 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$ and $h_{1M} := \sup_{x \in \Omega_i, t \geq 0} h_1(x, t) < +\infty$.

- (1) *If $h_2(x, t) < 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$, $h_{2m} := \inf_{x \in \Omega_i, t \geq 0} h_2(x, t) > -\infty$, and for $r_0 > r_1$,*

$$J_m + G_M h_{2m} > 0, \quad (2.15)$$

where r_0, r_1, J_m and G_M are defined in (2.8), then $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$. Moreover, if Φ satisfies

$$\Phi_t = \int_{\Omega_i} J(y-x)\Phi(y, t)dy + h_1(x, t)\Phi(x, t) + h_2(x, t)G_i * \Phi(x, t), \quad (2.16)$$

and $\Phi(x, 0) \not\equiv 0$ for $x \in \Omega_i$, then $\Phi(x, t) > 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$.

(2) If $h_2(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$ and $\sup_{x \in \Omega_i, t \geq 0} h_2(x, t) < +\infty$, then $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, +\infty)$.

Proof. (1) We only prove the case $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with analogously. We first prove the first part of (1). We claim that $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ holds on $(0, T_0)$, where $T_0 = \frac{1}{1+h_{1M}}$. If not, then there exist $x^1 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t^1 \in (0, T_0)$ such that $\Phi(x^1, t^1) < 0$, which implies that we can find $0 < t^0 < T_0$ such that

$$\Phi_{inf} := \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N \times [0, t^0]} \Phi(x, t) < 0.$$

By the condition in this lemma, we have $\Phi_{inf} > -\infty$. We can then extract two sequences $\{x_n\} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\{t_n\} \in [0, t^0]$ such that

$$\Phi(x_n, t_n) \rightarrow \Phi_{inf}, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

From (2.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(x_n, t_n) - \Phi(x_n, 0) \\ &= \int_0^{t_n} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x_n) \Phi(y, s) dy + h_1(x_n, s) \Phi(x_n, s) + h_2(x_n, s) G_1 * \Phi(x_n, s) \right) ds \\ &\geq \int_0^{t_n} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} (J(y - x_n) + h_2(x_n, s) G(y - x_n)) \Phi(y, s) dy + h_{1M} \Phi_{inf} \right] ds \\ &\geq \int_0^{t_n} (1 + h_{1M}) \Phi_{inf} ds = t_n (1 + h_{1M}) \Phi_{inf} \\ &\geq t^0 (1 + h_{1M}) \Phi_{inf}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

Since $\Phi(x, 0) \geq 0$, then letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (2.17), we get

$$\Phi_{inf} \geq t^0 (1 + h_{1M}) \Phi_{inf} > \Phi_{inf},$$

which leads to a contradiction. Thus, $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $t \in [0, T_0)$. By continuation, we obtain $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$.

Now we prove the second part. It follows from the above discussion that $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$. If there exist $\hat{t} > 0$ and $\hat{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\Phi(\hat{x}_0, \hat{t}) = 0$, then using the fact that $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$ and the continuously differential of Φ with respect to t , we obtain from (2.16)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} [J(y - \hat{x}_0) + h_2(\hat{x}_0, \hat{t}) u_2(\hat{x}_0, \hat{t}) G(y - \hat{x}_0)] \Phi(y, \hat{t}) dy = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

By assumptions (A_0) and (2.15), it follows from (2.18) that

$$\int_{B_{r_1}(\hat{x}_0)} [J(y - \hat{x}_0) + h_2(\hat{x}_0, \hat{t}) G(y - \hat{x}_0)] \Phi(y, \hat{t}) dy = 0,$$

and

$$\int_{B_{r_0}(\hat{x}_0) \setminus B_{r_1}(\hat{x}_0)} J(y - \hat{x}_0) \Phi(y, \hat{t}) dy = 0,$$

which means that $\Phi(x, \hat{t}) = 0$ for $x \in B_{r_0}(\hat{x}_0)$. Similarly, we can choose any $\hat{x}_1 \in \partial B_{\frac{r_1}{2}}(\hat{x}_0)$ such that $\Phi(x, \hat{t}) = 0$ for all $x \in B_{\frac{3}{2}r_1}(\hat{x}_1)$. Thus we have $\Phi(x, \hat{t}) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. By general group theory, (2.16) has a unique solution $\tilde{u}(\cdot, t; u_0) \in \hat{X}_1$ with initial value $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $\Phi(x, t) = 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$ which contradicts the condition $\Phi(x, 0) \not\equiv 0$ for $x \in \Omega_1$. Hence, $\Phi(x, t) > 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, +\infty)$.

(2) The proof of conclusion (1) is similar to that of (1) and hence is omitted. \square

Remark 2.5. *By the arguments of Lemma 2.2, if $\Phi(x, t)$ is not continuous in x , the conclusion $\Phi(x, t) \geq 0$ in Lemma 2.2(1) (resp. in Lemma 2.2(2)) still holds.*

3 Global existence and boundedness

In this section, we study the global existence and boundedness of solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) with given initial functions in \hat{X}_i and give a proof of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (1). We only focus on the case $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with analogously.

First, for given $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \hat{X}_1$, define Au and $F(t, u)$ as

$$(Au)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y)dy - u(x),$$

$$F(t, u)(x) = u(x)[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u(x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u(x)].$$

It is clear that $-A$ is a linear bounded operator on \hat{X}_1 . Hence $-A$ generates a uniformly continuous semigroup on \hat{X}_1 . It is also clear that for given $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u \in \hat{X}_1$, $F(t, u) \in \hat{X}_1$. Moreover, it is not difficult to verify that the mapping $[\mathbb{R} \times \hat{X}_1 \ni (t, u) \mapsto F(t, u) \in \hat{X}_1]$ is continuous in t and locally Lipschitz continuous in $u \in \hat{X}_1$. Then by general semigroup theory (see [35, Theorem 6.1.4, Corollary 4.2.6]), for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1$, there exists a $t_{\max} \leq \infty$ such that (\mathbf{P}_1) has a unique solution $u_1(x, t; u_0) \in \hat{X}_1$ on $[0, t_{\max})$ satisfying $u_1(x, 0; u_0) = u_0(x)$, and if $t_{\max} < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_{\max}^-} \|u_1(\cdot, t; u_0)\|_{\hat{X}_1} = \infty.$$

Next, we claim that, if initial value $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1^+$, then $u^* = u_1(\cdot, t; u_0) \in \hat{X}_1^+$ for all $t \in [0, t_{\max})$. In fact, set $u^* = u_1(x, t; u_0)$. Note that u^* satisfies

$$\begin{cases} u_t^* = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u^*(y, t)dy - u^*(x, t) + u^*[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u^* - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u^*], \\ u^*(x, 0) = u_0(x) \in \hat{X}_1^+. \end{cases}$$

Hence u^* is a solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y, t)dy - u(x, t) + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u^* - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u^*], \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \in \hat{X}_1^+. \end{cases}$$

Then it follows from Proposition 2.1 that $u^* = u_1(\cdot, t; u_0) \geq 0$ for $t \in [0, t_{\max})$. In particular, if $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1^+$ and $u_0 \not\equiv 0$, then $u_1(x, t; u_0) > 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in (0, t_{\max})$.

We now prove that, for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1^+$, $t_{\max} = \infty$. Note that $u_1(\cdot, t; u_0) \geq 0$ for $t \geq 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_t^* &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u^*(y,t)dy - u^*(x,t) + u^*[a_1(x,t) - b_1(x,t)u^* - c_1(x,t)G_1 * u^*] \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u^*(y,t)dy - u^*(x,t) + u^*[a_1(x,t) - b_1(x,t)u^*], \end{aligned}$$

which together with Definition 2.3 implies that u^* is a sub-solution of the following equation

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u(y,t)dy - u(x,t) + u[a_1(x,t) - b_1(x,t)u], \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x) \in \hat{X}_1^+. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Obviously, equation (3.1) admits a solution which exists globally. This implies that $t_{\max} = \infty$.

Finally, if (\mathbf{A}_1) holds, as stated before, $u_1(t, \cdot; u_0)$ is a sub-solution of (3.1). It is then clear that for any $M_1 > \max\{\|u_0\|_1, \frac{a_1 M}{b_1 L}\}$, we have $u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq M_1$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. The proof of Theorem 2.1 (1) is thus completed. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2.1 (2), we first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For $i = 1, 2, 3$, if \bar{U}_i and \underline{U}_i are a pair of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$, and $\bar{U}_i(x, 0) \geq \underline{U}_i(x, 0)$, then $\bar{U}_i(x, t) \geq \underline{U}_i(x, t)$ on $\Omega_i \times (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. We only consider the case $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with similarly. Since \bar{U}_1 and \underline{U}_1 are a pair of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) on $\mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, then there is $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq \bar{U}_1(x, t) < M_0, \quad 0 \leq \underline{U}_1(x, t) < M_0 \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty).$$

Setting $\omega = e^{ht}(\bar{U}_1 - \underline{U}_1)$, where h is positive constant that will be determined later, then $\omega(x, 0) \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_t &= h e^{ht}(\bar{U}_1 - \underline{U}_1) + e^{ht}(\bar{U}_{1t} - \underline{U}_{1t}) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)\omega(y,t)dy + p(x,t)\omega + c_1(x,t)\bar{U}_1 G_1 * \omega, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$p(x, t) = h + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(\bar{U}_1 + \underline{U}_1) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{U}_1.$$

Choose h large enough such that $p(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, then it follows from Lemma 2.2 (2) that $\omega(x, t) \geq 0$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$ which implies $\bar{U}_1(x, t) \geq \underline{U}_1(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$. \square

Remark 3.1. *By Remark 2.5 and the arguments of Lemma 3.1, if $\bar{U}_i(x, t)$ and $\underline{U}_i(x, t)$ are not continuous in x , the conclusion $\bar{U}_i(x, t) \geq \underline{U}_i(x, t)$ in Lemma 3.1 still holds.*

Now we give a proof of Theorem 2.1 (2).

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (2). We only consider the case $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with similarly.

First, let $0 \leq \underline{U}_1 \leq \bar{U}_1 \leq M_0$ and choose \bar{M} large enough such that

$$\min_{0 \leq \eta \leq M_0} (a_{1L} - 2b_{1M}\eta + \bar{M}) \geq 0,$$

then for any $\eta \in [0, M_0]$ and $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, we have $a_1(x, t) - 2b_1(x, t)\eta + \bar{M} \geq 0$.

Next, we construct two sequences $\{\bar{U}_1^k\}$ and $\{\underline{U}_1^k\}$ with $\bar{U}_1^0 = \bar{U}_1$ and $\underline{U}_1^0 = \underline{U}_1$ such that for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} \bar{U}_{1t}^k - \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{U}_1^k] = \bar{U}_1^{k-1}[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^{k-1}] - c_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^k G_1 * \underline{U}_1^{k-1} - \bar{M}(\bar{U}_1^k - \bar{U}_1^{k-1}), \\ \underline{U}_{1t}^k - \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{U}_1^k] = \underline{U}_1^{k-1}[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1^{k-1}] - c_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1^k G_1 * \bar{U}_1^{k-1} - \bar{M}(\underline{U}_1^k - \underline{U}_1^{k-1}), \\ \bar{U}_1^k(x, 0) = u_0(x), \\ \underline{U}_1^k(x, 0) = u_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

Using the general semigroup theory, we know that for any given $(\bar{U}_1^{k-1}, \underline{U}_1^{k-1})$ with $\bar{U}_1^{k-1}(x, t), \underline{U}_1^{k-1}(x, t)$ being continuous in t and $\bar{U}_1^{k-1}(\cdot, t), \underline{U}_1^{k-1}(\cdot, t) \in \hat{X}_1$ for $t \geq 0$, equation (3.3) has exactly one solution $(\bar{U}_1^k, \underline{U}_1^k)$, which implies for each $k \geq 1$, the sequences $\{\bar{U}_1^k\}$ and $\{\underline{U}_1^k\}$ are well-defined, and $\bar{U}_1^k(x, t), \underline{U}_1^k(x, t)$ are continuous in t and $\bar{U}_1^k(\cdot, t), \underline{U}_1^k(\cdot, t) \in \hat{X}_1$ for $t \geq 0$.

Second, we claim that $\{\bar{U}_1^k\}$ and $\{\underline{U}_1^k\}$ have the following ordered relationship for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\underline{U}_1(x, t) \leq \underline{U}_1^k(x, t) \leq \underline{U}_1^{k+1}(x, t) \leq \dots \leq \bar{U}_1^{k+1}(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1^k(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1(x, t). \quad (3.4)$$

In fact, let $\bar{\omega}_1 = \underline{U}_1(x, t) - \underline{U}_1^1(x, t)$, then $\bar{\omega}_1$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \bar{\omega}_{1t} \leq \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{\omega}_1] - [c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1 + \bar{M}]\bar{\omega}_1, \\ \bar{\omega}_1(x, 0) = \underline{U}_1(x, 0) - \underline{U}_1^1(x, 0) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

By Proposition 2.1, we have $\bar{\omega}_1 \leq 0$, namely, $\underline{U}_1(x, t) \leq \underline{U}_1^1(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$. Similarly, we also have $\bar{U}_1^1(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1(x, t)$. Let $\hat{\omega}_1 = \underline{U}_1^1(x, t) - \bar{U}_1^1(x, t)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\omega}_{1t} &= \mathcal{L}_1[\hat{\omega}_1] + \underline{U}_1[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1] - \bar{U}_1[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1] \\ &\quad + \bar{M}(\underline{U}_1 - \bar{U}_1) - c_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^1 G_1 * (\bar{U}_1 - \underline{U}_1) - [c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1 + \bar{M}]\hat{\omega}_1 \\ &= \mathcal{L}_1[\hat{\omega}_1] + (\bar{M} + a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\eta_1)(\underline{U}_1 - \bar{U}_1) \\ &\quad + \bar{M}(\underline{U}_1 - \bar{U}_1) - c_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^1 G_1 * (\bar{U}_1 - \underline{U}_1) - [c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1 + \bar{M}]\hat{\omega}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_1 = \underline{U}_1 + \bar{U}_1$. It follows from $\bar{M} + a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\eta_1 \geq 0$ and $\underline{U}_1 \leq \bar{U}_1$ that

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\omega}_{1t} \leq \mathcal{L}_1[\hat{\omega}_1] - [c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1 + \bar{M}]\hat{\omega}_1 \\ \hat{\omega}_1(x, 0) = \underline{U}_1^1(x, 0) - \bar{U}_1^1(x, 0) = 0 \leq 0, \end{cases}$$

which together with the comparison principle (see Proposition 2.1) implies that $\underline{U}_1^1 \leq \bar{U}_1^1$. Hence we get that

$$\underline{U}_1(x, t) \leq \underline{U}_1^1(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1^1(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1(x, t).$$

Moreover, by the choice of \bar{M} and using the facts that $\underline{U}_1(x, t) \leq \underline{U}_1^1(x, t)$ and $\bar{U}_1^1(x, t) \leq \bar{U}_1(x, t)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{U}_{1t}^1 - \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{U}_1^1] \\ &= \underline{U}_1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1) - c_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1^1 G_1 * \bar{U}_1 - \bar{M}(\underline{U}_1^1 - \underline{U}_1) \\ &\leq \underline{U}_1^1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1^1 - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1^1) + (\bar{M} + a_1(x, t) - 2b_1(x, t)\eta_2)(\underline{U}_1 - \underline{U}_1^1) \\ &\leq \underline{U}_1^1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}_1^1 - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}_1^1), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{U}_{1t}^1 - \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{U}_1^1] \\ &= \bar{U}_1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1) - c_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^1 G_1 * \underline{U}_1 - \bar{M}(\bar{U}_1^1 - \bar{U}_1) \\ &\geq \bar{U}_1^1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^1 - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{U}_1^1) + (\bar{M} + a_1(x, t) - 2b_1(x, t)\eta_3)(\bar{U}_1 - \bar{U}_1^1) \\ &\geq \bar{U}_1^1(a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}_1^1 - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{U}_1^1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\underline{U}_1 \leq \eta_2 \leq \underline{U}_1^1$ and $\bar{U}_1^1 \leq \eta_3 \leq \bar{U}_1$, which means that \bar{U}_1^1 and \underline{U}_1^1 are also a pair of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) . By the above procedure, for any $k = 2, 3, \dots$, we have

$$\underline{U}_1^k \leq \underline{U}_1^{k+1} \leq \bar{U}_1^{k+1} \leq \bar{U}_1^k.$$

So by induction, we obtain the ordered relationship (3.4).

Now, by the monotonicity of $\{\bar{U}_1^k\}$ and $\{\underline{U}_1^k\}$, we have two functions \bar{u}_1 and \underline{u}_1 such that $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ is upper semi-continuous and $\underline{u}_1(x, t)$ is lower semi-continuous, $\bar{U}_1^k \rightarrow \bar{u}_1$ and $\underline{U}_1^k \rightarrow \underline{u}_1$ pointwise in $\mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, and $\bar{u}_1 \geq \underline{u}_1$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_1^k(x, t) &= u_0(x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_1(\bar{U}_1^k)(x, s) ds + \int_0^t \bar{U}_1^k [a_1(x, s) - b_1(x, s)\bar{U}_1^k - c_1(x, s)G * \underline{U}_1^k] ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t M[\bar{U}_1^k(x, s) - \bar{U}_1^{k-1}(x, s)] ds, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{U}_1^k(x, t) &= u_0(x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_1(\underline{U}_1^k)(x, s) ds + \int_0^t \underline{U}_1^k [a_1(x, s) - b_1(x, s)\underline{U}_1^k - c_1(x, s)G * \bar{U}_1^k] ds \\ &\quad - \int_0^t M[\underline{U}_1^k(x, s) - \underline{U}_1^{k-1}(x, s)] ds, \end{aligned}$$

then by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_1(x, t) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_1(\bar{u}_1)(x, s) ds + \int_0^t \bar{u}_1 [a_1(x, s) - b_1(x, s)\bar{u}_1 - c_1(x, s)G * \underline{u}_1] ds, \\ \underline{u}_1(x, t) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}_1(\underline{u}_1)(x, s) ds + \int_0^t \underline{u}_1 [a_1(x, s) - b_1(x, s)\underline{u}_1 - c_1(x, s)G * \bar{u}_1] ds. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

which implies that $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ and $\underline{u}_1(x, t)$ are continuous in t .

Note that there is $K > 0$ such that

$$|\partial_t \bar{U}_1^k(x, t)| \leq K, \quad |\partial_t \underline{U}_1^k(x, t)| \leq K \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \quad t \geq 0, \quad k \geq 1. \quad (3.6)$$

Hence $\bar{U}_1^k(x, t)$ and $\underline{U}_1^k(x, t)$ are continuous in $t \geq 0$ uniformly with respect to $k \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. This implies that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \bar{U}_1^k(y, t) dy$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \underline{U}_1^k(y, t) dy$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y-x) \bar{U}_1^k(y, t) dy$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y-x) \underline{U}_1^k(y, t) dy$ are continuous in $t \geq 0$ uniformly with respect to $k \geq 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. It then follows that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \bar{u}_1(y, t) dy$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \underline{u}_1(y, t) dy$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y-x) \bar{u}_1(y, t) dy$, and $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} G(y-x) \underline{u}_1(y, t) dy$ are continuous in t . This together with (3.5) implies that $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ and $\underline{u}_1(x, t)$ are differentiable in t for $t \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_{1t} - \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{u}_1] = \bar{u}_1[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{u}_1 - c_1(x, t)G * \underline{u}_1], & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \\ \underline{u}_{1t} - \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{u}_1] = \underline{u}_1[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{u}_1 - c_1(x, t)G * \bar{u}_1], & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \\ \bar{u}_1(x, 0) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N \\ \underline{u}_2(x, 0) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \end{cases}$$

By Remark 3.1, we have $\bar{u}_1 \leq \underline{u}_1$ and then $u(x, t) = \bar{u}_1(x, t) = \underline{u}_1(x, t)$ is both upper and lower semi-continuous and hence is continuous. So $\bar{u}_1 = \underline{u}_1 = u_1(x, t; u_0)$ is a solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) . The proof is completed. \square

Remark 3.2. (1) For $i = 1$, if we can find a small $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and a large $\bar{M}_1 > 0$ such that for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{M}_1 - c_1(x, t)\epsilon_1 \leq 0, \\ a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\epsilon_1 - c_1(x, t)\bar{M}_1 \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

then ϵ_1 and \bar{M}_1 are a pair of sub- and sup- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_1) . Hence,

$$Q_{\epsilon_1}^{\bar{M}_1} := [\epsilon_1, \bar{M}_1] = \{u \in \hat{X}_1 : \epsilon_1 \leq u(x) \leq \bar{M}_1\}$$

is an invariant region of (\mathbf{P}_1) .

(2) For $i = 2$, if we can find a small $\epsilon_2 > 0$ and a large $\bar{M}_2 > 0$ such that for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} \int_{\Omega} J(y-x) dy - 1 + a_2(x, t) - b_2(x, t)\bar{M}_2 - c_2(x, t)\epsilon_2 \int_{\Omega} G(y-x) dy \leq 0, \\ \int_{\Omega} J(y-x) dy - 1 + a_2(x, t) - b_2(x, t)\epsilon_2 - c_2(x, t)\bar{M}_2 \int_{\Omega} G(y-x) dy \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

then ϵ_2 and \bar{M}_2 are a pair of sub- and sup- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_2) . Hence,

$$Q_{\epsilon_2}^{\bar{M}_2} := [\epsilon_2, \bar{M}_2] = \{u \in \hat{X}_2 : \epsilon_2 \leq u(x) \leq \bar{M}_2\}$$

is an invariant region of (\mathbf{P}_2) .

(3) For $i = 3$, if we can find a small $\epsilon_3 > 0$ and a large $\bar{M}_3 > 0$ such that for $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, \infty)$,

$$\begin{cases} a_3(x, t) - b_3(x, t)\bar{M}_3 - c_3(x, t)\epsilon_3 \int_{\Omega} G(y-x) dy \leq 0, \\ a_3(x, t) - b_3(x, t)\epsilon_3 - c_3(x, t)\bar{M}_3 \int_{\Omega} G(y-x) dy \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

then ϵ_3 and \bar{M}_3 are a pair of sub- and sup- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_3) . Hence

$$Q_{\epsilon_3}^{\bar{M}_3} := [\epsilon_3, \bar{M}_3] = \{u \in \hat{X}_3 : \epsilon_3 \leq u(x) \leq \bar{M}_3\}$$

is an invariant region of (\mathbf{P}_3) .

4 Persistence

The aim of this section is to investigate the uniform persistence of (\mathbf{P}_i) and to give the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We only consider the case $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with similarly. We shall prove this theorem in four steps.

Step 1. Let $\underline{u}_0 = 0$ and $\bar{u}^0 = u_1^*(x, t)$. In this step, we will prove that the system

$$\begin{cases} \underline{u}_{kt} = \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{u}_k] + \underline{u}_k[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{u}_k - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^{k-1}], \\ \bar{u}_t^k = \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{u}^k] + \bar{u}^k[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{u}^k - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_k] \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$, has exactly one positive periodic solution $\{(\underline{u}_k, \bar{u}^k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$, and that

$$0 < \underline{u}_1 \leq \underline{u}_2 \leq \dots \leq \underline{u}_k \leq \dots \leq \bar{u}^k \leq \dots \leq \bar{u}^2 \leq \bar{u}^1 \leq \bar{u}^0. \quad (4.2)$$

First, since $a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_1^*(x, t) > 0$ and $\bar{u}^0 = u_1^*(x, t)$, then it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}_1^* - b_1(x, t)u]$$

has exactly one positive periodic solution and we denote it by \underline{u}_1 . It follows from the comparison principle that $\underline{u}_1 \leq \bar{u}_1^*$ and

$$a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_1 \geq a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}_1^* > 0.$$

Thus

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_1 - b_1(x, t)u]$$

has exactly one positive periodic solution and we denote it by \bar{u}^1 . Meanwhile, by comparison principle we also have $\bar{u}^1 \geq \underline{u}_1$. Thus

$$\underline{u}_0 < \underline{u}_1 \leq \bar{u}^1 \leq \bar{u}^0.$$

Next, suppose that for any $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$, \underline{u}_k is a unique positive periodic solution of

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^{k-1}(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u],$$

and \bar{u}^k is a unique positive periodic solution of

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_k(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u],$$

and that

$$\underline{u}_0 < \underline{u}_1 \leq \dots \leq \underline{u}_m \leq \bar{u}^m \leq \dots \leq \bar{u}^1 \leq \bar{u}^0. \quad (4.3)$$

Note that

$$a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^m \geq a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}_1^* > 0.$$

This implies that equation

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^m(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u]$$

has exactly one positive periodic solution, which are denoted by \underline{u}_{m+1} . By the comparison principle, we obtain $\underline{u}_{m+1} \leq u_1^*$ and

$$a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_{m+1} \geq a_1(t, x) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}_1^* > 0.$$

Then it implies that

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_{m+1}(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u]$$

has exactly one positive periodic solution, which is denoted by \bar{u}^{m+1} . Using comparison principle and the fact that $\underline{u}_m \leq \bar{u}^m$, we have $\underline{u}_{m+1} \leq \bar{u}^{m+1}$. It follows from (4.3) and the first equation of (4.1) that $\underline{u}_m \leq \underline{u}_{m+1}$, which together with the second equation of (4.1) implies $\bar{u}^{m+1} \leq \bar{u}^m$. Hence by induction, we can obtain two function sequences $\{\underline{u}_n\}$ and $\{\bar{u}^n\}$ satisfying (4.2).

Step 2. In this step, we will prove that for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_1$ satisfying $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$, any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and any $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{H}_1$ with

$$\bar{H}_1 = \min_{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, T]} \underline{u}_1(x, t), \quad (4.4)$$

there exists an increasing sequence $\{t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ with $t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^0 = 0$ such that

$$\underline{u}_n - \varepsilon \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^{n-1} + \varepsilon, \quad (4.5)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^n$.

To this end, we first claim that there exists t_{ε, u_0}^1 such that

$$\underline{u}_1 - \varepsilon \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^0 + \varepsilon \quad (4.6)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^1$. Note that

$$u_t \leq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u], \quad (4.7)$$

then by [36, Theorem E], we can find $\hat{t}_{\varepsilon, u_0}^1 > 0$ such that

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^0 + \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \geq \hat{t}_{\varepsilon, u_0}^1. \quad (4.8)$$

Choose $0 < \bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ such that $a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$, then from Lemma 2.1, we know that the equation

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}]$$

admits exactly one positive periodic solution, which is denoted by $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^0)$. From (4.8), we know that for $t \geq \hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1$, $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies that

$$u_t \geq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}].$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.1, there exists $t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1 \geq \hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1$ such that

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \geq \hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^0) - \bar{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1.$$

Since $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^0) \rightarrow \underline{u}_1$ as $\bar{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^0) \leq \underline{u}_1$, we can find a small enough $\bar{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^0) - \bar{\varepsilon} \geq \underline{u}_1 - \varepsilon,$$

and hence for this $\bar{\varepsilon}$,

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \geq \underline{u}_1 - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1. \quad (4.9)$$

Let $t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1 = \max\{\hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1, t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1\} (> 0)$, then (4.6) holds for $t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^1$.

Next, assume that for any $0 < \varepsilon < \bar{H}_1$ there exist $t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^k \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^{k-1} \geq \dots \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^2 \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^1$ with $k \geq 2$ such that

$$\underline{u}_k - \varepsilon \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^{k-1} + \varepsilon \quad (4.10)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^k$. We shall prove that there exists $t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^{k+1} \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^k$ such that

$$\underline{u}_{k+1} - \varepsilon \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^k + \varepsilon \quad (4.11)$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^{k+1}$. Choose $0 < \bar{\varepsilon} < \varepsilon$ such that

$$a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$$

and hence that

$$a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^k - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon} \geq a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon} > 0.$$

Then by Lemma 2.1, each of the following two equations

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_k + c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}]$$

and

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^k - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}]$$

admits exactly one positive periodic solution, which are denoted by $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \underline{u}_k)$ and $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^k)$, respectively. It follows from (4.10) that for $t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^k$, $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies

$$u_t \leq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_k + c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}]. \quad (4.12)$$

Thus, there exists $t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \underline{u}_k}^k \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0}^k$ such that

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \underline{u}_k) + \bar{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \underline{u}_k}^k.$$

Since $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \underline{u}_k) \rightarrow \bar{u}^k$ as $\bar{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \underline{u}_k) \geq \bar{u}^k$, we can find a small enough $\bar{\varepsilon}$ such that $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \underline{u}_k) + \bar{\varepsilon} \leq \bar{u}^k + \varepsilon$, which means

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^k + \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \underline{u}_k}^k. \quad (4.13)$$

It follows from (4.13) that there exists $t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \underline{u}_k}^k$ such that for $t \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k$, $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies

$$u_t \geq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^k - c_1(x, t)\bar{\varepsilon}]. \quad (4.14)$$

Thus from (4.14) and by Lemma 2.1, we can find $\hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k \geq t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k$ such that

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \geq \hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^k) - \bar{\varepsilon} \quad \text{for all } t \geq \hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k.$$

Since $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^k) \rightarrow \underline{u}_{k+1}$ as $\bar{\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ and $\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^k) \leq \underline{u}_{k+1}$, there exists a small enough $\bar{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$\hat{u}(x, t, \bar{\varepsilon}, \bar{u}^k) - \bar{\varepsilon} \geq \underline{u}_{k+1} - \varepsilon,$$

which means

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \geq \underline{u}_{k+1} - \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } t \geq \hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k. \quad (4.15)$$

Let $t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^{k+1} = \max\{t_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \underline{u}_k}^k, \hat{t}_{\bar{\varepsilon}, u_0, \bar{u}^k}^k\} (\geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^k)$, then (4.11) holds for $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^{k+1}$. Therefore by induction, (4.5) holds for any $n \geq 1$.

Step 3. In this step, we prove that for any given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \geq 1$, $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i$ with $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$, if

$$\underline{u}_n \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}^{n-1}, \quad (4.16)$$

then

$$\underline{u}_n \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^{n-1} \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0 \quad (4.17)$$

To this end, we first prove

$$\underline{u}_1 \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^0 \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (4.18)$$

It follows from (4.7) and $u_0 \leq \bar{u}^{n-1} \leq \bar{u}^0$ that

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^0, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Then $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies

$$u_t \geq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^0 - b_1(x, t)u].$$

for $t \geq 0$. By comparison principle and $\underline{u}_1 \leq \underline{u}_n \leq u_0$, we have $\underline{u}_1 \leq u_1(x, t; u_0)$ for $t \geq 0$, which together with (4.19) implies (4.18).

Next, suppose that $\underline{u}_k \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^{k-1}$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, j$ ($j \leq n-1$). We shall prove that

$$\underline{u}_{j+1} \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^j. \quad (4.20)$$

Since $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies

$$u_t \leq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{u}_j(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u]$$

for $t \geq 0$, and $u_0 \leq \bar{u}^{n-1} \leq \bar{u}^j$, we obtain

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^j \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.21)$$

Meanwhile, we have $\underline{u}_{j+1} \leq \underline{u}_n \leq u_0$ and $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ satisfies

$$u_t \geq \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{u}^j(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u],$$

for $t \geq 0$, which implies

$$u_1(x, t; u_0) \geq \underline{u}_{j+1}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (4.22)$$

Thus (4.21) and (4.22) imply (4.20). By induction, we get (4.17).

Step 4. From Step 1, we know that $\{\underline{u}_n\}$ is a non-decreasing bounded function sequence and $\{\bar{u}^n\}$ is a non-increasing bounded function sequence. Thus $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{u}_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}^n$ exist. Let

$$\underline{U}^1(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \underline{u}_n(x, t), \quad \bar{U}^1(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}^n(x, t), \quad (4.23)$$

then \underline{U}^1 and \bar{U}^1 are bounded positive periodic functions. In this step, we shall prove that \underline{U}^1 and \bar{U}^1 satisfy the properties stated in Theorem 2.2.

First, it follows from (4.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}^n(x, t) &= \bar{u}^n(x, 0) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)(y, s) dy + \bar{u}^n(x, s) (-1 + a_1(x, s) \\ &\quad - b_1(x, s) \bar{u}^n(x, s) - c_1(x, s) G_1 * \underline{u}_n(x, s)) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.24) and using the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}^1(x, t) &= \bar{U}^1(x, 0) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)(y, s) dy + \bar{U}^1(x, s) (-1 + a_1(x, s) \\ &\quad - b_1(x, s) \bar{U}^1(x, s) - c_1(x, s) G_1 * \underline{U}^1(x, s)) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{U}^1(x, t) &= \underline{U}^1(x, 0) + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)(y, s) dy + \underline{U}^1(x, s) (-1 + a_1(x, s) \\ &\quad - b_1(x, s) \underline{U}^1(x, s) - c_1(x, s) G_1 * \bar{U}^1(x, s)) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

Then by the arguments similar to those in the proof of the continuity and differentiability of $\underline{u}_1(x, t)$ and $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ in t in Theorem 2.1 (2), we have that $\bar{U}^1(x, t)$ and $\underline{U}^1(x, t)$ are continuous as well as differentiable in t . Moreover, we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{U}_t^1(x, t) = \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{U}^1](x, t) + \bar{U}^1(x, t)[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}^1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)(G_1 * \underline{U}^1)(x, t)] \\ \underline{U}_t^1(x, t) = \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{U}^1](x, t) + \underline{U}^1(x, t)[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U}^1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)(G_1 * \bar{U}^1)(x, t)] \end{cases} \quad (4.27)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\tilde{a}_1(x, t) = a_1(x, t) - c_1(x, t)(G_1 * \underline{U}^1)(x, t) (> 0)$. Then $\tilde{a}_1(x, t)$ is continuous in $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and \bar{U}^1 is a positive periodic solution of

$$u_t = \mathcal{L}_1[u] + u[\tilde{a}_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u]. \quad (4.28)$$

By [36, Theorem E], (4.28) has exactly one positive periodic solution, which is continuous in x and is asymptotically stable with respect to strictly positive perturbations. We denote it by \bar{U}^* . By [36, Theorem E] and [43, Proposition 3.1], we have $\bar{U}^1 = \bar{U}^*$ and thus \bar{U}^1 is continuous in x . Similarly, \underline{U}^1 is also continuous in x .

Next we prove (2.11). By the continuity and periodicity of $\overline{U}_1(x, t)$ and $\underline{U}_1(x, t)$ in $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the convergence in (4.23) is uniform with respect to $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It then follows from (4.5) and (4.23) that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that

$$0 < \underline{U}^1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \underline{u}_N - \varepsilon \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}_{N-1} + \varepsilon \leq \overline{U}^1 + \varepsilon$$

for all $x \in B_1$ and $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, u_0}^N$ which implies that (2.11) holds.

Now if $\underline{U}^1 \leq u_0 \leq \overline{U}^1$, then it follows from (4.2) that

$$\underline{u}_n \leq \underline{U}^1 \leq u_0 \leq \overline{U}^1 \leq \bar{u}^{n-1}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the conclusion in Step 2, we have

$$\underline{u}_n \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}^{n-1}, \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, t \geq 0.$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\underline{U}^1 \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \overline{U}^1.$$

Theorem 2.2 is thus proved. \square

Remark 4.1. (1) Since for $i = 1, 2, 3$, \underline{U}^i and \overline{U}^i satisfy $\overline{U}^i \geq \underline{U}^i$ and

$$\begin{cases} \underline{U}_t^i = \mathcal{L}_i[\underline{U}^i] + \underline{U}^i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\underline{U}^i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \overline{U}^i], \\ \overline{U}_t^i = \mathcal{L}_i[\overline{U}^i] + \overline{U}^i[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)\overline{U}^i - c_i(x, t)G_i * \underline{U}^i], \end{cases}$$

then \underline{U}^i and \overline{U}^i can be viewed as a pair of sub-solution and sup-solution of (\mathbf{P}_i) . Therefore the last part of Theorem 2.2 also can be obtained by Theorem 2.1(2).

(2) Similar arguments as those in the proof of Theorem 2.2 are first established in the proof of [38, Theorem 1.2].

5 Existence, uniqueness, and stability of positive time periodic solutions

In this section, we study the existence, uniqueness and stability of positive time periodic solutions for (\mathbf{P}_1) - (\mathbf{P}_3) , and prove Theorem 2.3.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 2.3 (1)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.3 (1).

First, we give a definition of sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) , $i = 1, 2, 3$ in a standard way.

Definition 5.1. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, a non-negative bounded continuous function $u(x, t)$ on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ is said to be a sup-solution (or sub-solution) of (\mathbf{P}_i) if $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}$ exists and is continuous on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$, and

$$u_t(x, t) - \mathcal{L}_i[u](x, t) \geq (\leq) u(x, t)[a_i(x, t) - b_i(x, t)u(x, t) - c_i(x, t)(G_i * u)(x, t)]$$

for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$.

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let

$$\check{C}_i := \{C : J(x) \geq c_{iM}CG(x), x \in B_{r_1}\}, \quad C_{i0} = \max \check{C}_i.$$

Under the assumptions (\mathbf{A}_0) and (\mathbf{A}_3) , $C_{i0} < +\infty$, $\check{C}_i \neq \emptyset$, and $C_{i0} > \frac{a_i M}{b_i L}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Assume that assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) holds. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, if u_1 and u_2 are sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$, respectively, and satisfy*

$$u_1(x, 0) \geq u_2(x, 0) \quad x \in \Omega_i,$$

and

$$u_2 \leq C_{i0} \quad \text{or} \quad u_1 \leq C_{i0},$$

then $u_1(x, t) \geq u_2(x, t)$ in $\Omega_i \times (0, \infty)$.

Proof. We only consider the case where $i = 1$ because the other cases can be dealt with similarly. In view of Definition 5.1, there is $M_0 > 0$ such that

$$0 \leq u_i(x, t) \leq M_0 \quad \text{for} \quad (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Let $W = e^{ct}(u_1 - u_2)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W_t &= ce^{ct}(u_1 - u_2) + e^{ct}(u_{1t} - u_{2t}) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)W(y, t)dy + [c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) \\ &\quad - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_1] W - c_1(x, t)u_2G_1 * W. \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_t &= ce^{ct}(u_1 - u_2) + e^{ct}(u_{1t} - u_{2t}) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)W(y, t)dy + [c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) \\ &\quad - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_2] W - c_1(x, t)u_1G_1 * W. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

We can choose c large enough such that for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$,

$$c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_1 \geq a_{1L} > 0.$$

and

$$c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_2 \geq a_{1L} > 0.$$

Then it follows from the first part of Lemma 2.2 (1) and assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) that $u_2(x, t) \leq u_1(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times (0, \infty)$. □

Corollary 5.1. *Assume that assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) holds. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $u_1 \leq C_{i0}$ and $u_2 \leq C_{i0}$ be sup- and sub- solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$, respectively, and $u_1(\cdot, t), u_2(\cdot, t) \in \hat{X}_i$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then for any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i$ satisfying*

$$u_1(x, 0) \geq u_0(x) \geq u_2(x, 0),$$

equation (\mathbf{P}_i) admits a solution $u_i(x, t; u_0)$ on $\Omega_i \times [0, \infty)$ which satisfies

$$u_2(x, t) \leq u_i(x, t; u_0) \leq u_1(x, t) \quad \text{for} \quad (x, t) \in \Omega_i \times [0, \infty).$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 5.1 directly. \square

Furthermore, we have the following comparison principle for (\mathbf{P}_i) .

Corollary 5.2. *Assume that assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) holds. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, let $u_1(x, t)$ and $u_2(x, t)$ be solutions of (\mathbf{P}_i) with initial value $u_{10} \in \hat{X}_i$ and $u_{20} \in \hat{X}_i$, respectively. If the initial values u_{20}, u_{10} satisfy*

$$u_{20} \neq u_{10}, \quad 0 \leq u_{20} \leq u_{10}$$

and

$$u_{10} \leq \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}} \quad \text{or} \quad u_{20} \leq \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}.$$

then $u_2(x, t) < u_1(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times (0, \infty)$.

Proof. Note that $u(x, t) \equiv \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}$ is a super-solution of (\mathbf{P}_i) and $u \equiv 0$ is a sub-solution of (\mathbf{P}_i) , and that $\frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}} < C_{i0}$. Then by Corollary 5.1, we have

$$0 \leq u_2(x, t) \leq \frac{a_{iM}}{b_{iL}}.$$

By Lemma 5.1, we have

$$u_2(x, t) \leq u_1(x, t).$$

Let $W_1 = e^{ct}(u_1 - u_2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1t} = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)W_1(y, t)dy + [c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) \\ & - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_1] W_1 - c_1(x, t)u_2G_1 * W_1. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} W_{1t} = & \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)W_1(y, t)dy + [c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) \\ & - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_2] W_1 - c_1(x, t)u_1G_1 * W_1. \end{aligned}$$

We can choose c large enough such that for any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$,

$$c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_1 \geq a_{1L} > 0.$$

and

$$c + a_1(x, t) - 1 - b_1(x, t)(u_1 + u_2) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u_2 \geq a_{1L} > 0.$$

Then it follows from the second part of Lemma 2.2 (1) and assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) that $u_2(x, t) < u_1(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \Omega_i \times (0, \infty)$ \square

We now prove Theorem 2.3 (1).

Proof of Theorem 2.3 (1). We only consider the case where $i = 1$ because other cases can be dealt with similarly. The proof can be divided into the following four steps.

Step 1. By the assumption (\mathbf{A}_3) and Definition 5.1, we know that $\bar{u} = C_{10}$ and $\underline{u} = \epsilon_0$ are sup-solution and sub-solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) , respectively, where $\epsilon_0 > 0$ is a small enough constant.

Recall that $u_1(x, t; u_0)$ is the solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) with initial value u_0 , For any $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, we denote

$$\bar{u}_n(x, t) = u_1(x, t + nT; \bar{u}), \quad \underline{u}_n(x, t) = u_1(x, t + nT; \underline{u}).$$

By Corollary 5.1, we know that $\{\bar{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a monotone decreasing sequence and $\{\underline{u}_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a monotone increasing sequence with respect to n ; meanwhile, $\bar{u}_n \geq \underline{u}$ and $\underline{u}_n \leq \bar{u}$ for all n . Thus, we can define the following two functions:

$$u^+(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u_1(x, t + nT; \bar{u}), \quad u^-(x, t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_1(x, t + nT; \underline{u}).$$

Then $u^+(x, t) \geq u^-(x, t)$, and $u^+(x, t)$ and $u^-(x, t)$ are periodic in both x and t .

Step 2. In this step, we will claim that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $u^+(x, t)$ and $u^-(x, t)$ are uniformly continuous with respect to t and that for any $t \geq 0$, $u^+(x, t)$ and $u^-(x, t)$ are uniformly continuous with respect to x . In what follows, we only discuss $u^+(x, t)$, and the case for $u^-(x, t)$ can be analyzed similarly.

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_n(x, t) = \bar{u}_n(x, 0) + \int_0^t & [\mathcal{L}_1[\bar{u}_n(x, s)] + \bar{u}_n(x, s) (a_1(x, s) \\ & - b_1(x, s)\bar{u}_n(x, s) - c_1(x, s)G_1 * \bar{u}_n(x, s))] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and by dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u^+(x, t) = u^+(x, 0) + \int_0^t & [\mathcal{L}_1[u^+(x, s)] + u^+(x, s) (a_1(x, s) \\ & - b_1(x, s)u^+(x, s) - c_1(x, s)G_1 * u^+(x, s))] ds. \end{aligned}$$

By the arguments similar to those in the proof of the continuity and differentiability of $\underline{u}_1(x, t)$ and $\bar{u}_1(x, t)$ in t in Theorem 2.1 (2), we have that $u^+(x, t)$ is continuous as well as differentiable in t , and

$$u_t^+ = J * u^+ - u^+ + u^+[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u^+ - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u^+] \quad (5.3)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For each fixed x , set

$$a_x(t) = a_1(x, t), \quad b_x(t) = b_1(x, t), \quad c_x(t) = c_1(x, t), \quad u_x^+(t) = u^+(x, t),$$

and consider the following auxiliary equation

$$u_t = u[a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)u - c_x(t)(G_1 * u^+)(x, t)] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u^+(y, t)dy, \quad (5.4)$$

Obviously, u_x^+ is a positive periodic solution of (5.4). We claim that (5.4) has exactly one positive time periodic solution. Indeed, If not, then (5.4) has two positive time periodic solutions \hat{u}_1 and \hat{u}_2 satisfying $\hat{u}_1(t) > \hat{u}_2(t)$ for $t \in [0, T]$. Let $\hat{u} = \hat{u}_1 - \hat{u}_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_t &= \hat{u}_{1t} - \hat{u}_{2t} \\ &= [a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)\hat{u}_1 - c_x(t)G_1 * u^+]\hat{u}_1 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u^+(y, t)dy \\ &\quad - [a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)\hat{u}_2 - c_x(t)G_1 * u^+]\hat{u}_2 - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u^+(y, t)dy \\ &= \hat{u}[a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)(\hat{u}_1 + \hat{u}_2) - c_x(t)G_1 * u^+] \\ &< \hat{u}[a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)\hat{u}_1 - c_x(t)G_1 * u^+]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{u}(T) &< \hat{u}(0) \exp \left(\int_0^T (a_x(s) - 1 - b_x(s)\hat{u}_1(s) - c_x(s)(G_1 * u^+)(x, s)) ds \right) \\
&= \hat{u}(0) \exp \left(\int_0^T \left(\frac{\hat{u}_{1t} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x)u^+(y, s)dy}{\hat{u}_1} \right) ds \right) \\
&< \hat{u}(0) \exp \left(\int_0^T \frac{\hat{u}_{1t}}{\hat{u}_1} ds \right) = \hat{u}(0),
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have that for any x , u_x^+ is the unique positive periodic solution of (5.4).

Given a sequence $\{x_n\}$ and x satisfying $x_n \rightarrow x$ as n goes to ∞ , we denote $u_n^+(t) = u^+(x_n, t)$. It is easy to see that $u_n^+(t)$ is uniformly bounded and equi-continuous on $[0, T]$. By Arzela Ascoli theorem, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{u_n^+\}$, which converges uniformly to a certain periodic function u^* . Recall that

$$u_{nt}^+ = u_n^+[a_{x_n}(t) - 1 - b_{x_n}(t)u_n^+ - c_{x_n}(t)(G * u^+)(x_n, t)] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x_n)u^+(y, t)dy. \quad (5.5)$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$u_{nt}^+ \rightarrow u^*[a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)u^* - c_x(t)(G * u^+)(x, t)] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u^+(y, t)dy$$

uniformly on $[0, T]$. This implies that u^* is differentiable in t and

$$u_t^* = u^*[a_x(t) - 1 - b_x(t)u^* - c_x(t)(G * u^+)(x, t)] + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u^+(y, t)dy.$$

Thus, we get $u^*(t) = u^+(x, t)$, which implies the continuity of $u^+(x, t)$ in x .

Step 3. Consider the following two equations

$$u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u(y, t)dy - u + up^+(x, t) \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$u_t = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)u(y, t)dy - u + up^-(x, t), \quad (5.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
p^+(x, t) &= a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u^+ - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u^+, \\
p^-(x, t) &= a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)u^- - c_1(x, t)G_1 * u^-.
\end{aligned}$$

If $u^+ \not\equiv u^-$, by Corollary 5.2 and the periodicity of u^+ and u^- , we get $u^+(x, t) > u^-(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$. Thus, $p^+ < p^-$. We can find $c^* > 0$ such that $p^+ \leq p^- - c^*$. Note that for any $c_* > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(c_*u^-e^{-c^*t})_t &= c_*u_t^-e^{-c^*t} - c_*c^*u^-e^{-c^*t} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)(c_*u^-e^{-c^*t})(y, t)dy - c_*u^-e^{-c^*t} + c_*u^-e^{-c^*t}(p^- - c^*) \\
&\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y - x)(c_*u^-e^{-c^*t})(y, t)dy - c_*u^-e^{-c^*t} + c_*u^-e^{-c^*t}p^+.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $c_* u^- e^{-c_* t}$ is a sup-solution of (5.6). Since $\underline{u} \leq u^+ \leq \bar{u}$, we can choose c_* such that $c_* u^-(x, 0) \geq u^+(x, 0)$. Then, by Proposition 2.1, we have $u^+(x, t) \leq c_* e^{-c_* t} u^-(x, t)$ for $(x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times [0, \infty)$, which is a contradiction by the boundedness and periodicity of u^- and u^+ . Therefore, $u^+ \equiv u^- =: u_P$. From the above discussion and Corollary 5.1, for any initial condition u_0 satisfying $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$ and $0 < u_0 \leq \bar{u}$, we have

$$\|u_1(\cdot, t; u_0) - u_P(\cdot, t)\|_{\hat{X}_1} \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.8)$$

For any u_0 satisfying $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$, we know that $u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \hat{u}_1(x, t; u_0)$, where $\hat{u}_1(x, t; u_0)$ is defined in Section 2. On the other hand,

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \frac{a_{1M}}{b_{1L}}.$$

Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough, we can find T_0 such that

$$u_1(x, T_0; u_0) \leq \sup_{x \in D_1} \hat{u}_1(x, T_0; u_0) \leq \frac{a_{1M}}{b_{1L}} + \varepsilon \leq C_{10},$$

which implies that (5.8) also holds. \square

5.2 Proof of Theorem 2.3 (2)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.3 (2).

Proof of Theorem 2.3 (2). We only consider the case $i = 1$ and the other cases can be dealt with similarly. By Theorem 2.2, we can obtain two positive time periodic functions \underline{U} and \bar{U} which satisfy $\underline{U} \leq \bar{U}$ and

$$\begin{cases} \underline{U}_t = \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{U}] + \underline{U}[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\underline{U} - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \bar{U}], \\ \bar{U}_t = \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{U}] + \bar{U}[a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)\bar{U} - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{U}]. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, by Theorem 2.2, if $u_0 \in X_1^+ \setminus \{0\}$, then $\bar{U}, \underline{U} \in X_1^{++}$ and for any small enough $\epsilon > 0$, there is $t_{\epsilon, u_0} > 0$ such that

$$\underline{U}(x, t) - \epsilon \leq u_1(t, x; u_0) \leq \bar{U}(x, t) + \epsilon \quad \forall t \geq t_{\epsilon, u_0}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

It then suffices to prove that $\underline{U}(x, t) \equiv \bar{U}(x, t)$.

To do so, let $W = \bar{U} - \underline{U}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} W_t &= \bar{U}_t - \underline{U}_t \\ &= \mathcal{L}_1[\bar{U}] + a_1(x, t)\bar{U} - b_1(x, t)\bar{U}^2 - c_1(x, t)\bar{U}G_1 * \underline{U} \\ &\quad - \mathcal{L}_1[\underline{U}] - a_1(x, t)\underline{U} + b_1(x, t)\underline{U}^2 + c_1(x, t)\underline{U}G_1 * \bar{U} \\ &= \mathcal{L}_1[W] + h_1(x, t)W + h_2(x, t)G_1 * W, \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(x, t) &= a_1(x, t) - b_1(x, t)(\bar{U} + \underline{U}) - c_1(x, t)G_1 * \underline{U}, \\ h_2(x, t) &= c_1(x, t)\underline{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (5.9) by W and integrating it over the space periodic domain D_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{D_1} W^2 dx &= \int_{D_1} h_1(x, t) W^2 dx - \int_{D_1} W^2 dx \\ &\quad + \int_{D_1} W \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) W(y, t) dy dx + \int_{D_1} h_2(x, t) W G_1 * W dx. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Next we claim that

$$\int_{D_1} \varphi(x) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \varphi(y, t) dy dx - \int_{D_1} \varphi(x)^2 dx \leq 0 \quad (5.11)$$

for all $\varphi \in X_1$. For $z \in \mathbb{R}^N$, let

$$\hat{J}_1(z) = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_N \in \mathbb{N}} J(z + (i_1 p_1, i_2 p_2, \dots, i_N p_N)).$$

Then by the assumption that $J(\cdot)$ is symmetric with respect to 0, $\hat{J}_1(\cdot)$ is also symmetric with respect to 0, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) \varphi(y) dy = \int_{D_1} \hat{J}_1(y-x) \varphi(y) dy.$$

Meanwhile,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(z) dz = \int_{D_1} \hat{J}_1(z) dz = 1.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{D_1} \int_{D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(y) \varphi(x) dy dx - \int_{D_1} \varphi^2(x) dx \\ &= \int_{D_1} \int_{D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(y) \varphi(x) dy dx - \int_{D_1} \int_{D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi^2(x) dy dx \\ &= \int_{D_1} \int_{D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(x) (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)) dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{D_1 \times D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(x) (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)) dy dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{D_1 \times D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(x) (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)) dy dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{D_1 \times D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(x) (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x)) dy dx + \frac{1}{2} \int \int_{D_1 \times D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) \varphi(y) (\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)) dy dx \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int \int_{D_1 \times D_1} \hat{J}(y-x) (\varphi(y) - \varphi(x))^2 dy dx \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

in which we have used the symmetric properties of $\hat{J}(\cdot)$. Then (5.11) holds and hence

$$-\int_{D_1} W^2(\cdot, t) dx + \int_{D_1} W(\cdot, t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} J(y-x) W(y, \cdot) dy dx \leq 0$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Similarly, we have

$$\int_{D_1} W(\cdot, t) G_1 * W(\cdot, t) dx \leq \int_{D_1} W^2(\cdot, t) dx.$$

This, together with (5.10), implies that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{D_1} W^2 dx \leq \int_{D_1} (h_1(x, t) + h_2(x, t)) W^2 dx.$$

Now, by (\mathbf{A}_4) ,

$$\sup_{x \in D_1, t \in \mathbb{R}} h_1(x, t) + h_2(x, t) < 0.$$

Hence there is $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{D_1} W^2 dx \leq -\alpha \int_{D_1} W^2 dx.$$

This implies that

$$\int_{D_1} W^2 dx \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Note that W is a time period continuous function, then $\underline{U} \equiv \overline{U} := U^*$, which is a positive time periodic solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) . \square

5.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3 (3)

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 2.3 (3).

Proof of Theorem 2.3 (3). In this case, according to [25], we know that the equation

$$u_t = u[a_1(t) - (b_1(t) + c_1(t))u]$$

has exactly one positive T -period solution $\phi^*(t)$ and for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $K > 0$, there exists $t_{\varepsilon, K}$ such that for $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, K}$,

$$\hat{u}(t; K) - \varepsilon \leq \phi^*(t) \leq \hat{u}(t; K) + \varepsilon,$$

where $\hat{u}(t; K)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u[a_1(t) - (b_1(t) + c_1(t))u], \\ u(0) = K > 0. \end{cases}$$

Obviously, $\phi^*(t)$ is also a positive time period solution of (\mathbf{P}_1) . For any $u_0 \in \hat{X}_i$ with $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x) > 0$, denote $\bar{u}(0) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x)$ and $\underline{v}(0) = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^N} u_0(x)$ and let $(\bar{u}(t), \underline{v}(t)) = (\bar{u}(t; \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)), \underline{v}(t; \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)))$ be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t = u[a_1(t) - b_1(t)u - c_1(t)v], \\ v_t = v[a_1(t) - b_1(t)v - c_1(t)u]. \end{cases}$$

with initial condition

$$(\bar{u}(0; \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)), \underline{v}(0; \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0))) = (\bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)),$$

then by Lemma 3.1, we have $\bar{u}(t) \geq \underline{v}(t)$ and

$$\underline{v}(t) \leq u_1(x, t; u_0) \leq \bar{u}(t). \quad (5.12)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_t = \bar{u}[a_1(t) - b_1(t)\bar{u} - c_1(t)\underline{v}] \geq \bar{u}[a_1(t) - b_1(t)\bar{u} - c_1(t)\bar{u}], \\ \underline{v}_t = \underline{v}[a_1(t) - b_1(t)\underline{v} - c_1(t)\bar{u}] \leq \underline{v}[a_1(t) - b_1(t)\underline{v} - c_1(t)\underline{v}], \end{cases}$$

which means $\bar{u}(t) \geq \hat{u}(t; \bar{u}(0))$ and $\underline{v}(t) \leq \hat{v}(t; \underline{v}(0))$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\bar{u}(0) > 0$ and $\underline{v}(0) > 0$, there exists $t_{\varepsilon, \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)} = \max\{t_{\varepsilon, \bar{u}(0)}, t_{\varepsilon, \underline{v}(0)}\}$ such that for $t \geq t_{\varepsilon, \bar{u}(0), \underline{v}(0)}$,

$$\underline{v}(t) - \varepsilon \leq \hat{u}(t; \underline{v}(0)) - \varepsilon \leq \phi^*(t) \leq \hat{u}(t; \bar{u}(0)) + \varepsilon \leq \bar{u}(t) + \varepsilon. \quad (5.13)$$

Now we claim that $0 \leq \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} \rightarrow 0$ as t goes to ∞ . Note that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} = \frac{\bar{u}'(t)}{\bar{u}(t)} - \frac{\underline{v}'(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} = -(b_1(t) - c_1(t))(\bar{u} - \underline{v}) \leq - \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{b_1(t) - c_1(t)\}(\bar{u} - \underline{v}),$$

and $b_{1L} > c_{1M}$, we know that $\inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{b_1(t) - c_1(t)\} \geq b_{1L} - c_{1M} > 0$. Note that $-(a - b) \leq -b \ln \frac{a}{b}$ for $a > b > 0$, then we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} \leq - \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{b_1(t) - c_1(t)\} \underline{v}(t) \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)}.$$

Then $\frac{d}{dt} \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} \leq -K_0 \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)}$, where

$$K_0 = \inf_{t \in [0, T]} \{b_1(t) - c_1(t)\} \inf_{t \geq 0} \underline{v}(t) > 0.$$

Thus,

$$0 \leq \ln \frac{\bar{u}(t)}{\underline{v}(t)} \leq \ln \frac{\bar{u}(0)}{\underline{v}(0)} \exp(-K_0 t) \rightarrow 0, \quad t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (5.14)$$

It follows from (5.12)-(5.14) that (2.13) holds. \square

Acknowledgments

Jianping Gao would like to thank the China Scholarship Council of China (201706130064) for financial support during the period of his overseas study and to express his gratitude to the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Auburn University for its kind hospitality. Shangjiang Guo is partially supported by NSF of China (11671123).

References

- [1] M. Alfaro and J. Coville, Rapid traveling waves in the nonlocal fisher equation connect two unstable states, *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 25(12):2095–2099, 2012.
- [2] F. Andreu-Vaillo, M. Mazón, J. D. Rossi, and J. Toledo-Melero, *Nonlocal diffusion problems*, Number 165. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [3] N. Apreutesei, N. Bessonov, V. Volpert, and V. Vougalter, Spatial structures and generalized travelling waves for an integro-differential equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 13(3):537–557, 2010.

- [4] N. Apreutesei, A. Ducrot, and V. Volpert, Travelling waves for integro-differential equations in population dynamics, *Discrete Cont. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 11:541–561, 2009.
- [5] H. Berestycki, G. Nadin, B. Perthame, and L. Ryzhik, The non-local fisher–kpp equation: travelling waves and steady states, *Nonlinearity*, 22(12):2813, 2009.
- [6] H. Berestycki, J. Coville, and H. H. Vo, Persistence criteria for populations with non-local dispersion, *Journal of mathematical biology*, 72(7):1693–1745, 2016.
- [7] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel, and L. Roques, Analysis of the periodically fragmented environment model: I–species persistence, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 51(1):75–113, 2005.
- [8] H. Berestycki, F. Hamel, and L. Roques, Analysis of the periodically fragmented environment model: Iibiological invasions and pulsating travelling fronts, *Journal de Mathématiques pures et appliquées*, 84(8):1101–1146, 2005.
- [9] S. Bian, L. Chen, and A. Latos, Global existence and asymptotic behavior of solutions to a nonlocal fisher–kpp type problem, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 149:165–176, 2017.
- [10] J. Billingham, Dynamics of a strongly nonlocal reaction–diffusion population model, *Nonlinearity*, 17(1):313, 2003.
- [11] F. Corrêa, M. Delgado, and A. Suárez, Some nonlinear heterogeneous problems with non-local reaction term, *Advances in Differential Equations*, 16(7/8):623–641, 2011.
- [12] J. Coville, J. Dávila, and S. Martínez, Existence and uniqueness of solutions to a non-local equation with monostable nonlinearity, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 39(5):1693–1709, 2008.
- [13] J. Coville and L. Dupaigne, Propagation speed of travelling fronts in non local reaction–diffusion equations, *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, 60(5):797–819, 2005.
- [14] M. Delgado, G. M. Figueiredo, M. T. Pimenta, and A. Suárez, Study of a logistic equation with local and non-local reaction terms, *Topological Methods in Nonlinear Analysis*, 47(2):693–713, 2016.
- [15] K. Deng, On a nonlocal reaction-diffusion population model, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Series B*, 9(1):65, 2008.
- [16] K. Deng and Y. X. Wu, Global stability for a nonlocal reaction–diffusion population model, *Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications*, 25:127–136, 2015.
- [17] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, and P. Tkachov, Traveling waves and long-time behavior in a doubly nonlocal fisher-kpp equation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.02215*, 2015.
- [18] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, S. Molchanov, and P. Tkachov, Global stability in a non-local reaction-diffusion equation, *Stochastics and Dynamics*, page 1850037, 2017.
- [19] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, and P. Tkachov, Doubly nonlocal fisher-kpp equation: Front propagation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.10262*, 2018.

- [20] D. Finkelshtein, Y. Kondratiev, and P. Tkachov, Doubly nonlocal fisher-kpp equation: Existence and properties of traveling waves, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.10258*, 2018.
- [21] R. A. Fisher, The wave of advance of advantageous genes, *Annals of Human Genetics*, 7(4):355–369, 1937.
- [22] J. Furter and M. Grinfeld, Local vs. non-local interactions in population dynamics, *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 27(1):65–80, 1989.
- [23] S. Genieys, V. Volpert, and P. Auger, Pattern and waves for a model in population dynamics with nonlocal consumption of resources, *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena*, 1(1):63–80, 2006.
- [24] S. Gourley, Travelling front solutions of a nonlocal fisher equation, *Journal of mathematical biology*, 41(3):272–284, 2000.
- [25] J.K. Hale, H. Buttanri, and H. Kocak, *Dynamics and Bifurcations*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer New York, 1996.
- [26] F. Hamel and L. Ryzhik, On the nonlocal fisher–kpp equation: steady states, spreading speed and global bounds, *Nonlinearity*, 27(11):2735, 2014.
- [27] P. Hess, *Periodic-parabolic boundary value problems and positivity*, Longman Scientific & Technical, 1991.
- [28] V. Hutson and M. Grinfeld, Non-local dispersal and bistability, *European Journal of Applied Mathematics*, 17(2):221–232, 2006.
- [29] A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrovskii, and N. Piscunov, A study of the equation of diffusion with increase in the quantity of matter, and its application to a biological problem, *Byul. Moskovskogo Gos. Univ.*, 1(6):1–26, 1937.
- [30] C. Kuehn and P. Tkachov, Pattern formation in the doubly-nonlocal fisher-kpp equation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.02116*, 2018.
- [31] L. Ma, S. Guo, and T. Chen, Dynamics of a nonlocal dispersal model with a nonlocal reaction term, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, 28(03):1850033, 2018.
- [32] G. Nadin, Existence and uniqueness of the solution of a space–time periodic reaction–diffusion equation, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 249(6):1288–1304, 2010.
- [33] G. Nadin, Reaction–diffusion equations in space–time periodic media, *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 345(9):489–493, 2007.
- [34] G. Nadin, Traveling fronts in space-time periodic media, *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées*, 92:232–262, 2009.
- [35] A. Pazy, *Semigroups of Linear Operators and Applications to Partial Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1983.

- [36] N. Rawal and W. Shen, Criteria for the existence and lower bounds of principal eigenvalues of time periodic nonlocal dispersal operators and applications, *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, 24(4):927–954, Dec 2012.
- [37] N. Rawal, W. Shen, and A. Zhang, Spreading speeds and traveling waves of nonlocal monostable equations in time and space periodic habitats, *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems A*, 35:1609, 2015.
- [38] R. Salako and W. Shen, Parabolic-elliptic chemotaxis model with space-time dependent logistic sources on \mathbb{R}^N , I. Persistence and asymptotic spreading, to appear in *Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences* (see also <https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.05785>).
- [39] W. Shen, Stability of transition waves and positive entire solutions of fisher-kpp equations with time and space dependence, *Nonlinearity*, 30(9):3466, 2017.
- [40] W. Shen and X. Xie, Spectral theory for nonlocal dispersal operators with time periodic indefinite weight functions and applications, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.08672*, 2016.
- [41] W. Shen. and A. Zhang, Stationary solutions and spreading speeds of nonlocal monostable equations in space periodic habitats, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 140(5):1681–1696, 2012.
- [42] W. Shen. and A. Zhang, Spreading speeds for monostable equations with nonlocal dispersal in space periodic habitats, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 249(4):747–795, 2010.
- [43] W. Shen and A. Zhang, Traveling wave solutions of spatially periodic nonlocal monostable equations, *Communications on Applied Nonlinear Analysis*, 19(3):73–101, 2012.
- [44] L. Sun, J. Shi, and Y. Wang, Existence and uniqueness of steady state solutions of a nonlocal diffusive logistic equation, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik*, 64(4):1267–1278, 2013.
- [45] J. W. Sun, W. T. Li, and Z. C. Wang, The periodic principal eigenvalues with applications to the nonlocal dispersal logistic equation, *Journal of Differential Equations*, 263(2):934–971, 2017.