

Spatio-temporal dynamics for non-monotone semiflows with limiting systems having spreading speeds

Taishan Yi

School of Mathematics (Zhuhai)
Sun Yat-Sen University
Zhuhai, Guangdong 519082, China

Xiao-Qiang Zhao*

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Memorial University of Newfoundland
St. John's, NL A1C 5S7, Canada

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the study of propagation dynamics for a large class of non-monotone evolution systems. In two directions of the spatial variable, such a system has two limiting systems admitting the spatial translation invariance. Under the assumption that each of these two limiting systems has both leftward and rightward spreading speeds, we establish the spreading properties of solutions and the existence of nontrivial fixed points, steady states, traveling waves for the original systems. We also apply the developed theory to a time-delayed reaction-diffusion equation with a shifting habitat and a class of asymptotically homogeneous reaction-diffusion systems.

Key words: Asymptotic translation invariance, evolution system, fixed point, propagation dynamics, steady state, traveling wave.

AMS Subject Classification. 35B40, 35C07, 35K57, 37C65, 37L15, 92D25.

1 Introduction

We start with the following scalar reaction-diffusion equation:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Delta u + u(1 - u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.1)$$

In 1937, Fisher [20] proved that equation (1.1) has a nonnegative traveling wave $U(x-ct)$ connecting 1 and 0 if and only if $c \geq c_{min} = 2$. In the same year, Kolmogoroff, Petrowsky and Piscounoff [28] obtained the similar result on the minimum wave speed when the reaction term $u(1-u)$ is replaced by a general monostable function $f(u)$, and also proved a convergence result. Aroson and Weinberger [1, 2] further established the existence of the asymptotic speed of spread (in short, spreading speed) in the sense that any nontrivial and nonnegative solution $u(t, x)$ of equation (1.1) with the continuous initial data $u(0, \cdot)$ having compact support admits the following spreading properties:

*The corresponding author. E-mail: zhao@mun.ca

$$(a) \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty, |x| \geq ct} u(t, x) = 0, \quad \forall c > c^* = 2;$$

$$(b) \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty, |x| \leq ct} u(t, x) = 1, \quad \forall c \in (0, c^*).$$

Since these seminal works, there have been extensive investigations on travelling wave solutions and propagation phenomena for various evolution equations, see, e.g., [6, 12, 13, 19, 39, 40, 46, 53] and references therein.

For any $\phi \in BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$, let $u(t, x, \phi)$ be the unique solution of equation (1.1) with $u(0, \cdot, \phi) = \phi$. Then the time- t map Q_t of equation (1.1) is defined as

$$Q_t[\phi] = u(t, \cdot, \phi), \quad \forall t \geq 0, \phi \in BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+).$$

For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the translation operator T_y by

$$T_y[\phi](x) = \phi(x - y), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \phi \in BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+).$$

Note that if $u(t, x)$ is a solution of equation (1.1), then so is $u(t, x - y)$ for any given $y \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, equation (1.1) admits the comparison principle. It then easily follows that each map Q_t has the following properties:

$$(P1) \text{ (Translation invariance)} \quad Q_t \circ T_y = T_y \circ Q_t, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}.$$

$$(P2) \text{ (Monotonicity)} \quad Q_t[\phi] \geq Q_t[\psi] \text{ whenever } \phi \geq \psi.$$

From the viewpoint of dynamical systems, Weinberger [43] established the theory of traveling waves and spreading speeds for monotone discrete-time systems with spatial translation invariance. This theory has been greatly developed for *monotone* discrete and continuous-time semiflows in [17, 18, 33, 34, 35, 36, 44] and some *non-monotone* systems in [48, 52] so that it can be applied to a variety of evolution systems in homogeneous or periodic media. By employing the Harnack inequality up to boundary and the strict positivity of solutions, Berestycki *et al.* [7, 8] investigated the asymptotic spreading speed for KPP equations in periodic or non-periodic spatial domains. A quite different method was used in [47] to study the spreading speed and asymptotic propagation for the Dirichlet problem of monostable reaction-diffusion equations on the half line, see also [50, Section 6.3] for an abstract approach to such a problem with time delay.

Motivated by mathematical modeling of impacts of climate changes and biological invasions (see, e.g., [3, 23, 27, 41]), there have been numerous works on traveling waves and long-term behavior of solutions for evolution equations with a shifting habitat, see, e.g., [4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 37, 42, 45, 54, 55] and references therein. Another class of evolution equations consists of those being small perturbations of homogeneous systems or in locally spatially inhomogeneous media (see [21, 22, 29]). To be more specific, we consider a scalar reaction-diffusion equation with a shifting habitat:

$$u_t = d\Delta u + f(x - ct, u), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0, \quad (1.2)$$

where $d > 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is the shifting speed, and f is C^1 such that $f(z, 0) = 0, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}$. Letting $z = x - ct$ and $v(t, z) = u(t, z + ct)$, we change equation (1.2) into the following spatially inhomogeneous reaction-diffusion-advection equation:

$$v_t = d\Delta v + cv_z + f(z, v), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq 0. \quad (1.3)$$

Let Φ_t be the time- t map of equation (1.3). Since $f(z, v)$ depends on z , it is easy to see that the map Φ_t does not admit the translation invariance (P1).

Assume that $\lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(z, v) = f_{\pm}^{\infty}(v)$ uniformly for v in any bounded subset of \mathbb{R}_+ . Then equation (1.3) has the following two limiting equations:

$$v_t = d\Delta v + cv_z + f_{\pm}^{\infty}(v), \quad z \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.4)$$

Let Φ_t^{\pm} be the time- t map of equation (1.4). Clearly, Φ_t^{\pm} admits the translation invariance (P1). If, in addition, $f(z, v)$ is nondecreasing in $z \in \mathbb{R}$, then we easily see that each Φ_t has the following property:

$$(P3) \quad T_{-y} \circ \Phi_t[\varphi] \geq \Phi_t \circ T_{-y}[\varphi], \quad \forall \varphi \in BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Note that systems (1.3) and (1.4) admit the comparison principle, and hence, their time- t maps Φ_t and Φ_t^{\pm} still satisfy the monotonicity (P2). In applications, however, we often meet non-monotone evolution systems. As a simple example, we consider a scalar reaction-diffusion equation with time delay:

$$u_t = d\Delta u + f(x - ct, u(t - \tau, x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad (1.5)$$

where $\tau > 0$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and f is C^1 such that $f(z, 0) = 0, \forall z \in \mathbb{R}$. It is well known that system (1.5) does not admit the comparison principle unless the function $f(z, u)$ is nondecreasing in $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for each $z \in \mathbb{R}$.

Under an abstract setting, recently we studied the propagation dynamics for a large class of monotone evolution systems without translation invariance in [50]. More precisely, we established the spreading properties and the existence of nontrivial steady states for monotone semiflows with the property (P3) under the assumption that one limiting system has both leftward and rightward spreading speeds (good property G) and the other one has the uniform asymptotic annihilation (bad property B).

The purpose of our current paper is to investigate the propagation dynamics for non-monotone semiflows without the property (P3) in the case where two limiting systems have good property G (i.e., the GG combination). To overcome the difficulty induced by the lack of (P3), we give unilateral estimates of the discrete orbits for a special class of initial data having compact supports in the case where one limiting system admits the upward convergence property (see Propositions 2.1 and 2.2). Another innovation in this project is the establishment of spreading properties for nonlinear maps under the assumption of the global asymptotic stability of a positive fixed point (see Theorem 3.8). We note that the BB combination for two limiting systems has been addressed more recently in [51], and the GB combination for two limiting systems will be investigated in a forthcoming paper.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present notations and preliminary results. In particular, we introduce the (NM) condition for non-monotone maps and show that it is satisfied automatically whenever the map is monotone. And we also establish the links between the system with asymptotic translation invariance and its limiting systems. In Section 3, we prove the existence of fixed points and asymptotic propagation properties for discrete-time semiflows

in both unilateral and bilateral limit cases, respectively. In Section 4, we extend these results to continuous-time semiflows and a class of nonautonomous evolution systems with asymptotic translation invariance, respectively. In Section 5, we apply the developed theory to two prototypical evolution systems in the bilateral limit case: a time-delayed reaction-diffusion equation with a shifting habitat and a class of asymptotically homogeneous reaction-diffusion systems. Here we leave the study of the unilateral limit case to readers who are interested in these illustrative examples. We expect that our developed theory may find more applications in other types of evolution systems having spatio-temporal heterogeneity such as those population models with seasonality or nonlocal dispersal.

2 Preliminaries

Let $X = BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$ be the normed vector space of all bounded and continuous functions from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R}^N with the norm $\|\phi\|_X \triangleq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \sup_{|x| \leq n} \{\|\phi(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}\}$. Let $X_+ = \{\phi \in X : \phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\}$ and $X_+^\circ = \{\phi \in X : \phi(x) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N), \forall x \in \mathbb{R}\}$. For a given compact metric space M , let $Y = C(M, \mathbb{R}^N)$ be the Banach space space of all continuous functions from M into \mathbb{R}^N with the norm $\|\beta\|_Y \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in M} \{\|\beta(\theta)\|_{\mathbb{R}^N}\}$ and $Y_+ = C(M, \mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Clearly, $\text{Int}(Y_+) = \{\beta \in Y : \beta(\theta) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N), \forall \theta \in M\}$.

Let $C = C(M, X)$ be the normed vector space of all continuous functions from M into X with the norm $\|\varphi\|_C \triangleq \sup_{\theta \in M} \{\|\varphi(\theta)\|_X\}$, $C_+ = C(M, X_+)$ and $C_+^\circ = C(M, X_+^\circ)$. It follows that C_+ is a closed cone in the normed vector space C . Note that $C_+^\circ \neq \text{Int}(C_+)$ due to the non-compactness of the spatial domain \mathbb{R} . For the sake of convenience, we identify an element $\varphi \in C$ with a bounded and continuous function from $M \times \mathbb{R}$ into \mathbb{R}^N . Accordingly, we can also regard X and Y as subspaces of C .

For any $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$, we write $\xi \geq_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta$ if $\xi - \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$; $\xi >_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta$ if $\xi \geq_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta$ and $\xi \neq \eta$; $\xi \gg_{\mathbb{R}^N} \eta$ if $\xi - \eta \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Similarly, we use Y_+ and $\text{Int}(Y_+)$ to define $\geq_Y, >_Y$ and \gg_Y for the space Y . For any $\xi, \eta \in X$, we write $\xi \geq_X \eta$ if $\xi - \eta \in X_+$; $\xi >_X \eta$ if $\xi \geq_X \eta$ and $\xi \neq \eta$; $\xi \gg_X \eta$ if $\xi - \eta \in X_+^\circ$. We also employ C_+ and C_+° to define $\geq_C, >_C, \gg_C$ for the space C in a similar way. For simplicity, we write $\geq, >, \gg$, and $\|\cdot\|$, respectively, for $\geq_*, >_*, \gg_*$, and $\|\cdot\|_*$, where $*$ stands for one of \mathbb{R}^N, X, Y and C .

For any given $s, r \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ with $s \geq r$, define $C_r = \{\varphi \in C : 0 \leq \varphi \leq r\}$ and $C_{r,s} = \{\varphi \in C : r \leq \varphi \leq s\}$. For any given $\varphi \in C_+$, define $C_\varphi = \{\psi \in C : 0 \leq \psi \leq \varphi\}$. We also define $[\varphi, \psi]_* = \{\xi \in * : \varphi \leq_* \xi \leq_* \psi\}$ and $[[\varphi, \psi]]_* = \{\xi \in * : \varphi \ll_* \xi \ll_* \psi\}$ for $\varphi, \psi \in *$ with $\varphi \leq_* \psi$, where $*$ stands for one of \mathbb{R}^N, X, Y and C . Let $\check{\mathbf{1}} := (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\check{\mathbf{1}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with $(\check{\mathbf{1}})_{ij} = 1, \forall i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. For any given $y \in \mathbb{R}$, we define the spatial translation operator T_y on C by

$$T_y[\varphi](\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x - y), \quad \forall \varphi \in C, \theta \in M, x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

As a convention of this paper, we say a map $Q : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ is continuous if for any given $r \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $Q|_{C_r} : C_r \rightarrow C_+$ is continuous in the usual sense. The map $Q : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ is said to be monotone if $Q[\phi] \leq Q[\psi]$ whenever $\phi, \psi \in C_+$ with $\phi \leq \psi$.

Throughout the whole paper, unless specified otherwise, we fix a continuous map $Q : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$, and always assume that

- (A) There exist $r^* \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ and a continuous map $Q_+ : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ such that $Q_+[r^*] = r^*$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\varphi] = Q_+^n[\varphi]$ in C for all $\varphi \in C_+$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following observation is a straightforward consequence of assumption (A).

Lemma 2.1. *The map $Q_+ : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ admits the following properties:*

- (i) $Q_+[\varphi](\theta, x) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} T_{-y} \circ Q \circ T_y[\varphi](\theta, x), \forall \varphi \in C_+, (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) $T_y[Q_+[\varphi]] = Q_+[T_y[\varphi]]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times C_+$.
- (iii) Q_+ is monotone whenever Q is monotone.

The following upward convergence was requested for the map Q_+ in [50]. In the main results of the current paper, however, we do not directly assume that Q_+ has property (UC).

- (UC) There exist $c_-^*, c_+^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_+^* + c_-^* > 0$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, n}^+} \|Q_+^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*(\cdot)\| = 0, \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \frac{c_+^* + c_-^*}{2}), \varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, n}^+ = n[-c_-^* + \varepsilon, c_+^* - \varepsilon]$.

Define a continuous function $h : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$h(\theta, x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in [-1, 1], \\ 0, & x \in (-\infty, -2] \cup [2, \infty), \\ 2 - x, & x \in (1, 2), \\ 2 + x, & x \in (-2, -1). \end{cases}$$

By the arguments similar to those for Proposition 2.1 in [50], we can prove the first part of the following result, while the second part easily follows from the first one.

Proposition 2.1. *Assume that Q_+ satisfies (UC). Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{3c_+^* + 3c_-^*}{4})$, there exist $n_0 := n_0(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N} \cap [\frac{6}{\varepsilon}, \infty)$ and $y_0 := y_0(\varepsilon) > 2$ such that*

$$T_{-nc} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{r^*}{4}h, \quad \forall (c, n, y) \in [-c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}] \times [n_0, 2n_0] \times [y_0, \infty).$$

If, in addition, Q is monotone, then

$$T_{-y} \circ (T_{-n_0c} \circ Q^{n_0})^n \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{r^*}{4}h, \quad \forall (c, n, y) \in [-c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}] \times \mathbb{N} \times [y_0, \infty).$$

Following [56], we say Q is a subhomogeneous map on $[0, r^*]_C$ if $Q[\kappa\phi] \geq \kappa Q[\phi]$ for all $(\kappa, \phi) \in [0, 1] \times [0, r^*]_C$.

By modifying the proof of [50, Proposition 2.2], we can obtain the following result without assuming the translation monotone property (P3).

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that Q is monotone and Q_+ satisfies (UC). Let $c_+^* > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$, and let $n_0 := n_0(\varepsilon)$ and $y_0 := y_0(\varepsilon)$ be defined as in Proposition 2.1. Then*

$$T_{-nc} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{r^*}{4}h, \quad \forall c \in [\max\{0, -c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}], n \geq n_0, y \geq y_0.$$

If, in addition, Q is subhomogeneous on $[0, r^]_C$, then for any $\delta \in [0, 1]$, there holds*

$$T_{-nc} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{\delta r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{\delta r^*}{4}h, \quad \forall c \in [\max\{0, -c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}], n \geq n_0, y \geq y_0.$$

Proof. Define

$$n^* := \sup \left\{ k \in [n_0, \infty) \cap \mathbb{N} : T_{-nc-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{r^*}{4}h, \right. \\ \left. \forall (c, n, y) \in [\max\{0, -c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}] \times [n_0, k] \times [y_0, \infty) \right\}.$$

Clearly, $n^* \geq 2n_0$ due to Proposition 2.1. It suffices to prove $n^* = \infty$. Otherwise, we have $n^* < \infty$. By Proposition 2.1 and the choices of y_0, n_0 and n^* , it follows that for any $c \in [\max\{0, -c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}]$ and $y \geq y_0$, we have

$$T_{-(n^*+1)c-y} \circ Q^{n^*+1} \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \\ = T_{-n_0c - [(n^*+1-n_0)c+y]} \circ Q^{n_0} \circ T_{(n^*+1-n_0)c+y} [T_{-(n^*+1-n_0)c-y} \circ Q^{n^*+1-n_0} \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h]] \\ \geq T_{-n_0c - [(n^*+1-n_0)c+y]} \circ Q^{n_0} \circ T_{(n^*+1-n_0)c+y} [\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \frac{r^*}{4}h,$$

which contradicts the choice of n^* . For any $\delta \in [0, 1]$, the subhomogeneity of Q implies that

$$T_{-nc} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{\delta r^*}{16}h] \geq \delta T_{-nc} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\frac{r^*}{16}h] \geq \delta \frac{r^*}{4}h,$$

for all $c \in [\max\{0, -c_-^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_+^* - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}]$, $n \geq n_0$, and $y \geq y_0$. □

It is easy to verify the following properties for Q_+ .

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that Q_+ satisfies (UC). Then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $Q_+^n[\alpha r^*](\theta, x) = Q_+^n[\alpha r^*](\theta, 0)$, $\forall (n, \alpha, \theta, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times M \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q_+^n[\alpha r^*] = r^*$ in $L^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, $\forall \alpha \in (0, \infty)$.

The following assumption is quite different from the assumption (SP) in [50], although we still denoted it by (SP) for the convenience in applications.

(SP) There exist $(\rho^*, N^*) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}$ and $\varrho^* \in (\rho^*, \infty)$ such that for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ with $\varphi(\cdot, a) \subseteq Y_+ \setminus \{0\}$, we have $Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ for all $n \geq N^*$ and $x - a \in [n\rho^*, n\varrho^*]$.

Lemma 2.2. *If the map $Q : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ satisfies (SP) and K is a compact subset of $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$, then for any $\eta > 0$, there exist $\delta_0 = \delta_0(K, \eta) \in (0, 1)$, $\eta_0 = \eta_0(K, \eta) > 2 + \eta$, and $\mathfrak{N}_0 = \mathfrak{N}_0(K, \eta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{-\eta_0} Q^{\mathfrak{N}_0}[\varphi] \geq \delta_0 r^* h$ for all $\varphi \in K$.*

Proof. Since K is a compact subset of $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there exist $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a finite sequence $\{(a_j, O_j)\}$ with $a_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and $O_j \subset K$ for all $1 \leq j \leq j_0$ such that $K = \bigcup_{j=1}^{j_0} O_j$ and

$$\varphi(\cdot, a_j) \subseteq Y_+ \setminus \{0\}, \forall \varphi \in O_j, 1 \leq j \leq j_0.$$

It follows from **(SP)** that $Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \subseteq \text{Int}(Y_+)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [N^*, \infty)$, $x \in a_j + [n\rho^*, n\varrho^*]$, and $\varphi \in O_j$ with $j \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, j_0]$. Let $I_n = \bigcap_{j=1}^{j_0} [a_j + n\rho^*, a_j + n\varrho^*]$. Then we have

$$I_n \supseteq \left[\sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |a_j| + n\rho^*, - \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |a_j| + n\varrho^* \right] \neq \emptyset, \forall n > \mathbf{n}^* := \frac{4 + \eta + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |a_j|}{\varrho^* - \rho^*}.$$

Consequently, for any $n \geq \mathfrak{N}_0 := 1 + N^* + \mathbf{n}^*$, there holds

$$Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \subseteq \text{Int}(Y_+), \forall x \in \left[\sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |a_j| + n\rho^*, - \sum_{j=1}^{j_0} |a_j| + n\varrho^* \right], \varphi \in K.$$

In particular, there exists $\eta_0 = \eta_0(K) > 2 + \eta$ such that

$$Q^{\eta_0}[\varphi](\cdot, x) \subseteq \text{Int}(Y_+), \forall x \in [\eta_0 - 2, \eta_0 + 2], \varphi \in K.$$

By virtue of the compactness of K , there exists $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$Q^{\eta_0}[\varphi](\cdot, x) \geq \delta_0 r^*, \forall x \in [\eta_0 - 2, \eta_0 + 2], \varphi \in K.$$

This, together with the definition of h , completes the proof. \square

In Lemma 2.2, for any $\eta > 0$ we emphasize the importance of $\eta_0 > 2 + \eta$, not just its existence, which is helpful for later discussions such as the proof of Theorem 3.1.

For any $(d, \varrho) \in (0, \infty) \times [1, \infty)$, we define two functions:

$$\xi_d(\theta, x) := \max\{0, \min\{1, d + 1 - |x|\}\}, \quad \forall (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$\tilde{\xi}_{d, \varrho}(\theta, x) := \min\{\varrho, \max\{1, (\varrho - 1)|x| - \varrho d + d + 1\}\}, \quad \forall (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $r^* \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ be given. For any $(d, r, s, z, n, \varrho) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^6)$ with $s \geq r$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varrho \geq 1$, we introduce two numbers:

$$I_{d, r, s, z, n, \varrho} := \sup\{\beta \geq 0 : T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\varphi](\cdot, 0) \geq \beta r^*, \forall \varphi \in [r\xi_d r^*, s\tilde{\xi}_{d, \varrho} r^*]_C, y \in [z, \infty)\}$$

and

$$S_{d, r, s, z, n, \varrho} := \inf\{\beta \geq 0 : T_{-y} \circ Q^n \circ T_y[\varphi](\cdot, 0) \leq \beta r^*, \forall \varphi \in [r\xi_d r^*, s\tilde{\xi}_{d, \varrho} r^*]_C, y \in [z, \infty)\}.$$

In order to study the nonlinear map Q with $Q_+[r^*] = r^*$ for some $r^* \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$, we need the following assumption.

(NM) If $t \geq s \geq r > 0$ and $\{r, s\} \neq \{1\}$, then there exist $n(r, s) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma(r, s) \in (0, r)$ and $(d(r, s, t), z(r, s, t)) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ such that either

$$I_{d(r,s,t), r-\gamma(r,s), s+\gamma(r,s), z(r,s,t), n(r,s), \frac{t+\gamma(r,s)}{r-\gamma(r,s)}} \geq r + \gamma(r, s)$$

or

$$S_{d(r,s,t), r-\gamma(r,s), s+\gamma(r,s), z(r,s,t), n(r,s), \frac{t+\gamma(r,s)}{r-\gamma(r,s)}} \leq s - \gamma(r, s).$$

Lemma 2.3. *If Q is monotone and Q_+ satisfies **(UC)**, then **(NM)** holds true.*

Proof. Fix $r, s, t \in (0, \infty)$ with $t \geq s \geq r$ and $\{r, s\} \neq \{1\}$. By Proposition 2.3-(ii), we easily see that there exist $n(r, s) \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma(r, s) \in (0, r)$ such that in the case $r < 1$,

$$Q_+^{n(r,s)}[(r - \gamma(r, s))r^*] > (r + 3\gamma(r, s))r^* \in C_{r^*};$$

and in the case where $s > 1$,

$$Q_+^{n(r,s)}[(s + \gamma(r, s))r^*] < (s - 3\gamma(r, s))r^* \in r^* + C_+.$$

By the continuity of Q_+ , it then follows that there exists $d(r, s, t) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$Q_+^{n(r,s)}[(r - \gamma(r, s))\xi_{d(r,s,t)}r^*](\cdot, 0) > (r + 2\gamma(r, s))r^*$$

when $r < 1$; and

$$Q_+^{n(r,s)}[(s + \gamma(r, s))\tilde{\xi}_{d(r,s,t), \frac{t+\gamma(r,s)}{r-\gamma(r,s)}}r^*](\cdot, 0) < (s - 2\gamma(r, s))r^*$$

when $s > 1$. In view of **(A)**, there exists $z(r, s, t) \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$T_{-y} \circ Q_+^{n(r,s)} \circ T_y[(r - \gamma(r, s))\xi_{d(r,s,t)}r^*](\cdot, 0) > (r + \gamma(r, s))r^*, \quad \forall y \in [z(r, s, t), \infty)$$

in the case $r < 1$; and

$$T_{-y} \circ Q_+^{n(r,s)} \circ T_y[(s + \gamma(r, s))\tilde{\xi}_{d(r,s,t), \frac{t+\gamma(r,s)}{r-\gamma(r,s)}}r^*](\cdot, 0) < (s - \gamma(r, s))r^*, \quad \forall y \in [z(r, s, t), \infty)$$

in the case $s > 1$. Thus, **(NM)** follows from the monotonicity of Q . \square

In the current paper, we use the non-monotonicity **(NM)** to replace the monotonicity for the map Q . Throughout the whole paper, we make the following assumption on the uniform boundedness for the map Q .

(UB) There exists a sequence $\{\phi_k^*\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\text{Int}(Y_+)$ such that $\phi_{k+1}^* > \phi_k^*$, $Y_+ = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} [0, \phi_k^*]_Y$, and $Q[C_{\phi_k^*}] \subseteq C_{\phi_k^*}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Instead of the subhomogeneity and **(UC)** assumed in Proposition 2.2, we introduce the following asymptotic monotonicity, subhomogeneity, and **(UC)** hypothesis.

(ACH) There exist sequences $\{c_{l,\pm}^*\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in \mathbb{R} , $\{r_l^*\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in $\text{Int}(Y_+)$, $\{Q_l\}_{l=1}^\infty$ and $\{Q_{l,+}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ such that for any positive integer l , there hold

- (i) $c_+^* := \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} c_{l,+}^*$, $c_-^* := \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} c_{l,-}^*$, and $r_l^* \leq \phi_1^*$.
- (ii) $Q_l, Q_{l,+} : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ are continuous and monotone maps with $Q \geq Q_l$ in $C_{\phi_l^*}$, where ϕ_l^* is defined as in **(UB)**.
- (iii) Q_l is subhomogeneous on $[0, r_l^*]_C$.
- (iv) $Q_{l,+}$ satisfies **(UC)** with $(c_{l,-}^*, c_{l,+}^*, r_l^*)$.
- (v) $(Q_l, Q_{l,+}, r_l^*)$ satisfies **(A)**.

3 Discrete-time semiflows

In this section, we study the upward convergence, asymptotic annihilation, and the existence of fixed points for discrete-time systems according to the unilateral and bilateral limit cases, respectively.

3.1 The unilateral limit case

We first consider discrete-time systems under the unilateral limit assumptions. We start with the upward convergence in the unilateral **(UC)** case.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume that Q satisfies **(ACH)**, **(NM)**, and **(SP)**. Let $c_+^* > 0$ and $c \in (-c_-^*, c_+^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$. Then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \geq \alpha, \alpha + nc \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon), \text{ and } \varphi \in K \right\} = 0$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0, c_+^* - c)$ and for any compact, uniformly bounded subset K of $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.
- (ii) $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \geq \alpha, \alpha + nc \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \right\} = 0$ for all $(\varepsilon, \varphi) \in (0, c_+^* - c) \times C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. (i) Fix a compact and uniformly bounded subset K of $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. For any given $(\varepsilon, \alpha) \in (0, c_+^* - c) \times (0, \infty)$, we define

$$\mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon, \alpha} = \{(n, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} : n \geq \alpha, \alpha + nc \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)\},$$

$$U_-(\varepsilon) = \liminf_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \left\{ \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \geq \beta r^*, \forall (n, x) \in \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon, \alpha}, \varphi \in K \right\} \right],$$

and

$$U_+(\varepsilon) = \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf \left\{ \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \leq \beta r^*, \forall (n, x) \in \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon, \alpha}, \varphi \in K \right\} \right].$$

By the definition of $U_-(\varepsilon)$ and $U_+(\varepsilon)$, it easily follows that $0 \leq U_-(\varepsilon) \leq U_+(\varepsilon)$, $U_-(\varepsilon)$ is non-decreasing in $\varepsilon \in (0, c_+^* - c)$, and $U_+(\varepsilon)$ is nonincreasing in $\varepsilon \in (0, c_+^* - c)$. Since $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon_1, \alpha} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon_2, \alpha}$ for all $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon_1 < c_+^* - c$, without loss of generality, we assume $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^* - c, c + c_-^*, c_+^* + c_-^*\}$. By **(ACH)**-(i) and **(UB)**, there exist $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tau_0 \in (0, 1)$ such that $|c_{l_0,+}^* - c_+^*| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$, $|c_{l_0,-}^* - c_-^*| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$, $\frac{1}{\tau_0} r^* \geq r_{l_0}^* \geq \tau_0 r^*$, and $K \subseteq C_{\phi_{l_0}^*}$. Thus, $\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_{l_0,+}^*, c_{l_0,-}^* + c_{l_0,+}^*\})$. Applying Proposition 2.2 to Q_{l_0} , we easily see that for any $\mathfrak{c} \in [\max\{0, -c_{l_0,-}^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_{l_0,+}^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}]$, there holds

$$T_{-n\mathfrak{c}} \circ T_{-y} \circ Q_{l_0}^n \circ T_y \left[\frac{\delta r_{l_0}^*}{16} h \right] \geq \frac{\delta r_{l_0}^*}{4} h, \forall n \geq n_0\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right), y \geq y_0\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right), \delta \in [0, 1],$$

where $n_0(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ and $y_0(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ are defined as in Proposition 2.2 with Q_{l_0} and $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$.

By **(SP)** and Lemma 2.2, it follows that there exist $\delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, $\eta_0 > y_0(\frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ and $\mathfrak{N}_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_{-\eta_0} Q^{\mathfrak{N}_0}[\varphi] \geq \delta_0 r^* h > \frac{\delta_0 \tau_0 r_{l_0}^*}{16} h$ for all $\varphi \in K$, and hence,

$$Q^n[\varphi] = Q^{n-\mathfrak{N}_0} \circ T_{\eta_0}[T_{-\eta_0} \circ Q^{\mathfrak{N}_0}[\varphi]] \geq Q_{l_0}^{n-\mathfrak{N}_0} \circ T_{\eta_0}[\frac{\delta_0 r_{l_0}^*}{16} h], \quad \forall n \geq \mathfrak{N}_0, \varphi \in K.$$

Thus, for any $\mathbf{c} \in [\max\{0, -c_{l_0,-}^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}, c_{l_0,+}^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}]$, $n \geq n^{**} := n_0(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}) + \mathfrak{N}_0$ and $\varphi \in K$, we have

$$T_{-(n-\mathfrak{N}_0)\mathbf{c}} \circ T_{-\eta_0} \circ Q^n[\varphi] \geq T_{-(n-\mathfrak{N}_0)\mathbf{c}} \circ T_{-\eta_0} \circ Q_{l_0}^{n-\mathfrak{N}_0} \circ T_{\eta_0}[\frac{\delta_0 r_{l_0}^*}{16} h] \geq \frac{\delta_0 r_{l_0}^*}{4} h > \frac{\delta_0 \tau_0 r^*}{4} h.$$

In other words, $Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \geq \frac{\delta_0 \tau_0 r^*}{4}$ for all $(n, x, \varphi) \in \mathcal{J} \times K$, where

$$\mathcal{J} = \left\{ (n, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} : n \geq n^{**} \text{ and } \max\{0, -c_{l_0,-}^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\} \leq \frac{x - \eta_0}{n - \mathfrak{N}_0} \leq c_{l_0,+}^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right\}.$$

By the choices of l_0 and ε , we can verify that for any $\alpha \geq n^{**} + \eta_0 + \frac{3\mathfrak{N}_0 c_+^*}{\varepsilon} + \mathfrak{N}_0 |c_-^*|$, there holds $\mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$, and hence

$$Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \geq \frac{\delta_0 \tau_0 r^*}{4}, \quad \forall (n, x, \varphi) \in \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \times K.$$

This, together with the definitions of $U_{\pm}(\varepsilon)$ and the arbitrariness of ε , implies that

$$0 < \frac{\delta_0 \tau_0}{4} \leq U_-(\varepsilon) \leq U_+(\varepsilon) < U^* := 1 + \inf\{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : \phi_{l_0}^* \leq \beta r^*\} < \infty,$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^* - c, c_-^* + c, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$.

To finish the proof, it suffices to prove $U_{\pm}(\varepsilon) = 1$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^* - c, c_-^* + c, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$. Otherwise, there exists $\varepsilon_0 \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^* - c, c_-^* + c, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$ such that $\{U_-(\varepsilon_0), U_+(\varepsilon_0)\} \neq \{1\}$. Thus, $\{U_-(\varepsilon), U_+(\varepsilon)\} \neq \{1\}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$. Due to the monotonicity of U_{\pm} , we may assume, without loss of generality, that for some $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, U_{\pm} is continuous at ε_1 . Note that $\{U_-(\varepsilon_1), U_+(\varepsilon_1)\} \neq \{1\}$ due to $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.

In view of **(NM)**, there exist $\gamma_0 \in (0, U_-(\varepsilon_1))$, $d_0, z_0 \in (0, \infty)$, and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that one of the following properties holds true:

- (a) $T_{-z} \circ Q^{N_0} \circ T_z[\varphi](\cdot, 0) \geq (U_-(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0) r^*$, $\forall (z, \varphi) \in [z_0, \infty) \times [\psi_1, \psi_2]_C$,
- (b) $T_{-z} \circ Q^{N_0} \circ T_z[\varphi](\cdot, 0) \leq (U_+(\varepsilon_1) - \gamma_0) r^*$, $\forall (z, \varphi) \in [z_0, \infty) \times [\psi_1, \psi_2]_C$,

where $\psi_1 = (U_-(\varepsilon_1) - \gamma_0) \xi_{d_0} r^*$ and $\psi_2 = (U_+(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0) \tilde{\xi}_{d_0, \frac{U_+ + \gamma_0}{U_-(\varepsilon_1) - \gamma_0}} r^*$. In the following, we only give the details to get a contradiction for the case (a) since the case (b) can be addressed in a similar way.

According to the definition of $U_-(\tau)$, for any given $\tau \in (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0)$, there exist sequences $\{\alpha_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, \infty)$ and $\{(\theta_k, n_k, x_k, \varphi_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $M \times \mathcal{I}_{\tau, \alpha_k} \times K$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} r^*(\theta_k) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} n_k = \infty$, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} Q^{n_k}[\varphi_k](\theta_k, x_k) - U_-(\tau) r^*(\theta_k) \in \partial(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$. Since for any bounded subset \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{R} , $\{n_k - N_0\} \times (x_k + \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\varepsilon_1, \alpha_k - N_0 - \sup_{x \in \mathcal{B}} |x|}$ for all large k and bounded subset \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{R} , we obtain

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k - N_0}[\varphi_k](\cdot, x) \geq \beta r^* \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{B}\} \right] \in [U_-(\varepsilon_1), U_+(\varepsilon_1)]$$

and

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf \{ \beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k - N_0}[\varphi_k](\cdot, x) \leq \beta r^* \text{ for all } x \in \mathcal{B} \} \right] \in [U_-(\varepsilon_1), U_+(\varepsilon_1)].$$

It then follows that there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_k \geq z_0$ and

$$T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k - N_0}[\varphi_k] \in [(U_-(\varepsilon_1) - \gamma_0)\xi_{d_0} r^*, (U_+(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0)\tilde{\xi}_{d_0, \frac{U_+ + \gamma_0}{U_-(\varepsilon_1) - \gamma_0}} r^*]_C, \forall k \geq k_0.$$

In the case (a), we easily check that

$$T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k}[\varphi_k](\cdot, 0) = T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{N_0} \circ T_{x_k}[T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k - N_0}[\varphi_k](\cdot, 0)],$$

and hence,

$$T_{-x_k} \circ Q^{n_k}[\varphi_k](\cdot, 0) \geq (U_-(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0)r^*, \forall k \geq k_0.$$

This implies that

$$\liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left[Q^{n_k}[\varphi_k](\theta_k, x_k) - (\gamma_0 + U_-(\varepsilon_1))r^*(\theta_k) \right] \in \mathbb{R}_+^N.$$

By the choices of θ_k, n_k, x_k , and $r^*(\cdot)$, there holds

$$U_-(\tau) \geq U_-(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0 > U_-(\varepsilon_1).$$

Letting $\tau \rightarrow \varepsilon_1$, we obtain $U_-(\varepsilon_1) \geq U_-(\varepsilon_1) + \gamma_0 > U_-(\varepsilon_1)$, a contradiction.

Consequently, $U_-(\varepsilon) = U_+(\varepsilon) = 1$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^* - c, c_-^* + c, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$. This shows that statement (i) holds true.

(ii) follows from (i) by taking $K = \{\varphi\}$. □

Remark 3.1. *From the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is easy to see that if each Q_l in (ACH) satisfies (SP), then the set K can be replaced by an order interval $[u_0, v_0]_C$ with $u_0 > 0$.*

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that all the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold and $c_+^* > 0$. Then for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$, the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\} \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \text{ and } \varphi \in K \} = 0$ for any compact, uniformly bounded subset K of $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\} \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \} = 0$ for all $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. Let $J_{\varepsilon, n} = \{n\} \times [n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\}, n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)]$ and

$$\mathcal{J}_{\varepsilon, \alpha, c} = \{(n, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} : n \geq \alpha, \alpha + nc \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)\}, \quad \forall (n, \varepsilon, \alpha, c) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+^3.$$

Since $J_{\varepsilon, n} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \frac{n \min\{1, \varepsilon\}}{3}, \frac{\varepsilon}{3} - \min\{0, c_-^*\}}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, Theorem 3.1 yield all the desired conclusions. □

For any given $(\varphi, \mu) \in L^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \times \mathbb{R}$, we define a function

$$e_{\varphi, \mu}(\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x)e^{-\mu x}, \quad \forall (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Let L, L_+ and L_- be monotone linear operators on the space of functions

$$\tilde{C} := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^l e_{\varphi_k, \mu_k} : l \geq 1, (\varphi_k, \mu_k) \in L^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N) \times \mathbb{R}, \forall 1 \leq k \leq l \right\}$$

equipped with the pointwise ordering. Here and after, let us denote the set of all bounded maps from $M \times \mathbb{R}$ into \mathbb{R}^N by $L^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$ with the pointwise ordering induced by $L^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+^N)$. For any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ with $L_+[e_{\bar{1}, \mu}](\cdot, 0) \in Y_+$, we define $L_{+, \mu} : Y \rightarrow Y$ by

$$L_{+, \mu}[\phi](\theta) = L_+[e_{\phi, \mu}](\theta, 0), \quad \forall \theta \in M, \phi \in Y.$$

Assume that $I_{L_+} := \{\mu \in (0, \infty) : L_+[e_{\bar{1}, \mu}](\cdot, 0) \in Y_+\} \neq \emptyset$, $T_{-z} \circ L_+ \circ T_z[e_{\zeta, \mu}] = L_+[e_{\zeta, \mu}]$ for all $(z, \mu, \zeta) \in \mathbb{R} \times I_{L_+} \times Y_+$, and there exists $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(L_{+, \mu})^{l_0}$ is a compact and strongly positive operator on Y for all $\mu \in I_{L_+}$. It follows that $L_{+, \mu}$ has the principal eigenvalue $\lambda(\mu)$ and a unique strongly positive eigenfunction ζ_μ associated with $\lambda(\mu)$ such that $\inf\{\zeta_\mu^i(\theta) : \theta \in M, 1 \leq i \leq N\} = 1$. Let

$$c_{L_+}^* := \inf_{\mu \in I_{L_+}} \frac{1}{\mu} \log \lambda(\mu)$$

and define

$$\underline{L}[\varphi; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) = \min\{\alpha \zeta_\mu(\theta), L[\varphi](\theta, x)\}, \quad \forall (\varphi, \theta, x) \in \tilde{C} \times M \times \mathbb{R}, (\alpha, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2.$$

To obtain the asymptotic annihilation properties, we make the following assumption.

(LC) For any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\mu \in I_{L_+}$, there exists $\mathfrak{r}_{\epsilon, \mu} > 0$ such that

$$L[e_{\zeta_\mu, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq (1 + \mu\epsilon)L_+[e_{\zeta_\mu, \mu}](\theta, x), \quad \forall \theta \in M, x \geq \mathfrak{r}_{\epsilon, \mu}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let (LC) hold. Then for any $(\epsilon, \alpha) \in (0, \infty)^2$, there exist $\mu := \mu_\epsilon \in I_{L_+}$ and $\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha} > \alpha$ such that*

$$\underline{L}^n[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \beta e^{\mu(-x+n \max\{0, c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon\})} \zeta_\mu(\theta), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta, n) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty) \times \mathbb{N},$$

where $v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}(\theta, x) = \min\{\alpha, \beta e^{-\mu x}\} \zeta_\mu(\theta)$.

Proof. Fix $(\epsilon, \alpha) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$. If $c_{L_+}^* < -\infty$, then by the definition of $c_{L_+}^*$, there exists $\mu := \mu_\epsilon \in I_{L_+}$ such that $\lambda(\mu) < e^{\mu(c_{L_+}^* + \frac{\epsilon}{3})}$. It follows from **(LC)** that for any $\theta \in M$ and $x \geq \mathfrak{r}_\epsilon := \mathfrak{r}_{\frac{\epsilon}{3}, \mu_\epsilon}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} L[e_{\zeta_\mu, \mu}](\theta, x) &\leq \left(1 + \frac{\mu\epsilon}{3}\right) L_+[e_{\zeta_\mu, \mu}](\theta, x) \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\mu\epsilon}{3}\right) \lambda(\mu) \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x} \\ &\leq \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x + \mu(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha} = \alpha e^{\mu(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon + \mathfrak{x}_\epsilon)}$, we have

$$\alpha \zeta_\mu(\theta) \leq \beta \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x + \mu(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon)}, \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta) \in M \times (-\infty, \mathfrak{x}_\epsilon] \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty),$$

$$\underline{L}[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \beta \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x + \mu(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon)}, \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta) \in M \times [\mathfrak{x}_\epsilon, \infty) \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty),$$

and

$$\underline{L}[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \alpha \zeta_\mu(\theta), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty).$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{L}[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) &\leq \min\{\alpha \zeta_\mu(\theta), \beta \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x + \mu(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon)}\} \\ &\leq e^{\mu \max\{0, c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon\}} v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}(\theta, x) \end{aligned}$$

for all $(\theta, x, \beta) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty)$, and hence,

$$\underline{L}^n[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \beta e^{\mu(-x + n \max\{0, c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon\})} \zeta_\mu(\theta), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta, n) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}.$$

Next, if $c_{L_+}^* = -\infty$, then by **(LC)**, there exist $\mu := \mu_\epsilon \in I_{L_+}$ and $\mathfrak{x}_\epsilon := \mathfrak{x}_{\frac{\epsilon}{3}, \mu_\epsilon}$ such that $\lambda(\mu) < \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\mu_\epsilon}{3}}$ and hence, $L[e_{\zeta_\mu, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq \zeta_\mu(\theta) e^{-\mu x}$ for any $\theta \in M$ and $x \geq \mathfrak{x}_\epsilon$. By the definitions of $\underline{L}, v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}$, we easily check that $\underline{L}[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu] \leq v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}$ for all $\beta \geq \beta_{\epsilon, \alpha} := \alpha e^{\mu \mathfrak{x}_\epsilon}$. Thus, we have

$$\underline{L}^n[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \beta e^{-\mu x} \zeta_\mu(\theta), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \beta, n) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\beta_{\epsilon, \alpha}, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

In the following, we write $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \psi_l = \psi$ in $L_{loc}^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$ provided that

$$\limsup_{l \rightarrow \infty} \{|\psi_l(\theta, x) - \psi(\theta, x)| : (\theta, x) \in M \times [-k, k]\} = 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In order to verify **(LC)** in applications, we introduce the following assumption on L and L_\pm .

(SLC) For any real interval I and $(\mu, \nu, \zeta) \in (0, \infty)^2 \times Y_+$ with $\zeta \geq \check{1} := (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\mathfrak{J}_\mu^\pm := \{\theta \in M : L_\pm[e_{\check{1}, \mu}](\theta, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N\} \neq \emptyset$, there hold

- (i) the map $M \times \mathbb{R} \ni (\theta, z) \mapsto L_\pm[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[z, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is bounded and continuous on $M \times \mathbb{R}$ with $L_+[e_{\check{1}, \mu}](\cdot, 0) \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$, $L_\pm[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\cdot, 0) \in Y_+$, $\lim_{z \rightarrow -\infty} L_\pm[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[z, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) = L_\pm[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\theta, 0)$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} L_\pm[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[z, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) = 0$ for all $\theta \in M$.
- (ii) $\lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} T_{-z} \circ L \circ T_z[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}] = L_\pm[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}]$ in $L_{loc}^\infty(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, where $e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}(\theta, x) = \zeta(\theta) e^{-\mu x} \mathbf{1}_I(x)$ for all $(\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (iii) $T_{-z} \circ L \circ T_z[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}]$ is nonincreasing in $z \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (iv) There exists $\kappa = \kappa_\nu > 1$ such that $\frac{1}{\kappa} L_+[e_{\check{1}, \nu}] \leq L_-[e_{\check{1}, \nu}] \leq \kappa L_+[e_{\check{1}, \nu}]$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let **(SLC)** hold. Then $\mathfrak{J}_\mu^+ = \mathfrak{J}_\mu^-$ and $\mathfrak{J}_\mu := \mathfrak{J}_\mu^\pm \in \{\emptyset, M\}$ for all $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover, if $(\mu, \zeta) \in (0, \infty) \times Y_+$ with $\mathfrak{J}_\mu = M$ and $\zeta \geq \check{1}$, then the following statements hold:*

- (i) $T_{-z} \circ L_{\pm} \circ T_z[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}] = L_{\pm}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}]$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and any interval I in \mathbb{R} . Hence, for any $(\theta, x, z) \in M \times \mathbb{R}^2$, there hold

$$e^{\mu x} L_{\pm}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[x-z, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x) = L_{\pm}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0)$$

and

$$e^{\mu x} L_{\pm}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x-z]}, \mu}](\theta, x) = L_{\pm}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, -z]}, \mu}](\theta, 0).$$

- (ii) $L_{-}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}] \geq L[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}] \geq L_{+}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}]$ for any interval I in \mathbb{R} .
(iii) For any $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$, there exists $\varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ such that

$$L[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x-\varrho]}, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq \gamma L[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x), \forall (\theta, x, \varrho) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta}, \infty).$$

- (iv) For any $(\delta, \varrho) \in (0, \infty)^2$, there exist $\varrho_0 := \varrho_0(\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta) > \varrho$ and $\rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ such that

$$L[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq (1 + \delta) L_{+}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x), \forall \theta \in M, x \geq \rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta}.$$

- (v) For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ such that

$$L[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\cdot, x) \leq (1 + \mu\epsilon) L_{+}[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\cdot, x), \forall x \in [\mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \mu, \zeta}, \infty).$$

In particular, the assumption **(LC)** holds.

Proof. Clearly, by the former statement of **(SLC)**-(iv), we may check that $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{+} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{-}$ for all $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. Then $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{+} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{-} = \emptyset$ or $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{+} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{-} \neq \emptyset$. If $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{+} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{-} \neq \emptyset$, then **(SLC)**-(i) implies that $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{+} = \mathfrak{J}_{\mu}^{-} = M$. Now, let us fix $(\mu, \zeta) \in (0, \infty)^2 \times Y_{+}$ with $\mathfrak{J}_{\mu} = M$ and $\zeta \geq \check{1}$.

- (i) follows from **(SLC)**-(ii) and the definition of $e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_I, \mu}$.
(ii) follows from **(SLC)**-(ii,iii).
(iii) Fix $\gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and define $F : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$F(\theta, \varrho) = \gamma L_{+}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) - L_{-}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, -\varrho]}, \mu}](\theta, 0), \forall (\theta, \varrho) \in M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

In view of **(SLC)**-(i,iii) and the definition of F , we easily see that $F \in C(M \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, $\lim_{\varrho \rightarrow \infty} F(\theta, \varrho) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_{+}^N)$, and $F(\theta, \varrho)$ is nondecreasing in ϱ . These, together with the compactness of M , imply that there exists $\varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ such that $F(\theta, \varrho) \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^N$ for all $\varrho \geq \varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ and $\theta \in M$. Hence, by (i), we obtain that

$$L_{-}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x-\varrho]}, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq \gamma L_{+}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x), \forall (\theta, x, \varrho) \in M \times \mathbb{R} \times [\varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta}, \infty).$$

Thus, (iii) follows from (ii).

(iv) Suppose that $(\delta, \varrho) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_{+}^2)$. In view of **(SLC)**-(i), we easily see that for any given $\theta_0 \in M$, there exist $\varrho_{\theta_0} := \varrho_{\theta_0, \delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta} > \varrho > -\varrho > \hat{\varrho}_{\theta_0, \delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta} =: \hat{\varrho}_{\theta_0}$ such that

$$L_{-}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-\hat{\varrho}_{\theta_0}, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta_0, 0) \ll \frac{\delta}{3} L_{+}[e_{\zeta \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_{\theta_0}, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta_0, 0).$$

This, together with **(SLC)**-(i,iii) and the compactness of M , implies that there exist $\sigma_0 \in (0, 1)$ and $\varrho_0 := \varrho_0(\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta) > \varrho > -\varrho > \hat{\varrho}_0 := \hat{\varrho}_0(\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta)$ such that

$$\frac{\delta}{3}L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) - L_-[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\hat{\varrho}_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, 0) \geq \sigma_0 \check{1}, \quad L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, \varrho_0]}, \mu}](\theta, 0) \geq \sigma_0 \check{1}, \quad \forall \theta \in M.$$

Hence, by (i) and (ii), we have

$$L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\hat{\varrho}_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x) \leq L_-[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\hat{\varrho}_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x) \ll \frac{\delta}{3}L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\theta, x), \quad \forall (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

By **(SLC)**-(ii), we easily check that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \|T_{-x} \circ L \circ T_x[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, -\hat{\varrho}_0]}, \mu}](\cdot, 0) - L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, -\hat{\varrho}_0]}, \mu}](\cdot, 0)\| = 0.$$

Thus, there exists $\rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta} > 0$ such that

$$T_{-x} \circ L \circ T_x[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, -\hat{\varrho}_0]}, \mu}](\cdot, 0) \ll (1 + \frac{\delta}{3})L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, 0), \quad \forall x \geq \rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta}.$$

It then follows from statement (i) that

$$L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, x-\hat{\varrho}_0]}, \mu}](\cdot, x) \ll (1 + \frac{\delta}{3})L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x), \quad \forall x \geq \rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta}.$$

This shows that $L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x) \leq (1 + \delta)L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_0, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x)$ for all $x \geq \rho_{\delta, \varrho, \mu, \zeta}$.

(v) Fix $\epsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Let $\gamma = \delta := -1 + \sqrt{1 + \mu\epsilon}$, $\varrho_1 = \varrho_0(\delta, \varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta}, \mu, \zeta)$, and $\mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \mu, \zeta} := \rho_{\delta, \varrho_{\gamma, \mu, \zeta}, \mu, \zeta} > 0$. By applying (iii) and (iv), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\cdot, x) &= L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_1, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x) + L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x-\varrho_1]}, \mu}](\cdot, x) \\ &\leq (1 + \gamma)L[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_1, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x) \\ &\leq (1 + \delta)(1 + \gamma)L_+[e_{\zeta, \mathbf{1}_{[x-\varrho_1, \infty)}, \mu}](\cdot, x) \\ &\leq (1 + \mu\epsilon)L_+[e_{\zeta, \mu}](\cdot, x), \quad \forall x \geq \mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \mu, \zeta}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Now we are ready to prove the asymptotic annihilation for discrete-time systems under the assumption **(LC)**, which is highly nontrivial since we do not assume **(P3)** for the map Q .

Theorem 3.3. *Let **(LC)** hold. If there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $Q[\varphi] \leq L[\varphi]$ for all $\varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}$, then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $c_L^* := c_{L_+}^* \geq 0$ and $\varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}$ is such that $\varphi(\cdot, x)$ is zero for all sufficiently positive x , then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n(c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon) \} = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.*
- (ii) *If $c_L^* := c_{L_+}^* < 0$ and $\varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}$ satisfies that $\varphi(\cdot, x)$ is zero for all sufficiently positive x , then $\limsup_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq \sigma \text{ with } n \in \mathbb{N} \} = 0$, and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n\epsilon \} = 0$ for all $\epsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}$ with $\varphi(\cdot, x)$ being zero for all sufficiently positive x . By **(UB)** and $\varphi \leq \phi_k^*$, we have $Q^n[\varphi] \leq \phi_k^*$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Take $\alpha \geq \|\phi_k^*\|$ and

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, & c_{L_+}^* \geq 0 \\ -c_{L_+}^*, & c_{L_+}^* < 0. \end{cases}$$

According to the choices of φ and α , there is $\beta > \beta_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ such that $\varphi(\theta, x) \leq \beta e^{-\mu_\varepsilon x} \zeta_{\mu_\varepsilon}(\theta)$, and hence, $\varphi(\theta, x) \leq v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu_\varepsilon}(\theta, x)$ for all $(\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$, where $\beta_{\varepsilon, \alpha}$ and μ_ε are defined as in Lemma 3.1. By the method of induction, we then easily see that $Q^n[\varphi] \leq \underline{L}^n[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu_\varepsilon}]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$Q^n[\varphi](\theta, x) \leq \underline{L}^n[v_{\alpha, \beta, \mu_\varepsilon}; \alpha, \mu](\theta, x) \leq \beta e^{\mu_\varepsilon(-x+n \max\{0, c_{L_+}^* + \epsilon\})}, \forall (n, \theta, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

This, together with the choice of ϵ , yields the desired results. \square

Theorem 3.3 suggests that $\{Q^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ may exhibit some asymptotic annihilation property. It is worth noting that when Q admits the translation invariance, Theorems 3.3 also provides a new proof for the asymptotic annihilation property, which is quite different from the approaches developed in [43] and [8].

Next we turn to the existence and nonexistence of fixed points for the unilateral **(UC)** type discrete-time systems. Recall that ϕ is a nontrivial fixed point of the map Q if $\phi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $Q[\phi] = \phi$.

The following result is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 3.1-(ii) with $\varphi = W$.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that all the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold. If $c_+^* > 0$ and W is a nontrivial fixed point of the map Q in $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$, then $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$.*

Lemma 3.4. *Let **(NM)** hold. If $a > b > 0$ and W is a nontrivial fixed point of the map Q in $C_{ar^*} \setminus \{0\}$ with $W(\cdot, x) \geq br^*$ for all large x , then $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$.*

Proof. Note that there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that $W(\cdot, x) \geq br^*$ for all $x \geq x_0$. Let $t = a + 1$, $r = \liminf_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : W(\cdot, y) \geq \beta r^*\} \right]$, and $s = \limsup_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left[\inf\{\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+ : W(\cdot, y) \leq \beta r^*\} \right]$. Then $W(\cdot, x) \leq tr^*$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t > s \geq r \geq b > 0$ due to the choices of x_0, t, r and s . Now, it suffices to prove $r = s = 1$. Otherwise, $\{r, s\} \neq \{1\}$. In view of **(NM)**, there exist $N_1 := n(r, s) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_1 := \gamma(r, s) \in (0, r)$, and $(d_1, z_1) := (d(r, s, t), z(r, s, t)) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^2)$ such that either $I_{d_1, r-\gamma_1, s+\gamma_1, z_1, N_1, \frac{t+\gamma_1}{r-\gamma_1}} > r + \gamma_1$, or $S_{d_1, r-\gamma_1, s+\gamma_1, z_1, N_1, \frac{t+\gamma_1}{r-\gamma_1}} < s - \gamma_1$. By the choices of r, s and t , there exists $y_1 > z_1$ such that

$$T_{-y}[W] \in [(r - \gamma_1)\xi_{d_1} r^*, (s + \gamma_1)\tilde{\xi}_{d_1, \frac{t+\gamma_1}{r-\gamma_1}} r^*]_C, \forall y \geq y_1.$$

It then follows that either

$$W(\cdot, y) = T_{-y} \circ Q^{N_1} \circ T_y[T_{-y}[W]](\cdot, 0) \geq (r + \gamma_1)r^*, \forall y \geq y_1,$$

or

$$W(\cdot, y) = T_{-y} \circ Q^{N_1} \circ T_y[T_{-y}[W]](\cdot, 0) \leq (s - \gamma_1)r^*, \forall y \geq y_1.$$

This leads to a contradiction to the choices of r and s . Thus, the desired conclusion holds true. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Assume that Q_+ satisfies (UC). If there exist $r^{**} \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ and $x_0 \in (-c_+^*, c_-^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $Q[r^{**}] \leq r^{**}$, $Q|_{C_{r^{**}}}$ is monotone, and $\{(T_{x_0} \circ Q)^n[r^{**}] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in C for some $x_0 \in (-c_+^*, c_-^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $x_0 = 0$, then Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{r^{**}}$ such that $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$. Moreover, $W(\cdot, x)$ is nondecreasing in x provided that $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$.*
- (ii) *If $x_0 > 0$ and $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$, then $T_{x_0} \circ Q$ has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{r^{**}}$ such that $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $W(\cdot, x)$ is nondecreasing in x .*

Proof. Note that $\{c_+^* + x_0, c_-^* - x_0\} > 0$. By Proposition 2.3 and the conditions of Q, Q_+ , we easily see $r^{**} \geq r^*$. Let $\mathcal{Q} = T_{x_0} \circ Q$ and

$$W_n(\cdot, x) = \mathcal{Q}^n[r^{**}](\cdot, x), \quad \forall (x, n) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $0 \leq W_{n+1} \leq W_n \leq r^{**}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the compactness of $\{\mathcal{Q}^n[r^{**}] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ in C , it follows that there exists $W \in C_{r^{**}}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|W_n - W\| = 0$, and hence, $T_{x_0} \circ Q[W] = W$.

By applying Proposition 2.1 to Q with $c = -x_0$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{\min\{c_-^* - x_0, c_+^* + x_0, c_+^* + c_-^*\}}{3}$, we see that there exist $n_0, y_0 > 0$ such that

$$T_{-y} \circ (T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0})^n \circ T_y\left[\frac{r^{**}}{16}h\right](\cdot, 0) \geq T_{-y} \circ (T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0})^n \circ T_y\left[\frac{r^*}{16}h\right](\cdot, 0) \geq \frac{r^*}{4} > 0$$

and

$$T_{-y} \circ (T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0})^n[r^{**}](\cdot, 0) \geq T_{-y} \circ (T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0})^n[r^*](\cdot, 0) \geq \frac{r^*}{4} > 0$$

for all $(n, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times [y_0, \infty)$. Then we have the following claim.

Claim. $W_{nn_0}(\cdot, y) \geq \frac{r^*}{4}$ for all $(n, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times [y_0, \infty)$.

Indeed, if $x_0 = 0$, then we have

$$W_{nn_0}(\cdot, y) = T_{-y} \circ (Q^{n_0})^n[r^{**}](\cdot, 0) \geq \frac{r^*}{4} > 0, \quad \forall (n, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times [y_0, \infty).$$

If $x_0 > 0$ and $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$, then $Q \circ T_{x_0}[\varphi] \geq T_{x_0} \circ Q[\varphi]$ for all $\varphi \in C_{r^{**}}$. It follows that $(T_{x_0} \circ Q)^{n_0} \geq T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0}$, and hence, for any $(n, y) \in \mathbb{N} \times [y_0, \infty)$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} W_{nn_0}(\cdot, y) &= (T_{x_0} \circ Q)^{nn_0}[r^{**}](\cdot, y) \\ &\geq T_{-y} \circ (T_{n_0 x_0} \circ Q^{n_0})^n[r^{**}](0, \cdot) \geq \frac{r^*}{4} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. Thus, $W(\cdot, y) \geq \frac{r^*}{4}$ for all $y \geq y_0$. In view of Lemmas 2.3 and 3.3, we obtain $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$. Additionally, we easily verify that $W(\cdot, x)$ is nondecreasing in x provided that $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Assume that there exist $r^{**} \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ and $W \in C_{r^{**}} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $Q[r^{**}] \leq r^{**}$, $Q|_{C_{r^{**}}}$ is monotone, and W is a nontrivial fixed point of the map Q in $C_{r^{**}} \setminus \{0\}$ with $W(\cdot, s)$ being nondecreasing in $s \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\{(T_{-z} \circ Q)^n[r^{**}] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in C for some $z \in (0, \infty)$, then $T_{-z} \circ Q$ has a nontrivial fixed point W_z in C_+ . Moreover, if $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$, then $W_z(\cdot, \infty) \geq r^*$ and $W_z(\cdot, x)$ is nondecreasing in x .*

Proof. By the conditions on W and z , it follows that $r^{**} \geq T_{-z} \circ Q[W] = T_{-z}[W] \geq W > 0$. We can define $W_z := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T_{-z} \circ Q)^n[r^{**}]$ due to the compactness and monotonicity. Then $T_{-z} \circ Q[W_z] = W_z$ and $W \leq W_z \leq r^{**}$. Moreover, if the additional conditions hold, then we easily see that $W_z(\cdot, \infty) \geq r^*$ and $W_z(\cdot, x)$ is nondecreasing in x . \square

With the help of Lemmas 3.5 and 3.6, we can easily prove the following result.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that $c_-^* > 0$ and Q_+ satisfies (UC). If there exists $r^{**} \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ such that $Q[r^{**}] \leq r^{**}$, $Q|_{C_{r^{**}}}$ is monotone, and $\{Q^n[r^{**}] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in C , then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $c_+^* > 0$, then Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{r^{**}}$ such that $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Q^n[r^{**}] - W\| = 0$. Moreover, $W(\cdot, s)$ is nondecreasing in $s \in \mathbb{R}$ provided that $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$.*
- (ii) *If $c_+^* \leq 0$, $\{(T_{x_0} \circ Q)^n[r^{**}] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is precompact in C for some $x_0 \in (-c_+^*, c_-^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$, and $T_{-y} \circ Q[\varphi] \geq Q \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}}$, then Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{r^{**}}$ such that $W(\cdot, \infty) \geq r^*$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|Q^n[r^{**}] - W\| = 0$, and $W(\cdot, s)$ is nondecreasing in $s \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Theorem 3.4. *Assume that Q satisfies (ACH), (NM), and Q has at least one fixed point in \mathcal{K} for any closed, convex, and positively invariant set \mathcal{K} of Q . Let $c_-^* > 0$ and $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{\phi_1^*}$. If for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $z := z_l \in (-c_{l,+}^*, c_{l,-}^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\{(Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(T_z \circ Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are precompact in C , then Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{\phi_1^*}$ such that $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$.*

Proof. Clearly, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_{l_0,-}^* > 0$. In view of (ACH)-(i), we have $r_{l_0}^* \leq \phi_1^*$. By applying Proposition 3.1 to $Q_{l_0}|_{C_{\phi_1^*}}$, we obtain that $Q_{l_0}[W^*] = W^*$ for some $W^* \in C_{\phi_1^*}$ with $W^*(\cdot, \infty) \geq r_{l_0}^*$. Let $\mathcal{K} = [W^*, \phi_1^*]_C$. Then $Q[\mathcal{K}] \subseteq \mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$ and \mathcal{K} is a closed and convex subset of C . It follows that we obtain that Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $[W^*, \phi_1^*]_C$, and hence, there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that $\frac{r_{l_0}^*}{2} \leq W(\cdot, x) \leq \phi_1^*$ for all $x \geq x_0$. Thus, the desired conclusion follows from Lemma 3.4. \square

Remark 3.2. *In view of Proposition 3.1-(i), in Theorem 3.4 we can use $c_+^* > 0$ to replace the assumption that $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(l, y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r_l^*}$.*

3.2 The bilateral limit case

Next we study the propagation dynamics for the discrete-time systems in the bilateral limit case. For convenience, we define the reflection operator \mathcal{S} on C by

$$[\mathcal{S}(\varphi)](\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, -x), \forall (\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}, \varphi \in C.$$

We need a series of basic assumptions.

(**A**₋) There exist $r_-^* \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ and a continuous map $Q_- : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ such that $Q_-[r_-^*] = r_-^*$ and

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} T_{-y} \circ Q_-^n \circ T_y[\varphi] = Q_-^n[\varphi] \text{ in } C \text{ for all } \varphi \in C_+ \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(**SP**₋) There exist $(\rho_-^*, N_-^*) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{N}$ and $\varrho_-^* \in (\rho_-^*, \infty)$ such that for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ with $\varphi(\cdot, a) \subseteq Y_+ \setminus \{0\}$, we have $Q_-^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$ for all $n \geq N_-^*$ and $x - a \in [-n\varrho_-^*, -n\rho_-^*]$.

(**UC**₋) There exist $c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty) > 0$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{x \in \mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, n}^-} \|Q_-^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*(\cdot)\| = 0, \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \frac{c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)}{2}), \varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_{\varepsilon, n}^- = n[-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon, c_+^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon]$.

(**ACH**₋) There exist sequences $\{c_{-l, \pm}^*\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in \mathbb{R} , $\{r_{-l}^*\}_{l=1}^\infty$ in $\text{Int}(Y_+)$, $\{Q_{-l}\}_{l=1}^\infty$, and $\{Q_{-l, -}\}_{l=1}^\infty$ such that for any positive integer l , there hold

(i) $c_+^*(-\infty) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} c_{-j, +}^*$, $c_-^*(-\infty) := \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} c_{-j, -}^*$, and $r_{-l}^* \leq \phi_1^*$.

(ii) $Q_{-l}, Q_{-l, -} : C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ are continuous and monotone maps with $Q \geq Q_{-l}$ in $C_{\phi_l^*}$, where ϕ_l^* is defined as in (**UB**).

(iii) Q_{-l} is subhomogeneous on $[0, r_{-l}^*]_C$.

(iv) $Q_{-l, -}$ satisfies (**UC**₋) with $(c_{-l, -}^*, c_{-l, +}^*, r_{-l}^*)$.

(v) $(Q_{-l}, Q_{-l, -}, r_{-l}^*)$ satisfies (**A**₋).

(**NM**₋) $\mathcal{S} \circ Q \circ \mathcal{S}$ satisfies (**NM**) with r^* replaced by r_-^* .

(**LC**₋) $(\mathcal{S} \circ L \circ \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S} \circ L_- \circ \mathcal{S})$ satisfies (**LC**) with (L, L_+) replaced by $(\mathcal{S} \circ L \circ \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S} \circ L_- \circ \mathcal{S})$.

(**GLC**) There exists a sequence of linear operators $\{(L_k, L_{k, +})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with (**LC**) such that

$$Q[\varphi] \leq L_k[\varphi], \forall \varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(**GLC**₋) There exists a sequence of linear operators $\{(\hat{L}_k, \hat{L}_{k, -})\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with (**LC**₋) such that

$$Q[\varphi] \leq \hat{L}_k[\varphi], \forall \varphi \in C_{\phi_k^*}, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Define

$$\tilde{Q}[\varphi](\theta, x) = Q[\varphi(\cdot, -\cdot)](\theta, -x), \tilde{Q}_+[\varphi](\theta, x) = Q_-[\varphi(\cdot, -\cdot)](\theta, -x), \forall (\varphi, \theta, x) \in C_+ \times M \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Clearly, $\tilde{Q} = \mathcal{S} \circ Q \circ \mathcal{S}$, and $\tilde{Q}_+ = \mathcal{S} \circ Q_- \circ \mathcal{S}$. It then follows that Q and Q_- satisfy (**A**₋), (**SP**₋), (**UC**₋), (**NM**₋), (**ACH**₋), (**LC**₋), (**GLC**₋) if and only if \tilde{Q} and \tilde{Q}_+ satisfy (**A**), (**SP**), (**UC**), (**NM**), (**ACH**), (**LC**), (**GLC**), respectively, with different parameters.

Let $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) = 1, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) = 0, \forall x \in (-\infty, 0)$. Our first result is on the upward convergence under the bilateral (**UC**)/(**UC**)-type assumption.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that Q satisfies (**ACH**), (**NM**), (**SP**), (**ACH**₋), (**NM**₋), and (**SP**₋).*

Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Then the following statements are valid:

(i) If $\min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| : x \in \mathcal{B}_{n,\varepsilon} \} = 0,$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^* + c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$ and $\mathcal{B}_{n,\varepsilon} = [n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\}, n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)] \cup [n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), n \min\{-\varepsilon, c_+^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon\}]$.

(ii) If $\min\{c_-^*, c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^*(1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| : (n, x) \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \} = 0,$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$ and $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \{(n, x) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R} : n \geq \alpha \text{ and } x \in [\alpha, n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)] \cup [n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), -\alpha]\}$.

Proof. By applying Theorem 3.2-(ii) to $\{Q, \varphi\}$ and $\{\tilde{Q}, \mathcal{S}[\varphi]\}$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\max \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\} \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_+^* + c_-^*\})$, and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\max \{ \|\tilde{Q}^n[\mathcal{S}[\varphi]](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| : n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_+^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon\} \leq x \leq n(c_-^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$. The latter implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\max \{ \|\mathcal{S} \circ Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| : n \max\{\varepsilon, -c_+^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon\} \leq x \leq n(c_-^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0,$$

and hence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\max \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| : n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \leq x \leq n \min\{-\varepsilon, c_+^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon\} \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$. Thus, statement (i) holds true.

(ii) By applying Theorem 3.1-(ii) with $c = 0$ to $\{Q, \varphi\}$ and $\{\tilde{Q}, \mathcal{S}[\varphi]\}$, we obtain

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \geq \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, c_+^*)$, and

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \|\tilde{Q}^n[\mathcal{S}[\varphi]](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| : n \geq \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \leq x \leq n(c_-^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, c_-^*(-\infty))$. It then follows that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, -x) - r_-^*\| : n \geq \alpha \text{ and } \alpha \leq x \leq n(c_-^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, c_-^*(-\infty))$, and hence,

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| : n \geq \alpha \text{ and } -\alpha \geq x \geq n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, c_-^*(-\infty))$. This shows that statement (ii) holds true. \square

Applying Theorem 3.3 to $\{(Q, \varphi), (\tilde{Q}, \mathcal{S}[\varphi])\}$, we have the following result on the asymptotic annihilation under the bilateral **(GLC)** / **(GLC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 3.6. *Assume that **(GLC)**, and **(GLC₋)** hold. Let $\varphi \in C_+$ with the compact support, $c_1^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{L_k}^*$, and $c_2^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{\mathcal{S} \circ \hat{L}_k \circ \mathcal{S}}^*$. Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n(c_1^* + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq -n(c_2^* + \varepsilon) \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(ii) *If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n\varepsilon \text{ or } x \leq -n(c_2^* + \varepsilon) \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iii) *If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \leq -n\varepsilon \text{ or } x \geq n(c_1^* + \varepsilon) \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iv) *If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x|, n \geq \alpha \text{ with } n \in \mathbb{N} \} = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x| \geq n\varepsilon \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Proof. We only prove (i) since the other statements can be dealt with some similar arguments. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\varphi \in C_+$ with φ having the compact support. In view of **(UB)**, **(GLC)**, and **(GLC₋)**, we have $\varphi \leq \inf\{\phi_{k_0}^*, \phi_{k_1}^*\}$, $|c_{L_{k_0}}^* - c_1^*| < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$, and $|c_{\mathcal{S} \circ \hat{L}_{k_1} \circ \mathcal{S}}^* - c_2^*| < \frac{\varepsilon}{6}$ for some $(k_0, k_1) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. By applying Theorem 3.3-(i) to $\{(Q, L_{k_0}, \varphi, \frac{\varepsilon}{3}), (\tilde{Q}, \mathcal{S} \circ \hat{L}_{k_1} \circ \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}[\varphi], \frac{\varepsilon}{3})\}$, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n(c_{L_{k_0}}^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) \text{ or } x \leq -n(c_{\mathcal{S} \circ \hat{L}_{k_1} \circ \mathcal{S}}^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) \right\} = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

It then follows from (3.1) and choices of k_0 and k_1 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n(c_1^* + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq -n(c_2^* + \varepsilon) \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Recall that W is a nontrivial fixed point of the map Q if $W \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $Q[W] = W$. The following result is on the existence of fixed points under the bilateral **(UC)** / **(UC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 3.7. *Assume that **(ACH)**, **(NM)**, **(SP)**, **(ACH₋)**, **(NM₋)**, and **(SP₋)** hold, and Q has at least one fixed point in \mathcal{K} for any closed, convex and positively invariant set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq C_{\phi_1^*}$ of Q . Let $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times C_{\phi_1^*}$ with $ly \geq 0$, where Q_l is defined as in **(ACH)** and **(ACH₋)**. Then Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{\phi_1^*}$ such that $W(\cdot, \pm\infty) = r_{\pm}^*$ provided that one of the following conditions is satisfied:*

- (i) $\min\{c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0$ and for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $z := z_l \in (-c_{l,+}^*, c_{l,-}^*)$ such that $lz_l \geq 0$, $\{(Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, and $\{(T_z \circ Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are precompact in C .
- (ii) $\min\{c_-^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$ and for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $z := z_l \in (-c_{l,+}^*, c_{l,-}^*) \cap \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\{(Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(T_z \circ Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are precompact in C .
- (iii) $\min\{c_+^*, c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0$ and for any $-l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $z := z_l \in (-c_{l,+}^*, c_{l,-}^*) \cap (-\infty, 0]$ such that $\{(Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $\{(T_z \circ Q_l)^n[\phi_1^*] : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ are precompact in C .

Proof. (i) Clearly, there is $l_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_{l_0,-}^* > 0$ and $c_{-l_0,+}^* > 0$. By applying Theorem 3.4 to Q_{l_0} and $\mathcal{S} \circ Q_{-l_0} \circ \mathcal{S}$, we obtain that $Q_{l_0}[W_+^*] = W_+^*$ and $Q_{-l_0}[W_-^*] = W_-^*$ for some $(W_+^*, W_-^*) \in C_{\phi_1^*} \times C_{\phi_1^*}$ with $W_+^*(\cdot, \infty) = r_{l_0}^*$ and $W_-^*(\cdot, -\infty) = r_{-l_0}^*$. Let $\mathcal{K} = [W_+^*, \phi_1^*]_C \cap [W_-^*, \phi_1^*]_C$. Then $Q[\mathcal{K}] \subseteq \mathcal{K} \neq \emptyset$ and \mathcal{K} is a closed and convex subset of C . It follows that Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in \mathcal{K} . Thus, there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that $\frac{\inf\{r_{l_0}^*, r_{-l_0}^*\}}{2} \leq W(\cdot, x) \leq \phi_1^*$ for all $|x| \geq x_0$. Now the desired conclusion follows from Lemma 3.4.

(ii) Theorem 3.4 implies that Q has a nontrivial fixed point W in $C_{\phi_1^*}$ with $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$. By applying Lemma 3.3 to $\{(\mathcal{S}[W], \tilde{Q})\}$, we have $\mathcal{S}[W](\cdot, \infty) = r_-^*$, and hence, $W(\cdot, -\infty) = r_-^*$.

(iii) follows from statement (ii), as applied to \tilde{Q} . \square

Remark 3.3. By Remark 3.2, it follows that in Theorem 3.7, we can use the condition that $\min\{c_+^*, c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty), c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$ to replace the assumption that $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $(l, y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \times \mathbb{R} \times C_{r_l^*}$ with $ly \geq 0$.

To present our last result, we need the following assumption on the global asymptotic stability of a positive fixed point.

(GAS) There exists $W \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} Q^n[\varphi] = W$ in C for all $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.

Theorem 3.8. Assume that Q satisfies **(GAS)** and $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. If **(ACH)**, **(NM)**, **(SP)**, **(ACH₋)**, **(NM₋)**, and **(SP₋)** hold, and

$$\min\{c_-^*, c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0,$$

then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{ \|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| : n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \leq x \leq n(c_+^* - \varepsilon) \} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$.

Proof. Given $\gamma > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$. In view of Theorem 3.5-(ii), there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^*(1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| < \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\|W(\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^*(1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| < \frac{\gamma}{2}$ for all $(n, x) \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0, \varepsilon}$. Thus, $\|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma$ for all $(n, x) \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0, \varepsilon}$. It follows from **(GAS)** that there exists $N_0 > 0$ such that $\|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma$ for all $x \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0]$ and $n > N_0$. This, together with the choices of $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha_0, \varepsilon}$, α_0 , and N_0 , implies that $\|Q^n[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma$ for all $x \in [n(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), n(c_+^* - \varepsilon)]$ and $n > \max\{N_0, \alpha_0\}$. Now the arbitrariness of γ completes the proof. \square

4 Continuous-time systems

In this section, under the bilateral **(UC)** assumption we study the existence of equilibrium points or traveling wave solutions and the asymptotic behavior of other solutions for continuous-time autonomous and nonautonomous systems. The unilateral **(UC)** case can be dealt with in a similar way as in Section 3.1.

4.1 Autonomous semiflows

A map $Q : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ is said to be a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ if for any given vector $r \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $Q|_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r \rightarrow C_+$ is continuous, $Q_0 = \text{Id}|_{C_+}$, and $Q_t \circ Q_s = Q_{t+s}$ for all $t, s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $Q_t \triangleq Q(t, \cdot)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Let $\{Q_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ be a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ . We say that W is a nontrivial equilibrium point of $\{Q_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$ if $W \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $Q_t[W] = W$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

We start with the upward convergence under the bilateral **(UC)**/**(UC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ such that Q_{t_0} satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 for some $t_0 > 0$. Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $\min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| : x \in \mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon} \right\} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2t_0} \min\{c_+^, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^* + c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$, where*

$$\mathcal{B}_{t,\varepsilon} = [t \max\{\varepsilon, -\frac{c_-^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\}, t(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon)] \cup [t(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon), t \min\{-\varepsilon, \frac{c_+^*(-\infty)}{t_0} - \varepsilon\}].$$

(ii) *If $\min\{c_-^*, c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - r_-^*(1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| : (t, x) \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \right\} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{t_0} \min\{c_+^, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$, where*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} : t \geq \alpha t_0 \text{ and } x \in [\alpha, t(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon)] \cup [t(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon), -\alpha]\}.$$

Proof. Since $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is an autonomous semiflow, we assume that $t_0 = 1$ in our proof. Otherwise, we consider the autonomous semiflow $\{\hat{Q}_t\}_{t \geq 0} := \{Q_{t_0 t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ instead of $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$. Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $K = Q[[0, 1] \times \{\varphi\}]$. Then $K \subseteq C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and K is compact in C .

(i) Given any $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^* + c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$ and $\gamma > 0$. By applying Theorem 3.2-(i) to Q_1 with K , we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \|Q_n[Q_t[\varphi]](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : x \in \left[n \max\{\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, -c_-^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}, n(c_+^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) \right], t \in [0, 1] \right\} = 0.$$

This implies that there is $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|Q_{t+n}[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \gamma$ for all $n > N_0$, $x \in [n \max\{\frac{\varepsilon}{3}, -c_-^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\}, n(c_+^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3})]$, and $t \in [0, 1]$. As a result, $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \gamma$ for all $t >$

$1 + N_0 + \frac{3c_+^*}{\varepsilon}$ and $x \in [t \max\{\varepsilon, -c_-^* + \varepsilon\}, t(c_+^* - \varepsilon)]$. By our aforementioned discussions, as applied to $\{\mathcal{S}[\varphi], \{\mathcal{S} \circ Q_t \circ \mathcal{S}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}\}$, there is $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| < \gamma$ for all $t > 1 + N_1 + \frac{3c_-^*(-\infty)}{\varepsilon}$ and $x \in [t(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), t \min\{-\varepsilon, c_+^*(-\infty) - \varepsilon\}]$. Hence, (i) follows from the arbitrariness of γ .

(ii) Given $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$ and $\gamma > 0$. Applying Theorem 3.1-(i) to Q_1 with K and $c = 0$, we have

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_n[Q_t[\varphi]](\cdot, x) - r^*\| : n \geq \alpha, x \in \left[\alpha, n\left(c_+^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right)\right], t \in [0, 1] \right\} = 0.$$

Thus, there is $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\|Q_{t+n}[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \gamma$ for all $n \geq \alpha_0$, $x \in [\alpha_0, n(c_+^* - \frac{\varepsilon}{3})]$, and $t \in [0, 1]$. This implies that $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \gamma$ for all $t > 1 + \alpha_0 + \frac{3c_+^*}{\varepsilon}$ and $x \in \left[1 + \alpha_0 + \frac{3c_+^*}{\varepsilon}, t(c_+^* - \varepsilon)\right]$. In view of our aforementioned discussions, as applied to $\{\mathcal{S}[\varphi], \{\mathcal{S} \circ Q_t \circ \mathcal{S}\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}\}$, it follows that there is $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| < \gamma$ for all $t > 1 + \alpha_1 + \frac{3c_-^*(-\infty)}{\varepsilon}$ and $x \in [t(-c_-^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), -1 - \alpha_1 - \frac{3c_-^*(-\infty)}{\varepsilon}]$. Hence, (ii) follows from the arbitrariness of γ . \square

We need the following uniform continuity, as introduced in [50], to prove the asymptotic annihilation for Q_t under the bilateral **(GLC)** / **(GLC)** -type assumption.

(SC) For any $s > 0$ and $\phi \in \text{Int}(Y_+)$, there holds $\lim_{C_\phi \ni \varphi \rightarrow 0} T_{-y} \circ Q_t \circ T_y[\varphi](\cdot, 0) = 0$ in Y uniformly for all $(t, y) \in [0, s] \times \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ such that **(SC)** holds and Q_{t_0} satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 3.6 for some $t_0 > 0$. Let $\varphi \in C_+$ with the compact support, $c_1^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{L_k}^*$, and $c_2^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{S \circ L_k \circ S}^*$. Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t \left(\frac{c_1^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right) \text{ or } x \leq -t \left(\frac{c_2^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(ii) *If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t\varepsilon \text{ or } x \leq -t \left(\frac{c_2^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iii) *If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \leq -t\varepsilon \text{ or } x \geq t \left(\frac{c_1^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iv) *If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \{\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x|, t \geq \alpha\} = 0$ and*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x| \geq t\varepsilon\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

Proof. We only prove (i) since we can use similar arguments to deal with (ii-iv). Since $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is an autonomous semiflow, we assume that $t_0 = 1$ without loss of generality. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varphi \in C_{\phi_{k_0}^*}$ with φ having the compact support.

It follows from **(SC)** that there exist $\delta = \delta(\gamma) > 0$ and $d = d(\gamma) > 0$ such that if $\psi \in C_{\phi_{k_0}^*}$ with $\|\psi(\cdot, x)\| < \delta$ for all $x \in [-d, d]$, then $\|T_{-y} \circ Q_t \circ T_y[\psi](\cdot, 0)\| < \gamma$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}$.

By virtue of Theorem 3.6-(i), we obtain

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq n(c_1^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) \text{ or } x \leq -n(c_2^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}) \right\} = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

It then follows from (4.1) that there is an integer $n_1 > 0$ such that

$$\|Q_n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| < \delta, \quad \forall x \in [n(c_1^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}), \infty) \cup (-\infty, -n(c_2^* + \frac{\varepsilon}{3})], \quad n > n_1.$$

Let $n_2 = \max\{n_1, \frac{3d}{\varepsilon}\}$. Then for any $n > n_2$ and $y \in [n(c_1^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}), \infty) \cup (-\infty, -n(c_2^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3})]$, we have

$$\|T_{-y} \circ Q_n[\varphi](\cdot, x)\| < \delta, \quad \forall x \in [-d, d].$$

According to these discussions, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Q_{t+n}[\varphi](\cdot, y)\| &= \|T_{-y} \circ Q_t \circ T_y \circ T_{-y} \circ Q_n[\varphi](\cdot, 0)\| \\ &= \|T_{-y} \circ Q_t \circ T_y[T_{-y} \circ Q_n[\varphi](\cdot, 0)]\| < \gamma, \end{aligned}$$

where $n > n_2$, $y \in [n(c_1^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}), \infty) \cup (-\infty, -n(c_2^* + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3})]$, and $t \in [0, 1]$. In particular, $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, y)\| < \gamma$ for all $t > 1 + n_2$ and $y \in [t(c_1^* + \varepsilon), \infty) \cup (-\infty, -t(c_2^* + \varepsilon)]$. Thus, (i) follows from the arbitrariness of γ . \square

The following result is on the existence of equilibrium points under the bilateral **(UC)**/**(UC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that $t_0 > 0$, $r^{**} \in \underline{\phi}_1^* + Y_+$, and Q and \underline{Q} are continuous-time semiflows on C_+ such that $Q_t[C_{r^{**}}] \subseteq C_{r^{**}}$, $Q_t[\varphi] \geq \underline{Q}_t[\varphi] \geq \underline{Q}_t[\psi]$ for all $(t, \varphi, \psi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^{**}} \times C_{r^{**}}$ with $\varphi \geq \psi$, and \underline{Q}_{t_0} satisfies all conditions in Theorem 3.7 with parameters r, c and ϕ being underlined. If $\{Q_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ has at least one equilibrium point in \mathcal{K} for any nonempty, closed, convex and positively invariant set $\mathcal{K} \subseteq C_{r^{**}}$ of Q_t , then $\{Q_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ has an equilibrium point W in $C_{r^{**}}$ with $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $W(\cdot, -\infty) = r_-^*$.*

Proof. By applying Theorem 3.7 to \underline{Q}_{t_0} , we know that \underline{Q}_{t_0} has a nontrivial fixed point \underline{W} in $C_{r^{**}}$ such that $\underline{W}(\cdot, \infty) = \underline{r}^*$ and $\underline{W}(\cdot, -\infty) = \underline{r}_-^*$. Let $\mathcal{K} = \bigcap_{t \in [0, t_0]} [Q_t[\underline{W}], r^{**}]_C$. Then \mathcal{K} is a nonempty, closed, convex and positively invariant set of Q_t , and hence, $\{Q_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ has an equilibrium point W in \mathcal{K} with $\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} W(\cdot, x) \geq \underline{r}^*$ and $\liminf_{x \rightarrow -\infty} W(\cdot, x) \geq \underline{r}_-^*$. By Lemma 3.4, as applied to $\{(Q_{t_0}, W)\}$ and $\{(\mathcal{S} \circ Q_{t_0} \circ \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}[W])\}$, we have $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $W(\cdot, -\infty) = r_-^*$. \square

Remark 4.1. *By Remark 3.3 and the proof of Theorems 4.3, it follows that in Theorem 4.3, we can use $\min\{c_+^*, c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty), c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$ to replace the assumption that $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{r^*}$.*

To present our last result in this subsection, we need the following assumption.

(GAS-CSF) There exists $W \in C_+$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_t[\varphi] = W$ in C for all $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$.

Theorem 4.4. *Assume that $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ such that $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies **(GAS-CSF)**. Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $t_0 \in (0, \infty)$. If Q_{t_0} satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 with Q replaced by Q_{t_0} , then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| : t\left(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right) \leq x \leq t\left(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon\right) \right\} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{t_0} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$.

Proof. Given $\gamma > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$. Applying Theorem 4.1(ii) to Q_{t_0} , we see that there exists $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \frac{\gamma}{2}, \|W(\cdot, x) - r^*\| < \frac{\gamma}{2}, \forall t \geq \alpha_0 t_0, x \in [\alpha_0, t\left(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon\right)]$$

and

$$\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| < \frac{\gamma}{3}, \|W(\cdot, x) - r_-^*\| < \frac{\gamma}{2}, \forall t \geq \alpha_0 t_0, x \in [t\left(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right), -\alpha_0].$$

Thus, we have

$$\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma, \forall t \geq \alpha_0 t_0, x \in [\alpha_0, t\left(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon\right)] \cup [t\left(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right), -\alpha_0].$$

It follows from **(GAS-CSF)** that there exists $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma, \forall x \in [-\alpha_0, \alpha_0], t > T_0.$$

These, together with the choices of α_0 and T_0 , imply that $\|Q_t[\varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x)\| < \gamma$ for all $t > \max\{T_0, \alpha_0 t_0\}$ and $x \in [t\left(-\frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon\right), t\left(\frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon\right)]$. Now the arbitrariness of γ gives rise to the desired result. \square

4.2 Nonautonomous systems

Assume that $P : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ is a map such that for any given $r \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $P|_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r \rightarrow C_+$ is continuous. For any given $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we define a family of mappings $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$ with parameter $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

We say that $W(\cdot, x - ct)$ is a travelling wave of P if $W : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a bounded and nonconstant continuous function such that $P[t, W](\theta, x) = W(\theta, x - tc)$ for all $(\theta, x) \in M \times \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. By applying Theorem 4.1 to $\{\varphi, \{Q_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}\}$, we have the following result on the upward convergence under the bilateral **(UC)**/**(UC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that there exist $t_0 > 0$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ and Q_{t_0} satisfies all the conditions in Theorem 3.5. Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $\min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \max \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct) - r_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct))\| : x \in \mathcal{B}_{t, \varepsilon, c} \right\} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2t_0} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^* + c_-^*, c_+^*(-\infty) + c_-^*(-\infty)\})$, where

$$\mathcal{B}_{t, \varepsilon, c} = [t \max\{\varepsilon + c, c - \frac{c_-^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon\}, t(c + \frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon)] \cup [t(c - \frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon), t \min\{c - \varepsilon, c + \frac{c_+^*(-\infty)}{t_0} - \varepsilon\}].$$

(ii) If $\min\{c_-^*, c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty), c_+^*(-\infty)\} > 0$, then

$$\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - r^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct) - r^*(1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct))\| : (t, x) \in \mathcal{C}_{\alpha, \varepsilon, c} \right\} = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{t_0} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$, where

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha, \varepsilon, c} = \left\{ (t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} : t \geq \alpha t_0 \text{ and } x \in [\alpha + ct, t(c + \frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon)] \cup [t(c - \frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon), ct - \alpha] \right\}.$$

Under the bilateral **(GLC)** / **(GLC)** -type assumption, we are able to apply Theorem 4.2 to $\{\varphi, \{Q_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}\}$ to obtain the following result.

Theorem 4.6. *Assume that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ , **(SC)** holds, and Q_{t_0} satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 3.6 for some $t_0 > 0$. Let $\varphi \in C_+$ with having the compact support, $c_1^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{L_k}^*$, and $c_2^* := \liminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} c_{\mathcal{S} \circ \hat{L}_k \circ \mathcal{S}}^*$. Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t(c + \frac{c_1^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq -t(\frac{c_2^*}{t_0} - c + \varepsilon) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(ii) If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* \geq 0$, then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t(c + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq -t(\frac{c_2^*}{t_0} - c + \varepsilon) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iii) If $c_1^* \geq 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t(c + \frac{c_1^*}{t_0} + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq t(c - \varepsilon) \right\} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

(iv) If $c_1^* < 0$ and $c_2^* < 0$, then $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x - ct| \geq \alpha \text{ and } t \geq \alpha \} = 0$ and

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : |x - ct| \geq t\varepsilon \} = 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0.$$

As an application of Theorems 4.3, we have the following result on the existence of travelling waves under the bilateral **(UC)** / **(UC)**-type assumption.

Theorem 4.7. *Suppose that $c \in \mathbb{R}$, and $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$, \underline{Q}_t are continuous-time semiflows on C_+ such that $\{Q_t, \underline{Q}_t\}$ satisfies all conditions in Theorem 4.3. Then $\{P[t, \cdot]\}_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ has a travelling wave $W(\cdot, x - ct)$ in $C_{r^{**}}$ with $W(\cdot, \infty) = r^*$ and $W(\cdot, -\infty) = r_-^*$.*

Regarding the global attractivity of the positive travelling wave, we can use Theorem 4.4 to establish the following result.

Theorem 4.8. *Assume that there exists $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$ is a continuous-time semiflow on C_+ and $\{Q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ satisfies **(GAS-CSF)**. Let $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. If there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that Q_{t_0} satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 with Q replaced by Q_{t_0} , then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - W(\cdot, x - ct)\| : t \left(c - \frac{c_-^*(-\infty)}{t_0} + \varepsilon \right) \leq x \leq t \left(c + \frac{c_+^*}{t_0} - \varepsilon \right) \right\} = 0,$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{t_0} \min\{c_+^*, c_-^*(-\infty)\})$.

Following [56, Section 3.1], we say a map $Q : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ is a continuous-time ω -periodic semiflow on C_+ if for any given $r \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $Q|_{\mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r} : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_r \rightarrow C_+$ is continuous, $Q_0 = \text{Id}|_{C_+}$, and $Q_t \circ Q_\omega = Q_{t+\omega}$ for some number $\omega > 0$ and all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $Q_t := Q(t, \cdot)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Remark 4.2. *In the case where $Q_t := T_{-ct} \circ P[t, \cdot]$ is a continuous-time ω -periodic semiflow on C_+ , we can apply main results in Section 3 to the Poincaré map Q_ω to establish the spreading properties and the forced time-periodic traveling waves with speed c for the nonautonomous evolution system $P[t, \cdot]$. We refer to [33] for the Poincaré map approach to monotone periodic semiflows.*

5 Applications

In this section, we apply our developed theory in Sections 3 and 4 to two classes of evolution equations in the bilateral limit case, but we leave the investigation in the unilateral limit case to readers.

5.1 A delayed reaction-diffusion equation with a shifting habitat

Consider the following time-delayed reaction-diffusion equation with a shifting habitat:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x) = du_{xx}(t, x) - \mu u(t, x) + \mu f(x - ct, u(t - \tau, x)), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x), & (\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $d, \mu, \tau > 0$, and the initial data φ belongs to $C([- \tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+) \cap L^\infty([- \tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Note that the shifting speed c in system (5.1) can be made positive via the transformation: $-c \rightarrow c$, $-x \rightarrow x$, $u(t, -x) \rightarrow u(t, x)$ and $f(-x, u) \rightarrow f(x, u)$ when $c < 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $c \geq 0$.

We always assume that $f \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ and $f_\pm^\infty \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfy the following condition:

- (B) $f(s, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$, $f(s, 0) = 0, \forall s \in \mathbb{R}$; $0 \leq f_\pm^\infty(u) \leq \frac{df_\pm^\infty(0)}{du}u, \forall u \in \mathbb{R}_+$; there exists a sequence $\{u_k^*\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, \infty)$ such that $u_k^* < u_{k+1}^*$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} u_k^* = \infty$, and $f(\mathbb{R} \times [0, u_k^*]) \subseteq [0, u_k^*]$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

To study bilateral propagation dynamics, we also need the following assumptions on f :

- (B₊) There exists $u_+^* > 0$ such that $\{u > 0 : (f_+^\infty)^2(u) = u\} = \{u_+^*\}$, $\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} > 1$, $f_+^\infty(0, \infty) \subseteq (0, \infty)$, $\inf_{x>1} \frac{f_+^\infty(x)}{x} < 1$, $f(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)) \subseteq (0, \infty)$, and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} f(s, \cdot) = f_+^\infty(\cdot)$ in $C_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$;
- (B₋) There exists $u_-^* > 0$ such that $\{u > 0 : (f_-^\infty)^2(u) = u\} = \{u_-^*\}$, $\frac{df_-^\infty(0)}{du} > 1$, $f_-^\infty(0, \infty) \subseteq (0, \infty)$, $\inf_{x>1} \frac{f_-^\infty(x)}{x} < 1$, $f(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)) \subseteq (0, \infty)$, and $\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} f(s, \cdot) = f_-^\infty(\cdot)$ in $C_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$.

Note that we do not assume that $f(s, u) \leq \partial_u f(s, 0)u$ for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

The following result is adapted from [49, Lemma 4.2] and [50, Lemma 6.1], which gives a monotone and subhomogeneous nonlinear lower bound for the function f .

Lemma 5.1. *Let (B₊) hold. Then for any $u^{**} \geq u_+^*$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - 1)$ with $f(\mathbb{R} \times [0, u^{**}]) \subseteq [0, u^{**}]$, there exist $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}(u^{**}, \gamma) > 0$, $K = K_{u^{**}, \gamma} > 0$, and $r = r_{u^{**}, \gamma} \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that*

(i) r is a nondecreasing function having the property that $-\frac{1}{K} = r(-\infty) = r(s_1) < r(s_2) = r(\infty) = \frac{\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - 1 - \gamma}{K}$ for all $(s_1, s_2) \in (-\infty, \mathfrak{s}] \times [1 + \mathfrak{s}, \infty)$;

(ii) $f(s, u) \geq f_{u^{**}, \gamma}(s, u)$ for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, u^{**}]$, where

$$f_{u^{**}, \gamma}(s, u) = \begin{cases} \frac{(1+Kr(s))^2}{4K}, & (s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [\frac{1+Kr(s)}{2K}, \infty), \\ u + Ku(r(s) - u), & (s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \frac{1+Kr(s)}{2K}). \end{cases}$$

(iii) $f_{u^{**}, \gamma}(\infty, \cdot)$ has a unique fixed point u_∞ in $(0, \infty)$ with

$$u_\infty \in (0, u^{**}] \text{ and } u_\infty = \begin{cases} \frac{(1+Kr(\infty))^2}{4K}, & r(\infty)K > 1, \\ r(\infty), & r(\infty)K \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

and hence, $u_\infty \leq u_1^*$.

Proof. Fix $u^{**} \geq u_+^*$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - 1)$. By the choice of γ , there exists $\delta_1 := \delta_1(\gamma) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{df_+^\infty(u)}{du} > \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - \frac{\gamma}{3}, \quad \forall u \in [0, \delta_1].$$

This, together with (B_+) , implies that there exists $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}(u^{**}, \gamma) > 0$ such that

$$f_* := \inf f([\mathfrak{s}, \infty) \times [\delta_1, u^{**}]) > 0, \quad \partial_u f(s, u) > \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - \frac{2\gamma}{3}, \quad \forall (s, u) \in [\mathfrak{s}, \infty) \times [0, \delta_1].$$

Take $K = \frac{1}{4f_*} [\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du}]^2$ and define $r : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$r(s) = \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - 1 - \gamma}{K}, & s \geq \mathfrak{s} + 1, \\ \frac{(\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - \gamma)(s - \mathfrak{s}) - 1}{K}, & \mathfrak{s} < s < \mathfrak{s} + 1, \\ -\frac{1}{K}, & s \leq \mathfrak{s}. \end{cases}$$

With the definitions of $r(\cdot)$ and $f_{u^{**}, \gamma}$, we can easily verify that $r(\cdot)$ and $f_{u^{**}, \gamma}$ have all properties presented in Lemma 5.1. \square

The following observation is useful for us to verify the assumptions (GLC) and (GLC_-) .

Lemma 5.2. *Let (B_\pm) hold. Then for any $u^{**} > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, there exists $\bar{R} = \bar{R}_{\gamma, u^{**}}(\cdot) \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that*

(i) \bar{R} is a nonincreasing function with $\infty > \bar{R}(-\infty) > \bar{R}(\infty) = \gamma + \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du}$;

(ii) $f(s, u) \leq \bar{R}(s)u$ for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, u^{**}]$.

Lemma 5.3. *If $x^* \in (0, \infty)$ and $g \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}_+)$ such that $g(0) = 0 < 1 < g'(0)$, $\inf_{x>1} \frac{g(x)}{x} < 1$, and $\{x \in (0, \infty) : g(g(x)) = x\} = \{x^*\}$, then for any $b \geq a > 0$ with $\{a, b\} \neq x^*$, there exist $b^* > a^* > \gamma^* > 0$ such that $[a, b] \subseteq [a^*, b^*]$, $g([a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*]) \subseteq (a^* + \gamma^*, b^* - \gamma^*)$, and either $a + \gamma^* < \inf g([a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$ or $b - \gamma^* > \sup g([a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$.*

Proof. Note that $g(x) > x$ for all $x \in (0, x^*)$ and $g(x) < x$ for all $x \in (x^*, \infty)$. Fix $b \geq a > 0$ with $\{a, b\} \neq \{x^*\}$. In view of [48, Lemma 5.3], we see that there exist $a', b' \in (0, \infty)$ such that $[a, b] \subseteq [a', b']$, $g([a', b']) \subseteq [a', b']$, and either $a < \inf g([a', b'])$ or $b > \sup g([a', b'])$. Thus, $a' < \inf g([a', b'])$ or $b' > \sup g([a', b'])$. Next we finish the proof according to three cases.

Case 1. $a' < \inf g([a', b'])$ and $b' > \sup g([a', b'])$.

In this case, we may select $\gamma^* \in (0, a')$ such that

$$a' + \gamma^* < \inf g([a' - \gamma^*, b' + \gamma^*]), \quad b' - \gamma^* > \sup g([a' - \gamma^*, b' + \gamma^*]),$$

and

$$\text{either } a + \gamma^* < \inf g([a' - \gamma^*, b' + \gamma^*]), \text{ or } b - \gamma^* > \sup g([a' - \gamma^*, b' + \gamma^*]).$$

These, together with $a^* = a'$ and $b^* = b'$, yield the desired conclusions.

Case 2. $a' < \inf g([a', b'])$ and $b' = \sup g([a', b'])$.

In this case, it is easy to see $b' \geq x^*$. Take $\delta' > 0$ such that $a' < \inf g([a', b' + \delta'])$ and either $a < \inf g([a', b' + \delta'])$ or $b > \sup g([a', b' + \delta'])$. Since $b' = \sup g([a', b'])$ and $x > g(x)$ for all $x \in (b', b' + \delta']$, it follows that $b' + \delta' > \sup g([a', b' + \delta'])$. By applying (i) to $\{a', b' + \delta'\}$, we then obtain the desired conclusions.

Case 3. $a' = \inf g([a', b'])$ and $b' > \sup g([a', b'])$.

In this case, $a' \leq x^*$. Select $\delta'' > 0$ such that $b' > \sup g([a' - \delta'', b'])$ and either $a < \inf g([a' - \delta'', b'])$ or $b > \sup g([a', b' + \delta''])$. Since $a' = \sup g([a', b'])$ and $x > g(x)$ for all $x \in [a' - \delta'', a')$, it follows that $a' + \delta'' < \sup g([a' - \delta'', b'])$. By applying (i) to $\{a' - \delta'', b'\}$, we then get the desired conclusions. \square

Based on Lemma 5.3 and the assumptions (B_{\pm}) , we easily see that the real functions may exhibit **(NM)** and **(NM₋)** features when the limiting functions have unique positive periodic-two point, which plays a key role in our verification of **(NM)** and **(NM₋)**.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $b \geq a > 0$. Then the statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $\{a, b\} \neq \{u_+^*\}$ and (B_+) hold, then there exist $b^* > a^* > \gamma^* > 0$ and $z^* > 0$ such that $[a, b] \subseteq [a^*, b^*]$, $Cl(f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])) \subseteq (a^* + \gamma^*, b^* - \gamma^*)$ and either $a + \gamma^* < \inf f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$ or $b - \gamma^* > \sup f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$.*
- (ii) *If $\{a, b\} \neq \{u_-^*\}$ and (B_-) hold, then there exist $b^* > a^* > \gamma^* > 0$ and $z^* > 0$ such that $[a, b] \subseteq [a^*, b^*]$, $Cl(f((-\infty, -z^*] \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])) \subseteq (a^* + \gamma^*, b^* - \gamma^*)$ and either $a + \gamma^* < \inf f((-\infty, -z^*] \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$ or $b - \gamma^* > \sup f((-\infty, -z^*] \times [a^* - \gamma^*, b^* + \gamma^*])$.*

By the arguments similar to those for [56, Lemma 2.3.2], we have the following observation.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $F^* \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$, $F \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$, $F(x, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$, and $F(x, 0) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. If $F(x, \cdot)|_{[0, F^*]_{\mathbb{R}^N}}$ is a subhomogeneous map for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $F(x, u) \leq D_u F(x, 0)u$ for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, F^*]_{\mathbb{R}^N}$;

(ii) $D_u F(x, u)u \leq D_u F(x, 0)u$ for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, F^*]_{\mathbb{R}^N}$. In particular, $D_u F(x, u) \leq D_u F(x, 0)$ for all $(x, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, F^*]_{\mathbb{R}^N}$ with $N = 1$.

Let $M = [-\tau, 0]$, $X = BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, $X_+ = BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$, $C = BC([-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$, and $C_+ = BC([-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+)$. Define

$$e_{\phi, \nu}(\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x)e^{-\nu x}, \quad \forall (\varphi, \nu, x) \in C \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$\tilde{C} := \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^p e_{\varphi_k, \nu_k} : (\varphi_k, \nu_k) \in C \times \mathbb{R}, p \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Let $S(t)$ be the semigroup generated by the linear parabolic equation:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = d\Delta u(t, x) + cu_x - \mu u, & t > 0, \\ u(0, x) = \phi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases}$$

that is, for $(x, \phi) \in \mathbb{R} \times X$,

$$\begin{cases} S(0)[\phi](x) = \phi(x), \\ S(t)[\phi](x) = \frac{\exp(-\mu t)}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(y) \exp\left(-\frac{(x+ct-y)^2}{4dt}\right) dy, & t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

For any $(x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{C}$, we also extend the domain of S to define

$$\begin{cases} S(0)[\varphi(0, \cdot)](x) = \varphi(0, x), \\ S(t)[\varphi(0, \cdot)](x) = \frac{\exp(-\mu t)}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(0, y) \exp\left(-\frac{(x+ct-y)^2}{4dt}\right) dy, & t > 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

Since $S(t)[e_{\phi, \nu}] \in X$, it follows that

$$S(t)[\varphi(0, \cdot)] \in X, \quad \forall (t, \phi, \nu) \in (0, \infty) \times X \times \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi \in \tilde{C}.$$

By the standard step arguments, it follows that for any given $\varphi \in C_+$, equation (5.1) has a unique mild solution on \mathbb{R}_+ , denoted by $u^\varphi(t, x; f)$ or $(u^{\varphi; f})_t$, which is also the classical solution of (5.1) on (τ, ∞) with $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto (u^{\varphi; f})_t \in C_+$ being continuous. Recall that $(u^{\varphi; f})_t(\theta, x) = u^\varphi(t + \theta, x; f)$, $\forall (\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}$. Further, we have the following result on the monotonicity and boundedness of solutions to system (5.1).

Proposition 5.1. *Assume that $M^* > 0$ and $f_1, f_2 \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$ satisfy $f_2(\cdot, \cdot) \geq f_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $f_2(s, u) \leq M^*$ for all $(s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, M^*]$. Let $\psi, \varphi \in C_+$ with $\varphi \leq \psi \leq M^*$. If $f_1(s, u)$ is nondecreasing in $u \in [0, M^*]$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$ or $f_2(s, u)$ is nondecreasing in $u \in [0, M^*]$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then $0 \leq u^\varphi(t, x; f_1) \leq u^\psi(t, x; f_2) \leq M^*$ for all $(t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $0 \leq u^\varphi(t, x; f) \leq u_k^*$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varphi \in C_{u_k^*}$.*

Now we introduce the following three auxiliary equations:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = cu_x + du_{xx}(t, x) - \mu u(t, x) + \mu f(x, u(t - \tau, x + c\tau)), \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = cu_x + du_{xx}(t, x) - \mu u(t, x) + \mu f_\pm^\infty(u(t - \tau, x + c\tau)), \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5.5)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = du_{xx}(t, x) - \mu u(t, x) + \mu f_{\pm}^{\infty}(u(t - \tau, x)), \quad t > 0, x \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.6)$$

Define $P : \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+ \rightarrow C_+$ by

$$P[t, \varphi; f](\theta, x) = u^{\varphi}(t + \theta, x; f), \quad \forall (t, \theta, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times [-\tau, 0] \times C_+,$$

and let $Q[t, \varphi; f]$, $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi; f_{\pm}^{\infty}]$ and $\Phi_{\pm}[t, \varphi; f_{\pm}^{\infty}]$ be the mild solutions of equations (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6) with the initial value $u_0 = \varphi \in C_+$, respectively. For simplicity, we denote $P[t, \varphi; f]$, $Q[t, \varphi; f]$, $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi; f_{\pm}^{\infty}]$ and $\Phi_{\pm}[t, \varphi; f_{\pm}^{\infty}]$ by $P[t, \varphi]$, $Q[t, \varphi]$, $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi]$ and $\Phi_{\pm}[t, \varphi]$, respectively.

In the following, we also use $Q[t, \varphi; \zeta(\cdot)Id_{\mathbb{R}}]$ to represent the mild solution of the following linear reaction-diffusion equation with time delay:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x) = cu_x + du_{xx}(t, x) - \mu u(t, x) + \mu \zeta(x)u(t - \tau, x + c\tau), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u(\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x), & (\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

where $\zeta \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi \in \tilde{C}$. In other words, $Q[t, \varphi; \zeta(\cdot)Id_{\mathbb{R}}](x)$ satisfies the integral form of equation (5.9):

$$\begin{cases} u(t, x) = S(t)[\varphi](x) + \int_0^t S(t-s)[\mu \zeta(\cdot)u(s - \tau, \cdot + c\tau)](x)ds, & (t, x) \in [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ u_0 = \varphi \in \tilde{C}. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Using the standard step arguments, one can easily obtain the global existence on \mathbb{R}_+ and positivity of solutions to (5.8).

By the definitions of P, Q, Q_{\pm} and Φ_{\pm} , it is easy to verify the following relations.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varphi \in C_+$. Then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $Q[t, \varphi](\theta, x) = P[t, \varphi](\theta, x + ct)$ for all $(\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) If $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(s, \cdot) = f_{\pm}^{\infty}$ in $L_{loc}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$, then $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi] = \lim_{y \rightarrow \pm\infty} Q[t, T_y[\varphi]](\cdot, \cdot + y)$ in C .
- (iii) $\Phi_{\pm}[t, \varphi] = Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi](\cdot, \cdot - ct)$.

We can easily verify the following result on the compactness, monotonicity and positivity.

Proposition 5.3. *The following statements are valid:*

- (i) $Q[t, C_+ \setminus \{0\}] \subseteq C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $Q[t, C_{u_k^*}] \subseteq C_{u_k^*}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Moreover, $Q[t, \varphi] \in C_+^{\circ}$ for all $(t, \varphi) \in (\tau, \infty) \times C_+$ with $\varphi(0, \cdot) > 0$ or $f(\cdot, \varphi(\cdot, \cdot)) > 0$, and hence, $Q[(\tau, \infty) \times (C_+ \setminus \{0\})] \subseteq C_+^{\circ}$ provided that $f(\mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty)) \subseteq (0, \infty)$.
- (ii) If $f(s, u)$ is nondecreasing in $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then $Q[t, \varphi] \geq Q[t, \psi]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varphi, \psi \in C_+$ with $\varphi \geq \psi$.
- (iii) If $f(s, u)$ is nondecreasing in $s \in \mathbb{R}$ for each $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then $T_{-y}[Q[t, T_y[\varphi]]] \geq Q[t, \varphi]$ for all $(t, y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times C_+$.
- (iv) If $f(s, u)$ is nonincreasing in $s \in \mathbb{R}$ for each $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$, then $T_{-y}[Q[t, T_y[\varphi]]] \leq Q[t, \varphi]$ for all $(t, y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \times C_+$.

- (v) If $r > 0$, then $Q[t, C_r]$ is precompact in C for all $t > \tau$ and $Q[t, C_r](0, \cdot)$ is precompact in X for all $t > 0$.
- (vi) If $f(s, \alpha u) \geq \alpha f(s, u)$ for all $(s, u, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, 1]$, then $Q[t, \alpha \varphi] \geq \alpha Q[t, \varphi]$ for all $(t, \varphi, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \times C_+ \times [0, 1]$.

The following three lemmas are useful in our verification of **(NM)** and **(NM₋)**.

Lemma 5.6. Assume that there exists $x^* \in (0, \infty)$ such that $f(\mathbb{R}_+ \times [0, x^*]) \subseteq [0, x^*]$. Let $T \in [\tau, 2\tau]$, $\beta \in (0, x^*)$, and $x^* > b > a > 0$. Then the following statements are valid:

- (i) If $\beta < \inf f_{\pm}^{\infty}([a, b])$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(s, \cdot) = f_{\pm}^{\infty}$ in $L_{loc}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$, then for any $\gamma^* > 0$, there exist $\sigma^* = \sigma^*(x^*, \gamma^*) > 0$ and $z^* = z^*(x^*, \gamma^*, a, b, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$T_{-z} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]](0, 0) > \beta + (\inf\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^*, \sigma^*]\} - \beta)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^*$$

for all $\hat{z} \geq z^*$ and $(\pm z, t, \varphi) \in [\hat{z}, \infty) \times (0, T] \times \mathcal{H}_{\sigma^*, \hat{z}}^{\pm}$, where

$$\mathcal{H}_{\sigma_0, z_0}^{\pm} := \{\psi \in C_+ : T_{-z-c\tau} \circ Q[[0, T - \tau], T_z[\psi]] \subseteq [a\xi_{\sigma_0}, b\tilde{\xi}_{\sigma_0, \frac{x^*}{b}}]_C, \forall \pm z \geq z_0\}$$

for all positive numbers σ_0 and z_0 .

- (ii) If $\beta > \sup f_{\pm}^{\infty}([a, b])$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} f(s, \cdot) = f_{\pm}^{\infty}$ in $L_{loc}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R})$, then for any $\gamma^* > 0$, there exist $\sigma^{**} = \sigma^{**}(x^*, \gamma^*) > 0$ and $z^{**} = z^{**}(x^*, \gamma^*, a, b, \beta) > 0$ such that

$$T_{-z} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]](0, 0) < \beta + (\sup\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^{**}, \sigma^{**}]\} - \beta)e^{-\mu t} + \gamma^*$$

for all $\hat{z} \geq z^{**}$ and $(\pm z, t, \varphi) \in [\hat{z}, \infty) \times (0, T] \times \mathcal{H}_{\sigma^{**}, \hat{z}}^{\pm}$.

Proof. We only consider the cases of $+$ since the cases of $-$ can be derived by applying the results of $+$ to $\mathcal{S} \circ Q[t, \cdot; f] \circ \mathcal{S}$.

(i) Fix $t \in (0, T]$ and $\gamma^* > 0$. Selete $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $2x^*\delta < \gamma^*$. Take $\sigma^*, z^* \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y| \geq \frac{\sigma^* - 2\tau c}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy < \delta, \quad f([z^* - \sigma^*, \infty) \times [a, b]) \subseteq [\beta, \infty).$$

It follows from (5.4) that for any $\hat{z} \geq z^*$, $(z, \varphi) \in [\hat{z}, \infty) \times \mathcal{H}_{\sigma^*, \hat{z}}^+$ with $\underline{a} = \inf\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^*, \sigma^*]\}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} & T_{-z} \circ Q[t, \cdot] \circ T_z[\varphi](0, 0) \\ &= \frac{e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(0, y) e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy \\ & \quad + \mu \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y+z, T_{-z-c\tau}[Q[s, T_z[\varphi]]](s, y)) e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds \\ & \geq \frac{\underline{a}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\sigma^*}^{\sigma^*} e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\mu \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{-\sigma^*}^{\sigma^*} \inf f(y+z, [a, b]) e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds \\
& \geq \frac{\underline{a}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\sigma^*}^{\sigma^*} e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy + \mu\beta \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{-\sigma^*}^{\sigma^*} e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds \\
& = \frac{\underline{a}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^*-ct}{2\sqrt{dt}}}^{\frac{\sigma^*-ct}{2\sqrt{dt}}} e^{-y^2} dy + \mu\beta \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^*-cs}{2\sqrt{ds}}}^{\frac{\sigma^*-cs}{2\sqrt{ds}}} e^{-y^2} dy ds \\
& \geq \frac{\underline{a}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^*}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}}^{\frac{\sigma^*-2\tau c}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy + \mu\beta \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^*}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}}^{\frac{\sigma^*-2\tau c}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy ds \\
& \geq \underline{a}(1-\delta)e^{-\mu t} + \beta(1-\delta)(1-e^{-\mu t}) \\
& \geq \beta + (\underline{a} - \beta)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (i) follows from the definition of \underline{a} .

(ii) Fix $t \in (0, T]$ and $\gamma^* > 0$. Selete $\delta \in (0, 1)$ such that $x^*\delta < \gamma^*$. Take $\sigma^{**}, z^{**} \in (0, \infty)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y| \geq \frac{\sigma^{**}-2\tau c}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy < \delta, \quad f([z^{**} - \sigma^{**}, \infty) \times [a, b]) \subseteq [0, \beta].$$

It follows from (5.4) that for any $\hat{z} \geq z^{**}$, $(z, \varphi) \in [\hat{z}, \infty) \times \mathcal{H}_{\sigma^{**}, \hat{z}}^+$ with $\bar{b} := \sup\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^{**}, \sigma^{**}]\}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& T_{-z} \circ Q[t, \cdot] \circ T_z[\varphi](0, 0) \\
& = \frac{e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(0, y) e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy \\
& \quad + \mu \int_0^t \frac{e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y+z, T_{-z-c\tau}[Q[s, T_z[\varphi]]](\tau, y)) e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds \\
& \leq \frac{\bar{b}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{-\sigma^{**}}^{\sigma^{**}} e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy + \frac{x^*e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{4d\pi t}} \int_{|y| \geq \sigma^{**}} e^{-\frac{(ct-y)^2}{4dt}} dy \\
& \quad + \mu \int_0^t \frac{\beta e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{-\sigma^{**}}^{\sigma^{**}} e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds + \mu \int_0^t \frac{x^*e^{-\mu(t-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(t-s)}} \int_{|y| \geq \sigma^{**}} e^{-\frac{(c(t-s)-y)^2}{4d(t-s)}} dy ds \\
& = \frac{\bar{b}e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^{**}-ct}{\sqrt{4dt}}}^{\frac{\sigma^{**}-ct}{\sqrt{4dt}}} e^{-y^2} dy + \frac{x^*e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y\sqrt{4dt}+ct| \geq \sigma^{**}} e^{-y^2} dy \\
& \quad + \mu \int_0^t \frac{\beta e^{-\mu s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\frac{-\sigma^{**}-cs}{\sqrt{4ds}}}^{\frac{\sigma^{**}-cs}{\sqrt{4ds}}} e^{-y^2} dy ds + \mu \int_0^t \frac{x^*e^{-\mu s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y\sqrt{4ds}+cs| \geq \sigma^{**}} e^{-y^2} dy ds \\
& \leq \bar{b}e^{-\mu t} + \frac{x^*e^{-\mu t}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y| \geq \frac{\sigma^{**}-2c\tau}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy \\
& \quad + \beta(1-e^{-\mu t}) + \mu \int_0^t \frac{x^*e^{-\mu s}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{|y| \geq \frac{\sigma^{**}-2c\tau}{2\sqrt{2d\tau}}} e^{-y^2} dy ds \\
& < \beta + (\bar{b} - \beta)e^{-\mu t} + x^*e^{-\mu t}\delta + x^*(1-e^{-\mu t})\delta \\
& < \beta + (\bar{b} - \beta)e^{-\mu t} + \gamma^*.
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with the definition of \bar{b} , implies (ii). □

For any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\Psi_{\pm, \mu}(t, \cdot)$ be the solution maps of the following linear reaction-diffusion equations with time delay:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t, x) = dv_{xx}(t, x) - \mu v(t, x) + \mu \frac{df_{\pm}^{\infty}(0)}{du} v(t - \tau, x), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ v(\theta, x) = \varphi(\theta, x), & (\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

where $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}) \cap L^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$. Here and after, we extend the domain of $\Psi_{\pm, \mu}(t, \cdot)$ to \tilde{C} by the step argument. Now we define $L_{\pm, \mu} : Y \rightarrow Y$ by

$$L_{\pm, \mu}[\phi] = \Psi_{\pm, \mu}(1, e_{\phi, \mu})(\cdot, 0), \quad \forall \phi \in Y,$$

where $e_{\phi, \mu}(\theta, x) = \phi(\theta)e^{-\mu x}$. Clearly, $L_{\pm, \mu}$ is continuous and positive. Moreover, $(L_{\pm, \mu})^{n_0}$ is a compact and strongly positive operator on Y for some $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. According to [34, Lemma 3.2], we know that $L_{\pm, \mu}$ has the unique principal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\pm}(\mu)$ and a unique strongly positive eigenfunction ζ_{μ}^{\pm} associated with $\lambda_{\pm}(\mu) > 0$ such that $\|\zeta_{\mu}^{\pm}\| = 1$. Let

$$c^*(\pm\infty) := \inf_{\mu > 0} \frac{1}{\mu} \log \lambda_{\pm}(\mu).$$

Then $c^*(\pm\infty) > 0$ provided that $\frac{df_{\pm}^{\infty}(0)}{du} > 1$. By [34, Theorem 5.1], it follows that $c^*(\pm\infty)$ is the spreading speeds of the right and left limiting systems (5.6), respectively, in the case where f is nondecreasing. In such a case, [34, Theorem 5.1] and Proposition 5.2-(iii) imply that $t(c^*(\pm\infty) - c)$ and $t(c^*(\pm\infty) + c)$ are just the right and left spreading speeds of $Q_{\pm}[t, \cdot]$ for any given $t > 0$.

Proposition 5.4. *Then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) $Q[2\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(NM)** if (B_+) holds.
- (ii) $Q[2\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(NM₋)** if (B_-) holds.

Proof. It then suffices to prove **(NM)** since **(NM₋)** can be verified in a similar way.

Fix $r^* = u_+^*$ and $\tilde{t} \geq s \geq r > 0$ with $\{r, s\} \neq \{1\}$. In view of Lemma 5.4-(i), there exist $b^* > a^* > \delta^* > 0$ and $z^* > 0$ such that

$$[rr^*, sr^*] \subseteq [a^*, b^*], \quad Cl(f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \delta^*, b^* + \delta^*])) \subseteq (a^* + \delta^*, b^* - \delta^*),$$

and one of the following two cases happens:

- (a) $rr^* + \delta^* < \inf f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \delta^*, b^* + \delta^*]);$
- (b) $sr^* - \delta^* > \sup f([z^*, \infty) \times [a^* - \delta^*, b^* + \delta^*]).$

In the following, we only consider the case (a) since the case (b) can be dealt with in a similar way. Note that in the case (a), we easily see that

$$f_+^{\infty}([a^* - \frac{\delta^*}{3}, b^* + \frac{\delta^*}{3}]) \subseteq (a^* + \delta^*, b^* - \delta^*)$$

and

$$f_+^{\infty}([a^* - \delta^*, b^* + \delta^*]) \subseteq (rr^* + \delta^*, \infty).$$

Take $\gamma^* = \frac{\delta^*(1-e^{-\mu\tau})}{3}$, $\gamma = \frac{\gamma^*}{r^*}$, and $x^* = u_{k_0}^* \geq (1 + \gamma + \tilde{t})r^* + 2b^* + 1$ for some $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\sigma^* = c\tau + \max\{\sigma^*(x^*, \gamma^*), \sigma^{**}(x^*, \gamma^*)\}$ and $z^* = \max\{z^*(x^*, \gamma^*, a^* - \frac{\delta^*}{3}, b^* + \frac{\delta^*}{3}, a^* + \delta^*), z^*(x^*, \gamma^*, a^* - \delta^*, b^* + \delta^*, rr^* + \delta^*), z^{**}(x^*, \gamma^*, a^* - \frac{\delta^*}{3}, b^* + \frac{\delta^*}{3}, b^* - \delta^*)\}$, where $\sigma^*(\cdot), \sigma^{**}(\cdot), z^*(\cdot), z^{**}(\cdot)$ are defined as in Lemma 5.6.

By applying Lemma 5.6 with $a = a^* - \frac{\delta^*}{3}$, $b = b^* + \frac{\delta^*}{3}$, $\beta \in \{a^* + \delta^*, b^* - \delta^*\}$, and $T = \tau$, we see that for any $t \in (0, \tau]$, $z \geq z^*$, and $\varphi \in [a\xi_{\sigma^*}, b\tilde{\xi}_{\sigma^*, \frac{x^*}{b}}]_C$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
b^* + \delta^* &\geq b^* - \delta^* + (b^* + \frac{\delta^*}{3} - b^* + \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} + \gamma^* \\
&\geq b^* - \delta^* + (\sup\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^*, \sigma^*]\} - b^* + \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} + \gamma^* \\
&\geq b^* - \delta^* + (\sup\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^* + c\tau, \sigma^* - c\tau]\} - b^* + \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} + \gamma^* \\
&> T_{-z} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]](0, 0) \\
&> a^* + \delta^* + (\inf\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^* + c\tau, \sigma^* + c\tau]\} - a^* - \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^* \\
&\geq a^* + \delta^* + (\inf\{\varphi(0, y) : y \in [-\sigma^*, \sigma^*]\} - a^* - \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^* \\
&\geq a^* + \delta^* + (a^* - \frac{\delta^*}{3} - a^* - \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^* \\
&\geq a^* - \delta^*.
\end{aligned}$$

This, together with the choices of σ^* and z^* , implies that

$$T_{-z-c\tau} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]] \in [(a^* - \delta^*)\xi_{\sigma^*}, (b^* + \delta^*)\tilde{\xi}_{\sigma^*, \frac{x^*}{b^* + \delta^*}}]_C$$

for all $(z, t, \varphi) \in [z^* + \sigma^* + 1, \infty) \times [0, \tau] \times [a\xi_{2+2\sigma^*+c\tau}, b\tilde{\xi}_{2+2\sigma^*+c\tau, \frac{x^*}{b}}]_C$. In particular,

$$T_{-z-c\tau} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]] \in [(a^* - \delta^*)\xi_{\sigma^*}, (b^* + \delta^*)\tilde{\xi}_{\sigma^*, \frac{x^*}{b^* + \delta^*}}]_C$$

for all $(z, t, \varphi) \in [z^* + \sigma^* + 1, \infty) \times [0, \tau] \times [(rr^* - \gamma r^*)\xi_{2+2\sigma^*+c\tau}, (sr^* + \gamma r^*)\tilde{\xi}_{2+2\sigma^*+c\tau, \frac{x^*}{sr^* + \gamma r^*}}]_C$.

By Lemma 5.6-(i) with $a = a^* - \delta^*$, $b = b^* + \delta^*$, $\beta = rr^* + \delta^*$, and $T = 2\tau$, it then follows that for any $t \in [\tau, 2\tau]$ and $\varphi \in [(rr^* - \gamma r^*)\xi_{\sigma_0}, (sr^* + \gamma r^*)\tilde{\xi}_{\sigma_0, \frac{x^*}{sr^* + \gamma r^*}}]_C$ with $z \geq z_0 := z^* + \sigma^* + 1$ and $\sigma_0 := 2 + 2\sigma^* + c\tau$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{-z} \circ Q[t, T_z[\varphi]](0, 0) &> rr^* + \delta^* + (rr^* - \gamma r^* - rr^* - \delta^*)e^{-\mu t} - \gamma^* \\
&= rr^* + \delta^* - (\gamma r^* + \delta^*)e^{-\mu\tau} - \gamma^* \\
&> rr^* + \gamma r^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $Q[2\tau, \cdot; f]$ satisfies **(NM)**. □

Regarding assumptions **(ACH)** and **(ACH₋)**, we have the following observation.

Proposition 5.5. *The following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If (B_+) holds, then $Q[2\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(ACH)** with $T_{-y} \circ Q_l[\varphi] \geq Q_l \circ T_{-y}[\varphi]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$, where Q_l is defined as in **(ACH)**.*
- (ii) *If (B_-) holds, then $Q[2\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(ACH₋)** with $T_y \circ Q_{-l}[\varphi] \geq Q_{-l} \circ T_y[\varphi]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(y, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$, where Q_l is defined as in **(ACH₋)**.*

Proof. We only prove (i) since (ii) follows from (i), as applied to $\mathcal{S} \circ Q[2\tau, \cdot] \circ \mathcal{S}$. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let us denote $\gamma_l = \frac{1}{2l}(\frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} - 1)$, $r_l = r_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, $K_l = K_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, $f_l = f_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, and $f_l^\pm(u) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \pm\infty} f_l(s, u)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $r_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, $K_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, and $f_{u_l^*, \gamma_l}$, are defined as in Lemma 5.1. Then (f_l, f_l^\pm) satisfies (B) for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, $0 \leq f_l(s, u) \leq f(s, u)$, $f_l(s, u)$ is nondecreasing in s, u , and $f_l(s, \alpha u) \geq \alpha f_l(s, u)$ for all $(s, u, \alpha) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$r_l^* := \begin{cases} \frac{(1+K_l r_l(\infty))^2}{4K_l}, & r_l(\infty)K_l > 1, \\ r_l(\infty), & r_l(\infty)K_l \leq 1, \end{cases}$$

$Q_l = Q[2\tau, \cdot; f_l]$, and $Q_{l,+} = Q[2\tau, \cdot; f_l^+]$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 5.1-(ii) in [34], and Propositions 5.2-(ii), 5.3, we easily verify that $Q[2\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(ACH)**. \square

Proposition 5.6. $Q[\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(GLC)** with $\tau(c^*(\infty) - c)$ and **(GLC₋)** with $\tau(c^*(-\infty) + c)$ provided that **(B₊)** and **(B₋)** hold.

Proof. It suffices to verify **(GLC)**. For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $R_l = \bar{R}_{\frac{1}{l}, u_l^*}$, where $\bar{R}_{\frac{1}{l}, u_l^*}$ is defined as in Lemma 5.2. Then R_l is a bounded and nonincreasing function such that

$$R_l(-\infty) > R_l(\infty) = \frac{df_+^\infty(0)}{du} + \frac{1}{l}, \quad f(s, u) \leq R_l(s)u, \quad \forall (s, u) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, u_l^*].$$

Define

$$L_0[\varphi](\theta, x) = \frac{e^{-\mu(\theta+\tau)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(\theta+\tau)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(0, y) e^{-\frac{(x+c[\theta+\tau]-y)^2}{4d(\theta+\tau)}} dy,$$

$$L_l[\varphi](\theta, x) = L_0[\varphi](\theta, x) + \mu \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \frac{e^{-\mu(\theta+\tau-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(\theta+\tau-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(y) \varphi(s-\tau, y+c\tau) e^{-\frac{(x+c(\theta+\tau-s)-y)^2}{4d(\theta+\tau-s)}} dy ds,$$

and

$$L_l^+[\varphi](\theta, x) = L_0[\varphi](\theta, x) + \mu \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \frac{e^{-\mu(\theta+\tau-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(\theta+\tau-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(\infty) \varphi(s-\tau, y+c\tau) e^{-\frac{(x+c(\theta+\tau-s)-y)^2}{4d(\theta+\tau-s)}} dy ds$$

for all $(\theta, x, \varphi) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{C}$. According to the definitions of R_l, L_l, L_l^+ , we easily see that

$$\tau(c^*(\infty) - c) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} c_{L_l^+}^*, \quad Q[\tau, \cdot; f]|_{C_{u_l^*}} \leq L_l|_{C_{u_l^*}}, \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To finish this proof, we only need to verify that (L_l, L_l^+) satisfies **(LC)** for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $(l, \epsilon, \nu, \zeta) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, \infty)^2 \times BC([-\tau, 0], [1, \infty))$. In view of the positivity of L_0 , it suffices to prove that $(L_l - L_0, L_l^+ - L_0)$ satisfies **(LC)**. By letting

$$P_l(s, x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(2\sqrt{ds}y + x + cs - 2\nu ds) e^{-y^2} dy$$

and

$$P_l^+(s, x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(\infty) e^{-y^2} dy = \sqrt{\pi} R_l(\infty)$$

for all $(s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times \mathbb{R}$, we easily check that there exists $\mathfrak{r}_{\epsilon, \nu} > 0$ such that

$$P_l(s, x) \leq (1 + \nu\epsilon) P_l^+(s, x), \quad \forall (s, x) \in [0, \tau] \times [\mathfrak{r}_{\epsilon, \nu}, \infty).$$

By the definitions of L_0 and L_l , it then follows that for any $(\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_l[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) - L_0[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) \\
&= \mu \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \frac{e^{-\mu(\theta+\tau-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(\theta+\tau-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(y) e_{\zeta, \nu}(s-\tau, y+c\tau) e^{-\frac{(x+c(\theta+\tau-s)-y)^2}{4d(\theta+\tau-s)}} dy ds \\
&= \mu \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \frac{e^{-\mu(\theta+\tau-s)}}{\sqrt{4d\pi(\theta+\tau-s)}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(y) \zeta(s-\tau) e^{-\nu y - \nu c\tau} e^{-\frac{(x+c(\theta+\tau-s)-y)^2}{4d(\theta+\tau-s)}} dy ds \\
&= \frac{\mu e^{-\nu c\tau - \nu x}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \zeta(\theta-s) e^{(d\nu^2 - c\nu - \mu)s} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} R_l(2y\sqrt{ds} + x + cs - 2\nu ds) e^{-y^2} dy ds \\
&= \frac{\mu e^{-\nu c\tau - \nu x}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \zeta(\theta-s) e^{(d\nu^2 - c\nu - \mu)s} P_l(s, x) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

From the definitions of L_0, L_l^+ , we similarly check that for any $(\theta, x) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_l^+[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) - L_0[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) \\
&= \frac{\mu e^{-\nu c\tau - \nu x}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^{\theta+\tau} \zeta(\theta-s) e^{(d\nu^2 - c\nu - \mu)s} P_l^+(s, x) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see from the choice of $\mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \nu}$ that

$$L_l[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) - L_0[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) \leq (1 + \nu\epsilon)(L_l^+[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x) - L_0[e_{\zeta, \nu}](\theta, x)), \quad \forall \theta \in [-\tau, 0], \quad x \geq \mathfrak{x}_{\epsilon, \nu}.$$

In particular, (L_l, L_l^+) satisfies **(LC)**. Consequently, $Q[\tau, \cdot]$ satisfies **(GLC)**. \square

Under assumptions (B_+) and (B_-) , we have the following result for system (5.1).

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that f satisfies (B_+) and (B_-) . Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$, $c < c^*(\infty)$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2} \min\{c^*(-\infty), c^*(\infty) - c\})$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - u_+^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct) - u_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct))\| : x \in t\mathcal{E}_{\varepsilon, c} \} \right] = 0.$$

Moreover, if $c < c^(-\infty)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c^*(-\infty) - c, c^*(\infty) - c\})$, then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - u_+^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct) - u_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x - ct))\| : (t, x) \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha, \varepsilon, c} \} \right] = 0.$$

Here, $\mathcal{E}_{\varepsilon, c} = [-c^(-\infty) + \varepsilon, \min\{c, c^*(-\infty)\} - \varepsilon] \cup [c + \varepsilon, c^*(\infty) - \varepsilon]$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha, \varepsilon, c} = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} : x \in [t(-c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), -\alpha + ct] \cup [\alpha + ct, t(c^*(\infty) - \varepsilon)]\}$.*

(ii) *If $\varphi \in C_+$ has the compact support, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x)\| : x \geq t(\max\{c, c^*(\infty)\} + \varepsilon) \text{ or } x \leq -t(c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

(iii) *P has a nontrivial travelling wave $W(x - ct)$ such that $W(\infty) = u_+^*$ and $W(-\infty) = u_-^*$.*

(iv) If $c < \min\{c^*(\infty), c^*(-\infty)\}$ and $f(s, u)$ is nondecreasing and subhomogeneous in $u \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$, then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{ \|P[t, \varphi](\cdot, x) - W(x - ct)\| : t(-c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \leq x \leq t(c^*(\infty) - \varepsilon) \} \right] = 0$$

for all $(\varepsilon, \varphi) \in (0, \min\{c^*(\infty) - c, c^*(-\infty) + c\}) \times C_+ \setminus \{0\}$, where W is defined as in (iii).

Proof. (i) follows from Theorem 4.5.

(ii) follows from Theorem 4.6-(i) and (ii).

(iii) follows from Theorem 4.7.

(iv) To finish the proof, we only need to prove **(GAS-CSF)** in $C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ due to Theorem 4.8.

More precisely, it suffices to prove

$$\omega(\varphi) := \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} Cl(\{Q[t, \varphi] : t \geq s\}) = \{W\}, \quad \forall \varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}.$$

Fix $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Let $a_-^* = \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} : \omega(\varphi) \geq aW\}$ and $a_+^* = \inf\{a \in \mathbb{R} : \omega(\varphi) \leq aW\}$. Then $0 < a_-^* \leq 1 \leq a_+^* < \infty$ and $a_-^*W \leq \omega(\varphi) \leq a_+^*W$. We claim that $a_+^* = a_-^* = 1$; otherwise, $\{a_+^*, a_-^*\} \neq \{1\}$. By the conditions of f , we have

$$a_+^* f(x, W(x)) \geq f(x, \psi(\theta, x)) \geq a_-^* f(x, W(x)), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \psi) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R} \times \omega(\varphi).$$

We only consider the case of $a_-^* < 1$ since the case of $a_+^* > 1$ can be dealt with in a similar way. Note that there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that

$$f(x, \psi(\theta, x)) > a_-^* f(x, W(x)), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \psi) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R} \times \omega(\varphi) \text{ with } |x| \geq x_0.$$

By the definition of $Q[t, \cdot]$ and the invariance of $\omega(\varphi)$, it follows that for any $(t, x, \psi) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R} \times \omega(\varphi)$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} Q[t, \psi](0, x) &= S(t)[\psi(0, \cdot)](x) + \mu \int_0^t S(t-s)[f(\cdot, Q[s, \psi](-\tau, c\tau + \cdot))](x) ds \\ &> a_-^* S(t)[W](x) + \mu \int_0^t S(t-s)[a_-^* f(\cdot, W(c\tau + \cdot))](x) ds \\ &= a_-^* W(x). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have

$$\psi(\theta, x) > a_-^* W(x), \quad \forall (\theta, x, \psi) \in [-\tau, 0] \times \mathbb{R} \times \omega(\varphi),$$

which, together with the limiting properties of W and $\omega(\varphi)$, gives rise to $\omega(\varphi) \geq (a_-^* + \delta_0)W$ for some $\delta_0 > 0$, a contradiction. This shows that (iv) holds true. \square

We should point out that the first two conclusions in Theorem 5.1 were obtained in [24] and [49], respectively, in the special case where $\tau = 0$ and $f(x, u)$ is monotone in x . Further, the third conclusion on the existence of forced waves for system (5.1) with or without time delay seems to appear for the first time.

5.2 Asymptotically homogeneous reaction-diffusion systems

In this section, we consider a class of cooperative reaction-diffusion systems:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t}(t, x) = D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x)}{\partial x^2} + \mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u}(t, x)), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

where $\mathbf{u}(t, x) = (u_1(t, x), u_2(t, x), \dots, u_N(t, x))^T$, $D = \text{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_N)$, and the reaction term $\mathbf{f} = (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N)^T \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$.

An $N \times N$ matrix $A = (A_{ij})$ is said to be cooperative if $A_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq N$. And the stability modulus of A is defined as $s(A) := \max\{\text{Re} \lambda : \det(A - \lambda I) = 0\}$. We always assume that (C1) $d_k > 0$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

(C2) $\mathbf{f}_\pm \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$, $\mathbf{f}(s, \cdot) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, and $\mathbf{f}(s, 0) = 0$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

(C3) $D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u}) := \left(\frac{\partial f_i(x, \mathbf{u})}{\partial u_j} \right)$ is a cooperative matrix for each $(x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^N$.

(C4) There exists $\mathbf{M} \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that $\mathbf{f}_\pm(\alpha \mathbf{M}) \ll 0$ and $\mathbf{f}(x, \alpha \mathbf{M}) \ll 0$ for any $\alpha > 1$, and $\mathbf{f}(x, \cdot)$ is subhomogeneous on \mathbb{R}_+^N for each $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

For two limiting functions $\mathbf{f}_\pm \in C(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$, we need the following additional assumptions:

(C₊) (i) There exists $\mathbf{u}_+^* \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0\} : \mathbf{f}_+(\mathbf{u}) = 0\} = \{\mathbf{u}_+^*\}$; (ii) $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{f}(x, \cdot) = \mathbf{f}_+$ in $C_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$; (iii) The matrix $D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}_+(\mathbf{u})$ is irreducible for each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and $s(D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}_+(0)) > 0$.

(C₋) (i) There exists $\mathbf{u}_-^* \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ such that $\{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \setminus \{0\} : \mathbf{f}_-(\mathbf{u}) = 0\} = \{\mathbf{u}_-^*\}$; (ii) $\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \mathbf{f}(x, \cdot) = \mathbf{f}_-$ in $C_{loc}^1(\mathbb{R}_+^N, \mathbb{R}^N)$; (iii) The matrix $D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}_-(\mathbf{u})$ is irreducible for each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ and $s(D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}_-(0)) > 0$.

Let $C = BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)$, and $C_+ = BC(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}_+^N)$. We consider the mild solutions of (5.10) with initial values $\varphi \in C_+$. Here a mild solution solves the following integral equation with the given initial function:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{u}(t, \cdot) &= S_{\alpha_0^*}(t)[\varphi] + \int_0^t S_{\alpha_0^*}(t-s)[\alpha_0^* \mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(\mathbf{u}(s, \cdot))] ds, & t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) &= \varphi \in C_+, \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

where $\alpha_0^* > 0$ is fixed such that

$$\alpha_0^* E + D_{\mathbf{u}} \mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u}) \geq 0, \quad \forall (x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R} \times [0, \mathbf{M}]_{\mathbb{R}^N},$$

$\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(x, \mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u} + \frac{\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u})}{\alpha_0^*}, \quad \forall (x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^N,$$

and $S_{\alpha_0^*}(t)$ is the semigroup generated by the following linear reaction-diffusion system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} &= D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}}{\partial x^2} - \alpha_0^* \mathbf{u}, & t > 0, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, \cdot) &= \varphi \in C, \end{cases}$$

that is, for $(x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times C$, we have

$$\begin{cases} S_{\alpha_0^*, k}(0)[\varphi] &= \varphi_k, \\ S_{\alpha_0^*, k}(t)[\varphi](x) &= \frac{\exp(-\alpha_0^* t)}{\sqrt{4\pi d_k t}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi_k(y) \exp\left(-\frac{(x-y)^2}{4d_k t}\right) dy, \quad t > 0. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known that for any given $\varphi \in C_+$, equation (5.10) has a unique mild solution on a maximal interval $[0, \eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}})$, denoted by $\mathbf{u}^\varphi(t, x; \mathbf{f})$, which is also the classical solution of (5.10) on $(0, \eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}})$ with $[0, \eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}}) \ni t \mapsto \mathbf{u}^\varphi(t, \cdot; \mathbf{f}) \in C_+$ being continuous and $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}}^-} \|\mathbf{u}^\varphi(t, \cdot; \mathbf{f})\| = \infty$ whenever $\eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}} < \infty$. By the Phragmén-Lindelöf type maximum principle [38] and the standard comparison arguments, it easily follows that

$$0 \leq \mathbf{u}^\varphi(t, x; \mathbf{f}) \leq \alpha \mathbf{M}, \quad \forall \alpha \in [1, \infty), \quad (t, x, \varphi) \in [0, \eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}}) \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \alpha \mathbf{M}]_C,$$

and hence, $\eta_{\varphi; \mathbf{f}} = \infty$.

Now we introduce the following auxiliary reaction-diffusion systems:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t}(t, x) = D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x)}{\partial x^2} + \mathbf{f}(x + z, \mathbf{u}(t, x)), & (t, x, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^2, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.12)$$

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t}(t, x) = D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x)}{\partial x^2} + \mathbf{f}_+(\mathbf{u}(t, x)), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.13)$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t}(t, x) = D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}(t, x)}{\partial x^2} + \mathbf{f}_-(\mathbf{u}(t, x)), & (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \quad (5.14)$$

Let $Q[t, \varphi; \mathbf{f}]$, $Q[t, \varphi; \mathbf{f}_\pm]$ be the mild solutions of (5.10), (5.13) and (5.14) with the initial value $u(0, \cdot) = \varphi \in C_+$, respectively. For simplicity, we denote $Q[t, \varphi; \mathbf{f}]$ and $Q[t, \varphi; \mathbf{f}_\pm]$ by $Q[t, \varphi]$ and $Q_\pm[t, \varphi]$, respectively. By the standard arguments, we can verify the following properties for Q and Q_\pm .

Proposition 5.7. *The following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $(t, \varphi) \in (0, \infty) \times C_+$ with $\varphi_k > 0$ for all $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, then $Q[t, \varphi] \in C_+^\circ$, and hence, $Q[(0, \infty) \times C_+^\circ] \subseteq C_+^\circ$. Moreover, $Q[(0, \infty) \times (C_+ \setminus \{0\})] \subseteq C_+^\circ$ if (C_+) or (C_-) holds true.*
- (ii) *$Q[\mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{\alpha \mathbf{M}}] \subseteq C_{\alpha \mathbf{M}}$ and $Q_\pm[\mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{\alpha \mathbf{M}}] \subseteq C_{\alpha \mathbf{M}}$ for all $\alpha \in [1, \infty)$. Moreover,*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{\mathbf{M} - Q[t, \varphi](x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \right], \quad \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \left[\sup\{\mathbf{M} - Q_\pm[t, \varphi](x) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \right] \in \mathbb{R}_+^N,$$

and hence, $\omega(\varphi; Q) \cup \omega(\varphi; Q_\pm) \subseteq C_{\mathbf{M}}$ for all $\varphi \in C_+$, where $\omega(\varphi; Q)$ and $\omega(\varphi; Q_\pm)$ represent the positive limiting sets of Q and Q_\pm , respectively.

- (iii) *Q and $Q_\pm : \mathbb{R} \times C_{r\bar{1}} \rightarrow C_+$ are continuous. Moreover, $Q[t, C_{r\bar{1}}]$ and $Q_\pm[t, C_{r\bar{1}}]$ are precompact in C for each $(t, r) \in (0, \infty)^2$.*
- (iv) *$T_{-z} \circ Q[t, \cdot] \circ T_z[\varphi](\theta, x)$ is the mild solution of (5.12) for each $z \in \mathbb{R}$.*

- (v) If (C_{\pm}) holds, then $\lim_{y \rightarrow \pm\infty} Q[t, T_y[\varphi]](\cdot, \cdot + y) = Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi]$ in C for all $(t, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$, and hence, $Q_{\pm}[t, T_y[\varphi]](\cdot, \cdot + y) = Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi]$ for all $(y, t, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$.
- (vi) $Q[t, \varphi] \geq Q[t, \psi]$ and $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi] \geq Q_{\pm}[t, \psi]$ for all $(t, \varphi, \psi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+ \times C_+$ with $\varphi \geq \psi$.
- (vii) $Q[t, \alpha\varphi] \geq \alpha Q[t, \varphi]$ and $Q_{\pm}[t, \alpha\varphi] \geq \alpha Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi]$ for all $(\alpha, t, \varphi) \in [0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_{\mathbf{M}}$.
- (viii) $Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi(-\cdot)] = Q_{\pm}[t, \varphi](-\cdot)$ for all $(t, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$.
- (ix) $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q_{\pm}[t, \mathbf{w}_k^{\pm}] \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_{\pm}^*$ in C for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ for some sequence $\{\mathbf{w}_k^{\pm}\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $Int(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}_k^{\pm} = 0$ provided that (C_{\pm}) holds.

For any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $L_{\pm, \mu} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$L_{\pm, \mu}[\phi] = Q[1, e_{\phi, \mu}; D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}_{\pm}(0) \cdot Id_{\mathbb{R}^N}](0), \quad \forall \phi \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where $e_{\phi, \mu}(x) = \phi e^{-\mu x}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Clearly, $L_{\pm, \mu}$ is a strongly positive linear operator on \mathbb{R}^N provided that (C_{\pm}) holds. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, it follows that $L_{\pm, \mu}$ has the unique principal eigenvalue $\lambda_{\pm}(\mu)$ and an unique eigenfunction $\zeta_{\mu}^{\pm} \in Int(\mathbb{R}_+^N)$ associated with $\lambda_{\pm}(\mu) > 0$ such that $\|\zeta_{\mu}^{\pm}\| = 1$. Following [43, 34], we define

$$c^*(\pm\infty) := \inf_{\mu > 0} \frac{1}{\mu} \log \lambda_{\pm}(\mu). \quad (5.15)$$

Under the assumptions (C_+) and (C_-) , it follows from [34] that $c^*(\pm\infty)$ are the spreading speeds of the right and left limiting systems (5.13) and (5.14), respectively. We can easily verify the following properties of $c^*(\pm\infty)$.

Proposition 5.8. *Let $c^*(\pm\infty)$ be defined as above. Then the following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If $s(D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}_+(0)) > 0$, then $c^*(\infty) > 0$.*
- (ii) *If $s(D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}_-(0)) > 0$, then $c^*(-\infty) > 0$.*

By using [34, Theorem 2.17-(ii)], Proposition 5.7 and Lemma 2.3, we can easily verify the following result.

Proposition 5.9. *The following statements are valid:*

- (i) *If (C_+) holds, then for each $t > 0$, the map $Q_+[t, \cdot]$ satisfies **(UC)** with $tc^*(\infty)$, where $c^*(\infty)$ is defined in (5.15). Hence, $Q[t, \cdot]$ satisfies **(NM)**.*
- (ii) *If (C_-) holds, then for each $t > 0$, the map $Q_-[t, \cdot]$ satisfies **(UC₋)** with $tc^*(-\infty)$, where $c^*(-\infty)$ is defined in (5.15). Hence, $Q[t, \cdot]$ satisfies **(NM₋)**.*

Let $\mathbb{L}[t, \varphi; \zeta]$ be the mild solution of the following linear system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial t} = D \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{u}}{\partial x^2} + \zeta(x)\mathbf{u}, & t > 0, \\ \mathbf{u}(0, x) = \varphi(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \quad (5.16)$$

where $\zeta \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ and $\varphi \in C$. By the definitions of \mathbb{L} and \mathbb{L}_{\pm} , we can easily prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. Assume that $\zeta \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ such that $\zeta(x)$ is cooperative and nonincreasing in $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and both $\zeta(\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(x)$ and $\zeta(-\infty) := \lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \zeta(x)$ are irreducible $N \times N$ matrices. Then the following statements are valid:

- (i) $\mathbb{L}[t, C_+ \setminus \{0\}; \zeta] \subseteq C_+^\circ$ for all $t \in (0, \infty)$.
- (ii) $\mathbb{L}[t, \cdot; \zeta]|_{[-r\check{1}, r\check{1}]_C} : [-r\check{1}, r\check{1}]_C \rightarrow C$ is a continuous and compact map for each $(t, r) \in (0, \infty)^2$.
- (iii) $\mathbb{L}[t, \cdot; \zeta] : (C, C_+, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)}) \rightarrow (C, C_+, \|\cdot\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^N)})$ is a bounded and positive operator for each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.
- (iv) $T_{-z} \circ \mathbb{L}[t, \cdot; \zeta] \circ T_z$ is nonincreasing in $z \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (v) $\lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} \|\mathbb{L}[t, \cdot; \zeta] \circ T_z - \mathbb{L}[t, \cdot; \zeta(\pm\infty)]\| = 0$ for each $(t, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C$.
- (vi) $\mathbb{L}[t, \varphi; D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{0})] \geq Q[t, \varphi]$ for all $(t, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times C_+$.

A straightforward computation gives rise to the following result.

Lemma 5.8. Let $a, \mu \in (0, \infty)$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, and let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ be a cooperative matrix. Then

$$l_{\mu, a} : \mathbb{R} \ni z \mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi a}} \int_{-z}^{\infty} e^{-\mu y} \exp\left(-\frac{y^2}{4a}\right) dy \in \mathbb{R}$$

is a bounded and continuous function on \mathbb{R} with $l_{\mu, a}(-\infty) = 0$ and $l_{\mu, a}(\infty) = e^{a\mu^2}$. Hence,

$$L_{\mu, \mathbf{b}, A} := e^A (\mathbf{b}_1 l_{\mu, d_1}, \mathbf{b}_2 l_{\mu, d_2}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N l_{\mu, d_N})^T$$

is a bounded and continuous vector-valued function on \mathbb{R} with $L_{\mu, \mathbf{b}, A}(-\infty) = 0$ and

$$L_{\mu, \mathbf{b}, A}(\infty) = e^A (\mathbf{b}_1 e^{d_1 \mu^2}, \mathbf{b}_2 e^{d_2 \mu^2}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N e^{d_N \mu^2})^T = e^{A + \mu^2 D} \mathbf{b}.$$

For any given $a, x \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\chi_a(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x > a, \\ x - a + 1 & a - 1 \leq x \leq a, \\ 0, & x < a - 1. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.10. $Q[1, \cdot]$ satisfies **(GLC)** with $c^*(\infty)$ whence (C_+) holds and **(GLC₋)** with $c^*(-\infty)$ whence (C_-) holds, where $c^*(\infty)$ and $c^*(-\infty)$ are defined as in (5.15).

Proof. It suffices to prove that Q satisfies **(GLC)**. Since Lemma 5.5-(i) implies that

$$\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{u}) \leq D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{0})\mathbf{u}, \quad \forall (x, \mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+^N,$$

it follows that for any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\zeta_l \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{N \times N})$ such that

$$\zeta_l \geq D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \mathbf{0}), \quad \zeta_l(\infty) = \frac{1}{l} \check{\mathbf{1}} + \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} D_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{f}(x, \mathbf{0}), \quad \zeta_l(-\infty) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N},$$

and $\zeta_l(x)$ is cooperative, irreducible, and nonincreasing in $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Let $(l, \mu) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, \infty)$ be given. By the Riesz representation theorem and Lemma 5.7-(iii), there exist bounded nonnegative measure matrices $(m_{ij,l}(x, dy))_{N \times N}$ and $(m_{ij,l}^\pm(dy))_{N \times N}$ such that for any $(x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times C$, there hold

$$\mathbb{L}[1, \varphi; \zeta_l](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (m_{ij,l}(x, dy))_{N \times N} \varphi(x - y),$$

and

$$\mathbb{L}[1, \varphi; \zeta_l(\pm\infty)](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (m_{ij,l}^\pm(dy))_{N \times N} \varphi(x - y).$$

Define L_l and $L_l^\pm : \tilde{C} \rightarrow \tilde{C}$ by

$$L_l[\varphi](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (m_{ij,l}(x, dy))_{N \times N} \varphi(x - y),$$

and

$$L_l^\pm[\varphi](x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} (m_{ij,l}^\pm(dy))_{N \times N} \varphi(x - y), \forall (x, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \tilde{C}.$$

It then follows that $Q[\varphi] \leq L_l[\varphi]$ for all $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and

$$0 \ll L_l^+[\varphi] \leq T_z \circ L_l \circ T_z[\varphi] \leq L_l[\varphi] \leq L_l^-[\varphi], \forall (z, \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \tilde{C}_+ \setminus \{0\}.$$

The latter implies that L_l and L_l^\pm satisfy **(SLC)**-(iii). Since

$$L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z, \infty)}, \mu}](0) = L_{\mu, \mathbf{b}, \zeta_l(\pm\infty)}(z), \forall z \in \mathbb{R},$$

(SLC)-(i) and **(SLC)**-(iv) follow from Lemma 5.8.

To verify **(SLC)**-(ii), by **(SLC)**-(iii), it suffices to prove

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \pm\infty} T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}] = L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}] \text{ in } L_{loc}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), \forall \mu > 0.$$

Fix $\gamma, \epsilon, \mu > 0$. Note that

$$L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z, \infty)}, \mu}](x) = e^{-\mu x} L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z-x, \infty)}, \mu}](0), \forall x, z \in \mathbb{R},$$

and

$$L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z, \infty)}, \mu}](x) \leq L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z}(\cdot), \mu}](x) \leq L_l^\pm[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z-1, \infty)}, \mu}](x), \forall x, z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This, together with **(SLC)**-(i,iii), implies that there exists $z_0 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_l^+[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x) - L_l^+[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}](x)\| &\leq \|L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x) - L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}](x)\| \\ &\leq \|L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z_0, \infty)}, \mu}](x) - L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}](x)\| \\ &= \|L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{[-z_0-x, \infty)}, \mu}](0) - L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}](0)\| e^{-\mu x} \\ &< \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \quad \forall x \in [-\gamma, \gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

In view of **(SLC)**-(iii) and the choice of z_0 , we easily see that for any $(x, z) \in [-\gamma, \gamma] \times \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} &\|T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x) - T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu}](x)\| \\ &= \|T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu} - e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x)\| \\ &\leq \|L_l^-[e_{\mathbf{i}, \mu} - e_{\mathbf{i} \cdot \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $e_{\bar{1}, \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu} \in C$, Lemma 5.7-(v) implies that there exists $z^* > 0$ such that

$$\|T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\bar{1}, \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x) - L_l^\pm[e_{\bar{1}, \chi_{-z_0}(\cdot), \mu}](x)\| < \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \forall (x, \pm z) \in [-\gamma, \gamma] \times [z^*, \infty).$$

Thus, we can verify that for any $x \in [-\gamma, \gamma]$, there holds

$$\|T_{-z} \circ L_l \circ T_z[e_{\bar{1}, \mu}](x) - L_l^\pm[e_{\bar{1}, \mu}](x)\| < \epsilon, \forall \pm z \in [z^*, \infty).$$

Consequently, the arbitrariness of γ and ϵ completes the proof. \square

Now we are in a position to present the result on the propagation dynamics for system (5.10) in the bilateral **(UC)**/**(UC)** case.

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that (C_+) and (C_-) hold and let $c^*(\pm\infty)$ be defined as in (5.15). Then the following statements are valid:*

(i) *If $\varphi \in C_+ \setminus \{0\}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \min\{c^*(\infty), c^*(-\infty)\})$, then*

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow \infty} \max\{\|Q[t, \varphi](x) - \mathbf{u}_+^* \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x) - \mathbf{u}_-^* \cdot (1 - \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{R}_+}(x))\| : (t, x) \in \mathcal{B}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}\} = 0,$$

$$\text{where } \mathcal{B}_{\alpha, \varepsilon} = \{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} : t \geq \alpha, x \in [\alpha, t(c^*(\infty) - \varepsilon)] \cup [t(-c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon), -\alpha]\}.$$

(ii) *If $\varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and $\phi \in C_+$ has the compact support, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \|Q[t, \phi](x)\| : x \in [t(c^*(\infty) + \varepsilon), \infty) \cup (-\infty, -t(c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon)] \right\} = 0.$$

(iii) *Q has a nontrivial equilibrium points W in $C_{\mathbf{M}}^0$ such that $W(\infty) = \mathbf{u}_+^*$ and $W(-\infty) = \mathbf{u}_-^*$.*

(iv) *If $(\varepsilon, \varphi) \in (0, \min\{c^*(\infty), c^*(-\infty)\}) \times (C_+ \setminus \{0\})$, then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup \{\|Q[t, \varphi](x) - W(x)\| : t(-c^*(-\infty) + \varepsilon) \leq x \leq t(c^*(\infty) - \varepsilon)\} = 0,$$

where W is defined as in (iii).

Proof. (i) follows from Theorem 4.1-(ii).

(ii) follows from Theorem 4.2-(i).

(iii) follows from Remark 4.1.

(iv) We only need to prove **(GAS-CSF)** in $C_{\mathbf{M}} \setminus \{0\}$ due to Theorem 4.4-(i) and Proposition 5.7-

(i). More precisely, it suffices to show that

$$\omega(\varphi) := \bigcap_{s \in \mathbb{R}_+} Cl(\{Q[t, \varphi] : t \geq s\}) = \{W\}, \forall \varphi \in C_{\mathbf{M}} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Fix $\varphi \in C_{\mathbf{M}} \setminus \{0\}$. Let

$$a_-^* = \sup\{a \in \mathbb{R} : \omega(\varphi) \geq aW\}$$

and

$$a_+^* = \inf\{a \in \mathbb{R} : \omega(\varphi) \leq aW\}.$$

By (i) and (iii), we then have

$$0 < a_-^* \leq 1 \leq a_+^* < \infty, \quad a_-^* W \leq \omega(\varphi) \leq a_+^* W.$$

This, together with Proposition 5.7-(vii), implies that

$$Q[t, a_-^* W] \geq a_-^* W, \quad Q[t, a_+^* W] \leq a_+^* W, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Thus, there exist two equilibrium points $\overline{W}, \underline{W}$ in C_+° such that

$$\underline{W} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q[t, a_-^* W] \leq W \leq \overline{W} := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} Q[t, a_+^* W]$$

and $\underline{W} \leq \omega(\varphi) \leq \overline{W}$. Then (i) implies that

$$\overline{W}(\infty) = \underline{W}(\infty) = \mathbf{u}_+^*, \quad \overline{W}(-\infty) = \underline{W}(-\infty) = \mathbf{u}_-^*.$$

To finish the proof, it suffices to prove $a^* := \sup\{a > 0 : \underline{W} \geq a\overline{W}\} = 1$. Otherwise, $a^* \in (0, 1)$ and $\overline{W} \geq \underline{W} \geq a^*\overline{W}$. Thus, by the subhomogeneity of f and the choice of α_0^* , we have $\mathbf{f}(\cdot, a^*\overline{W}) \geq a^*\mathbf{f}(\cdot, \overline{W})$ and $\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(\cdot, \underline{W}) \geq a^*\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(\cdot, \overline{W})$. In view of (C₊) and (C₋), we easily see that

$$u_+^* + \frac{\mathbf{f}_+(u_+^*)}{\alpha_0^*} \gg a^*[u_+^* + \frac{\mathbf{f}_+(u_+^*)}{\alpha_0^*}]$$

and hence there exists $x_0 > 0$ such that $\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(x, \underline{W}(x)) \gg a^*\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(x, \overline{W}(x)), \forall |x| \geq x_0$.

It follows from (5.11) and the definition of $Q[t, \cdot]$ that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, there holds

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{W}(x) &= Q[1, \underline{W}](x) \\ &\geq S_{\alpha_0^*}(1)[\underline{W}](x) + \int_0^1 S_{\alpha_0^*}(1-s)[\alpha_0^*\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(\cdot, \underline{W}(\cdot))](x)ds \\ &\gg a^*S_{\alpha_0^*}(1)[\overline{W}](x) + a^*\int_0^1 S_{\alpha_0^*}(1-s)[\alpha_0^*\mathbf{f}_{\alpha_0^*}(\cdot, \overline{W}(\cdot))](x)ds \\ &= a^*\overline{W}(x). \end{aligned}$$

This, together with the limits of \underline{W} and \overline{W} , gives rise to $\underline{W} \geq (a^* + \epsilon_0)\overline{W}$ for some $\epsilon_0 > 0$, a contradiction. As a result, (iv) holds true. \square

Finally, we remark that the first two conclusions in Theorem 5.2 were established in [24] and [49], respectively, in the special case where $N = 1$ and $\mathbf{f}(x, u)$ is monotone in x . Here we proved that these two conclusions hold true no matter whether $\mathbf{f}(x, u)$ is monotone in x . Moreover, the third conclusion on the existence of the nontrivial steady states for system (5.10) seems to appear for the first time.

Acknowledgements. T. Yi's research is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 11971494), and X.-Q. Zhao's research is supported in part by the NSERC of Canada (RGPIN-2019-05648).

References

- [1] D. G. ARONSON AND H. F. WEINBERGER, *Nonlinear diffusion in population genetics, combustion, and nerve pulse propagation*, Partial Differential Equations and Related Topics, J. A. Goldstein, ed., 5–49, Lecture Notes in Mathematics Ser., 446. Springer-Verlag, 1975.
- [2] D. G. ARONSON AND H. F. WEINBERGER, *Multidimensional nonlinear diffusion arising in population dynamics*, Adv. Math., 30 (1978), 33-76.
- [3] C. BELLARD, C. BERTELSMEIER, P. LEADLEY, W. THUILLER AND F. COURCHAMP, *Impacts of climate change on the future of biodiversity*, Ecol. Lett., 15 (2012), 365-377.
- [4] H. BERESTYCKI, O. DIEKMANN, C.J. NAGELKERKE AND P.A. ZEGELING, *Can a species keep pace with a shifting climate?* Bull. Math. Biol., 71 (2009), 399-429.
- [5] H. BERESTYCKI AND J. FANG, *Forced waves of the Fisher-KPP equation in a shifting environment*, J. Differential Equations, 264 (2018), 2157-2183.
- [6] H. BERESTYCKI AND F. HAMEL, *Generalized transition waves and their properties*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 65 (2012), 592-648.
- [7] H. BERESTYCKI, F. HAMEL AND N. NADIRASHVILI, *The speed of propagation for KPP type problems. I: Periodic framework*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 7 (2005), 173-213.
- [8] H. BERESTYCKI, F. HAMEL AND N. NADIRASHVILI, *The speed of propagation for KPP type problems. II: General domains*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., 23 (2010), 1-34.
- [9] H. BERESTYCKI AND L. ROSSI, *Reaction-diffusion equations for population dynamics with forced speed. I. The case of the whole space*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 21 (2008), 41-67.
- [10] H. BERESTYCKI AND L. ROSSI, *Reaction-diffusion equations for population dynamics with forced speed. II. Cylindrical-type domains*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 25 (2009), 19-61.
- [11] J. BOUHOURS AND T. GILETTI, *Spreading and vanishing for a monostable reaction-diffusion equation with forced speed*, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqns., 31 (2019), 247-284.
- [12] M. BRAMSON, *Convergence of solutions of the Kolmogorov equation to travelling waves*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 44 (1983).
- [13] Y. DU AND H. MATANO, *Convergence and sharp thresholds for propagation in nonlinear diffusion problems*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 12 (2010), 279-312.
- [14] Y. DU, L. WEI AND L. ZHOU, *Spreading in a shifting environment modeled by the diffusive logistic equation with a free boundary*, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqn., 30 (2018), 1389-1426.
- [15] J. FANG, Y. LOU AND J. WU, *Can pathogen spread keep pace with its host invasion?* SIAM J. Appl. Math., 76 (2016), 1633-1657.

- [16] J. FANG, R. PENG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Propagation dynamics of a reaction-diffusion equation in a time-periodic shifting environment*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 147 (2021), 1-28.
- [17] J. FANG, X. YU AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Traveling waves and spreading speeds for time-space periodic monotone systems*, J. Functional Analysis, 272 (2017), 4222-4262.
- [18] J. FANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Travelling waves for monotone semiflows with weak compactness*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 46 (2014), 3678-3704.
- [19] P.C. FIFE AND J.B. MCLEOD, *The approach of solutions of nonlinear diffusion equations to travelling front solutions*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 65 (1977), 335-361.
- [20] R. FISHER, *The wave of advance of advantageous genes*, Ann. Hum. Genet., 7 (1937), 355-369.
- [21] F. HAMEL, *Reaction-diffusion problems in cylinders with no invariance by translation. I. Small perturbations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire, 14 (1997), 457-498.
- [22] F. HAMEL, *Reaction-diffusion problems in cylinders with no invariance by translation. II. Monotone perturbations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincare Anal. Non Lineaire, 14 (1997), 555-596.
- [23] M. HOLZER AND A. SCHEEL, *Accelerated fronts in a two-stage invasion process*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 46(2014), 397-427.
- [24] C. HU, J. SHANG, B. LI *Spreading speeds for reaction-diffusion equations with a shifting habitat*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 2020, 32(4): 1941-1964.
- [25] H. HU, T. YI AND X. ZOU, *On spatial-temporal dynamics of Fisher-KPP equation with a shifting environment*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 148 (2020), 213-221.
- [26] Y. HU, X. HAO, X. SONG, AND Y. DU, *A free boundary problem for spreading under shifting climate*, J. Differential Equations, 269 (2020), 5931-5958.
- [27] E. KINTISCH, *Impacts research seen as next climate frontier*, Science, 322 (2008), 182-183.
- [28] A. KOLMOGOROV, I. PETROVSKY AND N. PISKUNOV, *Etude de lequation de la diffusion avec croissance de la quantite de matiere et son application a un probleme biologique*, Moscow Univ. Math. Bull., 1 (1937), 1-25.
- [29] L. KONG AND W. SHEN, *Positive stationary solutions and spreading speeds of KPP equations in locally spatially inhomogeneous media*, Methods and Applications of Analysis, 18 (2011), 427-456.
- [30] P. D. LEENHEER, W. SHEN, AND A. ZHANG, *Persistence and extinction of nonlocal dispersal evolution equations in moving habitats*, Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications, 54 (2020), 103-110.
- [31] B. LI, S. BEWICK, J. SHANG AND W.F. FAGAN, *Persistence and spread of a species with a shifting habitat edge*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 74 (2014), 1397-1417.

- [32] W.-T. LI, J.-B. WANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Spatial dynamics of a nonlocal dispersal population model in a shifting environment*, J. Nonlinear Sci., 28 (2018), 1189-1219.
- [33] X. LIANG, Y. YI AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Spreading speeds and traveling waves for periodic evolution systems*, J. Differential Equations, 231(2006), 57-77.
- [34] X. LIANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Asymptotic speeds of spread and travelling waves for monotone semiflows with applications*, Commun. Pure Appl. Math., 60 (2007), 1-40.
- [35] X. LIANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Spreading speeds and travelling waves for abstract monostable evolution systems*, J. Funct. Anal., 259 (2010), 857-903.
- [36] R. LUI, *Biological growth and spread modeled by systems of recursions, I. Mathematical theory*, Math. Biosci., 93 (1989), 269-295.
- [37] A. POTAPOV AND M. A. LEWIS, *Climate and competition: the effect of moving range boundaries on habitat invasibility*, Bull. Math. Biol., 66(2004), 975-1008.
- [38] M. PROTTER AND H. WEINBERGER, *Maximum Principles in Differential Equations*, Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- [39] W. SHEN, *Variational principle for spreading speeds and generalized propagating speeds in time almost periodic and space periodic KPP models*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 362 (2010), 5125-5168.
- [40] A. I. VOLPERT, V. A. VOLPERT AND V. A. VOLPERT, *Traveling Wave Solutions of Parabolic Systems*. Transl. Math. Monogr. 140, Amer. Math. Soc., 1994.
- [41] G.-R. WALTHER, E. POST, P. CONVEY, A. MENZEL, C. PARMESAN, T.J.C. BEEBEE, J.-M. FROMENTIN, O. HOEGH-GULDBERG AND F. BAIRLEIN, *Ecological responses to recent climate change*, Nature, 416 (2002) 389-395.
- [42] J.-B. WANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Uniqueness and global stability of forced waves in a shifting environment*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 147 (2019), 1467-1481.
- [43] H. F. WEINBERGER, *Long-time behavior of a class of biological models*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 13 (1982), 353-396.
- [44] H. WEINBERGER, *On spreading speeds and travelling waves for growth and migration models in a periodic habitat*, J. Math. Biol., 45 (2002), 511-548.
- [45] C. WU, Y. WANG AND X. ZOU, *Spatial-temporal dynamics of a Lotka-Volterra competition model with nonlocal dispersal under shifting environment*, J. Differential Equations, 267 (2019), 4890-4921.
- [46] J. XIN, *Front propagation in heterogeneous media*, SIAM Rev., 42 (2000), 161-230.

- [47] T. YI AND Y. CHEN, *Study on monostable and bistable reaction-diffusion equations by iteration of travelling wave maps*, J. Differential Equations, 263 (2017), 7287-7308.
- [48] T. YI, Y. CHEN AND J. WU, *Unimodal dynamical systems: Comparison principles, spreading speeds and travelling waves*, J. Differential Equations, 254 (2013), 3376-3388.
- [49] T. YI, Y. CHEN AND J. WU, *Asymptotic propagations of asymptotical monostable type equations with shifting habitats*, J. Differential Equations, 269 (2020), 5900-5930.
- [50] T. YI AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Propagation dynamics for monotone evolution systems without spatial translation invariance*, J. Funct. Anal., 279 (2020), 108722.
- [51] T. YI AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Global dynamics of evolution systems with asymptotic annihilation*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems (Ser. A), 43(2023), 2693-2720.
- [52] T. YI AND X. ZOU, *Asymptotic behavior, spreading speeds, and travelling waves of nonmonotone Dynamical systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 47 (2015), 3005-3034.
- [53] T. YI AND X. ZOU, *Propagation and heterogeneous steady states in a delayed nonlocal R-D equation without spatial translation-invariance*, Journal of Differential Equations, 268 (2020), 1600-1632.
- [54] G.-B. ZHANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Propagation dynamics of a nonlocal dispersal Fisher-KPP equation in a time-periodic shifting habitat*, J. Differential Equations, 268 (2020), 2852-2885.
- [55] Z. ZHANG, W. WANG, AND J. YANG, *Persistence versus extinction for two competing species under a climate change*, Nonlinear Analysis: Modelling and Control, 22 (2017), 285-302.
- [56] X.-Q. ZHAO, *Dynamical Systems in Population Biology*, second edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2017.