

Logistic growth in seasonally changing environments

Daniel Daners and Zeaiter Zeaiter

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
 daniel.daners@sydney.edu.au, zeaiter.zeaiter@sydney.edu.au

June 6, 2024

Abstract

We consider a parameter dependent periodic-logistic problem with a logistic term involving a degeneracy that replicates time dependent refuges in the habitat of a population. Working under no or very minimal assumptions on the boundary regularity of the domain we show the existence of a time-periodic solution which bifurcates with respect to the parameter and show their stability. We show that under suitable assumptions that the periodic solution blows up on part of the domain and remains finite on other parts when the parameter approaches a critical value.

1 Introduction

Following the pioneering work by Hess [26] and in particular Du and Peng [23, 24] we consider the existence of non-trivial positive solutions of the periodic-parabolic logistic equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{A}(t)u &= \mu u - b(x, t)g(x, t, u) && \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \mathcal{B}(t)u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ u(\cdot, 0) &= u(\cdot, T) && \text{in } \Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The bounded domain $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ represents the habitat of some species with population density $u(x, t)$ at location $x \in \Omega$ and time $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The time T is the length of a seasonal cycle and referred to as the period. The operator $\mathcal{A}(t)$ is a second order uniformly elliptic operator that includes intrinsic diffusion, convection and reproduction rates, depending T -periodically on $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The operator $\mathcal{B}(t)$ determines what happens when the species approaches the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of the habitat and is also a T -periodic function of $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The boundary operator is of Dirichlet, Neumann or Robin type, modelling hostile, no-flux or partly permeable boundaries of the habitat. We also admit mixed boundary conditions with different types of boundary conditions on different parts of $\partial\Omega$. The parameter $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ adjusts the reproduction rate. The non-linear term $b(x, t)g(x, t, u)$ is a rate that limits the growth depending on

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35K20, 35B09, 35K37

Keywords: Periodic-parabolic equation, logistic growth, periodic solution

the size of the population. We assume that the growth rate is reduced as the population density increases, which means that the function $u \mapsto g(x, t, u)$ is strictly increasing and that $b(x, t) \geq 0$. The size of $b \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T])$ is a weight that determines how favourable the conditions in the habitat are at any place and time (x, t) . Ideal living conditions are given in the region where $b(x, t) = 0$, where unrestricted growth is possible. One of the main features in this paper is to deal with the natural assumption that such places change throughout a seasonal cycle. Large values of $b(x, t)$ model a hostile environment.

As demonstrated in [26], many properties of (1.1) are determined by the spectrum of the periodic-parabolic eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{A}(t)u + \gamma b(x, t)u &= \mu u && \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \mathcal{B}(t)u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ u(\cdot, 0) &= u(\cdot, T) && \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

where $\gamma \geq 0$ is a parameter. We call an eigenvalue μ_1 a *principal eigenvalue* of (1.2) if it has a positive eigenfunction. A positive eigenfunction of norm one is called a *principal eigenfunction*. It turns out that there is exactly one principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction. We will consider the principal eigenvalue as a function of the zero order term γb and write $\mu_1 = \mu_1(\gamma b)$. As shown in [19, Section 4] such a periodic-parabolic eigenvalues and eigenfunctions exist. The principal eigenvalue turns out to be strictly increasing and hence

$$\mu^*(b) := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\gamma b) \in (-\infty, \infty] \tag{1.3}$$

exists. Under precise assumptions to be specified in Section 2 and Section 6 we will prove the following result.

Theorem 1.1. *The equation (1.1) has a non-trivial positive weak solution if and only if $\mu_1(0) < \mu < \mu^*(b)$. In that case this solution is unique and linearly stable.*

A version of the above theorem with $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ appears for the first time in Du and Peng [23], where b had very special spacial and temporal degeneracies, and the linear part of the equation was autonomous. We remove all these restrictions.

As a corollary we recover and generalise a result due to Hess [26, Section 28], but allow b to have degeneracies. It is about the existence and uniqueness of a non-trivial positive solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mathcal{A}(t)u &= mu - b(x, t)g(x, t, u)u && \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T), \\ \mathcal{B}(t)u &= 0 && \text{on } \partial\Omega \times [0, T], \\ u(\cdot, 0) &= u(\cdot, T) && \text{in } \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

where $m \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$ possibly changes sign. It is an immediate consequence of (1.1) with $\mathcal{A}(t)$ replaced by $\mathcal{A}(t) - m(t)$ and $\mu = 0$. One can replace m by λm with $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ a parameter, and recover some of the results in [1, 2], but under much weaker assumptions on the regularity of the coefficients and the domains.

Corollary 1.2. *Under the above assumptions, the problem (1.4) has a non-trivial solution if and only if $\mu_1(-m) < 0 < \mu^*(m, b)$, where*

$$\mu^*(m, b) := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\gamma b - m). \tag{1.5}$$

In that case this solution is unique and linearly stable.

Part of this material is contained in the PhD Thesis [36] by the second author. Related results for linear equations or systems also appear in [3, 4].

2 Precise assumptions

We will be working with non-autonomous boundary value problems in divergence form. We assume that $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain, that $T > 0$ is fixed and that $\mathcal{A}(t)$ has the form

$$\mathcal{A}(t)u := - \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N a_{jk} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} + a_j u \right) + \sum_{k=1}^n b_k \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} + c_0 u, \quad (2.1)$$

where $a_{jk}, a_j, b_k, c_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega \times \mathbb{R})$ are real valued and T -periodic in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We also assume that $\mathcal{A}(t)$ is uniformly strongly elliptic, that is, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\alpha |\xi|^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N a_{jk}(x, t) \xi_j \xi_k \quad (2.2)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and almost all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. We assume that $\partial\Omega = \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$ is a disjoint union with Γ_0 . We consider the boundary operator

$$\mathcal{B}(t)u := \begin{cases} u_{\Gamma_0} & \text{on } \Gamma_0 \text{ (Dirichlet b.c.)} \\ \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^N a_{jk} \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} + a_j u \right) \nu_k + \beta_0 u & \text{on } \Gamma_1 \text{ (Neumann/Robin b.c.).} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Here $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_N)$ is the outer unit normal on Γ_1 , and $\beta_0 \in L^\infty(\Gamma_1 \times \mathbb{R})$ T -periodic in $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that we do not assume that the Γ_k are open and closed in $\partial\Omega$ and we generally make no restrictions on the sign of β_0 . For simplicity we assume that a neighbourhood of Γ_1 in $\partial\Omega$ is Lipschitz. In that case we can in particular assume without loss of generality that $\beta_0 \geq 0$. According to [15, Section 3] this can be achieved by rewriting the pair of operators $(\mathcal{A}(t), \mathcal{B}(t))$ in an equivalent form. Hence in what follows we always assume without loss of generality that $\beta_0 \geq 0$.

The boundary conditions (2.3) as well as the elliptic operator (2.1) are to be interpreted in a weak form. To do so we introduce the bilinear form associated with $(\mathcal{A}(t), \mathcal{B}(t))$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}_0(t, u, v) := & \int_{\Omega} \sum_{k=1}^N \left(\sum_{j=1}^N a_{jk}(x, t) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_j} + a_j(x, t) \right) \frac{\partial v}{\partial x_k} dx \\ & + \int_{\Omega} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N b_k(x, t) \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_k} + c_0(x, t) u \right) v dx. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

for all $u, v \in H^1(\Omega)$. To incorporate the boundary conditions we introduce the space

$$H_{\mathcal{B}}^1(\Omega) := \overline{\{u \in H^1(\Omega) : u = 0 \text{ in a neighbourhood of } \Gamma_0\}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where the closure is taken in the Sobolev space $H^1(\Omega)$. We define

$$\mathfrak{a}(t, u, v) := \mathfrak{a}_0(t, u, v) + \int_{\Gamma_1} \beta_0(x, t) uv d\sigma, \quad (2.6)$$

for all $u, v \in H_{\mathcal{B}}^1(\Omega)$, where the integral over Γ_1 is taken with respect to the $(N - 1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure restricted to Γ_1 . The following proposition collects some standard properties of the form \mathfrak{a} , see for instance [20, XVIII Section 4.4]. We will denote by $u^+ := \max\{u, 0\}$ and $u^- := \max\{-u, 0\}$ the positive and negative parts of $u \in V$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let the above assumptions be satisfied and set $V := H_{\mathcal{B}}^1(\Omega)$ and $H := L^2(\Omega)$. Then the following assertions are true:*

(i) $[0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto \mathfrak{a}(t, u, v)$ is measurable for all $u, v \in V$.

(ii) $V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(u, v) \mapsto \mathfrak{a}(t, u, v)$ is bilinear and there exist $M \geq 0$ such that

$$|\mathfrak{a}(t, u, v)| \leq M \|u\|_V \|v\|_V \quad (2.7)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $v \in V$.

(iii) There exists $\omega_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that we can choose $\alpha > 0$ so that,

$$\frac{\alpha}{2} \|u\|_V^2 \leq \mathfrak{a}(t, u, u) + \omega \|u\|_H^2 \quad (2.8)$$

for all $\omega \geq \omega_0$ and all $u \in V$.

(iv) $\mathfrak{a}(t, u^+, u^-) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and all $u \in V$.

It follows from the above proposition that there exist operators $A(t) \in \mathcal{L}(V, V')$, $t \in [0, T]$, such that $\langle A(t)u, v \rangle = \mathfrak{a}(t; u, v)$ for all $u, v \in V$ and that

$$\|A(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(V, V')} \leq M \quad (2.9)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence, given $s \in [0, T)$, $u_0 \in H$ and $f \in L^2((s, T), V')$ it makes sense to consider the linear initial value problem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u &= f(t) \quad t \in (s, T], \\ u(s) &= u_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

We call u a *solution* of (2.10) if

$$u \in W(s, T; V, V') := \left\{ u \in L^2((s, T), V) : \dot{u} \in L^2((s, T), V') \right\} \quad (2.11)$$

and it satisfies (2.10). The space $W(s, T; V, V')$ is a Hilbert space with norm

$$\|u\|_W := \left(\int_s^T \|u(t)\|_V^2 dt + \int_s^T \|\dot{u}(t)\|_{V'}^2 dt \right)^{1/2}.$$

It is well known that

$$W(s, T; V, V') \hookrightarrow C([s, T], H), \quad (2.12)$$

see for instance [20, XVIII Section 1.2]. Hence, the initial condition $u(s) = v \in H$ makes sense and $u \in C([s, T], H)$. Moreover, as $V \hookrightarrow H$ is compact, the embedding

$$W(s, T; V, V') \hookrightarrow L^2([s, T], H), \quad (2.13)$$

is compact as well, see [29, Theorem 1.5.1]. There are several ways to characterise solutions to (2.10). In particular $u \in L^2((s, T), V)$ is a solution of (2.10) if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle u(s), \dot{v}(s) \rangle + \int_s^T \langle u(\tau), \dot{v}(\tau) \rangle d\tau + \int_s^T \mathbf{a}(\tau, u(\tau), v(\tau)) d\tau \\ = \int_s^T \langle f(\tau), v(\tau) \rangle d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

for all $v \in W(s, T; V, V')$ with $v(T) = 0$ or a dense subset thereof, see for instance [20]. It can be proved either by Galerkin approximation or by Lion's generalisation of the Lax-Milgram theorem that (2.10) has a unique solution in $W(s, T; V, V')$, see [20], [28, Section IV.1] or [33, Section III.2]. We will make use of the following a priori estimates for the solutions. The important feature for us is the independence on a positive potential.

Proposition 2.2 (A priori estimates). *Suppose that the above assumptions are satisfied and that $m \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $m \geq 0$. Let $s \in [0, T)$, $u_0 \in H$ and $f \in L^2((s, T), V')$. Let $u \in W(s, T; V, V')$ be a solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u + m(t)u &= f(t) \quad t \in (s, T] \\ u(s) &= u_0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

Then for any $\omega \geq \omega_0$ and $t \in [s, T]$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} u(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \|e^{-\omega(t-s)} u(t)\|_H^2 \\ \leq \|u(s)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'} d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} \dot{u}(\tau)\|_{V'}^2 d\tau \leq 2(M + \|m\|_\infty)^2 \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} u(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau \\ + 2 \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'}^2 d\tau \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where M is from (2.7).

Proof. First note that $w(t) := e^{-\omega(t-s)} u(t)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w + \omega w + m(t)w &= e^{-\omega(t-s)} f(t) \quad t \in (s, T] \\ w(s) &= u_0. \end{aligned}$$

By the integration by parts formula for functions in $W(s, T; V, V')$ we have that

$$\frac{1}{2} (\|w(t)\|_H^2 - \|w(s)\|_H^2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_s^t \frac{d}{d\tau} \|w(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau = \int_0^T \langle \dot{w}(\tau), w(\tau) \rangle d\tau, \quad (2.18)$$

see for instance [20, Theorem XVIII.1.2]. Hence it follows from (2.8) and the positivity of m that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha \int_s^t \|w(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{2} \|w(t)\|_H^2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \int_s^t \langle \dot{w}(\tau), w(\tau) \rangle + \mathbf{a}(\tau, w(\tau), w(\tau)) + \omega \|w(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \int_s^t \langle \dot{w}(\tau) + A(\tau)w(\tau) + \omega w(\tau), w(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \int_s^t e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} \langle f(\tau), w(\tau) \rangle d\tau - \int_s^t \langle m(\tau)w(\tau), w(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'} \|w(\tau)\|_V d\tau \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2} \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{2\alpha} \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'}^2 d\tau + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_s^t \|w(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\alpha \int_s^t \|w(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \|w(t)\|_H^2 \leq \|w(s)\|_H^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_s^t \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'}^2 d\tau.$$

Taking into account that $w(t) = u(t)e^{-\omega(t-s)}$ we obtain (2.16). Now consider the derivative \dot{u} . If $v \in V$, then by (2.15)

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \dot{u}(\tau), v \rangle| & = |-\mathbf{a}(\tau, u(\tau), v) - \langle m(\tau)u(\tau), v \rangle + \langle f(\tau), v \rangle| \\
& \leq (M\|u(\tau)\|_V + \|m\|_\infty\|u(\tau)\|_V + \|f(\tau)\|_{V'}) \|v\|_V
\end{aligned}$$

Here we cannot omit the term with $m(\tau)$ since it does not necessarily have a positive sign. By the definition of the dual norm we see that

$$\|\dot{u}(\tau)\|_{V'} \leq M\|u(\tau)\|_V + \|m\|_\infty\|u(\tau)\|_V + \|f(\tau)\|_{V'}.$$

It follows that

$$\|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} \dot{u}(\tau)\|_{V'}^2 \leq 2(M + \|m\|_\infty)^2 \|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} u(\tau)\|_V^2 + 2\|e^{-\omega(\tau-s)} f(\tau)\|_{V'}^2,$$

Now (2.17) follows by integration over $[s, t]$. \square

Remark 2.3. Combining (2.16) and (2.17) we can deduce that any solution of (2.10) satisfies an estimate of the form

$$\|u\|_{W(s,T;V,V')} \leq C \left(\|u_0\|_H^2 + \int_s^T \|f(t)\|_{V'}^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.19)$$

with C independent of f , u_0 and $s \in [0, T]$, but dependent on $\|m\|_\infty$. In particular, the solution to (2.10) is unique and continuously depends on u_0 and f .

As a consequence of Proposition 2.1(iv) for any positive initial condition, $v \geq 0$, and inhomogeneity, $f \geq 0$, we have that the solution u of (2.10) satisfies $u(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in [s, T]$, see for instance [6, Proposition 3.1]. The above is collected in the following abstract existence theorem.

Theorem 2.4. *Under the above assumptions the equation (2.10) has a unique solution $u \in W(s, T; V, V')$ for every $v \in H$ and $f \in L^2((s, T), V')$. That solution satisfies the a priori estimate (2.19) with constant depending only on α , ω , M and T . If $f, u_0 \geq 0$, then the solution $u \geq 0$.*

The following perturbation result is crucial for our treatment of the logistic equation.

Theorem 2.5 (perturbation result). *Suppose that $m_n, m \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$, that $u_{0n}, u_0 \in H$ and $f_n, f \in L^2((0, T), V)$ with $m_n \xrightarrow{*} m$ weak* in $L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$, $u_{0n} \rightharpoonup u_0$ weakly in H and $f_n \rightharpoonup f$ weakly in $L^2((0, T), V')$. Let $s \in [0, T)$ and let $u_n \in W(s, T; V, V')$ be the solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u}_n + A(t)u + m_n(t)u &= f_n(t) \quad t \in (s, T], \\ u(s) &= u_{0n}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Let u be the solution of (2.15). Then $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W(s, T; V, V')$ and strongly in $L^2((s, T), H)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly in $L^2((s, T), V')$, then $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in H for all $t \in (s, T]$ and $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $W(s + \delta, T; V, V')$ for all $\delta > 0$ with $s + \delta < T$.

Proof. We first note that due to the weak* convergence there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|m_n\|_\infty \leq C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence it follows from Proposition 2.2 that $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence in $W(s, T; V, V')$. Hence there exists a subsequence $(u_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $u_{n_k} \rightharpoonup u$ weakly in $W(s, T; V, V')$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ for some $u \in W(s, T; V, V')$. By the compact embedding (2.13) we also have strong convergence in $L^2((s, T), H)$. If $v \in W(s, T; V, V')$ with $v(T) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} -\langle u_{n_k}(s), \dot{v}(s) \rangle + \int_s^T \langle u_{n_k}(\tau), \dot{v}(\tau) \rangle d\tau + \int_s^T \mathbf{a}(\tau, u_{n_k}(\tau), v(\tau)) d\tau \\ + \int_s^T \langle m_{n_k}(\tau)u_{n_k}(\tau), v(\tau) \rangle d\tau = \int_s^T \langle f_{n_k}(\tau), v(\tau) \rangle d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ we see that u is a solution of (2.15). By the uniqueness of solutions the full sequence converges. Assume now that $f_n \rightarrow f$ strongly. Fix $t \in (s, T]$. Since $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^2((s, T), H)$ and thus has a subsequence that is convergent almost everywhere there exist $s_0 \in (s, t)$ and a subsequence $(u_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $u_{n_k}(s_0) \rightarrow u(s_0)$ in H as $k \rightarrow \infty$. By the integration by parts formula similar to (2.18) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_{s_0}^t \|u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \frac{1}{2} \|u_n(t) - u(t)\|_H^2 \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \|u_n(s_0) - u(s_0)\|_H^2 + \int_{s_0}^t \langle \dot{u}_n(\tau) - \dot{u}(\tau), u_n(\tau) - u(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\ + \int_{s_0}^t \mathbf{a}(\tau, u_n(\tau) - u(\tau), u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)) d\tau \\ + \omega \int_{s_0}^t \|u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau \\ = \int_{s_0}^t \langle f_n(\tau) - f(\tau), u_n(\tau) - u(\tau) \rangle d\tau + \omega \int_{s_0}^t \|u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau \\ - \int_{s_0}^t \langle m_n(\tau)u_n(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau), u_n(\tau) - u(\tau) \rangle d\tau. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

We know that $u_n - u \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2((s, T), H)$ and $m_n u_n - mu \rightarrow 0$ weakly in $L^2((s, T), H)$. By assumption $f_n - f \rightarrow 0$ in $L^2((s, T), V')$ and $u_{n_k}(s_0) - u(s_0) \rightarrow 0$ in H . Hence (2.21) shows that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_{n_k}(t) - u(t)\|_H^2 = 0.$$

By the uniqueness of the limit, the full sequence converges, which in particular means that $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in H for all $t \in (s, T]$. Hence, choosing any $s_0 \in (s, T]$ it follows that $u_n \rightarrow u$ in $L^2((s_0, T), V)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next we consider the convergence of \dot{u}_n . Given $v \in V$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \dot{u}_n(\tau) - \dot{u}(\tau), v \rangle| \\ &= |\langle A(\tau)(u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)) + (m_n(\tau)u_n(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau)) - (f_n(\tau) - f(\tau)), v \rangle| \\ &\leq (M\|u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)\|_V + \|m_n(\tau)u_n(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau)\|_{V'} + \|f_n - f\|_{V'})\|v\|_V. \end{aligned}$$

Hence by definition of the dual norm

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\dot{u}_n(\tau) - \dot{u}(\tau)\|_{V'} \\ & \leq M\|u_n(\tau) - u(\tau)\|_V + \|m_n(\tau)u_n(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau)\|_{V'} + \|f_n - f\|_{V'} \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

for all $\tau \in (s, T]$. We know from the first part of the proof that $m_n(\tau)u_n(\tau) \rightarrow m(\tau)u(\tau)$ weakly in $L^2((s, T), H)$. If we can show that $m_n u_n \rightarrow mu$ in $L^2((s, T), V')$, then it follows from (2.22) that $\dot{u}_n \rightarrow \dot{u}$ in $L^2((s_0, T), V')$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since

$$\|m_n u_n - mu\|_{V'} \leq \|m_n\|_\infty \|u_n - u\|_{V'} + \|(m_n - m)u\|_{V'}$$

it is sufficient to show that $m_n u \rightarrow mu$ in $L^2((s, T), V')$. To do so we use the compactness criterion [34, Theorem 1] for vector valued L^p -spaces. We know that $m_n u \rightarrow mu$ weakly in $L^2((s, T), H)$. Moreover, given that $\|m_n\| \leq C$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$|\langle m_n(\tau)u(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau), v \rangle| \leq 2C\|u(\tau)\|_H\|v\|_H$$

for all $v \in V$ and $\tau \in (s, T)$. Hence by the dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_s^T |\langle m_n(\tau)u(\tau) - m(\tau)u(\tau), v \rangle|^2 d\tau = 0.$$

The convergence means that the family $(m_n u)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is scalarly compact. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and let

$$J_r := \{\tau \in (s, T) : C\|u(\tau)\|_H \geq r\}.$$

We know that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$\int_{J_r} \|Cu(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau < \varepsilon.$$

It implies that

$$\int_{J_r} \|m_n(\tau)u(\tau)\|_H^2 d\tau < \varepsilon$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, as $H \hookrightarrow V'$, the family $(m_n u)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equi-integrable in $L^2((s, T), V')$. We can also choose $r > 0$ such that $(s, T) \setminus J_r$ has measure less than ε . Also,

$$m_n(\tau)u(\tau) \in B_r := \{v \in H : \|v\|_H \leq r/c\}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the compact embedding $H \hookrightarrow V$ it follows that $B_r \subseteq V'$ is relatively compact in V' . It means that $m_n(\tau)u(\tau)$ is in the relatively compact set B_r for all $\tau \in J_r$ and thus the family $(m_n u)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is uniformly tight as defined in [34]. It follows that $(m_n u)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively compact in $L^2((s, T), V')$ as claimed. \square

3 Evolution systems and their properties

As a special case of (2.10) we can look at solutions to the homogeneous problem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u &= 0 & t \in (s, T] \\ u(s) &= v \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

for $v \in H$. The unique solvability of the linear homogeneous problem (3.1) stated in Theorem 2.4 allows us to define

$$U(t, s)v := u(t)$$

where u is the unique solution of (3.1). By the linearity, $U(t, s)$ is a linear operator on H . We call the family $(U(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ the *evolution system* on H associated with $(A(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$, where

$$\Delta_T := \{(t, s) : 0 \leq s \leq t \leq T\}. \quad (3.2)$$

We furthermore set

$$\dot{\Delta}_T := \{(t, s) : 0 \leq s < t \leq T\}. \quad (3.3)$$

We denote by $\mathcal{L}_s(H)$ is the space of bounded linear operators on H with the strong operator topology, that is, the topology of pointwise convergence. We next collect the properties of the evolution system we need, see also [36, Chapter 3].

Proposition 3.1 (Properties of evolution system). *The evolution system has the following properties:*

- (U1) $U(t, t) = I$ for all $t \in [0, T]$;
- (U2) $U(t, s) = U(t, \tau)U(\tau, s)$ for all $0 \leq s \leq \tau \leq t \leq T$;
- (U3) $U(\cdot, s) \in C([s, T], \mathcal{L}_s(H))$ for all $s \in [0, T]$;
- (U4) $U(t, \cdot) \in C([0, t], \mathcal{L}_s(H))$ for all $t \in (0, T]$;
- (U5) $U(t, s) \in \mathcal{L}(H, BC(\Omega))$ and there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|U(t, s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2, L^\infty)} \leq C(t - s)^{-N/4} \quad (3.4)$$

for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$;

- (U6) $U(t, s) \in \mathcal{L}(L^\infty(\Omega))$ for all $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$ and $\sup_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T} \|U(t, s)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^\infty(\Omega))} < \infty$;
- (U7) If $v > 0$, then $[U(t, s)v](x) > 0$ for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$ and all $x \in \Omega$;
- (U8) $U(t, s) \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is compact for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$.

Moreover, if $f \in L^2((s, T), H)$ and $v \in H$, then the solution u of (2.10) can be represented in the form

$$u(t) = U(t, s)v + \int_s^t U(t, \tau)f(\tau) d\tau. \quad (3.5)$$

Proof. Properties (U1)–(U3) are a direct consequence of Theorem 2.4 and (2.12). Property (U4) follows by looking at the dual problem as in [12, Theorem 2.6]. It follows from heat kernel estimates, for instance in [12, Corollary 7.2], that $U(t, s) \in \mathcal{L}(H, L^\infty(\Omega))$ for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$ with the given estimate. The continuity of $U(t, s)v$ as a function of $x \in \Omega$ then follows from standard Hölder estimates for parabolic equations such as those in [7]. The boundedness on $L^\infty(\Omega)$ in (U6) follows from [12, Corollary 7.2].

If all coefficients of $\mathcal{A}(t)$ and $\mathcal{B}(t)$ and the domain Ω are smooth, then the parabolic maximum principle implies that $[U(t, s)v](x) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (s, T]$. Using [12, Theorem 8.3 and Lemma 8.4] the same statement holds in general. Alternatively one could use the parabolic Harnack inequality from [8]. This proves (U7).

To prove (U8) we note that $L^\infty(\Omega)$ is the principal ideal generated by the constant function with value one in the Banach lattice H . By (U5) we have $U(t, s)H \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega)$ for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$. As $U(t, s) = U(t, \tau)U(\tau, s)$ whenever $0 \leq s < \tau < t \leq T$ it follows from [16, Theorem 2.2] that $U(t, s) \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is compact.

If we deal with Dirichlet boundary conditions, then (3.5) follows from [7, Theorem 9]. In a more abstract setting, using the Galerkin approximation, the formula holds for the finite dimensional approximations, and remains valid by taking a limit. \square

We refer to (3.5) as the *variation-of-constants* formula. We next prove a perturbation theorem, weaker than that usually found in the literature. The proof only relies on the properties of the evolution system and is valid in other settings as well, but to keep our exposition simple we refrain from proving a more general version.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that $b_n \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$ is such that $b_n(\tau) \xrightarrow{*} b(\tau)$ weak* in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ for almost all $\tau \in (0, T)$. Let $(U_n(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ be the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + b_n(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and let $(U(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ be the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + b(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$. Then $U_n(t, s) \rightarrow U(t, s)$ in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let $0 \leq s < t \leq T$. By taking $f_n = 0$ it follows from Theorem 2.5 that $U(t, s)v_n \rightarrow U(t, s)v$ whenever $v_n \rightarrow v$ weakly in H . By Proposition 3.1 $U(t, s)$ is compact. Hence, by [14, Proposition 4.1.1] it follows that $U_n(t, s) \rightarrow U(t, s)$ in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Using [5, Proposition 2.2] we obtain as a corollary to Theorem 3.2 the following perturbation result on the spectral radius of $U(t, s)$. The result is also related to [26, Lemma 15.7], but uses much less regularity.

Corollary 3.3. *Under the assumption of Theorem 3.2 we have that,*

$$r(U_n(t, s)) \rightarrow r(U(t, s))$$

for all $(t, s) \in \dot{\Delta}_T$. Moreover, if v_n is the positive eigenfunction of $U_n(t, s)$ with $\|v_n\|_2 = 1$, then $v_n \rightarrow v$ in H and v is the positive eigenfunction of $U(t, s)$.

We will use the above perturbation theorem with a specific set of perturbations.

Remark 3.4. Let $b \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $b \geq 0$. For $\delta > 0$ define

$$\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega: \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta\}$$

and let

$$b_\delta(x, t) := b(x, t)1_{\Omega_\delta}(x)$$

for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$. Then b_δ has compact support in $\Omega \times [0, T]$ and $b_\delta \uparrow b$ pointwise. In particular, if we choose $\delta_n \downarrow 0$ we have that $b_\delta(t) \xrightarrow{*} b(t)$ weak* in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.

We also need a comparison theorem.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $b_1, b_2 \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $0 \leq b_1 < b_2$. For $k = 1, 2$ let $(U_k(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ be the evolution systems associated with $(A(t) + b_k(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$. Then $U_2(t, s) \leq U_1(t, s)$ for all $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$. Moreover, $U_2(T, 0)v \ll U_1(T, 0)v$ for all $v \in H$ with $v > 0$.*

Proof. Let $v \in H$ with $v > 0$ and let $u_k(t) := U_k(t, s)v$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then $u_1, u_2 \geq 0$ and we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{u}_1 - \dot{u}_2) + A(t)(u_1 - u_2) + b_1(t)(u_1 - u_2) &= (b_2(t) - b_1(t))u_2 \quad t \in (s, T] \\ u_1(s) - u_2(s) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As $(b_2 - b_1)u_2 \geq 0$ it follows from Theorem 2.4 that $u_2(t) \leq u_1(t)$ for all $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$. By the positivity of $U(t, s)$ and since $b_2 - b_1 \geq 0$ we deduce that $U_2(t, s) \leq U_1(t, s)$. To show that $U_2(T, 0)v \ll U_1(T, 0)v$ we note that by Proposition 3.1 we have $U(t, \tau)v \gg 0$ for all $\tau \in [0, t)$. By assumption $b_2(\tau) - b_1(\tau) > 0$ for τ in a set of positive measure in $(0, T)$ and hence $[b_2(\tau) - b_1(\tau)]U_1(\tau, s)v > 0$. It follows that

$$U_2(T, \tau) [b_2(\tau) - b_1(\tau)] U_1(\tau, 0)v \gg 0$$

for τ in a set of positive measure in $(0, T)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(T, 0)v &= U_2(T, 0)v + \int_0^T U_2(T, \tau) [b_2(\tau) - b_1(\tau)] U_1(\tau, 0)v d\tau \\ &\gg U_2(T, 0)v \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. □

4 Periodic-parabolic eigenvalue problems

In this section we keep the notation and assumptions from Section 2 and 3. We discuss properties of the *periodic-parabolic eigenvalue problem*,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u + b(t)u &= \mu u \quad t \in [0, T] \\ u(0) &= u(T) \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

in H , where $b \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$. We denote the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + b(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$ by $(U_b(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$.

Definition 4.1. We call μ a *principal eigenvalue* of (4.1) if there exists $u \in W(0, T; V, V')$ such that $u > 0$ and (4.1) is satisfied. Then, u is called the *principal eigenfunction* corresponding to the eigenvalue μ . We define the principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction of an operator similarly.

We make use of the following proposition to reason the existence and uniqueness of a T -periodic principal eigenfunction of (4.1). This is similar to [26, Proposition 14.4].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $b \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $b \geq 0$. Then $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue of $U_b(T, 0)$ if and only if*

$$\mu = -\frac{1}{T} \log(\lambda) \quad (4.2)$$

is an eigenvalue of (4.1). If v is an eigenvector of $U_b(T, 0)$ corresponding to λ , then

$$u(t) = e^{\mu t} U_b(t, 0)v.$$

is an eigenfunction of (4.1) corresponding to λ . Likewise, if u is an eigenfunction for (4.1), then $v := u(0)$ is an eigenvector of $U_b(T, 0)$. Moreover, λ is a principal eigenvalue of $U_b(T, 0)$ if and only if μ is a principal eigenvalue of (4.1)

Under some further assumptions on $U_b(T, 0)$ we can guarantee the existence of a unique principal eigenvalue of (4.1).

Theorem 4.3. *Let $b, b_1, b_2 \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$. Then problem (4.1) has a unique principal eigenvalue we denote by $\mu_1(b)$ and a unique principal eigenfunction. Moreover, if μ is another eigenvalue of (4.1), then $\mu_1(b) \leq \operatorname{Re}(\mu)$. Finally, if $b_1 \leq b_2$, then $\mu_1(b_1) \leq \mu_1(b_2)$ with equality if and only if $b_1 = b_2$ almost everywhere.*

Proof. As a result of Proposition 3.1 $U_b(T, 0)$ is compact by (U8) and irreducible on H by (U7). By de Pagter's theorem

$$r(b) := r(U_b(T, 0)) > 0, \quad (4.3)$$

see [21, Theorem 3] or [32, Theorem 4.2.2]. Now by an application of the Krein-Rutman theorem we have the existence of a principal eigenfunction $v_b \geq 0$, see [35, Theorem 41.2]. Since $U_b(T, 0)$ is positive and irreducible, we have that v_b is a quasi-interior point, that is, $v_b \gg 0$, see for instance [32, Lemma 4.2.9]. Moreover, by [32, Corollary 4.2.15] $r(U_b(T, 0))$ is algebraically simple and the only eigenvalue of $U_b(T, 0)$ having a positive eigenvector. The relationship established in Lemma 4.2 gives a unique principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction pair of (4.1) when suitably normalized. If $\mu \neq \mu_1(b)$ is an eigenvalue of (4.1), then we know that $|\lambda| \leq r(U_b(T, 0))$. Then the corresponding eigenvalue μ of (4.1) given by (4.2) satisfies $\operatorname{Re}(\mu) \geq \mu_1(b)$.

We next look at the comparison of eigenvalues. Using the notation from Proposition 3.5 we have $0 \leq U_2(T, 0) < U_1(T, 0)$ if and only if $b_1 < b_2$. As $U_1(T, 0)$ and $U_2(T, 0)$ are compact and irreducible it follows from [5, Theorem 2.1] that $0 < r(U_2(T, 0)) \leq r(U_1(T, 0))$ with equality if and only if $U_2(T, 0) = U_1(T, 0)$. By the relationship (4.2) we have that $\mu_1(b_1) \leq \mu_1(b_2)$ with equality if and only if $b_1 = b_2$ almost everywhere. \square

It is beneficial to study properties of (4.1) for the family of potentials $(\gamma b)_{\gamma \geq 0}$. In such a case let us denote the corresponding evolution system by $U_\gamma(t, s)$. The following proposition is a slight generalisation of [19, Theorem 3.1 and 4.2].

Proposition 4.4. *Suppose that $b \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ with $b > 0$. Denote by $(U_\gamma(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + \gamma b(t))_{t \in [0, T]}$. Let $\mu_1(\gamma b)$ be the principal eigenvalue and $0 < \varphi_\gamma$ a corresponding eigenfunction of (4.1). Then the following assertions are true*

- (i) *If $v \in H$ and $v \geq 0$, then $U_\gamma(t, s)v$ is decreasing as a function of $\gamma \geq 0$ for all $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$.*

(ii) $\mu_1(\gamma b)$ is increasing as a function of $\gamma \geq 0$ and

$$\mu^*(b) := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\gamma b) \in (\mu_1(0), \infty] \quad (4.4)$$

exists.

(iii) If $\mu^*(b) < \infty$, then there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\|\varphi_\gamma\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T])} \leq c \|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2 \quad (4.5)$$

for all $\gamma \geq 0$.

(iv) $\varphi_\gamma \in C(\Omega \times [0, T])$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\varphi_\gamma(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$.

(v) For all $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\omega \geq \max\{0, \omega_0\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_0^T \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \gamma \int_0^T \langle b(\tau)\varphi_\gamma(\tau), \varphi_\gamma(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\ \leq (\mu_1(\gamma b) + \omega) \int_0^T \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where ω_0 is from (2.8).

Proof. Parts (i) and (ii) follow directly from Proposition 3.5 and the fact that any increasing function has a proper or improper limit. To prove part (iii) note that by (i), Lemma 4.2, Proposition 3.1, Proposition 3.5 and the T -periodicity of φ_γ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi_\gamma(t)\|_\infty &= \|\varphi_\gamma(T+t)\|_\infty \\ &= e^{\mu_1(\gamma b)(T+t)} \|U_\gamma(t+T, 0)\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_\infty \\ &\leq e^{\mu_1(\gamma b)(T+t)} \|U_0(t+T, 0)\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2, L^\infty)} \|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2 \\ &\leq e^{2|\mu^*(b)|T} CT^{-N/4} \|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence we can set $c =: e^{2|\mu^*(b)|T} CT^{-N/4}$ to conclude the proof. Part (iv) follows from Proposition 3.1 (U5) and (U7) since

$$\varphi_\gamma(t) = \varphi_\gamma(T+t) = e^{\mu_1(\gamma b)(T+t)} U_\gamma(t+T, 0)\varphi_\gamma(0)$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$. For part (v) we use the integration by parts formula for functions in $W(0, T; V, V')$ to conclude that

$$0 = \frac{1}{2} (\|\varphi_\gamma(T)\|_2 - \|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2) = \int_0^T \frac{d}{d\tau} \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau = \int_0^T \langle \dot{\varphi}_\gamma(\tau), \varphi_\gamma(\tau) \rangle d\tau.$$

see for instance [20, Theorem XVIII.1.2]. Hence, using (2.8) and the fact that φ_γ is an eigenfunction, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_0^T \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_V^2 d\tau + \gamma \int_0^T \langle b(\tau)\varphi_\gamma(\tau), \varphi_\gamma(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\ \leq \int_0^T \mathbf{a}(\tau, \varphi_\gamma(\tau), \varphi_\gamma) d\tau + \gamma \int_0^T \langle b(\tau)\varphi_\gamma(\tau), \varphi_\gamma(\tau) \rangle d\tau \\ + \omega \int_0^T \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \\ = (\mu_1(\gamma b) + \omega) \int_0^T \|\varphi_\gamma(\tau)\|_2^2 d\tau \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

If the family of potentials $(b_\gamma)_{\gamma \geq 0}$ are of a particular form we can make conclusions on the behaviour of solutions to the equivalent homogeneous problem to (4.1). This is a slightly different version of [19, Theorem 4.2] in the sense that no explicit assumptions on the zero set of b are made. To formulate the theorem we introduce the set

$$Q_b := \left\{ (x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T] : \liminf_{(y,s) \rightarrow (x,t)} b(x, t) > 0 \right\}, \quad (4.7)$$

Theorem 4.5. *Let $b \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ and set $b_\gamma(t) := \gamma b(t)$, $\gamma \geq 0$. Let $\mu_1(\gamma b)$ and φ_γ be the principal eigenvalue and eigenfunction of (4.1) normalised such that $\|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2 = 1$. If $\mu^*(b) < \infty$, (4.4), then there exists a sequence (γ_k) with $\gamma_k \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

$$\varphi_\infty(t) := \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\gamma_k}(t),$$

exists in H and $b(t)\varphi_\infty(t) = 0$ for almost all $t \in (0, T]$. Moreover, $0 < \varphi_\infty \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$ and $\varphi_{\gamma_k} \rightarrow \varphi_\infty$ weakly in $L^2((0, T), V)$. Finally, $\varphi_\infty \rightarrow 0$ locally uniformly in Q_b .

Proof. Let $(U_\gamma(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ be the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + \gamma b(t))_{t \geq 0}$. By [19, Theorem 3.1 and 3.2] it follows that $U_\gamma(t, s)$ is decreasing as a function of γ and that

$$U_\infty(t, s) := \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} U_\gamma(t, s)$$

exists in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ for all $(t, s) \in \Delta_T$. Moreover, $U_\infty(t, s) = U_\infty(t, \tau)U_\infty(\tau, s)$ for all $0 \leq s < \tau < t \leq T$. As a limit of compact positive operators $U_\infty(t, s)$ is compact and positive as well. Since $\|\varphi_\gamma(0)\|_2 = 1$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$ it follows that there exists an increasing sequence (γ_k) in $[0, \infty)$ such that $\gamma_k \rightarrow \infty$ and $\varphi_{\gamma_k}(0) \rightarrow v_\infty$ weakly in H as $k \rightarrow \infty$. It follows from [14, Proposition 4.4.1] that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{\gamma_k}(0) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} e^{\mu_1(\gamma_k b)T} U_{\gamma_k}(T, 0) \varphi_{\gamma_k}(0) = e^{\mu^*(b)T} U_\infty(T, 0) v_\infty$$

in H . In particular $\varphi_{\gamma_k}(0) \rightarrow v_\infty$ in H and thus $\|v_\infty\|_2 = 1$. We let

$$\varphi_\infty(t) := e^{\mu^*(b)t} U_\infty(t, 0) v_\infty.$$

for all $t \in (0, T]$ and extend T -periodically to $t \in \mathbb{R}$. As $U_\gamma(t, 0) \rightarrow U_\infty(t, 0)$ in $\mathcal{L}(H)$ we have that $\varphi_{\gamma_k}(t) \rightarrow \varphi_\infty(t)$ in H for all $t \in [0, T]$. Moreover, by (4.5) it follows that $\varphi_\infty \in L^\infty(\Omega \times (0, T))$ and $\varphi_{\gamma_k} \rightarrow \varphi_\infty$ in $L^2((0, T), H)$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. As $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ it follows from (4.6) that there is also weak convergence in $L^2((0, T), V)$. Letting $k \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.6) also implies that

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^T \langle b(\tau) \varphi_{\gamma_k}(\tau), \varphi_{\gamma_k}(\tau) \rangle d\tau = \int_0^T \langle b(\tau) \varphi_\infty(\tau), \varphi_\infty(\tau) \rangle d\tau.$$

Hence $b\varphi_\infty = 0$ almost everywhere on $\Omega \times (0, T)$. We finally have that

$$\varphi_\gamma(t) = e^{\mu_1(\gamma b)T} U_\gamma(t+T, 0) \varphi_\gamma(0) \leq e^{2|\mu^*(b)|T} T^{-N/4} U_\gamma(t+T, 0) 1$$

for all $\gamma > 0$ and all $t \in [0, T]$. We know that $U_\gamma(t+T, 0)1 = U_\gamma(t, 0)1 \downarrow U_\infty(t, 0)1$. \square

We next give a criterion for $\mu^*(b)$ to be finite established originally in [19].

Lemma 4.6. *Suppose that $b \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, L^\infty(\Omega))$ is T -periodic. Let*

$$Q_0 := \text{int}\{(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} : b = 0 \text{ a.e. in a neighbourhood relative to } \Omega \times \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (4.8)$$

Assume that there exists a T -periodic function $\beta \in C(\mathbb{R}, \Omega)$ such that $(\beta(t), t) \in Q_0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mu^(b) < \infty$.*

Proof. As Q_0 is open, there exists $r > 0$ such that

$$A := \{(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} : \|x - \beta(t)\| \leq r\} \subseteq Q_0.$$

Define $\tilde{b}(x, t) = 0$ for all $(x, t) \in A$ and $\tilde{b}(x, t) = \|b\|_\infty$ otherwise. Then $b \leq \tilde{b}$ and thus by Theorem 4.3 we have that $\mu_1(\gamma b) \leq \mu_1(\gamma \tilde{b})$ for all $\gamma > 0$. By [19, Theorem 4.2] it follows that $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} \mu_1(\gamma \tilde{b}) < \infty$. Hence also $\mu_1^*(b) < \infty$. \square

Remark 4.7. The first example for $\mu_1(b)$ to be finite appears in [23]. A general criterion that is at least close to necessary is given in [19] and was used in Lemma 4.6: Assume that $b \in L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T])$ and extend it T -periodically in t to the infinite strip $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Assume that Q_0 as defined in (4.8) and that $\text{supp}(b)$ are both non-empty. According Lemma 4.6 we have that $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ if there exists a *forward moving* T -periodic path in Q_0 . The optimality of this condition for $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ is discussed in [19, Section 5] with a counter example if that condition is violated. A further counter example appears in [31]. We note that for $\mu^*(b)$ to be finite it is not necessary that the zero set of b has non-empty interior. An example in the stationary case (which is periodic with any period) is given in [18, Remark 4.1].

The assumptions in Lemma 4.6 guarantee that $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ and in turn, by Theorem 4.5, gives the existence of a sequence of eigenfunctions that have a limit in H . The same argument as in the proof of [19, Theorem 4.2], shows that φ_∞ is a weak solution of

$$\frac{\partial \varphi_\infty}{\partial t} + \mathcal{A}(t)\varphi_\infty = \mu^*(b)\varphi_\infty \quad \text{in } Q_0.$$

It is important point out differences with the elliptic case such as treated in [18]. In that case every connected component of $\{x \in \Omega : b(x) = 0\}$ is either contained in the support of the eigenfunction of the equivalent limit eigenvalue problem, or it has empty intersection with that support. Let us explore an example in the periodic-parabolic problem, where that is not the case.

First we define some sets that will be convenient here and in later sections. Take all assumptions as in Lemma 4.6 and set

$$\Omega_t := \{x \in \Omega : (x, t) \in Q_0\} \quad (4.9)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Assume now that C is the connected component of Q_0 containing $(x, 0)$ and let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the set of $y \in \Omega_T$ such that there exists $\beta_1 \in C([0, T], \Omega)$ with $\beta_1(0) = x$ and $\beta_1(T) = y$. Let $\tilde{Q}_0 \subseteq Q_0$ such that there exists $x \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and a function $\beta_2 \in C([0, t], \Omega)$ such that $\beta_2(0) = x$ and $(\beta_2(s), s) \in Q_0$ for all $s \in [0, t]$. Then \tilde{Q}_0 is connected and as a consequence of [19, Theorem 3.12] and by the T -periodicity of the limit eigenfunction φ_∞ , it follows that either $\varphi_\infty(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \tilde{Q}_0$ or $\varphi_\infty(x, t) = 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \tilde{Q}_0$.

Figure 4.1 shows an example of a weight function b . The shaded regions represent Q_b and the white region including the dotted part represents Q_0 . The set \tilde{Q}_0 is the white region excluding the dotted part. The figure also shows a curve given by $\alpha \in C([0, T], \Omega)$




Figure 4.1: Example of b with $\mu^*(b) < \infty$.

inside the zero set with $\alpha(0) = \alpha(T)$. The figure also shows the path connecting points as required in the definition of \tilde{Q}_0 . From our previous comments, $\varphi_\infty(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \tilde{Q}_0$. Let us now focus our attention on the dotted region within \tilde{Q}_0 . That region is part of a cylinder $U \times [t_0, t_1]$ for some open set $U \subseteq \Omega$ and $0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq T$. Its parabolic boundary lies in Q_b as shown in Figure 4.1. We know from Theorem 4.5 that $\varphi_\gamma(x, t) \rightarrow 0$ on $(U \times \{t_0\}) \cup \partial U \times [t_0, t_1]$. Hence the parabolic maximum principle implies that $\varphi_\gamma(x, t) \rightarrow 0 = \varphi_\infty(x, t)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ for all $(x, t) \in U \times [t_0, t_1]$.

The periodic-parabolic spectrum gives us a way to prove the existence of periodic solutions to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u &= f(t) \quad \text{in } (0, T] \\ u(0) &= u(T). \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

whenever $f \in L^2((0, T), V')$. Since we are interested in positive solutions we establish the following theorem, see also [11, Theorem 2.3].

Theorem 4.8. *Assume that $1 \in \varrho(U(T, 0))$. Then (4.10) has a unique solution $u \in W(0, T; V, V')$. Moreover, if $f \geq 0$, then (4.10) has a positive solution if and only if $r(U(T, 0)) < 1$ or equivalently $\mu_1(0) > 0$.*

Proof. Let $w(t)$ be the unique solution of $\dot{w} + A(t)w = f(t)$ for $t \in (0, T)$ with $w(0) = 0$. Such a solution exists due to Theorem 2.4 and is positive if $f \geq 0$. As $1 \in \varrho(U(T, 0))$ then $(I - U(T, 0))^{-1}$ is a positive operator. Define $u_0 := (I - U(T, 0))^{-1}w(T) \geq 0$ and set $u(t) := U(t, 0)u_0 + w(t)$. Then $\dot{u} + A(t)u = f(t)$ for $t \in (0, T]$, $u(0) = u_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} u(0) &= (I - U(T, 0))^{-1}w(T) \\ &= U(T, 0)(I - U(T, 0))^{-1}w(T) + w(T) \\ &= w(T) - w(T) + (I - U(T, 0))^{-1}w(T) = u(0), \end{aligned}$$

so u is a solution of (4.10). Since $U(T, 0)$ is irreducible and compact we finally note that $u_0 = (I - U(T, 0))^{-1}w(T)$ cannot be positive if $r(U(T, 0)) \geq 1$, see for instance [17, Corollary 12.4]. \square

5 Comparison of Principal Eigenfunctions

The main result for this section is a comparison of the principal eigenfunctions of (4.1). The comparison we show here will be fruitful in showing the existence of sub and super-solutions of (1.1) on a non-smooth domain, which are crucial to derive the existence result Theorem 1.1. This is a counterpart of [5, Theorem 6.1] in a periodic-parabolic setting under somewhat different assumptions.

Theorem 5.1. *Let φ_0 and φ_1 denote the principal eigenfunction of (4.1) for b_0 and $b_1 > 0$, respectively. If b_1 has compact support and $\mu_1(b_0) \leq \mu_1(b_1)$, then there exists $c > 0$ such that,*

$$\varphi_0 < c\varphi_1$$

in $\Omega \times [0, T]$.

Proof. Set $v_c := \varphi_0 - c\varphi_1$. We prove the existence of some $c_0 > 0$ such that $\varphi_0 - c\varphi_1 \leq 0$ on $\Omega \times [0, T]$ for all $c \geq c_0$. This is equivalent to showing $v_c^+ = 0$ for all $c \geq c_0$.

Let us assume $v_c^+ > 0$ for all $c \geq 0$ and work towards a contradiction. We have the following equations,

$$\dot{\varphi}_0 + A(t)\varphi_0 + b_0(t)\varphi_0 = \mu_1(0)\varphi_0 \quad (5.1)$$

$$\dot{\varphi}_1 + A(t)\varphi_1 = \mu_1(b_1)\varphi_1 - b_1(t)\varphi_1 \quad (5.2)$$

Subtract c lots of (5.2) from (5.1),

$$\dot{v}_c + A(t)v_c + b_0(t)\varphi_0(t) = \mu_1(b_0)\varphi_0(t) - c\mu_1(m)\varphi_1(t) + cb_1(t)\varphi_1(t)$$

By assumption $\mu_1(b_0) < \mu_1(b_1)$ and $b_0(t)\varphi_0(t) \geq 0$ and thus

$$\dot{v}_c + A(t)v_c \leq \mu_1(b_0)v_c + cb_1(t)\varphi_1(t).$$

By Proposition 4.4 we have that $\varphi_k \in BC(\Omega \times [0, T])$ with $\varphi_k(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$. Since $\text{supp}(b_1) \subseteq \Omega \times [0, T]$ is compact there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\varphi_1(x, t) > \delta$ for all $(x, t) \in \text{supp}(b_1)$. Thus there exists $c_0 > 0$ with,

$$b_1 v_c^+ = b_1(\varphi_0 - c\varphi_1)^+ = 0$$

for all $c \geq c_0$. We note that $v_c^+ \in L^2((0, T), V)$ is a valid test function in the variational framework and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \langle \dot{v}_c(t), v_c^+(t) \rangle dt + \int_0^T \mathbf{a}(t, v_c(t), v_c^+(t)) dt \\ \leq \mu_1(b_0) \int_0^T \langle v_c(t), v_c^+(t) \rangle dt \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

for all $c \geq c_0$. Applying [12, Lemma 3.3], the T -periodicity of v_c and the definitions of $\mathbf{a}(t, \cdot, \cdot)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \mathbf{a}(t, v_c^+(t), v_c^+(t)) dt \\ = \frac{1}{2} \left(\|v_c^+(T)\|^2 - \|v_c^+(0)\|^2 \right) + \int_0^T \mathbf{a}(t, v_c(t), v_c^+(t)) dt \\ \leq \mu_1(b_0) \int_0^T \langle v_c(t), v_c^+(t) \rangle dt = \mu_1(b_0) \int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|^2 dt \end{aligned}$$

for all $c \geq c_0$. By Proposition 2.1 we can choose $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ sufficiently large so that $\mu(0) + \omega > 0$ and

$$\alpha \int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_V^2 dt \leq (\mu_1(b_0) + \omega) \int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_H^2 dt$$

for all $c \geq c_0$. Hence there exists $K > 0$ such that,

$$\int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_V^2 dt \leq K \int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_H^2 dt \quad (5.4)$$

By Rellich-Kondarchov embeddings [9, Theorem 9.16], $V \hookrightarrow L^q(\Omega)$ for some $q > 2$, so there exists $K_1 > 0$ such that,

$$\int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_q^2 dt \leq K_1 \int_0^T \|v_c^+(t)\|_V^2 dt \quad (5.5)$$

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we can choose a compact set $A_\varepsilon \subseteq \Omega$ such that the measure $|A_\varepsilon^c| < \varepsilon$ and

$$\text{supp}(b_1) \subseteq A_\varepsilon \times [0, T].$$

Also, as φ_1 is continuous and $\varphi_1 > 0$ on $A_\varepsilon \times [0, T]$, there exists $c_1 \geq c_0$ such that,

$$v_c^+ = (\varphi_0 - c\varphi_1)^+ = 0 \quad \text{in } A_\varepsilon$$

on $A_\varepsilon \times [0, T]$ for all $c \geq c_1$. Set,

$$w_c(t) := \frac{v_c^+(t)}{\|v_c^+(t)\|_{L^2((0,T),H)}}.$$

By Hölder's inequality, (5.5) and (5.4) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_0^T \|w_c(t)\|_H^2 dt = \int_0^T \|w_c(t)1_{A_\varepsilon^c}\|_2^2 dt \\ &\leq |A_\varepsilon^c|^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} \int_0^T \|w_c(t)\|_q^2 dt \leq \varepsilon^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} K_1 \int_0^T \|w_c(t)\|_V^2 dt \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} K_1 K \int_0^T \|w_c(t)\|_H^2 dt = \varepsilon^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} K_1 K \end{aligned}$$

for all $c \geq c_1$. If we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varepsilon^{2(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{1}{q})} K_1 K < 1$, then we have a contradiction. Hence there exists a $c > 0$ such that $v_c^+ = 0$, that is $\varphi_0 \leq c\varphi_1$ as claimed. \square

6 The periodic-parabolic logistic equation

In this section we prove the results in Theorem 1.1. We have introduced precise assumptions and an abstract framework for the linear problem in Section 2 and Section 3. We continue to use that as well as the assumptions on the nonlinearity below.

Assumption 6.1. Let $g \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$ with

- $g(x, t, 0) = 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$;
- $g(x, t + T, \xi) = g(x, t, \xi)$ for all $(x, t, \xi) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$ (T -periodicity);
- $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi} \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty))$ and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(x, t, \xi) > 0$ for all $(x, t, \xi) \in \overline{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$.
- $g(x, t, \xi) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly with respect to (x, t) in compact subsets of $\Omega \times [0, T]$.

Given a function $u: \overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ the function $(x, t) \mapsto g(x, t, u(x, t))$ defines a function on $\overline{\Omega} \times [0, \infty)$. For convenience we often write $g(t, u)$ for the function given by $t \mapsto g(t, \cdot, u(\cdot, t))$ or even $g(u)$ for the function $g(\cdot, \cdot, u(\cdot, \cdot))$.

With these assumptions and notation the periodic parabolic evolution equation (1.1) can be written in the abstract form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u &= \mu u - b(t)g(t, u)u \quad t \in (0, T] \\ u(0) &= u(T). \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

in H . We seek necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence of a non-trivial positive solution. We also consider solutions of the semi-linear evolution equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u &= \mu u - b(t)g(t, u)u \quad t \in (0, T] \\ u(0) &= u_0. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

with $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. By a solution to (6.1) or (6.2) we mean an element $u \in W(0, T; V, V')$ with $g(\cdot, u)u \in L^2((0, T), V')$ that satisfies (6.1) or (6.2), respectively. We extend $A(t)$, $b(t)$ T -periodically to \mathbb{R} . Then any solution of (6.1) can be extended T -periodically to $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and any solution of (6.2) can be extended to a solution for $t \geq 0$. We first prove that positive solution to (6.1) or (6.2) are necessarily bounded.

Lemma 6.2. *If u is a non-trivial positive solution of (6.1) or (6.2), then $u \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ and $u(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T]$ and*

$$0 \leq u(t) \leq e^{\mu t} U(t, 0)u(0)$$

for all $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let u be a positive solution of (6.2) with $u(0) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Then, the function given by $w(t) := e^{\mu t} U(t, 0)u(0) - u(t)$ satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w - \mu w &= b(t)g(t, u)u \quad t \in (0, T], \\ w(0) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

As $b(t)g(t, u) \geq 0$ it follows from Theorem 2.4 that $w \geq 0$. Hence

$$0 \leq u(t) = e^{\mu t} U(t, 0)u(0) - w(t) \leq e^{\mu t} U(t, 0)u(0)$$

for all $t \geq 0$. In case of a solution of (6.1) we have that

$$\|u(0)\|_\infty = \|u(T)\|_\infty \leq e^{\mu T} \|U(T, 0)u(0)\|_\infty \leq ce^{\mu T} T^{-N/4} \|u(0)\|_2 < \infty$$

by Proposition 3.1(U5). Hence in either case it follows from Proposition 3.1(U6) that there exists $C > 0$ with

$$\|u(t)\|_\infty \leq e^{\mu t} \|U(t, 0)u(0)\|_\infty \leq C e^{|\mu|T} \|u(0)\|_\infty$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$, showing that $u \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$. Setting $m(t) := b(t)g(t, u(t))$ we have $m \in L^\infty([0, T], L^\infty(\Omega))$ and u satisfies the linear equation

$$\dot{u} + A(t)u + (m(t) - \mu)u = 0$$

for $t \in [0, T]$ with $u(0) > 0$. Hence, if $(U_m(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ is the evolution system associated with $(A(t) + m(t) - \mu)_{t \in [0, T]}$, then $u(t) = U_m(t, 0)u_0$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and thus $u(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T]$ by Propostion 3.1(U7). \square

Remark 6.3. We note that from the above lemma the function $[t \mapsto b(t)g(t, u(t))] \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty)$ if u is a solution of (6.1). As a consequence, u is a positive periodic-parabolic eigenvector for $(A(t) + b(t)g(t, u(t)))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and hence according to Theorem 4.3 we have

$$\mu_1(bg(u)) = \mu,$$

where we write $bg(u)$ as a short hand for the function $t \mapsto b(t)g(t, u(t))$. As before, given $m \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$, we use the notation $\mu_1(m)$ for the principal periodic-parabolic eigenvalue of $\dot{u} + A(t)u + m(t)u = \mu u$, $u(0) = u(T)$.

We next prove that any non-trivial positive solution to (6.1) is unique. The following tool is useful also for other purposes.

Lemma 6.4. *Let $\xi_1, \xi_2 \geq 0$. Then*

$$g(x, t, \xi_2) - g(x, t, \xi_1) = m(x, t, \xi_1, \xi_2)(\xi_2 - \xi_1), \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$m(x, t, \xi_1, \xi_2) := \int_0^1 \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(x, t, \xi_1 + s(\xi_2 - \xi_1)) ds \quad (6.4)$$

and $m(x, t, \xi_1, \xi_2) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$.

Proof. Given $\xi_1, \xi_2 \geq 0$ the fundamental theorem of calculus implies that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x, t, \xi_2) - g(x, t, \xi_1) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(x, t, \xi_1 + s(\xi_2 - \xi_1)) ds (\xi_2 - \xi_1) \\ &= m(x, t, \xi_1, \xi_2)(\xi_2 - \xi_1) \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

The assumptions on g imply that $m(x, t, \xi_1, \xi_2) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$. \square

Proposition 6.5 (Uniqueness of solutions). *For every $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, the periodic-parabolic problem (6.1) has at most one solution.*

Proof. Suppose that $u, v > 0$ are two positive solutions of (6.1). Taking into account Lemma 6.4 we see that $w := v - u$, satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w + b(t)[g(t, v) + m(t, u, v)u]w &= \mu w \quad t \in [0, T] \\ w(0) &= w(T). \end{aligned}$$

If $w \neq 0$ it follows that μ is a periodic-parabolic eigenvalue for the operators $(A(t) + b(t)[g(t, v) + m(t, u, v)v])_{t \in [0, T]}$. By (6.4) and Lemma 6.2 we have that

$$b(t)[g(t, v) + m(t, u, v)u] > 0$$

We also know from (6.1) that μ is a periodic-parabolic eigenvalue for the operators $(A(t) + b(t) + g(t, v(t)))_{t \in [0, T]}$ and thus by Theorem 4.3

$$\mu = \mu_1(b(t)g(t, v)) < \mu_1(b[g(v) + m(u, v)u]) \leq \mu.$$

This is impossible and thus $u = v$ as claimed. \square

We next give a necessary condition for the existence of a positive solution.

Proposition 6.6 (Necessary condition for existence). *Suppose that (6.1) has a non-trivial positive solution. Then $\mu_1(0) < \mu < \mu^*(b)$.*

Proof. We note that rearranging (6.1) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u + b(t)g(t, u)u &= \mu u \quad t \in (0, T] \\ u(0) &= u(T), \end{aligned}$$

that is, u is a principal eigenfunction corresponding to the eigenvalue $\mu_1(bg(\cdot, u))$. As $0 < bg(\cdot, u)$ and $\gamma := \|bg(\cdot, u)\|_\infty < \infty$, by Lemma 6.2, we deduce from Theorem 4.3 that

$$\mu_1(0) < \mu = \mu_1(bg(\cdot, u)) \leq \mu_1(\gamma b) < \mu^*(b)$$

as claimed. \square

We use the method of sub- and super-solutions to show that the necessary conditions for the existence of a positive solution of (6.1) in Proposition 6.6 is also sufficient. By a *sub-solution* of (6.1) we mean a function $\underline{u} \in W(0, T; V, V') \cap L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\underline{u}} + A(t)\underline{u} &\leq \mu \underline{u} - b(t)g(t, \underline{u})\underline{u} \quad t \in (0, T] \\ \underline{u}(0) &\leq \underline{u}(T). \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

By a *super-solution* of (6.1) we mean a function $\bar{u} \in W(0, T; V, V') \cap L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\bar{u}} + A(t)\bar{u} &\geq \mu \bar{u} - b(t)g(t, \bar{u})\bar{u} \quad t \in (0, T] \\ \bar{u}(0) &\geq \bar{u}(T). \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

We call \underline{u} and \bar{u} and ordered pair of sub- and super-solutions if $\underline{u}(0) \leq \bar{u}(0)$. These definitions are a more abstract version of [26, Definition 21.1]. We show that a pair of ordered sub- and super-solutions is ordered on all $[0, T]$.

Proposition 6.7 (Comparison). *Suppose that \underline{u} and \bar{u} are an ordered pair of sub- and super-solutions of (6.1) and that u, v are solutions of (6.2) with $\underline{u}(0) \leq u(0) \leq v(0) \leq \bar{u}(0)$. Then $\underline{u}(t) \leq u(t) \leq v(t) \leq \bar{u}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.*

Proof. Setting $w := \bar{u} - \underline{u}$ we can use (6.3) to write

$$g(t, \bar{u})\bar{u} - g(t, \underline{u})\underline{u} = [m(t, \underline{u}, \bar{u})\underline{u} + g(t, \bar{u})] w$$

Subtracting (6.6) from (6.7) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w - \mu w + [g(t, \bar{u}) + m(t, \underline{u}, \bar{u})\underline{u}]w &=: f(t) \geq 0 \quad t \in (0, T] \\ \bar{u}(0) - \underline{u}(0) = w(0) &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Since $g(t, \bar{u}) + m(t, \underline{u}, \bar{u})\underline{u} \in L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ and $f \in L^2((0, T), V')$ it follows from Theorem 2.4 that $w \geq 0$, that is, $\underline{u}(t) \leq \bar{u}(t)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. A similar argument holds if we replace the pair \underline{u} and \bar{u} by any combination of \underline{u} , u , v , and \bar{u} with difference of initial conditions positive. This concludes the proof of the proposition. \square

Knowing that solutions, if they exist, are trapped between sub- and super-solutions allows us to show the existence of a solution to the initial value problem (6.2) for any initial condition between $\underline{u}(0)$ and $\bar{u}(0)$. We let

$$\tilde{g}(x, t, \xi) := \min\{g(x, t, \xi), g(x, t, \|\bar{u}\|_\infty)\}$$

for all $(x, t, \xi) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$. We also extend the function by zero for $\xi < 0$. Taking into account (6.3) it follows that $\xi \rightarrow \tilde{g}(x, t, \xi)\xi$ is Lipschitz continuous on \mathbb{R} uniformly with respect to $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$. It then follows that we have a substitution operator $F : H \rightarrow H$ given by

$$F(t, u)(x, t) := \tilde{g}(x, t, u(x, t))u(x, t)$$

for any function $u : \Omega \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then it is easily checked that $F \in C(\mathbb{R} \times H, H)$ is Lipschitz continuous uniformly with respect to $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that for every $u_0 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} + A(t)u - \mu u &= F(t, u) \quad t \geq 0 \\ u(0) &= u_0 \end{aligned}$$

has a unique global (mild) solution, see for instance [17, Section 16] (the proofs work under our assumptions) or [13, Theorem 4.5]. Due to Proposition 6.7 that solution coincides with the solution of (6.2) for all $t \geq 0$ if $\underline{u}(0) \leq u_0 \leq \bar{u}(0)$. A mild solution is a function $u \in C((0, T), H)$ such that

$$u(t) = U(t, 0)u_0 + \int_0^t U(t, \tau)(\mu u(\tau) - F(\tau, u(\tau))) d\tau$$

for all $t \geq 0$. By Proposition 3.1 this solution is also in $W(0, T; V, V')$.

We next construct a sub-solution for (6.1) in the same way as done in the proof of [26, Theorem 28.1].

Lemma 6.8 (Existence of sub-solution). *Suppose that $\mu > \mu_1(0)$ and let φ_0 be the principal periodic-parabolic eigenfunction as defined in Theorem 4.3. Then there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $\varepsilon\varphi_0$ is a subsolution of (6.1) for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$.*

Proof. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\varepsilon\varphi_0) + A(t)(\varepsilon\varphi_0) &= \mu_1(0)(\varepsilon\varphi_0) \\ &= \mu(\varepsilon\varphi_0) - b(t)g(t, \varepsilon\varphi_0)(\varepsilon\varphi_0) + [\mu_1(0) - \mu + b(t)g(t, \varepsilon\varphi_0)](\varepsilon\varphi_0). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\mu_1(0) - \mu < 0$. Moreover, by assumption on g and Proposition 4.4 we have that

$$0 \leq g(t, \varepsilon\varphi_0) \leq g(t, \varepsilon\|\varphi_0\|_\infty) \rightarrow 0$$

as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ uniformly with respect to $(x, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$. Hence, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mu_1(0) - \mu + b(t)g(t, \varepsilon\varphi_0) < 0$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. Therefore,

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\varepsilon\varphi_0) + A(t)(\varepsilon\varphi_0) < \mu(\varepsilon\varphi_0) - b(t)g(t, \varepsilon\varphi_0)(\varepsilon\varphi_0)$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$. □

We next prove the existence of a supersolution for $\mu < \mu^*(b)$. The construction follows the idea of [18, Proposition 3.1] or [5, Proposition 7.8]. The construction is different from that in [1, Section 5] which makes use of more regularity properties.

Proposition 6.9 (Existence of super-solution). *Suppose that $\mu < \mu^*(b)$. For $\delta > 0$ define*

$$\Omega_\delta := \{x \in \Omega: \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) \geq \delta\}$$

and let $b_\delta := 1_{\Omega_\delta}b$. Then the following statements hold.

- (i) *There exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $\mu < \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta) < \mu^*(b)$.*
- (ii) *If ψ is the principal eigenfunction associated with $\mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)$ from (i), then there exists $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that $\kappa\psi$ is a super-solution of (6.1) for all $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$.*

Proof. We start by proving (i). By definition of $\mu^*(b)$ we can choose $\gamma > 0$ such that $\mu < \mu_1(\gamma b)$. It follows from Corollary 3.3, Remark 3.4 and Lemma 4.2 that $\mu_1(\gamma b) \leq \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)$ and $\mu_1(\gamma b_\delta) \rightarrow \mu_1(\gamma b)$ as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Hence there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu < \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta) < \mu^*(b)$.

To prove (ii) let $\psi > 0$ be a positive eigenfunction corresponding to $\mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)$. note that since $\mu < \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\kappa\psi) + A(t)(\kappa\psi) &= \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)(\kappa\psi) - \gamma b_\delta(t)(\kappa\psi) \\ &> \mu(\kappa\psi) - b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi)(\kappa\psi) + [b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi) - \gamma b_\delta(t)](\kappa\psi). \end{aligned}$$

On $\Omega \setminus \Omega_\delta$ we have that

$$b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi) - \gamma b_\delta(t) = b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi) \geq 0.$$

Since $\Omega_\delta \subseteq \Omega$ is compact we deduce from Proposition 4.4(iv) that there exists $c > 0$ such that $\psi(x, t) \geq c$ for all $x \in \Omega_\delta \times [0, T]$. Hence on Ω_δ we have $g(t, \kappa\psi) \geq g(t, \kappa c) \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly with respect to $(x, t) \in \Omega_\delta \times (0, T)$ Hence there exists $\kappa_0 > 0$ such that

$$b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi) - \gamma b_\delta(t) > 0$$

on Ω_δ for all $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$. It follows that

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\kappa\psi) + A(t)(\kappa\psi) > \mu(\kappa\psi) - b(t)g(t, \kappa\psi)(\kappa\psi)$$

for all $\kappa > \kappa_0$, showing that ψ is a super-solution of (6.1). □

There is no guarantee that the sub and super-solutions constructed above can be used to get an ordered pair. Usually the ordering is achieved by using C^1 -regularity of the solutions and the Hopf boundary maximum principle. The key to overcome this restrictions on regularity is the eigenfunction comparison Theorem 5.1. We use a monotone iteration scheme similar to [26, Section 1 and 21].

Theorem 6.10. *Let $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$ then there exists a unique non-trivial positive weak solution of (1.1). Moreover, that solution is linearly stable.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon\varphi$ and $\kappa\psi$ be the sub and super-solutions constructed in Lemma 6.8 and Proposition 6.9 for $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and $\kappa \geq \kappa_0$. Since b_δ has compact support and $\mu_1(0) < \mu < \mu_1(\gamma b_\delta)$, Theorem 5.1 implies the existence of $\kappa_1 \geq \kappa_0$ such that $\varepsilon\varphi \leq \kappa\psi$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and all $\kappa \geq \kappa_1$.

Fix a pair of sub and super-solutions \underline{u} and \bar{u} . Let w be the solution of (6.2) with initial condition $\underline{u}(t)$. Then it follows by Proposition 6.7 and induction that

$$0 < \underline{u}(t) \leq w(t + nT) \leq w(t + (n + 1)T) \leq \bar{u}(t) \leq \|\bar{u}\|_\infty \quad (6.8)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular

$$u(t) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} w(t + nT)$$

exists as a pointwise limit for all $t \in [0, T]$. The monotone convergence theorem implies convergence in $L^2((0, T), \Omega)$. Also, by the variation-of-constants formula and the T -periodicity

$$\begin{aligned} w((n + 1)T) &= U(T, 0)w(nT) \\ &+ \int_0^T U(T, \tau) [\mu w(\tau + nT) - b(\tau)g(\tau, w(\tau + nT))] w(\tau + nT) d\tau \end{aligned}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, T]$. By letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ and the dominated convergence theorem we have

$$u(0) = U(T, 0) + \int_0^T U(T, \tau) [\mu u(\tau) - b(\tau)g(\tau, u(\tau))] u(\tau) d\tau.$$

This shows that u is a solution of (6.1).

For the linear stability we consider linearize the equation about u_μ . That linearization can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dw}{dt} + [A(t) - \mu + bg(x, t, u_\mu)]w + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi} g(x, t, u_\mu) u_\mu w &= 0 \quad \text{for } t > 0 \\ w(0) &= w_0. \end{aligned}$$

We know that $\mu_1(-\mu + bg(u_\mu)) = 0$. Since $u_\mu(x, t) > 0$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$, g is strictly increasing and $b \neq 0$ it follows from 4.4 that

$$\mu_1 \left(-\mu + bg(u_\mu) + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi} g(u_\mu) u_\mu \right) > 0.$$

Hence, the linear stability follows from [17, Theorem 22.2]. \square

7 Smoothness with respect to the parameter

The non-trivial positive solution to (6.1) has some desirable properties with respect to the parameter μ . We continue the work with the same assumptions and framework as in Section 6. We have seen in Theorem 6.10 that (6.1) has a unique solution if and only if $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$. One key property is the monotonicity.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$ and let u_μ be the unique positive solution of (6.1). Then $[\mu \mapsto u_\mu] \in C^1((\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b)), W(0, T; V, V'))$ and u_μ is increasing as a function of $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$. Moreover, the derivative $v_\mu := \frac{du_\mu}{d\mu}$ is the unique solution*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_\mu + A(t)v_\mu + b(t) \left[g(t, u_\mu) + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(t, u_\mu)u_\mu \right] v_\mu - \mu v_\mu &= u_\mu & t \in (0, T], \\ v_\mu(0) &= v_\mu(T). \end{aligned} \quad (7.1)$$

Proof. We first prove the monotonicity. Suppose $\mu_1(0) < \mu, \lambda < \mu^*(b)$ with $\mu \neq \lambda$. Setting

$$v_\lambda := \frac{u_\lambda - u_\mu}{\lambda - \mu}$$

we deduce from (6.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_\lambda + A(t)v_\lambda + b(t) [g(t, u_\lambda) + m(t, u_\mu, u_\lambda)u_\mu] v_\lambda - \lambda v_\lambda &= u_\mu \\ v_\lambda(0) &= v_\lambda(T) \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

We note that $bm(t, u_\mu, u_\lambda)u_\mu > 0$ and $\mu_1(b(t)g(t, u_\lambda) - \lambda) = 0$ by Remark 6.3. Hence by Theorem 4.3 we have that

$$\mu_1(bg(t, u_\lambda) - \lambda + bm(t, u_\mu, u_\lambda)u_\mu) > 0 \quad (7.3)$$

for all $\lambda \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$. Now Theorem 4.8 implies that v_λ is the unique solution to (7.2) and since $u_\mu > 0$ we have $v_\lambda > 0$. In particular u_μ is increasing as a function of μ .

To prove the continuity fix $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$. By the monotonicity it follows that $u_\lambda \rightarrow w$ in $L^2((0, T), H)$ and $u_\lambda(0) \rightarrow w(0)$ in H as $\lambda \rightarrow \mu^+$. Fix $\delta > 0$ such that $\mu + \delta < \mu^*(b)$ and consider $\lambda \leq \mu + \delta$. Then $0 < u_\lambda \leq \|u_{\mu+\delta}\|_\infty$ and the family $(g(\cdot, u_\lambda))_{\lambda \in (\mu_1(0), \mu+\delta)}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$. In particular, $g(\cdot, u_\lambda) \xrightarrow{*} g(\cdot, w)$ weak* in $L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$. By Theorem 2.5 v is a solution to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w &= \mu w - b(t)g(t, w)w & t \in [0, T] \\ w(0) &= w(T) \end{aligned} \quad (7.4)$$

and $u_\lambda \rightarrow w$ in $W(0, T; V, V')$. By the uniqueness of solutions from Proposition 6.5 it follows that $w = u_\mu$. A similar argument applies if $\lambda \rightarrow \mu^-$.

For the differentiability define $\delta > 0$ as above then

$$m(t, u_\mu, u_\lambda) \xrightarrow{*} \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(t, u_\mu)$$

weak* in $L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$, similarly to $g(\cdot, u_\lambda)$ as above. For any $\lambda \in (\mu_1(0), \mu + \delta)$ denote by $(U_\lambda(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ the evolution system associated with

$$(A(t) + b(t) [g(t, u_\lambda) + m(t, u_\mu, u_\lambda)u_\mu] - \lambda)_{t \in [0, T]}.$$

Then by (7.3) we have $1 \in \rho(U_\lambda(T, 0))$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.8 we then have $v_\lambda(t) = U_\lambda(t, 0)w_\lambda(0) + y_\lambda(t)$ and in particular $v_\lambda(0) = (I - U_\lambda(T, 0))^{-1}y_\lambda(T)$. By Theorem 3.2 and a well-known perturbation result [27, Theorem IV 2.25]

$$v_\lambda(0) = (I - U_\lambda(T, 0))^{-1}y_\lambda(T) \rightarrow (I - U_\mu(T, 0))^{-1}y_\mu(T) =: v_0 \quad \text{in } H$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow \mu$, where $(U_\mu(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ is the evolution system associated with the family of operators in (7.2). Hence, Theorem 2.5 implies $v_\lambda \rightarrow v_\mu$ in $W(s_0, T; V, V')$ for every $s_0 \in (0, T]$. In particular $v_\lambda(0) = v_\lambda(T) \rightarrow v_\mu(T) = v_\mu(0)$ in H . Hence $v_\lambda \rightarrow v_\mu$ in $W(0, T; V, V')$ and v_μ is a solution of (7.1). By (7.3) and Theorem 4.8 that solution is unique and positive. The continuity of the derivative follows from the continuity of m_μ as a function of μ and Theorem 2.5. \square

Corollary 7.2. *Given $\mu^*(b) < \infty$ we have $\|u_\mu\|_\infty \downarrow 0$ as $\mu \downarrow \mu_1(0)$ and $\|u_\mu\|_\infty \uparrow \infty$ as $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mu \downarrow \mu_1(0)$. As in the continuity part of the proof of Theorem 7.1 there exists w such that $u_\mu \rightarrow w$ in $W(0, T; V, V')$ and w satisfies the equation (7.4) with $\mu = \mu_1(0)$. By Proposition 6.6 it follows that $w = 0$ and in particular $u_\mu(0) \rightarrow 0$ in H as $\mu \downarrow \mu_1(0)$. By Lemma 6.2 and Proposition 3.1 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_\mu(t)\|_\infty &= \|u_\mu(t+T)\|_\infty \leq e^{\mu t+T} \|U(t+T, 0)u_\mu(0)\|_\infty \\ &\leq C e^{2|\mu^*(b)|T} T^{-N/4} \|u_\mu(0)\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\mu \downarrow \mu_1(0)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. Hence $u_\mu \rightarrow 0$ in $L^\infty((0, T), L^\infty(\Omega))$ as $\mu \downarrow \mu_1(0)$. In the case $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b) < \infty$ we argue by contradiction. Suppose,

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)} \|u_\mu\|_\infty = M < \infty$$

then the same argument as used in the continuity part of Theorem 7.1 shows that $u_\mu \rightarrow w$ in $W(0, T; V, V')$ as $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b)$ and w solves (7.4) with $\mu = \mu^*(b)$. However this is a contradiction to Proposition 6.6 and so $\|u_\mu\|_\infty \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b)$. \square

The differentiability in Theorem 7.1 coupled with the convergence and uniform boundedness of eigenfunctions of the equation (4.1) allow us to specify where the blowup of solutions occurs. As an auxiliary problem we consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w &= 1 & t \in [0, T] \\ w(0) &= w(T) \end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Proposition 7.3. *Let w_γ denote a solution of*

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{w} + A(t)w + \gamma b(t)w + \omega w &= 1 & t \in (0, T], \\ w(0) &= w(T) \in H, \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

where $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose $\mu^*(b) < \infty$. If there exists $\mu_0 \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$ and $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that $u_{\mu_0} \geq w_{\gamma_0}$ then $u_\mu(x, t) \uparrow \infty$ as $\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$ for all $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ where $\varphi_\infty(x, t) > 0$.

Proof. We take the family of uniformly bounded principal eigenfunctions, $(\varphi_\gamma)_{\gamma \geq 0}$, from Proposition 4.4. For each $\gamma \geq 0$ denote by $(U_\gamma(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ the evolution system associated with the family $(A(t) + \gamma b(t) + \omega)_{t \in [0, T]}$. By the uniform bound on the family $(\varphi_\gamma)_{\gamma \geq 0}$ and monotonicity of $\mu_1(\gamma b)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\gamma(0) &= (I - U_\gamma(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\gamma(T, s) (\mu_1(\gamma b) + \omega) \varphi_\gamma(s) ds \\ &\leq (I - U_\gamma(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\gamma(T, s) (\mu^*(b) + \omega) C ds \\ &= (\mu^*(b) + \omega) C (I - U_\gamma(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\gamma(T, s) ds = (\mu^*(b) + \omega) C w_\gamma(0), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\gamma \geq 0$. Hence, by Theorem 2.4 we have $w_\gamma \geq M \varphi_\gamma$ for all $\gamma \geq 0$ where $M := ((\mu^*(b) + \omega)C)^{-1}$. From Proposition 4.4 $U_\gamma(t, s)$ is in γ and so we have w_γ is decreasing as $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$. Now, by assumption there exists $\mu_0 \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$ and $\gamma_0 > 0$ such that $u_{\mu_0} \geq w_{\gamma_0} \geq w_\gamma \geq M \varphi_\gamma$ for all $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$. Moreover, by Theorem 7.1, $u_\mu \geq M \varphi_\gamma$ for all $\mu \in [\mu_0, \mu^*(b))$ and all $\gamma \geq \gamma_0$.

Fix $\mu \in [\mu_0, \mu^*(b))$ and choose $\gamma(\mu) > 0$ such that

$$\gamma(\mu) > \max \left\{ \left\| g(\cdot, u_\mu) + \frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}(\cdot, u_\mu) u_\mu \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega \times [0, T])}, \gamma_0 \right\}$$

and $\mu_1(\gamma(\mu)b) > \mu_0$. By assumptions on g and $\frac{\partial g}{\partial \xi}$, we have from Corollary 7.2 that $\gamma(\mu) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$. From Theorem 7.1 we have that $v_\gamma := \frac{du_\mu}{d\mu}$ exists. Let $(U_\mu(t, s))_{(t,s) \in \Delta_T}$ denote the evolution system associated with the problem v_μ satisfies. An application of Proposition 4.4 gives $U_\mu(T, 0) > U_\gamma(T, 0)$ for all $\gamma \geq \gamma(\mu)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} v_\mu(0) &= (I - U_\mu(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\mu(T, s) u_\mu(s) ds \\ &\geq (I - U_\mu(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\mu(T, s) M \varphi_\gamma(s) ds \\ &> (I - U_\gamma(T, 0))^{-1} \int_0^T U_\gamma(T, s) M \varphi_\gamma(s) ds = M \varphi_\gamma(0) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\gamma \geq \gamma(\mu)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_\mu + A(t)v_\mu + \gamma b(t)v_\mu - \mu v_\mu &> u_\mu \\ &\geq \frac{M}{(\mu_1(\gamma(\mu)b) - \mu)} (\mu_1(\gamma(\mu)b) - \mu) \varphi_\gamma \\ &= \frac{M}{(\mu_1(\gamma(\mu)b) - \mu)} (\dot{\varphi}_\gamma + A(t)\varphi_\gamma + \gamma b(t)\varphi_\gamma - \mu \varphi_\gamma) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$v_\mu \geq \frac{M}{(\mu_1(\gamma(\mu)b) - \mu)} \varphi_\gamma \quad \forall \gamma \geq \gamma(\mu).$$

Choosing a sequence (φ_{γ_n}) so that Theorem 4.5 holds we have

$$v_\mu(x, t) \geq \frac{M}{(\mu_1(\gamma_n(\mu)b) - \mu)} \varphi_{\gamma_n}(x, t) \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } \mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$$

for any $(x, t) \in \Omega \times [0, T]$ where $\varphi_\infty(x, t) > 0$ and so $u_\mu(x, t) \uparrow \infty$. \square

Remark 7.4. The existence of w_γ in Proposition 7.3 is guaranteed by taking ω sufficiently large. If $\mu_1(\gamma b + \omega) > 0$ then by Theorem 4.8 there exists a positive solution of (7.6). In particular, we can choose $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ independent of γ due to the monotonicity of $\mu_1(\gamma b)$.

8 Local boundedness of blow up solutions

We saw in Corollary 7.2 that the solution u_μ of (6.1) blows up as $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b)$ on the set where the limit eigenfunction φ_∞ from Theorem 4.5 is positive. We now show that at least in some special case, the solutions u_μ of (4.1) have a finite limit as $\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$ if $\mu^*(b) < \infty$. We work with the following assumptions.

Assumption 8.1. We make the following assumptions for the remainder of this section:

(B1) By a non-trivial positive solution of (1.1) we mean the case where

$$\mathcal{A}(x, t) := -\alpha(t)\Delta,$$

where $\alpha \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ is T -periodic such that there exist constants $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 > 0$ with $\alpha_0 \leq \alpha(t) \leq \alpha_1$ for almost every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Under this assumption

$$\mathbf{a}(t, u, v) = \alpha(t)(\nabla u, \nabla v)_H \quad \forall u, v \in V.$$

(B2) In addition to the usual conditions, we assume there exist $c > 0$ and $p \in (2, \infty)$ such that

$$g(x, t, \xi) \geq c\xi^{p-1}$$

for all $(x, t, \xi) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$.

As a result of the monotonicity of solutions u_μ (Theorem 7.1), with respect to μ , we have that

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)} u_\mu(x, t) = u_\infty(x, t) \in (0, \infty] \quad (8.1)$$

exists, so we can consider the sets

$$\tilde{Q}_\infty := \text{int} \{ (x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} : u_\infty(x, t) < \infty \}$$

and

$$Q_\infty := \tilde{Q}_\infty \cap (\Omega \times [0, T]).$$

We will show later that $Q_b \subseteq Q_\infty$, possibly with strict inclusion. For now we will derive a Sobolev estimate which will be used to show u_∞ is a Sobolev function satisfying a PDE locally in Q_∞ .

Lemma 8.2. *Given two sub-cylinders $Q_i := \Omega'_i \times (s_i, t_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that*

$$Q_1 \Subset Q_2 \Subset \Omega \times (0, T)$$

we have

$$\|u_\mu\|_{L^2((s_1, t_1), H^1(\Omega'_1))} \leq \frac{C}{\alpha_0} \sqrt{\mu^*(b) + 1} \|u_\mu\|_{L^2(Q_2)} \quad (8.2)$$

for every $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^(b))$, where C depends on $\text{dist}(Q_1, \mathcal{P}(Q_2))$ and α_1 , where $\mathcal{P}(Q_2)$ is the parabolic boundary of Q_2 .*

Proof. We begin by showing an estimate on any sub-cylinder $\Omega' \times (s, t) \in \Omega \times (0, T)$ that depends on the choice of test function. For convenience set $Q' := \Omega' \times (s, t)$. Fix $v \in C_c^\infty(Q')$. For a given $u \in V$ we have the following identity,

$$\mathbf{a}(vu, vu) = \mathbf{a}(u, v^2u) + (u^2, |\nabla v|^2)_{L^2}.$$

We also have from (2.18)

$$0 = \int_s^t \left\langle \frac{d}{d\tau}(vu_\mu), vu_\mu \right\rangle d\tau = \int_s^t \langle \dot{v}, vu_\mu^2 \rangle d\tau + \int_s^t \langle \dot{u}_\mu, v^2u_\mu \rangle d\tau$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 \int_s^t \|\nabla(vu_\mu)\|_{L^2(Q')}^2 d\tau &\leq \int_s^t \mathbf{a}(\tau, vu_\mu, vu_\mu) d\tau \\ &= \int_s^t \mathbf{a}(\tau, u_\mu, v^2u_\mu) d\tau + \alpha_1 \int_s^t (u_\mu^2, |\nabla v|^2)_{L^2} d\tau \\ &= \mu \int_s^t (u_\mu, vu_\mu^2)_{L^2} d\tau - \int_s^t \left(b(\tau)g(\tau, u_\mu)u_\mu, v^2u_\mu \right)_{L^2} d\tau \\ &\quad - \int_s^t \langle \dot{u}_\mu, v^2u_\mu \rangle d\tau + \alpha_1 \|u_\mu \nabla v\|_{L^2(Q')}^2 \\ &\leq \mu \|vu_\mu\|_{L^2(Q')}^2 + \int_s^t \langle \dot{v}, vu_\mu^2 \rangle d\tau + \alpha_1 \|u_\mu \nabla v\|_{L^2(Q')}^2 \\ &\leq \left(\mu^*(b) \|v\|_\infty + \|\dot{v}v\|_{L^\infty(Q')} + \alpha_1 \|\nabla v\|_{L^\infty(Q')}^2 \right) \|u_\mu\|_{L^2(Q')}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing $v \in C_c^\infty(Q_2)$ such that $0 \leq v \leq 1$ and $v \equiv 1$ on Q_1 the inequality (8.2) follows. \square

Theorem 8.3. *Let u_∞ be as in (8.1). Then, u_∞ is a local weak solution of the equation*

$$\partial_t u_\infty - \alpha(t)\Delta u_\infty = \mu^*(b)u_\infty - b(x, t)g(x, t, u_\infty)u_\infty \quad (8.3)$$

in Q_∞ .

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $(x, t) \in Q_\infty$ and choose a sub-cylinder $Q_1 = \Omega_1 \times (s_1, t_1)$ such that its closure is contained in Q_∞ . Let $v \in C_c^\infty(Q_1)$. By Lemma 8.2 it follows that u_μ is bounded in $L^2((s_1, t_1), H^1(\Omega_1))$, so there exists a sequence (u_{μ_n}) such that $u_{\mu_n} \rightharpoonup u_\infty$ in $L^2((s_1, t_1), H^1(\Omega_1'))$ weakly as $n \rightarrow \infty$. As u_∞ is a unique limit the convergence holds for the family $(u_\mu)_{\mu \geq 0}$ as $\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$. Let $\theta \in C_c^\infty(Q_1)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{s_1}^{t_1} (u_\mu, \partial_t \theta)_{L^2} d\tau + \int_{s_1}^{t_1} \mathbf{a}(\tau, u_\mu, \theta) d\tau \\ = \int_{s_1}^{t_1} (\mu u_\mu - b(\tau)g(\tau, u_\mu)u_\mu, \theta)_{L^2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By the weak convergence of $(u_\mu)_{\mu \geq 0}$ we have in the limit $\mu \rightarrow \mu^*(b)$

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_{s_1}^{t_1} (u_\infty, \partial_t \theta)_{L^2} d\tau + \int_{s_1}^{t_1} \mathbf{a}(\tau, u_\infty, \theta) d\tau \\ = \int_{s_1}^{t_1} (\mu^*(b)u_\infty - b(\tau)g(\tau, u_\infty)u_\infty, \theta)_{L^2} d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence u_∞ is a local weak solution of (8.3) as claimed. \square

The set Q_∞ by definition is the set on which the periodic solutions u_μ have a local L^∞ -bound as $\mu \uparrow \mu^*(b)$. The aim is to show that $Q_b \subseteq Q_\infty$. For that purpose we construct local super-solution for (1.1) that are independent of $\mu \leq \mu^*(b)$. These local super-solutions on sub-cylinders of Q_b constructed in a very similar way as those in [25]. There are similar results for the stationary problem, see for instance [10, 22, 30].

Proposition 8.4. *Suppose that Assumption 8.1 is satisfied. Then the family of periodic solutions $(u_\mu)_{\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))}$ is bounded in $L_{loc}^\infty(Q_b)$.*

Proof. The proof relies on the comparison of solutions u_μ with a super-solution to a boundary blow-up problem on strongly included sub-cylinders of Q_b . Let $U \Subset \Omega$, with C^2 boundary, and $(s, t) \subseteq [0, T]$ such that $\overline{U} \times [s, t] \subseteq Q_b$. Let $c > 0$ and $p > 2$ be as in the assumptions. By definition of Q_b there exists $B > 0$ such that $b(x, \tau) \geq B$ for all $(x, t) \in \overline{U} \times [s, t]$. For every $\mu \in (\mu_1(0), \mu^*(b))$ we have that u_μ is a sub-solution of

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u - \alpha(t)\Delta u &= \mu^*(b)u - Bcu & \text{in } U \times (s, T^*], \\ u(x, t) &= u_\mu(x, t) & \text{on } \partial U \times (s, T^*], \\ u(x, s) &= u_\mu(x, s) & \text{in } U. \end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

In order to construct a super-solution of (8.4) use the solutions of two problems. It is easily verified that the Bernoulli type differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z} &= \mu^*(b)z - cBz^p \quad t > s, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow s^+} z(t) &= \infty, \end{aligned}$$

has a unique strictly positive solution. Moreover, it is known that the elliptic boundary blow-up problem

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta w &= \frac{\mu^*(b)}{\alpha_0}w - \frac{cB}{\alpha_1}w^p & \text{in } U, \\ w &= \infty & \text{on } \partial U, \end{aligned}$$

also has a unique strictly positive continuous solution, see for instance [22, Theorem 6.14 & 6.18]. Setting $v(x, t) := w(x) + z(t)$ we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t v - \alpha(t)\Delta v &= \dot{z} - \alpha(t)\Delta w \\ &= \mu^*(b) \left(\frac{\alpha(t)}{\alpha_0}w + z \right) - cB \left(\frac{\alpha(t)}{\alpha_1}w^p + z^p \right) \\ &\geq \mu^*(b)(w + z) - cB(w^p + z^p) \\ &\geq \mu^*(b)(w + z) - cB(w^p + z^p) \geq \mu^*(b)v - cBv^p \end{aligned}$$

in $U \times (s, T^*]$, where the last inequality follows from Minkowski's inequality. Hence, v is a super-solution of (8.4). It follows from the weak maximum principle, see for instance [8, Theorem 1] that

$$v(x, t) > u_\mu(x, t) \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in U \times (s, t]$$

for all $\mu > \mu^*(b)$, showing that the family of periodic solutions is locally bounded. \square

The key to Proposition 8.4 is the existence of a blow-up solution on a strongly included sub-cylinder whose parabolic boundary lies in Q_b . One can then ask what occurs when Q_0 has regions which can be taken as part of the interior of a strongly included sub-cylinder

whose parabolic boundary lies Q_b . In Figure 4.1 we have such an example given by the dotted region enclosed by the sub-cylinder $U \times (t_0, t_1]$. After the transformation $v_\mu := e^{-\mu t} u_\mu$ we have by Proposition 8.4 that there exists $M > 0$ such that $v_\mu \leq M e^{|\mu^*(b)|T}$ in a neighbourhood of $\mathcal{P}(U \times (t_0, t_1])$ in Q_b and so, by the weak parabolic maximum principle,

$$\sup_{\bar{U} \times [t_0, t_1]} v_\mu \leq M e^{|\mu^*(b)|T} \implies \sup_{\bar{U} \times [t_0, t_1]} u_\mu \leq M e^{2|\mu^*(b)|T}.$$

In a more general scenario, where the set Q_0 and Q_b may have a geometry that does not work so easily with a single sub-cylinder as in Figure 4.1. We can take a finite collection of overlapping sub-cylinders with parabolic boundary in Q_b or a cylinder below, for example see Figure 8.1 for an illustration. It then follows that $Q_b \subseteq Q_\infty$ but depending on the geometry of Q_0 it is possible that $Q_\infty \cap Q_0 \neq \emptyset$.




Figure 8.1: Q_b (shaded) with overlapping sub-cylinders covering part of Q_0

This provides a clear distinction between the behaviour of positive solutions of (1.1) and those of the corresponding elliptic logistic equation. As illustrated by the examples in Figure 4.1 and Figure 8.1, solutions may blow up only on part of a connected component of Q_0 in the periodic-parabolic case, whereas if there is blowup in for the solutions of the corresponding solution of the stationary equation, it is on the whole connected component of that zero set.

References

- [1] D. Aleja, I. Antón, and J. López-Gómez, *The weighted periodic-parabolic degenerate logistic equation*, 2021, arXiv:2110.14492 [math.AP]. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2110.14492](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2110.14492)
- [2] D. Aleja, I. Antón, and J. López-Gómez, *Characterizing the existence of positive periodic solutions in the weighted periodic-parabolic degenerate logistic equation*, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B* **28** (2023), 1471–1479. DOI: [10.3934/dcdsb.2022130](https://doi.org/10.3934/dcdsb.2022130)
- [3] P. Álvarez-Caudevilla, M. Bonnard, and A. Lemenant, *Asymptotic limit of linear parabolic equations with spatio-temporal degenerated potentials*, *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.* **26** (2020), 1–20. DOI: [10.1051/cocv/2019023](https://doi.org/10.1051/cocv/2019023)
- [4] P. Álvarez-Caudevilla, Y. Du, and R. Peng, *Qualitative analysis of a cooperative reaction-diffusion system in a spatiotemporally degenerate environment*, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **46** (2014), 499–531. DOI: [10.1137/13091628X](https://doi.org/10.1137/13091628X)
- [5] W. Arendt and D. Daners, *Semilinear elliptic equations on rough domains*, *J. Differential Equations* **346** (2023), 376–415. DOI: [10.1016/j.jde.2022.11.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jde.2022.11.043)

- [6] W. Arendt, D. Dier, and E. M. Ouhabaz, *Invariance of convex sets for non-autonomous evolution equations governed by forms*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **89** (2014), 903–916. DOI: 10.1112/jlms/jdt082
- [7] D. G. Aronson, *Non-negative solutions of linear parabolic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **22** (1968), 607–694.
- [8] D. G. Aronson and J. Serrin, *Local behavior of solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **25** (1967), 81–122. DOI: 10.1007/BF00281291
- [9] H. Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext, Springer, New York, 2011. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-387-70914-7
- [10] F.-C. Şt. Cîrstea and V. D. Rădulescu, *Existence and uniqueness of blow-up solutions for a class of logistic equations*, Commun. Contemp. Math. **4** (2002), 559–586. DOI: 10.1142/S0219199702000737
- [11] D. Daners, *Domain perturbation for linear and nonlinear parabolic equations*, J. Differential Equations **129** (1996), 358–402. DOI: 10.1006/jdeq.1996.0122
- [12] D. Daners, *Heat kernel estimates for operators with boundary conditions*, Math. Nachr. **217** (2000), 13–41. DOI: 10.1002/1522-2616(200009)217:1<13::AID-MANA13>3.3.CO;2-Y
- [13] D. Daners, *Perturbation of semi-linear evolution equations under weak assumptions at initial time*, J. Differential Equations **210** (2005), 352–382. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2004.08.004
- [14] D. Daners, *Domain perturbation for linear and semi-linear boundary value problems*, Handbook of differential equations: stationary partial differential equations. Vol. VI, Handb. Differ. Equ., Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 1–81. DOI: 10.1016/S1874-5733(08)80018-6
- [15] D. Daners, *Inverse positivity for general Robin problems on Lipschitz domains*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **92** (2009), 57–69. DOI: 10.1007/s00013-008-2918-z
- [16] D. Daners and J. Glück, *The role of domination and smoothing conditions in the theory of eventually positive semigroups*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **96** (2017), 286–298. DOI: 10.1017/S0004972717000260
- [17] D. Daners and P. Koch Medina, *Abstract evolution equations, periodic problems and applications*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 279, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, Essex, 1992.
- [18] D. Daners and J. López-Gómez, *Global dynamics of generalized logistic equations*, Adv. Non-linear Stud. **18** (2018), 217–236. DOI: 10.1515/ans-2018-0008
- [19] D. Daners and C. Thornett, *Periodic-parabolic eigenvalue problems with a large parameter and degeneration*, J. Differential Equations **261** (2016), 273–295. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2016.03.007
- [20] R. Dautray and J.-L. Lions, *Mathematical analysis and numerical methods for science and technology. Vol. 5*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-58090-1
- [21] B. de Pagter, *Irreducible compact operators*, Math. Z. **192** (1986), 149–153. DOI: 10.1007/BF01162028
- [22] Y. Du, *Order structure and topological methods in nonlinear partial differential equations. Vol. 1*, Series in Partial Differential Equations and Applications, vol. 2, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2006, Maximum principles and applications. DOI: 10.1142/9789812774446
- [23] Y. Du and R. Peng, *The periodic logistic equation with spatial and temporal degeneracies*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364** (2012), 6039–6070. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-2012-05590-5
- [24] Y. Du and R. Peng, *Sharp spatiotemporal patterns in the diffusive time-periodic logistic equation*, J. Differential Equations **254** (2013), 3794–3816. DOI: 10.1016/j.jde.2013.02.004

- [25] Y. Du, R. Peng, and P. Poláčik, *The parabolic logistic equation with blow-up initial and boundary values*, J. Anal. Math. **118** (2012), 297–316. DOI: [10.1007/s11854-012-0036-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11854-012-0036-0)
- [26] P. Hess, *Periodic-parabolic boundary value problems and positivity*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series, vol. 247, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, Essex, 1991.
- [27] T. Kato, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, 2nd ed., Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 132, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1976. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-66282-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-66282-9)
- [28] J.-L. Lions, *Équations différentielles opérationnelles et problèmes aux limites*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. Band 111, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg, 1961.
- [29] J. L. Lions, *Quelques méthodes de résolution des problèmes aux limites non linéaires*, Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- [30] J. López-Gómez, *Metasolutions of parabolic equations in population dynamics*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2016.
- [31] J. López-Gómez, *Protection zones in periodic-parabolic problems*, Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **20** (2020), 253–276. DOI: [10.1515/ans-2020-2084](https://doi.org/10.1515/ans-2020-2084)
- [32] P. Meyer-Nieberg, *Banach lattices*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-76724-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-76724-1)
- [33] R. E. Showalter, *Monotone operators in Banach space and nonlinear partial differential equations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 49, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. DOI: [10.1090/surv/049](https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/049)
- [34] J. van Neerven, *Compactness in the Lebesgue-Bochner spaces $L^p(\mu; X)$* , Indag. Math. (N.S.) **25** (2014), 389–394. DOI: [10.1016/j.indag.2013.06.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indag.2013.06.002)
- [35] A. C. Zaanaen, *Introduction to operator theory in Riesz spaces*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-642-60637-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60637-3)
- [36] Z. Zeaiter, *Periodic solutions of the generalised logistic equation*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Sydney, 2024. Available at <https://hdl.handle.net/2123/32486>