

# Global Dynamics of Nonlocal Diffusion Systems on Time-Varying Domains

Xiandong Lin<sup>a,c</sup>, Hailong Ye<sup>1b,c</sup>, and Xiao-Qiang Zhao<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>School of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, Guangdong, China

<sup>b</sup>School of Mathematical Sciences, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen 518060, Guangdong, China

<sup>c</sup>Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL A1C 5S7, Canada

## Abstract

We propose a class of nonlocal diffusion systems on time-varying domains, and fully characterize their asymptotic dynamics in the asymptotically fixed, time-periodic and unbounded cases. The kernel is not necessarily symmetric or compactly supported, provoking anisotropic diffusion or convective effects. Due to the nonlocal diffusion on time-varying domains in our systems, some significant challenges arise, such as the lack of regularizing effects of the semigroup generated by the nonlocal operator, as well as the time-dependent inherent coupling structure in kernel. By investigating a general nonautonomous nonlocal diffusion system in the space of bounded and measurable functions, we establish a comprehensive and unified framework to rigorously examine the threshold dynamics of the original system on asymptotically fixed and time-periodic domains. In the case of an asymptotically unbounded domain, we introduce a key auxiliary function to separate vanishing coefficients from nonlocal diffusions. This enables us to construct appropriate subsolutions and derive the global threshold dynamics via the comparison principle. The findings may be of independent interest and the developed techniques, which do not rely on the existence of the principal eigenvalue, are expected to find further applications in the related nonlocal diffusion problems. We also conduct numerical simulations based on a practical model to illustrate our analytical results.

**Keywords:** Nonlocal diffusion systems, time-varying domain, global dynamics, periodic system, bounded and measurable functions.

**2020 MSC:** 35B40, 35K57, 37C65, 92D25.

## 1 Introduction

The overwhelming majority of studies devoted to diffusion processes assume they occur in a static media. However, the expansion and contraction of spatial media is ubiquitous in reality. In fact, the universe we live in undergoes an accelerating expansion [44], and elementary biological processes such as morphogenesis (i.e., the process whereby organisms grow from a single cell) involve tissue expansion [47]. At the species scale, the habitats of most organisms frequently shift in response to changes in ecological environments. For example, the depth and surface area of many rivers and lakes fluctuate seasonally. During summer or the rainy season, rising water levels expand habitats, benefiting organisms living within. Conversely, in winter or the dry season, the water levels drop, reducing the

---

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author: yhl@szu.edu.cn

available habitat. There are also several examples of habitats that are constantly expanding, such as those of *Aedes* mosquitoes, which can transmit dengue fever, yellow fever, Zika virus, and other infectious diseases. Global warming and frequent human activities have significantly expanded areas suitable for their survival and reproduction ([32, 42]). All these facts highlight the need to incorporate time-varying domains into reaction-diffusion models to better capture population dynamics in changing environments.

The role of domain growth in reaction-diffusion models was first investigated by Newman and Frisch [39] in their studies of chick limb development. Kondo and Asai [30] demonstrated that growth could account for the stripe patterning observed in the *Pomacanthus* fish, where additional stripes emerge progressively as the fish matures (see also Painter et al. [40]). Crampin et al. [7–10] further introduced mathematical models to incorporate more general growth cases. Their results highlighted the critical role of domain growth in enhancing pattern robustness and generating diverse biological patterns. In addition, Chaplain et al. [6] extended reaction-diffusion models to spherical surfaces, demonstrating how domain geometry and growth drive spatial heterogeneity in solid tumor development. Since then, population persistence and pattern formation on time-varying domains have attracted increasing interest in the study of reaction-diffusion models, see, e.g., [26, 27, 38, 41, 42] and references therein. In particular, Lam et al. [32] studied the asymptotic dynamics of reaction-diffusion systems under the different evolving cases of domain using the theories of chain transitive sets ([53]) and principal eigenvalues. In the aforementioned studies, all spatial diffusion processes in the models are described by Laplacian operator.

Recently, the nonlocal diffusion, describing the movements between both adjacent and nonadjacent spatial locations, has been introduced in reaction-diffusion equations, see [5, 14, 43, 45, 46, 51]. Besides, the associated nonlocal convolution-type operators have been widely employed to model various movements arising in population dynamics, phase transition phenomena and image processing, see [17, 20, 24] and the references therein. Therefore, beyond the independent interest in specific models, a clearer and deeper understanding of nonlocal diffusion is expected to offer valuable insights with implications across multiple disciplines.

In light of these reasons and inspired by [32, 46], we aim to propose a class of reaction-diffusion systems with nonlocal diffusion and investigate their global dynamics on time-varying domains. More precisely, we consider the following nonlocal diffusion system for  $x \in \Omega_t$  and  $t > 0$ ,

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (a \cdot \nabla)v + (\nabla \cdot a)v = D \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x-z)v(t, z) dz - Dv + f(v), \quad (1.1)$$

under the different evolving conditions of domain  $\Omega_t$ , which incorporates the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition

$$v(t, x) = 0, \quad t > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_t, \quad (1.2)$$

and the initial condition

$$v(0, x) = v_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega_0. \quad (1.3)$$

For the detailed derivation of (1.1)–(1.3), we refer to Section 2. Here,  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_m)^T$  represents the vector of densities of  $m$  interacting species,  $m$  and  $n$  are positive integers,  $D = \text{diag}\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ ,  $d_i > 0$  is diffusion coefficient for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $f(v) = (f_1(v), \dots, f_m(v))^T$  denotes the reaction terms, the kernel  $J$  satisfies the assumption **(J)** below, and  $\Omega_t \subset \mathbb{R}^n$  is simply connected and bounded with smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega_t$  for all

$t \geq 0$ . The condition (1.2) indicates that the habitat outside  $\Omega_t$  is so hostile that the species die immediately upon entering ([24]).

Notice that for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , the diffusion of the density  $v_i$  at a point  $x$  and time  $t$  depends on the values of  $v_i$  at all points in the set  $\{x\} + \text{supp}J$ , which is what makes the diffusion operator nonlocal in system (1.1). As stated in [19], the kernel  $J(x - z)$  denotes the probability distribution of an individual jumping from location  $z$  to location  $x$ , then the rate at which individuals are arriving to position  $x$  from all other places is given by  $d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x - z)v_i(t, z) dz$ , while the rate at which they are leaving location  $x$  to travel to all other sites is given by  $-d_i \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(z - x)v_i(t, x) dz = -d_i v_i(t, x)$ .

In addition to the nonlocal feature, system (1.1) incorporates two additional terms associated with the flow  $a$ , which arises from domain evolution:  $(a \cdot \nabla)v$  and  $(\nabla \cdot a)v$ . The former represents material transport around the domain at a rate determined by the flow, while the latter accounts for dilution or concentration due to local volume changes. As the first step in the analysis, it is essential to reformulate the model (1.1)–(1.3) on a fixed domain. For this purpose, we focus on a class of time-varying domains characterized by linear isotropic deformation with spatially uniform rates. Then a smooth positive function  $\rho$ , with  $\rho(0) = 1$ , is introduced to measure the growth of the domain:  $\Omega_t = \rho(t)\Omega_0$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Detailed discussions and fundamental assumptions are provided in Section 2. Thus, by denoting  $u(t, y) := v(t, \rho(t)y)$ , we derive the following equivalent model,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y - z)u(t, z) dz - Du - \frac{n\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)}u + f(u), & t > 0, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0, y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (1.4)$$

where

$$J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y) := \rho^n(t)J(\rho(t)y), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (1.5)$$

Obviously, the transport effect is excluded in (1.4) at the cost of the kernel being inherently coupled with  $\rho(t)$ , making them inseparable. In view of the equivalence between (1.1)–(1.3) defined on  $\Omega_t$  and (1.4) reformulated on  $\Omega_0$ , we will focus on the global dynamics of (1.4) under the following three asymptotic cases of  $\rho$ . Each case corresponds to a specific type of domain evolution. Notably, the first two cases describe asymptotically bounded domains since  $\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho(t) < \infty$ .

- *Asymptotically fixed case:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(t) = \rho_\infty > 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \dot{\rho}(t) = 0.$$

In this case, the domain  $\Omega_t$  asymptotically approaches a fixed domain as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . A biologically reasonable example is logistic or saturated growth ([38, 41]) of the form  $\rho(t) = \frac{\rho_\infty e^{\kappa t}}{\rho_\infty - 1 + e^{\kappa t}}$ , where  $\kappa > 0$ . This can be seen easily by noting  $\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \kappa\rho \left(1 - \frac{\rho}{\rho_\infty}\right)$ .

- *Asymptotically time-periodic case:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\rho(t) - \rho_T(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\dot{\rho}(t) - \dot{\rho}_T(t)) = 0.$$

Here,  $\rho_T$  denotes a positive  $T$ -periodic function for some  $T > 0$ , and the domain  $\Omega_t$  asymptotically exhibits periodic oscillations as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  ([27, 32]).

- *Asymptotically unbounded case:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(t) = +\infty, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} = k \geq 0.$$

In this case, the domain  $\Omega_t$  eventually expands to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , with the relative growth rate of  $\rho(t)$  approaching a nonnegative constant  $k$ . Biologically relevant examples of  $\rho$  include exponential growth  $\rho(t) = e^{kt}$  and a simpler alternative  $\rho(t) = 1 + \kappa t$  with  $\kappa > 0$ , both of which have been discussed in [38, 41].

It should be noted that, though the problem (1.4) can be regarded as a nonlocal counterpart of those studied in [7–10, 26, 32, 38, 41, 42], it presents greater challenges for the analysis of its global dynamics. For example, there is no regularizing effect in general due to nonlocal diffusion, which renders the arguments employed in the local setting invalid, including the theories of asymptotically autonomous semiflows and chain transitive sets [53]. Furthermore, in the local version of (1.4) as shown in [7, 26, 32, 38], the diffusion term is given by  $\frac{d}{\rho^2(t)}\Delta u$ . This decoupling of the Laplacian operator from  $\rho(t)$  allows it to be treated independently, enabling the principal eigenvalue theory as a powerful tool for analyzing the asymptotic dynamics of local systems. However, this method is no longer applicable to the nonlocal system (1.4) because of the inherent coupling structure in (1.5), particularly in the asymptotically unbounded case, where the diffusion effect vanishes as  $\rho(t) \rightarrow +\infty$ . In addition, the principal eigenvalue of nonlocal diffusion operators do not exist in general. Therefore, the previous arguments need to be improved or reconceived.

In Section 3, to characterize the asymptotic dynamics of (1.4) in the first two cases, we consider a general nonautonomous nonlocal diffusion system given by

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y)u(t, y) dy - Du + g(t, x, u), \quad t > 0, x \in \Omega_0. \quad (1.6)$$

Let  $\omega(\Phi)$  denote the spectral bound of the evolution family generated by the corresponding linearized system. When  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = \mathcal{K}(x)$  and  $m = 1$ , the global dynamics of (1.6) in the case  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$  was established by Rawal and Shen [43], where the construction of a perturbed problem admitting a principal eigenvalue is a crucial step in proving the existence and uniqueness of a positive time-periodic solution. Subsequently, Shen and Vo [46] extended the above results to the case  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ . It is noteworthy that, in the critical case  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$ , the uniqueness of a nonnegative time-periodic solution and the global dynamics of system (1.6) remain an interesting and challenging open problem due to several overwhelming difficulties, including the absence of regularizing effects and the principal eigenvalue for the nonlocal diffusion operator. If  $g(t, x, u) = g(x, u)$ , the global dynamics in the critical case was established in [3, 4] using a Harnack-type inequality for nonlocal elliptic equations and bootstrap arguments. For traveling waves and spreading speeds in nonlocal diffusion equations with time heterogeneities in both the kernel and the reaction, we refer to the recent works [15, 16].

Here we propose some novel approaches for rigorously analyzing the threshold dynamics of (1.6) in the time-periodic case based on  $\omega(\Phi)$ . The techniques developed here are independent of principal eigenvalue and may be applicable to a wide class of related nonlocal diffusion problems. Specifically, we establish the comparison principle and well-posedness of (1.6) in  $C(\mathbb{R}_+, \hat{X}_+)$ , and develop a deeper understanding of time-periodic solutions in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ , where  $\hat{X}$  and  $\hat{X}^v$  are two spaces of bounded and measurable functions on  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  and  $\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ , respectively, see Lemma 3.8 and Theorem 3.10 for more details. These results will be utilized in Section 4 to analyze the threshold dynamics of (1.4) in the asymptotically fixed and time-periodic cases.

In Section 5, we consider the asymptotically unbounded case. To address the challenges posed by the inherent coupling structure in (1.5), we construct a nonnegative function

$\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , supported on  $\Omega_0$ , satisfying

$$\int_{\Omega_0} J \frac{1}{\rho(t)}(x-y)\phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \geq -\frac{1}{\rho(t)}\phi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \geq T.$$

This inequality partially decouples the vanishing factor  $\frac{1}{\rho(t)}$  from the effects of nonlocal diffusion. Combined with the entire solution of limiting system corresponding to (1.4), this auxiliary function enables the construction of appropriate subsolutions, leading to the derivation of global threshold dynamics via the comparison principle.

For a given  $v \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$ , let  $\mathbb{M} := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^m : 0 \leq u \leq v\}$ . Through out the paper, we always assume that  $J$  and  $f$  satisfy the following assumptions:

**(J)**  $J : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a continuous nonnegative function with  $J(0) > 0$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x) dx = 1$ ;

**(F)**  $f \in C^{0,0,1}(\mathbb{R} \times \overline{\Omega}_0 \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$ ;  $\mathcal{D}f(u) := (\frac{\partial f_i(u)}{\partial u_j})_{m \times m}$  is cooperative and irreducible for  $u \in \mathbb{M}$ ;  $f(0) = 0$ , and there exists  $\sigma > 0$  such that for each  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $f_i(u) - n \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} v_i \leq -\sigma$  whenever  $t \geq 0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{M}$  with  $u_i = v_i$ ;  $\alpha f(u) < f(\alpha u)$  for all  $u \in \mathbb{M}$  with  $u \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

We remark that the kernel  $J$  is not necessarily symmetric or compactly supported, which means that individuals have greater probability of jumping in one direction than in others, provoking anisotropic diffusion or convective effects ([1, 25]). In contrast to the previous studies [10, 32, 41, 42], we remove the assumption that  $\dot{\rho} > 0$ , allowing the domain to expand and shrink, as described in [27] for positive and negative growth.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we derive the nonlocal diffusion model on a time-varying domain and reformulate it on a fixed domain. In Section 3, we provide a comprehensive framework to characterize the threshold dynamics of a general nonautonomous nonlocal diffusion system. These results subsequently are utilized in Section 4 to rigorously examine the global dynamics of the original nonlocal system on asymptotically fixed and time-periodic domains, respectively. In Section 5, we investigate the global dynamics on asymptotically unbounded domains. Finally, numerical simulations are given in Section 6.

## 2 Nonlocal model: a derivation

In this section, we derive the nonlocal diffusion systems formulated on a time-varying domain. To this end, some basic assumptions are required on the time-varying domain. Following the approach of [7–10], we adopt a general framework without distinguishing between specific tissue or media types, enabling the inclusion of properties for any given tissue or medium. As a result, no constitutive equations are introduced, and the tissue is assumed to be incompressible, that is, the domain undergoes deformation and expansion due to growth, with no accompanying change in density.

### 2.1 Time-varying domain and flow

Suppose that tissue which occupies the domain  $\Omega_0 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  at time  $t = 0$  deforms and expands so that at a subsequent time  $t$  it occupies a new continuous, simply connected and bounded domain  $\Omega_t$ , and that each point of  $\Omega_t$  can be identified with position vector  $x$ , which is occupied at  $t$  by the particle in tissue with position vector  $\mathcal{X}$  at the time  $t = 0$ .

Then the motion of tissue can be described by specifying the dependence of the positions  $x$  of the particles of tissue at time  $t$  on their initial positions  $\mathcal{X}$  at time  $t = 0$ , that is,

$$x = \Gamma(t, \mathcal{X}), \quad t \geq 0,$$

for all  $\mathcal{X} \in \Omega_0$ , where  $\Gamma : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \Omega_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a smooth injection.

In the spatial description, the flow  $a(t, x)$  represents the velocity at time  $t$  of the particle which was at  $\mathcal{X} = \Gamma^{-1}(t, x)$  initially, that is,

$$a(t, x) = \left. \frac{\partial \Gamma(t, \mathcal{X})}{\partial t} \right|_{\mathcal{X}=\Gamma^{-1}(t, x)}, \quad (2.1)$$

which may be typically generated by rigid motions and deformations of the tissue. Here, we neglect rigid motions since they do not affect the reaction and diffusion processes, and assume that the flow arises solely from the (positive or negative) growth of the tissue. It is worth noting that the velocity gradient tensor  $\nabla a$ , which describes the relative velocity of each particle with respect to its neighbors, is locally determined by some constitutive equations characterizing tissue properties, such as prepatterns in growth factors, as well as cellular or sub-cellular structures influencing the direction of growth. These detailed factors, however, are beyond the scope of this paper. By continuum mechanics [21], the diagonal components of  $\nabla a$  represent the rate of extension. Consequently, for any fixed time  $t \geq 0$ , the domain  $\Omega_t$  expands if  $\nabla \cdot a(t, x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \Omega_t$ , and contracts if  $\nabla \cdot a(t, x) < 0$  for all  $x \in \Omega_t$ .

## 2.2 Nonlocal diffusion system

Let  $v(t, x) = (v_1(t, x), v_2(t, x), \dots, v_m(t, x))^T$  denote the vector of densities of  $m$  interacting species at position  $x \in \Omega_t$  and time  $t$ . Inspired by the idea in [12], we define the nonlocal flux functional  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot, \cdot; \psi)$  for any pair of measurable domains  $\Omega'$  and  $\Omega''$ , where  $\psi$  is a nonnegative integrable function defined on  $\Omega' \cup \Omega''$ , as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}(\Omega', \Omega''; \psi) = \int_{\Omega''} \int_{\Omega'} J(x - z) \psi(z) \, dz dx - \int_{\Omega'} \int_{\Omega''} J(z - x) \psi(x) \, dx dz,$$

which quantifies the net flux from  $\Omega'$  to  $\Omega''$  arising from the nonlocal interactions of  $\psi$  over these domains. Obviously,  $\mathcal{F}(\Omega', \Omega''; \psi) = -\mathcal{F}(\Omega'', \Omega'; \psi)$ . Then, the nonlocal balance law [13] for  $v$  over an elemental volume  $V_t$  evolving in time is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_{V_t} v(t, x) \, dx = D\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus V_t, V_t; v) + \int_{V_t} f(v) \, dx,$$

where  $D$  represents the diffusion coefficient, and  $f(v)$  denotes the reaction term. Applying the Reynolds transport theorem for the left-hand side, we obtain

$$\int_{V_t} \left( \frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (a \cdot \nabla)v + (\nabla \cdot a)v \right) dx = D\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus V_t, V_t; v) + \int_{V_t} f(v) \, dx.$$

The domain is fixed in time and so we may differentiate through the integral. By the arbitrariness of  $V_t$ , the governing equation becomes

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + (a \cdot \nabla)v + (\nabla \cdot a)v = D \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x - z)v(t, z) \, dz - Dv + f(v) \quad (2.2)$$

for  $x \in \Omega_t$ ,  $t > 0$ .

Compared to the standard reaction-diffusion systems, the time-varying domain introduces two additional terms into (2.2). The first term,  $(a \cdot \nabla)v$ , represents the transport of material around the domain driven by the flow. The second term,  $(\nabla \cdot a)v$ , accounts for dilution due to local volume expansion when  $\nabla \cdot a > 0$ , or concentration due to local volume contraction when  $\nabla \cdot a < 0$ . Consequently, by incorporating the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$v(t, x) = 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_t, \quad t > 0, \quad (2.3)$$

and the initial condition

$$v(0, x) = v_0(x), \quad x \in \Omega_0, \quad (2.4)$$

we formulate the initial-boundary value problem (2.2)–(2.4) with nonlocal diffusion on the time-varying domain.

### 2.3 Linear isotropic deformation

In most cases, the properties of solutions to (2.2)–(2.4) on time-varying domains are difficult to study, even after reformulating the problem on a fixed domain, where the resulting form is significantly more complex, see for example [38]. In this paper, we focus on a special class of time-varying domains undergoing linear isotropic deformation, with deformation rates independent of spatial position. By neglecting the rigid-body translations and rotations of the tissue, the coordinate system can be appropriately chosen such that there is a reference point which remains at the origin of the coordinate all the time. Then there exists a smooth positive function  $\rho$  defined on  $[0, +\infty)$  with  $\rho(0) = 1$  such that

$$x = \Gamma(t, \mathcal{X}) = \rho(t)\mathcal{X}, \quad \mathcal{X} \in \Omega_0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

The flow can then be determined by (2.1) as  $a(t, x) = \dot{\rho}(t)\mathcal{X} = x\dot{\rho}(t)/\rho(t)$ . To facilitate analysis, we transform the spatial coordinates into the reference domain  $\Omega_0$ , which is independent of time, and simplify notation by using the coordinate  $y \in \Omega_0$  instead of  $\mathcal{X}$  hereafter. Define

$$u(t, y) = v(t, x) = v(t, \rho(t)y), \quad y \in \Omega_0, \quad t > 0.$$

Then transformed nonlocal system of (2.2)–(2.4) with nonautonomous coefficients becomes

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z)u(t, z) dz - Du - \frac{n\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)}u + f(u), & y \in \Omega_0, \quad t > 0, \\ u(0, y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0, \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

where  $J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y) = \rho^n(t)J(\rho(t)y)$  satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y) dy = 1$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

**Remark 2.1.** Assume that  $J$  is a smooth, nonnegative, and symmetric function supported on the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(y)dy = 1$ . By appropriately rescaling the kernel  $J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}$  in (2.5) and taking the limit as the scaling parameter goes to zero, the solutions of the nonlocal system (2.5) converge uniformly to the solution of the local analogous system (see [32]) on  $[0, T]$  for any fixed  $T > 0$ . For the proof, please refer to [45]. If  $J$  is asymmetric, similar convergence results can be found in [1].

### 3 A general nonautonomous nonlocal diffusion system

In this section, we consider a class of nonautonomous nonlocal diffusion systems within a fixed domain:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x-y)u(t, y) dy - Du + g(t, x, u), & t > 0, x \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{K}(t, x-y)u(t, y) := (\mathcal{K}_1(t, x-y)u_1(t, y), \dots, \mathcal{K}_m(t, x-y)u_m(t, y))^T$ . We first prove the comparison principle and establish the well-posedness of system (3.1), and then provide a comprehensive framework to characterize the threshold dynamics of (3.1) in the time-periodic case based on the spectral bound. These results will be utilized in Section 4 to rigorously examine the global dynamics of the original system on asymptotically fixed and time-periodic domains, respectively.

#### 3.1 Comparison principle and well-posedness

The following assumptions are imposed on  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $g$ :

- (K) For each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_i$  is a nonnegative continuous function with  $\mathcal{K}_i(t, 0) > 0$ , and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{K}_i(t, x) dx = 1$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ;
- (G1)  $g \in C^{0,0,1}(\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0 \times \mathbb{R}^m, \mathbb{R}^m)$ ;  $(\frac{\partial g_i(t, x, u)}{\partial u_j})_{m \times m}$  is cooperative for all  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0, t \geq 0, 0 \leq u \leq v$ , and for each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $g_i(t, x, 0) = 0, g_i(t, x, u) \leq 0$  whenever  $u \in \mathbb{M}$  with  $u_i = v_i$ ;
- (G2)  $(\frac{\partial g_i(t, x, u)}{\partial u_j})_{m \times m}$  is irreducible for all  $t \geq 0, x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  and  $u \in \mathbb{M}$ .

Define the norm on  $\mathbb{R}^m$  as  $\|a\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} := \max_{i=1, \dots, m} |a_i|$ , where  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_m)^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . We denote  $X := C(\bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , equipped with the maximum norm  $\|\varphi\|_X := \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0} \|\varphi(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ , and the positive cone  $X_+ := C(\bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R}_+^m)$ . Inspired by [28, 51], we introduce

$$\hat{X} := \{\varphi : \bar{\Omega}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m; \varphi \text{ is bounded and Lebesgue measurable on } \bar{\Omega}_0\}$$

which is equipped with the norm  $\|\varphi\|_{\hat{X}} := \sup_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0} \|\varphi(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ , and the corresponding positive

cone  $\hat{X}_+ := \{\varphi \in \hat{X} : \varphi(x) \geq 0, x \in \bar{\Omega}_0\}$ . It can be readily verified that  $(\hat{X}, \|\cdot\|_{\hat{X}})$  is a Banach space and  $\text{Int}(\hat{X}_+) \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^m$ . We write  $a - b \geq 0$  if  $a - b \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ ;  $a - b > 0$  if  $a - b \in \mathbb{R}_+^m \setminus \{0\}$ ; and  $a - b \gg 0$  if  $a - b \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$ . Similar to the order defined in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , we can define the partial order induced by the positive cone in  $X$  and  $\hat{X}$ , respectively. For any given  $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we denote

$$X_+^a := \{\varphi \in X : 0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq a, x \in \bar{\Omega}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{X}_+^a := \{\varphi \in \hat{X} : 0 \leq \varphi(x) \leq a, x \in \bar{\Omega}_0\}.$$

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $l \in (0, +\infty]$ . The function  $u \in C([0, l], \hat{X})$  is called a supersolution (or subsolution) of the equations corresponding to (3.1) if  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x)$  exists for  $t \in [0, l)$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ , and satisfies*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \geq (\leq) D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x-y)u(t, y) dy - Du + g(t, x, u), \quad t \in (0, l), x \in \Omega_0.$$

The function  $u \in C([0, l], \hat{X})$  is called a solution of system (3.1) if it is both a supersolution and subsolution, and  $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$ .

We first establish the maximum principle for the following linear system, and then apply it to derive the comparison principle for the problem (3.1),

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) u(t, y) dy - Du(t, x) + M(t, x) u(t, x) \quad (3.2)$$

for  $t > 0$ ,  $x \in \Omega_0$ , where  $M(t, x) = (m_{ij}(t, x))_{m \times m}$  is cooperative for all  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , with  $m_{ij} \in C(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R})$ , and there exists a point  $x_0$  such that  $M(t, x_0)$  is irreducible for all  $t \geq 0$ . For this purpose, it is necessary to introduce an auxiliary lemma. Define a set

$$\hat{\mathbf{0}} := \{\phi \in \hat{X} : \phi(x) = 0 \text{ almost everywhere in } \bar{\Omega}_0\}.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Assume that  $(\mathbf{K})$  holds and  $T_0 > 0$ . Let  $u \in C([0, T_0], \hat{X})$  and satisfy the system (3.2) on  $[0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . If  $u(0, \cdot) \in \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ , then  $u(t, \cdot) \in \hat{\mathbf{0}}$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u := (u_1, \dots, u_m)^T$  and define the vector-valued sign function  $\text{sgn}(u) := (\text{sgn}(u_1), \dots, \text{sgn}(u_m))^T$ . Denote  $\tilde{u} := \sum_{i=1}^m |u_i|$ . Taking the inner product of the governing equation for  $u$  with  $\text{sgn}(u)$ , and integrating the resulting equation over  $\Omega_0$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\Omega_0} \tilde{u}(t, x) dx \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^m d_i \left( \int_{\Omega_0} \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}_i(t, x - y) |u_i(t, y)| dy dx - \int_{\Omega_0} u_i \text{sgn}(u_i) dx \right) + C \int_{\Omega_0} \tilde{u} dx \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^m d_i \left( \int_{\Omega_0} |u_i(t, y)| dy - \int_{\Omega_0} |u_i(t, x)| dx \right) + C \int_{\Omega_0} \tilde{u} dx \\ & = C \int_{\Omega_0} \tilde{u}(t, x) dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C > 0$ . By the Gronwall inequality, it follows that  $\int_{\Omega_0} \tilde{u}(t, x) dx = 0$  for  $t \in (0, T_0]$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3** (Maximum principle). *Assume that  $(\mathbf{K})$  holds and  $T_0 > 0$ . Let  $u \in C([0, T_0], \hat{X})$  satisfy that  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x)$  exists for  $t \in [0, l]$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Moreover,  $u$  satisfies the differential inequality:*

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \geq D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) u(t, y) dy - Du(t, x) + M(t, x) u(t, x), \quad t \in (0, T_0], x \in \bar{\Omega}_0.$$

- (1) If  $u(0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+$ , then  $u(t, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .
- (2) If  $u(0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+ \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ , then  $u(t, \cdot) \in \text{Int}(\hat{X}_+)$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .
- (3) If  $u(0, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_0$ , then  $u(t, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .
- (4) If  $u(0, x) > 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_0$ , then  $u(t, x) > 0$  a.e. in  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$\bar{h} := \sum_{i,j} \max_{(t,x) \in [0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0} |m_{ij}(t, x)| < +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{d} := \max\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}.$$

Set  $w(t, x) := e^{(\bar{h} + \bar{d})t} u(t, x)$ . Then for  $t \in (0, T_0]$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ , it satisfies

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} \geq D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) w(t, y) dy - Dw + (\bar{h} + \bar{d})w + Mw. \quad (3.3)$$

(1) Let  $u(0, x) \geq 0$  in  $\Omega_0$ . It then suffices to verify that  $w(t, x) \geq 0$  for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Suppose that

$$\underline{w} := \inf_{(t,x) \in [0, t_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0, 1 \leq i \leq m} w_i(t, x) < 0,$$

where  $t_0 = \frac{1}{2(2\bar{h} + \bar{d})}$ . Thus, there exists  $\{(t_k, x_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty \in [0, t_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$  such that  $w_{i_0}(t_k, x_k) \rightarrow \underline{w}$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$  for some  $i_0$ . Integrating the  $i_0$ -th inequality of (3.3) over  $[0, t_k]$ , we have

$$w_{i_0}(t_k, x_k) \geq w_{i_0}(0, x_k) + t_0 (\bar{d} + 2\bar{h}) \underline{w}.$$

Letting  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ , then  $\underline{w} \geq t_0 (\bar{d} + 2\bar{h}) \underline{w}$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $w(t, x) \geq 0$  on  $[0, t_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Repeating this arguments, we conclude that  $w(t, x) \geq 0$  for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .

(2) Let  $u(0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+ \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ . Assume that there exists  $(\tilde{t}_*, \tilde{x}_*) \in (0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$  such that  $w_{i_0}(\tilde{t}_*, \tilde{x}_*) = 0$  for some  $i_0$ . Notice that

$$\frac{\partial w_{i_0}}{\partial t}(\tilde{t}_*, \tilde{x}_*) \leq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K}_{i_0}(\tilde{t}_*, 0) > 0.$$

Using the cooperative property of  $M$ , we deduce that  $w_{i_0}(\tilde{t}_*, x) = 0$  almost everywhere in  $\bar{\Omega}_0$ . To clarify which components of  $w$  are equal to zero almost everywhere at time  $\tilde{t}_*$ , we define the following index set:

$$\mathcal{I} := \{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} : w_i(\tilde{t}_*, x) = 0 \text{ almost everywhere in } \bar{\Omega}_0\}.$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{I} \neq \emptyset$ , and the complementary set  $\mathcal{J} := \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \mathcal{I}$ . In view of the above discussion, we can derive that  $w_j(\tilde{t}_*, x) > 0$  for all  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  if  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Since  $M(t, x)$  is a continuous matrix with respect to  $t$  and  $x$ , and  $M(t, x_0)$  is irreducible for all  $t \geq 0$ , there exists some point  $x^*$  such that  $M(\tilde{t}_*, x^*)$  is irreducible and  $w_i(\tilde{t}_*, x^*) = 0$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ . Hence, we have

$$0 \geq \frac{\partial w_i}{\partial t}(\tilde{t}_*, x^*) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} m_{ij}(\tilde{t}_*, x^*) w_j(\tilde{t}_*, x^*), \quad i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

This implies  $m_{ij}(\tilde{t}_*, x^*) = 0$  for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ , which contradicts the irreducibility of  $M(\tilde{t}_*, x^*)$  if  $\mathcal{J}$  is nonempty. Therefore,  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Since

$$\frac{\partial w_i}{\partial t}(t, x) \geq (\bar{d} - d_i + \bar{h} - m_{ii}(t, x)) w_i \geq 0, \quad (t, x) \in (0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0, \quad i \in \mathcal{I},$$

it follows that  $w_i(\tilde{t}_*, x) > 0$  if  $w_i(0, x) > 0$ . Consequently,  $u(0, x) (= w(0, x)) = 0$  almost everywhere, leading to a contradiction. Hence, we have proven that for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $w_i(t, x) > 0$  for  $(t, x) \in (0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . It follows that for any fixed  $t \in (0, T_0]$  and each

$i = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_i(t, x) := d_i \int_0^t \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}_i(s, x - y) w_i(s, y) dy ds$  is a continuous function on  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  with a positive minimum. Integrating the governing equation for  $w_i$  over  $[0, t]$ , we obtain  $w_i(t, \cdot) \geq \mathcal{W}_i(t, \cdot)$  on  $\bar{\Omega}_0$ , which implies  $w(t, \cdot) \in \text{Int}(\hat{X}_+)$ .

(3) Let  $u(0, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_0$ . Set  $\tilde{u} := u + v$  such that  $\tilde{u}(0, x) \geq 0$  for any  $x \in \Omega_0$ , where  $v := v(t, x)$  is given by Lemma 3.2. Following the approach in case (1), we deduce that  $\tilde{u}(t, x) \geq 0$  in  $[0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Furthermore, by Lemma 3.2, it holds that  $v(t, x) = 0$  a.e. in  $[0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Hence, it follows that  $u(t, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $[0, T_0] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .

(4) The proof is similar to that of Case (3) and is therefore omitted here.  $\square$

Now, we establish the comparison principle for (3.1) and prove its well-posedness.

**Theorem 3.4** (Comparison principle). *Assume that (K) and (G1) hold. Let  $\bar{u}, \underline{u} \in C([0, T_0], \hat{X}_+)$  be a supersolution and a subsolution of the equation associated with (3.1) for some  $T_0 > 0$ . Denote  $w(t, x) := \bar{u}(t, x) - \underline{u}(t, x)$ . Then the following statements are valid:*

- (1) *If  $w(0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+$ , then  $w(t, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .*
- (2) *If (G2) holds and  $w(0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+ \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ , then  $w(t, \cdot) \in \text{Int}(\hat{X}_+)$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .*
- (3) *If  $w(0, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_0$ , then  $w(t, x) \geq 0$  a.e. in  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .*
- (4) *If (G2) holds and  $w(0, x) > 0$  a.e. in  $\Omega_0$ , then  $w(t, x) > 0$  a.e. in  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  for any  $t \in (0, T_0]$ .*

*Proof.* By assumption (G1), there exists  $H(t, x, \bar{u}, \underline{u})$  which is cooperative and satisfies  $g(t, x, \bar{u}) - g(t, x, \underline{u}) = H(t, x, \bar{u}, \underline{u})w$ . Applying Lemma 3.3 to the system for  $w$ , we deduce the desired conclusions.  $\square$

It is worth noting that the above maximum and comparison principles remain valid on  $[s, s + T_0]$  if we consider  $s$  as the initial time. This fact will be utilized when needed in the following proofs.

**Proposition 3.5** (Well-posedness). *Assume that (K) and (G1) hold. For each  $u_0 \in \hat{X}_+^v$ , the problem (3.1) admits a unique solution  $u \in C(\mathbb{R}_+, \hat{X}_+^v)$  such that  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x)$  exists for  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ .*

*Proof.* For any given  $t_0 > 0$ , let  $Y_{t_0} := C([0, t_0], \hat{X})$  equipped with the norm  $\|u\|_{Y_{t_0}} := \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\hat{X}}$ . Define an operator  $\Gamma_{t_0}$  on  $Y_{t_0}$  as

$$[\Gamma_{t_0}\phi](t, x) := u_0(x) + \int_0^t \left[ D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(s, x - y) \phi(s, y) dy - D\phi(s, x) + g(s, x, \phi(s, x)) \right] ds.$$

Set  $a := 2 \|v\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}$ , and define

$$Y_{t_0}^a := \left\{ \phi \in Y_{t_0} : \|\phi\|_{Y_{t_0}} \leq a \right\}.$$

Obviously, there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\Gamma_{t_0} Y_{t_0}^a \subset Y_{t_0}^a$  for any  $t_0 \in [0, \delta]$ . Let  $\bar{d} := \max\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ . By assumption (G1), it is straightforward to verify that

$$\|\Gamma_{t_0}\phi_1 - \Gamma_{t_0}\phi_2\|_{Y_{t_0}} \leq (2\bar{d} + M)t_0 \|\phi_1 - \phi_2\|_{Y_{t_0}},$$

where  $M = M(\delta, a) > 0$  is Lipschitz constant of  $g$ . Let  $\delta_0 := \frac{1}{2(2d+M)}$ . Then for any  $t_0 \in [0, \delta_0]$ ,  $\Gamma_{t_0}$  is a contraction mapping on  $Y_{t_0}^a$ , which implies the existence of a unique  $u \in Y_{\delta_0}^a$  satisfying  $\Gamma_{\delta_0} u = u$ . It follows that system (3.1) admits a unique local mild solution  $u \in Y_{\delta_0}$  in the sense that

$$u(t, x) = u_0(x) + \int_0^t \left[ D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(s, x - y) u(s, y) dy - Du(s, x) + g(s, x, u(s, x)) \right] ds.$$

By iterating the above arguments, we can extend the solution to the maximal interval of existence  $[0, T_{\max})$  satisfying

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow T_{\max}^-} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{X}} = +\infty \quad \text{if } T_{\max} < +\infty.$$

Applying Lemma 3.3, we conclude that  $u(t, x) \leq v$  for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T_{\max}) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ , which yields  $T_{\max} = +\infty$ . It is easy to verified that  $u(t, x)$  is a uniformly continuous function with respect to  $t$  for each fixed  $x$ , and  $\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t, x)$  exists for  $t \geq 0$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** *If  $u_0 \in X_+^v$ , a similar argument shows that (3.1) admits a unique solution  $u \in C^{1,0}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R}^m)$ .*

**Remark 3.7.** *Since system (3.1) admits the comparison principle, the arguments similar to those for [52, Lemma 2.1] imply that any locally attractive solution of system (3.1) is Liapunov stable.*

### 3.2 Threshold dynamics of (3.1) in the time-periodic case

In this subsection, we propose a general framework for rigorously analyzing the threshold dynamics of (3.1) in the time-periodic case. We need the following additional assumptions on  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $g$ :

- (T) For each  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_i(t, x) = \mathcal{K}_i(t + T, x)$  and  $g_i(t, x, u) = g_i(t + T, x, u)$ ;
- (G3)  $\alpha g(t, x, u) < g(t, x, \alpha u)$  for  $u \in \mathbb{M}$  with  $u \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ ;
- (G3')  $\alpha g(t, x, u) \ll g(t, x, \alpha u)$  for  $u \in \mathbb{M}$  with  $u \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{R}_+^m)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ ,  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

When  $m = 1$ , the assumptions (G3) and (G3') are equivalent. Define

$$\mathcal{C}_T := \{u \in C(\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R}^m) : u(t, x) = u(t + T, x)\}$$

equipped with the norm  $\|u\|_{\mathcal{C}_T} := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_X$ , and the cone

$$\mathcal{C}_T^+ := \{u \in \mathcal{C}_T : u(t, x) \geq 0\}.$$

Let  $\tilde{X}$  denote the set of all bounded and measurable functions  $u : \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$  that satisfy  $u(t, x) = u(t + T, x)$  for all  $(t, x)$ . This space is equipped with norm  $\|u\|_{\tilde{X}} := \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{X}}$ . The corresponding positive cone is defined as

$$\tilde{X}_+ := \left\{ u \in \tilde{X} : u(t, x) \geq 0, (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0 \right\}.$$

Similarly, the partial order induced by the cone can be defined for  $\mathcal{C}_T$  and  $\tilde{X}$ .

For any given  $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , let

$$\tilde{X}_+^a := \left\{ u \in \tilde{X} : 0 \leq u(t, x) \leq a, (t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0 \right\}.$$

Define

$$[L_T u](t, x) := -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} u(t, x) + D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x-y) u(t, y) dy - Du + \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} u(t, x),$$

for  $u \in \mathcal{C}_T$ . We denote the spectrum of  $L_T$  by  $\sigma(L_T)$ . The spectral bound of  $L_T$  is given by  $s(L_T) := \sup \{\operatorname{Re} \mu : \mu \in \sigma(L_T)\}$ . Let  $\Phi(t, s)$  denote the evolution family on  $X$  generated by the system

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x-y) u(t, y) dy - Du + \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} u, \quad t > 0, x \in \Omega_0.$$

The exponential growth bound of evolution family  $\Phi(t, s)$  is defined as

$$\omega(\Phi) := \inf \left\{ \tilde{\omega} : \exists M \geq 1 \text{ such that } \|\Phi(t, s)\| \leq M e^{\tilde{\omega}(t-s)}, \forall t, s \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq s \right\}.$$

By applying [49, Proposition 5.5 and Lemma 5.8], along with the discussion in [36, Section 2.2], we have

$$s(L_T) = \omega(\Phi) = \frac{\ln r(\Phi(T, 0))}{T}, \quad (3.4)$$

where  $r(\Phi(T, 0))$  denotes the spectral radius of  $\Phi(T, 0)$ .

To investigate the threshold dynamics of system (3.1) in the time-periodic case, we propose the following periodic problem associated with system (3.1):

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x-y) u(t, y) dy - Du + g(t, x, u), & t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \Omega_0, \\ u(t, x) = u(t+T, x), & t \in \mathbb{R}, x \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

Since the solution mapping of (3.1) lacks compactness in  $C(\bar{\Omega}_0, \mathbb{R}^m)$ , only the pointwise convergence of solutions can be examined as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . This obstacle motivates us to analyze (3.5) in the space  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ . Furthermore, in the subsequent proof, we introduce a method for constructing subsolutions in the absence of a principal eigenvalue, which can also be extended to address other similar problems where the principal eigenvalue does not exist.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Assume that **(K)**, **(G1)–(G3)** and **(T)** hold. The following statements are valid for system (3.5):*

- (1) *If  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ , then 0 is the unique nonnegative solution in  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ ;*
- (2) *If  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$ , and either **(G3')** holds, or  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue, then 0 is the unique nonnegative solution in  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ ;*
- (3) *If  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , then (3.5) admits a unique positive solution  $w^* \in \tilde{X}_+^v$ . Moreover,  $w^* \in \operatorname{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$ .*

*Proof.* It is evident that (3.5) admits at least one trivial solution. Let  $u$  be a  $T$ -periodic solution of (3.5) in  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ . The following proof is divided into three cases:  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ ,  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$ , and  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ .

**Case 1.** When  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ , we choose  $\bar{u} \in X$  such that  $u(0, x) \leq \bar{u}(x)$ . By Theorem 3.4, it holds that  $u(t, x) \leq u(t, x; \bar{u})$ . Since  $\alpha g(t, x, u) \leq g(t, x, \alpha u)$  for  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ , applying Theorem 3.4 again yields  $u(t, x; \bar{u}) \leq [\Phi(t, 0)\bar{u}](x)$ . Thus, we have

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{\tilde{X}} \leq \|\Phi(t, 0)\bar{u}\|_X \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow +\infty,$$

which implies  $u \equiv 0$ .

**Case 2.** When  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$ , define:

$$\underline{u}_i := \inf_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \bar{\Omega}_0} u_i(t, x) \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

and the index sets:

$$\mathcal{I} := \{i \in \{1, \dots, m\} : \underline{u}_i = 0\}, \quad \mathcal{J} := \{j \in \{1, \dots, m\} : \underline{u}_j > 0\}.$$

We claim that  $\mathcal{J} = \emptyset$ . Suppose, for contradiction, that this is not the case. By Theorem 3.4 and the temporal periodicity of  $u$ , there exists  $c_1 > 0$  such that  $\min\{\underline{u}_1, \dots, \underline{u}_m\} \geq c_1$ . Below, we proceed with the proof to derive a contradiction, assuming that either **(G3')** holds or  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue.

Assume that **(G3')** holds. Then there exists  $c_2 = c_2(c_1) > 0$ , independent of  $t, x, i$  and  $u$ , such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} u_j - g_i(t, x, u) \geq c_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

We obtain

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \leq D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) u(t, y) dy - Du + \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} u - c_3 u,$$

where  $c_3 = \frac{c_2}{\|u\|_{\tilde{X}}}$ . It follows that  $r(e^{-c_3 T} \Phi(T, 0)) < r(\Phi(T, 0)) = 1$ . By the same arguments as those in the case where  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ , we conclude  $u \equiv 0$ , which is a contradiction.

Next, we assume that  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue. Let  $p$  be the principal eigenfunction associated with  $\omega(\Phi)$  such that  $0 \ll p \ll u$  in  $\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . By **(G3)**, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \omega(\Phi)p(t, x) \\ &= \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) p(t, y) dy + Dp - \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} p \\ &\leq \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} - D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) p(t, y) dy + Dp - g(t, x, p) \end{aligned}$$

in  $\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Define  $\alpha^* := \sup\{\alpha > 0 : \alpha u \leq p \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0\}$  and set  $\xi := p - \alpha^* u$ . Then  $\alpha^* \in (0, 1)$  and  $\xi \in \tilde{X}_+^v$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \xi}{\partial t}(t, x) &\geq D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) \xi(t, y) dy - D\xi + g(t, x, p) - \alpha^* g(t, x, u) \\ &> D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) \xi(t, y) dy - D\xi + g(t, x, p) - g(t, x, \alpha^* u) \\ &= D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y) \xi(t, y) dy - D\xi + H(t, x, p, \alpha^* u) \xi, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where  $H(t, x, p, \alpha^*u)$  is  $T$ -periodic, cooperative and irreducible. Suppose there exists  $t_0$  such that  $\xi(t_0, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+ \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ . By Lemma 3.3 and the temporal periodicity of  $\xi$ , it follows that  $\xi(t, \cdot) \in \text{Int}(\hat{X}_+)$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  which contradicts the definition of  $\alpha^*$ . Otherwise, we must have  $\xi(t, \cdot) \in \hat{X}_+ \cap \hat{\mathbf{0}}$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . In this case, there exists  $(t_0, x_0) \in \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$  such that  $\xi(t_0, x_0) = 0$ . Considering (3.6) at  $(t_0, x_0)$ , we again arrive at a contradiction.

According to Theorem 3.4, we conclude that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $u(t, x) = 0$  almost everywhere for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Assume that there exists  $(t^*, x^*) \in \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$  such that  $u(t^*, x^*) > 0$ . It follows that  $u(t, x^*) > 0$  for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and satisfies the following periodic differential equation:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d}{dt}u(t, x^*) = -Du + g(t, x^*, u), & t > 0, \\ u(t, x^*) = u(t + T, x^*), & t \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

For each  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ , define the operator:

$$Q_x(t)v := e^{-Dt + \int_0^t (\frac{\partial g_i(s, x, 0)}{\partial u_j})_{m \times m} ds} v, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

According to [34, Lemma B.2] and (3.4), we have  $\max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0} r(Q_x(T)) \leq r(\Phi(T, 0)) = 1$ . By [53, Theorem 2.3.4], we can show that  $\|u(t, x^*)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  which leads to a contradiction. Thus, we conclude that  $u(t, x) \equiv 0$  for all  $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .

**Case 3.** When  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , we first show that the positive solution is unique, if it exists. Suppose that  $w$  is another positive solution of (3.5) in  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ . Based on the previous analysis, it holds that

$$\inf_{(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}_0, i=1, \dots, m} w_i(t, x) > 0.$$

Define  $\beta^* := \sup\{\beta > 0 : \beta u \leq w \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0\}$  and set  $\tilde{\xi} := w - \beta^*u$ . Without loss of generality, assume  $\beta^* \in (0, 1]$ . Then, applying a similar argument on the equation of  $\tilde{\xi} \in \tilde{X}_+^v$  as in Case 2, we obtain  $\beta^* = 1$ , that is,  $u \leq w$  in  $\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Similarly, we can also show  $u \geq w$  in  $\mathbb{R} \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Thus, the positive solution of (3.5) is unique.

Next, we prove the existence of a positive solution for (3.5). If there exists a function  $\phi \in X_+^v$  such that  $\Phi(T, 0)\phi \geq \phi$ , then, following the similar arguments as in [51, Theorem 2.2], it can be shown that (3.5) admits a positive solution  $w \in \tilde{X}_+^v$ . Furthermore, in view of the discussion on [51, Theorem 2.2] (or [43, Theorem E]) and the uniqueness of positive solution, we also have  $w \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$ .

We proceed to construct a function  $\phi \in X_+^v$  such that  $\Phi(T, 0)\phi \geq \phi$ . If  $r(\Phi(T, 0)) > \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0} r(Q_x(T))$ , based on the results of [34, Lemmas 2.5 and B.2] (or [2, Theorem 2.1]), we conclude that there exists  $\phi \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$  with  $\|\phi\| = 1$  satisfying  $L_T\phi = s(L_T)\phi$ . Since

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \left\| \frac{g(t, x, \delta\phi(t, x))}{\delta} - \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} \phi(t, x) \right\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} = 0$$

uniformly for  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ , it follows that there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that

$$g(t, x, \delta\phi) \geq \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} \delta\phi - s(L_T)\delta\phi$$

for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . As a result, the following inequality holds:

$$\delta \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi(t, x) \leq D\delta \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y)\phi(t, y) dy - D\delta\phi + g(t, x, \delta\phi), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Thus, we conclude that  $\Phi(T, 0)\delta\phi(0, \cdot) \geq \delta\phi(0, \cdot)$ .

If  $r(\Phi(T, 0)) = \max_{x \in \bar{\Omega}_0} r(Q_x(T))$ , there exist  $x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  and  $\varrho > 0$  such that  $r(Q_{x_0}(T)) > 1$  for all  $x \in B_{x_0, \varrho}$ . As stated in [29, Section II], the function  $r(x) := r(Q_x(T))$  is continuous, and there exists a continuous function  $\varphi(x)$  satisfying  $Q_x(T)\varphi(x) = r(x)\varphi(x)$  for  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Define  $r_0 := \min_{x \in B_{x_0, \frac{2}{3}\varrho}} r(x) > 1$ , and construct the cut-off function

$$\eta(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \|x - x_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{1}{3}\varrho, \\ 1 - \frac{3}{\varrho}(\|x - x_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} - \frac{1}{3}\varrho), & \frac{1}{3}\varrho \leq \|x - x_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \leq \frac{2}{3}\varrho, \\ 0, & \|x - x_0\|_{\mathbb{R}^n} \geq \frac{2}{3}\varrho. \end{cases}$$

By assumption **(G2)**, we can choose  $\varphi(x)$  such that

$$\max_{x \in B_{x_0, \frac{2}{3}\varrho}} \|\varphi(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{x \in B_{x_0, \frac{2}{3}\varrho}} |\varphi_i(x)| > 0 \quad \text{for all } i.$$

Define  $\psi(t, x) := e^{-\frac{\ln r_0}{T}t} Q_x(t)\varphi(x)$ . Similarly, there exists  $\delta' > 0$  such that

$$g(t, x, \delta'\psi) \geq \left( \frac{\partial g_i(t, x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} \delta'\psi - \frac{\ln r_0}{T} \delta'\psi$$

for all  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . Since  $\eta(x) \in [0, 1]$ , it follows that  $g(t, x, \delta'\eta\psi) \geq \eta g(t, x, \delta'\psi)$ . Thus, for  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ , we have

$$\delta'\eta(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi(t, x) \leq D\delta' \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(t, x - y)\eta(y)\psi(t, y) dy - D\delta'\eta\psi + g(t, x, \delta'\eta\psi).$$

Consequently, we obtain  $\Phi(T, 0)\delta'\eta\psi(0, \cdot) \geq \delta'\eta\psi(T, \cdot) \geq \delta'\eta\psi(0, \cdot)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main results of this section.

**Theorem 3.9.** *Assume that **(K)**, **(G1)**–**(G3)** and **(T)** hold. The following statements are valid for system (3.1):*

- (1) *If  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  and either **(G3')** holds or  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue, then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (3) *If  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , then  $w^*$  is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ , where  $w^*$  is obtained in Lemma 3.8(2).*

*Proof.* In the case where  $\omega(\Phi) \leq 0$ , for any  $\phi \in X_+^v$ , by comparison principle, we have  $0 \leq u(t, x; \phi) \leq u(t, x; v)$ . It is clear that

$$u(kT + t, x; v) \leq u((k-1)T + t, x; v) \leq v, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Then the sequence  $\{u(kT + t, x; v)\}$  converges pointwise as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$  to some function  $u_* \in \tilde{X}_+^v$ . By Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, it is straightforward to verify that  $u_*$  is a nonnegative solution of (3.5). Furthermore, by Lemma 3.8, we deduce that

$u_*(t, x) \equiv 0$ . Subsequently, applying Dini's theorem, we conclude that  $u(t, x; v) \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$  uniformly for  $x \in \overline{\Omega}_0$ . Therefore,  $u(t, x; \phi)$  also converges to 0 uniformly for  $x \in \overline{\Omega}_0$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . The desired result immediately follows from [52, Lemma 2.1].

In the case where  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , by Lemma 3.8, (3.5) admits a unique positive solution  $w^*(t, x)$ . For any  $\phi \in X_+^v$  with  $\phi \neq 0$ , Theorem 3.4 implies that  $u(T, x; \phi) \in \text{Int}(X_+)$ . Thus, there exists  $0 < \delta < 1$  such that  $u(T, x; \phi) \geq \delta w^*(0, x)$ . Since  $\delta w^*(t, x)$  is a subsolution of the equation corresponding to (3.1) due to **(G3)**, we have  $\delta w^*(t, x) \leq u(t, x; \delta w^*(0, \cdot))$ . It follows that, for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$u((k+1)T + t, x; \phi) \geq u(kT + t, x; \delta w^*(0, \cdot)) \geq u((k-1)T + t, x; \delta w^*(0, \cdot)).$$

According to Lemma 3.8, it is easy to see that the sequences  $\{u(kT + t, x; v)\}$  and  $\{u(kT + t, x; \delta w^*(0, \cdot))\}$  converge pointwise to the same function  $w^* \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$  as  $k \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then, by Dini's theorem, we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot; v) - w^*(t, \cdot)\|_X = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot; \delta w^*(0, \cdot)) - w^*(t, \cdot)\|_X = 0,$$

which yields

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot; \phi) - w^*(t, \cdot)\|_X = 0.$$

With Remark 3.7, we then obtain the global asymptotic stability of  $w^*$ .  $\square$

Next, we present a generalized version of Theorem 3.9, which provides the global dynamics of (3.1) in  $\hat{X}$ .

**Theorem 3.10.** *Assume that **(K)**, **(G1)–(G3)** and **(T)** hold. The following statements are valid for system (3.1):*

- (1) *If  $\omega(\Phi) < 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ ;*
- (2) *If  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  and either **(G3')** holds or  $\omega(\Phi) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue, then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ .*
- (3) *If  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , then  $w^*$  is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ , where  $w^* \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$  as obtained in Lemma 3.8(2).*

*Proof.* In the case where  $\omega(\Phi) \leq 0$ , the proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.9. For the case where  $\omega(\Phi) > 0$ , according to Theorem 3.4, the solution of system (3.1) in  $\hat{X}_+^v \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$  becomes strongly positive at any positive time. We may consider a positive time as the initial time. The subsequent proof is analogous to that of Theorem 3.9 and is therefore omitted.  $\square$

Finally, we consider a special case where  $\mathcal{K}$  and  $g$  are independent of  $t$ , specifically:

**(T0)**  $\mathcal{K}(t, x) = \mathcal{K}(x)$  and  $g(t, x, u) = g(x, u)$ .

In this case,  $L_T$  and problem (3.5) reduce to

$$[L_0 u](x) := D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(x-y)u(y) dy - Du + \left( \frac{\partial g_i(x, 0)}{\partial u_j} \right)_{m \times m} u(x), \quad u \in X,$$

and

$$D \int_{\Omega_0} \mathcal{K}(x-y)u(t, y) dy - Du + g(x, u) = 0, \quad (3.7)$$

respectively. According to [49, Theorem 3.14], [37, Corollary 2.1] or [48, Proposition 2.4], it holds that  $s(L_0) = s(-\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + L_0)$ . Here,  $-\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + L_0$  is considered as an operator on  $\mathcal{C}_T$ . Based on Theorem 3.9, we can deduce the following conclusions.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Assume that **(K)**, **(G1)**–**(G3)** and **(T0)** hold. The following statements are valid for system (3.1):*

- (1) *If  $s(L_0) < 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable for system (3.1) in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $s(L_0) = 0$  and either **(G3')** holds or  $s(L_0) = 0$  is the principal eigenvalue, then 0 is globally asymptotically stable for system (3.1) in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (3) *If  $s(L_0) > 0$ , then problem (3.7) admits a unique positive solution  $w^*$  in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ . Moreover,  $w^* \in \text{Int}(X_+)$  and is globally asymptotically stable for system (3.1) in  $X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ .*

## 4 Asymptotically bounded domain

In this section, we investigate the global dynamics of system (1.4) when the domain  $\Omega_t$  is asymptotically bounded, with a particular focus on two cases where  $\Omega_t$  converges asymptotically to a fixed domain or a time-periodic domain.

### 4.1 Asymptotically fixed domain

In this subsection, we consider the case where the domain  $\Omega_t$  asymptotically converges to a fixed domain. Specifically, we assume that  $\rho(t)$  satisfies the following asymptotic condition:

$$\mathbf{(B1)} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(t) = \rho_\infty > 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \dot{\rho}(t) = 0.$$

We start with the limiting system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho_\infty}}(y-z)u(t,z) dz - Du(t,y) + f(u), & t > 0, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0,y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Define

$$[Lu](y) := D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho_\infty}}(y-z)u(z) dz - Du(y) + \mathcal{D}f(0)u(y), \quad u \in X.$$

Let

$$[\bar{L}_\varepsilon u](y) := D \int_{\Omega_0} \left[ J_{\frac{1}{\rho_\infty}}(y-z) + \varepsilon \right] u(z) dz - Du(y) + \varepsilon u(y) + \mathcal{D}f(0)u(y), \quad u \in X,$$

and

$$[\underline{L}_\varepsilon u](y) := D \int_{\Omega_0} \left[ \max \left\{ J_{\frac{1}{\rho_\infty}}(y-z) - \varepsilon, 0 \right\} \right] u(z) dz - Du(y) - \varepsilon u(y) + \mathcal{D}f(0)u(y), \quad u \in X.$$

According to [2, 37],  $L$  admits principal eigenvalue, as do  $\bar{L}_\varepsilon$  and  $\underline{L}_\varepsilon$ . Let  $\lambda^* := s(L)$ ,  $\bar{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* := s(\bar{L}_\varepsilon)$  and  $\underline{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* := s(\underline{L}_\varepsilon)$  which are the principal eigenvalues of  $L$ ,  $\bar{L}_\varepsilon$  and  $\underline{L}_\varepsilon$ , respectively. It is easy to verify that  $\bar{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* \rightarrow \lambda^*$  and  $\underline{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* \rightarrow \lambda^*$  as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ .

Indeed, let  $U(t)$ ,  $\bar{U}_\varepsilon(t)$  and  $\underline{U}_\varepsilon(t)$  denote the  $c_0$ -semigroup generated by  $L$ ,  $\bar{L}_\varepsilon$  and  $\underline{L}_\varepsilon$ , respectively. Obviously, for any given  $T > 0$ ,

$$r(\underline{U}_\varepsilon(T)) \leq r(U(T)) \leq r(\bar{U}_\varepsilon(T)).$$



Let  $\bar{u}_\varepsilon(t, y)$  and  $\underline{u}_\varepsilon(t, y)$  denote the solutions of (4.2) and (4.3), respectively. By comparison principle, we have

$$\underline{u}_\varepsilon(t, y) \leq u(t, y) \leq \bar{u}_\varepsilon(t, y) \text{ for } y \in \bar{\Omega}_0, t \geq t_\varepsilon. \quad (4.4)$$

When  $\lambda^* > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $\bar{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* > 0$  and  $\underline{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* > 0$  for all  $\varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$ . Due to **(F)**, we can verify that  $v$  is a supersolution for system (4.2) and (4.3) for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  small enough, and the conclusions obtained in Section 3 still hold for these system. By Corollary 3.11, system (4.2) and (4.3) admit a unique positive steady state  $\bar{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$  and  $\underline{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$ , respectively, and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\bar{u}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot) - \bar{u}_\varepsilon^*\|_X = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\underline{u}_\varepsilon(t, \cdot) - \underline{u}_\varepsilon^*\|_X = 0. \quad (4.5)$$

One can verify that  $\bar{u}_\varepsilon^*(y) \geq \underline{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$ , and  $\bar{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$  is nondecreasing and  $\underline{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$  is nonincreasing in  $\varepsilon$ . Hence, for each  $y \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ ,  $\bar{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$  and  $\underline{u}_\varepsilon^*(y)$  converge to some  $\bar{u}^*(y)$  and  $\underline{u}^*(y)$  as  $\varepsilon$  tends to zero, respectively. By Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, it is straightforward to verify that  $\bar{u}^*(y)$  and  $\underline{u}^*(y)$  satisfy the same equation

$$D \int_{\Omega_0} \frac{J_{\cdot 1}}{\rho_\infty}(y - z)u(z) dz - Du(y) + f(u(y)) = 0.$$

According to Proposition 4.1, we have  $\bar{u}^* = \underline{u}^* = u^* \in X$ . Therefore, by Dini's theorem,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|\bar{u}_\varepsilon^* - u^*\|_X = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \|\underline{u}_\varepsilon^* - u^*\|_X = 0 \quad (4.6)$$

By combining (4.4)–(4.6) with Remark 3.7, we obtain the global stability of  $u^*$ .

When  $\lambda^* < 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_1$  such that  $\bar{\lambda}_{\varepsilon_1}^* < 0$ . By Corollary 3.11, one has  $\bar{u}_{\varepsilon_1}(t, y)$  converges to zero uniformly in  $y \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ , which implies

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot)\|_X = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

When  $\lambda^* = 0$ , we have  $\bar{\lambda}_\varepsilon^* > 0$  for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Hence, to prove (4.7), it suffices to show that  $\bar{u}^*(y) \equiv 0$ . According to Proposition 4.1 (or Lemma 3.8), this holds true. In view of Remark 3.7, we then deduce the global asymptotic stability of 0.  $\square$

By Theorem 3.10, we also have the following observation.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Assume **(B1)** holds. The following statements are valid for system (1.4):*

- (1) *If  $\lambda^* \leq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $\lambda^* > 0$ , then  $u^*$  is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ .*

## 4.2 Asymptotically time-periodic domain

In this subsection, we explore the global dynamics in the case where  $\Omega_t$  is asymptotically time-periodic. Specifically, we assume that there exists a positive  $T$ -periodic function  $\rho_T$  satisfying the following asymptotic condition:

$$\mathbf{(B2)} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\rho(t) - \rho_T(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\dot{\rho}(t) - \dot{\rho}_T(t)) = 0.$$

Consider the limiting system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho_T(t)}}(y-z)u(t,z) dz - Du(t,y) - n \frac{\dot{\rho}_T(t)}{\rho_T(t)} u + f(u), & t > 0, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0,y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.8)$$

and the linearized system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho_T(t)}}(y-z)u(t,z) dz - Du(t,y) - n \frac{\dot{\rho}_T(t)}{\rho_T(t)} u + \mathcal{D}f(0)u, & t > 0, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0,y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.9)$$

Let  $V(t,s)$  denote the evolution family on  $X$  generated by (4.9). Consider an eigenvalue problem association with (4.9):

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho_T(t)}}(y-z)u(t,z) dz - Du(t,y) - n \frac{\dot{\rho}_T(t)}{\rho_T(t)} u + \mathcal{D}f(0)u + \lambda u, & t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(T+t,y) = u(t,y), & t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

According to [2], problem (4.10) admits the principal eigenvalue  $\lambda_T^*$ , which satisfies

$$\lambda_T^* = -\omega(V) = -\frac{\ln r(V(T))}{T}.$$

By applying Theorem 3.9, we derive the following results.

**Proposition 4.4.** *The following statements are valid for system (4.8):*

- (1) *If  $\lambda_T^* \geq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $\lambda_T^* < 0$ , then system (4.8) admits a unique positive steady state  $u_T^*$  in  $\tilde{X}_+^v$ ; moreover,  $u_T^* \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{C}_T^+)$  and is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ .*

Based on Theorem 3.9 (or Lemma 3.8), Proposition 4.4, and the arguments in Theorem 4.2, we have the following result.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Assume (B2) holds. For system (1.4), the following statements are valid:*

- (1) *If  $\lambda_T^* \geq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $\lambda_T^* < 0$ , then  $u_T^*$  is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ .*

Theorem 3.10 gives rise to the following observation.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Assume (B2) holds. The following statements are valid for system (1.4):*

- (1) *If  $\lambda_T^* \geq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $\lambda_T^* < 0$ , then  $u_T^*$  is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v \setminus \hat{0}$ .*

## 5 Asymptotically unbounded domain

In this section, we continue to investigate the global dynamics of system (1.4) in the case where  $\Omega_t$  is asymptotically unbounded. Accordingly, we assume that  $\rho(t)$  satisfies the following infinite growth condition:

**(B3)**  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(t) = +\infty$ ,  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} = k \geq 0$  and  $\Omega_0$  is convex.

In addition to the assumption **(J)**, we also impose the following assumption on  $J$  in this section:

**(J1)**  $J$  is compactly supported with its center of mass at the origin, i.e.,  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J(x)x \, dx = 0$ .

Throughout this section, we always assume that **(B3)** and **(J1)** hold. Consider the limiting system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dw}{dt} = -nkw + f(w), & t > 0, \\ w(0) = w_0 \in \mathbb{M}. \end{cases} \quad (5.1)$$

For convenience, denote  $A := -nkI + \mathcal{D}f(0)$  where  $I$  is a identity matrix. Note that the Perron–Frobenius theorem implies that  $s(A)$  is the principal eigenvalue of  $A$ , that is, there exists a vector  $\bar{z} \gg 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  such that  $A\bar{z} = s(A)\bar{z}$ . According to [53, Theorem 2.3.4], we have the following threshold dynamics result for system (5.1).

**Proposition 5.1.** *The following statements are valid:*

- (1) *If  $s(A) \leq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable for system (5.1) in  $\mathbb{M}$ .*
- (2) *If  $s(A) > 0$ , then system (5.1) has a unique positive equilibrium  $w_e$ , and it is globally asymptotically stable for system (5.1) in  $\mathbb{M} \setminus \{0\}$ .*

Consider the following auxiliary problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dw}{dt} = -n \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} w + f(w), & t > 0, \\ w(0) = w_0 \in \mathbb{M}. \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

Clearly, system (5.1) is the limiting system of (5.2). Applying the theory of asymptotically autonomous semiflows or the theory of chain transitive sets (see [53, Section 1.2.1]), we can deduce that if  $s(A) \leq 0$ , the solution  $w(t; w_0)$  of (5.2) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} w(t; w_0) = 0$ .

For each  $\phi \in X_+^v$ , let  $w_0 := \max_{y \in \Omega_0} \phi(y)$ . According to Theorem 3.4, we have  $u(t, y; \phi) \leq w(t; w_0)$ . It follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot; \phi)\|_X = 0$ . That is, we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 5.2.** *If  $s(A) \leq 0$ , for each  $\phi \in X_+^v$ , the solution  $u(t, y; \phi)$  of system (1.4) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|u(t, \cdot; \phi)\|_X = 0$ .*

In the following discussion, we focus on the global dynamics of system (1.4) for  $s(A) > 0$ . Consider the following system:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z)u(t, z) \, dz - Du - nku + f(u), & t > 0, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(0, y) = u_0(y), & y \in \Omega_0. \end{cases} \quad (5.3)$$

We first analyze the asymptotic behavior of the solutions to system (5.3) and then derive the dynamics of system (1.4) by the comparison principle. To construct a subsolution of the equation corresponding to system (5.3), we introduce an auxiliary function that partially decouples the vanishing factor  $\frac{1}{\rho(t)}$  from the effects of nonlocal diffusion.

**Lemma 5.3.** *There exist a nonnegative function  $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ , which is strictly positive in  $\Omega_0$  and vanishes outside it, and a constant  $T > 0$  such that*

$$\int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \geq -\frac{1}{\rho(t)}\phi(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \geq T. \quad (5.4)$$

*Proof.* We first consider the case where  $\Omega_0$  is an open ball  $B_{2R}$ , defined as  $B_{2R} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : |x - x_0| \leq 2R\}$ , where  $|x|$  denotes the Euclidean distance from  $x$  to the origin. Without loss of generality, assume  $x_0 = 0$ . Define

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B_R, \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}, \\ \frac{1}{R^2}(\bar{x} - x)^2, & x \in B_{2R} \setminus B_R, \end{cases}$$

where  $\bar{x}$  is the orthogonal projection of  $x$  onto  $\partial B_{2R}$ . Define a smooth function

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} C \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1-x^2}\right), & x \in B_1, \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_1, \end{cases}$$

where  $C$  is the normalizing constant such that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x) dx = 1$ . For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\psi_\varepsilon(x) := \varepsilon^{-n} \psi(x/\varepsilon)$ , which defines a mollifier. Here, we take  $\varepsilon = \frac{R}{100}$  and denote  $\text{supp} \psi_\varepsilon$  by  $K$ . Define

$$\eta(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in B_R + K, \\ 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (B_R + 2K), \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \cos\left(\pi \frac{50|x| - 51R}{R}\right), & x \in (B_R + 2K) \setminus (B_R + K). \end{cases}$$

Clearly,  $\eta \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  and satisfies  $\eta(x) = 1$  for  $|x| \leq \frac{51R}{50}$  and  $\eta(x) = 0$  for  $|x| \geq \frac{26R}{25}$ . We define

$$\phi(x) = \eta(x)\varphi_\varepsilon(x) + (1 - \eta(x))\varphi(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where  $\varphi_\varepsilon = \psi_\varepsilon * \varphi$ . It follows that  $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  which is strictly positive in  $B_{2R}$  and vanishes outside it.

Next, we verify that the function  $\phi$  satisfies the inequality (5.4).

(i). Let  $x \in B_R + 3K$ . By Taylor's Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \\ &= \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)(\phi(y) - \phi(x)) dy \\ &= \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)(\nabla\phi(x)(y-x) + o(|y-x|)) dy \\ &= \nabla\phi(x) \int_{B_{2R}-\{x\}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(-z)z dz + \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)o(|y-x|) dy \\ &= \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)o(|y-x|) dy, \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

for sufficiently large  $\rho(t)$ . Since  $\phi$  is bounded below by a positive constant on  $B_R + 3K$ , there exists  $T_1 > 0$ , independent of  $x$ , such that

$$\int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\phi(y) dy - \phi(x) \geq -\frac{1}{\rho(t)}\phi(x), \quad x \in B_R + 3K, \quad t \geq T_1. \quad (5.6)$$

(ii). Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (B_R + 3K)$ . By the definition of  $\phi$ , we have

$$\phi(x) = \varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{2R}, \\ \frac{1}{R^2}(\bar{x} - x)^2, & x \in B_{2R} \setminus (B_R + 2K), \end{cases}$$

which is convex on  $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus (B_R + 2K)$ . Take  $R(x) := 2R + |x|$ , then we have

$$x = \int_{B_{R(x)}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)y dy, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (B_R + 3K), \quad t \geq T_2,$$

for sufficiently large  $T_2 > 0$ . Using Jensen's inequality [22], we conclude

$$\phi(x) \leq \int_{B_{R(x)}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\phi(y) dy = \int_{B_{2R}} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\phi(y) dy, \quad (5.7)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus (B_R + 3K)$  and  $t \geq T_2$ . Thus, we have established (5.4) for the case where  $\Omega_0$  is an open ball.

For a general bounded convex domain  $\Omega_0$  with a smooth boundary  $\partial\Omega_0$ , based on the John ellipsoid, we may apply an affine transformation  $\mathcal{T}$  to map  $\Omega_0$  onto an open ball. Using the same approach, we may construct a function  $\phi_{ball}(\cdot)$  corresponding to the ball. By the inverse affine transformation, we obtain a function  $\phi_{\Omega_0}(\mathcal{T}^{-1}(\cdot)) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ . This function is convex in a neighborhood of  $\partial\Omega_0$ , and further satisfies (5.4). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Assume  $s(A) > 0$ . Then there exist constants  $\delta_0 > 0$  and  $N > 0$  such that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , the function  $\underline{u}_\delta(y) := \delta \bar{z}\phi(y)$ , where  $\bar{z}$  is the positive eigenvector of  $A$  and  $\phi \in C^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$  is given by Lemma 5.3, is a subsolution of the equations corresponding to (5.3) in  $[N, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .*

*Proof.* We fix a real number  $k_A > 0$  such that  $A + k_A I$  has positive diagonal entries and set  $s(A) := \bar{r}$  and  $\epsilon_0 := \frac{\bar{r}}{2(\bar{r} + k_A)}$ . By an elementary analysis (see, for example, (6.10) in [18]), there exists a vector  $\hat{v} \gg 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^m$  satisfying

$$f(u) - nku \geq Au - \epsilon_0(Au + k_A u), \quad u \in [0, \hat{v}]_{\mathbb{R}^m}.$$

Next, we choose a sufficiently small  $\delta_0 > 0$  such that  $\underline{u}_\delta(x) \in [0, \hat{v}]_{\mathbb{R}^m}$  for all  $x \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ . It follows that for any  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\underline{u}_\delta(y) dy - D\underline{u}_\delta - nku_\delta + f(\underline{u}_\delta) \\ & \geq -\frac{1}{\rho(t)}D\underline{u}_\delta + \left( (1 - \epsilon_0)A - \epsilon_0 k_A I \right) \underline{u}_\delta \\ & \geq \left( -\frac{\bar{d}}{\rho(t)} + (1 - \epsilon_0)\bar{r} - \epsilon_0 k_A \right) \underline{u}_\delta \\ & = \left( -\frac{\bar{d}}{\rho(t)} + \frac{\bar{r}}{2} \right) \underline{u}_\delta, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{d} := \max \{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_m\}$ , and hence,

$$D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(x-y)\underline{u}_\delta(y) dy - D\underline{u}_\delta - nk\underline{u}_\delta + f(\underline{u}_\delta) \gg 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^m \text{ for all } x \in \Omega_0,$$

provided that  $\rho(t) \geq \frac{2\bar{d}}{\bar{r}}$ . The proof is completed.  $\square$

Next, we use the subsolution obtained in Lemma 5.4 to further construct a generalized subsolution (see, e.g., [31]) of the equation corresponding to system (5.3), which is instrumental in establishing the asymptotic behavior of solutions to the system. Define  $\Omega_\eta := \{x \in \Omega_0 : d(y, \partial\Omega_0) > \eta\}$ . It is clear that  $\Omega_\eta \nearrow \Omega_0$  as  $\eta \rightarrow 0^+$ . Let  $\varrho_\eta(y)$  be a smooth cut-off function satisfying  $\varrho_\eta(y) = 0$  in  $\Omega_0 \setminus \Omega_\eta$  and  $\varrho_\eta(y) = 1$  in  $\Omega_{2\eta}$ . If  $s(A) > 0$ , by the Dancer-Hess connecting orbit theorem (see, e.g., [11, Proposition 1] and [23, Proposition 2.1]), it follows that system (5.1) admits a connecting orbit  $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$  such that

$$\alpha(-\infty) = 0, \quad \alpha(+\infty) = w_e, \quad \alpha'(t) \gg 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Since  $\alpha(-\infty) = 0$ , there exists  $\underline{\tau} = \underline{\tau}(\delta, \eta)$  such that

$$\alpha(\underline{\tau}) \leq \underline{u}_\delta(y) \text{ for all } y \in \bar{\Omega}_\eta. \quad (5.8)$$

**Lemma 5.5.** *For any given  $u \in X$  with  $u|_{\partial\Omega_0} = 0$ , then*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \left\| \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(\cdot - z)u(z) dz - u \right\|_X = 0.$$

*Proof.* We extend  $u(y)$  to be zero for  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega_0$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z)u(z) dz - u(y) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) [u(z) - u(y)] dz \\ &= \int_{\text{supp}J} J(z) \left[ u\left(y + \frac{z}{\rho(t)}\right) - u(y) \right] dz. \end{aligned}$$

For any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $t_\varepsilon > 0$ , independent of  $z$ , such that

$$\left\| u\left(\cdot + \frac{z}{\rho(t)}\right) - u(\cdot) \right\|_X \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq t_\varepsilon, z \in \text{supp}J,$$

since  $\rho(t) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow +\infty$ . Consequently, we obtain

$$\left\| \int_{\text{supp}J} J(z) \left[ u\left(\cdot + \frac{z}{\rho(t)}\right) - u(\cdot) \right] dz \right\|_X \leq \varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq t_\varepsilon.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Motivated by [32, Lemma 3.2], we have the following result.

**Lemma 5.6.** *Assume  $s(A) > 0$ . For any given  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0], \eta > 0, \underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\underline{\tau} < \bar{\tau}$  and (5.8), there exist two positive constants  $\beta = \beta(\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau})$  and  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(\eta, \underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) > N$  such that for any  $t_0 \geq \hat{N}$ , the function*

$$\underline{u}(t, y) := \max \left\{ \underline{u}_\delta(y), \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \bar{\tau} - (\bar{\tau} - \underline{\tau})e^{-\beta(t-t_0)}) \right\}$$

*is a generalized subsolution of the equations corresponding to (5.3) in  $[t_0, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .*

*Proof.* For any given  $\eta > 0$  and  $\bar{\tau} > \underline{\tau}$ , we define that

$$c_1 := c_1(\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, m} \left\{ \max_{s \in [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]} \frac{\alpha'_i(s)}{\alpha_i(s)} \right\} > 0,$$

$$c_2 := c_2(\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) = \min_{i=1, \dots, m} \left\{ \min_{s \in [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]} \frac{\alpha'_i(s)}{2\alpha_i(s)} \right\} > 0.$$

We extend the function  $\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau)$  to  $\bar{\Omega}_0$ , defining it as 0 at any point  $y \in \bar{\Omega}_0$  where  $\varrho_\eta(y) = 0$ , for all  $\tau \in [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]$ . Clearly, under this extension,  $\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau)$  is a continuous function on  $\bar{\Omega}_0 \times [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]$ , satisfying  $\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau) = 0$  for  $\partial\Omega_0 \times [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]$ . According to Lemma 5.5, there exists  $\hat{N} = \hat{N}(\eta, \underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}) > N$  such that

$$D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(z) + \tau) dz - D\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau) \geq -\frac{1}{2} \min_{s \in [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]} \alpha'(s). \quad (5.9)$$

Let  $\beta := \frac{c_2}{c_1(\bar{\tau} - \underline{\tau})}$  and  $\tau(t) := \bar{\tau} - (\bar{\tau} - \underline{\tau})e^{-\beta(t-t_0)}$ , where  $t_0 \geq \hat{N}$  is an arbitrarily chosen constant. Define the set

$$\mathcal{D} := \{(t, y) \in [t_0, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0 : \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \geq \underline{u}_\delta(y)\}.$$

Clearly, it holds that  $\underline{u}(t, y) = \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t))$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ . By (5.8), and due to the monotonicity of  $\alpha$ , we have  $\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t) \geq \underline{\tau}$  in  $\mathcal{D}$ . At the same time, direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) &\leq c_1(\bar{\tau} - \underline{\tau})\beta \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \\ &= c_2 \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) - nk\alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t))) &= \alpha'(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \min_{s \in [\underline{\tau}, \bar{\tau}]} \alpha'(s) + c_2 \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

Together with (5.9)–(5.11), and using the fact that

$$D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) \underline{u}(t, z) dz \geq D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(z) + \tau(t)) dz,$$

we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) \leq D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) \underline{u}(t, z) dz - D\underline{u} - nk\underline{u} + f(\underline{u}) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}. \quad (5.12)$$

By virtue of Lemma 5.4, in the set

$$\mathcal{D}^c := \{(t, y) \in [t_0, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0 : \underline{u}_\delta(y) > \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t))\},$$

we have

$$0 = \frac{\partial \underline{u}_\delta(y)}{\partial t} \leq D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z) \underline{u}(t, z) dz - D\underline{u} - nk\underline{u} + f(\underline{u}). \quad (5.13)$$

Combining (5.12) and (5.13), it follows that  $\underline{u}(t, y)$  is a generalized subsolution of the equations corresponding to system (5.3) in  $[t_0, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .  $\square$

Next, using the subsolution constructed in Lemmas 5.4 and 5.6, we establish the asymptotic behavior of solutions to system (5.3). Furthermore, under assumption **(B3)**, we perturb system (5.3) and employ the comparison principle to analyze the asymptotic behavior of solutions to system (1.4).

**Proposition 5.7.** *Assume  $s(A) > 0$ . For any  $\phi \in X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ , the solution  $u(t, y; \phi)$  of system (5.3) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) = w_e$  uniformly in any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ .*

*Proof.* According to Theorem 3.4, the solution  $u(t, \cdot; \phi) \in \text{Int}(X_+^v)$  for  $t > 0$ . We can choose  $\delta \in (0, \delta_0]$  small enough such that  $u(1, y; \phi) \geq \underline{u}_\delta(y)$  for all  $y \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ . It follows that  $u(t, y; \phi) \geq \underline{u}_\delta(y)$  in  $[1, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ .

Let  $\eta > 0$  be an arbitrarily given constant,  $\underline{\tau}$  be chosen to satisfy (5.8), and  $\bar{\tau} > \underline{\tau}$  be another arbitrarily given constant. Set  $t_0 = \max\{1, \hat{N}\}$ , and let  $\underline{u}$  be defined as in Lemma 5.6 with time  $t_0$ . Clearly,  $\underline{u}(t_0, y) = \underline{u}_\delta(y)$  on  $\bar{\Omega}_0$  due to (5.8). According to Theorem 3.4, we have  $u(t, y; \phi) \geq \underline{u}(t, y)$  in  $[t_0, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . It follows that

$$u(t, y; \phi) \geq \alpha(\ln \varrho_\eta(y) + \tau(t)) = \alpha(\tau(t)), \quad \forall y \in \Omega_{2\eta}, t \in [t_0, +\infty),$$

since  $\varrho_\eta(y) = 1$  in  $\Omega_{2\eta}$ . Due to  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \tau(t) = \bar{\tau}$ , we have

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \geq \alpha(\bar{\tau}) \text{ uniformly for } y \in \Omega_{2\eta}.$$

Letting  $\bar{\tau} \rightarrow +\infty$ , then

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \geq w_e \text{ uniformly for } y \in \Omega_{2\eta}. \quad (5.14)$$

On the other hand, let  $w_0 = \max_{y \in \bar{\Omega}_0} \phi(y)$ . By comparison principle, we have  $u(t, y; \phi) \leq w(t; w_0)$  for  $t \geq 0$  and  $y \in \bar{\Omega}_0$ , where  $w(t; w_0)$  is the solution of system (5.1) with  $w(0; w_0) = w_0$ . By Proposition 5.1, we have

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \leq w_e \text{ uniformly for } y \in \Omega_0. \quad (5.15)$$

Together with (5.14)–(5.15), we deduce  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) = w_e$  uniformly for  $y \in \Omega_{2\eta}$ . By the arbitrariness of  $\eta$ , it follows that the conclusion holds for any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.8.** *Assume  $s(A) > 0$ . For any  $\phi \in X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ , the solution  $u(t, y; \phi)$  of system (1.4) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) = w_e$  uniformly in any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $s(A) > 0$ , there exists  $\varepsilon_0 > 0$  such that  $s(A \pm \varepsilon I) > 0$  for all  $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ . By assumption **(B3)**, there exists  $t_\varepsilon$  such that

$$nk - \varepsilon \leq n \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} \leq nk + \varepsilon \text{ for all } t \geq t_\varepsilon.$$

Let  $u_{\pm\varepsilon}^*$  denote the positive equilibrium of the system

$$u'(t) = -nku \pm \varepsilon u + f(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{M}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+} u_{\pm\varepsilon}^* = w_e$ . Notice that every nontrivial solution of  $u'(t) = -nku + \varepsilon u + f(u)$  is a supersolution for (1.4) in  $[t_\varepsilon, +\infty) \times \bar{\Omega}_0$ . By Theorem 3.4 and Proposition 5.1, it follows that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \leq u_{+\varepsilon}^* \text{ uniformly for } y \in \bar{\Omega}_0.$$

Letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ , we obtain

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \leq w_e \text{ uniformly for } y \in \overline{\Omega}_0. \quad (5.16)$$

On the other hand, consider the following auxiliary problem:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = D \int_{\Omega_0} J_{\frac{1}{\rho(t)}}(y-z)u(t, z) dz - Dv - nku - \varepsilon u + f(u), & t > t_\varepsilon, y \in \Omega_0, \\ u(t_\varepsilon, y) = u(t_\varepsilon, y; \phi), & y \in \Omega_0, \end{cases}$$

and denote its solution by  $\psi$ . By Theorem 3.4, it holds that  $u(t, y; \phi) \geq \psi(t, y)$  for  $t \geq t_\varepsilon$  and  $y \in \overline{\Omega}_0$ . Furthermore, by Proposition 5.7, we have  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \|\psi(t, \cdot) - u_{-\varepsilon}^*\|_{C(\Omega')} = 0$ , for any compact subset  $\Omega' \subset \Omega_0$ . It follows that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y; \phi) \geq w_e \quad (5.17)$$

uniformly for  $y$  in any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ . Combining (5.16) and (5.17), the proof is complete.  $\square$

By combining Propositions 5.2 and 5.8, we have the following threshold-type results on the global dynamics of system (1.4).

**Theorem 5.9.** *The following statements are valid for system (1.4):*

- (1) *If  $s(A) \leq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $X_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $s(A) > 0$ , for each  $u_0 \in X_+^v \setminus \{0\}$ , the solution  $u(t, y; u_0)$  of system (1.4) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y, u_0) = w_e$  uniformly in any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ , where  $w_e$  is shown as in Proposition 5.1(2).*

As a consequence of Theorems 3.4 and 3.10, we also have the following result.

**Theorem 5.10.** *For system (1.4), the following statements are valid:*

- (1)  *$s(A) \leq 0$ , then 0 is globally asymptotically stable in  $\hat{X}_+^v$ .*
- (2) *If  $s(A) > 0$ , for each  $u_0 \in \hat{X}_+^v \setminus \hat{\mathbf{0}}$ , the solution  $u(t, y; u_0)$  of system (1.4) satisfies  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} u(t, y, u_0) = w_e$  uniformly in any compact subset of  $\Omega_0$ .*

## 6 Numerical simulations

In this section, we present numerical simulations based on a practical model to illustrate our analytic results. Specifically, we consider a West Nile (WN) virus model proposed in [33, 50], which is described by the following ODE dynamical system:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dL_V}{dt} &= b_V(S_V + E_V + I_V) - m_V L_V - d_L L_V, \\
\frac{dS_V}{dt} &= -\alpha_V \beta_R \frac{I_R}{N_R} S_V + m_V L_V - d_V S_V, \\
\frac{dE_V}{dt} &= \alpha_V \beta_R \frac{I_R}{N_R} S_V - (\kappa_V + d_V) E_V, \\
\frac{dI_V}{dt} &= \kappa_V E_V - d_V I_V, \\
\frac{dS_R}{dt} &= -\alpha_R \beta_R \frac{S_R}{N_R} I_V + \eta_R R_R, \\
\frac{dI_R}{dt} &= \alpha_R \beta_R \frac{S_R}{N_R} I_V - (\delta_R + \gamma_R) I_R, \\
\frac{dR_R}{dt} &= \gamma_R I_R - \eta_R R_R, \\
\frac{dX_R}{dt} &= \delta_R I_R.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

The meanings of the parameters in the system (6.1) are provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Description of variables and parameters of the model (6.1).

Parameters	Description
$L_V, S_V, E_V, I_V$	the numbers of the classes of larval, susceptible, exposed and infectious (infective) adult in female mosquito, respectively
$S_R, I_R, R_R, X_R$	the numbers of the classes of susceptible, infectious, removed and dead in bird, respectively
$N_R = S_R + I_R + R_R$	total live population of bird
$b_V$	mosquito birth rate
$d_L, d_V$	larval, adult mosquito death rate
$\delta_R$	bird death rate, caused by virus
$\alpha_V, \alpha_R$	WN transmission probability per bite to mosquitoes, birds
$\beta_R$	biting rate of mosquitoes on birds
$m_V$	mosquito maturation rate
$\kappa_V$	virus incubation rate in mosquitoes
$\gamma_R$	bird recovery rate from WN
$\eta_R$	bird loss of immunity rate

As noted by Lewis et al. [33], “both bird and mosquito movements actually involve a mixture of local interactions, long-distance dispersal and, in the case of birds, migratory flights”. Thus, it is natural to incorporate nonlocal diffusion into system (6.1). Under appropriate assumptions ([33]), this system simplifies to:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial I_V}{\partial t} &= D_V \int_{\Omega_0} J(x-z) I_V(z, t) dz - D_V I_V \\
&\quad + \alpha_V \beta_R \frac{I_R}{N_R} (A_V - I_V) - d_V I_V, & x \in \Omega_0, t > 0, \\
\frac{\partial I_R}{\partial t} &= D_R \int_{\Omega_0} J(x-z) I_R(z, t) dz - D_R I_R \\
&\quad + \alpha_R \beta_R \frac{I_V}{N_R} (N_R - I_R) - \gamma_R I_R, & x \in \Omega_0, t > 0,
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{6.2}$$

where  $D_V$  and  $D_R$  denote the diffusion coefficients with  $D_V \ll D_R$  as mosquitoes disperse more slowly than birds, and  $A_V := S_V + E_V + I_V$  and  $N_R$  are constants. We now consider the nonlocal system (6.2) on a time-varying domain and use the approach discussed in Section 2 to rewrite (6.2) in the following form. For convenience, the unknown functions retain their original symbols.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\partial I_V}{\partial t} = D_V \int_{\Omega_0} \rho(t) J(\rho(t)(y-z)) I_V(z, t) dz - D_V I_V \\ \quad + \alpha_V \beta_R \frac{I_R}{N_R} (A_V - I_V) - \left( d_V + \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} \right) I_V, \\ \frac{\partial I_R}{\partial t} = D_R \int_{\Omega_0} \rho(t) J(\rho(t)(y-z)) I_R(z, t) dz - D_R I_R \\ \quad + \alpha_R \beta_R \frac{I_V}{N_R} (N_R - I_R) - \left( \gamma_R + \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} \right) I_R, \end{array} \right. \quad \begin{array}{l} y \in \Omega_0, t > 0, \\ y \in \Omega_0, t > 0. \end{array} \quad (6.3)$$

In this system, we have  $\bar{v} := (A_V, N_R)$  and  $\mathbb{M} := [0, A_V] \times [0, N_R]$ . It follows that all the above analytical results are applicable to (6.3). For simplicity, we set  $\Omega_0 := (0, 1)$  and define  $J(x)$  as follows:

$$J(x) := \begin{cases} 1 - |x|, & |x| \leq 1, \\ 0, & |x| > 1. \end{cases}$$

At the following numerical simulations, we choose the initial values

$$I_V(0, y) = \sin \frac{y}{2}; \quad I_R(0, y) = 0.5y - 0.5y^2.$$

For illustrative purpose, we set

$$\gamma_R = 0.01, \quad N_R = 100, \quad A_V = 5000, \quad D_V = 0.03, \quad D_R = 2.$$

For other parameters, we use values as estimated in [50], namely,

$$d_V = 0.029, \quad \alpha_V = 0.24, \quad \alpha_R = 1, \quad \beta_R = 0.16.$$

Next, we consider different asymptotic cases of  $\rho$  and conduct numerical simulations to validate the theoretical results established for both asymptotically bounded and unbounded cases.

### Case 1. Asymptotically fixed domain

Take  $\rho(t) := \frac{\frac{3}{2}e^{2t}}{1 + \frac{1}{2}e^{2t}}, t \geq 0$ . It follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \rho(t) = 3$  and  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \dot{\rho}(t) = 0$ . Let  $\lambda^*$  be the principal eigenvalue of the following eigenvalue problem

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} D_V \int_{\Omega_0} \rho_\infty J(\rho_\infty(y-z)) I_V(z, t) dz - D_V I_V + \frac{\alpha_V \beta_R A_V}{N_R} I_R - d_V I_V = \lambda^* I_V, \\ D_R \int_{\Omega_0} \rho_\infty J(\rho_\infty(y-z)) I_R(z, t) dz - D_R I_R + \alpha_R \beta_R I_V - \gamma_R I_R = \lambda^* I_R. \end{array} \right.$$

It can be shown that  $\lambda^* > 0$ , and numerical computations yield  $\lambda^* \approx 0.2196$ .

### Case 2. Asymptotically periodic domain

Take  $\rho(t) := (1 - e^{-t})(0.2 \sin(0.1\pi t) + 1) + 1$ . It follows that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\rho(t) - \rho_T(t)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} (\dot{\rho}(t) - \dot{\rho}_T(t)) = 0$ , where  $T = 20$  and  $\rho_T(t) = 0.2 \sin(0.1\pi t) + 1$ . Let  $\lambda_T^*$  be the

principal eigenvalue of the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial I_V}{\partial t} = D_V \int_{\Omega_0} \rho_T(t) J(\rho_T(t)(y-z)) I_V(z, t) dz - D_V I_V \\ \quad + \frac{\alpha_V \beta_R A_V}{N_R} I_R - d_V I_V - \frac{\dot{\rho}_T(t)}{\rho_T(t)} I_V + \lambda_T^* I_V, & t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in (0, 1), \\ \frac{\partial I_R}{\partial t} = D_R \int_{\Omega_0} \rho_T(t) J(\rho_T(t)(y-z)) I_R(z, t) dz - D_R I_R \\ \quad + \alpha_R \beta_R I_V - \gamma_R I_R - \frac{\dot{\rho}_T(t)}{\rho_T(t)} I_R + \lambda_T^* I_R, & t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in (0, 1), \\ I_V(T+t, y) = I_V(t, y), I_R(T+t, y) = I_R(t, y), & t \in \mathbb{R}, y \in (0, 1). \end{cases}$$

It can be shown that  $\lambda_T^* < 0$ , and numerical computations yield  $\lambda_T^* \approx -0.2829$ .

### Case 3. Asymptotically unbounded domain

Let  $\rho(t) := 0.5t + 1$ . Then  $k := \lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\dot{\rho}(t)}{\rho(t)} = 0$ . We choose this linear function because, in numerical simulations, a rapidly growing  $\rho$  can lead to increased numerical errors and reduced simulation accuracy. Denote

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} -d_V - k & \frac{\alpha_V \beta_R A_V}{N_R} \\ \alpha_R \beta_R & -\gamma_R - k \end{pmatrix}$$

By calculation,  $s(A) = \frac{-0.039 + \sqrt{0.039^2 + 1.22764}}{2} - k \approx 0.5348 > 0$ .

### Case 4. Asymptotically fixed domain with an asymmetric kernel

We are also interested in how an asymmetric kernel affects the solution distribution. Since the kernel is not necessarily symmetric or compactly supported in the asymptotically fixed domain case, we consider the following kernel  $J$ :

$$J(x) = \begin{cases} C e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}, & x \leq 0, \\ C(1 - 2x), & 0 < x < \frac{1}{2}, \\ 0, & x \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases}$$

where  $C = 1/(0.25 + \sqrt{\pi/2})$  is the normalizing constant. A direct computation shows that  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} J(x) dx = 1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}} J(x)x dx \approx -0.6375 < 0$ . Other parameters are the same as in Case 1. Through similar calculations, we obtain  $\lambda_1^* \approx 0.1181$ .

From Fig. 1–3, we observe that the results of the numerical simulations are consistent with our theoretical proofs. Although we have chosen relatively small diffusion coefficients, the influence of spatial diffusion is still evident in the figures. Furthermore, a symmetrical pattern emerges as time evolves, characterized by a central peak and decreasing values on both sides of the graph. This results from the symmetry of the kernel and the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions. Additionally, as shown in Fig. 4, the distribution pattern of the kernel function significantly affects the location of population aggregation. Since kernel's center of mass lies on the negative half-axis, the populations exhibit a significant leftward shift, leading to the aggregation (or maximum) point appearing near the leftmost boundary.

Moreover, from Fig. 3, it is shown that the solution approaches a constant in the middle part, while near the boundary, it decreases rapidly within a small neighborhood of the boundary as time evolves. This phenomenon primarily arises from the shrinking support of the kernel over time, as well as the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition. Furthermore, it highlights the necessity of imposing the conditions on compact subsets, as demonstrated in our proof in Section 5.




Fig. 1. Dynamics of  $I_V$  and  $I_R$  in Case 1.




Fig. 2. Dynamics of  $I_V$  and  $I_R$  in Case 2.




Fig. 3. Dynamics of  $I_V$  and  $I_R$  in Case 3.




Fig. 4. Dynamics of  $I_V$  and  $I_R$  in Case 4.

## Acknowledgments

X. Lin's research was supported in part by CSC (202306380200) and NSFC (12471176). H. Ye's research was supported in part by NSFC (12271186, 12271178), the Science and Technology Program of Shenzhen, China (20231120205244001), and CSC (202308440378). X.-Q. Zhao's research was supported in part by the NSERC of Canada (RGPIN-2019-05648).

## References

- [1] F. ANDREU-VAILLO, J. MAZÓN, J. ROSSI, AND J. TOLEDO-MELERO, *Nonlocal diffusion problems*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Real Sociedad Matemática Española, Madrid, 2010.
- [2] X. BAO AND W. SHEN, *Criteria for the existence of principal eigenvalues of time periodic cooperative linear systems with nonlocal dispersal*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 145 (2017), pp. 2881–2894.
- [3] H. BERESTYCKI, J. COVILLE, AND H.-H. VO, *Persistence criteria for populations with non-local dispersion*, J. Math. Biol., 72 (2016), pp. 1693–1745.
- [4] H. BERESTYCKI, J. COVILLE, AND H.-H. VO, *On the definition and the properties of the principal eigenvalue of some nonlocal operators*, J. Funct. Anal., 271 (2016), pp. 2701–2751.
- [5] J. CAO, Y. DU, F. LI, AND W. LI, *The dynamics of a Fisher-KPP nonlocal diffusion model with free boundaries*, J. Funct. Anal., 277 (2019), pp. 2772–2814.
- [6] M. A. J. CHAPLAIN, M. GANESH AND I. G. GRAHAM, *Spatio-temporal pattern formation on spherical surfaces: numerical simulation and application to solid tumour growth*, J. Math. Biol., 42 (2001), pp. 387–423.
- [7] E. J. CRAMPIN, E. A. GAFFNEY, AND P. K. MAINI, *Reaction and diffusion on growing domains: Scenarios for robust pattern formation*, Bull. Math. Biol., 61 (1999), pp. 1093–1120.

- [8] E. J. CRAMPIN, E. A. GAFFNEY, AND P. K. MAINI, *Mode-doubling and tripling in reaction-diffusion patterns on growing domains: A piecewise linear model*, J. Math. Biol., 44 (2002), pp. 107–128.
- [9] E. J. CRAMPIN, W. W. HACKBORN, AND P. K. MAINI, *Pattern formation in reaction diffusion models with nonuniform domain growth*, Bull. Math. Biol., 64 (2002), pp. 747–769.
- [10] E. J. CRAMPIN, AND P. K. MAINI, *Modelling biological pattern formation: the role of domain growth*, Comments in Theoretical Biology, 6 (2001), pp. 229–249.
- [11] E. N. DANCER AND P. HESS, *Stability of fixed points for order-preserving discrete-time dynamical systems*, J. Reine Angew. Math., 419 (1991), pp. 125–139.
- [12] Q. DU, M. GUNZBURGER, R. B. LEHOUCQ, AND K. ZHOU, *Analysis and approximation of nonlocal diffusion problems with volume constraints*, SIAM Rev., 54 (2012), pp. 667–696.
- [13] Q. DU, M. GUNZBURGER, R. B. LEHOUCQ, AND K. ZHOU, *A nonlocal vector calculus, nonlocal volume-constrained problems, and nonlocal balance laws*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., 23 (2013), pp. 493–540.
- [14] Y. DU, F. LI, AND M. ZHOU, *Semi-wave and spreading speed of the nonlocal Fisher-KPP equation with free boundaries*, J. Math. Pures Appl., 154 (2021), pp. 30–66.
- [15] A. DUCROT, AND Z. JIN, *Generalized travelling fronts for non-autonomous Fisher-KPP equations with nonlocal diffusion*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., 201 (2022), pp. 1607–1638.
- [16] A. DUCROT, AND Z. JIN, *Spreading speeds for time heterogeneous prey-predator systems with nonlocal diffusion on a lattice*, J. Differential Equations, 396 (2024), pp. 257–313.
- [17] D. B. DUNCAN, M. GRINFELD, AND I. STOLERIU, *Coarsening in an integro-differential model of phase transitions*, European J. Appl. Math., 11 (2000), pp. 561–572.
- [18] J. FANG AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Bistable traveling waves for monotone semiflows with applications*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 17 (2015), pp. 2243–2288.
- [19] P. FIFE, *Some nonclassical trends in parabolic and parabolic-like evolutions*, in Trends in nonlinear analysis, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2003), pp. 153–191.
- [20] G. GILBOA AND S. OSHER, *Nonlocal operators with applications to image processing*, Multiscale Model. Simul., 7 (2008), pp. 1005–1028.
- [21] M. E. GURTIN, *An introduction to continuum mechanics*, Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1981.
- [22] G. H. HARDY, J. E. LITTLEWOOD, AND G. PÓLYA, *Inequalities*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- [23] P. HESS, *Periodic-parabolic boundary value problems and positivity*, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1991.

- [24] V. HUTSON, S. MARTINEZ, K. MISCHAIKOW, AND G.T. VICKERS, *The evolution of dispersal*, J. Math. Biol., 47 (2003), pp. 483–517.
- [25] L. I. IGNAT, AND J. D. ROSSI, *A nonlocal convection-diffusion equation*, J. Funct. Anal., 251 (2007), pp. 399–437.
- [26] D. JIANG, AND Z. WANG, *The diffusive logistic equation on periodically evolving domains*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 458 (2018), pp. 93–111.
- [27] S. JOHNSTON, AND M. SIMPSON, *Exact solutions for diffusive transport on heterogeneous growing domains*, Proc. A., 479 (2023), Paper No. 20230263, 27 pp.
- [28] C. KAO, Y. LOU, AND W. SHEN, *Random dispersal vs. non-local dispersal*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst., 26 (2010), pp. 551–596.
- [29] T. KATO, *Perturbation theory for linear operators*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [30] S. KONDO, AND R. ASAL, *A reaction-diffusion wave on the skin of the marine angelfish Pomacanthus*, Nature, 376 (1995), pp. 765–768.
- [31] K.-Y. LAM AND Y. LOU, *Introduction to reaction-diffusion equations: Theory and applications to spatial ecology and evolutionary biology*, Springer, New York, 2022.
- [32] K.-Y. LAM, X.-Q. ZHAO, AND M. ZHU, *Global dynamics of reaction-diffusion systems with a time-varying domain*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 84 (2024), pp. 1742–1765.
- [33] M. LEWIS, J. RENCLAWOWICZ, AND P. VAN DEN DRIESSCHE, *Traveling waves and spread rates for a West Nile virus model*, Bull. Math. Biol., 68 (2006), pp. 3–23.
- [34] X. LIANG, L. ZHANG, AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *The principal eigenvalue for degenerate periodic reaction-diffusion systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., 49 (2017), pp. 3603–3636.
- [35] X. LIANG, L. ZHANG, AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Basic reproduction ratios for periodic abstract functional differential equations (with application to a spatial model for Lyme disease)*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, 31 (2019), pp. 1247–1278.
- [36] X. LIN AND Q. WANG, *Threshold dynamics of a time-periodic nonlocal dispersal SIS epidemic model with Neumann boundary conditions*, J. Differential Equations, 373 (2023), pp. 108–151.
- [37] X. LIN AND Q. WANG, *The spectral bound and basic reproduction ratio for nonlocal dispersal cooperative problems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 530 (2024), Paper No. 127651, 21 pp.
- [38] A. MADZVAMUSE, E.A. GAFFNEY AND P.K. MAINI, *Stability analysis of non-autonomous reaction-diffusion systems: the effects of growing domains*, J. Math. Biol., 61 (2010), pp. 133–164.
- [39] STUART A. NEWMAN, AND H. L. FRISCH, *Dynamics of Skeletal Pattern Formation in Developing Chick Limb*, Science, 205 (1979), pp. 662–668.

- [40] K. J. PAINTER, P. K. MAINI, AND H. G. OTHMER, *Stripe formation in juvenile Pomacanthus explained by a generalized Turing mechanism with chemotaxis*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 96 (1999), pp. 5549–5554.
- [41] R.G. PLAZA, F. SÁNCHEZ-GARDUÑO, P. PADILLA, R.A. BARRIO AND P.K. MAINI, *The effect of growth and curvature on pattern formation*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, 16 (2004), pp. 1093–1121.
- [42] L. PU, AND Z. LIN, *Spatial transmission and risk assessment of West Nile virus on a growing domain*, Math. Methods Appl. Sci., 44 (2021), pp. 6067–6085.
- [43] N. RAWAL AND W. SHEN, *Criteria for the existence and lower bounds of principal eigenvalues of time periodic nonlocal dispersal operators and applications*, J. Dynam. Differential Equations, 24 (2012), pp. 927–954.
- [44] ADAM G. RIESS ET AL, *Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant*, Astron. J., 116 (1998).
- [45] W. SHEN AND X. XIE, *Approximations of random dispersal operators/equations by nonlocal dispersal operators/equations*, J. Differential Equations, 259 (2015), pp. 7375–7405.
- [46] Z. SHEN AND H.-H. VO, *Nonlocal dispersal equations in time-periodic media: principal spectral theory, limiting properties and long-time dynamics*, J. Differential Equations, 267 (2019), pp. 1423–1466.
- [47] B. I. SHRAIMAN, *Mechanical feedback as a possible regulator of tissue growth*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 102 (2005), pp. 3318–3323.
- [48] H. R. THIEME, *Positive perturbation of operator semigroups: growth bounds, essential compactness, and asynchronous exponential growth*, Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems, 4 (1998), pp. 735–764.
- [49] H. R. THIEME, *Spectral bound and reproduction number for infinite-dimensional population structure and time heterogeneity*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 70 (2009), pp. 188–211.
- [50] M. J. WONHAM, T. DE CAMINO-BECK, AND M. A. LEWIS, *An epidemiological model for west nile virus: Invasion analysis and control applications*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B, 271 (2004), pp. 501–507.
- [51] R. WU AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *Spatial invasion of a birth pulse population with nonlocal dispersal*, SIAM J. Appl. Math., 79 (2019), pp. 1075–1097.
- [52] R. WU AND X.-Q. ZHAO, *The evolution dynamics of an impulsive hybrid population model with spatial heterogeneity*, Commun. Nonlinear Sci. Numer. Simul., 107 (2022), Paper No. 106181, 15 pp.
- [53] X.-Q. ZHAO, *Dynamical systems in population biology*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2017.