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#### Abstract

In this note, we derive the stability of various monostable traveling waves in two different classes of three-species competition systems. This includes cases of three weak competitors and two-weak-one-strong competitors.


## 1. Introduction

In this note, we consider the following three-species diffusive competition system

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(u_{i}\right)_{t}=\left(u_{i}\right)_{x x}+u_{i} g_{i}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right), x \in \mathbb{R}, t>0, i=1,2,3 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
g_{1}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right):=r_{1}\left(1-u_{1}-a_{2} u_{2}-a_{3} u_{3}\right),  \tag{1.2}\\
g_{2}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right):=r_{2}\left(1-b_{1} u_{1}-u_{2}-b_{3} u_{3}\right), \\
g_{3}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right):=r_{3}\left(1-c_{1} u_{1}-c_{2} u_{2}-u_{3}\right)
\end{array}\right.
$$

in which the positive parameters $r_{i}, i=1,2,3$, denote the intrinsic growth rates, and $a_{j}, b_{k}, c_{l}$ are the inter-specific competition coefficients of three species with densities $u_{i}, i=1,2,3$. Here we assume all species have the same diffusivities 1 and the carrying capacity of each species is normalized to be 1 which can be done by taking a suitable scaling.

Suppose that (1.1) has two different constant equilibria $\left\{E_{\mp}\right\}$ such that $E_{-}$is unstable and $E_{+}$is stable in the ODE sense. A monostable traveling wave of (1.1) connecting $E_{-}$ and $E_{+}$is a solution $u$ of (1.1) such that

$$
u_{i}(x, t)=\phi_{i}(z), z:=x+s t, i=1,2,3,
$$

for some positive constant $s$ (the wave speed) and function $\Phi:=\left(\phi_{1}, \phi_{2}, \phi_{3}\right)$ (the wave profile) satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Phi(-\infty)=E_{-}, \Phi(\infty)=E_{+} \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Then it is easy to see that $\{s, \Phi\}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{i}^{\prime \prime}(z)-s \phi_{i}^{\prime}(z)+\phi_{i} g_{i}(\Phi(z))=0, z \in \mathbb{R}, i=1,2,3 \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the existence of traveling waves in competition systems and non-cooperative systems, we refer the reader to, e.g., $[2,3,4,5]$. In particular, in the case of three weak competitors such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}+a_{3}<1, b_{1}+b_{3}<1, c_{1}+c_{2}<1 \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

there exist a unique positive co-existence state $E_{*}:=\left(u_{*}, v_{*}, w_{*}\right)$, with $u_{*}, v_{*}, w_{*} \in(0,1)$, the semi-coexistence state $E_{c}:=\left(0, v_{c}, w_{c}\right)=\left(0,\left(1-b_{3}\right) /\left(1-b_{3} c_{2}\right),\left(1-c_{2}\right) /\left(1-b_{3} c_{2}\right)\right)$, and the state $E_{3}:=(0,0,1)$. It is easy to see that both $E_{3}$ and $E_{c}$ are unstable, while $E_{*}$ is stable in the ODE sense. Recall from [3] that (1.1) has a positive traveling wave connecting $E_{-}=E_{3}$ and $E_{+}=E_{*}$ if and only if $s \geq 2 \sqrt{r_{1}\left(1-a_{3}\right)}$, provided

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{2}\left(1-b_{3}\right)=r_{1}\left(1-a_{3}\right) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

While, (1.1) has a positive traveling wave connecting $E_{-}=E_{c}$ and $E_{+}=E_{*}$ if and only if $s \geq 2 \sqrt{r_{1} \beta}, \beta:=1-a_{2} v_{c}-a_{3} w_{c}$, provided

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{1} \beta \geq \max \left\{r_{2}\left(b_{1}+b_{3} c_{2} v_{c}\right), r_{3}\left[c_{1}+c_{2}\left(1-v_{c}\right)\right]\right\} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, for the case of two weak and one strong competitors, under the assumption

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}+a_{3}<1, b_{3}, c_{2}<1, b_{1} \geq 1 / a_{2}, c_{1} \geq 1 / a_{3} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

by $[2,3]$, (1.1) has a positive traveling wave connecting $E_{-}=E_{3}=(0,0,1)$ and $E_{+}=E_{1}:=$ $(1,0,0)$ if and only if $s \geq 2 \sqrt{r_{1}\left(1-a_{3}\right)}$, provided

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{2}\left(1-b_{3}\right)=r_{1}\left(1-a_{3}\right) \geq r_{3}\left(c_{1}+c_{2}-1\right)_{+} . \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

While, (1.1) has a positive traveling wave connecting $E_{-}=E_{c}$ and $E_{+}=E_{1}$ if and only if $s \geq 2 \sqrt{r_{1} \beta}$, provided (1.7) is enforced.

The aim of this paper is to derive the stability of these traveling waves. For the study of stability of traveling waves in non-cooperative systems using the Evans function's approach, we refer the reader to, e.g., $[7,8]$, and the references cited in [6]. Recently, by a very fundamental method, a stability theorem was proved in [6] for general reaction-diffusion systems with equal diffusivities. In [6], an application of this general theorem to derive the stability of traveling waves in various predator-prey systems was given.

Let $\mathcal{I}:=[0,1]^{3}$. Suppose that there exists a set of positive constants $\left\{\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right\}$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_{i}\left(u_{i}-v_{i}\right)\left\{g_{i}\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right)-g_{i}\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right)\right\} \leq 0, \forall\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right),\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right) \in \mathcal{I} \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then a distance function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{K}[U]:=\sum_{i=1}^{3} \sigma_{i} \mathcal{K}_{i}\left[U_{i}\right], \quad \mathcal{K}_{i}\left[U_{i}\right]:=U_{i}-\phi_{i}-\phi_{i} \ln \frac{U_{i}}{\phi_{i}}, \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

is defined for any positive function $U=\left(U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right): \mathbb{R} \mapsto(0, \infty)^{3}$. Note that $\mathcal{K}[U](z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{K}[U](z)=0$ if and only if $U(z)=\Phi(z)$ for some $z \in \mathbb{R}$. For a positive constant $R$, we let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=\lambda(s ; R):=\frac{s-\sqrt{s^{2}-4 R}}{2}, s \geq 2 \sqrt{R} . \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Also, using the moving coordinate $z=x+s t$, (1.1) is re-written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(u_{i}\right)_{t}=\left(u_{i}\right)_{z z}-s\left(u_{i}\right)_{z}+u_{i} g_{i}(u), z \in \mathbb{R}, t>0, i=1,2,3 \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

hereafter $u=u(z, t):=\left(u_{1}(z, t), u_{2}(z, t), u_{3}(z, t)\right)$.
Then we have the following two stability theorems.
Theorem 1. Assume, in addition to (1.5), that either $a_{2} b_{3} c_{1}=a_{3} b_{1} c_{2}$ or

$$
a_{2}+b_{1}+a_{3}+c_{1} \leq 2, a_{2}+b_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2} \leq 2, a_{3}+c_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2} \leq 2
$$

Let $\Phi$ be a positive traveling wave of (1.1) connecting $E_{-} \in\left\{(0,0,1),\left(0, v_{c}, w_{c}\right)\right\}$ and $E_{+}=$ $E_{*}$ with wave speed $s \geq 2 \sqrt{R}$, where $R:=\max \left\{r_{1}, r_{2}, r_{3}\right\}$. Then $\{s, \Phi\}$ is stable in the sense that $u(z, t) \rightarrow \Phi(z)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ for any solution $u$ of (1.13) with initial data $u_{0}$ at $t=0$ satisfying $e^{-\lambda z} \mathcal{K}\left[u_{0}\right] \in L^{1}(\mathbb{R})$, where $\lambda=\lambda(s ; R)$ is defined in (1.12) and the constants $\left\{\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right\}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{K}$ in (1.11) are chosen so that (1.10) holds.

Theorem 2. Assume, in addition to (1.8), that $a_{2} b_{1}=1=a_{3} c_{1}$ and

$$
2 a_{2} a_{3}=a_{2}^{2} b_{3}+a_{3}^{2} c_{2}
$$

Let $\Phi$ be a positive traveling wave of (1.1) connecting $E_{-} \in\left\{(0,0,1),\left(0, v_{c}, w_{c}\right)\right\}$ and $E_{+}=$ $E_{1}$ with wave speed $s \geq 2 \sqrt{R}$, where $R:=\max \left\{r_{1}, r_{2}, r_{3}\right\}$. Then $\{s, \Phi\}$ is stable in the sense described in Theorem 1.

In fact, Theorems 1 and 2 follow from an application of the general theorem [6, Theorem 1.1]. We make some remarks on the perturbation of initial data as follows. At the stable tail of traveling wave, i.e., $z=\infty$, the perturbation is allowed to be arbitrarily large due to condition $e^{-\lambda z} \mathcal{K}\left[u_{0}\right] \in L^{1}(\mathbb{R})$. Note that $\lambda>0$. However, at the unstable tail $(z=-\infty)$, the perturbation can only be made with decay rate faster than $e^{\lambda z}$. This is a typical phenomenon in the stability of monostable waves in many reaction-diffusion systems, including their discrete analogues. Note that the exponent $\lambda$ is a function of the wave speed $s$.

In applying [6, Theorem 1.1], we first note that the constant $R$ is defined by

$$
\max _{1 \leq i \leq 3} \sup _{z \in \mathbb{R}}\left\{g_{i}(\Phi(z))\right\} \leq R .
$$

Hence $R=\max \left\{r_{1}, r_{2}, r_{3}\right\}$ by using $\phi_{i} \geq 0$ for all $i$. Therefore, to prove Theorems 1 and 2 , all we need to do is to find some conditions on the parameters in (1.2) along with a suitable set of constants $\left\{\sigma_{1}, \sigma_{2}, \sigma_{3}\right\}$ such that (1.10) holds. The verification of (1.10) is given in the next section. The main contribution of this note is providing some conditions on the parameters in (1.2) to ensure the stability of traveling waves in competition systems. The importance of this work is that these stability results can be proved by a very simple method without any hard work on spectral analysis.

Note that $R>r_{1}\left(1-a_{3}\right)$ and $R>r_{1} \beta$. The stability of wave with speed $s<2 \sqrt{R}$ is still left open. In fact, the stability of wave with speed $s<2 \sqrt{R}$ can be proved if one can derive sharper lower bounds for wave profiles. We also remark that the conditions on the parameters in (1.2) imposed in Theorems 1 and 2 may not be optimal. The stability and instability of traveling waves for the other cases are still left open.

## 2. Verification of (1.10)

For notational convenience, we let

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
u:=\left(u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right), v:=\left(v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right), I:=-\sum_{i=1}^{3}\left\{\sigma_{i}\left(u_{i}-v_{i}\right)\left[g_{i}(u)-g_{i}(v)\right]\right\} \\
X:=u_{1}-v_{1}, Y:=u_{2}-v_{2}, Z:=u_{3}-v_{3}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Then $I$ is computed as

$$
\begin{align*}
I= & {[X, Y, Z] B\left[\begin{array}{l}
X \\
Y \\
Z
\end{array}\right]=\sigma_{1} r_{1} X^{2}+\sigma_{2} r_{2} Y^{2}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} Z^{2} } \\
& +\left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{2}+\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{1}\right) X Y+\left(\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{2}\right) Y Z+\left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{1}\right) X Z \tag{2.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
B:=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
\sigma_{1} r_{1} & \left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{2}+\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{1}\right) / 2 & \left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{1}\right) / 2 \\
\left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{2}+\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{1}\right) / 2 & \sigma_{2} r_{2} & \left(\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{2}\right) / 2 \\
\left(\sigma_{1} r_{1} a_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{1}\right) / 2 & \left(\sigma_{2} r_{2} b_{3}+\sigma_{3} r_{3} c_{2}\right) / 2 & \sigma_{3} r_{3}
\end{array}\right] .
$$

Our task is to find some conditions on parameters in (1.2) and a suitable set of $\left\{\sigma_{i}\right\}$ so that (1.10) holds, i.e., $I \geq 0$. This is also equivalent to find some conditions on parameters in (1.2) and positive constants $\left\{\sigma_{i}\right\}$ such that the matrix $B$ is symmetric positive semi-definite.

### 2.1. Three weak competitors.

Case 1. $a_{2} b_{3} c_{1}=a_{3} b_{1} c_{2}$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{a_{2} b_{3}}{b_{1}}=\frac{a_{3} c_{2}}{c_{1}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

With (1.5) and the choice

$$
\sigma_{1}=\frac{1}{r_{1}}, \sigma_{2}=\frac{a_{2}}{r_{2} b_{1}}, \sigma_{3}=\frac{a_{3}}{r_{3} c_{1}},
$$

we obtain from (2.1) and (2.2) that $I \geq 0$, since by using (2.2) we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
I= & \left(1-a_{2}-a_{3}\right) X^{2}+\frac{a_{2}}{b_{1}}\left(1-b_{1}-b_{3}\right) Y^{2}+\frac{a_{3}}{c_{1}}\left(1-c_{1}-c_{2}\right) Z^{2} \\
& +a_{2}(X+Y)^{2}+a_{3}(X+Z)^{2}+\frac{a_{2} b_{3}}{b_{1}}(Y+Z)^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Case 2. condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{2}+b_{1}+a_{3}+c_{1} \leq 2, a_{2}+b_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2} \leq 2, a_{3}+c_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2} \leq 2 \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is enforced. Setting $\sigma_{i}=1 / r_{i}, i=1,2,3$, we obtain from (2.1) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
I & =X^{2}+Y^{2}+Z^{2}+\left(a_{2}+b_{1}\right) X Y+\left(a_{3}+c_{1}\right) X Z+\left(b_{3}+c_{2}\right) Y Z \\
B & =\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & \left(a_{2}+b_{1}\right) / 2 & \left(a_{3}+c_{1}\right) / 2 \\
\left(a_{2}+b_{1}\right) / 2 & 1 & \left(b_{3}+c_{2}\right) / 2 \\
\left(a_{3}+c_{1}\right) / 2 & \left(b_{3}+c_{2}\right) / 2 & 1
\end{array}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence $I \geq 0$ under condition (2.3), by Gerschgorin's Theorem [1]. Indeed, we can write $I$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
I= & \frac{a_{2}+b_{1}}{2}(X+Y)^{2}+\frac{a_{3}+c_{1}}{2}(X+Z)^{2}+\frac{b_{3}+c_{2}}{2}(Y+Z)^{2}+\left[1-\frac{a_{2}+b_{1}+a_{3}+c_{1}}{2}\right] X^{2} \\
& +\left[1-\frac{a_{2}+b_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2}}{2}\right] Y^{2}+\left[1-\frac{a_{3}+c_{1}+b_{3}+c_{2}}{2}\right] Z^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

so that $I \geq 0$, if condition (2.3) holds. Thereby, Theorem 1 is proved.

### 2.2. Two weak and one strong competitors.

This case is more delicate. Recall from the fundamental theory of linear algebra that $B$ is symmetric positive semi-definite if and only if all principal minors of $B$ are nonnegative.

First, we take $\sigma_{1}=1 / r_{1}$. Then the symmetric positive semi-definiteness of $B$ requires

$$
\begin{equation*}
r_{2}^{2} b_{1}^{2} \sigma_{2}^{2}-2 r_{2}\left(2-a_{2} b_{1}\right) \sigma_{2}+a_{2}^{2} \leq 0 . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, in order to have some $\sigma_{2}>0$ such that (2.4) holds, we need

$$
\begin{equation*}
2-a_{2} b_{1}>0 \text { and }\left(2-a_{2} b_{1}\right)^{2} \geq a_{2}^{2} b_{1}^{2} \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since (2.5) holds if and only if $a_{2} b_{1} \leq 1$, we obtain from condition $a_{2} b_{1} \geq 1$ in (1.8) that $a_{2} b_{1}=1$ and so, by (2.4),

$$
\sigma_{2} r_{2}=\frac{a_{2}}{b_{1}}=a_{2}^{2}
$$

Next, since the symmetric positive semi-definiteness of $B$ also requires

$$
r_{3}^{2} c_{1}^{2} \sigma_{3}^{2}-2 r_{3}\left(2-a_{3} c_{1}\right) \sigma_{3}+a_{3}^{2} \leq 0
$$

a similar argument as before implies that we must have $a_{3} c_{1}=1$ and

$$
\sigma_{3} r_{3}=\frac{a_{3}}{c_{1}}=a_{3}^{2}
$$

It follows that

$$
B=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & a_{2} & a_{3} \\
a_{2} & a_{2}^{2} & \left(a_{2}^{2} b_{3}+a_{3}^{2} c_{2}\right) / 2 \\
a_{3} & \left(a_{2}^{2} b_{3}+a_{3}^{2} c_{2}\right) / 2 & a_{3}^{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Note that

$$
\operatorname{det}(B)=-\left[a_{2} a_{3}-\left(a_{2}^{2} b_{3}+a_{3}^{2} c_{2}\right) / 2\right]^{2}
$$

Hence all eigenvalues of $B$ are nonnegative if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 a_{2} a_{3}=a_{2}^{2} b_{3}+a_{3}^{2} c_{2} \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall from (1.8) that $b_{3}, c_{2} \in(0,1)$. To see (2.6) is admissible for some $\left\{b_{3}, c_{2}\right\} \in(0,1)$, we consider, e.g., $a_{3}=2 a_{2}$. Then (2.6) is equivalent to $b_{3}+4 c_{2}=4$, which can be achieved when we choose $c_{2} \in(3 / 4,1)$ and $b_{3}=4\left(1-c_{2}\right)$.

Now, using (2.6), $B$ can be re-written as

$$
B=\left[\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & a_{2} & a_{3} \\
a_{2} & a_{2}^{2} & a_{2} a_{3} \\
a_{3} & a_{2} a_{3} & a_{3}^{2}
\end{array}\right]
$$

It is easy to see that $B$ has the eigenvalues $\left\{0,0,1+a_{2}^{2}+a_{3}^{2}\right\}$ with the corresponding orthogonal eigenvectors

$$
\left[0,-a_{3}, a_{2}\right]^{T},\left[-\left(a_{2}^{2}+a_{3}^{2}\right), a_{2}, a_{3}\right]^{T},\left[1, a_{2}, a_{3}\right]^{T} .
$$

We conclude that $I \geq 0$, under the assumptions (1.8), $a_{2} b_{3}=1=a_{3} c_{1}$ and (2.6), with

$$
\sigma_{1}=1 / r_{1}, \sigma_{2}=a_{2}^{2} / r_{2}, \sigma_{3}=a_{3}^{2} / r_{3}
$$

In fact, we have $I=\left(X+a_{2} Y+a_{3} Z\right)^{2}$. This proves Theorem 2 .
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