

This article was downloaded by: [Ackleh, Azmy S.]

On: 12 October 2008

Access details: Access Details: [subscription number 903562394]

Publisher Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Journal of Biological Dynamics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t744398444>

Discrete three-stage population model: persistence and global stability results

Azmy S. Ackleh^a; Patrick De Leenheer^b

^a Department of Mathematics, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA, USA ^b Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Online Publication Date: 01 October 2008

To cite this Article Ackleh, Azmy S. and De Leenheer, Patrick(2008)'Discrete three-stage population model: persistence and global stability results',Journal of Biological Dynamics,2:4,415 — 427

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/17513750802001812

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513750802001812>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.informaworld.com/terms-and-conditions-of-access.pdf>

This article may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Discrete three-stage population model: persistence and global stability results

Azmy S. Ackleh^{a*} and Patrick De Leenheer^b

^a*Department of Mathematics, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, LA, USA;*

^b*Department of Mathematics, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA*

(Received 10 October 2007; final revision received 20 February 2008)

A general three-stage discrete-time population model is studied. The inherent net reproductive number for this model is derived. Global stability of the origin is established provided that the inherent net reproductive number is less than one. If it is larger than one the existence of a unique positive fixed point is proved and the persistence of the system is established. Finally, for certain parameter ranges global stability of the positive fixed point is proved.

Keywords: discrete three-stage model; extinction; persistence; global stability

AMS Subject Classifications: 92D25; 39A11

1. Introduction

Linear and nonlinear matrix models have played a central role in understanding the dynamics of many populations (see [5,11] and the reference therein) including endangered species [4], invasive species [19], and such with rich dynamical behaviour. A recent well-known similar model is the nonlinear discrete three-stage LPA model developed in [7] to describe the dynamics of a flour beetle population. The nonlinearities in this model account for the cannibalism of eggs by both larvae and adults and the cannibalism of pupae by adults and are of the Ricker type [3,5]. The resulting deterministic model and its stochastic counterparts were very successful in predicting experimentally observed dynamics of flour beetles including cyclic and chaotic behaviour [8–10,13]. This work has enriched the literature with yet another example of the predictive power of such models.

The purpose of this paper is to theoretically study a matrix model which describes the dynamics of a general closed (no immigration or migration) population composed of individuals having one of the following three stages: (1) juveniles, (2) sexually immature adults (non-breeders), and (3) reproductive adults (breeders). In addition, it is assumed that juveniles depend on different resources than adults. Thus, no competition for resources takes place between them. Such life

*Corresponding author. Email: ackleh@louisiana.edu

history is typical of amphibians where larvae which are called tadpoles metamorphose into adults, where the adults are composed of sexually immature and mature individuals. Also, for many amphibians tadpoles are herbivorous, while adults are carnivorous. Thus, juveniles and adults depend on different resources. A particular amphibian example which motivated this theoretical study is the green tree frog (*Hyla cinerea*), which we have been monitoring since 2004 [18].

Stage-structured models similar to the one presented here have been applied recently to describe the dynamics of amphibian populations [23]. The model presented in [23] assumes that the population is divided into two stages, namely juveniles and adults. In contrast with the three-dimensional matrix model considered here, such a simplifying assumption results in a two-dimensional nonlinear matrix population model, which is related to a general class of juvenile-adult models studied recently in [12]. The model in [23] was applied to two amphibian species *Bufo boreas* and *Ambystoma macrodactylum* with different reproductive strategies (the former species has a clutch size more than 100 times larger than the latter one). Local stability of the interior equilibrium was established and elasticity analysis was used to determine the most influential stage-survival rate on amphibian declines, a problem which was extensively discussed in [6,22].

In contrast with a two-dimensional counterpart, the (Beverton–Holt type) nonlinearities in the three-dimensional model presented here – which are due to competition between sexually mature and immature adults – generally lead to a non-monotone discrete dynamical system. For monotone systems, global stability can often be established, thanks to the availability of a well-developed theory, see [20] and cited references therein for a review. Non-monotone systems on the other hand lack a similar theory, and their global stability analysis is therefore usually more complicated. Our approach will be as follows. We first note that for a particular choice of some of the parameters in the model, the system is monotone, and global stability can be established. Secondly, we show that when the parameters are perturbed slightly away from their above critical values, global stability is preserved despite the fact that the perturbation destroys the monotonicity of the model.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the discrete model. In Section 3, we prove persistence for the general model and provide an existence–uniqueness result for an interior fixed point. In Sections 4 and 5 we establish global stability results for special cases of the model. Finally, concluding remarks are provided in Section 6.

2. The discrete model

As mentioned above, the discrete model we consider describes the dynamics of a population divided into three stages, where juveniles compete for one resource while non-breeders and breeders compete for another. The model is given by the following system of difference equations:

$$\begin{aligned} J(t+1) &= bB(t) + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J(t))J(t) \\ N(t+1) &= \gamma_1s_1(J(t))J(t) + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) \\ B(t+1) &= \gamma_2s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) + s_2(N(t) + B(t))B(t). \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The state variables $J(t)$, $N(t)$ and $B(t)$ represent the number of juveniles, non-breeders, and breeders, respectively, at time t . The parameter $b > 0$ is the birth rate, while $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1)$ represent the fraction (in one time unit) of juveniles that become non-breeders and non-breeders that become breeders, respectively. The functions s_1 and s_2 are the survivorship functions of juveniles (tadpoles) and non-breeders/breeders (adults), respectively. We assume that $s_i, i = 1, 2$,

satisfy the following assumption:

$$(\Sigma 1) \quad s_i \in C^1[0, \infty), s_i(0) = a_i, 0 < a_i < 1, \frac{d}{dz} s_i(z) < 0, \frac{d}{dz} (s_i(z)z) > 0, \\ \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} s_i(z) = 0, \text{ and } \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} s_i(z)z = \hat{a}_i < \infty \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

The assumption $(\Sigma 1)$ is satisfied, for example, by the following Beverton–Holt function:

$$s_i(z) = \frac{a_i}{1 + k_i z}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The above difference equation system (1) can be written in the following matrix form:

$$x(t + 1) = A(x(t))x(t), \tag{2}$$

where $x(t) = (J(t), N(t), B(t))^T$ and the projection matrix A has the form

$$A(x) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J) & 0 & b \\ \gamma_1 s_1(J) & (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N + B) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 s_2(N + B) & s_2(N + B) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that

$$x \leq y, \text{ implies } A(y) \leq A(x). \tag{3}$$

Here vector and matrix inequalities hold componentwise.

3. Existence–uniqueness of interior fixed point and persistence

In this section, we prove the existence of a unique interior fixed point for the model (1) and show that the system is persistent. We begin by finding the inherent net reproductive number. To this end, following [5,11] we let

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma_1)a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \gamma_1 a_1 & (1 - \gamma_2)a_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 a_2 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the inherent projection matrix of the nonlinear system

$$A(0) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma_1)a_1 & 0 & b \\ \gamma_1 a_1 & (1 - \gamma_2)a_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2 a_2 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} = F + G.$$

Thus, the inherent net reproductive number R_0 is the positive, simple, and strictly dominant eigenvalue of $F(I - G)^{-1}$. Simple calculations show that

$$R_0 = \frac{b\gamma_1\gamma_2 a_1 a_2}{(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)a_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)a_2)(1 - a_2)}. \tag{4}$$

When necessary we will use the notation $A(0, (\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$ and $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ to indicate the dependency of $A(0)$ and R_0 on γ_1 and γ_2 . We now have the following result:

LEMMA 1 *If $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) < 1$, then the origin $E_0 = (0, 0, 0)$ is a globally asymptotically stable fixed point of system (1).*

Proof Since the inherent projection matrix, $A(0)$, of system (2) is non-negative, irreducible, and primitive, it has a positive, simple, and strictly dominant eigenvalue r . Furthermore, since $R_0 < 1$, it follows from [11] (Theorem 1.1.3, p. 10) that $r < 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} A^t(0) = 0$. Now, for any $x(0)$ we have that $0 \leq x(1) = A(x(0))x(0) \leq A(0)x(0)$ by (3), and repeating this we get that $0 \leq x(t) \leq A^t(0)x(0)$. Since $A^t(x(0))x(0)$ converges to 0 as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the conclusion follows. ■

We now establish the existence and uniqueness of an interior fixed point as follows:

THEOREM 1 *If $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$, then (1) has a unique interior fixed point $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$.*

Proof A positive fixed point of (1) is a point $(J^*, N^*, B^*) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} J &= bB + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J)J \\ N &= \gamma_1s_1(J)J + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N + B)N \\ B &= \gamma_2s_2(N + B)N + s_2(N + B)B. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

From the first equation in (5) we get

$$h(J) := (1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J))J = bB.$$

It is easy to see that $h'(J) > 0$, $h(0) = 0$, and $\lim_{J \rightarrow \infty} h(J) = \infty$. Thus, $h : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is one to one and onto. Therefore, $J(B) = h^{-1}(bB)$. Furthermore, $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} J(B) = \infty$, $J(0) = 0$, and $J'(B) > 0$. Observe also that

$$J = \frac{bB}{1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J)}. \tag{6}$$

Now letting $W = N + B$ and adding the second and the third equations of (5), we get

$$W = N + B = \gamma_1s_1(J)J + s_2(N + B)(N + B) = \gamma_1s_1(J)J + s_2(W)W.$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{h}(W) := (1 - s_2(W))W = \gamma_1s_1(J)J.$$

Therefore, noticing that $\tilde{h}'(W) > 0$ by $(\Sigma 1)$ and arguing as above, we get that W can be solved as a function of B . In particular, $W(B) = \tilde{h}^{-1}(\gamma_1s_1(J(B))J(B))$ and $W(0) = 0$. Furthermore, using $(\Sigma 1)$ once again it follows by implicit differentiation that $W'(B) > 0$.

Using the notation $s_1(J) = s_1$ and $s_2(W) = s_2$ we get from adding the second and third equations of (5)

$$N(1 - s_2) = \gamma_1 s_1 J + (s_2 - 1)B.$$

Solving for N yields

$$N = \frac{\gamma_1 s_1 J + (s_2 - 1)B}{1 - s_2}. \tag{7}$$

Plugging the equations (6) and (7) for J and N into the B equation of (5) results in

$$B = \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s_2 b B}{(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)} + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2 B$$

Since we are interested in the existence and uniqueness of a positive equilibrium dividing by B we obtain

$$1 = \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s_2 b}{(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)} + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s_2 b + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(1 - s_2) + s_2 + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) \\ &= \hat{H}(J(B), W(B)) := H(B). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Clearly, any interior equilibrium must satisfy (8).

Now differentiating $H(B)$ with respect to B we see that

$$\begin{aligned} H' &= \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s'_1 J' s_2 b + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s'_2 W' b + s'_1 J'(1 - s_2)(1 - \gamma_1) - s'_2 W'(1 - \gamma_1)s_1 + s'_2 W' \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma_2)s'_2 W'(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2 s'_2 W'(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) \\ &\quad - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(1 - s_2)(1 - \gamma_1)s'_1 J' \\ &= \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s'_1 J' s_2 b + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s'_2 W' b + s'_1 J'(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2) \\ &\quad + s'_2 W'(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) - (1 - \gamma_2)s'_2 W' s_2(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) \\ &\quad + (1 - \gamma_2)s'_2 W'(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) \\ &= \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s'_1 J' s_2 b + \gamma_1 \gamma_2 s_1 s'_2 W' b + s'_1 J'(1 - \gamma_1)(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2) \\ &\quad + s'_2 W'(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2) + (1 - \gamma_2)s'_2 W'(1 - s_2)(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

since $J' > 0$, $W' > 0$ and $s'_i < 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Therefore, H is a decreasing function. Also note that $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} H(B) = 0$. Thus, it follows that if $H(0) > 1$ then there exists a unique B^* such that $1 = H(B^*)$. (Clearly, $H(0) > 1$ is equivalent to $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$). From this and the above established relations between W , J , and B it follows that there exists a unique interior equilibrium $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$. ■

The next result establishes boundedness of solutions, uniformly in the parameters.

LEMMA 2 *There is a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}_+^3$ such that every forward solution sequence of (1) enters K in at most two time steps, and remains in K forever after.*

Proof It is clear that \mathbb{R}_+^3 is forward invariant. Consider now the dynamics of

$$W(t + 1) = N(t + 1) + B(t + 1),$$

then from $(\Sigma 1)$ we have

$$W(t + 1) = \gamma_1 s_1(J(t))J(t) + s_2(W(t))W(t) \leq \gamma_1 \hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2 \leq \hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2, \quad \forall t = 0, 1, \dots,$$

so that in particular

$$N(t), B(t) \leq \hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2, \quad \forall t = 1, 2, \dots$$

Therefore

$$J(t + 1) \leq b(\hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2) + (1 - \gamma_1)\hat{a}_1, \quad \forall t = 1, 2, \dots,$$

hence

$$J(t) \leq (b + 1)\hat{a}_1 + b\hat{a}_2, \quad \forall t = 2, 3, \dots$$

The conclusion of the lemma follows by defining

$$K = \{(J, N, B) \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \mid J \in [0, (b + 1)\hat{a}_1 + b\hat{a}_2], N, B \in [0, \hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2]\}.$$

■

Next, we show that if the net reproductive number is greater than one, then the origin is unstable and system (1) is uniformly persistent.

THEOREM 2 *If $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$, then (1) has an unstable fixed point at the origin. Moreover, (1) is uniformly persistent.*

Proof Since $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$ it follows from Theorem 1.1.3 in [11] that $A(0)$ has a positive strictly dominant eigenvalue $r > 1$. This shows that the origin is unstable. Uniform persistence will follow from an application of Theorem 4.1 in [16]. Using the notation of that paper, we let $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}_+^3$, $\mathcal{Y} = \text{bd}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$, and f denote the map on the right hand side of (1). Then clearly $f(\mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{Y}) \subset \mathcal{H} \setminus \mathcal{Y}$ since $\text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ is positively invariant for system (1). By Theorem 2.1 in [15] and using Lemma 2, it follows that there exists a global attractor X in \mathcal{H} . Let M be the maximal compact invariant set in \mathcal{Y} . Here, $M = \{(0, 0, 0)\}$. Uniform persistence follows if we can prove that

1. M is isolated in X .
2. $W^s(M) \subset \mathcal{Y}$,

where $W^s(M)$, the stable set of M , denotes the set of points whose solution sequence for (1) converges to M . In fact, we will prove the stronger result that M is a repeller which by Theorem 2.1 in [16] is equivalent to showing

1. M is isolated in \mathcal{H} .
2. $W^s(M) \subset M$.

To prove that M is a repeller, we will construct a continuous function $P : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is 0 on M . Furthermore, there is a neighbourhood U/M such that for all $x \in U/M$, there exists a $t > 0$, where $P(f^t(x)) > P(x)$. Let us now construct P . Since $A(0)$ is non-negative and irreducible, its

dominant eigenvalue r (which is larger than 1) has a corresponding left eigenvector $p > 0$, *i.e.*,

$$p'A(0) = rp'.$$

Pick $r^* \in (1, r)$ such that $p'A(0) - r^*p' > 0$. Then by continuity of $A(x)$, there exists a neighbourhood U of M in \mathcal{H} such that

$$p'A(x) - r^*p' > 0.$$

Define $P : \mathbb{R}_+^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as follows:

$$P(x) = p'x.$$

Then $P(x) = 0$ for $x \in U$ iff $x \in M$, and positive elsewhere in U . Moreover,

$$P(f(x)) = p'A(x)x > r^*p'x > P(x), \quad \forall x \in U \setminus M.$$

This establishes that system (1) is uniformly persistent, *i.e.*, there is some $\eta > 0$ such that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} J(t), N(t), B(t) \geq \eta$

$$\inf_{t \rightarrow \infty} J(t), N(t), B(t) \geq \eta$$

for all non-zero orbits in \mathbb{R}_+^3 . ■

4. Global stability for the case $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$

Throughout this section we assume that $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$. We begin by establishing a convergence result for monotone maps. Consider a map $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. We say that T is monotone if $x \leq y$ implies that $T(x) \leq T(y)$.

LEMMA 3 *Let $T : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous, monotone map and $a \leq b$ be points in \mathbb{R}^n . If $a \leq T(a)$ and $T(b) \leq b$, and if T has a unique fixed point x^* in the order interval $[a, b] := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n | a \leq x \leq b\}$, then every solution sequence of the discrete system*

$$x(t + 1) = T(x(t)), \tag{9}$$

starting in $[a, b]$, converges to x .

Proof Note that the assumptions on T imply that

$$a \leq T(a) \leq T(b) \leq b,$$

so by induction the solutions sequences starting in a and b are non-decreasing and non-increasing, respectively. Since they also remain in the compact set $[a, b]$, they must converge, and since T is continuous, the limits must be fixed points of T in $[a, b]$. As there is only one fixed point x^* in $[a, b]$, both limits are the same and equal to x^* . Now for an arbitrary $x \in [a, b]$, we have that $a \leq x \leq b$, hence monotonicity of T implies that $T^k(a) \leq T^k(x) \leq T^k(b)$ for all $k = 1, 2, \dots$. This, and the fact that $T^k(a), T^k(b) \rightarrow x^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$, implies that $T^k(x) \rightarrow x^*$, concluding the proof. ■

The inherent net reproductive number for the case $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$ is given by

$$R_0(1, 1) = \frac{ba_1a_2}{1 - a_2}. \tag{10}$$

If $R_0 > 1$ then by Theorem 1 there exists a unique positive equilibrium $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$, where B^* solves (8) (see proof of Theorem 1), which here simplifies to

$$1 = bs_2(s_1(bB)bB + B)s_1(bB) + s_2(s_1(bB)bB + B), \tag{11}$$

$J^* = bB^*$, and $N^* = s_1(J^*)J^*$. We sometimes write $E^*(1, 1)$ to denote the unique positive fixed point for the case $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$.

LEMMA 4 *Let $R_0(1, 1) = ba_1a_2/(1 - a_2) > 1$. Then, the unique positive fixed point $E^*(1, 1) = (J^*(1, 1), N^*(1, 1), B^*(1, 1))$ of system (1) is locally asymptotically stable.*

Proof Let $W^* = N^* + B^*$. The linearized system at (J^*, N^*, B^*) has the following coefficient matrix:

$$A^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & b \\ A_{21}^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A_{32}^* & A_{33}^* \end{pmatrix},$$

where $A_{21}^* = s_1'(J^*)J^* + s_1(J^*)$, and $A_{32}^* = A_{33}^* = s_2'(W^*)W^* + s_2(W^*)$. The characteristic polynomial associated with this matrix is given by $Q(s) = s^3 - A_{33}^*s^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^* = 0$. In the following, we shall verify that the following three Jury conditions [3] hold and conclude that the roots of this polynomial have magnitude less than 1:

$$(1)Q(1) > 0, (2)Q(-1) < 0, \text{ and } (3)1 - b^2(A_{21}^*)^2(A_{32}^*)^2 - |bA_{33}^*A_{21}^*A_{32}^*| > 0.$$

To this end, observe that $A_{21}^* > 0$, $A_{32}^* > 0$, and $A_{33}^* > 0$ by our assumption $(\Sigma 1)$. Since B^* satisfies (11), $J^* = bB^*$, and $N^* = s_1(J^*)J^*$, we have by (11) that

$$1 = bs_2(W^*)s_1(J^*) + s_2(W^*). \tag{12}$$

Substituting the above expression of 1 in $Q(1) = 1 - A_{33}^* - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*$ yields

$$Q(1) = -s_2'(W^*)W^* - bs_1'(J^*)J^*s_2(W^*) - bs_2'(W^*)W^*[s_1'(J^*)J^* + s_1(J^*)] > 0.$$

It is also clear that

$$Q(-1) = -1 - A_{33}^* - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^* < 0$$

as $A_{21}^* > 0$, $A_{32}^* > 0$, and $A_{33}^* > 0$. We proceed to verify the last inequality $1 - b^2(A_{21}^*)^2(A_{32}^*)^2 - |bA_{33}^*A_{21}^*A_{32}^*| > 0$, which is equivalent to $\xi := 1 - b^2(A_{21}^*)^2(A_{32}^*)^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*A_{33}^* > 0$. For notational convenience, we replace $s_1(J^*)$ by s_1 and $s_2(W^*)$ by s_2 . Replacing 1 by the square of the right hand side of (11), *i.e.*

$$1 = b^2s_1^2s_2^2 + 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2,$$

then

$$\xi = b^2s_1^2s_2^2 + 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - b^2(A_{21}^*)^2(A_{32}^*)^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*A_{33}^*. \tag{13}$$

Notice $b^2s_1^2s_2^2 - b^2(A_{21}^*)^2(A_{32}^*)^2 = [bs_1s_2 + bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*][bs_1s_2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*]$, where $bs_1s_2 + bA_{21}^*A_{32}^* > 0$, and $bs_1s_2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^* = -bs_1'J^*(s_2'W^* + s_2) - bs_1s_2'W^* > 0$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*A_{33}^* &= 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*s_2'W^* - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*s_2 \\ &> 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bA_{21}^*A_{32}^*s_2 = 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - b(s_1'J^* + s_1)(s_2'W^* + s_2)s_2 \\ &= 2bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bs_1's_2'J^*W^*s_2 - bs_1'J^*s_2^2 - bs_1s_2'W^*s_2 - bs_1s_2^2 \\ &> bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bs_1's_2'J^*W^*s_2 - bs_1'J^*s_2^2 \\ &= bs_1s_2^2 + s_2^2 - bs_1's_2J^*[s_2'W^* + s_2] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\xi > 0$. This completes the proof that E^* is locally asymptotically stable. ■

Next, we prove that if the net reproductive number is larger than 1, then the unique positive fixed point is globally attractive.

THEOREM 3 *Suppose that $R_0(1, 1) = ba_1a_2/(1 - a_2) > 1$. Then every solution of (1) starting in $\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$ converges to $E^*(1, 1) = (J^*(1, 1), N^*(1, 1), B^*(1, 1))$.*

Proof Notice that every solution starting on the boundary of \mathbb{R}_+^3 , but not in $(0, 0, 0)$ enters the positively invariant set $\text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ in at most 2 time steps, so it is enough to establish the lemma for solutions in $\text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. Pick $x(0) = (J(0), N(0), B(0)) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$. In fact, by Lemma 2 it suffices to consider $x(0) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \cap K$. The unique positive fixed point $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$ clearly belongs to K . Define $b := \sup K$ (this is the maximal element in K). Then again by Lemma 2 we have that $T(b) \leq b$ (where $T(x)$ denotes the right hand side of (1), which is clearly monotone since $DT(x)$ is a non-negative matrix for all x). Since $A(0)$ is an irreducible non-negative matrix, its spectral radius r (which we know is larger than 1) is an eigenvalue with a corresponding positive eigenvector v :

$$A(0)v = rv.$$

In addition, for all $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there holds that

$$T(\epsilon v) = r\epsilon v + o(\epsilon) \geq \epsilon v,$$

since $r > 1$. Now for a given $x(0) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3) \cap K$, we can pick a sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$a := \epsilon v \leq x(0) \text{ and } a \leq T(a).$$

The conclusion now follows from an application of Lemma 3. ■

The global asymptotic stability of the unique interior fixed point (J^*, N^*, B^*) follows from Theorem 3 and Lemma 4 (local asymptotic stability and global attractivity).

5. Global stability results for a perturbation around $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 = 1$

We start with an auxiliary result that establishes that the origin is a repeller for (1), uniform in the parameters.

LEMMA 5 *Let $R_0(1, 1) = ba_1a_2/(1 - a_2) > 1$. Then the fixed point at the origin for system (1) is a repeller, uniform in the parameter $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, near $(1, 1)$. More precisely, there is an open neighbourhood \mathcal{N}_0 of 0 in \mathbb{R}_+^3 , and constants $g_i \in (0, 1)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that for every $x(0) \neq 0$ and every $\gamma \in [g_1, 1] \times [g_2, 1]$, there is some $\bar{t} = \bar{t}(x(0), \gamma) \geq 0$ such that*

$$T_\gamma^t(x(0)) \notin \mathcal{N}_0, \quad \forall t \geq \bar{t},$$

where $x(t) = (J(t), N(t), B(t))$, and $T_\gamma(x(t))$ denotes the right hand side of system (1).

Proof The proof will follow from an application of a result due to Fonda – see Corollary 2.2 in [16] – applied to the following extended system:

$$\begin{aligned}
 J(t + 1) &= bB(t) + (1 - \gamma_1(t))s_1(J(t))J(t) \\
 N(t + 1) &= \gamma_1(t)s_1(J(t))J(t) + (1 - \gamma_2(t))s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) \\
 B(t + 1) &= \gamma_2(t)s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) + s_2(N(t) + B(t))B(t) \\
 \gamma(t + 1) &= \gamma(t).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{14}$$

Obviously all solution sequences of (1) can be embedded in solution sequences of (14). Notice that the right hand side of this system can be rewritten in pseudo-linear form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} A(x(t), \gamma(t)) & 0 \\ 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x(t) \\ \gamma(t) \end{pmatrix}$$

with

$$A(x, \gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J) & 0 & b \\ \gamma_1s_1(J) & (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N + B) & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2s_2(N + B) & s_2(N + B) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us reconsider $A(0, (1, 1))$ (which is equal to the matrix $A(0)$ above), which has a spectral radius $r > 1$ by our assumption. Since this matrix is non-negative and irreducible, there is a vector $p > 0$ such that $p'A(0, (1, 1)) = rp'$. Consequently, there is some $r^* \in (1, r)$ such that $p'A(0, (1, 1)) - r^*p' > 0$. In fact, by continuity of $A(x, \gamma)$, there are $\epsilon > 0$ and $f_i \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$p'A(x, \gamma) - r^*p' > 0, \forall x \in B_\epsilon^+(0), \forall \gamma \in (f_1, 1] \times (f_2, 1],$$

where $B_\epsilon^+(0) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^3 \mid |x| < \epsilon\}$. Let $g_i = (f_i + 1)/2$ for $i = 1, 2$, set $z = (x, \gamma)$, and let $Z := \mathbb{R}_+^3 \times [g_1, 1] \times [g_2, 1]$. Then Z is invariant for system (14), and we restrict the dynamics to Z henceforth. Define the continuous function $P : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as follows

$$P(z) = p'x.$$

Let $M := \{(0, 0, 0)\} \times [g_1, 1] \times [g_2, 1]$. Then clearly M is compact and invariant, and $Z \setminus M$ is positively invariant for (14). Moreover $P(z) = 0$ iff $z \in M$. Finally, observe that (we slightly abuse notation by also denoting the right hand side of (14) by T),

$$P(T(z)) = p'A(z)x > r^*p'x > P(z), \quad \forall z \in U \setminus M.$$

where

$$U := B_\epsilon^+(0) \times [g_1, 1] \times [g_2, 1]$$

is a neighbourhood of M in Z . Therefore, all conditions of Corollary 2.2 in [16] hold, and hence M is a repeller for (14). This concludes the proof of this Lemma. ■

THEOREM 4 *Let $R_0(1, 1) = ba_1a_2/(1 - a_2) > 1$. Then there is a continuous map $E^* : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ with $\Gamma = (\gamma_1^l, 1] \times (\gamma_2^l, 1]$ for some $\gamma_i^l \in (0, 1), i = 1, 2$ and $E^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = (J^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_2), N^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_2), B^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_2))$ is locally asymptotically stable and globally attractive fixed point of (1) with respect to non-zero initial conditions.*

Proof The proof follows from an application of Theorem 2.1 in [21]. Using the notation from that theorem, we let $X = \mathbb{R}_+^3, U = \mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}, \Lambda = [g_1, 1] \times [g_2, 1]$ (see Lemma 5), $\lambda_0 = (1, 1)$

and $x_0 = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$. Clearly, all the needed smoothness requirements hold. The conditions on the unperturbed map follow from Lemma 4 (locally asymptotically stable positive fixed point) and Lemma 3 (globally attractive positive fixed point). Condition (H1) in that paper holds by setting for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $B_\lambda = K \cap (\mathbb{R}_+^3 \setminus \mathcal{N}_0)$, where K follows from Lemma 2 and \mathcal{N}_0 from Lemma 5. Condition (H2) holds by the compactness of B_λ and by Lemma 5. This concludes the proof. ■

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have studied a three-stage structured population model. We have established persistence results for the full model and global stability of the positive fixed point only for γ_1 and γ_2 in an interval near one. The global attractivity result given in Theorem 3 can be extended to the case where $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$, since in this case the map defined by the right hand side of (1) is still monotone. The main difficulty in studying the global attractivity of the positive fixed point for the full model (1) is that the nonlinear map governing the system is not monotone when $0 < \gamma_2 < 1$. Thus, the theory developed for monotone systems (see for example, [14,20]) and used to study global attractivity of other stage-structured models (e.g., [1,2,17]) does not apply. Currently, no proof of global convergence to the unique positive fixed point is known in case $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (0, 1]$ when the inherent net reproductive number $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is larger than one, although a large number of simulations we performed suggest that this might be the case.

We remark that the results in Sections 3–5 can be extended to the following system of difference equations:

$$\begin{aligned} J(t + 1) &= bB(t) + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J(t))J(t) \\ N(t + 1) &= \gamma_1s_1(J(t))J(t) + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) \\ B(t + 1) &= \gamma_2s_2(N(t) + B(t))N(t) + s_3(N(t) + B(t))B(t), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $s_i, i = 1, 2, 3$ satisfy $(\Sigma 1)$, provided that the following assumption holds:

$$(\Sigma 2) \quad 0 < s_2(0) \leq s_3(0) < 1 \text{ and } s'_2(x) \leq s'_3(x) \text{ for } x \in (0, \infty).$$

Clearly assumption $(\Sigma 2)$ implies that $s_2(x) \leq s_3(x)$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$, which states that the survivorship of an individual in the non-breeding stage is at most as high as that of an individual in the breeding stage. This may happen, for instance, if the older reproductive individuals (in comparison with newly metamorphosed juveniles) are better at avoiding predators (perhaps due to their larger size and stronger muscles, ability to move faster, or knowledge of predator locations), hence, increasing their chance of survival. Furthermore, individuals in the non-breeding stage may suffer more severe density effects than individuals in the breeding state, due to breeders being better competitors for food/resources than non-breeders.

Similarly, the results in Sections 3–5 can also be extended to the case where non-breeders are better competitors than breeders, and instead of $(\Sigma 2)$ the following condition is satisfied by $s_i, i = 2, 3$:

$$(\Sigma 3) \quad 0 < s_3(0) \leq s_2(0) < 1 \text{ and } s'_3(x) \leq s'_2(x) \text{ for } x \in (0, \infty),$$

which implies that $s_3(x) \leq s_2(x)$ for $x \in [0, \infty)$. Such a scenario may occur because reproduction requires the expenditure of immense amounts of energy leaving reproductive individuals more

vulnerable to environmental conditions in comparison with non-reproductive adults and hence reducing their survival chances.

The proof of Theorem 1 changes slightly and only requires that $(\Sigma 1)$ holds ($(\Sigma 2)$ or $(\Sigma 3)$ are not needed here). But $(\Sigma 1)$ together with either $(\Sigma 2)$ or $(\Sigma 3)$ are required to establish monotonicity of system (15), for the case $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$. We defer the details to the Appendix.

We conclude this paper by pointing out that frogs reproduce seasonally. Thus, the birth rate is generally described by a periodic function which is positive during the reproduction season and zero otherwise. This results in a non-autonomous version of (1), where b is replaced with $b(t)$. Our future efforts will focus on studying the long term behaviour of solutions to (1) with a periodic birth rate of this form.

Acknowledgements

The research of A.S. Ackleh is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grants DUE-0531915 and DMS-0718465. The research of P. De Leenheer is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-0614651.

References

- [1] A.S. Ackleh, Y. Dib, and S. Jang, *A three-stage discrete-time population model: seasonal versus continuous reproduction*, J. Biol. Dynam. 1 (2007), pp. 305–319.
- [2] A.S. Ackleh and S. Jang, *A discrete two-stage population model: continuous versus seasonal reproduction*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. 13 (2007), pp. 261–274.
- [3] L.J.S. Allen, *Introduction to Mathematical Biology*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 2007.
- [4] J. Carter, A.S. Ackleh, B.P. Leonard, and H. Wang, *Giant Panda (Ailuropoda Melanoleuca) population dynamics and bamboo (subfamily Bambusoideae) life history: a structured population approach to examining carrying capacity when the prey are semelparous*, Ecol. Model. 123 (1999), pp. 207–223.
- [5] H. Caswell, *Matrix Population Models*, 2nd ed., Sinauer, Sunderland, 2001.
- [6] J.P. Collins and A. Storfer, *Amphibian decline: sorting the hypothesis*, Divers. Distrib. 9 (2003), pp. 89–98.
- [7] R.F. Costantino, J.M. Cushing, B. Dennis, and R.A. Desharnais, *Experimentally induced transitions in the dynamic behavior of insect populations*, Nature 375 (1995) pp. 227–230.
- [8] R.F. Costantino, R.A. Desharnais, J.M. Cushing, and B. Dennis, *Chaotic dynamics in an insect population*, Science 275 (1997), pp. 389–391.
- [9] ———, *Transitions in population dynamics: equilibria to periodic cycles to aperiodic cycles*, J. Anim. Ecol. 66 (1997), pp. 704–729.
- [10] J.M. Cushing, S.M. Henson, R.A. Desharnais, B. Dennis, R.F. Costantino, and A. King, *A chaotic attractor in ecology: theory and experimental data*, Chaos Solitons Fract. 12 (2001), pp. 219–234.
- [11] J.M. Cushing, *An Introduction to Structured Population Dynamics*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1998.
- [12] ———, *A juvenile-adult model with periodic vital rates*, J. Math. Bio. 53 (2006), pp. 520–539.
- [13] R.A. Desharnais, B. Dennis, J.M. Cushing, S.M. Henson, and R.F. Costantino, *Chaos and population control of insect outbreaks*, Ecol. Lett. 4 (2001), pp. 229–235.
- [14] A. Grove and G. Ladas, *Periodicities in Nonlinear Difference Equations*, Boca Raton, CRC Press, 2005.
- [15] J.K. Hale and P. Waltman, *Persistence in infinite-dimensional systems*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. 20 (1989), pp. 388–395.
- [16] J. Hofbauer and J.W.-H. So, *Uniform persistence and repellers for maps*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 107 (1989), pp. 1137–1142.
- [17] Y. Kuang and J.M. Cushing, *Global stability in a nonlinear difference-delay equation model of flour beetle population growth*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. 2 (1995), pp. 31–37.
- [18] L. Pham, S. Boudreaux, S. Karhbet, B. Price, A.S. Ackleh, J. Carter, and N. Pal, *Population estimates of Hyla cinerea (Schneider) (Green Tree Frog) in an urban environment*, Southeast. Nat. 6 (2007), pp. 203–216.
- [19] P. Govindarajulu, R. Altwegg, and B. R. Anholt, *Matrix model investigation of invasive species control: bullfrogs on Vancouver island*, Ecol. Appl. 15 (2005), pp. 2161–2170.
- [20] H. Smith, *Monotone maps: a review*, J. Difference Equ. Appl. 11 (2005), pp. 379–398.
- [21] H.L. Smith and P. Waltman, *Perturbation of a globally stable steady state*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 127 (1999) pp. 447–453.
- [22] A. Storfer, *Amphibian decline: future directions*, Divers. Distrib. 9 (2003), pp. 151–163.
- [23] J.R. Vonesh and O.D.L. Cruz, *Complex life cycles and density dependence: assessing the contribution of egg mortality to amphibian declines*, Oecologia 133 (2002), pp. 325–333.

Appendix

First notice that for (15) the inherent net reproductive number changes to

$$R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) := \frac{b\gamma_1\gamma_2a_1a_2}{(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)a_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)a_2)(1 - a_3)}. \tag{A1}$$

THEOREM 5 *Let $(\Sigma 1)$ hold for $i = 1, 2, 3$. If $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$, then (15) has a unique interior fixed point $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$.*

Proof A positive fixed point of (1) is a point $(J^*, N^*, B^*) \in \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^3)$ that satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} J &= bB + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J)J \\ N &= \gamma_1s_1(J)J + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(N + B)N \\ B &= \gamma_2s_2(N + B)N + s_3(N + B)B. \end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

From the first equation in (A2) we get:

$$h(J) := (1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J))J = bB.$$

Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 1, we have $J(B) = h^{-1}(bB)$ where $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} J(B) = \infty$, $J(0) = 0$ and $J'(B) > 0$. Observe also that

$$J(B) = \frac{bB}{1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1(J(B))}. \tag{A3}$$

Define $W = N + B$ and solve the second equation of (A2) for N :

$$N(W, B) = \frac{\gamma_1s_1(J(B))J(B)}{1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(W)}. \tag{A4}$$

Thus, adding the second and the third equations of (A2) we get

$$W = \gamma_1s_1(J)J + s_2(W)N + s_3B.$$

Then

$$\tilde{h}(W, B) := W - s_2(W)N(W, B) - s_3(W)B - \gamma_1s_1(J(B))J(B) = 0,$$

and notice that $\tilde{h}(0, 0) = 0$. Now

$$\tilde{h}'_W = 1 - s'_2(W)N(W, B) - s_2(W)N'_W(W, B) - s'_3(W)B$$

and

$$\tilde{h}'_B = -s_2(W)N'_B(W, B) - s_3(W) - \gamma_1s'_1(J(B))J'(B)J(B) - \gamma_1s_1(J(B))J'(B).$$

From (A4) it follows that $N'_W(W, B) < 0$ and $N'_B(W, B) > 0$ for any $(W, B) > 0$. Thus $h'_W > 0$ and $\tilde{h}'_B < 0$. Now, applying the Implicit Function Theorem we get that there is a smooth $W(B)$ with $W(0) = 0$, $\tilde{h}(W(B), B) = 0$ and $W'(B) > 0$ for all $B > 0$.

Plugging the Equations (A3) and (A4) for J and N into the B equation of (A2) results in

$$B = \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2s_1s_2bB}{(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2)} + s_3B.$$

As we are interested in a positive fixed point, dividing by B we obtain:

$$1 = \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2s_1s_2b}{(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2)} + s_3.$$

This is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \gamma_1\gamma_2s_1s_2b + (1 - \gamma_1)s_1 + (1 - \gamma_2)s_2(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1) + s_3(1 - (1 - \gamma_1)s_1)(1 - (1 - \gamma_2)s_2) \\ &= \hat{H}(J(B), W(B)) := H(B). \end{aligned} \tag{A5}$$

It is clear that any interior equilibrium must satisfy (A5).

Now differentiating $H(B)$ with respect to B and using the positivity of W' and J' together with a similar calculation as in the proof of Theorem 1, we get $H' < 0$. Also note that $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} H(B) = 0$. Thus, it follows that if $H(0) > 1$ then there exists a unique B^* such that $1 = H(B^*)$. (Clearly, $H(0) > 1$ is equivalent to $R_0(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) > 1$). From this and the above established relations between W , J , and B it follows that there exists a unique interior equilibrium $E^* = (J^*, N^*, B^*)$. ■

Finally, it is not difficult to show that if $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1]$ and $\gamma_2 = 1$, then system (15) is monotone provided that $(\Sigma 2)$ or $(\Sigma 3)$ holds.