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#### Abstract

This is part II of our study on the free boundary problems with nonlocal and local diffusions. In part I, we obtained the existence, uniqueness, regularity and estimates of global solution. In part II here, we show a spreading-vanishing dichotomy, and provide the criteria of spreading and vanishing, as well as the long time behavior of solution when spreading happens.
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## 1 Introduction

We continue our investigation in [1] on the free boundary problems with nonlocal and local diffusions

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t}=d_{1} \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} J(x-y) u(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} u+f_{1}(u, v), & t>0, g(t)<x<h(t),  \tag{1.1}\\ v_{t}=d_{2} v_{x x}+f_{2}(u, v), & t>0, g(t)<x<h(t), \\ u(t, g(t))=u(t, h(t))=v(t, g(t))=v(t, h(t))=0, & t \geq 0, \\ h^{\prime}(t)=-\mu v_{x}(t, h(t))+\rho \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{h(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & t \geq 0, \\ g^{\prime}(t)=-\mu v_{x}(t, g(t))-\rho \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{g(t)} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & t \geq 0, \\ u(0, x)=u_{0}(x)>0, v(0, x)=v_{0}(x)>0, & -h_{0}<h<h_{0}, \\ h(0)=-g(0)=h_{0}>0, & \end{cases}
$$

where $\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]$ represents the initial population range of the species $u$ and $v ; x=g(t)$ and $x=h(t)$ are the free boundaries to be determined together with $u(t, x)$ and $v(t, x)$, which are always assumed to be identically 0 for $x \in \mathbb{R} \backslash[g(t), h(t)] ; d_{i}$ and $\mu, \rho$ are positive constants. The kernel function $J: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and satisfies
(J1) $J \in C^{1-}(\mathbb{R}), J(0)>0, J(x) \geq 0, \int_{\mathbb{R}} J(x) \mathrm{d} x=1, J$ is symmetric, and $\sup _{\mathbb{R}} J<\infty$, where $J \in C^{1-}(\mathbb{R})$ means that $J$ is Lipschitz continuous in $\mathbb{R}$. Reaction terms $f_{1}, f_{2}$ are either classical competition model:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}(u, v)=u(a-u-b v), \quad f_{2}(u, v)=v(1-v-c u), \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]or classical prey-predator model:
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{1}(u, v)=u(a-u-b v), \quad f_{2}(u, v)=v(1-v+c u), \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

It follows from (J) that there exist constants $\bar{\varepsilon} \in\left(0, h_{0} / 4\right)$ and $\delta_{0}>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J(x, y)>\delta_{0} \quad \text { if } \quad|x-y|<\bar{\varepsilon} \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote by $C^{1-}(\Omega)$ the Lipschitz continuous function space in $\Omega$. Under the conditions:

$$
\left(u_{0}, v_{0}\right) \in C^{1-}\left(\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]\right) \times W_{p}^{2}\left(-h_{0}, h_{0}\right) \text { with } p>3, u_{0}\left( \pm h_{0}\right)=v_{0}\left( \pm h_{0}\right)=0
$$

it has been proved in the first part (11) that (1.1) has a unique global solution $(u, v, g, h)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<u \leq k_{1}, \quad 0<v \leq k_{2}, \quad g^{\prime}(t)<0, \quad h^{\prime}(t)>0, \quad 0<-v_{x}(t, h(t)), \quad v_{x}(t, g(t)) \leq k_{3} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
and

$$
k_{2}=\max \left\{\left\|v_{0}\right\|_{\infty}, 1\right\} \quad \text { when (1.2) hold, } \quad k_{2}=\max \left\{\left\|v_{0}\right\|_{\infty}, 1+c k_{1}\right\} \quad \text { when (1.3) hold. }
$$

Moreover, for any given $0<\tau<T<\infty$, we have

$$
g, h \in C^{1+\alpha / 2}([0, T]), \quad u \in C^{1,1-}\left(\bar{D}_{g, h}^{T}\right), \quad v \in C^{1+\alpha / 2,2+\alpha}([\tau, T] \times[g(t), h(t)])
$$

where

$$
D_{g, h}^{T}=\left\{(t, x) \in \mathbb{R}^{2}: 0<t \leq T, g(t)<x<h(t)\right\},
$$

$u \in C^{1,1-}\left(\bar{D}_{g, h}^{T}\right)$ means that $u$ is differentiable continuously in $t \in[0, T]$ and is Lipschitz continuous in $x \in[g(t), h(t)]$.

In view of (1.5) we can define

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t)=g_{\infty} \in\left[-\infty,-h_{0}\right), \quad \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t)=h_{\infty} \in\left(h_{0}, \infty\right] .
$$

Clearly we have either

$$
\text { (i) } h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty, \quad \text { or (ii) } h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty \text {. }
$$

We will call (i) the vanishing case, and call (ii) the spreading case.
The main aims of this part are concerned with the spreading-vanishing dichotomy, the criteria of spreading and vanishing, as well as the long-time behavior of solution when spreading happens. The main results of this part are the following theorems.

Theorem 1.1 (Spreading-vanishing dichotomy). Let $(u, v, g, h)$ be the unique solution of (1.1). Then either
(i) Spreading: $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$,
or
(ii) Vanishing: $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ and

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \max _{g(t) \leq x \leq h(t)} u(t, x)=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \max _{g(t) \leq x \leq h(t)} v(t, x)=0 .
$$

To determine the long-time behavior of the solution when spreading happens, we restrict to two special cases:
(a) The weak competition case: $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.2) with $1 / c>a>b$.
(b) The weak predation case: $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.3) with $a>b+a b c$.

Theorem 1.2 (Long-time behavior). Let $(u, v, g, h)$ be the unique solution of (1.1) and $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(g(t), h(t))=$ $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., spreading happens.
(i) in the weak competition case we have

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(u(t, x), v(t, x))=\left(\frac{a-b}{1-b c}, \frac{1-a c}{1-b c}\right) \quad \text { locally uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

(ii) in the weak predation case we have

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(u(t, x), v(t, x))=\left(\frac{a-b}{1+b c}, \frac{1+a c}{1+b c}\right) \text { locally uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{R} \text {. }
$$

We remark that, the spreading-vanishing dichotomy and long-time behavior when spreading happens are parallel to those of the local system ( $[2, ~ 3, ~ 4, ~ 4)$ and nonlocal system (5]). Unfortunately, we have to leave the spreading speeds of the moving boundaries $g, h$ when spreading happens as open issue.

Theorem 1.3 (Spreading-vanishing criteria). Under the conditions of Theorem 1.1. If one of the following holds:
(i) $a \geq d_{1}$,
(ii) $h_{0} \geq \frac{1}{2} \pi \sqrt{d_{2}}$,
(iii) $a<d_{1}$ and $h_{0} \geq \ell^{*} / 2$, where $\ell^{*}$ satisfies $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{I}+a\right)=0$ when $|I|=\ell^{*}$,
then spreading always happens.
If $a<d_{1}$ and $h_{0}<\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$, then there is $\Lambda^{*} \geq \Lambda_{*}>0$ such that $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{*}$, and $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \geq \Lambda^{*}$.

Here we mention that, same as the single equation in [6], nonlocal diffusion will change the spreading-vanishing criteria. For the corresponding local diffusive competition and prey-predator models, from the results of [2, 3, 4, 7] we see that no matter how small is the diffusion coefficient $d_{1}$ in $d_{1} u_{x x}$ relative to $a$, vanishing can always happen if $h_{0}$ and $\mu, \rho$ are sufficiently small. However, for the nonlocal and local diffusions problem (1.1), Theorem 1.3 shows that when $a \geq d_{1}$, spreading always happens no mater how small $h_{0}, \mu, \rho, u_{0}$ and $v_{0}$ are. Moreover, we find a new critical value $\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$ which plays an important role in governing the spreading and vanishing phenomenon.

This paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 gives some preliminary results. Section 3 is devoted to the spreading-vanishing dichotomy and long-time behavior when spreading happens. The criteria governing spreading and vanishing will be given in Section 4.

## 2 Preliminaries

For the given $T>0$, we define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{H}^{T} & =\left\{h \in C^{1}([0, T]): h(0)=h_{0}, 0<h^{\prime}(t) \leq R(t)\right\}, \\
\mathbb{G}^{T} & =\left\{g \in C^{1}([0, T]):-g \in \mathbb{H}^{T}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

### 2.1 Maximum principle and comparison principle

Lemma 2.1 (Maximum Principle [6, Lemma 2.2]). Assume that $J$ satisfies (J) and d is a positive constant, and $(r, \eta) \in \mathbb{G}^{T} \times \mathbb{H}^{T}$. Suppose that $\psi, \psi_{t} \in C\left(\bar{D}_{\eta, r}^{T}\right)$ and fulfill, for some $\varrho \in L^{\infty}\left(D_{\eta, r}^{T}\right)$,

$$
\begin{cases}\psi_{t} \geq d \int_{\eta(t)}^{r(t)} J(x, y) \psi(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d \psi+\varrho \psi, & (t, x) \in D_{\eta, r}^{T}, \\ \psi(t, \eta(t)) \geq 0, \psi(t, r(t)) \geq 0, & 0 \leq t \leq T, \\ \psi(0, x) \geq 0, & |x| \leq h_{0} .\end{cases}
$$

Then $\psi \geq 0$ on $\bar{D}_{\eta, r}^{T}$. Moreover, if $\psi(0, x) \not \equiv 0$ in $\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]$, then $\psi>0$ in $D_{\eta, r}^{T}$.
Lemma 2.2 (Maximum principle [6, Lemma 3.3]). For $T>0$, set $\Omega_{0}:=(0, T] \times\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]$. Suppose $u, u_{t} \in C\left(\bar{\Omega}_{0}\right)$ and for some $\varrho \in L^{\infty}\left(\Omega_{0}\right)$,

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t} \geq d \int_{-h_{0}}^{h_{0}} J(x-y) u(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d u+\varrho u, & (t, x) \in \Omega_{0}, \\ u(0, x) \geq 0, & |x| \leq h_{0} .\end{cases}
$$

Then $u \geq 0$ on $\bar{\Omega}_{0}$. Moreover, if $u(0, x) \not \equiv 0$ in $\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]$, then $u>0$ in $\Omega_{0}$.
Lemma 2.3 (Comparison principle). Let $T>0, \bar{h}, \bar{g} \in C([0, T]), \bar{u} \in C\left(\bar{D}_{\bar{g}, \bar{h}}^{T}\right), \bar{v} \in W_{p}^{1,2}\left(D_{\bar{g}, \bar{h}}^{T}\right)$ with $p>3$ and satisfy

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{u}_{t} \geq d_{1} \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}), & (t, x) \in D_{\bar{g}, \bar{h}}^{T},  \tag{2.1}\\ \bar{v}_{t} \geq d_{2} \bar{v}_{x x}+\bar{v}(1-\bar{v}), & (t, x) \in D_{\bar{g}, \bar{h}}^{T}, \\ \bar{u}(t, \bar{g}(t)) \geq 0, \quad \bar{v}(t, \bar{h}(t)) \geq 0, & 0<t \leq T, \\ \bar{h}^{\prime}(t) \geq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, h(t))+\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{\bar{h}(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & 0<t \leq T, \\ \bar{g}^{\prime}(t) \leq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, g(t))-\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\bar{g}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & 0<t \leq T, \\ \bar{u}(0, x) \geq u_{0}(x), \quad \bar{v}(0, x) \geq v_{0}(x) ; & |x| \leq h_{0}, \\ \bar{h}(0) \geq h_{0}, \quad \bar{g}(0) \leq-h_{0} . & \end{cases}
$$

Let $(u, g, h)$ be the unique solution of (1.1) in there $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.2). Then we have

$$
u \leq \bar{u}, \quad v \leq \bar{v}, \quad g \geq \bar{g}, \quad h \leq \bar{h} \quad \text { in } \quad D_{g, h}^{T} .
$$

Lemma 2.4 (Comparison principle). In Lemma 2.3, if we replace the second inequality of (2.1) by

$$
\bar{v}_{t} \geq d_{2} \bar{v}_{x x}+\bar{v}(1-\bar{v}+c \bar{u}), \quad(t, x) \in D_{\bar{g}, \bar{h}}^{T},
$$

and let $(u, v, g, h)$ be the unique solution of (1.1) in there $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.3), then the conclusion is still true.

Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 can be proved by the combination of proofs of [2, Lemma 5.1], 6, Theorem 3.1] and [8, Lemma 3.1]. We omit the details here.

### 2.2 Some related eigenvalue problems

Here we recall some results on the principal eigenvalue of linear operator $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta: C(\bar{\Omega}) \mapsto C(\bar{\Omega})$ defined by

$$
\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right) \varphi:=d\left(\int_{\Omega} J(x-y) \varphi(y) \mathrm{d} y-\varphi\right)+\theta(x) \varphi
$$

where $\Omega$ is an open interval in $\mathbb{R}^{n}$, possibly unbounded, $\theta \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $J$ satisfies the condition (J).
Define the generalized principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta$ :

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right):=\inf \left\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}:\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right) \varphi \leq \lambda \varphi \text { in } \Omega \text { for some } \varphi \in C(\bar{\Omega}), \varphi>0\right\} .
$$

As usual, if $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right)$ has a continuous and positive eigenfunction, i.e., there exists a continuous and positive function $\varphi_{p}$ such that $\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right) \varphi_{p}=\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right) \varphi_{p}(x)$, we call $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right)$ a principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta$.

Using the variational characterization of $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right)$ (see, e.g., [9]):

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right)=\sup _{0 \neq \varphi \in L^{2}(\Omega)} \frac{d \int_{\Omega} \int_{\Omega} J(x-y) \varphi(y) \varphi(x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x+\int_{\Omega}(\theta(x)-d) \varphi^{2}(x) \mathrm{d} x}{\int_{\Omega} \varphi^{2}(x) \mathrm{d} x}
$$

we can show that $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta\right)$ is strictly increasing in $\theta(x)$, i.e., $\theta_{1}(x) \leq \theta_{2}(x)$ and $\theta_{1}(x) \not \equiv \theta_{2}(x)$ implies

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta_{1}\right)<\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+\theta_{2}\right)
$$

( $\mathbf{F}) f \in C(\mathbb{R} \times[0, \infty))$ and is differentiable with respect to $u, f_{u}(\cdot, 0)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $\mathbb{R}, f(\cdot, 0) \equiv 0$ and $f(x, u) / u$ is strictly decreasing with respect to $u \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$. Moreover, there exists $M>0$ such that $f(x, u)<0$ for all $u \geq M$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

We consider the problem

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t}=d\left(\int_{\Omega} J(x-y) u(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-u\right)+f(x, u), & t>0, x \in \Omega  \tag{2.2}\\ u(0, x)=u_{0}(x), & x \in \Omega\end{cases}
$$

Proposition 2.5. ([10, 11) Suppose (J) and (F) hold. Then (2.2) admits a unique positive steady state $u_{\Omega} \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ if and only if

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+f_{u}(x, 0)\right)>0
$$

Moreover, for $u_{0} \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $u_{0} \geq, \not \equiv 0$, the unique solution $u(t, x)$ of (2.2) satisfies $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \| u(t, \cdot)-$ $u_{\Omega}(\cdot) \|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}=0$ if $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+f_{u}(x, 0)\right)>0$, while $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C(\bar{\Omega})}=0$ if $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Omega}+f_{u}(x, 0)\right) \leq 0$.

Proposition 2.6. ([6, Proposition 3.4]) Assume that the condition (J) holds, $\theta_{0}$ is a constant and $-\infty<\ell_{1}<\ell_{2}<\infty$. Then the following hold true:
(i) $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(\ell_{1}, \ell_{2}\right)}+\theta_{0}\right)$ is strictly increasing and continuous in $\ell:=\ell_{2}-\ell_{1}$,
(ii) $\lim _{\ell_{2}-\ell_{1} \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(\ell_{1}, \ell_{2}\right)}+\theta_{0}\right)=\theta_{0}$,
(iii) $\lim _{\ell_{2}-\ell_{1} \rightarrow 0} \lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(\ell_{1}, \ell_{2}\right)}+\theta_{0}\right)=\theta_{0}-d$.

Remark 2.7. Since $\theta_{0}$ is a constant, it follows easily from the definition that $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(\ell_{1}, \ell_{2}\right)}+\theta_{0}\right)$ depends only on $\ell:=\ell_{2}-\ell_{1}$, i.e.,

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(\ell_{1}, \ell_{2}\right)}+\theta_{0}\right)=\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{(0, \ell)}+\theta_{0}\right) \quad \text { with } \ell:=\ell_{2}-\ell_{1} .
$$

## 3 Spreading-vanishing dichotomy and long-time behavior

To establish the spreading-vanishing dichotomy we first give some abstract propositions. Let $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t)=h_{\infty}$ and $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t)=g_{\infty}$. Clearly, $h_{\infty},-g_{\infty} \leq \infty$. In what follows, we always suppose that $f_{1}, f_{2}$ satisfy (1.2) or (1.3).

Lemma 3.1. ([12, Proposition 2]) Let $d, C, \mu$ and $\eta_{0}$ be positive constants, $w \in W_{p}^{1,2}((0, T) \times$ $(0, \eta(t)))$ and $w_{0} \in W_{p}^{2}\left(0, \eta_{0}\right)$ for some $p>1$ and any $T>0$, and $w_{x} \in C([0, \infty) \times(0, \eta(t)])$, $\eta \in C^{1}([0, \infty))$. If $(w, \eta)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}w_{t}-d w_{x x} \geq-C w, & t>0, \quad 0<x<\eta(t) \\ w \geq 0, & t>0, \quad x=0 \\ w=0, \quad \eta^{\prime}(t) \geq-\mu w_{x}, & t>0, \quad x=\eta(t) \\ w(0, x)=w_{0}(x) \geq, \not \equiv 0, & x \in\left(0, \eta_{0}\right) \\ \eta(0)=\eta_{0}\end{cases}
$$

and $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta(t)=\eta_{\infty}<\infty, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \eta^{\prime}(t)=0$,

$$
\|w(t, \cdot)\|_{C^{1}([0, \eta(t)])} \leq M, \quad \forall t>1
$$

for some constant $M>0$. Then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \max _{0 \leq x \leq \eta(t)} w(t, x)=0$.
The following lemma provides an estimate for the solution component $v$.
Lemma 3.2. Let $(u, v, g, h)$ be the unique global solution of (1.1) and $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ and $D_{\infty}=$ $[0, \infty) \times[g(t), h(t)]$. Then there is $C>0$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|v\|_{C^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}, 1+\alpha}\left(D_{\infty}\right)} \leq C, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\|v_{x}(t, h(t))\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\left(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}\right)}+\left\|v_{x}(t, g(t))\right\|_{C^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\left(\overline{\mathbb{R}}_{+}\right)} \leq C . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since the proof is similar to that of [13, Theorem 2.1] and [14, Theorem 2.2], we give the sketch of the proof and omit the details. It is easy to derive from (1.5) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
0<h^{\prime}(t),-g^{\prime}(t) \leq \mu k_{3}+\rho k_{1}\left(h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}\right)=: C_{0}<\infty . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We straighten the free boundary. Similar to the above, set $w(t, y)=u(t, x(t, y)), z(t, y)=$ $v(t, x(t, y))$. Then

$$
\begin{cases}z_{t}=d_{2} \xi(t) z_{y y}+\zeta(t, y) z_{y}+f_{2}(w, z), & t>0,|y|<1 \\ z(t,-1)=z(t, 1)=0, & t \geq 0 \\ z(0, y)=v_{0}\left(h_{0} y\right)=: z_{0}(y), & |y| \leq 1\end{cases}
$$

Due to (3.3), it is easy to get

$$
\|\xi\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+}\right)} \leq 1 / h_{0}^{2}, \quad\|\zeta\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+} \times \Sigma\right)} \leq 2 C_{0} / h_{0}, \quad\left\|f_{2}^{*}\right\|_{L^{\infty}\left(\mathbb{R}^{+} \times \Sigma\right)} \leq L k_{2},
$$

where $\Sigma=[-1,1]$. By using the arguments in the proofs of [13, Theorem 2.1] and [14, Theorem 2.2 ] with some minor modifications, we can get the estimate (3.1). This completes the proof.

Proposition 3.3. If $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$, then $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} g^{\prime}(t)=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} h^{\prime}(t)=0$.
Proof. It follows from (3.3) that $g^{\prime}(t)$ and $h^{\prime}(t)$ are bounded. Let

$$
\varphi_{1}(t)=v_{x}(t, h(t)), \quad \varphi_{2}(t)=\int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{h(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) v(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x .
$$

By (3.2) we have that, for $t, s>0$,

$$
\left|\varphi_{1}(t)-\varphi_{1}(s)\right| \leq C_{1}|t-s|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}
$$

Using the arguments in the proof of [5, Proposition 4.1], one can show that, there is $C_{2}>0$ such that

$$
\left|\varphi_{2}(t)-\varphi_{2}(s)\right| \leq C_{2}|t-s|, \quad \forall t, s>0 .
$$

Note that $h^{\prime}(t)=-\mu \varphi_{1}(t)+\rho \varphi_{2}(t)$. We see that $h^{\prime}(t)$ is uniformly continuous in $[0, \infty)$. Therefore, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} h^{\prime}(t)=0$ due to $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t)=h_{\infty}<\infty$. Similarly, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} g^{\prime}(t)=0$.

Theorem 3.4. If $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$, then the solution $(u, v, g, h)$ of (1.1) satisfies

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}=0
$$

Proof. Noticing $f_{2}(u, 0)=0$, and $f_{2}(u, v)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$and $0<u \leq$ $k_{1}, 0<v \leq k_{2}$, we can write $f_{2}(u, v)=\varrho(t, x) v$ with $\varrho \in L^{\infty}$. Thanks to $h^{\prime}(t) \geq-\mu v_{x}(t, h(t))$ and $g^{\prime}(t) \leq-\mu v_{x}(t, g(t))$. It can be deduced by Lemma 3.1 that

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}=0
$$

We next show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right)}+a\right) \leq 0 \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

To save spaces, for $\varepsilon>0$ we set

$$
h_{\infty}^{ \pm \varepsilon}=h_{\infty} \pm \varepsilon, \quad g_{\infty}^{ \pm \varepsilon}=g_{\infty} \pm \varepsilon .
$$

Assume on the contrary that $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right)}+a\right)>0$. Clearly, there is $\varepsilon_{1}>0$ such that, for $\varepsilon \in\left(0, \varepsilon_{1}\right)$, $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)}+a-b \varepsilon\right)>0$. For such $\varepsilon>0$, one can find $T_{\varepsilon}>0$ such that

$$
h(t)>h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}, \quad g(t)<g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, \quad\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}<\varepsilon, \quad \text { for } t>T_{\varepsilon} .
$$

Then $u$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t} \geq d_{1} \int_{g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}}^{h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}} J(x-y) u(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} u+u(a-u-b \varepsilon), & t>T_{\varepsilon}, x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right], \\ u\left(T_{\varepsilon}, x\right)=u\left(T_{\varepsilon}, x\right), & x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right] .\end{cases}
$$

Consider the problem

$$
\begin{cases}w_{t}=d_{1} \int_{g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}}^{h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}} J(x-y) w(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} w+w(a-w-b \varepsilon), & t>T_{\varepsilon}, x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right]  \tag{3.5}\\ w\left(T_{\varepsilon}, x\right)=u\left(T_{\varepsilon}, x\right), & x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right] .\end{cases}
$$

Since $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right)}+a-b \varepsilon\right)>0$, it follows from Proposition 2.5 that the solution $w_{\varepsilon}(t, x)$ of problem (3.5) converges to the unique steady state $W_{\varepsilon}(x)$ of (3.5) uniformly in $\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right]$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. From Lemma 2.2 and a simple comparison argument, there holds that

$$
u(t, x) \geq w_{\varepsilon}(t, x) \text { for } t>T_{\varepsilon} \text { and } x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right] .
$$

Hence, there is $T_{1 \varepsilon}>T_{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$
u(t, x) \geq \frac{1}{2} W_{\varepsilon}(x)>0 \quad \text { for } t>T_{1 \varepsilon}, x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right]
$$

Recall (1.4), for $0<\varepsilon<\min \left\{\varepsilon_{1}, \bar{\varepsilon} / 2\right\}$ and $t>T_{1 \varepsilon}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
h^{\prime}(t) & \geq \rho \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{h(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x \geq \rho \int_{g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}}^{h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}} \int_{h_{\infty}}^{\infty} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x \\
& \geq \rho \int_{h_{\infty}^{-\bar{\varepsilon}} / 2}^{h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}} \int_{h_{\infty}}^{h_{\infty}^{+\bar{\varepsilon} / 2}} \delta_{0} \frac{1}{2} W_{\varepsilon}(x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x>0,
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies that $h_{\infty}=\infty$. We get a contradiction, and so (3.4) holds.
Let $\bar{u}$ be the unique solution of

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{u}_{t}=d \int_{g_{\infty}}^{h_{\infty}} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) d y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}), & t>0, x \in\left[g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right], \\ \bar{u}(0, x)=u_{0}(x), \quad|x| \leq h_{0} ; \quad \bar{u}(0, x)=0, & x \in\left[g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right] \backslash\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right] .\end{cases}
$$

Using (3.4) and Proposition 2.5 we have $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{u}(t, x)=0$ uniformly in $\left[g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right]$. As $v \geq 0$, it is clear that $u$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t} \leq d_{1} \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} J(x-y) u(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} u+u(a-u), & t>0, g(t)<x<h(t) \\ u(t, g(t))=u(t, h(t))=0, & t \geq 0 \\ u(0, x)=u_{0}(x), \quad|x| \leq h_{0} . & \end{cases}
$$

Evidently, $\bar{u}$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{u}_{t} \geq d_{1} \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}), & t>0, g(t)<x<h(t) \\ \bar{u}(t, g(t)) \geq 0, \quad \bar{u}(t, h(t)) \geq 0, & t \geq 0 \\ u(0, x)=u_{0}(x), \quad|x| \leq h_{0} & \end{cases}
$$

Take advantage of Lemma 2.1 and a comparison argument it can be shown that $u(t, x) \leq \bar{u}(t, x)$ for $t>0$ and $x \in[g(t), h(t)]$. Thus, $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \max _{g(t) \leq x \leq h(t)} u(t, x)=0$. The proof is end.

Lemma 3.5. Let $f_{1}, f_{2}$ satisfy (1.3), or (1.2) with $1 / c>a>b$ (weak competition). Then $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=$ $\infty$ if and only if $h_{\infty}=\infty$ and $g_{\infty}=-\infty$.

The proof of Lemma 3.5 is similar to those of [5, Proposition 3.10], [8, Proposition 4.1] and [12, Proposition 3], and we omit the details.

Here we should mention that if $f_{1}, f_{2}$ satisfy (1.2) without $1 / c>a>b$, i.e., the general competition model, we don't know if Lemma 3.5 is true or not. Even for the local diffusion competition model with double free boundaries

$$
\begin{cases}u_{t}-u_{x x}=u(a-u-b v), & t>0, \quad g(t)<x<h(t) \\ v_{t}-d v_{x x}=v(1-v-c u), & t>0, \quad g(t)<x<h(t) \\ u=v=0, \quad g^{\prime}(t)=-\mu_{l}\left(u_{x}+\rho_{l} v_{x}\right), & t>0, \quad x=g(t) \\ u=v=0, \quad h^{\prime}(t)=-\mu_{r}\left(u_{x}+\rho_{r} v_{x}\right), & t>0, \quad x=h(t) \\ u(0, x)=u_{0}(x), \quad v(0, x)=v_{0}(x), & x \in\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right] \\ g(0)=-h_{0}, \quad h(0)=h_{0}\end{cases}
$$

such a problem is still not clear.
Now we study the long-time behavior of $(u, v)$ when spreading happens.

Theorem 3.6. Suppose that $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$.
(i) In the weak competition case we have

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(u(t, x), v(t, x))=\left(\frac{a-b}{1-b c}, \frac{1-a c}{1-b c}\right) \quad \text { locally uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

(ii) In the weak predation case we have

$$
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}(u(t, x), v(t, x))=\left(\frac{a-b}{1+b c}, \frac{1+a c}{1+b c}\right) \quad \text { locally uniformly for } x \in \mathbb{R}
$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.5 that $h_{\infty}=\infty$ and $g_{\infty}=-\infty$. Similar to the proofs of [5, Theorem 1.4] and [8, Theorem 4.3], by using [5, Lemma 3.14], [8, Propositions B.1, B.2] and iteration arguments, we can get the desired results. To save space, we omit the details.

## 4 The criteria governing spreading and vanishing

To study the criteria governing spreading and vanishing, we first give two abstract lemmas to affirm that the habitat can be large provided that the moving parameter of free boundary is large enough.

Lemma 4.1. ([12, Lemma 4.3]) Let $C$ be a positive constant. For any given positive constants $r_{0}, H$, and any function $w_{0} \in W_{p}^{2}\left(\left(-r_{0}, r_{0}\right)\right)$ with $p>1, w_{0}\left( \pm r_{0}\right)=0$ and $w_{0}>0$ in $\left(-r_{0}, r_{0}\right)$, there exists $\mu^{0}>0$ such that when $\mu \geq \mu^{0}$ and $(w, l, r)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}w_{t}-w_{x x} \geq-C w, & t>0, l(t)<x<r(t) \\ w=0, l^{\prime}(t) \leq-\mu w_{x}, & t \geq 0, x=l(t) \\ w=0, r^{\prime}(t) \geq-\mu w_{x}, & t \geq 0, x=r(t) \\ w(0, x)=w_{0}(x), & -r_{0} \leq x \leq r_{0} \\ r(0)=-l(0)=r_{0}, & \end{cases}
$$

we must have $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} l(t) \leq-H, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t) \geq H$.
Lemma 4.2. Let the condition (J) hold, $d, C>0$ be constants. For any given constants $H>r_{0}>$ 0 , and any function $w_{0} \in C\left(\left[0, r_{0}\right]\right)$ satisfying $w_{0}\left( \pm r_{0}\right)=0$ and $w_{0}>0$ in $\left(-r_{0}, r_{0}\right)$, there exists $\rho^{0}>0$, depending on $J(x), d, C, w_{0}(x)$ and $r_{0}$, such that when $\rho \geq \rho^{0}$ and $(w, r, l)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}w_{t} \geq d \int_{l(t)}^{r(t)} J(x-y) w(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d w-C w, & t>0, l(t)<x<r(t) \\ w(t, l(t))=w(t, r(t))=0, & t>0, \\ r^{\prime}(t) \geq \rho \int_{l(t)}^{r(t)} \int_{r(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) w(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & t>0, \\ l^{\prime}(t) \leq-\rho \int_{l(t)}^{r(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{l(t)} J(x-y) w(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, & t>0 \\ w(0, x)=w_{0}(x), r(0)=-l(0)=r_{0}>0, & |x| \leq r_{0}\end{cases}
$$

we must have $\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} l(t) \leq-H, \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} r(t) \geq H$.
Proof. The idea of this proof comes from [3, Lemma 3.2]. First of all, the comparison principle ([6, Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3]) gives

$$
r^{\prime}(t)>0, \quad l^{\prime}(t)<0, \quad w(t, x)>0, \quad \forall t>0, \quad l(t)<x<r(t) .
$$

Take a function $\kappa(t) \in C^{1}([0,1])$ satisfying $\kappa(t)>0$ in $[0,1], \kappa(0)=r_{0}$ and $\kappa(1)=H$, and set $\omega(t)=-\kappa(t)$. Consider the following problem

$$
\begin{cases}z_{t}=d \int_{\omega(t)}^{\kappa(t)} J(x-y) z(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d z-C z, & 0<t<1, \omega(t)<x<\kappa(t) \\ z(t, \kappa(t))=z(t, \omega(t))=0, & 0<t<1 \\ z(0, x)=w_{0}(x), & |x| \leq r_{0} .\end{cases}
$$

In view of Lemma 2.3 of [6], this problem has a unique solution $z$ which is continuous and positive in $\bar{D}_{1, \omega, \kappa}$. Thus the functions of $t$ :

$$
r(t)=\int_{\omega(t)}^{\kappa(t)} \int_{\kappa(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) z(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, \quad l(t)=\int_{\omega(t)}^{\kappa(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\omega(t)} J(x-y) z(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x
$$

are positive and continuous on $[0,1]$, and so $r(t), l(t) \geq \sigma>0$ on $[0,1]$ for some constant $\sigma$. Note that $\omega^{\prime}(t)$ and $\kappa^{\prime}(t)$ are bounded on $[0,1]$, we can find $\rho^{0}>0$ such that when $\rho \geq \rho^{0}$, there hold:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \kappa^{\prime}(t) \leq \rho r(t)=\rho \int_{\omega(t)}^{\kappa(t)} \int_{\kappa(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) z(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, \\
& \omega^{\prime}(t) \geq-\rho l(t)=-\rho \int_{\omega(t)}^{\kappa(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\omega(t)} J(x-y) z(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x
\end{aligned}
$$

for all $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Applying the comparison principle ([6, Theorem 3.1]) we get

$$
l(t) \leq \omega(t), \quad r(t) \geq \kappa(t), \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq 1,
$$

and so $r(1) \geq \kappa(1)=H$ and $l(1) \leq \omega(1)=-H$ when $\rho \geq \rho^{0}$. The desired conclusion is obtained and the proof is complete.

Theorem 4.3. If $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\infty}-g_{\infty} \leq \pi \sqrt{d_{2}} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Recall Theorem [3.4, $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}=\lim _{t \rightarrow \infty}\|v(t, \cdot)\|_{C([g(t), h(t)])}=0 \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Assume on the contrary that $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}>\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}$. Then there exist $0<\varepsilon \ll 1$ and $\tau \gg 1$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}-2 \varepsilon>\pi \sqrt{d_{2}(1-c \varepsilon)}, \\
g(\tau)<g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, \quad h(\tau)>h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}, \\
0 \leq u(t, x)<\varepsilon, \quad \forall t \geq \tau, \quad x \in\left[g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right] .
\end{gathered}
$$

Then $v$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}v_{t} \geq d_{2} v_{x x}+v(1-c \varepsilon-v), & t>\tau, g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}<x<h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon} \\ v\left(t, g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}\right)>0, \quad v\left(t, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)>0, & t \geq \tau, \\ v(\tau, x)>0, & g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}<x<h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\end{cases}
$$

Let $w$ be the unique positive solution of

$$
\begin{cases}w_{t}=d_{2} w_{x x}+w(1-c \varepsilon-w), & t>\tau, g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}<x<h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon} \\ w\left(t, g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}\right)=w\left(t, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)=0, & t \geq \tau, \\ w(\tau, x)=v(\tau, x), & g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}<x<h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\end{cases}
$$

In view of the known parabolic comparison principle, we have

$$
w(t, x) \leq v(t, x), \quad t \geq \tau, g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon} \leq x \leq h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon} .
$$

Since $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}-2 \varepsilon>\pi \sqrt{d_{2}(1-c \varepsilon)}$, it is well known that $w(t, x) \rightarrow \eta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly in the compact subset of $\left(g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)$, where $\eta(x)$ is the unique positive solution of

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{l}
d_{2} \eta_{x x}+\eta(1-\eta)=0, \quad x \in\left(g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right), \\
\eta\left(g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}\right)=\eta\left(h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)=0 .
\end{array}\right.
$$

Hence, $\liminf _{t \rightarrow \infty} v(t, x) \geq \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} w(t, x)=\eta(x)>0$ for all $x \in\left(g_{\infty}^{+\varepsilon}, h_{\infty}^{-\varepsilon}\right)$. This is a contradiction to (4.2). Thus, (4.1) holds.

From Theorem 4.3 and $g^{\prime}(t)<0, h^{\prime}(t)>0$ for $t>0$, we have
Corollary 4.4. If $h_{0} \geq \frac{1}{2} \pi \sqrt{d_{2}}$, then spreading happens, i.e., $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$.
Assume $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies either (1.2) or (1.3). If $a \geq d_{1}$, then $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{(0, \ell)}+a\right)>0$ for all $\ell>0$ by Proposition [2.6. Thus, the vanishing can not happen by (3.4), i.e., $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$ always holds. Hence, we have

Theorem 4.5. If $a \geq d_{1}$, then spreading always happens.
Now we assume that $a<d_{1}$. Then, $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{(0, \ell)}+a\right)<0$ if $0<\ell \ll 1$, and $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{(0, \ell)}+a\right)>0$ if $\ell \gg 1$ by Proposition 2.6. According to the monotonicity of $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{(0, \ell)}+a\right)$ with respect to $\ell$, there exists $\ell^{*}>0$ such that

$$
\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{I}+a\right)=0 \text { if }|I|=\ell^{*}, \quad \lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{I}+a\right)<0 \text { if }|I|<\ell^{*}, \quad \lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{I}+a\right)>0 \text { if }|I|>\ell^{*},
$$

where $I$ stands for a finite open interval in $\mathbb{R}$, and $|I|$ denotes its length. Making use of (3.4) we see that if $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ then $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty} \leq \ell^{*}$. Thus, $h_{0} \geq \ell^{*} / 2$ implies $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$.

Lemma 4.6. Suppose that $a<d_{1}$. If $h_{0}<\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$, then there is $\Lambda_{0}>0$ such that $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{0}$.

Proof. The idea of this proof comes from [6, Theorem 3.12] and [7, Lemma 4.4]. Since $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(-h_{0}, h_{0}\right)}+\right.$ a) $<0$, we can choose $h_{0}<h_{1}<\ell^{*} / 2$ such that

$$
\lambda:=\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(-h_{1}, h_{1}\right)}+a\right)<0 .
$$

Case 1: The competition model. That is, $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.2). Let $\bar{u}$ be the unique solution of

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{u}_{t}=d_{1} \int_{-h_{1}}^{h_{1}} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+a \bar{u}, & t>0,|x| \leq h_{1},  \tag{4.3}\\ \bar{u}(0, x)=u_{0}(x), & |x| \leq h_{0}, \\ \bar{u}(0, x)=0, & |x|>h_{0} .\end{cases}
$$

And let $\varphi>0$ be the corresponding normalized eigenfunction of $\lambda$, namely $\|\varphi\|_{\infty}=1$ and

$$
\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(-h_{1}, h_{1}\right)}+a\right)[\varphi](x)=\lambda \varphi(x), \quad \forall|x| \leq h_{1} .
$$

For $C>0$ and $z(t, x)=C e^{\lambda t / 2} \varphi(x)$, it is easy to check that

$$
\begin{aligned}
d_{1} \int_{-h_{1}}^{h_{1}} J(x-y) z(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} z+a z-z_{t} & =C e^{\lambda t / 2}\left(d_{1} \int_{-h_{1}}^{h_{1}} J(x-y) \varphi(y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \varphi+a \varphi-\frac{\lambda}{2} \varphi\right) \\
& =\frac{\lambda}{2} C e^{\lambda t / 2} \varphi(x)<0, \quad \forall t>0,|x| \leq h_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Choose $C>0$ large enough such that $C \varphi(x)>u_{0}(x)$ on $\left[-h_{1}, h_{1}\right]$. Then we can apply Lemma 2.2 to $\bar{u}-z$ to deduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{u}(t, x) \leq z(t, x)=C e^{\lambda t / 2} \varphi(x) \leq C e^{\lambda t / 2}, \quad \forall t>0,|x| \leq h_{1} . \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $0<\delta, \sigma<1$ and $K>0$ be constants, which will be determined later. Set

$$
\begin{gathered}
s(t)=h_{0}\left(1+2 \delta-\delta \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t}\right), \quad \phi(y)=\cos \frac{\pi y}{2}, \quad 0 \leq y \leq 1, \\
\bar{v}(t, x)=K \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t} \phi(x / s(t)), \quad t \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq x \leq s(t) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Recall $h_{0}<\frac{1}{2} \pi \sqrt{d_{2}}$. Similar to the arguments in the proof of [15, Lemma 3.4], we can verify that, for suitably small positive constants $\delta, \sigma$, and large positive constant $K$, the pair $(\bar{v}, s)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{cases}\bar{v}_{t}-d_{2} \bar{v}_{x x}-\bar{v}(1-\bar{v}) \geq 0, & t>0,-s(t)<x \leq s(t),  \tag{4.5}\\ \bar{v}(0, x) \geq v_{0}(x), & -h_{0}(1+\delta) \leq x \leq h_{0}(1+\delta) .\end{cases}
$$

Set

$$
\bar{h}(t)=h_{0}-\mu \int_{0}^{t} \bar{v}_{x}(\tau, s(\tau)) \mathrm{d} \tau+2 \rho C h_{1} \int_{0}^{t} e^{\lambda \tau / 2} \mathrm{~d} \tau, \quad \bar{g}(t)=-\bar{h}(t), \quad t \geq 0
$$

We claim that if $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{0}$ and $\Lambda_{0}>0$ is small enough, then $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{g}, \bar{h})$ is an upper solution of (1.1) in there $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.2). In fact, let

$$
m=\max \left\{\frac{\pi K}{2 \sigma h_{0}(1+\delta)},-\frac{4 C h_{1}}{\lambda}\right\} .
$$

Noticing

$$
\bar{v}_{x}(t, s(t))=-\frac{\pi K}{2 s(t)} \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t}
$$

and $\lambda<0$. It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{h}(t) & =h_{0}+\mu \int_{0}^{t} \frac{1}{2 s(\tau)} \pi K \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma \tau} \mathrm{d} \tau-\frac{4}{\lambda} \rho C h_{1}\left(1-e^{\lambda t / 2}\right) \\
& <h_{0}+\mu \frac{\pi K}{2 h_{0}(1+\delta)} \int_{0}^{t} \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma \tau} \mathrm{d} \tau-\frac{4}{\lambda} \rho C h_{1} \\
& <h_{0}+\mu \frac{\pi K}{2 \sigma h_{0}(1+\delta)}-\frac{4}{\lambda} \rho C h_{1} \leq h_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

provided that

$$
0<\mu+\rho \leq \frac{h_{1}-h_{0}}{m} .
$$

Similarly, $\bar{g}(t)>-h_{1}$. In the same way we can show that

$$
\bar{h}(t)<h_{0}(1+\delta) \leq s(t)
$$

provided that

$$
0<\mu+\rho \leq \delta h_{0} / m
$$

Set

$$
\Lambda_{0}=\min \left\{\frac{h_{1}-h_{0}}{m}, \frac{\delta h_{0}}{m}\right\} .
$$

Then

$$
\bar{h}(t)<\min \left\{h_{1}, s(t)\right\}, \quad \bar{g}(t)>\max \left\{-h_{1},-s(t)\right\}
$$

provided $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{0}$. Thus, by (4.3) and (4.5) we have

$$
\bar{u}_{t} \geq d \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}), \quad t>0, \bar{g}(t)<x<\bar{h}(t)
$$

and

$$
\bar{v}_{t}-d_{2} \bar{v}_{x x}-\bar{v}(1-\bar{v}) \geq 0, \quad t>0, \bar{g}(t)<x<\bar{h}(t)
$$

Due to (4.4), it is easy to check that

$$
\int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{\bar{h}(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x \leq 2 C h_{1} e^{\lambda t / 2} .
$$

On the other hand,

$$
-\bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{h}(t))=\frac{\pi K}{2 s(t)} \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t} \sin \frac{\pi \bar{h}(t)}{2 s(t)} \leq \frac{\pi K}{2 s(t)} \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t} .
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{h}^{\prime}(t) & =-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, s(t))+2 \rho C h_{1} e^{\lambda t / 2}=\mu \frac{\pi K}{2 s(t)} \mathrm{e}^{-\sigma t}+2 \rho C h_{1} e^{\lambda t / 2} \\
& \geq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{h}(t))+\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{\bar{h}(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly,

$$
\bar{g}^{\prime}(t) \leq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{g}(t))-\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\bar{g}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x .
$$

The above arguments show that $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{g}, \bar{h})$ is an upper solution of (1.1). By Lemma 2.3, $g(t) \geq \bar{g}(t), h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$. Therefore $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty} \leq 2 \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}(t) \leq 2 h_{1}$.

Case 2: The prey-predator model. That is, $\left(f_{1}, f_{2}\right)$ satisfies (1.3). Let $h_{1}, \lambda$ and $\varphi$ be as above. Set $\varepsilon=\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}}{2}-h_{0}\right)$. It then follows from $h_{0}<\frac{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}}{2}$ that

$$
\frac{d_{2} \pi^{2}}{4\left(h_{0}+\varepsilon\right)^{2}}>1
$$

Take $\sigma$ small such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
c \sigma \leq \cos \frac{\pi h_{1}}{2\left(h_{1}+\varepsilon\right)} . \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For these fixed $\varepsilon$ and $\sigma$, choosing $k$ large enough such that

$$
k \sigma \varphi(x) \geq u_{0}(x), \quad k \cos \frac{\pi x}{2\left(h_{0}+\varepsilon\right)} \geq v_{0}(x) \quad \text { for } x \in\left[-h_{0}, h_{0}\right]
$$

Let

$$
\theta=2 \sigma k h_{1} \rho, \quad \delta=\frac{k \pi}{2 h_{0}} \mu, \quad \gamma=\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{-\lambda, \frac{d_{2} \pi^{2}}{4\left(h_{0}+\varepsilon\right)^{2}}-1\right\}>0
$$

Then, for the fixed $\varepsilon, \sigma, k$ and $\gamma$, there exists $0<\Lambda_{0} \ll 1$ such that

$$
h_{0}+\frac{\theta+\delta}{\gamma} \leq h_{1}, \quad \frac{d_{2} \pi^{2}}{4\left[h_{0}+(\theta+\delta) / \gamma+\varepsilon\right]^{2}}-\gamma-1>0
$$

when $0<\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{0}$. We define

$$
\begin{gathered}
\bar{h}(t)=h_{0}+\frac{\theta+\delta}{\gamma}\left(1-e^{-\gamma t}\right), \quad \bar{g}(t)=-\bar{h}(t), \quad t \geq 0, \\
\bar{u}(t, x)=\sigma k e^{-\gamma t} \varphi(x), \quad \bar{v}(t, x)=k e^{-\gamma t} \cos \frac{\pi x}{2(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad|x| \leq \bar{h}(t) .
\end{gathered}
$$

Clearly, $\bar{h}^{\prime}(t)=(\theta+\delta) e^{-\gamma t}, h_{0} \leq \bar{h}(t)<h_{1}, \bar{h}(0)=h_{0}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d_{2} \pi^{2}}{4(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}}-\gamma-1>0 \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thanks to (4.6) and $\varphi(x) \leq 1, \bar{h}(t)<h_{1}$, it is not hard to derive

$$
\begin{equation*}
c \bar{u}(t, x) \leq \bar{v}(t, x) \quad \text { for } t>0,|x| \leq \bar{h}(t) . \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The choices of $\varepsilon, \sigma$ and $k$ guarantee that

$$
\bar{u}(0, x) \geq u_{0}(x), \quad \bar{v}(0, x) \geq v_{0}(x) \quad \text { for } \quad|x| \leq h_{0} .
$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that

$$
\bar{u}(t, \pm \bar{h}(t)), \bar{v}(t, \pm \bar{h}(t)) \geq 0 .
$$

It is easy to deduce that, for $t>0$ and $|x| \leq \bar{h}(t)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{u}_{t}-d_{1} \int_{-h_{1}}^{h_{1}} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y+d_{1} \bar{u}-a \bar{u} & =\sigma k e^{-\gamma t}\left(-\gamma \varphi-\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(-h_{1}, h_{1}\right)}+a\right)[\varphi]\right) \\
& =\sigma k e^{-\gamma t}(-\gamma \varphi-\lambda \varphi) \\
& \geq \sigma k e^{-\gamma t} \gamma \varphi>0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Consequently,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{u}_{t} & \geq d_{1} \int_{-h_{1}}^{h_{1}} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}) \\
& \geq d_{1} \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y-d_{1} \bar{u}+\bar{u}(a-\bar{u}), \quad t>0,|x| \leq \bar{h}(t) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Writing $y=\frac{\pi x}{2(h(t)+\varepsilon)}$. Then $\frac{\sin y}{\cos y} x \geq 0$ for $|x| \leq \bar{h}(t)$. By direct calculations, we have, for $t>0$ and $x \in[\bar{g}(t), \bar{h}(t)]$,

$$
\bar{v}_{t}(t, x)=-\gamma \bar{v}+k e^{-\gamma t} \frac{\pi x r^{\prime}(t)}{2(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}} \sin y
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =-\gamma \bar{v}+\bar{v} \frac{(\theta+\delta) \pi e^{-\gamma t}}{2(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}} \frac{\sin y}{\cos y} x \\
& \geq-\gamma \bar{v}, \\
\bar{v}_{x x}(t, x) & =-\frac{\pi^{2}}{4(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}} \bar{v} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Recall (4.7) and (4.8). It follows that, for $t>0$ and $|x| \leq \bar{h}(t)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\bar{v}_{t}-d_{2} \bar{v}_{x x}-\bar{v}(1-\bar{v}+c \bar{u}) & \geq \bar{v}\left(-\gamma+\frac{\pi^{2}}{4(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}}-1+\bar{v}-c \bar{u}\right) \\
& \geq \bar{v}\left(-\gamma+\frac{\pi^{2}}{4(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)^{2}}-1\right) \\
& \geq 0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to verify that, for $t \geq 0$,

$$
\begin{gathered}
\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{\bar{h}(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x \leq 2 \rho \sigma k h_{1} e^{-\gamma t}=\theta e^{-\gamma t}, \\
-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{h}(t))=\frac{\mu k \pi}{2(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)} \sin \frac{\pi \bar{h}(t)}{2(\bar{h}(t)+\varepsilon)} e^{-\gamma t} \leq \frac{\mu k \pi}{2 h_{0}} e^{-\gamma t}=\delta e^{-\gamma t} .
\end{gathered}
$$

It follows that

$$
\bar{h}^{\prime}(t)=(\theta+\delta) e^{-\gamma t} \geq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{h}(t))+\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{\bar{h}(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x .
$$

Similarly, one has

$$
\bar{g}^{\prime}(t) \leq-\mu \bar{v}_{x}(t, \bar{g}(t))-\rho \int_{\bar{g}(t)}^{\bar{h}(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{\bar{g}(t)} J(x-y) \bar{u}(t, y) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x .
$$

Above all, we conclude that $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{g}, \bar{h})$ is an upper solution of (1.1). By Lemma 2.4, $h(t) \leq \bar{h}(t)$, $g(t) \geq \bar{g}(t)$. Therefore, $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty} \leq 2 \lim _{t \rightarrow \infty} \bar{h}(t) \leq 2 h_{1}<\infty$. This completes the proof.

Theorem 4.7. Suppose that $a<d_{1}$.
(i) If $h_{0} \geq \frac{1}{2} \min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$ then spreading always happens;
(ii) If $h_{0}<\frac{1}{2} \min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$, then there is $\Lambda^{*} \geq \Lambda_{*}>0$ such that $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{*}$, and $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \geq \Lambda^{*}$.

Proof. (i) If $h_{0} \geq \frac{1}{2} \pi \sqrt{d_{2}}$, then spreading happens by Corollary 4.4. If $h_{0} \geq \ell^{*} / 2$ and vanishing happens, then $\left[g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right]$ is a finite interval with length strictly bigger than $2 h_{0} \geq \ell^{*}$. Hence $\lambda_{p}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\left(g_{\infty}, h_{\infty}\right)}+a\right)>0$. This contradicts (3.4).
(ii) As $u, v$ are bounded, there exists constant $C>0$ such that $f_{1}(u, v) \geq-C u, f_{2}(u, v) \geq-C v$. Clearly,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& h^{\prime}(t)>-\mu v_{x}(t, h(t)), \quad h^{\prime}(t)>\rho \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{h(t)}^{\infty} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, \quad t \geq 0 \\
& g^{\prime}(t)<-\mu v_{x}(t, g(t)), \quad g^{\prime}(t)<-\rho \int_{g(t)}^{h(t)} \int_{-\infty}^{g(t)} J(x-y) u(t, x) \mathrm{d} y \mathrm{~d} x, \quad t \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

Fixed a constant $H>\min \left\{\pi \sqrt{d_{2}}, \ell^{*}\right\}$ and let $\mu^{0}$ and $\rho^{0}$ be obtained by Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, respectively, and set $\Lambda^{0}=\mu^{0}+\rho^{0}$. Then $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}=\infty$ when $\mu+\rho>\Lambda^{0}$ by Lemma 4.1, Lemma 4.2 and the conclusion (i). Let $\Lambda_{0}$ be given by Lemma 4.6. Then $h_{\infty}-g_{\infty}<\infty$ when $\mu+\rho \leq \Lambda_{0}$.

By use of the continuity method: increasing $\Lambda_{0}$ and decreasing $\Lambda^{0}$ continuously, similar to the arguments of [8, Theorem 5.2], we can show the desired conclusions and the details are omitted here. This completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The statements in Theorem 1.3 are contained in Corollary 4.4, Theorem 4.5 and Theorem 4.7.
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