

ON THE EXISTENCE OF PERIODIC SOLUTION FOR NEUTRAL DELAY COMPETITIVE SYSTEM

Zhanji Gui and Weigao Ge

Abstract. In this paper, the n -species neutral delay competitive differential system with periodic coefficients is investigated by means of an abstract continuous theorem of k -set contractive operator and some analysis techniques. Sufficient conditions are obtained for periodic solution.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the periodic neutral delay competitive differential equations

$$(1) \quad \dot{x}_i(t) = x_i(t) \left[r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)x_j(t - \tau_{ij}(t)) - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{x}_i(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)) \right],$$
$$i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where the functions $r_i(t)$, $a_{ij}(t)$, $b_{ij}(t)$, $\tau_{ij}(t)$, $\sigma_{ij}(t)$ are continuous periodic functions with period $\omega > 0$ and $r_i(t) \geq 0$, $a_{ij}(t) \geq 0$, $b_{ij}(t) \geq 0$, $\tau_{ij}(t) \geq 0$ and $\sigma_{ij}(t) \geq 0$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$) for all $t \geq 0$. Furthermore, $\tau_{ij}(t)$ are continuously differentiable with $\tau'_{ij}(t) < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Single species population models have been studied by a lot of authors (see [1-8]). The simplest and most widely adopted single species growth model is the well-known Logistic equation

$$(2) \quad \dot{x}(t) = rx(t) \left[1 - \frac{x(t)}{K} \right],$$

where r is called the intrinsic growth rate of the species x , K is interpreted as the environment capacity for x , and $r[1 - x(t)/K]$ is the per capita growth rate of x at

Received October 10, 2005, accepted April 11, 2006.

Communicated by Song-Sun Lin.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 34B15, 35K13.

Key words and phrases: Periodic solution, k -Set contraction, Competitive system, Neutral delay equation.

time t . Smith [5] argued that the per capita growth rate in (2) should be replaced by $r[1 - (x(t) + \rho\dot{x}(t))/K]$. This leads to the equation

$$(3) \quad \dot{x}(t) = rx(t) \left[1 - \frac{x(t) + \rho\dot{x}(t)}{K} \right].$$

Gopalsamy et al. [6] studied a periodic version of (3) that takes the form

$$(4) \quad \dot{x}(t) = r(t)x(t) \left[1 - \frac{x(t - m\omega) + c(t)\dot{x}(t - m\omega)}{K(t)} \right],$$

where $r(t)$, $c(t)$ and $K(t)$ are positive continuous periodic functions of period ω , and m is a positive integer.

In 1993, Kuang in [3] proposed an open problem (open problem 9.2) to obtain sufficient conditions for the existence of positive periodic solutions to the following equation

$$(5) \quad \frac{dx}{dt} = r(t)x(t) \left[a(t) - \beta(t)x(t) - b(t)x(t - \tau(t)) - c(t)\dot{x}(t - \tau(t)) \right],$$

where $r(t)$, $a(t)$, $\beta(t)$, $b(t)$, $c(t)$, $\tau(t)$ are continuous periodic functions with period $\omega > 0$. Li [9-11], by use of Mawhin's continuation theorem, studied system (5) and

$$(6) \quad \frac{dN}{dt} = N(t) \left[a(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n b_j(t)N(t - \sigma_j) - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(t)\dot{N}(t - \tau_i) \right]$$

and system

$$(7) \quad \frac{dN_i}{dt} = N_i(t) \left[r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ij}(t)N_j(t - \tau_{ij}) - \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij}(t)\dot{N}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}) \right],$$

$$i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

where σ_j , τ_i , τ_{ij} and σ_{ij} ($i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are constants. But, Li did not verify the important assumption that operator $\mathcal{N} : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow X$ was L -compact in all the papers [9-11]. So the main theorems in [9-11] may not be true. For example, under the transformation $N(t) = e^{x(t)}$, Li rewrote system (6) in the following form

$$Lx = \mathcal{N}x,$$

where $L = \frac{d}{dt}$, $\mathcal{N}x = a(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n b_j(t)e^{x(t - \sigma_j)} - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i(t)\dot{x}(t - \tau_i)e^{x(t - \tau_i)}$. Even if $\sigma_j = \tau_j$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, n$), according to the definition of operator K_p , P , Q and

Banach space $X = \{x : x \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}), x(t + \omega) \equiv x(t)\}$ in [10], one can find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 K_P(I - Q)\mathcal{N} : X &\rightarrow X, \\
 K_P(I - Q)\mathcal{N}x &= \int_0^t \left[a(s) - \sum_{j=1}^n (b_j(s) - \dot{c}_j(s))e^{x(t-\tau_j)} \right] ds \\
 &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^n \left[c_j(t)e^{x(t-\tau_j)} - c_j(0)e^{x(-\tau_j)} \right] \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega \int_0^t \left[a(s) - \sum_{j=1}^n (b_j(s) - \dot{c}_j(s))e^{x(s-\tau_j)} \right] ds dt \\
 &\quad - \left(\frac{t}{\omega} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \int_0^\omega \left[a(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n (b_j(t) - \dot{c}_j(t))e^{x(t-\tau_j)} \right] dt.
 \end{aligned}$$

As the right side of the above formula contains

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left[c_j(t)e^{x(t-\tau_j)} - c_j(0)e^{x(-\tau_j)} \right],$$

one can not verify that $K_P(I - Q)\mathcal{N}(\bar{\Omega})$ is relatively compact in X for any bounded set $\Omega \subset X$.

It is easy to see that system (7) is a special case of system (1), The purpose of this article is to establish criteria to guarantee the existence of positive periodic solutions to system (1). By using the continuation theory for k -set contractions [12-18], we obtain a new result.

2. PREPARATION

In order to study system (1), we should make some preparations. Let E be a Banach space. For a bounded subset $A \in E$, denote by

$$\alpha_E(A) = \inf\{\delta > 0 \mid \text{there is finite number of subsets } A_i \subset A,$$

$$\text{such that } A = \bigcup_{i=1} A_i \text{ and } \text{diam}(A_i) \leq \delta\}$$

the (Kuratowski) measure of noncompactness, where $\text{diam}(A_i)$ denotes the diameter of set A_i . Let X, Y be two Banach spaces and Ω a bounded open subset of X . A continuous and bounded map $x : \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is called k -set contractive if for any bounded set $A \subset \Omega$ we have

$$\alpha_Y(N(A)) \leq k\alpha_X(A).$$

Also, for a Fredholm operator $L : X \rightarrow Y$ with index zero, according to [15,16] we may define

$$l(L) = \sup \{r \geq 0 \mid r\alpha_X(A) \leq \alpha_Y(L(A)), \text{ for all bounded subset } A \subset X\}.$$

Lemma 1. ([17, 18]) *Let $L : X \rightarrow Y$ be a Fredholm operator with index zero, and $a \in Y$ a fix point. Suppose that $N : \Omega \rightarrow Y$ is a k -set contractive with $k < l(L)$, where $\Omega \subset X$ is bounded, open, and symmetric about $0 \in \Omega$. Furthermore, we assume that*

- (a) $Lx \neq \lambda Nx + \lambda r$, for $x \in \partial\Omega$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, and
 (b) $[QN(x) + Qr, x][QN(-x) + Qr, x] < 0$, for $x \in \ker L \cap \partial\Omega$, where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ is a bilinear form on $Y \times X$ and Q is the project of Y onto $\text{coker}(L)$.

Then there is $x \in \bar{\Omega}$ such that

$$Lx - Nx = r.$$

In order to use Lemma 1 for system(1), By the transformation $x_i(t) = e^{u_i(t)}$, system (1) can be rewritten as

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{u}_i(t) = & r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} \\ & - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Let $u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_n(t))^T$. We write $u > 0$ if $u_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We take $C_\omega^0 = \{u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_n(t))^T \in C^0(R, R^n) : u_i(t+\omega) = u_i(t), i = 1, \dots, n.\}$ with the norm defined by $|u|_0 = \max_{t \in [0, \omega]} |u(t)|$, and

$$C_\omega^1 = \{u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_n(t))^T \in C^1(R, R^n) : u_i(t+\omega) = u_i(t), i = 1, \dots, n.\}$$

with the norm $|u|_1 = \max_{t \in [0, \omega]} \{|u|_0, |\dot{u}|_1\}$. Then C_ω^0, C_ω^1 are all Banach spaces. Let $L : C_\omega^1 \rightarrow C_\omega^0$ be defined by $Lu = \frac{du}{dt}$, and $N : C_\omega^1 \rightarrow C_\omega^0$ defined by

$$(9) \quad Nu = \begin{bmatrix} -\sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{1j}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{1j}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{1j}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{1j}(t))} \\ \vdots \\ -\sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{nj}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{nj}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{nj}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{nj}(t))} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see from [15] that L is a Fredholm operator with index zero. Now, system (8) has an ω -periodic solution if and only if $Lu = Nu + r$ for $u \in C_\omega^1$, where $r =: r(t)$.

In this paper, the notations

$$f^L = \min_{t \in [0, \omega]} f(t), \quad f^M = \max_{t \in [0, \omega]} f(t), \quad \bar{f} = \frac{1}{\omega} \int_0^\omega f(t) dt.$$

will be used.

Lemma 2. ([17]). *The differential operator L is a Fredholm operator with index zero and satisfies $l(L) \geq 1$.*

Lemma 3. *Let γ_1, γ_2 be two positive constants and $\Omega = \{u | u \in C_\omega^1, |u|_0 < \gamma_1, |\dot{u}|_1 < \gamma_2\}$. If $k = \max\{\sum_{i=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0 e^{\gamma_1}\} < 1$, then $N : \Omega \rightarrow C_\omega^0$ is a k -contractive map.*

Proof. Let $A \subset \bar{\Omega}$ be a bounded subset and let $\eta = \alpha_{C_\omega^1(A)}$. Then, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a finite family of subsets A_i satisfying $A = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$ with $\text{diam}(A_i) \leq \eta + \varepsilon$. Now let $V_i(t, u, z, w) = V_i(t, u_1, \dots, u_n, z_1, \dots, z_n, w_1, \dots, w_n), i = 1, \dots, n$ and

$$(10) \quad \begin{bmatrix} V_1(t, u, z, w) \\ \vdots \\ V_n(t, u, z, w) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}(t)e^{u_j} + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{1j}(t)w_j e^{z_j} \\ \vdots \\ \sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}(t)e^{u_j} + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{nj}(t)w_j e^{z_j} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Since $V_i(t, u, z, w)$ are uniformly continuous on any compact subset of $R \times R^{3n+1}$, A and A_i are precompact in C_ω^0 . It follows that there is a finite family of subsets A_{ij} of A_i such that $A_i = \bigcup_{j=1}^n A_{ij}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} & |V_i(t, u(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), u(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)))| \\ & - |V_i(t, v(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), v(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)))| \\ & = \left| \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)e^{u_j(t - \tau_{ij}(t))} + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{v}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{u_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)e^{v_j(t - \tau_{ij}(t))} + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{v}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{v_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) \left| e^{u_j(t - \tau_{ij}(t))} - e^{v_j(t - \tau_{ij}(t))} \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t) |\dot{v}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))| \left| e^{u_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))} - e^{v_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))} \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}^M e^{\gamma_1} + b_{ij}^M \gamma_2 e^{\gamma_1}) \sup_{s \in [0, \omega]} |u_j(s) - v_j(s)| \leq \varepsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

for any $u, v \in A_{ij}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|Nu_i - Nv_i|_0 & = \sup_{t \in [0, \omega]} |V_i(t, u(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), u(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{u}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))) \\
& \quad - V_i(t, v(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), v(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)))| \\
& \leq \sup_{t \in [0, \omega]} |V_i(t, u(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), u(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{u}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))) \\
& \quad - V_i(t, u(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), u(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)))| \\
& \quad + \sup_{t \in [0, \omega]} |V_i(t, u(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), u(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))) \\
& \quad - V_i(t, v(t - \tau_{ij}(t)), v(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)), \dot{v}(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)))| \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0 e^{\gamma_1} |\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t)) - \dot{v}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))| + \varepsilon \\
& \leq k\eta + (k + 1)\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

As ε is arbitrary small, it is easy to see that

$$\alpha_{C_\omega^0}(N(A)) \leq k\alpha_{C_\omega^1}(A).$$

Lemma 4. Let $\Phi \in C_\omega^0$, $\tau \in C_\omega^1$, and $\dot{\tau}(t) < 1$, then $\Phi(\nu(t)) \in C_\omega^0$, where $\nu(t)$ is the inverse function of $t - \tau(t)$.

Proof. We need only to prove that $\nu(a + \omega) = \nu(a) + \omega$, for arbitrary $a \in R$. By the condition $\tau' < 1$, it is easy to see that the equation $t - \tau(t) = a$ and $t - \tau(t) = a + \omega$ exist a unique solution t_1, t_2 respectively. That is

$$t_1 - \tau(t_1) = a, \quad t_2 - \tau(t_2) = a + \omega,$$

i.e.,

$$(11) \quad \nu(a) = t_1 = a + \tau(t_1) \text{ and } \nu(a + \omega) = t_2.$$

As

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega + a + \tau(t_1) - \tau(\omega + a + \tau(t_1)) & = \omega + a + \tau(t_1) - \tau(a + \tau(t_1)) \\
& = \omega + a + \tau(t_1) - \tau(t_1) \\
& = \omega + a.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $t_2 = \omega + a + \tau(t_1)$. So by (11), we have $\nu(a + \omega) = \nu(a) + \omega$ for $\forall a \in R$. ■

Throughout this paper, we assume that $\tau_{ij} \in C^2_\omega$, $\sigma_{ij} \in C^2_\omega$, $\dot{\tau}_{ij} < 1$, $\dot{\sigma}_{ij} < 1$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$). So $t - \tau_{ij}(t)$ or $t - \sigma_{ij}(t)$ has a unique inverse, and we set $\nu_{ij}(t)$, $\mu_{ij}(t)$ to represent the inverse of function $t - \tau_{ij}(t)$, $t - \sigma_{ij}(t)$, respectively.

3. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 1. *Suppose $b_{ij} \in C^1_\omega$, $\bar{r}_i > 0$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$, and*

$$\begin{aligned} a_{ij}(t) &> \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t), \\ \Phi_{ij}(t) &= : \frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} > 0, \\ \Psi_{ij}(t) &= : \frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\theta_2 a_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t)) + \theta_1 \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

$i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Further, we assume that

$$k = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0, \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}^0|_0 \right\} e^M < 1,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \left| \log \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}} \text{Big} \right|, M_i, N_1 \right\}, \\ M_i &= 2\bar{r}_i\omega + A_{ii} + \sum_{j=1}^n B_{ij} |b_{ij}^0|_0, \\ A_{ii} &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \bar{r}_i \left(\frac{a_{ii}(\nu_{ii}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ii}(\nu_{ii}(\xi_i))} - \frac{\theta_2 a_{ii}(\mu_{ii}(\xi_i)) + \theta_1 \dot{b}_{ii}^0(\mu_{ii}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ii}(\mu_{ii}(\xi_i))} \right)^{-1} \right\}, \\ B_{ij} &= \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \left\{ \frac{\bar{r}_i}{a_{ij}(\xi_i) - \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\xi_i)} \right\}, \quad b_{ij}^0 = \frac{b_{ij}(t)}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}}, \\ N_1 &= \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ A_{ii} + \omega \left(\bar{r}_i + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} \right) \left(1 - e^{M_j} \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}^0|_0 e^{M_j} \right)^{-1} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

θ_1, θ_2 are positive satisfying $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 1$. Then Eqs.(1) has at least one positive ω -periodic solution.

Proof. We consider the operator equation

$$Lu = \lambda Nu + \lambda r, \quad \lambda \in (0, 1).$$

We have

$$(12) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \dot{u}_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ \dot{u}_n(t) \end{bmatrix} = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} r_1(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{1j}(t))} \\ \vdots \\ r_n(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{nj}(t))} \\ - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{1j}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{1j}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{1j}(t))} \\ \vdots \\ - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{nj}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{nj}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{nj}(t))} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Suppose that $u(t) = (u_1(t), \dots, u_n(t))^T$ is any arbitrary solution of system (12) for a certain $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, then we have

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{u}_i(t) = \lambda & \left[r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating system (13) over the interval $[0, \omega]$, we obtain

$$(14) \quad \int_0^\omega \left[r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t)e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt = 0.$$

Clearly

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_0^\omega b_{ij}(t)\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} dt \\ & = \frac{b_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \Big|_0^\omega - \int_0^\omega e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} db_{ij}^0(t) \\ & = - \int_0^\omega \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} dt. \end{aligned}$$

From (14) and (15), we have

$$(16) \quad \bar{r}_i \omega = \int_0^\omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt.$$

Let $t - \tau_{ij}(t) = s$, *i.e.*, $t = \nu_{ij}(s)$, and $t - \sigma_{ij}(t) = s$, *i.e.*, $t = \mu_{ij}(s)$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, n$). According to Lemma 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\omega a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} dt &= \int_{-\tau_{ij}(0)}^{\omega-\tau_{ij}(\omega)} \frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(s))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(s))} e^{u_j(s)} ds \\ &= \int_0^\omega \frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} e^{u_j(t)} dt, \\ \int_0^\omega \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} dt &= \int_{-\sigma_{ij}(0)}^{\omega-\sigma_{ij}(\omega)} \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} e^{u_j(t)} dt \\ &= \int_0^\omega \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} e^{u_j(t)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

So from (16), we get

$$(17) \quad \bar{r}_i \omega = \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} \right] e^{u_j(t)} dt.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\omega \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[u_i(t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] \right| dt \\ &= \lambda \int_0^\omega \left| \left[r_i(t) - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} + \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] \right| dt \\ (18) \quad &= \lambda \int_0^\omega \left| \left[r_i(t) - \left(\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} \right) e^{u_j(t)} \right] \right| dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\omega r_i(t) dt + \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} \right] e^{u_j(t)} dt \\ &= 2\bar{r}_i \omega. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{r}_i \omega &= \theta_1 \int_0^\omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt \\
&\quad + \theta_2 \int_0^\omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt \\
&= \int_0^\omega \left[(\theta_1 + \theta_2) \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} \right. \\
(19) \quad &\quad \left. - \theta_2 \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} - \theta_1 \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^\omega \theta_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left(a_{ij}(t) - \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) \right) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} dt \\
&= \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\theta_2 a_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t)) + \theta_1 \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} \right] e^{u_j(t)} dt \\
&\quad + \int_0^\omega \theta_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij}(t) - \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) \right] e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

From (19) there is $\xi_i \in [0, \omega]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
(20) \quad \bar{r}_i &= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi_i))} - \frac{\theta_2 a_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i)) + \theta_1 \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i))} \right] e^{u_j(\xi_i)} \\
&\quad + \theta_2 \sum_{j=1}^n \left[a_{ij}(\xi_i) - \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\xi_i) \right] e^{u_j(\xi_i - \sigma_{ij}(\xi_i))}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}
(21) \quad u_j(\xi_i) &\leq \bar{r}_i \left(\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi_i))} - \frac{\theta_2 a_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i)) + \theta_1 \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(\xi_i))} \right)^{-1} \\
&= A_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.
\end{aligned}$$

$$(22) \quad e^{u_j(\xi_i - \sigma_{ij}(\xi_i))} \leq \frac{\bar{r}_i}{a_{ij}(\xi_i) - \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\xi_i)} \leq B_{ij}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

It follows from (18), (20) and (21) that

$$u_i(t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \leq u_i(\xi_i) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(\xi_i) e^{u_j(\xi_i - \sigma_{ij}(\xi_i))}$$

$$\int_0^\omega \left| \frac{d}{dt} \left[u_i(t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] \right| dt$$

$$\leq 2\bar{r}_i\omega + A_{ii} + \sum_{j=1}^n B_{ij} |b_{ij}^0|_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then

$$(23) \quad u_i(t) + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} < M_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

As

$$\lambda \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} > 0,$$

it follows that

$$(24) \quad u_i(t) < M_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

From (13) and (23), we have

$$\int_0^\omega |\dot{u}_i(t)| dt \leq \bar{r}_i\omega + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}\omega e^{M_j} + e^{M_j} \sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij}(t) |\dot{u}_j(t - \sigma_{ij}(t))| dt$$

$$\leq \bar{r}_i\omega + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}\omega e^{M_j} + e^{M_j} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{b_{ij}(\mu_{ij})}{1 - \dot{\sigma}(\mu_{ij}(t))} |\dot{u}_j(t)| dt,$$

i.e.,

$$(25) \quad \int_0^\omega |\dot{u}_i(t)| dt \leq \omega \left(\bar{r}_i + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} \right) \left(1 - e^{M_j} \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}^0|_0 e^{M_j} \right)^{-1}.$$

It follows from (21), we have

$$|u_i(t)| \leq |u_i(\xi_i)| + \int_0^\omega |\dot{u}_i(t)| dt$$

$$\leq A_{ii} + \omega \left(\bar{r}_i + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} \right) \left(1 - e^{M_j} \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}^0|_0 e^{M_j} \right)^{-1} =: N_1.$$

By (13) and (26), we get

$$|\dot{u}_i|_0 \leq |r_i|_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|_0 e^{M_j} + \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0 e^{M_j} |\dot{u}_j|_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

It follows that

$$(26) \quad |\dot{u}_i|_0 \leq \frac{|r_i|_0 + \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|_0 e^{M_j}}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0 e^{M_j}} =: N_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Let $\Omega = \{u \in C_\omega^1 : |u|_0 < N_3, |\dot{u}|_0 < N_2\}$ and define a bounded bilinear form $[\cdot, \cdot]$ on $C_\omega^0 \times C_\omega^1$ by

$$\begin{bmatrix} [v_1, u_1] \\ \vdots \\ [v_n, u_n] \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\omega v_1(t)u_1(t)dt \\ \vdots \\ \int_0^\omega v_n(t)u_n(t)dt \end{bmatrix}.$$

Also we define $Q : v \rightarrow \text{coker}(L)$ by $v_i \rightarrow \int_0^\omega v_i(t)dt, i = 1, \dots, n$. Obviously

$$\{ u \mid u \in \ker L \cap \partial\Omega \} = \{ u \mid u \equiv N_3 \text{ or } u \equiv -N_3 \}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $u \equiv N_3$. thus

$$(27) \quad \begin{aligned} & [QN(u) + Q(r), u][QN(-u) + Q(r), u] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} [QN(u_1) + Q(r_1), u_1][QN(-u_1) + Q(r_1), u_1] \\ \vdots \\ [QN(u_n) + Q(r_n), u_n][QN(-u_n) + Q(r_n), u_n] \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} N_3^2 \omega^2 \left[\int_0^\omega r_1(t)dt - e^{N_3} \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}(t)dt \right] \\ \vdots \\ N_3^2 \omega^2 \left[\int_0^\omega r_n(t)dt - e^{N_3} \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}(t)dt \right] \\ \times \left[\int_0^\omega r_1(t)dt - e^{-N_3} \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n a_{1j}(t)dt \right] \\ \vdots \\ \times \left[\int_0^\omega r_n(t)dt - e^{-N_3} \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n a_{nj}(t)dt \right] \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} N_3^2 \omega^2 \left[\bar{r}_1 - e^{N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{1j} \right] \times \left[\bar{r}_1 - e^{-N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{1j} \right] \\ \vdots \\ N_3^2 \omega^2 \left[\bar{r}_n - e^{N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{nj} \right] \times \left[\bar{r}_n - e^{-N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{nj} \right] \end{bmatrix}.$$

If

$$N_3 > \left| \log \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}} \right|, \quad i = 1, \dots, n;$$

then

$$e^{N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} > \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} = \bar{r}_i,$$

$$e^{-N_3} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} < \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij}} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{a}_{ij} = \bar{r}_i.$$

So from (28) we get

$$(28) \quad [QN(u_i) + Q(r_i), u_i][QN(-u_i) + Q(r_i), u_i] < 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

From the condition

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0, \sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}^0|_0 \right\} e^{M_j} < 1,$$

we have that there is a constant $\bar{M} > M$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^n |b_{ij}|_0 e^{\bar{M}} < 1$. Applying Lemmas 1 and 3 with $\Omega = \{u | u \in C_\omega^1, |u|_0 < \gamma_1, |\dot{u}|_0 < \gamma_2\}$, we set $\gamma_1 = \bar{M}, \gamma_2 = M$. Then it follows from (23), (28) and (29) that all the conditions of Lemma 1 are satisfied. Hence system (1) has at least one positive ω -periodic solution.

Theorem 2. *If $\bar{r}_i > 0$ and $\Phi_{ij}(t) \leq 0, \forall t \in [0, \omega]$, then system (1) does not have any positive ω -periodic solution.*

Proof. We need only to prove that system (8) does not have any positive ω -periodic solution. If (8) have a ω -periodic solution $u(t)$, then integrating two

sides of system (8) on the interval $[0, \omega]$, we get

$$\int_0^\omega r_i(t) dt = \int_0^\omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}(t) e^{u_j(t-\tau_{ij}(t))} - \sum_{j=1}^n \dot{b}_{ij}^0(t) e^{u_j(t-\sigma_{ij}(t))} \right] dt,$$

i.e.,

$$\bar{r}_i \omega = \int_0^\omega \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(t))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(t))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(t))} \right] e^{u_j(t)} dt.$$

So there exists a number $\xi \in [0, \omega]$ such that

$$\bar{r}_i \omega = \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\frac{a_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi))}{1 - \dot{\tau}_{ij}(\nu_{ij}(\xi))} - \frac{\dot{b}_{ij}^0(\mu_{ij}(\xi))}{1 - \dot{\sigma}_{ij}(\mu_{ij}(\xi))} \right] \int_0^\omega e^{u_j(t)} dt.$$

As $\bar{r}_i > 0$, it follows that $\Phi_{ij}(\xi) > 0$ which contradicts $\Phi_{ij}(\xi) \leq 0, \forall t \in [0, \omega]$. this contradiction implies that system (8) does not have any positive ω -periodic solution. Theorem 2 is now proved.

Theorem 3. *If $\bar{r}_i = 0$ and $\Phi_{ij}(t) \geq 0$ or $\Phi_{ij}(t) \leq 0$, and furthermore, $\bar{\Phi}_{ij} \neq 0$, then system (1) does not have any positive ω -periodic solution.*

We omit the proof of Theorem 3 since it is similar to that of Theorem 2.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank the referees for their valuable suggestions and comments. This work is supported by the Natural Sciences Foundation of Hainan Province under Grant 80522 and the Foundation of office of Education of Hainan Province under Grant Hj200617.

REFERENCES

1. B. G. Zhang and K. Gopalsamy, Global attractivity and oscillations in a periodic delay logistic equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **150** (1990), 274-283.
2. S. M. Lenhart and C. C. Travis, Global stability of a biological model with time delay, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **96** (1986), 75-78.
3. Y. Kuang, *Differential Equations with Applications in Population Dynamics*, Academic Press, New York, 1993.
4. K. Gopalsamy, *Stability and Oscillations in Delay Differential Equations of Population Dynamics*, Kluwer Academic publishers, Boston, 1992.

5. H. L. Smith, Population dynamics in daphnia magna, *Ecology*, **44** (1963), 651-653.
6. K. Gopalsamy, X. He and L. Wen, On a periodic neutral logistic equation, *Glasgow Math. J.* **33** (1991), 281-286.
7. H. I. Freedman and J. Wu, Periodic solutions of single-species models with periodic delay, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **23** (1992), 689-701.
8. B. R. Tang and Y. Kuang, Existence, uniqueness and asymptotic stability of periodic functional differential systems, *Tohoku Math. J.*, **49** (1997), 217-239.
9. Y. Li, Positive periodic solutions for a neutral delay model, *Acta. Math. Sinica*, **39** (1996), 789-795.
10. Y. Li, Periodic solutions of a periodic neutral delay model, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **214** (1997), 11-21.
11. Y. Li, On a periodic neutral delay Lotka-Volterra system, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **39** (2000), 767-778.
12. Z. Yang and J. Cao, Sufficient conditions for the existence of positive periodic solutions of a class of neutral delay model, *Appl. Math. Comput.*, **142** (2003), 123-142.
13. H. Fang and J. Li, On the existence of periodic solutions of a neutral delay model of single-species population growth, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **259** (2001), 8-17.
14. S. Lu, On the existence of positive periodic solutions for neutral functional differential equation with multiple deviating arguments, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **280** (2003), 321-333.
15. R. E. Gaines and J. L. Mawhin, *Lectures Notes in Mathematics*, Springer-verlag, Berlin, 1977, p. 568.
16. Z. Gui, *Biological Dynamic Models and Computer Simulation*, Science Press, Beijing, 2005.
17. W. V. Petryshyn and Z. S. Yu, Existence theorem for periodic solutions of higher order nonlinear periodic boundary value problems, *Nonlinear Analysis*, **6** (1982), 943-969.
18. Z. Liu and Y. Mao, Existence theorem for periodic solutions of higher order nonlinear differential equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **216** (1997), 481-490.

Zhanji Gui

Department of Computer Science,
Hainan Normal University,
Haikou 571158, P. R. China

Weigao Ge

Department of Mathematics,
Beijing Institute of Technology,
Beijing 100081, P. R. China