INVASION GENERATES PERIODIC TRAVELLING WAVES (WAVETRAINS) IN PREDATOR-PREY MODELS WITH NONLOCAL DISPERAL

JONATHAN A. SHERRATT∗

Abstract. Periodic travelling waves (wavetrains) have been studied extensively in systems of reaction-diffusion equations. An important motivation for this work is the identification of periodic travelling waves of abundance in ecological data sets. However for many natural populations diffusion is a poor representation of movement, and spatial convolution with a dispersal kernel is more realistic because of its ability to reflect rare long-distance dispersal events. In marked contrast to the literature on reaction-diffusion systems, there has been almost no previous work on periodic travelling waves in models with nonlocal dispersal. In this paper the author considers the generation of such waves by the invasion of the unstable coexistence state in cyclic predator-prey systems with nonlocal dispersal for which the dispersal kernel is thin-tailed (exponentially bounded). The main result is formulae for the wave period and amplitude when the parameters of the local population dynamics are close to a Hopf bifurcation point. This result is tested via detailed comparison of the dependence on parameters of the stability of the periodic travelling waves generated by invasion. The paper concludes with a comparison between the predictions of the nonlocal model and the corresponding reaction-diffusion model. Specifically, the parameter regions giving stable and unstable waves are shown to be the same to leading order close to a Hopf bifurcation point, irrespective of the choice of dispersal kernel.
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1. Introduction. Periodic travelling wave (PTW) solutions of reaction-diffusion equations have been studied since the 1970s [1]. At that time the main foci of research were the existence and stability of PTWs, and applications to oscillatory chemical reactions. Mechanisms by which PTWs might arise naturally in applications were first studied in the 1990s, in particular the generation of PTWs behind invasive fronts [2–4]. Shortly after this, new ecological data sets revealed PTWs of abundance in some cyclic populations [5,6]. Consequently there has been a large body of subsequent research on PTW generation by biological invasions. This includes work on applications to fungal colonies [7], tumour growth [8] and cell populations [9], but by far the largest body of literature concerns systems of predators and their prey [4,10–17]. In parallel with this theoretical research, field studies are revealing PTWs in an increasing wide range of natural populations, including voles [18,19], moths [20] and red grouse [21]. To my knowledge, there is no definitive evidence for the origin of the PTWs in any of these systems, but invasion is a clear contender in many cases.

The dominant model formalism used for studying PTWs in ecological systems has been reaction-diffusion equations. However for many ecological populations, spatial convolution is more realistic than diffusion as a representation of dispersal. Empirical data on many plant and animal species reveal rare long-distance dispersal events, and these can be reflected in a quantifiable way in dispersal kernels. Methods for kernel estimation include tracking of dispersing individuals (e.g. [22]), mark-recapture (e.g. [23]), and for plants, genotyping of individual seedlings to determine the source plant (e.g. [24]). The review paper [25] gives a comprehensive list of populations for which kernels have been estimated using such methods.
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In [26] I studied the existence and stability of PTW solutions of equations with nonlocal dispersal and with oscillatory kinetics of “\(\lambda-\omega\)” type (defined below). To my knowledge that is the only study of PTWs in autonomous models in which dispersal is represented by an integral term, and in the present paper I will extend that work to study PTW generation in both \(\lambda-\omega\) and predator-prey models with nonlocal dispersal. However it is important to comment that there is a relatively large literature on PTWs in reaction-diffusion models with nonlocal terms in the kinetics. This includes equations in which intraspecific competition terms involve spatial convolutions [27, 28], and those with nonlocal delays [29–31]. Of particular note is that in contrast to the local case, scalar reaction-diffusion equations with nonlocal kinetics can have PTW solutions [28]. Of particular relevance to the present paper is the work of Merchant and Nagata [32,33] on PTWs in predator-prey models with nonlocal prey competition; this will be discussed in more detail below. Finally, some authors have studied PTWs in integrodifferential equation models for populations in landscapes that vary periodically in space or time [34,35], although here the wave periodicity simply reflects the periodic variation in the parameters.

Predator-prey models typically have three spatially uniform equilibria: the trivial state with no predators or prey, a prey-only state, and a coexistence state. Cyclic population dynamics arise when the last of these loses stability via a Hopf bifurcation. These local dynamics lead to the consideration of two different invasion scenarios: invasion of the prey-only state by predators, and invasion of the coexistence state by oscillatory behaviour. The first of these is the most important, but also the most complicated. When the coexistence state is stable, one expects simple invasive transition fronts, and their existence has been proved for a number of models [36–38]. However for cyclic populations numerical simulations (e.g. [4,13,16]) reveal a rich variety of behaviours. This includes “point-to-periodic” fronts in which the front is followed by a wavetrain moving in parallel with it; a PTW behind the front moving with a different speed and in some cases in the opposite direction; a band of PTWs behind the front, followed by spatiotemporal disorder; and spatiotemporal disorder immediately behind the front. In addition, the coexistence state can appear as a permanent spatiotemporal transient behind the front, separating it from the spatiotemporal oscillations. Even for the much-studied case of reaction-diffusion models, our understanding of these phenomena remains very incomplete. It is known that in some cases a “point-to-periodic” invasive front exists [39–41], and it is known that close to Hopf bifurcation, the point-to-point invasive transition front exists and remains stable, with the spatiotemporal oscillations in the wake of the front being separated from the front interface [42,43]. Beyond this there are no precise results, although a number of authors have attempted to understand the complex array of behaviours using formal or approximate methods. In particular, in [44] I predicted the wavelength of the PTW occurring behind the front when the kinetic parameters are close to Hopf bifurcation, and this approximation was improved significantly in recent work by Merchant and Nagata [16,33]. Also, the widths of spatiotemporally transient regions of coexistence steady state and PTWs have been estimated using absolute stability theory [45–47].

In view of this highly incomplete picture of the invasion of the prey-only state by predators for (local) reaction-diffusion models, I will not consider this type of invasion in my work on the more complicated case of models with nonlocal dispersal – of course, it remains a natural area for future work. Instead I will restrict attention to the invasion of the coexistence state. From the viewpoint of applications, this is relevant when a change in environmental conditions alters the local dynamics from non-cyclic
to cyclic, so that the coexistence state changes stability: a local disturbance would then initiate an invasion process. For example, in Southern Finland the characteristic 3-year cycle in vole abundance disappeared in the mid-1990s, reappearing about 5 years later [48], possibly due to the differing responses of interacting vole species to climate changes. This corresponds to a stabilisation and then a destabilisation of the coexistence state; unfortunately there is no spatially extended field data for this system. A number of other multi-year population cycles have also collapsed over the last two decades; see [49] for a detailed review. For example long-standing vole cycles in Kielder Forest (UK) disappeared in the late 1990s; here the cause is thought to be milder winters [18]. In this case there has not been a reappearance of cycles but it seems likely that a series of severe winters would destabilise the non-cycling state. The invasion of the coexistence state is also important mathematically. The various studies described above on the invasion of the prey-only state all suggest that the key to understanding this process, and to predicting the wavelength of PTWs generated by invasion, actually lies in invasions of the coexistence state. This is particularly emphasised by the recent work of Merchant and Nagata [16, 33].

The main result of the present paper is a prediction of the wavelength and amplitude of the PTW generated by the invasion of the coexistence steady state for parameter values close to a Hopf bifurcation point in the local population dynamics. The outline of the paper is as follows. In §2 I describe the predator-prey model used, and I present the results of numerical simulations. In §3 and §4 I consider behaviour close to a Hopf bifurcation in the local population dynamics; in that case I am able to make analytical predictions of the selected PTW and its stability. In §5 I discuss numerical tests of these predictions in the case of a dispersal kernel of Laplace type, for which the two nonlocal equations can be rewritten as a system of four (local) partial differential equations; this enables a more detailed numerical investigation of PTW solutions. In §6 I make a quantitative comparison between the nonlocal predator-prey model and the corresponding (local) reaction-diffusion model, focussing on the regions in parameter space giving stable and unstable PTWs behind invasion. Finally in §7 I discuss the implications of my results and highlight some key questions for future work.

2. Numerical simulations of invasion of the predator-prey coexistence state. The approach used in this paper is not restricted to particular predator-prey kinetics, but for the purposes of specific illustration I will use the Rosenzweig-MacArthur model [50], augmented by nonlocal dispersal:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{predators} & \quad \frac{\partial p}{\partial t} = \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)p(y,t)dy - p + \frac{(C/B)hp/(1+Ch)}{1+Ch} - \frac{p}{AB} \\
\text{prey} & \quad \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} = \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)h(y,t)dy + h(1-h) - \frac{Cph}{1+Ch}.
\end{align*}
\] (2.1a) (2.1b)

These equations are non-dimensional with \( p(x,t) \) and \( h(x,t) \) denoting predator and prey densities at space point \( x \) and time \( t \); throughout the paper I will consider only one-dimensional spatial domains. The local population dynamics make the simple assumptions of logistic prey growth, an increasing saturating rate of prey consumption per predator, a birth rate of predators that is proportional to this consumption, and
a constant per capita predator death rate. For mathematical simplicity I assume that the two populations disperse at the same rate. This is appropriate for most aquatic systems, but many terrestrial predators disperse more rapidly than their prey, and potential extensions to unequal dispersal are discussed in §7. The dispersal kernel \( K(y) \) must be \( \geq 0 \) for all \( y \), and must satisfy \( \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} K(y) \, dy = 1 \) so that the dispersal term conserves population. I assume that \( K(.) \) is even, corresponding to unbiased dispersal; an important case for which an asymmetric kernel would be appropriate is a population living in a river [51]. Also, I will restrict attention to kernels that are “thin-tailed”, i.e. exponentially bounded, using as particular examples the Laplace and Gaussian kernels:

\[
\text{Laplace kernel: } K(s) = \left(\frac{1}{2a}\right) \exp\left(-|s|/a\right) \\
\text{Gaussian kernel: } K(s) = \left(\frac{1}{a\sqrt{\pi}}\right) \exp\left(-s^2/a^2\right)
\]

\((a > 0)\) which are probably the most widely used kernels in ecological and epidemiological applications (e.g. [51–53]). Note that I exclude from consideration kernels that are “fat-tailed”. These are used in many ecological applications [25, 54, 55], especially in the context of invasion fronts (e.g. [56]). A detailed study of PTWs for such kernels is an important issue for future work, but in [26] I showed that for the commonly-used Cauchy kernel all non-trivial PTWs are unstable, suggesting that PTWs may not be an important solution form for populations that disperse via fat-tailed kernels.

Equations (2.1) have three homogeneous steady states: trivial \( p = h = 0 \); prey-only \( p = 0, h = 1 \); and coexistence \( p = Ah_s(1-h_s), h = h_s \equiv 1/[C(A-1)] \). The last of these is unstable when \( A > 1 \) and \( C > (A+1)/(A-1) \), with a stable limit cycle [57]. Figure 2.1 shows typical numerical simulations of the invasion of the coexistence state when it is unstable, following a localised disturbance. An invasion front moves across the domain, leaving behind it either PTWs (Figure 2.1a) or a band of PTWs followed by spatiotemporal irregularity (Figure 2.1b). It is important to comment that I have not proved the existence of PTWs for (2.1) and this is a natural area for future work. However numerical results such as those in Figure 2.1 strongly suggest existence.

My numerical results are qualitatively the same as those found in numerical simulations of reaction-diffusion predator-prey models [59–61], where the irregular oscillations develop when the PTW selected behind the invasion is unstable. However the details of PTW selection for general parameters remain unclear even for reaction-diffusion models, and in this paper I will focus on behaviour close to Hopf bifurcation, that is when \( C \) is slightly greater than \((A+1)/(A-1)\). In this case I will derive an approximation to the selected PTW.

3. Invasions in \( \lambda - \omega \) systems. Close to a Hopf bifurcation in the local dynamics, (2.1) can be approximated by the appropriate normal form. For oscillatory reaction-diffusion equations and a wide range of other spatially extended oscillatory systems, the normal form is the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation [62, 63]. However for systems with nonlocal spatial coupling a different, nonlocal normal form is needed [64–67], and for (2.1) this is

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} &= \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)u(y,t)dy - u + (\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 r^2)u - (\omega_0 + \omega_1 r^2)v \\
\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} &= \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)v(y,t)dy - v + (\omega_0 + \omega_1 r^2)u + (\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 r^2)v.
\end{align*}
\]
Fig. 2.1. Examples of ptw generation in the predator-prey model (2.1). In (a) the selected ptw is stable, while in (b) it is unstable so that one sees a band of ptws immediately behind the invasion, followed by spatiotemporal disorder. I show space-time plots for predator and prey densities when (a) $2500 \leq t \leq 2580$, (b) $5500 \leq t \leq 5580$; the vertical separation of the solutions is proportional to the time interval. The equations were solved numerically by discretising in space using a uniform grid ($\delta x = 0.5$) and solving the resulting system of ordinary differential equations using the stiff ode solver rowmap [58] (http://numerik.mathematik.uni-halle.de/forschung/software/), with relative and absolute error tolerances both set to $10^{-8}$. The ode system includes a numerical calculation of the spatial convolutions using fast Fourier transforms. To avoid the difficulties posed by boundaries with non-Dirichlet conditions, my simulations actually involved invasions initiated by a local perturbation in the centre of the domain (at $x = 0$); the solutions are plotted for $x > 0$ only.

Here $r = \sqrt{u^2 + v^2}$ and $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \omega_0$ and $\omega_1$ are constants with $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 > 0$. The “$\lambda$--$\omega$” kinetics in (3.1) are the same as in the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation, which has been widely studied in both the applied mathematics [68] and physics [63] literatures. In (3.1) $u = v = 0$ corresponds to the coexistence steady state of the predator-prey model (2.1), and Figure 3.1 shows two numerical simulations of invasions of this steady state, following a localised disturbance. As expected, the solution for $u$ (and for $v$) shows a clear resemblance to the predator-prey solutions in Figure 2.1. Moreover, plots of the amplitude $r$ and phase gradient $\partial \theta / \partial x$ (where $\theta = \tan^{-1}(v/u)$) have the form of transition fronts moving with constant shape and speed (middle and lower panels of Figure 3.1). This solution form is the key to predicting the ptw that is selected by the invasion.

Specifically, I will prove the following, which is the main result of the paper:

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose that (3.1) has a solution of the form $r(x, t) = \tilde{r}(z) > 0$ and $\theta_z = \tilde{\psi}(z)$ where $z = x - ct$ with $c > 0$ constant, and with

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{r}(z) &\to R, \quad \tilde{r}'(z) \to 0, \quad \tilde{\psi}(z) \to \alpha \text{ as } z \to -\infty \\
\tilde{r}(z) &\sim r_0 e^{-\xi z}, \quad \tilde{\psi}(z) \sim \psi_0 e^{-\xi z} \text{ as } z \to \infty
\end{align*}
\]

where $R > 0$, $r_0 > 0$ and $\psi_0 \neq 0$. Suppose also that $K(\cdot)$ is even with $K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta|s|}$.
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Fig. 3.1. Examples of PTW generation in the $\lambda-\omega$ equations (3.1). In (a) the selected PTW is stable, while in (b) it is unstable so that one sees a band of PTWs immediately behind the invasion, followed by spatiotemporal disorder. The upper panels show space-time plots for $u$ when $70 \leq t \leq 100$, with the vertical separation of the solutions being proportional to the time interval; the corresponding solutions for $v$ are qualitatively the same but with a phase difference in the oscillations. The middle panels show the amplitude $r$ as a function of space $x$ at times $t = 10, 20, 30, \ldots, 100$. The thick grey line indicates the amplitude predicted by the calculations in §4. The lower panels show the corresponding solutions for the phase gradient $\partial\theta/\partial x$; this is not defined when $r = 0$, and is only plotted when the numerical solution for $r$ exceeds $10^{-5}$. In these panels the thick grey line indicates the wavenumber predicted by the calculations in §4. The equations (3.1) were solved numerically as described in the legend of Figure 2.1, with a uniform space mesh of width 0.05 and with the absolute and relative error tolerances in rowmap set to $10^{-10}$.

when $|s|$ is sufficiently large, for some $K_0 > 0$ and some $\theta > \xi$. Then (i) $\alpha$ satisfies

$$c\alpha = (\omega_1/\lambda_1) \left[ 1 - \lambda_0 - \int_{s=+\infty}^{s=-\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds \right]$$

(3.2)

(ii) to leading order as $z \to \infty$, $\tilde{r}(z)$ satisfies

$$c \frac{\partial \tilde{r}}{\partial z} + \int_{\zeta=-\infty}^{\zeta=+\infty} K(z - \zeta) \tilde{r}(\zeta) \, d\zeta + (\lambda_0 - 1) \tilde{r} = 0.$$  

To avoid confusion, I remark that I use the notation $f_1(z) \sim f_2(z)$ as $z \to \infty$ to mean that $f_1(z)/f_2(z) \to 1$. 
The appropriate value of $c$ is suggested by work on spreading speeds in simpler equations. For the scalar integrodifferential equation

$$\frac{\partial w}{\partial t} = \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)w(y,t)dy - w + f(w) \quad (3.3a)$$

with $f(0) = f(1) = 0 \quad f'(0) > 0 \quad f'(1) < 0 \quad (3.3b)$

spreading speeds were first considered by Medlock & Kot [52], who argued intuitively that for localised disturbances to the $w = 0$ state, the spreading speed of the disturbance will be $\min_{\eta>0}(1/\eta) [M(\eta) - 1 + f'(0)]$; I denote by $\eta_{\min}$ the value of $\eta$ at which this minimum occurs. Here the moment generating function $M(\eta) = \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=+\infty} K(s)e^{\eta s}ds$. The arguments of Medlock & Kot [52] also indicate that the tail of the wave front decays to zero in proportion to $e^{-\eta_{\min}z}$.

These intuitively based results were subsequently proved by Lutscher et al. [51] given suitable assumptions on $f(.)$ and $K(.)$, and then by Zhang et al. [69] for more general functions. For systems of integrodifferential equations, the only results on spreading speeds that I am aware of concern SIR epidemic models [70]. In particular, Theorem 3.1(ii) implies that linearising (3.1) about $u = v = 0$ gives an integrodifferential equation for $r$ that corresponds exactly with the linearisation of (3.3) about $w = 0$. This suggests that for invasion in $\lambda$-$\omega$ systems, the appropriate value of the invasion speed $c$ is

$$c = \min_{\eta>0} \mathcal{C}(\eta) \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{C}(\eta) = (1/\eta) [M(\eta) - 1 + \lambda_0] \quad . \quad (3.4)$$

Moreover, the value of $\xi$ in the statement of the theorem will be $\eta_{\min}$. Typically the set $\mathcal{S} := \{\eta | M(\eta) \text{ is defined}\}$ is either the whole real line or an open subset; this is assumed, for example, in the work of Lutscher et al. [51], and it holds for both the Laplace and Gaussian kernels. Then $\xi = \eta_{\min} \in \mathcal{S}$, and also there is a $\theta \in \mathcal{S}$ that is $> \xi$, as required for Theorem 3.1. I cannot prove (3.4) but I have confirmed it in numerical simulations for a wide range of parameter values, for the Laplace and Gaussian kernels.

Taken together, (3.2) and (3.4) can be solved for $\alpha$, the value of $\partial \theta/\partial x$ behind the invasion. Solutions of (3.1) with constant $r = R$ and $\partial \theta/\partial x = \alpha$ are periodic travelling waves, with the form

$$u = R \cos[(\alpha x + (\omega_0 + \omega_1 R^2) t) \quad \quad v = R \sin[(\alpha x + (\omega_0 + \omega_1 R^2) t) \quad . \quad [26]$$

Moreover $R$ is given in terms of $\alpha$ by

$$R = \left[(1/\lambda_1) \left(\lambda_0 - 1 + \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=+\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s)\right)\right]^{1/2} \quad (3.5)$$

[26]. Therefore the determination of the value of $\alpha$ behind the invasion solves the PTW selection problem. In §4 I will illustrate this by constructing explicit solutions for the cases of Laplace and Gaussian kernels, and I will compare my results with those from numerical simulations. In the remainder of this section I present a proof of Theorem 3.1. The main difficulty in the proof is the delicate limiting behaviour of the various improper integrals near the two asymptotes of the transition front.
Proof of Theorem 3.1.
Stage 1: Formulating the travelling wave equations. I begin by rewriting (3.1) in terms of \( r(x, t) = (u^2 + v^2)^{1/2} \) and \( \theta(x, t) = \tan^{-1}(v/u) \), which gives

\[
\frac{\partial r}{\partial t} = \int_{y = -\infty}^{y = +\infty} K(x - y) r(y, t) \cos[\theta(y, t) - \theta(x, t)] \, dy + (\lambda_0 - 1) r - \lambda_1 r^3 \quad (3.6a)
\]

\[
\frac{\partial \theta}{\partial t} = \int_{y = -\infty}^{y = +\infty} K(x - y) \frac{r(y, t)}{r(x, t)} \sin[\theta(y, t) - \theta(x, t)] \, dy + \omega_0 + \omega_1 r^2. \quad (3.6b)
\]

The solution form given in the statement of the theorem is \( r = \tilde{r}(z) \) and \( \theta = \tilde{\Psi}(z) + \theta_0(t) \), where \( \tilde{\Psi}(\cdot) \) is an integral of \( \tilde{\psi}(\cdot) \). Substituting this into (3.6) implies that \( d\theta_0/dt \) is a constant, say \( \theta_0 = \theta_1 t + \theta_2 \), with the travelling wave equations being

\[
0 = c \frac{d\tilde{r}}{dz} + \mathcal{I} + (\lambda_0 - 1) \tilde{r} - \lambda_1 \tilde{r}^3 \quad (3.7a)
\]

\[
0 = c\tilde{\psi} - \theta_1 + \mathcal{J} + \omega_0 + \omega_1 \tilde{r}^2. \quad (3.7b)
\]

\[
\mathcal{I} = \int_{\zeta = -\infty}^{\zeta = +\infty} K(z - \zeta) \tilde{r}(\zeta) \cos[\tilde{\Psi}(\zeta) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] \, d\zeta \quad (3.7c)
\]

\[
\mathcal{J} = \int_{\zeta = -\infty}^{\zeta = +\infty} K(z - \zeta) \frac{\tilde{\gamma}(\zeta)}{\tilde{r}(z)} \sin[\tilde{\Psi}(\zeta) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] \, d\zeta. \quad (3.7d)
\]

Stage 2: Form of (3.7a) as \( z \to -\infty \). Consider a function \( \sigma(z) > 0 \) such that \( \sigma(z) \) and \( |z| - \sigma(z) \) both \( \to \infty \) as \( z \to \pm \infty \). Later in the proof I will impose a tighter restriction on \( \sigma(z) \). I then define \( \rho(z) = \sup_{s \geq -\sigma(z)} |\tilde{r}(z - s) - R| \) and \( \delta(z) = \sup_{s \geq -\sigma(z)} |\tilde{\psi}(z - s) - \alpha| \). Note that the limiting behaviours \( z + \sigma(z) \to -\infty, \tilde{r}(z) \to R \) and \( \tilde{\psi}(z) \to \alpha \) as \( z \to -\infty \) together imply that \( \rho(z) \) and \( \delta(z) \) → 0.

My basic approach is to use the behaviour of (3.7a) as \( z \to -\infty \) to deduce a relationship between \( R \) and \( \alpha \). The difficulty lies in determining the behaviour of \( \mathcal{I} \) in this limit. I will investigate this by splitting the domain of integration into two parts: \( \zeta < z + \sigma(z) \) and \( \zeta > z + \sigma(z) \). The limiting behaviour of the first part can be resolved using the property \( \sigma(z) \to \infty \) as \( z \to -\infty \), while for the second part I use \( z + \sigma(z) \to -\infty \).

Using the triangle inequality, \( \mathcal{I} - R \int_{s = -\infty}^{s = +\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds \leq \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3 \) where

\[
\mathcal{I}_1 = \int_{s = -\infty}^{s = -\sigma(z)} K(s) \tilde{r}(z - s) \cos[\tilde{\Psi}(z - s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] \, ds
\]

\[
\mathcal{I}_2 = \int_{s = -\sigma(z)}^{s = +\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z - s) \cos[\tilde{\Psi}(z - s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] \, ds - R \int_{s = -\sigma(z)}^{s = +\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds
\]

\[
\mathcal{I}_3 = R \int_{s = -\infty}^{s = -\sigma(z)} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds.
\]

Now \( \mathcal{I}_1 \leq \int_{s = -\infty}^{s = -\sigma(z)} K(s) \tilde{r}(z - s) \, ds \). Since \( \tilde{r}(z) \) is defined for all \( z \) and tends to finite limits as \( z \to \pm \infty \), it is bounded, say \( \tilde{r}(z) \leq C_1 \) for all \( z \). Thus \( \mathcal{I}_1 \leq C_1 \int_{s = -\infty}^{s = -\sigma(z)} K(s) \, ds \). This integral converges for all \( z \) since \( K(\cdot) \) is exponentially bounded. Moreover \( \sigma(z) \to \infty \) as \( z \to -\infty \). Therefore \( \mathcal{I}_1 \to 0 \) as \( z \to -\infty \). Similarly \( \mathcal{I}_3 \to 0 \) as \( z \to -\infty \).
I turn now to the more difficult case of $\mathcal{I}_2$, which can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \left[ \tilde{r}(z-s) \cos [\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] - \frac{R}{p_2} \cos(\alpha s) \right] ds.$$ 

I use the inequality $|p_1 q_1 - p_2 q_2| \leq |q_1| \cdot |p_1 - p_2| + |p_1 - q_1| \cdot |q_1 - q_2|$ with the $p_i$'s and $q_i$'s as indicated. Noting that $|\tilde{r}(z-s) - R| \leq \rho(z)$ throughout the range of integration, this gives

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \leq \rho(z) \int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) ds + R \int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \left[ \cos [\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] - \cos(\alpha s) \right] ds. \quad (3.8)$$

Since the derivative of $\cos(\cdot)$ is $\leq 1$ in absolute value, the mean value theorem implies

$$\left| \cos [\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] - \cos(\alpha s) \right| = \left| \cos [\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)] - \cos(-\alpha s) \right| 
\leq \left| \tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z) + \alpha s \right|$$

and applying the mean value theorem again gives

$$\left| \tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z) + \alpha s \right| \leq |(s) \tilde{\psi}(z - \tau s) - \alpha| \quad \text{for some } \tau \in (0,1)$$

$$\leq |s| \delta(z) \text{ for all } s \geq -\sigma(z).$$

Also $\int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) ds \leq \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) ds = 1$. Hence (3.8) implies that $\mathcal{I}_2 \leq \rho(z) + \delta(z) R \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) |s| ds$. The kernel $K(\cdot)$ is exponentially bounded, and thus the integral in this expression converges. Since $\rho(z)$ and $\delta(z)$ both $\to 0$ as $z \to -\infty$, $\mathcal{I}_2 \to 0$ also.

I have shown that $\mathcal{I} \to R \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) ds$ as $z \to -\infty$. Since $\tilde{r}'(z) \to 0$ and $\tilde{r}(z) \to R$ in this limit, (3.7a) implies that $\lambda_0 - 1 - \lambda_1 R^2 + \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) ds = 0$.

**Stage 3:** Form of (3.7b) as $z \to -\infty$. For (3.7b) the basic difficulty in determining behaviour as $z \to -\infty$ again lies in the integral term. Directly analogous methodology to that used above for $\mathcal{I}$ shows that as $z \to -\infty$, $\mathcal{J} \to \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \sin(\alpha s) ds = 0$ since $K(\cdot)$ is even. The only new feature in the proof of this limit, compared to that for $\mathcal{I}$, is that one must consider the term $\left( [\tilde{r}(z-s)/\tilde{r}(z)] - 1 \right)$ in an integral with respect to $s$ with limits $s = -\sigma(z)$ and $s = \infty$. For this, I note that throughout the range of integration and for $z$ sufficiently large and negative, $R - \rho(z) \leq \tilde{r}(z)$, $\tilde{r}(z-s) \leq R + \rho(z)$. Also, for $z$ sufficiently large and negative, $\rho(z) \leq \frac{1}{2} R$. Together these imply $\left| [\tilde{r}(z-s)/\tilde{r}(z)] - 1 \right| \leq (4/R) \rho(z)$. With the addition of this inequality, the argument used above for the limiting value of $\mathcal{I}$ can be extended directly to $\mathcal{J}$. The limiting form of (3.7b) as $z \to -\infty$ then follows immediately:

$$c \alpha - \theta_1 + \omega_0 + \omega_1 R^2 = 0.$$

**Stage 4:** Value of $\theta_1$. It remains to determine the value of the constant $\theta_1$, which follows from a consideration of the limiting behaviour of the travelling wave equations (3.7) as $z \to \infty$. I will show that $\mathcal{J} \to 0$ in this limit, from which it follows that
I consider first $\mathcal{J}_1$. I have $\tilde{r}(z) \sim r_0 e^{-\xi z} \Rightarrow \tilde{r}(z) \geq C_2 e^{-\xi z}$ for sufficiently large $z$, and also $\tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_3 e^{-\xi(z-s)} \leq C_3 e^{-\xi(z+\sigma(z))}$ for $s \leq -\sigma(z)$, again for sufficiently large $z$. Here $C_2$ and $C_3$ are suitably chosen positive constants. Also $K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta s}$ throughout the range of integration, for sufficiently large $z$. Combining these gives

$$|\mathcal{J}_1| \leq (C_3 K_0 / C_2) e^{-\xi \sigma(z)} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=-\sigma(z)} e^{\theta s} ds = (C_3 K_0 / C_2) e^{-\left(\xi + \theta\right) \sigma(z)} \to 0 \text{ as } z \to \infty.$$  

For $\mathcal{J}_3$ a similar argument can be used with one important difference. For $s$ in this range of integration $\tilde{r}(z-s)$ may or may not approach zero as $z \to \infty$; however I argued above that $\tilde{r}()$ is bounded. Hence throughout the range of integration $\tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_1$. Also, as for $\mathcal{J}_1$, provided that $z$ is sufficiently large $\tilde{r}(z) \geq C_2 e^{-\xi z}$, and also $K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta s}$ throughout the range of integration. Therefore

$$|\mathcal{J}_3| \leq (C_1 K_0 / C_2) e^{\xi z} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\sigma(z)} e^{-\theta s} ds = (C_1 K_0 / C_2) e^{\left(\xi - \theta \sigma(z)\right)}.$$  

(3.9)

Thus far, the choice of $\sigma(z)$ has been arbitrary within the constraints that $\sigma(z)$ and $|z| - \sigma(z) \to \infty$ as $z \to \pm \infty$. I now make the more specific assumption that $\sigma(z) = \gamma |z|$ with $1 > \gamma > \xi / \theta$. Then (3.9) implies that $\mathcal{J}_3 \to 0$ as $z \to \infty$.

I will now show that $\mathcal{J}_2$ also $\to 0$ as $z \to \infty$. This requires consideration of the sin function in the integrand. I define $\mu(z) = \sup_{s \leq \sigma(z)} |\psi(z-s)|$. Since $z - \sigma(z) \to \infty$ and $\tilde{\psi}(z) \to 0$ as $z \to \infty$, $\mu(z) \to 0$. The mean value theorem implies that for some $\tau \in (0,1)$, $|\tilde{\psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\psi}(z)| \leq |s| \cdot |\tilde{\psi}(z-\tau s)| \leq \mu(z)|s|$: this holds for all $s \leq \sigma(z)$. Since the derivative of sin is at most 1 in absolute value, applying the mean value theorem again gives $|\sin[\tilde{\psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\psi}(z)]| \leq \mu(z)|s|$. Turning attention to the $\tilde{r}(z-s)/\tilde{r}(z)$ term, for sufficiently large $z$ we have $\tilde{r}(z) \geq C_2 e^{-\xi z}$ and also $\tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_3 e^{\xi(s-z)}$ for any $s \in (-\sigma(z), \sigma(z))$. Here $C_2$ and $C_3$ are suitably chosen positive constants. These various inequalities give $|\mathcal{J}_2| \leq (C_3 / C_2) \mu(z) \int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\sigma(z)} |s| K(s) e^{\xi z} ds$. Since $K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta|s|}$ for sufficiently large $|s|$ with $\theta > \xi$, the integral in the above expression converges as $z \to \infty$, implying that $\mathcal{J}_2 \to 0$. This completes the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

Stage 5: Linearisation of (3.7a) as $z \to \infty$. The approach used to prove that $\mathcal{J} \to 0$ as $z \to \infty$ can also be used to prove part (ii) of the theorem, concerning the linearisation of (3.7a) ahead of the invasion. Using $\tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_1$ and $|\cos[\tilde{\psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\psi}(z)] - 1| \leq 2$ for all $z$ and $s$,

$$\left|I - \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) ds\right| \leq 2C_1 \int_{s=-\sigma(z)}^{s=\sigma(z)} K(s) ds + \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\sigma(z)} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \cdot |1 - \cos[\tilde{\psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\psi}(z)]| ds.$$
For sufficiently large \( s, K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta s} \Rightarrow 2C_1 \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \, ds \leq 2(C_1K_0/\theta) e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} \) for sufficiently large \( z \). I have shown above that \( |\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)| \leq \mu(z)|s| \) for \( s \leq \sigma(z) \) and \( z \) sufficiently large; also \( \tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_3 e^{-\xi(z-s)} \). Using the standard inequality \( 1 - \cos \phi \leq \frac{1}{2} \phi^2 \) (valid for all \( \phi \)) it follows that

\[
\int_{-\infty}^{\sigma(z)} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \cdot |1 - \cos[\tilde{\Psi}(z-s) - \tilde{\Psi}(z)]| \, ds \leq \frac{1}{2} C_3 \mu(z)^2 e^{-\xi z} \int_{-\infty}^{\sigma(z)} K(s) \varepsilon^x \, ds
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} C_3 \mu(z)^2 e^{-\xi z} \int_{-\infty}^{\sigma(z)} K(s) e^{\xi s} \, ds
\]

\[
\leq C_0 \mu(z)^2 e^{-\xi z}
\]

for some \( C_0 > 0 \) as a result of the asymptotic behaviour of \( K(s) \) as \( s \to \pm \infty \). Also \( \tilde{\psi}(z) \sim \psi_0 e^{-\xi z} \) as \( z \to \infty \Rightarrow \mu(z) \sim |\psi_0| e^{-\xi(z-\sigma(z))} \). Combining these results gives

\[
|\mathcal{I} - \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds| \leq 2(C_1K_0/\theta)e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} + C_7 e^{-3\xi z + 2\xi \sigma(z)} \quad (3.10)
\]

for some \( C_7 > 0 \).

As \( z \to \infty \) both \( \mathcal{I} \) and \( \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \to 0 \). To obtain the linearisation of (3.7a) ahead of the wave, it is necessary to augment (3.10) with a careful estimate of \( \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \) for large \( z \). To do this, I recall that \( C_2 e^{-\xi(z-s)} \leq \tilde{r}(z-s) \leq C_3 e^{-\xi(z-s)} \) for all \( s \leq \sigma(z) \), when \( z \) is sufficiently large. Also \( K(s) \leq K_0 e^{-\theta s} \) when \( |s| \) is sufficiently large. Therefore for sufficiently large \( z \), \( \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \) lies in

\[
\left[ C_2 e^{-\xi z} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\sigma(z)} K(s) e^{\xi s} \, ds, C_3 e^{-\xi z} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\sigma(z)} K(s) e^{\xi s} \, ds + K_0 \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} e^{-\theta s} \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \right]
\]

\[
\subseteq \left[ C_2 e^{-\xi z} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=0} K(s) e^{\xi s} \, ds, C_3 e^{-\xi z} \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=0} K(s) e^{\xi s} \, ds + (C_1K_0/\theta) e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} \right].
\]

The asymptotic form of \( K(s) \) as \( s \to \pm \infty \) implies convergence of the integrals of \( K(s) e^{\xi s} \) on \((-\infty, 0)\) and \((-\infty, \infty)\). Moreover both integrals must be strictly positive. Therefore for suitable \( C_8, C_9 > 0 \)

\[
K_0 e^{-\xi z} \leq \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=0} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \leq C_9 e^{-\xi z} + (C_1K_0/\theta) e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} \quad (3.11)
\]

Thus far I have assumed that \( \sigma(z) = \gamma |z| \) with \( 1 > \gamma > \xi/\theta \). I now tighten this restriction, requiring \( 1 > \gamma > 3\xi/(2\xi + \theta) \). Then \( e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} \ll e^{-\xi z} \) and \( e^{-\theta \sigma(z)} \ll e^{-3\xi z + 2\xi \sigma(z)} \) as \( z \to \infty \). Therefore (3.10) implies that

\[
|\mathcal{I} - \int_{s=\sigma(z)}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds| \leq C_{10} e^{-\xi z} e^{-2(1-\gamma)\xi z}
\]

for some \( C_{10} > 0 \) when \( z \) is sufficiently large, while (3.11) gives

\[
C_{11} e^{-\xi z} \leq \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \leq C_{11} e^{-\xi z}
\]

for some \( C_{11} > 0 \). Therefore \( \mathcal{I} \sim \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \tilde{r}(z-s) \, ds \) as \( z \to \infty \) which completes the proof of part (ii) of the theorem.
4. PTW selection in $\lambda$-$\omega$ systems for Laplace and Gaussian Kernels.

To illustrate the PTW selection implied by (3.2) and (3.4), and to enable numerical verification of my results, I now consider the specific cases of kernels of Laplace (2.2) and Gaussian (2.3) types.

4.1. Laplace kernel. For the Laplace form (2.2) of the kernel $K(.)$, PTW solutions of (3.1) are discussed in detail in [26]. Briefly, there is a one-to-one relationship between wavenumber $\alpha$ and amplitude $R$: $\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 R^2 = a^2 \alpha^2 / (1 + a^2 \alpha^2)$. If $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ there are PTWs for all values of $\alpha$, while if $\lambda_0 < 1$ then $\alpha$ must be $\leq \left[ \lambda_0 / (1 - \lambda_0) \right]^{1/2}/a$, with the amplitude $R$ being 0 at this maximum wavenumber. PTW stability is also determined in [26]: PTWs are unstable / stable when $|\alpha|$ is above / below $\alpha_{\text{stab}}^{\text{L}} \in (0, 1/a)$. This is the unique solution of an algebraic equation given in [26].

For this kernel, the moment generating function $M(\eta) = 1/(1 - a^2 \eta^2)$ (valid for $|\eta| < 1/a$). Using this, (3.4) gives $c = \alpha \kappa$, where $\kappa$ is an (algebraically complicated) function of $\lambda_0$. Turning to (3.2), the integral $\int_{s=-\infty}^{s=+\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) ds = 1/(1 + \alpha^2 a^2)$ and thus $\alpha$ satisfies

$$\kappa \alpha = (\omega_1/\lambda_1) \left[ 1 - \lambda_0 - 1/(1 + \alpha^2 a^2) \right].$$

To consider solutions of (4.1), suppose first that $\omega_1 > 0$. Since $\lambda_1 > 0$, the left- and right-hand sides of (4.1) are respectively increasing and decreasing functions of $\alpha$ on $\alpha < 0$, and their values at $\alpha = 0$ and $-\infty$ imply that there is exactly one solution for $\alpha$ in this range. The possibility of positive solutions must also be considered. If $\lambda_0 > 1$ this can be ruled out immediately because the right-hand side of (4.1) is always negative. If $\lambda_0 < 1$ then (4.1) can in fact have solutions with $\alpha > 0$. However, PTWs are restricted to $\alpha < \left[ \lambda_0 / (1 - \lambda_0) \right]^{1/2}/a$, and in this range (and with $\alpha > 0$) the right-hand side of (4.1) is negative so that no solutions are possible. Directly analogous arguments apply when $\omega_1 < 0$.

Thus (4.1) has exactly one solution for $\alpha$, which has the opposite sign to $\omega_1$. This solution can be above or below $\alpha_{\text{stab}}^{\text{L}}$, implying that the selected PTW can be either stable or unstable. Figure 3.1a shows an example of the former case. The invasion leaves a PTW in its wake whose wavenumber and amplitude match the predicted solution for $\alpha$ and the corresponding value of $R$.

4.2. Gaussian kernel. For $K(.)$ given by (2.3), PTW solutions of (3.1) are again discussed in detail in [26]. Again there is a one-to-one relationship between wavenumber $\alpha$ and amplitude $R$, in this case given by $\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 R^2 = 1 - \exp(-a^2 \alpha^2/4)$. Again if $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ there are PTWs for all values of $\alpha$, while if $\lambda_0 < 1$ there is a maximum possible value of $\alpha$, corresponding to $R = 0$: $(2/a) \left[ \log(1/(1 - \lambda_0)) \right]^{1/2}$. PTWs are unstable / stable when $|\alpha|$ is above / below a critical value $\alpha_{\text{stab}}^{\text{G}} \in (0, \sqrt{2}/a)$, which is the unique solution of an algebraic equation given in [26].

As for the Laplace kernel, there is a unique solution of (3.2, 3.4) for $\alpha$ in this case, whose sign is opposite to that of $\omega_1$. The argument justifying this is directly analogous to that for the Laplace kernel, and I give only a brief summary. Equation (3.4) gives $c = \alpha \kappa$, where $\kappa > 0$ depends on $\lambda_0$. Then (3.2) implies

$$(\lambda_1/\omega_1) \kappa \alpha = \left[ 1 - \lambda_0 - e^{-a^2 \alpha^2/4} \right].$$

When $\alpha$ and $\omega_1$ have opposite signs, one side of (4.2) is increasing with the other decreasing, as functions of $\alpha$, and there is exactly one solution. When the signs are
the same, the left hand side of (4.2) is positive, while the right hand side is negative for all α if λ₀ > 1, and for all α < (2/α) [log(1/(1 − λ₀))]^{1/2} if λ₀ < 1.

Again the solution for α can be above or below α_{stab}^{w}, implying that the selected PTW can be either stable or unstable. Figure 3.1b shows an example of the latter case. A PTW develops behind the invasion and then destabilises, giving irregular spatiotemporal oscillations. Again, the wavenumber and amplitude of the PTW match the predicted solution for α and the corresponding value of R. Note that in reaction-diffusion equations with λ-ω kinetics, the width of the band of PTWs immediately behind the invasion front can be determined using the theory of absolute and convective instabilities [45, 47]. For integrodifferential equations there is currently no corresponding theory, and this is a natural target for future research.

5. Comparison of PTW selection in predator-prey and λ-ω systems.

For given predator-prey kinetics, the appropriate coefficients λ₀, λ₁, ω₀ and ω₁ can be determined by the standard process of reduction to normal form [71]. For (2.1) this process is described in detail in [13] and [72], and online supplements to those papers contain MAPLE worksheets that perform the derivation, with C treated as the bifurcation parameter. The results are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_0 &= \frac{(A - 1)C - (A + 1)}{2A(A + 1)} \\
\lambda_1 &= \frac{A + 1}{4A} \\
\omega_0 &= \left(\frac{A - 1}{AB(A + 1)}\right)^{1/2} + \frac{[(A - 1)C - (A + 1)](A - 1)^{1/2}}{2A^{3/2}(A + 1)^{3/2}B^{1/2}} \\
\omega_1 &= \frac{(A + 1)^{1/2}(2A^2 + 5AB - A^2B - A^4 - 4A^2B^2 + 2A^2 - 4A^2B^2 + 5AB - 1)}{24(A(A - 1)B^2)^{1/2}}.
\end{align*}
\]

These formulae enable quantitative comparisons between numerical results for (2.1) and my analytical results for (3.1). Such comparisons are most effective if one can compare not only predictions of the existence and selection of PTWs but also predictions of their stability. To my knowledge there is currently no methodology by which one can determine the stability of a PTW solution of a general integrodifferential equation such as (2.1), even numerically. However for the special case of the Laplace kernel (2.2) there is a standard trick via which (2.1) can be reduced to a system of (local) partial differential equations. Standard numerical methods are then available to test PTW stability, and this approach was used previously by Merchant and Nagata [33] in their study of PTWs in a reaction-diffusion predator-prey model with nonlocal prey competition. Using the notation \( P(x, t) = \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)p(y, t)dy \) and \( H(x, t) = \int_{y=-\infty}^{y=+\infty} K(x-y)h(y, t)dy \), (2.1) can be rewritten as

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} &= P + (C/B)hp/(1 + Ch) - (1 + 1/AB)p \\
\frac{\partial h}{\partial t} &= H - h^2 - Cph/(1 + Ch) \\
0 &= \frac{\partial^2 P}{\partial x^2} + (p - P)/a^2 \\
0 &= \frac{\partial^2 H}{\partial x^2} + (h - H)/a^2.
\end{align*}
\]

I used the software package WAVETRAIN [73], which uses numerical continuation to determine the existence and stability of PTW solutions of partial differential equations. In (5.2), the branches of PTW solutions start at Hopf bifurcation points in the travelling wave ODES, and WAVETRAIN traces these branches numerically to determine
PTW existence. For stability, WAVETRAIN calculates the spectrum of a PTW by numerical continuation, starting from eigenfunctions with the same periodicity as the PTW – these can be approximated by solving a matrix eigenvalue problem [74]. The absence of time derivatives in (5.2c,d) means that this matrix eigenvalue problem is of generalised type [75]. WAVETRAIN can also track the boundary between stable and unstable PTWs in a parameter plane, by numerically continuing parameter pairs at which either the spectrum has zero curvature at the origin (Eckhaus points), or the spectrum touches the imaginary axis away from the origin (Hopf points) [75].

The normal form coefficients (5.1) apply when $C$ is regarded as the bifurcation parameter; recall that the kinetics have a Hopf bifurcation at $C = (A + 1)/(A − 1)$. Therefore it is most convenient to consider the dependence of PTWs on the parameter $B$, with fixed values of $A$ and $C$. Figure 5.1 illustrates the results of investigations of this type, with $A = 2$ and $C = 3.5, 3.1$ and 3.02; the Hopf bifurcation occurs at $C = 3$. The figure shows wavelength vs $B$. I plot the minimum wavelength for PTWs and the stability boundaries, both as calculated numerically for (5.2) (dashed curves) and as obtained using my analytical results for (3.1) with (5.1) (solid curves). For both loci the analytical approximations and numerical calculations approach one another as $C$ approaches the Hopf bifurcation value, as expected. WAVETRAIN identifies the stability boundary as being of Eckhaus type, as predicted by my analysis in [26] of PTW stability for (3.1,2,2). I also plot my prediction of the PTW selected by invasion in (3.1,2,2,5,1), and the wavelength of the PTWs that develop in numerical simulations of invasion in (2.1). Again, the two approach one another as $C$ approaches $(A + 1)/(A − 1)$. In keeping with the form of the stability boundaries, my numerical simulations show a band of PTWs followed by spatiotemporal irregularities when $B$ is either small or large, but only PTWs at intermediate $B$ (Figure 5.1d–f). Note that when the selected wave is unstable but close to the stability boundary, the band of PTWs is very wide, and irregularities only occur on a large spatial domain.

6. Comparison of PTW stability in local and nonlocal predator-prey models. My numerical simulations (Figures 2.1,3.1,5.1d–f) demonstrate a strong qualitative similarity between PTW generation in models with nonlocal dispersal and in reaction-diffusion models. However my analytical work enables a more quantitative comparison. A natural approach to this is to consider the stability of the PTW selected by the invasion process close to Hopf bifurcation, as a function of the kinetic parameters $A$ and $B$. To begin I choose $\epsilon > 0$. Then for given values of $A > 1$ and $B$, I take $C = (1 + \epsilon)(A + 1)/(A − 1)$; recall that $(A + 1)/(A − 1)$ is the Hopf bifurcation point in the local population dynamics. I then calculate the coefficients $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \omega_0$ and $\omega_1$ using (5.1), and I use (3.2) and (3.4) to determine the wavenumber of the PTW selected behind invasion. I then test the stability of this PTW using the conditions derived in [26]. Using this approach, one can divide the $A$–$B$ plane into regions giving stable and unstable PTWs behind invasion. In [13] I implemented this procedure for the reaction-diffusion model with the same local dynamics as in (2.1) but with dispersal represented by scalar linear diffusion; the results are presented in Figure 3 of [13] and are reproduced in Figure 6.1 of the present paper. The selected PTW is unstable for small (close to 1) and large values of $A$, but (provided that $B$ is greater than about 2) there is a range of intermediate values of $A$ for which the PTW is stable.

For the reaction-diffusion model the stability of the selected wave is independent of $\epsilon$ (i.e. of $C$) and depends only on $A$ and $B$ [13]. This statement requires clarification: what I mean is that within the context of the normal form approximation (3.1),
Fig. 5.1. (a)–(c) Comparison of numerical results on PTWs and analytical results from the normal form approximation, for the Laplace dispersal kernel (2.2). The parameter $A = 2$ in all cases, so that the Hopf bifurcation in the kinetics occurs at $C = 3$. Three types of curve are plotted: the locus of Hopf bifurcation points in the travelling wave equations, which gives the minimum wavelength for PTWs to exist; the stability boundary, above which PTWs are stable; and the locus of PTWs selected by invasion. All three of these curves are calculated analytically in §4.1 for the normal form equations. The minimum wavelength and the stability boundary were calculated numerically for (5.2) using the software package wavetrain, as described in the main text. The wavelength selected by invasion was calculated by numerical simulation: details of my numerical method are given in the legend of Figure 2.1. Numerical convergence tests show that the error arising from the spatial discretisation is proportional to $\delta x^2$. I calculated the wavelength for $\delta x = 0.5$ and $\delta x = 0.25$, and then used Richardson extrapolation to obtain a more accurate wavelength estimate. Note that the variable time-stepping used by rowmap makes it impossible to use convergence acceleration to reduce the temporal component of the error; I set both the absolute and relative error tolerances to $10^{-8}$.

(d)–(f) Space-time plots of PTW generation by invasion for $C = 3.5$ and for three different values of $B$. These plots are intended to illustrate the behaviours represented in (a)–(c), and the corresponding data points are labelled in (a). The simulations are actually run on $-4000 \leq x \leq 4000$, with the coexistence steady state perturbed near $x = 0$ at time $t = 0$, but for greater clarity I show only part of the domain. The solutions are plotted for $14600 \leq t \leq 14640$, with time increasing up the page and with the separation of the solutions being proportional to the time interval. In all three cases a PTW is generated behind the invasion. In (d) and (f) the PTWs are unstable and occur only as a relatively thin band before destabilising into spatiotemporal disorder. In (e) the PTW is also unstable (see (a)), but the maximum positive eigenvalue associated with the instability is much smaller and therefore the PTWs persist for a much greater distance behind invasion: in fact there is no visible instability even on the full domain $-4000 \leq x \leq 4000$. 

stability is determined by the coefficients $\lambda_1$ and $\omega_1$ only, and these are independent of $C$. Away from the Hopf bifurcation in the local dynamics the stability of the selected ptw does depend on $C$, but close to Hopf bifurcation this occurs only via higher order terms, beyond the basic $\lambda-\omega$ normal form expansion. However my calculations in §3 and §4 show that for the normal form of the model with nonlocal dispersal (2.1) the selected wave and its stability depend on the coefficient $\lambda_0$ (as well as $\lambda_1$ and $\omega_1$) and hence on $\epsilon$. Figure 6.1 shows the boundary in the $A$–$B$ plane between stable and unstable waves, for two different values of $\epsilon$, and for the Laplace and Gaussian kernels. Even for the large value of $\epsilon = 1$ the two curves are close to one another and to the stability boundary for the reaction-diffusion model; for small values of $\epsilon$ the three curves are almost indistinguishable. This remarkable result implies that provided the kinetic parameters are not too far from the Hopf bifurcation point, there is a close quantitative similarity between the predictions of reaction-diffusion models of ptw generation behind invasion, and those of models with nonlocal dispersal.

I now explore this quantitative similarity in detail, proving the following result.

**Theorem 6.1.** Consider the generation of ptws in (2.1) by an invasion with speed given by (3.4), and suppose that the kernel $K(.)$ is exponentially bounded. Then to leading order as $C \to (A + 1)/(A - 1)^+$, the condition for the selected ptw to be Eckhaus stable is the same as in the corresponding reaction-diffusion model, i.e. the equations with the same local dynamics and scalar diffusion.

The phrase “Eckhaus stable” means that the ptw is stable to perturbations of sufficiently small wavenumber. For the reaction-diffusion model (with scalar diffusion) corresponding to (3.1) it is known that Eckhaus stability of a ptw implies stability; and in [26] I show that this also holds for (3.1) when the kernel is of Laplace or Gaussian type. However in general Eckhaus stability does not imply stability for (3.1), even for thin-tailed kernels: a counter-example is given in [26].

Theorem 6.1 implies that to leading order close to Hopf bifurcation, the boundary in parameter space between the generation of stable and unstable ptws behind invasion is the same whether dispersal is modelled by diffusion or by a spatial convolution, for any dispersal kernel for which Eckhaus stability of ptws implies stability. The
intuitive explanation for this can be seen in the proof below: to leading order close to Hopf bifurcation, the Eckhaus stability of the selected PTW in the nonlocal model depends only on the second moment of the kernel, which is the term corresponding to diffusion in a power series expansion.

**Proof of Theorem 6.1.** If $C$ is close to $(A + 1)/(A - 1)$ then the leading order behaviour can be deduced from (3.1), and $\lambda_0$ is small. The selected PTW is given by (3.2) and (3.4); I begin by considering the second of these equations. $C'(\eta) = 0$ when $\eta \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s)e^{\eta s} \, ds + 1 - \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s)e^{\eta s} \, ds = \lambda_0$. The left hand side of this equation is strictly positive when $\eta > 0$, implying that at a local minimum $\eta = o(1)$ as $\lambda_0 \to 0$. Since $K(.)$ is exponentially bounded at infinity, the integrals can be expanded as Taylor series in $\eta$ by differentiating under the integral sign, which shows that $\eta_{\text{min}} = 2\lambda_0^{1/2}/\Gamma + o(1)$ where $\Gamma = (2 \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} s^2 K(s) \, ds)^{1/2}$. Substituting this value of $\eta$ back into (3.4) and expanding as a Taylor series in $\lambda_0^{1/2}$ shows that to leading order the invasion speed $c = \lambda_0^{1/2}/\Gamma$.

Considering now (3.2), this implies that $\alpha$ must also $\to 0$ as $\lambda_0 \to 0$, and Taylor series expansion gives

$$
\frac{1}{4}\frac{L^2}{\omega_1^2} \alpha^2 - \lambda_0^{1/2} \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{\omega_1} \Gamma \alpha \right) = \lambda_0 + o(\lambda_0) + o(\lambda_0^{1/2} \alpha) + o(\alpha^2). \quad (6.1)
$$

In [26] I show that the condition for a PTW solution of (3.1) with wavenumber $\alpha$ to be Eckhaus stable is

$$
\left[ \lambda_0 - 1 + \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds \right] \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} s^2 K(s) \cos(\alpha s) \, ds > \left( \int_{s=-\infty}^{s=\infty} sK(s) \sin(\alpha s) \, ds \right)^2 \left( 1 + \omega_1^2/\lambda_1^2 \right). \quad (6.2)
$$

Performing Taylor series expansions in $\alpha$ for all of the integrals, this gives $3 + 2\omega_1^2/\lambda_1^2 \Gamma^2 \alpha^2 < 4\lambda_0 + o(\lambda_0)$. Eliminating $\alpha$ between this inequality and (6.1) gives the leading order condition for stability of the PTW selected behind the invasion as $(\omega_1/\lambda_1)^6 + 2(\omega_1/\lambda_1)^4 - (\omega_1/\lambda_1)^2 < 3$. This is exactly the condition derived in [44] for the stability of PTWs generated by invasion in the reaction-diffusion model with the same kinetics as (3.1) and scalar diffusion, which completes the proof of the theorem. Numerical solution of the cubic polynomial shows that the stability condition is equivalent to $|\omega_1|/\lambda_1 < 1.0714\ldots$; this can be translated into a condition on the parameters $A$ and $B$ using (5.1).

**7. Discussion.** The generation of PTWs in the wake of invasion in cyclic populations has been predicted by a large number of modelling studies. This includes simulation-based work using integrodifference equations [11, 76], coupled map lattices [77], and cellular automata [11, 78]. However the only previous detailed analysis of PTW generation by invasion is for (local) reaction-diffusion models, with the exception of the recent work of Merchant and Nagata on reaction-diffusion models with nonlocal kinetics [32, 33]. A shortcoming of such models is that diffusion is a poor representation of dispersal for many ecological systems; convolution with a dispersal kernel is more realistic because of its ability to reflect occasional long-distance dispersal events [25, 56]. However the only previous work on PTWs in models with nonlocal dispersal is my recent paper [26], which considers existence and stability of PTWs when the local dynamics are of “$\lambda-\omega$” type (3.1). In the present paper I have presented the first results on PTW generation by invasion in such models.
As expected from a preliminary study such as this, my work raises many questions for future work amongst which I highlight four. Firstly, I have assumed throughout that the dispersal term is the same for predators and prey. Different dispersal coefficients would lead to cross-dispersal terms in the normal form, while different dispersal kernels would give a much more complicated normal form structure. Investigation of PTWs in these cases is an important future challenge. Secondly, my calculations of PTW selection only apply close to Hopf bifurcation in the local dynamics. Extension of these results to more general parameters is an important research topic, but a challenging one – it remains unsolved even for reaction-diffusion models. However the recent work of Merchant and Nagata [16,33] provides a starting point for future study. Thirdly, formal questions of existence and uniqueness remain unexplored for the model (2.1). A number of such results have been proved for models of single populations with nonlocal dispersal [79–81] but to my knowledge there are no corresponding results for systems. In addition, formal proof of the existence of PTW solutions is a major outstanding problem. Finally, perhaps the most important area for future work is the generation of PTWs by the invasion of the prey-only state, rather than the coexistence state. This is important from the viewpoint of applications, but is significantly more difficult from a mathematical viewpoint. However, experience with reaction-diffusion models [13,16,33,44] suggests that the detailed understanding of the invasion of the coexistence state that I have presented will provide an essential precursor to the study of this more complicated invasion process.
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