

Research Article

Uniqueness of Traveling Waves for a Two-Dimensional Bistable Periodic Lattice Dynamical System

Chin-Chin Wu

Department of Applied Mathematics, National Chung Hsing University, 250 Kuo Kuang Road, Taichung 402, Taiwan

Correspondence should be addressed to Chin-Chin Wu, chin@email.nchu.edu.tw

Received 28 December 2011; Accepted 30 January 2012

Academic Editor: Muhammad Aslam Noor

Copyright © 2012 Chin-Chin Wu. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We study traveling waves for a two-dimensional lattice dynamical system with bistable nonlinearity in periodic media. The existence and the monotonicity in time of traveling waves can be derived in the same way as the one-dimensional lattice case. In this paper, we derive the uniqueness of nonzero speed traveling waves by using the comparison principle and the sliding method.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the following two-dimensional (2D) lattice dynamical system:

$$\dot{u}_{i,j}(t) := \frac{d}{dt}u_{i,j}(t) = D_2[u_{i,j}](t) + f(u_{i,j}(t)), \quad i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, t > 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where f is a C^2 function in \mathbb{R} and

$$\begin{aligned} D_2[u_{i,j}] &:= p_{i+1,j}u_{i+1,j} + p_{i,j}u_{i-1,j} + q_{i,j+1}u_{i,j+1} + q_{i,j}u_{i,j-1} - d_{i,j}u_{i,j}, \\ d_{i,j} &:= p_{i+1,j} + p_{i,j} + q_{i,j+1} + q_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

We assume that the coefficients $p_{i,j}, q_{i,j}$ are positive and bounded such that

$$p_{i+N,j} = p_{i,j} = p_{i,j+N}, \quad q_{i+N,j} = q_{i,j} = q_{i,j+N}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.3)$$

for some positive integer N . Furthermore, we consider the case of bistable nonlinearity, namely,

$$f(0) = f(1) = f(a) = 0, \quad f'(0) < 0 < f'(a), \quad f'(1) < 0, \quad (1.4)$$

for some constant $a \in (0, 1)$. For simplicity, we only consider the case when $a \in (0, 1/2]$.

We are interested in (planar) traveling wave solutions of (1.1) such that

$$u_{i,j} \left(t + \frac{kNr + mNs}{c} \right) = u_{i-kN, j-mN}(t) \quad \forall k, m \in \mathbb{Z}, t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.5)$$

for some (speed) $c \neq 0$ and

$$\lim_{ri+sj \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{ri+sj \rightarrow +\infty} u_{i,j}(t) = 1, \quad (1.6)$$

for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ in the direction $(r, s) := (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)$ for some $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$.

The study of lattice dynamical systems has attracted a lot of attention for past years. In particular, traveling wave solutions are important due to the wide applications of these special solutions. For example, the invading of one species to another can be described by traveling wave solutions (see, e.g., [1, 2]). The lattice dynamical system arises, for example, when the habitat is divided into discrete niches in certain biology models. We refer the reader to, for example, [3–9] for monostable nonlinearity and [10–16] for bistable nonlinearity in a one-dimensional lattice. In particular, in [16] the authors studied a very general model with bistable nonlinearity in a 1D lattice. Our purpose of this paper is to extend the result of [16] to the case of multidimensional lattice. For the study of multidimensional lattice, we refer to [17–19]. For the simplicity of presentation, we will only consider the 2D lattice dynamical system (1.1). Our results can be easily extended to the more general case with a convection term or spatially dependent nonlinearity as in [16].

In a similar manner as that in [16] for 1D lattice case, we can prove the existence of traveling wave solutions of (1.1)–(1.6) with profile $\{U_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and speed $c \in \mathbb{R}$, by transforming the problem (1.1)–(1.6) into an integral formulation. Moreover, if the speed $c > 0$, then we can obtain $\dot{U}_{i,j}(t) < 0$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. We will not repeat the proof here and focus on the study of the uniqueness of nonzero speed traveling waves. The uniqueness is in the sense that if there exist two traveling waves with nonzero speeds, then these two speeds are the same, and two wave profiles are the same except a translation. Due to that the nonlinearity is independent of spatial variable, our proof of the uniqueness is simpler and more transparent than that in [16]. In fact, motivated by the work of Fife and McLeod [20], Lemma 3.1 (below) provides some estimations in terms of a given traveling wave solution for the solution to the initial value problem for (1.1) with certain initial condition. Moreover, with Lemma 3.1, we employ the idea of moving coordinate and a sliding method to complete the proof of uniqueness (see Theorem 3.3).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries including a comparison principle. Then we prove uniqueness of traveling wave with nonzero speed in Section 3.

2. Preliminaries

The following lemma can be easily deduced from (1.5) and (1.6).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\{u_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a solution of (1.1)–(1.6). If $c > 0$ (< 0), then $u_{i,j}(t) \rightarrow 0$ ($\rightarrow 1$) as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and $u_{i,j}(t) \rightarrow 1$ ($\rightarrow 0$) as $t \rightarrow -\infty$ for each i, j .*

We can determine the sign of the speed c (when $c \neq 0$) as follows.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that $c \neq 0$, then c has the same sign as $[-\int_0^1 f(s)ds]$.*

Proof. For $K \geq \max\{1, N/|c|\}$, an integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-K}^K [\dot{u}_{i,j}(t)]^2 dt &= \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,j}(t) \{D_2[u_{i,j}](t) + f(u_{i,j}(t))\} dt \\ &= \int_{-K}^K p_{i+1,j} \dot{u}_{i,j} u_{i+1,j} dt - \int_{-K}^K p_{i,j} u_{i,j} \dot{u}_{i-1,j} dt + p_{i,j} u_{i-1,j} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K \\ &\quad + \int_{-K}^K q_{i,j+1} \dot{u}_{i,j} u_{i,j+1} dt - \int_{-K}^K q_{i,j} u_{i,j} \dot{u}_{i,j-1} dt + q_{i,j} u_{i,j-1} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} d_{i,j} u_{i,j}^2 \Big|_{-K}^K + \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,j} f(u_{i,j}) dt \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq N. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Then $1 \leq \forall j \leq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K [\dot{u}_{i,j}(t)]^2 dt &= \int_{-K}^K p_{N+1,j} \dot{u}_{N,j} u_{N+1,j} dt - \int_{-K}^K p_{1,j} \dot{u}_{0,j} u_{1,j} dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N p_{i,j} u_{i-1,j} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K q_{i,j+1} \dot{u}_{i,j} u_{i,j+1} dt + \sum_{i=1}^N q_{i,j} u_{i,j-1} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K \\ &\quad - \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K q_{i,j} u_{i,j} \dot{u}_{i,j-1} dt - \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} d_{i,j} u_{i,j}^2 \Big|_{-K}^K + \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,j} f(u_{i,j}) dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K [\dot{u}_{i,j}(t)]^2 dt &= \sum_{j=1}^N p_{1,j} \left\{ \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{N,j} u_{N+1,j} dt - \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{0,j} u_{1,j} dt \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{i=1}^N q_{i,1} \left\{ \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,N} u_{i,N+1} dt - \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,0} u_{i,1} dt \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ p_{i,j} u_{i-1,j} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K + q_{i,j} u_{i,j-1} u_{i,j} \Big|_{-K}^K - \frac{1}{2} d_{i,j} u_{i,j}^2 \Big|_{-K}^K \right\} \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-K}^K \dot{u}_{i,j} f(u_{i,j}) dt.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Sending K to ∞ , using (1.5) and Lemma 2.1, it follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [\dot{u}_{i,j}(t)]^2 dt = -\operatorname{sgn}(c) N^2 \int_0^1 f(s) ds. \tag{2.4}$$

Hence, the lemma follows. \square

As a simple consequence of Lemma 2.2, we have $c = 0$ if f is of balanced type, that is, $\int_0^1 f(s) ds = 0$. Notice that we cannot guarantee the speed c is zero or not by using the method developed in [16]. In fact, for the 1D lattice case, the classical work of Keener [21] indicates that the propagation failure (i.e., $c = 0$) occurs when the diffusion coefficient is sufficiently small, even when f is of unbalanced type. A similar result for 1D periodic case can be found in [22]. For our model, the problem for the propagation failure is still open.

Set $\mathbf{u} := \{u_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Define $\mathcal{N}_{i,j} \mathbf{u}(t) := \dot{u}_{i,j}(t) - D_2[u_{i,j}](t) - f(u_{i,j}(t))$. Then we have the following comparison principle.

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $i_0, j_0 \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $\mathbf{u} := \{u_{i,j}(t)\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\mathbf{v} := \{v_{i,j}(t)\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are bounded and continuous on*

$$\left\{ (i, j, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \times \mathbb{R} \mid t \geq t_0, ri + sj + ct \leq ri_0 + sj_0 + 1 \right\}, \tag{2.5}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_{i,j} \mathbf{u} &\geq \mathcal{N}_{i,j} \mathbf{v} \quad \forall t > t_0, ri + sj + ct \leq ri_0 + sj_0, \\
u_{i,j}(t_0) &\geq v_{i,j}(t_0) \quad \forall ri + sj + ct_0 < ri_0 + sj_0, \\
u_{i,j}(t) &\geq v_{i,j}(t) \quad \forall t \geq t_0, ri_0 + sj_0 \leq ri + sj + ct \leq ri_0 + sj_0 + 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

then $u_{i,j}(t) \geq v_{i,j}(t)$ for all $t > t_0$, $ri + sj + ct \leq ri_0 + sj_0$. Moreover, if there exists some (i_1, j_1) with $ri_1 + sj_1 + ct_0 < ri_0 + sj_0$ such that $u_{i_1, j_1}(t_0) > v_{i_1, j_1}(t_0)$, then $u_{i,j}(t) > v_{i,j}(t)$ for all $t > t_0$, $ri + sj + ct < ri_0 + sj_0$.

Since the proof is quite similar to the one given in [16, Lemma 1], we safely omit it here.

3. Uniqueness

In this section, we will study the uniqueness of traveling waves of (1.1)–(1.6). Firstly, applying a method of Fife-McLeod [20], we can derive the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $\mathbf{u} := \{u_{i,j}(t)\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a solution of (1.1) for $t > 0$, such that*

$$\limsup_{ri+sj \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(0) < a < \liminf_{ri+sj \rightarrow \infty} u_{i,j}(0) \quad (3.1)$$

and $0 < u_{i,j}(t) < 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. If $U_{i,j}^c(t)$ is a traveling wave solution with speed $c \neq 0$, then there exist a sufficiently large positive integer i_0 and j_0 , depending on the initial value, and positive numbers β_0 (depending on the value of $f'(s)$ near $s = 0$ and $s = 1$), $\delta_0 = \delta_0(\beta_0, l, f, U^c) > 0$, such that for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $t > 0$,

$$U_{i-i_0N, j-j_0N}^c(t - \delta e^{-\beta t}) - l e^{-\beta t} \leq u_{i,j}(t) \leq U_{i+i_0N, j+j_0N}^c(t + \delta e^{-\beta t}) + l e^{-\beta t} \quad (3.2)$$

if $\beta \in (0, \beta_0]$, $\delta \geq \delta_0$,

$$l \in \left[\max \left\{ \limsup_{ri+sj \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(0), 1 - \liminf_{ri+sj \rightarrow \infty} u_{i,j}(0) \right\}, \min \{ a - \epsilon, 1 - a - \epsilon \} \right], \quad (3.3)$$

for some small $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. We will only consider the case when $c > 0$. In this case, we have $U_{i,j}^c(t) < 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

First, we let

$$\Phi(0, p) = \begin{cases} [f(0) - f(p)]/p, & p > 0, \\ -f'(0), & p = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

Clearly, $\Phi(0, p)$ is continuous. Fixing ϵ with

$$0 < \epsilon < \min \left\{ a - \limsup_{ri+sj \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(0), \liminf_{ri+sj \rightarrow \infty} u_{i,j}(0) - a \right\}, \quad (3.5)$$

there exists $\mu_1 > 0$, such that $[f(0) - f(p)]/p \geq 2\mu_1$ for all $0 < p \leq a - \epsilon$. Since $f(s)$ is continuous, we would find $\Delta_1 > 0$, such that $(f(u) - f(u + p))/p \geq \mu_1$ for all $0 \leq u \leq \Delta_1$, $0 < p \leq a - \epsilon$. By

the same reasoning, there exist $\mu_2 > 0$ and $\Delta_2 > 0$, such that $(f(u) - f(u + p))/p \geq \mu_2$ for all $p \leq a - \epsilon$, $1 - \Delta_2 \leq u \leq 1$.

Define $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} := \{\tilde{u}_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where

$$\tilde{u}_{i,j}(t) := \min\left\{1, U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right\}. \quad (3.6)$$

Choose \tilde{l} satisfying $\limsup_{ri+s_j \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(0) < \tilde{l} < a - \epsilon < a$, and let i_0, j_0 be determined later. We claim that

$$u_{i,j}(0) \leq U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(\tilde{\delta}) + \tilde{l}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (3.7)$$

for some \tilde{i}_0 and \tilde{j}_0 . Since $\limsup_{ri+s_j \rightarrow -\infty} u_{i,j}(0) < \tilde{l}$, there exists m , such that

$$u_{i,j}(0) < \tilde{l}, \quad \forall ri + sj \leq m. \quad (3.8)$$

Moreover, since $\lim_{ri+s_j \rightarrow \infty} U_{i,j}(0) = 1$, there exist \tilde{i}_0 and \tilde{j}_0 , such that

$$u_{i,j}(0) \leq U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(\tilde{\delta}) + \tilde{l}, \quad \forall ri + sj \geq m. \quad (3.9)$$

Combining (3.8) and (3.9), we have proved the claim (3.7).

Now, we prove $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq 0$. If $\tilde{u}_{i,j}(t) = U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} &= \left(1 - \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right) \left(U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c\right)'(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) - \tilde{l}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} \\ &\quad - D_2 \left[U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right] - f\left(U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right) \\ &= -\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} \left(U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c\right)'(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) - \tilde{l}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} \\ &\quad + f\left(U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t})\right) - f\left(U_{i+\tilde{i}_0N, j+\tilde{j}_0N}^c(t + \tilde{\delta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}) + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Divide into three cases.

Case 1. $0 \leq U_{i,j}^c \leq \Delta := \min\{\Delta_1, \Delta_2\}$. From the above discussion, since $\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} \leq \tilde{l} < a - \epsilon$, we have

$$f\left(U_{i,j}^c\right) - f\left(U_{i,j}^c + \tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}\right) \geq \mu_1\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}. \quad (3.11)$$

Since $U_{i,j}^c < 0$, $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq -\tilde{l}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} + \mu_1\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} = (\mu_1 - \tilde{\beta})\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}$. Choosing $\tilde{\beta} \leq \mu_1$, we have $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq 0$ in this case.

Case 2. $1 - \Delta \leq U_{i,j}^c \leq 1$. As in Case 1, we have $\mu_2 > 0$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq -\tilde{l}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} + \mu_2\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} = (\mu_2 - \tilde{\beta})\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} \geq 0$ if $\tilde{\beta} \leq \mu_2$.

Case 3. $\Delta \leq U_{i,j}^c \leq 1 - \Delta$. If $\sigma := \min_{\Delta \leq U_{i,j}^c \leq 1-\Delta} |\dot{U}_{i,j}^c| > 0$ and $k := \max_{s \in [0,1]} |f'(s)| > 0$, then $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq \tilde{\delta}\tilde{\beta}\sigma e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} - \tilde{l}\tilde{\beta}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} - k\tilde{l}e^{-\tilde{\beta}t} = (\tilde{\delta}\tilde{\beta}\sigma - \tilde{l}\tilde{\beta} - k\tilde{l})e^{-\tilde{\beta}t}$. Choosing $\tilde{\delta} \geq \tilde{l}(\tilde{\beta} + k)/\tilde{\beta}\sigma$, we have $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq 0$ in this case.

Then $\mathcal{N}_{i,j}\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \geq 0$ for all cases. Hence, the second inequality of (3.2) follows from a comparison principle. By the same way, we have the first inequality of (3.2). This proves the lemma. \square

Note that we have the following different type of super- and sub-solutions which can be verified by a similar way as that of Lemma 3.1.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $\mathbf{w} := \{w_{i,j}(t)\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a solution of (1.1)–(1.6). For any $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{l} \in (0, l_0)$, $l_0 := \min\{a - \epsilon, 1 - a - \epsilon\}$, ϵ is a small number, and $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_0 = \sigma_0(\beta, f, w_{i,j}^c) > 0$, and let $\mathbf{w}^\pm = \{w_{i,j}^\pm(t)\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where*

$$w_{i,j}^\pm(t) := w_{i,j}(t + t_0 \mp \sigma_1 \tilde{l}(1 - e^{-\beta t})) \pm \tilde{l}e^{-\beta t}, \tag{3.12}$$

then $\pm \mathcal{N}_{i,j}\mathbf{w}^\pm \geq 0$.

We now prove the following uniqueness result.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose that $\{U_{i,j}^c\}, \{\bar{U}_{i,j}^{\bar{c}}\}$ are two traveling wave solutions of (1.1)–(1.6) with $c, \bar{c} \neq 0$, then one has $c = \bar{c}$ and $U_{i,j}^c(\xi) = \bar{U}_{i,j}^{\bar{c}}(\xi + \xi^*)$ for some $\xi^* \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. As before, we only consider the case when both c and \bar{c} are positive. Since

$$\lim_{ri+sj \rightarrow -\infty} U_{i,j}(0) = 0 < a < \lim_{ri+sj \rightarrow \infty} U_{i,j}(0) = 1, \tag{3.13}$$

by Lemma 3.1, we have

$$U_{i-i_0N, j-j_0N}^c(t - \delta e^{-\beta t}) - le^{-\beta t} \leq \bar{U}_{i,j}^{\bar{c}}(t) \leq U_{i+i_0N, j+j_0N}^c(t + \delta e^{-\beta t}) + le^{-\beta t}, \tag{3.14}$$

for all $t > 0, i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with the constants $i_0, j_0, l, \beta, \delta$ defined in Lemma 3.1.

Let $I_k = I + kN, J_m = J + mN$, and $I, J \in \{1, \dots, N\}, k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Take $(i, j) = (I_k, J_m)$. We get for all $t > 0, k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{I+kN-i_0N, J+mN-j_0N}^c(t - \delta e^{-\beta t}) - le^{-\beta t} &\leq \bar{U}_{I+kN, J+mN}^{\bar{c}}(t) \\ &\leq U_{I+kN+i_0N, J+mN+j_0N}^c(t + \delta e^{-\beta t}) + le^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall I, J. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

By the property (1.5) for all $t > 0, k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{I-i_0N, J-j_0N}^c \left(t - \frac{(rk+sm)N}{c} - \delta e^{-\beta t} \right) - l e^{-\beta t} &\leq \bar{U}_{I,J}^{\bar{c}} \left(t - \frac{(rk+sm)N}{\bar{c}} \right) \\ &\leq U_{I+i_0N, J+j_0N}^c \left(t - \frac{(rk+sm)N}{c} + \delta e^{-\beta t} \right) + l e^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall I, J. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Setting the moving coordinate

$$\xi := t - \frac{(rk+sm)N}{\bar{c}}, \quad (3.17)$$

we have for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$, for all I, J ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_{I-i_0N, J-j_0N}^c \left(\xi + (rk+sm) \left(\frac{N}{\bar{c}} - \frac{N}{c} \right) - \delta e^{-\beta t} \right) - l e^{-\beta t} \\ \leq \bar{U}_{I,J}^{\bar{c}}(\xi) \\ \leq U_{I+i_0N, J+j_0N}^c \left(\xi + (rk+sm) \left(\frac{N}{\bar{c}} - \frac{N}{c} \right) + \delta e^{-\beta t} \right) + l e^{-\beta t}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Suppose that $c \neq \bar{c}$. We may assume that $c < \bar{c}$. Fixing ξ and sending $t \rightarrow \infty$, this leads that either $\bar{U}_{I,J}^{\bar{c}}(\xi) \equiv 0$ or $\bar{U}_{I,J}^{\bar{c}}(\xi) \equiv 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $c = \bar{c}$.

We now suppress the dependence of c , and we obtain

$$U_{I-i_0N, J-j_0N}(\xi) \leq \bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I+i_0N, J+j_0N}(\xi), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \forall I, J. \quad (3.19)$$

For $\xi_0 := (ri_0 + sj_0)N/c$, we have

$$U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi_0) \leq \bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I,J}(\xi - \xi_0), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \forall I, J. \quad (3.20)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_* &:= \inf \left\{ \tilde{\xi} \mid U_{I,J}(\xi + \tilde{\xi}) \leq \bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi), \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \forall I, J \right\}, \\ \xi^* &:= \sup \left\{ \tilde{\xi} \mid \bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I,J}(\xi + \tilde{\xi}), \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \forall I, J \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

Since $\dot{U}_{i,j}(t) < 0$ due to $c > 0$, we have $\xi^* \leq \xi_*$. Assume that $\xi^* < \xi_*$. By the strong comparison principle, we know that

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) < U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^*), \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \forall I, J. \quad (3.22)$$

Since $\lim_{|\xi| \rightarrow \infty} \dot{U}_{I,J}(\xi) = 0$, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$2\sigma_1 |\dot{U}_{I,J}(\xi)| \leq 1, \quad \forall |\xi| \geq M, \quad \forall I, J, \quad (3.23)$$

where σ_1 is the number mentioned in Lemma 3.2. If $|\xi + \xi^*| \leq M + 1$, by the continuity of $U_{I,J}$, we would find $h \in (0, \eta)$, $\eta := \min\{1/(2\sigma_1), l_0\}$, such that

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) < U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h), \quad \forall I, J. \quad (3.24)$$

If $|\xi + \xi^*| \geq M + 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h) - \bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) &> U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h) - U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^*) \\ &= \dot{U}_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + \theta 2\sigma_1 h)(2\sigma_1 h), \quad \theta \in (0, 1) \\ &\geq -h, \quad \forall I, J. \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Combining (3.24) and (3.25), we get

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h) + h, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall I, J. \quad (3.26)$$

Hence,

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(0) \leq U_{I,J}(\xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h) + h, \quad \forall I, J. \quad (3.27)$$

By Lemma 3.2 and the comparison principle, we have

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I,J}\left(\xi + \xi^* + 2\sigma_1 h - \sigma_1 h\left(1 - e^{-\beta t}\right)\right) + h e^{-\beta t}, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \forall I, J. \quad (3.28)$$

Fixing ξ and sending $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\bar{U}_{I,J}(\xi) \leq U_{I,J}(\xi + \xi^* + \sigma_1 h). \quad (3.29)$$

This contradicts with the definition of ξ^* . Hence, $U_{i,j}(\xi) = \bar{U}_{i,j}(\xi + \xi^*)$. \square

Hence, we obtain the uniqueness (up to translations) of the traveling wave solution with nonzero speed.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National Science Council of the Republic of China under the Grant NSC 100-2115-M-005-001. The authors also thank the referee for some valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] R. A. Fisher, "The wave of advance of advantageous genes," *Annals of Eugenics*, vol. 7, pp. 355–369, 1937.
- [2] A. N. Kolmogorov, I. G. Petrovsky, and N. S. Piscounov, "Etude de l'équation de la diffusion avec croissance de la quantité de matière et son application à un problème biologique," *Bulletin de l'Université d'Etat à Moscou Serie International section A*, vol. 1, pp. 1–25, 1937.
- [3] B. Zinner, G. Harris, and W. Hudson, "Traveling wavefronts for the discrete Fisher's equation," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 105, no. 1, pp. 46–62, 1993.
- [4] S.-C. Fu, J.-S. Guo, and S.-Y. Shieh, "Traveling wave solutions for some discrete quasilinear parabolic equations," *Nonlinear Analysis. Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 48, no. 8, pp. 1137–1149, 2002.
- [5] X. Chen and J.-S. Guo, "Existence and asymptotic stability of traveling waves of discrete quasilinear monostable equations," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 184, no. 2, pp. 549–569, 2002.
- [6] X. Chen and J.-S. Guo, "Uniqueness and existence of traveling waves for discrete quasilinear monostable dynamics," *Mathematische Annalen*, vol. 326, no. 1, pp. 123–146, 2003.
- [7] J. Carr and A. Chmaj, "Uniqueness of travelling waves for nonlocal monostable equations," *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 132, no. 8, pp. 2433–2439, 2004.
- [8] X. Chen, S.-C. Fu, and J.-S. Guo, "Uniqueness and asymptotics of traveling waves of monostable dynamics on lattices," *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 233–258, 2006.
- [9] J.-S. Guo and F. Hamel, "Front propagation for discrete periodic monostable equations," *Mathematische Annalen*, vol. 335, no. 3, pp. 489–525, 2006.
- [10] B. Zinner, "Stability of traveling wavefronts for the discrete Nagumo equation," *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 1016–1020, 1991.
- [11] B. Zinner, "Existence of traveling wavefront solutions for the discrete Nagumo equation," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 96, no. 1, pp. 1–27, 1992.
- [12] S.-N. Chow, J. Mallet-Paret, and W. Shen, "Traveling waves in lattice dynamical systems," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 149, no. 2, pp. 248–291, 1998.
- [13] J. Mallet-Paret, "The Fredholm alternative for functional-differential equations of mixed type," *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–47, 1999.
- [14] J. Mallet-Paret, "The global structure of traveling waves in spatially discrete dynamical systems," *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 49–127, 1999.
- [15] P. W. Bates, X. Chen, and A. J. J. Chmaj, "Traveling waves of bistable dynamics on a lattice," *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 520–546, 2003.
- [16] X. Chen, J.-S. Guo, and C.-C. Wu, "Traveling waves in discrete periodic media for bistable dynamics," *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 189, no. 2, pp. 189–236, 2008.
- [17] J. W. Cahn, J. Mallet-Paret, and E. S. Van Vleck, "Traveling wave solutions for systems of ODEs on a two-dimensional spatial lattice," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 455–493, 1999.
- [18] J.-S. Guo and C.-H. Wu, "Existence and uniqueness of traveling waves for a monostable 2-D lattice dynamical system," *Osaka Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 327–346, 2008.
- [19] J.-S. Guo and C.-H. Wu, "Front propagation for a two-dimensional periodic monostable lattice dynamical system," *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 197–223, 2010.
- [20] P. C. Fife and J. B. McLeod, "The approach of solutions of nonlinear diffusion equations to travelling front solutions," *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 335–361, 1977.
- [21] J. P. Keener, "Propagation and its failure in coupled systems of discrete excitable cells," *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 556–572, 1987.
- [22] S.-G. Liao and C.-C. Wu, "Propagation failure in discrete periodic media," *Preprint*. In press.



Hindawi

Submit your manuscripts at
<http://www.hindawi.com>

