

# Linear competition processes and generalized Pólya urns with removals

Vadim Shcherbakov\*

Stanislav Volkov<sup>†‡</sup>

1st January 2024

## Abstract

A competition process is a continuous time Markov chain that can be interpreted as a system of interacting birth-and-death processes, the components of which evolve subject to a competitive interaction. This paper is devoted to the study of the long-term behaviour of such a competition process, where a component of the process increases with a linear birth rate and decreases with a rate given by a linear function of other components. A zero is an absorbing state for each component, that is, when a component becomes zero, it stays zero forever (and we say that this component becomes extinct). We show that, with probability one, eventually only a random subset of non-interacting components of the process survives. A similar result also holds for the relevant generalized Pólya urn model with removals.

**Keywords:** birth-and-death process, competition process, branching process, generalized Pólya urn with removals, martingale.

**Subject classification:** 60K35, 60G50

## 1 Introduction

A classical birth-and-death process on the set of non-negative integers is a continuous time Markov chain (CTMC) which evolves as follows. When the process is at state  $k$ , it can jump either to state  $k + 1$ , or to state  $k - 1$  (provided  $k > 0$ ), with transition rates that are state-dependent. The long term behaviour of the birth-and-death process is well studied. Given a set of transition rates one can, in principle, determine whether the corresponding CTMC is (positive) recurrent or (explosive) transient, and compute various other characteristics of the process.

A multivariate birth-and-death process is a CTMC with values in a multi-dimensional non-negative orthant, and the dynamics of which is similar to that of the classical birth-and-death process. A multivariate birth-and-death process can often be interpreted as a *system of interacting* one-dimensional birth-and-death processes. Competition process is, probably, the most known example of such Markov chains. For instance, competition processes with non-linear

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Royal Holloway, University of London, UK. Email address: vadim.shcherbakov@rhul.ac.uk

<sup>†</sup>Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Lund University, Sweden. Email address: stanislav.volkov@matstat.lu.se

<sup>‡</sup>Research supported by Crafoord grant no. 20190667

interaction (e.g., of the Lotka-Volterra type) were originally proposed to model competition between populations (please see [1], [10], [22], [23] and references therein).

In contrast to the one-dimensional case, the long term behaviour of multivariate birth-and-death processes is much less known, even though results are available in some special cases. While we do not provide a complete review of the relevant literature, we would like to mention the papers [9], [14] and [15], in addition to the references above, where the technical framework is somewhat close to that of the present paper. The approach to studying a multivariate birth-and-death process depends on a particular model. For example, it is well known that reversibility greatly facilitates the study of the long term behaviour of the birth-and-death process (e.g. see [13]). This is also the case in the multivariate situation ([12] and [24]). On the other hand, in the non-reversible case the Lyapunov function method ([19]) is widely used. The method has been applied to studying the long term behaviour of the multivariate birth-and-death processes since the 1960s (see [22]), in order to establish recurrence vs. transience, as well as to detect some more subtle phenomena ([20], [25]).

In the current paper we study the long term behaviour of a *linear* competition process: components increase as linear pure birth processes and decrease with a death rate, given by a linear function depending on other components. The functions determining death rates are, in turn, determined by a non-negative matrix, called *the interaction matrix*. When a component of the process becomes zero, it stays zero forever (becomes extinct); in other words, zero is an absorbing state for each component. If a component of the process never becomes zero, we say it *survives*.

The main result of the paper is the following. With probability one, eventually a random subset of the process's components survive. Every limit set of survivals is formed by mutually non-interacting components, so that the survived components evolve as independent linear pure birth processes (Yule processes). This result can be equivalently stated in terms of the discrete time Markov chain corresponding to the linear competition process (the embedded Markov chain). The embedded Markov chain can be regarded as an urn model with removals, where balls of several types are added to and removed from the urn with probabilities induced by the transition rates of the competition process. Hence, with probability one, eventually only balls of a random subset of types will be left in the urn (survive). The numbers of balls of the survived types will evolve according to the classical generalised Pólya urn model.

A crucial step in our proof is to show that, with probability one, eventually one of the interacting components becomes extinct. Showing this fact is straightforward, provided that the competition is sufficiently strong. This is similar to the models with non-linear competitive interaction, where strong interactions generate a sufficient drift directed towards the boundary. At the same time, more subtle phenomena, such as quasi-stationary distributions or extinction probabilities, are of primary interest in those models (e.g. see [5], [17], [18] and references therein).

Showing extinction is much harder when the interaction is weak. It turns out that the phase transition in the strength of the interaction is determined by the largest eigenvalue of the interaction matrix. This fact is not at all surprising, since the dynamics of the linear competition process has a striking resemblance with that of multi-type branching processes (MTBP), where eigenvalues (the largest one, in particular) of the mean drift matrix play a crucial role. This similarity allows us to adopt the well-known method for studying both MTBPs and urn-related models ([2], [3], [11]). In particular, the scalar products of eigenvectors of the interaction matrix and the embedded Markov chain provide us with useful semimartingales.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we state the model and the results rigorously. In Section 3 we prepare all necessary ingredients for the proof of the main results,

which are given in Section 4. Section 5 contains the proofs of the lemmas, and in Section 6.1 we describe some interesting examples.

## 2 The model and the main result

Let  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  be the set of all non-negative integers, and let  $\mathbb{R}_+$  be the set of all non-negative real numbers, both including zero. For a vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  we will write  $\mathbf{x} > 0$  whenever all  $x_i > 0$ . A vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is understood as a column vector, so that  $\mathbf{x}^\top$  is a row vector. Further,  $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{y}$  denotes a Euclidean scalar product of vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ , and  $1_{\{D\}}$  denotes an indicator of an event (or set)  $D$ . All random variables are realised on a certain probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . The expectation with respect to the probability  $\mathbb{P}$  will be denoted by  $\mathbb{E}$ .

**Definition 1.** Fix an integer  $N \geq 1$ . An  $N \times N$  matrix  $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$  with non-negative elements and zeros on the main diagonal is called an interaction matrix.

Given a number  $\alpha > 0$  and an interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij})$  consider a CTMC  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_N(t)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , with the following transition rates

$$q_{\mathbf{xy}} = \begin{cases} \alpha x_i, & \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_i; \\ \left( \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j \right) 1_{\{x_i > 0\}}, & \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{e}_i, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ ,  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is the  $i$ -th unit vector in  $\mathbb{Z}_+^N$ , i.e. a vector such that its  $i$ -th component is equal to 1 and all its other components are equal to 0. In what follows, we refer to a CTMC  $X(t)$  with transition rates (1) as a linear competition process (LCP).

**Remark 1.** The quantity  $a_{ij} \geq 0$  indicates how much component  $i$  is affected by component  $j$ . In biological terms, the fact that  $a_{ij} > 0$  can be interpreted as a predator  $j$  hunting prey  $i$ .

**Remark 2.** If  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{0}$ , then the LCP  $X(t)$  is a collection of independent pure linear birth processes with parameter  $\alpha$ . The latter means that if a component is at state  $k > 0$ , then it can only transit to state  $k + 1$  with rate  $\alpha k$ . Such a process is also known as Yule process (see e.g. [13]). In general, CTMC  $X(t)$  is a special case of the so called competition process (see the references above) and can be interpreted as a system of interacting birth-and-death processes with linear interaction.

Let  $\zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \dots, \zeta_N(n)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , be the embedded Markov chain (the embedded process) corresponding to the LCP  $X(t)$ . In other words,  $\zeta(n)$  is a discrete time Markov chain (DTMC) with the following transition probabilities

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\zeta(n+1) = \zeta(n) + \mathbf{e}_i | \mathcal{F}_n) &= \frac{\alpha \zeta_i(n)}{R(\zeta(n))}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\zeta(n+1) = \zeta(n) - \mathbf{e}_i | \mathcal{F}_n) &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \zeta_j(n)}{R(\zeta(n))} 1_{\{\zeta_i(n) > 0\}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{F}_n$  is the natural filtration generated by  $\zeta(k)$ ,  $k \leq n$ , and

$$R(\zeta) = \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \alpha \zeta_i + 1_{\{\zeta_i > 0\}} \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \zeta_j \right) \quad \text{for } \zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N. \quad (3)$$

Note that the DTMC  $\zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \dots, \zeta_N(n))$  can be regarded as an urn model with removals, where  $\zeta_i(n)$  is interpreted as a number of balls of type  $i$ .

Theorem 1 below is the main result of the paper.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_N(t)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , be a LCP with transition rates (1) specified by a parameter  $\alpha > 0$  and an interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . Let  $\zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \dots, \zeta_N(n)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , be the corresponding embedded DTMC with transition probabilities (2).*

*Suppose that  $X(0) = \zeta(0) > 0$ . Then, for every subset  $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_K\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that  $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$  for all  $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$  and containing all those  $i$  for which  $a_{ik} = 0$  for all  $k$ ,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_i(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \zeta_i(n) = \begin{cases} \infty, & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}; \\ 0, & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I} \end{cases}$$

*with positive probability.*

*No other limiting behaviour is possible. That is, with probability one, a random subset of non-interacting components of the process  $X(t)$  survives, and the survived components behave as independent Yule processes with parameter  $\alpha$ . As a result, for large  $n$  the process  $\{\zeta_i(n), i \in \mathcal{I}\}$  has the same distribution as the classical Pólya urn with  $K$  different types of balls.*

**Example 1.** Suppose that all non-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{A}$  are strictly positive, i.e. the underlying graph  $G$  is a complete graph, and any pair of the process components interact with each other. Then, by Theorem 1, only one population will survive a.s.

Finally, we describe a relevant urn model with  $N$  different types of balls. For simplicity, assume that both  $\alpha$  and all  $a_{ij}$  are integers. Consider a DTMC  $Y(n) = (Y_1(n), \dots, Y_N(n)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , where  $Y_i(n)$  represents a number of balls of type  $i = 1, \dots, N$  in a urn. The dynamics of the model is as follows. Suppose an urn contains  $Y_i \geq 1$  balls of type  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ . Pick a ball of type  $i$  with probability proportional to  $Y_i$ , and then return it to the urn with  $\alpha$  additional balls of type  $i$ ; at the same time for each  $j \neq i$  remove  $\tilde{a}_{ji}(n) := \min\{a_{ji}, Y_j\}$  balls of type  $j$ . By doing so, we obtain a generalized Pólya urn model with *removals*.

Formally, the transition probabilities of the urn are given by

$$\mathbb{P} \left( Y(n+1) = Y(n) + \alpha \mathbf{e}_i - \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{a}_{ji}(n) \mathbf{e}_j \mid Y(n) \right) = \frac{Y_i(n)}{\sum_{j=1}^N Y_j(n)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N. \quad (4)$$

Such a model with  $\alpha = 0$  and  $A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , called *the OK Corral model*, was considered in [16].

Another similar model with removals, called *Simple Harmonic Urn*, was studied in [6]. The connection between the above urn model and the LCP is explained in Section 4.2. Our results for the LCP extend to the urn model as follows.

**Theorem 2.** *The statement of Theorem 1 for the DTMC  $\zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \dots, \zeta_N(n)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , holds also for the urn process  $Y(n) = (Y_1(n), \dots, Y_N(n)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ .*

### 3 Preliminaries

#### 3.1 The model graph

Start with noting that the transposed interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}^\top$  can be regarded as a weighted adjacency matrix of a *directed* graph  $G$  defined below.

**Definition 2.** The graph corresponding to the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is a loopless directed graph  $G$  with the vertex set  $V = \{1, \dots, N\}$ , where vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are connected by a directed edge (written as  $i \curvearrowright j$ ) if and only if  $a_{ji} > 0$ .

We need some definitions related to the graph theory.

**Definition 3.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a directed graph with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ .

1. We say that there is a directed path from  $v \in V$  to  $w \in V$  and write  $v \rightsquigarrow w$ , if there exists a sequence of vertices  $v = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k = w$  of  $G$  such that  $v_{i-1} \curvearrowright v_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ .
2. We call a non-empty directed graph  $G$  strongly connected if it either consists of just one vertex, or if any two distinct vertices  $v, w \in G$  satisfy  $v \rightsquigarrow w$  and  $w \rightsquigarrow v$ . Equivalently, the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}_G$  of  $G$  is irreducible, i.e. the matrix  $\mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}_G + \mathbf{A}_G^2 + \dots + \mathbf{A}_G^n$  is strictly positive for some sufficiently large  $n$ .

**Definition 4.** Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a directed graph with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ .

1. Given a subset of vertices  $V' \subset V$  the corresponding induced subgraph is graph  $G' = (V', E')$  with edge set  $E'$  inherited from graph  $G$ .
2. Let  $G' \subset G$  be a subgraph induced by a non-empty subset of vertices  $V' \subset V$ . The subgraph  $G'$  is called a source subgraph, if there are no  $v \in V \setminus V'$  and  $v' \in V'$  such that  $v \curvearrowright v'$  (i.e., there are no edges incoming to  $G'$ ).

**Remark 3.** If the directed graph  $G$  is disconnected, then the corresponding linear competition process will behave independently on each of the connected components of  $G$ , with the transition rates appropriate for that component (of course, with a different sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{A}$ ). Also, whenever one of the components of the process ( $X_i$  or  $\zeta_i$  respectively) becomes zero, this is equivalent to removing the corresponding vertex  $i$  from the vertex set of  $G$ , along with all the edges incoming to or outgoing from  $i$  (that is, crossing out simultaneously the  $i$ th row and the  $i$ th column from  $\mathbf{A}$ ). As a result, a connected component of  $G$  containing vertex  $i$  might split into more than one connected components.

**Example 2.** Consider a directed graph  $G$  with eight vertices  $1, 2, \dots, 8$  depicted in Figure (1). It follows from Theorem 1 that the set of limit configurations of surviving components is determined by the following subsets of vertices  $(1, 3, i)$ , or  $(1, 5, i)$ , or  $(1, 3, 5, i)$ , for  $i = 6, 7, 8$ . For instance, the subset  $\{1, 3, 5, 6\}$  can be obtained as follows. First, vertex 2 is removed with all incoming and outgoing edges from the graph (i.e., component  $X_2$  becomes extinct). Then, say vertices 7, 8 and 4 are subsequently removed. It is easy to see that the same surviving subset can be obtained in many ways. Note that the directed graph  $G$  is not strongly connected, e.g. there is no path connecting vertex 2 and vertex 1. There are two strongly connected source subgraphs in this graph: a single vertex  $\{1\}$  (source vertex), and the subgraph induced by vertices  $\{6, 7, 8\}$ .




Figure 1: Graph with 8 vertices

**Lemma 1.** Any directed graph  $G = (V, E)$  contains a strongly connected source subgraph.

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Given a vertex  $v \in V$  let  $V(v)$  be the set of vertices containing vertex  $v$  itself and all vertices  $w$  such that  $v \rightsquigarrow w$  and  $w \rightsquigarrow v$ . Note that  $w \in V(v)$  implies  $v \in V(w)$ . Therefore, we can partition the vertex set  $V$  of the graph as follows

$$V = V(v_1) \sqcup V(v_2) \sqcup \dots \sqcup V(v_l)$$

for some vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l$ . Consider a directed graph  $\tilde{G}$  with  $l$  vertices  $\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_l$ , where  $\tilde{v}_i \curvearrowright \tilde{v}_j$ , whenever there are  $v \in V(v_i)$  and  $w \in V(v_j)$  such that  $v \curvearrowright w$ . The graph  $\tilde{G}$  cannot have cycles. Indeed, if  $\tilde{v}_1 \curvearrowright \tilde{v}_2 \curvearrowright \dots \curvearrowright \tilde{v}_m \curvearrowright \tilde{v}_1$  for some vertices  $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \dots, \tilde{v}_m$ , then all vertices of  $\bigcup_{k=1}^m V(v_k)$  must belong to the *same*  $V(v)$  for some vertex  $v$ , leading to a contradiction.

Since  $\tilde{G}$  does not have cycles, it is a tree or a forest (in case it is disjoint). It is also finite, hence it must have a root, i.e. a vertex  $\tilde{v}_i$  for which there is no  $j$  such that  $\tilde{v}_j \curvearrowright \tilde{v}_i$ . Then the subgraph of  $G$  induced by the set of vertices is  $V(v_i)$  is indeed a strongly connected source subgraph.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** Let  $G' \subseteq G$  be a source subgraph of  $G$  induced by a subset of vertices  $V' = \{i_1, \dots, i_{N'}\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, N\}$ , where  $2 \leq N' \leq N$ . Let  $X'(t) = (X_i(t), i \in \mathcal{I}) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N'}$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  i.e.  $X'(t)$  is a restriction of the LCP  $X(t)$  on subgraph  $G'$ . Then the random process  $X'(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{N'}$  is a LCP with transition rates (1) specified by parameter  $\alpha$  and interaction  $N' \times N'$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}'$  obtained from the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  by crossing out  $j$ -th row and  $j$ -th column for all  $j \notin \mathcal{I}$ .

Lemma 2 follows from the definition of the process  $X(t)$  and the definition of a source subgraph, and is effectively a version of *the restriction principle* (see e.g. [7, 8]). Indeed, it suffices to observe that the birth rate for any component  $X_v$  depends only the component itself, and the death rate for a component  $X_v$ , where  $v \in V'$ , is determined only by the process's components  $X_u$ ,  $u \in V'$ .

**Example 3.** Consider a LCP  $X(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^8$  the corresponding graph of which is given in Figure 1. Then a restricted process corresponding to the source subgraph induced by vertices 6, 7 and 8, i.e.  $X'(t) = (X_6(t), X_7(t), X_8(t)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^3$ , is a LCP with transition rates (1) determined by the parameter  $\alpha$  and an interaction matrix

$$\mathbf{A}' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{67} & a_{68} \\ a_{76} & 0 & a_{78} \\ a_{86} & a_{87} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

obtained from an interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A} = (a_{ij}) = (a_{ij})_{i,j=1}^8$  of the LCP  $X(t)$ .

### 3.2 The model semimartingales

Our next observation is that the dynamics of the LCP  $X(t)$  has a striking resemblance to that of continuous time multi-type branching process  $Z(t) = (Z_1(t), \dots, Z_N(t)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $N$  types of particles, where  $Z_i(t)$  is the number of particles of type  $i$  at time  $t$ . The branching process evolves as follows: after an exponential time with mean 1 a particle of type  $i$  splits to  $1 + \alpha$  particles of type  $i$  and  $a_{ji}$  particles of type  $j$ , all split times being independent.

Then, it is easy to see that, given  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ , the expected change of the  $i$ -th population of the branching process is

$$\mathbb{E}(Z_i(t + \Delta t) - Z_i(t) | Z(t) = \mathbf{x}) = \left( \alpha x_i + \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j \right) \Delta t + o(\Delta t) \quad (5)$$

and, similarly, the expected change of the  $i$ -th component of the LCP  $X(t) = (X_1(t), \dots, X_N(t)) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with transition rates (1) is

$$\mathbb{E}(X_i(t + \Delta t) - X_i(t) \mid X(t) = \mathbf{x}) = \left( \alpha x_i - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} x_j \right) \Delta t + \bar{o}(\Delta t) \quad \text{on } \mathbf{x} > 0, \quad (6)$$

where in both cases  $\bar{o}(\Delta t) \rightarrow 0$  as  $\Delta t \rightarrow 0$ . Observe that the right hand side of equation (6) differs from that of equation (6) only by the sign in front of the sum of the interaction terms. Therefore, although the models are different as probabilistic models, they are quite similar to each other algebraically. The rest of this section is devoted to introducing some semimartingales suggested by this similarity and useful for our proofs.

Since the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is non-negative, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem its largest in absolute value eigenvalue is real, strictly positive and simple. Without loss of generality we denote this eigenvalue by  $\lambda_1$ , and the remaining eigenvalues are denoted by  $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N$ . Note that  $\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N$  do not have to be distinct and may even be complex. In what follows,  $\Re(z)$  denotes the real part of a complex number  $z$ .

Let  $\mathbf{v}_i$  be a *left* eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$ , i.e.

$$\mathbf{v}_i^\top \mathbf{A} = \lambda_i \mathbf{v}_i^\top, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, we can choose  $\mathbf{v}_1$  to be non-negative, i.e.  $\mathbf{v}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ . If the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is irreducible, then  $\mathbf{v}_1$  is, in fact, strictly positive. Further, observe the following fact.

**Proposition 1.** *At least one eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  has a negative real part.*

*Proof.* By definition, the diagonal elements of the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  are zeros, so that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = \text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}) = 0$ . In addition,  $\lambda_1 > 0$ . Therefore, at least one eigenvalue of the matrix must have a negative real part, as claimed.  $\square$

Without loss of generality we assume throughout the rest of the paper that

$$\Re(\lambda_N) < 0. \quad (7)$$

Further, recall the quantity  $R$  defined in (3) and observe that

$$R(\zeta) = \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta \quad \text{for } \zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N) > 0, \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{1} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^N$  and  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $N \times N$  identity matrix. Let

$$R_n := R(\zeta(n)) = \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \quad \text{for } \zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \dots, \zeta_N(n)) > 0. \quad (9)$$

In these notations we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(\zeta_i(n+1) - \zeta_i(n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{\alpha \zeta_i(n) - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} \zeta_j(n)}{R_n} = \frac{((\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n))_i}{R_n} \quad \text{on } \{\zeta(n) > 0\}. \quad (10)$$

It is well known that scalar products of a multi-type branching process with eigenvectors of the corresponding mean drift matrix play an important role in the study of those processes ([3]). In light of the similarity between the linear competition process and the multi-type branching

processes, it is not surprising that the following similar quantities  $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , are useful in the study of the competition process. A key observation is that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n+1) - \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n) | \mathcal{F}_n) &= \frac{\mathbf{v}_i \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{R_n} \\ &= \frac{(\alpha - \lambda_i) \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n)}{R_n} \quad \text{on } \{\zeta(n) > 0\},\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

since  $\mathbf{v}_i$  is the left eigenvector for  $\mathbf{A}$ . Thus, the following process  $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n \wedge \sigma)$ , where

$$\sigma = \min \left( n \geq 0 : \min_{i=1, \dots, N} \zeta_i(n) = 0 \right),\tag{12}$$

can be sub- or super-martingale, depending on  $\lambda_i$  and  $\mathbf{v}_i$ .

### 3.3 Asymptotic behaviour of the total transition rate

Good control over the growth of the total transition rate  $R_n$  (defined in (9)) is required for our proof of the extinction in the most difficult case, when the interactions are not strong enough, i.e. when  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$ . In this section we obtain necessary estimates.

First, observe the following

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(R_{n+1} - R_n | \zeta(n) > 0) &= \frac{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A})(\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)} = \frac{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})(\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)} = \alpha,\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where we used the fact that matrices  $\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}$  and  $\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}$  commute.

The bound (13) would suffice for our purposes, as it implies that, while the process is away from the boundary, i.e.  $\zeta(n) > 0$ , then, with high probability,  $R_n \leq (\alpha + \varepsilon)n$  for sufficiently small  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We skip the details of the corresponding proof. Instead, we would like to present a more subtle fact, which can be of interest on its own, and from which the upper bound follows. Namely, we are going to show that, if  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$ , then  $R_n$  can be majorized by a random process which mean jump equals *exactly*  $\alpha$ . Precise statements are given in Propositions 2, 3 and 4 below.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose that  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$ . Define*

$$T_n = \alpha \mathbf{u} \cdot \zeta(n), \quad \text{for } \zeta(n) > 0, \quad \text{where } \mathbf{u} = (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N.\tag{14}$$

*Then  $T_n \geq R_n$  on  $\{\zeta(n) > 0\}$ .*

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Recall that  $\lambda_1 > 0$  is the largest in absolute value eigenvalue of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , and, hence, of the transposed matrix  $\mathbf{A}^\top$ . Since  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$  the matrix  $\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top$  is invertible. Therefore, both the vector  $\mathbf{u}$  and the quantity  $T_n$  are properly defined. Further, observe that

$$\left( [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top \alpha^{-1}]^{-1} \right)^\top = \left( [\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top \alpha^{-1}]^\top \right)^{-1} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} \alpha^{-1})^{-1} = \mathbf{I} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}^k \alpha^{-k}.$$



Then we get the following

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n - R_n &= \alpha \mathbf{1} \cdot ([\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top]^{-1})^\top (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}^\top)^\top \zeta(n) - \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \\
&= \mathbf{1} \cdot ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top \alpha^{-1})^{-1})^\top (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) - \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \\
&= \mathbf{1} \cdot (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} \alpha^{-1})^{-1} (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) - \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \\
&= \mathbf{1} \cdot ((\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A} \alpha^{-1})^{-1} - \mathbf{I}) (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \\
&= \mathbf{1} \cdot \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{A}^k \alpha^{-k} \right) (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n) \geq 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

Now we will show that  $T_n$ , roughly speaking, behaves like a random walk with a constant drift.

**Proposition 3.** *Under assumptions of Proposition 2*

$$\mathbb{E}(T_{n+1} - T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \alpha \quad \text{on} \quad \{\zeta(n) > 0\}.$$

*Proof of Proposition 3.* In all equations in the proof of the proposition we assume that  $\zeta(n) > 0$ . Then, equations (9) and (10) imply that

$$\mathbb{E}(\zeta(n+1) - \zeta(n) \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{(\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)},$$

therefore

$$\mathbb{E}(T_{n+1} - T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{\alpha \mathbf{u} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{u}^\top (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) &= \left[ (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}^\top) (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{1} \right]^\top (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \\
&= \mathbf{1} (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) (\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}) \\
&= \mathbf{1} (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}),
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}$  and  $\alpha \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{A}$  commute. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}(T_{n+1} - T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_n) = \frac{\alpha \mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)} = \alpha,$$

as required. The proposition is proved.  $\square$

The next statement, which is a sort of a strong law of large numbers, is adapted from [25, Lemma 6].

**Proposition 4.** *Under assumptions of Proposition 2*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{T_n}{n} - \alpha \right| 1_{\{\sigma = \infty\}} = 0 \quad \text{a.s.},$$

where  $\sigma$  is the stopping time defined in (12).

*Proof of Proposition 4.* Let

$$\hat{T}_n = \begin{cases} T_n - \alpha n & \text{if } n < \sigma, \\ T_\sigma - \alpha \sigma & \text{if } \sigma \leq n. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Then  $\hat{T}_n$  is a martingale with jumps bounded by some  $c \in (0, \infty)$ . Fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By the Azuma-Hoeffding inequality, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\hat{T}_n - \hat{T}_0| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq 2e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2c^2}}, \quad (16)$$

and by the Borel-Cantelli lemma the event above occurs finitely often. Since  $\varepsilon > 0$  is arbitrary and  $\hat{T}_0/n \rightarrow 0$  we get that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{T}_n/n = 0$  a.s. Next,

$$|T_n/n - \alpha| 1_{\{\sigma=\infty\}} = |\hat{T}_n/n| 1_{\{\sigma=\infty\}} \leq |\hat{T}_n/n| \rightarrow 0,$$

finishing the proof.  $\square$

## 4 Proofs of theorems

### 4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

The proof of Theorem 1 is based on Lemmas 1 and 2 (see Section 3.1) and Lemmas 3 and 4 stated below and proved later in Section 5.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $N = 2$  and  $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\beta > 0$  is a given constant. In other words, the model graph  $G$  contains just one edge  $1 \curvearrowright 2$ . Suppose that  $\zeta_1(0) > 0$  (equivalently,  $X_1(t) > 0$ ). Then, with probability one, the DTMC (equivalently, CTMC) dies out on vertex 2, i.e. there is a time  $n' \geq 0$  such that  $\zeta_2(n) = 0$  for all  $n \geq n'$ .*

**Lemma 4.** *Let the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  be irreducible, or, equivalently, the corresponding directed graph  $G$  (defined in Definition 2) be a strongly connected directed graph. Recall the stopping time  $\sigma$  defined in (12) and define similarly*

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \min \left( t \geq 0 : \min_{i=1, \dots, N} X_i(t) = 0 \right).$$

*Then  $\mathbb{P}(\sigma < \infty) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{\sigma} < \infty) = 1$ .*

The proof of the theorem is by induction on  $N$ . If  $N = 1$ , then the statement is trivial. Assume that  $N \geq 2$ . By Lemma 1 there is a strongly connected source subgraph  $G' = (V', E')$  with  $N'$  vertices. Now there are two possibilities.

- (a) If  $N' \geq 2$ , then we can apply Lemma 4. After one of the components  $X_v$ ,  $v \in V'$ , becomes 0, say, it is  $X_{v'}$ , we remove the vertex  $v'$  from  $V$ , and, hence, remove the corresponding column and row of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . New graph contains  $N - 1$  vertex for which the statement of the theorem holds by induction.
- (b) If  $N' = 1$ , then  $G'$  consists of just one source vertex, say,  $v$ . Since, by definition, there are no edges incoming to  $v$ , the death rate at  $v$  is zero. Therefore, the component  $X_v(t)$  will survive forever.

Further, there are two sub-cases to consider. First, if  $v$  is an isolated vertex of  $G$  (i.e. there are no edges coming into or going out of  $v$ ), then we can apply the induction to the subgraph induced by the vertex set  $V \setminus \{v\}$ .

If the vertex  $v$  is not isolated, then consider a vertex  $w$  for which  $v \curvearrowright w$ . Since the birth rate at  $v$  depends on  $X_v$  only, and the death rate at  $w$  results from the weighted sum of  $X_u$  for all  $u$  such that  $u \curvearrowright w$ , one can couple  $(X_v(t), X_w(t))$  with CTMC  $(\tilde{X}_v(t), \tilde{X}_w(t))$  on the graph  $\tilde{G}$  with two vertices  $\{v, w\}$  and the only edge  $v \curvearrowright w$  in such a way that

$$X_v(t) = \tilde{X}_v(t), \quad X_w(t) \leq \tilde{X}_w(t),$$

similarly to Lemma 2. The above inequality arises from the fact that there may be some vertex  $u$  such that  $u \curvearrowright w$ . By Lemma 3 the LCP on  $\tilde{G}$  dies out on  $w$ , and, hence, the same happens on  $G$ . Therefore, we can remove the vertex  $v$  and all vertices  $w$  such that  $v \curvearrowright w$  from the graph. The resulting graph will have  $\leq N - 2$  vertices, and we can apply the induction again.

**Remark 4.** It is crucial that one chooses the strongly connected **source** subgraph. Indeed, consider the graph in Figure (1), and assume that  $X_i(0) = 0$  for  $i = 5, 6, 7, 8$ . One might think that the subgraph with vertices  $\{2, 3, 4\}$  is admissible. Indeed, at a first glance, it looks like the chances that  $X_2$  dies out only “improve” due to the presence of the link  $1 \curvearrowright 2$ . However, this becomes not so apparent, if one considers the fact that the lower value at  $\{2\}$  results in higher values at  $\{3\}$ , which, in turn, leads to a lower value at  $\{4\}$ , and as a result, a smaller death rate at  $\{2\}$ .

## 4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

As before, we assume that all  $a_{ij}$ ,  $\alpha$  and  $Y_i(0)$ ’s are integers. This implies that all  $Y_i(n)$ ’s are integers for all  $n \geq 1$ . The proof can be easily adapted to the case when it is not true, but we do not want to complicate it unnecessary.

We start with explaining the connection between the urn model and the linear competition process. Note that, as long as the process is *sufficiently far away* from the boundary, (i.e. all  $Y_i$ ’s are sufficiently large) we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_i(n+1) - Y_i(n) \mid Y(n) = (Y_1, \dots, Y_N)) = \frac{\alpha Y_i - \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ij} Y_j}{\sum_{j=1}^N Y_j}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N,$$

where the numerator looks the same as the numerator on the right hand side of equation (10), giving the mean jump of a component of the DTMC  $\zeta(n)$  when  $\zeta(n) > 0$ . Therefore, the proof can be carried out similarly to that of Theorem 1, with a little bit more work. A new argument required is given below.

Assume that either  $N = 2$  and matrix  $\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $\beta > 0$  (i.e. as in Lemma 3), or the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is irreducible. Let

$$B = \max_{i,j} a_{ij}, \tag{17}$$

and define the following sets

$$D = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N : \text{at least one } x_i < B\},$$

$$D_0 = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N : \text{at least one } x_i = 0\}.$$

Similarly to Lemma 3 and Lemma 4, one can show that, with probability one, the DTMC  $Y(n)$  enters set  $D$ . Hence, if  $Y(n)$  leaves  $D$  without hitting  $D_0$ , it will have to re-enter  $D$  again. Let us show that it is impossible to enter and leave  $D$  infinitely many times without hitting  $D_0$ , i.e.

$$\{Y(n) \in D \text{ infinitely often}\} \subseteq \{Y(m) \in D_0 \text{ for some } m\}.$$

Assume that  $a_{12} > 0$ , and, hence  $a_{12} \geq 1$  ( $a_{ij}$  are integers by the earlier assumption). Note that if  $a_{1k}$  were 0 for all  $k$  then  $Y_1(n)$  would never decrease. Now, at time  $m > n$ , as long as  $Y(m) \in D \setminus D_0$ , the conditional probability that ball of type 2 is chosen given a ball of either type 1 or 2 is chosen, is at least  $\frac{1}{1+(B-1)} = \frac{1}{B}$ , provided  $Y_2(m) \geq 1$  (otherwise  $Y_2(m) = 0$ , i.e. the process has already reached the boundary  $D_0$ ). On the other hand, on this event

$$Y_1(m+1) = \max(Y_1(m) - a_{12}, 0) \leq Y_1(m) - 1.$$

Hence, if this conditional event happens consecutively (at most)  $B - 1$  times,  $Y_1$  will become zero. Since all types of balls (as long as they are present in the urn) are chosen infinitely often (the process does not explode), we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists m \geq n : Y(m) \in D_0 \text{ and } Y(k) \in D \text{ for all } k \in [n, m] \mid Y(n) \in D) \geq B^{-(B-1)} > 0.$$

The claim now follows.

The rest of the proof of Theorem 2 is identical to that of Theorem 1.

## 5 Proofs of lemmas

### 5.1 Proof of Lemma 3

We start with describing the intuition behind the proof. The behaviour of the LCP should be similar to that of the dynamical system, governed by the system of differential equations

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x} = x, \\ \dot{y} = y - \beta x. \end{cases}$$

The solution to this system is  $x = C_1 e^t$ ,  $y = (C_2 - \beta C_1 t) e^t$ . It is clear that there are no constants  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  for which both  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$  would remain positive for all  $t > 0$ .

The formal proof is as follows. First, assume w.l.o.g. that  $\alpha = 1$ . Note that the DTMC  $\zeta(n) = (\zeta_1(n), \zeta_2(n))$  can be coupled with the classical Pólya urn with two types of balls such that

$$\zeta_1(n) \geq \tilde{\zeta}_1(n), \quad \zeta_2(n) \leq \tilde{\zeta}_2(n),$$

where  $\tilde{\zeta}_1(n)$  and  $\tilde{\zeta}_2(n)$  denote the number of balls of type 1 and 2 respectively (if  $\beta = 0$  then our model will be exactly the Pólya urn). The well-known results says that, with probability one,  $\tilde{\zeta}_2(n)/\tilde{\zeta}_1(n) \rightarrow \xi/(1 - \xi)$ , where  $\xi$  is a Beta-distributed random variable, hence

$$r := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\zeta_2(n)}{\zeta_1(n)} < \infty \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Consequently, there exists an  $n_0 > 0$  such that for all  $n \geq n_0$  we have  $\zeta_2(n) \leq 2r\zeta_1(n)$ . Let  $V_n = \frac{\zeta_2(n)}{\zeta_1(n) + \zeta_2(n)}$ . Then, assuming  $x, y > 0$ , we have the following for  $n \geq n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(V_{n+1} - V_n | \mathcal{F}_n, \zeta(n) = (x, y)) &= \frac{x \left[ \frac{y}{x+y+1} - \frac{y}{x+y} \right] + y \left[ \frac{y+1}{x+y+1} - \frac{y}{x+y} \right] + \beta x \left[ \frac{y-1}{x+y-1} - \frac{y}{x+y} \right]}{(1+\beta)x + y} \\ &= \frac{-\beta x^2}{(x+y)(x+y-1)(x+y+\beta x)} \leq \frac{-\beta x^2}{(x+2rx)(x+2rx-1)(x+2rx+\beta x)} \\ &= -\frac{c+o(1)}{x} = -\frac{c+o(1)}{\zeta_1(n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $c = \frac{\beta}{(1+2r)^2(1+2r+\beta)} > 0$ . Hence, since  $\zeta_1(n) \leq n + \zeta_1(0)$ , for  $n \geq n_0$  we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(V_n) \leq \mathbb{E}(V_{n_0}) - \sum_{i=n_0}^n \frac{c+o(1)}{n + \zeta_1(0)} \rightarrow -\infty,$$

which is impossible since  $0 \leq V_n \leq 1$ . Consequently, eventually  $\zeta_2(n)$  will become 0.

**Remark 5.** Note that the dynamics described in Lemma 3 is similar to that of a triangular urn, studied in [21, Theorem 2.3].

## 5.2 Proof of Lemma 4

We are going to show that, with probability one, the stopping time  $\sigma$  is finite. This will imply that  $\tilde{\sigma}$  is also finite almost surely, since the LCP  $X(t)$  is a non-explosive CTMC. Let us consider two cases.

*Case 1:*  $\lambda_1 \geq \alpha$ . Recall that  $\mathbf{v}_1$  is the left eigenvector of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  corresponding to its largest in absolute eigenvalue  $\lambda_1 > 0$ . Since the matrix is irreducible, the vector  $\mathbf{v}_1$  is strictly positive. Let

$$S_n := \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \zeta(n). \quad (18)$$

Note that  $S_n \geq 0$ , since  $\mathbf{v}_1 > 0$  and  $\zeta_i(n) \geq 0, i = 1, \dots, N$ . Further, it follows from equation (11) that

$$\mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} - S_n | \mathcal{F}_n) \leq 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{\sigma > n\},$$

since  $\alpha - \lambda_1 \leq 0$ . Therefore, the following process  $S_{n \wedge \sigma}$  is a non-negative supermartingale, and, hence, it must converge a.s. Note that if  $\sigma > n$ , then at least one of the following events  $\{\zeta_i(n+1) - \zeta_i(n) = \pm 1\}, i = 1, \dots, N$ , must occur, and, hence,  $S_n = \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \zeta(n)$  will change at least by  $\varepsilon = \min_{j=1, \dots, N} \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_j > 0$ . Therefore, convergence of  $S_{n \wedge \sigma}$  is possible if and only if the stopping time  $\sigma$  is finite.

**Remark 6.** In addition, note that if  $\lambda_1 > \alpha$  then, using equation (11) and by definition of  $S_n$  (see equation (18)), we have that

$$\mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} - S_n | \mathcal{F}_n) = -(\lambda_1 - \alpha) \frac{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \zeta(n)}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \zeta(n)} \leq -(\lambda_1 - \alpha) \rho < 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \{\sigma > n\}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\rho = \inf_{\mathbf{x} > 0} \frac{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{x}} = \min_{\mathbf{x} > 0} \frac{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}}{\mathbf{1} \cdot (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \mathbf{A}) \mathbf{x}} = \min_{j=1, \dots, N} \frac{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_j}{\alpha + \sum_{k=1}^N a_{kj}} > 0,$$

since the right-most numerator is bounded below by  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In turn, equation (19) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}(\sigma) \leq \frac{S_0}{(\lambda_1 - \alpha)\rho} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \zeta(0)}{(\lambda_1 - \alpha)\rho} \quad \text{for } \zeta(0) > 0. \quad (20)$$

In other words, if  $\lambda_1 > \alpha$ , then the waiting time until extinction is linear in the initial position of the process.

*Case 2:  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$  (and hence all  $|\lambda_i| < \alpha$ ).* Recall that  $\mathbf{v}_N$  is the left eigenvector of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_N$ , the real part of which is negative, i.e.  $\Re(\lambda_N) < 0$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Let*

$$U_n = \mathbf{v}_N \cdot \zeta(n). \quad (21)$$

*Then*

$$\mathbb{E}(|U_{n+1}|^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq |U_n|^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{2(\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N))}{R_n} \right] \quad \text{on } \{\sigma > n\},$$

where<sup>1</sup>  $|U_n|^2 = U_n \overline{U_n}$  and  $R_n$  is defined in (9).

*Proof of Proposition 5.* Assume that  $\{\sigma > n\}$  (so that  $\zeta(n) > 0$ ) throughout the proof. It follows from (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} R_n \mathbb{E}(\zeta_i(n+1)\zeta_j(n+1) - \zeta_i(n)\zeta_j(n) | \mathcal{F}_n) \\ = 2\alpha\zeta_i(n)\zeta_j(n) - \zeta_i(n) \sum_{k=1}^N a_{jk}\zeta_k(n) - \zeta_j(n) \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}\zeta_k(n) \\ = 2\alpha\zeta_i(n)\zeta_j(n) - \zeta_i(n) (\mathbf{A}\zeta(n))_j - \zeta_j(n) (\mathbf{A}\zeta(n))_i \quad \text{for } i \neq j, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_n \mathbb{E}(\zeta_i^2(n+1) - \zeta_i^2(n) | \mathcal{F}_n) \\ = 2\alpha\zeta_i^2(n) + \alpha\zeta_i(n) + (-2\zeta_i(n) + 1) \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}\zeta_k(n) \\ = 2\alpha\zeta_i^2(n) + \alpha\zeta_i(n) + (-2\zeta_i(n) + 1)(\mathbf{A}\zeta(n))_i \quad \text{for } i = j, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

In the rest of the proof we write  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta_i$  for  $\zeta(n)$  and  $\zeta_i(n)$  respectively. Let  $c_1, \dots, c_N$  be the coordinates of  $\mathbf{v}_N$ . Note that in general some of  $c_i$  can be complex. In these notations

$$U_n = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i \zeta_i \quad \text{and} \quad |U_n|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i \zeta_j.$$

Using equations (22) and (23) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} R_n \mathbb{E}(|U_{n+1}|^2 - |U_n|^2 | \mathcal{F}_n) &= 2\alpha \sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i \zeta_j - \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_j (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i - \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_j \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^N |c_i|^2 (\alpha\zeta_i + 1)(\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i - 2 \sum_{i=1}^N |c_i|^2 \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>the bar denotes the complex conjugate

It is easy to see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N |c_i|^2 (\alpha \zeta_i + 1) (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 2\alpha \sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i \zeta_j = 2\alpha |U_n|^2,$$

which gives the following lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} R_n \mathbb{E}(|U_{n+1}|^2 - |U_n|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n) &\geq 2\alpha |U_n|^2 \\ &\quad - \sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N c_i \bar{c}_j [\zeta_j (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i + \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_j] - 2 \sum_{i=1}^N |c_i|^2 \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Observe that

$$\sum_{i,j=1, i \neq j}^N c_i \bar{c}_j [\zeta_j (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i + \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_j] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^N |c_i|^2 \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i = \sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_j (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i + \sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_j. \quad (26)$$

For the first sum on the right hand side of equation (26) we get that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_j (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_i = [\bar{\mathbf{v}}_N \cdot \zeta] [\mathbf{v}_N \cdot \mathbf{A}\zeta] = \overline{U_n} [\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{v}_N \cdot \zeta] = \lambda_N \overline{U_n} [\mathbf{v}_N \cdot \zeta] = \lambda_N |U_n|^2, \quad (27)$$

where we used the fact that  $\mathbf{v}_N$  is the right eigenvector of the transposed matrix  $\mathbf{A}^\top$  corresponding to the same eigenvalue  $\lambda_N$ . Similarly to the preceding display we obtain the following for the second sum on the right hand side of equation (26)

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N c_i \bar{c}_j \zeta_i (\mathbf{A}\zeta)_j = [\mathbf{v}_N \cdot \zeta] [\bar{\mathbf{v}}_N \cdot \mathbf{A}\zeta] = \overline{\lambda_N} |U_n|^2. \quad (28)$$

Consequently, using equations (26)-(28) in equation (25) we arrive at the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} R_n \mathbb{E}(|U_{n+1}|^2 - |U_n|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n) &\geq 2\alpha |U_n|^2 - \lambda_N |U_n|^2 - \overline{\lambda_N} |U_n|^2 \\ &= 2(\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N)) |U_n|^2 \quad \text{on} \quad \{\sigma > n\}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

implying the claim.  $\square$

The following statement follows from Propositions 2 and 5.

**Corollary 1.** *If  $\lambda_1 < \alpha$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E}(|U_{n+1}|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_n) \geq |U_n|^2 \left[ 1 + \frac{2(\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N))}{T_n} \right] \quad \text{on} \quad \{\sigma > n\}.$$

**Remark 7.** Recall that  $\mathbf{v}_N$  is the eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\lambda_N$  of  $\mathbf{A}$ . While  $\mathbf{v}_N$  cannot be a zero vector, some of its components may well be negative or zeros, or even complex. As a result, even when  $\zeta(n) > 0$ , it is possible that  $U_n = \mathbf{v}_N \cdot \zeta(n) = 0$ . In the rest of our proof we need to find *some*  $n$ , for which  $U_n \neq 0$ . The next proposition deals with this problem.

**Proposition 6.** Let  $c_1, \dots, c_N$  be coordinates of eigenvector  $\mathbf{v}_N$  (as in the proof of Proposition 5), and  $\zeta(0) > 0$ . Assume<sup>2</sup> w.l.o.g that  $c_1 \neq 0$  and define  $C_1 = \frac{1}{2}|c_1|$ . Let

$$\kappa = \inf\{n \geq 0 : |U_n| \geq C_1\}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa > n) \leq \frac{C_2}{n^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma+\alpha}}}$$

for some  $C_2 > 0$  and all  $n \geq 1$ , and where  $\gamma$  is defined in (30).

*Proof of Proposition 6.* Let

$$E_i = \{\zeta(i) = \zeta(i-1) \pm \mathbf{e}_1\}, \quad i \geq 1.$$

On  $E_i$  we have  $|U_i - U_{i-1}| = 2C_1$ , yielding that at least one of  $|U_i|$  or  $|U_{i-1}|$  must be as large as  $C_1$ . Consequently,

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n E_i \subseteq \{\kappa \leq n\} \iff \{\kappa > n\} \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i^c.$$

Further, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_{n+1} | \mathcal{F}_n) \geq \frac{\alpha \zeta_1(n)}{R_n} \geq \frac{\alpha}{R_0 + (\gamma + \alpha)n}, \quad \text{if } \zeta_1(n) \geq 1,$$

where

$$\gamma := \max_{i=1, \dots, N} \left( \sum_{j=1}^N a_{ji} \right). \quad (30)$$

Consequently, since  $\zeta_1(0) \geq 1$  and also  $\zeta_1(k) \geq 1$  on  $\cap_{i=1}^k E_i^c$  for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n E_i^c \right) &\leq \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( 1 - \frac{\alpha}{R_0 + (\gamma + \alpha)i} \right) \leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma + \alpha} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\rho + i} \right\} \\ &\leq \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha}{\gamma + \alpha} \ln \left( \frac{n}{\rho} \right) \right\} = \frac{C_2}{n^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma+\alpha}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho = \frac{R_0}{\gamma+\alpha}$  and  $C_2 = C_2(\alpha, \gamma, R_0) > 0$  is some constant.  $\square$

Now we are ready to finish the proof of Lemma 4 in Case 2. Recall that  $\Re(\lambda_N) < 0$ , and fix an  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that

$$\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N) > (\alpha + 2\varepsilon)(1 + \varepsilon/2). \quad (31)$$

It is easy to see that such  $\varepsilon$  exists. Recall the definition of  $\hat{T}_n$  from (15). Fix some large  $n_0 > T_0/\varepsilon$ , to be chosen exactly later, and let

$$\tau = \tau_{n_0} = \inf\{n \geq n_0 : \hat{T}_n/n > \varepsilon\}.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>at least one of the coordinates of  $\mathbf{v}_N$  must be not zero



Iterating Corollary 1 we obtain that for all  $m > n_0$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(|U_m|^2 | \mathcal{F}_\kappa) &\geq |U_\kappa|^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \sigma \geq m\}} \prod_{n=\kappa}^{m-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{2[\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N)]}{T_n} \right] \\ &\geq C_1^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \sigma \geq m\}} \prod_{n=n_0}^{m-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{2[\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N)]}{T_n} \right],\end{aligned}$$

where constant  $C_1$  is defined in Proposition 6. Further, using (31), the fact that  $T_0 < \varepsilon n_0$  and

$$T_n \leq T_0 + (\alpha + \varepsilon)n \leq (\alpha + 2\varepsilon)n \quad \text{on} \quad \{\tau > n\}, \quad \text{where} \quad n \geq n_0,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(|U_m|^2 | \mathcal{F}_\kappa) &\geq C_1^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \min(\sigma, \tau) \geq m\}} \prod_{n=n_0}^{m-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{2[\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N)]}{T_0 + n(\alpha + \varepsilon)} \right] \\ &\geq C_1^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \min(\sigma, \tau) \geq m\}} \prod_{n=n_0}^{m-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{2[\alpha - \Re(\lambda_N)]}{n(\alpha + 2\varepsilon)} \right] \\ &\geq C_1^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \min(\sigma, \tau) \geq m\}} \prod_{n=n_0}^{m-1} \left[ 1 + \frac{2 + \varepsilon}{n} \right] \geq C_1^2 1_{\{\kappa \leq n_0, \min(\sigma, \tau) \geq m\}} \left( \frac{m}{n_0 + 1} \right)^{2+\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, trivially  $|U_m|^2 \leq C_3 m^2$  for some  $C_3 > 0$ , thus  $\mathbb{E}(|U_m|^2) \leq C_3 m^2$  and

$$\mathbb{P}(\kappa \leq n_0, \min(\sigma, \tau) \geq m) \leq \frac{C_3 m^2}{C_1^2 m^{2+\varepsilon} / (n_0 + 1)^{2+\varepsilon}} \leq C_4 \frac{n_0^{2+\varepsilon}}{m^\varepsilon}$$

for some  $C_4 > 0$ . Consequently, by Proposition 6,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\sigma \geq m) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\sigma \geq m, \tau \geq m, \kappa \leq n_0) + \mathbb{P}(\kappa > n_0) + \mathbb{P}(\tau < m) \\ &\leq \frac{C_4 n_0^{2+\varepsilon}}{m^\varepsilon} + \frac{C_2}{n_0^{\frac{\alpha}{\gamma+\alpha}}} + \mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty).\end{aligned}$$

Using bound (16) and the elementary inequality  $1/(1 - e^{-x}) \leq 2 \max(1, 1/x)$  for all  $x > 0$ , we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau < \infty) \leq \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(|\hat{T}_n - \hat{T}_0| \geq \varepsilon n) \leq \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} 2 e^{-\frac{n\varepsilon^2}{2c^2}} \leq C_5 e^{-\frac{n_0 \varepsilon^2}{2c^2}}.$$

where  $C_5 = \max(4, 8c\varepsilon^{-2})$ . Hence, by choosing  $n_0 = m^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4+2\varepsilon}}$ , we finally obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\sigma \geq m) \leq \frac{C_4}{m^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}} + \frac{C_2}{m^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4+2\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\gamma+\alpha}}} + C_5 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^2}{2c^2} m^{\frac{\varepsilon}{4+2\varepsilon}} \right\} \sim m^{-\frac{\varepsilon}{4+2\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\gamma+\alpha}}, \quad (32)$$

which goes to zero as  $m \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark 8.** Note that the upper bound (32) *a priori* says nothing about the finiteness of  $\mathbb{E}\sigma$ . Sometimes, the bound can be improved in order to demonstrate that, in fact, this expectation is finite. We conjecture, however, that if the interactions are sufficiently weak, then the distribution of the stopping time  $\sigma$  has a heavy tail, yielding  $\mathbb{E}(\sigma) = \infty$ .

## 6 Appendices

### 6.1 Appendix 1: examples

In this section we provide some examples. Suppose that the interaction matrix is  $\mathbf{A} = \beta \mathbf{A}_G$ , where  $\beta > 0$  is a given constant and  $\mathbf{A}_G$  is the adjacency matrix of a *non-directed* connected graph with  $N \geq 2$  vertices and a constant vertex degree  $d$ . The latter means that every vertex is connected exactly to  $d$  other vertices. In this case  $d$  is the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}_G$  (i.e. the largest eigenvalue of the graph), so that  $\lambda_1 = d\beta$  is the largest eigenvalue of the interaction matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . It is convenient to choose the corresponding eigenvector as follows  $\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{1} = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$ . Then the process  $S_n$  defined in the general case by equation (18) becomes

$$S_n = \zeta_1(n) + \dots + \zeta_N(n). \quad (33)$$

Further, observe that the total rate  $R_n$  (defined in (9)) is proportional to  $S_n$ , that is

$$R_n = (\alpha + d\beta)S_n \quad \text{on} \quad \{\sigma > n\}.$$

As a result, our proofs can be simplified due to the fact that the process  $S_n$  behaves as a simple random walk. Indeed, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} - S_n = 1 | \zeta(n) > 0) &= \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + d\beta} \\ \mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} - S_n = -1 | \zeta(n) > 0) &= \frac{d\beta}{\alpha + d\beta}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

and, hence,

$$\mathbb{E}(S_{n+1} - S_n | \zeta(n) > 0) = \frac{\alpha - d\beta}{\alpha + d\beta}. \quad (35)$$

Now, let  $G = (V, E)$  be a complete graph with  $N$  vertices. This is a special case of a regular graph with the constant vertex degree  $d = N - 1$ . It is easy to see that in this case the number of possible limit configurations is  $N$ . The corresponding interaction matrix has only two different eigenvalues, i.e.  $\lambda_1 = (N - 1)\beta$  and  $\lambda_2 = -\beta$ . The eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  is of multiplicity 1, and the other eigenvalue  $\lambda_2$  is of multiplicity  $d = N - 1$ . The set of corresponding eigenvectors can be chosen as follows:

$$\mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_i, \quad i = 2, \dots, N.$$

If  $\alpha > (N - 1)\beta$ , then, by Remark 6, the process  $S_{n \wedge \sigma}$  is a non-negative supermartingale with a strictly negative mean jump, so that the first extinction occurs in time linear in  $S_0 = \zeta_1(0) + \dots + \zeta_N(0)$ . If  $\alpha < (N - 1)\beta$ , then any process  $\mathbf{v}_i \cdot \zeta(n)$ ,  $i = 2, \dots, N$ , can be used to construct the process  $U_n$  in Proposition 5.

For example, if  $N = 2$ , then we get a special case of the model studied in [25]. In this particular case we have the following

$$\lambda_1 = \beta, \quad \mathbf{v}_1 = (1, 1)^\top, \quad (36)$$

$$\lambda_2 = -\beta, \quad \mathbf{v}_2 = (1, -1)^\top, \quad (37)$$

$$S_n = \mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \zeta(n) = \zeta_1(n) + \zeta_2(n), \quad (38)$$

$$U_n = \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \zeta(n) = \zeta_1(n) - \zeta_2(n). \quad (39)$$

For an illustration, we present in Figure 2 a simulation of the DTMC  $\zeta(n)$  in the case of the complete graph with  $N = 11$ . The plot shows positions of the components of the process

as functions of time. One can see that eventually only a single component survives. Similar simulations in the case of a complete graph with two vertices are shown in Figures 3 and 4. Table 1 provides a summary of the simulation results.




Figure 2: Simulation of the DTMC  $\zeta(n)$  on a complete graph with 11 vertices.




Figure 3: Simulation of lifetimes of the components of the DTMC  $\zeta(n)$  on a complete graph with 2 vertices. Parameters:  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0.3$  (left) and  $\beta = 0.5$  (right)




Figure 4: The embedded process  $\zeta(n)$  on a complete graph with 2 vertices.  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 0.7$  (left) and  $\beta = 1.5$  (right)

	$\beta = 0.3$	$\beta = 0.5$	$\beta = 0.7$	$\beta = 1.5$
$\alpha = 1$	$\sigma = 1713$	$\sigma = 570$	$\sigma = 500$	$\sigma = 160$

Table 1: Sample extinction times  $\sigma$ ,  $\zeta(0) = (50, 50)$

Table 2 gives numbers of possible limit configurations, the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue  $\lambda_1$  and a variant of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_N$  for the cycle, line and star graphs (with  $N \geq 2$  vertices). All graphs are non-directed, and  $v \sim u$  denotes that vertices  $v$  and  $u$  are connected by an edge.

Cycle graph $1 \sim 2 \sim \dots \sim N \sim 1$	Line graph $1 \sim 2 \sim \dots \sim N-1 \sim N$	Star graph $1 \sim i, i = 2, \dots, N-1$ (1 is the central vertex)
$M(G_N) = F_{N-1} + F_{N-3} - 1$	$M(G_N) = F_N - 1$	$M(G_N) = 2^{N-1}$
$\lambda_1 = 2\beta$	$\lambda_1 = 2\beta \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{N+1}\right)$	$\lambda_1 = \beta\sqrt{N-1}$
$\lambda_N = -2\beta \cos\left(\frac{\pi \mathbf{1}_{\{N \text{ is odd}\}}}{N}\right)$	$\lambda_N = -2\beta \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{N+1}\right)$	$\lambda_N = -\beta\sqrt{N-1}$

Table 2:  $M(G_N)$  denotes the number of the possible limit configurations for a graph  $G_N$ .  $F_k$  is the  $N$ -th Fibonacci number.

## 6.2 Appendix 2: conjecture for the model with immigration

First of all, note that motivation for the current paper comes from [25], where we considered a similar model only in the case where  $N = 2$ . In the model of [25] we allowed “immigration”, i.e.  $q_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_i} = \alpha_i x_i + \lambda_i$ , where  $\lambda_i > 0$  is the immigration rate, and we also allowed  $\alpha_i$  to be different. On the other hand, in [25] we demanded that  $a_{12} > 0$  and  $a_{21} > 0$ , which ensured that matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  is irreducible. In fact, possible non-reducibility of  $\mathbf{A}$  (and, hence, non-connectedness of  $G$ ) causes a substantial challenge in our current model as we have to deal with multiple possibilities for the structure of the underlying graph, and use the recursion in the proof.

Including the immigration rate into the current model with arbitrary  $N$  is straightforward. However, some computations will become more tedious (see e.g. the proof of Proposition 5), and we chose not to do so. At the same time, we believe it is possible to extend the results of Theorem 1 of the current paper and [25, Theorem 2] as follows.

**Conjecture 1.** *Suppose that we are given the interaction matrix satisfying Definition 1, and the transition rates are given by (1) with the correction that  $q_{\mathbf{xy}} = \alpha x_i + \lambda_i$ ,  $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_i$ ,  $\lambda_i \geq 0$ . Then there exists a.s. a time  $T$  and a subset of vertices  $\mathcal{I} = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_K\} \subset V$  satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1, such that for all  $t \geq T$*

$$X_i(t) \rightarrow \infty \text{ if and only if } i \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Moreover, for each  $j$  such that  $\lambda_j > 0$ , either  $j \in \mathcal{I}$ , or  $j \notin \mathcal{I}$  but there is an  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  such that  $i \rightsquigarrow j$ . Finally, for all  $j \notin \mathcal{I}$

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_j(t) = 0 \text{ and } \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} X_j(t) = 1 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

## References

- [1] Anderson, W. (1991). Continuous time Markov chains: an application oriented approach. Springer Verlag.
- [2] Athreya, K., and Karlin, S. (1968). Embedding of urn schemes into continuous time Markov branching processes and related limit theorems. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **39**, pp. 1801–1817.
- [3] Athreya, K., and Ney, P. (1972). Branching processes. Springer, Berlin.
- [4] Barbour, A., Hamza, K., Kaspı, H., and Klebaner, F. (2015). Escape from the boundary in Markov population processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, **47**, N4, pp. 1190–1211.
- [5] Champagnat, N., and Villemonais, D. (2019). Lyapunov criteria for uniform convergence of conditional distributions of absorbed Markov processes. *arXiv:1704.1928v2*.
- [6] Crane, E., Georgiou, N., Volkov, S., Wade, A., and Waters, R. (2011). The simple harmonic urn. *Ann. Probab.*, **39**, pp. 2119–2177.
- [7] Davis, B., and Volkov, S. (2002). Continuous time vertex-reinforced jump processes. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **123**, pp. 281–300.
- [8] Davis, B., and Volkov, S. (2004). Vertex-reinforced jump processes on trees and finite graphs. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, **128**, pp. 42–62.
- [9] Hutton, J. (1980). The recurrence and transience of two-dimensional linear birth and death processes. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, **12**, N3, pp. 615–639.
- [10] Iglehart, D. (1964). Multivariate competition processes. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **35**, pp. 350–361.
- [11] Janson, S. (2004). Functional limit theorems for multi-type branching processes and generalised Polya urns. *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, **110**, pp. 177–245.
- [12] Janson, S., Shcherbakov, V. and Volkov, S. (2019). Long term behaviour of a reversible system interacting random walks. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **175**, N1, pp. 71–96.
- [13] Karlin, S., and Taylor, H. (2012). A First Course in Stochastic Processes. 2nd Edition. Academic Press.
- [14] Kesten, H. (1972). Limit theorems for stochastic growth models. I. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, **4**, N2, pp. 193–232.
- [15] Kesten, H. (1976). Recurrence criteria for multi-dimensional Markov chains and multi-dimensional linear birth and death processes. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, **8**, N1, pp. 58–87.
- [16] Kingman, J., and Volkov, S. (2003). Solution to the OK Corral model via decoupling of Friedman’s urn. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **16**, pp. 267–276.
- [17] Lafitte-Godillon, P., Rachel, K., and Tran, V. (2013). Extinction probabilities for distylous plant population modeled by an inhomogeneous random walk on the positive quadrant. *SIAM. J. Appl. Math.*, **73**, N2, pp. 700–722.

- [18] Méléard, S., and Villemonais, D. (2012). Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes. *Probab. Surv.*, **9**, pp. 340–410.
- [19] Menshikov, M., Popov, S. and Wade, A. (2017). Non-homogeneous random walks: Lyapunov function methods for near-critical stochastic systems. Cambridge University Press.
- [20] Menshikov, M., and Shcherbakov, V. (2018). Long term behaviour of two interacting birth-and-death processes. *Markov Process. Related Fields*, **24**, Issue 1, pp. 85–106.
- [21] Pemantle, R., and Volkov, S. (1999). Vertex-reinforced random walk on  $\mathbb{Z}$  has finite range. *Ann. Probab.* **27**, pp. 1368–1388.
- [22] Reuter, G. (1961). Competition processes. In: Neyman J. (Ed.) Proceedings of The Fourth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, v.II: Contributions to Probability Theory. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- [23] Renshaw, E. (1991). Modelling biological populations in space and time. Cambridge University Press.
- [24] Shcherbakov, V. and Volkov, S. (2015). Long term behaviour of locally interacting birth-and-death processes. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **158**, Issue 1, pp. 132–157.
- [25] Shcherbakov, V. and Volkov, S. (2019). Boundary effect in competition processes. *J. Appl. Prob.*, **56**, N3, pp. 750–768.