

SPLITTING METHODS FOR ECOLOGICAL MODELLING OF VEGETAL META-COMMUNITIES

GAUTHIER DELVOYE, OLIVIER GOUBET, FRÉDÉRIC PACCAUT

ABSTRACT. A neutral model for the evolution of abundances in a vegetal metacommunity is introduced. Migration between the communities is explicitly modeled in a deterministic way, while the reproduction process is dealt with using Wright-Fisher models, independently within each community. The large population limit of the model is considered. The hydrodynamic limit is proved to be the solution of a partial differential equation with a deterministic part coming from the migration process and a diffusion part due to the Wright-Fisher process. The convergence in law of the piecewise affine extension of the discrete process is also established. Finally, the diversity of the metacommunity is addressed through one of its indicators, the mean extinction time of a species. At the limit, using classical comparison principles, the exchange process between the communities is proved to slow down extinction.

1. INTRODUCTION

Splitting methods (*méthodes de pas fractionnaires*) are commonly used in numerics to compute the solution of various problems coming from physics or other scientific areas. For instance, for the approximation of an ODE that reads

$$\dot{u} + A(u) + B(u) = 0,$$

one solves recursively on a small time step $\dot{u} + A(u) = 0$ and then on the same time step $\dot{u} + B(u) = 0$, and we do it again. Splitting methods find their origin in the famous Trotter formula that reads for two matrices A and B

$$\exp(A + B) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\exp\left(\frac{A}{n}\right) \exp\left(\frac{B}{n}\right) \right)^n.$$

Here we plan to apply splitting methods for an ecological modelling problem that reads as follows. We are interested in the evolution in time of several species living in forest stations that are linked with ecological corridors. If there is no corridor, the species on each forest station leaves on their own; one may model the evolution of the abundances on each station by a Wright-Fisher model that is commonly used in the literature ([Méléard](#)

MSC 2010: 60J60, 92D25, 35B51.

Keywords: metacommunity, neutral model, splitting methods, diffusion approximations, Wright-Fisher

[2016]). Besides, the very existence of corridors yields to some exchanges between the stations. Then we have two different phenomena that infer on the evolution of this meta-community: the birth/death process (reproduction process) on each patch and the exchange process between patches. Hence we have Σ species on a graph with Π forest patches/stations (the *vertices*) linked by corridors (the *edges*). We point out that we deal here with *neutral models* (Hubbell [2001], Alonso et al. [2006]), i.e. that our model does not take into account the traits of the species. Some metacommunities abundances models exists (Nagylaki [1980], Slatkin [1981], Wakeley and Takahashi [2004]), but the migration is not explicit. Other models are fully explicit (Economo and Keitt [2008], Vanpeteghem and Haegeman [2010], Chave and Leigh [2002]), but their output are not abundance but metacommunity diversity.

We are first interested here in the mathematical modelling of two species, on two forest patches (hence $\Sigma = \Pi = 2$) linked by some ecological corridor. We model the evolution by a splitting method, performing first the exchange process (see the definition of the corresponding Markov chain in the sequel) on a small time step, and then we perform independently on each station a birth/death process according to the Wright-Fisher model, and we reiterate.

Our first result is to compute the limit equation of this modelling when the time step goes to 0 and the size of the population diverges to ∞ . This issue, the *hydrodynamic limit*, i.e. to pass from the mesoscopic scale to the macroscopic one received increasing interest in the last decades. Instead of using a martingale problem (Ethier [1976]), we prove directly the convergence of operators towards a diffusion semi-group (Ethier and Nagylaki [1980]). We find a deterministic diffusion-convection equation, where the drift comes from the exchange process, while the diffusion comes from the limit of the Wright-Fisher process. Our second result is concerned with the comparison of the extinction time of one species for a system with exchange and a system without exchanges. We prove that the exchanges are good to the biodiversity, i.e. that the exchange process slows down the extinction time of one species.

This article outlines as follows. In a second section we describe the modelling at mesoscopic scale. We couple a Wright-Fisher model for the evolution of the abundances together with an exchange process. The third section is devoted to the hydrodynamic, that is the large population limit of the discrete process. In a fourth section we discuss some issues related to the extinction time; we compare the extinction time of one species with and without exchange process. In an Appendix we give the proof of two technical but important lemmas.

2. MODELS AT THE MESOSCOPIC SCALE

2.1. Modelling the exchange between patches. Consider two patches that have respectively the capacity to host (N_1, N_2) individuals, to be chosen into two different species α and β . Set (y_1^n, y_2^n) for the numbers of individuals of type α at time $n\delta t$ respectively in patch 1 and 2.

The exchange process is then simply modelled by

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} y_1^{n+1} &= (1 - \kappa d \delta t) y_1^n + \kappa \delta t y_2^n, \\ y_2^{n+1} &= (\kappa d \delta t) y_1^n + (1 - \kappa \delta t) y_2^n, \end{aligned}$$

where κ is the instantaneous speed of exchanges and $d = \frac{N_2}{N_1}$ represents the distortion between the patches (the ratio between the hosting capacities); we may assume without loss of generality that $d \leq 1$. With this modelling, and assuming that $\kappa \delta t \max(1, d) = \kappa \delta t \leq 1$, it is easy to check that

- The domain $[0, N_1] \times [0, N_2]$ is stable by the exchange process.
- The total population of individuals of type α that is $y_1^n + y_2^n$ is conserved.
- If we start with only individuals of species α (respectively β) then we remain with only individuals from α (respectively β); this reads $(N_1, N_2) \mapsto (N_1, N_2)$ (respectively $(0, 0) \mapsto (0, 0)$).

Set $x = (x_1 = \frac{y_1}{N_1}, x_2 = \frac{y_2}{N_2})$ belonging to $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1]^2$ for the population densities of a species α on two separate patches. Then we have alternatively

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} x_1^{n+1} &= (1 - \kappa d \delta t) x_1^n + \kappa d \delta t x_2^n, \\ x_2^{n+1} &= \kappa \delta t x_1^n + (1 - \kappa \delta t) x_2^n. \end{aligned}$$

This reads also $X^{n+1} = AX^n$ where A is a stochastic matrix.

Consider now the càdlàg process with jumps $X \mapsto AX$ at each time step δt . In other words, for any continuous function f defined on $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1]^2$ then $P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}(f)(x) = f(AX)$, where $P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}$ is the transition kernel of the exchange process.

2.2. Wright-Fisher reproduction model. On each patch we now describe that death/birth process that is given by the Wright-Fisher model. The main assumption is that the death/birth process on one patch is *independent* of the other one.

Consider then the first patch that may host N_1 individuals. The Markov chain is then defined by the transition matrix, written for $z_1 = \frac{j_1}{N_1} \in [0, 1]$

$$(3) \quad \mathbb{P}(x_1^{n+1} = z_1 | x_1^n = x_1) = \binom{N_1}{j_1} x_1^{j_1} (1 - x_1)^{N_1 - j_1}.$$

Since the two Wright-Fisher processes are independent, the corresponding transition kernel reads

$$(4) \quad P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(f)(x) = \sum_j \binom{N}{j} x^j (1 - x)^{N - j} f\left(\frac{j}{N}\right),$$

for any function f defined on $\mathcal{D} = [0, 1]^2$, where we have set for the sake of conciseness

$$\binom{N}{j} = \binom{N_1}{j_1} \binom{N_2}{j_2},$$

and

$$x^j (1-x)^{N-j} f\left(\frac{j}{N}\right) = x_1^{j_1} (1-x_1)^{N_1-j_1} x_2^{j_2} (1-x_2)^{N_2-j_2} f\left(\frac{j_1}{N_1}, \frac{j_2}{N_2}\right).$$

3. PASSING TO THE LIMIT

We consider the same scaling as for the Wright-Fisher usual model, that is $N_1 \delta t = 1$. We set $N = N_1$ in the sequel to simplify the notations. We may consider either the càdlàg process associated to the reproduction-exchange discrete process defined by $\bar{x}^t = x^n$ if $n\delta t \leq t < (n+1)\delta t$. We define also x^t to be the continuous piecewise linear function such that $x^t = x^n$ for $t = n\delta t$. We consider an analogous interpolation in space in order to deal with function that are defined on $[0, T] \times \mathcal{D}$ where $T > 0$ is given.

We set $M = \begin{pmatrix} d & -d \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and then $A = Id - \frac{\kappa}{N} M$. For a given Lipschitz continuous function f that vanishes at $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$, we now define the sequence of functions

$$(5) \quad u_N(t, x) = \mathbb{E}(f(x^t) | x^0 = x).$$

We may also use analogously $\bar{u}_N(t, x) = \mathbb{E}(f(\bar{x}^t) | x^0 = x) = (P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}})^n (f)(x)$.

3.1. Statement of the result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $T > 0$ be fixed. Assume f is a function of class C^2 on \mathcal{D} , that vanishes at $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$. The sequence u_N converges uniformly in $[0, T] \times \mathcal{D}$ to the unique solution u of the diffusion equation*

$$\partial_t u = Lu,$$

where L is defined as, for $x = (x_1, x_2)$,

$$Lu(x) = \frac{x_1(1-x_1)}{2} u_{x_1 x_1}(x) + \frac{x_2(1-x_2)}{2d} u_{x_2 x_2}(x) - \kappa(Mx \cdot \nabla u)(x),$$

and with initial data $u(0, x) = f(x)$.

Remark 3.2. *We may have proved that the càdlàg process associated to the reproduction-exchange process converges to a diffusion equation. We will discuss this in the sequel. Besides, we prove the convergence results for a sufficiently smooth f , and we will extend in the sequel the definition of a mild solution to the equation for functions f in the Banach space $E = \{f \in C(\mathcal{D}); f(0, 0) = f(1, 1) = 0\}$.*

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. The proof of the theorem is divided into several lemmata. The first one describes how far the discrete (Markov) reproduction/exchange process x^n is close from a true martingale.

Lemma 3.3. *The conditional expectation of the discrete reproduction-exchange process is*

$$(6) \quad \mathbb{E}(x^{n+1}|x^n) = Ax^n.$$

As a consequence $\mathbb{E}(x^{n+1} - x^n|x^n) = o(1)$ when N diverges to ∞ .

Proof Using the properties of the Bernstein polynomials, setting $y = Ax^n$,

$$\mathbb{E}(x^{n+1}|x^n) = \sum_{j_1, j_2=0}^{N_1, N_2} \binom{N_1}{j_1} \binom{N_2}{j_2} y_1^{j_1} (1-y_1)^{N_1-j_1} y_2^{j_2} (1-y_2)^{N_2-j_2} \begin{pmatrix} j_1 \\ \frac{N_1}{N} \\ j_2 \\ \frac{N_2}{N} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The result (6) follows promptly. Then the proof of the lemma is completed, observing that $A - Id = o(1)$. □

The next lemma is useful to prove that x^t and \bar{x}^t are close.

Lemma 3.4. *There exists a constant C such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|x^{n+1} - x^n|^2) \leq CN^{-1}.$$

Proof

We expand the ℓ^2 norm in \mathbb{R}^2 as

$$|x^{n+1} - x^n|^2 = |x^{n+1}|^2 - 2(x^n, x^{n+1}) + |x^n|^2.$$

We first have by linearity and by the Lemma 3.3 above that

$$\mathbb{E}((x^{n+1}, x^n)|x^n) = (Ax^n, x^n).$$

We now compute, setting $y = Ax^n$ and the very properties of Bernstein polynomials

$$(7) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x^{n+1}|^2|x^n) = |Ax^n|^2 + \frac{y_1(1-y_1)}{N} + \frac{y_2(1-y_2)}{dN}.$$

Therefore

$$(8) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x^{n+1} - x^n|^2) = \mathbb{E} \left(|Ax^n - x^n|^2 + \frac{y_1(1-y_1)}{N} + \frac{y_2(1-y_2)}{dN} \right),$$

that leads to

$$(9) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x^{n+1} - x^n|^2) \leq \left(\frac{\kappa \|M\|}{N} \right)^2 + \left(1 + \frac{1}{d} \right) \frac{1}{4N},$$

that completes the proof of the lemma. □

The next statement is a consequence of the inequality $|\bar{x}^t - x^t| \leq |x^n - x^{n+1}|$ for $t \in (n\delta t, (n+1)\delta t)$ and of the previous lemma

Corollary 3.5. *The processes x^t and \bar{x}^t are asymptotically close, i.e. there exists a constant C such that*

$$\mathbb{E}(|\bar{x}^t - x^t|^2) \leq CN^{-1}.$$

As a consequence, when looking for the limit when N diverges towards $+\infty$ of the process, we may either work with x^t or \bar{x}^t .

The next lemma is a compactness result on the bounded sequence u_N defined in (5).

Lemma 3.6. *There exists a constant C that depends on $\|f\|_{lip}$ and on T such that for any, x, y in \mathcal{D} and s, t in $[0, T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} |u_N(t, x) - u_N(t, y)| &\leq C|x - y|, \\ |u_N(t, x) - u_N(s, x)| &\leq C|t - s|^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof We begin with the first estimate. Introduce n such that $n\delta t \leq t < (n+1)\delta t$. Set y^t for the process that starts from $y = y^0$.

$$|x^t - y^t| \leq \max(|x^n - y^n|, |x^{n+1} - y^{n+1}|),$$

therefore, proving the first inequality for \bar{u}_N (which amounts to controlling $|x^n - y^n|$) will imply the inequality for u_N . Due to the properties of Bernstein's polynomials we have that

$$(10) \quad |\partial_{x_1} P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(f)(Ax)| \leq N\|A\|\omega(f, \frac{1}{N}),$$

where $\omega(f, \frac{1}{N_1})$ is the modulus of continuity of f . Then, using that $\|A - Id\| \leq CN^{-1}$, we infer that

$$(11) \quad |\partial_{x_1} P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(f)(Ax)| \leq \|f\|_{lip}(1 + \frac{C}{N}).$$

Iterating in time we have that

$$(12) \quad |\partial_{x_1} (P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}})^m(f)(x)| \leq \|f\|_{lip}(1 + \frac{C}{N})^m \leq \exp(CT)\|f\|_{lip}.$$

The other derivative is similar and then we infer from this computation that the first inequality in the statement of Lemma 3.6 is proved.

We now proceed to the proof of the second one. Introduce the integers m, n such that $m\delta t \leq s < (m+1)\delta t$ and $n\delta t \leq t < (n+1)\delta t$. Using that

$$|x^t - x^s|^2 \leq 9(|x^{m+1} - x^s|^2 + |x^{m+1} - x^n|^2 + |x^n - x^t|^2),$$

and that $|x^n - x^t| \leq (t - \frac{n}{\delta t})|x^n - x^{n+1}|$ we just have to prove the inequality for $\frac{t}{\delta t}$ and $\frac{s}{\delta t}$ in \mathbb{N} . Introduce the increment $y^j = x^{j+1} - x^j$. We have that, for $m \leq i, j \leq n$

$$(13) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x^n - x^m|^2) = \sum_j \mathbb{E}(|y^j|^2) + 2 \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E}(y^i, y^j).$$

On the one hand, by Lemma 3.4 we have that the first term in the right hand side of (13) is bounded by above by $\frac{C(m-n)}{N}$. On the other hand, using that the $\mathbb{E}(y^j|x^j) = (A - Id)x^j$ then

$$(14) \quad \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E}(y^i, y^j) = \sum_{i < j} \mathbb{E}(y^i, (A - Id)x^j) = \sum_j \mathbb{E}(x^j - x^m, (Id - A)x^j).$$

Since $\|Id - A\| \leq CN^{-1}$ then the right hand side of (14) is also bounded by above by $\frac{C(m-n)}{N}$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Thanks to Ascoli's theorem, up to a subsequence extraction, u_N converges uniformly to a continuous function $u(t, x)$. We now prove that u is solution of a diffusion equation whose infinitesimal generator is defined as the limit of $N(P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}} - Id)$.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider f a function of class C^2 on \mathcal{D} that vanish at $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0^+} N(P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}(f(x)) - f(x)) = Lf(x),$$

where L is defined in Theorem 3.1.

Proof Due to Taylor formula

$$(15) \quad P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}(f)(x) = f(x) - \kappa \delta t (Mx \cdot \nabla f)(x) + O((\delta t)^2),$$

where $O((\delta t)^2)$ is valid uniformly in x in \mathcal{D} .

Using that the linear operator $P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}$ is positive and bounded by 1 we then have

$$(16) \quad P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}(f)(x) = (P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} f)(x) - \kappa \delta t P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(Mx \cdot \nabla f)(x) + O((\delta t)^2),$$

The well-known properties of Bernstein polynomials entail the uniform convergence of $P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(Mx \cdot \nabla f)(x)$ to $Mx \cdot \nabla f(x)$. On the other hand, we compute the limit $N((P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} f)(x) - f(x))$ approximating f by linear combinations of tensor products $f_1(x_1)f_2(x_2)$. Then, using the classical results for Wright-Fisher one-dimensional processes, we have

$$(17) \quad \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}}(f)(x) - f(x)}{\delta t} = \frac{x_1(1-x_1)}{2} f_{x_1 x_1} + \frac{x_2(1-x_2)}{2d} f_{x_2 x_2}.$$

Denoting Δ_d the diffusion operator defined by the right hand side of (17), the Kolmogorov limit equation of our coupled Markov process is

$$(18) \quad \partial_t u - \Delta_d u = -\kappa (Mx \cdot \nabla u)(x),$$

with initial data $u(0, x) = f(x)$. Let us observe that u , the limit of $\mathbb{E}(f(x^t)|x^0 = x)$, vanishes at two points $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ in the boundary $\partial \mathcal{D}$.

□

We now complete the proof of the Theorem. Considering f such that the convergence in Lemma 3.7 holds. Then, for $n \leq tN < n + 1$,

$$(19) \quad \bar{u}_N(t, x) = f(x) + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \int_{k\delta t}^{(k+1)\delta t} (NP_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}}(\bar{u}_N(s, \cdot)))(x) ds.$$

Using the uniform convergence of \bar{u}_N , Lemma 3.7 and a recurrence on n we may prove that at the limit

$$(20) \quad u(t) = f + \int_0^t Lu(s) ds,$$

where we have omitted the variable x for the sake of convenience.

We now state a result that ensures the uniqueness of a solution to the diffusion equation (20). Such a solution is a solution to the diffusion equation in a weak PDE sense. Introduce $D(L) = \{f \in E; Lf \in E\}$.

Lemma 3.8. *Consider a function u in $C(\mathbb{R}^+, D(L))$ that satisfies*

- $u_t - Lu \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^+ \times [0, 1]^2$,
- $u(0, x) = f(x) \geq 0$ for x in $[0, 1]^2$,

then $u(t, x) \geq 0$.

We postpone the proof of this lemma to Appendix 5.1.

Lemma 3.8 implies uniqueness of the limit solution. Therefore the whole sequence u_N converge and the semigroup is well defined. Actually, setting $S(t)f = u(t)$ we then have defined for smooth f the solution to a Feller semigroup (see Bakry et al. [2013]) as follows

- (1) $S(0) = Id.$
- (2) $S(t + s) = T(t)T(s).$
- (3) $\|S(t)f - f\|_E \rightarrow 0$ when $t \rightarrow 0^+$
- (4) $\|S(t)f\|_E \leq \|f\|_E.$

The second property comes from uniqueness, the last one passing to the limit in

$$\|(P_{\delta t}^{\text{wf}} P_{\delta t}^{\text{ex}})^n f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

The third one is then simple. The third property allows us to extend the definition of $S(t)$ to functions in E by a classical density argument. Then we have a Feller semigroup in E that satisfies the assumptions of the Hille-Yosida theorem (see Brezis [2011]).

3.3. Convergence in probability. We address here the convergence in law/in distribution of the infinite dimensional processes related to the x_N^t . This is related to the convergence of the process towards the solution of a stochastic differential equations; we will not develop this here. Following Stroock and Varadhan [1997] or Kallenberg [2002], it is sufficient to check

the tightness of the process and the convergence of the finite m -dimensional law.

Dealing with \bar{x}_N^t instead of x_N^t , the second point is easy. Indeed, the Theorem 3.1 imply the convergence of the m -dimensional law for $m = 1$. We can extend the result for arbitrary m by induction using the Markov property. For the tightness, we use the so-called Kolmogorov criterion that is valid for continuous in time processes (see Stroock and Varadhan [1997] chapter 2 and Kallenberg [2002] chapter 14); this criterion reads in our case

$$(21) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x_N^s - x_N^t|^4) \leq C|t - s|^2.$$

We postpone the proof of this criterion to the appendix. We prefer to deal with continuous processes instead of càdlàg to avoid Skorohod spaces for the sake of simplicity (see Billingsley [1999]).

4. EXTINCTION TIME

4.1. Hydrodynamic limit of the extinction time. To begin with, recall that the discrete process describing the evolution of the abundances (migration and reproduction at each time step) is a Markov chain with state space $\{0, \frac{1}{N_1}, \dots, 1\} \times \{0, \frac{1}{N_2}, \dots, 1\}$ for which $(0, 0)$ and $(1, 1)$ are absorbing states. These two absorbing states correspond to the extinction of a species. Therefore, the hitting time Θ of the absorbing states will be called *extinction time*. Moreover, as the restriction of the chain to the non absorbing states is irreducible and there is at least one strictly positive transition probability from the non absorbing states to the absorbing states, this implies that Θ is almost surely finite. The following result provides the *hydrodynamic limit* of the mean extinction time Θ .

Proposition 4.1 (Extinction time). *Consider $\tau_N = \mathbb{E}_x(\Theta)$ the conditional expectation of the extinction time of the Markov chain starting at x . Then when N diverges towards $+\infty$, τ_N converges towards τ that is solution to the elliptic equation $-L\tau = 1$.*

Proof For a discrete Markov chain, we recall the formula, if x is not a trapping site

$$(22) \quad \mathbb{E}_x(\Theta) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\delta t \mathbb{P}_x(\Theta = n\delta t) = \delta t + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{P}(x^1 = \frac{j}{N} | x^0 = x) \mathbb{E}_{\frac{j}{N}}(\Theta).$$

Denoting $\tau(x)$ the limit of $\mathbb{E}_x(\Theta)$ when δt converges to 0 we then have, if L is the infinitesimal generator of the Markov process

$$(23) \quad -L\tau = \lim_{\delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}_x(\Theta) - \sum_{y \neq \{0,1\}} \mathbb{P}(x^1 = y | x^0 = x) \mathbb{E}_y(\Theta)}{\delta t} = 1.$$

□

4.2. Exchanges slow down extinction. Consider now a single patch whose hosting capacity is $N_1 + N_2 = (d + 1)N$ for $N = \frac{1}{\delta t}$. The limit equation for the classical Wright-Fisher related process is

$$(24) \quad \partial_t u = \frac{z(1-z)}{2(1+d)} \partial_z^2 u.$$

Hence the corresponding extinction time for the Wright-Fisher process without exchange is

$$(25) \quad \underline{\tau} = -2(1+d)(z \ln z + (1-z) \ln(1-z)),$$

where $z = \frac{x_1 + dx_2}{1+d}$ is the corresponding averaged starting density. We shall prove in the sequel

Theorem 4.2. *The extinction time $\underline{\tau}$ is a subsolution to the equation $-L\underline{\tau} = 1$. Besides, the operator L satisfies the comparison principle and then $\underline{\tau} \leq \tau$.*

Proof We point out that to check that $-L$ satisfies the comparison result is not obvious (see Appendix 5.1).

We first check that we have a subsolution, setting $\underline{\tau} = g(z)$. Then

$$(26) \quad (Mx \cdot \nabla g)(z) = (x_1 - x_2)g'(z)(d\partial_{x_1} z - \partial_{x_2} z) = 0,$$

due to the very definition of z . We also have

$$(27) \quad \frac{x_1(1-x_1)}{2} \partial_{x_1}^2 g(z) = -\frac{x_1(1-x_1)}{(1+d)z(1-z)},$$

and

$$(28) \quad \frac{x_2(1-x_2)}{2d} \partial_{x_2}^2 g(z) = -\frac{dx_2(1-x_2)}{(1+d)z(1-z)}.$$

Therefore

$$(29) \quad -L\underline{\tau} = \frac{x_1(1-x_1) + dx_2(1-x_2)}{(1+d)z(1-z)}.$$

Observing that by a mere computation

$$\frac{x_1(1-x_1) + dx_2(1-x_2)}{(1+d)z(1-z)} = 1 - \frac{d(x_1 - x_2)^2}{(1+d)^2 z(1-z)},$$

we have that $\underline{\tau}$ is a subsolution to the equation. □

4.3. Miscellaneous results. We address here the issue of the convergence of the limit extinction time $\tau = \tau_{d,\kappa}$ defined in Section 4 when κ or d converges towards 0. This extinction time depends on the starting point x .

Proposition 4.3. *Assume d be fixed. When κ converges to 0 then $\lim \tau_{d,\kappa}(x) = +\infty$ everywhere but in $x = (0, 0)$ or $x = (1, 1)$.*

Proof Consider here the function $V = \frac{x_1(1-x_2)+x_2(1-x_1)}{12\kappa}$. This function vanishes at $x = (0, 0)$ and $x = (1, 1)$ and satisfies

$$(30) \quad -LV = \frac{(x_1 - x_2)(d(1 - 2x_2) - (1 - 2x_1))}{12} \leq 1.$$

Then V is a subsolution to the equation $-L\tau = 1$ and by the comparison principle $V \leq \tau_{d,\kappa}$ everywhere. Letting $\kappa \rightarrow 0$ completes the proof of the Proposition. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Assume κ be fixed. When d converges to 0 then $\lim \tau = \tilde{\tau} = -2x_1 \ln x_1 - 2(1 - x_1) \ln(1 - x_1)$ that is the extinction time for one patch.*

Proof We begin with

$$(31) \quad -L(\tau - \underline{\tau}) = \frac{d(x_1 - x_2)^2}{(1 + d)^2 z(1 - z)}.$$

The strategy is to seek a supersolution X to the equation $-LX \geq \frac{(x_1 - x_2)^2}{z(1 - z)}$.

Consider now $X = -2(x_1 + x_2) \ln(\frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}) - 2(2 - x_1 - x_2) \ln(\frac{2 - x_1 - x_2}{2})$. The function X is nonnegative. We have by mere computations

$$(32) \quad -LX = \frac{x_1(1 - x_1)}{(x_1 + x_2)(2 - x_1 - x_2)} + \frac{x_2(1 - x_2)}{d(x_1 + x_2)(2 - x_1 - x_2)} + \\ + \kappa(x_1 - x_2)(d - 1) \ln\left(\frac{x_1 + x_2}{2 - x_1 - x_2}\right).$$

On the one hand the modulus of the function

$$\kappa(x_1 - x_2) \ln(x_1 + x_2) = \kappa \frac{x_1 - x_2}{x_1 + x_2} (x_1 + x_2) \ln(x_1 + x_2),$$

is bounded above by $C\kappa$ where C is a constant. On the other hand, by mere computations we claim that

$$(33) \quad \frac{x_1(1 - x_1) + \frac{1}{d}x_2(1 - x_2)}{(x_1 + x_2)(2 - x_1 - x_2)} \geq \frac{(x_1 - x_2)^2}{(x_1 + dx_2)((1 - x_1) + d(1 - x_2))}.$$

This amounts to prove that

$$(34) \quad \left(x_1(1 - x_1) + \frac{1}{d}x_2(1 - x_2) \right) (x_1 + dx_2)((1 - x_1) + d(1 - x_2)) \geq \\ (x_1^2 - x_2^2)((1 - x_1)^2 - (1 - x_2)^2)$$

Then an upper bound for the right hand side of this inequality is

$$(x_1(1-x_1))^2 + (x_2(1-x_2))^2$$

and a lower bound for the left hand side is

$$(x_1(1-x_1))^2 + x_2(1-x_2)(x_1(1-x_2) + x_2(1-x_1)).$$

We conclude easily.

Therefore we have that $X + C\kappa\tau$ is a supersolution of the problem. Then we have by the comparison principle

$$(35) \quad 0 \leq \tau - \underline{\tau} \leq \frac{d}{(d+1)^2}(X + C\kappa\tau),$$

and we conclude by letting d converge to 0 since $\underline{\tau}$ converges towards $-2x_1 \ln x_1 - 2(1-x_1) \ln(1-x_1)$. \square

5. APPENDIX

5.1. Proof of the comparison principle. The proof of the comparison principle for the parabolic operator in Lemma 3.8 or for the elliptic operator L is more or less the same. Let us prove the result for the evolution equation.

Consider u as in the statement of the Lemma. Consider ε small enough. Set $\mathcal{P} = \partial_t - L$. Set $\psi(x) = (x_1 + dx_2)(d+1-x_1-dx_2)$ and $\theta(x) = (x_1 - x_2)^2$. Introduce the auxiliary function

$$(36) \quad v(t, x) = u(t, x) + \varepsilon\psi(x) + \varepsilon^2\theta(x) + \varepsilon^3.$$

We prove below that $v(t, x) \geq 0$ for all t and x . Since u belongs to $D(L)$ then $v(t, x) = \varepsilon^3$ at the corners $x \in \{(0, 0), (1, 1)\}$. We also have $v(0, x) \geq \varepsilon^3$.

Let us then argue by contradiction. Introduce $t_0 = \inf\{t > 0; \exists x; v(t, x) < 0\}$. Then there exists x_0 such that $v(t_0, x_0) = 0$. We shall discuss below different cases according to the location of x_0 .

First case: x_0 belongs to the interior of \mathcal{D} .

We then have $v_t(x_0) \leq 0$, $v_{x_1}(x_0) = v_{x_2}(x_0) = 0$, and $v_{x_1x_1}(x_0), v_{x_2x_2}(x_0) \geq 0$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}v(t_0, x_0) \leq 0$

$$(37) \quad 0 \leq \mathcal{P}u(t_0, x_0) \leq \mathcal{P}v(t_0, x_0) + \varepsilon L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0).$$

Let us observe that if ε is chosen small enough

$$(38) \quad \begin{aligned} & L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0) = -(x_1(1-x_1) + dx_2(1-x_2)) + \\ & \varepsilon \left(x_1(1-x_1) + \frac{1}{d}x_2(1-x_2) \right) - \kappa\varepsilon(d+1)\theta(x)^2 < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Second case: x_0 belongs to $\partial\mathcal{D}$ but the four corners.

We may assume that $x_0 = (0, x_2)$ the other cases being similar. We have that $v_t(x_0) \leq 0$, $v_{x_2}(x_0) = 0$, and $v_{x_2x_2}(x_0) \geq 0$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}v(t_0, x_0) \leq 0$.

We then have as in (37) that $0 \leq L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0)$. Computing $L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0) = -\varepsilon\kappa(d+1)\theta^2(x_0) < 0$ gives the contradiction.

Third case: $x_0 = (0, 1)$ (the case $(1, 0)$ is similar).

We have that $v_t(x_0) \leq 0$, $v_{x_2}(x_0) \leq 0 \leq v_{x_1}(x_0)$. Therefore $\mathcal{P}v(t_0, x_0) \leq 0$. We then have as in (37) that $0 \leq L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0)$. Computing $L(\psi + \varepsilon\theta)(x_0) = -\varepsilon\kappa(d+1)\theta^2(x_0) < 0$ gives the contradiction.

We now conclude. since v is nonnegative we have

$$(39) \quad \inf_{[0, +\infty) \times \mathcal{D}} u \geq -\varepsilon \|\psi + \varepsilon\theta\|_{L^\infty} - \varepsilon^3.$$

Letting ε goes to 0 completes the proof of the Lemma.

5.2. Proof of the Kolmogorov criteria. This is a consequence of the following discrete estimate, since x_N^t is piecewise linear with respect to t ,

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a constant C such that for any $m < n$*

$$(40) \quad \mathbb{E}(|x^n - x^m|^4) \leq C \frac{|n - m|^2}{N^2}.$$

Proof

First step: using that x^n is close to a true martingale.

Let us set $A = Id - \frac{\kappa}{N}M = Id - B$. Introduce $z^0 = x^0$ and $z^n = x^n + B \sum_{k < n} x^k$. Then since $\mathbb{E}(x^{n+1}|x^n) = x^n - Bx^n$, we have that z^n is a martingale. Moreover we have the estimate, for $0 \leq m < n$

$$(41) \quad |(z^n - x^n) - (z^m - x^m)| \leq (n - m) \|B\| \leq C \frac{n - m}{N}.$$

Second step: computing the fourth moment.

To begin with we observe that, due to (41)

$$(42) \quad |x^n - x^m|^4 \leq 4 \left(|z^n - z^m|^4 + C \left(\frac{n - m}{N} \right)^4 \right).$$

Therefore we just have to prove that (40) is valid with z^n replacing x^n . We introduce the increment $y^j = z^{j+1} - z^j$. We then expand as follows, setting $|\cdot|$ and (\cdot, \cdot) respectively for the euclidian norm and the scalar product in \mathbb{R}^2 .

$$(43) \quad \mathbb{E}(|z^n - z^m|^4) = \sum_{i,j,k,l} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^j)(y^k, y^l) \right).$$

Since y^l is independent of the past, if for instance $l > \max(i, j, k)$ then $\mathbb{E}((y^i, y^j)(y^k, y^l)) = 0$. Therefore, (43) reads also

$$(44) \quad \mathbb{E}(|z^n - z^m|^4) = 2 \sum_{i,j < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^j) |y^k|^2 \right) + 4 \sum_{i,j < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^k)(y^j, y^k) \right) + 4 \sum_{i < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^k) |y^k|^2 \right) + \sum_k \mathbb{E}(|y^k|^4) = D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4.$$

Third step: handling D_4 and D_3 .

The key estimate reads as follows

$$(45) \quad \mathbb{E}(|y^k|^4 |x^k) \leq CN^{-2}.$$

Let us check that (45) is valid. Due to the very properties of Bernstein polynomials we know that $B_N(1) = 1, B_N(X) = x, B_N(X^2) = x^2 + \frac{x(1-x)}{N}$ and that $B_N(X^3) = x^3 + \frac{3x^2(1-x)}{N} + 0(\frac{1}{N^2})$ and $B_N(X^4) = x^4 + \frac{6x^3(1-x)}{N} + 0(\frac{1}{N^2})$. Therefore $B_N((X-x)^4) \leq CN^{-2}$ and since for any function h we have that $\mathbb{E}(h(x^{k+1})|x^k) = h(Ax^k)$ then, due to the very definition of z^k

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E}(|y^k|^4) \leq 4 \left(\mathbb{E}(|x^{k+1} - x^k|^4) + \frac{C}{N^4} \right) = O(N^{-2}).$$

Therefore $D_4 = O((n-m)N^{-2})$ and then the result.

For D_3 thanks to Hölder inequality, we have the estimate

$$(47) \quad D_3 = 4 \sum_{j < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^j, y^k) |y^k|^2 \right) \leq C(n-m)D_4 = O((n-m)^2 N^{-2}).$$

Fourth step: handling D_1 and D_2 .

Using the conditional expectation we have

$$(48) \quad D_1 = 2 \sum_{i,j < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^j) |y^k|^2 \right) = 2 \sum_{i,j < k} \mathbb{E} \left((y^i, y^j) \mathbb{E} \left(|y^k|^2 |x^k \right) \right).$$

Due to (45) and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\mathbb{E}(|y^k|^2 |x^k) = O(N^{-1})$ and it follows

$$(49) \quad D_1 \leq CN^{-1} \sum_{i,j < k} \mathbb{E}(|(y^i, y^j)|).$$

Due to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and to $\mathbb{E}(|y^j|^2) = O(N^{-1})$, we have

$$(50) \quad D_1 \leq CN^{-1} \sum_k \sum_{i < k} \mathbb{E}(|y^i|^2) \leq CN^{-2}(n-m)^2.$$

We now handle D_2 exactly as we did for D_1 . This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- D. Alonso, R.S. Etienne, and A.J. McKane. The merits of neutral theory. *Trends Ecol Evol*, 21:451–457, 2006.
- D. Bakry, I. Gentil, and M. Ledoux. *Analysis and geometry of Markov diffusion operators*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- P. Billingsley. *Convergence of Probability Measures*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc, New York, 1999.
- H. Brezis. *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*. Springer, New York, 2011.
- J. Chave and E.G. Leigh. A spatially explicit neutral model of beta-diversity in tropical forests. *Theor Popul Biol*, 62:153–168, 2002.
- E.P. Economo and T.H. Keitt. Species diversity in neutral metacommunities: a network approach. *Ecol Lett*, 11:52–62, 2008.
- S. Ethier. A class of degenerate diffusion processes occurring in population genetics. *Comm. in Pure and Applied Maths*, 29:483–493, 1976.
- S. Ethier and T. Nagylaki. Diffusion approximations of markov chains with two time scales and applications to population genetics. *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 12:14–49, 1980.
- S. Hubbell. *The unified neutral theory of biodiversity and biogeography*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001.
- O. Kallenberg. *Foundations of modern probability. Probability and its Applications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- S. Méléard. *Modèles aléatoires en écologie et évolution. Mathématiques et Application*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2016.
- T. Nagylaki. The strong-migration limit in geographically structured populations. *J. Math. Biol.*, 9:101–114, 1980.
- M. Slatkin. Fixation probabilities and fixation times in a subdivided population. *Evolution*, 35:477–488, 1981.
- D. Stroock and S. Varadhan. *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes. Classics in Mathematics*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1997.
- D. Vanpeteghem and B. Haegeman. An analytical approach to spatio-temporal dynamics of neutral community models. *Ecol Lett*, 61:323–357, 2010.
- J. Wakeley and T. Takahashi. The many-demes limit for selection and drift in a subdivided population. *Theoret Popul Biol*, 66:83–91, 2004.

Gauthier Delvoe, gauthier.delvoe@u-picardie.fr

Olivier Goubet, olivier.goubet@u-picardie.fr

Frédéric Paccaut, frederic.paccaut@u-picardie.fr

Laboratoire Amienois de Mathématiques Fondamentales et Appliquées

CNRS UMR 7352

Université de Picardie Jules Verne

33 rue St Leu, 80000 Amiens, France