

Spectral Monotonicity of Perturbed Quasi-positive Matrices with Applications in Population Dynamics*

Shanshan Chen[†]

Department of Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology
Weihai, Shandong, 264209, P. R. China

Junping Shi[‡]

Department of Mathematics, William & Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia, 23187-8795, USA

Zhisheng Shuai[§]

Department of Mathematics, University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida, 32816, USA

Yixiang Wu[¶]

Department of Mathematics, Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 37132, USA

*S. Chen is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No 11771109) and a grant from China Scholarship Council, J. Shi is supported by US-NSF grants DMS-1715651 and DMS-1853598, and Z. Shuai is supported by US-NSF grant DMS-1716445.

[†]Email: chenss@hit.edu.cn

[‡]Corresponding Author, Email: jxshix@wm.edu

[§]Email: shuai@ucf.edu

[¶]Email: yixiang.wu@mtsu.edu

Abstract

Threshold values in population dynamics can be formulated as spectral bounds of matrices, determining the dichotomy of population persistence and extinction. For a square matrix $\mu A + Q$, where A is a quasi-positive matrix describing population dispersal among patches in a heterogeneous environment and Q is a diagonal matrix encoding within-patch population dynamics, the monotonicity of its spectral bound with respect to dispersal speed/coupling strength/travel frequency μ is established via two methods. The first method is an analytic derivation utilizing a graph-theoretic approach based on Kirchhoff's Matrix-Tree Theorem; the second method employs Collatz-Wielandt formula from matrix theory and complex analysis arguments. It turns out that our established result is a slightly strengthened version of Karlin-Altenberg's Theorem, which has previously been discovered independently while investigating reduction principle in evolution biology and evolution dispersal in patchy landscapes. Nevertheless, our result provides a new and effective approach in stability analysis of complex biological systems in a heterogeneous environment. We illustrate this by applying our result to well-known ecological models of single species, predator-prey and competition, and an epidemiological model of susceptible-infected-susceptible (SIS) type. We successfully solve some open problems in the literature of population dynamics.

Keywords: spectral bound, Laplacian matrix, population persistence, population extinction, basic reproduction number, global stability, Karlin's Theorem.

MSC 2010: 34D20, 92D25, 15A18, 34L15, 92D40.

1 Introduction

Various patch models have been proposed to investigate the impact of the environmental heterogeneity and the connectivity of subregions on the population dynamics. For example, the impact of the dispersal rate of susceptible and infected individuals among patches on the transmission of diseases has been studied in [1, 5, 6, 14, 22, 23, 24, 36, 38, 45]; the evolution of dispersal in patchy environment has been shown to

favor strategies resulting in ideal free distributions in [8, 9, 10]; and the persistence and extinction of predator and prey species in patchy environment have been considered in [20, 30, 38].

The movement pattern of individuals among n subregions (or patches) can be described by a connectivity matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$, where $a_{ij} \geq 0$ ($i \neq j$) measures the movement of individuals from patch j to i and $a_{ii} = -\sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji}$ describes the total movement out from patch i . To study the effect of the connectivity of subregions on the population dynamics in a heterogeneous environment, one may consider a basic linear differential equation model

$$\frac{du_i(t)}{dt} = \mu \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}u_j(t) - a_{ji}u_i(t)) + q_i u_i(t), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.1)$$

where $u_i(t)$ is the population size in the i -th patch, μ is the movement rate of individuals between patches and q_i is the growth rate of the population in the i -patch. The growth or extinction of the population depends on the spectral bound $s(\mu A + Q)$ of matrix $\mu A + Q$, where $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ is a diagonal matrix. The dependence of the spectral bound $s(\mu A + Q)$ on the dispersal rate μ is of significant importance in determining the population dynamics of the basic patch model (1.1) and other complex biological models based on it (e.g., those in Section 5).

Studies on the monotone dependence of $s(\mu A + Q)$ on μ started by Karlin [32], and he proved that $s(((1 - \mu)I + \mu P)R) = s(\mu(P - I)R + R)$ is strictly decreasing in μ for $\mu \in (0, 1)$ unless R is a multiple of the identity matrix I , where P is a stochastic matrix and R is a positive diagonal matrix. Karlin's Theorem has been interpreted as the mathematical explanation of the *reduction principle* [3, 4, 19] in evolutionary biology: greater mixing reduces growth. While studying the evolution of dispersal in patchy landscapes, Kirkland *et al.* [34] independently discovered Karlin's Theorem with P being a substochastic matrix. More recently Altenberg [3] generalized Karlin's Theorem to linear operators on Banach spaces, and in context of matrix version, Altenberg's result actually showed that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is decreasing in μ when A is quasi-positive with $s(A) \leq 0$. Karlin's original proof in [32] utilizes the Donsker-Varadhan formula [17] for

principal eigenvalues of quasi-positive matrices, while Altenberg’s proof in [3] relies on convex spectral functions due to Cohen [12], Friedland [21] and Kato [33]. Kirkland *et al.*’s proof [34] employs techniques from matrix analysis.

In this paper, we provide two new different approaches to prove Karlin-Altenberg’s Theorem, which also implies Karlin’s original theorem. Our first proof combines analytic method and a graph theory method based on Kirchhoff’s Matrix-Tree Theorem and Tree-Cycle Identity. The Tree-Cycle Identity has previously been used to construct Lyapunov functions for coupled systems of differential equations on a network [25, 26, 38], and here we show again the Tree-Cycle Identity is an effective way to study the impact of network structure on the population dynamics. Specifically, we are able to show that

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}s(\mu A + Q) < 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d^2}{d\mu^2}s(\mu A + Q) > 0$$

if Q is not a multiple of I , where the result on the strict positivity of the second derivative of $s(\mu A + Q)$ seems to be new. Our second proof to show that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is decreasing in μ uses only the “min-max” Collatz-Wielandt formula for the principal eigenvalue. We use a result from complex analysis to prove that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is either constant or strictly decreasing: the zeros of analytic functions are isolated; we also compute the limit of $s(\mu A + Q)$ as μ approaches zero or infinity.

The monotone dependence of $s(\mu A + Q)$ on μ can be applied to study the impact of the connectivity of subregions on the dynamics of population models. In particular, we will consider the role of movement rate in single species model, predator-prey model, competition model, and epidemic SIS model in a multi-patch setting. Notably, for the competition model, we consider a situation that the two competing species are identical except for the movement rate, and we prove that the species with a slower dispersal rate will out-compete the one with faster dispersal rate. This result is in agreement with the corresponding reaction-diffusion model [16, 28]. For the epidemic SIS model, we prove the monotone dependence of the basic reproduction number on the movement rate of the infected population, which was addressed as an open problem in [1].

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we list the terminology and state

Karlin's Theorem. In Sections 3 and 4, we give two different proofs of Karlin's Theorem. In Section 5, we will consider some population models from ecology and epidemiology and study the impact of the movement rates of species between patches on the population dynamics.

2 Preliminary

Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix and let $\sigma(A)$ be the set of eigenvalues of A . Let $r(A)$ be the *spectral radius* of A , i.e.,

$$r(A) = \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}.$$

Let $s(A)$ be the *spectral bound* (also called *spectral abscissa*) of A , i.e.,

$$s(A) = \max\{\operatorname{Re}\lambda : \lambda \in \sigma(A)\}.$$

A vector $u \gg 0$ means that every entry of u is positive. We use I to denote the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

A square matrix is called *stochastic* if all the entries are nonnegative and every column adds up to 1. Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be a square matrix; A is called an *M-matrix* if $a_{ij} \leq 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $A = sI - B$ with B having all off-diagonal elements negative and $s \geq r(B)$; A is called *quasi-positive* (also called *Metzler matrix*) if $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$. The connection between *M*-matrices and quasi-positive matrices can be viewed through the following well-known results: $-A$ is a non-singular (singular) *M*-matrix if and only if A is quasi-positive with $s(A) < 0$ ($s(A) = 0$); if A is a singular *M*-matrix, then $A + D$ is a non-singular *M*-matrix for any diagonal matrix $D = \operatorname{diag}(d_i)$ with $d_i > 0$ for all i .

A square matrix L is called a *Laplacian* matrix if all the off-diagonal entries are nonpositive and the sum of each column is zero. If L is a Laplacian matrix, it is easy to see that $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$ is a left eigenvector of L corresponding to the eigenvalue 0. In our applications to spatial population dynamics, the Laplacian matrix encodes all movement between patches and no population loss is assumed during the dispersal.

For our purpose, a square matrix $L = (\ell_{ij})$ is called *sub-Laplacian* if $\ell_{ij} \leq 0$ for all $i \neq j$ and $\ell_{jj} \geq -\sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{ij}$ for all j . A sub-Laplacian matrix L is called *strongly (strictly) sub-Laplacian* if $\ell_{jj} > -\sum_{i \neq j} \ell_{ij}$ for all (some) j . Sub-Laplacian matrices defined above allow us to include possible population loss during the dispersal in our studies; see, for example, Section 5.1.

In [32], Karlin proved the following theorem on the monotonicity of the spectral radii of a family of matrices, which was interpreted as the mathematical explanation of the *reduction principle* [3, 19] in evolution biology. Karlin's proof relies on the Donsker-Varadhan formula for the principal eigenvalue. Later, this result has been discovered independently by Kirkland et al. [34] (see also [41]), and their proof is based on techniques of matrix analysis.

Theorem 2.1 (Karlin's Theorem). *Let P be an irreducible stochastic matrix. Consider the family of matrices $P_\mu = (1 - \mu)I + \mu P$ with $0 < \mu < 1$. Then for any diagonal matrix $R = \text{diag}(r_i)$ with $r_i > 0$ for all i , $r(P_\mu R)$ is strictly decreasing in μ provided that R is not a multiple of I .*

Theorem 2.1 has been applied to the following discrete time linear population model [32]:

$$x(t+1) = [(1 - \mu)I + \mu P]Rx(t). \quad (2.1)$$

Here, $x(t)$ is a vector-valued function denoting the frequency of each subdivision of some population (e.g., genotypes); R is a diagonal matrix measuring the growth rate of each subdivision; stochastic matrix P represents the pattern of dispersal; μ is the rate of dispersal (or mutation, mixing, etc.). The spectral radius $r(P_\mu R)$ measures the growth rate of the population. Biologically, Theorem 2.1 implies that the evolution of population favors a smaller rate of dispersal.

To view the connection between the spectral radius problem on (2.1) and our spectral bound problem on (1.1), we set $P_\mu R = \mu(P - I)R + R = \mu A + R$, where $A = (P - I)R$ is a quasi-positive matrix. The corresponding continuous-time version of model (2.1)

can be written as

$$x'(t) = [\mu A + Q]x(t),$$

where $Q = R - I$ is a diagonal matrix representing the growth rate of each subdivision, but the diagonal entry $q_i = r_i - 1$ of Q is not necessarily positive. Since A is quasi-positive, it generates a positive semigroup $Exp(tA)$, which measures the dispersal (or mutation, mixing, etc.) between subdivisions. The impact of dispersal rate μ has been shown in the following Karlin-Altenberg's Theorem:

Theorem 2.2 (Altenberg [2, 3]). *Let A be an irreducible quasi-positive matrix and let Q be a diagonal matrix. Consider the family of matrices $M(\mu) = \mu A + Q$ with $\mu > 0$. Then*

1. $s(M(\mu))$ is either a constant or strictly decreasing in $\mu \in (0, \infty)$ if $s(A) \leq 0$.

Moreover,

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}s(M(\mu)) \leq s(A),$$

and the equality holds if and only if Q is a multiple of I ;

2. $s(M(\mu))$ is convex in μ , i.e. for any $0 < \alpha < 1$, and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \geq 0$ with $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$,

$$s((1 - \alpha)M(\mu_1) + \alpha M(\mu_2)) \leq (1 - \alpha)s(M(\mu_1)) + \alpha s(M(\mu_2)),$$

and the equality holds if and only if Q is a multiple of I .

Theorem 2.2 can be used to prove Theorem 2.1 (see the proof at the end of this section). In [3], Altenberg uses the strict convexity of $r(P_\mu R)$ by Friedland [21] to show the strict monotonicity of $r(P_\mu R)$. Alternatively, one may compute the limits $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} r(P_\mu R)$ and $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} r(P_\mu R)$: these two limits do not equal if and only if R is not a multiple of I , and therefore Theorem 2.2 implies the strict monotonicity of $r(P_\mu R)$. We will use this idea in the proof of Theorem 4.4. We remark that the original statement of Theorem 2.2 in [3] are for operators on Banach spaces. Altenberg's proof is based on the convexity of the spectral radius due to Cohen [12] and Kato [33].

Finally we prove that Theorem 2.2 implies Theorem 2.1. In the next two sections, we give two proofs of strengthened versions of Theorem 2.2, which also lead to new proofs of Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1 from Theorem 2.2. Since P is an irreducible stochastic matrix, $P_\mu = (1 - \mu)I + \mu P = I - \mu(I - P)$ is a nonnegative irreducible matrix. Hence, $P_\mu R = R - \mu(I - P)R$ is nonnegative as R is positive. It follows from the Perron-Frobenius theory that $r(P_\mu R) = s(P_\mu R)$. On the other hand, all off-diagonal entries of $(I - P)R$ are non-positive, and the sum of entries of each column of $(I - P)R$ is zero. Hence $A = -(I - P)R$ is a Laplacian matrix, and thus quasi-positive with $s(A) = 0$. Notice that A is also irreducible since P is irreducible. Therefore, by Theorem 2.2, $r(P_\mu R) = s(P_\mu R)$ is strictly decreasing in z provided that R is not a multiple of I . \square

3 A graph theoretical proof of Karlin's theorem

In this section, we will use a graph theoretical approach to prove Karlin-Altenberg's Theorem, and the results we obtain on the convexity are slightly stronger than Theorem 2.2. The terminology and results from graph theory can be found in the appendix.

Let L be a Laplacian matrix and let Q be a diagonal matrix. If L is irreducible, then $Q - \mu L$ is irreducible and, by the Perron-Frobenius Theorem, $s(Q - \mu L)$ is the principal eigenvalue of $Q - \mu L$, which is simple and associated with a positive eigenvector. To study the spectral bound $s(Q - \mu L)$, we consider the weighted directed graph with n vertices associated with the Laplacian matrix L .

Theorem 3.1. *Let L be an irreducible Laplacian matrix, and let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Denote $M(\mu) = Q - \mu L$. Then for any $\mu > 0$,*

(i)

$$\frac{d}{d\mu} s(M(\mu)) \leq 0, \tag{3.1}$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \dots = q_n$;

(ii)

$$\frac{d^2}{d\mu^2} s(M(\mu)) \geq 0, \tag{3.2}$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \dots = q_n$.

Proof. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, $s(M(\mu))$ is the principal eigenvalue of $M = M(\mu)$. Denote $\lambda^* = s(M) = s(M^T)$, where M^T is the transpose of M . Since M^T is quasi-positive and irreducible, λ^* is an eigenvalue of M^T with corresponding eigenvector $w = (w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)^T$ with $w_j > 0$ for all j . Notice that w_i and λ^* depend smoothly on μ . Without loss of generality, we assume that $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1$ for any $\mu > 0$, which implies that (here $'$ is the derivative with respect to μ)

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w'_i = 0. \quad (3.3)$$

Since Q is diagonal, $M^T = Q - \mu L^T$. Hence, for each i ,

$$\lambda^* w_i = q_i w_i - \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_i + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j. \quad (3.4)$$

We first prove (i). Differentiating (3.4) with respect to μ yields

$$(\lambda^*)' w_i + \lambda^* w'_i = q_i w'_i - \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_i - \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_i + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_j. \quad (3.5)$$

Multiplying (3.5) by w_i gives

$$(\lambda^*)' w_i^2 + \lambda^* w'_i w_i = q_i w'_i w_i + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} (w_j - w_i) w_i + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} (w'_j - w'_i) w_i. \quad (3.6)$$

By substituting (3.4) into the second term of (3.6), we obtain

$$(\lambda^*)' w_i^2 = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j w_i \left(1 - \frac{w_i}{w_j}\right) + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j w_i \left(\frac{w'_j}{w_j} - \frac{w'_i}{w_i}\right). \quad (3.7)$$

Now set $\bar{A} = (\bar{a}_{ij})_{n \times n}$ with $\bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} w_i w_j$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Let $(\bar{\alpha}_1, \bar{\alpha}_2, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_n)^T$ denote the positive, normalized principal right eigenvector of the Laplacian matrix corresponding to \bar{A} . Multiplying (3.7) by $\bar{\alpha}_i$ and summing these over all i yield

$$(\lambda^*)' \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\alpha}_i w_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{\alpha}_i \bar{a}_{ji} \left[1 - \frac{w_i}{w_j} + \mu \left(\frac{w'_j}{w_j} - \frac{w'_i}{w_i}\right)\right]. \quad (3.8)$$

It follows from the Tree-Cycle identity (see Appendix) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{\alpha}_i \bar{a}_{ji} \left[1 - \frac{w_i}{w_j} + \mu \left(\frac{w'_j}{w_j} - \frac{w'_i}{w_i}\right)\right] \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} w(\mathcal{Q}) \sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \left[1 - \frac{w_s}{w_r} + \mu \left(\frac{w'_r}{w_r} - \frac{w'_s}{w_s}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where \mathcal{Q} is the set of all spanning unicycle graphs of (\mathcal{G}, \bar{A}) , $w(\mathcal{Q}) > 0$ is the weight of \mathcal{Q} , and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the directed cycle of \mathcal{Q} with directed edge set $E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})$. Along any directed cycle $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ of length l ,

$$\sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \left(1 - \frac{w_s}{w_r}\right) = l - \left(\sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \frac{w_s}{w_r}\right) \leq l - l \cdot \left(\prod_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \frac{w_s}{w_r}\right)^{1/l} = l - l \cdot 1 = 0. \quad (3.10)$$

Here we use the AM-GM inequality $(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_l)/l \geq \sqrt[l]{x_1 x_2 \dots x_l}$ and

$$\sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \left(\frac{w'_r}{w_r} - \frac{w'_s}{w_s}\right) = 0. \quad (3.11)$$

Combining (3.8)-(3.11) yields $(\lambda^*)' \leq 0$. Notice that $(\lambda^*)' = 0$ if and only if the equality holds in (3.10) for any directed cycle, that is, $w_r = w_s$ for any pair of (s, r) locating in a directed cycle of (\mathcal{G}, \bar{A}) . Since \bar{A} is irreducible, (\mathcal{G}, \bar{A}) is strongly connected. As a consequence, $w_i = w_j$ for any i, j . Substituting these into (3.4) yields $\lambda^* = q_i$ for all i , which completes the proof of (i).

Next we prove (ii). In the following $''$ is the second derivative with respect to μ . Differentiating (3.5) with respect to μ yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda^*)'' w_i + 2(\lambda^*)' w'_i + \lambda^* w''_i \\ &= q_i w''_i - 2 \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_i - \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w''_i + 2 \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_j + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w''_j. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Multiplying (3.12) by w_i gives

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda^*)'' w_i^2 + 2(\lambda^*)' w'_i w_i + \lambda^* w''_i w_i \\ &= q_i w_i w''_i - 2 \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_i w_i - \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w''_i w_i + 2 \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w'_j w_i + \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w''_j w_i. \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

Substituting (3.4) and (3.7) into (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda^*)'' w_i^2 &= \mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j w_i \left(\frac{w''_j}{w_j} - \frac{w''_i}{w_i}\right) + 2 \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j w_i \left(\frac{w'_j}{w_j} - \frac{w'_i}{w_i}\right) \\ &\quad - 2\mu \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j w_i \left[\frac{w'_j w'_i}{w_j w_i} - \left(\frac{w'_i}{w_i}\right)^2\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Recall $\bar{a}_{ij} = a_{ij}w_iw_j$. Multiplying (3.7) by \bar{a}_i and summing these over all i yields

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda^*)'' \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i w_i^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \neq i} \bar{a}_i \bar{a}_{ji} \left[\mu \left(\frac{w_j''}{w_j} - \frac{w_i''}{w_i} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{w_j'}{w_j} - \frac{w_i'}{w_i} \right) - 2\mu \left(\frac{w_j' w_i'}{w_j w_i} - \left(\frac{w_i'}{w_i} \right)^2 \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

It follows from the Tree-Cycle identity, (3.11) and (3.11) type equality for w_j''/w_j that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\lambda^*)'' \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{a}_i w_i^2 \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} w(\mathcal{Q}) \sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \left[\mu \left(\frac{w_r''}{w_r} - \frac{w_s''}{w_s} \right) + 2 \left(\frac{w_r'}{w_r} - \frac{w_s'}{w_s} \right) - 2\mu \left(\frac{w_r' w_s'}{w_r w_s} - \left(\frac{w_s'}{w_s} \right)^2 \right) \right] \\ &= \mu \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathcal{Q}} w(\mathcal{Q}) \sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} \left(\frac{w_r'}{w_r} - \frac{w_s'}{w_s} \right)^2 \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Notice that $(\lambda^*)'' = 0$ if and only if $\frac{w_r'}{w_r} = \frac{w_s'}{w_s}$ for any pair of (s, r) locating in a directed cycle of (\mathcal{G}, \bar{A}) . Since \bar{A} is irreducible, the graph (\mathcal{G}, \bar{A}) is strongly connected. As a consequence, $\frac{w_i'}{w_i} = \frac{w_j'}{w_j}$ for any i, j . Therefore, $w_i' = kw_i$ for all i for some $k \in \mathbb{R}$. This, combined with (3.3) and $w_i > 0$, implies that $w_i' = 0$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n$. Substituting $w_i' = 0$ into (3.5), we have

$$(\lambda^*)' w_i = - \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_i + \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ji} w_j,$$

which implies that $(\lambda^*)'$ is the principal eigenvalue of $-L^T$ and therefore $(\lambda^*)' = 0$. From (i) we see that $\lambda^* = q_i$ for all i , and (ii) holds. \square

In Theorem 3.1, the column sum of the Laplacian matrix L is zero which represents that the dispersal has no loss of population. A slightly stronger results hold for \tilde{L} in which there is a loss of population when dispersing. Since Corollary 3.2 follows directly from Theorem 3.3, we do not prove it here.

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\tilde{L} = (\tilde{\ell}_{ij})_{n \times n}$ be an irreducible strictly sub-Laplacian matrix, let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix, and $\tilde{M}(\mu) = Q - \mu \tilde{L}$. Then for any $\mu > 0$,*

(i)

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}s(\tilde{M}(\mu)) < 0.$$

(ii)

$$\frac{d^2}{d\mu^2}s(\tilde{M}(\mu)) \geq 0,$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_n$.

Now we use the results in Theorem 3.1 to prove the following version of Karlin-Altnerberg Theorem (Theorem 2.2).

Theorem 3.3. *Let A be a quasi-positive irreducible matrix and let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Then the following statements hold:*

(i)

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}s(\mu A + Q) \leq s(A),$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_n$.

(ii)

$$\frac{d^2}{d\mu^2}s(\mu A + Q) \geq 0,$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_n$.

Proof. First we assume that $s(A) = 0$. Since A is an irreducible quasi-positive matrix, by Perron-Frobenius theorem, A has a left principal eigenvector $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T \gg 0$ corresponding with eigenvalue $s(A)$. Denote $U = \text{diag}(u_i)$ and $L = -UAU^{-1}$. Since $s(A) = 0$, L is a Laplacian matrix. Indeed since $UAU^{-1} = (u_i a_{ij} u_j^{-1})$, the matrix UAU^{-1} is quasi-positive and the sum of the j -th column is $u_j^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n u_i a_{ij} = s(A) u_j^{-1} u_j = s(A)$. If $s(A) = 0$, then the sum of each column of UAU^{-1} is zero and $-UAU^{-1}$ is a Laplacian matrix. Since $s(\mu A + Q) = s(U(\mu A + Q)U^{-1}) = s(Q - \mu L)$, the results follow from Theorem 3.1.

If $s(A) \neq 0$, we replace A by $A - s(A)I$ to obtain

$$\frac{d}{d\mu}s(\mu A + Q) \leq s(A) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d^2}{d\mu^2}s(\mu A + Q) \geq 0,$$

and the equality holds if and only if $q_1 = q_2 = \cdots = q_n$. □

The non-increasing property of the spectral bound of irreducible matrices as established in Theorem 3.3 also holds for reducible matrices.

Corollary 3.4. *Let A be a quasi-positive matrix with $s(A) \leq 0$, and let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is non-increasing and convex for all $\mu > 0$.*

Proof. The eigenvalues and spectral bound of A are invariant under permutation similarity transformation $P^{-1}AP$ for a permutation matrix P . So without loss of generality, we can assume that A is a block upper triangular matrix:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & * & \cdots & * \\ 0 & B_2 & \cdots & * \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & B_k \end{bmatrix}$$

where B_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) are $p_i \times p_i$ irreducible quasi-positive matrices with size $p_i \geq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = n$. We also break $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ to match with the size of A : $Q = \text{diag}(Q_i)$, where Q_i is a diagonal matrix of size $p_i \times p_i$. Apparently $s(\mu A + Q) = \max\{s(\mu B_i + Q_i) : 1 \leq i \leq k\}$.

Since for each i , $s(\mu B_i + Q_i)$ is non-increasing and convex in μ from Theorem 3.3, we conclude that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is also non-increasing and convex in μ as the maximum of a finite number of non-increasing and convex functions. Indeed we can have the strict inequality if either (i) $s(\mu A + Q) = s(\mu B_i + Q_i)$ for a fixed $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $Q_i \neq cI_i$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and I_i is the $p_i \times p_i$ identity matrix, or (ii) for each $1 \leq i \leq k$, $Q_i \neq cI_i$ for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. In either case, the strict inequality follows from Theorem 3.3. \square

One may suspect that the graph theoretical method can be used to show that the third derivative of $s(\mu A + Q)$ is negative or positive. However, from following example, we can see that the third derivative may not be of one sign. Let

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & -1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we can compute

$$s(\mu) := s(Q - \mu L) = \frac{6 - 3\mu + \sqrt{9\mu^2 - 4\mu + 4}}{4}.$$

From elementary calculation, we can see that $s(\mu) > 0$, $s'(\mu) < 0$ and $s''(\mu) > 0$ for all $\mu > 0$, which is in agreement with Theorem 3.1. But the third derivative $s^{(3)}(\mu)$ changes sign.

4 A constructive proof of Karlin's theorem

In this section, we will use a different method to prove Karlin-Altenberg's Theorem (Theorem 2.2). Our proof is based on the "min-max" Collatz-Wielandt formula:

$$s(A) = \min_{u \gg 0} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{[Au]_i}{[u]_i},$$

where $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ is a quasi-positive irreducible matrix. Our method to prove that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is decreasing in μ is elementary, and then we use a theory from complex analysis to prove that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is strictly decreasing: the zeros of analytic functions are isolated.

The following elementary algebra lemma is essential for the proof of monotonicity of $s(\mu A + Q)$, which may be of independent interests.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mu, \mu', u_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Suppose $u_i \neq u_j$, for all $i \neq j$, where $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. Then there exist $k_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, such that*

$$\frac{u_j(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_i + \mu u_j} < \frac{k_i}{k_j} < \frac{\mu' u_j + \mu u_i}{u_i(\mu + \mu')}, \quad \forall i \neq j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume $u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_n$. Firstly, we show that (4.1) makes sense, i.e.

$$\frac{u_j(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_i + \mu u_j} < \frac{\mu' u_j + \mu u_i}{u_i(\mu + \mu')}. \quad (4.2)$$

Eq. (4.2) equivalent to

$$u_i u_j (\mu + \mu')^2 < (\mu' u_i + \mu u_j)(\mu' u_j + \mu u_i),$$

which can be simplified as

$$2u_i u_j < u_i^2 + u_j^2.$$

Since $u_i \neq u_j$, (4.2) is true.

Now we construct k_1, k_2, \dots, k_n . Let $k_1 = 1$. We choose $k_i > 0$, $i \geq 2$, recursively, such that

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_i} < \frac{k_{i+1}}{k_i} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+1}}{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1. \quad (4.3)$$

We only need to prove that k_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, satisfy (4.1).

We claim that

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_i} < \frac{k_{i+2}}{k_i} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+2}}{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-2. \quad (4.4)$$

To see this, by (4.3),

$$\frac{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_{i+1}} < \frac{k_{i+2}}{k_{i+1}} < \frac{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_{i+2}}{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')}. \quad (4.5)$$

Multiplying (4.3) and (4.5), we obtain

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_i} \frac{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_{i+1}} < \frac{k_{i+2}}{k_i} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+1}}{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')} \frac{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_{i+2}}{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')}. \quad (4.6)$$

To show (4.4), it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_i} < \frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_i} \frac{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_{i+1}} \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+1}}{u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu')} \frac{\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_{i+2}}{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+1}}{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')}.$$

These two inequalities can be checked directly. We only show (4.7), as the other is similar. Eq. (4.7) is equivalent to

$$(\mu' u_{i+1} + \mu u_i)(\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_{i+1}) < (\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_i)u_{i+1}(\mu + \mu'),$$

which can be simplified as

$$\mu' \mu (u_{i+1}^2 + u_i u_{i+2}) < \mu' \mu (u_{i+1} u_{i+2} + u_i u_{i+1}).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\mu' \mu (u_{i+1} - u_{i+2})(u_{i+1} - u_i) < 0,$$

which holds as $u_i < u_{i+1} < u_{i+2}$. This proves (4.4).

By (4.3) and (4.4), we can show that

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+3} + \mu u_i} < \frac{k_{i+3}}{k_i} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+3}}{u_{i+3}(\mu + \mu')}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-3. \quad (4.8)$$

The proof of (4.8) is similar to (4.4). Indeed, by (4.3), we have

$$\frac{u_{i+2}(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+3} + \mu u_{i+2}} < \frac{k_{i+3}}{k_{i+2}} < \frac{\mu' u_{i+2} + \mu u_{i+3}}{u_{i+3}(\mu + \mu')}.$$

Multiplying this inequality with (4.4), we can show (4.8). Then by induction, we can show that

$$\frac{u_i(\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_{i+j} + \mu u_i} < \frac{k_{i+j}}{k_i} < \frac{\mu' u_i + \mu u_{i+j}}{u_{i+j}(\mu + \mu')}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n-j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.9)$$

This proves (4.1). □

In the following, we prove the Karlin-Altenberg's Theorem via several steps. First we show that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is non-increasing.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ be a quasi-positive irreducible matrix such that $-A^T$ is sub-Laplacian, and let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is non-increasing in $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. If, in addition, $-A^T$ is strongly sub-Laplacian, then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is strictly decreasing in $\mu \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, $A_\mu := \mu A + Q$ has a positive eigenvector $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$ corresponding with eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = s(A_\mu)$. Then, we have

$$q_i u_i + \mu a_{i1} u_1 + \mu a_{i2} u_2 \cdots + \mu a_{in} u_n = \lambda_1 u_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.10)$$

For any $\mu' > 0$, to show $s(A_{\mu+\mu'}) \leq s(A_\mu)$, by the Collatz-Wielandt formula, it suffices to find a strictly positive vector $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)^T$ such that

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \frac{[A_{\mu+\mu'} v]_i}{[v]_i} \leq \lambda_1. \quad (4.11)$$

Suppose $v_i = k_i u_i$ for some $k_i > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We need to find k_i satisfying (4.11), i.e.

$$\frac{q_i k_i u_i + (\mu + \mu') a_{i1} k_1 u_1 + (\mu + \mu') a_{i2} k_2 u_2 \cdots + (\mu + \mu') a_{in} k_n u_n}{k_i u_i} \leq \lambda_1, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (4.12)$$

Solving λ_1 from (4.10) and plugging it into (4.12), (4.12) is equivalent to

$$a_{ii} \mu' k_i u_i \leq \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij} u_j (\mu k_i - (\mu + \mu') k_j), \quad \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (4.13)$$

Since $|a_{ii}| \geq \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij}$ as $-A^T$ is sub-Laplacian, (4.13) holds if

$$\mu' k_i u_i \geq u_j ((\mu + \mu') k_j - \mu k_i), \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{k_i}{k_j} \geq \frac{u_j (\mu + \mu')}{\mu' u_i + \mu u_j}, \quad \forall j \neq i. \quad (4.14)$$

By Lemma 4.1, we can find k_i satisfying (4.14) (if $u_i = u_j$, we may set $k_i = k_j$). This proves $r(A_{\mu+\mu'}) \leq r(A_\mu)$.

If $-A^T$ is strongly sub-Laplacian, then the inequality (4.12) is strict and $r(A_\mu)$ is strictly decreasing. \square

Next, we show that $s(\mu A + Q)$ is analytic in μ . Since the zeros of analytic functions are isolated and $s(\mu A + Q)$ is decreasing, $s(\mu A + Q)$ is either strictly decreasing or constant in μ .

Lemma 4.3. *Let $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ be a quasi-positive irreducible matrix such that $-A^T$ is sub-Laplacian, and $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is either strictly decreasing or constant in $\mu \in (0, \infty)$.*

Proof. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem, $s^*(\mu) := s(\mu A + Q)$ is a simple root of some polynomial equation $F(\mu, s) = 0$ for each $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(\mu, s^*) \neq 0 \quad \text{for all } \mu \in (0, \infty).$$

By the implicit function theorem, $s^*(\mu)$ is analytic in μ (we may extend the domain of μ and s to the complex plane). Since the zeros of analytic functions are isolated

and $s(\mu A + Q)$ is decreasing by Lemma 4.2, $s(\mu A + Q)$ is either strictly decreasing or constant in μ . \square

Now we are ready to establish monotonicity of the spectral bound $s(\mu A + Q)$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ be a quasi-positive irreducible matrix and let $Q = \text{diag}(q_i)$ be a diagonal matrix. Then the following results hold:*

1. *If $s(A) < 0$, then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is strictly decreasing in $\mu \in (0, \infty)$. Moreover*

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} s(\mu A + Q) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\} \text{ and } \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(\mu A + Q) = -\infty.$$

2. *If $s(A) = 0$, then $s(\mu A + Q)$ is strictly decreasing provided that Q is not a multiple of I . Moreover,*

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} s(\mu A + Q) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\} \text{ and } \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(\mu A + Q) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i q_i,$$

where $v_i \in (0, 1)$ for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ is determined by A and satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 1$ (if A has each row sum equaling zero, then v is a left positive eigenvector of A).

Proof. It is easy to see that $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} s(\mu A + Q) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\}$. Let $u = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n)^T$ be the positive eigenvector of A corresponding to $s(A)$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n u_i = 1$ and let $U = \text{diag}(u_i)$.

If $s(A) < 0$, then $\tilde{A} := U^{-1}AU$ is quasi-positive, and $-\tilde{A}^T$ is strongly sub-Laplacian. By Lemma 4.2, $s(\mu A + Q) = s(\mu \tilde{A} + Q)$ is strictly decreasing. Since

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \mu \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} + q_i \right\} \leq s(\mu A + Q) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ \mu \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} + q_i \right\}, \quad (4.15)$$

and $\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} < 0$ for each i , we have $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(\mu A + Q) = -\infty$.

If $s(A) = 0$, then \tilde{A} is quasi-positive and $-\tilde{A}^T$ is Laplacian. By Lemma 4.3, $s(\mu A + Q) = s(\mu \tilde{A} + Q)$ is strictly decreasing or constant in μ . By (4.15), $s(\mu \tilde{A} + Q)$ is bounded below by $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\}$ and above by $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\}$. Therefore, $\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(\mu \tilde{A} + Q)$

exists. Let $v_\mu = (v_{\mu 1}, v_{\mu 2}, \dots, v_{\mu n})$ be the left positive eigenvector satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n v_{\mu i} = 1$ for $\mu\tilde{A} + Q$. Up to a subsequence, we have $v_\mu \rightarrow v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ as $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ for some nonnegative vector v satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 1$. Dividing both sides of $v_\mu(\mu\tilde{A} + Q) = s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q)v_\mu$ by μ and taking $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain $v\tilde{A} = 0$. Therefore, v is the left positive eigenvector of \tilde{A} satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i = 1$. Summing up all the equations of $v_\mu(\mu\tilde{A} + Q) = s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q)v_\mu$ and using the fact that \tilde{A} has each row sum equaling zero, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n v_{\mu i} q_i = s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q) \sum_{i=1}^n v_i = s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q).$$

Taking $\mu \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q) = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i q_i.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i q_i < \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{q_i\}$ if and only if (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) is not a multiple of $(1, 1, \dots, 1)$, $s(\mu\tilde{A} + Q)$ is strictly decreasing if Q is not a multiple of I . \square

5 Applications

In this section we apply Theorems 3.3 and 4.4 to study several population models in heterogeneous environment from ecology and epidemiology.

5.1 Single species model

We consider a general single species model in a heterogeneous environment of n patches ($n \geq 2$)

$$u_i' = u_i f_i(u_i) + \mu \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij} u_j - a_{ji} u_i) - \mu \epsilon_i u_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5.1)$$

where u_i denotes the population size (or density) in patch i ; function f_i denotes the intrinsic growth rate in patch i ; the connectivity matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ describes the dispersal pattern between patches, where $a_{ij} \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$ quantifies the dispersal from

patch j to patch i , and $a_{jj} = -\sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij}$ is the total movement out from patch j ; $\mu \geq 0$ is the dispersal rate, and $\epsilon_i \geq 0$ is the death rate due to dispersal. When $\epsilon_i = 0$ for all i , there is no loss of individuals during the movement between patches; and when $\epsilon_i > 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$, there are losses of individuals during the movement between patches. The intrinsic growth function f_i ($1 \leq i \leq n$) satisfies

- (f) For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $f_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and strictly decreasing. Moreover, there exists $c_i > 0$ such that $f_i(u_i) < 0$ for all $u_i > c_i$.

System (5.1) admits a trivial equilibrium $E_0 = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, representing the state of species extinction, and its stability can be determined by the Jacobian matrix $J = \mu(A - \text{diag}(\epsilon_i)) + \text{diag}(f_i(0))$.

Assume that A is irreducible. It follows from Perron-Frobenius theorem that $A - \text{diag}(\epsilon_i)$ has a principal eigenvector $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T > 0$ corresponding to the principal eigenvalue 0 such that $\alpha_i > 0$ for all i . As shown in Theorem 4.4, α_i serves as the weight constant in determining the impact of patch i on the dynamics of the interconnected system (5.1) for larger value of μ . The following result describes this phenomenon in detail.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that A is an irreducible quasi-positive matrix, and assume (f) is satisfied. Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T > 0$ denote the normalized eigenvector of $A - \text{diag}(\epsilon_i)$ corresponding to the principal eigenvalue 0 such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. Let $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{f_i(0)\}$ and $m = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i f_i(0)$. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *If $M < 0$, then the equilibrium E_0 is globally asymptotically stable in \mathbb{R}_+^n for all $\mu > 0$.*
- (ii) *If $\epsilon_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $m > 0$, then the equilibrium E_0 is unstable for all $\mu > 0$. Furthermore, system (5.1) admits a unique positive equilibrium $E^* = (u_1^*, \dots, u_n^*)$, which is globally asymptotically stable in $\mathbb{R}_+^n - \{E_0\}$.*
- (iii) *If either $\epsilon_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $m < 0 < M$, or $\epsilon_i > 0$ for at least some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and $M > 0$, then there exists a unique $\mu^* > 0$ such that*

E_0 is globally asymptotically stable in \mathbb{R}_+^n for $\mu \geq \mu^*$ while E_0 is unstable for $0 < \mu < \mu^*$. Furthermore, if $0 < \mu < \mu^*$, then there exists a unique positive equilibrium E^* , which is globally asymptotically stable in $\mathbb{R}_+^n - \{E_0\}$.

Proof. The local stability of E_0 is determined by the sign of the spectral bound of the Jacobian matrix $J(\mu) = \mu(A - \text{diag}(\epsilon_i)) + \text{diag}(f_i(0))$, i.e. E_0 is locally asymptotically stable if $s(J(\mu)) < 0$ and it is unstable if $s(J(\mu)) > 0$. By Theorem 4.4, if $\epsilon_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $s(J(\mu))$ is non-increasing for $\mu \in (0, \infty)$ with

$$m = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(J(\mu)) \leq s(J(\mu)) \leq \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} s(J(\mu)) = M,$$

and if $m < M$ then $s(J(\mu))$ is strictly decreasing; if $\epsilon_i > 0$ for at least some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $s(J(\mu))$ is strictly decreasing in μ with

$$-\infty = \lim_{\mu \rightarrow \infty} s(J(\mu)) < s(J(\mu)) < \lim_{\mu \rightarrow 0} s(J(\mu)) = M.$$

The claim on the local stability of E_0 follows from these observations.

Since A is irreducible and quasi-positive, (5.1) generates a strongly monotone dynamical system [42]. Since f_i is strictly decreasing for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the semiflow generated by (5.1) is strongly sub-homogeneous [46] (i.e. $\lambda T(t)u_0 \ll T(t)\lambda u_0$ for all $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ and initial data $u_0 \gg 0$, where $T(t)$ is the semiflow induced by (5.1)). Moreover, by the assumption (f), the solutions of (5.1) are bounded and dissipative (i.e. uniformly ultimately bounded). Therefore, by [46, Theorem 2.3.4], if $s(J(\mu)) \leq 0$, E_0 is globally stable; if $s(J(\mu)) > 0$, E_0 is unstable and there exists a unique globally stable positive steady state E^* . This completes the proof. \square

Remark 5.2. 1. If the maximum growth rates $f_i(0)$ at the i -th patch are not all identical, then $m < M$.

2. The i -th patch is a sink if $f_i(0) \leq 0$ and it is a source if $f_i(0) > 0$. If all patches are source, then apparently $m > 0$, but the population can still become extinct for large μ if there is population loss during dispersal. If some patches are sink, then it is possible that $m < 0$ but it still depends on the network connection. when the sink patches carries a larger weight α_i , it is more likely that $m < 0$.

3. The extinction/persistence dichotomy of dynamics in terms of stability of extinction state and the global stability of positive equilibrium of (5.1) are well-known, see for example [13, 37, 39]. Theorem 5.1 shows how the extinction or persistence of population depends on the dispersal coefficient μ .
4. A similar result for reducible A can also be obtained by using Corollary 3.4 and the approach in [18].

5.2 Predator-prey model

We consider the following predator-prey model with a general functional response in heterogeneous environment of n patches ($n \geq 2$):

$$\begin{cases} u'_i = r_i u_i \left(1 - \frac{u_i}{K_i}\right) - g_i(u_i) v_i + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij} u_j - a_{ji} u_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ v'_i = v_i (c_i g_i(u_i) - d_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (b_{ij} v_j - b_{ji} v_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases} \quad (5.2)$$

where u_i and v_i denotes the population density of the prey and predators in the i -th patch, respectively; $r_i, K_i > 0$ are the growth rate and carrying capacity of the prey in the i -th patch, respectively; d_i is the mortality rate of the predator, and c_i is the conversion rate of the predation; the connectivity matrices $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$ and $B = (b_{ij})_{n \times n}$ describe the dispersal pattern between patches for prey and predators respectively, where $a_{ij} \geq 0$ and $b_{ij} \geq 0$, $i \neq j$, denote rate of the prey and predators from patch j to patch i , and $a_{jj} = -\sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij}$ and $b_{jj} = -\sum_{i \neq j} b_{ij}$ are the total movement out from patch j of the prey and predators, respectively; $\mu_u, \mu_v \geq 0$ denote the rates of dispersal of the two species u and v , respectively. Function g_i denotes the functional response of predator in the i -th patch and satisfies the following assumption.

- (g) For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $g_i : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is continuous, strictly increasing and $g_i(0) = 0$.

The following result highlights the impact of dispersal rates on population dynamics of (5.2).

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that A and B are irreducible matrices, and assume (g) is satisfied. Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be the positive eigenvector of B corresponding to eigenvalue 0 with $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. Then for any $\mu_u > 0$, $\mu_v > 0$, system (5.2) admits a trivial equilibrium $E_0 = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ and a unique semitrivial equilibrium $E_1 = (u_1^*, \dots, u_n^*, 0, \dots, 0)$, where $u_i^* > 0$ and satisfies*

$$r_i u_i^* \left(1 - \frac{u_i^*}{K_i}\right) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij} u_j^* - a_{ji} u_i^*) = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (5.3)$$

Denote $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i\}$ and $m = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i (c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i)$. Then the following statements hold:

- (i) E_0 is unstable for any $\mu_v > 0$.
- (ii) If $M < 0$, then the equilibrium E_1 is globally asymptotically stable for all $\mu_v > 0$.
- (iii) If $m > 0$, then the equilibrium E_1 is unstable for all $\mu_v > 0$.
- (iv) If $m < 0 < M$, then there exists a unique $\mu_v^* > 0$ such that E_1 is globally asymptotically stable for $\mu_v > \mu_v^*$ while E_1 is unstable for $0 < \mu_v < \mu_v^*$.

Proof. The existence and uniqueness of E_1 follow from Theorem 5.1. We prove the local stability/instability of E_1 in (ii)-(iv), as the proof of (i) is similar and simpler. Linearizing (5.2) at E_1 , the local stability of E_1 is determined by the following eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{cases} \lambda \phi_i = r_i \phi_i \left(1 - 2 \frac{u_i^*}{K_i}\right) - g(u_i^*) \psi_i + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij} \phi_j - a_{ji} \phi_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \lambda \psi_i = \psi_i (c_i g(u_i^*) - d_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij} \psi_j - a_{ji} \psi_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

If $\text{Re} \lambda < 0$ for any eigenvalue λ of (5.4), then E_1 is locally asymptotically stable; if (5.4) has an eigenvalue λ with $\text{Re} \lambda > 0$, then E_1 is unstable.

We claim that the local stability of E_1 is determined by the sign of $s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i))$. To see this, let (ϕ, ψ) with $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)^T$ and $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n)^T$

be an eigenvector of (5.4) corresponding to eigenvalue λ . If $\psi = 0$, then λ is an eigenvalue of

$$\lambda\phi_i = r_i\phi_i \left(1 - 2\frac{u_i^*}{K_i}\right) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\phi_j - a_{ji}\phi_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

i.e. an eigenvalue of $\mu_u A + \text{diag}(r_i(1 - 2u_i^*/K))$. By (5.3) and Perron-Frobenius Theorem, $s(\mu_u A + \text{diag}(r_i(1 - u_i^*/K))) = 0$. Therefore, $s(\mu_u A + \text{diag}(r_i(1 - 2u_i^*/K))) < s(\mu_u A + \text{diag}(r_i(1 - u_i^*/K))) = 0$. Hence, we have

$$\text{Re}\lambda \leq s(\mu_u A + \text{diag}(r_i(1 - 2u_i^*/K))) < 0. \quad (5.5)$$

If $\psi \neq 0$, λ is an eigenvalue of

$$\lambda\psi_i = \psi_i(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\psi_j - a_{ji}\psi_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

i.e. λ is an eigenvalue of $\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i)$. Noticing (5.5), we see that the local stability of E_1 is determined by the sign of $s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i))$. Then the results (ii)-(iv) on the local stability of E_1 follow from the claim and Theorems 3.3 and 4.4.

It remains to prove the global stability of E_1 when $s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i)) < 0$. Suppose that $(u_1(0), u_2(0), \dots, u_n(0))$ is nontrivial. Let $\hat{u}_i(t)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} \hat{u}'_i = r_i \hat{u}_i \left(1 - \frac{\hat{u}_i}{K_i}\right) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\hat{u}_j - a_{ji}\hat{u}_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \hat{u}_i(0) = u_i(0), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

By the comparison principle, we have $u_i(t) \leq \hat{u}_i(t)$ for all $t \geq 0$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$. By Theorem 5.1, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_i(t) = u_i^*$, and it follows that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{u}_i(t) = u_i^*$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Choose $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that $s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^* + \epsilon_0) - d_i)) < 0$. Then there exists $T > 0$ such that $u_i(t) \leq u_i^* + \epsilon_0$ for all $t \geq T$. By the second equation of (5.2) and the monotonicity of g_i , we have

$$\begin{cases} v'_i \leq v_i(c_i g_i(u_i^* + \epsilon_0) - d_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (b_{ij}v_j - b_{ji}v_i), & t \geq T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ v_i(T) \leq C\tilde{\alpha}_i, & t \geq T, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

where $(\tilde{\alpha}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_2, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_n)$ is a positive principal eigenvector of $\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^* + \epsilon_0) - d_i)$ corresponding with eigenvalue $s_0 := s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^* + \epsilon_0) - d_i))$ and $C > 0$ is large. By the comparison principle, we have $v_i(t) \leq \hat{v}_i(t)$ for $t \geq T$, where \hat{v}_i is the solution of the problem

$$\begin{cases} \hat{v}'_i = \hat{v}_i(c_i g(u_i^* + \epsilon_0) - d_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (b_{ij} \hat{v}_j - b_{ji} \hat{v}_i), & t \geq T, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \hat{v}_i(T) = C \tilde{\alpha}_i, & t \geq T, i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

It is easy to check that the solution of (5.6) is $\hat{v}_i(t) = C \tilde{\alpha}_i e^{s_0(t-T)}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since $s_0 < 0$, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_i(t) = 0$, which implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} v_i(t) = 0$. Finally by the theory of asymptotically autonomous semiflows (see, e.g., [43]) and Theorem 5.1, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} u_i(t) = u_i^*$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. \square

Remark 5.4. 1. When $\mu_v = 0$, then $s(\mu_v A + \text{diag}(c_i g_i(u_i^*) - d_i)) = M$ so part (ii) in Theorem 5.3 still holds.

2. When E_1 is unstable, one can show the existence of a coexistence equilibrium E_2 through the theory of uniform persistence. When the functional response g_i is of Lotka-Volterra type ($g_i(u_i) = u_i$), E_2 can be shown to be globally asymptotically stable when $\mu_v = 0$ (see [38, Theorem 6.1]). But when g_i is of Monod type ($g_i(u_i) = u_i/(a_i + u_i)$), (5.2) is an n -patch Rosenzweig-MacArthur predator-prey system, E_2 may be unstable and the system could have a limit cycle even in the 1-patch case.
3. In Theorem 5.3, the growth rate r_i for the prey is assumed to be positive in all patches. If r_i are not all positive, then from Theorem 5.1, a unique critical prey dispersal rate $\mu_u^* > 0$ may exist so that E_0 is globally asymptotically stable for $\mu_u > \mu_u^*$ while E_0 is unstable for $0 < \mu_u < \mu_u^*$. In that case, results (ii)-(iv) in Theorem 5.3 hold for $0 < \mu_u < \mu_u^*$.

5.3 Lotka-Volterra competition model

We consider the following Lotka-Volterra competition model in a heterogeneous environment of n patches ($n \geq 2$):

$$\begin{cases} u'_i = u_i(p_i - u_i - v_i) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}u_j - a_{ji}u_i), & i = 1, \dots, n, \\ v'_i = v_i(p_i - u_i - v_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}v_j - a_{ji}v_i), & i = 1, \dots, n, \\ u(0) = u_0 \geq (\neq)0, v(0) = v_0 \geq (\neq)0, \end{cases} \quad (5.7)$$

where $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, and u_i and v_i denote the population densities of two competing species in patch i , respectively; $\mu_u, \mu_v \geq 0$ are the dispersal rates of the two species, respectively; $p_i \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the intrinsic growth rates of species u_i and v_i in patch i ; and $a_{ij} \geq 0$ ($i \neq j$) is the movement rate from patch j to patch i , $a_{jj} = -\sum_{i \neq j} a_{ij}$ is the total movement out from patch j , and the matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is irreducible. Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be the positive eigenvector of A satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$. The two competing species are assumed to be identical except for the dispersal rates.

Denote $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{p_i\}$ and $m = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i p_i$. If $M < 0$, then the trivial equilibrium is the only nonnegative equilibrium, which is globally asymptotically stable. Therefore, in the following we assume that $M > 0$. By Theorem 5.1, we obtain the following result about the existence/nonexistence of nonnegative semi-trivial equilibria:

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose $M > 0$ and $\mu_u < \mu_v$. Then the following results hold:*

- (i) *if $m > 0$, then system (5.7) admits exactly two nonnegative semi-trivial equilibria $(u^*, 0)$ and $(0, v^*)$, where $w^* = (w_1^*, \dots, w_n^*)$ for $w = u, v$.*
- (ii) *if $m < 0$, then there exists a unique $\mu_* > 0$ such that $s(\mu_* A + \text{diag}(p_i)) = 0$. Moreover, when $\mu_* \leq \mu_u < \mu_v$, there exists no nonnegative semi-trivial equilibrium; when $\mu_u < \mu_* \leq \mu_v$, there exists exactly one nonnegative semi-trivial equilibrium $(u^*, 0)$; and when $\mu_u < \mu_v < \mu_*$, there exist exactly two nonnegative semi-trivial equilibria $(u^*, 0)$ and $(0, v^*)$.*

Next we show that system (5.7) has no positive equilibrium.

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose $M > 0$ and $\mu_u < \mu_v$. If (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) is not a multiple of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$, then system (5.7) admits no nonnegative equilibrium $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n)$ with $\bar{u} \geq (\neq) 0$ and $\bar{v} \geq (\neq) 0$.*

Proof. Assume on the contrary that such an equilibrium $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_n, \bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_n)$ exists. Let $Q = \text{diag}(p_i - \bar{u}_i - \bar{v}_i)$. Since (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) is an equilibrium of (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u}_i(p_i - \bar{u}_i - \bar{v}_i) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \bar{u}_j &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \bar{v}_i(p_i - \bar{u}_i - \bar{v}_i) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \bar{v}_j &= 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, \bar{u} and \bar{v} are nonnegative eigenvectors of $\mu_u A + Q$ and $\mu_v A + Q$ corresponding with eigenvalue 0, respectively. Since A is irreducible, by the Perron-Frobenius theorem, we have

$$s(\mu_u A + Q) = s(\mu_v A + Q) = 0.$$

Since $\mu_u < \mu_v$, by Theorem 3.3 or Theorem 4.4, Q is a multiple of I and \bar{u}, \bar{v} are eigenvectors of A . It follows that $p_1 - u_1 - v_1 = p_2 - u_2 - v_2 = \dots = p_n - u_n - v_n = 0$ and (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) is a multiple of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$, which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

In the following, we will use monotone dynamical system theory to investigate the global dynamics of (5.7). Let $\leq_K, <_K, \ll_K$ be the order of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ generated by the cone $\mathbb{R}_+^n \times (-\mathbb{R}_+^n)$ defined in the usual way. For example, $(u, v) <_K (w, z)$ means

$$u \leq w, \quad v \geq z \quad \text{and} \quad (u, v) \neq (w, z).$$

Then the solutions of system (5.7) induce a strictly monotone semiflow on $\mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$:

Lemma 5.7. *Let $(u^{(i)}(t), v^{(i)}(t))$ be the corresponding solutions of (5.7) with nonnegative initial value $(u_0^{(i)}, v_0^{(i)})$ for $i = 1, 2$, where $u_0^{(2)} \geq (\neq) 0$, $v_0^{(1)} \geq (\neq) 0$ and*

$$(u_0^{(2)}, v_0^{(2)}) <_K (u_0^{(1)}, v_0^{(1)}).$$

Then $(u^{(2)}(t), v^{(2)}(t)) \ll_K (u^{(1)}(t), v^{(1)}(t))$ for any $t > 0$.

Proof. Since $u^{(2)}(t)$ is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u'_i = u_i(p_i - u_i - v_i) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}u_j - a_{ji}u_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ u(0) = u_0^{(2)} \geq (\neq) 0, \end{cases}$$

and A is quasi-positive and irreducible, we have $u^{(2)}(t) \gg 0$ for all $t > 0$ (see [42]).

Similarly, $v^{(1)}(t) \gg 0$ for all $t > 0$.

Let $\bar{u}(t) = u^{(1)}(t) - u^{(2)}(t)$, $\bar{v}(t) = v^{(2)}(t) - v^{(1)}(t)$, $\bar{u}_0 = u_0^{(1)} - u_0^{(2)}$ and $\bar{v}_0 = v_0^{(2)} - v_0^{(1)}$.

Then $(\bar{u}(t), \bar{v}(t))$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \bar{u}_i = \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}\bar{u}_j + \bar{u}_i \left(p_i - u_i^{(1)} - u_i^{(2)} - v_i^{(1)} \right) + u_i^{(2)}\bar{v}_i, \\ \bar{v}_i = \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}\bar{v}_j + \bar{v}_i \left(p_i - v_i^{(1)} - v_i^{(2)} - u_i^{(2)} \right) + v_i^{(1)}\bar{u}_i, \\ (\bar{u}(0), \bar{v}(0)) \geq (\neq) 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Since $u_i^{(2)}, v_i^{(1)} > 0$ for all $t > 0$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and A is quasi-positive and irreducible, (5.8) is cooperative and irreducible [42]. It then follows that $\bar{u}_i(t), \bar{v}_i(t) > 0$ for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $t > 0$. This proves the claim. \square

Since the solutions of system (5.7) induce a strictly monotone semiflow on $\mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n$, we can use the theory of monotone dynamical systems in [29, 31, 35, 42] to investigate the asymptotic behavior of (5.7). Specifically, if $(u^*, 0)$ is the only semi-trivial equilibrium which is locally asymptotically stable, then it is globally asymptotically stable; if both $(u^*, 0)$ and $(0, v^*)$ exist with $(u^*, 0)$ stable and $(0, v^*)$ unstable and there exists no positive equilibrium, then $(u^*, 0)$ is globally asymptotically stable. Then the following result follows from Lemmas 5.5-5.6:

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose that $M > 0$, $\mu_u < \mu_v$, and (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) is not a multiple of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$. Let μ_* , u^* be defined as in Lemma 5.5. Then the following statements hold:*

- (i) *if $m > 0$, then semi-trivial equilibrium $(u^*, 0)$ is globally asymptotically stable.*

- (ii) if $m < 0$, then the trivial equilibrium is globally asymptotically stable for $\mu_u \geq \mu_*$; and the semi-trivial $(u^*, 0)$ is globally asymptotically stable for $\mu_u < \mu_*$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, $(u^*, 0)$ always exists. We show that $(u^*, 0)$ is locally asymptotically stable whenever it exists. Linearizing (5.7) at $(u^*, 0)$, we obtain the following eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} \lambda\phi_i = \phi_i(p_i - 2u_i^*) - u_i^*\psi_i + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\phi_j - a_{ji}\phi_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ \lambda\psi_i = \psi_i(p_i - u_i^*) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\psi_j - a_{ji}\psi_i), & i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

It suffices to show $\operatorname{Re}\lambda < 0$ for any eigenvalue λ of (5.9). Let (ϕ, ψ) with $\phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_n)$ and $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots, \psi_n)$ be an eigenvector corresponding to λ . If $\psi = 0$, then λ satisfies

$$\lambda\phi_i = \phi_i(p_i - 2u_i^*) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\phi_j - a_{ji}\phi_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

i.e. λ is an eigenvalue of $\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - 2u_i^*)$. Since A is quasi-positive and irreducible and u^* satisfies

$$0 = u_i^*(p_i - u_i^*) + \mu_u \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}u_j^* - a_{ji}u_i^*), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

u^* is a positive eigenvector of $\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)$ corresponding with principal eigenvalue $s(\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)) = 0$. Therefore, $s(\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - 2u_i^*)) < s(\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)) = 0$. It follows that

$$\operatorname{Re}\lambda \leq s(\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - 2u_i^*)) < 0.$$

Therefore, we may assume $\psi \neq 0$. Then, λ satisfies

$$\lambda\psi_i = \psi_i(p_i - u_i^*) + \mu_v \sum_{j=1}^n (a_{ij}\psi_j - a_{ji}\psi_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

i.e. λ is an eigenvalue of $\mu_v A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)$. Since $s(\mu_u A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)) = 0$ and $\mu_u < \mu_v$, $s(\mu_v A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - u_i^*)) < 0$ by Theorems 3.3 or 4.4. Hence, $\operatorname{Re}\lambda < 0$. This implies that $(u^*, 0)$ is locally asymptotically stable. Similarly, we have $s(\mu_v A + \operatorname{diag}(p_i - v_i^*)) > 0$

and $(0, v^*)$ is unstable if it exists. By Lemma 5.6, (5.7) has no positive equilibrium. Therefore, the results follow from the theory of strictly monotone dynamical systems [29, 31, 35, 42]. \square

Remark 5.9. 1. For the reaction-diffusion Lotka-Volterra competition model, it was shown in [16] that the species with slower diffusion rate out-competes the one with faster diffusion rate, when the two species are identical except for the diffusion rates. Theorem 5.8 is an analogous result for the patch model.

2. When $p = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ is a multiple of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$, the nonexistence of positive equilibria in Lemma 5.6 no longer holds. Indeed it is easy to see that for any $s \in [0, 1]$, $((1-s)p, sp)$ is a nonnegative equilibrium of (5.7). The fact that (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) is a multiple of $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)$ implies that the movement strategy defined by $A = (a_{ij})$ is an ideal free dispersal strategy with respect to (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) , and in (5.7), both species have ideal free dispersal strategies with respect to (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n) , hence coexistence can be achieved (see [9]). Theorem 5.8 shows that when neither species takes the ideal free strategy, the slower disperser will prevail.

5.4 SIS epidemic model

Finally, we consider an SIS (susceptible-infected-susceptible) epidemic model in a heterogeneous environment. Let $S_j(t)$ and $I_j(t)$ denote the number of the susceptible and infected individuals in patch j and at time t , respectively. The epidemic patch model proposed by [1] is the following:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dS_j}{dt} = \mu_S \sum_{k \in \Omega} (a_{jk} S_k - a_{kj} S_j) - \frac{\beta_j S_j I_j}{S_j + I_j} + \gamma_j I_j, & j \in \Omega, \\ \frac{dI_j}{dt} = \mu_I \sum_{k \in \Omega} (a_{jk} I_k - a_{kj} I_j) + \frac{\beta_j S_j I_j}{S_j + I_j} - \gamma_j I_j, & j \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

where $\Omega = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $n \geq 2$; $\mu_S, \mu_I > 0$ are the dispersal rates of the susceptible and infected populations, respectively; $\beta_j \geq 0$ denotes the rate of disease transmission in patch j , and $\gamma_j > 0$ represents the rate of disease recovery in patch j ; and A is the

same as in Section 5.3. Summing up all the equations in (5.10), one observes that the total population remain constant:

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (S_j(t) + I_j(t)) = N, \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0, \quad (5.11)$$

where N is the total population.

A major assumption in [1] is that the movement rates from patch j to i and from patch i to j are the same, i.e. $a_{ji} = a_{ij}$ for all $i \neq j$. Here we do not impose this assumption. The detailed discussion of model (5.10)-(5.11) with asymmetric A will be in a forthcoming paper [11]. Here, we will briefly discuss the application of Theorems 3.3 and 4.4 to this model.

Model (5.10)-(5.11) has a unique disease free equilibrium (i.e. the disease component is zero) $(\hat{S}, 0)$ with $\hat{S} = \alpha N$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_i)$ is the unique positive eigenvector of A satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$ corresponding with principal eigenvalue 0. The basic reproduction number R_0 , a threshold value for the model, is computed by the standardized process in [15, 44]. Specifically, the new infection and transition matrices are respectively given by

$$F = \text{diag}(\beta_j), \quad V = \mu_I A - \text{diag}(\gamma_j), \quad (5.12)$$

where $V + F$ can be obtained by linearizing the model (5.10)-(5.11) around $(\hat{S}, 0)$. Since V is strictly diagonally dominant, $-V$ is a non-singular M -matrix with $-V^{-1}$ being nonnegative. Therefore, the basic reproduction number

$$R_0 = r(-FV^{-1})$$

is well-defined, which is the principal eigenvalue of $-FV^{-1}$ by the Perron-Frobenius theorem. Moreover, if we assume $\beta_j > 0$ for all j , then $VF^{-1} = \mu_I AF^{-1} - Q$ with $Q = \text{diag}(\gamma_j/\beta_j)$. Since AF^{-1} is quasi-positive and has each column summing up to zero, it follows from Theorem 3.3 or Theorem 4.4 that $s(VF^{-1}) = s(\mu_I AF^{-1} - Q)$ is strictly decreasing in μ_I provided that Q is not a multiple of I . Therefore, we have the following result:

Theorem 5.10. *Suppose that $\beta_j, \gamma_j > 0$ for all j and A is an irreducible quasi-positive matrix. Then, the following statements hold:*

(i) $R_0 - 1$ has the same sign as $s(V + F) = s(\mu_I A + \text{diag}(\beta_j - \gamma_j))$; if $R_0 < 1$, then the disease-free equilibrium $(\hat{S}, 0)$ of (5.10)-(5.11) is locally asymptotically stable.

(ii) R_0 is strictly decreasing in μ_I with

$$\lim_{\mu_I \rightarrow 0} R_0 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left\{ \frac{\beta_j}{\gamma_j} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\mu_I \rightarrow \infty} R_0 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \beta_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \gamma_j},$$

provided that (β_j) is not a multiple of (γ_j) .

Proof. (i) follows directly from the definition of R_0 and [15, 44]. Since $s(VF^{-1}) = s(\mu_I AF^{-1} - Q)$ is strictly decreasing in μ_I , $s(-FV^{-1})$ is strictly decreasing in μ_I if Q is not a multiple of I . Therefore, $R_0 = r(-FV^{-1}) = s(-FV^{-1})$ is strictly decreasing in μ_I if (β_j) is not a multiple of (γ_j) . The limit of R_0 as $\mu_I \rightarrow 0$ is obvious. To see the limit of R_0 as $\mu_I \rightarrow \infty$, we notice that $F\alpha = (\alpha_1\beta_1, \alpha_2\beta_2, \dots, \alpha_n\beta_n)$ is a principal eigenvector of AF^{-1} , which can be normalized as $(\alpha_1\beta_1, \alpha_2\beta_2, \dots, \alpha_n\beta_n) / \sum_j \alpha_j \beta_j$. Since F^{-1} has each column sum equaling zero, it follows from Theorem 4.4 that

$$\lim_{\mu_I \rightarrow 0} s(\mu_I AF^{-1} - Q) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \gamma_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \beta_j}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\lim_{\mu_I \rightarrow \infty} R_0 = -\frac{1}{\lim_{\mu_I \rightarrow 0} s(\mu_I AF^{-1} - Q)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \beta_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \gamma_j}. \quad \square$$

Remark 5.11. In Theorem 5.10, we have assumed that β_j is positive for all j , which is not necessary. However, if we drop this assumption, the proof will be more technical. We will leave this to the forthcoming paper [11].

The monotonicity of R_0 with respect to μ_I has been addressed as an open problem in [1]. During the preparation of our current paper, we learned that this problem was independently solved in [22, 23]. The proof of monotonicity of R_0 with respect to μ_I in [23] uses Karlin’s Theorem as well.

Appendix: Notation from graph theory and Tree-Cycle identity

Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be a nonnegative $n \times n$ matrix. A *weighted digraph* $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_A$ associated with A can be constructed as follows: $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ is a pair of two sets, a set $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ of vertices and a set E of arcs (i, j) with weight a_{ij} leading from initial vertex j to terminal vertex i . Specifically, $(i, j) \in E(\mathcal{G})$ if and only if $a_{ij} > 0$.

A digraph is *strongly connected* if, for any ordered pair of distinct vertices i, j , there exists a directed path from i to j . A weighted digraph \mathcal{G}_A is strongly connected if and only if the weight matrix A is irreducible [7].

A subdigraph \mathcal{H} of \mathcal{G} is *spanning* if \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{G} have the same vertex set. The *weight* of a subdigraph \mathcal{H} is the product of the weights of all its arcs. A connected subdigraph \mathcal{T} of \mathcal{G} is a *rooted in-tree* if it contains no directed cycle, and there is one vertex, called the root, that is not an initial vertex of any arcs while each of the remaining vertices is an initial vertex of exactly one arc. A subdigraph \mathcal{Q} of \mathcal{G} is *unicyclic* if it is a disjoint union of rooted in-trees whose roots form a directed cycle. Every vertex of unicyclic \mathcal{Q} is an initial vertex of exactly one arc, and thus a unicyclic graph has also been called a functional digraph [27, page 201].

Notice that our definitions of rooted in-trees and unicyclic graphs (functional digraphs) above are different as those in [37]. Specifically, rooted out-trees and contra-function digraphs (a disjoint union of rooted out-trees whose roots form a directed cycle) are considered in [37], respectively. As a consequence, a slightly different version of Tree-Cycle identity, in analog to Theorem 2.2 in [37], can be established using Kirchhoff’s Matrix-Tree Theorem [40].

Theorem A.1 (Tree-Cycle identity). *Let \mathcal{G}_A be a strongly connected weighted digraph. Let $L = (\ell_{ij})$ be the Laplacian matrix of \mathcal{G}_A ; that is, $\ell_{ij} = -a_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$ and $\ell_{ii} =$*

$\sum_{k \neq i} a_{ki}$. Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be a positive, normalized principal right eigenvector of L . Then the following identity holds:

$$\sum_{i,j=1} \alpha_i a_{ji} F_{ji}(x_j, x_i) = \sum_{\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{Q}} w(\mathcal{Q}) \sum_{(s,r) \in E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})} F_{sr}(x_s, x_r),$$

where \mathbb{Q} is the set of all spanning unicycle graphs of (\mathcal{G}, A) , $w(\mathcal{Q}) > 0$ is the weight of \mathcal{Q} , and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}}$ denotes the directed cycle of \mathcal{Q} with arc set $E(\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{Q}})$.

Since \mathcal{G}_A is strongly connected, equivalently, A is irreducible, 0 is a simple eigenvalue of L . Let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n)^T$ be a positive, normalized principal right eigenvector of L . It follows from Kirchhoff's Matrix-Tree Theorem that $\alpha_i = \frac{C_{ii}}{\sum_{k=1}^n C_{kk}}$. Here C_{ii} is the cofactor of the i -th diagonal entry of L and can also be interpreted as $C_{ii} = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathbb{T}_i} w(\mathcal{T})$ where \mathbb{T}_i is the set of all spanning in-trees rooted at i . Therefore, each term in the product $\alpha_i a_{ji}$ corresponds to a unicyclic graph that is formed by adding arc (j, i) from i to j to a spanning in-tree rooted at i . So, the same argument as in the proof of [37, Theorem 2.2] can be applied to establish Theorem A.1, and thus is omitted.

References

- [1] L. J. S. Allen, B. M. Bolker, Y. Lou, and A. L. Nevai. Asymptotic profiles of the steady states for an *SIS* epidemic patch model. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 67(5):1283–1309, 2007.
- [2] L. Altenberg. Karlin theory on growth and mixing extended to linear differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1006.3147*, 2010.
- [3] L. Altenberg. Resolvent positive linear operators exhibit the reduction phenomenon. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 109(10):3705–3710, 2012.
- [4] L. Altenberg, U. Liberman, and M. W. Feldman. Unified reduction principle for the evolution of mutation, migration, and recombination. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 114(12):E2392–E2400, 2017.

- [5] J. Arino. Diseases in metapopulations. In *Modeling and dynamics of infectious diseases*, volume 11 of *Ser. Contemp. Appl. Math. CAM*, pages 64–122. Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2009.
- [6] J. Arino and P. van den Driessche. Disease spread in metapopulations. In *Nonlinear dynamics and evolution equations*, volume 48 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 1–12. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [7] A. Berman and R. J. Plemmons. *Nonnegative matrices in the mathematical sciences*, volume 9 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1994.
- [8] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, D. L. Deangelis, and V. Padron. The ideal free distribution as an evolutionarily stable strategy. *J. Biol. Dyn.*, 1(3):249–271, 2007.
- [9] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, and Y. Lou. Evolutionary stability of ideal free dispersal strategies in patchy environments. *J. Math. Biol.*, 65(5):943–965, 2012.
- [10] R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, Y. Lou, and S. J. Schreiber. Evolution of natal dispersal in spatially heterogenous environments. *Math. Biosci.*, 283:136–144, 2017.
- [11] S.-S. Chen, J.-P. Shi, Z. Shuai, and Y.-X. Wu. Asymptotic profiles of the steady states for an SIS epidemic patch model with asymmetric connectivity matrix. Submitted.
- [12] J. E. Cohen. Convexity of the dominant eigenvalue of an essentially nonnegative matrix. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 81(4):657–658, 1981.
- [13] C. Cosner. Variability, vagueness and comparison methods for ecological models. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, 58(2):207–246, 1996.
- [14] T. Dhirasakdanon, H. R. Thieme, and P. Van Den Driessche. A sharp threshold for disease persistence in host metapopulations. *J. Biol. Dyn.*, 1(4):363–378, 2007.

- [15] O. Diekmann, J. A. P. Heesterbeek, and J. A. J. Metz. On the definition and the computation of the basic reproduction ratio R_0 in models for infectious diseases in heterogeneous populations. *J. Math. Biol.*, 28(4):365–382, 1990.
- [16] J. Dockery, V. Hutson, K. Mischaikow, and M. Pernarowski. The evolution of slow dispersal rates: a reaction diffusion model. *J. Math. Biol.*, 37(1):61–83, 1998.
- [17] M. D. Donsker and S. R. S. Varadhan. On a variational formula for the principal eigenvalue for operators with maximum principle. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 72:780–783, 1975.
- [18] P. Du and M. Y. Li. Impact of network connectivity on the synchronization and global dynamics of coupled systems of differential equations. *Phys. D*, 286/287:32–42, 2014.
- [19] M. W. Feldman, F. B. Christiansen, and L. D. Brooks. Evolution of recombination in a constant environment. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 77(8, part 2):4838–4841, 1980.
- [20] H. I. Freedman and Y. Takeuchi. Global stability and predator dynamics in a model of prey dispersal in a patchy environment. *Nonlinear Anal.*, 13(8):993–1002, 1989.
- [21] S. Friedland. Convex spectral functions. *Linear and Multilinear Algebra*, 9(4):299–316, 1980/81.
- [22] D.-Z. Gao. Travel frequency and infectious diseases. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 79(4):1581–1606, 2019.
- [23] D.-Z. Gao and C.-P. Dong. Fast diffusion inhibits disease outbreaks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.12229*.
- [24] D.-Z. Gao and S.-G. Ruan. A multipatch Malaria model with logistic growth populations. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 72(3):819–841, 2012.

- [25] H. Guo, M. Y. Li, and Z. Shuai. Global stability of the endemic equilibrium of multigroup SIR epidemic models. *Can. Appl. Math. Q.*, 14(3):259–284, 2006.
- [26] H. Guo, M. Y. Li, and Z. Shuai. A graph-theoretic approach to the method of global Lyapunov functions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136(8):2793–2802, 2008.
- [27] F. Harary. *Graph Theory*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, 1969.
- [28] A. Hastings. Can spatial variation alone lead to selection for dispersal? *Theoret. Population Biol.*, 24(3):244–251, 1983.
- [29] P. Hess. *Periodic-Parabolic Boundary Value Problems and Positivity*, volume 247 of *Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series*. Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow, 1991.
- [30] M. D. Holland and A. Hastings. Strong effect of dispersal network structure on ecological dynamics. *Nature*, 456(7223):792–795, 2008.
- [31] S. B. Hsu, H. L. Smith, and P. Waltman. Competitive exclusion and coexistence for competitive systems on ordered Banach spaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 348(10):4083–4094, 1996.
- [32] S. Karlin. Classifications of selection-migration structures and conditions for a protected polymorphism. In *Evolutionary Biology*, volume 14, pages 61–204. Plenum Press, New York, 1982.
- [33] T. Kato. Superconvexity of the spectral radius, and convexity of the spectral bound and the type. *Math. Z.*, 180(2):265–273, 1982.
- [34] S. Kirkland, C.-K. Li, and S. J. Schreiber. On the evolution of dispersal in patchy landscapes. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, 66(4):1366–1382, 2006.
- [35] K.-Y. Lam and D. Munther. A remark on the global dynamics of competitive systems on ordered Banach spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 144(3):1153–1159, 2016.

- [36] H.-C. Li and R. Peng. Dynamics and asymptotic profiles of endemic equilibrium for SIS epidemic patch models. *J. Math. Biol.*, 79(4):1279–1317, 2019.
- [37] M. Y. Li and Z. Shuai. Global stability of an epidemic model in a patchy environment. *Can. Appl. Math. Q.*, 17(1):175–187, 2009.
- [38] M. Y. Li and Z. Shuai. Global-stability problem for coupled systems of differential equations on networks. *J. Differential Equations*, 248(1):1–20, 2010.
- [39] Z. Y. Lu and Y. Takeuchi. Global asymptotic behavior in single-species discrete diffusion systems. *J. Math. Biol.*, 32(1):67–77, 1993.
- [40] J. W. Moon. *Counting Labelled Trees*. Canadian Mathematical Congress, Montreal, 1970.
- [41] S. J. Schreiber and J. O. Lloyd-Smith. Invasion dynamics in spatially heterogeneous environments. *The American Naturalist*, 174(4):490–505, 2009.
- [42] H. L. Smith. *Monotone Dynamical Systems: An Introduction to the Theory of Competitive and Cooperative Systems*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [43] H. R. Thieme. Convergence results and a Poincaré-Bendixson trichotomy for asymptotically autonomous differential equations. *J. Math. Biol.*, 30(7):755–763, 1992.
- [44] P. van den Driessche and J. Watmough. Reproduction numbers and sub-threshold endemic equilibria for compartmental models of disease transmission. *Math. Biosci.*, 180:29–48, 2002.
- [45] W.-D. Wang and X.-Q. Zhao. An epidemic model in a patchy environment. *Math. Biosci.*, 190(1):97–112, 2004.
- [46] X.-Q. Zhao. *Dynamical Systems in Population Biology*, volume 16 of *CMS Books in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.