

Demographic fluctuations in a population of anomalously diffusing individuals

Piero Olla

ISAC-CNR and INFN, Sez. Cagliari, I-09042 Monserrato, Italy.

(Dated: October 17, 2018)

The phenomenon of spatial clustering induced by death and reproduction in a population of anomalously diffusing individuals is studied analytically. The possibility of social behaviors affecting the migration strategies has been taken into exam, in the case anomalous diffusion is produced by means of a continuous time random walk (CTRW). In the case of independently diffusing individuals, the dynamics appears to coincide with that of (dying and reproducing) Brownian walkers. In the strongly social case, the dynamics coincides with that of non-migrating individuals. In both limits, the growth rate of the fluctuations becomes independent of the Hurst exponent of the CTRW. The social behaviors that arise when transport in a population is induced by a spatial distribution of random traps, have been analyzed.

PACS numbers: 02.50.Ey,05.40.Fb,87.23.Cc,

I. INTRODUCTION

A population of Brownian walkers in the presence of processes of birth and death, is known to undergo phenomena of spatial clustering [1, 2]. It was argued that this effect could contribute in important way to the spatial inhomogeneity of the plankton distribution in the ocean [3], and could have application in the modeling of algal blooms.

The mechanism is of quite general nature, and can be seen as a simple “bosonic” realization of directed percolation [4]. There are several situations, however, in which normal diffusion is not an appropriate description of individual migration. In the case of plankton, for example, the presence of long lived vortices may lead to trapping phenomena and to the possibility of subdiffusive behaviors [5]. Similar coupling of birth-death processes and subdiffusion are expected to occur in the spreading of radioactive substances in geologic structures [6]. On the other hand, the migration strategies of living organisms, over a large range of scales, is often associated with long jumps [7, 8], and this may lead to superdiffusion [9]. Again, the generalization from Brownian to anomalously diffusing agents has a close counterpart in the anomalous directed percolation studied in [10], in which jumps are modeled by Lévy flights.

It should be stressed that modelling transport in a random environment as a diffusive process, even in the absence of demography, is a non trivial problem (see e.g. [11, 12]). The correlations induced by the spatial structure of the environment are clearly lost if the individuals are treated as independent random walkers. In the case of living organisms, these correlations could be seen as a form of social behavior, and this leads naturally to the question of what is the impact of social behaviors, in the broad sense, on transport.

We have considered a situation in which each individual, upon arrival at a certain location, fixes the time of next jump not only for itself, but also for all of its descendants, and have shown that this leads to clustering phenomena analogous to those in a random environment.

What we have found is that correlated behaviors analogous to those induced by the spatial structure of the environment could be generated through inheritance, without the need to invoke any additional spatial interaction among individuals. This similarity between correlated behaviors is lost instead if an “antisocial” condition is considered, in which each individual migrates independently, following an internal clock.

There is therefore a prescription problem in the way newly generated individuals are made to jump, that is absent in the normal diffusion case. It is important to notice that this implies differences in the transport properties of the population, that show up already at the level of one-individual statistics. We mention that similar prescription problems were observed in [13], which dealt with a reaction – anomalous diffusion system, with reaction of coagulation type: $A + A \rightarrow A$.

We shall consider a simple, spatially homogeneous population model, with Markovian births and deaths, and a migration dynamics of CTRW type [9, 14]. Following [3], we shall refer to the individuals in the simplified population model as “bugs”. A single offspring will be assumed in each birth event, with equal birth and death rates Γ for stationarity. Both superdiffusive and subdiffusive regimes will be considered, although, as it will soon appear, the degree of sociality of the bugs affects the long-time population dynamics much more than the regime of anomalous diffusion.

II. THE MODEL

We briefly recall here the main properties of the CTRW model (more details in Appendix A).

The model is a generalization of the random walk, in which the walker migrates through a sequence of independent jumps, separated by randomly chosen waiting times. The joint PDF (probability density function) for the jump length x and waiting time t can be taken in the

following form, in one dimension ($D = 1$):

$$\psi(x, t) \sim \frac{\Delta t^\mu}{t^{1+\mu} \Delta x(t)} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2(\Delta x(t))^2}\right), \quad (1)$$

where $0 < \mu < 1$ and $\Delta t \ll t$ fixes a microscale for the problem. In the absence of birth and death processes, both subdiffusive and superdiffusive behaviors may be generated, setting appropriately the jump length $\Delta x(t)$ [9]. Focusing on the case of a power-law dependence of the typical jump length on the waiting time:

$$\Delta x(t) \simeq \Delta x(0)(t/\Delta t)^{\nu/2}, \quad t \gg \Delta t, \quad (2)$$

we have basically the following possibilities, provided we set $t \gg \Delta t$ and again neglect the effect of deaths [9, 11]:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu \leq \mu &\Rightarrow \langle |x(t) - x(0)|^2 \rangle \sim \kappa_\mu t^\mu, \\ \mu < \nu &\Rightarrow \langle |x(t) - x(0)|^2 \rangle \sim \kappa_\nu t^\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where we have introduced the generalized diffusivity $\kappa_\alpha = [\Delta x(0)]^2/\Delta t^\alpha$. We see that subdiffusion and superdiffusion are obtained respectively for $\nu < 1$ and $\nu > 1$. However, as described in detail in Appendix A, the presence of demography prevents the long-time asymptotics described in Eq. (3) to be ever reached. Thus, the long-time evolution of a population that was concentrated initially at a single spot, is described, in the presence of demography, by a normal diffusion process.

Of course, with or without demography, normal diffusion can be equally generated by choosing a waiting time PDF that is not fat-tailed.

We shall study the CTRW model with births and deaths, given an initial condition at time $t = 0$, in which the bugs are uniformly distributed in the domain: $\rho_1(x, 0) = n_0$, where ρ_1 is the bug density. As the parameters in Eq. (1) are chosen independent of the coordinate, the density will remain uniform also for $t > 0$; in particular, imposing equality of the death and birth rates: $\rho_1(x, t) = \rho_1(x, 0) = n_0$. Demography however, through fluctuations, induces a secular component in the higher order correlations, that is a manifestation of clustering.

To study the phenomenon, following [15], we will consider the two-bug density

$$\rho_2(x_{1,2}, t_{1,2}) \equiv \rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = n_0^2 + \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \quad (4)$$

and we shall derive evolution equations for the connected component $\rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ in the two opposite regimes of antisocial and inheritance governed, strongly social bugs. Notice that, contrary to [15], in which it was sufficient to consider the evolution of the one-time PDF $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}; t, t)$, the non-Markovian nature of the CTRW will force us to study the full two-time statistical problem.

III. THE ANTISOCIAL CASE

In this case, the jump PDF is reinitialized at each birth event. The dynamics is that of reactions in the presence of anomalous diffusion, that has been extensively




FIG. 1: Contribution to the 1- and two-bug densities by different classes of family trees. Vertical lines ending with the small circle indicate a factor $\hat{\Phi}$. Letters A, B, and D indicate arrival, birth and death events. A line with a kink ending in A indicates the sequence of a waiting time and a jump, and is associated with a factor $\hat{\psi}$, as indicated in Eq. (12). A birth event is associated with a factor Γ .

studied in the mean field regime (see e.g. [16] and references therein). Extension to two-bug statistics requires derivation of an evolution equation for the two-bug density $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \equiv \rho_2(x_{1,2}, t_{1,2})$:

$$\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \eta_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\Phi}(\tau_1) \hat{\Phi}(\tau_2), \quad (5)$$

where $\eta_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau})$ is essentially the rate of formation (birth plus arrival) of bug pairs in $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau})$ and the $\hat{\Phi}(\tau_{1,2})$ are the probabilities that the bugs arriving or born in $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau})$ survive without jumping until $t_{1,2}$. Since $e^{-\Gamma t}$ is the survival probability in a time t , $\Phi(t) = \hat{\Phi}(t)e^{\Gamma t}$ is the no-jump probability; from Eq. (1):

$$\Phi(t) = \int_t^\infty d\tau \int dx \psi(x, \tau) \sim (\Delta t/t)^\mu. \quad (6)$$

Equation (5) is the generalization of similar equations connecting the one-bug density ρ_1 and arrival/birth rate η_1 derived in [9] and [16] (see Appendix A).

The bug density $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ can be represented as a sum of contributions by family trees, of the kind illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2. The small circles on top of the graphs identify the argument of the density function (the one-bug density ρ_1 in the first line of Fig. 1 and ρ_2 in the second) and the vertical lines ending in the small circles identify the factors $\hat{\Phi}$. The part of the graphs that is obtained chopping out these top lines accounts therefore for the rates $\eta_{1,2}$.

Clustering is accounted for by the connected part of ρ_2 . The family trees responsible for this contribution are those summing to case (b) in Fig. 2. In this picture, graphs (c) and (d) in Fig. 2 appear to play an important role. It turns out that they act as a discrete source in Eq. (5), which we will see is associated with the fact that any




FIG. 2: Family trees contributing to the two-bug density $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$; (a): disconnected part; (b): connected part ρ_{2c} ; (c) and (d) [in (d) we have $t_2 > \tau'_2 > t_1$]: family trees acting as discrete source for ρ_{2c} . Notice that chopping down branches in (b), we end up with family trees in either form (c) or (d).

family tree in case (b) of Fig. 2 can be obtained adding or extending branches in a family tree in (c) or (d).

The discrete nature of graph (c) can be understood, based on the direct parenthood relation implied between bugs 1 and 2, which is an intrinsically discrete property [in case (d), this direct relation exists only when $t_1 = t_2$]. These considerations prompt us to separate from the start discrete and continuous contributions $\eta_2 = \eta_2^{disc} + \eta_2^{cont}$, with η_2^{disc} accounting for graphs (c) and (d) in Fig. 2, and to rewrite the corresponding contribution in Eq. (5) as a source term:

$$s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \eta_2^{disc}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\Phi}(\tau_1) \hat{\Phi}(\tau_2). \quad (7)$$

Let us evaluate explicitly this component. Let us start by evaluating the increment ΔN_V^c that the family trees represented in case c of Fig. 2, produce on $N_V = \int_V dx_2 \rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$, with V some interval containing x_1 . The width L_V of the interval V will play the role of a coarse graining length for ρ_2 .

To obtain ΔN_V^c , we must calculate the product of the number of bugs generated in (x_1, τ_1) , surviving without jumps to t_1 , and the number of bugs originated after τ_1 from the parent bug (PB) (plus the PB itself, if still alive) that are counted in V . The number of bugs generated by each PB in $(\tau_1, \tau_1 + d\tau_1)$, that survive at x_1 without jumps till t_1 , is $\Gamma d\tau_1 \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1)$. Let us indicate with $G_V(t_2, \tau_1, \tau)$ the number of bugs originating from this same PB after τ_1 (again, including the PB itself, if still alive), that are counted in V at time t_2 (τ indicates the time of birth or arrival at x_1 of the PB). Taking into account the rate $\eta_1(x_1, \tau)$ of birth and arrival of bugs in (x_1, τ) and the probability $\hat{\Phi}(\tau_1 - \tau)$ of their being available for parenthood in (x_1, τ_1) , we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta N_V^c &= \Gamma \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau \eta_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \\ &\times \hat{\Phi}(\tau_1 - \tau) G_V(t_2, \tau_1, \tau). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Now, for L_V large enough, all the descendants of the PB will remain in V , and, provided the birth and

death rates are equal: $G_V(t_2, \tau_1, \tau) \rightarrow 1$. This causes the two integrals in Eq. (8) to decouple. We have $\int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau \eta_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{\Phi}(\tau_1 - \tau) = \rho_1(x_1, \tau_1) = n_0$, the uniform one-bug density [this is just the evolution equation for the one-bug density; see Eq. (A1)]. From here we get the expression:

$$\Delta N_V^c(\mathbf{t}) = n_0 \Gamma \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1).$$

We proceed in identical way to calculate the contribution ΔN_V^d from graphs (d) in Fig. 2. An analogous calculation leads to the result

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta N_V^d &= \Gamma \int_0^{t_1} d\tau'_2 \int_0^{\tau'_2} d\tau \eta_1(x_1, \tau) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau'_2) \\ &\times \hat{\Phi}(\tau'_2 - \tau) G_V(t_2, t_1, \tau'_2). \\ &= n_0 \Gamma \int_0^{t_1} d\tau'_2 \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau'_2). \end{aligned}$$

From here we obtain for $\Delta N_V = \Delta N_V^c + \Delta N_V^d$, using Eq. (6):

$$\Delta N_V(\mathbf{t}) = 2n_0 \Gamma \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \sim n_0 (\Gamma \Delta t)^\mu. \quad (9)$$

We see that most bugs contributing in (x_1, t_1) to $\Delta N_V(\mathbf{t})$ are born in an interval of width Δt before t_1 . Thus, for $t_2 - t_1 \gg \Delta t$, the bugs in V will have dispersed (dying and reproducing) for a time $\simeq t_2 - t_1$, and for Eq. (9) to hold, we need $L_V \gg X(t_2 - t_1)$ where $X(t)$ is the typical separation at time t of bugs originating from a common ancestor at time zero. We thus see that, if we are interested in time scales $t_2 - t_1 \gg \Delta t$, and we are able to coarse grain ρ_2 at a scale $L_V \gg X(t_2 - t_1)$, we can write for the source in Eq. (7):

$$s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \sim n_0 (\Gamma \Delta t)^\mu \delta(x_1 - x_2). \quad (10)$$

Let us pass to analysis of η_2^{cont} , that can be decomposed into contributions from births (B) and arrivals (A):

$$\eta_2^{cont} = \eta_2^{AA} + \eta_2^{AB} + \eta_2^{BA} + \eta_2^{BB}, \quad (11)$$

with $\eta_2^{AB}(x_1, t_1; x_2, t_2) = \eta_2^{BA}(x_2, t_2; x_1, t_1)$. The components η_2^{AA}, \dots obey equations that are generalizations of those for one-bug [9, 16] (see Appendix A). It is convenient to isolate from the start the connected contributions to η_2^{AA}, η_2^{AB} and η_2^{BA} , meaning that the contribution from the initial condition $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, 0)$ is disregarded (contribution by graph a in Fig. 2). This leads to the result:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{2c}^{AA}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \eta_{2c}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &\times \hat{\psi}(y_1, \tau_1) \hat{\psi}(y_2, \tau_2), \\ \eta_{2c}^{AB}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= n_0 \Gamma \int_0^t d\tau \int dy \eta_{1c}(x_1 - y, t_1 - \tau | x_2 t_2) \\ &\times \hat{\psi}(y, \tau), \\ \eta_{2c}^{BB}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \Gamma^2 \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{\psi}(x, t) = \psi(x, t)e^{-\Gamma t}$ is the PDF that the bug makes a jump of length x at time t after birth or after a previous jump, and that therefore it did not die in the meanwhile. One more equation is needed for $\eta_{1c}(xt|x't')$, that is the rate of birth and arrival of bugs at (x, t) given presence of a bug at (x', t') . This is the equation for the conditional density $\rho_{1c}(x_1 t_1 | x_2 t_2) = n_0^{-1} \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$:

$$\rho_{1c}(x_1 t_1 | x_2 t_2) = \int_0^{t_1} d\tau \eta_{1c}(x_1 \tau | x_2 t_2) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau). \quad (13)$$

The integral equations (12) have a graphical interpretations as operations of adding (through birth) or extending (through jumps) branches in the family trees of Figs. 1-2. For instance, the contribution $\eta_{2c}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\psi}(y_1 \tau_1) \hat{\psi}(y_2, \tau_2) d^2 \tau d^2 y$ to $\eta_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ can be seen as the operation of extending a branch from $(x_1 - y_1, t_1 - \tau_1)$ to (x_1, t_1) , and another one from $(x_2 - y_2, t_2 - \tau_2)$ to (x_2, t_2) in the family trees contributing to $\eta_{2c}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau})$. This substantiates the role of graphs (c) and (d) in Fig. 2 as source for ρ_2 through Eqs. (5) and (12) [notice that η_2^{disc} still contributes in the RHS of the first and second of Eq. (12)].

A. Dependence on the kind of diffusion

The system of equations (5,11-13) can be solved by Fourier-Laplace transform: $f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \rightarrow f_{k\mathbf{z}}$. Defining $\rho_{2c k\mathbf{z}} = 2\pi\delta(k_1 + k_2) C_{k_1 \mathbf{z}}$ and $s_{k\mathbf{z}} = 2\pi\delta(k_1 + k_2) \sigma_{k_1 \mathbf{z}}$, and indicating $\hat{z}_{1,2} = \Gamma + z_{1,2}$, the result is, after little algebra (see Appendix B):

$$\{1 - \psi_{k\hat{z}_1} \psi_{k\hat{z}_2} - \Gamma[\psi_{k\hat{z}_1} \Phi_{\hat{z}_2} + \psi_{k\hat{z}_2} \Phi_{\hat{z}_1}] + \Gamma^2 \Phi_{\hat{z}_1} \Phi_{\hat{z}_2}\} C_{k\mathbf{z}} = \sigma_{k\mathbf{z}}. \quad (14)$$

We are going to consider separately the parameter ranges in Eq. (3) that would lead, in the absence of demography, to sub and super diffusion (the case of normal diffusion is going to be discussed in Appendix C). We thus consider $\mu < 1, \nu = 0$ for subdiffusion, and $\mu < 1, \nu > 1$ for superdiffusion. Fourier-Laplace transforming Eq. (1) in the limit $k, z_{1,2} \rightarrow 0$, we obtain the result, in the two cases:

$$\psi_{kz} = 1 - (\Delta\tilde{t}z)^\mu - (z\Delta\tilde{t})^{\mu-\alpha} (\Delta\tilde{x}k)^2/2, \quad (15)$$

where $\alpha = \mu, \nu$, respectively, in the subdiffusive and superdiffusive case, and we have reabsorbed in the two parameters $\Delta\tilde{t} \sim \Delta t$, $\Delta\tilde{x} \sim \Delta x(0)$ any numerical coefficient arising in the Fourier-Laplace transform. In the same way, we obtain from Eq. (6) the expression for Φ_z valid in the two cases:

$$\Phi_z = \Delta\tilde{t}^\mu z^{\mu-1}. \quad (16)$$

If we are interested in evaluating $\rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ at separations $t_2 - t_1 \gg \Delta t$ and $x_2 - x_1 \gg X(t_2 - t_1)$, we can use Eq. (10) to evaluate the source: $\sigma_{k\mathbf{z}} \sim n_0(\Gamma\Delta t)^\mu/(z_1 z_2)$; in

the long-time regime $\Gamma t_{1,2} \gg 1$, we can Taylor expand in $z_{1,2}$, and Eq. (14) becomes in both superdiffusive and subdiffusive cases:

$$C_{k\mathbf{z}} \sim [(\bar{z} + \bar{\kappa}k^2)z_1 z_2]^{-1} n_0 \Gamma, \quad (17)$$

where $\bar{z} = z_1 + z_2$ and $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_\alpha \Gamma^{1-\alpha}$, (again, $\alpha = \mu, \nu$ in the subdiffusive and superdiffusive case).

The reason why both subdiffusive and superdiffusive regimes lead to the same Eq. (17) is that in the limit $\Gamma z_{1,2} \rightarrow 0$, we can expand $\Phi_{\hat{z}_{1,2}} \simeq \Phi_\Gamma + \Phi'_\Gamma z_{1,2}$, and similarly for $\psi_{k\hat{z}_{1,2}}$. In other words, the condition $\Gamma z_{1,2} \ll 1$ destroys any anomalous scaling with respect to $z_{1,2}$ in $\Phi_{\hat{z}_{1,2}}$ and $\psi_{k\hat{z}_{1,2}}$, and therefore also in $C_{k\mathbf{z}}$. This has the counterpart in the original variables (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) in the observation that for $\Gamma t_{1,2} \gg 1$, the dominant factor in the individual bug dynamics is its own death, which prevents the long waiting times responsible for anomalous scaling in Eq. (3) to be ever reached (see Appendix A).

Inverse Fourier-Laplace transform of Eq. (17) leads to the final result for $C(x, \mathbf{t}) \equiv \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})|_{x_2 - x_1 = x}$:

$$C(x, \mathbf{t}) \sim n_0 X_\Gamma^{-1} (\Gamma \bar{t})^{1/2} f(x^2/(\bar{\kappa} \bar{t})), \quad (18)$$

where $\bar{t} = (t_1 + t_2)/2$, $X_\Gamma^2 = \bar{\kappa} \Gamma^{-1} \sim (X(\Gamma^{-1}))^2$ is the square of the typical bug displacement in a lifetime, and $f(x)$ is a function equal to one at $x = 0$ and decaying rapidly to zero at $|x| > 1$. The scaling in f shows that for $|t_2 - t_1| \ll \bar{t}$ it is possible to set $L_V \gg X(|t_2 - t_1|)$ and still have L_V much smaller than the spatial scale of variation of C at time \bar{t} . By continuity, this allows us to evaluate $C(x, \mathbf{t})$ at $x = 0, t_1 = t_2$, where the derivation leading to Eq. (10) and then to (18) would not apply.

We notice the physical meaning of the parameter $\bar{\kappa}$, that is the only place in which memory of the initial scaling exponents of the process is preserved. This is the effective diffusivity for the bugs in the presence of demography. Equation (18) is basically telling us that for $\Gamma \bar{t} \gg 1$, the bugs behave as if they were simple Brownian walkers, which execute at intervals Γ^{-1} steps of order X_Γ .

The scaling in Eq. (18) is the same as obtained in [15], in the case of individuals undergoing normal diffusion (Brownian bugs). As illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4, this result is confirmed by numerical simulations. The similarity with the results in [15] extends to $D > 1$. Multiplying the right hand side (RHS) of Eq. (17) by k^{D-1} and then inverse Fourier-Laplace transforming, we confirm in fact the result in [15], of logarithmic divergence of $C(x, \mathbf{t})$ for $\bar{t} \rightarrow \infty$ for $D = 2$ and no divergence for $D = 3$.

IV. THE SOCIAL CASE

The analysis carried on so far illustrates the importance of initialization upon birth of the jumping PDF. One expects that anomalous behaviors may occur if a




FIG. 3: Result of numerical simulations in $D = 1$ for $\mu = 1/2$, $\nu = 0$ (without demography, this would correspond to a subdiffusive regime). Main graph: (a) plot of $\tilde{C} = \Gamma^{-(1+\mu)/2}C$ vs. $\tilde{t} = t/\Delta t$ in the antisocial case and fit by $\tilde{t}^{1/2}$; (s) plot of $\tilde{C} = \Gamma^{-1}C$ vs. $\tilde{t} = t/\Delta t$; in the social case; (d) plot of $\tilde{C} = \Gamma^{-1}C$ vs. $\tilde{t} = t/\Delta t$; in the case of transport by a random field with correlation length $l_c = \Delta x/10$. The fit of (s) and (d) is provided by \tilde{t} . In all three cases (a), (s) and (d), dotted, heavy and thin lines correspond respectively to $\Gamma\Delta t = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1$. Insert: plot of the correlation length λ (units Δx) of \tilde{C} in the antisocial case and fit by $\lambda \propto \tilde{t}^{1/2}$. In all cases: total population $N_0 = 2 \times 10^5$; domain size $L = 2 \times 10^4 \Delta x$. In case (d) we have put $\epsilon = 10$ [see Eq. (31)].




FIG. 4: Same as Fig. 3 in the case $\mu = 1/2$, $\nu = 3/2$ (without demography, this would correspond to a superdiffusive regime).

less strong form of reinitialization for ψ is adopted. However, it turns out that also imposing an excessive social constraint could result in anomalous scaling break-up.

We consider a situation in which the time of first jump for a bug is determined by the ancestor that initiated the colony to which the bug belongs. All the bugs in that colony (and, if still alive, the ancestor itself) will jump therefore at the same time, independently. It is interesting to notice that this social regime is indistinguishable, at the one-bug level, from what would be obtained in the absence of demography. The reason for this is that the number of individuals in a colony – if the birth and death rates are equal – will remain equal to one on the aver-

age. The dispersal of the bugs, when their jump time arrives, will produce therefore the same result, essentially, as what would be obtained from considering different realizations of the initial bug in the absence of births and deaths. (The same result would obviously be obtained considering the still tighter constrain that all the bugs jump together as a single entity).

This situation leads to a strongly simplified population dynamics at the two-bug level, as compared to the antisocial case. We can write in fact, setting $t_2 > t_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \eta_2^{AA}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \tau) \\ &\times \langle F(t_1 - \tau) \rangle \langle F(t_2 - \tau) \rangle \\ &\times \Phi(t_1 - \tau_1) \Phi(t_2 - \tau_2) + s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \delta(x_1 - x_2) \int_0^{t_1} d\tau \eta_1^A(x_1, \tau) \\ &\times \langle F(t_1 - \tau) F(t_2 - \tau) \rangle \Phi(t_2 - \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where η_1^A is the rate of arrival of individual bugs, and $F(t)$ is the fluctuating number of descendants at time t of a bug alive at $t = 0$. The variable F describes a Galton-Watson process [17], which, for equal birth and death rates, is characterized by a constant average $\langle F(t) \rangle = 1$, and a linearly growing correlation:

$$\langle F(t_1) F(t_2) \rangle = 1 + 2\Gamma \min(t_1, t_2). \quad (21)$$

Notice the absence in Eqs. (19-20) of hats on the Φ 's, and of contributions AB, BA and BB in η_2 , as all demography is contained in the factors F . Absorption of demography in the factors F and the fact that $\langle F \rangle = 1$ is what makes the dynamics identical at the one-bug level, to the one of a simple CTRW in the absence of birth and death. At the two-bug level of Eq. (19), however, we still find a source $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$, that accounts for the fluctuations in the number of individuals in a given colony. As illustrated in Eq. (20), this quantity must be proportional to the arrival rate of individual bugs at $x_1 = x_2$, and to the probability that the colony does not disperse before the final time t_2 .

Let us analyze in detail the structure of this source term and start by evaluating its long-time behavior. Notice that, thanks to the fact that $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ depends only on space difference, we can write $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = \sigma_k(\mathbf{t}) \delta(x_1 - x_2)$.

Let us focus first on the equal time case and proceed by Laplace transforming $\sigma_k(t, t)$. We obtain:

$$\mathcal{L}_z[\sigma_k] = 2\Gamma \eta_{1z}^A \Phi'_z \sim n_0 \Gamma z^{-2} \Rightarrow \sigma_k(t, t) \sim n_0 \Gamma t, \quad (22)$$

where use has been made of Eqs. (16,20) and (21), $\Phi'_z \equiv d\Phi_z/dz$, and of the result, generalizing Eq. (19) to one-bug statistics: $n_0 = \int_0^t d\tau \eta_1^A(x, \tau) \Phi(t - \tau) \Rightarrow \Phi_z \eta_{1z}^A = n_0/z$ [compare with Eq. (A1)]. On the other hand we have, from Eqs. (20) and (21), for $t_2 \gg t_1$: $\sigma_k(\mathbf{t}) \sim \Gamma \Phi(t_2) \int_0^{t_1} d\tau \eta_1^A(\tau) (t_1 - \tau)$. Laplace transforming in t_1 , using again Eqs. (16,20-21) and $\eta_{1z}^A = n_0/(z\Phi_z)$, we get:

$$\mathcal{L}_{z_1}[\sigma_k] \sim n_0 \Gamma z_1^{-2-\mu} t_2^{-\mu} \Rightarrow \sigma_k(\mathbf{t}) \sim n_0 \Gamma t (t_1/t_2)^\mu. \quad (23)$$

We could interpolate Eqs. (22-23) to obtain, for $t_2 \geq t_1$:

$$s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) \sim n_0 \Gamma t_1 (t_1/t_2)^\mu \delta(x_1 - x_2). \quad (24)$$

We notice at this point the important difference with respect to the antisocial regime. While in that case fluctuation build-up was produced as a balance between a constant $O((\Delta t)^\mu)$ forcing and diffusion, in the present case, this build-up is realized directly in $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$, which is here a macroscopic quantity [18]. In the present case, the only possible balance in Eq. (19) is $\rho_2 = s$ at $x_1 = x_2$, which tells us that $\rho_2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ must grow linearly in time for $x_1 = x_2$.

To be convinced of this result, let us write down explicitly the evolution equation for ρ_2 . We separate in the arrival rate η_2^{AA} the connected component η_{2c}^{AA} , which obeys an equation analogous to the first of Eq. (12):

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{2c}^{AA}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \eta_{2c}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &\times \psi(y_1, \tau_1) \psi(y_2, \tau_2), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

with $\eta_{2c} = \eta_{2c}^{AA} + \eta_2^{disc}$, and η_2^{disc} providing the discrete contribution to the social dynamics. This last contribution is associated with pairs of bugs that belong to a same colony and can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_2^{disc}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= 2\Gamma \delta(t_1 - t_2) \int_0^{t_1} d\tau \int dy \eta_1^A(y, \tau) \\ &\times \psi(x_1 - y|t_1 - \tau) \psi(x_2 - y|t_2 - \tau), \\ &\times (t_1 - \tau) \psi(t_1 - \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $\eta_1(y, \tau)$ gives the rate of arrival of the common ancestors at (y, τ) , and $2\Gamma(t_1 - \tau)$, from Eq. (21), is the average number of pairs of descendants per ancestor, available to jump at time $t_1 = t_2$. [Of course, $\psi(t)$ is the waiting time PDF and $\psi(x|t) \equiv \psi(x, t)/\psi(t)$ is the jump length conditional PDF].

Substituting Eqs. (25) and (26) into Eq. (19), exchanging the order of the convolutions and setting again $\langle F \rangle = 1$, we obtain the expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \psi(y_1, \tau_1) \psi(y_2, \tau_2) \\ &\times K(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) + s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned}$$

where $K = \rho_{2c} + \mathfrak{s} - s$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \eta_2^{disc}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &\times \Phi(\tau_1) \Phi(\tau_2). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

From here we reach the final result:

$$\rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) + \bar{\rho}_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \quad (28)$$

where $\bar{\rho}_{2c}$ obeys the equation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \psi(y_1, \tau_1) \psi(y_2, \tau_2) \\ &\times \bar{\rho}_{2c}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) + \bar{s}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{s}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \psi(y_1, \tau_1) \psi(y_2, \tau_2) \\ &\times \mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\tau}) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

is a source term that, as can be checked from Eqs. (26,27) and (30), is continuous with respect to $x_1 - x_2$.

Comparing with Eqs. (24) and (29), we thus see that the two terms on the RHS of Eq. (28) account respectively for the singular and regular components of ρ_{2c} . The singular component $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$, in particular, coincides with what would be observed in a population that does not migrate (in fact, its dynamics is that of a Galton-Watson process). The only place in the singular component, where migration seems to have some effect, is the structure of time correlations, as accounted for by the power-law decay in Eq. (24) [compare with Eq. (21)]. As illustrated in Figs. 3 and 4, the clustering dynamics at long times is dominated by the singular component $s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t})$ in both the superdiffusive and the subdiffusive case.

We stress that these results are conditioned to the waiting time PDF $\psi(t)$ being fat-tailed. If this condition were not satisfied, it is possible to see that ρ_{2c} would not have a singular component and the dynamics would become that of Brownian bugs [18].

V. POPULATION DYNAMICS IN A RANDOM ENVIRONMENT

The kind of social behavior discussed in the previous section is very close to what one could expect if the bug migration were determined by a spatial arrangement of random traps. The opening time of the trap determines the time of dispersal of the bugs that are located in it. When a trap opens, all the bugs jump independently and remain caught either in the same trap (whose opening time is now updated) or in some other trap elsewhere.

The important difference, with respect to the case of inheritance produced social behaviors, is that now, colonies that were initiated by bugs that happened to be caught in the same trap, will share an identical dispersal time. In the case considered in the previous section, the dispersal time of colonies sharing the same location in space was in general different.

To verify the possibility of discrepancies between the two mechanisms for social behavior, a series of numerical simulation have been carried on in $D = 1$ and $D = 2$, with random traps whose opening times are independently distributed with PDF $\psi(t) \propto t^{-1+\mu}$. The jump length PDF for the bugs $\psi(x|t) = \psi(x, t)/\psi(t)$ is the one provided by Eq. (1).

In all cases considered, periodic boundary conditions were utilized, and the total number of bugs was kept fixed, varying from the outside the birth and death rates in the population. (The meaning of a constant population constraint is to subtract any global finite population




FIG. 5: Sequence of snapshots of the population spatial distribution from a numerical simulation of bugs in a $D = 2$ random environment. Going clockwise from top left: $t/\Delta t = 4 \times 10^3, 4 \times 10^4, 4 \times 10^5, 4 \times 10^6$. Parameters of the simulation: $\mu = 1/2$, $\nu = 3/2$ (would be superdiffusive case); $\Gamma\Delta t = 0.01$; $\kappa_0 = 10^{-3}(\Delta x(0))^2/\Delta t$. Domain size in units $\Delta x(0)$: 1400×1400 . Correlation length for random field: $l_c = 14\Delta x(0)$. Total population: $N_0 = 2 \times 10^5$; occupation number: $\epsilon = 10$.

effect from the local fluctuations associated with clustering [19]). In addition to this, in $D = 2$, the possibility of a small normal diffusivity κ_0 acting beside the jumps, has been considered, to mimick the effect of individual small scale motion of the bugs. (In the case of plankton, this additional component may be interpreted as due to individual swimming, while the long jumps are associated with eddy break-up and transport of plankton patches away, along strain filaments). A picture of what would occur in this case is presented in Fig. 5.

It is clear that the discrepancy between different social mechanisms will be negligible if the population is so dilute that on the average, at most one colony (and therefore one bug) is present at a given time in a given trap. Given a typical size l_c of the trap, an important parameter is therefore the product

$$\epsilon = n_0 l_c^D \quad (31)$$

that gives the typical occupation number of a trap.

What we have found, in both $D = 1$ and $D = 2$, is that clustering is remarkably insensitive to whether the population is concentrated or diluted, or to the presence of small scale motions that cause bug leakages from the traps. As illustrated in Fig. 6, a change of more than two orders of magnitude in ϵ does not produce any appreciable change in the fluctuation amplitude $C(0; t, t)$. In the same way, as can be seen in Figs. 3 and 4, the difference in the profile for $C(0; t, t)$ in the two cases in which sociality is produced by inheritance and spatially extended random traps, are negligible. The same result holds both




FIG. 6: Plot of $\tilde{C} = \Gamma^{-1}C$ vs. $\tilde{t} = t/\Delta t$ and fit by \tilde{t} , in the case of transport by a random field. (a): $D = 2$, the same case as Fig. 5; the fluctuation amplitude $C(0; t, t)$ was coarse grained at scale l_c . The case $\kappa_0 = 0$ leads to a profile that is indistinguishable from the one in figure. (b) $D = 1$; again a would be superdiffusive case, with $\mu = 1/2$, $\nu = 3/2$ and $\Gamma\Delta t = 0.01$; the three curves correspond to $\epsilon = 1$ (heavy line), $\epsilon = 20$ (thin line), $\epsilon = 200$ (dotted line); for the rest, the same parameter as case (d) in Figs. 3 and 4 were utilized. A slope $\propto \tilde{t}$ is shown for comparison.

in the subdiffusive and the superdiffusive case.

An explanation for the insensitivity of clustering to the value of the parameter ϵ , and to the mechanism for sociality, is the fact the clustering behavior accounted for by Eqs. (24) and (28) is already extremal. The maximal fluctuation growth, corresponding to individuals that do not migrate, as described by the Galton-Watson regime of Eq. (21), is already achieved in the inheritance governed dynamics of the previous section. Passing to a random trap governed dynamics, further diminishes the degree of dispersal of the bugs and maintains the clustering on the maximal level $C(0; t, t) \propto t$. Increasing the value of the parameter ϵ goes in the same direction and does not modify the result.

Geometrically, as accounted for by Eqs. (24) and (28), this corresponds to a situation in which, unless some small scale migration is assumed, the typical cluster size is zero. Repetition of the $D = 2$ simulation of Fig. 5 with $\kappa_0 = 0$ can be shown to lead, in fact, to a bug distribution in the long time limit, that is a discrete set of isolated towers, as it would occur with bugs that do not migrate at all [3]. The same can be seen to occur also in the $D = 1$ simulations, in both the inheritance and random trap governed cases. This contrasts with the result in the antisocial case (see insert in Figs. 3 and 4), which describes cluster whose size λ is a growing function of time.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The main result of the present analysis is that social behaviors can play a strong role in the transport prop-

erties of a population, whose individuals migrate following a CTRW strategy. An interesting aspect, with potentially useful application, is that enforcing a simple inheritance-social constraint on the bugs, is sufficient to replicate the dynamics of a population in a random environment (say, an assembly of random traps). This means that it is not necessary to impose spatial interactions among the CTRW-bugs to mimic the common response of nearby individuals to the environment. Nevertheless, a social constraint is necessary to guarantee that the dynamics of CTRW-bugs and that of individuals in a field of random traps be identical. Antisocial bugs, for instance, do not satisfy this property and their dynamics coincides instead with that of Brownian bugs. In particular, as in the Brownian case of [15], antisocial bugs are characterized by reduced clustering in $D > 1$, with fluctuations that grow only logarithmically ($D = 2$) or saturate to a constant level ($D = 3$).

The clustering behavior in the social case (and therefore also in the case of a random environment) coincides with what would be observed in the case of bugs that do not migrate. The growth of the fluctuation amplitude is described by a Galton-Watson process independently of the dimensionality of the problem, and the size of the clusters is determined by eventual small scale motions of the individuals. (This is opposite to the behavior of antisocial and Brownian bugs, where the clusters are produced by a competition between migration and demography). In consequence of this, no clustering reduction with increasing dimensionality occurs in the social case.

Thus, in realistic situations of a population dispersed in a bi- or three-dimensional random environment, a transport dynamics governed by random traps with long permanence times, will lead to much stronger clustering behaviors than it would occur if the transport dynamics were of the normal diffusion type. This result is independent of the kind of transport, either superdiffusive or subdiffusive, that would result if no birth and death effects were present. The only important constraint is that the waiting time PDF in the CTRW (or in the random traps) be fat-tailed. On the contrary, the strong role of sociality is lost in the case of Brownian bugs. Also, transport by an assembly of random traps with exponentially distributed opening times, turns out to be described by a Brownian bug dynamics, without the need of imposing social constraints of any sort.

In all cases, demography appears to be very good at destroying anomalous scaling behaviors. Antisocial behaviors bring the dynamics back to that of Brownian bugs; strongly social behaviors bring it back to that of non-migrating individuals. In the antisocial case, anomalous scaling could possibly be recovered for $\bar{t} \ll \Gamma^{-1}$. From Eq. (18), we see however that fluctuations become relevant, i.e. $C(x, t, t) \sim n_0^2$, only when $\Gamma \bar{t} \sim (n_0 X_\Gamma)^2$, which is small unless the density is so low that the typical bug separation is at least of the order of their displacement in a lifetime.

The question remains open on whether anomalous scal-

ing could be obtained from regimes half-way between the strongly social and antisocial cases that have been considered so far. Anomalous scaling could arise as well from social behaviors that do not originate from inheritance, but are the result of more general spatial interactions between the bugs, as discussed e.g. in [20]. Similarly, the question remains open on the effect of demography on bugs in which anomalously diffusive behaviors are produced by means different from a CTRW, say, a fractional Brownian motion [21] or a sequence of Lévy flights [20].

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank Silvano Ferrari for his contribution to the initial part of this research. This research was funded in part by Regione Autonoma della Sardegna.

Appendix A: Anomalous diffusion and demography in the antisocial case

To check for the presence of anomalous diffusion behaviors, we study the scaling of the bug density $\rho_1(x, t)$, given the initial condition $\rho_1(x, 0) = \delta(x)$. This choice of initial conditions makes $\rho_1(x, t)$ coincide with the PDF of finding the original bug or one of its descendants at position x at time t .

The integral equation satisfied by ρ_1 has a form analogous to Eq. (5) [9, 16]:

$$\rho_1(x, t) = \int_0^t d\tau \eta_1(x, \tau) \hat{\Phi}(t - \tau), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where η_1 is the rate of arrival and birth of individual bugs at (x, t) , and $\hat{\Phi}(t) = e^{-\Gamma t} \Phi(t)$ is the probability that the bug does not jump or die in a time t [see Eq. (6)]. Let us decompose as in Eq. (11), η_1 into contributions from arrival and birth: $\eta_1 = \eta_1^A + \eta_1^B$. The arrival contribution $\eta_1^A(x, t)$ is obtained summing over all the bugs that were born or arrived at a previous time τ at any position y and from there jumped at x at time t . Following [9], it is possible to include in $\eta_1^A(x, t)$ an initial condition $\rho(x, 0)$, so that we can write, for $t \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_1^A(x, t) &= \int_0^t d\tau \int dy \eta_1(y, \tau) \hat{\psi}(x - y, t - \tau) \\ &+ \rho(x, 0) \delta(t), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

while $\eta(x, t) = 0$ for $t < 0$. The factor $\hat{\psi}(x, t) = e^{-\Gamma t} \psi(x, t)$ is the PDF that the bug jumps at a time t after a previous arrival or birth, that the length of the jump is x , and that the bug is still alive at the time of the jump. The birth rate $\eta_1^B(x, t)$ satisfies instead:

$$\eta_1^B(x, t) = \Gamma \rho_1(x, t). \quad (\text{A3})$$

Substituting Eqs. (A3) and (A2) into Eq. (A1), we obtain, after inverting the order of the convolutions, the

evolution equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1(x, t) &= \int_0^t d\tau \left[\int dy \rho_1(y, \tau) \hat{\psi}(x - y, t - \tau) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \Gamma \rho_1(x, \tau) \hat{\Phi}(t - \tau) \right] + \rho(x, 0) \hat{\Phi}(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

Fourier transforming in space and Laplace transforming in time, Eq. (A4) becomes, imposing the initial condition $\rho_1(x, 0) = \delta(x)$:

$$\rho_{1kz} = \frac{\Phi_{\hat{z}}}{1 - \psi_{k\hat{z}} - \Gamma \Phi_{\hat{z}}},$$

where, as in Eq. (14), $\hat{z} = \Gamma + z$. From here we obtain, in the regime $\hat{z}\Delta t \ll 1$, using Eqs. (15) and (16):

$$\rho_{1kz} \simeq \frac{1}{z} - \frac{1}{2} \kappa_\alpha \hat{z}^{1-\alpha} z^{-2} k^2 \quad (\text{A5})$$

where $\kappa_\alpha \sim \Delta \tilde{x}^2 \Delta \tilde{t}^{-\alpha}$, with $\alpha = \mu, \nu$, respectively, in the subdiffusive and superdiffusive case. The variance $X^2(t)$ of the PDF ρ_1 is obtained as the inverse Laplace transform of the quantity

$$-\frac{\partial^2 \rho_{1kz}}{\partial k^2} \Big|_{k=0} = \begin{cases} \kappa_\alpha z^{-1-\alpha}, & \Gamma \ll z \ll \Delta \tilde{t}^{-1} \\ \bar{\kappa} z^{-1}, & z \ll \Gamma \end{cases} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa_\alpha \Gamma^{1-\alpha}$. We obtain the final result

$$X^2(t) \sim \begin{cases} \kappa_\alpha t^\alpha, & \Delta \tilde{t} \ll t \ll \Gamma^{-1} \\ \bar{\kappa} t, & t \gg \Gamma^{-1} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A7})$$

and we see that demography kills anomalous scaling for $\Gamma t \gg 1$.

Appendix B: Equations for the two-bug statistics in the antisocial case

Let us fill the steps to go from Eqs. (5,11-13) to Eq. (14). Substituting Eqs. (12) into the connected part of Eq. (5), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int d^2y \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &\quad \times \hat{\psi}(x_1 - y_1, t_1 - \tau_1) \hat{\psi}(x_2 - y_2, t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \left[\eta_{2c}^{AB}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) + \eta_{2c}^{BA}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \eta_{2c}^{BB}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \right] \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &\quad + s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

where use has been made of Eq. (7) to eliminate η^{disc} from the expression. On the other hand, we can write,

using the second of Eq. (12) and Eq. (13):

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \eta_{2c}^{AB}(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &= n_0 \Gamma \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{\tau_1} d\tau_1' \int dy_1 \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &\quad \times \eta_{1c}(y_1 \tau_1 | x_2 \tau_2) \hat{\psi}(x_1 - y_1, \tau_1 - \tau_1') \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \\ &= \Gamma \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int dy_1 \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &\quad \times \rho_2(y_1 \tau_1; x_2 \tau_2) \psi(x_1 - y_1, t_1 - \tau_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Substituting Eq. (B2) with the third of Eq. (12) into Eq. (B1), we get the result, after inverting the order of the convolutions:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) &= \int_0^{t_1} d\tau_1 \int_0^{t_2} d\tau_2 \left\{ \int d^2y \rho_{2c}(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \right. \\ &\quad \times \hat{\psi}(x_1 - y_1, t_1 - \tau_1) \hat{\psi}(x_2 - y_2, t_2 - \tau_2) \\ &\quad + \Gamma \int dy_1 \rho_{2c}(y_1, x_2; \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\psi}(x_1 - y_1, t_1 - \tau_1) \\ &\quad \times \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) + \Gamma \int dy_2 \rho_2^c(x_1, y_2; \boldsymbol{\tau}) \\ &\quad \times \hat{\psi}(x_2 - y_2, t_2 - \tau_2) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \\ &\quad \left. + \Gamma^2 \rho_2^c(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \hat{\Phi}(t_1 - \tau_1) \hat{\Phi}(t_2 - \tau_2) \right\} \\ &\quad + s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

which, Fourier transforming in space and Laplace transforming in time, gives Eq. (14).

Appendix C: Application to the case of Brownian bugs

Using Eqs. (14) and (10) in the Brownian bug case is like using a shotgun to take down a mosquito. Nevertheless, it allows one to test the techniques derived in the present paper on the known results in [15].

In the case of Brownian bugs we have, in place of Eqs. (1) and (6):

$$\psi(x, t) = \frac{2^{1/2}}{\pi^{1/2} \Delta t \Delta x} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\Delta t} - \frac{x^2}{2\Delta x^2}\right) \quad (\text{C1})$$

and

$$\Phi(t) = \exp(-t/\Delta t). \quad (\text{C2})$$

From here we can write, in place of Eqs. (15) and (16):

$$\psi_{kz} = \frac{\exp(-(\Delta x k)^2/2)}{1 + \Delta t z}; \quad \Phi_z = \frac{\Delta t}{1 + \Delta t z}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

Substituting Eq. (C2) into Eq. (9), we obtain, in place of Eq. (10):

$$s(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = 2n_0 \Gamma \Delta t \delta(x_1 - x_2). \quad (\text{C4})$$

Substituting Eqs. (C3) and (C4) into Eq. (14) and Taylor expanding around $k, \mathbf{z} = 0$, we find in place of Eq. (17):

$$C_{k\mathbf{z}} = 2[(\bar{z} + \kappa k^2)z_1 z_2]^{-1} n_0 \Gamma, \quad (\text{C5})$$

where $\bar{z} = z_1 + z_2$, and $\kappa = \Delta x^2 / \Delta t$ is the diffusion of the Brownian walkers. Contrary to the case of Eq. (17), the transport part of the dynamics, accounted for by the diffusivity κ , is independent of demography. We see that Eq. (C5) is the Laplace transform of the forced heat diffusion equation

$$\partial_t C(x, t) = \kappa \partial_x^2 C(x, t) + 2n_0 \Gamma \delta(x), \quad (\text{C6})$$

where $C(x, t) \equiv C(x; t, t)$.

It is possible to see that Eq. (C6) corresponds to the continuous limit of the result in [15]. Rather than taking the continuous limit of that result, we take the limit directly on the original problem on the lattice.

Let the discretization in time be given by Δt and the one in space by $\ell > \Delta x$. Thus $C(x, t) = \ell^{-2} \langle N(0, t) N(x, t) \rangle$, with $N(x, t)$ the instantaneous number of bugs in the cell x . We can easily fix the jump probability, to obtain a diffusive dynamics with diffusivity $\kappa = \Delta x^2 / \Delta t$. Analysis of the source term in Eq. (14)

requires a little more work. Let us indicate by $\Delta C(x, t)$ the contribution to $C(x, t + \Delta t) - C(x, t)$ from demography. Again, we easily see that for $x \neq 0$, due to independence of the birth and death processes, we have $\ell^2 \Delta C(x, t) = \langle N(0, t) \Delta N(x, t) \rangle + \langle \Delta N(0, t) N(x, t) \rangle = 0$. If $x = 0$, however, we have that the quantity $\langle \Delta N^2(0, t) | N(0, t) \rangle$ is non-zero. Introducing the indicator function $\delta_i = 0, 1, 2$ depending on whether bug i dies, remains inactive, or gives birth, we have in fact a contribution to $\langle \Delta N^2(0, t) | N(0, t) \rangle$:

$$\sum_{ij}^{N(0,t)} \langle \delta_i \delta_j \rangle = 2N(0, t) \Gamma \Delta t,$$

where we have used the fact that $\langle \delta_i \delta_j \rangle = 0$ for $j \neq i$, and $\delta_i = 0, 1, 2$ with probabilities $\Gamma \Delta t$, $1 - 2\Gamma \Delta t$ and $\Gamma \Delta t$. Exploiting the fact that $\langle N(0, t) \rangle = n_0 \ell$, we find in the end

$$\Delta C(0, t) = 2n_0 \Gamma \Delta t \ell^{-1},$$

which leads in the continuous limit to the expression for the source provided in Eq. (C6).

-
- [1] Y.-C. Zhang, M. Serva and M. Polikarpov, *J. Stat. Phys.* **58**, 849 (1990).
[2] M. Meyer, S. Havlin and A. Bunde, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 5567 (1996).
[3] W.R. Young, A.J. Roberts and G. Stuhne, *Nature* **412**, 328 (2001).
[4] M. Paesens and G.M. Schütz, *J. Phys. A* **37**, 4709 (2004)
[5] A. Provenzale, *Ann. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **31**, 55 (1999).
[6] A. Zoia, *Phys. Rev. E* **77**, 041115 (2008)
[7] K.C. Leptos, J.S. Guasto, J.P. Gollub, A.I. Pesci and R.E. Goldstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 198103 (2009).
[8] D.W. Sims *et Al.*, *Nature* **451**, 1098 (2008).
[9] J. Klafter, A. Blumen and M.F. Shlesinger, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 3081 (1987).
[10] H. Hinrichsen and M. Howard, *Eur. Phys. J. B* **7**, 635 (1999)
[11] J.P. Bouchaud and A. Georges, *Phys. Rep.* **195**, 128 (1990)
[12] H. Hinrichsen, *Adv. Phys.* **49**, 815 (2000);
[13] S.B. Yuste, J.J. Ruiz-Lorenzo, and K. Lindenberg, *Phys. Rev. E* **80**, 051114 (2009)
[14] E.W. Montroll and G.H. Weiss, *J. Math. Phys.* **6**, 167 (1965).
[15] B. Houchmandzadeh, *Phys. Rev. E* **66**, 052902 (2002).
[16] M.G.W. Schmidt, F. Sagues and I.M. Sokolov, *J. Phys. Condens. Matter* **19**, 065118 (2007).
[17] T. Harris, *The theory of branching processes* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1963).
[18] This property is lost in the case of Brownian bugs, in which case Eq. (22) becomes $\sigma_k(t, t) \sim n_0 \Gamma \Delta t$.
[19] For a total population $\langle N(t) \rangle = N_0$ the global fluctuation amplitude can be estimated using Eq. (21): $\langle [N(t)]^2 \rangle = N_0^2 + 2N_0 \Gamma t$.
[20] E. Heinsalu, E. Hernández-García and C. López, *Europhys. Lett.* **92**, 40011 (2010)
[21] J. Beran, *Statistics for Long-Memory Processes* (Chapman & Hall, London, 1994)