Optimal diffusion in ecological dynamics with Allee effect in a metapopulation

Marcelo A. Pires*

Brazilian Center for Research in Physics, Brazil

Sílvio M. Duarte Queirós[†]

Brazilian Center for Research in Physics, Brazil and

National Institute of Science and Technology for Complex Systems

(Dated: September 28, 2018)

How diffusion impacts on ecological dynamics under the Allee effect and spatial constraints? That is the question we address. Employing a microscopic minimal model in a metapopulation (without imposing nonlinear birth and death rates) we evince — both numerically and analitically — the emergence of an optimal diffusion that maximises the survival probability. Even though, at first such result seems counter-intuitive, it has empirical support from recent experiments with engineered bacteria. Moreover, we show that this optimal diffusion disappears for loose spatial constraints.

Keywords: Ecology, metapopulation, optimal diffusion, minimal model, Monte Carlo simulations

 $^{^*}$ piresma@cbpf.br

[†] sdqueiro@cbpf.br

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	2
II. Model and Monte Carlo Simulation	4
Monte Carlo Algorithm	4
Mathematical approach	5
Survival-extinction phase transition	6
III. Results and Discussion	8
IV. Final Remarks	12
References	14

I. INTRODUCTION

The Allee effect, the influential finding named after the ecologist Warder Clyde Allee [1], is phenomenon typically manifested by a departure from the standard logistic growth that enhances the susceptibility to extinction of an already vulnerable sparse population. Curiously, W. C. Allee did not provide a definition of the effect [2], but in general terms it can be defined as "the positive association between absolute average individual fitness and population size over some finite interval." [3]. The strong Allee effect, which is the focus of this work, corresponds to the case when the deviation from the logistic growth includes an initial population threshold below which the population goes extinct [4]. On the other hand weak version of the Allee effect treats positive relations between the overall individual fitness and population density and does not present threshold population size nor density.

The Allee effect can turn up from a variety of mechanisms such as mate limitation, cooperative breeding, cooperative feeding, habitat amelioration [3, 4]. Although empirical support for the Allee Effect is little, it is possible to find instances thereof in some terrestrial arthropods, aquatic invertebrates, mammals, birds, fish, and reptiles [4, 5]. Despite that fact, there is nowadays enough technology that allows Synthetic Biology to program new collective behaviour in bacteria, including the Allee effect [6].

Besides Ecology and Conservation Biology [4], there is a growing number of studies addressing

the importance of the Allee Effect in other subjects such as Epidemiology [7–9] and Cancer Biology [10, 11] among others. Explicitly, in Ref. [10] the authors suggest the manifestation of the Allee Effect as the tumor growth threshold may be explored in the appearance.

For long the Allee effect was mostly studied at the population scale, but in Ref. [12] it was shown the relevance of this effect at the metapopulation level as well. Afterwards, it was effectively demonstrated the Allee effect at the metapopulation level can emerge from the Allee effect at the local population level [13, 14].

Focusing on the theoretical approach to the problem, several models ranging from phenomenological to purely microscopic have been able to successfully capture the Allee effect and to explore its dynamical consequences [15, 16], namely those coping with the interplay between the Allee Effect and dispersal. Let us mention some examples hereinafter: on the one hand, there are works showing a positive association between migration and the number of invaded patches [17]; the invasion diagram presented in Ref. [18] shows that the propagation failure regime shrinks as the dispersal rate increases, whereas in Ref. [22] it as asserted that an increase in migration leads to an increase in the mean time to extinction in a simple metapopulation dynamics. On the other hand, there are works indicating that combination of the Allee effect and dispersal negatively impacts population dynamics as in Ref. [19] where the authors claim that the vulnerability to extinction increases with the mean-square displacement. Considering a nonlinear dynamics analysis of the effect, the survivalextinction bifurcation diagram shown in Ref. [20] reveals an increase in the extinction regime as the dispersal probability increases. The results conveyed in Ref. [21] indicate that populations under the Allee effect face an inverse relation between the establishment probability and the pre-mating dispersal. Complementary, it was also found that a dispersive population under the Allee effect faces a dramatically slowed spreading, especially the early spread [23].

Particularly in Population Ecology, Windus and Jensen [24] proposed a minimal model that successfully captures the Allee Effect by means of a bistable dynamics that naturally arises from their microscopic rules. Inspired by their model we develop an ecological metapopulation dynamics in order to explore how the threefold interplay between the Allee Effect, diffusion and spatial constrains impacts on the survival probability of a population dynamics. It is reasonably expected that the diffusion has a beneficial impact on the population survival by decreasing the local competition for resources, but interestingly we observe that for severe spatial constrains there is the emergence of an optimal diffusion rate that promotes the highest survival probability. This nonmonotonic relation between survival and dispersal — which is not very intuitive at first glance — was recently observed

in controlled experiment with engineered bacteria [6].

The remaining of this manuscript is organised as follows: in the next section we describe our model, algorithm and the mathematical approach, respectively. In section 3, we introduce our results and in Section 4 we present our final remarks and future avenues of research on this subject-matter.

II. MODEL AND MONTE CARLO SIMULATION

Consider a metapopulation [25, 26] with L subpopulations composed of agents that are able to move, die or reproduce. As usual in metapopulation dynamics [25], we assume a well-mixed subpopulation, i.e., inside each subpopulation all individuals have the possibility to interact with each other. ¹ The mobility is implemented as a random walk between the neighbour subpopulations and it occurs with probability D for each agent. At a given time step, if the diffusion event is not chosen (probability 1-D) then one of the two events is chosen [24]: death of an agent with probability α or reproduction with probability λ when two agents meet.

At this point, three remarks are worth making: first, heed that D controls the time scale between migration or death/reproduction; second, it is clear that we make no extra assumptions on the probabilities α or λ ; and third, this proposal naturally incorporates the environmental changeability since the carrying capacity of each subpopulation is not fixed. Moreover, there is no local condensation of the agents because the random walk uniforms the agents distribution among the subpopulations.

We would like to stress that our goal is not to model a specific ecological dynamics, but rather to investigate the possible emerging scenarios from this minimal agent-based migration-reproduction-death dynamics. This approach can be naturally seasoned with further elements that account for the traits of a given system. It is well-known that the use of minimal models are very helpful in providing an understanding of the cornerstone mechanisms present in tailored models.

Monte Carlo Algorithm

Computationally², we use an array with N states divided into the L subpopulations. Each state in the subpopulation u indicates an agent, i_A^u or a vacancy, i_V^u . The time is measured in Monte Carlo Steps (mcs) that consists of a visit to each one of the N states.

Monte Carlo Step:

¹ In Statistical Physics parlance that is to say that our local dynamics exhibits a mean-field character.

² Our main code is available at [27].

For each state i = 1, ..., N:

- First get the subpopulation, say u, of the state i.
- With probability *D*:
 - **Diffusion:** If the state i indicates an agent, i_A^u , then move it to one of its neighbours w chosen at random: $i_A^u \Rightarrow i_A^w$
- With probability 1 D:
 - **Reproduction:** If the state i indicates a vacancy, i_V^u , then pick at random another state j in the same subpopulation u. If this j indicates an agent, j_A^u , then pick at random another state l in the same subpopulation u. If the state l indicates another agent, l_A^u , then transform the vacancy i_V^u into an agent i_A^u with rate λ : $i_V^u + j_A^u + l_A^u \Rightarrow i_A^u + j_A^u + l_A^u$
 - **Death:** If the state *i* indicates an agent, i_A^u , then transform it into a vacancy with rate α : $i_A^u \Rightarrow i_V^u$

After each Monte Carlo Step we apply a synchronous updating of the states.

Mathematical approach

Consider that $A_u(t)$ and $V_u(t)$ are the number of agents and vacancies in the subpopulation u at instant t, respectively. We use a ring metapopulation where each node is a subpopulation connected to k neighbour subpopulations. The parameter k controls the magnitude of the spatial constraints. Let $u = 1, \ldots, L$. Considering the well-mixed population (mean-field) at the local scale, the time evolution of the coupled system is given by

$$\frac{dV_u}{dt} = (1 - D) \left[\underbrace{-\frac{\lambda V_u A_u^2}{(V_u + A_u)^2}}_{\text{Reproduction}} + \underbrace{\alpha A_u}_{\text{Death}} \right]$$
 (1)

$$\frac{dA_u}{dt} = (1 - D) \left[\underbrace{-\frac{\lambda V_u A_u^2}{(V_u + A_u)^2}}_{\text{Reproduction}} + \underbrace{\alpha A_u}_{\text{Death}} \right] + D \left[\underbrace{-A_u}_{\text{Emigration}} + \underbrace{\sum_{z=1}^{L} \frac{1}{k} W_{uz} A_z}_{\text{Immigration}} \right]$$
(2)

with W_{uz} being the elements of the adjacency matrix which assumes the value 1 if u and z are connected or 0 otherwise. The variability of the carrying capacity of each subpopulation is represented in Eqs. (1)-(2) by the term $V_u(t) + A_u(t)$.

Aiming at taking into account both the cases of single and multiple sources of invasion, we shall use an initial condition given by

$$A_u(0) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n_s} \frac{N}{L} & u = 1, \dots, n_s \\ 0 & u = n_s, \dots, L \end{cases}$$
 (3)

where N/L is the initial size of each subpopulation and n_s is the number of initial sources. By default, we use $V_u(0) = N/L - A_u(0)$ as well.

Survival-extinction phase transition

From a preliminary numerical analysis we observed that the steady-state solution satisfies

$$A_u^{\infty} = \bar{A}, \quad V_u^{\infty} = \bar{V} \quad \forall u \quad u = 1, 2, \dots, L$$

$$\tag{4}$$

Using that observation as an ansatz to solving our equations implies

$$N = \sum_{u=1}^{L} (A_u + V_u) = L(\bar{A} + \bar{V}) \Rightarrow \bar{V} = N/L - \bar{A}$$
 (5)

$$\frac{d\bar{A}}{dt} = (1 - D) \left[\frac{\lambda (N/L - \bar{A})\bar{A}^2}{(N/L)^2} - \alpha \bar{A} \right] + D \left[-\bar{A} + \frac{1}{k} \left(k\bar{A} \right) \right] = 0 \tag{6}$$

From Eq. (6) we can obtain three solutions to A. The stability analysis yields

$$A_u^{\infty} = \begin{cases} \frac{N}{2L} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\frac{\alpha}{\lambda}} \right) & A_u(t = 0) \ge A_c^o \text{ and } \alpha \ge \lambda/4\\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
 (7)

Where A_c^o is the threshold initial population size required for the local persistence:

$$A_c^o = \frac{N}{2L} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4\frac{\alpha}{\lambda}} \right) \tag{8}$$

Equations (7)-(8) do not explicitly take into account the diffusion parameter D, but they allow us to get an insight into the nature of the survival-extinction phase transition: they show that the subpopulation faces a discontinuous transition at the critical point $\alpha_c = \lambda/4$. As in the long-term, the mobility spreads the absence of local correlations to the whole metapopulation, then the global dynamics undergoes an abrupt phase transition as well; we numerically confirm in the next section.




FIG. 1: Total number of agents vs time (in mcs) for $D = \{0.03, 0.05, 0.07, 0.09, 0.14, 0.19\}$ with L = 10, $N = 10^4 L$, $n_s = 1$. The symbols were obtained from Monte Carlo simulations and the lines from Eqs. (1)-(2).




FIG. 2: Stationary density of agents a^{∞} vs mortality rate α with D=0.2, k=2, L=10, $N=10^4L, n_s=1$. The symbols come from the Monte Carlo Simulations and the lines come from the numerical integration of Eqs1-2.




FIG. 3: Phase diagram α v D > 0 for $n_s = 1, 2, ..., 6$ sources. The point D = 0 is excluded from the diagram since it refers to isolated populations with threshold $\alpha_c = \lambda/4 = 0.25$ L = 10, $N = 10^4 L$. In all the cases $n_0 = \frac{10^4}{n_s}$, where n_0 is the initial subpopulation size. The lines are obtained from Eqs. (1)-(2).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present our results for metapopulations of sizes $10 \le L \le 50$ and increasing k, but all of the results remain valid for larger networks as we checked using Monte Carlo Simulation and our coupled differential equations (1)-(2), which represent the limit of very large systems. For the sake of simplicity and without losing generality for our results we fix $\lambda = 1$.

Let us start by looking at the time series of the total number of agents in the metapopulation for different diffusion rates as depicted in Fig.1. The temporal evolutions for $D = \{0.03, 0.09, 0.019\}$ exhibit a single stable (steady) state, but the cases with $D = \{0.05, 0.07, 0.014\}$ display bistable solutions. This rich dynamics is the outcome of competition between the reproducibility and mortality. It is worth stressing the role of randomness — governed by our probability parameters — in revealing




FIG. 4: Survival area in the phase diagram $\alpha \times D$ versus the number of sources n_s for 0 < D < 1. The case D = 1 is excluded because it implies no reproduction/death. The case D = 0 is excluded because it implies no migration between the patches. In all cases we keep the initial subpopulation size fixed $n_0 = \frac{10^4}{n_s}$ and we use $N = 10^4 L$.

that bistability. A clear outcome of the combination of randomness and bistability is the existence of ecological scenarios in which extinction can take place without apparent reason, even in the presence of abundant resources. Last, a scenario marked by two well-separated stochastically-induced steady-states is a hallmark of a sudden phase transition as anticipated in the previous section. Such discontinuous transition is confirmed in Fig. 2 where we show the density of individuals, which is our order parameter, displays a pronounced jump for a critical mortality rate α_c . To fully grasp the idea behind the survival-extinction transition in Fig. 2, consider the ecological scenarios with $\alpha = \{0.04, 0.08, 0.12\}$. If the environmental conditions rise the mortality from $\alpha = 0.04$ to $\alpha = 0.08$, the total density of individuals undergoes just a slight drop (which may cause a false impression resilience). However, if the mortality increase from point $\alpha = 0.08$ to $\alpha = 0.12$, there is tremendous dynamical response in the population density namely the mass extinction. That is, the same amount of rising in mortality rate can spark either a small or drastic decline in the population. In other words, the population can behave either in a robust or fragile manner to environmental perturbations depending on the proximity to the threshold point. This feature is a remarkable fingerprint of discontinuous phase transition. It is worthwhile to mention that abrupt phase transitions are not an




FIG. 5: Phase diagram α vs D > 0 for networks with increasing number of neighbors k = 2, 4, 6, 8 (decreasing spatial constraints). The theoretical lines (red) comes from numerical integration of Eqs 1-2.

odd phenomenon biological dynamics [28].

Up to now, we have not distinguish between the role of D and that of n_s on the threshold $\alpha_c(D)$. In order to separate out each contribution we call attention to Fig. 3 disentangles the role played by the interplay between the D and n_s . To estimate the thresholds we have employed an iterative procedure quite similar to that described in section 2.1 of Ref. [24]: (i) first we set an initial guess for the threshold α_c' , then the dynamics starts; (ii) if a given sample enters in the extinction state we decrease α_c' by a given amount $d\alpha$; (iii) if a given sample has a long-term persistent population, then




FIG. 6: Regime diagram of the dependence between threshold mortality α_c vs diffusion rate D for L=50. The vertical line that separates the two regimes is $k_{threshold}=30$. For $k < k_{threshold}$: $\alpha_{max} > \alpha_{D=0.5}$ then $\alpha_c \times D$ displays a nonmonotonic dependence. For $k \ge k_{threshold}$: $\alpha_{max} = \alpha_{D=0.5}$ then $\alpha_c \times D$ exhibits a monotonic dependence.

we increase α_c' by a given amount $d\alpha$. In the Fig. 3 we see that this iterative procedure provides a reasonable good estimation of the threshold that agrees very well with the theoretical threshold obtained from Eqs. (1)-(2). Also note that there is an optimal diffusion rate that allows the population to have comparatively high threshold mortality rates α_c . The number of sources do not change the nonmonotonic dependence of α vs D, but it changes the magnitude of this dependence.

Interestingly, Fig.4 shows there exists an optimal number of sources that promotes the largest survival area in the diagram α vs D > 0, as antecipated in Fig. 3; that is to say, the survival probability is maximised for an intermediate number of sources, wherefrom we understand that in populations subjected to the Allee Effect it is best to spare the population in many sources, but not too much. Similar results were found in Ref. [14] where the authors came up with an integrated model that displays an Allee-like effect at the metapopulation level, which is the outcome of imposing the Allee effect at the local population level. That is in contrast with our work because we use a microscopic model with no extra assumption on the birth and death rates.

The survival-extinction phase diagram in Fig. 5 shows that a decrease in the severity of the spatial constraints — i.e., an increase of k — leads to a decreasing in the threshold mortality $\alpha_c(D)$ for all k. That is to say, the population becomes more vulnerable to extinction when there are

more open paths to emigrate. This result is supported by Ref. [17] where it was found that "with fewer connections, the probability of invasion is greater". Furthermore, we observe the emergence of two regimes: α_c increases nonmonotonically with D for severe spatial constraints (k = 2, 4), but it increases monotonically with D for loose spatial constraints (k = 6, 8). Although we used a simplified minimal network it already shows the importance of spatial constraints in changing the qualitative behaviour of the system. At last, Fig. 6 summarises our results for different magnitudes of spatial constraints k. Clearly there is a threshold for k, above which there is a monotononic dependence between α_c and D.

What is the underlying mechanism behind the qualitative change presented in Fig.5-6? When the geometric constraints are very severe, we have a nonmonotonic regime caused by the source-sink dynamics between the donor subpopulation and its surroundings. For small diffusion, the source cannot provide enough individuals to produce a sustainable colony in the first-neighbours that in turn acts as a drain from the donor subpopulation. For intermediate diffusion the first neighbours receive enough individuals to bear sufficient reproduction to overcome the Allee Effect. However, if the diffusion is further augmented, then the first neighbours receive as many individuals as they lose for the next-nearest neighbours, which yields an insufficient net reproduction to foster long-term survival. Alternatively, in the monotonic regime the of loose spatial constraints allows the emergence of multiple secondary sources that feed one another in a way that by boosting the diffusion one enhances the net reproduction to overcome the Allee effect.

From the empirical side, the specific work of Smith et al [6] supports our finding of the optimal diffusion. Therein, they engineered *E. coli* colonies aiming at displaying the strong Allee effect and found that dispersal acts as a double-edged sword. In other words, intermediate dispersal rates favours bacterial spreading whereas both low and high dispersal rates inhibits the spreading.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

We have investigated the spectrum of scenarios arising from a metapopulation dynamics under the Allee Effect using a minimal individual-based model which points at describing fundamental mechanisms thereof. Employing numerical and analytical tools we have showed that the survivalextinction boundary has a nonmonotonic behaviour for severe spatial constraints and but a monotonic behaviour for loose spatial constraints. The verification of this qualitative change in the dependence of the mortality threshold as a function of the diffusion highlights the importance of the threefold interplay between the Allee Effect, diffusion and geometric constraints for the persistence of populations. Besides the experimental work of Ref. [6], there are previous theoretical models pointing to our conclusions over the likely existence of an intermediate mobility rate that optimises the survival probability. Explicitly, Ref. [29] found a "a nonmonotonic dependence of the critical Allee thresholds on the migration rate." by imposing the Allee Effect at the microscopic scale considering a nonlinear per capita birth rate $rn_i/C + rn_ic/C^2$ per capita death rate $rn_i^2/C + rc/C$.³ In addition, we can also refer to Ref. [30] in which it was used an individual two-gender population on a hexagonal grid where the juveniles disperse away from their natal territory with dispersal distances distributed as a negative exponential. In that case, the population growth was highest for an optimal distance of the dispersal. Yet, both works did not observe the fact that the magnitude of the spatial constraints can change qualitatively the survival-extinction boundary from a nonmonotonic to a mononotonic dependence. Our finding prompts an inquiry into the actual role of network topology in the macroscopic outcome of ecological dynamics; something we intend to explore in future work.

In a broader view, there are other biological systems that exhibit nonmonotonic effects of diffusion such as epidemic spreading [31], birth-death-competition dynamics with migration [32], evolutionary dynamics with the Allee effect and sex-biased dispersal [33], logistic growth dynamics in metapopulations with heterogeneous carrying capacities [34], metapopulation genetics dynamics with balancing selection [35], two-type (mutants, strains, or species) population dynamics under the Allee effect [36], and range expansion of a genetically diverse population where individuals may invest its limited resources partly in motility and partly in reproduction [37]. As we adopted a minimal ecological model, it is possible to bring forth different extensions of the present work in order to fit for the traits of the problems we have just mentioned. For instance, instead of using a memoryless random walk, we can use a more realistic mobility dynamics: random walks that intermittently revisits previously visited places [38].

• Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge financial support from the Brazilian funding agencies CAPES (MAP) as well as CNPq and FAPERJ (SMDQ).

• Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

 $^{^3}$ n_i stands for the number of individuals on habitat patch i, C is the carrying capacity, c is an Allee threshold

• Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: MAP and SMDQ; Formal analysis: MAP; Funding acquisition: SMDQ; Investigation: MAP and SMDQ; Methodology: MAP and SMDQ; Software: MAP; Supervision: SMDQ; Validation: MAP and SMDQ; Writing - original draft: MAP; Writing - review & editing: SMDQ.

- [1] Allee, W. C. Animal aggregations, a study in general sociology. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago. 1931.
- [2] Stephens PA, Sutherland WJ, Freckleton RP. What is the Allee effect?. Oikos. 1999 Oct 1:185-90.
- [3] Drake, JM and Kramer AM. "Allee effects." Nat. Educ. Knowl 3.10 (2011): 2.
- [4] Courchamp F, Berec L, Gascoigne J. Allee effects in ecology and conservation. Oxford University Press; 2008 Feb 14.
- [5] Kramer AM, Dennis B, Liebhold AM, Drake JM. The evidence for Allee effects. Population Ecology. 2009 Jul 1;51(3):341.
- [6] Smith R, Tan C, Srimani JK, Pai A, Riccione KA, Song H, You L. Programmed Allee effect in bacteria causes a tradeoff between population spread and survival. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2014 Feb 4;111(5):1969-74.
- [7] Regoes RR, Ebert D, Bonhoeffer S. Dose-dependent infection rates of parasites produce the Allee effect in epidemiology. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences. 2002 Feb 7;269(1488):271-9.
- [8] Deredec A, Courchamp F. Combined impacts of Allee effects and parasitism. Oikos. 2006 Mar;112(3):667-79.
- [9] Hilker FM, Langlais M, Malchow H. The Allee effect and infectious diseases: extinction, multistability, and the (dis-) appearance of oscillations. The American Naturalist. 2008 Dec 5;173(1):72-88.
- [10] Korolev KS, Xavier JB, Gore J. Turning ecology and evolution against cancer. Nature Reviews Cancer. 2014 May 1;14(5):371-80.
- [11] Sewalt L, Harley K, van Heijster P, Balasuriya S. Influences of Allee effects in the spreading of malignant tumours. Journal of theoretical biology. 2016 Apr 7;394:77-92.
- [12] Amarasekare P. Allee effects in metapopulation dynamics. The American Naturalist. 1998 Aug;152(2):298-302.
- [13] Zhou SR, Wang G. Allee-like effects in metapopulation dynamics. Mathematical biosciences. 2004 May

- 1;189(1):103-13.
- [14] Zhou SR, Wang G. One large, several medium, or many small?. Ecological Modelling. 2006 Feb 5;191(3-4):513-20.
- [15] Boukal DS, Berec L. Single-species models of the Allee effect: extinction boundaries, sex ratios and mate encounters. Journal of Theoretical Biology. 2002 Oct 7;218(3):375-94.
- [16] Berec L. Models of Allee effects and their implications for population and community dynamics. Biophysical Reviews and Letters. 2008 Apr;3(01n02):157-81.
- [17] Ackleh AS, Allen LJ, Carter J. Establishing a beachhead: a stochastic population model with an Allee effect applied to species invasion. Theoretical Population Biology. 2007 May 1;71(3):290-300.
- [18] Keitt TH, Lewis MA, Holt RD. Allee effects, invasion pinning, and species' borders. The American Naturalist. 2001 Feb;157(2):203-16.
- [19] Hopper KR, Roush RT. Mate finding, dispersal, number released, and the success of biological control introductions. Ecological entomology. 1993 Nov;18(4):321-31.
- [20] Hadjiavgousti D, Ichtiaroglou S. Existence of stable localized structures in population dynamics through the Allee effect. Chaos, Solitons & Fractals. 2004 Jul 1;21(1):119-31.
- [21] Robinet C, Lance DR, Thorpe KW, Onufrieva KS, Tobin PC, Liebhold AM. Dispersion in time and space affect mating success and Allee effects in invading gypsy moth populations. Journal of Animal Ecology. 2008 Sep 1;77(5):966-73.
- [22] Brassil CE. Mean time to extinction of a metapopulation with an Allee effect. Ecological Modelling. 2001 Oct 15;143(1-2):9-16.
- [23] Veit RR, Lewis MA. Dispersal, population growth, and the Allee effect: dynamics of the house finch invasion of eastern North America. The American Naturalist. 1996 Aug 1;148(2):255-74.
- [24] Windus A, Jensen HJ. Allee effects and extinction in a lattice model. Theoretical population biology. 2007 Dec 1;72(4):459-67.
- [25] Hanski I, Gilpin M. Metapopulation dynamics: brief history and conceptual domain. In Metapopulation dynamics: Empirical and theoretical investigations 1991 (pp. 3-16).
- [26] Hanski I. "Metapopulation dynamics." Nature 396.6706 (1998): 41-49.
- [27] https://github.com/PiresMA/optimal_diffusion_ecological_dynamics
- [28] Solé RV. Phase Transitions. Princeton U. Press. Princeton. 2011.
- [29] Yang KC, Wu ZX, Holme P, Nonaka E. Expansion of cooperatively growing populations: Optimal migration rates and habitat network structures. Physical Review E. 2017 Jan 10;95(1):012306.

- [30] South AB, Kenward RE. Mate finding, dispersal distances and population growth in invading species: a spatially explicit model. Oikos. 2001 Oct;95(1):53-8.
- [31] Silva DH, Ferreira SC. Activation thresholds in epidemic spreading with motile infectious agents on scale-free networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01004. 2018.
- [32] Lampert A, Hastings A. Synchronization-induced persistence versus selection for habitats in spatially coupled ecosystems. Journal of The Royal Society Interface. 2013 Oct 6;10(87):20130559.
- [33] Shaw AK, Kokko H. Dispersal evolution in the presence of Allee effects can speed up or slow down invasions. The American Naturalist. 2015 Mar 4;185(5):631-9.
- [34] Khasin M, Meerson B, Khain E, Sander LM. Minimizing the population extinction risk by migration. Physical review letters. 2012 Sep 27;109(13):138104.
- [35] Lombardo P, Gambassi A, Dall'Asta L. Nonmonotonic effects of migration in subdivided populations. Physical review letters. 2014 Apr 8;112(14):148101.
- [36] Korolev KS. Evolution arrests invasions of cooperative populations. Physical review letters. 2015 Nov 13;115(20):208104.
- [37] Reiter M, Rulands S, Frey E. Range expansion of heterogeneous populations. Physical review letters. 2014 Apr 11;112(14):148103.
- [38] Boyer D, Solis-Salas C. Random walks with preferential relocations to places visited in the past and their application to biology. Physical review letters. 2014 Jun 18;112(24):240601.