

Long-Time Behavior of a PDE Replicator Equation for Multilevel Selection in Group-Structured Populations

Daniel B. Cooney^{1,2,3} and Yoichiro Mori^{1,2,3}

¹Center for Mathematical Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

²Department of Mathematics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

³Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

May 14, 2022

Abstract

In many biological systems, natural selection acts simultaneously on multiple levels of organization. This scenario typically presents an evolutionary conflict between the incentive of individuals to cheat and the collective incentive to establish cooperation within a group. Generalizing previous work on multilevel selection in evolutionary game theory, we consider a hyperbolic PDE model of a group-structured population, in which members within a single group compete with each other for individual-level replication; while the group also competes against other groups for group-level replication. We derive a threshold level of the relative strength of between-group competition such that defectors take over the population below the threshold while cooperation persists in the long-time population above the threshold. Under stronger assumptions on the initial distribution of group compositions, we further prove that the population converges to a steady state density supporting cooperation for between-group selection strength above the threshold. We further establish long-time bounds on the time-average of the collective payoff of the population, showing that the long-run population cannot outperform the payoff of a full-cooperator group even in the limit of infinitely-strong between-group competition. When the group replication rate is maximized by an intermediate level of within-group cooperation, individual-level selection casts a long shadow on the dynamics of multilevel selection: no level of between-group competition can erase the effects of the individual incentive to defect. We further extend our model to study the case of multiple types of groups, showing how the games that groups play can coevolve with the level of cooperation.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Model of Multilevel Selection	4
1.2	Summary of Main Results	8
2	Steady State Solutions of Multilevel Dynamics	15
2.1	Well-Posedness of Multilevel Dynamics	15
2.2	Possible Steady State Solutions of Multilevel Dynamics	17
2.3	Properties of Steady State Densities	19
2.4	Achievable Long-Time Steady States for PD Dynamics	23

3	Useful Properties of Multilevel Dynamics	23
4	Convergence to Steady State Population	28
4.1	Weak Convergence for Measure-Valued Initial Population	29
4.2	Convergence to Delta-Function at Full-Cooperation	33
5	Extinction or Weak Persistence of Cooperation	33
5.1	Convergence to Delta-Function at Full-Defection	34
5.2	Bounds on Average Group Reproduction Function	35
5.3	Convergence to Full-Cooperation in the Prisoners' Delight	37
6	Generalization to Multilevel Competition with N Populations	38
6.1	Convergence of Population to Dominant Subpopulation	38
6.2	Application To Hawk-Dove and Stag-Hunt Games	39
7	Discussion	42

1 Introduction

Across a variety of biological and social systems, population structure often induces selective forces operating at multiple levels of organization. Of particular interest are hierarchical structures in which there is a tug-of-war between the interests at a one level of organization and the interests at a larger level. For problems of cooperation or collective behavior, the incentives of an individual to be a free-rider are often misaligned with the incentives of its group to produce a collective benefit for all of its members [1]. Considering the effects of selection at multiple levels of organization is particularly important in systems on the cusp of undergoing a transition to a higher order of complexity, establishing a collective unit that can compete or replicate as a single unit. Multilevel selection has been invoked to describe major evolutionary transitions, with examples ranging from the evolution of multicellularity [2–7], to the evolution of social group structure [8, 9]. The transition to higher levels of biological complexity can be understood as a triumph of cooperative behavior via multilevel selection, in which groups can form a cooperative population structure overcoming individual competition within the group [10–12].

Questions about multilevel selection have ranged widely across scales. On one end of the spectrum, ideas of conflict between individuality and collective behavior have been considered for the evolution of multicellularity [3, 6], replication control of plasmids [13], and the evolution of mutualism in the microbiome [14]. At the other end, the alignment of the individual-level and group-level incentives have been studied for problems ranging from collective hunting in animal groups [15] and the eusocial structure of insect colonies [8, 9] to the establishment of cooperative institutions for the management of common-pool resources [16–18] and within-group cooperation coevolving with warfare [19, 20] in human societies. Experimental and field work has addressed problems ranging from the cooperative cofounding of ant colonies [21], to the establishment of multicellularity in biofilms [4], and the artificial selection for nonaggression in chickens [22–25]. A natural tension between selective forces at different levels of selection arises in the evolution of virulence in infectious disease dynamics, in which competition for pathogen replication within an individual host promotes selection for more virulent pathogens, while increased virulence can also harm the host and prevent onward transmission within the host population [26–31].

One framework that has often been used to study multilevel selection is evolutionary game theory, which provides stylized models for the evolution of cooperative behavior in which individuals can maximize payoff by cheating, while groups achieve higher collective payoffs when at least some of their members cooperate. Traulsen and coauthors have studied the evolution of cooperation in the presence of multilevel selection, showing that group-level competition for replication could help to promote the fixation of cooperators over defectors in finite populations [32–34]. The work of Simon and coauthors has further explored how more realistic mechanisms like group-level fission and fusion events and the possibility of non-constant group size can help to facilitate cooperation win out over the defection that is favored by individual-level selection [35–38]. Further work on stochastic multilevel selection models in evolutionary games have explored the role of group-level extinctions [39], the role of spatial structure on between-group competition [40], and asymptotic formulas for fixation probabilities in the limit of large population size [41].

Luo introduced a stochastic model of two-level selection featuring two types of individuals: one with a constant reproductive advantage at the individual level (i.e. defectors), and the other that confers a selective advantage to its group (i.e. cooperators) [42, 43]. In the limit of infinitely many groups of infinite size, Luo derived a non-local hyperbolic PDE describing the simultaneous competition within and between groups [42]. Luo and Mattingly characterized the long-time behavior of this PDE based upon the relative strengths of selection at the two levels and the Hölder exponent of the initial condition near the full-cooperator group [44]. They showed that there was a threshold level of between-group selection strength such that defectors would fix in the population when between-group competition below the threshold, while the population converges to a steady state density supporting positive levels of cooperation for between-group selection above the threshold. Further work on related nested birth-death models for multilevel selection has explored application to host-pathogen dynamics [45–47], as well as mathematical aspects of behavior in alternate infinite-population scaling limits, including fixation probabilities in stochastic Fleming-Viot models [44, 48, 49] and quasi-stationary distributions in a Wright-Fisher diffusion equation with multilevel selection [50, 51].

This model of two-level selection was later extended to include individual-level and group-level birth rates that depended on the personal and collective payoffs obtained from a two-strategy games played between members of the groups [52]. Results analogous to those of Luo and Mattingly were demonstrated for special cases of the Prisoners’ Dilemma (PD) and Hawk-Dove (HD) games in which the within-group dynamics were exactly solvable, and further work explored the multilevel dynamics all two-player, two-strategy social dilemmas [53] and in the presence of within-group mechanisms of assortment or reciprocity [54]. For the PD and HD games, it was conjectured that, for sufficiently strong between-group competition, the population would converge to the unique steady state with the same Hölder exponent near $x = 1$ as that of the initial distribution. These steady state densities displayed a surprising property, called the “shadow of lower-level selection”, in which the payoff of the modal group composition at steady state and the average payoff of the steady state population were limited by the payoff of the full-cooperator group. As a result, for games in which group payoff was maximized by intermediate levels of cooperation, the population always features less cooperation than optimal, even in the limit of infinitely strong between-group competition.

In this paper, we extend the previous work on multilevel selection in multiple directions. We consider a formulation of two-level competition that allows for any continuously differentiable individual-level and group-level replication rates. For this model, we prove a generalization of the conjecture for the PD game from previous work on the convergence of the population to steady state densities [53]. We also extend our analysis beyond the class of initial measures with a well-defined Hölder exponent near full-cooperation considered in previous work [44, 52, 53], showing in this case that the population does not necessarily converge to any steady state. However, we show that cooperation

can persist in the long-time population in the presence of sufficiently strong between-group competition and provide long-time bounds on the time-averaged collective payoff that serve as a dynamical analogue of the "shadow of lower-level selection". Finally, we relax the assumption that all groups have the same within-group and between-group replication rates, allowing us to study the coevolution of group features and the strategic composition of groups. We provide a sufficient condition for the long-time concentration of the population upon a single type of group under our multi-type two-level birth-death dynamics, and apply this framework to prove a generalization of conjectures about the HD and Stag-Hunt games [53].

In Section 1.1, we describe the mathematical formulation of our model of multilevel selection with comparisons to previous work on multilevel selection in evolutionary games. In Section 1.2, we summarize our main results for the long-time dynamics of our PDE model of multilevel selection.

1.1 Model of Multilevel Selection

For our model of multilevel selection, we consider a population with m groups that is each composed on n members. The within-group selection follow a frequency-dependent Moran process replacing a randomly chosen member of the same group. In a group with i cooperators, cooperators and defectors give birth with rates $1 + w_I \pi_C(\frac{i}{n})$ and $1 + w_I \pi_D(\frac{i}{n})$, respectively, where $\pi_C(\cdot)$ and $\pi_D(\cdot)$ are C^1 functions on $[0, 1]$ and w_I is the intensity of selection for within-group competition. We can further consider the advantage of defectors over cooperators under within-group competition in an i -cooperator group through the quantity

$$\pi\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) := \pi_D\left(\frac{i}{n}\right) - \pi_C\left(\frac{i}{n}\right). \quad (1.1)$$

Between-group competition takes place through a group-level birth-death process in which a group with i cooperators produces a copy of itself and replaces a randomly chosen group with rate $\Lambda(1 + w_G G(\frac{i}{n}))$, where w_G is the selection intensity of between-group competition and Λ describes the relative rate of within-group and between-group replication events. We note that the choice of $\pi(x) = s$ and $G(x) = x$ recovers the functions for within-group and between-group competition for the Luo-Mattingly model [42, 44].

In the limit as the number of groups and group size tend to infinity ($m \rightarrow \infty, n \rightarrow \infty$), we can describe the composition of strategies in the group-structured population by $u(t, x)$, the probability density of groups composed x cooperators and $1 - x$ defectors at time t . Using either a heuristic derivation [42, 43, 52] or a weak convergence argument [44], we can show that the large-population limit of the stochastic ball-and-urn process can be describe by the following partial differential equation for the evolution of $u(t, x)$

$$\frac{\partial u(t, x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (x(1 - x)\pi(x)u(t, x)) + \lambda \left(G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)u(t, y)dy \right) u(t, x), \quad (1.2)$$

where $\lambda := \frac{\Lambda w_G}{w_I}$ describes the relative strength of within-group and between-group competition. The first term on the right-hand side of Equation 1.2 describes the dynamics of within-group competition, in which defectors (respectively cooperators) increase in frequency within groups when $\pi(x) > 0$ (respectively $\pi(x) < 0$). The second term in Equation 1.2 describes the impact of between-group competition, and groups with composition x increase in frequency when their replication rate $G(x)$ exceeds the average group-replication rate in the population $\int_0^1 G(y)u(t, y)dy$.

Equation (1.2) is paired with initial data given by

$$u(0, x) = u_0(x) \geq 0, \quad \int_0^1 u_0(x) dx = 1. \quad (1.3)$$

It is easily checked that, if $u(x, t)$ is a solution to Equation 1.2, it will be of unit mass for all t . Equation 1.2 is a hyperbolic PDE, whose characteristic curves are given by solutions of the following ODE

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -x(1-x)\pi(x), \quad x(0) = x_0, \quad (1.4)$$

which we note is the well-known replicator equation for individual-level selection within a given group [55]. The function $\pi(x)$, sometimes called the gain function [56, 57] describes the relative advantage of defectors over cooperators under within-group competition in an x -cooperator group.

The dynamics of Equation (1.6) also have independent biological interest for studying multilevel selection in which x -cooperator reproduce with rate $G(x)$ and no groups are removed from the population. Such models of an expanding group-structured population may be relevant in applications in which the group-level reproduction corresponds to cell division [58–61] or fission of social groups [38, 62].

We can also consider a measure-valued formulation corresponding to the multilevel dynamics described by Equation (1.2). For an initial Borel probability measure $\mu_0(dx)$ and any $C^1([0, 1])$ test-function $v(x)$, the $\mu_t(dx)$ evolves according to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x)\pi(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) + \lambda \int_0^1 \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y) \bar{\mu}_t(dy) \right] \bar{\mu}_t(dx). \quad (1.5)$$

Again considering an auxiliary linear equation with initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$ solving

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x)\pi(x) \mu_t(dx) + \lambda \int_0^1 G(x) \mu_t(dx), \quad (1.6)$$

we see that solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to the measure-valued multilevel dynamics of Equation (1.5) can be related to solutions $\mu_t(dx)$ of Equation (1.6) through the normalization given by

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \frac{\mu_t(dx)}{\int_0^1 \mu_t(dy)}. \quad (1.7)$$

We will also consider an extension of the multilevel dynamics in which groups belong to one of N possible subpopulations, with each subpopulation featuring its own reproduction rates $\pi_j(\cdot)$ and $G_j(\cdot)$. Within-group competition proceeds according to $\pi_j(\cdot)$, while between-group competition consists of group replicating with rate proportion to $G_j(\cdot)$ and replacing a randomly-chosen group from any of the N subpopulations. For example, each subpopulation could be defined by a different two-strategy game played within its groups, and then the corresponding multilevel dynamics describe the coevolution of cooperation and the fraction of groups playing each game.

Denoting the set of subpopulations by $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$, we describe the composition of x -cooperator groups in the subpopulation $j \in \mathcal{N}$ at time t by the density $u^j(t, x)$. This family of densities evolves according to PDEs of the form

$$\frac{\partial u^j(t, x)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [x(1-x)\pi_j(x)u^j(t, x)] + \lambda u^j(t, x) \left[G_j(x) - \sum_{k=1}^N \int_0^1 G_k(y)u^k(t, y)dy \right], \quad (1.8)$$

for each $j \in \mathcal{N}$, and this system is paired with initial data satisfying

$$u^j(t, x) = u_0^j(x) \geq 0, \quad \sum_{k=1}^N \int_0^1 u_0^k(x) dx = 1. \quad (1.9)$$

We can also consider a measure-valued analogue of our multipopulation model by describing the strategic composition of groups in the j th subpopulation by the measure $\mu_t^j(dx)$. For a $C^1([0, 1])$ test-function $v_j(x)$, this measure evolves according to the following equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^1 v_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx) &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v_j(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x) \pi_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx) \\ &+ \lambda \int_0^1 v_j(x) \left[G_j(x) - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\int_0^1 G_i(y) \mu_t(dy) \right) \right] \mu_t(dx), \end{aligned} \quad (1.10)$$

where the subpopulations are coupled through the nonlocal regulation term describing between-group competition. The system described by Equation (1.10) is paired with initial data given by the measures $\mu_0^j(dx)$ for $j \in \mathcal{N}$, which together satisfy the normalization condition given by

$$\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_0^j([0, 1]) = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^1 \mu_0^j(dx) = 1. \quad (1.11)$$

We can also associate with Equation (1.10) a system of N decoupled linear equations of the form

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^1 v_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx) = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v_j(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x) \pi_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx) + \lambda \int_0^1 v_j(x) G_j(x) \mu_t(dx). \quad (1.12)$$

Given solutions $\mu_t^1(dx), \dots, \mu_t^N(dx)$ to the linear dynamics of Equation (1.12), we can find a corresponding solution $\bar{\mu}_t^j(dx)$ to Equation (1.10) for the j th subpopulation through the normalization given by

$$\int_0^1 v_j(x) \bar{\mu}_t^j(dx) = \frac{\int_0^1 v_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_t^j([0, 1])} \quad (1.13)$$

1.1.1 Motivating Example: Two-Strategy Evolutionary Games

To formulate assumptions about the behavior of the functions $\pi(x)$ and $G(x)$ characterizing within-group and between-group competition, we can consider the special case of the multilevel selection dynamics depend on payoffs from two-player, two-strategy social dilemmas [52, 53]. We consider games with symmetric payoff matrices of the form

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \begin{array}{cc} C & D \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} C \\ D \end{array} & \begin{pmatrix} R & S \\ T & P \end{pmatrix}, \end{array} \quad (1.14)$$

where the entries of the payoff matrix correspond to the reward for mutual cooperation (R), the sucker payoff from cooperating with a defector (S), the temptation to defect against a cooperator (T), and

the punishment for mutual defection (P). In this paper, we will consider the multilevel dynamics corresponding to generalizations of four two-strategy social dilemmas: the Prisoners' Dilemma (PD), the Hawk-Dove game (HD), the Stag-Hunt (SH), and the Prisoners' Delight (PDel). These four games are characterized by the following rankings of payoffs

$$\text{PD} : T > R > S > P \quad (1.15a)$$

$$\text{HD} : T > R > P > S \quad (1.15b)$$

$$\text{SH} : R > T > S > P \quad (1.15c)$$

$$\text{PDel} : R > T > P > S. \quad (1.15d)$$

For a group composed of fractions x cooperators and $1-x$ defectors, the average payoff for a cooperator and defector are given by

$$\pi_C(x) = Rx + S(1-x) \quad (1.16a)$$

$$\pi_D(x) = Tx + P(1-x). \quad (1.16b)$$

In previous work on multilevel selection in evolutionary games, it was assumed that the group-level reproduction rate in an x -cooperator group depend on the average payoff of group members $G(x) = x\pi_C(x) + (1-x)\pi_D(x)$ [52, 53]. Using the cooperator and defector payoffs from Equation (1.16), we then have that the dynamics of Equation (1.2) have the following dependence on the payoff matrix from Equation (1.14)

$$\pi(x) = P - S - (R - S - T + P)x \quad (1.17a)$$

$$G(x) = P + (S + T - 2P)x + (R - S - T + P)x^2. \quad (1.17b)$$

From Equation 1.17b, we can see that the group-reproduction function satisfies

$$G(1) = R > P = G(0) \quad (1.18)$$

for each of the social dilemmas described in Equation (1.15). Under the game-theoretic model, the characteristic curves from Equation (1.4) evolve according to

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -x(1-x)[P - S - (R - S - T + P)x], \quad (1.19)$$

which has equilibria at $x = 0$, $x = 1$, and a possible interior equilibrium $x = x_{eq}$ given by

$$x_{eq} = \frac{P - S}{R - S - T + P}. \quad (1.20)$$

For the PD game, we can use the payoff rankings and the fact that $\pi(x)$ is an affine function to see that

$$\pi(x) \geq \min(\pi(0), \pi(1)) = \min(P - S, T - R) > 0,$$

and therefore the within-group dynamics feature global stability of the all-defector equilibrium $x = 0$. For the Prisoners' Delight game, we can use the payoff rankings from Equation (1.15d) to see that

$$\pi(x) < \max(\pi(0), \pi(1)) = \max(P - S, T - R) < 0, \quad (1.21)$$

and therefore full-cooperation is globally stable under individual-level selection.

Using these properties, we formulate a generalization of the multilevel PD and PDel dynamics by considering $G(x), \pi(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$ satisfying $G(1) > G(0)$ and either $\pi(x) > 0$ (in the PD case) or $\pi(x) < 0$ (in the PDel case). This class of reproduction functions $G(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ include those used in the Luo-Mattingly model [42], in models used to describe the evolution of protocells [63], and within-group dynamics following the Fermi update rule for social learning [32]. We will take this generalization of the PD and PDel dynamics as a generic picture of multilevel selection in populations without internal within-group equilibria, and will assume that the dynamics of multiple subpopulations described by Equation (1.8) reflects a PD or PDel scenario within a given subpopulation. For games such as the HD and SH with internal within-group equilibria, we will apply the multiple subpopulation formulation using the fact that the dynamics above and below the within-group equilibria for such games reflect either a PD or PDel scenario.

Remark 1.1. *For the game-theoretic dynamics, $G(x)$ is maximized by the following level of cooperation*

$$x^* = \begin{cases} 1 & : 2R \geq S + T \\ \frac{S + T - 2P}{2(S + T - R - S)} & : 2R < S + T \end{cases}, \quad (1.22)$$

so an intermediate level of cooperation can optimize group-level reproduction when the total payoff $S + T$ generated by the interaction of a cooperator and defector exceeds the total payoff $2R$ generated by two cooperators. In addition, we see from the fact that $G(x)$ is a quadratic function of x in the game-theoretic setting that $G'(x)$ changes sign at most once in $[0, 1]$, and that $G(x)$ experiences a single upcrossing of $G(1)$ in $[0, 1]$. For our generalized PD or HD multilevel dynamics, $G(x)$ can either be maximized by interior levels of cooperation or by full-cooperation and can feature arbitrarily many upcrossings of $G(1)$.

1.2 Summary of Main Results

1.2.1 Results for a Single Group-Structured Population

Now we present our main results for the dynamics of solutions to Equation (1.2) for the generalized Prisoners' Dilemma scenario. We first look to understand steady-state solutions to Equation (1.2), and the conditions under which such solutions can be achieved under the multilevel dynamics. In Section 2, we show that, under generic conditions on λ , $G(\cdot)$, and $\pi(\cdot)$, the achievable steady states are delta-concentrations of full-defector groups $\delta(x)$ and full-cooperator groups $\delta(1 - x)$, as well as a family of density steady states which we characterize below.

In previous work on special cases of Equation (1.2), the long-time behavior and convergence to steady state of the multilevel dynamics was studied for initial measures $\mu_0(dx)$ with given Hölder exponent near $x = 1$ [44, 52, 53]. This Hölder exponent and its associated Hölder constant quantify the extent to which the initial distribution concentrates or decays near the full-cooperator group, and is defined as follows.

Definition 1.2. *The measure $\mu_t(dx)$ has Hölder exponent $\theta_t \geq 0$ near $x = 1$ if*

$$\theta_t = \inf \left\{ \Theta \geq 0 : \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1 - x, 1])}{x^\Theta} > 0 \right\}. \quad (1.23)$$

Furthermore, $\mu_t(dx)$ has Hölder constant $C_{\theta_t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ if

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^{\theta_t}} = C_{\theta_t}. \quad (1.24)$$

Measures of the form $\mu(dx) = \theta(1-x)^{\theta-1}dx$ for finite $\theta > 0$ have Hölder exponent θ near $x = 1$. Examples with Hölder exponent of 0 and ∞ are measures satisfying $\mu(\{1\}) > 0$ and $\mu([1-\epsilon, 1])$ for some $\epsilon > 0$, respectively.

We show in Section 2.3 that steady state density solutions to Equation (1.2) can be parametrized by λ and their Hölder exponent $\theta > 0$ near $x = 1$. We calculate that these steady states are given by the following densities

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) &= \frac{f_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x)}{\int_0^1 f_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) dx}, \\ f_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) &= x^{\nu_{\theta}-1} (1-x)^{\theta-1} \frac{\pi(1)}{\pi(x)} \exp\left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{C(s) ds}{\pi(s)}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (1.25)$$

where the parameter ν corresponds to

$$\nu_{\theta} := \left(\frac{1}{\pi(0)}\right) (\lambda [G(1) - G(0)] - \theta \pi(1)) \quad (1.26)$$

and the term $-\lambda \tilde{C}(x)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\lambda \tilde{C}(x) &= \lambda \left(\frac{G(x) - G(0)}{x}\right) + \left(\frac{\lambda [G(1) - G(0)] - \theta \pi(1)}{\pi(0)}\right) \left(\frac{\pi(x) - \pi(0)}{x}\right) \\ &\quad + \lambda \left(\frac{G(x) - G(1)}{1-x}\right) - \theta \left(\frac{\pi(x) - \pi(1)}{1-x}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (1.27)$$

We note that $\lambda \tilde{C}(x)$ is bounded on $[0, 1]$ because $\pi(x), G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$. Because we are considering $\theta > 0$, we see that the $f_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x)$ is integrable provided that $\nu_{\theta} > 0$, which occurs when between-group competition is sufficiently strong so that

$$\lambda > \lambda^* := \frac{\theta \pi(1)}{G(1) - G(0)}. \quad (1.28)$$

This threshold condition is increasing in $\pi(1)$, the relative within-group advantage of a defector over a cooperator in a full-cooperator group, and is decreasing in $G(1) - G(0)$, the relative between-group advantage of a full-cooperator group over a full-defector group. From this we see that the ability to promote cooperation via multilevel selection can be understood as the collective incentive to cooperate winning out over the individual incentive to defect against cooperators. In addition, λ^* is an increasing function of θ , which means that larger cohorts of near full-cooperator groups are able to maintain a steady state density featuring cooperation over a large range in the strength of between-group competition.

We further show in Section 2.3 that the average level of group reproduction $G(x)$ achieved in the steady state distribution p_{θ}^{λ} is given by

$$\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f = \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{\lambda}\right) G(0) + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^*}{\lambda}\right) G(1). \quad (1.29)$$

The average group reproduction function (or collective payoff in the game-theoretic scenario) interpolates between the collective outcome of all-defector groups to that of all-cooperator groups as λ ranges from λ^* to ∞ , and that the average at steady state $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f$ is limited by the collective outcome for the all-cooperator group. In particular, this means that if $G(x)$ is maximized by an interior level of cooperation x^* , then the average collective reproduction at steady state does not achieve its optimal possible level even in the limit of infinitely strong between-group competition when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. This generalizes the so-called “shadow of lower-level selection” seen in previous work on multilevel selection in evolutionary games.

We may also visualize the impact of increasing the intensity of between-group competition by plotting the steady state densities from Equation (1.25) for various values of λ . In Figure 1, we display these steady state densities for special cases of the game-theoretic examples from Section 1.1.1 in which the collective payoff of the group is either maximized by full-cooperation ($x^* = 1$, Figure 1a) or by a composition of 75 percent cooperators ($x^* = \frac{3}{4}$, Figure 1b). In the former case, we see arbitrarily high levels of cooperation are achieved by the group for sufficiently large λ , whereas in the latter case the densities do not come close to achieving the optimal composition of cooperators. In fact, in the latter case, the density appears to concentrate around $\bar{x} = \frac{1}{2}$, the unique interior level of cooperation satisfying $G(x) = G(1)$.




Figure 1: Steady state densities from Equation (1.25) for various values of between-group selection intensity λ for the game-theoretic case of Section 1.1.1 and scenarios in which $G(x)$ is maximized by full-cooperation (left) or by 75 percent cooperators (right). The dashed lines in the bottom panel correspond to the group type x^* maximizing $G(x)$ and the group type \bar{x} for which $G(\bar{x}) = G(1)$. Densities have Hölder exponent $\theta = 3$ near $x = 1$, and payoff parameters are chosen from the family of games with $S = 1$, $P = 2$, $T = R + 2$ with either $R = 2.5$ (left) or $R = 3$ (right).

In fact, we can formalize the intuition from Figure 1 to show that the steady states of Equation (1.2) in the PD case concentrate as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ upon measures supported only at points satisfying $G(x) = G(1)$. To highlight the dependent of our steady-state density on λ , we can rewrite the expression of our steady state in the form

$$p_\theta^\lambda(x) = \frac{b(x) \exp(\lambda h(x))}{\int_0^1 b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy}, \quad (1.30)$$

where $b(x)$ and $h(x)$ are given by the formulas

$$b(x) := (1-x)^{\theta-1} \frac{\pi(1)}{x\pi(x)} \exp\left(\int_x^1 \frac{\theta[\pi(1) - s\pi(s)]}{s\pi(s)} ds\right) \quad (1.31a)$$

$$h(x) := \int_x^1 \left[\frac{G(s) - G(1)}{s(1-s)\pi(s)} \right] ds \quad (1.31b)$$

From the form of Equation (1.30), we expect $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ to concentrate around the global maximizer of $h(x)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. The critical points x_c of $h(x)$ satisfy $G(x_c) = G(1)$, and we further compute that

$$h''(x) \Big|_{x=x_c} = \frac{-x(1-x)\pi(x)G'(x) - (x(1-x)\pi(x))' [G(1) - G(x)]}{x^2(1-x)^2\pi(x)^2} \Big|_{x=x_c} = \frac{-G'(x_c)}{x_c(1-x_c)\pi(x_c)}.$$

Because $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$ under the PD assumptions, we see that the local maxima of $h(x)$ are upcrossings of $G(1)$, and the local minima of $h(x)$ are downcrossings of $G(1)$. In Proposition 1.3, we consider the case in which $h(x)$ is maximized by an interior level of cooperation $\bar{x} \in (0, 1)$, and use the Laplace integration method [64] to show that $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ concentrates upon \bar{x} as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

Proposition 1.3. *Consider the steady state densities given by Equation (1.31) under the assumptions that $G(x), \pi(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$, $G(1) > G(0)$ and $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. Suppose that $G(x)$ has an interior maximizer x^* satisfying $G(x^*) > G(1)$, and that $h(x)$ has a unique maximizer $\bar{x} < 1$. Then the family of steady states $p_\theta^\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x - \bar{x})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.*

Furthermore, if \bar{x} is the only upcrossing of $G(1)$ in $[0, 1]$, then $\bar{x} < x^*$ and the level of cooperation achieved as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ is less than the level that achieves the maximal group reproduction rate $G(x^*)$. In particular, we note from Remark 1.1 that this is true for all PD and HD games with corresponding quadratic $G(x)$ given by Equation (1.17).

When $h(x)$ is maximized by $\bar{x} = 1$, the Laplace method breaks down because of the behavior of $b(x)$ at $x = 1$, so we employ a different approach to show that $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ concentrates upon full-cooperation as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ under the additional assumption that $\theta > 1$.

Proposition 1.4. *Consider the steady state densities given by Equation (1.31) under the assumptions on $G(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ from Proposition 1.3. Suppose $h(x)$ achieves a unique maximum at $x = 1$ and consider $\theta > 1$. Then, for our family of steady-state solutions $p_\theta^\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x - 1)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.*

In particular, $h(x)$ has a global maximum at $x = 1$ when $G(x)$ is non-decreasing on $[0, 1]$, and therefore the population concentrates upon the optimal level of cooperation as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ when full-cooperation is the best possible group composition. However, there exist group reproduction functions $G(x)$ for which $h(x)$ is still maximized by full-cooperation even though intermediate levels of cooperation are collectively-optimal. In such cases, Proposition 1.4 tells us the population can concentrate at a level of cooperation greater than is optimal for group-level reproduction, so the shadow of lower-level selection can also manifest itself by promoting too much cooperation.

Next we explore the conditions under which steady states of the form $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ are achieved as the long-time behavior under the dynamics of Equation (1.2). Considering initial populations that have a well-defined Hölder exponent, we show in Theorem 1.5 that solutions $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) converge weakly to a steady state density when $\lambda > \lambda^*$. This result constitutes a generalization of Conjecture 4.1 from [53], which addressed the long-time behavior for multilevel selection for Prisoners' Dilemma games with the payoff matrix of Equation (1.14).

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$, $G(1) > G(0)$, and $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. Consider an initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$ having a Hölder exponent $\theta > 0$ near $x = 1$ with corresponding positive, finite Hölder constant C_θ . If $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \theta\pi(1)$, then $\bar{\mu}_t$ converges weakly to the probability measure defined by the density function $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ defined in Equation (1.25):*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx \quad (1.32)$$

where $v(x)$ is an arbitrary continuous function on $[0, 1]$.

It is important to note that the limits characterizing the Hölder exponent and constant in Equations (1.23) and (1.24) do not necessarily exist for a given measure $\mu_t(dx)$. To supplement the Hölder exponent in characterizing initial measures by the behavior near $x = 1$, we introduce the following quantities that can be defined for any initial measure.

Definition 1.6. *The infimum Hölder exponent $\bar{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ satisfies*

$$\bar{\theta}_t := \sup \left\{ \Theta > 0 : \liminf_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^\Theta} = 0 \right\} \quad (1.33)$$

Furthermore, the infimum Hölder constant $C_{\bar{\theta}_t}$ is given by

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^{\bar{\theta}_t}} = C_{\bar{\theta}_t}. \quad (1.34)$$

Definition 1.7. *The supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ satisfies*

$$\underline{\theta}_t := \sup \left\{ \Theta > 0 : \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^\Theta} = 0 \right\} \quad (1.35)$$

Furthermore, the supremum Hölder constant $C_{\underline{\theta}_t}$ is given by

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^{\underline{\theta}_t}} = C_{\underline{\theta}_t}. \quad (1.36)$$

Remark 1.8. *The infimum and supremum Hölder exponents satisfy the inequality $\underline{\theta} \leq \bar{\theta}$. This is true because, for any $\Theta \geq 0$,*

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^\Theta} \leq \limsup_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mu_t([1-x, 1])}{x^\Theta}. \quad (1.37)$$

Therefore if the left-hand side is positive for a given Θ , then right-hand side is positive as well. Furthermore, we also see from Equation 1.37 that if $\underline{\theta} = \bar{\theta}$, then the infimum and supremum Hölder constants satisfy $C_{\bar{\theta}} \leq C_{\underline{\theta}}$.

Remark 1.9. *It can be shown that, if our initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$ has infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\bar{\theta}$ and $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ with constants $C_{\bar{\theta}}$ and $C_{\underline{\theta}}$, then the solution $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.6) has the same infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\bar{\theta}$ and $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ with constants $C_{\bar{\theta}} e^{[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t}$ and $C_{\underline{\theta}} e^{[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t}$. This allows us to see that the set of measures with well-defined Hölder exponent and Hölder constant near $x = 1$ is closed under our multilevel dynamics.*

Using the definition of the supremum Hölder exponent, we show in Proposition 1.10 that if the initial

population contains a positive probability of full-cooperator groups, then the whole population will concentrate upon full-cooperation in the long-time limit.

Proposition 1.10. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that the initial population can be written as*

$$\mu_0(dx) = a_1 \delta(1-x) + (1-a_1) \rho_0(dx) \quad (1.38)$$

for $a_1 > 0$ and $\rho_0(dx)$ a probability measure with a supremum Hölder exponent of $\underline{\theta} > 0$ near $x = 1$. Then the solution to Equation (1.2) $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ converges weakly to the delta-function $\delta(1-x)$ concentrated at full-cooperation as $t \rightarrow \infty$.

The supremum Hölder exponent can also be used to characterize the long-time behavior of solutions to Equation (1.2) for a more general class of initial conditions than we considered in Theorem 1.5. In fact, we can find an analogous threshold quantity to Equation (1.28) given by

$$\lambda^*(\underline{\theta}) := \frac{\underline{\theta}\pi(1)}{G(1) - G(0)}, \quad (1.39)$$

which determines whether populations with initial measures $\mu_0(dx)$ with supremum Hölder exponent $C_{\underline{\theta}}$ near $x = 1$ are capable of supporting long-time cooperation. In Theorem 1.11, we show that, if $\lambda < \lambda^*(\underline{\theta})$, cooperation goes extinct and the population converges to a delta-function $\delta(x)$ concentrated upon the all-defector group.

Theorem 1.11. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that the initial distribution $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$. If $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] < \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, then $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

For the case in which $\lambda > \lambda^*(\underline{\theta})$, we show in Theorem 1.12 that the time-average of the average reproduction rate $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s}$ eventually satisfies bounds in terms of the supremum and infimum Hölder exponents of the initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$. In Corollary 1.13, we use these bounds to deduce that cooperation survives in the population for $\lambda > \lambda^*(\underline{\theta})$ and that the population will never converge to steady state when the infimum and supremum Hölder exponents of $\mu_0(dx)$ near $x = 1$ disagree. Mathematically, cooperation is shown to survive in the sense of weak persistence [65], which has often been used to characterize the survival and coexistence of strategies in evolutionary games and related ecological models under individual-level dynamics [55, 65–68]. For the edge case in which $\lambda = \lambda^*(\underline{\theta})$, we show in Section 5.1 that the population will converge to $\delta(x)$ for a more restricted class of group-reproduction functions $G(x)$.

Theorem 1.12. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that the initial distribution $\bar{\mu}_0(dx)$ has positive supremum and infimum Hölder exponents $\underline{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ near $x = 1$. If $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, then weak solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) satisfy*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s} ds = G(1) - \frac{\underline{\theta}\pi(1)}{\lambda} \quad (1.40a)$$

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s} ds = \max \left\{ G(1) - \frac{\bar{\theta}\pi(1)}{\lambda}, G(0) \right\}. \quad (1.40b)$$

Corollary 1.13. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$, and $\mu_0(dx)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.12. If*

$\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, then the average fraction of cooperators satisfies

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 x \bar{\mu}_t(dx) > 0. \quad (1.41)$$

Furthermore, if $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$ and $\underline{\theta} \neq \bar{\theta}$, then the $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ does not converge weakly to any Borel measure.

The bounds from Theorem 1.12 tell us that, in a time-averaged sense, the long-time collective outcome is limited by the group-reproduction rate $G(1)$ of the full-cooperator group. This extends our idea of the shadow of lower-level selection seen in Equation (1.29), showing that this limitation on the collective reproduction rate holds for any initial measure and making an explicit connection between this limitation and the dynamics of Equation (1.2).

We also consider the long-time behavior for the case of the Prisoners' Delight game. Because both within-groups and between-group competition push to increase cooperation under the PDel dynamics, we show in Proposition 1.14 that the population concentrates upon the full-cooperator group when there is any between-group competition and any cooperators in the initial population.

Proposition 1.14. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x) \in C^1[0, 1]$, $G(1) > G(0)$, and $\pi(x) < 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$. If $\mu_0((0, 1]) > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$, then $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x - 1)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

1.2.2 Results for Multiple Population Dynamics

As we saw for the dynamics of a single interval, the growth of the non-normalized solution can be associated with a principal exponential growth rate that can be associated with the average payoff at steady state. For a given interval j with well-defined Hölder exponent θ^j near $x = 1$,

$$r_j = \begin{cases} \lambda G_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) < 0 \\ \lambda G_j(1) - \theta^j \pi_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \theta^j \pi_j(1) > 0 \\ \lambda G_j(0) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \theta^j \pi_j(1) < 0 \end{cases} . \quad (1.42)$$

However, in the case in which $\mu_0^j(dx)$ does not have a well-defined Hölder exponent near $x = 1$, we can possibly only bound the principal growth rate in terms of the infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\bar{\theta}^j$ and $\underline{\theta}^j$ near $x = 1$. Recalling that $\underline{\theta}^j \leq \bar{\theta}^j$, we can see that the principal growth rate $r_j \in [r_j^m, r_j^M]$, where we can our lower bound in terms of $\underline{\theta}^j$ as

$$r_j^m = \begin{cases} \lambda G_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) < 0 \\ \lambda G_j(1) - \bar{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \bar{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) > 0 \\ \lambda G_j(0) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \bar{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) < 0 \end{cases} \quad (1.43a)$$

and our upper bound in terms of $\underline{\theta}^j$ as

$$r_j^M = \begin{cases} \lambda G_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) < 0 \\ \lambda G_j(1) - \underline{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \underline{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) > 0 \\ \lambda G_j(0) & : \pi_j(x) > 0, \lambda[G_j(1) - G_j(0)] - \underline{\theta}^j \pi_j(1) < 0 \end{cases} . \quad (1.43b)$$

In particular, this means that the possible growth rates for two intervals can potentially overlap. In the remainder of the paper, we will focus on the case in which there is an interval j such that $r_j^m > r_k^M$ for all other intervals k . When such a condition holds, we can show that the whole population will eventually concentrate upon the subpopulation with the dominant principal growth rate.

Theorem 1.15. *Suppose that each subpopulation $j \in \mathcal{N}$ has reproduction functions $G_j(x), \pi_j(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$ satisfying $G_j(1) > G_0$ and either $\pi_j(0) > 0$ for x in $[0, 1]$ or $\pi_j(0) < 0$ for x in $[0, 1]$ and that its initial measure $\mu_0^j(dx)$ have infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\bar{\theta}^j > 0$ and $\underline{\theta}^j > 0$ near $x = 1$. Suppose there is a subpopulation k such that $r_k^m > r_j^M$ for $j \in \mathcal{N} - \{k\}$. Then, for all such j , we see that $\bar{\mu}_t^j([0, 1]) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, if $\mu_0^k(dx)$ has well-defined Hölder exponent θ^k and Hölder constant C_{θ^k} near $x = 1$ that are positive and finite, then $\bar{\mu}_t^k \rightarrow p_\theta^{\lambda, k} dx$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if $\lambda[G_k(1) - G_k(0)] > \theta^k \pi_k(1)$, where $p_{\theta, k}^\lambda(x)$ is the steady state density given by Equation (1.25) with $G(x) := G_k(x)$ and $\pi(x) := \pi_k(x)$.*

1.2.3 Outline of Paper

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we discuss properties of the steady state solutions to the multilevel PD dynamics, exploring the time-independent problem and characterizing the average payoff of the density steady states and show the concentration of steady states to delta-functions supported at full-cooperation in the limit of strong between-group competition. In Section 4, we discuss useful properties of the time-dependent solutions to multilevel dynamics, and characterize sufficient conditions for the population to converge to steady states supporting positive levels of cooperation. In particular, we prove in this section that the population converges weakly to a steady state density if the initial distribution has a well-defined Hölder exponent and constant. In Section 5, we characterize how cooperation can either collapse or persist in the population, depending on the initial distribution of the population and the relative intensity of within-group and between-group competition. In Section 6, we characterize the long-time behavior of the multipopulation dynamics described by Equation (1.10), and then apply these results to understand the long-time behavior of solutions to Equation (1.2) for the case of HD or SH games. In Section 7, we discuss our results and directions for future research.

2 Steady State Solutions of Multilevel Dynamics

In this section, we discuss properties of steady state solutions to Equation (1.2). We first address the well-posedness of measure-valued solutions to Equation (1.2) Section 2.1. In Section 2.2, we characterize the properties of weak steady-state solutions and show distributions can only consist of combinations of delta-concentrations at equilibria of the within-group dynamics and densities supported on non-equilibrium levels of cooperation that are strong solutions to the steady-state ODE. In Section 2.3, we derive expressions for steady state densities under the PD set of assumptions, characterizing the average payoff at steady state in Section 2.3.1 and proving Propositions 1.3 and 1.4 for the concentration of the steady state densities under strong between-group competition in Section 2.3.2. In Section 2.4, we further show which of the possible weak steady-state solutions can actually be achieved as the long-time behavior of solutions of Equation (1.2).

2.1 Well-Posedness of Multilevel Dynamics

We will explore the sense in which we have weak solutions $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2). To do this, we first consider solutions to the the linear problem of Equation (1.6) for which we use the method of

characteristics. We consider the following ordinary differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dx}{dt} &= -x(1-x)\pi(x), \quad \frac{dq}{dt} = \lambda G(x)q, \\ x(0) &= y, \quad q(0) = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

whose solution we denote by

$$x(t) = \phi_t(y), \quad q(t) = \psi_t(y). \tag{2.2}$$

We can then consider the representation formula μ_t given by

$$\int_0^1 v(x)\mu_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)\mu_0(dx), \quad w_t(x) = \psi_t(\phi_t^{-1}(x)) \tag{2.3}$$

for all continuous text functions $v(x)$. We note that $\mu_t(dx)$ is a Borel measure due to the Riesz-Markov-Kakutani theorem, and we can use the representation formula to show that $\mu_t(dx)$ solves Equation (1.6) for any test-function $v(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$. From the normalization relation from Equation (1.7), we also have established that the existence of a Borel measure $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ solving Equation (1.2) in the weak sense.

To explore uniqueness of solutions, it is helpful to establish a bijective correspondence between the measures $\mu_t(dx)$ and $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ solving Equations (1.6) and (1.2). By considering the test-function $v(x) = 1$ and using the assumption that $\mu_0(dx)$ is a probability measure, we can calculate the mass of $\mu_t(dx)$ solving Equation (1.6) is given by

$$\mu_t([0, 1]) = \int_0^1 \mu_t(dx) = \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right), \quad \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} := \frac{\int_0^1 G(x)\mu_t(dx)}{\int_0^1 \mu_t(dx)}. \tag{2.4}$$

Then, applying this to the normalization relation from Equation (1.7), we can express solutions $\bar{\mu}_t$ to the full multilevel dynamics in terms of $\mu_t(dx)$ by

$$\int_0^1 v(x)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right) \mu_t(dx). \tag{2.5}$$

Given a solution $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to the measure-valued formulation of Equation (1.2), we can also check that the following representation formula for $\mu_t(dx)$ provides a solution to the linear dynamics of Equation (1.6)

$$\int_0^1 v(x)\mu_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s} ds\right) \bar{\mu}_t(dx). \tag{2.6}$$

We can now use this correspondence between solutions of the linear and nonlinear forms of the multilevel dynamics to study well-posedness of measure-valued solutions to Equation (1.2).

Proposition 2.1. *Denote by $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ and $C^1([0, 1])^*$ the set of Borel measures on $[0, 1]$ and the dual space of $C^1([0, 1])$, respectively. Given the initial measure $\mu_0(dx) \in \mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ and any $T \geq 0$, there exists a unique $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \in C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}([0, 1])) \cap C^1([0, T]; C^1([0, 1])^*)$ such that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ is a weak solution to Equation (1.2).*

Proof. We start by establishing the well-posedness of solutions $\mu_t(dx)$ to the linear model from Equation (1.6). Knowing from the representation formula of Equation (2.3) that $\mu_t(dx)$ exists in the appropriate space, we now suppose that Equation (1.6) has two solutions $\mu_t^1(dx)$ and $\mu_t^2(dx)$ for given initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$. Considering the difference $\tilde{\mu}_t(dx) := \mu_t^1(dx) - \mu_t^2(dx)$ with $\tilde{\mu}_0(dx) = 0dx$.

Considering a test-function $v(t, x) \in C^{1,1}([0, T] \times [0, 1])$ we can use the linearity of Equation (1.6) to see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_0^1 v(t, x) \tilde{\mu}_t(dx) = \int_0^1 \left[\frac{\partial v(t, x)}{\partial t} + x(1-x)\pi(x) \frac{\partial v(t, x)}{\partial x} + \lambda G(x)v(t, x) \right] \tilde{\mu}_t(dx). \quad (2.7)$$

We can simplify Equation (2.7) by choosing $v(t, x)$ solve the dual problem to the linear dynamics of Equation (1.6), given by

$$\frac{\partial v(t, x)}{\partial t} + x(1-x)\pi(x) \frac{\partial v(t, x)}{\partial x} = -\lambda G(x)v(t, x), \quad v(t, x) = \omega(x) \in C^1([0, 1]). \quad (2.8)$$

Noting that such a solution $v(t, x)$ exists by the method of characteristics, we can see with this choice that the righthand side of Equation (2.7) will vanish. This allows us to integrate Equation (2.7) in time to see that

$$\int_0^1 v(T, x) \tilde{\mu}_T(dx) = \int_0^1 v(0, x) \tilde{\mu}_0(dx) \implies \int_0^1 \omega(x) \tilde{\mu}_T(dx) = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

Because this identity holds for each $\omega(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$, we can deduce that the solution $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.6) is unique in $C^1([0, 1])^*$, and further that it is unique in $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ by the density of continuous test-functions in $C^1([0, 1])$.

Existence of a weak solution $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) in $C([0, T]; \mathcal{M}([0, 1])) \cap C^1([0, T]; C^1([0, 1])^*)$ follows from the existence of a solution $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.6) and the mapping of Equation (2.5). To establish uniqueness, we consider solutions $\bar{\mu}_t^1(dx)$ and $\bar{\mu}_t^2(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) for initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$, and apply the mapping of Equation (2.6) and the uniqueness of the solution $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.6) to see that, for any C^1 test-function $v(x)$,

$$\int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s^1} ds\right) \bar{\mu}_t^1(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s^2} ds\right) \bar{\mu}_t^2(dx). \quad (2.10)$$

We can then use this to deduce that there is a function of time $c(t)$ such that

$$\int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t^1(dx) = c(t) \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t^2(dx). \quad (2.11)$$

Because $\bar{\mu}_t^1(dx)$ and $\bar{\mu}_t^2(dx)$ are probability measures for all $t \geq 0$, we can further deduce that $c(t) \equiv 1$ and conclude that $\bar{\mu}_t^1(dx) = \bar{\mu}_t^2(dx)$ in $C^1([0, 1])^*$ and in $\mathcal{M}([0, 1])$ by density of continuous test-functions in $C^1([0, 1])$. \square

2.2 Possible Steady State Solutions of Multilevel Dynamics

One aspect of the long-term behavior we would like to characterize is the conditions under which solutions to the measure-valued dynamics $\bar{\mu}_t$ converge to weak solutions $\mu(dx)$ of the steady-state ODE given by

$$-\int_0^1 \frac{dv(x)}{dx} x(1-x)\pi(x) \mu(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y) \mu(dy) \right] \mu(dx), \quad (2.12)$$

and, furthermore, when such time-independent solutions to Equation 2.12 have corresponding densities $f(x)$ that are strong solutions to the steady-state ODE given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} [x(1-x)\pi(x)f(x)] = \lambda f(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)f(y) \right]. \quad (2.13)$$

In Lemma 2.2, we show that if solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ converges to a limit $\mu_\infty(dx)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then the limit must be a strong solution to the steady state ODE at all non-equilibrium points of the within-group dynamics. Under the PD dynamics, this means that probability mass can accumulate at the within-group equilibrium at the endpoints 0 or 1, and that either the steady state $\mu_\infty(dx)$ vanishes identically on $(0, 1)$ or is everywhere nonzero on $(0, 1)$.

Lemma 2.2. *If a weak solution $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) converges weakly to a limit function $\mu_\infty(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then the limit $\mu_\infty(x)$ is a weak solution to the steady state ODE in Equation (2.12). Furthermore, denoting the set of points $E = \{x \in (0, 1) : \pi(x) \neq 0\}$, we see that there $\mu_\infty(dx)$ has corresponding density $f_\infty(x)$ for $x \in E$, which solves $f_\infty(x)$ the strong form of the steady state ODE given in Equation (2.13). For any interval $\mathcal{I} \subset E$, either $f_\infty(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}$ or $f_\infty \equiv 0$ for all $x \in \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Using the measure-valued formulation of the multilevel dynamics, we integrate Equation (1.5) in time from T to $T + 1$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v(x)\bar{\mu}_{T+1}(dx) - \int_0^1 v(x)\bar{\mu}_T(dx) &= \int_T^{T+1} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x)\pi(x)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \\ &\quad + \lambda \int_T^{T+1} \int_0^1 v(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)\bar{\mu}_t(dy) \right] \bar{\mu}_t(dx). \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Because $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ converges weakly to $\mu_\infty(dx)$ by assumption, we know that, for any C^1 test function $V(x)$, $\int_0^1 V(x)\bar{\mu}_t dx \rightarrow \int_0^1 V(x)\mu_\infty(x)dx$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, this tells us that the lefthand side of Equation (2.14) vanishes in the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, because $G(\cdot)$, $\pi(\cdot)$, and $v(\cdot)$ are C^1 functions, we see that the following limits hold as $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x)\pi(x)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) &\rightarrow \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} x(1-x)\pi(x)\mu_\infty(dx) \\ \int_0^1 v(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \right] \bar{\mu}_t(dx) &\rightarrow \int_0^1 v(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)\mu_\infty(dy) \right] \mu_\infty(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can take the limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$ on both sides of Equation (2.14), we allows us to see that the limiting measure $\mu_\infty(dx)$ is a weak solution to the steady state ODE from Equation (2.12).

Using the shorthand $Q(dx) = x(1-x)\pi(x)\mu_\infty(x)$, we can rewrite Equation (2.12) to see that

$$- \int_0^1 \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} Q(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x)\lambda \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y)\mu_\infty dy \right] \mu_\infty(dx). \quad (2.15)$$

Because Equation (2.15) tells us that the distributional derivative of $Q(dx)$ is a finite (signed) measure, we can deduce that there is a function $q(x)$ such that $Q(dx) = q(x)dx$ that has bounded variation, and furthermore that $q(x) \in L^1([0, 1])$ [69]. Then, for any closed interval $\mathcal{J} \subset E$ such that $\min_{x \in \mathcal{J}} |\pi(x)| >$

0, we can deduce that there is a density $f_\infty(dx)$ such that

$$f_\infty(x) = \frac{q(x)}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} \in L^1(\mathcal{J}).$$

Then, restricting ourselves to test-functions with support contained in \mathcal{J} , we can rewrite Equation (2.15) as

$$-\int_{\mathcal{J}} \frac{\partial v(x)}{\partial x} q(x) dx = \int_{\mathcal{J}} v(x) \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 G(y) \mu_\infty(dy) \right] \mu_\infty(dx). \quad (2.16)$$

Because $f_\infty(x)$ is integrable on \mathcal{J} , we see from the righthand side of Equation (2.16) that $q(x)$ has an integrable weak derivative, and therefore $q(x)$ and $f_\infty(x)$ are absolutely continuous. Applying this again to Equation (2.16) tells us that $q(x)$ has a continuous weak derivative, and therefore $q(x), f_\infty(x) \in C^1(\mathcal{J})$. Furthermore, this means that $f_\infty(x)$ is actually a strong solution to the steady state ODE of Equation (2.13) for $x \in \mathcal{J}$. We can then extend our definition of the interval \mathcal{J} as needed to show that this also holds for any $x \in E$.

To discuss positivity, we can rewrite the the steady-state relation Equation (2.13) for $f_\infty(x)$ as

$$\frac{\partial f_\infty(x)}{\partial x} = \left(\frac{1}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} \right) \left(\lambda \left[G(x) - \int_0^1 f_\infty(y) dy \right] - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} [x(1-x)\pi(x)] \right) f_\infty(x). \quad (2.17)$$

This ODE has a unique solution on any interval of the form \mathcal{J} because the righthand side is Lipschitz in $f_\infty(x)$ and is continuous in x away from the equilibria of the within-group dynamics. If $f_\infty(x) = 0$ for an $x \in \mathcal{J}$, then $\frac{\partial f_\infty(x)}{\partial x} = 0$ and therefore $f_\infty(x)$ is identically 0 on \mathcal{J} . \square

2.3 Properties of Steady State Densities

2.3.1 Average Group Payoff at Steady State

Having shown in Lemma 2.2 that steady states solutions measure-valued ODE from Equation (2.12) are actually strong solutions to Equation (2.13) for $x \in E$ (the non-equilibrium levels of cooperation), we can now calculate possible steady state densities directly from Equation (2.13). Such nonzero density steady states $f(x)$ must satisfy

$$\frac{f'(x)}{f(x)} = -\frac{[x(1-x)\pi(x)]'}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} + \lambda \frac{\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(x)}{x(1-x)\pi(x)}. \quad (2.18)$$

We can rewrite the last term of Equation 2.18 as

$$\frac{\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(x)}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} = \frac{\lambda}{\pi(0)} \left(\frac{\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(0)}{x} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)} \left(\frac{\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)}{1-x} \right) + \frac{\lambda C(x)}{\pi(x)} \quad (2.19)$$

where, using the shorthand notation $\tilde{G}(x) := G(x) - \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f$, we can write $C(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} C(x) &= \left(\frac{1}{x(1-x)} \right) \left[-\tilde{G}(x) + \frac{\tilde{G}(0)}{\pi(0)} (1-x)\pi(x) + \frac{\tilde{G}(1)}{\pi(1)} x\pi(x) \right] \\ &= \frac{\tilde{G}(0) - \tilde{G}(x)}{x} + \left(\frac{\tilde{G}(0)}{\pi(0)} \right) \left(\frac{\pi(x) - \pi(0)}{x} \right) + \frac{\tilde{G}(1) - \tilde{G}(x)}{1-x} + \left(\frac{\tilde{G}(1)}{\pi(1)} \right) \left(\frac{\pi(x) - \pi(1)}{1-x} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

Using Equation (2.19), we can see that steady state densities must satisfy the implicit expression

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{Z_f} x^{\frac{\lambda}{\pi(0)}} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(0)]^{-1} (1-x)^{\frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)}} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)]^{-1} \pi(x)^{-1} \exp\left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{C(s)}{\pi(s)} ds\right). \quad (2.21)$$

Because $G(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ are C^1 functions, we see from Equation (2.20) that $C(x)$ remains bounded near 0 and 1. This means that the density $f(x)$ from Equation (2.21) will be integrable on $(0, 1)$ if the average payoff $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f$ satisfies the following bounds

$$G(0) < \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f < G(1). \quad (2.22)$$

In particular, this tells us that valid steady state densities cannot have a higher group-reproduction rate than the rate of a full-cooperator group $G(1)$, providing a signature of the shadow of lower-level selection.

From the implicit relation of Equation (2.21), we see that there are infinitely many possible steady state densities $f(x)$ for a given relative selection strength λ , one for each value of $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f$ satisfying the bounds from Equation (2.22). Because the Hölder exponent near $x = 1$ is preserved under the dynamics of Equation (1.2), we will parametrize the measures corresponding to the densities from Equation (2.21) by their Hölder exponents θ near $x = 1$ to obtain an explicit representation for our family of density steady states.

Noting that $C(x)$ is bounded on $[0, 1]$, we can compute that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{\int_{1-x}^1 f(y) dy}{x^\Theta} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{f(1-x)}{\Theta x^{\Theta-1}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\Theta Z_f} \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \left[x^{\frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)}} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)]^{-\Theta} (1-x)^{\frac{\lambda}{\pi(0)}} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(0)]^{-1} \pi(x)^{-1} e^{-\lambda \int_{1-x}^1 \frac{C(s)}{\pi(s)} ds} \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & : \Theta < \left(\frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)}\right) [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)] \\ (\Theta \pi(1) Z_f)^{-1} & : \Theta = \left(\frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)}\right) [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)] \\ \infty & : \Theta > \left(\frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)}\right) [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)] \end{cases} . \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we can deduce from Definition 1.2 that the Hölder exponent that the Hölder exponent near $x = 1$ for our steady state densities $f(x)$ is given by

$$\theta = \frac{\lambda}{\pi(1)} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f - G(1)]. \quad (2.23)$$

We can then use this expression to obtain the explicit family of steady states $f_\theta^\lambda(x)$ of Equation (1.25). Furthermore, the average of the group-reproduction function $G(x)$ on such steady states is given by

$$\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f = G(1) - \frac{\pi(1)\theta}{\lambda}. \quad (2.24)$$

Using the expression from Equation (1.28) for the threshold λ^* required for integrability of the density $f_\theta^\lambda(x)$, we can deduce that

$$\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f = \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{\lambda}\right) G(0) + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda^*}{\lambda}\right) G(1). \quad (2.25)$$

This provides an improvement upon the bounds from Equation (2.22), showing that $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f$ interpolates between $G(0)$ when $\lambda = \lambda^*$ and $G(1)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$.

2.3.2 Most Abundant Group Composition for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$

Proof of Proposition 1.3. We start by integrating both sides of Equation 1.30 against a test-function $v(x)$, obtaining

$$\int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx = \int_0^1 \psi(x) \frac{b(x) \exp(\lambda h(x))}{\int_0^1 b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy} dx = \frac{\int_0^1 v(x) b(x) \exp(\lambda h(x)) dx}{\int_0^1 b(x) \exp(\lambda h(x)) dx}.$$

We can further rearrange this expression to obtain

$$\int_0^1 \psi(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx = v(\bar{x}) \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda|h''(\bar{x})|}} b(\bar{x}) \exp(\lambda h(\bar{x}))}{\int_0^1 b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy} \right) \left(\frac{\int_0^1 v(y) b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy}{v(\bar{x}) \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda|h''(\bar{x})|}} b(\bar{x}) \exp(\lambda h(\bar{x}))} \right) \quad (2.26)$$

Because $b(x)$ is continuous and nonzero at $\bar{x} < 1$, we can use the interior critical-point case of the Laplace method [64] to obtain the following asymptotic formulas for the two terms in parenthesis

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda|h''(\bar{x})|}} b(\bar{x}) \exp(\lambda h(\bar{x}))}{\int_0^1 b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy} \right] = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\lambda|h''(\bar{x})|}} v(\bar{x}) b(\bar{x}) \exp(\lambda h(\bar{x}))}{\int_0^1 v(y) b(y) \exp(\lambda h(y)) dy} \right] = 1. \quad (2.27)$$

Taking the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ in Equation (2.26), we can apply the asymptotic formulas from Equation (2.27) to see that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx = v(\bar{x}),$$

and we conclude that $p_\theta^\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x - \bar{x})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Remark 2.3. *If, in addition to assumptions of Proposition 1.3, $G(x)$ has a unique upcrossing $\bar{x} < 1$ of $G(1)$, then $\bar{x} < x^*$. Because $p_\theta^\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x - \bar{x})$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, this means that the level of cooperation achieved as steady state as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ will be less than the optimal level of cooperation when $x^* < 1$ and \bar{x} is the unique upcrossing of $G(1)$.*

Proof of Proposition 1.4. We assume, for contradiction, that there is a test-function $v(x) \in C^1$ such that $\int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx \not\rightarrow v(1)$. In that case, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any $\Lambda > 0$, there is a $\lambda > \Lambda$ for which

$$\epsilon < \left| \int_0^1 \psi(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx - v(1) \right| \leq \int_0^1 |v(x) - v(1)| p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx, \quad (2.28)$$

where the second inequality follows because $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ is a probability density. Because $v(\cdot)$ is continuous, there is $\delta > 0$ such that $|v(x) - v(1)| < \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ for $x \in [1 - \delta, 1]$, so we can further estimate that

$$\left| \int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx - v(1) \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \int_0^{1-\delta} |v(x) - v(1)| p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + 2\|v\|_\infty \int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx. \quad (2.29)$$

Combining the results of Equations 2.28 and 2.29, we see that there are $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ such that for any $\Lambda > 0$, there exists $\lambda > \Lambda$ for which

$$\int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx > \frac{\epsilon}{4\|v\|_\infty} > 0. \quad (2.30)$$

For such λ , we can then consider the steady state probability $\int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx$ found on the interval $[0, 1 - \delta]$. Using Equation (1.30) and the fact that $b(x) \geq 0$, we can estimate that, for any $\Delta > 0$,

$$\int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) = \frac{\int_0^{1-\delta} b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} dx}{\int_0^1 b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} dx} \leq \frac{\int_0^{1-\delta} b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} dx}{\int_{1-\Delta}^1 b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} dx}. \quad (2.31)$$

Because we have assumed that $h(x)$ has a global maximum at $x = 1$ and that $G(x)$ is a C^1 function, we know that $h(x)$ is locally non-decreasing as $x \rightarrow 1^-$. Therefore, choosing sufficiently small $\Delta > 0$, we see that there is an $A > 0$ such that

$$\int_{1-\Delta}^1 b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} dx \geq e^{\lambda h(1-\Delta)} \int_{1-\Delta}^1 b(x) dx \geq Ae^{\lambda h(1-\Delta)} \quad (2.32)$$

Turning to the numerator of Equation 2.31, we can use the fact that $(1-x)^{\theta-1} \leq 1$ for $\theta > 1$ to see that the integrand in the numerator satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} &\leq \exp\left(\lambda h(x) + \theta \int_x^1 \frac{[\pi(1) - s\pi(s)]}{s\pi(s)} ds\right) \\ &= \exp\left(\int_x^1 \left\{ \frac{1}{s\pi(s)} \left[\frac{\lambda[G(s) - G(1)] + \theta[\pi(1) - s\pi(s)]}{1-s} \right] \right\} ds\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

In particular, we note that when $s = 0$, the term in square brackets takes the value $\lambda[G(0) - G(1)] + \theta\pi(1)$, which is negative when steady state densities of the form $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ exist. Because $G(x), \pi(x) \in C^1[0, 1]$, the integrand on the last line of Equation (2.33) is negative for x close enough to 0, and therefore there is d close enough to 1 and $M < \infty$ such that, for $x \in [0, 1 - \delta]$,

$$\begin{aligned} b(x)e^{\lambda h(x)} &\leq \exp\left(h(\max(x, 1-d)) + \theta \int_{\max(x, 1-d)}^1 \frac{[\pi(1) - s\pi(s)]}{s\pi(s)} ds\right) \\ &\leq M \exp\left(\max_{x \in [1-d, 1-\delta]} h(x)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (2.34)$$

Further denoting $\hat{h}_{d,\delta} = \max_{x \in [1-d, 1-\delta]} h(x)$, we can combine the estimates from Equations (2.31), (2.32), and (2.34) to see that

$$\int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx \leq MA^{-1}(1-\delta) \exp\left(\lambda \left[\hat{h}_{d,\delta} - h(1-\Delta)\right]\right). \quad (2.35)$$

Because $h(x)$ has a unique global maximum at $x = 1$, there is a $\Delta^* > 0$ such that, for any $\Delta < \Delta^*$, $h(1-\Delta) > h(x)$ for $x \in [0, 1 - \Delta^*]$. Namely, choosing $\Delta < \min(\Delta^*, \delta)$ allows us to additionally deduce that $h(1-\Delta) > \hat{h}_{d,\delta}$ and conclude that

$$\int_0^{1-\delta} p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.36)$$

contradicting the existence of a subsequence of λ -values tending to infinity on which the inequality of Equation (2.30) holds. Therefore we can conclude that $p_\theta^\lambda(x) \rightarrow \delta(x-1)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. \square

2.4 Achievable Long-Time Steady States for PD Dynamics

Lemma 2.2 tells us that the only possible steady states of Equation (1.2) are convex combinations delta-functions supported at equilibria of the within-group equilibria and densities that are strong solutions to the steady state ODE on intervals between within-group equilibria. As a first step to exploring which steady states can actually be achieved through the long-time behavior of Equation (1.2) for the PD case, we can consider initial measures of the form

$$\mu_0(dx) = a_0\delta(x) + a_1\delta(1-x) + (1-a_0-a_1)p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx \quad (2.37)$$

for $a_0, a_1 \geq 0$ satisfying $a_0 + a_1 \leq 1$ and $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ given by Equation (1.25). In Proposition 2.4, we characterize the long-time behavior of solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) for such initial measures, and we see that the only possible long-time steady states are $\delta(x)$, $\delta(1-x)$, and $p_\theta^\lambda(x)$ if there is any between-group competition (i.e. when $\lambda > 0$).

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \pi(1)\theta$ and that the population has initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$ given by Equation (2.37). If $a_1 > 0$, then the solution $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) satisfies $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(1-x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. If $a_1 = 0$ and $a_0 < 1$, then we have instead that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow p_\theta^\lambda(x)$.*

Proof. Noting from Proposition 2.1 that solutions $\mu_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.6) are unique, we can check the solution $\mu_t(dx)$ corresponding to the initial measure of Equation (2.37) is given by

$$\mu_t(dx) = a_0e^{\lambda G(0)t}\delta(x) + a_1e^{\lambda G(1)t}\delta(1-x) + (1-a_0-a_1)e^{[\lambda G(1)-\theta\pi(1)]t}p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx. \quad (2.38)$$

We can use Equation (2.38) and the normalization relation from Equation (1.7) to further see that solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to the full multilevel dynamics satisfy

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \frac{e^{-\lambda G(1)t}\mu_t(dx)}{e^{-\lambda G(1)t}\int_0^1\mu_t(dy)} = \frac{a_0e^{\lambda[G(0)-G(1)]t}\delta(x) + a_1\delta(1-x) + (1-a_0-a_1)e^{-\theta\pi(1)t}p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx}{a_0e^{\lambda[G(0)-G(1)]t} + a_1 + (1-a_0-a_1)e^{-\theta\pi(1)t}}. \quad (2.39)$$

Then, using the fact that that $G(1) > G(0)$ and $\theta\pi(1) > 0$, we can further see that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(1-x)$ as long as $a_1 > 0$. If, instead, $a_1 = 0$, we can see that

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \frac{e^{[\theta\pi(1)-\lambda G(1)]t}\mu_t(dx)}{e^{[\theta\pi(1)-\lambda G(1)]t}\int_0^1\mu_t(dy)} = \frac{a_0e^{(\theta\pi(1)-\lambda[G(1)-G(0)])t}\delta(x) + (1-a_0)p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx}{a_0e^{(\theta\pi(1)-\lambda[G(1)-G(0)])t} + (1-a_0)}. \quad (2.40)$$

Because $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \theta\pi(1)$ by assumption, we can use the expression in Equation (2.40) to conclude that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. \square

3 Useful Properties of Multilevel Dynamics

In this section, we provide some useful properties for the solutions $u(t, x)$ to Equation 1.2 and the behavior of the dynamical properties of our model of multilevel selection. In particular, we characterize the impacts of within-group and between-group competition on solutions $u(t, x)$ through properties of the characteristic curves and the solutions along characteristics.

First we obtain an expression for the backward characteristic curves $\phi_t^{-1}(x)$.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and let ϕ_t be as in Equation (2.2). For $0 < x \leq 1$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(\pi(1)t)(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x)) &= (1 - x) \exp\left(\int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)}\right), \\ Q(s) &= \frac{\pi(1) - \pi(s)}{1 - s} + \pi(s). \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp(\pi(1)t)(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x)) = (1 - x) \exp\left(\int_x^1 \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)}\right). \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Let $z(t) = 1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x)$. Given $q(t) = \phi_t(x_0)$ satisfies Equation (2.1), $z(t)$ satisfies the following differential equation:

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = -z(1 - z)\pi(1 - z), \quad z(0) = z_0 = 1 - x. \quad (3.3)$$

We thus have:

$$\int_{z_0}^z \frac{ds}{s(1 - s)\pi(1 - s)} = -t. \quad (3.4)$$

We may rewrite the left hand side as:

$$\int_{z_0}^z \frac{ds}{s(1 - s)\pi(1 - s)} = \int_{z_0}^z \frac{ds}{\pi(1)s} + \int_{z_0}^z \frac{((\pi(1) - \pi(1 - s))/s + \pi(1 - s))ds}{\pi(1)(1 - s)\pi(1 - s)}. \quad (3.5)$$

We thus have:

$$\ln\left(\frac{z}{z_0}\right) + \int_{1-z_0}^{1-z} \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)} = -\pi(1)t \quad (3.6)$$

Exponentiating both sides, we obtain Equation (3.1). We obtain Equation (3.2) by noting that $\phi_t^{-1}(x) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and that $Q(s)$ is a bounded function for $0 < x \leq s \leq 1$ since $\pi(s)$ is a C^1 function by assumption. \square

We next study $w_t(x)$ to describe the effect of between-group competition.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and consider $w_t(x)$ given in Equation (2.3). For $0 < x \leq 1$, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\lambda G(1)t)w_t(x) &= \exp\left(-\lambda \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds\right) \\ R(s) &= \frac{G(1) - G(s)}{1 - s}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

In particular, we have:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \exp(-\lambda G(1)t)w_t(x) = \exp\left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds\right). \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. Let $q(t) = w_t(x)$. It is readily seen from (2.1) and (2.2) that $q(t)$ satisfies the differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp}{dt} &= p(1-p)\pi(p), \quad \frac{dq}{dt} = \lambda G(p)q, \\ p(0) &= p_0 = x, \quad q(0) = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Note here that $p(t) = \phi_t^{-1}(x)$. Let $r(t) = q(t) \exp(-\lambda G(1)t)$. The function $r(t)$ satisfies the equation:

$$\frac{dr}{dt} = \lambda(G(p) - G(1))r. \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, using (3.9), we have:

$$\frac{dr}{dp} = \frac{\lambda(G(p) - G(1))}{p(1-p)\pi(p)} r. \quad (3.11)$$

Using $r(0) = q(0) = 1$, we have:

$$r(t) = \exp\left(-\lambda \int_{p_0}^{p(t)} \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds\right). \quad (3.12)$$

We obtain Equation (3.2) by noting that $\phi_t^{-1}(x) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ and that $G(s)$ is C^1 and thus the integral in Equation (3.2) is bounded as the upper bound of the integral tends to 1. \square

Next we obtain an expression for $\partial\phi_t^{-1}(x)/\partial x$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and consider $\phi_t^{-1}(x)$ as defined in Equation (2.2). We have that*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_t^{-1}(x) = \frac{(\phi_t^{-1}(x)(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x))\pi(\phi_t^{-1}(x)))}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} \quad (3.13)$$

Proof. Let $J(t) = \partial\phi_t^{-1}(x)/\partial x$. Then, using (2.1), we see that J must satisfy the following differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dp}{dt} &= p(1-p)\pi(p), \quad \frac{dJ}{dt} = ((1-p)\pi(p) - p\pi(p) + p(1-p)\pi'(p)) J, \\ p(0) &= p_0 = x, \quad J(0) = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

where π' is the derivative of π , which exists given our assumption that π is C^1 . From the above, we see that:

$$\frac{dJ}{dp} = \left(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{1-p} + \frac{\pi'(p)}{\pi(p)}\right) J. \quad (3.15)$$

Integrating the above differential equation, we obtain the desired formula:

$$J(t) = \frac{p(t)(1-p(t))\pi(p(t))}{p_0(1-p_0)\pi(p_0)}. \quad (3.16) \quad \square$$

We can also use the formula from $w_t(x)$ from Lemma 3.2 to find upper and lower bounds for the growth rates of solutions along characteristics described by $\psi_t(x) = w_t(\phi_t(x))$.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that $G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$ and that $G(0) < G(1)$. Then, for $x \in (0, 1)$, there exist positive constants $\underline{M}, \overline{M} < \infty$ such that*

$$\underline{M}e^{\lambda G(1)t} \phi_t(x)^{\lambda[G(1)-G(0)]} \leq \psi_t(x) \leq \overline{M}e^{\lambda G(1)t}. \quad (3.17)$$

Proof. For our upper bound, we can use Equation (3.7) to estimate that

$$\psi_t(x) = w_t(\phi_t(x)) = e^{\lambda G(1)t} \exp \left(\lambda \int_{\phi_t(x)}^x \left[\frac{G(q) - G(1)}{q(1-q)\pi(q)} \right] dq \right) \leq e^{\lambda G(1)t} \underbrace{\exp \left(\lambda \int_0^1 \frac{[G(q) - G(1)]_+}{q(1-q)\pi(q)} dq \right)}_{:= \overline{M}}, \quad (3.18)$$

where we have ignored non-positive contributions to the integral using the notation

$$[G(q) - G_a(1)]_+ = \begin{cases} G(q) - G(1) & : G(q) > G(1) \\ 0 & : G(q) \leq G(1) \end{cases}. \quad (3.19)$$

Noting that the integrand in the last term of Equation (3.18) is bounded as $x \rightarrow 1$ because $G(x)$ is C^1 and bounded as $x \rightarrow 0$ because $G(0) < G(1)$, we can deduce that $\overline{M} < \infty$.

To find a corresponding lower bound on $\psi_t(x)$, we can first our the expression $R(q)$ from Equation (3.7) as

$$R(q) = \frac{G(0) - G(1)}{\pi(0)q} + \frac{1}{(1-q)\pi_j(q)} \left(\frac{G(q) - G(0) + [G(0) - G(1)] \left[1 - (1-q) \frac{\pi(q)}{\pi(0)} \right]}{q} \right), \quad (3.20)$$

where we can check that the second term on the righthand side is bounded above on $[0, 1]$ because $G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$. This means that there exists $N > -\infty$ such that

$$\int_{\phi_t(x)}^x R(q) dq \geq N + [G(1) - G(0)] \log(\phi_t(x)), \quad (3.21)$$

and then, letting $\underline{M} := e^{\lambda N}$, we can use Equation (3.7) to estimate that

$$\psi_t(x) = e^{\lambda G(1)t} \exp \left(\lambda \int_{\phi_t(x)}^x R(q) dq \right) \geq \underline{M}e^{\lambda G(1)t} \phi_t(x)^{\lambda[G(1)-G(0)]}. \quad (3.22) \quad \square$$

We can now apply Lemma 3.4 to obtain bounds on the growth rate of $\mu_t(dx)$ in terms of the group-reproduction rate of the full-cooperator group $G(1)$ and the infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\underline{\theta}$ and $\overline{\theta}$ of the initial measure $\mu_0(dx)$ near $x = 1$.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that $G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$ and $G(0) < G(1)$. Consider $a \in (0, 1)$ and $\mu_0(dx)$ with supremum and infimum Hölder exponents near $x = 1$ satisfying $0 < \underline{\theta} \leq \overline{\theta}$. For any $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$, there exists $B(\Theta) < \infty$ such that*

$$\mu_t([a, 1]) \leq B(\Theta)e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t}, \quad (3.23a)$$

while for any $\Theta > \underline{\theta}$, there exists $b(\Theta) > 0$ and a sequence of times $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\mu_{t_n}([a, 1]) \geq b(\Theta)e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t_n}. \quad (3.23b)$$

Similarly, for $\Theta > \bar{\theta}$, there exists $d(\Theta) > 0$ such that

$$\mu_t([a, 1]) \geq d(\Theta)e^{\lambda G(1) - \Theta \pi(1)t}, \quad (3.23c)$$

and for $\Theta < \bar{\theta}$, there exists $D(\Theta) < \infty$ and a sequence of times $\{s_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$\mu_t([a, 1]) \leq D(\Theta)e^{\lambda G(1) - \Theta \pi(1)s_n}. \quad (3.23d)$$

Furthermore, when the Hölder constants $C_{\underline{\theta}}$ or $C_{\bar{\theta}}$ of $\mu_0(dx)$ near $x = 1$ are positive and finite, we can obtain versions of each of the bounds from Equation (3.23) with $\Theta = \underline{\theta}$ or $\Theta = \bar{\theta}$, respectively.

Proof. Using the upper bound on $\psi_t(x)$ from Lemma 3.4, we know that there exists an $\bar{M} < \infty$ such that

$$\int_a^1 \mu_t(dx) = \int_{\phi_t^{-1}(a)}^1 \psi_t(x) \mu_0(dx) \leq \bar{M} e^{\lambda G(1)t} \int_{\phi_t^{-1}(a)}^1 \mu_0(dx) = \bar{M} e^{\lambda G(1)t} \mu_0([\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1]). \quad (3.24)$$

Using the lower bound from Lemma 3.4, we know that there is an $\underline{M} > 0$ such that

$$\int_a^1 \mu_t(dx) = \int_{\phi_t^{-1}(a)}^1 \psi_t(x) \mu_0(dx) \geq \underline{M} e^{\lambda G(1)t} \int_{\phi_t^{-1}(a)}^1 \phi_t(x)^{\lambda[G(1) - G(0)]} \mu_0(dx). \quad (3.25)$$

Using our assumption that $G(0) < G(1)$ and the fact that $\phi_t(x) \in [a, 1]$ for $x \in [\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1]$, we can further estimate that

$$\int_a^1 \mu_t(dx) \geq \underline{M} a^{\lambda[G(1) - G(0)]} \mu_0([\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1]). \quad (3.26)$$

Our next step is to obtain bounds on $\mu_0([\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1])$. We can use the formula from Lemma 3.1 for $1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x)$ to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_0([\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1]) &= \mu_0([1 - (1 - \phi_t^{-1}(a)), 1]) \\ &= \mu_0\left(\left[1 - e^{-\pi(1)t} (1 - a) \exp\left(\int_a^{\phi_t^{-1}(a)} \frac{Q(q)}{q\pi(q)} dq\right), 1\right]\right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.27)$$

From our assumption that $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta} > 0$, we know that $\limsup_{x \rightarrow 0} x^{-\Theta} \mu_0([1 - x, 1]) = 0$ for $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$. For such Θ , there is therefore a constant C such that

$$\mu_0([\phi_t^{-1}(a), 1]) \leq C e^{-\Theta \pi(1)t} (1 - a)^{\Theta} \exp\left(\Theta \int_a^{\phi_t^{-1}(a)} \frac{Q(q)}{q\pi(q)} dq\right). \quad (3.28)$$

Combining this with our estimate from Equation (3.24) and the expression for $Q(q)$ from Equation (3.1), we can see that

$$\mu_t([a, 1]) \leq \underbrace{C \bar{M} (1 - a)^{\Theta} \exp\left(\Theta \int_a^1 \frac{[\pi(1) - q\pi(q)]_+}{q\pi(q)} dq\right)}_{:=B(\Theta)} e^{\lambda G(1) - \Theta \pi(1)t}. \quad (3.29)$$

Similarly, we note that $\limsup_{x \rightarrow 0} x^{-\Theta} \mu_0([x, 1]) > 0$ for $\Theta > \underline{\theta}$. Combining this with the expression from Equations (3.26) and (3.27), we see that there is $C > 0$ and a sequence of times $\{t_n\}$ tending to

infinity such that

$$\mu_{t_n}([a, 1]) \geq \underbrace{CM(1-a)^\Theta \exp\left(\Theta \int_a^1 \frac{[\pi(1) - q\pi(q)]_-}{q\pi(q)} dq\right)}_{:=b(\Theta)} e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t}. \quad (3.30)$$

Further, we know that $b(\Theta) > 0$ and $B(\Theta) < \infty$ because $\pi(x)$ is C^1 . We can obtain the desired bounds depending on the infimum Hölder exponent $\bar{\theta}$ of $\mu_0(dx)$ near $x = 1$ with an analogous approach. \square

We can also derive approximate lower bounds for the growth rate of $\mu_t(dx)$ in terms of the growth rate near the equilibrium of the within-group dynamics.

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that $\mu_0(dx)$ has positive Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ and consider the quantity $\check{G}_w := \min_{x \in [0, a]} G(x)$. For w sufficiently close to 0, there exists a constant $A_w > 0$ such that*

$$\mu_t([0, 1]) \geq A_w e^{\lambda \check{G}_w t}. \quad (3.31)$$

Proof. Due to our assumption that $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta} > 0$, there is $w' < 1$ such that $\mu_0([0, w']) > 0$. Because $\phi_t(x)$ decreases in time and satisfies $\phi_t(x) \rightarrow 0$ for $x \in (0, 1)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, we have that, for any $w < w'$, there is a T_w such that $\phi_{T_w}(w') = w$ and $\phi_t(w') \leq w$ for $t > T_w$. Now we can estimate the integral of the group-reproduction function along characteristic curves by

$$\int_0^t G(\phi_s(x)) ds = \int_{T_w}^t G(\phi_s(x)) ds + \int_0^{T_w} G(\phi_s(x)) ds \geq \check{G}_w t + (\check{G}_{w'} - \check{G}_w) T_w. \quad (3.32)$$

We can then apply this estimate and the fact that $\mu_0(dx)$ is a probability measure to deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \mu_t(dx) &= \int_0^1 \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t G(\phi_s(x)) ds\right) \mu_0(dx) \geq \int_0^{w'} \exp\left(\lambda \int_0^t G(\phi_s(x)) ds\right) \mu_0(dx) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda(\check{G}_{w'} - \check{G}_w)T_w} e^{\lambda \check{G}_w t} \int_0^{w'} \mu_0(dx) \\ &\geq e^{\lambda(\check{G}_{w'} - \check{G}_w)T_w} e^{\lambda \check{G}_w t}. \quad \square \end{aligned} \quad (3.33)$$

4 Convergence to Steady State Population

In this section, we consider the long-time behavior of solutions $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) for initial conditions with well-defined Hölder exponents and Hölder constants. In Section 4.1, we prove Theorem 1.5, demonstrating weak convergence of the population to steady state densities for sufficiently strong between-group competition and initial measures with well-defined nonzero, finite Hölder exponents and constants. In Section 4.2, we prove Proposition 1.10, which tells us that a population with an initial partial delta-peak at full-cooperation will fix full-cooperation in the group-structure population in the long-time limit.

4.1 Weak Convergence for Measure-Valued Initial Population

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 1.5, we will first rewrite our expression for the steady state densities from Equation (1.25) into a form that is most compatible with the expressions related to the method of characteristics derived in Lemmas 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. We start by considering the following expression for steady state density solutions to Equation (1.2)

$$f_\theta^\lambda(x) = (1-x)^{\theta-1} \frac{\pi(1)}{x\pi(x)} \exp\left(\int_x^1 \frac{M_\theta(s)ds}{s\pi(s)}\right), \quad M_\theta(s) = -\lambda R(s) + \theta Q(s). \quad (4.1)$$

Combining the steady state expressions from Equation (1.25) and (4.1), we can write $M_\theta(s)$ using the following decomposition

$$M_\theta(s) = \frac{\nu}{s} + \frac{C(s)}{\pi(s)} \quad (4.2)$$

where ν and $C(s)$ are given by Equations (1.26) and (1.27), respectively.

Now we will study the convergence of $\mu_t(dx)$ to these density steady states. We will start by the integrating the righthand side of Equation (2.3) by parts to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)\mu_0(dx) &= v(1)\psi_t(1)F(1^-) - v(0)\psi_t(0)F(0^+) \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)) F(y)dy, \quad F(y) = \mu_0([0, y]). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

In the above, we used the fact that $\phi_t(0) = 0$ and $\phi_t(1) = 1$. For initial measures $\mu_0(dx)$ with positive supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$, $F(1^-) = 1$ and therefore

$$\int_0^1 v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)\mu_0(dx) = v(0)\psi_t(0)(1 - F(0^+)) + \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)) (1 - F(y))dy. \quad (4.4)$$

In Lemma 4.1, we estimate the growth rate of both terms in Equation (4.4), and show that the time-dependent family of integrands in the second term is bounded by an integrable function that is independent of time. Using Lemma 4.1, we can then apply the Dominated Convergence Theorem to help prove convergence to steady state densities in Theorem 1.5.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ that is nonzero and finite. If $\nu_\theta = \lambda [G(1) - G(0)] - \underline{\theta}\pi(1) > 0$, then, for any $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$, there exists a constant $C^v(\Theta) < \infty$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)) (1 - F(y)) \right| &\leq C^v(\Theta) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t} d(x) \\ d(x) &:= \begin{cases} (1-x)^{\Theta-1} x^{\nu-1} & \text{if } \nu < 1, \\ (1-x)^{\Theta-1} & \text{if } \nu \geq 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

Furthermore, we can use Equation (4.4) to see that there are positive constants C_1^v and $C_2^v(\Theta)$ such that

$$\int_0^1 v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)\mu_0(dx) \leq C_1^v e^{\lambda G(0)t} + C_2^v(\Theta) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t}. \quad (4.6)$$

If, in addition, the supremum Hölder constant of $\mu_0(dx)$ is finite and nonzero, then we can obtain bounds analogous to those of Equations (4.5) and (4.6) for $\Theta = \underline{\theta}$.

Proof. We start with the integral in Equation (4.4). Changing variables to $x = \phi_t(y)$, we have:

$$\int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} (v(\phi_t(y))\psi_t(y)) (1 - F(y)) dy = \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} ((v(x)w_t(x)) (1 - F(\phi_t^{-1}(x)))) dx \quad (4.7)$$

Our goal is to estimate the following quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 I_1 I_2 dx &:= e^{-(\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1))t} \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} ((v(x)w_t(x)) (1 - F(\phi_t^{-1}(x)))) dx, \\ I_1 &= e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} ((v(x)w_t(x))), \quad I_2 = e^{\theta \pi(1)t} (1 - F(\phi_t^{-1}(x))). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Let us first consider I_1 . Using Equation (3.7), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} - \lambda K(x)v(x) \right) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right), \\ K(x) &= \frac{R(\phi_t^{-1}(x))}{\phi_t^{-1}(x)\pi(\phi_t^{-1}(x))} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \phi_t^{-1}(x) - \frac{R(x)}{x\pi(x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Using Equation (3.13) and the definition of R in Equation (3.7), we have:

$$K(x) = \frac{G(x) - G(\phi_t^{-1}(x))}{x(1-x)\pi(x)}. \quad (4.10)$$

Using the fact that G is C^1 and that $\phi_t^{-1}(x) \geq x$, we have that

$$|G(x) - G(\phi_t^{-1}(x))| = \left| \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} G'(z) dz \right| \leq \|G'\|_\infty (\phi_t^{-1}(x) - x) \quad (4.11)$$

Denoting $\pi_{\min} := \min_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \pi(s) > 0$, we may thus estimate $K(x)$ by

$$|K(x)| \leq \frac{\|G'\|_\infty (\phi_t^{-1}(x) - x)}{x(1-x)\pi(x)} \leq \frac{\|G'\|_\infty \phi_t^{-1}(x)}{\pi_{\min} x(1-x)}, \quad (4.12)$$

and therefore deduce that

$$\left| \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} - \lambda K(x)v(x) \right| \leq \left\| \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda \|G'\|_\infty \|v\|_\infty \phi_t^{-1}(x)}{\pi_{\min} x(1-x)} \leq \underbrace{\left(\left\| \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} \right\|_\infty + \frac{\lambda \|G'\|_\infty \|v\|_\infty}{\pi_{\min}} \right)}_{:=C_1} \frac{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}{x(1-x)}. \quad (4.13)$$

Returning to Equation (4.9), we see that I_1 can be estimated as

$$|I_1| \leq C_1 \frac{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}{x(1-x)} \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right). \quad (4.14)$$

We now estimate I_2 in Equation (4.8). Because $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ and $1 - F(\phi_t^{-1}(x)) = \mu_0((\phi_t^{-1}(x), 1])$, we can use Equation (3.27) to see that, for any $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$, there is

a constant $C_2 < \infty$ such that

$$|I_2| \leq \exp(\Theta\pi(1)t)(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x))^\Theta \leq C_2(1 - x)^\Theta \exp\left(\Theta \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{Q(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds\right). \quad (4.15)$$

Combining Equations (4.14) and (4.15), we have that

$$|I_1 I_2| \leq C_1 C_2(\Theta)(1 - x)^{\theta-1} \frac{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}{x} I_3, \quad I_3 = \exp\left(\int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{M_\Theta(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds\right), \quad (4.16)$$

where $M_\Theta(s)$ is defined as in Equation (4.1). To estimate I_3 , we see from Equation (4.2) that

$$\int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{M_\Theta(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds = -\nu_\Theta \ln\left(\frac{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}{x}\right) + \int_x^{\phi_t^{-1}(x)} \frac{C(s)}{\pi(s)} ds, \quad (4.17)$$

and we can use the fact that $C(s)$ is bounded on $[0, 1]$ to see that

$$|I_3| \leq C_3 \left(\frac{x}{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}\right)^\nu, \quad C_3 = \exp\left(\int_0^1 \frac{C(s)}{\pi(s)} ds\right) < \infty. \quad (4.18)$$

Combining this with Equation (4.16), we see that

$$|I_1 I_2| \leq C^v(\Theta)(1 - x)^{\theta-1} \left(\frac{x}{\phi_t^{-1}(x)}\right)^{\nu_\Theta-1}, \quad C^v(\Theta) = C_1 C_2(\Theta) C_3. \quad (4.19)$$

Since $\phi_t^{-1}(x) \geq x$, we can use the definitions of $d(x)$, I_1 , and I_2 from Equations (4.5) and (4.8) to see that $||I_1 I_2|| \leq d(x)e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t}$, where we note that $d(x)$ is integrable because $\Theta > 0$ and $\nu_\Theta > \nu_\theta > 0$ for any $\Theta < \theta$. We can further use this estimate of $||I_1 I_2||$, the fact that $\psi_t(0) = e^{\lambda G(0)t}$, and the choice of constants $C_1^v = |v(0)|(1 - F(0^+))$ and $C_2^v(\Theta) = C^v(\Theta) \int_0^1 d(x)dx$ to obtain the estimate of Equation (4.6). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.5. We first prove Equation (1.32) when $v(x)$ is a C^1 function. We will evaluate the following quantity as $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$e^{-(\lambda G(1) - \theta\pi(1))t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx) = e^{-(\lambda G(1) - \theta\pi(1))t} \int_0^1 v(\phi_t(y)) \psi_t(y) \mu_0(dx), \quad (4.20)$$

which we can express through Equation (4.4). From the boundary term of Equation (4.4), we can use the fact that $\psi_t(0) = e^{\lambda G(0)t}$ to see that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\lambda G(1) - \theta\pi(1))t} v(0) \psi_t(0) (1 - F(0^+)) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-(\lambda(G(1) - G(0)) - \theta\pi(1))t} v(0) (1 - F(0^+)) = 0, \quad (4.21)$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\mu_0(dx)$ has Hölder exponent θ near $x = 1$. Recalling that $\theta > 0$ and $\nu > 0$ by assumption, we can apply Lemma 4.1 to see that the integrand on the righthand side of Equation (4.4) is bounded by an integrable function independent of t . We may thus use the Dominated Convergence Theorem to pass to the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ in the integral in Equation (4.8).

Using Equations (3.8), (4.9) and (4.10), we can compute that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} I_1 = \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\lambda R(x)v(x)}{x\pi(x)} \right) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(v(x) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right) \right), \quad (4.22)$$

Furthermore, can use Equation (3.2) and the fact that $\mu_0(dx)$ has Hölder exponent θ with constant C_θ near $x = 1$ to see that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} I_2 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1 - F(\phi_t^{-1}(x))}{(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x))^\theta} \left(\exp(\pi(1)t)(1 - \phi_t^{-1}(x)) \right)^\theta = C_\theta (1-x)^\theta \exp \left(\theta \int_x^1 \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)} \right). \quad (4.23)$$

Therefore we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 I_1 I_2 dx &= \int_0^1 \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(v(x) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right) \right) C_\theta (1-x)^\theta \exp \left(\theta \int_x^1 \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)} \right) dx \\ &= \left(v(x) C_\theta (1-x)^\theta \exp \left(\int_x^1 \frac{M_\theta(s)ds}{s\pi(s)} \right) \right) \Big|_0^1 \\ &\quad - \int_0^1 \left(v(x) \exp \left(-\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{R(s)}{s\pi(s)} ds \right) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(C_\theta (1-x)^\theta \exp \left(\theta \int_x^1 \frac{Q(s)ds}{s\pi(s)} \right) \right) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

where we integrated by parts in the second equality. Using Equation (4.2) and the fact that $\nu_\theta > 0$, we see that the boundary term vanishes. After some simplifications, we see that:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 I_1 I_2 dx = C_\theta \theta \int_0^1 v(x) f_\theta^\lambda(x) dx. \quad (4.25)$$

Combining this with Equation (4.21), we see that:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx) = C_\theta \theta \int_0^1 v(x) f_\theta^\lambda(x) dx. \quad (4.26)$$

Using the test-function $v(x) = 1$, we further have that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{-[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t} \int_0^1 \mu_t(dx) = C_\theta \theta \int_0^1 f_\theta^\lambda(x) dx. \quad (4.27)$$

Using the normalization relation from Equation (1.7), we may now compute the limit in Equation (1.32).

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{-[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx)}{e^{-[\lambda G(1) - \theta \pi(1)]t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx)} = \frac{\int_0^1 v(x) f_\theta^\lambda(x) dx}{\int_0^1 f_\theta^\lambda(x) dx} = \int_0^1 v(x) p_\theta^\lambda(x) dx, \quad (4.28)$$

where we used Equation (4.26) and (4.27) in the second equality. We have thus established (1.32) when $v(x)$ is C^1 . To see that Equation (1.32) is valid for merely continuous $v(x)$, we may use a standard approximation argument. Note that we may approximate $v(x)$ arbitrarily closely by a C^1 function $w(x)$ in the sup norm:

$$\text{for any } \epsilon > 0, \text{ there exists } w(x) \in C^1 \text{ such that } \|v - w\|_\infty \leq \epsilon. \quad (4.29)$$

Using this and the fact that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ and $p_\theta^\lambda(x)dx$ are probability measures, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 v \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - \int_0^1 v p_\theta^\lambda dx \right| &\leq \int_0^1 |v - w| \bar{\mu}_t(dx) + \left| \int_0^1 w \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - \int_0^1 w p_\theta^\lambda dx \right| + \int_0^1 |v - w| p_\theta^\lambda dx \\ &\leq 2\epsilon + \left| \int_0^1 w \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - \int_0^1 w p_\theta^\lambda dx \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

As $t \rightarrow \infty$, the last expression tends to 0 since $w(x)$ is C^1 . Since ϵ is arbitrary, we obtain the desired conclusion. \square

4.2 Convergence to Delta-Function at Full-Cooperation

Proof of Proposition 1.10. Using the push-forward representation of $\mu_t(dx)$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) &= \frac{e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \int_0^1 v(x) \mu_t(dx)}{e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \int_0^1 \mu_t(dx)} \\ &= \frac{a_1 v(1) + (1 - a_1) e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \int_0^1 v(\psi_t(x)) \psi_t(x) \rho_0(dx)}{a_1 + (1 - a_1) e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \int_0^1 \psi_t(x) \rho_0(dx)}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Using Lemma 4.1, we know that there exist positive constants $C_1^v, C_2^v < \infty$ such that for any $\tilde{\theta} \in (0, \underline{\theta})$

$$(1 - a_1) e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \left| \int_0^1 v(\psi_t(x)) \psi_t(x) \rho_0(dx) \right| \leq (1 - a_1) \left[C_1^v e^{\lambda[G(0) - G(1)]t} + C_2^v e^{-\tilde{\theta}\pi(1)t} \right]$$

Because $G(0) < G(1)$ and $\tilde{\theta} > 0$, we can further see that

$$(1 - a_1) e^{-\lambda G(1)t} \left| \int_0^1 v(\psi_t(x)) \psi_t(x) \rho_0(dx) \right| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty.$$

Applying this limit to the numerator and denominator in Equation 4.31, we can then conclude that

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = v(1), \quad (4.32)$$

and we have shown that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(1 - x)$. \square

Remark 4.2. *Proposition 1.10 generalizes results for the Luo-Mattingly model and models from evolutionary games in which full-cooperation maximizes collective payoff [44, 63]. The proofs in those cases had relied on the fact that $G(1) \geq \langle G(x) \rangle_{\mu_t(dx)}$ at all times t , but did not require the additional assumption that the portion of the initial measure not concentrated at full-cooperation have a positive supremum Hölder exponent near $x = 1$. In the present case, the population concentrates upon full-cooperation even when group reproduction function is maximized by an interior level of cooperation.*

5 Extinction or Weak Persistence of Cooperation

In this section, we consider the long-time behavior of solutions of Equation (1.2) for initial measures $\mu_0(dx)$ with a given supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$. For the Prisoner's Dilemma case,

we present the proof of Theorem 1.11 for convergence of the population to full-defection in Section 5.1 and the proof of Theorem 1.12 characterizing long-time bounds on the time-averaged collective group reproduction-rate in Section 5.2. In Section 5.3, we prove Proposition 1.14, showing that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ concentrates upon full-cooperation in the Prisoners' Delight case.

5.1 Convergence to Delta-Function at Full-Defection

Proof of Theorem 1.11. To show weak convergence of $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to $\delta(x)$, we consider any continuous test function $v(x)$ and look to show that $\int_0^1 v(x)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow v(0)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. We can use the continuity of $v(x)$ to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_0^1 v(x)\bar{\mu}_t(dx) - v(0) \right| \leq \epsilon + 2\|v\|_\infty \int_\delta^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \quad (5.1)$$

We note that $\mu_0(dx)$ must have a supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta} > 0$ near $x = 1$ in order to satisfy our assumption on λ . Therefore we can apply Lemma 3.6 and the normalization relation from Equation (1.7) to say that, for w sufficiently close to 0, there exists $A_w > 0$ such that

$$\int_\delta^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \frac{\int_\delta^1 \mu_t(dx)}{\int_0^1 \mu_t(dx)} \leq A_w^{-1} e^{-\lambda \check{G}_w t} \int_\delta^1 \mu_t(dx), \quad (5.2)$$

where $\check{G}_w = \min_{x \in [0, w]} G(x)$. We can apply Lemma 3.5 to the integral on the righthand side of Equation (5.2) to say that, for $\Theta < \underline{\Theta}$, there exists $B(\Theta) < \infty$ such that

$$\int_\delta^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \leq B(\Theta) A_w^{-1} \exp(\{\lambda [G(1) - \check{G}_w] - \Theta\pi(1)\} t) \quad (5.3)$$

Because $G(\cdot) \in C^1([0, 1])$, we know that we can make \check{G}_w arbitrarily close to $G(0)$ by choosing w sufficiently close to 0. Because our assumption on λ is the strict inequality $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] < \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, we know, for any given λ , that we can choose Θ sufficiently close to $\underline{\theta}$ and w sufficiently close to 0 such that

$$\lambda [G(1) - \check{G}_w] < \Theta\pi(1) \quad (5.4)$$

as well. This condition then guarantees that

$$2\|v\|_\infty \int_\delta^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \leq 2B(\Theta) A_w^{-1} \|v\|_\infty \exp(\{\lambda [G(1) - \check{G}_w] - \Theta\pi(1)\} t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

which, in combination with Equation (5.2), allows us to conclude that $\mu_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ when $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] < \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$. \square

Because we show in Theorem 1.11 and Corollary 1.13 that cooperation dies out for $\lambda < \lambda^*$ and weakly persists when $\lambda > \lambda^*$, it is natural to ask what happens in the edge case when $\lambda = \lambda^*$. For the special case in which the group reproduction achieves a unique minimum at $x = 0$, we can show that the population still concentrates at $\delta(x)$ when $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] = \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$. We rely on the following lemma, which was previously used to study special cases of the model under consideration [44, 63].

Lemma 5.1. *Consider $\pi(x), G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$ and suppose that $G(x) > G(0)$ for $x \in (0, 1]$. If $\int_0^\infty [(G(\cdot))_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds < \infty$, then $\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_t} \rightarrow G(0)$ and $\mu_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose the initial distribution $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near 1 with corresponding Hölder constant $C_{\underline{\theta}} < \infty$. If $G(x) > G(0)$ for $x \in (0, 1]$ and $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] = \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, the $\mu_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.2. From the continuity of the test function $v(x)$ to see that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\left| \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - v(0) \right| \leq \epsilon + 2\|v\|_{\infty} \int_{\delta}^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \quad (5.5)$$

From our assumptions that $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] = \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$ and $\mu_0(dx)$ has Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta} > 0$ with positive, finite Hölder constant, can use Lemma 3.5 and the exponential normalization from Equation (2.5) to see that there is a constant $B(\underline{\theta}) < \infty$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\delta}^1 \bar{\mu}_t(dx) &\leq B(\underline{\theta}) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \underline{\theta}\pi(1)]t} \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right) \\ &= B(\underline{\theta}) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Because $G(x) \geq G(0)$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, either $\int_0^{\infty} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds < \infty$ or $\int_0^{\infty} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In the former case, Lemma 5.1 tells us that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. In the alternate case, $\int_0^{\infty} [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $e^{-\int_0^t [\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} - G(0)] ds} \rightarrow 0$, and we can use Equation (5.5) allows us to conclude that

$$\left| \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - v(0) \right| \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty,$$

and therefore we see that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x)$ when $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] = \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$. \square

Remark 5.3. *A key aspect of the proof of Theorem 1.11 was that the strict inequality condition that $\lambda < \lambda^*$ provided us the freedom to consider a slightly smaller exponent $\tilde{\theta} < \underline{\theta}$ and still obtain exponential decay to $\delta(x)$. In the equality case with $\lambda = \lambda^*$ considered in Proposition 5.2, we had to assume a finite supremum Hölder constant $C_{\underline{\theta}}$ to get a bound involving the exact supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$.*

5.2 Bounds on Average Group Reproduction Function

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 1.12, we first provide a result analogous to Lemma 4.1 showing the existence of a sequence tending on which solutions to Equation (1.6) can be bounded in terms of the infimum Hölder exponent near $x = 1$.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 1.5 and that $\mu_0(dx)$ has infimum Hölder exponent $\bar{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ that is nonzero and finite. Then, for $\Theta < \bar{\theta}$, there are positive constants E_1^v and $E_2^v(\Theta)$ and a sequence $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that*

$$\int_0^1 v(\phi_{t_n}(y)) \psi_{t_n}(y) \mu_0(dx) \leq E_1^v e^{\lambda G(0)t_n} + E_2^v(\Theta) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t_n}. \quad (5.7)$$

Proof of Theorem 1.12. We will first consider the case in which $\bar{\theta} \geq \underline{\theta} > 0$, and then mention how to generalize our argument to the case in which $\underline{\theta} = 0$. Using the exponential normalization of Equation (2.5) and the assumptions that $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ and that $\lambda[G(1) - G(0)] > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, we can apply Lemma 4.1 for the test-function $v(x) = 1$ to see that, for $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$, there are constants $C_1^1, C_2^1(\Theta)$, and \tilde{C} such that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}_t([0, 1]) &\leq \left(C_1^1 e^{\lambda G(0)t} + C_2^1(\Theta) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t} \right) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \exp\left([\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t - \lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

Noting that $\bar{\mu}_t([0, 1]) = 1$, we must eventually have that $\frac{\lambda}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds \leq \lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)$, as otherwise the righthand side of Equation (5.8) will exceed 1 for sufficiently large t . Because this is true for all $\Theta < \underline{\theta}$, we can deduce that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds \leq G(1) - \frac{\underline{\theta}\pi(1)}{\lambda}$. Similarly, we may use Lemma 3.5 to see that, for any $\Theta > \underline{\theta}$ there is a sequence of times $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ and a constant $b(\Theta)$ such that

$$\bar{\mu}_{t_n}([0, 1]) \geq b(\Theta) \exp\left([\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t_n - \lambda \int_0^{t_n} \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right). \quad (5.9)$$

Using this estimate, we may deduce that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds \geq G(1) - \frac{\Theta\pi(1)}{\lambda}$ for $\Theta > \underline{\theta}$, allowing us to conclude that $\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds = G(1) - \frac{\underline{\theta}\pi(1)}{\lambda}$.

To study the corresponding limit infimum, we apply Lemma 5.4 for the test-function $v(x) = 1$ to see that there are constants E_1^1, E_2^1 , and \tilde{E} and a sequence $\{\tau_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying $\tau_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that, for any $\Theta < \bar{\theta}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}_{\tau_n}([0, 1]) &\leq \left(E_1^1 e^{\lambda G(0)\tau_n} + E_2^1(\Theta) e^{[\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]\tau_n} \right) \exp\left(-\lambda \int_0^{\tau_n} \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right) \\ &\leq \tilde{E} \exp\left(\max\{\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1), \lambda G(0)\} \tau_n - \lambda \int_0^{\tau_n} \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds\right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

This allows us to deduce that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds \leq \max\{\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1), \lambda G(0)\}$. To study the analogous lower bound on the time-average collective group-reproduction rate, we consider two cases depending on the relative values of $\lambda G(1) - \bar{\theta}\pi(1)$ and $\lambda G(0)$. First, we apply Lemma 3.5 to see that, for $\Theta \geq \bar{\theta}$, there exists $d(\Theta) > 0$ such that

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \geq d(\Theta) \exp\left([\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1)]t - \lambda \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s} ds\right). \quad (5.11)$$

Second, denoting $\check{G}_w := \min_{x \in [0, w]} G(x)$, we apply 3.6 to see that, for w sufficiently close to 0, there exists $A_w > 0$ such that

$$\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \geq A_w \exp\left(\lambda \left[\check{G}_w t - \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\bar{\mu}_s} ds \right]\right). \quad (5.12)$$

Combining the bounds of Equations (5.11) and (5.12) allows us to see that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds \geq \max\{\lambda G(1) - \Theta\pi(1), \lambda \check{G}_w\}$. Because this bound holds for all $\Theta > \bar{\theta}$ and all w sufficiently close to

0, we can use the fact that $\tilde{G}_w \rightarrow G(0)$ as $w \rightarrow 0$ to conclude that $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \langle G(\cdot) \rangle_{\mu_s} ds = \max \{ \lambda G(1) - \bar{\theta} \pi(1), \lambda G(0) \}$.

For the case in which $\underline{\theta} = 0$ (and perhaps $\bar{\theta} = 0$ as well), we can still obtain the upper bounds from Equations (5.9) and (5.11) using our existing proof. To obtain the corresponding upper bounds on $\bar{\mu}_t([0, 1])$, we can use the bound of solutions along characteristics from Lemma 3.4 and the fact that $\mu_0(dx)$ is a probability measure. Then applying these bounds allows us to deduce the limiting time-averaged behavior of Equation (1.40) in these cases as well. \square

5.3 Convergence to Full-Cooperation in the Prisoners' Delight

Before proceeding to the proof of Proposition 1.14, we introduce several lemmas that allow us to estimate the measure $\mu_t(dx)$ solving Equation (1.2) under the Prisoners' Delight scenario. These lemmas serve as analogues to Lemma 3.5 and 3.6, and can be proved with a similar approach.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 1.14. For any $a \in (0, 1)$, there exists $M_a < \infty$ such that*

$$\rho_t([0, 1]) := \mu_t((0, a]) \leq M_a e^{\lambda G(0)t}. \quad (5.13)$$

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose that $G(x), \pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Proposition 1.14. Considering the quantity $\hat{G}_a := \min_{x \in [a, 1]} G(x)$, we see that for z sufficiently close to 1, there exists $A_z > 0$ such that*

$$\mu_t([0, 1]) \geq A_z e^{\lambda \hat{G}_z t}. \quad (5.14)$$

Proof of Proposition 1.14. To show that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ converges to a delta-function at $x = 1$, we consider a continuous test function $v(x)$ and use the fact that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ is a probability distribution to see that, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - v(1) \right| &\leq \int_0^{1-\delta} |(v(x) - v(1))| \bar{\mu}_t(dx) + \int_{1-\delta}^1 |(v(x) - v(1))| \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \\ &\leq \epsilon + 2 \|v\|_\infty \int_0^{1-\delta} \bar{\mu}_t(dx) \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

We can use the assumption that $a_0 := \mu_0(\{0\}) < 1$ to write our initial measure by a decomposition of the form

$$\mu_0(dx) = a_0 \delta(x) + (1 - a_0) \rho_0(dx) \quad (5.16)$$

where $\rho_0(dx)$ is a probability measure satisfying $\rho_0((0, 1]) = 1$. Because we have assumed that $\mu_0(dx) \neq \delta(x)$, we can apply Lemma 5.6 to see that, for z sufficiently close 1, there is $A_z > 0$ such that $\mu_t([0, 1]) \geq A_z e^{\lambda \hat{G}_z t}$. Combining this with the normalization relation of Equation (1.7) and the decomposition of our initial measure from Equation (5.16), we can estimate that

$$\int_0^{1-\delta} \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \frac{\int_0^{1-\delta} \mu_t(dx)}{\int_0^1 \mu_t(dx)} \leq A_z^{-1} e^{-\lambda \hat{G}_z t} \left[a_0 e^{\lambda G(0)t} + (1 - a_0) \rho_t([0, 1 - \delta]) \right] \quad (5.17)$$

From Lemma 5.5, we know that there is $M_a < \infty$ such that $\rho_t([0, 1 - \delta]) \leq M_a e^{\lambda G(0)t}$. Combining this with our estimates from Equation (5.15) and (5.17) allows us to see that there exists $\tilde{M} < \infty$

such that

$$\left| \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) - v(1) \right| \leq \epsilon + 2\tilde{M} \|v\|_\infty \exp\left(\lambda \left[G(0) - \hat{G}_z\right] t\right). \quad (5.18)$$

Because $G(1) > G(0)$ for the PDel game, we know that we can pick z sufficiently close to 1 such that $\hat{G}_z > G(0)$. For such choices of z , we can deduce that

$$2\tilde{M} \|v\|_\infty \exp\left(\lambda \left[G(0) - \hat{G}_z\right] t\right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

as long as $\lambda > 0$, and we can conclude that $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(1-x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ for $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu_0(dx) \neq \delta(x)$. \square

6 Generalization to Multilevel Competition with N Populations

In this section, we discuss results for the N -population multilevel selection model whose dynamics are described by Equation (1.10). In Section 6.1, we provide the proof of Theorem 1.15, demonstrating a sufficient condition for the long-time behavior of the population to feature concentration upon the subpopulation with the maximal principal growth rate. In Section 6.2, we reformulate the multilevel dynamics for the generalizations of the Hawk-Dove and Stag-Hunt games in a single population as a two-population problem and characterize the long-time behavior for Equation (1.2) for these games.

6.1 Convergence of Population to Dominant Subpopulation

Proof of Theorem 1.15. Using the normalization from Equation (1.13), we can estimate the $\bar{\mu}_t^j([0, 1])$ of having groups in subpopulation $j \in \mathcal{N} - \{k\}$ by

$$\bar{\mu}_t^j([0, 1]) = \frac{\mu_t^j([0, 1])}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mu_t^i([0, 1])} \leq \frac{\mu_t^j([0, 1])}{\mu_t^j([0, 1]) + \mu_t^k([0, 1])}. \quad (6.1)$$

If faced with the relevant case for the principal growth r_k^m , we can use the quantities $\check{G}_w = \min_{x \in [0, w]} G(x)$ for w sufficiently close to 0, $\hat{G}_z = \min_{x \in [z, 1]} G(x)$ for z sufficiently close to 1, or $\bar{\Theta}^k$ sufficiently close to but greater than $\bar{\theta}^k$ to introduce a modified principal growth rate \tilde{r}_k^m that satisfies

$$\tilde{r}_k^m = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \lambda \hat{G}_k^z & : \pi_k(x) < 0 \\ \lambda G_k(1) - \bar{\Theta}^k \pi_k(1) & : \pi_k(x) > 0, \lambda [G_k(1) - G_k(0)] - \bar{\theta}^k \pi_k(1) > 0 \\ \lambda \check{G}_k^w & : \pi_k(x) > 0, \lambda [G_k(1) - G_k(0)] - \bar{\theta}^k \pi_k(1) < 0 \end{array} \right\} > r_j^M. \quad (6.2)$$

Across the three cases, we can apply Lemmas 3.5, 3.6, and 5.6 to see that there exists $L > 0$ such that $\mu_t^k([0, 1]) \geq L e^{\tilde{r}_k^m t}$. We can then combine this with Equation (6.1) to estimate that

$$\bar{\mu}_t^j([0, 1]) = \frac{e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^j([0, 1])}{e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^j([0, 1]) + e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^k([0, 1])} \leq \frac{e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^j([0, 1])}{e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^j([0, 1]) + L} \leq L^{-1} e^{-\tilde{r}_k^m t} \mu_t^j([0, 1]). \quad (6.3)$$

Our next step is to estimate $\mu_t^j([0, 1])$. If $\pi_j(x) < 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, we may estimate that

$$\int_0^t (G(\phi_s(x)) - G(1)) ds = \int_x^{\phi_t(x)} \frac{G(q) - G(1)}{q(1-q)|\pi(q)|} dq \leq \int_0^1 \frac{[G(q) - G(1)]_+}{q(1-q)|\pi(q)|} dq < \infty, \quad (6.4)$$

and therefore there exists an $A_1 < \infty$ such that

$$\mu_t^j([0, 1]) = e^{\lambda G(1)t} \int_0^1 e^{\lambda \int_0^t [G(\phi_s(x)) - G(1)] ds} \mu_0(dx) \leq A_1 e^{\lambda G(1)t} = A_1 e^{r_j^M t}. \quad (6.5)$$

If instead $\pi_j(x) > 0$ for $x \in [0, 1]$, we can use the fact that $\mu_0^j(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\theta} > 0$ to apply Lemma 4.1. Therefore we can introduce a modified supremum Hölder exponent $\underline{\Theta} < \underline{\theta}$ sufficiently close to $\underline{\Theta}$ and a modified principal growth rate $\tilde{r}_j^M \in (r_j^M, \tilde{r}_k^m)$, which allows us to see that there exist constants $C_1^1, C_2^1, A_2 < \infty$ such that

$$\mu_t^j([0, 1]) \leq C_1^1 e^{\lambda G_j(0)t} + C_2^1 e^{[\lambda G_j(1) - \underline{\theta}^j \pi_j(1)]t} \leq A_2 e^{\max\{\lambda G_j(0), \lambda G_j(1) - \underline{\theta}^j \pi_j(1)\}t} \leq A_2 e^{\tilde{r}_j^M t}. \quad (6.6)$$

Between the two cases for the sign of $\pi_j(x)$, we can see that there exists $A < \infty$ and $\tilde{r}_j^M < \tilde{r}_m^k$ such that $\mu_t^j([0, 1]) \leq A e^{\tilde{r}_j^M t}$. Combining this estimate with Equation (6.3), we can use the fact that $\tilde{r}_k^m > \tilde{r}_j^M$ to deduce that

$$\bar{\mu}_t^j([0, 1]) \leq AL^{-1} \exp([\tilde{r}_j^M - \tilde{r}_k^m]t) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty, \quad (6.7)$$

and we can conclude that the population will concentrate upon subpopulation k in the long-time limit.

Now we turn to describing the long-time behavior of $\bar{\mu}_t^k(dx)$ in the case for which $\mu_0^k(dx)$ has a well-defined Hölder exponent and constant near $x = 1$. We can write describe the distribution of group compositions in subpopulation k as

$$\int_0^1 v_k(x) \bar{\mu}_t^k(dx) = \frac{\int_0^1 v_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \mu_t^j([0, 1])} = \frac{e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \int_0^1 v_j(x) \mu_t^j(dx)}{e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \mu_t^k([0, 1]) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq k}}^N \left\{ e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \mu_t^j([0, 1]) \right\}}. \quad (6.8)$$

Using the same approach as in the proof of Theorem 1.5, we can see that

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \int_0^1 v_k(x) \mu_t^k(dx) \rightarrow \int_0^1 v_j(x) f_{\theta^k}^\lambda(x) dx \\ e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \mu_t^k([0, 1]) \rightarrow \int_0^1 f_{\theta^k}^\lambda(x) dx \end{array} \right\} \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.9)$$

Because $r_k^m = \lambda G_k(1) - \theta^k \pi_k(1)$ in this case, we know from above that $e^{[\theta^k \pi_k(1) - \lambda G_k(1)]t} \mu_t^j([0, 1]) \rightarrow 0$ for $j \neq k$. Applying this to Equation (6.8) allows us to conclude that

$$\int_0^1 v_k(x) \bar{\mu}_t^k(dx) \rightarrow \frac{\int_0^1 v_k(x) f_{\theta^k}^\lambda(dx)}{\int_0^1 f_{\theta^k}^\lambda(dx)} = \int_0^1 v_k(x) p_{\theta^k}^\lambda(dx) \text{ as } t \rightarrow \infty. \quad (6.10) \quad \square$$

6.2 Application To Hawk-Dove and Stag-Hunt Games

6.2.1 Assumptions HD and SH Dynamics and Formulation as a 2-Population Scenario

To generalize the multilevel Hawk-Dove and Stag-Hunt dynamics, we adapt our assumptions on our replication rates $\pi(x)$ and $G(x)$ to reflect the properties of the payoff rankings for these two games. In particular, we see from Equations 1.19 and 1.20 that $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in (x_{eq}, 1]$ and $\pi(x) < 0$ for $x \in [0, x_{eq})$ for HD games, while the opposite signs hold for the SH game.

For the group payoff function, we can use the rankings of payoffs for the HD and SH games and Equation 1.20 to see that

$$\begin{aligned} G(1) - G(x_{eq}) &= \frac{(R - S)(R - T)}{R - S - T + P} > 0 \\ G(0) - G(x_{eq}) &= \frac{(S - P)(T - P)}{R - S - T + P} < 0, \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

and therefore we the group reproduction function satisfies $G(0) < G(x_{eq}) < G(1)$ for both games.

To reformulate the dynamics of the HD and SH games in terms of the multipopulation dynamics studied in Section 6.1, it is helpful to try to understand ODE of Equation (1.4) in comparison to a logistic ODE supported on one of the intervals $[0, x_{eq}]$ or $(x_{eq}, 1]$. We do this by rewriting Equation (1.4) in the form

$$\frac{dx(t)}{dt} = -x(1 - x)(x - x_{eq}) \left(\frac{\pi(x)}{x - x_{eq}} \right), \quad x(0) = x_0. \quad (6.12)$$

Next, we can map the intervals $[0, x_{eq}]$ or $(x_{eq}, 1]$ into $[0, 1]$ using the rescaled variables

$$X_1 = \frac{x}{x_{eq}} \quad . \quad X_2 = \frac{x - x_{eq}}{1 - x_{eq}}. \quad (6.13)$$

Then we can describe the respective within-group dynamics below and above the equilibrium x_{eq} using the modified gain functions

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1(X_1) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{(1 - x_{eq}X_1)\pi(x_{eq}X_1)}{1 - x_1} & : X_1 \in [0, 1) \\ -x_{eq}(1 - x_{eq})\pi'(x_{eq}) & : X_1 = 1 \end{cases} \\ \Pi_2(X_2) &:= \begin{cases} \frac{(x_{eq} + (1 - x_{eq})X_2)\pi(x_{eq} + (1 - x_{eq})X_2)}{X_2} & : X_2 \in (0, 1] \\ x_{eq}(1 - x_{eq})\pi'(x_{eq}) & : X_2 = 0 \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

Further introducing the measures $\bar{\mu}_t^1(dX_1) = 1_{X_1 \in [0, 1]} \bar{\mu}_t(dX_1)$ and $\bar{\mu}_t^2(dX_2) = 1_{X_2 \in [0, 1]} \bar{\mu}_t(dX_2)$ as well as the modified group-reproduction functions $G_1(X_1) = G(x_{eq}X_1)$ and $G_2(X_2) = G(x_{eq} + (1 - x_{eq})X_2)$, we can see that these measures $\bar{\mu}_t^1(dX_1)$ and $\bar{\mu}_t^2(dX_2)$ evolve according to Equation (1.10) for our choices of modified gain and group-reproduction functions. To guarantee that modified gain functions $\Pi_1(X_1), \Pi_2(X_2) \in C^1([0, 1])$ in line with the assumption of Theorem 1.15, we see from Equation (6.14) that it suffices to assume that the original gain function satisfies $\pi(x) \in C^2([0, 1])$.

6.2.2 Summary of Long-Time Behavior for HD and SH Dynamics

We start with the case of the Stag-Hunt game. Because $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in (0, x_{eq})$ and $\pi(x) < 0$ for $x \in (x_{eq}, 1)$ for the SH game, we see that $r_2^m = \lambda G_2(1) = \lambda G(1)$, while $r_1^M \leq \lambda G_1(1) = G(x_{eq})$. Therefore the two-population representation of the SH game will always satisfy the hypothesis of Theorem 1.15 regarding a dominant subpopulation, and so the support groups below x_{eq} vanishes in the long-time limit. Because the dynamics above x_{eq} resemble a PDel game, we can use an approach inspired by the proof of Proposition 1.14 to show fixation upon full-cooperation.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that $G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$, $\pi(x) \in C^2([0, 1])$, $G(0) < G(x_{eq}) < G(1)$, $\pi(x)$ has a single root $x_{eq} \in (0, 1)$, and that $\pi'(x_{eq}) > 0$. We further assume that the initial distribution contains groups with levels of cooperation exceeding the within-group equilibrium, i.e. $\mu_0((x_{eq}, 1]) > 0$. If $\lambda > 0$, $\bar{\mu}_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(1 - x)$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

This generalizes a previous result for SH games with the payoff matrices of Equation (1.14) [53], whose proof relied on the fact that the quadratic $G(x)$ of Equation (1.17b) is increasing for $x > x_{eq}$ under the SH payoff rankings. By contrast, Proposition 6.1 only requires the ranking of the values group-reproduction function at the equilibria of the within-group dynamics.

We now turn to the Hawk=Dove game and consider initial measures with infimum and supremum Hölder exponents near $x = 1$ satisfying $\infty > \bar{\theta} \geq \underline{\theta} > 0$. Because $\pi(x) < 0$ for $x \in (0, x_{eq})$ and $\pi(x) > 0$ for $x \in (x_{eq}, 1)$, we can find that the principal growth rates on our two intervals are given by $r_1^M = \lambda G(x_{eq})t$ and $r_2^m = \max\{\lambda G(x_{eq}), \lambda G(1) - \bar{\theta}\pi(1)\}$. We can show for either possible value of r_2^m that the probability $\bar{\mu}_t([0, x_{eq}))$ vanishes as $t \rightarrow \infty$, with the case of $r_2^M = \lambda G(1) - \bar{\theta}\pi(1)$ following from Theorem 1.15 and the case of $r_2^M = \lambda G(x_{eq})$ requiring an argument analogous to the proof of Proposition 1.14. We can further characterize the long-time behavior of the multilevel HD dynamics by analyzing the distribution of groups above x_{eq} in the same way we studied the PD dynamics in previous sections.

We show in Theorem 6.2 that the population concentrates upon a delta-function $\delta(x - x_{eq})$ at the within-group equilibrium when $\lambda[G(1) - G(x_{eq})] < \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, while we show in Theorem 6.3 that the fraction of cooperators in the population exceeds the equilibrium level x_{eq} infinitely often when $\lambda[G(1) - G(x_{eq})] > \bar{\theta}\pi(1) > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$. Under the stronger assumption that the initial measure has a well-defined positive, finite Hölder exponent and constant near $x = 1$, we show in Theorem 6.4 that the population converges to a steady state density whose support consists of groups with fractions of cooperation between x_{eq} and 1.

Theorem 6.2. *Suppose that $G(x) \in C^1([0, 1])$, $\pi(x) \in C^2([0, 1])$, $G(0) < G(x_{eq}) < G(1)$. We further assume that the initial distribution $\mu_0(dx)$ has supremum Hölder exponent θ near $x = 1$, that $\pi(x)$ has a single root $x_{eq} \in (0, 1)$, and that $\pi'(x_{eq}) > 0$. If $\lambda(G(1) - G(x_{eq})) < \theta\pi(1)$, then $\mu_t(dx) \rightarrow \delta(x - x_{eq})$.*

Theorem 6.3. *Suppose that $G(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 and that the initial distribution $\bar{\mu}_0(dx)$ has nonzero infimum and supremum Hölder exponents $\bar{\theta}$ and $\underline{\theta}$ near $x = 1$ with corresponding Hölder constants $C_{\bar{\theta}}$ and $C_{\underline{\theta}}$ that are finite and nonzero. If $\lambda[G(1) - G(x_{eq})] > \bar{\theta}\pi(1) > \underline{\theta}\pi(1)$, then*

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_{x_{eq}}^1 x \bar{\mu}_t(dx) > x_{eq}. \quad (6.15)$$

To consider long-time steady states with support above the within-group equilibrium, we look for strong solutions to Equation (2.18) that take the form

$$f_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & : x < x_{eq} \\ g_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) & : x \geq x_{eq}, \end{cases} \quad (6.16)$$

where $g_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x)$ is given by

$$g_{\theta}^{\lambda}(x) = (x - x_{eq}) \left(\frac{\lambda[G(1) - G(x_{eq})] - \theta\pi(1)}{x_{eq}(1 - x_{eq})\pi'(x_{eq})} - 1 \right) (1 - x)^{\theta-1} \exp \left(\lambda \int_x^1 \frac{C(s)}{(1-s)(s - x_{eq})} ds \right) \quad (6.17)$$

and the term $C(s)$ is defined as

$$C(s) = \frac{G(x) - G(x_{eq})}{x - x_{eq}} + \left(\frac{G(x_{eq}) - G(1) + \frac{\theta}{\lambda}\pi(1)}{\pi(x_{eq})(x - x_{eq})} \right) \left(\frac{x\pi(x)}{x - x_{eq}} - x_{eq}\pi'(x_{eq}) \right) \\ + \frac{G(x) - G(1)}{1 - x} + \frac{\theta}{\lambda} \left(\frac{1}{1 - x} \right) \left(\frac{x\pi(x)}{x - x_{eq}} - \frac{\pi(1)}{1 - x_{eq}} \right). \quad (6.18)$$

Theorem 6.4. *Suppose that $G(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 6.2 and that the initial distribution $\mu_0(dx)$ has Hölder exponent θ near $x = 1$ with corresponding positive, finite Hölder constant C_θ . If $\lambda[G(1) - G(x_{eq})] > \theta\pi(1)$, then, for any continuous test-function $v(x)$, the solution $\bar{\mu}_t(dx)$ to Equation (1.2) satisfies*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 v(x) \bar{\mu}_t(dx) = \int_0^1 v(x) q_\theta^\lambda(x) dx, \quad q_\theta^\lambda(x) = \frac{g_\theta^\lambda(x)}{\int_0^1 g_\theta^\lambda(y) dy}. \quad (6.19)$$

Using the same approach as in Section 2.3.1, we can characterize the threshold level of between-group competition required for an integrable steady state

$$\lambda_H^*(\theta) := \frac{\theta\pi(1)}{G(1) - G(x_{eq})}. \quad (6.20)$$

Then we can use this expression to see that the average payoff at steady state is given by

$$\langle G(\cdot) \rangle_f = \left(\frac{\lambda_H^*(\theta)}{\lambda} \right) G(x_{eq}) + \left(1 - \frac{\lambda_H^*(\theta)}{\lambda} \right) G(1), \quad (6.21)$$

so average payoff interpolates between $G(x_{eq})$ at $\lambda = \lambda_H^*$ and $G(1)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. Because $G(1) > G(x_{eq})$, we see that the average group payoff increases with λ and that group payoff is limited by the average payoff of a full-cooperator group, even if group payoff $G(x)$ is maximized by an interior fraction of cooperators.

7 Discussion

In this paper, we have analyzed the long-time behavior in a PDE model of multilevel selection, in which a tension exists between the individual-level incentive to defect and group-level competition favoring groups that cooperate. We show that defectors take over the group-structured population when within-group competition is stronger than between-group competition, and that cooperation can weakly persist in the population for all time when the relative strength of between-group competition exceeds a threshold value. We also provide sufficient conditions for the population to converge to a long-time steady state density featuring coexistence of cooperators and defectors, and further characterize the average level of cooperation and group-reproduction rate at steady state in the limit of strong between-group competition. These results generalize and extend previous work on PDE models of multilevel selection with within-group and between-group dynamics arising from frequency-independent competition [42–44] or from the payoffs of evolutionary games [52–54].

By considering arbitrary C^1 functions $\pi(x)$ and $G(x)$ to describe the within-group and between-group competition, we have a general analysis to study how long-term cooperation depends on the

tug-of-war of between the individual-level and group-level incentives. In this more general setting, we are able to understand the key role the full-cooperator group plays in determining the level of cooperation and collective average payoff supported by the long-time behavior of multilevel dynamics. In particular, we see that increasing the relative advantage of the full-cooperator group or increasing the initial cohort of many-cooperator groups (corresponding to lower Hölder exponent θ) helps to promote the evolution of cooperative behavior via multilevel selection, consistent with analytical and simulation results from finite population models of multilevel selection [33, 34, 70].

Considering a broader class of initial conditions for which the infimum and supremum Hölder exponents or constants disagree also reveals important properties of our multilevel dynamics. In particular, convergence to a steady solution of Equation (1.2) is not guaranteed for generic initial probability measures of group compositions, and instead a more natural notion for quantifying the ability for cooperation to survive via multilevel selection is the weak persistence of cooperation for sufficiently strong between-group competition. This distinction between weak persistence and convergence to steady state may also be relevant for exploring multilevel selection for more complex strategy spaces, as it may be more difficult to identify or quantify the possible steady state behaviors beyond a one-dimensional state space for group compositions. As a question for future work, one could look for analogous weak persistence thresholds for PDE models of multilevel selection including additional evolutionary forces like genetic drift or migration [59–61, 71, 72], or models in which the assumption of fixed group size is relaxed and group-level events such as fission and fusion can help to drive the evolution of cooperation [35–38].

As in the special cases previously studied for evolutionary games [52, 53], we establish that the collective payoff of the steady state population is limited by the payoff of a full-cooperator group. This means that the so-called “shadow of lower-level selection” is present for all group reproduction functions which are maximized by an intermediate level of cooperation: no level of between-group competition produces a steady-state population that achieves the maximum possible group-reproduction rate. Even in the limit of infinitely strong between-group competition, the population still concentrates as a delta-function at a level of cooperation that produces the same collective-reproduction rate as that of a (sub-optimal) full-cooperator group. In addition, we have now established a dynamical analogue to the shadow of lower-level selection in terms of the bounds on the time-average of the group-reproduction rate in the population, highlighting that this limitation of the collective outcome to that of a full-cooperator groups can be seen through the dynamics of our model of multilevel selection. Given the bounds on the time-averaged collective outcome, a natural question for future research is whether there is a sense in which the potentially oscillatory long-time solutions of the multilevel dynamics concentrate upon group compositions with the group-reproduction rate $G(1)$ for sufficiently strong between-group competition, extending the concentration behavior seen for steady-state densities.

Our analysis of the threshold selection strength and average payoff at steady state also provide a window to understanding how mechanisms that alter within-group and between-group competition may facilitate cooperation. In particular, we see that decreasing the incentive to defect in a many-cooperator group, $\pi(1)$, can help decrease the between-group competition strength needed to allow long-time survival of cooperation, but it cannot increase the maximum possible achievable group-average payoff in the limit of strong between-group competition. Because altering within-group interactions – through the mechanisms of assortment, other-regarding preference, indirect reciprocity, and network reciprocity – can increase $\pi(0)$ to a positive value and provide cooperators an individual-level advantage in a many-defector group [12, 54, 73, 74], we can also see that such within-group mechanisms can change the dynamics of multilevel selection from following the generalized Prisoners’ Dilemma assumptions to following the generalized Hawk-Dove or Stag-Hunt assumptions. Through

our results on the long-time behavior of the multilevel dynamics under each of each of these generalized games, we can further explore the synergistic effects of within-group population structure and between-group competition on the evolution of cooperation [54].

This paper constitutes an in-depth analysis of a class of hyperbolic PDEs that generalize the equation studied by Luo and Mattingly [42] to include variety of replication functions corresponding to different within-group and between-group competition scenarios. In turn, Equation (1.2) corresponds to the two-level replicator equation that arises from a generalization of the two-level Moran process introduced by Luo [42] under one possible scaling in the limit of infinite group size and of an infinite number of groups. Because our PDE is derived from an individual-based model with finite populations, an important consideration is the extent to which the behavior of solutions to the PDE correspond to properties of the underlying finite population dynamics. In particular, an interesting question for future research is the extent to which behaviors like persistence of cooperation or convergence to steady state densities in the PDE corresponds to any analogous support for cooperation in the original stochastic two-level selection model with finite populations or in alternate deterministic scaling limits that retain the diffusive effects of finite group size [42, 44, 52].

Our results in Section 6 on multiple population dynamics also provide motivation for future work on the coevolution of cooperative strategies and the games played by members of groups. Because the principle growth rate of a subpopulation often corresponds to the average collective outcome at steady state, we can see the long-time behavior of the multipopulation competition as picking out the pair of gain and group-reproduction functions $\pi_j(x)$ and $G_j(x)$ most capable of producing a beneficial level of cooperation under the two-level dynamics for a given set of initial distributions. Future modeling work can examine how competition between different group types can impact the evolution of group properties such as within-group population structures or social norms [54, 75]. In addition, the approach of reformulating multilevel selection models multipopulation models can be extended to evolutionary games with more complicated within-group dynamics, allowing for the analysis of long-time behavior for nonlinear public goods games [76, 77] or for models of efficient extraction of common-pool resources [18, 78]. Going forward, the study of multilevel selection models with multiple group types can serve as a potential next step for mathematically understanding the role which multilevel selection can play on the cusp of major evolutionary transitions.

Acknowledgments

DBC received support from the National Science Foundation through grant DMS-1514606 and the Army Research Office through grant W911NF-18-1-032x5. YM received support from DMS-1907583. Both DBC and YM were supported by the Math+X grant from the Simons Foundation. The authors thank Joshua Plotkin for many fruitful conversations about the model and helpful comments on the manuscript. DBC also thanks Simon Levin and Denis Patterson for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Simon Levin. Crossing scales, crossing disciplines: collective motion and collective action in the global commons. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 365(1537):13–18, 2010.
- [2] Paul B Rainey and Katrina Rainey. Evolution of cooperation and conflict in experimental bacterial populations. *Nature*, 425(6953):72–74, 2003.
- [3] Corina E Tarnita, Clifford H Taubes, and Martin A Nowak. Evolutionary construction by staying together and coming together. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 320:10–22, 2013.

- [4] Caroline J Rose, Katrin Hammerschmidt, Yuriy Pichugin, and Paul B Rainey. Meta-population structure and the evolutionary transition to multicellularity. *Ecology Letters*, 23(9):1380–1390, 2020.
- [5] Yuriy Pichugin, Chaitanya S Gokhale, Julián Garcia, Arne Traulsen, and Paul B Rainey. Modes of migration and multilevel selection in evolutionary multiplayer games. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 387:144–153, 2015.
- [6] Yuriy Pichugin and Arne Traulsen. Reproduction costs can drive the evolution of groups. *bioRxiv*, page 325670, 2018.
- [7] Merlijn Staps, Jordi van Gestel, and Corina E Tarnita. Emergence of diverse life cycles and life histories at the origin of multicellularity. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 3(8):1197–1205, 2019.
- [8] Martin A Nowak, Corina E Tarnita, and Edward O Wilson. The evolution of eusociality. *Nature*, 466(7310):1057–1062, 2010.
- [9] Feng Fu, Sarah D Kocher, and Martin A Nowak. The risk-return trade-off between solitary and eusocial reproduction. *Ecology Letters*, 18(1):74–84, 2015.
- [10] Eörs Szathmáry and John Maynard Smith. The major evolutionary transitions. *Nature*, 374(6519):227–232, 1995.
- [11] Martin A Nowak. Five rules for the evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 314(5805):1560–1563, 2006.
- [12] Christine Taylor and Martin A Nowak. Transforming the dilemma. *Evolution: International Journal of Organic Evolution*, 61(10):2281–2292, 2007.
- [13] Johan Paulsson. Multileveled selection on plasmid replication. *Genetics*, 161(4):1373–1384, 2002.
- [14] Simon Van Vliet and Michael Doebeli. The role of multilevel selection in host microbiome evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(41):20591–20597, 2019.
- [15] Gergely Boza and Szabolcs Számadó. Beneficial laggards: multilevel selection, cooperative polymorphism and division of labour in threshold public good games. *BMC evolutionary biology*, 10(1):336, 2010.
- [16] Elinor Ostrom. Beyond markets and states: polycentric governance of complex economic systems. *American Economic Review*, 100(3):641–72, 2010.
- [17] Maja Schlüter, Alessandro Tavoni, and Simon Levin. Robustness of norm-driven cooperation in the commons. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1822):20152431, 2016.
- [18] Alessandro Tavoni, Maja Schlüter, and Simon Levin. The survival of the conformist: social pressure and renewable resource management. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 299:152–161, 2012.
- [19] Gil JB Henriques, Burton Simon, Yaroslav Ispolatov, and Michael Doebeli. Acculturation drives the evolution of intergroup conflict. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(28):14089–14097, 2019.
- [20] Peter Turchin. Warfare and the evolution of social complexity: A multilevel-selection approach. *Structure and Dynamics*, 4(3), 2010.
- [21] Zachary Shaffer, Takao Sasaki, Brian Haney, Marco Janssen, Stephen C Pratt, and Jennifer H Fewell. The foundress’s dilemma: group selection for cooperation among queens of the harvester ant, *pogonomyrmex californicus*. *Scientific reports*, 6:29828, 2016.
- [22] William M Muir. Group selection for adaptation to multiple-hen cages: selection program and direct responses. *Poultry Science*, 75(4):447–458, 1996.
- [23] Piter Bijma, William M Muir, and Johan AM Van Arendonk. Multilevel selection 1: quantitative genetics of inheritance and response to selection. *Genetics*, 175(1):277–288, 2007.
- [24] Piter Bijma, William M Muir, Esther D Ellen, Jason B Wolf, and Johan AM Van Arendonk. Multilevel selection 2: estimating the genetic parameters determining inheritance and response to selection. *Genetics*, 175(1):289–299, 2007.

- [25] Michael J Wade, Piter Bijma, Esther D Ellen, and William Muir. Group selection and social evolution in domesticated animals. *Evolutionary Applications*, 3(5-6):453–465, 2010.
- [26] Simon Levin and David Pimentel. Selection of intermediate rates of increase in parasite-host systems. *The American Naturalist*, 117(3):308–315, 1981.
- [27] Greg Dwyer, Simon A Levin, and Linda Buttel. A simulation model of the population dynamics and evolution of myxomatosis. *Ecological Monographs*, 60(4):423–447, 1990.
- [28] Michael A Gilchrist, Daniel Coombs, and Alan S Perelson. Optimizing within-host viral fitness: infected cell lifespan and virion production rate. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 229(2):281–288, 2004.
- [29] Michael A Gilchrist and Daniel Coombs. Evolution of virulence: interdependence, constraints, and selection using nested models. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 69(2):145–153, 2006.
- [30] Neil W Blackstone, Sarah R Blackstone, and Anne T Berg. Variation and multilevel selection of sars-cov-2. *Evolution*, 2020.
- [31] Maciej F Boni, Tran Dang Nguyen, Menno D de Jong, and H Rogier van Doorn. Virulence attenuation during an influenza a/h5n1 pandemic. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 368(1614):20120207, 2013.
- [32] Arne Traulsen, Anirvan M Sengupta, and Martin A Nowak. Stochastic evolutionary dynamics on two levels. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 235(3):393–401, 2005.
- [33] Arne Traulsen and Martin A Nowak. Evolution of cooperation by multilevel selection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(29):10952–10955, 2006.
- [34] Arne Traulsen, Noam Shresh, and Martin A Nowak. Analytical results for individual and group selection of any intensity. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 70(5):1410, 2008.
- [35] Burton Simon. A dynamical model of two-level selection. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, 12(5):555–588, 2010.
- [36] Burton Simon and Aaron Nielsen. Numerical solutions and animations of group selection dynamics. *Evolutionary Ecology Research*, 14(6):757–768, 2012.
- [37] Burton Simon, Jeffrey A Fletcher, and Michael Doebeli. Towards a general theory of group selection. *Evolution*, 67(6):1561–1572, 2013.
- [38] Burton Simon and Michael Pilosov. Group-level events are catalysts in the evolution of cooperation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 410:125–136, 2016.
- [39] Marvin A Böttcher and Jan Nagler. Promotion of cooperation by selective group extinction. *New Journal of Physics*, 18(6):063008, 2016.
- [40] Ashhan Akdeniz and Matthijs van Veelen. The cancellation effect at the group level. *Evolution*, 74(7):1246–1254, 2020.
- [41] Brian McLoone, Wai-Tong Louis Fan, Adam Pham, Rory Smead, and Laurence Loewe. Stochasticity, selection, and the evolution of cooperation in a two-level Moran model of the snowdrift game. *Complexity*, 2018, 2018.
- [42] Shishi Luo. A unifying framework reveals key properties of multilevel selection. *Journal of theoretical biology*, 341:41–52, 2014.
- [43] Matthijs van Veelen, Shishi Luo, and Burton Simon. A simple model of group selection that cannot be analyzed with inclusive fitness. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 360:279–289, 2014.
- [44] Shishi Luo and Jonathan C Mattingly. Scaling limits of a model for selection at two scales. *Nonlinearity*, 30(4):1682, 2017.
- [45] Cornelia Pokalyuk and Irene Goerzer. Diversity patterns in parasite populations capable for persistence and reinfection with a view towards the human cytomegalovirus. *bioRxiv*, page 512970, 2019.

- [46] Cornelia Pokalyuk and Anton Wakolbinger. Maintenance of diversity in a hierarchical host–parasite model with balancing selection and reinfection. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2019.
- [47] Luis Osorio and Anita Winter. Two level branching model for virus population under cell division. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14352*, 2020.
- [48] Donald A Dawson. Multilevel mutation-selection systems and set-valued duals. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, pages 1–84, 2018.
- [49] Roland Meizis. Convergence of metric two-level measure spaces. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 130(6):3499–3539, 2020.
- [50] Aurélien Velleret. Two level natural selection with a quasi-stationarity approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10161*, 2019.
- [51] Aurélien Velleret. Individual-based models under various time-scales. *ESAIM: Proceedings and Surveys*, 68:123–152, 2020.
- [52] Daniel B Cooney. The replicator dynamics for multilevel selection in evolutionary games. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 79(1):101–154, 2019.
- [53] Daniel B Cooney. Analysis of multilevel replicator dynamics for general two-strategy social dilemma. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 82:1–72, 2020.
- [54] Daniel B Cooney. Assortment and reciprocity mechanisms for promotion of cooperation in a model of multilevel selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.06933*, 2019.
- [55] Josef Hofbauer and Karl Sigmund. *Evolutionary games and population dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [56] Lars A Bach, Torbjørn Helvik, and Freddy B Christiansen. The evolution of n-player cooperation—threshold games and ess bifurcations. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 238(2):426–434, 2006.
- [57] Artem Kaznatcheev, Robert Vander Velde, Jacob G Scott, and David Basanta. Cancer treatment scheduling and dynamic heterogeneity in social dilemmas of tumour acidity and vasculature. *British journal of cancer*, 116(6):785–792, 2017.
- [58] José F Fontanari, Mauro Santos, and Eörs Szathmáry. Coexistence and error propagation in prebiotic vesicle models: a group selection approach. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 239(2):247–256, 2006.
- [59] Jose Fernando Fontanari and M Serva. Solvable model for template coexistence in protocells. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 101(3):38006, 2013.
- [60] José F Fontanari and Maurizio Serva. Effect of migration in a diffusion model for template coexistence in protocells. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*, 76(3):654–672, 2014.
- [61] José F Fontanari and Maurizio Serva. Nonlinear group survival in kimura’s model for the evolution of altruism. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 249:18–26, 2014.
- [62] Shay Gueron and Simon A Levin. The dynamics of group formation. *Mathematical biosciences*, 128(1-2):243–264, 1995.
- [63] Daniel B Cooney. *PDE Models of Multilevel Selection: The Evolution of Cooperation and the Shadow of Lower-Level Selection*. PhD thesis, Princeton University, 2020.
- [64] Carl M Bender and Steven A Orszag. *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers I: Asymptotic Methods and Perturbation Theory*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [65] Herbert I Freedman and Peter Moson. Persistence definitions and their connections. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 109(4):1025–1033, 1990.
- [66] Josef Hofbauer. A general cooperation theorem for hypercycles. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 91(3):233–240, 1981.

- [67] Josef Hofbauer and Sebastian J Schreiber. To persist or not to persist? *Nonlinearity*, 17(4):1393, 2004.
- [68] Alexander S Bratus, Vladimir P Posvyanskii, and Artem S Novozhilov. Solutions with a bounded support promote permanence of a distributed replicator equation. *Applicable Analysis*, 96(15):2652–2668, 2017.
- [69] Lawrence Craig Evans and Ronald F Gariepy. *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*. CRC press, 2015.
- [70] Albert J Markvoort, Sam Sinai, and Martin A Nowak. Computer simulations of cellular group selection reveal mechanism for sustaining cooperation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 357:123–133, 2014.
- [71] Yukio Ogura and Norio Shimakura. Stationary solutions and their stability for Kimura’s diffusion model with intergroup selection. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University*, 27(2):305–347, 1987.
- [72] Yukio Ogura and Norio Shimakura. Stationary solutions and their stability for Kimura’s diffusion model with intergroup selection II. *Journal of Mathematics of Kyoto University*, 27(4):635–655, 1987.
- [73] Alan Grafen. The hawk-dove game played between relatives. *Animal Behaviour*, 27(4):905–907, 1979.
- [74] John Maynard Smith. *Evolution and the Theory of Games*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [75] Francisco C Santos, Fabio ACC Chalub, and Jorge M Pacheco. A multi-level selection model for the emergence of social norms. In *European Conference on Artificial Life*, pages 525–534. Springer, 2007.
- [76] Marco Archetti and István Scheuring. Coexistence of cooperation and defection in public goods games. *Evolution*, 65(4):1140–1148, 2011.
- [77] Jorge M Pacheco, Francisco C Santos, Max O Souza, and Brian Skyrms. Evolutionary dynamics of collective action in n-person stag hunt dilemmas. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1655):315–321, 2009.
- [78] Andrew R Tilman, James R Watson, and Simon Levin. Maintaining cooperation in social-ecological systems. *Theoretical Ecology*, 10(2):155–165, 2017.