

Adaptive Dynamics of Diverging Fitness Optima

Blaine Van Rensburg
BXV114@student.bham.ac.uk

Fabian Spill
f.spill@bham.ac.uk

Manh Hong Duong
h.duong@bham.ac.uk

November 3, 2023

Abstract

We analyse a non-local parabolic integro-differential equation modelling the evolutionary dynamics of a phenotypically-structured population in a changing environment. Such models arise in the study of species adapting to climate change, or cancer adapting to therapy. Our results concern the long-time behaviour, in the small mutation limit, of the model. The main novelty of our work is that the time- and trait-dependent per capita growth rate is characterised by having multiple (locally) optimal traits which shift at possibly different velocities. When the velocities are the same we find that the solution concentrates on a point-set which depends on the shifting speed. These points can be thought of as “lagged optima” and the fitness value at each lagged optima is the “lagged fitness”. When the velocities of the optimal traits are different and each has a potentially different optimal fitness, we find that the solution in fact concentrates as a Dirac delta function on the positive lagged optimum with maximum lagged fitness. Our results imply that in populations undergoing competition in temporally changing environments, both the true optimal fitness and the required rate of adaptation for each of the diverging optimal traits contribute to the eventual dominance of one trait.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 1.1 | Model and Main Questions | 2 |
| 1.2 | Overview of Results and Structure of Paper | 4 |
| 1.3 | Biological Relevance | 5 |
| 2 | Statement of Results and Strategy of Proof | 5 |
| 2.1 | Case 1: Two Peaks Shifting in The Same Direction at the Same Speed | 5 |
| 2.2 | Case 2: Two Peaks Shifting at Different Speeds | 8 |
| 3 | Proofs of Main Results | 10 |
| 3.1 | Proof of Theorems 1 and 2 | 10 |
| 3.2 | Proof of Theorem 3 | 20 |
| 4 | Numerical Computations | 27 |
| 4.1 | Description of Numerical Methods | 27 |
| 4.2 | Results | 28 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5 | Discussion and Future Work | 33 |
| 5.1 | Discussion | 33 |
| 5.2 | Towards Modelling Decoy Fitness Peaks | 34 |
| A | Summary of Previous Results | 35 |
| A.1 | Related Models | 35 |
| A.2 | Principle Floquet Bundles for Linear Parabolic Equations with Time Dependent Coefficients | 37 |
| B | Proofs of technical lemmas | 39 |
| B.1 | Proof of Lemma 6 | 39 |
| B.2 | Proof of Lemma 9 | 42 |
| B.3 | Proof of Lemma 13 | 45 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Model and Main Questions

The non-local reaction-diffusion equation considered in this paper models an asexual population undergoing natural selection in a changing environment in the presence of multiple traits that give a locally optimal reproduction rate. Each optimum shifts due to the environment, possibly with different velocities.

Generally, we study models of the form:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n(x, t) - \sigma \Delta n(x, t) = n(x, t) \left(A(x, t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} n(y, t) dy \right), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^k \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Here $n(x, t)$ represents the concentration of individuals with trait $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ present at time t . The function $A(x, t)$ is the trait- and time-dependent per capita growth term. The function $A(x, t)$ is also called the “fitness” function [1, 2, 3]. The evolutionary concept of fitness is nuanced, but in the context of this work it can be regarded as synonymous with growth rate. The effect of a changing environment is captured through the time-dependence of $A(x, t)$. The term $\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} n(y, t) dy$ is the total population at time t , and so $A(x, t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} n(y, t) dy$ is the per capita growth rate modified by competition, i.e Lotka-Volterra where the competition is across traits. Movement in trait-space is due to genetic alterations such as mutations. For simplicity, we model this using the diffusion term $\sigma \Delta n$ where the diffusive coefficient is given by σ . While this is a common assumption, one can also take more general mutation terms. In particular, one can use more general mutational kernels as in [4] or [5].

Similar models have been studied, under differing assumptions on the per capita growth term $A(x, t)$, in many papers [2, 6, 3, 7]. Indeed, it is difficult to say much about the behaviour of the solution given a very general $A(x, t)$ so we will later make some simplifying assumptions on this function.

The case of multiple globally optimal traits is investigated in [2] in a static environment, and the case of a single optimal trait in a shifting and periodic environment is investigated in [3]. For the latter paper, the results pertain to the question of whether a species can adapt fast enough to a changing environment to survive. This phenomenon has also been investigated in a spatial context in [8].

The authors of [3] find conditions on the rate of environmental shift and the maximum fitness to determine whether the population goes extinct or not. They assume that the trait- and time-dependent per capita growth rate $A(x, t)$ is given by a function $a(x - \tilde{c}t, e(t))$ where $e(t)$ is a periodic function with period T , and $\bar{a}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int a(x, e(t))$ has just one global optimum. An implicit assumption is that the entire population responds instantly to environmental changes, hence the effect of changing environment can be encoded entirely in the per capita growth rate. Also, by using a growth function with this linearly shifting form, they assume that the rate at which the changing environment shifts locally optimal phenotypes is equal. That is, a change in the environment would shift all local optima by the same distance. In reality, the change of the trait and time-dependent per capita growth function will change in much more complicated ways. Here, we investigate the consequences of allowing the optimal traits to shift at different speeds.

In the present work, we take a more general form of the per capita growth function that allows for two locally optimal traits which are affected by the environment at different rates: we still suppose that the population responds instantly to environmental change, but allow that a change in the environment would shift two local optimal traits to different extents.

This leads to the following natural questions:

1. Under what conditions does the entire population go extinct?
2. Under which conditions does the subpopulation following a particular optima go extinct?

We are ultimately interested in the situation where $A(x, t)$ in (1) has multiple time-dependent maxima $x_j(t)$ which shift at constant speeds in different directions, representing alternative evolutionary trajectories (i.e the cancerous and decoy phenotypes). This situation is complicated by various facts, so we will study two different cases. We refer to the model with multiple global optima, moving in the same direction at the same speed, as Case 1. The model with multiple optima moving at different speeds in different directions is Case 2. To this end introduce the two variants of the model.

Case 1: For the case of multiple peaks shifting in the same direction at the same speed, the model (1) reduces to the following PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \sigma \partial_{xx} n = n (a(x - \tilde{c}t) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(y, t) dy), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Here $\tilde{c} > 0$ and can be interpreted as the rate of environmental change, although it's also more accurate to say it's the rate at which the fitness of phenotypes responds to environment shift. Later we will take the particular scaling $\sigma = \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{c} = \varepsilon c$ where c is constant.

We assume that there are only finitely many maxima of $a(x)$ and we let $M = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a(x)$, where x_i are distinct points. We also assume there is a fixed $\delta > 0$ such that $a(x) < -\delta$ for $|x|$ sufficiently large. We let $a_M := \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a(x)$. Note that we are assuming that the complex interaction between the environment and the population overall leads to a linearly shifting optimal trait. The linear case is of particular interest (compared to a sublinear or superlinear case). See for instance [9] where it is shown for a general class of models that for sublinear shifts the population can adapt perfect (i.e there is no lag in fitness) but for superlinear shifts the population goes extinct.

Case 2: In the case where the optimal traits diverge, we will study the following PDE:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \sigma \Delta n = n (a_1(x - \tilde{c}_1 t) + a_2(x - \tilde{c}_2 t) - \delta - \int n(y, t)), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here we assume $\tilde{c}_1 < 0 < \tilde{c}_2$, and that δ is a positive constant. We assume each a_i is continuous, compactly supported in $[-R_0, R_0]$, and has a unique maximum value $a_{i,M}$ at $x = x_i$.

In the specification of this model, we have made some simplifying choices that allow for clearer presentation without sacrificing the generality of the results. Firstly, by taking a_i with compact support and constant δ we are considering only models which have a *constant* negative fitness away from the optimal traits, whereas the previous model only required that the fitness be bounded above by a negative constant. Ultimately, this should result since the solutions localise to the moving optima in the limits we will consider.

Another simplification is that we choose to deal with only two a_i , each with a unique maximum, but the theory here is applicable to the case of any finite number of a_i , each with a finite number of maxima. Again, this is because the peaks all separate eventually so only interact through the competition term.

1.2 Overview of Results and Structure of Paper

The main results of the paper are as follows. In Case 1, where we consider shifting fitness landscape with multiple globally optimal traits, as modelled by (2), we show that the solution concentrates on the set of lagged optima in the small mutation limit. This is the contents of Theorem 1. This theorem provides the conditions under which the population will go extinct, and partially answers which traits we expect to be dominant in the long-time limit.

We expect this set of concentration points can be further refined, and Theorem 2 shows that a particular weighted rescaling of the limiting solution will concentrate only on the shallowest peak, i.e. the $x_i \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a(x)$ which minimises $a''(x_i)$. This suggests a peculiar result, regarding answering the second question about which subpopulations persist: the subpopulation which persists is the one which follows the flattest moving optimum, even though that subpopulation may be itself concentrated at a trait where $|a''(x)|$ is large. This is not intuitive because it suggests the subpopulation benefits from the trait x_i that none of the numbers of the limiting population have, since they are concentrated at the lagged optima.

In Case 2, where it is assumed that two optima are diverging, modelled by (3), we provide necessary and sufficient conditions for the population to go extinct, and moreover, when the population does not go extinct, we show the solution concentrates on the maximum of the positive lagged optima in Theorem 3. The interpretation is more straightforward here: a subpopulation following a particular moving optimal trait, even if not globally optimal, can persist provided the other optimal trait moves fast enough.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we will present our main results in more detail, which answer the questions we have asked regarding persistence and extinction, and outline the strategy for proving them. In Section 3 we will prove Theorems 1 to 3 and in Section 4 we will illustrate our results with numerical simulations (which provide some insight into the transient dynamics which are not captured by our theorems). In Section 5 we will discuss the biological interpretation of the results and suggest some future directions. For the sake of being self-contained, we collect some results from the literature in Appendix A. Moreover, this provides examples of the sort of results one can expect for this problem. We confine the more technical proofs to Appendix B.

1.3 Biological Relevance

Our results may be relevant for cancer biology, with regards to the phenomenon of decoy fitness peaks [10]. To summarise it, the hypothesis is that certain mutations (for instance in the NOTCH1 gene) may be non-cancerous but enable the mutants to survive better in an aged microenvironment allowing them to compete with pre-cancerous cells and thus suppress the development of tumours. Recent experimental evidence in support of this hypothesis can be found in [11]. This phenomenon involves competition between two optimal phenotypes each of which is adapting to a time-dependent environment (in this case, due to ageing). Although our focus here is on the relevance of differing rates of adaption, we suggest that this framework offers a useful starting point for modelling situations where asexual populations are in competition in a temporally changing environment.

2 Statement of Results and Strategy of Proof

In this section, we set up the problem more thoroughly in each of the two cases so that we can state our main theorems precisely. We comment on our strategies for proving these results.

2.1 Case 1: Two Peaks Shifting in The Same Direction at the Same Speed

The system (2), after taking the appropriate scaling of the mutation and drift terms ($\tilde{c} = c\varepsilon$, and $\sigma = \varepsilon^2$), becomes:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} n = n (a(x - c\varepsilon t) - \int n(y, t)), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We make the following assumptions:

(A1) There exists a $R_0, \delta > 0$ such that $a(x) < -\delta$ provided $|x| > R_0$.

(A2) $a(x) \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\|a\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq d_0$.

(A3) $0 \leq n_0 \leq e^{C_1 - C_2|x|}$ for some positive constants C_1 and C_2 , and $n_0 \in C(\mathbb{R})$.

(A4) There are finite number of global maxima of a .

To state our last assumption succinctly, we must introduce some notation. We let $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a(x)$, and denote a_M the maximum of $a(x)$. We assume the optima are ordered $x_i < x_{i+1}$.

If $a_M - \frac{c^2}{4} > 0$, we let \bar{x}_i be the greatest solution to

$$a(\bar{x}_i) = a_M - \frac{c^2}{4},$$

which satisfies $\bar{x}_i < x_i$. Such a \bar{x}_i exists and is unique since $a(x)$ is continuous and eventually negative, so by the intermediate value theorem it passes through $a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$ and there will be a maximum such value which is less than x_i .

(A5) We assume there are no other solutions to $a(y) = a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$ in (x_i, x_{i+1}) other than \bar{x}_{i+1} (for $i \geq 2$), and that there are no other solutions other than \bar{x}_1 in the interval (∞, x_1) .

In preparation for the statement of our first result, we first introduce some transformed problems and the associated eigenvalue problems. Firstly, we take $N(x, t) = n(x + \varepsilon ct, t)$ so that $N(x, t)$ solves:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t N - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} N - \varepsilon c \partial_x N = N \left(a(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} N(y, t) dy \right), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ N(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Next one can linearise this by working with the equation for $m = N e^{\int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds}$ where $\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(y, t) dy$.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t m - \varepsilon c \partial_x m - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} m = a(x)m, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ m(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Finally, by one can remove the drift term by applying a Liouville transform $M = m e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t M - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} M = M \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4} \right), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ M(x, 0) = n_0(x) e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Associated to (6) is the following eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t p_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} p_\varepsilon - \varepsilon c \partial_x p_\varepsilon - a(x)p_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon, & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ p_\varepsilon > 0. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Our main theorem then characterises the long term behaviour in terms of this eigenvector, eigenvalue pair.

Theorem 1. *Under the assumptions (A1) to (A5), and additionally assuming $a_M - \frac{c^2}{4} > 0$, the following are true:*

There is a (time-independent) positive solution $p_\varepsilon(x)$ to (8), which is unique up to normalization. We choose the normalization such that $\|p_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})} = 1$.

Then there are non-negative constants a_i which sum to 1 such that

$$p_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \delta_{\bar{x}_i},$$

and

$$\left\| N(x, t) - \left(a_M - \frac{c^2}{4} \right) p_\varepsilon(x) \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

Here $\delta_{x_i}(x)$ is the Dirac delta measure centred at x_i .

This theorem generalises some of the results from [2] and [3]; specifically it categorises the long-term behaviour of solutions in the case of a linearly shifting growth rate which has multiple global optima. This is the first investigation of this combination of features in this class of abstract models.

To prove this theorem, we require the use of theory from [12] to construct the non-negative solutions to (8). We review this theory in Appendix A.2.

Although this theorem gives some information about the limiting solution we expect it can be made stronger by further restricting the set of points where the solution concentrates. This will be shown via numerical simulations. We note that in [2] the set of limit points is refined further, according to Proposition 3 in [2] (restated as Lemma 15 in Appendix A).

While unable to fully classify the limit measure we are able to show the convergence of the transformed and rescaled eigenvalue defined as

$$\hat{p}_\varepsilon = \frac{p_\varepsilon e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}}{\|p_\varepsilon e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}.$$

We prove this result by considering a second eigenvalue problem which is obtained after a Liouville transform.

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t P_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} P_\varepsilon - \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) P_\varepsilon = \hat{\lambda}_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}, \\ P_\varepsilon > 0. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

The function \hat{p}_ε is the unique, normalised, time-independent solution to (9).

By borrowing a result from semi-classical analysis (as is done in [2]) we will prove

Theorem 2. *Let $S(x) = |a''(x)|$ for $x \in M := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a(x)$. Let $M_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{x_j} S(x_j) = \{x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k}\}$.*

Then, up to extraction of subsequences,

$$\hat{p}_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_j a_j \delta_{x_{i_j}},$$

where $a_j > 0$ for each j and $\sum_{j=1}^k a_j = 1$.

The main difficulty in proving Theorem 2 lies in the fact that we work on an unbounded domain, whereas Proposition 3 from [2] is obtained for problems in a bounded domain (or on a compact Riemannian manifold in [13]).

We will use the results in [12] to construct the solution to (9) as the limit of solutions to the following Dirichlet problems in bounded domains:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t P_{R,\varepsilon} - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} P_{R,\varepsilon} - \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) P_{R,\varepsilon} = \lambda_{R,\varepsilon} P_{R,\varepsilon}, & (x, t) \in B_R, \\ P_{R,\varepsilon} > 0, & (x, t) \in B_R, \\ P_{R,\varepsilon} = 0 & (x, t) \in \partial B_R \times \mathbb{R}^+ \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Such a construction is also used in [3], and in our proof of Theorem 1. Fortunately, this procedure also enables us to approximate the eigenfunction-eigenvalue pair $(P_\varepsilon, \lambda_\varepsilon)$ in terms of $(P_{R,\varepsilon}, \lambda_{R,\varepsilon})$. We can apply the same semi-classical analysis results as used in [2], which require us to work in a bounded domain, to these approximate problems, allowing us to refine the set of concentration points of P_ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The procedure of estimating the problem on the whole real line can similarly be used to estimate λ_ε and obtain its limiting value as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ which will be used to determine the limiting set. Indeed, we will show that:

Lemma 1. $\lambda_{R,\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$ and this convergence is uniform in R .

We will use the fact that convergence in R is uniform to adapt the methods used in [2] to show the required concentration result.

2.2 Case 2: Two Peaks Shifting at Different Speeds

Our main aim is to study the competition between two competing phenotypes of asexually reproducing organisms in a changing environment when those phenotypes follow different optimal values of the fitness function.

In this case, we consider (1) and set $a(x, t) = a_1(x - \varepsilon c_1 t) + a_2(x - \varepsilon c_2 t) - \delta$. We arrive at the equation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \varepsilon^2 \Delta n = n (a_1(x - \varepsilon c_1 t) + a_2(x - \varepsilon c_2 t) - \delta - \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(y, t) dy), & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Here we assume the following:

(B1) The functions a_1 and a_2 are in $C_c^1([-R_0, R_0])$, $\|a_1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} + \|a_2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} - \delta < d_0$ for some constant $d_0 > 0$. Each a_i has a single positive maxima.

(B2) $c_1 < 0 < c_2$.

(B3) $0 \leq n_0 \leq e^{C_1 - C_2|x|}$ for some positive constants C_1 and C_2 .

We let $x_1 = \operatorname{argmax} a_1(x)$ and $x_2 = \operatorname{argmax} a_2(x)$ and denote $a_{i,M} = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} a_i(x)$.

(B4) If $a_{i,M} - \frac{c_i^2}{4} > \delta$ and $c_i > 0$ then we assume there is a unique \bar{x}_i satisfying $\bar{x}_i \leq x_i$ and $a(x_i) - \frac{c_i^2}{4} = a(\bar{x}_i)$.

One of our inspirations is from the competition between non-cancerous and pre-cancerous mutants which are both adapting to the aged environment, but this model is not specific to cancer, and merely represents Lotka-Volterra dynamics where there are two alternative shifting optima in the fitness landscape. In other words, at a given time t , there are two locally optimum traits, $x_1 + \varepsilon c_1 t$ and $x_2 + \varepsilon c_2 t$. In light of the previous results, we seek to answer the questions: can the two traits coexist, and under which conditions do one or both species become extinct?

To state our main result for this case, we need the following transformed problems:

We let $N_i(x, t) = n(\varepsilon c_i t + x, t)$, $C = c_2 - c_1$ and $m_i = N_i(x, t) e^{\int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds}$, where we recall $\rho_\varepsilon(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(y, t) dy$. Then m_i solves:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t m_i - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} m_i - \varepsilon c_i \partial_x m_i = m_i (a_i(x) + a_{i'}(x + (-1)^i \varepsilon C t) - \delta) & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ m_i(x, 0) = n_0(x). \end{cases}$$

where i' is 1 if $i = 2$ and 2 if $i = 1$.

Repeating similar transformations as before, by letting $M_i = m_i e^{\frac{c_i x}{2\varepsilon}}$, we find that M_i solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t M_i - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} M_i = M_i \left(a_i(x) + a_{i'}(x + (-1)^i \varepsilon C t) - \frac{c_i^2}{4} - \delta \right) & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ M_i(x, 0) = n_0(x) e^{\frac{c_i x}{2\varepsilon}}. \end{cases}$$

We also need the following eigenvalue problems. Firstly, for the Liouville transformed problems,

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t P_i - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} P_i = P_i \left(\lambda_i + a_i(x) - \frac{c_i^2}{4} - \delta \right) & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ P_i > 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \int P_i e^{-\frac{c_i y}{\varepsilon}} dy = 1, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

and for the problem without Liouville transform:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t p_i - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} p_i - \varepsilon c_i \partial_x p_i = p_i (\lambda_i + a_i(x) - \delta) & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ p_i > 0 & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ \int_{\mathbb{R}} p_i dy = 1. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

We suppress the dependence of p_i on ε to avoid cluttering the notation. We also note that $P_i = p_i e^{-\frac{c_i y}{2\varepsilon}}$ by the choices of normalization.

We proceed similarly to [1], and obtain estimates on local growth rate near each of the dominant traits. We obtain the following result

Theorem 3. *Under the assumptions (B1) to (B4), and additionally assuming, without loss of generality, $a_1(x_1) - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\{\delta, a_2(x_2) - \frac{c_2^2}{4}\}$:*

For each i , there is a unique time-independent solution $p_{i,\varepsilon}$ to (13), and

$$p_{i,\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{\bar{x}_i},$$

where $\bar{x}_i \leq x_i$ is the unique solution to $a_i(\bar{x}_i) = a_{i,M} - \frac{c_i^2}{4}$.

Also there is a $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ such that $\gamma(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \infty$ and

$$n_\varepsilon(x + \varepsilon c_1(t + \gamma(\varepsilon)), t + \gamma(\varepsilon)) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left(a_1(x_1) - \frac{c_1^2}{4} \right) \delta_{\bar{x}_1}.$$

If $a_i(x_i) - \frac{c_i^2}{4} - \delta \leq 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ then n_ε instead converges uniformly to 0.

This result can be interpreted as follows: the solution concentrates on the maximum of the positive lagged optima. Interestingly, this is not necessarily the solution that follows the true global optimum.

To prove Theorem 3, we will use super- and subsolutions to obtain some bounds which will help constrain the possible Hamilton-Jacobi equation solutions. To end this section, we will offer some heuristics in support of Theorem 3.

Suppose that, as might be expected from [1], we have obtained

$$N_i(x, t)e^{\int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds + \lambda_i t} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \alpha_i p_{i, \varepsilon}.$$

When extinction does not occur, we expect that $\rho_\varepsilon(t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \rho_\infty$ for some positive constant, and, of course that $0 < \|n\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < \infty$. These facts together mean the only possible value of ρ_∞ is $\max(-\lambda_1, -\lambda_2)$, since any other value would mean extinction (or blow up).

Without loss of generality we assume that $a_{1, M} - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\left\{a_{2, M} - \frac{c_2^2}{4}, \delta\right\}$. In this case, if extinction does not occur, the solution will concentrate on \bar{x}_1 .

3 Proofs of Main Results

3.1 Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

In the case of multiple global optima shifting at the same speed, Theorem 1 is a consequence of Lemmas 2 to 4 below.

Lemma 2. *Assume $a_M - \frac{c^2}{4} > 0$. For each i , let \bar{x}_i be the largest solution of $a(x) = a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$ such that $\bar{x}_i < x_i$, and assume that this is the only solution in (x_{i-1}, x_i) for $i = 2, \dots, n$ and only solution in $(-\infty, x_i)$ if $i = 1$.*

Then

$$p_\varepsilon \xrightarrow[\varepsilon \rightarrow 0]{} \sum a_i \delta_{\bar{x}_i},$$

where the a_i are non-negative and sum to 1.

Lemma 3. *Let $\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(x, t) dx$. Under the assumptions outlined in Section 2.1, for N the solution to (5), we have*

$$\left\| \frac{N}{\rho_\varepsilon(t)} - p_\varepsilon \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0.$$

Lemma 4. *For $\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int n(x, t) dx$ we have:*

$$\rho_\varepsilon(t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} \int a p_\varepsilon dy.$$

Theorem 2 will be proved using Lemma 15 (in Appendix A.2) and Lemma 5 below.

Lemma 5. *The solutions $P_{R,\varepsilon}$ to (10) converge locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R} \times [-t, t]$ for each $t > 0$ to a solution P_ε to (9) for some λ_ε such that $\lambda_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$.*

We begin with the proof of Lemma 1 since we will require the limiting value of λ_ε as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Proof of Lemma 1. We start with the limit of $\lambda_{R,\varepsilon}$. It is clear that $\lambda_{R,\varepsilon} \geq -\left(a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}\right)$ using the Rayleigh-Quotient:

$$\lambda_{R,\varepsilon} = \inf_{\phi \in H_0^1(B_R) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_R} |\partial_x \phi|^2 - \int_{B_R} \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) \phi^2}{\int_{B_R} \phi^2}.$$

We need to pick a sequence of $\phi_\varepsilon \in H_0^1(B_R) \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\frac{\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_R} |\partial_x \phi_\varepsilon|^2 - \int_{B_R} \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) \phi_\varepsilon^2}{\int_{B_R} \phi_\varepsilon^2} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -\left(a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}\right).$$

We cannot use the same sequence as in [2] since their functions do not vanish on the boundary, and are hence not in $H_0^1(B_R)$. Instead we do the following.

Let χ be a smooth cut off function such that $\chi(x) = 0$ for $|x| > 1$, and $\chi(x) = 1$ for $x \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$.

Then, similarly to [2], take $G = D_1 \chi^2 e^{-|x|^2}$ where D_1 is a normalising constant.

Define the sequence $\phi_\varepsilon^2 = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} G\left(\frac{x-x_i}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)$ for $x_i \in \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right)$. We have (due to the normalisation) that $\phi_\varepsilon^2 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \delta_{x_i}$. The choice of x_i is arbitrary, we need only get a sequence of functions which concentrate at one of the global optima.

Thus, we only need to check that $\varepsilon^2 \int_{B_R} |\partial_y \phi_\varepsilon(y)|^2 dy \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$. We compute

$$|\partial_y \phi_\varepsilon(y)|^2 = \varepsilon^{-1} \left| (G^{\frac{1}{2}})' \left(\frac{y-x_i}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2,$$

which is sufficient since

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_R} \left| (G^{\frac{1}{2}})' \left(\frac{y-x_i}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 dy &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| (G^{\frac{1}{2}})' \left(\frac{y-x_i}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) \right|^2 dy \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |(G^{\frac{1}{2}})'(y)|^2 dy \end{aligned}$$

and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |(G^{\frac{1}{2}})'(y)|^2 dy$ is a fixed constant.

Hence we get that $\lambda_{R,\varepsilon} \rightarrow -\left(a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}\right)$. We note that we can pick the same ϕ_ε^2 independently of R (supposing R is large enough) and so this convergence is independent of R . \square

We next prove Lemma 5 which allows us to use $p_{R,\varepsilon}$ to estimate p_ε

Proof of Lemma 5. Define $\tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} = e^{-\lambda_{R,\varepsilon}t} P_{R,\varepsilon}$. Then $\tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon}$ solves:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} \tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} - \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) \tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} = 0 & \text{in } B_R, \\ \tilde{p} > 0, \\ \tilde{p} = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

But this is a particular case of the sequence of Dirichlet problems considered in [12]. We only need to check the exponential separation property, which follows straightforwardly from the formula $\tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} = e^{-\lambda_{R,\varepsilon}t} P_{R,\varepsilon}$.

Hence, by Lemma 16, a subsequence $\tilde{p}_{R_n,\varepsilon}$ converges locally uniformly to \tilde{p}_ε which solves

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \tilde{p}_\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 \partial_{xx} \tilde{p}_\varepsilon - \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4}\right) \tilde{p}_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R} \\ \tilde{p} > 0 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Since $\lambda_{R,\varepsilon}$ are monotonic in R via the Rayleigh formula, and bounded because of Lemma 1, we know these converge to a limiting value λ_ε , and that $\lambda_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} -\left(a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}\right)$. Thus:

$$P_{R,\varepsilon} = e^{\lambda_{R,\varepsilon}t} \tilde{p}_{R,\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow \infty} e^{\lambda_\varepsilon t} \tilde{p}_\varepsilon.$$

One checks that the last term is P_ε which the exact solution to (9). \square

Using this result, we can prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Note that the expression

$$\hat{p}_\varepsilon = \frac{p_\varepsilon e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}}{\|p_\varepsilon e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}},$$

is merely the L_1 normalised solution P_ε to (9).

According to Lemma 15, the functions $P_{R,\varepsilon}$, similarly normalized in L^1 , satisfy:

$$P_{R,\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{x_i \in M \cap M_1} a_i \delta_{x_i}.$$

But $P_{R,\varepsilon}$ approaches P_ε locally uniformly according to Lemma 5. Hence if $P_{R,\varepsilon} \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ in some bounded open set U , then the same is true for P_ε . This completes the proof. \square

Next we proceed with the proof of Theorem 1, but require some more set up to do so. Our approach here is similar to that in [3] except that we are working directly with viscosity solutions to the (time-independent) eigenvalue problem rather than with the original PDE. We will first apply the WKB ansatz. Letting ψ_ε satisfy,

$$p_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{A_\varepsilon} e^{\frac{\psi_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}},$$

where A_ε is a normalising factor, we find that ψ_ε solves

$$\varepsilon \partial_{xx} \psi_\varepsilon - \left| \partial_x \psi_\varepsilon + \frac{c}{2} \right|^2 = a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4} + \lambda_\varepsilon.$$

We will show, analogously to Theorem 1.1 in [3], the following lemma:

Lemma 6. *Assuming (A1) to (A5) the function ψ_ε converges (up to extraction of subsequences) locally uniformly to a viscosity solution ψ of*

$$\begin{cases} -|\partial_x \psi + \frac{c}{2}|^2 = a(x) - a_M, \\ \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi = 0. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

A corollary of this lemma is that p_ε concentrates on the set of points such that $\psi = 0$.

Corollary 1. *Assume there are only finitely many points solving $\psi(x) = 0$. Let these be x'_1, x'_2, \dots, x'_k . For the function p_ε we have, after an extraction of subsequences*

$$p_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i \delta_{x'_i},$$

where $a_i > 0$ for each i and $\sum_i a_i = 1$.

Note that we can also prove that p_ε concentrates on the finitely many points by following Proposition 1 in [2]. Unfortunately, this method includes more concentration points than expected, since it does not exclude the smallest value y_i which satisfies both $y_i > x_i$ and $a(y_i) = a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$. We can get a more refined result using the Hamilton-Jacobi equation method. To use this method, we consider the equation solved by $u = \phi(x) + \frac{cx}{2}$, which is:

$$\begin{cases} -|\partial_x u|^2 = a(x) - a_M, \\ \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} u - \frac{cx}{2} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

To show that, up to an extraction of subsequences, ψ_ε converges locally uniformly to a viscosity solution $\psi = u + \frac{c}{2}x$ we will use a perturbed test function method. This is along the same lines as is done in [3], hence we postpone the proof. Instead, we assume this convergence and find the possible set of points for which $\psi = 0$. We do not seek to show uniqueness of solutions, only refine the set of concentration points. We recall a well-known result for viscosity solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations which is proved in [14].

Let Ω be a bounded domain and $n(x) \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ and $n > 0$. Then, for the following system

$$\begin{cases} |Du| = n(x) \text{ in } \Omega, \\ u(x) = \phi(x) \text{ in } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

we let

$$L(x, y) = \sup \left\{ - \int_0^{T_0} n(\zeta(s)) ds : (T_0, \zeta) \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \zeta(0) = x, \zeta(T_0) = y, \left| \frac{d\zeta}{ds} \right| \leq 1 \text{ a.e in } [0, T_0], \zeta(t) \in \bar{\Omega} \quad \forall t \in [0, T_0] \right\}.$$

One has a representation formula for solutions in terms of L .

Lemma 7 ([14]). *The viscosity solution to (18) is unique and given by*

$$u(x) = \sup_{y \in \partial\Omega} [\phi(y) + L(x, y)].$$

This is proved for $u(x) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} [\phi(y) - L(x, y)]$, so we shall show this equivalence briefly.

Proof. We first define

$$L'(x, y) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^{T_0} n(\zeta(s)) ds : (T_0, \zeta) \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \zeta(0) = x, \zeta(T_0) = y, \left| \frac{d\zeta}{ds} \right| \leq 1 \text{ a.e in } [0, T_0], \zeta(t) \in \bar{\Omega} \quad \forall t \in [0, T_0] \right\}.$$

Given this L' ,

$$u(x) = \inf_{y \in \partial\Omega} [\phi(y) + L'(x, y)]$$

is the unique viscosity solution to (18). One can also find an alternative formula with sup instead of inf by using the fact that $v := -u$ solves the same equation with boundary data $-\phi(y)$, and that $L(x, y) = -L'(x, y)$. \square

When $n(x) = 0$ for multiple points in Ω , then there is not in general a unique viscosity solution, as is the case for $n(x) = \sqrt{a_M - a(x)}$, but the representation formula still applies between the zeros of $n(x)$ and this is enough to refine the set of concentration points.

We are now ready to prove Lemma 2 which is the first part of Theorem 1.

Proof of Lemma 2. We apply this representation formula between two maxima x_1 and x_2 to get

$$u(x) = \max \left\{ u(x_1) - \int_{x_1}^x \sqrt{a_M - a(y)} dy; u(x_2) - \int_x^{x_2} \sqrt{a_M - a(y)} dy \right\}$$

We let x^* be an intersection point between $u(x)$ and $\frac{cx}{2}$. Clearly, from (16), $u(x) = \frac{cx}{2}$ could only be true for $x = x_1^+$ or $x = x_2^-$ which are the only solutions to $a(x) = a_M - \frac{c^2}{4}$ on this interval, thus x^* is one of these two values. Moreover, $u(x)$ can only intersect the line $\frac{cx}{2}$ from below due to the constraint $u(x) - \frac{cx}{2} = 0$, and so $u(x)$ must be increasing for $x \in (x^* - \kappa, x)$ for some small κ . We note that the intersection cannot be at the point where the two functions

compared in the max function are equal since this would imply $u > \frac{cx}{2}$ for all $x \in (x_1, x_2)$: since $u(x) = \max\{f_1(x), f_2(x)\}$ we see that it is increasing for $x > x^*$. Therefore, there is an interval I containing x^* , in which we have:

$$u(x) = u(x_2) - \int_x^{x_2} \sqrt{a_M - a(y)} dy$$

and

$$\partial_x u = \sqrt{a_M - a(x)}.$$

We must also have that $\partial_{xx}u(x^*) < 0$ since otherwise u will exceed $\frac{cx}{2}$. Differentiating the above equation we find

$$\partial_{xx}u = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{a'(x)}{\sqrt{a_M - a(x)}}$$

By the definition of the points x_1^+ and x_2^- we have that $a'(x_1^+) < 0$ and $a'(x_2^-) > 0$, therefore only x_2^- is a possible concentration point. □

We can now relate this to the solution $n_\varepsilon(x, t)$ of (2), which do with Lemma 3. Firstly, we will need the following lemma which provides a bound on the solution N_ε of (5) (with $\sigma = \varepsilon^2$ and $\tilde{c} = c\varepsilon$).

Lemma 8. *Define*

$$G_K(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in (-1 - K, 1 + K), \\ \frac{2K+1-|x|}{K} & x \in (-2K - 1, -1 - K) \cup (1 + K, 1 + 2K), \\ 0 & x \in (-\infty, -2K - 1) \cup (2K + 1, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Let η be a standard mollifier with compact support in $[-1, 1]$, and define $\eta_K = \frac{1}{K}\eta\left(\frac{x}{K}\right)$. We define the following smooth cut-off function:

$$\chi_K = \eta_K * G_K.$$

We have for sufficiently large K , and a constant $d > d_0$ (from (A4)) the inequality:

$$N_\varepsilon(x, t) \leq \bar{N}(x, t) = e^{d\chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right)t + C_1 - C_2|x|}.$$

Here K depends on an arbitrary positive parameter ν .

Remark 1. The super solution constructed here localises the location of unbounded growth. It is an elementary idea, only relying on the comparison principle and, but is still one of the novel ideas in this analysis. The parameter ν gives greater control of the speed at which the mass of this upper bound spreads at the cost of potentially larger K . Typically we will use this to balance between a uniformly in x exponentially decreasing in t term $\Sigma(x, t)$ and a term of the form $e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}$, as is done in the proof of Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 8. The following properties of χ can be verified:

1. χ_K is $C_c^\infty([-3K - 1, 3K + 1])$.
2. $\chi_K = 1$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$.
3. $|\chi'_K| \leq \frac{1}{K}$.
4. $|\chi''_K| \leq \frac{1}{K}$.

Proceeding, we drop the K in χ_K but the function is still dependent on this parameter. We will now show \bar{N} is a supersolution. Substituting \bar{N} into the PDE yields to following requirement for \bar{N} to be a supersolution:

$$d\chi - \frac{dx\nu t\varepsilon}{(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)^2}\chi' - \varepsilon^2 \left[\frac{dt}{(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)^2}\chi'' + \left(\sigma(x)C_1 + \frac{dt}{R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon}\chi' \right)^2 \right] - c\varepsilon \left[\sigma(x)C_1 + \frac{dt}{R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon}\chi' \right] - a(x) > 0, \quad (19)$$

where $\sigma(x)$ is the sign of x .

This simplifies on the three regions

$$R_1 = [-(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon), (R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)],$$

$$R_2 = [-(1 + 3K)(R_0 - \nu t\varepsilon), -((R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)) \cup ((R_0 - \nu t\varepsilon), (1 + 3K)(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon))],$$

and

$$R_3 = (-\infty, -(1 + 3K)(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)) \cup ((1 + 3K)(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon), \infty).$$

In R_1 the requirement becomes:

$$d - a(x) - \varepsilon^2 C_1 - c\varepsilon \sigma(x) C_1 > 0$$

which is fulfilled by the hypothesis $a(x) \leq d_0$ by taking $d > d_0 + (\varepsilon^2 + c\varepsilon)C_1$.

In R_3 , the requirement becomes

$$-a(x) - \varepsilon^2 C_1 - c\varepsilon \sigma(x) C_1 > 0$$

which is fulfilled (for small enough ε) because we have assumed $a(x) < -\delta$ for $x > R_0$.

Finally, in the region R_2 we can use the following inequalities to determine (19):

1. $d\chi > 0$ because $\chi > 0$.
2. $-\frac{dx\nu t\varepsilon}{(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)^2}\chi' \geq 0$ because the sign of χ' and $-x$ are always equal.
3. $\varepsilon^2 \frac{dt}{(R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon)^2}\chi'' \leq C_\nu \|\chi''\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < \frac{C_\nu}{K}$ because the prefactor is bounded dependent on ν .
4. Similarly we have $\left(\sigma(x)C_1 + \frac{d_0 t}{R_0 + \nu t\varepsilon}\chi' \right) < C'_\nu \|\chi'\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < \frac{C'_\nu}{K}$.

5. $-a(x) > \delta$ by the hypothesis on $a(x)$.

Combining these, the required inequality reduces to:

$$\delta - \frac{C_\nu + C'_\nu}{K} > 0. \quad (20)$$

Recalling that we can choose K arbitrarily large, this completes the proof. \square

We can now proceed with the proof of Lemma 3.

Proof of Lemma 3. The first part follows similarly to the proof of proposition 2 in [1]. For $N(x, t)e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon} + \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds + \lambda_0 t}$, owing to Corollary 4, we have

$$\|N(x, t)e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon} + \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds + \lambda_0 t} - \alpha_\varepsilon P_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} 0.$$

Moreover, this convergence is exponential.

This can be written in terms of p_ε and a new constant:

$$\|N(x, t)e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon} + \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds + \lambda_0 t} - \alpha'_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon e^{\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} 0.$$

This implies

$$N(x, t)e^{\int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s)ds + \lambda_0 t} = \alpha'_\varepsilon p_\varepsilon + \Sigma_1(x, t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}},$$

where $\|\Sigma_1(x, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ exponentially.

We use this to write

$$\frac{N}{\rho_\varepsilon} = \frac{\alpha p_\varepsilon + \Sigma_1(x, t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}}{\int \alpha p_\varepsilon + \Sigma_1(x, t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}} dx}.$$

We would like to proceed analogously as in [1], where the authors use a partition $\mathbb{R} = K_t \cup K_t^c$ where $K_t = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| > At\}$ for a large enough A . We cannot pick arbitrarily large A due to the factor $e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}}$, but we can complete the proof due to the more precise upperbound given in Lemma 8.

We write

$$\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{K_t} \alpha p_\varepsilon + \int_{K_t} \Sigma_1(x, t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}} + \int_{K_t^c} N(x, t).$$

We need to show that the latter two terms converge to 0 as $t \rightarrow 0$. The function $\Sigma(x, t)$ decays exponentially in time, so there exists an $\beta > 0$ and $D > 0$ such that $\|\Sigma(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq D e^{-\beta t}$. Therefore we can estimate:

$$\int_{K_t} \Sigma_1(x, t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}} \leq D e^{\frac{cAt}{\varepsilon} - \beta t}.$$

The function $De^{\frac{cA}{\varepsilon}-\beta t}$ will uniformly converge to 0 provided $A \leq \varepsilon \frac{\beta}{c}$. Therefore we take $A = A_\varepsilon = \frac{\beta \varepsilon}{2c}$.

We can now bound the final term:

$$\int_{K_t^c} N(x, t) \leq \int_{K_t^c} e^{d_0 \chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right) t + C_1 - C_2 |x|}.$$

By taking $\nu = \frac{\beta}{3c} < \frac{A_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$, we can ensure that after a sufficiently long time, the integral becomes

$$\int_{K_t^c} e^{C_1 - C_2 |x|}.$$

which will converge to 0 exponentially.

This completes the proof. \square

We can now prove Lemma 4.

Proof of Lemma 4. This follows similarly to [1]. Computations identical to the preceding lemma show that

$$\left\| \frac{\int a(y)N(y, t)dy}{\rho_\varepsilon(t)} - \int a(y)p_\varepsilon(y)dy \right\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This convergence is exponential. By integrating the original equation, we obtain:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} = \rho_\varepsilon \left(\int a p_\varepsilon dy + \Sigma_2(t) - \rho_\varepsilon \right),$$

where $\Sigma_2(t)$ is exponentially decreasing. By applying Gronwall's lemma, we can show the long term limit of ρ_ε is $\int a(x)p_\varepsilon$. This can be done as follows:

Firstly, $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ is eventually bounded above by $\bar{\gamma} = \int a(x)p_\varepsilon + 2|\Sigma_2(T)|$ for any fixed T . Suppose that $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ exceeds $\bar{\gamma}$ at some point $t_1 > T$ and let t_2 be next time where $\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \bar{\gamma}$ if such a point exists and be ∞ otherwise. Then for all $t \in (t_1, t_2)$: we have:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} \leq \rho_\varepsilon (\Sigma_2(t) - 2|\Sigma_2(T)|),$$

in particular:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} \leq -\rho_\varepsilon |\Sigma_2(T)|.$$

Thus by Gronwall's inequality,

$$\rho_\varepsilon(t) \leq \rho_\varepsilon(t_1) e^{-(t-t_1)|\Sigma_2(T)|}.$$

This implies t_2 is finite. But now it is clear $\rho'_\varepsilon(t)$ will be negative if ρ_ε exceeds $\bar{\gamma}$ again, thus $\bar{\gamma}$ is an upper bound for all $t > t_1$.

This shows that

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int a p_\varepsilon dy.$$

We must still find a lower bound. Firstly, since $N \geq 0$ we can ensure 0 is a lower bound for $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$. We define $\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon(t) = \rho_\varepsilon(t) e^{-\int_0^t \Sigma(s) ds}$ which solves:

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon}{dt} = \hat{\rho}_\varepsilon \left(\int a p_\varepsilon dy - \hat{\rho}_\varepsilon e^{\int_0^t \Sigma(s) ds} \right).$$

The term $e^{\int_0^t \Sigma(s) ds}$ is bounded above by $k = e^{\int_0^\infty |\Sigma(s)| ds}$ so we have:

$$\frac{d\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon}{dt} \geq \hat{\rho}_\varepsilon \left(\int a p_\varepsilon dy - k \hat{\rho}_\varepsilon \right).$$

This means that $\frac{d\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon}{dt}$ is positive as long as $\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon \leq \frac{\int a p_\varepsilon dy}{k}$. In particular this means $\hat{\rho}_\varepsilon$ is increasing and thus ρ_ε has:

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varepsilon \geq \rho_{\min} > 0.$$

The lower bound is important in what follows.

Proceeding similarly as before we define $\underline{\gamma} = \int a p_\varepsilon dy - 2|\Sigma_2(T)|$ for an arbitrary T . We suppose there is a time $t_3 > T$ such that $\int a(x) p_\varepsilon + \Sigma_2(t_3) > 0$ and $\frac{\rho_{\min}}{2} < \rho_\varepsilon(t) < \underline{\gamma}$ for all $t > t_3$. Then:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} \geq \frac{\rho_{\min}}{2} \left(\int a(x) p_\varepsilon - |\Sigma(T)| - \rho_\varepsilon \right).$$

Let $\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon = \int a p_\varepsilon dy - |\Sigma'(T)| - \rho_\varepsilon$. Then $\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon$ satisfies:

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon}{dt} \leq -\frac{\rho_{\min}}{2} \tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon.$$

We can proceed as before to show $\tilde{\rho}_\varepsilon$ is decreasing (and thus ρ_ε is increasing) at an exponential rate. We conclude, as we have for the upper bound, that:

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int a p_\varepsilon dy.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Theorem 1 follows by combining Lemmas 2 to 4. □

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3

In order to prove Theorem 3, our first lemma provides local growth rates in terms of the eigenvalues λ_i and is the main ingredient in the proof.

Lemma 9. *For some constants $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ we have:*

$$\underline{\alpha}\tilde{p}_i \leq \tilde{M}_i e^{\lambda_i t} \leq \bar{\alpha}\tilde{p}_i + \Sigma(t) e^{d\chi\left(\frac{x-x_2-\varepsilon Ct}{R_0+\varepsilon\nu t}\right)t}.$$

where $\Sigma(t) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} 0$, and χ has the same definition as in Lemma 8, although possibly with different parameters.

This is a weaker result than Corollary 4 since we cannot guarantee convergence to an exact multiple of \tilde{p}_i but is sufficient for our purposes. The idea behind the lower bounds is to use the fact that $a_{i'} \geq 0$ and the idea behind the upper solution is to localise the growth due to $a_{i'}$ exploiting the fact it has compact support. This will give localised growth rates centred on each moving optimum trait.

The proof is following a similar idea as the proof of Lemma 8, but is more technical. We therefore show the proof in the Appendix B.2. A corollary is:

Corollary 2. *Denoting the upper and lower solutions for each $i = 1, 2$ as \bar{P}_i and \underline{P}_i respectively, we note that $\bar{P} = \min\{\bar{P}_1, \bar{P}_2\}$ is also a valid supersolution and $\underline{P} = \max\{\underline{P}_1, \underline{P}_2\}$ is a valid subsolution. Hence for large enough t , and the constants $\underline{\alpha}_i$ and $\bar{\alpha}_i$ defined as before:*

$$\underline{\alpha}_1 \tilde{p}_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} + \underline{\alpha}_2 \tilde{p}_2 (x - \varepsilon Ct) e^{-\lambda_2 t} \leq \tilde{M}_1 \leq \bar{\alpha}_1 \tilde{p}_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} + \bar{\alpha}_2 \tilde{p}_2 (x - \varepsilon Ct) e^{-\lambda_2 t} + \Sigma'(t).$$

Here $\Sigma'(t)$ is bounded. Furthermore, let $-\lambda_1 > -\lambda_2$, then

$$\underline{\alpha}_1 \tilde{p}_1 \leq \tilde{M}_1 e^{\lambda_1 t} \leq \bar{\alpha}_1 \tilde{p}_1 + \Sigma(t).$$

where $\Sigma(t)$ decays exponentially.

Remark 2. Essentially the same proof applies for any finite number of a_i , each with compact support.

It is also convenient to have an estimates for $N_i(x, t)$ that emphasises the decay as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, that is, an equivalent to Lemma 8

Lemma 10. *We have for sufficiently large K , and sufficiently small ε , the inequality:*

$$N_1(x, t) \leq \bar{N}(x, t) = e^{d_0 t^*} e^{d_0 \chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0+\nu t \varepsilon}\right)(t-t^*) + d_0 \chi\left(\frac{x-x_2-\varepsilon Ct}{R_0+\nu t \varepsilon}\right)(t-t^*) - C_2 |x|}, \text{ for all } t \geq t^*.$$

Proof. It is easy to check that (for sufficiently small ε)

$$n(x, t^*) \leq e^{C_1 - C_2 |x| + d_0 t^*},$$

using the comparison principle and assumptions (B1) and (B3).

We can now use the comparison principle again with the initial data $e^{C_1 - C_2|x| + d_0 t^*}$ to conclude: by our choice of time t^* we have that $\chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right) \chi\left(\frac{x - x_2 - \varepsilon C t}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right) = 0$, i.e at most one of these is positive at each (x, t) coordinate. Hence this reduces to exactly Lemma 8. \square

Lemma 11. *Let n be the solution to (11), $\rho_\varepsilon(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(x, t)$. Under the assumptions (B1) to (B4), and additionally assuming $a_1(x_1) - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\{\delta, a_2(x_2) - \frac{c_2^2}{4}\}$: and assuming $a(x_1) - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\left\{a(x_2) - \frac{c_2^2}{4}, \delta\right\}$ we have:*

$$\frac{\underline{\alpha} \tilde{p}_1}{\underline{\alpha} + \Sigma_1(t)} \leq \frac{N_1 e^{\frac{c \varepsilon}{2 \varepsilon}}}{\rho_\varepsilon(t)} \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_1}{\underline{\alpha}} + \frac{\Sigma(t)}{\underline{\alpha}},$$

where $\Sigma(t)$ is the same as in the preceding lemmas and $\Sigma_1(t)$ decays exponentially, and $N_1(x, t) = n(x + \varepsilon c_1 t, t)$.

A convenient corollary of this is:

Corollary 3. *For some constant C_q independent of ε , and exponentially decaying function $\Sigma_2(t)$ we have:*

$$p_1 e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} - \Sigma_2(t) \leq \frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon(t)} \leq p_1 e^{\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} + \Sigma_2(t).$$

Proof of Lemma 11. We let $q(t) = \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds + \lambda_1 t$. From Corollary 2, we have

$$\underline{\alpha} \tilde{p}_1 e^{-q(t)} \leq N_1(x, t) e^{\frac{c_1 x}{2 \varepsilon}} \leq (\bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_1 + \Sigma(t)) e^{-q(t)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\varepsilon(t) &= \int N_1(x, t) \\ &\geq e^{-q(t)} \underline{\alpha} \int \tilde{p}_1 e^{-\frac{c_1 y}{2 \varepsilon}} dy = \underline{\alpha} e^{-q(t)}. \end{aligned}$$

The final inequality comes from the normalization of \tilde{p}_1 fixed at the beginning. The upper bound is now immediate.

The lower bound is a bit more difficult because we need to estimate $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ from above and need to deal with $\Sigma(t)$ term but is the same idea as in Lemma 3.

To this end, we define $B_1(t) := B(x_1, R_0 + At)$, the ball of radius $R_0 + At$ centered at x_1 , and define $B_2(t) := B(x_2 + \varepsilon C t, R_0 + At)$ as the ball of radius $R_0 + At$ centered at $x_2 - \varepsilon C t$.

Next we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\varepsilon(t) &= \int N(x, t) \\ &= \int_{B_1(t)} N_1 + \int_{B_2(t)} N_1 + \int_{B_1(t)^c \cap B_2(t)^c} N_1 \end{aligned}$$

and estimate each term separately.

Using Lemma 10,

$$\int_{B_1(t)^c \cap B_2(t)^c} N_1 \leq \int_{B_1(t)^c \cap B_2(t)^c} N_1 e^{d_0 \chi\left(\frac{x}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right)(t-t^*) + d_0 \chi\left(\frac{x-x_2 - \varepsilon C t}{R_0 + \nu t \varepsilon}\right)(t-t^*) - C_2 |x|}$$

which is exponentially small at $t \rightarrow \infty$ provided that $A > \nu \varepsilon$.

Thus

$$\frac{N_1 e^{\frac{c_1 x}{2\varepsilon}}}{\rho_\varepsilon(t)} \geq \frac{\underline{\alpha} \tilde{p}_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} e^{-\int \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds}}{(\bar{\alpha}_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t} + \bar{\alpha}_2 e^{-\lambda_2 t}) e^{-\int \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds} + |B_1(t)| \Sigma(t) e^{\frac{c_1(A t + R_0 + x_1)}{2\varepsilon}} + H(t)},$$

where $H(t)$ decays exponentially.

We need only to ensure that $\frac{c_1 A}{2\varepsilon} \leq -\lambda_1$. But the only requirement on A so far is that it is larger than $\nu \varepsilon$. As before, we can take $\nu < \frac{c_1 A}{2}$ and we are done. Therefore we can multiply through by $e^{+\lambda_1 t}$ and the lower bounds follows.

To complete the proof, one just needs to recall the expressions for $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\alpha}$.

□

We can now use this to show a lemma giving the convergence of $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$.

Lemma 12. *We have that*

$$\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s) ds \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} -\lambda_1,$$

and for large enough t

$$|\rho_\varepsilon(t) + \lambda_1| \leq h_\varepsilon,$$

where $h_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$.

Proof. By integrating (11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} &= \int N_1 (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon c t) - \rho_\varepsilon), \\ &\geq \underline{\alpha} e^{-q(t)} \int p_1 (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon c t) - \rho_\varepsilon), \\ &\geq \underline{\alpha} e^{-q(t)} \int p_1 (a_1(x) - \delta - \rho_\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact p_1 is concentrated at x_1 , the latter term is positive and so there is $\gamma > 0$ such that $\rho_\varepsilon(t) > \gamma > 0$ for all $t > 0$, hence the population does not go extinct.

To be more precise we will use the inequality:

$$\rho_\varepsilon(t) \leq \bar{\alpha}e^{-q(t)} + \Sigma_1(t).$$

To derive it, we begin with

$$N_1(x, t) \leq (\bar{\alpha}p_1 + \Sigma(t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}})e^{-q(t)},$$

but actually, we should refine this so that it is:

$$N_1(x, t) \leq \min \left\{ (\bar{\alpha}p_1 + \Sigma(t)e^{-\frac{cx}{2\varepsilon}})e^{-q(t)}, \bar{N}(x, t) \right\}.$$

From this, we get:

$$\rho_\varepsilon(t) < e^{-q(t)} \int_{x > -Bt} (\bar{\alpha}p_1 + \Sigma_1(t)e^{-\frac{Cx}{2}}) + \int_{x < -Bt} \bar{N}.$$

By choosing B sufficiently small we can ensure that all terms except $e^{-q(t)} \int_{x > -Bt} \bar{\alpha}p_1$ decay exponentially to 0. For that term it is bounded above by $\bar{\alpha}e^{-q(t)}$. The desired inequality follows.

The bound on the average of $\rho_\varepsilon(s)$ is because if we assumed otherwise we would arrive at a contradiction with the lower bound on ρ_ε : Given $\eta > 0$, suppose that the average $\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \rho_\varepsilon(s)$ exceeds $-\lambda_1 + \eta$ for time points t_n such that $t_n \rightarrow \infty$ then $e^{-q(t_n)} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} 0$ which would contradict the lower bound for $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ obtained at the start. We can similar find an upperbound (in fact it is easier) and thus show that for any $\eta > 0$ and any sufficiently large t , $\rho_\varepsilon(t) > -\lambda_1 - \eta$. Hence the convergence is obtained.

We move on to obtain the limiting bounds of ρ_ε :

By integrating (11) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} &= \rho_\varepsilon \int \frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon} (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct) - \rho_\varepsilon), \\ &= \rho_\varepsilon \int_{|x| \leq (2C+\nu)t} \frac{N}{\rho_\varepsilon} (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct) - \rho_\varepsilon) + \rho_\varepsilon \int_{|x| > (2C+\nu)t} \frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon} (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct) - \rho_\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

The first equality in fact gives $0 < \rho_\varepsilon(t) < a_{1,M} + a_{2,M} - \delta$ for large enough t , since the sign of $\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} < 0$ for $\rho_\varepsilon > a_{1,M} + a_{2,M} - \delta$ is negative.

Because we have only a uniform estimate for $\frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon}$ we have split the domain. We will estimate each term separately.

For the latter term, we can estimate it as:

$$\left| \int_{|x| > (2C+\nu)t} N_1(a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct) - \rho_\varepsilon) \right| \leq D_1 \int_{|x| > (2C+\nu)t} e^{C_1 - C_2|x|}. \quad (21)$$

This estimate follows from the fact that \bar{N} is an upper bound for N and since $\bar{N}(x, t) \leq e^{C_1 - C_2|x|}$ for $|x| > (2C + \nu)t$. We estimate the terms multiplying N by the bound assumed for $a(x, t)$ and the upper bound for ρ_ε just obtained. This term will decay exponentially.

For the inner term, we write:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\varepsilon \int_{|x| \leq (2C+\nu)t} \frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon} (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct) - \rho_\varepsilon) &\geq \rho_\varepsilon \int_{|x| \leq (2C+\nu)t} (-\Sigma_2(t) + e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} p_1) (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon Ct) - \rho_\varepsilon), \\ &\geq -\rho_\varepsilon \Sigma_2 D_2 + \rho_\varepsilon e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} \int_{|x| < (2C+\nu)t} p_1 (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon Ct) - \rho_\varepsilon) \\ &\geq -\rho_\varepsilon \Sigma_2 D_2 + e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} \rho_\varepsilon (a_1(x_1) - \delta + a_2(x_1 - \varepsilon Ct) - \rho_\varepsilon - \frac{h_\varepsilon}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we are using the fact that p_1 is approximately a Dirac delta centred at x_1 . For large enough time the term $e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} a_2(x_1 - \varepsilon ct)$ is 0 and we can also estimate

$-\rho_\varepsilon \Sigma_2 D_2 > -\rho_\varepsilon \Sigma_3 e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}}$ where Σ_3 is exponentially decaying. This gives

$$\rho_\varepsilon \int_{|x| \leq (2C+\nu)t} \frac{N_1}{\rho_\varepsilon} (a_1(x) - \delta + a_2(x - \varepsilon Ct) - \rho_\varepsilon) \geq \rho_\varepsilon (-\Sigma_3 + e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} (a_1(x_1) - \delta - \frac{h_\varepsilon}{2} - \rho_\varepsilon))$$

We can now take sufficiently large t so that $-\Sigma_3 > -\frac{h_\varepsilon}{2} e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}}$ yielding:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} \geq e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} \rho_\varepsilon (a_1(x_1) - \delta - h_\varepsilon - \rho_\varepsilon).$$

From the earlier part in the proof, we know that $\rho_\varepsilon(t) > \gamma > 0$ for all sufficiently large t , thus:

$$\frac{d\rho_\varepsilon}{dt} \geq e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} \gamma (a_1(x_1) - \delta - h_\varepsilon - \rho_\varepsilon).$$

This step assumes the term in brackets is positive; but if it is never positive then it is a lower bound as required.

Since this is linear we can, with a change of variables, apply Gronwall's inequality and determine a lower bound is in fact $a_1(x_1) - \delta - h_\varepsilon$.

We can proceed similarly for the upper bound, but omit this since the calculations are identical. \square

With these bounds on $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ we can now give the following bounds for $N_1(x, t)$ as:

$$\max \left\{ e^{-\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} p_1 - \Sigma_2(t), 0 \right\} \leq N \leq \min \left\{ e^{\frac{C_q}{\varepsilon}} p_1 + \Sigma_2(t), \bar{N}(x, t) \right\}.$$

We can write this in terms of the phase function too where we take $N_1(x, t) = e^{\frac{\psi_\varepsilon(x, \tau)}{\varepsilon}} = e^{\frac{u_\varepsilon(x, \tau) + \frac{c_1 x}{2}}{\varepsilon}}$, where $\tau = t - \gamma(\varepsilon)$, $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ to be chosen later. For $\tau \geq 0$ we will have:

$$-C_q + \psi_{1, \varepsilon} \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq C_q + \psi_{1, \varepsilon},$$

and also

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \partial_\tau \psi_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \partial_{xx} \psi_\varepsilon - \left| \partial_x \psi_\varepsilon + \frac{c_1}{2} \right|^2 = a_1(x) + a_2(x - \varepsilon C \tau - \varepsilon \gamma(\varepsilon) C) - \delta - \rho_\varepsilon(\tau + \gamma(\varepsilon)), \\ \psi_\varepsilon(x, 0) = \varepsilon \log(n(x, \frac{t^*}{\varepsilon})). \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

In any bounded set Ω the a_2 term will eventually vanish, and indeed we can pick $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ depending on Ω such that $a_2 = 0$ in Ω for $\tau \geq 0$, giving us the same Hamilton-Jacobi equation as in the one peak case, except now the initial condition depends on ε . Fortunately, the given bounds ensure this does not blow up.

The reason it is necessary to shift the time coordinate is because we wish to show convergence of $\psi_\varepsilon(x, \tau)$ to the viscosity solution of

$$\begin{cases} - \left| \partial_x \psi + \frac{c_1}{2} \right|^2 = a(x) - a(x_1) \\ \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi = 0, \\ -C_q + \psi_1 \leq \psi \leq C_q + \psi_1. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we only care about the long-term behaviour where we know $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$ and $\rho_\varepsilon(\tau + \gamma(\varepsilon))$ converge to a constant. If we did not shift the time forward depending on ε , then we would not capture the eventual separation of the peaks. That is, growth term would be $a_1(x) + a_2(x - \varepsilon C \tau)$, which in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ would become $a_1(x) - a_2(x)$, i.e this captures the behaviour if the solution in the short term on the fast time-scale, rather than the long term on the fast time-scale.

In other words, provided we have the appropriate L^∞ and Lipschitz bounds of $\psi_\varepsilon(x, \tau)$, we can justify passing to the limit and we will obtain the exact same Hamilton-Jacobi equation as in the one peak case on any bounded set Ω . Since convergence is locally uniform anyway, the restriction to Ω is inconsequential.

The next lemma provides these bounds, and will imply the locally uniform convergence of $\psi_\varepsilon(x, \tau)$ along subsequences to a viscosity solution. It is analogous to Theorem 3.1 in [3], and the proof can be found in Appendix B.1.

Lemma 13. *Let Ω be a bounded, open set. Define $\psi_\varepsilon = \varepsilon \log(N_1(x, t + \gamma(\varepsilon)))$ and $u_\varepsilon = \psi_\varepsilon + \frac{c_1 x}{2}$, where $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ is such that $a_2(x - \varepsilon \gamma(\varepsilon) C) = 0$ in Ω and $\rho_\varepsilon(\gamma(\varepsilon)) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} a(x_1) - \frac{c_1^2}{4} - \delta$*

Then:

1. We have the following bound: $-C_q + \psi_{1, \varepsilon} \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq C_q + \psi_{1, \varepsilon}$

2. The family of functions $w_\varepsilon = \sqrt{2C_q - \psi_\varepsilon}$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous in the x variable in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$.
3. $(\psi_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ is locally equicontinuous in time on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T]$ and moreover, for any $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$, we have:

$$|\psi_\varepsilon(x, s) - \psi_\varepsilon(x, t)| \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Following from these bounds, $\psi_\varepsilon(x, t)$ converges locally uniformly (with respect to ε) to a time-independent function $\psi(x) \in C(\mathbb{R})$ which is the unique viscosity solution of

$$\begin{cases} -|\partial_x \psi + \frac{c}{2}|^2 = a(x) - a(x_1) \\ \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \psi = 0, \\ -C_q + \psi_1 \leq \psi \leq C_q + \psi_1. \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

The time dependence of the limiting solution follows from part 3.

Theorem 3 will now follow.

Proof of Theorem 3. Let ψ_ε satisfy

$$n^*(x, t) = n(x + \varepsilon c(t + \gamma(\varepsilon)), t + \gamma(\varepsilon)) = e^{\frac{\psi_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}.$$

As we have shown, ψ_ε converges locally uniformly to ψ which satisfies (23). But this is precisely the homogenised equation in [3]. Thus we have the following explicit formula for ψ :

$$\psi = \frac{c}{2}(\bar{x}_1 - x) + \left| \int_{x_1}^{\bar{x}_1} \sqrt{a_1(x_1) - a(y)} dy \right| - \left| \int_{x_1}^x \sqrt{a_1(x_1) - a(y)} dy \right|.$$

Define $f_\varepsilon(x, t) = \frac{n(x + \varepsilon c(t + \gamma(\varepsilon)), t + \gamma(\varepsilon))}{\rho_\varepsilon(t + \gamma(\varepsilon))}$.

Take any compact set Ω and a function $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$.

We write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\varepsilon(y, t) \eta(y) dy - \eta(\bar{x}_1) \right| &= \int_{B_r(\bar{x}_1)} f_\varepsilon(y, t) \eta(y) dy + \int_{B_r(\bar{x}_1)^c} f_\varepsilon(y, t) \eta(y) dy \\ &\leq \sup_{|x - \bar{x}_1| < r} |\eta - \eta(\bar{x}_1)| + 2 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\eta| e^{\inf_{|x - \bar{x}_1| \geq r} \frac{\psi_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned}$$

We can pick $r(\varepsilon)$ such that $r(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$ and $\inf_{|x - \bar{x}_1| \geq r} \psi_\varepsilon \leq -\beta \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This is possible because ψ_ε converges locally uniformly to ψ which is strictly negative except at $x = \bar{x}_1$. Then we see that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_\varepsilon(y, t) \eta(y) dy - \eta(\bar{x}_1) \right| = 0.$$

Thus f_ε converges weakly to $\delta(\cdot - \bar{x}_1)$.

Combining this with the limit of $\rho_\varepsilon(t + \gamma(\varepsilon))$ implies Theorem 3. □

4 Numerical Computations

To complement theoretical results, we present several numerical examples which illuminates interesting features of the transient dynamics, as well as demonstrating our conclusions for the long-time behaviour.

4.1 Description of Numerical Methods

To obtain the numerical results, we make use of a simple finite difference scheme. We discretize space, which we take as $[0, L]$ as $x_i = \delta x i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N_x$ where $x_{N_x} = L$. We discretize the time interval $[0, T]$ as $t_i = \delta t i$ for $i = 1, \dots, N_t$ where $\delta t N_t = T$. Iterations are computed using the forward in time Euler scheme with a centre difference approximation of the Laplacian:

$$n_j^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{\delta t}{\delta x^2} (n_{j+1}^k - 2n_j^k + n_{j-1}^k) + \delta t n_j^k a(x_j, t_{k+1}) & \text{for } j = 2, \dots, N_x - 1, k = 0, \dots, N_t \\ 0 & \text{for } j = 1, N_x - 1, k = 0, \dots, N_t \end{cases}$$

Although we're seeking to approximate a solution on an unbounded domain, we apply Dirichlet boundary conditions rather than, for instance, truncating the spatial domain at each time point, because as the solution is expected to concentrate we suppose that the boundary conditions ultimately do not significantly impact the final solution.

We also make use of an adaptation of the asymptotic preserving scheme given in [15]. For a detailed description, we refer to their paper but will summarise the key points. This scheme works with the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$\begin{cases} \partial_\tau \bar{u}_\varepsilon + |\partial_x \bar{u}_\varepsilon - \frac{c}{2}|^2 = \varepsilon \partial_{xx} \bar{u}_\varepsilon - \left(a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4} - \rho(t) \right) \\ \rho(t) = \int e^{-\frac{\bar{u}_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} dx \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

so that $N = e^{-\frac{\bar{u}_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}}$ solves (5).

Where \bar{u}^0 is specified, the iterations are then given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\bar{u}_i^{n+1} - \bar{u}_i^n}{\Delta t} + H \left(\frac{\bar{u}_i^n - \bar{u}_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2}, \frac{\bar{u}_{i+1}^n - \bar{u}_i^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2} \right) = \varepsilon \frac{\bar{u}_{i+1}^n - 2\bar{u}_i^n + \bar{u}_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x^2} - \left(a(x_i) - \frac{c^2}{4} - \rho_n \right) \\ \rho_n = \Delta x \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-\frac{\bar{u}_i^n}{\varepsilon}}. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Here

$$H(p, q) = \max \{ H^+(p), H^-(q) \}$$

where

$$H^+(p) = \begin{cases} p^2 & \text{if } p > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } p < 0. \end{cases}$$

and

$$H^-(q) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } q > 0, \\ q^2 & \text{if } q < 0. \end{cases}$$

When $c = 0$ this is exactly their scheme S_ε . We note that although the actual schemes are almost identical, we have quite different assumptions on the growth term, which is for us given by $R(x, I) = a(x) - \frac{c^2}{4} - I$. In particular, for $I = 0$ this is negative for $|x| > R_0$ but in [15] it is assumed that that $R(x, I)$ is a) strictly increasing in I and b) there exists an $I_m > 0$ such that $R(x, I_m) > 0$ for all x . We find that the scheme converges to what is expected but to prove the convergence is beyond the scope of the current paper and we leave it for future work.

Associated with the above scheme is also a limit scheme

$$\begin{cases} \frac{v_i^{n+1} - v_i^n}{\Delta t} + H\left(\frac{v_i^n - v_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2}, \frac{v_{i+1}^n - v_i^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2}\right) = -\left(a(x_i) - \frac{c^2}{4} - P_n\right) \\ \min_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} v_i^{n+1} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Here P_{n+1} is the limiting value of ρ_{n+1} as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ which is unique according to [15]. This is computed by finding the root of the following function

$$J \mapsto \min_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \left\{ v_i^{n+1} - \Delta t H\left(\frac{v_i^n - v_{i-1}^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2}, \frac{v_{i+1}^n - v_i^n}{\Delta x} - \frac{c}{2}\right) - \Delta t R(x_i, J) \right\}.$$

This function's unique root is P_{n+1} according to Remark 4.3 in [15].

4.2 Results

The following numerical simulations provide additional support for our conclusions about the long-term behaviour of solutions. Moreover, they also provide insights into the transient behaviour which is not captured by the theorems in Section 3.




Figure 1: Dynamics of $n(x, \tau)$ on a fixed space and time interval. The initial condition is taken as a $n_0(x) = \frac{1}{10} e^{-\frac{(x-37.5)^2}{10^2}}$. We choose $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(x) = (\frac{5}{2} - (x-35)^4)^+$, $a_2 = (\frac{5}{2} - (x-40)^2)^+$, $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $c_1 = c_2 = 1$.

In Fig. 1 we plot the solution $n(x, \frac{t}{\varepsilon})$. We see that the solution does in fact concentrate, as proved in Theorem 2, on the lagged optimum following the global optimum which satisfies $x_i = \operatorname{argmin}_{z \in \{x_1, x_2\}} |a_i''(z)|$. This is not captured by Theorem 2 although it is suggested by it.

We can compare results using the other numerical scheme too. In Fig. 2, we plot \bar{u} which is the numerical solution approximating $u_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon \log N$ at four time points. Since the solution is time-dependent, there is a time-dependent minimum $x(T)$ where $u(x_T, T) = 0$. We find that, as expected, $x(T)$ approaches the \bar{x}_1 both for the $\varepsilon > 0$ scheme and the limit scheme.




Figure 2: The solution $u(x, T)$ to (25) and (26) for $T \in \{\frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, 2\}$. The initial condition is taken as $u_\varepsilon(x, 0) = -\varepsilon \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{10}\right) - \frac{(x-37.5)^2}{10^2} \right)$. We choose $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(x) = \left(\frac{5}{2} - (x-35)^4\right)^+$, $a_2 = \left(\frac{5}{2} - (x-40)^2\right)^+$, $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $c_1 = c_2 = 1$.

Moreover, the results show that the solution initially concentrates near both peaks, even though ultimately one dies out. This suggests that both subpopulations (following x_1 and x_2) will coexist for some significant time (recall the time units are $\tau = \frac{t}{\varepsilon}$).

We can also compare this to results for an asymptotic scheme which we adapt from [15] in Fig. 2. We observe that the limiting scheme and the $\varepsilon > 0$ scheme both reproduce the observation of the finite differences method where the solution concentrates only at the lagged optimum \bar{x}_i associated to peak with minimal $|a''(x_i)|$.

Next, we investigated the effect of increasing the speed c_2 while leaving c_1 fixed. As shown in in Fig. 3, when c_2 is small, $a_{1,M} - \frac{c_1^2}{4} < a_{2,M} - \frac{c_2^2}{4}$ and so we expect the solution to concentrate on $\bar{x}_2 + \varepsilon c_2 t$ in the long-term, as required by Theorem 3. However when c_2 is large enough we will instead have $a_{1,M} - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\left\{\delta, a_{2,M} - \frac{c_2^2}{4}\right\}$ and we expect concentration at $\bar{x}_1 + \varepsilon c_1 t$ in the long term. Indeed, this occurs, and we also see that for $c_2 = 2.5$ initially the subpopulation following $\bar{x}_2 + \varepsilon c_2 t$ grows and the subpopulation following $\bar{x}_1 + \varepsilon c_1 t$ decays. We expect that this is due to the fact that there is initially mass near the true optimum at x_2 and $a_{2,M} > a_{1,M}$. This allows an initially higher growth rate near $x_2 + \varepsilon c_2 t$ for small times. The competition then suppresses the growth everywhere else. However, due to the shift, the population near $x_2 + \varepsilon c_2 t$ cannot be sustained and starts to lag, allowing the population near $\bar{x}_1 + \varepsilon c_1 t$, which has the higher lagged fitness, to overtake.




Figure 3: We choose $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(x) = (\frac{7}{4} - (x - 32)^2)^+$, $a_2 = (\frac{5}{2} - (x - 48)^2)^+$, $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $c_1 = -1$ and c_2 to vary as in the above plots.

We also looked at the effect of initial conditions on the transient behaviour. We keep the parameters fixed and find that the initial conditions can alter where the solution initially concentrates. In particular, for nearby initial conditions, it will concentrate on some point which is likely the single lagged optimum of $a_1(x - \varepsilon c_1 t) + a_2(x - \varepsilon c_2 t)$ before the sufficiently separate and it instead follows the maximum of the positive lagged optima.




Figure 4: The long-term behaviour of $n(x, \tau)$ for a range of initial conditions. We choose $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(x) = (\frac{7}{4} - (x - p_1)^2)^+$, $a_2 = (\frac{5}{2} - (x - p_2)^2)^+$, $\varepsilon = 0.1$ and $c_1 = -1$ and $c_2 = 2.5$. We pick $(p_1, p_2) = (28 + z, 52 - z)$ for $z = 12, 8, 4, 0$.

Finally, we determine the behaviour of $\rho(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(x, t) dx$, or the total population in Fig. 5 for an example initial condition where the two peaks overlap. In this case, $\rho(t)$ is non-linear but eventually monotonic. If this property could be established rigorously, it would simplify some of the proofs presented here, in particular Theorem 3.

We find that for such an initial condition solution concentrates at a point which is initially at neither $\bar{x}_i + \varepsilon c_i t$ due to the overlapping support of a_1 and a_2 . Once these have separated sufficiently, it concentrates at the point which has the maximum lagged optimum.




Figure 5: We choose $\delta = -\frac{1}{2}$, $a_1(x) = (\frac{7}{4} - (x - 40)^2)^+$, $a_2 = (\frac{5}{2} - (x - 40)^2)^+$, $\varepsilon = 0.05$ and $c_1 = -\frac{6}{5}$ and $c_2 = \frac{6}{5}$.

5 Discussion and Future Work

5.1 Discussion

Our work has focused on understanding the long-term behaviour of solutions to a novel integro-differential model of asexual reproduction in a temporally changing environment. Our model is novel in that it allows for different optimal traits to move at different rates due to the changing environment and builds on the work in [2] which have a static fitness function with multiple global optima and [3] which considers a linearly-shifting fitness function.

Specifically, we have answered the following questions in Theorems 1 to 3:

1. Under what conditions does the entire population go extinct?
2. Under which conditions does the subpopulation following a particular optima go extinct?

Theorem 1, which applies to Case 1 where there are multiple global optima shifting with the same speed, shows that the solution concentrates on a subset of the “lagged optima” in the small-mutation and long-time limit. Theorem 2 we prove a weighted rescaling will converge on only the shallowest optima. This, combined with the numerical results, suggest that it concentrates on the lagged optima behind the shallowest peaks.

In Case 2, where there are multiple optima shifting at different speeds, Theorem 3 shows that if $a_{1,M} - \frac{c_1^2}{4} > \max\{a_{2,M} - \frac{c_2^2}{4}, \delta\}$ then the solution concentrates on the lagged optimum \bar{x}_1 , and if the lagged fitness associated to both a_i are negative, then the population goes extinct. This means that the population concentrates at the lagged optimum with maximum positive lagged fitness.

This shows that the dominant subpopulation depends on the lagged optimum fitness and not just the true optimal fitness. From the numerical results in Section 4, we observe that it can first appear that one subpopulation (the one following the optimum with the true optimal fitness) is dominant only to later be overtaken by the subpopulation with the higher lagged optimum. This is particularly relevant when the population initially begins with the optimal traits overlapping. This would be an interesting feature to look out for in cell populations in an aging environment

where there are known to be several evolutionary strategies to cope with the environmental change, i.e the case of decoy fitness peaks mentioned in the introduction. Such a mechanism may be responsible for a fairly sudden emergency of cancer cells, not because they are truly more suited to the environment, but because they can adapt fastest to a changing environment.

5.2 Towards Modelling Decoy Fitness Peaks

In both the one peak and multiple peak cases, we have made some simplifying assumptions: 1), that the maximum fitness does not change over time, 2) that the optimal phenotype is changing linearly, 3) that there is no feedback between the emerging dominant phenotypes and the environment, 4) that competition is uniform between traits.

The first is clearly not true in the long term since advanced cancer is known to exhibit a highly proliferative phenotype. As for the second, we remark that the edge case of linear spreading is particularly interesting in light of the results in [9]: assuming a quadratic fitness function with a time-dependent fitness that is assumed only to be continuous, they show that if the optimum moves superlinearly then it guarantees extinction, whereas if it moves sublinearly there is no lag in the fitness. Of course, this conclusion may not survive significant changes to the model, such as choosing a different mutation kernel, or a more complicated fitness function, but in the context of the model given by (1) we expect interesting results, particularly in the case of linearly shifting fitness.

As for the third and fourth assumptions, we remark that it is well beyond the scope of the techniques used here to analyse a coupled system of equations and would require very different methods to analyse. A generic model may look like this:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \sigma \Delta n = n (a(x, E_1, \dots, E_k, t) - \int n(y, t) b(x, y)) & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, t) = n_0(x). & (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \{t = 0\}, \\ \frac{dE_i}{dt} = G(H_i, t), \\ H_i(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \phi_i(y) n(y, t). \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

For this model, it is possible to have quite complicated and non-linear competitive behaviour between phenotypes (represented by the term $b(x, y)$), and dynamic feedback with some finite number of environmental variables E_i . The function H_i is a collective signal from the current distribution of phenotypes on the environmental variable E_i . Forgetting the feedback for a moment, we see that this makes the growth term non-autonomous and likely it will not vary linearly. This will prevent us from making a transformation to remove the time dependence, and thus we will be unable to compare the solution to stationary growth terms except for in some quite special cases. We remark that it would be interesting to investigate this problem in future work, perhaps in the context of cancer-inflammation a model of inflammation-cancer feedback, studied in [16].

As for allowing for more complicated competition, although this is interesting, it immediately prevents us from linearising the problem by the substitution $n(x, t)e^{-\int \rho_\varepsilon(x, s) ds}$ since now $\rho_\varepsilon = \rho_\varepsilon(x, t)$ depends on x . This step is essential for the precise theorems concerning extinction.

There are of course methods to study this type of model. For instance, in [17] the authors use an entropy functional to show solutions converge to a particular steady state which is a sum of Dirac masses. This problem has a static growth function so it is unclear what techniques one would use instead of those outlined in Appendix A.2 which rely on this linearisation.

A Summary of Previous Results

A.1 Related Models

The problem where $a(x, t)$ is time independent and has multiple peaks in a bounded domain with Neumann boundary conditions is studied in [2]. This problem is given by:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t n - \sigma \partial_{xx} n = n(a(x) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} n(y, t) dy) & (x, t) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+, \\ n(x, 0) = n_0(x), \\ \nabla n \cdot \nu(x) = 0 & (x, t) \in \partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^+. \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

For problems in smooth bounded domains and periodic parabolic problems (even in unbounded domains) one can use the Krein-Rutman theorem to assert the existence of a principle eigenvalue and associated positive eigenfunction solution for the linearised problem. The Krein-Rutman theorem is a generalisation of the well-known Perron–Frobenius theorem (which asserts the existence of a positive eigenvalue and eigenvector for square matrices where all entries are positive) to positive operators on Banach spaces [18]. This is useful because one can usually relate the solutions for arbitrary initial conditions to the solution to the eigenvalue problem which is easier to analyse.

The problem without periodic coefficients and in an unbounded domain excludes the use of the Krein-Rutman theorem. According to [19]: “The Krein-Rutman theory cannot be applied if Ω is nonsmooth or unbounded (except for problems in periodic settings), because the resolvent of L [the operator in question] is not compact.”

Our problem (2) must be considered in the unbounded domain due to the shift term. We can reduce this problem to one with time-independent coefficients with the following two transformations as given in the previous section, leaving us with (7), which we recall here.

This reduces the problem to almost (28) except for the fact the domain is unbounded, and the diffusion coefficient appears on in the term $-M \frac{\tilde{c}^2}{4\sigma}$. As will be done later, we can take the scaling $\sigma = \varepsilon^2$ and $\tilde{c} = c\varepsilon$. This leaves only the issue of the unbounded domain and problems associated with carrying over results from the transformed equations to the original (in particular we cannot simply undo the Liouville transform once we find the limiting solution as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ since it depends on ε).

It is shown that the solution to the problem on a bounded domain (28) with $\sigma = \varepsilon$ converges as $t \rightarrow \infty$ to a multiple of the solution to the eigenvalue problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon \partial_{xx} \psi_\varepsilon - a(x) \psi_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon \psi_\varepsilon & x \in \Omega, \\ \nabla \psi \cdot \nu(x) = 0 & x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \psi \geq 0 & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

where $\nu(x)$ is the outward unit normal.

It is also shown that $\psi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_i a_i \delta_{x_i}$. From these two facts, one can conclude the solution concentrates on some subset of the maximum points of $a(x)$.

Due to this concentration, it can be expected that the fact that the domain is unbounded should not matter (i.e the highly concentrated solutions should be relatively unaffected by the boundary conditions at any fixed distance as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.)

To establish the existence of a solution ψ_ε to (29), and also its convergence to a sum of Dirac deltas, one makes use of Krein-Rutman theorem which gives a variational formula of the eigenvalue (also known as the Rayleigh-Quotient formula).

Lemma 14 (Lemma 1 in [2]). *There exists an eigenvector, eigenvalue pair $(\psi_\varepsilon, \lambda_\varepsilon)$ solving (29). The eigenfunction is unique up to normalization and the eigenvalue is characterised by the following formula:*

$$\lambda_\varepsilon = \inf_{\phi \in H^1(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\varepsilon \int_\Omega |\nabla \phi|^2 - \int_\Omega a(x) \phi^2}{\int_\Omega \phi^2}.$$

Using this lemma, one gets that ψ_ε concentrates by: firstly, choosing an appropriate sequence ψ_ε such that $\lambda_\varepsilon \rightarrow -a_M$. Then a simple computation shows, for a test function $\eta \in C(\bar{\Omega})$ supported away from $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, that

$$\int_\Omega \eta \psi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

Unfortunately, the use of the Rayleigh quotient is lost for unbounded domains except under some specific conditions on the fitness function $a(x)$, for instance, if the fitness function is confining, i.e $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} a(x) = -\infty$. The condition comes from the study of confining potentials in quantum mechanics, and the authors of [20] obtain some results regarding evolutionary branching under the assumption the fitness function is a confining potential.

After establishing the basic concentration results, the authors of [2] are able to find further constraints for the subset of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ where the solution eventually concentrates: their Proposition 2 shows an example of a symmetric fitness function $a(x)$ which leads to equal concentration on two peaks, and their Proposition 3 refines the concentration set according the concavity of $a(x)$ at each of its maxima. They borrow this result from semi-classical analysis, as given in [13] for operators defined on a compact Riemannian manifold, independent of boundary conditions. We will usually consider Dirichlet boundary conditions when working with approximate problems on bounded domains, of the general form:

$$\begin{cases} -\varepsilon \partial_{xx} \psi_\varepsilon - a(x) \psi_\varepsilon = \lambda_\varepsilon \psi_\varepsilon & x \in \Omega, \\ \psi = 0 & x \in \partial\Omega, \\ \psi \geq 0 & x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (30)$$

We borrow the same result, phrased suitably for our problem.

Lemma 15 (Proposition 3 in [2]). *Let $S(x) = |a''(x)|$ for $x \in M := \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} = \operatorname{argmax}_{x \in \Omega} a(x)$. Let $M_1 = \operatorname{argmin}_{x_j} S(x_j)$. Then the solution ψ_ε to (30), satisfies, up to extraction of subsequences:*

$$\psi_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \sum_{x_i \in M \cap M_1} a_i \delta_{x_i}.$$

Although in [2] this result holds for a Neumann problem, the semiclassical analysis result they use remains applicable to Dirichlet problems.

We similarly wish to analyse and find the concentration results for the problem (2) under the scaling $\sigma = \varepsilon^2$ and $\tilde{c} = c\varepsilon$. We aim to do this by similarly analysing the eigenvalue problem, using the results from [12] which construct solutions to the eigenvalue problem for such parabolic problems on unbounded domains as a limit of Dirichlet problems on bounded domains.

The authors of [3] (who take $a(x, t) = a(e(t), x - \tilde{c}t)$ for some periodic function $e(t)$ with period T) also make use of theory presented in [12]. Under the scaling $\tilde{c} = c\varepsilon$ and $\sigma = \varepsilon^2$ they show that the shifted solution $N_\varepsilon(x, t) := n_\varepsilon(x + c\varepsilon t, t)$ will concentrate at a point \bar{x} which they call the lagged optima. Letting $\bar{a}(x) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T a(e(t), x)$ and x_m be the unique maxima of \bar{a} , the authors show that the lagged optima satisfies the following equation

$$\bar{a}(\bar{x}) = a(x_m) - \frac{\tilde{c}^2}{4\sigma}.$$

In particular, if the right-hand side is negative, the population dies out.

We are able to show that the solution $M_\varepsilon(x, t)$ to (7) concentrates on some set of finite points as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ by using theory presented [12] to reduce the problem to one in a finite domain, then combining the results in [2] and [3] to determine these locations more precisely, and to show under what conditions we can obtain concentration to a single location.

It remains is beyond the scope this paper to translate this result to what it means for $n_\varepsilon(x, t)$ the solution to (2). We predict that the Liouville transform will have simply shifted these concentration points but a precise characterisation of $\varepsilon \log(n_\varepsilon)$ would be required to find the locations. This is exactly what one studies when performing a WKB-transform, but for this particular problem difficulties are encountered in determining uniqueness of this solution.

A.2 Principle Floquet Bundles for Linear Parabolic Equations with Time Dependent Coefficients

This reviews the main result we need from [12] and is included in the introduction for completeness.

Consider the following two problems. First, on the whole space \mathbb{R}^N

$$\partial_t u - \Delta u = A(x, t)u \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^N \times (s, \infty) \quad (31)$$

where s is some arbitrary number in \mathbb{R} . Secondly on a ball of radius R , the Dirichlet problem:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - \Delta u = A(x, t)u & (x, t) \in B_R \times (s, \infty), \\ u \geq 0, & \\ u = 0 & (x, t) \in \partial B_R \times (s, \infty) \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

It is assumed (hypothesis A in [12]) that for there are constants A_0 and r_0 such that $\|A\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R})} \leq A_0$, and $A(x, t) \leq 0$ a.e for $|x| \geq r_0$.

It is also assumed that, for each $s = s_0$ there is a solution ϕ of (31) such that $\phi(\cdot, t) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $t \geq s_0$ and for some positive constants ε and C , we have:

$$\frac{\|\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\|\phi(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \geq C e^{\varepsilon(t-s)} \text{ for } s_0 \leq s \leq t.$$

As is proved in [12] this is equivalent to the hypothesis on (32), which is that there are constants R_0 , C_0 and ε_0 such that for each $s = s_0$ the problem (32) with $R = R_0$ has a positive solution $u(\cdot, s_0) \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and

$$\frac{\|u(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \geq C_0 e^{\varepsilon_0(t-s)} \text{ for } s_0 \leq s \leq t.$$

The latter will be easier to show in general, and as remarked in [12], the second hypothesis holds for all $R > R_0$ if it is shown to hold for $R = R_0$.

To state the first theorem we will later use, we need to also introduce the adjoint problem to (31):

$$-\partial_t v - \Delta v = A(x, t)v \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \times (s, \infty). \quad (33)$$

This is obtained from (32) by the change of variables $t \rightarrow -t$.

We have the following theorem:

Theorem 4 (From Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 in [12]). *There exist positive solutions ϕ of (31) and ψ of the adjoint problem (33), both with $s = -\infty$.*

Let

$$X_1(t) = \text{span}\{\phi(\cdot, t)\}$$

and

$$X_2(t) = \{v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \psi(x, t)v(x)dx = 0\}.$$

The following are true

- (i) $X_1(t) \oplus X_2(t) = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (ii) X_1 and X_2 are invariant. That is, if $u(\cdot, t; s, u_0)$ is a solution to (31) with initial condition $u_0 \in X_i(s)$ then $u(\cdot, r; s, u_0) \in X_i(t)$ for all $t \geq s$.
- (iii) There are positive constants C and γ such that

$$\frac{\|u(\cdot, t; s, u_0)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\|\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \leq C e^{-\gamma(t-s)} \frac{\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\|\phi(\cdot, s)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}.$$

We also state a second lemma which is proved in [12] during the course of proving the above theorem, but not presented as an independent result.

Lemma 16. *A subsequence of solutions ϕ_{R_n} (32) will converge (as $n \rightarrow \infty$) locally uniformly in $\mathbb{R}^N \times [-t, t]$ for all $t > 0$ to a solution ϕ of (31). Hence a positive entire solution to (31) exists.*

We will mainly be interested in the following corollary of this theorem, which provides the long-term behaviour for any (sensible) initial condition:

Corollary 4. *Given any initial condition $u_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, there exists a constant α such that*

$$\frac{\|u(\cdot, t; s, u_0) - \alpha\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\|\phi(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \xrightarrow{t \rightarrow \infty} 0.$$

This is a consequence of noting that we can decompose the initial condition as $u_0 = \phi + \alpha v$ where $v \in X_2(s)$.

B Proofs of technical lemmas

B.1 Proof of Lemma 6

Here we prove Lemma 6 by providing some uniform bounds on ϕ_ε . For the equivalent eigenvalue problem in [3] it is remarked that this can be done but since the computations are similar they do not provide a proof, hence do for completeness.

Proof. We will first prove that ψ_ε is bounded above and below uniformly.

We define

$$\hat{p}_{\varepsilon, \infty} = \frac{\hat{p}_\varepsilon}{\|\hat{p}_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\infty)}}$$

We check that

$$\bar{p} = \begin{cases} e^{-\bar{\nu}(|x| - R_0)} & |x| > R_0 \\ 1 & |x| \leq R_0 \end{cases}$$

is a super solution where $|x| > R_0$.

For the region $|x| < R_0$, this is already clear by the normalization.

Denote the differential operator by $\mathcal{L}_\varepsilon := -c\varepsilon\partial_x - \varepsilon^2\partial_{xx} - (a(x) + \lambda_\varepsilon)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\bar{p}) &= (c\varepsilon\bar{\nu}\mathbf{sign}(x) - \varepsilon^2\bar{\nu} - (a(x) + \lambda_\varepsilon))\bar{p}. \\ &\geq (-c\varepsilon\bar{\nu} - \varepsilon^2\bar{\nu}^2 + \delta)\bar{p}. \end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact $a(x) < -\delta$ for $|x| > R_0$.

The last term is positive if $\delta > c\varepsilon\bar{\nu} + \varepsilon^2\bar{\nu}^2$ so we pick $\bar{\nu} = \frac{\delta}{2\varepsilon\max(1, c)}$.

We can also find a subsolution. Let x_ε be a point where $p_{\varepsilon, \infty}(x_\varepsilon) = 1$, and $m_\eta = \min_{y \in (x_\varepsilon - \eta, x_\varepsilon + \eta)} p_{\varepsilon, \infty}(y)$.

Define

$$\underline{p}_\eta = \begin{cases} e^{-\underline{\nu}|x - x_\varepsilon| - \eta} & |x - x_\varepsilon| > \eta, \\ 1 & |x - x_\varepsilon| \leq \eta. \end{cases}$$

We can check that to satisfy $\mathcal{L}(\underline{p}_\eta) \leq 0$ we require that $\varepsilon^2\underline{\nu}^2 - c\varepsilon\underline{\nu} - \delta - a_M + \frac{c^2}{4} \geq 0$. Letting $\frac{A_0}{2}$ be the positive solution to $x^2 - cx - \delta - a_M + \frac{c^2}{4} = 0$, we can take $\underline{\nu} = \frac{A_0}{\varepsilon}$.

We also have that $p_{-\eta} \leq p_{\varepsilon, \infty}$ on the boundary of the set $A = \{x : |x - x_\varepsilon| > \eta\}$ so applying the maximum principle yields

$$p_{-\eta} \leq p_{\varepsilon, \infty}, \forall |x - x_\varepsilon| < \eta.$$

Taking the limit as $\eta \rightarrow 0$ gives:

$$e^{-\frac{A_0}{\varepsilon}|x-x_\varepsilon|} \leq p_{\varepsilon, \infty}.$$

Now we connect this with \hat{p}_ε . Written in terms of $\hat{p}_{\varepsilon, \infty}$ this is:

$$\hat{p}_\varepsilon = \frac{\hat{p}_{\varepsilon, \infty}}{\|\hat{p}_{\varepsilon, \infty}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}.$$

Denoting the normalising factor by $A_\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\|\hat{p}_{\varepsilon, \infty}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}}$ and define w_ε as the solution to

$$A_\varepsilon e^{\frac{\psi_\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}} = \hat{p}_\varepsilon$$

then the above calculations show

$$-A_0|x| - \varepsilon \log A_\varepsilon \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq -\varepsilon \log(A_\varepsilon).$$

The lower bound for \hat{p}_ε shows that $A_\varepsilon \leq \frac{A_0}{2\varepsilon}$ hence $\varepsilon \log(A_\varepsilon) \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

This shows the uniform bounds. We also need Lipschitz bounds. The Bernstein-type method presented in [3, 1] can be used to obtain these. The idea is to show $\partial_x w_\varepsilon$ is a subsolution to some other elliptic PDE to which we can apply a maximum principle and obtain a uniform upper bound.

The method proceeds as follows:

First we define $w_\varepsilon = \sqrt{2C - \psi_\varepsilon}$ where $C > -\varepsilon \log(A_\varepsilon)$. w_ε solves:

$$-\varepsilon \partial_{xx} w_\varepsilon - \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{w_\varepsilon} - 2w_\varepsilon \right) |\partial_x w_\varepsilon|^2 - c \partial_x w_\varepsilon = \frac{a(x) + \lambda_\varepsilon}{-2w_\varepsilon}.$$

Denote $W_\varepsilon = \partial_x w_\varepsilon$. We differentiate the above with respect to x , and multiply by $\frac{w}{|w|}$ to obtain:

$$-c \partial_x |W_\varepsilon| - \varepsilon \partial_{xx} |W_\varepsilon| - 2 \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{w_\varepsilon} - 2w_\varepsilon \right) \partial_x |W_\varepsilon| W_\varepsilon + \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{w_\varepsilon^2} + 2 \right) |W_\varepsilon|^3 = \frac{a'(x) W_\varepsilon}{-2w_\varepsilon |W_\varepsilon|} + \frac{|W_\varepsilon|(a(x) + \lambda_\varepsilon)}{2w_\varepsilon^2}.$$

Firstly, using the bounds for $a(x), a'(x)$ and the following bound

$$\sqrt{C} \leq w_\varepsilon \leq \sqrt{A_0|x|}$$

we have the inequality:

$$-c\partial_x|W_\varepsilon| - \varepsilon\partial_{xx}|W_\varepsilon| - 2\left(A_1 + A_2|x|^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)|W_\varepsilon\partial_x|W_\varepsilon| + 2|W_\varepsilon|^3 \leq A_3 + A_4|W_\varepsilon|,$$

for positive constants A_i .

This implies, for large enough Θ (depending on A_i):

$$-c\partial_x|W_\varepsilon| - \varepsilon\partial_{xx}|W_\varepsilon| - 2\left(A_1 + A_2|x|^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)|W_\varepsilon\partial_x|W_\varepsilon| + 2(|W_\varepsilon| - \Theta)^3 \leq 0.$$

We have shown that $|W_\varepsilon|$ is a subsolution to the PDE:

$$-c\partial_x u - \varepsilon\partial_{xx}u - 2(A_1 + A_2|x|^{\frac{1}{2}})u\partial_x u + 2(u - \Theta)^3 = 0.$$

It is trivially also a subsolution of the time-dependent equation:

$$\partial_t u - c\partial_x u - \varepsilon\partial_{xx}u - 2(A_1 + A_2|x|^{\frac{1}{2}})u\partial_x u + 2(u - \Theta)^3 = 0.$$

One can check that that the function

$$\bar{W} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{t}} + \Theta$$

is a solution to the above equation too, and $\bar{W}(0) = \infty$. Hence we expect that $|W_\varepsilon| \leq \bar{W}$ assuming we have a comparison principle. We can verify this as follows (similarly to [3]):

Let t_0 be the earliest time for which the function $|W_\varepsilon| - \bar{W}$ has a maximum (in x) equal to 0. Then at the maximum point x_M we have:

1. $\partial_x|W_\varepsilon| - \partial_x\bar{W} = 0$.
2. $\partial_{xx}|W_\varepsilon| - \partial_{xx}\bar{W} < 0$
3. $W\partial_x|W| = \bar{W}\partial_x\bar{W}$.

It is for the sake of the first of these relations that we artificially introduced the time-variable.

From this this we obtain:

$$(W - \Theta)^3 - (\bar{W} - \Theta)^3 \leq -\partial_t\bar{W} = -\frac{1}{4}t_0^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

This implies that $W < \bar{W}$ at (x_M, t_0) which contradicts the fact that this equals 0. So we conclude that $|W_\varepsilon| \leq \bar{W}$ for all t and so:

$$|W_\varepsilon| \leq \Theta.$$

Thus we have a Lipschitz bound. Then, by the Arzela-Ascoli theorem, we conclude locally uniform convergence to a continuous function which is the viscosity solution of (16). The constraint follows from the normalization. □

B.2 Proof of Lemma 9

Proof of Lemma 9. We will use standard comparison theorems for semilinear parabolic equations on \mathbb{R} to provide these upper and lower bounds.

We define

$$\mathcal{L}(u) := \partial_t u - \varepsilon^2 \bar{\partial}_{xx} u - u(a_1(x) - \delta - \frac{c_1^2}{4} + a_2(x - \varepsilon ct)).$$

We will first show the upper bound and show

$$\bar{p} = \bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_i e^{-\lambda_i t} + (1 - \chi_2) D e^{d\chi_1 \left(\frac{x - x_2 - \varepsilon Ct}{R_0 + \varepsilon \nu t} \right) t}$$

is a supersolution for some choice of parameters. Here $\chi_2 := \chi_{K_2}$ for another K_2 which we will define later.

To show \bar{p} is a supersolution it suffices to show that $\bar{p} \geq n_0$ and that $\mathcal{L}(\bar{p}) \geq 0$. To ensure the inequality is satisfied for the initial condition is satisfied, we can select $\bar{\alpha}$, depending on K_2 , such that $\bar{\alpha} p_i \geq n_0(x, t)$ for $|x| < 3K_2 + 1$. Then we can choose $D \geq \|n_0\|_{L^\infty(\{|x| \geq 3K_2 + 1\})}$. We will require a large enough K_2 since we will later need to bound the derivative of χ_2 .

We could argue analogously for $n(x, t^*)$ for any finite t^* instead of $n_0(x)$, so from now we will assume without loss of generality that we can take the distance between $\text{supp} a_1$ and $\text{supp} a_2$ arbitrarily large (in this case, D and $\bar{\alpha}$ will depend on t^*).

Let us be more explicit with the bounds now. Firstly, there is a fixed T_1 such that $\text{supp} a_i(x) \cap \text{supp} a_{i'}(x - \varepsilon Ct) = \emptyset$ for all $t > \frac{T_1}{\varepsilon}$. Thus we can fix $t^* = \frac{T_1}{\varepsilon}$.

By the bounds on a_1 we have that:

$$\|n_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{-d_0 t^*} \leq n(x, t^*) \leq \|n_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{d_0 t^*}.$$

Therefore it is sufficient to take

$$\bar{\alpha} \geq \sup_{|x| < 3K_1 + 1} \frac{\|n_0\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} e^{d_0 \frac{T_1}{\varepsilon}}}{\tilde{p}_1}.$$

The latter term is not infinite since $\tilde{p}_1 > 0$. In fact, we can find a more explicit bound. Since p_1 is the eigenvector for the problem with a single peak, we can use the results from [3]. We make the usual transformation

$$\tilde{p}_i = e^{\frac{u_{i,\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon}},$$

It can be shown that $u_{i,\varepsilon}$ (up to a subsequence) converges uniformly in bounded sets to the following function

$$u_{i,0}(x) = \frac{cx^*}{2} + \left| \int_{x_m}^{x^*} \sqrt{a_{i,M} - a(y)} dy \right| - \left| \int_{x_m}^x \sqrt{a_{i,M} - a(y)} \right|,$$

which is the solution to (17), as is shown by Lemma 6.

Thus $\inf_{|x| \leq 3K_1+1} \tilde{p}_1 = e^{\frac{u_\varepsilon(x_p)}{\varepsilon}}$ for some $|x_p| \leq 3K_1+1$ (actually this is the boundary value). Since u_ε converges locally uniformly to u_0 , we have that for small enough ε :

$$|u_\varepsilon - u_0| \leq 1,$$

in the set $\{x : |x| < 3K_1 + 1\}$.

We can finally take

$$\bar{\alpha} = e^{\frac{\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(|x| < 3K_1+1)} + 1 + d_0 T_1}{\varepsilon}}.$$

In the following, we take χ_1 as implicitly a function of $f := \left(\frac{x-x_2-\varepsilon Ct}{R_0+\nu t}\right)$, $a_{i'}$ is implicitly a function of $x - \varepsilon Ct$, and χ_2 and a_i are implicitly functions of x . We will now proceed to check this is a supersolution by computing $\mathcal{L}(\bar{p})$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\bar{p}) = e^{d\chi_1 t} & \left[D(1 - \chi_2) \left(d\chi_1 + d\chi_1' \partial_t f t - \varepsilon^2 (d\chi_1'' (\partial_x f)^2) t + (d\chi_1' \partial_x f t)^2 \right) - \left(a_i + a_{i'} - \frac{c_i^2}{4} - \delta \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \varepsilon^2 (2\chi_2' d\chi_1' \partial_x f t + \chi_2'') \right] - a_{i'} \bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_i e^{-\lambda_i t}. \end{aligned}$$

Take $d > -\lambda_i$. Then for all $x \in [-R_0, R_0]$ we have that $\tilde{p}_i e^{-\lambda_i t} a_{i'}(x) \leq \tilde{p}_i e^{d\chi_1 t} a_{i'}(x)$, from which we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\bar{p}) \geq e^{d\chi_1 t} & \left[D(1 - \chi_2) \left(d\chi_1 + d\chi_1' \partial_t f t - \varepsilon^2 (d\chi_1'' (\partial_x f)^2) t + (d\chi_1' \partial_x f t)^2 \right) - \left(a_i + a_{i'} - \frac{c_i^2}{4} - \delta \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \varepsilon^2 (2\chi_2' d\chi_1' \partial_x f t + \chi_2'') - a_{i'} \bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_i \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now, because $a_{i'}$ has compact support and \tilde{p}_i decays as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$, we can take D yet larger so that

$$D \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) - a_{i'} \bar{\alpha} \tilde{p}_i \geq \frac{D}{2} \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right).$$

This gives us the following sufficient condition to conclude \bar{p} is a supersolution:

$$\begin{aligned} L(x, t) = & (1 - \chi_2) \left(d\chi_1 + d\chi_1' \partial_t f t - \varepsilon^2 (d\chi_1'' (\partial_x f)^2) t + (d\chi_1' \partial_x f t)^2 \right) - (a_i + a_{i'}) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) \\ & + \varepsilon^2 (2\chi_2' d\chi_1' \partial_x f t + \chi_2'') \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{C}$$

By taking a large enough K_1 (we recall all constants so far depend on K_1 which is so far independent) we can assume $\text{supp } a_1 \subset \chi_2^{-1}(1)$. By taking t^* (and thus $\bar{\alpha}$) large enough, we can

also assume that $\text{supp}\chi_2 \subset (\chi_1 f)^{-1}(0)$ for all $t > t^*$. This partitions \mathbb{R} into 9 intervals. Rather than give the explicit expression of these, which is not informative, we just give the unique properties which distinguish them.

1. R_1 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and $\chi_2 = 0$, and $\sup R_1 < \inf R_2$.
2. R_2 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and χ_2 is strictly increasing.
3. R_3 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and $\chi_2 = 1$.
4. R_4 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and χ_2 is strictly decreasing.
5. R_5 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and $\chi_2 = 0$ and $\inf R_5 > \sup R_4$'s and $\sup R_5 < \inf R_6$.
6. R_6 : $\chi_1(f)$ is strictly increasing and $\chi_2 = 0$.
7. R_7 : $\chi_1(f) = 1$ and $\chi_2 = 0$.
8. R_8 : $\chi_1(f)$ is strictly decreasing and $\chi_2 = 0$.
9. R_9 : $\chi_1(f) = 0$ and $\chi_2 = 0$ and $\inf R_9 > \sup R_8$.

The condition (C) simplifies on each of these domains.

In R_1 the condition becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) \geq 0.$$

To obtain this, we note that a_i and $a_{i'}$ are both 0 in R_1 .

In R_2 we require:

$$\frac{1}{2}(1 - \chi_2) \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) + \varepsilon^2 \chi_2'' \geq 0,$$

which is also satisfied trivially, noting that $\chi_2'' \geq 0$. This can be checked by noting that $\chi_2''(x) = \eta_{K_2}'' * G_{K_2} \geq 0$ since η_{K_2} satisfies $\eta_{K_2}' \geq 0$.

In R_3 the requirement is satisfied since $L(x, t) = 0$.

In R_4 , we obtain the same condition as in R_2 .

In R_5 we get the same condition as in R_1 .

In R_6 the condition becomes:

$$d\chi_1 + d\chi_1' \partial_t f t - \varepsilon^2 (d\chi_1'' (\partial_x f)^2) t + (d\chi_1' \partial_x f t)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) \geq 0.$$

Reasoning similarly to Lemma 8, we can guarantee for large enough K_1 that this is positive.

In R_7 the condition is

$$d - a_i' + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{c_i^2}{4} + \delta \right) \geq 0$$

which is guaranteed if $d > \|a_{i'}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ which can be chosen for d sufficiently large.

The condition in R_8 is the same as in R_6 , and in R_9 $L(x, t) = 0$.

Thus we have shown both conditions and \bar{p} is a supersolution.

To show the subsolution is similar, except we take

$$\underline{p} = \underline{\alpha}(1 - \chi_2)\tilde{p}_1.$$

The calculations are in fact easier. This reduces to showing

$$-\varepsilon^2 \left(\frac{\chi_2''}{R^2} p_1 + \frac{2\chi_2'}{R} \tilde{p}_1' \right) \leq 0,$$

which follows from the concavity of χ_2 , that $\tilde{p}_1 > 0$ and the explicit formula for \tilde{p}_1 which shows that χ_2' and $\partial_x \tilde{p}_1$ have the same sign (where $\chi_2' \neq 0$).

To ensure that $\underline{p} \leq n(x, t^*)$ we take

$$\underline{\alpha} = e^{\frac{-\|u_0\|_{L^\infty(|x| < 3K_1 + 1)}^{-1-d_0 T_1}}{\varepsilon}}.$$

To conclude the proof, we can take $\Sigma(t) = De^{\lambda_i t}$.

□

B.3 Proof of Lemma 13

Proof of Lemma 13. The first set of bounds ψ_ε follows from Corollary 3 and Lemma 12.

The Lipschitz bounds require an argument like the one given in Appendix B.1. But we have exactly the same relevant assumptions (i.e bounds on ψ_ε and thus w_ε , as well as bounds on $a(x, t)$) except that we need to work the time-dependent equation. Since the proof in Appendix B.1 uses the time-dependent equation artificially anyway, we do not repeat it as it will be identical.

For the third point, it follows by [3] since their proof depends only on the boundedness and continuity of ψ_ε which have been established. The only difference is the initial condition, but this does not matter since we seek a time-independent solution. Since some technical details differ, we will include it here.

The aim is to show that for any $\eta > 0$ there are constants Λ_1 and Λ_2 such that for any $(y, t) \in B_{\frac{R}{2}}(0) \times [0, T]$, and $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have

$$\psi_\varepsilon(x, s) - \psi_\varepsilon(y, t) \leq \eta + \Lambda_1|x - y| + \varepsilon\Lambda_2(t - s), \quad \forall (s, y) \in B_R(0) \times [0, t].$$

To do this, we will show

$$\bar{\psi}_\varepsilon(x, s) = \psi(y, t) + \eta + \Lambda_1|x - y| + \varepsilon\Lambda_2(t - s),$$

is a supersolution on $B_R(0) \times [s, T]$.

We have the bounds (from the proof of Lemma 6 in Appendix B.1):

$$-C_q - A_0|x| - \varepsilon \log A_\varepsilon \leq -C_q + \psi_{1,\varepsilon} \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq C_q + \psi_{1,\varepsilon} \leq C_q - c_1 - c_2|x| - \varepsilon \log A_\varepsilon,$$

which we can further simplify to:

$$-C - A_0|x| \leq \psi_\varepsilon \leq C,$$

where C is independent of ε . From this we can conclude that there is a constant Λ_1 such that:

$$\frac{4\|\psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0)\times[0,T])}}{R} \leq \Lambda_1.$$

Thus for any $\eta > 0$ and $(x, s) \in \partial B_R(0) \times [0, t]$, so long as $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$, we have that $\psi_\varepsilon \leq \bar{\psi}_\varepsilon$. This shows the function dominates one part of the parabolic boundary. We'd now like to show it dominates at time $t = s$ and then show it is a supersolution of the PDE.

Suppose it is not true, then there would exist an η_0 and $y_{\Lambda_1, \eta}$ such that for every $\Lambda_1 > 0$ we have:

$$|\psi_\varepsilon(x, s) - \psi_\varepsilon(y_{\Lambda_1, \varepsilon}, s)| > \eta_0 + \Lambda_1|x - y_{\Lambda_1, \varepsilon}|.$$

By rearranging this we get:

$$|x - y_{\Lambda_1, \varepsilon}| \leq \frac{\|\psi_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(B_R(0)\times[0,T])}}{\Lambda_1}.$$

Thus for large enough Λ_1 we can ensure $|x - y_{\Lambda_1, \varepsilon}| < \delta_0$ where δ_0 is so small that

$$|\psi_\varepsilon(x, s) - \psi_\varepsilon(y_{\Lambda_1, \varepsilon}, s)| < \frac{\eta_0}{2},$$

which contradicts the assumption on η_0 . Thus we can pick large enough Λ_1 to ensure the function $\bar{\psi}_\varepsilon$ dominates at time $t = s$.

Finally, it can be checked that $\bar{\psi}_\varepsilon$ is a supersolution to (22) for large enough Λ_2 (independent of ε). This establishes equicontinuity in time and the fact that

$$|\psi_\varepsilon(x, t) - \psi_\varepsilon(x, s)| \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0.$$

which implies the limiting function (after taking subsequences) is independent of time.

With these bounds established, it is possible to determine that $\psi(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \psi(x, t)$ is a viscosity subsolution to (23). We let $\phi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and assume there is an z_0 such that $\psi(z_0) = \phi(z_0)$ and $\psi - \phi$ has a strict local maximum at z_0 . To show ψ is a viscosity subsolution we must show:

$$-\left|\partial_x \phi(z_0) + \frac{c}{2}\right|^2 - a(z_0) + a(x_1) \leq 0.$$

We know that $\psi_\varepsilon(x, t)$ tends locally uniformly to $\psi(x)$. As such, there is a point $(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon)$ such that $(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon)$ maximises $\psi_\varepsilon - \phi$ and $z_\varepsilon \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} z_0$, possibly after passing to a subsequence.

From this we know that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_x \psi_\varepsilon(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) &= \partial_x \phi(z_\varepsilon), \\ \partial_{xx} \psi_\varepsilon(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) - \partial_{xx} \phi(z_\varepsilon) &\leq 0, \\ \partial_t \psi_\varepsilon(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

The last equality comes from the fact that ϕ is independent of time. Inserting these equalities and inequalities into (22) we get:

$$\begin{cases} -\left|\partial_x \psi_\varepsilon(z_\varepsilon, t_\varepsilon) + \frac{c}{2}\right|^2 - a_1(z_\varepsilon) - a_2(z_\varepsilon - \varepsilon C t_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \gamma(\varepsilon)C) + \delta + \rho_\varepsilon(t_\varepsilon + \gamma(\varepsilon)) \leq \varepsilon \partial_{xx} \phi(z_\varepsilon), \\ \psi_\varepsilon(x, 0) = \varepsilon \log(n(x, \frac{t^*}{\varepsilon})). \end{cases}$$

Then taking the limit as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ yields:

$$-\left|\partial_x \phi(z_0) + \frac{c}{2}\right|^2 - a_1(z_0) + a_1(x_1) \leq 0,$$

as required. Here we have used the regularity of ϕ , the choice of $\gamma(\varepsilon)$ that allows $\rho_\varepsilon(\gamma(\varepsilon)) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} a(x_1) - \delta$, and $a_2(z_\varepsilon - \varepsilon C t_\varepsilon - \varepsilon \gamma(\varepsilon)C) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} 0$ locally uniformly.

The proof that it is a viscosity supersolution is similar. The constraint comes from the bounds on $\rho_\varepsilon(t)$. \square

Acknowledgement

The research of MHD was funded by an EPSRC Research Grant EP/V038516/1 and a Royal Society International Exchange Grant IES\ R3\ 223047. A UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship supported F.S., grant no. (MR/T043571/1).

References

- [1] Susely Figueroa Iglesias and Sepideh Mirrahimi. “Long time evolutionary dynamics of phenotypically structured populations in time-periodic environments”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 50.5 (2018), pp. 5537–5568.
- [2] Tommaso Lorenzi and Camille Pouchol. “Asymptotic analysis of selection-mutation models in the presence of multiple fitness peaks”. In: *Nonlinearity* 33.11 (2020), p. 5791.
- [3] Susely Figueroa Iglesias and Sepideh Mirrahimi. “Selection and mutation in a shifting and fluctuating environment”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.07317* (2021).
- [4] José Antonio Carrillo, Sílvia Cuadrado, and Benoît Perthame. “Adaptive dynamics via Hamilton–Jacobi approach and entropy methods for a juvenile-adult model”. In: *Mathematical Biosciences* 205.1 (2007), pp. 137–161.

- [5] Odo Diekmann et al. “The dynamics of adaptation: an illuminating example and a Hamilton–Jacobi approach”. In: *Theoretical population biology* 67.4 (2005), pp. 257–271.
- [6] Camille Pouchol et al. “Asymptotic analysis and optimal control of an integro-differential system modelling healthy and cancer cells exposed to chemotherapy”. In: *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 116 (Aug. 2018), pp. 268–308. DOI: 10.1016/j.matpur.2017.10.007. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2017.10.007>.
- [7] P Magal and GF Webb. “Mutation, selection, and recombination in a model of phenotype evolution”. In: *Discrete and continuous dynamical systems* 6.1 (2000), pp. 221–236.
- [8] Henri Berestycki and Jian Fang. “Forced waves of the Fisher–KPP equation in a shifting environment”. In: *Journal of differential equations* 264.3 (2018), pp. 2157–2183.
- [9] Lionel Roques et al. “Adaptation in general temporally changing environments”. In: *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics* 80.6 (2020), pp. 2420–2447.
- [10] Kelly C Higa and James DeGregori. “Decoy fitness peaks, tumor suppression, and aging”. In: *Aging Cell* 18.3 (2019), e12938.
- [11] B Colom et al. “Mutant clones in normal epithelium outcompete and eliminate emerging tumours”. In: *Nature* 598.7881 (2021), pp. 510–514.
- [12] Juraj Húska and Peter Polacik. “Exponential separation and principal Floquet bundles for linear parabolic equations on \mathbb{R}^N ”. In: *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems* 20.1 (2008), p. 81.
- [13] David Holcman and Ivan Kupka. “Singular perturbation for the first eigenfunction and blow-up analysis”. In: (2006).
- [14] M. G. Crandall and P. L. Lions. “Two Approximations of Solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi Equations”. In: *Mathematics of Computation* 43.167 (1984), pp. 1–19. ISSN: 00255718, 10886842. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2007396> (visited on 05/15/2023).
- [15] Vincent Calvez, Hélène Hivert, and Havva Yoldaş. “Concentration in Lotka-Volterra parabolic equations: an asymptotic-preserving scheme”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.04146* (2022).
- [16] Johnny T Ottesen et al. “Bridging blood cancers and inflammation: The reduced Cancitis model”. In: *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 465 (2019), pp. 90–108.
- [17] Pierre-Emmanuel Jabin and Gaël Raoul. “On selection dynamics for competitive interactions”. In: *Journal of mathematical biology* 63.3 (2011), pp. 493–517.
- [18] King-Yeung Lam and Yuan Lou. *Introduction to Reaction-Diffusion Equations: Theory and Applications to Spatial Ecology and Evolutionary Biology*. Springer Nature, 2022.
- [19] Henri Berestycki and Luca Rossi. “Generalizations and properties of the principal eigenvalue of elliptic operators in unbounded domains”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* 68.6 (2015), pp. 1014–1065.
- [20] Matthieu Alfaro and Mario Veruete. “Evolutionary branching via replicator–mutator equations”. In: *Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations* 31 (2019), pp. 2029–2052.