

# STOCHASTIC POPULATION GROWTH IN SPATIALLY HETEROGENEOUS ENVIRONMENTS

STEVEN N. EVANS, PETER L. RALPH, SEBASTIAN J. SCHREIBER, AND ARNAB SEN

ABSTRACT. Classical ecological theory predicts that environmental stochasticity increases extinction risk by reducing the average per-capita growth rate of populations. For sedentary populations in a spatially homogeneous yet temporally variable environment, a simple model of population growth is a stochastic differential equation  $dZ_t = \mu Z_t dt + \sigma Z_t dW_t$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , where the conditional law of  $Z_{t+\Delta t} - Z_t$  given  $Z_t = z$  has mean and variance approximately  $z\mu\Delta t$  and  $z^2\sigma^2\Delta t$  when the time increment  $\Delta t$  is small. The long-term stochastic growth rate  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \log Z_t$  for such a population equals  $\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}$ . Most populations, however, experience spatial as well as temporal variability. To understand the interactive effects of environmental stochasticity, spatial heterogeneity, and dispersal on population growth, we study an analogous model  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^n)$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , for the population abundances in  $n$  patches: the conditional law of  $\mathbf{X}_{t+\Delta t}$  given  $\mathbf{X}_t = x$  is such that the conditional mean of  $X_{t+\Delta t}^i - X_t^i$  is approximately  $[x^i \mu_i + \sum_j (x^j D_{ji} - x^i D_{ij})] \Delta t$  where  $\mu_i$  is the per capita growth rate in the  $i$ -th patch and  $D_{ij}$  is the dispersal rate from the  $i$ -th patch to the  $j$ -th patch, and the conditional covariance of  $X_{t+\Delta t}^i - X_t^i$  and  $X_{t+\Delta t}^j - X_t^j$  is approximately  $x^i x^j \sigma_{ij} \Delta t$  for some covariance matrix  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$ . We show for such a spatially extended population that if  $S_t = X_t^1 + \dots + X_t^n$  denotes the total population abundance, then  $\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{X}_t/S_t$ , the vector of patch proportions, converges in law to a random vector  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and the stochastic growth rate  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \log S_t$  equals the space-time average per-capita growth rate  $\sum_i \mu_i \mathbb{E}[Y_\infty^i]$  experienced by the population minus half of the space-time average temporal variation  $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i,j} \sigma_{ij} Y_\infty^i Y_\infty^j]$  experienced by the population. Using this characterization of the stochastic growth rate, we derive an explicit expression for the stochastic growth rate for populations living in two patches, determine which choices of the dispersal matrix  $D$  produce the maximal stochastic growth rate for a freely dispersing population, derive an analytic approximation of the stochastic growth rate for dispersal limited populations, and use group theoretic techniques to approximate the stochastic growth rate for populations living in multi-scale landscapes (e.g. insects on plants in meadows on islands). Our results provide fundamental insights into “ideal free” movement in the face of uncertainty, the persistence of coupled sink populations, the evolution of dispersal rates, and the single large or several small (SLOSS) debate in conservation biology. For example, our analysis implies that even in the absence of density-dependent feedbacks, ideal-free dispersers occupy multiple patches in spatially heterogeneous environments provided environmental fluctuations are sufficiently strong and sufficiently weakly correlated across space. In contrast, for diffusively dispersing populations living in similar environments, intermediate dispersal rates maximize their stochastic growth rate.

stochastic population growth, spatial and temporal heterogeneity, dominant Lyapunov exponent, ideal free movement, evolution of dispersal, single large or several small debate, habitat fragmentation

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1 Environmental conditions (e.g. light, precipitation, nutrient availability) vary in space and time. Since these con-  
 2 ditions influence survivorship and fecundity of an organism, all organisms whether they be plants, animals, or viruses  
 3 are faced with a fundamental quandary of “Should I stay or should I go?” On the one hand, if individuals disperse  
 4 in a spatially heterogeneous environment, then they may arrive in locations with poorer environmental conditions.  
 5 On the other hand, if individuals do not disperse, then they may fare poorly due to temporal fluctuations in local  
 6 environmental conditions. The consequences of this interaction between dispersal and environmental heterogeneity  
 7 for population growth has been studied extensively from theoretical, experimental, and applied perspectives [Hast-  
 8 ings, 1983, Petchey et al., 1997, Lundberg et al., 2000, Gonzalez and Holt, 2002, Schmidt, 2004, Roy et al., 2005,

---

SNE was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0907630.

PLR was supported by funds to SJS from the Dean’s Office of the College of Biological Sciences, University of California, Davis, and by NIH fellowship F32-GM096686.

SJS was supported in part by NSF grants EF-0928987 and DMS-1022639.

AS was supported by EPSRC grant EP/G055068/1.

9 Boyce et al., 2006, Matthews and Gonzalez, 2007, Schreiber, 2010, Durrett and Remenik, in press]. Here, we provide a mathematically rigorous perspective on these interactive effects using spatially explicit models of stochastic population growth.

12 Population growth is inherently stochastic due to numerous unpredictable causes. For a single, unstructured population with overlapping generations, the simplest model accounting for these fluctuations is a linear stochastic differential equation of the form

$$(1) \quad dZ_t = \mu Z_t dt + \sigma Z_t dB_t,$$

15 where  $Z_t$  is the population abundance at time  $t$ ,  $\mu$  is the mean per-capita growth rate (that is,  $\mathbb{E}[Z_{t+\Delta t} - Z_t | Z_t = z] \approx z\mu\Delta t$ ),  $\sigma^2$  is the “infinitesimal” variance of fluctuations in the per-capita growth rate (that is,  $\mathbb{E}[(Z_{t+\Delta t} - Z_t - z\mu\Delta t)^2 | Z_t = z] \approx z^2\sigma^2\Delta t$ ), and  $B_t$  is a standard Brownian motion. Equivalently, the log population abundance  $\log Z_t$  is normally distributed with mean  $\log Z_0 + (\mu - \sigma^2/2)t$  and variance  $\sigma^2 t$ . Hence, even if the mean per-capita growth rate  $\mu$  is positive these populations decline exponentially towards extinction when  $\sigma^2/2 > \mu$  due to the predominance of the stochastic fluctuations. Despite its simplicity, the model (1) is used extensively for projecting future population sizes and estimating extinction risk [Dennis et al., 1991, Foley, 1994, Lande et al., 2003]. For example, Dennis et al. [1991] estimated  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  for six endangered species. These estimates provided a favorable outlook for the continued recovery of the Whooping Crane (i.e.  $\mu \gg \sigma^2/2$ ), but unfavorable prospects for the Yellowstone Grizzly Bear.

25 Individuals cannot avoid being subject to temporal heterogeneity, but it is only when they disperse that they are affected by spatial variation in the environment. The effect of spatial heterogeneity on population growth depends, intuitively, on how individuals respond to environmental cues [Hastings, 1983, Cantrell and Cosner, 1991, Dockery et al., 1998, Chesson, 2000, Cantrell et al., 2006, Kirkland et al., 2006, Schreiber and Lloyd-Smith, 2009]. When movement is towards regions with superior habitat quality, the presence of spatial heterogeneity increases the rate of population growth [Chesson, 2000, Schreiber and Lloyd-Smith, 2009]. The most extreme form of this phenomenon occurs when individuals are able to disperse freely and ideally; that is, they can move instantly to the locations that maximize their per-capita growth rate [Fretwell and Lucas, 1970, Cantrell et al., 2007]. Anthropogenically altered habitats, however, can cause a disassociation between cues used by organisms to assess habitat quality and the actual habitat quality. This disassociation can result in negative associations between movement patterns and habitat quality and a corresponding reduction in the rate of population growth [Remeš, 2000, Delibes et al., 2001, Schreiber and Lloyd-Smith, 2009]. For “random diffusive movement” (that is, no association between movement patterns and habitat quality), spatial heterogeneity increases population growth rates due to the influence of patches of higher quality. However, this boost in growth rate is most potent for sedentary populations [Hastings, 1983, Dockery et al., 1998, Kirkland et al., 2006, Schreiber and Saltzman, 2009]. This dilutionary effect of dispersal on population growth was observed in the invasion of a woody weed, *Mimosa pigra*, into the wetlands of tropical Australia [Lonsdale, 1993]. A relatively fast disperser, this weed had a population doubling time of 1.2 years on favorable patches, but it exhibited much slower growth at the regional scale (doubling time of 6.7 years) due to the separation of suitable wetland habitats by unsuitable eucalyptus savannas.

44 Despite these substantial analytic advances in understanding separately the effects of spatial and temporal heterogeneity on population growth, there are few analytic studies that consider the combined effects. For well-mixed populations with non-overlapping generations living in patchy environments, Metz et al. [1983] showed that population growth is determined by the geometric mean in time of the spatially (arithmetically) averaged per-capita growth rates. A surprising consequence of this expression is that populations coupled by dispersal can persist even though they are extinction prone in every patch [Jansen and Yoshimura, 1998]. This “rescue effect”, however, only occurs when spatial correlations are sufficiently weak [Harrison and Quinn, 1989]. Schreiber [2010] extended these results by deriving an analytic approximation for stochastic growth rates for partially mixing populations. This approximation reveals that positive temporal correlations can inflate population growth rates at intermediate dispersal rates, a conclusion consistent with simulation and empirical studies [Roy et al., 2005, Matthews and Gonzalez, 2007]. For example, Matthews and Gonzalez [2007] manipulated metapopulations of *Paramecium aurelia* by varying spatial-temporal patterns of temperature. In spatially uncorrelated environments, the populations coupled by dispersal always persisted for the duration of the experiment, while some of the uncoupled populations went extinct. Moreover, metapopulations experiencing positive temporal correlations exhibited higher growth rates than metapopulations living in temporally uncorrelated environments.

Here, we introduce and analyze stochastic models of populations that continuously experience uncertainty in time and space. For these models, our analysis answers some fundamental questions in population biology such as:

- How is the long-term spatial distribution of a population related to its rate of growth?
- When are population growth rates maximized at low, high, or intermediate dispersal rates for populations exhibiting diffusive movement?
- What is ideal free movement for individuals constantly facing uncertainty about local environmental conditions?
- To what extent do spatial correlations in temporal fluctuations hamper population persistence?
- How do multiple spatial scales of environmental heterogeneity influence population persistence?

In Section 2 we introduce our model for population growth in a patchy environment. It describes temporal fluctuations in the qualities of the various patches using multivariate Brownian motions with correlated components.

In Section 3, we first consider the vector-valued stochastic process given by the proportions of the population in each patch. These proportions converge in distribution to a (random) equilibrium at large times. The probability that this equilibrium spatial distribution is in some given subset of the set of possible patch proportions is just the long-term average amount of time that the process spends in that subset. We derive a simple expression for the stochastic growth of the population in terms of the first and second moments of this equilibrium spatial distribution. We also show that this equilibrium spatial distribution is characterized by a solution of a PDE that we solve in the case of two patches and use to examine how the equilibrium spatial distribution depends on the dispersal mechanism. We then present some numerical simulations to give a first indication of the interesting range of phenomena that can occur when there is spatial heterogeneity in per-capita growth rates and biased movement between patches.

We use the results from Section 3 in Section 4 to investigate ideal free dispersal in stochastic environments. That is, we determine which forms of dispersal maximize the stochastic growth rate for given mean per-capita growth rates in each of the patches and given infinitesimal covariances for their temporal fluctuations.

We consider the effect of constraints on dispersal in Section 5. We suppose that the dispersal rates are fixed up to a scalar multiple  $\delta$  and establish an analytic approximation for the stochastic growth rate of the form  $a + b/\delta$  for large  $\delta$ . We use this approximation to give criteria for whether low, intermediate, or high dispersal rates maximize the stochastic growth rate. In particular, we combine this analysis with tools from group representation theory to obtain results on the stochastic growth rate for environments with multiple spatial scales.

We discuss how our results relate to existing literature in Section 6. We end with a collection of Appendices where, for the sake of streamlining the presentation of our results in the remainder of the paper, we collect most of the proofs.

## 2. THE MODEL

We consider a population with overlapping generations living in a spatially heterogeneous environment consisting of  $n$  distinct patches and suppose that the per-capita growth rates within each patch are determined by a mixture of deterministic and stochastic environmental inputs. Let  $X_t^i$  denote the abundance of the population in the  $i$ -th patch at time  $t$  and write  $\mathbf{X}_t = (X_t^1, \dots, X_t^n)^T$  for the resulting column vector (we will use the superscript  $T$  throughout to denote the transpose of a vector or a matrix). If there was no dispersal between patches, it is appropriate to model  $\mathbf{X}$  as a Markov process with the following specifications for  $\Delta t$  small:

$$\mathbb{E}[X_{t+\Delta t}^i - X_t^i | \mathbf{X}_t = x] \approx \mu_i x^i \Delta t,$$

where  $\mu_i$  is the mean per-capita growth rate in patch  $i$ , and

$$\text{Cov}[X_{t+\Delta t}^i - X_t^i, X_{t+\Delta t}^j - X_t^j | \mathbf{X}_t = x] \approx \sigma_{ij} x^i x^j \Delta t,$$

where  $\Sigma = (\sigma_{ij})$  is a covariance matrix that captures the spatial dependence between the temporal fluctuations in patch quality. More formally, we consider the system of stochastic differential equations of the form

$$dX_t^i = X_t^i (\mu_i dt + dE_t^i),$$

where  $\mathbf{E}_t = \Gamma^T \mathbf{B}_t$ ,  $\Gamma$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix such that  $\Gamma^T \Gamma = \Sigma$ , and  $\mathbf{B}_t = (B_t^1, \dots, B_t^n)^T$ ,  $t \geq 0$ , is a vector of independent standard Brownian motions.

In order to incorporate dispersal that couples the dynamics between patches, let  $D_{ij} \geq 0$  for  $j \neq i$  be the per-capita rate at which the population in patch  $i$  disperses to patch  $j$ . Define  $-D_{ii} := \sum_{j \neq i} D_{ij}$  to be the total per-capita immigration rate out of patch  $i$ . The resulting matrix  $D$  has zero row sums and non-negative off-diagonal entries. We

105 call such matrices *dispersal matrices*. It is worth noting that any dispersal matrix  $D$  can be viewed as a generator of a  
 106 continuous time Markov chain; that is, if we write  $P_t := \exp(tD)$  for  $t \geq 0$ , so that  $P_t, t \geq 0$ , solves the matrix-valued  
 107 ODE

$$\frac{d}{dt} P_t = P_t D,$$

108 then the matrix  $P_t$  has nonnegative entries, its rows sum to one, and the Chapman-Kolmogorov relations  $P_s P_t = P_{s+t}$   
 109 hold for all  $s, t \geq 0$ . The  $(i, j)$ -th entry of  $P_t$  gives the proportion of the population that was originally in patch  $i$  at  
 110 time 0 but has dispersed to patch  $j$  at time  $t$ .

111 Adding dispersal to the regional dynamics leads to the system of stochastic differential equations

$$(2) \quad dX_t^i = X_t^i (\mu_i dt + dE_t^i) + \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ji} X_t^j dt.$$

112 We can write this system more compactly as the vector-valued stochastic differential equation

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} d\mathbf{X}_t &= \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_t) (\mu dt + d\mathbf{E}_t) + D^T \mathbf{X}_t dt \\ &= \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_t) (\mu dt + \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t) + D^T \mathbf{X}_t dt, \end{aligned}$$

113 where  $\mu := (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)^T$ , and, given a vector  $u$ , we write  $\text{diag}(u)$  for the diagonal matrix that has the entries of  $u$   
 114 along the diagonal.

115 We implicitly assume in the above set-up that all dispersing individuals arrive in some patch on the landscape.  
 116 To account for dispersal induced mortality, we can add fictitious patches in which dispersing individuals enter and  
 117 experience a mortality rate before dispersing to their final destination.

118 Also, our model does not include density-dependent effects on population growth. However, one can view it as a  
 119 linearization of a density-dependent model about the extinction equilibrium  $(0, \dots, 0)^T$  and, therefore, (3) determines  
 120 how the population grows when abundances are low. Moreover, for discrete-time analogues of our model, positive  
 121 population growth for this linearization implies persistence in the sense that there exists a unique positive stationary  
 122 distribution for corresponding models with compensating density-dependence [Benaïm and Schreiber, 2009]. We  
 123 conjecture that the same conclusion holds for our continuous time model.

124 **From now on we assume** that the dispersal matrix  $D$  is *irreducible* (that is, that it can not be put into block  
 125 upper-triangular form by a re-labeling of the patches). This is equivalent to assuming that the entries of the matrix  
 126  $P_t = \exp(tD)$  are strictly positive for all  $t > 0$ , and so it is possible to disperse between any two patches. Also, we  
 127 will assume that the covariance matrix  $\Sigma$  has full rank (that is, that it is non-singular). This assumption implies  
 128 that the randomness in the temporal fluctuations is genuinely  $n$ -dimensional.

### 129 3. THE STABLE PATCH DISTRIBUTION AND STOCHASTIC GROWTH RATE

130 **3.1. Stable patch distribution.** The key to understanding the asymptotic stochastic growth rate of the population  
 131 is to first examine the dynamics of the spatial distribution of the population. Let  $S_t := X_t^1 + \dots + X_t^n$  denote the  
 132 total population abundance at time  $t$  and write  $Y_t^i := X_t^i / S_t$  for the proportion of the total population that is in  
 133 patch  $i$ . Set  $\mathbf{Y}_t := (Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^n)^T$ . The stochastic process  $\mathbf{Y}$  takes values in the probability simplex  $\Delta := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_i y_i = 1, y_i \geq 0\}$ .  
 134

135 The following proposition, proved in Appendix A, shows that the stochastic process  $\mathbf{Y}$  is autonomously Markov;  
 136 that is, that its evolution dynamics are governed by a stochastic differential equation that does not involve the total  
 137 population size. Moreover, it says that the law of the random vector  $\mathbf{Y}_t$  converges to a unique equilibrium as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ .  
 138 Recall, the *law of a random vector*  $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is the probability measure  $\mu_{\mathbf{Y}}$  on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  defined by  $\mu_{\mathbf{Y}}(A) = \mathbb{P}\{\mathbf{Y} \in A\}$  for  
 139 all Borel sets  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, for any  $\mu_{\mathbf{Y}}$ -integrable function  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the *expectation of  $h(\mathbf{Y})$*  is defined by

$$\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{Y})] = \int h(y) \mu_{\mathbf{Y}}(dy).$$

140 A sequence of random vectors  $\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \dots$  *converges in law* to a random vector  $\mathbf{Y}_{\infty}$  if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{Y}_n)] = \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{Y}_{\infty})]$$

141 for every continuous, bounded function  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ . Convergence in law of a sequence of random vectors is also  
 142 called convergence in distribution of the random vectors and is equivalent to weak convergence of their laws.

143 **Proposition 3.1.** Suppose that  $\mathbf{X}_0 \neq 0$ . Then, the stochastic process  $\mathbf{Y}$  satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$(4) \quad d\mathbf{Y}_t = (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + D^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt + (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) (\mu - \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_t) dt.$$

144 Moreover, there exists a random variable  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  taking values in the probability simplex  $\Delta$  such that  $\mathbf{Y}_t$  converges in  
 145 law to  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and such that the empirical measure  $\Pi_t := \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t \delta_{\mathbf{Y}_s} ds$  converges almost surely to the law of  
 146  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The law of  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  does not depend on  $X_0$ .

147 The empirical probability measure  $\Pi_t$  appearing in Proposition 3.1 describes the proportions of the time interval  
 148  $[0, t]$  that the process  $\mathbf{Y}$  spends in the various subsets of its state space  $\Delta$ . Namely, for a Borel set  $A \subseteq \Delta$  of patch  
 149 occupancy states,  $\Pi_t(A)$  equals the fraction of time spent in these states over the time interval  $[0, t]$ . For example, if  
 150  $A = \{y \in \Delta : y_1 > 1/2\}$ , then  $\Pi_t(A)$  equals the fraction of time for which at least 50% of the population is in patch  
 151 1 during the time interval  $[0, t]$ .

152 **3.2. Stochastic growth rates.** Recall that  $S_t = X_t^1 + \dots + X_t^n$  is the total population size at time  $t$ . That is,  
 153  $S_t = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{X}_t$ , where  $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$ . Because  $D\mathbf{1} = 0$ , it follows from (3) that

$$dS_t = \mathbf{X}_t^T \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \mu^T \mathbf{X}_t dt = S_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + S_t \mu^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt.$$

154 Therefore, by Itô's lemma [Gardiner, 2004],

$$\log S_t = S_0 + \int_0^t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \int_0^t \mu^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \Gamma^T \Gamma \mathbf{Y}_t dt.$$

155 Dividing by  $t$ , taking the limit as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ , and applying Proposition 3.1 yields the following result.

156 **Theorem 3.2.** Suppose that  $\mathbf{X}_0 \neq 0$ . Then,

$$(5) \quad \chi := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^{-1} \log S_t = \mu^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty^T \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_\infty] \quad \text{almost surely,}$$

157 where  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  is described in Proposition 3.1.

158 The limit  $\chi$  in (5) is generally known as the *Lyapunov exponent* for the Markov process  $\mathbf{X}$ . Following Tuljapurkar  
 159 [1990], we also call  $\chi$  the *stochastic growth rate* of the population, as it describes the asymptotic growth rate of the  
 160 population in the presence of stochasticity. To interpret (5), notice that

$$(6) \quad \langle \mu \rangle := \mu^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty] = \sum_i \mu_i \mathbb{E}[Y_\infty^i] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sum_i \mu_i \mathbb{E}[Y_t^i]$$

161 corresponds to weighted average of the per-capita growth rates with respect to the long-term spatial distribution  
 162  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  of the population. To interpret the other component of (5), let  $\text{Var}[X]$  denote the variance of a random variable  
 163  $X$ . Since  $\sum_i Y_t^i (E_{t+\Delta t}^i - E_t^i)$  for small  $\Delta t > 0$  is approximately the average environmental change experienced by  
 164 the population over time interval  $[t, t + \Delta]$ ,

$$(7) \quad \langle \sigma^2 \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty^T \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_\infty] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \text{Var}[\mathbf{Y}_t^T (\mathbf{E}_{t+\Delta t} - \mathbf{E}_t)] = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \text{Var}\left[\sum_i Y_t^i (E_{t+\Delta t}^i - E_t^i)\right] \text{ for any } \Delta t > 0$$

165 corresponds to the infinitesimal variance of the environmental fluctuations weighted by the long-term spatial distri-  
 166 bution.

167 **Biological interpretation of Theorem 3.2.** The stochastic growth rate  $\langle \mu \rangle - \langle \sigma^2 \rangle / 2$  for a spatially structured  
 168 population is just what we see for an unstructured population where  $\langle \mu \rangle$  and  $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle$  are the per-capita growth rate and  
 169 the infinitesimal covariances of the temporal fluctuations averaged appropriately with respect to the equilibrium spatial  
 170 distribution. Hence, as in a spatially homogeneous environment, environmental fluctuations reduce the population  
 171 growth rate. However, as we show in greater detail below, interactions between dispersal patterns, spatial heterogeneity  
 172 and environmental fluctuations may increase the stochastic growth rate by increasing  $\langle \mu \rangle$  or decreasing  $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle$ .

173 To get a more explicit expression for the stochastic growth rate, we need to determine the distribution of the  
 174 equilibrium  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$ , or at least find its first and second moments. This problem reduces to solving for the time-invariant




FIGURE 1. Spatial distribution and population growth in a two patch environment. In (a), the stochastic growth rate  $\chi$  is plotted as a function of the dispersal rate  $\delta$ . In (b), the stationary density of the fraction of individuals in patch 1 is plotted for different dispersal rates. Parameter values are  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0.3$ ,  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1$ , and  $D_{12} = D_{21} = \delta$ .

175 solution of the Fokker-Planck equations with appropriate boundary conditions [Gardiner, 2004], Namely, the density  
 176  $\rho : \Delta \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  of  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  satisfies

$$(8) \quad - \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} M_i(y) \rho(y) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_i \partial y_j} V_{ij}(y) \rho(y) = 0 \quad \text{for } y \in \Delta,$$

177 where  $M_i$  and  $V_{ij}$  are the entries of

$$M(y) = D^T y + (\text{diag}(y) - yy^T) (\mu - \Sigma y) \quad \text{and} \quad V(y) = (\text{diag}(y) - yy^T) \Gamma^T \Gamma (\text{diag}(y) - yy^T),$$

178 respectively, and  $\rho$  is constrained to have  $\int_\Delta \rho(y) dy = 1$ . However, the PDE (8) needs to be supplemented with  
 179 appropriate boundary conditions. In principle, these are found by characterizing the domain of the infinitesimal  
 180 generator of the Feller diffusion process  $Y$  and thence characterizing the domain of the adjoint of this operator  
 181 [Khas'minskii, 1960, Bhattacharya, 1978, Bogachev et al., 2002, 2009]. This appears to be a quite difficult problem.  
 182 However, in the case of two patches, the problem simplifies to solving an ODE on the unit interval.

183 **Example 3.1 Stochastic growth in two patch environments.** Assume there are two patches. For simplicity,  
 184 suppose there are no environmental correlations between the patches; that is, that  $\sigma_{ii} = \sigma_i^2$  and  $\sigma_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .  
 185 Proposition 3.1 gives that  $Y_t^1 = X_t^1 / (X_t^1 + X_t^2)$  satisfies the one-dimensional stochastic differential equation

$$dY_t^1 = M_*(Y_t^1) dt + \sqrt{V_*(Y_t^1)} dB_t$$

186 where

$$M_*(y) := y(1-y)(\mu_1 - \mu_2 - \sigma_1^2 y + \sigma_2^2(1-y)) - D_{12}y + D_{21}(1-y)$$

and

$$V_*(y) := y^2(1-y)^2(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2).$$

187 We can then apply standard tools for one-dimensional diffusions [Gardiner, 2004] (checking that the boundaries at  
188 0 and 1 are “entrance”, and hence inaccessible) to find that the density  $\rho(x) : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  of  $Y_\infty^1$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(y) &= \frac{C_1}{V_*(y)} \exp\left(2 \int \frac{M_*(y)}{V_*(y)} dy\right) \\ &= \frac{C_2}{y^2(1-y)^2} \exp\left(\frac{2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} \int \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{y(1-y)} - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{1-y} + \frac{\sigma_2^2}{y} - \frac{D_{12}}{y(1-y)^2} + \frac{D_{21}}{y^2(1-y)} dy\right) \\ &= C_3 y^{\beta - \alpha_1} (1-y)^{-\beta - \alpha_2} \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} \left(\frac{D_{21}}{y} + \frac{D_{12}}{1-y}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

189 where the  $C_i$  are normalization constants, and

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_i &:= \frac{2\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} \\ \beta &:= \frac{2}{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2} (\mu_1 - \mu_2 + D_{21} - D_{12}).\end{aligned}$$

190 Using this expression in (5), we get the following explicit expression for the stochastic growth rate

$$\begin{aligned}\chi &= \mu_1 \int_0^1 y \rho(y) dy + \mu_2 \int_0^1 (1-y) \rho(y) dy - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{2} \int_0^1 y^2 \rho(y) dy - \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2} \int_0^1 (1-y)^2 \rho(y) dy \\ &= \mu_2 - \frac{\sigma_2^2}{2} + (\mu_1 - \mu_2 + \sigma_2^2) \int_0^1 y \rho(y) dy - \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}{2} \int_0^1 y^2 \rho(y) dy.\end{aligned}$$

191 Despite its apparent complexity, this formula provides insights into how dispersal may influence population growth.  
192 For example, consider a population dispersing diffusively between statistically similar but uncorrelated patches (that  
193 is,  $D_{12} = D_{21} = \delta/2$ ,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$ , and  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$ ). We claim that the stochastic growth rate  $\chi$  is an increasing  
194 function of the dispersal rate  $\delta$ . Intuitively, this occurs because increasing  $\delta$  decreases the variance of the random  
195 variable  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  but has no effect on its expectation.

196 To verify our claim that  $\chi$  is increasing with  $\delta$ , write  $\rho(\cdot; \delta)$  for the density of  $Y_\infty^1$  to emphasize its dependence on  
197  $\delta$  and notice that in this case

$$\rho(y; \delta) = \frac{1}{C(\delta)} y^{-1} (1-y)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{2\sigma^2 y(1-y)}\right), \quad y \in (0, 1),$$

198 where  $C(\delta) = \int_0^1 y^{-1} (1-y)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{2\sigma^2 y(1-y)}\right) dy$  is the normalization constant and

$$(9) \quad \chi(\delta) = \mu - \sigma^2/2 + \sigma^2 \int_0^1 y(1-y) \rho(y; \delta) dy.$$

199 It suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 y(1-y) \rho(y; 2\delta\sigma^2) dy &= \frac{\int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy}{C(2\delta\sigma^2)} \\ &= \frac{\int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy}{\int_0^1 y^{-1} (1-y)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy}\end{aligned}$$

200 is an increasing function of  $\delta > 0$ . Differentiating with respect to  $\delta$  and carrying the differentiation inside the integral  
201 sign, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}C(2\sigma^2\delta)^{-2} \times \left[ \int_0^1 y^{-2} (1-y)^{-2} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy \times \int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy \right. \\ \left. - \left( \int_0^1 y^{-1} (1-y)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{y(1-y)}\right) dy \right)^2 \right].\end{aligned}$$

202 This quantity is the variance of the random variable  $(Y_\infty^1(1 - Y_\infty^1))^{-1}$  and is thus nonnegative.

203 For the purpose of comparison with general asymptotic approximations that we develop later, we note that after  
 204 a change of variable

$$\frac{\int_0^1 \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{2\sigma^2 y(1-y)}\right) dy}{\int_0^1 y^{-1}(1-y)^{-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta}{2\sigma^2 y(1-y)}\right) dy} = \frac{\int_0^\infty e^{-z} z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2\sigma^2 z}{\delta} + 4\right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} dz}{\int_0^\infty e^{-z} z^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{2\sigma^2 z}{\delta} + 4\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} dz}.$$

205 Upon expanding the two functions  $w \mapsto (w+4)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  and  $w \mapsto (w+4)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$  in Taylor series around 0 and integrating,  
 206 we find that the ratio of integrals is of the form

$$\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\sigma^2}{16} + O\left(\frac{1}{\delta^2}\right)$$

207 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , so that

$$(10) \quad \chi(\delta) \approx \mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{4} - \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\sigma^4}{16}$$

208 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ .

209 Approximation (10) implies, as we prove more generally in Proposition 4.1, that  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \chi(\delta) = \mu - \sigma^2/4$ .

210 **Biological interpretation of Example 3.1.** *Even if two patches are unable to sustain a population in the*  
 211 *absence of dispersal, connecting the patches by dispersal can permit persistence. This phenomenon occurs only at*  
 212 *intermediate levels of environmental stochasticity (i.e.  $2\mu < \sigma^2 < 4\mu$ ). Moreover, when this phenomenon occurs,*  
 213 *there is a critical dispersal threshold  $\delta^* > 0$  such that the metapopulation decreases to extinction whenever its dispersal*  
 214 *rate is too low (i.e.  $\delta \leq \delta^*$ ) and persists otherwise (Fig. 1).*

215 Because there do not appear to be closed-form expressions for the law of the stable patch distribution  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  when  
 216 there are more than two patches, we must seek other routes to understanding the stochastic growth rate in such cases.  
 217 One approach would be to solve the PDE (8) numerically. A second approach would be to simulate the stochastic  
 218 process  $\mathbf{Y}$  for long time intervals and derive approximate values for the first and second moments of the equilibrium  
 219 distribution. To give an indication of the range of phenomena that can occur in even relatively simple systems where  
 220 there is biased movement between patches, we adopt the even simpler approach of simulating the stochastic process  
 221  $\mathbf{X}$  directly for long time intervals to obtain an approximate value of the stochastic growth rate. We implemented the  
 222 simulations in a manner similar to that of Talay [1991], and the R code used is provided as supplementary material.

223 **Example 3.2 Spatially heterogeneous environments with biased emigration.** For these simulations, we  
 224 consider a metapopulation with either  $n = 8$  or  $n = 40$  patches of which one quarter are higher quality ( $\mu_i = 10$  in  
 225 these patches) and the remainder are lower quality ( $\mu_i = 1$  in the remaining patches). All patches have the same  
 226 level of spatially uncorrelated environmental noise ( $\sigma_{ii} = 16$  for all  $i$  and  $\sigma_{ij} = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ ). When an organism exits  
 227 a patch it chooses from the other patches with equal probability, but the emigration rate from a patch depends on  
 228 the patch quality.

229 First, we consider the case in which emigration is “adaptive” in the sense that individuals emigrate more rapidly  
 230 out of lower quality patches than higher quality patches:

$$D_{ij} = \begin{cases} \delta, & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n/4 \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ 10\delta, & \text{for } i = n/4 + 1, \dots, n \text{ and } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

231 Here, the parameter  $\delta > 0$  scales the emigration rate, so that doubling  $\delta$  doubles the emigration rate from all patches.  
 232 As expected, since in this case dispersal is “adaptive”, Figure 2 shows that stochastic growth rate  $\chi = \chi(\delta)$  as a  
 233 function of  $\delta$  increases with  $\delta$ . Moreover, Figure 2 shows asymptotic values at  $\delta = \infty$  for each case, and illustrates  
 234 that the analytic approximation developed later in Theorem 5.2 works reasonably well for large values of  $\delta$ . The  
 235 Figure also shows extremely slow convergence as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  to  $\chi(0) = \max_i \mu_i - (1/2)\sigma_i^2$  (note the logarithmic scale  
 236 on the horizontal axis), indicating that although  $\chi$  is continuous at  $\delta = 0$  by Proposition 5.1 below, it may not be  
 237 differentiable there.






FIGURE 2. The effect of dispersal rate  $\delta$  on populations emigrating more rapidly out of lower quality patches than higher quality patches. Shown is the stochastic growth rate  $\chi$  estimated from simulation of the SDE for 100 time units, across a range of values of  $\delta$ , for both a 40-patch and a 8-patch model. Standard errors are estimated using the standard deviation of the stochastic growth rates across nonoverlapping time segments of a given simulation. Details of the dispersal matrix and parameter values are described in the main text. The right-hand axis shows asymptotic values for  $\delta = 0$  and  $\delta = \infty$ , which are:  $\chi(0) = \max_i \mu_i$  and  $\chi(\infty) = \mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi$  (Proposition 4.1). “High dispersal” shows the approximation of the form  $\chi(\delta) \approx a + b/\delta$  for large  $\delta$  calculated from formula (19) of Theorem 2.

238 Next we consider a case in which emigration is “maladaptive”, in the sense that individuals emigrate more rapidly  
 239 out of higher quality patches than out of lower quality patches:

$$D_{ij} = \begin{cases} 10\delta, & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n/4 \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ \delta, & \text{for } i = n/4 + 1, \dots, n \text{ and } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

240 It is possible to show using the results of Section 5 below that in this regime, high dispersal rates lead to a *lower*  
 241 stochastic growth rate than sedentary populations (that is,  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \infty} \chi(\delta)$  is dominated by  $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \chi(\delta)$ ), and yet  $\chi(\delta)$   
 242 increases with  $\delta$  when  $\delta$  is large. As illustrated in Figure 3, the stochastic growth rate  $\chi(\delta)$  exhibits a rather complex  
 243 dependence on  $\delta$ : increasing at low dispersal rates, declining at higher dispersal rates, and finally increasing again  
 244 at the highest dispersal rates.

245 In a conservation framework, increasing  $\delta$  corresponds to facilitating movement between patches by increasing the  
 246 size or number of dispersal corridors between patches.

247 **Biological interpretation of Example 3.2.** *For populations exhibiting adaptive movement, increasing the size*  
 248 *or number of dispersal corridors between patches enhances metapopulation growth rates. For populations exhibiting*  
 249 *maladaptive movement, however, increasing dispersal rates can either increase or decrease metapopulation growth*  
 250 *rates.*




FIGURE 3. The effect of dispersal rate  $\delta$  on populations emigrating more rapidly out of higher quality patches than lower quality patches. Details are as in Figure 2, but with different dispersal scheme; parameter values are described in the main text.

#### 251 4. IDEAL FREE DISPERSAL IN A STOCHASTIC ENVIRONMENT

252 A basic quandary in evolutionary ecology is, “For a given set of environmental conditions, what dispersal pattern  
 253 maximizes fitness?” Since fitness in our context corresponds to the stochastic growth rate of the population, we can  
 254 rephrase this question as, “Given  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$ , what form of the dispersal matrix  $D$  maximizes  $\chi$ ?” Following Fretwell and  
 255 Lucas [1970], we call such an optimal dispersal mechanism *ideal free dispersal* as individuals have no constraints on  
 256 their dispersal (i.e. are “free”) and have complete knowledge about the distribution of spatial-temporal fluctuations  
 257 (i.e. are “ideal”).

258 Equation (5) provides a means to answer this question. Because  $\Sigma$  has full rank, the function  $y \mapsto \frac{1}{2}y^T\Sigma y$  is  
 259 strictly convex, and so Jensen’s inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty^T \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_\infty] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty]^T \Sigma \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_\infty],$$

260 with equality if and only if the random vector  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  is almost surely constant. Hence, to maximize the stochastic  
 261 growth rate  $\chi$ , we need to eliminate the variability in  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$ , so that  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty = y$  almost surely for a constant  $y$  that is  
 262 chosen to maximize

$$(11) \quad \mu^T y - \frac{1}{2} y^T \Sigma y$$

263 subject to the constraint  $y \in \Delta$ . Under our standing non-degeneracy assumptions on  $D$  and  $\Sigma$ , the law of  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$   
 264 is supported on all of  $\Delta$ , and so we cannot actually achieve a situation in which  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$  is a constant. However, the  
 265 following result, which we prove in Appendix B, shows that we can approach this regime arbitrarily closely. Recall  
 266 that the *stationary distribution*  $\pi$  for an irreducible dispersal matrix  $Q$  is a probability vector  $\pi \in \Delta$  such that  
 267  $\pi^T Q = 0$ . We note that any vector  $\pi$  in the interior of  $\Delta$  is the stationary distribution for some irreducible dispersal  
 268 matrix  $Q$ . For example, given  $\pi$ , we can define  $Q = \mathbf{1}\pi^T - I$  where  $I$  denotes the identity matrix.

269 **Proposition 4.1.** Consider a vector  $\pi$  in the interior of  $\Delta$  and an irreducible dispersal matrix  $Q$  that has  $\pi$  as  
 270 its unique stationary distribution. Let  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty(\delta)$  be the equilibrium patch distribution and  $\chi(\delta)$  be the stochastic growth  
 271 rate for (3) with  $D = \delta Q$ . Then  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty(\delta)$  converges in law to the constant vector  $\pi$  as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\chi(\delta)$  converges to  
 272  $\mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi$  as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ .

273 In the absence of population growth due to deterministic or stochastic effects, each of the dispersal matrices  $\delta Q$   
 274 in Proposition 4.1 sends the patch distribution to the vector  $\pi$  regardless of the initial conditions, and the speed  
 275 at which this happens increases with  $\delta$ , so that it becomes effectively instantaneous for large  $\delta$ . Proposition 4.1  
 276 says that this push towards a deterministic equilibrium overcomes any disruptive effects introduced by population  
 277 growth provided  $\delta$  is sufficiently large, and so it is possible to produce random equilibrium patch distributions that  
 278 are arbitrarily close to any given vector  $\pi$  in the interior of  $\Delta$ . If we further approximate vectors  $\pi$  on the boundary  
 279 of  $\Delta$  by ones in the interior, we see that it is possible to produce equilibrium patch distributions that are arbitrarily  
 280 close to any given vector in  $\Delta$ .

281 Given that any patch distribution can be approximated arbitrary closely by the equilibrium patch distribution of a  
 282 suitable population of rapidly dispersing individuals, the problem of optimizing  $\chi$  reduces, as we have already noted,  
 283 to maximizing the strictly concave function  $g(y) = \mu^T y - \frac{1}{2} y^T \Sigma y$  over the compact, convex set  $\Delta$ . This concavity  
 284 implies there exists at most one local maximum. Denote this unique maximizer by  $y^* = (y_1^*, \dots, y_n^*)^T$ .

285 It is optimal for all individuals to remain in the single patch  $k$  (that is,  $y_k^* = 1$ ) only if

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial y_i}(e_k) - \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_k}(e_k) = \mu_i - \sigma_{ik} - \mu_k + \sigma_{kk} < 0 \text{ for all } i \neq k,$$

286 where  $e_k$  is the  $k$ -th element of the standard basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , or, equivalently,

$$(12) \quad \mu_k - \mu_i > \sigma_{kk} - \sigma_{ik} \text{ for all } i \neq k.$$

287 **Biological interpretation of equation (12).** If the variances of environmental fluctuations are sufficiently  
 288 large in all patches and the spatial covariances in these environmental fluctuations are sufficiently small, then ideal  
 289 free dispersers occupy multiple patches.

290 When it is optimal to disperse between several patches, we can solve for the optimal dispersal strategy  $y^*$  by using  
 291 the method of Lagrange multipliers. Without loss of generality, assume that the optimal strategy  $y^*$  makes use of  
 292 all patches, that is, that  $y^*$  is in the interior of  $\Delta$ . Indeed, if the optimal strategy does not make use of all patches,  
 293 then we can consider analogous problems on the faces of the convex polytope  $\Delta$  of the form  $\{y \in \Delta : y_i = 0, i \in A\}$ ,  
 294 where  $A$  is a subset of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . Because

$$\nabla g(y) = \mu - \Sigma y \text{ and } \nabla \left( \sum_i y_i \right) = \mathbf{1},$$

295 the optimal  $y^*$  must satisfy

$$(13) \quad \mu - \Sigma y^* = \lambda \mathbf{1},$$

296 where  $\lambda$  is a Lagrange multiplier. Notice that

$$(\Sigma y)_i = \frac{1}{\Delta t} \mathbb{E} \left[ (E_{t+\Delta t}^i - E_t^i) \sum_j y_j (E_{t+\Delta t}^j - E_t^j) \right].$$

297 Hence, we get the following interpretation.

298 **Biological interpretation of equation (13).** Ideal free populations using multiple patches are distributed  
 299 across the patches in such a way that the differences between the mean per-capita growth rates and the covariances  
 300 between the within patch noise and the noise experienced on average by an individual are equal in all occupied patches.  
 301 In particular, the local stochastic growth rates  $\mu_i - \sigma_{ii}/2$  need not be equal in all occupied patches.

302 Now,

$$(14) \quad y^* = \Sigma^{-1}(\mu - \lambda \mathbf{1}),$$




FIGURE 4. Effects of spatial correlations on the ideal free patch distribution in a 15 patch environment. Per-capita growth rates  $\mu_i$  are plotted in the top left. The ideal free patch distribution  $y^*$  is plotted at three levels of spatial correlation  $\rho$ . Covariances are  $\sigma_{ii} = 2$  and  $\sigma_{ij} = 2\rho$  for  $i \neq j$ .

303 and the constraint  $\mathbf{1}^T y = 1$  yields

$$1 = \mathbf{1}^T \Sigma^{-1} (\mu - \lambda \mathbf{1}),$$

304 so that

$$(15) \quad \lambda = \frac{\mathbf{1}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu - 1}{\mathbf{1}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{1}}$$

305 and

$$(16) \quad y^* = \Sigma^{-1} \left( \mu - \frac{\mathbf{1}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mu - 1}{\mathbf{1}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{1} \right).$$

306 The right-hand side of equation (16) is the optimal vector  $y^*$  we seek, provided that it belongs to the interior of  $\Delta$ .  
 307 Otherwise, as we remarked above, we need to perform similar analyses on the faces of the simplex  $\Delta$ .

308 To illustrate the utility of this formula, we examine two special cases: when the environmental noise between  
 309 patches is uncorrelated, and when the patches experience the same individual levels of noise but they are spatially  
 310 correlated.

311 **Example 4.1 Spatially uncorrelated environments.** Suppose that there are no spatial correlations in the  
 312 environmental noise, so that  $\Sigma$  is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries  $\sigma_{ii} = \sigma_i^2$ . It follows from equation (16)

313 that the ideal free patch distribution is

$$(17) \quad y_i^* = \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2 \sum_j 1/\sigma_j^2} \left[ \sum_j \frac{\mu_i - \mu_j}{\sigma_j^2} + 1 \right],$$

314 provided that  $\sum_j (\mu_j - \mu_i)/\sigma_j^2 < 1$  for all  $i$ .

315 **Biological interpretation of equation (17).** *In the absence of spatial correlations in environmental fluctuations, ideal free dispersers visit all patches whenever the environmental variation is sufficiently great relative to differences in the mean per-capita growth rates. In particular, if all mean per-capita growth rates are equal, then the fraction of individuals in a patch is inversely proportional to the variation in temporal fluctuations in the patch; that is,  $y_i^* = (1/\sigma_i^2)/(\sum_j 1/\sigma_j^2)$ .*

320 **Example 4.2 Spatially correlated environments.** Suppose that the infinitesimal variance of the temporal fluctuations in each patch is  $\sigma^2$  and that the correlation between the fluctuations in any pair of patches is  $\rho$ . Thus, 321  $\Sigma = \sigma^2(1 - \rho)I + \sigma^2\rho J$ , where  $J = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$  is the matrix in which every entry is 1. Provided that  $-\frac{1}{n-1} < \rho < 1$ , the 322 matrix  $\Sigma$  is non-singular with inverse 323

$$\Sigma^{-1} = \frac{1}{(1 - \rho)\sigma^2}I - \frac{\rho}{(1 - \rho)(1 + (n - 1)\rho)\sigma^2}J.$$

324 Denoting by  $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_i \mu_i$  the average across the patches of the mean per-capita growth rates, the optimal dispersal 325 strategy is given by

$$(18) \quad y_i^* = \frac{\mu_i - \bar{\mu}}{\sigma^2(1 - \rho)} + \frac{1}{n}$$

326 provided that  $y_i^* > 0$  for all  $i$ . Notice that (18) agrees with (17) when  $\rho = 0$  and  $\sigma_i = \sigma$ .

327 **Biological interpretation of equation (18).** *If environmental fluctuations have a sufficiently large variance  $\sigma^2$ , then ideal free dispersers visit all patches and spend more time in patches that support higher mean per-capita growth rates. Increasing the common spatial correlation  $\rho$  results in ideal free dispersers spending more time in patches whose mean per-capita growth rate is greater than the average of the mean per-capita growth rates and less time in other patches (Fig. 4). When the spatial correlations are sufficiently large, it is no longer optimal to disperse to the patches with lower mean per-capita growth rates ( $\rho = 0.5$  and  $\rho = 0.95$  in Fig. 4).*

## 333 5. THE EFFECT OF CONSTRAINTS ON DISPERSAL

334 While the ideal free patch distribution is a useful idealization to investigate how organisms should disperse in 335 the absence of constraints, organisms in the natural world have limits on their ability to disperse and to collect and 336 interpret environmental information. Recall from Section 4 that if the optimal patch distribution  $y^*$  for an ideal free 337 disperser is in the interior of the probability simplex  $\Delta$ , then, loosely speaking, the ideal free disperser achieves the 338 maximal stochastic growth rate by using a strategy for which dispersal rate matrix is of the form  $D = \delta Q$ , where 339  $Q$  is any irreducible dispersal matrix with  $(y^*)^T Q = 0$  and  $\delta = \infty$ . At the opposite extreme, if  $y^*$  assigns all of its 340 mass to a single patch, then an ideal free disperser never leaves that single most-favored patch.

341 To get a better understanding of how constraints on dispersal influence population growth, we consider dispersal 342 matrices of the form  $D = \delta Q$ , where  $\delta \geq 0$  and  $Q$  is a fixed irreducible dispersal matrix  $Q$  with a stationary distribution 343  $\pi$  that is not necessarily the optimal patch distribution for an ideal free disperser in the given environmental 344 conditions. We write  $\chi(\delta)$  for the stochastic growth rate of the population as a function of the dispersal parameter 345  $\delta$  and ask which choice of  $\delta$  maximizes  $\chi(\delta)$ . In particular, we are interested in conditions under which some 346 intermediate  $\delta > 0$  maximizes the stochastic growth rate  $\chi(\delta)$ .

347 We know from Proposition 4.1 that  $\chi(\delta)$  approaches  $\pi^T \mu - \frac{1}{2}\pi^T \Sigma \pi$  as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ . We therefore set  $\chi(\infty) =$  348  $\pi^T \mu - \frac{1}{2}\pi^T \Sigma \pi$ . On the other hand, if there is no dispersal ( $\delta = 0$ ), then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log X_t^i = \mu_i - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2}$  with probability 349 one whenever  $X_0^i > 0$ , and so  $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log S_t = \max_i \{\mu_i - \frac{\sigma_i^2}{2}\}$  whenever  $X_0^i > 0$  for all  $i$ . Hence, it is reasonable to

350 set  $\chi(0) = \max_i \{\mu_i - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\}$ . The following result, which we prove in Appendix C, implies that the function  $\delta \mapsto \chi(\delta)$   
 351 is continuous on  $[0, \infty)$ .

352 **Proposition 5.1.** *The function  $\delta \mapsto \chi(\delta)$  is analytic on the interval  $(0, \infty)$  and continuous at the point  $\delta = 0$ .*

353 One way to establish that  $\chi(\delta)$  is maximized for an intermediate value of  $\delta$  is to show that  $\chi(0) < \chi(\infty)$  and  
 354 that  $\chi(\delta) > \chi(\infty)$  for all sufficiently large  $\delta$ . The following theorem provides an asymptotic approximation for  $\chi(\delta)$   
 355 when  $\delta$  is large that allows us to check when the latter condition holds. We prove the theorem under the hypothesis  
 356 that the dispersal matrix  $Q$  is *reversible* with respect to its stationary distribution  $\pi$ ; that is, that  $\pi_i Q_{ij} = \pi_j Q_{ji}$   
 357 for all  $i, j$ . Reversibility implies that at stationarity the Markov chain defined by  $Q$  exhibits “balanced dispersal in the  
 358 absence of local demography.” Namely, if a large number of individuals are independently executing the equilibrium  
 359 movement dynamics, then the rate at which individuals move from patch  $i$  to patch  $j$  equals the rate at which  
 360 individuals move from patch  $j$  to patch  $i$ . We note that diffusive movement (that is, the matrix  $Q$  is symmetric)  
 361 and any form of movement along a one-dimensional landscape (that is, the matrix  $Q$  is tridiagonal) are examples of  
 362 reversible Markov chains. We provide a proof of the theorem in Appendix D. Corollary 5.3 below, which we prove in  
 363 Appendix E, provides a more readily computable expression for the asymptotics of the stochastic growth rate under  
 364 further assumptions.

365 **Theorem 5.2.** *Suppose that  $Q$  is reversible with respect to its stationary distribution  $\pi$ . Then,*

$$(19) \quad \chi(\delta) = \left( \mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi \right) + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ (\mu - \Sigma \pi)^T \nu - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( \exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \exp(Q s) \Sigma \right) ds \right] + O(\delta^{-5/4})$$

366 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\nu$  is the unique vector satisfying  $\mathbf{1}^T \nu = 0$  and  $Q^T \nu = -(\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) (\mu - \Sigma \pi)$ .

367 When the dispersal matrix  $D = \delta Q$  is consistent with ideal dispersal in the limit  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , equation (13) implies  
 368 that  $(\mu - \Sigma \pi)^T \nu = \lambda \mathbf{1}^T \nu = 0$ . On the other hand, the proof of Theorem 5.2 shows that

$$\int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( \exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \exp(Q s) \Sigma \right) ds = \text{Tr} (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}_\infty \mathbf{V}_\infty^T] \Sigma) > 0$$

369 where  $\mathbf{V}_\infty$  is a Gaussian random vector. Hence, as expected,  $\chi(\delta)$  is an increasing function for large  $\delta$  when  $\pi$   
 370 corresponds to the ideal free distribution associated with  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$ . However, when  $\pi$  does not correspond to the  
 371 ideal free distribution,  $\chi(\delta)$  may be increasing or decreasing for large  $\delta$  as we illustrate below.

372 When  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  commute, the asymptotic expression (19) for  $\chi(\delta)$  simplifies a great deal.

373 **Corollary 5.3.** *Suppose that  $Q$  is symmetric and  $Q \Sigma = \Sigma Q$ . Let  $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-1} < \lambda_n = 0$  be the eigenvalues of  $Q$   
 374 with corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ . Then, the eigenvalues  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  of  $\Sigma$  can be ordered so that  
 375  $\Sigma \xi_k = \theta_k \xi_k$ , for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and the approximation (19) reduces to*

$$(20) \quad \chi(\delta) = \left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2n} \theta_n \right) - \frac{1}{\delta n} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \left( (\xi_k^T \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{4n} \theta_k^2 \right) \right] + O(\delta^{-5/4})$$

376 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum \mu_i$ .

377 To illustrate the utility of this latter approximation, we develop more explicit formulas for three scenarios: diffusive  
 378 movement in a landscape where all patches are equally connected (that is, a classic “Levins” style landscape [Levins,  
 379 1969]), diffusive movement in a landscape consisting of a ring of patches, and diffusive movement in a landscape with  
 380 multiple spatial scales (that is, a hierarchical Levins landscape).

381 **Example 5.1 Fully connected metapopulations with unbiased movement.** Consider a population in which  
 382 individuals disperse at the same per-capita rate  $\delta/n$  between all pairs of patches. Let  $\sigma^2$  be the variance of the  
 383 within patch fluctuations and  $\rho$  be the correlation in these fluctuations between any pair of patches. Under these  
 384 assumptions, the dispersal matrix is  $Q = J/n - I$  and the environmental covariance matrix is  $\Sigma = (1 - \rho)\sigma^2 I + \rho\sigma^2 J$ ,  
 385 where recall that  $J = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T$  is the matrix of all ones. Because  $Q$  is symmetric, the stationary distribution of  $Q$  is  
 386 uniform; that is,  $\pi_1 = \dots = \pi_n = \frac{1}{n}$ . Hence, in the absence of population growth there would be equal numbers of  
 387 individuals in each patch at large times.

388 Because the matrices  $I$  and  $J$  commute, the matrices  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  also commute. Recall the notation of Corollary 5.3.  
 389 The eigenvector  $\xi_n$  is  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{1}$ . If  $\xi$  is any vector of length one orthogonal to  $\xi_n$ , then  $J\xi = 0$ , and so  $Q\xi = -\xi$  and  
 390  $\Sigma\xi = (1 - \rho)\sigma^2\xi$ . We may thus take  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}$  to be any orthonormal set of vectors orthogonal to  $\xi_n$ . Moreover,  
 391  $\lambda_1 = \dots = \lambda_{n-1} = -1$  and  $\theta_1 = \dots = \theta_{n-1} = (1 - \rho)\sigma^2$ .

392 Now,  $(\xi_n^T \mu)^2 = (1/n)(\sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k)^2 = n(\bar{\mu})^2$ , and so Parseval's identity implies that  $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\xi_k^T \mu)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k^2 -$   
 393  $n(\bar{\mu})^2 = \mu^T \mu - n(\bar{\mu})^2$ . Denote the variance of the vector  $\mu$  by

$$\text{Var}[\mu] = \frac{1}{n} \mu^T \mu - (\bar{\mu})^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\xi_k^T \mu)^2.$$

394 Substituting these observations into equation (20), we get that

$$(21) \quad \chi(\delta) = \bar{\mu} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2n} (1 + (n-1)\rho) + \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ \text{Var}[\mu] - \frac{(n-1)((1-\rho)\sigma^2)^2}{4n^2} \right] + O(\delta^{-\frac{5}{4}}).$$

395 Recall that for the special case of two uncorrelated patches with  $D_{12} = D_{21} = \delta/2$ ,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu$ , and  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \sigma$ ,  
 396 we showed from our exact formula for  $\chi(\delta)$  in the two patch case that

$$\chi(\delta) \approx \mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{4} - \frac{1}{\delta} \frac{\sigma^4}{16}$$

397 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ , see (10). Hence, this approximation agrees with (21).

398 Approximation (21) implies that  $\chi(\delta)$  is decreasing for large  $\delta$  whenever

$$(22) \quad \frac{n}{\sqrt{n-1}} \sqrt{\text{Var}[\mu]} > \frac{(1-\rho)\sigma^2}{2},$$

399 and that  $\chi(\delta)$  is increasing if the opposite inequality holds. We have remarked that, in general, an intermediate  
 400 dispersal rate is optimal when  $\chi(0) < \chi(\infty)$  and  $\chi(\delta) > \chi(\infty)$  for all sufficiently large  $\delta$ . This will occur for  
 401 individuals in this diffusive dispersal regime when

$$(23) \quad \frac{(1-\rho)\sigma^2}{2} > \frac{\max_i \mu_i - \bar{\mu}}{1 - 1/n}$$

402 and (22) holds. In particular, when there are many patches (that is,  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ), inequalities (23) and (22) are both  
 403 satisfied if

$$(1-\rho)\sigma^2/2 > \max_i \mu_i - \bar{\mu} > 0.$$

404 **Biological interpretation of equations (22) and (23).** *Highly diffusive movement has a negative impact on*  
 405 *population growth whenever there are sufficiently many patches and there is sufficient spatial variation in the mean*  
 406 *per-capita growth rates. Alternatively, if there is no spatial variation in the mean per-capita rates and stochastic*  
 407 *fluctuations are not perfectly correlated, then the population growth rate continually increases with higher dispersal*  
 408 *rates. This latter observation is consistent with individuals being distributed equally across the landscape is the*  
 409 *optimal patch distribution. In contrast, if there is some spatial variation in the mean per-capita growth rates and*  
 410 *there are sufficiently large, but not perfectly correlated environmental fluctuations, then an intermediate dispersal rate*  
 411 *maximizes the stochastic growth rate for diffusively dispersing populations.*

412 In order to apply Corollary 5.3, we need to to simultaneously diagonalize the matrices  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$ . A situation  
 413 in which this is possible and the resulting formulas provide insight into biologically relevant scenarios is when the  
 414 dispersal mechanism and the covariance structure of the noise both exhibit the symmetries of an underlying group.  
 415 Example 5.1 above is a particular instance of this situation.

416 More specifically, we suppose that the patches can be labeled with the elements of a finite group  $G$  in such a  
 417 way that the migration rate  $Q_{g,h}$  and environmental covariance  $\Sigma_{g,h}$  between patches  $g$  and  $h$  both only depend  
 418 on the "displacement"  $gh^{-1}$  from  $g$  to  $h$  in  $G$ . That is, we assume there exist functions  $q$  and  $s$  on  $G$  such that  
 419  $Q_{gh} = q(gh^{-1})$  and  $\Sigma_{gh} = s(gh^{-1})$ . For instance, if  $G$  is the group of integers modulo  $n$ , then the habitat has  $n$   
 420 patches arranged in a circle, and the dispersal rate and environmental covariance between two patches only depends  
 421 on the distance between them, measured in steps around the circle. We do not require that the vector  $\mu$  of mean  
 422 per-capita growth rates satisfies any symmetry conditions.

423 The matrices  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  will commute if  $q$  and  $s$  are *class functions*, that is, if  $q(gh) = q(hg)$  and  $s(gh) = s(hg)$  for  
 424 all  $g, h \in G$ . We assume this condition holds from now on. Note that if  $G$  is Abelian (that is, the group operation is  
 425 commutative), then any function is a class function.

426 **5.1. Background on group representations.** We now record a few facts about representation theory, the tool  
 427 that will enable us to find the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$ , resulting in Theorem 5.4. We refer readers  
 428 interested in more detail to [Serre, 1977, Diaconis, 1988], while readers interested in less mathematical detail may  
 429 skip directly to Examples 5.2 and 5.3 without loss of continuity.

430 A *unitary representation* of a group  $G$  is a homomorphism  $\rho$  from  $G$  into the group of  $d_\rho \times d_\rho$  unitary matrices,  
 431 where  $d_\rho$  is called the *degree* of the representation. Two representations  $\rho'$  and  $\rho''$  are *equivalent* if there exists a  
 432 unitary matrix  $U$  such that  $\rho''(g) = U\rho'(g)U^{-1}$  for all  $g \in G$ . A representation  $\rho'$  is *irreducible* if it is not equivalent  
 433 to some representation  $\rho''$  for which  $\rho''(g)$  is of the same block diagonal form for all  $g \in G$ . A finite group has a  
 434 finite set of inequivalent, irreducible, unitary representations, which we denote by  $\hat{G}$ . The simplest representation is  
 435 the *trivial representation*  $\rho_{\text{tr}}$  of degree one, for which  $\rho_{\text{tr}}(g) = 1$  for all  $g$ .

436 For a simple example that we will return to, let  $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$ , the group of integers modulo  $n$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is Abelian, all the  
 437 irreducible representations are one-dimensional ( $d_\rho = 1$  for all  $\rho \in \hat{G}$ ), and are of the form  $\rho^{(m)}(j) = \exp(2\pi imj/n)$ ,  
 438 so that  $\hat{G} = \{\rho_m^{(m)} : 0 \leq m \leq n-1\}$ .

439 The matrix entries of irreducible representations are *orthogonal*: for  $\rho', \rho'' \in \hat{G}$ ,

$$(24) \quad \sum_{g \in G} \rho'_{ij}(g)\rho''_{kl}(g)^* = \begin{cases} \frac{\#G}{d_\rho}, & \text{if } \rho' = \rho'' \text{ and } (i, j) = (k, \ell), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

440 where  $z^*$  denotes the complex conjugate of a complex number  $z$ , and  $\#G$  is the number of elements of  $G$ .

441 The *Fourier transform* of a function  $f : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a function  $\hat{f}$  on  $\hat{G}$  defined by

$$(25) \quad \hat{f}(\rho) := \sum_{g \in G} f(g)\rho(g) \quad \text{for } \rho \in \hat{G}.$$

442 Note that  $\hat{f}(\rho)$  is a  $d_\rho \times d_\rho$  matrix. It follows from the orthogonality properties of the matrix entries of the irre-  
 443 reducible representations recorded above that the Fourier transform may be inverted, giving  $f$  explicitly as the linear  
 444 combination of matrix entries of  $\hat{f}$ . The inversion formula is

$$f(g) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\rho \in \hat{G}} d_\rho \text{Tr}(\rho(g^{-1})\hat{f}(\rho)).$$

445 For  $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$ , this is the familiar *discrete Fourier transform*, for which orthogonality of matrix entries is the fact  
 446 that  $(1/n) \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \exp(2\pi ij(\ell - m)/n) = \delta_{\ell m}$ . The transform is given by  $\hat{f}(\rho^{(m)}) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f(k) \exp(2\pi imk/n)$  for  
 447  $0 \leq m \leq n-1$ , and  $f(k) = (1/n) \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \hat{f}(\rho^{(m)}) \exp(-2\pi imk/n)$ . The trivial character is  $\kappa_{\text{tr}} = \rho^{(0)}$ .

448 Associated with a representation  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  is its *character*  $\kappa$ , defined by  $\kappa(g) := \text{Tr}(\rho(g))$ . We write  $\tilde{G}$  for the set of  
 449 characters of irreducible representations. The characters are class functions, and form an orthogonal basis for the  
 450 subspace of class functions on  $G$  and all have the same norm:  $\sum_{g \in G} |\kappa(g)|^2 = \#G$ , where  $|z| = \sqrt{zz^*}$  is the modulus  
 451 of the complex number  $z$ . For  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  with character  $\kappa \in \tilde{G}$ , the Fourier transform of a class function  $f$  satisfies

$$\hat{f}(\rho) = \frac{1}{d_\rho} \tilde{f}(\kappa)I$$

452 where  $I$  is the  $d_\rho \times d_\rho$  identity matrix and

$$(26) \quad \tilde{f}(\kappa) := \sum_{g \in G} f(g)\kappa(g).$$

453 Consequently,

$$(27) \quad f(g) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\kappa \in \tilde{G}} \kappa(g)^* \tilde{f}(\kappa).$$

454 As noted above, if  $G = \mathbb{Z}_n$  then all irreducible representations are one-dimensional, so in this case we may identify  
 455 the characters with the irreducible representations,  $\hat{G} = \tilde{G}$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is Abelian, all functions on  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  are class  
 456 functions, so that the two Fourier transforms (25) and (26) are equal.



457 Finally, given a function  $f$  on  $G$  and character  $\kappa$ , define

$$\|f\|_{\kappa}^2 := \frac{d_{\rho}}{\#G} \sum_{g,h \in G} \kappa(gh^{-1})f(g)f(h)^*.$$

458 The following theorem is proved in Appendix F.

459 **Theorem 5.4.** *Suppose that the  $n$  patches are labeled by a finite group  $G$  in such a way that  $Q_{gh} = q(gh^{-1})$  and*  
 460  *$\Sigma_{gh} = s(gh^{-1})$ , where  $q$  and  $s$  are class functions. Suppose further that  $q(g) = q(g^{-1})$ ,  $g \in G$ , so that the matrix  $Q$*   
 461 *is symmetric. Let  $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \mu(g)$  and  $\bar{s} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} s(g)$ . Then,*

$$(28) \quad \chi(\delta) = \left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{s} \right) - \frac{1}{\delta n} \sum_{\kappa \in \tilde{G} \setminus \{\kappa_{\text{tr}}\}} \frac{d_{\kappa}}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} \left( \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 - \frac{1}{4n} \tilde{s}(\kappa)^2 \right) + O(\delta^{-5/4})$$

462 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\tilde{q}(\kappa) < 0$  for all  $\kappa \in \tilde{G} \setminus \{\kappa_{\text{tr}}\}$ .

463 Roughly speaking, this expression tells us about the respective roles of variance of patch quality ( $\mu$ ) and covariance  
 464 of environmental noise ( $s$ ). The fact that  $\tilde{q}(\kappa)$  is negative for all  $\kappa$  leads to the following.

465 **Biological interpretation of equation (28).** *If variability in patch quality at a certain scale is larger than*  
 466 *the correlation in environmental noise at that scale, in a sense made precise above, then the stochastic growth rate*  
 467 *decreases with increasing dispersal rates at that scale. Conversely, if environmental noise is strongly correlated*  
 468 *between patches and the mean patch quality is similar, then more dispersal is expected to be better. The relevant*  
 469 *sense of “at that scale” is in the sense of the Fourier transform, analogous to the “frequency domain” in Fourier*  
 470 *analysis.*

471 **Example 5.2 Circle of Patches.** Suppose that the  $n$  patches of a habitat are arranged in a circle and are labeled  
 472 by  $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ , the group of integers modulo  $n$  with identity element 0. As reviewed above, the Fourier  
 473 transform is the familiar discrete Fourier transform.

474 If we assume that individuals disperse only to neighboring patches and these dispersal rates are equal, then  
 475  $q(1) = q(n-1) = 1/2$ ,  $q(0) = -1$  and  $q(2) = \dots = q(n-2) = 0$ . Assume the environmental noise is independent  
 476 between patches and has variance  $\sigma^2$  i.e.  $s(0) = \sigma^2$  and  $0 = s(1) = \dots = s(n-1)$ . Finally, suppose that patch  
 477 quality as measured by the average per-capita growth rates is spatially periodic, so that  $\mu(k) = \bar{\mu} + c \cos(2\pi k\ell/n)$   
 478 for some  $c > 0$ ,  $\bar{\mu}$ , and  $1 \leq \ell < n/2$ .

479 Under this set of assumptions, we can compute that for  $m \neq 0$ ,  $\tilde{q}(m) = \cos(2\pi m/n) - 1$  and  $\tilde{s}(m) = \sigma^2$ .  
 480 Furthermore,  $\|\mu\|_{\kappa_{\ell}}^2 = \|\mu\|_{\kappa_{n-\ell}}^2 = nc^2/4$  and  $\|\mu\|_{\kappa_m}^2 = 0$  otherwise. From these computations, Theorem 5.4 implies  
 481 that

$$\chi(\delta) \approx \bar{\mu} - \sigma^2/2 - \frac{1}{\delta n} \left( \frac{nc^2}{2(\cos(2\pi\ell/n) - 1)} - \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \frac{\sigma^2}{4n(\cos(2\pi m/n) - 1)} \right)$$

482 for large  $\delta$ . Using the identity  $\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (1 - \cos(2\pi k/n))^{-1} = (n^2 - 1)/6$  (see equation 1.381.1 in Gradshteyn and Ryzhik  
 483 [2007]’s table of integrals and series), this approximation simplifies to

$$(29) \quad \chi(\delta) \approx \bar{\mu} - \sigma^2/2 + \frac{1}{4\delta n^2} \left( \frac{2n^2 c^2}{1 - \cos(2\pi\ell/n)} - \frac{1}{6} (n^2 - 1) \sigma^4 \right).$$

484 Since  $\chi(0) = \bar{\mu} + c - \sigma^2/2$ , high dispersal is better than no dispersal if  $\chi(\infty) - \chi(0) = \sigma^2(1 - 1/n)/2 - c > 0$ .  
 485 When the number of patches is sufficiently large, this inequality implies that highly dispersive populations grow faster  
 486 than sedentary populations provided that the temporal variation is sufficiently greater than the spatial variation in  
 487 per-capita growth rates i.e.  $\sigma^2 > 2c$ . On the other hand,  $\chi(\delta)$  is decreasing for large  $\delta$  if the coefficient of  $1/\delta$  is  
 488 positive i.e.

$$4c^2 > \frac{1}{3} (1 - \cos(2\pi\ell/n))(1 - n^{-2})\sigma^4.$$

489 Hence, if  $\ell/n$  is small enough, then  $\chi(\delta)$  is decreasing for large  $\delta$ .

490 **Biological interpretation of equation (29).** *In a circular habitat with nearest-neighbor dispersal and sinu-*  
 491 *soidally varying patch quality, intermediate dispersal rates maximize the stochastic growth rate provided that spatial*  
 492 *heterogeneity occurs on a short scale (i.e.  $\ell/n$  sufficiently small) and temporal variability is sufficiently large.*

493 **Example 5.3 Multi-scale patches.** Suppose now that our organism lives in a hierarchically structured habitat.  
 494 For example, individuals might live on bushes, the bushes grow around the edges of clearings, and the clearings are  
 495 scattered across an archipelago of islands. We label each bush with an ordered triple recording on which island, in  
 496 which clearing, and in what bush around the clearing it lives, so that for instance  $(2, 1, 4)$  denotes the fourth bush in  
 497 the first clearing of the second island. To make the mathematical picture a pretty one, we suppose that each of the  
 498  $I$  islands has the same number  $C$  of clearings and each clearing has the same number  $B$  of bushes. This enables us  
 499 to identify the habitat structure with the group  $\mathbb{Z}_I \otimes \mathbb{Z}_C \otimes \mathbb{Z}_B$ , where, as above,  $\mathbb{Z}_m$  is the group of integers modulo  
 500  $m$ . We will get particularly simple and interpretable results if we also assume that dispersal rates and environmental  
 501 covariances only depend on the scale at which the movement occurs – between bushes, clearings, or islands.

502 Although it requires imaginative work to find examples with many more scales than this (do the organism’s fleas  
 503 have fleas?) it does not cost us anything to work in greater generality. Suppose, then, that the patches in the habitat  
 504 are labeled with the group  $G = G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_k$ , where  $G_j = \mathbb{Z}_{n_j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ .

505 Thus, one patch is labeled with the identity element  $\mathbf{id}_G = (\mathbf{id}_1, \dots, \mathbf{id}_k)$  and every other patch is labeled by  
 506 the displacement required to get there from  $\mathbf{id}_G$ . The later coordinates are understood to be at finer “scales”,  
 507 so that if  $g_i = h_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq j - 1$ , then  $g$  and  $h$  represent patches in the same *metapatch at scale*  $j$ . For  
 508 instance, in our example above, the archipelago of islands is the single metapatch at scale 1 and the metapatches  
 509 at scales 2 and 3 are, respectively, the islands and the clearings. We label the metapatches at scale  $r$  with the set  
 510  $Z_r := \{g \in G : g_r = \mathbf{id}_r, \dots, g_k = \mathbf{id}_k\}$ , with the convention that  $Z_{k+1} := G$ . Because a label  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_k) \in G$   
 511 represents displacement, the coordinate of the leftmost non-identity element of  $g$ , denoted by

$$\ell(g) := \min\{j : g_j \neq \mathbf{id}_j\} \text{ and } \ell(\mathbf{id}_G) = k + 1,$$

512 tells us the scale on which the motion occurs:  $g \in G$  corresponds to a displacement that moves between patches  
 513 within the same metapatch at scale  $\ell(g)$  but moves from a patch within a metapatch at scale  $\ell(g) + 1$  to a patch  
 514 within some other metapatch at that scale. Note that  $1 \leq \ell(g) \leq k + 1$ .

515 We assume that the dispersal rate and the environmental covariance between two patches only depends on the scale  
 516 of the displacement necessary to move between the two patches. That is, we suppose there are numbers  $q_1, \dots, q_{k+1}$   
 517 and  $s_1, \dots, s_{k+1}$  such that  $q(g) = q_{\ell(g)}$  and  $s(g) = s_{\ell(g)}$ .

518 In Appendix G we show that the Fourier transforms appearing in Theorem 5.4 depend on the following quantities.  
 519 Let  $N_r := \#Z_r = \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} n_j$  be the number of metapatches at scale  $r$ . Write  $\bar{Z}_r := \{g \in G : g_j = \mathbf{id}_j, j \leq r\}$  for the  
 520 subgroup of displacements that move from one patch to another within the same metapatch at scale  $r + 1$  and set  
 521  $\bar{N}_r := \#\bar{Z}_r = \prod_{j=r+1}^k n_j$ . Set

$$v_\mu(r) := \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{g \in Z_r} \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \left( \frac{1}{\bar{N}_r} \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 - \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \frac{1}{\bar{N}_r} \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 \right).$$

522 We can interpret this quantity as follows. There are  $N_r$  metapatches at scale  $r$ . Each one has within it  $n_r$  metapatches  
 523 at scale  $r + 1$ . First, compute the average of  $\mu$  over all the patches within each metapatch at scale  $r + 1$ , then compute  
 524 the variance of these averages within each metapatch at scale  $r$ , and finally average these variances across all the  
 525 metapatches at scale  $r$  to produce  $v_\mu(r)$ . Thus,  $v_\mu(r)$  measures the variability in  $\mu$  that can be attributed to scale  
 526  $r + 1$ . Set

$$\tilde{s}(r) = \sum_{\ell=r}^k (s_{\ell+1} - s_\ell) \bar{N}_\ell$$

527 and

$$\tilde{q}(r) = - \sum_{\ell=1}^r q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - q_r \bar{N}_r.$$

528 The following result agrees with equation (21), which describes the special case where there is a single scale.

529 **Theorem 5.5.** *For a habitat with the above multi-scale structure, equation (19) reduces to*

$$(30) \quad \chi(\delta) = \left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{s} \right) - \frac{1}{\delta} \sum_{r=1}^k \frac{1}{\tilde{q}(r)} \left( v_{\mu}(r) - \frac{N_{r+1} - N_r}{4N_{k+1}^2} \tilde{s}(r)^2 \right) + O(\delta^{-5/4})$$

530 *as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\tilde{q}(r) < 0$  for all  $1 \leq r \leq k$ .*

531 Note that if  $s_{\ell}$  increases with  $\ell$  (that is, two patches within the same metapatch have a higher environmental  
532 covariance than two patches in different metapatches at that scale), then  $\tilde{s}(r)$  decreases with  $r$ . Also, if  $q_{\ell}$  increases  
533 with  $\ell$  (that is, there is a higher rate for dispersing to a patch within the same metapatch at some scale than to a  
534 patch in another metapatch at that scale), then  $\tilde{q}(r)$  is negative and decreases with  $r$ . Using these observations, we  
535 may read off several things from (30).

536 First, consider a simple example with a fixed, large number  $n$  of patches distributed among a variable number of  
537 islands. Now  $k = 2$ , and let the number of islands  $n_1 = 1/\alpha$ , with  $\alpha \geq 1$ , so that the number of patches on each  
538 island is  $n_2 = \alpha n$ . In this case,  $N_1 = 1$ ,  $N_2 = 1/\alpha$ , and  $N_3 = n$ , while  $\bar{N}_0 = n$ ,  $\bar{N}_1 = \alpha n$ , and  $\bar{N}_2 = 1$ , so (30) reads

$$(31) \quad \chi(\delta) \approx \left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{s} \right) - \frac{1}{\delta} \left\{ -\frac{v_{\mu}(1)}{q_1 n} + \frac{(1-\alpha)((s_3 - s_2) + \alpha n(s_2 - s_1))^2}{\alpha q_1 n^2} - \frac{v_{\mu}(2) - (\alpha n - 1)(s_3 - s_2)^2}{\alpha n^2 (q_2 \alpha + q_1 (1 - \alpha))} \right\}$$

$$= \left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2} \bar{s} \right) - \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)(s_2 - s_1)^2}{\delta q_1} + O(n^{-1}).$$

539 The effect of higher dispersal depends on the difference in covariances between patches on the same island and on  
540 different islands, and on the number of islands.

541 **Biological interpretation of equation (31).** *If a sufficiently large number of patches are distributed equally*  
542 *across a number of islands, then for a given dispersal pattern, the stochastic growth rate increases with the dispersal*  
543 *rate (at high levels of dispersal). This effect is strongest if there are only two islands (i.e.  $\alpha = 1/2$ ).*

544 Secondly, imagine a fixed ensemble of patches with varying mean per-capita growth rates and consider the following  
545 two possibilities for assignment of these patches to metapatches at scale 2 (the islands in our bush-clearing-island  
546 example). One possibility is that some islands are assigned patches that are primarily of high quality, whereas other  
547 islands are mostly assigned poor patches. The other possibility is that patches of different quality are evenly spread  
548 across the islands, with the range of quality within an island similar to the range of quality between islands. In  
549 the first case, the variance across islands of within-island means is comparable to the variance across all patches, so  
550  $v_{\mu}(1) \approx v_{\mu}(k)$ . In the second case, the within-island means are approximately constant, so that  $v_{\mu}(1)$  will be small.  
551 Therefore, since  $\tilde{q}(r)$  is negative for all  $r$ , having local positive association of  $\mu$  at nearby patches leads to higher  
552 stochastic growth rates, at least for large enough values of the dispersal parameter  $\delta$ .

553 **Biological interpretation of equation (30).** *All other things being equal, the species will do better if the good*  
554 *habitat is concentrated on particular islands, rather than spread out across many.*

555 Finally, we can observe that adding new scales of metapatch may change the situation from one in which  $\chi(\delta)$  is  
556 maximal at high values of the dispersal parameter  $\delta$  to one in which  $\chi(\delta)$  is maximal at intermediate values of  $\delta$ , or  
557 vice-versa. If  $n_1 = 1$ , then  $\tilde{s}(1)$  and  $v_{\mu}(1)$  are both zero, and changing  $n_1$  (for example, going from one to several  
558 islands in our example) will increase  $\tilde{s}(1)$ . Changing  $n_1$  will also add the quantity  $-q_1(n_1 - 1)\bar{N}_1$  to all values of  
559  $\tilde{q}(r)$ . The result of this could be to change the sign of the coefficient of  $\frac{1}{\delta}$  in (19).

560 **Biological interpretation of equation (30).** *The optimal level of dispersal for a subpopulation, and the growth*  
561 *rate at that level of dispersal, may differ drastically depending on whether it is connected (or connectable) by dispersal*  
562 *to other subpopulations.*

## 563 6. DISCUSSION

564 Classical ecology theory predicts that environmental stochasticity increases extinction risk by reducing the long  
565 term per-capita growth rate of populations [May, 1975, Turelli, 1978]. For sedentary populations in a spatially ho-  
566 mogeneous yet temporally variable environment, a simple model of their growth is given by the stochastic differential

567 equation  $dZ_t = \mu Z_t dt + \sigma Z_t dB_t$ , where  $B$  is a standard Brownian motion. The stochastic growth rate for such  
568 populations equals  $\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}$ ; the reduction in the growth rate is proportional to the infinitesimal variance of the noise.  
569 Here, we show that a similar expression describes the growth of populations dispersing in spatially and temporally  
570 heterogeneous environments. More specifically, if average per-capita growth rate in patch  $i$  is  $\mu_i$  and the infinitesimal  
571 spatial covariance between environmental noise in patches  $i$  and  $j$  is  $\sigma_{ij}$ , then the stochastic growth rate equals the  
572 average of the mean per-capita growth rate  $\langle \mu \rangle = \sum_i \mu_i \mathbb{E}[Y_\infty^i]$  experienced by the population when the proportions  
573 of the population in the various patches have reached equilibrium minus half of the average temporal variation  
574  $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{i,j} \sigma_{ij} Y_\infty^i Y_\infty^j]$  experienced by the population in equilibrium. The law of  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$ , the random equilibrium  
575 spatial distribution of the population which provides the weights in these averages, is determined by interactions  
576 between spatial heterogeneity in mean per-capita growth rates, the infinitesimal spatial covariances of the environ-  
577 mental noise, and population movement patterns. To investigate how these interactions effect the stochastic growth  
578 rate, we derived analytic expressions for the law of  $\mathbf{Y}_\infty$ , determined what choice of dispersal mechanisms resulted in  
579 optimal stochastic growth rates for a freely dispersing population, and considered the consequences on the stochastic  
580 growth rate of limiting the population to a fixed dispersal mechanism. As we now discuss, these analytic results  
581 provide fundamental insights into “ideal free” movement in the face of uncertainty, the persistence of coupled sink  
582 populations, the evolution of dispersal rates, and the single large or several small (SLOSS) debate in conservation  
583 biology.

584 In spatially heterogeneous environments, “ideal free” individuals disperse to the patch or patches that maximize  
585 their long term per-capita growth rate [Fretwell and Lucas, 1970, Harper, 1982, Oksanen et al., 1995, van Baalen and  
586 Sabelis, 1999, Schreiber et al., 2000, Schreiber and Vejdani, 2006, Kirkland et al., 2006, Cantrell et al., 2007]. In the  
587 absence of environmental stochasticity and density-dependent feedbacks, ideal free dispersers only select the patches  
588 supporting the highest per-capita growth rate. Here, we show that uncertainty due to environmental stochasticity  
589 can overturn this prediction. Provided environmental stochasticity is sufficiently strong and spatial correlations  
590 are sufficiently weak, equation (16) implies that ideal free dispersers occupy all patches despite spatial variation  
591 in the local stochastic growth rates  $\mu_i - \sigma_i^2/2$ . Intuitively, by spending time in multiple patches, including those  
592 that in isolation support lower stochastic growth rates, individuals reduce the net environmental variation  $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle$  they  
593 experience and, thereby, increase their stochastic growth rate. Hence, dispersing to lower quality patches is a form of  
594 bet-hedging against environmental uncertainty [Slatkin, 1974, Philippi and Seger, 1989, Wilbur and Rudolf, 2006].  
595 When environmental fluctuations in higher quality patches are sufficiently strong, this spatial bet-hedging can result  
596 in ideal free dispersers occupying sink patches; patches that are unable in the absence of immigration to sustain a  
597 population. This latter prediction is consistent with Holt’s analysis of a discrete-time two patch model [Holt, 1997].  
598 Spatial correlations in environmental fluctuations, however, can disrupt spatial bet-hedging. Movement between  
599 patches exhibiting strongly covarying environmental fluctuations has little effect on the net environmental variation  
600  $\langle \sigma^2 \rangle$  experienced by individuals and, therefore, movement to lower quality patches may confer little or no advantage to  
601 individuals. Indeed, when the spatial covariation is sufficiently strong, ideal free dispersers only occupy patches with  
602 the highest local stochastic growth rates  $\mu_i - \sigma_i^2/2$ , similar to the case of deterministic environments. In deterministic  
603 environments, density dependent feedbacks can result in ideal-free dispersers occupying multiple patches including  
604 sink patches [Fretwell and Lucas, 1970, Cantrell et al., 2007, Holt and McPeck, 1996]. Our results show that even  
605 density-independent processes can result in populations occupying multiple patches. However, both of these processes  
606 are likely to play important roles in the evolution of patch selection.

607 A sink population is a local population that is sustained by immigration [Holt, 1985, Pulliam, 1988, Dias, 1996].  
608 Removing immigration results in a steady decline to extinction. In contrast, source populations persist in the  
609 absence of immigration. Empirical studies have shown that landscapes often partition into mosaics of source and  
610 sink populations [Murphy, 2001, Kreuzer and Huntly, 2003, Keagy et al., 2005]. For discrete-time two-patch models,  
611 Jansen and Yoshimura [1998] showed, quite surprisingly, that sink populations coupled by dispersal can persist, a  
612 prediction supported by recent empirical studies with protozoan populations [Matthews and Gonzalez, 2007] and  
613 extended to discrete-time multi-patch models [Roy et al., 2005, Schreiber, 2010]. Here, we show a similar phenomena  
614 occurs for populations experiencing continuous temporal fluctuations. For example, if the stochastic growth rates in  
615 all patches equal  $\mu - \sigma^2/2$  and the spatial correlation between patches is  $\rho$ , then equations (5) and (18) imply that  
616 populations dispersing freely between  $n$  patches persist whenever  $\mu - ((n-1)\rho + 1)\sigma^2/2n > 0$ . Hence, ideal free  
617 movement mediates persistence whenever local environmental fluctuations produce sink populations (i.e.,  $\sigma^2/2 >$   
618  $\mu > 0$ ), environmental fluctuations aren’t fully spatially correlated (i.e.  $\rho < 2\mu/\sigma^2$ ) and there are sufficiently many  
619 patches (i.e.,  $n > ((1-\rho)\sigma^2)/(2\mu - \rho\sigma^2)$ ). This latter expression for the necessary number of patches to mediate

620 persistence is an exact, continuous time counterpart to an approximation by Bascompte et al. [2002] for discrete time  
 621 models. When two patches are sufficient to mediate persistence, equation (9) reveals that there is a critical dispersal  
 622 rate below which the population is extinction prone and above which it persists. Our high dispersal approximation  
 623 (see equation (21) with  $\text{Var}[\mu] = 0$ ) suggests this dispersal threshold also exists for an arbitrary number of patches.

624 While ideal free movement corresponds to the optimal dispersal strategy for species without any constraints on  
 625 their movement or their ability to collect information, many organisms experience these constraints. For instance,  
 626 in the absence of information about environmental conditions in other patches, individuals may move randomly  
 627 between patches, in which case the rate of movement (rather than the pattern of movement) is subject to natural  
 628 selection [Hastings, 1983, Levin et al., 1984, McPeck and Holt, 1992, Holt and McPeck, 1996, Dockery et al., 1998,  
 629 Hutson et al., 2001, Kirkland et al., 2006]. When density-dependent feedbacks are weak and certain symmetry  
 630 assumptions are met, our high dispersal approximation in (20) implies there is selection for higher dispersal rates  
 631 whenever

$$(32) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|} \frac{1}{4n} \theta_k^2 > \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{|\lambda_k|} (\xi_k^T \mu)^2$$

632 where, recall,  $\lambda_k < 0$ ,  $\xi_k$  are the eigenvalues/vectors of the dispersal matrix,  $\mu$  is the vector of per-capita growth rates,  
 633 and  $\theta_k$  are the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix for the environmental noise. Roughly speaking, equation (32)  
 634 asserts that if temporal variation (averaged in the appropriate manner) exceeds spatial variation, then there is  
 635 selection for faster dispersers; a prediction consistent with the general consensus of earlier studies [Levin et al., 1984,  
 636 McPeck and Holt, 1992, Hutson et al., 2001]. More specifically, in the highly symmetric case where the temporal  
 637 variation in all patches equals  $\sigma^2$  and the spatial correlation between patches is  $\rho$ , equation (32) simplifies to

$$(33) \quad \frac{(1 - \rho)\sigma^2}{2} > \frac{n}{\sqrt{n-1}} \sqrt{\text{Var}[\mu]},$$

638 in which case lower spatial correlations and larger number of patches also facilitate selection for faster dispersers.  
 639 Another important constraint influencing the evolution of dispersal are travel costs that reduce fitness of dispersing  
 640 individuals. While the effect of these costs have been investigated for deterministic models [DeAngelis et al., 2011],  
 641 it remains to be seen how these traveling costs interact with environmental stochasticity in determining optimal  
 642 dispersal strategies.

643 Previous studies have shown that spatial heterogeneity in per-capita growth rates increases the net population  
 644 growth rate for deterministic models with diffusive movement [Adler, 1992, Schreiber and Lloyd-Smith, 2009]. Intu-  
 645 itively, spatial heterogeneity provides patches with higher per-capita growth rates that boost the population growth  
 646 rate, a boost that gets diluted at higher dispersal rates. Our high dispersal approximation (20) shows that this boost  
 647 also occurs in temporally heterogeneous environments, i.e. the correction term  $-\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} (\xi_k^T \mu)^2 / \delta$  is positive. More  
 648 importantly, the multiscale version of this correction term (30) implies this boost is larger when the variation in the  
 649 per-capita growth rates occurs at multiple spatial scales. For example, for insects living on plants in meadows on  
 650 islands, the largest boost occurs when the higher quality plants (i.e. the plants supporting the largest  $\mu_i$  values) occur  
 651 on the same island in the same meadow. This analytic conclusion is consistent with numerical simulations showing  
 652 that habitat fragmentation (e.g. distributing high quality plants more evenly across islands and meadows) increases  
 653 extinction risk [Fahrig, 1997, 2002]. Intuitively, spatial aggregation of higher quality patches increases the chance of  
 654 individuals dispersing away from a high quality patch arriving in another high quality patch. Even without spatial  
 655 variation in per-capita growth rates, equation (30) implies that strong spatial aggregation of patches maximizes  
 656 stochastic growth rates for dispersive populations living in environments where temporal correlations decrease with  
 657 spatial scale. This finding promotes the view that a single large (SL) reserve is a better for conservation than several  
 658 small (SS) reserves. This finding is consistent with many arguments in the SLOSS debate [Diamond, 1975, Wilcox  
 659 and Murphy, 1985, Gilpin, 1988, Cantrell and Cosner, 1989, 1991]. For example, using reaction-diffusion equations,  
 660 Cantrell and Cosner [1991] found that even in deterministic environments “[it] is better for a population to have a  
 661 few large regions of favorable habitat than a great many small ones closely intermingled with unfavorable regions.”  
 662 However, our results run contrary to a numerical simulation study of Quinn and Hastings [1987] that, unlike ours,  
 663 applies to sedentary populations experiencing independent environments [Gilpin, 1988].

664 While our work provides a diversity of analytical insights into the interactive effects of temporal variability,  
 665 spatial heterogeneity, and movement on long-term population growth, many challenges remain. Most notably, are  
 666 there analytic approximations for relatively sedentary populations? What effect do correlations in the temporal

667 fluctuations have on the stochastic growth rate? Can the explicit formulas for stochastic growth rates in two patch  
668 environments be extended to special classes of higher dimensional models? Can one extend the analysis to account for  
669 density-dependent feedbacks? Answers to these questions are likely to provide important insights into the evolution  
670 of dispersal and metapopulation persistence.

#### 671 REFERENCES

- 672 F.R. Adler. The effects of averaging on the basic reproduction ratio. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 111:89–98, 1992.
- 673 J. Bascompte, H. Possingham, and J. Roughgarden. Patchy populations in stochastic environments: Critical number  
674 of patches for persistence. *American Naturalist*, 159:128–137, 2002.
- 675 M. Benaïm and S. J. Schreiber. Persistence of structured populations in random environments. *Theoretical Population*  
676 *Biology*, 76:19–34, 2009.
- 677 R. N. Bhattacharya. Criteria for recurrence and existence of invariant measures for multidimensional diffusions. *The*  
678 *Annals of Probability*, 6(4):pp. 541–553, 1978. ISSN 00911798. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2243121>.
- 679 V I Bogachev, M Röckner, and W Stannat. Uniqueness of solutions of elliptic equations and uniqueness of invariant  
680 measures of diffusions. *Sbornik: Mathematics*, 193(7):945, 2002. URL [http://stacks.iop.org/1064-5616/193/](http://stacks.iop.org/1064-5616/193/i=7/a=A01)  
681 [i=7/a=A01](http://stacks.iop.org/1064-5616/193/i=7/a=A01).
- 682 Vladimir I Bogachev, Nikolai V Krylov, and Michael Röckner. Elliptic and parabolic equations for measures. *Russian*  
683 *Mathematical Surveys*, 64(6):973, 2009. URL <http://stacks.iop.org/0036-0279/64/i=6/a=R02>.
- 684 M.S. Boyce, C.V. Haridas, C.T. Lee, and the NCEAS Stochastic Demography Working Group. Demography in an  
685 increasingly variable world. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 21:141 – 148, 2006.
- 686 R. S. Cantrell and C. Cosner. The effects of spatial heterogeneity in population dynamics. *Journal of Mathematical*  
687 *Biology*, 29:315–338, 1991.
- 688 R. S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, and Y. Lou. Movement toward better environments and the evolution of rapid diffusion.  
689 *Mathematical Biosciences*, 204(2):199–214, 2006.
- 690 R.S. Cantrell and C. Cosner. Diffusive logistic equations with indefinite weights: population models in disrupted  
691 environments. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. Section A. Mathematics*, 112(3-4):293–318, 1989.
- 692 R.S. Cantrell, C. Cosner, D. L. Deangelis, and V. Padron. The ideal free distribution as an evolutionarily stable  
693 strategy. *Journal of Biological Dynamics*, 1:249–271, 2007.
- 694 P.L. Chesson. General theory of competitive coexistence in spatially-varying environments. *Theoretical Population*  
695 *Biology*, 58:211–237, 2000.
- 696 G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite-dimensional systems*, volume 229 of *London Mathematical Society*  
697 *Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- 698 D.L. DeAngelis, G.S.K. Wolkowicz, Y. Lou, Y. Jiang, M. Novak, R. Svanbäck, M.S. Araújo, Y.S. Jo, and E.A. Cleary.  
699 The effect of travel loss on evolutionarily stable distributions of populations in space. *American Naturalist*, 178:  
700 15–29, 2011.
- 701 M. Delibes, P. Gaona, and Ferreras P. Effects of an attractive sink leading into maladaptive habitat selection.  
702 *American Naturalist*, 158:277–285, 2001.
- 703 B. Dennis, P.L. Munholland, and J.M. Scott. Estimation of growth and extinction parameters for endangered species.  
704 *Ecological monographs*, 61:115–143, 1991.
- 705 P. Diaconis. *Group representations in probability and statistics*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics Lecture Notes—  
706 Monograph Series, 11. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, Hayward, CA, 1988.
- 707 J.M. Diamond. The island dilemma: lessons of modern biogeographic studies for the design of natural reserves.  
708 *Biological Conservation*, 7:129–146, 1975.
- 709 P.C. Dias. Sources and sinks in population biology. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, pages 326–330, 1996.
- 710 J. Dockery, V. Hutson, K. Mischaikow, and M. Pernarowski. The evolution of slow dispersal rates: a reaction diffusion  
711 model. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 37:61–83, 1998.
- 712 R. Durrett and D. Remenik. Evolution of the dispersal distance. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, in press.
- 713 L. Fahrig. Relative effects of habitat loss and fragmentation on population extinction. *The Journal of Wildlife*  
714 *Management*, 61:603–610, 1997.
- 715 L. Fahrig. Effect of habitat fragmentation on the extinction threshold: a synthesis. *Ecological Applications*, 12:  
716 346–353, 2002.
- 717 P. Foley. Predicting extinction times from environmental stochasticity and carrying capacity. *Conservation Biology*,  
718 pages 124–137, 1994.

- 719 S.D. Fretwell and H.L. Jr. Lucas. On territorial behavior and other factors influencing habitat distribution in birds.  
720 *Acta Biotheoretica*, 19:16–36, 1970.
- 721 C.W. Gardiner. *Handbook of stochastic methods: for physics, chemistry & the natural sciences*, volume 13 of *Series*  
722 *in synergetics*. Springer, 4th edition, 2004.
- 723 C. Geiß and R. Manthey. Comparison theorems for stochastic differential equations in finite and infinite dimensions.  
724 *Stochastic Processes and Applications*, 53:23–35, 1994.
- 725 M.E. Gilpin. A comment on quinn and hastings: extinction in subdivided habitats. *Conservation Biology*, 2:290–292,  
726 1988.
- 727 A. Gonzalez and R.D. Holt. The inflationary effects of environmental fluctuations in source-sink systems. *Proceedings*  
728 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99:14872–14877, 2002.
- 729 I. S. Gradshteyn and I. M. Ryzhik. *Table of integrals, series, and products*. Elsevier/Academic Press, Amsterdam,  
730 seventh edition, 2007. Translated from the Russian, Translation edited and with a preface by Alan Jeffrey and  
731 Daniel Zwillinger.
- 732 D.G.C. Harper. Competitive foraging in mallards: “ideal free” ducks. *Animal Behaviour*, 30:575–584, 1982.
- 733 S. Harrison and J. F. Quinn. Correlated environments and the persistence of metapopulations. *Oikos*, 56:293–298,  
734 1989.
- 735 A. Hastings. Can spatial variation alone lead to selection for dispersal? *Theoretical Population Biology*, 24:244–251,  
736 1983.
- 737 R.D. Holt. Patch dynamics in two-patch environments: Some anomalous consequences of an optimal habitat distribu-  
738 tion. *Theor. Pop. Biol.*, 28:181–208, 1985.
- 739 R.D. Holt. On the evolutionary stability of sink populations. *Evolutionary Ecology*, 11:723–731, 1997.
- 740 R.D. Holt and M.A. McPeck. Chaotic population dynamics favors the evolution of dispersal. *American Naturalist*,  
741 148(4):709–718, 1996.
- 742 V. Hutson, K. Mischaikow, and P. Poláčik. The evolution of dispersal rates in a heterogeneous time-periodic envi-  
743 ronment. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 43:501–533, 2001.
- 744 N. Ikeda and S. Watanabe. *Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes*, volume 24 of *North-Holland*  
745 *Mathematical Library*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1989.
- 746 V. A. A. Jansen and J. Yoshimura. Populations can persist in an environment consisting of sink habitats only.  
747 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*, 95:3696–3698, 1998.
- 748 J. Keagy, S. J. Schreiber, and D. A. Cristol. Replacing sources with sinks: When do populations go down the drain?  
749 *Restoration Ecology*, 13:529–535, 2005.
- 750 R. Z. Khas'minskii. Ergodic properties of recurrent diffusion processes and stabilization of the solution to the cauchy  
751 problem for parabolic equations. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 5(2):179–196, 1960. ISSN 0040585X.  
752 doi: DOI:10.1137/1105016. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/1105016>.
- 753 S. Kirkland, C.K. Li, and S. J. Schreiber. On the evolution of dispersal in patchy landscapes. *SIAM Journal on*  
754 *Applied Mathematics*, 66:1366–1382, 2006.
- 755 M. P. Kreuzer and N. J. Huntly. Habitat-specific demography: evidence for source-sink population structure in a  
756 mammal, the pika. *Oecologia*, 134:343–349, 2003.
- 757 R. Lande, S. Engen, and B.E. Sæther. Stochastic population dynamics in ecology and conservation: an introduction.  
758 2003.
- 759 S. A. Levin, D. Cohen, and A. Hastings. Dispersal strategies in patchy environments. *Theoretical Population Biology*,  
760 26:165 – 191, 1984.
- 761 R. Levins. Some demographic and genetic consequences of environmental heterogeneity for biological control. *Bulletin*  
762 *of the ESA*, 15:237–240, 1969.
- 763 W. M. Lonsdale. Rates of spread of an invading species- *mimosa pigra* in northern Australia. *Journal of Ecology*,  
764 81:513–521, 1993.
- 765 P. Lundberg, E. Ranta, J. Ripa, and V. Kaitala. Population variability in space and time. *Trends in Ecology and*  
766 *Evolution*, 15:460–464, 2000.
- 767 D. P. Matthews and A. Gonzalez. The inflationary effects of environmental fluctuations ensure the persistence of  
768 sink metapopulations. *Ecology*, 88:2848–2856, 2007.
- 769 R. M. May. *Stability and Complexity in Model Ecosystems*, 2nd edn. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1975.
- 770 M.A. McPeck and R.D. Holt. The evolution of dispersal in spatially and temporally varying environments. *American*  
771 *Naturalist*, 6:1010–1027, 1992.

- 772 J. A. J. Metz, T. J. de Jong, and P. G. L. Klinkhamer. What are the advantages of dispersing; a paper by Kuno  
773 extended. *Oecologia*, 57:166–169, 1983.
- 774 M. T. Murphy. Source-sink dynamics of a declining eastern kingbird population and the value of sink habitats.  
775 *Conserv. Biol.*, 15:737–748, 2001.
- 776 T. Oksanen, M.E. Power, and L. Oksanen. Ideal free habitat selection and consumer-resource dynamics. *American*  
777 *Naturalist*, 146:565–585, 1995.
- 778 O. L. Petchey, A. Gonzalez, and H. B. Wilson. Effects on population persistence: The interaction between en-  
779 vironmental noise colour, intraspecific competition and space. *Proceedings: Biological Sciences*, 264:1841–1847,  
780 1997.
- 781 T. Philippi and J. Seger. Hedging one’s evolutionary bets, revisited. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, 4:41–44, 1989.
- 782 H. R. Pulliam. Sources, sinks, and population regulation. *Amer. Nat.*, 132:652–661, 1988.
- 783 J.F. Quinn and A. Hastings. Extinction in subdivided habitats. *Conservation Biology*, 1:198–209, 1987.
- 784 V. Remeš. How can maladaptive habitat choice generate source-sink population dynamics? *Oikos*, 91:579–582, 2000.
- 785 M. Roy, R.D. Holt, and M. Barfield. Temporal autocorrelation can enhance the persistence and abundance of  
786 metapopulations comprised of coupled sinks. *American Naturalist*, 166:246–261, 2005.
- 787 D. Ruelle. Analyticity properties of the characteristic exponents of random matrix products. *Adv. in Math.*, 32:68–80,  
788 1979.
- 789 K. A. Schmidt. Site fidelity in temporally correlated environments enhances population persistence. *Ecology Letters*,  
790 7:176–184, 2004.
- 791 S. J. Schreiber. Interactive effects of temporal correlations, spatial heterogeneity, and dispersal on population per-  
792 sistence. *Proceedings of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences*, 277:1907–1914, 2010.
- 793 S. J. Schreiber and J. O. Lloyd-Smith. Invasion dynamics in spatially heterogenous environments. *American Natu-  
794 ralist*, 174:490–505, 2009.
- 795 S. J. Schreiber and E. Saltzman. Evolution of predator and prey movement into sink habitats. *American Naturalist*,  
796 174:68–81, 2009.
- 797 S. J. Schreiber and M. Vejdani. Handling time promotes the coevolution of aggregation in predator-prey systems.  
798 *Proceedings of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences*, 273:185–191, 2006.
- 799 S. J. Schreiber, L. R. Fox, and W. M. Getz. Coevolution of contrary choices in host-parasitoid systems. *American*  
800 *Naturalist*, pages 637–648, 2000.
- 801 J.P. Serre. *Linear representations of finite groups*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. Translated from the second  
802 French edition by Leonard L. Scott, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 42.
- 803 M. Slatkin. Hedging one’s evolutionary bets. *Nature*, 250:704–705, 1974.
- 804 Denis Talay. Approximation of upper Lyapunov exponents of bilinear stochastic differential systems. *SIAM Journal*  
805 *on Numerical Analysis*, 28(4):1141–1164, 1991. ISSN 00361429. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2157791>.
- 806 S. Tuljapurkar. *Population Dynamics in Variable Environments*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1990.
- 807 M. Turelli. Random environments and stochastic calculus. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 12:140–178, 1978.
- 808 M. van Baalen and M. W. Sabelis. Nonequilibrium population dynamics of “ideal and free” prey and predators. *The*  
809 *American Naturalist*, 154:69–88, 1999.
- 810 H. M. Wilbur and V. H. W. Rudolf. Life-history evolution in uncertain environments: Bet hedging in time. *The*  
811 *American Naturalist*, 168:398–411, 2006.
- 812 B.A. Wilcox and D.D. Murphy. Conservation strategy: the effects of fragmentation on extinction. *American Natu-  
813 ralist*, 125:879–887, 1985.

814 APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1

815 Define the matrix  $R$  by

$$R := \text{diag}(\mu) + D.$$

816 Equation (3) becomes

$$d\mathbf{X}_t = \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_t)\Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + R^T \mathbf{X}_t dt.$$



817 Recall that  $Y_t^j = X_t^j / (X_t^1 + \dots + X_t^n)$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^n)^T$ . Fix  $j$  and define  $f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) :=$   
 818  $x_j / (x_1 + \dots + x_n)$ , so that  $Y^j = f_j(\mathbf{X})$ . Using  $\partial_k$  to denote differentiation with respect to  $x_k$ , observe that

$$\partial_j f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \left( \sum_{\ell \neq j} x_\ell \right) / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^2, \quad \partial_k f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = -x_j / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^2, \quad k \neq j.$$

819 Moreover,

$$\partial_{jj} f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = -2 \left( \sum_{\ell \neq j} x_\ell \right) / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^3,$$

$$\partial_{jk} f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = -1 / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^2 + 2x_j / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^3, \quad k \neq j$$

821 and

$$\partial_{km} f_j(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 2x_j / \left( \sum_{\ell} x_\ell \right)^3, \quad k, m \neq j.$$

822 It follows from Itô's lemma [Gardiner, 2004] that for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^j &= \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k f_j(\mathbf{X}_t) X_t^k \Gamma_{*k}^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \sum_{k=1}^n \partial_k f_j(\mathbf{X}_t) \mathbf{X}_t^T R_{*k} dt \\ &\quad + (1/2) \sum_{k,m=1}^n \partial_{km} f_j(\mathbf{X}_t) X_t^k X_t^m (\Sigma)_{km} dt, \end{aligned}$$

823 where  $\Gamma_{*k}$  and  $R_{*k}$  denote the  $k^{\text{th}}$  columns of the matrices  $\Gamma$  and  $R$  respectively. Substituting in the derivatives of  
 824  $f_j$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t^j &= - \sum_{k \neq j} Y_t^j Y_t^k \Gamma_{*k}^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \sum_{k \neq j} Y_t^j Y_t^k \Gamma_{*j}^T d\mathbf{B}_t \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \neq j} Y_t^j Y_t^T R_{*k} dt + \sum_{k \neq j} Y_t^k Y_t^T R_{*j} dt \\ &\quad + (1/2) \sum_{k,m \neq j} 2Y_t^j Y_t^k Y_t^m \Sigma_{km} dt - (1/2) \sum_{k \neq j} 2Y_t^k (Y_t^j)^2 \Sigma_{jj} dt \\ &\quad + (1/2) \times 2 \sum_{k \neq j} \left( -Y_t^j Y_t^k + 2Y_t^k (Y_t^j)^2 \right) \Sigma_{kj} dt \\ &= - Y_t^j \sum_k Y_t^k \Gamma_{*k}^T d\mathbf{B}_t + Y_t^j \Gamma_{*j}^T d\mathbf{B}_t - Y_t^j \sum_k \mathbf{Y}_t^T R_{*k} dt + \mathbf{Y}_t^T R_{*j} dt \\ &\quad + Y_t^j \sum_{k,m} Y_t^k Y_t^m \Sigma_{km} dt - Y_t^j \sum_k Y_t^k \Sigma_{kj} dt. \end{aligned}$$

825 Since  $D\mathbf{1} = 0$ , we have  $\sum_k R_{*k} = R\mathbf{1} = \text{diag}(\mu)\mathbf{1} = \mu$ , and the above system of SDEs can be written in the following  
 826 compact way

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{Y}_t &= - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t \\ &\quad - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \mu dt + R^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt + \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_t dt - \text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_t dt \\ &= (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + D^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt \\ &\quad + (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) (\mu - \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

827 Now that the SDE (4) is established, we will prove the ergodicity of the Markov process  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  defined in (4).

828 **Existence.** Clearly  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a Feller process. Since for each  $t \geq 0$ , the random vector  $\mathbf{Y}_t$  takes values in the  
 829 compact state space  $\Delta$ , it trivially follows that the family of probability measures  $\{\mathbb{P}^y\{\mathbf{Y}_t \in \cdot\} : t > 0\}$  is uniformly  
 830 tight for any fixed  $y \in \Delta$ , where  $\mathbb{P}^y$  denotes the law of the process with  $\mathbf{Y}_0 = y$ . Hence, by the Krylov-Bogolyubov

831 theorem (see, for example, [Da Prato and Zabczyk, 1996, Corollary 3.1.2]), there exists at least one probability  
 832 measure  $\mu$  on  $\Delta$  which is an invariant measure for the process  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , that is,

$$\int_{\Delta} \mu(dy) \mathbb{P}^y \{ \mathbf{Y}_t \in \cdot \} = \mu \{ \cdot \}.$$

833 **Uniqueness.** The uniqueness of the invariant measure for  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is ensured by the Doob-Khasminskii theorem (see,  
 834 for example, [Da Prato and Zabczyk, 1996, Chapter 7] ), provided this process satisfies the following two properties:

- 835 •  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is *irreducible*, that is,  $\mathbb{P}^y \{ \mathbf{Y}_t \in V \} > 0$  for any  $t > 0$  and any open set  $V$  in the simplex  $\Delta$ .
- 836 •  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is *strong Feller*, that is,  $\Delta \ni y \mapsto \int_{\Delta} \mathbb{P}^y \{ \mathbf{Y}_t \in dz \} f(z)$  is continuous for any bounded measurable  
 837 function  $f : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

838 These conditions also ensure that  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  converges in law to the unique invariant measure. We next establish  
 839 irreducibility and the strong Feller property of  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  separately.

840 **(a) Irreducibility.** It clearly suffices to show that the process  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  as defined by (3) is irreducible, that is, that  
 841  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_t \in U \} > 0$  for each  $t > 0$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$  and open set  $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+^n$ .

842 We will first prove that  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ X_t^i > 0 \forall i \} = 1$  for all  $t > 0$  and all  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ , by induction on the size of the set  
 843  $G := \{1 \leq i \leq n : x_i = 0\}$ . First consider the case  $\#G = 0$ . By a suitable comparison theorem for SDEs [Geiß and  
 844 Manthey, 1994, Theorem 1.1],  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_t \geq \widehat{\mathbf{X}}_t \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \} = 1$ , where  $\widehat{X}$  is defined by

$$d\widehat{X}_t^i = \mu_i \widehat{X}_t^i dt + \widehat{X}_t^i dE_t^i + D_{ii} \widehat{X}_t^i dt, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

845 This SDE has the unique solution  $\widehat{X}_t^i = x^i \exp(E_t^i + (\mu + D_{ii} - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_{ii})t) > 0$ , so

$$(34) \quad \mathbb{P}^x \{ X_t^i > 0 \forall i \text{ for all } t > 0 \}, \quad x \in (0, \infty)^n.$$

846 Now suppose  $\#G = k < n$ . By the irreducibility of the infinitesimal generator matrix  $D$ , there exist  $i_0 \in G, j_0 \notin G$   
 847 such that  $D_{j_0, i_0} > 0$ . Consider the new SDE

$$d\widetilde{X}_t^i = \mu_i \widetilde{X}_t^i dt + \widetilde{X}_t^i dE_t^i + D_{ii} \widetilde{X}_t^i dt, \quad i \neq i_0,$$

848 and

$$d\widetilde{X}_t^{i_0} = \mu_{i_0} \widetilde{X}_t^{i_0} dt + \widetilde{X}_t^{i_0} dE_t^{i_0} + (D_{j_0 i_0} \widetilde{X}_t^{j_0} + D_{i_0 i_0} \widetilde{X}_t^{i_0}) dt.$$

849 By the same comparison theorem,  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_t \geq \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_t \text{ for all } t \geq 0 \} = 1$ . Clearly,  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \widetilde{X}_t^i > 0 \} = 1$  for all  $i \notin G$  and for all  
 850  $t > 0$ . Since  $\widetilde{X}_0^{i_0} = 0$  and  $\widetilde{X}_0^{j_0} > 0$ , at time  $t = 0$  the diffusion component of  $\widetilde{X}_t^{i_0}$  vanishes but its drift coefficient  
 851 is strictly positive. It follows that  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \widetilde{X}_t^{i_0} > 0 \} = 1$  for all  $t > 0$ . Hence, at any positive time  $t$ , almost surely  $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_t$   
 852 has at most  $k - 1$  zero coordinates, and, by the comparison theorem, so does  $\mathbf{X}_t$ . Using the Markov property and  
 853 the induction hypothesis, we deduce that  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ X_t^i > 0 \forall i \} = 1$  for all  $t > 0$ . This proves that each component of  $\mathbf{X}$  is  
 854 strictly positive with probability 1 for each  $t > 0$ .

855 Let  $\varphi : (0, \infty)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  be the homeomorphism given by  $\varphi(x) = (\log x_1, \dots, \log x_n)$ . Set  $\mathbf{H}_t = \varphi(\mathbf{X}_t)$ , with  
 856  $\mathbf{H}_t = (H_t^1, \dots, H_t^n)^T$ . By (34), this stochastic process is well defined provided  $\mathbf{X}_0 \in (0, \infty)^n$ . Note that  $(\mathbf{H}_t)_{t \geq 0}$   
 857 satisfies the following SDE,

$$dH_t^i = (\mu_i - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_{ii}) dt + dE_t^i + e^{-H_t^i} \sum_{j=1}^n D_{ji} e^{H_t^j} dt, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

858 By Girsanov's theorem (see [Ikeda and Watanabe, 1989, Section 4 of Chapter IV]), the law of  $(\Gamma^T)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_t$  (and hence  
 859 the law of  $\mathbf{H}_t$ ) is absolutely continuous with respect to the law of  $\mathbf{B}_t$  for any  $t > 0$ . Thus,  $\mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{H}_t \in V \} > 0$  for any  
 860 open set  $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ . Finally, for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_t \in U \} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^n} \mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in dy \} \mathbb{P}^y \{ \mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in U \} \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)^n} \mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in dy \} \mathbb{P}^y \{ \mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in U \} \\ &= \int_{(0, \infty)^n} \mathbb{P}^x \{ \mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in dy \} \mathbb{P}^{\varphi(y)} \{ \mathbf{H}_{t/2} \in \varphi(U) \} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

861 **(b) Strong Feller property.** Note that  $\mathbf{H}$  satisfies a SDE of the form  $d\mathbf{H}_t = \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + b(\mathbf{H}_t)dt$  for some smooth  
 862 function  $b : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ . For each  $K \geq 1$ , consider a new SDE

$$d\mathbf{H}_t^K = \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + b^K(\mathbf{H}_t)dt,$$

863 where  $b^K : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$  is a smooth bounded function with bounded derivative such that  $b^K(x) = b(x)$  on  $[-K, K]^n$ .  
 864 Since the matrix  $\Gamma$  is nonsingular, the associated Fisk-Stratonovich type generator of  $(\mathbf{H}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$  is trivially hypoelliptic,  
 865 which in turn implies that  $(\mathbf{H}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$  is strong Feller for every  $K \geq 1$  (see [Ikeda and Watanabe, 1989, Section 8 of  
 866 Chapter V]). If we define a sequence of stopping times  $\tau_K := \inf\{t : \|X_t\|_\infty \geq K\}$ , then  $\mathbf{H}_0^K = \mathbf{H}_0 = x \in [-K, K]^n$   
 867 implies  $\mathbf{H}_t^K = \mathbf{H}_t$  for  $t \in [0, \tau_K]$ . Let  $t > 0$  and  $f$  be a bounded measurable function. Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then for any  
 868  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t)] - \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t^K)]| \leq 2\|f\|_\infty \mathbb{P}^x\{\tau_K < t\}.$$

869 Hence, for any open neighborhood  $U(x)$  of  $x$ ,

$$|\mathbb{E}^y[f(\mathbf{H}_t)] - \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t)]| \leq |\mathbb{E}^y[f(\mathbf{H}_t^K)] - \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t^K)]| + 4\|f\|_\infty \sup_{z \in U(x)} \mathbb{P}^z\{\tau_K < t\} \quad \text{for all } y \in U(x).$$

870 Since almost surely  $\tau_K \uparrow \infty$ , we can choose  $K$  large enough such that  $\mathbb{P}^x\{\tau_K < t\} < \epsilon(8\|f\|_\infty)^{-1}$ . More-  
 871 over, by the Feller property of  $(\mathbf{H}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , there exists a neighborhood  $U^1(x)$  of  $x$  such that  $\sup_{z \in U^1(x)} \mathbb{P}^z\{\tau_K <$   
 872  $t\} < \epsilon(8\|f\|_\infty)^{-1}$ . From the strong Feller property of  $(\mathbf{H}_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$ , there exists a neighborhood  $U^2(x)$  of  $x$  such that  
 873  $|\mathbb{E}^y[f(\mathbf{H}_t^K)] - \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t^K)]| < \epsilon/2$  for all  $y \in U^2(x)$ . Thus,  $|\mathbb{E}^y[f(\mathbf{H}_t)] - \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t)]| < \epsilon$  for all  $y \in U^1(x) \cap U^2(x)$ .  
 874 Hence,  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}^x[f(\mathbf{H}_t)]$  is continuous. Now, for  $t > 0$  and a bounded measurable function  $g : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}^x[g(\mathbf{X}_t)] = \int_{(0, \infty)^n} \mathbb{P}^x\{\mathbf{X}_{t/2} \in dy\} \mathbb{E}^{\varphi(y)}[g(\varphi^{-1}(\mathbf{H}_{t/2}))], \quad x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n.$$

875 Therefore, the map  $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}^x[g(\mathbf{X}_t)]$  is continuous, and so  $(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a strong Feller process. It follows easily that  
 876  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is also a strong Feller process.  $\square$

#### 877 APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1

878 By rescaling time  $\tau := \delta t$  and setting  $\epsilon := 1/\delta$ , (4) becomes

$$(35) \quad d\mathbf{Y}_\tau^\epsilon = \sqrt{\epsilon} f(\mathbf{Y}_\tau^\epsilon) d\mathbf{B}_\tau + \epsilon g(\mathbf{Y}_\tau^\epsilon) dt + Q^T \mathbf{Y}_\tau^\epsilon dt$$

879 where  $f(y) := (\text{diag}(y) - yy^T) \Gamma^T$ ,  $g(y) := (\text{diag}(y) - yy^T) (\mu - \Sigma y)$ , and  $\mathbf{Y}_\tau^\epsilon := \mathbf{Y}_{\tau/\epsilon}$ .

880 For  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $\nu_\epsilon$  be the unique invariant probability measure for (35) guaranteed by Proposition 3.1. The  
 881 irreducibility of  $Q$  implies that  $\pi$  is the unique stable point for the ODE

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} y_\tau^x = Q^T y_\tau^x, \quad y_0^x = x \in \Delta,$$

882 and that  $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} y_\tau^x = \pi$  for any  $x \in \Delta$ . Write  $\nu_0$  for the Dirac measure at the point  $\pi \in \Delta$ . By the compactness of  
 883 Borel probability measures on  $\Delta$  in the topology of weak convergence, it suffices to show if  $\nu_{\epsilon_k}$  converges weakly to  
 884  $\nu$  for some sequence  $\epsilon_k \downarrow 0$ , then  $\nu = \nu_0$ , and hence it is sufficient to check that

$$\int_{\Delta} h(y_\tau^x) \nu(dx) = \int_{\Delta} h(x) \nu(dx)$$

885 for every  $\tau \geq 0$  and Lipschitz function  $h : \Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ .

886 Set  $\mathbf{Y}_\tau^k = \mathbf{Y}_\tau^{\epsilon_k}$  and  $\nu_k = \nu_{\epsilon_k}$  for ease of notation. Let  $L$  be the Lipschitz constant for the function  $h$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Delta} (h(y_\tau^x) - h(x)) \nu(dx) \right| &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Delta} (h(y_\tau^x) - h(x)) \nu_k(dx) \right| \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \underbrace{\left| \int_{\Delta} (\mathbb{E}^x [h(\mathbf{Y}_\tau^k)] - h(x)) \nu_k(dx) \right|}_{=0 \text{ by invariance of } \nu_k} \\ &\quad + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{\Delta} \mathbb{E}^x [h(y_\tau^x) - h(\mathbf{Y}_\tau^k)] \nu_k(dx) \right| \\ &\leq \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} L \int_{\Delta} \mathbb{E}^x [\|y_\tau^x - \mathbf{Y}_\tau^k\|] \nu_k(dx), \end{aligned}$$

887 where  $\|\cdot\|$  is the usual Euclidean norm on  $\mathbb{R}^n$ .

888 It remains to show that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}^x [\|y_\tau^x - \mathbf{Y}_\tau^k\|] = 0$ . Fix  $x \in \Delta$  and set  $Z_\tau^k := y_\tau^x - \mathbf{Y}_\tau^k$ . By Itô's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{Z}_\tau^k\|^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_0^\tau 2\langle \mathbf{Z}_s^k, Q^T \mathbf{Z}_s^k \rangle - 2\epsilon_k \langle \mathbf{Z}_s^k, g(\mathbf{Y}_s^k) \rangle + \epsilon_k \text{Tr}(f(\mathbf{Y}_s^k)f(\mathbf{Y}_s^k)^T) ds \right] \\ &\leq 2\|Q^T\| \int_0^\tau \mathbb{E}^x [\|\mathbf{Z}_s^k\|^2] ds + \epsilon_k C\tau, \end{aligned}$$

889 for some constant  $C$  that does not depend on  $x$  or  $\tau$ , where we write  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  for the usual Euclidean inner product on  
890  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\|Q^T\| = \sup_{\|z\|=1} |\langle z, Q^T z \rangle|$ . Gronwall's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{E}^x [\|Z_\tau^k\|^2] \leq \epsilon_k C e^{2\|Q^T\|\tau},$$

891 and so, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathbb{E}^x [\|Z_\tau^k\|] \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_k C} e^{\|Q^T\|\tau}.$$

892 It follows that  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{x \in \Delta} \mathbb{E}^x [\|y_\tau^x - \mathbf{Y}_\tau^k\|] = 0$ , and hence  $\nu = \nu_0$ , as required.

893 In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\delta) &= \int_\Delta \mu^T y \nu_{1/\delta}(dy) - \frac{1}{2} \int_\Delta y^T \Sigma y \nu_{1/\delta}(dy) \\ &\rightarrow \mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi \end{aligned}$$

894 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ . □

#### 895 APPENDIX C. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.1

896 Fix  $\delta \in [0, \infty)$ , and denote our underlying probability space by  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Define

$$\Phi_{s,t}^\delta : \mathbb{R}^n \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad 0 \leq s \leq t,$$

897 by  $\Phi_{s,t}^\delta(\mathbf{x}, \omega) = \mathbf{X}_t^\delta(\omega)$ , where  $(\mathbf{X}_u^\delta)_{u \geq s}$  is the unique solution of

$$\mathbf{X}_u^\delta = \mathbf{x} + \int_s^u \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_v^\delta) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_v + \int_s^u (R_\delta)^T \mathbf{X}_v^\delta dv$$

898 with  $R_\delta := \text{diag}(\mu) + \delta Q$ .

899 Note that for all  $0 \leq s \leq w \leq t$ ,

$$(36) \quad \Phi_{s,t}^\delta(\cdot, \omega) = \Phi_{w,t}^\delta(\cdot, \omega) \circ \Phi_{s,w}^\delta(\cdot, \omega).$$

900 It is easy to see that  $\Phi_{s,t}^\delta(\cdot, \omega)$  is a linear map from  $\mathbb{R}^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and thus can be represented by a matrix  $\mathbf{M}_{s,t}^\delta(\omega)$ .

901 From (36), it follows that

$$\mathbf{M}_{s,t}^\delta(\omega) = \mathbf{M}_{w,t}^\delta(\omega) \mathbf{M}_{s,w}^\delta(\omega) \quad \text{for all } 0 \leq s \leq w \leq t.$$

902 Since  $\mathbf{M}_{s,t}^\delta$  is constructed from  $(\mathbf{B}_u - \mathbf{B}_s)_{u \in [s,t]}$ , the matrices  $\{\mathbf{M}_{k,k+1}^\delta\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  are independent. Moreover, since the  
903 drift and the diffusion coefficients do not depend on time,  $\{\mathbf{M}_{k,k+1}^\delta\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  is a stationary sequence.

904 We note that the Lyapunov exponent  $\chi(\delta)$  of  $(\mathbf{X}_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$  is the same as

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [k^{-1} \log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,k}^\delta\|] = \inf_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E} [k^{-1} \log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,k}^\delta\|],$$

905 where we set

$$\|A\| := \sup \left\{ \sum_{i,j} A_{ij} x_j : \sum_k x_k = 1, x_k \geq 0 \forall k \right\}$$

906 for a matrix  $A$  with nonnegative entries.

907 Set  $\mathbb{R}_+^n := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \geq 0\}$ . If  $\delta > 0$ , then it follows from the irreducibility of  $Q$  that

$$(37) \quad \mathbf{M}_{s,t}^\delta(\mathbb{R}_+^n) \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_i > 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{0\}$$

908 and hence  $\chi(\delta)$  is analytic on  $(0, \infty)$  by [Ruelle, 1979, Theorem 3.1].

909 The condition (37) fails to hold when  $\delta = 0$  and so we must proceed differently. We first claim that for fixed  
910  $t > 0$  the map  $\delta \mapsto t^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\|]$  is upper semicontinuous on  $[0, \infty)$ . To see this, fix  $\delta \in [0, \infty)$ . Set  $\log^+ x =$

911  $\max(0, \log x)$  and  $\log^- x = \min(0, \log x)$ . It follows from the continuous dependence of the solution of a SDE on its  
 912 parameters [Gardiner, 2004, 4.3.2], that  $\mathbf{X}_t^{\delta'} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}_t^\delta$  almost surely as  $\delta' \rightarrow \delta$ , which implies that  $\|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{\delta'}\| \rightarrow \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\|$   
 913 almost surely as  $\delta' \rightarrow \delta$ . An application of Gronwall's lemma gives that  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{0 \leq \delta \leq c} \|\mathbf{X}_t^\delta\|] < \infty$  for each  $c > 0$ .  
 914 Hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \log^+ \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{\delta'}\| \right] \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \left[ \log^+ \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\| \right] \text{ as } \delta' \rightarrow \delta.$$

915 On the other hand, by Fatou's lemma,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ -\log^- \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\| \right] \leq \liminf_{\delta' \rightarrow \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ -\log^- \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{\delta'}\| \right].$$

916 Combining these two inequalities gives

$$\limsup_{\delta' \rightarrow \delta} \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^{\delta'}\| \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\| \right],$$

917 and the claim follows.

918 Since  $\chi(\delta) = \inf_{t>0} t^{-1} \mathbb{E} \log \|\mathbf{M}_{0,t}^\delta\|$  is the infimum of a family of upper semicontinuous functions, it is itself upper  
 919 semicontinuous, or equivalently,  $\limsup_{\delta' \rightarrow \delta} \chi(\delta') \leq \chi(\delta)$ . In particular,  $\limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \chi(\delta) \leq \chi(0)$ .

920 We now prove the opposite inequality that  $\liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \chi(\delta) \geq \chi(0)$ . Fix  $\delta > 0$ , and without loss of generality  
 921 suppose that  $\max_i -Q_{ii} = 1$ , so that if  $x_i \geq z_i \geq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then  $(Qx)_i \geq -z_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Consider the two  
 922 SDEs

$$d\mathbf{X}_t^\delta = \text{diag}(\mathbf{X}_t^\delta) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + (\text{diag}(\mu) + \delta Q^T) \mathbf{X}_t^\delta dt$$

923 and

$$d\mathbf{Z}_t^\delta = \text{diag}(\mathbf{Z}_t^\delta) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + \text{diag}(\mu - \delta) \mathbf{Z}_t^\delta dt.$$

924 If  $\mathbf{X}_0^\delta = \mathbf{Z}_0^\delta$ , then, by the comparison theorem,

$$\mathbf{X}_t^\delta \geq \mathbf{Z}_t^\delta \text{ for all } t \geq 0$$

925 almost surely.

926 Thus, the Lyapunov exponent of  $(\mathbf{X}_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$  dominates that of  $(\mathbf{Z}_t^\delta)_{t \geq 0}$ . Note that the coordinates of  $\mathbf{Z}^\delta$  are decoupled  
 927 and hence the Lyapunov exponent of this process is the maximum of the stochastic growth rates for the individual  
 928 coordinate processes. Therefore,

$$\chi(\delta) \geq \max_j \left( \mu_j - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sigma_{kj}^2 \right) - \delta.$$

929 In particular,

$$(38) \quad \liminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0^+} \chi(\delta) \geq \max_j \left( \mu_j - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \sigma_{kj}^2 \right) = \chi(0),$$

930 as required. □

#### APPENDIX D. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.2

932 Recall that

$$d\mathbf{Y}_t = (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) \Gamma^T d\mathbf{B}_t + D^T \mathbf{Y}_t dt + (\text{diag}(\mathbf{Y}_t) - \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{Y}_t^T) (\mu - \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_t) dt,$$

933 where  $D$  is of the form  $\delta Q$ , with  $Q$  an irreducible infinitesimal generator matrix and  $\delta > 0$ . Moreover,  $Q$  is assumed  
 934 to be reversible with respect to the unique probability vector  $\pi$  satisfying  $Q^T \pi = 0$ ; that is, that  $\pi_i Q_{ij} = \pi_j Q_{ji}$  for  
 935 all  $i, j$ .

936 Define an inner product on  $\mathbb{R}^n$  by  $\langle u, v \rangle_\pi := \sum_i \frac{1}{\pi_i} u_i v_i = u^T \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} v$ . It follows from reversibility that the  
 937 linear operator  $v \mapsto Q^T v$  is self-adjoint with respect to this inner product; that is, that  $\langle u, Q^T v \rangle_\pi = \langle Q^T u, v \rangle_\pi$  for  
 938 all  $u, v$ .

939 From the spectral theorem and the Perron-Frobenius theorem, the linear operator  $v \mapsto Q^T v$  has eigenvalues  
 940  $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-1} < \lambda_n = 0$  and corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$  with  $\xi_n = \pi$  such that

$$Q^T v = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_k \xi_k \langle v, \xi_k \rangle_\pi, \quad v \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

941 Note that

$$(39) \quad \mathbf{1}^T v = \langle v, \pi \rangle_\pi = 0 \implies \langle v, Q^T v \rangle_\pi \leq -\kappa \|v\|_\pi^2,$$

942 where  $\kappa := -\lambda_{n-1} > 0$  and  $\|\cdot\|_\pi$  is the norm associated with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\pi$ .

943 Note also that if  $\mathbf{1}^T v = 0$ , then

$$w := \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_k^{-1} \xi_k \langle v, \xi_k \rangle_\pi$$

944 is the unique vector with the properties

$$\langle w, \pi \rangle_\pi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q^T w = v.$$

945 In particular,

$$\mathbf{1}^T (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) (\mu - \Sigma\pi) = (\pi^T - \pi^T) (\mu - \Sigma\pi) = 0,$$

946 and so there is a unique vector we denote  $\nu$  such that

$$(40) \quad \mathbf{1}^T \nu = \langle \nu, \pi \rangle_\pi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q^T \nu = -(\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) (\mu - \Sigma\pi).$$

947 We emphasize that  $\nu$  does not depend on  $\delta$ .

948 Consider the stochastic process

$$\mathbf{U}_t := \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mathbf{Y}_{t/\delta} - \pi - \delta^{-1}\nu),$$

949 so that

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_{\delta t} + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu.$$

950 Observe that  $\pi + \delta^{-1}\nu$  is indeed a probability vector for  $\delta$  sufficiently large. Because we are only interested in the  
 951 equilibrium law of the process  $\mathbf{Y}$ , we assume that  $\mathbf{Y}_0 = \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu$  and hence  $\mathbf{U}_0 = 0$ . Note that  $0 = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{U}_t = \langle \mathbf{U}_t, \pi \rangle_\pi$   
 952 for all  $t \geq 0$ .

953 We have for the standard Brownian motion  $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t := \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{B}_{t/\delta}$  that

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{U}_t &= \left( \text{diag}(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu) - (\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu)(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu)^T \right) \Gamma^T d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t \\ &\quad + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \delta Q^T (\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu) dt \\ &\quad + \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \text{diag}(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu) - (\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu)(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu)^T \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( \mu - \Sigma(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t + \pi + \delta^{-1}\nu) \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

954 Using  $Q^T \pi = 0$  and (40), we get

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathbf{U}_t &= [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \Gamma^T d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t + Q^T \mathbf{U}_t dt \\ &\quad + \left[ \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-1} A_1(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} A_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-2} A_2(\mathbf{U}_t) \right] d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t \\ &\quad + \left[ \delta^{-1} b_1(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-\frac{3}{2}} b_{\frac{3}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-2} b_2(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-\frac{5}{2}} b_{\frac{5}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-3} b_3(\mathbf{U}_t) + \delta^{-\frac{7}{2}} b_{\frac{7}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) \right] dt, \end{aligned}$$

955 where

$$A_{\frac{1}{2}}(u) := [\text{diag}(u) - u\pi^T - \pi u^T] \Gamma^T$$

956

$$A_1(u) := [-uu^T + \text{diag}(\nu) - \pi\nu^T - \nu\pi^T] \Gamma^T$$

957

$$A_{\frac{3}{2}}(u) := [-u\nu^T - \nu u^T] \Gamma^T$$

958

$$A_2(u) := -\nu\nu^T \Gamma^T$$

959 and

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(u) &:= -\pi u^T \mu - u \pi^T \mu + \pi u^T \Sigma \pi + u \pi^T \Sigma \pi + \pi \pi^T \Sigma u \\ &\quad + \text{diag}(u) \mu - \text{diag}(\pi) \Sigma u - \text{diag}(u) \Sigma \pi \end{aligned}$$

960

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\frac{3}{2}}(u) &:= -uu^T \mu - \pi\nu^T \mu - \nu\pi^T \mu \\ &\quad + \pi u^T \Sigma u + u \pi^T \Sigma u + uu^T \Sigma \pi + \pi\nu^T \Sigma \pi + \nu\pi^T \Sigma \pi + \pi\pi^T \Sigma \nu \\ &\quad - \text{diag}(\pi) \Sigma \nu - \text{diag}(u) \Sigma u + \text{diag}(\nu) \mu - \text{diag}(\nu) \Sigma \pi \end{aligned}$$

961

$$\begin{aligned}
b_2(u) &:= -u\nu^T\mu - \nu u^T\mu \\
&\quad + uu^T\Sigma u + u\pi^T\Sigma\nu + u\nu^T\Sigma\pi + \pi u^T\Sigma\nu + \pi\nu^T\Sigma u + \nu u^T\Sigma\pi + \nu\pi^T\Sigma u \\
&\quad - \text{diag}(u)\Sigma\nu - \text{diag}(\nu)\Sigma u \\
962 \\
b_{\frac{3}{2}}(u) &:= -\nu\nu^T\mu + uu^T\Sigma\nu + u\nu^T\Sigma u + \nu u^T\Sigma u + \pi\nu^T\Sigma\nu + \nu\pi^T\Sigma\nu + \nu\nu^T\Sigma\pi \\
&\quad - \text{diag}(\nu)\Sigma\nu \\
963 \\
b_3(u) &:= uu^T\Sigma\nu + \nu u^T\Sigma\nu + \nu\nu^T\Sigma u \\
964 \\
b_{\frac{7}{2}}(u) &:= \nu\nu^T\Sigma\nu.
\end{aligned}$$

965 By Itô's lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
d\|\mathbf{U}_t\|_\pi^2 &= 2\mathbf{U}_t^T \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \Gamma^T d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t + 2\langle \mathbf{U}_t, Q^T \mathbf{U}_t \rangle_\pi dt \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{\ell=1}^4 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t^T \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} A_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{\ell=2}^7 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} \mathbf{U}_t^T \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} b_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) dt \\
&\quad + \text{Tr} \left( \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \Gamma^T \Gamma [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \right) dt \\
&\quad + \text{Tr} \left( \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^4 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} A_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) \times \sum_{\ell=1}^4 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} A_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t)^T \right) dt.
\end{aligned}$$

966 Note also that

$$(41) \quad |U_t^i| \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad 1 \leq i \leq n,$$

967 for an appropriate constant  $C$  because  $0 \leq Y_t^i \leq 1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Each function

$$u \mapsto u^T \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} b_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(u), \quad 2 \leq \ell \leq 7,$$

968 is a polynomial in  $u$  with total degree at most  $\ell$ , and each function

$$u \mapsto \text{Tr} \left( \text{diag}(\pi)^{-1} A_{\frac{\ell'}{2}}(u) A_{\frac{\ell''}{2}}(u)^T \right), \quad 1 \leq \ell', \ell'' \leq 4,$$

969 is a polynomial in  $u$  with total degree at most  $\ell' + \ell''$ .

970 It follows that

$$(42) \quad \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t\|_\pi^2] \leq -2\kappa \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t\|_\pi^2] + C'$$

971 for all  $t \geq 0$  for a suitable constant  $C'$  that does not depend on  $\delta$ . Hence,

$$(43) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t\|_\pi^2] \leq \frac{C'}{2\kappa}$$

972 (recall that  $\mathbf{U}_0 = 0$ ).

973 Let  $(\mathbf{V}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  be the solution of the stochastic differential equation

$$d\mathbf{V}_t = [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \Gamma^T d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t + Q^T \mathbf{V}_t dt$$

974 with  $\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{U}_0 = 0$ . Note that  $d(\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{V}_t) = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , and so  $\langle \mathbf{V}_t, \pi \rangle_\pi = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{V}_t = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . It is readily  
975 checked that

$$\mathbf{V}_t = \int_0^t \exp(Q^T(t-s)) [\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T] \Gamma^T d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_s.$$

976 So  $\mathbf{V}$  is a Gaussian process for which  $\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{V}_t] = 0$  and

$$(44) \quad \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{V}_t^T] = \int_0^t \exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) \exp(Qs) ds$$

977 for all  $t \geq 0$ . Consequently,

$$(45) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} [|V_t^i|^p] < \infty$$

978 for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $p \geq 0$ .

979 In the notation above,

$$d(\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}_t) = Q^T(\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}_t) dt + \left[ \sum_{\ell=1}^4 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} A_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) \right] d\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_t + \left[ \sum_{\ell=2}^7 \delta^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} b_{\frac{\ell}{2}}(\mathbf{U}_t) \right] dt.$$

980 Applying Itô's lemma and a combination of (41), (43) and (45), we can argue along the lines we followed to establish  
981 (42) to see that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}_t\|_{\pi}^2] \leq -2\kappa \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}_t\|_{\pi}^2] + \delta^{-1} C''$$

982 for all  $t \geq 0$  for a suitable constant  $C''$  that does not depend on  $\delta$ . Hence,

$$(46) \quad \sup_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{U}_t - \mathbf{V}_t\|_{\pi}^2] \leq \delta^{-1} \frac{C''}{2\kappa}.$$

983 Now let  $\mathbf{Y}_{\infty}$ ,  $\mathbf{U}_{\infty}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{\infty}$  be random vectors that are distributed according to the equilibrium laws of  $(\mathbf{Y}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ ,  
984  $(\mathbf{U}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  and  $(\mathbf{V}_t)_{t \geq 0}$ , respectively. Also let  $\hat{U}^i$  and  $\hat{V}^i$  be the  $i$ -th component of the vectors  $\mathbf{U}_{\infty}$  and  $\mathbf{V}_{\infty}$  respectively.

985 From (41), (43) and the linearity of the function  $b_1$ ,

$$0 = Q^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}] + \delta^{-1} b_1(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}]) + O(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}).$$

986 Noting that  $\langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}], \pi \rangle_{\pi} = 0$  because  $\langle \mathbf{U}_t, \pi \rangle_{\pi} = 0$  for all  $t \geq 0$ , we have from (39) that

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}]\|_{\pi}^2 &\leq -\langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}], Q^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}] \rangle_{\pi} \\ &= \delta^{-1} \langle \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}], b_1(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}]) \rangle_{\pi} + O(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \\ &\leq C''' \delta^{-1} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}]\|_{\pi}^2 + O(\delta^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

987 for a suitable constant  $C'''$ , and hence,

$$(47) \quad \mathbb{E}[\hat{U}^i] = O(\delta^{-\frac{3}{4}}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

988 From (43), (45) and (46),

$$(48) \quad \left| \mathbb{E} [\hat{U}^i \hat{U}^j] - \mathbb{E} [\hat{V}^i \hat{V}^j] \right| = O(\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}}), \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

989 Recall that  $\chi(\delta)$  is the Lyapunov exponent, and that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\delta) &= \mu^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\infty}] - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Y}_{\infty}^T \Sigma \mathbf{Y}_{\infty}] \\ &= \mu^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_{\infty} + \pi + \delta^{-1} \nu \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_{\infty} + \pi + \delta^{-1} \nu \right)^T \Sigma \left( \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{U}_{\infty} + \pi + \delta^{-1} \nu \right) \right] \\ &= \delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mu^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}] + \mu^T (\pi + \delta^{-1} \nu) \\ &\quad - \delta^{-1} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}^T \Sigma \mathbf{U}_{\infty}] - 2\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{U}_{\infty}^T \Sigma (\pi + \delta^{-1} \nu)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\pi + \delta^{-1} \nu)^T \Sigma (\pi + \delta^{-1} \nu). \end{aligned}$$

990 Substituting in (47) and (48), and noting from (44) that the random vector  $\mathbf{V}_{\infty}$  is Gaussian with mean vector 0 and  
991 covariance matrix

$$\int_0^{\infty} \exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \exp(Qs) ds,$$



992 we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi(\delta) &= \left( \mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi \right) \\
&\quad + \delta^{-1} \left[ (\mu - \Sigma \pi)^T \nu - \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{V}_\infty \mathbf{V}_\infty^T] \Sigma) \right] \\
&\quad + O(\delta^{-\frac{5}{4}}) \\
&= \left( \mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi \right) \\
&\quad + \delta^{-1} \left[ (\mu - \Sigma \pi)^T \nu \right. \\
&\quad \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \text{Tr}(\exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) \exp(Q s) \Sigma) ds \right] \\
&\quad + O(\delta^{-\frac{5}{4}})
\end{aligned}$$

993 as  $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ . □

#### 994 APPENDIX E. PROOF OF COROLLARY 5.3

995 We now assume that the matrices  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$  are both real symmetric ( $\Sigma$  is, of course, always symmetric) and that  
996 they commute. Hence, as noted in the statement of the corollary, if  $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_{n-1} < \lambda_n = 0$  are the eigenvalues of  
997  $Q$  with corresponding orthonormal eigenvectors  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ , where  $\xi_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \mathbf{1}$ , then

$$Q = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k \xi_k \xi_k^T$$

998 and it is possible to write the eigenvalues  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$  of  $\Sigma$  in some order so that

$$\Sigma = \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k \xi_k \xi_k^T.$$

999 By the assumption that  $Q$  is symmetric,  $\pi = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \xi_n$ . Therefore,

$$\mu^T \pi - \frac{1}{2} \pi^T \Sigma \pi = \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2n} \theta_n$$

1000 where  $\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mu_i$ .

1001 To find the unique vector  $\nu$  that solves

$$\mathbf{1}^T \nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q^T \nu = -(\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi \pi^T) (\mu - \Sigma \pi),$$

1002 write  $\nu = \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \xi_k$ . The condition  $\mathbf{1}^T \nu = 0$  dictates that  $a_n = 0$ . The second condition becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \lambda_k \xi_k &= -\frac{1}{n} (I - \xi_n \xi_n^T) \left( \mu - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \theta_n \xi_n \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \xi_k \xi_k^T \right) \left( \mu - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \theta_n \xi_n \right) \\
&= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\xi_k^T \mu) \xi_k,
\end{aligned}$$

1003 so that  $a_k = -(\xi_k^T \mu)/(n\lambda_k)$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mu - \Sigma\pi)^T \nu &= - \left( \mu - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \theta_n \xi_n \right)^T \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\xi_k^T \mu}{n\lambda_k} \xi_k \right) \\ &= - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(\xi_k^T \mu)^2}{n\lambda_k}. \end{aligned}$$

1004 Lastly, the matrices inside the trace in the integral

$$\int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( \exp(Q^T s) (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) \Sigma (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T) \exp(Qs) \Sigma \right) ds$$

1005 commute and so the integral is

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( (\text{diag}(\pi) - \pi\pi^T)^2 \Sigma^2 \exp(2Qs) \right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( (I - \xi_n \xi_n^T) \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \theta_k^2 \xi_k \xi_k^T \right) \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \exp(2s\lambda_k) \xi_k \xi_k^T \right) \right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \int_0^\infty \text{Tr} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \theta_k^2 \exp(2s\lambda_k) \xi_k \xi_k^T \right) ds \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \int_0^\infty \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \theta_k^2 \exp(2s\lambda_k) \right) ds \\ &= -\frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\theta_k^2}{2\lambda_k}. \end{aligned}$$

1006 Therefore, our asymptotic approximation of  $\chi(\delta)$  is

$$\left( \bar{\mu} - \frac{1}{2n} \theta_n \right) - \frac{1}{\delta} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{n\lambda_k} \left( (\xi_k^T \mu)^2 - \frac{1}{4n} \theta_k^2 \right) \right] + O(\delta^{-5/4})$$

1007 as  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . □

1008

#### APPENDIX F. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.4

1009 To show that Theorem 5.4 follows from Corollary 5.3, we show that the matrix entries of each irreducible repre-  
1010 sentation belong to a common eigenspace of  $Q$  and  $\Sigma$ . Suppose that  $c$  is a class function and the matrix  $C$  is given  
1011 by  $C_{g,h} = c(gh^{-1})$ . Recall from (27) that

$$c(g) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\kappa \in \hat{G}} \tilde{c}(\kappa) \kappa(g)^*.$$

1012 Therefore,

$$C_{g,h} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\kappa \in \hat{G}} \tilde{c}(\kappa) \kappa(gh^{-1})^*.$$

1013 If  $\kappa$  is associated with the irreducible representation  $\rho \in \hat{G}$ , then

$$\kappa(gh^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(\rho(gh^{-1})) = \text{Tr}(\rho(g)\rho(h)^\dagger) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d_\rho} \rho_{ij}(g)\rho_{ij}(h)^* =: (\Xi(\kappa))_{gh},$$

1014 where  $\dagger$  denotes the Hermitian conjugate of a matrix. Set  $\Pi_\kappa := (d_\kappa/\#G)\Xi(\kappa)$ . The  $\#G \times \#G$  matrix  $\Pi_\kappa$  is  
1015 Hermitian, and it follows from (24) that  $\Pi_\kappa^2 = \Pi_\kappa$ , so that  $\Pi_\kappa$  is the projection onto a  $d_\kappa^2$ -dimensional subspace.  
1016 Again by (24), the matrices  $\Pi_{\kappa'}$  and  $\Pi_{\kappa''}$  are orthogonal for distinct  $\kappa', \kappa''$ . Thus,

$$C = \sum_{\kappa \in \hat{G}} \frac{\tilde{c}(\kappa)}{d_\kappa} \Pi_\kappa.$$

1017 This expression is nothing other than the spectral decomposition of the matrix  $C$ . It shows that  $\tilde{c}(\kappa)/d_\kappa$  is an  
 1018 eigenvalue of  $C$  with multiplicity  $d_\kappa^2$ . In summary, for each  $\kappa \in \tilde{G}$  there are eigenvalues  $\tilde{q}(\kappa)/d_\kappa$  of  $Q$  and  $\tilde{s}(\kappa)/d_\kappa$  of  
 1019  $\Sigma$ , each with multiplicity  $d_\kappa^2$ .

1020 Therefore, in the notation of Corollary 5.3,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\theta_k^2}{\lambda_k} = \sum_{\kappa \neq \kappa_{\text{tr}}} d_\kappa^2 \left( \frac{\tilde{s}(\kappa)}{d_\kappa} \right)^2 \frac{d_\kappa}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} = \sum_{\kappa \neq \kappa_{\text{tr}}} d_\kappa \frac{\tilde{s}(\kappa)^2}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)}.$$

1021 Similarly, we can split the sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{\lambda_k} (\xi_k^T \mu)^2$$

1022 up into contributions from each non-trivial character  $\kappa$  that are of the form

$$\frac{d_\kappa}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} \sum_k (\xi_k^T \mu)^2,$$

where the sum is over the indices that correspond to eigenvectors in the range of the projection  $\Pi_\kappa$ . By pairwise orthogonality of the matrices  $\Pi_\kappa$  and the fact the  $\mu$  is real, this last quantity is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d_\kappa}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} \|\Pi_\kappa \mu\|^2 &= \frac{d_\kappa}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} \left( \frac{d_\kappa}{\#G} \right) \sum_{g,h \in G} \mu(g) \kappa(gh^{-1}) \mu(h) \\ &= \frac{d_\kappa}{\tilde{q}(\kappa)} \|\mu\|_\kappa^2, \end{aligned}$$

1023 by definition of  $\|\mu\|_\kappa$ . □

#### APPENDIX G. PROOF OF THEOREM 5.5

1024 We first recall some notation. For  $0 \leq r, \ell \leq k+1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_r &= G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_{r-1} \otimes \{\mathbf{id}_r\} \otimes \cdots \otimes \{\mathbf{id}_k\}, \\ \bar{Z}_\ell &= \{\mathbf{id}_1\} \otimes \cdots \otimes \{\mathbf{id}_\ell\} \otimes G_{\ell+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes G_k \end{aligned}$$

1027 and

$$\ell(g) := \min\{j : g_j \neq \mathbf{id}_j\}.$$

1028 The displacement associated with  $g \in G$  moves between two patches that are in the same metapatch at scale  $\ell(g)$   
 1029 but different metapatches at scales  $\ell(g)+1, \ell(g)+2, \dots$ . Recall also that  $\#G_r = n_r$ ,  $N_r = \#Z_r = \prod_{j=1}^{r-1} n_j$  and  
 1030  $\bar{N}_\ell = \#\bar{Z}_\ell = \prod_{j=\ell+1}^k n_j$ .

1031 Writing  $\mathbf{1}_j$  for the trivial character on  $G_j$ , put

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Z}_r &:= \tilde{G}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{G}_{r-1} \otimes \{\mathbf{1}_r\} \otimes \cdots \otimes \{\mathbf{1}_k\} \\ &= \{\kappa \in \tilde{G} : \kappa(g) = 1 \ \forall g \in \bar{Z}_{r-1}\} \end{aligned}$$

1032 and

$$r(\kappa) := \max\{j : \kappa \notin \tilde{Z}_j\}.$$

1033 The following orthogonality property of characters:

$$\sum_{g \in G} \kappa'(g) \kappa''(g)^* = \begin{cases} \#G & \text{if } \kappa' = \kappa'' \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1034 leads to the relation

$$\sum_{g \in \bar{Z}_r} \kappa(g) = \begin{cases} \bar{N}_r, & \text{if } \kappa \in \tilde{Z}_{r+1}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

1035 We denote this quantity, as a function of  $\kappa$ , by  $\bar{N}_r \delta_{\bar{Z}_{r+1}}(\kappa)$ .

1036 Define the function  $f_\ell : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by setting  $f_\ell(g) = 1$  if  $\ell(g) = \ell$  and  $f_\ell(g) = 0$  otherwise. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{f}_\ell(\kappa) &= \sum_{g:\ell(g)=\ell} \kappa(g) \\ &= \sum_{g \in \tilde{Z}_{\ell-1}} \kappa(g) - \sum_{g \in \tilde{Z}_\ell} \kappa(g) \\ &= \bar{N}_{\ell-1} \delta_{\tilde{Z}_\ell}(\kappa) - \bar{N}_\ell \delta_{\tilde{Z}_{\ell+1}}(\kappa).\end{aligned}$$

1037 Our assumption that  $s(g) = s_{\ell(g)}$  implies that  $s(g) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} s_\ell f_\ell(g)$ . Since  $\kappa \in \tilde{Z}_\ell$  if and only if  $r(\kappa) + 1 \leq \ell$ , it  
1038 follows by linearity that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{s}(\kappa) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{k+1} s_\ell \left( \bar{N}_{\ell-1} \delta_{\tilde{Z}_\ell}(\kappa) - \bar{N}_\ell \delta_{\tilde{Z}_{\ell+1}}(\kappa) \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)+1}^{k+1} s_\ell \bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)}^{k+1} s_\ell \bar{N}_\ell \\ &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)}^k s_{\ell+1} \bar{N}_\ell - \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)}^k s_\ell \bar{N}_\ell \\ &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)}^k (s_{\ell+1} - s_\ell) \bar{N}_\ell,\end{aligned}$$

1039 where we used the convention  $\bar{N}_{k+1} = 0$ .

1040 Turning to  $q$ , we have  $q(g) = q_{\ell(g)}$  for  $g \neq \mathbf{id}_G$  and  $q(\mathbf{id}_G) = q_{k+1} = -\sum_{\ell=1}^k q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell)$ . By the same argument  
1041 as above,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{q}(\kappa) &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)+1}^{k+1} q_\ell \bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)}^{k+1} q_\ell \bar{N}_\ell \\ &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)+1}^{k+1} q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - q_{r(\kappa)} \bar{N}_{r(\kappa)} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=r(\kappa)+1}^k q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - \sum_{\ell=1}^k q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - q_{r(\kappa)} \bar{N}_{r(\kappa)} \\ &= -\sum_{\ell=1}^{r(\kappa)} q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - q_{r(\kappa)} \bar{N}_{r(\kappa)} \\ &= -\sum_{\ell=1}^{r(\kappa)-1} q_\ell (\bar{N}_{\ell-1} - \bar{N}_\ell) - q_{r(\kappa)} \bar{N}_{r(\kappa)-1}.\end{aligned}$$

1042 Lastly, for an arbitrary function  $\mu$  we need to evaluate

$$\frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\kappa:r(\kappa)=r} \|\mu\|_\kappa^2.$$

1043 We do that by using the following lemma that follows immediately from orthogonality of characters.

1044 **Lemma G.1.** *Let  $H$  and  $K$  be two finite Abelian groups. For  $f : H \otimes K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ ,*

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \tilde{H}} \left| \sum_{(h,k) \in H \otimes K} f(h,k) \kappa(h) \right|^2 = \#H \sum_{h \in H} \left| \sum_{k \in K} f(h,k) \right|^2.$$

1045 Using lemma G.1 applied to the decomposition of  $G$  as  $Z_r \otimes \bar{Z}_{r-1}$ , we get

$$\sum_{\kappa \in \bar{Z}_r} \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 = \frac{N_r}{\#G} \sum_{g \in Z_r} \left( \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_{r-1}} \mu(gz) \right)^2.$$

1046 Further decomposing  $Z_{r+1}$  as  $Z_r \otimes G_r$  and  $\bar{Z}_{r-1}$  as  $\bar{Z}_r \otimes G_r$ , and using  $N_{r+1} = n_r N_r$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\kappa: r(\kappa)=r} \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 &= \sum_{\kappa \in \bar{Z}_{r+1}} \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 - \sum_{\kappa \in \bar{Z}_r} \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 \\ &= \frac{N_{r+1}}{\#G} \sum_{g \in Z_{r+1}} \left( \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(gz) \right)^2 - \frac{N_r}{\#G} \sum_{g \in Z_r} \left( \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_{r-1}} \mu(gz) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{n_r N_{r+1}}{\#G} \sum_{g \in Z_r} \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \left( \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

1047 To turn the remaining sums into averages, we need to pull out a factor of  $N_r \bar{N}_r^2$ , leaving us with  $n_r N_{r+1} N_r \bar{N}_r^2 =$   
 1048  $\prod_{\ell=1}^k n_{\ell}^2 = \#G^2$ . Therefore, recalling that

$$v_{\mu}(r) = \frac{1}{N_r} \sum_{g \in Z_r} \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \left( \frac{1}{\bar{N}_r} \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 - \left( \frac{1}{n_r} \sum_{h \in G_r} \frac{1}{\bar{N}_r} \sum_{z \in \bar{Z}_r} \mu(ghz) \right)^2 \right),$$

1049 we have

$$\sum_{\kappa: r(\kappa)=r} \|\mu\|_{\kappa}^2 = \#G \times v_{\mu}(r).$$

1050 The theorem follows once we note that

$$\#\{\kappa : r(\kappa) = r\} = \#(\tilde{Z}_{r+1} \setminus \tilde{Z}_r) = N_{r+1} - N_r.$$

1051

□

1052 DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS #3860, 367 EVANS HALL, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, CA 94720-3860, USA  
 1053 *E-mail address:* [evans@stat.berkeley.edu](mailto:evans@stat.berkeley.edu)

1054 DEPARTMENT OF EVOLUTION AND ECOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, CA 956116, USA  
 1055 *E-mail address:* [plralph@ucdavis.edu](mailto:plralph@ucdavis.edu)

1056 DEPARTMENT OF EVOLUTION AND ECOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, CA 956116, USA  
 1057 *E-mail address:* [sschreiber@ucdavis.edu](mailto:sschreiber@ucdavis.edu)

1058 STATISTICAL LABORATORY, CENTRE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE CB3 0WB, UNITED KINGDOM  
 1059 *E-mail address:* [A.Sen@statslab.cam.ac.uk](mailto:A.Sen@statslab.cam.ac.uk)