

# Non local Lotka-Volterra cross-diffusion systems in heterogeneous media

Joaquin Fontbona\* and Sylvie Méléard†

September 28, 2018

## Abstract

We introduce a stochastic individual model for the spatial behavior of an animal population of dispersive and competitive species, considering various kinds of biological effects, such as heterogeneity of environmental conditions, mutual attractive or repulsive interactions between individuals or competition between them for resources. As a consequence of the study of the large population limit, global existence of a nonnegative weak solution to a multidimensional parabolic strongly coupled model of competing species is proved. The main new feature of the corresponding integro-differential equation is the nonlocal nonlinearity appearing in the diffusion terms, which may depend on the spatial densities of all population types. Moreover, the diffusion matrix is generally not strictly positive definite and the cross-diffusion effect allows for linearly growing influences of the subpopulations' sizes. We prove uniqueness of the finite measure-valued solution and give conditions under which the solution takes values in a functional space. We then make the competition kernels converge to a Dirac measure and obtain the existence of a solution to a locally competitive version of the previous equation. The large population limit is obtained by means of weak convergence tools for measure valued processes. The techniques employed in the study of the limiting equation are novel, and are essentially based on the underlying stochastic flow related to the dispersive part of the dynamics, together with the use of suitable dual distances in the space of finite measures.

This is an extended version of the paper “Non local Lotka-Volterra system with cross-diffusion in a heterogeneous medium” appeared in *J. Math. Biol* (2015) 70:829-854.

## 1 Introduction

The spatial structure of a biological community and in particular the spatial distribution formed by dispersive motions of populations with intra- and inter-specific interactions is a fundamental subject in mathematical ecology (see e.g. Keller & Segel 1970, Nisbet & Gurney 1975*a*, Nisbet & Gurney 1975*b*, Mimura & Murray 1978, Mimura & Yamaguti 1982, Shigesada, Kawasaki & Teramoto 1979). In the present work, the spatial behavior of a population of competitive species is studied. The dispersive motion of an individual in its environment is modeled as the result of various kinds of biological effects, such as

---

\*DIM-CMM, UMI(2807) UCHILE-CNRS, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 170-3, Correo 3, Santiago-Chile, E-mail: fontbona@dim.uchile.cl.

†CMAP, Ecole Polytechnique, CNRS UMR 7641, route de Saclay, 91128 Palaiseau Cedex-France; E-mail: sylvie.meleard@polytechnique.edu.

heterogeneity of environmental conditions, mutual attractive or repulsive interactions with other individuals and competition for resources. These different effects will be modeled by local interaction kernels depending on the type of the individual and acting either on its spatial parameters or on its ecological parameters.

The population is composed of  $M$  sub-populations (species) characterized by different phenotypes. Each species has its own spatial and ecological dynamics depending on the spatial and genetic characteristics of the whole population. We assume that the motion of each individual (of a given type) is driven by a diffusion process on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  whose coefficients depend on the spatial repartition of the different species around. Moreover, the individuals may reproduce and die, either from their natural death or because of the competition pressure for sharing resources. Each species has its own growth rate. The competition pressure of an individual of type  $j$  on an individual of type  $i$  depends both on the location of these individuals and on their type. It is called intra-specific competition if  $i = j$ , and inter-specific in case  $i \neq j$ . It is not assumed to be symmetric in  $(i, j)$ .

We describe the stochastic dynamics of such a population by an individual-based model. Each individual is characterized by its type and its spatial location. Because of the births and deaths of individuals, the population doesn't live in a vector space of positions. We model its dynamics as a Markov process with values in the  $M$ -dimensional vector space of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -point measures.

We introduce the charge capacity parameter  $K$  describing the order of the population size so that, to be consistent, the individuals are weighted by  $\frac{1}{K}$ . The existence of the population process is obtained by standard arguments. Then, large population asymptotics is studied, using classic tools for the convergence of measure valued processes.

We show that when  $K$  tends to infinity, the population process converges to a weak solution of the following nonlocal (in trait and space) nonlinear parabolic cross-diffusion-reaction system: for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^i &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d \partial_{x_k x_l}^2 (a_{k,l}^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * u^1, \dots, G^{iM} * u^M) u^i) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_{x_k} (b_k^i(\cdot, H^{i1} * u^1, \dots, H^{iM} * u^M) u^i) + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * u^j \right) u^i. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here,  $u^i(t, \cdot)$  denotes general a finite measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for any  $t \geq 0$ , and  $(G^{ij}, H^{ij}, C^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  are  $3M^2$  nonnegative and smooth functions defined from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}_+$  that model the spatial interactions between individuals of type  $i$  and  $j$ .

By means of this convergence result, we get a theorem of existence of a weak solution to Equation (1). Next we prove the uniqueness of such a solution and we give two sets of assumptions under which the measure solution has a density with respect to the Lebesgue measure, thus establishing the existence of a function solution to (1). The tools we use to establish these and the forthcoming results are again probabilistic ones.

In the model leading to Equation (1), the competition between two individuals is described as a function of the distance between them. This biological assumption is clear: the closer the animals are, the stronger is the fight to share resources. An extreme situation is the local case, when individuals only compete if they stay at the same place. Mathematically speaking, this means that for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  and for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , the competition kernel has

the form

$$C^{ij}(x) = c_{ij}C_\varepsilon(x),$$

where  $c_{ij}$  are positive constant numbers and the measures  $C_\varepsilon(x - y)dy$  weakly converge to the Dirac measure at  $x$  when the range of interaction  $\varepsilon$  tends to 0 (for instance,  $C_\varepsilon$  may be the centered Gaussian density with variance  $\varepsilon$ ). In this setting, we study the convergence of the solution  $u^\varepsilon$  of (1) when  $\varepsilon$  tends to zero, showing its convergence to the unique solution  $u$  of the spatially nonlocal nonlinear cross-diffusion equation: for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^i &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l=1}^d \partial_{x_k x_l}^2 (a_{k,l}^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * u^1, \dots, G^{iM} * u^M) u^i) \\ &\quad - \sum_{k=1}^d \partial_{x_k} (b_k^i(\cdot, H^{i1} * u^1, \dots, H^{iM} * u^M) u^i) + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M c_{ij} u^j \right) u^i. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Ecological models featuring space displacements have been studied by Champagnat & Méléard (2007), Arnold, Desvillettes & Prévost (2012) and Bouin, Calvez, Meunier, Mirrahimi, Perthame, Raoul & Voituriez (2012), but the diffusion coefficients therein only depend on the type of each individual, and not on the spatial distribution of the other animals alive. To our knowledge, the nonlocal nonlinear Equations (1) and (2) have never been studied in such generality, despite the fact that they naturally arise from the biological motivation. A recent paper on conservative relaxed cross-diffusion Lepoutre, Pierre & Rolland (2012) addresses well posedness issues in a model with nonlocal interaction in the diffusion terms. Nonlocal reaction terms have otherwise been considered by Coville & Dupaigne (2005), Berestycki, Nadin, Perthame & Ryzhik (2009), Genieys, Volpert & Auger (2006) and in references therein. Our model incorporates those two features simultaneously. The dependance of the diffusion coefficient on the individual density is indeed the main new difficulty we deal with. It is the reason why the introduction of different techniques from those developed in the aforementioned works will be needed.

Cross-diffusion models with local spatial interaction and local competition have excited the scientific community, see for example the works of Mimura & Murray (1978), Mimura & Kawasaki (1980), Lou, Martínez & Ni (2000), Chen & Jüngel (2004, 2006) and more recently in a work by Desvillettes, Lepoutre & Moussa (2014) by developing suitable entropy methods. The prototypical equation in this situation has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t u^1 &= d_1 \Delta ((a_1 + b_{12} u^2) u^1) + (r_1 - c_{11} u^1 - c_{12} u^2) u^1, \\ \partial_t u^2 &= d_2 \Delta ((a_2 + b_{21} u^1) u^1) + (r_2 - c_{21} u^1 - c_{22} u^2) u^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with  $a_i \geq 0$ ,  $b_{ij} > 0$ ,  $i, j = 1, 2$  and boundary conditions on a given bounded smooth domain of  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . Global existence results were obtained by Chen & Jüngel (2004, 2006) for such equation with  $a_i > 0$ . We refer the works (Desvillettes, Lepoutre, Moussa & Trescases 2015) and (Jüngel 2015) for more recent (and generalized) developments based on entropy approaches. We notice that those techniques do not apply, in principle, to nonlocal interactions at the level of the diffusion and drift coefficients as we will consider here. In turn, using our techniques, we cannot yet recover well posedned results for equations like (3). Establishing the convergence of the system (2) to systems of the type of (3) when the kernels  $G$  and  $H$  tend to Dirac measures, is indeed to be a highly difficult open challenge.

For later use, let us introduce some notation:

- We denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the space of finite measures in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  endowed with the weak topology.
- For  $k \geq 1$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{C}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of  $k$  times differentiable functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  which have bounded derivatives up to the  $k$ -th order and a globally  $\alpha$ -Holder derivative of order  $k$ . Notice that functions in  $\mathcal{C}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  are not required to be bounded.
- The subspace of bounded functions in  $\mathcal{C}^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{C}_b^{k,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .
- The notation  $\mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_b^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$  is defined analogously, without the Holder continuity requirement.
- The super-indexes in the above notations will be omitted when  $k = \alpha = 0$ .
- $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  denotes the space of compactly supported continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .
- $\mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  will denote the space of functions on  $[0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  which are continuously differentiable up to the order 2 in the space variable and continuously differentiable in the time variables (with lateral limits when needed).

## 2 The Individual-based Model

### 2.1 Assumptions

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{S}_+(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of symmetric nonnegative diffusion matrices and define for  $i = 1, \dots, M$  the measurable functions

$$\begin{aligned} a^i &: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^M \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_+(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ b^i &: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}_+^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, \\ r_i &: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by  $\sigma^i$  the  $d \times d$ -matrix such that  $a^i = \sigma^i (\sigma^i)^*$ . We will assume throughout this work the following hypotheses:

**(H):**

- i) There is a positive constant  $L$  such that for any  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and any  $v_j, v'_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sigma^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M) - \sigma^i(x', v'_1, \dots, v'_M)| + |b^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M) - b^i(x', v'_1, \dots, v'_M)| \\ &\leq L \left( |x - x'| + \sum_{j=1}^M |v_j - v'_j| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there exists  $C_\sigma > 0$  such that for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $v = (v_1, \dots, v_M) \in \mathbb{R}_+^M$ ,

$$|\sigma^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)| \leq C_\sigma(1 + |v|).$$

- ii) The functions  $(G^{ij}, H^{ij}, C^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  defined from  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}_+$  are assumed to be non-negative, bounded and Lipschitz continuous.
- iii) The nonnegative functions  $r_i$  are assumed to be continuous and bounded by  $\bar{r} > 0$ .

## 2.2 The diffusive $M$ -type stochastic population dynamics

Let us now describe the dynamics of the population we are interested in. The population dynamics will be modeled by a point measure-valued Markov processes, which takes into account the births and deaths of all individuals, as well as their motion during their life.

Let us fix the charge capacity  $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and define

$$\mathcal{M}_K = \left\{ \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^N \delta_{x^n}, x^n \in \mathbb{R}^d, N \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

as the space of weighted finite point measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . The stochastic population process  $(\nu_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$  representing the populations' dynamics will take values in  $(\mathcal{M}_K)^M$ . The  $i$ th coordinate of this process describes the spatial configuration of the subpopulation of type  $i$ . Thus,

$$\nu_t^K = (\nu_t^{1,K}, \dots, \nu_t^{M,K}) = (\nu_t^{i,K})_{1 \leq i \leq M}$$

with

$$\nu_t^{1,K} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^1} \delta_{X_t^{n,1}}, \dots, \nu_t^{M,K} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^M} \delta_{X_t^{n,M}}, \quad (4)$$

where for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,  $N_t^i = K \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \in \mathbb{N}$  stands for the number of living individuals of type  $i$  at time  $t$  and  $X_t^{1,i}, \dots, X_t^{N_t^i,i}$  indicate their positions in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ .

The dynamics of the population can be roughly summarized as follows:

- The initial population is characterized by the measures  $(\nu_0^{i,K})_{1 \leq i \leq M} \in (\mathcal{M}_K)^M$  at time  $t = 0$ . Any individual of type  $i$  located at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  at time  $t$  has two independent exponential clocks: a “clonal reproduction” clock with parameter  $r_i(x)$  and a “mortality” clock with parameter  $\sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_t^{j,K}(x)$ . If the reproduction clock of an individual rings, then it produces at the same location an individual of same type as itself. If its mortality clock rings, then the individual disappears. The death rate of an  $i$ th type individual depends on the positions of the other individuals through the kernel  $C^{ij}$ , which describes how species  $j$  acts on  $i$  in the competition for resources.
- During its life, an individual will move as a diffusion process whose coefficients depend on all individual positions. The motion of an individual with type  $i$  is a diffusion process with diffusion matrix  $a^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * \nu_t^{1,K}, \dots, G^{iM} * \nu_t^{M,K})$  and drift vector  $b^i(\cdot, H^{i1} * \nu_t^{1,K}, \dots, H^{iM} * \nu_t^{M,K})$ . The coefficients thus take into account the non-homogeneous spatial densities of the different species: a species can be attracted or repulsed by the other ones and the concentration of species may increase or decrease the fluctuations in the dynamics.

The vector-measure valued process  $(\nu_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$  will be a Markov process that can be rigorously constructed as solution of a stochastic differential equation driven by  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motions  $(B^{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq M, n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and Poisson point measures  $(Q^i(dt, dn, d\theta))_{1 \leq i \leq M}$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+$  with intensity  $dt \otimes \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^*} \delta_m(dn) \otimes d\theta$ , all independent and independent of the initial condition  $(\nu_0^{1,K}, \dots, \nu_0^{M,K})$ .

Let us give an explicit algorithmic construction of  $(\nu_t^K)_{t \geq 0}$  in terms of these objects. To that end, we fix first an arbitrary ordering  $\preceq$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  (say, the lexicographical one), which will be used to define a numbering of the positions of the individuals  $(X_t^{1,i}, \dots, X_t^{N_t^i,i})$  of the population  $i$  at some specific time instants  $t \geq 0$ . We then proceed as follows:

0. Set  $m = 0$  and  $T_0 = 0$ . For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , the vector  $(X_0^{1,i}, \dots, X_0^{N_0^i,i})$  is defined as the  $\preceq$ -ordered elements of the support of  $\nu_0^{i,K}$ .
1. For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  the  $i$ th population follows the dynamics

$$\begin{aligned} X_t^{n,i} = X_{T_m}^{n,i} &+ \int_{T_m}^t \sigma^i(X_s^{n,i}, G^{i1} * \nu_s^{1,K}(X_s^{n,i}), \dots, G^{iM} * \nu_s^{M,K}(X_s^{n,i})) dB_s^{n,i} \\ &+ \int_{T_m}^t b^i(X_s^{n,i}, H^{i1} * \nu_s^{1,K}(X_s^{n,i}), \dots, H^{iM} * \nu_s^{M,K}(X_s^{n,i})) ds, \quad n = 1, \dots, N_{T_m}^i \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

until the next jump time  $t$  of any of the measures

$$Q^j(dt, dn, d\theta), \quad j \in \{1, \dots, M\},$$

such that the corresponding atom  $(t, n, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+$  and index  $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  satisfy

$$n \leq N_{T_m}^j \quad \text{and} \quad \theta \leq r_j(X_{t-}^{n,j}) + \sum_{l=1}^M C^{jl} * \nu^{l,K}(X_{t-}^{n,j}). \quad (6)$$

We then set  $T_{m+1} = t$ .

2. For  $i = j$  and  $(t, n, \theta) = (T_{m+1}, n, \theta)$  as before,
  - if  $\theta \leq r_i(X_{t-}^{n,i})$  we set  $N_t^i = N_{t-}^i + 1$  and define the vector

$$\left( X_t^{1,i}, \dots, X_t^{N_t^i,i} \right)$$

as the increasing  $\preceq$ -rearrangement of  $(X_{t-}^{1,i}, \dots, X_{t-}^{N_{t-}^i,i}, X_{t-}^{n,i})$  or, otherwise,

- if  $r_i(X_{t-}^{n,i}) < \theta \leq r_i(X_{t-}^{n,j}) + \sum_{l=1}^M C^{il} * \nu^{l,K}(X_{t-}^{n,i})$  we set  $N_t^i = N_{t-}^i - 1$  and define the vector

$$\left( X_t^{1,i}, \dots, X_t^{N_t^i,i} \right)$$

as the increasing  $\preceq$ -rearrangement of  $(X_{t-}^{1,j}, \dots, X_{t-}^{n-1,j}, X_{t-}^{n+1,j}, \dots, X_{t-}^{N_{t-}^j,j})$ .

For  $i \neq j$ , we take  $\left( X_t^{1,j}, \dots, X_t^{N_t^j,j} \right) = \left( X_{t-}^{1,j}, \dots, X_{t-}^{N_{t-}^j,j} \right)$ .

3. We increase  $m$  by 1 and go to step 1.

We have

**Lemma 2.1** *Assume that  $\mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle) < \infty$  for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . Then, the process  $(\nu_t^{i,K})_{1 \leq i \leq M}$  given by (4) is defined for all  $t \geq 0$ .*

**Proof:** Notice first that  $(T_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$  are stopping times with respect to the filtration  $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}$  generated by the processes  $(B^{n,i})_{1 \leq i \leq M, n \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and  $(Q^i(dt, dn, d\theta))_{1 \leq i \leq M}$  on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+$  and the measures  $(\nu_0^{1,K}, \dots, \nu_0^{M,K})$ . Moreover, thanks to **(H)**, conditionally on  $\mathcal{F}_{T_m}$  the coefficients of equations (5) seen as an SDE in  $\prod_{i=1}^M \mathbb{R}^{dN_{T_m}^i}$ , are globally Lipschitz continuous (with Lipschitz constants depending on  $(N_{T_m}^1, \dots, N_{T_m}^M)$ ) and so the processes  $(X_t^{n,i})_{1 \leq n \leq N_{T_m}^i, 1 \leq i \leq M}$  can be defined, for all  $t \in [T_m, T_{m+1})$ , as the restriction to that interval of some process of fixed dimension defined on  $[T_m, \infty)$ .

The process  $(\nu^{i,K})_{1 \leq i \leq M}$  is thus defined on  $[0, T_\infty)$  with  $T_\infty := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} T_m$  so we need to prove that  $T_\infty = \infty$  a.s. Writing  $S_R := \inf\{s \in [0, T_\infty) : \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \geq R\}$  for each  $R > 0$ , by construction of  $\nu^{i,K}$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_{t \wedge S_R}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle &= \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \\ &+ \int_{[0, t \wedge S_R] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \frac{\left( \mathbf{1}_{\theta \leq r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i})} - \mathbf{1}_{r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i}) < \theta \leq r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i}) + \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu^{j,K}(X_{s-}^{n,i})} \right)}{K} \mathbf{1}_{n \leq K \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle} Q^i(ds, dn, d\theta), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

hence

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \leq \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle + \frac{1}{K} \int_{[0, T \wedge S_R] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{\theta \leq \bar{r}, n \leq K \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle} Q^i(ds, dn, d\theta)$$

and, by compensation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) + \bar{r} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_{s \wedge S_R}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) ds \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) + \bar{r} \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Gronwall's lemma then yields  $\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) \leq e^{\bar{r}T} \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right)$  and, by monotone convergence as  $R \nearrow \infty$ ,  $\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge T_\infty]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) < \infty$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ . Since by (6) the number of jumps of  $\nu^{i,K}$  on the interval  $[0, T \wedge T_\infty]$  is bounded by

$$\int_{[0, T \wedge T_\infty] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \mathbf{1}_{\theta \leq \bar{r} + K \sum_{i=1}^M \|C^{ii}\|_\infty \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge T_\infty]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle, n \leq K \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge T_\infty]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle} Q^i(ds, dn, d\theta) < \infty,$$

we deduce that  $T_\infty \geq T$  for each  $T > 0$  and this completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 2.2** *It is clear from their construction that the real processes  $t \mapsto \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, f \rangle = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^j} f(X_t^{n,j})$  are right continuous with left limits for each  $f \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , hence the processes  $t \mapsto \frac{1}{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N_t^j} \delta_{X_t^{n,j}}$  are right continuous with left limits in the space  $\mathcal{M}$  endowed with the weak topology.*

For each  $\nu = (\nu^i)_{1 \leq i \leq M} \in \mathcal{M}^M$ , let us now introduce a second order differential operator acting on real  $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$  functions  $f$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu^i f(x) &:= \text{Tr} \left( (a^i(x), G^{i1} * \nu^1(x), \dots, G^{iM} * \nu^M(x)) \text{Hess} f(x)) \right) \\ &+ b^i(x, H^{i1} * \nu^1(x), \dots, H^{iM} * \nu^M(x)) \cdot \nabla f(x) \end{aligned}$$

By applying Itô's formula to  $\left(X_s^{1,i}, \dots, X_s^{N_{T_m}^i, i}\right)$  for  $s \in [T_m, T_{m+1})$ , summing over  $n \in \{1, \dots, N_{T_m}^i = K \langle \nu_s^i, 1 \rangle\}$  and then, for given  $t \geq 0$ , over  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $T_m \leq t$ , the process  $(\nu_t^{i,K})_{t \geq 0}$  is seen to satisfy for any function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  the stochastic differential equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, f(t, \cdot) \rangle &= \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, f(0, \cdot) \rangle + \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \partial_s f(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_{\nu_s^{i,K}}^i f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \\ &+ \frac{1}{K} \int_0^t \sum_{n=1}^{K \langle \nu_s^i, 1 \rangle} \nabla^* f(s, X_s^{n,i}) \sigma^i(X_s^{n,i}, G^{i1} * \nu_s^{1,K}(X_s^{n,i}), \dots, G^{iM} * \nu_s^{M,K}(X_s^{n,i})) dB_s^{n,i} \\ &+ \int_{[0,t] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \left( \mathbf{1}_{\theta \leq r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i})} - \mathbf{1}_{r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i}) < \theta \leq r_i(X_{s-}^{n,i}) + \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K}(X_{s-}^{n,i})} \right) \\ &\quad \times \frac{f(s-, X_{s-}^{n,i})}{K} \mathbf{1}_{n \leq K \langle \nu_{s-}^i, 1 \rangle} Q^i(ds, dn, d\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

By compensation, we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, f(t, \cdot) \rangle &= \langle \nu_0^i, f(0, \cdot) \rangle + \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \partial_s f(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_{\nu_s^{i,K}}^i f(s, \cdot) + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K} \right) f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \\ &+ M_t^{i,f,B} + M_t^{i,f,Q}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $M^{i,f,B}$  and  $M^{i,f,Q}$  are, respectively, a continuous local martingale with quadratic variation given by

$$\langle M^{i,f,B} \rangle_t = \frac{1}{K} \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \nabla^* f(s, \cdot) a^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * \nu_s^{i,K}, \dots, G^{iM} * \nu_s^{M,K}) \nabla f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \quad (11)$$

and a compensated pure jump local martingale with predictable quadratic variation

$$\langle M^{i,f,Q} \rangle_t = \frac{1}{K} \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \left( r_i + \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K} \right) f^2(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds. \quad (12)$$

The local martingales  $M^{i,f,B}$  and  $M^{i,f,Q}$  will be fundamental in the study of the limit of  $(\nu_t^K)_{t \in [0, T]}$  when  $K$  goes to  $\infty$ .

Using the above formulae we can characterize the law of  $(\nu_t^K)_{t \in [0, T]}$  as a process with values in  $\mathcal{M}^M$ . To that end, observe first that the zero order term on the r.h.s. of (10) can be rewritten as a jump term for the process  $\nu^{i,k}$ , namely

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K} \right) f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle &= K \int \nu_s^{i,K}(dx) \left[ \left( \langle \nu_s^{i,K} + \frac{1}{K} \delta_x, f(s, \cdot) \rangle - \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, f(s, \cdot) \rangle \right) r_i(x) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \langle \nu_s^{i,K} - \frac{1}{K} \delta_x, f(s, \cdot) \rangle - \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, f(s, \cdot) \rangle \right) \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K}(x) \right] \end{aligned}$$



It follows by Itô's formula that for each function  $F : \mathcal{M}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form

$$F(\nu) = F(\langle \nu^1, f_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \nu^M, f_M \rangle) \quad (13)$$

with  $F \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(\mathbb{R}^M)$  and  $f_i \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , the process

$$F(\nu_t^K) - F(\nu_0^K) - \int_0^t L^K F(\nu_s^K) ds$$

is a local martingale, if

$$L^K F(\nu) = L_e^K F(\nu) + L_d F(\nu)$$

is the sum of a jump operator  $L_e^K F$  defined by

$$\begin{aligned} L_e^K F(\nu) &= K \sum_{i=1}^M \int \nu_s^i(dx) r_i(x) \left( F(\nu + \frac{1}{K} \delta_x^i) - F(\nu) \right) \\ &\quad + K \sum_{i=1}^M \int \nu_s^i(dx) \left( \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu^j(x) \right) \left( F(\nu - \frac{1}{K} \delta_x^i) - F(\nu) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the  $i$ -th coordinate of the vector measure  $\delta_x^i \in \mathcal{M}^M$  is  $\delta_x$  and the other ones vanish, plus a diffusion operator  $L_d F$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} L_d F(\nu) &= \sum_{i=1}^M \left( \langle \nu^i, \mathcal{L}_{\nu_s^i} f_i \rangle \partial_i F(\langle \nu^1, f_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \nu^M, f_M \rangle) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \nu^i, (\nabla f_i)^* a^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * \nu^1, \dots, G^{iM} * \nu^M) \nabla f_i \rangle \partial_{ii}^2 F(\langle \nu^1, f_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \nu^M, f_M \rangle) \right) \end{aligned}$$

(which is similar to the one obtained for branching diffusing processes in (Dawson 1993).) The cylindrical functions (13) are a standard class generating the set of bounded and measurable functions from  $(\mathcal{M}_K)^M$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ . It is classical to deduce from the previous that the right continuous process  $(\nu_t^K)_t$  in  $(\mathcal{M}_K)^M$  is Markov, with law characterized by the infinitesimal generator  $L^K$ .

### 3 Large population approximation and non local Lotka-Volterra cross diffusion system

#### 3.1 Existence and uniqueness of weak measure solutions

We now state a large population approximation for the previous  $M$  species model by making the charge capacity  $K$  tend to infinity. This result in particular implies the existence of weak solutions to a non local cross-diffusion system of nonlinear partial differential equations.

**Theorem 3.1** *Assume that for some  $p \geq 3$ ,  $\sup_K \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p) < +\infty$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . Assume also **(H)** and moreover that the sequence of finite measures  $(\nu_0^{1,K}, \dots, \nu_0^{M,K})$  converges in law as  $K$  goes to infinity to the deterministic vector of finite measures  $(\xi_0^1, \dots, \xi_0^M)$ .*

Then, the sequence  $(\nu^{1,K}, \dots, \nu^{M,K})$  converges in law in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  when  $K$  tends to infinity to the unique deterministic continuous finite measure-valued function  $\xi = (\xi^1, \dots, \xi^M)$  which is a weak solution of the following cross-diffusion system: for each  $i = 1, \dots, M$ ,

$$\langle \xi_t^i, f(t, \cdot) \rangle = \langle \xi_0^i, f(0, \cdot) \rangle + \int_0^t \left\langle \xi_s^i, \partial_s f(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_{\xi_s^i}^i f(s, \cdot) + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \xi_s^j \right) f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \quad (14)$$

for every  $f \in C_b^{1,2}([0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that

$$\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|) |\nabla f(t, x)| < \infty. \quad (15)$$

**Remark 3.2** In contrast to the models of cross-diffusion introduced by Shigesada et al. (1979) or Mimura & Kawasaki (1980), Equation (14) allows for long range interaction in the coefficients of spatial diffusion. For example, taking  $G^{ij} = H^{ij} = 1$ , the spatial behavior of individuals of type  $i$  depend on the total mass of the subspecies  $j$ . It also covers some cases where the diffusion matrix might vanish, e.g.  $a^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M) = I_d \Psi_i^2(\sum_{j=1}^M v_j)$  with  $\Psi_i : [0, \infty] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  a Lipschitz continuous function vanishing at 0 and  $I_d$  the identity matrix.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 consists in the following steps:

- i) Propagation of moments of the total mass and control of tails.
- ii) Uniform tightness of the laws of  $(\nu^{1,K}, \dots, \nu^{M,K})$ .
- iii) Identification of the limits in distribution as solutions to (14).
- iv) Uniqueness of solutions to (14).

The first three steps are relatively standard and can be done by general arguments developed in Fournier & Méléard (2004), Champagnat & Méléard (2007), (Jourdain, Méléard & Woyczynski 2012) or in (Bansaye & Méléard 2015, Theorem 7.4). In the remainder of this section, we provide complete detailed proof of steps i), ii) and iii) for the specific model we deal with. Step iv), namely uniqueness of weak measure solutions to (14), will in turn require new techniques and arguments, in order to deal with the nonlinear diffusion terms of the equation. The proof will be given in Section 4.

The following bounds following from assumption **(H)** will be useful at several points: for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $v_j \in \mathbb{R}_+, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , we have

$$|a^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)| \leq C \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M v_j^2 \right) \quad \text{and} \quad |b^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)| \leq C \left( 1 + |x| + \sum_{j=1}^M v_j \right). \quad (16)$$

It follows that for any  $\nu = (\nu^i)_{1 \leq i \leq M} \in \mathcal{M}^M$  and any function  $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  satisfying the growth estimate (15), one has

$$\left| \mathcal{L}_\nu^i f(x) \right| \leq C_f \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu^j, 1 \rangle^2 \right) \quad (17)$$

and

$$(\nabla f)^* a^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * \nu^i, \dots, G^{iM} * \nu^M) \nabla f \leq C_f \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu^j, 1 \rangle^2\right) \quad (18)$$

for some finite constant  $C_f > 0$  depending only on the supremum (15).

In the sequel,  $C > 0$  denotes some constant, which can change from line to line and which only depends on the assumptions of our model.

### 3.2 Moments of the total mass and control of tails

We start with two basic but crucial estimations.

**Lemma 3.3** *Suppose (H) holds. Then, for each  $T > 0$ , any  $p \geq 1$  and some constant  $C_{T,p} > 0$  we have*

$$\sup_K \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) \leq C_{T,p} \sup_K \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p).$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ .

**Proof.** We can assume that  $\sup_K \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p) < \infty$ . Since the process  $\langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p$  is pure jump and of finite variation, for all  $t \geq 0$  we have

$$\langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p = \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p + \sum_{s \leq t} \left[ \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle + \Delta_s \right]^p - \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p,$$

where  $\Delta_s = \frac{1}{K}$  or  $-\frac{1}{K}$  if  $s$  is a jump time and  $\Delta_s = 0$  otherwise. Let  $S_R$  be the same stopping time as in (7). Neglecting the negative jumps and bounding the rate of positive ones, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_{t \wedge S_R}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p &\leq \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p + \sum_{s \leq t \wedge S_R, \Delta_s = \frac{1}{K}} \left[ \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle + \frac{1}{K} \right]^p - \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \\ &\leq \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \\ &\quad + \int_{[0, t \wedge S_R] \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{R}_+} \left( \left[ \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle + \frac{1}{K} \right]^p - \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) \mathbf{1}_{\theta \leq \bar{r}, n \leq K} \langle \nu_{s-}^{i,K}, 1 \rangle Q^i(ds, dn, d\theta). \end{aligned}$$

Since for  $a \geq 0$ ,  $b \in [0, 1]$  and some constant  $C_p > 0$ ,

$$(a + b)^p - a^p = \int_a^{a+b} p y^{p-1} dy \leq p b (a + b)^{p-1} \leq C_p b (a^{p-1} + 1)$$

we deduce, in a similar way as in (8), that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) + \bar{r} C_p \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p + \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \right) dt \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) + \bar{r} C_p \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + 2 \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge S_R]} \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^p \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from Gronwall's lemma, letting then  $R \nearrow \infty$ .

□

Let  $B(0, R)$  denote the centered ball of radius  $R > 0$  in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be a radially non-decreasing function of class  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\Psi(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in B(0, 1)$  and  $\Psi(x) = 1$  for all  $x \in B(0, 2)^c$ . For each  $m \geq 1$  define a  $C^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  function  $\Psi_m$  by

$$\Psi_m(x) := \Psi(x/m), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (19)$$

Observe that, since for each  $m \geq 0$  and any  $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$  one has

$$\mu(B(0, 2m)^c) \leq \langle \mu, \Psi_m \rangle \leq \mu(B(0, m)^c),$$

a family  $(\mu_k)_k$  of elements of  $\mathcal{M}$  is tight if and only if  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_k \langle \mu_k, \Psi_m \rangle = 0$ .

**Lemma 3.4** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, there is a constant  $C_0 > 0$  depending on  $T$  and on  $\sum_{i=1}^M \sup_K \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i,K}, 1 \rangle^3) < \infty$  but not on  $m$ , such that*

$$\sup_K \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) \leq C_0 \sup_K \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right)$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . As a consequence, for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$  we have

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_K \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) = 0.$$

**Proof:** It is readily seen that the functions  $(1 + |x|)\nabla\Psi_m(x)$  and  $(1 + |x|^2)\text{Hess}\Psi_m(x)$  are globally bounded, uniformly in  $m \geq 1$ . Therefore, (17) holds for some constant  $C_{\Psi_m}$  which in fact does not depend on  $m$ . This and (10) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle &\leq \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle + C \int_0^t \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle + \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu_s^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right) ds \\ &\quad + M_t^{i, \Psi_m, B} + M_t^{i, \Psi_m, Q}, \end{aligned}$$

where the local martingales  $M_t^{i, \Psi_m, Q}$  and  $M_t^{i, \Psi_m, B}$  moreover satisfy

$$\langle M^{i, \Psi_m, Q} \rangle_t + \langle M^{i, \Psi_m, B} \rangle_t \leq \frac{C}{K} \int_0^t \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu_s^{j,K}, 1 \rangle + \langle \nu_s^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right) ds$$

for some constant which is independent of  $m$ . Using the BDG inequality, we get for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$  and  $K > 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) dt \\ &\quad + CT \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right) \right) \\ &\quad + C\sqrt{T} \mathbb{E} \left( \sqrt{\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) &\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \langle \nu_s^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) dt \\
&\quad + C(T+1) \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i, K}, 1 \rangle^3 \right)^{1/3} \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j, K}, 1 \rangle^3 \right)^{2/3} \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) + C(T+1) \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu_0^{j, K}, 1 \rangle^3 \right) \\
&\quad + C \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} \langle \nu_s^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) dt,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 3.3 in the last inequality. The first statement follows with Gronwall's lemma.

As for the last statement, notice that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , by Lemma 3.3 with  $p = 3$  and the inequality  $z \leq z \wedge n + z^3 n^{-2}$  for  $z \geq 0$  we get

$$\mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle) \leq \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \wedge n) + \frac{C}{n^2},$$

from where

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) \leq \langle \xi_0^i, \Psi_m \rangle.$$

This easily yields  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*} \mathbb{E}(\langle \nu_0^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle)$  and we conclude using the first part.  $\square$

### 3.3 Tightness

Let us denote by  $\mathcal{P}_K$  the law of the process  $(\nu^{1, K}, \dots, \nu^{M, K})$ . We will first prove a slightly weaker tightness result than required.

**Lemma 3.5** *Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K$  denote the law of the process  $(\nu^{1, K}, \dots, \nu^{M, K})$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , when seen as a random element of the space  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v))^M$ , with  $\mathcal{M}_v$  denoting the space  $\mathcal{M}$  endowed with the vague topology. Then, under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, the sequence  $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_K)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is tight.*

Since the product of compact sets is a compact set, it is enough to prove tightness in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v)$  for the family of processes  $\nu^{i, K}$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , for each  $i = 1, \dots, M$ . To that end, we use a criterion established in (Roelly-Coppoletta 1986):

Let  $(\mu_t^K)_{t \in [0, T]}$  denote the canonical process in  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v))$  under a given probability law  $\mathcal{Q}_K$ . A sequence  $(\mathcal{Q}_K)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of laws on  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v))$  is tight if and only if

- For each function  $f \in \mathcal{C}_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the sequence of laws  $(\mathcal{Q}_K^f)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of the processes  $(\langle \mu_t^K, f \rangle)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is tight in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ .
- The sequence of laws  $(\mathcal{Q}_K^1)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of the processes  $(\langle \mu_t^K, 1 \rangle)_{t \in [0, T]}$  is tight in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ .

**Proof of Lemma 3.5:** For each  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , we need to prove that the sequence of laws of the processes  $(\langle \nu_t^{i,K}, f \rangle)_{t \in [0, T]}$ ,  $K \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , is tight in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  for all  $f \in C_0^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and for  $f = 1$ . The same proof will work in both cases. Let us write

$$A_t^f := \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^{i,K}, \mathcal{L}_{\nu_s^K}^i f + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^{j,K} \right) f \right\rangle ds.$$

By (10) and the Aldous-Rebolledo criterion, it is enough to prove that

$$\lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, f \rangle > \frac{1}{\eta} \right) = 0,$$

and that, if  $S_\delta$  and  $S'_\delta$  denote for each  $\delta > 0$  generic  $(\mathcal{F}_t)$ -stopping times such that  $S_\delta \leq S'_\delta \leq (S_\delta + \delta) \wedge T$ , then

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S_\delta, S'_\delta} \mathbb{P}(|A_{S_\delta}^f - A_{S'_\delta}^f| \geq \eta) = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{S_\delta, S'_\delta} \mathbb{P}(|\langle M^{i,f,B} \rangle_{S_\delta} - \langle M^{i,f,B} \rangle_{S'_\delta}| + |\langle M^{i,f,Q} \rangle_{S_\delta} - \langle M^{i,f,Q} \rangle_{S'_\delta}| \geq \eta) = 0.$$

The first property follows from Lemma 3.3 and Markov's inequality. From (17) and using similar estimates as in the proof of Lemma 3.4, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( |A_{S_\delta}^f - A_{S'_\delta}^f| \right) &\leq C \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{S_\delta}^{S'_\delta} \langle \nu_s^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \langle \nu_s^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right) ds \right) \\ &\leq \delta C \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^3 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (11), (18) and (12) similarly yield

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left( |\langle M^{i,f,B} \rangle_{S_\delta} - \langle M^{i,f,B} \rangle_{S'_\delta}| + |\langle M^{i,f,Q} \rangle_{S_\delta} - \langle M^{i,f,Q} \rangle_{S'_\delta}| \right) \\ \leq C \sqrt{\delta} \mathbb{E} \left( \sqrt{\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i,K}, 1 \rangle \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^2 \right)} \right) \\ \leq \sqrt{\delta} C \mathbb{E} \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^M \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{j,K}, 1 \rangle^3 \right) \end{aligned}$$

The remaining conditions then follow by Markov's inequality.  $\square$

Tightness in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  can now be deduced from the next criterion proved in (Mélard & Roelly 1993):

For each  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $(\mu_t^j)_{t \in [0, T]}$  denote the canonical process in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})$  under a given probability law  $\mathcal{Q}_j$  (notice that  $t \mapsto \mu_t^j$  is assumed to be weakly continuous under  $\mathcal{Q}_j$ ), and assume that

- the sequence  $(\mathcal{Q}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is weakly convergent in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v)$  to some law  $\mathcal{Q}$ ,
- the canonical process  $(\mu_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$  in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})$  is continuous under  $\mathcal{Q}$  and
- the sequence of laws of the processes  $(\langle \mu_t^j, 1 \rangle)_{t \in [0, T]}$  weakly converge to the law of the process  $(\langle \mu_t, 1 \rangle)_{t \in [0, T]}$ .

Then, the sequence  $(\mathcal{Q}_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  is weakly convergent in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})$  to  $\mathcal{Q}$ . This criterion's assumptions hold in our case, thanks to the next result:

**Lemma 3.6** *Let the law  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  on  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v))^M$  be a weak limit of some subsequence  $(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{K_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and let  $(\nu^1, \dots, \nu^M)$  denote the canonical process under  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, M$  we have:*

- i)  $\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^i, 1 \rangle^3 \right) < \infty$  and  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^i, \Psi_m \rangle \right) = 0$ ,
- ii) the process  $t \mapsto \nu_t^i \in \mathcal{M}$  is a.s. weakly continuous under  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  and
- iii) the processes  $\langle \nu_t^{i, K_j}, 1 \rangle$  converge in distribution to  $\langle \nu_t^i, 1 \rangle$  in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ .

**Proof:** For notational simplicity we assume that the whole sequence  $(\nu^{1, K}, \dots, \nu^{M, K})$  in  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v))^M$  converges in distribution to  $(\nu^1, \dots, \nu^M)$ .

Recall that for each  $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the mappings

$$\mu. \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v) \mapsto \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \mu_t, \psi \rangle - \langle \mu_{t-}, \psi \rangle| \in \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$\mu. \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v) \mapsto \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \mu_t, \psi \rangle \in \mathbb{R}$$

are continuous, by standard properties of the Skorokhod topology.

i) Fix  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with values in  $[0, 1]$  and for  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , set  $\phi_l := \phi(1 - \Psi_l) \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ . From Lemma 3.3, we get that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( n \wedge \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^i, \phi_l \rangle^3 \right) < C$$

for some constant  $C < \infty$  neither depending on  $n$  nor on  $l$ . The first property then follows by choosing  $\phi = 1$  and letting  $n, l \rightarrow \infty$  using Fatou's lemma. Taking next  $\phi = \Psi_m$  for a fixed  $m \geq 1$ , we get by Lemma 3.4 that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( n \wedge \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^i, \phi_l \rangle \right) \leq \sup_K \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i, K}, \Psi_m \rangle \right).$$

Letting  $n, l \rightarrow \infty$ , thanks to Lemma 3.4 the second asserted property follows.

ii) For each  $\psi \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \nu_t^i, \psi \rangle - \langle \nu_{t-}^i, \psi \rangle| \leq n \wedge \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \nu_t^i, \psi \rangle - \langle \nu_{t-}^i, \psi \rangle| + \frac{2\|\psi\|_\infty}{n^2} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \nu_t^i, 1 \rangle^3|$$

Since for all  $n, K \in \mathbb{N}^*$  one has  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \nu_t^{i, K}, \psi \rangle - \langle \nu_{t-}^{i, K}, \psi \rangle| \wedge n \leq \frac{\|\psi\|_\infty}{K}$ , the first term on the right hand side is null. By part i), the last term is a.s. finite and goes to 0 when  $n$

goes to infinity. Thus,  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\langle \nu_t^i, \psi \rangle - \langle \nu_{t-}^i, \psi \rangle| = 0$  a.s. and the statement follows by separability of  $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

iii) Let  $F : \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Lipschitz bounded function and  $i = 1, \dots, M$  be fixed. It is enough to show that

$$\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 \rangle)) \rightarrow \mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 \rangle))$$

when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ . We have for each  $K, m \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 \rangle)) - \mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 \rangle))| &\leq |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 \rangle) - F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle))| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle)) - \mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle))| \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 \rangle) - F(\langle \nu^i, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle))| \\ &\leq C \sup_{K'} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^{i, K'}, \Psi_m \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle)) - \mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle))| \\ &\quad + C \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \langle \nu_t^i, \Psi_m \rangle \right), \end{aligned}$$

where, in the second inequality, we used the fact that the Skorokhod distance in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})$  is bounded above by the distance induced by the supremum norm. By Lemma 3.4 and part i), for each  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $m \geq 0$  large enough such that the first and third terms on the right hand side of the last inequality are less than  $\varepsilon$ . On the other hand, the expectation of the second term goes to 0 when  $K \rightarrow \infty$  since  $1 - \Psi_m \in \mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and the mapping  $\mu \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}_v) \mapsto \langle \mu, 1 - \Psi_m \rangle \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  is continuous. We thus get

$$\limsup_{K \rightarrow \infty} |\mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^{i, K}, 1 \rangle)) - \mathbb{E}(F(\langle \nu^i, 1 \rangle))| \leq 2\varepsilon$$

and the statement follows.  $\square$

Bringing all together, we get:

**Proposition 3.7** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, the sequence  $(\mathcal{P}_K)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  of laws on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  is tight.*

**Proof:** By Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6 applied to a subsequence, we readily get that the sequence  $(\mathcal{P}_K)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  is tight when each process  $(\nu^{1, K}, \dots, \nu^{M, K})$  is seen as a random element of the product space  $(\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}))^M$ . Taking as distance in  $\mathcal{M}^M$  the maximum of the distances used in each copy of  $\mathcal{M}$ , the Skorokhod modulus of continuity of an element  $\mu \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  is seen to be bounded above by the maximum of the  $M$  modulus of continuity of its coordinates  $\mu^i \in \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})$ . The result easily follows.  $\square$

### 3.4 Identification of the limiting processes

**Lemma 3.8** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, let the law  $\mathcal{P}$  be a weak limit on  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M})^M$  of some subsequence  $(\mathcal{P}_{K_j})_{j \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  and let  $(\nu^1, \dots, \nu^M)$  denote the canonical process under  $\mathcal{P}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{P}$ -a.s. we have*

$$\langle \nu_t^i, f \rangle = \langle \xi_0^i, f \rangle + \int_0^t \left\langle \nu_s^i, \partial_s f(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_{\nu_s^i}^i f(s, \cdot) + (r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \nu_s^j) f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \quad (20)$$



for all  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , every  $t \in [0, T]$  and all  $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^{1,2}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that  $\sup_{(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbb{R}^d} (1 + |x|^2) (|\nabla f(t, x)|^2 + |\text{Hess } f(t, x)|) < \infty$  and every  $t \in [0, T]$ .

**Proof:** For notational simplicity we again assume that the whole sequence  $(\mathcal{P}_K)_{K \in \mathbb{N}^*}$  converges to  $\mathcal{P}$ . For fixed  $i = 1, \dots, M$ ,  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^{1,2}([0, T], \mathbb{R}^d)$  with the required growth conditions, define a functional  $\Phi^i : \mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  acting on an element  $\mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^M)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi^i(\mu^1, \dots, \mu^M) &= \langle \mu_t^i, f \rangle - \langle \xi_0^i, f \rangle \\ &\quad - \int_0^t \left\langle \mu_s^i, \partial_s f(s, \cdot) + \mathcal{L}_{\mu_s^i}^i f(s, \cdot) + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M C^{ij} * \mu_s^j \right) f(s, \cdot) \right\rangle ds \end{aligned}$$

Since, from the previous section,  $\mathcal{P}$  is concentrated on  $\mathbb{C}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$ , it is enough to show that for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the bounded function  $\mu \mapsto |\Phi^i(\mu)| \wedge n$  is continuous at points  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  and that  $\mathbb{E}(|\Phi^i(\nu^{1,K}, \dots, \nu^{M,K})| \wedge n) \rightarrow 0$  when  $K \rightarrow \infty$ .

Let  $(\mu_t(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a sequence converging in  $\mathbb{D}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  to  $\mu_t \in \mathbb{C}([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$ . Then,  $\mu_t^i(k) \rightarrow \mu_t^i$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , uniformly on  $[0, T]$  when  $k \rightarrow \infty$  and, in particular, all masses are bounded uniformly in time and in  $k$ . Since for each  $t \in [0, T]$  the coordinates of the sequence  $(\mu_t(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  are tight, the sequences  $(\mu_t^i(k) \otimes \mu_t^j(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $(\mu_t^i(k) \otimes \mu_t^j(k) \otimes \mu_t^l(k))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$  are tight too, and by taking test functions of product form they are seen to converge weakly to the product measures  $\mu_t^i \otimes \mu_t^j$  and  $\mu_t^i \otimes \mu_t^j \otimes \mu_t^l$ . These facts and the (locally) Lipschitz character of the functions  $a^i$  and  $b^i$  easily yield the continuity of  $|\Phi^i| \wedge n$  at  $\mu$ , by dominated convergence.

Last, from equations (10), (11) and (12), the bound (18) and similar estimates as in the last part of the proof of Lemma 3.5, we get that

$$\mathbb{E}(|\Phi^i(\nu^{1,K}, \dots, \nu^{M,K})| \wedge n) \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{K}}$$

for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . This together with the convergence in law of the initial conditions complete the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.9** Notice for later reference that any solution to (14) satisfies  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV} \leq e^{\bar{r}^i T} \|\xi_0^i\|_{TV}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , as is readily seen by taking  $f = 1$  and using the non negativity of the functions  $C^{ij}$  and Gronwall's lemma.

## 4 Uniqueness

Uniqueness is established in next result where, for notational simplicity, we will deal only with the case  $M = 2$ . All arguments easily extend to the general case.

**Proposition 4.1** Let  $\xi = (\xi^1, \xi^2)$  and  $\tilde{\xi} = (\tilde{\xi}^1, \tilde{\xi}^2)$  be two solutions of the system (14) in  $[0, T]$  with  $M = 2$ . Then  $(\xi_t^1, \xi_t^2) = (\tilde{\xi}_t^1, \tilde{\xi}_t^2)$  for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

We will need to use a distance that is weaker than to total variation one but better adapted to perturbations in the diffusion coefficients. Denote by  $\mathcal{LB}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  the space of Lipschitz

continuous and bounded functions on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , and by  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{LB}}$  or simply  $\|\cdot\|$  the corresponding norm,

$$\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}} := \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)|}{|x - y|} + \sup_x |\varphi(x)|.$$

We endow  $\mathcal{M}$  with the distance induced by the dual norm with respect to  $\mathcal{LB}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,

$$\|\eta - \mu\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*} := \sup_{\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}} \leq 1} |\langle \mu - \eta, \varphi \rangle|, \quad \eta, \mu \in \mathcal{M}.$$

Given a solution  $(\xi_t^1, \dots, \xi_t^M)_{t \in [0, T]}$  to (14), let us set for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(i, t, x) &= \sigma^i(x, G^{i1} * \xi_t^1(x), \dots, G^{iM} * \xi_t^M(x)), \\ b(i, t, x) &= b^i(x, H^{i1} * \xi_t^1(x), \dots, H^{iM} * \xi_t^M(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

**Remark 4.2** From assumption **(H)** i), ii) and Remark 3.9, the functions in (21) are Lipschitz functions of  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , uniformly in  $[0, T]$ .

We introduce next the family of SDEs associated with the coefficients (21), and the corresponding transition semigroups. For each  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $s \in [0, T]$  consider the unique (strong) solution

$$X_{s,t}^i(x) = (X_{s,t}^{i,1}(x), \dots, X_{s,t}^{i,d}(x)) \quad t \in [s, T]$$

of the stochastic differential equation in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$X_{s,t}^i(x) = x + \int_s^t \sigma(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(x)) dB_r^i + \int_s^t b(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(x)) dr, \quad t \in [s, T] \quad (22)$$

where  $B^i = (B^{i,q})_{q=1}^d$  is a standard  $d$ -dimensional Brownian motion in a given probability space. The fact that for each  $s$  the mapping  $(t, x) \mapsto X_{s,t}^i(x)$  is measurable can be classically deduced from the properties of functions  $\sigma(i, t, x)$  and  $b(i, t, x)$  noted in Remark 4.2. The three parameter process  $(s, t, x) \mapsto X_{s,t}^i(x)$  is called the *stochastic flow* associated with the coefficients  $\sigma(i, t, x)$  and  $b(i, t, x)$ . Finer properties of this process will be recalled and used later.

Given a second solution  $(\tilde{\xi}_t^1, \tilde{\xi}_t^2)_{t \in [0, T]}$  of (14), define analogously coefficients  $\tilde{\sigma}(i, t, x)$  and  $\tilde{b}(i, t, x)$  in terms of  $(\tilde{\xi}_t^1, \tilde{\xi}_t^2)$ , and the processes  $\tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x)$  given for  $i = 1, 2$  by the solution to the SDEs

$$\tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x) = x + \int_s^t \tilde{\sigma}(i, r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x)) dB_r^i + \int_s^t \tilde{b}(i, r, \tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x)) dr,$$

driven by the same Brownian motions  $B^i$  as the processes  $X_{s,t}^i(x)$  in (22).

The proof of Proposition 4.1 will rely on stability properties of the non homogenous transition semigroups of  $X_{s,t}^i(x)$  and  $\tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x)$ , which we respectively denote by

$$P_{s,t}^i(x, dy) = \mathbb{P}(X_{s,t}^i(x) \in dy) \text{ and } \tilde{P}_{s,t}^i(x, dy) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x) \in dy).$$

As usual,  $C > 0$  denotes a constant that may change from line to line.

**Lemma 4.3** For all  $T > 0$ ,  $\varphi \in \mathcal{LB}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $0 \leq s \leq t \leq T$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ ,

$$a) \|P_{s,t}^i \varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}}^2 \leq C(\xi^1, \xi^2, T) \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}}^2 \text{ and } \|\tilde{P}_{s,t}^i \varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}}^2 \leq C(\tilde{\xi}^1, \tilde{\xi}^2, T) \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}}^2.$$

b) For all  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$|P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x) - \tilde{P}_{s,t}^i \varphi(x)|^2 \leq C'(\xi^1, \xi^2, \tilde{\xi}^1, \tilde{\xi}^2, T) \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}}^2 \int_s^t \|\xi_r^1 - \tilde{\xi}_r^1\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 + \|\xi_r^2 - \tilde{\xi}_r^2\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 dr$$

The constants depend on  $\xi^i$  or  $\tilde{\xi}^i$  only through  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV}$  and  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\xi}_t^i\|_{TV}$ , and can be chosen to depend only on  $e^{\bar{r}T} \|\xi_0^i\|_{TV}$ .

**Proof:** a) It is enough to control the Lipschitz constants of the function  $P_{s,t}^i \varphi$  or  $\tilde{P}_{s,t}^i \varphi$ . We have, by Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_{s,t}^i(x) - X_{s,t}^i(y)|^2 &\leq C|x - y|^2 + C \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|\sigma(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(x)) - \sigma(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(y))|^2 dr \\ &\quad + C \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|b(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(x)) - b(i, r, X_{s,r}^i(y))|^2 dr \\ &\leq C|x - y|^2 + C \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|X_{s,r}^i(x) - X_{s,r}^i(y)|^2 dr \end{aligned}$$

for all  $s \leq t$ . The above constants depend on bounds for the Lipschitz constants of the coefficients  $\sigma^i$ ,  $b^i$  and of the kernels  $G^{1j}$  and  $H^{1j}$  as well as on  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV}$  and  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\xi}_t^i\|_{TV}$ . The latter suprema are in turn controlled by  $e^{\bar{r}T} \|\xi_0^i\|_{TV}$  by Remark 3.9. By Gronwall's lemma we get  $\mathbb{E}|X_{s,t}^i(x) - X_{s,t}^i(y)|^2 \leq C|x - y|^2$ , which easily yields

$$|P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x) - P_{s,t}^i \varphi(y)|^2 \leq C \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}}^2 |x - y|^2$$

as required.

b) For notational simplicity we consider first the case  $b = 0$ . Using similar types of inequalities as before, we have for all  $s \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|X_{s,t}^i(x) - \tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x)|^2 &\leq C' \left( \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|X_{s,r}^i(x) - \tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x)|^2 + \mathbb{E}|G^{i1} * \xi_s^1(X_{s,r}^i(x)) - G^{i1} * \tilde{\xi}_s^1(\tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x))|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}|G^{i2} * \xi_s^2(X_{s,r}^i(x)) - G^{i2} * \tilde{\xi}_s^2(\tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x))|^2 dr \right) \\ &\leq C'' \left( \int_s^t \mathbb{E}|X_{s,r}^i(x) - \tilde{X}_{s,r}^i(x)|^2 + \mathbb{E} \left| \int G^{i1}(X_{s,r}^i(x) - y)(\xi_s^1(dy) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dy)) \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left| \int G^{i2}(X_{s,r}^i(x) - y)(\xi_s^2(dy) - \tilde{\xi}_s^2(dy)) \right|^2 dr \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since the functions  $y \mapsto G^{ij}(X_s^i(x) - y)$  are uniformly Lipschitz continuous, we deduce with Gronwall's lemma that

$$\mathbb{E}(|X_{s,t}^i(x) - \tilde{X}_{s,t}^i(x)|^2) \leq C \int_s^t \|\xi_r^1 - \tilde{\xi}_r^1\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 + \|\xi_r^2 - \tilde{\xi}_r^2\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 dr$$

which allows us to easily conclude. The case  $b \neq 0$  is similar with additional terms involving the kernels  $H^{ij}$ . □

**Lemma 4.4** For each  $t \geq 0$  and  $\varphi \in C_0^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , the function  $(s, x) \mapsto P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x)$  satisfies the decay condition (15) on each interval  $[0, T']$  with  $T' < t$ .

**Proof:** It is enough to show that

$$\sup_{s \in [0, T'], x \in \mathbb{R}^d, |y| \leq 1} |x||y|^{-1} |P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x) - P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x+y)| < \infty. \quad (23)$$

Since  $\varphi$  and its derivatives are supported on  $B(0, R)$  for some  $R > 0$ , and given that  $a^i$  and  $b^i$  are globally Lipschitz under **(H)**, we get by applying Itô's formula on  $\varphi$  that, for some constant  $C_R > 0$  and every  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $|y| \leq 1$ , it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |x| |P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x) - P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x+y)| &\leq C_R |y| \mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq R+1} \\ &+ C_R |x| \int_s^t \mathbb{E}(|X_{s,r}^i(x) - X_{s,r}^i(x+y)| \mathbf{1}_{\min\{|X_{s,r}^i(x)|, |X_{s,r}^i(x+y)|\} \leq R}) dr \end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the proof of the previous Lemma we deduce that

$$|x| |P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x) - P_{s,t}^i \varphi(x+y)| \leq C_R |y| \mathbf{1}_{|x| \leq R+1} + C_R |x| |y| \int_s^t \mathbb{P}^{1/2}(\min\{|X_{s,r}^i(x)|, |X_{s,r}^i(x+y)|\} \leq R) dr$$

Since for each  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$  the coefficients of  $X_{s,r}^i(z)$  grow linearly,  $\sup_{r \in [s, T']} \mathbb{E}(|X_{s,r}^i(z) - z|^2)$  is finite so that, for  $|z| > R$  one has  $\mathbb{P}(\min\{|X_{s,r}^i(z)|\} \leq R) \leq C_{T'}/(|z| - R)^2$ . This and the previous estimate easily yield (23).  $\square$

**Proof of Proposition 4.1:** Consider  $t \in [0, T]$ ,  $\varphi \in C_0^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\varepsilon < T - t$ . By the Feynmann-Kac formula (e.g Karatzas & Shreve 1991), the function  $f^{(t+\varepsilon)}(s, x) = \mathbb{E}(\varphi(X_{s,t+\varepsilon}^i(x))) = P_{s,t+\varepsilon}^i \varphi(x)$  is the unique classic (bounded) solution of the linear parabolic problem

$$\partial_s f^{(t+\varepsilon)}(s, x) + a_{kl}^1(\cdot, G^{i1} * \xi_s^1, G^{i2} * \xi_s^2) \partial_{x_k x_l} f^{(t+\varepsilon)}(s, x) + b_k^1(\cdot, H^{i1} * \xi_s^1, H^{i2} * \xi_s^2) \partial_{x_k} f^{(t+\varepsilon)}(s, x) = 0$$

with final condition at time  $s = t + \varepsilon$  equal to  $\varphi(x)$ . By Lemma 4, the function  $P_{s,t+\varepsilon}^i \varphi(x)$  moreover satisfies condition (15) on  $[0, t]$ . Replacing it in the first equation in (14) on  $[0, t]$  and letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , we see that  $\xi^1$  satisfies

$$\langle \xi_t^1, \varphi \rangle = \langle \xi_0^1, P_{0,t}^1 \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \int (r_1(x) - C^{11} * \xi_s^1(x) - C^{12} * \xi_s^2(x)) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(dx) ds,$$

and for all  $\varphi \in C_0^3(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and then (by an elementary approximation argument) for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{LB}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ , which we chose such that  $\|\varphi\| \leq 1$ . In a similar way we get

$$\langle \tilde{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle = \langle \xi_0^1, \tilde{P}_{0,t}^1 \varphi \rangle + \int_0^t \int (r_1(x) - C^{11} * \tilde{\xi}_s^1(x) - C^{12} * \tilde{\xi}_s^2(x)) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx) ds$$

for all  $\varphi \in \mathcal{LB}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  with  $\|\varphi\| \leq 1$ . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \xi_t^1 - \tilde{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \\ &\leq \langle \xi_0^1, (P_{0,t}^1 - \tilde{P}_{0,t}^1) \varphi \rangle^2 + C \int_0^t \left\{ \left[ \int (P_{s,t}^1 - \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1) \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(dx) \right]^2 + \left[ \int \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(dx) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx)) \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad + \left[ \int C^{11} * (\xi_s^1 - \tilde{\xi}_s^1)(x) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(dx) \right]^2 + \left[ \int C^{11} * \tilde{\xi}_s^1(x) (P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) \xi_s^1(dx) \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \left[ \int C^{11} * \tilde{\xi}_s^1(x) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(dx) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx)) \right]^2 + \left[ \int C^{12} * (\xi_s^2 - \tilde{\xi}_s^2)(x) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(dx) \right]^2 \\ &\quad \left. + \left[ \int C^{12} * \tilde{\xi}_s^2(x) (P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) \xi_s^1(dx) \right]^2 + \left[ \int C^{12} * \tilde{\xi}_s^2(x) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(dx) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx)) \right]^2 \right\} ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \xi_t^1 - \tilde{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \\
& \leq C \sup_y |(P_{0,t}^1 - \tilde{P}_{0,t}^1)\varphi(y)|^2 + C \int_0^t \left\{ \sup_y |(P_{s,t}^1 - \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1)\varphi(y)|^2 + \langle \xi_s^1 - \tilde{\xi}_s^1, \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi \rangle^2 \right. \\
& \quad + \sup_y |C^{11} * (\xi_s^1 - \tilde{\xi}_s^1)(y)|^2 + \left[ \int C^{11} * \tilde{\xi}_s^1(x) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(dx) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx)) \right]^2 \\
& \quad \left. + \sup_y |C^{12} * (\xi_s^2 - \tilde{\xi}_s^2)(y)|^2 + \left[ \int C^{12} * \tilde{\xi}_s^2(x) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(dx) - \tilde{\xi}_s^1(dx)) \right]^2 \right\} ds,
\end{aligned}$$

for constants depending on  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV}^2$ ,  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\tilde{\xi}_t^i\|_{TV}^2$  and  $T$ . The functions  $x \mapsto C^{1j}(x - y)$  are Lipschitz continuous uniformly in  $y$  and, by Lemma 4.3 a),  $\tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi$  and  $C^{1j} * \tilde{\xi}_s^j(x) \tilde{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)$  are Lipschitz continuous bounded functions, uniformly in  $s, t \in [0, T]$ . Together with Lemma 4.3 b), this entails

$$\langle \xi_t^1 - \tilde{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \leq C \int_0^t \sum_{i=1,2} \|\xi_s^i - \tilde{\xi}_s^i\|_{\mathcal{L}B^*}^2 ds,$$

and we can analogously obtain a similar bound for  $\langle \xi_t^2 - \tilde{\xi}_t^2, \varphi \rangle^2$ . Taking  $\sup_{\|\varphi\| \leq 1}$ , summing the two obtained inequalities and using Gronwall's lemma we conclude that

$$\|\xi_t^i - \tilde{\xi}_t^i\|_{\mathcal{L}B^*}^2 = 0$$

for all  $t \in [0, T]$  and  $i = 1, 2$ , hence uniqueness for system (14).  $\square$

## 5 Regularity of the stochastic flow and function solutions

We next show under two types of suitable assumptions on the coefficients and the initial condition that the solution  $\xi_t^i(dx)$  has a density  $\xi_t^i(x)$  with respect to Lebesgue measure for  $i = 1, \dots, M$ .

**Lemma 5.1** *Let  $(\xi_t^1, \dots, \xi_t^M)_{t \in [0, T]}$  be the measure solution of (14). Then, for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\xi_t^i \leq e^{\bar{r}_i T} m_t^i,$$

where  $m_t^i$  is the finite measure defined by

$$\langle m_t^i, \varphi \rangle := \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(X_{0,t}^i(x)) \xi_0^i(dx) \right) \tag{24}$$

for any bounded function  $\varphi$ .

**Proof:** We write the proof for  $M = 2$  and  $i = 1$ , and omit for notational simplicity the superscript 1 in the flow  $X_{s,t}^1(x)$ . Taking in the first equation in (14) the function

$$f^{(t)}(s, x) := \mathbb{E} \left( \varphi(X_{s,t}(x)) \exp \left\{ \int_s^t r_1(X_{s,r}(x)) - C^{11} * \xi_r^1(X_{s,r}(x)) - C^{12} * \xi_r^2(X_{s,r}(x)) dr \right\} \right),$$

which is by the Feynman-Kac formula (see Karatzas & Shreve 1991) the unique classic (bounded) solution of the parabolic problem

$$0 = \partial_s f^{(t)}(s, x) + \frac{1}{2} a_{kl}^1(\cdot, G^{i1} * \xi_s^1, G^{i2} * \xi_s^2) \partial_{x_k x_l} f^{(t)}(s, x) + b_k^1(\cdot, H^{i1} * \xi_s^1, H^{i2} * \xi_s^2) \partial_{x_k} f^{(t)}(s, x) \\ + (r_1(x) - C^{11} * \xi_s^1 - C^{12} * \xi_s^2) f^{(t)}(s, x)$$

with final condition at time  $s = t$  equal to  $\varphi(x)$ , we get that

$$\langle \xi_t^1, \varphi \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(X_{0,t}(x)) \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r_1(X_{0,s}(x)) - C^{11} * \xi_s^1(X_{0,s}(x)) - C^{12} * \xi_s^2(X_{0,s}(x)) ds \right\} \xi_0^1(dx) \right) \quad (25)$$

for each continuous bounded function  $\varphi \geq 0$ . The above function  $f^{(t)}(s, x)$  can be seen to satisfy condition (15) when  $\varphi$  is as in Lemma 4 and  $r_i$  is replaced by a bounded and Lipschitz continuous function  $\tilde{r}_i$ ; one then gets 25 up to an error that goes to 0 if  $\tilde{r}_i$  goes to  $r_i$  pointwise. It is the easy to deduce 25 for  $\varphi \in C_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ .

This yields  $\langle \xi_t^1, \varphi \rangle \leq e^{\bar{r}_1 T} \langle m_t^1, \varphi \rangle$  for all bounded continuous  $\varphi$ . The measure  $\xi_t^1 + e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1$  being regular, for each Borel set  $A$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  we can find a closed set  $B \subseteq A$  s.t.  $\langle \xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1, A \setminus B \rangle \leq \epsilon$ . Since the sequence of bounded continuous functions  $f_k(x) = (1 - kd(x, B)) \vee 0$  pointwise converges to  $\mathbf{1}_B$  as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\langle \xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1, \mathbf{1}_B - f_k \rangle \rightarrow 0$  by dominated convergence w.r.t. the positive finite measure  $|\xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1|$ . It follows that for  $k$  sufficiently large

$$\langle \xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1, A \rangle \leq \langle \xi_t^1 + m_t^1, A \setminus B \rangle + \langle \xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1, \mathbf{1}_B - f_k \rangle + \langle \xi_t^1 - e^{\bar{r}_1 T} m_t^1, f_k \rangle \leq 2\epsilon,$$

that is,  $\langle \xi_t^1, A \rangle \leq e^{\bar{r}_1 T} \langle m_t^1, A \rangle$ . □

We immediately deduce from (24) the following

**Corollary 5.2** *For any initial finite measure  $(\xi_0^1, \dots, \xi_0^M)$  and in the uniform elliptic case:  $\exists \lambda_i > 0$  such that  $y^* a^i(x, v) y \geq \lambda_i |y|^2 \forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, v \in \mathbb{R}_+^M$ , the measure  $\xi_t^i(dx)$  has a density  $\xi_t^i(x)$  with respect to Lebesgue measure for all  $t \in (0, T]$ .*

Indeed, in that case, the law of the random variable  $X_{0,t}^i(x)$  has a density with respect to Lebesgue measure. Lemma 5.1 allows us to conclude.

As pointed out in Remark 3.2, some natural biological examples are not covered by this ellipticity assumption. We will next provide a finer result covering some non elliptic cases under additional regularity assumptions. In all the sequel, we assume

(H)' : Hypothesis (H) holds and moreover

- i)  $\sigma^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)$  and  $b^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)$  are respectively  $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)^M)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)^M)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- ii) The functions  $(G^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  and  $(H^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  are respectively of class  $\mathcal{C}_b^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{C}_b^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .

**Remark 5.3** Under assumptions  $(\mathbf{H})'$  and by Remark 3.9,  $\sigma(i, t, x)$  and  $b(i, t, x)$  in (21) are respectively  $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , uniformly in  $[0, T]$ .

**Proposition 5.4** Assume hypothesis  $(\mathbf{H})'$ . If for some type  $i$  the measure  $\xi_0^i$  has a density, then  $\xi_t^i$  has a density for all  $t \in [0, T]$ .

The proof will require classical regularity properties of stochastic flows stated by Kunita (1984) and summarized in the next Lemma.

**Lemma 5.5** Under assumptions  $(\mathbf{H})'$ , the process  $(s, t, x) \mapsto X_{s,t}^i(x)$  has a continuous version such that, a.s. for each  $s < t$  the function  $x \mapsto X_{s,t}^i(x)$  is a global diffeomorphism of class  $\mathcal{C}^{1,\beta}$  for all  $\beta \in (0, \alpha)$ .

Moreover, for each  $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  the inverse mappings  $\eta_{s,t}^i(y) := (X_{s,t}^i)^{-1}(y)$ ,  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ , satisfy the stochastic differential equation

$$\eta_{s,t}^i(y) = y - \int_s^t \sigma(i, r, \eta_{r,t}^i(y)) \widehat{d}B_r^i - \int_s^t \hat{b}(i, r, \eta_{r,t}^i(y)) dr \quad (26)$$

where for  $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,  $\hat{b}_k(i, r, y) = b_k(i, r, y) - \sum_{q,l=1}^d \sigma_{lq}(i, r, y) \partial_{y_l} \sigma_{kq}(i, r, y)$  and  $\widehat{d}B^i$  refers to the backward Itô integral with respect to the Brownian motion  $B^i$  (see p. 194 in Kunita 1984).

Finally, for each  $(t, y) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$  the (invertible) Jacobian matrix  $\nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y) = \left( \partial_{y_l} \eta_{s,t}^{i,k}(y) \right)_{k,l=1}^d$  of  $\eta_{s,t}^i(y)$  satisfies the system of backward linear stochastic differential equations :

$$\partial_{y_l} \eta_{s,t}^{i,k}(y) = \delta_{kl} - \sum_{p,q=1}^d \int_s^t \partial_{x_p} \sigma_{kq}(i, r, \eta_{r,t}^i(y)) \partial_{y_l} \eta_{r,t}^{i,p}(y) \widehat{d}B_r^{i,q} - \sum_{p=1}^d \int_s^t \partial_{x_p} \hat{b}_k(i, r, \eta_{r,t}^i(y)) \partial_{y_l} \eta_{r,t}^{i,p}(y) dr. \quad (27)$$

**Proof:** Thanks to assumption  $(\mathbf{H})'$  and Remark 5.3 we can apply Theorems 3.1 and 6.1 in Ch. II of Kunita (1984). □

**Proof of Proposition 5.4:** Let  $\varphi \geq 0$  be a bounded measurable function in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . By the previous lemma, we can do the change of variable  $X_{0,t}(x) = y$  in the integral inside the expectation in (24), to get

$$\langle m_t, \varphi \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \varphi(y) \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) |det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)| dy \right) < +\infty.$$

Everything being positive in the above expression, Fubini's theorem yields that  $m_t$  has the (integrable) density  $y \mapsto \mathbb{E} [\xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) |det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)|]$  with respect to Lebesgue measure, and we conclude by Lemma 5.1. □

## 6 Convergence to local competition

Our aim in this section is to describe some situations where the interaction range of the competition is much smaller than the one inducing spatial dispersal. For example one may assume that animals interact for sharing resources as they are on the same place but diffuse depending on the densities of the different species staying around them in a larger neighbourhood. To model such situation, we suppose now that  $C^{ij} = c^{ij}\gamma_\varepsilon$  for  $c^{ij} \geq 0$  some fixed constant and  $\gamma_\varepsilon$  a suitable smooth approximation of the Dirac mass as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . Our goal is to show that, under additional regularity assumptions, the (unique) solution  $\xi = (\xi^1, \dots, \xi^M)$  of Equation (14) given by Theorem 3.1 for such competition coefficients converges, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , to a weak function solution of the system of Equations (2).

In what follows, stronger conditions on the coefficients will be enforced, namely:

(H)'' : Hypothesis (H) holds and moreover

- i)  $\sigma^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)$  and  $b^i(x, v_1, \dots, v_M)$  are respectively  $\mathcal{C}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)^M)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, \infty)^M)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ .
- ii) Functions  $(G^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  and  $(H^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  are respectively  $\mathcal{C}^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $\mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Moreover, functions  $(C^{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq M}$  are integrable in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and have bounded derivatives.
- iii) Functions  $r_i$  have bounded derivatives.

**Remark 6.1** Under assumptions (H)'', functions  $\sigma(i, t, x)$  and  $b(i, t, x)$  in (21) are respectively  $C_b^{3,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and  $C^{2,\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , uniformly in  $[0, T]$ , and with bounds that do not depend on the kernels  $C^{ij}$  (cf. Remark 3.9).

We will next establish

**Theorem 6.2** Assume that hypothesis (H)'' hold, and that the initial measures  $(\xi_0^1, \dots, \xi_0^M)$  have densities in  $L^1 \cap L^\infty$  and distributional derivatives in  $L^\infty$ .

Furthermore, assume that  $C^{ij} = c^{ij}\gamma_\varepsilon$  for  $c^{ij} \geq 0$  some fixed constant and  $\gamma_\varepsilon = \gamma(x/\varepsilon)\varepsilon^{-d}$  for some regular function  $\gamma \geq 0$  satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma(x)dx = 1$  and  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |x|\gamma(x)dx < \infty$ .

Then, for each  $T > 0$  the unique weak function-solution  $\xi^\varepsilon$  to Equation (14) converges in the space  $C([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  (endowed with the uniform topology) at speed  $\varepsilon$  with respect to the dual Lipschitz norm, to a solution  $u = (u^1, \dots, u^M)$  of the non local cross-diffusion system with local competition:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle u_t^i, f_t^i \rangle &= \langle \xi_0^i, f_0^i \rangle + \int_0^t \int \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l} a_{kl}^i(\cdot, G^{i1} * u_t^1, \dots, G^{iM} * u_t^M) \partial_{x_k x_l} f_s^i \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_k b_k^i(\cdot, H^{i1} * u_t^1, \dots, H^{iM} * u_t^M) \partial_{x_k} f_s^i + \left( r_i - \sum_{j=1}^M c^{ij} u_s^j \right) f_s^i + \partial_s f_s^i \right\} (x) u_s^i(x) dx ds. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Moreover the function  $u$  is the unique function solution of (28) such that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|u_t\|_1 + \|u_t\|_\infty + \|\nabla u_t\|_\infty < +\infty. \tag{29}$$



To prove Theorem 6.2, we will extend to a convergence argument some of the techniques previously used in the uniqueness result. The same dual norm will be used, along with some additional estimates and technical results:

**Lemma 6.3** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 6.2, for each  $t \in [0, T]$  the functions  $(\xi_t^\varepsilon)^i, i = 1, \dots, M$  have bounded first order derivatives. Moreover, there exists for each  $i$  a constant  $K_i > 0$  depending on the functions  $C^{ij}, j = 1, \dots, M$  only through their  $L^1$  norms  $c^{ij}$  (and not on  $\varepsilon$ ), such that*

$$\max\left\{\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|(\xi_t^\varepsilon)^i\|_\infty, \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla(\xi_t^\varepsilon)^i\|_\infty\right\} < K_i, \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, M.$$

This result relies on an enhancement of Lemma 5.5 needing finer properties of stochastic flows established by Kunita (1990).

**Lemma 6.4** *Under assumption  $(\mathbf{H})''$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, M$  and  $p \geq 2$ , there exist finite constants  $K_{i1}(p) > 0$  and  $K_{i2}(p) > 0$  not depending on the kernels  $C^{ij}$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y)|^p \right) < K_{i1}(p) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\det \nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y)|^p \right) < K_{i2}(p).$$

Moreover, for each  $s < t$  with  $s, t \in [0, T]$  the function  $y \mapsto \det \nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y)$  is a.s. differentiable and there exists  $K_{i3}(p) > 0$  not depending on the kernels  $C^{ij}$  such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\nabla_y [\det \nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y)]|^p \right) < K_{i3}(p).$$

**Proof of Lemma 6.4:** For fixed  $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  and  $t \in [0, T]$  we define coefficients  $\beta : [0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $A^q : [0, t] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d, q = 1, \dots, d$  with components  $\beta_k$  and  $A_k^q, k = 1, \dots, d$  by

$$\beta_k(s, y) := -\hat{b}_k(i, t - s, y), \quad A_k^q(s, y) := \sigma_{kq}(i, t - s, y)$$

(see Lemma 5.5 for the notation) and the process  $(Z_s(y); s \in [0, t], y \in \mathbb{R}^d)$  by  $Z_s(y) = \eta_{t-s,t}^i(y)$ . Then, denoting by  $W = (W^1, \dots, W^d)$  the standard  $d$ - dimensional Brownian motion  $W_s := B_{t-s}^i - B_t^i$ , it easily follows from Lemma 5.5 that  $Z_s(y)$  satisfies the classic Itô stochastic differential equation

$$Z_s(y) = y + \int_0^s A(r, Z_r(y)) dW_r + \int_0^s \beta(r, Z_r(y)) dr, \quad (30)$$

whereas the associated Jacobian matrix satisfies the linear system:

$$\partial_{y_l} Z_s^k(y) = I_d + \sum_{m,q=1}^d \int_0^s \partial_{x_p} A_k^q(r, Z_r(y)) \partial_{y_l} Z_r^m(y) dW_r^q + \sum_{m=1}^d \int_0^s \partial_{x_p} \beta_k(r, Z_r(y)) \partial_{y_l} Z_r^m(y) dr. \quad (31)$$

Notice that the (non-homogenous) coefficients of this linear SDE are uniformly bounded (cf. Remark 6.1) independently of kernels  $C^{ij}$ . Using the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, the boundedness of the derivatives of  $A^q$  and  $\beta$  and Gronwall's lemma, we deduce that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\nabla_y Z_s(y)|^p \right) < K_{i1}(p) \quad (32)$$

for some constant  $K_{i1}(p)$  which depends on bounds for those derivatives and on  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV}$  (cf. Remark 5.3) but does not depend on  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . This yields the first asserted estimate. In order to get the estimates for the determinant and its gradient, we rewrite (30) in Stratonovich form

$$Z_s(y) = y + \int_0^s A(r, Z_r(y)) \circ dW_r + \int_0^s \beta^\circ(r, Z_r(y)) dr$$

where  $\beta^\circ(r, x) = \beta(r, x) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l, q} A_l^q(r, x) \partial_{x_l} A^q(r, x)$ . By the proof of Lemma 4.3.1 of Kunita (1990),  $\det \nabla_y Z_s(y)$  satisfies the linear Stratonovich stochastic differential equation

$$\det \nabla_y Z_s(y) = 1 + \int_0^s \det \nabla_y Z_r(y) \sum_{k=1}^d \left[ \sum_{q=1}^d \partial_{y_k} A_k^q(r, Z_r(y)) \circ dW_r^q + \partial_{y_k} \beta_k^\circ(r, Z_r(y)) dr \right]. \quad (33)$$

Again, the coefficients of this scalar linear SDE are uniformly bounded independently of the kernels  $C^{ij}$ . Using Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality in the Itô's form of the previous equation, we deduce using also Gronwall's lemma that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\det \nabla_y Z_s(y)|^p \right) < K_{i2}(p) \quad (34)$$

for some constant  $K_{i2}(p)$  depending on bounds on the (up to second order) derivatives of  $\sigma^i$  and (up to first order derivatives) of  $b$ , on  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_{TV}$  and on the constant  $C_M$  in assumption **(H)''** i). This yields the second required estimate. Remark 3.9 ensures that the constants  $K_{i1}(p)$  and  $K_{i2}(p)$  do not depend on the kernels  $C^{ij}$  nor on  $\varepsilon$ .

Finally, under assumptions **(H)''** we deduce from equation (33) and Theorem 3.3.3 of Kunita (1990) (see also Exercise 3.1.5 therein) the a.s. differentiability of the mapping  $y \mapsto \det \nabla_y \eta_{s,t}^i(y)$ , and the fact that its derivative with respect to  $y_l$  satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{y_l} [\det \nabla_y Z_s(y)] &= \int_0^s \partial_{y_l} [\det \nabla_y Z_r(y)] \sum_{k=1}^d \left[ \sum_{q=1}^d \partial_{y_k} A_k^q(r, Z_r(y)) \circ dW_r^q + \partial_{y_k} \beta_k^\circ(r, Z_r(y)) dr \right] \\ &+ \int_0^s \det \nabla_y Z_r(y) \sum_{m, k=1}^d \partial_{y_l} Z_s^m(y) \left[ \sum_{q=1}^d \partial_{y_m y_k}^2 A_k^q(r, Z_r(y)) \circ dW_r^q + \partial_{y_m y_k} \beta_k^\circ(r, Z_r(y)) dr \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that all coefficients inside the square brackets are uniformly bounded functions (independently of kernels  $C^{ij}$ ). Writing this equation in Itô's form, we now deduce with the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality that  $\phi(s) := \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{r \in [0, s]} |\nabla_y [\det \nabla_y Z_r(y)]|^p \right)$  satisfies the inequality

$$\phi(s) \leq C' \int_0^s \phi(r) dr + C'' \int_0^s \mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{\theta \in [0, r]} |\det \nabla_y Z_\theta(y)|^p \sup_{\theta \in [0, r]} |\nabla_y Z_\theta(y)|^p \right) dr.$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the estimates (32) and (34) with  $2p$  instead of  $p$ , the above expectation is seen to be bounded uniformly in  $r \in [0, t], y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . We deduce by Gronwall's lemma that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |\nabla_y [\det \nabla_y Z_s(y)]|^p \right) < K_{i3}(p)$$

for some constant  $K_{i3}(p)$  as required, and conclude the third asserted estimate.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 6.3:** We again consider  $M = 2$ ,  $i = 1$  and omit the superscript 1 in the process  $X_{s,t}^1(x)$ , the inverse flow and its derivative. By Lemma 5.5 we can do the change of variables  $X_{0,t}(x) = y$  in the integral with respect to  $dx$  inside the expectation in (25). Using the semigroup property of the flow and its inverse stated by Kunita (1984, 1990) together with Fubini's theorem (thanks to Lemma 6.4), we deduce that for a.e.  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,

$$\xi_t^1(y) = \mathbb{E}[\Psi(t, y)] \quad (35)$$

where  $\Psi(t, y)$  is the random function

$$\Psi(t, y) := \exp \left\{ \int_0^t (r_1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{11} * \xi_r^1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{12} * \xi_r^2(\eta_{r,t}(y))) dr \right\} \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) \det \nabla_y \eta_{0,t}(y).$$

Notice that we have used the fact that  $\det \nabla_y \eta_{0,t}(y) > 0$ , which follows from  $\det \nabla_y \eta_{r,t}(y) \neq 0$  for all  $r \in [0, t]$  and  $r \mapsto \nabla_y \eta_{r,t}(y)$  being continuous with value  $I_d$  at  $r = t$ . The bound on  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\xi_t^i\|_\infty$  readily follows from the previous identity, the assumptions on  $\xi_0^i$  and the second estimate in Lemma 6.4.

The function  $y \mapsto \Psi(t, y)$  is moreover continuously differentiable, by Lemmas 5.5 and 6.4. Since the kernels  $C^{11}$  and  $C^{12}$  have bounded derivatives we deduce that, a.s.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \Psi(t, y) = & \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r_1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{11} * \xi_r^1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{12} * \xi_r^2(\eta_{r,t}(y)) dr \right\} \\ & \times \left[ \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) \det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y) \int_0^t \nabla^* \eta_{r,t}(y) [\nabla r_1 - (\nabla C^{11}) * \xi_r^1 - (\nabla C^{12}) * \xi_r^2](\eta_{r,t}(y)) dr \right. \\ & \left. + \nabla^* \eta_{0,t}(y) \nabla [\xi_0^1](\eta_{0,t}(y)) \det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y) + \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) \nabla [\det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

for all  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . From Lemma 6.4, thanks to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( |\det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)| \int_0^t |\nabla \eta_{r,t}(y)| dr + |\nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)| |\det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)| + |\nabla [\det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)]| \right) < \infty.$$

Thus, we can take derivatives inside the expectation (35) and deduce the existence of

$$\nabla \xi_t^1(y) = \mathbb{E}[\nabla \Psi(t, y)],$$

and moreover that  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla \xi_t^1\|_\infty < \infty$ . Similarly,  $\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\nabla \xi_t^2\|_\infty < \infty$ . We can now rewrite (36) as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \Psi(t, y) = & \exp \left\{ \int_0^t r_1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{11} * \xi_r^1(\eta_{r,t}(y)) - C^{12} * \xi_r^2(\eta_{r,t}(y)) dr \right\} \\ & \times \left[ \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) \det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y) \int_0^t \nabla^* \eta_{r,t}(y) [\nabla r_1 - C^{11} * \nabla \xi_r^1 - C^{12} * \nabla \xi_r^2](\eta_{r,t}(y)) dr \right. \\ & \left. + \nabla^* \eta_{0,t}(y) \nabla [\xi_0^1](\eta_{0,t}(y)) \det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y) + \xi_0^1(\eta_{0,t}(y)) \nabla [\det \nabla \eta_{0,t}(y)] \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Since  $\|C^{1j}\|_1 = c^{1j}$ , we have  $\|C^{1j} * \nabla \xi_s^j\|_\infty \leq c^{1j} \|\nabla \xi_s^j\|_\infty$  for all  $s \in [0, T]$ . Taking expectation in (37) and using the estimates in Lemma 6.4, we deduce that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\|\nabla \xi_t^1\|_\infty \leq C'' \int_0^t (\|\nabla \xi_r^1\|_\infty + \|\nabla \xi_r^2\|_\infty) dr + C'''$$

for constants  $C''', C'' > 0$  depending on the functions  $C^{1j}$  only through their  $L^1$  norms  $c^{1j}$  (in particular not depending on  $\varepsilon$ ). Summing the later estimate with the analogous one for  $\|\nabla \xi_t^2\|_\infty$ , we conclude thanks to Gronwall's lemma.  $\square$

We are now ready for the

**Proof of Theorem 6.2:** Again, we write the proof in the case  $M = 2$ . Let  $\varepsilon > \bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ . To lighten notation, we denote simply by  $\xi = (\xi^1, \xi^2)$  and  $\bar{\xi} = (\bar{\xi}^1, \bar{\xi}^2)$  two solutions of system (14) in  $[0, T]$  respectively with  $C^{ij} = c^{ij} \varphi_\varepsilon$  and  $\bar{C}^{ij} := c^{ij} \varphi_{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ . Proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, we deduce that for all function  $\varphi$  with  $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{LB}} \leq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \xi_t^1 - \bar{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \\ & \leq \langle \xi_0^1, (P_{0,t}^1 - \bar{P}_{0,t}^1) \varphi \rangle^2 + C \int_0^t \left\{ \left[ \int_0^t (P_{s,t}^1 - \bar{P}_{s,t}^1) \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int_0^t \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(x) - \bar{\xi}_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \right. \\ & \quad + \left[ \int_0^t C^{11} * (\xi_s^1 - \bar{\xi}_s^1)(x) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int_0^t C^{11} * \bar{\xi}_s^1(x) (P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) \xi_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int_0^t C^{11} * \bar{\xi}_s^1(x) \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(x) - \bar{\xi}_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int_0^t [C^{11} - \bar{C}^{11}] * \bar{\xi}_s^1(x) \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \bar{\xi}_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int_0^t C^{12} * (\xi_s^2 - \bar{\xi}_s^2)(x) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int_0^t C^{12} * \bar{\xi}_s^2(x) (P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) \xi_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int_0^t C^{12} * \bar{\xi}_s^2(x) \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (\xi_s^1(x) - \bar{\xi}_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \left[ \int_0^t [C^{12} - \bar{C}^{12}] * \bar{\xi}_s^2(x) \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \bar{\xi}_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \right\} ds. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Thanks to Lemma 6.3,  $P_{s,t}^1 \varphi \xi_s^1$  is a bounded Lipschitz function with Lipschitz norm bounded independently of  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\bar{\varepsilon}$  and  $s, t \in [0, T]$ . We thus can rewrite and bound the first term in the third line of of (38) as follows:

$$\left[ \int_0^t (\xi_s^1 - \bar{\xi}_s^1)(y) C^{11} * (P_{s,t}^1 \varphi \xi_s^1)(y) dy \right]^2 \leq C \|\xi_s^1 - \bar{\xi}_s^1\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2$$

for some  $C > 0$  not depending on  $\varepsilon, \bar{\varepsilon}$ . The second term in the third line is controlled by

$$C \|\bar{\xi}_s^1\|_\infty^2 \|\xi_s^1\|_{TV}^2 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \bar{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)|^2 \leq C \|\bar{\xi}_s^1\|_\infty^2 \|\xi_s^1\|_{TV}^2 \int_s^t \|\xi_r^1 - \bar{\xi}_r^1\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2 + \|\xi_r^2 - \bar{\xi}_r^2\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2 dr$$

thanks to Lemma 4.3 b). The term in the fourth line is easily controlled by  $C\|\xi_s^1 - \bar{\xi}_s^1\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2$ . Using the fact that, by Lemma 6.3,  $\bar{\xi}_s^1$  has derivatives uniformly bounded independently of  $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$  and  $s \in [0, T]$ , we deduce by the assumption on  $\gamma$  that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |[C^{11} - \bar{C}^{11}] * \bar{\xi}_s^1(x)|^2 \leq C|\varepsilon - \bar{\varepsilon}|^2.$$

A similar upper bound then follows for the term in the fifth line of (38). The last three lines can be bounded in a similar way, and the first line on the right hand side is bounded in terms of dual Lipschitz distances by similar arguments as in Proposition 4.1. Proceeding in a similar way as therein, we now obtain the estimate

$$\langle \xi_t^1 - \bar{\xi}_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \leq C \int_0^t \sum_{i=1,2} \|\xi_s^i - \bar{\xi}_s^i\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 ds + C|\varepsilon - \bar{\varepsilon}|^2,$$

where the constants do not depend on  $t \in [0, T]$  nor on  $\varepsilon$  or  $\bar{\varepsilon}$ . Taking suitable suprema, the latter estimate can thus be strengthened to

$$\sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\xi_r^1 - \bar{\xi}_r^1\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 \leq C \int_0^t \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{r \in [0, s]} \|\xi_r^i - \bar{\xi}_r^i\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 ds + C|\varepsilon - \bar{\varepsilon}|^2,$$

which when summed with the corresponding estimate for  $i = 2$  yields

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{r \in [0, T]} \|\xi_r^i - \bar{\xi}_r^i\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 \leq C|\varepsilon - \bar{\varepsilon}|^2, \quad (39)$$

after applying Gronwall's lemma. Therefore, as  $\varepsilon$  goes to 0, the sequence  $(\xi^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$  is Cauchy in the Polish space  $C([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  and thus converges to some element in that space. Dunford-Pettis criterion for weak compactness in  $L^1$ , together with the uniform bounds both in  $L^1$  and  $L^\infty$  for  $(\xi_t^\varepsilon)_{\varepsilon > 0}$ , imply that the components of the previous limit have densities for each  $t \in [0, T]$ , which we denote by  $u_t^i(x)$ , and which satisfy the same  $L^1$  and  $L^\infty$  bounds.

Weak  $L^1$ -convergence is however not enough to identify  $u$  as a solution of (28) and some regularity of the limit will be needed to do so. We denote by  $\hat{P}_{s,t}^i(x, dy)$  the semigroup associated with the SDE with coefficients defined in terms of the measures  $(u_t^i(x)dx)_{t \in [0, T]}$  as previously. For  $\varphi$  such that  $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}} \leq 1$ , we set

$$\Psi^1(t, \varphi) := \langle u_t^1, \varphi \rangle - \langle \xi_0^1, \hat{P}_{0,t}^1 \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \int (r_1(x) - c^{11}u_s^1(x) - c^{12}u_s^2(x)) \hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) u_s^1(x) dx ds.$$

Since  $\xi = \xi^\varepsilon$  satisfies

$$\langle \xi_t^1, \varphi \rangle - \langle \xi_0^1, P_{0,t}^1 \varphi \rangle - \int_0^t \int (r_1(x) - C^{11} * \xi_s^1(x) - C^{12} * \xi_s^2(x)) P_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \xi_s^1(x) dx ds = 0,$$

proceeding in a similar way as done to obtain the estimate (38), we deduce that

$$|\Psi^1(t, \varphi)|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{r \in [0, t]} \|\xi_r^i - u_r^i\|_{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{B}^*}^2 + \int_0^t \left[ \int [C^{1i} * u_s^i(x) - c^{1i}u_s^i(x)] \hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 ds \quad (40)$$

(the last term corresponding to the sum of the fifth and last lines in (38) when  $\bar{\varepsilon} = 0$ ). Now, by Lemma 6.3, there exists a constant  $K > 0$  (independent of  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $s \in [0, T]$ ) such that for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  one has  $|\langle (\xi_s^\varepsilon)^i, \partial_{x_l} \varphi \rangle| \leq K \|\varphi\|_1$  for any  $C^\infty$  compactly supported function  $\varphi$ . By letting  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the same bound is satisfied by  $u_s^i$ . By standard results on Sobolev spaces (see e.g. Proposition IX.3 of Brezis 1983) we get that  $u_s^i$  has distributional derivatives in  $L^\infty$  and that  $u_s^i$  is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant less than or equal to  $K$ . Since  $C^{1i} * u_s^i(x) - c^{1i} u_s^i(x) = c^{1i} \int \gamma(z) [u_s^i(x + \varepsilon z) - u_s^i(x)] dz$  and  $\int \gamma(z) |z| dz < \infty$ , we deduce that  $\|C^{1i} * u_s^i - c^{1i} u_s^i\|_\infty \leq C\varepsilon$ , which combined with the bound

$$\sum_{i=1,2} \sup_{r \in [0,t]} \|\xi_r^i - u_r^i\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2 \leq C\varepsilon^2,$$

following from (39), yields  $|\Psi(t, \varphi)| \leq C\varepsilon$  for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . That is,  $u$  solves (28).

Let us finally prove the uniqueness of the solution  $u$ . Recall that  $\hat{P}_{s,t}^i(x, dy)$  denotes the associated diffusion semigroup. Consider a second function solution  $v$  in  $C([0, T], \mathcal{M}^M)$  satisfying (29) and with associated semigroups denoted  $\check{P}_{s,t}^i(x, dy)$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle u_t^1 - v_t^1, \varphi \rangle^2 \\ & \leq \langle u_0^1, (\hat{P}_{0,t}^1 - \check{P}_{0,t}^1) \varphi \rangle^2 + C \int_0^t \left\{ \left[ \int (\hat{P}_{s,t}^1 - \check{P}_{s,t}^1) \varphi(x) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (u_s^1(x) - v_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \right. \\ & \quad + \left[ \int c^{11} (u_s^1 - v_s^1)(x) \hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int c^{11} v_s^1(x) (\hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int c^{11} v_s^1(x) \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (u_s^1(x) - v_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad + \left[ \int c^{12} (u_s^2 - v_s^2)(x) \hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 + \left[ \int c^{12} v_s^2(x) (\hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x)) u_s^1(x) dx \right]^2 \\ & \quad \left. + \left[ \int c^{12} v_s^2(x) \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) (u_s^1(x) - v_s^1(x)) dx \right]^2 \right\} ds. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The functions  $\hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi u_s^1$  and  $\check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi v_s^1$  having Lipschitz norm bounded independently of  $s, t \in [0, T]$ , the first term in the third line and the term in the fourth line above are bounded by  $C \|u_s^1 - v_s^1\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2$ . The second term in the third line is bounded by

$$C \|v_s^1\|_\infty^2 \|u_s^1\|_1^2 \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left| \hat{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) - \check{P}_{s,t}^1 \varphi(x) \right|^2 \leq C \|v_s^1\|_\infty^2 \|u_s^1\|_1^2 \int_s^t \|u_r^1 - v_r^1\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2 + \|u_r^2 - v_r^2\|_{\mathcal{LB}^*}^2 dr$$

by Lemma 4.3 b). The last three lines are similarly dealt with and we can easily conclude as in Proposition 4.1.  $\square$

## 7 Concluding remarks

We have developed models for dispersive and competitive multi species population dynamics permitting nonlocal nonlinearity in the diffusive behavior of individuals. Depending

on the value of the spatial competition range, the continuum (macro) limits of the individual (micro) dynamics turned out to be described by deterministic solutions of nonlocal cross-diffusion systems with nonlocal or local competition terms. These systems generalize usual diffusion-reaction systems with nonlocal or local spatial nonlinearity in the diffusive coefficients, and nonlocal or local nonlinearity in the reaction terms. These limiting objects can now be used as approximate objects for numerical simulation of spatial and ecological dynamics, when the individual behaviors depend on the non homogeneous spatial densities of the different species. Of course, estimators of the relevant parameters of the phenomena under study have to be obtained first.

In the future it may also be worthwhile to elucidate the situation where the spatial interaction range would be very small. This could thus justify by an individual-based approach the cross-diffusion models with local spatial interaction and local competition extensively studied by the scientific community.

**Acknowledgements:** The authors acknowledge support of ECOS-CONICYT C09E05 project. J. Fontbona also thanks partial support from Basal-CONICYT grant “Center for Mathematical Modeling” (CMM), Millenium Nucleus Stochastic Models of Disordered and Complex Systems NC120062 and the hospitality of École Polytechnique. S. Méléard thanks the Chair “Modélisation Mathématique et Biodiversité ” of Veolia Environnement - École Polytechnique - Museum National d’Histoire Naturelle - Fondation X, and hospitality of CMM. Both authors also thank Salomé Martínez and Juan Dávila for interesting and motivating discussions at the beginning of this work, as well as for pointing out important references on cross-diffusion models. We also thank the anonymous referees for pointing out some relevant references, and for remarks that allowed us to rectify or make more precise the statements of some of the hypothesis.

## References

- Arnold, A., Desvillettes, L. & Prévost, C. (2012), ‘Existence of nontrivial steady states for populations structured with respect to space and a continuous trait’, *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* **11**(1), 83–96.
- Bansaye, V. & Méléard, S. (2015), *Stochastic models for structured populations*, Vol. 1 of *Mathematical Biosciences Institute Lecture Series. Stochastics in Biological Systems*, Springer, Cham; MBI Mathematical Biosciences Institute, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH. Scaling limits and long time behavior.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-21711-6>
- Berestycki, H., Nadin, G., Perthame, B. & Ryzhik, L. (2009), ‘The non-local Fisher-KPP equation: travelling waves and steady states’, *Nonlinearity* **22**(12), 2813–2844.
- Bouin, E., Calvez, V., Meunier, N., Mirrahimi, S., Perthame, B., Raoul, G. & Voituriez, R. (2012), ‘Invasion fronts with variable motility: phenotype selection, spatial sorting and wave acceleration’, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **350**(15-16), 761–766.
- Brezis, H. (1983), *Analyse fonctionnelle*, Collection Mathématiques Appliquées pour la Maîtrise. [Collection of Applied Mathematics for the Master’s Degree], Masson, Paris. Théorie et applications. [Theory and applications].

- Champagnat, N. & Méléard, S. (2007), ‘Invasion and adaptive evolution for individual-based spatially structured populations’, *J. Math. Biol.* **55**(2), 147–188.
- Chen, L. & Jüngel, A. (2004), ‘Analysis of a multidimensional parabolic population model with strong cross-diffusion’, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **36**(1), 301–322 (electronic).
- Chen, L. & Jüngel, A. (2006), ‘Analysis of a parabolic cross-diffusion population model without self-diffusion’, *J. Differential Equations* **224**(1), 39–59.
- Coville, J. & Dupaigne, L. (2005), ‘Propagation speed of travelling fronts in non local reaction-diffusion equations’, *Nonlinear Anal.* **60**(5), 797–819.
- Dawson, D. A. (1993), Measure-valued Markov processes, in ‘École d’Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XXI—1991’, Vol. 1541 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 1–260.
- Desvillettes, L., Lepoutre, T. & Moussa, A. (2014), ‘Entropy, duality, and cross diffusion’, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **46**(1), 820–853.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/130908701>
- Desvillettes, L., Lepoutre, T., Moussa, A. & Trescases, A. (2015), ‘On the entropic structure of reaction-cross diffusion systems’, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **40**(9), 1705–1747.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03605302.2014.998837>
- Fournier, N. & Méléard, S. (2004), ‘A microscopic probabilistic description of a locally regulated population and macroscopic approximations’, *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **14**(4), 1880–1919.
- Genieys, S., Volpert, V. & Auger, P. (2006), ‘Pattern and waves for a model in population dynamics with nonlocal consumption of resources’, *Math. Model. Nat. Phenom.* **1**(1), 65–82.
- Jourdain, B., Méléard, S. & Woyczynski, W. A. (2012), ‘Lévy flights in evolutionary ecology’, *J. Math. Biol.* **65**(4), 677–707.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00285-011-0478-5>
- Jüngel, A. (2015), ‘The boundedness-by-entropy method for cross-diffusion systems’, *Nonlinearity* **28**(6), 1963–2001.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0951-7715/28/6/1963>
- Karatzas, I. & Shreve, S. E. (1991), *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, Vol. 113 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, second edn, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Keller, E. & Segel, L. (1970), ‘Initiation of slime mold aggregation viewed as an instability’, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **26**(3), 399–415.
- Kunita, H. (1984), Stochastic differential equations and stochastic flows of diffeomorphisms, in ‘École d’été de probabilités de Saint-Flour, XII—1982’, Vol. 1097 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, Springer, Berlin, pp. 143–303.
- Kunita, H. (1990), *Stochastic flows and stochastic differential equations*, Vol. 24 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.



- Lepoutre, T., Pierre, M. & Rolland, G. (2012), ‘Global well-posedness of a conservative relaxed cross diffusion system’, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **44**(3), 1674–1693.
- Lou, Y., Martínez, S. & Ni, W.-M. (2000), ‘On  $3 \times 3$  Lotka-Volterra competition systems with cross-diffusion’, *Discrete Contin. Dynam. Systems* **6**(1), 175–190.
- Méléard, S. & Roelly, S. (1993), ‘Sur les convergences étroite ou vague de processus à valeurs mesures’, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **317**(8), 785–788.
- Mimura, M. & Kawasaki, K. (1980), ‘Spatial segregation in competitive interaction-diffusion equations’, *J. Math. Biol.* **9**(1), 49–64.
- Mimura, M. & Murray, J. D. (1978), ‘On a diffusive prey-predator model which exhibits patchiness’, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **75**(3), 249–262.
- Mimura, M. & Yamaguti, M. (1982), ‘Pattern formation in interacting and diffusing systems in population biology’, *Adv. Biophys* **15**, 19–65.
- Nisbet, R. M. & Gurney, W. (1975a), ‘A note on non-linear population transport’, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **56**(1), 441–457.
- Nisbet, R. M. & Gurney, W. (1975b), ‘The regulation of inhomogeneous populations’, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **52**, 249–251.
- Roelly-Coppoletta, S. (1986), ‘A criterion of convergence of measure-valued processes: application to measure branching processes’, *Stochastics* **17**(1-2), 43–65.  
**URL:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17442508608833382>
- Shigesada, N., Kawasaki, K. & Teramoto, E. (1979), ‘Spatial segregation of interacting species’, *J. Theoret. Biol.* **79**(1), 83–99.