

constant portality. We note that independently on the value of the portality m_i , the considered contact mode exhibits very strong clustering that is reflected in the bound on the correction functions that only depend on time t . Note that this effect on the behaviour of the computer simulation is discovered already in [1] and no other than the rigorous theoretical formulation and derivation. A direct consequence of the competition in the model is the suppression of such clustering. Nevertheless, the strong enough competition and the high intrinsic portality m_i produce the sub-Poissonian bound for the solution to the moment equations provided such bound is true for the initial state. Moreover, we can verify specific influences of the constant and the density dependent portality intensities separately. More precisely, the high enough intrinsic portality m_i gives uniform in time bound for each correction function and the strong competition results ensure the regular spatial distribution of the typical configuration for any moment of time that is reflected in the sub-Poissonian bound. Joint influence of the intrinsic portality and the competition leads to the existence of the unique invariant measure for our model which is just Dirac measure concentrated on the empty configuration. The latter means that the corresponding stochastic evolution of the population is asymptotically extinguishing.

The measure $\mu_n(K)$ is called the correction measure of K .
As shown in [1] for $\mu_n(K)$ and any $G \in L^1_{\mu_n}(K)$ the series $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mu_n(K) G$ is absolutely convergent. Furthermore $KG \in L^1_{\mu_n}(K)$.

here

$$D_x^+ F = F(x) - F$$

and κ^+ is so the positive constant

The existence of the process associated with L_+ can be shown using the same technique as in [1]. Let k_t be the corresponding evolution of measures in time on $\mathbf{M}_{\text{fin}}^1$. By $k_t^{(n)}$, $n \geq 1$, we denote the dynamics of the corresponding n th order correlation functions provided they exist. Note that each of such functions describes the density of the system at the moment t .

Then using [1] for any continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with bounded support we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x k_t^{(1)}(x) dx &= \frac{d}{dt} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \kappa^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x k_t^{(1)}(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} x a^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} k_t^{(1)}(x) dx \end{aligned}$$

here $\int$ denotes the classical convolution on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Hence $k_t^{(1)}$ grows exponentially in t . In particular for the transition in critical case one has $k_0^{(1)}(x) \equiv k_0^{(1)}$ and so the result

$$k_t^{(1)} = e^{\kappa^+ t} k_0^{(1)}$$

One of the possibilities to prevent the density growth of the system is to include the death mechanism. The simplest one is described by the independent death rate mortality m . This means that any element of population has an independent exponentially distributed with parameter m random lifetime. The independent death together with the independent creation of new particles yields existing ones describe the so-called **contact model** in the continuum (see e.g. [2]). The pre-generator of such model is given by the following expression

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{CM}} F &= m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D_x^- F + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} L_+ F \\ &= m \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} D_x^- F + \kappa^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+(x-y) D_x^+ F dx \end{aligned}$$

here

$$D_x^- F = F(x) - F$$

The Markov process associated with the generator L_{CM} is constructed in [3]. This construction is generalized in [4] for more general classes of functions a^+ . Let us note that the contact model in the continuum is used in the epidemiology to model the infection spreading process. The states of this process represent the states of the infected population. This is an analog of the contact process on lattice. Of course such interpretation is not in the spatial ecology concept. On the other hand contact process is a spatial branching process with given mortality rate.

The dynamics of correlation functions in the contact model is considered in [5]. Note that for correctness we have for any $n \geq 1$ the correlation

function of n th order has the following form

$$k_t^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)t} \prod_{i=1}^n e^{tL_{a^+}^i} k_0^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \\ - \int_0^t e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)(t-s)} \prod_{i=1}^n e^{(t-s)L_{a^+}^i} \\ \times \sum_{i=1}^n k_s^{(n-1)}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \sum_{j: j \neq i} a^+(x_i - x_j) ds$$

where

$$L_{a^+}^i k^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^+(x_i - y) k^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) - k^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dy$$

and the symbol x_i means that the i th coordinate is omitted. Note that $L_{a^+}^i$ is the generator and the corresponding semigroup in L^∞ space is

$e^{tL_{a^+}^i}$

Let us consider $t \geq 0$. One can prove by induction that for any $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in B_n$ $\geq$

$$k_t^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq n! e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)t} n!$$

Indeed, for $n = 1$ this statement has been proved. Suppose that it holds for $n - 1$. Then, by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} k_t^{(n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) &\geq \kappa^+ \int_0^t e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)(t-s)} n! e^{(n-1)(\kappa^+ - 1)s} n! e^{-(n-1)s} ds \\ &\geq n! e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)t} \int_0^t e^{-(\kappa^+ - 1)s} ds \geq n! e^{n(\kappa^+ - 1)t} n! \end{aligned}$$

As it is mentioned before, the theorem shows the clustering in the contact mode. A previous consideration was extended for the case $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we should only replace y by m in the previous calculations.

As a conclusion, we have the presence of mortality m, κ^+ in the free growth mode prevents the growth of density, i.e., the correlation functions of all orders decay in time. But it doesn't influence on the clustering in the system. One of the possibilities to prevent such clustering is to consider the so-called density-dependent death rate. Now let us consider the following pre-generator,

$$LF = \sum_{x \in \gamma} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \dots$$

Proof. It is not difficult to show that L_0 is densely defined and closed operator in $\mathbf{L}_C$.

Let $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$ be arbitrary and fixed. Clearly, for $\zeta \in \text{Sect } \frac{\pi}{2}$

$$\|m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \quad \text{if } \text{Re } \zeta \geq 0$$

Therefore, for any $\zeta \in \text{Sect } \frac{\pi}{2}$ the inverse operator $L_0 - \zeta^{-1}$ the action of which is given by

$$L_0 - \zeta^{-1} G \mapsto \frac{1}{m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\|} G \mapsto$$

is well defined on the whole space $\mathbf{L}_C$. Moreover, it is bounded operator in this space and

$$\|L_0 - \zeta^{-1}\| \leq \begin{cases} \frac{8}{|\zeta|} & \text{if } \text{Re } \zeta \geq 0 \\ \frac{M}{|\zeta|} & \text{if } \text{Re } \zeta < 0 \end{cases}$$

where the constant M does not depend on ζ .

The case $\text{Re } \zeta \geq 0$ is direct consequence of the following inequality

$$\|m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\| \leq \frac{1}{|\zeta|} \quad \text{if } \text{Re } \zeta \geq 0$$

We prove now the bound in the case $\text{Re } \zeta < 0$ using the following

$$\|L_0 - \zeta^{-1} G\|_C \leq \left\| \frac{1}{m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\|} G \right\|_C \leq \frac{|\zeta|}{\|m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\|} \|G\|_C$$

Since $\zeta \in \text{Sect } \frac{\pi}{2}$

$$|\zeta| \geq |\zeta| \sin \frac{\pi}{2} = |\zeta| \cos \frac{\pi}{2}$$

Hence

$$\frac{|\zeta|}{\|m\| \left\| \frac{\kappa^{-1} E^{a^-}}{\zeta} \right\|} \leq \frac{|\zeta|}{\|m\| |\zeta|} \leq \frac{1}{\cos \frac{\pi}{2}} = M$$

and $\mathbf{L}_C$ is fulfilled.

The rest of the statement of the theorem follows directly from the theorem of Hille-Yosida (see e.g. [10]). $\square$

We define now

$$L_1 G \mapsto \kappa^{-1} \sum_{x \in \eta} \sum_{y \in \eta} a^-(x-y) G \mapsto y \quad G \in D(L_1) \subset D(L_0)$$

The following proposition states that the operator L_1 is well defined.

Lemma 4.1. For any $\eta \in \mathcal{H}$ the operator L_1 is well defined and $\|L_1\| \leq M$.

Proof. By Fubini's property

$$\|L_1 G\|_C = \int_{\Gamma_0} |L_1 G(x)| |C|^{|n|} dx$$

can be estimated by

$$\kappa^- \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{x \in \eta} \int_{y \in \eta} |a^-(x-y)| |G(x)| |C|^{|n|} dy dx$$

By Minkowski's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \kappa^- \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{x \in \eta} |a^-(x-y)| |G(x)| |C|^{|n|+1} dy dx \\ & \leq \kappa^- \int_{\Gamma_0} |C| \|G(x)\| |C|^{|n|} dx \leq \frac{\kappa^-}{m} C \|L_0 G\|_C \end{aligned}$$

Therefore it holds with

$$a = \frac{\kappa^- C}{m}$$

Consequently

$$C_0 = \frac{m}{\kappa^-}$$

we obtain that for $C = C_0$

□

We set now

$$\begin{aligned} L_2 G(x) &= L_{2, \kappa^+} G(x) = \kappa^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{y \in \eta} |a^+(x-y)| |G(x)| |C|^{|n|} dy dx \\ G &\in D(L_2) \subset D(L_0) \end{aligned}$$

The operator defined as

$$NG, \quad \|G\|_C \leq 1, \quad G \in D(L_0)$$

is called the nonlinear operator

Remark 4.4 We proved, in particular, that for $G \in D(L_0) \cap D(L_1) \cap D(L_2)$

$$\|L_1 G\|_C \leq \kappa^- C \|NG\|_C$$

$$\|L_2 G\|_C \leq \kappa^+ \|NG\|_C$$

Finally we consider the semigroup of the operator $\mathcal{B}$

$$L_3 G, \quad \kappa^+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\gamma \cap \eta} a^+(x-y) G, \quad \|x\| dx \in D(L_3), \quad D(L_0)$$

Lemma 4.5 For any η and any κ^+, C, m such that

$$\kappa^+ E^{a^+}, \quad C \kappa^- E^{a^-}, \quad m \leq 1$$

the following estimate holds

$$\|L_3 G\|_C \leq a \|L_0 G\|_C, \quad G \in D(L_3)$$

with $a = \kappa^+ C$.

Proof. Using the semigroup properties in the two previous lemmas we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|L_3 G\|_C &= \int_{\Gamma_0} \|L_3 G, \|C\|^{\eta} dx \\ &\leq \kappa^+ \int_{\Gamma_0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\gamma \cap \eta} a^+(x-y) |G, \|x\| dx \|C\|^{\eta} dx \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.5 it is equivalent to

$$\frac{\kappa^+}{C} \int_{\Gamma_0} E^{a^+}, \|G, \|C\|^{\eta} dx$$

The assertion of the lemma is now trivial. $\square$

Theorem 4.6 Assume that the functions a^-, a^+ and the constants κ^-, κ^+, C, m and C satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} C \kappa^- a^- &\geq \kappa^+ a^+, \\ m &\leq \kappa^- C \kappa^+ \end{aligned}$$

Then, the operator $\mathcal{B}$ is a generator of a holomorphic semigroup $U_t, t \geq 0$ in L_C .

Proof. The statement of the theorem follows directly from Remark 4.4 and the theorem about the perturbation of holomorphic semigroup (see e.g. For the reader's convenience we relegate its formulation).

For any $T \in \mathbb{H}$ and for any u there exists positive constants α, β such that if the operator A satisfies

$$\|Au\| \leq \alpha \|Tu\| + \beta \|u\|, \quad u \in D(T) \cap D(A)$$

with a , b , then T

Let us denote for $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$S k_t = - \frac{\kappa^-}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \times \int_{x \in \eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} k(y \oplus_t a^- x - y) dy \\ - \frac{\kappa^+}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \times \int_{x \in \eta} \int_{y \in \eta \setminus x} a^+ x - y k_t \setminus x \\ - \frac{\kappa^+}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{y \in \eta} \int_{y \in \eta \setminus x} a^+ x - y k_t \setminus y \oplus x dx$$

and

$$S k_t \oplus_t =$$

Let

$$\|k\|_C = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\eta \in \Gamma_0} \frac{\|k_t\|}{C|\eta|}$$

then

$$\|S k\|_C \\ \leq \|k\|_C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\eta \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{\kappa^- C}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \times \int_{x \in \eta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^- x - y dy \\ + \frac{\|k\|_C}{C} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\eta \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{\kappa^+}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \times \int_{x \in \eta} \int_{y \in \eta \setminus x} a^+ x - y \\ + \|k\|_C \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\eta \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \{\emptyset\}} \frac{\kappa^+}{m \|\cdot\| \kappa^- E^{a^-}_t} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{y \in \eta} a^+ x - y dx \\ \leq \|k\|_C \frac{C \kappa^-}{m} + \|k\|_C \frac{\kappa^+}{m} + \|k\|_C \frac{C}{C} + \|k\|_C$$

Since E^{a^-} , for $|\lambda| \leq 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n - m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n C^n}{n!} \left| \left| \right|^n - \kappa^- \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n C^n}{n!} \int_{\Lambda^n} E^{a^-} x^{(n)} dx^{(n)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \kappa^+ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n C^n}{n!} \left| \left| \right|^{n-1} \int_{\Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} a^+ x - y dx dy - b \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{t^n C^n}{n!} \left| \left| \right|^n \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - m t C \left| \left| e^{Ct|\Lambda|} - \kappa^- \int_{\Gamma_{\Lambda}} E^{a^-} \right| \right| d_{Ct} \right| \right. \left. \kappa^+ C t e^{Ct|\Lambda|} \int_{\Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} a^+ x - y dx dy \right. \\
& \quad \left. - b e^{Ct|\Lambda|} - \right. \\
& \quad \left. - m t C \left| \left| e^{Ct|\Lambda|} - \kappa^- C^2 t^2 \int_{\Gamma_{\Lambda}} \int_{\Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} a^- x - y dx dy d_{Ct} \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. \kappa^+ C t e^{Ct|\Lambda|} \int_{\Lambda} \int_{\Lambda} a^+ x - y dx dy - b e^{Ct|\Lambda|} - \right| \mathfrak{P}
\end{aligned}$$

D. A. Birch and W. R. Young *A master equation for a spatial population model with pair interactions* Theoretic Popu tion Bio ogy 1972 pp 1-10

N. N. Bogoliubov *Problems of a dynamical theory in statistical physics* Studies in St tistic Mech nics 1946 pp 1-10

B. M. Bolker and S. W. Pacala *Using Moment Equations to Understand Stochastically Driven Spatial Pattern Formation in Ecological Systems* Theoretic Popu tion Bio ogy 1999 pp 1-10

B. M. Bolker and S. W. Pacala *Spatial moment equations for plant competitions: Understanding Spatial Strategies and the Advantages of Short Dispersal* The A eric n N tur ist no 1999 pp 1-10

U. Dieckmann and R. Law *Relaxation projections and the method of moments* The Geo etry of Eco ogic Inter ctions C ridge ni Press 1996 pp 1-10

U. Dieckmann, R. Law, and D. J. Murrell *On moment closures for population dynamics in continuous space* ourn of Theoretic Bio ogy 1998 pp 1-10

D. L. Finkelshtein, Yu. G. Kondratiev, and M. J. Oliveira *Markov evolutions and hierarchical equations in the continuum I. One-component systems* http: r i org s 1999

