HAL open science

Concentration estimates in a multi-host epidemiological model structured by phenotypic traits

Jean-Baptiste Burie, Arnaud Ducrot, Quentin Griette, Quentin Richard

To cite this version:

Jean-Baptiste Burie, Arnaud Ducrot, Quentin Griette, Quentin Richard. Concentration estimates in a multi-host epidemiological model structured by phenotypic traits. 2019. hal-02319518v1

HAL Id: hal-02319518

https://hal.science/hal-02319518v1

Preprint submitted on 19 Oct 2019 (v1), last revised 27 Jul 2020 (v2)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Concentration estimates in a multi-host epidemiological model structured by phenotypic traits

Jean-Baptiste Burie[(a)], Arnaud Ducrot[(b)], Quentin Griette[(a)] and Quentin Richard[(a)]
[(a)] IMB, UMR CNRS 5251, Université de Bordeaux.
F-33400 Talence, France.
[(b)] LMAH, UMR CNRS 3335, Université Le Havre Normandie.
F-76600 Le Havre, France.

Abstract

In this work we consider an epidemic system modelling the evolution of a spore-producing pathogen within a multi-host population of plants. Here we focus our analysis on the study of the stationary states. We first discuss the existence of such nontrivial states by using the theory of global attractors. Then we introduce a parameter $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ that characterises the width of the mutation kernel, and we describe the asymptotic shape of steady states with respect to ε. In particular, we show that the distribution of spores converges to the singular measure concentrated on the maxima of fitness of the pathogen in each plant population. This asymptotic description allows us to show the local stability of each of the positive steady states in the regime of narrow mutations $\varepsilon \ll 1$, from which we deduce a uniqueness result for the nontrivial stationary states by means of a topological degree argument. These analyses rely on a careful investigation of the spectral properties of some non-local operators.

Keywords: Nonlocal equation, steady state solutions, epidemiology, population genetics, degree theory, concentration phenomenon.

2010 Mathematical Subject Classification: 35B40, 35R09, 47H11, 92D10, 92D30.

1 Introduction

In this work we study the stationary states of the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}S_k}{\mathrm{d}t}(t) = \xi_k\Lambda - \theta S_k(t) - S_k(t)\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)A(t,y)\mathrm{d}y, \quad k=1,2, \\ \dfrac{\partial I_k}{\partial t}(t,x) = \beta_k(x)S_k(t)A(t,x) - (\theta + d_k(x))I_k(t,x), \quad k=1,2, \\ \dfrac{\partial A}{\partial t}(t,x) = -\delta A(t,x) + \displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\left[r_1(y)I_1(t,y) + r_2(y)I_2(t,y)\right]\mathrm{d}y. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

The above system describes the evolution of a pathogen producing spores in a heterogeneous plant population with two hosts. This model has been proposed in [21] to study the impact of resistant plants on the evolutionary adaptation of a fungal pathogen.

Here the state variables are nonnegative functions. The function $S_k(t)$ denotes the healthy tissue density of each host $k \in \{1,2\}$, $I_k(t,x)$ represents the density of tissue infected by pathogen with phenotypic trait value $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, while $A(t,x)$ describes the density of airborne spores of pathogens with phenotypic trait value $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. Here $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ is a given and fixed integer.

The positive parameters Λ, θ, δ respectively denote the influx of total new healthy tissue, the death rate of host tissue and the death rate of the spores. The parameters $\xi_k \in (0,1)$ correspond to the proportions of influx of new healthy tissue for each host population and therefore satisfy the relation $\xi_1 + \xi_2 = 1$. Note that in the absence of the disease, namely when $I_1 = I_2 = A = 0$, the density of tissue at equilibrium for each host k is equal to $\xi_k\Lambda/\theta$.

The phenotypic traits of the pathogen considered in the model are supposed to influence the functions r_k, β_k and d_k that respectively denote the spores production rates, the infection efficiencies and the infectious periods of the pathogen. Those parameters depend on the phenotypic value $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and the host $k = 1, 2$.

The function m_ε is a probability kernel that characterise the mutations arising during the reproduction process. More precisely, given a spore with phenotypic value y, $m_\varepsilon(x - y)$ stands for the probability that a daughter spore has a phenotypic value x. Therefore m_ε describes the dispersion in the phenotypic trait space $\mathbb{R}^N$ arising at each production of new spores.

Here we consider that mutated daughter spores cannot have a phenotypic value which is very different from the one of their mother. In other words, mutations are occurring within a small range of the phenotypic space. More precisely we assume that the mutation kernel is highly concentrated and depends on a small parameter $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ according to the following scaling form

$$m_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon^N} m\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

where m is a fixed probability distribution (see Assumption 1 in Section 2 below).

In this work we aim at studying the existence and uniqueness of nontrivial steady states for the above system of equations. We also investigate the shape of these steady states for $\varepsilon \ll 1$ and we shall more precisely study their concentration around some specific phenotypic trait values when the mutation kernel is very narrow $\varepsilon \to 0$.

The above problem supplemented with an age of infection structure has been investigated by Djidjou et al. [16] using formal asymptotic expansions and numerical simulations. In the aforementioned work, the authors proved the convergence of the solution of the Cauchy problem toward highly concentrated steady states.

Moreover, the case of a single host population has already been studied thoroughly. A refined mathematical analysis of the stationary states has been carried out in [15] with a particular emphasis on the concentration property for $\varepsilon \ll 1$. We also refer to [8, 7] for the study of the dynamical behaviour and the transient regimes of a corresponding simplified Cauchy problem for a single host.

Our model (1) is related to the selection-mutation models for a population structured by a continuous phenotypic trait introduced in [11, 19] to study the maintenance of genetic variance in quantitative characters. Since then, several studies have been devoted to this class of models, in which mutation is frequently modelled by either a nonlocal operator or a Laplacian. In many of these works the existence of steady state solutions is related to the existence of a positive eigenfunction of some linear operator and to the Krein-Rutman Theorem, see e.g. [4, 6, 10, 9]. In particular, in [10, 9] it is assumed that the rate of mutations is small; in this case the authors are able to prove that the steady state solutions tend to concentrate around some specific trait in the phenotypic space as the mutation rate tends to 0. In [2], the steady state solutions for a nonlocal reaction-diffusion model for adaptation are given in terms of the principal eigenfunction of a Schrödinger operator.

As far as dynamical properties are concerned and under the assumption of small mutations, another fruitful approach introduced in [14] consists in proving that the solutions of the mutation selection problem are asymptotically given by a Hamilton-Jacobi equation. Propagation properties have also been investigated in related models, see *e.g.* [18] and [1] for spatially distributed systems of equations.

As already mentioned above, in this paper we are concerned with the steady states of (1). Using the symbol $\star$ to denote the convolution product in $\mathbb{R}^N$, steady state solutions of (1) solve

the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} S_k = \dfrac{\xi_k \Lambda}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y) A(y) \mathrm{d}y}, \quad k = 1, 2, \\ I_k(x) = \dfrac{\beta_k(x)}{\theta + d_k(x)} S_k A(x), \quad k = 1, 2, \\ \delta A(x) = m_\varepsilon \star \left[r_1(\cdot) I_1(\cdot) + r_2(\cdot) I_2(\cdot) \right](x). \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The above system can be rewritten in the form of a closed equation for $A = A^\varepsilon \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$

$$A^\varepsilon = T^\varepsilon \left(A^\varepsilon \right), \tag{3}$$

where the nonlinear operator T^ε is given by

$$T^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \sum_{k=1,2} \frac{L^\varepsilon_k(\varphi)}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) \varphi(z) \mathrm{d}z}. \tag{4}$$

Here, for $k = 1, 2$, L^ε_k denotes the following linear operator

$$L^\varepsilon_k = \frac{\Lambda \xi_k}{\theta} m_\varepsilon \star \left(\Psi_k \cdot \right), \qquad k = 1, 2, \tag{5}$$

and Ψ_k corresponds to the fitness function of the pathogen in host k

$$\Psi_k(x) = \frac{\beta_k(x) r_k(x)}{\delta(\theta + d_k(x))}, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^N, \qquad k = 1, 2. \tag{6}$$

Conversely, if $A^\varepsilon \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is a fixed point of T^ε, a stationary solution $(S^\varepsilon_1, S^\varepsilon_2, I^\varepsilon_1, I^\varepsilon_2, A^\varepsilon)$ to the original system (1) can be reconstructed by injecting A into the first two equations of (2). The trivial solution $A^\varepsilon \equiv 0$ is always solution of (2) and corresponds to the disease-free equilibrium. When A^ε is nontrivial, the corresponding stationary state is said to be endemic.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state the main results obtained in this work. In Section 3 we prove the existence of an endemic (nontrivial) equilibrium for model (1) by using dynamical system arguments and the theory of global attractors. In Section 4 we prove that any nontrivial fixed point of (4) roughly behaves as the superposition of the solution of two single host problems, corresponding to the fixed points of the non-linear operators

$$T^\varepsilon_k[\varphi] = \frac{\xi_k \Lambda}{\theta} \frac{m_\varepsilon \star (\Psi_k \varphi)}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) \varphi(z) \mathrm{d}z}, \tag{7}$$

provided the fitness functions Ψ_k defined in (6) have disjoined support. Finally, in Section 5, we investigate the uniqueness of the non-trivial fixed point of T^ε, for $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Our analysis relies on the precise description of the shape of A^ε coupled with topological degree theory.

2 Main results and comments

In this section we state and discuss the main results that are proved in this paper. Throughout this manuscript we make the following assumption on the model parameters.

Assumption 1. *We assume that*

a) *the parameters ξ_1, ξ_2, Λ, θ and δ are positive constants with $\xi_1 + \xi_2 = 1$;*

b) *for each $k = 1, 2$, the functions β_k, d_k, r_k are continuous, nonnegative and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N$ and the function Ψ_k defined in (6) satisfies*

$$\|\Psi_k\|_{L^\infty} \neq 0, \quad \lim_{\|x\| \to \infty} \Psi_k(x) = 0;$$

c) *the function* $m \in L^\infty_+(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ *is positive almost everywhere, symmetric and with unit mass, i.e.*

$$m(x) > 0,\ m(-x) = m(x) \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^N, \text{ and } \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m(x)\mathrm{d}x = 1.$$

Moreover for every $R > 0$*, the function satisfies*

$$x \longmapsto \sup_{\|y\| \le R} m(x+y) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

As already mentioned in the Introduction, in this work we discuss some properties of the nonnegative fixed points for the nonlinear operator T^ε in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Recall that $A \equiv 0$ is always a solution of such an equation. Our first result provides a sharp condition for the existence of a nontrivial fixed point. This condition relies on the spectral radius $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ of the linear bounded operator $L^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}\left(L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)\right)$ defined by

$$L^\varepsilon(\varphi) := L^\varepsilon_1(\varphi) + L^\varepsilon_2(\varphi) = m_\varepsilon \star \left[(\xi_1\Psi_1 + \xi_2\Psi_2)\,\varphi\right], \forall \varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{8}$$

Our first result reads as follows.

Theorem 2.1 (Equilibrium points of System (1))**.** *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied and let* $\varepsilon > 0$ *be given.*

(i) If $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \le 1$*, then* $A \equiv 0$ *is the unique solution of* (3) *in* $L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$*.*

(ii) If $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$*, then there exists at least a continuous function* $A^\varepsilon > 0$ *such that*

$$A^\varepsilon \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N) \text{ and } A^\varepsilon = T^\varepsilon\left(A^\varepsilon\right),$$

where the nonlinear operator T^ε *is defined in* (4)*. Furthermore, the solution* A^ε *belongs to* $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^N)$*, the space of bounded and continuous functions on* $\mathbb{R}^N$*, and the family* $\{A^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon>0}$ *is uniformly bounded in* $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$*.*

The proof of the above Theorem involves the theory of global attractors applied to the discrete dynamical system generated by T^ε. Note that the operator L^ε is the Fréchet derivative of T^ε (see (4)) at $A = 0$. The position of the spectral radius $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ with respect to 1 describes the stability and instability of the extinction state $A = 0$ for the aforementioned dynamical system.

In our next result we consider the situation where $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$ and investigate the shape of the nontrivial and nonnegative solutions of the fixed point problem (3) for $\varepsilon \ll 1$. Observe that the threshold $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ converges to a limit when $\varepsilon \to 0$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = R_0 := \frac{\Lambda}{\theta}\|\xi_1\Psi_1 + \xi_2\Psi_2\|_{L^\infty}. \tag{9}$$

In addition to Assumption 1, we introduce further conditions on the functions β_k and on the decay rate of the mutation kernel m.

Assumption 2. *We assume that the mutation kernel satisfies, for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$*,*

$$\lim_{\|x\| \to \infty} \|x\|^n m(x) = 0.$$

In other words, m *satisfies* $m(x) = o\left(\frac{1}{\|x\|^\infty}\right)$ *as* $\|x\| \to \infty$*.*

Furthermore, we assume that functions β_1 *and* β_2 *have compact supports, separated in the sense*

$$\text{dist}\ (\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) > 0 \text{ with } \Sigma_k = \overline{\{x \in \mathbb{R}^N,\ \beta_k(x) > 0\}},\ k = 1, 2, \tag{10}$$

where dist *is the usual distance between sets in* $\mathbb{R}^N$

$$\text{dist}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) := \inf_{x \in \Sigma_1} \inf_{y \in \Sigma_2} \|y - x\|.$$

This second assumption will allow us to reduce the study of the fixed points of T^ε to the two simpler fixed point problems associated with T_k^ε (defined in (7)). Our last assumption concerns the spectral gap of the bounded linear operators L_k^ε (see (5)). Let us recall that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k = 1, 2$, the spectrum $\sigma\left(L_k^\varepsilon\right)$ of L_k^ε is composed of isolated eigenvalues (except 0) with finite algebraic multiplicities, among which $r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon)$ is a simple eigenvalue. Moreover,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) = R_{0,k} := \frac{\xi_k \Lambda}{\theta}\|\Psi_k\|_{L^\infty},\ k = 1, 2. \tag{11}$$

We refer to Appendix A for a precise statement of those spectral properties. Recalling the definition of R_0 in (9), observe that, due to Assumption 2, we have

$$R_0 = \max\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\}.$$

Next for $k = 1, 2$ we denote by $\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} > \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,2}$ the first and the second eigenvalues of the linear operator L_k^ε and we assume that the spectral gaps are not too small, namely

Assumption 3 (Spectral gap)**.** *We assume that for each $k = 1, 2$ there exists $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} - \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,2}}{\varepsilon^{n_k}} > 0.$$

Note that the above assumption is satisfied for rather general functions Ψ_k. An asymptotic expansion of the first eigenvalues of the operators L_k^ε has been obtained in [15] when the mutation kernel has a fast decay at infinity and when Ψ_k are smooth functions. In that case, the asymptotic expansions for the first eigenvalues involve the derivative of the fitness functions Ψ_k at their maximum. Roughly speaking, for each $k = 1, 2$, Assumption 3 is satisfied when each – partial – fitness function Ψ_k achieves its global maximum at a finite number of optimal traits, and its behaviour around any two optimal traits differs by some derivative. Assumption 3 allows us to include the situation studied in [15] in a more general framework. A similar abstract assumption has been used in [8, 7] to derive refined informations on the asymptotic and the transient behaviour of the solutions to (1) in the context of a single host population.

The single host problem

$$T_k^\varepsilon\left(A_k^\varepsilon\right) = A_k^\varepsilon. \tag{12}$$

has been extensively studied in Djidjou et al. [15]. In particular it has been shown that, when $R_{0,k} > 1$, this equation admits a unique positive solution $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ as soon as ε is sufficiently small. Our next result shows that any nontrivial solution of (3) is close to the superposition of the solutions to the two uncoupled problems (12) for $k = 1, 2$, when $\varepsilon \ll 1$.

Theorem 2.2 (Asymptotic shape of the solutions of (8))**.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 be satisfied and assume further that $R_0 > 1$. Let $A^\varepsilon \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a nontrivial solution of (3). Then the following estimate holds for $\varepsilon \ll 1$:*

$$\|A^\varepsilon - (A_1^{\varepsilon,*} + A_2^{\varepsilon,*})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

where, for $k = 1, 2$, $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the unique positive fixed-point of T_k^ε if $R_{0,k} > 1$ and $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} \equiv 0$ otherwise.

In particular, Theorem 2.2 gives a concentration property for the nontrivial fixed point solutions of (3) and thus for the endemic solutions of (1) as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (see Figures 1 and 2). It shows that each infectious population I_k concentrates around the phenotypic value that maximizes Ψ_k if $R_{0,k} > 1$ or goes to 0 a.e. if $R_{0,k} \le 1$. If each Ψ_k achieves its maximum at a single point $x_k \in \Sigma_k$, a slightly more precise result can be stated.

Corollary 2.3 (Concentration property of the endemic equilibrium points)**.** *Assume that each fitness function Ψ_k admits a unique maximum at $x = x_k$ and that $R_{0,k} > 1$ for all $k = 1, 2$, that is*

$$R_{0,k} = \frac{\xi_k \Lambda}{\theta}\Psi_k(x_k) > 1,\ \forall k = 1, 2.$$



Figure 1: Fitness functions and endemic equilibrium in the case $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} > 1$.

For $\varepsilon \ll 1$, denote by $(S_1^\varepsilon, S_2^\varepsilon, I_1^\varepsilon, I_2^\varepsilon, A^\varepsilon)$ any endemic equilibrium point of (1). Then, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, the following behaviour holds

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} S_k^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\Psi_k(x_k)}$$

and for any function f continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N$, we have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) I_k^\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{d}x = \frac{R_{0,k} - 1}{\Psi_k(x_k)\left(1 + \frac{d_k(x_k)}{\theta}\right)} f(x_k)$$

and

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} f(x) A^\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{d}x = \frac{\theta}{\beta_1(x_1)}(R_{0,1} - 1) f(x_1) + \frac{\theta}{\beta_2(x_2)}(R_{0,2} - 1) f(x_2).$$

Numerical explorations suggest that the latter concentration property may fail to hold when Assumption 2 does not hold. Indeed, we can find examples where $R_{0,1} > 1, R_{0,2} > 1$ and where the population of spores does not concentrate to either maximum of Ψ_1 or Ψ_2. Such an example is shown in Figure 3).

Finally, we are able to prove the uniqueness of the positive equilibrium of (1) given by Theorem 2.1, when ε is sufficiently small. The case where $\min(R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}) = 1$ requires an additional assumption on the speed of convergence of the smallest spectral radius as $\varepsilon \to 0$, which is quite natural in our context (it holds for exponentially bounded mutation kernels [15]).

Theorem 2.4 (Uniqueness of the endemic equilibrium)**.** *Let Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 be satisfied. Assume moreover that $R_{0,1} > 1$ and that one of the following properties is satisfied:*

- *either $R_{0,2} \neq 1$,*



Figure 2: Fitness functions and endemic equilibrium in the case $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} < 1$

- *or* $R_{0,2} = 1$ *and the convergence of* $r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon)$ *is at most polynomial in* ε*, namely* $r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon) \leq 1 - C\varepsilon^n$ *for some* $C > 0$*,* $n > 0$*.*

Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ *sufficiently small,* T^ε *has exactly one nonnegative nontrivial fixed point.*

Our proof is based on a computation of the Leray-Schauder degree in the positive cone of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1) \times \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_2)$. The use of the Leray-Schauder degree is usually restricted to showing the existence of solutions to nonlinear problems, or to giving lower bounds on the number of solutions; here, we were able to derive the *uniqueness* of the solution. Since, for $\varepsilon > 0$, it can be shown that any equilibrium is *stable*, the topological degree provides a way to count the exact number of positive equilibria for the equation, and show uniqueness. Occurrences of such an argument in the literature are scarce but include [17] and more recently [20].

3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.1. To do so, we investigate some dynamical properties of the nonlinear operator T^ε defined in (4). The existence of a nontrivial fixed point follows from the theory of global attractors while the non-existence follows from comparison arguments. Throughout this section we fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Set $\Psi = \xi_1\Psi_1 + \xi_2\Psi_2$, $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ the open set given by

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \Psi(x) > 0\},$$

and let us denote by χ_A the characteristic function of a set A.

We split this section into two parts. Section 3.1 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.1 (i), namely the non-existence of a nontrivial fixed point when $R_0 \leq 1$. In Section 3.2 we prove the existence of a nontrivial solution when $R_0 > 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small.



Figure 3: Fitness functions and endemic equilibrium when Assumption 2 does not hold. Though Ψ_2 takes its maximum value in $x = 0.7$, functions A, I_1 and I_2 concentrate around the trait value $x_3 \simeq 0.652$.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1 (i)

To prove the first part of the theorem, we suppose that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \leq 1$. We denote by $L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}$ the operator defined for every $\varphi \in L^1(\Omega)$ by:

$$L^\varepsilon_{|L^1(\Omega)}(\varphi)(x) = L^\varepsilon\tilde{\varphi}(x), \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega;$$

where $\tilde{\varphi} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x) = \begin{cases} \varphi(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega; \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Lemma A.1 then applies and ensures that the operator $L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)} \in \mathcal{L}(L^1(\Omega))$ is positivity improving, compact, has a positive spectral radius and satisfies

$$r_\sigma\left(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right) = r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon).$$

Next using Lemma A.2 (1), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})^n(\varphi)}{\left(r_\sigma\left(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right)\right)^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0, \ \forall \varphi \in L^1(\Omega), \tag{13}$$

where Π denotes the spectral projection associated to $L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}$ onto

$$\text{Ker}\left(I - \frac{(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})}{\left(r_\sigma\left(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right)\right)}\right).$$

Let $A \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a fixed point of T^ε. To prove Theorem 2.1 (i), let us show that $A \equiv 0$. To that aim note that we have

$$A_{|\Omega} = \chi_\Omega (T^\varepsilon)^n(A) \leq (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})^n(A_{|\Omega}),\ \forall n \geq 0. \tag{14}$$

Now let us observe that, under the stronger assumption that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) < 1$, then Lemma A.2 applies and shows

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \left(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right)^n (A) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0.$$

Hence $\|A\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0$ and therefore $A = T^\varepsilon(A) = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$. This completes the proof of the result when $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) < 1$.

We now consider the limit case $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = 1$. To handle this case let us recall that $\Pi\left(A_{|\Omega}\right) \in \mathrm{Ker}\left(I - (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})\right)$. This allows us to decompose and estimate (14) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(A_{|\Omega}) + (I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}) &= \chi_\Omega (T^\varepsilon)^n(A^\varepsilon) \\ &\leq (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})^n(\Pi(A_{|\Omega}) + (I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega})) \\ &\leq \Pi(A_{|\Omega}) + (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})^n(I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}), \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

for every $n \geq 0$. This leads to

$$(I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}) \leq (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})^n(I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}),\ \forall n \geq 1. \tag{16}$$

Next since $(I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}) \in \mathcal{R}(I-(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}))$, the part of $L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}$ in $\mathcal{R}(I-(L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)}))$ has a spectral radius strictly smaller than 1. Hence letting $n \to \infty$ in (16) leads to

$$(I-\Pi)(A_{|\Omega}) = 0.$$

Recalling (15) this yields

$$A_{|\Omega} = \chi_\Omega T^\varepsilon(A) = (L^\varepsilon{}_{|L^1(\Omega)})(A_{|\Omega}),$$

and this ensures that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) A_{|\Omega}(z)\mathrm{d}z = 0 \quad \forall k \in \{1,2\},$$

and therefore $A_{|\Omega} = 0$ a.e. in Ω (recall $\beta_1+\beta_2 > 0$ on Ω by definition (6)). The equation $A = T^\varepsilon(A)$ ensures that $A = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^N$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1 (i). □

3.2 Proof of Theorem 2.1 (ii)

We now turn to the proof of the existence of a nontrivial fixed point for the nonlinear operator T^ε. To that aim we shall make use of the theory of global attractors and uniform persistence theory for which we refer to [22]. To perform our analysis and prove the theorem we define the sets

$$\mathcal{M}_0 := \left\{ \varphi \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) : \int_\Omega \varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y > 0 \right\} \text{ and } \partial\mathcal{M}_0 = \{\varphi \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) :\ \chi_\Omega\varphi = 0\ a.e.\}, \tag{17}$$

so that

$$L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) = \mathcal{M}_0 \cup \partial\mathcal{M}_0.$$

Note also that we have the following invariant properties

$$T^\varepsilon(\mathcal{M}_0) \subset M_0 \text{ and } T^\varepsilon(\partial\mathcal{M}_0) = \{0_{L^1}\} \subset \partial\mathcal{M}_0.$$

Next let us observe that T^ε is bounded on $L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Indeed, recalling the definition of Ψ_k in (6) it is readily checked that

$$\|T^\varepsilon(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\delta\theta}\left[\xi_1\|r_1\|_{L^\infty} + \xi_2\|r_2\|_{L^\infty}\right],\ \forall \varphi \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N). \tag{18}$$

Our first lemma deals with the weak persistence of T^ε and our result reads as follows. We let T^ε_k be defined as:

$$T^\varepsilon_k = \frac{L^\varepsilon_k(\varphi)}{1+\theta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\varphi(z)\mathrm{d}z}, \qquad k \in \{1,2\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied. If $r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) > 1$ for some $k \in \{1,2\}$, then we have*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T_k^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2}\left(r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) - 1\right), \ \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{M}_0. \tag{19}$$

If now $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$, then there exists $k \in \{1,2\}$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2}\left(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) - 1\right), \ \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{M}_0. \tag{20}$$

Proof. Let us first show (20). We argue by contradiction by assuming that there exists $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}_0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y < \frac{\theta}{2}(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) - 1) =: \eta, \qquad k = 1,2.$$

Then, there exists an integer $n_0 \geq 1$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T^\varepsilon)^{n_0}(\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y \leq \eta, \qquad k = 1,2,$$

therefore

$$(T^\varepsilon)^{n_0+1}(\varphi)(x) \geq \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)((T^\varepsilon)^{n_0}(\varphi))(x), \qquad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathbb{R}^N,$$

and by induction

$$(T^\varepsilon)T^{n_0+n}(\varphi) \geq \left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)^n((T^\varepsilon)^{n_0}(\varphi))(x) \geq \left(\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right)^n(\varphi) \tag{21}$$

for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and for every $n \geq 1$. Next set

$$\tilde{\varphi} = ((T^\varepsilon)^{n_0}(\varphi))_{|\Omega} \in L^1_+(\Omega)\setminus\{0\}.$$

By Lemma A.1, the operator $\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)_{|L^1(\Omega)} \in \mathcal{L}(L^1(\Omega))$ is positivity improving, compact and satisfies

$$r_\sigma\left(\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right) = \frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = \frac{2r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)}{1+r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)} > 1$$

since $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$. Applying Lemma A.2 yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\|\left(\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\eta}L^\varepsilon\right)_{|L^1(\Omega)}\right)^n(\tilde{\varphi})\right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \infty,$$

so that (21) ensures that the sequence $\|(T^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ is unbounded. This contradicts the point dissipativity of T (18). The statement (19) for T_1^ε and T_2^ε is proven similarly. □

We are now able to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 (*ii*).

Proof of Theorem 2.1 (*ii*). Recall that throughout this section, $\varepsilon > 0$ is fixed. Assume that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$. Since T^ε is bounded and compact, it was shown in [22, Theorem 2.9] that there is a compact global attractor $\mathcal{A} \subset L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for T^ε, *i.e.* $\mathcal{A}$ attracts every bounded subset of $L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ under the iteration of T^ε. Next by Lemma 3.1, T^ε is weakly uniformly persistent with respect to the decomposition pair $(\mathcal{M}_0, \partial\mathcal{M}_0)$ of the state space $L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Next [22, Proposition 3.2]) applies and ensures that T^ε is also strongly uniformly persistent with respect to this decomposition, *i.e.* there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to+\infty} \|(T^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \kappa, \ \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{M}_0.$$

As a consequence, according to [22], $T^\varepsilon_{|\mathcal{M}_0}$ admits a compact global attractor $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{M}_0$ and T^ε has at least one fixed point $A \in \mathcal{A}_0$. From the equation $A = T^\varepsilon(A)$, it is readily checked that $A > 0$ a.e. and belongs to $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, while the uniform boundedness (with respect to ε) of such a fixed point follows from (18).

Finally, it remains to prove the continuity of the fixed point A. The facts that $\Psi_k A \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for each $k = 1, 2$ and $m_\varepsilon \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$, imply (see *e.g.* [3, Corollary 3.9.6, p. 207]) that $m_\varepsilon \star (\Psi_k A) \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. From the expression (4) of T^ε, it follows that $A \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.1 (*ii*). □

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this section, we investigate the shape of the endemic equilibria and we prove Theorem 2.2. Hence we assume throughout this section that Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. We furthermore assume that

$$R_0 = \max\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\} > 1.$$

Next recall that since $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \to R_0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, Problem (3) has at least a nontrivial fixed point for ε sufficiently small. For ε sufficiently small we denote by $A^\varepsilon \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ a nontrivial fixed point of T^ε. It is not difficult to check that $A^\varepsilon > 0$ a.e. We recall the definition of the open sets

$$\Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \Psi_k(x) > 0\},\ k = 1, 2, \qquad \Omega = \Omega_1 \sqcup \Omega_2 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \Psi(x) > 0\},$$

and recall that Assumption 2 ensures that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\|x - y\| \geq \eta$ for all $(x, y) \in \Omega_1 \times \Omega_2$. In what follows the functions χ_{Ω_k} denotes the characteristic functions for Ω_k.

Throughout this section we let $A^\varepsilon \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be a positive solution to the equation:

$$A^\varepsilon = \frac{\Lambda \xi_1 (m_\varepsilon \star \Psi_1 A^\varepsilon)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(z) A^\varepsilon(z) \mathrm{d}z} + \frac{\Lambda \xi_2 (m_\varepsilon \star \Psi_2 A^\varepsilon)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(z) A^\varepsilon(z) \mathrm{d}z}. \tag{22}$$

4.1 Preliminary estimates

Recall the definition of L^ε_k in (5). Let $\phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $\phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k > 0$ and $\|\phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ be the principal eigenvector of L^ε_k associated to its principal eigenvalue, which is equal to the spectral radius $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon_k)$. We now recall some results related to the one host model. We refer to [15] for more details (see also Lemma A.1).

Lemma 4.1. *Let Assumption 1 be satisfied. Let $k \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given and assume that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon_k) > 1$. Then the equation*

$$A_k = \frac{\Lambda \xi_k \chi_{\Omega_k} (m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_k A_k))}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) A_k(z) \mathrm{d}z}, \qquad A_k \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\},$$

has a unique solution given by

$$A^{\varepsilon,*}_k = \nu^\varepsilon_k \phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k \ \text{ with } \nu^\varepsilon_k = \frac{\theta(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon_k) - 1)}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) \phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k(z) \mathrm{d}z}. \tag{23}$$

Now, using the assumptions on the sets $\Omega_k, k \in \{1, 2\}$ and on the decay at infinity of m, we prove some properties on the coupling in T^ε as ε goes to 0.

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. Then, for each $(k, l) \in \{1, 2\}^2$ with $k \neq l$, the following properties hold:*

(a) we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\Sigma_l} \phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k(z) \mathrm{d}z = o(\varepsilon^\infty), \qquad \nu^\varepsilon_k \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\Sigma_l} \phi^{\varepsilon,1}_k(z) \mathrm{d}z = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

for all $\varepsilon \ll 1$, where Σ_l and ν^ε_k are respectively defined in (10) *and* (23).

(b) Let $p \in [1,\infty)$ be given. Then, for any $A \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$, the following estimate holds

$$\|\chi_{\Sigma_k} m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_l A)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|A\|_{L^1(\Omega_l)} \times o(\varepsilon^\infty), \tag{24}$$

where the term $o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ is independent of $A \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$.

Proof. We first prove (a). To that aim let us first notice that, due to Assumption 2, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that $\|x-y\| \geq \eta$ for all $(x,y) \in \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$. Thus, due to the decay assumption for m at infinity, one obtains

$$m_\varepsilon(x-y) = o(\varepsilon^\infty), \tag{25}$$

uniformly for (x,y) in the compact set $\Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2$. Now let $(k,l) \in \{1,2\}^2, k \neq l$ be given. By definition of $\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ we have

$$\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1} = \frac{\Lambda \xi_k}{\theta r_\sigma\left(L_k^\varepsilon\right)} \left(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_k \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1})\right). \tag{26}$$

Integrating (26) over Σ_l and recalling that $\|\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ we get

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\Sigma_l} \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z \leq \frac{\Lambda \xi_k |\Sigma_l|}{\theta r_\sigma\left(L_k^\varepsilon\right)} \|\Psi_k\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)} \sup_{(x,y)\in\Sigma_k\times\Sigma_l} m_\varepsilon(x-y).$$

Since $r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) \to R_{0,k} > 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$ (recalling (11)), this yields

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \chi_{\Sigma_l} \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z = o(\varepsilon^\infty) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

and completes the proof of the first estimate in (a). Next coming back to (26) and recalling the definition of Ψ_k in (6) we get for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$

$$\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(x) \leq \frac{\Lambda \xi_k}{\theta r_\sigma\left(L_k^\varepsilon\right)} \frac{\|m_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty}\|r_k\|_{L^\infty}}{\delta\theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y.$$

Hence since $\|\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = 1$ and $\|m_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-N})$, integrating the above inequality over the bounded set Σ_k, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\Sigma_k} \beta_k(y)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq C\varepsilon^N, \ \forall \varepsilon \ll 1.$$

Hence we get

$$\nu_k^\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-N}) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0,$$

and the second estimate in (a) follows. We now turn to the proof of (b). Let $\varphi_2 \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N)$ be given. Then we have, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_2\varphi_2)(x)| \leq \sup_{(y,z)\in\Sigma_1\times\Sigma_2} m_\varepsilon(y-z) \ \ \|\Psi_2\|_{L^\infty}\|\varphi_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_2)}, \ \forall x \in \Sigma_1.$$

Hence, integrating the above inequality on the compact set Σ_1, we obtain that, for all $p \in [1,\infty)$:

$$\|\chi_{\Sigma_1} m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_2\varphi_2)(x)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq |\Sigma_1|^{1/p} \sup_{(y,z)\in\Sigma_1\times\Sigma_2} m_\varepsilon(y-z) \ \ \|\Psi_2\|_{L^\infty}\|\varphi_2\|_{L^1(\Omega_2)},$$

and the estimate with $k=1$ and $l=2$ follows recalling (25). The other estimate interchanging the index 1 and 2 is similar. This completes the proof of (b). □

4.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.2. Throughout this section we assume that $R_0 > 1$ so that, since $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \to R_0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that Problem (3) has a nontrivial fixed point A^ε for each $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ (see Theorem 2.1). Recall that since T^ε is bounded with respect to ε, there exists $M > 0$ such that

$$\|A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq M, \ \forall \varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0].$$

As before, set

$$A_k^\varepsilon = \chi_{\Omega_k} A^\varepsilon,\ k=1,2,\ \varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0],$$

and observe that $\|A_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)} + \|A_2^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_2)} \le M$ for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$. Now let us define

$$\mu_k^\varepsilon = \theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(z) A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z, \quad \forall k\in\{1,2\}, \quad \forall\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0] \tag{27}$$

as well as

$$\Psi^\varepsilon := \frac{\Lambda\xi_1\Psi_1}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} + \frac{\Lambda\xi_2\Psi_2}{\mu_2^\varepsilon}.$$

With these notations, note that A^ε becomes a positive fixed point for the linear operator $K^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(L^1(\mathbb{R}^N))$ defined by

$$K^\varepsilon\varphi := m_\varepsilon \star (\Psi^\varepsilon\varphi), \qquad \varphi\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N).$$

Our first step consists in proving the next lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *The following estimate holds*

$$r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) \le \frac{\mu_k^\varepsilon}{\theta}. \tag{28}$$

Proof. Let us first note that

$$\theta \le \mu_k^\varepsilon \le \theta + M\|\beta_k\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall k\in\{1,2\}, \quad \forall\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0] \tag{29}$$

for some constant $M>0$. Note that since $A^\varepsilon>0$ and $K^\varepsilon A^\varepsilon = A^\varepsilon$, we obtain by a version of the Krein-Rutman theorem (see *e.g.* [23, Corollary 4.2.15 p.273]) that on the one hand

$$r_\sigma(K^\varepsilon) = 1, \forall\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0].$$

On the other hand, we have $A^\varepsilon = K^\varepsilon A^\varepsilon = \frac{\theta}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} L_1^\varepsilon A^\varepsilon + \frac{\theta}{\mu_2^\varepsilon} L_2^\varepsilon A$, thus for $n\ge 1$ we have

$$0 \le \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} L_1^\varepsilon\right)^n A^\varepsilon \le \left(\frac{\theta}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} L_1^\varepsilon\right)^{n-1} A^\varepsilon \le \ldots \le \frac{\theta}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} L_1^\varepsilon A^\varepsilon \le A^\varepsilon,$$

therefore the contrapositive of Lemma A.2 item 2 shows that $\frac{\theta}{\mu_1^\varepsilon} r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) \le 1$. Similarly, we have $\frac{\theta}{\mu_2^\varepsilon} r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon) \le 1$. □

We recall that throughout this section the condition $R_0 = \max\{R_{0,1}, R_{0,2}\} > 1$ holds. We now set $\Theta_k = \sqrt{\Psi_k}$ and we define the self-adjoint operators $S_k^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega_k))$ (recall $\Omega_k = \{\Psi_k > 0\}$), for $k=1,2$, by

$$S_k^\varepsilon = \frac{\Lambda\xi_k}{\theta}\Theta_k(m_\varepsilon \star (\Theta_k\cdot)).$$

Here recall that $\sigma(S_k^\varepsilon) = \sigma(L_k^\varepsilon)$ since Ω_k is bounded (see Lemma A.1). Our next lemma reads as follows.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $k\in\{1,2\}$ be such that $R_{0,k}>1$. Then we have*

$$\mathrm{dist}\left(\frac{\mu_k^\varepsilon}{\theta}, \sigma(S_k^\varepsilon)\right) = \mathrm{dist}\left(\frac{\mu_k^\varepsilon}{\theta}, \sigma(L_k^\varepsilon)\right) = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \forall\varepsilon\ll 1. \tag{30}$$

Proof. Let us assume that $R_{0,1}>1$ (the case $R_{0,2}>1$ is obtained by the symmetry of the problem with respect to the indices). We recall that

$$\Omega_k = \{x\in\mathbb{R}^N :\ \Psi_k > 0\},\ k=1,2,$$

and we denote by $\{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n\ge1}$ of eigenvalues of S_k^ε (and of L_k^ε) ordered by decreasing modulus, so that $\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} = r_\sigma(S_k^\varepsilon) = r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon)$. Next multiplying (22) by Θ_1 and using Lemma 4.2 (b) yields

$$\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon}{\theta} - \frac{\Lambda\xi_1\Theta_1(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_1 A^\varepsilon))}{\theta} = \frac{\Lambda\xi_2\mu_1^\varepsilon\Theta_1(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_2 A^\varepsilon))}{\theta\mu_2^\varepsilon} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

in $L^2(\Omega_1)$. Hence the following estimate holds

$$\left\| \left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta} I - S_1^\varepsilon \right) \Theta_1 A^\varepsilon \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{31}$$

On the other hand, since S_1^ε is self-adjoint, then the following estimate holds (see e.g. [24, Example VII.2, p. 224])

$$\left\| \left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta} I - S_1^\varepsilon \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2(\Omega_1))} = \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}\left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta}, \sigma(S_1^\varepsilon) \right)}.$$

By setting

$$y_1^\varepsilon := \left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta} I - S_1^\varepsilon \right) \Theta_1 A^\varepsilon,$$

we get

$$\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon = \left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta} I - S_1^\varepsilon \right)^{-1} y_1^\varepsilon, \qquad \|y_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

so that

$$\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} \leq \frac{\|y_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}}{\operatorname{dist}\left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta}, \sigma(S_1^\varepsilon) \right)}$$

and

$$\operatorname{dist}\left(\frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta}, \sigma(S_1^\varepsilon) \right) \leq \frac{\|y_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}}{\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{|\Omega_1|}\|y_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}}{\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)}}, \tag{32}$$

where we have used the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in $L^2(\Omega_1)$.

To complete the proof of the lemma, we show that the quantity $\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)}$ does not become too small when $\varepsilon \to 0$. To do so, recall the definition of the nonlinear operator T_1^ε:

$$T_1^\varepsilon(\varphi) = \frac{L_1^\varepsilon(\varphi)}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\Omega_1} \beta_1(x)\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x},$$

for all $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Omega_1)$. Then, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) \left(T_1^\varepsilon\right)^n (\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2} \left(r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) - 1\right) > 0,$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small and every $\varphi \in L^1_+(\mathbb{R}^N) \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, we also have

$$A^\varepsilon(x) = (T^\varepsilon)^n (A^\varepsilon)(x) \geq (T_1^\varepsilon)^n (A^\varepsilon)(x)$$

for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We get for ε sufficiently small:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\beta_1\|_{L^\infty} \|\chi_{\Sigma_1} A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A^\varepsilon(y)\mathrm{d}y \\ &\geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) \left(T_1^\varepsilon\right)^n (A^\varepsilon)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2} \left(r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Next multiplying (22) by χ_{Σ_1} and integrating leads to

$$\frac{\Lambda\xi_1}{\theta} \|\Theta_1\|_{L^\infty} \|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)} \geq \frac{\mu_1^\varepsilon \|\chi_{\Sigma_1} A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}}{\theta} - \frac{\Lambda\xi_2\mu_1^\varepsilon}{\theta\mu_2^\varepsilon} \iint_{\Omega_1\times\Omega_2} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi_2(y)A^\varepsilon(y)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x,$$

while Lemma 4.2 ensures that

$$\iint_{\Omega_1\times\Omega_2} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi_2(y)A^\varepsilon(y)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x = o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

As a consequence there exist $\overline{\varepsilon} > 0$ and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)} \geq \eta, \ \forall \varepsilon \in (0, \overline{\varepsilon}].$$

The latter estimate combined with (32) completes the proof of the lemma. □

As a corollary of the above lemma, we also have the following result.

Corollary 4.5. *Let $k \in \{1,2\}$ be such that $R_{0,k} > 1$. Then the following holds true for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small*

$$\frac{\mu_k^\varepsilon}{\theta} = \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} + o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{33}$$

Proof. Here we consider the case where $R_{0,1} > 1$. The case where $R_{0.2} > 1$ is obtained by the symmetry of the problem with respect to the indices.

In view of Lemma 4.4, we argue by contradiction and assume that there exists a sequence $\{\varepsilon_k\} \subset (0,\infty)$ going to 0 as $k \to \infty$ and a sequence $n_k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0,1\}$ such that for all k one has

$$\frac{\mu_1^{\varepsilon_k}}{\theta} = \lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,n_k} + o(\varepsilon_k^\infty).$$

We have:

$$\frac{\mu_1^{\varepsilon_k}}{\theta} = \lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,n_k} + o(\varepsilon_k^\infty) \le \lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,2} + o(\varepsilon_k^\infty), \qquad \forall k \ge 0.$$

Next recall that by Assumption 3 one has $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,1} - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,2} \ge c\varepsilon_k^{n_1}$ for all k large enough, where $c > 0$ and $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ are given constants independent of k. This yields

$$\frac{\mu_1^{\varepsilon_k}}{\theta} - r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) = \frac{\mu_1^{\varepsilon_k}}{\theta} - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon_k,1} \le -c\varepsilon_k^{n_1} + o(\varepsilon_k^\infty),\ \forall k \gg 1.$$

This contradicts the estimate provided by Lemma 4.3. Corollary 4.5 is proved. □

Our next lemma describes the asymptotic shape as $\varepsilon \to 0$ of the fixed points in the domain Ω_k, when $R_{0,k} > 1$.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $k \in \{1,2\}$ such that $R_{0,k} > 1$ and A^ε be a positive solution to $T^\varepsilon A^\varepsilon = A^\varepsilon$. Then, the following estimate holds for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small:*

$$\left\| A^\varepsilon - \nu_k^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1} \right\|_{L^2(\Omega_k)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty), \tag{34}$$

where ν_k^ε is defined in (23).

Proof. Here we only deal with the case $R_{0,1} > 1$, the case $R_{0,2} > 1$ being obtained by symmetry with respect to the indices.

We first remark that, by definition of Ψ_1 (see (6)), $\Omega_1 \subset \Sigma_1$ and $\Psi_1 = \Theta_1 = 0$ on $\Sigma_1 \setminus \Omega_1$. Observe that Corollary 4.5 together with (31) yields

$$\|(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} I - S_1^\varepsilon)\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{35}$$

Let us denote by Π_1 the positive one-dimensional rank projection on $\mathrm{Ker}(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} I - S_1^\varepsilon)$. Consider $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^\varepsilon$ a closed circle with center $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}$ and the radius $\eta_1(\varepsilon)$ given by

$$\eta_1(\varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2}\left|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,2}\right|,$$

so that the resolvent $(\lambda I - S_1^\varepsilon)^{-1}$ exists for every $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}$. Recalling the formula for spectral projectors [12, Theorem 1.5.4], we obtain for ε sufficiently small:

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \Pi_1(\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon) &= \frac{1}{2i\pi}\oint_{\mathcal{C}} (\lambda - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1})^{-1} \mathrm{d}\lambda \Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \frac{1}{2i\pi}\oint_{\mathcal{C}} (\lambda - S_1^\varepsilon)^{-1} \mathrm{d}\lambda \Theta_1 A^\varepsilon \\ &= \frac{1}{2i\pi}\oint_{\mathcal{C}} (\lambda - S_1^\varepsilon)^{-1}(\lambda - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1})^{-1}(S_1^\varepsilon - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1})\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon \mathrm{d}\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, since S_1^ε is self-adjoint, we obtain the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \Pi_1(\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} &\le \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1(\varepsilon)}\right)^2 \|(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - S_1^\varepsilon)(\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} \\ &\le \left(\frac{2}{\left|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,2}\right|}\right)^2 \|(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - S_1^\varepsilon)\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now recall that the spectral gap $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,2}$ is at most polynomial (see Assumption 3). Estimate (35) leads to

$$\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \Pi_1(\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon)\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{36}$$

We remind that $(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})$ is the principal eigenpair of L_1^ε. Hence $(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}, \Theta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})$ is the principal eigenpair of S_1^ε and the spectral projector Π_1 is given by

$$\Pi_1(\varphi) = \|\Theta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}^{-2}\Theta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\left(\int_{\Omega_1}\Theta_1(x)\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(x)\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x\right).$$

Since $\Theta_1 = 0$ on $\Sigma_1 \setminus \Omega_1$, (36) becomes

$$\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\Theta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty) \tag{37}$$

for some constant $\alpha_1^\varepsilon > 0$, that will be investigated below. Note now that since A^ε is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, then (22) together with Lemma 4.2 (b) yield

$$\chi_{\Omega_1}\left(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)A^\varepsilon = \Lambda\xi_1\chi_{\Omega_1}(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_1 A^\varepsilon)) + o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \forall\varepsilon \ll 1.$$

Next we deduce from the above equality that, for ε sufficiently small,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\left(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)A^\varepsilon - \Lambda\xi_1\left(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_1\alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} \\ \leq \left\|\Lambda\xi_1\left(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_1 A^\varepsilon - \Psi_1\alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} + o(\varepsilon^\infty) \\ \leq \Lambda\xi_1\|m_\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}\|\Theta_1\|_{L^\infty}\left\|\Theta_1 A^\varepsilon - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\Theta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)}^2 + o(\varepsilon^\infty),\end{aligned}$$

so that (37) implies that

$$\left\|\left(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)A^\varepsilon - \Lambda\xi_1\left(m_\varepsilon * (\Psi_1\alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})\right)\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{38}$$

The above equality also rewrites as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\left(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)A^\varepsilon - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\theta L_1^\varepsilon(\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} \\ = \left\|\left(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z\right)A^\varepsilon - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\theta\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty).\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

On the other hand we deduce from (27) and (33) that

$$\theta\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} = \theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z + o(\varepsilon^\infty), \tag{40}$$

so that (39) becomes

$$\left\|\theta\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}A^\varepsilon - \theta\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}\alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^\varepsilon\right\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

Since $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} \to R_{0,1} > 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, the above estimate rewrites as

$$\|A^\varepsilon - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^2(\Omega_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \forall\varepsilon \ll 1. \tag{41}$$

To complete the proof of the lemma, it remains to show that α_1^ε is close to 1. In the following we prove that $\alpha_1^\varepsilon = 1 + o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Combining (40) with the definition of ν_1^ε (see (23)) that also rewrites as $\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z = \theta(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - 1)$, we have

$$\theta(1 - \alpha_1^\varepsilon)(\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - 1) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(z)\left(A^\varepsilon(z) - \alpha_1^\varepsilon\nu_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\right)\mathrm{d}z + o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

Using the fact that $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - 1 \to R_{0,1} - 1 > 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain

$$1 - \alpha_1^\varepsilon = o(\varepsilon^\infty) \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0$$

which completes the proof of the Lemma. □

Equipped with the above lemmas we are now in the position to complete the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We split our argument into two parts. We first consider the case where $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} > 1$ and show that the result directly follows from Lemma 4.6. In a second step we investigate the case where $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} \leq 1$. Using the symmetry of the problem with respect to the indices, this covers all the possible cases.

First case: We suppose that $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} > 1$. In this case, Lemma 4.6 applies and ensures that

$$\|A^\varepsilon{}_{|\Omega_k} - \nu_k^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}{}_{|\Omega_k}\|_{L^2(\Omega_k)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\ \forall \varepsilon \ll 1 \tag{42}$$

for each $k \in \{1,2\}$. Moreover, since A^ε is a fixed point of T^ε, we have

$$A^\varepsilon(x) = \Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \left(\frac{\xi_1 \Psi_1(y)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} + \frac{\xi_2 \Psi_2(y)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} \right) A^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y \tag{43}$$

for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$. It follows from (26) that

$$\nu_k^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(x) = \frac{\Lambda}{\theta \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}} \int_{\Omega_k} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \xi_k \Psi_k(y) \nu_k^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(y) \mathrm{d}y$$

for each $k \in \{1,2\}$, where we recall that $\Omega_k = \{\Psi_k > 0\}$ and $\Omega = \Omega_1 \sqcup \Omega_2$. Injecting the latter equation into (43) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \left| A^\varepsilon - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} - \nu_2^\varepsilon \phi_2^{\varepsilon,1} \right| (x) \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1,2} \frac{\Lambda}{\theta \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \xi_k \Psi_k(y) \left| \left(\frac{\theta \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} A^\varepsilon(y)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} \right) - \nu^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(y) \right| \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

We then infer from (40) that

$$\frac{\theta \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} = 1 + o(\varepsilon^\infty) \text{ for each } k \in \{1,2\}.$$

Recalling that $\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} \to R_{0,k} > 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and that the family $\{A^\varepsilon\}_{\varepsilon > 0}$ is uniformly bounded in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by Theorem 2.1, we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \left| A^\varepsilon - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} - \nu_2^\varepsilon \phi_2^{\varepsilon,1} \right| (x) \mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\Lambda}{M\theta} \sum_{k=1,2} \|\Psi_k\|_{L^\infty} \|A^\varepsilon{}_{|\Omega_k} - \nu_k^\varepsilon \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}{}_{|\Omega_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega_k)} + o(\varepsilon^\infty) = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

for some constant $M > 0$, where we have used (42). Finally, since $\|\chi_{\Omega_1} \phi_2^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ and $\|\chi_{\Omega_2} \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$, we have indeed shown $\|A^\varepsilon - (\nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} + \nu_2^\varepsilon \phi_2^{\varepsilon,1})\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$.

Second case: We assume now that $R_{0,1} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} \leq 1$. Note that Lemma 4.6 applies and ensures that (42) holds for A_1^ε. From Lemma 4.2 (b) and (43), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{d}x &= \frac{\Lambda \xi_2}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} \int_{\Omega_2} \int_{\Omega_2} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \Psi_2(y) A^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}x + o(\varepsilon^\infty) \\ &\leq \frac{\theta R_{0,2} \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(s) A^\varepsilon(s) \mathrm{d}s} + o(\varepsilon^\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

It follows that

$$\left(1 - \frac{\theta R_{0,2}}{\theta + \|\beta_2 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}} \right) \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{d}x = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{45}$$

Now we prove that

$$\int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x) \mathrm{d}x = o(\varepsilon^\infty) \tag{46}$$

holds. In the case $R_{0,2} < 1$, equation (45) implies:

$$(1 - R_{0,2}) \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x \leq \left(1 - \frac{R_{0,2}}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(z) A_2^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z}\right) \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x) = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

hence (46) holds.

Now suppose that $R_{0,2} = 1$. From (45), we see that

$$\frac{\left(\int_{\Omega_2} \beta_2(x) A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x\right)^2}{\|\beta_2\|_{L^\infty}(\theta + M\|\beta_2\|_{L^\infty})} \leq \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(x) A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x}{\theta + \|\beta_2 A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)}} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

for some constant $M > 0$ such that $\|A^\varepsilon\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)} \leq M$ for all ε small. Therefore, we have

$$\int_{\Omega_2} \beta_2(x) A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{47}$$

Next (44) allows us to control $\int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z$ by $\int_{\Omega_2} \beta_2(z) A^\varepsilon(z)\mathrm{d}z$ as follows

$$\int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\Lambda \xi_2 \|r_2\|_{L^\infty}}{\delta\theta} \int_{\Omega_2} \beta_2(x) A^\varepsilon(x)\mathrm{d}x + o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

and therefore (46) holds.

To finish the proof of the theorem, there remains only to show that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \left| A^\varepsilon(z) - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(z) \right| \mathrm{d}z = o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

To this end, we follow the proof of the first case to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \left| A^\varepsilon - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} \right| (x)\mathrm{d}x &\leq \frac{\Lambda \xi_2}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(x) A^\varepsilon(x) dx} \|\Psi_2\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\Omega_2} A^\varepsilon(x) dx \\ &+ \frac{\Lambda}{\theta \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \xi_1 \Psi_1(y) \left| \left(\frac{\theta \lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} A^\varepsilon(y)}{\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(s) A^\varepsilon(s)\mathrm{d}s} \right) - \nu^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(y) \right| \mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

From (46), we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega} \left| A^\varepsilon - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} \right| (x)\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\Lambda}{\theta} \|\Psi_1\|_{L^\infty} \|A^\varepsilon - \nu_1^\varepsilon \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)} + o(\varepsilon^\infty) = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

by using the fact that (42) holds for A_1^ε, which concludes the proof. □

5 Proof of Theorem 2.4

In this section we handle the uniqueness of the endemic steady state for ε sufficiently small and we prove Theorem 2.4. To this end, we use degree theory (see e.g. [5, 25]).

Our strategy is as follows: we first show point-wise estimates on the spectrum of the linearised equation around each stationary solution for $\varepsilon > 0$ small. More precisely, we show that every stationary solution is locally stable for the discrete dynamical system generated by T^ε. Next, we compute the Leray-Schauder degree of the (nonlinear) operator in a subset of the positive cone which contains all the nonnegative nontrivial fixed point, and show that it is equal to one. Because of the additivity property of the Leray-Schauder degree, those two arguments combined show that there cannot be more than one stationary solution.

Recall $T^\varepsilon = T_1^\varepsilon + T_2^\varepsilon$ (see the definitions (4) and (7)). In this section, in order to work in a solid cone of a Banach space, we will be mainly interested in the properties of T^ε, T_1^ε and T_2^ε considered as operators acting on $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$, $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1)$ and $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_2)$, where, according to Assumption 2, Σ_1 and Σ_2 are defined in (10) while Σ denote the compact set given by

$$\Sigma = \Sigma_1 \sqcup \Sigma_2.$$

Recall also that $\Omega_k = \{\Psi_k > 0\}$ and $\Omega = \Omega_1 \sqcup \Omega_2$. And note that due to the definition of Ψ_k in (6) one has $\Omega \subset \Sigma$ and $\Omega_k \subset \Sigma_k$ for each $k \in \{1, 2\}$.

We will use the fact that the fixed-points of T^ε are close to the fixed-point of the uncoupled problem:

$$A^{\varepsilon,*} := A_1^{\varepsilon,*} + A_2^{\varepsilon,*}, \tag{48}$$

where $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^N)$ is the unique nontrivial solution of $T_k^\varepsilon A_k^{\varepsilon,*} = A_k^{\varepsilon,*}$ if $R_{0,k} > 1$ and $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} \equiv 0$ otherwise, for $k = 1, 2$.

Recall finally that the spectra of L_1^ε and L_2^ε, considered as bounded operators on $L^p(\Omega_k)$, $L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ with $1 \le p < \infty$, or $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k)$, consist in a real sequence of decreasing eigenvalues, independent of the space considered (see Lemma A.1), which we denote

$$\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) = \{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}, n \ge 1\}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Lemma 5.1 (Computation of the spectrum)**.** *Assume that $R_{0,1} > 1$ and that one of the following properties is satisfied:*

- *either $R_{0,2} \neq 1$,*
- *or $R_{0,2} = 1$ and the convergence of $r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon)$ is at most polynomial: $r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon) \le 1 - C\varepsilon^M$ for some $C > 0$ and $M > 0$.*

Then, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \varepsilon \le \varepsilon_0$ and for any nonnegative nontrivial fixed point $A^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ of T^ε, we have:

$$\sigma(D_{A^\varepsilon} T^\varepsilon) \subset (-1, 1),$$

where $D_{A^\varepsilon} T^\varepsilon$ is the Fréchet differential of T^ε for the $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ topology.

Proof. We divide the proof in three steps.

Step one: We show that

$$\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon) = \{0\} \cup \left\{ \frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}} \right\}_{n \ge 2} \cup \left\{ \frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}} \right\}, \qquad \forall k \in \{1, 2\},$$

if $R_{0,k} > 1$, and

$$\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon) = \sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) = \{0\} \cup \{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n \ge 1}$$

otherwise, where $A_k^{\varepsilon,*}$ is the solution to the uncoupled problem $T_k^\varepsilon A_k^{\varepsilon,*} = A_k^{\varepsilon,*}$ and $D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon$ is the Fréchet differential of T_k^ε for the $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k)$ topology.

Let us consider the case $R_{0,k} > 1$. We first recall that, since T_k^ε is compact, its Fréchet differential is also compact and its spectrum is consequently identical to its point spectrum. Let $k \in \{1, 2\}$ be given and let $L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)$ be the weighted L^2 space defined by the inner product $\langle f, g \rangle_{\Psi_k} := \int_{\Omega_k} f(z) g(z) \Psi_k(z) \mathrm{d}z$. Since $L^\varepsilon_{k|L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)}$ is self-adjoint in the space $L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)$, there exists an Hilbert basis of $L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)$ composed of eigenfunctions of the operator $L^\varepsilon_{k|L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)}$, which we denote $\{\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n \ge 1}$, and related to the sequence of eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n \ge 1}$. Observe that $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k) \subset L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)$, since $\Psi_k \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and Σ_k is compact. Observe also that, contrary to the previous Sections, here $\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ is not normalized in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$ but in $L^2_{\Psi_k}(\Omega_k)$: $\|\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^2_{\Psi_k}} = 1$.

Moreover, every $\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}$ can be extended to a function in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \cap \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^N)$ by the identity:

$$\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}(x) := \frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}} \int_{\Omega_k} m_\varepsilon(x - y) \Psi_k(y) \phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}(y) \mathrm{d}y, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega_k.$$

Let $h \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k)$, we have:

$$D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon h = \frac{L_k^\varepsilon h}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y) A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y} - \frac{L_k^\varepsilon A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y) A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y) h(y) \mathrm{d}y}{\theta}.$$

Let us write $h^n := \langle h, \phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}\rangle_{\Psi_k}$. We compute, recalling that $1+\theta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(z)\mathrm{d}z = \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ and that $A_k^{\varepsilon,*} = \theta\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}-1}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z}\phi^{\varepsilon,1}$:

$$\langle D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon h, \phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}\rangle_{\Psi_k} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{h^1\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1} - \dfrac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}\langle A_k^{\varepsilon,*},\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}\rangle_{\Psi_k}}{1+\theta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(y)A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(y)\mathrm{d}y}\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{\beta_k(y)}{\theta}h(y)\mathrm{d}y}{1+\theta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(y)A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(y)\mathrm{d}y}, & \text{if } n=1,\\ \dfrac{h^n\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{1+\theta^{-1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(y)A_k^{\varepsilon,*}(y)\mathrm{d}y}, & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

$$= \begin{cases} h^1 - \frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}-1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(y)h(y)\mathrm{d}y}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z}, & \text{if } n=1,\\ \dfrac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}h^n, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases} \tag{49}$$

We deduce that $\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ is an eigenvector of $D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon$ associated with the eigenvalue $\frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}$, and that every function

$$\tilde{\phi}_k^{\varepsilon,n} := \phi_k^{\varepsilon,1} + \left(\frac{1-\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}-1}\right)\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}(z)\mathrm{d}z}\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}$$

is an eigenvector of $D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon$ associated with the eigenvalue $\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}$. Thus:

$$\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon) \supset \{0\}\cup\left\{\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\right\}_{n\geq 2}\cup\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\right\}$$

Conversely let $\lambda\in\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon)\setminus\{0\}$ be given and $h\in\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k)\setminus\{0\}$ be an associated eigenfunction. If $\operatorname{supp} h\subset\Sigma_k\setminus\Omega_k$ then

$$\lambda h = -\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}-1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(y)h(y)\mathrm{d}y}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_k(z)\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}(z)\mathrm{d}z}\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1},$$

which implies $h=\phi_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ (up to the multiplication by a nonzero scalar), and this is a contradiction. Therefore $\operatorname{supp} h\cap\Omega_k\neq\varnothing$. Then, taking the scalar product with $\phi_k^{\varepsilon,n}$ one finds that (49) still holds. In particular, λ is either one of the $\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}$ or $\frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}$. We have shown:

$$\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon) \subset \{0\}\cup\left\{\frac{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\right\}_{n\geq 2}\cup\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}}\right\},$$

hence the equality holds.

If now $R_{0,1}\leq 1$, we have $A_k^{\varepsilon,*}\equiv 0$ and therefore $D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon = L_k^\varepsilon$. Then

$$\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon) = \sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) = \{0\}\cup\{\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n}\}_{n\geq 1}.$$

Since $\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,n} < \lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}$ for any $k\in\{1,2\}$ and $n\geq 2$, we deduce that whenever $R_{0,k}\neq 1$, there exists $\varepsilon_0>0$ such that for every $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0]$, we have:

$$\sigma\left(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon\right)\subset[0,1). \tag{50}$$

If $R_{0,k}=1$, then (50) holds because of our assumption that $\lambda_k^{\varepsilon,1}\leq 1-C\varepsilon^M$.

Step two: For each $\varepsilon>0$, let $\lambda^\varepsilon\in\sigma(D_{A^\varepsilon}T^\varepsilon)\setminus\{0\}$ be given and consider a bounded family of associated eigenvectors $h^\varepsilon\in\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. We prove that

$$\sup_{\Sigma_k}\left|(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}}T_k^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)h_k^\varepsilon\right| = o(\varepsilon^\infty),\quad k=1,2, \tag{51}$$

for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, where $h_1^\varepsilon := \chi_{\Sigma_1} h^\varepsilon$ and $h_2^\varepsilon := \chi_{\Sigma_2} h^\varepsilon$.

Let us show the property for $k = 1$. The case $k = 2$ will follow by the symmetry of the problem with respect to the coefficients. We rewrite the identity $\chi_{\Sigma_1} D_{A^\varepsilon} T^\varepsilon h^\varepsilon = \lambda^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon$ as follows:

$$(D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I) h_1^\varepsilon = (D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon - D_{A_1^\varepsilon} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon) - D_{A_2^\varepsilon} T_2^\varepsilon h_2^\varepsilon \quad \text{in } \Sigma_1. \tag{52}$$

Our next task is to show that the right-hand side of the previous equation has order $o(\varepsilon^\infty)$. We first remark that, by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\sup_{x \in \Sigma_1} \left| D_{A_2^\varepsilon} T_2^\varepsilon h_2^\varepsilon(x) \right| = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{53}$$

Next we claim that, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, one has

$$\sup_{\Sigma_k} \left| D_{A_1^\varepsilon} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon - D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon \right| = o(\varepsilon^\infty). \tag{54}$$

Indeed, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{A_1^\varepsilon} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon - D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon &= \left(\frac{1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y} - \frac{1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y} \right) L_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon \\ &- \left(\frac{L_1^\varepsilon A_1^\varepsilon}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} - \frac{L_1^\varepsilon A_1^{\varepsilon,*}}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} \right) \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{\beta_1(y)}{\theta} h_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

On the one hand, using Theorem 2.2, we have:

$$\left| \frac{1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y} - \frac{1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y} \right| \leq \frac{\|\beta_1\|_{L^\infty}}{\theta^2} \|A_1^\varepsilon - A_1^{\varepsilon,*}\|_{L^1(\Sigma_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

which settles the first term on the right-hand side of (55). On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L_1^\varepsilon A_1^\varepsilon}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} - \frac{L_1^\varepsilon A_1^{\varepsilon,*}}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} &= \frac{L_1^\varepsilon (A_1^\varepsilon - A_1^{\varepsilon,*})}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\varepsilon(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} - \frac{1}{\left(1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y\right)^2} \right) L_1^\varepsilon A_1^{\varepsilon,*}, \end{aligned}$$

and, for all $x \in \Sigma_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| L_1^\varepsilon (A_1^\varepsilon - A_1^{\varepsilon,*}) \right| (x) &= \frac{|\xi_1 \int_{\Omega_1} m_\varepsilon(x - y) \Psi_1(y) (A_1^\varepsilon(y) - A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y)) \mathrm{d}y|}{(\theta + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y) \mathrm{d}y)^2} \\ &\leq \frac{\xi_1}{\theta^2} \|\Psi_1\|_{L^\infty} \int_{\Omega_1} m\left(\frac{x - y}{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{|A_1^\varepsilon(y) - A_1^{\varepsilon,*}(y)|}{\varepsilon^N} \mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \frac{\xi_1}{\theta^2} \|\Psi_1\|_{L^\infty} \|m\|_{L^\infty} \frac{\|A_1^\varepsilon - A_1^{\varepsilon,*}\|_{L^1(\Omega_1)}}{\varepsilon^N} = o(\varepsilon^\infty), \end{aligned}$$

thus (54) holds. Combining (52), (53) and (55), we have indeed shown (51).

Step three: Assume by contradiction that there exists a sequence $\lambda^\varepsilon \in \sigma(D_{A^\varepsilon} T^\varepsilon)$ with $\varepsilon \to 0$ and such that

$$|\lambda^\varepsilon| \geq 1.$$

Let $h^\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ be a sequence of associated normed (in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$) eigenvectors. Then there is $k \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\sup_{\Sigma_k} |h_k^\varepsilon| = 1$ for infinitely many $\varepsilon > 0$. Using the symmetry with respect to the indices and the possible extraction of subsequences, we will assume in this step that $k = 1$.

Let us first consider the case where $R_{0,1} > 1$. Then, let us define $g^\varepsilon := (D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I) h_1^\varepsilon$. We know from (51) that $\|g^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1)} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$. Taking the inner product with $\phi_1^{\varepsilon,n}$ yields, as in (49):

$$\langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,n} \rangle_{\Psi_1} = \frac{1}{\frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \lambda^\varepsilon} g_n^\varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq 2,$$

where $g_n^\varepsilon := \langle g^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,n}\rangle_{\Psi_1}$. Then,

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \lambda^\varepsilon\right| \geq |\lambda^\varepsilon| - \left|\frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\right| \geq 1 - \frac{|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,2}|}{|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}|} \geq \frac{|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}| - |\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,2}|}{|\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}|} \geq C\varepsilon^M,$$

for some $C > 0$ and $M > 0$ independent of ε and n. This shows:

$$|\langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,n}\rangle_{\Psi_1}| = |g_n^\varepsilon| \times \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-M}), \quad \forall n \geq 2$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\|h_1^\varepsilon - \langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\rangle_{\Psi_1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|^2_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} &= \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty} |\langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,n}\rangle_{\Psi_1}|^2 = \sum_{n=2}^{+\infty}\left|\frac{1}{\frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,n}}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \lambda^\varepsilon} g_n^\varepsilon\right|^2 \\ &\leq C^{-2}\varepsilon^{-2M}\sum_{n=2}^{+\infty}|g_n^\varepsilon|^2 \leq C^{-2}\varepsilon^{-2M}\|g^\varepsilon\|^2_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} = o(\varepsilon^\infty)\end{aligned}$$

by using (51). Let $\mu^\varepsilon := h_1^\varepsilon - \langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\rangle_{\Psi_1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}$, then we have $\|L_1^\varepsilon \mu^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1)} = \mathcal{O}(\|\mu^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}}) = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$. By means of (51), we deduce that:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon + o(\varepsilon^\infty) = D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}} T_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon &= \frac{L_1^\varepsilon(\mu^\varepsilon + \langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\rangle_{\Psi_1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1})}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - 1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(y)h_1^\varepsilon(y)\mathrm{d}y}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1(y)\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} \\ &= \left(\langle h_1^\varepsilon, \phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\rangle_{\Psi_1} - \frac{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} - 1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1 h_1^\varepsilon}{\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\beta_1\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\right)\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} + o(\varepsilon^\infty) := \alpha^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} + o(\varepsilon^\infty). \qquad (56)\end{aligned}$$

Next note that

$$1 \leq |\lambda^\varepsilon| \sup_{x\in\Sigma_1}|h_1^\varepsilon(x)| = |\alpha^\varepsilon| \sup_{x\in\Sigma_1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(x) + o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{x\in\Sigma_1}\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(x) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\sup_{x\in\Sigma_1} L_1^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(x) = \frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}}\sup_{x\in\Sigma_1}\frac{\Lambda\xi_1}{\theta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi_1(y)\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y \\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda\xi_1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}\theta}\frac{\|m\|_{L^\infty}}{\varepsilon^N}\|\Psi_1\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\|_{L^2_{\Psi_k}} = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-N}),\end{aligned}$$

therefore $|\alpha^\varepsilon| \geq C\varepsilon^N$ for some constant $C > 0$. By definition of h^ε and using (53)-(56), it follows that

$$o(\varepsilon^\infty) = (D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,1}}T_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)h_1^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\lambda^\varepsilon}(D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,1}}T_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)(\alpha^\varepsilon\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} + o(\varepsilon^\infty)) = \frac{\alpha^\varepsilon}{\lambda^\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \lambda^\varepsilon\right)\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1} + o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

then multiplying by $\phi_1^{\varepsilon,1}\Psi_1$ and integrating, we get:

$$\left|\frac{1}{\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1}} - \lambda^\varepsilon\right| = o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

Since $\lambda^\varepsilon \geq 1$ and $\lambda_1^{\varepsilon,1} \to R_{0,1} > 1$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain a contradiction.

Now we assume that $R_{0,1} \leq 1$, then we have $A_1^{\varepsilon,*} \equiv 0$, hence

$$D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}}T_1^\varepsilon = L_1^\varepsilon,$$

which leads to

$$r_\sigma(D_{A_1^{\varepsilon,*}}T_1^\varepsilon) = r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to 0]{} R_{0,1} \leq 1.$$

Moreover, by definition of λ^ε and using (51), we have $(L_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)h_1^\varepsilon =: g^\varepsilon = o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ hence

$$\|h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} \leq \|(L_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)^{-1} g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} \leq \|(L_1^\varepsilon - \lambda^\varepsilon I)^{-1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^2_{\Psi_1})} \|g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} = \frac{1}{\mathrm{dist}(\lambda^\varepsilon, \sigma(L_1^\varepsilon))} \|g^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}}.$$

Now let us observe that there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that $\|h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} \geq C\varepsilon^N$ for ε sufficiently small. To see this, note that one has, for all $x \in \Sigma_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |h_1^\varepsilon|(x) &= \frac{1}{|\lambda^\varepsilon|} |L_1^\varepsilon h_1^\varepsilon(x) - g^\varepsilon(x)| \leq \frac{1}{|\lambda^\varepsilon|} \left(\frac{\Lambda \xi_1}{\theta} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x-y) |h_1^\varepsilon|(y) \Psi_1(y) \mathrm{d}y + |g^\varepsilon|(x) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\varepsilon^N} \|h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}} + o(\varepsilon^\infty), \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 0$ is some constant independent of ε. Finally recalling that $\|h_1^\varepsilon\|_{\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1)} = 1$ this prove the expected lower bound for $\|h_1^\varepsilon\|_{L^2_{\Psi_1}}$. This estimate allows us to conclude that

$$\mathrm{dist}(\lambda^\varepsilon, \sigma(L_1^\varepsilon)) = o(\varepsilon^\infty),$$

which is a contradiction since $\lambda^\varepsilon \geq 1$ while

$$\sup\{|\lambda|, \lambda \in \sigma(L_1^\varepsilon)\} = r(L_1^\varepsilon) \leq 1 - C\varepsilon^M,$$

by our assumptions and (50). This completes the proof of Lemma 5.1. □

Our next task is to compute the Leray-Schauder degree of the operator T^ε in a subset of the positive cone, $\mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma)$, of $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. For $\alpha > 0$ we define the open set

$$K_\alpha := \{A \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma) : A(x) > \alpha \quad \forall x \in \Sigma\}.$$

Lemma 5.2 (Computation of the degree)**.** *Assume that $R_{0,1} > 1$. Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any nonnegative nontrivial fixed point $A \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ of T^ε, we have:*

$$A \in K_\alpha.$$

Moreover,

$$deg\,(I - T^\varepsilon, K_\alpha) = 1, \tag{57}$$

where deg denotes the Leray-Schauder degree.

Proof. Our proof relies on the construction of a suitable homotopy which allows us to separate the variables in order to compute the Leray-Schauder degree. For technical reasons, we do not use the same homotopy in the case $R_{0,2} > 1$ and $R_{0,2} < 1$. Therefore, we split the proof into two parts.

Part 1: the case $R_{0,2} > 1$. Let us define, for $\tau \in [0,1]$, $A \in \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma)$ and $(A_1, A_2) := (\chi_{\Sigma_1} A, \chi_{\Sigma_2} A)$, the operators

$$\begin{aligned} T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) &:= \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_1} L_1^\varepsilon A_1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1(y) \mathrm{d}y} + \tau \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_1} L_2^\varepsilon A_2}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(y) A_2(y) \mathrm{d}y} = \chi_{\Sigma_1} T_1^\varepsilon A_1 + \tau \chi_{\Sigma_1} T_2^\varepsilon A_2, \\ T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) &:= \tau \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} L_1^\varepsilon A_1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1(y) \mathrm{d}y} + \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} L_2^\varepsilon A_2}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2(y) A_2(y) \mathrm{d}y} = \tau \chi_{\Sigma_2} T_1^\varepsilon A_1 + \chi_{\Sigma_2} T_2^\varepsilon A_2, \\ T^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) &:= T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau} A + T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau} A \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where T_k^ε is defined in (7) for each $k \in \{1,2\}$. The mapping $\tau \mapsto T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ is continuous from $[0,1]$ into $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{C}(\Sigma))$. Let us first observe that there exists $M > 0$ such that for all $\tau \in [0,1]$, if $A \in \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma)$ satisfies $A = T^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A)$ then $\|A\|_{L^1(\Sigma)} \leq M$. One may also notice that this upper bound can be chosen independently of $\varepsilon > 0$.

We first show that the fixed points of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ can be estimated from below uniformly in $\tau \in (0,1)$. This will allow us to easily compute the Leray-Schauder degree, since $T^{\varepsilon,0}$ is completely uncoupled in its variables.

Step 1: We show that there exists $\alpha > 0$ (independent of $\tau \in [0,1]$) such that

$$\min_{x\in\Sigma}(A^\tau(x)) > \alpha, \tag{59}$$

for any nontrivial and nonnegative A^τ satisfying $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}A^\tau = A^\tau$ for some $\tau \in [0,1]$.

Let $\tau \in [0,1]$ and $(A_1^\tau, A_2^\tau) \in \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma_1) \times \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma_2) \subset L^1_+(\Sigma_1) \times L^1_+(\Sigma_2)$ be a nontrivial fixed point of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$, *i.e.* $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A_1^\tau + A_2^\tau) = (A_1^\tau + A_2^\tau)$. We remark that

$$T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau}A^\tau \geq T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau}A_1^\tau = \chi_{\Sigma_1}T_1^\varepsilon A_1^\tau \quad \text{and} \quad T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau}A^\tau \geq T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau}A_2^\tau = \chi_{\Sigma_2}T_2^\varepsilon A_2^\tau.$$

In particular, we have

$$A_k^\tau = (T_k^{\varepsilon,\tau})^n A^\tau \geq \chi_{\Sigma_k}(T_k^\varepsilon)^n A_k^\tau, \tag{60}$$

everywhere in Σ_k and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 1,2$. Since $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) = R_{0,k} > 1$, we can find $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that $r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) > 1$ and $r_\sigma(L_2^\varepsilon) > 1$ for any $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0,\varepsilon_0]$ be given, then using (19) we get

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T_k^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2}(r_\sigma(L_k^\varepsilon) - 1) > 0,$$

for any $k \in \{1,2\}$ and any $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Sigma_k) \setminus \{0\}$. We deduce that there exists $\eta > 0$ (independent of ε small and τ) such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)A_k^\tau(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(y)(T_k^\varepsilon)^n(A_k^\tau)(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq \eta \tag{61}$$

for any $k \in \{1,2\}$. Next, using (25) and since the fixed points of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ are bounded by some constant M in $L^1(\Sigma)$, we obtain $A_k^\tau = T_k^{\varepsilon,\tau}A^\tau \leq L_k^\varepsilon A_k^\tau + o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ where $o(\varepsilon^\infty)$ is uniform with respect to $\tau \in [0,1]$ and $x \in \Sigma_k$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(x)A_k^\tau(x)\mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\Lambda\xi_k}{\theta}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_k(x)m_\varepsilon(x-y)A_k^\tau(y)\Psi_k(y)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x + o(\varepsilon^\infty)\\ &\leq \frac{\Lambda\xi_k\|\beta_k\|_{L^\infty}}{\theta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \Psi_k(y)A_k^\tau(y)\mathrm{d}y + o(\varepsilon^\infty).\end{aligned}$$

Using (60), we get for any $k \in \{1,2\}$ and any $x \in \Sigma_k$:

$$\begin{aligned}A_k^\tau(x) &\geq \frac{\Lambda\xi_k}{\theta + M\|\beta_k\|_{L^\infty}}\int_{\Omega_k} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi_k(y)A_k^\tau(y)\mathrm{d}y\\ &\geq \frac{\Lambda\xi_k}{\theta + M\|\beta_k\|_{L^\infty}}\min_{x\in\Sigma_k}\min_{\tau\in[0,1]}\int_{\Omega_k} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi_k(y)A_k^{\varepsilon,\tau}(y)\mathrm{d}y \geq c(\varepsilon).\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $M > 0$ and $c(\varepsilon) > 0$ independent of A^τ and $\tau \in [0,1]$. This shows (59) and thus that, for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists $\alpha = \alpha(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that for any $\tau \in [0,1]$, any nontrivial and nonnegative fixed points A^τ of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ satisfies $A^\tau \in K_\alpha$.

Step 2: We compute the Leray-Schauder degree of the operator T^ε in the open set K_α.

We have shown in the previous step that $A \in K_\alpha$ for any positive fixed point of the operator $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ with $\tau \in (0,1]$. In particular, there is no fixed point of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ on the boundary of K_α for $\tau \in (0,1]$. For $\tau = 0$, the operator $T^{\varepsilon,0}$ is uncoupled and hence we can compute the set of nonnegative fixed points of $T^{\varepsilon,0}$, which is $\{(0,0),(A_1^{\varepsilon,*},0),(0,A_2^{\varepsilon,*}),(A_1^{\varepsilon,*},A_2^{\varepsilon,*})\}$. None of those points lie in the boundary of K_α. In particular, [5, Theorem 11.8] applies and shows that the Leray-Schauder degree in K_α is independent of τ, *i.e.*

$$\deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,0}, K_\alpha) = \deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,1}, K_\alpha).$$

Since $T^{\varepsilon,0}$ is uncoupled with respect to $(A_1,A_2) \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_1)\times\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_2)$, the product property of the Leray-Schauder degree (see [5, Theorem 11.3]) implies that:

$$\deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,0}, K_\alpha) = \deg(I - T_1^\varepsilon, K_\alpha^1) \times \deg(I - T_2^\varepsilon, K_\alpha^2),$$

where $K_\alpha^k := \{A_k \in \mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k) \,|\, A_k(x) > \alpha, \forall x \in \Sigma_k\}$ for $k \in \{1,2\}$. Finally, since T_k^ε has exactly one fixed point in K_α^k and $1 \notin \sigma\left(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon\right)$, the degree of the nonlinear operator T_k^ε can be linked to the degree of its Fréchet differential near $A_k^{\varepsilon,*}$ (see [5, Theorem 22.3]):

$$\deg(I - T_k^\varepsilon, K_\alpha^k) = \deg(I - D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon, B(0,1)),$$

where $B(0,1)$ is the open ball of radius 1 in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma_k)$. The explicit formula of the degree of linear operators (see [5, Theorem 21.10]) allows us to conclude that:

$$\deg(I - D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon, B(0,1)) = 1,$$

since $\sigma(D_{A_k^{\varepsilon,*}} T_k^\varepsilon) \subset (-1,1)$ for $k \in \{1,2\}$. This shows (57) and ends the proof of Lemma 5.2 in the case $R_{0,2} > 1$.

Part 2: the case $R_{0,2} \leq 1$. In this case we cannot use the same homotopy as in Part 1 to compute the Leray-Schauder degree, because T_2^ε has no nonnegative nontrivial fixed point. Instead, we define, for $\tau \in [0,1]$, $A \in \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma)$ and $(A_1, A_2) := (\chi_{\Sigma_1} A, \chi_{\Sigma_2} A)$, the operators

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) :&= \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_1} L_1^\varepsilon A_1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1(y) \mathrm{d}y} + \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_1} L_2^{\varepsilon,\tau} A_2}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2^\tau(y) A_2(y) \mathrm{d}y}, \\
T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) :&= \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} L_1^\varepsilon A_1}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1(y) \mathrm{d}y} + \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} L_2^{\varepsilon,\tau} A_2}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_2^\tau(y) A_2(y) \mathrm{d}y}, \\
T^{\varepsilon,\tau}(A) :&= T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau} A + T_2^{\varepsilon,\tau} A.
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where $\beta_2^\tau(y) := \left(1 + \tau\left(\frac{2}{R_{0,2}} - 1\right)\right) \beta_2(y)$, $\Psi_2^\tau(y) := \frac{\beta_2^\tau(y) r_2(y)}{\delta(\theta + d_2(y))}$ and

$$L_2^{\varepsilon,\tau} \varphi = \frac{\Lambda}{\theta} \int_{\Omega_2} m_\varepsilon(x-y) \xi_2 \Psi_2^\tau(y) \varphi(y) \mathrm{d}y$$

which is well-defined since $R_{0,2} > 0$ (recall that $\Psi_2 \not\equiv 0$ by Assumption 1). This corresponds to artificially increasing the basic reproductive number of the second equation until it becomes greater than 1. In particular, for $\tau = 1$ we are in the same situation as in Part 1 since

$$\frac{\Lambda}{\theta} \xi_2 \|\Psi_2^1\|_{L^\infty} = 2.$$

Note that, as above, there exists $M > 0$ such that for all $\tau \in [0,1]$, any fixed point $A^\tau \in \mathcal{C}_+(\Sigma)$ of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$ satisfies $\|A^\tau\|_{L^1(\Sigma)} \leq M$. Here our only task consists in finding a uniform lower bound for the fixed point of $T^{\varepsilon,\tau}$.

Claim: There is $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $\tau \in (0,1)$ and any nonnegative nontrivial A^τ solution to $T^{\varepsilon,\tau} A^\tau = A^\tau$, we have $A \in K_\alpha$.

Indeed, let A^τ be such a fixed point. We first remark that $A_1^\tau \geq \chi_{\Sigma_1} (T_1^\varepsilon)^n A_1^\tau$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, hence:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\tau(y) \mathrm{d}y \geq \limsup_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) (T_1^\varepsilon)^n (A_1^\tau)(y) \mathrm{d}y \geq \frac{\theta}{2}(r_\sigma(L_1^\varepsilon) - 1) > 0,$$

where we have used (19) as in the Step 1 of Part 1. Thus, we have

$$A_1^\tau(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda \xi_k c(\varepsilon)}{\theta + M \|\beta_1\|_{L^\infty}} \geq \eta > 0, \qquad \forall x \in \Sigma_1$$

for some constants $M > 0$ and $\eta > 0$. To estimate A_2^τ, we remark that

$$A_2^\tau \geq \chi_{\Sigma_2} T_1^\varepsilon A_1^\tau = \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} L_1^\varepsilon A_1^\tau}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\tau(y) \mathrm{d}y} = \frac{\Lambda}{\theta} \frac{\chi_{\Sigma_2} \int_{\Omega_1} m_\varepsilon(\cdot - y) \xi_1 \Psi_1(y) A_1^\tau(y) \mathrm{d}y}{1 + \theta^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(y) A_1^\tau(y) \mathrm{d}y}$$

and, as in Part one, we have $A_1^\tau = T_1^{\varepsilon,\tau} A^\tau \leq L_1^\varepsilon A_1^\tau + o(\varepsilon^\infty)$, and thus

$$\eta \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(x) A_1^\tau(x) \mathrm{d}x \leq \frac{\Lambda \xi_1}{\theta} \iint_{\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N} \beta_1(x) m_\varepsilon(x-y) A_1^\tau(y) \Psi_1(y) \mathrm{d}y \mathrm{d}x + o(\varepsilon^\infty)$$

$$\leq \frac{\Lambda\xi_1\|\beta_1\|_\infty}{\theta}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\Psi_1(y)A_1^\tau(y)\mathrm{d}y + o(\varepsilon^\infty).$$

We conclude

$$A_2^\tau(x) \geq \frac{\Lambda\xi_1\eta}{\theta + M\|\beta_1\|_{L^\infty}}\min_{x\in\Sigma_2}\int_{\Omega_1} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\mathrm{d}y > 0$$

for every $x \in \Sigma_2$. This proves our Claim.

To finish the proof of the second part, we remark that the Leray-Schauder degree is independent of τ (see [5, Theorem 11.8]), *i.e.*

$$\deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,0}, K_\alpha) = \deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,1}, K_\alpha),$$

and we have proved in Part 1 that, for α sufficiently small, we have $\deg(I - T^{\varepsilon,1}, K_\alpha) = 1$. This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.2. □

Lemma 5.3. *There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for every $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$, there is a finite number of nonnegative nontrivial fixed point of T^ε.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and assume by contradiction that there exists infinitely many fixed points of T^ε. Since T^ε is compact from $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$ into itself, there exists a sequence $A^n \in \overline{K_\alpha}$ of fixed points of T^ε and $\overline{A}$ such that

$$\|A^n - \overline{A}\|_{L^\infty} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0.$$

By definition we have $T^\varepsilon(A^n) = A^n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the continuity of T^ε we get

$$T^\varepsilon(\overline{A}) = \overline{A}.$$

Since T^ε is Fréchet differentiable at the point $\overline{A}$, we have as $n \to \infty$

$$\frac{\overline{A} - A^n}{\|\overline{A} - A^n\|_{L^\infty}} = \frac{T^\varepsilon(\overline{A}) - T^\varepsilon(A^n)}{\|\overline{A} - A^n\|_{L^\infty}} = \frac{1}{\|\overline{A} - A^n\|_{L^\infty}} D_{\overline{A}}T^\varepsilon\left(A^n - \overline{A}\right) + o(1).$$

Let us define

$$U^n = \frac{\overline{A} - A^n}{\|\overline{A} - A^n\|_{L^\infty}},$$

then we have

$$U^n := D_{\overline{A}}T^\varepsilon U^n + o(1) \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

By the compactness of T^ε, we can extract from U^n a subsequence $\bar{U}^n$ which converges to U^∞ with $\|U^\infty\|_{L^\infty} = 1$. We conclude

$$U^\infty = D_{\overline{A}}T^{\varepsilon,1}U^\infty$$

which is a contradiction since $1 \notin \sigma(D_{\overline{A}}T^{\varepsilon,1})$ by Lemma 5.1. This finishes the proof of Lemma 5.3. □

We can finally prove the uniqueness for $\varepsilon > 0$ small:

Proof of Theorem 2.4. By Lemma 5.3, there exists a finite number N_ε of fixed points of T_τ^ε. Denote by $A^{\varepsilon,i}$, $i \in [\![1, N_\varepsilon]\!]$ an enumeration of the fixed points of T_τ^ε. By the additivity property of the Leray-Schauder degree (see [5, Theorem 11.4, p. 79] and [5, Theorem 11.5, p. 79]), we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\deg\left(I - T^\varepsilon, K_\alpha\right) &= \deg\left(I - T^\varepsilon, \bigcup_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon} B(A^{\varepsilon,i}, \eta)\right)\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{N_\varepsilon}\deg\left(I - T^\varepsilon, B(A^{\varepsilon,i}, \eta)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{63}$$

for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small, where $\alpha > 0$ is the constant from Lemma 5.2 and $B(A^{\varepsilon,i}, \eta)$ is the ball of center $A^{\varepsilon,i}$ and of radius η in $\mathcal{C}(\Sigma)$. Next, using [5, Theorem 22.3], we can link the degree of T^ε to the one of its Fréchet derivative close to a fixed point:

$$\deg\left(I - T^{\varepsilon,1}, B(A^{\varepsilon,i}, \eta)\right) = \deg\left(I - D_{A^{\varepsilon,i}} T^{\varepsilon,1}, B(0,1)\right) = 1$$

for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small and for every $i \in [\![1, N_\varepsilon]\!]$. This leads to

$$\deg\left(I - T^{\varepsilon,1}, K_\alpha\right) = N_\varepsilon,$$

where we have used (63). Since we have shown in Lemma 5.2 that $\deg(I - T^\varepsilon, K_\alpha) = 1$, we conclude that $N_\varepsilon = 1$. We have proven the uniqueness of the nonnegative nontrivial fixed point of T^ε for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, which finishes the proof of Theorem 2.4. □

A Spectral properties of a weighted convolution operator

In this appendix, we state and recall some basic spectral properties of a weighted convolution operator of the form

$$L^\varepsilon = m_\varepsilon \star (\psi \cdot), \tag{64}$$

where $m_\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-N} m\left(\varepsilon^{-1} \cdot\right)$, m satisfies Assumption 1 and $\psi : \mathbb{R}^N \to [0, \infty)$ is a non-zero continuous function tending to 0 at infinity. Define the set

$$\Omega = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : \ \psi(x) > 0\}.$$

We start this section by reminding the following definition about positive operators:

Definition 1. *Let $p \geq 1$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $K \in \mathcal{L}(L^p(I))$. We denote by*

$$L^p_+(I) := \{\varphi \in L^p(I) : \varphi(x) \geq 0 \ a.e.\}$$

the positive cone of $L^p(I)$. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the duality product between $L^p(I)$ and its dual $L^{p'}(I)$ where $1/p + 1/p' = 1$. For $\varphi \in L^p(I)$, the notation $\varphi > 0$ will refer to $\varphi \in L^p_+(I)$ and $\varphi \not\equiv 0$ while the notation $\varphi >> 0$ will refer to $\varphi \in L^p_+(I)$ and $\varphi(x) > 0$ a.e. We say that:

1. *K is positive if $K\varphi \in L^p_+(I)$ for every $\varphi \in L^p_+(I)$;*
2. *K is positivity improving if, for every $\varphi \in L^p(I), \varphi > 0$ and $\phi \in L^{p'}(I), \phi > 0$, we have $\langle K\varphi, \phi \rangle > 0$.*

We start with the following useful lemma:

Lemma A.1. *Let Assumption 1 hold. Then the following properties hold:*

1. *For every $p \geq 1$, the operator L^ε defined in (64) considered as an endomorphism on $L^p(\Omega)$ or $\mathcal{C}(\Omega)$ is compact and positivity improving. Its spectrum $\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \backslash \{0\}$ is composed of isolated eigenvalues with finite algebraic multiplicity and is independent of p. The spectral radius, denoted by $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ is a positive algebraically simple eigenvalue and is such that there exists a function $\phi^{\varepsilon,1} \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (independent of p) satisfying*

$$\phi^{\varepsilon,1} >> 0, \qquad L^\varepsilon \phi^{\varepsilon,1} = r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)\phi^{\varepsilon,1}.$$

Finally, if $\phi \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^N), \phi > 0$ satisfies the equality $L^\varepsilon \phi = \alpha\phi$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\phi >> 0$ if and only if ($\phi \in span(\phi_p)$ and $\alpha = r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$).

2. *Suppose that Ω is bounded. Then we have $\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = \sigma(S^\varepsilon)$, where*

$$S^\varepsilon : L^2(\Omega) \ni \varphi(x) \mapsto \sqrt{\Psi(x)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} m_\varepsilon(x - y)\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y \in L^2(\Omega) \tag{65}$$

and we have a Rayleigh formula for $r_\sigma(S^\varepsilon)$:

$$r_\sigma(S^\varepsilon) = \sup_{\substack{\varphi \in L^2(\Omega) \\ \|\varphi\|_{L^2(\Omega)} = 1}} \int_\Omega \int_\Omega \sqrt{\Psi(x)}\sqrt{\Psi(y)} m_\varepsilon(x - y)\varphi(x)\varphi(y)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y. \tag{66}$$

3. We have

$$r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}$$

and moreover

$$r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \xrightarrow[\varepsilon\to 0]{} \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}$$

Proof. Item 1 is rather classical and we refer the interested reader to [15] for a proof. We concentrate on the proof of the remaining items 2 and 3.

Let us show Item 2. Let $\lambda \in \sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ be an eigenvalue and $\varphi \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ be the associated eigenvector for L^ε, i.e.

$$L^\varepsilon\varphi(x) = \int_\Omega m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi(y)\varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y = \lambda\varphi.$$

Multiplying the above equation by $\sqrt{\Psi(x)}$, we get:

$$\sqrt{\Psi(x)}\int_\Omega m_\varepsilon(x-y)\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y = \lambda\sqrt{\Psi(x)}\varphi(x).$$

$$\iff \qquad S^\varepsilon\Phi(x) = \lambda\Phi(x),$$

with $\Phi(x) := \sqrt{\Psi(x)}\varphi(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega)$ since Ω is supposed bounded. Therefore $\lambda \in \sigma(S^\varepsilon)$. We have shown:

$$\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \subset \sigma(S^\varepsilon).$$

Let us show the reverse inclusion. By the same arguments as in Step 1, the operator S^ε is compact on $L^2(\Omega)$ and therefore its spectrum is equal to its point spectrum. Let $\lambda \in \sigma(S^\varepsilon)\backslash\{0\}$ be an eigenvalue and $\Phi \in L^2(\Omega)$ be an associated eigenvector. Then:

$$\frac{\Phi(x)}{\sqrt{\Psi(x)}} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\cdot\int_\Omega m_\varepsilon(x-y)\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\Phi(y)\mathrm{d}y \in L^\infty(\Omega),$$

therefore $\Phi(x) = \varphi(x)\sqrt{\Psi(x)}$ for some $\varphi(x) \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. The function φ satisfies:

$$\lambda\varphi(x) = \int_\Omega m_\varepsilon(x-y)\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\sqrt{\Psi(y)}\varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y = L^\varepsilon\varphi(x),$$

thus $\lambda \in \sigma(L^\varepsilon)$. We have shown

$$\sigma(S^\varepsilon) \subset \sigma(L^\varepsilon),$$

which shows the first part of Item 2. Formula (66) is classical for positive and symmetric operators.

Finally, we show Item 3. Let $\phi^{\varepsilon,1}$ be the eigenfunction of L^ε associated with $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$, normalised so that $\int_\Omega \phi^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y = 1$. We first notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)\int_\Omega \phi^{\varepsilon,1}(x)\mathrm{d}x &= \iint_{\Omega\times\Omega} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\Psi(y)\phi^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}\int_\Omega\int_\Omega m_\varepsilon(x-y)\mathrm{d}x\,\phi^{\varepsilon,1}(y)\mathrm{d}y \leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}. \end{aligned}$$

Next let $x_0 \in \Omega$ be such that $\Psi(x_0) = \sup_{x\in\Omega}\Psi(x_0)$. Using (66) with the test function $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|B(x_0,r)|}}\chi_{B(x_0,r)}(x)$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) = r_\sigma(S^\varepsilon) &\geq \frac{1}{|B(x_0,r)|}\iint_{\Omega\times\Omega}\sqrt{\Psi(x)}\sqrt{\Psi(y)}m_\varepsilon(x-y)\chi_{B(x_0,r)}(x)\chi_{B(x_0,r)}(y)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \\ &\geq \left(\inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)}\sqrt{\Psi(x)}\right)^2\frac{1}{|B(x_0,r)|}\iint_{B(x_0,r)^2} m_\varepsilon(x-y)\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y \\ &= \inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)}\Psi(x)\frac{1}{|B(x_0,r)|}\varepsilon^N\iint_{B(x_0,r/\varepsilon)^2} m\left(x-y\right)\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}x \end{aligned}$$

$$= \inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)} \Psi(x) \frac{\varepsilon^N \left|B\left(x_0, \frac{r}{\varepsilon}\right)\right|}{|B(x_0,r)|} \int_{B(0,r/\varepsilon)} m\left(y\right) \mathrm{d}y$$

$$= \inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)} \Psi(x) \int_{B(0,r/\varepsilon)} m\left(y\right) \mathrm{d}y \underset{\varepsilon\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)} \Psi(x),$$

for $r > 0$ sufficiently small so that $B(x_0, r) \subset \Omega$. This shows:

$$\inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)} \Psi(x) \leq \liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0} r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \leq \limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0} r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) \leq \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Since $\lim_{r\to 0} \inf_{x\in B(x_0,r)} \Psi(x) = \|\Psi\|_{L^\infty}$, we have shown Item 3. This ends the proof of Lemma A.1. □

We now give some asymptotic results of compact and positivity improving operators. The following result is classical but we give the proof for completeness:

Lemma A.2. *Let Assumption 1 hold.*

1. *The operator L^ε defined in* (64) *satisfies $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 0$ and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0$$

   for every $\varphi \in L^1(\Omega)$, where Π is the finite-rank projection into Ker$(I - \frac{L^\varepsilon}{r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)})$. Moreover Π is positivity improving.

2. *If $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \infty$$

   for every $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$. If $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) < 1$, then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0$$

   for every $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. **Step one:** We show Item 1.

Since L^ε is compact and positivity improving, then $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 0$ by [13, Theorem 3] and $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ is a simple eigenvalue of L^ε (see Lemma A.1). We recall that

$$L^1(\Omega) = \mathrm{Ker}\left(I - \frac{L^\varepsilon}{r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)}\right) \oplus \mathcal{R}(I - \Pi).$$

It is known that the projection Π is given by the formula:

$$\Pi(\varphi) = \frac{\langle \phi', \varphi\rangle}{\langle \phi', \phi\rangle}\phi$$

where ϕ and ϕ' are respectively the eigenfunctions of L^ε and its dual $(L^\varepsilon)'$, associated to $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$. Note that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$ is a pole of the resolvent of L^ε and an eigenvalue of $(L^\varepsilon)'$ by the Krein-Rutman theorem (see e.g. [23, Theorem 4.1.4, p. 250] and [23, Theorem 4.1.5, p. 251]). Moreover, $\phi' >> 0$ (see e.g. [26, Proposition 4]). Consequently Π is positivity improving and for every $\varphi \in L^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$L^\varepsilon(\varphi) = L^\varepsilon(\Pi(\varphi)) + L^\varepsilon(I - \Pi)(\varphi) = r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)\Pi(\varphi) + L^\varepsilon(I - \Pi)(\varphi)$$

and by induction

$$(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi) = (r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n \Pi(\varphi) + \left[L^\varepsilon(I - \Pi)\right]^n(\varphi)$$

for every $n \geq 0$. We deduce that

$$\left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \frac{\|(L^\varepsilon(I - \Pi))^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n}$$

$$\leq \frac{\|(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi))^n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^1(\Omega))}}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n}\|\varphi\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

On one hand it is known (see e.g. [12, Theorem 1.5.4, p. 30]) that

$$\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) = \sigma(L^\varepsilon) \setminus \{r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)\},$$

and therefore

$$r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) < r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon).$$

On the other hand, the Gelfand equality implies that

$$r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{\|(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi))^n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^1(\Omega))}}$$

thus

$$\|(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi))^n\|_{\mathcal{L}(L^1(\Omega))} \leq (r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) + \eta)^n$$

for any $\eta > 0$ and n large enough. Consequently we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \left(\frac{r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) + \eta}{r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)} \right)^n \|\varphi\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = 0$$

where $\eta > 0$ is chosen such that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon(I-\Pi)) + \eta < r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon)$. This shows that Item 1 holds.

Step two: We show Item 2. Suppose first that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) < 1$. Let $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Omega)$. We notice by Item 1, that we have:

$$0 = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \|\Pi(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Assume by contradiction that:

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} > 0.$$

Then, there exist $\eta > 0$ and a sequence $n_k \to \infty$ such that

$$\|(L^\varepsilon)^{n_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \eta > 0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\eta}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^{n_k}} \leq \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^{n_k}(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^{n_k}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \|\Pi(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + o_{k\to\infty}(1),$$

which is a contradiction.

Now, suppose that $r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon) > 1$ and let $\varphi \in L^1_+(\Omega)$ such that $\int_\Omega \varphi(y)\mathrm{d}y > 0$. Again, by Item 1, we have

$$0 = \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} - \Pi(\varphi) \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \|\Pi(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} - \limsup_{n\to\infty} \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^n} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Assume by contradiction that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \|(L^\varepsilon)^n(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} < \infty.$$

Then, there is $\eta > 0$ and a sequence $n_k \to \infty$ such that

$$\|(L^\varepsilon)^{n_k}\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq \eta < \infty.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{\eta}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^{n_k}} \geq \left\| \frac{(L^\varepsilon)^{n_k}(\varphi)}{(r_\sigma(L^\varepsilon))^{n_k}} \right\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \geq \|\Pi(\varphi)\|_{L^1(\Omega)} + o_{k\to\infty}(1),$$

which is a contradiction and item 2 is proved. This finishes the proof of Lemma A.2. □

References

[1] L Abi Rizk, J.-B Burie, and A Ducrot. Travelling wave solutions for a non-local evolutionary-epidemic system. *J. Differential Equations*, 267(2):1467–1509, 2019.

[2] M Alfaro and M Veruete. Evolutionary branching via replicator–mutator equations. *J. Dynam. Differential Equations*, Jul 2018.

[3] V I Bogachev. *Measure theory. Vol. I, II.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2007.

[4] O Bonnefon, J Coville, and G Legendre. Concentration phenomenon in some non-local equation. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 22(3):763–781, 2017.

[5] R F Brown. *A topological introduction to nonlinear analysis.* Springer, Cham, third edition edition, 2014.

[6] R Bürger and I Bomze. Stationary distributions under mutation-selection balance: structure and properties. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.*, 28(1):227–251, 1996.

[7] J.-B Burie, R Djidjou-Demasse, and A Ducrot. Slow convergence to equilibrium for an evolutionary epidemiology integro-differential system. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B*, 22, 2017.

[8] J.-B Burie, R Djidjou-Demasse, and A Ducrot. Asymptotic and transient behaviour for a nonlocal problem arising in population genetics. *European J. Appl. Math.*, page 1–27, 2018.

[9] A Calsina and S Cuadrado. Stationary solutions of a selection mutation model: the pure mutation case. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 15(7):1091–1117, 2005.

[10] A Calsina, S Cuadrado, L Desvillettes, and G Raoul. Asymptotics of steady states of a selection-mutation equation for small mutation rate. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 143(6):1123–1146, 2013.

[11] J F Crow and M Kimura. *An introduction to population genetics theory.* Harper & Row, Publishers, New York-London, 1970.

[12] E B Davies. *Linear operators and their spectra*, volume 106 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.

[13] B de Pagter. Irreducible compact operators. *Math. Z.*, 192(1):149–153, 1986.

[14] O Diekmann, P.-E Jabin, S Mischler, and B Perthame. The dynamics of adaptation: An illuminating example and a hamilton–jacobi approach. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 67(4):257 – 271, 2005.

[15] R Djidjou-Demasse, A Ducrot, and F Fabre. Steady state concentration for a phenotypic structured problem modeling the evolutionary epidemiology of spore producing pathogens. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 27(2):385–426, 2017.

[16] R Djidjou-Demasse, S Lion, A Ducrot, J.-B Burie, and F Fabre. Evolution of pathogen traits in response to quantitative host resistance in heterogeneous environments. *bioRxiv*, 2018.

[17] A Ducrot and S Madec. Singularly perturbed elliptic system modeling the competitive interactions for a single resource. *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, 23(11):1939–1977, 2013.

[18] Q Griette. Singular measure traveling waves in an epidemiological model with continuous phenotypes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(6):4411–4458, 2019.

[19] M Kimura. A stochastic model concerning the maintenance of genetic variability in quantitative characters. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 54(3):731–736, 1965.

[20] S Li, J Wu, and Y Dong. Uniqueness and stability of positive solutions for a diffusive predator-prey model in heterogeneous environment. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 58(3):Art. 110, 42, 2019.

[21] G Lo Iacono, F van den Bosch, and N Paveley. The evolution of plant pathogens in response to host resistance: factors affecting the gain from deployment of qualitative and quantitative resistance. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 304:152–163, 2012.

[22] P Magal and X.-Q Zhao. Global attractors and steady states for uniformly persistent dynamical systems. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 37(1):251–275, 2005.

[23] P Meyer-Nieberg. *Banach lattices.* Universitext. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.

[24] M Reed and B Simon. *Methods of modern mathematical physics. I. Functional analysis.* Academic Press, New York-London, 1972.

[25] E Zeidler. *Nonlinear functional analysis and its applications. I.* Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986. Fixed-point theorems, Translated from the German by Peter R. Wadsack.

[26] M Zerner. Quelques propriétés spectrales des opérateurs positifs. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 72(2):381 – 417, 1987.